J
11
1R
appx
V. 113
June-July
1967

Appendix

Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 31, 1967

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to attend the 25th anniversary observance of Zionist Day in Birmingham, Ala., this past weekend, and I am taking the privilege today of including in the RECORD my remarks to that fine organization.

I should like to point out that one seldom meets so thoroughly dedicated a group as it was my pleasure to associate with over the weekend in Birmingham. The officers of the Birmingham District, ZOA, are Charles Kimerling, president; Max Slaughter, vice president; Norman Niren, secretary; Morris Fisher, treasurer, and Mr. Harry Jaffe, who handled the arrangements for my visit to Birmingham.

My remarks follow:

ADDRESS OF CONGRESSMAN ROMAN C. PUCINSKI AT THE ZIONIST ORGANIZATION OF AMERICA DINNER IN BIRMINGHAM, ALA., SUNDAY, MAY 28, 1967

Not long ago, Reinhold Niebuhr spoke to each of us when he said, "Man's capacity for justice makes democracy possible, but man's inclination to injustice makes democracy *necessary*."

We stand here tonight in the name of freedom.

We stand here tonight in a moment of great irony for the world. For as the world pays tribute to the 19th Anniversary of the Independence of Israel, her very sovereignty and exsitence are being more seriously threatened today than ever before in the past two decades.

For Israel today—despite 19 years of incessant and unyielding harassment by her warring neighbors is not only a free state—Israel is also an ideal.

Nothing is more irresistible than an idea whose time has come.

Ideas, toiling up throughout the centuries leave few milestones by the road.

History remembers, and gratefully, Pericles and the assembly at Athens which traced outlines of beauty.

History remembers Justinian and his code for the idea that law has majesty in itself. For law is the crystallized conscience of man.

History remembers the meadow at Runnymede; the birth of the Magna Carta which freed man from fear of the state.

History remembers the Constitutional Convention; The Bill of Rights—and for years to come, it must remember the rebirth of conscience 19 years ago when the world restored to the Jewish people their homeland and gave a new dimension to human dignity.

Today, as that rebirth of conscience is being seriously threatened in the attacks on Israel by the Arab states, we as Americans and, yes, the entire free world, must recall the firm commitments made toward the principle that an attack against Israel is an attack against freedom itself.

We must recall the words of President Johnson when on August 2, 1966, during the Washington visit of Israeli President Shazar, the President said, "We subscribe to the policy stated by President Kennedy on May 6, 1963, that we support the security of both Israel and her neighbors and we strongly oppose the use of force in the Near East."

We must resolutely recall this same principle enunciated by President Eisenhower in his message to Congress on January 5, 1957.

History demands that we also recall the administration of President Truman, when America joined Britain and France in the Tri-Partite Declaration of 1950 which said in part:

"The three governments take this opportunity of declaring their deep interest and their desire to promote the establishment and maintenance of peace and stability in the area and their unaltered opposition to the use of force or threat of force by any of the states in the area of the Middle East."

If justice and reason are to prevail, we must also recall and remind the nations of the world that in 1956 the United States joined with the other nations of the world in endorsing the resolution of the General Assembly of the United Nations to send a United Nations peacekeeping force to Egypt.

The whole rationale of that deep-rooted resolution to preserve peace in the Middle East has been demolished with U Thant's hasty agreement to meet Egypt's demand that those same peace-keeping troops must be removed.

If man has any respect for justice, he must recall the impassioned plea of only a few days ago by Israeli Prime Minister Levi Eshkol to Egypt that she pull back her trooks from the border of Israel and Eshkol's solemn pledge that Israel would do the same.

Today as Israel's freedom is again threatened, America and the entire free world must use all resources at our command to impress upon Egypt the inherent dangers embodied in Egypt's demand for withdrawal of United Nations troops.

We must, above all, remind our own people here in the United States that the problem in the Middle East today is not a problem involving Israel alone. It would be a tragic mistake to treat this as a "Jewish problem" for, indeed, Israel today stands alone as the bastion in the Middle East against the Soviet Union's bold design to use the Middle East as the gateway for ultimate conquest by the communists of the entire continent of Africa.

It would be even a more tragic mistake to let Israel alone suffer the full brunt of her determination to check Soviet expansion. This is a task for the entire free world and not Israel alone.

We must firmly support President Johnson's unequivocal statement that the Gulf of Aqaba and the Straights of Tiran are international water, open to all shipping, including Israeli, and that we shall never agree to any limitations on such shipping for, indeed, America's own national interest is vitally involved in preserving these troubled waters as international waters.

We must support whatever measures are necessary by the United States to impress upon the Egyptian government the dangers of miscalculating America's unyielding and unbending determination to preserve the sovereignty of Israel, which we helped to establish 19 years ago.

There is no more indisputable fact in the annals of civilization than the fact that every single major conflict started by man since the birth of civilization has been started by a miscalculation.

The most tragic miscalculation in the history of man was perpetuated by Hitler when he failed to understand that sooner or later America would come to the defense of freedom against this tyranny.

The lives of 6 million Jews tragically murdered for no other reason than their religious beliefs could have been spared; the great tragedy of World War II and the massive loss of lives on all sides; the destruction beyond a thousand hurricanes could have been spared if Hitler had not engaged in this monstrous miscalculation of the world's stubborn refusal to yield to tyranny.

Finally we must support the use of the full influence and leadership of the United States to halt continuous attacks on Israel and permit that Nation as well as all the nations in the Middle East to develop their resources in an atmosphere of peace and mutual understanding.

If freedom is to survive, the Middle East must not be permitted to become a holocaust of man's inhumanity to his fellow man.

For, at the heart of that freedom is the belief that the individual man, the child of God, is the hallmark of value, and all society, all groups, the state itself, exist for his benefit.

The world's population now stands at more than 3.3 billion, double the figure of 1900.

At the present rate of growth, the human race will number 7 billion souls by the year 2,000.

Half of today's world population has been born since the end of World War II.

Of the children entering this life, 85% are born in the underdeveloped nations of Asia, Africa and Latin America. The population of Latin America is tripling every 35 years.

Occupying 6% of the land area of the world and with less than 6% of the population, the United States accounts for on-third of the world's gross national product. Our future is inescapable and burdensome.

Of the world's children under 6 years of age, 70% suffer from malnutrition.

Currently, the world's population if receiving an average diet of 2,100 calories per person per day. By the year 2,000, this will drop to an average of 1,340 calories per person per day. Experts say the absolute starvation level is 1,350 calories per day.

Starvation in May of 1967 is killing an estimated 12,000 people each and every day—four million each year.

Two-thirds of the world's population lives in areas where the per capita income is $160 a year or less.

Forty-five per cent of the population of the world's poorest nations is under 15 years of age.

Horrifying statistics, you think, incredible. Unbelieveable, perhaps. But chilling realisties to men who have seen The Apocalypse.

Each of us here in this room is confronted with the vision of global problems on a scale so vast no man hope to ignore them or hide from them.

Our right to express and communicate ideas; to set ourselves apart from the animals in the field and forest; to call governments to their duties and obligations; above all, our right to affirm our membership in society and to the man with whom we share the land and our children's future—all these constitute the very soul of freedom.

This distinguishing freedom of speech goes hand in hand with the power to be heard—to share in the decisions of government which shape men's lives.

The essential *humanity* of men can be protected and preserved only where government must answer, not just to those of a particular religion or a particular race, but to all its people.

Government and law are the armour and sword of individual rights. In our world at this moment, there are forces raging which can destroy forever the hopes of man for perpetuating life on this planet.

"To feed on the past is to bite the dust," Victor Hugo said. The world no longer has the space or the time for dreams of conquest and destruction, for old hatreds and ancient animosities.

Unless we begin anew to work with one another and for one another toward the common goal of survival, we face an extinction of our own making—all of us—poor, wealthy, overfed, underfed, philosopher, philanderer, beggar, and bureaucrat.

In our quest for stability and a lasting, genuine peace on this earth, we must reaffirm our need of idealism, high aspirations and deep convictions.

Honor cannot be a misplaced commodity in our world of modern technology.

There is no inconsistency between ideals and realistic possibilities. There is no separation between the deepest desires of heart and mind and the rational application of human effort in the solution of human problems.

Surely, one of the great examples of man's infinite capacity for growth is Israel itself.

In the 19 brief years since independence, Israel has confounded the cynics, amazed the nonbelievers, and captured the imagination and hearts of men of peace the world over.

Refusing to acknowledge the danger of futility—the belief there is nothing one man or woman can do against the enormous arsenal of the world's ills—the Israelis have set 2 goals for themselves; first of all, to survive; secondly, to insure the survival of Israel.

Each time a human being stands up for an ideal, or acts to improve the lot of another, or strikes out against injustice, he sends forth a tiny ripple of hope to the farthest reaches of our planet.

For the past 2 decades, Israel's reverence for life, for freedom, for the infinite worth of all God's creations has blazed out across the world in waves of hope and light.

Today, this tiny nation is threatened by countries whose long tradition of grinding human souls to powder and sand has been documented through all the centuries of man's existence.

The leaders of what is known as the United Arab Republic, unable and unwilling to face the outrageous deprivation and poverty that characterize the Middle East today, have resorted to violence and threats of violence directed against Israel.

Armies have been mobilized, equipment moved, men and machines placed on alert along the border awaiting the signal.

And all of this to hide the futility of purpose, the total disregard for the impoverished millions who have suffered the unending vanities of conquerors.

Israel is *too* bright a hope, *too* significant an achievement to perish in the flames of war.

The people of Israel *care* too deeply for one another and for the land.

Their lives, however individually poverty-stricken or difficult, have meaning and attainable goals.

In contrast, the nations of the United Arab Republic have been festering sores on the body of human progress for centuries.

Rather than face their responsibilities to their people, initiate meaningful improvements, and work with one another to harness the resources available to them to improve their conditions, they have chosen to destroy and to trample and to pillage the dreams of dignity which have become a triumphant reality in Israel.

In the current issue of Jewish Frontier, Abba Eban wrote:

"Our eyes are wide open to the barrenness of the Arab policy of enmity. So we offer neighboring peoples an alternative vision: a Middle East distinguished for its diversity, for its many centers of freedom, for a free and separate existence of different sovereignties, a region in which there will be a free ferment of disparate policies, a region whose varying vistas will, together, present a diversified mosaic and not a monolith . . .

"This stretch of earth in which the State of Israel dwells is limited in size, but it is graced by the wonderful attribute of centrality; it is the crossroads of continental communication.

"Israel can open up access to the Mediterranean for Jordan, develop joint resources with it, make a flow of men and goods possible all along the eastern shore of the Mediterranean, from the river of Egypt to the north of Syria.

"In a word: In conditions of *hostility*, the Arab mind conceives of Israel as a barrier. In conditions of *peace*, Israel at once becomes a bridge."

My friends, I ask you to consider the wisdom and depth of humanity that would impel a man to reach out with such compassion and offer once more, in this dark hour, the open hand of friendship across thousands of years of bitterest prejudice and persecution, as Abba Eban did in this historic pronouncement.

No one who knows the tenacious heart of the Israeli can doubt he will defend to his last breath his right to stand on his own soil.

His courage is legendary; his skill as a soldier unsurpassed in all the armies of the world.

That is why Nasser and his fellow conspirators have so cruelly abdicated their responsibility to their own wretchedly-deprived countrymen, trusting that a war will unite their people.

Aesop said, "Any excuse will serve a tyrant." And Nasser has proved him correct.

For every 10 men who are willing to face the guns of an adversary, there is only one willing to brave the censure of his colleagues, the wrath of his society. Moral courage is a rarer commodity than bravery in battle or great intelligence.

Yet it is the one essential, vital quality for those who seek to change a world which yields most painfully to change.

For the fractional fortunate among us there is comfort. There is a temptation to follow the easy and familiar paths of personal ambition and financial success so grandly spread before those who have the privilege of education.

But that is not the only road beckoning to us and it is not the only course marked for our nation.

There is a Chinese *curse* which says, "May he live in interesting times."

Like it or not, we live in interesting times—times of danger, uncertainty, threats of holocaust and pain.

But they are also times more open to the creative energy of men than any other time in history.

And everyone on this planet will ultimately be judged on the effort he has contributed toward building a more human world society—one which is less dependent on terror, more dependent on the gift of self.

I ask you to ponder just a moment. No one quite like you has ever lived before, nor will again. No one who looks just like you, who has exactly the same dreams, talents and aspirations. No one with quite your potential for making a particular mark in a particular field of endeavor.

Understand this great gift of life which is yours to use so freely, with so few restrictions. Understand it, be grateful for it, and *use* it. For you will never have another and your world has great need of you.

Each of us will be judged by the extent to which our ideals and goals have shaped the vision of man free of hunger, free of crippling ailments and death in childhood, free of ignorance and cruelty.

Man has that vision constantly before him. We *can* be what we aspire to be. The charisma of mind, heart and soul that is Israel today has instilled life to that shining miraculous vision.

Only the truly brave know how to forgive. When a man says of the affairs of state, "What does it matter to me?", the state may be given up for lost.

In these "interesting" times, we must strive, seek, find and never yield in our pursuit of the freedom which is each man's right.

I am unalterably opposed to Communism because it exalts the state over the individual and the family, and because of the lack of freedom of speech, of protest, of religion and of the press which is so characteristic of totalitarian states.

But the way of opposition to Communism is not to imitate its dictatorship. Rather it is to enlarge human freedom everywhere on the globe.

There are privileged minorities in every land who believe they serve the cause of that freedom by labeling as "communist" every threat to their privilege. But the denial of freedom only strengthens the very Communism it claims to oppose.

The United States, with its great wealth, great technology, has been called to exercise its influence and strength in Vietnam, in Cuba, in the Dominican Republic, in Korea—wherever the encroachments against self-determination threaten the security of those who desire to choose their own destiny.

We have not hesitated to use our measured strength in defense of liberty. We are fully prepared to assist in bringing stability and peace to the Middle East. We will never abandon Israel.

The rights of the small nations to survive unfettered shall not be forsaken by the United States—surely the most powerful nation in the history of the world.

And what *are* the United States and Israel but people—people who share a vision of what human existence could be. So long as that vision is bright for us, any sacrifice to obtain it for our brothers on this earth is a sacrifice well made.

Many years ago, a wise man wrote to his son: "Let me exhort you to do your utmost to think outside and beyond our present circle of ideas. For every idea gained is a hundred years of slavery remitted."

He might well have addressed each of us. Some time ago, I said our future was inescapable and burdensome. It needs the best of each man and woman and our response must be soon.

Down through our western peaks runs an invisible boundary known as the Great Divide. And down through the range of centuries, an invisible boundary has marred the progress and elevation of man.

Throughout these centuries working together, and believing fervently in their high ideals, the Jewish people have elevated man. In their stubborn defense of human dignity, they have helped mankind cross the Great Divide; they have charted man.

In order to understand why America is determined to defend our noble ally, Israel, we must understand the Jewish people themselves.

There may be some truth to the idea that Jews are like other people—only more so.

The tradition is that every Jewish generation worries and frets—with clucking affection—about the next one.

This deep concern of one Jewish generation over the next one is the mortar which has held these gallant people together.

In more than 4,000 years of unbroken continuity of a magnificent people have been constructed out of that affectionate worry by one Jewish generation over the next Jewish generation.

What a monumental source of pride it must be to a young Jew to know that in his veins flows the blood of a people who have endured and stubbornly survived 4,000 years of the most outrageous attempt to destroy their abiding faith in the glory of man.

Sooner or later every human being must ask himself: "Who am I?"

We didn't grow on a tree; we weren't carved from rock, we were born from man and as each generation of Jews looks upon his background he finds a glorious litany of forefathers who against odds which have destroyed weaker men, have withstood and survived in their tenacious belief in the dignity of man.

No race of human beings has written a prouder record of sacrifice that freedom may find its rich fulfillment in the human community.

The Zionist Organization of America, since its inception has been the catalyst which has brought this fantastic cultural wealth of the Jews into a meaningful form and today the ZOA continues to guide these resources into ever more meaningful service to humanity.

The ZOA has been the chief interpreter of the magnificence of Jewish culture and tradition which has given us these 4,000 years of unbroken continuity of the Jewish people.

Today more than ever before the ZOA needs your help for never before in its existence has this magnificent tradition of Jewish dignity been threatened.

Just as in Israel, where every man is a builder and every man is a defender of the land so throughout our land the ZOA has tried to impress upon not only the Jewish people but all Americans the brotherhood of men.

If the Jews are able today to make a significant contribution to our future generations and keep alive the rich tradition of their past, it is only because the ZOA lights the way.

It has been argued that the social freedom of American life is separating the Jewish youngster from the tradition of his people.

Those who would seek to blame this charge on the American environment are, in truth, indicting the spirit of American freedom. For, in a free society, the Jewish community is free to do nothing. Free to wither. Free to disappear.

And the magnificence of a Jewish community in a free society is that it is free to be as vibrantly and creatively Jewish as it wants to be. Free to invest in its future. Free to encourage its youth to a mature awareness of the relevancy of the Jewish tradition in the modern world.

The very freedom of the choice poses the challenge.

There are a great number of Jews in this world who do not have the advantage of making this choice. I am speaking now of the Jews of the Soviet Union.

For the past several years, I have sponsored a resolution in the House of Representatives expressing the sense of Congress that persecution of any persons because of their religion by the Soviet Union be condemned, and that the Soviet Union in the name of decency and humanity cease executing persons for alleged economic offenses and fully permit the free exercise of religion and the pursuit of culture by Jews and all others within its borders.

The Jewish youngster in our American society who is groping for some understanding of his Judaism is also, in a sense, cast into a bewildering world.

There is a Jewish consciousness in the Soviet Union today struggling to stay alive. There is a Jewish consciousness among our youth today, eager to be vibrant and alive, as well.

Against the onslaught of intransigent Communism, our task of preserving this rich Judaic cultural and philosophical inheritance becomes a matter of personal choice, a family decision, a community decision.

Perhaps the special satisfaction that is ours in America is the knowledge that we are seeking in some measure to be active participants in a great enterprise—that which Malachi defined as "turning the heart of the fathers to the children and the heart of the children to their fathers."

We are responding to a generation of questioning youth, of troubled youth, who are not blind to the great social and moral issues of our times.

We are also responding to a generation of sophisticated youth who want to determine for themselves just what are the modern values of Judaic tradition.

The depth of our response will determine the quality of the next generation.

Today as the whole world wonders can mankind survive; can a free Israel survive, can our rich tradition of freedom survive, yes, can we ourselves survive—let us remember an ancient Jewish philospher who wrote:

"When you have shut your doors, and darkened your room, remember never to say that you are alone, for you are not alone. God is within and your genius is within—and what need have *they* of light to see what you are doing?"

Getting Tough With Britain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 1, 1967

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an editorial entitled "Getting Tough With Britain," published in the Richmond News Leader of Tuesday, May 30, 1967.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Getting Tough With Britain

In exasperation, one reads of the agreement signed 10 days ago, under which Britain will construct a $45,000,000 fertilizer plant in Cuba by 1970.

The agreement has caused diplomatic commotion because of United States opposition; a similar stir arose in 1964 over the sale of British-made buses to the Castro regime. The U.S. has notified Britain repeatedly that such transactions seriously weaken the economic blockade this country is trying to impose on Cuba. Certain Latin American nations—notably Venezuela, Colombia and Bolivia—are understood to resent the deal even more because of Cuban-backed guerrilla operations in their countries.

As Virginia's Senator Harry Byrd Jr. has noted time and time again, Britain has refused to honor American wishes in Vietnam, too. British ships continue to sail blithely into Haiphong harbor with supplies for the Viet Cong.

British fortunes these days are intricately tied to her American friendship, but one wonders whether the way to keep a friend is to trade with his enemy. On dubious grounds, Britain successfully has mobilized the sentiment of the world against Rhodesia. But the United States, the mightiest nation in the world at last report, apparently cannot enlist the support of Britain against Castro and Ho Chi Minh.

There appears to be an obvious and simple solution. The United States ought to say to Britain: If you insist on building fertilizer plants in Cuba and trading with North Vietnam, then we shall trade with Rhodesia, because we do believe—indeed we do—that Fidel Castro and Ho Chi Minh are greater threats to world peace than is Ian Smith.

The Big Department of Defense Buildup

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1967

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following:

The Big DOD Buildup

(By Louis Stockstill)

What started out 20 years ago as a small office to "coordinate" the activities of the Army, Navy and Air Force, has emerged on the eve of manhood with hardly a recognizable feature of its infancy.

The once small-boned diminutive creature has muscled-up, fleshed-out, and grown into a towering endomorph.

Characteristically, most of the growth took place during the teen years—the years since Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara became house-mother.

When he took office in 1961, the present Secretary of Defense inherited from the Eisenhower Administration an organization whose civilian work force—those under the direct control of the SecDef—totalled about 1500 men and women.

The changes that have since taken place in the DoD civilian payroll are staggering.

Today—after an unprecedented six years in office and numerous organizational changes which have added hefty layers to the Pentagon's manpower biceps—Secretary McNamara personally commands a work force of 67,000 "headquarters" civilians.

The outer skin consists of 150 ranking aides who earn $25,000 to $30,000 per year.

Next comes a layer of muscle composed of 300 civilian employees whose pay is $20,000 to $24,280, and more than one thousand others whose average salary is about $19,000.

Descending layers of tissue are held together by some 24,000 employees who are in pay brackets with a top-salary range of $10,000 to $17,000. For this group, alone, salaries total $252 million.

The 67,000 men and women who now crowd Secretary McNamara's payroll (an increase of 5,000 in the past year) constitute only DoD civilians. Not taken into accounts are the thousands of military personnel assigned to DoD offices. Nor does the number embrace the million civilians or the three-million uniformed personnel directly under the Army, Navy, Air Force and Marine Corps.

The DoD civilians have bloomed with the speed of a spring crop of dandelions.

Shortly after Secretary McNamara first took office, he complained (February 1961) that there were too many Pentagon "executives" reporting directly to him and the

Deputy Secretary of Defense. He said 15 Presidential appointees fell into this category, and the situation was "impossible."

The only major way it has since changed, however, is that the number of top civilians has proliferated.

At the time of Secretary McNamara's 1961 statement, the DoD Secretariat included—in addition to the SecDef and Deputy SecDef—the following officials: Director of Defense Research & Engineering ($22,000); seven Assistant Secretaries of Defense ($20,000); the DoD General Counsel ($20,000) and an Assistant to the SecDef ($20,000). In addition, there were 13 DoD civilians earning $19,000 each.

Today, the top jobs still exist, but the wages have been upgraded and large numbers of other high-salaried executives have been added.

Current data shows that the Secretariat now includes Secretary McNamara ($35,000), Deputy SecDef Cyrus Vance ($30,000), the Director of Defense R&E ($28,500), seven Assistant Secretaries of Defense ($27,000 each), the DoD General Counsel ($27,000), the "principal" Deputy Director of DR&E ($27,000,) and 11 assistants who earn $26,000.

Those in the $26,000 bracket include the Assistant to the SecDef (Legislative Affairs), the Special Assistant to the SecDef, the Chairman of the Military Liaison Committee to the AEC, the Deputy Assistant SecDef (Comptroller), the Deputy General Counsel, the Director of the Advanced Research Projects Agency, and five more Deputy Directors of DR&E.

In addition, today there are 128 other top DoD aides who earn $25,800-25,890 per year.

This group includes 25 Deputy Assistant Secretaries of Defense (one of whom has just been added), five Deputy DoD Comptrollers, four Assistant DoD General Counsels, Special Assistants and Assistants to the SecDef and Deputy SecDef, and dozens of others who hold titles as directors, deputy directors, assistant directors, assistant deputy directors, deputy assistant directors, assistants for . . . , chiefs of . . . , assistant chiefs and special assistants.

(The Defense Department civilian manpower budget also covers funds to pay a "staff assistant" for President Johnson—$22,085—and an "aide" for Vice President Humphrey—$22,755.)

The next biggest DoD civilian-employee group includes almost 300 in the $20,000 to $24,260 bracket, plus more than 1,000 others whose pay is not specified on an individual basis (in data which has been furnished to Congress), but whose average salary is about $19,000. A spot-check of 340 of the jobs in the latter group disclosed an average salary of $19,573.

For 23 "digital computer systems administrators," alone, the average salary is $19,661.30. For three "historians," it is $19,775.67.

But this is not the end of the list.

The largest group of Defense Department civilian workers who come under Secretary McNamara's direct control—some 24,500—fall into pay grades GS–9, 10, 11, 12 and 13. Of these, more than 11,000 are in pay brackets where the top-salaries range from $12,000 to $16,905.

Growth of the GS–9 to GS–13 group has been spectacular. Although much of it can be attributed to initial transfers of personnel from the individual Services to the new Defense Agencies created under Secretary McNamara, this offers only a partial explanation. In the past two years, alone, there has been an increase of more than 8,600 DoD employees in the GS–9 to GS–13 group—from 23,806 in fiscal '66 to 32,414 budgeted for the new fiscal year which starts 1 July.

When Secretary McNamara took office, there were less than 150 such positions in DoD.

In providing Congress with a breakdown of the DoD civilian employees, the Administration, purposely or otherwise, has concealed the specific DoD activity to which they are assigned, except where job-title (Deputy Director DR&E, for example) is self-explanatory.

The salaries for the entire group of DoD civilians—including Secretary McNamara, himself—are budgeted, incongruously, under the Department's appropriations account for "Operations and Maintenance, Defense Agencies." This makes them somewhat difficult to digest, since several six-course meals are spread on the banquet table at once. And it will suggest to some that the practice may have been designed more to confuse than clarify.

Isolated examples from long lists of civilian employees in pay grades GS–14 and GS–15, alone, show that DoD has 271 auditors earning $4.7 million annually; 69 digital computer systems administrators earning $1.2 million; 23 digital computer systems analysts earning $390,000; 30 systems analysts earning over $500,000; 56 management analysts earning $960,000; 64 program analysts earning $1.3 million, and 15 management evaluation officers earning about $290,000. There's no evidence to indicate how many of these employees are assigned to the Office of the Secretary of Defense, how many to the Defense Supply Agency, Defense Intelligence Agency, Defense Communications Agency, or other DoD activity.

And, the isolated examples barely scratch the surface. At levels of employment below GS–14, there is no break-down even by title. The DoD civilian employees in the latter groups are simply lumped into numerical designations. If listed, separately, they would take up as much space as the entire telephone book for a good-sized city. Those in GS–9 through GS–13 pay grades, for example, number more than 24,000. Their combined pay exceeds a quarter of a billion dollars.

As previously indicated, growth of the DoD civilian manpower force can be attributed in part to the establishment of central agencies to direct such functions as supply, intelligence and communications. Many of the employees of these agencies were transferred from Army, Navy and Air Force payrolls to the DoD payroll. But the agencies have continued to grow.

The average number of civilian employees in DoD in fiscal '66 was 53,206. In the fiscal '68 budget, the Department has estimated an average total of 68,193—an increase of about 15,000. Funds requested for the DoD civilian payroll in FY '68 add up to almost $600-million.

Much of the DoD civilian manpower build-up has taken place within the Office of the Secretary of Defense.

In the fiscal '61 Defense budget, submitted to Congress just before Secretary McNamara took office, $20-million was sought for "direction and coordination of defense activities (total obligations)."

At the time, there were in OSD, 11 Deputy Assistant Secretaries of Defense and two Deputy Directors of Defense R&E. Today, Secretary McNamara has seven Deputy Directors of Defense R&E, one Deputy General Counsel and 32 Deputy Assistant Secretaries of Defense. (Five of the posts are held by military officers).

Also at the time of the FY '61 budget presentation, OSD had 46 Public-Law–313 civilian employees, including eight in ARPA. Today, the Department has 81 of the special "positions established by the Secretary of Defense." About half of the group earn more than $25,000 per year.

A comparison of the listings in the Pentagon telephone directory illustrate to some extent what has been happening. In February 19691, Defense Department section of the book's yellow pages (where mostly executive-types are listed) took up three and one-half pages. The same section in the "Spring 1967" issue of the directory covers ten and one-half pages.

The increase in the DoD civilian payroll over the six years of Secretary McNamara's tenure has been prodigious, both in overall numbers and in the number caliber of top-salaried workers. And, regardless of where the employees came from—whether by transfer from the individual Services or by creation of new jobs—the big work force dramatically underscores the extent to which the Secretary of Defense has brought the direction of Armed Forces activities under his centralized control.

A Capitol Hill source who has been uneasily eyeing Mr. McNamara's big build-up, recently commented: "It's true, he has accomplished a lot—but he didn't do it without assistance."

Nor, as the DoD manpower data attests, without assistants.

Elliot Williams Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 1, 1967

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, South Carolina is honored to have as one of its citizens Elliot Williams of Darlington, S.C. Mr. Williams recently retired after 20 years of naval service, during which he compiled a record that places him in the category of the great patriots of our day.

In a period when people are being recognized in the press each day for such deeds as public destruction of their draft cards, burning of the American flag, and acts of civil disobedience, it is refreshing to reflect on the record of a patriot such as Elliot Williams.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the newspaper article entitled "Elliot Williams Day Named," which appeared in the News and Press of Darlington, S.C., Thursday, March 30, 1967, be printed in the Appendix to the Record:

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Elliot Williams Day Named

Mayor Frank A. Welk has proclaimed April 6 "Elliot Williams Day" in Darlington to honor a native son who has returned from an action-packed year in the Vietnam war with 16 medals for heroism.

Williams, who is to retire next month after 20 years of Naval service, is Darlington's most decorated hero of the Vietnam war. His 16 citations include a recommendation for the Navy Cross, the highest decoration for bravery that the Navy bestows.

Details concerning the formal program April 6 will be given in next week's issue of The News and Press.

Williams has been cited by the President for "heroism, bold leadership and loyal devotion to duty in the face of great personal risk to himself" when as patrol officer of a river boat on October 31 on the Mekong River he directed the complete disruption of the largest enemy river crossing to that time in the Vietnam war.

Williams' 16 decorations for bravery include:

The Navy Cross (recommended), two Silver Stars, three Bronze Stars, a Legion of Merit, the Navy and Marine Corps Medal, two Purple Hearts, the Navy Commendation Medal, three Crosses of Gallantry from the Vietnamese government, the Presidential Unit Citation, and the Vietnamese Campaign Medal.

DELAYED A YEAR

Mr. Williams, who holds the rank of Boatswain's Mate First Class, had thought he would retire from active service last April, and the family made plans accordingly, erecting a home in a new Spring Street Extension development while he was conveniently stationed in Charleston. His service, however, was extended by a year when he received the assignment in Vietnam. Williams is scheduled to be released next month. His business plans are indefinite, but the family does plan to remain in Darlington—hometown for both of them.

Mrs. Williams, the former Elaine Weaver, and Elliot were school sweethearts and neighbors for many years. She has played the role of a Navy wife for 20 years, accompanying her husband whenever possible and living in many sections of the United States. Their five children range in age from 7 to 16; and they, especially, will be glad to settle down to one school for a while.

Moderation Should Be Revived

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1967

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, in the midst of much intemperate talk, of extreme statements on both sides, it is refreshing when one reads a rather calm and rational point of view on the conflict in Vietnam.

Surprising to some, I am sure, but not to me, is the fact that the voice of moderation to which I refer is that of an editorial writer of a college newspaper.

On Wednesday, May 24, Gordon Young, writing on the editorial page of the Daily Iowan at the University of Iowa, Iowa City, wrote an editorial which I recommend as worthy reading to my colleagues in the House:

MODERATION SHOULD BE REVIVED

Reason and moderation are always the first domestic casualties in wartime. It is difficult to be dispassionate when one's friends and relatives are being killed. This is particularly true now that we are involved in a war in which American policies are so readily debated and misunderstood.

The question of why we ever got involved in Vietnam in the first place is buffeted about in whirlwinds of political oratory. The extent to which our national interest requires us to risk a major land war in Asia is debatable. The advisability of pouring lives and national treasure into Vietnam is open to question.

Further obscuring the clarity of our position has been a tendency by the Johnson Administration to be less than candid in spelling out its policies and programs in Vietnam.

Indeed, the whole mess sometimes seems so complicated that many are tempted to shrug off concern, assume that the government knows best and bleat platitudes about supporting our boys in Vietnam.

on the other hand, many thoughtful persons are quite vocal in their dissent. Senators, journalists, professors and others express their disagreement with war policies in a respected and honorable tradition of loyal opposition.

The freedom to speak out against Administration policy is fundamental to our democracy. Whether a "higher loyalty' 'to humanity supercedes a citizen's obligation to respect his own government is a moot point. In any event, to accuse dissenters of aiding the enemy is tantamount to calling them traitors and it borders of McCarthyism.

Students seem to have a keener interest in the Vietnamese war than other adults, not necessarily because of any intellectual superiority, but merely because they are more likely to be called upon to bear arms. There has been no lack of debate here at the University on the subject for the past several months.

Some of the dissent, in fact, has been expressed in impractical and foolish methods. Prof. Barnett's withholding of grades had no more practical effect on troop levels in Vietnam than if he had advocated vegetarianism. Likewise, the melodramatic behavior of some of the students and former students at the Induction Station in Des Moines last week seemed to some observers to have been less a serious effort to influence opinion than a springtime panty raid.

Perhaps it is impossible to refrain from theatrics when debating or demonstrating about the war. Certainly there is nothing moderate, restrained or reasonable about napalming children.

Yet if the demonstrators' goal is to persuade others that the war is wrong, it seems that a Day of Inquiry or a silent vigil is a more effective means of communicating than dashing about on a motorcycle or going limp in the arms of a U.S. Marshal.

No one should belittle Kuris Raits, the former student who last week changed his mind and was inducted into the Army. His earlier statements that he would refuse to take the step forward were undoubtedly sincere. Similarly, his decision not to spend five years in a penitentiary seems sensible. The penalty is oppressively harsh, and no one but a masochist would willingly submit to it unless his convictions were as solid as the walls which would confine him.

Raits' case dramatizes the need for more understanding of the status of a conscientious objector (CO). Perhaps he had his own reasons for failing to list himself as CO. Other young men eligible for the draft, however, may want to investigate the alternative.

Congress enacted CO legislation so that an individual would have an honorable means of maintaining faith with his pacifist convictions. The U.S. Supreme Court has broadened the interpretation in two significant ways.

The court has ruled that to declare one's self a CO, one needs not profess a belief in a Supreme Being. In other words, an individual who adheres to a humanistic or ethical philosophy which does not include reference to any supernatural entity can still qualify as a CO. The court, in addition, has said that one need not hold 100 per cent pacifist views to achieve CO status. This means that one may feel that some wars—World War II, for example,—are just, but not the one in Vietnam. This element of selectivity, while perhaps philosophically inconsistent, grants the right to alternative service to those who see no national interest in the Vietnamese conflict.

Being a CO does not mean that a young man retreats to an ivory tower of philosophical meditation. It can involve hard, unpleasant work. Inevitably, there will be some who regard a CO as a sissy, coward or even as a traitor.

This is unfortunate. Actually, by filing for CO status (a simple act which any minister can facilitate), one may express his opposition to the war in a sincere, responsible and perhaps even courageous fashion. University students who face the draft but who regard the current war as unjust and evil should investigate it.

Meanwhile, it would seem particularly appropriate in a university setting to attempt to revive moderation and reason when discussing the war. If nothing else, the few hawks on campus might remember that dissenters are not automatically yellow-bellied cowards.

And the doves would do well to realize that some persons see the war as undesirable but necessary in the overall view of the balance of power. It might even be possible that such persons are not the stereotype, wave-the-bloody-flag fascists so often depicted.

Memorial Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHALMERS P. WYLIE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1967

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of the observance of Memorial Day at Ridgeview Junior High School, Columbus, Ohio, I was privileged to express some thoughts which I respectfully insert in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

MEMORIAL DAY

Mr. Tilton, teachers, and students of Ridgeview Junior High School, it is a great privilege and honor for me to appear before you today and share some thoughts reflecting on this solemn occasion. At the outset, I should like to commend Mr. Robison and his very fine band for their excellent participation in this Memorial Observance. As the young man played the drum solo, I was reminded of a very special moment of a very special day—the Sunrise ceremonies last Easter at the Tomb of the Unknowns at Arlington National Cemetery.

The Marine Band was playing as only that band could on such an occasion. Now the Marine Band is selected from the top musicians in the land, according to the same standards musically that the marines set physically for the selection of their fighting units. Just to be selected presupposes a musician is excellent. His selection seems to give him a further pride and inspire him to greater excellence. There came a time in the ceremony—just at dawn, when the drama of the moment was to be emphasized by a drum solo. Now a drum solo, while seemingly the simplest of instrumental solos, is anything but that. There is no melody to distract from any slight deviation in precision. The Marine Band drummer chosen to execute this solo stepped forth. He was short of stature—not particularly handsome—and he wore thick-lensed glasses, all of which would not lead to the conclusion that he is a Marine.

As the first stroke of his drumstick broke the awesome silence, I thought—here is a Marine. He outperformed any other drummer I have ever heard. His superior performance did more than emphasize the symbolic occasion. He was, to me at that moment, a symbol of this age of opportunity—in which what you are born with, or without, is of less importance than your own ability to achieve excellence in your chosen field. What this young man lacked in physical attributes, he made up for in achievement. It was pretty obvious that a lot of determination, discipline, and perseverence had gone into achieving the degree of skill he had mastered, no doubt through hours of dedication and practice. You, too, can make your contribution to our way of life—doing what you do best—in the best way you know how.

I thought it appropriate to discuss the history of Memorial Day—a little lesson in civics—and something of the true meaning of Memorial Day.

Memorial Day is the day when we pay tribute (as Lincoln once put it) "to those who gave their lives that this nation might live." No one gave more in the defense of the freedoms we enjoy. We are again engaged in a patriotic struggle in Vietnam because of a conflict—on great issues of political philosophy. We went into Vietnam to prevent a Communist take-over at the request of the South Vietnamese people—we are told. And there is no question but that Communism is a threat to our way of life. It is a threat to the freedoms we enjoy and love. Can you imagine this news dispatch from Washington? "The Commissar has found positive proof that George Washington, Benjamin Franklin, Betsy Ross, and Patrick Henry were all traitors, and appropriate action will be taken at once. The city's name will be changed so that it will no longer be referred to as Washington, D.C. The stars and stripes will be replaced with a new flag. All old flags and old patriotic books in America must be burned immediately. Benjamin Franklin will be replaced by Benedict Arnold in all literature. All postage stamps picturing Washington, Franklin, Jefferson, and Lincoln will be be burned. Any crank citizen who protests will be executed."

Preposterous? Don't be too sure! Russia accomplished just such a "repatriotization" in barely five years by eliminating freedom of speech, freedom of press and other freedoms which we enjoy.

The point I make is that these freedoms we have are not so obvious except in comparison with the lack thereof in other nations. We must remember them and be thankful for them this day, and do whatever is necessary to preserve them.

We are gathered here to honor our dead who so courageously have given their lives on the battlefields of distant lands so that our great democracy might be preserved. National recognition of their bravery and sacrafice is the only fitting way to show our gratitude.

In this Memorial Day talk, it is altogether fitting and proper that I refer to Lincoln because this great and good man is, in my opinion, responsible more than anyone else for the other reason for this day—a time of rededication to God and country.

Shortly after Lincoln's death on April 14, 1865, the Grand Army of the Republic was formed. General John Logan, who had served with Lincoln's Union Army, became its Commander-in-Chief in January of 1868. The G.A.R. was an organization of Union Soldiers.

Many persons have laid claims as having originated Memorial Day, commonly called "Decoration Day." One claim originated when, on May 5, 1868, General John Logan issued an order designating May 30th as a day for all members of the G.A.R. to strew with flowers the "graves of comrades who had died in defense of their country during the late rebellion." Probably, most historians credit General Logan with initiating Memorial Day and set its beginning as May 30, 1868. In his order, Logan expressed the desire that the ceremonies would be kept from year to year, and that the Republic "would garland the passionless mounds with the choicest flowers of Springtime."

Many of the departments and posts of the government seized on the idea with skepticism. Debate raged about the idea of a Memorial Day. Some said: "A national observance of such a holiday would unnecessarily keep alive war-time bitterness and foster animosities that should be buried in oblivion." These objections were lost in the tremendous outpouring of people when May 30, 1868 dawned.

Excursions piled crowds of people into the larger cities who formed into parades, decorated graves and made speeches to commemorate the occasion.

A national holiday had been born, even if the government of the United States was never to *declare it so*. The States in the north rapidly made it a day of legal observance with the Southern States joining, differing only in the date. North and South Carolina named the 10th of May, which is the anniversary of Stonewall Jackson's death. All of the rest of the Dixie States named April 26th.

Some say that Logan got the idea from the Confederate Soldiers who made an occasional decoration of a comrade's grave. Others say that General John J. Murray of New York had told of his leadership of ex-soldiers to Union graves on Sunday, May 22, 1866, two years before. Adj. General Chipman of the G.A.R. insisted that he had given the idea to Logan around May 1, 1868 in a letter by which he had suggested that they adopt the old German Custom of scattering flowers on the graves of the dead each Springtime. Comrade T. C. Campbell of Cincinnati claimed that he had headed a delegation of veterans taking flowers to the cemetery in the Spring of '67 and that the idea originated for propagation at that instant.

General Logan's wife got in on the act and declared that it was she who had prompted her husband to issue the order, having borrowed the thought from the memorial services which she had witnessed in Richmond, Virginia earlier in the Spring of 1868.

Through the South lived still more numerous claims to the inauguration of the customs. Each state claimed that it was the originator. The Richmond Times-Dispatch claimed that it was responsible for the custom in an article on July 15, 1906. On May 10, 1866, the Oakwood Cemetery Memorial Association adorned the graves of Confederate dead and hung flags in the city. On April 26, 1866, the anniversary of General Joseph E. Johnson's surrender to General Sherman, the people of the City of Columbus, Georgia, put flowers on soldiers' graves with an appropriate observance. A woman by the name of Miss Lizzie Rutherford claims that she made the suggestion to a group of Ladies' Aid Society. And so the numerous claims persisted.

Always this dispute will go on because the date itself came from nowhere—everywhere. The greater the number of claimants for its birthplace, the plainer the proof that the Republic was aching vaguely with eagerness to speak its grief after four years of killing. The funeral of the war's greatest figure pointed that way.

Each little fugitive decoration of graves across the land, each little individual call to action, was a spontaneous outburst of the sentiment that had been crystallized at the burial-drama of Lincoln. It was at his funeral that flowers were strewn on his grave and marked the way of the funeral parade while veterans and their families spoke—fired salutes and sang their old favorite war songs.

By 1869, thirty-one states had adopted the custom. Some of the earlier memorial days were marked by strife and by demonstrations of anti-southern wrath in the north and anti-northern wrath in the south. Hatred still burned bright and at the National Cemetery in Arlington, Marines were stationed at Confederate graves to prevent southerners from placing roses thereon. It was quite obvious that General Grant was ignorant of these episodes in the graveyard and the antics were never repeated. On the same day, Union Soldiers helped decorate the graves of Confederate Soldiers who had been buried at Alexandria, another suburb of the Capital.

Since then, Memorial Day has become a day of rededication—a day of patriotism all over the nation and has aided in the healing of ancient wounds and has made us ever mindful of our responsibility to our country which was so torn by strife in its inception.

A Memorial Day celebration recalls many memories of our national beginning. Patriotism is of many inspirations and receives refreshments from many springs. None are more powerful than our traditions of service, of suffering, of accomplishment and memorial dedication to our heroes.

These memories are indeed the impoundable force which builds and cements our national life.

We have another reason today for remembering. At this very moment mothers, fathers, wives and sweethearts are anxious about their loved ones in Vietnam. As we honor our dead from past wars this Memorial Day, let us also salute our valiant men in Vietnam—and pray for an honorable and speedy end to hostilities over there.

Remember, too, that the future is in your hands. The future is important to you because you will spend the rest of your lives in it—which according to life expectancy tables could be over 50 years. More than 50 percent of the people now living in the United States are 26 years old and under. We'll try to leave a legacy which you will be proud to defend by your best effort whatever form it might take. I'm sure you'll do your part.

Vietnam War Must Be Won

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday; June 1, 1967

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

[From the San Diego (Calif.) Union, May 16, 1967]

RED ENIGMA OR THREAT? VIETNAM WAR MUST BE WON

The greatest enigma and the greatest potential threat to world peace is Communist China.

The one factor is the product of the other. Red China's intent to remain the implacable enemy of the United States is basic. But we lack specific knowledge of the state of the country and its 700 million people and, more importantly, the 70 or so men who guide their destiny.

It is 18 years since Mao Tse-tung said China was committed to the "long-term struggle between the communistic bloc and the camp of imperialism led by the United States of America." The years between have not lessened the vehemence of Mao's determination to encircle and crush America. And time is on his side.

It is supremely difficult to arrive at any sound prognostication of the shape of events on the Chinese mainland. A curtain of silence effectively cloaks their domestic affairs. Internal dissensions and open rebellion have certainly torn the country repeatedly over recent months, and Mao's tenure has been shaken.

Unfortunately the lack of real information gives rise, as always, to rumors. In this case it has led many people to the euphoric view that the Communist regime there is too preoccupied to continue its dedication to the destruction of the free world exemplified by the United States.

Events in Vietnam indicate otherwise. And even though the Moscow-Peking axis of atheistic communism has suffered serious breaches recently, any sign of a permanent break is entirely absent.

The Communists have it in their power to stop the war in Vietnam immediately. They have only to withdraw their support for Hanoi and advise Ho Chi Minh to get to the conference table.

United Nations Secretary General U Thant, in a gloomy survey last week, said the third world war, between the United States and Red China, had already been "initiated."

69 487 AA A 30

Pessimistically, he regards a direct confrontation as "inevitable."

Is U Thant expressing the fear and conviction which others hesitate to declare? Is he simply exhibiting the despondent thoughts of a tired, disillusioned negotiator? Or is he merely trying to frighten the world into "peace?" Or, more specifically, who is he supporting?

The United States, examining the Red Chinese menace, is in a classic dilemma. We must view the facts as they are, the indications as they point. The nuclear capability which China possesses soon may be a major physical threat. By keeping the United States occupied in Vietnam Mao gains time, while we lose it.

We cannot gamble on the internal disruption and Red-axis differences to preoccupy Mao and his henchmen. We must proceed to win militarily in Vietnam and speedily regardless of the so-called Red Chinese menace.

The great dilemma must be settled now. Later will be too late.

What Rural Electrification Means to Me and My Community

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1967

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, this year, as in past years, the Nebraska Rural Electric Association has sponsored a very worthwhile essay contest in which the youth of Nebraska are invited to compete. The topic of the essay contest is "What Rural Electrification Means to Me and My Community." Winning essayists are rewarded by being permitted to participate in a Nebraska Youth Tour to Washington.

It is always a pleasure for me to include some of the prize-winning essays in the Congressional Record. I hope my distinguished colleagues will find the following essays as interesting as I have:

The Value of Rural Electrification in Our Home and Community

(By Joe A. Ingerle, 16, Elba Consolidated High School)

(Note.—Contestant sponsored by the Howard Greeley Rural Public Power District, St. Paul, Nebr., in cooperation with the Nebraska Rural Electric Association.)

There are few adjectives which can adequately describe the value of rural electrification in our modern society. Without it, we would be reduced to a state of living little above that of the dark ages. With it, we can work more efficiently and with less effort. And when our work is done, we are able to relax and entertain ourselves in ways not possible before the advent of the R.E.A.

To illustrate how important rural electrification is, let us compare the average work day of two farmers; one who lived before the R.E.A. was adopted, and one who is presently operating a farm with considerable use of his electric co-operative's service.

Our first visit will be to the homestead of Mr. Average Farmer of 1925. Mr. Farmer gets up at 6:00 A.M. every morning, and by the light of a kerosene lantern, hand milks his small dairy herd. Concluding his milking, he then feeds his fat cattle by carrying the feed, in buckets, from the bin to the bunks. After finishing his morning chores, he goes to the house, carries in water and wood, and washes for breakfast, which his wife has cooked on her wood-burning stove.

With breakfast finished, Mr. Farmer proceeds to the field where today he will pick corn by hand. After picking a load, he must then return home and scoop the corn into a crib where he stores it for future use.

When next we see Mr. Farmer, the sky is growing dark as he trudges homeward with the last load of the day. Following the unloading of the wagon, he again goes through the routine of doing chores.

Our last glimpse of Mr. Farmer, shows him sitting in his house after supper, listening to his battery radio and reading his newspaper by kerosene lamp.

Such was the life of most farmers before rural electrification became a rapidly spreading reality. A modern farmer, however, lives a much easier and more productive life because of his extensive use of electrically powered implements and appliances.

An example of this type of farmer is Mr. Average Farmer's son, Modern Farmer. A tour of Modern's electrified operation and a totalization of the labor needed to run this farm show quite a change over his father. Although his day still starts at 6:00 A.M., Modern experiences very few of the hardships his father faced. For example, his barn is equipped with an electric milker, bulk tank, and washing system for his dairy operation, and an automatic silo unloader and feed distribution system for his herd of beef cattle. Also found in his barn is an item considered more luxury than necessity, that being his stereo radio and speaker system.

After his chores are finished, Modern goes to his up-to-date, electrically complete house where his wife has just prepared breakfast on her new electric range, which is equipped with an automatic shutoff that discontinues the heat after a pre-set time. But this is not all, for Modern's house is chock-full of modern conveniences and luxuries, such as the electric heating and air conditioner, the cold storage units, and the color television and radios. His house is also lighted by electric fixtures which are cleaner, less work to care for, and more pleasing to the eye than the old kerosene lanterns or lamps.

With breakfast finished, Mr. Farmer goes to the field in his new corn combine. And Modern's corn harvesting technique is really something to marvel at. His massive combine, which picks and shells the ears of six rows, is easier to drive and handle than his new automobile. After his corn is picked and hauled to the yard, it is elevated into bins by an electrically powered grain auger which Modern found he could operate cheaper and more efficiently than with other forms of power. His recently constructed drying bins are equipped with special heater-blowers which force heated-dry air through the perforated floor of the bin and up through the grain. The fans are also equipped with an automatic switch which turns them on when the temperature of the grain reaches a certain level.

Concluding his day in the field, Modern hurries home, breezes effortlessly through his chores and is ready to spend a relaxing evening with his wife and children in their comfortable electric home.

So, there you see, before the advent of rural electrification, the life of the farmer was one of hardship, long hours spent at laborous tasks and few luxuries to ease his burden when his work was done. However, since electricity has become common to the farm, the farmer's load has been lightened quite considerably and his ways of relaxation have been increased. But farmers are not the only ones affected by electrical development. In the innumerable towns and cities of our nation, much the same result has been reached with the only difference being in the methods used to employ electrical power.

Perhaps now you, too, can see why I believe there are few modifiers which can adequately and thoroughly describe the value of rural electrification. For in 1935, when President Franklin D. Roosevelt signed the bill creating the Rural Electrification Administration, he opened the door for the betterment of farmers and workers all over the United States of America.

The Value of Rural Electrification in Our Home and Community

(By Donnalee Spivey, 16, Broken Bow High School)

(Note.—Contestant sponsored by the Custer Public Power District, Broken Bow, Nebr., in cooperation with the Nebraska Rural Electric Association.)

Since this is Nebraska's Centennial year, scores of pictures have suddenly been brought from the past showing how people of the region lived before the conveniences and advantages of today. These pictures bring, to the minds of those who can remember, a vision of all the work then involved on things today taken for granted. To the younger generation, on the other hand, these pictures have brought a sigh of relief. This sigh has indeed been one of sincere gratitude for what this younger generation has been saved through the work of the Rural Electrification Administration.

This sigh of thanks might not have been uttered when it was, had it not been for the efforts of Nebraska's Senator George Norris and his followers. For it was through their continued endeavors that the bill creating the REA reached the hands of President Franklin D. Roosevelt and received his signature on May 11, 1935. It had truly been a "dark land" up to that point and at the time only eleven per cent of the farms were enjoying the benefits of rural electrification. But soon, little by little, light by light, power swept across America and within twenty-five years of its origin the REA was serving ninety-seven per cent of the farms.

To these farm homes rural electrification brought advantages and benefits never dreamed possible by our ancestors. An unseen helper appeared and, as if by magic, the flip of a switch, push of a button or turn of a dial completed chores and duties with less time, more output and greater efficiency than ever before.

To some people, rural electrification meant a long list of statistics stating the dollars and cents saved, as well as many other figures. To most, however, its advantages were not so much the ones figured as the ones felt. For rural electrification brought comfort, health, and happiness to the homes which is served. Electric heating systems and air conditioners kept the family cozy warm in winter and refreshingly cool in summer. Electric washers, for clothes, as well as for dishes, brought added convenience to the housewife's hands. With electric ranges, refrigerators and many other kitchen appliances, meals were prepared sooner and were more healthful and delicious than ever before. Through a great many other electric appliances fresh air, pure water, and greater cleanliness were brought into the home. As for the husband, electricity accomplished tasks which had once required the help of the entire neighborhood. Great weights were lifted, grains were dried, and crops were irrigated with the help of electricity. Lights brought added protection to the farm yard and enabled activities to continue far after sunset. Friends and relatives were brought closer to home with telephone, and leisure hours were filled with pleasure and enjoyment with the radio and television. Thus rural electrification brought to the rural homes of America a service easily forgotten in the rush of modern living, yet impossible to get along without.

Rural electrification also provided the communities of rural America with innumerable benefits. Electric sirens told the inhabitants of the time of day and warned them of tornadoes and fires. Businesses and industries worked more effectively with the help of electric power. Also, more prosperity was brought to the community served by rural electrification due to continued low rates.

All told, the Rural Electrification Administration is one of the most successful and beneficial programs ever established by our government. But in this year of looking to the past, let us not forget the future. Demands for electricity increase so rapidly that there is a continual need for new facilities. Therefore, it is hoped, that with the help of additional legislation, the REA can serve us in the future as they have served us in the past.

THE VALUE OF RURAL ELECTRIFICATION IN OUR HOME AND COMMUNITY

(By Jonie Thompson, 17, Elsie High School)

(NOTE.—Contestant sponsored by the Midwest Electric Membership Corp., Grant, Nebr., in cooperation with the Nebraska Rural Electric Association.)

The day was in June, 1947. The sun had just gone down when out of the night came a bright light shining across the black wilderness. Was it lightning? Was it a fire? No, it was the first "light from heaven," a light which would change the farmer's life completely! It was to become one of his most faithful and helpful friends.

The Rural Electrification Administration gave the farmers this indispensable helper. The chief problem, however, was one of getting electricity at a cost that would permit farmers and other rural people to put it to work. This has been achieved by the determination and will power of local people, with the help of a realistic Federal loan program.

Behind the successful and rapid development of rural electrification in the United States lie the efforts of almost 1,000 nonprofit electric systems. These non-profit cooperatives are locally owned and managed enterprises incorporated under state law.

The objective of a rural electric system is to provide electricity to its members at the lowest possible cost, consistent with reliable service. This is an economic objective, born of necessity. Nearly half of all member-consumers are farmers, and no one believes more firmly in the profit system than the American farmer. Without the reliable help of the R.E.A. the farmers and rural people wouldn't have the many luxuries and work-saving devices which once just belonged to the city people.

I live on a grade A dairy farm north of Elsie and I am fully aware of how much the dairy farmer depends on the R.E.A. Without electricity our dairy farm is helpless! Electricity is depended upon from the electric-heat lamp that has saved many small calves' lives, which would have otherwise died in the winter cold, to the bulk tank cooler which keeps the milk fresh and cool until it is picked up by the milk truck.

So many of us have taken electricity for granted through all these years. But the snow-storm last March 22, 1966 will long be remembered by everyone. The poles were broken and electric lines were down for miles on end. Despair was in everyone's heart and then like an answer to our prayers came the "Big Green Trucks" down the road. As they came closer we saw it was the dynamic R.E.A. forces from all over the country. It was just a matter of time and hard work on everyone's part, when the lights went on and once again life was as it was before. But it will be a long time before all the bleak memories of the "dark nights of '66" will be forgotten. Thus, our appreciation for our electricity was renewed.

Perhaps the greatest progress of the rural life has been made possible through the service of the R.E.A. by helping the farmer to have a happier, healthier and easier life.

Old Glory Defended

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1967

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, I am in receipt of Louisiana's House Concurrent Resolution No. 200, enacted unanimously by all members of the Louisiana House of Representatives and Senate to memorialize this Congress to enact legislation to make the unlawful burning and malicious damaging of the American flag a Federal crime.

I have already introduced H.R. 9398 to provide for such a crime and I am proud to include the full text of the Louisiana resolution in the RECORD:

H. CON. RES. No. 200

A concurrent resolution to memorialize Congress to enact legislation to make the unlawful burning and malicious damaging of the American flag a Federal crime

Whereas the valiant defenders of Freedom are now engaged in a life and death struggle in the jungles, swamps and mountains of Viet Nam with the insidious hordes of atheistic communism, and

Whereas from the birth of our nation, the American flag has been a symbol of our country and the freedoms for which it stands as proclaimed by the Declaration of Independence and guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States of America, and

Whereas whenever the American flag is displayed all believers in freedom and democracy honor it with pride, dignity and reverence, and

Whereas certain seditious elements who have overstepped the boundaries of legitimate dissent have had the audacity to besmirch and attempt to destroy this sacred symbol of freedom, and

Whereas such actions are reprehensible, loathsome and disgusting to every loyal American citizen, and

Whereas such actions give aid and comfort to the enemy by attempting to subvert the morale of the armed forces of the United States, and

Whereas such actions are an attempt to create the false opinion abroad that the climate of opinion in this country is opposed to the American defense of Freedom in Viet Nam, and

Whereas legal sanctions should be imposed to prevent these despicable actions, and

Whereas legislation has been introduced in in the First Session of the 90th Congress to outlaw the malacious destruction of the American flag: Therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, the Senate concurring herein, That the Legislature of the state of Louisiana hereby urges and requests the members of the Congress of the United States, and especially the members from the state of Louisiana, to act promptly and favorably and enact into law the proposed "flag burning" legislation.

Be It Further Resolved that the Legislature extends its thanks, congratulations and commendation to the members of the Louisiana delegation for their efforts in favor of said legislation.

Be It Further Resolved that copies of this Resolution shall be transmitted by the Clerk of the House to the President of the United States, to each member of the Louisiana Delegation in Congress, to the chairmen of the respective Congressional Committees before whom this proposed legislation will be heard, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives and the President of the United States Senate.

VAIL M. DELONY,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
C. C. AYCOCK,
Lieutenant Governor and President of the Senate.

To attest:

W. CLEGG COLE,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

It Can Be Done

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT TAFT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1967

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, C.M. Sgt. John H. Hatcher will make Air Force history this month when he is presented a dictor of philosophy degree in American History from the University of Cincinnati. The 42-year-old airman, currently assigned to the headquarters, U.S. European Command, Stuttgart-Vaihingen, Germany, is the first Air Force airman to achieve a doctorate while serving on active duty.

LONG ARDUOUS JOURNEY

The road leading to this outstanding honor has been long and arduous. Sergeant Hatcher entered the Air Force in January 1943 after completion of only one semester of college work. During the next 20 years, he diligently applied himself by earning semester hours whenever time away from official duties would permit. His efforts were first rewarded in 1962 when he received a bachelor of arts degree from the University of Omaha under the Air Force Operation Bootstrap program.

Sergeant Hatcher completed requirements for a master of arts degree with both a major and minor in American History at Hardin-Simmons University, Abilene, Tex., during 1963–64. His master's thesis was titled "Dyess in Its First Decade; a Study in Base Community Relations."

DEDICATION BRINGS RESULTS

In March 1964, Sergeant Hatcher accepted a full tuition scholarship offered by the University of Cincinnati to commence advanced studies in American history leading to conferral of a doctor of philosophy degree. While engaging in advanced studies, Sergeant Hatcher was placed under the general supervision of the Air Force Institute of Techology.

At the University of Cincinnati, Sergeant Hatcher completed 104 hours of formal classroom work plus the dissertation maintaining a 3.86 grade average on a four-point scale. One of his seminar papers has been published with four more scheduled during the next 1½ years.

John Henry Hatcher, son of Mr. and Mrs. William B. Hatcher, 178 Devonshire

Avenue, Dayton, Ohio, was born December 10, 1924, in West Prestonburg, Ky. His wife, Hildegard, is from Munich; his daughter Eva, was born in Frankfurt, where Sergeant Hatcher was stationed during one of his three different tours of Europe. A son, John Henry, III, arrived at Dyess Air Force Base in 1962.

M. Sgt. John H. Hatcher has proved that whatever the difficulties, whatever the barriers, the desire for higher education can be fulfilled. Sgt. John Henry Hatcher has proved that it can be done.

Reorganization Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1967

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, when I was home during the Memorial Day weekend, a great number of veterans and veterans' organizations inquired about the delay in the reorganization bill in the House of Representatives.

Many veterans over the Nation are watching with interest and hoping that the House of Representatives will take action on the various proposals made by the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress.

An editorial follows:

[From the Stars and Stripes-The National Tribune, June 1, 1967]

REORGANIZATION BILL

The Congressional Reorganization Bill was approved by the United States Senate some weeks ago. It is now before the House of Representatives for consideration.

This bill is of particular interest to organized veterans because it provides for a long-desired objective, namely the creation of a Veterans' Affairs Committee in the United States Senate.

For many years veterans have endeavored to secure legislation of this type but despite numerical majority for this legislation in the Senate some 5 years ago, the bill could never be approved.

Now that the Senate has paved the way for passage, it is incumbent upon the House of Representatives to act. It is understood that the measure is bogged down in the House in part because some Committee chairmen would lose certain areas of their jurisdiction over legislation that is referred to their Committee. It appears that some control over certain legislation would be lost, particularly by the Agriculture Committee and the Committee on Merchant Marine.

The long-standing precedent of Congressional appointment of postmasters thruout the land would also be abolished should the bill pass in its present form.

It is unfortunate that the Congress is always slow and reluctant to modernize its legislative machinery. No Member wants to offend a fellow Member if it can possibly be avoided. As a result, those Congressmen with originality and vision often see their handiwork and ideas wind up in the wastebasket.

It is to be hoped that Members of the House will forget and ignore petty differences and proceed to consideration of this legislation that is urgently needed to streamline the activities of Congress.

Racism and the State Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1967

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that no one who has worked in the executive branch is better informed than Carl T. Rowan, relative to the lack of cooperation on the part of the executive branch in carrying out the civil rights legislation. Mr. Rowan's article, which points out the rather misleading operation on the part of Mr. Katzenbach, appeared in the Washington Star on May 31. His article follows:

RACISM AND THE STATE DEPARTMENT

When Undersecretary of State Nicholas Katzenbach set out on his just-concluded trip across Africa, he raised enough hell to see that some public relations points were taken care of.

His jet had a Negro co-pilot.

He also took along a Negro administrative officer and invited along another Negro as a guest—Ted Harris of the African-American Institute.

Three cheers for Nick Katzenbach. With the Rev. Martin Luther King accusing the United States of using black Americans as "mercenaries" in Vietnam, and with the Communists trying to portray the struggle in Southeast Asia as a race war, he'd have been a fool to visit the "dark continent" with anything other than a "totally integrated" entourage.

The tragedy is that the dumbest African envoy in town knows that the Katzenbach collection is not typical of the State Department that Katzenbach is supposed to shake up.

I have received at least a dozen calls during the last week from State Department employes about the sagging morale, the revival of racism in the foreign service, the resurgence of "the establishment" in a department that ought by all means to represent all America and all its people.

Some callers simply mourn the retirement of William Crockett, who had his troubles as deputy undersecretary of state, but who had the guts to fight racism with such vigor that he will be hated till his last breath by the old guard in the foreign service, to which he belonged.

Other callers just want to laugh about how it was Southern congressmen, irony of ironies, who protested that State and other agencies were asking employes to identify themselves according to race in order that authorities might know whether employment policies were becoming less discriminatory.

Well, the Johnson administration knuckled under and stopped the "racial census." And they've got to be glad at State, for the figures add up to a pretty sorry indictment of Dean Rusk, Nick Katzenbach and all their top colleagues.

State's census, so far made known to only a handful of people, shows that 9 percent of the employes are Negroes—well below the government average of 13 percent.

But only 2.5 percent of State's Negroes are officers whereas 65 percent of the white employes have officer status.

The census further reveals that if you are a white employe of State, the odds are 50-50 that you are representing the United States abroad. If you are a minority group member (Negro, Oriental, Indian or Spanish decent) the odds are 6-to-1 that you do not serve abroad. If you are a Negro employe, the odds jump to 11-to-1 that you do not set an official foot outside the United States.

There has been a lot of talk recently about the fact that 23 percent of the casualties in Vietnam are Negroes. But consider the State Department bureau that deals with Vietnam. State's census shows that only 88/100 of 1 percent of the officers in the Bureau of East Asian and Pacific Affairs are Negroes.

Let's hope the Russians don't create a crisis in Berlin, for State's Bureau of European Affairs would be doubly embarrassed to have to rely on any black GIs. Of 1,448 officers answering the census in that bureau, a mere six were Negroes.

I could go on for columns citing incriminating evidence from this report. But it isn't classified "top secret-eyes only." The President or Dean Rusk can get easy access to it.

The point I want to make, as one who has supported our basic commitment in Vietnam, is that Rusk cannot convincingly talk glib moralisms about freedom and justice 10,000 miles away while his own department is symbolic of the racial dark ages.

And Nick Katzenbach cannot make friends and influence people in the Africa of 1967 with traveling companions who are counterfeit versions of what Katzenbach's department ought to look like, and think like.

If Katzenbach brought anything back from Africa, it ought to be an awareness that no nation or continent is very easily suckered these days. So his first request to the President ought to be for the backing needed to make the State Department close to what he wanted Africans to believe it is.

India's Cow Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1967

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, as the time approaches for the Foreign Affairs Committee to write up the foreign aid bill, I feel the editorial in the Washington Post under date of May 21, 1967, should be made available by placing it in the appendix of the RECORD.

The editorial follows:

INDIA'S COW CRISIS

As famine laps at India's people, India's sacred cows eat food and divert resources that could keep humans alive. By one way of looking, the 10 million tons of grain India's foreign friends have pledged to give this year will be eaten by cows. By another way, those 10 million tons let India sustain a code of animal reverence which is at direct odds with the demands of development.

A former consultant to the State Department and United Nations, has pointed out that cows supply some milk for food, manure for fuel and bullocks for power, but they don't themselves work, their flesh is not eaten as meat, and Indians won't kill them. Of the 79 million cows estimated in 1961, only 20 percent produced milk. Mr. Miller, president of World Trade Relations Inc., believes that out of a misguided respect for Indian religious convictions, the United States has failed to give proper warning that its generosity and food supplies are limited. He faults India's leaders for not telling their people forthrightly that "in a matter of only a few years" foreign aid will be inadequate to feed the country's hungry.

Sacred cows are, admittedly, only one factor in Indian misery, but a factor particularly difficult for foreigners to understand. How can reverence for animals be expressed in the existence of pathetically sick and scrawny cows which scavenge unmolested in Indian villages, trample crops while villagers stand by, and die on the roads? Some Indian scholars suggest that animal reverence arises not from scriptures but merely from custom of a nonreligious sort. But a few months ago, riots forced the New Delhi government to impose a total nation-wide ban on cow slaughter. It is sobering to contemplate the relation between traditional culture and modern progress.

Try To Remember

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHALMERS P. WYLIE
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 1, 1967

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of the observance of Memorial Day at Hilliard, Ohio, on May 30, 1967, I was privileged to express some thoughts which I respectfully insert in the Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

TRY TO REMEMBER

It is a great honor for me to have the privilege of giving this Memorial Day address. This is the type of occasion when one feels hardly adequate. I wish we could hear from the one we came to honor. He would be a more fitting speaker. But he is unable to be here because of a more important commitment. I hope that my words may be essentially the thoughts he would express were he able to talk with you this day. The "he" I mention, who is best qualified to speak, is the one we came to honor—one of the brave men lying nearby. His commitment to America was so strong that he gave his life because he chose to defend our way of life. If I may, for the moment "represent" him and these other noble men, I should like to ask you, on their behalf, to "try to remember":

Try to remember that Memorial Day isn't entirely a sad occasion. It would be a very sad occasion indeed if these brave men who gave their lives for what they believed died in vain. The country and the democracy they so nobly defended lives on so they did not die in vain. While Memorial Day is primarily a day of reverence, reminiscence and respect, it is, also, a day to be grateful. That is one of the things to try to remember today: to be grateful—grateful that we live in a country such as ours and that the basic principle on which this Nation was founded—Freedom—still lives. At this very moment while we are here honoring those who have died for Freedom, a terrible war is claiming still more lives on Freedom's altar.

Try to remember that these men who lie here as well as those who today are lying in fox-holes in Vietnam, all had a choice: They could have chosen not to fight. Others have taken devious ways out of service—ranging the gamut from deliberately failing physical or mental tests to announcing simply that they refuse to be inducted and will choose jail as an alternative. But these men chose instead to go out and defend that freedom of choice—that same freedom of choice that permits some of their fellow citizens to refuse to fight even though they may not deserve this choice.

To paraphrase Voltaire: "We do not agree with your decision not to help in our struggle for freedom but we will risk our lives in that war to defend your decision—right or wrong."

The majority of our boys today do accept this responsibility of defending our freedom, for a successful democracy is predicated upon the majority of its citizens shouldering their share (and sometimes somebody else's share) of responsibility.

Citizens of countries that are not democracies have another kind of freedom: they have freedom from responsibility. But they have no freedom of choice.

In Vietnam we have another kind of responsibility. We have given our word—made a commitment—and now find ourselves faced with a responsibility to go through with what we said we'd do. An individual or nation cannot go back on a promise once given. That's another thing we must *try to remember* today, and I'm afraid all too many people are inclined to forget it.

We are fretting over proceeding with a decision we actually have already made. It wasn't a pleasant choice. Nobody wants war. But there are somethings that are more intolerable than war. Once having decided that there was a situation in Vietnam that could not be tolerated—that war was necessary to correct that situation, we find ourselves in the awkward position of indecision as to how, how soon, and even *if* we should completely implement our promise.

What should we do? Today is a day to respect and venerate the war dead—and so I think it appropriate to listen to the wishes of the dead of another war—World War One, whose wishes were in a poem articulated by John McCrae. Now John McCrae was not a poet by trade. He was a surgeon serving with the Canadian Artillery in Europe, during the hottest phase of the Second Battle of Ypres. In the dressing station right on the battlefield. Dr. McCrae tended the wounded soldiers, and heard the last words of those whose wounds he could not mend. In this same dressing station he wrote a most moving poem, in which he speaks for the dead soldiers being buried within his view. No doubt, Dr. McCrae had many occasions in those hectic and terrible days to hear the last wishes of many a dying soldier. I would like you to listen carefully to the words of those soldiers as expressed in the last stanza of his now famous poem "In Flanders Fields":

> Take up our quarrel with the foe:
> To you from failing hands we throw
> The torch; be yours to hold it high.
> If you break faith with us who die
> We shall not sleep, though poppies grow
> In Flanders fields.

The men whom we have come here to honor today sacrificed their lives to keep that torch alight. Do not we whose lives have been illuminated by that thus far eternal flame have a duty to keep the light of freedom burning? The sacrifice these men have made for us should be inspiration enough to overcome the sorrow we feel in their loss. But let us ask ourselves: Why are we grieving? Does not much of our grief stem from the fact that these loved ones are no longer around to enrich our lives? If so, are we not grieving in vain? These men died so that we could continue to live our lives in the manner that each of us finds most enriching—in other words, so that we could continue freely to choose the type of life we live. Thus they continue to enrich our lives, and will so long as we guard that freedom they defended for us. Thus their very loss has enriched our lives. Try to remember that: "without a hurt the heart is hollow."

There is a bittersweet quality to Memorial Day. This is so because memory itself is bittersweet. Yet memory is one of the things that makes us human. In fact, memory is perhaps the most significant difference between mankind and the animal kingdom. Memory permits the development of reasoning power, another extremely important difference between the human and animal kingdoms. How very sad indeed when humans are denied the very highest realization of their humanity—free choice that is made possible by the power of reasoning and the ability to remember. Try to remember—try very hard to remember that mankind was never to be ruled by any earthly master. Rather, man was given dominion over all the creatures of the earth, and instructed to know no other master than God himself. No matter how each of us individually defines God, we can surely agree that God intended us to be free—else he would have planned things so our behavior was automatic—as automatic as the instinct of the animal world. I think we can further agree that God would want us to use all the power He has given us to keep all men on earth free.

The Civil War that originally occasioned our Memorial Day was fought for that very principle of human freedom. "Now we are engaged in (another) Great Civil War, testing whether (our) nation or any nation so conceived and so dedicated can long endure (the ravages of Communism that would shackle the free world)." It is altogether fitting and proper that we should close this Memorial Day address with the words of one of the greatest men ever to die in the name of freedom. He was a man who exhibited the qualities of forgiveness and concern for all mankind, with the courage to proceed with a grievous war in order to grant freedom to a people who were not then in a position to champion their own cause. His words should identify him to each of you:

"With malice toward none, with charity for all, *with firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right*, let us strive on to finish the work we are in, to bind up the nation's wounds, to care for him who shall have borne the battle and for his widow and his orphan, to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations."

I hope these words today have evoked some meaningful memories in you. *Try to remember* just one more thing: actions speak louder than words. These men you have come here today to honor have clearly spoken with the bravest of all actions. They have given their lives in action. *Try always to remember* why they bequeathed the ultimate gift.

Political Financing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED SCHWENGEL
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 1, 1967

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, the recent action of the Senate concerning the $1 tax checkoff for presidential campaign funds was most gratifying. I have introduced legislation to repeal this provision of the 1966 "Christmas Tree" tax bill. I feel that this action should be taken, even though the Senate has delayed the implementation of the checkoff system.

An editorial by radio station WHO recently stated that people should be given an incentive to give small donations to political parties and candidates. This is a position I have held for some time. The editorial follows:

POLITICAL FINANCING

Unless some new way is found to bring it up again, the plan for a 60-million dollar, tax-financed campaign fund is dead. We hope it stays dead. Paying for political campaigns is a big problem and something needs to be done, but the 60-million dollar fund would have just created more power at the top of the political totem pole. What's needed in reforming political financing is more power in the hands of the average voter. This could be done by encouraging small gifts to political parties and candidates, by making them deductable on the federal income tax return. Many small gifts would make politicians less obligated to those who can hand out the big contributions, and would help the cause of good government.

No More Coverup

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 1, 1967

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

NO MORE COVERUP

(By Louis Stockstill)

Secretary McNamara's memorandum on "free flow of information" should afford solace and pleasure to the Armed Forces.

It is a straight-from-the-shoulder declaration which defies misunderstanding.

"News management and meddling with the news will not be tolerated," the Secretary said, "either in external public information or internal troop information."

To us and, we trust, to every office, officer, civilian employee and subordinate military command throughout the world, this means no coverup, no hush-up, no distortion. It means improved access to all internal military information of a non-security nature, and it means that external news will not be sugar-coated to the specifications of some misguided individual who seeks to impose his own viewpoint on others.

The Secretary makes this clear when he says that the DoD public information policy "demands maximum disclosure of information except for that which would be of material assistance to potential enemies." He underlines it when he says the Pentagon Public Affairs office must assure "that nothing inhibits the flow of unclassified information to the American people." He emphasizes it when he says military people "are entitled to the same unrestricted access to news as are all other citizens."

When he says there will be no "meddling," we take him at his word. And we, as well as many other publications, will be alert to see that his orders are carried out and to publicize any derelictions.

We assume that the memorandum is but the forerunner of a more definitive Defense Department information directive which will be appearing shortly.

Under a new law approved last year and due to go into effect on Independence Day this year, all departments of the Government will be required to respond more openly to requests for information of a non-security nature.

This should put at end to classifications such as "For Official Use Only" which (whatever their merit) do not involve "classified" material, and which have been used to shield internal activities from the eyes of outsides toward whom the departments have taken the attitude: "it's none of your business." Information either is in the public domain or it is not. And all activities of tax-supported departments and agencies of the Government should be public property unless they involve basic security or unless, as Secretary McNamara says, information about them "would be of material assistance to protential enemies."

The new rules, as the Secretary has outlined them, are heartening. We trust that they were intended to mean precisely what they say.

If we were to find any fault with the memorandum it would have to focus on the fact that nowhere in the statement is there an injunction that the flow of news must be handled with dispatch. We hope that the need for reasonable speed in responding to queries will be highlighted in the subsequent directive.

Long years in the news-gathering field have taught us that some officials have developed effective techniques for soundlessly slamming a door in a reporter's face. They kill him with kindness, with friendliness, with a bright smile and lip-service and promises—and either never deliver or else supply answers only when the information is no longer timely, useable or newsworthy. They are well aware that nothing is as dead as yesterday's news, unless it's the news of yesterday that never saw print.

Fortunately, the new law—when it takes effect in July—will offer injunctive relief in the courts against those who withhold the news. And, if there are flagrant violations of the law, we can expect to see this new procedure brought into play.

Naturally, we hope there will be no need for such action—that the "meddling" will stop, that there will be "maximum disclosure" and that the news will, indeed, flow freely.

Tribute to Jefferson Davis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. G. V. (SONNY) MONTGOMERY
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 1, 1967

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of the 159th anniversary of the birth of Jefferson Davis, I would like to pay tribute to this great leader of our country as well as of the South. Jefferson Davis, born on June 3, 1808, should be remembered as a statesman, soldier, patriot.

Jefferson Davis, a graduate of the U.S. Military Academy at West Point, distinguished himself in the Black Hawk war. It might be noted as a sidelight that at the beginning of the Black Hawk war, Davis was sent to Illinois to accept and muster into the U.S. services any volunteers. One of the young men who volunteered and was mustered into service by Jefferson Davis was Abraham Lincoln. Thus, Jefferson Davis administered to Lincoln the first oath of allegiance to the U.S. Government that Lincoln took.

He again served in a military capacity during the war with Mexico as the colonel in command of the Mississippi Rifles, the regiment that was a major force in the winning of the Battle of Buena Vista. It was at this battle that Davis, while urging his soldiers forward, spoke the famous phrase, "stand fast, Mississippians." Following the secession of Mississippi at the beginning of the War Between the States, he was offered and accepted a commission as major general to command the military forces of Mississippi, a post he had to resign when he was chosen President of the Confederacy.

Jefferson Davis, the statesman, served his State and country in many ways. He served as a U.S. Representative, and following the war with Mexico, Davis was apponted a U.S. Senator from Mississippi. He ranks among the greats in the Senate. He served as Secretary of War in the Cabinet of President Pierce, and took to that position brilliant leadership. He selected workers on the basis of competency, adapted and updated many modes of warfare, introduced improved weapons, established forts for the protection of western settlers, and was influential in bringing about the Gadsden Purchase. He made himself a conspicuous figure in Pierce's Cabinet, and made vast improvements in the organization of the Department.

Davis was returned to the U.S. Senate and was a leader and defender of States' rights. He resigned to return to Mississippi when his State seceded. I quote from his speech of resignation concerning the secession:

> This is done not in hostility to others, not to injure any section of the country, not even for our own pecuniary benefit, but from the high and solemn motive of defending and protecting the rights we inherited and which it is our duty to transmit unshorn to our children.

On February 18, 1861, Davis assumed the reins of leadership of the Confederate States of America. He was the first and only President of the Confederacy.

Davis was a patriot and sincere lover of the whole country. He did not advocate secession, but he firmly believed in the right of secession and of States' rights. His loyalty to his State and this principle compelled him to join his State at the time of secession.

In addition, Jefferson Davis was a deeply religious man and a good Christian. He was an author, an outstanding orator, and he was a man who was beloved by many.

In closing, I would like to quote from remarks that he made in March 1888, to a group of young men who were holding a convention at Mississippi City, Miss., which was near Davis' home, Beauvoir, on the Mississippi gulf coast. In his remarks, Davis foresaw the future of the United States and the glory and potential that the country had. These words should be an inspiration to all people. They truly indicate the great man that he was, a man who deserves the honor and respect of the people of our entire country as well as the South. After beginning his speech with the words, "Friends and fellow citizens," he paused and said:

> Ah, pardon me, the laws of the United States no longer permit me to designate you as fellow citizens, but I am thankful that I may address you as friends. I feel no regret that I stand before you a man without a country, for my ambition lies buried in the grave of the Confederacy.

He further continued:

> The faces I see before me are those of young men; had I not know this I would not have appeared before you. Men in whose hands the destinies of our Southland lie, for love of her I speak my silence, to speak to you a few words of respectful admonition. The past is dead; let it bury its dead, its hopes and its aspirations. Before you lies the

future—a future full of golden promise; a future of expanding national glory, before which all the world shall stand amazed. Let me beseech you to lay aside all rancor, all bitter sectional feeling, and to take your places in the ranks of those who will bring about a consummation devoutly to be wished—a reunited country."

International Peace Garden—A Monument to Brotherhood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS S. KLEPPE
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 1, 1967

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, in this time of strife, turmoil, and conflict in so many parts of the world, it is a refreshing and inspiring experience to visit the International Peace Garden which straddles the United States-Canadian border in North Dakota and Manitoba. This park is a living monument to the eternal friendship of the people of the United States and their good neighbors to the north. The words on the dedicatory boundary plaque of the Peace Garden pledge "that as long as men shall live, we will not take up arms against one another."

July 14 will mark the 35th anniversary of the dedication of the International Peace Garden. Mr. Phil Hoghaug, secretary of the American section of the International War Veterans' Alliance, an organization which is deeply interested in the garden, has called my attention to an editorial in the Minot, N. Dak, Daily News of May 20, 1967, entitled "We Salute the Peace Garden." I want to include it in the RECORD, together with an address delivered at Winnipeg, Manitoba, on August 25, 1966, by Mr. John A Stormon, Rolla, N. Dak., president of the International Peace Garden, Inc., before the Mid-Continent Regional Park and Recreation Conference, an affiliate of the National Recreation and Park Association. It is an excellent account of the history and the purposes of the Peace Garden:

WE SALUTE PEACE GARDEN

Some kind of salute is in order, with congratulations from the grassroots in North Dakota, to the citizens private and public who have worked without rest to bring the International Peace Garden to the place of importance it has today.

We were moved to say something about it as we read a report this week of the semiannual meeting of the board held at Brandon.

For one thing we noted that Rep. Oscar Solberg of Mylo, than whom the Peace Garden has had no more indefatigable salesman among North Dakotans, was elected to the board.

For another we noted that Canadians interested in the Peace Garden paid a fitting ceremonial honor to John A. Stormon of Rolla for his 10 years of service as president, and then topped it off by appointing him honorary deputy governor of Brandon for the remainder of the Canadian Centennial Year.

Since the death of Erick F. Willis of Winnipeg, former lieutenant governor of the province of Manitoba, Mr. Stormon is one of the few remaining founders of the International Peace Garden association.

We marvel how this group of dedicated individuals, most of them private citizens, have managed to make the dream of the International Peace Garden come true. And we marvel how they have stayed with it, in season and out of season all these years, and how they have been able to enlist the enthusiastic support of influential men and women, including Rep. Brynhild Haugland of Minot and Rep. Solberg, to carry the banners after them.

The Peace Garden founders started with nothing but faith and hope and an idea conceived by a horticulturalist in eastern Canada, which they transplanted to the Turtle Mountains. Our reference files remind us that come next July 14 it will be 35 years since the Peace Garden grounds and the original boundary plaque were dedicated.

The founders took hold of every string and bootstrap within their reach to get the Peace Garden idea off the ground and into stage after stage of development. What the private citizens' organization has accomplished through the years, appealing to citizens' groups in both countries, and also to state, provincial and national governments, for development funds, is nothing short of remarkable. At the same time they have kept rather diligent and effective control of the remarkable international park in the hands of this citizens' corporation.

Admittedly, the complexity of involvement of local, state and provincial, and national governments and their agencies in this project has become a little too deep for some bureaucratic minds to understand. In the course of the years funds and services to help the Peace Garden along have come through the national park services of both countries, through provincial and state agencies as well, including the State Highway Department and the State Historical Society in North Dakota, and corresponding set-ups in Manitoba. It may confound modern accountants of some of these government agencies to understand how, and why, legislatures and governments on both sides of the boundary have been willing to funnel public funds into the border-straddling park. But it is a tribute to the confidence the public has in the private citizens' organization that these government contributions have continued to be forthcoming. And those small-minded bureaucrats who have raised questions about fiscal procedures and responsibilities usually have had their ears boxed.

Whatever the future holds as to public or private control of this grand international venture, both Canadian and U.S. citizenry owe a debt of gratitude to the individuals who have served on the Peace Garden board of directors. It will be remembered as long as the Peace Garden exists that this is something ordinary citizens, not government officials, succeeded in doing. They have proved to the satisfaction of most of us that the old adage holds: Where there is a will there is a way.

THE INTERNATIONAL PEACE GARDEN, PAST AND FUTURE

The International Peace Garden situated atop the Turtle Mountains of Manitoba and North Dakota, on the border between the United States and Canada, midway between the Atlantic and the Pacific, and near the geographical center of the North American Continent, is a living symbol of the philosophy of brotherhood among peoples and nations. It the spirit of brotherhood which it typifies, were to be accepted and practiced in the affairs of individuals and nations, the unrest which now disturbs the entire world would disappear. It would create tolerance and better understanding. It would eliminate selfishness and greed among nations. The result would be peace and good will in our international and national relations, and this world would be a better place in which to live. The International Peace Garden is therefore entitled to the serious consideration of all people and of all nations who believe in the philosophy of brotherhood among peoples and nations, and in the so-called American Way of Life.

Our two countries are confronted with a great challenge. Our freedoms and our rule of law, our very civilization, is being challenged and ridiculed by the communist dominated areas of the world. And the question may well be asked: wherein have we lost our influence, and perhaps—why is there now a question about our leadership? It is therefore essential that we do our part, and that we hold out to the world, to the best of our ability, the purposes for which the International Peace Garden was founded, in an era when peace among nations was thought possible.

Dr. C. N. Nelson, President of the North Dakota School of Forestry, in an address at the Peace Garden a few years ago, said: "The developments in plantings, masonry, facilities and program of the Peace Garden to the present time have been magnificent, but do not by any means represent its potential. I foresee the possibility of this Garden becoming the continental cultural center where the finest expressions of the aspirations of free men, as found in all forms of art, might be presented for public edification. I see the possibility of this being the shrine which would draw peace pilgrimages from all parts of the world. I see the possibility of this Garden being the scene of symposiums similar to the Goethe bicentennial held at Aspen, Colorado in 1949 when the most influential people, and including Albert Schweitzer, gathered to properly honor one of the greatest literary artists of continental Europe. I see it as a place where thoughtful, influential, and concerned men and women might come for meditation and contemplation and out of this gain a world greatly enriched thereby. I see it not so much as a place of fun or carnival-like entertainment, as a place of recreation in the finest sense. I see it finally as a place, not dedicated to the escapism of feverish activity too common to most tourist attractions, but a place where a man might find respite from the tensions and troubles of his everyday world, and find here the serenity and peace, the atmosphere and environment he needs to see the true purpose of his life".

And again he said: "It ought to reflect, as a mirror, man's understanding of God with all the integrity, reason, revelation and faith made available to him. Among these elements are beauty, grace, truth, mercy and love. As long as these expressions of virtue find their way into the plans and projects of the Peace Garden, the spirit of Henry Moore and all others who have contributed to its development will ask the benediction of the Creator upon all efforts in its behalf. And if such be the case we can look forward to a development exceeding our fondest dreams. * * *"

But the facts regarding the Peace Garden must now be given to you. Its detailed history will be found in "A History of the International Peace Garden" published by the State Historical Society of North Dakota in 1964, and available to all interested persons. We shall mention only such facts as we deem elementary and essential.

For your general information I must state it was proposed by Henry J. Moore of Islington, Ontario, in August of 1929, at the annual convention of the National Association of Gardeners, held at Toronto. The convention approved the idea, appointed a committee to select the site, and to make plans for its realization. The site was selected by a committee of three, officially confirmed at Toronto in December 1931.

International Peace Garden, Inc., was incorporated as a non-profit membership corporation under the laws of the State of New

York, September 17th, 1930, and its Articles of Incorporation have been filed in North Dakota and Manitoba, authorizing it to do business therein. Its purpose was the creation and maintenance of a Garden as a memorial to the peace that has existed between the United States of America and the Dominion of Canada.

The Cairn was built in 1932, and dedicated July 14, 1932, and it contains the dedication pledge, which reads: "To God in His Glory, we two nations dedicate this Garden and pledge that as long as men shall live, we will not take up arms against one another".

The first development in the Peace Garden was in 1934 when a Civilian Conservation Corps Park Camp was allocated to the area. The camp remained until 1941, and its development included The Lodge, the Cabins, the creation of Lake Udall, the fencing of the American section, and considerable work in the eastern section of the formal area on the border.

The Peace Garden area comprises 2,339.3 acres, of which 888 acres are in the United States, and 1451.3 acres in Canada.

Since CCC days, the development has been in funds appropriated by the U.S. Congress, the Canadian House of Commons, the North Dakota Legislature, the Manitoba Legislature, and contributions made by organizations and individuals interested in the development of the project.

Regarding our operations, as an illustration I may state that in the last fiscal year ending July 31st, 1966, United States Federal funds available were slightly in excess of $70,000.00. And moneys received by our Treasurer from the sources mentioned totalled the sum of $113,791.14. During the same period the disbursements of our Peace Garden Treasurer for development and maintenance have totalled the sum of $111,961.83. In addition the Canadian Centennial Pavilion is being constructed and completed this year at a cost of $100,000.00, one-third being provided by Canadian and two-thirds being provided by Manitoba. The hard surfacing of the main road in the United States Section costing in excess of $76,000.00 is being paid $60,000.00 with United States Federal funds, and the balance provided by the State of North Dakota.

The National Park Service of the United States, with the cooperation of the National Park Service of Canada, and Manitoba and North Dakota Park Authorities, has prepared a Master Plan for the future development of the International Peace Garden. This has been presented to the Congress of the United States with request for further cooperation in the completing of the development of the formal area. Following action by Congress, the Canadian House of Commons and the Government of Canada will be asked to cooperate in the completion of the formal area on the Canadian side of the border. Most funds for maintenance are now being received from North Dakota and Manitoba, and from rents from use of facilities, and from contributions by interested organizations.

The International Peace Garden is now the home of the International Music Camp, which on July 31st completed its 11th year. In seven weekly camps there was an enrollment of 2150 students receiving instruction in Band, Twirling, Piano, Organ, Orchestra, Musical Drama, Chamber Music, Ballet, Modern Dance and Art, with a distinguished international faculty under the able direction of Dr. Merton Utgaard, Camp Director. Thousands of people are attracted to the weekly Sunday afternoon concerts. In 1966 following the camps, 130 young people toured Europe for two weeks, being a Band of 70 pieces, and a Chorus of 60, winning many distinguished honors, including a first in an international music competition in Holland.

A Farm Bureau Seminar was held the first week in August for 266 boys and girls, with a distinguished list of National speakers. The Royal Canadian Legion Track and Field Camp for Manitoba, Saskatchewan, and Western Ontario was held the second and third weeks in August for 216 girls and 188 boys, with 20 coaches coming from 16 different Universities. The Peace Garden has one of the finest cinder tracks in the mid-continent. The camp is for young men and women of junior and senior high school age, interested in physical fitness and desiring instruction in track and field events. Boy Scouts also extensively use the Garden for annual camping events.

Other youth groups on a national level are planning to make use of the facilities at the Peace Garden. The Peace Garden is now the Youth Center of the Mid-North American Continent with more than 3000 of our boys and girls receiving instruction in Music, Song, Dance, Fine Arts, Sports, Patriotism and Religion, the basic essentials for our youth in our civilization and way of life. It is now one of the largest youth camp centers on the North American Continent, and our facilities are among the best to be found anywhere.

The general plan for the construction was prepared by Hugh Vincent Feehan, a landscape architect, acting for the American Society of Landscape Architects. It has been further developed by architect with the National Park Service of the United States, in cooperation with the National Parks Service in Canada. It is fast becoming a tourist attraction in the mid-continent, drawing into the Garden more than 150,000 visitors during the summer season. The Sovereign Grand Lodge of Odd Fellows have provided a Main Entrance at a cost exceeding $41,000.00. The General Grand Chapter, Order of the Eastern Star are raising a fund of $75,000.00 for a project in the formal area. The Knights of Columbus, Fourth Degree, have contributed the funds for the construction of the Outdoor Theatre in the Amphitheatre. The North Dakota and National Homemakers Councils, and the Canadian and Manitoba Womens Institutes, have provided substantial sums of money for development of picnic and catering facilities at the Garden. The Imperial Order Daughters of the Empire have for more than twenty years contributed money annually for development of the Garden, and many other organizations, too numerous to mention in the allotted time, have greatly aided or contributed to its development.

The International Peace Garden was proposed in 1929, located in 1931, dedicated in 1932, and now has been 34 years in the building, and it is far from completed. It is only beginning to visualize the dreams of Henry J. Moore, the National Association of Gardeners, and the men and the women who may be said to be the founders and builders. When it is completed it will be worthy of the faith, the effort, the sacrifice and the toil that has gone into it. It will be a mighty living "memorial to the peace that has existed between the United States of America and the Dominion of Canada". It will stand as a mighty monument to the dedication pledge: "To God in His Glory, we two nations dedicate this Garden and pledge ourselves that as long as men shall live, we will not take up arms against one another".

Yes, the International Peace Garden has a future, and it will soon become one of the major attractions on the North American continent, a living Garden of flowers, plants, shrubs and trees to symbolize the philosophy of Brotherhood among peoples and nations, a major institution in the development of the young people of the mid-continent, rendering an outstanding service to our American and Canadian way of life, with its freedoms and its rule of law.

What Rural Electrification Means to Me and My Community

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1967

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, this year, as in past years, the Nebraska Rural Electric Association has sponsored a very worthwhile essay contest in which the youth of Nebraska are invited to compete. The topic of the essay contest is "What Rural Electrification Means to Me and My Community." Winning essayists are rewarded by being permitted to participate in a Nebraska youth tour to Washington.

It is always a pleasure for me to include some of the prize-winning essays in the RECORD. I hope my distinguished colleagues will find the following essays as interesting as I have.

Three of the essays follow:

THE VALUE OF RURAL ELECTRIFICATION IN OUR HOME AND COMMUNITY

(By Tony Booth, age 16, junior, Thomas County High School, son of Russell Booth, Thedford, Nebr.)

(NOTE.—Contestant sponsored by the Custer Public Power District, Broken Bow, Nebr., in cooperation with the Nebraska Rural Electric Association.)

This year we are celebrating the Centennial of Nebraska and what a celebration it should be! We have gone through many changes in the past one hundred years—from being a part of the Great American Desert, which many of our friends in the East think it still is, to being the best of the fifty states. Much of this has been brought about through the coming of electricity. For this we owe a debt of gratitude to Senator George W. Norris for his efforts in bringing electricity into Nebraska through the Rural Electrification Administration.

When I compare the lives of my grandparents and my parents to my life today I am most grateful for electricity. The R.E.A. line was built to my ranch home when I was three years old so I have but a faint memory of living without electricity; very few kids born in Nebraska since 1950 have had that experience. Before the days of electricity, people used kerosene lamps, did the outdoor chores by the light of a coal oil lantern, broke the ice in the tanks for the livestock, and chopped their wood with an ax or burned "Hereford lump" which the kids picked and piled on weekends in the fall. The kids pumped and carried that water, and my grand mothers heated their water on a stove and washed by hand on a washboard.

Cooking must have been difficult in those days because the old range heat was not uniform. They had no dishwashers, no refrigerators, no deepfreezes in which to store their foods. It is all so different today, and we are able to have a much greater variety of food. At one time last fall we had, in addition to the usual Nebraska beef and pork, Canadian fish, deer, wild turkey, duck, grouse and pheasant. We keep a supply of factory packaged frozen foods which makes for "easy batching" when the need arises.

Custer Public Power supplies the energy for our all-electric home. Attractive baseboard heaters supplies our home with clean, quiet, healthful and uniform heat. Electricity cools our home in summer, cooks our meals, heats our water, washes, dries and irons our clothes, automatically turns on our security yard light at dusk and runs a multitude of labor-saving appliances in our house, garage and barn. It warms the drinking water and living quarters for our livestock, besides providing the power for irrigation of our yard and garden.

Our entire community is very dependent upon electricity. It lights our streets, schools, churches and offices. It runs our movies, pumps our gasoline and in the limited number of words, I cannot begin to name all the uses of electricity. I can only say that when it is "Off" we are at a standstill.

Due to the efficiency of the skilled maintenance crews, only once last winter were we able to "enjoy" living as in the days before the wonders of electricity. Current was restored then, in less than eight hours and life went back to normal. Since electricity came to our community, we have almost everything one can find in the metropolitan areas, except problems such as smog and congestion. Through radio and television, we are kept informed about local, state, national and international news, weather and sports. They furnish us with a variety of entertainment.

I am glad to be living in this all-electric age. New industries are coming to Nebraska. Irrigation with electric power is making farming and ranching more pleasant and profitable. Nebraska is becoming more and more a state of great opportunities as each day new uses are being found for this most vital commodity—electricity.

What Rural Electrification Means to Me and My Community

(By Ann Hinkle, age 17, junior, St. John's Catholic School, daughter of Emery A. Hinkle, Petersburg, Nebr.)

(Note.—Contestant sponsored by the Cornhusker Public Power District, Columbus, Nebr., in cooperation with the Nebraska Rural Electric Association.)

"Electricity is the core around which today's life is built." Within the last 50 years the new discoveries of this great energy are remarkable. Many of the greatest wonders of the world are due to the new machines which use this power.

In the beginning, farmers wanted electricity primarily for more convenient lighting. Now, however, entire farms are wired to provide efficient, labor-saving methods of doing work on the farm. Farm electrification is no longer a luxury—it is the number one necessity.

Today farms must produce on a large scale. As rural population is on the decrease, every farm must be operated at top efficiency. Electricity is the main source which makes this possible.

Our farmland produces top yields because of water brought to the field from electrically-powered irrigation pumps. Electric grain drying and efficient machanized feeding equipment enables feeders to market livestock to provide meat for our nation. Dairy farmers use electric milkers, refrigerated bulk tanks and separators.

Electric welders, drills, power saws, etc., help farmers to keep their equipment up to peak performance at a low cost. Electric mercury vapor yard lights discourage prowlers and illuminate feedlots at a cost of pennies a week.

The home is run completely on electricity. Electricity provides heat in the winter and air conditioning in the summer. Water pumps and water heaters mean instant hot water for all household needs. Electric dishwashers, washers and dryers, mixers, vacuum cleaners, frying pans, coffee makers, toasters, and many other appliances allow the housewife to have more leisure time for her family. The radio and television, which provide enjoyment for the whole family, also use electricity.

The wide spread use of electricity was greatly due to the Rural Electrification Act, which provided funds allowing cities, private companies and other organizations to distribute the God given power to rural areas.

Never before have farmers been able to live as well as they do now—bcause of electricity. Never before have so few farmers been able to produce such quantities of food as farmers do now—because of electricity. Farmers now are able to spend less time working on the farm and more time to give to community and Church activities.

What Rural Electrification Means to Me and My Community is this: "It is essential for a growing and progressive America."

The Value of Rural Electrification in My Community

(By Robert Turek, age 17, junior, Hemingford High School, son of Frank E. Turek, Hemingford, Nebr.)

(Note.—Contestant sponsored by the Panhandle Rural Electric Membership Association, Alliance, Nebr., in cooperation with the Nebraska Rural Electric Association.)

Rural electrification is one of the most wonderful inventions that my community, which depends on farming and ranching for its livelihood, enjoys.

I have heard my parents tell of the unpredictable system of electric power which they first used. It consisted of a windcharger and batteries; it depended on the wind velocity to produce the amount of power needed to charge the batteries. If the wind velocity was not enough to charge the batteries, power had to be used sparingly. Electricity is now used for practically every job connected with farming or ranching; when the power is interrupted for even an hour or so, we feel it is a disaster. More labor and time-saving devices are being invented for use with electricity all of the time, and we on the farm can make use of these devices the same as our city neighbors.

Radio and television are a great help, because my community is better informed, about weather conditions and world news; consequently it is more prosperous and the people are happier. The young men are more inclined to stay and work in the community after they are grown, because they have the same opportunities as others in the city, and also enjoy pure water and unpolluted air. Electricity is used to pump the water, and light our homes. It also is used to run the household conveniences which make the work easier for the housewife.

During the storm in November, 1966, we realized the full value of rural electrification to our community. Several poles had been felled and the wires broken, so the community was without power for quite some time. Cattle in the feeding pens were without water, unless it was hauled to them by hand, and the people were without lights, water and heat until the line was repaired. No one fully appreciated the value of rural electrification before this time; now we knew that it would be almost impossible to get along without it.

Rural electrification is not to be considered lightly in my community, as everyone appreciates its valuableness to us all. As one looks over the community at night and sees the many dots of light looking like so many stars; one cannot help but feel thankful that he lives in a country where it is possible to have all these modern conveniences and a chance to improve his way of life.

Yes, rural electrification is a boon to my community in more ways than can be listed here. I will say that its value can never be measured adequately, but I am thankful it serves my community. I hope we will never be without rural electrification and that it will continue to prosper.

Denial of the Right To Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. RARICK
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 1, 1967

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Supreme Court has now ruled that the guaranteed right to vote is but a myth. For in their decision on the California case involving proposition 14, or the Rumford Act, these judges have found that "the right to vote" is guaranteed only if the electorate votes for and adopts policies acceptable to the unelected Federal judiciary and the other members of their bureaucratic team while they continue hard at it in a constant war against individual liberty, private ownership of property, and free enterprise.

So the right to vote is no longer fundamental—the democratic dream of "ordered equality" has now turned into a political tool to steal power and maintain control.

This case typifies basic Warrenism and can be explained simply as this. They want everyone to have "the right to vote" but they regard the people as too stupid to know how to vote, so, the unelected rulers must abridge the power of the people should the people disagree.

Shameful—to break their oaths, to deny a fundamental constitutional right and shatter 190 years of tried, tested, and proven rule of government by the voters.

Why should the U.S. Supreme Court hate and despise their fellow Americans so? Why should they be afraid to let the people govern themselves?

This decision mocks human rights and destroys individual liberty. We behold a prostituting of the law to take liberty from our people under the emotional smokescreen of giving something to another class.

Mr. Warren and the rest of the bureaucratic team have, by this decision, tried and convicted every taxpayer, voter, and State in the United States without a charge, a trial or a hearing, and has in effect sentenced them to a socialistic ideological slavery. Voters' supremacy is now replaced with a ruling guideline of acceptability by a bureaucratic supremacy.

This is reverse extremism, overthrowing the meaning and purpose of the first 10 amendments which free any individual to privately discriminate as he wishes. Liberty can only exist so long as there is freedom to discriminate. Any government that abolishes discrimination destroys individual liberty. Are we, as individual Americans, to be robots because a few appointed judges so desire?

Henceforth, all State constitutions and local charters are subject to attack, suspension, or overthrow by the black-robed theorists if the people's governing provisions do not jibe with the intellectuals' desires and delights.

Freedom of dissent, speech, and religion can all now be voided if "the boys" decide it is racist. How long before an

elected official can be ruled out of office because the Court finds his votes were racially gained?

If a candidate says he is white and is elected, can his election be attacked because his votes were racially motivated? If taxpayers reject a bond issue in a racially mixed neighborhood, can the Supreme Court throw out all votes "against"?

Who and what influences so-called Americans that they are afraid to trust their people to control their own lives and futures. The theories are foreign, alien and un-American, and may be examined with recent announcements such as Earl Warren and Mrs. Warren listed as "junketeers" for the State Department on taxpayers' dollars, interfering in Latin American countries and accompanied by, of all people, Drew Pearson, the vehement antijunketeer. He has not yet smeared his fellow travelers, the Warrens.

And then, Earl Warren's son-in-law, a former F. D. R. correspondent, receiving the directorship of the Voice of America. Could there be any connection between these junkets and alinements? I insert the articles of May 30, from the Morning Advocate, the Chicago Tribune, and the Evening Star in the RECORD:

[From the Morning Advocate, May 30, 1967]

HIGH COURT RULES ILLEGAL CALIFORNIA'S PROPOSITION 14

WASHINGTON (AP).—The Supreme Court held California's Proposition 14 unconstitutional Monday and said states may not "authorize racial discrimination in the housing market."

The 5–4 ruling found that the voter-approved amendment to the state constitution did more than wipe out two California laws that had barred discrimination in housing sales and rentals.

It made "the right to discriminate" one of the basic policies of the state, said Justice Byron R. White for the high court.

The amendment, adopted through the initiative process in November 1964 by a margin of nearly 2 to 1, gave property owners "absolute discretion" in housing sales and rentals.

The Proposition 14 decision Monday upholds the California Supreme Court which ruled last May that the amendment unconstitutionally involves the state in racial discrimination.

"There is no sound reason for rejecting this judgment," White said.

Proposition 14 had knocked down California housing rental and sale acts sponsored by Byron Rumford and Jesse Unruh.

Former assemblyman Rumford welcomed Monday's decision as "heartwarming" and said "it is a glorious day for the fundamental rights of the citizens of California."

Thomas Lynch, who fought to overthrow Proposition 14 with the help from the federal government, said of the Court's decision: "I am delighted. I was sure the California Supreme Court's stand would be upheld."

White said adoption of Proposition 14 gave private discrimination in housing a far different status than was the case before passage of the Rumford-Unruh antidiscrimination laws.

"The right to discriminate, including the right to discriminate on racial grounds, was now embodied in the state's basic charter, immune from legislative, executive, or judicial regulation at any level of the state government," White wrote.

Justice John M. Harlan, speaking for the four dissenters, said "I am wholly at loss to understand how this straight-forward effectuation of a change in the California Constitution can be deemed a violation of the 14th Amendment."

Harlan said the 14th Amendment "does not reach such state constitutional action any more than it does a simple legislative repeal of legislation forbidding private discrimination."

Voting with White to affirm the California court's ruling were Chief Justice Earl Warren, a former California governor, and Associate Justices William O. Douglas, William J. Brennan Jr. and Abe Fortas.

Dissenting with Harlan were Justices Hugo L. Black, Tom C. Clark and Potter Stewart.

The California Supreme Court, White said, "armed as it was with the knowledge of the facts and circumstances concerning the passage and potential impact" of Proposition 14, "and familiar with the millieu in which that provision would operate, has determined that the provision would involve the state in private racial discriminations to an unconstitutional degree."

"We accept this holding of the California court."

California real estate interests had campaigned for adoption of the state amendment. Two apartment owners, Neil Reitman of Santa Ana and Clarence Snyder of Los Angeles, appealed the California court's ruling to the Supreme Court.

[From the Chicago Tribune, May 30, 1967]

WARREN LISTED AS JUNKETEER—TAKES WIFE ALONG ON STATE DEPARTMENT PAY

(By Philip Warden)

WASHINGTON, May 30.—Chief Justice Earl Warren got the state department to pay most of his expenses on a trip to South America, a House appropriations committee report on hearings on a 400 million dollar state department appropriation request for 1968 disclosed today.

Warren got the state department to pay the expenses of his wife. Nina Palmquist Warren, by listing her as a "voluntary social welfare" worker, the state department record showed.

13-DAY TRIP

"Is Mrs. Warren an expert on social welware?" a Warren aid at the Supreme court was asked yesterday.

"Social welfare expert?" the Warren aid asked in astonishment.

Warren, whose government salary is $40,000, collected $586 from the state department for a 13-day trip to Bolivia, Peru, and Colombia, as a visiting "United States specialist."

"Field of activity—participate in informal seminar type discussions," the state department report said. The field of activity in Mrs. Warren's case was listed as "voluntary social welfare." Her pay: $362.

Warren is the former Republican nominee for the Vice Presidency whose court decisions have made him the darling of the Democratic liberals.

STEWART PAID TOO

Another justice of the court also traveled abroad at state department expense, but what he charged the government was not recorded in the hearings. He is Associate Justice Potter Stewart, who visited Austria, England, Italy, and the Netherlands under one grant, and Japan, Thailand, and Viet Nam under another. His travel-for-pay assignment was to "hold discussions with jurists, government officials, lawyers, and others concerned with law and society."

"The United States government civilian exchange programs for fiscal year 1968 were [are] estimated at $449,934,450 as compared with $5,821,513 20 years ago," the appropriations committee reported to the House.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, May 30, 1967]

HIS NEW LINE—DALY CHOSEN TO RUN 'VOICE'

He's bigger than a breadbox and works for a profit-making organization.

But he soon won't.

He, of course, is John Charles Daly, the host of TV's "What's My Line?"

Daley, 53, was named yesterday to be the new director of the Voice of America.

Daly will succeed John Chancellor, who is returning to television as national affairs correspondent for NBC.

Leonard H. Marks, director of the U.S. Information Agency, told a news conference of the change yesterday.

The new VOA director said he is much honored to succeed Chancellor, who has been director since September 1965.

In response to a question, Daly said, "The standards of truth which have always been current pretty much rule out the problem of a 'credibility gap' as far as the Voice is concerned."

Marks noted that Chancellor is returning to NBC at a considerably increased salary.

Daly laughed and said his pay will be reduced. His annual pay will drop from about $250,000 to $24,500 in his new job.

Daly plans to take up his new post around Labor Day, when "What's My Line" will have ended its long television run.

Daly will join another member of the family in government service. He is married to the former Virginia Warren, whose father, Earl Warren, has been chief justice since 1953.

Daly was born in Johannesburg, South Africa, where his Boston-born father was a geologist and mining engineer. His mother was English, and Daly comes naturally by an accent that led adolescent critics in prep school to observe that he "talked funny."

Funny or not, the fluent Daly talked his way to national recognition.

He started out as a $25-a-week wool sorter in Boston, moved to Washington where he was a bus dispatcher for Capital Transit and in 1937 joined CBS as a radio announcer.

Daly traveled more than 150,000 miles as a White House correspondent with President Franklin D. Roosevelt. During World War II, he was a war correspondent in Africa, the Middle East and Italy.

In 1953, Daly became news and public affairs director of ABC, but resigned in 1960 in a policy dispute. He continued his CBS role as quiz show moderator during his tenure with ABC.

Daly's first wife was the former Margaret Criswell Neal, and they were divorced in 1960. They had three children, now grown. Daly has two sons by his second marriage.

Ruthless Mob Rule Must Be Held Down

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1967

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, the people of this country are very much disturbed about the activities of some of the ultraliberal and leftist groups.

To put it mildly, some of the acts of these people are shocking as well as unlawful and indecent. In fact, many of the actions of the Carmichaels, the Kings, and their followers border on anarchy as well as treason.

That eminent columnist and writer, the executive vice president of the Southern States Industrial Council, Mr. Thurman Sensing, has recently written an article entitled "Ruthless Mob Rule Must Be Held Down." The article was very appropriately carried as an editorial by the Laurel Leader-Call, a highly respected newspaper published in Laurel, Miss.

With the hope that this splendid article may receive even wider circulation, I am placing it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The article is as follows:

RUTHLESS MOB RULE MUST BE HELD DOWN

(By Thurman Sensing)

The worsening of the climate of violence, anarchy and civil disobedience was grimly apparent in recent days in several sections of the country. The rapid breakdown of law and order and of public safety and private decency could well become a prime issue in the next presidential campaign.

In California, a band of ruffians who call themselves Black Panthers knocked over sergeants at arms and invaded the California legislature while it was in session. The invaders carried with them a variety of loaded weapons, including sawed-off shotguns. The leaders of the group broke into the proceedings of the legislature and shouted insults.

In New Hampshire, former Gov. George Wallace of Alabama who had been invited to speak at Dartmouth College, was forced off the speaking platform by a gang of roughnecks. Approximately a thousand students then surrounded him in his automobile, rocked it, and came close to injuring him. Mr. Wallace showed remarkable coolness in a dangerous situation, but he rightly pointed out that kind of "academic freedom" displayed by the Dartmouth students could get one killed. The editor of the Dartmouth student newspaper said of the incident, which came close to resembling a lynching party: "I'm ashamed." Indeed the entire administration and student body of the famous old "liberal arts" college should feel shame for what took place.

In Kentucky, radical demonstrators threatened to disrupt the historic Kentucky Derby if they did not get their way on "open housing" demands, and forced the governor to call out National Guardsmen to preserve the peace.

In New Jersey, a radical protest group based in Rochester, N.Y., and known as FIGHT (Freedom, Integration, God, Honor—Today) conducted a huge demonstration against Eastman Kodak Company, one of the country's model employers and most progressive business enterprises.

The demonstration took place at the company's annual meeting, and 100 state policemen were needed to contain demonstrators who had been recruited at Cornell, Princeton and other colleges. The leader of FIGHT, the Rev. Franklin D. Roosevelt Florence, vowed to war against Kodak until demands for exclusive control over hiring of unskilled workers had been met. In a speech at the company session, he gave stockholders a one-hour ultimatum to bow to FIGHT's demands. Fortunately, the stockholders refused to pay heed to this.

These and other developments around the country point to a situation which is getting out of hand. Lawless, contemptuous elements in the country believe they have free rein to do what they want to disturb the peace. Not only do they want to trample on the rights of the majority, but they want to have police protection while they go on a rampage of disorderly behavior. For example, when Gen. William C. Westmoreland received an honorary degree from the University of South Carolina—his native state—the ceremony was rudely interrupted. A handful of demonstrators later were indignant that they had not been protected in their protest by state police.

Unless the disorderly protest minority is curbed in this country, life may become intolerable to decent, respectable citizens and responsible businesses. The California legislature may not be the last to be invaded by armed groups. Traditionally, this has been a tolerant country. Americans sensibly have realized that every nation has a tiny element of kooks who have to be humored a little. But there is a limit on just toleration. The small group of oddballs—the lunatic fringe in American life—cannot be allowed to ride roughshod over the laws or to create a kind of epidemic of disorder.

This is the real danger. No doubt the students at Dartmouth College are generally good citizens. It is likely that the vast majority were caught up in the fever of excitement created by a small cadre of disruptionists. That's the way all mobs work: the few incite the many, and terrorism and tragedy results. To prevent mob rule in this country, on the campus and off, will require some stern leadership in public office, the press, the bar, and in the pulpit. Those clergymen who have involved themselves in demonstrations bear an especially heavy responsibility for what is taking place. They should examine their consciences, and wake up to the necessity for upholding law and decency.

A Quarter Century of Community Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1967

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, year after year, day after day, a large part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is devoted to newspaper articles and editorials. The practice is highly salutary, for it not only familiarizes Members with prevailing spirit and temper of the various States and communities, but also provides a repository of information for future reference.

A newspaper column frequently contains the genesis of constructive legislation, and just as often a proposed law is put to rest through opposition developed by the fourth estate. The concensus reflected in a constituency's press is always an invaluable asset to a conscientious public servant.

The Pittsburgh Press Club and the Pittsburgh chapter of Sigma Delta Chi earlier this year presented the Johnstown, Pa., Observer with the Golden Quill Award for general excellence in local coverage. In further emphasis of the quality of this weekly publication, the Pennsylvania award in the National Travel Writing Contest for Newspapers has been made to Mrs. Betty Marky for a column appearing in the Observer. The contest brought 689 entries from 45 States, with one winner in each State.

The Observer will celebrate its silver jubilee on the coming June 2, and these honors will serve as fitting birthday rememberances. I should like the RECORD to include Mrs. Marky's "Come Along With Me Column," which was the Pennsylvania winner in the contest designed to give editors an incentive to publicize travel attractions in their localities and to support the President's discover America program.

The article follows:

A DIFFERENT SIGHT

(By Betty Marky)

So you think you've been everywhere and done everything? You've watched the sun set in the Grand Canyon, sighed over the charm of Paris from atop the Eiffel Tower, gone for a camel ride in Egypt and picked bananas in Panama. You've climbed the highest mountains and swum the deepest seas. There's nothing left to excite, stimulate or entertain you. Ho, hum. Travel and sightseeing have become one great bore with everyone doing the same things and visiting the same old tourist spots. Well, brighten up, and be prepared to change your mind about "nothing different to do and see." There is something different and interesting to see, and it's right here in Cambria County.

Have you ever been down in a coal mine? No, I'm not kidding and I'm not changing the subject. A coal mine is the newest tourist attraction in Cambria County, and one of the most unusual places to visit throughout the state of Pennsylvania. Located near St. Boniface between Patton and Hastings on State Route 36, the Seldom Seen Valley Mine is becoming a "must see" stop on the itinerary of many tourists from throughout the country—and even the world. But how many area residents have visited this educational and different site? Those of us who have resided in this section most of our lives tend to take our coal and steel industrial surroundings for granted, or to ignore them completely.

Because friends or relatives have worked in mines or mill we have little or no curiosity about places that are as familiar to us as our own back yards. Yet newcomers and visitors from other sections of the country are fascinated and impressed with the power and vigor our mills and mines give to Western Pennsylvania. This power and vigor have shaped the personalities of the Western Pennsylvania inhabitants as well as created an atmosphere characteristic and unique to this part of the State. So far, it's impossible to tour any area steel mills, but at Seldom Seen Mine a tour lasting about an hour can leave even a life-time Cambria County resident with a new impression of his own home ground. And if he has never actually known any coal miners he will come away from the tour with a new respect and understanding of these rugged men who literally chop their living from the insides of the earth.

TOUR DETAILS

Seldom Seen Valley Mine is located exactly where its name states. In a seldom seen valley in the rugged mountain country of northern Cambria County, about an hour's ride from Johnstown, the road turns off over an old strip mine to the soft coal mine site. The surrounding mountains visible from this road are themselves as awesome sight. Gaily painted frame buildings greet the visitor as he drives up to the mine where there is ample parking space. The tour starts at the main building, which also houses a refreshment counter and souvenir shop. After paying the admission charge of $1.75 for adults and 85¢ for children (special rates for groups), the tourist is given a protective "hard hat," just like the miners wear on the job, for the trip through the mine. The trip is made in the same kind of little open cars that the miners use to reach their jobs, and is pulled by a mine "motor." Only difference is these cars are protected by plastic roofs. The cars are operated by veteran coal miners, who also serve as guides. These men are colorful, interesting individuals who have worked in the mines many, many years and know their subject and surroundings thoroughly. Their commentary is not the prepared spiel of so many tourists guides, but an explanation based on their actual experiences of working in a coal mine. After traveling some 2250 feet into one of the most productive coal seams in Western Pennsylvania the visitor will see how the "black diamonds" are removed, how tunnels are "dusted" to eliminate mining hazards and how a coal cutting machine and shaker conveyor work. As a comparison to modern mining methods miners demonstrate the laborious cutting of coal with a hand pick just as it was done some years back. Rock strata and coal formation are also explained in the underground tour.

The mine is a marvelous place to be on a hot day. When the temperatures are in the 80s outside they are about 40 degrees cooler inside. Our guide summed up the comfort to be found there on the hot, sultry afternoon we visited the mine: "If I had a keg of beer, I'd stay in here all day." But if you're prone to chills you'd best take a light wrap along for the tour. The mine is well ventilated and has a minimum of dust. Seldom Seen has a lot of unusual requirements to meet. It not only accommodates tourists, but as it is still a working coal mine in the winter (it turns out about 80 to 120 tons of coal a day) it must also pass Federal and State mine inspections.

MUSEUM AND ART EXHIBITS

After touring the mine, the visitors will probably also want to tour the museum housed in another building. For an admission charge of 25 cents for adults and 10 cents for children, visitors can see a collection of mining equipment, mining lamps and articles used by miners when the industry was a lot more primitive and dangerous than it is today. They can also see three rooms of a miner's home of the past, and if they are unfamiliar with this segment of American culture, might be struck with the crude and simple living arrangements that were often hardships themselves. Also on display in the little museum is one of the most unique art exhibits we have ever seen. A collection of wood carvings by Joseph Lefebure, a retired coal miner residing in Cherry Tree—a nearby community. Mr. Lefebure's carvings are each made from a solid piece of wood. His detail is excellent and his work fine examples of American folk art. His exhibit includes a lifelike "Self Carving" and two huge old-time wooden Indians.

Seldom Seen Mine, open daily from 9 to 9 from May 15 to Sept. 30 and on weekends during October, is a unique experience. From the "hard hats" worn on the tour to Mr. Lefebure's carvings and even to the jewlery made from coal and the "coal candy" sold in the souvenir shop, a Seldom Seen Visit is refreshing and unusual. Put it on your "must see" list for summer and fall. Then the next time someone asks, "What's new?" you can reply, "Well, you see I went down into this coal mine and . . ."

Ignoring Need for a Strong Merchant Marine Is Flouting Facts of Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1967

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

[From the La Mesa (Calif.) Scout, May 18, 1967]

IGNORING NEED FOR A STRONG MERCHANT MARINE IS FLOUTING FACTS OF LIFE

Historically, the United States has shown little interest in preparedness or any of the many facets of industrial life that relate to a common defense of the States.

Our nation's characteristics—and that of many a democracy—has been one of indifference to military preparedness.

Americans have thought of themselves as "peace loving" since before the day of Bunker Hill. While the bulk of the territory now a part of the United States was under British domain in the 1700s our forefathers were engaged in battles with the French, with the Indians and in encounters on the high seas against buccaneers.

Since its founding, our country has been engaged in both big and little wars. In no case, were we even moderately prepared. Not only were we "peace loving," but we had no monarchs or dictators to impose their will, to seek power or to aggrandise.

As a democracy, the United States has attempted to promote peace as witnessed by disarmament movements most recently fostered by this nation for nearly 50 years.

We have watched other nations become involved and we have sat back as other countries have built military juggernauts.

We have ignored the fact that our own military forces have become outmoded.

More than 20 years ago, when the Second World War was at an end, the emphasis was on demilitarization. Between atomic bombs and "mothballs," we assumed we were safe. The atomic bombs would be the deterrent, the mothballed military equipment would be our protection in the event war eventually flared,

Twenty years ago, it was assumed that the next war would be a "pushbutton war." Rockets and atomic weaponry would be paramount in the event another great war were to take place.

But, as a benevolent victor in World War II, this nation felt it necessary to help other nations. Foreign aid was granted. Provisional governments were supported. And, to protect our idea of government by the people, aggrandiers were opposed. Our involvement—yes, our violation of neutrality—could lead us only to strife, we have found ourselves unprepared. We have resorted to stopgap measures with regard to both military and diplomatic commitments.

Our near-disastrous involvement in the Korean "police action" saw our weakened armed forces fighting with World War II weaponry. And just as the P–51 plane was used extensively in that mess, our military has had to fall back on similar arms in the struggle in Viet Nam. Aircraft carriers that saw action in World War II are again in the South Pacific.

And, while our country is engaged in the costly production of a huge, supersonic transport which is too large for most airports, too fast for any but long hauls and too noisy for trips over heavily-populated areas, our country seems almost deliberate in its disregard of one of the basic fundamentals of transportation—merchant shipping.

No facet of our national defense has been so neglected as this highly important factor in international movement.

Look at the record.

When World War I had developed to the point that United States involvement was a foregone eventuality to all but the most naive, this country had little in the way of a merchant fleet.

Belatedly, this country tried to develop an outmoded type of combination freight-passenger vessel known as the Hog Island. Despite the fact that the ship had been a relic even in World War II, numerous ships of this type were pressed into service in World War II. By World War II, this country was just an unprepared as it had been 20 years previously. World War II was a fact but an American merchant fleet virtually was a myth.

While German U boats were sinking millions of tons of Allied shipping, it was recognized that anything with motive power that could float would be of use. Hence, this country resorted to the expediency of mass producing a type of vessel known as the Liberty ship. It wasn't much as a ship goes. Its successor, the Victory ship, was little better. Yet, many of these very vessels are serving this country at sea today.

The predicament was compounded in the years after World War II.

As American wage demands rose, shipping became a less profitable venture. And the United States, anxious to convert its wartime shipping to cash, was happy to dispose of the vessels that had been built to supply two great war fronts. Naturally, the buyers sought the best vessels.

A nationa that sometimes shuns subsidies decided that the merchant marine needed little or no support.

Shrewd and moneyed shippers of various nationalities saw the truth. They manipulated shipping interests under various foreign flags. And their foresight has paid off for many years. Today, American war supplies are shipped in American bottoms under foreign registry. And American vessels, flying foreign flags, are supplying those who oppose us.

If this weren't a dangerous situation, the utter apathy not only by our country leaders but by the general public seems to doom us to further merchant marine discrepancy. New construction is puny, hardly enough to offset deterioration. Not only has the United States merchant tonnage dropped to ninth among the nations of the world its ships are old and inefficient.

One of the almost—unbelieveable developments in recent weeks has been the movement by this country toward mothballing the world's only atomic merchant vessel, the Savannah. If nothing else, here was a step ahead in the development of a competent, modern merchant marine. The claim—and probably justified—has been made that the vessel is not economically suited to world trade competition. However, the fact remains that, on the basis of current wage scales, the entire United States merchant marine is not competitive with other nations just as American shipyards are not competitive.

What is forgotten is that the matter of logistics support as a key in the matter of military preparedness.

If we are to become militarily involved overseas by development of the best, most practical merchant fleet possible.

If the argument advanced in the case of the new supersonic air transport has validity in the way of creating jobs, then the same argument applies to the development of a more adequate supply of seagoing vessels. If the spirit of competitiveness (the French and English are building a supersonic transport jointly and Russia is believed in the same endeavor) is a valid argument for the plane, then the same applies to our merchant marine.

We may be in the "jet age" but we are flouting the facts of life if we ignore the needs of a strong merchant marine, the only known means of major overseas transportation.

Union Camp Corp. Dedicates New Plant in Alabama

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. ANDREWS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1967

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, recently the Union Camp Corp. invited me to attend dedication ceremonies for their new papermill in Alabama. Since the date coincided with our night-long debate on the education bill, I was unable to be present for the ceremonies.

The Union Camp Corp. has invested a great deal of time and more than $50 million in order to open this new plant in Alabama. I know that Union Camp invested wisely, not only because Alabama has some of the finest land, forests, and water supplies in the Nation, but because Alabama has a labor force able and ready to work and a State government interested in cooperating to the fullest with industry.

I know from my association with Union Camp officials that Alabama will profit from their friendship, knowledge, and interest, as well as from the tangible proceeds of their new Alabama plant.

I am pleased to insert at this point the address given by Mr. Alexander Calder, president of the Union Camp Corp., on the occasion of the dedication ceremonies:

Governor Wallace, honored guests, ladies and gentlemen, it is perhaps unnecessary to say that it is a happy occasion for my associates and me to join with you today in dedicating this new mill.

We are proud of this mill. It is the most modern up-to-date mill of its kind in the world today. The plant and equipment are the most efficient that money and engineering talent can put together.

Not only are we proud of our mill, but we are also extremely grateful for the help we have received from the people of Alabama in making all of this possible.

Our investment in this mill exceeds $50,000,000. Maybe we are old fashioned, but when we build something as permanent and expensive as a modern day paper mill, we like to back it up with a raw material supply at least for the next few hundred years. So, we made an additional substantial investment in Alabama timberlands. In the aggregate, our total investment here becomes something over $100,000,000.

This is by far the largest investment in a single project in our history. Understandably, we did a good bit of looking around before we decided where to lay our money on the line. We literally combed the country. You can probably guess some of the important considerations: wood supply, water supply, transportation facilities, manpower . . . to name a few.

Without question, the natural resources offered by the State of Alabama and the characteristics of the particular site location here were important to our final choice. However, I want to emphasize that one of the most compelling factors of all was the clear welcome extended from the very beginning by your State and local officials and the business community generally.

So this new plant—which, incidentially, commenced operation about three weeks ahead of schedule is solid testimony to the fact that the welcome we were offered was no high powered, empty sales pitch. Your welcome, your help, and cooperation were real. Therefore, my most important message here today is to tell you that we are truly grateful.

A new plant like this is obviously an investment in the future; so our primary attention should be toward building to the future rather than dwelling on the past. I would, however, like to take a minute to describe our company to you. (It has changed a lot in the last thirty years.)

In 1936, the sales of the Union Bag and Paper Company were $11,750,000. In 1966, the Union Camp Corporation (product of a merger of Union Bag and the Camp Manufacturing Company in 1956) had sales of $323,000,000.

A hundred years ago we were solely in the business of making paper bags, today, bags are less than 20% of our business, although we are probably the largest bag producer in the world. In addition to bags, our stake in the *packaging business* includes *15 corrugated box* plants and *two folding carton* plants with sales of over *$100,000,000.* Overseas, we own or have an interest in ten more corrugated box plants and seven bag plants.

We are also in the building materials business—with two sawmills, a plywood plant being built, and three plants producing paper honeycomb structures.

We are in the communications and education business—producing white printing and office papers at Franklin, Va., and tablets and other school supplies at two separate factories.

And finally, relatively few people are aware of the scope of our chemical business. In 5 plants in Georgia and Florida we manufacture wood based chemical products ranging from a long list of industrial chemicals to aromatics and vitamin components.

Altogether we employ over 13,000 people and our total company payroll is around $91,000,000.

So much for *what we are now*. What about the future?

First and foremost, we are a growing company in a growing industry. Last year each man, woman and child in the United States used an average of 530 pounds of paper products for a total usage of 52 and a half million tons. This is exclusive of our growing export market.

A little over 30 years ago we had a dedication like this at our mill in Savannah. It was a one machine mill with a capacity of a little over 50,000 tons annually. I can remember that some participants in that dedication were optimistic enough to predict that some day the Savannah Mill would be doubled or even tripled in size. Last year that same Savannah Mill—on the largest in the world—produced over 1,000,000 tons, a twenty fold increase.

If there is a single secret to this successful growth, it is that we were able to keep our costs down and our efficiencies up and thus compete successfully in both the domestic and world markets for the sale of our products. With your help, we intend to use that same secret weapon here in Alabama.

Closely allied to growth is stability of employment. Not only did the total number of people employed naturally increase during our 30 years of growth at Savannah, but there has been little in the way of month to month fluctuations in our operations. The demand for paper products is fortunately a very even one with little in the way of seasonal changes . . . and we try to accentuate this favorable situation with good inventory planning.

Speaking of employment, this might be a good time to say that Union Camp is an equal opportunity employer. A man advances in our organization according to his ability and not according to his color, religion, or national origin. This is not only according to law, but is a matter of basic company policy which, in our opinion, promotes that *same efficiency* I mentioned a moment ago.

In order to be efficient, it is obvious that a plant must not only have the latest equipment, but it must also have a good management. In Jim Hungerpiller, and General Superintendent Ralph Hall, Sid Kinne in charge of Woodlands, and others in their group we provided this mill with trained professional managers—with many years of experience gained at our Savannah operation. The local men they are now training will in the coming years probably be the nucleus of a similar management group which someday will be starting another new mill at some other location.

I mentioned at the outset that we have to think "long range" in our business. That means that we not only utilize in our operations the fine natural resources with which your State is blessed, but we are just as interested as you are in protecting and improving them. In our 30 years operations at Savannah we have planted many more trees than we have cut. As a result of our research in tree genetics, an increasing number of the seedlings planted will grow into carefully selected "superior" trees—faster growing, taller, straighter, with a greater resistance to fire and insects.

And let me quickly make it clear that we are not just interested in our own land. Whatever woodlands knowledge we have—selective cuting programs, reforestation techniques and the like—have *always* been at the disposal of our neighboring landholders. We expect always to purchase an important share of our wood requirements in the open market—so we naturally will always be interested in the wood supply in the entire area.

The same goes for water. Our 5,000 acre plant site has an elaborate system of lagoons and settling ponds which enable us to control waste water from our operation in such a way as to prevent any adverse affect on fishing or other recreational uses of the Alabama River. As a matter of fact, our detailed plan for waste control was discussed with and approved by the Alabama State Water Commission long before we started building the mill.

Mention of the *State Commission* reminds me of another conviction that many of us in the company hold; namely, that as many matters as possible should be handled at the State and community level rather than by the federal government. Most problems today are so complex they require intimate knowledge of their many facets. And it seems to me such knowledge is most likely to be found at the local level.

Well, my friends, that's about all I have to say. And I might summarize it all in four sentences:

1. We are sincerely grateful for your welcome and spirit of helpfulness;
2. We are going to try very hard to be useful citizens of your community;
3. We expect to be here for at least a few hundred years;
4. We are looking forward to it.

Thank you.

Postal Deficit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1967

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include last week's public service television and radio newscast, "The Kee Report." The subject discussed is the postal deficit.

The report follows:

This is Jim Kee, bringing you the Kee Report.

President Johnson recently recommended that Congress authorize substantial increases in the four main classes of postal rates. This additional revenue would help reduce the annual postal deficits which now amount to more than a billion dollars annually.

Just before the President made his recommendation, Postmaster General Lawrence F. O'Brien suggested that the Post Office Department should be reduced from its present cabinet status and converted into a Government corporation organized on a business basis. This Corporation would have authority to fix postal rates—instead of Congress—and the authority to issue bonds for new postal construction. The general purpose would be to convert the Department from a chronic money loser into a well-run business establishment.

While everyone wants to reduce the deficit, it is unlikely that the Postmaster General's suggestion will be adopted in the near future by the Congress. It is reasonable that the Congress will reduce the annual deficit.

However, this is a good time to review what the postal system has meant in the life of our nation. The postal system is usually referred to as a public service—which it is. But the founding fathers looked upon it as something more than that. They wanted a postal system which would help weld this new nation into a unified whole and they succeeded in doing just that.

The Constitution itself authorized Congress to establish post offices and post roads. Shortly after the Federal Government started functioning, Congress created what is known as second class mail with special rates for the transportation of newspapers, magazines, and other publications. In doing this, Congress recognized that the spread of ideas on the widest possible basis was urgently needed to keep our nation both united and prosperous.

The privilege of second class mailing is no longer of much importance to the big metropolitan dailies. But this mailing privilege is still highly important to the small-town dailies and weeklies which play such an important part in the nation's rural life. And it is still very important to the national magazines which depend for their existence on mass circulation in all of the fifty States.

Over the years, Congress has created two other classes of mail for the convenience of those who use the postal system. The third class authorizes bulk mailing and this is often attacked for promoting the growth of so-called junk mail—meaning advertising matter unwanted by those who receive it. Yet without this class, the large mail order houses would be severely handicapped. Fourth class is used mainly for the carrying of books and records and this is very important to public libraries and educational institutions.

Thanks to the encouragement given by Congress, the U.S. postal system now handles nearly as much mail as all the other postal systems in the world combined. It has played a notable part in promoting national unity. The devotion of a loyal corps of postal workers has made it into a model of dependability.

In cutting down the deficit, we should avoid injuring one of the finest public service organizations in the world.

Thank you for listening.

Law Covers Even Devil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1967

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, one of the highest regarded and most talented radio, television, and newspaper personalities—WDSU, Clarion Herald—is Mel Leavitt of New Orleans.

His wide scope and grasp is well reflected in the column which appears below and which I commend to you.

In contrast to the erroneous and misleading editorials in the Wall Street Journal, Cleveland Plain Dealer, Chicago Daily News, Detroit Free Press, Cincinnati Inquirer, and other newspapers throughout the country, who have distorted and misled their readers in connection with my discussion of the first amendment, Mel Leavitt gives a most scholarly and objective examination of the issue.

I am sure you will agree with me after reading his column which is reprinted here for your attention.

The column follows:

LAW COVERS EVEN DEVIL

(By Mel Leavitt)

Extremists, both of the far right and of the far left, seem to have found a common stomping-ground on which to exercise their passions.

Both are currently engaged in a kind of reckless ranting at Washington. Both seem intent on abusing and discrediting our federal government.

The right-wing zealots hint of dark plots emanating in the nation's capitol, designed to brainwash America into communist thinking.

The left-wing zealots see conspiracy of a totally different sort involving some kind of sinister industrial-military cabal with ominous fascist overtones.

Extremes beget extremes, and now each camp is using the other camp's irrationality to justify its own irrational behavior.

A group of Vietnam war-protesters burns an American flag in an orgy of self-righteousness.

So, a few weeks later, a group of anti-war protesters tars and feathers a man they suspect of being a "peacenik."

One wonders who descrates the American flag the most: the nuts who burn it, or the ones who wrap themselves in it as an excuse for stormtrooper tactics and vigilante abuses.

Any American with an iota of feeling or respect for what our flag represents was necessarily outraged by the Central park flag-burning episode. It was an act brazenly calculated to outrage most Americans. And it did.

More than 50 bills have been introduced in the House to make flag-burning a federal crime. Freedom of speech and peaceful assembly is one thing. But total contempt for the nation that guarantees such freedom?

However, the line is difficult to draw legally. Where does freedom of speech and peaceful assembly end, and treason and sedition, or even incitement to violence, or the overthrow of a country, begin?

Congressman F. Edward Hébert attempted to get a definition from the Attorney General's office, and determine—if there were no laws limiting mob action—what new laws, or strengthened laws might be written.

After repeated statements to him indicating protesters were protected by the "umbrella of the First Amendment," Hébert said, "Forget about the First Amendment." This statement was promptly plucked out of context by some writers, and one national cartoonist. Hébert, they intimated, was a fascist in patriot's clothing.

Granted Hébert's statement, read out of context, is deplorable. In context, it reflects the frustrations of many concerned Americans who, realizing that most laws are abridgements of the First Amendment and all laws subject to vagaries of interpretation or enforcement, are seriously concerned with our inability to curtail mob action and individual threats to general, or national, security.

It is too easy for liberals to beg the question by finding a conservative scapegoat for a serious legal dilemma and labelling him a fascist.

As Thurmond Arnold recently said: "Dissent is not sacred. The right of dissent is. Yet this simple principle of law has not yet been learned by some alienated intellectuals."

Freedom of speech and assembly, like all freedoms, has its limitations. The limitations arise when it encroaches on other freedoms, other individual rights, or threatens security, or even jeopardize the "peace and tranquility" of subsantial numbers of other citizens.

Whether flag-burning threatens national security or not is a moot point. But Hébert was not referring to this, although this one overt act is being used to symbolize and emotionalize a very complex issue.

Hebert insists he did not mean "throw out the First Amendment," and if his critics carefully read his statement, in full context, in the Congressional Record, they would realize this.

"Stop using the First Amendment as a protective umbrella to justify further and further abuses of freedom" is a more accurate statement of what he said. And that is the dilemma.

There appears to be an abundance of laws on the books to safeguard national security—laws against treason, espionage, desertion, draft evasion, violent overthrow of the government. There are also laws against inciting to riot, disturbing the peace, loitering, disrupting orderly processes, et cetera, et cetera.

Unfortunately, there appears to be a reluctance on the part of some officials, federal and local, to enforce them or interpret them vigorously.

The more strident voices of both the far right and left are using this legal vacuum to justify further and further excesses, and blame each other for them while whispering of conspiracies inside the federal government.

Strangely enough, some of those who yell loudest in defense of their freedom of speech and assembly are quickest to outshout or disrupt assemblies involving opponents.

Northern students made a travesty of the First Amendment recently when they repeatedly heckled and jeered George Wallace in an obvious attempt to drown him out and force him from the podium.

Ironically, this kind of contempt for free speech invariably helps the victim more than it hurts him. Thus the extremists of both the right and left repeatedly use each other as an emotional prop to keep their supporters riled up, and inevitably build up support for their opponents by their excesses.

Alabama's Richmond Flowers, a racial moderate, has even suggested that Wallace and Stokely Carmichael run together as a third-party ticket. Both, he says, exhibit great contempt for the federal government. Both are evangelists of a special kind of freedom, as interpreted in their own racist terms. Both, he says, advocate defiance of the law—Wallace on schools, Carmichael on the draft.

Of course, Wallace's defiance advocates a careful pitty-patting around the law. Carmichael's behavior borders on insurrection. Encouraging riots and making treasonable statements is strong stuff, and the federal government seems to be pitty-patting around Carmichael, for fear of offending the Negro minority vote.

So the Feds are caught in the squeeze and the enemies of rational government seek to make the most of the situation by spreading chaos and suspicion.

The federal government, like the elephant, makes a big convenient, clumsy target. The larger the country becomes, the more complex its problems, the more cumbersome its government, the more vulnerable that government is to attack from individuals frustrated by its bigness and ineptness.

Fear of big government today afflicts both liberal and conservative. It leads automatically to hatred, defiance and suspicion.

People desperately want, and seek, heroes today—bigger than life individuals who wear bright, white hats. Realistically, most public officials wear hats of varying shades of gray, and when lost in the morass that is institutional Washington, the distant grays begin to look darker and eventually black—especially this year, the year of the Dodd and Powell investigations.

The climate has never been riper for the development of regional and local demagogues: Big, strong individuals in white hats who will protect us from other individuals in black hats, and a confusing society that is tattle-tale gray.

Yes, there are limitations on individual freedom—even freedom of speech. As classically stated: No one has the right to yell fire in a crowded theater. But one must be very careful, in his zeal to deny someone he considers "suspicious" his rights, that he does not unwittingly deny rights he may want to use some day.

Thomas More once said that the law must be extended, even to the devel. For if you cut down every law in order to catch the devil, what would you have to hide behind once every law has fallen—when the devil suddenly stops running and turns on you?

REA Essay Winners in Nebraska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT V. DENNEY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1967

Mr. DENNEY. Mr. Speaker, annually a statewide essay contest is sponsored by the Nebraska Rural Electric Association on "What Rural Electrification Means to Me and My Community." It is my privilege today to insert in the RECORD, the winning essays of six of the State winners who reside in my congressional district. Later on this month these winners, along with others from Nebraska, will travel to Washington to see their Government in operation as part of their prize for submitting winning essays. The REA, through "lighting the farm," has contributed greatly to the progress of the American farmer.

The essays follow:

THE VALUE OF RURAL ELECTRIFICATION TO OUR HOME AND COMMUNITY

(By Roxanne Rae Picken, Davenport High School; Sponsor: South Central Public Power District, Nelson, Nebr.)

"Those were the good old days." But were they really good? No lights. No running water. No electrical appliances. Because of the work of a few great men, rural electrification has changed the "good old days" to the "better new days." Among other immeasurable values of rural electricity, it has enabled my family to run our farm in a more economical, efficient, and modern way.

Since its beginning, the rural electrification program has provided low-cost electricity to farms like ours. This electricity, in addition to being inexpensive in itself, has increased our farm profits. For example, irrigation wells, run by electricity, have brought up crop production, thereby raising profits. Profits also increase when cattle are provided with light at night. Consuming more food because of the light, the cattle become heavier and bring higher prices at the market. Without rural electrification, two of the many economical devices, irrigation and stockyard lighting, would be impossible.

Our farm has become much more efficient with rural electrification, because electricity (1) saves time, (2) saves effort, and (3) makes for more and better work output. Electrical tools such as drills, saws, and sanders finish in a few moments jobs that would take perhaps hours with ordinary tools. Also, with these same tools, less effort is required than with hand work. When a job is done faster and with less effort, more of that job can usually be done and done better. These three principles can be applied to almost any household or outdoor electrical appliance. With these three ideas in mind, we can say that rural electrification has indeed minimized wastefulness on our farm.

As a result of electrification, rural modernization has been simple. New and better inventions making use of electricity have continually been employed. Among these have been the effective, effortless household appliances, such as washing machines, sewing machines, and refrigerators. Milking machines, grain dryers, and electric augers are some of the items utilized by the "electric farmer." And making this modernization possible has been the low cost available to the patron of the rural electrification program. With cheap electrical rates, a farmer can afford the latest technical advances in electricity. Therefore, by advancing efficiency and economy, electricity has also furthered modern farming.

By providing efficient, economical, and modern farming achievements, rural electrification has brought our farm and many others up to date. Electricity has provided the desirable farm of today. In the future, my family and I will look to electricity for the better farm of tomorrow.

WHAT RURAL ELECTRIFICATION MEANS TO ME AND MY COMMUNITY

(By Lynelle Fredrickson, Stromsburg High School; sponsor: Polk County Rural Public Power District, Stromsburg, Nebr.)

Today there are power lines spanning the breadth of our nation. Power lines stretching out to the most remote desert ranch. Power lines winding up a mountain to an isolated saw mill. All of these lines have one purpose or goal. This is to provide the people with dependable and inexpensive power. Power to irrigate our rich country's fields of corn and milo. Power to water many, many head of cattle. Power is what has helped our country become the glorious and great nation that it is today. Our country has grown and prospered by the help of a powerful labor force and industry, but there is another force which I think is equally important. This force is the electricity that local rural public power districts have provided for farmers. Rural electrification has helped to provide the power necessary to grow the food that this expanding nation demands. Half of the world's supply of electricity is generated and used in the United States.

The difference between city living and country living is growing smaller and smaller in terms of easier and convenient living. Today the average farmhome can have all the conveniences of a city home, plus the many advantages of country living. In the country you can have more privacy but you certainly aren't shut away from the world. I think rural electrification is the factor that has made country living so much more enjoyable.

During a bad storm last winter our electricity went out. We were without electricity for a short time. What to do during this time was a problem. There was no television to watch, no stereo to listen to, not enough light to read by, and no heat to make anything to eat. I think this shows how dependent we are on electricity. Our life is geared to this current that feeds our homes with power. Every member of the family depends on it in one way or another. The husband needs it to irrigate and water his stock. The wife needs it to make her home as comfortable for her family as possible. The children need it to run their toys and to watch the cartoons. Rural electrification has "spoiled" us to the point where we cannot live without it.

This year our state is celebrating its 100th birthday. We are all aware of the progress that our state has made. I just wonder how much of this progress could have taken place without rural electrification.

THE VALUE OF RURAL ELECTRIFICATION IN OUR HOME AND COMMUNITY

(By Jack Gustafson, Wakefield High School; Sponsor: Northeast Nebraska Rural Public Power District, Emerson, Nebr.

Far too often we take our rural development for granted and do not fully appreciate its value. Such is the case of rural electrification in our home and community. We recognize the value of something most when suddenly we find ourselves without it. For a moment visualize the scene of a bundled-up family, huddling in a cold house lighted only with the faint glow of a candle, and a howling wind and blowing snow battering everything in its path. Those without a standby generator can well testify to the importance of rural electrification to their lives.

The problems of no lights, no water, no heat, and no mechanized feeding in this situation are only a temporary inconvenience. What would happen if these effects were prolonged indefinitely?

To show what would happen, let us take a specific example in the Northeast Nebraska community of Wakefield. The biggest industry in this agrarian community is an egg processing plant. If for some reason electricity would become nonavailable in the areas surrounding Wakefield, a chain reaction would occur which would eventually spell disaster. Many rural citizens would not tolerate the inconveniences of no electricity and would flock to the cities for jobs. Those who stayed on the farms could not raise chickens and eggs profitably without electricity and would cause this thriving egg industry to close down. The town depends so heavily on this industry and the products and business of the farmers that it, too, would soon collapse.

Rural electrification provides opportunities for social and economic growth which would not be available otherwise. It makes possible local industries which provide capital not only for the employees but also for the local businesses through increased sales. With more purchasing power and the expansion of industry and markets, our community stays financially independent and socially advanced. These increased opportunities attract more young people and more professional workers to the area.

The use of electricity increases the production and earnings of the farmer, speeds up his work, and gives him an overall higher standard of living. The use of an electric milking machine or feeding auger, for instance, will get the job done faster and give the farmer more free time. The farm family is provided with many hours of economical labor through the use of electrical appliances and tools.

These examples show how the posterity of our town and country depends upon the increased production in rural areas which electricity has made possible. The value of the rural electrification program was best summarized by Norman M. Clapp, Administrator of the REA, when he said its basic objectives "is to improve the economic status and living standards of people in rural areas through the benefits of electric service." It has been through the efforts of men like George Norris and Franklin D. Roosevelt that these improved standards have been made possible. The people of Nebraska, in this Centennial year, should well recognize and appreciate the progress that rural electrification has brought to their communities and to their state.

THE VALUE OF RURAL ELECTRIFICATION IN OUR HOME AND COMMUNITY

(By Sheralyn Lostroh, University High School; Sponsor: Seward County Rural Public Power District, Seward, Nebr.)

In this centennial year, Nebraska rural families, like families everywhere within our state, our experiencing the fun of dressing in great-grandpa's or grandma's clothes, and for a few hours pretending that they are living in a world of long-ago. But how many farm families would really enjoy stepping from our "one-hundred years ago" fantasy to the reality of rural living during that time period?

Farm life was once a culture within itself. Isolated from their urban counterparts, the members of an American rural family were tied to an almost never-ending cycle of farm "chores" and crop-tending. In the last few years, however, rural electrification has been greatly responsible for causing changes in the life of a farm family.

Can you remember getting up on a cold, dark winter morning to milk several indignant cows, or boiling water to pour over a frozen pump when it was time to bring in the water? So do many farmers who are a good deal less than one hundred years old. But those are only memories. Today, even in the middle of a Nebraska blizzard, farmers awaken to the pleasant sound of music from a clock radio. Leaving the warmth of that electric blanket isn't nearly as painful, when his home is electrically heated. And even milking all those cows isn't drudgery when electric milkers do most of the job. With electric heaters keeping running water running, and electric lights dispelling the dismalliness of a barn atmosphere, the farmer's job has been greatly improved.

Electrification helps and cheers the busy farmer's wife too. She uses her electric kitchen appliances and especially her electric range and oven to prepare gigantic meals for hungry harvesters or for the family gatherings at Thanksgiving and Christmas. She washes and dries her housedresses, her husband's jeans, the children's schoolclothes, and the baby's diapers in her electric washer and drier, and irons them with her lightweight electric iron. Electricity provides for fluorescent lighting to help along her prize houseplants and powers the television set that brings her everything from soap operas to Leonard Bernstein.

The family's children, and especially its teenagers, are far from left out. Daughter couldn't do without her electric hair dryer and nail buffer, or the electric sewing machine on which she creates a formal for the prom or her latest 4-H sewing project. Son, too, finds that electricity is an important part of his everyday life. He uses the welder and electric power tools to make repairs and building projects much easier, and Mom's vacuum always comes in handy when it's time to clean his car. Everyone in the family enjoys the combination stereo and AM-FM radio which brings them not only hours of entertainment, but also the latest in weather reports and forecasts.

It may be exciting to hold an old-fashioned husking-bee or to squeeze into great-grandmother's high button shoes, but farm families will agree that electrification has brought about huge advances in rural living. And they are advances we would hate to live without.

THE VALUE OF RURAL ELECTRIFICATION IN OUR HOME AND COMMUNITY

(By Marietta Matulka, Aquinas High School; Sponsor: Butler County Rural Public Power District, David City, Nebr.)

As you look out the window, you see a few slender wires stretched from house to house. At the source of these wires are the huge generators which produce an energy that you rely on more than you realize. What was farm life really like without these wires?

In the Past—

In the early pioneer life almost everything was done manually. Animal power was also used which, at times, was not very dependable. The pioneers and settlers had to work from dawn until dark every day to keep up with all the mounting work.

To the Present—

Today your means of living is contained in this energy called electricity. Down those wires come water for the house and for the stock. New submersible pumps are replacing the old pumps, and electrical progress enables the pumps to run quietly and efficiently without any lubrication. These modern pressure pumps can also be sealed to prevent water contamination.

Through these wires this energy brings us heat to cook our meals and it brings cold for our refrigerator and home freezer. It brings light that we may read in comfort or, finish last-minute chores outside in safety.

In the summer this energy brings the cool breezes of air-conditioning.

In the winter, it is the source of heating. This electrical heating brings comfort, cleanliness, safety, convenience, and economy. It also helps to keep the stock tank open and the baby pigs and baby chicks warm in below zero weather.

This same energy brings power to operate machinery, making our daily tasks lighter and more efficient.

Today electricity works hand in hand with the farmer of Nebraska to help them be the most productive they have ever been. Electricity, now available to every farm in the United States, performs hundreds of daily tasks once done manually. And electricity is not expensive. The electrical industrial developments giving greater efficiency in generating, transmitting, and distributing electricity have made the cost of electriicty decrease immensely.

To the Future—

Some day everything will be instamatic—tasks will be accomplished by simply the touch of a button. One example of this is remote control farming.

In agriculture, electric soil conditioning, soil heating, and field lighting hold great potential for increasing the yield of crops to feed our world's growing population.

Electricity holds great promise in solving such problems as—converting salt water into fresh water, because scientists have already informed us that our fresh water supply cannot last forever. Electrically controlled highways will also help to control our ever-increasing number of automobiles, and fumeless automobiles, which will be replacing the old ones in the near future, will help to abolish our air pollution problem.

Every day man is discovering new uses for electricity—such as climate control, new methods of food preparation and new forms of entertainment.

In education and in every field . . . electricity will provide or make possible far-reaching advances. Truly electriicty is progress.

DEVELOPMENT OF RURAL ELECTRIFICATION IN MY AREA

(By Suzanne Reeker, Battle Creek High School; Sponsor: Elkhorn Rural Public Power District, Battle Creek, Nebr.)

Rural Electrification began when Franklin D. Roosevelt signed a bill creating its organization on May 11, 1935. Our Nebraska Senator, George W. Norris, was instrumental in introducing the R.E.A. bill into the Congress. He along with Representative Sam Rayburn of Texas, co-sponsored the Norris-Rayburn bill, that enabled Rural Electrification to receive the necessary money to begin this great endeavor.

Little could anyone imagine what effect this would have on our rural residents. No one could ever in their fondest dreams, hopes, and prayers, have foreseen the many great advantages our farm families would enjoy as a result of this organization.

Until the beginning of R.E.A., the farmers were living in the dark ages of kerosene lamps. All the menial tasks around the farm were done by hand. Those families who were lucky enough to have their own Delco power plants were fortunate. Even then, the facilities were very limited. Small watt bulbs provided inadequate lighting. Appliances were very few. Some families had radios, irons, and perhaps a washing machine. These people considered themselves very fortunate. The tiresome chore of daily running the light plant, seemed little enough to do for these conveniences.

Excitement ran high for those who were on the first sections of lines to be laid out and built. Those little stakes the surveyors set out, marked future pole settings. When at last the man came to dig the holes for the poles, that were laying in the ditches, everyone knew the long awaited project was progressing. Poles were set and wires were strung. Then began the wait for energy to run through the lines.

As my present home, the lines were energized on June 3, 1940. What anticipation there must have been there. Farmers in the neighborhood could now enjoy adequate lights. Dreams of milking machines, motors for water systems, refrigeration units, and many more appliances could now be a reality.

When the first lines were energized, the number of miles were one hundred sixteen. Consumers numbered only one hundred forty-eight. As the years went by, more and more miles were energized and consumers were added in great numbers. Today over nineteen hundred miles of power lines are in use by the Elkhorn Rural Public Power District. Consumers on these lines number over thirty-six hundred.

The first consumers of electric power in our district used only about sixty KWH per farm. The average consumer usage now totals over nine hundred fifty per farm. Use of electric appliances has grown until very few choring jobs around the farm are left that cannot be done directly or indirectly by electric power.

Through the efforts of a great many men, through the course of the last twenty-seven years, has our Rural Electrification grown. Today all farm families who wish may enjoy the same blessings of modernization that our city neighbors have taken for granted for so many years. We certainly owe these hard working men a debt of gratitude, both in the fields of administration and mainten- in the fields of administration and maintenance.

Maj. Gen. J. W. O'Neill Reassigned to New Unit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1967

Mr. MORSE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, among the recent military promotions announced by the President was that of U.S. Air Force Maj. Gen. John W. O'Neill, present commander of the L. G. Hanscom Field, in Bedford, Mass., to the rank of lieutenant general. General O'Neill is slated to be transferred to the post of commander of a new missile and space unit in California.

As commander at Bedford, General O'Neill has rendered outstanding service to the Air Force and has maintained excellent relations with the surrounding communities. I include in the RECORD an article from the Bedford Minute-Man of May 25, 1967 outlining the general's career and accomplishments.

MAJ. GEN. J. W. O'NEILL REASSIGNED TO NEW UNIT

Reassignment of Maj. Gen. John W. O'Neill, commander of the Air Force Electronic Systems Division at Hanscom Field for the past three years, to a new missile and space unit on the West Coast was announced last week.

The assignment was announced by Gen. James Ferguson, commander of the Air Force Systems Command, parent organization of both the Electronic Systems Division and the new missile/space unit.

Nomination of General O'Neill for a third star, promoting him to the rank of lieutenant general, was also announced. This nomination is subject to confirmation by Congress.

The new unit will combine at Los Angeles Air Force Station, Cal., element of the Ballistic Systems Division and the Space Systems Division. These two Divisions are responsible for developing, testing and acquiring equipment for the nation's military space efforts and the intercontinental ballistic missile program.

General Ferguson stated that the combination of the two Divisions is the result of an extensive study to determine the most effective management posture for the Air Force's missile and space programs.

General O'Neil was born in Brookline, Mass. He was graduated from Brookline High School in 1936 and from Boston University in 1940. Upon graduation, he was commissioned a second lieutenant in the United States Army, and assigned to Fort Devens. Later, he was with the First Infantry Division in Mass. and Fla.

He earned his pilot's wings in 1942, and served as a B–29 combat crew member and Squadron Commander in the South Pacific. Following World War II, he participated in the first peacetime A-bomb tests at Bikini as Air Operations Officer and pilot of the Command Aircraft.

He earned a Masters Degree at the University of Pittsburgh in 1950–51 and later graduated from the Air War College.

In the ensuing years, he has served in Washington, D.C., Penns., Fla., Ala., Europe and Cal. In Cal., he held key positions in the development of Air Force Ballistic Missiles. Before taking command of the Electronic Systems Division in July 1964, General O'Neill was assigned to the Office of the Director of Defense Research and Engineering, Office of the Secretary of Defense, Washington, D.C.

Among his decorations are the Legion of Merit, the Distinguished Flying Cross, the Air Medal, the Air Force Commendation Medal, the Army Commendation Medal, and the Distinguished Unit Badge.

He is married to the former Dorothea M. Howley of Arlington, Mass. They have six children.

Maj. Gen. John L. McCoy, Commander of the Ballistic Systems Division, will become deupty commander for missiles in the new unit, and will be stationed at Norton Air Force Base, Cal. Maj. Gen. Paul T. Cooper, Space Systems Division commander, will be deputy commander for space at Los Angeles Air Force Station.

The new unit will be known as the Space and Missile Systems Organization and will formally begin operations July 1, 1967.

Memorial Day 1967

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1967

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, very properly our Nation's press took notice of Memorial Day and in proper appreciation of this historic holiday urged Americans to soberly reflect on our Nation's heritage and its noble foundation. A very thoughtful Memorial Day commentary was carried by the Blue Island, Ill., Sun-Standard in its Thursday, May 25, issue, which preceded the holiday. I insert this editorial at this point in the RECORD:

MEMORIAL DAY 1967

Memorial day—May 30, 1967. Has there ever been a time when the need was more urgent to observe a holiday to honor service men who have died in battlefields defending the freedom of the United States then now?

With peace marches, draft card burners, and desecration of the flag making daily headlines, has it ever been more important that our servicemen be reassured of our loyalty to them. They must be told that the sacrifice they are making is not going unheeded. How mixed up and confused we must appear to other nations! But we know that those who protest are few in numbers, and we must show the world that ours is indeed a united nation. Let us unite in our observance of Memorial Day 1967.

The observance of Memorial Day began unofficially during the Civil war, when southern women placed flowers on the graves of fallen confederate and Union soldiers. In 1868 General John A. Logan, Commander of the Grand Army of the Republic, called on its members to decorate the graves of Union soldiers on May 30. The practice was later extended to honor fallen servicemen of all wars. In 1967 let's show the world that we are strong and display our patriotism in a manner which will shove those few non-conformists into the shadows.

What thoughts run through the minds of the parents, wives, families and sweethearts of those who have given the most vital thing they possess—their lives—when they witness or read about draft card burners and draft dodgers? Let them know that their loved one died with honor for a cause which is right and just—freedom.

When the flag passes in parade, signify your respect by placing your hat or hand on your heart. Sing the Star Spangled Banner with pride and gusto, such as has never been heard before; let the heavens ring in this song of praise of our country.

Don't waste your anger on those few nonconformists who put on shows of defiance for the very principles upon which our country has been built. Pity those who would not serve in the defense of our country. Pity them, for they'll never know the pride of wearing the uniform of a mighty country willing to protect other friendly nations who are fighting communism. Pity them because their parents and teachers fell short in their duties and haven't delivered the message in the history of our country. They take our freedom for granted—they'll never know the determination our forefathers had when they crossed a mighty ocean to settle and tame this wilderness, then just a few scattered colonies. They'll never know what it is to unite, as these first settlers did, to build a nation. In their ignorance, these misfits would attempt to tear down the very form of government upon which the country was built, rather than conform to the laws which are based on the premise of majority rule.

Pity those who would desecrate Old Glory! Those who have not known a heart bursting with pride at the sight of the red, white and blue; the banner of hope and freedom for generations of Americans. Our flag, the symbol of a country that has grown from a struggling group of thirteen colonies to a united nations of 50 sovereign states.

Yes, pity these misdirected young men and women, feel shame for them, but don't vent your anger on them for as long as men love liberty more than life itself, and the principles of truth, justice and charity for all remain rooted in human hearts, the United States of America will endure.

Memorial Day—May 30, 1967. Bow your head and thank God that those not willing to defend our nation are few. Bend your knees and ask God's blessing on those on the battlefield of Vietnam that they might have the strength to serve well, and have the knowledge that we are supporting them wholeheartedly, bursting with pride in the knowledge that ours is a country in which the majority of the young men are brave enough to defend its freedom with their very lives, if necessary.

Lest We Forget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1967

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, it is easy to overlook success stories in Government, and articles critical of public works projects always seem to get the headlines while the positive side of the news gets less attention.

An exception to this general rule is a fine article which appeared on May 31, 1967, in the Cleveland Plain Dealer, reporting on the 150-year success story of the Erie Canal.

The success of this early inland waterway is part of the heroic history of our country, and the canal's important role in the development of the Nation is undisputed.

Once derided as "Clinton's Ditch," the Erie Canal helped build a great State and a great Nation.

The Plain Dealer article follows:

[From the Cleveland Plain Dealer, May 31, 1967]

ERIE CANAL MADE NEW YORK THE EMPIRE

WASHINGTON.—One-hundred and fifty years ago the first earth was turned for "Clinton's Ditch," the great canal that transformed New York into the Empire State.

Just before dawn on July 4, 1817, notables paraded throughout the haze to a site near the wilderness village of Rome. As the sun rose, cannons boomed. Onlookers cheered. A canal official made a noble speech, and a judge thrust a spade into the soil to start the controversial Erie Canal.

The crowd started digging, too, the Utica Gazette reported, in a "demonstration of joy, of which all partook on that interesting occasion."

"By this great highway," said the canal commissioner, "unborn millions will easily transport their surplus productions to the shores of the Atlantic, procure their supplies, and hold a useful and profitable intercourse with all the maritime nations of the earth."

Dissenters weren't convinced. They said there wasn't a chance in the world that a canal 363 miles long could be gouged through roadless wilderness and solid-rock barriers between Albany and Buffalo.

But New York Governor De Witt Clinton, his supporters, and certain editors had done a masterful job of molding opinion. The public wanted the Erie Canal. Said a state senator: "Our tables groaned with the petitions of the people."

It was significant, however, that construction began near Rome in the center of the state. Digging promised to be easiest there;

progress initially would be swift. And, as the local people said, work could proceed "both ways at once."

Digging Clinton's Ditch created a lusty chapter in Empire State lore. Fights among workers, especially the high-spirited Irish immigrants fresh from peat bogs, were heroic. Legend says the quickest way to start a row in a lockside tavern was to mention with disrespect any of the counties of Ireland.

No previous public works projects in the United States could compare with that of hacking a corridor from the Hudson River to Lake Erie, then gouging a ditch 40 feet wide and 4 feet deep in the middle of it. Eighty-three locks and 18 adqueducts had to be built.

Young America had no master engineers or bulldozers. The contractors, mostly local farmers, invented tools and techniques.

When the $7-million canal was opened along its entire length on October 25, 1825, New Yorkers could truly boast that they'd "built the longest canal, in the least time, with the least experience, for the least money, to the greatest public benefit."

The Erie Canal was a fabulous success. A chain of cities sprouted on the towpath. Travel time was reduced from weeks to days; freight costs dropped from $100 to $6 per ton. Golden harvests flowed eastward; packets carried tens of thousands of settlers to the west.

On its 150th Birthday, the old Erie is still going strong; it has been widened, improved, and in some places relocated over the years. Great barges on the Erie and other units of the modern State Barge Canal System still push about 3,800,000 tons of cargo each year.

Sea Pollution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK BROOKS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1967

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, the Ninth District of Texas, which I represent, encompasses several great ports. Many million gallons of oil and petroleum products are exported each year through these ports. For this reason we are acutely aware of the possibility of a situation occurring on our own coasts such as was caused by the tragic accident involving the merchant ship *Torrey Canyon.*

That accident which despoiled the beaches along England's Cornish coast by inundating them with oil had dramatized a serious pollution problem. But it is a problem which President Johnson has wasted little time in directing governmental effort toward finding a solution. Last week he announced that Secretary of Transportation Alan Boyd and Secretary of Interior Stewart Udall would conduct a special study for this very purpose.

For years we have had our best brains studying ways and means of reducing pollution of the air. Thousands of dollars have been spent researching the best ways of cleaning up our rivers and streams. Now we are presented with a new dilemma—pollution at sea. This problem has existed for some time, but it took the *Torrey Canyon* to focus national and international attention on the dangers inherent in pollutant spillages at sea.

The President, deeply concerned over this problem, directed Secretaries Boyd and Udall to make their recommendations to him within 90 days.

The President has asked them to look for a method of transporting large quantities of oil securely; to find a way of containing vast oil spillages if such an accident should occur again; to develop legislative proposals to enable Federal agencies to take immediate action in the event of an accident; and to suggest regulations to minimize spillage from pipelines, offshore towers and other appurtenances as the result of earthquake damage, hurricanes, tidal waves and other natural causes.

Secretaries Boyd and Udall do not have an easy task. Investigations to date have provided no explanation of the *Torrey Canyon's* grounding on a well-marked reef. None of the experts who tried everything in the book to contain the oil and keep it from destroying Britain's beaches were at all successful. Over 40,000 tons of oil coated the sea for thousands of miles causing untold damage to bird and marine life, before the vast pool was finally destroyed.

International maritime officials have called for strict regulations to govern ocean ship movement through well-defined, specified seaplanes in order to restrict the possibility of a recurrent disaster.

However, as it is not humanly possible to absolutely prevent the future occurrence of oil spillages, we need to find immediate methods of containing and destroying oilslicks before they reach disastrous proportions.

I am confident that these men, with the assistance and expertise of their respective Departments, will be able to solve these knotty problems. I look forward to their recommendations.

Lt. John Bunce McHale

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1967

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, Lt. John Bunce McHale, a young Marine pilot from the Inwood section of Manhattan, died in October of 1965 while serving his country in Vietnam. Lieutenant McHale was returning from a bombing mission near Da Nang when his aircraft was shot down.

On Memorial Day of this year a small park near his home was dedicated to Lieutenant McHale's memory. This is a fitting tribute to his bravery which will serve to remind the citizens of Inwood of the valor and dedication of the young men who are called upon to serve their country.

Mr. and Mrs. Martin McHale, his parents, and Mrs. Patricia McHale, his widow, may well be proud of his record, and the fact that his memory will be perpetuated through the park which will bring pleasure into the lives of both young and old.

I include the article from the Times of May 31, which describes the ceremony dedicating the park to Lt. John B. McHale.

[From the New York Times, May 31, 1967]

FOUR HUNDRED JOIN FAMILY TO HONOR PILOT KILLED IN VIETNAM

John Bunce McHale was a tall, brown-haired boy who lived in the Inwood section of upper Manhattan. He was born there, attended school there, and married a girl from the neighborhood six weeks before he left for Vietnam.

Four months later, on Oct. 26, 1965, as he was returning from a bombing mission near Da Nang, his Phantom jet was shot down. Lieutenant McHale was 22 years old. He was one of the youngest pilots killed in the Vietnam war.

Yesterday, as some of his former neighbors leaned out over window boxes in tall brick apartment houses to watch, and others stopped their holiday strolls, a small park was dedicated to Marine First Lieut. John B. McHale on the sun-washed corner of Arden Street and Sherman Avenue.

Some of the 400 Inwood residents at the ceremony were there because they had known him. Some came to give speeches. Others were simply curious.

PRAYERS AND SPEECHES

The ceremony began at noon. There were prayers, and speeches by Assemblyman John J. Walsh and City Councilman David B. Friedland.

"As we dedicate this park, which to his memory becomes hallowed ground, we rededicate ourselves to the principle that the freedom we enjoy here may some day prevail throughout the world," Mr. Friedland said.

Mrs. Martin McHale, Lieutenant McHale's mother, and Mrs. John B. McHale, his 23-year-old widow, put a huge wreath of carnations, gladioli and irises above the simple bronze plaque that was placed in the park in the lieutenant's memory. His mother wore his gold wings on the lapel of her black suit.

Mr. McHale, who is a carpenter for Macy's, stood with his three other children and watched the wreath placed. Lieutenant McHale was his oldest child. The others are: Denise, 17; Gerald, 15, and Martina, 10.

Lieutenant McHale's widow, the former Patricia Eichele, is a slender, brown-haired girl who wore a navy-blue coat. She is a registered nurse and lives in Neptune, N.J., with her family.

Mrs. McHale said that after their marriage she and Lieutenant McHale had a week's honeymoon in the Pocono Mountains and then drove to California where she last saw him.

"But he called me from Japan before going to Vietnam," she said. "That was the last time I spoke to him."

Her husband intended to become a career pilot in the Marine Corps, Mrs. McHale said, adding, "He loved it."

Maj. Vincent Whelan, resplendent in Marine dress uniform came up to Lieutenant McHale's mother after the ceremony.

"I appreciate your coming," she said. "I feel better that the Marines are represented."

Major Whelan, who is with the Sixth Communications Battalion in the Bronx,, explained. "I'm here as a friend of the McHale family and then as a representative of the Marine Corps."

He had met the family when he brought them the news that their son had been killed.

The 3,400-square foot grassy park has orange benches scattered about it. It belongs to the New York Telephone Company, which has a building on adjoining property at 50 Thayer Street. The park was opened to the public last September.

The ceremony was soon over, and the crowd dispersed quietly. Members of the American Legion, the Catholic War Veterans, the Jewish War Veterans and the Veterans of Foreign Wars, furled their flags and disappeared into the holiday crowds. Far off, hardly distinguishable from the hum of the traffic, could be heard the beat of drums from a parade.

Tribute to the Late Honorable Walter M. "Pete" Haynes of Tennessee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1967

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the State of Tennessee and its people are mourning the passing of a great legislative leader, the Honorable Walter M. "Pete" Haynes of Decherd and Winchester in Franklin County, Tenn., whose fine abilities and talents of leadership were dedicated to the people of Tennessee in the general assembly of my State for many years.

Senator Haynes served three terms as speaker of the Tennessee House and two terms as Lieutenant Governor and speaker of the senate. He was able, talented, and dedicated to his beloved State. He was a great and accomplished parliamentarian, a genial friend, a man whose death leaves his multitude of friends with a feeling of being diminished by his departure.

I extend my deepest sympathy to his family in their loss and bereavement, and in this connection, in view of the interest of my colleagues and the Nation in legislative affairs, I ask unanimous consent that a recent editorial and news article on Speaker Haynes be reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The articles from the Nashville Tennessean follows:

[From the Nashville Tennessean, May 30, 1967]

MR. W. M. (PETE) HAYNES

Mr. Walter M. (Pete) Haynes, a former lieutenant governor, a long-time Tennessee legislator and a widely known Winchester attorney, is dead at the age of 69.

Mr. Haynes had been a member of most sessions of the General Assembly from 1923 until 1962. As a speaker of the Senate, he was lieutenant governor of the state in 1949 and 1951. He was speaker of the House in 1931, 1935, and 1937.

Mr. Haynes was one of a trio of legislators who through the years acquired a sort of joint reputation for keen ability, good humor, legislative skill, and frolicsome nature.

One of the three, Mr. I D. Beasley of Carthage, is dead. The third, Mr. James Cummings of Woodbury, was the speaker of the House in the legislature just adjourned. Their pictures hang in Committee Room 1 at the state Capitol, where the trio was paid tribute by the State Legislative Council in 1965 as representing "the finest tradition of Tennessee government."

Mr. Haynes was chosen the most outstanding member of the legislature in 1949, but the extent of his service to the state cannot be measured by his performance in a single year—but in a career of public service.

The Franklin County attorney was also noted as an able, dedicated trial lawyer. He opened his law office in Winchester in 1919 and—with the exception of one-year intervals as referee in bankruptcy and an assistant state attorney general—spent the rest of his life practicing in his native county.

Mr. Haynes was widely known in Tennessee and elsewhere in the nation. His circle of friends ranged from great national leaders to regular courtyard whittlers. He will be greatly missed.

[From the Nashville Tennessean, May 30, 1967]

LEADING TENNESSEANS MOURN PASSING OF WALTER M. HAYNES

WINCHESTER.—Prominent Tennessee political figures eulogized veteran legislator Walter M. (Pete) Haynes yesterday as a "great stateman" who left an "indelible imprint" on Tennessee.

Haynes, the country lawyer who had one of the most successful and colorful careers in Tennessee political history, died yesterday at his home.

"He was one of the most capable men I was ever associated with," said former Gov. Gordon Browning. "I never had a more loyal associate or lieutenant governor than he was."

"Pete Haynes was a man of charming personality who won friends and never lost them," said another former governor, Jim Nance McCord. "People will remember for some time the contributions of Pete Haynes to the state he loved so well."

Haynes' lifelong friend Nashville attorney, John J. Hooker Sr., called him "one of the greatest trial lawyers who ever lived in this state."

The 69-year-old Haynes, a former lieutenant governor and veteran of nearly 40 years in the General Assembly, was found dead about 9:30 a.m. yesterday by an employee who had gone to the home to drive Haynes to his law office.

An examining physician said Haynes apparently had died in his sleep about six hours earlier.

Joe R. Hickerson, an associate in Haynes' law firm, said the cause of death had not been determined and that no autopsy would be performed.

Haynes suffered heart attack about 20 years ago and a light stroke in the early 1960s. However, Hickerson said, Haynes had appeared in good health recently and had not complained of any illness. He worked his usual day at the law office Friday.

Services will be at 3 p.m. tomorrow at Moore-Cornner Funeral Home.

Haynes' contributions to Tennessee were evidenced by the stature of those who mourned his death.

Sen. Albert Gore said:

"Mr. Haynes mastered the art of practical politics. His ability to put together the possible made him one of the effective Tennessee political leaders of our time. His passing is a great loss to the state."

Gov. Buford Ellington called Haynes a "man of great ability" and said:

"He was a veteran of many legislative battles and a man loved and respected by all who knew and worked with him. His many actions and achievements speak for him and have left an indelible imprint upon his state and community."

Two other former governors issued statements paying tribute to Haynes.

"Pete Haynes was a life-long dear friend," said Prentice Cooper, who went into the legislature with Haynes in 1923. "The state has lost an outstanding and distinguished lawmaker and member of the bar."

Former Gov. Frank Clement called Haynes "one of the outstanding public figures in Tennessee, a hard fighter, an able lawyer and dedicated servant to the people of Tennessee."

Nashville Atty. John J. Hooker Jr. said Haynes was "a great personality who brought good humor and joy to every meeting. He was kind, highly intelligent and an unfailingly marvelous human being. I am deeply saddened not to be in his company again and there are many others who will sadly miss him."

A practicing attorney here since 1919, Haynes left his mark on Tennessee in the laws he helped push through the legislature and the hundreds of people he served as a defense attorney.

Born in Decherd, Tenn., Oct. 2, 1897, Haynes attended Franklin County public schools and received his law degree from Cumberland University at Lebanon in 1918.

His entire legal career was spent in Winchester except for one-year assignments as a federal bankruptcy referee in 1925 and assistant state attorney general in 1930.

He began his legislative career in 1923 and went on to serve nine terms in the House and three in the Senate—representing Franklin, Grundy, Marion and Warren counties.

Five of those terms were spent as speaker of one of the two chambers. He was speaker of the House in 1931, 1935 and 1937, and Speaker of the Senate in 1949 and 1951.

Haynes was designated Tennessee's first lieutenant governor by an act of the 1951 legislature.

During his tenure as an assemblyman, Haynes teamed with Rep. Jim Cummings of Woodbury, present House speaker, and the late I. D. Beasley of Carthage, to form what became affectionately known as the "unholy trinity."

Together, the colorful trio became a dominant force representing the rural viewpoint in the legislature for more than 30 years.

With Haynes serving as the parliamentarian and Cummings and Beasley fighting the battles on the floor, the three probably controlled more legislation than any other three men in Tennessee history.

A picture of Cummings, Beasley and Haynes hangs in Committee Room 1 at the Capitol as a tribute for their representation of "the finest tradition of Tennessee government." It was placed there in 1965 by the State Legislative Council.

Cummings, who did not win a speakership until the 1967 session, yesterday termed Haynes "one of the all-time great speakers. In my opinion, he quickly developed great legislative strength with a sharp understanding of the process of government. In my judgment, he was one of the better parliamentarians—one of the all-time great speakers."

In addition to his prowess as a legislator, Haynes also gained wide recognition as a courtroom attorney.

John J. Hooker Sr. once described him as having a "way with a jury you don't see very often."

Upon learning of his death yesterday, Hooker said:

"Pete was one of the closest friends I ever had. Because of his political prominence, people were inclined to lose sight of his great ability as a lawyer. I regarded him as one of the greatest trial lawyers that ever lived in this state."

Haynes, who defended more that 400 persons charged with crimes that call for the death penalty, rejected many offers to join big law firms in larger cities.

"I like it where I am," he said.

Besides his experiences of the legislature and the courtroom, Haynes' fondest memories were of participating in the state constitutional convention of 1953 and of being a delegate in the Democratic presidential conventions of 1928, 1952, 1956, and 1960.

Haynes suffered one of his few political defeats, in his last Senate race, to Ernest Crouch of McMinnville in 1962.

Following the balloting, Haynes said he was "relieved" to lose the race and would try to get "depoliticket."

"Now I can practice law with a clear mind," he said.

Since that time Haynes had been associated in law practice with Hickerson, Charles S. Ramsey Jr., Thomas M. Hull and State Rep. Thomas Wiseman of Tullahoma.

Crouch yesterday termed the veteran Democrat a great statesman.

"Pete Haynes was a man of vision and courage," Crouch said. "He contributed much to the welfare of his state and community. He provided leadership when leadership was needed—serving with distinction in both houses."

In 1929, Haynes married the former Virginia Wilson of Tulsa, Okla. She died in 1964.

Haynes was a Mason and a Shriner and a member of the Trinity Episcopal Church.

The Rev. Walter Norcross, pastor of Trinity will officiate at tomorrow's services. Burial will be in Memorial Gardens at Winchester.

Survivors include a sister, Miss Elizabeth Haynes, and a brother, J. L. (Buck) Haynes, both of Dechard.

Members of the Franklin and Coffee County bar associations will serve as honorary pallbearers.

Active pallbearers include John J. Hooker Sr., Jim Cummings, Ernest Martin, Thomas A. Wiseman Jr., Thomas M. Hull, Charles S. Ramsey Jr., Charles Stubblefield and Joe R. Hickerson.

SBA Loan and Advice Help Salem, Oreg., Businessman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AL ULLMAN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 22, 1967

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, the role of the Small Business Administration in assisting the growth of our free enterprise economy is well known to many of the Members of this House.

The program of Administrator Bernard L. Boutin to achieve greater use of SBA guarantees by banks and greater bank participation in small business loans is showing results throughout our county. For instance, in January, 72 percent of the business loans approved by the SBA were either guaranteed loans or loans made with bank participation. To appreciate the magnitude of their assistance to our economy, during the first 7 months of this fiscal year SBA approved nearly 4,000 loans to small firms totaling $175 million.

Mr. William T. J. Foster of Salem, Oreg., is a successful businessman in my congressional district, who has profited from SBA financial and professional assistance. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring Mr. Foster's experience to the attention of the Congress.

For several year, Mr. Foster was a successful homebuilder. As a sideline he began building furniture, TV tables, and bookshelves in a a small shop behind his home. Later he invested his savings in a small factory building and began to produce furniture on a larger scale.

Finally, he branched out into what was to be his specialty, the manufacture of wrought-iron lawn furniture and ornaments. He called his shop the Little Iron Works.

Like many small businessmen, Mr. Foster had a solid technical foundation. He had no difficulty in designing and manufacturing quality products that were in demand.

In 1962, Mr. Foster visited SBA's office in Portland. Despite his diligent work, his business was showing little profit. To the SBA financial specialist who consulted with him the trouble was readily apparent. He needed to install a cost accounting system in order to lower costs and increase sales.

SBA took positive steps to give him the assistance he needed. An SBA loan for $25,000 was approved so he could purchase machinery and equipment, build up his inventory of raw materials, and have adequate working capital.

SBA specialists in management outlined for Mr. Foster an intensive advertising campaign and showed him how to establish a market for the new products he was offering.

With SBA's help, Mr. Foster installed an effective accounting system. Foster visited other wrought iron factories around the country to learn how they operated. This convinced him that he needed a retail outlet in a large city. Accordingly, he opened a retail store in Portland which his wife helps him operate.

In less than 2 years, this small firm's sales doubled—and they are still increasing at a healthy rate. The firm's assets have tripled since SBA's assistance.

Today Mr. Foster has 11 persons on his payroll in addition to his wife and himself. In 1962 he had only two employees.

This is the kind of help SBA gives to enterprising small businessmen. It backed this small businessman's venture with a $25,000 loan and followed up with practical, effective management guidance. This SBA loan is being repaid with interest, and this business is definitely an asset to the communities in which he operates.

Mr. Speaker, I commend Mr. Foster for his foresight and industry and the Small Business Administration for their managerial and financial assistance in developing the Little Iron Works of Salem, Oreg.

The Fine Work of the Chatsworth, Calif., Business & Professional Women's Club

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. CORMAN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 1, 1967

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to call to the attention of the Members of the House the generous and patriotic efforts of the Business & Professional Women's Club of Chatsworth, Calif., in behalf of our servicemen overseas.

Every month these ladies have sent gift boxes to Chatsworth servicemen on tours of duty outside the United States. Approximately 60 of the 76 Chatsworth boys are now stationed in South Vietnam—and they are all, wherever they are, grateful to be remembered by their home community. I would like to quote a letter of May 13, from one serviceman:

> DEAR LADIES: It is 7 a.m. and I just got off a 12 hour shift at the hangar. We're working 12 hours on—12 hours off now.
>
> I received your latest package and once again I think you. The thoughtfulness of your organization surpasses that of any other that I have heard of. The foot powder that is in this box is very welcome. It's hard to keep things dry in this climate. There is a lot of mildew and everything rots or rusts if not constantly taken care of.
>
> I'll have to make it a point to visit and thank you in person when I return home. I'll write more later. I'm dead beat right now.
>
> Sincerely,
>
> JOHN JOHNSTON.

I am told by the past president of the organization that—and I quote from a recent letter:

> Next weekend (May 27), we shall be packing boxes for our boys overseas . . . and thanks to the Chatsworth American Legion, we do not have to worry about the postage this month, for they are sending us a $25 check. In April, we mailed 45 boxes to our servicemen . . . the most we have ever sent in one month . . . and we hope to be able to top that amount this month.
>
> We have begun a new type of service to our servicemen . . . keeping them posted on other Chatsworth boys stationed in or around their camp. We have personally written nine of our boys stationed in various small towns in Germany; notifying them of the other eight boys who are there also . . . and now comes the waiting time to find out if they were able to get together for a weekend reunion. This new service will perhaps in some small way help them to realize their community does care about them all year long.

I extend to the officers and members of the Chatsworth Business & Professional Women's Club my best wishes for its continued success. Its efforts in the community have always been notable and worthwhile. It is now graced with the knowledge that by this added service to the boys overseas, it is serving its community and its Nation extraordinarily well.

Public Support for War on Poverty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 17, 1967

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, a recent Louis Harris survey has determined that six out of 10 Americans want the war on poverty expanded or at least continued at its present level. Since the purpose of the overall strategy of the war on poverty is—program by program—to move people from welfare to tax-producing employment, one can only conclude, despite the heavy criticism, that the program has brought returns on the investment.

Sargent Shriver has said that the real problems are not inherent in the war, but in poverty itself. To those who question not the value of the programs, but their operations, he has wondered why they have not made their voices heard earlier.

I include at this point in the Record an excellent article by Roscoe Drummond of the Washington Post in this connection, and urge support for retaining OEO as the central administration and coordination agency, with continued funding at the optimum level possible.

The article follows:

THE WAR ON SHRIVER—PUBLIC BACKS FIGHT ON POVERTY

(By Roscoe Drummond)

The American people are making no mistake in giving their strong support to the war on poverty.

Voters are 60 per cent behind the war on poverty and want it continued or expanded, the Harris Survey shows. Public support has been growing steadily for the last seven months.

The Nation as a whole has come to accept the war on poverty as one of the most compassionate, humane, and intelligent programs of the Johnson Administration.

And the Republican leadership in Congress, launching its own "opportunity crusade," avows that it favors all of the antipoverty programs and backs all of the antipoverty goals—but would do the whole thing differently.

Surely all this should be sweet music to the White House and the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Why, then, as he goes to Congress soon to defend his proposed budget, should Sargent Shriver, the coordintion-in-chief of the war on poverty, be the target of so much criticism for his administration of the program? Has he been a flop? Has he been incompetent? Has he been a dull-minded and routine administrator?

No one will argue, certainly not Shriver, that everything has come up roses in the Office of Economic Opportunity. But the volume and sharpness of the Republican attacks on the OEO, to the point that it ought to be closed out and the programs sprinkled around the already overburdened Washington bureaucracy, are excessive and ill-considered.

These facts ought to be borne in mind:

1. Much of the criticism comes from the extremists who pretty much cancel each other out—those who attack Shriver because they don't want the war on poverty to be doing anything and those who want Shriver to be asking for ten times as much as he is now doing.

2. The OEO has made mistakes. They should be recognized and corrected. The new antipoverty bill now before Congress greatly tightens the program. But the OEO had to do things quickly in its early period and obviously it has not done them well. But let's not forget that if there were no OEO there would be no war on poverty. There would be no Headstart. There would be no Job Corps. There would be no Community Action and, above all, there would be little recognition on the part of middle-class American that poverty in the United States acutely exists—32 million men, women, and children beneath the poverty line who must be relieved.

There is no doubt in my mind that the war on poverty continues to need innovative, pioneering, open-minded, let's-try leadership. It would be very unwise to bury these new and experimental programs in existing departments which have more than they can do already and too many officials wedded to old programs.

The Attorney General Sets the Record Straight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1967

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, an editorial in a Washington newspaper May 22 left the false impression that Attorney General Ramsey Clark does not recognize crime as a major challenge in America.

Members of the Congress, the press, and the public who have even superficially followed the public statements of the Attorney General know of his recognition of, and deep concern about the rising crime rate.

For example, I note that he discussed crime in two Law Day, 1967, appearances.

In a television interview on April 30 he said:

> We have to be very much concerned about the rise of crime in the United States . . . I think we know now, that there is an increase that exceeds the population growth rate several fold,. at least, and that we are compelled to take strong action to arrest and reverse the trend toward lawlessness that we see among us.

The following day he stated in a speech at Los Angeles that:

> We cannot define with precision the extent of crime's increase. We can only be sure that crime is increasing . . . the rate of increase is a cause for real concern.

Since the editorial contradicted the views often expressed by the Attorney General, I inquired of him and today received the following reply:

May 31, 1967.

Hon. Ramsey Clark,
The Attorney General of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Attorney General: Knowing of your commitment to explore every possible avenue to deal with the increase in crime throughout our Nation, I was astonished to note the editorial in the May 22 edition of the Evening Star indicating you are of the view that crime is not a major problem in this country.

Having spent hours with you before our Subcommittee urging enactment of the legislation submitted by the President to deal with the crime problem, I cannot believe the editorial correctly reflects your views.

For this reason, I would appreciate having the gist of your remarks in the interview to which the editorial referred.

Sincerely,

Emanuel Celler,
Chairman.

Office of the Attorney General,
Washington, D.C., June 1,1967.

Hon. Emanuel Celler,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman: You have asked for my comments on an editorial entitled "Crime—What's That" which quotes me as saying there is no crime wave. The editorial apparently was based on a single news story appearing in one New York newspaper which resulted from a conversation with a reporter while en route to La Guardia Airport in a taxi.

During that conversation, I was asked whether I thought we are experiencing a crime wave. I said I wish it were a crime wave because waves rise and fall, but unfortunately crime has increased steadily over the years without any signs of a recession.

Why the editorial writer chose to assume from this one news story that I do not believe crime to be a serious problem, I cannot say.

Considerably more than half my time, indeed more than half the resources of this entire Department are devoted to crime reduction.

In the less than three months since I became Attorney General, I have made speeches from coast to coast urging greater effort in the war on crime. In numerous press conferences I have consistently urged action to reduce crime. I have testified more than 20 hours before committees of the House and Senate seeking legislation to vastly increase the crime fighting resources of the nation. I have convened two conferences of national leaders in law and law enforcement to consider implementation of a national strategy against crime.

I am, as you know, personally deeply concerned about the incidence of crime in America and committed to do everything within my power to arrest and then reverse the trend toward lawlessness which prevails.

For these reasons I deeply regret that the public might be led to believe that I do not think crime is a problem. It is a grave national problem.

Sincerely,

Ramsey Clark,
Attorney General.

A Salute to Mae Morgan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HASTINGS KEITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1967

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, an old friend of mine, Mary C. Morgan, of Randolph, Mass., who is a constituent of my colleague, Congressman James Burke, has recently retired after 27 years of loyal service to the U.S. Army and the Boston Army Base. During the trying years of World War II, Mae Morgan was a loyal and devoted secretary in the office of the Army base's commanding general. From 1947 until 1954 she was personal secretary to the commanding generals of that base. In 1954 the Army decided that Boston no longer needed a commanding general, and Mae Morgan moved to the public information office.

The public relations work she did there was a labor of love. Meeting the public, dealing with the press, and keeping the Army's best foot forward were both challenging and satisfying. In August 1964, when the Boston Army Base's commander, Col. Philip B. Melody, was retiring, he presented Miss Morgan with an "outstanding sustained superior performance award."

The Defense Department is now hiring thousands of civilians to free military men for military tasks. If these employees match Mae's record of loyal and devoted service, they shall have served their country well.

Johnson Picks Covey Oliver for Top Latin Policy Post

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1967

Mr. MORSE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, last week President Johnson announced his intention to nominate Covey T. Oliver as Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs to succeed Lincoln Gordon who will assume the presidency of Johns Hopkins University after a distinguished career as an Ambassador to Brazil and as Assistant Secretary.

In my judgment, the President has made an outstanding choice. A distinguished international legal scholar, proficient in the two principal languages of Latin America, and a highly successful Ambassador to Colombia, Professor Oliver can be expected to bring his intellectual and humane qualities to bear on our problems in the hemisphere in an effective manner.

I include in the RECORD an article from the Washington Star of May 25 commenting on Professor Oliver's selection:

JOHNSON PICKS COVEY OLIVER FOR TOP LATIN POLICY POST

President Johnson has selected a fellow Texan, former Ambassador to Colombia Covey T. Oliver, to succeed Lincoln Gordon as assistant secretary of state for inter-American affairs.

The President's decision to nominate the 54-year-old Oliver to the top policymaking post at the State Department for Latin America was disclosed late yesterday by White House Press Secretary George Christian. Oliver's name was never mentioned even in the highest administration circles in previous speculation.

Oliver, a native of Laredo, Tex., is a lifelong Democrat and is accomplished in both law and economics. He speaks both Spanish and Portuguese fluently.

The nominee has been a professor of law at the University of Pennsylvania since he left the ambassadorship in Colombia last fall after two years of service in Bogota. He and his wife have five children and currently live in Lansdowne, Pa.

TO START IN JUNE

In a telephone interview, Oliver said he first learned of Johnson's intention to nominate him just 24 hours before the White House announcement was made. He said he will take over the job—upon confirmation by the Senate—at the end of June.

The nominee refused to categorize himself in terms of liberal or conservative in relation to the approach he will take to the job of steering U.S. policy on Latin America. "This is the tyranny of words," he said. "I like to think of myself as a rationalist who feels he has a balance between the intuitive knowledge of the needs of Latin America in relation to the policies and needs of the United States."

Some officials who know Oliver well consider him a warm, gregarious humanist, whose character is deeply rooted in his long experience as a professor of law at his own University of Texas, at the University of California in Berkeley and at Penn.

One official described Oliver as a man with "no cant" about him, and predicted he would approach the job as an interested and knowledgeable man rather than in the mold of a tired, career diplomat.

Oliver said he intends, if confirmed, to stick pretty close to his desk for a considerable time to bring himself up to date on the problems of Latin America.

ON ECONOMIC WELFARE BOARD

He already has had considerable experience in that field, beginning in the early stages of World War II when he and a predecessor in the new job, Thomas C. Mann, served with the Board of Economic Welfare, working on matters related to the assets of enemy countries in Latin America.

Oliver joined the Foreign Service Reserve in 1942 and served for two years in the economic section of the U.S. Embassy in Madrid. He headed various State Department divisions.

Oliver went back to teaching law in 1949 and was a Fulbright scholar and lecturer at the University of Sao Paulo, Brazil, in 1963. His two years as ambassador to Colombia followed.

With the assistant secretaryship, Oliver also will become U.S. coordinator of the Alliance for Progress.

To Extend the Provisions of the Older Americans Act of 1965

SPEECH

OF

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 31, 1967

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, today, I have introduced into the House of Representatives a bill designed to extend the provisions of the Older Americans Act of 1965 and to increase the amount of Federal money available to plans both in progress and contemplated.

Too often in the past our Nation and its citizens have turned our backs on those productive and vital members of our society who have, merely through the passage of years, become regarded as unnecessary. Increased medical knowledge has stretched the life span; the Older Americans Act attempts to match this scientific advance with a corresponding social response. This act has already seen positive results and it is my hope that the extension and increased funding which I introduce today will carry forward and expand this exercise in fundamental human decency.

Specifically, my bill will extend the grant provisions of the act through 1972. In fiscal year 1968, $10,550,000 will be granted to the States for projects already begun and to allow for 240 to 300 new projects; $6,400,000 is authorized for research, demonstration, and training programs, with a particular emphasis on nutrition. Such sums as may prove necessary may be requested from the Congress for the next 4 years.

The provisions of my bill are in accordance with the bold and imaginative plans projected by President Johnson in his message on aid for the aged. I am pleased to associate myself with many distinguished specialists in the problems of longevity, whose knowledge and wisdom is only exceeded by their compassion. I feel that the extension of the Older Americans Act provided for by my bill, and the enlarging of its range and scope, is in keeping with the increased awareness that our social scientists have given us about aging and is a continuation of the noble tradition of allowing all Americans to enjoy the blessings of our unprecedented prosperity.

Red Ink Not Needed To Sustain Prosperity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1967

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the widely read international columnist, Henry Hazlitt, writing in the Chicago Tribune on Friday, May 26, touched on a subject in a fashion that should be thoughtfully studied by the upper echelon of the administration, the Treasury Department, and the Bureau of the Budget. His point of view is especially timely as Congress prepares to debate the demands of the Executive to increase the national debt ceiling. His commentary follows:

RED INK NOT NEEDED TO SUSTAIN PROSPERITY

(By Henry Hazlitt)

One of the reasons we have had a budget deficit in each of the last seven years, and 31 deficits in the last 37 years, is the persistence of the myth that budget deficits are necessary to sustain prosperity.

I have frequently argued against that myth and am happy to find support for my arguments in a recent speech by Yale Brozen, professor at the University of Chicago.

"Of the great array of myths underlying the policies of the Great Society," said Brozen, "the most pernicious and the most widely believed is that the 'longest boom' [i.e., the 1961–67 recovery and prosperity] is a consequence of supreme success in the manipulation of federal fiscal policy.

"The unbroken series of federal deficits beginning with fiscal 1961 is credited with producing an unprecedented stability in economic growth and with breaking the business cycle pattern. This widely accepted idea is now leading to a policy of 'fine tuning' of the economy with fiscal gimmicks and quick-change tax laws that are destroying any basis for firm expectations on which to plan investment, build business policy or for making long-range commitments . . .

"The result has been and will be instability in many industries, a neglect of the proper use of monetary policy, and a federal budget out of control growing at a monstrous rate. We must destroy the myth of fiscal omnipotence and permanent prosperity thru permanent deficits before it destroys us."

Brozen then went on to point out that the variations in the economy in the period since 1961 can be far better explained by changes in the stock of money than by chanes in deficits and tax rates.

LACK OF COMPARISONS

If we go even further back than his comparisons, we find that the lack of relation between deficits and prosperity is glaring. The most notorious experience was in the 10-year period from 1931 to 1940 inclusive. There was a deficit in every one of those years. It averaged 2.8 billion dollars annually, which was 3.6 percent of the gross national product of the period.

Deficits of the same percentage of today's GNP would come to an average of 27.5 billions a year. Yet during the 10 years of these huge proportionate deficits the average annual unemployment rate was 18.6 per cent of the total working force.

Let's look at the reverse situation. In the fiscal year 1948 there was a budget surplus of 8.4 billions. Yet the GNP in 1948 was more than 4 per cent higher than in 1947. Unemployment in 1948 was only 3.8 per cent, not only a remarkably good figure in itself [far better than the 1961–1967 average record of 5.3 per cent, but a tiny bit better than the 3.9 per cent of 1947].

MONEY SUPPLY ALL-IMPORTANT

What the new economists, the tax manipulators, and the deficit worshipers fail to see is that it is not the existence or size of a budget deficit or surplus that decides whether and how much "purchasing power" is being pumped into or out of the economy, but what happens to the money supply.

The new economists are helping to bring on budgetary chaos because they do not understand elementary monetary economics.

Communications Workers of America Scholarship Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 31, 1967

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, several days ago it was my privilege to draw the names of the first winners in a new international scholarship program established by the Communications Workers of America, AFL–CIO, to honor the late Ray Hackney, a vice president of that union.

It was entirely appropriate that the Communications Workers set up a scholarship program as a living memorial to Ray Hackney, because he and the union he served so faithfully have long been dedicated to the cause of education for all.

Ray Hackney, whose memory the scholarship program honors, took the lead in strengthening our Nation's ties with the people of Latin America. He worked on behalf of his union and from his own strong convictions to foster education and training for those at home and abroad who might have gone without that education had it not been for the valient efforts of CWA and Ray Hackney.

It is eminently fitting, then, that one of the scholarships established by his uion went to a young man from a Latin American nation. The other to a high school graduate in this country who is the son of a CWA member.

At the ceremonies to select the scholarship winners, Joseph A Beirne, the president of CWA, who is an ardent advocate of education for all, declared:

> The only real threat to our democracy is the possible failure of our people to understand how it works.

This is not only true, but needs saying again and again. Our form of government is the best in the world—but it is also complex—and its complexity demands understanding.

There were several hundred applicants for the first Ray Hackney scholarships including a substantial number from Latin American countries. On their application form the young men and women who applied were asked to define their goal upon completion of their college work.

It was heartening for me and all the others present at CWA's selection ceremony to learn that so many of these young people want to enter the field of service to their fellow human beings.

An overwhelming proportion of the applicants—almost one-fourth of the entire 700—named teaching as their No. 1 choice.

The field of medicine came next on the list of preferences; then, international affairs, the Peace Corps, social welfare work, religion, government, politics, the law, research, engineering, the space program, the armed forces, the computer field, photography, other forms of art, and library work.

While I cannot name each of the choices, several intrigued me.

Two applicants wanted to study archeology. Three wished to go into the field of atomic science. Nine chose home economics. Four would like to study marine biology. One prefers wild life management. And one ambitious young applicant defined his goal as "to work to become president of CWA."

I am deeply impressed by the evident desire of these young men and women to make the most of an opportunity to go to college. Of major significance is the fact that so many of these young people want to go abroad and to work in the interest of humanity. And we should view with special interest, and seriously question, why none of these youngsters express a clear-cut interest in going into business.

All of us know that many substantial scholarships are available. I single this one out for special mention today because it represents a major effort by a major union to provide educational opportunities for those who might otherwise have been deprived of a chance that might some day make a significant impact on our world and times.

For making this opportunity possible, I salute CWA, its officers and its membership. I wish fervently that more groups were as devoted so completely to the cause of democracy and equality of opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the survey conducted by the CWA is tremendously interesting in that it gives us a good idea of what young Americans desire in the way of a career.

The list follows and indicates the number of youngsters who selected each category:

Teaching	137
Uncertain	90
Medicine	66
Travel	52
Peace Corps	28
Welfare (social)	20
Research engineer	20
Electric engineer	16
Business administration	14
Law	13
Armed Forces	11
Accounting	10
Home economics	9
Research chemist	8
Writing	8
Computers	8
Space program	7
Music	7
Veterinary medicine	7
Journalism	7
Medical missionary	6
Government	6
Telephone work	6
Secretarial	6
Architect	6
Politics	5
Airline stewardess	5
Artist	5
Airline pilot	4
Ministery	4
Merchandising	4
Marine biology	4
Television (broadcasting)	3
Atomic energy program	3
Languages	3
Archeology	2
Wild life management	2
FBI	2
Play sports	2
Advertising	2
Librarian	2
Public relations	1
Bell laboratories	1
Priesthood	1
Build golf courses	1
Fashion design	1
Repeal 14(b)	1
Construction	1
Ranching	1
Automotive design	1
Insurance	1
Photography	1
President of CWA	1
Crime research	1

Congressman Robert L. Leggett Presents Penetrating Analysis of American Maritime Program in Propeller Club Speech

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1967

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, on May 24, 19967, in an observance of National Maritime Day, our distinguished colleague, the Honorable ROBERT L. LEGGETT, of California, delivered an address to the Propellor Club of Los Angeles.

Congressman LEGGETT's speech is a penetrating analysis of the dangerous level to which we have permitted the American maritime program to fall, and he made clear that the revival of American shipbuilding capabilities is imperative to our national security and well-being.

I commend Congressman LEGGETT's timely remarks to the attention of the Members and other readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

ADDRESS BY HONORABLE ROBERT L. LEGGETT TO THE PROPELLER CLUB OF LOS ANGELES, MAY 24, 1967

President Wright and gentlemen of the Pacific Coast Maritime industry. I want to thank you for inviting me to come from Washington to Los Angeles to help celebrate National Maritime Day with you—May 22.

The day might also be known as the *Rise and Fall of the Savannah* in 155 years.

It would be well if we could say that we have come a long way since the first Savannah steamed across the Atlantic to Europe in 1812. Instead we must report that the N.S. Savannah after visiting 40 ports and sailing but 130,000 miles, the world's most modern ship, has more or less been in mothballs since last August.

In a way this action is par for the course with today's American maritime program. Labor, management and the administration in Washington are all jointly responsible. The industry, maritime labor and the Federal Maritime Administration have probably been damned and praised by more great speakers over the past few years than any other facet of American life by Ed Hood, Ralph Dewey and from the Navy Department's Admiral David L. McDonald to Department of Transportation's Secretary, Alan Boyd.

My concern with this industry is partly provincial. I represent in the Congress of the United States the 4th Congressional District which contains the Mare Island Division of the San Francisco Bay Naval Shipyard. To those who say our American shipbuilding know-how has deteriorated I would say look over the SSBNs *Stonewall Jackson, Woodrow Wilson* and the latest, *Mariano Guadalupe Vallejo,* SSBN 658—all built at Vallejo. These are true precise accurate and durable instruments of American foreign policy—and their quietness and capability have no peer in the free or Communist world.

The secret of these ships, however, is money—$35 to $55 million for the shipyard work and nearly $100 million of government provided equipment.

My Mare Island yard was the yard that constructed 392 ships and repaired and overhauled a total of 4,560 ships during World War II—the yard that launched the World War I destroyer *Ward* in 16½ days.

When I came to Congress 5 years ago I quickly discovered, however, in the 65–35 battles with Ed Hood and Representative Jerry Ford that it just was not in the cards that we would long have a thriving Naval shipyard industry if we were perennially scrapping with private industry over the same Navy dollar. In a word we couldn't be healthy in public yards if the private yards were not prospering. As a practical matter the whole issue of 65–35 was the eventual distribution of $100 million of Naval and repair work—less than 3% of the total ship work being performed in the country. We are now beyond the 65–35 encounters in Washington and not merely because of Vietnam but because my House Committee on Armed Services under the inspired leadership of my colleague, Chairman Mendel Rivers of South Carolina, intends to upgrade not only the Naval shipyards but private yards as well.

At the insistence of our committee, Secretary Nitze announced a few weeks ago that Kaiser Industries would shortly complete a 5–7 year $600 to $700 million Naval ship modernization program. 8 or 9 Naval shipyards will each achieve a 20th Century capability.

Moving forward simultaneously with this improvement I hope and I know will be a *Modern Merchant Program* for which the Congress has waited well over two years. Nearly every Member of Congress I know has got a gut feeling that we should be moving ahead with a radically new Merchant Ship Program. How do you do it. There has been so much written by so many people—some enlightening—some confusing—we have had Task Force Reports and Maritime Committee Reports and all of these thoughts have been capsulated so many times it is difficult to expound a new idea to resolve the problems of building foreign or forming an independent Maritime Administration.

I frankly believe that we have enough steam or nuclear propulsion in the maritime industry to insist on and stimulate the creation of a new American Maritime industry—*of space program proportion.* We've been thinking large but we are budget programmed small at the federal level. The Maritime Administration received a total support of $303 million for '66, $280 million for '67 and $305 million is scheduled for '68. We announced recently that the '68 funds were up $25 million from '67 and that amounts were included for 13 new vessels as part of our subsidized fleet. *This kind of a replacement program begins no place, ends no place and will do little to abate block obsolescence.*

For ship construction "to provide for National Defense features in the form of construction subsidy this year" is the monumental sum of $106 million and I am sure someone will claim that the $143 million included in the '68 budget may break the bank. Certainly these kind of budgets are exactly in line with testimony of Secretary Robert McNamara before our House Merchant Marine Committee in 1962 and recently when he said:

"From a purely military point of view the Reserve Fleet, plus vessels in service, plus the construction program previously outlined appear adequate to our needs . . . I do not wish to overstate the military requirement thereby providing an umbrella under which a huge shipbuilding program for the Merchant Marine can be justified . . ."

I personally think Secretary McNamara is the best we've had and the best in the business but on this issue he's dead wrong.

We all considered it rather ironic that the Secretary then should decide to move full steam ahead this year with a $2 billion Fast Deployment Logistics Shipbuilding Program. The Secretary said:

"Not only does it cost twice as much to build a ship in this country, it also takes twice as long." He said the reason is not higher labor costs or less killed workers so much as the fact that American shipyards are "generally technically obsolete compared to those of Northern Europe and Japan."

I dispute what the Secretary says but if he is accurate I think he and the Department of Defense are to blame for compressing our American shipbuilding industry from a better than 1,000 ship per year capacity at the end of World War II to the 13 Merchant ships delivered and 16 ships ordered by and in American yards last year. This policy has allowed our skilled Naval shipbuilding levels to degenerate at one point to 75,000 and private shipbuilding levels was near 100,000 men. We have had in years past a true '*survival of the fittest*' in American shipbuilding with the government forcing companies to bid at cost and under cost to both harpoon each other and Naval shipyards in the competition. Needless to say, except in exceptional contracts there have not been fat profits for modernization programs and with the government spending 85% of the shipbuilding dollars it is no wonder that there has been a degree of status quo in the industry.

How ironic for the Secretary to make statements that he does and then propose a $2 billion shipbuilding program which includes $100 million in the contract for a new shipyard. This program has rightfully been indicated by Stewart Cort of Bethlesem, Ralph Dewey of your Pacific Association and by our House Merchant Marine Committee almost unanimously. To many of us in Washington when we saw the Secretary of Defense, Navy, Army and all the Joint Chiefs of Staff unite simultaneously before our hearing for a program, we thought there must be something wrong with it.

My personal indictment in letters to the President and on the House floor went something like this:

". . . Over the past year and before I have concerned myself about the need for and manner of construction of the projected $2 billion Fast Deployment Logistics Shipbuilding Program. I am concerned likewise with this Nation's critical need for a nuclear Navy and the needs of this Nation for a crash program to revitalize out rapidly depleting Merchant Marine Fleet.

"It is obvious that as a result of our Southeast Asia involvement our Nation has become critically aware of our Nation's current deficit in ability to commandeer on short notice a surface fleet capability to deliver logistic material support on underdeveloped having participated as a member of the Armed Services Committee on a South Asia inspection tour last year, however, I am satisfied that this deficit was overcome by our Department of the Army and Navy at Chu Lai and Cam Ranh Bay by alternative means. I am personally also satisfied that though we moved troops to the shore before supplies, the overall delay has not seriously affected our total overall effort.

"The FDL program could overcome the referenced deficiency. You could speculate that perhaps the program could also assist in providing the United States with a continuing capability with the C5A aircraft that would allow us to retract troops from overseas positions and still allow us to involve ourselves very quickly in a police action or war overseas. I am satisfied that the United States needs more of a capability to get out of encounters easily rather than get in. The nuclear Navy which I support has a 'defensive' world image. A patrolling FDL fleet, I am sure, would be considered as 'offensive.'

Secretary McNamara said last year in Montreal that during the past 8 years there were 150 encounters around the world, one-third of which were affected by communism—some intracountry and some between nations in all of which the United States could have involved itself.

"The idea of maintaining a $2 billion fleet—an amount equal to the shipyard cost of our Polaris fleet, I think is preposterous.

"I personally believe that the purpose of the FDL program and its manner of procurement have been confounded.

"My reasons for opposing this program can be summarized as follows:

"First. The timing is wrong. Our current year deficit of $9.7 billion should be limited in every way possible.

"Second. The FDL program would be mutually exclusive to a nuclear Navy program which program I know carries paramount priority by the Navy Department. In the 1960's we have averaged $1½ billion annual Navy expenditure for new construction. The FDL program while perhaps only 6 percent of the total U.S. shipbuilding program would comprise nearly 25 percent of all Navy construction procurement for the next 6 years.

"Third. The FDL program I believe to be the most cost ineffective to ever receive the stamp of approval of the Secretary of Defense. The ships constructed will not be operational because they will have no place to go. To tie up $2 billion of a merchant fleet we do not have dockside, loaded with progressively obsolete military equipment is not sound.

"First, the Army and Marines would have to buy two of everything, one-half of which would be hermetically sealed for perhaps a 5-year period when it must be replaced without ever going in service—hopefully. If the ships were used once capriciously or ill timed, thereafter our fleet would be persona non grata all over the world.

"The ships also would be manned 24 hours a day with military crews or civilians claiming overtime, hazard, and special-duty pay.

"Far better it would be to build a fleet with a function; that is, a true, modern fast merchant fleet that would be available on priority call to the Department of Defense. It is my information that such a fleet could be constructed for private merchant marine operation in private shipyards and could be available on call to the Department of Defense. The Department would pay an annual rental for the preemptive rights which financial guarantee I am informed would be adequate for private financing and construction.

"The proposed pending FDL submission could be used to develop the required merchant fleet with the full FDL capability. This type of program has real merit. The work would be spread to all private shipyards or to one on a competitive bid. The United States would not get into the merchant shipping business. The ships would be in full operation and operated under the regulations of the Military Sea Transportation Service or Navy Department maintaining perhaps a partial FDL capability at all times. Taxpayers money would be involved at a minimum. The base could be laid for a new modern merchant fleet and the fleet operation would not be construed as a hostile act.

"Fourth. It would seem that if we must preposition logistics hardware, that we could do it much cheaper at the many American bases overseas. If the FDL have a quick offloading capability, they must also have a quick onloading capability of containerized material. There should be no need, therefore, to maintain idle a complete fleet of floating warehouses . . ."

I further stated to my Chairman:

". . . I, personally, believe that this is the chance of a lifetime for our Committee to lay the groundwork for a Merchant Marine as a national defense requirement." I don't think the Secretary has discharged his obligations in this respect and at all. I believe that if it is worthwhile for us to spend $20 billion to meet the Russians on the moon, for which purpose we are not really sure, it is certainly worth our while to meet the Russians on the high seas, which constitute four-fifths of the earth's surface.

"I would like to see the United States undertake a sealift program of a billion dollar magnitude with the same enthusiasm that we undertake the Space Program based primarily on a national defense requirement. Certainly, the intelligence which we would acquire by means of having large numbers of American ships plying the international trade routes would be invaluable and could not be satisfied by foreign crews manning 'flag ships of convenience . . .' "

Our committee heard witnesses from all over the country and decided on the FDL to go slow and, specifically, we found in our report as follows:

"The committee, therefore, in approving two of the five FDLs requested in this year's budget does not commit itself to approval of the 30 ship program . . . before considering any further expansion of the FDL program beyond that recommended in the proposed legislation, the committee will want to see an approved program submitted by DOD with respect to

"(a) Modernization of naval shipyards.

"(b) A strengthened American Merchant Marine.

"(c) A continued assurance that none of the ships previously authorized will be used in competition with the American Merchant Marine.

"It is also possible that other shipbuilding companies who have not submitted proposals on the FDL program may find themselves qualified to bid on the design of one of the aerospace companies. If the proposal permits such a possibility the DOD would be remiss in not taking advantage . . ."

The importance to the Maritime industry of the FDL program is the fact that Secretary McNamara for the first time is talking about a sealift requirement being worth $2 billion. This was the first time that Defense talked of space magnitude dollars in a Merchant shipping program.

I say if the Soviets can do it so can the United States—it's all a question of postulating a program. The United States with a $760 billion G.N.P. has twice the economic power of the Soviet Union by any measure of comparison. California alone with a $90 billion G.N.P. is equal to France, 10% ahead of Japan and by 1975 our state will be leading the United Kingdom and West Germany. Yet since 1962 the Great Society has built but 87 ships averaging about $100 million annual federal cost, whereas the Soviets built 502 Merchant ships during the period at nearly $1 billion cost per year. As a result 60% of the Soviet fleet is less than 10 years old and 80% of the United States fleet is more than 20 years old. The Soviets carry 75 to 85% of their commerce. The United States, which accounts for 25% of all of the world's ocean commerce, carries but 7.7% of that trade in her own American flag bottoms. The Soviets employ 9,000 in oceanography—we employ 3,700. The Soviets last year caught 6.5 million tons of fish in near American waters. We caught 2.3 million tons, while the Soviets have gone from 1.8 million tons of ocean shipping in 1950 to 9.8 million tons last year and have a projected 15 million tons by 1970—all pursuant to a massive Russian 1958 seven year shipbuilding plan. While the Soviets have presently on order 556 ships, the United States is building 48. While the Soviet Fleet expanded catastrophically, the United States fleet slumped from 22 million tons to 14 million tons with many second class ships.

If DOD has been derelict respecting our Merchant Marine, it has likewise neglected our Navy. In our Armed Services Committee report on Defense procurement we also addressed ourselves to block obsolescence of our Naval Fleet. We recited that according to Navy studies but 490 of our existing fleet would still be in commission in 1973. That even if we continued to build at the current 43 ship per year standard that the Navy would still lose 306 ships net over the next 5 year period. We stated "there has been a stunning indifference in the Pentagon to the inevitable declination in the size of our fleet—a resolute incuriosity about it." Our Armed Services Committee is charged under the Constitution with the duty of "providing and maintaining a Navy." If my Chairman has anything to say about it, we will perform our function.

To rehabilitate our American Merchant Marine and to change the trend of our time it's going to take more than 30 Merchant ships per year to do the job—more than a simple "Respond" program to marshal the forces of our existing Merchant fleet. We must think big. If we wait for a tranquil year in the post Vietnam era it won't happen. Our Defense budget escalated from $41 billion in 1960 to $76 billion next year and they say that it is still $5 billion light. In addition, the Secretary of Defense has withheld approval of hardware and construction totaling $23 billion additional requested by his departments.

I say if we can afford to spend $3 billion a month for Vietnam, we can spent $1 billion a year for a ship program for better than a half a million man industry to *insure our world commerce in that area.*

Wait for a year of surplus to start a program? Get ready for a long wait. We raised the national debt $2 billion last summer, $6 billion in February and plan to try for $8 billion next month. We have sold off $2 billion stockpiles, $5 billion of Mortgage Participation Certificate paper and sales of $5 billion of the same paper is projected for next year. We've held back spending $4½ billion in our domestic authorized appropriated programs and we still have a $9.7 billion deficit planned—and next year looks worse.

The point is that there are tremendous claims for funds around Capitol Hill. Obviously not enough to go around. *But if the Administration doesn't request an adequate program, nothing happens.* Congress has nothing to act on.

We recently enacted legislation in the House to change this in the form of H.R. 158. This bill vests the function in the Congress every year to authorize an adequate Merchant program in compliance with the Jones Act. I supported this bill on the floor.

I have saved to the last a commentary on the proposal submitted recently by Secretary Boyd for a new Maritime policy. To begin with his suggestion although it talks of a 100% increase in program is not of Space Program proportions. As I understand it, the President asked for a program that would achieve the full support of *all segments* of industry and would allow the United States to recapture a substantial amount of her foreign commerce cartage. The Boyd Plan, I believe, much like the Task Force recommendation, is conceived in defeat from the outset. According to Ed Hood's latest shipbuilding report, Japan last year completed 6.4 million tons (46.1% of the world's new ships), West Germany 1.1 million tons (8.2%), Sweden 1.1 million tons (8%) Great Britain 1 million tons (7.5%), Italy 3.7% and the United States ranked 13th at 191,000 tons (1.3%). In other words Japan completed last year more total tonnage than the United States completed during the whole of World War II.

Stated another way total export and import ocean cargo of the United States while escalating from 64 million tons in 1936 to 404 million tons last year, the United States share of this cargo in U.S. bottoms has slipped from 29.7% to 7.2%. In other words, while our commerce has expanded nearly 700%, our ship capability has remained static. As a practical matter under existing law over the past 20 years, 1,229 ships totaling 35 million tons have been built by American companies in foreign yards.

If we're trying to equalize these figures I don't think you start off with the Boyd Plan of *building foreign* in any respect. We have as an objective not merely recapturing our foreign operating Flags of Convenience, but we also want to recapture the building industry for new construction and repairs. Last year the Secretary of Defense negotiated a deal to trade among other things $50 million Naval ship construction business for $1½ billion in F 111 contracts. Last week the English bids came in only 5% below American tax paying shipbuilding industries offers. Nick Johnson's whole theory of foreign building last year was conditioned on his idea that $330 million was the sky top limit of U.S. support to our Merchant Marine—the $800 million recommended by the Maritime Committee we couldn't afford. Similarly, Secretary Boyd said at the Maritime Trades Convention last year that as far as he was concerned "government assistance should be a *minimum* to accomplish the purpose and to provide for the defense requirements of the nation." He said he *could not* be an advocate of land, sea or air. He pointed out that he was charged with unsnarling downtown traffic under the Mass Transit Act and building a multi-billion U.S. highway network."

I say the purpose in establishing a Department of Transportation was to stimulate all industries as required not to checkmate our ocean commerce by explaining that a particular offer is the last one and that there is a breaking point where the interests of the public and shipping industry necessarily separate. I am one who believes firmly that the interests of our American shipping industry and the public interest and our national defense have much more in common than the Secretary would believe. Far better it would be to have a Secretary who would, in fact, do what the President has asked—postulate a multi-billion dollar shipbuilding program over a 5 year period to tie into sea science, fishing and oceanography and then let the Congress decide whether the program is larger than the American public will sustain and support.

If a Secretary has vision it would matter little then as I see it whether he headed a Cabinet Department or an independent Maritime Agency which has been supported in the Congress by a 3 to 1 vote.

It's the purpose not the form that counts.

I personally have been assured by responsible leaders of industry and organized labor that they would both contemplate making sacrifices for an adequate program.

This, then, is the challenge of our time. I know that my Democratic Party is equal to meeting this challenge by proposing a program. I also know that the Congress of the United States will bi-partisanly enact such a program by a strong majority.

Aviation—Past, Present, and Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. WYDLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1967

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, it was my great pleasure to be at Hofstra University in my district on May 20 when Najeeb E. Halaby, senior vice president, Pan American World Airways, delivered a most appropriate address on the occasion of the 40th anniversary of Charles A. Lindbergh's dramatic flight from the Army's Mitchell Field, Long Island, to Le Bourget Field in Paris, France. An area, I might add, where a great deal of aviation history is still being made, and which I proudly represent in the Congress of the United States.

There are, in my opinion, few men in this country today as qualified as "Jeeb" Halaby to discuss the field of aviation—its past, its present, and its future.

During World War II he was a naval aviator and later a production test pilot for the Lockheed Aircraft Corp. He has also served as vice chairman, White House Aviation Facilities Study Group; Governor, Flight Safety Foundation; secretary-treasurer, Aerospace Corp.; and Administrator, Federal Aviation Administration, a position he held until he joined Pan American.

As FAA Administrator he prepared the groundwork which led to the favorable decision to proceed with the development of an American supersonic transport, a decision which will have an immeasurably favorable impact on our balance-of-payments position as well as vastly increasing our technological knowledge, allowing us to maintain our current lead in the field of aviation.

Those of my colleagues who are attending the 27th International Aeronautics and Space Show being held now in Paris can take pride in the fact that the show is honoring a great American, Charles A. Lindbergh, on the occasion of the 40th anniversary of his historic flight across the Atlantic. They can also rest assured that as long as this country of ours continues to produce men like "Jeeb" Halaby we will continue to lead the way to more and even greater breakthroughs in aviation.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I place excerpts from Mr. Halaby's address at this point in the RECORD:

EXCERPTS FROM AN ADDRESS BY NAJEEB E. HALABY ON THE OCCASION OF THE 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE LINDBERGH FLIGHT

At seven minutes of eight this morning, eastern standard time, it was just forty years ago and near this very spot, that a young air mail pilot nursed a fragile-looking little airplane into the rain-misted sky to challenge the wide Atlantic Ocean—alone. Before he would touch the earth again, those wings would carry the world into that new and wondrous age man had dreamed of since the beginning of time, the age of wings, which that first miracle of flight—the creation of the flying machine itself—had promised just four years and two brief decades before.

First, let's fix the setting. This Garden City Hotel, of course, housed the giants of that age. There they waited fretfully before taking off in the race into the unknown—Byrd, Chamberlain, Acosta, Balchen, Fonck—the list is a long roster of heroes. Our sponsoring University, Hofstra, stands on a part of what once was the Army's Mitchell Field. Across Stewart Avenue, on the North, stood the factory of Glenn Curtiss and just beyond were the joining flying fields of Curtiss and Roosevelt. So, in a very real sense, we stand here on hallowed ground.

And the time? The interest of the world was then focused on Long Island, where so much aviation history is still being made. Many of you can recall the tense excitement of those days. Flying was still new, adventure was high. The press and the newly found radio waves were filled with stories of derring do. A young Army Lieutenant named Doolittle had flown more than two hundred miles an hour. A Navy Lieutenant Commander Richard Evelyn Byrd had flown over the North Pole. New and bolder challenges were being announced every day.

It was at this dramatic moment when, out of the west, a small silver gray monoplane, with "Spirit of St. Louis" painted on its nose, circled for a landing and rolled up to the Curtiss hangar. *This* was the airplane to challenge the Atlantic? Newspaper stories said that Ryan Airlines had built it out in California—in two months! It looked terribly small. It was completely blind. The entire front end, behind the Whirlwind engine, was taken up with a big gas tank. The only way the pilot could see forward was by sticking his head out the small window on either door or by squinting through a makeshift periscope. A cut-down wicker porch chair took up most of the cockpit. But, it looked crowded and uncomfortable. It looked all business.

Who could have measured the intensity of the beam from that candle of courage that one man was determined to light to show the way to man's progress through the skies? All the wonders of the air world around us today, the great fleets of airliners, lifting millions of people and tons of cargo on their swift, sure wings; the teeming air terminals that dot the globe; the vast, complex industry of research, design and manufacture that is so swiftly and so confidently moving us across the threshold into the even greater wonders of a universe in Space—all these are one measure.

The details of the epochal flight are known, even to some of our youngsters. But those who were there on the May morning in 1927 tell of a strange feeling, almost mystic. There was something more than the frightening if rather splendid courage of this youngster who ventured off to challenge the unknown, alone. Even today, four decades after the event, scholars and historians have found no better words than to call it "the Lindbergh phenomenon."

Between 7:53 A.M. on May 20th and 10:24 P.M. on May 21st a miracle had taken place. Lindbergh has said that when he was learning to fly he believed that man had a great destiny in the air and that America, who gave birth to the airplane, should lead the world in developing its great potential for mankind. But there were few, outside the flying profession, that shared his vision. Many intelligent, well-informed people had considered aviation as a stunt to be marvelled at. Few could see transportation by air in any sensible scheme of human activity. One year before, and only after ten years of debate, Congress had finally passed a law to give aviation a legal standing. The Postmaster General offered contract for the carriage of the mails by air. But there had been few takers. If he could prove the airplane against wind, and weather and distance and darkness he could convince even the most *skeptical*.

That one flight did this—perfectly. But, to this was added a thrilling example of supreme courage—and this at a time when bravery was the badge of the flying profession.

When this daring and calculating young pilot landed in Paris—just as he said he would, he unloosened what editorials of the day described as "The greatest mass emotion ever witnessed in human history." He had made his vision come true.

Overnight, the public's fear of flying was converted into a growing faith in the airplane. Now, people clamored for sights of airplanes. Cities vied with cities in building airports. Hard-headed bankers who a week before wouldn't have let a pilot into their office, now began to offer the capital so vital if aviation was to grow. People rushed in with more money than judgment. Mistaking the Seaboard Airline for an aviation company, investors sent the railroad's shares skyrocketing on the Stock Exchange! The waves of popular enthusiasm reached flood proportions, not only in America, but all over the globe. It powered a breakthrough of profound proportions.

Lindbergh had shown the way; careful planning, patient preparation, and the courage—and determination—to carry the plan through. "Savoir Faire", as the Airmen at Le Bourget put it. All those who had for so many years struggled to get airlines established, designers who had tried to get enough capital to start manufacturing; engineers who needed help to undertake research of promising aeronautical projects—all these and others now found sympathy and some support. Greatest of all the motivating sources, perhaps, was the total commitment of this new and surging spirit to the betterment of mankind. Here, too, Lindbergh set the example. Historians estimate that, for no more effort than it took to sign his name to a few testimonials, he could have had twenty million dollars. Instead, he wired his backers in St. Louis: "Please explain we are not in this to make money, but to advance aviation."

In no period in man's history has this progress been so spectacular. What we have seen within the span of a single lifetime eclipses, by far, what man had achieved in transportation—indeed in all technology—in the previous thousand years.

Set free to plan, by the early 1930's our engineers could already see the need to go beyond piston-power and propellers. Lindbergh and a few others sat at the feet of Dr. Robert Goddard. His rockets were thirty years ahead but his principles, today, are carrying our astronauts into orbit and will land them on the moon. Before World War II halted our peacetime advance, we had crossed all the oceans, linked all the continents. We had under development the first multi-engined high altitude pressurized airliners that were to carry us farther and faster.

During the war years, pooled efforts brought to the practical operating stage such things as atomic reactors, radar, electronics, plastics, new metals, rocket and jet power. All of these, in time, were converted to our peace time service and we continue to surge forward.

How far we have come! Only ten yers ago we moved into the Commercial Jet Age. That magically broadened ou rtravel and trade horizons. In fact, during the next 33 hours, 30 minutes—Lindburgh's flight time—268 flights will cross the ocean he made into a lake—carrying 23,385 passengers. Soon now, the great 366 passenger Boeing 747 superjet will demonstrate even further the true potential of jet power, not only for speed and capacity but, as we progress, for lower travel costs than ever before. Each one of these, in a single month, can carry across the Atlantic as many passengers as the ocean liner Queen Mary could carry in an entire year. They will be on the airways to Europe, across the Pacific to Hawaii and to the far reaches of South America less than three years from now. Other elements of our technology are advancing in step. Helicopters are growing larger and faster. Advances in navigational aids, in airborne computers, in automatic monitoring devices have been nothing short of fantastic. Radio-active isotopes X-Ray machines. Sophisticated computers devour data on winds and weather and analyze the atmosphere to give your jet captain not one but thirty different flight paths. Airborne radar scans the skies head for turbulence and electronic safety sentinels stand guard over your airliner every mile of its flight.

Looming beyond these are the first of the exciting SST's. The French-English version, The Concorde, is designed to carry 124 passengers at a speed of 1450 miles an hour between New York and Paris. It is scheduled to fly next February, and be in scheduled operation by 1971. After 6 years of intensive research and development and with our Government's strong support, we are now going forward, full throttle, with the prototype of the much larger, faster and far more advanced American version. Powered by General Electric and to be built by Boeing, these great super-liners will carry 270 passengers at Mach 2.7 or about 1800 miles an hour. Then London and Paris will be less than three hours, South America two hours, Hong Kong and Tokyo—halfway around the world—scarcely eight hours away. Only one major problem remains—the sonic boom. So far, this noisy nuisance has baffled our best engineering minds. They have figured how we could fly the SST from New York to Los Angeles tonight in two hours, but they have yet to find how we could keep from disturbing twelve million people on the way! I am confident that the SST will serve over water in the early 70's and the genius that brought the SST into being and is sending man into Space will solve the boom problem, in time.

What lies ahead for aviation? Beyond the SST is the projected rocket-propelled plane to whisk twelve-hundred tourists from here to Hong Kong in sixty minutes, to London in twenty-six. This one will have to be aimed before it leaves New York. It will take twenty-six hundred miles for it to make a one hundred and eighty degree turn! Several types of vertical take-off and landing craft are being flight tested. "Flying carpets" are being developed, some powered with laser beams. We have seen sketches of a nuclear-powered "space bus" designed to take a thousand families on a Sunday picnic tour among the planets. With the next step-up in speed we quite literally run out of earth.

We have already seen the dream of the airplane's worldwide usefulness to man come true. Without the airplane to bring peoples together, there would have been no United Nations. It has made possible the pilgrimages of the Pope across the seas, the first in 2,000 years, in the quest of peace. It has facilitated the growing exchange of technical brains between the nations. In the service of the humanities, the greatest doctors and surgeons are on call around the globe. The exchange of students and scholarships enable our young people who will lead tomorrow's world to learn the language and to share the lives of once-distant peoples with whom they will live as neighbors. All of these, on a global scale, are products of this air age. All of them serve one major purpose—the spread of understanding among men of good will.

Yet, after the tremendous progress of these same 40 years, it is a sad commentary that the destructive potential of the airplane is still essential for the survival of freedom in the world.

The destructive force of military aviation is incalculable. Yet the constructive power of air transportation to advance the peaceful progress of mankind is, like the air itself, boundless. Through air transportation, and the world over, this tremendous potential of the airplane is being used to wage peace. We are constantly seeking new and better ways to promote a free exchange of ideas and ideals among all the peoples of the free world. Through this we can give expression to the universal principles of morality that all freedom-loving people hold.

Certainly, eternal hopefulness still rests in the belief that God did not put man on this earth to destroy himself.

Certainly, if we share Charles Lindbergh's faith, we, too, must believe that the true purpose of the airplane—the product of a free America—is to help bring the peace of freedom to the world.

Certainly, the same faith that carried his wings across the vastness of an ocean, will one day carry the Spirit of Freedom to unite all the people of the earth in a true brotherhood of the air.

Can there be any doubt that this is the meaning of the "Spirit of St. Louis"?

No Faltering on Guidelines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES G. O'HARA

OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 1, 1967

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, in recent months, attacking the school desegregation guidelines has become a favorite pastime of some people. So much has been said—so frequently and so loudly—against the guidelines, that one might be tempted to conclude, erroneously, that they are almost universally disapproved.

This, as we know, most certainly is not the case. And, in this connection, I was pleased to read an editorial in the Boston Globe which helps to set the guidelines record straight. It appeared in the May 12 edition of the newspaper:

NO FALTERING ON GUIDELINES

The kind words which HEW Secretary John W. Gardner directed to Education Comr. Harold Howe Wednesday for his handling of civil rights enforcement in the education field were well deserved.

Southerners who disapprove the commissioner's desegregation guidelines have called him everything from an "idiot" to a "dictator" and have tried their best to get him dismissed. But the guidelines have stood up in court and have satisfied the majority of congressmen who wrote the compliance provisions into the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

The fact that only 38 school districts are now cut off from Federal funds under the compliance program, and that since the beginning only 54 have been so penalized, certainly does not suggest a ruthless or precipitate enforcement policy.

It is important, therefore, that the recent consolidation of all of HEW's civil rights enforcement activities in the office of the Secretary should not be interpreted as a change of front or a rebuke to Mr. Howe. Mr. Gardner has stated emphatically that it is neither, and there is no reason to doubt him.

The consolidation was ordered by Congress last year as a part of HEW's annual appropriation bill. The idea originated, not with Southern critics of the education agency, but with the subcommittee chairman, the late John Fogarty of Rhode Island, who hoped it would improve enforcement throughout the department.

Civil rights leaders are nevertheless well advised to maintain an attitude of watchful waiting. We cannot afford even unintentional backsliding at this point.

Italy: A Democratic Republic Founded on Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH

OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 1, 1967

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, on June 2, 1946, the citizens of Italy ended, by direct vote, their constitutional monarchy, and established from that time forth the sovereign Republic of Italy. More than 50 million Italian citizens, together with the millions of Italian-Americans in this country, and friends all over the world, will salute the 21st anniversary of the republic in a spirit of jubilance.

The installation of a new system of government in Italy signaled an unprecedented era of reconstruction, remolding, growth, and progress. Four years after the republic was established, the economy of Italy had regained the level it had attained prior to World War II. Since 1950, it has surged ahead with such furious activity that today, Italy is heralded as the leader among the Mediterranean countries and one of the fastest growing in the world. The nation is enjoying a pulsating, spirited life, and the people, far from relaxing on their laurels, are working endlessly to make their country greater. Intelligent economic planning has remodeled Italy from a land where agriculture predominates to a fast-moving, modern industrial nation. Today, industry is responsible for twice as much of the economic wealth as is agriculture. Today, the average worker earns twice what he has in years past. The annual growth rate in GNP is one of the highest in the world. Italy's foreign trade is booming and the tourist business is increasing yearly at a phenomenal rate. The economy maintains a large reserve placing Italy in the market for a multiude of foreign products. A generation of jet-age industrialists have taken the reins of the Italian economy and their fast-thinking, shrewd business manner is enabling Italian enterprises to hold their own in the world market.

The unprecedented progress made by the Italian Republic since its birth fills the Italian people with a swelling pride and a deep sense of satisfaction—and well it should. For although the western powers contributed much to aid this crippled nation following the terrible years of World War II, the credit for Italy's phenomenal rise to economic power is wholly due to the diligent, hard-working spirit of the Italian people. Our American experience has taught us only too well that no gains are made without years of strenuous toil and dedicated effort. It is this industrious quality which today we honor most in the Italian people. They have demonstrated to all the world that order can come from chaos, that a nation can rise from almost total devestation to unequalled success—in a remarkably short period. Indeed, the people of Italy have evidenced an energetic force, a will to build and to grow which few peoples can claim in our time.

Perhaps the greatest example of the strength and spirit of the Italian character occurred last November after the devastating floods which hit Florence and other areas of the north. Twenty years ago, this tragedy would have dealt a death blow to the Italian economy and sorely shattered the morale of the people. Instead, in the Italy to today, the Government has managed to absorb much of the cost of the flood damage, and Italians have steeled themselves to the task of rebuilding their homes and businesses, and restoring their precious Renaissance art treasures.

Italy's luminous future is being carved today through the diligent activity of all of the Italian people. On this anniversary of the Italian Republic, we in the United States extend our heartiest congratulations to the citizens of that beautiful country on a job well done. It has been said that Italy is a democratic republic founded on work. It should also be said that Italy is a 20th-century success story authored by the love and dedication of her people.

Open Housing—The Supreme Court's Decision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 31, 1967

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, the cause of equality, of equal protection under the laws of our land for all men, was strengthened by the Supreme Court's recent decision declaring California's proposition 14 unconstitutional.

The traditional American promise of equal opportunity still needs to be fulfilled in many areas. In education and employment, Negroes and other minority groups, all too often, still find their path impeded or their progress slowed.

But perhaps the most flagrant violations of equal protection and equal rights today are in the field of housing. The "white noose" of the suburbs condemns great numbers of our Negro citizens to rundown housing in the ghettos of our urban areas.

The U.S. Commission on Civil Rights has reported that—

> Housing seems to be the one commodity in the American market that is not freely available on equal terms to everyone who can afford to pay.

The New York Times, in an editorial of May 30, has emphasized that if the United States is ever to achieve a society in which "no racial or religious barriers exist between an individual and the lawful exercise of his freedom, the vicious patterns of housing segregation will have to disappear."

The Supreme Court's decision, upholding the courageous action of California's own highest court, is a step in the right direction. But it is only a step.

As the Times has gone on to comment—and this is a most important observation—now—

> The main burden falls upon the conscience and good sense of Californians and other Americans. The courts cannot indefinitely sustain freedoms that citizens do not understand or will not support.

Mr. Speaker, this is a pointed reminder of the tasks that lie ahead. It is a timely reminder that we in California may have to fight yet another well-financed effort to repeal our fair housing law. We cannot expect the forces of bigotry and racism to sit back and accept this rebuff to their callous and misguided sense of justice.

The Supreme Courts of California and the United States have done their duty. The job of insuring equality for all men is now in our hands.

Mr. Speaker, I include the New York Times editorial, referred to in my remarks, for the attention of our colleagues:

The Open Housing Decision

If the United States is ever to achieve its ideal of a racially integrated society in which no racial or religious barriers exist between an individual and the lawful exercise of his freedom, the vicious patterns of housing segregation will have to disappear.

These patterns have developed out of fear and greed and misplaced pride. Gentlemen's agreements, restricted covenants, inequitable laws and the connivance of many people in the real estate and banking professions have all combined to sustain discriminatory housing patterns.

During the past quarter-century a revulsion of consicence has at last produced an attack by the forces of decency. More than one-third of the states have passed laws of varying scope and effectiveness intended to forbid racial discrimination in the sale or rental of housing. But the practitioners of bigotry have not hesitated to counterattack. They scored one of thier major regressive triumphs in California in 1964 when the voters approved the so-called Proposition Fourteen.

Proposition Fourteen, placed on the ballot by an initiative petition, not only repealed in effect the state's anti-discrimination laws in the housing field but also asserted as a constitional right an individual's privilege of selling, or leasing or renting his property to any person he chose, "in his absolute discretion."

The highest court of California struck down this proposition as a clear violation of the "equal protection of the laws" section of the Fourteenth Amendment of the Constitution. The Supreme Court of the United States yesterday upheld this interpretation.

As Justice Douglas observed in his interesting concurring opinion, there is an analogy between what Proposition Fourteen sanctions and the restrictive covenants which the Supreme Court held unconstitutional many years ago. Those who defend racism in housing misuse an ancient and honorable rallying cry of libertarians, "A man's home is his castle." What goes on inside a man's home is truly privileged, but a homeowner cannot manipulate his ownership of property in tacit collaboration with other property owners to keep a neighborhood all white or all anything else. A homeowner's deed is not a hunting license to discriminate.

It is regrettable that the Court divided 5-to-4 on this case, since the principle at stake is highly important. But in this area as in others, there is a limit to the creative role of the judiciary. The main burden falls upon the conscience and good sense of Californians and other Americans. The courts cannot indefinitely sustain freedoms that citizens do not understand or will not support.

Medicare Should Include the Cost of Medicines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 31, 1967

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, as one of the cosponsors of the original Medicare Act, I have been extremely interested in following the development of the administration of this act. Medicare has enabled our older citizens to face their retirement years secure in the knowledge that if they should contract serious or prolonged illness their life savings will not be lost, that they will not become a burden to their friends and relatives, or become wards of the State.

This law offers incalculable peace of mind and security to those who have worked hard to make this country what it is today. Illness is never a pleasant occurrence, but when it strikes the aged and is combined with the prospect of creating financial obligations which can never be met, then it becomes unbearable.

The signing of the Medicare Act represented the culmination of years of hard work, determination, and frustrating debates. It was the realization of the dream of all those who had sought to eliminate the specter of financial destitution, because of medical expenses facing our older citizens. Medicare has been hailed by many as a declaration of independence for the aged against the threat of economic ruin from sickness.

In spite of the great promise which medicare offers, however, there remains one important area not covered by the original legislation. This is the inclusion of the cost of prescription drugs, which for many of the aged and chronically ill may represent a substantial portion of their medical expenses. Persons over 65 pay about $700 million for prescription drugs each year. Many times those who can least afford drugs often need them most. For instance, 86 percent of the elderly people living on annual incomes of $2,000 or less suffer from chronic illnesses. Thus, in the absence of assistance in the payment of drugs prescribed by physicians, the present Medicare Act may be inadequate to help those most in need.

In order to further extend and improve the medicare program, and allow it to fulfill the original purpose of protecting our aged from the anguish and financial ruin of illness, I am introducing a bill to include the cost of drugs requiring a doctor's prescription under the provisions of the Medicare Act. The need for congressional action has been widely recognized and endorsed. President George Meany of the AFL–CIO recently stated before the House Ways and Means Committee that labor union health centers dealing directly with retired workers, "express concern over the large number of the aged who have chronic diseases, requiring the continuous use of expensive prescription drugs, which they really cannot afford to buy."

Mr. Walter J. Sheerin, executive director of the New York Labor-Management Council of Health and Welfare Plans, Inc., speaking before the House Ways and Means Committee, said:

> Most of the aged have chronic ailments that do not require hospitalization, but require continuous use of expensive drugs. This financial burden is borne by the aged. Medicare should round out its program by filling this great need of providing drug prescription coverage.

In a statement before the same committee, Dr. Charles I. Schottland, president-elect of the National Association of Social Workers, pointed out as follows:

> Prescription drugs take about 18 cents out of every consumer dollar for medical care services. When one considers the serious limitations on incomes of the aged, it becomes evident that their health is being harmed by not having such a benefit as part of the program. Studies over the years have shown that very substantial numbers of physician prescriptions remain unfilled largely because of the costs involved. If it is the intent of Congress to approach comprehensiveness of health care for the elderly, as we believe it is, payment for prescription drugs cannot continue to be an exclusion.

The legislation which I have introduced will help stimulate the drug industry, as well as generate additional business for pharmacists. Our entire older population, which requires drugs in such large volume, will be able to purchase the medication they need. The pharmacist will be able to collect his professional fee, the drug industry will benefit from the larger demand, and most important of all, our older citizens will receive the medicines to ease their pain and suffering and allow them to spend their retired years in the best possible health.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that in the years to come the Medicare Act will prove to be one of the greatest legislative accomplishments in the history of Congress and of the Nation. The humanitarian goals that it will achieve and the mental well-being and security that it will give our older citizens, will provide our Nation with an even more durable foundation on which to go forward to meet the many challenges of the future. However, in order to secure these ideals, we must complete the job and bring the payment of prescription drugs for our older citizens under the provisions of the Medicare Act.

Support for H.R. 6385, Congressman James H. Quillen's Bill To Prohibit the Desecration of Our Flag

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 31, 1967

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. M. A. Urquiza, an active member of the Kingsport, Tenn., Lions Club and Elks Lodge has written me a most gracious letter, to extend to me the support of both organizations on my bill to prohibit the desecration of our flag.

This is another example of the groundswell of public support that is behind my endeavor and that of many of my colleagues, to see that the Congress enacts a law to provide penalties for those who dishonor our beloved flag.

Mr. Speaker, I include Mr. Urquiza's letter at this point in the RECORD:

KINGSPORT LODGE NO. 1833,
Kingsport, Texas, May 17, 1967.

Re H.R. 6385
Hon. JAMES H. QUILLEN,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR JIMMY: It makes me very happy and extremely proud to write you at this time to notify you of recent happenings.

The Kingsport Lions Club at its Tuesday, May 9, meeting unanimously voted to have a letter written to you to commend you for introducing H.R. 6385.

It was decided that it would be my pleasant duty, as Chairman of the Citizenship Committee, to notify you of this vote.

Then at the Thursday, May 11, meeting of BPO Elks Lodge No. 1833 I, as Chairman of the Americanism Committee, was instructed to convey to you the commendation of the Lodge. Immediately, I received instructions from the President of the Tennessee Elks Association to allow my first official action, as Americanism State Chairman, be to offer to you the congratulations of all the Brothers from the Volunteer State.

I was asked also to send a copy of this letter to all the Tennessee Delegations and respectfully request that they use all the influence they have to help the Bill along so that our Glorious Flag may have the protection it rightfully deserves.

It is sad indeed that the Bill is required. I can well imagine our forefathers never dreamed that there could ever live so low a man that a Law to punish him should be needed. And yet, the Almighty gave us as a Commandment: "Honor Thy Father and Thy Mother." Could there be a son so miserable that such a Commandment be needed? He, in all Infinite Wisdom, knew that there would be, and the Commandment was given to us. Let us now, in all haste put in the law books of our Country a law that will protect our Beloved Flag. Maybe we cannot make it a law to love and honor it, but we can punish those who would dare violate the Glorious Emblem of the most Blessed Nation history has ever seen.

Very truly yours,

M. A. URQUIZA.

L. B. J.: A Man To Be Trusted When the Going Is Rough

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1967

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, Americans like to spout off about their Presidents. There seems to be something satisfying about giving the man in the White House a hard time. But when the chips are down, most Americans will back a Chief Executive who acts firmly and decisively in the national interest.

Such a President, in my books, is Lyndon Johnson. Our President has taken his share of the critical lumps, as all strong Presidents do. But the American people know that when the going gets rough they have a man in the White House who is wise in the business of government and courageous in the making of decisions.

A recent article in the Tulsa, Okla., Tribune underscores what I mean. The article, written by Jim Downing, takes the point of view of the average American who is often critical of the man who occupies the White House.

But when all the griping and doubts are cast aside, Mr. Downing notes:

> I did not vote for Lyndon Johnson. He has the faculty of being monumentally wrong. But he also can be astronomically right. I rather like the way he puts his pants on.

In down-home talk, Mr. Downing has put his finger on how most Americans feel: When the chips are down, and the going is rough, Lyndon Johnson is a man who can be trusted to lead our Nation.

I insert this article in the RECORD:

DOWNING'S STREET: HE LIKES WAY THE MAN PUTS ON HIS PANTS

(By Jim Downing)

You, there. Yes, you with the razor in your hand, blearily inspecting yourself in the bathroom mirror. Your allergies are kicking up—look at those eyes!—and the crick in your neck is no better.

You just know you're going to have your regular 3 p.m. headache—the one with the bright flashes coming in from the outer corners of your eyes . . .

With all that to bother you, suppose that, in addition, you happen to be the president of the United States?

The President is a man, too. I'm sure he holds his razor and blearily inspects his face in the mirror every morning, even as you and I. Maybe he has a barber, but I rather doubt it, not every morning, anyhow.

Maybe, if we keep that only-a-man idea in mind when we read the headlines, we can get a little better perspective. Suppose you, man, had the crick in the neck and the allergies—AND the personal responsibility of deciding what to do about Nasser, the blockade of the Gulf of Aqaba and the war in Vietnam today.

The President is only a man who, by happenstance and luck and coincidence, occupies the White House for a term or two. His election doesn't make him any more intelligent, more all-knowing, more competent than any other guy who puts his pants on one leg at a time as you do.

But, happily, Nasser and Ho Chi Minh and even Leonid Brezhnev also put their pants on one leg at a time. Who know, perhaps even Charles de Gaulle does also—although there is always the possibility that gnomes come in the night and dress him.

The Presidency, by its very nature, demands a man of immense vanity. He MUST believe he is better qualified than anyone else to handle the rudder of the great ship of state. He must believe it because he must sleep with the tiller in his hands, after all the advisers, counsellors, experts, yes-men and no-men have gone home.

I have talked with a couple of men who became president—Harry Truman and Lyndon Johnson—and have covered the campaigns of several who would have liked to have been president—Sen. Robert Taft, Harold Stassen, Thomas E. Dewey, Frank Gannett, Wendell Wilkie and Alfred M. Landon.

Of those, only Landon gave the appearance of being essentially an humble man. Perhaps he was. I don't believe he ever entertained any real idea that he could beat Franklin D. Roosevelt; nor did the Republican party.

Taft was a cold, forbidding, forthright man of awesome principles, absolutely certain he was born to be President, as had his father before him. Had he been nominated, and elected, he would have revolutionized American government.

Stassen was political expediency itself, bent on being every man's man, the mouther of the calculated catch-phrase.

Dewey was impossible, a grudge-nurser, vastly conceited. Gannett, a New York publisher, simply saw himself in a magnifying mirror. Wilkie was a poseur, an actor.

Harry Truman, an unschooled county politician, attained greatness and made me eat many a word in retrospect.

I did not vote for Lyndòn Johnson. He has the faculty of being monumentally wrong. But he also can be astronomically right. I rather like the way he puts his pants on.

A Tribute to Samuel Kaufman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1967

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, last week a dear friend of mine, Samuel J. Kaufman, celebrated his 70th birthday. His long career has been one of dedicated public service, and I am pleased to call to the attention of my colleagues articles from the Star-Ledger and the Newark Evening News marking this happy milestone.

[From the Star-Ledger, May 23, 1967]

THE 70TH

Today the birthday congrats fall upon Samuel J. Kaufman, local attorney, N.J. Supreme Court Commissioner and former confidential aide and law secretary to the late Circuit Judge Edwin J. Caffrey and late Superior Court Judge Daniel J. Brennan. He'll be feted with his wife, Anna, in New York by son and daughter-in-law, Norman and Barbara Kaufman with the four grandchildren in attendance.

Kaufman is presently the chairman of the appeal board under Selective Service System for New Jersey. Has been a practicing attorney since 1918. Was admitted to practice before the U.S. Supreme Court in 1932 on motion of Joseph P. Tumulty, secretary to President Woodrow Wilson.

[From the Newark Evening News, May 24, 1967]

DRAFT APPEAL BOARD HEAD IS HONORED

Samuel J. Kaufman of 355 Keer Ave., chairman of Selective Service Appeal Board No. 1 since 1949, was honored yesterday at a luncheon in the 744 Club on his 70th birthday.

The luncheon was given by members of the appeal board and also top ranking members of the staff of State Selective Service Director Col. Joseph T. Avella. They included Deputy State Director Lt. Col. Harold Hoenig, Cmdr. William D. Connor, chief of the administration division, Lt. Col. Edward J. Henderson, chairman of the manpower division, and Julius S. Boresik, chief field supervisor.

Kaufman has been engaged in Selective Service activities for 27 years. He was government appeal agent during 1948–1949, and was secretary of the Newark and Essex County Advisory Board for registrants. In this position he advised several hundred attorneys on the regulations applicable to registrants and of their obligations under the Selective Service system.

He has been a practicing attorney and counselor at law since 1918. Kaufman was admitted to practice before the U.S. Supreme Court in 1932.

Frustration Over Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1967

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, on one of his radio broadcasts last week, Edward P. Morgan, of ABC, read excerpts of a gripping letter he had received from a student friend. The letter discussed many questions that our young people today are asking themselves about the U.S. involvement in Vietnam. Their frustration, Mr. Morgan concluded, "is too real to be idly brushed aside as the foolish idealism of youth."

The transcript of the thought-provoking commentary follows:

FRUSTRATION OVER VIETNAM

Lest we forget, there is still a shooting war on in Vietnam. While Washington is obliged to divide its attention between Saigon and Suez, the youth of America who are thinking, and there are many, are more consumed with concern about what Vietnam is doing to them and their future. Instead of taking standard final exams, members of the senior class of Sidwell Friends School here in Washington are going, so to speak, to where their interest in the action is. Some have gone to hospital wards, others to government offices, to watch these instruments of society function. One group has spent all week being briefed by the State Department, senators of opposing stands, and even journalists about the war. Some of their facts may be twisted—whose aren't?—but the earnestness of their interest is almost palpable.

While I listened to their discussions this morning, a part of my mind kept rereading a letter I received the other day from a friend of mine in Seattle. He is student number 6332998 at the University of Washington, about to graduate, and eagerly looking forward to a hitch, if he's lucky, with the Peace Corps. But his letter, five typewritten pages, single-spaced, was such a moving message of honest torment that it deserves to be shared. It speaks, without presumption, for millions of this fellow's generation, and how valuable it would be to the country if President Johnson and other government leaders could find time to listen.

"I am against the war in Vietnam," my friend wrote.

"In a situation as complicated as this, I have to plead some ignorance . . . but I've done enough research on it to be pretty sure that the greater part of the American public is more ignorant about it than I am.

"President Johnson repeatedly says that we've got to stand firm in Vietnam to protect our friends from Communist aggression. His terminology bothers me. Isn't American involvement also aggressive . . .? Isn't the bombing of Hanoi and aggressive act? . . .

". . . I don't think the United States can say with any conviction that it is supporting a democratic government in South Vietnam. I don't think the Vietnamese peasant is politically aware enough to understand a democracy . . . I'm beginning to wonder if I ever understood it myself.

"General Westmoreland's visit to the legislature," this university senior's letter goes on, "was . . . sort of frightening. I'd like to think of Congress as a body of men with cool, reasoning dispositions; but press accounts state that . . . the great majority . . . were overwhelmed with patriotic emotion at the very sight of him. Put in concrete terms . . . this . . . means . . . the deepening of our military commitment . . .

"I remember a recent article in Life which, after giving a depressing appraisal of the war, led itself to the conclusion that had we known it would reach its present proportions we would never have become involved . . . (But it) went on to insist that our only possible course is to continue the fight in hopes that some unseen turn of fortune will finally show us an 'honorable way out.' . . . The article finally concluded, ironically, with an invocation to prayer.

"I say this is our problem, not God's. As I see it, we've got to admit that we've made a horrible mistake . . .

"Many draft-eligible students who are either confused by or strongly opposed to the war, I find, are kept from protesting by the prospect of induction as punishment for 'un-American activities.' The precedent is there. However, the majority of those I've talked to who favor the war do so more out of ignorance than from any careful appraisal of the problem. I was shocked to find, for instance, that many students enrolled in ROTC programs were genuinely confused about the justifiableness of the 'conflict', but were still willing, as Thoreau says, to 'march in admirable order over hill and dale to the wars, against their wills' for the sake of expediency . . .

"I stay awake at night imagining the hordes of Americans who don't know enough about this war even to be confused by it. Maybe one of the weaknesses of a democracy is that it produces a breed of fat cat that never makes any noise because he's personally too content.

"Well, what can we do? What can I do? Do I really have a say in all this, or will my letter to the President, like that of a friend, be sent to the National Selective Service System? More to the point, when freedom of speech, although not openly restricted, is subtly punished with induction notices, what can any individual do but go to jail, or leave the country?"

There was more to this University of Washington senior's letter than that, much more, but that was the core of it. There were, obviously, some misconceptions in it. But his questions were justified, his protests genuine. He is entrapped in a situation not of his making and over which he has no control but in which he may be required to give his life in a war in which he does not believe because, in large part surely, because he has taken literally the lessons of ethics and morals he was taught at home and at school. This frustration is too real to be idly brushed aside as the foolish idealism of youth.

Modernize Social Security and Medicare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 1967

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include herein an excellent statement by my friend, Mr. Philip Saponaro of Natick, Mass., entitled "A Proposal To Reform Some Inequities in the Social Security Act."

I think this statement is one of the best of its kind that I have seen on the subject, and contains much food for thought.

I have suggested that Mr. Saponaro furnish a copy of it to each member of the great House Ways and Means Committee, and especially to my able and distinguished colleague, Congressman JAMES A. BURKE, who has been taking such a deep, special interest in these matters on the committee.

I have also suggested that the statement should be sent to the able and distinguished members of the Senate Finance Committee for their attention and to the great Chairman of Ways and Means, our beloved, Mr. MILLS.

It is my personal view that the social security system is certainly one of the most efficient agencies of the Federal Government. I wish I could say as much concerning the laws under which its highly skilled, dedicated and efficient leaders and employees have to try to administer this program, because it is a complex admixture of intricacies, complexities, contradictions and inadequacies and, I may add, it sometimes causes serious injustices to some worthy beneficiaries.

Personally, I do not believe the act can be adequately overhauled. I think, perhaps, it would be better to start again from scratch, and enact a new law that would cover, not only social security, but also the health problems encompassed by medicare and related laws.

Admittedly, this is a huge task, but it will have to be undertaken before the system becomes totally chaotic, unworkable, and inadequate to meet the great, human needs it is designed to meet.

These programs, in my humble judgment, might well be based and predicated on some actuarily sound insurance principles and methods, providing the rich benefits of social security and modern medicine for all people within our society.

I think Congress should also study the problems of the personnel who administer the system and the doctors and hospitals whose services and facilities are required to implement it in its entirety, to the end that we may in time, as soon as possible, establish and build this system upon feasible free enterprise principles, so that we can avoid the excesses, maladjustments, inadequacies, and shortcomings with respect to some of the most important problems people have to face in this country today, and there are many very serious ones.

I realize how heavily burdened our great Committee on Ways and Means is, but these matters are so important that I think that at the earliest possible time a massive study should be inaugurated, one that would go far beyond anything that has been done to date in these areas, designed to make sure that the principles of freedom, initiative, individual dignity and the real incentives of our society are assured, and that the system will not degenerate into a huge, grandiose, inefficient, misguided bureaucratic complex of socialized institutions, including socialized medicine and perhaps even socialized welfare.

I do not believe there is any more justification for socialized medicine in this country than for socializing other service groups, individuals, or businesses, and I hope and trust that the rights and interests of the individual shall be preserved, guaranteed, and enforced. Our medical system is the best in the world. Let us keep it that way and strengthen it where this needs to be done.

There is a close relationship between the social benefits this Government makes available and the national economy which in the last analysis, largely has to provide funds for about everything which is done by Government. The U.S. Treasury is not an inexhaustible reservoir of money. It must secure its funds from the people.

In such a study as I propose, it would be well, I believe, to lean upon the counsel and seek the suggestions and advice of experts in the various fields represented and affected by the impact of every phase of social security and Medicare, including skilled, experienced representatives of the insurance industry, who could, perhaps best of all, inform and show us how such a free system, huge as it would be, could be established on a sound, actuarial basis that would respond to the demands for efficient administration, and provide adequately for the social security and medical needs of all Americans.

This is something that will have to be done sooner or later, and we should tackle the job to make sure it is done, not under socialistic or communistic principles and techniques, but under the principles and techniques of our great free enterprise system, which has served us so well throughout the years, and has contributed so mightily to making us the greatest, most powerful and most prosperous nation of all times.

The statement follows:

A PROPOSAL TO REFORM SOME INEQUITIES IN THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

About 15,000,000 retirees over 65 years of age continue to work part time in order to supplement their benefits (pension) under the Social Security Act. Under the provisions of the "Retirement Test" they are permitted to earn up to $1,500 per year. Any earnings above this amount reduces their benefits (pension). The amount of reduction is $1 for each $2 earned, up to $2,700 earnings per year, beyond which the deduction is $1 for each $1 earned, until the benefits (pension) is completely wiped out. The "Retirement Test" and its provisions should be cancelled for several obvious reasons.

The law specifically provides that "there shall be no means test." A person shall be eligible to receive benefits (pension) after contributing X dollars for a specified time *and his employer contributes a like amount.* A person has a right to these benefits (pension) regardless of how much he has in income from savings, investments or property, etc. Income from these sources is considered as a supplement to the Social Security benefits. However, if a man works and earns over $1,500 he will have benefits (pension) taken away as outlined in the first paragraph. In this sense his earnings over $1,500 become a substitute for his benefits (pension).

Let us examine in detail what happens in fact when a person earning $5,000 becomes 65 years of age and wishes to retire partially. In 1966 he paid $220 and his employer also paid in $220 toward his social security benefits, total $440 for the year. According to the computations of his past earnings he will be eligible to receive benefits (pension) of $1,560 or $130 per month. Now he can work and earn up to $1,500 per year. If he can meet his obligations on $3,060 total per year then he can retire partially and be happy. If he cannot meet his obligations on $3,060 then he must continue to work and in so doing loss his benefits (pension) as outlined in the first paragraph. It is obvious that this man must continue to work until he reduce his standard of living to $3,060 per year and that he must continue to contribute $220 per year (in addition to a like contribution from his employer) toward a Social Security System which he cannot enjoy; but he sure can look forward to working like this until he is 72 years when the social security law provides that there will be no loss of benefits regardless of earnings. At this time his SS benefits are considered a supplement, not a substitute to his income. At age 72, therefore, but not before, he can reduce his workload and maintain his standard of living.

If the description in the previous paragraph is as common as many believe it is, then the Congress would serve America well by the immediate cancellation of the Retirement Test.

The hundreds of proposals to increase benefits by 8% or 15% or any % miss the point completely in regard to earned income. Any tampering with a man's benefits (which are an earned right) is immoral and increasing a benefit without cancelling out the "Retirement Test" is not facing up to the real issue. The American Way is to Earn by Work and there should be no law which will take away an earned right or benefit (pension) because a man wants to work to earn a little more to better himself.

Everybody should ask congress to cancel the "Retirement Test."

PHILIP SAPONARO.

Essay on Freedom by Tim Tsurumoto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 29, 1967

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the Sertoma Club of Hayward, Calif., recently held a "Freedom Week Essay Contest" which was won by young Tim Tsurumoto.

I believe that Tim's essay well deserved the first prize because it is a fine statement of what responsible freedom means. It is, therefore, a pleasure for me to place this award winning essay in the Record:

FREEDOM

Freedom is like a rare gem.

Only after years of struggle can you obtain this priceless gem. Yet after this you must spend years polishing it, to make it shine. And if you don't take care of it, dust begins to settle on the jewel and dim the shine.

We are, especially in the United States, reaching this stage. When the meaning of freedom becomes covered with dust, I think it is time we get some polish and a cloth.

Although you have the freedom to do what you want, you must also accept the responsibilities which come with it. Responsibilities which you do not have to fulfill, but responsibilities which will affect your life, as well as others, whether you do or not.

Respect for human dignity is one of your main responsibilities.

Only with respect for the human life will all your responsibilities be fulfilled.

You must honor and respect your country, and what is symbolizes. For only with your respect will it progress and improve. If you honor your country, you will be willing to fight for what it symbolizes. Thinking not only of those living, but also of those still to be born.

Yes, you can be indifferent and enjoy all the pleasures life brings. But what would you have accomplished? Nothing.

But, on the other hand, if you become active in public life, you help progress the welfare and development of your nation. Not only for those living, but for the generations to come. Your responsibility to home and country is what makes a nation powerful.

He who sits and watches the world revolve under his feet is of no value to his country. The liberties and rights which come with freedom were not granted for this purpose. They were granted to you so you could use your rights to the furthest extent in order to improve and progress your nation.

Voting, one of the rights granted to you, is priceless. Would you throw away a Mona Lisa or a Rembrandt? Then why do a good percentage of you throw away the privilege to vote? When you do not vote you automatically show us your irresponsibilty. It shows the rest of the country that you do not care how or by whom the country is run, even if you really care. You must understand and realize the importance of your one vote before you begin to value it.

Respect and honor are the two things which will gain your country respect and prestige.

When you see something which you think is wrong, don't just watch what the other people will do. Do something yourself! Your individual action makes your country more powerful.

Voting is the priceless right which guarantees you that your nation will be run in a democratic manner.

Every individual who accomplishes each of these things makes his nation move one step closer to its goal.

These responsibilities which come with freedom are not just possible to accomplish in the United States, but in other countries as well. These responsibilities are not only possible to accomplish today or tomorrow, but for years and years to come.

If we were all to accomplish these responsibilities our generation would be famous for the great strides in, not only the welfare of a human life, but in the scientific and cultural advancements.

We must, however, before thinking of fame, accept these responsibilities and do them. We must set an example for generation after generation to follow. Once we set this example we will know that we have accomplished our goal in life, and more, for we will have constructed a base, made of the strongest substance known to man, in a never ending chain of generations.

Shrewsbury, Mass., High School Memorial Day Assembly Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1967

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, at the annual Memorial Day assembly of the Shrewsbury, Mass., High School, John Kaletski, a junior class student, was selected to deliver the address, and I am pleased to include it in the Record as a pertinent revelation of the genuine understanding of and respect for American tradition; the serious concern for our national destiny; and the fervent ambition to help in the achievement of peace possessed by the great and wholesome majority of American youth.

The address follows:

MEMORIAL DAY ADDRESS

On April 15, in Central Park's Sheep Meadow, an American flag was burned. Nearby, a father who had lost his son in Vietnam, watched in horror and silently wept. His tears were not for his own child and the enormity of the sacrifice he so willingly made . . . but, rather, for the young, laughing men he observed . . . the young, laughing men wantonly desecrating the glowing symbol of loyalty, patriotism, freedom and democracy. This incident could only have occurred here! . . . Here, within the realm of a great nation whose enormity of freedom allows even the bigoted the opportunity of inquiry . . . expression . . . and dissent. And, ironically, while that flag burned and crumbled to blackened ash . . . somewhere, thousands of miles away, another American was felled . . . giving his life for the preservation of this very symbol.

On this Memorial Day, we pay homage to him, and to the countless Americans before him who chose to sacrifice themselves so that this nation might endure. Their devotion to country and flag is symbolic of a nation born, bred, and raised on sacrifice . . . a nation devoted to liberty . . . a nation unwilling to destroy the seed of freedom, sown in the souls of those oppressed by totalitarianism . . . a nation of people who cannot . . . will not . . . dodge its responsibility.

We here, today, make it known that no one loves peace more than Americans. No one would sacrifice more, to seek peace, than Americans. No one is bound more to a common obligation, than Americans.

On this Memorial Day, let us reaffirm our supreme allegiance to these United States of America, and to the constitution and laws that govern it. Let us reaffirm our covenant to answer totalitarianism, wherever it occurs. Let us reaffirm our heritage to preserve American liberty and freedom, whenever it is threatened. Let it be known that these are our innate responsibilities, and we shall continue to honor them, whatever the cost.

As Americans, we cannot . . . we must not . . . feed the communist cause, and allow the world to misjudge our "right" to dissent as proof that we are a divided people. Instead, let us show our willingness to band together and strive for the solution of peace and good-will between nations . . . cognizantly aware, that riots . . . draft-card burnings . . . protest marches . . . and the desecration of our beloved American flag is *not* the answer to peace. There *is* an answer, however . . . there *must* be . . . and we, a new generation of Americans will find it. Let his be our living memorial to the memory of those men who have given so much so that we may enjoy our precious legacy of freedom. United, we can meet this end . . . United, we can accomplish the seemingly impossible!

May God, in His infinite wisdom, give us the strength to fulfill our pledge . . . May God, in His grace, give us the courage to find a true and lasting peace—so that our sons . . . and their sons after them . . . may live in a world blessed with tranquility and understanding.

Cigarette Smuggling—Federal Action Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT TENZER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1967

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker on March 30, 1966, in the 89th Congress, I introduced legislation (H.R. 14153) to amend the Jenkins Act to assist States to collect cigarette taxes and curb the illicit practice of cigarette bootlegging.

I have again introduced this legislation in the 90th Congress—H.R. 2153.

The problem of cigarette bootlegging, according to New York State and city officials has caused a revenue loss of approximately $60 million annually—more than $40 million to New York State and about $20 million to New York City.

Mr. Speaker, when I addressed the House on the subject of cigarette bootlegging, last year, I pointed out that many of our youth were being misled by unscrupulous persons, who encourage them to sell unstamped cigarettes to their families and neighbors to "make a few dollars."

That is why I initiated and have led the fight for enactment of Federal legislation in this field. See the Congressional Record for March 30, 1966, page A1819.

In April of 1966, the Honorable Louis L. Goldstein, Comptroller of the State of Maryland called a meeting of east coast cigarette tax administrators to discuss methods to curtail the illegal traffic in contraband cigarettes. I was subsequently advised by Comptroller Goldstein that the following jurisdictions unanimously endorsed the passage of my bill at the Baltimore conference: Connecticut, Delaware, Massachusetts, Michigan, New Jersey, New York, North Dakota, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia, West Virginia, Maryland, New York City, and the District of Columbia.

Tax authorities from these jurisdictions have been working together in an effort to curb cigarette bootlegging, but they and other States faced with similar problems need the assistance of the Federal Government.

As a result of the revenue loss to New York State and New York City and the alarming increase in bootlegging activity, both Gov. Nelson Rockefeller and Mayor John Lindsay have endorsed my bill, H.R. 2153, to bring relief to States and local governments in dealing with this problem. See the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for April 20, 1966, page A2161.

Governor Rockefeller has announced plans to convene a conference of Governors from 16 States this summer to discuss this problem with particular emphasis on cooperation among the States in policing shipments of smuggled cigarettes and the need for Federal legislation to assist the States.

Since 1966, Mr. Speaker, the activity has taken on new dimensions. Cigarettes are now being shipped in interstate commerce not only by private car "trunkload" but in carload and trailer load lots.

To escape detection, it was recently revealed that two station wagons loaded with unstamped cigarettes were being transported piggy-back style in a large interstate trailer.

As the city and State taxing authorities increase their surveillance, other and more devious means are being employed. The distinguished and courageous district attorney of Kings County, N.Y., Aaron Koota, now has before the grand jury a case involving an arrest made last week "involving over 11,000 cartons of untaxed cigarettes." The district attorney stated to me that "indications are that the vendor of these cigarettes in North Carolina actively participated in concealing these cigarettes through a form of camouflage so as to prevent detection by law enforcement officials."

The full text of the district attorney's letter is as follows:

OFFICE OF THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY,
Kings County, May 24, 1967.

Hon. HERBERT TENZER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR HERBERT: Please forgive my delay in replying to your letter of May 3rd.

I had asked Irving Seidman, who is in charge of my Rackets Bureau and of the cigarette investigation, to prepare the necessary documentation. He, in turn, has been in touch with Inspector Cottell, Chief of the Police Department Central Confidential Investigation unit and working closely with us in this inquiry. Documentation is being prepared and when ready I will write directly to the Attorney General and send you a copy of the letter.

I have also your letter of May 22nd which I read with a great deal of interest. I am asking Mr. Seidman to get me details and will advise you as quickly as I can.

Mr. Golden, my Chief Assistant, told me about the conversation he had with you while I was in Albany as a delegate to the Constitutional Convention. He told me that he advised you that in an arrest we made the other day involving over eleven thousand cartons of untaxed cigarettes, indications are that the vendor of these cigarettes in North Carolina actively participated in concealing these cigarettes through a form of camouflage so as to prevent detection by law enforcement officials.

With best wishes, I am
Sincerely yours,
AARON.

Recent grand jury proceedings in New York City have raised speculation that the illicit practice of cigarette smuggling has become such a big business that underground elements have taken over this field. Because of my concern that organized crime syndicates may be involved and in light of my request for a Justice Department investigation into cigarette bootlegging, I also contacted New York State and city officials as well as district attorneys in the five counties of New York City and Nassau and Westchester Counties asking them to cooperate by turning over any pertinent evidence to the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

I have been told that in order to facilitate distribution of bootlegged cigarettes, counterfeit State tax stamps are affixed to each cigarette pack. Since these cigarettes are shipped in interstate commerce, I contacted the Attorney General of the United States to request a review of existing Federal statutes to ascertain whether there was Federal jurisdiction in such cases.

I place in the RECORD at this point a letter which I received from Assistant Attorney General Fred M. Vinson, Jr., confirming that Federal statutes are being violated:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
Washington,, May 18, 1967.

HON. HERBERT TENZER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: This responds to your letter of May 3, 1967, to the Attorney General in which you referred to the growing practice of cigarette smuggling and asked whether the use of counterfeit State tax stamps constitutes a violation of any Federal criminal statute.

The mere affixing of a counterfeit stamp or making of a false meter impression is not a Federal criminal violation unless the package on which it is affixed or imprinted is transported in interstate commerce. The third paragraph of Section 2314, Title 18, United States Code, proscribes the transportation, in interstate commerce, of "any falsely made, forged, altered, or counterfeited securities or tax stamps. . . ." The fourth paragraph proscribes the transportation, in interstate commerce, of any tool or thing used in the making of such false security or tax stamp. The legislative history of Section 2314 reveals that it was amended in 1961 to cover state tax stamps and meter impressions after state officials had testified before the House Committee on the Judiciary about the large revenue losses suffered by states affected by the use of false stamps and impressions, especially when they had been made in another state.

Violations of this statute are investigated by the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Investigations of offenses involving "underworld elements" are given special attention in the Criminal Division.

It is a pleasure to serve you in this matter.
Sincerely,
FRED M. VINSON, Jr.,
Assistant Attorney General.

The fourth paragraph of District Attorney Koota's letter illustrates the need for Federal legislation and Federal action in curbing cigarette smuggling. On May 24, 1967 I wrote to FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover requesting an FBI investigation into cigarette bootlegging and the possible violation of the Federal statute referred to in Assistant Attorney General Vinson's opinion of May 18, 1967.

Following my letter to Mr. Hoover, I met with FBI officials and presented the case for Federal action to them. I was assured that the FBI would undertake an investigation with particular attention to possible underworld involvement and the violation of Federal law.

I have also kept the distinguished chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee informed of the facts set forth above and I urge my colleagues to follow the situation in their own States and advise the chairman and the Attorney General accordingly.

I urge my colleagues in the House to contact their State officials and district attorneys to ascertain the scope of this problem in their areas and to encourage them to turn over all pertinent evidence to the FBI. I also call upon my colleagues to support efforts to achieve Federal action and to pass effective Federal legislation to curb this illicit practice.

Who Really Benefits?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 1, 1967

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Citizen Newspaper, serving the western suburbs of Chicago, is known for its very practical commentary and its sober views of national fiscal policies. An editorial, which appeared in its May 25 edition, raises very interesting questions on numerous Federal programs. In view of the issues which we will debate in the House in the near future this editorial has special significance:

WHO REALLY BENEFITS?

Aside from the obvious and necessary benefits to those elderly citizens who, through no fault of their own, would have no means of support, the main value of the Social Security program seems to be to buy votes in election years.

We read this past week that a St. Louis oil company has figured how one of its average young employees will stand to lose at least $24 and as much as $436 a month during retirement by having his money stuck in social security instead of a trust fund accruing a reasonable four per cent a year.

The company figured it out this way:

"In 1966, you paid 4.2 per cent on $6,600 or a total of $277.20 to the Social Security fund. In 1967, with the .2 per cent increase, you will pay $290.40 into the fund. If you make $6,600 or more a year, you and the company put in $580.80 each year as a total.

"Let's explore this payment a little further. Suppose you just started work here and your age was 21, and suppose you work until you are 65.

"If there were no more increases in social security payments, that would mean total contributions by you and the company of $25,555.20 during the 44 years of your employment.

"If the contributions were placed in a trust fund accruing four per cent interest yer year, the interest over 44 years would amount to approximately $22,500. That means at age 65, you would have at least $48,055 in your account. With that amount of money in the bank drawing four per cent interest, you could withdraw $160 per month for the rest of your life in interest alone and never touch the principal.

"If you chose to spend all you had accumulated in your account, you could draw about $560 a month for 10 years before you ran out of funds and in addition you could work and earn as much as you pleased without losing this income!

"The maximum amount payable now under social security is between $124.00 and $135.90 a month.

"Makes you wonder, doesn't it?"

Yes it does. It also set Timothy P. Sheehan, county Republican chairman, a-wondering. He commented this week that "the present program is neither fair nor financially sound. It must be strengthened and improved."

He cited figures from the Tax foundation, which came up with a similar set of circumstances as did the oil company.

Other comments offered by Sheehan:

"The government's social security trust fund is actuarialy unsound. There is less than one year's payout. Think what this could mean in case of sudden economic downturn.

"Social security is unfair to elderly widows. They receive only a percentage of male benefits. Widows need the full amount.

"The program tends to keep too many elderly close to poverty. If you earn more than $1,500 a year, you lose benefits. For greater economic independence, Sen. Everett M. Dirksen has proposed the earnings limit be raised.

"Before every election, the administration suggests an increase in benefits. Because inflation hits pensioners so hard, raises should be automatic, tied to price increases, not politics.

"Last year, while instituting Medicare with one hand, the administration took away full medical deductions with the other. Now the administration wants to make social security benefits subject to the income tax. This is wrong.

"A program that takes an ever-bigger bite out of the average man's wages should score much higher in performance."

That sounds right to us; doesn't it to you?

Nebraska Rural Electric Association Essay Winners

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVE MARTIN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1967

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, each year the Nebraska Rural Electric Association conducts a statewide essay contest for high school students. Their topic is entitled, "What Rural Electrification Means to Me and My Community." Today it is my honor to place in the RECORD, for proper recognition, the names and winning essays of six of the State winners from my congressional district. These six winners and others from the State of Nebraska will be in Washington during the week of June 11 as part of their reward for the outstanding work on their essays. It gives me great pleasure to place their essays in the RECORD today:

WHAT RURAL ELECTRIFICATION MEANS TO MY STATE

(By Bonnie Potrzeba, age 17, junior, Northwest High School, Grand Island, Nebr.)

(NOTE.—Contestant sponsored by the Southern Nebraska Rural Public Power District, Grand Island, Nebr., in cooperation with the Nebraska Rural Electric Association.)

This being Nebraska's centennial year, let us visualize the changes in rural life in Nebraska due to electrification. We know that agriculture was and still is the most important industry in Nebraska. Many of the other industries that have developed in Nebraska are a direct result of the need to process agricultural products or to manufacture products that are needed by agriculture.

Rural electrification has a past to be proud of as actually it has only been during the last twenty-five years that rural people in Nebraska have been given the chance to find out how really wonderful this servant could be. In 1935, a Rural Electrification Administration was created by the Federal Government. Then 1936 the REA Bill was passed which authorized $40 million annually for loans for the purpose of financing the construction and operating of the generating plants, transmission lines, and distribution lines. Much work had to be done. Then only a few brave farmers were willing to try and prove how really convenient and helpful electricity could be. They spread the good news and soon more farmers were inquiring as to how electricity could be obtained for their farms.

What a change took place on Nebraska farms, thanks to REA. Now we find the farmers and their families enjoying modern homes, many of which are heated and cooled by electricity. They can now have all the modern electric appliances which their city cousins enjoy.

They can have entertainment and educational progress through radio and television. The farmer himself, has many uses for electricity to help him in his work. Electric power costs only about 1% as much as hired man power so farmers use more than five times as much electricity as they did 20 years ago. With a stand-by power source, he can keep his equipment operating and avoid much inconvenience and possible financial loss in the event of power failure due to storms, accidents, or equipment failure.

But if electricity has had a glowing past, its future is even more brilliant. We have only just begun to put electricity to work for us. More computers will be used to help name planting dates, foretell crop maturity, mix feeds, and figure out the best money making possibilities. Some of the biggest energy using areas such as transportation, soil conditioning, soil heating, and insect and disease control have barely been touched. For example as in agriculture, electric soil conditioning, soil heating, and field lighting, hold great potential for increasing the yield of crops to feed our world's growing population. Soil conditioning could augment chemical fertilizers, while soil heating could make a year-round growing season and combined with artificial sunlight, these new uses for electricity could make the shortest day in winter as productive as the longest day in summer.

So what does rural electrification mean to my state? It means progress. It means Nebraskans can look to the future with great hopes and expectations. It means as time goes on electrification will transform our state to meet its challenge as more and more uses for electricity appear on the horizon. The possibilities are limitless and with the help of new legislation to coincide with the changing needs, Nebraska will progress beyond our greatest imagination.

A SALUTE TO REA

(By Bill J. Thiemann, age 16, junior, Grand Island Senior High School, Grand Island, Nebr.)

(NOTE.—Contestant sponsored by the Southern Nebraska Rural Public Power District. Grand Island, Nebr., in cooperation with the Nebraska Rural Electric Association.)

Listen to the words of any politician, any Chamber of Commerce rally, or any business meeting. What do they strive for? Growth, development of our resources, opportunity, new industry and expansion.

But what happens when the meeting is over? Tragically, judging from past performances, usually little or nothing. They talk high and mighty, become enraptured by their own words, then let their dreams fade away.

However, there is one among us that does not let this happen. They set their goals, outline their plans, set their sights on high levels, then by sheer hard work, determination, cooperative spirit, and oneness of purpose go out and make the dream come true. This is the "Jolly Green Giant" of the rural communities . . . the R.E.A.

Jolly, because what other organization has brought more joy and good living to a large group of people than the R.E.A.?

Green, because what other group has changed the landscape of our farms from drabness to the greenness of growth and full expansion?

Giant, because this R.E.A. while starting small has grown to a giant in size and its accomplishments can only be measured in the superlative.

In the beginning these people had a dream that seemed almost hopeless. But step by step, in spite of failures, they began to make this dream come true. Never satisfied or content to rest on their successes, they have moved steadily forward to seemingly miraculous accomplishments.

The R.E.A. throughout its life span has brought a better economy to the country, state and community.

It has released the farmer from the drudgery of old farm methods. Through the use of electricity he has multiplied the fruits of his labor tenfold.

It has given the rural housewife the leisure time to enjoy the better things of life. She can take a more active part in community affairs. It has broadened her life and spirit.

Radio and television have helped to expand the horizons of the rural people.

In the community, as well as in the state, the R.E.A. has created new jobs and markets for manufactured goods. This has contributed to the growth of these areas and has enabled them to build better schools, hospitals, and other public facilities.

Nationally, the R.E.A. has had a far reaching effect in helping the United States become what it is today. By the use of its facilities better production has been possible. Thus, we as a nation are the best fed in the world, yet at the same time have enough food to share with underdeveloped countries.

The whole is only equal to the sum of all its parts. The R.E.A. helped first the family, then the community, the state, the nation and finally the world.

Can there be any greater reward for success than such a record as this? Let us not forget the R.E.A. stands among us as a giant of prosperity and as a working symbol of the great American heritage which is ours.

Rural Electrification and the Value of Electricity in the Home and on the Farm

(By Beverly Goodenberger, age 16, junior, Lincoln Southeast High School, Trenton, Nebr.)

(Note.—Contestant sponsored by the Southwest Public Power District, Palisade, Nebr., in cooperation with the Nebraska Rural Electric Association.)

It is nighttime in Nebraska. Across the darkened countryside earthly constellations form as farmstead lights come on. To a troubled world they spell out a message of hope: "Here is a young state—only one hundred years of age—in a country young as countries go, but old in the realization that men need to be free. "Agrarian reform" has been no problem here. Back in 1935 this government improved the lot of its farm families by adding another freedom to those they already cherished—Freedom from drudgery."

Prior to 1935 the rural residents of America had little chance to show their true potentiality. The typical farmer toiled from dawn to dusk, using his own strength and that of draft animals. His wife waged a never-ending battle to keep her family clean and well-fed. Doing dishes, washing, ironing, gardening, canning, cleaning house—these filled her day. She was aided by the children, who were used to chores like filling the woodbox and thawing a frozen pump in order to get water. There was almost no leisure time for the farm family.

Their plight became the concern of an electrical engineer, Morris L. Cooke. He was one of the main instigators for creating the Rural Electrification Administration. Two distinguished men who helped the cause along were Nebraska's own Senator George W. Norris and Representative Sam Rayburn of Texas. The REA was formally created on May 11, 1935 by Executive Order 7037 of President Franklin D. Roosevelt. The rural revolution was about to begin.

As might be expected, there were dissenters who predicted the failure of the project. "How," they asked, "Can farm families use enough electricity to make rural electrification profitable?" The farm families proceeded to show them. As a rule, most rural homemakers started using electricity before their husbands did. Electric irons and washing machines headed the women's "want list." The ordeal of the old-fashioned washday could now become a memory. Vacuum cleaners and refrigerators were also in great demand and electric pumps brought fresh, clean water into the house.

The farmers themselves purchased radios before they even considered other electrical equipment. Radios brought an end to rural isolation from the rest of the world. Farmers next discovered that they could cut their work in half by letting electricity do everything for them from milking cows to drying grain. Experimentation with the use of brood lamps resulted in decreased mortality rates among young chickens, pigs and calves. Crop production was more than doubled by electrically-pumped irrigation water.

Rural youth, blessed for the first time with ideal studying conditions and some leisure hours, were now able to participate fully in school, community, and church activities. They could become as diversified as their city cousins.

The REA accomplished more than just lifting the load from the shoulders of the farm family. The farmer's prosperity was reflected in the local shopping centers. The demand for new goods and services provided job opportunities for previously unemployed people. Thus the nation was lifted from the "jaws of the depression."

Yes, those lights shine reassuringly tonight. With the help of rural electrification, America's 16,000,000 free farmers outproduce Russia's 102,000,000 farmers and China's 345,000,000 farmers. Fully aware of their importance to their community, state, and nation and to the world, today's farmers are no longer second-class citizens. Freedom from drudgery has made the farm an ideal place to live. More and more rural young people are saying "Those city lights don't seem so bright after all!"

The Value of Rural Electrification in Our Home and Community

(By Danny Bose, age 15, sophomore, Stamford High School, Oxford, Nebr.)

(Note.—Contestant sponsored by the Twin Valleys Public Power District, Cambridge, Nebr., in cooperation with the Nebraska Rural Electric Association.)

We could ask ourselves, "what is the real value of Rural Electrification?", but could we give an accurate description? To us R.E.A. is a common word, a word we use when we are asking "where do you get your electricity?" But R.E.A. means more than this, it has a large responsibility for only three small letters.

We all know what value means. It is that which renders anything desirable or useful, and everyone should know what electricity is: it is an imponderable and invisible force of nature, used by man to produce light, heat and power.

Although light and lighting have been associated with man for centuries, electric lighting was not developed until the 19th century. Now let us take a look at the different ways in which Rural Electrification has helped us advance in our time. Can you imagine our parents getting up every morning, lighting kerosene lamps, start fires in wood burning stoves, and then try to get water out of a pitcher pump? "This" you might say "is old fashioned" but we would still be doing it if R.E.A. had not been developed.

With the aid of electricity we can have water pressure, making it possible to have automatic washers, dryers and the luxuries of a bath room. There can be automatic water systems and tank heaters for livestock and poultry. An electric water heater is an improvement over heating water in a boiler on top of a wood burning stove.

By 1961, the majority of homes in the United States had at least 13 different electrical appliances, compared with only seven types in 1951. The cleanliness and economy of electric heating has brought us a long way. No more do we bring in wood and carry out ashes. Through electricity we are able to enjoy radio, stereo, and television. Our entertainment and our information on world affairs would be limited.

The farmers daily chores are made easier through Rural Electrification. Electrical tools in the shop have saved a busy farmer many trips to the blacksmith shop. Electricity performs some 400 tasks that formerly were done by manual labor, making it the cheapest hired man for a farmer.

The first vapor lamp to utilize mercury was developed by Peter Cooper Hewitt in 1901. It is a warm friendly welcome to drive into a well lighted yard with a modern dusk to dawn security light.

Comfort and luxuries, through electricity, is no longer confined to the cities and small towns. To Rural Electricity can be attributed the responsibility for changing our uncomfortable living to more economic, easy and enjoyable lives. There is more time for the farmer to participate in the community affairs, therefore, bringing rural life and community life closer together.

We have so many luxuries we take for granted that we should give a special "Thank You" each day to the R.E.A. and to the many people who have made these luxuries possible.

What Local Ownership of Cherry-Todd Cooperative Means to My Community

(By Donald S. Beman, age 16, sophomore, Valentine High School, Valentine, Nebr.)

(Note.—Contestant sponsored by the Cherry-Todd Electric Cooperative, Inc., Mission, S. Dak., in cooperation with the Nebraska Rural Electric Association.)

The benefits derived from local ownership of Cherry-Todd Electric are practically unlimited. The most important of these ways is economically. The local ownership of the electrical distribution facility, as we have in our community, means that the greatest majority of the money paid to the company is sunk into the community's economy and into the enlargement of the facility. The redistributed funds are used in many ways. The wages paid to the employees are the greatest means of redistribution. These wages are spent wisely in the business establishments in both communities, Mission and Valentine. Likewise, the workers who receive the wages are good assets to the community just by their presence there. These people are good citizens in our towns for they attend the many churches, serve on different boards and councils and support the various local civic organizations.

The local cooperative enlarges its service capabilities and thus aids in the development of our community with part of the money paid to it. These changes come in the form of improved service to its members. A pertinent example is through the purchase of additional equipment always over and above the previous equipment as far as safety and effectiveness are concerned. Better lighting of our streets and farm yards make our towns and rural homes a safer place to live and the electricity is provided at a cheaper rate to encourage greater usage. The improved capacity of the facilities encourages new industry to locate in our towns, also, since new industry prefers a good community with an adequate supply of good, dependable and inexpensive electricity.

The local ownership of Cherry-Todd Electrict is an asset to us. Our local ownership proves to new prospective businesses and industries that we have, and will use, our initiative and thus make a good place for their business. They also have a continuous supply of electricity that is reasonably priced, and the lower rates which took effect at the beginning of 1967 make electricity an even better buy. The prestige derived from owning our own cooperative for them to look up to and use as a guide. The members are admired by their non-member neighbors. It is a great day when a person increases his standard of living by adding the convenience of electricity to his home, or in some other way uses it to better his life and surroundings.

Yes, the advent of electricity has changed and improved the lives of us all. Since the coming of electricity we have had adequate lighting in our homes, and especially in our schools. With the electric washer, dryer, and steam iron, wash day is a very small job to be done when needed, instead of the day-long family affair that it used to be. Cooking is almost a dream with everything electric from stoves to carving knives to dishwashers. Even housekeeping has become almost a pleasure with all the added convenience. The electric welders, an almost infinite variety of electric power tools, plus heat lamps and heaters for the newborn livestock, milking machine for the cows, and ice free watering devices for year round operations are just some of the many things that take the "chore" out of chores. Country and city families alike now enjoy electric heat, air conditioning, television, electric lights and back-saving electrical machines. When compared with yesteryears, our lives are definitely lived in luxury, thanks to local ownership of our Cherry-Todd Electric Cooperative.

THE VALUE OF RURAL ELECTRIFICATION IN OUR HOMES AND COMMUNITY

(By Mary Mahr, age 16, sophomore, Lorenzo Public School, Sidney, Nebr.)

(NOTE.—Contestant sponsored by the Wheatbelt Public Power District, Sidney, Nebr., in cooperation with the Nebraska Rural Electric Association.)

Rip Van Winkle, the famous character in Irving's *Sketch Book*, fell asleep for 20 years. When he stumbled back to his village, the changes which had taken place amazed him. The people he talked with and the places he visited were strange.

Suppose some farmer who had never known the benefits of electricity were to wander back to his farm after having slept for many years. His son and family now live there. Imagine his surprise and bewilderment at the change which had occurred.

After showing his father around the farm, the newly reunited father and son sit down to talk. If we could listen in on their conversation we might hear something like this:

"What value is all this electric stuff anyway?" asked the elderly gentleman.

"It has many uses. In the barn, electricity is used in several different ways. The electric lights make it possible to do chores when it is dark. Milking machines help dairy farmers greatly. They can milk more cows in a shorter period of time than was ever possible for a single man to do before."

"What about that fence I touched this morning" interrupted his father. "What good is that?"

"When animals touch it, they get a shock just like you did. It has therefore, helped the farmer in his efforts to keep his livestock in the proper places.

"In the shop, there is the electric welder, electric drills, power saw, and numerous other electrical tools," continued the son. "They enable the farmer to make more of his own equipment and repair his machinery with greater ease."

"What about all these things here in the house?"

"Electricity is very important in the house. Electric cooking and heating is much cleaner and safer than gas or the old wood fires. Our freezer enables us to grow and buy larger quantities of food and store them. We can freeze our meat when we butcher instead of canning or curing it as you had to do. Automatic washers, dryers, and electric irons have made washday a less burdensome task," replied the son.

"What about that picture box and the noise box? interrupted his father.

"Oh you mean the television and the radio. They enable us to hear the latest news almost as soon as it happens. We can also get the weather reports. Television and radio provide entertainment for the whole family.

"Electricity," continued the son, "made all these and many more time and labor-saving devices possible. Farmers and ranches can manage their farms and ranches more efficiently and with greater ease. They can expand their farming or ranching operations and thus make larger profits. At the same time, they are benefiting people living in urban communities. They have more variety and larger quantities of goods to choose from because of increased farm production."

"I'm beginning to see the value of electricity," his father says, "It really is an asset to the farmer. I have only one more question, Electricity, what took you so long?"

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402, at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Thursday, June 1, 1967

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Senate took up bill on silver certificates.

Senate committee reported bill on congressional reapportionment.

See Résumé of Congressional Activity.

See Congressional Program Ahead.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S 7553–S 7603

Bills Introduced: 11 bills and one resolution were introduced, as follows: S. 1884–1894; and S. Con. Res. 31. **Pages S 7556–S 7557**

Bill Reported: Report was made as follows: H.R. 2508, providing for the reapportionment of congressional districts, with amendments (S. Rept. 291). **Page S 7556**

Bill Referred: H.R. 10345, fiscal 1968 appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary, and related agencies, was referred to Committee on Appropriations. **Page S 7553**

President's Message—Reorganization Plan No. 3 (D.C.): President transmitted message with his legislative recommendations to provide a better government for the citizens of the national Capital—referred to Committee on Government Operations. **Pages S 7630–S 7631**

Kentucky Anniversary: Senate concurred in H. Con. Res. 204, marking the 175th anniversary of the admission of Kentucky to the Union. This completed legislative action on the resolution. **Pages S 7575–S 7576**

Authority To Report: Committee on Government Operations was granted extension of time until June 30, 1967, to file reports entitled "Investigation Into Small Business Companies" and "Investigation Into FHA Multiple Dwelling Projects." **Page S 7556**

Congressional Reapportionment: Authority was granted for filing of minority and individual views on H.R. 2508, providing for the reapportionment of congressional districts. **Page S 7556**

Veterans: Senate concurred (with an amendment) in House amendments to S. 16, to provide additional readjustment assistance to veterans who have served in the military during the Vietnam era. This amendment to the House amendments was in the nature of a substitute by Senator Long (Louisiana), and prior to its adoption was modified by acceptance of a Javits amendment (for himself and Senators Randolph and Yarborough) and by acceptance of a Gruening amendment. Motion to reconsider adoption of the Long substitute amendment, as modified, was tabled.

Senate insisted on its amendment, asked for conference with House, and appointed as conferees Senators Long (Louisiana), Smathers, Randolph, Yarborough, Williams (Delaware), and Dominick. **Pages S 7603–S 7613**

Silver Certificates: Senate made its unfinished business S. 1352, authorizing adjustments in the amount of outstanding silver certificates. **Pages S 7613–S 7614**

Legislative Program: Majority leader announced that on Monday, June 5, Senate will consider its unfinished business S. 1352, adjustments in amounts of outstanding silver certificates, following which, on Tuesday, it will consider S.J. Res. 33, to establish a National Commission on Product Safety. Following these bills it is hoped that Senate may take up S. 1030, informational media guaranty, and on Wednesday, S. 450, popular election of Governor of Virgin Islands.

On Thursday and Friday of next week it is hoped that the legislation dealing with current railway labor dispute will have been reported, in which event it will be taken up, if necessary meeting on Saturday to complete its consideration. **Page S 7614**

Program for Monday: Senate met at noon and adjourned at 3:52 p.m. until noon Monday, June 5, when it will consider its unfinished business S. 1352, adjustments in outstanding silver certificates. **Page S 7631**

Committee Meetings

(*Committees not listed did not meet*)

APPROPRIATIONS—AGRICULTURE

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee concluded its hearings on fiscal 1968 budget estimates for the Department of Agriculture, and related agencies, after receiving testimony on proposed Colorado-Ute generation and transmission loan from Norman M. Clapp, Administrator, Rural Electrification Adminis-

Appendix

Patriotism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS COTTON

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 5, 1967

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Patriotism," which appeared in the April issue of the school newspaper published by students at New Hampshire College, in Manchester, N.H.

I had the pleasure of addressing the student body at this fine school a few months ago and was impressed at the time with the appearance and demeanor of the young men and women in attendance. They evidently do not reflect the disregard for obligations to country and, for that matter, law and order which has been witnessed on some campuses. I think this fine editorial characterizes the representative attitude of the student body at New Hampshire College.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PATRIOTISM

(By Fran Croteau)

Is it a disgrace to proclaim oneself a patriot? My answer to this question is an emphatic NO! First of all, "Patriotism" is defined by Webster's dictionary as: "One's love for his country."

Do you love your country, the United States of America? I ask the reader to search his conscience and find an answer to this question.

The U.S.A. to me is the greatest country in the history of civilization. Where else or when has an individual been able to speak his mind so freely. Economically, we are of tremendous strength and power. Politically, we are free to vote for whomever we want, and anytime we want. The list of qualifications for greatness could go on to eternity.

We are now engaged in a conflict war, struggle, call it what you may, in Vietnam. My brother, your son, your cousin, your nephew: they are all over there fighting for a cause which I think is well worth while. The U.S.A. has taken upon itself to be the "Savior of The World." This role should be accepted by all Americans. "It isn't practical," some of you say. Maybe it seems impractical but this country above all others has always been idealistic and that's the reason for our past success. Do you realize this?

I cannot deny humanity freedom. The U.S.A. isn't perfect in all areas of thought and action, however, this country is definitely the nearest to perfection. Every G.I. who fights or dies in Vietnam must feel patriotic, for if they didn't, all would be incarcerated under our present laws. These laws are of necessity, for if we had no laws we would have chaos.

The anti-Vietnam war demonstrating "scum" talk of peace, but in actuality they are nothing but traitors and unrealistic dreamers, who feed on deception and idiocy. These persons are the traitors.

I ask you, fellow patriots to do as John F. Kennedy stated: "Ask not what your country can do for you, but ask what you can do for your country."

The Radical Right

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1967

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, our present difficulties at both home and abroad, have given rise to extremist groups which threaten to destroy our democratic process.

The radical right and the John Birch Society are poisoning American minds with false claims concerning the American war effort and are furthermore seriously affecting the civil rights movement.

Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues an article concerning this problem which appeared in the April 1967, Bulletin of the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith:

THE RADICAL RIGHT

(By Benjamin R. Epstein and Arnold Forster)

(This article is excerpted from *The Radical Right—Report On The Birch Society and Its Allies,* to be published by Random House. The book, by Benjamin R. Epstein, national director of the League, and Arnold Forster, its general counsel, may be ordered through ADL regional offices.)

The political extremism of the Radical Right and of the John Birch Society is no minor skin rash on the body politic. It can be a creeping malignancy that would destroy the vital center of the American political organism.

In the last few years, the Radical Rightist movement helped to spark the backlash which in 1966 slowed down progress toward equal civil rights for all Americans. It is a movement which now desperately strives to keep the backlash alive. In hundreds of communities across the country, for example, the Birch Society film, *Anarchy USA*, is being shown, not to Birchite audiences alone, but to veterans groups, civic organizations and police associations, often unaware that they are watching Birch Society propaganda. The poisonous seeds are being implanted in many American minds that the just demands of Negroes for equal rights, equal justice and equal opportunity are somehow part of a worldwide Communist conspiracy—implanted in American minds already frightened and anxious over genuine Communist threats around the world.

Now the Radical Right is zeroing in on the central issue that tears at the American heart and tests the nation's capacity for steadiness and steadfastness—the war in Vietnam.

Robert Welch has already sounded the call to his followers and Radical Right sympathizers for a major effort on the issue of Vietnam. Like the Communists, he exploits the nation's continuing agony over a distasteful war.

In rallying his forces for this new effort and this new emphasis on Vietnam, Welch declared that "we have before us the most fertile ground in which to sow the seeds and nourish the plants of understanding that we have yet reached in our struggle." And he added:

> The American people are more deeply concerned about the growing mess in Vietnam—and hence more ready to pay attention to our cries of alarm—than they have been about anything else the Communist conspiracy has done to them so far.

Welch referred to the Vietnam war as a "crooked game in which all the cards are stacked against us" and as an engagement which, if not ended on terms prescribed by Welch himself, "will mark the beginning of the formal and finite end of the American Republic—exactly as the Communists in Moscow and Paris and London, and in Washington and New York, have intended that it should."

Explaining the proposed shift in Birchite emphasis from the war against the civil rights movement to Vietnam. Welch first recalled that "five years ago, few people who were thoroughly familiar with the main divisions of Communist strategy saw any chance of keeping the Negro Revolutionary Movement from reaching decisive proportions." Then he went on to say that "the required semblance of civil war which was to have been created—exactly as had been done in China and Algeria and Cuba—to help the Communists in the final stages of taking over our country, failed to materialize."

The danger of that "semblance of civil war," however, is "still with us," Welch warned his faithful followers, "because the Communists never give up in connection with any predetermined course. But today they are certainly having to bide their time a bit on this one, and their progress on this front has been slowed to a stand still."

Claiming Birch activities as a major factor in slowing down the civil rights movement, Welch pointed out that it had been accomplished by "the creation of sufficient understanding"—the Welchian euphemisim for Society propaganda efforts.

In short, Welch told his members, the civil rights issue was no longer in his view as important or as urgent as it had been, and the time had come for the Society to fry other fish. And since there had been success in the civil rights area, he wrote, "who says that we cannot do an even bigger and better job in connection with the Communist strategy which revolves around the Vietnam War?"

He added:

> The stakes are even higher than in the civil rights' fraud. The whole power of the federal government can be used, and is being used, far more openly, directly, and forcefully to support the great deception, and to stifle all opposition, than in connection even with the civil rights' agitation.

He had, after all, long ago told the Society membership that "Washington has been taken over!"—that "Communist influences are now in working control of our Federal Government" and that "the Communists and their dupes, allies, and agents, throughout this vast appartus of government, now actually determine almost all policies, actions, and decisions."

In the intervening years, Welch told his followers that Communists were calling the shots on both sides in the Vietnam war—in Washington and in Hanoi—and that the whole American war effort was part of the larger Communist plan for taking over the United States. He expanded on these themes in a February, 1967, pamphlet called *The Truth About Vietnam* in which he raised 25 invidious questions about American policy in Vietnam.

The rest of the Radical Right can be expected to swing into line behind the Birchite effort to exploit American anguish over Vietnam. It is clear, and has been for some time, that the Birch Society and its founder tend to set the tone—and to a large extent the content—of the overall Radical Rightist propaganda thrust.

There are also larger implications inherent in the Radical Right movement of the 1960's of which the Society is the spearhead and bellwether. These, too, make the movement a matter of special concern in the panoply of extremism on the domestic scene.

The Radical Right is a permanent fixture in American political affairs—at least in the foreseeable future. So is the John Birch Society which has been the central factor in the flowering of the movement.

Whether the movement can be contained at its present strength, and whether the Birch Society can be quarantined on the fringe of the political spectrum depends in large measure on American conservatives. If they have the desire—and, more important, the will—to do the job, a housecleaning can take place on the American Right that would ostracize the Radicals. Even if the conservatives—the true conservatives—face up to their responsibility, the job will not be easy. It will also require the willingness of all Americans to recognize the danger and to accept the challenge—to realize that penetration of American life by the Birch Society and the Radical Right movement has already dented many communities and the political party structure itself.

The radical extremism of the movement, rooted in a conspiratorial concept of American history and of current events, threatens the democratic process and the democratic climate.

The Radical Rightist movement aids Communism by undermining public confidence in the patriotism of responsible officials, both elected and appointed, and by concentrating on a fancied internal Communist conspiracy, thus diverting public attention from real Communist threats, both internal and foreign.

The movement divides the nation by charging those who oppose it—and those whom it opposes—with being Communist dupes at best and agents at worst.

It wages war against remedies seeking justice and equality for Negroes, and it seeks to exploit, for its own purposes, American fears, tensions and anxieties.

The John Birch Society aims at political influence and political power. Its ultimate purpose is to stop the forward march of American development and to repeal the last 30 or 50 years of American history.

Birch Society members and Radical Rightist adherents have already begun to appear on the political scene. A few already hold office. More will be candidates. The Birchers and their allies bore into the vitals of our political parties.

The Birchers and their friends have penetrated and seek to influence public agencies such as the police, local governments and school boards.

The Birch Society seeks, through its members, influence in voluntary groups, civic organizations and other bodies which play a vital role in a free society.

The movement sucks in, each year, increasing millions of dollars for its divisive activities.

The Birch Society is a radical apparatus, comparable in size to the Communist apparatus at the peak of its power in the United States 20 or 25 years ago—and quite possibly stronger in impact.

The Society uses subterfuge and semisecrecy—including front groups—to carry out its work.

The Birchers and their allies have excellent opportunities for continuing their growth in the years that lie immediately ahead—until their actions produce firm reactions on the part of concerned Americans, consciously convinced that the Radical Right is a menace to the nation and ready to defeat it in their own communities and in the political arena.

The Radical Rightist movement is a byproduct of the fears and frustrations of a nation in transition at home and in a protracted struggle with Communism abroad—a by-product of the "long twilight struggle, year in and year out" of which the late President Kennedy spoke in his Inaugural Address.

America has rejected the false counsels of radical extremism in the past, always holding true to its best traditions—conservative in its sense of balance, liberal in its search for justice.

In the long run, Americans will also reject the false counsels of the Birchers and their allies. What is of deep concern, however, in the years ahead, is the damage that the Radical Rightist manifestation can do to the climate and the processes of democracy before the good sense and moderation of the American people render it a mere footnote in the history books of tomorrow.

Rental or Sale of Private Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 5, 1967

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an editorial entitled "4.5 Million To One," published in the Northern Virginia Daily, Strasburg, Va., of June 1, 1967. The editor and chief editorial writer of the Northern Virginia Daily is Mr. J. J. Crawford.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

4.5 Million to One

In November, 1964, the voters of California adopted an amendment to their state constitution known as Proposition 14. This was more than just another amendment, however.

Proposition 14 was the voters' method of remedying an earlier law, passed in 1963 by the California Legislature, which prohibited racial discrimination in the rental or sale of private housing of more than four units.

A clear and concise statement of the wishes of the people, the amendment (Proposition 14) read as follows:

"Neither the state nor any subdivision or agency thereof shall deny, limit or abridge, directly or indirectly, the right of any person, who is willing or desires to sell, lease or rent any part or all of his real property, to decline to sell, lease or rent such property to such person or persons as he, in his absolute discretion, chooses."

The amendment passed by an overwhelming 2 to 1 majority, the final tabulation being approximately 4.5 million votes in favor of adoption and approximately 2.4 against. The liberals and the civil righters screamed to the high heavens. However, by any reasonable interpretation of the theory of representative, democratic government, in which the majority rules, the results left little doubt the people of the Golden State did not wish to be bound by repressive limitations regarding the sale or rental of property which they own.

Nevertheless, this overwhelming majority of votes meant little or nothing when the matter reached the U.S. Supreme Court this week. By a majority of 5 to 4 the Court ruled the amendment unconstitutional. Thus, in one momentous decision the wishes of 4.5 million Californians, clearly expressed by a monumental 2 to 1 majority vote, were nullified by the vote of one Justice.

It seems to us that this once again raises the question of the advisability of requiring a two-thirds majority of the Court instead of a simple majority in cases involving basic constitutional issues. The suggestion has been previously argued with some success.

Certainly a 5 to 4 decision which, at one stroke. abrogates the obvious will of 4.5 million people of a sovereign state, tends to lend it validity.

Confederate Memorial Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 5, 1967

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the fallen sons of the South are not forgotten.

June 3 is Jefferson Davis' birthday and the first Sunday in June, on the 4th this year, the annual Confederate Memorial Services were held at Jackson Circle in Arlington National Cemetery, the hallowed national shrine to our country's heroes who lie buried on the former estate of our great military leader, Robert E. Lee, of Virginia.

The annual ceremony is conducted by the Confederate Memorial Committee, Washington, D.C., and is dedicated to the memory of the Confederate veterans and their descendants who served our country.

No more fitting tribute or remembrance could be said than the few short words emblazed on the Confederate monument at Jackson Circle:

Not for fame or reward, not for place or for rank,
Not lured by ambition, or goaded by necessity
But in simple obedience to duty, as they understood it
These men suffered all, sacrificed all, dared all . . . and died.

The orator for the day was Mr. Ulmont O. Cumming, of New York City, commander of General Archibald Gracie Camp of New York, Sons of Confederate Veterans.

I am pleased to include Commander Cumming's speech as part of my remarks for all our colleagues to read:

Honored guests, descendants of the Confederacy, ladies and gentlemen, and other guests.

It is an honor to be asked to speak to you today, inasmuch as I am practically unknown to most of you.

"After the war one of General Lee's daughters visited England where she was about to be presented to Queen Victoria." The Lord Chamberlain asked her: "Whom do we present? She replied: Tell the Queen I am the daughter of the world's greatest General. The Lord Chamberlain delivered his message, returned and announced: "It pleases her Gracious Majesty to receive *Miss Grant*."

On behalf of those who invited me here I extend greetings to all those grandsons, great grandsons, granddaughters and great granddaughters and friend of the Confederacy.

It is indeed a privilege to speak to you on this momentous day in Arlington National Cemetary, and within sight of that mansion up there which once belonged to our great leader, the greatest general the English Speaking World has ever produced, Robert E. Lee.

He was a superb figure to contemplate. The Southern people, as well as his soldiers, bestowed on him their unbroken faith in childlife simplicity and bounty. He was their military idol, their hope and their god of war, and richly did he deserve their confidence, and as he stood at the head, challenged, not only the admiration of his people, but that of the world.

We today commemorate with our affection, our reverence and our undying remembrance, the soldiers and sailors of the Southern States, who either lost their lives or fought the good fight to the bitter end to preserve their liberty, which they had inherited from their forefathers.

The Confederate soldier fought what might be referred to as a Second War for Independence.

The Confederate soldier fought to repel invasion and in defense of his Constitutional Rights, usually referred to as State Rights, and which since that time and even now are being whittled away bit by bit.

This conflict between the States, styled in its inception the irrepressible, although for a long time a standing menace of disunion and war, at the door of the capital, and whose clamor grew louder and louder each year, and finally broke its constitutional chains asunder like the frail crust of the mountain's dome before the irresistible eruption of the long suppressed volcano beneath, when it came, was a surprise to all, and it found no one prepared for it. Eleven States in the South withdrew from the Federation, whose encroachment they were unwilling to bear, and organized a confederation of their own—but it was without an army, and without a navy—it was without arms, without manufactories for war material and supplies, and without credit or recognition in the society or market of the nations of the world. In this helpless condition of orphanhood, inexperience and isolation, they were assailed, by their powerful neighbors and late associates, with all the force which organization, equipment and wealth could combine, sharpened by a malicious sectional hatred, and a morbid, irrational, puritanical fanaticism, which cemented them in a holy union for an unholy and un-Christian crusade against us. Yet, undismayed by the vast hosts which the North called to the field for their subjugation, the gallant little Confederacy, like the youthful David of old, went unhestitatingly forth to meet the boasting giant in combat with whatsoever, as weapons of defense, they could lay their hands on. How successfully this little Confederacy of only five and one-half millions of people maintained this combat for four long, weary years, against the united North of over twenty millions, in a "rough and tumble" fight, while the remainder of the nations of the earth stood passively by without interferring. The South was victorious in every battle in Virginia, from first to last, and finally yielded only to starvation.

The Confederate soldier, no matter who he was or from whence he came, whether he was a landowner, lawyer, stripling, or old, no matter what nationality he came from, took his battle station. He fought and suffered, but fought for two things, Truth and Justice. He understood for what he was fighting as no other soldier in our history.

He fought for his home, his people, his land, his way of living and his rights.

He had no shoes, no food but corn and unripe fruit. His footsteps stained the road and country side with blood from his unshod feet. My own grandfather used to tell me about this.

The Confederate soldier had respect for others. When he invaded Pennsylvania he did not deliberately destroy houses, and not even a gray hair from Barbara Fritchie's head. He was above all a gentlemen. What a contrast to Sherman's March to the Sea, who said himself "a crow would starve to death after I have passed."

If the valued heroes of the Confederacy no longer stir our hearts and minds, and if this particular Memorial Day ceases to be observed, then the future historians of the South will from that hour date the decadence of the people of the South.

It is a holy duty that we owe and which we reverently perform to say to our departed heroes that now we return to the hallowed ground wherein they lie and ask their souls to hear that we do still endorse, ratify, and approve their sacrifices and we bow our heads in humble reverence at the recital of their deeds of valor which have hallowed their names and exalted their martydom. We have come to denounce the slanders which partisan writers have cast upon them. Were they rebels? They were not. Did they fight to destroy the government founded by Washington, Jefferson and Madison? They did not.

Must the people of the South be ruled by men who were ever, and even today instilled with the darkest prejudices against the South and her institutions. We seek no further war only peace.

When the Confederate soldier returned after the war, he found his home destroyed, his property given to others, his family gone or dead. He was even disenfranchised. He could never forget the Reconstruction Period.

You recognize some of the Confederate soldiers as some of the most superb in history. There is the gallant Ashby, the raiding, fighting, reckless, rollicking Jeb Stuart, the cool and deliberate Hampton, the chivalrous Butler, the brave, buoyant and jolly Fitz Lee, the magnetic and intrepid Billy Payne, the handsome and soldierly Young, the dashing Earing, the impetuous Lige White, the immortal Pelham; and these were only some of them—all graceful horsemen, knightly gentlemen, ardent lovers, and brave as the bright swords which flashed from their strong uplifted arms, and withal as generous as the sunbeams that bathe the earth and as terrible to the foe as the lightning arrows of offended Jove.

This banner, under which they so gallantly and gloriously fought, is now the badge of our loyalty to ourselves. This is the cross which they bore with a courage, patience and fortitude which entitles every true, brave and tried Confederate soldier to a Patriot's immortal crown! This banner is consecrated by baptism in the blood of Stonewall Jackson, Turner Ashby, J.E.B. Stuart, and other Christian Knights of the South, whose proud names and glorious fame shall endure forever!

This banner is to the South what the Thistle is to Scotia and the Shamrock is to Erin—an emblem of her pride, patriotism and power! Its glory shall ever be my pride in all my life.

This is the flag of my country, and to our patriotic hearts, this flag symbolizes, by its stars of pure white, the self-illuminating light of State's sovereignty which is shed from every one of the fifty States as they move in their independent orbits, through the blue firmament of liberty; and these bands of red and white symbolize the bonds of flesh and bone, which in "E Pluribus Unum" unite them all in one union of national life and destiny.

I have been told on the Old Court House in Vicksburg, Mississippi, are these words which all of you should remember, and these are these words "Those who forget their past have no future" and we will never forget and always remember.

Let us concentrate ourselves to the maintenance and defense of those principles of constitutional liberty for which the Confederate soldier gave so much, and in the consciousness of duty faithfully performed we say as General Jackson said "Cross over the river and rest in the shade of the trees." There will always be a Dixie.

Public TV: A Power Struggle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 5, 1967

Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the other body recently passed a measure calling for the creation of a nonprofit, nongovernmental public broadcasting corporation to further the development of what has come to be known as educational television, and educational radio.

This bill is now pending before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, of which I am privileged to be a member. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Communications and Power, the bill is of special interest to me.

But as a television viewer and as a parent it is of even greater importance to me.

Educators tell us that we learn fastest that which we absorb with more than one sense. Television provides stimulation to both the sense of sight and hearing. And anyone who has heard small children singing television commercial jingles or demanding that their parents buy *x* brand of cereal in the supermarket can have no doubt of the impact of television on our young.

I believe that we need more, and better, educational programs for these young people. I believe that a public broadcasting corporation will help provide these programs. But the mere creation of such a corporation will not be an end unto itself. Much work and deliberation lies ahead. This is true here in the House in our study of the proposal and also throughout the broadcasting industry as a whole.

We have been presented with a marvelous gift in the form of television. We should do what we can to make the most of it.

In the June 5 issue of Newsweek Magazine there is a critique of educational television, its past, its present, and its future, written by Mr. Joseph Morgenstern who has had long experience in the field of educational television.

I found it to be of great interest and highly enlightening and recommend it to the attention of the Congress:

PUBLIC TV: A POWER STRUGGLE—SOME NASTY TRUTHS IN ITS PAST AND HARD FACTS AHEAD

(NOTE.—Despite constant lip service paid to the idea of public television, a major power struggle looms now that plans and pressures have been building to make it a reality. Newsweek's movies editor, an experienced critic who is also an alumnus of educational television, sorts the facts from the clichés.

(By Joseph Morgenstern)

Educational television, which has spent most of its fifteen years in a glass barrel on the brink of the falls, is about to be saved. The Senate has recently passed a bill creating a new corporation to preside over an enlarged noncommercial television system, and the measure may get through the House by midsummer. The Ford Foundation, meanwhile, is preparing a series of Sunday-night broadcasts to demonstrate how good noncommercial news coverage can be. The project will not go on the air until October, but already it has attracted such estimable help as Edward P. Morgan and Walter Lippmann.

The long-awaited revolution in American broadcasting may be at hand, yet no one seems to have noticed. I think I know why. Commercial television is appalling, but educational television has been a virtuous bore. Its best friends know this in their heart of hearts, and quietly repine. Its worst enemies know this in their purpose of purses, and quietly rejoice.

This is not to deny ETV its occasional success, the most remarkable of which was simply coming into being in 1952 and staying there, despite monstrous economic odds National Educational Television, which gets $6 million yearly from the Ford Foundation to produce and distribute programs among its more than 100 affiliates, has made some competent shows about science, music and consumer buying. It has recently presented some interesting documentaries, too: "A Time for Burning," "Every Seventh Child" and "The Way It Is," and has another good one coming up soon in "My Name Is Children."

Many dedicated and talented people work in educational television. In a number of cities—San Francisco, Boston, New York, Pittsburgh, Lincoln, Neb., Austin, Texas—they have developed their stations into formidable cultural forces and have turned out some first-rate programs in the process. New York's Channel 13 let teen-agers talk candidly of themselves in "The Comers." Los Angeles's Channel 28 produced a series of engrossing adult conversations called "Speculation." San Francisco's Channel 9 filmed a brilliant, unforgettable documentary of Negro life in Oakland called "Losing Just the Same." And then there is Julia Child from Boston's Channel 2. She is the Ingrid Superstar of ETV and deservedly so, a master of her culinary art and a paragon of energy and wit.

For every "French Chef," however, for every hour of intelligent news analysis, for every evening of satisfactory drama (the best of it bought from Britain or Canada), there are days and weeks and months of talk shows that aspire to conversation and never rise above chatter, of pussyfooting documentaries that studiously strike an objective balance between no conviction and no purpose, of Great Ideas brought home with all the humorless reverence and irrelevance of a nineteenth-century sermon. I hate to think ETV's crowning achievement is one of Mrs. Child's awesome *croques-enbouche*, a giant tower of cream puffs held together with caramel mortar. Yet I fear that the future of educational television may hold more of the same unless we face some nasty truths about it now.

Chronic poverty has done terrible things, but poverty is not the whole explanation, nor always the rule: many budgets for individual NET shows are as high as they might be on commercial television. Poverty cannot excuse NET's negligence of children's programs—only fifteen of the 260 hours of new programs it produces yearly. Poverty cannot excuse the absence of truly unpopular, unsafe or unexpected views in ETV's staple programing. Poverty cannot, but fear can. Local station managers are afraid of the wealth and influence represented by their local boards of directors. The members of those boards are afraid of pressure groups within their communities. NET, that coldbed of dilettantism, is afraid of the Ford Foundation, whence comes most of its money, and afraid of the very idea of getting good enough to compete with commercial television. So long as ETV remains a wistful cripple, the public will make allowances and the officers will keep their jobs.

Educational television fears its constituents just as desperately as commercial television does, except that failure in the commercial world means loss of revenue, which is measurable, while failure in the educational world means loss of integrity, which is not. A little integrity goes a long way in ETV. People running the dreary, dry-as-dust outlets in the smaller cities and towns sometimes excuse themselves from competence by saying that they "narrowcast," rather than broadcast, to a small but select audience. A mastery of the medium means showmanship, by their lights, and showmanship means vulgarization, and vulgarization means automatic loss of academic integrity. So the stations remain pure and their audiences remain small, bored, docile and generally silent.

It is the silence of indifference or condescension, not respect, and we are all accomplices to this crime. We commit it as viewers when we try to convince ourselves that ETV must be good if it's so damnably dull, when we gulp down our cultures as if it were castor oil. We commit it as critics when we apply a double standard that gives commercial television its due and educational television the benefit of every doubt.

But the system has run down. At the moment NET is nothing more than a holding operation, while most individual stations are merely struggling to stay on the air, pay their bills and meet their payrolls. EVT is in limbo. It wants money, love and respect. It feels like an aging professor who wishes he could do a juggling act to wake up the class, but also knows it might cost him his job. ETV is a quarreling, jealous, backbiting family with all the disadvantages of factionalism and none of the advantages of network interconnection except on rare and expensive occasions. If NET and its affiliates have anything in common, it is a fear of the immediate future. In this they may be right.

New men and new ideas are on the loose. The rules of the ETV game are changing fast. The Ford Foundation's Public Broadcasting Laboratory is renting studio facilities from NBC and hiring professionals at high salaries to make its demonstration project a success. Professionals always pose threats to dilettantes. Both Ford and the Carnegie Commission, headed by Dr. James R. Killian of MIT, agree that ETV needs massive injections of money to survive and flourish. Once again the implicit consensus is that ETV's gangling, irresponsible adolescence must soon come to an end, that its forced entry into the adult world is imminent.

The most significant change of rules can be found in the language of the Carnegie and Ford reports, and that of the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967, as proposed by the White House and approved by the Senate. The legislation no longer deals with educational television, but with *public* television. It suggests that purely educational television will henceforth be the province of instructional television—a teacher standing in front of a camera delivering a lecture.

Does this mean public television is doomed to be show biz shorn of its commercials? Hardly. Public television can and should be educational in its pursuit of excellence, its tolerance of dissent, its delight in beauty and its devotion to truth. But it should also be free to find its own style, to sweep away the conventions as if television had just been invented. The future need not be a dreary repetition of the past. But the millennium is not yet upon us. Senate Bill 1160 contains promises and hopes, not solutions. It sets up a nongovernmental, nonprofit Corporation for Public Broadcasting but says nothing on the crucial question of how the corporation will control network operations—assuming a network is created. The bill provides no long-term financing, only a $9 million appropriation for the corporation's first year of existence. The euphemism for this is "seed money." Never were seeds planted beneath bigger feet; never were big feet more anxious to stomp on tender shoots.

This is another truth to be faced: public television may never come to fruition unless its friends are as dedicated and resourceful as its foes. Who are its foes? That depends on what it tries to do. If public television wants to follow Fred Friendly and Ford Foundation president McGeorge Bundy in their astute plan for a noncommercial satellite to provide network interconnection and revenue as well, it can count on AT&T and Comsat for a fight: the former has land lines and microwave relays to rent, the latter wants all the business it can get transmitting broadcasts or data.

If PTV is willing to settle for Federal funds on a yearly basis so that Congress can be sure it likes the broadcasts before it buys any more, it will have clear sailing. If it wants to have funds on a nonreviewable basis to stay free of political pressures, the new noncommercial system may have some trying days ahead in the House. The only agency that gets money from Congress with no questions asked and no favors granted is the CIA.

If public television wants to continue ETV's tradition of "narrowcasting," if it chooses to remain charmingly amateur and keeps its good intentions under control, it can count on the continued blessings of the commercial networks. The heads of CBS, NBC and ABC all solemnly pledged support in the Senate hearing. They have even, at one time or another, offered gifts of cash and equipment to the noncommercial babe in its unlabeled swaddling clothes, and there has hardly been a dry eye on Madison Avenue as a result. This has not all been blatherskite and buncombe. The networks once believed that a better noncommercial service would relieve them of the obligation to make better programs themselves; they may believe it still. But the moment PTV decides to do adventurous work, to enlighten, delight, unsettle outrage and ultimately inspire the nation as a fine teacher can inspire a pupil, then it can also rely on the undying enmity of the commercial networks.

The hurricane warnings are already aloft. Broadcasting magazine, in a recent editorial, referred to noncommercial television as "subsidized TV" (as if commercial broadcasters were not being subsidized by a government that allows them to use public airwaves for a token franchise fee) and then argued: "The issue is whether the expanded noncommercial system is to operate from a dominant center of federally oriented power or from many stations with individual objectives and independent means." The National Association of Broadcasters obviously favors many stations, many objectives and many means. The more the merrier. The weaker the better.

Commercial broadcasters have another good reason to fear PTV. They know they may be called upon, like recalcitrant divorces, to cough up partial support, either through excise taxes on the sale of television sets or annual taxes on their broadcast franchises. Senate Bill 1160 may get through the House this year, but the monumental battles will be fought next year over money—a proper PTV system might require $100 million a year or more. And underlying the inevitable dispute over money is the fundamental issue of power: the power to provide news for a nation which has no national newspaper; the power to provide programs for children who spend more time each week in wront of television sets than inside schools; the power to speak out on great issues without fear of reprisal from advertisers or politicians, the power to be unassailably right or deafeningly wrong.

It has an awesome power, this television. In late June, NET will be the American participant in an eighteen-nation broadcast called "Our World," relayed by satellite with a total potential audience of a half-billion viewers. It is a dangerous power. But the dangers can easily be exaggerated. This is not Hitler's Germany, and McGeorge Bundy is not Goebbels. Government censorship is always a threat, but so is self-censorship born of timidity, stupidity or fear. It all comes back to fear, the worst foe of all. To have a fighting chance in the United States, public television must be bold enough to go for broke. It must demand network interconnection, and a strong central authority, and vigorous affiliates as well. It must demand the widest possible financial base, with reliable sources of private funds and nonreviewable sources of public funds. Its programing must be a Joseph's coat, with patches of the very special and patches of the very general and only execellence to hold them together. And the men who run it must always be considered temporary proprietors, or the only permanent proprietor must be the public.

Public television must look upon commercial television as an enemy at worst, a rival at best. This is as it should be. A little competition for the sales broadcasting monopoly can only benefit both sides, just as it has done in Britain, where a commercial network was set up to give the BBC's noncommercial monopoly a run for its money. With enough public support, with guidance in the House as wise and forceful as it was under Sen. John O. Pastore in the Senate and with a reasonable amount of luck, public television could have a healthy embattled and productively hectic future.

Would it be biased? Of course it would, and of course it should be—biased every which way. If the network staff bias is liberal, the affiliates' boards of directors will be conservative. Instead of puttering around with unbiased documentaries that say nothing with style and grace, public television should take any good library for its model: not balanced books, but a balance among unbalanced books. It should find ways of seeing through smogs and fogs and showing us the real world. It should muster all the intelligence and artistry it can find and bring it to bear on the goofy, ghastly, gorgeous spectacle of modern life with an abiding conviction—or faith, if you will—that there are truths and solutions after all, and that sweet reason can track them down.

The American Communists—Who Are They?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 5, 1967

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Raymond J. McHugh, Washington bureau chief of the Copley News Service, has written an article entitled "The American Communists," which appeared in the June issue of the Copley quarterly review Seminar. His article follows:

THE AMERICAN COMMUNISTS—WHO ARE THEY?

(By Raymond J. McHugh)

The scene was a courtroom in Minneapolis. The year was 1934. A young son of a Finnish immigrant was on trial for helping incite a riot.

"You are wiling to fight and overthrow this government?" asked the state's attorney.

"Absolutely."

"You are willing to take up arms and overthrow the constituted authorities?"

"When the time comes, yes."

The young rioter called himself "Gus Hall," although he was born Arvo Gust Halberg in Virginia, Minn., on Oct. 8, 1910. He had joined the Communist Party as a teenager. He had already attended the Lenin School in Moscow.

Today at 56 Gus Hall is the number one Communist in the United States. He is general secretary of the Communist Party, USA.

He lives in a comfortable $30,000 home in New York, travels about that city in a chauffeur-driven car, tours the country denouncing its leaders and skips about the world for conferences with Communist leaders in Moscow, Paris, Montevideo, Leningrad, Sevastopol, Yalta, Ulan Bator, East Berlin, Budapest, Prague, Warsaw, Sofia and Bucharest.

He gets red carpet treatment in every Red capital in the world. He is sought after by leaders of the so-called "new left" in the United States and has been a featured speaker of a dozen college campuses.

Official U.S. documents describe Hall as a "dedicated, hard-core Communist . . . completely loyal to the Soviet Union."

"His whole life has been spent in undermining the security of this country for the benefit of Russia and the Communist cause," says a top American security agent.

The sixties have been good years for Gus Hall.

He spent most of the fifties in prison after he was convicted of violating the anti-subversive Smith Act. He jumped bail and tried to escape to Mexico, but he was caught by FBI agents in 1951. After his release in 1959 he was elected to his post as general secretary.

Since then, Hall has worked toward one goal—political respectability for the Communist Party.

A series of Supreme Court decisions that pulled most of the teeth from the Smith and McCarran acts cleared his path. The passions of the civil rights issue and the controversy that has surrounded American policy in Vietnam gave him an audience.

For Gus Hall, the climax of his career as a Communist must have come last June when the Party staged a "national convention" in New York City. He was not only reelected general secretary, but he personally dictated every decision, dominated every discussion.

He accuses the United States of "criminal imperialist aggression" in Vietnam. He calls for an end to the bombing of North Vietnam, the withdrawal of all foreign troops and the establishment of a coalition government in Saigon which would include the Communist Viet Cong.

He recently directed his national committee to combine its "peace" campaign with efforts already underway to infiltrate civil rights groups and incite racial violence. He has ordered special campaigns aimed at young people in colleges, and industry, seeking to capitalize on anti-Vietnam sentiment, poverty, racial imbalance and the not always clear-headed idealism of youth.

Special Communist Party "youth groups" are being organized. Director J. Edgar Hoover of the FBI says flatly that the W.E.B. DuBois clubs springing up on many campuses are Communist-linked and that the Red also are active in the Students for a Democratic Society (SDS), the flag-carrier for the so-called "New Left."

Hall directs his Communist party apparatus from New York, but he is not alone. His top lieutenants include the notorious and the little known.

One is Herbert Aptheker, chief theoretician of the Communist Party, USA, and an unsuccessful candidate for Congress from New York in 1966.

Although the party's national convention claimed political "legitimacy" and although Aptheker admitted he was a Communist in campaign literature, he choose to run as a "peace party" candidate. The word "Communist" did not appear on the ballot.

Despite this, Aptheker polled only 2,800 votes—about 2 per cent of the district total. Rep. Edna Kelly, a Democrat who won, called Aptheker's racist-oriented, anti-Vietnam campaign "the most scurrilous thing I've ever seen."

Aptheker, 52, a World War II Army officer, is an articulate speaker and like Hall he has appeared on several college campuses. At Lawrence College in Appleton, Wis., in January he drew an overflow crowd of 400 in the student union for a speech about the "inevitability of communism."

It was Aptheker who, in 1966, accompanied Prof. Staughton Lynd of Yale and SDS leader Thomas Hayden to Hanoi for an unauthorized meeting with North Vietnamese Communist leaders. His daughter Bettina has gained notoriety as one of the leading student "rebels" at the University of California in Berkeley.

A lesser-known Hall lieutenant is Henry Winston, who was elected national chairman at the June convention. In a titular sense, Winston heads the Communist Party, USA, but Hall is the acknowledged power.

Winston, 53, has been a Communist since 1931. He was imprisoned for Smith Act violations in 1956. His sentence was commuted in 1961 by the late President Kennedy and Winston was allowed to go to Moscow for medical treatment for a brain tumor. He is almost blind.

"Actually, however " says a government report, "he was put on exhibition by the Soviets as an example of cruel and inhuman treatment of a Negro by 'American imperialism.' "

He appears frequently at Red youth rallies and often supports the "black power" theory among Negro groups. At the party's convention he sought to gain Negro support with the claim that he was the first of his race ever named national chairman of a major U.S. political party.

Other members of the Communist hierarchy in the United States include:

Mortimer Daniel Rubin, 35—National organizational secretary of the party, he is responsible for the operations and selections of personnel. He received a BA degree in political science at Swarthmore University in 1953 and an LLB from the University of Pennsylvania in 1958. A party member since student days, Rubin has been particularly active in youth affairs and helped organize the W.E.B. DuBois Clubs.

Dorothy Healey, 52—Chairman of the Southern California district of the Communist Party. She maintains a headquarters in Los Angeles. She also is a member of the national committee. In a recent speech at California Western University in San Diego, she said she has been a Communist for 37 years and an atheist. Her San Diego speech constituted a violent attack on U.S. actions in Vietnam.

Bettina Aptheker Kurzweil, 22—Probably the best-known young Communist in the United States as a result of her soap box oratory at the University of California at Berkeley, she is the product of a Communist family.

Urged on by her father, Herbert Aptheker, she plunged into party activities as a student at Erasmus High School in New York City. She entered the University of California in

1962 and is still enrolled as a history major. She was elected to the party's national committee at the June 1966 convention.

Franklin Delano Alexander, 25—National chairman of the W. E. B. DuBois Clubs, Alexander is a native of Chicago and now a resident of Los Angeles. His sister, Charlene Alexander Mitchell, has been identified by a congressional committee as a prominent Communist. Alexander has reportedly been involved in Communist affairs since student days at Los Angeles High School.

Philip Bart, 64—Secretary of the Ohio district; active in party affairs since the 1930s; born in Warsaw, Poland, and a graduate of the Lenin School in Moscow; former general manager of the *Daily Worker*.

Gilbert Green, 60—Chairman of New York district; party member since 1925; sentenced to prison in 1949 for conspiracy to violate the Smith Act while acting as chairman of the Illinois district; released on parole in 1963, he is now working in New York; he is regarded as a possible challenger to Gus Hall for top party position of general secretary.

James E. Jackson, 52—Member of National Committee; a Negro; a delegate to the 22nd and 23rd Communist Congress in Moscow in 1965 and 1966; publisher of the East Coast newspaper, *The Worker*.

Arnold Johnson, 62—Public relations director of the party; holds bachelor of arts and masters degrees; studied law for more than a year and once studied for the ministry; joined party in 1936; sentenced to three-year prison term in 1953 for violation of the Smith Act.

Anthony Krchmarek, 69—Chairman of the Ohio district; has traveled frequently to Russia and is active in the party's trade union efforts.

Sam Kushner, 51—National Committee member, Los Angeles reporter for *People's World*, West Coast publication.

Claude Lightfoot, 57—National vice chairman of the U.S. Communist party, chairman of the Illinois District and chairman of the party's Negro commission; figured in a recent Chicago scandal when city officials accused him of being a "slumlord."

Albert Jason Lima, 59—Chairman of the Northern California district; joined party in the 1930s and was a Communist party candidate for Congress in 1940; attended Communist party congress in Moscow in 1960.

Hyman Lumer, 57—National education secretary; holds a doctor of philosophy degree.

George Meyers, 54—Trade-union secretary; served prison term under Smith Act; was delegate to the 1960 congress in Moscow.

Burt Nelson, 56—Chairman of the Northwest district, regarded as an expert on Marxist theory, including the view that dissent within the party is unacceptable, but that this is not undemocratic.

Irvin Potash, 64—Organizer of the New Jersey district and former national labor secretary; a charter member of the Communist party, USA; born in Russia, once deported and now under Immigration Service supervision.

Betty Gannett Tormey, 59—Executive editor of *Political Affairs*, monthly theoretical organ of the party; a native of Poland, she and Dorothy Healey are vying for recognition as the "first lady of Communism in the United States"—a label once applied to the late Elizabeth Gurley Flynn.

Carl Winter, 60—Editor of *The Worker*, former chairman of the Michigan district and former national trade union secretary. His wife, Helen, is a member of the National Committee.

"The Carpenter" Backs Adoption Opportunity Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 5, 1967

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, one of America's most distinguished labor journals is The Carpenter, the official publication of the United Brotherhood of Carpenters & Joiners of America.

Because of its fine reputation, I was particularly pleased that The Carpenter, in its June 1967 issue, has given its editorial support to my bill, the Adoption Opportunity Act, H.R. 19.

This legislation would provide a tax deduction to couples for expenses incurred in a legal adoption, including social agency and attorney's fees. The idea is to give adoptive parents some kind of equity with natural parents who may deduct portions of medical expenses involved in a birth, and to encourage more childless couples to adopt, thereby benefiting those children and society as a whole.

The Carpenter states the case for this legislation very well, and I urge the attention of my colleagues to its editorial which follows:

TO ENCOURAGE ADOPTIONS

To anyone who has paced the depressing rows of crib-bound babies in many of the orphanages today, aware of the bleak promise life holds for these unfortunates, the tiniest hope that more of them will find their ways into normal homes is heartwarming news.

Despite the fact that the number of stable, young and loving homesteads is rising, as well as the number of children available for adoption, agencies have had to actively solicit the placement of babies. One of the biggest single obstacles to getting these homes and babies together may simply be money. In the most desirable homes, where the prospective parents are young, the burden falls hardest. Adoption expenses of 10% of annual income are routine, and they can go much higher than that.

Adoptive parents, unlike so-called "natural" parents (what could be more "natural" than the warm, normal relationship that develops between an adoptive child and parents?), must think long and hard about a decision to start a family. With clear choice, they must thoroughly explore all of the factors and undergo an extensive period of self-examination with the help of their agency. A significant factor in their planning has to be money. Non-adoptive parents often accept the inevitable and rejoice that the cost of having a baby is somewhat alleviated by the tax deduction.

Adoptive parents now have no comparable tax deduction, but Rep. Clement J. Zablocki (D-Wis.) has introduced a bill in the House (H. 19) which would give equal tax treatment to adoptive parents. He sees broad social benefit in this, both from the standpoint of the children, and the state agencies which must now support unadopted children. His Adoption Opportunity Act would allow adoptive parents to deduct up to $1,250 of the costs.

It is logical to allow an adoptive parent the same standing before the tax structure as non-adoptive parents. The philosophy behind the allowance for nonadoptive parents is to give tax relief so they may have more to spend on the care of their baby. Adopted babies need care, too!

We think Rep. Zablocki's bill makes hard sense. If you do too, why not let your own Congressman and Senator know?

In Reality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 31, 1967

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, an old friend of mine whom I have had admiration since his high school days has been so moved by the status of the world today that he felt a compulsion to express himself in verse hoping to fake his opinions more concise and effective.

Clay Calhoun, now one of New Orleans' most outstanding business leaders, was an all-America fullback of Loyola of the South during his college days and a great competitor at the Jesuit High School in New Orleans before that. His great patriotism is always evident. I know a majority would like to stand up for what is right and be heard—but it is always like yelling in a well, and the majority view is unavoidably silent.

Here at least is one man who is making an effort to express himself in a verse that comes from the heart and says what so many others would like to say. He calls the verse "In Reality" and I commend it to your reading, as follows:

IN REALITY

The Russian objective is world domination.
Their strategy and tactics may vary with location,
But they never veer from this determination.

How can we but realize
That appeasement will not minimize
Their bestial struggle, the world to communize.

Lenin vehemently did resent
The Soviet Empire in Capitalist encirclement,
Saying "twas best to wait a time more propitious
To engage the West, with their bombs prodigious.
This gave the Doves to speculate, mistakenly,
That co-existence was now a possibility.

Impressed with our docility and approbations
The crafty Stalin enhanced this factitious policy
For advantage in diplomatic and trade negotiations.
In this, the Doves of Peace could see
An amelioration of hostility.

The Hawks instead said Red animosity was inveterate
And looked for portent acts not rhetoric.
Befitting Red dichotomy of peace and war, love and hate,
While Stalin was avowing co-existence catholic,
Dimitri Manuilski, his comrade subordinate
Was proclaiming war with Capitalism inevitable.

But aware that they were still superable
Said, while professing a desire for peace and co-existence,
Capitalist nations, stupid and decadent, (he advanced),
Rejoicingly would cooperate in their own destruction.

While jumping at the chance for friendly aberration
They would smash, with surprise,
A lethal blow for our demise.

Duped by this travesty of peaceful co-existence
Stalin's iniquitous crimes were soon expiated.
By some metamorphosis, thought we, 'twas no more dissonance.
Then the abortive agreement at Yalta was consummated.
And Finland, Poland, Latvia, Estonia and Lithuania
Yugoslavia, Hungary, Bulgaria, Austria and Rumania
Czechoslovakia and half of Germany were subjugated
To the Communist dictatorship, which they depreciated.
Is this their version of liberation?
Or is it their relentless aim for world domination?

Had we not timely interceded,
Russia, by the Nazi, would have been defeated.
With England as an ally Nazi Europe was invaded.
Norway, Sweden, Spain and France were liberated,
As was Italy, North Africa and half of Germany;
But each of these now have their sovereignty.
Yet Russia says we are imperialistic.
If our gain was nothing, we must be altruistic.
Who now holds an Empire? Who is imperialistic?

Khrushchev too, a self-styled charlatan,
Easing international tension was his stratagem.
While Brezhnev made it all too clear
That co-existence was just political warfare
To gain the objective of world conquest.
For a Communist world, nothing less.

Like the four horsemen of the Apocalypse
Slaughter, conquest, famine and death
To the four corners, North, East, South and West;
Spreading large scale war and minor tiffs.
By subversion, revolution, conquest then enslavement,
The Russians sow the seeds for our abolishment
Furtively on each and every continent,
Their goal, world domination, is intransigent.

Bit by bit they will take it all
If their containment we forestall.

Once engulfed in Red entrapment
There are no avenues for renouncement.
Remember Poland and Hungary too?
Their enslavement, they tried to eschew,
But were slaughtered by Russian armament.
The Soviets hear no voice from the dissident.

Conducting limited "wars of liberation"
Vowed Nikita, with all deliberation,
As long as Capitalists are in this civilization.
Ghana, Kenya, Tanganyika, Berundi and the Congo
All were victims of Red techniques terroristic.
And who can recall the Bay of Pigs without feeling sick?
To use our air strength, the Doves considered impolitic.
Now Cuba is a bastion for propaganda and terroristic training
To subvert and conquer South America is their aiming.

Soviet neutrality still proclaiming,
Fomenting and fighting wars with proxies
Then accusing us for intervening,
Calling us the aggressor, are paradoxes.

The only barrier that the Reds recognize
Is a show of force with no compromise.
First Korea then at Lebanon
We stood our ground until they'd withdrawn.
When free China to Formosa did retreat
We held them on the mainland with the Seventh Fleet.

The Russian diurnal quest for domination
Keeps the world in consternation.
All South Asia they now jeopardize.
Following the same pattern, the Viets to Communize;
By subversion, revolution and aggression.
When importuned for assistance by Saigon
Incumbent was our intercession,
Or abnegate our SEATO treaty;
An act by which there'd be no amnesty.
Liberty must survive for us to be alive, is a verity.
The Doves that say it is not our war, we are intervening,
Would wait to be invaded instead of buffering.
Our life and death struggle for freedom, they are hampering.
By their policy of appeasing and accommodating,
The cause of peace they are obviating.

But we will soon be profligate
The way this war, we perpetrate.
Giving refuge to prime targets, our bombs fall awaste;
It's no wonder that this war cannot end in haste.
Impeded with restrictions by the Department of State,
Protecting our image and world opinion,
Our soldiers are forgotten and their lives they forsake,
Destroying faith in our own dominion.
(More serious by far, make no mistake.)

Why worry about world opinion, 'tis an anachronism
When one in every three is controlled by Communism.

We should forget about fear of escalation
And destroy military targets regardless of location,
With no concern for surrounding population.
Villagery placements were the V.C.'s machination.
Assuming that from attack we would refrain
Controlled by what the world might be saying.

But what of the lives of our youth they've cost?
Let our military handle this holocaust,
Or have the Department of State do the fighting
And the military try making peace inviting.

To make agreements with Russia is ludicrous
Fifty or more have they broken,
But the Doves are still presumptuous.
From the mouth of Lenin, these words were spoken:
"Agreements are like pie crust, made to be broken."

We'll believe that co-existence is auspicious
When from the plan of world domination, they've recanted.
When peace and freedom is ubiquitous.
When in Poland and Hungary, enslavement is supplanted.
When the Finns, Germans, Czechs, and the rest, have sovereignty,
Then, and only then, we'll believe there can be no enmity.

Until such time when there's been rejuvenation
We'll join the Hawks and share their skepticism.
Ever mindful of Stalin's provocation
That like an overripe fruit, rotten from within,
From the tree of liberty, we'll fall into the hands of Communism.

Great danger lies within our Country
Unless we punish with condignity,
All those who adhere to our enemy
Giving aid and comfort with immunity.

Lincoln, with perspicuity, did record,
"All our strength is in our Union
All our danger in discord."
Heed we must to his wisdom
Or moribund will be freedom.

Those who preach treachery and law denunciation,
If not subject to our law, should be subject to deportation.
Nor should we breach allegiance to our Constitution;
Where there's been aberration there should be restitution.

If we can stave the trend to autocracy
And be loyal to God and our Country
Then this will forever be
The Land of the Brave and the Home of the Free.

—CLAY CALHOUN.

Crisis in Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. S. JOHNNY WALKER
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 5, 1967

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to put myself on record as favoring any action the administration takes to preserve the territorial integrity of Israel.

In my opinion, the United States has a much bigger stake in the affairs of the Middle East than it does in Southeast Asia. I already have informed the administration of my feelings on this matter.

I do not, in any way, mean to imply that I will support any action that would jeopardize our military operations or the lives of our men in Vietnam.

The Arab nations, despite untold riches, have stultified, while Israel, with only a tiny foothold on the African continent, has forged ahead in social and material progress, proving, if nothing else, that it is people, not things, that make for greatness in nations. The first reports from the Middle East battlefields indicate that Israel, although surrounded on three sides by its enemy is making a heroic stand.

The imagination is hard put to envision the spectacle of the United States standing idly by while the Middle East becomes a slaughterhouse.

Essentially, the question which precipitated the crisis is a legal one. The suggestion that the International Court of Justice at The Hague be given jurisdiction still has merit, despite the fighting now going on. Both Israel and the United Arab Republic are members of the Court.

If both sides in the Middle East conflict would cease hostilities and accept a decision of the Court, it would be a tremendous victory for reason over emotion. It is still not too late to take this course.

If either side in the dispute refused to accept the International Court's jurisdiction, then the United States or the United Nations should seek an advisory opinion from the Court on the issue of free passage through the Gulf of Aqaba.

I believe the United States should reaffirm its desire to settle international disputes by the rules of reason and law, rather than by the irrational use of armed might.

Legality and Loyalty in Rhodesia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 5, 1967

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, yesterday there appeared in the Washington Post an article by former Secretary of State, Dean Acheson, with reference to the illegal Rhodesian sanctions. Mr. Atcheson was one of the first to point out this illegality. I insert his article in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The article follows:

LEGALITY AND LOYALTY IN RHODESIA

(By Dean Acheson, former Secretary of State)

The central issue involved in the assault by the United Nations and the United Kingdom against Rhodesia is its patent illegality despite a layer of bland sanctimony.

Happily, there has now been published a little book by C. Burton Marshall, "Crisis Over Rhodesia: A Skeptical View," whose careful scholarship and lively writing makes easy the duty of every member of Congress, every editor, every citizen who feels an obligation to keep track of what his Government is up to. After he reads it, he can have an informed opinion whether this country has ever before engaged in so unprovoked and unwarranted an injury to a friendly country.

When I made similar comments at the time of the second U.N. call for a coercive boycott against Rhodesia, Ambassador Goldberg undertook to defend it and our joining in it. As I read his arguments, the thought persisted that I had heard something like them before in another connection. Of course, it was at the time of the assault on South Korea.

Andrei Vishinsky found comfort in the same argument that South Korea was not a "state" but part of another "state" (which the Russians had divided). The invasion of South Korea by North Korea was not an aggression but a civil war. Hence the Soviet Union could aid North Korea with arms and military guidance, presumably because it approved of the North Koreans' objectives. The Charter, by Article 2, Paragraph 7, debarring the United Nations from intervening in Korea's internal affairs, forbade it to give aid to South Korea.

Goldberg goes a little further, arguing that Rhodesia is not a "state" because it is part of another "state." Therefore it possesses none of the immunities of a "state" protected by Article 2's prohibition against interference in its internal affairs. So when the British government declared Rhodesia's constitution revoked and sought to reduce that country to the status of a crown colony governed by a royal governor, the U.N. had the power to demand that its members under their Charter obligations must join in a boycott aimed at strangling Rhodesia into submission.

By the same reasoning, he can argue that if strangulation does not work, the same incantation by the Security Council—that Rhodesia threatens a breach of the peace—should require the members to join an armed crusade against Salisbury and throw all southern Africa into chaos.

"SOMETHING NASTY"

Elspeth Huxley, a British friend of Africa, where she grew up, and of the United States, sadly calls to us for help, not incitement to disaster:

"We in Britain cannot now extricate ourselves from the mess. We are on the escalator, going down, and there's something nasty in the basement. The United States is about the only hope we have. If it could persuade Mr. Wilson to snap out of his imperialist dreams of flags, rebels, governors, oaths of allegiance and so forth, there is no reason why a reasonable compromise that would secure the political advancement of Rhodesia's Africans without first obliging them to starve to death could not be reached."

To which Marshall adds:

"Policy is out on a limb. An account of how it got there will serve its purpose if it helps arouse concern for finding a way back from the predicament."

Marshall first tells us what we badly need to know, the history of Rhodesia's constitutional relationship with Great Britain. Rhodesia has never been supported by the British Exchequer or been under British administration. The constitution of 1923 extended an autonomy already well established. Its status was that of Canada, Australia and New Zealand 20 years earlier.

When at that time I visited my grandparents in Toronto, no one doubted that, whatever one called Canada's relation to Whitehall, it was wholly voluntary. Loyalty in Ontario ran to the Crown. Similarly, Salisbury regarded itself, and was, a self-governing member of an empire fast changing to a commonwealth.

Dominion status could have been had for the asking when World War II distracted the attention of governments. Rhodesia had executive accountability to a Rhodesian parliament with legislative autonomy. It handled its own foreign commerce, posted consuls abroad and participated in Commonwealth affairs on a virtual parity with the dominions.

A NEW CONSTITUTION

After 30 years of constitutional self-government, Rhodesia—voluntarily and on British urging—entered the ill-starred experiment of federation with Northern Rhodesia and Nyasaland. When these were preparing to withdraw and to become, with British agreement, the independent republics of Zambia and Malawi, a new constitution for Rhodesia was worked out and put into effect in 1961 with more elaborate provisions for the interests of the indigenous people. Rhodesia was led to believe that this constitution would be the basis for independence.

However, the Southern Hemisphere majority in the U.N. and the British Labor Party joined to bedevil the Conservative government in London and the government of Rhodesia. First, the United Nations majority sought to have the British government assume the burdens and pains of coercing Rhodesia to accept majority rule (which none of its U.N. advocates practiced). Later, however, Harold Wilson shrewdly sought to us the U.N. to assume the burden of doing what Britain could not, and would not, do: coerce Rhodesia into submitting to crown colony status.

The switch in the British position from that put forward by Sir Alec Home to that put forward by Wilson has played havoc with the ideology of the dialectics. Until recently, the British government asserted, with United States support, that, contrary to U.N. resolutions, Rhodesia was self-governing and that Britain did not possess the legal power to do to Rhodesia what the U.N. demanded.

Wilson now asserts, and Goldberg agrees for the United States, that Rhodesia is not self-governing and that, therefore, the U.N. has the power to do to Rhodesia what Wilson demands: reduce her to crown colony status and coerce all nations to help in the effort.

TWO HIGH HURDLES

To reach this conclusion requires overcoming two considerable hurdles: one, to lay the basic prerequisite to U.N. power to invoke mandatory sanctions by a finding of fact that Rhodesia had committed or threatened a breach of the peace or aggression; the other, the Charter prohibition against U.N. interference in the internal affairs of any state.

Regardling the first, Rhodesia—Marshall tells us—has done literally nothing except sever its connection with the British government (though not with the Crown). This, while rebellion, is certainly not aggression. Rhodesia has made no attack or threat of attack against anyone. The British government has denied any threat to attack Rhodesia. The suggestion that Rhodesia's neighbors might be driven to attack her for failing to practice universal suffrage seems improbable since, as already pointed out, they do not practice it themselves.

To this, reply is made that the existence of a threat to the peace may not be questioned once the Security Council has stated this conclusion. In short, the physical integrity of a small country and the wellbeing and livelihood of its people may be attacked by the U.N. if only the Security Council states the unsupported conclusion that it threatens the peace.

One would not be willing to accept so monstrous a doctrine as seriously advanced if Marshall did not tell us that just this occurred in the present case. The original British resolution calling for mandatory sanctions did not contain any finding of a threat to the peace. When the omission was pointed out, the desired conclusion was inserted without supporting facts. In short, says Marshall, it is enough to stop criticism of a pie to say that a baker made it.

A SEMANTIC BALLOON

However, this is not all which the mystic finding of threat to the peace accomplishes. It not only, in itself furnishes jurisdiction in the U.N. to coerce, but it removes the Charter prohibition against U.N. interference in the internal affairs of any state.

We have noted the argument that Rhodesia is not a "state." This is based on the assertion that a self-governing entity is not a "state" unless other "states" recognize it as a "state." This semantic balloon is pricked by Marshall's question: If so, how did the first state come into existence?

Clearly, what the Charter sought to protect against action by its members in association was what international law had protected for hundreds of years against interference by its members individually—that is, the internal affairs of political entities having the right and power to regulate them. Rhodesia was certainly such an entity.

To meet this confrontation with reality, a last desperate sophism is advanced. Article 2, paragraph 7 exempts from its scope internal interference incidental to suppression of a breach of or threat to the peace. So it is said a finding of a threat to the peace eliminates this Article and paragraph.

At last, Marshall's infinite patience wears thin. This is like arguing, he says, that since firemen may enter a house to put out fires but may not do so to interfere with the domestic affairs of the occupants, they may avoid the prohibition merely by sounding the fire alarm.

To review this sterile argument merely to score points would not be worth the effort. But to do so, as Marshall does, to reveal it for the sham it is and as involving the United States in a dangerous and reckless adventure, deserves the careful attention of us all.

America's Challenge to Youth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT B. (BOB) MATHIAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 5, 1967

Mr. MATHIAS of California. Mr. Speaker, I am very proud to call to the attention of the House of Representatives an outstanding youth group in the congressional district I represent, in Delano, Calif.

Established on February 24, 1963, the Father Garces Circle No. 1625, of the Columbia Squires, is an example to the entire community of Delano.

A good friend of mine, Bob Brooks, founded the organization and still remains active in all its programs. Certainly, his leadership and dedication to these young boys has meant a great deal to the continuing success of this group.

Briefly, the Columbian Squires are sponsored by the Knights of Columbus, and serve boys aged 13 to 18. They center their activities in four general areas: spiritual, social, civic-cultural and physical. All programs have as their underlying theme the advancement and betterment of the individual.

Some of their more notable volunteer activities have included work on behalf of the American Red Cross and the Kern County retarded children.

I also want to direct particular attention to a recent achievement of the Delano Circle of the Columbian Squires. In competition with more than 900 circles throughout the world and a membership in excess of 30,000, the Delano Circle was recognized as the "No. 1 International Circle of the Year."

Last April, I had the pleasure of addressing a dinner meeting sponsored by the Squires, and at this time I would like to share with my colleagues some of the remarks in my speech. While these ideas were directed to the Columbian Squires, I hope that other young people may also benefit from the message therein.

AMERICA'S CHALLENGE TO YOUTH

A British author, once commented that "Youth was so wonderful that it was a shame to waste it on the young." . . . But his attention to the condition of the younger generation of his day was hardly new. As long ago as ancient Greece the philosophers were lamenting that the young people of their day had lost all respect for the elders, and that the world would surely suffer because they were so irresponsible.

But we're here today, not to join in these laments, but to recognize the talents that this particular young generation possess. Perhaps as no other generation before, you are involved and aware of the world around you. Current morality, the bomb, Vietnam, the draft—all these and many other crucial issues find their way into your magazines, your class rooms, and your discussions. You are, without a doubt, the aware generation.

And few times in history have demanded awareness that this era does today. There was a time when America was isolated from the affairs of other nations by the physical barriers of the two oceans. But with the advent of the airplane, and particularly the jet, the most remote areas of the world are just a few hours away. And, as this nation has assumed a position of leadership in the free world, we can no longer be self-centered.

What does this all mean to you? I think, a great deal, not only because, as you have heard so often, today's youth are the leaders of tomorrow, but also because you have a definite and constructive role to play right now. The idea gets around that 21 is some sort of magic age—that citizenship and participation begin then, and only then. Nothing could be further from the truth. The fate of a nation rests upon the opinions of its young people. This means that the demands and challenges of the twentieth century must be met by you, not only in your future role as leaders, but in your present opportunities and roles as young people.

The first role you have is one of you share with all those who live in a democracy—to be well-informed of current events. A dictatorship is actually more efficient if the people who are ruled are NOT aware of what is going on. Then the tyrant can get away with all he wants, with little fear of discovery. But a democracy rests on the premise that the citizens are intelligent enough to choose their own government . . . A good representative government, if the citizens do not even know what is going on around them. What a farce that premise becomes. In other words, this democracy can continue to be a democracy only if the people who live in this country are informed on the crucial issues that confront us. Only through knowledge of the conditions around us can we prevent the erosion of our freedoms that can only take place in the shadows of ignorance and complacency.

People who are informed can exert their influence.

Let me give you an example.

A housewife in one of the Western States read in the papers that hunters and ranchers were killing and raiding herds of wild ponies, and that these beautiful animals were slowly being wiped out. This informed citizen wasn't content to read about it and sit home and do nothing. She began action that finally resulted in legislation enacted by Congress providing protection for those wild ponies by the National Park Service.

The story about the housewife points out the importance of participation. If that woman had read the papers, thought how bad it was that the ponies were being wiped out, and then did nothing, those animals would be gone by now. But she coupled her knowledge with action, and out of that combination came constructive results. Participation, however, doesn't require that you start a national campaign. There are many things that you, as young people, can do to become involved in politics.

Really, one of the best ways can be found in your school, and in its student government. Student government, or student council, or whatever you call it, is an excellent place to learn the workings of our system of government. First, it's Representative. All the students select a few students to decide upon their rules, plan their activities and determine other matters. Second, it's democratic. in that all vote for the few who finally represent them. But valuable experience does not limit itself merely to those who get elected. Those who run for office will learn about campaigning, with all its trials and sometime triumphs. You learn the art of building a platform, of making speeches, and see just how much is really involved. Those of you who are elected will learn the responsibility for making decisions for many others than just yourselves. And those who vote will learn to evaluate a campaign, and to try to pick the best candidate based on his merits. Thus, student government is the essence of the workings of a democratic republic such as ours, as well as being an excellent method of becoming involved in politics.

To the man on the street, politics is likely to be directly connected and limited to the major political parties. But there is a place for you here also. Both parties are eager to have young people working with them, and they have organizations designed specifically with you in mind. Whether you are a Young Democrat or a Young Republican, the experience is as invaluable as well as fun. Political parties need workers to pass out literature, to work in headquarters, and to perform a hundred other essential tasks.

Such activities as these can prepare you for an even fuller participation in politics in the years to come. The Congressional elections of this last year saw the election of many young Representatives, despite their young age, most of them had extensive preparation in politics.

Challenge awaits each and every one of you young adults here this evening. It's not only a challenge to make something of yourself, to become a success. It's the challenge to make something of this Nation, and of this world. Only through your initiative, your courage, and your determination, can America continue on the road to continued prosperity and freedom. No matter how trite it may sound, and no matter how many times you may have heard it, it's still true, that you are the leaders upon whom this country will rely for her future success.

This is the challenge of America. A challege of high ideas fostered since its birth, a challenge of vast potential yet to be tapped. It must be met by each of us, separately and together. We must all be informed, all be dedicated, all be involved in the crucial affairs of state. It's been said that a chain is no stronger than it's weakest link. That's especially true of a democracy, where all of us rely on each of us to do our part in bearing both the rights and the responsibilities of citizenship.

This is the challenge before you, it's yours to accept or reject. Our future rests with you.

Commerce Department Strengthened by Trowbridge Appointment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 25, 1967

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, there are two requirements which are necessary to assure the successful working of a democratic republic such as we have in the United States. One is the willingness of good men and women to serve their country in appointive public office. The other is wise choice of the right persons for the right jobs. Both of these requirements are fully met in President Johnson's nomination of Alexander B. Trowbridge to be Secretary of Commerce.

Mr. Trowbridge will bring the vigor of youth as well as the moderating influence of experience to this new position. At the age of 37, he has been Acting Secretary of Commerce for the past 4 months. Prior to that, he had served as Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Domestic and International Business. During his tenure in that office he traveled extensively in three other continents, promoting U.S. economic interests throughout the world. He also played an important role in the Federal Government's relationships with the U.S. business community.

In private life, Mr. Trowbridge was an executive in the oil industry—specifically, in the overseas operations of American petroleum firms. He worked in Latin

America and Asia, and at the time he entered public life, he was president and division manager of the Esso Standard Oil Co., of Puerto Rico.

Born in New Jersey, Mr. Trowbridge received his early education at Phillips Academy, and was a cum laude graduate of Princeton University. Indicative of his interest in public service, Mr. Trowbridge was a member of the International Interne Group at the United Nations between school years. During the Korean conflict, he served as a commissioned officer in the Marine Corps and won the Bronze Star. He is currently a major in the Marine Corps Reserve.

To sum up, it would be difficult to imagine a person better qualified for this office. This nomination reflects credit upon the President, upon Mr. Trowbridge, and upon the Nation as a whole.

A Check-Up Doesn't Mean It's Cancer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 5, 1967

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, an editorial appearing in Ward's Automotive Yearbook for 1967 by the publisher of this authoritative periodical in its field, Robert B. Powers, addresses itself, calmly and reasonably, to a special problem that has arisen as a result of the publicizing of automobile callbacks. Mr. Powers points out that auto manufacturers have been recalling cars for adjustments for years without fanfare, but that now, in view of the often highly emotional atmosphere that has been created concerning vehicle safety, press reports regarding these car recalls are sensationalized and cause unwarranted concern in the public mind.

So that a balanced appraisal may be made of this situation, I insert in the RECORD the editorial, entitled "A Check-Up Doesn't Meant It's Cancer." I commend it to the attention of all concerned with automobile safety:

A CHECK-UP DOES NOT MEAN IT IS CANCER

(By Robert B. Powers)

It was the second best automotive year of the century.

The year of 1966 was also the industry's worst year in federal regimentation.

The encroachment of the government was not entirely unexpected. It was only a question of "when." The drug industry has gone through federal scrutiny. Packaging is succumbing. Crime had its day in court as long ago as Kefauver. But while products can be controlled, dope, punks and the mafia are still with us and growing.

Historically, too, the federal government took over the regulation of the ships at sea, the railroads, the airlines—all systems of transportation.

Only the auto industry remained. Now it too must listen intently to its legislative betters in Washington.

In the course of time—and perhaps billions of dollars later—the industry that over the years has adjusted itself to higher costs and growing demands of labor will adjust itself to federal control of product as well.

The instinct for survival is as strong in business as it is in man, himself.

One needless harassment, however, is the government's pointed suggestion that all call backs be publicized by the auto makers.

Call backs for both minor and major engineering changes and defects are nothing new in the auto industry. Historically, the manufacturer—on his own—has pursued such a policy as an important part of providing a continually better automobile.

We know of no manufactured product that is so carefully tested both before and *after* it leaves the factory.

In 1916, Willys-Overland, on its own, recalled to the factory 35,000 automobiles whose rear axles proved faulty. The cost was staggering. It was an expensive good will gesture worthy of a news release, but none was made.

Why not let the industry pursue its long-established and successful recall program without the fanfare of alarming national publicity?

When the public reads about the recall of 5,000 and sometimes 100,000 models of a car, the inference is that the cars are unsafe and that the buyer has been duped.

Some of the poor sales performance of the 1967 model cars can be attributed to this confusion and misunderstanding.

In car call backs, the government simply demands what the industry for years has been doing voluntarily.

In a car as in a man a check-up doesn't mean the patient has cancer.

Why scare the wits out of the car buyer who contributes so mightily to the prosperity of our country and the tax-take of the federal government?

Carl E. Steiger, Distinguished Citizen of Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD

OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 5, 1967

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, today a distinguished citizen, Mr. Carl E. Steiger, of Oshkosh, Wis., will join the Secretary General of the United Nations, U Thant, in receiving an honorary doctor of laws degree from the University of Wisconsin.

Mr. Steiger, the father of Congressman WILLIAM A. STEIGER, has served his city, State, and Nation with distinction. It is fitting that the university he served so well as president of its board of regents should bestow this well-deserved honor.

Mr. Speaker, I join the citizens of Wisconsin in congratulating Mr. Steiger and thanking him for his many contributions. I include as part of my remarks an editorial from the Oshkosh Daily Northwestern in recognition of his accomplishments:

WELL DESERVED

Recognition to be given by the University of Wisconsin at Madison in June to an Oshkosh man is tribute well deserved. At that time Carl E. Steiger will be presented an honorary doctor of laws degree in company with U Thant, secretary-general of the United Nations.

The latter is better known, of course, around the world because of his position. But he is known only as a name, as the occupant of a position much in the news.

The former is known, particularly in Oshkosh by his "home town" neighbors, as a man who gets things done, a man to turn to for advice and help. But it isn't just his home town that has felt his influence. Like the UW whose board of regents he served as president and whose slogan is that "the borders are the borders of the state," Mr. Steiger has spread his helping hand far and wide.

He is an excellent choice for recognition now by the University which he served so well.

Ho Chi Minh Sends 7,000 Troops Into South Vietnam Each Month

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 5, 1967

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, every citizen of the United States should read the following article which appeared in the Washington Star on May 30:

TIME ON SIDE OF VIET REDS, HANOI GENERAL TELLS ARMY

(By Bernard Gwertzman)

A top North Vietnamese general, in a secret analysis of the Vietnam war, says the United States will give up rather than fight "for a long time."

Asserting that the United States is "unable to endure the hardships" of a long, drawn out war, Maj. Gen. Tran Do, deputy political officer of the Viet Cong armed forces and an alternate member of the North Vietnam Communist Party Central Committee, has urged his compatriots to avoid setting any timetable for victory.

He made it clear that he believes the United States can be defeated only over a long period of time—5 to 10 years—and he warns that if the Communists are not determined, "a situation of uncertainty can occur that can damage our decision to fight for a long time . . . we can become doubting."

Gen. Do spoke to a conference of representatives of the North Vietnam Army's 7th Division, which was fighting in South Vietnam.

His talk was given last August, and a tape recording of it was captured along with tons of other material in January during Operations Cedar Falls. The State Department made public a transcript of the lengthy talk.

Some of what Do said has been stated in other captured documents made available earlier.

A TYPICAL "HAWK"

Do appears as a typical North Vietnam "hawk." He is against peace talk at this time because, he argues, an end to the fighting can only benefit the Americans and the Saigon government.

"Our basic intention is to win militarily," he says. "We use military victories as decisive factors to end the present conflict. We want to end the war through military victories and not peace negotiations."

He indicated that he regards negotiations as capitulation by one side. Therefore, "we must gain military victories before even thinking of a diplomatic struggle."

"And even when we are fighting diplomatically, we must go on with our war efforts. We must multiply victories if we want to succeed diplomatically," Do said.

U.S. CALLED STUBBORN

He says the U.S. talk about peace negotiations boils down to a demand that "we have to withdraw."

"All that means is that we have to stop fighting, to lay down our weapons. All that means is that we have to let peace lie in the hands of the puppet government (Saigon)," he said.

The Communist view of peace, he said, is "to have the United States withdraw and the National Liberation Front accepted as the only organization which truly represents the South.

Do said someone asked North Vietnam President Ho Chi Minh once what he thought about the Saigon government.

Ho answered, he said, "There is no government in Saigon. There is only a clique of U.S. lackeys in Saigon."

Do said the United States is "stubborn."

"They are not yet disposed to yield to our demands," he said.

Do, obviously referring to East Europeans and nonaligned countries, said "many people in the world are advising us to accept the conditions offered by the Americans."

But he said that those people are afraid of the Americans and "they overestimate the American potential."

"If we accept the American proposals now, we will have to fight again, later on," he said. "We can enjoy peace right now, but not for long. We must not be confused. We must be determined to gain military victories. We must not be hypnotized by the peace mirage."

Do acknowledge that North Vietnam sends about 6,000 to 7,000 troops a month into South Vietnam.

"We can say openly that we certainly have the right and the duty, on a national scale, to help South Vietnam fight the enemy, to help morally and physically," he said. "We can say this bluntly and overtly. . . . There is nothing unusual about sending North Vietnam personnel to South Vietnam.

"Can we be expected not to bring in our men while the enemy brings in his," he said.

North Vietnam publicly has never acknowledged this.

LONG WAR PREDICTED

The captured documents have become extremely important sources for U.S. officials in determining long-range policy. Although most of the documents are now 8 months old, they seem to still represent Hanoi policy and outlook.

Implicit in Do's remarks, for instance, is the belief that the United States is too soft to carry on a long war, despite the immense wealth of the country.

"The enemy wants to conclude the war as early as possible," he said, "but the war is expected to be long, very long, and no one knows when it can be brought to an end."

"It is a very arduous task for the Americans to fight a protracted war although they are well-to-do people. We can endure the hardships of a lengthy war but they are unable to endure the hardships of such a war because they are well-to-do people," he said.

He said the Americans are faced with a deadlock—saying they are determined to go on fighting, but finding it difficult to do so.

COMPLIMENTS AMERICANS

Do said that because "they are stubborn by nature," the Americans may continue fighting, but they "can not continue for a long time."

In a rare compliment, Gen. Do said the Americans "will not let themselves be brought to their knees like the French who only wanted to do away with the fighting once and for all no matter how."

U.S. officials have speculated for many months on whether dissent in the United States contributes to the feeling in Hanoi that it can win a protracted war. Do's speech would tend to substantiate that fear.

Do cited several anti-Johnson demonstrations to bolster his view that the Americans will not be able to stick it out.

Louisiana Upholds Rights of the People To Keep and Bear Arms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. RARICK
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 5, 1967

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, I am in possession of House Concurrent Resolution 127 enacted by the Louisiana Legislature supporting the right of our people to keep and bear arms and opposing any and all attempts by the Congress to enact any antigun legislation.

I insert the Louisiana resolution in full text for our colleagues to review:

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 127

A concurrent resolution to place the Louisiana Legislature on record as opposing passage by the Congress of the United States of Senate Bill No. 1, as amended, and House Resolution No. 5384, and all similar legislation, imposing unreasonable and unwarranted restrictions on the sale, possession and use of firearms by sportsmen and other reputable citizens

Whereas, certain legislation has been introduced in the United States Congress, in particular Senate Bill 1, as amended, and House of Representatives Bill 5384, which would prohibit all mail order sales of firearms to individuals, and all interstate sales of handguns, and would permit such sales only between licensed importers, manufacturers and dealers, thereby placing severe, unreasonable and burdensome restrictions upon reputable citizens who desire or need to purchase any firearm by mail or handgun in interstate commerce, and

Whereas, the issuance of a federal firearms license after proper application had been made would be discretionary with the Secretary with the Secretary of the Treasury, and

Whereas, the "Findings and Declaration" of Senate Bill 1 and House of Representatives Bill 5384 are conflicting and in part erroneous, and

Whereas, the founders of the United States of America provided guarantees of freedom of religion, of speech, of the press and of assembly in the first amendment to the Constitution, and specifically granted to the people the right to defend these freedoms in the second amendment by providing that the right of the people to keep and bear arms should not be infringed, and

Whereas, the proposed firearms legislation as expressed in Senate Bill 1 and House of Representatives Bill 5384, and in bills of similar import introduced in the United States Congress, place severe restrictions and harrassments upon the purchase, use and ownership of firearms by responsible citizens and constitute serious infringement of the Articles of the Bill of Rights, in particular the second, ninth and tenth amendments to the Constitution of the United States, and

Whereas, by their terms and through administrative control, Senate Bill 1 and House of Representatives 5384 and similar legislation discourage and complicate the private acquisition and use of firearms to the extent that the private ownership of firearms might eventually cease, and

Whereas, such restrictive regulations as are contained in the Dodd Bill (S. 1) and the Celler Bill (H.R. 5384) and similar legislation against firearms sales could have a crippling effect on the economy of the multimillion-dollar-a-year sales and services business associated with recreational use of firearms in the state of Louisiana, and would only result in the further loss of American liberty, add to the workload and responsibility of our law enforcement agencies and personnel, and inconvenience and penalize law-abiding citizens, and

Whereas, the accessibility of firearms to all citizens does not contribute significantly to greater crime in the United States, but in fact the ownership of firearms by citizens trained in their use provides a deterrent to crime and to the lawless elements of our society, and

Whereas, the target for preventative legislation should be the crime and the criminal, not the tools used by the perpetrators of crimes, and severe penalties should be imposed on the criminal use of firearms, and

Whereas, Federal excise taxes on sales of firearms and other forms of revenue from special licenses and stamps for recreational hunting provide many millions of dollars annually for the conservation and preservation of wildlife of all kinds, and

Whereas, the passage of Senate Bill 1 and House of Representatives 5384 and similar legislation would greatly curtail the use of firearms by the youth of our Nation for recreational and sporting purposes, and thus prevent many of the young people of the Nation from learning the use of firearms under supervision and control, thereby creating a dangerous situation in later years whereby there would be a great number of inexperienced adults using firearms, and

Whereas, it is in the great interest of the national defense against enemy invasion that the people of the United States be familiar with, accustomed to using, and the owners of, firearms, and

Whereas, the training of all citizens, especially the young people of our Nation, in the safe and proper use of firearms constitutes the best method of reducing the misuse of firearms, by instilling responsibility, self-discipline and safety, and

Whereas, history has shown that in some countries it was partially through registration or exorbitant taxation of weapons and the control of all such weapons by a small percentage of the populace that the democratic form of government of the people, by the people, and for the people was lost, and

Whereas, the proposed legislation contained in Senate Bill 1 and House of Representatives 5384 and similar legislation if passed would in fact place many burdensome restrictions upon all states, local governments and their citizens, and would encroach upon the lawful activities of the states' legislatures and law enforcement bodies, usurping the power of the states to make and enforce laws reasonably regulating the use of firearms and ownership thereof by the citizens of each State, and

Whereas, House of Representatives 5384 is so worded as to place the Congress in the position of establishing a policy of preempting state firearms control if there is any direct and positive conflict between Federal law and state law concerning firearms ownership, acquisition and possession,

Therefore, be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, the Senate concurring herein, that the Louisiana Legislature does hereby go on record as opposing the passage of Senate Bill 1 as amended, known as the Dodd Bill, and as opposing the passage of House of Representatives 5384, known as the Celler Bill, and all similar legislation, and urges and requests that each and every member of the Louisiana delegation in the Congress of the United States actively oppose and vote against the passage of said Senate Bill 1 and House of Representatives 5384 and similar legislation, and

Be It Further Resolved that the Louisiana delegation in the Congress of the United States is hereby urged and requested to support legislation providing for the imposition of mandatory imprisonment of all persons who use a firearm in the perpetration or attempted perpetration of a crime in interstate commerce, and

Be It Further Resolved that the Clerk of the House of Representatives shall transmit, without delay, copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the presiding officers of each of the two Houses in Congress, the chairmen of the House and Senate Judiciary Committees, and to each Member of the Louisiana delegation in Congress.

VAIL M. DELONY,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
C. C. AYCOCK,
Lieutenant Governor and President of the Senate.

Valid Alternatives in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 5, 1967

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the New York Times, in its Sunday, June 4, 1967, edition published a letter and carried an editorial which raise some pertinent questions about our policy in Vietnam. Since the convening of the 90th Congress, I have hoped that these same issues would be raised in Congress and that the American people would get both sides in a full debate. In other words, have constructive alternatives, in truth and in fact, been available and proposed within our Government and outside it, at each stage in the escalation of the Vietnam conflict? Has the Johnson administration in all cases rejected these alternatives in favor of the policy of stepping up the war since 1965?

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, a review of our Vietnam policy is especially timely, due to the far more dangerous situation in the Middle East. The American people should be given explanations about these alternatives in order to properly evaluate our future course and future decisions.

President Johnson should state publicly if and why an opportunity to open direct secret talks with Hanoi went unheeded. Why, when Hanoi, last fall, showed an interest in direct secret talks, did the administration stiffen its peace terms and extend the bombing to the Hanoi area, thus disrupting the series of contacts conducted by Foreign Minister Rapacki, of Poland?

In truth and in fact, did the United States ignore a Soviet indication that Hanoi would come to the conference table if a bombing pause were extended?

Mr. Speaker, there are many questions to which the administration should provide answers. Is the United States ingenious and relentless in the pursuit of peace?

A great many Americans, including myself, have supported U.S. policies on a sort of "my country, right or wrong" basis. However, my responsibility goes far beyond that, and, therefore, I am calling for a reassessment of our Vietnam policy in light of events. In the meanwhile, I call for justification as to what has transpired in the past. Did valid alternatives go unheeded as set forth in the letter of former staff member of the National Security Council James C. Thomson and the editorial of the Times which follow:

WIDER ASIAN CONFLICT FEARED

(NOTE.—The writer, Assistant Professor of History at Harvard, was formerly a staff member of the National Security Council.)

TO THE EDITOR: As a student of Asian history and, until last autumn, an official of the Kennedy and Johnson Administrations in the field of Far Eastern policy, I write to express my alarm at the Administration's course of action in Vietnam. U Thant has warned that we may well be near the threshold of World War III. I reluctantly agree.

Two forces are at work which, if unchecked, can cause incalculable harm:

The first is the inherent dynamic of the quest for a military solution, a quest whose ultimate consequence can only be war with China and perhaps the Soviet Union. My layman's impression is that the Administration, despairing of a negotiated settlement, will give our military the step-by-step escalatory authority for which they have long pressed.

The second force is the inherent dynamic of the political process at home: the Administration's sensed need of a "solution," one way or the other, by the autumn of 1968. For all the talk of a long-protracted conflict, the facts of recent escalations belie such talk.

Add to these two forces the polarization between an apparent majority at home that sees the issue increasingly as "support for our boys" and a dissenting minority that sees few ways to influence policy except through civil disobedience and even violence.

The result is a nation, divided and distraught, that may trigger a much wider conflict with only the vaguest awareness of the issues, the stakes or the alternatives.

ALTERNATIVES REJECTED

My six years in the Federal Government revealed a melancholy truth that seems pertinent today: that at each stage of the Vietnam conflict, from 1961 onward, "constructive alternatives" have, in fact, been available and proposed, both within the Government and outside it; that at each stage such alternatives have been rejected as unpalatable; but that all such alternatives have become progressively more palatable in retrospect, once the opportunity to choose them has passed us by.

There are things we could and should have done a year ago, two, three and five years ago, that are infinitely harder to do today. I can attest that they were in fact proposed at the time, and that they were rejected at each stage because the short-term price of doing them seemed infinitely higher than the short-term price of not doing them and continuing, instead, on the same course. But the long-term price of not doing them turns out to be compounded daily and hourly. It is a price that bears no relation to the stakes.

Can we still learn from the bureaucratic record and, for once, call a halt before we have passed the point of no return? Or will the price of nonescalation—or de-escalation—be once more calculated as unsupportably high, as we plow on toward calamity?

The Vietnam conflict is a needless war—one that could and should have been avoided. Its resolution today certainly lies with men in Hanoi and elsewhere as well as men in Washington. But the men in Washington bear the paramount obligation.

For the greatest power on earth has the power denied to others; the power to take unilateral steps, and to keep taking them; the power to be as ingenious and relentless in the pursuit of peace as we are in the infliction of pain; the power to lose face; the power to admit error, and the power to act with magnanimity.

JAMES C. THOMSON Jr.

UNTRIED OPTIONS IN VIETNAM

The Johnson Administration has increasingly challenged the assertions of its critics that there are—or ever have been—valid alternatives to the dangerous and unsuccessful policy of escalation it has been pursuing in Vietnam since February 1965.

A letter on the opposite page from Prof. James C. Thomson, Jr. of Harvard, staff assistant to McGeorge Bundy, then the President's adviser for national security affairs, makes it clear that "constructive alternatives" were repeatedly proposed not only outside the Government but also inside, by the Administration's own experts. Unfortunately, they were unheeded.

The tragic turning point came between Election Day in November 1964, and February 1965. The policy of the Johnson Presidential campaign was reversed. An opportunity to open direct secret talks with Hanoi was rejected. Instead, the decision was made to bomb North Vietnam and to send the first of 450,000 American combat troops to fight a land war in Asia.

Two years later it was evident that the Communists had matched every increment in the American effort. Every upward whirl around the escalation spiral merely restored the military stalemate at a higher level of forces, cost and casualties.

Yet, when Hanoi last fall for the first time in two years showed an interest in direct secret talks, the Administration stiffened its terms, extended its bombing to the Hanoi area and disrupted an initial series of contacts conducted personally by Foreign Minister Rapacki of Poland.

Later, in February 1967, it ignored an indication from the Soviet Premier that Hanoi would come to the conference table if a bombing pause was extended. At the same time, it rejected an appeal from the British Prime Minister to give Ho Chi Minh something more than a forty-hour extension of the bombing pause to reply to the letter he had received from President Johnson only three days before.

Escalation now can hardly go much further. The target list, with the exception of the port of Haiphong and a few airfields, is virtually exhausted. Hanoi's will to resist has not been broken, nor has infiltration been reduced—the rate has more than tripled since the bombing began.

Further escalation can only force Russia's supply operation into greater dependence on China for transshipment. North Vietnam's planes might have to operate from Chinese bases, making Hanoi the political prisoner of Peking. A United States ground invasion of North Vietnam, if attempted, would almost certainly precipitate direct Chinese intervention.

The time has come, as Mr. Thomson's letter suggests, to try a new tack, to de-escalate and "to be as ingenious and relentless in the pursuit of peace as we are in the infliction of pain." A shift could hardly achieve less at more cost than the policy pursued for the last twenty-eight months.

Social Security Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL A. FINO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 5, 1967

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I reintroduced my bill to provide that disabled widows may receive full social security benefits at 50 rather than have to wait until age

62—reduced benefits are payable at age 60.

Under the present law, a disabled widow must wait until she is 62 in order to collect full social security benefits, unless she is the mother of a disabled child or one under 18.

This is totally unfair. A disabled widow is, beyond doubt, a very hard person to place in a job. The interim between the time she either becomes a widow or her child becomes 18, and the time she reaches 62, has aptly been described as the "valley of despair." She may have no means of support. The age requirement of 62, in this circumstance, is unrealistic and cruel. I strongly urge humanization of this law so that disabled widows can receive social security benefits at age 50.

Additional Expression of African Appreciation for U.S. Assistance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN C. CULVER
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 5, 1967

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, on April 18 I brought to the attention of the House a collection of official correspondence and new media reports indicating that American assistance is appreciated by African nations who are seeking to develop their own resources.

I recently received a letter from our Ambassador to Upper Volta, Elliott P. Skinner, commenting on our AID effort in that country, and including a public expression of appreciation by the president of the special delegation of the municipality of Ouagadougou.

I insert this correspondence at this point in the RECORD:

EMBASSY OF THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Ouagadougou, Upper Volta, May 11, 1967.

Hon. JOHN C. CULVER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CULVER: I much appreciate your support of the United States assistance program which appeared in the April 18 Congressional Record. Upper Volta is a small, desperately poor country that needs our help. The educated elite and present military leadership are united in giving economic development unquestioned priority. President Lamizana recently put it very bluntly, saying that development is a question of national survival.

Under these conditions, Upper Voltans are seeking to make their friends aware of the extent of their needs. They are also working hard and are gauging their meager resources very carefully. They appreciate all the more any assistance received. An example is the attached unsolicited comment appearing in both the press and on the radio on a $4,000 grant under the Self-Help fund.

United States relations with Upper Volta now depend very heavily on an effective contribution to increasing the country's national living standard. It is, therefore, a great pleasure to have your understanding and—much more—active support for our modest African AID program.

Sincerely yours,
ELLIOTT P. SKINNER,
Ambassador.

REPUBLIC OF UPPER VOLTA—MUNICIPALITY OF OUAGADOUGOU—ANNOUNCEMENT 35

The President of the Special Delegation of the Municipality of Ouagadougou brings to the public's attention that the Embassy of the United States, in the interest of helping the Municipality in the distribution of water during the present period of shortage, has furnished material worth $4,000 to repair and to put in operation the city's water trucks.

This gesture of international solidarity merits emphasis at a moment when the problem of water is so acute in our capital.

In the name of all the inhabitants of the Municipality, I ask the Embassy of the United States of America to accept herewith the expression of our profound gratitude.

Lt. CHARLES G. OUEDRAOGO,
President of the Special Delegation.
OUAGADOUGOU, *May 2, 1967*

Mayor's Committee Aids San Diego's Jobless

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LIONEL VAN DEERLIN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 5, 1967

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, in the short span of less than 2 years, the Mayor's Committee for Jobs, Inc., has trained and found regular work for some 1,100 unemployed San Diegans.

The committee is a separately incorporated entity that receives only staff assistance from the city of San Diego. Its primary support comes from a fortuitous combination of enlightened interests: business and labor, municipal and Federal Government.

The Labor Department and other Federal agencies so far have contributed more than $1 million for job training and other operations of the committee. Last month, the Economic Development Administration announced it was awarding the committee for jobs $57,000 to make a long-range study of possible new employment opportunities throughout San Diego County.

It is significant, I think, that the committee has achieved such excellent results despite an average outlay per trainee of only $325, about half the amount allowable under project specifications. There have been relatively few dropouts, and morale is said to be high among the trainees.

The accomplishments of the mayor's committee for jobs were noted in a recent editorial by the San Diego Evening Tribune.

The editorial follows:

JOBLESS PROJECT IS WORKING

A combined total of 464 years of training to 1,150 San Diego jobless of whom 98 per cent now are employed. That's the record achieved by the Mayor's Committee for Jobs, Inc., since the federally financed project went into action in August, 1965. Attorney Joseph J. Fisch is committee chairman.

Herbert W. Rubottom, project director, and the staff of up to six job developers, have placed the trainees in on-the-job slots comprising 132 occupations. Employers—the biggest have been the aerospace firms and shipyards—pay union scale wages for the work done but are reimbursed in part for training costs. Average training period has been 21 weeks. Regular employment follows.

To date, the Labor Department and other federal agencies have given the program approximately $1,072,000. Sufficient funds remain to continue through this year, Rubottom said. The cost per trainee has averaged $325, or half the amount allowable under project specifications.

Dropouts from training have been comparatively few and the leading reason for terminations has been one that pleases the committee most—advancement to better work.

"There's psychology in this—when a guy gets a job he gets confidence," said Rubottom. He and his staff are paid administrators of the project. Directors are members of the voluntary committee headed by Mayor Curran.

From labor, business and industry, members include Chairman Fisch, R. R. Richardson, J. W. Johnson, L. J. Zanville, A. J. Baffone, Nolan Wright, Fred Martinez, Dudley Wright and Steve Rosinski.

The Fire Marshal Plan, a Program of Sustained Classroom Sixth Grade Education, as Conducted in Boston and Other Communities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 5, 1967

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, for almost two decades I have followed with great interest a program that originated in my district in Boston and which, I am proud to say, has become known and adopted in many communities in the United States, and even adopted by other nations, such as Sweden.

It is known as the fire marshal plan, and is a sustained program of fire prevention by education conducted at the sixth-grade level. It is usually conducted by the local fire department in cooperation with the local schools. It is often sponsored by a local organization. In Boston the fire marshal plan has been sponsored by the Boston Board of Fire Underwriters.

However, many communities have the fire marshal plan so beneficial, not only for preventing fires but as an outstanding youth program, that the local fire and schools departments have incorporated the slight cost of the program in their budgets. My information is that the cost averages out to approximately 30 cents per sixth-grade pupil, boys and girls, and a rule of thumb is that there is an average of 100 sixth-grade pupils for every 8,000 in population.

In other words, the cost for an average size community of 50,000 would be about $150. This is an extremely small cost in view of the proven reduction in loss of life and property where the fire marshal plan has been conducted.

Let me just refer to some sample reports from communities that adopted the fire marshal plan:

Watertown, Mass.: The Watertown Press in a full page feature story cited the following fire loss figures:

> The year before adopting the Fire Marshal Plan Watertown fire losses were $235,483. The first year under the program they dropped to $38,789. The second year they dropped to an all-time low of $19,332.

Warren, Ohio: The chamber of commerce reported in a survey of the results following the first year of the fire marshal plan a drop of 10 percent in fire losses and a 20-percent drop in number of dwelling fires.

Woonsocket, R.I., reported a 40-percent drop in fire losses the first year of the fire marshal plan.

Flint, Mich., has conducted the fire marshal plan for many years with outstanding success. I am sure my fellow Congressmen who have represented Michigan recall the visits to Washington, under the leadership of Deputy Fire Marshal Dennis Sullivan of the Flint Fire Department, of the boys and girls who performed so faithfully in this fire marshal plan.

Johnstown, Pa., reported that not only had the fire marshal plan reduced fires and losses from fire, but that it had so many beneficial effects as a youth program that it has been renamed "A Fire Prevention and Juvenile Delinquency Program." For years it has been conducted and paid for by the school department.

This factor of being an outstanding youth program has become the source of praise from many communities and from church and youth leaders. I would like to quote from an article written by Richard Cardinal Cushing, of Boston, in the diocesan paper, The Pilot, in 1964. Aware for many years of the effectiveness of the fire marshal plan, he has praised the program for its collateral values in teaching children respect for property and instilling at the most impressionable age a lasting sense of civic responsibility and participation.

In his article, he was praising in particular the achievements of "two Negro boys who organized their neighbors and for a period of several weeks succeeded in turning in, respectively, 3,492 and 2,974 credit slips for corrected fire hazards certified by fire department instructors."

Cardinal Cushing added—

> These are only two of almost 15,000 Sixth Grade Boston boys and girls who each year so enthusiastically win the cooperation of parents and other adults in eliminating fire hazards.

The significance of all this has become apparent because of the success of what is known throughout the United States as the Boston plan.

One of the most sensitive and gravest urban problems in recent years has been that of fairly and nondiscriminatorily providing fire insurance in substandard areas and which, unfortunately, have have been referred to as "tension areas."

The Boston plan was a means whereby fire insurance for these areas would not be denied merely because of being in such areas and would not be rejected at standard rates without prior inspection.

The program began on October 1, 1960. For almost 7 years it has been possible to provide fire insurance at standard rates—that is, avoiding any surcharge because of area—to over 95 percent of the risks that have requested inspection.

I wish to quote from testimony given to the Massachusetts Legislature as recently as April 1967:

> From Oct. 1960, when the program got underway, to the year-end 1966, the plan has inspected 22,131 properties, issued 28,274 fire policies for a total value of $184,983,000.

It was further pointed out that the plan had resulted in fewer fires and loss of life and property in these areas than would normally be expected, and that the Boston fire department had supported this conclusion. Credit was given to the residents for their cooperation. The point is that the fire marshal plan instructors devoted extra attention to these areas. The attitude built up by years of instruction to sixth-grade children, and through them to their parents, as Cardinal Cushing pointed out, had greatly reduced the number of fires.

As a result, the Boston plan has been cited by the insurance industry as the model plan for other troubled cities, and has been adopted by several cities. This is one more reason why we urge the adoption of a sustained education program at the best age, such as the fire marshal plan.

We need only to look at Sweden to appreciate the value and success of this type of program. One of the earliest enthusiastic advocates of the fire marshal plan was a longtime Boston Swedish consul, Arthur J. Anderson, who died a few years ago. He was noted for his many civic activities. In his visits to Sweden, and with other contacts, he supplied information about the fire marshal plan.

It may well be that Swedish officials developed the idea separately, but their success provides further evidence of its value. At the 93d International Association of Fire Chiefs Convention, attended by over 5,000, from all over the world, the feature address was given by Chief Sven Sonnerberg, president of the Swedish Fire Chiefs Association. In his address, entitled "A Modern Scandinavian Fire Department of Our Time," he credited this program for a remarkable reduction in fires and an almost complete elimination of false alarms.

False alarms have long been held to be an evidence of vandalism and improper respect for property. Sweden has adopted this program universally at the seventh-grade level. In America, the sixth-grade level has been the choice of most school officials, but otherwise the program and, more important, the results have been the same in demonstrating the great value and need of this sustained classroom education by uniformed fire department instructors.

It is true that in many communities firefighters visit schools, especially during Fire Prevention Week, and often they distribute material in the hope that it will be brought home and read by parents. But more than 20 years of successful operation of the fire marshal plan proves that to be most effective any effort to educate schoolchildren must follow the well-established methods of our educational system.

This means that education must be directed at a certain grade. Our schools do not attempt to teach multiplication tables and algebra to the same age groups. Also, an effective fire prevention program must be taught in the classroom rather than in a school assembly of all grades. It must be sustained and taught by uniformed firefighters.

This places no extra burden on schoolteachers. On the contrary, to be effective the program must be the pupils' own program. It is centered around a key pupil designated as the room fire marshal. Hence the name of the program. Moreover, teachers have found that the interest generated by the visit of the uniformed firefighters can be directed most advantageously into general school work. This has happened so often that teachers have become the best advocates of the fire marshal plan.

I have brought this program up to date because the times and conditions in which we now find ourselves, such as the unrest, the tensions and, yes, the vandalism and wanton destruction of property, have given new value to this fire marshal plan which teaches at the best age a lasting sense of respect for property and a sense of civic participation.

It is for such reasons that in my State the Massachusetts State Chamber of Commerce has made the increased adoption of the fire marshal plan a major project. It has the support of such organizations as the New England Kiwanis, local chambers of commerce, local insurance groups, and many others.

I urge all to give serious thought to the adoption of this type of program in their own communities.

Political Process in America

SPEECH

OF

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1967

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, the President is to be applauded and the Congress is urged to act promptly on the five-point program transmitted to us recently to improve the political process in America.

Our present system of campaign financing obviously needs mending. Omissions, loopholes, and shortcomings in the existing law were highlighted in House hearings during the last Congress on legislation similar to the proposed Election Reform Act of 1967. The Committee on House Administration explored the need thoroughly last year; this year we should act.

As you know, the Presidential Election Campaign Fund Act of 1966 provides for public financing of presidential campaigns. In enacting it, the Congress recognized this would serve the public interest. This is a matter of great concern to me and I am particularly pleased to see the President submitting 11 recommendations to improve and strengthen the act.

The third major facet of the political process to which the President addressed himself is a strengthening of the Lobbying Act. The Senate decisively acted in this area about 2 months ago in passing the Legislative Reorganization Act.

Finally, the President has recognized the mobility of present-day society. He has recommended that a citizen, otherwise qualified to vote under the laws of a State, may not be denied his vote in a presidential election if he becomes a resident of the State before the first day of September preceding the election. This is a most important measure which should receive the wholehearted support of the Congress.

The Bloody Red Baron

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 5, 1967

Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to represent a district in which resides a man with a most unusual hobby. "Patsy" Carisella, of Wakefield, Mass., who is a close and valued friend of mine, has the largest private collection of memorabilia of Manfred von Richthofen, the famed Red Baron of World War I, in the world.

Mr. Carisella, a Navy flight engineer during World War II, has studied closely the history of World War aviation usage. For some 20 years, he has been collecting information about Von Richthofen through correspondence with surviving members of the Red Baron's famed "flying circus." Mr. Carisella has often presented lectures around the Boston area about Von Richthofen.

Recently, the Boston Sunday Globe printed an article about Von Richthofen written by Mr. Carisella.

As the Red Baron has been immortalized in many ways, including frequent reference through Snoopy in the popular comic strip Peanuts, I think that the article would be of interest to many outside the circulation area of the Boston Sunday Globe.

I insert the article by Mr. Carisella in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

THE BLOODY RED BARON—MANFRED VON RICHTHOFEN, WORLD WAR I'S GREATEST ACE, SHOT DOWN 80 ALLIED PLANES IN DOGFIGHTS BEFORE DYING AT 25 IN MYSTERY CRASH

(By P. J. Carisella)

By the time he was 25 years old, Manfred von Richthofen was a man of legendary exploits. Today 50 years later, Baron von Richthofen retains his fame as the most colorful figure in all air-war history.

Field Marshal Eric Ludendorff, head of the German High Command, once said Richthofen was worth three divisions of men to the German war effort. Not only did Richthofen shoot down 80 Allied airplanes, but he commanded the famous "Flying Circus"—a group of elite flyers who shot down 644 planes with the loss of only 56 pilots. It can safely be said that the "Red Baron" was the Fatherland's number one hero.

When the great war exploded in Europe, 22 year old von Richthofen was a second lieutenant in the cavalry stationed in Silesia, near the borders of Russia and Poland. For ten months he participated in very little combat.

On May 1, 1915, he received orders to prepare himself for another tour of duty in supply. So infuriated was the young German with these orders that he wrote his famous short letter of 18 words to the Commanding General of his division. ("My Dear Excellency—I have not gone to war to collect cheese and eggs, but for another reason.")

The impact that this letter had on headquarters is obvious: Lt. Richthofen was transferred to the flying service at the end of May, and was sent to Cologne for training.

This offered the future ace the opportunity for which he had been yearning—to be in contact with the enemy and to see the man he wanted to kill.

Becoming Germany's most famous pilot was difficult for the lieutenant. Observing and learning to fly were not as easy as he had imagined. But he overcame this by constant practice, even on his own time.

Soon the taste for battle was his. Richthofen was sent to the Russian front as an observer—a far cry, he recalled, from the muddy drudgery of the trenches.

His first pilot, Lt. Zeumer, was inflicted with tuberculosis and was dying. Zeumer chose to continue flying, caring little whether or not he met death in the air.

After several months on the Russian front where Richthofen established himself as a good observer in his squadron, he was posted to another squadron. Enroute to his new assignment, Lt. Richthofen chanced a meeting with Hauptmann Oswald Boelcke, at that time the greatest individual killer in the German Air Service. For Richthofen it was the start of his journey to becoming the war's most feared pilot and greatest ace.

In June of 1916, the German High Command proposed to reorganize its fighting units by integrating them into Jagdstaffeln, or pursuit squadrons. Boelcke was recalled and ordered to select his own men to form and to lead these squadrons.

Recalling his meeting with young Richthofen and the interest the latter had in the air corps, Boelcke chose him as one of his more capable pilots.

In September of the same year, under the guidance of Boelcke, Lt. Richthofen shot down his first plane—an FE2B. But 79 more Allied planes were to fall before this ace, two years later, became a victim of battle.

Cocky, sure of himself and his ability (which he would match against any other pilot), Lt. Manfred von Richthofen displayed his egotism by presenting himself with a silver cup in recognition of his first victory.

A month after Richthofen squeezed the trigger of his machine gun to down his first enemy plane, tragedy struck. On October 28, his hero Boelcke was killed when his plane collided with one in his own squadron during a dog fight with the enemy.

Richthofen, one of the three surviving pilots of the original 12 in Boelcke's squadron, was placed in command of the Jagdstaffeln.

At the first meeting with the pilots, their commanding officer announced a new concept in air fighting: organized or team flying.

Richthofen recognized the responsibility with which he was charged as commander and he was determined to show the world that the airplane could change the course of any war.

Those who did not meet Richthofen's expectations in the next few weeks, when they flew daily training missions in close formation, were dropped from the squadron. He impressed on his men that individual combats would be necessary at times but not the rule, and that in the air team work and discipline would prevail at all times.

The squadron's fighting capacity was put to its first real test two weeks later when more than 80 planes took part in one of the largest dog fights of World War I. Richthofen's men shot down four British planes, one more than he lost. Richthofen received his eighth silver cup.

Perhaps the most publicized victory for Richthofen was his eleventh over Major Lanoe Hawker, the highest ranking ace of the British Royal Flying Corps and the holder of the Victoria Cross.

The battle occurred on Nov. 23, and from Richthofen's diary are his own words to describe this action:

"I must confess that it was a matter of great pride to me to learn that the Englishman I shot down on Nov. 23, 1916, was the English equivalent of our great Max Immelmann. Of course I did not know who he was during the fight, but I did know from the masterly manner in which he handled his plane and the pluck with which he flew that he was a wonderful fellow.

"It was fine weather when I flew away from our airdrome that day. I was in the best of spirits and keen for the hunt. Flying at an altitude of about 10,000 feet I observed three English planes. I saw that they saw me, and from their maneuvers, I gathered that our hopes for the day's fun were mutual. They were hunting bent, the same as I.

"I was spoiling for a fight, and they impressed me much the same. They were above me, but I accepted the challenge. Being underneath and in no position to attack, I had to wait till the fellow dived on me. It was not long to wait. Soon he started down in a steep gliding dive, trying to catch me from behind.

"Both of his motors are speeding to the utmost; still neither of us seems to gain on the other. We are exactly opposite each other on the circumference of the circle, and in this position neither one of us can train our single forward shooting machine guns on the other.

"First we would go 20 times around to the right, and then swing into another circle going around 20 times to the left. We continued the mad race, neither gaining an advantage. I knew at once that I was dealing with no beginner, because he didn't appear to dream of trying to break off the fight and get out of the circling. His plane was excellent for maneuvering and speed, but my machine gave me an advantage by being able to climb better and faster. This enabled me at last to break the circle and maneuver into a position behind and above him.

"But in the circling fight, both of us had lost height. We must have come down at least 6,000 feet because we were a little more than 3,000 feet above the ground. The wind was in my favor. Throughout the fight, at the same time we kept getting lower, the wind was gradually drifting us back to the German lines. I saw that now we were even behind the German lines, in front of Bapaume, and my opponent should have noticed it was time for him to back out of the fight because he was betting farther into my territory.

"But he was a plucky devil. With me behind and above him, he even turned around and waved his arm at me, as though to say, 'Wie gehts?' We went into circles again—fast and furious and as small as we could drive them. Sometimes I estimated the diameters of the circle at between eighty and a hundred yards. But always I kept above him and at times I could even look down almost vertically into his cockpit and watch each movement of his head. If it had not been for his goggles, I could have seen what sort of face he had.

"He was a fine sportsman, but I knew that in time my close presence behind and above him would be too much for him, particularly as all the time we were getting lower and lower and farther behind my lines. We were getting so close to the ground that he would soon have to decide whether he would have to land behind our lines or whether he would break the circle and try to get back to his own side.

"Apparently the idea of landing and surrender never occurred to this sportsman, because suddenly he revealed his plans to escape by going into several loops and other maneuvers of equal folly. As he came out of them, heading back for his lines, my first bullets began whistling around his ears because up to now, with the exception of his opening shots, neither one of us had been able to range on the other.

"The battle is now close to the ground. He is not a hundred yards above the earth. Our speed is terrific. He starts back for his front. He knows I am right behind him and close on his tail. He knows my gun barrel is trained on him. He starts to zigzag making sudden darts right and left—right and left confusing my aim and making it difficult to train my guns on him. But the moment is coming. I am 50 yards behind him. My machine gun is firing incessantly, we are hardly 50 yards above the ground just skimming it.

"Now I am within 30 yards of him. He must fall. The gun pours out its stream of lead. Then it jams. Then it reopens fire. That jam almost saved his life. One bullet goes home. He is struck through the back of the head. His plane jumps and crashes down. It strikes the ground just as I swoop over. His machine gun rammed itself into the earth, and now it decorates the entrance over my door. He was a brave man, a sportsman and a fighter."

Richthofen's quotations from his diary were widely publicized in German newspapers and he was well on his way to becoming Germany's national hero. Cup number eleven was ordered.

On Jan. 16, 1917, Richthofen was awarded the coveted Order Pour le Merite, the highest honor Germany could bestow, Newspapers throughout his country announced the decoration with the boldest of headlines, hailing him as their air ace.

It was after this decoration that Richthofen had his speedy Albatross D 11 plane painted blood red. From that time on he was known throughout the Western Front as the "Red Baron." The purpose of painting his plane red was that now he wanted his adversaries in the air to know him and his plane, to fear it, and to realize that whenever they engaged him they were dueling with Germany's ace fighter pilot.

In the middle of January, Richthofen was transferred and placed in command of another Jagdstaffeln. He hand picked his fellow pilots from the entire German Air Service. His squadron scored its first victory on January 23, and the "Red Baron" bought another silver cup.

His victories continued to mount as the Jagdstaffeln was posted wherever fighting was the thickest. If the High Command believed a certain sector needed aerial assistance, Richthofen and his gentlemen were dispatched.

The Allies were frantic. "Get Richthofen" was the repeated cry, but it was another year before this was done.

On July 6, 1917, Richthofen had his first brush with death, and again his own words describe this action best.

"Suddenly something strikes me in the head. For a moment my whole body is paralyzed. My arms hang down limply beside me; my legs flop loosely beyond my control. The worst was that a nerve leading to my eyes had been paralyzed and I was completely blinded.

"I feel my machine tumbling down falling. At that moment, the idea struck me, 'This is how it feels when one is shot down to his death.' Any moment, I wait for my wings to break off. I am alone in my bus. I don't lose my senses for a moment.

"Soon I regained power over my arms and legs, so that I grip the wheel. Mechanically, I cut off the motor, but what good does that do? One can't fly without sight. I forced my eyes open—tore off my goggles but even then I could not see the sun. I was completely blind. The seconds seemed like eternities. I noticed I was still falling."

Richthofen went on to describe his near fatal plunge. He managed to pull back the stick to pull him out of his fall. He crash landed, the impact hurling him from the cockpit. He landed on a thorny bush, and later recalled that during his subsequent hospitalization when doctors extracted the thorns from his buttocks it was more painful than his earlier head wound.

After he recuperated from this experience Richthofen was never the same killer. He flew with more caution and for the first time realized how it felt to be shot down. However the "Red Baron" continued to bring death and destruction to the Royal Flying Corps. and to provide additions to his silver cup collection.

On March 24, 1918, Richthofen received a short note from the 5th Army Headquarters mentioning that Allied planes were raising havoc with ground troops and would the Commander please take care of the matter.

On April 20, 1918, Richthofen shot down his 80th plane. At that time the Germans were trying to make one more drive at cracking a hole in the Western Front. Richthofen and the circus were given the assignment to keep enemy aircraft from photographing and hindering German troops.

The following morning was cold but with a touch of Spring in the air. The "Red Baron" was jubilant when he awoke, for he had been granted a week's leave—to begin in two days.

"Oh well, the weather is cloudy; I doubt if here will be any air activity today," he stated to his adjustant Karl Bodenschatz.

These words had just been uttered when a messenger approached and handed him a note—"Two photographic RAF planes heading for the front at 8,000 feet."

Richthofen ordered his "Flying Circus" into the air.

The following events are probably the most controversial of any happenings in World War I. Most air historians have their own views on the following events—I have mine backed by more than 800 documents from eye witnesses on that Sunday, April 21, 1918.

Richthofen took off in his red Fokker triplane with four of his men. The others were to follow in 15 minutes. At 10:20 he located two Australian planes from No. 3 Squadron photographing an area along the Somme River. These planes had already taken 12 pictures when their pilots observed a close formation of five German planes heading in their direction. They quickly closed in and awaited the Huns. The Baron tried to maneuver his planes above and behind one of the RE 8's which had opened fire, when he noticed a larger flight of Sopwith Camels at a lower altitude.

He immediately ordered his men to break away and engage the oncomers. He felt that his second flight of men would take care of the two photographic planes.

At 3,000 feet, he engaged the enemy from 209 Squadron of the RAF, commanded by Capt. A. Roy Brown, an ace in his own right. The sky was filled with planes, twisting and dodging, each pilot looking for the deadly advantage.

Richthofen observed one RAF plane as it broke from the battle circle and headed for home. He immediately pushed his stick forward and the chase was on.

In the RAF plane was 2nd Lt. Wilfred "Wop" May, a Canadian and a newcomer to 209 Squadron. He looked back and saw the blood red German Fokker on his tail. The "Red Baron" opened fire. Captain Brown saw this action and quickly dropped down in back of the red Fokker. Flying at about 500 feet above the ground, Brown pressed his trigger and saw the Baron's plane quiver. He fired again and saw the Baron slump forward in his cockpit. Brown pulled away believing the red plane was going down.

It is at this point that the controversy develops . . . did Richthofen go down as Brown explains in his report? This author has hundreds of documents from eye witnesses that claim Richthofen righted his plane and continued his chase of Lt. May. These witnesses claim that Brown pulled away and the chase continued for over a mile at an altitude of 100 feet when a bullet from one of the Australian ground troops killed the "Red Baron."

Now 50 years later, the events that took place that Sunday morning on April 21, 1918 continue to confound historians.

Hawaii Employees' Group Supports Vietnam Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1967

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I am in receipt of a resolution which was unanimously adopted by the delegates present at the annual general council meeting of the Oahu Chapter, Hawaiian Government Employees' Association, Inc., on May 13, 1967.

This resolution expresses the chapter's full support of the policy being pursued by our President to bring peace to South Vietnam, and to assure the valiant people of that nation a free government, as well as admiration and gratitude to the members of the Armed Forces, and others, who are seeking to establish peace in Vietnam.

In order that my colleagues in the Congress will have the opportunity to note the views of this worthy group of Hawaii citizens in this respect, I am including the full text of the resolution in the RECORD at this point:

HAWAIIAN GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES' ASSOCIATION, INC., OAHU CHAPTER, RESOLUTION

Whereas, our nation is engaged in military action in support of the people of South Vietnam against communist aggression; and

Whereas, this support has been given at the direct request of the government of South Vietnam; and

Whereas, the United States is joined in this support of South Vietnam by other free nations of the Pacific-Asian world; and

Whereas, concurrent with the resistance against aggression, the United States is making every effort to assist the people of South Vietnam form a viable government and develop its economic and human resources; and

Whereas, the people of Hawaii have time and again reaffirmed their support of the National Administration's policy in Vietnam through projects such as "Operation Helping Hand" and through the direct sacrifice of the lives of sons of Hawaii; and

Whereas, the National Administration has repeatedly made attempts to cease hostilities and to negotiate a lasting peace in Vietnam;

Now, therefore, be it resolved that the Oahu Chapter of the Hawaiian Government Employees' Association go on record in full support of the policy being pursued by our President to bring peace to South Vietnam and to assure the valiant people of that nation a free government.

Be it further resolved, that this chapter expresses its admiration and gratitude to the members of the Armed Forces and to those countless other American men and women who are working in Vietnam to establish peace.

Be it further resolved, that copies of this resolution be transmitted to the members of our congressional delegation so they may properly represent our views in the Capitol.

Polish Ham and the Russian Hog

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 5, 1967

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker; the schemes of the administration to obtain legislative approval for plans to support Eastern European Communist countries through trade will be debated with great intensity thoroughout this session. I believe it is practical for us to note the views of properly motivated authorities in this field. Columnist Harry E. Dembkowski of the Polish American is a noted scholar who is aware of the political as well as the economic questions involved in this debate and, therefore, his discussion of this subject in his column on May 27 is of great interest. I insert his commentary at this point in the RECORD:

Polish Ham and the Russian Hog

(By Harry E. Dembkowski)

There was once a time when housewives could shop for their pantry needs in happy ignorance of prevailing international problems. But the "era of innocence" has been, or should be, consigned to history since even a housewife's decisions at the supermarket can be related to the political and economic questions of the nation and the world.

For Polish Americans, as for the other ethnic groups, there is a certain fondness towards the "old country" and, as a result, towards the products which are imported from there. This sentiment is thoroughly human and generally desirable. But situations sometimes arise when sentimental preferences conflict with political reality, and a cool reassessment of those sentiments is then in order.

The communization of Eastern Europe is a basic political fact. A reassessment of our sentiments towards consuming Eastern European products is therefore clearly in order.

Trade between East and West although still small is ever-growing. There are four major arguments usually given justifying trade with communist countries. They are: that trade can be a means of weakening the ties between Russia and her satellites; that it can improve the living conditions of the subjects of communism; that it benefits the West's economy; and that the increased world trade will somehow improve the chances for world peace.

Since the fourth "reason" is false, and the third is highly doubtful, only the first two arguments are worth discussing here.

The first argument assumes that Russia will permit her satellites to drift away. This is a doubtful proposition and is most unlikely in the absence of additional American policies directed towards that end as well as other favorable international conditions. But even assuming that it may be possible in the long run, what has our experience already revealed?

Up to now East-West trade has not gained very much for the subjects of communism. Products are exported from communist lands only through state-controlled export companies. The workers and farmers who produce the products seldom, if ever, see the profits. They may even be harmed—to the extent that the nation's best products are being exported and therefore are not available for home consumption. Also, the communist regimes are funneling most of their foreign trade profits into heavy industry and the military, which is not to the direct benefit of their subjects.

And there are greater objections. Since trade with any nation tends to strengthen that nation, it is obvious that trade with communist regimes—any trade in any form—strengthens them by enriching their fragile economies. Moreover, their economic gains encourage Russia to reap the harvest by diverting a part of their wealth for herself—just as she has looted their lands of their natural resources, as in the cases of Poland's coal and Rumania's oil.

What is at issue here is not the succulent goodness of Polish ham—or Czech beer or Russian caviar—but something much more basic. Since when is it in our self-interest to enrich communist economies, thereby subsidizing their regimes and, ultimately, that of the Soviet Union?

Some might object that this is an unfair formulation—that buying a few products cannot do any real harm. Perhaps. But buying a few products sets a trend into motion. It opens the gate of trade which, once opened, allows for more and more. And besides, the principle remains. Is it ever really wise to trade with one's adversaries?

Still, there is no easy final answer to the question of economic trade with communist countries. Probably the wisest course of all would be for such trade to be used by the United States government as an arm of foreign policy—used to encourage communist regimes to make various concessions, "mellow" their oppressive rule over the peoples, and decrease their enmity towards the Western Democracies.

Economic trade, if properly employed, could be a formidable weapon in the American arsenal for freedom and democracy; and the housewife in the supermarket is, in a sense, on one of the firing lines.

Decline and Fall?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 5, 1967

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, the Copley newspapers print a quarterly review for newspapermen which is entitled "Seminar." In the June issue there are several articles of real interest. One was the "Decline and Fall?—An Analogy Between Ancient Rome and Present-Day America." The article by Robert Burnham Watts follows:

Decline and Fall?—An Analogy Between Ancient Rome and Present-Day America

(By Robert Burnham Watts)

Above the entrance to the National Archives Building in Washington, where such historic documents as our Declaration of Independence and Constitution are kept, are carved the words, "What Is Past Is Prologue."

In other words, just as a football coach scans miles of film of past games to learn how to make his current team more successful, we can avoid possible serious dangers to our country if we see what conditions in the past caused similar dangers in other nations.

Frequently we hear it said our troubled times are much like those experienced in the Roman Republic and Empire. And it is urged that the decline and fall of that great civilization was caused by conditions so much like those we experience today that our United States may be facing a similar fate unless we promptly do something to change its course.

What lessons can we learn from Ancient Rome? Why not check some of the parallels which we may find there? To revert to the football coach, why not see how games were lost because of poor planning or muffed assignments?

No comparison with Roman history is going to be exact. Rome, both as a republic and as an empire, made magnificent contributions to the world. But in the course of her history, which began about 509 B.C. as a republic which lasted until 27 B.C., and continued as an empire from 27 B.C. to A.D. 476, she clearly showed characteristics of weakness and degeneracy which we should avoid.

One thing we should recognize at the very beginning is that the size, the power, and the world influence of our United States are not guarantees that our civilization cannot fall just as Rome's did. Rome, too, held sway over the world of its day from Britain to Egypt. Its legions, behind the eagle standard, were long invincible. Its wealth was beyond comprehension.

We may look at two mighty nations and see what one may learn from the other.

In his book, *The Grandeur That Was Rome*, J. C. Stobart complains bitterly about the vast literature which exposes and analyzes the cause of the fall of the Roman Empire. He advances the idea that despite all its degeneracy and corruption, Rome discharged its historic function by spawning the nations of Europe, and then, spent with the effort, died.

The United States may well face a similar fate.

Following initial experiences under kings, both Rome and the United States selected, in order to protect their liberty, a form of government known as a republic.

What is a republic, anyway? And why should we care whether we preserve ours or not? What is it supposed to do for us?

It is vital to every American to understand clearly the answers to these questions, for in large measure it may be said that many of our present troubles come from a failure to understand that in a free republic, the safety of the rights of every man depends upon his recognition of the rights of others.

First, then, what is a republic? Kant, in *The Science of Right*, gives a crystal clear answer. He says, "Every true republic is and can only be constituted by a representative system of the people. Such a representative system is instituted in the name of the people, and is constituted by all the citizens being united together, in order, by means of their deputies, to protect and secure their rights."

In other words, we act through our duly elected representatives and not through direct mass action or special interest organizations of any kind.

Second, what is the reason for having such a representative government?

In 1651, Thomas Hobbes, a distinguished commentator on Greek and Roman government, described the alternative in his book, *Leviathan*, by saying, ". . . amongst masterless men, there is perpetual war of every man against his neighbor; no inheritance to transmit to the son, nor to expect from the father; no propriety of goods or lands; no security; but a full and absolute liberty in every particular man . . ." It is to protect every citizen against such jungle warfare that government exists.

Imagine the chaos and carnage which would follow if every person were left free to drive on the freeways as he pleased, without regard to the rights of others. Or think about what would happen if all police and peace officers were suddenly withdrawn from our towns and cities.

Indeed, one of our greatest dangers today stems from our failure to read and to understand history. Each of us vehemently demands protection for himself and that which is his, and far too many of us insist, at the same time, on freedom to take by violence or destroy the belongings of others to get what we desire.

At the close of the American Constitutional Convention, Benjamin Franklin, one of its leading members, was asked, "What is the kind and form of our new government?"

He answered, "A republic—if you can keep it!"

George Washington sounded the same warning when he said, "Government is like a fire, which—if it is not controlled, will destroy you."

If these men had used the example of Rome, where the Republic was deftly turned into an Empire by Augustus in 27 B.C., they might have said that Augustus was simply using the old "shell game" to cheat the people of their freedom. The pea of real power was removed from the shell marked "Republic" to the one marked "Empire" so fast and silently that it fooled the onlookers.

To be sure, Augustus, bought insurance against the Roman Legions' interference by judicious favors and even bribes. But he managed to get all power in his own hands—even though always under the former names and procedures.

The historian Gibbon, in *The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire,* explains the technique. "Augustus was sensible that mankind is governed by names; nor was he deceived in his expectation that the Senate and people would submit to slavery, provided they were respectfully assured that they still enjoyed their ancient freedom."

And how quickly the Romans forgot their freedom is seen from the poignant cry of Tacitus, only 41 years later, "How few were left who had seen the Republic!"

This government shell game, by which people lose their freedoms and power, is an integral part of the Communist technique. In Russia, we still see the names and forms of elections, mockeries though they are. There is a gathering of "representatives" so elected in make-believe legislatures and the designation of despotic rulers by the old titles of "premier" and "secretary."

The same shell game was used in describing Communist take-overs in China as "agrarian reforms." It was again successfully used 90 miles from our territory by Fidel Castro, then called a "freedom fighter."

Surely, it is time now for us to heed the warnings of Franklin and Washington; to apply the lessons of Rome and later dictatorships.

Almost every U.S. citizen realizes that over recent years there has been a quiet but steady shift of power away from the people and the states to the federal government. Instances and examples lie on all sides of us.

Take the sheer size of the federal civilian payroll. *The New Age,* July, 1965, makes it graphic: "For every 10,000 people living in the United States there are 130 federal civilian employees. During the past decade their number has increased only 2 percent, but their total pay has climbed more than 70 per cent."

Between them, the Departments of the Interior and Agriculture assert that they administer 180-million acres, or more than 40 per cent of the total land and water resources of the United States.

In the field of education, the federal government directly spends some $3-billion yearly, and in welfare some $10-billion. In each case, federal grants always involve more and more control from Washington, and less voice for local citizens or for states.

More and more power is being asserted by the Washington bosses, although the closest reading of the Constitution would fail to reveal grants of power in many areas affected. An instance is what *Life* editorially referred to recently as "jawbone control for market forces."

If we turn to our judicial system we find comparable instances of the supplanting of local and state powers by the philosophies of the majorities of our Supreme Court justices. Tremendous concern has been expressed by responsible law enforcement officers over new limitations imposed on acceptable evidence in criminal cases. And the sweeping away of the right of states to have any legislative body representative of geographic areas constitute a massive push away from historic precedent and toward the absolute rule of mere numbers.

So powerful does the judiciary feel itself that recently a U.S. District Court judge actually forbade hearings by the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

None of the instances cited is fatal. None condemns us to the loss of our freedom in a government shell game. But they form an ominous pattern.

They should make us think back to Ancient Rome and to the modern dictatorship of communism. An alert citizenry can defend itself. Let us hope that we remain ever alert.

Two related sets of experience in ancient Rome and in our country both concern finance. Rome's led to bankruptcy and ruin.

Perhaps we still have time to avoid a similar disaster if we can reconize our danger and act in time.

One danger has been the outflow of gold reserves, accompanied by soaring inflation and the debasement of the currency. The other concerns the cost and effect of welfare and subsidies.

In republican Rome, silver was the basic currency, although there was also gold. The gold supply was constantly drained away, a large part of it going to India in payment for luxuries purchased there.

The main silver piece was the Roman denarius, which originally contained 94 per cent silver worth 20 cents. But as Rome's gold was depleted and its debts increased, both by welfare and other costs, the Roman Senate began as early as 122 B.C. to use the deadly device of inflation.

It did this by issuing new denarii made of base metals, plated over, and at the end contained only 5 per cent silver, worth ½ cent. This cheapening process was continued until the silver coins had become so mixed in value that no one knew what they were worth.

Finally, in 87 B.C., the Senate declared itself bankrupt. The end of the Republic was just around the corner.

By the time Augustus quietly turned the Republic into an Empire in 27 B.C., the effects of inflation and its "funny money"" were in full swing. Rome was full of citizens who were without means or without the willingness to work. The mobs were dangerous and politically dynamite. By whatever means, they had to be pacified.

As a result, over 200,000 residents of Rome began receiving free corn, with the rest of the populace expecting to buy it very cheaply, although all of it had to be imported. Later, the corn dole was changed to bread. And then free bacon was added—nearly 4-million pounds a year. To free food, free entertainment was added, with stupendous sums spent to amuse those on welfare.

The effect of these activities, both financially and in the area of moral decay, is widely known and will be recognized by any who study the decline and fall of Rome.

In the United States, the value of the dollar has decreased to about 43 cents since 1939. Our gold has gone abroad at a terrifying rate. These things we know but we cannot see them easily except in the dwindling amount of food our dollar will now buy.

But, one thing we can see and feel if we reach in our pockets and take out some silver coins. There is the same debasement of metals, the same plating, the same "cheap" money which the Romans experienced.

If we look at the field of public subsidies and welfare, the burden is so enormous that one wonders how long any nation can survive under it—leaving aside all questions of administrative costs, foreign aid and attempts to create false prices where free competition would provide abundances.

Also, there are the shocking instances of free living provided for those who are able but unwilling to work. U.S. Sen. Abraham Ribicoff recently estimated that on top of all subsidies, price supports and other governmental handouts, we have 7.4-million Americans who are welfare recipients.

Our inflation is rising rapidly, as did Rome's. Our welfare payments alone make Rome's free bread and circuses seem insignificant.

Are we in danger? Let the coins in our pockets be constant warnings and reminders that for the sake of our country we have to answer that question.

The reason why men have governments is to protect their rights and possessions, which would otherwise be fair game for anyone physically stronger.

If that be so, it follows that those who hold the law in contempt and work to weaken or destroy the government from within are destroying the very basis of that freedom for which they cry so loudly.

In other words, uncontrolled license simply kills liberty.

Yet this basic truth seems rarely to cross the minds of those who today proclaim themselves subject only to such laws as they choose to follow.

Carry the current cry of complete license to do what one wishes to its logical conclusion and we would find everyone similarly unrestrained. What good would it do then to save money or buy clothes or acquire a family home if at any time some stronger and lazier person or some neighborhood gang could strip you of them? The point is that if you go back to the jungle you have to live by the law of the jungle.

Writing on ancient Rome, J. H. Breasted says in *Ancient Times,* "Life and property were nowhere safe; turbulence, robbery and murder were everywhere." And further, "In the tempest of anarchy in the Third Century, the civilization of the ancient world suffered final collapse."

As emperor followed emperor, the Roman disregard for law produced amazing results. Ferdinand Lot says, "To harshness and dishonesty were added venality and peculation. Everyone stole."

Perhaps an all time low was reached when the emperorship itself was actually sold by the army in public bidding between Sulpicianus and Julianus. As for the people, the historian Gibbon tells us that "they no longer possessed that public courage which is nourished by the love of independence, the sense of national honor, the presence of danger, and the habit of command."

Many of us do not realize how far down this road our country is today.

Let's begin with crime. Serious crime is increasing more rapidly than our population. There were over 2.8-million such crimes in 1965, an incerase of 6 per cent over 1964.

Sweeping increases in drug addiction are occurring, and frighteningly so among our young people. Arrests for narcotic drug law violations were up to 12 per cent nationally. One out of every four individuals arrested was under 21 years of age.

More and more obscenity is being encountered and tolerated in our literature and plays. Hardly a novel appears without lurid sexual episodes, duly emblazoned on the cover and launched with hopeful eyes on Hollywood.

Obscene speech is flaunted on the campus of a great university supported by public funds. Professors and clerics, from the security of tenure, expound the "new morality," which cynically asserts that anything is moral if the circumstances are right.

Then there comes the jostling, blatant crowd made up of those who, following the Communist belief, loudly assert that spiritual values do not exist.

Some, again protected by academic tenure, seek to attract attention by shouting, "God is dead."

Others, high in the church, reject the creeds and beliefs accepted by millions for centuries. They advance new thoughts and personal theories.

Have we considered these new approaches? And is our basic faith and reliance upon God being shaken as we attempt to think through our proper courses of action?

The impact of the current attack upon spiritual matters is perhaps to be seen in the action of the Supreme Court forbidding even voluntary prayers in our public schools. And this is a nation whose founders, in our Declaration of Independence, pledged all they possessed to its support "with a firm reliance on the protection of Divine Providence."

We have the fanatics who give our Communist enemies open aid and comfort by loudly seeking to tie the hands of our men in Vietnam in any possible way, by attempting to block the movement of vital supplies to them, and by urging draft-dodging and any other action to draw still closer the hostile ring which surrounds us.

It may be that we should try on and check the fit of a recent description of modern people given by an English cleric. He said, "If people offend against society very badly indeed, they are social misfits, victims of the social order, unfortunates who need psychiaric treatment. But if they are just adulterers, liars, greedy and self-centered, then they are perfectly normal."

Do we believe that?

We may seem to act that way, but the real truth of the matter is that the great majority of Americans are lawabiding, decent and deeply spiritual.

Vast numbers are distressed by current trends and sometimes discouraged because they believe themselves alone and helpless in their convictions.

All such people should let their voices be heard. Had the Romans done that, the course of an Empire might have been changed.

When one looks around the current scene, one cannot avoid wondering about the growing tendency of Americans to excuse inaction by saying, "I don't want to get involved."

Apathy is one of the most deadly disorders which can strike the citizens of any country.

It was epidemic in ancient Rome. As we have seen, the Romans became so infected and weakened by it that they took no real interest in anything but their personal pleasures. They watched the onrushing ruin of the Empire with complete indifference.

To the extent that we see apathy in America, it is a relatively new and strange thing. Our whole history has been built on a pioneering spirit which overcame all the obstacles of raw nature in a new land by hard work, by concern for one's neighbors and by an ever-present willingness to come to their aid with a helping hand.

How, then, do we find ourselves so often unwilling even to identify ourselves as witnesses when we see terrible accidents on our highways and have the power to establish the truth as to responsibility? Many of us either rush on or, if curiosity causes us to stop and look, we quickly brush aside any request for our names as witnesses as we mutter the formula, "I don't want to get involved."

How often do we, in the face of a moral issue, refuse to speak out and align ourselves with what we honestly believe to be the right—simply because we don't want to get personally involved?

There is the classic case of Kitty Genovese, whose murderer repeatedly slashed her while her pleas from the open street for help were heard but ignored by neighbors.

In other places, women are assaulted, desperately injured people are left unaided, and hoodlums range far and wide with knives, chains and guns as they prey on the weak and unwary.

When one thinks of crime, one automatically thinks of peace officers. What about them? The record will show that in the last six years arrests for serious crimes rose 33 per cent, with arrests of youths under 18 in this group zooming 47 per cent. Fifty-seven officers were murdered in 1964; and another 53 in 1965. In addition, there were 10.8 assaults on law enforcement officers in 1965 for every 100 officers.

Yet despite this record, peace officers all over the country have been so vilified, hounded and second-guessed for split-second action taken in self-defense as they dealt with law violators that their morale is near the breaking point.

As one of them said recently, "People sympathize with us because our hands are tied, but they don't do anything about it."

Do we recognize these signs of apathy? Do we realize that a similar tendency, when ignored, did mortal harm to ancient Rome?

There also is the area of industrial disputes. Certainly we are all aware of recent instances, and probably most of us are concerned with what the future may hold.

All of us suffer when disputes interfere with services which are vital to everyone. All of us suffer if we make demands which, if exacted, will cripple or harm the activity from which we make our livelihood. All of us will suffer if our demands turn loose the forces of inflation.

Here again, we need the second look, the long-range view, to be sure that we seek fairness in sharing the proceeds of industry. Rome was sorely afflicted by the absence of any such concern for the public welfare.

In another direction, do we sense a growing public unconcern over repeated public charges of wrong-doing in high places? At least the Romans had the excuse that, since their officials received no salaries, it was reasonable to expect them to make the best of the "opportunities" of their jobs. But no such rationalization can be made today.

We come now to a truly crucial area of apathy—use of the ballot.

Power resides, save where delegated, in the people. The people in a republic exercise that power by voting. It is thus that they select or retire their representatives, from the President on down.

If the people care and shake off their lethargy, they can have the kind of laws, the kind of law enforcement and the kind of policies which will cause their republic to endure. If they forfeit this right, their servants become their masters and special interests prevail. Controlling the pea in the government shell game is just that simple.

In reflecting on events in our country as compared with those of ancient Rome, we might well think about one writer's summation of Rome's situation.

He says that "Italy was living through the fever of moral disintegration and incoherence which assails all civilized societies that are rich in the manifold resource of culture and enjoyment, but tolerate few or no restraints on the feverish struggle of contending appetites."

How closely do you think that description fits us, and how much should it concern us as individuals if it does apply? Probably we would all agree that we are indeed "rich in resources."

Might we not also recognize "feverish struggle(s)?" And would we also see a refusal to "tolerate restraints of contending appetites."

But let us be clear that for us to acknowledge these parallel symptoms is by no means to accept a counsel of despair. To be sure, many of the same weaknesses which we have seen in our country mortally wounded Rome. But that was because the citizens of Rome would neither recognize and admit their danger nor do anything about it.

For us, happily, there is still a choice.

The great historian, Arnold Toynbee, in his *Study of History*, reminds us that of 26 identifiable civilizations, 16 are dead and nine of the remaining 10 (all, in fact, except our own) have already broken down.

He goes further, and shows that basically these failures have resulted because the people involved in them have failed to respond and failed to overcome the challenges with which they were faced. Finally, he points to the recurring moral choice which each civilization has been required to meet in its critical hours.

We have been trying to consider together whether, in the light of Rome's experiences and what we see going on today, our country is facing real challenges. If we conclude that it is, and that such challenges are of the kinds we have been discussing, wherein do our choices lie?

Toynbee would tell us that one choice is to "let go" in the belief that by giving free rein to our own spontaneous appetities and aversions we shall somehow become free and receive strength to meet the challenges which confront us.

He would further say that the other choice is the hard road of applying self-control and discipline in order to regain the necessary mastery over the challenging and difficult situations.

In other words, from the professional view of the trained historian, we seem to face what is essentially a spiritual problem. If that be so, can we see our devastating self-centeredness, and save ourselves from its lethal effects by gaining mastery over it and turning to God and His eternal laws for guidance?

That this is the only sound choice to make is also the recent message of J. Edgar Hoover, director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Writing in the department's bulletin, Hoover says, "All citizens must earnestly rededicate their thoughts and actions to the principles on the Stone Tablets. Let every person, young and old . . . proudly stand for what he believes to be morally right, lawabiding and honorable.

"We live in a republic famed for its freedoms, including the freedom of choice. When it comes to choosing between right and wrong, let us be certain we perpetuate this freedom by makin the right choice."

Finally, let us listen carefully to the words of Abraham Lincoln as he voiced the hope at Gettysburg "that this nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom . . . and that government of the people, by the people, and for the people shall not perish from the earth."

The Fickle Frenchmen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENJAMIN B. BLACKBURN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 5, 1967

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, an editorial published in the June 2, 1967, issue of the Atlanta Journal has very succinctly expressed the explosive and tragic changes in attitude which create many needless problems in the world today. The observation of the editor of the Atlanta Journal is meritorious and I feel compelled to insert his words in the RECORD at this point:

THE FICKLE FRENCHMEN

The French, mused Napoleon Bonaparte, are a fickle nation.

Indeed. Young Frenchmen, in protest against the U.S. position in Vietnam, burned an American flag.

Research doesn't reveal an example of Americans burning the French flag when France invaded Algeria.

But for Americans, the French youngsters with matches would live today under the flag of the Third Reich.

The same impetuous young men cross the street to avoid greeting the Duke of Edinburgh.

In the military cemeteries of France, not one of the 60,000 Canadians has remonstrated.

Well, these kids are not the same Frenchmen who fervently kissed American tanks on the way to keep Paris from burning.

Gallic memory-lapse is not symptomatic of teenagers alone.

Hasn't De Gaulle conveniently dismissed Dunkirk, the Argonne, Omaha Beach from his mind? Petulance, arrogance and annoyance with Britain and the United States would indicate it.

He has ordered American troops from French soil. Not the thousands buried there; only those on active duty.

And young Frenchmen burn our flag in the streets of Paris.

"LaFayette, we are here." And gone.

Rabbi Martin M. Weitz, D.D., Honored by Lincoln University

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 5, 1967

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday my good friend and constituent, Rabbi Martin M. Weitz of the Hawthorne-Cedar Knolls School in Hawthorne, N.Y., was awarded an honorary doctor of divinity degree by Lincoln University. Dr. Weitz has devoted many years of outstanding service to this fine university and the honorary degree conferred upon him is certainly a well-deserved tribute.

I am very pleased to join with Rabbi Weitz' many friends and colleagues in expressing my heartiest congratulations on this important occasion and present herewith for inclusion in the Record a statement from the dean of Lincoln University which describes his 13 years of service:

OFFICE OF THE DEAN,
LINCOLN UNIVERSITY,
Lincoln University, Pa., April 12, 1967.

A J.C.S. RABBI SERVES LINCOLN UNIVERSITY 13 YEARS

We of Lincoln University wish to share with the Jewish Chautauqua Society our observations on the annual visits of Rabbi Martin M. Weitz for thirteen successive years on our campus, and to note also some unique parallel activities that relate to them:

1. Rabbi Weitz began his annual two- or three-day visits in 1954 while he was in Atlantic City, New Jersey, and has continued these annual events through 1967 from Syosset, Long Island, and Hawthorne, New York, where he now serves. These campus exposures include different challenging themes at convocations before our total student body; a series of classes, seminars, luncheons with students and faculty; as well as conferences with individual students from many countries, some of whom continue correspondence with him across the years.

2. He has visited our Vail Memorial Library regularly and has made available a total of over 300 books to our Library via from J. C. S. In addition, he has secured almost 2,000 books for us from several personal libraries willed to him through this period. His own books, *Life Without Strife, Year Without Fear, and Decalogues for Our Day*, grace our shelves and are welcome and useful additions and editions.

3. He has personally maintained an annual honor award to the senior student who has done most for inter-faith, inter-cultural, inter-racial and international understanding, and had the Religious School of his congregation make a similar award for a student who has done most for inter-religious values in society. He has helped make possible other awards and benefactions by others during these thirteen years.

4. He has helped through friends to secure summer employment for students at Lincoln, especially for those from foreign countries.

5. He has invited leaders of Lincoln University, such as President Marvin Wachman, to be keynote speaker for a Brotherhood Week Award as "Citizen of the Year" to the late Morris Cain, alumnus of Lincoln, at Atlantic City. I was invited as guest-speaker of a leading Protestant Church in Atlantic City and again in Syosset, Long Island, as well as his own congregation, at week-end inter-faith services sponsored by two congregations in both communities. I have served on similar invitations for J.C.S. at Allentown, Pennsylvania, and Wantagh, New York, through J.C.S. and Rabbi Weitz' efforts.

6. He has been responsible for a number of special programs by the Lincoln University's forty-voice Choir and Glee Club these thirteen years: In Atlantic City, Margate City, in Southern New Jersey; Philadelphia in Pennsylvania, Stamford in Connecticut, New York City, Garden City, White Plains, Hawthorne, Thornwood, Mary Knoll, Wantagh, Syosset, in New York, and has had tape recordings of some of them for international "World Tape Friends" as well as our own Archives.

7. On June 4, we have invited Dr. Weitz to Lincoln University for the award of an Honorary Doctorate, Doctor of Divinity, during our 1967 Commencement Ceremonies, to bespeak our collective appreciation for manifold creative contributions he has made not only to Lincoln University but to his many fields of interest—in congregations and colleges he has served, in communities in which he has lived, and too in parts of America and the world in which he has travelled.

In a way, this is his "Bar Mitzvah" year with us—and we thank you, the Jewish Chautauqua Society, for sending him to us for thirteen successive years—which marks a record for us—and perhaps for you too.

LEROY D. JOHNSON,
Dean of the College.

Immediate Cease-Fire in Middle East a Must

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1967

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, the fuse has been lit. Who lit it is not the question with which we ought to be primarily concerned. Every effort should be first executed to put the fuse out before it is too late.

Unless an early settlement is reached, the situation in the Middle East is more likely to explode into world war III than the conflict in Vietnam. It is my fervent hope that the United Nations Security Council will act with wisdom and dispatch to effect a cease-fire. If it fails to do so the usefulness of the United Nations as a peacekeeping organization will have ebbed to zero.

As responsible leaders of the most powerful member of that organization let us give full support to President Johnson's plea for immediate cease-fire action by the United Nations.

We Must Speak Out for Greek Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1967

Mr. FRASER. An impressive group of people from my State and a number of other parts of the country have issued a call for restoring a democratic Greece. Their statement appeared as an advertisement in the Washington Post last week.

With unanimous consent, I place it in the Record.

WE MUST SPEAK OUT FOR GREEK FREEDOM

Greece, the cradle of democracy has suffered much from political turmoil in this century. A period of exceptional stability and freedom began after World War II, when, with the help of the United States, Greeks successfully blocked an attempted coup by the totalitarian left.

Now, contrary to the will of the Greek people and to their constitution, a group of military officers have seized power. This military coup has destroyed the freedom that had been gained at immense cost in Greek lives and resources, freedom gained with the material and moral support of the United States Government.

The military have already suspended the elected parliament, have moved to abolish all local elections, and now dominate the church. The junta, having by its own admission plotted for at least two years to overthrow the legitimate government, is preparing to try Andreas Papandreou for crimes of which the junta itself is guilty.

Having deprived Andreas Papandreou of essential rights of defense, having abolished free press and intimidated the courts, the junta can count on obtaining the verdict it wants, no matter how contrary to facts. "A free trial is impossible in the present climate." (N.Y. Times editorial)

We support the steps our government is taking to reassert at this time the interests of the free world in a democratic Greece.

We cannot regard Greece as a nation with which the United States should maintain close political and military relations until political prisoners are released; until King Constantine appoints a government based upon a parliamentary majority; and until free elections are scheduled to permit the Greek people to express their political preferences by the only means legitimate in a democracy—the ballot box.

CALIFORNIA

Berkeley

Charles Aikin, George A. Akerlof, Hector R. Anton, David E. Apter, Joe S. Bain, Frederick E. Balderston, Edward W. Barankin, Edward N. Barnhart, Reinhard Bendix, Charles S. Benson, Jack Block, Herbert Blumer.

Travis Bogard, Wayne S. Boutell, George E. Break, N. Joseph Calarco, Earl F. Cheit, Milton Chernin, David A. Clarke, Jr., Richard

S. Crutchfield, Vernon A. Demars, Aaron J. Douglas, Garrett Eckbo, Albert Fishlow, Donald L. Foley, William B. Fretter, Clarence J. Glacken.

Steven M. Goldman, R. A. Gordon, Ewald T. Grether, Gregory Grossman, Leon A. Henkin, Austin C. Hoggatt, Richard H. Holton, Sidney S. Hoos, David J. M. Hooson, Emily H. Huntington, Roy W. Jastram, Chalmers Johnson, Van Dusen Kennedy.

William Konhauser, David Krech, George M. Kuznets, Jonas Langer, Erich L. Lehmann, Harvey Leibenstein, Abba P. Lerner, John M. Letiche, Norman Livson, Leo Lowenthal, Martin E. Malia Thomas A. Marschak, George J. Maslach, Herbert McClosky.

David McEntire, C. B. McGuire, Ralph E. Miller, Frederick C. Mosher, Paul H. Mussen, Jerzy Neyman, William I. Oliver, E. Kerrigan Prescott, Joan Quay, Roy Radner, Earl R. Rolph, Carl G. Rosberg, Mark Rosenzweig, Thomas J. Rothenberg.

Bernard Saffran, Edward E. Sampson, Henry Scheffe, Carl E. Schorske, Elizabeth L. Scott, Bo Sodersten, Charles G. Sellers, Phillip Selznick, Dan I. Slobian, Neil J. Smelser, Henry Nash Smith, M. Brewster Smith.

James E. Vance, Jr., Dow Votaw, Benjamin N. Ward, Melvin M. Webber, John T. Wheeler, Garff B. Wilson, Sheldon S. Wolin, Graduate Students of the Dept. of Economics, U. of Calif., Berkeley.

Los Angeles

Alan A. Brown, Barry Chiswick, Peter B. Clark, John E. Elliot, C. L. Ham, H. Robert Heller, Bruce Herrick, Jack Hirshleifer, Michael D. Intrilligator, Axel Leijonhufvud, Jacob Marschak, Aurelius Morgner, Raoul Savoie, Gerhard Tintner, Donald E. Yett, Y. C. Yin, Graduate Students of Dept. of Econ., U. of So. Calif.

Stanford

Moe Abramovitz, Kenneth J. Arrow, Richard Atkinson, Martin Bronfenbrenner, Herman Chernoff, Robert C. Coen, Robert A. Dahl, Emil Despres, Otto Eckstein, Bert G. Hickman, Samuel Karlin, Gerald J. Lieberman, S. M. Lipset, Julius Margolis, John Henry Merryman, Lincoln E. Moses.

Paul Olum, Ingram Olkin, Emanuel Parzen, Ralph Phillips, James N. Rosse, M. M. Schiffer, E. S. Shaw, Alberta E. Siegel, Patrick Suppes, L. Tarshis.

Other California cities

Charles R. Adrian, Alec P. Alexander, Joseph Esherick, Harold B. Gerard, Dr. Robert Goldberg, Seymour E. Harris, Dale Hekhuis, Klaus Liebhold, George Mandanis, Robert E. Manning, Bruce McKim, Martin Orans, R. Robert Russell, Stanley Scheinbaum, Saadi Schorr, Howard J. Sherman, Howard G. Tucker.

ILLINOIS

Irma Adelman, George Alexopoulos, C. Arnold Anderson, Lee Anderson, Walter L. Arnstein, George Blanksten, Mary Jean Bowman, Frank Brechling, Dr. & Mrs. George A. Buttrick, Parviz Chahbazi, Abraham Charnes, Ronald Cohen, Robert Dernberger, Robert Eisner, William Ellis, Raymond Ferguson.

Leslie Freeman, Clifford Geertz, Zvi Griliches, Arnold Harberger, Richard Heflebower, Bert F. Hoselitz, A. A. Hurwicz, F. Arthur Jacobson, Morris Janowitz, Arcadius Kahan, Lois M. Kahan, Marian H. Klings, Yolanda & Harvey Lyon, Frank McCallister, Daniel McFadden.

McKim Marriott, Lloyd A. Metzler, Charles C. Moskos, Jr., Manning Nash, Frances E. Oxley, Nicolas Petridis, Theodore W. Schultz, Milton Singer, Larry A. Sjaastad, Melford Spiro, L. S. Stravrianos, Robert Strotz, Sol Tax, Joseph & Cele Tuchinsky, Henri Theil, Elias Thermos, George Tolley, Frank Untermyer, Richard Wade, George H. Watson, Rolf A. Weil, G. F. Weisskopf, Otto Wirth, Arnold Zellner.

INDIANA

Edward Ames, Willis Barnstone, Leonard Bercovitz, Ralph Bray, Leonard J. Breen, Edwin W. Brown, Lance E. Davis, A. A. Fatouros, Harley Flanders, June Flanders, H. S. Gordon, David Hertzig.

Walter Hirsch, George Horwich, Meyer Jerison, George Lianis, Paul Lykoudis, N. Pepridis, Stanley Reifer, Nathan Rosenberg, Edward Silverman, Vernon L. Smith, James G. Witte, G. N. Wollan, E. C. Zachmanaglou.

MASSACHUSETTS

Morris A. Adelman, Sidney S. Alexander, Peter Anastas, John J. Arena, Reilly Atkinson, Hugo Bedau, Robert L. Bishop, Anthony Blackburn, E. Cary Brown, Betty Burch, Warren Carberg, Anne Carter, Richard Caves, John Chipman William Comanor, Robert W. Crandall, Dorothea Crook, Karl Deutsch, Peter Diamandopoulos.

A. Rodney Dobell, Robert Dorfman, Richard S. Eckaus, Leo Flioseff, Alexander Gerschenkron, Richard T. Gill, Sol Gittleman, Everett E. Hagen, Mrs. Evelyn Harmer, Franklyn Holzman, Mathilda Holzman, Hendrik Houthakker, David Isles, David Kendrick, Charles P. Kindleberger, Issac Kramnick, Edwin Kuh, David Landes.

John Lintner, Zella Luria, Raymond McNally, Mrs. Rita McNally, Roy C. Macridis, Edward Mason, John Meyer, Franco Modigliani, Richard Musgrave, David Newell, Lawrence Officer, Daniel Ounjan, Dwight Perkins.

Don K. Price, Howard Raiffa, Ronald Rohr, Gerald Rosenthal, Jerome Rothenberg, Paul A. Samuelson, Lars Sandberg, Thomas Schelling, Robert Schlaifer, James Schlesinger, James Scoville, Robert M. Solow, Carl M. Stevens, Subramanian Swamy, Lester Taylor, Lester C. Thurow, K. Tsipis, Ann Chalmers Watts, Thomas Wilson.

MICHIGAN

Alexander Eckstein, Thomas J. Finn, Bernard Goodman, Karl D. Gregory, John P. Henderson, Mark L. Kahn, Jan Kmenta, Robert F. Lanzillotti, Harold M. Levinson, John M. Mattila, James N. Morgan, Michael Rieber, Karl W. Roskamp, Stuart Schweitzer, Warren L. Smith, Daniel B. Suits, Shanti S. Tangri, Branko J. Widick.

MINNESOTA

Kassel Abelson, Dr. & Mrs. James H. Alevizos, Dr. Henry E. Allen, Mr. & Mrs. Richard Arnold, Mr. & Mrs. Carl Auerbach, Dr. & Mrs. Marvin Bacaner, R. Glen Berryman, Mrs. Carroll Binder, Val Bjornson, Francis M. Boddy, May Brodbeck, Mrs. Wright Brooks, O. H. Brownlee, Fr. Harry Bury, Mr. & Mrs. John Buttrick, Dr. Mildred L. Byrum, Mr. & Mrs. Perry Caranicas.

Mr. & Mrs. Arne Carlson, Mitchell V. Charnley, Edward Coen, Mr. & Mrs. Angelo Cohn, Anthony M. Coniaris, David Cooperman, Mrs. Gary B. Crawford, Raymond Dabbah, Samuel S. Dikel, Judge & Mrs. Chester Durda, Prof. & Mrs. Charles Edwards.

Edwin Emery, Dr. & Mrs. Robert L. Evans, George Farr, Mr. & Mrs. Henry Feikema, John H. Flavell, Edword Foster, Dr. & Mrs. Albert Frenkel, Norman Garmezy, Fr. George G. Garrelts, J. Edward Gerald, Robert Gomsrud, Rabbi Arnold M. Goodman.

Dr. & Mrs. Robert Gorlin, Paul V. Grambsch, David Graven, Leon W. Green, George Hage, Margaret S. Harding, Forrest Harris, Mr. & Mrs. Walter W. Heller, Herbert G. Heneman, Jr., Clifford Hildreth, Mr. & Mrs. Ralph Hofmeister, Mr. & Mrs. Leonid Hurwicz, Bruce B. James, Demetrius G. Jelatis, Mrs. Geri Joseph, Mr. & Mrs. Kajambokidis, Mr. & Mrs. Gerhard Kalisch, Judge & Mrs. B. Kantorowicz, Mr. & Mrs. John Kareken, Frank Kellner.

Mr. & Mrs. A. P. Kizilos, Joseph J. Kwiat, Judge & Mrs. David R. Leslie, Judge & Mrs. Paul A. Lommen, David T. Lykken, Mr. & Mrs. Robert MacGregor, Mr. & Mrs. Homer Mantis, E. Scott Maynes, Mrs. Malcolm McCannel, Mr. & Mrs. Thomas F. Meany, Mr. & Mrs. David Meiselman, John Melas.

Dr. & Mrs. Bernard Mirkin, Herbert Mohring, Rev. Alton M. Motter, D.D., Mr. & Mrs. William Munro, Leonard J. Nadasdy, Mr. & Mrs. Arthur Naftalin, Irving Nemerov, Mr. & Mrs. Albert H. Newman, Raymond B. Nixon, Judge & Mrs. Harold O. Odland, Floyd B. Olson, Mr. & Mrs. Steven Orey, Mr. & Mrs. William Otterness, Dr. S. E. Papaioannou.

Judge & Mrs. Edward J. Parker, Ralph S. Parker, Sr., Ralph S. Parker, 2d, George Perry, Mrs. Stanley Platt, Mr. & Mrs. Donald Rachner, Marcel K. Richter, Mrs. Sylvia W. Rosen, Rabbi Moses B. Sachs, Dr. & Mrs. John J. Salchert, Mr. & Mrs. W. E. Salovich, Jacob Schmookler.

Mr. & Mrs. George Seltzer, Dr. & Mrs. Irving Shapiro, Norman J. Simler, Mr. & Mrs. Paul Skjervold, Alpha Smaby, Louis Smerling, Mr. & Mrs. Harlan M. Smith, Milton Sobel, Hugo Sonnenschein, Francis J. Sorauf, Marvin L. Stein.

Barbara Stuhler, Morris Teubal, Dr. & Mrs. A. Boyd Thomes, Anders Thompson, Mr. & Mrs. David Thompson, Mr. & Mrs. Kenneth Tilsen, Meg Torbert, Mr. and Mr. Dimitri Tselos, John G. Turnbull, John E. Turner, George J. Vavoulis, Dr. & Mrs. Lee Wattenberg, O. Meredith Wilson, Mrs. Henry Wolf, Mr. & Mrs. Joseph R. Wright.

PENNSYLVANIA

Jere Behrman, Phillip W. Bell, Phoebus J. Dhrymes, Richard Easterin, Holland M. Hunter, Lawrence Klein, Irving Kravis, Helen Malenbaum, Thomas Sargent, Sidney Weintraub, Clair Wilcox.

WISCONSIN

Ralph L. Andreano, James S. Earley, P. T. Ellsworth, Edgar L. Feige, Arthur S. Goldberger, Harold M. Groves, Roger F. Miller, Theodore Morgan, Guy H. Arcutt, Gerald G. Somers, Peter O. Steiner, James Stern, Harold W. Watts, Leonard W. Weiss, Andrew J. Winnick.

ELSEWHERE IN U.S.

Harold J. Barnett (Mo.) Jules Brody (N.Y.), Karl Brunner (Ohio), Wm. M. Capron (D.C.), Gregory Chow (N.Y.), Hourmouzis Georgiadis (N.J.), Norman Kaplan (N.Y.), W. L'Esperance (Ohio), George W. McKenzie (Mo.), Hyman P. Minsky (Mo.), Sidney Morgenbesser (N.Y.), Hugh Rose (N.Y.), Perry Sharpiro (Mo.).

ORGANIZATIONS

West Coast Committee for the Restoration of Constitutional Democracy in Greece, (2275 Eunice, Berkeley, California).

Minnesotans for Democracy and Freedom in Greece (P.O. Box 9751, Minneapolis 55440).

Committee for the Restoration of Democratic Government in Greece (P.O. Box 648, Waltham, for Greater Boston and New England Area, Massachusetts).

American-Canadian Committee for Andrea Papandreou (64 Press Annex, New York, N.Y. 10003).

American Committee for Democracy and Freedom in Greece (1133 Broadway, New York, N.Y. 10010).

Council for Democracy in Greece (P.O. Box 111, Irvington, N.Y.).

Letter Shows Disturbing Conditions in Middle East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 22, 1967

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, Rabbi Charles Shulman, rabbi of the Riverdale Temple, recently received a letter from his daughter Debby, who is presently working in Israel. This letter clearly shows the difficult and disturbing conditions which were created by the present crisis in the Middle East, even before the outbreak of fighting. The letter also shows the historic attachment of Israel and the United States, and that one democracy instinctively turns to another in its time of need.

For the benefit of our colleagues and other readers of the RECORD, I insert at this point:

To the Members of Riverdale Temple, Shalom:

As you are no doubt all too keenly aware, the Middle East crisis now threatens the lives of the Jewish People here, the lives of Jewish people throughout the world and mankind itself. In the center of this situation stands the State of Israel, ready to defend both its citizenry and its beloved country.

Permit me for a moment to describe Israel at this time, erev Shabat, May 26, 1967. Large businesses which have been working steadily to help overcome our severe economic depression have closed down; the men have been drafted. Stores are locked and many windows emptied; the employees are in the army. Hotels packed with tourists several days ago stand empty. All tourists have left the country on the strong advice of the American Embassy. Streets and sidewalk cafes, beaches and places of entertainment, usually overflowing with young and old alike are deserted because almost every male and many female citizens are standing tensely, willingly, courageously and determinedly on the battlefront. Those few still at home await their call and are already in uniform. Wives and young chidren sit by their windows, peering out at the emptiness, feeling the heaviness of the air, waiting, hoping. Mothers and fathers (many of whom are also in service) pray for the lives of their young children who have been called to serve their country. The very few persons with no family directly involved, like myself, worry for their close friends and comrades. Indeed, many of my friends are either in the Negev or on the Northern Border.

Numerous volunteer groups have been mobilized for help. My job will soon change from that of a probation officer to a social worker with the families of the soldiers. The wagons of Mogen David Adom (our Red Cross) stand on almost every street corner in major areas taking blood from volunteers—and there are very few persons who do not volunteer. Courses are being held in first aid, civil defense and so on. Trenches often filled with debris and bomb shelters unused since Sinai have been cleaned and prepared. Markets are filled with housewives and children buying staples. From sundown to dawn every person remains at his home or at the home of friends or relatives awaiting the all-too-possible blackout and air-raid siren.

This, of course, is only a fragmentary part of the entire picture. In this hour of need we turn to our friends and Jewish brethren throughout the world, and thus, I, on behalf of all my Israeli friends, turn to you, my "second parents". I cannot ask you to volunteer your lives. This involves a very strong personal and ideological commitment which must come from the heart of each individual. But I do believe that I can ask for moral and financial support. By moral support we want to request the organization of and participation in demonstrations for the survival of Israel; letters and telegrams to Representatives, Senators and the President who has not even yet taken a firm stand. By financial support we hope that you will sacrifice somewhat from your personal comforts and contribute—more than you have ever contributed before—to our existence and the continued existence of the Jewish people throughout the world.

With love to all of you,

DEBBY SHULMAN.

Glen Rock Student Wins Honors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 5, 1967

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, we often read and hear about young people who have come into conflict with the established standards of behavior of our society. I am convinced, however, that the only reason that we are informed of such news is precisely because of the fact that it is news. Only a small minority of the Nation's young people experience such difficulties. The vast majority matures and takes its place in our society as responsible citizens without incident. I wish to give particular credit to this latter group by bringing to the attention of my colleagues the fine accomplishments of one of my young constituents, Neil Calman of Glen Rock, N.J.

Neil is a senior at Glen Rock High School who has distinguished himself both in school and in his community. Besides being a top student in his class, Neil has participiated in such varied activities as the Glen Rock High School Band, stage crew, Explorer Scouting, horseback riding, scuba diving, and leadership in the United Synagogue Youth chapter of the Glen Rock Jewish Center. But Neil's greatest interest lies not in these activities, but in his laboratory work in leukemia research.

It is Neil's research paper entitled "Respiratory Alterations Due to Drug Resistance in L1210 Ascites Tumor" that has won him national recognition with the recent honor of being one of 150 students invited to attend the National Junior Science and Humanities Symposium at the U.S. Military Academy at West Point, N.Y. The paper was the result of a tremendous amount of work at the Marcia Slater Leukemia Research Laboratory of the Jewish Memorial Hospital in Manhattan. After a summer of volunteer work at the laboratory in 1965 in which he learned the use of the lab equipment, Neil became an actual employee of the lab last summer. He was placed in charge of his own project, the procedure for which he devised himself, including the necessary library research.

Neil describes his research project as "a study of the oxygen consumption of mouse leukemia cells. The untreated cells were compared to cells that were resistant to either 6-mercaptopurine or methotrexate, both of which are antileukemia drugs. It was concluded that the 6-mercaptopurine mutation is associated with a change in the respiratory mechanisms."

Neil plans to continue his research project after his graduation from high school because of his awareness of the importance of repeating each experiment over and over to prove that the results are not mere coincidence. Significantly, Neil feels that the most important thing he has learned in his 2 years of research is "not only the responsibility to yourself, but the responsibility to other people."

Neil's abilities and interests will undoubtedly take him far in the career he plans to pursue in research after several years of study at the University of Chicago. I am certain that my colleagues in the House will join me in congratulating Neil on his achievements and in wishing him the best of luck in his future endeavors.

Industrial Revenue Bond Dialog Heats Up

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD T. HANNA
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 5, 1967

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday's Washington Evening Star reported that Warrenton, Oreg. will benefit from the largest industrial revenue bond issue in history. There are two unique aspects about this report. First little Warrenton, with a population of 1,117 will be the recipient of a $140 million aluminum plant development. The funds for the plant will be raised from bonds issued by the Port of Astoria Authority.

Second, the firm benefiting from this public bond issue is based in Japan. This is the second instance of a foreign firm reaping the benefits of a public, tax-exempt development bond.

I bring this to the attention of the House because what is taking place in Warrenton, Oreg. is a disastrous example of the extent to which we have distorted the tax-exempt municipal bond.

Let me make clear that my objection is not to foreign investment on American soil. I encourage such investment and am in the process of assisting in the development of a Pacific Trade Center within my own district.

My objection in this case is to the method of financing the capital project for the Yawata Iron & Steel Co. of Japan. The idea that a tax-exempt municipal bond is being used to attract foreign investment is nightmarish in its ramifications.

This Warrenton affair provides us with another compelling reason to pass legislation that will effectively resolve the tax-exempt industrial bond issue.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I would like the Washington Star article to be printed.

[From the Washington Star]

BIG TAX-EXEMPT FINANCING PLAN TO BENEFIT JAPAN FIRM

(By William Reddig Jr.)

Plans for a Japanese firm to benefit from the largest industrial revenue bond issue in the history of tax-exempt financing was reported today amid demands from the investment banking industry and Capitol Hill to curb the practice.

The Yawata Iron and Steel Co., Japan's largest, and Bell Intercontinental of the United States will guarantee leases on an aluminum plant to be built with an issue of $140 million in tax-free municipal industrial bonds, the Investment Bankers Association said.

The plant would go up in Warrenton, Ore., a town of 1,117 persons, with the bonds to be issued by the Port of Astoria Authority. Only one other foreign firm, a Canadian paper company, is known to have benefitted from industrial revenue bonds before and the largest issue sold so far is one last winter for $82.5 million by Middletown, Ohio, to finance a new plant for Armco Steel Co.

Meanwhile, the Treasury Department is said to be preparing legislation that would end the practice in many of the 38 states now permitting it. And the administration may have to call on a Republican, Rep. John W. Byrnes, of Wisconsin, ranking minority member of the House Ways and Means Committee, to steer the bill through Congress. Byrnes hasn't said whether he will go along with the Treasury, but has a bill in the works.

The chairman of the committee is Rep. Wilbur Mills, D-Ark., who comes from a state that has benefitted heavily from industrial revenue bond financing and who has been strongly opposed to changing the tax-exempt provisions.

The Treasury bill is said to exclude from federal income tax exemption the interest on municipal bonds related to industrial development. The investment bankers group, which has been strongly opposed to this kind of financing for some time, says it will support the bill if its effect is limited to bonds that supply funds for private corporations.

This would knock out industrial revenue financing but keep intact tax-exempt general obligation issues for schools, hospitals, sewers and other public needs. Under the industrial revenue practice, communities issue bonds which are repaid through selling or leasing a factory to private industry. The company, not the community, stands behind the issue.

A barrel of bills to block the practice has been introduced in Congress in the last few weeks. Nine senators and 16 representatives have gotten behind measures to end industrial development financing by denying firms a tax deduction for business expenses on the amount they pay to local governments for use of factories built with tax-free bonds.

This group, which includes most of the California Democratic delegation and is led by Reps. Henry Reuss, D-Wis., and Clement J. Zablocki, D-Wis., and Sen. Gaylord Nelson, D-Wis., thinks the legislation should also bite at the practice followed when general obligation bonds are used. Seven Southern states now permit general obligation bonds to be used in this way, letting the credit of the localities back the issue.

The IBA feels the industrial development bond practice is hiking interest rates and placing the entire tax-exempt system in jeopardy of being replaced by federal grants and loans.

Bache & Co. is said to be grooming the Oregon bond issue for underwriting. The plants would be built for Northwest Aluminum Co., a newly formed, wholly owned subsidiary of Bell Intercontinental. The commitment by the Japanese firm to guarantee the lease is said to be the largest one made by a private firm outside the country.

The approach taken in resolving this complicated issue must be carefully considered. On June 1, before the Municipal Forum of New York, Mrs. Ivy Baker Priest, treasurer for the State of California, suggested as a means of resolving the problem legislation that would "remove from bond-benefited industrial firms the right to deduct lease payments and depreciation from its tax report" should be passed.

I am delighted that Mrs. Priest supports this approach. Two weeks ago I introduced on behalf of nine of my colleagues from California a bill that will accomplish exactly what Mrs. Priest suggests.

I sincerely hope that Mrs. Priest makes her views known to those members of the California delegation who have not yet had the opportunity to review the various approaches available.

The text of the Bond Buyer's article on Mrs. Priest's remarks follows:

TREASURER'S STAND

Contemplated Treasury action aimed at eliminating the tax-exempt privilege of industrial aid bonds could open a dangerous door that could lead to Federal moves to control or abolish the issuance of tax-exempt municipal bonds for any reason, Ivy Baker Priest, California state treasurer, warned an audience of some 200 members and guests at the Municipal Forum of New York yesterday.

MAJOR VIOLATION

Mrs. Priest defended the issuance of tax-exempt state or municipal bonds as one of the vital and fundamental State's rights, saying "any attempt to weaken or destroy it must be considered a major violation of these rights."

Once this right has been violated, then the way has been cleared for similar action in the future, with or without legitimate cause; and the state's right to issue such bonds exists very precariously indeed, she added.

Mrs. Priest, who was speaking on "California and the Tax-Exempt Bond Market," also cautioned the luncheon group that many states and municipalities are venturing into relatively new—and dangerous—areas in an attempt to gain the utmost advantage out of the authority to issue tax-exempt bonds.

Emphasizing that she held no brief for some of the so-called "abuses" of the tax-exempt privilege, Mrs. Priest suggested that one logical answer to the "dilemma" would entail legislation to remove from a bond-benefited industrial firm the right to deduct lease payments from its tax report; and also to eliminate any deduction for depreciation of plants financed by tax-free bonds.

SUGGESTED ACTION

"This type of action, it seems to me, would effectively reduce the attractiveness of tax-exempt industrial bond financing, but it would also leave unimpaired the right of the state or other agency to issue the bonds," Mrs. Priest said.

California's state bond program, where the state stands now and what the outlook is for the future was outlined by Mrs. Priest. In the first five months of her administration the state sold $285 million in general obligation bonds. By the end of the year it is anticipated the state will have sold some $600 million of bonds.

During a question and answer period at the end of Mrs. Priest's discussion, she was asked whether she would accept a single bid under conditions of market stress. She replied she would rather defer that decision until such situation actually arises.

John Patrick Cody Elevated to Office of Cardinal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1967

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity today to extend my congratulations to Chicago Archbishop John Patrick Cody on his elevation to the College of Cardinals of the Roman Catholic Church. Certainly, this is a happy occasion not only for the Roman Catholic archdiocese of Chicago and its many Catholics in the Chicago area, but also for the city of Chicago which can take pride in the accomplishments of Archbishop Cody.

John Patrick Cody was enthroned as archbishop of Chicago in June 1965, succeeding the late Albert Cardinal Meyer. In this short period of less than 2 years, he has provided inspiration both to his archdiocese and to the city at large as a leader in both religious and civic affairs. As past president of the National Catholic Educational Association, Archbishop Cody had jurisdiction over the Nation's largest diocesan school system. A strong administrator, he has been a leader in building and strengtening schools and churches and has also taken a leading position in the area of social rights, particularly with respect to the integration of parish schools.

Archbishop Cody, whose local archdiocese is the largest in the United States and ranks third largest in the world, distinguishes the city of Chicago in becoming the fourth spiritual leader of Chicago-area Roman Catholics to attain the office of cardinal.

Two editorials follow:

[From the Chicago Daily News, May 31, 1967]

CHICAGO'S NEW CARDINAL

John Patrick Cody, a big, outspoken Irishman with a fine sense of humor and an eager interest in today's affairs, does not fit the traditional conception of a prince of the church. He is neither lean, nor ascetic looking. He could pass for a successful politician of the Jim Farley school. Indeed, he has some of the characteristics of a master politician, because that's what the job of running the nation's largest archdiocese calls for in these changed and still-changing times. He understands the issues.

But the new Cardinal Cody has a duty beyond the ordinary politician's scope of keeping things orderly and getting things done for his constituents; that is to give them spiritual leadership. In all the years of his priesthood he has taken that part of the task very sternly—so sternly that there were some in his old archdiocese of New Orleans who were glad to see him come to Chicago, and there are some in his new archdiocese who have ardently wished him back in New Orleans.

That is part of the reason, we suspect, that he is being made a cardinal; it is part of the reason why he stands to be a very good cardinal.

For this 59-year-old son of a deputy fire chief has a clear view of what the church should be and what it should do in this final third of the 20th Century. He does not believe it should hold aloof from the living world, but wants it to get into that world and mix with it, understand it and help move it in good ways.

In two years in Chicago Archbishop Cody has set his large organization in order so as to get at that task efficiently. He has made enemies among the stand-pats, and frightened some who felt he was moving too fast. But Cody doesn't think there is all that much time.

He has also made his position clear on the paramount social issue: "No American can in good conscience refuse a man a job or deny a man a home because of a difference in race, religion or nationality." And that hasn't set any better with some Chicagoans than it did with some New Orleans people. But a prince of the church has this advantage over the politician: He doesn't have to go back to the constituents for reapproval every so often, and can afford to gamble on the long pull for his place in history and the community's heart.

In its series of cardinals Chicago has known a rich variety of personalities—dynamic Mundelein, saintly Stritch, and Albert Meyer, whose outward mildness disguised stalwart character.

Cardinal Cody stands easily with these, and it is Chicago's great fortune to have him in these times.

[From the Chicago Sun-Times, May 30, 1967]

CHICAGO'S NEW CARDINAL

Since 1924, the Roman Catholic archbishops of Chicago also have been members of the College of Cardinals, the princes of the church.

The elevation of Archbishop John Patrick Cody announced Monday in Rome was, therefore, undoubtedly foreordained in June, 1965, when he was selected by Pope Paul VI to take over the nation's largest Catholic archdiocese here.

The big decision was his transfer from New Orleans to Chicago. His record as a builder, educator, his ability and willingness to work with those of other faiths on community problems, his forthright rejection of racism, all indicated he would be a strong leader in Chicago.

This he has been. His administration here has wrought important changes internally in the church and in its activities concerning the community problems of our day. He has demonstrated beyond doubt the qualities that are associated with a cardinal of outstanding leadership in spiritual and temporal matters. It must be said that he becomes a cardinal because he is John Patrick Cody and not because he presides over the Chicago archdiocese.

Cardinal-designate Cody has been courageous in his tackling of the problems of the church and the community here. He has raised the hackles of some parishioners by his open espousement of civil rights and fair housing. He moved to introduce a younger spirit in parishes by retiring some of the elderly pastors. He exemplifies the church's new concern with ecumenicalism. He was the first Roman Catholic archibishop in Chicago to attend an annual dinner of the Protestant Church Federation of Greater Chicago and to address, this year, an assembly of the Illinois Council of Churches.

The new Chicago cardinal at 59 is a man in tune with our changing times and with the changing temper within his own church. For all that he has the drive of a business executive and the intuition and tactics of a politician, his inspiration and his aspirations are obviously deeply rooted in the spiritual and social doctrines found in the Popes' encyclicals. The better his flock understands the application of those doctrines the better they will understand and appreciate their new cardinal.

Resolutions Supporting Bill To Prohibit Desecration of Flag

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 5, 1967

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I am continuing to receive resolutions that express support of my bill to prohibit the desecration of our flag, and I wish to make these voices heard by inserting two of these resolutions at this point in the RECORD.

My thanks go to Howard W. Collins, of Morristown, Tenn., commander of the First District Department of the Tennessee American Legion, and Mr. Gary E. Arwood, president of the East Tennessee State University Collegiate Civitan Club, for making copies of these resolutions available to me.

RESOLUTION

Whereas, At the present time there is no federal law on the books against desecration of the United States Flag, and

Whereas, There is more need today than in quite some time to respect the United States, with our fighting men dying in Vietnam, and

Whereas, The passage of this bill will serve as a reminder to those persons who would disrespect the United States Flag that they can no longer do this without being punished:

Now therefore be it resolved, That the First District, American Legion, Department of Tennessee meeting in Bluff City, Tennessee, April 29, 1967, does hereby request Representative Emanuel Celler, Chairman of the House Judiciary Committee of the United States Congress to clear from his Committee for passage by the Congress a bill by Representative James H. Quillen of the First Congressional District of the State of Tennessee, which provides that anyone who "publicly mutilates, defaces, defiles, tramples upon or casts contempt by work or act upon any flag, standard, colors or ensign of the United States", shall be punished by imprisonment of not more than one year and a fine of not more than $1,000.00.

EAST TENNESSEE STATE UNIVERSITY,
COLLEGIATE CIVITAN CLUB,
Johnson City, Tenn., May 12, 1967.

Hon. JAMES QUILLEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Following is a resolution which was passed by the unanimous vote of the members of the East Tennessee State University Collegiate Civitan Club during their regularly scheduled meeting held on May 11, 1967:

"Be it resolved, that the East Tennessee State University Collegiate Civitan Club, does hereby go on record as being in full support of any and all legislation that may be passed by our representatives in the Congress of the United States which will prohibit the desecration of our American Flag.

"Be it further resolved, that our Congressman, The Honorable James Quillen, of Tennessee, should be highly commended for his role in the initiation of such legislation."

On behalf of our club, I remain,

Cordially,

GARY E. ARWOOD,
President.

Newton Industrialist: "People to People" Head Mark Bortman, at 71

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 5, 1967

Mr. MORSE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday one of Massachusetts' most distinguished civic leaders and philanthropists passed away at the age of 71. Mark Bortman was well known not only in Massachusetts, but around the country as well for his leadership of the people-to-people program. His wise counsel and consistent readiness to help will be sorely missed by his friends and by the organizations which have benefited from his activities. I include in the RECORD the obituary which appeared in the Boston Globe on Saturday, June 3.

NEWTON PHILANTHROPIST: "PEOPLE TO PEOPLE" HEAD MARK BORTMAN, AT 71

Mark Bortman, 71, head of the President's People to People program and chairman of the Minuteman National Park Commission, died unexpectedly at his home Thursday morning.

Widely known historian, author, businessman and philanthropist, he was a native of Rumania who came to Boston as an infant.

He and his wife resided at 45 Moreland st., Newton.

Mr. Bortman attended Boston public schools, graduated from Boston University and Suffolk Law School and attended Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Founder and president of both the Bortman Plastics Co. and the Bortman Textile Co., he was also a partner in the Patent Fabrics Co.

He was active in a score of historical civic projects, and was a director of the International Advisory Council and of the West End House.

In 1962 Mr. Bortman was named by President Eisenhower to replace Charles E. Wilson as head of the People to People Plan which the President said was the key to world peace.

Mr. Bortman, who had traveled around the world 61 times, was dedicated to his job, claiming that in his travels he found that all peoples want peace and security, a chance to maintain a home and family, and a better education for their children.

He was firmly opposed to communism and in 1958 headed the "Declaration of Unity" drive which saw the mayors of the country sign up in support of President Eisenhower's endeavors to attain world peace, stamp out communism and strengthen the economy of our people.

Among the honors held by Mr. Bortman were the Sons of the American Revolution medal, the Queen Elizabeth Medal of the Honorable Artillery Company of London, Order of Merit of the Republic of Italy, Honorary Citizen of Istanbul, Turkey and of Periguex in France, City of Rome Medal, City of Istanbul Medal and the City of Trieste Medal.

He held citations from the United States Information Agency, Yale University, Boston University, Boston Museum of Fine Arts, Old West Boston Associates and Smith College.

Mr. Bortman was a lecturer at Boston University and New York University.

In 1948 he presented Boston University with a rare collection of Americana it took him 30 years to gather.

He credited his insatiable interest in America to his childhood when he was a paper boy trudging up to the doors of the great houses on Beacon Hill.

To him the "Hill" typified the beauty and dignity of early America. In the West End classroom where he mingled with the descendants of early settlers and the children of newly arrived immigrants, he began to sense the blend of races that is America.

He said of his philanthropies, "Perhaps I am merely giving back to the people what they gave to me."

Among other directorships and memberships held by Mr. Bortman were advisor to Endicott Junior College, trustee of Emerson College, advisor to Simmons College, director of the Bostonian Society and Old South Meeting House, senior deputy governor of the State Club, chairman of the Greater Boston Chamber of Commerce Committee on Historic Places, a proprietor of the Boston Athenaeum, member of the Massachusetts Historical Society, Colonial Society, American Antiquarian Society, and the Ancient and Honorable Artillery Company.

He was a national director and northeast regional cochairman of the National Conference of Christians and Jews, curator of the Boston University Library of Americana, Chairman of the Paul Revere Bowl Committee, associate of the Yale University Library, of the Society of the Plastics Industry, of the American Chemical Society, and of the Society of American Historians, and chairman of Boston Salute to Rome Committee.

Two years ago Mr. Bortman gave the Abigail and John Adams Presidential Coffee Urn to the White House, currently the centerpiece of the Adams Room, one of eight public rooms at the White House.

The holder of citations from some 30 governments, Mr. Bortman also instituted the international "Sister City" program.

He leaves a wife, the former Llaura Cohen; a daughter, Mrs. Jane Larus of West Orange, N.J.; two sisters, Mrs. Samuel Abrams of Newton and Mrs. Ethel Krakow of New York, and two grandsons.

Services will be Sunday at 3 p.m. in Temple Israel Meeting House, Boston.

Neshoba Case Stalled Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 5, 1967

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, 3 years ago this month, three courageous young civil rights workers were murdered near Philadelphia in Neshoba County, Miss. Although the identity of the murderers is something of an open secret, the trial has been postponed, this time indefinitely. The Justice Department must take every available legal step to bring this matter to an immediate trial. I believe that an editorial in the June issue of the Southern Courier is worth the attention of my colleagues. It follows:

[From the Southern Courier, June 4, 1967]

HOW MUCH LONGER?

Once again, the trial of the Neshoba County death case has been delayed—this time "indefinitely," U.S. District Judge Harold Cox—who took it upon himself to delay the trial—has shown once more that he is unfit for the federal bench. But the U.S. Justice Department must share the blame with Cox for this total frustration of justice.

Justice Department spokesmen said this week—as they said last time Cox stalled the trial—that they will simply wait for the case to be put back on the court schedule. Meanwhile, though, the department continues to let almost every other civil rights case in the South go completely to hell.

The government's handling of the Harvey Conner trial in Montgomery was uninspired, to say the least. The Justice Department has staged a slow-motion cake-walk through urgent school-desegregation cases, like the ones in Neshoba County and in Choctaw County, Ala. And dozens of new incidents of brutality against Negro citizens have barely been investigated, let alone prosecuted.

How much more time is going to be wasted on a case that the government has almost no chance of winning? Either the Justice Department should press for a quick trial in the Nesohba County killings, or it should go on to other cases that are equally important.

The goverment should ask Judge Cox to hold the trial immediately, or to remove himself from the case. If he refuses, his decision should be appealed to the U.S. Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals. The Justice Department could even go directly to the Fifth Circuit—in a "mandamus" proceeding—and ask the appeals court to order Cox to hold the trial.

It is only one tragedy of the Neshoba County death case that three more killings are going unpunished. Another—and possibly greater—tragedy is that while the Neshoba case occupies the attention of the Justice Department and the nation, Negroes across the South are suffering without even the hope of legal protection.

Glass Houses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 31, 1967

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, recently the president of the Amalgamated Meat Cutters Union, Thomas Lloyd, and his secretary-treasurer, Patrick Gorman, sent a timely and thoughtful message to all the people on the union staff.

This message was so eloquent and spoke so forcefully for dignity and truth that I believe it deserves the widest possible attention.

In a time of enormous tension, we would all do well to heed this message which reminds us of the greatness and charity which often lie dormant in men.

Years ago, a wise man said:

> Where is the man who owes nothing to the land in which he lives? He owes to it the most precious thing possessed by man—the morality of his actions and the love of virtue.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Lloyd's and Mr. Gorman's remarks follow:

GLASS HOUSES

(NOTE.—Glass Houses is from one of the weekly staffgrams of International President Thomas J. Lloyd and Secretary-Treasurer Patrick E. Gorman to the staff.)

With the population of the United States nearing 190,000,000, we frankly believe that not more than a thousand of this vast number can truthfully say that they do not live in some mental glass house. For fear of exposure, they would not dare chance entering it except on dark nights. There are few good men who have earned any justifiable halos for their brows. A good many of these, including even St. Augustine, had comfortless memories of the glass houses they created for themselves. The great Augustine confessed this. He knew that he could not throw stones at others without exposing his own unsaintly glass menagerie.

We grow only when we are thoughtful of others. We live only when we serve others and we are compensated in a permanent way when we do something worth while for others. If we attempt to ruin a man's reputation we degrade ourselves and very often we are more guilty of wrongdoing than the one we accuse. Either personally or organizationally, if we have gossipmongers spreading rumors about others who have contributed much to the progress of our International Union, they should be ashamed of themselves. While tong wars have disappeared, too many of us still have the tong-urge to throw the hatchet.

It is said that Bishop Fulton J. Sheen once sent a priest to the railroad station to bring to his house an old friend. The priest asked him, "How shall I recognize this man?" The reply was, "When the train comes in, you will see a tall gentleman who will be helping somebody else."

The greatest wealth a man possesses is his good name. Shakespeare, in Act III of his Othello, coined these world-famous lines, "He who steals my purse steals trash, but he who steals my good name robs me of that which not enriches him but makes me poor indeed."

The Lord Himself, when the biblical adulteress accosted Him and sought His protection from the vengeful mob, said, "Let he who is without sin cast the first stone!" There should not be that degree of savagery in any of us which would give satisfaction in the desire to assassinate the character of another man. When we join little cliques because of a dislike for others, frankly, it is a mark of personal poor character and eventually it will boomering to expose the glass house in which the cliquester himself lives.

John Wilkes Booth, when he assassinated Abraham Lincoln, shouted, "Sic semper tyrannis!" Booth, however, did not kill a tyrant—he killed a great man who did not live in a mental glass house.

The ugly spoken word usually emanates from the mouths of the ignorant who can not understand that, like the unleashed arrow, the ugly word cannot be retracted.

Is it too much to ask that we try to remember the word "brother"? Can't we visualize more often than we do, the forceful moral lesson emanating from Father Flanagan's Boy's Town in Nebraska—the youngster in the snowstorm with the exhausted boy on his back, saying only, "He's not heavy, Father. He's my brother." Are there those amongst us who, because of our dislike, would drop our brother in any kind of a storm and let him die? Are we so inexcusably calloused as to ignore the past good deeds we find in one? Must we shove a person into the gutter because we dislike him? Must we insist that a cross be erected on which to nail him hand and foot? Those who bitterly condemn others know that the themselves are something less than a saint.

We still honestly feel that of the 190,000,000 people in the United States, there are not more than a thousand who do not occasionally shiver in their mental glass houses. Certainly if they are not able to throw stones, they should also not risk taking a bath in the daytime!

Resolution of New York State Elks Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 5, 1967

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, the New York State Elks Association held its annual convention in New York City on May 13, 1967, and adopted by acclamation the following resolution, which I present herewith for inclusion in the RECORD:

RESOLUTION OF YONKERS LODGE No. 707, BENEVOLENT AND PROTECTIVE ORDER OF ELKS

Whereas, the New York State Elks Association, consisting of over 77,000 Americans in the Empire State, meeting at convention in the city of New York this 13th day of May 1967, acknowledge the right of every member of our Free Society to freedom of speech, and

Whereas, the New York State Elks Association has for over 55 years espoused the gift of freedom, pride of patriotism and dedication to our great Nation, and deplore, condemn and denounce acts of disloyalty, disrespect and defiance toward the United States Government, the American Flag, our President and Governmental Leaders, and

Whereas, we have continuously championed the cause of our War Veterans and Service Men, who have fought and continue to fight for the preservation of our Great Democracy, and

Whereas, we, as a State Association of the greatest American fraternity, desire to publicly state our position to our fellow Americans, now

Therefore, be it resolved, that the New York State Elks Association does hereby give its support to our Government in its Viet Nam policy, to President Lyndon B. Johnson and to the members of the Armed Forces serving in Viet Nam and other areas of our troubled World, and that a copy of this Resolution be sent to the Grand Lodge Americanism Committee, to the President of the United States, and be released to all available news media.

Postal Rates and Farm Publications

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 5, 1967

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, this morning, Mr. Thomas Hickey, vice president and associated publisher, Nebraska Farmer Co., presented testimony before the Postal Rates Subcommittee of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee concerning postal rate increases affecting farm publications.

There are two aspects of this testimony which I particularly want to call to the attention of my colleagues: First, the part that farm publications play as the key link between the Government's activities in agriculture and the farmer; second, the fact that the farmers and publishers are not asking that they be exempted from increased postal rates, but merely that consideration be given so that these periodicals are not priced out of business.

I commend this statement to your attention:

STATEMENT OF THOMAS C. HICKEY, VICE PRESIDENT AND ASSOCIATE PUBLISHER, NEBRASKA FARMER CO., LINCOLN, NEBR., AND IMMEDIATE PAST PRESIDENT, AGRICULTURAL PUBLISHERS ASSOCIATION, BEFORE THE HOUSE SUBCOMMITTEE ON POSTAL RATES, JUNE 5, 1967

Mr. Chairman and Members of the House Postal Rate Subcommittee: My name is Thomas C. Hickey. I am Vice President of the Nebraska Farmer Company in Lincoln, Nebraska, and I am Associate Publisher of our two state farm publications—namely, the Nebraska Farmer and the Colorado Rancher and Farmer. Also, I am the immediate past President of the Agricultural Publishers Association, the 50-year-old association representing some 29 leading farm publications across the Nation.

May I express my appreciation for this opportunity to appear before you today. My remarks will be brief, not only in the interest of time but, also, because we would not want too much repetition of what others have said or will be saying during these hearings. And, too, our industry was most ably represented last week when the current president of the Agricultural Publishers Association, Mr. James Milholland, Jr., spoke to you in detail.

May I say we are pleased and proud that one of our Congressmen from Nebraska sits on your important committee. Congressman Glenn Cunningham, the former mayor of Omaha, is a distinguished and, if I may say so, popular, Nebraskan.

I should like to take just a minute to emphasize or re-emphasize, as the case may be, that farm publications are highly unique in their service to subscribers. In a very real sense, farm publications represent an arm of the government and of the agricultural colleges in communicating new and vital information to the farmers throughout the land.

I have here a study made recently by the School of Journalism at the University of Nebraska. Farmers in Nebraska were asked a number of questions, including this: "Which of the following do you depend upon most for helpful, up-to-date information about new farming practices?" The answer to that question is contained in the following percentages:

	Percent
Farm publications	41.9
County agents	19.3
Neighbors	13.2
Radio	12.5
TV	9.2
All other	3.9
Total	100.0

As you perhaps know, many such studies have been made by various colleges—Iowa State, Purdue, Wisconsin, Ohio State, Cornell and others.

A summary to 12 such studies seeking similar information such as: "new farm practices," "most helpful information," "main source of farming information," etc., resulted as follows:

	Percent
Farm publications	65
Neighbors	50
County agents	37
Sales literature	26
Radio	18
Newspapers	9
Television	4

Thus, it will be noted that farm publications are, for most all practical purposes, the principal and, in a real sense, the only way farmers have in keeping themselves abreast with new information from the government and from the agricultural colleges. And may I say that farm publications are exceedingly proud of the important role they play in what is generally considered the Nation's biggest business—namely, agriculture.

Now, what about the health and vigor of farm publications? Well, many are reasonably prosperous but a far greater number are struggling, to say the least. The J. K. Lasser Company, a well-known auditing firm not too many years ago did a study for the Agricultural Publishers Association in which they pointed out that approximately one third of the farm publications were showing losses; another third were breaking about even; and the remaining third were showing some profits in varying degrees.

Rising costs are hurting the industry. The proposed postal rates would result in an increase of some 115% since 1952. During that same period, printing costs have gone up approximately 40%. But with the Nebraska Farmer, the advertising rates have increased less than 35% in that same 15-year period. And the Nebraska Farmer should be about average in its industry category.

The decline in the number of farms has, of course, caused farm publications to hold back on rate increases. The farms are fewer and better but the downtrend greately affects farm publications since advertising rates depend upon circulations. And in the advertising revenue department, even though we are the number one source of information to farmers, we find other media coming in for more and more of the advertising dollar.

As agriculture moves into a new era of expanded production, in supplying food and fiber for the fast-growing populations at home and abroad, we can say with certainty that the future role of farm publications will be greater and far more important to our government, and to our economy, and to our country than ever before.

It is highly important to the social, as well as the economic fabric of America, that the family farm pattern survives. In Russia, the state owns and operates agriculture. In the United States, 96% of the farms are family-owned businesses, operated by individuals.

These private businesses are the miracle of America's agriculture. And the communications system afforded by the farm press, working with the government, is perhaps the secret to our phenomenal success in the production of foodstuffs. Farm folk read our publications, not to be entertained but to do a better job of farming.

In the past 15 years something like 100 magazines in this country have gone out of business. Burdensome costs will continue this decimation. In the interest of our country's economy, we fervently hope the farm press will survive, even though, as we all know, some prominent farm publications have died in recent years.

Gentlemen, it would appear now that our advertising rate increases will be hard put to keep up with the burdensome increases in production costs. And, as we have pointed out, postal increases over the years have been sharpest of all, percentage-wise.

As President Milholland of the Agricultural Publishers Association points out, we want to help shoulder the load. We do expect some postal rate increases as time goes along, but we would hope the increases will not be nearly as abrupt as those now proposed. For these reasons we want to endorse the suggestions of Mr. Milholland made to you in his detailed presentation last week on May 31.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee.

Walter Lippmann Goes Home

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD D. McCARTHY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 24, 1967

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, the departure of Walter Lippmann from Washington, and a slowup in his usually constant output, are two events that can hardly be overlooked by those who have read him with admiration, respect, and enlightenment for so many years.

As James Reston observed so poignantly in the New York Times on May 26:

> Now his old friends, the philosophers, the historians, and the diplomats may criticize and even condemn him. We merely love him.

Mr. Speaker, as tribute to the unforgettable Mr. Lippmann, I would like to place in the RECORD today Mr. Reston's and two other articles which appeared in the Times on May 26:

WASHINGTON: WALTER LIPPMANN GOES HOME

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, May 25.—Walter Lippmann announced today that he is leaving Washington, but the reader should not be deceived. He is merely going away, as all men should, to the primary interests of his youth—back to New York, back to philosophy, back to Europe—but he is not really "leaving" Washington.

For he is the greatest journalist of the present age, and he will be around here much longer than he suspects. This is not because he was always right, but because he gave us a model of what newspaper political criticism should be, because he cut through the trivial to the important, because, as the title of his column—Today and Tomorrow—indicated, he put the day's events in the perspective of history, and because he was a gentleman who loved truth and reason and kept in touch with the coming age.

TODAY AND TOMORROW

He came to us in the newspaper business from the world of Santayana and James, when journalism was skeptical of intellectuals and vice versa, and he gave us a higher and nobler vision of our craft. Now his old friends, the philosophers, the historians and the diplomats, may criticize and even condemn him. We merely love him.

The reasons for this are fairly clear. It is not only that he showed us the way, but that he lived the ideal of most thoughtful newspapermen. That is to say that he managed to avoid the tedious rubbish that occupies the time of so many reporters, but that he managed to reconcile his personal and professional lives. He was not immune to the tyranny of the deadline—which is why he is now going away at 77—but in some mysterious way he managed to do what few people achieve in this business—he found time to think, time to write, and still had enough time for his wife and his friends and anybody who needed his counsel.

W.L. AND L.B.J.

All kinds of nonsense has been written about him leaving Washington because he wasn't getting on with President Johnson. He never expected that critics and Presidents should get along, or thought that they should. The personal relations between politicians and newspapermen, he wrote in 1936, when Lyndon Johnson was a rookie Congressman, "are invariably delicate and difficult. For obviously they must be close: correspondents must see much of the men they write about. Yet if they do, they soon find themselves compelled to choose between friendship and the ties of loyalty that come from companionship on the one hand, the stern embarrassing truth on the other.

"This is the unpleasantest side of newspaper work and I have never heard of any way of avoiding it. When a personal friend becomes a public man, a predicament soon arrives in which friendship and professional duty are at odds."

Walter Lippmann's career is too important to be discussed in terms of Lyndon Johnson's vicious vendetta. He has been writing his column for 35 years. He wrote "A preface to Politics" 54 years ago, "A Preface to Morals" 36 years ago. Since then he has been vilified by experts; by Presidents who won wars and even Presidents who avoided them, so the savage and cruel personal comments Johnson and others in the White House have made about him tell us more about them than they do about Lippmann.

The only significance in the Johnson-Lippmann feud is that it disproves one of Lippmann's ideals. As a young man he set himself the task of avoiding personal criticism and sticking to principle, and he discovered in the Johnson Administration that it was impossible to be both relevant and impersonal, because the news out of Washington and Vietnam was so often the reflection of President Johnson's mind and personality.

Thus he found himself writing of Johnson at the end: "The root of his troubles has been pride, a stubborn refusal to recognize the country's limitations or his own limitations. . . . Such pride goeth before destruction, and an haughty spirit before a fall."

This, however, is merely a disagreeable and probably inevitable incident in a glorious carrer. He has not only endured in a savagely competitive business for over half a century, but forced officials all the way to deal with his ideas, right or wrong.

NOT FOR KEEPS

He is going away sad, for his belief in reason in the world is not prevailing, but what is silly is to think he is leaving for keeps. He tried it once before, 33 years ago, but he soon came back. "In vain," he wrote then, "does a man imagine that he can go anywhere these days and shut himself away from the clamor of the front page. Even when the newspaper does not come, he is trying to imagine what is in the newspaper he has not seen. . . . The best one can do, I find, is to fret quietly for a few weeks instead of openly in public print."

Lippmann at 77 Cuts His Pace: Twice-a-Week Columns to End—Essays Planned Once a Month—Writer Says It's Simply That He's "Getting Older"

Thirty-six years after he wrote his first newspaper column, Walter Lippmann announced yesterday that, tired of the pressure of remaining "continually and closely on the alert, so attentive, so up to the minute," he was stopping his regular newspaper pieces.

In the brief final installment of his twice-a-week column, he wrote: "More and more I have come to wish to get rid of the necessity of knowing, day in and day out, what the blood pressure is at the White House and who said what and who saw whom and who is listened to and who is not istened to."

In a telephone conversation—an interruption in an afternoon of packing for a trip to Europe—he said, when asked why he was stopping the column, "Well, I'll tell you this, it wasn't Lyndon Johnson."

There had been speculation when Mr. Lippmann decided last December to move to New York that he was leaving his long-time Washington home because of dislike for the atmosphere under President Johnson.

A MATTER OF AGE

But he said yesterday that the explanation of the end of his regular newspaper columns was simple. It did not involve the President, nor the demise of The New York Herald Tribune, the home of his column from 1931 until the paper died last year, nor of its successor, The World Journal Tribune.

"It's a matter of getting older," he said. Mr. Lippman is 77.

The Los Angeles Times syndicate, which distributes his column to more than 300 newspapers around the world, will send a once-a-month Lippmann essay, starting in June, it's manager, Rex Barley, said in Los Angeles.

Mr. Lippmann has also been writing a column every other week for Newsweek. Osborn Elliott, editor of the magazine, said Mr. Lippmann would not write for four months each year, and would continue his twice-a-month column for the other eight months.

RAN EDITORIAL PAGE

Mr. Lippmann ran the editorial page of the old New York World until that newspaper was merged. In 1931 he began writing "Today and Tomorrow" for The Herald Tribune. His New York outlet became The World Journal Tribune, until that paper died, and then The New York Post, which published his last twice-a-week column yesterday, under the headline: "A Personal Word from Walter Lippmann."

It was the end of a series, he recalled yesterday in a voice husky from an attack of bronchitis, that had begun with a piece that "had something to do with the Depression."

How did it feel to be stopping after all these years?

Mr. Lippmann laughed. "Don't ask me to assess anything today. I'm packing, and I haven't got a thought in my head."

He leaves Saturday for France and will not come back until the end of October, he said. His home here is at 1021 Park Avenue. His permanent home had been in Washington since 1938.

Mr. Lippmann wrote in his final regular column; "as I do not mean to retire and lapse into silence, I have been experimenting with new forms—with longer articles which cover a wider range of subject matter. I have already made two experiments with these longer articles—one a review of the Manchester book and the other an article on public television. I shall experiment further during the summer when I am abroad. When I return in the autumn I shall again write occasional articles for the newspapers without fixed schedules and with no deadlines."

As Mr. Barley explained it in Los Angeles, the contracts with newspapers that publish the Lippmann column were being renegotiated under a plan for a once-a-month piece of 1,500 to 2,500 words or so.

At varying lengths, but with consistent literateness and balance, Mr. Lippmann has been writing opinions in books, magazines and newspapers for more than half a century.

Now, after a lifetime of meeting publication deadlines, he will commence a more relaxed approach.

A man famed for his capacity to take the dispassionate view (Heywood Broun once complained that Mr. Lippmann was able to see so many sides of a question that he could "score a field goal for Harvard and a touchdown for Yale on the same play"), Mr. Lippmann had this parting line about his new approach in his column yesterday:

"We shall see," he wrote, "what I can make of it."

Passages From Lippmann's Writings

We are unsettled to the very roots of our being. There isn't a human relation, whether of parent and child, husband and wife, worker and employer, that doesn't move in a strange situation. We are not used to a complicated civilization, we don't know how to behave when personal contact and eternal authority have disappeared. There are no precedents to guide us, no wisdom that wasn't made for a simpler age. We have changed our environment more quickly than we know how to change ourselves.

And so we are literally an eccentric people, our emotional life is disorganized, our passions are out of kilter. Those who call themselves radical float helplessly upon a stream amidst the wreckage of old creeds and abortive new ones, and they are inclined to mistake the motion which carries them for their own will. Those who make no pretentions to much theory are twisted about by fashions, "crazes," at the mercy of milliners and dressmakers, theatrical producers, advertising campaigns, and the premeditated gossip of the newspapers.—1914.

A free nation can tolerate much, and ordinarily toleration is its best defense. It can tolerate feeble Communist parties and feeble Fascist parties as long as it is certain that they have no hope of success. But once they cease to be debating societies and become formidable organizations for action, they present a challenge which it is suicidal to ignore. They use liberty to assemble force to destroy liberty. When that challenge is actually offered, when it really exists in the judgment of the sober and the well-informed, it is a betrayal of liberty not to defend it with all the power that free men possess.—1935.

The more I see of Europe the more deeply convinced do I become that the preservation of freedom in America, or anywhere else, depends upon maintaining and restoring for the great majority of individuals the economic means to remain independent individuals. The greatest evil of the modern world is the reduction of the people to a proletarian level by destroying their savings, by depriving them of private property, by making them the helpless employes of a private monopoly or of government monopoly. At that point they are no longer citizens. They are a mob. For when the people lose this sense of their separate and individual security, they cease to be individuals. They are absorbed into a mass. Their liberties are already lost and they are a frightened crowd ready for a master.—1938.

In the older, and truer, relationship between the generations, there is none of this sentimental foolery about youth as youth. To be young was glorious, no doubt, but it was not a career. To be young was to prepare for the duties and responsibilities to come, and what was respected in youths was not their immaturity but the eternal fact that a boy is going to be a man and a girl is going to be a woman.—1940.

Mr. Churchill seems to be the only statesman in the world who really believes that the people can and should be enabled to understand the war. Certainly he is the only one who goes to them whenever events have taken a new turn and tells them even in broad outline what has happened and why it has happened. Surely the willingness to explain what he has been doing is, even more than his great gifts of speech, the secret of his leadership—1942.

The constant knowledge must be with us that our power, like all power, is good only within the moral order. Therefore, when we send forth our men to kill or be killed, let us not in moral intertia and laziness of spirit refuse the effort of making sure that their battles are not meaningless and their sacrifices are not vain.—1943.

In the life and death of Mahatma Gandhi we have seen re-enacted in our time the supreme drama of humanity. Gandhi was a political leader and he was a seer, and perhaps never before on so grand a scale has anyone sought to shape the course of events in the world as it is by the example of a spirit which was not of the world as it is.—1948.

Like those who unhappily are made to get fat, the new Administration will have to learn how big is the difference between reducing and staying reduced. Every new Administration starts off on one of those 10-day miracle diets consisting of lettuce and a hard-boiled egg; always in the past it has ended as has the outgoing Truman Administration—especially in the outer world—on a diet of waffles and fudge.—1952.

If the country is to be governed with the consent of the governed, then the governed must arrive at opinions about what their governors want them to consent to. How do they do this?

They do it by hearing on the radio and reading in the newspapers what the corps of correspondents tell them is going on in Washington, and in the country at large, and in the world. Here, we correspondents perform an essential service. In some field of interest, we make it our business to find out what is going on under the surface and beyond the horizon, to infer, to deduce, to imagine, and to guess what is going on inside, what this meant yesterday, and what it could mean tomorrow.

In this we do what every sovereign citizen is supposed to do but has not the time or the interest to do for himself. This is our job. It is no mean calling. We have a right to be proud of it and to be glad that it is our work.—1960.

The so-called socialism which is supposed to be creeping up on us is in fact nothing more than the work of making life safe and decent for a mass society collected in great cities. Through the Federal, state and local governments we spend on these civilian necessities—no doubt with some waste and shenanigans—less than a sixth of all the wealth we produce. We spend an equal amount on the task of containing the Soviet Union and Red China and the Communist movement from expanding any further. The sums are large. We are, in a word, paying the price of having become a modern world power.—1962.

Hebrew Academy of Nassau County

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT TENZER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1967

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday evening, June 4, 1967, I attended the 14th annual dinner of the Hebrew Academy of Nassau County, honoring District Attorney William Cahn of Nassau County.

The Hebrew Academy of Nassau County has grown from an enrollment of 30 students 14 years ago to a student body of 600 from 30 communities throughout Nassau County and beyond. The academy has met the highest educational standards of New York State while at the same time providing a program of intensive Hebraic teaching. In its religious studies, covering the breadth of Biblical instruction, taught in Hebrew, the original language of the Old Testament, the academy has placed special emphasis on the development of ethical values of Judaism as applied to our American democracy.

The Hebrew Academy has also excelled in the field of Jewish day camping in Nassau County. The success of the HANC day camp program resulted in the construction of an additional modern campsite at the Mitchel Field Center.

Mr. Speaker, the invocation at the dinner was delivered by Rabbi Meyer Fendel, principal of the Hebrew Academy of Nassau County. He invoked the blessings of Almighty God, Creator of all men, in a prayer for peace for all mankind.

INVOCATION

As we meet in commemoration of our 14th year, to pay tribute to a faithful servant of our cause, our honored guest, William Cahn, the hearts and thoughts of all of us throb to the terrifying events of the past few days and we pray in the agony of our souls. For in this critical hour, the very fabric of all that is precious to our people stands threatened by overcast skies, darkened by clouds of war hovering over Thy holy land—the tiny State of Israel. Together with Israeli pioneers, those who were snatched from the embers of the inferno which raged no more than two score years ago transformed a desert into a blossoming garden and a wilderness into a home for the homeless. For the weary survivors of the gehinom of Europe, the only ray of hope beckoned from this ancient hallowed territory. Now the fury of aggression threatens this land and our people there . . . casting fear unto all mankind. As Israel stands menaced by those who cry out—

"Come let us cut them off from being a nation that the name Israel shall no longer be remembered," we echo the words of Thy psalmist: "Our earnest desire is for peace . . . while they seek war. Peace is Thy most precious gift and an embattled people fresh from the wounds of holocaust and decimation beseech thee from the depths of their being that this gift be vouchsafed unto them."

Grant that we who are assembled here, loyal proud citizens of a great nation, whose sacred task it is to illumine the drakened world with the reflected splendor of Thy teachings, and to strengthen the loyalties of Thy people everywhere; be equal to the hour of challenge and opportunity—that our solidarity with the people of that beleaguered land remain firm and steadfast, and that we be every ready to respond in whatever manner necessary for the welfare of their just and peaceful future.

Strengthen the defenders of the Holy Land; grant them salvation and crown them with victory. Establish peace in the land and everlasting joy for its inhabitants.

Imbue the leaders of our great country and the representatives assembled at the United Nations with wisdom, moral rectitude and courage so that justice may prevail.

Guardian of Israel—preserve the remanent of Israel: Let not Israel perish who proclaims for all the world the eternal verity of Thy Being in the words Hear O Israel.

At the dinner the following petition was circulated to the guests and was signed by more than 740 guests of all faiths and all political affiliations:

PETITION TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, LYNDON B. JOHNSON, TO ACT IN SUPPORT OF ISRAEL'S INDEPENDENCE AND INTEGRITY

We, the undersigned, Jews and Christians residing in Nassau County commend your forthright reiteration of America's commitment to the independence and integrity of the State of Israel and her rights to navigation through the Straights of Tiran.

It is on the basis of this solemn and unequivocal commitment that Israel voluntarily withdrew her forces in 1957 from Sinai and from Sharm el Sheikh. It is the creditability of this solemn commitment that is being challenged.

We therefore join with fellow American's of all persuasions in urging you, Mr. President, to take immediate steps inside the United Nations and outside of it, to restore the freedom of innocent passage through the Gulf of Aquaba to all nations including Israel.

The peace of the world in the Middle East as elsewhere requires that America honors her commitments.

Mr. Speaker, the petition with these signatures was presented to me for delivery to the President of the United States which, accordingly I have dispatched to the White House.

Mr. Speaker, I join in this petition to the President and urge all Members of Congress and Americans of all faiths to endorse the Presidents forthright statement of May 23, 1967. We must in addition, urge our Government to give Israel all possible material assistance and political support to bring an end once and for all, Nasser's policies of aggression and expansionism, designed to destroy the State of Israel, in a holy war.

Israel, an oasis in a desert of midieval feudalism, is the only bastion of democracy in the Middle East, the defense of Israel is in America's national interest.

Mr. Speaker, I would appeal to my colleagues in the Congress to urge the United Nations to push for direct negotiations between Israel and the Arab nations. This is so essential to the restoration of peace—for just as a skirmish can light the spark which starts a confrontation—the conflict can light the spark for a world war. Diplomatic channels which have not been successful of late in maintaining or in restoring peace in the troubled areas of the world must be made effective and the hands of our President must be strengthened to implement our Nation's commitment to the independence and integrity of the State of Israel and her rights to navigation through the Straights of Tiran.

We pray that diplomacy will succeed in the Middle East crisis—if it fails—we must not fail Israel.

Indonesia Big Boon to West

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 5, 1967

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, some spots seem destined to be the hinges upon which will turn the future of the world.

One of these would-be hinges is Indonesia, a nation which through a combination of geographical position and natural resources is almost certain to exert more than ordinary influence on the course of history to come.

Unfortunately, there are far too few indications that our Federal government understands the significance of Indonesia, or if it does understand, that it is doing anything about it.

Instead all eyes in our Federal Government seem hypnotized by what is happening in Vietnam, or, more lately, what is happening in the latest crisis in the Middle East.

Certainly, Vietnam and the Near East cannot and must not be ignored. This intense, all-out focus on single points with little regard for their relationship with the rest of the world is a distortion which can only lead to a lopsided foreign policy.

It would seem that one of the main purposes would be to head off crises before they develop. Otherwise, foreign policy is not policy at all, but simply an abili for doing that which must be done because of events over which we have no control.

We then are forced into a series of "field expedients" when crises develop, expedients adopted often at the sacrifice of principle and which, in themselves, are the seeds for new and more dangerous crises in the future.

We have an opportunity right now in Indonesia to help that nation of more than 100 million people to prepare for its destiny.

We have that chance under conditions which, while they might be termed serious, are certainly not in the same state of disarray as the situations in Vietnam or the Near East.

Recently, the chief of the Washington bureau of the Knight Newspapers, Mr. Robert S. Boyd, completed a tour of Asia which took him to Indonesia and in which he outlined the problems facing that nation and the steps it must take to get out of the ditch of economic despair and onto the road of solvency and prosperity.

I urge my colleagues to pay close attention to the articles which follow:

CAN AN AILING INDONESIA SURVIVE A RUGGED CURE?

(By Robert S. Boyd)

JAKARTA.—Indonesia today can be likened to the stranger who suddenly hands you a check for $1,000. It feels great, but you don't celebrate until you see if the check bounces.

Awed and delighted westerners, who have watched the cataclysmic changes in the world's fifth largest nation over the last two years, have their fingers crossed lest Indonesia take a wrong bounce.

Her 105 million people are hardly likely to plunge directly back into communism. The attempted Red coup and the shattering events of the fall of 1965 are too fresh for that.

But Indonesia's problems are so huge, and the wreckage left by 21 years of Sukarno's rule so devastating, that a relapse into anarchy or despair is always possible. Just last week, rumors of a possible new coup swept the capital.

Because of the government's sound but severe austerity program, ordinary people probably feel they are less well off than under Sukarno. And twice before, Indonesia's Communist Party, still one of the world's biggest, has staged comebacks.

Indonesia's foreign minister, Adam Malik, summed up his country's catalog of economic woes recently:

"The former government has left us with a legacy of economic and financial chaos. For years inflation has gone unchecked. The productive apparatus was allowed to deteriorate.

"The economic infrastructure was seriously damaged. Roads and transportation, harbor facilities and communications were in very bad condition. Mismanagement and corruption were rampant."

A drive through the hot, lush Indonesian countryside is like passing through a junkyard. Rows of rusting trucks, railroad cars, bulldozers—inoperable for lack of repair parts—are strewn along the potholed roads. Half-finished projects, monuments, skyscrapers—product of Sukarno's megalomania—just against the sky like pieces of a giant child's erector set.

The new government of General Suharto, groping for a way out of this mess, adopted an economic reform program last October.

Drawn up by a half dozen young economists, who received their training in the United States during the Sukarno years, the austerity program has made an impressive beginning. But it is only a beginning.

One of the top economists, Dr. Emil Salim, sat on his veranda the other day with a sheaf of papers and outlined the accomplishments so far:

Inflation, which ran a ruinous 800 percent in 1966, has been dramatically cut. Hopefully prices will rise by less than 60 percent this year. Even Dr. Salim isn't sure it can be done.

Exports, the lifeblood of an underdeveloped country, are up 25 percent over the first quarter of last year. Indonesia will still run a trade deficit of more than $200 million in 1967. But foreign creditors, including the U.S., have agreed to pick up the difference.

The national budget, which used to run riotously out of balance, has been brought in line with revenues.

Indonesia's $2.5 billion foreign debt, which Sukarno piled up like a drunken sailor, has been rescheduled. The debts would have required payments of $700 million this year—almost the entire national budget.

A start has been made toward overhauling the decrepit government machinery. The banking system has been reorganized. Tax collections were tightened.

All these reforms have administered a severe shock treatment to the ailing Indonesian economy. The question, Americans and Indonesians agree, is whether the treatment will kill the patient.

Even with stability and hope and steady outside support, Salim estimated it will take Indonesia at least 10 years to organize for "takeoff"—the miracle of self-sustaining economic growth all underdeveloped countries are aiming for.

And stability at home will be hard to achieve, in view of the problems swarming like angry bees around the new regime's brass hats.

In the opinion of thoughtful westerners and Indonesians, the greatest weakness of Indonesia is her people. They lack not only the experience or training to run a modern nation, but also the will.

"Our biggest need is a different mental attitude," said Salim. "Our people must come to want modernization before they can achieve it. It's going to be a long and difficult road."

Or as a professor at a Jakarta university put it: "Indonesia is like a sick man who has just gotten out of the hospital. We still don't know if we can walk."

INDONESIA BIG BOON TO WEST—BREAK WITH CHINA WIDENS

(By Robert S. Boyd)

JAKARTA, INDONESIA.—The most spectacular international flip-flop in many years—Indonesia's violent twist out of the communist embrace—is turning out to be a breathtaking windfall for the West.

Probably only the Chinese-Russian split has done so much to weaken communist pressure along the "Pacific frontier" between the United States and Red China. The full dimensions of the changeover in the fifth largest nation in the world are still coming into view.

Less than two years ago, this 3,000-mile island empire, with vast untapped wealth and 105 million inhabitants, was poised for a final slide down the throat of the red dragon. Western experts are convinced that former President Sukarno meant to take his country all the way into the Chinese Communist camp.

Today, however, Indonesia's millions—the equivalent of the populations of South Vietnam, South Korea, Taiwan (Formosa) and Thailand combined—have been subtracted from the communist lineup.

Though not a formal ally of the West, Indonesia is something which most U.S. officials consider just as good—a vigorously anti-communist, independent nation whose neutralism, for a change, is tipped toward the West.

"American and Indonesian interests are now almost entirely parallel," a leading Western expert in Jakarta said.

"I see no basic conflict of interest any more between our two countries," Indonesian Foreign Minister Adam Malik told an American audience recently.

The current similarity of outlook between the U.S. and Indonesia governments is striking.

The "new order" of Gen. Suharto has reversed Sukarno's march to socialism. A ruthless austerity program has slowed inflation, nearly balanced the budget, ended uneconomic subsidies and wasteful spending. The new regime has encouraged free enterprise and reopened Indonesia to foreign investment and managerial know-how.

Indonesia's rulers are almost pathologically sensitive to the danger of internal communist subversion. They speak darkly of efforts by the Indonesian Communist Party to regroup, allegedly with the help of the hated Chinese colony in Indonesia.

The anti-communist ferocity of ordinary Indonesians—including intellectuals, students and editors, who in most developing countries tend to be sympathetic to Marxism—is startling to a newcomer.

A mild-looking Sumatran businessman told me, almost apologetically, that "we killed ONLY 10 to 15 percent of the communists."

It was as if the fault lay not in the slaughter of 300,000 to 450,000 human beings in the bloody autumn of 1965, but in the fact that more than 2½ million were left alive.

In foreign affairs, with the partial exception of Vietnam, the U.S.-Indonesian parallelism continues:

Instead of distracting their people from their troubles by foreign adventures, Sukarno-stlye, the new government is concentrating on solving its internal problems. This is somthing the U.S. wishes a lot more underdeveloped nations would do.

Indonesia sees her No. 1 external enemy as Communist China. Lyndon Johnson and Dean Rusk agree.

Indonesia has ended her spiteful quarrel with Malaysia, and is now seeking to cooperate with her Southeast Asia neighbors in a variety of regional alliances. Mr. Johnson and Rusk are pushing regional co-operation as the best answer to Chinese expansionism.

Although Indonesia refuses to join any military alliance or "bloc," this is satisfactory to the Johnson administration. The old Dulles policy of the 1950's—you're with us or you're against us—is gone.

Indonesia is about the only country in the world to have some kind of relations with both Communist and Nationalist China, North and South Korea, East and West Germany, and both Hanoi and Saigon.

Even Vietnam, the tenderest joint in the U.S.-Indonesian relations, is becoming less troublesome. The Indonesian attitude on the war seems to be mellowing month by month.

In January, when the Indian foreign minister visited Jakarta, the two governments issued a communique urging that the bombing of North Vietnam "be stopped unconditionally and immediately."

In May, however, Indonesian Foreign Minister Malik told a visiting Yugoslav delegation that it's about time North Vietnam shows some interest in negotiations, too. And the "Armed Forces Mail," an organ of the Indonesian military, blamed communist "intransigence" for prolonging the war.

A Jakarta newspaper is running a series of articles giving the South Vietnamese side of the war story.

Publicly, this is about as far as the Indonesian government will go, so far. Officially, it deplores the war, opposes "foreign intervention," and says "Asian problems should be solved by Asians themselves."

Privately, however, Indonesian leaders have told westerners they appreciate the reasons for the U.S. stand in Vietnam and, they say, secretly applaud it. The last thing Indonesians want, these sources say, is for Red China to be on their doorstep.

Nevertheless, Indonesians are uneasy about the war for several reasons:

There is a natural emotional distaste for the idea of a rich, white western power making war on a poor, colored Asian people. The bombing of the North is especially distasteful.

Some intellectuals here disagree with the current U.S. version of the "domino theory"—the belief that if South Vietnam goes communist much of Southeast Asia will follow. These Indonesians claim to see little or no effect on their country from a communist triumph in Vietnam.

Some Indonesians note, a trifle smugly, that they handled their own communist problem without outside help. They feel the South Vietnamese are not carrying their share of the load, and are leaving too much to the United States. This cannot, in the long run, succeed.

Finally, Indonesians see their self-interest threatened by the war. They fear the U.S. is investing so much in Vietnam that there won't be enough left over to help them meet their own enormous problems.

They note, for example, that the U.S. spends in one day in Vietnam as much money as it will put into Indonesia in all 1967. Understandably, they feel their country should be at least as important as little South Vietnam.

This view, incidentally, is shared by experienced western diplomats here. They worry that preoccupation with Vietnam is distorting the Johnson administration's perspective on the rest of Asia.

Indonesia is not complaining about the current level of U.S. aid—about $65 million for 1967. But they expect their needs will multiply in the future as their domestic reforms take hold. And they wonder if the U.S. will be ready to give enough help.

Which leads to the biggest unanswered question—can the Indonesia miracle last?

George Meany Speaks Out on the Middle East Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 5, 1967

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, President George Meany of the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organization, long has been a champion of freedom, both on the domestic front and in international affairs.

On Thursday, June 1, President Meany issued a most interesting statement of his observations on the Middle East situation. Because of the intense concern which we all feel on this important crisis, I would like to call this statement to the attention of my colleagues:

American labor is deeply disturbed by the grave threat to world peace in the Middle East.

Soviet machinations over the past year are the primary cause of the dangerous deterioration of the situation in this pivotal area. Instead of striving for an Arab-Israeli understanding, the Soviet government has armed Nasser for aggression and led him to expel the UN peace-keeping force and to violate the freedom of the seas which is indispensable to world peace. On the very day (May 22) that Moscow notified Turkey that ten Soviet warships were to sail from the Black Sea through the Dardanelles and into the Mediterranean, the Egyptian dictator announced his closing of the Gulf of Aqaba to Israeli shipping.

Aided and abetted by the USSR, Nasser is frantically rallying all Arab countries for a war to destroy Israel. He has boasted before the Egyptian National Assembly that "the Soviet Union stands with us in this battle." We have here the voice of Nasser, but the hand of Brezhnev.

Realizing the gravity of the situation and the urgency of free world preparations to meet the crisis, American labor welcomes President Johnson's timely declaration that: "The United States considers the gulf to be an international waterway and feels that a blockade of Israeli shipping is illegal and potentially disastrous to the cause of peace." We support the President's unequivocal reaffirmation of the policy pursued by his predecessors, Presidents Truman, Eisenhower and Kennedy, that "The United States strongly opposes aggression by anyone in the area, in any form, overt or clandestine."

American labor favors the President's policy of utilizing all diplomatic channels, inclusive of the UN, and seeking combined efforts by the maritime powers to secure a just settlement of the present crisis in the Middle East. However, the Soviet government and its Communist bloc would make a fatal error to assume that our country's exhaustive diplomatic efforts for a just peace mean that the United States would, in the process, become exhausted and appease aggression by accepting actions which President Johnson has appropriately branded "illegal and potentially disastrous to the cause of peace."

Were Nasser and his masters permitted to succeed in their aggression, not only Israel but a number of other Middle Eastern countries—Arab lands—would also lose their national independence under the guise of so-called Arab national unity. Then the USSR would finally succeed in its drive to take over the entire Red Sea-Arabian Peninsula-Persian Gulf Region and to deny the free world access to its energy resources. Such a conquest would be the springboard from which the Soviet rulers could move to take over the mineral resources of South-Central Africa.

In the present critical situation, Israel is the first target of Soviet aggression by proxy (Nasser). Clearly, Israel is not the only or last target of this aggression. The freedom and security of our country, of the entire free world, are the real and final target of the Communist aggressors.

Education-Community Communications

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 5, 1967

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the vitality of the educational systems of our States is of paramount interest to all of us. We have recently had the Elementary and Secondary Education Act before us, and while there was a difference of opinion on methods of administering educational programs, no where was there an argument against education. A few years back I had the opportunity, through the cooperation of the Seattle Teachers Association, to spend a day visiting schools in my district. It was an enlightening day as I learned the problems of education, the goals, and the achievements. This fall I hope to again have the opportunity to be refreshed on what is being done in education in the Puget Sound area.

Mr. Speaker, I bring to the attention of my colleagues a most outstanding dissertation on the necessity of developing effective communications with the public at large and local community leaders, and the difficult tasks school districts are having in achieving this. Mr. Speaker, the text of the paper, "Evidence of Things Not Seen," by Carroll Hanson, director of publications and information department, Seattle public schools, follows:

EVIDENCE OF THINGS NOT SEEN [1]

(By Carroll Hanson)

It is important for the discussion this morning to understand the limitations of the public relations director. He is not a policy maker. He is not the captain of the ship. He is, if I may draw a comparison, somewhat like the navigator. In other words, he does not determine the cargo, the ports of call, nor the payroll of the crew. But he watches the winds, the tides, and the stars. He raises questions. He plans. He waits. Finally, he recommends to the superintendent how and when the case for the school board and the superintendent should be presented to the public and the school district employees.

---

[1] At the National School Boards Association Convention, 8:45 a.m. Sunday, April 23, 1967, Convention Hall, Portland, Oreg.

Let us touch, very briefly, on five items that loom up on school board agendas everywhere. What are some of their implications for the public relations function?

I. CHANGES IN CURRICULUM AND TEACHING METHODS

When we think of tomorrow, with its social problems, its political demands, and world-wide business opportunities, it is clear that tomorrow's citizen will have to be better equipped than we are in foreign languages and in the basic ability to seek out, analyze, and solve complex problems. University students have already pushed into tomorrow's world, with consequent upheavals on many campuses over academic, moral, and social issues.

In telling the story of curriculum and instructional needs, public relations programs will have to be more sophisticated than in the past. Curriculum changes are difficult to dramatize because their effect, like good teaching, is almost imperceptible except over a very long period of time. There is no explosion. Rather there is slow growth, like the acorn becoming an oak.

II. SCHOOL BUIDINGS

The changing curriculum and teaching methods will force radical changes in buildings and raise questions.

For example:

"Why not multi-storied instead of single?"
"Why is so much land needed?"
"Why carpeting?"
"Why swimming pools?"
"Why a continuous progress center?"

These and many other questions must be answered over and over again through the public relations program.

III. TEACHER NEGOTIATIONS

A new kind of teaching corps will be needed to handle the new curriculum. The new teachers will be professional in every respect.

Tomorrow's teachers will operate in a greatly expanded hierarchy, in which salaries will be somewhat greater than they now are for the top teachers. It will not be necessary for a teacher to become an administrator merely to get a decent salary.

Negotiations will accelerate decision making in education, with the school board members on one end of the table, the profession at the other, and the administration somewhere in between, although this last position is not entirely clear at this time.

The public must be constantly reassured that, despite negotiations, the school board is not abdicating final authority for policy making vested in it by voters and the State.

IV. DE FACTO SEGREGATION

This is a cancer in our land that must be removed. How to do it is one of the most crucial questions of the day. Its solution will require the closest collaboration between school boards and other governmental bodies. The public information office can assist by issuing teacher in-service information; by pointing out that the white population has as great a stake in the solution of the problem as does the Negro; by highlighting the achievements of Negro teachers and students; by involving Negro citizens in school affairs; by keeping communication channels open to the Negro community.

V. THE EDUCATION-INDUSTRIAL COMPLEX

This topic deserves an entire speech. I can only touch on it here, but I would like to point out two important possibilities connected with Federal funds: (1) the current drive for general Federal aid may fail, and (2) a partnership between large corporations and the U.S. Office of Education may be imminent. Such a partnership would be roughly comparable to our military-industrial complex. If these two possibilities actually occur, they could spell the end of local school board control. It seems clear today that the public will ultimately face this very tough question: *shall the Federal government assume the major share of financial support and policy direction for our schools?*

The answer will depend largely on how much strength—local, state, and national—school boards can maintain and how well they can keep their constituents informed.

Parenthetically, may I suggest that you all subscribe to *Education USA*, published weekly by National School Public Relations Association, Washington, D.C. It is your best source of fast, accurate information.

Now, may I illustrate what the School Board and Superintendent Forbes Bottomly are doing in Seattle about public relations and school support.

The laboratory

As background, let me sketch in the laboratory situation. Seattle is a booming city of more than half a million people, with a full-time and part-time public school enrollment of more than 100,000 children, youth, and adults.

The school district has a budget of about $70 million a year, of which about 20% depends on the *annual* passage of a special millage levy. The Washington state constitution requires a 60% majority to pass a levy and also requires a voter turnout equal to 40% of the number which voted in the preceding general election.

So far as I know, the requirements for passing a levy in Seattle are the most rigorous faced in any large city of the nation.

We have been fortunate, however. Since 1967, when the annual special levy was adopted as a regular effort to finance quality education, the levy has always passed, with one exception, either the first or second time around.

Voters passed a $43 million bond issue last September by a 60% plus majority, and a $15 million operating levy in January, 1967, by an 84.2% majority.

With this background in mind, it will not surprise you that the public relations program in Seattle has the solid support of everybody concerned with quality education, from the School Board and the Superintendent to the staff in each of the 118 schools of the city, as well as virtually every major organization in Seattle.

Policy—Not maybe

Nothing happens in a school public relations program unless it is a stated policy of the School Board and the firm conviction of the Superintendent that the public shall be informed and that the school system shall give full moral and financial support to the public relations department. I cannot stress this fact too strongly.

Lacking this policy, it would be impossible to:

1. Adequately staff the department.
2. Clothe it with authority to make decisions.
3. Give direction to school employees.
4. Acquire the funds to conduct a program of publications, slide presentations, motion pictures, research, and special events.

The long-range purpose of the public relations program is to make an impact on a substantial majority of the voters in Seattle and maintain, if not increase, the normal commitment that our citizens hold toward quality education. The immediate purpose is always to pass the annual levy—that slender thread which suspends disaster.

There are three phases to the total local relations program. They are: (1) an institutional, city-wide program, (2) a decentralized community relations program, (3) a levy information program.

All of the programs are planned, budgeted, and put into writing for the Superintendent's approval about six months before the beginning of the next fiscal year.

Once approved, it is the responsibility of the Director of the Publications and Information Department to execute the programs outlined, with the help of staff, outside consultants, and a variety of school employees, PTA members, and other citizens.

At this time the public relations group is composed of nine people, full or part-time, including a supervisor of information, a conference coordinator, the editor of the *Seattle Schools* newsletter, an artist, and five secretaries.

Central planning; decentralized execution

The central public relations staff operates in Seattle as a silent partner to the Superintendent.

It plans, creates, services, assigns, and evaluates across the whole gamut of public relations activity.

But if its name were "Legion" it could not begin to carry out all the programs that it sets in operation.

There is some danger, not to mention inefficiency, in a public relations office trying to do more than it should. Walter Lippmann's statement in *The Good Society* is applicable. He said: "It is generally supposed that the increasing complexity of the social order requires an increasing direction from officials. My own view is, rather, that as affairs become more intricate, more extended in time and space, more involved and inter-related, overhead direction by the officials has to become simpler, less intensive, less direct, more general."

The institutional program

Now a word about the city-wide institutional communications program. Its main purpose is to increase support for the *school system* (as distinguished from a single, local school) by building civic pride in the program and confidence in the school board and superintendent. It presents a concept far beyond the local do-it-yourself school; a concept which might be summed up as "Big School, Big Business." The focus is on the inter-relationship of the schools with the total community, particularly the fact that a good school system means a better economic climate, attractive to new industries, beneficial to property values, and conducive to full employment, trained manpower, and a higher standard of living. This concept appeals strongly to industrial and labor organizations, and other city-wide organizations.

We like the line in a Look magazine's story on Seattle's business education program. It said "Local businessmen love Seattle's business education program."

But in order to disseminate this concept we have to report more frequently to civic organizations and citizens in general and submit our school system programs and budgets to much closer scrutiny than we ever have in the past. We expect to have tough questions asked and the Board and Superintendent expect to live in the glare of publicity. Reporting to the public is routine for successful corporations. One of them reports 12 times a year to millions of stockholders at a cost of thousands of dollars.

The institutional program deals with material of a system-wide nature, such as board policy, the budget, board and administration views on state legislation, and lately, federal programs, professional negotiations, and *de-*

facto segregation. Material is sent to Seattle dailies, four television stations, several magazines, a dozen radio stations, 15 weeklies, and 20 special area publications.

Researchers tell us that the usual instruments of mass communication (television, radio, the press, and magazines) cannot by themselves change opinion. It is interesting to note, also, that Walter Cronkite recently stated that "the public needs to know a great deal more than we in television can communicate to them. Somehow or other, we have to teach the American people to seek more information . . ."

In practice therefore, we are placing less reliance on the mass media then we used to. However, we do not discount the mass media and we welcome all the time and space we can get. But in the past several years, in Seattle, we have paid more attention to weekly newspapers, and we have built up our own supplementary communications channels which can be focused at will on special publics and can carry news which is important to the school board but not sufficiently dramatic or immediate to gain acceptance by the mass media.

We need our own channels of communication, for example, to the teaching corps and other personnel in the school system; we need our own channels to key citizens; and we need our own channels to reach a nationwide audience of potential employees in the teacher training institutions of America. Schools need to fight much harder for their share of priceless talent.

We, therefore, send to each school home, each month, a copy of *Seattle Schools* newsletter. We also send a copy to every member of the Seattle Schools staff, as well as to key citizens, and leading teacher training institutions. Our total printing each month is 80,000 copies. We also prepare films and color-slide presentations on a variety of topics of public interest, such as "The Knowledge Explosion," "Business Education," and so forth. These are usually 20 minutes in duration, and can be booked for service clubs and lodges. The slide presentations are complete with a script, and a projector. Last year we offered six different presentations, which were viewed by nearly 10,000 civic leaders. We are now planning to go further with sound and color motion pictures. This is expensive but necessary.

We also prepare news conference materials, speeches, and statements; operate a clipping service and a special photo service; and publish a weekly news sheet for the district employees, in addition to *Seattle* Schools newsletter.

We also arrange for Superintendent's luncheons with the officers of city-wide organizations. These luncheons are off-the-record. They have done a great deal to bring key leaders into intimate contact with the school system and have had the general effect of creating an atmosphere of trust as well as clear communication.

The Superintendent's luncheon program this past year included the top officers of the Chamber of Commerce, the King County Labor Council, Seattle Council of Churches, the Municipal League, the Bar Association, the Presidents of nearby colleges and universities, the American Institute of Architects, the League of Women Voters, and the Chairmen of our Area Citizens Committees, to name a few.

We work with "mediating groups" such as the Junior Chamber of Commerce. We have just finished our first big Fine Arts Festival with them.

We have a speaker's bureau which distributes, at the beginning of each school year, a program booklet, complete with pictures of available speakers and topics.

We are currently reviewing our organizational contacts, setting up late spring and summer citizen budget sessions, and working with our IBM crew to establish a weekly profile of school-citizen contacts.

So much for the institutional program—the city-wide effort to build understanding and a commitment.

The community program

Next, the decentralized community relations program. The theory here is that each school must be in good shape on its communications or the whole system will suffer. In addition, this program reaches those persons who are loyal *only* to their local school and do not comprehend the *total* school system.

We have divided Seattle into 12 areas, using the senior high school attendance boundaries, for the most part. Each year the Superintendent appoints four principals in each area to serve as chairmen of the following committees:

1. Area Citizens
2. Programs and Exhibits
3. Rosters
4. Special Levy.

In this manner, a total of 48 principals are continuously involved in community relations work.

Let me detail briefly the functions of each committee.

The *Area Citizens* Committee is composed of about a dozen leading citizens, appointed by the chairman, and they follow a simple program; they visit three schools in their area each year, have lunch there, see a teacher and class in action. Then they wind up with a luncheon meeting with the area principals. Since membership changes each year, a new *mediating* group is formed each year and, hopefully, its influence permeates the community. We try to select citizens who are prominent in business and labor but not particularly active in school affairs—who would not normally come in contact with schools. We do not give the committee members any publicity because we do not wish in any way to suggest that the committee is replacing our regular school patrons, such as the PTA members.

The *Program and Exhibits* Committee is busy all during the school year, booking and showing color-slide presentations to the Rotary, Kiwanis, Lions, and other service clubs and lodges in its areas. We frequently have five showings a day throughout the city. In addition, this committee books youth groups into retirement homes during Christmas to sing carols and give readings.

This committee periodically sets up and services counter exhibits in banks, beauty parlors, drug stores, medical offices, and so forth for such booklets as "Where the Money Goes," "Problems and Progress," "People Are Asking," and "A World of Learning." Currently, it is working in cooperation with the Seattle Junior Chamber of Commerce on this program.

The *Roster* committee screens new names in the area, deletes the names of persons who depart the area, and is constantly keeping our IBM mailing lists up to date.

The *Special Levy* committee goes into action about two months before the date of the annual levy election. More about this later.

It is obvious to you, at this point, that no one principal or committee has a very burdensome assignment. This is desirable because the public relations work of the principals comes on top of their other work. But by splitting up the program into small, manageable segments, the total job gets done and, in the opinion of many citizens, the community relations program is effective. But we are constantly evaluating it. I am certain that we can make major improvements in the future.

My own observation is that many of our principals are finding in community relations a whole new field of interest. Most of them are revealing a genuine talent for involving their communities in the school enterprise.

I would venture to predict that (1) public relations will become part of the principal's regular responsibilities to an increasing degree, and (2) it is only a matter of time before our schools of education will offer substantial preparation on public relations to its administration majors.

These two predictions must come to pass if we are to make a real breakthrough in school public relations. The superintendent will always be "Mr. Education" to a city-wide audience, but this role can also be fulfilled by the principal for the patrons of his school and by outstanding classroom teachers with the parents of her pupils.

But clearly, today, it is the principal who is the key man in public relations. It is the principal who is closest to the people and who can give us the most reliable feed-back.

The levy program

Finally, the levy information program. This is carried out by a temporary coordinator, again a talented principal or vice-principal, who is brought in for two months immediately before the levy election. Six months prior to his arrival, a Citizens Committee has been established and a campaign timetable has been prepared. It is the duty of this coordinator to put the campaign into motion.

The timetable calls for a rapid, and somewhat frantic, succession of events: fund raising, briefing field workers, securing endorsements, preparing materials, and giving undivided attention to a thousand-and-one details. Endorsements are important, if only because they would be conspicuous by their absence. They are also important because researchers are finding that it is impossible to communicate with an individual in isolation from the groups to which he belongs or would like to belong. We use "mediating" groups, which finance and run their own subsidiary campaigns. We may also mount a subsidiary campaign involving all the school districts in Puget Sound area.

After the campaign, it calls for an analysis of the vote, and "thank you" letters to hundreds of individuals, particularly to PTA members who are the real backbone of our campaign. I would consider the campaign to be a "booster shot," so to speak, to increase the effect of the year around programs just described. We do not use every known campaign technique in any one campaign, because we have to have an election every year. I believe that almost any tax or bond election could be won *once* by an all-out effort. But an "all out" campaign every year would hurt us over the long pull.

So much for the public relations program.

The message

This brings me to the nature of the message that we try to communicate through all of the network of organizations and contacts and through all of the media at our disposal.

Facts alone are not enough. There must be an intimation of faith, hope and pride imparted by the leaders of city-wide and "grass roots" groups in their association with the individual citizen. There must be an emotional ingredient as well as an appeal to reason.

The *quality* in a large city school system is so *complex*, that the average voter *cannot* fully comprehend it. And he can only grasp it partially with a great deal of study and attention by reading in-depth coverage and visiting classrooms.

Only the School Board and the Superintendent can really have the total picture of a quality school system clearly in focus.

Therefore, the Board and the Administration must ask the voters to accept the stamp of approval given by key leaders who have become involved in depth in some part of the school program and have seen its quality with their own eyes.

The Board and Administration must ask the voter to accept the communication of isolated achievements in the school system as an adequate token of the total quality of the system.

The Board must ask the voter to accept the endorsement and findings, for example, of a board-appointed citizens study committee on the budget, the integration program, or the validity of a special levy.

The public must take the board and superintendent in good faith on many issues, and this is why a much more intensive effort must be made in many school districts to acquaint the public with board members and the superintendent.

The time is upon us when the school community relations programs must create a *climate of faith* as well as a flow of fact. For, as you all know, "Faith is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen."

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: the Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided,* That the makeup of the RECORD shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the Official Reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the Official Reporters of the respective Houses.

The Official Reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the Official Reporters in the next issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, nor to RECORDS printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20515

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Speaker: John W. McCormack

Abbitt, Watkins M., *Va*	
Abernethy, Thomas G., *Miss.*	6278 29th St.
Adair, E. Ross, *Ind*	4000 Mass. Ave.
Adams, Brock, *Wash*	
Addabbo, Joseph P., *N.Y*	
Albert, Carl, *Okla*	4614 Reno Rd.
Anderson, John B., *Ill*	
Anderson, William R., *Tenn.*	3006 P St.
Andrews, George W., *Ala*	3108 Cathedral Ave.
Andrews, Mark, *N. Dak*	
Annunzio, Frank, *Ill*	
Arends, Leslie C., *Ill*	4815 Dexter St.
Ashbrook, John M., *Ohio*	
Ashley, Thomas L., *Ohio*	
Ashmore, Robert T., *S.C*	
Aspinall, Wayne N., *Colo*	The Towers Apts., 4201 Cathedral Ave.
Ayres, William H., *Ohio*	
Baring, Walter S., *Nev*	
Barrett, William A., *Pa*	
Bates, William H., *Mass*	
Battin, James F., *Mont*	
Belcher, Page, *Okla*	
Bell, Alphonzo, *Calif*	
Bennett, Charles E., *Fla*	3421 Rusticway Lane, Falls Church, Va.
Berry, E. Y., *S. Dak*	118 Schotts Court NE.
Betts, Jackson E., *Ohio*	
Bevill, Tom, *Ala*	6224 N. 35th St., Arlington, Va.
Biester, Edward G., Jr., *Pa*	
Bingham, Jonathan B., *N.Y.*	
Blackburn, Benjamin B., *Ga.*	
Blanton, Ray, *Tenn*	
Blatnik, John A., *Minn*	
Boggs, Hale, *La*	
Boland, Edward P., *Mass*	
Bolling, Richard, *Mo*	307WarrentonDr., Silver Spring, Md.
Bolton, Frances P. (Mrs.), *Ohio.*	2301 Wyo. Ave.
Bow, Frank T., *Ohio*	4301 Mass. Ave.
Brademas, John, *Ind*	
Brasco, Frank J., *N.Y*	
Bray, William G., *Ind*	
Brinkley, Jack, *Ga*	
Brock, W. E. (Bill), *Tenn*	
Brooks, Jack, *Tex*	
Broomfield, William S., *Mich.*	
Brotzman, Donald G., *Colo*	
Brown, Clarence J., Jr., *Ohio.*	
Brown, Garry, *Mich*	
Brown, George E., Jr., *Calif*	
Broyhill, James T., *N.C*	
Broyhill, Joel T., *Va*	
Buchanan, John, *Ala*	
Burke, J. Herbert, *Fla*	
Burke, James A., *Mass*	
Burleson, Omar, *Tex*	
Burton, Laurence J., *Utah*	
Burton, Phillip, *Calif*	
Bush, George, *Tex*	
Button, Daniel E., *N.Y*	
Byrne, James A., *Pa*	
Byrnes, John W., *Wis*	1215 25th St. S., Arlington, Va.
Cabell, Earle, *Tex*	
Cahill, William T., *N.J*	
Carey, Hugh L., *N.Y*	
Carter, Tim Lee, *Ky*	
Casey, Bob, *Tex*	
Cederberg, Elford A., *Mich*	
Celler, Emanuel, *N.Y*	The Mayflower
Chamberlain, Charles E., *Mich.*	
Clancy, Donald D., *Ohio*	
Clark, Frank M., *Pa*	220 C St. SE.
Clausen, Don H., *Calif*	
Clawson, Del, *Calif*	
Cleveland, James C., *N.H*	
Cohelan, Jeffery, *Calif*	1202 Longworth House Office Bldg.
Collier, Harold R., *Ill*	
Colmer, William M., *Miss*	
Conable, Barber B., Jr., *N.Y.*	
Conte, Silvio O., *Mass*	5619 Lamar Rd., Washington 16, D.C.
Conyers, John, Jr., *Mich*	
Corbett, Robert J., *Pa*	
Corman, James C., *Calif*	
Cowger, William O., *Ky*	
Cramer, William C., *Fla*	6215 Beachway Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Culver, John C., *Iowa*	
Cunningham, Glenn, *Nebr*	
Curtis, Thomas B., *Mo*	
Daddario, Emilio Q., *Conn*	
Daniels, Dominick V., *N.J*	
Davis, Glenn R., *Wis*	
Davis, John W., *Ga*	
Dawson, William L., *Ill*	
de la Garza, Eligio, *Tex*	
Delaney, James J., *N.Y*	
Dellenback, John R., *Oreg*	5911 Onondaga Rd.
Denney, Robert V., *Nebr*	
Dent, John H., *Pa*	
Derwinski, Edward J., *Ill*	
Devine, Samuel L., *Ohio*	
Dickinson, William L., *Ala*	
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., *Mich*	
Dingell, John D., *Mich*	
Dole, Robert, *Kans*	6136 Beachway Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Donohue, Harold D., *Mass*	
Dorn, Wm. Jennings Bryan, *S.C.*	2030 Laburnum St., McLean, Va.
Dow, John G., *N.Y*	
Dowdy, John, *Tex*	
Downing, Thomas N., *Va*	
Dulski, Thaddeus J., *N.Y*	347 Cannon House Office Building
Duncan, John J., *Tenn*	
Dwyer, Florence P. (Mrs.), *N.J.*	
Eckhardt, Bob, *Tex*	
Edmondson, Ed, *Okla*	
Edwards, Don, *Calif*	9201 Fox Meadow La., Potomac, Md.,
Edwards, Edwin W., *La*	
Edwards, Jack, *Ala*	
Eilberg, Joshua, *Pa*	
Erlenborn, John N., *Ill*	
Esch, Marvin L., *Mich*	11754 Gainsborough Rd., Rockville, Md.
Eshleman, Edwin D., *Pa*	
Evans, Frank E., *Colo*	
Everett, Robert A., *Tenn*	
Evins, Joe L., *Tenn*	5044 Klingle St.
Fallon, George H., *Md*	
Farbstein, Leonard, *N.Y*	
Fascell, Dante B., *Fla*	
Feighan, Michael A., *Ohio*	
Findley, Paul, *Ill*	
Fino, Paul A., *N.Y*	
Fisher, O. C., *Tex*	Calvert-Woodley
Flood, Daniel J., *Pa*	The Congressional
Flynt, John J., Jr., *Ga*	
Foley, Thomas S., *Wash*	
Ford, Gerald R., *Mich*	514 Crown View Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Ford, William D., *Mich*	
Fountain, L. H., *N.C*	The Westchester
Fraser, Donald M., *Minn*	
Frelinghuysen, Peter H. B., *N.J.*	3014 N St.
Friedel, Samuel N., *Md*	
Fulton, James G., *Pa*	
Fulton, Richard, *Tenn*	
Fuqua, Don, *Fla*	
Galifianakis, Nick, *N.C*	
Gallagher, Cornelius E., *N.J.*	
Gardner, James C., *N.C*	
Garmatz, Edward A., *Md*	
Gathings, E. C., *Ark*	
Gettys, Tom S., *S.C*	
Giaimo, Robert N., *Conn*	
Gibbons, Sam, *Fla*	
Gilbert, Jacob H., *N.Y*	
Gonzalez, Henry B., *Tex*	200 C St. SE.
Goodell, Charles E., *N.Y*	3842 Macomb St.
Goodling, George A., *Pa*	
Gray, Kenneth J., *Ill*	
Green, Edith (Mrs.), *Oreg*	
Green, William J., *Pa*	
Griffiths, Martha W., (Mrs.), *Mich.*	
Gross, H. R., *Iowa*	
Grover, James R., Jr., *N.Y*	
Gubser, Charles S., *Calif*	
Gude, Gilbert, *Md*	
Gurney, Edward J., *Fla*	
Hagan, G. Elliott, *Ga*	
Haley, James A., *Fla*	
Hall, Durward G., *Mo*	
Halleck, Charles A., *Ind*	4926 Upton St.
Halpern, Seymour, *N.Y*	
Hamilton, Lee H., *Ind*	
Hammerschmidt, John Paul, *Ark.*	
Hanley, James M., *N.Y*	
Hanna, Richard T., *Calif*	
Hansen, George V., *Idaho*	
Hansen, Julia Butler (Mrs.), *Wash.*	
Hardy, Porter, Jr., *Va*	
Harrison, William Henry, *Wyo.*	
Harsha, William H., *Ohio*	
Harvey, James, *Mich*	
Hathaway, William D., *Maine.*	
Hawkins, Augustus F., *Calif.*	
Hays, Wayne L., *Ohio*	
Hébert, F. Edward, *La*	26 Cockrell St., Alexandria, Va.
Hechler, Ken, *W. Va*	
Heckler, Margaret M. (Mrs.), *Mass.*	
Helstoski, Henry, *N.J*	
Henderson, David N., *N.C*	
Herlong, A. S., Jr., *Fla*	
Hicks, Floyd V., *Wash*	
Holifield, Chet, *Calif*	
Holland, Elmer J., *Pa*	
Horton, Frank, *N.Y*	
Hosmer, Craig, *Calif*	
Howard, James J., *N.J*	
Hull, W. R., Jr., *Mo*	
Hungate, William L., *Mo*	
Hunt, John E., *N.J*	
Hutchinson, Edward, *Mich*	
Ichord, Richard (Dick), *Mo.*	
Irwin, Donald J., *Conn*	
Jacobs, Andrew, Jr., *Ind*	
Jarman, John, *Okla*	
Joelson, Charles S., *N.J*	
Johnson, Albert W., *Pa*	
Johnson, Harold T., *Calif*	
Jonas, Charles Raper, *N.C*	
Jones, Paul C., *Mo*	1111 Army-Navy Dr., Arlington, Va.
Jones, Robert E., *Ala*	
Jones, Walter B., *N.C*	
Karsten, Frank M., *Mo*	
Karth, Joseph E., *Minn*	
Kastenmeier, Robert W., *Wis.*	
Kazen, Abraham, Jr., *Tex*	
Kee, James, *W. Va*	5441 16th Ave., Hyattsville, Md.
Keith, Hastings, *Mass*	5906 Harwick Rd., Woodacres, Md.
Kelly, Edna F. (Mrs.), *N.Y*	
King, Carleton J., *N.Y*	
King, Cecil R., *Calif*	
Kirwan, Michael J., *Ohio*	
Kleppe, Thomas S., *N. Dak*	
Kluczynski, John C., *Ill*	
Kornegay, Horace R., *N.C*	
Kupferman, Theodore R., *N.Y.*	
Kuykendall, Dan, *Tenn*	
Kyl, John, *Iowa*	
Kyros, Peter N., *Maine*	
Laird, Melvin R., *Wis*	
Landrum, Phil M., *Ga*	
Langen, Odin, *Minn*	
Latta, Delbert L., *Ohio*	
Leggett, Robert L., *Calif*	
Lennon, Alton, *N.C*	
Lipscomb, Glenard P., *Calif.*	
Lloyd, Sherman P., *Utah*	
Long, Clarence D., *Md*	

Appendix

My Hope for the World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1967

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, the Lions Clubs have recently conducted a peace essay contest in York, Adams, and Cumberland Counties, Pa., counties which I have the honor and privilege of representing in the U.S. House of Representatives. This contest was open to all students between the ages of 14 and 22.

It is my pleasure to say that Miss Linda Myers, 401 West Maplewood Avenue, Mechanicsburg, Pa., wrote a prize-winning essay, a superb piece which artfully explains the elements of peace.

Because of the profound nature of this essay, I am inserting it into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and commending it to the attention of my colleagues:

MY HOPE FOR THE WORLD

We cannot search unless we know for what we are searching. We cannot find an answer unless we first suggest solutions. We cannot fight a battle when we are ignorant of our opponents and yet, we cannot win the prize without joining in the game. We cannot work toward a goal unless we first establish that goal and finally, we cannot be true victors if, after the victory, we fail to use the lessons we have learned. The value of the prize must be greater than the cost, and the means must substantiate the end.

The above statements are indeed generalizations, but since it is from such generalizations that hypotheses are formed, we can assure ourselves that they are essential and necessary to the development of the issue involved. And just what *is* the issued involved? What subject is it that has been the topic of conversation for centuries? In the forums of ancient Rome, in the Parliaments of Great Britain, on the deck of the first Mayflower and today, in the assemblies of the United Nations, this word has arisen again and again. It is a concern for the Future based on the outlook of the Present and the situations of the Past. It's a condition, a problem, a question, a goal and, most important of all, it is my hope for the world.

As a part of the masses, labeled as "youth," I feel that I have a duty and a responsibility to myself, to my generation, to my successors, and to my God. I owe it to myself to develop my abilities to the fullest capacity and to find a place for myself in the world of tomorrow. I owe it to my generation to make them proud of me and to contribute to the society in which we will one day rule. Yet, the most important and the significant responsibility I have is to my children and their children's children. To them, I must be able to serve as an example, and when the time comes for me to depart, I want to leave behind for them, a gift that will assure their security. I want that gift to be Peace.

I want to offer them that intangible, that sacred and priceless commodity known as Peace. It *is* attainable. There is no doubt of that. Why else would God have planted such an idea in our minds if he did not secretly hope that someday we would develop, on our own, a plan toward making world peace a reality? This is where my final responsibility enters. I owe it to God to nurture the seeds he has so carefully planted. He further assures that he favors such a project by his prophecy in the Holy Bible, Eccles. 3: 1–8, which states: "To every thing there is a season, and a time to every purpose under heaven . . . a time of war and a time of peace."

Let us act so to insure that this destined season of peace will be a domineering factor of the near-present Future. The quest for peace has been a long one, but now we are arriving at a very critical point in History. We are told that at the present time there are enough weapons of destruction on this earth to wipe clean the human race and to destroy even the solid ground on which we now walk. Steps must be taken now. We can't wait for the wounds of war to heal themselves. There is too much at stake to stand still, and to plead ignorance of the situation would be like committing suicide. Now we know for what we are searching, and the seriousness of the situation is evident. The next step is to define Peace since it is our ultimate goal and objective.

Until shortly after the halfway mark of the Twentieth Century, peace was considered with a negative approach and it was defined specifically in terms of its antonym, war. For example, in days gone by, peace meant the absence of war. The democracies of the Western World previously looked at war as an abnormal relation among nations, and, thus, peace was considered to be a normal relation. The Dutch statesman, Hugo Grotius, who is considered to be the founder of modern international law, presented his parallel thoughts to the Seventh Century philosophers in the historic book, *The Laws of War and Peace*, published in 1625 A.D. In it, he too defended what he called a "just" war, that is one undertaken for a valid reason, but he introduced the opinion that war was a usual and common situation. His philosophy may have been influenced by the previous existence of Greek city-states. As many historians know, wars were a prevailing part of ancient European history, and they were most definitely an accepted way of life. But, I must interject here, that it was because of their many civil wars that the communities of the Greek city-states were ultimately weakened and as a result lost their independence. So if you consider Grotius' way of thinking correct, you are condoning not only war itself, but self-destruction as well.

However, in recent years, peace has been given a much different connotation. It is no longer a usual situation, nor is it simply an interval between wars. The pessimistic light in which it was regarded is extinguished, and in its place are optimism, realism, and actuality. World peace to me is a universal challenge that offers security against aggression for all, regardless of race, religion, or nationality. It curtails freedom and liberty only at the expense of and for the preservation of human nature and human dignity.

And so now, two more elements are introduced, freedom and liberty. I included them in my definition because I believe they play an important part in choosing the *kind* of peace we want. We have at our command today, countless measures by which we could maintain peace. Mass communications, directed force, mass control, infiltration, and similar instruments are available to those who wish to turn our democratic societies into feudalistic units, withering under the brutal arm of force. Yes, they could find a peace, *their* peace, where peace is sought as an end instead of a means in itself. Their peace would be at the cost of the two fundamental prizes mankind has already won in some parts of the world, freedom and liberty.

We should not discourage ourselves by dwelling on the fact that the majority of the world today is not free. This does not mean that we should abandon the quest for peace because it seems to be impossible to obtain it, and in doing so, keep what we already have. We've already examined peace, so now let's take a closer look at freedom and liberty.

As a citizen of the United States of America, I see freedom daily. The democratic voting methods of our United States show other countries that we as citizens are given the chance to choose representatives to our federal government without fear of persecution.

I have the freedom to go to the church I choose on Sunday. No one forces me to attend church services, and the denomination I choose is a personal matter. I am compelled by law to go to school, but they cannot make me learn. I listen because I want to take advantage of the opportunities I am offered, and I do my homework, because I know it will help me to understand the subject matter. Once I am in school, there are no brutal methods used by the various organizations to force me to join. I have the freedom of choice.

And best of all, I have the freedom to be active today to insure the fact that tomorrow will be everything I want it to be. I go to sleep each night, secure in the fact that the government of these United States is *for* human rights, not against them. We, the people, have invested in the government the power to act as a mediator and a guardian, instead of as a dictator or a ruling class.

We, as Americans, have started the battle for freedom, and now it is necessary that the whole world adopt our cause, and join in the program for world-wide war. Whether or not that war exists in the form of armed combat or in the form of a war on poverty or a war on ignorance, it matters little. The fact remains that *all* our battles must be won, regardless of where they are fought—in the minds of men or on a bloody battlefield. Where there is dissatisfaction, poverty, disease or ignorance, there is a breeding ground for war. Eliminate these roots of destruction, and you will be pulling out the weeds and roots of war before they have a chance to be nourished.

If we work together toward a peace that is worth achieving together, then all thoughts of war among us will dissolve. As we work together, we will be able to gradually see the viewpoint of our colleagues. It is when we work *against* each other, distant in thoughts, that there is not a chance for a compromise. "All or nothing" is a commonly repeated adage, but it does not apply if we wish to retain our freedom. Like justice and equality, freedom relies on law for a place in our Society. The law, in turn, is dependent on the wishes of the people, and so the entire process is centered around the individual and his personal regard for liberties.

Human liberties can be divided into three categories. First, there is the region of the mind; the inner domain of consciousness; liberty of thought and spirit; and liberty of opinion, whether those opinions be on issues, real or imaginative, invented or produced. This is liberty revealed in freedom of the mind.

The second realm of liberty lies in greater boundaries. In the first division, the effects of liberty were felt within an individual, but in the second category, others are affected. This principle requires liberty of expression. We are given the chance to construct a suitable frame for our life, regardless of what the other people may think. The only limitation on this liberty is that what we decide to do would not affect others adversely. This explains the second part of my statement that defined peace: "It curtails freedom and liberty only at the expense of, and for the preservation of, human nature and human dignity."

Third, we extend the realm of liberty to include, at a maximum, the masses on the earth. From the second category, physical liberty of the individual, we derive the liberties of combination among people, with any purpose in mind except that which would harm others.

No society in which these liberties are not respected and designated as a free society, regardless of how satisfied the people seem to be with the type of government that is in effect, and no society is completely free unless these liberties are absolute and irreproachable. Unless they are held sacred along with the facets of personal freedom, peace would not be worth attaining, for the gains in comparison to the loss would be of little significance.

We cannot rely solely on an international organization for promoting and maintaining world peace. The regulating of societies cannot be placed entirely in the hands of a few, no matter how select and intelligent they may be. If enough of the "right" people in the world decide that they want to start a war, there would actually be little that could be done to stop them, short of direct force and physical suppression. Then, what would we be advocating but the tyrannical and dictatorial policies that we are seeking to eliminate? There would be a little time to talk to the insurgents, and the action of the world organization would probably be slow compared to the progress of the reactionary group.

We can rely, however, on human habits and conditionings to change the course of the moving tide. If we finally implant within the minds of the people in the world a sincere desire for peace that remains prevalent when others try to sway them, then we can be assured that something is being done, from the very moment that the opposition rises, without the use of armed weapons or force. We can put trust in the majority that they will reflect the philosophies of the peacemakers, and not resort to violence unless their lives are threatened. We don't want people to become obsessed with the desire to suppress the opposition, but neither do we wish to be a generation of martyrs. The habits of the society are absorbed by the individual, and so if we surround him with constructive weapons, we would be taking a step toward world peace.

One such weapon exists in the form of an ancient Chinese philosophy. Called the Spirit of Reasonableness, it is the greatest gift that China has been able to offer to the Western World. They claim that only in a world of reasonable and rational human beings can we hope to find peace and happiness. A comparison can be made to the institution of marriage. It is impossible to imagine perfect husbands and wives who never quarrel. Rather, we conceive of reasonable and rational husbands and wives who quarrel reasonably and then patch up their difference reasonably. This is the Spirit of Reasonableness, and as a result of adhering to this doctrine, the Age of Reasonableness will come about, and in it, we will find the Age of Peace.

I believe that our plan for peace should include a thirst for knowledge. There is a relevant passage concerning this philosophy in the schoolbooks of Chinese children. It is a lesson deemed highly important by the Confucian scholars and, for this reason, it is required memorization by all students. A portion of that passage is quoted below.

"The ancient people who desired to have a clear moral harmony in the world would first order their national life; those who desired to order their national life would first regulate their home life; those who desired to regulate their home life would first cultivate their personal lives; those who desired to cultivate their personal lives would first set their hearts right; those who desired to set their hearts right would first make their wills sincere; those who desired to make their wills sincere would first arrive at understanding; understanding comes from the exploration of knowledge of things. When the knowledge of things is gained, then understanding is reached; when understanding is reached, then will is sincere; when the will is sincere, then the heart is set right; when the heart is set right, then the personal life is cultivated; when the personal life is cultivated, then the home life is regulated; when the home life is regulated, then the national life is orderly; and when the national life is orderly, then the world is at peace."

From this we can concur that the conduct of a nation's affairs and the course of its social, moral and political development are all eventually based on the ideas that govern the individuals who compose that nation. It is this idea that I was building up to when I mentioned the actual effectiveness of a world organization. It is my opinion that such an international cooperation in the design of a forum-type meeting is a step in the right direction, but I believe that the steps they take are mostly preventative. So if we want to keep the peace, once we get it, we must take action to insure the fact that there will be someone to fight the opposition, no matter how quickly they rise.

This opposition would exist in the form of intelligent, educated and reasonable adults. In this area we can take concrete action. It should be the responsibility of each country to seek to produce such an "army" to defend the policies. In the event that a country is not economically capable of such a program, then I believe that a world organization could intervene with their aid programs. Here cooperation enters.

A project as big as peace demands the attention of all leaders of state. We cannot rely on less than 100% cooperation by each of the nations, and expect to have a successful program. Once we can get everyone to listen then we must be able to persuade them that peace would be advantageous to them. It is understandable that a country with millions of dollars tied up in military defense would not readily agree to total disarmament. In other words, we must plan our program to be slow enough not to upset the economies of any individual nation, but at the same time it must be fast enough that our objective is reached before the breaking point of the nations.

The breaking point would arrive when the majority of the leaders become dissatisfied with the rate of progress, and they therefore transmit their feelings to their people who begin to consider alternative methods. Then we would be back where we started with everyone pulling in a different direction. I took care *not* to say that the *end* must be reached before this breaking point arrives. In keeping with the type of peace we want, it is not correct to seek peace as an end in itself. Rather, it is a means by which we obtain a degree of satisfaction in relation to each other.

In planning for peace, we must be ready to meet opposition. It will not be an easy fight, and by no means a short one. The blueprint for world peace must start within each individual. He must govern himself to his surroundings, without sacrificing his identity. He must voice an opinion in matters he finds objectionable, without appearing hostile. He must be prepared to protect himself without always being on the defensive. He must place some trust in a Supreme Being, without relying on that Supreme Being to give him a life of ease. Finally, he must believe in the dignity of mankind and his life must reflect this doctrine.

It is possible to find the path to peace in the world itself. A modern theory of memorization today is the use of association. Since we are a modern world, let's devise a simple association that every human being could learn. The sum total of everyone's efforts just might be enough to move those mountains that are looming in front of us.

P could stand for pledge. Pledge yourself to the cause of peace. Promise to use restraint where power is involved and protect yourself from ignorance, disease and dissatisfaction, the roots that dig deep in the soil to crush the newly scattered seeds of peace.

E represents the enthusiasm and energy that is needed by the generation that wants to achieve peace. Evoke Supreme guidance. Entertain only pleasant thoughts for there is enough evil in the world without imagining more.

A is for advancement. Seek out your objectives and keep them in mind as you push onward. Aid and advise those who display a desire for your help. Accomplish your goal in steps so that you can measure your degree of achievement. Admire always the rights of others and they will in turn respect you. Agreements must be made with attention being paid to details so that trust can be developed from adherence to those agreements.

C offers us endless possibilities as we seek to instill confidence, cooperation and a common objective within the hearts of every individual. Conflicts arise from lack of proper communication, so strive always to be able to converse with an underlying motive for understanding.

E appears again, and we are reminded to direct our efforts toward the cultivation of the individual. Effective programs are based on constructive materials that are carried out with the proper attitude so keep in mind that practical solutions are necessary when considering a particular problem.

We can see that world peace has a challenge to it. I've offered what I believe to be applicable universal methods for solving a universal problem. It is because the nations of the world worked separately yesterday that problems exist today. Let's change this pattern and work together today to live together tomorrow.

To many, peace is a condition, and so they analyze it. To others it's a problem, and they're determined to solve it. Some consider it a question, and they seek answers. Yet, to others, it is a goal and they desire to reach it. To me, it is all of these and more, for peace is my hope for the world.

LINDA CONSTANCE MYERS.

A Taxpayer Evaluates the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1967

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, smalltown country newspapers are not controlled and give a free, unbiased, grassroots evaluation of the state of our Republic.

I insert the column of Mr. Ben Garris, "Hooks and Shells," which appeared in the May 25 St. Francisville Democrat in the RECORD following my remarks:

HOOKS AND SHELLS

(By Ben Garris)

The darkening clouds of what well may turn into World War III are gathering with exceeding rapidity these days. And, for the first time in many hundreds of years, they are gathering over the East and not over the West. Which, of course, does not mean that the West won't suffer, too.

In Korea, there is every evidence that Mao's Red Chinese and the Communist government in North Korea are planning a second attempt at taking South Korea. Photo recon planes clearly show that Communist forces in North Korea—and in mainland China, just north of the border—have experienced a massive buildup in numbers and equipment. Particularly, they have added to the number of large rockets of the type that are giving us so much trouble in Viet Nam.

In Cambodia, Laos, Thailand, the Philippines, and in certain states in India, the Communists have established underground forces that are now large enough to start guerrilla actions designed eventually to take over the countries.

In Viet Nam proper, the war has become a very big one, by any standards. By the end of the year, we will have at least 750,000 troops and many billions worth of supplies in that small country. North Viet Nam has demonstrated that she is not even thinking about peace talks, but is ready, willing, and able to escalate all phases of the war.

By their actions, they show the world (with the exception of the liberal "doves") that the two great Communist leaders, Red China and Russia, have joined hands again to continue their plans to dominate the world.

This is the situation in the Far East. And it is a situation that we are directly responsible for. We laid the dirty groundwork for this approach to World War III in the Korean War when we didn't play to win. We established boundaries, beyond which our Air Force and troops were not allowed to go.

This, of course, resulted in what amounted to a "Mexican stand-off". Peace talks lingered on and on, and still do. Nobody won, yet nobody lost. At least, that is the way our liberals in Washington had it figured.

Actually, we did lose the Korean War. And now the miserable chickens of appeasement are coming home to roost in Viet Nam and, in fact, throughout the world.

By our no-win stance in Korea, we convinced the Communist world that we wouldn't clobber them if they started something. Since that time, they have continually probed all over the world to check for weak spots and to cause us almost to break the country in military expenditures and in military aid to others.

In the early days of Viet Nam, we demonstrated to them that we would again play their game. Thus, we allowed the North Viet Namese to build a very strong military machine instead of bombing the devil out of their harbors and industry. We allowed them to use the Ho Chi Minh Trail to shuffle untold quantities of war material into South Viet Nam instead of sending enough troops in to cut the supply lines.

Because of this half-way policy pursued by JFK and LBJ, we will now lose countless lives and mountains of military supplies. We will also tie down almost a million troops when they should be available to counter Communist threats in other parts of the world.

The biggest threat to peace is not in the Far East, but in the Near East, where the Arab world is getting ready to charge Israel—with Russian help, of course. The Arabs, never too bright, don't see that the Russians only help them so that later they, the Russians, can take over the entire Near East.

So, here we have it: the Communist world is ready to open three major areas of war. The Far East, the Near East, and Korea. There is no way that America can fight on all three fronts with "conventional" weapons and forces in "brush fire" fashion.

They well know this. And they believe that we will not use nuclear weapons. So, they will open up the three wars.

We have brought it all on ourselves by not being firm. And now we will pay a terrible price—and so will they.

I wonder how a "dove's" conscience must feel when he finally realizes that his "way" might have saved a few thousand lives at first, but, in the long run, insured the death of millions?

Dissent Goes Far Beyond Limits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1967

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

[From The San Diego Union, May 25, 1967]

"TREASON" IS THE REAL WORD—DISSENT GOES FAR BEYOND LIMITS

Rep. F. Edward Hébert, Democrat of Louisiana, made a cogent point regarding dissent over Vietnam policy during his visit in San Diego.

He reminded Americans that Article III of the constitution of the United States of America has as much bearing as the First Amendment in considering the behavior of radical demonstrators.

Section 3 of Article III, effective since March 1789 states plainly:

"Treason against the United States shall consist only in levying war against them, or in adhering to their enemies, giving them aid and comfort."

The First Amendment in the Bill of Rights, which became effective in December 1791 and extended to the states by the Supreme Court in 1925 declares in part:

"Congress shall make no law . . . abridging the freedom of speech."

Article III and the First Amendment are integral and revered rights in the American way of life. And in juxtaposition they illustrate another important American fact: No right is absolute—each is limited by the considerations of reason.

There can be no dispute that freedom of speech, press and assembly as guaranteed by the Constitution is a cornerstone of our liberties. It is essential to assure maximum possible individual freedom and to find the truth collectively so we can govern with equity. We must guard these rights zealously.

We cannot survive as a nation, however, if we permit treason—activity that favors the enemy over the United States of America. And if we fail in our democracy all other assertions of rights will become meaningless because they will be lost.

There is a limitation to the First Amendment and it is in part spelled out by the third Article of the Constitution. Freedom of demonstrations and protest activity which come under the First Amendment cannot include treason or sedition.

Demonstrations and exhibitionism that encourage the enemy in Vietnam to prolong the war do not give aid and comfort to the United States of America. They comfort Hanoi.

Vituperation and physical activity directed against some of the highest officials of our land comforts the enemy, not the United States. So does interference with the Selective Service system.

And as Dean Rusk, secretary of state, has pointed out, what would we think if 100,000 North Vietnamese marched through Hanoi in protest to Ho Chi Minh's war policy?

There is a line when demonstrations pass the bounds of responsible dissent and free speech and become license. And the best definition of that line is in Section 3, Article III of the Constitution.

Treason.

The Washington Jungle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1967

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, 3 weeks ago I called for a reform movement here in our Nation's Capital as the beginning of a nationwide war against crime.

Since that time I have received a number of letters of encouragement from people here in Washington, D.C., from New York, from concerned Americans in Wisconsin, and from the people I represent in Nebraska. This response has been heartening to me because I can report to you that as far as decent, hardworking, taxpaying, law-abiding Americans are concerned there is no apathy about the crime crisis facing this Nation. The people are up in arms.

If there is apathy in the United States on the topic of crime and its terrible increase, it surely exists in the minds of frightened or lazy public officials who have failed to uphold the laws of our land.

I have been pleased with the interest of the Nation's press in the crime crisis and would like to insert an editorial from the Omaha World-Herald for inclusion in the RECORD.

THE WASHINGTON JUNGLE

The murder of 25-year-old Judy Robeson, an assistant to Senator Frank Carlson of Kansas, calls attention to a truth that some politicians in the capital would like to ignore. Namely: That Washington, D.C., has become one of the most lawless jungles in the land.

Perhaps it is the most lawless of all American cities.

For years, residents have been afraid to use the streets at night. Apartment dwellers even in the so-called "better" areas have been driven to take all manner of extraordinary precautions to protect themselves from the muggers and robbers and rapists. Even in daylight hours, knowledgeable Washingtonians do not stray from the heavily traveled thoroughfares.

Judy Robeson lived only three-quarters of a mile from the Capitol. Her apartment had 24-hour desk service. The area described as "fashionable," was patrolled by police. Here, if anywhere in Washington, a Government girl might expect to be safe. But here her nude and savagely beaten body was found amid indications of violent struggle.

Vicious crimes of that sort may take place anywhere, but in Washington they have become almost ordinary.

Washington is ruled by the Congress which each year spends billions to help and advise the rest of the world. It is the capital of permissive do-goodism, the show place of the Great Society.

Perhaps before going farther with its pretty sociological schemes, at home and abroad, the Congress would be well advised to establish resolutely, once and for all, the rule of law in Washington.

It can be done. Good police work, adequately financed, supported by a strong judiciary, can do the job there as well as anywhere else. The cost would be trivial by comparison with the sums the Government lavishes on lesser enterprises. Perhaps, if full success is to be achieved, it will be necessary to amend the powers of the Supreme Court, but even that lies within the authority of the Congress and the people.

Ralph W. Drury of Athol, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1967

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, there are few among us today for whom the name Ralph W. Drury means anything. The exploits for which the name was once symbolic have long since faded and passed away with the generation to whom they were familiar.

Ralph Drury passed away quietly the other day at the age of 93 after having been hospitalized for only a day at Athol Memorial Hospital in Athol, Mass. The preparation of his obituary has rekindled for a moment the lingering sparks that were once a part of the brilliant fire Ralph Drury cast on the annals of U.S. military history.

And it seems appropriate in this day of crisis and of testing for America and for all of the world, to recall the simple gallantry of an American farm boy for whom there could have been none of the doubts and misgivings which seem to plague so many among us these days. It seems appropriate to take special note of the passing of one of the countless thousands who have laid their lives on the line in defense of the spirit and principles of democracy and human freedom.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent procedures, I would like to include at this point in the RECORD, an obituary clipped from the pages of a Massachusetts newspaper which, in simple newspapering terms, outlines the highlights of an heroic life.

The clipping follows:

ATHOL WAR HERO SUCCUMBS—WAS ALL-AMERICAN IN 1893

ATHOL.—Ralph W. Drury, 93, a retired lieutenant colonel, World War I hero, and nationally known football player at West Point, died yesterday in the Athol Memorial Hospital where he had been a patient for a day. His home was at 165 Main St.

He was born in Athol on March 8, 1874, son of the late Horace and Althea (Smith) Drury. His father was a Civil War veteran of Co. E. 53rd Regiment, Massachusetts Volunteers.

Col. Drury lived the life of a farm boy. After graduating from Athol High School in 1891, he went on to become an outstanding scholar at the Massachusetts Agricultural College in Amherst (now the University of Massachusetts).

During his sophomore year, he learned of a vacancy at West Point and, in competition with 12 others, won admission to the military academy.

He entered West Point on Sept. 6, 1893, and gained fame as a freshman halfback on the football squad, being named to an All-American team. His name is inscribed on an athletic plaque at the Citadel.

He was graduated in 1897 in a class of 68, of whom less than 10 are still living.

He headed Gen. John J. Pershing's transport brigade in San Francisco in 1914 and saw duty in the Philippines, China and Japan.

He returned from the Philippines as a major in 1917 and was promoted to lieutenant colonel in 1918.

He served with distinction throughout the war and received two letters of commendation from Gen. Pershing "for distinguished and exceptional gallantry" and "for exceptionally meritorious and conspicuous service."

WINS SILVER STAR

He saw action in five major battles including Aisne, Marne, St. Mihiel, Meuse Argonne and Chateau-Thierry.

He won eight medals, including the Silver Star for gallantry in rescuing wounded from a shell-swept area near Chateau-Thierry on July 12, 1918.

Col. Drury was also awarded the French Croix de Guerre with gilt star for displaying "rare bravery and energy in directing the burial of the dead under a violent bombardment at Blanc Mont during Oct. 2–10, 1918.

He was the recipient of two Purple Hearts and several medals for sharpshooting.

His noncombat duties were outstanding as well. Once he planned and executed the movement of an entire division—28,000 men and 7,000 animals—within two hours, using 56 trains, each numbering 53 cars.

At war's end, Col. Drury performed special tasks in the Army of Occupation in Coblenz, Germany. These included the closing of all PXs in France and heading graves registration.

He returned to the United States in 1921, a year prior to his retirement at Ft. Porter in Buffalo, N.Y.

In 1960 his West Point fraternity presented him a ribbon and gold medallion as a distinguished alumnus.

After his retirement from active duty in 1922 he and his wife returned to Athol in 1925.

He was a sharp critic at town meetings and many an official felt the sting of his remarks. He ran unsuccessfully for selectman in 1932. He was named to the town's first Planning Board in 1931 and served until 1947.

MEMBER OF MASONS

He was a member of the Athol Lodge of Masons and received his 50-year pin in 1945, having joined the order while in the Philippines.

He was also a member of the Army Consistory, Valley of Ft. Leavenworth, also a Masonic order.

In Athol he was a member of the Edward H. Phillips Post, American Legion, the Historical Society of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

SURVIVORS

He leaves his widow, Anna L. (Colton) Drury, whom he met while at Madison Barracks, N.Y. They were married in El Paso, Tex., May 2, 1914. She followed him throughout his 20,000 mile army tour except during his years in war zones.

Other survivors are a daughter, Mrs. Edna Cassety of Buffalo, N.Y., two sisters, Mrs. Mrytle Wallace of Athol and Mrs. Blanche Griffith of Beverly, three grandchildren and 12 great-grandchildren.

America's Future—Both Exciting and Challenging

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. BYRNES

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1967

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to include, as part of my remarks, the essay of a ninth-grade student and constituent, Miss Sally Spaid, of Algoma, Wis. Her essay entitled "America's Future—Both Exciting and Challenging" recently won the American Legion Auxiliary, Department of Wisconsin, American essay contest. The quality of Miss Spaid's ideas and writing skill make it a privilege for me to bring this essay to the attention of the House:

AMERICA'S FUTURE—BOTH EXCITING AND CHALLENGING

During the past century, the knowledge of mankind has doubled eight times! As we move rapidly toward the twenty-first century, this means we must "learn eight times as fast and eight times as well or be eight times as ignorant." What a challenge! America's future depends on us. We must pursue progress from the standpoint of serving mankind, so that scientific and technical knowledge does not master man instead of benefiting him.

Let us first consider our exciting role in space. We face not only the challenge of space itself, we are being challenged by Communism's leading nation. No nation that expects to be the leader of other nations can dare to stay behind. There is a great wealth of knowledge o be gained and new rights to be won, but they must be won and used for the progress of all people. Increasing shortages of talented, highly trained scientists and engineers threaten the fulfillment of our national interests. Our freedom depends on remaining at the top in the space race.

The field of automation, too, is exciting and challenging. Observers predict that automated machines will some day prepare full dinners, tend babies and diagnose patients. Machines, however, have neither skill nor knowledge. They can do only what they are designed to do. There is no room for error. While there will be fewer jobs in factories, many more people will be needed in laboratories and offices as key punchers, programmers, and analysts. It is estimated that nearly twice as many scientists and engineers will be needed by 1975.

There is much to be done in the field of medicine. We are still searching for a cure for cancer. Work has begun to develop an artificial heart as a substitue for the human organ. Tuberculosis still remains a health hazard. We are in dire need of increased research and trained personnel to rehabilitate the handicapped.

Our struggle against "poisoned air" must soon become a reality. Air pollution and water pollution are threatening our national heritage. Lakes and streams once filled with fresh water are so polluted that even our fish can't survive. By 1980 scientists predict that in many cities our water demands will exceed our supply. We must constantly be alert to keep our water pure, forests green, and wildlife plentiful or lose a vital part of what we love to call America.

If people do not change the world for the better, the world will change people for the worse. A constructive attitude is necessary to find a solution to the problems that vex our nation and the world. Neither world peace or a future worth thinking about will be assured merely by reaching the moon. If it is achieved at all, it will be so only because of the determination, effort, and ability exercised to enrich and improve mankind. The world's great unfinished tasks must be carried out by those persons whose love for mankind is matched with knowledge and ambition. That challenge is ours!

GOP Errs Badly on Rent Subsidies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BYRON G. ROGERS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1967

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, the rent supplements program is one of the more important issues to come before the 90th Congress. It is essential that this program not be allowed to die in the name of "fiscal responsibility" or "party politics."

The rent supplements program makes sense economically as its prime purpose is to encourage private enterprise to enter the field of low-income housing. Our supply of adequate housing for low-income families is pathetically low and is dwindling. Also, as our urban renewal programs expand, people are removed from crowded conditions and are forced into even more crowded slum conditions. Today, millions of Americans are living in dilapidated housing which is not fit for habitation. The dimensions of this problem are far-reaching—it adversely effects our educational systems, our crime rates, our health conditions, and so forth. This trend cannot continue.

In commenting on the need for more public housing and for the rent supplement program a Denver Post editorial stated:

> Unless Congress provides adequate funds for one or the other, it is being morally irresponsible. And by axing the rent subsidy funds, it is also being economically irresponsible. This is a cheaper way to go for the taxpayer.

First, "fiscal responsibility" should not be used as a shield. I, too, favor fiscal responsibility, but I also recognize the serious crisis we are facing in providing low-income housing. The alternative to a rent-supplements program is a perpetuation of slum conditions and the many human problems attendant slum living. When we speak of fiscal responsibility, we should also take into account the economic savings—both human and monetary—that could flow from adequate funding of the rent-supplements program. Unless we consider the benefits, we are merely hiding behind meaningless words: "fiscal responsibility."

Secondly, this program should not become entwined and smothered by party politics. If the Republicans would stop to seriously consider this program, I believe they would recognize the pressing needs and the benefits of rent supplements. Also, they would realize the folly of their negative vote. The people do not respect negative votes cast only for political gains. If the Republicans believe otherwise, I suggest that they have misjudged the people they are representing and, in general, the mood of people all over this Nation.

Since I believe that a recent editorial in the Denver Post so adequately describes the mood of this country on the issue of full funding of the rent-supplements program, I would like to include it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

[From the Denver Post, May 19, 1967]

GOP ERRS BADLY ON RENT SUBSIDIES

House Republicans joined Southern Democrats Wednesday in chopping down to a pitiful $5 million the federal rent subsidies program. The kindest thing we can say for Republican participation in this action is that it was politically stupid and morally and economically irresponsible.

The GOP is the party that is supposed to be trying to win friends and regain lost power in the nation's cities. Of a certainty, Republicans will win no friends or votes among the urban poor this way, nor among intelligent taxpayers.

Their action is irresponsible for two reasons.

First, big and growing urban renewal programs all over the nation—including those in Denver—are razing slum dwellings and ousting their low-income inhabitants. And the new housing erected in these areas is almost invariably far too costly for those who lived there before.

Yet the evicted poor must go somewhere that they can afford. So where do they go? Either into other slum housing, or else where some landlord can crowd three families into a dwelling where one lived before, thereby starting a new slum in a different part of town.

Second, aside from urban renewal, there are millions of low-income families living in decrepit housing—the only kind they can afford. And private industry cannot afford to build new unsubsidized housing for them. That's a long-proven fact.

So how can they get decent housing? Only by some form of government subsidy—and there are only two known forms. One is government-built public housing; the other is rent-subsidized housing built by private, non-profit corporations—the rent subsidy law's method.

Unless Congress provides adequate funds for one or the other, it is being morally irresponsible. And by axing the rent subsidy funds, it is also being economically irresponsible. That is a cheaper way to go for the the taxpayer.

With government-built public housing, the taxpayer pays the whole construction bill, plus subsidizing rents for the low-income tenants, plus the salaries of managers and staff—who are public employees. Also the local taxpayer loses because public housing pays a sum in lieu of property taxes, which is usually less than ordinary taxes would be.

Under the rent subsidies act, a private non-profit or limited-dividend corporation provides the housing, getting its mortgage money from private lenders via an FHA-insured mortgage. The manager and staff are employes of the private corporation and it pays regular property taxes. All the taxpayer provides is the difference between what any individual tenant can afford and the rent necessary to pay off the mortgage and enable a nonprofit corporation to break even, or a limited-dividend corporation to make its dividend.

In every way, this method is better than old-fashioned public housing for the taxpayer. And it is also better for the tenants. They are not thrown out if their income rises—as is the case with public housing tenants. The goverment rent subsidy is simply cut as their income rises.

In short, there is simply no sensible reason—moral or economic—for the Republican position on this bill. We can only hope Senate Republicans act more responsibly.

Middle East Crisis

SPEECH

OF

HON. DON H. CLAUSEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1967

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, much has been said today about the current crisis in the Middle East which, we learned this morning, erupted into a major military clash between Egyptian and Israel forces in the Sinai Desert.

My mail of the past few weeks, Mr. Speaker, indicates deep concern and confusion over our position in the Middle East crisis and I must say, with all candor, that I share their concern and confusion.

The questions being raised, in my judgment, are valid. Are we or are we not committed to suport Israel by the tripartite agreements of 1950 and 1956? Should we or should we not take unilateral action in the Mideast if the United Nations continues to vacillate much longer? Can we or can we not oppose a blockade in one area of the world and impose one in another? Were we or were we not maneuvered into a corner by Russia and the United Arab Republic in this Middle East crisis?

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, anyone who understands the situation intimately is very concerned about the problem, particularly the unexplained action by the Secretary General of the United Nations, Mr. U Thant, in withdrawing U.N. troops from the contested Egyptian-Israel border. This he did apparently without even consulting the major powers of the world or obtaining the concurrence of at least those countries that have been carrying the major burden of international security obligations and commitments.

In light of this action, Mr. Speaker, I believe it is incumbent upon this administration, the Congress, and those who have been supporting the efforts of the United States within the framework of the United Nations to demand a detailed explanation of this action on the part of the Secretary General.

And further, Mr. Speaker, we, in turn, are certainly going to have to weigh, very carefully, our future course of action and support of the United Nations. If it cannot serve its basic purpose or even uphold its own charter, I doubt very much whether the American people will have confidence in its future ability to serve as the "peacekeeping" organization of the world.

If the conflict that is now underway in the Middle East ultimately results in a major war, I believe the blood is going to be on the hands of the Secretary General for what, in my judgment, has been unwise and untimely action on his part.

Mr. Speaker, I want to go on record as urging this administration, the United Nations, and all responsible authorities to take whatever action is necessary to bring about a cease-fire as soon as possible in this Middle East conflict.

Mideast Puts Soviet Goals in True Perspective

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1967

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, it has been a vogue for Americans to feel that the Russians are changing their nature, discarding their belligerent policy of world conquest, and embracing the more mature disposition of seeking peace through friendly relations with the United States and other members of the free world.

There is always the tendency for Americans to look on the bright and hopeful side of things for, by nature, we are optimists. The danger in this, however, is that if we have been incorrect in our basic appraisal of a situation, we are very apt to expose ourselves to danger.

In spite of the fact that we have tried to believe otherwise, there is much in recent events to point out that the Russians have not departed from their theme of antagonism toward the United States. The Russian tactics might have changed, but not the purpose—the Russian bear is still after the honey pot of world domination.

There is evidence to show that Russia is a vital ingredient in the war in Vietnam, for she is sending in to North Vietnam materials and supplies via overland routes through China. In a like manner, it is quite obvious that Russia has played a paramount part in causing the pot to boil in the Middle East.

Unless we stop kidding ourselves and face reality, the American citizen—as a soldier and as a taxpayer—is going to make sacrifices without end.

The question is this: Is the United States going to continue to be duped as to the long-range intentions of the Soviet Union? Richard Wilson has written an interesting article on this aspect in the June 5, 1967, issue of the Evening Star. I insert this article into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, for it is eminently worthwhile reading:

MIDEAST PUTS SOVIET GOALS IN TRUE PERSPECTIVE

(By Richard Wilson)

Those in official life who are most sadly grieved and confounded by Russian actions in the Mideast are the same officials who were hailing a few months ago a new era of good feeling with the Soviet Union—and Red China, for that matter.

It was not long ago that Sen. J. W. Fulbright, D-Ark., Sen. Robert F. Kennedy, D-N.Y., and others were anticipating the dawn of a new day, the day of bridge-building with China and Russia and a progressive improvement of relations based upon a more understanding attitude on our part, and on the now threadbare conclusion that we live in a changed world.

But now all these dreams are shattered once again—as they have so often been shattered in the past 30 years—and international tensions have increased in a resumption of the cold war and the outbreak of actual war in the Mideast.

As Sen. Harry F. Byrd Jr., D-Va., is so cogently pointing out, important administration officials have badly misjudged the intentions of the Soviet Union. U.N. Ambassador Arthur Goldberg is not to be excluded from this list. He still talks and acts in the U.N. as if he were dealing with some respected and beloved ally who has strayed from the path of righteousness.

The illusion persists that if it were not for Red China, Russia could and would deliver peace to us overnight in Vietnam. Then why does she not do it now by cutting off Ho Chi Minh's supply of arms? Ho's government can remain in Hanoi only because of Russian fighters, and antiaircraft installations,

Why does Russia instead increase the supply and variety of arms to North Vietnam? Why has she supplied up to $3 billions in military-related equipment to Arab nations in the Mideast?

These are the moves of the hard-minded technicians in the Kosygin-Brezhnev regime who, acting through or in concert with second parties, are extending outward the power and influence of the Soviet Union without sacrificing a single soldier.

They have been amazingly successful in contrast to the failures of their predecessor, Nikita Khrushchev. They have succeeded in erecting air defenses in North Vietnam with a greater intensity of fire than protected any city in World War II, and have brought down an incredible total of more than 500 U.S. aircraft at the same time an American expeditionary force of 500,000 has been kept contained by both military and diplomatic guile.

They have dealt skillfully with a very rambunctious ally, China, managing to avoid an open break that would lead to war. Now they have created the military and diplomatic atmosphere which makes it possible for an adventurous Egyptian dictator to challenge the maritime nations and engage in war with Israel.

It has been remarked that if this is not the way a third world war starts, it is a good imitation. There is not the slightest concrete evidence that Russia wishes the war in Vietnam to come to an end. The evidence is the other way.

Russia is sending more effective weapons to Vietnam. She gives every evidence of being very hard to deal with on a settlement in the Mideast. She is not about to relinquish strong positions in either the Near East or the Far East.

The impression is nevertheless strong here that Russia does not want a war so close to her borders and therefore she can be counted on eventually to restrain Colonel Gamal Abdel Nasser. This is a comforting conclusion which avoids Russia's very evident determination to see to it that, war or not, Nasser comes out on top.

Her support of Nasser is like her support to Ho Chi Minh—selectively adequate for the aims to be achieved, and those aims are the termination of American influence in the Near East and the Far East through the use of second parties for as long as it takes to do it.

The European powers, which have been indulging for some years now the illusion that Russia is no longer dangerous, are awakening to find her astride 55 percent of their normal oil supply which comes from the Mideast. These powers, no longer much interested in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, find that Russia's power and influence may be turning NATO's flank. And they are powerless to do anything much about it except to come flying to Washington as did British Prime Minister Harold Wilson, or to utter meaningless and ambiguous phrases as does President Charles de Gaulle.

So the issue lies where it really has always been, between the United States and the Soviet Union. This continuing crisis may at least help to dispel the euphoria which has clouded opinion in both the United States and Western Europe on the long-range intentions of the Soviet Union.

Commemorating 60th Anniversary of the Charter of the American Hungarian Federation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1967

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to join with my colleagues in commemorating the 60th anniversary of the charter of the American Hungarian Federation.

The federation, with its fine leaders and educators, has done much to help the Hungarians learn more about American ideals and principles in order to become more well-rounded individuals and better informed members of our society.

The history of the federation is filled with examples of courage, leadership, charity, firmness, American loyalty, and the promotion of freedom. It has done much to oppose the old way of life which still exists in Hungary today. The way of life in which the Government of Hungary is in the power of a small minority in complete opposition to the wishes of the majority.

I am pleased to have the opportunity to give recognition to these freedom-loving people and am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a brief history of the American Hungarian Federation since it was chartered in the early 1900's:

COMMEMORATING THE 60TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE CHARTER OF THE AMERICAN HUNGARIAN FEDERATION

The American Hungarian Federation was chartered in Cleveland, Ohio in 1907. It has been in continued existence ever since. Its present officers are: The Honorable Albert A. Fiok, municipal judge in Pittsburgh, Penna., as national president; The Right Reverend Dr. Zoltan Beky, bishop emeritus of the Independent Hungarian Reformed Church of America, and president, Hungarian Reformed Federation of America, as chairman of the board of directors; Professor Dr. Emery G. Szekely, Medical School Temple University, Philadelphia, Penna., Dr. Janos Nadas, President Kossuth Chapter, AHF, Cleveland, Ohio, Mr. Stephen Miko, President, American Hungarian Federation of the State of New York, Inc., Mr. Zoltan Vasvari, President, Cross and Sword Movement, Garfield, N.J., as national vice presidents, Mr. Richard J. Phillips, William Penn Fraternal Association, Pittsburgh, Penna., as treasurer, Mr. Bela Karlovitz, Esq., Counselor-at-Law, Pittsburgh, Pa., as general counsel, Messrs. Gabor Bodnar, Clifton, N.J., Andrew Eross, Sr., and Dr. Julius Hovany, editor, Chicago, Ill., as comptrollers, Dr. Louis Fury, writer and Professor Z. Michael Szaz, Department of Political Science, Seton Hall University, South Orange, N.J. as national secretaries.

For its sixty years of existence, the Federation was engaged in educating Hungarians about American values and political principles so that they may become well-informed and loyal citizens of the United States. The Federation also promoted the knowledge of Hungarian culture and literature among Americans not of Hungarian descent by sponsoring and distributing books and manuals.

In the past the Federation took an unequivocal stand against any atheistic and totalitarian ideology, having been opposed to Nazism as well as communism. For the last two decades it also tried to inform the American Government and public on the political, religious and economic situation in Hungary under Communist rule by dissemination of information and memoranda and thereby give expression to some of the aspirations and demands of the suppressed Hungarian people.

Several Presidents of the United States have received delegations of the American Hungarian Federation, and the Federation is in constant touch with the State Department and members of Congress on problems of American policy toward Hungary in particular and Eastern Europe in general.

Recently major studies by the Federation's Foreign Affairs Committee included one on the International Law Status of the Armed Forces of the U.S.S.R. Stationed on Hungarian Soil, sent to 111 U.N. Ambassadors, a Statement to Subcommittee Four of the House Judiciary Committee on bills proposing to make flag-burning a Federal crime, an Analysis of the Abortion Laws of Hungary, submitted to the American Medical Association, a Memorandum to the President of the United States on American policy toward Hungary and Eastern Europe.

The Federation sponsored 22,605 Hungarian refugees after World War II to this country, and helped 35,705 refugees after the 1956 Hungarian Fight for Freedom to come to America.

On charitable matters, the Federation, between 1945 and 1952, sent help to Hungary and to Hungarians living in Western Europe in the amount of $1,457,743.26 and its relief action after the Hungarian Revolution amounted to $512,560.08, even before a separate organization was chartered to do the relief work.

The Federation consists of the two American Hungarian fraternal associations (Hungarian Reformed Federation of America and William Penn Fraternal Association), its own state and local chapters, American Hungarian churches, associations, clubs and study groups which send delegates to the triennial convention, which, in turn, elects its officers and board of directors.

Holmes Alexander on the Department of Justice—In-Depth Reporting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1967

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, for many years Holmes Alexander has been recognized as a courageous, objective, and perceptive columnist.

In a recent column he has demonstrated these qualities in discussing the failure and refusal of the Department of Justice to prosecute agitators who preach sedition, arouse to riot, and give aid and comfort to the enemy of the United States in Vietnam.

I hesitated to bring this column to the attention of the House because of the flattering comments he had to say about me personally and about my distinguished colleague from South Carolina, L. MENDEL RIVERS. I think this is understandable.

After mature thought, however, I thought it more important to get this message to Members of the House than for me to hide behind the blush of modesty.

This is a discussion in depth of the real problem, and Holmes Alexander has done a good job.

The column follows:

HÉBERT TALKS SHOW JUSTICE PROSECUTORS DEFENDING DANGEROUS LUNATICS, FOOLS

WASHINGTON.—Ramsey Clark and Fred Vinson Jr. are a couple of second-generation Rooseveltians, more liberal than their fathers before them, and more's the pity.

The Justice Department under Ramsey Clark (Fred Vinson heads the Criminal Division) has discovered the First Amendment which protects the people's rights of speech, press, assembly and petition.

The true meaning of the amendment lies in the eye of the beholder. It can mean that genuine, legitimate protest shall not be abridged. Or it can mean that fools and knaves shall not be prevented from cheering on the enemy, obstructing troop trains, burning draft cards and the American flag, flopping in the corridors of the Pentagon and otherwise engaging in hostile acts while the nation is doing combat.

In general, the American Congress takes the first viewpoint—that the First Amendment was intended to protect sincere protesters.

In general, the Justice Department takes the other viewpoint—that the First Amendment prevents the nation from protecting itself against dangerous lunatics and treacherous rascals.

A couple of high-ranking congressmen, F. Edward Hébert of Louisiana, and Mendel Rivers, D-S.C., both of the House Armed Services Committee, are seeking ways to punish these internal enemies.

Atty. Gen. Clark and Asst. Atty. Gen. Vinson have been before House committees to say that it can't be done.

The attorney general, prior to his confirmation and providing very good reasons why he should not have been appointed or confirmed, visited the House Un-American Activities Committee. It was pointed out to him that Vietnam sympathizers could be prosecuted under two efficient and effective laws. One is the Trading with the Enemy Act. The other is the Export-Import Control Act.

"The record very clearly shows," an HUAC member, Rep. Ichord, D-Mo., told Rep. Hébert, "that to date there has not been a single prosecution or a single indictment obtained under these laws."

There's another law, the Selective Service Act (1948 version) which makes it a crime "to promote the success of its (the United States') enemies."

But when Mr. Vinson appeared before the House Armed Services Committee, which was considering amendments, he did everything except play-crazy to get out of promising that law's enforcement.

First, he said, "I am not familiar with the statute." Then he said that in enforcement of the law, "You definitely and distinctly have First Amendment problems."

Finally, he admitted that none of the Vietnik dissenters had been prosecuted "because the department felt that no one has violated the statute."

If you haven't already noticed, Atty. Gen. Clark and Asst. Atty. Gen. Vinson keep talking like defense attorneys. Their jobs, however, are those of prosecuting attorneys, and there's the rub.

We've got a Justice Department where the men appointed and paid for law enforcement have played turncoats. They've gone over to the opposite side of the courtroom. They are dragging their feet, straining their wits, splitting hairs and acting dumb in order to keep violators out of the clutches of the law.

This they can do, by quibble and chicanery, because some of the language in existing statutes isn't mod.

Congressmen Rivers and Hébert, among others, are trying to patch up the language. But that shouldn't be necessary if we had federal prosecutors who prosecuted. And even the amended language is going to collide with daffy interpretations of the First Amendment so long as we have the likes of Messrs. Clark and Vinson in the Justice Department.

Fino Introduces 30-Year Civil Service Retirement Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1967

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today I am reintroducing my bill to allow postal and civil service employees to retire after 30 years of service on full retirement annuities.

My purpose in reintroducing this legislation is simple. I believe that in our booming economy, we can afford to give our workers greater leisure periods, both during and after employment. There is no reason today why civil service employees ought not to be able to retire after 30 years of public service.

I strongly feel that any such 30-year retirement authorized ought to be allowed on a full annuity basis. If we are to allow and encourage civil servants to retire after 30 years on the job, we should not penalize them by giving them something less than full annuities.

International Commission of Jurists Condemns Coup in Greece

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1967

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the International Commission of Jurists, with headquarters in Geneva, has issued a statement condemning the military coup d'etat in Greece.

I believe this statement deserves careful attention by all:

THE RULE OF LAW ABROGATED IN GREECE

The International Commission of Jurists would be failing in its duty if it did not call attention to the extremely serious situation which has arisen in Greece following upon the coup d'état carried out by a self-appointed group of military officers.

Until April 21, when the coup d'état took place, a lawfully constituted Government was in control and elections were due to be held on May 28. This coup d'état was clearly intended to overthrow the Government and to prevent the Greek people from expressing their will at an election. This is in complete violation of the Rule of Law which the International Commission of Jurists seeks to protect. Indeed at the Athens Congress of the Commission, in 1955, it was laid down:

"The will of the people is the basis of the authority of public powers. This will must be expressed by free elections . . . The legislative power must be effectively exercised by an appropriate organ, freely elected by the citizens. The laws and other legal measures taken by the legislature cannot be abolished or restricted by a governmental measure."

Having seized de facto power, the military regime purported to issue a decree "suspending" all those articles of the Constitution which protect the rights of the individual and provide the guarantees necessary for the maintenance of the Rule of Law. This group of military officers had, of course, no authority to nullify the Constitution. In case of grave public danger the King on the advice of the Government, and subject to subsequent ratification by Parliament, could have suspended some Constitutional guarantees. The military officers went even further than the King, the Government and Parliament were entitled to go in that they purported to suspend Article 18 of the Constitution which cannot be suspended even in an emergency. It is the Article which forbids torture, capital punishment for political offense and total confiscation of property. This step can only give rise to real fears as to the intentions of the regime. The following fundamental constitutional safeguards are among those that have also been abrogated: freedom of the press and of expression, protection from arbitrary imprisonment, prohibition of special tribunals, freedom of association, inviolability of the home.

This illegal suspension of the constitutional safeguards of the Rule of Law was followed by a series of draconian measures, introduced by "emergency laws". Censorship and severe restrictions have been imposed upon the press resulting in the closure of several newspapers, public meetings have been prohibited, numerous homes have been searched, military courts have been set up and political parties have been dissolved, as have several hundred other organisations, including trade unions, cultural societies and sports clubs, their property being seized and their archives and bank accounts confiscated.

Some thousands of persons, including politicians, lawyers, journalists and ordinary citizens, have been arrested and detained. Their fate is still uncertain. On April 25, Colonel Papadopoulos said at a press conference that they would be tried by "commissions of security" which would include in their membership judges of the ordinary courts. However, some days later he said that: "Those who make a statement—which is accepted as sincere—and who will no longer be a danger to public security will be released. As for the others, they will wait until there is no longer any fertile soil in which they can sow their seeds of trouble. They will then be released, but kept out of the way". It is difficult to opt as to whether "trial by Commissions of Security" or a decision by some unknown authority in secret is to be preferred.

The fact that some jurists are in the service of the military regime and occasional protestations that "legality will be respected" can in no way conceal the flagrant violation of the Rule of Law which is taking place. Everyone knows only too well the fatal path along which are led all dictatorial regimes instituted by force and maintained in power by coercion, even when at the start the persons concerned acted in good faith and from the best of motives.

Greece is a party to the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights. The actions and methods of the Greek military regime clearly offend the provisions of the Convention. Acordingly these events concern not only Greece but all the other High Contracting Parties to the Convention and are highly damaging to the concepts of democracy and legality.

Wherever they take place, military coups d'état, forcible seizures of power, and the disregard of the fundamental principles of justice and freedom which have been painstakingly forged as civilization has developed, are always highly dangerous and damaging. There are cases where one can perhaps point to circumstances capable, if not of justifying or excusing such actions, then at least of making them less intolerable. This is not such a case. The fact that democracy should have been not only scorned but deported and placed in a concentration camp in a European country and more particularly in Greece, the cradle of the very concept of democracy and a country whose millenial humanist tradition had become a symbol, is felt by world public opinion with quite particular anxiety and distaste.

Time for Assessing Benefits Versus Cost

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVID PRYOR

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1967

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. Speaker, recently the Honorable WILBUR D. MILLS, of Arkansas, proposed a very thought provoking idea which I believe many Americans will find most timely and appropriate.

In a speech at the 75th anniversary celebration of the Security Trust Co., in Rochester, N.Y., on May 22, Congressman MILLS proposed a commission of outside and independent citizens to make an unbiased study and evaluation of Government spending and taxing.

His suggestion has been met with acclaim. I would like to include for the benefit of my colleagues a recent editorial from the Dumas Clarion, Dumas, Ark., which commented on his proposal:

TIME FOR ASSESSING BENEFITS VERSUS COST

Last week, Congressman Wilbur D. Mills proposed that the federal government needs a commission of outsiders to take a "cold-eyed" view of government spending and taxing.

Said the congressman: "We can't have a reasonable tax policy apart from a reasonable spending policy. We can't finance through taxes the programs now in existence as they may grow. Such taxes would throw the economy into a tailspin.

"But we lose our options for using tax policy to foster long-term growth because we simply don't know which programs are worth the most and which the least in terms of benefits related to costs.

"The best way to economize is not to cut $10 million from this activity or $20 million from that simply because you have the opportunity to do it. It might be much better to eliminate altogether the programs that are providing the least in relation to their cost."

An astute politician, Congressman Mills is also keen as keeper of the public pocketbook. He has made an observation which both national and state governments might follow. In the national government, we have programs and services which have outlived their usefulness. The same might be said for the scope of certain state services. We need commissions of able businessmen and leaders to make recommendations.

The tenacles of government have extended into so many areas, demanding more tax monies to feed them—despite the ultimate worth of the project. If we as a nation are to keep axes and government spending from boomeranging beyond ultimate control, we must make some effort now at a total review of the services of government, how we can afford those really worthwhile and how we can do without those which are not worth the price tag.

Negro Officer in Viet Raps Dr. King's Views

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1967

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

[From the San Diego (Calif.) Union, May 26, 1967]

NEGRO OFFICER IN VIET RAPS DR. KING'S VIEWS

CAMP BEARCAT, SOUTH VIETNAM.—Capt. Earle McCaskill, 29, an assistant judge advocate in the 9th Infantry Division, is one of 50,000 American Negroes who have served or are serving in South Vietnam.

McCaskill is by no means an "average" Negro soldier, if such a thing exists. He is better educated than most, he is an officer—a military lawyer—and he has a relatively uncommon job.

He shares with the majority of Negroes in Vietnam—officers and enlisted men, career men and draftees, young and old—a distaste for the antiwar sentiments expressed by Cassius Clay and the Rev. Martin Luther King.

"I think what they have done is most unfortunate," he said. "They demonstrated their lack of understanding of what we're doing here. King talks about a civil war, but anyone who's fought in Vietnam knows that the whole thing is being run by Hanoi."

McCaskill tended to dismiss the opinions of Clay—whom he described as "a competent fighter" but a publicity seeker—more readily than those of King, the civil rights leader.

"Dr. King may have a point when he says we are spending billions of dollars in Vietnam that could be used to help the impoverished Negroes in the cities," the captain said.

"But I think that he makes a false assumption when he concludes that the money would be used for that purpose if there were no war going on. They didn't appropriate the money to help the Negroes before the war. Why would they now?"

McCaskill, who studied at Talladega College, an integrated school in Alabama, and at Howard University in Washington, argued that antiwar civil rights leaders had missed what he called "a critically important point."

"In a way," he said, "the war puts the movement in focus. What we are trying to accomplish here is to guarantee personal liberty, economic opportunities and educational opportunities for everyone—the peasants and the sons of bankers—and that is what we Negroes need in the states."

The captain said he is convinced there is a disproportionate number of Negroes serving in Vietnam. He attributed part of the imbalance to the large number of Negroes who, attracted by prestige and higher pay, had volunteered for airborne training. Large numbers of paratroopers are sent here.

According to one unofficial calculation, 23 per cent of Army combat troops in Vietnam are Negroes, as compared with 11 percent of the U.S. population.

McCaskill was interviewed at a sandbagged command post along the earth wall that surrounds Camp Bearcat, the 9th Division's command post, 18 miles wets of Saigon.

"As a general proposition, I think discrimination among fighting troops in Vietnam—soldier to soldier and commander to soldier—is almost nonexistent," he said. "The situation is certainly far better than in most civilian situations."

Iowa Legislature Acts on Hoover Parks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1967

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, recently the Iowa Legislature passed a resolution calling on the Congress to appropriate the requested funds for completing the land acquisition program at the Herbert Hoover Historic Site at West Branch, Iowa.

The passage of the resolution indicates the broad support enjoyed by the Hoover park project in Iowa.

IOWA SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 40

Whereas, Iowans wish to honor Herbert Hoover, the 31st President of the United States, and the only Iowan ever to be elected President of the United States, and

Whereas, the Herbert Hoover National Historic Site at West Branch, Iowa, is of national interest, attracting more than 750,000 visitors since 1962, and

Whereas, this site includes the Presidential library and museum, and the grounds are the location of the former President's birthplace cottage and the gravesites of President and Mrs. Hoover, and

Whereas, the present site is incomplete and inadequate and part of it is in an unfinished and unsightly condition, Now Therefore, be it resolved by the Senate of the sixty-second General Assembly of the State of Iowa, the House of Representatives concurring:

That the General Assembly of the State of Iowa urges the Congress of the United States to approve the President's $470,000 appropriation request which was included in the Interior Department's appropriation bill for land and building acquisition and development at the Herbert Hoover National Historic Site.

Be it further resolved that a copy of this Resolution be forwarded to each of the members of the Iowa delegation in Congress.

We, Robert D. Fulton, Lieutenant Governor of Iowa and President of the Senate, Al Meacham, Secretary of the Senate, Maurice E. Baringer, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and William R. Kendrick, Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives, hereby certify that the above and foregoing resolution was adopted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the sixty-second General Assembly of Iowa.

ROBERT D. FULTON,
Lieutenant Governor of Iowa.
AL MEACHAM,
Secretary of the Senate.
MAURICE E. BARINGER,
Speaker of the House.
WILLIAM R. KENDRICK,
Chief Clerk of the House.

Aircraft Carrier U.S.S. "John F. Kennedy"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS N. DOWNING

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1967

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, on May 27, 1967, the aircraft carrier, U.S.S. *John F. Kennedy*, was launched by the Newports News Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co., at Newport News, Va. This was truly a momentous occasion, which was attended by an enthusiastic crowd of nearly 30,000 people.

So many dignitaries were present that it was impossible to afford everyone the hospitalities and courtesies that we would have desired. In addition to President Lyndon B. Johnson, we were graced by the presence of Mrs. John F. Kennedy and her lovely children, Caroline and John. Caroline sponsored the great ship, with her mother serving as her matron of honor.

In addition to those mentioned, the KENNEDY brothers and their lovely wives were present, as well as the vivacious mother of the late President, Mrs. Joseph P. Kennedy. The presence of Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara and Secretary of the Navy Paul H. Nitze also gave significance to this great occasion.

It was a beautiful day in Newport News, Va., and it was a great day for the Navy.

The President of the United States delivered the principal address, and it was eloquent, timely, and extremely appropriate.

Mr. Speaker, I am including the remarks of the President at the christening of the aircraft carrier, U.S.S. *John F. Kennedy*, at the Newport News Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co., at Newport News, Va., on May 27, 1967, in the RECORD.

The address is as follows:

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT AT THE CHRISTENING OF THE AIRCRAFT CARRIER U.S.S. "JOHN F. KENNEDY"

Mrs. Kennedy, Caroline and John, Mrs. Joseph Kennedy, Senators Kennedy and other members of the Kennedy family, Secretary McNamara, Secretar, Nitze, Mr. Holden, distinguished ladies and gentlemen:

In March, 1943, almost a quarter of a century ago, a young naval lieutenant assumed his first command—a tiny PT boat—and sailed intrepidly into the savage battle for the Solomons.

Next year 5,000 Americans will put to sea in this giant ship named John F. Kennedy, for whom the voyage of destiny began in the Solomons and ended tragically at the pinnacle of national affection and respect, the Presidency of the United States.

This is the third carrier since the end of the Second World War to bear the name of a man. Carriers are normally named for famous battles, or great ships of the past. Its only companions are named for Franklin Delano Roosevelt and James V. Forrestal.

This is highly appropriate because these three singular men had a great deal in common:

Each of them died in the service of his country.

Each of them understood that, whatever the risk, men must defend freedom, the leaven in the bread of life that alone makes true peace possible.

Each of them believed—in John Kennedy's moving words: "It is the fate of this generation . . . to live with a struggle we did not start, in a world we did not make. But the pressures of life are not always distributed by choice. And while no nation has ever been faced by such a challenge, no nation has ever been so ready to seize the burden and glory of freedom."

To face that challenge, John Kennedy knew, took strength as well as idealism: he knew it as a student who saw the failure of appeasement in the 1930's; he knew it as a Naval Officer in the South Pacific; he knew it as President of the United States.

Because John Kennedy understood that strength is essential to sustain freedom, because he recognized that we cannot afford to mark time or stand in place, he requested funds for this carrier from the Congress in 1963.

In the year 2000—and beyond—this majestic ship we christen today may still be sailing the oceans of the world. We pray that her years will be years of peace. But if she must fight, both the flag she flies and the name she bears will carry a profound message to friend and foe alike.

For the five thousand Americans who will man this great ship—and for all their countrymen, whose hopes ride with them—this is a moment of reflection.

Today, as throughout our history, we bear fateful responsibilities in the world. From the moment of our national creation, American ideals have served as a beacon to the oppressed and the enslaved.

In times past, it has often been our strength and our resolve which have tipped the scales of conflict against aggressors, or would-be aggressors. That role has never been an easy one. It has always required not only strength, but patience—the incredible courage to wait where waiting is appropriate, to avoid disastrous results to short-cut history.

And sacrifice—the tragic price we pay for our commitment to our ideals.

No President understood his Nation's historic role and purpose better than John F. Kennedy. No man knew more deeply the burdens of that role. And no man ever gave more.

Let this ship we christen in his name be a testament that his countrymen have not forgotten.

Thank you, very much.

St. Louis Globe-Democrat Endorses Saving the View From Mount Vernon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERVEY G. MACHEN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1967

Mr. MACHEN. Mr. Speaker, the St. Louis Globe-Democrat has joined the nationwide campaign to save the view from Mount Vernon across the Potomac River at Piscataway Park, Md.

The Globe-Democrat, in an editorial on May 25, 1967, presents a strong case for appropriation of funds to complete parkland purchase in order to maintain the setting across the historic Mount Vernon estate of our first President in much the same scenic state as when he viewed it. As the Globe-Democrat states:

> The natural beauty around Mount Vernon is an inherent part of this national shrine. To allow its destruction would be an irreparable tragedy.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the Globe-Democrat for its fine editorial on behalf of this project and to insert it in the Record for the benefit of my colleagues:

> No Substitutes for Beauty
>
> "I think that I shall never see
> A billboard lovely as a tree."
> —Ogden Nash
>
> No less intense than the fight to protect Missouri's scenic views from the explosive growth of billboards along highways is a similar campaign to preserve the natural beauty surrounding historic Mount Vernon, the home of George Washington.
>
> With tentative approval in the Missouri Senate of a measure to reduce the number of billboards along interstate and primary state highways in Missouri, a step has been taken in the right direction.
>
> The Senate measure, expected to meet federal regulations, is stronger than a bill passed by the House, which merely attempts to circumvent federal objections to billboard placements. Hopefully, the stiffer proposal will be enacted into law.
>
> Billboards, however, although offensive to the eye in search of trees and other natural beauty, may be transient things. They can be felled by a reversal of the permissive laws that allow their existence.
>
> The situation at Mount Vernon is not that simple. While George Washington's home in Virginia is not threatened, the tranquil view across the Potomac River toward the gently rolling fields of Maryland may disappear forever, engulfed by commercial development and high density construction, unless Congress restores the $2,700,000 necessary to complete the previously-authorized federal purchase of private lands and preserve the scenic beauty of the area forever.
>
> The funds were cut by the House Appropriations Committee in a short-sighted economy move. If the government fails to acquire the land by August, easements will revert to the donors. Increasing pressures of massive urban development from Washington, D.C., suburbs could then cause the scenic view once revered by our first President to be swallowed for all time in a sea of commercialism.
>
> The Senate Appropriations Committee now has the power to prevent this desecration by restoring the federal funds. The natural beauty around Mount Vernon is an inherent part of this national shrine. To allow its destruction would be an irreparable tragedy.

The Post Office Meets a Fact of Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1967

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, many of us are patiently waiting for Postmaster General O'Brien to provide specific details of his suggestion to remove politics from the Post Office Department and turn it into a quasi-private-enterprise operation. In the meantime it would seem to me in the public interest to continue constructive discussion of the steady deterioration within the Department and, therefore, I insert into the Record an editorial from the June 6 edition of the Chicago Tribune:

> The Post Office Meets a Fact of Life
>
> A cardinal principle of free enterprise is that the more costly or inefficeint a service becomes, the more eagerly people will look for a substitute. This is no doubt why, as as the Wall Street Journal reports, a good many companies have tried to set up their own systems for mail delivery.
>
> They have found, along with many others, that overnight mail delivery is becoming the exception rather than the rule—especially with inter-city mail. They find that they can do the job faster and at less expense by arranging for their own systems.
>
> The trouble, of course, is that in general it is illegal to use the public roads—or airways or waterways—to compete with the postoffice. In this land of free enterprise, the postoffice has protected itself by law with every available device to prevent competition. Not, mind you, that the post office objects if somebody else does its work; it merely wants to be paid for its nonservice. Anybody can send a letter or deliver it outside of the United States mail—but only if the sender has affixed the proper amount of United States postage and canceled the stamp himself.
>
> For three years the Public Service Company of Colorado has been hiring a bus company to pick up and deliver company mail and paying the postoffice $9,000 a year for the privilege of not using its service. A man in Richmond, Va., calculated that he could give that city better service for three cents a letter than the postoffice gives for five cents, but abandoned his plan to offer this service when he learned that he would have to pay the postoffice five cents for every letter thus handled.
>
> The devices being used by the postoffice are similar to those which have always been used to protect monopolistic and inefficient practices, especially by governments. The more often the postoffice finds it necessary to enforce these laws, the more obvious it should be that the postoffice is not doing it job properly.
>
> Postmaster General O'Brien has recognized this by proposing that the postoffice department be abolished and that the operation be turned over to an independent government corporation, free from politics and the often wasteful practices of federal employment. The only wiser suggestion would be to turn the job over to private industry.
>
> Unless something is done, matters are almost sure to grow worse. Service will continue to deteriorate. Black market mail service will increase. The cost of enforcing the postal monopoly will likewise increase, and the cost of postage will go up. This is a vicious circle which ought to be stopped, and the sooner the better.

The Mideast Crisis—An Extension of Vietnam War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB CASEY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1967

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, in these perilous days, when the winds of crises blow from all compass points, it is heartening to hear voices of logic and reason speak out across our land.

Like all our people, we watch developments unfold in the Mideast, uneasy and with deep concern for the dire consequences of such rashness on the part of the combatants—but firmly convinced in our mind that the crisis there is directly related to our effective efforts in Vietnam.

Surely, now is the time for all Americans to close ranks behind our President, and to offer him the deep moral support needed for the crucial decisions he must make in coming days to chart the course of our foreign policy.

I offer our President—and I know I speak for the majority of the people in the 22d District I am privileged to represent—my full support for his efforts to bring a cease-fire in the Israel-Arab conflict, to maintain freedom of the seas, and to curb aggression whether it be by friend or foe. For him, as Chief Executive Officer of our country, to do less, is for us to stand idly by while the flames of world war III are ignited.

It was, Mr. Speaker, a great pleasure for me to read the editorial broadcast May 30 by Mr. Lester Kamin, president of KXYZ radio station in Houston, and I include it here for the benefit of my colleagues in the House:

> KXYZ urges its listeners to support our Government in its greatest crisis since the Cuban confrontation between ourselves and Russia. KXYZ also urges that we consider closing ranks on Vietnam, for the Middle East crisis is but an extension of the same problem. As our President has stated, "The U.S. has always opposed the efforts of other nations to resolve their problems with their neighbors by the aggression route. We shall continue to do so."
>
> This has been the policy of the U.S. under our last four Presidents. It is the policy of both major political parties. Resisting aggression and protecting a nation's right for self-determination is the great lesson of the Second World War.
>
> We cannot live completely confined within our shores. Our very own freedom depends

on the freedom of mankind everywhere. Egypt's closing of the Gulf of Aqaba—an international waterway—is a threat to this freedom.

You can make your voice heard by letting your Congressman, your Senator, and your President know that we support our Government in its announced purpose of resisting aggression.

Des Moines Tribune Supports Preservation of the View From Mount Vernon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERVEY G. MACHEN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1967

Mr. MACHEN. Mr. Speaker, in an editorial on May 24, 1967, the Des Moines Tribune adds its editorial voice of support to the campaign to save the view from Mount Vernon.

Pointing out the loss in donated land and scenic easements that would occur if the Congress fails to appropriate funds sufficient to complete preservation of the view across the Potomac River at Piscataway Park, the Tribune states:

> More than one million U.S. and foreign visitors tour Mount Vernon every year. The splendid vista across the river, miraculously little changed from the view that Washington himself enjoyed, belongs to them much more, it seems to us, than it belongs to the few thousand people who might live there if the forest were bulldozed and "developed."

Mr. Speaker, I commend the Des Moines Tribune for its concise and intelligent editorial in support of this open space project, and insert it in the RECORD at this point:

MOUNT VERNON VISTA IN DANGER

The view from Mount Vernon is threatened again by suburban development. Senate action on an appropriation authorized by Congress last year may be the only way to save the forest land across the Potomac from George Washington's home, because the House Appropriations Committee has denied a needed $2.7 million.

Last year it seemed that the long fight to preserve the Mount Vernon vicinity had been won. Congress authorized $4.1 million to buy land, with the provision that private landowners and two foundations would donate enough land to more than match the federal contribution.

The foundations and private owners have done their part, donating 501 acres and granting valuable scenic easements on another 1,000 acres. But if Congress fails to appropriate $2.7 million to buy 500 acres for its part of the bargain, the donations will begin to revert to the donors in August.

Representative Harvy G. Machen of Maryland, in whose district the land is located, says that sewer and water facilities will be completed near the area within six months. If there is no assurance that Congress will live up to its bargain, can property owners be expected to sacrifice the profits that will come with high-rise apartments and $30,000 split-levels?

More than one million U.S. and foreign visitors tour Mount Vernon every year. The splendid vista across the river, miraculously little changed from the view that Washington himself enjoyed, belongs to them much more, it seems to us, than it belongs to the few thousand people who might live there if the forest were bulldozed and "developed."

Representatives John M. Murphy of New York, Addresses Dinner of American Veterans of Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1967

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, May 27, 1967, my friend and colleague, the Honorable JOHN M. MURPHY, of New York, addressed a dinner of the American Veterans of Israel at the Carnegie Endowment Center, New York City.

Representative MURPHY attributed the survival of the State of Israel primarily to the unfailing spirit of its people and to their commitment to democratic principles.

The example of the Israel peoples struggle for survival serves as a constant reminder to people throughout the world that the preservation of freedom requires a continual commitment. Thus, it is my pleasure to submit Mr. MURPHY's statement for the benefit of all our colleagues who today are gravely concerned over the Middle East situation:

REPRESENTATIVE JOHN M. MURPHY ADDRESSES DINNER OF AMERICAN VETERANS OF ISRAEL AT CARNEGIE ENDOWMENT CENTER IN NEW YORK, MAY 27, 1967

Just 2 weeks ago the State of Israel celebrated its 19th year of Independence. Like any birthday, it was a chance to pause and reflect on the past, take inventory on the present, and plan for the future.

But Israel was celebrating more than another year of progress and prosperity; it was celebrating another year of survival. All that Israel has achieved has come only through struggle and conflict. Those of you who manned the freedom ships which carried immigrants through the British blockade, and those of you who joined in the Israeli War of Independence, know the extent of that conflict, the difficulty of that struggle, and the miracle of that survival.

Even before Israel was founded, the Jews faced serious obstacles. After World War II, those who had survived the Nazi slaughter of nearly six million Jews sought refuge in Palestine. But there were already many Jews there, and the Arabs opposed additional immigration. The British, who controlled the Palestine area under a U.N. Mandate, reduced the immigration quota. Thus the Jews arriving from Europe had to cross a British Naval blockade before even reaching Palestine, and had to face Arab terrorism when they finally arrived.

By the time the British announced the date of their departure from Palestine the lines of battle had been drawn. Even before the British left, Arab armies invaded the area in defiance of the U.N. General Assembly. They harassed the Jewish population with border raids, ambushes, assassinations and terrorism. It was in the midst of this turmoil, on May 14, 1948, that the Jews proclaimed their independence, and the State of Israel was born.

The next day Azzam Pasha, the Secretary-General of the Arab League, made a statement which, in effect, announced the coming war and set the tone for Arab-Israeli relations from that time to the present day. He said:

"This will be a war of extermination and a momentous massacre which will be spoken of like the Mongolian massacres and the Crusades."

With that, the war began.

We all know the events that followed; Arab aggression encountered Israeli determination and the cause of freedom prevailed. The peace that followed was a tenuous peace, but it enabled Israel to turn to her own problems of growth and development. In the Years that followed Israel developed a thriving agriculture and a strong, modern economy where before a barren desert had existed. In addition, it produced a strong and stable democracy in an area where democracy and stability are the exception.

But again it was progress with struggle. Egypt closed the Suez Canal and the Gulf of Aqaba to Israeli shipping, and the rest of the Arab nations joined in economic boycott. Terrorist border raids continued and intensified. Nineteen years of progress while surrounded by aggressive opposition can only be explained by the unfailing spirit of the Israeli people.

This, I think, is the unique explanation of Israel's survival; whatever the obstacle, the spirit of of the Israeli people has prevailed. But it explains more than the success of one country. It prophesies the eventual triumph of freedom everywhere. All men yearn to be free, and though many are today under the oppressive heel of tyranny, as long as the spirit still burns in their hearts, their cause will prevail.

I think the Arab countries today would profit from an evaluation of the Israeli nation before pursuing a reckless course of aggression. Israel's determination to survive is no less today than it was nineteen years ago. And let there be no mistake—the United States and free nations everywhere will do whatever is necessary to maintain peace in the Middle East and to preserve the independence and territorial integrity of all nations.

The spirit of freedom that Israel has demonstrated so well has special significance for those of you who are Veterans of the Israeli War of Independence. The word Veteran usually means someone who did something in the past; it implies distance and isolation. But there is more to being a Veteran than reflecting on past accomplishments, although those accomplishments are worthy of reflection. Being a Veteran suggests a spirit that does not cease with the completion of a job, that does not die out, that can never be completely tucked away as a memory. The spirit of freedom which you all knew so well in 1947 has as much meaning today as it did then. Today, and every day, we are faced with obstacles no less threatening to our freedom than those you faced twenty years ago; our success today and tomorrow will require no less a dedication of spirit.

And so, I hope you use this annual gathering not just to pause and reflect, but to renew your commitment to freedom. You, better than most Americans, know that the preservation of this country depends on the strength of that commitment.

"Clown Prince" Honored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1967

Mr. MORSE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I submit for insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the recent article in the Lawrence Eagle Tribune in tribute to Stanley Mazotta of Lawrence, Mass., who is known to Greater Lawrence youngsters as Kilo, "Clown Prince of Softball."

For more than 10 years, Mr. Mazotta has shown unselfish devotion to cheering underprivileged and handicapped children with laughter and lollipops. In his spare time he has entertained to raise funds for children's charities. In addition, he is finance officer of the Italian-American Toilers, Inc., of Lawrence, and has been a member of that organization for 32 years.

In recognition of his unswerving service to the community, Mr. Mazotta was honored by the State Executive Council at a meeting of the Italian-American Toilers, Inc. All will agree, I am sure, that his activities and his dedication are an example to be recognized to the fullest, praised, and followed.

The article follows:

"CLOWN PRINCE" HONORED

Stanley S. Mazzotta, known to many local youngsters as "Kilo, Clown Prince of Softball", was recently honored by the state executive council at a meeting of the Italian-American Toilers, Inc.

Governor's Councilor Thomas J. Lane presented him with a resolution bearing the state seal and signed by Gov. John A. Volpe and Lt. Gov. Francis W. Sargent.

Mazzotta has for more than a decade devoted much of his free time to entertaining underprivileged and physically handicapped children in his role of "Kilo." He has entertained at hospitals, schools, and benefits, as well as local softball games.

The resolution cites Mazzotta for his work with the Jimmy Fund, various children's charities, blood donations, and the charitable endeavors of the Italian-American Toilers, Inc., of which he is finance officer.

Mazzotta, an employee of Western Electric Co., resides with his wife, the former Eva Aufiero, at 135 Lexington St. They have two daughters, Janice A., a teacher at Salem, N.H. High School, and Donna, a junior student at Lowell State College.

Harold D. Cooley Citation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS G. ABERNETHY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1967

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, Hon. Harold D. Cooley, of North Carolina, served with distinction in the House of Representatives for 32 years. It was my privilege to be associated here with this great man for 24 of those years. It is deeply satisfying and rewarding to me, as I am sure it is to all his many friends in this body, that he ended his long and eminent tenure here in a ring of applause and approbation from people back home whom he loved and served.

Of the many tributes to him, one particularly has come to my attention. This is a citation from the Farmers Cooperative Council of North Carolina. It is such a sincere and genuine expression of appreciation and devotion that Harold's former colleagues and friends here will find joy in reading it. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am inserting the text in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The citation follows:

CITATION, FARMERS COOPERATIVE COUNCIL OF NORTH CAROLINA

In admiration and appreciation of Honorable Harold D. Cooley of North Carolina, Member of Congress 1934–1966, Chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, U.S. House of Representatives, 81st, 82d, 84th, 85th, 86th, 87th, 88th, and 89th Congresses: Champion of the farmers of America.

He has devoted his life and his great talents and energies to the service of Agriculture. His works have benefited all Americans.

Through his leadership, the lot of farm families has improved, the United States has become the best fed nation on earth, and our abundance is shared with hungry people in all the Free World.

He went to Congress in the dark days of the great depression. Agriculture was destitute, and millions of people walked the streets, hungry and without jobs. He saw his greatest opportunity for service in membership on the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives, and became the first North Carolinian to serve that great Committee in 104 years. In due time he became Chairman and served in this chairmanship longer than any other man in history. He helped build the programs that lifted agriculture out of destitution and rescued America from economic caos and human suffering.

More legislation of benefit to farmers bears his name than the name of any other man.

He was the architect of laws which, through production adjustments, price guarantees, credit and other programs, changed the face of agriculture and improved the living conditions of those people who feed and clothe the Nation. He was one of the builders of REA which turned on the lights in Rural America.

In behalf of all Americans, and for the generations yet to come who will be blessed by the works of this distinguished man, the Farmers Cooperative Council of North Carolina salutes Harold D. Cooley as a great American, a dutiful public servant, a leader of men and a benefactor of all mankind.

The Farmers Cooperative Council of North Carolina in recognition of the significant achievements and meritorious service of Harold Dunbar Cooley confers upon him this Distinguished Service Award, given this twenty-eighth day of February, nineteen hundred and sixty-seven at Raleigh, North Carolina.

HARRY B. CALDWELL,
Executive Vice President.
G. DEWEY ARNDT,
Treasurer.
D. REDFERAN,
President.

Our Honored Dead in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1967

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of this House a poem which was written by a constituent, Mr. Louis Valente, of the Bronx, N.Y., as a Memorial Day salute to those of our soldiers who have made the supreme sacrifice in the Vietnamese war.

As Mr. Valente says, I think we have an obligation to see that these men, like those others who have died for America in past wars, have not given their lives in vain:

OUR HONORED DEAD IN VIETNAM

(By Lou Valente)

The battle is not yet over.
The victory not yet won.
Many brave men will die,
Before the next setting sun.
On the bloody battlefields of Viet-Nam,
Our brave young men,
Have stemmed the tide of tyranny,
Over and over again.
Many have sacrificed their lives,
For a cause they knew was just.
Their sacrifice is the reason why,
Our backing them is a must.
Let's show them that we care,
For we know why they were there.
Attend your house of worship,
And offer up a prayer.
A prayer to our Lord,
In his heaven up above,
To see to it that they haven't died in vain,
And have merited his love.
Wherever we may be,
On this, Memorial Day,
Let's honor our dead, in Viet-Nam,
In our time honored way.

Ian D. Smith, Prime Minister of Rhodesia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1967

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, liberty-loving individuals the world over continue to support the young Rhodesia republic with their prayers and well wishes.

How ironical that our country has allowed itself to "me too" the British to enforce sanctions against Rhodesia, while the United Nations refuses any consideration of a blockade of belligerents.

It would appear to most American people that if a blockade of Israel is an act of aggression calling for consideration of U.S. military and naval employment, most certainly our leaders will voluntarily abandon our continued embargo against Rhodesia—U.N.O. or no. For Rhodesia's position gets stronger and the economic sanctions of our country more ignominious.

Mr. Speaker, I include Prime Minister Ian D. Smith's comments, dated May 17, following my remarks:

THE PRIME MINISTER, SPEAKING IN THE DEBATE ON THE SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

Speaking in Parliament on 17th May, 1967, the Prime Minister, the Hon. I. D. Smith, mentioned what could be referred to as a general clamour for a resumption of negotiations [with Britain], not only on the part of members of the House but also outside the House and in many parts of the world. "There seem to be some people," he said, "who believe that if we were to resume negotiations this would be the end of all our troubles."

The Prime Minister went on to say that the door had never been closed. "The Leader of the Opposition did say in his contribution in this debate, that he regretted the stupidity, or words similar to that, of the British Prime Minister when he gave us a mere 24 hours in which to consider the proposals that were brought back from the Tiger. He fairly and squarely laid the fault at the feet of the British Prime Minister, and conceded no fault should be attached to our Government."

"I would ask," Mr. Smith said, "who I am supposed to negotiate with." The Rhodesian Government was in a pleasant position in that it had adopted a straightforward honest approach, and therefore moved with a clear easy conscience, in contrast with what the British Government had done. He reminded members of the House that it was not until 23rd April last year that the British Government had agreed to open talks—five months after the Declaration of Independence. The talks were on and off, on and off, and finally culminated in the talks on the Tiger. On 5th December, the British Prime Minister had stated to the world that there would be no more discussions, and since then, some five and a half months had passed. Altogether there had been nearly a year in which the British Government had been refusing to talk.

"In spite of the fact that we always have been and we still are prepared to talk, as each day passes, Mr. Speaker, I believe that the possibility of talks deteriorates and the gap widens. The possibility of salvaging any of the old ties, the old relationships, which existed between ourselves and the United Kingdom becomes more and more remote." Mr. Smith mentioned the agreements which had been made with other people—"with other countries if you wish"—for the duration of a certain time, and other agreements which were in the course of preparation, some of them with time periods attached, of two years, three years and in some cases even five years. "Once we make agreements and contracts, we do not break them," he said.

CONSTITUTIONAL CHANGES

The Prime Minister then turned to the constitutional changes which were imminent in Rhodesia, saying, "Of course, once we make these changes there will be no going back . . . Once the [Constitutional] Commission reports, and once Government acts on this report, there will be no going back from that position either."

"As far as this Government is concerned," Mr. Smith continued, "this is a Rhodesian Commission and I would remind hon. members that I think I am correct when I say that this is the first time in our history that we have had a completely Rhodesian Commission to report on a constitution or a constitutional issue for Rhodesia. Not only is it a Rhodesian commission, it is one that has been appointed by Rhodesians and it is going to report, in the interests of Rhodesians, on a Rhodesian constitution."

SANCTIONS

On the subject of sanctions imposed on Rhodesia, the Prime Minister said that some of Rhodesia's strongest opponents had said, openly and publicly, that they were amazed at the country's success in fighting the sanctions campaign. Many countries had expressed their admiration for Rhodesia's stand, and "for the dignified manner in which we have have conducted ourselves during the whole of the post-independence era—and that this is in stark contrast to the crude and dishonest mudslinging tactics of our opponents.

"Many of these outside countries have also accorded us *de facto* recognition and they have agreed to trade with us. You can call it *de facto* recognition or you can call it undercover recognition. Mr. Speaker, I do not think, from a practical point of view, there is much difference. In fact, I believe that from the point of view of trade there is no difference.

"The crucial point is that our products, the products of our industry, primary industry and secondary industry, are on the move, and I am happy to say, in many cases they are moving even better than they were before independence." If, Mr. Smith continued, Rhodesia's friends wished to "play it cool", then anybody who believed that Rhodesia should not respect their wishes was either a fool or acting against the interests of the State. "We have no intention of falling into the trap of exposing ourselves to the fire of the enemy."

SEPARATE DEVELOPMENT

Turning to the final point of his speech, the Prime Minister expressed astonishment at the concern some people had shown at Rhodesia's policy of separate development. "After all, since 1923, since we first had our Rhodesian Constitution, a Constitution which we have been told so many times gave us what was tantamount to independence, this principle of separate development has never been absent from any of those Constitutions. In fact it was enshrined originally and has been repeated in all successive Constitutions at the insistence of the British Government. This was fortunately one of those occasions when Rhodesians saw eye to eye with the British. I wonder why it is now that this has suddenly acquired a new, strange significance, when we know that in the past it was always accepted and history shows us that it has always been successful in the past. Why now, Mr. Speaker, simply because it is once more proclaimed by this Government should it for some reason or other be questioned? Surely there is nobody who has lived in this country for more than the proverbial five minutes who is not aware of the fact that we have always had the same as we have today, the Land Apportionment Act, which divides the land of this country between the European and the African.

"To get back to my story, not only has this applied as far as the Land Apportionment Act is concerned: this has certainly been the most fundamental provision, but it has been there in a number of other spheres, most of the important spheres that cover our everyday life, and of course it was introduced, so we have been told time and time again, for the protection of the African.

"There is no doubt in my mind about that, and I am satisfied that when this was introduced originally it was there for the protection of the Africans against exploitation from the so-called more sophisticated races, such as the Europeans and the Asiatics. I have never denied, and I do not think any European has, that there were advantages as far as the European was concerned. These were more in the long term. Short term, it could have been to the advantage of the European if this had been removed. They could have exploited the Africans, but I am happy to say that the Europeans who form part of the Rhodesian complex have never wished to do this."

Concluding his speech, Mr. Smith said: "I think this question of separate development is vital. We have grown up with this, and it will be a sad day when Rhodesians, irrespective of their colour, change their mind. I would say that separate development has been a most important principle enshrined in every constitution that we have ever had in Rhodesia, and I would say that this is without doubt the main reason for the harmonious race relations that exist in Rhodesia—this thing that has made Rhodesia the envy of so many other countries in the world, and particularly on the African continent. I believe that this is the fundamental, the main reason for this very happy and very pleasant state of affairs. It is something we know we have had for over 40 years in our Constitution. It is something, therefore, which has proved itself conclusively. It is what has been supported, not only by Rhodesians for over 40 years; it is also something which has been supported by the British Government for over 40 years. This is significant, is it not? In conclusion, I do not know of anything, not one tiny, single shred of evidence, which would be in support of us changing from this standard."

The Boston Herald Calls for Protection of the View From Mount Vernon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERVEY G. MACHEN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1967

Mr. MACHEN. Mr. Speaker, the Boston Herald has joined a large number of leading daily newspapers in editorial support of preservation of the view from Mount Vernon.

In an editorial on May 23, 1967, the Herald urges congressional approval of a $2 million appropriation for further parkland purchase at Piscataway Park, across the Potomac River from Mount Vernon, in order to prevent the total loss of the project altogether.

The Herald states:

> We are spending billions to get to the moon, to wage war, to build highways. Surely we can afford $2 million to protect the setting of Mount Vernon, a foremost American shrine.

Mr. Speaker, I could not agree with the Herald more. This Nation must not forget its national heritage, and it must not forget the great need for preservation of open spaces and natural beauty in a rapidly urbanizing society. To fail to complete a parkland project where Federal dollars would be more than matched by donated land and scenic easements would be tragic.

I commend the Boston Herald for its editorial in support of this unique open spaces project, and insert the editorial at this point in the RECORD:

SAVE MOUNT VERNON'S VIEW

George Washington never saw a billboard, a neon sign, or a highrise apartment. He wasn't underprivileged; he just lived in a different age. Yet, wonder of wonders, the view from Mount Vernon, Washington's home, is today much the same as when our first President lived there. (See picture below.)

It may not be for long, however. Pressures are mounting for the "development" of Piscataway Park, the area across the Potomac River from Mount Vernon.

Machinery exists for preserving the Mount Vernon view from urban sprawl and clutter. What is lacking at the moment is sufficient money to do the job. In 1961 Congress enacted legislation authorizing protection of the view through cooperative action by private landowners, two foundations, and the national government. But escalating land prices made the original authorization of $937,600 inadequate. Last year Congress passed another bill increasing the authorization for parkland purchase to $4,132,000.

So far, so good. But this year, when the question of actually spending the money came up, the House Appropriations Committee denied a request for $2.7 million. Fortunately, the Senate restored $2 million of that amount. That may be enough to save the scenery.

The question now is whether House conferees will accept the Senate action. They should. The foundations and private owners have done their part, but if Congress refuses to do its part the private donations of land for park purposes will revert to the original owners in August.

We're sure New Englanders, who know the satisfaction and joy that come from preservation of historic sites and buildings, would urge the appropriation. We are spending billions to get to the moon, to wage war, to build highways. Surely we can afford $2 million to protect the setting of Mount Vernon, a foremost American shrine.

Countdown in the Middle East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. ROSS ADAIR
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 6, 1967

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, a recent article in the National Review by Kermit Roosevelt, entitled "What's in It for the United States," is thought provoking and appropriate at this particular time. I commend it to the reading of all who are concerned about current happenings in that part of the world:

WHAT'S IN IT FOR THE UNITED STATES?

(By Kermit Roosevelt)

A clear, thoughtful analysis of basic American interests in the Middle East is badly needed and difficult to obtain, from government or other sources, for two reasons. The first is the emotional and domestic political overtones which have, since the creation of Israel, colored U.S. relations with Israel and the Arab states alike. The second is the curious unwillingness of many people, in government and out, to discuss foreign policy in terms of material self interest, particularly when oil is involved.

Yet the American stake in the Middle East is not difficult to define. The strategic importance of the area has been recognized by the European powers and Russia, in terms basically similar to those applying today, for close to two centuries. In this country, recognition has naturally come slowly, and came on a wide scale only during the Second World War. Then the battles of the Western desert, the Lend-Lease supply line to Russia through Iran, and the constant concern with precarious Turkish neutrality, emphasized the importance of this juncture of three continents even to a country as far away as ours. The latest power to be actively concerned in the area is Red China.

We have the same interest in the Middle East as we have elsewhere: that peace shall be preserved, or at least that no local conflict shall develop so as to endanger world peace.

ALL THAT BLACK GOLD

And then there is the oil. Oil gives the Middle East a special importance. In the great oil fields of Iran, Iraq and the Arabian Peninsula are contained about 70 per cent of the free world's proved reserves, some 250,000 billion barrels. It is important to us not because we as a nation are dependent upon it as fuel. We *could* get along without it, although the earnings of American companies operating in the area contribute substantially to the inflow of funds.

But the main reason why Middle East Oil is important to us is its importance to our allies in Western Europe. Even though their dependence upon it to meet their energy requirements may be diminished year by year as other oil and gas fields are opened in North Africa, West Africa, the North Sea and elsewhere, our closest ally, Great Britain, remains financially dependent upon it. Eliminate the income which Britain receives directly from the oil, and the hundreds of millions of pounds sterling deposited in London by oil-rich governments and individuals in the Persian Gulf area, and the British fiscal edifice must collapse.

We can gain a new appreciation of our own stake in the Middle East by considering Soviet interests and activities there. From the point of view of Russian national security, the interest is obivous, and has been expressed explicitly and forcefully for centuries. Talk of peaceful coexistence with the Soviet Union seems totally inapplicable in the Middle East today.

The kind of importance that Moscow attaches to the area may be deduced from a few figures. Since 1955, Moscow has extended $3 billion in economic and military assistance to the United Arab Republic alone. Military aid to the UAR, Syria, Iraq and Yemen exceeds $2 billion and continued an upward trend into 1966. Significantly, the Soviet economic aid program shifted emphasis recently to countries with an anti-Communist record such as Iran and Turkey. In 1965 over 75 per cent of new Soviet economic aid agreements outside of the Bloc were to CENTO countries.

The majority of all Soviet personnel engaged outside of the Bloc in military and technical assistance programs is concentrated in the Middle East and has increased approximately 300 per cent since 1960. Communist Bloc military technicians in the area number almost 2,000 with an additional 1,000 in nearby Algeria and Somalia; Soviet economic technicians in the area, now over 3,000, have increased even more rapidly, by 400 per cent since 1960. At least as significant are the 5,000 technicians from the underdeveloped countries who are trained in the USSR each year. Of the 5,000 military technicians being trained in the USSR today, 50 per cent are from the Arab Near East.

Russian intelligence agents occupy 60 to 70 per cent of all official USSR diplomatic positions in Middle East countries. Most of the senior Soviet diplomats are intelligence personnel. Of the eleven Soviet ambassadors to Arab states, five are known to be former intelligence officers.

There is certainly no mystery about what Soviet intentions with regard to Middle Eastern oil must be. Recent activities of the Egyptian and Syrian governments, with evident Soviet support, remind us that the Soviets would like to see Western oil operations nationalized by local governments amenable to Soviet influence. Such governments could be expected to negotiate directly with the governments of consuming countries, eliminating any role for private enterprise and placing the Soviet Union in a position to turn the valve and cut off petroleum supplies for Western Europe at will.

The Russians and their Egyptian and Syrian agents has learned a lesson from the Iranian nationalization of the early 1950s. If just one of the producing nations in the Gulf area nationalizes the industry, its neighbors would be able to make up the loss and grow fat at its expense. To obtain the necessary leverage at least two of the Big Four producers (Kuwait, Saudi Arabia, Iran, Iraq) must nationalize at about the same time.

Working against easy Soviet achievement of this objective, in addition to human cupidity, is the growing understanding, among government officials and the small informed segment of public opinion, of the astronomical cost of setting up transportation and marketing facilities which, assuming existing facilities would be denied them, would be required before they could benefit from nationalized oil.

Given these important interests in the area and intensive Russian activity against those interests, what are the principal local issues which affect us? There are two which do most seriously. One is the deep-rooted hostility between Israel and her Arab neighbors. The other is the contest, too often carried on by violence, between the revolutionary and the evolutionary societies in the area. It is the second of these conflicts which is more pertinent to American, and to Soviet, aims in the Middle East.

ISRAELI-ARAB EXPLOSION

Though the Russian "client" states do their best to create the impression that the Soviet Union is supporting the Arabs and the United States the Israelis, this is no longer widely believed. The myth which prevailed for some years after the creation of Israel—that United States Middle Eastern policy was wholly dictated by the Zionists—is no longer widely accepted; the United States has been seen to be acting quite "independently" in accordance with her own national interests—even if the action from time to time may have seemed to some of our friends in the area mysterious if not totally inexplicable. (For example, many Arabs and Iranians still cannot understand why we continued until very recently to aid President Nasser in the face of his great and explicitly stated hostility, his support of Soviet objectives, and his efforts, in Yemen and elsewhere, to destroy our friends in Saudi Arabia, Jordan and Iran.)

By attacking our friends on the grounds that they *are* our friends, or, more commonly and rudely stated, our stooges, the revolutionary propagandists have to a considerable extent blurred the picture they have so long presented of the United States as wholly the tool of Israel. What they are trying to do, in fact, is to use the Arab-Israeli conflict as a weapon in the revolutionary-evolutionary conflict—which their own action and words make clear is far more important to them, no matter how much they protest to the contrary.

How is the Israeli-Arab conflict used as a weapon in the intra-Arab conflict? Partly, as suggested above, on the old Arab principle that, "my enemy's enemy is my friend," and therefore "my enemy's friend is my enemy." The application to our Arab friends is obvious. More directly, however, the passions and hatreds which generated around the partition of Palestine, particularly as nursed by what might fairly be described as professionals among the refugees, can be turned against those said to be "preventing" the refugees from obtaining justice, or at least revenge.

The unwelcome knowledge that we are still as a country exclusively identified with Israel in enough areas so that Arabs obviously our friends become in the eyes of *some* fellow Arabs automatically their enemies, should impress upon us one basic lesson in foreign affairs: that is, a nation must not allow itself to be identified so exclusively with any one other nation as to lose, in the eyes of neighboring states, its ability to exercise its own sovereign rights of decision.

The plain fact is that no one in the area wants hostilities to develop between Israel and her Arab neighbors, with the possible exception of the Chinese Communists, who appear to have been egging the Syrian hotheads into ever more violent and dangerous action. Even Shoukairy and the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) publicly place a higher priority upon getting rid of King Hussein of Jordan than they do on "throwing the Israelis back into the sea." One objective is possibly within their reach, the other clearly is not.

The last thing in the world Nasser and his army want is a return engagement with the Israelis. Even the medieval armies of Yemen are more than they can handle. Nonetheless, the very real danger exists that in their efforts to use the Israeli-Arab conflict as a weapon in their attack upon the evolutionary societies, the UAR and Syria may inadvertently touch off an Israeli-Arab explosion which will destroy them along with their enemies. The trouble is, they are desperate and their other weapons are blunted.

I have described the contesting parties as revolutionary and evolutionary. The United Arab Republic and Syria are the leaders of the former with Iraq an occasional partner, and their supporters are scattered among the other Arab countries of the region. The evolutionists are led by Saudi Arabia and Jordan, and, non-Arab but deeply involved, Iran. These labels are not meant to identify, as American newspapers most commonly do, forces of the Left or progressive movements on the one hand, opposed to forces of the Right or at least conservative movements on the other. Actually it would be more nearly correct to describe this friction as one of police states *v.* welfare states. The contrast between the social and economic progress achieved in the last decade or two in Egypt, Syria and revolution-torn Iraq on the one hand and the monarchies on the other is striking, not to say educational. It may not be safe to argue that the evolutionary countries have achieved their progress *because* they are monarchies.

Obviously the disparity in the achievement between the two camps cannot be attributed to any one factor. For example, population pressure is a more basic cause of Egypt's economic plight than is Nasser's adventuresome foreign policy—in fact, it is a major cause of the latter, for when Nasser, disappointed in his stratagems abroad, has resolved to look inward, he has soon recoiled in horror from the array of domestic problems a birth rate of a million a year presents and for which there is no easy and spectacular solution.

FORTUNE FAVORS IRAN

Poor Iraq is a non-country with so much built-in national and religious instability that no government presently imaginable can keep it in hand. The old regime was indeed oppressive, but in many respects it functioned as a benevolent despotism and it must look much better now to many Iraqis than it did at the time of its overthrow. Syria, potentially a rich and most attractive country, has developed the world's most serious case of *coupitis*, and too many of her best citizens have, in sadness and despair, gone into exile.

On the other hand, fortune has favored Iran and Saudi Arabia.

In Iran we have been able to contrast the style of a genuine progressive evolutionist who happens to be a monarch, with that of a nationalist demagogue who talked a better reform program than he actually played and who happened to enjoy Soviet support. The Shah and Mossadegh each sought better terms from the oil companies. Fifteen years ago Mossadegh, who negotiated by propaganda, street mobs and threats, expelled the foreign "imperialist" company from Iran at the cost of a total loss of oil revenues during his own reign and a loss of Iran's competitive position in Middle East oil production, which has only recently been regained. The Shah proved a less noisy and far more effective negotiator. Even though his central argument—that in planning a world oil production program, account must be taken of the country's economic and social requirements—is one which the international oil companies theoretically cannot admit, he did achieve some practical recognition of his point and, more important, substantial material improvement in Iran's position. This has resulted in Iran's getting additional funds to support the Shah's so-called "White Revolution," the anti-illiteracy and health program, the land distribution, agricultural development, road building, and industrial development projects which have made appreciable progress in the last decade.

The American and British governments should work closely with the Shah and with King Faisal so that the occasional difficulties between them may be held to a minimum, and Iran and Saudi Arabia continue to play a badly needed leading role in constructive development of the Gulf area. This is particularly important, and difficult, in the context of Britain's forthcoming withdrawal from Aden and Southern Arabia.

AND SAUDI ARABIA

Since the abdication of ex-King Saud and the accession to the throne of his brother King Faisal, Saudi Arabia has made impressive progress, especially in education and medical programs, in the building of roads and airstrips, in agriculture and in the beginning of industrial development. Whereas King Saud squandered oil revenues on the Royal Family and such unproductive projects as the great, pink neon-lighted Nasiriyah Palace, which covers two square miles and has the second largest air-conditioning system in the world (the largest, naturally, is the Pentagon's), Faisal's spending has gone for schools, roads and hospitals. The school explosion reached a peak during which one new school was being opened every third day, with particular attention paid to education for girls, which was almost nonexistent in Saudi Arabia until Faisal's day. Since a large percentage of his subjects are nomads, Faisal has devoted special attention to agriculture; he has set up model farms and imported experts to teach new methods of farming. The Bedouin are encouraged to settle in areas where there is fertile land; they can get machinery, seed, and long-term loans at no interest. Development of petroleum by-products such as chemical fertilizer plants is in the works. There is an extensive program for desalinization of water and, against the day when oil may run out, foreign geologists are exploring the vast areas of Saudi Arabia for other minerals.

Iran and Saudi Arabia are naturally regarded by Nasser as the strongest enemies of his so-called Arab Socialism.

The smaller principalities and sheikhdoms of the Arabian Peninsula, even including wealthy Kuwait, will, from Nasser's point of view, fall into place once Saudi Arabia has been taken care of. Jordan and Lebanon are special problems. The former, despite its courageous, astute and resolute king, is the most vulnerable target. Unfortunately undersupplied with natural resources, it has more than it needs in the way of human problems, largely deriving from the East Bank remnants of Arab Palestine and the Palestinian refugees. The Cairo-based PLO, Nasser's propaganda machinery and Syrian terrorists and saboteurs, combine in making Jordan, and King Hussein personally, their principal target.

Lebanon, so often described as the Switzerland of the Middle East, reflects in miniature within its own borders all the ideology and religious conflicts in the Middle East with the exception of the Israeli-Arab one. Politics operate in terms of religious communities—the President, for example, must be Christian, the Prime Minister Moslem. Its commercial interests as well as its internal make-up require neutrality and this has been maintained, in peculiar Lebanese fashion, even at the cost of a civil war which was ended only by a Marine landing in 1958. Despite the anomalies which perplex us, Lebanon is a surprisingly solid little country, gifted by nature with beautiful scenery, mountains and beaches, and some very rich agricultural land. Lebanon's shrewd and industrious population is her main resource. Despite their many differences, the people have managed to live together in what is the closest thing to Western-style democracy anywhere to be seen in the area. Lebanon is currently struggling to overcome the aftereffects of the apparent failure of its biggest bank, Intra Bank, which was forced to close its doors last October in the face of massive withdrawals. A full audit, which has yet to be completed, may well show that its long term assets will suffice to cover its liabilities. It is hoped that the bank can be "refloated" under new management. In any event, the Lebanese can be counted on to work hard and shrewdly to restore confidence in their financial stability and integrity. New banking laws will help to achieve this objective.

THE U.S. POLICEMAN

Prospects at any given moment for continued peace and stability in the Middle East are never all that promising. Recent developments, including Israel's raid into Jordan and the continuing violence on the Israeli-Syrian frontier, the Syrian demands on Iraq Petroleum Company (British, French and American-owned) and the violence which is already developing around the prospective British withdrawal from Aden, are not particularly reassuring. To some extent, our role in the Middle East must be that of a policeman and "a policeman's lot is a 'appy one." It is always easier to make trouble than it is to maintain order, and the Russian hand is accordingly easier to play. We do have a common interest in holding down the arms race in the Middle East, if we can be brought to agree upon this, or at the very least, in preventing the development of nuclear capabilities by either the Israelis or the Arabs.

Recognizing that the continued security of Israel is a major U.S. policy objective, our principal problem in the near future is going to be how we can most effectively help Jordan maintain *its* security and integrity, and what line we can take most effectively to contain the PLO. In coping with these and other problems, there are three main points that we and our government should bear in mind: first, America *has* a stake in the Middle East, a big one; second, whatever has happened to the cold war elsewhere, it is still going strong in the Middle East; and third, in the struggle between revolutionary and evolutionary regimes, a major weapon is the Israeli-Arab conflict. We have not really taken account of that fact and we must.

Poor Need More Than Handouts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LIONEL VAN DEERLIN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1967

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, the current issue of Look magazine contains a provocative editorial about the war on poverty. It is the judgment of Look's editors that this is a war we cannot afford to lose. The editorial also raises some pertinent questions about the present conduct of our national campaign against poverty.

I am impressed by the force of Look's arguments against the type of handouts that have been such an integral feature of most of our public assistance programs of the past. The editors warn us that traditional welfare-type doles, while they may provide a measure of temporary relief, serve in the long run to freeze the recipients into a permanent proletariat, from which there is scant hope of escape.

The newer job-training programs also may not be an adequate answer for many of our poor. They might be sick or disabled, too old or too young, or—as Look puts it—they may be the sort of workers "who will never be paid a decent wage no matter how much training they get."

As an ultimate solution, Look appears to be eyeing a variation of the guaranteed annual income idea. Despite my reservations about some of its conclusions, I believe the editorial is worthy of study by all Members. Under unanimous consent, therefore, I am including it at this point in the RECORD:

THE WAR ON POVERTY: WE CAN'T QUIT NOW

Why wage a war on poverty unless we intend to win it? Promises won't work any more, and we're not going to do the job with nickels. But it will take more than the extra billions we must spend to avoid the disgrace of failure and the fury of a vengeful poor. We need money, not to cushion poverty, but to help the poor help themselves and join the rest of us in a truly middle-class America.

To be poor in America is to stand at the candy-store window with an aching sweet tooth, to be a bitter spectator at our feast of plenty. The economy that keeps grinding out new and more elaborate gimcracks for us also grinds down the poor. In those tumorous parts of the cities where they live, our fat wartime prosperity means nothing.

The recent Labor Department studies of big-city slums reported one-third of the work force was unemployed, underemployed or just couldn't be found. It was worse in Negro neighborhoods. Oakland's Bayside had a regular unemployment rate of 13 percent. Around Cleveland's troubled Hough, the rate was 15.6 percent, and one-half of the residents were what the study termed, "subemployed."

These are the most visible poor. They riot. They frighten us with the anger of their discontent. Negroes are one-third of the poor. Yet they get more than half the antipoverty aid, and with good reason. The War on Poverty must remedy years of stunted aspiration, for we are pledged to create equal—not just similar—opportunity.

Negro leaders, mostly middle class, have come out strongly for economic equality. They have helped organize the slums and proposed their own antipoverty formula in a massive Freedom Budget. But they have not become the voice of the poor, not even the Negro poor. And the poor have yet to find a voice of their own.

It is up to the Office of Economic Opportunity, not only to cope with the problems of poverty, but to argue the just demands of the poor from within the Government. Bureaucrats can run a Head Start program or even a Job Corps, once the wrinkles have been ironed out. OEO, however, has the rougher chore of goading the big Federal departments to respond to the needs of a powerless community.

But a real war on poverty means more than just providing added services for the poor, setting up better, but still separate, facilities for them. We cannot become so smug about Head Start classes and neighborhood centers in the slums that we forget our goal is to get people out of poverty and settle for the comfortable expedient of making poverty a more pleasant place for them to live.

When you ask the poor what they want, they'll tell you—good jobs. They're not just looking for work at $1.50 an hour for the rest of their lives (although many will grab it). They don't need the War on Poverty to live beneath the poverty line ($3,130 for an urban family of four). It's real jobs, with promotions and raises that they want, jobs they can't get. They need training, skills, but only if there is a job waiting for them when they are ready. First, many must be prepared to learn, taught the basics they never got in school, helped to overcome traits, like quick tempers and easy frustration, that make the poor difficult employees. We have programs for a few, but we need them for all the poor, and we have to open up more jobs by dropping unrealistic requirements. (One major food processor demands an eighth-grade education for chicken pluckers.) This way, we'll move millions up from poverty—and still be left with some unemployed.

There are workers who will never be paid a decent wage no matter how much training they get. Part of OEO's job is to figure out what's best for them. We could cut welfare costs by subsidizing their jobs, giving employers the difference between what they are paid and what they are worth. The Government might put them in some of the four million useful public-service jobs that OEO believes can be created.

But jobs are not the only answer to poverty. They will not help the old, the sick and disabled or many mothers of small children. The answer to their problem is easy—give them money. Welfare is one way, but the minimal kind of assistance we now pay (and only half of those eligible are on the rolls) is too expensive for what it buys. This kind of welfare doesn't cure poverty, it perpetuates it. It locks in people whose children are born into poverty and often never leave.

To guarantee a "practical minimum level of income" for all, the Government's Advisory Council on Public Welfare has proposed a national standard for welfare payments. Public assistance can vary from state to state by as much as 600 percent. Under the Council's plan, the only eligibility requirement would be need, determined initially by no more than the applicant's word. Welfare would be a right, like free education, protected by the courts.

A better welfare system is one way to meet this need. But we must consider other alternatives, even direct payments to the poor. The President's Council of Economic Advisors estimates it would cost about $11 billion to insure that every family in America has an income of at least $3,000 a year. This might be accomplished through a negative income tax, a device that should be carefully studied and debated. A low-cost, negative-tax plan that would create an incentive to work, and is favored at OEO, would give families half the difference between their annual incomes (from welfare or work) and $3,000.

It will take jobs to win the War on Poverty, and a decent income for those who cannot work. Everyone has the right to be free from the fear of want, just as he has the right to adequate medical care (Look editorial, March 21, 1967). But the poor must join the middle-class rest of us socially as well as economically. They must fight a part of the war themselves, through their neighborhood councils and action groups. While businessmen and politicians, labor leaders and social workers should have their say about community action, they cannot be allowed to push the poor aside. They must learn to listen to the poor while the poor are still quiet or they will only hear them in rage.

Certainly, the poor are going to need better services. Yet we must not delude ourselves that this is enough. We can squander billions on ghetto schools and public housing. We can build a wall of services between ourselves and the poor, creating a permanent, subsidized lower class. The harder choice, this generation's unique commitment, is to help the poor climb up to where they can compete with us for housing, education and the material pleasures of our world. We must make up our minds to do the whole job. It will be costly; it can't be done overnight. Business as much as Government must help. But we can end welfare waste, earn back our investment from the taxes and increased production of millions of new consumers. We have promised to let the poor in—and we can't quit now.—THE EDITORS.

Auto Liability Plan Is Rejected by Virginia State Corporation Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 6, 1967

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, there have been a number of references in the RECORD in recent weeks concerning problems throughout the country in the automobile insurance field. In Virginia our State corporation commission recently completed what has been termed a "landmark" investigation into auto insurance ratemaking procedures and cancellation and renewal practices. The investigation encompassed both a study and public hearings and extended over a period of more than 1 year.

To those interested in the problem, I thought it would be helpful to learn about the Virginia investigation and the report by the SCC. The report upheld the present ratemaking philosophy and found "a genuine sense of public responsibility" on the part of the insurance industry. I would like to insert in the RECORD a summary of the report as carried in the Richmond Times-Dispatch of May 16, 1967:

AUTO LIABILITY PLAN IS REJECTED BY SCC

(By Allan Jones)

The State Corporation Commission (SCC) yesterday rejected as "totally misleading" a rate-making plan for automobile liability insurance proposed by a Richmond certified public accountant.

The formula, proposed by T. Grayson Maddrea, would only "obscure the true picture of profit and loss" of companies writing such business, the SCC said in a 30-page decision.

The opinion stems from a landmark SCC investigation into the adequacy of existing rate-making machinery, and into the reasonableness of rules governing the cancellation and renewal of insurance policies.

Here are some of the other significant findings and conclusions of the commission:

1. Setting a major new precedent, the SCC announced it will discontinue the practice of setting manual rates (so-called because they are published in a handbook) on the loss experience of all companies writing liability business in Virginia.

BASED ON EXPERIENCE

Instead, the manual rates of the members and subscribers of the National Bureau of Casualty Underwriters (NBCU) will be based entirely on the expense and loss experience of these companies.

The Mutual Insurance Rating Bureau (MIRB) will be permitted to file separate rate petitions. The SCC did not specify the experience on which the MIRB's manual rates are to be based, however.

It will be the duty of nonbureau companies to file rates on the basis of such experience as the commission subsequently deems to be credible.

Heretofore the Commission has based its manual rates on the basis of a petition filed jointly by both bureaus.

2. The investment income from the loss reserves of the insurance industry should not be considered in the ratemaking process.

REASONABLE COMPETITION

3. The SCC said there is "reasonable competition" within the industry under existing statutes, implying with this comment that it disagreed with a proposal of a consultant that it permit a system of open competition in rate-making.

The consultant, Woodward and Fondiller, Inc., suggested a plan whereby companies would simply file rate schedules with the SCC, then begin using them. Under the present system the SCC must approve all rates before they can be put into effect.

4. As an appendix to its opinion the SCC made public a report of a survey of the underwriting practices of the industry.

C. W. Harris, a retired SCC official who made the survey, concluded the industry has a "genuine sense of public responsibility," but he also concluded that many applications for insurance are rejected by agents who are unwilling to obtain the additional information required by the companies in order to intelligently underwrite borderline risks.

COMMISSION GRABBERS

An "unfortunately large number" of agents who are new to the business are merely "commission grabbers" with no sense of responsibility to society or the individual, Harris said.

In discussing Maddrea's proposed rate-making plan, the SCC observed that it was based on cash accounting rather than accrual accounting.

Thus all premiums received by a company during a calendar year are treated as income for that year, and all losses paid during the year are treated as deductions from gross income for that year.

The problem, however, is that many of the losses paid during the year were for accidents in previous years, and that many of the policies written during the year provide coverage for accidents to occur in the following year.

"The attraction of the Maddrea formula to its advocates is that it will always make the profits look bigger than they are," the commission said.

Maddrea's formula was presented to the SCC by three Norfolk lawyers—State Sen. Henry E. Howell, Del. Stanley E. Sacks and H. Lee Kanter—and Del. George E. Allen Jr. of Richmond.

The SCC said "every actuary experienced in the field of insurance accounting is on the side of accrual accounting and Mr. Maddrea is in a minority of one. Therefore, we have given no weight to his testimony on this issue."

The commission spoke out strongly on the controversial issue of investment income from loss reserves, saying policyholders "are no more entitled to share in the earnings from the investment of the loss reserve than they are to share in the earnings derived from the investment of the original capital and paid-in surplus."

On the matter of insurance cancellations, the SCC said it has "no more jurisdiction to force an insurance company to liberalize its underwriting policies than it has to force a bank to liberalize its lending policies."

Harris, retired deputy commissioner of insurance, said his survey showed that many companies will not insure persons who cannot speak and understand the English language and, therefore, "would make poor witnesses in the event of litigation."

He concluded this from analyzing underwriting guides sent to him by 154 companies doing business in Virginia. He said the companies emphasized these are guides only and were not inviolate underwriting rules.

AGE A FACTOR

Twenty-eight companies limit the acceptance of applications of senior citizens, Harris said, but "only 15 companies placed restrictions on the acceptance of youthful drivers."

He observed that enlisted personnel in the armed forces "are not looked upon with favor as desirable risks. However, the companies generally will attempt to insure them except for the first three lowest grades, but these usually will be accepted if married and living with their spouses or families near the base."

Harris said if the state and the courts would discharge their obligation to the public and remove bad drivers from the highways the "public dissatisfaction that may exist with the industry will be greatly alleviated."

Lexington, Ky., Herald Endorses Saving the View From Mount Vernon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERVEY G. MACHEN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1967

Mr. MACHEN. Mr. Speaker, in a public-spirited editorial on May 25, 1967, the Lexington, Ky., Herald urges the Congress to act soon to save the view from Mount Vernon.

Ast the editorial correctly states:

> Our country needs a few open spaces and it is little short of tragic to see a beautiful area such as that at Mount Vernon destroyed by real estate developments.

Mr. Speaker, the Herald sees clearly the danger that exists for the view from Mount Vernon if the Congress does not act soon to meet the Federal responsibility at Piscataway Park, Md., across the Potomac River from the historic estate of our first President.

I commend the Herald for its position in favor of this project, and insert the editorial in the RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues:

MOUNT VERNON VISTA MUST BE SAVED

Visitors to George Washington's home, historic Mount Vernon, long have been charmed by the view across the Potomac River, realizing that they were seeing the same beautiful shoreline and forested hills that the first president looked upon in the closing years of his life. But this wonderful view may be lost to future Americans unless Congress acts to save the area called Piscataway Park, Md., from development.

Private landowners and foundations with holdings in the area have promised to give several hundred acres for the preservation of the view. Rep. Hervey G. Machen of Maryland has asked Congress for an appropriation to buy additional land but the House Appropriation Committee denied the grant and efforts now are being made to get the Senate to include funds for land purchase in its bill. The park supporters are asking $2.7 million and promise that private contributions of land will more than match the federal contribution.

Plans already call for installation of water and sewer lines in the affected area and this will mean that pressures will increase to convert the land to high density use. Where a scenic view now exists visitors will see high rise apartments and other urban developments. Our country needs a few open spaces and it is little short of tragic to see a beautiful area such as that at Mount Vernon destroyed by real estate developments.

Congress has an opportunity to save this view for the people of America. Under the law, lands given by private donors revert to former owners unless Congress acts by August 1. By all means the proper House and Senate committees should approve the appropriation speedily.

The Old Moorings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HANSEN

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1967

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, the church news section for the week ending May 27, included in the May 25 edition of the Deseret News, published in Salt Lake City, Utah, carried an excellent Memorial Day editorial on the direction in which the United States is now going.

The editorial pointed out that the United States was founded as a Christian nation and that its strength derived in great part from an abounding faith in God and in man's liberty and free agency.

Stating that many of the innovations now being tried are not even poor substitutes for true progress, the editorial raises many questions; questions which I believe deserve the careful study of every Member of Congress if we are to give to our children the freedoms bequeathed to us by our forebears.

The editorial follows:

THE OLD MOORINGS

Many Americans are slipping fast from the old moorings which have given us stability over the years.

They adopt new ideas and views which appear to intrigue and seem to be improvements, but in reality are very poor substistutes, if indeed they are substitutes at all.

America believes in progress. It has done so from the days of Columbus. But all that is new is not good, neither is all good which is merely refurbished.

Progressive America gave the modern world its first independent republic. That was progress. Moving from dictationship to a government of, by and for the people was one of the greatest steps forward mankind has ever made.

Our Patriots of '76 died to give this republic birth, and we honor them for it. Our patriots of 1812, of the Civil War, of two world wars, of the Korean War and now of Vietnam, fought and died for the same great principle. Freedom is worth whatever price we must pay for it. Understanding this led Patrick Henry to utter his immortal words: "Give me liberty or give me death."

The old moorings of liberty were tied to individual effort, private enterprise, each man willing to make his own way, pay his own debts, earn his own living, establish his own and his family's independence.

As we depart from those moorings, how are we affected? And what do we make of the sacrifices of all those who died to establish them?

On Memorial Day, as we honor veterans of all wars, will we remember the purpose of their sacrifice, or will we place flowers on their graves in empty gestures and then aid and abet a socialistic ideology which will undermine the very things for which they died?

Is the tribute we pay those men empty, or meaningful?

There are also the moorings of faith to which those patriots held. They believed in God and immortality, in Christ and the resurrection. It was this faith which gave them the courage to die for the freedom they so dearly cherished.

Today, as some attempt to subvert the liberties for which our patriots fought, similar efforts are being made to destroy the God-like faith which gave our fighting men courage to die.

Shall we who honor our patriot dead join in forces which make a mockery of them?

Shall we give comfort and assistance to those who ridicule both their faith and their patriotic convictions?

They fought for individual liberty and private enterprise.

They died believing in God and a hereafter.

They defended liberty because they wished us to enjoy it.

They believed in God, hoping to meet us—their dear ones—in a hereafter free from enmity and strife.

The same forces which would destroy liberty also would destroy faith in God. We, who live today must recognize this, and know that the moorings upon which our civilization is based are the moorings of liberty and faith.

If we lose those moorings, we lose all, and allow ourselves to sink into the morass of slavery through dictatorship and atheism.

Long ago the prophets taught that liberty is a gift of God, and that free agency is essential to the full enjoyment of the Gospel of Christ.

The Gospel and liberty come from the same root source. Both come from God.

To destroy liberty—even a little at a time—is to strike at one of the most important facets in the Gospel of Christ.

To destroy faith is to wipe out our hope of immortality, resurrection, and reunion with loved ones.

Are the substitutes worth more to us? Are they more enticing?

Can slavery through socialistic or Communistic power, be more alluring to us than liberty and independence?

Can empty promises of "sharing the wealth" ever become more attractive than the satisfaction of earning our own way by our own effort?

Can no faith be more beneficial than an abiding trust in God?

Does the philosophy that death ends all give us more satisfaction than the hope of immortality and a promise of eternal family relationships?

The old moorings of patriotism and faith have given us our happiness and prosperity. The so-called substitutes offer nothing but sorrow.

Shall we leave the trusted and the true for that which we know will enslave us?

Questionnaire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVE MARTIN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1967

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, in April I mailed out approximately 68,000 questionnaires to people in my district. We had a most gratifying return of approximately 13 percent. Listed below are the results of this poll.

One of the most timely and significant questions was number 1, in regard to what should be done in Vietnam—66.5 percent felt we should mount an all-out effort for military victory; only 6.5 percent agree with present policies in the conduct of the war; 4.3 percent advocated our withdrawal as soon as possible; 15.4 percent favor a negotiated peace; and 7.3 percent were undecided. With the four alternatives as an answer, it is most significant that two-thirds advocate strong military measures, utilizing all of our military might to win this war as quickly as possible.

Question number 4 concerning the success of the war on poverty indicated that 84 percent of our people feel that it is not successful, with only 4.8 percent feeling it had been successful. The mismanagement and waste in this program has certainly elicited no support from the people of Nebraska.

Sixty percent of those who answered the questionnaire favored my bill, H.R. 333, which would amend the Sherman Antitrust Act and bring the labor unions under its provisions. Thirty percent were opposed, and 10 percent undecided. This legislation would eliminate the monopoly, which, under the current law, is granted to the labor unions, but not to business.

Question number 6 dealt with a bill which I have introduced in the last four Congresses that would allow a $1,000 tax exemption for each child in college, where the parents contribute to their main support. The results were an overwhelming 80.6 percent in favor, with only 15.6 percent opposed. This clearly shows that Nebraskans are definitely opposed to sending millions of dollars in tax money to Washington and then having the Federal Government redistribute part of these funds for education and other welfare programs.

The questionnaire follows:

[In percent]

	Yes	No	Undecided
1. What should be done in Vietnam?			7.3
A. Continue present policies?	6.5		
B. Mount an all-out effort for military victory?	66.5		
C. Withdraw as soon as possible?	4.3		
D. Make a negotiated peace?	15.4		
2. Do you favor increased social security benefit payments financed by both employee and employer?	21.5	67.0	11.5
3. Do you favor a change in our draft laws by			58.4
A. Eliminating all education deferments?	.8		
B. Eliminating education deferments for postgraduate work only?	4.0		
C. Using a lottery system in determining order of call-up?	36.8		
4. We are spending this year, $1,500,000,000 on the war on poverty. Do you feel this program has been successful?	4.8	84.0	11.2
5. Do you favor my bill H.R. 333, which would amend the Sherman Antitrust Act and bring labor unions under its provisions?	60.0	30.0	10.0
6. Do you approve of the bill which I have introduced to allow parents who have children in college an additional $1,000 tax exemption per year for each student?	80.6	15.6	3.8
7. Do you favor import quotas on all beef and lamb imports?	83.0	7.9	9.1
8. Do you feel that crime has increased because of			35.4
A. Lack of Federal controls?	4.8		
B. Failure of the courts?	53.3		
C. General moral decline in America?	6.5		
9. Do you favor eliminating the electoral college and substituting the election of the President and Vice President by popular vote?	77.4	11.4	11.2

IRS, AID Combine in Latin Success Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1967

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Agency for International Development and the Internal Revenue Service are working together under the foreign assistance program to build efficient systems of taxation in the less-developed countries. As the money for development must come largely from the country itself, I think this is one of our most intelligent and farsighted foreign aid efforts.

As part of this program, teams of IRS advisers are working with the governments of the developing nations to modernize and improve their tax systems. These advisory teams do not impose an overly sophisticated tax reform on a country which is not prepared to accept it, but rather help the government to manage its existing tax laws more effectively through improved procedures and administration. Another phase of this assistance is to bring key foreign tax officials to the United States for training.

I include below an editorial that appeared in the May 19, 1967, Washington Star, which tells of the success of this tax reform program:

IRS, AID COMBINE IN LATIN SUCCESS STORY

(By Crosby S. Noyes)

These days, even a modest success story is something out of the ordinary. And when the success involves such improbable institutions as the Alliance for Progress and the U.S. Internal Revenue Service, the story becomes downright remarkable.

In the normal course of things, both the Alliance and the IRS get rather more than their share of lumps. But revenue agents who help to get other people to pay their taxes qualify as good guys. The contribution that the service has made toward setting up the beginnings of an effective system of taxation in Latin America is one of the brighter chapter in the brief and generally dreary history of the Alliance.

Paying taxes is not exactly traditional in Latin America. In fact, evading taxes—particularly taxes on personal income—has always been recognized as a universal pastime.

A recent survey in Rio de Janeiro showed that about 50 percent of self-employed professional people did not bother to file tax returns at all. Of those that did, at least 80 percent substantially understated their income. And Brazil is one of the more advanced countries in a part of the world where, until very recently, it was unheard of for anyone to be sent to jail for tax evasion.

The only drawback to this rollicking tradition of tax dodging is that it leaves the governments—and the countries—in something of a hole. Since most of them rate as distinctly underdeveloped nations, money for essential capital investments is among their most urgent and elementary needs.

Quite obviously, most of the money has to be raised within the countries themselves. The most ambitious program of foreign aid represents no more than a small, pump-priming fraction of the total need. So it is hard to imagine a better way of spending a part of this foreign aid money than in helping the various governments evolve more efficient and ingenious ways of extracting funds from their own reluctant citizens.

The idea of a foreign tax assistance program, combining the facilitities of IRS and AID, originated in 1961 at the Punta del Este conference where the Alliance for Progress was born. The first country project was started in Chile the following year. Since then, 15 other countries in Central and South America have asked for special teams of American tax experts to help them solve their problems.

From a slow start, the results by this year had reached impressive levels—the more so since, in the case of tax collections, the results are tangible and measurable.

For the entire area, collections since 1961 rose 35 percent, in the case of six countries over 40 percent. And the continuing modernization and strengthening of administrative machinery promises even greater dividends in the future.

Among some of the more spectacular signs of progress:

Colombia's total tax revenues jumped 48 percent in 1966, converting a deficit to a surplus of 1.9 billion pesos.

Revenues for Ecuador last year were up 26 percent over 1965.

For the first time in the history of Peru, a taxpayer went to jail for income-tax evasion. For the first time in Uruguay property was seized for nonpayment of delinquent taxes. Individual income tax returns were examined for the first time in the Dominican Republic.

In Brazil, collections rose 36 percent between January and October, even after discounting for inflation. In Chile, during the same period, the increase was 42 percent over the previous year, while collection of delinquent taxes had soared 88 percent.

In countries where 95 percent of the total wealth is likely to be controlled by about five percent of the population, any drastic effort at tax reform involves a number of tricky social and political problems.

For its part, the IRS makes no attempt to impose any uniform program on all of the countries involved—still less to try to remodel tax structures on an American pattern. Tax rates, the kind of taxes imposed and the distribution of the burden have been wisely left to the discretion of the individual governments.

Yet for the most part the governments themselves have been highly cooperative for the simple reason that they need the money.

Though much still remains to be done, this little-known effort promises, in fact, to result in an economic and social revolution of great importance. And it adds up to one of the more notable success stories in the area of foreign aid.

Louisville Courier-Journal Calls for Preservation of the View From Mount Vernon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERVEY G. MACHEN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1967

Mr. MACHEN. Mr. Speaker, another leading daily newspaper, the Louisville Courier-Journal, has joined the campaign to save the view from Mount Vernon across the Potomac River at Piscataway Park, Md.

In an editorial May 26, 1967, the Courier-Journal implores the Congress to appropriate funds to complete parkland acquisition at Piscataway Park to preserve the historic view. In part, the editorial states:

> This is the first shrine that proud Americans want to show to foreign visitors. Honor to George Washington is a sentiment that every schoolboy shares. It would be a strange way to show it for us to allow an item of two million dollars in a vast federal budget to fail, bringing destruction to the scene beloved by the father of his country.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the Courier-Journal for its excellent editorial, and I insert it at this point in the RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues:

A WAY TO INSULT THE MEMORY OF GEORGE WASHINGTON

Americans have become increasingly conscious of the need to preserve the great historic treasures of our past. Such a jewel is Mount Vernon. Its majestic site, high above the Potomac River, is the one George Washington chose beyond all others for his home.

Anybody who talked now of damaging the house or its grounds would be denounced as unpatriotic. Yet such damage threatens the shrine. The beautiful serenity of the house is due in large part to its setting, and to the sweeping view across the river. Here is where desecration impends.

The growth of the city has brought the neon sign, the pizza parlor, and the sad urban uglification to the very edge of this superb stretch of countryside, directly opposite Mount Vernon. Congress, in its lasting credit, recognized the danger in 1961. It authorized the purchase of land along this stretch of the river, to be known as Piscataway Park. Private donors and two foundations have pledged money to the project.

All seemed well on its way, with the government requesting $2.7 million from Congress to complete the acquisition of land. Then the House Appropriations Committee went on the war-path. It cut the whole sum for Piscataway Park out of the Interior Department appropriations bill, in the name of economy. The Senate has now come to the rescue with a unanimous vote for the bill, with $2 million in it for the Mount Vernon project. But next week, the conference committee must resolve the difference between two million dollars and zero dollars.

It is not only the government appropriation that is at stake. The pledges from private sources will expire on August 1, if Congress does not provide its share. Land prices in the area are rising steeply. The pressure to "develop" the shore line opposite Mount Vernon in the most damaging and unplanned way will intensify, and the chance of protection may be lost forever.

Nearly seven and a half million visitors have stood on the terrace at Mount Vernon, drinking in the view, since Congress first moved to save it in 1961. This is the first shrine that proud Americans want to show to foreign guests. Honor to George Washington is a sentiment that every schoolboy shares. It would be a strange way to show it for us to allow an item of two million dollars in a vast federal budget to fail, bringing destruction to the scene beloved by the father of his country.

Accomplishments of a Constituent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HANSEN

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1967

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, it is always a pleasure for a Congressman to recognize publicly the accomplishments of a constituent. It is, therefore, a distinct honor and privilege for me to include in the RECORD an editorial, broadcast on radio station KSRA, Salmon, Idaho, on May 28, in which the accomplishments of a young Salmon High School graduate are brought to light.

As pointed out by Mr. Dave Ainsworth, manager of the radio station, the accomplishments of this young man honor himself, his community and that community's school system.

And, Mr. Speaker, I would like to salute them all.

The editorial follows:

ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF A CONSTITUENT

The Salmon community should be vastly proud of one of its young citizens. Of all the perhaps million high school graduates of 1967, a Salmon youngster—from this small community of few more than three thousand people and a high school graduating class of only 84—was selected one of 121 in the whole nation honored as "Presidential Scholars." He will go to Washington, D.C., next month, along with 120 other high school graduates from all over the nation to receive his award from the hands of President Johnson.

It's a great honor for David McFarland, son of Mr. & Mrs. Arch McFarland, Carmen ranchers. And it's a great honor for the Salmon community and the Salmon school system.

Dave previously had been announced as a winner of a National Merit Scholarship, which in itself is a high honor. His being named a "Presidential Scholar" is icing on the cake for what has been a brilliant and useful career in high school.

All of us who know Dave know that its just the beginning of a great and helpful career for the nation and the world.

Dave's high school career is all the more wonderful for the fact that he isn't a total bookworm. He has been a great citizen in the school.

Dave still isn't very large. When he started to high school he was pretty small, but he wanted to play football. He went out as a freshman, and for his first year in high school he "scrubbed" it, as is to be expected with a freshman. But he made the varsity as center in his sophomore year, and continued to play that position ably for three years. He was a great inspirational player. In the first year of interscholastic wrestling in Salmon High, his junior year, Dave was a member of the wrestling squad, and if memory serves, Dave was defeated only once during the season. But he decided not to continue wrestling in his senior year. For three years he was statistician for the basketball team—his size just didn't fit him for play—and around school they'll tell you that his statistical reports on the basketball games look as though they were prepared by a C.P.A.

With all that, Dave made only two B's in his entire high school career—and they were in his first semester as a freshman. After that it was straight A's. He was president of the local chapter of the National Honor Society, and was active in many more ways.,

Our congratulations to Dave McFarland, to his wonderful mother and father, and to the Salmon schools.

You may have gathered this was leading up to something—a very brief comment on the Salmon schools. We've had some residents of the community—some who have actually moved away because of their opinion—who have criticised the school system here—who have said that the Salmon schools just didn't offer educational opportunity equal to other schools. That we doubt.

Since the National Merit Scholarship Program started, Salmon, I believe, has had three graduates who have won this honor. And our graduates probably have had much more than their share of other types of scholarships.

Sure, it isn't all the school. Part of it is the native intelligence—brilliance, if you will—of the individual student. Part of it is home environment, which includes encouragement, help, sound advice, and good family living. But part of it has to be the school system and the general environment of the community.

The Salmon school system is good. There may be some things that could be improved—if there weren't, we would have achieved perfection, and that's something hard to reach. But, the opportunity is there—the good teachers are there. The record proves that if the student wants a good education—wants to achieve great things—wants to excel—the opportunity is available in the Salmon school system.

One of 121 out of somewhere around a million—from big schools, little schools, private schools, public schools, great prep schools—get into the very long odds department.

To take a phrase from an old and slightly irreligious story, "One of our boys made it."

Wonderful.

They Live Their Work—Article by Ellen Schlafly of St. Louis Post-Dispatch on VISTA Volunteers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1967

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I believe the Members of Congress will read with warm appreciation an article which appeared on May 23, 1967, in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch in which staff writer Ellen Schlafly described the work and the motivation of some of the young people who are assigned to the Grace Hill Settlement House, the Greeley Presbyterian Church, and other agencies in St. Louis as VISTA volunteers.

June, for thousands of young men and women means the completion of 4 years or more of college and university training. This month, at graduation exercises all over the country, convocation speakers are urging graduates to embark upon purposeful and meaningful lives. Young people will be challenged to undertake occasional, if not full-time activity which improves the quality of community life and does not simply represent the unsatisfying pursuit of material profit.

If anyone doubts that American youth have lost the inclination or the energy to take up such a challenge, let me refer them to the fact that there are approximately 3,500 young men and women presently at work as Volunteers in Service to America—VISTA volunteers who responded to the call by the Office of Economic Opportunity to join the war on poverty. These volunteers serve without pay, for a year, living on a small subsistence allotment and on the satisfaction that comes from doing the work that needs to be done—in urban slums, in rural hollows—wherever the poor can use some help.

VISTA volunteers need not, of course, be college age, or college students, or college graduates. But I think we can take special encouragement from the fact that so many young college students and recent graduates have shown the selfless enthusiasm required of those who choose to be of service where they are so vitally needed, without pay, and without public notice. Among such VISTA volunteers are those quietly performing effective service in St. Louis, as described in the following story from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of May 23, 1967:

THEY LIVE THEIR WORK, OFFER NEEDY A VISTA

(By Ellen Schlafly)

What does it mean to be a VISTA volunteer in St. Louis?

For Jim Burke, 20 years old, of Paradise, Calif., it means living and working around the Patch Neighborhood Station, 329 East Courtois avenue," . . . down where the air pollution is so bad." He is one of about 50 members of the Volunteers in Service to America who are waging the war on poverty in the St. Louis and East Side area.

Under the aegis of Grace Hill Settlement House, Burke lives on an allowance of about $75 a month in a three-room flat over a candy store. The neighbors helped him fix up the flat.

"Saturday is a typical day for me," he said. "I get up about 7 a.m. and then start going around to homes, knocking on doors and getting together boys 14 to 16 years old who play on the Patch Center's volleyball team." This sports project falls into the "recreational and group work" category of Burke's one-year VISTA assignment.

"After that I get supplies for the afternoon play corps. We have an arts and crafts project for kids from 4 to 11 years old in the Patch Center. I work with the senior high volunteer youth group from the Jewish Community Centers Association. We then discuss and evaluate our work until late in afternoon.

"By about 6:30 p.m. the boys in the neighborhood are starting to prowl. There is no activity for teens and lots of times they'll come over and sit on my back porch and just talk.

"It can be a 24-hour-a-day, seven-day-a-week job. We have to keep detailed accurate records of the calls we make and the social services we provide."

Getting to know people in the neighborhood is one of the first steps for successful VISTA-ing because the program is based on person-to-person contact. Members of the domestic peace corps, established as a result of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, live and work in poverty areas.

"People don't trust VISTAs at first," said Miss Minnie Baker, 21, of Washington, D.C., who is in her second year as a volunteer assigned to Greeley Presbyterian Church, 2240 St. Louis Avenue. "I live at Greeley. It took me a year to establish a good rapport with the sponsoring agency and people I work with. I do recruiting for remedial reading classes and Head Start programs in the North Side Agency for Community Development." (The agency consists of 11 churches and agencies, including Greeley Church. Nine VISTAs are working under its sponsorship.)

"I look around, see children on the street, ask how old they are and where they live," Miss Baker said. "I just act friendly and natural when I visit their homes. The agency is short-staffed and teachers in the schools don't have time to find and enroll children in these programs. Everything I do is through the agency."

The Rev. Walter A. Case, minister of Greeley Presbyterian and co-ordinator of the North Side Agency, said, "The agencies are encouraged to think of the VISTAs as staff and let the volunteers take part in decision making. Through the Neighborhood Advisory Council of the Gateway Center residents help decide what projects are needed and where VISTAs can be used. Volunteers have enabled East Grand Presbyterian Church to have pre-school and tutoring programs."

After acceptance in the program, which is open without educational requirements to all American citizens above the age of 18, each volunteer takes six weeks of lectures, discussions and supervised field work in preparation for placement in a rural or urban area.

"The sponsoring agency has a responsibility in getting the most impact out of its resources," said George E. Eberle, director of Grace Hill. "We can't let anybody independent of the total agency wander off on their own. This doesn't mean that they don't have freedom. In the beginning, VISTA Washington was telling kids that the agencies were too stable and that they should go out and shake them up. That gave us some trying times, but this isn't done any more.

"All this is said within the context that we think VISTA is a good idea and we want to participate. The volunteers are, on the whole, bright kids with a sense of dedication. It's good for the neighborhood and the agency; a year of no-cost service."

One of these volunteers, Miss Barbara Yamanaka, 20, from Honolulu, said, "We arrived in December and live right in the Grace Hill neighborhood, at 3025½ North Twentieth street. We're on 24-hour a day call, with people knocking on our door. It took us about two months to get acquainted with people around us. This is important because it helps us to understand them and their problems. If you enter VISTA, you'd better enjoy people."

Among her activities are co-ordinating a child care course for teen-age mothers, teaching an adult education class and a Saturday tutorial class for schoolchildren as well as helping to staff the Murphy Neighborhood Station.

Like many others, Miss Yamanaka joined VISTA midway through her college career. "It has really helped me decide that I want to work with children after I finish school," she said.

One of her roommates and coworkers, Miss Mary Ericsen, 20, of North Bend, Ore., agreed with her reasons for joining and thoughtfully assessed her own half-finished VISTA experience: "It's great and I'd do it again, although there are times when I think, 'Why did I join?' I can look back and see that I didn't really notice conditions in my own community before, but after this year I know I won't be satisfied to just look at these problems. Maybe this is one of VISTA's objectives."

Government Career Spans 40 Years

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HANSEN

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1967

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, Rosel H. Hyde, Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, is one of a number of Idahoans serving with distinction in our Federal Government.

Benjamin Forgey, staff writer for the Washington Sunday Star, summed up the Federal career of this distinguished American in an article appearing in the June 4 edition of that paper.

Chairman Hyde, Mr. Speaker, is not a bureaucrat who thinks all the answers to all of our problems are provided by Government intervention. Rather, he is an individualist who has tremendous faith in the American free enterprise system—he agrees in principle with our great Thomas Jefferson that the best government is that which governs the least.

It gives me great pleasure, Mr. Speaker, to include, under leave to include extraneous material, Benjamin Forgey's article at this point:

HYDE'S GOVERNMENT CAREER SPANS 40 YEARS OF CHANGE

(By Benjamin Forgey)

In 1924, when Rosel H. Hyde first came to Washington from the little valley village of Downey, Idaho, there were about 16 million telephones in the United States.

In 1953, Hyde went over to the White House from the downtown office of the Federal Communications Commission to watch as the country's 50 millionth telephone was installed in President Eisenhower's office.

Last month in President Johnson's office, he saw the 100 millionth telephone installed.

Hyde, the white-haired chairman of the FCC, has been around Washington a long time, and he's spent most of it watching communications industries grow from the vantage point of the independent federal agency set up to regulate this growth.

He likes to use those two ceremonial visits to the White House to illustrate the "explosion of communications services" since World War II. This increase in sheer numbers has, of course, meant a tremendous increase in the volume of work done by the federal agency Hyde has worked for since 1928.

THE OLD FRC

When Hyde took a job in the finance office, the agency was called the Federal Radio Commission—which says something about the vast changes in the communications field as well.

Today the Federal Communications Commission is involved in making important decisions in areas as diverse as space communications, educational television, community antenna television systems, telephone rates, the relationship between computers and established communications systems, and fast-growing mobile radio services.

Any number of critics contend that the agency has tended to follow instead of lead the field in the era of vast technological change. FCC Commissioner Nicholas Johnson, for example, said last December that the commission needed a "vastly expanded and coordinated" research staff to deal with the flood of new technology.

Hyde is impatient with such criticisms. "These charges can always be made," he says, "for no matter how forward-looking you may be you can never anticipate all developments. The commission has done far more than some of its detractors would have you believe."

VOLUMINOUS BUSINESS

He does say, however, that traditionally most of the FCC budget has been for handling the voluminous broadcasting applications and not for research and analysis of communications needs and developments. Hyde requested an increase in the budget for fiscal 1968 from $17 million to $19 million to get the agency started in the right direction.

Hyde, a Republican, who also was chairman of the commission for a period during the Eisenhower years, was appointed chairman by President Johnson to fill out the term of Chairman E. William Henry when Henry resigned last year.

Henry and his immediate predecessor, Newton Minow, both Kennedy appointees, were wont to be a bit more impatient with the federal bureaucracy and with the broadcasting industry than is Hyde. The present chairman, for example, doesn't go around calling television a "vast wasteland," as Minow did.

On the old issue of government censorship versus public responsibility, Hyde is known as a conservative who does not feel the agency has any right to insist on upgrading the quality of programs offered by the networks.

"It seems to me," he says, "that you have to use the same judgment in choosing television programs as you do in choosing books at a library. You don't expect to like or use everything that comes to your attention. You select your materials. . . . The process of government must work in such a way as to encourage private enterprise . . . and to encourage conditions conducive to healthy competition."

EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION

Thus Chairman Hyde expects educational television—he prefers "civic broadcasting" as a name—to provide much-needed variety in the quality and kind of programs available to the public, and to stimulate the networks to do a better job in public affairs and "cultural" programming.

The FCC in 1952 allocated 242 channels for non-commercial, educational use, but educational television has been struggling ever since because of inadequate financial support. The Senate, however, recently adopted an administration-backed bill which would enlarge the federal government share in supporting ETV. The House has yet to act on the bill.

Hyde's views on the function of the regulatory agency in general are in tune with those of President Johnson. Both men favor a "cooperative" approach between the industry and the regulators, as opposed to the position in which the industries are regarded as inherent enemies of the government.

"I don't mean to say," Hyde comments, "that industry should not be kept at an arms length. No, where certain things are involved—payola, fraudulent practices, anticompetitive practices—the industry deserves the closest scrutiny so far as I'm concerned. But on this matter of programming, I think you'll get a better result by maintaining a healthy competitive situation than by having the government step in."

DELICATE POST

Hyde's position as chairman of the FCC is particularly delicate in an administration in which the President himself has substantial holdings in the television industry. The Johnson family broadcast holdings have been placed in temporary trust, but will revert to the family when the President leaves office.

Chairman Hyde, however, appears no worse for the wear. He expects to retire when the current assignment is up in 1969, and has no detailed plans as yet for his retirement. "The way I feel at the end of one of these crowded days, I wouldn't be looking for new ways to spend my energies," quips the 67-year-old chairman, who has been an FCC member since President Truman appointed him in 1946.

Rosel Hyde came to Washington, back in 1924, because he couldn't see much future in being assistant cashier at the village bank.

"It was kind of a reckless thing to do," Hyde recalls. He was 24, and had just married Mary Henderson, a school teacher up the valley in the village of Arimo, Idaho.

The couple arrived in Washington in September and for three months had to live on any part-time jobs they could pick up. "I tried the banks," he says, "but the hours were so long and the pay so low." In December, Hyde wandered in to take a civil service examination, and shortly thereafter he was given a job as a clerk typist in the Civil Service Commission.

NIGHT SCHOOL

Hyde, who had a bachelor's degree from Utah State University, went to law school at George Washington University at nights, and got his law degree in 1928. That's when he joined the old Radio Commission as a dispersing officer.

For a period prior to 1933 Hyde served as a hearing examiner, but when Franklin Roosevelt became president, Republican Hyde recalls, he went back to a "kind of new apprenticeship" in the FRC legal staff. His rise thereafter was steady, from hearing examiner to section chief to division chief, and finally to the agency's top legal job.

The Hydes now consider themselves Washingtonians, though they have always maintained a voting residence in Idaho. They have raised three sons (an electrical engineer, a Justice Department lawyer and an Air Force pilot) and a daughter (a senior at Utah State) here and have seven grandchildren. Since 1939, the Hydes have lived at 2709 McKinley St. NW.

AFL–CIO Industrial Union Department Praises Food Stamp Program as "Excellent" and Opposes Harmful Amendments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1967

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, it was with great pleasure that I received a letter today from Mr. Jack T. Conway, executive director of the industrial union department, AFL–CIO, strongly endorsing the food stamp program and urging favorable House action Thursday on H.R. 1318, my bill to provide authorization for appropriations to continue the program after June 30, 1967.

Mr. Conway's letter, in behalf of the 6,500,000 members of the 60 unions affiliated with the IUD, opposes the amendment to H.R. 1318 recommended by the House Committee on Agriculture which would require the States to pay a substantially increased portion of the cost of the food stamp program.

The States are now responsible for many of the administrative costs connected with the program, but do not have to pay any part of the cost of the extra food coupons given to those who regularly purchase food stamps under the program. Mr. Conway's letter opposes the committee recommendation that 20 percent of the value of these bonus coupons be assessed as a charge to the States. In view of the controversy this amendment has caused, I urge the Members to read and consider the letter from the industrial union department's executive director, as follows:

INDUSTRIAL UNION DEPARTMENT,
Washington, D.C., June 6, 1967.

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN,
House Office Building,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN SULLIVAN: The Industrial Union Department, AFL–CIO, consisting of 60 affiliated trade unions, with 6½ million members, strongly supports the Food Stamp program.

When the Food Stamp Act became law in 1964, it marked the first victory in this nation's war on poverty. It established public policy that fully recognized that a nutritionally adequate diet is a prerequisite for breaking the poverty cycle among the poor.

We firmly oppose any amendments which would reduce its scope. We strongly oppose any provisions that would require local or state governments to pay matching grants to finance this program. We oppose the amendment adopted by the House Agriculture Committee that will require, effective July 1, 1969, that states participating in the food stamp program would have to put up 20 percent of the cost. We support the present requirement that the federal government pay 100 percent of the cost. In addition, we also oppose any amendments that would reduce the federal authorization.

We believe that the food stamp program is intrinsically superior to the direct food program. It utilizes normal channels of distribution with resulting economies. It is more convenient for the needy. It provides the poor a much greater range of foods—essentials such as meats, vegetables, fruit and milk—with resulting improvements in nutrition. Any increased imposition of costs on local governments will inevitably result in a decrease in participation and without even the assurance that countries discontinuing food stamps will institute the inferior direct distribution program.

Our three-year experience with the food stamp program has been good, indeed, excellent. It has won wide support from all segments of the American population and economy. It should be continued.

Best wishes,
Sincerely,
JACK T. CONWAY,
Executive Director.

The 60th Anniversary of the American Hungarian Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 6, 1967

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, it is a great honor for me to point out to all Members that this year the American Hungarian Association is celebrating its 60th anniversary.

The American-Hungarian Federation has been a great force in promoting better relations between Americans of Hungarian extraction and other Americans. The federation has done yeoman work in educating Hungarians about American values in order that they might become useful and productive citizens of this Nation. In addition, the federation has done much to inform Americans about the ancient culture of the Hungarian nation.

The federation has done effective work in opposing totalitarianism of both the Nazi and the Communist variety and it has been a strong force for individual liberty and freedom, for not only the Hungarian nation, but for all people everywhere who live without freedom.

Mr. Speaker, I commend this useful organization on its 60th anniversary and it is my earnest wish that it enjoys the same success in the next three score years as it has in the last.

Zionist View of Arab-Israel Dispute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 31, 1967

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, in these troubled times, it is important that we take note of the historic background of the present conflict in the Middle East.

Mr. Sidney Letuch, chairman of the American Zionist Council in Chicago, described this background in detail. I believe it is important for each Member of Congress to be fully aware of the depth of treachery being perpetrated against Israel by the Arab States.

Mr. Speaker, the article follows:

ZIONIST VIEW ON ARAB-ISRAEL DISPUTE

(By Sidney J. Letuch)

It is tragic indeed that Arab and Israeli armies face each other menacingly across Israel's borders. How did this sad condition come about?

In 1947 the United Nations by overwhelming vote—including the active support of Russia—created the new state of Israel. This ended the carving up of the old Turkish empire, leaving 13 Arab states with several million square miles compared to little Israel with 8,000 square miles.

The Arab's openly defied the United Nations, invaded Israel and asked their Arab brothers in Israel to get out so as not to interfere with their fighting. They promised to do away with Israel in two or three weeks and thus enable their Arab brothers to return in glory. It did not work out that way. The Arabs were defeated and finally signed armistice agreements early in 1949.

Since then, they have constantly menaced Israel by infiltration, bombing, blockade and other means. Israel has offered many times to conclude peace and to compensate the Arab refugees so they may resettle in the population-hungry Arab countries of Syria, Iraq, Jordan and Saudi Arabia. The Arabs constantly refuse, openly vowing war and revenge. And they have done this to this very day.

The history of the present crisis is well known. The freedom of passage through the Strait of Tiran is no mere whim of Israel. It is actually a matter of economic life and death to her. Its freedom was guaranteed individually by the United States in February, 1957, and by all the maritime nations, including Russia, in April, 1958.

American submssion to Nasser's edict will not protect our oil interests or prevent Russian domination. On the contrary, it will encourage Nasser's appetite for oil nationalization and will further enlarge the already wide influence of Russia over Nasser and the entire Arab world.

Keeping one's pledge and seeing that justice is done may be old fashioned. Nevertheless, these are symbolic of America. One can but pray that even in these cruel times America will remain true to its great principles and to its trust.

Dr. Edward Lee Russell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD T. HANNA
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 5, 1967

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to give recognition to one of the outstanding citizens of my district, Dr. Edward Lee Russell. "Doc" Russell as he is affectionately known, will retire this year after almost 40 years of public service in the healing arts. He came to Orange County, Calif., in 1930. At that time it was a relatively sparsely settled farming area. In his 37 years of service to Orange County, first as chief of the county's division of maternal and child health, later as child psychiatrist for the county's juvenile courts, and for the last 28 years as county health officer, he has seen many changes take place. He has seen the county grow at an almost unparelleled pace. This great growth placed demands upon the county health department, demands which were met by "Doc" Russell and the able organization he was responsible for building and leading.

"Doc" Russell, in addition to taking an active leadership in Orange County, played a prominent role in State Public Health Affairs. He served as president of the health officers section, League of California Cities in 1946. In 1954 he was elected President of the Southern California Public Health Association. In 1955–56 he served as president of the California Conference of Local Health Officers. In 1960–61 he assumed the presidency of the important western branch of the American Public Health Association.

Today "Doc" Russell serves as both the senior attending physician and member of the board of trustees of Childrens Hospital of Orange County. He also holds membership in the Los Angeles Academy of Physicians.

During his long career, "Doc" Russell has contributed a score of important articles in the fields of public health. The development of these articles represents an extraordinary accomplishment when viewed in light of the fact that "Doc" Russell was at this same time shouldering important burdens of leadership noted above.

It would be a serious oversight to fail to recognize "Doc" Russell for his community services outside the medical profession. He has provided leadership in countless civic projects. In recognition of his civic leadership, the Edward Lee Russell Elementary School was dedicated in his name some 5 years ago.

I consider it a privilege to take this opportunity to express my personal respect for this outstanding individual. He has served his county and State with great distinction.

Philadelphia Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1967

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, the City Council of the City of Philadelphia, representing more than 2 million Americans of all faiths, races, and national origins, on May 25 of this year unanimously adopted a resolution.

It memorializes the President of the United States to use his good offices within the Government and United Nations to preserve peace in the Middle East and insure the security of Israel.

Mr. Speaker, because it reflects my feelings on the subject, which I have already made known on a number of occasions, and because it expresses the feeling of a substantial number of Americans. I request that the text of this resolution be spread upon the RECORD:

RESOLUTION 319

Resolution memorializing the President of the United States to use his good offices within the Government and the United Nations to preserve peace in the Middle East and insure the security of Israel

Whereas, The current crisis in the Middle East occasioned by the massing of troops and military armor along the Arab-Israeli border is fraught with the imminent danger of war; and

Whereas, The withdrawal of the United Nations peacekeeping force from the Israeli-Egyptian border heightens the danger of open conflict resulting from some provocative incident and aggressive action; and

Whereas, The mounting tensions in this area of the Middle East pose a serious threat to world peace, making the presence of a United Nations Emergency Force more necessary now than ever before; therefore

Resolved, By the Council of the City of Philadelphia, That we hereby memorialize the President of the United States to take all possible steps within the Government and the United Nations, to stabilize and preserve the peace in the Middle East.

Resolved, That certified copies of this Resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the Senators from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the Congressmen representing Philadelphia in the House of Representatives.

Certification: This is a true and correct copy of the original Resolution adopted by the Council of the City of Philadelphia on the twenty-fifth day of May, 1967.

PAUL D'ORTONA,
President of City Council.

Attest:

NATHAN WOLFMAN,
Chief Clerk of the Council.

Big Government Takes to the Air

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1967

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, the Paris Air Show ended in a personal tragedy for a valiant French flier. However, other lessons were learned from the biyearly demonstration in Paris. The age of the supersonic transport is here and the age of private American industry's ability to compete with the national industries of other countries is pointed out in the excellent article by Richard P. Cooke of the Wall Street Journal. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include his article:

BIG GOVERNMENT TAKES TO THE AIR

(By Richard P. Cooke)

PARIS.—A visitor to the Paris Air Show would have to be impressed. There are hundreds of exhibits of aircraft, space vehicles and components, from dozens of countries. Surely this is proof of vigorous competition.

But a closer look suggests that if there is such competition it is of a much different kind than free-enterprise businessmen are accustomed to. Talks with representatives of leading U.S. and European companies make clear that competition is entering a twilight, at least in the development of advanced aircraft. No longer does the big role go to enterprising individual corporate managements. The wave of the future is consortiums and political blocs, inevitably involving governments making inevitably political decisions.

The reason is simple. Important new aviation projects are just to expensive for one company to risk alone. Lately they have even become too costly for a single nation, as the recent British-French collaboration demonstrates.

Sir George Edwards, head of the big British Aircraft Corp., which has successfully—and on its own—designed and sold such planes as the Viscount and now the BAC 111, comes right out with it: "The reasons (for Anglo-French cooperation) are well known. The research and development effort and investment per nation are halved and the initial market is doubled or more."

One of Sir George's lieutenants, commenting specifically on a British-French project to build a new military jet, the Jaguar, says, "If we built the Jaguar on our own we might expect a market for 150 or so. But with the French we can see markets of 800 or more."

The magnitude problem has already resulted in the Anglo-French effort on the Concorde supersonic airliner. Another vast project is contemplated: An advanced fighter plane known as the AFVG (for Anglo-French Variable Geometry Aircraft—that means it has a hinged wing).

West Germany is also being drawn into the collective orbit. At present German and U.S. manufacturers have a preliminary contract to design a vertical rising fighter that could compete for some of the AFVG's missions. But—and here political considerations begin to appear—the U.S. Government is going slow on fully committing its share of the money for the project. The delay is making the West Germans nervous: If the project should fall through, they would probably be out of business. So further dallying by the Pentagon could force the West Germans to throw in with the British and French.

Britain, France and Germany have already agreed to collaborate on production and marketing of the Air Bus, a much-discussed large-capacity commercial jet for the 1970s.

In fact, aside from some executive jets and one new feeder-line jet, there isn't a single new long-range commercial aircraft program in sight on which manufacturers will compete.

These broad consortiums are emerging atop a pattern of consolidation within the industry itself, particularly in Great Britain. There the two leading engine builders, Rolls-Royce Ltd. and Bristol Siddeley Engines, have already merged. Discussions are under way that could result in the merger of British Aircraft and Hawker Siddeley Aviation, the two major manufacturers.

In West Germany the government is actually encouraging aviation companies to merge. France hasn't joined that trend yet, but the largest French manufacturer, Sud Aviation, is government owned. Dutch, Italian and Belgian aviation companies are increasingly taking part in joint ventures.

"What's being created is a sort of common market for aircraft, which will design planes for European needs and seek to escape the dependence on the American designs that have dominated the world market for two decades," says a knowledgeable official of a large British company. The Europeans want to buy their own products.

For the first time in aviation history an American plane, the SST, is noncompetitive and backed largely by the Government. Douglas Aircraft, now a part of McDonnell Douglas Corp., along with Boeing Co. and Lockheed Aircraft Corp., will no longer be trying to outdo each other. Boeing will be prime contractor, but all decisions will be made, or at least approved, in Washington.

That makes two large, government-backed competitors—the U.S. and Europe. Experts at the Air Show see a third major-bloc competitor in the world market of the 70s, the Soviet Union. The Russians are taking first steps toward making their planes conform to Western standards. Most observers here think it's likely that in a year or so the Russians will join the International Civil Air Organization and the International Air Transport Association, the two world-wide bodies that set international air transport standards.

It could well be that by 1975, when the American SST is expected to start hauling passengers, there will be three blocs of aircraft builders rather than a dozen competing companies. Of course, the blocs may compete with each other, and within each bloc there will be conventional competition among components suppliers, but the trend is toward the joint, public venture.

In any case, should there ever be a 6,000-mile-an-hour hypersonic plane—as some engineers envision within 25 years—there's little doubt it will be a creature not of the private economy but of government.

The Longest Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY C. SCHADEBERG

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1967

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, I would like to note that today is the "longest day"—in more ways than one—but in one way in particular. Today, 23 years ago, the Allied landings in Europe began.

June 6, 1944, was the longest day for millions of people all over the world, as the fate of a continent hung in the balance. All Americans would do well to pause and reflect on the courage of those who smashed through Fastung Europa. On that day, American troops combined with the Allied forces waded ashore into enemy fire. The result of one of the most momentous invasions in history was the liberation of Western Europe within a year.

It is with deep sadness that we mark this day in the midst of war and not peace. We again feel the shadow of war spread over the world. We are now more than two-thirds through this century and still the "guns of August" are firing.

Since we live in a world of continuing crises, it is a common tendency for many to become absorbed in the present and to forget the past. Yet, we should never fail to remember that the strength of America made June 6, 1944, the longest and one of the brightest days of free men.

Mandatory Oil Import Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ARCH A. MOORE, JR.

OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 6, 1967

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, the petrochemical industry is important to West Virginia and also, Union Carbide Corp., is of tremendous importance to my State. As a matter of fact, it may be of interest that presently Union Carbide Corp., is the largest single employer in the State of West Virginia, providing over 13,000 jobs for my fellow West Virginians.

It is for this reason that I believe it is imperative that I share the views of Mr. Hermann K. Intemann, vice president of Union Carbide Corp., and the comments that he has made on the mandatory oil import program and particularly its effect upon the petrochemical industry.

I include the statement made by Mr. Intemann in testimony before the Oil Import Board on May 23, 1965:

MANDATORY OIL IMPORT PROGRAM

Mr. Chairman, I am Hermann K. Intemann, a Vice President of Union Carbide Corporation. It is a privilege to have the opportunity to present our views on the Mandatory Oil Import Program, and to offer our recommendations as to the broad course of the Program over the next several years, particularly as it affects the international competitive position of the petrochemical industry. Accompanying me here today are Dr. C. M. Blair, President of Union Carbide's Chemicals and Plastics Operations Division and W. F. Keenan, Vice President of that Division and General Manager of its Hydrocarbon Raw Materials Department.

Why is the petrochemical industry important to the nation, and why is this industry concerned about oil imports?

Its basic products originate from components of oil and natural gas and are the chief "building blocks" for hundreds of synthetic organic materials. These chemicals and plastics are largely unseen in everyday life because they are the raw materials of industry and defense. As such, they help satisfy many human needs and military requirements in literally thousands of applications. They help make possible better food, clothing, and medicines, faster and safer transportation, quicker communications, reliable and effective weapons, and a stronger defense.

Chemical products are used for making antibiotics and vitamins, insecticides and pesticides. They are essential ingredients for missile fuels and nose cones, for jet engine fuels and hydraulic fluids. They are key materials for the textile industry, for electronic components and radar, for synthetic rubber, uranium production, and for water treatment.

Starting with natural gas liquids or petroleum distillates, this basic industry marshalls an investment of $4.5 billion, a large skilled workforce, and a technology unmatched in the world into the production of thousands of products essential in every aspect of our national existence, including our national defense. Yet, the demand for feedstocks for chemicals was, and still is, small in relation to the quantity going into energy markets. Chemical requirements, even today, amount to less than 5 per cent of the total petroleum hydrocarbon demand.

It has been 8 years since the Mandatory Oil Import Program was established. In the interest of national security the program sought to maintain a strong and vigorous domestic petroleum industry by controlling the importation of low cost crude and petroleum products into this country. This action appeared then to have relatively little effect on other sectors of the economy. We, in the petrochemical segment of the domestic organic chemical industry, however, have found that a program which affected us very little initially has now become a genuine threat to our international competitive position. If the program is not modified to recognize the particular needs of our industry, we will suffer not only overseas but ultimately at home as well. We cannot believe that the Mandatory Oil Import Program was intended to be used to maintain a healthy domestic oil industry regardless of its effect on the health of another vital industry. We do not believe that it was intended to weaken the chemical industry which is a leading positive contributor to the United States balance of payments, and which also is a significant factor in the national security. We believe that recognition must be given to the fact that the needs of the chemical industry are very different from those of the energy industry. Further, we believe that a solution to the chemical industry's problem can be found which will not violate the original intent of the program.

In this respect, we wish to make it clear that when we refer to the petrochemical segment of the chemical industry we include all producers whether they are associated with an integrated petroleum producer or only a single unit chemical plant.

We believe the solution lies in:

(a) recognizing that separate consideration must be given to the raw material problems of the domestic chemical industry from those of the domestic petroleum industry because the chemical industry competes unprotected in world-wide markets, while the domestic petroleum industry sells essentially to protected domestic markets,

(b) recognizing the need of the domestic organic chemical industry to industry to acquire foreign feedstocks in sufficient quantities to allow it to compete here and abroad against all comers, and

(c) protecting the objectives of the Oil Import Program by restricting by-products derived from foreign feedstocks used to produce chemicals from entering the domestic fuels market.

Now let us examine the problem in more detail. Restriction on imports of low cost crude oil by the Mandatory Oil Import Program, special tax treatment for oil producers, and a system of production proration has been developed in an effort to make the profitability of producing domestic crude oil high enough to encourage extensive exploration programs and maintenance of reasonable reserves. Concurrently, controlled imports of unfinished oils and finished products such as gasoline have protected selling prices and allowed the refining of domestic crude oil to be economically attractive even with raw material costs substantially higher than world prices. These actions are deemed necessary as a matter of national security. The Oil Import Program, therefore, has and is fulfilling its objective as far as the energy industry is concerned.

In 1959, the petrochemical industry in the U.S. was approximately one-third of its present size and relied largely on liquefied petroleum gases (L.P.G.), particularly ethane and propane, as its principal raw materials for the production of olefinic "building blocks". Ethane and propane were abundantly available domestically from natural gas sources and their raw material values were not related to crude oil pricing and regulation practices. Thus the chemical industry's feedstocks at that time were relatively unaffected by the Oil Import Program, and its products went overwhelmingly into nonenergy markets which were outside the scope and interest of the Program.

Although U.S. olefin manufacture has been based largely on L.P.G., the predominant method of manufacturing olefins in Europe and Japan is through the cracking of naphtha derived from crude oil. This choice has been made not only because of the comparative lack of availability of natural gas liquids such as ethane and propane in market centers, but also because naphtha has been readily available from refiners for both energy and chemical uses.

Our economic calculations indicate that if we were free to purchase foreign naphtha in the United States the return on investment for comparable olefins plants located in the U.S. would be virtually the same whether we used foreign naphtha or domestic ethane as a feedstock at today's prices. This result can be obtained without using ethylene co-product fuel credits. Foreign plants with access to foreign naphtha are slightly more attractive economically. (The chemical co-product credits are somewhat less but so is the naphtha cost.) Therefore, foreign chemical producers operating on foreign naphtha have a limited advantage over U.S. ethane-based production in third country foreign markets.

Some refiners project that chemical naphtha requirements will outgrow refinery surpluses abroad with the result that the naphtha price will increase toward its value in motor gasoline. Union Carbide does not concur with this view. With the expectation of world-wide crude oil remaining plentiful, we expect overseas organic chemical feedstocks to remain attractively priced and available in most areas over the long term. While naphtha has been widely used as a feedstock because of its price and availability, it is not the only part of the crude oil barrel than can be efficiently converted to chemicals. As long as crude itself remains plentiful, chemicals can be made from those fractions which are least in demand for outlets with greater resultant value.

Even those refiners who think that foreign chemical feedstock prices will rise must recognize that it is not the absolute level of chemical feedstock prices which creates the disadvantage for our industry, but the differential between domestic and international feedstock prices. We see domestic feedstock prices rising while our foreign competitors are free to acquire feedstocks derived from stably priced international crude oil and we are not under present regulations. If we are to compete with foreign producers for markets, we must also be able to compete with them in the purchase of our raw materials. In addition, Union Carbide believes that the growth of the domestic chemical industry is causing the demand for L.P.G. to outstrip the available supply. Thus, we, as our foreign competitors before us, must look to naphtha and other crude oil based feedstocks for at least a part of our increased future requirements. Here, however, we find that domestic naphtha from protected and high priced domestic crude puts us at a serious economic disadvantage to overseas producers. Not only is our potential purchase of new oil based feedstocks likely to be at the higher domestic prices but the entire price structure for the limited domestic L.P.G. supplies will also tend to rise more quickly since the Oil Import Program permits no low cost alternative. The result will necessarily be reduced exports of chemicals manufactured in the United States and increasing imports of chemicals manufactured abroad.

The domestic chemical industry, which has been committed by the recent Kennedy round of tariff reductions to greater exposure to foreign competition in chemicals, cannot maintain its vitality and contribution to trade balances with a noncompetitive raw material cost. The importance of this is evident from the fact that raw material represents about half the cost of ethylene, the basic building block of the petrochemical industry. We believe the Oil Import Program in its present form and the developing domestic L.P.G. situation will make the domestic petrochemical industry noncompetitive in the world market. If our U.S. made products cannot compete, the only alternative is for these producers to move abroad. Movement of our chemical facilities to foreign shores is undesirable from the viewpoint of national security, balance of payments and employment. This must and can be avoided.

In 1961, Union Carbide foresaw this problem and requested consideration by responsible government agencies. In 1962, a Petroleum Study Committee, created by the Office of Emergency Planning, conducted a study of petroleum requirements and supply with relation to national security objectives and concluded:

"It is not considered desirable to extend the oil import control program beyond its present scope. However, if it should appear necessary to redress the competitive equities involved it would be preferable to adjust the present method of establishing allocations for refiners with petrochemical facilities."

Beginning in 1962, the production of L.P.G. for chemical manufacturers and others was included in the total import pool. However, chemical manufacturers without refinery capacity were excluded from the Program. In 1965, as a result of an inter-agency review by a committee consisting of representatives of a number of government agencies, the Presidential Proclamation 3693 was issued and provided in part:

"For reasons of equity and competitive capability there should be authority to include petrochemical plants within the system of allocation of imports."

It is clear that the responsible government agencies have determined that the inclusion of the petrochemical industry in the Program would not impair the national security. Subsequent modifications to the Oil Import Regulation implemented the Proclamation and provided that consumers of qualifying feedstocks would receive import allocations regardless of whether the material was processed in refineries or petrochemical plants. We must bear in mind that this revision was designed solely to establish equity between oil refiners and petrochemical producers in the United States. It was not intended nor did it alter competitive relationships significantly between domestic and foreign chemical producers. The long term problem, therefore, of the international competitive position of the domestic chemical industry remains unsolved.

Since 1959, we have seen not only a decrease in the U.S. share of world-wide organic chemical output but a sizable drop in the U.S. share of the expanding export markets as well. Between 1959 and 1966 the U.S. share of world exports of organic chemicals and plastics decreased from 38 percent to 24 percent. Unless the controlling influences are changed, our estimates indicate that by 1971 the U.S. share is likely to drop further to about 16 percent of world markets. Third country markets have accounted for more than one-half of the U.S. exports of organic chemicals and plastics in recent years and it is in these markets that the U.S. producers meet European and Japanese producers head on. When all the new units being planned and constructed abroad come on-stream there will be enormous quantities of chemical products derived from foreign naphtha to be marketed. The U.S. is the largest single chemical market in the world and an obvious target for European and Japanese production because of the potentially higher cost of our product and the reduction of tariffs under the Kennedy round of negotiations.

One of the predictable implications of an adverse trend in relative feedstock costs between the U.S. and foreign countries is a sizable flow of U.S. investment capital overseas to construct facilities to supply products not only to third country markets but to the U.S. market itself. This could amount to more than $100 million per year in petrochemical investment abroad. If further governmental limitations should be imposed on foreign investment, the result would be, in effect, to deny to U.S. based companies continued participation in the growth of the world's organic chemical industry.

In 1965, U.S. exports of organic chemicals and plastics produced a net foreign trade surplus of $893,000,000. (Union Carbide's contribution as just one producer amounted to almost $100,000,000.) This is the contribution which is being threatened. Our projection indicates that the industry's favorable balance of trade in organic chemicals and plastics may decline $600,000,000 by 1971 if changes are not made.

We are confident that this conclusion will be further reinforced by the results of a survey recently made by the Department of Commerce. The survey was designed to project the petrochemical industry's pattern of investments and sales to 1970 under varying degrees of access to foreign feedstocks for domestic use. We believe that, despite the relatively short period involved, the survey will still show a sizable positive contribution to the domestic balance of payments with increasing access to foreign feedstocks.

We at Union Carbide plan our facilities about five years ahead and we believe we are not too different from the rest of the industry. Under present regulations and in the absence of a Program that recognizes the raw materials problem of the petrochemical industry, our plans of necessity must include a shift towards foreign manufacture. Initially, we would supply our third country markets from these installations but ultimately must consider supplying domestic markets as well. By contrast the domestic petroleum industry cannot supply economically any significant quantities of petroleum to third country markets and the foreign petroleum industry is prevented from supplying more than a limited portion of domestic markets by the Oil Imports Program. It is thus clear that an industry supplying nonenergy chemical products in international trade cannot remain strong under treatment which is designed to protect energy products for the domestic economy.

To maintain a strong U.S. chemical industry in the interest of national security we recommend a program be developed that:

(a) recognizes that separate consideration must be given to the raw material problems of the domestic chemical industry from those of the domestic petroleum industry because the chemical industry competes unprotected in world-wide markets, while the domestic petroleum industry sells essentially to protected domestic markets,

(b) recognizes the need of the domestic organic chemical industry to acquire foreign feedstocks in sufficient quantities to allow it to compete here and abroad against all comers, and

(c) protects the objectives of the Oil Import Program by restricting by-products derived from foreign chemical feedstocks used to produce chemicals from entering the domestic fuels market.

The technicalities of the proposed program will be difficult, but if the objectives are clear, industry working with the Department of the Interior can work the details out. The program should be put into effect on a gradual, staged basis over a period of several years to avoid possible dislocation to the domestic petroleum industry. Its provisions should apply to all petrochemical producers, treating them equitably whether or not they are also petroleum companies. In the meantime, if the industry has confidence that such a program will be developed, the new facilities needed to meet domestic and third country chemical market projections can be planned for this country instead of for foreign shores.

H. K. INTEMANN.

High School Dropouts Do Well in McClellan NYC Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. MOSS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1967

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, for most young people, dropping out of school means heading down a deadend street. They face a future of unemployment, or at best, menial low-paying jobs.

But, 122 young people in Sacramento, Calif.—most of them school dropouts—found a new lease on life when they enrolled in the Neighborhood Youth Corps program at McClellan Air Force Base.

An article in the May 12 Sacramento Valley Union Labor Bulletin describes how both the personnel at McClellan and the NYC enrollees have benefited from the project.

Significantly, the article points out, the remedial education part of their NYC experience has encouraged many of the dropouts to work toward their high school diplomas.

I insert this article into the RECORD as an excellent example of how young people can get that all-important second chance in life if someone cares. NYC shows them that someone does.

HIGH SCHOOL DROPOUTS DO WELL IN MCCLELLAN NEIGHBORHOOD YOUTH CORPS PROGRAM

Many McClellanites have, no doubt, recently seen some seasoned employes performing their assigned tasks with very young and eager helpers at their sides. This scene, which had its inception in December of 1966, is becoming more commonplace on the McClellan installation. The youths are enrollees in the "Neighborhood Youth Corps" (N.Y.C.) training program.

N.Y.C. is funded by the U.S. Department of Labor, and sponsored by the Sacramento Area Economic Opportunity Council. Under the direction of Carlton Stevenson and his four-member staff, the program is designed primarily for the sometimes forgotten youths, age 16 to 22, who are high school dropouts.

Stewart M. Roth, Manager of the Youth Opportunity Center (Y.O.C.) of the Department of Employment said, "When we see the fine results being produced by N.Y.C., it makes our job a pleasant one." Y.O.C. is responsible for recruiting enrollees for the program, pre-selection and post-selection counseling, and assistance in obtaining meaningful employemnt as a result of the N.Y.C. training, or, placing the enrollees in a formal on-the-job training program.

Marion J. Woods, Executive Director of S.A.E.O.C., said that the foundation of the program is centered around coordinated efforts of citizens from every segment of the community: city, county, state and federal organizations. "The program is not to be confused with any type of 'back-to-school' program in the County," he said. He further stated that the supervisors and employees at McClellan Air Force Base are to be praised for the excellent supervision and guidance they are giving these youngsgters. "The support which the McClellan administration is giving is just tremendous," he said.

Col. George S. Geanetos, Personnel Office Chief at McClellan, said there are presently 120 enrollees in N.Y.C. and in a short while they expect to have 155. "In four months," he said, "we have seen raw natural talent refined, hidden talent identified, gregariousness emerged, confidence restored, and life's goals taking form for these youngsters through N.Y.C. In the opinion of all those connected with the program, we see new and useful tax-paying citizens emerging from N.Y.C. We are most happy to participate in this worthwhile program."

Stevenson said that many of the enrollees are becoming more and more aware of the importance of receiving their high school diplomas. "They are receiving training in such departments as the library, hospital, procurement, communications, clerical and engineering. An eight-hour remedial education class is held on Fridays at McClellan, which is conducted by Grant Union High School on a contract basis, for which the students can receive fifteen credits toward graduation. In addition, many of the youngsters are also attending night school. It is mandatory that they receive at least six hours remedial education a week. Ninety-five percent of the youths in the program are high school dropouts. In many cases, N.Y.C. is like a new lease on life to these youngsters," he said.

Col. Geanetos added that he believes the key to the whole picture is the fact that the kids have found that someone really is interested in their future, and eager to help them attain their goals.

In a few weeks the Sacramento area will see an art exhibit by N.Y.C. enrollee Jonathan Hansard. Jon works days as a visual communications aide at McClellan and is due to receive his high school diploma soon. "I never dreamed I'd get a chance like this," Jon said, "and I am very grateful to everyone connected with N.Y.C."

Strait of Tiran and the Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 6, 1967

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, it would be difficult indeed to overemphasize the threat to world peace occasioned by the outbreak of warfare in the Near East. Although harsh events will prevent for the time being any rational discussion by the combatants, we should not lose sight of the central issue which underlies the conflict—the legal status of the Strait of Tiran.

We are indebted to Mr. Aaron L. Shalowitz, former special assistant to the Director of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, for a lucid and authoritative analysis of the status of the Strait of Tiran which appeared in a letter to the editor of the Washington Sunday Post on June 5. Mr. Shalowitz, who has written extensively on the subject of territorial waters, retired in 1964 from the Coast and Geodetic Survey after more than 40 years of service.

Mr. Shalowitz' editorial:

STRAIT OF TIRAN AND THE LAW

During the present crisis in the Middle East there has been considerable confusion regarding the legal and geographic terminology relating to the international status of the Strait of Tiran and the Gulf of Aqaba.

It is now generally agreed that the navigable waters of the world may be classified under three broad heads, namely, inland or national waters, the marginal or territorial sea, and the high seas. The term territorial waters includes both the territorial sea and the inland waters of a country, but is sometimes used synonymously but erroneously with the term territorial sea.

The inland or national waters of a coastal nation comprise its rivers, harbors, lakes, the shore between high water and low water, and coastal indentations that fall into the category of juridical or closed bays. Over these waters the coastal nation exercises complete sovereignty.

Seaward of the national waters lies the territorial sea—a belt of water 3 miles wide over which the coastal nation exercises a qualified sovereignty because foreign merchantmen have the right of innocent passage through them.

Beyond the territorial sea lies the high seas. Freedom is its principal characteristic, which means it is not subject to the sovereignty of any one country.

Specifically then, it is evident that along the open coast of Egypt, where no strait is involved—for example, along the Red Sea—a foreign merchant vessel would under international law have the right of innocent passage anywhere within Egypt's territorial sea as long as it remains outside its national waters. The question then arises as to what effect the existence of a strait, such as the Strait of Tiran has on this right of free navigation. The full width of the strait is about 4 miles and lies within the territorial seas of both Saudi Arabia and Egypt, but the usable channel (about one mile wide) lies wholly within the territorial sea of Egypt.

This is comparable to the *Corfu Channel* case (alluded to by Mr. Chalmers Roberts in his article May 28) in which the World Court in 1949 upheld the right of British warships to pass unimpeded through the narrow north Corfu Strait (1 mile wide) which separates Albania from the Greek island of Corfu, at a point well within Albania's territorial sea. This is a landmark case on the law of international straits, and the Court's observations are of considerable importance in the present situation. The Court said the test was not to be found in the volume of traffic passing through the strait nor its greater or lesser importance for international navigation.

The decisive criterion, it held, was "its geographical situation in connecting two parts of the high seas and the fact of its use for international navigation." The Court also said that it was "unable to accept the Albanian contention that the Government of the United Kingdom has violated Albanian sovereignty . . ." The obvious conclusions that must be drawn thus far from this decision are that neither the narrowness of a strait nor the fact that it lies wholly within the territorial sea of a coastal nation can have any relevancy as to its international status. It should also dispose effectively of the existing confusion as to whether the Strait of Tiran is sovereign waters of Egypt or international waters. The two are not mutually exclusive.

Mr. Roberts also makes brief reference to the 1958 Geneva Conference on the Law of the Sea, which specifically took cognizance of straits used for international navigation. Although the Geneva Conference failed to reach agreement on the breadth of the territorial sea, it did adopt four conventions, the Convention on the Territorial Sea being of special significance in the present Middle East crisis. This Convention came into force on Sept. 10, 1964 and has now been ratified by 33 Nations, among them being the United Kingdom, the United States, and the Soviet Union.

In considering the question of innocent passage through straits used for international navigation the Convention went beyond the rule of Corfu, which limited innocent passage to straits "connecting two parts of the high seas," and included also the "territorial sea" of a foreign state. The final article adopted by the Conference and embodied as Article 16 (4) of the Convention reads as follows: "There shall be no suspension of the innocent passage of foreign ships through straits which are used for international navigation between one part of the high seas and another part of the high seas or the *territorial sea of a foreign state.*"

Arthur Dean, the chairman of the U.S. delegation to the Conference stated that the provision not only goes further than did the decision in the *Corfu Channel* case, but "It specifically determines the heated controversy between Israel and the Arab states as to the right of Israeli shipping to pass through the Strait of Tiran to the Gulf of Aqaba."

The Gulf of Aqaba is a multinational body of water with outlets on the Gulf of four sovereign nations—Egypt, Saudi Arabia, Jordan and Israel. The prevailing accepted principle for such waters is that they are not closed seas, no matter how narrow the entrance may be, but are parts of the high seas. But apart from that, the Gulf, under a 3-mile territorial sea—the extent recognized by the United States—would contain a narrow belt of high seas running the full length of the Gulf, through which a foreign vessel would have an inherent right of passage, and the Strait of Tiran would connect two parts of the high seas and thus fall into the category of an international strait under the doctrine of *Corfu*. Even if a 12-mile territorial sea limit be accepted for Egypt and Saudi Arabia, which they now claim, the entire Gulf would be territorial seas, through which the right of innocent passage would lie under the traditional law of the sea, and the Strait of Tiran would be an international waterway under Article 16(4) of the Convention.

Freedom of the seas has been one of the keystones of American policy from the early history of the Republic. It has been reaffirmed on numerous occasions. The United States has a stake in the preservation of this freedom wherever it may be challenged.

Military Mailing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 6, 1967

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, along with several hundred other people yesterday, I found myself a captive passenger of the Pennsylvania Railroad. Since the service between Washington and my Philadelphia home was just about completely electrified, the just about complete failure of electrical power supply yesterday morning halted the train on which I was a passenger and left me cooling my heels for several hours.

I do not make the claim that I was inconvenienced any more than my fellow passengers, but I do make the claim that it caused me to lose an opportunity I very much wanted. I am referring to the opportunity to cast my vote in this House yesterday in favor of H.R. 10226.

This is a bill I have had my eye on for some time and this is a subject with which I am more than slightly familiar and completely in accord. There is no doubt in my mind that mailing privileges for members of our Armed Forces should indeed be extended to include many more Americans who are not scrimping on their services to us.

I am very sorry, Mr. Speaker, that the failure of electrical power cost me my opportunity to vote for that bill. If my train had stopped closer to the Capital than Wilmington, Del., I may even have considered—like our infantrymen and letter carriers themselves—walking.

Taps for the 37th—Ohio's Rainbow Division

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 22, 1967

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, the Department of Defense has announced the retirement of Ohio's 37th Infantry Division as part of a Pentagon efficiency program involving the Army National Guard. This action will touch the heartstrings of many Ohioans who have so proudly served in the Rainbow Division. This will seem to be the end of an era for this military unit, which distinguished itself in three wars. It was an all "Buckeye" division which made military history in every engagement in which it participated. The 37th may be demobilized, but its deeds of valor will live in history.

By leave obtained, I include editorials which appeared in the Cleveland papers—one on June 3 in the Cleveland Press and another on June 4 in the Plain Dealer:

[From the Cleveland Press, June 3, 1967]

TAPS FOR THE 37TH

Ohio's proud 37th Infantry Division is about to slip into history after having helped make it for a half century.

The death warrant for the Buckeye corps, identified by its round red and white shoulder patch, was handed down yesterday when the Defense Department announced its retirement after maneuvers this summer. It is part of the Pentagon's stream-lining program for the Army National Guard.

For Ohio National Guard officials, the news was not surprising. More than two years ago the Pentagon announced its modernization intention, and many observers expected the 37th to be demobilized then.

Writing at that time of the 37th's impending retirement, Press Military Editor Robert Stafford said: "It has a record of gallantry in combat unmatched by any other National Guard division, of conduct above and beyond the call of duty in three wars, and of patriotic response to any call to service in peace as well as war."

Stafford pointed out that the 37th's record is all the more impressive because it was compiled by "weekend warriors"—the civilian-soldiers suddenly called to fighting duty.

They became professionals fast, though, as the Germans can testify in World War I (Meuse-Argonne front) and the Japanese in World War II (Bougainville).

Eight members of the 37th have won Medals of Honor. One of them was Pvt. Rodger Young whose heroism was memorialized in the famous "Ballad of Rodger Young."

The fighting 37th, 1917–1967. Ohio—and the nation—can be proud.

[From the Plain Dealer, June 4, 1967]

THE 37TH—A GREAT DIVISION

Ohio's 37th Infantry Division, apparently on its way out due to the Defense Department's reorganization of the Army's National Guard and Reserve forces, always will have an important place in Ohio and national history.

Congress may halt the reorganization move for a time but there is little reason to believe that the objectors to the streamlining plan are motivated by very much more than local pride.

If the famed "Buckeye" division is indeed phased out in the reorganization, its old battle-won glory will be undiminished.

The division distinguished itself on the bloody Meuse-Argonne and four other fronts in World War I. Nearly 2,000 of them lost their lives in 600 days of heroic, victorious island-hopping in the Pacific in World War II.

Eight of the 37th's members won the Congressional Medal of Honor.

The exploits of men wearing the round red-and-white shoulder patch of the Ohio division will not be forgotten in the division's probable demise.

If We Don't Increase the Debt Limit?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1967

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, recently I asked the Secretary of the Treasury the question: What will happen if the Congress fails to pass legislation to increase the debt limit? His answer has just come to me in the following letter. It seems to me that, in view of the contents of this letter, a Congressman might vote against the measure as a symbolic protest; but not as a cost-saving device. The only realistic way to save money is vote to cut and eliminate authorizations and appropriations.

The letter follows:

THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, June 5, 1967.

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BENNETT: In reply to your question: "What will happen if the Congress fails to pass legislation to increase the debt limit?"—the simple and direct answer is that the United States Government would not be able to pay its bills or repay all of its maturing debt after June 30, 1967.

Under existing law, the temporary debt ceiling of $336 billion reverts, after June 30, 1967, to $285 billion. We estimate that the actual level of debt, which was $331.1 billion on May 31, will be about 327 billion on June 30—some $42 billion above the ceiling which would take effect the next day.

The debt in existence at that time would have been issued legally, but without Congressional action to raise the ceiling from the $285 billion level it would not be possible to issue new debt—including even the refunding of outstanding obligations as they came due.

The cash balance we would have on hand at that time—amounting to perhaps $7 billion—would not last long. Whether that limited amount would be used to meet current Government payments—for example, to purchase defense material, pay salaries, or pensions—or for repaying maturing debt obligations, is beside the point. The point is that without action on the debt limit the United States Government would not be able to meet its lawful obligations, and that is not a tolerable position to be in.

One might ask how long $7 billion of cash could last. The mere repayment of the first three weekly issues of Treasury bills coming due in July would use $6.9 billion—and that cash would not be available unless all other Treasury cash expenditures wer shut off completely; that would mean no payments on defense supplies, no payments of Government salaries, no payments of Government pensions, Social Security, unemployment benefits, and so on. Not only could no new savings bonds be sold, but we could also run out of cash to redeem existing bonds.

Last January, in spelling out the need for an immediate increase in the temporary debt ceiling, because an excessively tight debt limit had been interfering with normal Treasury cash and debt management operations since December 1966, I pointed out that unless the ceiling was raised by the beginning of March the Treasury would be able to pay only about half of the anticipated bills coming due in the first half of March.

The situation facing us at the end of June will be far more serious than that of early March. On that earlier occasion, it was a question of gradually pressing up to, and then byond, an existing debt ceiling of $330 billion. At the end of June, however, the current legislation provides a precipitate *drop* in the debt ceiling to a level, as noted, some $42 billion below the actual level of debt anticipated for June 30.

This country has never defaulted on its obligations, and I do not believe the Govrnment should be put in a position where its ability to fulfill its obligations is jeopardized.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY H. FOWLER.

A Commitment To Resist Aggression in the Middle East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT TENZER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1967

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, the Middle East situation has exploded into a senseless and dangerous war. This is a time when we must unite behind the President who must face difficult decisions in the days ahead.

The U.S. foreign policy to resist aggression in the Middle East was reiterated by President Johnson in clear and uncompromising terms in his statement of May 23, 1967, just as three Presidents before him stated over the past 20 years.

Mr. Speaker, during the last 10 days more than 116 Members of the House of Representatives have signed the statement made by our colleague, Emanuel Celler on May 23, 1967, pledging our fullest support "to measures which must be taken by the administration to make our position unmistakably clear to those who are now bent on the destruction of Israel that we are now prepared to take whatever action is necessary to resist aggression against Israel and to preserve the peace." As one of the Members who endorsed and cosponsored this statement of congressional resolve, I am prepared to support the President in any action necessary to help Israel resist Arab aggression in the Middle East. Our Nation's policy as restated by our President spells out our commitment to our only ally in the Middle East. This commitment must be backed up by any means necessary to convince the Arab forces that there is no place in the 20th century for "holy wars."

Israel fights valiantly while the maritime nations remain unable to agree on a simple declaration to guarantee freedom of passage through the Straits of Tiran, an international waterway.

Israel stands alone, even though the United States, England, and France guaranteed the independence and integrity of her territory.

Israel, in reliance on these solemn commitments, voluntarily withdrew her forces in 1957 from Sinai and from Sharm el Shrik. Today these solemn commitments are being challenged.

The Israeli Ambassador and General Dayan have stated that they do not want Americans to fight for Israel while the United Arab Republic by their lies and exaggerations are constantly seeking to encourage a confrontation between the United States and the Soviet Union.

With his nose bleeding, Nasser now seeks a cease-fire. The Israelis would undoubtedly agree to a cease-fire, but with no strings attached. This is what Ambassador Goldberg is now advocating at the United Nations. The Soviet Union, together with India, are suggesting a cease-fire, including a withdrawal to positions of June 4, the lines which existed prior to the opening of the present hostilities.

Should Israel pull back as it did in 1957 and leave the Arabs in a position to renew belligerency at another time? Is this not the time for the United States and the other nations of the world to support a realistic and permanent solution in the Middle East?

This is the time for the United States to insist upon direct negotiations between Israel and the Arab States. To achieve these desirable results our Government should give to Israel all possible material assistance and political support to bring an end once and for all to Nasser's policy of aggression and expansionism, designed to destroy the State of Israel, a member in good standing in the United Nations.

Notwithstanding the grave danger inherent in unilateral action by the United States I believe it is imperative that we declare our intention to meet our commitments should the United Nations and other diplomatic efforts fail. We cannot turn our back on an ally threatened with destruction at the hands of a group of nations who have proclaimed a "holy war."

In the face of the breaking of diplomatic relations with the United States by Egypt, Syria, and Algeria, it is my hope that the U.N. will take quick action to intervene and to bring about a cease-fire without strings attached.

The seeds of conflict in the Middle East were planted long ago and the tense situation has exploded just as predicted openly by Egypt and her allies.

On October 17, 1966—Congressional Record, page A5336—I warned of the grave danger. In the Middle East represented by Syria's attempts to goad its Arab neighbors into an attack against Israel. I stated then that—

> The Syrians have openly admitted that they are conducting a "people's war of liberation" aimed at the destruction of the State of Israel. They have boasted that Israel will become a second Vietnam with the El Fatah terrorists playing the role of the Vietcong and Syria acting as a North Vietnam.

I have also called for a cessation of U.S. contributions to the United Nations Relief and Works Administration which has fed, housed and educated 10,000 to 15,000 Arab refugees who enrolled in the Palestine Liberation Army trained in the Gaza strip and Sinai for the purpose of destroying the State of Israel.

On January 30, 1967, I called for a four-point policy to maintain peace in the Middle East. The proposal included a U.S. resolution calling upon the United Nations to institute full-scale peace talks between Israel and Arab countries; a substantial increase in the United Nations Emergency Force and border patrols to prevent aggression; a major diplomatic offensive to reach agreement with the Soviet Union on a cessation of the arms race in the Middle East and a suspension of financial assistance to Arab refugees who are enrolled in the Palestine Liberation Army.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the United Nations will rise to the occasion and will take this opportunity to achieve a cease-fire without strings and to settle once and for all the disputes which have kept the fires of conflict burning for 20 years in the Middle East. But we cannot build our foreign policy on hopes. We must look past the United Nations and decide now on a foreign policy which will make it clear that we will not tolerate aggression or international seaway robbery in the Middle East—and that we seek and will support a permanent solution to the tensions and disputes which have reigned in the Middle East.

Mr. Speaker, our Nation must stand firm and hope that the knowledge that the United States will not stand idly by will spur the United Nations to greater efforts and to greater achievements.

Let the nations of the world and the Members of the United Nations know that if they do not act, the United States will act—notwithstanding the grave dangers inherent in such action.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues in the House to once again voice their support for firm U.S. policy in the Middle East.

The Eighth President of the Johns Hopkins University

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 6, 1967

Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, this month Dr. Milton S. Eisenhower is retiring as president of the Johns Hopkins University. During his tenure at Hopkins, this distinguished educator has led Hopkins through a period of great growth and achievement, both as one of the Nation's leading universities and as a major contributor to the growth of Baltimore. As the Baltimore Evening Sun editorial of June 1 concluded, Johns Hopkins "has not just held its own but has risen in stature" during Dr. Eisenhower's inspiring service as its president.

I would like to call to the attention of the Congress this editorial tribute to one of America's finest educational leaders:

The Eighth President

Over the past eleven years at the Johns Hopkins University the prevailing themes have been growth, attainment and, increasingly, concord. Charles S. Garland, chairman of the university board of trustees, sums it up in the single word "cohesion." If instead of an abstract quality an individual person may be designated as the center of this forward movement, then Mr. Garland and behind him the professors and the secretaries, the post doctoral students and the day students all at this point would specify Milton S. Eisenhower, the retiring president of Johns Hopkins.

Several of the formal and informal judgments now being offered upon the tenure of the eighth head man since 1876 invoke the superlative. Reviewing "the landmark accomplishments" and "unprecedented progress" of the Eisenhower administration, Mr. Garland's special report declares that "not since its first decade has Johns Hopkins experienced such progress." Elsewhere about the university, the sort of skepticism that is seemingly built into academic life becomes abeyant; the hospital lions could be said to have lain down alongside the Homewood lambs; people are heard saying, "There goes the ablest Hopkins president in living memory."

The evidence warranting such language exceeds the practicalities of list-making: but prominent in it are remarkable fund-raising, building construction, salary rises, budgets quintuple their 1956 size, an almost 100 per cent increase in Ph. D. candidacies, continuation and upgrading of undergraduate programs (with 83 per cent of undergraduates seeing it through, as against 69 per cent in 1956), greater attention to and participation by Baltimoreans in the university's Evening School.

Radical increase goes on, at the same time, in the very quantity of this country's universities and colleges: they now number some 2,200. Eminence is harder than ever for any one institution to arrive at, and to sustain. Yet the university that is in some ways Baltimore's proudest ornament has not just held its own but has risen in stature and in the value of its contributions. To the applause of the academic world, as President Eisenhower completes his task, are joined the gratitude and esteem of the civilian community.

Give Israel U.S. Military Aid if Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD D. McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 24, 1967

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, on Monday evening, my friend and colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. BINGHAM], addressed the ninth annual citation dinner of the Buffalo Council on World Affairs in my home area of Buffalo, N.Y.

I would like to place in the RECORD today a Buffalo Courier Express article outlining his remarks on that occasion:

BINGHAM FAVORS GIVING ISRAEL U.S. MILITARY AID IF NECESSARY

(By John Pauly)

The United States should aid Israel against the Arab nations with "troops and other military assistance if necessary," U.S. Rep. Jonathan B. Bingham said here Monday night.

The Bronx congressman made the remark to a Courier-Express reporter following his talk before the ninth annual citation dinner of the Buffalo Council on World Affairs in the Statler Hilton Hotel.

Bingham spoke before 250 persons attending the dinner honoring John M. Galvin for his work in promoting the council's "Salute to International Visitors," an annual program honoring the area's international community.

The congressman said in his address:

"Over the years Israel said it wanted nothing but to be left alone. Israel wants only peace, whereas the Arabs have repeatedly said they want to destroy Israel."

United Arab Republic President Gamal Abdel Nasser "brought about the crisis" by demanding the removal of United Nations peace keeping troops and blockading an international waterway, he said, declaring the Arabs were "self-proclaimed aggressors."

MILITARY AID, IF NEEDED

Bingham told those attending that the President with the support of Congress should provide aid to Israel if the situation warranted it. Later, he told The Courier-Express he "would not exclude troops and other military aids," in the assistance package.

He said the assistance, however, probably would not be necessary because most people in Washington felt confident "that Israel can take care of itself."

Bingham was former U.S. representative on the Economic and Social Council of the U.N. and former president of the U.N.'s Trusteeship Council.

The Congressman explained that part of the trouble in the Middle East stemmed from the failure of the U.S. and Britain to state firmly they would not let the Arabs "push Israel into the sea." He termed our past policy "wishy-washy."

Bingham said the alignment of the Soviet Union with the Arabs prevents "effective U.N. action" in the dispute. "The U.N. simply cannot resolve major disputes between the Communist world and the non-Communist world; the U.N. was not set up to do so," he explained.

Bingham also urged we should pursue our efforts to prevent nuclear weapons from falling into the hands of additional nations.

The congressman advised concern with the "growing gap between the rich and poor nations of the world." "The more we can help the peoples of the developing world to make progress toward their economic, social and political goals, the better are our chances of preserving peace."

He also suggested we attempt to lead some Communist countries to turn toward "the pleasure of a consumer-oriented economy and away from the fanatical asceticism of the past."

AWARD PRESENTED TO SON

Galvin was unable to attend the dinner and his award was presented to his son, Richard, by Edward H. Kavinoky, a past recipient of the citation.

University of Buffalo President Martin Meyerson introduced Bingham. Wayne D. Wisbaum was dinner chairman.

Land Reform in South Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 22, 1967

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, the war in Vietnam is the most important issue facing this Nation. The military aspects have generated a great deal of public discussion and debate. This is natural because our efforts have been directed primarily to achieving the military objective of halting armed Communist aggression. But unless greater consideration is given to the economic and political development of South Vietnam, military successes will not bring about the long-range economic stability and political self-determination we seek for the Vietnamese people.

One of the specific problems which concerns me greatly and which deserves our immediate attention is the low priority assigned to the land reform program in the rural areas of South Vietnam. Although the United States will spend over $25 billion on the Vietnamese war this year, land reform has been allocated only $700,000, with an additional $800,000 for a related aerial land surveying project. Since 1954, we have provided less than $5.1 million for a program that may well prove to be the key to our success or failure in Vietnam.

When such a small share of our committed resources is allocated to land reform, it cannot be successfully pursued. A look at agricultural conditions in South Vietnam indicates the need for an immediate reevaluation of the program's importance in achieving a lasting peace in Vietnam. I, therefore, urge that Congress fully examine the current program and that the administration reconsider the low priority status heretofore assigned to the land reform program.

Even with the substantial population migration from the countryside to the provincial capitals and to Saigon, the rural people still comprise over 80 percent of Vietnam's population. It therefore follows that a program which lessens the serious land tenure abuses and increases rural living standards by increasing agricultural productivity and income and which promotes economic self-sufficiency is essential for establishing a stable economy and political unity.

Present land distribution policy in South Vietnam is based on an ordinance issued in 1956 which limited the amount of rice lands that could be held by one owner to about 246 acres. Since the initiation of the ordinance nearly 615,000 acres have been redistributed to almost 116,000 farmers. After over 10 years, however, the program is not finished. One million additional acres that were included in the original program remain undistributed.

The present status of these lands is as follows:

Squatter-occupied state lands: 250,000 acres.

Former French holdings: 250,000 acres.

Land taken by President Diem from large landowners: 155,000 acres.

Land development center lands: 333,000 acres.

These lands, along with the 615,000 acres of previously distributed lands, comprise only 1.6 million of the 8.6 million total acres of cultivatable land in South Vietnam.

The remaining 7 million cultivatable acres also are undistributed and present a major problem requiring a solution as quickly as conditions permit. It is difficult to affix a number to the acres still dominated by the Vietcong because of the fluidity of their movement, but best sources would pace it in the vicinity of 3,000,000 acres. Excluding this area, some 4,000,000 cultivatable acres remain in the hands of large landlords.

These holdings, as noted, are limited to 246 acres per individual by the ordinance of 1956. But the spirit of this law is being broken by wealthy landowners who transfer titles to relatives but maintain personal control. Farm experts in Vietnam estimate that the winter rice harvest on a 246-acre farm is worth between $15,000 and $20,000, which is a large amount of money in South Vietnam. Therefore, even without the prevailing practice of transferring title to family members, a very unequal distribution of agricultural wealth exists.

In addition to transfer of land title, a program to improve the rental poilcy was also initiated. In September 1965 competitive bidding for rental of village-owned lands was ended to curb the exorbitant rentals which went as high as 50 percent of the annual crop value. A ceiling of 25 percent of the value of the principal crop was placed on all land rentals. In addition, the tenants were exempted from paying back rents which accrued during periods of Vietcong threat or domination of the land.

Recent indications are that these rent ceilings are again being violated with tenants paying between 30 to 50 percent of their annual crop to the landlords.

A reexamination would therefore seem to be in order in these areas:

Determining violations of the rent ceilings pegged by law at 25 percent of the principal crop value.

Violations of the 246-acre ownership maximum per individual through title transfer to family members.

A speed up in the distribution of titles to land held by the South Vietnamese

Government which now lies in secure areas.

The accomplishment of these goals requires a greater level of financial support, encouragement, and advice from the United States.

In conclusion, a reference to the land reform programs of Japan and Taiwan, often pointed to as models, presents interesting examples of what might be possible in South Vietnam. These countries limit individual landholdings for agricultural purposes to 10 acres. Farm experts in South Vietnam estimate that if every average five-member farm family in South Vietnam were given 10 acres, it would be possible to eliminate tenant farming completely.

Even now in the Mekong Delta, 50 percent of the peasantry are completely landless, and 80 percent rent all but a small part of their ricelands. These statistics indicate the great need for land reform in only one agricultural area of South Vietnam. Although not to the same degree, the same general conditions prevail in the rest of the country.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the administration will provide a much higher percentage of AID funds and skilled manpower for this program in the future, and I urge we do so as quickly as efficient expansion permits. Only by taking immediate positive action on the very basic problem of land reform can this country help to provide the foundations for economic and political stability in South Vietnam.

Vocational School

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1967

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I recently had the rare privilege and pleasure to address a fine group of young citizens at the first commencement ceremonies of the new Southeastern Indiana Vocational School in Versailles.

I am proud of this school. It has been established through the cooperative efforts of citizens in seven counties. They have realized that they can act together to develop far better programs in vocational education than they ever could while they acted separately.

I am proud of the students. Their intelligence, their dedication, and their new skills will be an important contribution to the economic development of their counties of southeastern Indiana and the Ninth Congressional District. Without these young people, and those who will follow after them, economic development would be very difficult, perhaps even impossible.

The promise of this school is so great that it has begun to set a remarkable example to other rural areas of Indiana. Evidence of this can be found in a recent editorial of the Bedford, Ind., Daily Times-Mail.

Mr. Speaker, I insert the editorial and my address to the students in the RECORD:

COMMENCEMENT FOR SOUTHEASTERN AREA VOCATIONAL SCHOOL, VERSAILLES, IND.

Vocational education is vitally important to the nation, to Indiana, as well as to your own personal lives.

This afternoon is no ordinary graduation. It may be hard to realize it sitting in a pleasant commencement exercise, in the pleasant Southern Indiana town of Versailles, on a pleasant May afternoon. But this area vocational school, and especially the graduates of this school, are vital parts of the strength, the productivity and the security of this nation.

I can hear you mumbling to yourself now. You are probably saying, "That Congressman has really gone off the deep end this time—saying that vocational education is vital to the security of the nation, and talking about how important it is to the nation."

But in spite of your mumblings, I'll stand my ground and I'll tell you why.

One of the most critical goals of this nation is to enable every American citizen to realize his potential and to utilize it fully in his own and the nation's best interest.

Thomas Wolfe, the great American writer, wrote, "So then to every man his chance, to every man regardless of his birth, his shining, golden opportunity; to every man the right to live, to work, to be himself and to become whatever thing his manhood and his vision can combine to make him. This seeker is the promise of America."

By completing this course of vocational study, you are doing just what he wrote about. You've seized a chance, a golden opportunity. You've exercised your right to become whatever your manhood or womanhood and vision can combine to make. And that as Thomas Wolfe says, is the promise of America.

But it's more than just the promise of America, it is also the strength of America. It is only when men and women from across this broad and vast land are enabled to develop their abilities, their potential that America lives up to its commitment that human beings, individuals, are what really count. And it is only then that America is strong, free and productive.

I do not need to remind you of the enormous productivity of this nation. A new government statistic is that the manufacturing capacity of this nation has doubled since 1951. We have added as much capacity in the last 15 years as we did in the first 150 years of the nation's history.

Whether it is the American farmer producing 70% more per acre than he did in 1940;

Or the American postal worker handling 114,000 pieces each year (by far the best record in the world);

Or the American athlete running a 3 minute 50 second mile or pole vaulting 17 feet;

Or the American inventor turning out some 50,000 patents each year;

Or the American automobile worker producing 10,358,000 (1966) number of cars each year.

The lesson is the same—the American worker is enormously productive. And his productivity is the strength and therefore, the security of the nation.

You are now becoming one of America's productive workers. This should be a measure of personal satisfaction for you. Not all of us are in that category.

The other day my wife and I bought an outdoor grill. It was one of those fancy kinds with wheels, shelves, hooks for your utensils and all the rest. The problem was it came in a box completely disassembled. I'll not burden you with details, but suffice it to say that after two hours work with wheels, nuts, bolts and grills and a miscellaneous assortment of tubular pipes all over the basement floor, I came to the somewhat humiliating conclusion that I was not among that category of productive American workers.

But more seriously, and unfortunately, it is still true that despite our enormous productivity and prosperity, this country has some manpower problems. This is one of the paradoxes of prosperity.

12% of our young people were looking for jobs at the end of 1966.

Minority groups have unemployment rates double the overall rate.

Joblessness runs close to 10% in some slum areas.

During the course of 1966, probably about 10½ million workers suffered some unemployment.

Much of this unemployment occurs not because jobs are unavailable, but because people are unable to fill jobs.

Often the job is one place and the worker another place.

Sometimes the job calls for a special skill, the unemployed person does not have it.

Sometimes the employer insists on a high school diploma. The job seeker quit school.

Sometimes the employer demands a clean record and the applicant's record is marred by juvenile arrest.

Sometimes a job offers one day's work a week and a worker needs five days to support his family.

One of the problems, then, of our economy is this imbalance between the kinds of jobs there are and the skills of people who are available to take these jobs.

And this is why vocational education is so important to the nation. It helps to right the balance, to assure that skilled people are available to fill specified jobs. Frankly, I don't think we pay enough attention across the nation to this problem and the contribution vocational education can make toward solving it. Too little attention is paid to the 2 out of 3 people who do not go to college and the many others who do not finish college.

I hope, then, you are beginning to see why this vocational education area school is so important, why these teachers, administrators and participating school districts are playing such a vital role.

Let me put the task of vocational education to you in hard statistics.

Over 2 million people leave school with no more than high school education.

About 400,000 at most have a marketable skill. Now that leaves a million six hundred thousand people each year who must learn a skill. The conclusion must be that our educational system in America must move toward a system that will prepare the great majority more effectively for work. That's precisely the task that vocational education seeks to do.

Now we've been thinking about the broad national view. Let's think a little bit about Southern Indiana. All of us want to see Southern Indiana grow and prosper and develop. Ask the men and the women in the 17 counties of the 9th Congressional District, "What does your community need most?" Many will reply, "Industrial development."

My friends, there will be no industrial development in the 17 counties of the 9th District without skilled people. Vocational education is needed in Southern Indiana if we are to forge ahead or even to keep pace, in the decade of the 70's.

The years ahead are not going to be easy for Indiana. Industrial development is tied more and more to technology and science. I'll make a little wager with you. If you'll show me the state or communty that is today pouring vast resources into technology and science, then I will show you the state or community with a bright future in industrial development.

Indiana has made a remarkable transition from a purely agricultural economy to an industrial and agricultural economy. The question is now, whether Indiana will move ahead aggressively into science-based industries while maintaining and developing the health of our present basic industries.

Our leadership in the state must not falter in planning and providing for the vocational, technical, and scientific education for a growing industrial economy, hopefully moving toward a scientific economy.

Now this challenge is a formidable one. For this school cannot teach every occupation. It must emphasize those skills broadly representative of several occupational areas. Students must recognize that they will work four or five occupational areas in a life-time. And they must learn the essential skills that can be found in all job areas regardless of shifts to different occupational areas within the economy. It makes no sense to teach key punch operations in a vocational school when data processing is developing in the economy.

Southern Indiana will only grow as this school, educators and industrialists stay alert to the shifting occupational demands of a space age economy.

Vocational education is of great importance not only to the nation and state, but also to you.

Not long ago a young man who had just completed vocational education wrote a letter to me. He said, "The things I have learned are many and opportunities like these are few. I feel proud to have participated in this class. The things I have learned will not leave me after this school ends but will stay with me to build a better future for my family."

The plaque which hangs in this school expresses the same thought, perhaps more eloquently, "The doors shall be open to anyone who sincerely wants, needs and can profit from vocational and technical instruction so that our people will have the opportunity to become equipped with saleable skills, become gainfully employed, make a positive contribution to society and lead more useful and satisfying lives.

That's what we are all working for—an assurance that you, and hundreds who follow after you, will be equipped with marketable skills and able to make a positive contribution to society by leading useful and satisfying lives. Vocational education enables you to unlock your own potential. This is one of the great blessings in life—a sure sense of your own usefulness.

Fortunately, communities, people, governments are becoming aware of the importance of vocational education. Enrollments in vocational education courses have increased to more than 6 million in 1966, almost double the number enrolled in the previous years. The number of vocational education schools increased from 405 in 1966 to 756 in 1967. But with the great number of young people coming onto the labor market in the years ahead, we must constantly search to find better ways to reach and train them, for their benefit and the benefit of our state and nation.

Progress in vocational education and manpower is not the kind of thing you read about in the papers too much. Progress in this area are quiet victories. But each day victories are being won. We count 48 such victories today as the graduates step forward to receive their certificates.

This progress, these victories, come about because like-minded people in Southern Indiana have worked together for constructive purposes.

This school is a marvelous illustration of cooperative effort. The 7 counties that participate in this area vocational school were not big enough by themselves to have a large school, sponsoring a broad program of vocational education. But what they could not do individually, they have been able to do cooperatively.

This area vocational school serves as the vocational education department for several high schools. The participating school districts own property jointly and contribute money for its operation with a special levy. Now that's cooperation for a constructive purpose.

But that's not all of the cooperation. Business and industry have cooperated with this school. Advisory committees have been set to advise on the curriculum of the school to assure that the training young men, young women and some older ones too, get here will be needed in this area.

State, local and federal governments have worked together too in this creative partnership.

Now I know that there have been plenty of problems. I've had to involve myself in a few of them, just as many of you have. We also know there will be some more. But human beings are problem solvers—that's their most remarkable talent. And the overwhelming fact today is that this school is here, teachers are teaching, students are learning and all of us are the beneficiaries. All these things because like-minded people have worked together so you and those that follow, will become equipped with skills, will become gainfully employed, will make a positive contribution to society and will lead useful and satisfying lives.

It's worth all the effort, isn't it? Congratulations to all of you who have made it so.

[From the Bedford (Ind.) Daily Times-Mail, May 27, 1967]

VOCATIONAL SCHOOL

Congressman Lee Hamilton makes a strong point for the proposed new North Lawrence vocational school in a speech prepared for delivery tomorrow at the Area Vocational Educational School at Versailles.

The proposed new vocational school here will be part of a new high school and will provide facilities which until recently were found only in large cities. The school corporation already has approximately $300,000 in federal money to help pay for the vocational school.

In his prepared address, Hamilton says that vocational education is vitally important to the nation, to the state and in the personal lives of the students.

"By completing this course of vocational study," he said, "you are doing just what he (Thomas Wolfe) wrote about. You've seized a chance, a golden opportunity. You've exercised your right to become whatever your manhood or womanhood and vision can combine to make. And that is the promise of America."

The congressman said that vocational education is so important because it helps to right the balance, to assure that skilled people are available to fill specific jobs. "Frankly," he said, "I don't think we pay enough attention across the nation to this problem and the contribution vocational education can make toward solving it. Too little attention is paid to two out of three people who do not go to college and the many others who do not finish college."

Over two million people leave high school each year with no plans to go on to higher education. About 400,000 at most have a marketable skill. That leaves 1,600,000 each year who must learn a skill.

The Versailles school is apparently something akin to the one proposed near Bedford. Seven counties participate in the school and none of the seven was big enough to do the job by itself. What they could not do individually is being accomplished cooperatively.

While the North Lawrence vocational school will be strictly a project of this school corporation, facilities of the school will be open to transfers from other school corporations.

The school should be a great asset to this area. It should do much toward helping to keep high school graduates at home by training them for jobs in local industry. And with first-class training facilities available in the school system, prospective industries will no doubt give this careful consideration in their selection of plant sites.

Financier Chinn Ho Wins "Salesman of Year" Award in Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1967

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, the accolade of "1966 salesman of the year" has been justifiably bestowed on a distinguished citizen of Hawaii, Mr. Chinn Ho, of Honolulu.

President Lee Gray of the Hawaii Chapter of Sales & Marketing Executives-International, presented a plaque, and a unique framed cartoon drawn by the Honolulu Advertiser's Harry Lyons, depicting many of the highlights of the well-known financier's career, to Mr. Ho at recent ceremonies at the Royal Hawaiian Hotel.

In citing Mr. Ho as he joined the select circle of previous winners as the 10th recipient of the award, Mr. Porter Dickinson, publisher of the Honolulu Star-Bulletin, said of Mr. Ho:

> He is a great salesman whose interests in the State go far beyond any personnel reasons . . . he has great faith in Hawaii, is enthusiastic and has spread the word of Hawaii not only through the Mainland, but to the Orient.

This enthusiasm and faith in the dynamic growth of the 50th State is reflected in Mr. Ho's remarks upon acceptance of the award as he pointed to the even greater acceleration forecast for the future of Hawaii "not only in feeling the 'Aloha' spirit, but in keeping with the advances in communication and science." Mr. Ho commented:

> I am certain the future of Hawaii will be greater and greater than before.

Much credit for the dynamic growth of our State goes to outstanding citizens like Mr. Chinn Ho, and I join his many friends in extending congratulations on this well-deserved recognition as "salesman of the year."

I believe my colleagues in the House will find of interest the article about the awards ceremony by Reporter Wallace Willis which appeared in the Friday, May 26, 1967, issue of the Honolulu Advertiser, and for this reason I submit the article for inclusion in the RECORD:

CHINN HO NAMED SALESMAN OF YEAR

(By Wallace Willis)

Financier Chinn Ho has been named the 1966 Salesman of the Year by the Hawaii Chapter of Sales & Marketing Executives-International.

He became the 10th recipient of the award at a black tie dinner last night in the Royal Hawaiian Hotel.

Ho was presented a plaque as well as a framed cartoon, drawn by The Advertiser's Harry Lyons, which depicts some of the highlights of Ho's career. Lyons' cartoons honoring each year's winner have become a traditional part of the annual ceremonies.

Lee Gray, president of the local chapter of the Sales and Marketing Executives, made the presentation.

In introducing Ho to the large audience, Porter Dickinson, publisher of the Star-Bulletin, described Ho as "a great salesman whose interests in the State go far beyond any personal reasons."

Dickinson said Ho has "great faith in Hawaii, is enthusiastic and has spread the word of Hawaii not only throughout the Mainland, but to the Orient."

In accepting the award, Ho recalled that "it was only about 10 years ago that Hawaii witnessed an extraordinary breakthrough in its economy."

With even greater acceleration forecast for the years ahead, Ho said that "the main spring of this favorable trend is the success in sales and marketing of Hawaii as the place to visit."

This, he added, is "not only in feeling the 'Ahoha' spirit, but in keeping with the advances in communication and science."

Because of "such dynamic economic growth," Ho continued, "the responsibility rests heavily on our leadership here to exert effort to sell imaginative planning—with emphasis on quality."

Ho has been the spokesman for the Diamond Head Improvement Assn. which has been urging hotel-apartment development of an area at the base of Diamond Head.

Ho told his audience in the Regency Room that "you will agree with me that the program befitting to Hawaii for the future and in balance with tourism lies in the area of science, culture and education."

In marketing a program to attract the leaders and the brains of the world, "particularly of the Pacific," to Hawaii, he said the key to success is "motivation."

"The challenge is here and I am confident you and the leaders in Hawaii are equal to this challenge," he concluded.

Departing from his prepared text, Ho described himself as "more bullish today than ever before" about Hawaii.

"What we think is high-priced today will be relatively cheap in another 10 years," Ho said of land prices in the State.

Turning to the pessimism of the younger generation today, Ho commented: "I am certain the future of Hawaii will be greater and greater than before."

Previous winners of the award have been Police Chief Dan Liu, former Gov. William F. Quinn, Henry J. Kaiser, Duke Kahanamoku, Webley Edwards, Rev. Abraham K. Akaka, Advertiser columnist Bob Krauss, Mayor Neal S. Blaisdell and Dr. Thomas H. Hamilton, president of the University of Hawaii.

Among guests at the presentation last night were Mr. and Mrs. L. Kingsley Skellerup of Christchurch, N.Z. He is vice president of the Pacific region for Sales & Marketing Executives—International.

Why Our Nation Must Explore the Possibility of Adopting the Metric System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 5, 1967

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, last week, after years of agonizing discussions, frequently punctuated by periods when it appeared that unbridgeable chasms existed between our Nation and the other countries participating in the GATT talks, an agreement was reached providing for the substantial reduction of tariffs between the world's developed nations.

Although there has been a general reluctance to impute too much to this monumental agreement, it is surely safe to suggest that even the most conservative isolationist would concede that the significant reductions achieved will eventually spell sizable increase in world trade. How substantial? No one knows and few dare estimate. Nonetheless, it is clear that marked progress has been made in facilitating international commerce.

As President Johnson pointed out:

> The barriers that fell at Geneva clear the way for great advances in trade.

Yet the great success at Geneva makes ironical the fact that our Nation has been so slow in taking the concomitant steps needed to assure it an increasing share of the world markets which will be opened. I make specific reference to a small yet very important study for which my able colleague, Congressman GEORGE P. MILLER, has called. This investigation is embodied in H.R. 3136, which is now pending action by the Rules Committee. H.R. 3136 would "authorize the Secretary of Commerce to make a study to determine the advantages and disadvantages of increased use of the metric system in the United States."

"What," you might ask, "has a bill to authorize a study to determine the feasibility of increased use of the metric system to do with increased trade?" Over 90 percent of the world's nations have in use or are in the process of adopting the metric system as their official standard of measurement. Many of these same countries have made the use of the inch-pound, the English system, illegal. More directly related to the query is the fact that in nearly all of the world's developed nations—France, Italy, Japan, Germany, and England, yes, even the nation which originated our current system—have adopted or are in the process of adopting the metric system. If our Nation's industries are to compete effectively in world markets, if our goods are to be serviced overseas, if, in short, we are to take full advantage of the favorable trade climate made possible by the successful Kennedy round discussions, we must begin moving toward the adoption of the metric system.

The economic benefits which would accrue to our Nation should we adopt this system are so significant that we cannot consider further delay in acting favorably on this piece of legislation. It was estimated, over a year ago, that the acceptance by our Nation of the metric system would increase by $10 billion the amount of our annual foreign sales. Exports last year totaled less than $30 billion. The extent to which this amount would be multiplied by the reduction of tariff barriers has not been estimated. However, there can be little doubt that the increase would be significantly in excess of the earlier estimate. This potential increase, in exports of over one-third, and the substantial benefits accruing therefrom are highly significant. The value of this increased activity would benefit American business, industry, and labor. In addition, it could be an important contributing factor to the amelioration of our increasingly critical balance-of-payments problem. These substantial benefits would warrant a sizable expenditure of funds should this be necessary. However, no such significant expenditure of funds is called for by H.R. 3136. The bill authorizes a first-year appropriation of only a half million dollars. In my view, these funds and the underpining that they will provide for the possible adoption of the metric system may well represent the best investment that this Congress can make in the future growth and development of our country's economic vitality.

There have been many charges that the conversion to the metric system would be so vastly expensive that it should not be considered. I counter on two fronts. First, by asking the rhetorical question: Can we afford not to consider adopting the system? In this vein, I would only point to the great potential markets that we exclude from ourselves by using the incompatible "English" system. Second, I submit that no convincing evidence has been prepared to document the cost of the transition. No one has established, to my knowledge, that machines have a "preference" for making parts only on the "English" system. The record is clear that the study proposed in H.R. 3136 would explore this dimension of the problem. Surely the existing evidence, sketchy as it is, is not sufficient to support a conclusive finding, especially when the benefits appear so great and for less money than our Government spends annually for measuring devices, we can fully explore the potential costs and benefits arising from the implementation of the metric system.

In concluding, I wish to reemphasize my view that this important bill, H.R. 3136, should be enacted promptly so that progress can be made in fully exploring the implications of adopting the metric system.

Economic Aid in Foreign Assistance Act of 1967 Is Only One-third of 1 Percent of GNP

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 25, 1967

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, a former Member of this House from Wisconsin, Andrew J. Biemiller, recently pointed out that the economic aid request of $3.1 billion for the next fiscal year is only one-third of 1 percent of our gross national product. This contrasts with almost five times as great a proportion of our GNP for foreign aid in 1949.

Mr. Biemiller, who is now the legislative director of the AFL–CIO, made this statement in presenting the AFL–CIO position to the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. Since I believe all of us would like the opportunity to consider the testimony, under unanimous consent,

Mr. Speaker, I include the text in the Record, as follows:

Statement by Andrew J. Biemiller, Director, Department of Legislation, American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, to the House Committee on Foreign Affairs on Foreign Aid

Mr. Chairman, my name is Andrew J. Biemiller. I am Director of the Department of Legislation of the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations. I am here today to reiterate the support of the AFL–CIO for our nation's foreign aid program in general and to express our support for the foreign aid authorization legislation proposed by President Johnson for fiscal 1968.

The AFL–CIO Executive Council on February 26, 1967 declared:

"In the present international situation, overseas aid is an indispensable part of our nation's foreign policy for preserving world peace, promoting freedom and fostering economic progress based on social justice.

"In this recognition, the AFL–CIO urges Congress to give prompt and overwhelming support to President Johnson's proposal for $3.1 billion in new funds for 1968 foreign aid.

"The President reflects the viewpoint of the overwhelming majority of the American people in calling on the countries devoted to peace, democracy and human well-being for maximum cooperation in helping the developing nations achieve freedom from hunger, tyranny and war. Such concerted efforts would be a boon to all mankind and additionally they would strengthen the recipient nations' social base against subversion by Communists and other reactionary forces and thus tend to discourage aggressive adventurers endangering world peace.

"The Executive Council rejects the notion that the Foreign Aid program is a wasteful give-away or policy of futile philanthropy. Though comparatively prosperous, our own country has a better chance of attaining broadly-based stable prosperity in a peaceful world not weighed down by impoverishment, ignorance, illness and dictatorship."

The current economic aid request of $3.1 billion amounts to only one third of one percent of our gross national product. This is in sharp contrast to our foreign aid program in the late 1940's. In 1949 we were putting 1.5 percent of our GNP into foreign aid—almost five times the proportion of our GNP that we are now putting into foreign aid.

The AFL–CIO Executive Council has declared that this nation should have "an annual foreign aid authorization at least equal to one percent of the gross national product." The Executive Council says that "An authorization of one percent of GNP would be a realistic response to the President's admonition that 'in the long run, the wealthy nations cannot survive on islands of abundance in a world of hunger, sickness, and despair'."

As the Executive Council points out, "aid to the new nations is a more complex and difficult process. It will take longer to realize the fruits of our assistance programs and to attain decisive results in the industrially under-developed areas. It takes more time, effort and greater outside assistance to help the emerging nations develop the necessary modern social, economic and cultural changes and institutions.

"There is no other way to help these peoples achieve industrialization and modernization without repeating the tragic cost in human exploitation and degradation incurred by the industrial revolution in western Europe and by the forced industrialization and collectivization in the Communist countries. . . .

"The AFL–CIO has always insisted that our country's AID program should be directed and administered in such a way as to help the growth of democratic institutions, like free trade unions and cooperatives, in the less developed countries.

"We are proud of the role the AFL–CIO and organizations like the American Institute for Free Labor Development and the African-American Labor Center have played in this work and we intend that it shall be continued and expanded."

We would like to mention some of the specific activities and accomplishments of the AIFLD and the AALC.

In Latin America the AIFLD, since 1961, has supported several thousand educational courses in trade unionism and more than 100 social projects to strengthen free trade unions so that they can better represent the interests of the workers.

More than 500 Latin American labor leaders have graduated from the advanced training school in Front Royal, Virginia during the past five years.

More than 60,000 trade unionists have graduated from evening weekend, and month-long courses given at AIFLD centers in Latin America.

A new AIFLD program—training in labor economics at the graduate school level in the United States—recently graduated 15 Latin American trade unionists who will set up research offices and training programs in their own unions in Latin America.

The effectiveness of this AIFLD education program can best be judged by the number of graduates who stay in the labor movement after their training. More than 80 percent of these trade unionists are still actively working to preserve free, democratic trade unions in Latin American countries and in English-speaking Caribbean countries..

Social projects such housing, credit and savings associations, vocational schools, and medical facilities strengthen free trade unions by showing progress attainable through unionism. In five years, about 7,500 housing units have been completed with a total financing of over $34 million. AIFLD has plans for more than 6,000 more units in nine countries.

In Peru a worker's savings and loan association has attracted more than 7,800 depositors and $2 million in savings in three years of operation. These savings have helped finance about 500 homes.

AIFLD is active also in rural areas working with "campesino" unions in Northern Brazil, Central America, Colombia and many other countries. Three rural service centers have been built in Brazil and one is being developed in Colombia. These centers are focal points for community action, vocational instruction, union activities, health services and literacy training.

Success with AIFLD in Latin America encouraged the AFL–CIO to start a similar effort for Africa. In 1965 the African-American Labor Center was established by the AFL–CIO.

We are fully aware that the social and economic problems of workers and unions in the newly emerging countries of Africa are quite different from South America, but our objective is the same—the development of a strong free democratic labor movement as a vital force for social, economical and political development.

The AALC, still in its infancy, is helping workers in 13 different African countries. AALC projects include job training and education for workers, medical clinics, cooperatives and housing.

We believe the AALC is making an urgently needed contribution to the development of free democratic trade unionism in Africa in a manner parallel to the AIFLD operation. We urge the strong support of this committee for both these programs.

These two programs fully accord with the intent of Title IX of the Foreign Assistance Act. This title calls for "Utilization of Democratic Institutions in Development." The importance of Latin American and African labor unions and labor leadership cannot be downgraded or underestimated. This view lies behind our support for the African-American Labor Center and for AIFLD. But obviously the AIFLD and the AALC need expanding AID support.

For this reason we regret that the portion of AID technical cooperation funds going to labor projects has been so small. Figures now available for fiscal 1966 show a decline in the share of world-wide technical assistance grants for labor projects from 1.8 percent in fiscal 1965 down to 1.32 percent in fiscal 1966.

In Latin America, labor projects received only 4.6 percent of technical assistance grants in 1965 and 1966. In Africa, labor projects received a mere 0.6 percent of the technical assistance grants. This very low percentage indicates a lack of appreciation of the role of labor in Africa today.

We believe the allocation of AID technical assistance funds should reflect the importance of labor unions in Latin America and Africa. Therefore, we urge this Committee to direct AID to allocate a larger share of its technical assistance funds for labor projects.

Last year your Committee declared that "the portion of technical assistance going to labor is small in proportion to the role it is generally agreed labor must play in democratic development." The portion is still too low. We hope this Committee will again express its views to AID on this subject.

The President has requested a world-wide technical assistance authorization of $243 million for fiscal 1968 with $100 million for Latin America and $91 million for Africa. In line with our support for technical assistance generally and for labor projects financed with technical assistance funds, we urge this Committee to approve the full amount requested by the President for technical assistance.

In connection with Africa, the "Labor Impact Fund," is essential to AALC work in Africa. This fund, which consists of contributions by AID, as well as by the AFL–CIO, enables the AALC to implement projects throughout Africa with only Ambassador's or Mission Director's approval, and without the necessity for time-consuming red tape. At present, this fund is completely committed and we request the Committee to instruct AID to increase its size in order to permit an expanded use of this excellent mechanism.

A similar and equally important aspect of our foreign assistance program which has not received sufficient attention by AID is the Special Development Activities Fund administered by every AID mission director. The money in this fund, which is supported solely by AID, is channeled directly to private groups in developing countries. It gives us a chance to provide an immediate demonstration of programs while greater and more time-consuming projects are in the mill. Your Committee strongly supported this fund last year, and we urge that you again emphasize the high potential of these projects.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, let me repeat a point we have made before to this Committee. As our AFL–CIO Executive Committee has said:

"Over the years, some mistakes have been made in conceiving AID programs and administering them. Experience has to be gained and errors have to be corrected. The AID program now proposed by the President has had the advantage of two decades of experience behind it—experience under Republican and Democratic Administrations.

"On this basis, the Executive Council welcomes the President's proposal 'to provide the continuity needed for sound management' by requesting 'authorizations covering two years'."

Let me make it clear that we strongly support longer authorization of funds. Indeed, we believe a five-year authorization is reasonable and desirable. We urge that this

Committee approve at least a two-year authorization for our foreign aid program.

We also support the President's request for authorization to establish a "National Advisory Committee on Self Help" which will consist of members from both parties, from the business community, from labor, from universities and from other walks of life. We believe such a committee can make a valuable contribution to our foreign aid program.

To us the Administration's foreign aid proposals appear very sound, and therefore we urge passage of the 1967 Foreign Assistance Act. We are ready to do our part in the aid program, and the specific recommendations we have made in this testimony, if adopted, will allow us to act more effectively in our particular portion of this total effort which is so vital to the progress of the developing areas and the peace of mankind.

Mr. Chairman, I respectfully request that the AFL-CIO Executive Council Statement of February 26, 1967, "Overseas Aid," be included in the record at the conclusion of my testimony. I thank you for this opportunity to present the views of the AFL-CIO.

The Dilemma of Two Wars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. MURPHY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 6, 1967

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, the recent outbreak of war in the Middle East carries special significance for the United States. Our commitments in the Middle East are no less important than those in Vietnam. In a very excellent and searching editorial in the Albany Times Union, Tom Wicker, of the New York Times, evaluates this difficult situation as it relates to possible courses of action open to the United States. I urge all of the Members to read this excellent editorial:

Two Wars Pose Dilemma for Johnson

(By Tom Wicker)

WASHINGTON—The combination of war in the Middle East on top of war in Vietnam leaves President Johnson in a considerable dilemma. It is no wonder, therefore, that the administration is concentrating its efforts at the moment on finding a United Nations formula that will produce a quick ceasefire between Israel and the Arab nations.

The presumptive evidence, at least, is that the Israelis launched the actual fighting but even that much may never be totally clear; and it can be argued that from the moment Nasser of Egypt closed the Gulf of Aqaba to Israel was inevitable in the absence of a political solution to the crisis thus precipitated. The identity of the real "aggressor" therefore is by no means selfevident.

What seems most likely is that Israel having no faith in the likelihood of UN action, seeing little evidence that the maritime powers including United States were prepared to force open the gulf, and confronted by an usually militant ring of Arab states that had been unified and encouraged by Nasser's coup, decided to act for itself.

The dilemma this produced for President Johnson is that in any situation short of the impending destruction of Israel, he is not well situated to assist her; yet, to leave Israel isolated in a way her supporters in this country will view as one for her survival will be politically difficult.

ANOTHER FRONT DOESN'T APPEAL

With a major war already on his hands in Vietnam, and with its casualty lists growing longer, the President will not be eager to put American troops into action on another front. Already, as a result of Vietnam and the Dominican Republic, he has been accused of resorting to force too casually. Americans alarmed and uneasy by the Vietnamese stalemate will certainly not welcome another engagement of their sons and their national strength.

Moreover, as a consequence of the vast Vietnamese effort that has grown from the Tonkin Gulf Resolution of 1964, Congress is extremely wary. Congressional sanction for action in the Middle East for any purpose but to save Israel from destruction would be hard to achieve.

Since the destruction of Israel is not an immediate threat, the President therefore has concentrated on trying to arrange an immediate ceasefire. Even the neutral stance this requires, however, is politically difficult.

Israel's supporters can already point out that despite American pledges and commitments to Israel—which are more numerous and more specific than any ever given to South Vietnam—the administration was unable to achieve a political solution to the Aqaba crisis; it was unable to arrange an effective multination challenge to Nasser's control of the Strait of Tiran; and is showed little willingess to act along to assert Israel's claim to innocent passage.

ONE CALLED NECESSITY NOT THE OTHER

Thus, on the one hand, the administration presents its war in Vietnam as necessary to honor its commitments and as one for the protection of a small nation from aggression; but on the other it has not met the demands of Israel's supporters that it take the same attitude in the Middle East. They are likely to feel that the war is a result and the longer it goes on the more they will demand that the administration do as much in the Middle East as it has done in Southeast Asia.

This is not merely a domestic political problem for the President, although Jewish voting strength is concentrated in those states with the largest electoral vote totals—which happen also to be the states in which Johnson is the deepest political difficulties already—New York, for instance.

It will also diminish his ability to maintain support for the war in Vietnam. It will be hard to make a claim that commitments have to be honored and that small nations have to be protected from aggression if the administration, having failed to prevent war in the Middle East, finds itself unable or unwilling to assist the Israelis.

Israel may prove, of course, that it does not need help to win its fight. But in that event, the danger of some form of Soviet assistance to the Arabs would become acute, and would confront the administration with new demands to back Israel.

Even a quick ceasefire offers only a breathing space, not a real resolution of the dilemma. A truce would only make it necessary once again to seek a political solution to a crisis that already has defied any but a military settlement.

Proposed Change in Patent Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 6, 1967

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced in this Congress H.R. 7454, which, if enacted, would revise and update our patent laws. Inasmuch as this legislation is very technical in its provisions, I have had the following fact sheet prepared, summarizing the changes proposed by my legislation and comparing these amendments with both the present laws and H.R. 5924, an alternate proposal for revision:

Changes Made in Title 35 of the United States Code, "Patents", By H.R. 7454 and H.R. 5924 of the 90th Congress, Two Recodifications of This Title

PART I

§ *1 and 2.* Neither bill makes any change with respect to these sections, establishing the Patent Office as part of the Department of Commerce and providing it with a seal to be used for the authentication of its documents.

§ *3.* Both bills increase the authorized maximum number of examiners-in-chief from 15 to 24. Both bills continue the provision for the appointment of the commissioner by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. Both bills transfer the power of appointment of assistant commissioners and examiners-in-chief from the President to the Secretary of Commerce upon nomination of the Commissioner of Patents. Both bills fix the maximum salary of assistant commissioners at that provided for Grade 18 in the General Schedule of positions referred to in Section 5104 of Title V of the United States Code.

§ *4.* Both bills continue the existing restrictions on officers and employees obtaining an interest in patents.

§ *5.* Both bills continue existing bonding provisions.

§ *6.* Both bills subject all regulations issued by the Commissioner of Patents to the approval of the Secretary of Commerce. At the present time only regulations pertaining to the conduct of proceedings are specifically subject to approval of the Secretary of Commerce.

§ *7.* H.R. 5924 in addition to continuing the present provisions of the code extends the jurisdiction of the Board of Appeals to cover, review or consideration of actions pertaining to re-examinations of published applications, as provided in section 136 which is added to the Code by this bill, and review or considera- of actions pertaining to the validity of a claim in an issued patent, as provided for in section 257 added to the Code by this bill. And, this bill also transfers to the Board of Appeals the functions of the boards of patent interferences.

H.R. 7454 makes no change in this section of the Code.

§ *8.* Neither bill makes any change which affects the establishment of the Patent Office Library.

§ *9.* Both bills modify the authority in reclassification of patents to spell out authority to classify published specifications of United States patents, and of scientific and technical information to facilitate the determination of the novelty of inventions.

§ *10.* Both bills rewrite the provision for supplying certified copies of the records of the Patent Office, to require specifically the payment of a fee and to limit the supplying of certified copies to persons entitled thereto. There is no definition to to who are "persons entitled thereto".

§ *11.* Both bills extend the publication authority of the Commissioner to allow publication of: patent abstracts, indexes of published applications and applicants, classification manuals and indexes of the classifications of patents, and the trademark laws. H.R. 5924 also adds to the publication authority the right to publish applications and patents. Both bills delete the authority of the Commissioner to exchange the Official Gazette, the annual indexes of patents and trademarks, the annual decisions in patent and trademark cases and pamphlet copies of the laws and regulations for publications desirable for use in the Patent Office.

§ *12.* Both bills delete this section which authorizes the exchange of copies of patents with foreign countries and add the provision as subsection (d) to rewritten section 41. H.R. 5924 substitutes a new section 12 which imposes upon the Commissioner the duty to conduct a program of research and development to expedite the handling of patent research and the duty, in consultation with the Advisory Council, to conduct studies of the needs and effectiveness of the patent system. H.R. 7454 imposes only the first of these duties.

§ *13.* Both bills delete this section, authorizing the supplying of public libraries with printed copies of specifications and drawings of patents.

§ *14.* Both bills delete this section requiring the Commissioner to make an annual report to Congress.

§ *15.* H.R. 5924 establishes an Advisory Council on patents of between 12 and 14 persons selected from public sectors affected by the patent system to study and evaluate the patent system.

§ *21.* Neither bill makes any change with respect to taking action or paying a fee when a due date falls on Saturday, Sunday, or a holiday.

§ *22.* Neither bill makes any change in the requirement as to the printing or typewriting of papers to be filed in the Patent Office.

§ *23.* Neither bill makes any change in the requirement as to the taking of affidavits and depositions in patent cases.

§ *24.* Neither bill changes the provisions covering the subpeonaing of witnesses in contested patent cases.

§ *25.* Both bills continue the present provisions of subsections (a) and (b) as subsections (b) and (c) and insert as a new subsection (a) a provision spelling out who may administer oaths and how their authority may be approved in language practically identical with that now in section 115 of the present Code.

§ *26.* Both bills continue the provision of this section authorizing the Commissioner to accept provisionally defectively executed documents.

§ *31.* Both bills continue this section of the Code, which allows the Commissioner, subject to approval by the Secretary of Commerce, to prescribe rules and regulations for governing recognition and conduct of agents and attorneys.

§ *32.* Both bills restate the provisions of the Code covering the suspension or exclusion of persons, agents, and attorneys from practice before the Patent Office.

§ *33.* Both bills continue the provisions of this section of the Code which imposes penalty for unauthorized representation as a practitioner.

§ *41.* H.R. 5924 rewrites this section, which at the present time fixes definite fees, so as to allow the Commissioner to prescribe fees by regulations which will in effect provide an overall recovery in the range of 65 to 75 percentum of the costs of the operation of the Patent Office. H.R. 5924 also adds a subsection (d) which is the provision formally carried as section 12 of the Code, which this bill deletes. H.R. 7454 restates the existent fees and adds the provision of the delted section 12 as subsection (d). The wording starting with the word "special" on line 5 of page 9 and ending with the word "year" on line 7 of page 9 should be deleted from H.R. 7454, because of the previous deletion of section 13.

§ *42.* Both bills continue this section which provides for the deposit of fees in the Treasury and permits refunds of overpayments of fees.

PART II

§ *100.* Both bills continue the present definition of "invention", "process", "United States", and "patentee". Both bills add to the definitions, the term "applicant" to mean any person who has filed an application for a patent as provided in Title 35. H.R. 5924 further defines the term "effective filing date" to include, when used in reference to a complete application for patent, the filing date to which such application or the subject matter of any claim thereof, may be entitled under Section 119 (which pertains to benefits of early filing date in a foreign country) or under Section 120 (which pertains to benefits of early filing date in the United States). H.R. 5924 also provides that a complete application or the resulting patent may contain separate claims for subject matter having different effective dates.

§ *101.* Both bills extend the right to obtain a patent to successors in title of the inventor or the discoverer.

§ *102.* H.R. 7454 restates the provisions of the Code. H.R. 5924 rewrites the section to provide that a person shall not be entitled to a patent if prior to the effective filing date of the application the subject matter: was known to the public; had been disclosed in tangible form; had been in public use or on sale; had been disclosed in a published United States application or patent having a prior effective filing date unless the applicant is the same person as the prior applicant.

§ *103.* H.R. 5924 fixes the date for controlling the denial of a patent because of the obviousness thereof to a person having ordinary skill in the art as of the filing date of the application. H.R. 7454 continues the Code provision which fixes the date at the time the invention was made.

§ *104.* H.R. 5924 deletes this section of the Code which limits the establishment of a date of invention abroad to procedures under Section 119, and which entitles a person domiciled in the United States and serving in a foreign country on behalf of the United States to the same right of priority with respect to an invention made abroad as if the invention were made in the United States. H.R. 7454 continues this section as it is in the Code.

§ *105.* H.R. 5924 adds this new section to the Code to provide that a public disclosure of subject matter concerning an invention made less than six months prior to the date of filing a complete application shall not bar issuance of patent if such information was derived from the inventor and the disclosure was in violation of an obligation not to disclose. This section also authorizes the Commissioner to establish procedures for determinations hereunder which determinations in favor of an inventor shall not be subject to direct judicial review. H.R. 7454 does not add this section.

Both bills add a section to provide that computer programs are not patentable. H.R. 5924 (§106) and H.R. 7454 (§105).

§ *111.* Both bills amend the Code section to authorize the owner of an invention to make application for a patent. And both bills require that the application by the owner shall include a statement of the facts supporting the allegation of ownership. Neither bill changes the required contents of an application. H.R. 5924 adds three subsections to this section of the Code: (c) permitting the filing of a preliminary application; (d) providing that the omission of an inventor's name without deceptive intent may be corrected; and (e) providing that published abstract of the technical disclosures of a complete application shall not be used to determine or interpret the scope of the invention claimed.

§ *112.* Neither bill changes this provision of the Code pertaining to what must be contained in the specification.

§ *113.* Neither bill changes the requirement for supplying drawings.

§ *114.* The provisions as to models and specimens are not changed by either bill.

§ *115.* Both bills amend this section of the Code, pertaining to the oath so as to provide for the making of oaths when the applicant is other than the inventor.

§ *116.* Both bills amend this section, pertaining to joint inventors, to permit publication of an application when a joint inventor is omitted in the application.

§ *117.* Neither bill changes this Code provision authorizing applications by legal representatives of deceased or incapacitated inventors.

§ *118.* Both bills authorize the filing of an application by a person other than the inventor when oath and assignment cannot be obtained and when necessary to preserve the rights of the parties.

§*119.* H.R. 5924 gives the benefit of an earlier filing date in a foreign country to any person, his predecessor or successor in title who has filed a complete application instead of as provided in the Code to any person, his legal representative or assign who has filed an application for a patent. It also deletes these Code provisions: that a patent hereunder shall not be granted if the invention had been patented or described in a printed publication in any country more than a year prior to filing of application in the United States; that the invention had been in public use or on sale in the United States; that priority rights based on a subsequent regularly filed application shall not be entitled to priority rights if the first application was laid open to public inspection. Further, the bill provides that no right to priority hereunder shall be given unless the applicant makes claim therefor at the time the complete application is filed and complies with any regulation prescribed by the Commissioner. As now provided in the Code, no right to priority shall be granted unless the applicant makes claim therefor and files within six months of the application's filing date certified copies of the original foreign application, specifications and drawings along with the translation of any papers filed in connection therewith if so required by the Commissioner. H.R. 7454 amends this section to shorten the time provided by the Code for filing certified copies of the original foreign application, specifications and drawings required to obtain priority emanating from an earlier filing date in a foreign country.

§ *120.* H.R. 5924 provides that a complete application for patent shall have the benefit of an earlier filing date in a preliminary application filed not more than one year previously and the benefit of an earlier filing date of a prior complete application including any benefits therein from an earlier date in a preliminary application thereto of foreign filing. The requirements as to the same inventor, the making of claims, and the filing of foreign application and so forth of the previous application are not materially changed from the provisions of the Code. H.R. 7454 is the same as the Code provisions.

§ *121.* Both bills delete this Code provision which provides that a patent issued as the result of a requirement for restriction shall not be used as a reference in the Patent Office or the Courts against a divisional application or the original application if the divisional application is filed before the issuance of a patent on the other application.

§ *122.* This provision of the Code as to confidential status of an application is not changed by either bill.

§ *123.* This is a new section added by H.R. 5924 to the Code to provide that a pending complete application shall be published as soon as practical after the earliest effective filing date claim but not less than 18 months nor more than 24 months thereafter. H.R. 7454 does not add this section.

§ *131.* Both bills are the same as the Code with the exception that H.R. 5924 provides that the examination shall be made of the "complete" application.

§ *132.* H.R. 5924 amends this section of the Code pertaining to rejection and reexamination of claims by the substitution of the "completed application" instead of the "claim for a patent" as the base for determination. H.R. 7454 makes no change in the Code provision.

§ *133*. Providing for the controlling of the time for prosecution of an application is not changed by either bill.

§*134*. This provision of the Code for appeals from twice rejected claims to the Board of Appeals is not changed by either bill.

§*135*. This provision covering interferences is deleted by H.R. 5924 from the Code. H.R. 7454 adds a new subsection (e) to this Code provision to provide that in making a determination of priority under this section and other sections of the Code the party shall be able to show any and all such dates for respective acts but shall only be entitled to rely upon dates of conception and reduction to practice no earlier than two years prior to the date of filing the first filed parent application for patent in the United States Patent Office.

§*136*. This is a new section added to the Code by H.R. 5924 to provide that any person (whose identity shall not be disclosed without his consent or unless required by an act of Congress or deemed necessary by the Commissioner) may cause a reexamination after publication of an application for patent upon giving written notice within three months or such further time as the Commissioner may fix but not longer than six months after the publication under Section 151, and upon citing the pertinency of patents or publications affecting the attacked patent.

§ *137*. This section is added to the Code by H.R. 5924 to provide that in all proceedings in the Patent Office in which the patentability of a claim is in issue the applicant shall have the burden of persuading the officer that the claim is allowable. H.R. 7454 does not add either of these last two sections to the Code.

§ *141*. This section pertaining to appeals to the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals is amended by H.R. 5924 to extend the right of appeal from the Board of Appeals, now possessed by applicants, to successors in title and to patentees. It also deletes references to appeals from boards of interference as these boards were abolished and their functions transferred to the Board of Appeals earlier in this bill. H.R. 7454 does not make these changes. It does, however, eliminate reference to waiver of right to appeal to the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia in interference cases; this is done in order to conform with the deletion made later in the bill of Section 145 providing for such appeals.

§ *142*. H.R. 5924 deletes from this section the necessity of including in the Notice of Appeal the reasons for the appeal. H.R. 7454 does not delete this provision of the Code.

§ *143*. Proceedings on appeal are not changed by H.R. 7454. H.R. 5924 adds a provision which permits the Commissioner in proceedings on appeal to appear in Court by representative for the purpose of presenting the position of the Patent Office and it deletes the provision of the Code which requires the Commissioner to furnish the Court in exparte cases with the grounds of the decision of the Patent Office touching all points involved by reasons of the appeal.

§ *144*. H.R. 5924 amends this section to provide that the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals in the case of a review of a refusal of a patent may adjudge the applicant entitled to receive a patent as specified in any claim involved in the decision of the Board and in case of a review of a revocation of a claim, a finding by the Court that a claim should not be allowed cancels the claim from the patent. H.R. 7454 deletes from this section the provision that decisions of the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals shall be limted to the evidence produced before the Patent Office and adds a provision allowing either the applicant or the Commissioner to petition the Supreme Court for a review of the Court's decision.

§ *145*. H.R. 5924 amends this section to extend the right to proceed against the Commissioner in a civil action in the United States District Court in the District of Columbia (now possessed by applicants) to successors in title to the applicants and to patentees. H.R. 7454 deletes this section from the Code.

§ *146*. This section of the Code providing for civil actions in case of interference is deleted by both bills.

§ *147*. H.R. 5924 adds this section to the Code to authorize any party or the Commissioner of Patents dissatisfied with the decision of the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals to appeal to the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia. H.R. 7454 does not add this provision to the Code.

§ *148*. This section is added to the Code by H.R. 5924 to provide that in all actions before the Board of Appeals and in civil actions, Patent Office decisions shall be given the presumption of correctness and shall be upheld unless without substantial basis or not in accordance with law. H.R. 7454 does not add this section to the Code.

§ *151*. This section is amended by H.R. 5924 to provide for publication in connection with the issuance of patents. H.R. 7454 does not change this section of the Code.

§ *152*. This section of the Code providing for the issuance of patents to assignees is deleted by H.R. 5924 and is left unchanged by H.R. 7454.

§ *153*. H.R. 5924 deletes the present requirement of this section that the Commissioner's signature on patents shall be attested by an officer of the Patent Office designated by the Commissioner. H.R. 7454 does not delete this provision from the Code.

§ *154*. Both bills rewrite this section of the Code in identical language so as to change the term of a patent from 17 years after issuance to 20 years after effective filing date of the application plus any period of time, if any, the patent has been kept secret for national security reasons.

§§*161–164* pertaining to Plant patents are not changed by either bill.

§§*171–172* pertaining to Design Patents are not materially changed by either bill.

§*181*. H.R. 7454 makes no change in this Code provision pertaining to secrecy of inventions and the withholding of patents. H.R. 5924 amends this section to provide that the authority to withhold disclosure of the invention for security reasons shall be extended to disclosure by publications.

§*182*. Neither bill changes the Code provision pertaining to abandonment of an invention for unauthorized disclosure.

§*183*. Neither bill changes the Code provision pertaining to the right to compensation when patent is withheld for national security reasons.

§*184*. H.R. 5924 defines the term "application" when used in relation to U.S. application for purposes covered by §§183–188, pertaining to secrecy of certain inventions and foreign applications, to mean a "complete application".

§§*185–188*. Neither bill changes these Code provisions.

§§*191–194*. H.R. 5924 adds to the Code a new chapter covering these sections which authorize the initiation of a deferred examination system by the Secretary of Commerce. H.R. 7454 does not add this chapter.

PART III

§ *251*. Both bills delete from this section the provision which authorizes an application for reissue patent to be made and sworn to by the assignee of the entire interest if the application does not seek to enlarge the scope of the claims of the original patent. H.R. 5924 also deletes from this section: the authority to reissue a patent defective because the patentee claimed less than he had a right to claim; the authority to reissue defective patents enlarging the scope of the claims of the original patent if applied for within 2 years from the grant of the original patent; and the authority of the Commissioner to issue several reissue patents for distinct and separate parts of things patented upon demand of the applicant and upon payment of the required fees for reissued patents.

§ *252*. Neither bill changes this provision of the Code.

§ *253*. H.R. 5924 adds subsection (c) to provide that the expiration at the same time by means of a terminal disclaimer or dedication shall have no effect in the determination of the patentability or the validity of the claim in either.

§§ *254 and 256*. Neither bill changes these sections.

§ *256*. Both bills reword this section by identical language without making any substantive changes therein.

§ *257*. H.R. 5924 adds this section to the Code to provide that any person upon payment of a fee of $500 or the head of any agency of the Government may, within three years of the issuance of a patent, petition for determination of the validity of a claim in view of cited patents and publications. If the Patent Office determines on the basis of the petition that the claim should not have been allowed, the owner of the patent has two alternatives: he may amend the claim and file for reissue of the patent or he may request reconsideration by the Board of Appeals. Denial of the petition shall not be subject to direct judicial review and in such case the petitioner shall be subject to reasonable costs and not to exceed $1000 for attorney fees. If the claim is cancelled or amended on the basis of patents or publications presented by the petitioner previously under the provisions for reexamination the fee shall be refunded.

§§ *261 and 262*. These sections pertaining to ownership and assignment were not changed by either bill.

§ *271*. H.R. 5924 adds a new section to the Code which subjects importers of products for use and trade or industry made in another country by a process patented in the United States to infringement claims, provided the process is not entitled to patent protection in the country of origin. H.R. 7454 adds this provision without the proviso.

§ *272*. Neither bill changes this section.

§ *273*. H.R. 5924 adds this section to the Code to authorize the recovery of reasonable royalties for infringements beginning during the period after the occurrence of all the following events: (1) publication of the application containing such claim; (2) such claim is indicated as allowable by the Patent Office; and (3) actual notice to the alleged unauthorized practitioner that such claim has been indicated as allowed and how his acts are considered to constitute unauthorized practice of the subject matter of such claim; and ending upon the issuance of the patent.

§§ *281–290*. Neither bill changes these sections.

§ *291*. H.R. 5924 deletes this section which grants the owner of an interfering patent relief against the owner of another by civil action in the courts.

§ *292*. This section pertaining to false marking is not changed by either bill.

§ *293*. This section of the Code pertaining to service and notice upon non-resident patentees is not changed by either bill.

§ *294*. H.R. 5924 adds this section to the Code to provide that in any action in the Federal Court in which the issue of the validity or the scope of a claim of a patent is before the Court a final adjudication thereof shall work an estoppel against the patentee and those in privity with him in any subsequent Federal action.

The foregoing are all of the definitive sections of Title 32, as rewritten by these bills.

H.R. 5924, in addition to enacting transitional provisions amending the judicial code, authorizes the District Court to appoint "civil Commissioners" to assist the Court when the volume of litigation arising under the patent laws so justifies such action.

R. & R. Program in Hawaii Tremendous Morale Booster for Vietnam Servicemen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA
OF HAWAII
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 6, 1967

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, Honolulu Star-Bulletin reporter Cornelius Downes has written an outstanding feature story on the benefiicent effects on the morale of our fighting men in Vietnam as a result of the Defense Department's rest and recreation program in Hawaii. Mr. Downes describes the extraordinary cooperation between the military authorities and civilians engaged in the program which has proved such a major factor in its phenomenally successful operation and popularity.

As one who initially supported and worked for the R. & R. program in Hawaii, I am deeply gratified by Hawaii's role in making the program the success it is in providing our weary servicemen a respite from the harsh rigors of combat.

I believe Mr. Downes' vivid report on the favorable impact of Hawaii's R. & R. program on the morale of the more than 5,000 U.S. servicemen who come to the islands each month—and the resultant happeness which reaches members of their families—will prove of tremendous interest to my colleagues in the House and to readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD throughout the Nation. I am therefore pleased to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the article "Five Days' Vacation From War," which appeared in the Wednesday, May 24, 1967, issue of the Hononlulu Star-Bulletin:

THE REST AND RECREATION PROGRAM: FIVE DAYS' VACATION FROM WAR

(By Cornelius Downes)

The Vietnam War, one of the most difficult ever fought by the United States despite the conflict's limited area, appears to be—militarily—one of the best-run wars in the nation's history.

The men who manage it and fight it are better educated, better trained, better motivated and better cared for than fighting men of earlier conflicts.

This is due to a booming economy; an educated and sensitive public; astonishing honesty in confessing errors; the development of on-the spot TV war coverage; and endlessly probing press, and the homing process of a passionately articulate minority who oppose all war, period.

It is also due to the development of war experience and skills in World War I, World War II and the Korean War, and—paradoxically—to the deep hatred of war itself by most fighting men.

Because war is hated and because the nation has learned so well what war does to a man, the nation's military leaders take great pains to lessen war's tragic effects on U.S. servicemen.

Military wisdom and first-class organization are evident in the program called R and R—Rest and recreation—for fighting men. It is a major factor in the high morale of these men.

There is outstanding co-operation between the military and civilians in this program as it operates in Hawaii.

It is a major, continuing troop movement from the front lines, expensive in money and manpower, but extraordinarily profitable in human relationships.

It began, for Hawaii, as a test, and has grown to considerable proportions. It will grow even larger as the nation's commitment to Vietnam increases. Every taxpayer finances it, but in Hawaii many do more than their share.

Excerpts from spontaneous letters and comments by servicemen and their wives who have been to Hawaii under the R and R program are an indication of how Hawaii—particularly hotel, tourist and travel people—cares for the men who defend the nation's interests:

"I've got to find out that Congressman's name because my husband is going to write him a letter . . ."

An Army major wrote: "I would like to say thank you to a great many people, and particularly to the people of Honolulu who made our trip so enjoyable. Everywhere we were welcomed by you and shown the graciousness for which the Hawaiian people are noted. It was a memorable visit for my wife and I, a memory that will remain with us always. 'War is hell,' but with experiences and opportunities such as this it is a little easier—for those who fight and for those who remain behind. Aloha!"

An Army wife: "Somehow, after this, the final four months my husband has in Vietnam won't be so hard to take."

A soldier: "I suppose everyone who comes here says this, but for me it has been five days in Paradise."

Another soldier: "May I take this opportunity to pass on to the people of Hawaii the appreciative comments expressed by soldiers returning from R and R to Hawaii. All have stated Hawaii is 'the greatest.' They have stated they have never been treated more courtesously and grandly anywhere else in the world. Many have said they would return again to Hawaii for a vacation . . . Such courteous goodwill is quite a blessing to anyone who is able to get away from Vietnam. As one soldier said, 'I was simply overwhelmed by the generosity of the Hawaiians when they learned I was on R and R.'"

THE STATISTICS

The extent of the R and R program can be seen in statistics. There were 442,000 American military men in Vietnam. Each serviceman is entitled to a five-day rest-and-recreation leave trip—exclusive of travel time—for each one year of duty in Vietnam. He becomes eligible six or seven months after arriving in Vietnam.

The serviceman may take his leave in Bangkok, Hong Kong, Manila, Tokyo, Kuala Lumpur, Naha, Singapore, Penang, Taipeh, Guam or Honolulu.

Here are the figures for last March for the most popular cities visited:

Honolulu	4,900
Tokyo	4,800
Hong Kong	4,500
Bangkok	4,500
Taipei	4,000
Manila	1,000

Singapore, Kuala Lumpur and the Island of Penang draw together about 1,000 men a month.

In April, the number of servicemen coming to Honolulu jumped sharply—to 6,762—reflecting the military's satisfaction with the program, as well as a big boost in the number of requests for trips to the Islands. Wives and children coming from the Mainland add to the visitor boom.

Generally speaking, family men prefer Hawaii because their wives and children are here or can come to Hawaii for the GI's vacation. Single men prefer the foreign cities, for a variety of reasons. As a result, Hawaii gets more mature men and a greater percentage of officers and sergeants.

At first, military officials in Vietnam opposed Honolulu as an R and R center because of the great distance from Vietnam and the high cost of moving the troops back and forth. Planes also were scarce.

Governor John A. Burns and Hawaii's Senator Daniel K. Inouye had written to the Defense Department in 1965, asking that Hawaii be designated an R and R point.

Pentagon officials appeared to favor the idea. In February, 1966, Defense Secretary Robert McNamara announced he favored the idea. But in April, 1966, as a result of a negative reaction from Vietnam military leaders, the Pentagon turned the idea down.

Women—wives of servicemen in Hawaii—helped change the decision. They bombarded Congressmen with petitions. Senator Daniel K. Inouye vowed to fight for R and R in Hawaii. The Defense Department finally agreed to it on an experimental basis in May last year. The first 165 arrivals flew in from Vietnam August 3, 1966. Since then the program has been remarkable for lack of complaints and for the consistent reports of appreciation from men on R and R leave.

One of the major reasons things run smoothly is because Hawaii's hotel and tourist industries decided well in advance that they would accept R and R as a continuing privilege-and-problem and would organize their co-operation with the military to forestall complaints, trouble, bitterness and hard feelings. The Chamber of Commerce and retail trade officials joined in.

Tourism in Hawaii has continuing growing pains due to the extraordinary popularity of the Islands. Hotels are jammed in peak seasons. More hotels are being rushed to completion. Over 10,000 visitors are due July 29 to August 10 for the American Bar Association convention, which may cause difficulties.

So far, the Hawaii Visitors Bureau, airlines and the Hawaii Hotel Association have managed to absorb all visitors and add to the total the extra work of housing R and R visitors.

By the end of the year, if present R and R schedules are maintained, about 75,000 military men will have come to Honolulu for their five days of rest and recreation.

This could go as high as 100,000 if the military decides to increase the numbers. With trouble developing in Hong Kong, it's conceivable that R and R might be halted there, which could mean many more R and R men coming to Hawaii.

HOTELS PRAISED

Robert C. Allen, executive vice-president of the Hawaiian Visitors Bureau, said of Hawaii's hotels this week, "I have never known any hotel industry anywhere to respond so willingly, without hesitation, to the military's request for help."

Gilbert Moss, manager of the Princess Kalulani Hotel and president of the Hawaii Hotel Association, said great credit must be given to Hawaii's smaller hotels, which have volunteered to provide rooms on a continuing basis for R and R men and their families.

The Hotel Association sent questionnaires to 130 hotels, and 97 responded. Most have voluntarily pledged rooms, so that the military can count on getting R and R men into what most set their hearts on—a Waikiki hotel.

There is no question that R and R benefits Hawaii and Waikiki financially and in other ways. Each man spends, for himself and his wife, about $300 during his five-day stay. This brings millions of dollars into Waikiki.

While hotels and other businesses give discounts, not all R and R men show their Aloha Cards for every purchase made. Most, however, do show them to hotels, which have cut their rates sharply for the Vietnam servicemen.

Small hotels are concerned that large hotels may get most of the R and R business during slack periods—April and May particularly—while smaller hotels will be asked to help out—at reduced R and R rates—during the peak summer travel periods when the small hotels could charge their highest rates to recoup slack-season declines. There is also the problem that a serviceman often will prefer a big-name hotel to a smaller one if he has a choice and can afford the difference.

This competition is a delicate issue which most hotel people are reluctant to discuss for publication. So far, the Waikiki hotel industry has shown a maturity in keeping public peace and harmony, whatever the private disagreements may be, for the sake of the R and R program itself.

The Paradise Hawaii Hotel owned and managed by Archie L. Swensen and his wife Margaret Anne is one of many small Waikiki hotels which welcome R and R personnel. The Star-Bulletin chose it at random from the telephone book to ask its owner about his experiences with the R and R program.

Swensen said: "We've had about 100 R and R men and their wives and children since the program began. Our busy-season rate is $12 a couple and our regular rate, $10. But for R and R couples we charge $8 a room, and $6 a room for single men.

"We welcome the R and R men. They've been very very good—well-mannered.

"Yes, we get other military men not from Vietnam. They get a speical rate, too, but not as low as the R and R rate. That's about as inexpensive as we can get."

Morristown (Tenn.) High School Wins "Heart of St. Petersburg" Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 5, 1967

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, recently the Morristown, Tenn., High School Hurricane Band participated in the 1967 Festival of States parade in St. Petersburg, Fla., and received the "Heart of St. Petersburg" award that goes to the band creating the most goodwill for its hometown.

This is an award that these young people richly deserve, and I am sure that the entire First District and the State of Tennessee join me in extending sincere congratulations and best wishes to the members of the band and its sponsors.

I think the following article on the band will be of interest to my colleagues and the readers of the Record, and I insert it at this point in the Record:

TENNESSEE BAND MEMBERS WOO ST. PETERSBURG—THEIR AIM: HEART OF THE CITY

(By David Legge)

A small town in Tennessee this week sent 84 young ambassadors on a "no-holds-barred" sell-our-city campaign, and they all came to St. Petersburg.

They arrived here Wednesday in a caravan of three buses and call themselves the Morristown High School Hurricane Band.

"We're here to win the 'Heart of St. Petersburg,'" a spokesman said, "and we've come prepared to do it."

The Heart of St. Petersburg Award is presented annually to the marching band leaving the most favorable impression with the city.

These high schoolers have come armed with gifts, slogans and a well-planned strategy.

They're handing out 8,000 Morristown postcards and another 16,000 good-will cards bearing the message:

"Folks like you we're pleased to meet, Just being here is quite a treat. We've practiced 'til we have sore feet to win the heart of 'Ole St. Pete."

Yesterday band members distributed "boxes and boxes" of Tennessee-shaped wall plaques made in Morristown from "chipwood." Surprise gifts will be handed out today.

Chaperones for the good-will delegation include not only a Tennessee state trooper and a Morristown policeman, but even the town mayor, John Henderson.

The youngsters can now be spotted wearing T-shirts, dark pants and Tennessee mountain hats adorned with corncob pipes and feathers.

Accounts of the band's "heart campaign" are being broadcast daily on Morristown's radio station.

Congressman Frank Annunzio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 1967

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is with a deep sense of pride and admiration that I rise today to pay tribute to an outstanding colleague of mine, who lends more than a substantial contribution not only to the Illinois delegation here in the House of Representatives, but to this distinguished body as a whole.

Congressman Frank Annunzio, who was recently recognized as "Man of the Year," by the Chicago West Suburban Chapter of UNICO, deserves not only the praise of his fellow Illinois Members, but also that of the entire Nation for his most commendable service to the Italian-American community.

UNICO, as many of us know, is a dedicated community service organization which takes as its motto, "Service Above Self." It can be credited with many fine accomplishments, among which are noted the awarding of hundreds of scholarships to deserving students; sending of thousands of underprivileged youngsters to fresh air camps; raising of hundreds of thousands of dollars for international relief; and many more about which we could go on further.

I am deeply gratified that such a constructive and essential organization as UNICO has chosen to bestow upon Congressman Annunzio the honor of this selection. It is most heartening to know that at a time when there are those in this country who would try to dismerge the Italian-American community of America, there are businessmen who would assemble to not only salute a great Congressman, but to join together in a mutual effort to establish a stable, as well as effective organization of lasting accomplishments. It is groups like UNICO that represent the true spirit of the Italo-American community which has contributed to America's growth since the very beginning of our Republic.

Congressman Frank Annunzio, before coming to the Congress in 1964, left an impressionable mark in the State of Illinois, which comes only as a result of his hard work and dedication in the areas of labor, education, and numerous civic and charitable organizations. Not only is it appropriate, Mr. Speaker, but also warranted that I today take this opportunity to applaud the activities of my colleague, who has served as a true statesman since he has come to the House, and is deserving not only of our recognition here in this body, but of that throughout the State of Illinois.

Frank Annunzio is a schoolteacher by profession and it is this background which has helped him become one of the most perceptive Members of Congress. We all applaud his impressive contributions as a member of the House Banking Committee and frequently find ourselves seeking his expert advice in matters coming before his committee.

Mr. Speaker, Frank Annunzio has brought a new dimension of dignity to the entire Italo-American community and a new spirit of leadership to the inspiring causes which Italian-Americans espouse for the good of all Americans in the United States. It is a privilege to be associated with Frank Annunzio in this Congress.

I think that House Resolution 171 of the Illinois Legislature best characterizes the feelings of the people of Illinois toward this man of outstanding ability and dedication, and the text of that resolution, which had 36 members of the Illinois House as sponsors, follows:

HOUSE RESOLUTION 171

Whereas, The Honorable Frank Annunzio, United States Representative from the 7th congressional district of Illinois, has been selected as "Man of the Year" by the Chicago West Suburban Chapter of Unico; and

Whereas, This proud honor, to be awarded at the 8th annual dinner dance to be held Saturday, May 13, 1967, at the Fontana D'or Restaurant, will be bestowed upon a well deserving man, for Congressman Annunzio has been a guiding light where darkness has generally prevailed; he has served youth through the Better Boys Foundation and the Catholic Youth Organization; he has actively served to better community relations through his participation on the Chicago Commission on Human Relations, the board of directors of the American Committee on Italian Migration, the executive board of the Joint Civic Committee of Italian-Americans; he has untiringly participated in and contributed to such charitable and service activities as the Knights of Columbus, the Little Flower Society, Carmelite Fathers, the Annual St. Jude Banquet, Claretian Fathers and as general chairman of the Villa Scalabrini Development fund as well as countless other civic, charitable and educational activities; and

Whereas, Continuously in the service of the public in such capacities as educator, chairman of the war Ration Board, member of the Advisory Committee on Unemployment Compensation, member of the Advisory Committee to the Illinois Industrial Commission of Health and Safety and Director of Labor for the State of Illinois from 1949 to 1952, Congressman Annunzio is to be commended for his devotion to the people of the State of Illinois and is certainly deserving of the "Man of the Year" award; therefore be it

Resolved, By the House of Representatives of the Seventy-fifth General Assembly of the

State of Illinois, that we congratulate the "Man of the Year", the Honorable Frank Annunzio, Representative from the 7th congressional district, for this great honor bestowed upon him by the Chicago West Suburban Chapter of Unico; that we commend Congressman Annunzio for his outstanding service to the people of his community, his State and his country; and that a suitable copy of this resolution be forwarded to him.

The officers of UNICO which paid such an inspiring tribute to our colleague, Mr. Annunzio, are listed herewith.

UNICO National: Chicago West Suburban Chapter

James V. Battista, *District Govenor.*

OFFICERS FOR 1967

Dr. Sam J. Glorioso, President.
John Battista, Executive Vice President.
Tony Audino, First Vice President.
Jack Cerone, Second Vice President.
Tony Quatraro, Recording Secretary.
Joe Colletti, Recording Secretary.
Harry Pucillo, Corresponding Secretary.
Dr. A. J. Ceddia, Treasurer.
Seven Buttita, Sergeant-at-Arms.

Directors: Edward Del Genio, Rocco Di Grazio, Vincent R. Lucania, Bernard FioRito, Ralph Castrovillari, James Battista.

Chaplain: Father Thomas Vitro, St. Giles Church.

Dinner Dance Committee: Angelo Provenzano, Chairman; Jack Cerone, Ralph Massey, John Battista, Nunzio Tisci.

Scholarship Committee: Ralph Castrovillari, Chairman; Dr. S. J. Glorioso, Harry Pucillo, Dr. Albert Ceddia.

Frank Annunzio was born and raised in Chicago and was graduated from its public schools and entered DePaul University, attending night classes.

He earned a B.S. degree and took on postgraduate studies and was granted a master's degree in education. While still attending DePaul he taught in Chicago high schools for 9 years.

He became the director of the Illinois Department of Labor under Gov. Adlai Stevenson.

Mr. Annunzio was elected to the U.S. House of Representatives in 1964 and reelected in 1966.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Code of Laws of the United States

Title 44, Section 181. Congressional Record; arrangement, style, contents, and indexes.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the Congressional Record, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the Congressional Record semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

Title 44, Section 182b. Same; illustrations, maps, diagrams.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the Record without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the Congressional Record the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily Record as follows: the Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided*, That the makeup of the Record shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the Congressional Record, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the Record shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the Record issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the Record for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the Record of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the Record shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the Record style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the Record.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the Congressional Record any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent Record is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the Congressional Record the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the Congressional Record.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the Congressional Record shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the Official Reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the Official Reporters of the respective Houses.

The Official Reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the Official Reporters in the next issue of the Congressional Record, nor to Records printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the Congressional Record by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the Congressional Record which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Appendix

Preserving the Usable Past of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. LAUSCHE

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 7, 1967

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, an article entitled "Preserving the Usable Past of America," written by James J. Kilpatrick, was published on the editorial page of the Washington Evening Star of May 31, 1967. I was deeply impressed by the article. It contains thoughts that are constructive and worthy of deep consideration.

Mr. Kilpatrick quotes Henry Steele Commager, who wrote movingly of America's "search for a usable past":

> Perhaps nowhere else in the Western world is loyalty such a touchstone as in the United States.
>
> Yet, on this Memorial Day—

Laments Mr. Kilpatrick—

> one is struck by the sobering thought that the "usable past" he [Mr. Commager] describes is not today being used, or enlarged, or revered. It is being perverted instead.

Mr. Kilpatrick cites examples of this perversion:

> In the vocabulary of the intellectual establishment "patriotism" has become a dirty word. Loyalty is now linked to "loyalty oath," and such oaths are widely scorned. General Westmoreland comes home from Vietnam, and the New Republic snickers at his speech to Congress. . . .
>
> On some campuses, the fashion is not to salute the flag, or to serve it, but to burn it. When the Congress ponders a flag-burning bill, a flabby Department of Justice testifies to diffident doubts and reservations. . . .
>
> In the benevolent grasp of government, old values of self-reliance tend to atrophy. In the arts, craftsmanship yields to the transient blob. Our churchmen abandon ancient forms of worship and debate instead the death of God. Harvard's young lawyers are cool, man; they are cool.

Yet, affirms Mr. Kirkpatrick:

> There are men and institutions who do seek to preserve America's usable past.

Thus far in Vietnam, 10,000 American men have given their lives in defense of duty, honor, and country.

> The least we might contribute—

Concludes Mr. Kirkpatrick—

> out of the ancient reservoirs, is a surging wave of self-renewal here at home.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Kirkpatrick's fine article be placed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRESERVING THE USABLE PAST OF AMERICA

(By James J. Kilpatrick)

In a perceptive essay a few years ago, Henry Steele Commager wrote movingly of America's "search for a usable past." On this Memorial Day, one is struck by the sobering thought that the "usable past" he described is not today being used, or enlarged, or revered. It is being perverted instead.

Commager's point was that, alone among the great nations of the world, America embarked on nationhood with no distinctive "past" that might be called her own. The sansculottes, emerging from their Revolution, had a past that reached to ancient Gaul. The Russian revolutionaries, storming the winter palace, trod upon the rosebeds of the czars. The Italians, Germans, Greeks, Turks, Egyptians, Chinese—in every case, the transmutations that led to their nationhood had a national past to build on.

It was different here. Our revolutionary forefathers, bringing forth their new nation, surely were endowed with a florous past—crowned heads, and Shakespeare's plays, the seeds that sprang from Runnymede—but this was not an American past. It was largely hand-me-down British. The few domestic symbols and heroes of that time were essentially colonial; they were local to Virginia or Massachusetts or Pennsylvania or New York, and the descendants of Oglethorpe had little to share with the descendants of Mather and Williams. The task of creation had to be done from scratch.

"Nothing in the history of American nationalism," wrote Commager, "is more impressive than the speed and the lavishness with which Americans provided themselves with a usable past; history, legends, symbols, paintings, sculpture, monuments, shrines, holy days ballads, patriotic songs, heroes, and—with some difficulty—villains."

Speedily, we embraced the eagle as a national emblem, contrived a flag that gave "visible evidence of growth," and hailed that star-spangled banner in words that bristled with national pride. There were patriots in those days, and men were proud to be known by that name. From one generation to another, through the winning of the West, through bloody wars, through the assimilation of immigrants, Americans cherished their past and honored its meaning. Children piped their pledges of allegiance to the flag. Men marched in "I Am an American Day" parades.

"Perhaps nowhere else in the Western world," wrote Commager, "is loyalty such a touchstone as in the United States."

Is this true of Memorial Day in 1967? In the vocabulary of the intellectual establishment, "patriotism" has become a dirty word. Loyalty is now linked to "loyalty oath," and such oaths are widely scorned. Gen. Westmoreland comes home from Vietnam, and the New Republic snickers at his speech to Congress: The general says "me-tick-lous" and "calkerlated" and "continyuh." The editors of New Republic find fighting men distasteful.

On some of our campuses, the fashion is not to salute the flag, or to serve it, but to burn it. When the Congress ponders a flag-burning bill, a flabby Department of Justice testifies to diffident doubts and reservations. Flag-burning, after all, may be no more than a form of free expression. One must respect dissent. It is the new American way.

Now, it is easy enough to say that these manifestations are no more than pimples on the body politic—mere surface blemishes that bear false witness to a healthy spirit down below. In the name of God and country, let us pray this is so.

Yet it is one of the eternal verities that most men are followers, not leaders. They take their cue from the top. And whether one looks to government, or to the arts, or to the church, or to the great teaching institutions, one looks for guidance on standards and values. Here the old tablets traditionally have been kept. Who is preserving them now?

In the benevolent grasp of government, old values of self-reliance tend to atrophy. In the arts, craftsmanship yields to the transient blob. Our churchmen abandon ancient forms of worship and debate instead the death of God. Harvard's young lawyers are cool, man; they are cool.

Yes, there are men and institutions who do seek to preserve America's usable past—proud men who defend a simple faith: My country, right or wrong. They do a great work. Yet it is rare, as rare as a single parade in May, that there voices drown out the cackle of peacenik geese.

Ten thousand American men have died thus far in Vietnam. They now are part of the past. In the defense of Western freedom, however imperfectly that concept may be understood, they gave their lives on distant hills to duty, honor and country. The least we might contribute, out of the ancient reservoirs, is a surging wave of self-renewal here at home.

Edwin Carl Ekstrom of Corpus Christi, Tex.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN YOUNG

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1967

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call attention today and to pay tribute to a man who was the founder of the Greyhound Bus Co., and could literally be called the father of our modern bus transportation system, Mr. Edwin Carl Ekstrom of Corpus Christi, Tex.

"Mr. Ed," as he was affectionately known to his friends, was born in Ludington, Mich., on March 19, 1889, and died in Corpus Christi, Tex., on May 8, 1967. During that span of 78 years his life was distinguished by remarkable achievements and personal greatness. He was a quiet man; he shunned publicity, devoting his energies to making himself expert in the business he loved and helped create. A partial chronicle of the greatness and achievements of Ed Ekstrom would take more space than is possibly available. Suffice it to say that he was truly an outstanding man representing a great business: as a man of fine character and an outstanding American, he set an example in the transportation industry that will not soon be surpassed. His dedication, his tenacity and his determination was source of inspiration to all who knew him. The world is a better place for his having lived. This, indeed, is the richest legacy that any of us could hope to leave.

Mr. Ed was born the son of Swede-Finns who emigrated from Finland in the early 1880's and settled in Ludington, Mich., later moving to Hibbing, Minn., where he completed his grammar school education in 1901. Due to dire circumstances, it was necessary that he should work to help support his family, so during the next 2 years he was employed as a tallyboy in an underground mine, located about 3 miles from Hibbing, then was transferred to their office as a supply clerk. He worked as a bookkeeper and accountant in Hibbing where he became acquainted with the men who later developed jitney service into transcontinental bus service. Ekstrom kept books for these jitney drivers who hauled ore from town to town in the Minnesota ore fields. When one of the original six jitney drivers died in 1917, Ekstrom bought into the company which at that time was transporting passengers between Hibbing and Duluth, Minn.

The firm was known as the Mesaba Transportation Co. and charged a 15 cent fare for a 3-mile trip from Hibbing to Alice The bus company pioneers finally split up in 1923 and Ed Ekstrom moved to Madison, Wis., where he bought a bus line running from Madison to Fon Du Lac, and named it the Eastern Wisconsin Co.

Ekstrom then moved to Michigan and opened the Safety Motor Coach Lines which ran from Grand Rapids to Muskegon. This later turned out to be the nucleus of the Greyhound Lines and it was later extended to Chicago.

It was in 1926 that the now famous Greyhound name was born. Frank Fageol, builder of the first twin coaches for Transcontinental lines, sold Ekstrom 52 buses, a figure that was unheard of at this time. For this sale, Fageol presented Ekstrom with a white greyhound dog which was promptly named "Bus." "Bus" soon became the symbol of the Safety Motor Coach Lines, and was used extensively in its advertising program, although Ekstrom never bothered to register it as a trademark while he owned the firm. The dog was killed a few years later when it was struck by a car in San Antonio.

Ekstrom was a pioneer in snow removal on the route north of Muskegon, which he kept clear with his own plows, in order to see that the regular schedules that he had set up were maintained. Together with this, he also established a permanent system of stations, garages, and other equipment, in order to keep pace with his expansion program.

In 1928, Ekstrom sold out to one of the original jitney drivers, C. E. Wickman, and a group of his associates. Wickman not only took the greyhound name, but also the famous blue and white color scheme of the buses which are now seen all over the country.

Ekstrom then moved to San Antonio in 1928, where he organized the Red Ball Transportation Co., which later became the Southland Greyhound Lines, soon becoming tied in with the one operating farther north. The operations spread out over almost all of Texas, and 2 years later, Ekstrom again sold out to Wickman. Ed then became associated with the Yellow Taxi Co. in San Antonio during the depression years of 1931 and 1932, but he again sold out and moved to Corpus Christi. It was in Corpus Christi that Ed Ekstrom bought out the Central Power & Light Co. Bus System, and the Colunga Bus Lines, as well. Ekstrom also owned the Nueces Mack Co. Truck Sales and the Nueces Mack Leasing Co. He sold these shortly after he sold the Nueces Transportation Co. to the city of Corpus Christi in late 1966.

Mr. Ed was not only an outstanding example of initiative and perseverance in the world of business and transportation; he was an outstanding civic leader as well. He was a member of the board of directors of the chamber of commerce, an original member of the Area Development Committee, and a vestryman of the Episcopal Church of the Good Shepherd.

He was a benefactor of the Carmelite Day Nursery and served as chairman of a fund drive in 1965 to raise funds to construct a new building which has since been named in memory of him.

Last September 22, Ekstrom was cited by his city council for contributions to the community during the years that he owned and operated the bus system. They praised him for his part in making the city of Corpus Christi lovelier, and particularly for making life better, both individually and collectively by his financial contributions in time of crisis, and his liberal donations to hospital and child care programs and facilities.

Although he gave a substantial portion of his income away, Ed Ekstrom did not want applause or acclaim, he was merely trying to give aid to the needy throughout America without any reference to race or creed. He deplored greed in every form and felt that money's worth could only be measured by the good it could do. Loved and respected by his friends and associates, it was often said of him, "the pattern was lost when they made Ed."

It is because of men like Ed Ekstrom that our free enterprise system stands as a shining example of limitless opportunity and good will not only to the people of these United States, but also to all other people in the world today. Ed was a stalwart defender of the American way of life, and gave his all to see that it was maintained. He held all of his employees in respect, and they, in turn, gave their respect to him. In one of the bulletins that he sent to his employees, he pointed out the necessity of cooperation if there is to be success in business. He told his employees to do their best at all times, and to "Smile; results will amaze you if you heed this tip."

Ed Ekstrom is survived by his wife, Ethel; a son, Edwin Carl Ekstrom, Jr.; a daughter, Mrs. Paul S. Peck; a brother, Harold Ekstrom, all of Corpus Christi. Four sisters: Mrs. Howard Smith, and Mrs. Arthur Luchs, both of Glen Ellyn, Ill.; Mrs. Mark Wilson of Rochester, Minn.; Mrs. Frank Rauschel of Chisholm, Minn.; and two grandsons: Carl and Randal Peck.

We may never leave a legacy such as was left by Edwin Ekstrom, and we are in his debt, for truly the world is a better place for his having lived.

The Building of Character—Essay by Utah 4-H Boy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. MOSS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 7, 1967

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, what could be more refreshing in this world of war and dissention and strikes and demonstrations than a statement by a fine, upstanding young American of what he hopes to make of the "spring of his life."

Such a statement was made recently by Russell Frandsen, of Centerfield, Sanpete County, Utah, in discussing what the 4-H program has meant to him and how it has developed his character. I ask unanimous consent that his essay be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the essay was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Building of Character

(By Russell Frandsen, Centerfield, Sanpete County, Utah; son of Mr. and Mrs. Allen J. Frandsen)

"Since you are only young once, what are you going to do about it? Don't let the spring of your life pass into summer without doing something about the things you can do something about!" I am young, and I do want to do something about the spring of my life! In fact, I not only want to do something, I have done something. I have taken 4-H through some of the most important years in my life, and I would like to relate this 4-H story. The story of 4-H can be divided into two principal areas, the project work itself, and the "extra-curricular" activities.

To the younger 4-H member, the project work is the principal mark of 4-H, but as a member grows older, he often disregards the value of project work. Only recently have I come to realize the great value of it in application to many problems. My first project was in the electricity program and I was captivated by it. I learned the fundamentals of the theory of electricity, of completing circuits, and I acquired skills needed in working with electricity. It can be honestly said that work in this 4-H project put me ahead of the others later in school work. It has enabled me to make many valuable and necessary home repairs thus saving time and money. My exhibits went to the county and State fairs, and I received a pin for outstanding work in the electric program.

The next project undertaken was that of cooking. This was one of the most enjoyable years of 4-H I've had. Visions of cottage cheese and peanuts sandwiches still remain in my memory. Cooking is a valuable art to know, and my project has contributed greatly. It has certainly helped my home situation where I cook occasionally. My cookies were selected for display at the State fair where they received a blue ribbon.

The project in which I am currently enrolled and which I've been carrying for the past four years is the Automotive program. In view of the tremendous problems which face us on the highways, driver education is one of the most important things to realize. My attitudes toward the physical factors concerning the operation of the car, i.e. stopping ability, weight distribution, steering problems, and facts like the entire control of a car rests upon four small areas which contact the road and are no bigger than an average high school text book, have really improved.

Through 4-H I have gained the proper respect for the automobile. The mechanical functions of a car are intriguing, and 4-H is the only place I have been able to explore it. Everyone should have some knowledge of the car in case emergencies arise where the car might fail.

Through driving habits I've acquired in 4-H, much money has been saved, and wear and tear on the car has been kept to a minimum. I've been a member of two automotive demonstration teams, one of which was devoted to safety on the highways. We competed in the State contest and were selected top winners. Our demonstration was taped and broadcast on television; we received honor at the National 4-H Roundup, and received an automotive award at the achievement program. After completing the regular three year program, we continued into the fourth year by authoring our own program. The highlights of this were a community safety project, a dance emphasizing safety, and an economy run. The automotive program has been the outstanding project of my 4-H experience.

I have taken junior leadership for the past two years and have led two clubs each year. This was a challenging experience and one which I enjoyed. It has taught me wise use of time, the importance and need of good planning, the essentials of working and cooperating with people, and has given me greater insight into the nature of people. Each year there have been State fair exhibits from my clubs.

The second and most exciting part of my story is about the activities in which I've participated. I had always admired 4-H members who attended the different activities, and I had set a goal of gaining the chance to participate myself. In 1963, a friend and I prepared and presented a demonstration on the engine of a car. Although we were too young to attend the State contests, we did receive an automotive award at the achievement program. The next year, our demonstration "Safety and Sanity" was declared the top winner in the State.

In 1964, I attended the 4-H Youth Leadership Conference at Snow College. This was a great experience. The theme was "Career Exploration" and was very timely. I served as discussion leader at the conference. I was a candidate for membership on the steering committee at the next conference. I was selected for a television interview at the conference, and later taped a radio program concerning the conference. The friends I met and made at the conference were tremendous and I meet them almost everywhere I go. Later in that same year, I was on the planning committee for our county camp and was in charge of mediation.

In 1965, I attended a five-county camp where I served as a discussion leader. I helped tape a radio report while at camp, and was selected as the outstanding boy at the camp. At "Fun-Day" for the younger 4-H members, I helped carry out the program.

In the fall of 1965, I participated in the public speaking contest where I was named alternate State public speaking winner. I participated in home economics judging, and the style dress revue as an escort.

In 1966, I again attended the 4-H Youth Leadership Conference held at Snow College. The theme was "A Responsible ME in America" which is one of my favorite topics. I served as a discussion leader, and was selected to help plan a six-county camp.

At the camp, I was in charge of the discussion committee, helped with the social committee, emceed the talent program, and headed a committee to report on the Youth Conference. Again I helped with "Fun-Day" for the younger 4-H members.

During the summer, I was selected as the outstanding four-square boy in Utah, and received a scholarship to attend Camp Miniwanca. This is the greatest honor I have received, and the opportunity I most respect. It really humbled me to think that I was chosen to represent the thousands of 4-H members in the State of Utah. I gained tremendous knowledge during the short two weeks, and since that time I have been reporting by experiences to different groups of people.

This fall, I again participated in the State public speaking contest and was selected as one of the finalists. I participated in the style dress revue as an escort, and entered the home economics judging contest. I was on a special volunteer committee to help plan and carry through a friendship party at that State activity, and I was asked to report on my Camp Miniwanca experience at a Thursday night meeting.

I have outlined my 4-H experiences, and related all the activities in which I have participated; but all this means nothing unless it carries further than just the record books. 4-H experiences have helped me in the most important phases of life. I have learned to appreciate, respect, tolerate, communicate, and understand people. I enjoy people and 4-H has given me the opportunity to develop my social skills. My whole viewpoints have been broadened by experiences such as the Youth Leadership Conferences, and Camp Miniwanca. I have learned to make friends and meet people, to speak and write to other people, to organize and use time wisely, to practice thrift, to listen to and understand others, to cooperate, and I have had a chance to serve others. Indeed, I owe unpayable debts to the 4-H program, its leaders, its activities, and its interest in young people. I thank and salute the 4-H program for what it has done for me.

Assessing the Effectiveness of Team Teaching

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1967

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, the resurging interest in the field of teaching over the last decade or so is a familiar story to all of us. Academicians more and more are devoting thought and investigation to the theories of teaching, to development of new techniques and new concepts in methodology. We have seen a number of unprecedented developments as a result, ranging all the way from vast new Federal aid programs to something called "the new math."

One of the still untried and unproven concepts in the field of education is that of team teaching. Much has been said pro and con about the potential value of this new concept, but very little has emerged so far of a conclusive nature one way or the other.

We may, however, be on the verge of some definitive data about team teaching through the work of a group of scholars headed by Dr. John A. Schmitt, director of testing services at Boston College.

Dr. Schmitt, together with three other colleagues, is presently involved in a thorough evaluation of the team-teaching method through conditions that are, to the extent possible, controlled for study purposes. Although the study is not yet complete nor its findings final, Dr. Schmitt feels that certain trends and directions are unmistakable.

In a recent paper presented to the 27th annual conference of the National School Board Association, Dr. Schmitt makes some penetrating predictions about what his study is likely to reveal. He discusses, in terms more firm than ever before, just what the potential effectiveness, and the probable drawbacks may be in the team-teaching method.

Because I am sure Dr. Schmitt's paper will be of utmost value and interest to those of us in this body who are concerned about this Nation's educational programs, and to the American public in general, I insert at this point in the RECORD the text of Dr. Schmitt's paper:

ASSESSING THE EFFECTIVENESS OF TEAM TEACHING

(By John A. Schmitt, Boston College)

Opinions regarding the instructional advantages and limitations of team teaching as an organizational pattern are quite easy to come by. Early in 1964 my colleagues and I surveyed 141 publications having the words *team teaching* in their titles, and since that time almost three times as many such publications have been listed in the *Education Index*. Since only a certain number of advantages and limitations can be conjured up on any topic, however, most of the current reports simply reasonable those that have been cited by earlier writers, usually with slightly different emphases.

All but a very few of the existing reports are theoretical discussions of pure opinion. Empirical evidence regarding the presumed benefits of, and supposed difficulties with, team teaching is very sketchy. Where data have been collected which permit the testing of hypotheses, they have frequently been associated with research designs of questionable quality, making their interpretation meaningless. A few carefully designed studies have been reported, but these have usually been accomplished within a single school or school district, thus greatly restricting the possibilities of generalization to other situations.

Three years ago, Professor John Montean of the University of Rochester and I initiated a controlled evaluation of team teaching in high school biology. Since we had just completed—in cooperation with others—a three year evaluation of large-group instruction in high school chemistry and felt that we had made most of the mistakes that were possible, we were confident that we could design and execute a study which would provide a definitive answer, at least in one subject-matter area and with respect to progressive, innovative and research-minded schools. With financing provided by the New York State Education Department and six New York State school districts, the study got under way in the fall of 1964.

For a number of reasons which have been detailed elsewhere, things did not work out as we had planned. We are presently three years and almost $90,000 into the project, and the modifications in our design have been considerable, dashing our hopes for a near-perfect experimental evaluation—hopes which I now consider to be quite unrealistic, when research is done in schools. Schools are not laboratories, after all, and pupils are not guinea pigs (however hard we in educational research might wish).

The results of our investigation will not be reported for another year, but at this point I feel quite confident in predicting what they will be. Whatever criterion of achievement is applied (we are using a series of locally developed achievement tests, the New York State Biology Regents Examination administered at the end of the course, and the Nelson Biology Test administered nine months following completion of the course), in some schools the team-taught group will significantly excel pupils taught by the same teachers in conventional classes, while in other schools the opposite will be found; it can further be predicted with some assurance that this will be true regardless of the application of statistical controls to compensate for pre-existing differences in aptitude between the groups. These differences, while they will probably be significant from a statistical standpoint, will just as probably be of minimal practical significance.

It will probably be found, also, that the measured achievement of pupils taught by the participating teachers—whether in conventional or team-taught classes—improved from year to year, while the investigation was in progress. It will certainly be disappointing if this improvement is not substantial enough to warrant the conclusion that participation in a project like this one changes teachers in desirable ways, and that these changes are reflected in the achievement of pupils.

These, I predict, will be our major findings with respect to the learners, but as the data we have accumulated are reworked by others, some more valuable findings may emerge. It may be possible to develop information permitting distinctions among those pupils who will do well under any circumstances, those for whom one or the other instructional organization would be preferable, and those for whom a new set of course objectives must be set, if curricular success is to be achieved. Unfortunately, data from this study will not further the identification of teachers who would be effective team members.

With respect to the teachers who have been working with us on this project, it has been possible to subject several hypothesized advantages and limitations of team teaching to critical—albeit nonstatistical—evaluation. We have confirmed the in-service training value of team meetings or planning sessions and the contribution of the teaching team to the process of inducting new faculty members. The team quite definitely exploits specific competencies of its individual members, and team pressure stimulates improved preparation, but we have observed a tendency for large-group lectures to be prepared and presented in terms of the other team members rather than the pupils, and the individual teacher's competencies may deteriorate to some extent in subject-matter areas where other team members have primary responsibility for the teaching. Use of audio-visual aids increased substantially in all cases, perhaps to excess in some.

We found little evidence to support claims that the team structure provides increased recognition for outstanding teachers and permits flexibility in grouping. These things appear to be much more closely related to administrative practices than to instructional organization. We found no evidence of increased student interest, greater effort by individual pupils or freedom of teachers from routine tasks. In large-group presentations, however, student attention appeared to be greater and more constant than in conventional classes; maintenance of discipline was not a problem in the large groups, and both of these factors may be related to recognition by the students that the opportunity to recover missed material is reduced by the large-group organization.

Regarding hypothesized disadvantages, we have observed deleterious effects on both individual teachers and teams resulting from forced team participation of a teacher who really doesn't want to participate. Younger teachers seem to adapt to the team more readily than older ones, but of course there are exceptions on both sides, and no one would suggest that an ideal team would consist entirely of young, inexperienced teachers. Younger teachers bring adaptability and a sound knowledge of modern biology to the team, while older teachers contribute planning skill and a working knowledge of practical psychology.

Some of our additional findings to date relate to the conduct of large-group sessions, tutoring sessions and seminars, and to the planning procedures and techniques that seem most efficient. These items are of greater interest to the professional educator than to the school board member.

However, I would not like to close this report without reference to a personal conclusion that is important to me and may be important to you as potential supporters of research. The experience of this current study and some earlier ones strongly implies to me that our research emphasis may have been misplaced for a long time. In concentrating attention on the organization for, and procedures of, *teaching*—a term which no one has ever defined to my satisfaction—the learner may have been neglected in much the same way as the *base* metals were ignored by the alchemists, except as potential sources of gold. I'm practically certain that there is no single, *best* way of teaching anything, or any *best* tactical or strategic instructional organization for assaulting the ignorance of *all* pupils. Rather, it seems likely that, "One man's meat is another's poison," when it comes to learning; that the approach proving best for the average pupil (who, of course, does not exist outside of the statistician's conceptualization) will not even be *good* for the real pupils for whom schools and school boards exist. Identifying the measurable characteristics of pupils that are associated with varying degrees of success under different instructional organizations is a research area with a practically unscratched surface.

Finally, it should be noted that whatever the possible benefits of team teaching may be, they are unlikely to be achieved unless certain essential administrative provisions are made. Time must be allocated to the team members for planning, and if large-group instruction is to be employed, then a special demonstration room must be outfitted (the auditorium will not suffice in most cases), and these are expensive provisions. Further expense can be anticipated as innovation proceeds from the team planning, and the library budget rises and the audio-visual budget rises, and other areas experience similar increases. However effective team teaching may be in other areas, it is very effective in raising costs.

The Shape of Academic Libraries To Come

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 7, 1967

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the new library dedicated at Hofstra College, Hempstead, N.Y., has been aptly described as a "landmark for learning." Serving a growing university, which today has some 12,000 students and in future years, in this tremendous Nassau-Suffolk Counties growth area, will have more, the library utilizes the most modern means to make available to young students the accumulated wisdom of the centuries. It was altogether fitting, therefore, that the address delivered at the library's dedication last month should deal with the potentials of academic libraries and that the speaker should be one preeminent in the field, Dr. Robert Gordon Vosper, who has been president of the Association of College and Research Libraries, the Association of Research Libraries, and the American Library Association, in addition to his activities in the International Federation of Library Associations.

I ask unanimous consent that a summary of Dr. Vosper 's address be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the summary of the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

All of us, whether in public or in academic life, have heard a great deal . . . about the so-called "information explosion," notably in the sciences, and the sharply mounting rate of publication. The number of scientific journals and technical reports is . . . large and is increasing, to the point where libraries, as the responsible public agency for dealing with them, must continually seek new ways usefully to relate published information to the real needs of students and scholars.

Less widely recognized, and of greater complexity and consequence, in my judgment, is the extent of publication and the demand for speedy access in other fields as well, notably in the social sciences. Here . . . a far louder publication and information explosion is bursting under libraries than is the case in the sciences and the technologies. A . . . little recognized aspect of this . . . is the rising amount of significant publication, important to the American intellectual effort, in the new countries of the world.

What library tactics, what organization of services, what techniques of automation and of cooperation will best resolve these forces into the future, I do not pretend to say. But I do say that these numerical forces must be reckoned with seriously. They won't go away. And . . . they won't be resolved cheaply either, no more than the problems of education in general will be resolved cheaply.

More impressive from a library point of view than the sheer numbers of students in general is the mounting number of graduate and professional students, including post-doctoral fellows, for it is at this level that the library responsibility is heaviest. According to U.S. Office of Education figures, there were 63,500 MA's awarded in 1952; 139,000 are expected in 1970. In 1952 about 8,000 doctoral degrees were granted. By 1964/65 this figure had grown to 16,467, while the 1975–76 estimate is for 36,900. This is a doubling in ten years and less, and the demand for this level of training only increases. People are easily shocked by the thought of libraries doubling in size every ten to seventeen years, as though such growth were the result of the librarian's unselective passivity, whereas in fact the librarian is merely adjusting to a relevant sequence of vital factors that demand growth at increasing rates.

At the recent conference in The Hague of the International Federation of Library Associations it was abundantly clear that in Sweden, England, France, and Belgium there are urgent problems in the provision of adequate library services for newly established universities and faculties, just as there are in California and New York. Not only does this kind of expansion exacerbate our competition in the world book market; this force also requires serious attention to the broader organization of library services and deployment of library resources in the public interest.

Until the Second World War, academic teaching and research in this country centered pretty much on our Anglo-European heritage. But in the immediate post-war years American scholars discovered the world. . . Today one of the greatest changes on the academic scene, powerfully influencing the organization of academic government and policy as well as libraries, is the foreign area studies program and research institute. Every self-respecting university . . . has an African Studies Center or a Middle Eastern Research Institute, and the profession of linguistics has become as important as mathematics. My own university, (U.C.L.A.) . . .

professes to teach 95 languages, including 28 African, 19 Near Eastern and 37 European.

For university libraries in particular this impressive and socially important development has meant a major involvement of acquisitions and cataloging effort, to a degree of complexity and cost that is seldom recognized. . . The complexities of language, bibliography, selection, procurement, and organization . . . for this global effort are . . . quite beyond the resources singly of any of the universities that are involved, even the greatest. . . The urgency of need is at a level once thought requisite only for the scientist. Today's social scientist concerned with the economics of Nigeria or the political scene in Laos requires equally rapid and precise library service, and the literature he requires is far more diffuse and difficult to deal with than the literature of the physical sciences.

* * * * *

This global scope of intellectual interest is a major force at work on the academic library scene. . . Not the least consequential question is whether book collections should be organized according to geographical area rather than according to disciplinary fields.

* * * * *

These centers bring together, for a new intellectual approach, men who earlier were devoted to economics, political science, or linguistics . . . this interdisciplinary reorientation increasingly and frequently affects the entire university. New institutes of urban affairs or of brain research are part of the same pattern in many universities.

For libraries this development poses basic problems of . . . logistics of resources and services.

Too many people who should know better have raised visions of the early development of an all-embracing . . . electronic library, or of a neatly patterned national library network that will disgorge innumerable bits of information without regard to patterned knowledge. We Americans . . . are great on gadgets, but I would urge . . . that we should not be so bedazzled by the glamor of future automation that we overlook or defer attention to some very real and important library functions that desperately need attention in the actual world of today . . . we have already suffered some damage as a result of . . . assumptions that automation will easily, soon, and inexpensively solve all of our library problems.

* * * * *

There are in hand or on the horizon responsible developments in computer science, photography, telecommunications, and the like, which promise to speed up, enhance, and extend our access to certain kinds of information and library services. If we wisely and optimistically develop teaching and research programs, in universities, that relate these technical advances to the actual demands on libraries and the requirements of the various users of libraries, we are bound to modify the shape of academic libraries to come. But we won't . . . do away with the need for libraries, nor will we reduce the costs of library service. As a matter of fact . . . we will increase those costs by making library services more desirable and useful. Universities have long thought it important to be concerned with research into problems of agriculture and of highway engineering. If they will devote equivalent research attention to the equally vexing and challenging problems of libraries—economic and social as well as technical—the changes we foresee may come the sooner and be more satisfying to all concerned.

* * * * *

In recent years government officials and politicians . . . have begun to take a more realistic approach. . . . the Federal government has increasingly in the last decade demonstrated a sense of responsibility, including financial responsibility, for the effective development of academic libraries. The Public Law 480 program of 1958 and following, which brings foreign books to this country through use of surplus U.S. credits abroad, the National Science Foundation grants for studies in information science, the Medical Library Assistance Act of 1965, and now the Higher Education Act of 1965 with its impressive Title II devoted to college library collections, buildings, training, and research—these mark the turn. Most indicative of the Federal concern was President Johnson's appointment last October of a National Advisory Commission on Libraries, chaired by President Douglas Knight of Duke University. This American equivalent of a Royal Commission is charged with looking, in the public interest, at the whole fabric of library services, from those for children to those for Byzantine scholars, and with indicating what the requirements are and where the responsibilities lie.

Clearly the Federal government *has* a responsibility to reach into its purse, and it must soon reach even deeper, for the costs are large and the needs are national in scope and emphasis.

This partnership is taking several shapes. There is a movement toward a better interrelationship among libraries, with assistance from improved communication systems. The Medical Library Assistance Act . . . provides for a national pattern of regional medical libraries deriving computerized bibliographical records from the National Library of Medicine at the center. Under Title II–C of the Higher Education Act, a deceptively modest yet in fact far-reaching provision designed by the Association of Research Libraries, Congress has authorized and funded the Library of Congress to enter into a global procurement and cataloging effort that will serve all academic libraries. This new Library of Congress "shared cataloging" program has been so successful that last fall Sir Frank Francis, Director of the British Museum, abandoned British understatement to term it "a major breakthrough on the international bibliographical scene."

The 60th Anniversary of the American Hungarian Federation

SPEECH

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1967

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to join my colleagues in commemorating the 60th anniversary of the American Hungarian Federation.

This federation has taken an active part in educating Hungarians, and bringing about harmonious relationships between Americans of Hungarian descent and other Americans. It has done much to help these people become useful and valuable citizens of our Nation. It has also disseminated information among Americans about Hungarian customs and traditions.

The federation has steadfastly opposed any atheistic and totalitarian ideologies, looking forward to the day when freedom can replace communism in the land of their forefathers.

Groups such as the American Hungarian Federation are to be commended for the services they render in helping newly arrived immigrants solve their problems.

I congratulate the federation upon this, its 60th anniversary, for a job well done, and wish it ever-increasing success in the future.

An American 1984

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. E. (BILL) BROCK

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1967

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, a recent editorial on "The Journal of David Q. Little," published on May 30 in the New York Daily News, should be of interest to my colleagues.

I am including the editorial as part of my remarks in the Appendix to the RECORD:

AN AMERICAN "1984"

On May 30 each year, the nation pays its respects to those fighting men who have died in all its wars—its numerous wars.

It is altogether fitting and proper that we do this, to borrow a phrase from President Abraham Lincoln's Gettysburg Address (Nov. 19, 1863); and Memorial Day this year takes on added meaning and poignancy from U.S. participation in the Vietnam War.

It also seems fitting that on Memorial Day we should give some thought to ways and means of avoiding the death of the United States as we know it.

That death is being plotted in at least two world capitals—Moscow and Peking, the capitals respectively of Soviet Russia and Red China.

The Kremlin plotters, 50 years after Lenin and Trotsky and a handful of their Communist comrades grabbed control of Russia, seem to hope to trick the United States into some sort of bloodless or nearly bloodless surrender to Marxism.

Mao Tse-tung and his associates in Peking are openly planning to blast the U.S.A. off the map as soon as Red China gets enough nuclear muscle to do so.

The only way to remove the Mao threat would seem to be to blow Red China's nuclear plants off the map first—preferably with U.S. bombers manned by Free China (Taiwan, Formosa) pilots as proposed by Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek.

Maybe our national leaders will wake up to the Peking menace in time; maybe not. If not, Heaven help us all.

But regarding the—

SOVIET RUSSIAN MENACE

—a just-published novel contains a lot of valuable ideas about how to counteract it.

The book is "The Journal of David Q. Little," by R. Daniel McMichael; Arlington House, New Rochelle, N.Y. 10801; 527 pages, $6.95.

Many of us remember the late George Orwell's novel "1984," about a world—particularly a Great Britain—sunk in totalitarianism in the not-distant future. It was and is a ghastly story.

Big fears, bad treaty

Mr. McMichael's book could well be called an American "1984." It takes place mostly in Pittsburgh, the author's home town, and—like the Orwell book—in a not too distant future.

The book tees off from an imagined treaty of friendship between the U.S.A. and the USSR—a treaty entered into out of nationwide fear of a nuclear war. This fear had been carefully built up by numerous U.S. publicists and politicians, some of them Soviet agents and more of them plain defeatists.

Under this treaty, vital American rights were—

SURRENDERED

—to a successor to the United Nations. The new outfit was called the World Order of Nations (WON).

The U.S.A. pledged to give up all selfish interests, work for the good of the whole world, and in the process bleed itself white by shipping all manner of raw materials and manufactured goods to the under-developed nations.

There were various catches in this arrangements—all of them to the growing disadvantage of the U.S.A. and the advantage of the Soviet rascals who bossed the WON.

Things went from bad to worse to almost worst-imaginable. The national slide downhill is chronicled in this journal, supposed to have been kept by David Q. Little, a salesman for a Pittsburgh steel company.

Grisly parable

We don't want to tell any more of the story; it wouldn't be fair to the author, the book or its publishers to do so.

We do advise a wide reading of "The Journal of David Q. Little" by Americans who love their country, like the lives they lead, hope their children may lead still better lives, and want to ward off the manifold miseries which a Communist takeover—direct or indirect—could deal this nation and all its people except the few who are Communists.

Here is a frightening book—but a healthily frightening one, and if its message gets to enough of us in time, all our Red enemies may be defeated, permanently.

National Teacher Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1967

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include last week's public service television and radio newscast, "The Kee Report." The subject discussed is the National Teacher Corps.

The newscast follows:

NATIONAL TEACHER CORPS

This is Jim Kee, bringing you the Kee Report.

The National Teacher Corps was created two years ago to pioneer in the development of better teaching techniques to help the youngsters from poverty-stricken families.

The formation of this special group was frankly an experiment. It was in no sense a criticism of the splendid men and women who teach in the nation's public schools. On the contrary, it was designed to provide special help for those elementary school teachers who are working under the handicaps usually found in city slums and rural slums as well.

The growth and development of this country is bound up with the progress made in educating our youngsters. In most civilized countries, the male school master had come to be traditional. So Europeans were amazed that in the developing public school system of hte United States, most of the teachers were women. They predicted that American children, coddled by their female teachers, would grow up unable to cope with the harsh realities of adult life.

The prophets were wrong. Our dedicated lady school teachers were such a success in teaching the three R's that the little Red Schoolhouse became a symbol of all that is good in America. And the youngsters trained in those schools became known both for their character and their initiative.

But today's teacher must do more than teach reading, writing, and arithmetic. Where the majority of children come from poor families, the teacher in the lower grades must be health consultant and guidance counselor as well.

American educators were among the first to appreciate that hidden health defects very often caused children to fail in school. So regular health check-ups were started and it was soon found that the so-called backward boy or girl was suffering from poor eyesight, poor hearing, or some other physical defect which could be corrected by proper medical treatment.

But this enlarged role for the primary grade teacher is very difficult when classrooms are over-crowded and the work load is heavy. This is where the Teacher Corps comes in. A special team composed of an experienced teacher and college graduates with special training is sent in to help the regular teacher. This team helps carry the teaching load, and the members of the group do much more to help the children.

In North Carolina, one teaching corps is serving oatmeal breakfasts before classes to hungry youngsters. In Tennessee, the children had no playground and the members of the corps built one for them. In one rural community, it was found that many children suffered from speech defects. Local doctors were persuaded to give them free corrective treatment.

In the city slums, the task of the Teacher Corps is far more complicated. The temptations of a big city are many and the youngsters who grow up without proper guidance may easily fall into a life of crime. And the job of present-day educators is to teach good citizenship as well as the elementary subjects of grade school education.

The Teacher Corps is still in its infancy. The dedicated young men and women in its ranks are learning as well as teaching. They are trying to find the surest way of converting under-privileged children into useful citizens.

Thank you for listening.

Crime as a Vocation?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MASTON O'NEAL

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1967

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, Atlanta Journal columnist Ernest Rogers has a way of bringing our most serious problems into sharp focus with his tongue-in-cheek commentary. The growing problem of crime in the United States and especially the now accepted practice of coddling criminals is just ridiculous enough to provide Mr. Rogers the necessary fabric to weave a biting, yet entertaining, column which follows:

GAMBLING OR ROBBERY: CRIME CONSIDERED AS VOCATION

(By Ernest Rogers)

"Well, young man, what have you chosen as your life's work?"

"I think I'll be a criminal."

"A criminal?"

"Yeah. A life of crime provides plenty of excitement, the pay is good, as long as you don't get caught, and if you are caught nothing much happens. You are indicted, convicted, sentenced to serve a long sentence but in no time at all everybody connected with the case is begging for you to be turned loose—and there you are."

"Are you thinking of specializing in any particular line of crime?"

"Well, gambling in general, with bank robbery as a kind of second choice."

"But don't you know all of this is against the law?"

"So what? In the crime business you have practically everything going for you. The public is sympathetic. If you operate a little horse book or lottery racket everybody is overjoyed that you were smart enough to take the suckers for a ride."

He paused a moment.

"The bank robbery racket is riskier and there's likely to be a little violence. But it doesn't cost much to go in business. All you need is a woman's stocking (even with a run in it) and a $2 revolver and you're in business. The hours are good too. You can pick your own time to work."

After filing his fingernails for a few minutes he went on.

"Look at it this way. I heist a bank for, say, 100 grand. I'm arrested, indicated, tried and convicted and maybe get a six- or eight-year sentence. Well, in a couple of years I'm back on the street again with a parole officer breathing down my neck—but can you think of an easier way to make $50,000 a year with room and board free."

"Have you given any thought to murder and kidnaping?" I asked.

"They're out," the replied. "Only in very rare cases is there any important money to be made in notching a guy, and kidnaping—well, there is too much finagling. Everybody gets in an uproar—all kinds of fuzz—and for the payoff you've got to collect your ransom money some time, somewhere—and there's where you put your foot in the bear trap."

"Have you committed any crimes so far?" I asked.

"No," he replied, "unless you consider this big lie I have been telling you a misdemeanor."

The Worsening Farm Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT DOLE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1967

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, the economic image of the American farmer and, in particular, the wheat farmer of the High Plains region is unfortunately all too often a distorted one in the minds of people who know little about the problem.

An editorial appearing in the June 1, 1967, issue of the Ulysses, Kans., News by a talented western Kansas writer, Mr. Jay Baugh, tells in a graphic way the impossible situation in which countless farm operators find themselves because of the nagging cost-price squeeze.

I ask permission to include the editorial, "Farmers in a Bind," in the RECORD at this point.

The article follows:

FARMERS IN A BIND

The average southwest Kansas farmer has an investment of $265,000 in his business and he is bound constantly in a cost squeeze.

Figures from the Southwest Kansas Farm Management association records show how much he is in a bind. This average southwest Kansas farmer must pay up to $85 in costs for each $100 of gross income. Some of the bigger and most efficient farmers have been able to trim that figure down to about $69 in costs per $100 of gross return. Most others are higher.

From 40 percent to 65 percent of the farmer's investment is farm machinery. An Iowa extension man said that any Iowa farmer who has 40 percent of his investment in machinery is in deep trouble, although we have always thought of Iowa with high land values as a state in which farm investment would be higher than it is here. But it isn't.

A few of the larger and more efficient farm operators can run a gross income up to $150,000 to $200,000, but there are many smaller farmers who gross less than $20,000 and they don't make any net. The average net income for southwest Kansas farmers in 1966 was $11,000, and that average included those who had no net income as well as those who had much more.

The Farm Management association is a group of farmers cooperating in accurate record keeping, working with the Kansas State University extension department through three fieldmen in Garden City. From the records the association shows there are four factors in successful farming, all of which are important and must be kept intact. They are land, capital, labor and farm management.

The precarious state of the southwest farmer is shown in that average of $11,000 net return on a $265,000 investment. It is about four percent and that is the average of all those who made more and those who made less.

In no other industry, and farming is big industry, does an owner receive so small a return on his investment. We know one large scale irrigation farmer whose investment in land, irrigation facilities and equipment is more than $1 million—and he would be happy to net four percent on that amount but it is impossible, and he is one of the most efficient operators in southwest Kansas agriculture. The smaller farmers who gross less than $20,000 and there are many of them who receive virtually no return on their investment because it is proportionately higher than that of the big, efficient farmer.

That is the effect of the cost squeeze on the farmer and the reason to believe that before long all farming will be done by corporations on a massive scale. Only few individuals can survive.

A Graduation Editorial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1967

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, the weekly newspapers of Minnesota last week were reprinting an editorial written by Mr. Lynn Smith, editor of the Monticello Times, a constituent of mine.

Because of the basic traditional American philosophy expressed in this editorial, I would like to share it with my colleagues by inserting it in the RECORD at this point:

A GRADUATION EDITORIAL

If my son were graduating tonight, I'd try to impart to him a few thoughts that would stand him in good stead in the years ahead.

Admittedly, the thoughts expressed here aren't new. He's probably heard them before. Yet at this time of graduation a parent can't help but naturally feel a compelling urgency to communicate with his son or daughter.

So I'd try to instill in him a zest for knowledge and life—not just for academic learning for its own sake—but a quest for those real-life experiences that help bring understanding and discernment.

Then I'd try hard, too, to make him realize that possession of mere knowledge isn't an end in itself. Rather to be sought is the ability to effectively translate this knowledge—through the leavening influence of wisdom—into meaningfulness in one's life and in other's.

Tempered with prudence, understanding and compassion, such knowledge can be truly a potent force for good. Add enthusiasm and resourcefulness and perseverance . . . and the sky literally becomes the limit to one's aspirations.

I'd try to tell my son to be both tolerant and intolerant. There's a dignity to every human being—whatever his race, creed or economic status. This dignity, with the accompanying human frailities and shortcomings that we all possess, should be inviolate. And so tolerance is needed.

Intolerance is needed, too, an intolerance of hypocrisy, malice, envy, greed and corruption. Badly needed is a vigilant and vigorous spirit to combat the apathy, the don't-involve-me attitude, or the what's-the-issue resignment that characterizes so much of our times.

Also I'd try to tell my son to be of an inquisitive nature—and not blindly accept the opinions or teachings of others. Skepticism isn't necessarily bad. Such questioning can dispel the shams or falsehoods or misconceptions that may cloud the thinking of himself and others.

Then, too, I'd try to inspire my son to develop an appreciation and reverence for things of beauty—for books, words, music, art, and nature itself. These can be of enduring beauty and joy. Even more vitally needed is a firm spiritual faith in this world of unbelief and uncertainty.

For it's a space age we're living in now. It's an era that's seen man himself—within a single generation—uncover latent cosmic forces so awesome in magnitude that the continued existence of mankind itself is threatened. It's a computerized age of astounding technological advances that at times obviate the need for the human element. And it's a materialistic society we live in—with the relentless acquisition of goods and status often obscuring the deeper significance of life.

Engulfed by such powerful forces on all sides, one finds it more and more difficult to retain individual identity, to establish a perspective of values, to discover purposefulness in one's being.

And so I'd try to tell my son to strive constantly to express his individuality through thought and action. This doesn't mean mere non-conformance just for itself. But rather it's the self-determination of the course an individual must take—though it be at times a lonely one—if he's to honestly follow the dictates of an enlightened conscience and an understanding heart.

It calls for courage, for the follow-the-crowd attitude and the easy-way-out philosophy not only abound, but even seem to proliferate. In the day of the fast buck, what's-the-percentage-for-me, the kick-back and the hand-out, those age-old virtues of honesty and integrity are taking a real beating.

But it's these very same virtues of honesty, integrity, self-reliance and understanding that are—and always will be—needed if one is to fulfill his role in life. And that's to serve himself and others to the very best of his God-given talents and ability.

World Poverty and World Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. TUNNEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1967

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. Speaker, on May 2, Senator EDWARD M. KENNEDY spoke at Johns Hopkins University on the subject "World Poverty and World Peace." In a most informative speech, the Senator points out that world peace is not possible when nations are poor and people are miserable. He says:

> If we hope to avert Vietnams in the future, if there is ever to be a greater measure of peace and stability in the world, the legitimate aspirations of the 1.5 billion people of the underdeveloped countries for a better life must be satisfied.

And, the Senator urges a long-range foreign aid program to help these underdeveloped countries through the stages of development. He says:

> Our aid should not turn on and off, depending on how "threatened" a nation is, but be a long rang program, with long-term appropriations, on which the poor nations can depend, so they can plan to do their part in their development.

I would like to share Senator KENNEDY's address with my colleagues and include it in the RECORD:

WORLD POVERTY AND WORLD PEACE

(Address by Senator EDWARD M. KENNEDY, at Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, May 2, 1967)

The critical struggle for freedom and humanity, over the next ten and fifteen years, is going to come in the underdeveloped nations, where two-thirds of the world's people live in abject poverty. The task will be to help bring them a decent standard of life, and some hope for their future.

In the last eight years, there have been over 170 outbreaks of serious violence in various parts of the globe, aimed at overthrowing the existing governments. Almost all of them have taken place in lands where the income per person is under $300 a year. Of the 38 poorest countries in the world, with incomes of less than $100 a year, 32 of them have suffered significant wars and conflicts.

If you seek the underlying causes of the war in Vietnam, one will be poverty. Even the tensions between India and Pakistan and between the Arab countries and Israel, founded as they are in religious differences or territorial questions, are intensified by poverty. When nations are poor and people are miserable, there will be insurgencies and violence; and governments will mount adventures of aggression against other countries, to divert their own peoples' attention from their hopeless lives.

If we hope to avert Vietnams in the future, if there is ever to be a greater measure of peace and stability in the world, the legitimate aspirations of the 1.5 billion people of the underdeveloped countries for a better life than they have must be satisfied.

At the present time, the process is not going well. Despite all the foreign aid, despite the significant attempts poor nations have made to develop themselves, there has been no measurable improvement in the lives of most of these people. In some countries, the standard of life has deteriorated over the last few years. The poor nations of the world face a harsh decade. There is the prospect of widespread famine in Asia and Africa, because production of food has not kept pace with their swelling populations. They face the near certainty that their exports will not be able to pay for what they must import, since the commodities that give them the bulk of their export earnings are declining as a share of the world market. The gap in living standards between the poor nations of the world and the rich grows greater. Last year, the national income of the United States increased by $40 billion. This increase was more than the total national incomes of the 700 million people in India and the nations of black Africa.

INDIA AS AN EXAMPLE

To illustrate the difficulties and the dangers, I would cite India. For years we have been told that India is the crucial testing ground of whether a poor nation can develop under conditions of freedom. After three five-year plans, after immense efforts by her planners and her people, the results, in human terms, have been very disappointing. The economic growth of India since 1946, when adjusted for population, has been 1 per cent a year. For the average Indian, this has meant an increased income of 70 cents a year. India today has 12 million unemployed workers. A bitter famine has spread to 60 million people in two large states. As a result of the recent Indian election, in which a major issue was economic discontent, the majority of India's states have rejected the ruling Congress Party, two in favor of left-wing governments. This is just a taste of what could come if the pace does not improve.

THE CYCLE OF REVOLUTION

We cannot ignore the cycle by which development failure breeds insurrection and revolution. It could involve us as deeply as we are involved today in Vietnam. Lest we feel these countries and their problems are remote, just think of the difficulties we would be in if, at the same time we were fighting in Vietnam, widespread anti-American revolutionary movements were overturning governments by force in Latin America and Africa.

This danger increases, year by year, but the efforts to meet it do not. The total amount of public development capital moving from the developed to the undeveloped countries of the world, for the last six years, has remained static at the level of a little over $6 billion. Support in the United States for an adequate foreign aid program has slackened. Since 1962, the foreign aid budgets proposed by Presidents Kennedy and Johnson have been cut, in Congress, by 10 to 20 per cent a year. This year, the outlook is even grimmer. Last year's foreign aid budget was saved from a 30 per cent cut by a margin of only two votes. Thirty-three of the Congressmen who voted against the cut were defeated in last November's election.

AN OUTDATED RATIONALE

And so we must greatly increase, and improve our foreign aid program and we must begin by recognizing that the current rationale for American foreign aid is out of date. Senator Vandenberg of Michigan, the man who led the Republican Party out of isolationism, once advised President Truman that to gain acceptance for the revolutionary idea of foreign aid, he would "have to scare hell out of the country." We have continued to do this for eighteen years. One secretary of state after another, in testimony and public statements, have tried to sell foreign aid to the American people as the way to stop the spread of Communism. Of course, we wished to build healthy economies; of course, we wanted friendly nations to maintain their independence; of course, it was the right and moral thing to do; but behind all these was the persuasive argument that foreign aid, by fighting Communism with money, could avoid the need to fight it with troops.

Regarding foreign aid as an instrument of the Cold War has hurt the program in many ways. It has resulted in too much aid going for military purposes, and too little for economic development. Money that could have gone to build a dam or irrigate a valley has gone to prop up a general or strengthen an unpopular regime.

We have sent most of our assistance not to the places where the opportunity for development was best, but to where the Communist threat was strongest at the time. The aid budget for this year proposes more money for South Vietnam than for all the nations of Latin America combined. In Africa, where very small investments could yield great returns, the aid program in most countries, for all practical purposes, has ceased, simply because the short-run Communist threat is considered to be on the wane. In Kenya, for example, there is a chance for important break-throughs in the new farm technology, and to build agricultural cooperatives that could be a model for the entire continent. But there aren't enough Communists in Kenya, so the aid is not forthcoming.

The anti-Communist rationale for foreign aid has led us to surround our program with political restrictions that tend to undermine some of the most important development efforts. There is no more hopeful project in Asia today than the international development of the Mekong River Basin. It premises energy for industry, irrigation, flood control and agricultural development that will greatly benefit 30 million people. The four nations of Southeast Asia, despite their political differences, are working on it together. Yet just two months ago, our government had to withdraw its support for a dam in Cambodia, a key to the entire project—because Cambodia has sent food to Hanoi, and we forbid aid for countries that trade with Hanoi.

We also forbid aid to countries that trade with Cuba, or in other ways assist the Communist "bloc." To the poor countries, all these restrictions make it look like we are using our aid as a club, to force them to support us in foreign affairs. Nations like Burma—non-Communist nations desperately in need of assistance—have all but ended American aid because they feel their national independence is being put into jeopardy. Nations that are poor are nonetheless proud. They do not want to be wards of wealthy countries, taking their aid in return for voting for them in the UN or supporting their foreign adventures.

In all these ways, the anti-Communist rationale has hurt foreign aid in the past. We followed it because foreign aid was a new and controversial program. It was felt Americans would not support the so-called "giveways" unless they could be linked with fighting Communism. But if the detente with Russia grows over the next ten years, and if China becomes so preoccuplied with its internal convulsions that it loses interest in aggression, where will the rationale be then?

The receding of the Communist threat might well take with it the American foreign aid program—long before it has accomplished its real purposes, and at a time when it is needed more than ever.

A NEW GOAL FOR AID

So we must begin with a new rationale. Foreign aid should be designed not to combat any enemy or doctrine, not to win support for our foreign policies, when that support is really for our comfort instead of our aid. Some foreign aid will continue to have as its purpose the strengthening of the security of these nations and, indirectly, of our own. But henceforth the real goal of foreign aid should be to preserve the peace by completing the modernization of the planet.

We should adopt a well-planned, and well-enunciated strategy of development, based on the accepted principles of what nations must do and must have, to pass through the stages leading to self-sustaining economic growth. Our aid should not turn on and off, depending on how "threatened" a nation is, but be a long range program, with long-term appropriations, on which the poor nations can depend, so they can plan to do their part in their development.

I would like to block out tonight five imperatives of such a strategy of development.

First, we must be patient. The French have an expression that "it takes three generations to make a Frenchman." The task of world economic modernization will take almost that long. No nation on earth, with the exception of Japan, has been able to do it in less than sixty years. We sometimes get impatient with the progress that the newly independent nations have made since foreign aid began fifteen years ago. But we should remember that fifteen years after our own independence, most of our states were in default on their obligations.

Second, we must be more generous. One of the reasons a nation like India is in such difficult straits is because, on a per capita basis, the aid to her has come to only $3 per year. Neither we, nor the other developed nations, have really made the effort that is going to be necessary. We all pay lip service to the pledge taken in the United Nations to devote 1 per cent a year of our national production to foreign assistance. But in totaling up our contributions, we include such things as Social Security payments made to persons living abroad, and some of them include loans made at very high rates of interest. Even the six billion plus I mentioned previously is in many ways a misleading figure. In recent years, the poor nations have had to pay back almost half this much in interest and amortization on loans received in the past. Added to their increased need to import goods, this means the many poor countries are being drained, each year, of more foreign exchange than they receive as aid.

The poor nations must be able to predict, with some certainty, how much aid they will receive, so they need not abandon development projects midway for lack of foreign exchange. The best estimates are that the poor countries could use effectively at least $4 billion a year more than they are receiving. To make this possible, I believe that all the developed nations should agree now to achieve a transfer of at least 1 per cent of their gross national products to world development programs by 1970.

For the United States, this would mean a doubling of the present level of aid. I surely think, that for this important purpose, we can manage to spend as much, each year, as we spend on toys and cosmetics.

Third, a larger part of our aid should be given on a multilateral basis. Bilateral aid cannot be accepted in the spirit it is given. When white men offer dollars and come in to supervise how they should be spent, it causes resentment and loss of self-esteem in the poor countries. There is too much danger such aid will have, even indirectly, political strings. There is a role for bilateral aid, in countries where the leadership will not undertake solution of difficult problems without our prodding. But we must be prepared to give increasing amounts of aid through international organizations.

We need not fear that international control of our aid would bring waste or corruption—although bilateral aid has not avoided it. Organizations like the World Bank and the International Development Association have developed strict procedures and controls. They have, or could be given, sufficient personnel to supervise each project as well as we could ourselves.

I would hope that over the next ten years we could channel an increasing percentage of our aid through the World Bank, IDA, the UN development program, and the regional development banks which are now beginning to operate. To further show we believe aid should be removed from international politics, we should join with the Russians to fund a significant aid project for a nation like India—and then ask the other advanced Communist countries to join us in further programs for other poor nations.

Fourth, our other economic policies should be consistent with the aims of the aid program. Much of the aid we give is today being cancelled out by other policies we pursue. To understand this, you must realize that in purely economic terms, what foreign aid does is to increase the amount of foreign exchange a poor country has available to use to purchase the things it needs. Poor countries also try to increase their foreign exchange earnings by exporting goods and entertaining tourists. If we pursue policies that take foreign exchange away from them, we cancel the benefits of the aid.

For example, almost all of the trade policies of the rich countries of the world are stacked against the efforts of the poor to increase their trade. The Common Market with its high levies on imports of agricultural goods and many of our tariff restrictions and our import quotas are reminders of the old colonial days, when poor countries existed merely to provide cheap raw material for the industries of the mother countries.

In the early years of the 1950's, the nations of Europe, still recovering from the war, told us that trade, not aid, was their most important need. The poor nations of today are in the same position. Eighty-five per cent of their export earnings come from the sale of primary products. They cannot make progress if the few goods they can now offer the world cannot bring a decent price. They are not going to be able to develop modern industries, no matter how many power grids or factories foreign aid puts in, if they cannot sell their manufactures to the countries that use them. The modernization we seek will not take place unless and until we revise the whole web of arrangements by which rich nations make trade more difficult for the poor.

To see how severely trade policies can retard development, we need only look at Latin America. Since 1954, we have made $12 billion in aid available. But the money Latin America has received from exporting its coffee, copper, rubber and other commodities over the same period has declined by $12 billion. In terms of the money available for development, all our aid, including all in the Alliance for Progress, has been wiped out.

Of the eighty underdeveloped countries of the world, almost fifty of them depend for foreign earnings on the export of one or two crops or commodities. These exports are a source of much more money for development than is foreign aid. But in recent years, these poor countries have been severely injured by the steady drop in world community prices. Colombia, for example, used to be able to count on up to $500 million in foreign exchange each year from its sales of coffee. This year, it will be a little more than half of that—and as a result, Colombia must cut its economic development plan by one-third. Eduardo Frei, the President of Chile, is one of the most progressive leaders in all Latin America. For a long time, his administration was a symbol of how the Alliance for Progress can work. But President Frei's government is in deep trouble today, primarily because the price of copper on the world market fell in one year from 56 to 42 cents a pound.

The goal should be to increase the export earnings of the poor countries by 6 per cent each year. To do this, the nations of the world should formulate price stabilization agreements on commodities like rubber, tin, cocoa, tea and petroleum, similar to the coffee agreement of 1963, which has been partially successful. Until these can be worked out, international organizations should be allowed to make quick grants of funds to single countries dependent on one or two commodities, to cushion them against sudden drops in the world price of what they sell. We should try to agree with the Common Market to eliminate duties on tropical agricultural products.

For our own part, it will involve reappraising the entire network of restrictions we have erected, for the benefit of our own industries, over the years. I refer not only to tariffs and quotas on imports, but to the laws which require aid-receiving nations to buy American products and ship them in American bottoms. These laws lower the value of our aid by almost 20 per cent. I refer, as well, to our depreciation allowances and our many other subsidies to domestic business that make it harder for the poor nations to compete in our market. President Johnson's statement at the Latin summit conference—that he would be willing to look into the possibility of creating tariff preferences for the manufactured goods of the poor countries—shows his willingness to consider these possibilities. We should spread this willingness to the nation as a whole. Changing these policies might involve temporary dislocations in some parts of our economy. But the last few years have shown how expansionist, and wonderfully flexible, the American economy has become. Millions of jobs have been destroyed, through automation, geographic shifts and changing defense needs—but even more jobs have been created. Domestic industries that might be adversely affected by the trade policy I have mentioned should be eligible for the same adjustment assistance as the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 provides—but I thing the industries where this would happen are very, very few.

Fifth, we must encourage private enterprise to join in the development process. Even if world aid is doubled, there will still be a gap between what the rich countries provide and what the poor countries are going to need. This can best be supplied by private investment. It is no coincidence that the handful of developing countries which have enjoyed good growth in recent years—Korea, Mexico, Venezuela, Taiwan—are countries which have encouraged local and international private investment.

The most important potential field for private investment is in industries producing products, like fertilizer, that agriculture needs, and industries using agricultural products. In many ways, this is the most critical of all the areas of development, and the most difficult. Unless the poor nations can modernize their agriculture—unless they experience the same technological revolution of the farm that we have had, their people, very simply, are going to starve. As we see in India today, the other efforts in development will come to a halt, as nations are forced to spend all their capital on food.

The giant new "agribusiness" industries of the developed countries have the know-how to change this. They have learned how to increase production, develop better strains of crops, conserve the soil and make the available water go around better. They can help develop the buying and selling co-operatives, and the pricing systems that would allow the farmers of these countries to invest even their meagre funds in the new techniques. But private firms cannot be expected to invest in the agricultural improvement of poor nations unless they have the reasonable confidence of making a profit. Our government can help in this through better guarantees against risk, similar to what was given to the New York City Bank that has agreed to supervise the modernization of the agriculture of Thailand. We can help, as well, through interest subsidies, through disseminating of more information about investment opportunities, and by helping our companies cut the red tape that surrounds doing business with the governments of many poor nations. All of this is vital to development, for it will determine, in large part, whether poor countries can have a balanced growth, or whether they will have to spend all they have to buy food to ward off starvation.

CHALLENGE OF DEMOCRATIC DEVELOPMENT

Democratic development is not just a process of economic change. In many ways it will require a social revolution. And it will require much more effort on the poor nations' part than on ours. Japan was able to modernize her economy in thirty years without any foreign aid at all, because she was a nation. Her people were one with her leaders and they worked with tremendous energy.

The process of modernization is a fundamental process of social and economic change. The American people are not going to support a development program that merely makes the rich richer and the class structure more rigid. Nations must be willing to change their ways so that their people can have a share in the fruits of the development process. Farmers will not be inspired by shiny machines and modern methods if they do not own the land they till. Commodity agreements will not help if the higher prices go only to wealthy growers who salt the money away in European banks. The most modern schools and school books will be useless if the class system is so rigid that people cannot rise according to their ability, for then they have no incentive for education. Nor will they be inspired by a growing industrial system, if it is dominated by foreign managers and gives them no opportunity to rise through the ranks.

In short, social justice and individual opportunity are going to be indispensable to economic progress and to the efforts the nations must make for themselves.

To create world peace through world development is an immense task, but it is no different, in philosophy, from what we have done in our own country. Since the beginning of the century, we have known that the greatest source of domestic discord and danger lay among those who lived in poverty. And we know that increasing their demand for goods is the surest foundation of a healthy economy. Most of our grant-in-aid laws, for schools, hospitals, airports and such, contain "equalization" formulas that insure more for our poor states than our rich states. Our farm price supports are directed not just to the wealthy farmer, but to the family farmer. Fifty years of government effort, from the New Freedom to the New Frontier and the Great Society, have resulted in a redistribution of wealth to the underpriviledged, which has increased everybody's wealth, and created the strongest economy the world has ever known. So there is nothing revolutionary or untried in this.

THIS GENERATION'S TASK

I have not come here tonight merely to ask you to support the foreign aid program. This generation of college students should have higher sights. I would propose that you take up, as the task of your generation, nothing less than the modernization of the poor nations of this planet. I propose you do it hand in hand with the young people who today comprise a majority of those countries, and who, in your lifetime, will be no more than two or three hours away from you by supersonic transport.

By modernization I do not mean merely the kind of material growth we associate with the Industrial Revolution of the West. This is important, but if there is anything that your generation has taught its elders, it is that material goods are not enough to make a satisfying life. And this is also in the deepest tradition of Asia, Africa and Latin America. We are interested as well in the development of the mind and the spirit, the improvement of the quality of life and the quality of social justice here in our own country and in the poor nations.

There is more to this challenge than the preservation of world peace, vital as it is. There is the creative explosion of whole cultures. We speak of poor peoples, but many of them belong to some of the oldest, most creative cultural traditions on this earth. If the people of these countries, now bound down by poverty, could live in a way in which they could use their talents and historic cultural abilities to the fullest, they could make this world infinitely richer and more exciting for all of you.

Your generation is especially qualified to undertake this, for you will have at your command all the marvels of the new technology—to automate industry, teach through machine, irrigate the deserts, tap the ocean depths and create new sources of food and fabric.

Eight years ago, President Kennedy called the gap between the rich nations and the poor the most critical challenge in the world. Today the gap is greater and more dangerous than ever. The United States owns fully half the wealth of the entire free world. Is this great blessing not also a danger? Can we remain aloof from the poverty and misery of the world? As Pope Paul said, in his Encyclical on Peace and Development, "If today's flourishing civilizations remain selfishly wrapped up in themselves, they could easily place their highest values in jeopardy, sacrificing their will to be great to the desire to possess more."

But I do not think that you want that kind of America. I think you want a deeper involvement. The spirit of democratic development in all its fullness of material, social and spiritual change is the spirit that excities our young people and excites the enthusiasm and commitment of people around the world.

I hope you are ready to take up this challenge as the great task of your generation—to take this as your responsibility to the wider world community of which you are a part, and which in your time, you are going to lead.

Legacy of Suez

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. E. (BILL) BROCK

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1967

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, only too rarely does a prominent publication address itself to our international difficulties with a cogency and candor sufficient to warrant its attention by every Member of Congress and the Nation as a whole. The "Legacy of Suez," printed on May 29 in Barron's, is such an article. I highly recommend it for your consideration.

Mr. Speaker, I ask to have the article printed in the Appendix of the Record:

LEGACY OF SUEZ—U.S. DIPLOMACY IN THE MIDDLE EAST IS BANKRUPT

In a day and age which no longer declares war, and even seems to have trouble telling the good guys from the bad, last week's crisis in the Middle East struck us as strangely old-fashioned. While lights may or may not have burned late in the chancelleries—the White House frugally made the six o'clock television news on Tuesday—both sides exchanged stiff notes and massed troops. There was a sudden flurry of diplomatic activity: the Secretary-General of the United Nations flew from New York City to Cairo and back again, while the President of Israel, cutting short a visit to Expo 67, hurriedly returned to Tel Aviv. The war scare affected, albeit briefly, both the stock and commodity markets, and triggered a burst of grim topical jokes ("Did you hear the one about the clash in the Negev? . . ."). Finally, all shades of American political opinion were able to agree on the villain of the piece. "A Middle Eastern dictator," said the dove-like New York Times with unwonted ferocity, "threatens the peace of the world"

Overnight, it seems, those who used to blur issues are drawing sharp lines; after years of murky gray, black-and-white is suddenly in style. As anti-Nasserites of longstanding—Barron's had the ruler of Egypt pegged as a tool of the Kremlin a decade ago, when most observers were hailing him as a symbol of Arab unity—we welcome the abrupt hardening of public opinion. However, at the risk of alienating our new-found friends, we venture to suggest that the onus for the latest crisis does not rest solely with Gamal Abdel Nasser. On the contrary, there is plenty of blame to go round.

Part of it falls on so-called uncommitted countries like Yugoslavia and India, which rarely miss a chance to oppose the legitimate interest of the West and last week rallied behind the United Arab Republic. The United Nations, which packed up its peacekeeping mission in the Sinai Peninsula and Gaza Strip in unseemly haste, also shares the burden of responsibility. Guiltiest party of all is the United States, which for over 10 years, under Republican and Democratic Presidents alike, has abetted Egyptian subversion and aggression. Since Suez, for example, Washington has lavished more than $1 billion worth of foreign aid on Cairo. Food for Peace has underwritten Egypt's undeclared war on Yemen, while the U.S., almost alone in the non-Communist world, hastened to recognize Nasser's new puppet state. Even in a land of milk and honey, appeasement still bears bitter fruit.

Since Suez the world has had more than one forestaste of things to come. In 1957, barely nine months after an unholy alliance between the U.S. and USSR had rescued Egypt from ignominious defeat, Syria (which subsequently became part of the United Arab Republic) fell to a Communist-inspired palace revolution. In the following year a Nasserite coup toppled the Iraqi monarchy, while U.S. Marines landed in Lebanon (and British paratroopers in Jordan) to save these unhappy fellahs from a similar fate. When fighting broke out in the fall of 1963 between socialist Algeria and the kingdom of Morocco, the latter's forces, to their surprise, wound up taking Egyptian prisoners. In Yemen, Cairo has deployed upwards of 60,000 troops in a revolt against the Royalist government, and, according to authentic reports, made savage use of poison gas. In recent months it has bombed unarmed towns in Saudi Arabia, which supports the duly constituted Yemeni authorities. Emboldened by the lack of sanctions, it also is twisting the feeble British lion's tail in Aden.

From the Straits of Gibraltar to the Red Sea, in short, Egypt repeatedly has violated international law. Yet somehow these outrages have failed to evoke a word of protest either from the peace-loving Parliament of Man or the pious diplomat who presides over its destinies. This month both the UN and its Secretary-General revealed where their sympathies lie. At a nudge from Gamal Abdel Nasser, Yugoslavia and India, which make up a sizable part of the UN peacekeeping force in the Middle East, agreed to fold their tents. Their withdrawal threatened to leave on the scene only Western troops from Brazil, Canada and New Zealand, a contingency which, according to the Christian Science Monitor, "the Secretary-General disapproved." Hence without consulting anyone, and in disregard of clear-cut commitments, U Thant abruptly ordered the UN Emergency Force to pull out. The move, of course, was applauded by both so-called neutrals. It also enjoyed the support of the Soviet Union, which helped prevent the hastily convened (and newly expanded) UN Security Council from taking action. UN headquarters in New York City may make headlines, but Moscow (to which the Egyptian Minister of War flew to get his marching orders last Thursday) is calling the shots.

If war explodes, the blame will lie primarily with the United States, which, with an occasional lapse into common sense, as in the case of the Lebanon landings, generally has pursued a ruinous course in the Middle East. The folly began with Suez, when John Foster Dulles, for obscure and legalistic reasons, turned his back on this nation's oldest allies and made common cause with its relentless foe. Since then things have gone from bad to worse. Thus, the late President Kennedy appointed as Ambassador to Cairo a man named John Badeau, who penned a glowing preface to "The Philosophy of the Revolution," Nasser's version of Mein Kampf. "Egypt," wrote the admiring diplomat, "has rapidly emerged as the dominant influence in the Arab world, and its revolution has spilled over the Nile Valley to become the 'wave of the future' in adjacent lands."

Washington has shown goodwill in deeds as well as words. In the decade after 1952, when King Farouk was overthrown, the U.S. supplied Egypt with an estimated $500 million worth of foreign aid; in fiscal '63 alone, the total came to nearly $200 million, including $10 million from the Export-Import Bank, $48 million from the Agency for International Development and $140 million in so-called Food for Peace, a program run at the time by George S. McGovern, now Senator from South Dakota and, ironically, a notorious dove. All told, one way or another this country doubtless has furnished Gamal Abdel Nasser well over a billion dollars, nor, at least until the latest crisis, was the end in sight. On the contrary, last fall, shortly after the tenth anniversary of the seizure of the Suez Canal, the head of the World Bank visited Cairo with an eye toward financing an expansion of the captive waterway. Again, while Nasser happens to be in arrears on nearly $25 million of the $105 million owed the International Monetary Fund, IMF emissaries last month seemed on the verge of granting him new drawing rights. Despite all lapses—the UAR also has defaulted on an Eximbank loan—the Commodity Credit Corp. early this year was still lending money to the "Middle Eastern dictator." Egypt may be insolvent, but U.S. dollar diplomacy is bankrupt.

And not just in the Middle East. For if last week's sound and fury signify anything, it's that the nation is under attack throughout the world. For too long President Johnson, like his predecessor, has pretended that Vietnam is merely an isolated, painful confrontation. For too long he has sought to build bridges on the quicksand of Communist enmity. While statesmen who should know better prate of peace on earth, this Memorial Day sees the U.S. more and more deeply involved in war. Until it learns to recognize the enemy, it cannot hope to prevail.

Fino Seeks Change Making Commutation Expenses Tax Deductible

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1967

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today I have reintroduced my bill to allow taxpayers to deduct commutation expenses.

There is no reason that commutation expenses—a necessary part of holding remunerative employment to so many people—should not be treated like other business expenses and made tax deductible.

Under the tax laws as they now stand, commutation expenses may in certain odd circumstances be deductible, but those ordinarily incurred are not. The typical commuter gets no tax relief with respect to the large amounts of money spent by him each year reaching the place of his employment. This expense, to my way of thinking, is very clearly a business expense—particularly where you have the situation in which a company almost dictates an executive's choice of residence. I think that it is high time that the Congress gave this tax break to the hard-pressed middle-income taxpayer.

Representative Henry P. Smith III Lauds Advances Made by Hooker Chemical Corp. in the Field of Fire-Retardant Chemistry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY P. SMITH III

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1967

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, there is an interesting story behind a recent announcement by a Department of Defense procurement agency regarding the awarding of contracts for some 16,000,000 yards of cotton oxford cloth for use as tent liners. It is especially interesting, in my opinion, because of two words included in the specifications which the successful bidders must meet—fire resistant.

The facts behind this story are known to me because they so intimately involve a company which has achieved a number of significant technological developments in the very sophisticated field of fire-retardant chemistry. Hooker Chemical Corp.'s firmly established predominance in this field results from many years of experience in developing and supplying industry with products and systems which reduce or eliminate fire hazards in a wide range of applications.

There is no need to dwell here on the grim statistics published annually by the National Fire Protection Association, or the Public Health Service. Fire does kill or maim thousands of people every year, many of them childlren. The tragedy of it all is that much of this crippling and killing could be prevented or significantly reduced.

Some years ago Hooker management decided to support research efforts aimed at utilizing its proficiency in fire-retardant chemistry through the development of chemical systems that could be used in textiles, such as cotton fabrics used in manufacturing protective work garments. Working closely with leading mills, and the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Southern Regional Research Laboratory at New Orleans, La., Hooker did develop chemical systems for treating fabrics which set new standards for durable fire retardancy.

It is to the credit of the American free enterprise system that others also worked and continue to work on providing compounds or materials that will help alleviate this flammable fabrics problem. Hooker, which pioneered in this effort, continues to this day to work on it. Notable progress has been made.

There's comfort to be derived in the knowledge that the Department of Defense is providing the best in fire-resistant tenting, mattress ticking, and flight suits for our service personnel. However, it is not just in the military field that milestone applications have been achieved. There are a good many more commonplace and mundane uses for this technology than tenting liners, such as fire-retardant blankets, bed linens, cubicle curtains, work garments, and even sweat shirts. These products are now available or could be produced by leading mills and suppliers under various labels, many of them as the result of Hooker's efforts.

It is to be hoped that steady progress will continue to be made in those continuing efforts aimed at speeding the day when consumers generally can look for and expect to find those same two words—fire resistant on a growing range and variety of everyday clothing and household fabrics.

Remarks of the Honorable Jerome Waldie at the Democratic Volunteer Committee Convention in Los Angeles, Calif.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1967

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I hereby insert in the Appendix of the Congressional Record a speech that was made by my friend and colleague, the Honorable Jerome Waldie, of California, at a convention in Los Angeles, on Saturday, June 3, of the Democratic Volunteer Committee and all elements of the official Democratic Party.

American history has frequently demonstrated that our strongest and best Presidents are often those who have been exposed to the most hostility and abuse of the people.

The reason is perhaps best explained by an old proverb: "Behold the turtle. He makes progress only when he sticks his neck out."

Our best Presidents—most of whom needless to say, were Democrats—have made progress for this magnificent Nation of ours by using the same anatomical methods as the turtle.

The saving grace, of course, is that while we abuse "That Man in the White House," we seldom fail to re-elect them.

All of which is to say that the strident and harsh voices of scorn, abuse and vilification directed at President Johnson indicate that he is doing his job—and doing it well.

Let me make something very clear: I am not speaking of those who criticize American policy *responsibly* and *compassionately*. I am speaking of those who trade on fear and hatred.

The racists abuse President Johnson for being the President who has done more for civil rights than any other President in our history.

The reactionaries and far right-wingers abuse him for being the President who has most strenuously advocated social reforms in our domestic structure. And the far-out left wing abuses him for our Nation's stand against Communist aggression.

Personally, as far as these groups are concerned, I think we would all congratulate the President on the excellent enemies he has made.

But I do believe it is time that the great majority of responsible Americans—and, in particular, members of our own Democratic Party—take a more active role in rallying to the President's cause against the hateful and insulting *personal* attacks that defame his integrity, honesty, patriotism and sincerity.

The President has emphasized the necessity for preserving freedom of speech—without excepting from that protection, the speech of those who are little more than rabble-rousers or demagogues. But the President and the Nation has the right to expect responsible dissent.

For, as the President said recently, "dissent is a two-way street." There must be a responsible dialogue on the issues, if the dissenters are to serve the best interest of the Nation.

It is one thing to oppose our policies in Vietnam. But is quite another to collect funds for the enemy or burn our flag.

And let me add quickly, that it is one thing to strongly protest the conduct of some of the dissenters, but it is quite another to seek to abridge their basic rights of freedom of speech or of lawful asesmbly.

Short of unlawful behavior, we—all of us who call ourselves Americans—must urgently insist for the dissenters the right to be heard.

I emphasize this very fundamental point because I believe that there has been a dangerous escalation of bad judgment by both the far left and the far right.

We have paid a high price in the past for such uncontrolled, irresponsible behavior. We have seen the sad results that occur in a climate of hatred and blind emotionalism.

Have we forgotten so soon the shame of our treatment of Japanese Americans during World War II?

Have we forgotten the nightmare of the McCarthy period?

Have we forgotten the horror of President Kennedy's murder?

These terrible events have one common denominator—they occurred during the periods of hatred, distrust and disunity.

The meaning of all this is clear: it is high time for the Democratic Party to end its bickering and local wranglings and stand with the President in these difficult times.

I know that there are some Democrats who so strongly oppose Vietnam that they have turned a deaf ear on pleas for support for the President or his policies. Let me address them for a moment.

Our Nation prides itself on upholding a bipartisan foreign policy. The agreements entered into by previous Aministrations—whether Republican or Democratic—are upheld by subsequent Administrations, regardless of party.

President Johnson has honored an agreement that he himself did not make. This is as it should be. For the word of a great Nation must never be doubted by friend or foe.

He has honored our commitments in Vietnam. And he will honor our commitments in the Middle East.

It is difficult to speak about Vietnam without sounding like a hawk or a dove. Yet, the truth is that neither hawks nor doves truly reflect the President's policy in Vietnam.

We want peace in Vietnam—not military occupation of a conquered Nation. And the President has only one objective for Vietnam—a peaceful and honorable settlement.

Those who actively protest against our involvement in this conflict accurately convey our Nation's distaste for the necessity of war.

I can tell you that not one of these peace-marchers or draft card burners detests this war as much as President Johnson does.

And no one in the world is working harder or is more anxious to find a peaceful settlement.

Let me say to my sincere friends who believe the President has conducted the Vietnam war without restraint, patience or reason that of those entities in our Government who have most to say about the conduct of the war, the President is the *only* one who advocates and exercises reasonable restraint. There are actually only three groups vested with any part of the responsibility to escalate, de-escalate or hold the line in Vietnam. The President, as Commander-in-Chief; the Pentagon, representing the military; and the Congress. Clearly, the Pentagon believes escalation to the ultimate is required; equally clearly, the Congress, *overwhelmingly*, and particularly since last November, advocates a far more "hawkish" stance in Vietnam than has occurred to date. The President, then, is the *only* person of those who can make these decisions, to advocate and, fortunately, to compel, a policy of reasoned restraint in the application of our unbelievable military power.

I have heard from deeply concerned people the accusation that the President is personally responsible for the war in Vietnam. I have heard the obscene charge that the war is "Lyndon Johnson's War." I have heard the equally obscene charge that the President continues this war for his own personal and political gain. Frequently, the same person concludes with the solemn prediction that the President will be defeated because of the Vietnam war—that his popularity has severely declined because of his policies in that war.

I reply to these critics that there is an inconsistency of considerable proportions in that charge.

If it is true that the Vietnam war represents a loss in political support to the President, how can it similarly be true that he seeks personal gain from the war?

Obviously, the presence or lack of political popularity resulting from the war plays no part in the determination of Administration policy. Equally obviously, the President's policy, rightly or wrongly, is predicated on his deep conviction that the Nation's and the World's best interest are served by repulsion of aggression whenever and wherever it occurs.

Such motivation governed President Truman when he confronted aggression in Korea; when he confronted similar aggression in the Berlin blockade.

Such motivation governed President Kennedy when he confronted aggression in Cuba and in Vietnam.

And such motivation governed President Eisenhower when he began the confrontation with aggression in Vietnam.

Reflect for a moment, how the course of history might have been changed had similar motivation been present when Hitler tested the resolve of the democracies in Europe prior to World War II—when Mussolini tested that resolve and found it wanting in Ethiopia.

Consider how the history yet to be written might read had the motivation to meet aggression not been present in Korea; in Cuba; in Vietnam—and now in the Middle East.

I believe this Nation, as the most powerful and responsible Nation in the Free World, will continue to be tested by the other World. I dread the day when their probes, wherever they occur, result in finding an absence of resolve on the part of this Nation to meet their challenge.

It is not always easy to be a citizen of the most powerful free Nation in the World. It might be personally easier to be a citizen of a small nation with responsibility to no one—but it also would not be as challenging nor would it be as satisfying. At the risk of sounding "jingoistic," I am proud to be an American—I believe in this country—I want it to continue a great Nation. I am convinced under the leadership of men such as Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy and Now Johnson, there is every reason to hope and believe its greatness will not diminish.

Reuben W. Askanase

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE BUSH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1967

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, a great citizen of Houston and a former citizen of North Dakota recently traveled to his native State to dedicate the breaking of ground for a new building at North Dakota State University. This new edific is named Askanase Hall after our beloved Houstonian, Reuben W. Askanase. And since Mr. Askanase has contributed so greatly to my home city, I think it proper to enter into the RECORD his remarks at the ground breaking.

In these days of crisis, the words of one of our leading Jewish citizens take on very special meaning. We must never lose sight of the dreams that he envisons for America.

The remarks follow:

Chairman Walsh, Governor Guy, Mrs. Guy, Dr. and Mrs. Albrecht, Mrs. Walsh, Mr. and Mrs. Fred Scheel, my wife and 35-year partner, Hilda, friends.

We are gathered today for a most pleasurable and exciting event. While this may not be the most earth-shaking ground-breaking, it is of considerable moment to many of us who worked together in this great educational adventure—in this exciting example of cooperative endeavor between the citizens of the state and the city of Fargo and North Dakota State University. We are here to break ground for more than a future edifice of brick and mortar perfection. We are here to break ground for more than a future physical asset to this great University. We are here to break ground for the intangible and yet the real, a greater monument to the spirit which eminates and permeates every inch of this campus, this city, this community.

Many of us gathered here may well look back into yesterday and remember the great Red River Valley and how time has changed it. Those of us who experienced the great depression and wondered as to its outcome can see the change in time. The cataclysm of the by-gone era, which seemed to overwhelm so much of the world through which we were the witnesses, has left its scars but time, too, has changed our outlook and one of these days the prophetic vision of peace will envelop this world of ours. Time is the factor of change and we must build our youth to make of time the handmaiden of progress to a greater humanity.

It is because of these many factors that we rejoice in this ground-breaking for this is the forerunner of a better tomorrow. Who knows that perhaps from these completed walls may come the men and women who will shape this nation and this world of the future. From within these walls may come the fresh new voices of music, art, and literature. Those who will roam the halls of this building and attend its classes may write the music tomorrow's world will sing. Perhaps from these halls of learning will come the great American novel and our students may write the nation's text books as well as its laws. Perhaps we will create the song as well as the singer, and many will wander strange pathways to bring the glad tidings everywhere. Not alone the great, but the great majority who will quietly listen, work, and live, whose hearts and minds will be strengthened by the bonds of our common heritage—all of these will combine to enrich and bless this great country of ours with appreciation and understanding. It is to this role that we envision these future bricks and stone and mortar.

I wish to take a personal privilege in reminiscing for a few minutes. The groundbreaking for this building brings to me the memory of my parents—who had a dream which began in a country across the Atlantic. They fled that land of oppression, even as did the Israelites from Egypt, to find a new home and a new hope. They chose America—as it was known in Europe as the "goldene medina" which, translated, means the land of golden opportunity. As they passed through that narrow harbor known as New York, they saw the majestic Statue of Liberty. The flame of the torch held aloft kindled a spark they already had. They were believers and in time began to understand what they believed by instinct—the meaning of security, the potential of opportunity, and the common destiny of all Americans as outlined by the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. Their belief was in a great democratic society free from the harshness of tyrannical rule, free from the flailing whips of the Cossack and the religious hatred of their neighbors.

This was the land of their dreams and it was here they looked for fulfillment. This was the soil they wanted to own, a handful to own and to have without any strings or options. They began to understand that Jews were people, that the plaque on the base of the Statue of Liberty was factual and true—that this was the land to which the tempest tossed came and found new life. They learned that there were many immigrants, from every nation, from every religious background, of all races. The dream they dreamed long ago had begun to come to life. Here they were greeted by neighbors with strangely accented tongues; here they were bade welcome by the rich and the poor, the different and the ordinary; and the crowning glory of all this brotherhood when a holy roller mission preacher called on them to say "hi" and "we pray you will be with us a long time in health and happiness".

Had they lived to this day—the parents who gave me the will to complete their dream—they would look upon these future bricks, mortar, stone, and wood as symbols of their belief in the goodness of this land and its people. This dream is shared by many of us—a dream which is singularly individualistic and at the same time, the possession of our collective citizenry; a dream closely attuned to the greatness of this country and dedicated to equal opportunity to all people. Life is a journey for all of us and we make of that journey that which we will. To some it offers the challenge of restless need and change, as it did to me; to others it is a stopping place along the road to oblivion. To some this land of ours offers the tools and the craft; to others it offers skills and the ability to utilize them. Each of us has a role in this drama of life and this University offers each student a partnership in the great enterprise of living in a democratic society dedicated to bettering humanity and civilization. How fortunate to have the great leadership here at the school of the dedicated Dr. Albrecht and his associates whose task is Herculean.

It is because so many believe in giving opportunity to others and in a better educated people that such future edifices as this are to be built. It is because of the confidence in the future generations which are to use the classrooms and assembly halls of this and other buildings like this that we look with much anticipation to the near tomorrow. It is the dedication to the dream of America's greatness that we all strive to make a reality, a living symbol for all people to see and take example. We, you and I, and all our friends and neighbors, are part of that dream. The citizenry of Fargo, of North Dakota and those of the fifty states of the United States stand united to uphold the torch of liberty and equal opportunity. Let all rafters ring with the glad tidings, with the spirit which makes glorious our religious heritage all wrapped into one package called patriotism and devotion to this glorious country of ours.

A long time ago I picked up a stray four line stanza which seems appropriate as the closing remarks for these few minutes allotted me. They are simple words and I remember them well for their beauty and their meaning. I quote:

"Lord, give me not just words to say
Though I need right words too;
But a strength to live in such a way
That my life will make my words come true."

If there is any certainty in that tomorrow it is because we give that tomorrow over to our youth knowing well they will carry on as we have done those noble traditions to which we dedicate the future of this Hall. May it be enshrined in the hearts and minds of the men and women who will use its facilities and may they pass it on to their children in honor and glory and in the words of a very ancient Hebrew peace prayer—Hashkivaynu Avinu Leshalom—Our Father, grant us sleep in peace.

Thank you.

National Cemeteries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1967

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, the Iowa General Assembly has passed a resolution calling on the Congress and the Executive to maintain sufficient national cemeteries for the burial of our veterans.

The resolution adequately expresses the need for such action.

The resolution follows:

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 43

Whereas, United States Department of Defense statistics for fiscal year 1966 reveal that 873 of the 4,873 servicemen killed in Vietnam fighting for freedom were interred in national cemeteries; and

Whereas, many more of the servicemen who have lost their lives would probably also have been buried in a national cemetery had there been space available near the home of the next of kin; and

Whereas, there are those in governmental authority who are against expanding the national cemetery system or providing additional space in those national cemeteries already existing; and

Whereas, the burial allowances of the Veterans Administration and those allowances provided under Federal Social Security are far too meager in many instances to provide for the last rites of many veterans and servicemen; and

Whereas, world unrest is again exposing and committing large numbers of persons to military service and battle; and

Whereas, this is not a proper time for limiting or closing the national cemetery system to those presently serving or expecting to serve in the uniform of our country; now therefore

Be it resolved by the Senate, the House concurring, That the Congress of the United States is hereby urged to take such action as is necessary to direct the Department of Defense, the Bureau of the Budget, and other appropriate governmental agencies to establish and maintain an adequate and permanent national cemetery system to provide burial space for all United States military servicemen or women so entitled and who wish to be so interred; and

Be it further resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate forward copies of this resolution to the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States, the Honorable Robert S. McNamara, United States Secretary of Defense, the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, and to each member of the Iowa delegation serving in the United States Congress.

We, Robert D. Fulton, Lieutenant Governor of Iowa and President of the Senate, Al Meacham, Secretary of the Senate, Maurice E. Baringer, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and William R. Kendrick, Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives, hereby certify that the above and foregoing resolution was adopted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the Sixty-second General Assembly of Iowa.

ROBERT D. FULTON,
Lieutenant Governor of Iowa.
MAURICE E. BARINGER,
Speaker of the House.
AL MEACHAM,
Secretary of the Senate.
WILLIAM R. KENDRICK,
Chief Clerk of the House.

What Ever Happened to the Gentleman From Arkansas?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1967

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I am sure there are many here who would agree with me that one of our most gifted and distinguished colleagues over the last decade or so was the former Congressman from Arkansas, the Honorable Brooks Hays.

I regret to say that I never had the privilege of working alongside Mr. Hays as a Member of this body, since he lost his seat in the same campaign in which I was first elected, 1958. Since that time, however, I have had the pleasure of knowing Mr. Hays in another capacity—I, as his Congressman—he as my constituent.

For the past 9 months or so, Mr. Hays has been teaching a course in politics and government at the University of Massachusetts, in Amherst, in the First Congressional District of Massachusetts.

While there are many here undoubtedly who have missed the enlightened and always articulate contributions by Mr. Hays to our debates, the students at the University of Massachusetts quite obviously do not mourn the fates that cost Mr. Hays his seat in this Chamber. To them, that calamity is something less than calamitous.

Mr. Hays, through his brief series of lectures to date, has won a lasting place in the hearts and minds of those students who have been fortunate enough to find a chair in his classes.

Because I am certain there is much interest among many of us here in what our most distinguished former colleague has been up to lately, I insert at this point in the RECORD a clipping from the pages of the Massachusetts Daily Collegian, the student newspaper on the campus of the University of Massachusetts, at Amherst. The article leaves little doubt as to the tremendous contribution the gentleman is still making to the betterment of life in America.

The clipping follows:

[From the Massachusetts Daily Collegian, May, 9, 1967]

EX-CONGRESSMAN HAYS ENDING YEAR AT UMASS

"Politics is the delicate balance between principles and pragmatism," says Brooks Hays, former Democratic Congressman from Arkansas who is now completing his second semester of teaching at the University of Massachusetts.

The practicing politician, Mr. Hays tells his UMass classes, must be skillful at a sensitive task. "He must have values worth defending, be faithful to those values, and yet be flexible enough to succeed in advancing his beliefs and principles through the complex machinery of government."

The distinguished career of Brooks Hays, spanning over 40 years in public service, stands as a monument to his ability to be effective while at the same time maintaining his integrity in the world of politics, a world he calls "a hotbed of tranquility."

An eloquent, outspoken man with a pleasant Arkansas drawl, Hays served his country as Congressman, Assistant Secretary of State, United Nations Delegate and Democratic National Committeeman. Defeated for reelection to Congress in 1958, Mr. Hays has served as special assistant to Presidents Kennedy and Johnson, and has also taught at Rutgers University. He came to UMass last fall as the University's Distinguished Professor of Practical Politics, a lectureship sponsored by a Ford Foundation grant.

So successful—and so popular—were his seminars, that the University invited him to remain on campus another semester to give more students a chance to benefit from his knowledge, charm and wit.

His lectures, always enhanced with colorful anecdotes drawn from his experience, cover many topics in the realm of public affairs. He talks of his own career, the relationship of religion to politics, the sources of power, the next Presidential election, the campaigns, and current issues facing Congress such as the Powell and Dodd cases.

Common to all subjects discussed, however, is the theme that the public servant must first be committed to values worth defending, and then be effective in advancing those values.

For example, as a Congressman, Hays was willing to modify his position on minor issues so that he could remain in a position of responsibility as an unyielding advocate of his principles when grave issues were at stake.

Such a situation arose, he says, in the selection of Post Office sites in his Congressional District. Hays yielded to local sentiment when it came time to decide on locations for new Post Offices although he may have favored different sites.

But when opposition to the Supreme Court's school integration order plunged Little Rock into a racial crisis in 1956, requiring the intervention of Federal troops, Congressman Hays, a dedicated moderate on the race issue, spoke forcefully of his belief in the rule of law and compliance with the Court's decisions. His efforts on behalf of Negroes and his attempts to mediate the dispute between Governor Orval Faubus and the Federal Government were highly unpopular with many of his constituents, and led ultimately to his defeat for reelection to Congress in 1958.

He had yielded in the relatively minor matter of a Post Office site to defend later his principles when the gravity of the situation called for it. It was, he says, "a painful dilemma."

The benefits of his vast political experience are enhanced by Hays' unique gifts in the realm of public speaking. Dr. William C. Havard, head of the department of government at UMass, has called former Congressman Hays a "verbal artist."

He's probably one of the most effective platform orators and easily the greatest example of grace and wit among public figures around." Prof. Havard says. "In addition, his career has been an example of integrity in public life."

The statesman's oratorical prowess has made him much sought after as a speechmaker, and he remains a close friend and adviser to many national leaders. In the classroom, for example, he often begins his remarks with "as I said to a group in San Francisco last week . . ." or "as President Truman pointed out to me . . ." Such introductions are invariably followed by a pertinent story enunciating an important principle.

And, too, his students get valuable advice about the inner workings of official Washington. "The martinis they serve there are lethal," he said while discussing the function of parties and the social aspects of government.

He has also discussed such matters as informal relationships among Congressmen ("highly important"); race relations ("the issue of our ties"); the two-party system ("necessary . . . an opportunity to protest"); and even philosophy ("I insist that politics needs more philosophers in every branch, people who are equipped to follow consistently ideals that are rooted in sound philosophy").

Some Plain Talk About American Youth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JIM WRIGHT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1967

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, my friend, J. Frank Young, of Azle, Tex., dropped me a letter the other day and enclosed a copy of the commencement address delivered by his daughter Betty, one of the honor graduates of Azle High School. Frank obviously was proud of what his daughter said. I was proud of it, too, and I think most Americans would be.

I want to put Betty's speech into the RECORD because it does such a magnificent job of placing in historical perspective all the gloomy talk we've been hearing lately about the younger generation. If today's miniskirts and surfer dances raise eyebrows, we need to remember that flapper dresses and the "Blackbottom" did, too.

Betty's speech follows:

Supt. Hoover, Mr. Silkwood, Members of the Faculty, Parents, and Friends:

I wish to extend to each of you a sincere welcome to the evening's proceedings.

Perhaps most of all, I wish to give assurance to the adults that today's high school graduates are not going to be a generation of irresponsible, irreligious, spoiled youths.

I want to assure you further that we are not the "Black Knight of Evil" bent on the destruction of the gallant Sir Lancelot, the defender of all that is good and pure.

I want to advise further that we are fed up with the image of American youth being created by beatniks, draft card burners and unpatriotic demonstrators.

In plain English, our generation is not "going to the dogs."

Why do I make these statements? How do I know? Because reason as well as history is on our side.

Statistics indicate that 95 per cent of the students today are as concerned about our American ideals as they have always been. For every Vietnik who burns his draft card, a thousand proudly wear the uniform of their country. For every college student who says there is no God, ten thousand will testify that there is and they believe in Him. For every bearded hoodlum, we have thousands of dedicated and patriotic young Americans.

What about history? How does it help us assure you that our American heritage will not be lost when it comes into our hands?

Permit me to say that General Frank Elliott, an Air Force commander in Viet Nam, recently said of our young soldiers, "This crop of youngsters is the best yet. No less than one fourth of our servicemen are under twenty. Our Generals and Admirals agree that they are the finest young fighting men our country has ever had. They are as tough as their fathers in World War II and Korea."

What does history have to say about our social life, our fads, our crazes, and our songs and dances?

If we go back into history, you will find that every generation had its teen-age fads, music, and dances. Also history reveals that every generation of fathers and mothers disapproved of these youthful forms of amusement and entertainment.

For the record, we might compare the "flappers" of the Roaring Twenties and their rolled-down hose with the present-day mini skirts. Adults of that day called the flapper skirts risque, saying they were immodest, and that the wearers were brazen and shameful.

Considering the flappers from our vantage point of time, let's see how they turned out. Most of them are now sedate grandmothers with the age-old idea that their grandchildren are headed for trouble.

We must not forget our grandfathers who once sported peg-topped trousers and loud silk shirts, topped off with their pompadour hair-do. How did these "Mods of the Twenties" turn out as American citizens? They certainly came to no good, for some became ministers, some teachers, some doctors, and one is now President of the United States.

Our present-day dances have caused raised eyebrows. Let me remind you that we have heard about your "Black Bottom" and "Charleston" dances. I think they would fit right in with our "Skate and Surfer" dances of today.

How did the Blackbottom addicts receive their just dues? Some are now past-presidents of the P-TA, and some are Sunday school teachers trying to direct the morals of their grandchildren into the right path.

Friends, you may rest your fears. Your children are not doomed, but they are going to make some changes. We believe changes are needed. And in so doing, we shall not let it be said of us that we squandered our inheritance.

We need—and can have—an uprising of youth that will reshape history. And if we are to have a new age, we need new home life, new economic life, new governmental life, and a religious life dedicated to a living God.

If the philosophy prevails that God is dead, then freedom will perish in our generation.

But if we decide to pay the price of a new society, to be honest about where God's will crosses our will in home life, career, sex, and ambition, then we can together turn the page of history, and in the words of our 1967 Senior Class song, we shall truly strive:

To dream the impossible dream,
To fight the unbeatable foe,
To run where the brave dare not go,
To bear the unbearable sorrow,
To right the unrightable wrong,
To be better far than you are,
To try when your arms are weary,
And, to reach the unreachable star.

Thank you.

Public-Spirited Good Citizen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1967

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to tell the Congress about a friend of mine. Whit Shaver is in the real estate business in Wynne, Ark. His advertisements consist of verses and thoughts he has found beautiful and helpful. He is a public-spirited good citizen. He gets things done and he accepts the responsibilities of leadership with a relish that makes others admire and respect him.

Bill Courtney, the editor of the Wynne Progress, who has a flair for words, recently told on Whit for something that he did, and it is such a heartwarming story that I wish to share it with the Members:

SHAVER'S LETTER WRITING PROVIDES LUXURY TRANSPORTATION FOR ORPHANS

"Old Whit" has done it again!

Several years ago, Arkansas College needed a bus and Whit Shaver found out about it. He went to work, raised the money, the new bus was purchased and was named "Old Whit" in his honor. The bus is still in service.

Several weeks ago, Whit found out the Vera Lloyd Home, an institution sponsored by the Presbyterian Church, needed a replacement for a station wagon. Here's what happened:

Vernie L. Barnett of Banks, a member of the Child Care Board of the Church, called Whit to discuss trading the old station wagon in on a new one.

Whit knew the frugality of the Vera Lloyd Home people, who get the very final use out of everything, and he just didn't relish trading for a vehicle that even they conceded was worn out. So he went to work.

Whit wrote and mailed 650 letters to persons throughout the state that should be interested in the Vera Lloyd Home. He asked each of them for only $20. He answered their inquiries, talked to many of them on the phone and it kept him busy. If you have trouble answering ONE letter, you can imagine keeping track of 650.

The best response came from college towns, Arkadelphia, Batesville, Little Rock, Pine Bluff, El Dorado, from Forrest City, and also from Wynne. Most of the gifts were $20 each, although there were some for $40 and one or two for $100. The total soon reached above $3,000, and will probably exceed $4,000.

Although he had enough money to pay retail price, Whit assumed the buyer's role in a car transaction and it wasn't difficult to get a rock-bottom deal from Mr. Barwick of Barwick Ford Company. We're not going to mention the price paid for the Country Squire with all the trimmings, because it would break your heart. We can assure you that no Ford dealer will ever sell one cheaper.

Last week, Leroy Acree, superintendent of the Vera Lloyd Home came to Wynne and took delivery on the new nine-passenger station wagon. He gets to keep the old one, too, and the Home will get all the excess funds saved on the purchase price.

Oh, yes, they're already calling the new station wagon "Old Whit."

Culver Urges Official Recognition of Eastern Orthodox Church

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. CULVER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1967

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, last week, a significant event took place in the State of Iowa as Rev. Alexander George, pastor of St. John's Eastern Orthodox Church in Cedar Rapids, delivered the invocation in the Iowa General Assembly.

Father George was the first Orthodox priest in Iowa history to offer these opening prayers, and on that occasion, Iowa became the 37th State to so recognize the church as a major faith.

It is past time, Mr. Speaker, that the U.S. Government gave its formal recognition to the Eastern Orthodox Church, which is already in fact—if not in form—a major faith in our Nation.

I reintroduced legislation earlier this year—House Resolution 410—to accomplish this objective by requiring that all references by Federal agencies to major faiths include the Eastern Orthodox Church.

According to the latest Yearbook of American Churches, there are over 3 million Eastern Orthodox Christians in the United States today. And since in the Orthodox Church only heads of households are counted as members, the total is probably well over 6 million with women and children included.

That same yearbook lists 5,585,000 members of the Jewish community, 44,874,371 Roman Catholics, and 66,854,200 Protestants in the United States.

Yet we automatically consider only "three major religious faiths"—Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish.

However, there is a growing recognition of the important position of Orthodoxy in the United States:

The Armed Forces use the letters "EO" on dog tags to identify Eastern Orthodox Christians.

A representative of the Eastern Orthodox faith has been invited to participate in recent Presidential inauguration ceremonies.

Legislatures of at least half the States have enacted resolutions officially designating Orthodoxy as a separate fourth major faith.

Enactment of House Resolution 410 would not require any direct public expense. It would not ask any major effort by the Government. But it would give the full and proper recognition to Orthodox Christians which they have a legitimate right to expect.

I insert at this point in the RECORD the text of House Resolution 410, and urge the prompt consideration of the matter in the House of Representatives:

H. RES. 410

Whereas the Eastern Orthodox Church is a major faith in the United States and throughout the world; and

Whereas Senate bill 106, Eighty-fourth Congress, led to the designation of the Eastern Orthodox faith as a separate religious faith in the Armed Forces of the United States; and

Whereas several Federal agencies have omitted Eastern Orthodoxy in projects in which Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish faiths have been invited to participate; and

Whereas more than half of the States in the United States through their legislators have passed resolutions recognizing Eastern Orthodoxy as a major religious faith; and

Whereas the Eastern Orthodox faith has millions of communicants throughout the world including several million in the United States; and

Whereas where anything is said concerning the major faiths, usually the Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish faiths are referred to; and

Whereas it therefore follows that a religious distinction is being made in omitting the Eastern Orthodox Church, which is contrary to the prevailing principle of democracy and freedom of religion in this country: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Eastern Orthodox Church is a major faith in this country; and that all references by Federal agencies to major faiths now limited to Protestants, Catholics, and Jews include the Eastern Orthodox Church.

Resolution Adopted by the Canaveral Press Club Commending the Report of Apollo 204 Review Board

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS N. DOWNING

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1967

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, since the tragic Apollo 204 accident in January of this year, and its subsequent investigation by NASA and by committees of the Congress, the press reports have been largely critical of NASA management. Unfortunately, the picture that has been presented to the public has tended to make the situation look much worse than it is. As a matter of fact, I believe NASA should be commended for its attitude and activities following the accident. There was no attempt, for example, to conceal any of the facts surrounding the tragic event. On the contrary, the report of the Review Board headed by Dr. Floyd L. Thompson, the extremely able Director of the Langley Research Center, was a model of objectivity and candor. Those of us who know Dr. Thompson would expect nothing less from a man of his integrity.

It is refreshing to note that certain members of the press have recognized the contribution of Dr. Thompson's Board, and have stated so publicly. I wish to call my colleagues' attention to a resolution recently adopted by the Canaveral press corps dealing with this matter, as follows:

CANAVERAL PRESS CLUB RESOLUTION

Be it resolved, That the Canaveral Press Club, upon a study and examination of the "Report of Apollo 204 Review Board," to the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, feels it incumbent upon the Canaveral Press Club to commend those officials and personnel responsible for the preparation and issuance of this Report.

From a cruel national disaster there has emerged a new level of maturity on the part of N.A.S.A. as concerns its openness of relationships with the American public. The "Report of the Apollo 204 Review Board" is one of the finest examples of selfless candor, sweeping objectivity, and acceptance of responsibility which has ever been read by the members of the Canaveral Press Club. It is our judgment that this candor and promptness in attempting objectively to ascertain certain weaknesses in the Apollo program is a welcome sign of growing maturity in the N.A.S.A. organization, and one that can reflect only well for the future.

As members of the news corps covering the activities of the Kennedy Space Center we have at times in the past expressed less than satisfaction with news media-N.A.S.A. relationships. Now, in N.A.S.A.'s most trying moment, it behooves us to express our sincere gratitude, on behalf of the Canaveral Press Club, and the American people whom we represent, for a Report that can only increase, and secure, new levels of reliability for the future manned space flights of the United States.

Submitted by Ethics Committee:

MARTIN CAIDIN,
Chairman for Canaveral Press Club.
GEORGE MEGUIAR,
President.

[SEAL]

Approved by Board of Directors, April 12, 1967.

JIM STROTHMAN,
Vice President, Associated Press.
L. P. CLARK,
Secretary, Public Relations, Bendix Corp.
RICHARD DOWNS,
Treasure, Florida Industrial Commission.
BUD CLARK,
TWA.
KEN GRINE,
Public Relations, Douglas Aircraft.
JACK RAYMOND,
Assistant Managing Editor, Brevard Sentinel-Star.

Under Secretary of Air Force Norman S. Paul Address to the Graduates at Air Force Academy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1967

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, my good friend and Under Secretary of the Air Force, the Honorable Norman S. Paul, was the principal speaker at the graduation exercises at the Air Force Academy on Wednesday, June 7.

His remarks to these new second lieutenants and future leaders of our Nation's Air Force are noteworthy, and I am including them in the RECORD so that everyone may have the benefit of the words from such a dedicated, knowledgeable and capable public servant.

His speech follows:

Address by Hon. Norman S. Paul, Under Secretary of the Air Force, at the Air Force Academy Graduation, Air Force Academy, Colo., June 7, 1967

Professions—like men—are shaped by events. In the long view of history, there is, of course, a reciprocal relationship in which men and professions influence actions and institutions. These, in turn, affect the course of events. But at any given point in time, the tone and status of a profession will reflect a society's real or imagined need for that profession. This is as true of the military profession as it is of medicine or law.

You are beginning your careers as officers at a time when the American military profession has achieved a position unique in our history—unique, I believe, in the history of the modern world. You have studied the events that shaped this unique position, so I don't need to describe them in detail. Three principal factors were:

The expansion of Communism following World War II, and its continued aggressive attitudes;

The dramatic advances in nuclear, electronic, aeronautical and space technology;

The emergence of about 60 newly-independent nations whose growing pains often have been a real or potential source of strife in a world from which we neither could nor would wish to withdraw into isolation.

Under the impact of these events, our military forces have become a permanent operating instrument of national policy—to deter war if possible, to fight effectively if deterrence were to fail, to assist other government and international agencies in creating a stable but progressive world order.

The mission of our Armed Forces makes them unique in another way. Our military might surpasses that of any other nation, yet we have no designs on anyone's territory or independence. In the years following World War II, the United States possessed the power to have created an empire. We could have established a retinue of puppet states. We could have attacked and destroyed any nation that threatened our interests or opposed our will. Instead we drew on our great economic and military strength, our prestige and our humanitarian traditions in support of the cause of peace—to persuade, to negotiate, to arbitrate, to adjust. But we used our national power with firmness and with resolution—during the Berlin Crisis, the Cuban Missile Crisis and now in Vietnam—knowing well that those who suffer an undue abhorrence of war are likely to draw it down upon themselves. I think that a politically mature America has divested itself of a weakness which we can no longer afford: that of being too pacifistic in peacetime and too belligerent in war. And we have successfully deterred large scale general war for more than 20 years, at the same time helping friends and allies preserve their freedom.

Many of you will spend at least a part of your Air Force careers maintaining the superiority of our strategic deterrent force—as bomber or interceptor air crew members, missile launch officers, in research and development or other capacities. The United States does not intend to yield strategic superiority to any nation so long as there remains a threat of aggression to this country or to our allies.

THE CHANGING NATURE OF WAR

But the very success of our strategic deterrent force has brought about a change in the nature of warfare. Today general nuclear war is extremely unlikely. So are large scale conventional wars on the order of World War II. Instead, we and our allies are faced with a more subtle, but in the long-run, no less dangerous form of warfare. The Communists call it "Wars of National Liberation," and as you know, that is the kind of war we are fighting in Vietnam. Essentially it is Communist inspired and supported aggression in which the large Communist states do not expect to participate as combatants. Its purpose is to overthrow legitimate non-Communist governments and force a Communist controlled regime on the conquered people.

In a very real sense, Vietnam is a testing ground of America's determination to assist her friends and allies in keeping their freedom and in developing viable economic and political systems. It also is a testing ground for our ability to adapt to a kind of warfare that is new to our experience—particularly to Air Force experience.

Three years ago, many observers doubted that airpower could be effective in a jungle war against an enemy who relies heavily on guerrilla and small unit tactics. Today, there are very few doubters. Airpower has proven itself an indispensable element of our military operations in Southeast Asia. Air Force people, including a great many Academy graduates, have shown tremendous imagination and resourcefulness in developing the tactics and equipment that played a major part in breaking the attempted Communist offensive of 1965. Since that time we have continued to improve both hardware and ideas and we have held the initiative. In the last 18 months in Vietnam, allied forces have not lost an engagement of battalion size or larger. This could not have been true without close support, interdiction, reconnaissance, air superiority, airlift and special air warfare provided by the United States Air Force in cooperation with the Air Force of the Republic of South Vietnam and our own Navy and Marine air.

The great majority of Americans are firmly behind our Vietnam policy. None of us wants a war, but as President Johnson has said:

"We must deal with the world as it is and we cannot walk away from the simple fact that the peace and security of many nations is threatened if aggressors are permitted to succeed in a strategic area of the world, if vital treaties are broken, and if men and arms are moved illegally across international boundaries to conquer and gobble up helpless small countries that can't defend themselves. . . . Perhaps it reflects poorly on our world that man must fight limited wars to keep from fighting larger wars. But that is the condition of the world today. Our objective in Vietnam is very simple: We want the killing to stop and the people of Vietnam to make their own future in peace."

There is, however, a very vocal minority in this country and others abroad who oppose an American commitment to the Republic of Vietnam. Most of this group—particularly the younger dissenters here at home—have viewed the war from a distance. It is remarkable how first-hand acquaintance with the facts often changes one's opinions. After his recent visit to Vietnam, Mr. Alastair Hetherington, editor of the *Manchester Guardian*, a respected British newspaper that had been opposed to American participation in the war, had this to say:

"The best chance for a peaceful life for the South Vietnamese is to let the Americans continue their military operations. Let us realize what a bloodbath there would be in the South if the Americans were to withdraw."

While we might wish that Mr. Hetherington had urged wider Free World participation in turning back Communist aggression rather than merely endorsing American operations, we should be thankful to him for calling attention to a frequently overlooked aspect of the war—the carefully planned Communist use of terror against the people of Vietnam.

It has struck me as rather odd that many people who criticize our very carefully controlled bombing of targets in the North because of inadvertent civilian casualties, conveniently overlook the Communist record of murder, torture and kidnapping in South Vietnam. A careful study conducted by the U.S. Mission in Vietnam has disclosed that the Viet Cong assassinated more than 11,000 South Vietnamese civilians between 1959 and October 1966. In the same period, they kidnapped nearly 40,000 civilians who were forced into labor battalions, Viet Cong guerrilla units, or imprisoned. Virtually an entire segment of the South Vietnamese population—the natural leaders of the villages and hamlets—has been liquidated by the Viet Cong in their attempt to destroy non-Communist civilian leadership in the Republic of South Vietnam. What can one call this but planned and deliberate campaign of terror and murder?

Recently I visited our bases in Southeast Asia. In my conversations with Air Force and Army people—including several of the 300 Academy graduates who are in Vietnam—I found no one who felt that we should abandon the South Vietnamese. I was particularly impressed by the understanding of this very complex war on the part of our younger officers, by their high morale and sense of purpose, and by the fantastic professionalism of their performance.

More than the 1100 graduates of the Air Force Academy have helped the people of South Vietnam advance toward their objective of halting Communist aggression so that they can get on with the development of their country. Twenty-one have given their lives in the service of our country and the cause of Vietnamese freedom. Fourteen have been awarded the Silver Star, nearly 100 the Distinguished Flying Cross and many more have earned Air Medals. Their performance has been a reflection of the standards that have become a tradition of the Air Force Academy. The depth of their commitment is demonstrated by the number of graduates who have volunteered for service in Vietnam and the number who have requested second and even third tours of duty in Southeast Asia. Our pride in these men knows no bounds; our gratitude finds no adequate words.

From their sacrifices and the sacrifices of the thousands of others who have fought, bled and died in Vietnam, we must draw a renewed sense of dedication to the purpose for which the Air Force—for which all American military forces—exist: the preservation of peace; the building of a world in which every man has a voice in determining his own future and that of those who follow after him.

EXTENDING THE CONCEPT OF DETERRENCE

The spawning ground for turmoil and aggression is the under-developed two-thirds of the world where poverty, disease and ignorance set the stages for demagogues and agitators. Clearly, the United States cannot and will not police the world alone. But together with like-minded nations, we can help those who are willing to help themselves. We can provide economic, technical and political advice and assistance. But perhaps even more important, we can use our great military strength to deter aggression, for internal improvement ceases to progress in nations at war.

The challenge before you, in whom the future hope of America resides, is to help find the way to prevent limited war and insurgency as effectively as we have deterred nuclear war. The Air Force, with its great mobility, speed and fire power is ideally suited to this role. But success will demand weapons, munitions, concepts and tactics that we perhaps do not even imagine today.

The war in Vietnam has pointed up several areas where we must find better ways of doing things. We need, for example, to be able to find all kinds of targets and hit them accurately, on the first pass, by day or night, in any kind of weather. We need to build an air logistics system that will operate right up to the forward battle areas. We need to refine our concepts of the integrated use of aerospace power for deterring war at every level from insurgency to general war. We need to develop new techniques for measuring the effectiveness of airpower and predicting the effects of a particular air action on an over-all campaign and on our national objectives.

In our search for better weapons, better techniques, better coordinating concepts, we will be permanently associated with the civilian intellectual and scientific community, with a wide range of other government departments and agencies—State, Treasury, Commerce, HEW, NASA, AEC—with an equally wide segment of the civilian economy, and with a world-wide array of allied and associated nations. Our military forces definitely are not outside the main stream of American life today. We are at or close to its center. Technical competence, political maturity, breadth of vision are the key words. There can be no room for parochialism.

YOUR SPECIAL PLACE IN THE AIR FORCE

You will be starting your careers as officers alongside a large number of Air Force ROTC graduates. Last month I attended the annual conclave of the Arnold Air Society, the honor society of Air Force ROTC. I was tremendously impressed by the intelligence, enthusiasm and awareness of these young men. I know you will be too.

Although most new ROTC graduates have the potential to become outstanding career officers, it's likely that a majority do not now plan an Air Force career. Whether or not a talented ROTC graduate decides to make the Air Force his career will be strongly influenced by the example you young career officers set in your daily professional and social contacts with your fellow officers. I realize that the bonds which unite Academy graduates are strong and enduring. But do not become a clique within your organizations. That would be a disservice to yourselves, your contemporaries and to the Air Force. You have a special responsibility for upholding by example professional standards of courage, competence, dedication and character wherever you go. There is no duty that is more important.

The Air Force Academy has given you superb preparation for your professional life through its program of intellectual, moral, physical and leadership training—a program that is more than the sum of its parts. You leave the Academy as unusually mature and responsible young men with a body of professional attitudes and with that very rare asset—disciplined but flexible minds.

I know that at times the going has been rough, for the Cadet Wing as a whole and for many of you as individuals. We have shared with you the anguish of your ordeals, including the recent Honor Code violations. There are those who blame instruments, such as the Code, for incidents which can, and do occur at every first rate institution. Too tough, they say—Un-American.

I say to them, and I say to you: *Is* something wrong with a system, adopted and administered by the students themselves, which does not tolerate lying, cheating and stealing? Is something wrong with the premise, on which *your* Honor Code is based, that if a young man learns, and lives the highest standards of good citizenship in his formative years, these qualities are likely to endure for life, to the betterment and inspiration of others? The answer to these questions—*your* answer—is a resounding "no." Nothing is wrong with the premise, or its application. We share your pride in the Code, and we are proud of the manner in which this Cadet Wing and its Honor Representatives have found, from this ordeal, renewed strength and purpose.

The profession upon which you are about to embark does not offer an easy life. It is a life full of physical, intellectual and moral challenge; heavy responsibility; sacrifice and hard work It is a profession that is not always popular, that is seldom understood in depth. Even today, with the constant flow of military and civilian people between camp and campus, with the intermingling of civilian and military professions in a thousand ways, the caricature of the narrowly specilized, rigid, unimaginative military man dies hard. But it is dying, and you will hasten its demise.

The very elements that make the military profession difficult and demanding also make it one of the most rewarding of all professions. You will be always at the forefront of technology whether your individual careers are associated with earth-bound activities, aircraft or space vehicles. You aren't likely to find yourselves in a rut, for the learning process in your profession never ends. But most rewarding of all is the knowledge that you will be performing an indispensable service to your fellow men who live today—and to those still unborn.

I congratulate you on the honor which is about to be bestowed upon you. Guard it well, for in the virtues which are symbolized by graduation from the Air Force Academy lies our future.

Cuba Condemned as Communist Aggressor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1967

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, all indications are that at long last the Organization of American States will condemn Communist Cuba as an aggressor in South America.

While our boys fight and die against Communist aggression in Vietnam and the world's attention is being directed toward the northeast Africa crisis, in our own backyard Castro's Communist trained revolutionaries follow the ideals set forth in the Tricontinental Conference toward toppling our neighboring American Republics.

With only Mexico and Honduras excepting, all members of the OAS supported the resolution. The organization agreed that aggression of Cuba must be stopped.

Mr. Speaker, I include the inconspicuous news release from the June 6 Evening Star and a pertinent portion of the Allen Scott report of May 24 in the RECORD:

[From the Washington Evening Star]

OAS Ready To Condemn Cuba as Aggressor in Venezuela

(By Jeremiah O'Leary)

The Organization of American States will ready the machinery today to condemn Cuba for committing aggression against Venezuela, which the Havana government has not only admitted but openly boasts about.

Notice of the plans came late yesterday when the OAS Council voted unanimously to call an early meeting of Western Hemisphere foreign ministers to take up the complaint of the Caracas government.

What the OAS proposes to do, in effect, is belabor Communist Cuba with words and then inform the U.N.'s Security Council that it has done so.

TO FIX DATE

The OAS will meet this afternoon to fix a date, place and agenda for the meeting of foreign ministers. The session probably will be held in Washington within a month. Several countries, with varying degrees of vigor, wanted to convoke the foreign ministers under the Rio treaty of mutual assistance.

Bolivia's Ambassador Raul Diez de Medina, said his government, which has Cuban-sponsored guerrillas of its own to contend with, would have preferred something more than a mere resolution. The United States privately preferred invoking the Rio pact instead of the OAS Charter but did not say so publicly.

Venezuela's Ambassador Pedro Paris Montesinos presented his resolution with a vigorous attack on Cuba. Fidel Castro, he said, is a head of a government that is not in Cuban hands. He described the capture of two Cuban soldiers landing Havana-trained commandos on Venezuela's coast early last month and said it was time for the OAS to act.

"We stand ready to make any sacrifice if the aggression of Cuba is not stopped," Paris declared. But his resolution fell far short of anything that will stop Castro from his announced aim of toppling other governments in the Americas.

BACK MEETING ONLY

The Venezuelans asked that the OAS Council call the foreign ministers to consider the case, to appoint nine members to decide where and when and how to inform the United Nations of the resolution.

One after another the OAS ambassadors, except those of Mexico and Honduras, supported the proposal for a meeting. But before the unanimous vote, several envoys pointedly indicated the meeting was all they were supporting, and said they reserved the right to decide later what they would vote for when the foreign ministers convene.

Chilean Ambassador Alejandro Magnet said his country supported the meeting under the OAS Charter but that it would not have been feasible to invoke the real pact since Cuba is no longer an OAS member. He said the complaint was a matter of concern for the United Nations, where Cuba still sits in membership.

[From the State-Times, Baton Rouge, La., May 24, 1967]

Trade With Cuba

(By Allen Scott)

It is now official.

Despite previous disclaimers, the State Department now admits that wheat purchased in Canada by Russia was shipped directly to Cuba.

The department's latest report on free world and Communist trade with Cuba reveals this. Prepared for the House Foreign Affairs Committee, the document states:

"Communist exports to Cuba in 1966 totaled more than $600 million. Free world exports, including Canadian wheat paid for by the Soviet Union, dropped by one-fourth to $208 million. Shipments of Canadian wheat purchased by Russia continued to Cuba for the third year."

Another State Department report to the committee lists China's trade with the free world at $2.5 billion in 1966. Eight countries provided nearly three-fourths of China's imports from the free world.

They are Japan, Australia, Canada, Argentina, Germany, Britain, France and Italy.

"Australia Today and, I Hope, Tomorrow"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN DOWDY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1967

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask to be inserted in the RECORD the words of the

Honorable Edward Clark in an address delivered to a dinner group hosted by George Patterson, president of Buckeye Pipeline Co., at the Links Club in New York on April 24, 1967. Mr. Clark, one of my valuable constituents from San Augustine, Tex., is American Ambassador to Australia, and is an able man and fine gentleman, doing a splendid job for the United States of America.

The address follows:

AUSTRALIA TODAY AND I HOPE TOMORROW

Without much hesitation, and without any apologies, I can say that I have the most pleasant job of anyone in this room in representing our interests in Australia. The essence of any Ambassador's function, of course, is negotiation. To many of you, that must mean the skillful use of reason, cajolery, arm-twisting, and sometimes the blackjack. In Canberra, negotiation usually boils down to liaison between two governments that have identical Asian policies and interests, and to determining how and with what we might best support each other and our mutual interests. I am not saying that the Australians are pushovers—far from it. When our interests differ, as they do in some limited areas such as trade and tariff policies, or when they believe that someone is putting somehing over on them, then the Aussie is just about the toughest diplomatic adversary you will find. But fortunately for us, our interests do not often diverge and, on the big issues which concern us in this room today, we see eye to eye.

Indeed, and I want to emphasize this point—the United States has no closer ally and no closer friend anywhere in the world today than Australia. And I don't mean just the Australian Government. The warmth and depth of friendship toward the United States is a tangible thing which we who serve in Australia feel every day.

Two events which occurred at the end of 1966 brought into sharp focus the nature of that friendship. In October there was President Johnson's four-day visit which resulted in an outpouring of sentiment and crowds not matched by any other event in recent Australian history, including visits by the Royal Family. This was followed a month later by an even more tangible yardstick. Prime Minister Holt's government was reelected with the greatest parliamentary majority of any government in Australian history. This was after a campaign during which the importance of the American alliance to Australia, and the question of the Australian commitment in Viet-Nam were the only issues. I might allude to one further indication of how the Australian look upon their alliance with us, and the threat of Chinese Communism.

Early this year, an Australian nation-wide Gallup Poll indicated that 65 percent of the population would favor the basing of a U.S. Nuclear strike force in Australia. Now I am not advocating the stationing of such a force in Australia—nor is the Holt Government—but I doubt that any other nation in the world today would come up with a similar response to such a poll.

There were other important developments during the past year which I'll tick off quickly:

1. The threefold increase in Australian military forces in Viet-Nam early in 1966 followed by the announcement at the end of the year of a further increase to include air and naval units.

2. Prime Minister Holt's Asian tour of last year, to be followed by two tours this year. These unprecedented visits are designed to show that the Australian government intends to play a positive and active role in this erea.

3. A number of public statements by Holt and other Australian officials clearly indicate that pragmatism rather than sentimental and historical ties will govern Australia's future relations with the British and the Commonwealth. This weakening of ties with the Commonwealth in part stems from basic economic developments of recent years. The United States has replaced Britain as Australia's major source of foreign capital, while the United States and Japan have overtaken Britain as Australia's principal trade partners.

All of the foregoing boils down to two basic developments in Australian foreign policy:

1. The steady post-war trend away from Britain and the Commonwealth and toward closer identification with the United States has reached its climax with Australia now giving public recognition to its total reliance on and commitment to the American alliance.

2. Public recognition of, and governmental action on the premise that Australia is part of Asia, that the security of Australia requires a free and stable Asia, and that Australia's role in this area must take precedence over relations with the Commonwealth and Europe.

Standing on the American sidelines, there would appear to be nothing startling in these developments, but for Australia, this has been an historic and dramatic change in her international relationships and outlook. The Aussies have had to loosen their cultural, economic, security and political ties with the Mother Country. This hasn't been easy.

What does all of this mean for us?

First, of course, it means that we have a partner in Asia that relies on us and trusts us, and deserves—and expects—utter frankness in her dealings with us. It means that we have a friend, unlike any other, on whom we can depend to react as we do in facing events which threaten our mutual interests in the area. It also means we have an ally which will do everything within its political, economic and military capacities to live up to its side of the partnership—and will expect us to do likewise. Australia recognizes and accepts that it must be a junior partner. But she is not and will not be a tool. She expects to be consulted on decisions and policy formulation that may affect her interests—just as she accepts that she must consult us and take into consideration our views on matters that affect our interests.

But what can Australia contribute as a partner in Asia? Quite obviously, with a population of less than twelve million, her role must be a limited one. She cannot, for example, take over British responsibilities in Asia. It is unlikely that she will ever be in position to act independently in Asia—even if she wanted to do so. But she can play an important supporting role in several ways. Diplomatically, she can provide a special link between east and west. Examples today are her particularly helpful relationships with Cambodia, and the special relationship that is developing between Japan and Australia, particularly in the economic area. There is also the special relationship that continues to exist with Malaysia and hopefully will develop further with Indonesia.

On the military side, Australia and her territories provide us a strategic reserve area with direct access to Southeast Asia. This alone is of immeasurable long-term value. Beyond this, Australia's present defense buildup is providing an increasing capacity to contribute to the military security of the area, particularly in Malaysia. She cannot, of course, be expected to fill Britain's military shoes completely. But she will do her utmost in this direction *provided* she can depend on our support under a broadened concept of the Australian-American alliance.

On the economic side, although Australia is a capital-short country, she can make an important contribution to Asian development. Her assistance program (which consists entirely of grant aid) is even larger than ours in terms of percent of GNP—approaching point eight percent.

As you are all aware, our post-war relationship with Australia was based primarily on the military alliance as embodied in ANZUS. In the twenty years since the ending of the Second World War, however, that relationship has been broadened in all fields to become an all-embracing one directed at the attainment of a wide range of mutual goals and the protection of mutual interests. It is clearly in our interest to encourage this continuing evolution and to seek further means for cooperation and mutual support.

Honolulu Reporter Has Narrow Escape From Vung Tau's Uncertain Allegiance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1967

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, free lance writer Gail Barclay has just returned to Hawaii following her second 6-week visit to South Vietnam, and she has written a vivid account of her experiences traveling in the Vietnamese countryside.

Her adventurous encounters on the highways and marshy outskirts between Saigon and the beach town of Vung Tau are described in a special report which appeared in the May 28, 1967, issue of the Honolulu Sunday Star-Bulletin & Advertiser.

Because her story touches in a very personal way on the enigmatic contradictions of war, I insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the attention of my colleagues Mrs. Barclay's very interesting article "With Dusk, Allegiance Changes":

[From the Honolulu Sunday Star-Bulletin & Advertiser, May 28, 1967]

WITH DUSK, ALLEGIANCE CHANGES

(NOTE.—Gail Barclay, a 26-year-old free lance writer, lives in Kailua with her husband, James, a University of Hawaii graduate student, and their children, a girl, 2, and a boy, 1. She has just returned from her second six-week visit to South Vietnam. It will be her last she says. Her husband watched the children while she was gone. "He's used to it," she said. "After all, it's my work.")

(By Gail Barclay)

"Vung Tau? On a motorcycle? You must be kidding," laughed Captain Mike Phillips. "Nobody goes to Vung Tau on a motorcycle."

But soon Captain Phillips and I were on our way . . . on a motorcycle . . . to Vung Tau.

Curious to see if the situation in the countryside was as ominous as Saigon sources claimed it was, I had managed to talk Captain Phillips into accompanying me.

Vung Tau is a beach resort some 65 kilometers from Saigon. It is popular with the Vietnamese, and has recently been named as an "In-Country" R&R site for American forces in Vietnam.

Although the highway between Saigon and Vung Tau is supposedly not secure, it was crowded with bicycle and foot traffic. Men waved, women smiled, and children gleefully chased the motorcycle. Past Bien Hoa, we came upon an Army Engineer convoy. Grim-faced guards and cocked machine-guns seemed out of place among the carefree Vietnamese.

We reached Vung Tau at noon. It is a quiet and colorful little town, boasting a broad strip of beach, shaded avenues, and hundreds of brightly-painted bars and bistros. After a lunch of crabmeat salad and beer, we changed into our bathing suits and headed for the beach.

We rented tilt-back chairs and a beach umbrella. A swarm of naked Vietnamese children were playing in the shallows, and the Korean family next to us had spread a picnic lunch out upon the sand. The sun was hot, and the water was refreshing.

The war seemed a million miles away.

Lulled by the beach and the open friendliness of everyone we'd met, Captain Phillips and I stayed in Vung Tau until the very last minute—and started back to Saigon much later than we'd meant to.

A SETBACK

Just beyond Vung Tau's marshy outskirts, we came upon two broken-down tanks. One of the tanks had thrown a tread, and the tankers were trying to fix it before sundown. Dusty and tired, they stared at the unusual sight of an American woman riding on the back of a Honda. One of them waved, and I smiled and waved back.

Twenty minutes later, the Honda swerved sharply. There was a soft whooshing sound, and the rear tire went flat.

We headed for a cluster of huts a hundred yards down the road. A horde of ragged children surged towards us as we neared the village. Pushing, yelling, grabbing at our pockets and at the bundle lashed to the back of the motorcycle, they pressed about us from all sides so that we could not move. There were at least fifty of them . . . and more came running as we stood there and wondered what to do.

A slender young Vietnamese waded into the melee then. He said something, and the children fell back.

"Parlez-vous francais?" I asked him.

He nodded. I explained what had happened, and asked him if he could repair the tire. He said that he could, and motioned us to his hut. He went inside, came out with several tools, and began to remove the punctured tire's tube.

He worked very slowly. The sun began to set.

Restlessly, I walked towards the road. I was immediately surrounded by the children. They tugged at my dress and at my hair, snatched the lens cap from the camera and pushed me back and forth. Their shrill voices and unsmiling laughter seemed more and more menacing to me, and I edged back to where the youthful Vietnamese was tinkering with the punctured tube, immersing it in a shallow panful of water in a futile attempt to find the hole.

Suddenly I noticed that there were no other men in the village. There were more than 60 children, and several women . . . but no men.

I whispered to Captain Phillips, and he nodded.

"I know. Lets just hope he fixes the tire so we can get out of here before dark."

The sun set. The children ringed tightly about us, pushing and throwing pebbles while the women looked on silently from their doors. One pebble glanced off the Honda's chrome; the next hit me in the side of the head.

Standing up, the youth who'd been fixing our tire said something in Vietnamese . . . something that made the women laugh and the children scream with delight.

He turned to me. He would not be able to repair the tire before morning, he said.

I insisted that we had to return to Saigon.

He shook his head, and told me that we could sleep in his hut.

"Okay," said Captain Phillips, before I could protest further. "Tell him it's all right. Just tell him it's all right."

Had we tried to run away or shown any sign or reluctance, we would probably have been shot. Later, we learned that we would have been worth nearly as much dead as alive . . . and no one would have known for sure. It was Captain Phillips' cool-headedness that saved our lives.

We went into the hut, and stood by while the young Vietnamese lit a kerosene lamp. A dull, mechanical sound droned somewhere in the distance, and I felt Captain Phillips' fingers tighten about my wrist.

"Come on!" he said urgently. "That's one of those tanks!"

He hauled me out of the hut and through the throngs of momentarily-motionless women and children that surrounded us. We stumbled out onto the road just as the first tank rumbled past. The second tank stopped, and a grimy tanker with an M-16 cocked and ready to fire leapt down.

QUICK RESCUE

Captain Phillips told him what had happened. The tanker snapped out an order. Things happended fast. Two men hoisted the crippled motorcycle onto the back of the tank, and someone gave me a hand up. Before I could catch my breath, I was lowered down into the tank's hatch. Less than a minute later, we were underway.

It was pitch-black, hot and noisy inside the tank. I poked my head through the open hatch, and asked if I could come out. Before the tanker could reply, a dull explosion shuddered through the darkness.

There was a silence. Then, a burst of machine-gun fire spattered unevenly into the night.

"Charlie just blew that culvert up ahead," the tanker told us. "Satchel charge. Another minute, and we'd have been right on top of it."

The tanks were too heavy to by-pass the destroyed culvert through the rice paddies that surrounded the road. We would have to return to Vung Tau. There was another explosion, this time about half a mile behind us . . . and we were cut off.

The tanks and the two MP jeeps that accompanied them pulled off the road and drew up in a defensive formation.

The tankers were incredulous when they'd heard our story.

"All these villages belong to Charlie," one sergeant told me. "If you'd slept there tonight, you wouldn't have woke up tomorrow morning . . . or ever." He made a sweeping gesture towards the darkness. "This whole area is half-secure," he joked. "In the daytime, it belongs to us; at night, it belongs to Charlie. If we hadn't thrown that tread, we wouldn't have been traveling this late ourselves." He shook his head. "You just don't know how lucky you are," he said wonderingly. "You just don't know."

FIRE POWER

By now, the "Dragon Ships" had arrived.

Watching "Puff The Magic Dragon" at the deadly work is an unforgettable experience. The dotted crimson line of tracers arched from the sky to the ground in total silence . . . and then, several seconds after the thousands of rounds of ammunition have hit the earth, a high-pitched whine sounds in the night.

When the "Dragon Ships" were done, the artillery began.

The sergeant set up a cot for me alongside one of the tanks, but I couldn't sleep. I lay there, watching the eerie orange flicker of the flares that lit our position for friend and enemy alike, and listening to the unrelenting thunk! of the mortars that fell all about us.

At last, I came to know the horrifying impersonality of war. I thought of my children. I thought of the fact that a "short-round" or a miscalculation could kill me as dead as could a sniper's bullet. I smelled gunpowder and smoke . . . and tasted the fear as I lay on my cot and prayed for morning.

At last, the sky grew light. The artillery ceased. The machine guns from the ARVIN outpost at our rear fired one last round. Then there was silence . . . and we could hear birds singing.

We drank coffee from empty C-Ration tins. Then, we moved out to wait for soldiers from Bien Hoa who would repair the culvert.

There was just as much foot and bicycle traffic on the road as there had been yesterday.

Everyone was friendly. Men waved, women smiled and the children clambered eagerly all over the tanks. Three smiling girls in gleaming ao dais offered us fresh pineapple, watermelon wedges and cubed sugar-cane. The sun was shining. But as soon as the sun went down, it would all belong to Charlie again.

Four More State Servicemen Die in Viet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1967

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, seven Maryland servicemen were recently killed in combat in Vietnam. They were. Pfc. Sandy Zimmerman, Jr., Capt. Martin N. Tull, Pfc. Robert J. Thomas, SSgt. James M. Mosgrove, Lance Cpl. Harold D. Shelton, Pfc. William J. Corbin, and Pfc. William M. Lumsden. I wish to commend the courage of these young men and honor their memory by including the following two articles from the Baltimore Sun in the RECORD:

FOUR MORE STATE SERVICEMEN DIE IN VIET

Four more Maryland servicemen—two soldiers and two marines—have been killed in Vietnam, the Defense Department reported yesterday.

The casualties were identified as:

Army Staff Sgt. James M. Mosgrove, Jr., 23, of 989 Dalton avenue, Baltimore.

Marine Lance Cpl. Harold D. Shelton, 20, of 541 Mosher street, Baltimore.

Marine Pfc. William J. Corbin, 18, of 113 Fern avenue, Joppa.

Army Pfc. William W. Lumsden, 19, of Loveville, St. Marys county.

Sergeant Mosgrove, a six-year infantry veteran, was killed Friday by a terrorist bullet while he was patrolling in his jeep. He was a member of the 12th Infantry, 4th Infantry Division, and had been in Vietnam since October.

He was not quite 17 when he joined the Army, and his mother, Mrs. Blanche A. Roberts, of 989 Dalton avenue, had to give her permission before he was allowed to enlist.

Mrs. Roberts said last night that family friends had tried to dissuade Sergeant Mosgrove from going to Vietnam, but that "he felt it was his duty, not only to his country but to his men."

He is survived by his mother; and his father, James M. Mosgrove, of Cleveland.

Corporal Shelton enlisted in the Marine Corps in January, 1966, while he was still in his senior year at City College.

He was killed Friday when a mortar shell exploded, sending fragments into his head, while defending his machine gun position against enemy attack. Corporal Shelton was a machine gunner in a 9th Marine Division weapons platoon.

"If it is the Lord's will, I will return," Corporal Shelton wrote his mother, Mrs. Clara Snowden, of 541 Mosher street. "I could be injured, or even be killed, but I am asking you not to worry."

He is survived by his mother; his father, Leonard Tyson, of Philalephia; three sisters, Barbara H. Snoden, Carolyn Snowden, and Linda Snowden, all of Baltimore; and a brother, Jesse W. Snowden, Jr., of Baltimore.

KILLED NEAR QUANG TRI

Pfc. Corbin, a mine detector and radio operator in the 3d Marine Division, was killed Friday by mortar fragments in the vicinity of Quang Tri.

He enlisted in the Marine Corps in August, 1966, two months after he graduated from Perry Hall High School, and arrived in Vietnam January 28.

On the day he was killed, his parents, Mr. and Mrs. William J. Corbin, of Joppa, received their last letter from him. He told them he was preparing to go out on patrol and added, "God knows when I'll get to write again."

Besides his parents, he is survived by his grandmother, Mrs. Mildred J. Corbin, of Joppa, and two stepbrothers, Vernon Raftery and Patrick Raftery, both of Gloucester, Mass.

PRIVATE LUMSDEN

Private Lumsden was killed by enemy shrapnel, while on a mission Sunday. James E. Taylor, the young soldier's father said he did not know where his son was when he was killed.

After enlisting in the Army in August, 1966, Private Lumsden was trained at Fort Bragg, N.C., and Fort Gordon, Ga. He had been in Vietnam since January.

At the time of his death, legal papers were being prepared to change his last name to Taylor. Mr. Taylor said his adopted son had attended school as "Billy Taylor" and wanted his name changed. He was adopted at the age of 5 days, Mr. Taylor said.

Private Lumsden, who dropped out of Margaret Brent High School after the 10th grade, is survived by his stepparents, a sister, Mrs. Betty Turner, of Parkland, Md. and two brothers, James E. Taylor, Jr., and Robert Hatton.

THREE MARYLAND SERVICE MEN KILLED IN VIET ACTION

Three Maryland servicemen, two marines and one soldier, have been killed in action in Vietnam, the Defense Department announced yesterday.

They were:

Pfc. Sandy Zimmerman, Jr., 19, a marine, son of Mr. and Mrs. Sandy Zimmerman, Sr., of 1629 North Bradford street, Baltimore.

Capt. Martin N. Tull, a marine, husband of Mrs. Martin N. Tull, of 11931 Viers Mill road, Wheaton.

Pfc. Robert J. Thomas, the soldier, son of George A. Thomas, of 2433 Callow avenue, Baltimore.

Private Zimmerman was shot in the chest and killed Saturday while on a patrol near Trung Luong, the Defense Department said in a wire to his parents. He had been in Vietnam since the first of May.

Private Zimmerman attended School No. 452 at McCulloh and Biddle streets and left there in June, 1965. Between that time and his Marine Corps enlistment in November, 1966 he worked as a busboy at Friendship International Airport and for an East Baltimore laundry.

Besides his parents, he is survived by two brothers, Paul and Douglas Zimmerman, and two sisters, Margaret and Emily Zimmerman.

The American Film Institute Is Organized

SPEECH

OF

HON. THEODORE R. KUPFERMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1967

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, for many years, there has been discussion about the need for preserving the great backlog of film heretofore produced and going back to the turn of the century.

Because of the great cultural potential, film and other reproductive devices deserve additional thought and assistance.

My colleagues will be interested in the fact that the American Film Institute has been organized as a nonprofit, nongovernmental corporation to preserve, protect, and develop the artistic and cultural use of film.

It will be noted that George Stevens, Jr., involved in the production of well-respected USIA film "Years of Lightning, Days of Drums," will be the chief executive officer of the new corporation.

The New York Times article of June 6 regarding this organization and the public figures connected with it follows:

AGENCY TO PRESS MOVIES' ARTISTRY—AMERICAN FILM INSTITUTE FORMED IN WASHINGTON

(By Vincent Canby)

WASHINGTON, JUNE 5.—The American Film Institute, a nonprofit, nongovernmental corporation, has been formally established to preserve and develop the nation's "artistic and cultural resources in film."

George Stevens Jr., 35-year-old director of the United States Information Agency's film division, is resigning that post to become director and chief executive officer of the new corporation, which will be guided by a 22-member board of trustees.

Formation of the institute, which will have headquarters in Washington, was announced at the Madison Hotel here today at a press conference held by George Stevens, Roger L. Stevens, chairman of the National Council of the Arts, and Gregory Peck, the actor who is acting chairman of the institute's board of trustees.

OTHER SUCH GROUPS LARGER

With an estimated budget of $5.3-million for the first three years, the American Film Institute comes into being as the third-largest such organization in the world in terms of money. Its Soviet counterpart has an annual budget of between $4-million and $5-million, and the Swedish Film Institute an annual budget of $2.25 million.

The United States, where motion pictures had their birth, is one of the last of the major producing nations to establish such an organization. Britain, France, Italy and India have them.

As outlined by Roger Stevens, the institute will concentrate on the following areas:

¶Filmmaker training. It will establish one or more Centers for Advanced Film Study, to act as a bridge between college or university study and a filmmaking career.

¶Film education. The institute will explore ways to help develop and improve the study of film as an art form "with its own esthetics, history and techniques."

¶Film production. The institute will make grants to young filmmakers for the production of documentary and experimental films, both short and feature-length, and will finance the production of such films at its Centers for Advanced Film Study.

¶Film archives. The institute will work to catalogue and preserve old films.

The institute will commission publications of film news, criticism and textbooks.

Of the institute's initial three-year budget three-quarters is already in hand or firmly committed.

COUNCIL GRANT IS LARGEST

The National Council on the Arts, in the largest single grant it has ever made, has given the institute $1.3-million. The Ford Foundation and the Motion Picture Association of America have each pledged themselves to grant $1.3-million, leaving $1.3-million still to be raised.

George Stevens Jr., son of the Hollywood filmmaker and no relation to Roger Stevens, pointed to the dominating influence of film today and said: "We cannot be casual about the training of the people who create these images."

PECK REPLIES TO CRITICS

As head of the U.S.I.A.'s film division for the last five years, Mr. Stevens has been responsible for the production and distribution around the world of 600 documentaries and newsreels annually. Under his leadership, the U.S.I.A. began an "interneship" program to train young filmmakers. A number of their films, notably the documentary feature on President Kennedy, "Years of Lightning; Day of Drums," have been well received.

Taking notice of criticism that the present board seems to be weighted in favor of the Hollywood motion-picture establishment, Mr. Peck noted:

"I have been in the theater and films for 25 years, and this is the first production in which I appeared that was reviewed before it opened."

The trustees other than George Stevens and Mr. Peck:

Elizabeth Ashley, the actress.
Charles Benton, educational film producer.
Francis Ford Coppola, film writer and director.
Sherrill Corwin, president of the National Association of Theater Owners.
The Rev. John Culkin, director of Fordham University's Center for Communications.
Bruce Herschensohn, documentary filmmaker.
Francis Keppel, former United States Commissioner of Education.
Arthur Knight, film critic and historian.
Richard Leacock, filmmaker.
Donald H. McGannon, president of Westinghouse Broadcasting Company.
David Mallery, director of studies for the National Association of Independent Schools.
William L. Pereira, architect and member of the National Council on the Arts.
Arnold Picker, executive vice president of United Artists Corporation.
Sidney Poitier, the actor.
Arthur M. Schlesinger Jr., the historian.
George Seaton, the firm director and producer.
Dan Taradash, film writer.
Jack Valenti, president of the Motion Picture Association of America.
Richard F. Walsh, president of the International Alliance of Theatrical Stage Employes.
Fred Zinnemann, the director.

American Hungarian Federation Celebrates 60th Anniversary

SPEECH

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1967

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, this year marks the 60th anniversary of the American Hungarian Federation. I feel that it is most appropriate to salute this fine organization on reaching an important milestone, and to note its many accomplishments.

During its entire existence it has served Hungarian immigrants in the United States and aided them in becoming loyal and useful citizens. In addition, the federation has acted as a focal point and spokesman for the problems and needs of American citizens of Hungarian background. For the last 20 years, the American Hungarian Federation has also served as the unofficial representative of the Hungarian people living in Hungary, who have been deprived of their democratic rights and free expression.

The federation has its own local and State chapters and in addition consists of the Hungarian Reformed Federation of America, the William Penn Fraternal Association, American Hungarian churches, associations, clubs, and study groups. All of these organizations send delegates to a triennial convention which elects officers and members of the board of directors.

After World War II, the federation sponsored over 22,000 Hungarians for admission to the United States, and later aided some 35,000 Hungarian refugees in coming to this country after the ruthless and tyrannical Soviet subjugation of their homeland. Between 1945 and 1952, the federation sent nearly $1.5 million to help Hungary and Hungarians living in Western Europe. After the valiant struggle for freedom in 1956, the federation provided $512,560 in relief funds prior to the time a separate organization was designated to provide this service.

The federation has long taken a strong and unequivocal stand against any form of totalitarian or atheistic ideology, and was in opposition to both nazism and communism. Over the past two decades it has sought to keep the U.S. Government and the American people informed on political, religious, and economic conditions in Hungary under Communist domination. This effort has been carried out by the publication and the dissemination of information with the hope that it will keep alive the spark of freedom in the hearts of those living under Communist imperialism.

The American Hungarian Federation was chartered in 1907 in Cleveland, Ohio. Its present officers are: The Honorable Albert A. Fiok, municipal judge, Pittsburgh, national president; Rt. Rev. Dr. Zoltan Beky, bishop emeritus of the Hungarian Independent Reformed Church of America and president of the Hungarian Reformed Federation of America, chairman of the board of directors; Prof. Dr. Emery G. Szekely, Temple Medical School, Philadelphia; Dr. Janos Nadas, president, Kossuth Chapter of AHF, Cleveland; Mr. Stephen Miko, president, AHF of the State of New York, Inc., and Mr. Zoltan Vasvari, president, Cross and Sword Movement, Garfield, N.J., the national vice presidents; Mr. Richard J. Phillips, William Penn Fraternal Association, Pittsburgh, treasurer; Mr. Bela Karlovitz, Pittsburgh, general counsel; Messrs. Gabriel Bodaner, Garfield, N.J., Andrew Eross, Sr., Bridgeport, Conn., and Dr. Julius Hovany, Chicago, Ill., comptrollers; Dr. Louis Furt, Washington, D.C., and Prof. Z. Michael Szaz, department of political science, Seton Hall University, South Orange, N.J., national secretaries.

Mr. Speaker, it is with pride that I recognize the very significant accomplishments of the American Hungarian Federation. On its 60th anniversary, I extend my best wishes and hope for its continual success and achievements. The federation typifies the contribution made by our citizens of Hungarian background to this Nation's greatness. Through its efforts and ours we may look forward to the time when the Hungarian nation is again able to remain and enjoy the independence and freedom which it so eagerly seeks.

Remarks of Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey at the First International Agribusiness Conference on "The Search for International Food Balance" Sponsored by Chicago Board of Trade, May 11, 1967

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 18, 1967

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, recently Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY addressed a most unusual assembly of American businessmen and investors who recognize the powerful impact of the agricultural community on the entire economy of America and yes, indeed, the entire world.

The first International Agribusiness Conference was sponsored in Chicago by the Chicago Board of Trade.

Present at the banquet which Vice President HUMPHREY addressed was a tremendously distinguished group of American businessmen who are working in harmony and unison with the agricultural community of this country.

I am proud that Chicago was the host to this first International Agribusiness Conference, and I am equally proud of of the manner in which Vice President HUMPHREY placed the significance of this conference in its proper perspective.

Vice President HUMPHREY made a powerful contribution toward a better understanding of how the Nation, by utilizing all of the segments of its business and agricultural community, can, indeed, reach heights never before imagined by man in human achievement.

Vice President HUMPHREY's speech follows:

REMARKS OF VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT H. HUMPHREY AT THE FIRST INTERNATIONAL AGRIBUSINESS CONFERENCE ON "THE SEARCH FOR INTERNATIONAL FOOD BALANCE," SPONSORED BY CHICAGO BOARD OF TRADE, MAY 11, 1967

I am honored to bring you this message from the President of the United States:

"I am very pleased to greet those attending the first International Agribusiness Conference.

"Your meeting is proof that the world is at last aware that a war must be waged on global hunger. That awareness, accompanied by a full commitment of talent and resources, is vital to our ultimate success.

"History teaches us that, given a creative, constructive partnership between private business and government, no challenge is too great—no problem insurmountable.

"The present food crisis is without parallel in the history of mankind. International cooperation backed by self-help is imperative. We in America can provide only a small margin of the human and material resources neded for food development. The major effort—the will—the leadership—the labor—and, indeed even most of the resources—must come from the low-income countries themselves.

"The developing countries which have made the best progress are those in which private initiative and enterprise have played a vigorous role in national growth.

"The encouragement of such initiative in the developing countries and the furthering of private U.S. participation in international development are salient objectives of our assistance program.

"We cannot expect to have the kind of stable and progressive world in which free institutions can survive and flourish unless the people of Asia, Africa, and Latin America can look forward to economic and social progress, earned by their own work in independence and self-respect. We were never meant to be an oasis of liberty and abundance in a worldwide desert of disappointed dreams.

"I salute you, and I wish you growing success in an indispensable task of our time."

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

We are citizens of the rich Western world. And we take almost for granted the prosperity and plenty which surround us.

But we would do well to realize that, as we sit comfortably this evening at our dinner tables, many hundreds of millions of the world's people do not know where their next meal is coming from.

Tonight, as we count our blessings here in America, I would like to share with you a few thoughts about those millions, and what they will mean to us in the years ahead.

Some 169 years ago the Reverend Thomas Malthus wrote a document entitled "An Essay on the Principle of Population." That document foresaw the time when world population would far outrun world food supply.

For many years the wise people in the economic ministries and universities pointed out the fallacies in Malthus' ideas, and reassured each other that such a thing would not happen.

But I bring you this news: Reverend Malthus' grim prophecy will come true, unless we act and act now.

Two things have saved mankind so far from such a fate.

First, there has been the spectacular increase in agricultural output and productivity in the advanced nations in the temperate zone, such as our United States.

Second, there has been the cruelly-high death rate in the poor nations, mostly in the tropic and subtropic zones.

But we are not keeping up. Because of modern medicine, death rates have been cut in the developing countries. And birth rates have increased. The result has been the now-famous "population explosion."

Let me give you a specific example, in terms of one basic commodity, of how times have changed.

Before World War II the developing countries, as a whole, shipped an average of five million tons of grain to the advanced nations each year.

Now the situation is reversed.

This year—despite the fact that they have 60 to 80 percent of their work forces in agriculture—the developing nations will *import* over 30 million tons of grain. And, with those imports, they will still be left desperately short of their needs.

For the past six years the world has consumed more grain than it has produced. The gap has been filled largely by so-called "surpluses" from North America.

But the only surplus today is a surplus of hunger.

And even our amazing American productivity will not be enough to meet the challenge.

Today we in America are putting unused acreage back into production.

But our unused capacity is limited, and so is that of the other great grain-producing countries.

Our best estimate is that the available land resources of the world give us about a *decade* to bring the equation between food and people into balance.

After that date, there will be no inexhaustible reservoirs of food grains for the hungry of the world.

That is only the supply side.

On the demand side, we must recognize that, by 1980, there will probably be more than another billion people in the world—most of them in food-short countries.

Based on these trends, the FAO estimates that cereals deficits in these countries will total around 42 million tons by 1975, a deficit greater than the current entire U.S. wheat crop.

At that rate, the deficit could exceed 80 million tons by 1985—or greater than total U.S. *capacity*, even if all conceivable acreage were brought back into production and technological improvement continued at its present rate.

Even now, ten thousand people—mostly children—die every day from malnutrition.

If the gap continues to grow, what will this figure be in the years ahead?

How can we hope for security or stability in a world where the few drink Metrecal while the many die in misery and starvation?

And how can we, as moral people, allow it to happen?

The answer is that we cannot.

If we are to really get to the problem, the developing countries will have to seriously look to family planning. They will also have to produce more of their own food.

That is why, in our new Food for Freedom program, we are stressing—yes, insisting on—self help.

This means that governments in these countries must give a much high priority to agriculture than they have in the past.

The time is past when a national airline . . . a steel mill . . . an officers' club and a superhighway from the national palace to the airport could pass for a "development" program.

A true development program—one with any hope of defeating hunger—is one which gives real production incentives to farmers.

It is one which provides better facilities for farm credit and for marketing.

It is one which brings basic measures of health and of mass education to the people of the countryside.

Yes, the hungry nations must more effectively help themselves.

But we, as world leaders and as responsible citizens of this planet, must do far better too. And that is where you come in.

If we are to defeat world hunger, we will need the effective efforts of all parts of our society—and particularly of free enterprise.

The Agency for International Development and the Department of Agriculture can serve as catalysts and energizers for private initiative.

I believe in the profit system. I also believe that it can work even more effectively than it has in the past for the public good.

In agriculture, our country especially needs the technical skills and organizational experience—the unmatchable skills and experience of the agribusiness community—to market abroad millions of tons of food and feed grains and oil seeds, and their products.

For the agribusiness community can do this job more efficiently and at less cost than government can.

For too long, business and government stood on opposite sides of an imaginery line—the line dividing the so-called "private sector" from the so-called "public sector"—and glowered at one another.

Some businessmen suspected government of an insatiable appetite to expand its functions, to encroach upon private enterprise, and ultimately to stifle it.

And some government officials regarded business as inherently oblivious or even antagonistic to the public interest. Some even regarded profits as actually immoral—rather than as an incentive essential to efficiency.

These old suspicions are fading into history, and mutual confidence and cooperation are replacing them. We have discovered that neither business nor government has a monopoly on wisdom—or on dedication to the public good.

The problems this country faces are just too large and complex for any one part of our society to handle alone.

If we are to meet the challenges of this last third of the 20th century, we will need everyone. All of us will need each other—each doing his own job in his own best way, yet coordinating our efforts for maximum effect.

For our part, we in government seek to make priority needs—both at home and abroad—profitable for private enterprise.

We seek to create an environment where private initiative can flourish and be rewarded, not penalized, in the course of meeting these needs.

I think you recognize this today in many places both at home and overseas.

Currently, Commodity Credit Corporation-owned stocks of grain are being insulated from the market. The grain markets are freer of the influence of government supplies than in many years.

Low rates for grains and oilseeds are substantially below market prices, enabling the forces of supply and demand to function. Farm prices are competitive in world markets in most cases without an export subsidy. Cooperating farmers are receiving supplemental direct payments.

The Food for Freedom Program, P.L. 480, will move over 1.5 billion dollars worth of farm products through the normal channels of trade this year.

This year we are exporting about 7 billion dollars worth of agricultural commodities. Of this, about 80 per cent are commercial exports. The farmer-agribusiness complex is making a substantial contribution to maintaining our balance of payments.

The Kennedy Round trade negotiations, now nearing completion, has included, at the President's insistence, the agricultural sector as well as industrial products—the first such negotiation to do so. We look to the Kennedy Round not only for increased world trading opportunities, but also as giving new impetus to multilateral food aid by the rich nations.

The Food Stamp Plan, operated through privately-owned retail stores, will be increasing in scope.

We are studying each of our programs with this question in mind: How can we best help private initiative do the job?

There is another opportunity for the agribusiness community.

I am privileged to chair the new National Council on Marine Resources and Engineering Development.

It is the high-priority business of our new Council to develop fully the potential wealth of food from the sea—wealth which can be a tremendous stimulus to the food processing industry.

And, I might add, food from the sea—rich in protein—also offers us new opportunities in the war on hunger.

Now, just what are the implications of the coming world food crisis—and I use the word "crisis" purposely—for our own American agricultural policy?

What must we do?

First of all—and this seems all too obvious—we must produce more food.

We must produce more food to meet requirements in our own country . . . to help fill growing commercial markets overseas . . . and to help feed the hungry of the world.

We must produce more food so that we will have reasonable reserves, in case of emergency. (And we do *not* have adequate reserves today.)

We must help the developing nations, where they wish help, in family-planning programs.

We must help them with programs of desalinization, so that unproductive soil may bloom.

We must help them develop their own rural economies and agricultural productivity to the maximum.

We must encourage rich and food-producing nations to join in this effort—as a matter of their own urgent self-interest.

But we shall be able to do none of these things *if* we in America unwisely choose to live with a policy of agricultural scarcity.

I believe farm abundance and farm prosperity are not in opposition to each other in this country. They can be, if farm programs are mismanaged and misdirected. But they will not be if we in government, and you in the agribusiness community, take care to see that the family which produces that abundance is given proper incentive and return.

The American farm producer carries a heavy burden, and meets a high responsibility, on behalf of our whole society. And he should receive his fair share of our society's overall prosperity.

He needs it.

He deserves it.

And we must help him get it—so that he need not fear that his very productivity will in the end drive him off the soil.

We must break away from the old patterns of thought.

As Abraham Lincoln said: "The dogmas of the quiet past are inadequate to the stormy present. The occasion is piled high with difficulty, and we must rise with the occasion. As our case is new, so must we think anew. We must disenthrall ourselves."

Yes, the occasion is "piled high with difficulty."

For peace and stability, and the future course of world politics, may very well hinge on whether or not we in the rich nations will be able to overcome world hunger.

We may disagree with many of the things Bertrand Russell has to say. But he was absolutely right when he posed this question a few years ago. "If one man offers you democracy and another offers you a bag of grain, at what stage of starvation will you prefer the grain to the vote?"

Democracy or totalitarianism; peace or violence? They make little difference to the starving man with nothing to lose.

And for those who prefer to see things in economic terms, I will point out that, until the people of the hungry nations are able to stand on their own healthy feet, we shall be wasting the world's greatest potential market.

The figures show that, for every 10 per cent increase in per-capita income abroad, our own commercial exports increase 16 per cent. They also show that every billion dollars worth of additional exports creates more than 100 thousand jobs in this country.

The starving and poverty-stricken don't buy much. The healthy and self-sustaining do. Now we face the crossroads.

We can turn back to the old habits and reap the whirlwind. Or we can reach with confidence to the future and reap the bounty of a world of progress . . . of plenty . . . and of peace.

Apollo Applications Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 7, 1967

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, June 6, Dr. George E. Mueller, Associate Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, addressed the local chapter of the American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics here in Washington, D.C.

The subject of his address was "The Apollo Applications Program—Status and Prospects."

It was my pleasure to hear Dr. Mueller and at the conclusion of his address I prevailed upon him to give me a copy of his address so that I could insert it into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I commend this reading to my colleagues, as follows:

THE APOLLO APPLICATIONS PROGRAM—STATUS AND PROSPECTS

It is always a pleasure to be with friends. The American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics is doing an outstanding job of keeping the scientific and technical community informed about the progress and prospects of space science and technology. It is a special pleasure to visit with this Section. Our meeting in November 1963 was my first opportunity after taking on this assignment to discuss it publicly and in perspective.

Last fall and winter, the meetings of this Section with industry spokesmen on "After Apollo—What Next?" were a most helpful contribution to the decision-making process. Much of the thinking in your outstanding series of presentations is reflected in the post-Apollo decision that resulted from this process.

Now what is this post-Apollo decision? It includes these things:

The extension of man's experience in space through a step-by step process in flights of one month, two months and eventually a year or more in orbit.

The continued scientific exploration of the moon after the initial landing at the rate of two to four flights a year.

Research and development of new payloads that will exploit the capability of the Saturn-Apollo systems in earth orbit and lunar orbit.

Improvements of the Apollo spacecraft so it can be used with the Saturn I launch vehicle as a six-man ferry between earth and earth orbit with capability for landing on land.

I believe the decision by the President to continue the exploration of space by implementing the NERVA, Voyager and Apollo Applications programs amounts to a major step forward. If approved by the Congress, this would represent a national commitment to meet the challenge of the future in space.

Today I would like to discuss the Apollo Applications program. A good way to begin is with the two principal program objectives. The first is concerned with the advancement of manned space flight capability. The second is related to things that can be done with this capability.

In the first category are efforts to develop capability for economical space flight and to determine the usefulness of man in space. In the second category are the conduct of astronomy observations, extended lunar exploration, and experiments to study benefits on earth.

The work toward economical space flight has several aspects. We have placed considerable emphasis on efforts toward improvements that reduce unit costs, so as to speed the arrival of the day when applications of manned space flight can be realized economically.

One of the cost-saving aspects of Apollo Applications is the re-use of the Command Module. We hope to refurbish Command Modules flown in the Apollo program for Apollo Applications, avoiding several million dollars in costs for new hardware.

Another step is the addition of land-landing capability which facilitates re-use of the Command Module. This would have even greater impact on costs if it should lead to the ability to dispense with the requirement for naval recovery forces.

The land-landing capability will provide still another major benefit, an increase in crew capacity from three to six. This is so because land landing requires retrorockets that soften the impact to three or four feet per second. In water landings, the impact is between 10 and 20 feet per second. The lowering of the impact shock reduces the requirements placed on the couches and their suspension—thus the increased crew capacity.

A fourth item is the double use of the second stage of the Saturn I—the S–IVB. After it has done its job in the launch phase of the mission, the stage is converted to the Orbital Workshop.

Fifth is the repeated use of the Orbital Workshop as an embryonic space station.

Sixth is the plan to conduct flights of increasing duration. The program worked out with the advice of the space medicine community envisions a series of steps that roughly double the length of each previous flight. We hope this process will lead to missions lasting a year or more in orbit.

Finally, one of the most important economy features of Apollo Applications is its basic concept—that of using the flight hardware and physical plant developed for Apollo, and employing the skills of the Apollo people and industrial organizations as they become available.

Altogether, we hope this series of innovations will permit sufficient reductions in unit costs of doing business in space to allow us to do in space some of the exciting things outlined by Dr. Lloyd Berkner a few weeks ago at the Dallas symposium. I would like to take this opportunity to pay tribute to a great scientist and a great citizen of this country whose vision time and again has laid a solid foundation for our nation's progress. It is characteristic of Lloyd Berkner that he should have been the chief arranger of our first smyposium on "Commercial Utilization of Space." I will miss his advise and wise counsel in the years ahead.

The objective of determining the usefulness of man in space is achieved by investigating human performance and habitability considerations. The large volume of the Orbital Workshop makes this possible.

Dr. Homer E. Newell, NASA's Associate Administrator for Space Science and Applications, has observed that both manned and automated operations will be required to meet the needs of the future. It will be of major importance to design hardware and to and to plan missions that will use man for those tasks that he does better than machines, and vice versa.

To provide the data for such determinations, we have scheduled a number of experiments, beginning with the first flight of the Workshop, which will deal with questions of how to live and work most efficiently in space. Some of these questions are:

How much cubic footage is needed for routine functions of life, science experiments, maintenance of equipment?

What is an optimum floor plan for crew quarters and work stations?

What is the best way to sleep in zero gravity?

What forms of exercise are most effective in keeping a crew physically fit?

What are the best foods and methods of preparing food, caring for personal hygiene, managing wastes and attending to other housekeeping matters?

What about intravehicular activity—that is, motion within the Orbital Workshop—and its effect on experiments and work performance?

When we have this kind of information, we will know a great deal more about man's ability to live and work in space.

Now let us move to the second category of Apollo Applications activities, related to the things that can be done with the available capability. The first is astronomy. The Apollo Telescope Mount is expected to carry on its first flight a package of five basic solar astronomy experiments. This comprises about a dozen major instruments mounted in an instrument support canister almost 7 feet in diameter, 11 feet long and over a ton in weight. It is the most comprehensive and sophisticated array of instruments ever assembled for observation of the sun. We plan to fly it near the peak of the solar cycle, about two years from now. Hopefully, the observations will lead to a considerable increase in the understanding of the sun and its relationship to the earth.

Later in the program, an Apollo Telescope Mount is to carry a package of instruments for stellar astronomy. The astronomers feel there is a real advantage if these observations can be carried out at higher altitudes, on the order of 20,000 miles or more. There are two reasons. One is that a vantage point beyond the magnetosphere reduces interference with observations in the gamma ray, X-ray, and high ultraviolet regions of the spectrum, as well as some radio observations. The second reason is that the spacecraft is in communication with each ground station for longer periods at high altitudes. With these considerations in mind, we are looking closely at the idea of a flying a stellar astronomy Telescope Mount at synchronous altitude or higher.

Another objective in the second category is extended lunar exploration. Activity could begin with a lunar orbital mission employing various types of sensors related to the lunar environment.

For the period following the initial Apollo mission, there is an opportunity to conduct missions that will extend the duration of stay on the moon's surface to 14 days. On the first Apollo lunar mission, the two astronauts are scheduled to limit their stay to about 18 hours. To clarify the options, we are studying the possible use of two Lunar Module derivations. One would land on the moon's surface unmanned, in advance of the men who use it. Its descent stage would not be changed, but its ascent stage would be modified to provide living conditions for 14 days, plus an airlock for egress and ingress. A second Lunar Module would deliver the astronauts to the vicinity of the first and return them to earth. Its only change from the basic design would be to allow it to remain on the surface for 14 days.

Later missions may have additional equipment to permit more extensive exploration. Examples are sensors, drills, subsurface probes and surface vehicles that might permit travel up to 10 or 15 miles from the landing site. Also under consideration is an advanced version of the Apollo Lunar Surface Experiments Package. The initial package, of course, is to be emplaced on the moon in the first Apollo mission.

Now let us turn to the last of the major objectives of the program—the study of benefits here on earth. The operational weather satellites are familiar to all of us. We take them so much for granted that we may occasionally forget that the forecast in this morning's paper was based in part on information returned to earth from space. But much more is possible. Beginning with the Applications A space module, we plan to experiment with advanced equipment, which may help the weather services to forecast more reliably and for longer periods of time.

All this will bring closer the time when we can really do something about the weather.

Perhaps the most interesting of the areas of experiment is the observation and study of the earth's resources, beginning with the Applications B space module. We plan to fly sensing equipment to determine the status of crops and forests, establish the whereabouts of schools of fish at sea, prospect for ores and oil deposits, keep world maps current, and plan transportation routes. As you know, the analysis of the photographs taken from the Gemini spacecraft show a tremendous potential.

Major research and development activity and studies by a number of government agencies would have to precede the inauguration of any such system. But the earth resources survey does seem to be a technically feasible way to help solve some of the most pressing problems of our growing world population.

Other applications may well be feasible. To define the situation better, the National Academy of Sciences is beginning this summer a searching injuiry into the feasibility, practicality, costs and time scales of using space systems for meeting existing and foreseen needs on earth.

Now I would like to spend a few moments discussing the first flights in the program. We are planning to begin with an earth-orbital experiments mission. About 15 experiments taken off the Apollo earth orbital flights would be performed.

Next would be a dual mission, first the Command and Service Modules and then the Orbital Workshop. Rendezvous and docking would initiate an open-ended mission lasting up to 28 days.

If a recovered Apollo Command Module can be refurbished for Apollo Applications, we plan to schedule its flight next in the program, to revisit the Workshop, to renew supplies of expendables, to exercise its systems and to determine that they are all in working order.

Following this would be another dual mission comprising the Command and Service Modules and the Apollo Telescope Mount. These two would rendezvous and dock. Then the combined vehicle would rendezvous and dock with the Workshop for an open-ended mission lasting up to 56 days.

The astronomy mission would be followed by another flight of a refurbished Command Module to revisit the cluster and resupply, reuse and recheck its systems. This would complete the first series of Apollo Applications missions launched by the Saturn I launch vehicle.

The next phase of the program would employ the Saturn I for the Applications A and B missions and the flights of duration increasing by stages to a year or more. The Saturn V would launch a lunar orbital mission, a flight at synchronous orbit altitude of 22,000 miles, and the beginning of extended lunar surface activity.

Next, what is the status of the program?

Douglas Aircraft is outfitting Saturn I second stages to permit the option of using them for the Orbital Workshop mission. Marshall Space Flight Center is selecting the subsystems for the Workshop. Preliminary crew station review has been completed. Preliminary design is well along toward completion.

The Multiple Docking Adapter design is under way at Marshall and a mockup is being fabricated. A neutral bouyancy training article is being constructed for training astronauts in the operation of the flight model.

McDonnell is preparing for a review of the airlock design. Manufacturing of a trainer is in the latter phases and the first flight article is well advanced.

McDonnell is preparing for a review of the system definition of the Apollo Telescope Mount. The final design effort is under way. Structural manufacturing drawings are to be released within the next month. Most of the long lead-time hardware and the experiments equipment is under contract. Some test hardware is now being delivered.

To sum up, this is a program that provides for a detailed measurement of the utility of man in space at a relatively low cost. The measurement is obtained by doing useful things—astronomical observation, extended exploration of the moon and experiments with sensing equipment that can lead to benefits of enormous significance to all mankind.

In the Apollo Applications program, we take a long step toward achieving a real return to the people here on earth from our investments in space. It leads to practical applications, new knowledge, advanced technology and the continued flow of new products, new processes and new ideas—the basic elements that have contributed to our present national prosperity and strength. And it permits us to continue the exploration of space.

And now, I would like to depart for a moment from specific discussion of the program to mention some underlying considerations related to the space effort.

There are three premises that I believe constitute the basic reasons for our space program.

The premise that using and controlling space comprise an essential element of our national security and its importance will grow with time.

The premise that developing the ability to work in space will provide both direct and indirect benefits to every person on earth and that these benefits are beyond our present ability to enumerate or evaluate.

The premise that the greatness of our nation will be measured in large part by our response to the challenge of developing and exploiting space.

I have faith that we will respond and that the benefits will more than repay the investment.

World Crisis in the Middle East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENJAMIN B. BLACKBURN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1967

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, at this time of crisis when, without responsible leadership, war will inevitably continue its rampage in the Middle East, the United States should act firmly to preserve peace and security. An encouraging step in this direction was Ambassador Goldberg's support of the peace resolution in yesterday's meeting of the United Nations.

I now strongly urge the President of the United States to use the great influence and prestige of this Nation to protect the international rights of all nations to open waterways, particularly the right of Israel to free access to the Gulf of Aqaba.

I further urge the President to continue the presence of the U.S. 6th Fleet in the Mediterranean as a display of this Nation's resolution. This country, having served as midwife during the birth of Israel as a free and independent nation, now has a moral responsibility to protect her rights as such, As a sovereign nation, Israel can expect to have free access to international waterways.

I sincerely pray that the forces of reason and moderation will stop the present conflict. When the fighting has ceased, it is my earnest hope that the Israeli nation will have a guarantee that her future rights to the Gulf of Aqaba will remain forever inviolate.

Bringing the Situation to Light

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1967

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, news of the events in Vietnam appear in the headlines almost every day, yet the situation often remains unclear.

Mr. Joseph Alsop has written an article which accurately brings to date the events and the overall siuation existing in Vietnam today.

I commend to the attention of our colleagues this most informative article which appeared in the May 24, 1967, edition of the Washington Post:

THE REASON FOR MORE TROOPS

(By Joseph Alsop)

The steadily intensifying drama of the cruel war in Vietnam is revealed, but it is never explained by the headlines. Hence it may be well to summarize recent developments and to show their effects.

By mid-April, in brief, Gen. William C. Westmoreland and his men had begun to achieve downright brilliant results in the huge, strategically vital region of South Vietnam—the many provinces of the II and III Corps areas. Here, in the center of the country, the enemy's big units had been repeatedly defeated. All were gravely understrength, and all were being progressively eroded by Gen. Westmoreland's "search and destroy" strategy.

For these very reasons, pacification was at last beginning to make good progress in one or two key areas, such as the rich Province of Binhdinh, which is the key to II Corps. At this juncture, however, and precisely because their big units were in such trouble in II and III Corps, the North Vietnamese began the running battle that is still raging along the northern border of South Vietnam, in I Corps.

For this purpose, Hanoi had to take measures different in character and scope from any that had been taken since the American intervention in 1965. Pre-intervention, in 1964–65, Hanoi had sent two full divisions of the regular North Vietnamese army into South Vietnam, to help the Vietcong win the quick victory that was then expected.

Many more regular troops came down from North Vietnam after the U.S. intervention, but this greatly increased Northern invasion of the South was entirely accomplished by calling up conscripts and creating new units. The seven remaining divisions of the North Vietnamese regular army always remained in North Vietnam, until last summer, when one division, with the designation 324B, made the first open invasion of the South across the mis-named demilitarized zone.

This first open invasion had been hurled back, with dreadful losser among the invaders, before last winter's fighting began. What is now happening is another invasion, again open and unconcealed, but on a far larger scale. At least three divisions, or nearly one half of the entire North Vietnamese home army, have now pushed wholly or partly across the DMZ.

The invading units are the old 324B Division, the 325th Division and the 341st Division. At least eight of the nine regiments of these divisions have been engaged, at one time or another, in the harsh fighting with the Marines that has been going on since late April. Hanoi's massive "escalation" (that non-word, again!) has in turn forced Gen. Westmoreland to borrow from Peter to pay Paul.

Specifically, he has already had to strengthen the American forces in I Corps by moving forces from the II and III Corps areas. From Phuyen Province, which had been well on the way to becoming another Binhdinh, he had to take the 101st Airborne Brigade. From Tayminh Province, he took the 196th Light Infantry Brigade.

Finally, he also took a brigade of the 25th Division, which had been aiding the 4th division to contain the pressure from the North Vietnamese units in Cambodian sanctuary. These three brigades now form Task Force Oregon in southern I Corps, under Maj. Gen. William C. Rosson.

The pressure on the enemy in the strategically vital II and III Corps areas has already been diminished, therefore, by the weight of an entire U.S. Division-equivalent. This is a deadly serious matter, in itself.

For in a war of attrition, it is always dangerous to reduce the pressure that causes attrition. And in this particular war, in which pacification is impossible until the enemy's big units have been cut off from the local population, slowing the erosion of these big units simply means slowing down pacification.

As yet, however, this borrowing from Peter to pay Paul has merely produced unfortunate results, rather than fatal results. But it will surely be fatal, for instance, if Gen. Westmoreland is also forced to move the First Air Cavalry Division before the Air Cavalry has disposed, for good and all, of their favorite enemy, the Third North Vietnamese Division.

If the Air Cavalry is moved, and the Third North Vietnamese Division gets a chance to make a comeback, all the great gains in Binh-dinh Province will promptly be lost. And if the people of the countryside are thus abandoned, once again, it will really be time to say pacification is a task that will require ten years' time.

This is why Gen. Westmoreland needs a least one more division, and needs it now, to resume the old pressure in II and III Corps, and to give him a fair margin of safety for the future.

Written Board Policies—An Essential

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1967

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, recently Mr. I. T. Johnson of Stanford University, presented a paper to the National School Boards Association meeting in Portland, Oreg., which is of great importance to school boards across the Nation. In order that Mr. Johnson's paper may receive the widest possible distribution, I submit portions thereof for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, which follow:

WRITTEN BOARD POLICIES—AN ESSENTIAL

(By I. T. Johnson, Stanford University)

School board members in the United States have, for years, been both an important audience and a popular subject—school administrators and educational researchers either preach to them or pontificate about them. During the past twenty years, a recurring theme of the statements to and about school boards has been the need for written board policies.

* * * * *

In 1946 the American Association of School Administrators published *School Boards in Action*. This book advises that comprehensive statements of policies, principles, and procedures are necessary to guide the board in its relationships to the administrative staff and to the school system as a whole, and to guide the administrative staff and other employees of the board in their work. Furthermore, "Often many changes and additions have been made in board policies over the years, but no one has a complete list of these changes. As a result, work may or may not be proceeding in complete accordance with the actions of the board. It would seem, thus, that periodic revision in publication would be helpful to all concerned."

Whalen's doctoral study at Indiana University in 1953 found that members of boards which had written board policies were significantly more effective than those who acted without written policies on fifteen of the thirty-two criteria for effective school board member performance which were developed by Barnhart. On none of the remaining 17 criteria were boards which had written policies *less* effective. One of the fifteen criteria is particularly interesting to us today: members of boards with written board policies were more likely to adhere to their policy-making and legislative functions.

In 1954 Smith and Smittle stated that the board of education, by having established written policies, can function more effectively. It is impossible for board members to constantly review the official board minutes. It is necessary, said Smith and Smittle, for board members to have important, established policies at hand as a guide to what has been done before. Boards of education change and school administrators change. Why should they treat the many details that come up from meeting to meeting without some adopted guide to follow in making their decisions? Smith and Smittle presented one new concept: if a board of education will go through the process of establishing (written) policies as described, that, in itself, will strengthen the function of the board. Here we have one of the first statements of the value of the process, as differentiated from the value of its product.

Stapley, in 1954, defined a policy as an agreement by members of an administrative body describing or defining the manner in which it will act. Every board has policies, he pointed out; at worst, the policy may be to make all decisions without regard to the manner in which other problems of a similar nature are decided. In such a case, the policy of the board will be to operate according to expediency, whim, or existing pressures. Stapley urged boards to differentiate policies from rules and regulations. A policy interprets a course of action based on an accepted principle of administration; a rule or regulation is a specific by-law set up as a guarantee that the policy will not be violated. While both policies and rules and regulations should be available to the public, written policies are more essential. Policies should be written, according to Stapley, because:

(1) Individuals and groups in every community have a right to know, and should know, how their schools are being administered. Administrative policies are comprehensible and significant as indices of efficient administration and operation;

(2) In order to write them, those who administer and control schools must focus their attention upon educational objectives and upon sound principles of administration;

(3) Uniformity of procedure cannot otherwise be guaranteed;

(4) Good administration requires that the actors know the parts they are to play—board members, as well as superintendents, should know precisely the nature of their functions;

(5) They can provide an excellent orientation instrument for new school board members and superintendents—continuity, to the extent that it is desirable, is fostered by the preparation of written policies; and

(6) Finally, policies should be written because their preparation develops strong lay leadership; laymen who prepare policies must objectively consider all aspects of the administrative process; afterward, they will think more in terms of policy formation and less in terms of the solution of day-by-day problems, which are properly the province of the school administrator.

Turnbaugh developed a method for codifying school board policies in his doctoral dissertation at the University of Illinois in 1955. He assumed that the procedure used in developing policies is closely related to the understanding and acceptance of them by individuals and groups concerned with them. Central to his method for codifying policies is the involvement of superintendent, staff, board members, faculty, and other school employees. He concluded that (1) policy codification does not require a prohibitive amount of time, (2) more conflict exists at board meetings prior to codification, and (3) those who work most in policy codification tend to persist in similar work to establish and clarify functions and relationships within their spheres of activity. In his third conclusion we are confronted again with the notion of the value of process irrespective of product.

The American Association of School Administrators in 1956 told board members and school administrators that written policies are the articles of agreement in the partnership of board and superintendent. They are the basic guides for policy and execution, and their precise meaning must be constantly reviewed. The use of written policies is important when a new superintendent is employed and when a new board member is introduced to his task. If either of these new team members, because of a lack of written policies, starts his work under illusion or confusion, future trouble can be guaranteed. This volume, *School Board-Superintendent Relationships*, contains an interesting justification for periodic review of board policy. "Because human beings are loath to admit their ignorance, and slow to admit their need for review of board policy, it is perhaps best to establish a formal, annual review of policies, which a new member or superintendent will accept as a matter of routine rather than as an action aimed at him in particular."

A fascinating little pamphlet, *Problems of School Board Members*, presents the following hypothetical arguments *against* written board policies:

"You can't formulate policies to cover everything. If you attempt to report what you will do before a situation arises, you are sticking your neck out and inviting the community to chop it off. Boards are already so busy that they can't afford to take on a major additional task. Boards already have written policies, since all of their actions are formally recorded in official minutes available to the public."

The authors then refuted these arguments against written board policies, pointing out that:

"If a superintendent makes decisions that are not based on the board's adopted policy, he either is guessing the will of the board, or is supplanting the board as the policy-making agent. The attitudes, opinions, and needs of both the school staff and the community should be thoroughly considered before a policy is enacted. To argue that a school board should not create a body of written policy is similar to arguing that a state legislature should not enact laws. Experience has shown that written policies foster good will and reduce unwarranted public criticism. Board minutes are the record of decisions taken in specific cases. They may, and often do, show inconsistency in board action."

An excellent treatment of boards in general is *The Effective Board*, by Houle, which was published in 1960. Houle's discussions are applicable to boards of various institutions, services, or associations—schools, businesses, settlement houses, churches, hospitals, service clubs, or other efforts of groups of people to carry on a useful function. In discussing boards' decisions about recurrent problems or issues, Houle comments that "These decisions should be recorded and made available to all who need to know them. This codification of policies essentially becomes a body of law for the agency. Usually the executive plays an important role in drafting, recommending, and recording policies, for they guide the program he administers." Later I will discuss a corollary of Houle's concept of written policies as a body of law.

Wells' 1960 doctoral dissertation at Michigan State University on the financial and administrative relationship between school attorneys, school superintendents, and boards of education, offers a wry commentary on school boards:

"There appears to be a great need for the adoption of administrative policies by school boards. The dearth of policies governing the relationship of the school attorney to the board and superintendent is only one aspect of this need for policies. A perhaps greater problem lies in the fundamental two-way relationship of the board and superintendent. It is suggested that a third party cannot be successfully introduced into a relationship that is already inadequately defined."

Another 1960 doctoral dissertation, Clowes' study at the University of Southern California of the functions of elected lay county boards of education, concludes with the recommendation that county boards of education should adopt carefully developed policies to govern their operation.

The 1961 revision of the California School Boards Association's guide, *Boardsmanship*, was edited by James, under the direction of a committee chaired by one of your distinguished colleagues, Helen Kerwin. While this guide concentrates on school board membership in California, it contains a number of general comments relevant to this discussion. For instance, policies adopted by a board of education should reflect certain convictions about desirable goals for the schools. These convictions, taken together, form a philosophy of education and provide a basis for evaluation. The guide makes three suggestions concerning the content of written board policies:

(1) Board rules and regulations (not to be confused with administrative rules and regulations) set forth the fundamental principles for the control, management, and operation of the public schools.

(2) They define the larger areas of authority and responsibility of the board and its employees.

(3) They should not include the details of management. These may be developed separately by the superintendent and staff as administrative rules and regulations, in accordance with the general policies of the board and subject to its approval.

In 1962, the U.S. Office of Education published White's report, *Local School Boards: Organization and Practices*. White effectively summarizes concern with and reasons for written school board policies. He notes that "One of the most significant and highly successful means of improving the overall efficiency of local school district operation is the development of comprehensive board policy manuals. While these manuals differ in content from district to district, essentially they set forth important school board decisions regarding such matters as employed personnel administration, pupil personnel administration, the educational program, special services, business management, and school-community relations." White goes on to say that the lack of a set of written school policies which is well-organized, precisely written, and up-to-date can be a major handicap to effective school board operation.

In listing fifteen ways in which written policies can contribute to effectiveness, White repeats a number of justifications which I have touched on earlier. He points out that, in addition, written policies can contribute to effectiveness by: (1) reducing pressures of special interest groups, (2) facilitating the improvement of staff morale by providing uniform and fair treatment, (3) keeping the public and school staff informed of board action, and (4) giving lay citizens a better understanding of how they can work with school authorities in building a good school system.

This review of the extensive body of literature stresses the necessity for written school board policies. Those who are relatively new to school board membership might at this point be thinking, "What's all the fuss? We have written policies," or "After all these years, most boards *must* have written policies."

The findings of a 1962 doctoral study show that, as recently as five years ago, the battle was far from won. Smith, studying at the University of Miami, evaluated school board policy manuals of selected urban school districts in ten Southeastern states. He found that, first, not only did just 45% of the school districts have manuals, but that the manuals which existed failed to meet many of the criteria suggested by authorities; second, most manuals did not have provisions for keeping the manual current; third, all but three of the manuals had a readability level (measured by the Flesch formula) above the median educational level of the adult population; fourth, less than half the manuals distinguished between statutory law and school board policy; fifth, most manuals failed to adequately treat educational organization and instructional programs; sixth, less than half the manuals stated the term of office and the method of selecting school board members, and only two-thirds of the manuals stated the duties and powers of the school board; and seventh, major weaknesses existed in policies affecting non-instructional personnel. It's no surprise that the vast majority of school board policy manuals are written at a level which frustrates the average citizen; many will agree that policy writing frustrates board members too. From Smith's study, we can draw another conclusion—one that is not so easy to shrug off: most school board policy manuals tend to offer inadequate guidance to school board members, employees of the board, and the general public.

NEGOTIATIONS AND PPBS

Two new developments in American education may further restrict local school board freedom of action. At the very least they will cause school board behavior to change; it is possible that the influence of one or both may result in the centralization of public education and the end of local control of schools by lay boards. I am referring to emerging patterns of school employer-employee negotiations and to the forthcoming widespread adoption of planning-programming-budgeting systems (PPBS) as a management tool. Both developments are relevant to this discussion of the necessity for definition of school board function through the establishment of written school board policies.

In a new publication by the American Association of School Administrators, *School Administrators View Professional Negotiation*, school superintendents, and those who hire them, are urged to accept the view that professional negotiations between school boards and their teaching staffs are here to stay. Let me paraphrase the statement by Forrest B. Conner, A.A.S.A. Executive Secretary, in a foreword to this book: School board members cannot afford to be in the untenable position of trying blindly to apply traditional concepts to new and changing circumstances. School board members must re-assess, and when appropriate, reshape and redesign their role.

In a paper prepared for presentation earlier this month to the National Conference on Educational Finance, Eugene McLeone predicts that:

"It may become commonplace to cite the experience of the trucking industry in negotiations with Hoffa and the Teamsters as the prototype for developments forced on education by teacher negotiations. Education, like trucking, is not organized nationally or regionally. Union negotiators in both instances have a remarkable knowledge of the operations—in education their knowledge often exceeds that of local board members and even local administrators. In each instance, the union has the advantage of comparing different conditions and situations and automatically building on its experience. The scatter producers in either trucking or education have no such mechanism."

Trends in teacher negotiations will directly affect established practices and attitudes. Instead of an education profession composed of teachers and administrators, we are seeing increasingly teachers arrayed against administrators and school boards in a labor-management relationship.

In McLeone's view, "Teacher negotiations will call for definition of a full-time teacher, the working conditions of schools, and the material support as well as salary. A voice for the teacher in all decisions will add another viewpoint. Nationally organized negotiations will mean more uniform standards among school districts with respect to personnel. Choices of local boards will be limited unless they develop appropriate mechanisms to cope with the changing situation." One implication of this changing situation is the necessity for written board policies. Another implication may be the necessity for strengthening regional and national school boards associations—a course of action which will mean that local school boards must relinquish a portion of their remaining autonomy to their parent bodies.

The AASA asserts that school superintendents occup unique roles which cannot be compared to anything existing in commercial or industrial fields. The Association rejects the position that the superintendent should be the school board's chief negotiator in all its dealings with the staff. Instead, he should be an independent third party in the negotiation process. His basic obligation is to the welfare of the pupils and to the leadership of sound educational policy." I am not about to enter a potential conflict between administrators' and school boards' associations. I can point out, however, that if administrators are not going to represent the citizens in school district-staff negotiations, then the public can only be represented by school board members, by professional negotiators employed by boards or groups of boards, or by no one at all.

Robert Doherty, associate professor of the New York State School of Industrial and Labor Relations at Cornell University, makes some important points in his article published in the February, 1967, issue of *Phi Delta Kappa:*

"Collective bargaining has a bright side to show as well as a dark one. It presents school boards with an opportunity of their own which has not yet been sufficiently exploited. This fact comes as no surprise to the student of labor relations. It took employers in private industry some time after the passage of the Wagner Act to realize that collective bargaining could be used to their advantage. . . . school boards can use the bargaining table to press their own demands. Increasingly . . . employers are exploiting the bargaining situation to win concessions. Wage increases and improved job security, for example, can be traded off for adjustments in seniority provisions and work rules. And some employers are finding that through bargaining they are able to make changes in employment conditions they wouldn't have dared to propose unilaterally. . . . The public schools are victims of 'irrational' employment practices. . . . Collective bargaining might provide school boards with the leverage they need to bring both rationality and flexibility into their employment practices. One thing appears certain: collective bargaining is going to be the method of determining employment conditions in ever more school districts. Unless school boards discover how to capitalize on this development, the negative aspects of bargaining . . . might eventually begin to outweigh the positive."

A second development which has implications for education is increased interest in planning-programing-budgeting systems. PPBS is a process aimed at helping management make better decisions on the allocation of resources among alternative ways to attain objectives. The current governmental interest in PPBS originated at the Federal level, first in the Department of Defense, but more recently in the Bureau of the Budget. The PPBS concepts also appear to be applicable to state and local governmental levels. The individual concepts of PPBS are by no means new ones. What is new is the combination of four concepts into a package, and the systematic application of that package in total to government planning. These are the four concepts:

First, PPBS focuses on identifying the fundamental objectives of the government and then relating all activities, regardless of organization placement, to these.

Second, implications for future years are explicitly considered.

Third, all pertinent costs are considered—including capital costs as well as non-capital costs, and associated as well as direct costs.

Finally, systematic analysis of all alternatives is undertaken. This characteristic is the crux of PPBS. It involves identification of the governmental objectives; explicit, systematic, identification of alternative ways of carrying out the objectives; estimation of the total cost implications of each alternative; estimation of the expected results of each alternative; and presentation of the resulting major cost and benefit tradeoffs among the alternatives along with the identification of major assumptions and uncertainties.

McLeone predicts that, with the advent of PPBS, not only educators and school board members but also other central decision-makers will be evaluating educational outcomes and costs. They will be looking at schools in terms of manpower needs, contributions to economic growth, and accomplishment of social aims. McLeone goes on to say that:

"Regardless of whether PPBS is viewed as a tool for decision-makers, as a set of rules for discussion, or merely as a means for taking a longer view of present action, its utilization will greatly affect the allocation of resources to programs within the public sector, including, obviously, the uses of available resources by schools. To a degree, PPBS establishes prices for public goods so that central decision-makers can choose among competing programs with given budget constraints and objectives. To a degree, PPBS establishes standards of performance which require subordinate administrators to evaluate output produced for resources used, or to face the possibility of an unfavorable comparison with similar units elsewhere. If grant programs from state or Federal governments are introduced, then the comparisons may become part of the grant operations."

As I said at the outset, school board members are both an important audience and a popular subject. School boards are responsible for the American public school system. By means of written board policies, and through their own efforts to define the school board role, school board members can improve the efficiency and effectiveness of our schools. I have described two recent developments which will affect written school board policies, the definition of the role of school boards, and the effectiveness with which board members perform that role. It's too late to ask whether the game should be played; it's time now to find out how to play.

Reporter Denby Fawcett Writes on Vietnam Elections

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA
OF HAWAII
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 7, 1967

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago I had the pleasure of calling to the attention of my colleagues in the House an award for distinguished achievements in journalism which was presented to Miss Denby Fawcett, head of the Honolulu Advertiser's Vietnam bureau.

Miss Fawcett, one of the few woman war correspondents in Vietnam, has written another in a series of on-the-scene reports from Vietnam giving a penetrating analysis of the recent elections aimed at restoring some of the traditional self-rule to the villages and hamlets of South Vietnam.

Because Miss Fawcett's article discusses a very interesting aspect of the recent elections, I am pleased to insert for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD her article "Viet Elections Are Only a Start," as it appeared in the Wednesday, May 24, 1967, issue of the Honolulu Advertiser:

VIET ELECTIONS ARE ONLY A START

(By Denby Fawcett)

SAIGON.—The hamlet and village elections this spring have been hailed as vital first steps toward democracy in Vietnam.

But most American observers who speak candidly agree these steps have been closer to tip-toeing than to striding.

"The mood of the peasants has been skeptical," one U.S. Embassy official said. "They've been told good things will come to them if they vote. But good things will have to come first before they believe it."

Another who has watched the elections in the Mekong Delta said:

"When officials come in and tell the farmers, 'Hooray, we're going to have elections,' the people merely sigh and think, 'When's the last time we heard that?' "

Vietnamese village elections last were held in 1964, but the village councils were given only an advisory role to the district and province chiefs appointed in Saigon.

The current elections are aimed at restoring some of the traditional self-rule to the villages and hamlets which have been overpowered by shaky Saigon governments since the start of the Indo-China war 22 years ago.

More than 80 per cent of South Vietnam's 16 million people live in villages.

Last month, 961 villages elected councils of six to 12 members, with the candidate who received the largest vote becoming chairman of the village.

The second phase of the elections started last Sunday when the hamlets—subdivisions of villages—began electing hamlet chiefs. By January, 5,487 hamlets (40 per cent of all hamlets in South Vietnam) will have elected leaders.

Between July and January, 275 villages in less secure areas will elect their councils on successive Sundays. This will give a total of 1,236 villages (49 per cent of all villages in the country) locally elected leaders.

But when the elections now scheduled are completed, less than half the people of Vietnam will have taken part in this basic process of democracy. Those who will not have voted had no choice. They live under Viet Cong control.

The Viet Cong, those who sympathize with them and neutralists are forbidden to run for office by a board on the district level which reviews prospective candidates.

Results of last month's elections show the majority of the villagers elected those leaders already placed over them. This seemed to indicate a cautiousness on the part of the peasants not to go beyond the government's choice. Many still believe the voting was just a government ruse to uncover opposition.

"Perhaps after going through the voting process for two or three years, the elections will be established as an institution instead of a government gimmick to find dissent," one observer said.

In the delta province of Vinh Long, 91 per cent of the voters returned their incumbents to office. In all, 94 per cent of the eligible voters in the province cast ballots.

"The percentages were high at the polls because the peasants knew that the government expected them to turn out," a U.S. official said.

"So they came and voted. If they want something next week or next month, they know that election records are kept, so why buy trouble?"

A U.S. political officer summed up the high voter turnout all over the country this way: "It's an obligation. The people are told to vote, so they vote."

The high percentages might also be explained by a Confucian influence that has been a part of Vietnamese elections since they began, that of the head of a family casting ballots for all eligible voters in his family.

"It's not provided for in the election laws, but is accepted in many places," the political officer said. It was the procedure in the elections held by Diem.

"Many peasants have shown up at the polls thinking it is still so and they don't turn them away," he said. "It's traditional in the villages for the head of the family to be the voice of the entire family."

The new village councils will be allowed to make decisions in 15 areas of government, from taxation to construction of public buildings. But they will be permitted to spend up to only $425 on any one project. Anything that costs more will have to be approved by the district and province chiefs.

"How meaningful can these elections be when the district and province chiefs over the councils are still appointed by Saigon?" asked one critic.

Another problem with the village voting has been that the villagers often didn't know the candidates they were voting for.

"In the United States people see a village as a square, compact unit, but here they spread and flow over the land like molasses spilled from a jar," a U.S. agricultural worker said. "Many of the villages were too large and spread out for the voters to know their candidates."

Officials admitted that in many cases the peasants didn't know whom they were electing to their village councils, but agreed the hamlet elections that started last Sunday would be more democratic because hamlets are smaller.

The head of the local police in Long Thanh hamlet in Vinh Long Province south of Saigon in the Mekong Delta, where 540 peasants raise rice and fish for their livelihood along a muddy delta canal, agreed.

"The people have been happy all day because they know the candidates," he said in the darkness of a Buddhist shrine where farmers were filing out of the makeshift voting booth of bamboo and black silk.

But the hamlet schoolteacher who was in charge of the pretty young girls in pastel Vietnamese dresses handing out the ballots admitted that he didn't know the names or occupations of any of the candidates.

The voters in Long Thanh each were handed three ballots, one for each candidate, and a brown envelope.

Each ballot was printed with the candidate's name and his chosen symbol—a house, a hat, a candle.

The voters then entered the booth. Many of those I observed didn't bother to close the black silk curtain after them.

Often they didn't even look at the ballots, but merely stuffed the one on top of the pile in the brown envelope.

Then they walked out and slipped the envelope into a wooden box marked with the yellow and red colors of Vietnam.

The unused ballots were dropped in a basket inside the booth.

Most seemed delighted to be leaving the dark shrine to return to their fields. Voters finished casting their ballots by 4 p.m.

Would it have been better not to hold the elections at all?

Even the most cynical observers said, "No."

The hamlet and village elections are a beginning, even if they are less than Saigon and Washington would like, and even though they seem like learning democracy by rote.

Address by Postmaster General at Seton Hall University Commencement Exercises

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1967

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to submit for the attention of our colleagues the noteworthy address delivered by the Honorable Lawrence F. O'Brien, Postmaster General of the United States, at the commencement exercises at Seton Hall University, South Orange, N.J., on June 3, 1967.

An honorary degree of doctor of public service was conferred upon the Postmaster General in recognition of his distinguished and dedicated service to our Nation.

The text of the address follows:

ADDRESS BY POSTMASTER GENERAL LAWRENCE F. O'BRIEN AT THE SETON HALL UNIVERSITY COMMENCEMENT EXERCISES

Let me begin by congratulating you who are graduates of this Class of 1967. You and your fellow graduates from colleges and universities across the nation make up the largest graduating class in the history of American higher education. There are one-half million young Americans in the Class of 1967, composing one-fifth of all Americans in your age group, and representing the best that our society has yet produced.

Though it is popular with the older generation to look with dismay at the younger generation, I am convinced from my observation that today's college graduate is on the whole undoubtedly more earnest, more informed, more free of the dead weight of old illusions, more passionately committed to truth and justice than any of his predecessors.

And you should be better. You have grown up in an unusually trying period in our history. Never before have the penalties of a major mistake of miscalculation in our foreign policy loomed so large; and never before have the answers been so obscure, stubborn, and unyielding to both good will and good sense. Never before in history has there been a nation with as much military and economic power as the United States; and never before in history has it been so necessary to show restraint in the use of that power. And never before has a nation met problems of racial and economic justice so successfully. Never before has a domestic revolution—and that is precisely what we have experienced—been compressed in so short a time.

You have grown up in a time when men look back nostalgically to the days when the mere flexing of our national muscle, even though it was an infinitely smaller muscle, was enough to produce the action we desired.

You leave this fine school armed with knowledge and filled with hope and purpose. But one of your first tasks, and perhaps your first disenchantment, will be to realize that the nostalgic men with their vast reserves of old memories exercise powerful influence, and that your good intentions are simply not enough. Each new generation of American college graduates forms a collective St. George who faces the dragon of shopworn but easily and widely accepted ideas. Some generations know what they must do, realize that this is the destiny with which they have a rendezvous, and slay the dragon with the weapons of truth and of conviction.

Other generations start equally well armed. But the lance rusts away from the corrosion of compromise, and the edge gives up its once keen temper to the enervating heat of the ivy-covered cottage of selfish contentment. Your days at Seton Hall may be defined as a period when you could move at a fast gallop over a smooth path to the bright horizon. They were days of great expectations for yourself and expectations of others for you—all to be fulfilled at an unspecified time called "someday." Well, you are graduating, and your name on that sheepskin signals the arrival of "someday."

The transformation of someday into now—means that you are being offered the role of St. George. And there are dragons in abundance waiting for you. The torch has passed to this new generation of Americans—a generation so eloquently described by President John Fitzgerald Kennedy as one ". . . born in this century, tempered by war, disciplined by a hard and bitter peace, proud of our ancient heritage—and unwilling to witness or permit the slow undoing of those human rights to which this nation has always been committed, and to which we are committed today at home and around the world."

At home there is the struggle for full achievement of racial justice. In recent years we have come very far, very fast in this area. The four major Civil Rights laws passed in this decade signal the fact that at least we are honoring the check issued by Thomas Jefferson and endorsed by Abraham Lincoln. We have come far, but in a sense we have only exhausted all the simple ways. For achievement of racial justice can no longer be confined to questions of civil rights alone. It is no longer so easy—and it is no longer so distant.

Today also the world continues to suffer from the chronic illness of a peace that is not peace and a war that is not war. The Class of 1967 may well complain of the legacy of inflamed international antipathies which faces it. About that legacy I can only say—it could be far worse. We destroyed the most evil and inhuman tyranny since Attila. We avoided stumbling into atomic holocaust. And we can take pride in passing along to you a world which gives the latent strength of democracy a grudging but nonetheless genuine respect.

The concern of this generation of college students with the course of our foreign affairs is a sign of health and vigor. For America is a nation that grows through dissent; and only through critical examination of old policies can we find better ones. So, I would ask you not to permit your growing domestic involvement with building a career to turn your eyes away from questions of foreign affairs. Foreign policy is too important to be left entirely to the experts—and a truly American foreign policy must reflect the real aspirations of America.

By the same token, however, I would ask that you build your criticism on the foundation of real knowledge of the world in which we live. The greatest, and potentially most dangerous, fallacy of all in dealing with foreign nations is to confuse what *should* be with what *is*.

Other nations should recognize our essential objectives. But some do not. Other nations should see that we have no desire for territory or expansion. But some do not. All nations of the world should cooperate in the common interest rather than fight over selfish interest. But, as we see, there is often far more conflict than cooperation.

This is not the world we would make—but this is the world as it is. In such a world, as President Johnson observed:

"We must recognize the obligation to match national strength with national restraint. We must be prepared at one and the same time for both the confrontation of power and the limitation of power. We must be ready to defend the national interest and to negotiate the common interest. This is the path that we shall continue to pursue. Those who test our courage will find it strong, and those who seek our friendship will find it honorable. We will demonstrate anew that the strong can be just in the use of strength; and the just can be strong in the defense of justice." That is what our President has said.

And this is the foundation of our policy, not alone in Vietnam, but wherever the virus of terror and aggression threatens to rupture the membrane of freedom.

There is much that you can do to help us move more firmly toward a world of peace and of mutual trust—but only if you clearly see that willingness to compromise differences is matched by vigilance in safeguarding our essential freedoms.

That truly is the test.

I would also like to make a specific comment about the problem of finding a durable peace in Southeast Asia and of some of the less considered reactions to the President's search for peace in that troubled area. As you recall, the Sermon on the Mount says, "Blessed are the peacemakers." It doesn't say anything about *peacelovers*. There's nothing special about a peacelover. Even a loud one. It's easy to be a peacelover. But it takes considerable though, energy, imagination, diplomacy, and, in the world in which we live, sometimes force to be a *peacemaker*. The President needs help in making peace. He's asked for it, but sometimes he can only hear the anguished cries of peacelovers.

U.N. Secretary General U Thant recently proposed some steps that could be taken to make peace. The President was quick to support his initiative. But North Vietnam wasn't. Ho Chi Minh shot down General Thant's proposals. As you may know, the President has also made it plain that he will respond favorably to almost any action from Hanoi that indicates a desire for negotiations. But the only reaction so far has been a beautifully contrived piece of psychological warfare that seems to have taken in some gullible people—that we should just stop bombing the north and someday, perhaps, there might be some kind of response—maybe.

The economic problem that you face is far different from the bleak prospect that often made other graduating classes contemplate an advanced degree. But in a way even the task of graduates who leaped out into the gray landscape of the depression was easier than your own. Because then the problem was how to survive in an economy of scarcity. Though not a pleasant situation, at least it wasn't new. Others had been coping with problems of scarcity since the beginning of organized society.

But now, we are in a new economic dimension. Traditional reactions to economic problems no longer suffice, simply because the problem today is no longer that of,scarcity—but of abundance. We need new responses. We must bridge the gap between private affluence and public necessity. We must assure the opportunity of better distribution of our enormous wealth without sapping the incentives that made that wealth possible. And we must seek a continuance of the expanding economy—because only through the resultant expansion of opportunity will we be able to wipe away the remaining vestiges of poverty and of unemployment.

Thus, you have a whole new set of problems facing you, problems that need fresh solutions—and finding those solutions will move us into a world of opportunity and challenge undreamed of by any other generation.

In a very real sense our economy is expanding because of the force of democratic education. Our American educational system based on equal opportunity is perhaps one of the greatest social developments of all time; and during the last few years we have made greater progress in education than ever before in our history.

This progress is a direct reflection of the passionate belief of President Johnson that this mighty nation cannot and should not rest until every American has access to superlative education. This sentiment is not new. We have all realized the importance of widely available quality education in a democracy. But never before has a President succeeded in translating this aspiration into the law of the land.

But, though we have new laws, a vastly increased availability of funds, and a national commitment to quality education to all, how well these laws will be excuted, how creatively the money spent, how successfully the commitment implemented depend in the final analysis on leadership in the States.

Certainly, New Jersey is fortunate in this regard.

You have a Governor who sees clearly, has always seen clearly, that human history is the record of the race between education and catastrophe.

He has left no doubt about his intention to have education win the race in the State of New Jersey. He has left no doubt not because of words, but through a series of brilliant actions. These include establishment, just last year, of the first Department of Higher Education in the history of New Jersey. Governor Hughes clearly perceives that higher education, quality education, is the key to the affluent individual and the affluent State.

Under the leadership of your Governor, State aid to local school districts nearly doubled in the past two years—from $120 million to over $228 million.

Still another reflection of that leadership was the fact that the State of New Jersey assumed responsibility, for the first time, for the public operation of two medical schools, one right here at Seton Hall, which is now the New Jersey College of Medicine and Dentistry.

Through these and other actions your State government has fully committed itself to quality education.

This record, this creative record, is one more reminder of what so many seem to forget so soon: that political institutions exist for one purpose only, to solve problems. They have not been created to hinder solutions.

Your generation is in the enviable position of being alive at a time when American history is in the process of making a gigantic, unprecedented swing. We are moving into a unique kind of society, away from a strident conflict over needs, to meaningful cooperation in determining how we can best meet those needs.

Already new Federal programs to aid education are helping to create a fresh kind of interaction among traditional levels of government and helping to form fresh political associations designed on regional or problem areas.

This is a creative building process that reflects the vigor of our political institutions—which shows beyond doubt that they are not political dinosaurs destined for oblivion, but flexible forms capable of growth and evolution.

In a democratic society, the power of the individual expressed through the ballot box is the ultimate power. And it is a very real, tangible and effective power. As educated Americans, it is not only desirable, but it is your duty to play an active role in the political process. Through public service you can magnify your education and turn the knowledge you have acquired here at Seton Hall into active programs for the betterment of America, to change the hearts and minds of men, for the creation of a more perfect society.

Another great Governor of New Jersey, Woodrow Wilson, once said:

"The vision of America will never change. America once, when she was a little people, sat upon a hill of privilege and had a vision of the future. She saw men happy because they were free. She saw them free because they were equal. She saw them banded together because they had the spirit of brothers. She saw them safe because they did not wish to impose upon one another. And the vision is not changed.

". . . America will move forward, if she moves forward at all, only with her face to that same sun of promise."

If Woodrow Wilson were alive today, I think he would agree that you still possess that vision and that your eyes are directed toward the sun of promise.

Science has found ways to extend the length of our lives.

But only the individual can control the scope and the depth of his life.

The prescription for such a life is ready at hand: Commit yourself fully and commit yourself without reservation.

I ask you simply to lift your eyes, I urge you to reach for the stars . . . for you have a rendezvous with excellence.

Gun Laws Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSHUA EILBERG
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 7, 1967

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, those who are opposed to the gun control legislation proposed by President Johnson seem to forget that the bill is aimed not at legitimate sportsmen, but at criminals.

This measure would impose no hardships, no restrictions on sportsmen and their organizations. But it would make it much more difficult for criminals and psychotics to purchase guns—guns which too often are used to kill and maim innocent persons.

Our crime problem is growing. We can help reduce it by keeping weapons out of the hands of criminals. An editorial in the Harrisburg, Pa., Patriot discussed this problem recently with insight, and I respectfully insert the editorial in the RECORD as part of my remarks:

GUN LAWS WORK—ASK NEW JERSEY OR PHILADELPHIA

Look no further than Philadelphia for evidence that municipal gun control laws do help curb crime. Look no further than neighboring New Jersey for proof that state gun control laws have a beneficial effect.

Philadelphia's law would be even more effective if the State of Pennsylvania had similar legislation that applied on a statewide basis. New Jersey's law would be even more effective if all adjoining states had similar laws.

And all Americans would be better off if there were Federal regulations controlling mail-order sales.

Governor Shafer, regrettably, says he isn't interested in pressing for a Pennsylvania gun control law like New Jersey's sensible one. And proposed federal legislation is still having a difficult time even getting out of congressional committees.

Philadelphia—as an article in the April 22 Saturday Review details—was roused to action after a series of senseless shootings in the summer of 1964. Even so, it was not until April of 1965 that the ordinance went into effect; it took that long to muster sufficient public support to offset highly organized opposition.

In its first 18 months, the Philadelphia ordinance is said to have prevented 110 convicted criminals from purchasing guns locally. Among those denied purchase permits were 25 burglars, 13 robbers, 22 persons with convictions for aggravated assault and battery, five dope addicts, two rapists, two habiual drunks, seven former mental patients, 16 people with records for illegally carrying concealed and deadly weapons, four convicted of intent to kill and two murders.

Federal Bureau of Investigation records show that the number of murders in Philadelphia during the first nine months of 1966 dropped 17 per cent below the figure in the corresponding period in 1965. During the same '66 period, the number in the nation as a whole increased 9 per cent.

Claims by the National Rifle Association and other strident opponents that a control ordinance would prevent honest sportsmen and hunters from purchasing guns have not been borne out. Only 139 people were denied permits out of a total of 5,034 prospective gun purchasers.

New Jersey's experience has been similar. Attorney General Arthur J. Sills reports that 7 per cent of the applicants for permits have been turned down because of criminal records.

Philadelphia and New Jersey would undoubtedly benefit even more if it were not possible for a person denied a permit simply to go outside the city limits or cross the state line—or write to an obliging mail order gun dealer.

Pennsylvania should be as strict as New Jersey in helping see to it that guns are denied to the homicidally bent, the mentally unstable and the irresponsible.

And all Americans should have the extra peace of mind in knowing that deadly weapons could not be ordered by mail or legally owned without registration with the police, a requirement that would be no greater hardship than a driver's license.

Ambassador Edward Clark Addresses the Far East-American Council

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1967

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, our capable Ambassador to Australia, the Honorable Edward Clark, has come to be recognized by his outstanding and distinguished tenure as one of the most knowledgeable and most listened to Americans on Far Eastern matters.

He has been a courageous and perceptive Ambassador to the great country down under, and through his dedicated service the ties between our Nation and Australia have been strengthened.

Recently, in an address before the Far East-American Council, he drew several significant parallels between America and Australia.

I wish to commend this fine address to your attention and to insert it in the RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues:

THE AUSTRALIAN-AMERICAN PARTNERSHIP IN THE FAR EAST

(Address of Ambassador Edward Clark before the Far East-American Council, Plaza Hotel, New York, April 27, 1967)

I said in a recent radio interview in Canberra that I considered my stay in Australia one of the happiest periods of my life. One reason why I could make that statement was because I have had the honor and privilege of serving as a link between two great nations, two nations which share a similar background, a similar outlook on the world and a similar promise of prosperity for themselves.

A great many factors unite these two wonderful lands. Both are young and vibrant and were settled by people yearning for a new way of life. Both share the heritage of democratic ideals and offer the guarantee of basic rights and political liberties to their citizens. Increasingly, both are called upon to play a responsible part on the world stage, and, particularly, to take the lead in matters affecting the Far East.

The physical attributes of the Australian continent still remind me of home, and when say home, I mean *Texas*.

It is an immense and sparsely populated populated land with a tremendous variety of terrain and climate. It is a rich country. Its wealth stems from oil and iron ore to agriculture, cattle and industry. This wealth has not been easy to realize, however. It has been earned by hard work, and wrung out of the land by an industrious and energetic people.

Australians are a warm and open people—as friendly as you could hope to meet anywhere. They are an inventive and technically able people. They are resourceful in finding solutions to their own problems and generous in sharing their know-how and resources with others. But if there is one feature of the Australian people and Australian society which is most noticed by outsiders, it is the concept of mateship: that is, personal loyalty to one's friends and associates. This concept of loyalty and support for one's friends has had a direct effect on the United States. We have had Australians fighting beside us as mates in World Wars I and II. They were with us in Korea and are shoulder to shoulder with us now in Viet-Nam, when some of our older friends have found it easier to limit themselves to moral support or less.

Sharing these burdens has not been the path of opportunism or of taking the easy road for Australia. In fact, Australian sacrifice in treasure and lives in the cause of freedom has ranked with or above that of any other country in the world. The Australian people know full well what is at stake and why those sacrifices are necessary. Many an Australian has told me how the "Yanks saved us" during the darkest days of the Second World War. They haven't forgotten and they are determined to cooperate with us to help contain the threats of today.

Certainly, similarity of culture and a history of common action to meet common threats have played important roles in the development of our staunch friendship. It is more than just the past, however, which cements that friendship. It is also a very important mutual concern for the present and for the future.

Australia has become a vital link between the West and the developing East. Geographically, of course, Australia is an Asian nation. But, culturally, politically, and economically Australia is Western.

The per capita gross national product in Austrialia is nearly $2,000. With the exception of Japan and New Zealand, no other country in the Far East has a per capita gross national product equal to even one-fourth that of Australia. I might also mention that, in terms of the amount of foreign aid it gives each year relative to its national income, Australia ranks among the top three or four aid donors in the world—and is ahead of us. In 1966 Australia provided economic assistance to Asian countries equivalent to something over point seven percent of her national income. Our aid during the same year, in percent of GNP, was something less than that. These few figures tell a dramatic story about these people, their vigor and industry, the political climate in which they work and their importance and potential for the future of the area around them.

Australia is in a unique position to exert a powerful influence in her part of the world. Having only eleven and one-half million people, she escapes any suspicion of imperialist ambitions against her neighbors. Her military forces pose no threat of aggression against anyone.

To the contrary, she has a well-earned reputation throughout the Asian/Pacific Area as a reliable friend—a nation which demonstrates the best of Western civilization to its Asian neighbors.

Australia has important interests in Asia and the Pacific. From a political point of view, the Australian Government has laid it down as a matter of policy that the country's first line of defense is in Southeast Asia in general and South Viet-Nam in particular. Australia was one of the founders of the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization and has remained fully loyal both to the letter and to the spirit of that agreement. That her troops are now fighting in Viet-Nam is an indication of just how important Australia considers her interests in that area and how seriously she takes her obligations under her treaty relationships. Prime Minister Harold Holt has made clear his Government's determination to stick by our common commitment and to help secure the peace and stability necessary for the economic and political progress of the area.

From an economic point of view, the markets of Southeast Asia provide a vital outlet for Australia's growing industrial capacity and for her output of agricultural and mineral products. As the economic ties with Britain and the Commonwealth have loosened, ties with Japan, the United States and the Pacific Area generally have become correspondingly more important. Naturally, Australia's own economic expansion depends to an important degree on the economic development of her neighbors and the expansion of trade with them. For this, as well as other reasons, Australia is deeply interested in the economic development of Asia. She takes part in a number of programs which contribute to the well-being of the area. Like the United States, Australia actively supports the work of the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East. One of the most important projects of this body is the Lower Mekong River Development Program, an Indo-Chinese equivalent of our own Tennessee Valley Authority. This project will not only provide protection against ruinous floods but also will provide cheap power to the four nations concerned. Perhaps more important than these economic consequences, this project will set a precedent for inter-Asian cooperation in economic affairs.

This plan has the direct support of President Johnson who has pledged that we will accept a major share of the burden for a regional development program based on the Mekong Valley plan if Communist aggression in Southeast Asia is ended. Australia is right behind us in this undertaking and will support it to the limit of available resources.

The Asian Development Bank is another international organization in which we and the Australians have taken a leading role. The bank will have not only its own capital available to finance programs of significance for the area, but will sponsor projects for joint financing with capital from other public as well as private sources.

The United States will subscribe two hundred million dollars of the Bank's capital (as will Japan) and Australia will subscribe eighty-five million. Sixty percent of the total capital will come from the Asian member nations, including Australia.

Also on the economic side, Australia is doing some serious thinking and has had some exploratory discussions with other countries about the possibility of establishing some form of Pacific Basin trade organization. It is too early yet to say what may come of these discussions, but they are another example of the kind of role Australia can play and wants to play in stimulating regional cooperation and helping the Asian nations to help themselves.

Australia also is a charter member of the recently established Council for Asian and Pacific Cooperation. This body aims at increasing regional cooperation and the exchange of cultural, economic and scientific knowledge among all non-Communist Asian nations regardless of their political outlook and ties.

Through the Colombo Plan, Australia has successfully provided developing nations of Asia with practical technical training and assistance for a number of years. This plan has enabled thousands of young Asians to study and live in Australia, to see a vital Western society in action and to obtain a great deal of valuable technical knowledge.

There are this year about 13,000 of these young Asian students attending Australian universities on Australian Government scholarships and through other means. Considering the many demands on the Australian budget and the keen competition for places in the universities, making this many places available to Asian students represents a real effort and a real sacrifice on Australia's part.

The South Pacific Commission is another body in which we are partners with Australia and it is worth mentioning because it is a body where we are not paying the largest share of the cost. The largest share is borne by Australia. The Commission takes on a variety of economic and technical aid projects to help out with the development of the many island territories of the South Pacific. These small pieces of territory could not possibly afford on their own the expert advice they need in the fields of agriculture, public health and economic development. By pooling the costs—and experience—on a regional basis, the technical help can be obtained more cheaply and efficiently.

We cannot forget that this area still retains some of the strategic importance it had during the Second World War and, whether we like it or not, will probably soon see the establishment of a number of independent states.

From the examples I have given, it can easily be seen that the United States and Australia jointly see the necessity for helping the new and weak countries of Asia to maintain their independence. This is a precondition for the success of long-run programs for political and economic stability and for raising the standards of living and the output of the peoples. This common view of the area and its problems was spelled out at the recent Manila Confreence which both President Johnson and Prime Minister Holt attended. That conference set forth the following basic goals for the Far East:

1. To assure freedom from aggression.
2. To conquor hunger, disease and illiteracy.
3. To build a region of security, order and progress.
4. To seek reconciliation and peace throughout Asia and the Pacific.

These are the goals the United States and Australia share with the other freedom-loving nations of Asia and will continue to share until they are realized.

We have examples before us which give hope that these aspirations can be realized. The Republic of Korea and the Republic of China, amongst others, have made tremendous progress in the last decade, especially when compared to the situations in North Korea and Communist China. While Red China's so-called Great Leap Forward was degenerating into the Great Slide Backwards, both the Republic of Korea and the Republic of China were making a genuine start in the fight against poverty and ignorance. This is the trend which must continue if world peace and prosperity are to be assured.

The power and influence of the United States often put us in a lonely position. That position is made less lonely and less burdensome when we have close partners with the same aims. Australia is such a partner. That partnership is one into which she has freely entered, not because of pressures, but because we face the same dangers, have the same hopes and are willing to back up our responsibilities with both men and money. This is the basis for our partnership with Australia in the Far East. I don't believe we have a closer or better partnership anywhere else in the world.

State Senator Barbara Jordan: "A Credit to Her State and Race"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB CASEY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1967

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, a year ago, an able and dedicated attorney asked the people of Harris County to permit her the responsibility of representing them in the senate of Texas.

She had two strikes against her from the beginning: she was a woman, and she was a Negro.

Undaunted, Barbara Jordan waged a determined campaign, and she became the first Negro woman senator in our State's history.

Her ability, dedication, and intelligence won her the confidence and support of her colleagues in the senate, and a few days ago, they paid her an unusual tribute by passing, unanimously, a resolution which stated in part:

> She has earned the esteem and respect of her fellow Senators by the dignified manner in which she has conducted herself while serving in the Legislature . . . and because of her sincerity, her genuine concern for others, and her forceful speaking ability . . . she has been a credit to her State as well as to her race.

Mr. Speaker, I join with Senator Jordan's colleagues in expressing my sincere congratulations and best wishes on her most successful session of the senate, and am pleased to bring to the attention of my colleague's an editorial commending her from the Houston Chronicle of May 31, 1967:

SENATE'S TRIBUTE TO BARBARA JORDAN

A year ago when Houston elected Sen. Barbara Jordan to office by a two-to-one margin, it was a political milestone. She became Texas' first Negro woman senator. Also the first Negro to serve in the Senate since Reconstruction, and the only woman member of the 60th Legislature.

"I'm not expecting any difficulty, other than any freshman senator, although I know I will be a novelty and that all eyes of the state will be on me," she said shortly after her victory.

We praised Miss Jordan as a credit to this city and to her race. Now that her first legislative session is over, we still hold that view—and so do her 30 fellow senators.

They paid her an unusual tribute Saturday. "She has earned the esteem and respect of her fellow senators by the dignified manner in which she has conducted herself while serving in the legislature," they said in a unanimously approved resolution, "and because of her sincerity, her genuine concern for others, and her forceful speaking ability. . . . She has been a credit to her state as well as to her race."

They accorded her prolonged applause. And so will all citizens who are pleased at this example of a racial precedent established in the Senate with such constructive results.

Letter From Kanazawa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1967

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, one of the dedicated members of the Alhambra Christian Church—Disciples of Christ—in my congressional district is Mrs. Ethel Rowley. She has just sent me a newsletter from a young man serving in Japan as a missionary from the church. This young man, Mr. Richard Dickinson, has grown up in the Alhambra Christian Church and is representative of the finest spirit of our Christian youth. His letter, sent back to the congregation he serves, reports the feelings of Japanese Christians about the war in Vietnam. I am asking that this letter be printed in the RECORD as an example of how one dedicated American perceives the attitude of our friends in Japan concerning our course in Asia. The letter follows:

LETTER FROM KANAZAWA

DEAR FRIENDS: I am worried. The other day two ministers of Kanazawa came to visit me and to express their grave concern. They informed me that many members of their churches had spoken to them about their feelings about the war and about their strong disillusionment with "Christian" America's attitude about the war. They wonder how our continued escalation, our increasing military control, our continued disregard for the feelings of Asians can truly promote any everlasting peace. They expressed their sorrow at the thousands of young men, American and Vietnamese who are dying in the prime period of their lives. They expressed their sadness at the innocent young and old who in any war seem caught in the middle and who also die. They recognize the terrible evil of Vietcong terrorism, but there seems to be so many more deaths involved while we fight our "war of liberation." They ask why not let Asia decide for themselves what their future destiny will be? Is this war worth as much as we seem to be putting at stake? On the latter question they cited the increasing tension that is again being built up between the Soviet Union and America.

These men can in no way be considered radicals. They are strongly committed conservative Christians. Last year when I had been asked to speak to a group of Christians on the American attitude toward the war and had tried to explain why many felt it necessary for us to be involved in Vietnam, one of these ministers was the only one who stood up in my defense. He had said at the time that although he personally could not agree, he recognized that a committed American Christian might be able to agree with America's policy. But now as he called, he could not understand how any Christian of any country could favor continuance of the war.

It is becoming increasingly difficult for Japanese Christians. Since America is considered by all Japanese to be *a*, if not *the* Christian country, they are hard put to explain what has happened and how a Christian country can not only continue in such a war, but step up her efforts to such an extent that World War III seems almost inevitable. Since the war to Japanese eyes is being fought by military forces with no moral persuasion, they wonder what victory will mean even if America achieves victory. The Kyodan News Letter stated: "We do not think that America can gain a real victory in this war through military effort. In any war that people cannot sincerely support from a moral standpoint, even if a military victory is won, it is a loathesome, empty victory. In this war there can be no honorable victory. There have been too many innocent women, old people, and women who have been humiliated, injured, and killed. The point is not our own reputation; rather it is, how long can we close our ears to this cry of agony?" (April 20, 1967)

Only a month ago the Moderator of the United Church of Christ in Japan (Kyodan), the Rev. Mr. Masahisa Suzuki, issued a statement in which he acknowledged the guilt and responsibility of the Kyodan in World War II, and admitted the mistakes made in the name of the Kyodan at that time. He said: "The Church, as 'the light of the world' and as 'the salt of the earth' should not have aligned itself with the militaristic purpose of the government. Rather on the basis of our love for her, and by the standard of our Christian conscience, we should have more correctly criticized the policies of our mother land. However, we made a statement at home and abroad in the name of the Kyodan that we approved of and supported the war, and we prayed for victory. Indeed, as our nation committed errors, we, as a Church sinned with her. We neglected to perform our mission as a 'watchman'. Now, with deep pain in our heart we confess this sin, seeking the forgiveness of our Lord."

"More than 20 years have passed since the war, and we are filled with anxiety, for our mother land seems unable to decide the course that we should follow; we are concerned lest she move in an undesirable direction due to the many pressures of today's turbulent problems. At this moment so that the Kyodan may not make again the same mistakes and in order that the Kyodan can correctly accomplish its mission in Japan and the world we seek God's help and guidance. In this way we look forward to tomorrow with humble determination." (Kyodan, 3/20/67)

The Japanese who issued this statement love their country as much if not more than we as Americans love our own. I hope that we will be able to see that the greatest patriotism or love of one's country often comes from those who are most critical of their country's action at some particular time. In this regard we can see that such men as Konrad Adenauer and Dietrich Bonhoeffer were the true patriots as they opposed Hitler in World War II.

We are losing friends in Asia; we are coming closer and closer to World War II; countless lives are being lost; more and more our decisions are being made on behalf of the military. In addition our efforts toward Christian evangelism seem a mockery in light of our actions. Our Christian witness around the world is greatly effected. To the Japanese, one of the most popular Americans is a member of Islam, Muhammad Ali or Cassius Clay. His popularity arises because he is willing to stand up and declare that war and killing is wrong. Japanese Christians are listening for the same kind of cry to come forth in as loud and strident a call from American Christians. They not only need it for support but for the sake of the whole Christian witness.

May God grant us courage, wisdom and peace,

Dick
RICHARD F. DICKINSON.
KANAZAWA-SHI, ISHIKAWA-KEN, JAPAN.

William Randolph Hearst Sees Pattern in Pressures and Outbreaks of Violence at Home and Abroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 7, 1967

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, as war flares in the Mideast, it is important for us to examine the worldwide pattern of disorder and violence that has unfolded.

In this connection, Mr. William Randolph Hearst, Jr., editor in chief, the Hearst Newspapers, Inc., in a recent Editor's Report provided a perceptive and penetrating analysis of this pattern of outbreaks and pressures.

Because of the interest of my colleagues and the American people in foreign affairs, I ask unanimous consent that this Editor's Report be reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The report follows:

EDITOR'S REPORT: TROUBLE AROUND A TROUBLED WORLD

(By William Randolph Hearst, Jr.)

Men like President Johnson or Prime Minister Harold Wilson of Great Britain, and their ministers of state, whose job and responsibility is to affect and direct the destinies of the free world, most certainly must have consumed a lot of aspirin with Alka-Seltzer chasers this past week. The troublemakers were at it hot and heavy all around this weary globe of ours.

In just one day, Thursday, the sedate New York Times had seven stories on the front page relating either to war, to mass violence or new threats to world peace. And the parade of trouble continued for page after page inside, ranging from Hong Kong to Houston, from Venezuela to Vietnam. I can almost hear the President saying sadly to himself:

"They warned me there would be days like this."

As usual, most of the trouble—but not all—was being stirred up one way or another by Communists. The biggest exception was French President Charles de Gaulle, that dour, would-be dictator who seems determined to get even with the United States and Great Britain for brushing him aside during World War II.

You might have thought he was having enough trouble at home. French Communists, socialists and other leftist groups were on the eve of paralyzing his nation with their 24-hour strike against his high-handed demand for more power. Yet on the very day before the walkout occurred, De Gaulle called a press conference whose main purpose was to drop more poison down the wells of his English-speaking former allies.

Britain got it the worst this time. The U.S. was merely clawed again for continuing to battle the same Communists who kicked the French out of Vietnam. England, however, was informed in great detail just how impossible it will be to join the European Common Market unless she does exactly what De Gaulle wants her to do.

His ultimatum, in essence, calls for the English to sever their close ties with this nation and accept Le Grand Charles as their mentor, master and spokesman. The British desperately need the kind of economic relief they would get in the Common Market. Washington may yet come up with some kind of an alternative to De Gaulle's demeaning terms. A free trade alliance among the English-speaking nations of the world might do the trick.

It was a bad week for the British all around the world. Communist mobs sacked the home of one of their diplomats in Shanghai and beseiged their mission in Peking. For the second week in a row, Communist-directed rioters rampaged through the Crown Colony of Hong Kong. In Aden, more British servicemen were killed and wounded in continuing anti-British violence. And Spain continued her pressure to get the British out of Gibraltar, even through Franco was having home-front trouble with student rioting at Madrid University.

It would be an act of insanity for the Reds to kick the English out of Hong Kong, from which they are reported to take some 700 million dollars a year, but then Mao and company are not noted for their sane or sensible behavior. Besides talking big to the United States, Russia, and now Great Britain, and after forcing Portugal to abjectly apologize for something they didn't do a few months ago, my opinion is that they are probably just throwing up a smokescreen to cover up their own trouble at home.

My own opinion is that they are doing just that.

Whatever the reason, it is another classic example of Communist pressure tactics—deliberate hell-raising led by Red agents, followed by wholly unjustified protests against the actions of the imperialists who are merely trying to keep order.

Deliberate Communist hell-raising also is the root cause of the latest eyeball-to-eyeball confrontation between Israel and her Arab neighbors. Syria has said she is unable to control the terrorists who keep infiltrating the Israel border. Believe it or not, it's just possible there is some truth to that—as was more than indictaed by a dispatch from Cairo last Wednesday.

It told of a mass rally in Gaza at which some bomb-thrower named Ahmed Shukair, head of the Palestine Liberation Organization, said: "We will keep sending in commandos, contingent after contingent, to destroy and burn." He added to his followers, reassuringly: "We have recently gotten huge quantities of arms from Communist China to use in our work."

If there's one thing you can bet on, it's that the Communists—Russian or Chinese—never sleep in their dirty work. And anybody who says they have stopped trying to take over the world is either misinformed, blind, a boob or is one of them.

It's no accident when Russian naval ships sideswipe an American destroyer two days in a row on the high seas.

Anybody needing more proof of Red subversion could have found it last week in our own hemisphere as well. In Ecuador, 2,000 pro-Chinese Communist student rioters almost succeeded in an armed bid to take control of a university. In Venezuela, pro-Cuban revolutionaries and members of the Moscow-oriented Communist Party were in open dispute over how best to conduct guerrilla warfare there. And in Mexico, police announced seizure of an undisclosed number of "professional agitators" after the army took control of riot-scarred Sonora State, just south of the Arizona border.

Inside the U.S., the biggest civic disorder was the four-man gun battle in Houston between 600 police and Negro students at the Texas Southern University, in which a policeman was killed. This riot, which is certain to have grave repercussions, ostensibly resulted from a minor incident.

Actually, the flames of long-smoldering violence had been whipped up at the school recently by viciously anti-white speeches delivered by Stokely Carmichael, the black power advocate.

I can't understand why this draft-dodging incendiary has not been jailed before this for inciting the riots and violence he urges. Right here, however, it is more important to note what FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover told Congress the testimony released last week:

"Carmichael has been in frequent contact with Max Stanford, field chieftain of the Revolutionary Action Movement. This is a highly secret, all-Negro Marxist-Leninist, Chinese Communist-oriented organization which advocates guerrilla warfare to obtain its goals."

Ex-Premier Khrushchev, living in political retirement and obscurity in his native land, might well be thinking these days of opening a little Russian tea shop with himself featured as the premier tea leaf reader. I remember his assuring me in a confidential but quite confident manner 12 years ago that my grandchildren would be living under Communism.

One thing is certain: The Communists, whether they be Russian, Chinese, Albanian or Cuban, are never going to give up trying. And certainly the sight and sound of thousands of unshaven, unwashed, unkempt young Beatniks—carrying flags of their country's enemies and demanding surrender of Asiatic Communism—must give them reason for believing they are at a least making some progress towards their goal of undermining one of the country's greatest sources of strength: Patriotism and pride of country.

The United States in Puerto Rico: 1898–1900

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE D. LONG
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 7, 1967

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw the attention of my distinguished colleagues of both parties to a review of a new book about the United States and Puerto Rico. This scholarly volume entitled "The United States in Puerto Rico: 1898–1900" was written by Father Edward J. Berbusse, S.J.

The review I now submit for the Record was prepared by one of my Maryland friends, Rev. Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, who is known to many of my distinguished colleagues in the Congress as "The Padre of the Americas." I refer, of course, to the fact that our beloved Speaker John W. McCormack and Father Thorning were the leaders who originated the official observance of Pan American Day, 23 years ago, in the House of Representatives:

> This is a study in depth of the vital transitional period, 1898–1900, which saw the transfer of Puerto Rican sovereignty from Spain to the United States of America. The reader is prepared for the complexities of change by two chapters indicating how persistently a majority of the island's élite had petitioned for self-government. Indeed, by 1897, home rule appeared to be on the horizon.
>
> When, the next year, the armed forces of the United States invaded the island, the swift campaign of nineteen days was described by Angel Rivero as "a model of modern, humanitarian warfare." Moreover, "the customs, laws, and religion of the people were respected." The action, this Puerto Rican writer adds, "took on something of a triumphal procession."
>
> Nevertheless, numerous islanders felt concern about the fate of their Iberian traditional culture. Just prior to the U.S. occupation, for example, Luís Muñoz Rivera, president of the cabinet and secretary of government under the autonomous charter granted by Spain, proclaimed: "We are Spaniards and wrapped in the Spanish flag will we die." Don Luís, father of the future Governor of the Commonwealth (Luís Muñoz Marín), lived to serve his fellow citizens under a succession of U.S. military governors and to prove his capacity for leadership in the new era.
>
> Prior to enactment of legislation, providing civil administration (1900), sponsored by Senator Joseph B. Foraker, two clergymen were appointed by Major General George R. Brooke to make a survey of social conditions throughout the island. One was the Reverend Thomas E. Sherman, S.J., son of William Tecumseh Sherman and Chaplain of the Fourth Missouri Division; the other, the Reverend Dr. Henry K. Carroll, a "distinguished member of the Methodist Episcopal Church." Both Father Sherman and Dr. Carroll produced valuable reports. Their findings, favorable to the Puerto Ricans and sympathetic to their aspirations for autonomous rule, proved helpful to the U.S. Senators and Representatives who voted for the Foraker Act.
>
> Soon after the consecration of Monsignor Jaime H. Blenk of the mainland as Bishop of Puerto Rico in the new order, this churchman had a two-hour conference (September 1899) with President William McKinley and Secretary of War Elihu Root. It was recognized in 1913, when the prelate returned to New Orleans, that Archbishop Blenk had helped the Puerto Ricans to acknowledge "American fair play and justice" and had prepared them to "accept that justice which America was prepared to give." The author also notes that General Guy V. Henry, not a member of the Mother Church of Christianity, "behaved as a more understanding person than many a nominal Catholic of Puerto Rico." This comment is included in the chapter on "problems in Church v. State and Education."
>
> An epilogue, "Trends in Puerto Rican Evolution," although necessarily brief, contains a beautiful pen-picture of the farm worker (jíbaro). "Respectful and obedient, fearful of the law and unconfiding in his superiors, . . . he is generous in the extreme, and shares his last banana with the first person who comes." He is "keen in evaluating people and shrewd in handling them."
>
> For the last seven years, Dr. Berbusse has been able to study Puerto Rico, its opportunities and problems at first hand. At present, he serves as lecturer in United States history at the University of Puerto Rico and as director of the Centro Universitario Católico in Rio Piedras.
>
> The value of this volume is enhanced by a list of abbreviations, a comprehensive system of notes, and a select bibliography which outlines manuscript sources, official documents, biographies, histories, special studies and articles. The index alone is inadequate. Despite some slips in proofreading on the part of the editors of the University of North Carolina Press, the book is outstandingly handsome in binding, format, paper and type.

The 60th Anniversary of the Charter of the American Hungarian Federation

SPEECH

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1967

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the American Hungarian Federation was chartered in Cleveland, Ohio, in 1907. It has been in continued existence ever since. Its present officers are: The Honorable Albert A. Fiok, municipal judge in Pittsburgh, Pa., as national president; the Right Reverend Dr. Zoltan Beky, bishop emeritus of the Independent Hungarian Reformed Church of America, and president, Hungarian Reformed Federation of America, as chairman of the board of directors; Prof. Dr. Emery G. Szekely, medical school, Temple University, Philadelphia, Pa.; Dr. Janos Nadas, president, Kossuth chapter, AHF, Cleveland, Ohio; Mr. Stephen Miko, president, American Hungarian Federation of the State of New York, Inc.; Mr. Zoltan Vasvari, president, Cross and Sword Movement, Garfield, N.J., as national vice presidents; Mr. Richard J. Phillips, William Penn Fraternal Association, Pittsburgh, Pa., as treasurer; Mr. Bela Karlovitz, Esq., counselor at law, Pittsburgh, Pa., as general counsel; Messrs. Gabor Bodnar, Clifton, N.J., Andrew Eross, Sr., and Dr. Julius Hovany, editor, Chicago, Ill., as comptrollers; Dr. Louis Fury, writer, and Prof. Z. Michael Szaz, department of political science, Seton Hall University, South Orange, N.J., as national secretaries.

During its 60 years of existence, the federation was engaged in educating Hungarians about American values and principles of democracy so that they may become well-informed citizens of the United States. The federation also promoted the knowledge of Hungarian culture and literature among Americans not of Hungarian descent by sponsoring and distributing books and literature.

The federation has taken an unequivocal stand against any atheistic and totalitarian ideology, having been opposed to nazism as well as communism. For the last two decades it has informed the American Government and public about the political, religious, and economic situation in Hungary under Communist rule by dissemination of information and memorandums and thereby give expression to some of the aspirations and demands of the suppressed Hungarian people.

Several Presidents of the United States have received delegations of the American Hungarian Federation, and the federation is in constant touch with the State Department and Members of Congress on problems of American policy toward Hungary in particular and Eastern Europe in general.

The federation assisted 22,605 Hungarian refugees after World War II to come to the United States, and helped 35,705 refugees after the 1956 Hungarian fight for freedom to come to America.

The federation, between 1945 and 1952, sent help to Hungary and to Hungarians living in Western Europe in the amount of $1,457,743.26, and its relief action after the Hungarian revolution amounted to $512,560.08, even before a separate organization was chartered to do the relief work.

The federation consists of the two American Hungarian fraternal associations—Hungarian Reformed Federation of America and William Penn Fraternal Association—its own State and local chapters, American Hungarian churches, associations, clubs, and study groups which send delegates to the triennial convention, which, in turn, elects its officers and board of directors.

John F. Kennedy "Prominent American" Stamp

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 1967

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, on May 29, 1967, Boston, Mass., was proud to host leaders from the political, business, and academic worlds who gathered to pay tribute to our late, beloved President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

On the occasion of the birthdate of this truly great American, the U.S. Post Office Department issued the 13-cent postage stamp to be used for international mail to honor his memory.

The principal speaker at the luncheon for the dedication of the stamp was Postmaster General Lawrence O'Brien who vividly described Kennedy the man, the politician, and the statesman.

From the lips of one of his closest friends came this story and tribute to John Fitzgerald Kennedy:

Address by Postmaster General Lawrence F. O'Brien at the Ceremony Dedicating the John F. Kennedy "Prominent American" Stamp, Boston, Mass., May 29, 1967

> I have very mixed emotions in dedicating this new stamp honoring President Kennedy.

I am proud and pleased, of course, for it is fitting that this latest monument to his memory be a postage stamp, since the postal service is the channel most often used by the American people to communicate with each other—and John F. Kennedy was a master communicator who touched the mind and the heart with the brilliance of his thought and his wit.

The denomination of this stamp was purposely chosen to permit it to be used on international mail. This, too, is appropriate, for John F. Kennedy's life and the tragic nature of his death seemed to reach out over barriers of race, and ideology, to brush aside old suspicions, and to touch men sharply and directly. For a moment the world was united through grief, and the loss was felt equally and shared as deeply in Dublin and Durban, in Moscow and Monrovia.

He was our man for all seasons, and for all peoples. And this stamp will be used 50 million times a year, a silent traveler through the world reminding all who see it of a great and noble spirit.

And so it is gratifying for me to dedicate this stamp.

Mixed with that gratification is a feeling of sadness.

Last fall I travelled to Runnymede, England, and I visited the Kennedy Memorial there. The inscription on that memorial reads: "This acre of English ground was given to the United States of America by the people of Britain in memory of John F. Kennedy, born 29 May, 1917, President of the United States 1961–63, died by an assassin's hand 22nd November, 1963." And then the most famous lines of his Inaugural Address. So on this day John Kennedy would have been 50 years old. And our sadness comes from the realization that long before its proper span, a giant tree was felled in the forest of our land, and has left an open place against the sky that will long remain.

In the three and a half years since his assassination, there have been dozens of books, thousands of articles, millions of words written about President Kennedy.

Almost all have tried to serve his memory well. They have tried from the same sense of loss that we feel, from the need to remind ourselves of the uniqueness of a splendid human being.

Along with many of you here today, I knew John Kennedy intimately. We worked with him closely, and saw him in moments of great stress as well as great success. However, having that experience and that knowledge, I am sometimes befuddled about the way he is depicted. Some have tried to recreate his image as a modern day Sir Galahad, wearing the invincible armor of righteousness, slaying all the dragons, with a charmed sword, marching toward victory unhindered.

I do not wish to argue about, and certainly not lower, the stature of John F. Kennedy in our history.

I do not even wish to disagree with those well-meaning Americans who seek always to make him larger than life.

For we seem to live in a cynical age, marked by lack of values and a dull sense of drift, anchorless on a dark and angry sea. Some of our young people seem consumed with hate for their own nation or their own personalities. They burn their flag with fire or their minds with drugs. So, in a time such as ours, when there are men proclaiming uneasily that "God is Dead" it is important and it is useful to honor a hero.

But in this hero building, there lies a dangerous element. Not only is it a wasteful and a ridiculous excess to add another hue to the rainbow, perfume the violet, and paint the lily—but in the case of John Fitzgerald Kennedy, the real man, the real human being and, yes, the real politician, are all submerged somewhere beneath the slowly accumulating weight of all those millions of feather-like words.

I say Kennedy the politician purposely. In our culture the word "politician" has somehow taken on an accumulation of barricades. We have always suffered from a national split personality about politicians. The politician was someone we wished somehow we could do without. And when we found we couldn't do without him, he was accepted only grudgingly.

Our Constitution was called by Gladstone "the most remarkable work . . . to have been produced by the human intellect, at a single stroke . . . in its application to political affairs." This Constitution was the product of politicians working together, hammering out creative compromise, holding us together when so many forces existed that might have torn us apart.

Our national folklore is full of jokes about politics and politicians, all of which would seem to indicate that an honest, effective, dedicated politician is the human equivalent of the square circle.

And yet men like Abraham Lincoln, Thomas Jefferson, Franklin D. Roosevelt, Daniel Webster, John Adams were politicians. The men in John Kennedy's *Profiles in Courage* were politicians. John Kennedy, himself, was certainly a politician.

And he was a *working* politician.

He began his career the hard way and the right way. His political career opened with a tough campaign in the Eleventh Congressional District. It was said then, "He doesn't even need to campaign. He can go to Washington now and forget the primary and election."

But John Kennedy wanted to campaign. And so he put in 18-hour days bounding up the rear stairs of those three deckers in Charlestown, knocking on doors, telling the voters who he was and what he thought he could do in Washington.

Well, the rest is history.

And despite the hero worship, it never came easily. Throughout his political carêer he had to do the equivalent of climbing the stairs of those Charlestown three deckers.

He had overcome the barrier of his religion. And he faced that issue directly and won.

He had to overcome the rumors that he was in failing health. And, despite a body that often was wracked with pain, he was a man of determination who proved again the power of mind over body.

He had a long and grueling struggle through the Presidential primaries.

And his campaign against Mr. Nixon was in the same tradition—fighting, working, travelling, little sleep, always on the move.

Since that grim November day three and a half years ago, there have been many monuments and memorials built to grace our land and honor his name.

We now have a Cape Kennedy instead of Cape Canaveral, and a Kennedy Space Center. We have a Kennedy Memorial Highway that helps connect Washington to the outside world. We have Kennedy memorial bridges and dams and roads and airports to dignify our nation. Just last Saturday we had the launching of a new aircraft carrier—the Kennedy. We now have this postage stamp that will remind so many millions overseas of John F. Kennedy.

But, though it is fitting and proper that we build physical reminders of his greatness, I think he would have preferred to be remembered for the product of his political genius. "By their fruits ye shall know them," the Book of Matthew tells us.

And I think we should therefore assess John Fitzgerald Kennedy in the way that he would have preferred: through the political events that he brought about.

Let us never for one moment overlook his accomplishments—accomplishments that are a splendid record of political action aimed at helping people in their most basic and vital aspirations, their hopes for peace, for prosperity, for progress, for a future for themselves and their children.

Let us not forget that the Alliance for Progress was launched by John F. Kennedy.

Let us not forget that he proposed The Trade Expansion Act of 1962, which recently reached fruition in the Kennedy Round of negotiations, and which was the most important piece of legislation affecting economics since the passage of the Marshall Plan.

Let us not forget that he initiated action that revitalized our economy . . . got America moving again . . . and created millions of jobs.

Let us not forget that he resisted Communist blackmail over Berlin and faced down, prudently but firmly, the terrible confrontation over the missiles in Cuba.

Let us not forget that he saw that a threat to freedom and American interests was growing in the Pacific as it receded in the Atlantic. As early as October 1961, President Kennedy said firmly that ". . . the United States is determined to help Vietnam preserve its independence, protect its people against Communist assassins, and build a better life through economic growth."

Let us not forget that John F. Kennedy was a compassionate man—perhaps best reflected in his call for a national program to combat mental retardation.

Let us not forget that he enlisted early in the fight for civil rights.

Let us not certainly ever forget that the world took a major step away from the brink of war with the conclusion of the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty he fought so hard to create.

And then we saw him in a car on a street in Dallas—he waved, one last time. And the flame was gone.

But his work, though still not completed, his dreams though still not fully realized, were not abandoned.

The Congress—under the leadership of Speaker McCormack and with the help of our own Massachusetts Congressional delegation here with us today—has worked together with President Johnson to build the kind of worthy memorial to John F. Kennedy—a memorial in the form of the greatest surge of progressive legislation in the nation's history coupled with the greatest economic boom in this or any other country.

John F. Kennedy was a hard-fighting politician, with solid, concrete goals. And we must remember him because of what he stood for.

A century ago, Oliver Wendell Holmes wrote:

> "I find the great thing in this world
>   Is not so much where we stand,
> As in what direction we are moving . . .
> We must sail sometimes with the wind and
>   Sometimes against it—
> But we must sail, and not drift, nor lie at
>   anchor."

President Kennedy often quoted these words. They expressed his philosophy. And they pose a challenge to us who survive him.

To those of us who served his cause, who followed his leadership, what is that challenge: It is not to permit ourselves to drift, never to depart from his program of compassion. It is the unfinished agenda, the programs of the Kennedy Administration and the Johnson Administration.

My friends, we can serve his memory best not by looking passively at monuments in marble and steel or issuing postage stamps, but by working together for a better America and a better world, where there is peace preserved, freedom guarded, mankind exalted, and where the chains and fetters that keep man from achieving his God-given potential are struck away, and we are free to be what it is in our power to become.

John F. Kennedy often quoted from a poem by Robert Frost that expressed his understanding that we cannot stand still and admire achievement, no matter how compelling it might be. "The woods are lovely, dark and deep," he said. "But I have promises to keep, And miles to go before I sleep, And miles to go before I sleep." He did not go the many miles he might have, and so it is up to us to keep those promises for him—for they are, after all, promises made to ourselves and our children—promises of a better America.

We can achieve those promises, and reach those goals through the political process—and it is to John F. Kennedy the politican that I wish to dedicate this stamp.

Bridges to the East?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE HANSEN
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 6, 1967

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, the President's proposal to "build bridges" to the East—East-West trade—is very much in the news these days, and is a matter that the Congress may soon consider.

In view of this I commend to my colleagues an excellent statement on the subject contained in a recent letter by Adm. Arthur W. Radford, USN, retired, a former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, to a corporation that was considering selling goods to Russia and her Eastern European satellites.

Admiral Radford has given me permission to use the statement, which follows, as I see fit:

Since the last meeting of the Board, remembering the discussion we had on the pros and cons of trading with the USSR or her Eastern European satellites, I have been giving considerable thought to the matter. With our government recommending to the Congress that present laws in regard to such trade be relaxed to encourage not only trade, but encourage it by extending long term, low interest credit under certain circumstances—I felt that I had to restudy the position I have previously taken not only publicly, but in Board discussions on several occasions. This letter is the result. You can use it as you wish—or if you like, I will read it to the Board at our next meeting.

In 1945 the United States successfully completed a world war which taxed even our great resources. We completely defeated our enemies—Germany and Japan—and wound up with the greatest fighting machine in being that the world has ever known. Except for out enemies—practically the whole world was allied with us in this great struggle, including the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. We poured out military aid to the Rusisans during the war and included them in our planning for the Post War World. Our wartime president was convinced until just before he died that he could trust Premier Stalin—that Rusisan would live up to its commitments. President Roosevelt returned from the meetings in Yalta early in 1945 with his first real misgivings as to our future relations with our then ally—Russia.

Events moved swiftly in 1945 following President Roosevelt's death in the spring. We had first the defeat of the Germans and Hitler's suicide—2nd the defeat and occupation of Japan—and 3rd, the great demobilization of our armed forces. Of these, the last had the greatest bearing on the post war world—even on events today.

Stalin moved swiftly after the victory. Violations of agreements did not bother him. Russia had maintained her war time military strength while the Western Allies had demobilized to the point of weakness. There were individuals in the Free World who warned against Russia's ambitions, but they were in the minority, and generally disregarded. Russia's take-over of Eastern Europe including the Baltic States happened rapidly after 1945 and was largely excused as an understandable defensive measure. Allied failure to enforce agreements regarding free elections and other understandings—particularly in regard to Poland—resulted from lack of real military power as much as lack of courage to force a showdown with a recent ally.

The Blockade of Berlin and finally the Korean War convinced even the most ardent supporters of allied unity that the USSR was actively opposing the post war efforts of the Free World.

We come then to 1950 and the outbreak of the Korean War. A courageous President of the United States—Truman—decided to oppose Russian expansionist ambitions. The Hot-Cold war heated up rapidly and among the other side effects we had agreements on the part of the Free World in regard to restrictions on trade with the Communist Bloc.

CoCOM—Coordinating Committee on Restraint of Trade with Communist countries—was formed about that time. The member countries agreed on a list of strategic goods in which trade was forbidden. The United States, in addition, forbid its nationals to trade at all with Communist China. It was generally understood that such trade as was permitted would be for cash or immediate barter—no credit.

In the succeeding 17 years, the CoCOM lists have been watered down extensively. Communist efforts to purchase forbidden items such as sophisticated electronic equipment of various types has often been ultimately successful—by roundabout methods. Some businessmen in the United States have chafed under the more strict interpretations of strategic goods made by our government as they watched European governments permit their nationals to evade restrictions—forgetting that (a) European countries were historically natural trading partners with Russia and its satellites, (b) the total of such trade was insignificant by our standards and (c) finally, we had to set an example. Were we to relax our restrictions, there soon would be none.

During the Eisenhower Administration, there was constant pressure from allies and some of our own citizens to relax and modify the CoCOM lists of strategic goods. These efforts were generally opposed by the JCS who were always consulted, but some changes were made. Beginning with the Kennedy Administration, greater efforts were made—with greater success—and they culminated in President Kennedy's offer to sell wheat to the Russians. Food has always been on lists of strategic goods. This action indicated to the Free World that the United States' position on trading with Communist countries had changed basically.

As of now, President Johnson has asked the Congress to change existing laws in regard to trading with Communist countries—except China—where the ban would remain in effect.

One would suppose that our government could support its request for these changes with bona fide instances of changed attitudes on the part of Communist governments. This does not seem to be the case. There are generalized statements to the effect that the USSR is more willing to discuss agreements which tend to relax cold war pressures (Atomic Test Ban—Non-Proliferation of atomic weapons—Consular Treaty, etc.). The impression is given that Communist countries are more interested in consumer goods and less interested in building up their armed forces. Our Secretary of Defense insists that we have overwhelming nuclear superiority and yet he took office after the campaign in 1960 where the Democratic candidate insisted there was a missile gap on our part!

To one who has been privy in the past to this information, these current arguments lack credibility. The record of recent Soviet actions does not support evidence of a change in Russian attitudes. Let us review the present situation briefly.

Soviet military capability in all areas continues to increase. Russia's current military budget is billions higher than it was last year. A good part has gone into the Russian navy—producing a navy second only to our own—including the largest fleet of submarines the world has ever seen—over 430 effective boats.

In nuclear armament, they appear to have set 1970 as the target date by which to exceed the United States in offensive intercontinental missile strength. They are known to be deploying anti-missile systems widely in Russia.

They have recently reorganized and reemphasized civil defense within Russia, placing responsibility therefor in the hands of Marshal Vasili Chuikov, former commander-in-chief of Soviet Land Armies.

In Viet Nam, there is no doubt that Russia is our real adversary. Except for rice, light weapons and ammunition which are supplied by Red China, North Viet Nam's war making potential is due almost entirely to Russian military aid. Billions of dollars worth of missiles—jet aircraft—artillery—as well as hundreds of thousands of tons of POL (Petroleum products of all kinds) have poured into North Viet Nam in the last two years.

In the Middle East, grand strategists of the Soviet Union are quite evidently determined to widen their sphere of influence and have apparently chosen this area as their next target. Israel is alarmed by the extent of Soviet involvement in the arming of the Arabs at a time when the Western Powers—particularly the United States—seem inclined to seek accommodation with Moscow.

If the foregoing has a basis in fact—and it is generally accepted as factual—why do we propose to increase trade with the USSR and her satellites? We have lent or given Poland over ½ billion dollars since 1956 and they are now sending arms to Viet Nam in Polish ships. Their Communist dictatorship is more strict and more powerful than it was when we started to try to wean them away from it!

Why sell strategic materials to our avowed enemies which we have denied to former allies? We would not sell computers to France because she might use them in her nuclear weapons effort—so it is now proposed to sell computers and other strategic material to the Communist Bloc.

There is probably an answer. Our President has been advised by individuals whom he trusts that by treating the Russians as friends, he will gain their good will and it will then be possible to go further towards an ultimate goal of world peace with world disarmament—a Utopia which all men would like to see.

If history is a guide, however, it is a dangerous game to play with realists like the Russians. Some of our leaders have tried similar tactics before, but we have never gone so far as we seem to be going this time—and this in the face of Russian actions indicating plainly that their aims and enmities have not changed.

There is one safe yardstick in the measurement of East-West trade. So long as the East persists in its determination to destroy the West, anything which helps them, probably hurts us. We sold scrap iron to Japan in 1939 and got it back in bombs at Pearl Harbor and in artillery shells at Bataan.

All present indications suggest that the increase in East-West trade now proposed, with long-term loans and low interest rates, and including commonly accepted strategic materials, is extremely dangerous to our security as a nation.

Tribute to Hon. Paul Rand Dixon, Chairman of Federal Trade Commission: Guardian of American Consumer and Free Enterprise System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 7, 1967

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, during recent years there has developed wide recognition of the outstanding work being carried on by the Federal Trade Commission.

Even though the Congress continues to place more and more laws into the hands of the Commission for enforcement—continues to add to the Commission's duties and responsibilities—the agency, under the Chairmanship of the Honorable Paul Rand Dixon, nevertheless has demonstrated its ability to handle these numerous assignments in a highly creditable manner.

Our distinguished colleague, Representative JOHN DINGELL, a member of the House Small Business Committee and chairman of its Subcommittee on Regulatory Agencies, has publicly commended Chairman Dixon and each of the members of the Commission for their accomplishments "for seeking, with remarkable vigor, to carry out their responsibilities under the laws of this country."

In line with all of these plaudits, the current issue of the Federal Bar News, an official publication of the Federal Bar Association, contains an article highly laudatory of the Commission and its Chairman, Paul Rand Dixon.

Under unanimous consent, I include this article in the Appendix of the RECORD:

PAUL RAND DIXON, CHAIRMAN OF THE FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

Anybody looking for an exercise in futility could do no better than attempt to sell Rand Dixon a sly and specious argument. The greying, powerfully built, personable and freely spoken Mr. Dixon can correctly assess the who, why, how and what of an unfair method of doing business and, happily for the public interest, he can order whatever attack will expose and correct them at the least cost in money and time.

More formally, he is Paul Rand Dixon, Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission. Taking over on March 21, 1961, he has served both as a commissioner and as administrative head of the 1150-man agency, now no longer known as the "old lady of Pennsylvania Avenue" but as a brisk mistress intent on getting unfairness and deception out of our free enterprise system without burning the house down.

Evidence that he has succeeded could be heard at a recent hearing before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House of Representatives. Nearly every member of the Committee present commended the FTC and especially the Chairman for their work in the public interest.

The appointment of Mr. Dixon as Chairman marks a milestone in FTC's history. During the six years of his Chairmanship, the Commission has changed the emphasis of its activities from patternless attack on law violators to the securing of voluntary compliance with the law wherever possible. Guidance to businessmen as to the requirements of the trade laws, equal treatment of competitors, and speedy action against law violators who choose not to accept guidance pretty much sums up the philosophy of Mr. Dixon as to how the FTC should operate. He believes that by tackling areas of illegality on as broad a scale and as quickly as resources permit, it is possible to take advantage of the willingness of most businessmen to compete fairly provided their competitors do likewise.

Mr. Dixon's strong belief in the objectives of the antitrust and trade regulation laws administered by the FTC, coupled with his background of experience in the field peculiarly qualified him for the position of Chairman. For four years immediately prior to his appointment, he was Counsel and Staff Director of the Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee. He assisted the Subcommittee in developing and focusing the attention of Congress and the public on important problems in the field of restraint of trade, including administered prices in a number of major industries. From 1938 to 1957, except for military service during the war years, Mr. Dixon was a trial attorney on the staff of the FTC.

During World War II, Mr. Dixon served with the U.S. Navy. He spent 23 months overseas and participated in the occupation of Africa and the invasion and occupation of Italy. Entitled to wear three battle stars, he presently is a Lieutenant Commander, U.S.N.R. (Ret.).

Born in Nashville, Tennessee in 1913, Mr. Dixon, after attending public schools, entered Vanderbilt University on an athletic scholarship, became varsity quarterback, and received his A.B. degree in 1936. His LL.B. degree was conferred by the University of Florida in 1938, where he was assistant football coach for two years.

Under Chairman Dixon's leadership there has been a complete reorganization of the staff of the FTC, as well as significant revisions in the agency's procedures and rules of practice. The primary purpose of the staff reorganization was to center the responsibility for the handling of legal matters. Formerly, the responsibility had been fragmentized among different organizational units. For example, one bureau initiated and investigated cases and another bureau tried them. Under the present organization, one unit has the responsibility for all matters arising under a particular law, or section of a law, and the attorney handling a particular case has full responsibility for it from beginning to end. Under a revised consent order procedure, more than 80% of the Commission's formal matters are settled without litigation. Rules governing the handling of matters by adjudication have been revised with the view toward eliminating undue delay at every stage of a proceeding. Formerly, hearings in an adjudicative proceeding were often held at many different places throughout the country at widely separated intervals of time. Present rules direct that "Hearings shall proceed with all reasonable expedition. Unless the Commission otherwise orders upon a certificate of necessity therefor by the hearing examiner, all hearings shall be held at one place and shall continue without suspension until concluded."

Rand Dixon is imbued with the idea that FTC's role is that of an umpire in the competitive business game—an umpire who makes clear to the players what the rules are keeps out of their way, and calls fouls only when business practices threaten injury to the players or deprive the spectators, the consuming public, of their money's worth.

The Right To Dissent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 7, 1967

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the right to dissent is one of our basic and most cherished rights. The minority in many instances voices criticism which is a great help in finding solutions to difficult problems. For this reason we must always keep an open ear and mind.

Unfortunately, this argument has been miscomprehended and distorted by a minority of individuals who are dissatisfied with our foreign policy.

Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues an article which appeared in the June 1967 monthly investment letter of Hayden, Stone, Inc. The article clearly expresses my views on the matter.

The article follows:

> "Drugs, elementary sexuality and herd-intoxication—these are the three most popular avenues of downward self-transcendence. . . . The unwitting purpose of the men and women who succumb to these collective manias is the same as that pursued by the sectaries who use the dance as a religious rite—namely, to escape from insulated selfhood into a state in which there are no responsibilities, no guilt-laden past or haunting future, but only the present blissful consciousness of being someone else. . . ."
>
> —ALDOUS HUXLEY.[*]

If the U.S. were to withdraw from Vietnam, the worst blood-bath in a generation would follow, when the communist "liberators" proceed to liquidate the opposition—by slaughtering half-a-million South Vietnamese who are either rich, respectable, or dissenters. With all due respect for the U.S. right of dissent, we find it difficult to reconcile the good intentions of the domestic opposition with the bad intentions of the communist dictatorship in North Vietnam. One may argue about the "goodness" or "badness" of any regime, or any system of government; the truth is round, rounder than the circles of Dante's Hell, and the path is just as tortuous, but if one can define certain fundamentals, occasional glimpses of light come through. We are reminded of Clemenceau's statement at the Peace Conference in 1919 when he was drawn into an involved discusion about war guilt; he admitted that the subject was confusing but he said he was sure about one thing—Belgium did not invade Germany. The so-called American "aggression" in Vietnam is a clear inversion of the term; we suggest a reading of G. F. Hudson's new book, "The Hard and Bitter Peace" for a proper perspective on communist aggression since 1945. Prof. Hudson is a noted British historian at Oxford; the title of the book reflects a phrase used by the Late President Kennedy in his inaugural address. Anyone who wants to know what the communists are up to has only to listen to what they say—officially.

HIPPIES

Although there must always be room for informed and well-meaning dissent, it seems to us that the argument is needlessly confused by the mindlessness of the huge mass of those who may generally be called "hippies." Some of our best friends are hippies, but we don't think that their vague yearnings for a better world—a nice, dirty world—

---

[*] Epilogue to "The Devils of Loudon" (Harper & Row, 1952)

should be allowed to influence national policy. Let's keep the hippies out of Congress, even though we must listen to dissent with a careful ear for possible new directions toward a peaceful solution.

Connecticut Firm Marks 50th Anniversary With Plant Expansion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 31, 1967

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, the State of Connecticut has long been distinguished by the originality and inventiveness of its artisans. It holds a proud position in the economic history of the United States, especially in the manufacturing of machinery and machine tools. The products of Connecticut factories craftsmen make a very significant contribution to our defense effort, as well as to the continuing economic growth of this country and other nations of the world. It is, therefore, always a pleasure to note the growth and development of a Connecticut company and join with it in celebrating a significant milestone.

This year marks the 50th anniversary of the J. C. Barton Co. of East Hampton, Conn., which manufactures tools and dies and performs all manner of special machine work. The town of East Hampton is located in my congressional district and is about 20 miles south of our State capital at Hartford. It is in close proximity to the largest natural lake in Connecticut, and can rightfully be called a "typical New England town." East Hampton is an excellent place to live and work, and a most enjoyable area to visit.

For over two centuries several East Hampton factories have manufactured many types of bells and thus has given the town the well-deserved nickname of the "Belltown of the World." In 1917, Mr. J. C. Barton organized a company to serve the tooling needs of the bell industry, specializing in precision tool work, job manufacturing and, more particularly, the design and manufacture of progressive dies. This industry has continued to grow and thrive under the leadership of its current president, Mr. Edwin A. Barton. Today the firm specializes in the design and building of precision tooling used in the manufacture of intricate contoured parts.

On its 50th anniversary and as an indication of the firm's growth and prosperity, the J. C. Barton Co. has begun construction of a 30,000-square-foot addition to its main plant. I believe that this company typifies the smaller but highly efficient machine and tool builders of this country who play such an essential part in the industrial development and vitality of our Nation. I am pleased to extend my best wishes to this firm, its officers and all its employees on their golden anniversary. I wish for them continuing expansion and success in the years to come.

The 60th Anniversary of the American Hungarian Federation

SPEECH

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1967

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased indeed to join today on the occasion of the 60th anniversary of the American Hungarian Federation in recognizing this significant event and extending my heartiest congratulations and best wishes for the future to the federation and all its officers and members.

The American Hungarian Federation was chartered in Cleveland, Ohio, in 1907. It has been in continued existence ever since. Its present officers are: The Honorable Albert A. Fiok, municipal judge in Pittsburgh, Pa., as national president; the Right Reverend Dr. Zoltan Beky, bishop emeritus of the Independent Hungarian Reformed Church of America, and president, Hungarian Reformed Federation of America, as chairman of the board of directors; Prof. Dr. Emery G. Szekely, Medical School, Temple University, Philadelphia, Pa.; Dr. Janos Nadas, president, Kossuth chapter, AHF, Cleveland, Ohio; Mr. Stephen Miko, president, American Hungarian Federation of the State of New York, Inc.; Mr. Zoltan Vasvari, president, Cross and Sword Movement, Garfield, N.J., as national vice presidents; Mr. Richard J. Phillips, William Penn Fraternal Association, Pittsburgh, Pa., as treasurer; Mr. Bela Karlovitz, Esq., counselor at law, Pittsburgh, Pa., as general counsel; Messrs. Gabor Bodnar, Clifton, N.J., Andrew Eross, Sr., and Dr. Julius Hovany, editor, Chicago, Ill., as comptrollers; Dr. Louis Fury, writer, and Prof. Z. Michael Szaz, Department of Political Science, Seton Hall University, South Orange, N.J., as national secretaries.

For its 60 years of existence, the federation was engaged in educating Hungarians about American values and political principles so that they may become well-informed and loyal citizens of the United States. The federation also promoted the knowledge of Hungarian culture and literature among Americans not of Hungarian descent by sponsoring and distributing books and manuals.

In the past the federation took an unequivocal stand against any atheistic and totalitarian ideology, having been opposed to nazism as well as communism. For the last two decades it also tried to inform the American Government and public on the political, religious, and economic situation in Hungary under Communist rule by dissemination of information and memorandums and thereby give expression to some of the aspirations and demands of the suppressed Hungarian people.

Several Presidents of the United States have received delegations of the American Hungarian Federation, and the federation is in constant touch with the State Department and Members of Congress on problems of American policy toward Hungary in particular and Eastern Europe in general.

Recently major studies by the federation's foreign affairs committee included one on the international law status of the armed forces of the U.S.S.R. stationed on Hungarian soil, sent to 111 U.N. ambassadors; a statement to Subcommittee No. 4 of the House Judiciary Committee on bills proposing to make flag burning a Federal crime; an analysis of the abortion laws of Hungary, submitted to the American Medical Association; and, a memorandum to the President of the United States on American policy toward Hungary and Eastern Europe.

The federation sponsored 22,605 Hungarian refugees after World War II to this country, and helped 35,705 refugees after the 1956 Hungarian fight for freedom to come to America.

On charitable matters, the federation, between 1945 and 1952, sent help to Hungary and to Hungarians living in Western Europe in the amount of $1,457,743.26 and its relief action after the Hungarian Revolution amounted to $512,560.08, even before a separate organization was chartered to do the relief work.

The federation consists of the two American Hungarian fraternal associations—Hungarian Reformed Federation of America and William Penn Fraternal Association—its own State and local chapters, American Hungarian churches, associations, clubs, and study groups which send delegates to the triennial convention, which in turn, elects its officers and board of directors.

I may add, Mr. Speaker, that my interest and admiration for the great Hungarian people have always inspired be to exert every possible effort to sustain and assist them and to support their struggles for freedom and personal liberty for themselves and for other people feeling the lash of Communist tyranny.

Moreover, my personal interest in people of Hungarian blood, who have so enriched our own country has been greatly stimulated by the very distinguished and admired spiritual leader, Rev. Alexander St.-Ivanyi, pastor of the historic Bulfinch Church of Lancaster, Mass., mother town to my hometown of Clinton.

Reverend St.-Ivanyi has long been profoundly interested and active in the affairs of the Hungarian people of this country as well as of his native land. He is a devoted, courageous leader, very deeply devoted to the cause of Hungary and the cause of freedom.

I know that he will be greatly pleased to know that the Congress of the United States as well as the executive department of this Government joins him and his friends of Hungarian blood in hailing this memorable anniversary and reaffirming loyalty to the principles of freedom and personal liberty that we share in common with the beloved and honored Hungarian people whose way of life and whose culture and virtues and amiable qualities have made such a deep impression on our fellow Americans and all those who prize the cherished heritage of the free world.

Lowell General Provides Equipment for Chile

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1967

Mr. MORSE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I was proud to note in a recent edition of the Lowell, Mass., Sun that Lowell General Hospital is one of a group of medical institutions in the country that has donated hospital equipment for use in Chile. The drive was organized by the American Hospital Association and now includes some 100 hospitals around the country.

This is the kind of cooperation from the private sector that many in Congress have urged should play a larger role in our entire development effort in Latin America and elsewhere in the developing world. I am delighted to note Lowell General's participation and to include in the RECORD the Lowell Sun article describing the program in more detail.

The article follows:

LOWELL GENERAL PROVIDES EQUIPMENT FOR CHILE

LOWELL.—Equipment donated by the Lowell General hospital to hospitals in Chile is scheduled to be shipped June 8, from Philadelphia, Penn.

The Lowell General was one of 100 hospitals in the United States which participated in an American Hospital Association Drive aimed at collecting $250,000 of hospital equipment for Chile. This drive has successfully closed with more than twice that amount in drugs and equipment donated by hospitals and other groups.

The first two shipments of more than $600,000 in material will be sent aboard the Chilean Line's S.S. Maipu to Valparaiso, Chile.

The program was undertaken approximately 12 months ago at the request of the Chilean Ambassador to the United States. It was mostly a volunteer program. After announcements appeared in the American Hospital Association's various publications, some 100 hospitals offered equipment and the Direct Relief Foundation, Santa Barbara, Calif., donated $120,983 in drugs. The Pan American Development Foundation, through its Tools for Freedom program, arranged for crating and trucking the equipment. In some instances the labor was donated by members of the Teamsters Union. Trucking firms hauled much of the material without charge.

The equipment will go to the Chilean National Health Service, which, because of a dollar shortage, could not afford to buy it. Some of the equipment will replace that destroyed in earthquakes and other disasters. Included are hundreds of different items ranging from operating and delivery tables, to hospital beds, oxygen tents and food conveyors.

These items will be distributed among the country's 210 hospitals, its 95 out-patient clinics and 490 health and nursing centers. The staff at many of these facilities has been treating patients with insufficient or obsolete equipment.

One result of the volunteer effort was that less than $10,000 of the $25,000 authorized by the Chilean National Health Service, had to be spent for transportation charges.

President's Science Adviser Calls for Noise Abatement Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT TENZER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1967

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, I recently wrote to Dr. Donald F. Hornig, the President's science adviser and Chairman of the White House Aircraft Noise Abatement Task Force for a status report on certain aspects of the administration's noise abatement program.

I made this inquiry because of my interest in aircraft noise abatement in general and my bill, H.R. 1398 in particular. H.R. 1398 would authorize the Secretary of Transportation to establish noise abatement standards for aircraft certification similar to that proposed in the administration bill.

In addition my bill would authorize Federal regulations concerning modifications to airports as well as aircraft to reduce noise. Reimbursement for part of the cost of modifying aircraft and airports and acquiring land near airports for buffer zones is authorized by H.R. 1398.

I have met with Dr. Hornig and his assistants from time to time during the past year to discuss these problems and I include in the RECORD at this point our latest exchange of correspondence:

MAY 19, 1967.

Dr. DONALD F. HORNIG,
Director, Office of Science and Technology, Executive Office of the President, Washington, D.C.

DEAR DR. HORNIG: I am pleased with the progress which the White House Aircraft Noise Abatement Task Force has made during the past year in coordinating various programs designed to reduce jet noise. As Chairman of that White House Task Force, you have been directed by the President to "frame an action program to attack this problem" and for that reason, I would appreciate your comments on the following aspects of federal efforts in this field:

1. The NASA appropriation request for $50 million over 5 years to develop a "wholly new quiet engine".

I have been concerned that this proposed 5 year program may represent a duplication of effort both within the federal government and private industry. While I will continue to support long range programs to reduce aircraft noise, I am concerned that we may not be placing enough emphasis on short range programs and on this point I would like your comments on the feasibility of a project to scale down the JT 9D jet engine already developed by a major engine company.

2. The White House Task Force recommended legislation last year to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to set aircraft noise standards for use in certifying aircraft under the Federal Aviation Act. Hearings on the Administration bill have not been scheduled as yet and I urge you to restate the importance of early action on this proposed legislation.

3. The Task Force has also emphasized the importance of developing programs to encourage and assist local communities in connection with compatable land use planning near airports—both present airports and future sites. I have proposed legislation H.R. 1398 which would provide federal grants to local communities for the acquisition of land near airports for light industry, parkland, and other comptable uses.

Would you please advise me what progress the Task Force has made in connection with recommendations for executive or legislative action in this area?

I appreciate your efforts to bring relief to the ever-increasing number of citizens living in the shadow of the Nation's airports and your consideration of the points raised in this letter.

Sincerely yours,

HERBERT TENZER,
Member of Congress.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
OFFICE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY,
Washington, D.C., June 5, 1967.

Hon. HERBERT TENZER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. TENZER: Thank you for your letter of May 19, 1967, concerning our efforts on behalf of aircraft noise alleviation. I appreciate your kind remarks concerning the progress of this program to which you have contributed so much and so am happy to comment on the points you have raised in your letter.

With respect to the *quiet engine program,* I should emphasize that it is a concept aimed at producing the quietest engine that is possible with current technology, as a standard for commercial engines rather than as a commercial engine development. At the present time, no authorization or appropriations for the complete program have been requested. NASA has requested $2 million for FY-1968 to conduct research in component technology leading to the *potential* development of such an engine, which would be significantly quieter than the JT–9D engine being developed by the Pratt and Whitney Aircraft Division of United Aircraft Corporation.

With respect to the duplication of efforts, our review of Federal research programs has not revealed any duplication within the government. Naturally, we would watch with care that any Federal program takes advantage of progress which has been made by private engine companies and does not duplicate their efforts. Of course, the government has no control over duplications of effort among the private companies. We know that noise reduction technology is a highly competitive matter, and some duplication among industrial concerns may prove generally advantageous, providing more complete exploration of possible routes to noise reduction and earlier and more economic results.

My review has revealed that it may be possible to scale down the JT–9D engine which has been designed for use in the Boeing 747. In fact, it is my understanding that tentative discussions are now underway within the air transport industry concerning the possibility of using a scaled down JT–9D for retrofit to reduce noise in current aircraft. However, there are many technical and economic problems which will need to be resolved before this route to aircraft noise alleviation can be shown to be practicable.

Concerning noise standards, I regard the passage of legislation authorizing the Secretary of Transportation to set *aircraft noise standards* to be critically important. In the long run it is the only way I can see to protect the public interest in this respect and legislation for this purpose was resubmitted by the Administration during the early days of the current Congress. I share your concern that hearings have not yet been scheduled. I cannot overemphasize the key importance in Federal efforts for aircraft noise alleviation of the authority which this legislation provides. Unless the government has power to set noise standards for future aircraft, progress simply cannot be assured.

It seems clear that Federal cooperation and assistance for states and communities will be necessary as part of a comprehensive program of *compatible land usage* near airports. A Task Force under the leadership of the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) has been exploring what can be done to encourage and assist local communities. Among the proposals being studied are various means of providing financial as well as other forms of assistance to communities for achieving the basic objectives outlined in your proposed legislation. I will be in touch with you when we are ready to propose recommendations, and I hope they will receive your support.

I appreciate your interest in this important and difficult problem and if I can be of further assistance to you please let me know.

Sincerely,

DONALD F. HORNIG, *Director*.

The President's science adviser has called the passage of aircraft noise abatement certification standards "critically important." I certainly share this view and have urged passage of effective noise abatement legislation since January of 1965.

I urge my colleagues to support the efforts of the White House Task Force on Noise Abatement and to call for early congressional hearings on all bills introduced in this subject.

Hawaii Student Papers Win National Awards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1967

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to advise my colleagues that three schools from the Garden Isle of Kauai were among the schools from the State of Hawaii winning awards in the annual nationwide contest among journalism classes sponsored by the National Tuberculosis Association and the Columbia Scholastic Press.

Congratulations to the staffs and advisers of these outstanding papers, Kapaa High and Intermediate School's "The Tradewind," Kauai High School's "Ka Welo O Kala," and Kekaha Grammar School's "Chitter Chatter," for their journalistic achievements in this educational project which earned them this well-deserved national recognition.

The news article from the May 10, 1967, issue of the Garden Island, which lists the student editors, coeditors, and advisers of these award-winning papers, follows:

KAUAI PAPERS WIN NATIONAL AWARDS

Congratulations go to "The Tradewind," Kapaa High and Intermediate School; "Ka Welo O Kala," Kauai High School; and "Chitter Chatter," Kekaha Grammar School who won certificates of honor in a nationwide contest among journalism classes sponsored by the National Tuberculosis Association and the Columbia Scholastic Press. This is an annual contest conducted as an educational project and requires evidences of research, accuracy, originality, understanding of the subject matter as well as journalistic style in presentation of material.

This year's topics for investigation and reporting included: (1) Tuberculosis—prevention; eradication; TB and poverty; (2) Other Respiratory Diseases—including such specific problems as cigarette smoking; air pollution; and (3) Health Careers. Five other schools from the State of Hawaii received national awards also.

Student editor of "The Tradewind" is Stephanie Miyashiro and adviser, Mr. Robert McKellar; "Ka Welo O Kala" co-editors are Sandra Takiguchi and Katherine Querubin, Advisor Miss Drewcilla Brown; and "Chitter Chatter" co-editors are Alva Okamura and Donna Emoto, adviser Miss Patricia Ono.

St. Joe's Rowing Sweep Makes Eight-Oared History

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD D. McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 24, 1967

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, last week, the North American Heavy Eight Schoolboy Rowing Championships for both the United States and Canada were won by St. Joseph's Collegiate Institute, of Buffalo.

This tremendous coup represents the first time in the history of schoolboy rowing that the same crew has won both the United States and Canadian nationals in the same year. It was effected May 27 and May 28 and resulted in upsets for the favored St. Catherine's Collegiate Institute, Ontario.

It is an enormous tribute both to St. Joseph's Collegiate Institute and to the entire Buffalo area to have so proficient a rowing team in its midst.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in the RECORD today both the New York Times' and the Buffalo Evening News' accounts of this remarkable victory:

[From the New York Times, May 28, 1967]

DIETZ AGAIN WINS U.S. SCULLING TITLE—BRONX SCHOOLBOY DEFEATS STADEL—ST. HELENA'S STAR SCORES BY NINE LENGTHS TO POST HIS 33D STRAIGHT TRIUMPH

ST. CATHARINES, ONTARIO, May 27.—Jim Dietz of Saint Helena's High School, the Bronx, successfully defended his United States scholastic single sculling championship today, winning by about nine lengths from Bill Stadel of Stamford (Conn.) High School.

The races were rowed on Canada's new million-dollar International Rowing Course on the Old Welland Canal. Dietz sprinted to an open-water lead in the first 100 yards of the mile race and rowed a steady 22 beats into a moderate headwind on calm water.

After the half mile mark was passed, Dietz led by six lengths and Stadel, who gave his heavier rival a 45-pound advantage, was rowing several beats higher, but was not able to cut down the Bronx sculler's lead.

Dietz crossed the line in 5 minutes 58.1 seconds. This was Dietz's 33d straight high school rowing victory. He is expected to enter Northeastern University this fall.

Blessed Sacrament High School of New Rochelle, N.Y., won the championship doubles by six lengths, defeating St. Joseph Prep of Philadelphia in the fast time of 5:37, St. Augustine's Prep of Margate, N.J., and Roosevelt High School of Wyandotte, Mich., trailed far back.

Charles Doyle and Peter Ferrara led from the start, rowing at 32 for most of the course. The New Rochelle crew moved steadily away and easily led their Philadelphia rivals who had beaten them last week in Philadelphia.

Blessed Sacrament also finished second in the junior doubles and fourth in the senior fours.

This was the 33d annual United States championships and it was held in Canada for the first time.

Haverford School of Pennsylvania, after learning that its athletic director, John Parker, had dropped the sport of rowing after this season, won the junior and senior fours with coxswain and the junior doubles.

St. Joseph's Prep of Buffalo upset favored St. Catherines Collegiate Institute and Washington and Lee High School in the senior eights winning by three feet from St. Catherines, with Washington and Lee a half length back in third place.

Thirty-four schools and 297 oarsmen competed and most will row today in the Canadian secondary schools championships. Deitz is heavily favored to win the Canadian championship singles title and Stadel will be rowing in the 145-pound senior singles.

[From the New York Times, May 29, 1967]

DIETZ CAPTURES SCULLING CROWN—BRONX SCHOOLBOY ADDS THIRD CANADIAN TITLE IN ROW

ST. CATHARINES, ONTARIO, May 28.—Jim Dietz of St. Helena's High School, the Bronx, won his third straight Canadian singles sculling championship today defeating George Przygocki of Theodore Roosevelt High School of Wyandotte, Mich.

Dietz took the lead in the first 100 yards, and rowing at 34 strokes a minute to Przygocki's 37, continued to move away. At the half-mile he dropped his stroke to a long 20 to his rival's 32.

The St. Helena's sculler won by 10 lengths in 6:12.3.

Charles Doyle and Peter Ferrara of Blessed Sacrament High School won the doubles event by 10 lengths in 6:12.3. The New Rochelle oarsmen led from the start, rowing at 42 strokes a minute. They built a three-length lead at the first quarter-mile, with Theodore Roosevelt High School in second place and Cardinal O'Hara High School of Springfield, Pa., another two lengths back.

Doyle and Ferrara then settled to 33 and led by five lengths at the half-mile mark. The heavier Blessed Sacrament crew continued to move away from the field in very calm water against a 6 M.P.H. headwind and crossed the line with a 12-length lead. Cardinal O'Hara was third and Port Credit High School of Ontario was fourth.

Tom Henwood of Philadelphia's West Catholic High School upset the defending champion, Bill Stadel of Stamford (Conn.) Catholic High School, by four lengths in 6:44.4.

More than 700 oarsmen competed in the 36 events including heats in the three-day regatta, which was considered the largset scholastic rowing regatta ever held in North America.

The St. Joseph's Prep eight-oared crew added the Canadian championship to its Untied States title, which it won yesterday. The Buffalo schoolboys defeated St. Catharine's Collegiate Institute by a quarter length in 5:22.4. Cardinal O'Hara of Springfield, Pa., was third, followed by Brockville, Sir Winston Churchill of St. Catherine's and Cardinal O'Hara of Tonawanda, N.Y.

THE SUMMARIES

Fours With Coxswain—1, Cardinal O'Hara High School, Springfield, Pa.; 2, Brockville Collegiate, Brockville, Ont.; 3, Cardinal O'Hara H.S. No. 2; 4, St. Catharines Collegiate Institute, St. Catharines, Ont.; 5, Blessed Sacrament High School, New Rochelle, N.Y.;

6, Sir Winston Churchill High School, St. Catharines, Ont. Time—5 minutes 50 seconds.

Double Sculls—1, Charles Doyle and Peter Ferrara, Blessed Sacrament High School; 2, Theodore Roosevelt High School, Wyandotte, Mich.; 3, Cardinal O'Hara High School; 4, Port Credit High School, Port Credit, Ont. Time—6 minutes 12.3 seconds.

135-Pound Eights—1, Lakeport Secondary School, St. Catharines, Ont.; 2, Brockville Collegiate; 3, Delta Secondary School, Hamilton, Ont.; 4, Grantham High School, St. Catharines, Ont.; 5, Blessed Sacrament High School. Time—5 minutes 38.2 seconds.

145-Pound Fours—1, Sir Winston Churchill High School; 2, Grantham High School; 3, Lorne Park Secondary School; 4, Lakeport Secondary School; 5, St. Catharines Collegiate. Time—5 minutes 55.4 seconds.

145-Pound Singles—1, Tom Henwood, West Catholic High School, Philadelphia; 2, William Stadel, Stamford (Conn.) Catholic High School; 3, Larry Holmes, Lakeport Secondary School; 4, William Maher, Hamilton Collegiate School, Hamilton, Ont. Time—6 minutes 44.4 seconds.

Four-Oared Shell Without Coxswain—1, St. Catherines Collegiate School; 2, Cardinal O'Hara of Tonawanda, N.Y.; 3, Westdale Secondary School, Hamilton, Ont.; 4, Western Tech Secondary School, Toronto; 5, Delta Secondary School, Hamilton. Time—6 minutes 48 seconds.

145-Pound Eights—1, Sir Winston Churchill High School; 2, Lakeport High School, St. Catharines; 3, Westdale Secondary School, Hamilton; 4, Theodore Roosevelt, Wyandotte; 5, Grantham High School, St. Catharines; 6, St. Catharines Collegiate School, St. Catharines. Time—5 minutes 26.4 seconds.

135-Pound Fours—1, Denis Morris, St. Catharines, Ont.; 2, Lakeport Secondary School, St. Catharines; 3, Hutchinson Collegiate Tech, Buffalo; 4, Delta Secondary School, Hamilton, Ont.; 5, Lorne Park Secondary School, Port Credit, Ont.; 6, St. Catharines Collegiate Institute, Time—6 minutes 10.2 seconds.

Championship Singles—1, James Dietz, St. Helena's High School, Bronx, N.Y.; 2, George Przygock, Theodore Roosevelt High School, Wyandotte, Mich. Time—7.09.4.

Championship Eights—1, St. Joseph's Prep, Buffalo; 2, St. Catharines Collegiate Institute, St. Catharines; 3, Cardinal O'Hara, Springfield, Pa.; 4, Brockville Collegiate School, Brockville, Ont.; 5, Sir Winston Churchill, St. Catharines; 6, Cardinal O'Hara of Tonawanda, N.Y. Time—5 minutes 22.4 seconds.

The point scores

Lakeport School	77½
Churchill	68
St. Catharines	57
St. Joseph's Prep	40
O'Hara, Spfld, Pa.	39¾
Brockville	38
St. Helena's	10
Blessed Sac.	26
Grantham	24
Theo. Roosevelt	17½
O'Hara, Tonawanda	14

[From the Buffalo Evening News]

St. Joe's Rowing Sweep Makes Eight-Oared History

St. Catharines, Ontaraio, May 29.—St. Joseph's Collegiate Institute has:

1 — The first Buffalo crew to win the United States scholastic senior eight-oared championship in 25 years.

2 — The first from the city to win the Canadian title in 12 years.

3 — The first crew from anywhere ever to sweep both U.S. and Canadian honors in the same year.

What's more, that powerful St. Joe eight has made a rowing buff of the school principal, the Rev. Brother Albian Victor, FSC.

Brother Victor never had seen a rowing race before coming here for the combined U.S. and Canadian Scholastic Regatta Saturday and Sunday. He was less than enthusiastic about the sport.

PRINCIPAL GIVES PEP TALK

But, after watching St. Joe win the U.S. title Saturday in one of the closest races in history—his school won by less than a foot—the principal became a rooter. So much so, in fact, that he gave his oarsmen a pep talk before Sunday's Canadian final.

His efforts paid off. The St. Joe eight, coached by Dave Zak, won by 1¼ lengths over St. Catharines C. I., the crew that finished just inches behind in the U.S. final.

O'Hara of Springfield, Pa., finished third; Brookville, Ont., C. I. fourth; Sir Winston Churchill of St. Catharines, fifth, and O'Hara of Tonawanda, sixth.

St. Joe represented the West Side Rowing Club, O'Hara the Niagara Frontier Rowing Club. Bill Lawless stroked the championship crew which included Mark Murphy, Skip White, Bob Adams, Pete Mancuso, Mike Moore, John Hart, Doug Daigler and coxswain Ed Tuttle.

ST. JOE TAKES LEAD AT HALF

St. Joe took the lead midway through the mile course. With 150 yards to go, St. Catharines staged a dramatic dash to catch up, but St. Joe hit a steady 40 strokes to the minute and won easily. Winning time was 5 minutes 22.4 seconds against a slight headwind. Saturday's winning time was 5:18.8.

An O'Hara crew from the NFRC finished second to St. Catharines C. I. in the senior fours. Technical from the WSRC placed third in the 135-pound fours, won by Denis Morris of St. Catharines.

Lakeport Secondary School of St. Catharines snapped a 5-year winning streak by St. Catharines C. I. by running up the most points ever for the Cosgrove Trophy, emblematic of the team title. Lakeport won with 77½ points. St. Joe was fourth with 40 and O'Hara of the NFRC was 13th with 14. Tech of the WSRC had five points and Kenmore of the NFRC one.

Citizenship Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1967

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to insert in today's Congressional Record the text of a resolution adopted by the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors, at the request of Supervisor Ernest Debs, commending Col. John Hirschman of Los Angeles for 25 years of outstanding humanitarian and civic service to his fellow men.

The resolution follows:

Whereas, Col. John Hirschman, 813¼ N. Hudson Ave., Los Angeles, California, 90038, for the past 25 years, has dedicated his time and energies to many humanitarian and civic endeavors for the benefit of the entire community, and,

Whereas, his distinguished career includes service as Executive Director of the Junior Police of America, Founder and Director of the Veterans Memorial, Publicity Director for the Reconstruction of the Abbey of Monte Cassino, Director of Public Relations for Disabled American Veterans, Public Relations Officer for the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Member of the Hospital Committee for Veterans, Chairman of V.F.W. Buddy Poppy Drive, Member of the Los Angeles Press Club, Member of the Welfare Foundation, Director of Public Relations for the Los Angeles Sister Cities Program, and Youth Achievement worker with Mayor Yorty's Youth Council,

Now, therefore, on behalf of the County of Los Angeles, this expression of highest commendation is hereby extended to Col. John Hirschman who, through his selfless devotion to the ideal of helping his fellow man, exemplifies the highest standard of American citizenship.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the Record.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402, at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided,* That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the Congressional Record, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Appendix

A letter to a Constituent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VERNON W. THOMSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1967

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, our colleague from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] issued a very interesting and provocative newsletter which will be mailed this evening to some of his constituents in the Seventh Congressional District.

I believe that the letter from the gentleman from Wisconsin to his constituents should be called to the attention of all Members of this body and insert it in the RECORD at this point. The letter referred to follows:

JUNE 7, 1967.

DEAR FRIEND: June is the time of year for report cards. As our young people graduate or as they are advanced from one grade to the next in their educational careers, they are presented with an accounting of how well or how poorly they did in their efforts to obtain a good education.

Government should be no different. It seems to me that this is a good time to issue a "report card" on the progress being made by the Johnson Administration and its three to two Democratic majority in the U.S. House of Representatives.

Of course, as Chairman of the Republicans in the House of Representatives, my grading may be questioned by some. But I do not believe the facts which are presented on pages two and three of this letter can be disputed.

AGRICULTURE

With parity at a depression-time low of 72, compared with 80 in 1960, farmers are in near-revolt. Imports of dairy products, mink pelts, wool and meat—eased by Administration policies—are driving prices down. Production costs, meanwhile, keep mounting, forcing more and more farmers off the land. Since 1960, the total number of farmers declined by nearly four million. Yet Department of Agriculture employees continue to increase, with one for every 26 farms in the country today compared with one per 39 farms in 1960. The Administration's solution? More of the same control and quota policies that led to the problem in the first place.

COST OF LIVING

Since 1960, the cost of living has shot up 10.5%, eroding the savings and pension plans of millions of older citizens and wiping out income advances of the younger ones. Inflation is like a national sales tax which affects everyone. Today's dollar is worth 45¢ compared to the one of 1941—and $2.22 is required to buy what $1 would have bought 25 years ago. What's the Administration's solution? More spending. More deficits. This year, the deficit could go as high as $29 billion and a large tax increase may be unavoidable. This means more inflation, not less. Since 1963, the Johnson Administration has spent some $40 billion more than it took in—mostly on domestic programs. Since 1960, defense spending, goaded by the war in Vietnam, jumped 68% while domestic spending skyrocketed 97 percent.

CREDIBILITY

From the President on down, the Administration's spokesmen have lost the confidence of the American people and the press in what they say and do. War statistics and cost estimates for example have been withheld, twisted, or reshaped. The American Society of Newspaper Editors among many others has publicly complained about this record. The Administration's answer seems to be more press agents. The General Accounting Office estimates that nearly 7,000 publicists are presently on the federal payroll—the largest number ever employed by an Administration—to "sell" Administration programs to the American people.

CRIME

Since 1960, crimes of all types in this country jumped an amazing 46%, the largest increase in any comparable period in history, while the nation's population increased only 8%. In other words, crime rose nearly six times faster than the population. In the past year, crimes shot up 11% across the country and a startling 27% in the nation's Capitol. Crime is estimated to cost the nation $50 billion annually. The Administration's solution appears to be merely more Crime Commissions, study groups and categorical grant programs. Last year the President vetoed the only anti-crime bill Congress enacted and opposed the Republican-sponsored anti-riot measure.

FOREIGN POLICY

Around the world, U.S. prestige has dipped sharply since 1960. American citizens abroad are attacked, embassies sacked, missions stoned, and U.S. flags burned. Yet, the Administration continues to pour foreign aid into these nations in a seeming effort to buy the friendship and respect it appears unable to earn. In Vietnam, U.S. forces now number over 450,000 and are expected to reach half a million shortly. Casualties mount daily, now totaling some 10,000 American dead and 60,000 wounded. We now have a Middle East Crisis and the possibility of other crises in Latin America and Africa. There is no clear indication of what our foreign policy is and no attempt to put the Soviet Union—the principal instigator and supporter of these wars—on the defensive in the court of world opinion.

At home and abroad, the situation continues to grow worse. Though progress has been made on some fronts, the records in these major fields of public concern certainly do not add up to very high marks when measured in terms of the results we have witnessed so far. It is good, I think, in a Democracy for the Minority Party to continually review the actions and measure the results of the programs of the party in power so that the public can be informed. Only in this way can better programs and better approaches be devised for the massively complex problems that face our society.

This past past month was an extremely busy one for your Congressman. As the ranking Minority Member of the Committee which provides all the funds for the health activities of our federal government, I spent several days in Geneva at the Twentieth World Health Assembly. The picture at left was taken during a general session which both Senator Edward Kennedy (D-Mass) and I attended as members of the U.S. Delegation.

The Labor, Health, Education and Welfare Appropriations Bill was also passed by the House of Rpresentatives during the month of May. As the ranking minority member, it was my responsibility to manage the bill during debate on the Floor of the House. Though my amendment which provides that the new $16.5 million Food and Drug Research Laboratory cannot be built in the Washington area was challenged by a Democratic Congressman from this area, the House overwhelmingly supported my position. This insures that the Laboratory will be built at the University of Wisconsin in Madison.

This month, the House will act on the massive Defense Appropriation bill which finances our activities in Vietnam and also provides all the money for the national security needs of our country. The bill this year will contain well over $70 billion and will occupy much of my time for the remainder of this month.

Best regards

MEL LAIRD.

What the Flag Means to Judy Covington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. LAUSCHE

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 8, 1967

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, as has been its custom for several years, the Canton Kiwanis Club again sponsored an essay contest, on a voluntary basis, for all eighth-grade students in the city of Canton. The title of the essay is "The U.S. Flag and What It Means to Me."

First prize this year went to a blind girl, Judy Covington, of the Dennis R. Smith School, in Canton, Ohio. I rejoice with Judy in the honor that has come to her and extend my felicitations to her.

I ask unanimous consent that Judy's excellent essay be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the essay was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE U.S. FLAG AND WHAT IT MEANS TO ME

(By Judy Covington, Dennis R. Smith School, Canton, Ohio)

The United States Flag always reminds me of my love and respect for my America. It symbolizes such things as the work of the early men and women, who made our country what it is today. The hard struggles of the pioneers were certainly worth the effort because they made it possible for Americans today to enjoy many freedoms.

My Flag represents courage, it makes men brave enough to fight for what they believe to be right. Many men fought and died in our wars so that our nation might live with dignity.

My United States Flag is significant of the geography of our vast land. The rivers, the lakes, the mountains, the trees, and the many other things of nature are beautiful to behold.

My United States Flag reminds me of the freedoms that Americans enjoy. Many other countries in our world are not so privileged. The Flag means that we, as Americans, have the ability to speak, to think, to worship, and to choose our way of life. We may even criticize the government if we so desire.

My Flag identifies a democracy where people can work together. American cities are not divided by a wall as in Berlin, Germany. People, who have relatives in Berlin, and live on the wrong side of the wall, cannot even visit them. In America, we come and go freely, and cherish our family festivities.

My Flag stands for love and respect for people in other countries. When we send money and supplies to our fighting men in Vietnam, I am sure that it makes our military men grateful They know that the citizens at home stand shoulder to shoulder with them as they fight for freedoms with foreign peoples.

My Flag symbolizes my love for my country. When I say "The Pledge of Allegiance" and sing "The Star-Spangled Banner," I am promising to respect, honor, and cherish my beloved United States of America. Even though I am blind since my birth, and cannot see my Flag, I know in my heart that it is a beautiful emblem of "Power and Glory." No country in this vast world has more ideals to cherish than "the land of the free, and the home of the brave!"

The Community Alert Patrol

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 1967

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, in recent days my office and those of many of my colleagues have been bombarded with telephone calls and mail protesting the approval of a Federal grant to the community alert patrol located in Los Angeles. These attacks have obviously come from ultraconservative elements in Los Angeles and surrounding counties and reveal a disturbing lack of knowledge and unsound fear about the program to be carried out by CAP.

Publicity about the purposes of the patrol has been misleading. Criticism expressed by the mayor of Los Angeles and the police chief is surprising in view of their previous failure to express formal opposition even though the police department was consulted before the grant was announced.

Here are the facts:

First. The police department was consulted on the project but at no time prior to the funding registered formal opposition or suggested any changes.

Second. The local economic and youth opportunities agency was consulted but has registered no opposition.

Third. A panel of outstanding national educators and foundation heads evaluated and recommended the project.

Fourth. The patrol was never intended as a "police" detachment, never intended to follow police cars, and could not legally be constituted as a "vigilante" group as claimed. On the other hand, neither was it intended that the patrol would dodge basic issues or look the other way if the legally constituted law-enforcement officials committed acts they should not. The patrolmen would be bound as any citizen to report any criminal acts committed in their presence.

Fifth. The patrol has been operating for about a year but with voluntary effort and private donations. Its efforts have been widely commended and no opposition expressed by anyone.

I am further convinced the police department could in such instances play the constructive role of supporting workable Federal financed community projects in cooperation with and not against community leaders. Certainly such cooperation should be a vital link in good law enforcement.

To enable my colleagues to understand better the purposes and aims of CAP, I include a letter from the executive director of the Community Relations Conference of Southern California which recognizes the real value of this community project.

The letter follows:

COMMUNITY RELATIONS CONFERENCE OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA,
Los Angeles, Calif., June 2, 1967.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HAWKINS: There have been a number of recent public attacks on Community Alert Patrol concentrating on the manner in which federal funds are to be used. Since the budget reflects the program, perhaps it would be useful for the public and public officials to understand the basic rationale for the program and related expenditures. Most informed residents of the Los Angeles area are aware of the desperate need for improved relationships between our official law enforcement agencies and the various ghetto communities, regardless of their color. Most of us believe that we now have a police administration willing to consider new approaches to improving the relationship with impoverished communities before still another holocaust. But the problem is immense. No other municipal police force in the country has so large an area to cover and so small a police force per capita. Under these circumstances, the need for community support and organization of itself for maintenance of order is even greater than usual. Negroes living in South Los Angeles have years of accumulated grievances against the police; these will not vanish overnight. Time and substantial evidence of sincerity, on both sides, are required. A group of young men, from precisely that segment of the population most troublesome to the police and to themselves, is undertaking to help in protecting the community. To do the job properly on a sustained basis requires resources beyond their means; hence, the application for federal funds. Inasmuch as improper maintenance of their own cars has accounted for much of their past trouble with the police, it seemed sensible to provide them with the means of looking after their cars, training them in related skills at the same time.

It seemed to the adults who undertook the support of the program that, for a relatively small investment of public funds, a number of positive ends might be achieved. First, a group in need of a useful role is given an opportunity to serve the community, its community. Furthermore, the role is one chosen *by* the group, not, as is true of so many programs, one foisted on an indifferent or reluctant group. They *invented* the idea of patroling for peace in their neighborhood. They also discovered the satisfaction of being useful, perhaps for the first time in their lives.

In the hope that we, as a society, can learn from experience, the sponsors of Community Alert Patrol have applied two principles well authenticated in other fields:

First, that simply having observers present in any official encounter changes, usually for the better, the quality of behavior on the part of all concerned. It is axiomatic, for instance, in the field of medical care, that the quality of care provided in a teaching hospital is superior to that in non-teaching hospitals because the physician's performance, records, etc., are subject to constant scrutiny of his colleagues, students, and nurses. The physician is simply more careful.

We think it very likely that routine encounters between police and members of minority groups will be more civil if observers are present.

Second, a very important lesson from the field of rehabilitation of offenders: there is small likelihood of reform for men in their late teens and early twenties with police records, few skills, very little sense of self worth or of being part of any socially acceptable world. If such a group is to have a place in our community outside of jails and morgues, they must have a role acceptable both to them and to the rest of the community.

It was to achieve these ends that the program of Community Alert Patrol was designed by a local group of concerned citizens and funded by the Office of Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Delevopment. It should be obvious that such a program requires a high order of discipline and law-abiding behavior on the part of all the participants.

There is no guarantee it will succeed; no promises were made, except to try. Nobody connected with the program thinks the task will be easy. A very small group, only 15 young men, are being supported in a very large endeavor. But if, in even a small way, the group succeeds, first of all in finding community service a good way of life; second, in learning a useful skill; and, finally in providing their neighbors with a low cost automotive maintenance service—will it not be worth $238,000 of the taxpayers' money? Alternative costs for leaving the tasks undone would, in all probability, be vastly larger.

Finally, let me say that our hope for the implementation of a responsible program by the Community Alert Patrol is not without foundation. On its Board of Directors is the Chairman of our own Board of Directors, the Rev. Dr. Melvin Wheatley and Attorney Arnett Hartsfield, a community leader with whom we have worked for more than ten years.

We ask our fellow citizens and our local officials to allow the Community Alert Patrol to continue with funds what it has proved without them—that it is a responsible group of young men who are an asset in keeping the peace in Los Angeles.

Sincerely yours,

CURT MOODY,
Executive Director.

DAR Presents Books for Communism Study

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 8, 1967

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, it recently came to my attention that the Metter, Ga., chapter of the Daughters of the American Revolution has presented the local high school with several specially prepared books on the subject "Communism Versus Americanism."

This is indeed a commendable action, and I have congratulated the Metter

DAR on its interest in informing the people of the evils of totalitarian communism compared with the freedom and liberty which we enjoy and seek to preserve as Americans.

J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, also has commended the Metter DAR. I ask unanimous consent that the newspaper article concerning this endeavor and Mr. Hoover's letter be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DAR PRESENTS BOOKS FOR COMMUNISM STUDY—SPECIAL COURSE AT METTER HIGH

Communism received a blow Wednesday as the Metter DAR Chapter, presented the high school several special texts which give the real low-down on just what communism is. The texts will be used by Professor Eddie Potts in his special course, "Communism vs Americanism."

The texts are the beginning of a special library on this subject which will be added to from time to time with other texts which enable high school students to better understand the communist threat.

Rev. John Bagwell gave the devotional after which the pledge to the flag was given and the national anthem was sung.

Mrs. Hugh Reid of Vidalia, State Chairman of National Defense, DAR and 1st Vice Regent of Georgia Society DAR, addressed the high school students on the importance of an informed student body on the dangers of communism. Mrs. Reid was introduced by Mrs. Sam Fine of Metter.

Hamp Langford of Lyons, state winner in the DAR oratorical contest presented his prize winning address on "Free Enterprise." Langford is State President of the Children of the American Revolution.

In presenting the books to Mr. Potts, Mrs. R. G. Daniell, Jr. explained the desire of the local DAR chapter to assist in the starting of the library on communism. Mrs. Daniell said local citizens and organizations were generous in their contributions to assist the DAR in the purchase of the special texts. She recognized Dr. Robert S. Robinson, Metter Kiwanis Club, Canoochee Chapter of the American Revolution, Metter Chapter DAR, Metter Lions Club, Metter Advertiser, Dr. Ben T. Franklin, Dr. Henry Sparks, Dr. Leon Curry, Melvin Rigdon and Joe Pittman.

In making the presentation Mrs. Daniell quoted J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation who said, "A free society depends for its vitality and strength upon the vigor and patriotism of its individual citizens. Knowledge of communism, the challenge of our age and an appreciation of our American heritage will enable us to discipline ourselves for the hard decisions, the responsible judgments, the dedication and sacrifices which will have to be made to insure the continued existence of our nation and the perpetuation of freedom itself."

"With this in mind," said Mrs. Daniell, "the daughters of the American Revolution hoped to have a part in shaping young minds to be able to cope with the responsibilities of our democratic society."

Out of town visitors were Mrs. Rosylan Frame, Savanah; Mrs. Brenda Stokes, Pooler; Mrs. John I. Brinson, Mrs. Margaret Watson and Mrs. Allen Brewer of Twin City.

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION,
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
Washington, D.C., April 26, 1967.
MRS. ROBERT G. DANIELL, Jr.,
Metter, Ga.,

DEAR MRS. DANIELL: I have been advised of the program of presenting books on the topic of communism to high schools which was initiated by your Chapter of the Daughters of the American Revolution. This is indeed a worthwhile project and you are to be congratulated on it.

The world communist conspiracy and its advocates in the United States continue to pose a basic threat to our country. It is most urgent that our citizens and our young people in particular gain a thorough knowledge of the objectives and operations of this movement. The program you have undertaken is a step in the right direction.

As a token of my appreciation, I am forwarding, under separate cover, a copy of "A Study of Communism" which I have autographed to you.

Sincerely yours,

J. EDGAR HOOVER.

Fear of Law Is No Way To Build a Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DON EDWARDS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 8, 1967

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, how to effectively cope with crime is certainly a subject of overwhelming concern to the American people today. One of the ways to effectively combat crime, Attorney General Ramsey Clark suggested recently, is to create in all of our people a respect for the rule of law.

This has particular relevance, Mr. Clark said, to juveniles—a segment of the population which is responsible for a disproportionate amount of crime.

One way to implant that respect is to overhaul and reform the criminal justice system, as has been suggested by President Johnson's National Crime Commission. And, as the Commission has urged, special emphasis must be given to the youthful offender.

This whole area of concern was discussed with insight recently in an editorial in the Sacramento, Calif., Bee, and I respectfully insert it in the RECORD as part of my remarks:

FEAR OF LAW IS NO WAY TO BUILD A DEMOCRACY

There is in this nation a vocal group which expresses a belief fear is the best way of enforcing the laws of society. There are those who counsel greater employment of intimidation and threats of fierce retaliation as a means of keeping everyone in line.

But there is another, more human, sensible and eventually more effective approach. This is respect of the law and not fear of it.

U.S. Atty. Gen. Ramsey Clark, son of a U.S. Supreme Court justice and a young man who has been raised in the tradition of the laws of democracy, recently spoke to this point in a Law Day address before the Los Angeles County Bar Association.

He said firm, sure, speedy justice is essential. "But," he continued, "law enforcement alone, however great its power or effective its action, cannot over the long run substantially reduce crime where the people have the will to commit crime. Where there is the will, a way will be found. That will cannot long be suppressed by fear. It can be permanently conquered only by creating in the hearts of our people a respect for the rights of others, which is to say—a respect for the rule of law."

In this regard, Clark noted the failure of the adult society to instill in the young an understanding of the rule of law which permits the individual to pursue his own good as he sees it in his own way so long as he does not interfere with others in their exercise of a similar pursuit. Of all ages, from cradle to grave, 15-year-olds are arrested most frequently. The young are the nation's most lawless citizens.

Thus it is vital that most urgent efforts be devoted to the young. All institutions of society must emphasize more and more a reverence for law, a recognition that law is the only technique devised for preserving individual freedoms.

Abraham Lincoln, as a 28-year-old in 1838, spoke similarly when he said reverence for the law should become the political religion of the nation, practiced from infanthood to old age, written in primers, preached from the pulpit, proclaimed in legislative halls and enforced in courts of justice.

Power To Control Is the Power To Destroy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. RARICK
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 8, 1967

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the recent unconscionable ruling ordering ratio race mixing by the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals in the Jefferson case has begun to destroy the structure and foundation of public education in Louisiana. Foremost is the potential permanent damage the implementation of such a ruling will have upon the little children and other innocent parties—the parents, teachers, and principals. Are we to believe the people of the United States have become so racially extremist they intend to destroy education in the South if they cannot force a theoretical ratio of race mixing? That teaching of reading, writing and arithmetic are not incidental or secondary to race acceptability?

This power-to-destroy decree applies only to six States and, if not overruled will turn public education back 100 years in each of the States involved.

Louisianians are understably disturbed, as best expressed in Louisiana Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 75, which was passed unanimously by that body.

So that my colleagues may better understand this court-instigated dilemma we face in Louisiana, I include the resolution following my remarks:

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 75

Concurrent resolution to urge and request that the President of the United States, the Congress of the United States, and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, take such action as may be calculated to prevent the disruption of the educational program in the public schools of Louisiana which can be expected to result from the precipitous enforcement of the guidelines issued by U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare

Whereas, drastic and sudden changes in the administration and operation of the public schools of Louisiana which will follow as a consequence of the guidelines issued by the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and of the subsequent Court decrees upholding and enforcing the said guidelines, and

Whereas, the enforcement of the aforementioned guidelines is even now jeopardizing the recruitment of qualified teachers for the public schools of Louisiana, and

Whereas, much damage to teacher morale has resulted from the announcement that existing contracts negotiated in good faith between school boards and public school teachers are to be abrogated as a consequence of recent Court decisions, and

Whereas, many competent and dedicated teachers can be expected to resign or retire as a result of the uncertainties and disruption attendant upon the enforcement of the aforementioned guidelines, and a sufficient number of competent replacements cannot be found, and

Whereas, the objective of the public school system is to provide the best possible education for all students, and

Whereas, the attainment of this objective will be thwarted as a result of the enforcement by the Courts of the guidelines issued by the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and

Whereas, the damage to and disruption of the public school system will have an adverse effect upon the quality of education offered all students, including those whom the guidelines seek to benefit: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate of the Legislature of Louisiana, the House of Representatives concurring herein, That the Legislature of Louisiana does urge and request of the President, the Congress of the United States, and the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare that appropriate action be taken to modify the guidelines of the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, particularly in such respects as may prevent the sudden and serious loss of large numbers of qualified teachers in the public school system of Louisiana and the attendant damage to the education of the children of this state; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate shall transmit, without delay, copies of this Resolution to the President of the United States, the presiding officers of each of the two Houses in Congress, the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and to each member of the Louisiana Delegation in Congress.

C. C. Aycock,
Lieutenant Governor and President of the Senate.

Vail M. Delony,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The 60th Anniversary of American Hungarian Foundation

SPEECH
OF
HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 6, 1967

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues in offering my congratulations to the American Hungarian Foundation on the occasion of its 60th anniversary. This splendid organization has for 60 years promoted knowledge of Hungarian culture and literature among the American people. They have busied themselves in educational and charitable pursuits over the years in helping Hungarian Americans to become well-informed and loyal citizens of the United States.

In recent years, the foundation has worked tirelessly against the atheistic and totalitarian ideology which has engulfed Hungary. They have sponsored over 50,000 Hungarian political refugees who have fled the oppression in their homeland to become citizens of the United States.

I congratulate them, Mr. Speaker, and wish them all success in the future.

Remarks of the Honorable William T. Murphy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 8, 1967

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask for unanimous consent to include into the Appendix of the Record a speech made by Representative Murphy of Illinois upon his return from Israel as the representative of Speaker McCormack to the dedication of the Israel Knesset—Parliament—on August 28, 1966. I think it is singularly appropriate at this time of crisis in the Middle East that the Members of the House have the benefit of Representative Murphy's statement giving the history and general background of the creation of the State of Israel.

The statement follows:

In August of last year it was my privilege to be the personal representative of the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives at the dedication of the new Knesset Building in Jerusalem. This was an occasion of extraordinary significance because the dedication was attended by Parliamentary leaders of forty-one nations throughout the world.

The State of Israel is a parliamentary democracy in which supreme authority is vested in the Knesset, the representative assembly.

The Knesset is a single chamber, 120 member legislature, elected for a four year term by universal suffrage under proportional representation.

During my eight-day tour of Israel, I had ample time to reflect on the great history of this Nation once called Canaan and later Palestine.

It was here that Jewish history began four thousand years ago. In 66 A.D. the Jews revolted against Rome and four years later the Roman General Titus captured Jerusalem, burned the city and destroyed the Temple. This was the beginning of the dispersion of the Jews, known as the "Diaspora" that has lasted almost two thousand years.

The Modern State of Israel had its beginning with the First Zionist Congress which met at Basle, Switzerland in 1897, and gave public voice to the right of the Jewish people to national restoration in their land.

This right was acknowledged by the "Balfour Declaration" made by the British Foreing Minister on November 2, 1917 and confirmed in the "Mandate for Palestine" of the League of Nations July 24, 1922.

This accorded international validity to the historical connection between the Jewish people and the land of Israel, and to their right to re-establish their National Home.

On November 29, 1947, the General Assembly of the United Nations adopted a resolution calling for the establishment of a Jewish State in Palestine.

On May 15, 1948, the date of the termination of the "British Mandate for Palestine", the "National Council" representing the Jewish people in Palestine, proclaimed the establishment of a Jewish State to be known as the "State of Israel", and also proclaimed that "The State of Israel will be open to Jewish immigration and the ingathering of exiles".

Israel is a country slightly larger than New Jersey. It has a varied topography which includes the hilly and mountainous area of Galilee in the north, the coastal plain and Judean hills in the center and the Negev desert in the south.

The principal cities are Jerusalem and Tel Aviv. Jerusalem, the capital of Israel, lies west and adjacent to the biblical city of Jerusalem which lies in Jordan. Tel Aviv, originally a suburb of the ancient City of Jaffe, is the largest city and cultural center of Israel. This country has three major seaports, in Haifa in the north, and Ashdod in the south both on the Mediterranean Sea, and Eilat on the Red Sea.

It has a population over two and one-half million people; about 89% of these are Jews and 11% non-Jews mostly Arabs. Judaism is the principal religion.

Literacy in this country is very high, approaching 90% for Jews and 50% for Arabs.

Israel has been making great progress since it became a State in 1948. It has been growing at a rate exceeding that of almost any other country in the world.

Its present Gross National Product is about three and one-half billion dollars or fourteen hundred dollars per capita.

Agriculture forms an important sector of the economy.

The main crops are citrus fruits which are exported in considerable quantity, and food stuff, such as vegetables, barley, wheat, and poultry products. However, she has to import grain, sugar, and meat which she does not produce in sufficient quantities for domestic consumption.

Industry has greatly expanded in Israel. Diamond cutting, textiles, potash, phosphates, rubber goods, are produced in quantity. Several of these diamonds, textiles and minerals, are exported.

Exports reached a total of four hundred and thirty million dollars in 1965 while imports that year came to eight hundred and thirty-five million dollars.

Since its independence Israel has received well over one billion dollars of United States Government Aid.

It also receives large sums annually from German reparation payments, private contributions from world Jewish organizations, and various loan funds for investment purposes.

The large Histadrut Labor Confederation acts as a roof organization for most of the country's labor unions. Cooperative enterprises find an important place in agriculture life, while government investment also assists many of the new industries.

Israel's precarious position, in a state of Armistice and not real peace with its neighbors, requires a large outlay for defense.

Universal military training for boys and girls provides a means of social integration as well as a preparation for defense.

The three major problems facing the State of Israel are her relations with her neighbors, water shortage, and assimilation of the Oriental Jews into the social and economic life of the community.

With reference to her neighbors, the armies of Egypt, Jordan, Syria, Lebanon, and Iraq invaded Israel a few hours after the proclamation of its independence. This action by the Arab military was aimed at the surpression of the National Liberation Movement in Palestine.

After seven months of intermittent fighting, during the first half of 1949, separate General Armistice Agreements were concluded between Israel and Egypt, Jordan, Lebanon, and Syria.

These Agreements are still in effect but there has been sporadic incidents in the northeast with Syria in the last year. The present relationship with her Arab neighbors affects the stability of the Middle East and has worldwide implications.

Insofar as the water shortage is concerned, nearly nine tenths of the proven water resources are in regular use. Most of the ground water and springs are already utilized. Strict economy and an efficient control over water use are, therefore, necessary. Recent progress in the desalination of sea and brackish water encourages the hope that the cost may become more acceptable for general utilization.

Speaking of the problem of assimilation, it has been the Western Jews from Europe with their great heritage of intellectual, scientific, and commercial achievements, who have guided Israel's growth so far. Against this dynamic background the cultural gap has become great between the settlers from the West and those from the East namely from Asia and Africa, because the Oriental Jews have lower incomes, larger families, a lower standard of living, and less education.

This, then, is a brief sketch of Israel today. It is an interesting place to be and to observe. Though its problems are great, one senses that the reserves of strength and courage are there for the maintenance of a free democracy and religious freedom in the Near East.

Resolutions Adopted by the New York State Department, Polish Legion of American Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 1967

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, at the 35th convention of the New York State Department, Polish Legion of American Veterans, several resolutions were passed. They have my wholehearted support, and I wish to include them in the Congressional Record.

The New York State Department, Polish Legion of American Veterans, is to be highly commended for their outstanding patriotism and continuous fight for freedom.

The resolutions follow:

Resolutions

Whereas, the Polish Legion of American Veterans is in favor of arrest, prosecution and conviction of any person or persons, organization or organizations who desecrate the United States flag by burning, tearing, treading upon or any other means.

Therefore be it resolved, that the delegates of the New York State Department's thirty-fifth convention, Polish Legion of American Veterans strongly support any legislation enacted, be it the State or National Government or both.

Whereas, the United States of America once again finds itself on the battlefield in support of freedom and

Whereas, the members of the Polish legion of American veterans have served their country with honor and distinction from World War I to the present and

Whereas, a small vociferous minority have questioned and in many cases condemned these actions in support of freedom, it is therefore

Resolved that the thirty-fifth annual convention of New York State Department, Polish legion of American veterans do hereby pledge their full support of our forces in Vietnam and any action our government dems necessary to bring a swift but meaningful end to that conflict.

Whereas, it is the duty of every American during a period of national emergency to serve his country, and

Whereas, in a Democratic country such as ours, the only known way to protect our liberty under threat, is through some form of the draft. The Polish legion of the American veterans urges all those eligible to submit patriotically and willingly to the service of their country, it is therefore,

Resolved, that the thirty-fifth annual convention of the New York State department, Polish legion of American veterans, do hereby demand that the Government of the United States of America prosecute to the fullest extent of the law any and all of those, who, regardless of their station or prominence refuse to serve their country in the armed forces.

Chairman Teague Says Lessons of History Warn Against Yielding to Aggression

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 1967

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished colleague and chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Teague], recently delivered an outstanding address on our commitment in Vietnam, placing America's fight against aggression and communism in Southeast Asia in historical perspective.

Excerpts from this address were reprinted in a recent issue of V.F.W. magazine, the publication of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and because of the interest of my colleagues and the American people in Vietnam, I am inserting these excerpts from Chairman Teague's address in the Appendix of the Record.

The excerpts follow:

The Way Out of Vietnam—"Win Our Way Out"

I support—on principle—the position of the Johnson administration on Vietnam.

I have some reservations about the way the war is being conducted. I feel we should step *up* our military effort in Vietnam, not decrease it. I believe we should do everything within our power to bring this dismal and degrading war to a quick and successful conclusion.

I say this advisedly and from experience. I hate war with all my heart. I have been a soldier—I have seen it close up—and anyone who has had that experience must hate everything about war.

I wish with all my being that there were an easy, cheap and honorable way to get out of Vietnam. There simply is no such thing. The only way we can get our soldiers out of Vietnam is to *win* our way out—fight our way out—bomb our way out.

And—despite all the agonized protests of the peaceniks and the bearded pickets—I never came across a single soldier in Vietnam who did not wholeheartedly agree with this point of view.

I talked with a lot of our fighting men—from General Westmoreland to the cooks in the field messes—the whole spectrum of our military commitment. They all hated the war. That's natural and normal. But even though they hated what they were doing—*every single one of them agreed that what they were doing was right and unavoidable.* Everyone to whom I spoke had faith in the righteousness of our cause, and the absolute necessity of victory.

And—at the risk of sounding intolerant—I want to say that I am far more inclined to accept their testimony than to accept the testimony of a bunch of bearded pickets in front of the White House.

My view on Vietnam is this:

We are there because we have a moral commitment there. That's point one. The United States of America is one of the few nations left in the world capable of feeling the force of having a moral commitment toward those weaker than ourselves. And I am proud of that. I wouldn't want it to be any other way.

But even more compelling is the global reason for our being there.

The battle against Communist tyranny in Southeast Asia and all the world is being fought today in Vietnam. We are not looking for temporary results, we are looking for permanent results. We are engaged in a battle to stop Chinese Communism just as cold as we have stopped Russian Communism in the Western world.

Vietnam is not an isolated battleground. It happens to be the place where we have drawn a line in the sand and have said we will not retreat one step further. It happens to be the place where we have decided to fight for the freedom of the entire East.

One thing is for sure: If the United States were to be so shortsighted as to abandon the fight, we would unwillingly and helplessly witness the spread of Communist despotism in ever widening circles throughout all Asia to a point where the freedom and the security of the entire world were threatened. If we were to abandon our crusade in Vietnam we would see the entire balance of power tilt irrevocably against us.

If we win our struggle—and I am sure we shall win—South Vietnam will become a successful bastion of democracy in the Asiatic orbit, just as South Korea has become—and we don't have a more successful product of our international policy of idealistic self-interest than South Korea.

Surely we have learned by this time—in such bitter classrooms as Munich and Yalta—that peace cannot be bought cheaply and whenever we attempt to buy peace foolishly at a basement bargain price, we end up by paying a price we cannot afford to pay.

The most frustrating point about Vietnam is that this is a war we could win any time we wanted to if we were only willing to take the steps necessary for victory. I am not a bloodthirsty man, or a vengeful man, or even a reckless man—but I cannot agree with the policy of fighting a limited war when that policy is extending the hostilities and costing the lives of our young men in uniform

I am *not* talking about atmoic bombing. We can win without that.

I *am* talking about giving our military commanders the authority to go out and demolish every worthwhile target in North Vietnam—air bases, hydroelectric power plants, the works.

With ordinary, conventional weapons we could close up the port of Haiphong as tight as a drum and stop the flow of war material by doing so.

If we were to do this—and I sincerely hope we do—the Communists would come running to the peace conference and we would be calling the shots at the negotiating table. That is the only way we can effect a meaningful peace.

As of now, the government of North Vietnam and the Viet Cong are convinced that the United States has neither the patience nor fortitude to carry the war to a successful conclusion. They are convinced that the Americans will-to-resist will collapse—and they overestimate the influence and the validity of the loud-mouthed minority which opposes and derides our efforts and our intentions in Vietnam.

These oppositionists are, in fact, prolonging the war. The Communists read all the publicity they create and are actually convinced that we are poised on the brink of an enormous political division on the war which will make our continued effort impossible.

We may not take the bearded pickets seriously, but the enemy does.

As a result of this, Ho Chi Minh has shown absolutely no sincerity in is mouthings about peace talks. He has not budged an inch from his insistence that we must withdraw our troops before such talks can begin. If we yielded to such a proposal we would be absolutely *through* as a world power. Every non-committed nation in the world would immediately look eastward for protection and support, since we would have proved ourselves morally independable and militarily incapable of subduing a third-rate power in a minor war.

We are sick of the war. We have had enough of it and we are a peaceful people. The rest of the world is sick of war. Every day we conitnue to fight in Vietnam gives our enemies, even in friendly nations, the opportunity to attack us and to misinterpret our intentions. The faster we put an end to the whole depressing—but necessary—business the better, not only for us, but for both the North and the South Vietnamese and for the rest of the free world.

If we agreed to stop our bombing of North Vietnam, they would interpret this as weakness and would achieve a military build-up which would make our efforts at negotiation futile. If we step up our bombing and make it impossible for North Vietnam to continue the war, we can then sit down and put our feet under the same table with the Communists, serene in the knowledge that we are bargaining from a position of strength, not weakness.

Our role in Vietnam is not sinful. It is heroic. We are fighting for the freedom of humankind. We are making enormous sacrifices for an unselfish principle. Our position is worthy not of scorn but of pride. And it's about time that more Americans treated this ordeal with the respect it deserves.

Buddhist Teacher Speaks on Attitude Toward United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 1967

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I, along with many other Representatives and Senators, have long felt that the fundamental conflict in South Vietnam is civil, and that the question of aggression from the north is not the central issue in this agonizing situation. The opposition of the Buddhists and the lack of allegiance by the peasants to the Ky government are forces which cannot be denied—there are substantial historic and political reasons for the strength of these forces. America's massive presence in support of the Ky regime has a significant effect on this civil conflict and on the people and spirit of South Vietnam. This effect is vividly described by Miss Cao Ngoc Phuong, a young Buddhist teaching botany at Saigon University, in the following article from the New York Times of May 17, 1967. I commend her comments to my colleagues and include the article in the Record at this point:

Buddhist Teacher Says "Most of Us Vietnamese" Hate the United States

(By R. W. Apple Jr.)

Saigon, South Vietnam, May 16.—Two months ago, 59 Saigon teachers and students drafted an appeal for peace and sent copies to pacifist groups around the world.

Today, one of those who signed the document, a 33-year-old teacher named Pham Thi Mai, was dead, having doused herself with gasoline and burned herself. She left behind half a dozen letters calling for an American withdrawal from Vietnam and appealing again for peace.

In one letter, delivered to Ambassador Ellsworth Bunker for transmission to President Johnson, Miss Mai wrote, "most of us Vietnamese hate, from the bottom of our hearts, the Americans who have brought the sufferings of this war."

She said, "the tons of bombs and money you have poured on our people have shattered our bodies and nationalist sentiments."

The peace petition was the idea of a frail young botany teacher at Saigon University, Cao Ngoc Phuong. She is a disciple of Thich Tri Quang, monk who organized the anti-Government movement last spring, and she was a strong influence on Miss Mai.

Miss Phuong, 29 years old, is shy and modest in the presence of foreigners, but she is regarded as a heroine by peace-oriented young intellectuals in South Vietnam.

In an interview at her sister's house near the Phuth racetrack, in southwestern Saigon, Miss Phuong conceded that she did not know exactly how the war could be ended.

But she said, with a look of agony, "If the war continues we will lose not only thousands of lives but all of the cultural and human values of our beloved country."

Again and again, she spoke of "the need for a just cause" and insisted that she and her generation has nothing to fight for. She assailed the policies of Premier Nguyen Cao Ky.

"What has Ky done for the peasants?" she asked. "What more does he offer than the Communists? If the South Vietnamese Army cannot win on the battlefield, it is because they do not defend anything worth defending.

"The North Vietnamese and the Vietcong have no foreign troops but we have so many. The majority of Vietnamese cannot distinguish between the French colonialists and the American allies. And the majority of Vietnamese cannot really believe in the goodwill of President Johnson to end this terrible war."

Speaking in halting English, with some phrases in French mixed in, Miss Phuong brushed her long black hair out of her eyes and continued.

"Many of my friends seem to have joined the Vietcong," she said. "We are losing the elite of our country. These people know the National Liberation Front is closely allied with the Communists and we don't like Communism. But they see no future in this Government.

"I think there must be a coup d'etat or some drastic change to generate a new spirit—a spirit of conciliation."

She was asked if she did not think it would be better to wait for the presidential election this fall and make a change in an orderly manner.

"They will not be real elections," she replied. "Oh, no!"

Miss Phuong said she would vote, if she could, for a man who favored opening negotiations with the National Liberation Front, the political organization of the Vietcong, and who had pledged to appoint a peace cabinet. But she said no such candidate would be permitted to run.

"So I shall go to the polls on election day," she added, "to urge all my friends to refuse to take part in electing Ky."

Picking distractedly at one of the shreds of red upholstery on the tattered settee next to her, Miss Phuong said carefully that she was "not anti-American" at all. She recalled having spent three weeks in New York in 1963, buying books on botany, and said she had a "very good time" there.

But she argued that the Americans were doing more harm than good in Vietnam.

"That was my brother-in-law," she said, pointing to a color photograph of a Vietnamese Army captain on the wall behind her.

"He was a district chief, down in the delta, and he was a very good man. The people loved him, and they warned him every time the Vietcong came to town.

"Then they sent an American adviser to help him, and the people said he was like the French. They didn't warn him any more. The Vietcong killed him."

Miss Phuong's political views are well known to the Government. The Chief of Police, Brig. Gen. Nguyen Ngoc Loan, has apparently put considerable effort into harassing her.

The University of Hue asked her to spend a week every two months teaching there, and she agreed. But when she arrived at the Hue airport on March 20, she was arrested and held for three days.

Although not formally charged, she was told that she had been picked up because she was carrying a propeace book, "Lotus in a Sea of Fire," by a Vietnamese Buddhist scholar, Thich Nhat Hanh. (The book was published in the United States by Hill & Wang last year).

After three days, Miss Phuong said, she was brought to Saigon and put in jail here. Three days later, she saw General Loan.

The young teacher supplied the following account of their conversation, which Government sources did not challenge:

General Loan asked Miss Phuong to send a letter to the rector at Hue, declining to come there to teach. She refused.

He Lists Restrictions

He then said that if she went to Hue to teach, she must promise to talk politics with no one and never to go to a pagoda. She would also be required to go to a police station in both cities to advise the authorities of her whereabouts.

"I am a free woman in a free country," Miss Phuong said she replied, "and I am not free when I go to Hue, I will not go to Hue at all, ever again."

General Loan arranged for her release, but since then she has been followed constantly by a plainclothesman. Today he stood conspicuously at a sidewalk stand that sells pho, a Vietnamese soup, across the street from her sister's house.

The Vanishing American Farmer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 1967

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the Ford Farming magazine recently reported alarming facts on the decrease in the number of American farms.

With the population and food problem being talked into prominence—the time has come for more relief for our farmers from bureaucratic control lest we, too, join that growing list of Socialist nations who are unable to feed their peoples. Just stopping agriculture imports from foreign countries would offer great assistance.

I insert the editorial from the Baton Rouge Morning Advocate, of June 5, and the UPI release of May 18 in the RECORD following my remarks:

[From the Baton Rouge Morning Advocate, June 5, 1967]

THE "VANISHING" FARMER

More than 2.4 million farms disappeared between 1939 and 1964 and the number of farms continued to decline rather rapidly. But the idea that agriculture is a faltering industry and all the farmers are thinking of going out of business is one of America's greatest myths. It is based on confusion about who is a farmer and what a farm is.

The editors of Ford Farming, a publication of the tractor division of the Ford Motor Company, support that statement with detailed statistics which provide a different and in fact much more correct and optimistic picture of American agriculture.

They point to the following facts:

Of the 3,326,000 farms estimated to be in operation in 1965—

—1.4 million grossed less than $2,500 per farm, netted less than $1,000, and accounted for only 4.3 per cent of the total farm production.

—410,000 grossed between $2,500 and $5,000, netted an average of $2,383, and accounted for 3.9 per cent of the total farm production.

—498,000 grossed between $5,000 and $10,000, netted an average of $3,471, and accounted for 9.5 per cent of the total farm production.

—519,000 grossed between $10,000 and $20,000, netted an average of $5,592, and accounted for 18.5 per cent of the total farm production.

—499,000 grossed more than $20,000, netted an average of $13,574, and accounted for 63.8 per cent of the nation's total farm production.

The publication notes, finally, that while farms with a gross income of $10,000 or less decreased by 1.7 million between 1954 and 1964, those with a gross of more than $10,000 increased by 375,000. In 1965 the top million farms with a gross of $10,000 or more accounted for 82.2 per cent of the nation's farm production. The 2,314,000 with a gross of $10,000 or less accounted for the remaining 17.8 per cent.

Agriculturists long have realized that so far as farm output and the nation's food supply is concerned, statistics on the number of farms can be made a sort of numbers game and given many different interpretations. Included in the large number of farms with a gross of less than $2,500 and a net of less than $1,095 are many which produce even less than these figures indicate and in fact contribute virtually nothing to the total marketed farm production.

Among the operators of these farms are the rural "underemployed" about whom there is a great deal of concern. But also among them are retired people, hobby farmers, part-time farmers and others who get most of their income from other sources and are little concerned about how much their farms actually produce.

From one point of view the farmer looks like the vanishing American. From the viewpoint of the farmers who actually do the most to feed the country, the farmer looks like a vigorous, growing and increasingly prosperous segment of the American economy.

VALLEY FARMER SAYS U.S. AG POLICY RUINOUS

WASHINGTON (UPI).—A fruit and vegetable grower from the rich Rio Grande Valley protested to Congress Wednesday that government trade and agriculture policies were forcing farmers out of business.

Mike Frost, secretary-treasurer of the Texas Farm Bureau, presented testimony to the House General Subcommittee on Labor.

"The Texas Valley fruit and vegetable growers have weathered many storms such as weather, price declines and labor shortages. These problems have been serious but our industry has made continued progress. We have for the past five years been confronted with a Washington attitude which has created problems for us that frankly we cannot solve," Frost said.

Over the past six years, Frost continued, 275 growers in the Valley have gone out of business. He added that between 35 and 40 per cent of the growers left in the region would go out of business in the next three years unless conditions changed.

One of the chief troubles, Frost said, was imports. He said agriculture imports from Mexico were up last year 119.39 per cent of what they were in 1961. He cited various commodities—strawberries, tomatoes, etc.—to back up his general contention. He also cited figures for various crops showing declines in carload shipments out of the Valley in recent years.

In summary our various legislative programs have authorized the administration to formulate programs that are forcing us to convert from hand labor to machines. The general trend is toward increased production costs and lower prices for our produce.

"Labor cannot and will not be paid more than what it produces. When Congress passes a law which sets a wage above what worker can produce it simply means that the worker is unemployed and that is our situation at the present time.

"Automation, inflation and other changes required to meet the standards set by legislation has increased our cost of production above the competing prices. In our case primarily Mexican production.

"Imports from Mexico come before our crops are ready for the market. This timing usually takes the bloom off some of our markets. This situation cannot be solved under present conditions.

"Our only move is to Mexico or another industry," Frost concluded.

Memories and the U.N. Dream

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. E. (BILL) BROCK

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 1967

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, I have here a clipping from the Chattanooga Times which contains the text of a letter from a mother to her son. It is no ordinary letter. Miller Smith was killed in World War II. He now rests besides thousands of his fellow Americans in a U.S. military cemetery in France. Each Memorial Day, Mrs. George Smith writes to her son. The letter is mailed to the newspaper as a remembrance of Miller Smith and of all his countrymen who have given their lives in the defense of fredom.

It is indeed a regrettable circumstance that, 22 years after the end of World War II, we still seem to be far from achieving that peace with freedom for which Miller Smith and his fellow soldiers gave their lives.

I commend this letter—the sentiment and the message which it conveys—to the attention of every Member of this House. I include it in the Appendix to the RECORD:

ON MEMORIAL DAY: MEMORIES AND THE U.N. DREAM

(By Emily Miller Smith)

(NOTE.—A valued contributor to The Times, Mrs. George Blackwell Smith writes movingly of human aspirations and realities on this day.)

MY DEAR YOUNG SOLDIER: Once more, my son, using this form of a letter to you I offer Memorial Day tribute to our beloved country's heroic war dead. For Memorial Day is here again. This is May 1967. The years plunge on heralding always to mortal man permanence of change. And, oh, how greatly the world has changed, my forever young son, since you and your comrades of World War II died to make it a better place, died for your dear homeland, died in the hope of an achieved lasting peace.

Yet, one thing has not changed, one thing most certainly has not changed in the nearly 200 years since the American colonists fought to establish independence on this continent, and did establish an independent nation, the United States of America. For fine young Americans drawn from the flower of American youth still die in battle fighting for American's ideals and for her freedom and for her survival. And so, on this unutterably bitter Memorial Day as we Americans pay proud and heartfelt homage to the legions of our young countrymen who have died in battle throughout our country's history, it is with the heartbreaking knowledge that even now splendid young Americans are bravely and, alas, apparently necessarily adding their red American blood to the Seven Red Stripes in our flag.

Our world is indeed greatly changed, my son, since the days of World War II. Our globe still turns in space, but nowadays in a space of considered other worlds which man seriously aspires to understand, to visit and perhaps eventually to colonize. Yet, not even in the quest for those God-given secrets—which perhaps concern every moment of the life of every human being—are the great minds of earth permitted to labor openly together!

At the time you trod your mortal span, dear son, this world was largely composed of more or less isolated nations, dwelling side by side by often quite alien to each other, controlled by their isolated nationalisms of culture and belief. There are no longer truly isolated nations in this earth, or isolated lands even isolated peoples. Widespread technological knowledge and application, booming developments in travel and communication have seen to that. But, strangely, isolated nationalisms of culture and action and belief continue to exist and there is indication they are growing steadily stronger. Russia and China are probably examples. And we ourselves are in perhaps dire danger of being flung back into blindly overwhelming desire for a completely isolationist type of nationalism. Of course, the time most definitely has come when we Americans must take stock of our own brand of nationalism, which is applied democracy, its workings, its outstanding success and its glaring mistakes and failures both at home and abroad. But even our urgent, our most urgent concentration on our own country must not lure us into aloofness from the world, because there is no corner of that world, and our own beloved United States of America is no longer an exception, where men can take refuge from the machinations and the assaults of their fellow men.

The world has indeed changed, dear young son. In many ways, in countless ways it is a better place than ever before. Man holds in the hollow of his hand the answers for the whole world's fuller betterment. But—man also holds within the hollow of his hand the immediate power to pile the ashes of our great, vaunted 20th-Century Civilization upon the dust heap of the dead past. At the present moment we are most keenly aware of that horrifying fact.

How very hard the United States of America struggled to establish unbreakable peace at the end of World War II! The recollection of our lack of zeal for Woodrow Wilson's League of Nations amounted to sort of a national guilt obsession, and certainly helped lead us into an incredible measure of overzeal for the United Nations, into some perhaps rather hastily approved and other somewhat perilous commitments, and, worst of all, into overgenerous and self-effacing acquiescence in the selfishness of other nations. Many of us looked back to World War I and felt that a strong League of Nations could have prevented the Second. Perhaps it might have—one can never be sure of the might-have-beens!

The United States was most enthusiasitically proud of the establishment of the United Nations. We Americans believed that it could and would work. Then the Korean War swooped upon us. We have swallowed insult after insult in our constant and tenacious effort to make the United Nations succeed. We have never deserted the United Nations although the same cannot be said of the organization's attitude toward us. We have run the risk of jeopardizing our own economy in our prodigal gifts to foreign aid, ofttimes receiving in return not even lip-service respect for the principles and institutions of American democracy. But, oh how many starving children, how many of the sick and disabled and downtrodden we have helped! Probably many of the recipients are not ungrateful, merely incapable of understanding. But there has certainly been much exploitation of the funds by the unscrupulous and the thieving.

With our heads in the billowing clouds of our United Nations dream of America's being all thing to all men, our feet stumbled into the ghastly war in Vietnam, into a ground war in Asia. We are in it and we cannot withdraw, evidently from the standpoint of our own national safety we cannot be defeated there. Yet we have to realize that this is no old-fashioned war from which victorious armies march home, breathe a sigh of relief and proceed to the serenity of their civilian duties. While we must have a victory in Vietnam it is unclear to many of us what victory there constitutes.

The Vietnam war is a terrible problem and one that is tearing at the hearts of all true Americans, but it is not our only problem. The entire world seems to be in turmoil. At home our nation is assailed by law-breakers and lawbreaking. In tolerating contempt for certain laws we have inadvertently fostered contempt for the constituted obedience to law and order which is the absolutely necessary foundation of the American system of government. The time has definitely come for us to insist on the strict enforcement of laws, and to set in motion a concerted and powerful concentration on the repeal of all outmoded or discriminatory laws. If we continue to tolerate contempt for law we may actually destroy our own beloved country.

A fortnight ago, dear son, your Dad and I stopped once again by Yorktown. As I stood reading the names on the tablet beside the monument it was as if all the gay, happy young Americans who have fought this nation's wars were gathered there, not only those like yourself who died on the field of battle, but all the others who fought, and lived to give of themselves in devoted service in civilian life to the principles of democracy which Americans so firmly believe. And I grieved that any American citizen is ignorant or unappreciative of his country's history, her greatness, the magnificent possibilities of her future, and her unequaled contributions of every type to the welfare of mankind.

Always at Yorktown I see in my mind's eye the French ships. This time my thoughts flew to the United States Military Cemeteries in France—of course to one in particular. And I had the feeling that however much France's recent treatment of the United States has coroded the long existent link between the two nations it will somehow never be completely severed.

We shall be thinking of you this Memorial Day, our dear young soldier, and of your grave beneath a cross in France. But I am comforted because I know that for you the Promise of the Cross is eternally fulfilled.

One does not mail letters to the dead. As always I am sending this to a newspaper. Even in this dark hour the struggle for peace and friendship among the men of earth continues. If this letter can be of any small use I hope it will be published.

Devotedly,

MOTHER.

Memorial Day Speech

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DEL CLAWSON

OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 8, 1967

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, during Memorial Day observances this year in my home city of Compton, Calif., an address was given by a Compton teenager, Pamela Brown, which was so well received by those of us attending, and which displayed such a depth of understanding of the meaning of Memorial Day that I would like to commend it to the attention of my colleagues in the House. I have known the family of Pamela Brown for several years. In fact, they are neighbors on the same street in Compton. And so it gives me particular satisfaction to include this fine Memorial Day speech in the Appendix of the RECORD. The text follows:

MEMORIAL DAY SPEECH

Today we are gathered together for the purpose of observing a day that has been set aside for many years, dedicated to memorializing those brave men and women who have laid down their lives in the defense of our Nation. This is the day when throughout the Nation many speeches are being made and many different thoughts are being expressed as to what Memorial Day really means.

As the person selected to deliver this speech for the Disabled American Veterans I represent an organization of nearly a quarter of a million veterans who have very strong feelings about Memorial Day. To many of these men and women it brings to mind recollections of the events that transpired that made them disabled persons. Perhaps today they are thinking of those who were less fortunate than they and who died as a result of the same mechanism of warfare that brought about their own disabilities.

It is time for sober reflection and the one burning question of "Why?" Why did these men and women have to die and what is the meaning and purpose behind their untimely deaths? Perhaps a disabled person might ask the same question as to his disabilities—why did he have to become disabled? What is the sum total of achievement, if any, and why do we have a Memorial Day?

At another time in our history such a question would seem superflous, if not ridiculous, for there has been a time in this Nation when patriotic ideals and values were unquestioned. Today there are those in our midst who would devaluate American patriotism. There are those who think it is unsophisticated to call oneself a patriotic American. Our sophisticated brothers tell us that such utterances are "corny" and the bright intellectuals tell us that we must be one-world minded and forget all the old fashioned talk about loyalty to one's Nation and to the principles upon which our Nation was founded. These people forget that were it not for the United States of America, with it's freedom of speech and of thought, such utterances as these sophisticates might well result in permanent residence in a concentration camp.

We here today honor Memorial Day because we want to remember. We want to think of the GI Joes we helped lay to rest on foreign soil. We want to remember him as a patriotic American. He was not an idealist or a philosopher, sometimes he was not even too brilliant but he had something no other Nation could give him—he had a sense of meaning and this sense of meaning told him that what he had here in these United States was better than his foreign cousins had ever been able to produce. He might not have been a particularly brave man, he might have been just as frightened as any man can possibly be but to him what he was fighting for was so overpowering that to lose any of the great freedoms that came to him as an American was intolerable. Even death itself was better than living under tyranny.

He was fighting for the preservation of the way of life he had come to love and respect, not just for himself, but for his loved ones as well. We wanted his children to be brought up with the full advantages he had come to cherish. He wanted his home and the home of his parents to be inviolate from the brutal heel of the tyrant. If he could speak to you today he might say he fought to preserve the right to disagree, the right to vote for whichever candidate he chose, the right to pick himself up with his family and move to any place in the Nation he wanted to move and still maintain the full measure of freedom he enjoyed in the place of his birth. Yes, he needed to be permitted to do all the things we Americans today accept as commonplace but which many other men and women may only do by special permission of an iron-fisted dictatorship. This is why those we honor here today left their homes to die upon a foreign shore.

We pause today to pay tribute to these champions of our way of life. Perhaps more than ever before in our history we need to remind ourselves of these things of which I have spoken.

Memorial Day is the day of marching bands, waving flags, a day of recreation, boating, golfing, and hundreds of other activities which are enjoyed by prosperous and peaceful Americans. Historically, Memorial Day began in 1868 when General John A. Logan, then Commander of the Grand Army of the Republic, issued his now-celebrated general order designating May 30 as a day set aside for the decoration of the graves of those who had died in the Civil War. The stark tragedy of our great Civil War, with all its bitterness, has faded into the pages of history. In its place have come other wars and new graves cut in lands far removed from the sites of that great conflict.

Yet, as we stand here today reflecting upon the nobility of the great sacrifices made by those we honor here today, it comes to us that all of them have parted this life for the same purpose, and that purpose is the preservation of Americanism and American ideals. The preservation of a system of laws and not of men. A system where men gather together and elect their chosen representatives to create the law of the land by which we are governed and by which we prosper. It is a system that provides that no one man is greater than the law, or, for that matter, any group of men who would deny the will of the people.

As we bow our heads in sober reflection and sorrow, as we pray for the departed heroes of our battles, we can give thanks that this Nation has been able to produce such men and women of courage and valor. We here today must rededicate ourselves to those principles. It is our God given right and responsibility that we must continue to defend American ideals and American principles whenever they are attacked within our own Nation. We must continue to bring the message of Memorial Day to the youth of our Nation. It is part of their heritage that they should know the full reason and spirit of this great patriotic day.

The America we know and love today was not built upon a one day a year basis. It was built and it is reflected in the entire history of our Nation, full of chapters of sacrifice and deprivation that has made us the greatest Nation of men ever known upon this earth. We must take a bit of Memorial Day with us each year and keep it in our hearts and on our minds and let it be rekindled each year on this day to keep the fire of freedom ever burning.

Memorial Day asks the question of "Why?" and, as we reflect upon it, it gives us the answer. As we depart from here to go about our normal pursuits let us remember the words of Abraham Lincoln who said—"It is for us the living rather to be dedicated here to the unfinished work which they who fought here have thus far so nobly advanced." This statement was made at Gettysburg, but it is just as true today as it was then. Let no American be afraid to say he is an American. Let no American fail to show his pride in his Country and in its great works.

Memorial Day is both a day of sadness and rejoicing; sadness because of the thousands of lives that have been sacrificed to make us what we are today, rejoicing in the knowledge that those sacrifices have not been made in vain.

Housing Discrimination and the Negro Serviceman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 8, 1967

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, there is much weeping these days among certain people about the Defense Department's efforts to prevent housing discrimination against Negro servicemen and their families. Apparently there are those among us who, in the guise of protecting the right of privacy, place property rights, or perhaps more correctly, although wrongfully, the right to discriminate above the lives of our fighting men.

I am, therefore, inserting in the Record a letter which I have received from one of those fighting men, Maj. Lawrence K. Johnson, a Negro who is not only fighting today in Vietnam for our democracy but is also a member of a strategic service unit whose job it is to sell our way of life to the people of Southeast Asia.

Major Johnson describes how he cannot even purchase a home of his choice in the Los Angeles area for his family for no other reason than the color of his skin.

Perhaps if we would reflect on the implications of this case, we might come to understand our difficulties in convincing the peoples of the world, two-thirds of whom are dark skinned, that we are sincerely fighting for democracy.

Equally effective as our military might in winning eventual victory over the enemy is our posture of democracy here at home which cannot be sold to others if we continue to discriminate in housing, in our schools, and in employment. If we require our youth to face death at the front, we can at least sacrifice our own prejudices to make the cause for which they fight a just one.

The letter follows:

May 16, 1967.

Congressman Augustus Hawkins,
Congressman, State of California,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: The enclosed letter is self explanatory. I would appreciate any advice, guidance and assistance you can give me. Thank you for your help.

Sincerely,
Lawrence K. Johnson.

May 16, 1967.

Realty Board, Spring Realty & Nichols Realty,
Palos Verdes Peninsula, Calif.

Gentlemen: Since October last year my wife and I have tried without success to purchase a home on the Palos Verdes Peninsula. We have tried the majority of the realtors in the area, concentrating our effort with Spring Realty and Nichols Realty.

Our wants and needs are quite simple; a $35,000–$45,000, 2 or 3 bedroom, new house with a family room and separate dining room. We have made several offers but with no acceptance.

In a letter from my wife she indicates that she has been told that nothing in Palos Verdes is available for sale to her because we are negroes. This has been told us by Mr. Brame of Spring Realty and Tuesday of last week by a Mrs. Fuller of Nichols Realty. I will retire in September of this year after 25 years of service which includes WW II, Korea, and Vietnam. I also was on standby for Berlin, Cuba, and Lebanon.

I am particularly disturbed because I am in Vietnam fighting for a democratic way of life. I am a part of an Infantry unit that has covered itself with glory in Search and Destroy operations, Cordon and Search and now in Revolutionary Development. This last phase is trying to win the minds and hearts of the Vietnamese people while giving a firm measure of protection and feeling of security to the villages and hamlets. This pacification program will lead to the ultimate victory over our adversaries because we will win the people's minds and hearts.

However, it seems that I need to win the minds and hearts of my fellow, free democratic Americans. I face death, as do all the soldiers here, on a daily basis. I do it willingly because I believe in democracy and freedom of choice. I am proud of our "ideals". But you make me wonder if you know what this world wide struggle is all about. Yes, I want to "reach" you to appeal to your minds and hearts. We believe here that anyone who believes in God cannot be part of the Viet Cong. I also believe that anyone, in America, who *really* believes in God cannot practice prejudice, bigotry, and discrimination. Do you believe in God?

My appeal is simple, I want to find a realtor who will sell us a house without fear or prejudice. I am addressing my appeal to three sources, to the real estate dealers we have previously contacted and to the Realty Board in the Peninsula area. I am sending copies of this letter to my senator, to my congressman, and to the governor to be investigated at all levels. But back to my appeal if you or any realtor is interested in selling a house, contact my wife Bertha at: 12612½ Wilmington Ave., Compton, California, Telephone: NE 6-9086.

I can well afford to buy anywhere I desire as I have substantial savings accounts with two savings and loan associations. I have a savings account with the Bank of America, have the maximum in the Uniform Savings Program here in Vietnam, own and rent seven (7) houses in the Los Angeles area and am free of debt.

I would like to wrap this up with an appeal for help. Please, advise what you can do for me as I'm doing a lot over here for you and yours.

Sincerely,
Lawrence K. Johnson.

Flat Creek Watershed Project and Recreational Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 8, 1967

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Hollis R. Williams, Deputy Administrator for Watersheds, Soil Conservation Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, delivered the principal address on the occasion of the dedication of the Flat Creek watershed project and recreational development located near Walnut Ridge, in Lawrence County, Ark.

Mr. Williams worked with the sponsors of the project from its inception when he was State conservationist located at Little Rock, Ark., and has followed its progress to its fruition. This project demonstrated full well the cooperation of community, county, State, and Federal governments, all interests working in harmony in behalf of the project.

Hollis R. Williams is America's foremost authority on soil and water conservation. He received the Department of Agriculture's Distinguished Service Award in 1965. In 1966 he was awarded the degree of fellow by the Soil Conservation Society of America in recognition of his achievement and leadership in connection with soil and water conservation.

Mr. Williams is a native of Vilonia, Ark., where he is a landowner. He holds a bachelor of science degree in physical and biological sciences from Arkansas State Teachers College. He also attended Hendrix College in Conway, Ark., and was awarded his law degree from North Texas School of Law at Fort Worth, Tex. He has been Deputy Administrator for Watersheds since 1959, where he is responsible for watersheds and flood prevention work of the Soil Conservation Service.

The program participants, in addition to Mr. Williams, included the following: L. N. Moody, minister; R. S. Rainwater, chairman, Lawrence County Soil and Water Conservation District; Brooks Penn, judge; E. C. Gathings, Representative, First District, Arkansas; William B. Davey, State conservationist, Soil Conservation Service; Wilbur D. Mills, Representative, Second District, Arkansas;

C. C. Snapp, supervisor, Lawrence County Soil and Water Conservation District; Winthrop Rockefeller, Governor; James E. Tillman, minister.

Mr. Williams' provocative and forthright address follows:

ADDRESS BY HOLLIS R. WILLIAMS, DEPUTY ADMINISTRATOR FOR WATERSHEDS, SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, AT THE DEDICATION OF LAKE CHARLES RECREATION DEVELOPMENT, FLAT CREEK WATERSHED PROJECT, ARKANSAS, MAY 28, 1967

I'm always pleased to return home to Arkansas, and to be with my people. This trip is an especially proud one.

To honor, to dedicate the fruition of many years' labor in Lawrence County;

To look at what Arkansas, and their own groups, and their governments, have done together;

To testify that here is a community that is showing the way to progress, advancement, a fuller life.

I know what Lake Charles Recreation Park means to you—what was envisioned by the late Jimmie Sloan, who knocked on doors about conservation when soil conservation districts were only a dream, who promoted the Flat Creek Watershed Project when the watershed program was mostly on paper—to C. C. Snapp, R. Sloan Rainwater, and other strong unselfish community leaders who helped make Flat Creek project a reality, and to county, state, and federal government people whose helping hand meant a great deal.

I am happy that I was associated with these people in the early stages of this activity, and I'm certainly happy about the results of their labors.

I know what I am going to think about every time I see this beautiful Lake Charles with its tame waters and scenic shores providing enjoyment for our citizens: Cooperation.

Flat Creek is known across the nation as an example of the outstanding success that can be made by farmers, businessmen, agencies, organizations, all working together to solve mutual problems and take advantage of mutual opportunities. Nowhere else has a state fish and game commission, for example, taken such an active role.

I'm going to think about what that kind of cooperation has made possible in my Arkansas and around the nation.

Caney Creek, where careful conservation land treatment and seven floodwater-retarding structures like this one we are gathered near are protecting the City of Wynne and nearby bottomland farms, and at the same time are making possible 40,000 or more visitor-days of healthful outdoor recreation.

Muddy Fork of the Illinois, where new supplies of water from a watershed reservoir have brought new life, new hustle to the town of Lincoln where the economy used to be on the downswing.

Poteau River, where flood protection and new water supplies are making the City of Waldron a better place to live.

The many other multiple-purpose watershed projects in Arkansas that make me proud to be a part of this great land.

And hundreds of other projects with similar successes in America's can-do watershed program.

I'm going to think, when I see Lake Charles, about the broadening of the watershed concept, because of the way you people on Flat Creek have been at the forefront in most of its growth.

From the original—and still primary—objectives of watershed protection and flood prevention, the watershed program has come to include a variety of other purposes—recreation, water supplies for town or industry, irrigation, drainage, and fish and wildlife improvements. Six pieces of legislation are now in the Congress to add water quality control as a purpose under Public Law 566. The outlook is for continuing attention to broader resources development through the watershed approach.

Mainly, whoever visits Lake Charles from this day forward will see people having fun—people living right here in Lawrence County, or thousands of visitors from three or more states.

As of May 1, the Soil Conservation Service was helping local watershed project sponsors develop recreation facilities in 112 projects in 33 states, building new opportunity for outdoor relaxation where none had been before. This is a contribution that is sorely needed.

Our outdoor recreation needs are going to more than double in the next decade, as more people and more leisure time are added every day. You can see how crowded our public parks and camping areas are right now, even in the "wide open spaces" out West.

At Yosemite Park, California, 54,000 people tried to cram into the park one Fourth of July weekend. Campers sometimes have to wait days for a spot near Glacier Point. All the problems of a city are here—crime, sewage disposal difficulties, bumper-to-bumper traffic, smog from thousands of campfires.

At Grand Canyon, 15,000 visitors a day pour in. Not so long ago, you could stop along the mule trail there for hours without anyone else coming by. Not far into the future, that narrow trail probably will be an 8-lane superpath, with helicopters overhead directing traffic and snack bars around every bend.

So our "wide open spaces" are getting narrower all the time.

We probably can develop a few more big parks in isolated areas of the West. But what we need even more, in every part of the country, are recreation spots close enough to towns and cities so that people can reach them for Sunday outings. We need more developments in community-size watersheds like Flat Creek and on farm and local park land near cities.

Recreation for urban people is not a new need, but it has new urgency.

Forty years ago, there were fewer Americans, smaller cities and more open space. Town and city children could play on the vacant lot next door. Today that vacant lot is an 11-story apartment building. The empty alley used for baseball is an 8-lane freeway. The big lot on the edge of town where they went horseback riding became a suburb long ago. The old swimming hole is polluted by city sewage. The woods for hiking are a shopping center, and the old city park is now a parking lot.

Outdoor recreation used to be a free gift of Nature. Now, we've got to plan to save land for hiking trails, ponds, and parks. And we've got to properly develop the sites we have so that, as our population and industries grow and demand more room, we will still have enough open space to make life pleasant.

The need for outdoor recreation is not an "extra" tacked onto the so-called "real life" of work. It is basic to us all—the need for frequent re-involvement with Nature and its Creator through which we gain a sense of well-being and harmony. This need becomes greater as our world grows more complex.

A desire for reunion with nature is common to everyone. John Hershey's book "Hiroshima" describes how, after the bomb was dropped, men and women instinctively headed for the parks and open spaces, in a desire to cling to something fundamental. Here in America, in totally different circumstances, millions of suburbanites spend an extra hour or two a day commuting to a home where they can live near a little space and greenery.

We can, through our care of land and its resources, make a moment with Nature available to more men and women for their strength, comfort, and pleasure. Watershed recreation developments like Lake Charles and those on privately owned farms and ranches throughout rural America go a long way toward meeting this need.

I want to pay a special "thank you" to the Forest Service for its expert help in designing the fine facilities for recreation that you see around Like Charles and that you will see as you visit many other watershed recreation areas. Throughout its long history of caring for and improving our 183 million acres of National Forests, the Forest Service has been working to build expertise in how to make these areas more enjoyable for the visiting public, and we in the Soil Conservation Service are grateful for the Forest Service's sharing its knowhow.

It is this kind of sharing of knowledge by many parties—and rolled-up shirtsleeves—that gives the watershed program, and all of our resource conservation effort, the image that it has of being an effective medium for solving some of America's most critical resource problems.

It is the blending of local talents in a flexible framework that makes the watershed program fit everywhere in the nation . . . that takes it out of a regional or purely local context and makes it workable wherever there are soil and water problems that need to be solved.

And there are many.

The National Inventory of Soil and Water Conservation Needs, first completed in 1962 and now being updated, found that some 8,300 small watersheds out of a total of 12,000 need the kind of resource action that Public Law 566 watershed projects can provide. With only 1,300 projects in even the planning stage, you can see that we need to step up our efforts.

Let's take just one of the resource problems that need to be dealt with hurriedly—water.

Water . . . how vital a substance it is in our life—for thirst, for food, for health. What a friend it is when it is available in the right quantity at the right time, and at the right place.

What an enemy it is when it rushes too quickly down our streams and rivers, destroying, clogging, and sogging our very existence.

Representatives of more than 40 nations—from Afghanistan to Yugoslavia—are gathered this very week in our Nation's Capital at an International Conference and Exposition on Water For Peace to trade information and seek ways to meet water needs around the globe.

We take water for granted, but more than 900 million people were without any kind of public water service in 1964; only one person in nine in the world had water piped to where he lives.

Those who are gathered in Washington today recognize that water development is fundamental to the elimination of poverty in the world and to raise the quality of man's life.

Water is but one great resource need; it cannot be divorced from the land's resources with which it is interrelated. More attention to protection and proper use of all our resources—soil, water, mineral, plant, animal, air—is vital.

The kind of heads-up resource conservation that America's landowners and operators are working on is the key to making sure we marshall our resources for a better life.

I am proud that Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman looked to the small watershed program as a fine example of this conservation activity, when he dedicated the 1,000th wateshed project dam in neighboring Texas last fall. He pointed to conservation as the key to providing services and jobs that will enable Americans to live where they want to—in city or country.

"Conservation means building an economic base in the countryside", the Secretary said, "one that has both utility and beauty . . . which will make it possible for millions more to live and work and play in rural America rather than jamming together in our great cities and creating almost insolvable problems . . .

"Conservation means making the best possible use of space. Seventy percent of Americans now live in 1 percent of the space available in the Nation. If the present trend continues, by the year 2,000 four out of five Americans will live in metropolitan areas . . .

"The time has come," Secretary Freeman said, "to give Americans a choice of where they want to live. This can only be done by providing rural America with services and economic opportunities equal to those in the big cities. Industry will locate in the countryside because it is good business to do so.

"Conservation is a key to providing these services and opportunities. It harnesses the basic natural resources that are mostly underdeveloped and puts them to work for the good of the people. A solid, properly developed and properly managed natural resource base is essential to the welfare and prosperity of a community, a State, a nation.

The Secretary pointed to the small watershed project to prove that rural America is able to provide living and working space for millions more than at present.

He noted that more than 500 businesses and industries have located in watershed areas, attracted by new water supplies and opportunity for recreation and attractive country living for their employees.

"A watershed project," he said, "like all soil and water conservation developments, is an economic shot in the arm. As the pebble cast on the pond, it spirals into countless other economic ripples that weave a new pattern of community growth and prosperity in areas that in many cases were dead or on their way to oblivion."

We are gathered today on the shores of Lake Charles to honor the efforts of many people—town and country alike—who have given a shot in the arm to Lawrence County. We need to get rural folks and townspeople all over America to work together this way, to blend the city and the countryside to make a better life in every corner of this great nation.

For, as Benjamin Franklin said to his fellow "rebels" during the Revolutionary War, "Gentlemen, if we don't all hang together, we shall hang separately." If we don't all work together for our common good, we and our children will regret it.

We can change our lives for the better by putting all our shoulders to the wheel, as you are doing, in the Flat Creek watershed project and in the Lawrence County Soil and Water Conservation District.

The late Adlai Stevenson once said, "There is a new America every morning when we wake up. It is upon us whether we like it or not. This new America is the sum of many small changes—a new subdivision here—a new school there—a new industry where yesterday there was vacant swampland—changes that add up to a transformation of our lives. Our task is to guide these changes. For, although change is inevitable, change for the better is a full-time job."

America's conservation leaders—including the people gathered at Lake Charles—are assuring that our America will change for the better.

This is a proud occasion. Let us resolve to continue our mutual job of bettering this earth, that we and our children shall have proud tomorrows. As John Ruskin wrote so eloquently in his book, "The Seven Lamps of Agriculture," "God has lent us the earth for our life; it is a great entail."

God bless our Flat Creek watershed, our Arkansas, our great Nation, and the fine citizens whose work we dedicate here.

Vietnam War Being Compromised in African Campaign?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 1967

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the recent Allen-Scott report suggests that our leaders may have made concessions to the Russian Communists to prevent their threatened intervention in the Arab-Israeli confrontation.

The American people wonder what and how far we went. When, if ever, will they be fully advised? Could it have been that the African-Middle East war was encouraged by the Kremlin crowd in order to gain relief for their Vietcong allies and to smokescreen Castro's revolutionary threats in Latin America?

While some encounter difficulty in assessing the North Vietnamese aggression to Russia, our leaders have no difficulty in knowing to whom to turn for negotiation, compromise, and discussion.

If Communist Russia is the conscience in control of peace in Vietnam, Cuba, and northeast Africa, is she not also in responsibility for the war effort?

Aggression dare not prosper—for if it prosper none dare call it aggression.

I follow my remarks with the Allen-Scott report of June 5.

GOLDBERG WANTS VIETNAM AND MIDDLE EAST LINKED

(By Robert S. Allen and Paul Scott)

WASHINGTON.—U.N. Ambassador Arthur Goldberg has touched off a heated debate in administration inner circles by proposing a U.S.-Soviet deal linking Vietnam and the Middle East.

In bargaining for Russia's cooperation to keep guns from exploding in the Gulf of Aqaba, Goldberg reportedly is urging President Johnson to offer the Kremlin concessions disturbing to other presidential advisers.

The Goldberg proposal calls for the U.S. to offer guarantees of continued safe passage for Communist ships to North Vietnam ports in exchange for similar assurances for Western ships to Israel, including those passing through the Gulf of Aqaba.

To enforce this "freedom of the seas" agreement, the Goldberg plan would provide that U.N. pilots be assigned to vessels requesting them. If a ship was intercepted or its passage blocked, the U.S. and Russia would join in action, under the U.N. charter, to assure passage to either Israel or North Vietnam, including the port of Haiphong.

OPPOSING THE LINK

Significantly, Secretary of State Rusk who opposed concessions to Khrushchev after the Cuban missile crisis in 1962, has taken the lead in vigorously opposing Goldberg's proposal.

In the White House discussions, Rusk has argued against linking Vietnam and the Middle East on the grounds this could result in widening the conflicts into a world crisis should negotiations fail.

Also, Rusk contends the Soviets, if granted this concession in Vietnam, would press for others by stirring up new troubles in Berlin, Cuba, and Korea.

Although making clear that he still opposes a U.S. naval blockade of North Vietnam Rusk stressed that this option should be left open for the President. He pointed out that a blockade might become necessary if China and-or Russia should send "volunteers" to North Vietnam.

The secretary also urged to President Johnson that the job of the U.S. representative at the United Nations is to carry out policy, not to try make it.

OPEN QUESTION

While President Johnson hasn't yet taken sides in the Goldberg-Rusk dispute, administration insiders are betting he will eventually back his secretary of state.

Ever since Ambassador Goldberg talked him into urging U Thant to accept another term as Secretary-General, President Johnson has turned more and more to Secretary Rusk for advice on U.N. matters.

When a member of the House remarked at a White House affair recently that he was going to New York to discuss a U.N. issue with Ambassador Goldberg, the President told him:

"Take it up with Secretary Rusk. You will get the best advice from him. I should never have listened to Goldberg when he asked me to persuade U Thant to stay on. The secretary-general is against us on Vietnam and everything else."

FOOD AS A WEAPON

Two weeks before the crisis broke over Egypt's blockade of the Israeli port of Elath, President Nasser received an old British friend in Cairo.

Conversation ranged over the regime economic problems—and in particular the wheat shortage.

"Our granaries have supplies left for only two weeks," said Nasser. "The Americans have cut off supplies to put pressure on me, but it will backfire on them. I will get it from them one way or the other. The Russians will send it even if they must buy the grain in the U.S."

The story, relayed by the U.S. embassy in London to the State Department, illuminates the importance Nasser attaches to U.S. wheat shipments.

It also is the basis for a Central Intelligence Agency warning that Nasser plans to use his threat of blockading the Gulf of Aqaba to try to obtain a payoff in U.S. grain.

Because of poor growing weather in Southern Russia, the CIA states, the Kremlin has informed Nasser it can supply only enough wheat to feed the U.A.R. for about three months. After September, Nasser was told his wheat supplies must come from the U.S.

These intelligence authorities assert Nasser believes that by threatening and then pulling back from a big war he can be rewarded—as the Russians were, following the Cuban missile crisis. After the 1962 showdown, the Kennedy administration approved a massive sale of wheat to Moscow.

Nasser's troublemaking in Yemen and Aden was the reason the U.S. decided to stop wheat shipments earlier this year. Since then Nasser has defaulted on $1.8 million of principal and $900,000 in interest owed on loans made through the U.E. Export-Import Bank for past shipments.

Resolution of Support

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. TUNNEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 1967

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following resolution passed by the Associated Student Body of Riverside California City College. I do not believe that anyone in this Nation, regardless of their views on the efficacy or conduct of the Vietnam conflict, can deny that support is due our fighting men in that embattled land in Southeast Asia.

RESOLUTION OF SUPPORT

Whereas, we believe that the United States Forces serving in Vietnam deserve the loyalty and support of the Citizens of the United States; and

Whereas, we, as college students and loyal Citizens of the United States, do support our armed forces, and further wish to show respect and to honor them for their valor and self-sacrifices; and

Whereas, we feel that a public display of our respect is in order, to demonstrate to all persons our sincerity;

Therefore be it resolved, that we, the Associated Student Body of Riverside City College, as a measure of our respect do hereby request that the United States Flag be flown continuously, day and night, above our College, until such time as the present conflict in Vietnam shall be resolved; and

Therefore be it further resolved, that copies of this resolution be sent to each college and university in the United States, along with an invitation to join us in this humble, but necessary endeavor, in order that men everywhere will see that our fighting men have the support, respect, and devotion of the American people; and

Therefore be it further resolved, that copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the Governors of the individual States, the United States Senate, the House of Representatives of the United States, the Senate and Assembly of the State of California, the President of Riverside City College, and the Board of Trustees of Riverside City College.

A Soldier's Letter from Vietnam: "For This I Willingly Fought"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JIM WRIGHT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 1967

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, a year ago Capt. Gerald A. Brown, a young Army officer serving in Vietnam, wrote a letter to his parents, Mr. and Mrs. L. F. Spaulding, of Fort Worth. The message was to be opened only in the event of his death.

On Friday, May 19, his parents received a telegram which began:

> The Secretary of the Army has asked me to express his deep regret. . . .

It went on to say that Captain Brown, 25, was killed by small arms fire while on a combat operation in Vietnam May 16.

His death came 3 weeks before he would have been rotated home.

The letter he wrote to his parents about a year ago was opened and subsequently published, with his parents' permission, in the Fort Worth Star-Telegram. I include this letter in the RECORD because it describes with simple eloquence the causes for which this heroic young man laid down his very life. The letter follows:

JUNE 1, 1966.

DEAR MOTHER AND BUD: These are a few of the things that were always left unsaid for some reason or other. First, I loved you very much, and was always very grateful for the many blessings that you saw that I was provided with. Sometimes we didn't say "I love you," enough, so I just wanted to make sure I didn't take off without making sure you understood how much I cared for you.

Second, do not be bitter or have doubts over the cause of my death. If I go fighting for my country, or for the people in Vietnam, then I go by my own free will because it is right. It is right because:

(1) It is God's will that we love all our fellow men—regardless of race, creed or color. This I believe, and for this I willingly fought. There is good in every single human, and one needs to look until you find it.

(2) I am an American. I believe in our country and in all of the ideals on which it was founded, and I prefer death rather than to be guilty of not defending it or its principles to the maximum. By the same token, if a man asks me or my country for help—then he should expect to be able to receive it. Not just money, but a personal, individual, commitment of an individual American to his problem. It was my turn to fulfill this individual commitment, and I could not ignore my duty.

(3) I believe in God, and it is only through personal commitment that His will is accomplished. At least I have tried. Read Hebrews 11, that was the source of my strength.

Those are my reasons, and whether you understand them or not, I don't know. But I did, and that is sufficient.

Do not be sad, and for pete's sake don't play a lot of sad songs at my funeral. If you must play music by all means play "When The Saints Go Marching In"! (and play a good jazzed up version of it too!) Also, the beautiful sound of TAPS played on a good bugle was always great—but end it with a rousing charge. You may rest assured that by the time you read this I will be hard at work in God's Angel corps or swapping yarns with Big Daddy while hoeing in His heavenly garden (watermelons—what else?) So don't cry over me, I'll be just as happy as I always was.

Good-bye for a while. Until we meet again in heaven, remember—

I love you,

JERRY.

City Says Thanks to the Corpsmen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 1967

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, we read a lot today about the frivolous activity of our young people. Too many times we overlook those young persons who are doing each day in their own way some worthwhile act to make their communities better places to live. I would like to point out that the Job Corps includes a group of these youths who are striving each day to make a better life for themselves and in the long run a better life for all of us.

An example of the activity of the young men of Job Corps is illustrated in a recent article appearing in the Pleasanton, Calif., Times on May 3 of this year. This article tells of how the young men at the Parks Job Corps Center have painted several city fire rigs and the city council now would like to do something in return for the contribution of the corpsmen to the Pleasanton community. This article exemplifies what actually is happening all over the country each day with young men and women of the Job Corps contributing to their communities in a constructive manner and learning to become useful citizens after they graduate from the Job Corps. I commend the young men at the Parks Job Corps Center, and I urge each of my colleagues to read of the useful contribution these young men have made. Also, I include this article in the RECORD:

CITY SAYS THANKS TO THE CORPSMEN

Pleasanton appreciates the effort of Job Corpsmen who have painted several city fire rigs, and the council would now like to reciprocate by buying them a dinner, or something.

"I don't mean the whole 2000," said Councilman Bernard Gerton in recommending a gesture for the Camp Parks personnel. But the city will seek to "show our appreciation" in some way for the recent Corpsmen contributions to beautifying Pleasanton . . . by painting pumper trucks and other fire rigs.

It's part of the "on the job training" for the Camp Parks Center, with Pleasanton sharing in the completed course.

Mideast Position Documented—International Government by Law Barring Aggression Is as Necessary as Internal Law and Order

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 1967

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished columnist, David Lawrence, has written a most perceptive article on the background of international law as it relates to the matter of the Gulf of Aqaba being an international waterway.

Mr. Lawrence also writes that American foreign policy is consistent:

> The truth is that American foreign policy has been consistent under Republican as well as Democratic administrations. America's military action to protect the freedom of the people of South Vietnam is based on what the United States did in the Middle East 10 years ago and in Greece and Turkey 20 years ago.

This is an excellent article, and because of the great interest of my colleagues and the American people in foreign affairs, I am including the article, which appeared recently in the Washington Evening Star, as part of my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The article follows:

MIDEAST POSITION DOCUMENTED

(By David Lawrence)

Who is right and who is wrong in the dispute between Egypt and Israel over the closing of the Gulf of Aqaba, which triggered the current hostilities in the Middle East? All that one has to do to answer this question is to examine carefully a report just issued by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee which gives all the background documents on the action taken by the United Nations in making peace between Israel and the Arab countries in 1957.

When one reads the words of President Eisenhower and the late secretary of state, John Foster Dulles, as formally communicated to the heads of the various governments in the Mideast, it becomes evident that the basic issues have not changed at all and that the fundamental principles of international law which are being defied today were fully accepted by both sides in 1957. Thus, the U.S. Department of State declared on June 27, 1957:

"It is the United States view that the Gulf of Aqaba comprehends international waters and that no nation has the right to prevent free and innocent passage in the gulf and through the straits giving access thereto. . . .

"The position of the United States is based on broad, long established principles of international law, extending beyond the specific problems connected with the Gulf of Aqaba. Because of its worldwide responsibilities, the United States must take into account the legal effects and precedents which might be established in other situations and areas. . . .

"It is, of course, clear that the enjoyment of the rights of free and innocent passage is inconsistent with aggression. Thus, in the United States views Israel's right to free and innocent passage was dependent upon withdrawal of its forces behind the armistice lines in accordance with the United Nations resolutions."

When the United Nations set up on the Gaza Strip a military force to maintain peace and when Egypt and Israel agreed to withdraw their troops from the strip, the problem was definitely considered to have been resolved so far as international law is concerned. The same document from the Department of State added:

"The United States has stated that in the absence of some overriding decision to the contrary, as by the International Court of Justice, the United States, on behalf of vessels of its own registry, is prepared to exercise the right of free and innocent passage and to join with others to secure general recognition of this right."

No ruling has ever come from the international court to upset the principles enunciated at that time by the United States. They were accepted in 1957 by both the Arab countries and Israel and were embodied in the resolutions of the United Nations, which set up a peacekeeping force to uphold the decisions made that year.

When the U.N. force, however, was withdrawn a few weeks ago by Secretary-General U Thant in response to a demand from the Egyptian government, the right of free passage through the Gulf of Aqaba was not repealed but was simply ignored.

The document just issued by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee deserves to be read also by the critics of the war in Vietnam because it includes a message to Congress by President Truman in 1947 in which he declared the policy of the United States as follows:

"The United Nations is designed to make possible lasting freedom and independence for all its members. We shall not realize our objectives, however, unless we are willing to help free peoples to maintain their free institutions and their national integrity against aggressive movements that seek to impose upon them totalitarian regimes."

The truth is that American foreign policy has been consistent under Republicans as well as Democratic administrations. America's military action to protect the freedom of the people of South Vietnam is based on what the United States did in the Middle East 10 years ago and in Greece and Turkey 20 years ago.

A government of law is designed to assure domestic peace. Similarly, government by law is the only way to preserve international peace.

Parents, School, Society, and Government—We're All at Fault

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT PRICE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 1967

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, as crime continues unabated in the Nation's Capital and other major cities of our country, we hear and read dire predictions of further violence in the streets if more money is not spent on the antipoverty prgoram. These predictions are actually open invitations to those who advocate violence and disregard of law under the guise of civil rights.

Lumarion Sumner, a writer for the woman's page of the Amarillo, Tex., Daily News put the matter into its proper perspective recently in an article for that newspaper.

I'm sick and tired—

She said—

of the sort of thinking sociologists, politicians and ideologists have hung around our collective necks like one great albatross and whose weight is reducing us to helplnessness.

I'm sick to death—

She wrote—

of the notion poverty breeds crimes and criminals and that society—Great Society—should shoulder all responsibility for the poor.

Mr. Speaker, I believe there are many of us who are "sick to death" with this notion and I submit the article for inclusion in the RECORD:

PARENTS, SCHOOL, SOCIETY, AND GOVERNMENT—WE'RE ALL AT FAULT

(By Lumarion Sumner)

To borrow a phrase, causes aren't my forte. I don't have very many causes, and when on occasion I'm tempted to champion one, I'm a short-winded champion.

I've never intentionally used this column to influence a people's thinking because of that common belief the pen is mightier than the sword, for I'm not certain I believe that to be true.

But today a sword not being handy, I'm taking up my pen to tilt a windmill or two because what I want to say has to be said or I might go hunting a sword.

I'm sick to death of the notion poverty breeds crime and criminals and that society—Great Society—should shoulder all responsibility for the poor . . . that on my nickel, my time and my conscience, should rest responsibility for mentally and physically sheltering the poor from their impoverishment and the psychological damage their poverty is said to incur . . . that we, society, should excuse all crime because of the humble circumstance of a wrongdoer's birth, his warped mind or his physical handicap which gives him license to do what he will and be secure in his deed because of a great, enlightened understanding of the WHY of the matter . . . that, caught in the bounds of understanding WHY, we must then turn him loose and continue paying in one fashion or another for all his future transgressions . . .

I'm sick of the sort of thinking sociologists, politicians and ideologists have hung around our collective necks like one great albatross and whose weight is reducing us to helplessness.

I can't remember the dark years of the depression breeding any great surge of crime among the young, and there were millions of us who lived in circumstances today's enlightened humanists would consider "depressed areas" and we, the underprivileged. Deprivation gave us no license to steal, to hack and maim, to kill, to tear apart and damage the property of others, to flaunt authority. The "underprivileged" of that day, or that of any previous American generation, did not have a social permissiveness which relieved a wrongdoer of his punishment, and neither was a wrongdoer from among the "privileged" relieved of responsibility for any crime, petty or large, he might commit.

What I can remember is the long list, the impressively long list, of the great men who molded countries and the world—the majority of these statesmen, inventors, artists, musicians and humanitarians born in the direst poverty and in many instances by their own bootstraps rising above other men to make a world better, and to contribute most that made it better.

Poverty and humble circumstances doesn't automatically carry the brand of crime and criminals. On the contrary, history and humanity have proved adversity makes the strong, stronger; the weak, weaker.

I repeat, I'm sick of some of our present-day ideology.

I am also very angry.

I am angry that society's permissiveness allows vandalism to a degree I put my car in a garage every night because that $50 deductible I'd have to pay if the windshield is smashed represents $50 I can't afford.

I'm angry that from the accounts I read each morning in my newspaper, I know there is no home safe from irresponsibly-fired shots from passing cars, no public building immune to desecration and wanton pilfering and destruction, no person secure in driving the streets or walking them.

I'm angry that the agencies of law are so busily engaged in protecting the wrongdoer's rights, there seemingly is no time to protect mine and thine . . . and that government is so busily appropriating more of my money to prevent crime by abolishing poverty, and so busily engaged with legislation which further protects the rights of the wrongdoer, evidently there is no time for executive, legislative and judicial government to concern itself with laws which would untie some of those "bonds of understanding" which now have so ensnarled due process of law that as a consequence we're fast becoming a lawless society.

Poverty does not breed crime and criminals, but permissiveness does. Permissiveness first, by parents. Permissiveness next, by a society who turns and looks the other way at a child's tantrums and outright bullying of "understanding" adults, and of teenagers' violences and crimes. Permissiveness then, of a government turning loose—if ever they are contained—the murderers, perverts, embezzlers, lunatics and habitual criminals, each to go his own free way and again take license to do as he will.

Abolishing poverty will not abolish crime, for much of the crime committed by the young—be it breaking out windows or mass murder—is being committed by the young from all economic levels.

The four young men who thought their kicks would come from frightening and shocking a middle-aged woman walking down South Harrison at twilight one evening were driving a Cadillac. It would appear they were more affluently blessed than most, and they weren't of the beatnik crowd.

Yet the lewd suggestions called from the car as they paced the woman walking along the sidewalk, awaiting her frightened reaction, placed them in the gutter.

The authority—Authority with a capital A—still is possible and carries some weight is attested by the boys' own reaction to it.

Foolish as this may seem, the woman suddenly became so angry she turned swiftly to the car, marched across the intervening short space and grabbing a door handle of the slowly-moving vehicle, ordered the boys out.

"If your parents didn't have the sense enough to do this when you were younger, I darn sure do now! Get out! I'm going to give each of you the whipping of your life!"

How this would have been accomplished is beside the point.

What happened is.

So amazed and shocked were the young men, and so frightened at this challenge to their wilfulness, they mumbled apology and sped away. It's possible this was their first exposure to an emphatic "No!"

I choose to think Authority has to come back into the vocabulary of a people, and a great deal of common sense into our thinking, or else soon thee and me will have to be guarding our property, our rights, and our persons with our own .45.

Short-winded champion I may be at times, but not today.

But all that's holy, today I have said what I've wanted to say for quite a number of days.

Trying To Save a Million Dollars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 1967

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, for several months a Springfield business firm, which makes rubber stamp presses, has attempted to interest the Federal Government in its product, the "Simple-X Press." Mr. Donald Hubbard believes a significant savings could be accomplished through the use of this rubber stamp press. Even though some Federal agencies have utilized this equipment and found it most effective and economical, GSA apparently does not consider it to be worthwhile to supply all Federal agencies with rubber stamps through this press. Mr. John S. Ktechum has written to the Administrator citing some of the difficulties that have been encountered and I insert this in the RECORD:

JOHN S. KETCHUM & ASSOCIATES,
Springfield, Mo., May 25, 1967.

Reference: FPNMV–S R5–67–75 "Simple–X Press."

MR. LAWSON B. KNOTT, Jr.
Administrator,
General Services Administration,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. KNOTT: Mr. Donald Hubbard has been trying to save the Federal Government one million dollars a year. He is a small businessman, (you can't get any smaller). He has become so ensnarled in your red tape and horse and buggy thinking that he is ready to chuck it. A million may be chicken feed to you, but it is still big money to the folks here in the Ozarks Hills.

Mr. Hubbard makes presses which make rubber stamps. You buy over three million dollars worth of rubber stamps each year. It takes you up to three weeks to get a stamp made, and you are paying more than three times what you could make them for yourselves. You say that you don't want to compete with the businessmen who are now making rubber stamps for GSA. This is certainly a commendable philosophy, but this same philosophy would have you taking all your copy work to the local blueprinter as you did before the Civil War instead of utilizing the modern office copier or asking the local school marm to do your figuring for you instead of owning your own computers. This would be silly, wouldn't it, because it would be "horse and buggy" thinking.

Congressman Durward Hall has been most gracious and helpful in trying to lead Mr. Hubbard through the red tape jungle. In over a year of negotiation with your Washington, New York, and Chicago offices, he has found only one of your staff, Mr. Joel Leckness of Chicago, who evidenced any understanding and tried to help. Paying lip-service to economy and allowing antiquated thinking to cost the taxpayers a million dollars doesn't make sense.

Many government agencies are now using Mr. Hubbard's presses because of the saving in time and money. Why can't they be offered to all agencies? Are rubber stamp contracts a political plum, or am I being naive? Any "Sad Sack" can make a rubber stamp in a fraction of the time and at a fraction of the cost of your present method of operation. I sincerely believe that Mr. Hubbard's individual effort to save you a million dollars should be taken seriously and reconsidered.

I believe that the strength of this nation is wrapped up, not in big business, but in the individual who takes seriously the admonition "Not what your country can do for you, but what you can do for your country."

It has taken Mr. Hubbard as much as two months to get an answer from members of your Administration, so I shall not wait with baited breath for yours.

Sincerely,

JOHN S. KETCHUM.

Appointment of James B. Childs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 1967

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call attention to the appointment of an outstanding constituent and friend of mine, Mr. James B. Childs, to serve as honorary consultant in government document bibliography at the Library of Congress for the next 3 years.

Mr. Childs' background is indeed excellent, and I include in this RECORD an article concerning him which appeared in the Library of Congress Information Bulletin on June 1, 1967.

The article reads as follows:

James B. Child, who retired from the Library of Congress staff in December 1965 after 41 years' service to the Federal Government, has been appointed by the Librarian to serve as the Library's Honorary Consultant in Government Document Bibliography for 3 years. In his honorary post, Mr. Childs will continue to perform bibliographic research in the Library's Serial Division.

Through diligent personal and professional achievement, Mr. Childs has won a position of unusual prestige in the area of government document bibliography. He is recognized both nationally and internationally for his scholarship in this area. During his career, he has produced many Library of Congress publications and working papers, including *Government Document Bibliography in the United States and Elsewhere* (3 editions); *Guide to the Official Publications of Other American Republics* (5 volumes); *Author Entries for Government Publications;* "German Federal Republic Official Publications, 1949–57"; "German Democratic Republic Official Publications, 1945–1958"; and "Spanish Government Publications After July 17, 1936." His articles in professional journals are too numerous to cite.

Mr. Child's career at the Library of Con- began in 1925 as Chief of the Documents Division. Later he served as Chief of the Cataloging Division. In 1954 he became the Library's Specialist in Government Document Bibliography. Mr. Childs attended the University of Illinois during the period 1914–21, where he earned Bachelor of Arts and Bachelor of Library Science degrees. Before joining the Library of Congress staff, Mr. Childs served as a cataloger for the John Crerar Library in Chicago. Except for 3 months of military service in 1918, all his service to the U.S. Government has been given to the Library of Congress. He received a 40-year Federal Service Award in 1965, when a sketch of his career and a photograph of him appeared in the *Information Bulletin* (March 15, 1965, pp. 128–29).

The Waiting Game

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 1967

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

THE WAITING GAME

(By Louis Stockstill)

What, we would like to know, is so sacrosanct about the DoD study of the military compensation structure?

We support the study and we think, so far at least, it has been outstanding. We also think there's a better than even chance that the recommendations it will make are likely to be soundly conceived.

But we are getting a shade weary of the Defense Department using the study as a yellow light every time Congress steps in with a proposal to alter some part of existing compensation or benefits.

When the House sought to enact legislation creating constructive credit for officers holding advanced degrees. DoD immediately cried, "No, no. Not yet. You're jumping the gun. We're looking at the problem in our overall compensation study and we don't want any decision to be made until we've had a chance to appraise the 'part' in relationship to the whole."

That, in effect, is what the Department said in killing the constructive credit bill last year. This year when the proposal came up again, the Department went a step further and said, "You're still jumping the gun. Our overall study isn't completed yet. And when it is completed, we think we'll find that the idea isn't any good anyway."

In other words, the Department is ready to prejudge the issue but unwilling to have Congress do so.

Now, the same thing is happening on the proposal to improve overseas mail delivery to military personnel.

DoD's reaction to the legislation to provide speedier mail delivery to Armed Forces personnel overseas is, again: "Wait until the overall compensation study is completed."

We're beginning to suspect that the "think" signs which formerly decorated some Pentagon offices have been replaced by new signs that read, "wait." Is this becoming the DoD watchword?

We remember vividly that two years ago when House Armed Services Committee Chairman Mendel Rivers proposed substantive changes in the military pay scales, DoD said "No, no. Wait until we've studied the whole pay structure." At that time, the Department promised that the study would be completed and sent to Congress by March of this year.

The timetable got lost, however, and this year the Department said, "Wait. We'll get our recommendations to you in time for action in 1968."

And, meanwhile, all we hear is "wait" on this and "wait" on that.

But the shoe squeaks only when Congress is trying it on—not the other way around.

The Department has had no hesitancy about submitting proposed legislation of its own which relates to the overall compensation system. (For which we have to be grateful.) But why do proposals fostered by the Department automatically receive a green light and those developed by the Congress (where legislation is supposed to originate) automatically run into yellow blinkers?

If Congress is not already irritated by this approach, we hope it gets irritated. And that its anger intensifies. And that it stays irritated.

If the demand to await the outcome of the "structural" pay study does not apply to the piecemeal compensation and benefits proposals drafted by the Pentagon, there's no good reason why it should apply to piecemeal legislation sponsored by the Congress.

We believe the bill to improve overseas mail delivery is good, is needed and stands on its own merits—DoD study or no DoD study.

President Johnson has said military people are entitled to at least the kind of life they are defending for others. If so, they should get their mail as rapidly as the folks at home.

What's there to wait for?

God's Crucible

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES B. UTT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 8, 1967

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include in the Appendix of the Record an address delivered recently at the annual meeting of the La Jolla unit of Pro America, La Jolla, Calif., by the Reverend Robert B. Watts, LL. D., D.D.

Dr. Robert Burnham Watts, the author of this address, is a nationally known corporate executive, lawyer, and priest of the Protestant Episcopal Church

He is the recipient in 1966 and 1967 of the George Washington Medal and cash award from the Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge.

He is the State chairman of the Americanism program of the Scottish Rite in California.

He is chairman of the overseers of Bates College, a trustee of the Bishop's School in La Jolla, past president of the directors of Scripps Memorial Hospital, and past president of the La Jolla Town Council.

He was educated at Bates College and the Yale Law School, through both of which he earned his way with the aid of scholarships won by his academic standing.

I have had the pleasure of inserting in the Record some of his sermons which I felt were outstanding. I wish that we had more ministers of his caliber.

God's Crucible

Israel Zangwill, poet and playwright, wrote four words in one of his most successful plays which have often come to my mind in these recent days and which I should like to use as a framework for some straightforward thinking with you. The four words are: "America is God's Crucible."

A crucible is, of course, a melting pot—but the word "crucible" also has another meaning. That meaning is "a trying and purifying agency." And so, when we think of our beloved America as "God's Crucible," we are reminded of the high destiny of our Country to serve as a place where, in the fierce fire of God's truth, the false and the unworthy are to be revealed and burned away from the pure principles upon which our Nation was founded and upon which it must endure.

The first of those principles was the acknowledgement that this was to be a nation "under God." Wherever we turn we see the deep reliance upon Divine guidance evidenced by our forefathers.

In his "Call to Arms" in 1775, Patrick Henry eloquently said, "— we shall not fight our battles alone. There is a just God who presides over the destinies of nations —." In 1776, the Declaration of Independence concluded with the words, "And for the support of this Declaration, with a firm reliance on the protection of Divine Providence, we mutually pledge to each other our Lives, our Fortunes, and our sacred Honor." In the troubled hours of creating our Constitution, Benjamin Franklin called for daily prayer, saying, "I have lived a long time, and the longer I live the more convincing proofs I see of this truth, that God governs in the affairs of men." And General Washington echoes these convictions when, after his election as President, he said, "I can almost trace the finger of Divine Providence through those dark and mysterious days which first led the Colonists to assemble in convention —."

Today, the American principle of Divine Guidance is under direct attack. We hear, in current speeches by many whose salaries are paid as teachers or, more unbelievably, as preachers, all the variations on the theme of Karl Marx who wrote, "There is no God! When Communists deny God, they simultaneously deny every virtue and every value which originates with God. There are no moral absolutes, no right or wrong. The Ten Commandments and the Sermon on the Mount are invalid."

Right there we have a cesspool of moral filth from which we see streams of poison being pumped into our society on every side. And of what concern is it whether the pumpers be just plain atheists, starry-eyed "do-gooders," or fellow-travellers who see in the destruction of decency and reverence for God the wide pavements leading to Communism? Whoever they are, their attacks on our Country should be challenged and their despicable teachings fought to the bitter end whenever and wherever they are found.

Moral issues? Certainly—but the basis of military strength and national power of survival. Treason is moral degradation—and the traitor opens the gates from within. Cowardice is lack of moral fiber—the coward abandons his fellows and demonstrates against the shipment of their food and supplies. Addiction to sex-deviation, sexual immorality, drugs or to the obscene generally, means not only self-destruction to individuals—but with terrible efficiency also wipes out even their instinct of self-preservation. A morally corrupt and God-sneering people will most certainly prove, by loss of their liberty, the truth of the awesome prophecy of Hosea—"They have sown the wind, and they shall reap the whirlwind."

A second principle of our Republic, and indeed the only valid basis for the creation of any Republic, is the establishment of a governmental organization to protect the rights, the safety and the property of all of its citizens. Such has been the purpose of all organized society, for unless law displaces anarchy and peaceful possession of personal liberty and personal belongings is maintained, we revert either to slavery to the mob or slavery to absolute despotism. What then do we see revealed as God's Crucible applies the fierce fire of truth in this area?

We see a frightening condition which menaces our very existence. Crime is increasing in the United States as it has never increased before, with ever-rising juvenile involvement in serious violations. We see the almost unbelievable spectacle of the President of the United States publicly admitting that in great areas of this Republic—especially in the larger cities, including the capital itself—it is not even safe to venture on the public streets. Think of it! Such has become the arrogance of hoodlums that men and women are assaulted, robbed, raped and terrified even in hours of daylight. Police are villified and falsely charged with brutality as part of a deliberate racial campaign to achieve, not equality of opportunity, but preferential treatment. Citizens refuse cooperation in all too many cases, don't want to be bothered by jury duty, and fail to protest when politicians angle for votes by condoning mass violations of law.

All we have to do to see ourselves in the Crucible is to see how the blackmail of civil violence is rewarded by floods of money, special projects, and special treatment—with ominous warnings constantly heard of more riots to come unless the distribution or something-for-nothing is stepped up. More and more welfare is pumped out—Senator Ribicoff telling us that on top of all subsidies, price supports, and other government handouts, we are carrying some 7½ million Americans on welfare. We pour money abroad in unbelievable amounts, so much so that our own gold supplies are at rock-bottom lows, our currency is debased (feel some in your purses if you have forgotten)—and inflation is stealing our savings as prices and taxes soar.

What do we do about these things? We revert to honest fundamentals. We begin by doing all it takes to build up, and to maintain, all the power necessary to enable our police to enforce the laws straight across the board. That's the only road to physical safety.

We continue by living within our means. That means that we spend what we have available and call a halt to all the fancy items and social experiments that the spenders would like to continue to play with. And it means that in no uncertain terms our citizens must stand up and give loud and powerful support to those exceptions in public office who are courageously fighting to keep our expenses somewhere near our income.

The alternative is clear. Rome experienced it shortly after its Senate—which had poured money abroad, and surrendered to the mobs which demanded, and got, free food, free entertainment, and freedom from any requirement to work for a living—declared itself bankrupt. Its debased currency had become worthless. All that Augustus then had to do to kill the Republic and form his absolute Empire was, in the words of Gibbon, respectfully to assure the people that they still enjoyed their ancient freedom—knowing that mankind is so easily deceived by mere words.

One could go on, as the searing fire of the Crucible illuminates the current scene. There would be visible the low moral standards to be seen in the very halls of Congress. There would be seen what is politely called the "credibility gap," which actually means that our government is lying to us is instance after instance. And there would be seen our present wallowing in Viet Nam.

The Vice President was asked recently in an appearance before the British House of Parliament whether our purpose in Viet Nam "is only a matter of holding the line against Communist aggression." To his credit, he replied, "if that were the only reason, it would be reason enough"—and he went on to say that, "We made a commitment and we will keep it."

With those sentiments most Americans would agree—despite the beatniks, and the "preachniks" like Martin Luther King who was given national television time on April 4th to threaten antiwar mass demonstrations and beyond that to invite refusals of military service by saying, "I would advocate that those who are prepared, be conscientious objectors."

Personally, I am tired of all the talk about "doves" and "hawks." I submit that what we need are not birds but Americans who will rise up and say that the way to end the present war is to win it. Let us no longer sacrifice our men in timidity that if we attack air-bases and blockade supply ports we might offend the very Communists whose Khrushchev screamed in our ears, "We will bury you!"

Finally, we would see in God's Crucible two related matters which transcend all other secular items. Both relate to our use or failure to use, the ballot.

I don't have to tell this audience of the tremendous importance of the ballot. It is the life-blood of our Republic. By its use we can select representatives of stature and courage, and insist upon their protection of our basic principles upon peril of defeat if they fail or refuse.

Neither do I have to tell you of the failure of Americans to exercise this supreme power of citizenship. Critical municipal elections in Los Angeles recently, involving local lawmakers, school board members, and vital charter amendments, drew only 30% of the registered voters! We must destroy such apathy. We must see to it that we know the issues of the day and the candidates who seek election. And then we must have the American courage to elect the candidates who are truly pro-America, regardless of their political affiliations otherwise.

There remains the other related crucial matter, Don't allow yourselves to be caught unprepared by the ratification of the resolution for our first Constitutional Convention since the 1700's. We are at the brink of exactly that—a new Constitutional Convention. And don't forget that such a Convention can propose any changes in our present Constitution. It can propose to wipe it out. It can propose to strengthen it. It can either give us new weapons against the large numbers of those who have with increasing success over the past 50 years sought to turn it into a centralized, socialized welfare-state instrument or it can make proposals which would strip us of our liberties, our freedoms, and our very identity as a nation separate from a world congress.

Take heed of this looming event. Be certain that our enemies will bend every effort to use such a Convention for their purposes. And if we are to survive, we must, at whatever cost, see that Americans who believe in our Republic are the ones who are given the awesome duty of taking up the pens which were laid down by Washington, Jefferson, Madison, Franklin and their colleagues.

Let me conclude with a paragraph written last month by my old and valued friend, J. Edgar Hoover. He said,

"It is high time we took action to improve conditions.

"Let us stop persecuting enforcement officers when we should be prosecuting criminals. Let us stop defying offbeat dolts whose ability is measured only by how deep they can dip their poisonous pens into the pots of blasphemy, filth, and falsehood. Let us stop listening to half-truths and criticisms of time-tested ideals and start telling and selling the true story of democracy as we know it. In short, let us stop being led blindly toward the cavern of self-destruction by bogus Pied Pipers and get on with the perpetuation of the self-evident truths which, with Divine guidance, have served our Nation so well over the years."

Only by responding to such calls, by seeing clearly the dangers which surround us and by taking vigorous action where action is so clearly needed, may we be sure that from God's Crucible will come a cleansed and purified America—our America.

Of the response on your part, I am certain.

American Gold Stabilizes Red China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 1967

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, Eliot Janeway's June 5 report on Red China's gold accumulation should be read and reread by all of our colleagues.

I insert it following my remarks:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, June 5, 1967]

GOLD OUTFLOW BOOMERANGS

(By Eliot Janeway)

NEW YORK.—The anger which swept America after Pearl Harbor was intensified by the discovery that scrap iron we had sold to Japan was being shot back at us. America's gold outflows are now being boomeranged back at us in the same incendiary way by Red China.

In the days of the Chinese war lords, the fighting in China was done with "silver bullets"—meaning money. But now that war is being fought for keeps out there, money is no longer a substitute for military power. It has become a source of military power.

The military commitment we have undertaken to hold the line against communism in Asia can be made good only if we back it up with a supporting commitment to defend the dollar. Instead, however, our mismanagement on the fiscal and monetary fronts is playing directly into Red China's hands. Red China is poised to enter the Vietnam war against us; and our Treasury's bumbling and fumbling in the war of silver and gold are financing a windfall for her mobilization to fight against us in the war of rockets and missiles.

Our troubles came to a head dramatically last month when the Treasury was caught flatfooted by a run on its silver. The Johnson administration tried to fight off the run with one hand tied behind its back, leaning over to "play fair" with the speculators against the dollar. It resolved to stay with the outmoded metallic reserve supposedly held as cover behind the silver certificates in circulation; although hoarding has long since driven silver certificates out of sight.

President Johnson himself has not exactly been soft on his critics. But the Treasury in its smugness felt safe in playing softball against the speculators who had organized the run on its silver because it saw no connection between the admitted fact of the silver run against the dollar and the threatened danger of a gold run—that is, not until the gold run started. In fact, even after it had, the Treasury stood pat on its halfway measures.

Henry S. Reuss, Milwaukee congressman, chairman of the international finance subcommittee of the house banking and currency committee, and an administration stalwart, has faulted the Treasury for not extending its embargo on silver outflows to include silver bullion, and for continuing to produce silver half-dollars.

But if the American Treasury hasn't learned how to play the money war game, the Chinese Communists certainly have. In fact, the Chinese Communists have just treated America's supposedly capitalistic government to a homespun demonstration of how markets work—to their profit and at our expense.

Ever since America went all out in Vietnam, Red China has bided her time militarily, but she has bet hard cash against us financially. Her way of doing this has been to buy gold on the theory that, if once America did get itself over-extended in Vietnam, the dollar would fall in price and gold would rise.

When the Treasury allowed the silver run to get ahead of it, and to touch off the gold run against the dollar that is raging now, Red China began to cash in her chips. The London Times reported on May 12 that Red China had chartered seven Boeings in London from Pakistan airlines to airlift the better part of $150 million in gold out east. According to the London Times, this represents approximately a third of Red China's gold accumulation.

It is understandable that Red China should have favored Pakistan with the profitable freight business; for, although Pakistan has done well on American aid and military assistance, (never, for example, having been asked to disgorge any of her silver hoardings in payment!), she lines up on China's side of the Asiatic power struggle.

The official Washington price of gold is $35 an ounce. But the new wave of hoarding stirred up by the silver and gold runs on the dollar has driven the black market price at Hong Kong and Macao up to $80 an ounce. Little wonder that China is taking her gold home. The Treasury's failure to stop the silver run is inviting Red China to peddle her $35 gold off for $80, more than doubling her ability to buy munitions to use against American soldiers.

OEO Funds for Family Planning in San Antonio, Tex.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 1967

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, on June 8, 1967, testimony was presented by Mr. William Price Clark, president, Planned Parenthood Center, of San Antonio, before the Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower and Poverty of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, U.S. Senate.

This testimony describes how a local birth and control program has been aided by allocation of funds designed for use in fighting poverty. It will be noted that funds alloted will be used in the most effective manner, and with the maximum of community support and cooperation. This is most commendable. San Antonio sets an example which other American communities would do well to emulate. It is a mark of enlightened progress.

Mr. Speaker, family planning is the most meaningful and important step that can be taken in dealing with poverty. The problem is worldwide. It must be attacked on every front. The Federal allocation for this purpose has been far too little. An ounce of prevention is, indeed, worth a pound of cure. It is much less expensive and far more effective to prevent poverty and starvation than it is to control and treat it. One dollar properly spent on this project may very well be worth $10 spent in other ways in our efforts to cope with the problems of poverty.

Let us examine the overall problem for a moment. Latin America's population now stands just under 250 million, and at the present rate will double within the next 25 years and reach an astounding 600 million by the year 2000.

This growth rate, the highest in the world, is already straining national economies and canceling most efforts to raise the standard of living.

Worldwide, at the present rate population will double in the next 35 years. Looking into the future, it may very well be that control of population will be more important to mankind than control of the atom bomb. And the place to start in coping with this problem is in the villages, the towns and the metropolitan centers right here in our own country. San Antonio has made the move, and that city and all others which have control programs are entitled to all-out support.

The testimony given by Mr. Clark follows:

Senator Clark and distinguished subcommittee members, San Antonio is a city of 700,000 people with a high incidence of poverty and with slums which have been compared to those of Hong Kong, Rio de Janiero and Harlem. There are more than 40,000 women of child bearing age in families receiving total incomes of less than $3,000 per annum. These are the potential Planned Parenthood patients. This total is far higher than the number in cities of comparable size elsewhere in the United States.

Our present clinic, established in 1939, serves 5,000 women which leaves an unmet need to serve 35,000 women. The clinic operates in one central downtown location with a mobile unit that serves outlying areas with supplies and makes appointments for the women to go to the downtown clinic for examinations.

The population of San Antonio is approximately 6% Negro and 40% Latin American. (85% of our present patients are Latin American.) There are large areas of the city where little or no English is spoken. Many of the women in these areas seldom if ever leave their own neighborhoods and in order to reach them services must be established in the neighborhood.

We need neighborhood clinics staffed with a local resident who has been trained in Family Planning to inform the women about birth control. The $209,000 OEO program will establish twelve of these clinics in the poorest and most populous neighborhoods.

The patient level reception of our current program has been excellent. However there was a good deal of caution on the part of the established authorities in their support of Family Planning. One of the principal concerns was the attitude of the Roman Catholic Church. An editorial in the local archdiocesean newspaper, "The Alamo Messenger", on August 12, 1966 was headlined "Class Suicide" in reference to the Planned Parenthood OEO proposal.

Despite these reactions the City Council voted to allow Planned Parenthood to operate in the neighborhood Public Health Department clinics, most of which are located in Public Housing units. We then obtained approval from the Federal Housing Authority to operate in their units. The County Judge expressed his approval.

The Bexar County Medical Society endorsed the Planned Parenthood OEO concept and a number of other professional and religious groups endorsed our proposal. The local press reported favorably on our request and stressed the necessity of a family planning component in the local War on Poverty. In one editorial the San Antonio Express commented, "The aim of Planned Parenthood and its impact on San Antonio is commendable in that the program does not merely remedy an existing condition, but can be effective in preventing the abject misery that prompted the poverty war in the first place."

Then on January 16, 1967 Archbishop Robert E. Lucey issued a statement in which he said, "Some of our fellow citizens sincerely believe that the Catholic Church advocates irresponsible parenthood. They imagine that our motto is: 'The larger the family, the better for everybody.' This is not true . . . The Church also teaches that parents have the freedom and the responsibility ultimately to pass judgment in the sight of God as to the size of their family . . . . The Planned Parenthood Association shares with us a desire to inform married parents of their responsibility to society in bearing children . . . A divine mandate has not been bestowed on Catholic citizens to prevent non-Catholics from receiving certain privileges approved by civil law . . . Realizing that it is the duty of the Church not only to instruct its members on what is sinful but also on what is good and decent, we acknowledge our obligation to give necessary instruction to our people and to offer cooperation to men of good will for the well being of our community and for the peace of conscience of our people. Therefore, I approve of a grant of Federal funds to this Association as described above."

At this point all major local community groups supported the program. Despite this the local CAP board was very reluctant to pass the proposal. After much acrimonious debate it did approve the program as part of the Community Action Program. The total funding requested in the CAP grant for San Antonio exceeded the final amount of money available to the local CAP by more than 100%. This was due to a lack of communication between the local CAP office and the OEO regional office.

The regional OEO office then removed the three health programs from the local CAP budget in the hope that 211 funds could be obtained for a comprehensive health center. However, the programs did not even closely approach the specification for health centers. Thus the Family Planning component which had been endorsed by the poor through continuous and expanding use since 1939; and by local religious, political and welfare groups was left with no funds.

At this stage National OEO stepped in and funded San Antonio directly with funds from the Supplementary Allowance to the Regions. This was the only possible source of operating money for our program. There were no other public funds available and we had been unable to secure the necessary funding from our regular private donors to establish the neighborhood clinics.

This program will provide employment for local residents in each of the twelve neighborhoods served. Each clinic will have a full time social work aide who will be a local resident and will assist the social worker in helping the women in each neighborhood. In addition there will be a representative from each of the areas served on the Poverty Board to be established to administer the program.

The local Spanish language television station, KWEX, has offered free time to Planned Parenthood to discuss family planing in the community and we will include descriptions of the neighborhood clinics.

In addition to furnishing family planning services the program provides for yearly physical examinations and cancer tests which will lead to the discovery of a number of cancers in the early stages. In numerous cases Planned Parenthood is the only contact a family will have with the medical-welfare structure. When other problems are discovered in the families referrals will be made to the appropriate agencies.

Thus, the program will involve the poor at all levels of service and operation in addition to assisting with other problems whenever possible.

We feel that it is particularly significant that National OEO did step in and fund this project not only because of the general necessity of Family Planning in a true War on the *Causes* of poverty so aptly described by Dr. Guttmacher a moment ago; but also because of the extremely broad based community approval of the program including the dramatic official reversal of long standing opposition on the part of the spokesman for a substantial segment of the local population.

The Next Phase in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 1967

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, we have made important accomplishments in Vietnam. Of utmost importance—the peaceful development of the country.

I commend to the attention of our colleagues an article concerning the future of Vietnam, by Mr. Joseph Kraft, which appeared in the May 24, 1967, edition of the Washington Post:

NEXT PHASE IN VIETNAM

In the Senate and elsewhere serious debate on Vietnam is back in fashion because the string is being run out on the present phase of the struggle. And in thinking about the next phase, a special premium should be placed on one consideration—steadiness.

This country's outlook and operation need to be adjusted toward a long pull. The unpredictable, staccato mixing of spasms of peace with spasms of violence wants to give way to a measured pace down a well-laid out and widely understood path of action. Staying power ought to be built into the American position.

The phase now ending was marked by the American military build-up in South Vietnam, and by the use of bombing in North Vietnam for the dual purpose of interdiction and bringing the other side to the peace table. On the list of targets presently before the President, however, the only major military item not yet struck is the port of Haiphong. But the President, Secretary of State Dean Rusk, Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara, and Walt Rostow of the White House staff are all against such a strike—mainly, it seems, because of what the Russians would be likely to do in retaliation. Thus the end of the present phase is in sight.

In looking back, no one needs to be ashamed. A Communist military takeover of South Vietnam is now out of the question. There has been set in motion progress toward what could become a legitimate government with a broader popular base. Still there are problems remaining and lessons to be learned.

The other side retains a capacity to go on fighting for a long time. Neither the bombing of the North, nor the large daytime operations of American units in the South have had an enduring impact on the adversary's village strongholds.

Mixing up talk of peace with acts of war, moreover, has worked to develop on the other side a cynical doubt about American purposes which militates against any early settlement by negotiations. And the war-peace combination has confused the American public in a way that gives easy pickings to extremists who argue for pushing the war to a military conclusion in an anti-Communist crusade.

The first requirement of the new phase, in these circumstances, is a serious effort to reach the villages. That means that the South Vietnamese army must be pushed out into the countryside in something like a quadrillage, or grid system, encompassing all of South Vietnam.

Protecting this military deployment against attack by regular North Vietnamese units will remain important. In that connection, limited bombing of North Vietnam for interdiction purposes seems appropriate. So does the idea of a fortified barrier against infiltration. But bombing for political purposes does not make sense.

What does make sense politically is the pushing ahead with a unilateral process in which, under no compulsion and at a time of its own choice, the other side may elect to participate. One feature of that process, of course, is the development of a constitutional government through elections.

In that connection, the American interest is in the broadest participation under the most honest and democratic conditions possible in the presidential and legislative elections set for later this year. For the hope would be to find a way to rally to the standard of the Saigon regime many of those now supporting the insurgents.

More important still, Washington and Saigon need to lay out a long-term program for eventually bringing reunification to Vietnam. For unification is the central issue at stake in the conflict. Until some means of achieving unification is blocked out, serious negotiations are not in prospect. But once a program is laid out then pressure for entering talks can be expected to develop on the other side.

But all of this demands time. And thus a central condition for successful transition to the next phase is that there be conveyed to the American public a sense of the long perspective that now stretches ahead.

"Yes" on Teacher Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD D. McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 1967

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, as the time when it will still be possible to refund the National Teacher Corps draws shorter and shorter, I feel we must consider carefully the tremendous advantages of this program.

Already this program has proved itsellf a definite, growing asset to our country's educational system. Indications are that its potential is even greater.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to place in the RECORD today an editorial on this subject which appeared in the Buffalo Evening News on May 25:

"YES" ON TEACHER CORPS

The need for continued financing of the National Teacher Corps shouldn't be lost in the furious House debate now under way over how Uncle Sam can best aid American primary and secondary education.

First authorized in 1965, the Corps recruits idealistic college graduates, adds some special training and then assigns them to schools with a heavy concentration of impoverished, disadvantaged children.

The 1200 members working in 275 schools in 29 States during the current academic year include 23 here in Buffalo. And expert opinion, both locally and nationally, gives the Corps if not an "A," at least a solid "B" for a good beginning.

The teachers assigned to Buffalo have established some library projects, but have mostly worked in teams with small, remedial classes. City principals agree that they taught their subjects well, but in addition have motivated the youngsters, taking a positive personal interest in them and, in some cases, even in their parents.

Not that improvements cannot be made—if Congress extends the Corps authorization. Local principals favor assigning individual teachers for the full September-to-June year to a particular school, instead of the half-year assignment chosen this time, in order to make the teacher-pupil relationship more consistent. The teachers' focus should be more on the school, the principals believe, and less on the wider community.

We believe the Teacher Corps is producing results for a number of reasons. Chiefly, though, because it humanizes an impersonal government effort and concentrates on the most promising age group for breaking the poverty cycle—the young—and in the most promising field—education

Public Debt Limit

SPEECH

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1967

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 10328) to increase the public debt limit set forth in section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act, and for other purposes.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL].

(Mr. SCHWENGEL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Chairman, the Committee is being asked today to raise the debt limit for the 11th time since the Democrats took control of the White House in 1961.

In less than 3 months the Congress is being asked to raise the debt limit by $35 billion. If the House agrees to this increase, the debt limit will have been raised $72 billion in 6 years of Democratic administrations. That is an average of $12 billion per year.

It is clear that the cost of the Great Society of this administration is the great debt. And, friends, let us realize now and ponder this—a greater debt will not really give us a greater society. This debt, I remind you, we are passing on to future generations.

What does this administration offer as assurance that spending will be brought under control should this measure before us be approved? I will tell you. Absolutely none.

In fact, at this time it refuses to say whether it will even press for a tax increase. Its record at attempting to predict the costs of the Vietnam war has been unreliable—and that is being charitable.

A good case can be made for the allegation that war costs have been consistently underestimated to ward off cuts in domestic spending. Despite a good deal of talk about spending priorities made by the President earlier this year, no evidence that any priorities have been set has been seen by this Member of the House.

As a result, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means himself has estimated that the budget deficit for the next fiscal year could reach over $28 billion.

Spending priorities—holding the line—these words of the administration now it seems to me have a very hollow ring.

It is clear to me that it is up to the Congress to take the leadership in bringing its disjointed fiscal policy back into focus.

It seems to me, for instance, that a more serious view of their responsibilities could be taken by the majority members of the Ways and Means Committee, and indeed by the majority of the members of this Committee.

I must say that I was encouraged by the recent statement of the distinguished chairman if the Committee on Ways and Means which, in effect, asked for restraint in spending and asked that the Congress more often ascertain the long range effect of its action, especially in the authorization of new programs.

But I ask you, Is it not distorting the function of the Committee on Ways and Means for it to consistently come before this House with requests for debt limit increases?

The best way to solve fiscal matters like this is not always avoiding meeting its responsibilities to raise the money to pay the bills.

When I served in the Iowa general assembly, the Committee on Ways and Means consistently kept the assembly aware of the implications and aware of the results of its appropriations. This is what ought to be done more often here.

The constitution of the State of Iowa prohibits the State from going into debt and we should emulate Iowa and the example that it sets in this regard.

Thank goodness that the constitutions of many States contain the same sort of provision that the Iowa constitution contains. If the States were allowed to follow the same fiscal policy set by this administration, there would be utter economic chaos in this country. Instead of bringing a bill before the House to increase the debt limit, I believe the Ways and Means Committee would serve the public interest much better if it would come before us with a frank and forthright report of the revenues available under present taxes and a frank and forthright statement of what new revenues would be needed to cover appropriations over and above revenues available, and finally its frank and forthright recommendation of how these additional revenues should be raised.

I am sure that these statements would act as a restraint on Government spending.

Lest anyone misinterpret what I have said permit me to hasten to say that I do not advocate a tax increase. Instead I am asking that spending requests be reduced. Tax loopholes should be closed and spending priorities should be set.

Certainly we can and must make sure that our efforts in Vietnam are supported to the fullest extent. But there are other areas in which spending should be cut and this must be done.

I oppose the bill before us. I urge its defeat.

The Miracles on West Street

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 1967

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of the Members of the House an article entitled, "The Miracles of West Street," which appeared in the May 1967 edition of the Employment Service Review. This is the success story of the Adult Work Training demonstration project administered by the Community Progress, Inc., of New Haven, Conn., with the cooperation of the U.S. Department of Labor.

I am proud to have been a member of the Education and Labor Committee in the 87th Congress, and to have played a part in establishing the 1962 Manpower Training and Development Act, the first comprehensive peace-time effort by the Federal Government to assist in the training and development of our labor force to meet the technological challenge of the future. Since that time, we have expanded and improved our programs designed to retrain workers with obsolete skils for new jobs. The following article, describing the success of teaching unskilled and even illiterate adults, the skills necessary for them to become employable, is testimony to the foresight of this body in establishing legislation of this kind:

THE MIRACLES ON WEST STREET

(By Irene Smith)

Small miracles are happening at 100 West St. in New Haven, Conn.

Nothing about the appearance of the building prepares you to believe this. It is squat, square, and brick with "No Parking" and a soft drink sign painted on its outside walls. A smaller sign with the familiar Community Progress, Inc. (CPI), insignia tells you the Adult Work Training Program is located here. Men in work clothes have their eyes and hands concentrated on the machines and the latticework of wires. They give the visitor only a brief stir of recognition—a few heads look up, some smile, but most remain bent over their work.

The feeling of miracles comes in conversations with the men.

They are no longer young. A few are in the early 30's, but most are 45 and over.

With few exceptions they are unskilled. In the past they worked as sand loaders, ditch diggers, box folders, and foundry men. Now, their age or a physical disability bars them from hard labor and they have become welfare cases or family burdens.

Bryant G. is a 59-year-old Negro who looks closer to 75. A life of hard work on construction gangs and the responsibility of raising nine children (six are still at home) have added years to his appearance. But if he is tired, it doesn't show in the story he tells about himself.

He is learning to identify, install, and repair simple wiring systems. Two days a week he studies reading, writing, and arithmetic in classes at the Skill Center.

"Yes' ma'am, I can write now," he tells me in a deferential manner of speech that belies the fact he was born in Philadelphia. "I can write my name. I can write 'white' and 'black' and 'red.' "

He begins to make the first stroke of "w" but his hand is so shaky that the final letter looks shot through with electrical current. He apologizes for this with the explanation that he is a little nervous.

The instructor, Joseph Oliver, told me Bryant had been struck during an electrical storm and the palsy-like tremor in his right arm does get worse when he is nervous.

I asked Oliver the purpose of teaching electrical work to a man who lacks the physical and educational qualifications for acceptance as an electrician's helper or an apprentice. He answered that there are job possibilities in electrical supply houses. Learning to do simple wiring and repair has familiarized Bryant with up-to-date electrical devices. Such knowledge qualifies him for stock handling. With assistance from CPI job developers, it is entirely possible that he will be fitted into a job that uses the skills he has learned in the program.

Al D. teaches data processing to four other men. He was a student himself when the program started in September.

Unlike most of the participants in adult work training, he is young (30), articulate, a high school graduate, and a skilled machinist. He left a good full-time job in Ansonia as a machinist (he is still working there part time at night). He came to the center because he is ambitious to move up the skill ladder. His progress in data processing has been rapid and spectacular. When the regular instructor left the program to take another position, Al was put in his place.

Three of his students were seated around him in front of an accounting machine. Using a forbidding-looking manual on programing computers, Al asked questions of each student—What happens when you depress a certain lever? How do you suppress the printing of the last two digits?

From the question and answer period they moved to manipulation of the machine to make it perform the functions they had just discussed.

The whole performance revealed a maturity and a skill in teaching that were truly amazing. Just to be sure he remains ahead of his students and in command of his subject, Al soon will start a 2-week course at International Business Machines in Hartford.

All the men were happy to be in training but sorry that the opportunity had come so late in life.

"If I had this training 30 years ago, I'd be some place today," was the way one man put it. Several years ago he injured his back while working on a forklift truck. He has had few steady jobs since then. He is taking electrical training but, like Bryant G., he is too old and not healthy enough to qualify as an apprentice or an electrician's helper. His instructor says, however, that he has enough background now to make a good candidate for bench assembly work and other subsidiary electrical jobs.

The miracle of men who are striving to remake themselves against great odds underlines the waste of human resources which poverty and prejudice cause.

John Moriarity, machine shop instructor, put it somewhat bitterly: "We should be spending our money on 'our own' instead of sending it overseas." It brings his "Irish up" to realize that men with skill and potential will never make the full climb to setup work or tool-and-die making because they have so little basic education.

He was referring specifically to his prize student, Glaston D. who had only 5 years of schooling in South Carolina. He is only 32 but has six children and a wife to support.

His wife encouraged him to shift to part time on his machine job at Sargent & Co. so he could attend classes at the center during the day. His hope is to get a promotion at Sargent's and advanced training (which has been tentatively offered him on the basis of his performance at West St. and his improvement in math and reading).

In spite of instructor Moriarity's frustration, he has high praise for the effort.

"The training we give is relaxed. It brings out the best. If these men were being trained in a factory, they'd fail because the pressure is so much greater.

"If a man can't read or write well, he can't be rushed through a training course. This is a wonderful program."

And he repeated what the other men had said in varying ways, "Too bad we didn't have something like this years ago."

Congress Must Act Against Organized Crime

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 1967

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, a distinguished news columnist, Norman Ross, of the Chicago Daily News, produced a most illuminating column recently on the subject of organized crime. In addition to pointing out the sophisticated methods employed by the modern syndicate crime personalities, Mr. Ross points up the need for increased research and new techniques for combating the organized crime elements which threaten our Nation.

It is my hope that the Congress may take decisive action at this session in behalf of Federal programs both of research and training to lead the Nation in a comprehensive and determined fight against crime.

I am pleased to attach Norman Ross' article which appeared in the May 20, 1967, edition of the Chicago Daily News:

ENCOURAGING SIGNS IN NATION'S WAR AGAINST MOBSTERS

(By Norman Ross)

How archaic are the methods and instruments used to fight organized crime in the United States?

Consider the following facts:

Some 200,000 scientists and engineers are involved in research for the military. Only a handful battle crime.

Each year the federal government spends $15 billion on research. Until 1965 the only cabinet-level department which did not share in these funds was the Department of Justice.

Notre Dame is the only major law school in the country that regularly conducts exhaustive seminars on organized crime.

According to Santa Barbara (Calif.) Prof. Donald R. Cressy, there is not a single up-to-date sociological study of such crime. He is preparing one.

The government is highly fragmented in terms of its response to crime. There are 26 or 27 separate investigative agencies at the federal level. Each operates apart from the others and does not share information which, if combined, might make a case against syndicate hoodlums.

Our courts, calamitously overloaded, still operate under procedures dating back to colonial days when people lived in small, rural communities instead of crowded urban areas.

Metropolitan areas might profit by county-wide police forces. But if a county has 30 or 40 governments, there are 30 or 40 men who are anxious to protect their small empires and jealous of interlopers.

It will, of course, take far more than just additional funds or a few new laws to wipe out crime, for it has penetrated too many aspects of American life over too long a time.

The grandsons of last century's "robber barons" turned legitimate. But the sons of today's Mafia leaders study accounting and business administration in college, and apply the latest of techniques to the firms their fathers have subverted.

To combat them, most crime fighters insist that they must be able to use rigidly proscribed eavesdropping techniques. President Johnson disagrees with them though a high percentage of their information comes from wiretaps.

There are encouraging signs, however.

For example, beginning in August, the first stage of an information-sharing system will go into operation in the greater New York area.

The hope is to develop, under rigid restrictions, a general data bank accessible to probation and parole officials, courts and district attorneys as well as police.

Private industry has come up with a number of tools especially helpful in the fight against individual criminal acts.

These include uses for closed-circuit TV, infrared rays, tranquilizer pellets, computers, advanced alarm systems and the like.

An interesting example, and one I've watched in operation, is the Community Radio Watch program initiated by the communications division of Motorola.

Under it, users of two-way car radios act as eyes and ears for the police. If they spot a potentially dangerous situation, they do not take the law into their own hands as did the man who recently curbed a speeding car, made a citizens' arrest, and was himself jailed since he had nabbed a policeman.

Instead they quickly report to a base station operator who, in turn, passes along the information to the police.

Communities in 38 states already have joined the program. Twelve thousand companies, employing 140,000 persons, have pledged support. In Detroit, a fuel-truck driver saved a woman's life when he saw her go through her windshield. In Cincinnati, police have been saved at least $100,000 by eliminating the need for extra expressway patrol officers.

Hopefully, one day such ingenuity on the part of the business community—and sociologists, engineers, educators, psychologists and others—will be applied to the even graver problems posed by organized crime. The sooner the better.

Legal Services Program of the Office of Economic Opportunity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 8, 1967

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, long before there was a war on poverty, there was, on the part of certain elements, a war on the poor themselves. This was a war waged by the most unscrupulous against the most vulnerable.

I am speaking of certain unenlightened persons whose tactics of entrapment and intimidation for too long victimized the poor in this country. There are a few such people busy today. They single out the poor, whose knowledge of their rights and whose understanding of sharp practices is limited. They induce the poor to enter into contracts which are snares for the uninformed, and then they attempt to compel compliance or payment if the poor "default." They have used not only collection agencies, but the power of the courts to profit from these unconscionable schemes.

It is not surprising, therefore, that the American Bar Association, the National Bar Association, and the National Legal Aid and Defender Association so warmly support the legal services program of the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Almost 250 legal services agencies funded by OEO will have handled more than 300,000 cases from some 600 neighborhood law offices by the end of the present fiscal year. The 1,200 lawyers who staff these offices are helping to insure that a citizen without resources will have the same protection of the law that is enjoyed by those who can afford lawyers of their own. The legal services program is an important part of the war on poverty. Not only does it furnish the weak with direct and timely legal assistance against the unscrupulous, but it furnishes continuing instruction in legal rights and responsibilities at the neighborhood level, thereby creating a greater respect for law.

The story which follows, from the Oakland, Calif., Tribune of May 25, provides an interesting insight into the work of one such local legal aid society.

LEGAL AID SOCIETY HELPS THE POOR AND IGNORANT

(By Dave Lamb)

HAYWARD.—With seven children and a poverty-level income, the man could hardly afford a $500 correspondence course that promised to train him as a jet mechanic in 30 weeks.

He spoke no English, had no money, and his dreams of grandeur had been replaced months before by a poverty-infested existence.

But then there appeared the chance to escape, the opportunity to succeed, all packaged in a bold-lettered, full-page magazine ad. He signed a contract, began the course and never made a payment.

The story is not unusual, hardly different from that of a couple who spent $800 on baby furniture. The unemployed laborer who financed a $2,000 car for $3,100, the woman supported by welfare who bought a $350 set of encyclopedias.

Each is a financial cripple, but not without recourse. For legal assistance, long denied the poor because of prohibitive fees, is available under the auspices of the War on Poverty.

The Eden Area Legal Aid Society opened at 22531 Watkins St. nine months ago with one lawyer, a secretary, two chairs and a card table.

Now staffed with four lawyers, three secretaries, two student research assistants and a full complement of furniture, the office has served 1,653 persons, most requesting help in landlord-tenant relationships, domestic situations, consumer problems, unemployment and welfare squabbles.

The office, supported by a $120,000 annual federal grant, is part of the Alameda County Legal Aid Society, which operates similar agencies in Oakland and Livermore.

"We have filled a need in the community, but we aren't close to offering all the legal assistance that the poor needs," said Ron Watts, 29, a 1964 graduate of Golden Gate Law School and head attorney in the Hayward office.

"There are 280,000 persons in our target area, 20,000–30,000 of whom probably meet poverty qualifications. We have served only about 5 per cent. For the first time, though, legal assistance is available to those who traditionally couldn't afford it."

Criticism of the War on Poverty has been widespread on many fronts. Only the legal assistance portion seems to have escaped the attacks. It recently received additional funds from Congress despite a general cutback in anti-poverty monies.

For the most part, castigation directed at legal aid has been limited to various attorneys and bar associations, which feared reduced incomes and the inception of socialized law practices.

This contention, Watts said, was premature and unfair. "If anything," he adds, "we have increased the law profession's gross income by referring many of our ineligible clients to private attorneys."

Federal guidelines defining poverty contain flexibilities molded by many variables. A family of four, for example, with an annual income of less than $4,000 is considered poverty-stricken and is eligible for free legal assistance.

Domestic problems—child custody, divorce, annulment—constitute about 35 per cent of legal aid cases. Most would be outside the financial realm of the poor if handled by private attorneys.

"That is not to say we have become a tool or whipping boy for disgruntled wives," Watts said. "Each case is screened, evaluated and handled on a priority basis. Usually domestic cases receive a low priority.

"Nor does it mean that divorce is encouraged because the means to achieve it are provided. Most of the marriages already had broken up, and the divorce merely makes the separation legally final. I don't think the poor's divorce rate is any higher than any other group's. The poor often become tangled in a web of financial hopelessness, left to flounder under the oppressive burden of self-inflicted monetary responsibilities.

"It's incredible that someone with barely enough to support his family would sign up for expensive correspondence courses or buy lavish furniture," Watts said. "But it happens all the time."

To alleviate some of the legal problems confronting the poor, Watts poses two partial solutions:

One is instruction of a mandatory basic law course in all high schools. The other a 72-

hour waiting period before a signed contract becomes valid.

Either may help an aspiring jet mechanic out of the hangar until his children were fed. A dream of grandeur might be lost. But so would a nightmare of financial unsurety.

Rochester's Rabbi Philip S. Bernstein Focuses on Mideast Future at Emergency Washington Meeting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 1967

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, last night, Rabbi Philip S. Bernstein of Temple B'rith Kodesh in Rochester, N.Y., who serves as president of the well-known American-Israel Public Affairs Committee, addressed an emergency meeting of the Nation's Jewish leaders held here in Washington.

His remarks were directed to the very serious and pressing problem of working out a new alinement in the Middle East, one which will not leave Israel open to the kind of terroristic harassment and threats to her existence that she has undergone since 1948.

Rabbi Bernstein served during and after World War II as chief adviser on Jewish affairs to the U.S. command in Europe and to Presidents Truman and Roosevelt. His primary task after the war was the relocation of the quarter of a million displaced Jewish survivors of the Nazi extermination program. Thus, his involvement with the State of Israel was an early and intimate one. He is today among the foremost American authorities on Israel and the Mideast. Knowing the concern of my colleagues in the House for the events that are now occurring in the Eastern Mediterranean, I am pleased to share with them, Rabbi Bernstein's remarks at the Sheraton Park Hotel meeting last night:

ADDRESS OF RABBI PHILIP S. BERNSTEIN, OF ROCHESTER, CHAIRMAN OF THE AMERICAN ISRAEL PUBLIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE IN WASHINGTON, JUNE 7, 1967

It was just twenty years ago that I flew into Washington from Germany to testify on behalf of the Stratton Bill. This was legislation being considered by the 80th Congress to liberalize immigration laws so as to enable some displaced persons among others to enter the United States. At that time I was serving as Advisor on Jewish Affairs to the U.S. military commander in Europe and it was my concern, as it was that of the U.S. Army, to find some refuge for the quarter of a million displaced persons then trapped in the U.S. Zone of Germany. When the 80th Congress had finished with this legislation, it not only did not admit those displaced persons who wanted to come here, but in effect excluded them.

It was only when Israel came into existence as a State and took control of Jewish immigration into Jewish hands that the DP camps were swiftly liquidated and the problem solved. From that day to this, every Jew, regardless of age or condition who has had some reason to go home has found doors of that home wide open to him in Israel.

It is this issue, among others, that has been at stake in the struggle in the Middle East. If Nasser and his cohorts had prevailed, there would have been no ready refuge, no coming home for those Jews who felt unhappy or unwanted elsewhere. And it would have meant the slaughter of the over two million Jews now in Israel.

Therefore, there is in our hearts a profound gratitude over the events that have occurred in the past 72 hours. I say this not as a warmonger, for I have served in two wars and know their terrible cost. But I express the profound gratification of all Jews and of innumerable decent people throughout the world that this disaster has been staved off by Israeli valor and strength. We are grateful, too, that these results have been achieved quickly and with a minimal loss of life and of national and human treasure.

Israel's army has made indelibly clear that Jews may no longer be slaughtered with impunity. There will not be another annilihation of Jews in our generation.

The Arab leadership responsible for this conflict is getting what it deserves. I feel differently about the Arab masses, who I suspect for the most part are victims of the vicious and false propaganda that their leaders have perpetrated. For what grievance really does the poor Arab fellah have against the Jews of Israel who have so much to teach him and who can effectuate with him a mutually fructifying relationship?

I should like to make the same point about the poor peasants of India, which for reasons of political expediency, has given support to the enemies of Israel. I was in Jaipur in December 1966 and attended a great industrial and agricultural exhibition there. The most popular exhibit was that of the Israelis, for it demonstrated a plow which could be worked with one ox rather than two. To the impoverished Indian peasant this was much more important than the political issues which the government raised to appease India's 50 million Moslems. The plain people of India had no more quarrel with Israel than the plain people of Israel have with India.

It is the Arab leadership, primarily President Nasser, who have brought the Middle East to the brink of catastrophe. It was Nasser who surrounded Israel with 100,000 Arab troops screaming for a Holy War. It was Nasser who said that Israel must be destroyed. It was Nasser who drove out the United Nation's peacekeeping contingents. It was Nasser who blockaded the Straits of Tiran.

Shall we now rehabilitate Nasser? Shall we repeat the mistakes of 1956? When Israel won the war and great power blundering defaulted on the opportunity to win peace. Shall we give Nasser the opportunity to improvise some victory out of defeat? Shall we reestablish the conditions which have made and will make peace impossible.

The answer is obvious. The objective of the peace-loving powers should be to encourage liberal Arabs to come forward now, prepared to think in terms of the welfare of the Middle East, of its people and its freedoms. The objective should be to give every encouragement to those elements in the Arab world which are prepared for peace.

The opportunity to do this has been created by Israel. Certainly the little Jewish state had some material aid from friendly western nations, but there were no troops and no active intervention. Nasser was guilty of a most dangerous and inflammatory falsehood when he charged that the United States and the British had intervened militarily on Israel's side. Was this a desperate attempt to bring the Soviet Union to his aid, an action which might have precipitated World War III.

It was Israel that won the victory. It must not now lose in peace what it was compelled to win in war. It should settle for nothing less than defensible borders. It must have freedom of navigation not only in the Red Sea but in the Suez Canal as well. Its people must no longer be compelled to live in an intolerable state of siege. They must be permitted to walk and work in peace.

The Arab war on Israel will not be brought to an end if once again we resort to evasive devices and mechanisms, and if we are satisfied with temporary truces and armistices, which are flouted and forgotten. There is only one way. Once and for all the international community must summon the Arab states to recognize that Israel exists and must call for direct Arab-Israel peace negotiations which will lead to a lasting and permanent peace.

I think it is not presumptuous to say that Israel is now rendering an historic service to the freedom-loving nations of the West. If it were not for Israel's single-handed achievements in these days, who knows what the U.S. might have been called upon to do, confronted by arrogant Arab states supported by the Soviet Union and supporting its ambitions. An aggressive and expansionist Nasser had long threatened not only Israel, but every Arab state oriented to the West. Nasser has incessantly sought to undermine America's vital interests in the Middle East. Only a couple of days ago, there were those who said that Israel and the west would have to make new concessions to Nasser because he had gained new political prestige and power. But over night, the balance of power and the balance of opinion have changed. Nasser no longer dominates the Middle East and not only Israel but other governments in that area may feel they can breathe more easily.

Israel has prevented for the present at least Soviet dominance of the Near East and the Mediterranean. Who knows what impact this would have had upon Asia and Africa? Perhaps Israel's valor and sacrifices have spared the United States a two-front conflict.

Not victory but peace is our true objective. Now there will be the opportunity to avoid the mistakes of the recent past and to achieve a peace that will be in the best interests of all. For such a peace we hope and pray, and we will labor and we will sacrifice.

The Mideast Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD D. McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 1967

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, tonight, in my home town of Buffalo, a large turnout of persons of all faiths is expected at a special service of concern for the State of Israel in Temple Beth Zion, an exciting new architectural masterpiece.

I would like to propose that the Congress authorize the Secretary of Defense to negotiate a contract for the military services of Israel's Gen. Moshe Dayan when, as seems certain, he soon winds up his current assignment.

But I will instead take time to express my views on the situation in the Middle East—past, present, and future.

Aggression against Israel began 20 years ago when the Arab world set out to flaunt the will of the United Nations and destroy the newly authorized State. Against the expressed decision of the world body, the seven Arab States launched a broad attack on the Jewish communities in the Holy Land. Only a stout and noble defense thwarted their plan.

An armistice was rushed through when the Arab armies were in hasty retreat, but it never matured into a treaty. The pressure off, the Arab States balked at accepting the status quo. Unfortunately, the great powers did not frankly face up to the issue. Arab plans for vengeance were discounted as domestic propaganda. Arab arms purchases were increased and accepted under the guise of bringing stability to the area. Foreign aid was extended to the Arab States without compelling them to integrate into their economies those Arabs who had taken flight at Arab urging.

Encouraged by international indecision, the Arabs began to organize terrorist infiltration of Israel. War was planned. Russian arms were built up in the Sinai Peninsula. In 1956, Israel defended its very existence during the Sinai campaign.

Her swift victory offered the world another chance to face the larger issues. Pledges were made. The Suez Canal would be an open waterway. Plans would be effected to provide for the disposition of the Arabs who remained in the camps. Israel was guaranteed access to the East through the Straits of Tiran. Pledges were made, but they were not followed out. The Suez Canal remained closed. Aid continued to the so-called refugees without any effective redeployment of these people. The Arab world again was encouraged to dream the ugly dreams of vengeance. She found a source of encouragement and military aid in the Soviet Union. The Russians dispatched jet aircraft, missiles, tanks, and armor in vast numbers.

In Cairo 3 years ago, a concerted strategy for the destruction of Israel was devised. These bitter seeds have borne fruit. Today Israel is defending herself and our ideals.

It is my opinion that when these hostilities come to an end the United States must take the lead in mobilizing an international effort to create viable instrumentalities for a stable Middle East peace and to establish the principle of freedom of international waters in the area. A cease-fire will be meaningless unless it includes the requirement of peace negotiations. Israel cannot bargain away her rights without assurances of security.

This great Nation, dedicated to peace and law, must be in the forefront in creating the conditions which will make direct peace negotiations possible.

Automobile Liability Insurance Policies

SPEECH

OF

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 5, 1967

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, on January 26, I joined four other Members of the House in introducing legislation creating a Federal Motor Vehicle Insurance Guaranty Corporation, to protect policyholders and injured parties against automobile insurance company failures. This measure is designed to solve one specific insurace problem; but other more fundamental insurance practices such as soaring insurance rates, arbitrary cancellations, and nonrenewals continue to plague insurance policyholders, particularly the youthful driver and elder citizen.

As we are all aware, every year auto accidents keep increasing regardless of substantial safety programs by both public and private organizations. A recent national magazine estimated auto insurance settlements for 1966 approaching $4 billion. This rising level of claims has resulted in a policy-writing loss for many insurance companies. This serves as their justification for seeking substantial increases in the premiums charged citizens. I can understand the concern of these insurance executives for maintaining a profit margin, but quite frankly, I am not convinced that the size of insurance premium increases requested by insurance companies are necessary. As was recently noted, many insurance companies earn a healthy income from the investments they make during a year on the premiums collected from customers. Therefore, many companies, although possibly losing money on premiums, more than make up for it from the investments incomes earned. I believe investment incomes should be included in computing policyholders auto rates.

I have received a number of letters from citizens from all parts of the country as a result of my support for the Federal Motor Vehicle Insurance Guaranty Corporation. These letters have listed a wide range of complaints about insurance companies; but a large number of them dealt with the questions of arbitrary cancellations and nonrenewal of policies. Many of these cancellations involved young people but others included experienced drivers who have driven for years without an accident, but who in a brief period were involved in one or two accidents. All of a sudden, these citizens have been notified by companies, often ones with which they have done business for years, that their policy had been cancelled. It is not uncommon for such cancellations to be made without clearly stating the cause.

Mr. Speaker, the automobile has become a part of every American's leisure life, but it also plays a vital role in the working day. To cancel a driver's insurance without just cause can work an economic hardship on many responsible citizens.

The non-renewal of a policy seems to be a practice particularly pertaining to elder citizens who, because of age, are no longer considered preferred risks. Again, I believe insurance companies must be responsible for showing just cause for non-renewal and, in addition, provide a means through which citizens can appeal such action. I do not consider age as showing just cause.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress in 1945, gave the power to regulate insurance to the individual States. It seems evident to me that present regulation is not adequate and that it is time the Congress reviewed the present practice of these insurance companies. The many complaints of our citizens can not continue to be ignored. We have a responsibility to them to assure that they are receiving both responsible and responsive auto insurance service. I know many of my colleagues share this concern.

Mid-Decade Census

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 1967

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, one of our distinguished colleagues, the Honorable WILLIAM J. GREEN, has earned wide acclaim for his cogent advocacy of a mid-decade census.

He has pointed out quite rightly that the once reliable decennial census is no longer sufficient for planning Federal programs or for charting the mobility of the American people.

In an editorial in its June 7, 1967, edition, the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette enthusiastically endorsed Mr. GREEN's proposal for a mid-decade census.

> The difficulties and costs of such a survey would be slight as compared to the incalculable benefits to the economy and the social sciences—

The editorial stated.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I insert the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette editorial in the RECORD at this point, and I urge my colleagues to pay close attention to the excellent case Mr. GREEN makes for a mid-decade census.

MID-DECADE CENSUS

The need for more reliable population data becomes increasingly urgent with the passage of time. The federal government spends more than $50 billion a year on domestic programs. State and local governments add an estimated $75 billion. Despite this enormous expenditure, government agencies have no accurate guidelines to determine where public needs are most pressing.

In order to carry out domestic aid programs, government agencies must have accurate census data to estimate current needs and to project future demands. Sargent Shriver, director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, has complained that census data cannot be processed quickly enough to be of any practical use to his agency.

The realization that the data supplied by the 1960 census is no longer adequate, has prompted a number of congressman to call for a census to be taken every five years. One of the most enthusiastic supporters of a mid-decade census is Representative William J. Green III of Pennsylvania, chairman of the House subcommittee on census and statistics. The 10-year census might have reflected the nation's growth in 1940, he asserts, but is hopelessly incapable of charting the soaring U.S. birth rate and the mobility of American families. He points out the impossibility of intelligent economic planning when fully half of the American people no longer live where they did in 1960.

The Census Bureau estimates that the 1970 census will cost $178 million and will be conducted principally by mail. Census takers will visit those homes which do not submit a completed form. Mr. Green proposes the use of sampling techniques in the mid-decade census instead of the door-to-door head count. This approach would not be as accurate as the person-to-person count, but would provide invaluable data for the framing of legislation and the allocation of public funds.

Some House members frown on a five year census as an unsettling measure leading to reapportionment. But actually because the membership of the House of Representatives is based on 1960 census figures, rapidly growing areas are not fairly represented in Congress. A mid-decade census would seem to be a necessity if certain inequities are not to be perpetuated.

The difficulties and costs of such a survey would be slight as compared to the incalculable benefits to the economy and social sciences. Education, housing, hospital construction, law enforcement, highway planning, mass transportation, water and air pollution control—all call for more precise population data.

Israel Struck Blow for Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES R. GROVER, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 1967

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Speaker, the kaleidoscope of events in the past week in the Mideast finds many of us without complete facts.

One thing is clear, however: the Israel forces accomplished the seeming impossible, and in doing it alone, struck a great blow for freedom, not only for Israel, but for the entire world.

My thoughts are summed up in the following letter to a constituent in my district:

JUNE 8, 1967.

Mr. ALFRED W. LEVY,
President, Huntington Hebrew Congregation, Huntington, N.Y.

DEAR MR. LEVY: I was very pleased that you and Mr. Kaufman were able to visit with me at my Washington office today to discuss the problems of the Mid-East generally, and Israel in particular, as well as the important part which America must, and I am sure, will play in protecting the territorial integrity and international rights of this valiant little country now and in the future.

The events of the past week have moved swiftly, and our early fears and apprehensions have turned to admiration and pride in the historic military victories of an oppressed, outnumbered, but courageous little nation.

In the past several years, America's Middle East policy has been steeped in paradox. We have given 245 million dollars in military aid to the Arab nations—but not with my vote! We have fed Nasser's armies with U.S. tax subsidized wheat—but not with my vote! We gave 9 billion dollars in aid to ungrateful India to see her turn her back on Israel and the United States.

And the day before hostilities began, Americans with U.S. jet aircraft were training Jordan's pilots.

The inconsistency and wishy-washy semantic flip-flop from "neutral" to "interested belligerent" was a most unsatisfactory diplomatic posture for a country pledged to stem aggression and stand for freedom. How much in contrast have been the stately and confident pronouncements by Abba Eban.

It is time for our Government and all Americans to rally behind the Israeli, who have accomplished more in one week in the cause of freedom and to check the advance of Fascist and Communist aggression than most nations in a generation.

I opposed American intervention in the 1956 Suez Crisis and its policy of roll-back, and do hope our Government this time will do all possible to use these great military victories as a base for negotiation for a lasting settlement predicated on equity, justice, and freedom.

With kindest regards,
Sincerely yours,
JAMES R. GROVER, Jr.,
Representative in Congress.

Urges United States To Support Permanent Solutions for Permanent Israel-Arab Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 1967

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, while the outbreak of violence in the Mideast has been most disturbing, there are definite indications today that many of the causes of this outbreak may now be removed.

The existence of a viable State of Israel as a permanent member of the community of nations must be fully recognized. Indeed, the State of Israel has demonstrated progress which may serve as an example for many other nations of the world.

In my recent visit to the Mideast, I had occasion to discuss the subject of Arab-Israel relations with a number of persons in Israel as well as in neighboring Jordan. It appeared that a substantial portion of the Jordanian population is ready to recognize the permanent status of Israel and to develop long-range and cordial relations of mutual respect.

It would not be a solution to the problem for us to acquiesce in any temporary or makeshift arrangements which would leave unsolved problems in the Mideast area. This view also applies to the Gulf of Aqaba and the Suez Canal. Certainly, complete access to these waters must be granted to the State of Israel without any restrictions.

The awkward and anomalous action which has permitted access to Israel through Jordan but has prevented passage to Jordan from Israel is another objectionable condition which our Nation must help to resolve on a permanant basis.

While the action of Secretary General U Thant in withdrawing U.N. Emergency Forces from Egypt was precipitate and ill advised, the attitudes displayed more recently by members of the United Nations Security Council suggest a strong desire for multinational cooperation in behalf of permanent solutions to the problems of the Middle East. We must, by all means possible, encourage such multinational cooperation and action. This in turn can provide the essential element of permanence to the Middle East countries.

Mr. Speaker, many loyal and dedicated Americans of the Jewish faith residing in the 12th District of Illinois as well as countless thousands who recognize the justice of the mission and the cause of the State of Israel have expressed their concern for this young state and its future. The concern thus expressed has been both reasonable and objective, and I have been greatly assisted in recent days by numerous communications and individual conferences with leaders of the Jewish community in my congressional district. I am grateful for their assistance, and am proud to have provided support and cooperation in their behalf.

Mr. Speaker, I am satisfied that under the steady hand and wise guidance of our Secretary of State Dean Rusk and Assistant Secretary for Near Eastern Affairs Lucius Battle, we may help the State of Israel to achieve its goals of an honorable peace together with the recognition and respect to which a sovereign nation is entitled.

Mr. Speaker, I will watch the progress of events during these coming days and will stand ready to lend my support to the appropriate decisionmaking of our executive department.

Foe of Aggressive Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 1967

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, the American trade union movement has always been a formidable foe of the aggressive forces that are bent on Communist conquest of the world. In keeping with this traditional commitment to freedom and democracy, the National Maritime Union and the International Longshoremen's Association, AFL–CIO, announced a few days ago a boycott of shipping to any Egyptian port if the United Arab Republic attempted to implement its threat to close the Gulf of Aqaba to free shipping. It is most regrettable that the resolute and positive action of these unionists has not been matched by the United Nations that has failed so abjectly to meet the realities of the hour.

I wish to associate myself wholeheartedly with the following letter of June 2, from Mr. Joel R. Jacobson, president, New Jersey State Industrial Union Council, AFL–CIO, Newark, N.J.:

NEW JERSEY STATE INDUSTRIAL
UNION COUNCIL, AFL–CIO,
Newark, N.J., June 2, 1967.

Hon. JOSEPH G. MINISH,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MINISH: The National Maritime Union, AFL–CIO and the International Longshoremen's Association, AFL–CIO, have both announced that they will boycott any ship travelling to, or carrying cargo for any Egyptian port, if the United Arab Republic should attempt to implement its threat to close the Gulf of Aqaba to free shipping.

The New Jersey Industrial Union Council, AFL–CIO, is proud to extend its strongest possible support of the courageous actions of these two unions and their attempt to end the threat to free shipping in the Middle East.

The American trade union movement has always stood as a bulwark of freedom in resistance to Communist aggression. Today, in the Middle East, the threat of aggression against free international trade and free shipping is obviously being manipulated by the Soviet Union, and callously camouflaged by the United Arab Republic.

I am writing to ask you to urge American policymakers to fulfill the commitments made previously by Presidents Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy and Johnson to preserve the international freedom of the seas.

The May 23 declaration by the President of the United States that our nation will meet its frequently reiterated commitments is encouraging. But, mere words alone are not enough.

The vigorous action planned by the National Maritime Union, AFL–CIO and the International Longshoremen's Association, AFL–CIO, is a keynote which should be pursued by our government.

Your support of this vigorous pro-democratic, and effective anti-communist action is earnestly solicited.

Sincerely,

JOEL R. JACOBSON,
President.

The Los Angeles Times Reassesses Our Commitment in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. CORMAN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 1, 1967

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, in an editorial of June 4, the Los Angeles Times presented a most perceptive analysis of America's role in the Vietnam conflict and a clear reassessment of our objectives there. Those who espouse escalation as well as those who decry escalation would do well to take note of this editorial. The administration has continually reaffirmed its commitment to a limited war for limited objectives, and the editors of the Los Angeles Times have done a commendable job of evaluating the means employed in meeting these objectives. I urge the attention of my colleagues to this fine and responsible editorial:

REASSESSMENT IN VIETNAM

The American military effort in Vietnam was begun—and supported by The Times among others—with the idea of fighting a limited conflict to obtain one limited basic objective: prevention of a Communist takeover of South Vietnam by force of arms.

The Times now sees a growing danger that the means being used to achieve this objective may soon pass beyond the military boundaries which define limited war. There is danger, in short, that U.S. power may be used in ways that will compromise or even destroy the American intention of keeping the war limited, that by accident, inadvertence or miscalculation a confrontation with the Soviet Union or Communist China will be made inevitable.

Before it is too late, before steps are taken which might involve the United States in a far larger conflict, a fresh assessment of what is going on in Vietnam would be in order. This does not mean a reconsideration of basic U.S. objectives, which we continue to believe are sound. But it does mean that the tactics employed to realize those objectives require a new evaluation, particularly as they involve North Vietnam.

Specifically, The Times believes that:

There should under no circumstances be a U.S. land invasion of North Vietnam.

Haiphong harbor should not be mined, bombed or blockaded.

Hot pursuit of North Vietnamese planes should not extend across the Chinese border, nor should there be any U.S. air attacks on Chinese bases, unless the Chinese actively intervene in the war.

Bombing in the north should remain limited to military targets, supply points and infiltration routes to the south. There should be no saturation bombing of population centers.

The American government has, of course, said before that the United States has no intention of invading North Vietnam, or of destroying its form of government. The Peking regime has also made clear that Chinese intervention in the Vietnam conflict would follow either a U.S. invasion of the north or an attempt to depose the Communists from power in Hanoi.

The combined effect of these statements seems to assure that there would be no basis for Chinese intervention in Vietnam. This is not, however, necessarily the case. Peking's leaders speak as if they believe the United States is preparing to strike into North Vietnam, on the ground. They may well be prepared to act on this conviction before the fact.

Some U.S. actions in North Vietnam, and some statements by congressional sources and others, may encourage the Chinese opinion that a major expansion of the war is imminent.

For example, recent U.S. moves into the demilitarized zone, while beyond any doubt militarily justified, may have served to support the belief that a land invasion is being prepared. Similarly, air attacks on the north have been expanded to include targets in Hanoi and Haiphong, as well as sites close to the Chinese border. Nonetheless the list of targets approved by the President and not yet hit is rapidly shrinking. The logical question is what next, and the answer the Communists may draw is that targets hitherto off-limits are to be attacked.

This is particularly the case with the port of Haiphong. Increasingly, the call is heard to mine, blockade or bomb the harbor, in the hope that the influx of supplies from other Communist countries can be reduced or shut off. Yet the considerations which so far have prevented strikes at Haiphong remain as sound as ever. An attack on the harbor would immeasurably increase the chances of active Soviet or Chinese participation in the conflict.

The U.S. government, to be sure, repeatedly affirms its intentions to keep the war limited, and probably these assurances are based on sincere aims and hopes. The trouble is that the American people have heard such assurances in the past and have seen that, by design or not, they have come to nothing.

Thus the U.S. commitment in Vietnam began in an effort to help the South Vietnamese defeat essentially by themselves the Communist-directed insurgency. But as the Saigon regime consistently showed that it was incapable of solving its own problems alone the U.S. effort was increased.

From 685 advisers U.S. strength expanded steadily: to 5,000 in early 1962, to 12,000 a year later, to 25,000 by the end of 1963, and so on, up and up until there are now nearly half a million U.S. troops in Vietnam. These troops not only are doing most of the fighting but, because the South Vietnamese have failed at it, the U.S. command has now also taken over the pacification effort, a task that may require another 150,000 men.

This is the kind of creeping escalation, essential as it may have been, that creates strong concern at this time that we may go beyond the brink of limited war into something far larger. There is still time to step back from that brink, however, by steering clear of any escalation which threatens to exceed the policy of limited war.

This does not mean any unilateral reduction of strength or effort at this time. We believe that the bombing of military targets in the north must continue so long as there is a strategic need for it, or until North Vietnam gives signs of wanting to talk about a political settlement, or begins reducing its forces in the south.

We believe, similarly, that all possible military pressure on the Communists in South Vietnam should be maintained.

At the same time we strongly feel that intensified new efforts must be made to search for ways to achieve a mutual de-escalation of the conflict. To this end the United States should try to enlist the cooperation of others, including the Soviet Union, whose influence on North Vietnam might be put to work to achieve a climate in which both sides can begin a lowering of the level of the conflict.

We recognize that the odds now are against any accommodating move by the Communists. Our expectation is that the war will continue for some time. But we feel it is vitally important that the limits governing our conduct in that war be fully recognized, and adhered to, at all times.

The risks of abandoning limited war are too great for us not to be wary.

Emergency Strike Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN JARMAN
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 8, 1967

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, the House may soon be considering House Joint Resolution 559, a bill to provide for the settlement of the labor dispute between certain carriers by railroad and certain of their employees. In that connection, I think it of real importance that each Member read the following editorial from the Washington Post of Thursday, June 8, 1967:

EMERGENCY STRIKE BILL

The President's bill to settle the railroad shopcraft dispute was a bitter pill for the Senate to swallow. No one likes settlements imposed by the Government. The Labor and Public Welfare Committee approved the bill 14 to 2 and the Senate passed the measure 70 to 15 only because they had no reasonable alternative. We surmise that a large majority in both Congress and the country is in agreement with Secretary McNamara that a railroad strike at this time would be unthinkable. The Senate merely faced up to what must be regarded as a national necessity.

The decision in the House is not likely to be different. Chairman Harley O. Staggers of the House Commerce Committee has said that Congress could just do nothing. But if his Committee or the House should follow that irresponsible suggestion, some political careers would doubtless be jeopardized and the image of Congress would be sadly tarnished. It seems highly improbable that the House will take upon itself direct responsibility for the calamity of a nation-wide railway tie-up in the present circumstances.

The chief issue before the House is not the protection of collective bargaining. In this instance, as Secretary of Labor Wirtz has acknowledged, "collective bargaining has fallen flat on its face." The issue is one of saving the country and the people from incalculable losses because of the breakdown of collective bargaining for which they are not responsible.

We think the settlement formula put forward by the Administration is fair to both sides and will have a minimum impact on the principle of free collective bargaining. It substantially extends the bargaining and mediation processes. The Government will go several extra miles to bring the disputing parties into agreement. If all efforts for a voluntary settlement should fail after 90 extra days of trying, the recommendations of a board of experts would go into effect for two and a half years unless a prior settlement were reached by the parties.

The only safe course is prompt enactment of the bill without risking a new crisis when the existing strike ban expires on June 19. We think it is unfortunate that the bill applies to only this one dispute, but its enactment will at least avert a crisis now and put other groups on notice as to what they must expect if they permit their disputes over wages and working conditions to reach a point where a national emergency is threatened.

A Great Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED SCHWENGEL
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 8, 1967

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker last Saturday one of the best friends in the First District of Iowa that I have had, Clarence Moody, passed away.

Mr. Moody served as the editor of the Burlington Hawk-Eye Gazette from 1941 to 1957. In his retirement he continued to be active. In 1964 he ran on the Republican ticket for the State legislature.

Clarence Moody was a man of conviction and determination. He gave much to his community, State, and Nation. He will be missed.

The Burlington Hawk-Eye Gazette's stories on Clarence Moody contain a record of his accomplishments.

The articles follow:

"Uncle Clarence," 1892–1967—C. W. Moody Rites Tuesday

Clarence W. Moody, retired editor-publisher of The Hark-Eye Gazette, died Saturday at 8:45 a.m. in Klein hospital. He was 74.

Mr. Moody suffered a severe stroke Thursday and failed to rally.

Services will be Tuesday 10:30 a.m. in Christ Episcopal church with Rev. E. William Strauser officiating. Burial will be in Aspen Grove cemetery. The body is at Prugh's chapel.

A memorial has been established at Christ Episcopal church.

CAME UP HARD WAY

A veteran of more than 50 years in newspapering, Mr. Moody's career had extended from printer's devil to Iowa Master Editor.

Forced to quit school to earn a living, he was a self-educated man whose civic service included a number of national posts.

He was named Burlington Citizen No. 1 for 1953. The city council, in 1956, named Moody Lane after him.

After his retirement Sept. 1, 1957, he had continued to write Sunday "Items From Hawkeye Creek" which won him a Master Columnist award. (His final column is on Page 5 today.)

Under his editorship from 1941 to 1957, Mr. Moody and The Hawk-Eye Gazette won a score of national and state awards.

He was affectionately known to his staff as "Uncle Clarence."

Among his citations was an honorary Doctor of Laws degree from Parsons college, Fairfield, in 1957.

"I'm an LLD who never got through high school," he quipped.

An independent Republican in politics, he did not hesitate to take issue with the party when he thought it was wrong. He was proud of his friendship with Democrat as well as Republican leaders.

He declared that he "never let the ties of friendship deter me from doing what I thought was right."

BORN ON FARM

Born on a farm near Skidmore, Mo., Sept. 24, 1892, he was the son of Colonel and Jennie Wampler Moody. He attended rural schools in Nodaway county, Missouri, as the family moved from one farm to another.

When he was 12, he and his mother moved to Ottawa, Kans. It was on the Ottawa Herald that he did his first formal newspaper writing as a $6 a week reporter in 1911.

Mr. Moody entered the Army in 1918 and was taking officer's training when the Armistice was signed.

He returned to the Ottawa Herald and in 1927 transferred to the Chanute, Kans., Tribune. He became editor-publisher of the Chanute paper in 1933. He came to Burlington from Chanute in 1941.

MARRIED IN OTTAWA

Mrs. Moody is the former Bess Sutton. They were married July 19, 1920, in Ottawa.

Although the Moodys had no children, they reared a niece of Mrs. Moody, Wilma Cookus Allen. Mrs. Allen was a resident of North Kansas City, Mo., when she was kidnaped and killed in 1955.

Mr. Moody headed the Iowa Daily Press Assn. from 1955-57. He had been a trustee of Parsons and Culver-Stockton colleges and a member of the Iowa Wesleyan Associates. He was also a trustee of the William Allen White Foundation in Lawrence, Kans.

In 1955 he was an Iowa delegate to President Eisenhower's White House Conference on Education.

In Burlington he had served on boards of the Chamber of Commerce, Community Chest, county historical society, the Mercy hospital advisory group and had headed the library board for 17 years.

The library board last week honored Mr. Moody with the purchase of the book "Of Man and Rivers" by Virginia Eifert. Mr. Moody had been a member of the board from September of 1944 until his retirement in April of this year.

HELPED GET STAMP

He was state chairman for Radio Free Europe in 1958–59. A member of the Iowa Section of the Mississippi River Parkway commission, he was instrumental in the issuing of a US stamp commemorating the Great River road which extends along both sides of the Mississippi from the Gulf into two Canadian provinces.

Mr. Moody was a member of the Iowa advisory group to the National Civil War Centennial commission.

ACTIVE IN CHURCH

Chairman of the board of Burlington Federal Savings & Loan Assn. here, he was also a Rotarian and a member of a number of fraternal, civic and professional organizations.

He was a 50-year member of the Masonic Order and Elks lodge. He belonged to the American Legion.

Mr. Moody was a member of Christ Episcopal church where he was a vestryman and a lay reader. He was also active in diocesan activities.

A Gentleman of the Press

Clarence W. Moody was one of the true "gentlemen of the press."

The courtly tip of his homberg and his graciousness both in and out of the office marked him as a man of manners.

His gentlemanly outlook carried over into his workday life as an editor and a boss.

He often referred to the staff as "the Hawk-Eye Gazette family." He and his wife, Bess, made it a point to keep up-to-date on new babies, marriages, illnesses and deaths. He was affectionately referred to as "Uncle Clarence."

He also liked to call his newspaper "the family journal."

But his gentle approach didn't stop him from sitting down to a 2-finger attack on a typewriter to pound out a stinging rebuke that punctured the pompous or put the editorial finger on a community wrong.

"I'm not, and never have claimed to be, a crusader," he once said. Yet he gave the editorial support and exerted the continued pressure that cleared Burlington of slot machines and kept them out.

He was a stickler for factual reporting and believed in printing both sides of a controversial matter.

He quit school early to earn a living and was largely a self-educated man. His use of words often sent copy readers to the dictionary and helped increase their vocabularies.

"The dictionary is not in the newsroom to press flowers," he more than once reminded a reporter trapped by a spelling error.

He firmly believed that a newspaper's prime purpose is to keep the public informed about public business, especially in the tax field.

And he felt that to be worth your salt, you had to be active in your community, a maxim he continued to live up to after his retirement as an active newspaperman in 1957.

His community service brought him the title of Burlington Citizen No. 1 for 1953 and the naming of Moody Lane for him in 1956.

He and his newspaper won a score of civic and professional honors and none probably pleased him more at the time than an honorary Doctor of Laws degree from Parsons college in 1957. "I'm an LLD who never got through high school," he quipped.

Even after his retirement, and up to three days before his death, he continued to write a Sunday "Items From Hawkeye Creek" which had won him an Iowa Master Columnist award to add to the Iowa Master Editor title bestowed by the Iowa Press association.

Clarence Moody made no secret that the policy of his paper leaned Republican. But he was not above taking a swipe at the party when he felt it was wrong. He was proud that leaders in the Democrat as well as the Republican party were some of his best friends.

Looking back over a half century of newspapering, he once confided that he "never let the ties of friendship deter me from doing what I thought was right."

Which isn't a bad epitaph for a newspaperman—or any man, for that matter.

Hope Behind the Iron Curtain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JEFFERY COHELAN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 8, 1967

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, increasingly, in our evaluation of foreign policy developments, of the merits of our foreign assistance programs, and of the wisdom of encouraging East-West trade, it is important for us to be aware of changes taking place in the countries within the Communist bloc.

An example is the development within Yugoslavia of evidences of economic liberalism. These are in themselves healthy, and they are heartening also for the effect they may have in Yugoslavia's future social and political structure. Columnists Rowland Evans and Robert Novak provide further information on these developments in their article in today's Washington Post, which I call to my colleagues' attention:

YUGOSLAVIA'S SECOND REVOLUTION

(By Rowland Evans and Robert Novak)

BELGRADE.—What began in 1965 as strictly an economic reform is racing out of control in the direction of a peaceful political revolution to democratize Yugoslav communism.

This is precisely the aim of influential Communist liberals, currently battling entrenched bureaucrats in the state and Party apparatus.

"We are aiming ultimately for an open, democratic society," a leader of the Party's liberal wing told us. If they succeed, it will be no less a revolution than the armed rising a generation ago by Marshal Josip Broz Tito's Red Partisans.

The size of the stakes here is scarcely appreciated in the West. Even today there is incomparably more personal and political freedom in Yugoslavia than in any other Communist country (and more, too, than in many Western nations). Moreover, if the liberals complete their revolution, Yugoslavia will remain Communist in name only.

Yugoslavia was still an authoritarian, semi-police state in 1965, when Tito—unwittingly, in all probability—triggered a chain reaction by approving a many-sided economic reform.

That reform, dramatic enough in its own right, applies principles of modern capitalist economics to a Socialist society. Each Socialist business enterprise makes its decisions without government interference or financing, can dispose of its profits either by distributing them among workers or reinvesting them, can invest in other enterprises, or—if business is bad—can go bankrupt. The pictures of Karl Marx and V. I. Lenin were turned to the wall.

Orthodox Communist apparatchiks correctly saw the reform emasculating the state bureaucracy and the Communist Party. They quickly launched a bitter sabotage campaign against the reform under the leadership of Alexander Rankovic, then Vice President of Yugoslavia and boss of the all-powerful state security apparatus. Rankovic lost the intra-Party fight, and was purged by Tito last summer.

Tito acted to save the economic reform, but Rankovic's fall opened the way to political reforms Tito eyes with suspicion. Freed suddenly from harassment and the constant threat of arrest by Rankovic's secret police, Party liberals started their political revolution.

Some advances since then are obvious: new power for state and federal parliaments, hotly contested parliamentary elections that saw scores of official Party candidates lose, uncensored press criticism of government and Party decisions (but not, of course, of Tito personally). More important, however, is behind-the-scenes activity of the liberals.

Based on the failure of parliamentary government here between the wars, these liberals do not want a multiparty system. Rather, they seek what Professor Svetozar Stojanovic of Belgrade University, a leading liberal theoretician, calls "Socialist pluralism."

It would provide open discussion inside the Communist Party, a wide variety of Socialist views both inside and outside the Party and, ultimately, even airing of non-Socialist or anti-Socialist opinion.

The Communist Party, which in Yugoslavia as elsewhere in Communist Europe is a haven for bureaucrats and career military men, would be given a broader base but stripped of all real power. In general, the liberals are groping for a non-Western form of democracy fitted to their own needs.

It should be stressed that these Communist liberals have no connection with or sympathy for the famed and persecuted critics of the Tito regime: former Vice President Milovan Djilas (recently released from prison) and Mihajlov (recently sentenced to prison). Yet to the man, the liberals privately criticize Tito for ordering Mihajlov's prosecution.

"The real enemy," says one liberal, "is not Mihajlov. It's the military and the bureaucrats." Indeed, even with Rankovic gone, these apparatchiks still dominate the Party, attempting to frustrate reform.

Furthermore, the economic reform that spawned the political revolution is threatened by heavy unemployment it caused in its initial stages. If the reform fails, a reaction against political liberalism would be inevitable.

With the issue very much in doubt, then, the United States ought to be doing all it can for the reform. The fact that it is not is a curious story worth telling in a future column.

Hanna Hails Anniversary of Consumer Credit Counselors of Orange County

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD T. HANNA
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 5, 1967

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I note with a great deal of pleasure the passing of the first anniversary of the Consumer Credit Counselors of Orange County. This fine group, whose headquarters are located in Santa Ana, Calif., is a nonprofit corporation made up of business, labor, and county service groups. Its purpose is to provide a free credit counseling service to the community.

The Consumer Credit Counselors of Orange County first opened its doors on June 1, 1966. Under the leadership of Carl F. Lindquist, the manager and executive director; Mike Booth, the president; Wendell K. Johnston, treasurer, as well as a board of directors of public-minded citizens, the group has grown and expanded. During the course of its initial year of operation, it has aided numerous families in Orange County.

In large measure, credit for the success of this service can be claimed by three broad groups: the consumer finance industry, banks, and retailers in Orange County. Representatives of each of these industries have given a great deal of financial assistance to the counseling group.

While the vast majority of American families can and do handle their credit obligations without difficulty in this era of installment credit, there unfortunately do exist some families which become so enmeshed in financial difficulties, either through accident, ill health, and so forth, that they are unable to meet their obligations when due. This results in loss for the creditors, and often acute family disruption, inefficiency, garnishment, job loss, and other problems for the debtor. If debt problems are permitted to become acute, they can become social problems which affect the entire community. They can also generate criticism of the whole consumer credit system which has become such a vital part of the postwar economic growth of our Nation.

Unfortunately, I must point out that California with about 9½ percent of the Nation's population records more than 18 percent of all U.S. personal bankruptcies. This is despite a per capita income that places California fifth among all States.

The consumer credit counselors have established educational and publicity programs on the economics of sound credit, the wide use of credit, and family income management. They have included educational seminars, family counseling, and assistance to social workers in the various agencies in the field of credit counseling.

It has been my distinct privilege to serve on the board of directors of this fine organization. On the occasion of their first anniversary, I congratulate them and wish them every success in the future.

Marguerite Justice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES H. WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 8, 1967

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, Cervantes wrote in Don Quixote:

> He is a good man . . . and a true Christian every inch of him.

I rise today to pay tribute to a woman whom that immortal passage describes perfectly.

Mrs. Marguerite Justice, who resides at 4300 South Kenwood Avenue in Los Angeles, has made an outstanding contribution to her community, State, and Nation, and therefore deserves our commendation.

Marguerite Justice, whose husband is with the Northrop Corp., in Hawthorne, Calif., is a prominent member of the congregation of St. Mark's Methodist Church in Los Angeles. In July 1965, Mrs. Justice volunteered to take charge of the church's youth fellowship program. Because of her leadership, St. Mark's today provides a vitally significant program of activities for the young people of Washington and Morningside High Schools. In an era when so few young people are exposed to sensitive adult advice and guidance, Mrs. Justice has sought to fill the void. She has arranged dances, beach and ice skating parties, youth conferences, theater outings, and tours of municipal buildings and art museums.

Marguerite Justice is not only concerned about young people; she is doing something constructive in their behalf. Unlike so many of our citizens, who merely criticize the younger generation, Mrs. Justice has succeeded in making religion a relevant and central force in their lives.

Her sincere and selfless commitment to her fellowman has materially improved the quality of life in our community. She is an inspiration to others because she practices each day those Christian principles she seeks to instill in the young.

Mr. Speaker, I know that my colleagues in the House of Representatives join me in saluting Marguerite Justice and the fine work she is doing.

Copter Pilot, Marine, Viet Casualties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 1967

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, two Maryland residents were recently killed in combat in Vietnam. They were CWO Robert W. Cook, an Army helicopter pilot shot down in combat; and Marine Pfc. John W. Avelleyra, killed while on a combat mission. I wish to commend the courage of these young men and honor their memory by including the following articles from the Baltimore Sun in the RECORD:

COPTER PILOT, MARINE, VIET CASUALTIES

An Army helicopter pilot from Claiborne, Talbot county, and a young marine from Mount Rainier, Prince Georges county, have been killed in Vietnam, the Defense Department announced yesterday.

Both Chief Warrant Office Robert W. Cook, the pilot, and Pfc. John W. Avelleyra had been in constant combat duty in their tours in Vietnam, the former having won the Bronze Star and the Distinguished Flying Cross and the latter being awarded two Purple Hearts.

Warrant Officer Cook, who was 29, died last Friday when his helicopter was shot down while on a combat mission notheast of Saigon. He had been in Vietnam since January and in the Army since 1955.

He was an Army career man who had seen two earlier tours of duty in Korea and one in Europe. He completed flight training last August at Fort Rucker, Ala., and was promoted recently to chief warrant officer.

SURVIVORS NAMED

He is survived by his father and mother and a sister, Alice C. Cook, all of Claiborne. He was also the grandson of the late Henry R. Cook, Jr., a vice president of the Baltimore Gas and Electric Company.

Private Avelleyra was shot Sunday while on a combat mission near Quang Tri, close to the buffer zone between North and South Vietnam. He was 18 years old.

During his two months in Vietnam, he had been wounded twice. On one mission, his unit was pinned down by Communist fire for 40 hours. He was stationed at Con Thien and wrote home about the terror of enemy mortar fired sporadicaly into the post.

Private Avelleyra enlisted in the Marine Corps last October after graduating from Archbishop John Carroll High School in June. His father served in the Pacific with the marines during World War II.

He was the second oldest of eight children. The others are Linda, Francesca, Carla, Tina, Mary Margaret, Michael and Marcus Avelleyra. His mother and father also survive. The family lives at 4200 Thirtieth street, Mount Rainier.

The Negro Past

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 1967

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, until recently the Negro's part in the development of our country has been hidden behind ignorance and discrimination. At long last, an effort is being made to reveal the Negro's vital role in the history of our Nation.

Volumes of Negro history, revised textbooks, and extensive research are just a few among many attempts being made in order to give the Negro his due.

Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues an article which appeared in the May 17, 1967, edition of the Wall Street Journal. This informative article details the various efforts being made to reveal an obscure, but nevertheless essential, part of American life.

The article follows:

THE BLACK PAST: CIVIL RIGHTS MOVEMENT SPURS INTEREST IN ROLE OF NEGROES IN HISTORY—NEW TEXTS, REVISIONS OFFER MORE POSITIVE TREATMENT—BIG LIFT FOR SELF-ESTEEM?—THE NEGROES NOBODY KNOWS

(By Peter H. Prugh)

Who wrote the first American almanac, helped plan Washington, D.C., began the settlement of Chicago, invented the cowboy art of bulldogging steers, was with Peary at the North Pole and pioneered in the development and use of blood plasma?

Black men all—but until recently hardly anyone knew their names or deeds.

All that is changing, though. The civil rights movement has brought with it a spectacular growth of interest in the Negro's role in American history. Publications devoted entirely to detailing the individual and collective achievements of Negroes are rolling off the presses in record numbers, and more Negro history is being written into revisions of standard textbooks.

Scholars generally agree that until recently the black man had been all but shut out of history books, and they applaud recent attempts to recognize his contributions to American life. The current revival of Negro history, however, is of more than just academic importance.

A LIFT FOR SELF-ESTEEM?

Benjamin Quarles, professor of history at Morgan State College in Baltimore, says that Negroes usually hear of themselves in connection with American problems—as the passive victims of slavery (actually, they were not so passive as "white" histories would indicate), an issue which helped precipitate one of the bloodiest wars ever fought; as juvenile delinquents and criminals; and, in general, as social misfits. They rarely get the opportunity to learn about the "constructive role they played in general American history," says Mr. Quarles. He and many others, Negro and white, hope the flood of new publications and revisions will give a much-needed lift to the Negro's self-esteem.

Also, a more extensive knowledge of Negro history by whites might help them discard "myths" about Negroes, says Erwin A. Salk, a Chicago mortgage banker and editor of A Layman's Guide to Negro History. For example, he says that most books, movies and TV shows about the West have only "tall, lean Anglo-Saxons" as folk heroes; a Negro is seldom if ever seen, even though the West had some 5,000 Negro cowboys at one time. One of them, Bill Pickett, is the man credited with inventing the bulldogging technique.

The publishers are doing all they can to spread the word. "There's a concerted effort to give the Negro his due," says an editor for Scott, Foresman & Co., which is readying two college texts on Negro history.

A 10-VOLUME LIBRARY

Publishers Company Inc., Washington, is producing a 10-volume series, the International Library of Negro Life and History, and already has sold out the first press run of 20,000 sets even though only the first five volumes are currently available. They deal with the Negro's role in the Civil War, medicine, the theater, and music and art. A collection of Negro biographies is also included in the initial volumes.

Afro-Am Publishing Co., a two-man Chicago firm founded in 1963, is prospering mightly. Great Negroes, Past and Present, the company's only book, has sold 62,000 copies and is in its fourth printing. And schools are snapping up visual aid materials on Negro history also sold by Afro-Am, says David P. Ross Jr., president.

The handful of scholars specializing in Negro history are being swamped with offers to write, advise, teach and lecture. "I've had to decline six lecture dates in California this school year alone," says Arna Bontemps, professor at the University of Illinois' Chicago Circle campus and a well-known Negro author. An estimated 10% of the nation's colleges now offer Negro history courses, compared with less than 5% five years ago.

Companies using Negro historical subjects for promotion or advertising are amazed at the public response. American Oil Co., a subsidiary of Standard Oil Co. (Indiana), has distributed more than 500,000 free copies of its 64-page booklet, American Traveler's Guide to Negro history.

First published in 1963, the booklet includes descriptions and photographs of monuments and landmarks pertinent to Negro history in 28 states. It has been used, among other places, in schools and in Job Corps training.

An advertising campaign for Old Taylor bourbon featuring outstanding Negroes has brought 100,000 requests for free booklets on the subjects of the ads. Queries are coming from "schools, government agencies, churches, prisons and consumers," says an executive of National Distillers & Chemical Corp.

Perhaps the most significant breakthrough, however, is occurring in the general American history textbooks used regularly by millions of pupils, black and white. These volumes have long neglected the Negro. Ebony magazine has said that "black people have been made Orwellian non-persons in the symbolic world projected by textbook writers." Just last year Irving Sloan wrote a scathing review for the American Federation of Teachers on the poor treatment of the Negro in standard textbooks.

But there have been marked changes lately. Scott-Foresman has a new text for high school seniors out this year that has two pages listing dates and events showing "the changing status of the American Negro." The text also mentions the "Harlem

Renaissance," a literary movement of the 1920s, and in a chapter on the colonial period says that the labor of Negro slaves was a key ingredient in the development of the nation. The book, United States History, by Richard N. Current, Alexander de Conde and Harris L. Dante, makes numerous other references to Negroes.

Some revisions of standard works have been exhaustive. One junior high school text, The Growth of America, written by Rebekah R. Liebman and Gertrude A. Young and first published by Prentice-Hall Inc. in 1959, was criticized in its original version by a University of California study group. It said the book "singled out" the Negro "not only for unsympathetic and inadequate treatment but for non-treatment."

The revised book, however, gets good marks from critic Sloan, among others. The book says Negroes "hated slavery," only acted "pleasant" and "obedient" to avoid their masters' disfavor, frequently ran away and plotted against their masters more often than is supposed. Many other text imply that Negroes were acquiescent under slavery.

The Prentice-Hall book also provides considerable material on the role of the Negro in the Civil War—230,000 Negroes fought on the Union side, 37,000 were killed in action, 20 won Congressional Medals of Honor—and points out the positive contributions of Negroes during Reconstruction. Mr. Sloan says the difference between the original and revised edition is "tremendous."

Often it's to the publisher's advantage to give fuller and fairer coverage to Negro history in general texts. One editor says more and more textbook buyers for school systems are checking indexes carefully to see how books treat this topic.

The surge of interest in Negro history has brought the names and exploits of many little-known Negroes to the attention of readers. Among them are Benjamin Banneker, who wrote the first American almanac; Jean du Sable, Chicago's first settler; Matthew Henson, co-discoverer of the North Pole; John James Audubon, the naturalist; Dr. Charles Drew, developer of blood plasma, and Elijah McCoy, an inventor who, it's said, built lubricating devices of such quality that buyers insisted on getting only "the real McCoy." (Other sources say this expression originated as a reference to a boxer, Kid McCoy, who shared his name with another pugilist of inferior skills.)

Tracing the history of Negroes in America has been difficult, however. As slaves, most Negroes were not permitted to learn how to read and write, so there are few documents from them dealing with this period. Also, some Southern states destroyed the papers of Negroes prominent during the Reconstruction. "Negroes didn't usually file their papers or publications in the Library of Congress," says Mr. Quarles of Morgan State. Many materials are scattered across the country and are poorly indexed, he adds.

In New Jersey, members of Alpha Kappa Alpha, a Negro sorority, are resorting to interviews with long-time Negro residents in an attempt to piece together Negro history in that state. They already know that as far back as 1790 New Jersey had a Negro population of about 11,000, including 3,000 freemen, and the sorority says some Negroes interviewed can trace their lineage back to African royal families.

There are some centers of material on Negro history, however, including Howard University in Washington and Atlanta University. One of the best-known is the Schomberg Collection, a part of the New York Public Library System. Located in Harlem, the collection has 44,000 volumes and a vast quantity of uncataloged materials. A few years ago, its reading room was used but little; now it's often crowded.

Castro and the New York Times: An Image in Transition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD W. POLLOCK

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 1967

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Speaker, I personally take a great deal of pride in the excellent record written by the newspapers of this Nation. American newspapers have served a vital and absolutely essential role in the furtherance of our national ideals. Not too often can a legitimate finger of criticism be pointed at American newspapers. Their record has been remarkable.

Newspapers, along with other news media, convey images, however favorable or unfavorable, of people, places and events. The images conveyed in large measure determine what the American public will think on a given subject. In effect, the news media establishes "reality" for the American public. The journalism profession as a part of the news media bears a heavy responsibility in our society for this reason.

When a newspaper distorts "reality," it creates an untrue image in the minds of the American public. Such a distortion of "reality," though I am sure unintentional, occurred in the pages of one of journalism's foremost organs, the New York Times, during the rise of Fidel Castro in Cuba.

The story of Castro's image in the New York Times and its many implications for the American public and our foreign policy makers is accurately recorded in the spring, 1967, issue of Modern Age. Coauthoring this article are Carl D. McMurray and Charles W. Dunn. Both hold Ph. D.'s in political science. Dr. McMurray is administrative assistant to the Governor of Alaska, Walter J. Hickel, and Dr. Dunn is special assistant to the minority whip of the House of Representatives, the Honorable LESLIE C. ARENDS. I highly recommend this article as a thorough and scholarly study of an unfortunate event in newspaper history.

The article follows:

CASTRO AND THE NEW YORK TIMES: AN IMAGE IN TRANSITION

(By Carl D. McMurray and Charles W. Dunn)

"Too much of the regular output of the press consists of a miscellaneous succession of stories and images which have no relation to the typical lives of real people anywhere. Too often the result is meaningless, flatness, distortion and the perpetuation of misunderstanding among widely scattered groups, whose only contact is through these media."[1]

It is commonplace to note that newspapers and other mass media play a leading role in the development of public images of famous personalities. The images are created over a period of time through reports, apparently authoritative, which give the reading, viewing, and listening public pictures of the *prominent ones* in terms of physical makeup, likes, dislikes, ideals, goals, and a variety of personality quirks. The impressions generated may or may not be accurate portrayals of the models. But, accurate or inaccurate, the images do affect the way individuals within the mass audience react to the names, statements, and actions of "real" persons.

Without any effort to describe the connection between foreign policy and public opinion, it seems reasonable to assume that when an image of the leader of a foreign nation has been created for popular consumption in the United States, the nature of this image will influence public opinion and consequently set limits within which policy makers must operate when dealing with that person. The exact nature of these limits is not a concern in the following account of *The New York Times'* development of the Castro image; but the reader should recognize the potential significance of a mass media "image" of the Cuban leader when it is interposed between American policy makers and the uncertain qualities that are the "real" Castro.

I. FROM "FIDEL" TO "CASTRO"

Few newspaper audiences have been treated to an experience in image creation and transformation comparable to that offered readers of *The New York Times* as that paper painted its changing portrait of Fidel Castro. It is an obvious understatement to note that the *Times* is not an average American newspaper, even if we discount the size of its circulation. Not only does it lay claim to printing "All the News That's Fit to Print," it also enjoys a reputation for clean and unsensational coverage of the news. At the beginning of each academic year, college professors throughout the country direct new classes of students to that shortcut to scholarly research, the *Times' Index,* and often they imply (if they do not openly assert), "the *Times* is a newspaper of straight reporting with little bias." We propose to examine this proposition.

Sidestepping the question of whether any reporting can be free of bias, we ask, "Was the *Times* reporting of Castro's takeover in Cuba designed to create an image of the Cuban leader that, in retrospect, had little resemblance to the 'real' Castro?" Three stages of image development and transformation are examined. During the first stage of image development, the *Times'* reports fondly refer to the Cuban leader as "Fidel" and repeatedly tell the reader that "No one ever calls him anything else." He is presented as a swashbuckling hero, a great humanitarian, and a dedicated friend of liberty. The second stage is a transitional period in which the *Timesreader* is confronted with facts that do not conform to the original image; but the image is maintained untarnished, and the unpleasant facts are blamed on situations and circumstances, not on "Fidel." The final stage is a period of "agonizing reappraisal" in which the *Times'* editors enter what we designate as the "Castro" stage, and the *Timesreader* is asked to reject the initial image of "Fidel" and adopt another. Since the "Castro" image is that of a Communist dictator, the reader is left to wonder whether anyone still calls the fellow "Fidel."

II. STAGE ONE: THE TIMES' "FIDEL" PERIOD

In February, 1957, the *Times'* Latin American correspondent, Herbert L. Matthews, gave the paper's reading public its first "clear" picture of Fidel Castro—a picture of a folk-hero garbed in American ideals:

"The personality of the man is overpowering. It was easy to see that his men adored him and also to see why he has caught the imagination of the youth of Cuba all over the island. Here was an educated, dedicated fa-

---

Footnotes at end of speech.

natic, a man of ideals, of courage, and of remarkable qualities of leadership. . . . He has strong ideas of liberty, democracy, social justice, the need to restore the constitution, hold election."[2]

Later the same month, any claim of Communist domination in the "26th of July Movement," headed by Castro, was repudiated in the *Times;* and the counterclaim was set forth that Castro and his men "are giving their lives for an ideal and for their hopes of a clean democratic Cuba."[3] When President Batista took exception to these observations and charged Fidel and his brother, Raul, with having Communist connections, the editors of the *Times* reported:

"[It] is vital . . . to repudiate the unworthy accusation by President Batista that these youths are 'pro-Communist.' This is the cry of all dictators, especially in Latin America. . . . Neither the university students' movement nor the '26th of July Movement,' headed by Fidel Castro, who is fighting a guerrilla action in the Sierra Maestra of Oriente Province, has any taint of communism of pro-communism."[4]

Herbert Matthews and his image of Castro move to the front page of the *Times* in June, 1957. The *Timesreader* is treated to a glance at a "Fidel" who is loved by all the oppressed; indeed, he is more than loved:

"Fidel (No one ever calls him anything else) is worshipped here in Oriente Province. . . . [The worshippers range from] poor farmers and workers to the highest levels of conservative, religious elements of society, business and the professions. . . . No figure has attained this stature in Cuba since the struggle for indepedence against Spain."[5]

The "Fidel" image is beginning to take on definite conformations. He is a freedom-loving, democratic idealist whose very name is cherished by his followers. But wait! The picture is not yet complete. What of the manly arts, bravery and humility? *Times'* battle sketches fill in these features:

"The attackers were led by Senor Castro with his customary dash and rash bravery. . . . [And, treating prisoners with kindness] has helped to win for Senor Castro so extraordinary a place in the hearts and minds of Cubans and has caused the Government's accusations of criminality and communism to be ridiculed."[6]

Comes July, 1958. Herbert L. Matthews has received on Overseas' Press Club Award for his Cuban reporting, the Castro forces have kidnapped thirty-eight Americans and two Canadians, and the *Timesreader* is being reassured of the good intentions of "Fidel." The kidnappings are dismissed as a good old American practice—a publicity stunt:

"It was clear that Fidel (as he is universally known in Cuba) was doing three things [when he kidnapped the forty men.] He was registering a protest against American policies which he felt favored the military dictator President Fulgencio Batista. He was showing that he and his followers were masters in the eastern third of Cuba. . . . Finally, he was calling attention to himself and to his cause in a spectacular way."[7]

The day of triumph for "Fidel" is January 2, 1959. President Batista has fled, the military junta he left behind has been rejected by the revolutionaries, and Havana prepares to welcome her bearded hero. As "Fidel" consolidates his power, the *Timesreader* is invited to join in the rejoicing, i. e., temperate rejoicing of course, since he is told, "The youthful soldiers of Fidel Castro do not drink alcoholic beverages."[8] The *Times* views the fall of Batista as "an acknowledgment to the extraordinary young man, Fidel Castro, who fought against such heavy odds with such tenacity, bravery and intelligence since his pathetically weak band of youths landed in Oriente Province on Dec. 2, 1956. A great burden now falls on his shoulders. . . . The American people wish him and all Cubans good fortune."[9]

Some two months after "the extraordinary young man" came to power, the *Times* carried an exclusive article by Mr. Matthews appraising the revolution and its leader. The story is of particular interest since it brings into focus vital details of the "Fidel" portrait. In adulatory phrases scattered across three pages, the *Timesreader* is told:

"Standing or sitting, he gets right up close. He cannot bear to sit even two feet from the person he is talking to. . . . His dark, rich brown eyes are hypnotic in their intensity. . . . Fidel (no one ever calls him anything else) obviously arouses all the maternal instincts in women. . . . His followers—now almost all Cuba—would also add that he is a man of high moral principles and is essentially good in the moral sense, although some worry about the way in which the force of circumstances has willy-nilly given him the power of a dictator."[10]

A month later in April, 1959, Fidel Castro visited New York City and Washington, D.C. He was accorded a hero's welcome, and the *Times* carried a page one report of his comments before a joint meeting of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the House Foreign Affairs Committee. The report held no surprises for the *Timesreaders*. Grazing hypnotically out over the Senators and Representatives with his "dark, rich brown eyes," Fidel emphasized several points: the Cuban revolution was not Communistic, rather it was humanitarian; and the revolutionaries had no desire to confiscate foreign private industry, rather they sought increased capitalization by foreign business to bolster employment.[11]

III. STAGE TWO: THE TRIBULATIONS OF "FIDEL"

By July, 1959, mass trials, executions and anti-U.S. statements by the Cuban leader receive notice in the pages of the *Times;* and the editors are satisfied to carry with minimum comment Castro's statements about a war scare with the Dominican Republic and the resignation of Cuba's Chief of Air Force, Major Pedro Diaz Lanz:

"If the current crisis has been created by persons seeking to provoke war between Cuba and the Dominican Republic to justify intervention in Cuba by the United States or by the Organization of American States, we are going to give them a pretext, ['Fidel'] said . . . [Moreover, he] declared that the recent resignation of Cuba's Chief of Air Force, Major Pedro Diaz Lanz, was part of a plan to accuse Cuba of communism."[12]

After his resignation, Diaz testified before a committee of the U.S. Congress, and when asked if Raul Castro was the most powerful Communist in the new government, he replied, "I think it is Fidel himself." He also said Castro had talked to him "about getting rid of the banks, taking land from 'everybody' and giving Cuba 'a system like Russia has.'"[13]

The pressure of these events—the mass trials, anti-American comments by Castro, and the Major's testimony—did not lead the *Times* to abandon the "Fidel" image. After all, had not "Fidel" predicted that Major Diaz Lanz would say just what he did say? The extent of the continuing commitment to this image may be measured by Herbert Matthews' rebuttal of the Major's testimony. Under the title, "Cuba Has a One Man Rule And It Is Called Non-Red," he wrote:

"This is not a Communist revolution in any sense of the word, and there are no Communists in positions of control . . . The accusations of [Major Diaz Lanz] . . . are rejected virtually by all Cubans. . . . The use to which his defection was put in Washington has aroused more bitterness and resentment against the United States than any event in the history of Cuban-American relations. . . . The only power worth considering in Cuba is in the hands of Premier Castro, who is not only not Communist, but decidedly Anti-Communist, even though he does not consider it desirable in present circumstances to attack or destroy the Reds—as he is in position to do anytime he wants."[14]

Further on in the same article, Mr. Matthews attempted to keep alive the image of a dynamic and popular leader and to explain the lack of elections in Cuba. He echoes with obvious approval a "cry of all dictators.":

"Premier Castro is avoiding elections in Cuba for two reasons. He feels that his social revolution now has dynamism and vast popular consent and he does not want to interrupt the process. Moreover, most observers would agree, that Cubans today do not want elections. The reason is that elections in the past have merely meant to them the coming of corrupt politicians seeking the spoils of power."[15]

IV. STAGE THREE: THE "CASTRO" PERIOD

That article represented the last major effort in the pages of the *Times* to salvage "Fidel." It is also Herbert Matthews' last exclusive on the Cuban Premier. Reports from Havana and associated articles are now furnished by R. Hart Phillips, E. W. Kenworthy, Max Frankel, and Tad Szulc. Typical of the transitional steps toward the "Castro" image is an illustrated article, "As Castro Speaks: The Wall! The Wall!" in the Sunday magazine section, December 13,1959. The author, Tad Szulc, says that "Marxist ideas" dominate official thinking in Cuba and critics of Castro and his policies are "tabbed as colonialists, imperialists, counter revolutionaries, traitors or worse."[16]

On the first anniversary of the collapse of the Batista puppet government, an appraisal of Castro's year in power is made by R. Hart Phillips. The *Timesreader* confronts the fact that "Premier Castro" has really been a "poor sport" ever since he came to power. Reporter Phillips points out:

In the year Premier Castro has destroyed the old order. It had not been a "crime" to start a revolution in Cuba; former President Batista six years ago let Fidel Castro out of Cuba after he and a group of youthful revolutionaries had staged a futile revolt July 26, 1953. Now, however, Premier Castro has changed all that. More than 450 members of the former Batista regime were tried by military courts and shot by the firing squads during the first months of 1959"[17]

Another example of the 'new line" appears some two weeks later in an article by E. W. Kenworthy. Entitled "U.S. Goes Slow," the commentary mirrors in its evaluation of official U.S. attitudes the same agonies of reappraisal noted in the pages of the *Times*:

"In the year since Fidel Castro ousted the Batista dictatorship, official feelings here toward the new revolutionary Government of Cuba have progressed from hope, to patience, to exasperation, and now to anger . . . But the anger—which finally has been aroused by the continued propaganda charges, temper tantrums, studied insults, excesses and illegalities—is being kept under firm control."[18]

The *Times'* "Castro" of 1960 is an increasingly controversial figure. But, some things do not change. At the annual meeting of the American Society of Newspaper Editors in Washington, D.C., Herbert L. Matthews gropes desperately for someone other than the Cuban leader to blame for the evolving crisis. From the *Times'* account of his statement at the meeting:

"Mr. Matthews said there was real danger to Cuba and the United States in the revolution. But he said the menace to this country had been exagerated. . . . [He] found no sign that Communists dominated the Castro program but that the leadership of the movement was characterized by 'extreme nationalism and radicalism'. . . . 'In my thirty years on the *N.Y. Times* I have never seen a

---

Footnotes at end of speech.

big story so badly handled and so misinterpreted [by others?] as the Cuban revolution.' "[19]

Following official U. S. announcement, July 8, 1960, of the 856,000 tons cut from the Cuban sugar quota, Castro charged the United States with trying to destroy the Cuban revolution.[20] A month later he announced the seizure of all remaining U. S. private property in Cuba, and his government cracked down on the transmission of critical news items from Cuba by foreign reporters. News which could not be smuggled out or written up outside the country as "off the scene" articles and editorials became quite bland.

Indicative of the state of the news during this period is an August 7 report from Havana by R. Hart Phillips. No attempt is made to assess the situation in Cuba, and the only descriptive reference to Castro is the comment, "The Premier looking drawn and tired opened his address with an appeal to Latin-American nations to unite against Yankee imperialism."[21]

Although "exclusive, authoritative and informative" articles by Herbert Matthews on Fidel Castro are gone from the pages of the *Times*, Matthews' name is not. On August 13, the paper carries an interview with former U.S. Ambassador to Cuba (1953–57), Arthur Gardner. Ambassador Gardner said:

"[I] attempted to convince the State Department that Premier Fidel Castro talked and acted like a Communist and did not merit the support or friendship of the United States. . . . Herbert L. Matthews of the *New York Times*, more than any other U.S. writer, sold Americans, including the State Department, on the idea that Dr. Castro was a bright-eyed idealist and the savior of his people."[22]

The Ambassador also revealed that his successor, Earl F. Smith, had been instructed to consult with Mr. Matthews before taking his post.[23] The *Timesreader* must have wondered in what editorial limbo these news scraps had been hung during the previous year.

An editorial in the same issue reviews the deterioration in relations between the U.S. and Cuba and attempts to summarize the popular attitude in the U.S. toward the Cuban revolution. Reduced to its essence, the editorial states: "The tragedly of it is that the American government and American people fully sympathized with the original ideals and purposes of the Castro revolution."[24] The writer fails to note that the sympathy Americans had for the ideals and purposes of the Cuban revolution reflected their sympathy for ideals and purposes similar to those pictured by the *Times* as belonging to the revolution. Certainly, the tragedy of disillusionment among *Timesreaders* might have been mitigated if they had been given a more balanced choice of interpretations of the Cuban revolution.

"Castro" graciously removed from the *Times'* staff the responsibility for pinning the Marxist label on him. This he did himself over Havana TV when he affirmed: "I absolutely believe in Marxism. . . . Marxism or scientific socialism has become the revolutionary movement of the working class."[25]

The "Castro" image could now be completed. The *Times* had started with the portrait of an educated and dedicated "Fidel" who possessed remarkable qualities of humanitarianism and a strong sense of democratic morality; but through the pressure of events this image was retouched to create an impression of a power-mad dictator who turned his country into a Communist camp. A final tinting of the portrait of "Castro" is made after his profession of attachment to Marxist doctrine. Fittingly enough, this final act is performed on page 36, far removed from the original, page one sketches of "Fidel":

"The revolutionary Cuban government has now been placed squarely and officially "on the path to Communism." Premier Fidel Castro in announcing this during one of his interminable television speeches stated his firm personal belief in Marxism-Leninism. The new monolithic type party . . . is apparently ready to be set up."[26]

---

[1] Commission on Freedom of the Press, *A Free and Responsible Press* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1947), p. 68.

[2] *The New York Times*, February 24, 1957, p. 1, col. 5. Footnotes indicate page and column where the story originates.

[3] *Ibid.*, February 27, 1957, p. 1, col. 7.

[4] *Ibid.*, March 5, 1957, p. 24, col. 3.

[5] *Ibid.*, June 9, 1957, p. 1, col. 4.

[6] *Ibid.*

[7] *Ibid.*, July 6, 1958, sec. 4, p. 4, col. 5.

[8] *Ibid.*, January 28, 1959, p. 1, col. 7.

[9] *Ibid.*, January 2, 1959, p. 24. col. 2.

[10] *Ibid.*, March 8, 1959, sec. 6, p. 22.

[11] *Ibid.*, April 18, 1959, p. 1, col. 8.

[12] *Ibid.*, July 4, 1959, p. 1, col. 3.

[13] *Ibid.*, July 15, 1959, p. 1, col. 2.

[14] *Ibid.*, July 16, 1959, p. 1, col. 2.

[15] *Ibid.*

[16] *Ibid.*, December 13, 1959, sec. 6, p. 11.

[17] *Ibid.*, January 2, 1960, p. 3, col. 5.

[18] *Ibid.*, January 17, 1960, sec. 4, p. 7, col. 2.

[19] *Ibid.*, April 22, 1960, p. 18, col. 1.

[20] *Ibid.*, July 8, 1960, p. 1, col. 4.

[21] *Ibid.*, August 7, 1960, p. 1, col. 8.

[22] *Ibid.*, August 12, 1960, p. 5, col. 5.

[23] *Ibid.*

[24] *Ibid.*, p. 18, col. 1.

[25] *Ibid.*, December 2, 1961, p. 3, col. 4.

[26] *Ibid.*, December 4, 1961, p. 36, col. 2.

The Air We Breathe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GILBERT GUDE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 1967

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Northern Virginia Sun. It gives credit to the Metropolitan Council of Governments' model ordinance on air pollution. Any such effort to make people more aware of the seriousness of air pollution deserves our commendation.

The editorial follows:

THE AIR WE BREATHE

A few weeks ago (May 8) spokesmen from steel, chemical and paper manufacturing industries argued against the Administration's national standards to limit air pollution from industrial plants and said that the problem is best controlled at the state and local levels.

We couldn't agree with those more. The Administration's focus on the problems of air pollution are warranted, however, because the matter has become a national health problem. Yet, local government officials in Northern Virginia apparently could care less about it.

It's been almost a year now since representatives of the Metropolitan Council of Governments first announced their "model ordinance." The Washington area trials 10 other heavily populated areas in the severity of its air pollution problems, yet no suburban local government has taken it upon itself to enact ordinances that will arrest air pollution and set necessary restrictions.

The model ordinance presented by COG is a good one which should be enacted by all localities from the smallest jurisdiction to the largest in Northern Virginia. We cannot halt or reduce air pollution merely by talking or thinking about it. Because automotive exhaust is the primary contributor to the National Capital area's air pollution, we must begin by taking a look at the devices now marketed to filter auto exhaust. Although they may need improvement, they could effectively retard pollution which is damaging to our health.

The medical profession has pointed out that besides damage to our eyes and senses, air pollution can be a hazard to sufferers of asthma, emphysema and other respiratory ailments, or to our elderly citizens.

Northern Virginia is going to continue to grow, and its highways will be strained by increasing numbers of cars. Until rail rapid transit relieves our highways and eliminates a number of autos from the roadways, we must safeguard our health by lessening poisonous automotive combustion. Rapid transit will probably not be a reality for another decade in Northern Virginia and, it is highly doubtful that the recently innovated electric automobiles will be replacing today's cars before 1977. So, we cannot ignore our responsibility to keep the air we breathe clean and as nearly pure as possible. We need to act now in Northern Virginia.

Automobile Insurance

SPEECH

OF

HON. JAMES C. CORMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 5, 1967

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I listened with much concern to the discussion on the floor on June 5 regarding automobile liability insurance policies and the great and immediate need for public hearings on the controversy. This matter has been the subject of many congressional remarks during the past few months.

Serious charges have been directed against the auto insurance industry. Many insurance companies are claiming financial difficulties because of the increasing number of automobile accidents. My colleagues, Mr. CAHILL from New Jersey and Mr. GREEN from Pennsylvania, have wisely called for "a broad examination by Congress of the auto insurance business."

The rising cost of auto insurance premiums, the complaints of policyholders that policies are unwarrantedly canceled in many instances, and the alleged discriminatory practices of some insurance companies are very disturbing. Equally disturbing are statements from some insurance companies that the increasing number of auto accidents and settlement costs are causing them severe financial difficulties. With some 83 million automobiles on the road—and this number is ever increasing—it is time that this controversy is brought into the open and fully debated.

I believe that the Congress has a responsibility to provide a forum where this confused issue can be heard; where a good, hard look can be taken at what is happening in this country where a situation exists in which more than $8 billion in auto insurance premiums is written annually and over $4 billion is paid in claims, and where many accusations are made on both sides concerning the cause of skyrocketing costs of automobile insurance.

My colleagues, Mr. CAHILL and Mr. GREEN, should be commended for initiating this discussion. We need to get all the facts and we need to find a course of action that will provide a fair and equitable solution to this problem so that adequate protection can be afforded the public.

Middle East Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 1967

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, in light of the events in the Middle East, I would like to call to the attention of the Members of the House the following resolution passed by the Court of Common Council of the City of Hartford, Conn.:

CITY OF HARTFORD COURT OF COMMON COUNCIL RESOLUTION

Whereas, Nasser's reckless actions during the past week are driving the entire Middle East toward a tragic war that threatens the peace of the world; and

Whereas, Egypt has massed on Israel's borders the largest troop concentration ever recorded in the area; and

Whereas, Nasser has blockaded the Gulf of Aqaba, an international waterway which is Israel's outlet to Africa and Asia—a step that is tantamount to an act of war against Israel, threatening its very life, its development of the Negev, and its economic survival; and that flagrantly defies international guarantees of the right of free and innocent passage through international waterways; and

Whereas, The dangers posed by these provocations and aggressions must not be underestimated since miscalculation about Nasser's intentions were a major factor in precipitating the present crisis and continued world acquiescence to his belligerence can only deepen the already critical prospect of war; and

Whereas, The vital interests of the United States in preserving peace and the freedom of all nations in this area are obvious and the abandonment of Israel can only result in the complete subjugation of the entire Middle East by the enemies of democracy; and

Whereas, It would strike a crippling blow to American power and prestige, as well as our strategic necessities; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we commend the clear restatement by President Johnson of our country's firm commitment to the political independence and territorial integrity of all Middle Eastern nations; and be it further

Resolved, That we commend the President for his reaffirmation that the Gulf of Aqaba is an international waterway and that a blockade of Israel's shipping is illegal and potentially disastrous to the cause of peace; and for his declaration that the right of free and innocent passage of international waterways is of vital interest to the United States as well as to the international community; and be it further

Resolved, That we express our support for such action that our country must take, either in concert with other nations or on its own, to protect Israel's national sovereignty and territorial integrity; to guarantee the international waterway, and to preserve peace in the Middle East.

Results of Public Opinion Survey in 21st Texas District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 1967

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I recently sent questionnaires to all the people whose names appeared on the 1966 poll lists in the district I represent. The responses were most gratifying. Replies were received from about 20 percent, which I understand is an unusually high ratio of returns. It is believed the results represent a fairly accurate cross section of public opinion on the topics covered.

I am indebted to my constituents for making this survey such a success. The returns included thousands of interesting and constructive comments on a variety of subjects. These people are understandably concerned about the constant growth of big government in Washington at the expense of local self-government. They want some breaks applied.

The questions and the results of the tabulation follows:

1. Vietnam. Which course do you favor in Vietnam? (Choose one—a, b, or c).

	Percent
a. Withdrawal	5.5
b. Take whatever military action that may be necessary to achieve a decisive victory	83.4
c. Keep up present military and peace efforts in hopes the Communists will negotiate	8.7

(Note.—A few of the answers suggested a cessation of bombing in North Vietnam.)

2. Inflation. In fighting inflation, which of the following do you consider more desirable?

	Percent
a. A 6-percent increase in income taxes	6.4
b. A reduction in nondefense spending	91.1

3. Social security. Do you favor increasing Social Security taxes in order to provide increased Social Security benefits?

	Percent
Yes	21.3
No	73.7

4. Medicare. Do you favor the President's desire to extend medicare to an additional 1.5 million under age of 65 who are disabled, with an increase in tax to pay for it?

	Percent
Yes	16.8
No	73.2

5. Minimum income. Are you in favor of having Government guarantee a minimum annual income (of about $3,000) for all, whether they work or not?

	Percent
Yes	1.8
No	97.0

6. Open housing. Do you believe homeowners should have the right to sell or rent their property to whomever they choose, regardless of race?

	Percent
Yes	89.3
No	9.4

7. Jury selection. Do you favor the President's other civil rights provision, giving the Federal Government jurisdiction over selection of juries in State courts to assure nondiscriminatory jury selections?

	Percent
Yes	7.7
No	87.3

8. Labor unions. Some say labor unions which cover whole industries are actually monopolies and should come under antitrust laws. Do you agree?

	Percent
Yes	81.8
No	7.6

9. Apportionment. Do you favor allowing any State that desires, the right to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population?

	Percent
Yes	45.6
No	33.9

10. Rent subsidies. Do you favor the President's rent subsidy program, under which low income tenants are required to pay no more than 25 percent of monthly income on rentals, with Federal Government paying the balance?

	Percent
Yes	5.7
No	90.2

11. Poverty. Do you feel the "War on Poverty" has been worth the money?

	Percent
Yes	6.0
No	87.5

12. School prayer. Do you favor, on a voluntary basis, Bible reading and prayer in public schools?

	Percent
Yes	92.2
No	5.3

13. Right-to-work. Do you favor repeal of Sec. 14b of Taft-Hartley Act, which permits States to have "right to work" laws?

	Percent
Yes	22.2
No	66.3

14. Do you feel that, considering the costs and results, the Great Society programs have been justified?

	Percent
Yes	6.1
No	84.0

Permanent Peace Treaty for Middle East

SPEECH

OF

HON. JACOB H. GILBERT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1967

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, I commend President Johnson and Ambassador Goldberg for the success of their efforts in securing the cease-fire resolution of the United Nations. The resolution is an important first step, but there is still a long road to final and lasting peace in this troubled area. A peaceful solution must be reached, Mr. Speaker, and I suggest and urge a permanent peace treaty with international guarantees.

A Middle East permanent peace treaty must include the following essential elements:

First. A guarantee of freedom of navigation through the Suez Canal and the Straits of Tiran for the ships of Israel and other nations. Second. A guarantee of political independence and territorial security and integrity of all nations in the area. Third. A permanent settlement of border issues and acceptance of Israel's statehood. Fourth. A guarantee against any further infiltration, terrorism, and threats of destruction by the Arab States.

Hell Is Truth Seen Too Late

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB CASEY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 1967

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, it has been said that "hell is truth seen too late." I am truly thankful that the people of this country are not going through the agonizing experience today of having many truths about their domestic petroleum industry brought home to them in this agonizing way.

Yet this would be their predicament if the Congress and the administration had listened to some professed prophets and pundits. I am referring to those who have been claiming for years that import restrictions on petroleum were some kind of sham—not at all justified by national security considerations. These people were completely unconvinced by arguments that it was imperative to keep up a strong and healthy domestic oil producing industry. They saw no need for it when there is such an abundance of oil in the Middle East. They felt it was in the national interest to avail ourselves of that lower priced Middle Eastern crude oil—even if this meant letting our own domestic oil producing industry go into a decline.

Had we listened to these people, and followed their advice, they and all the American people, every last man, woman, and child in our country would know the full ugly significance of that proverb: "hell is truth seen too late."

These same pundis mocked at the oil conservation laws as some kind of elaborate fakery, and even voiced suspicions about the real purpose of Interstate Oil Compact Commission. They deplored our admittedly costly domestic conservation efforts, when there was that bargain priced Middle Eastern oil available for the taking.

And if the majority of Congress had listened to this line of argument, we would all be agreeing this day that "hell is truth seen too late."

Percentage depletion has also been condemned, roundly condemned, by some vocal individuals on the grounds that it is senseless to give this kind of encouragement to high-risk oil exploration in the United States when we know there is an abundance of oil in the Middle East. Why look for oil where it is hard and costly to find, why have tax provisions that make it possible for our domestic producers to keep up the high-risk research, when there is so much readily available in those oil-rich Middle Eastern lands?

Had we followed the reasoning of depletion's critics, today we in this Congress would by saying to ourselves, and to our constitutents: "hell is truth seen too late."

Mr. Speaker, those of us who come from the oil-producing States have been warning for years that our country could not, that it dare not, let its domestic oil-producing industry decline as a result of misguided or shortsighted governmental policies. Often our words were mocked. Often our arguments were ridiculed. And though we have prevailed at some points—in justifying percentage depletion, in curbing a completely overwhelming flood of imports, in upholding conservation policies that prevent both economic and physical waste, it has been a tough, uphill battle all the way.

It is small comfort to us that it took a tragedy such as is now going on in the Middle East to bring home the truth that we have been trying to express to doubting listeners. But we do derive some consolation from the fact that many of our warnings were heeded and that the Nation did not take the fatal course of totally abandoning its domestic producing industry for the lure of bargain-basement oil from the Arab States. Had the Nation done this, we would be facing paralysis today, hunger, the loss of our crops, the immobilization of our defense forces. And the critics of oil import restrictions, of the conservation program, of percentage depletion would be face to face with the bitter knowledge that their mistakes in judgment had helped to bring this tragedy on their country. I am glad for their stake, as well as for all of ours, that this never happened, and that none of us has to experience the awful hell of truth seen too late.

Resolution of the Judicial Conference of the District of Columbia Circuit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 1967

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the Judicial Conference of the District of Columbia Circuit has recently heard a presentation by the Department of Justice concerning two recommendations of the President's Commission on Crime in the District of Columbia—gun control and revision of the Criminal Code.

I am the sponsor of H.R. 5463, which would prohibit the mail-order sale of guns and which would impose stricter regulations on the sale and ownership of pistols and other dangerous weapons.

Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the resolution adopted by the Judicial Conference of the District of Columbia Circuit. I urge that these recommendations receive the early and careful consideration of the Congress.

The resolution follows:

JUDICIAL CONFERENCE OF THE
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT,
Washington, D.C., June 5, 1967.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The Judicial Conference of the District of Columbia Circuit composed of the judges of the United States Court of Appeals, the United States District Court, other judges of local courts, and a cross section of the bar in this community duly convened on May 25, 1967. It made the following recommendations and directed me to send them to you:

"After hearing the presentation by the Department of Justice with respect to the recommendations of the President's Commission on Crime in the District of Columbia relating to (1) gun control legislation, and (2) revision of the criminal code, the Judicial Conference of the District of Columbia Circuit resolved to endorse these recommendations and the legislation which has been submitted to Congress for their implementation; and the Secretary of the Conference was directed to transmit notice of this action to all members of the Congress."

Sincerely yours,

NATHAN J. PAULSON,
Secretary.

Vice Adm. William I. Martin is in Command of 6th Fleet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 1967

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, one of America's top admirals—William I. Martin—is in command of the 6th Fleet in the Mediterranean. A native of the Ozark country in Missouri, Admiral Martin is one of the most popular and respected officers in the U.S. Navy today. With a most distinguished career behind him, Martin was chosen for one of the most important and sensitive commands in the Navy when he was assigned to his present post.

Admiral Martin was former Congressman Dewey Short's first appointee to the Naval Academy. Many of us think of Bill Martin as a personal friend. From firsthand knowledge we know of his great ability and dedication. It is also of interest to know that his childhood friends—those who have known him intimately since his birth—follow his advancement and achievements with so much pride. In the June 2, 1967, issue of the Springfield, Mo., Daily News there appeared a news story which quotes some of Bill Martin's old friends—the people who know him best.

The article follows:

"COULDN'T HAVE BETTER MAN" SAY OZARKS FRIENDS OF 6TH FLEET COMMANDER MARTIN

"The 6th Fleet's in good hands!"

That's the way many Ozarkers—friends of Vice Adm. William I. Martin, an Ava native, who March 3 was named commander of the strategic 6th Fleet, based in the Mediterranean—view the tense situation in the Middle East.

Though they may have differing opinions about the current Egypt-Israel crisis, all were unanimous in their faith in Adm. Martin.

As Harold Owen, of Republic, a friend of the admiral, noted, "He's a very capable man and has had a lot of experience. The fleet," he noted, "is in good hands."

"They couldn't have a better man than he is—so dependable and such a good American," said Mrs. Bess Allman, Galena, sister of former Congressman Dewey Short. Martin, 56, who began his Naval career in 1930, was Short's first appointee to the Naval Academy.

Mrs. Allman noted that she had talked to Adm. Martin when she was in Washington earlier in the year.

"He was getting ready to leave then (for the 6th fleet)," she said, "and he was thrilled that he was being sent.

"He said what he wanted to do was to serve this country best. He'll be doing what he thinks is best," Mrs. Allman concluded.

"I'm just kind of tickled that a hillbilly is over there protecting things. I feel a little safer about it," commented a friend, Ava attorney James E. Curry.

"Bill has, of course, always been a hero to Ava since he's been in the Navy. He's had a tremendous career and we're proud of him and confident he's going to do a good job over there," commented Curry.

"He's trained for this kind of thing" the attorney noted. "He came up from the bottom to the top you might say."

A boyhood friend, Dr. Marvin Gentry, of Ava, who was reared in the house across the street from the Martin home, expressed similar sentiments.

"He's inherited a lot of his father's stock . . . His dad was one of the shrewdest horse traders who ever came out of Douglas County and had a lot of good common sense and Bill has it too."

Dr. Gentry noted that Martin "uses good judgment and holds his head in a time of emergency. If all were as good, talented and conscientious as he is, I'd have a lot more confidence."

Jack H. G. Cooper, Route 2, president of Harry Cooper Supply Company here, described Martin as "an able person. He's been in the service a long, long time and understands the problems."

Martin attended the public schools of Ava and Oklahoma and Missouri universities before entering the Military Academy.

He has served as assistant chief for Naval operations for air, and executive assistant and senior aide to the chief of Naval operations.

A flyer, he commanded dive bomber squadrons aboard the old USS Enterprise and the Navy's first night air group during World War II.

Housing Programs for Low-Income Families

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 25, 1967

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, June 2, I held a workshop for my constituents on Federal housing programs for low-income families. Several officials of the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development traveled to Greensburg, Pa., to discuss such programs with our local officials. The workshop was a great success and all who attended were benefited by the exchanges which took place.

Heading the HUD representation was Mrs. Marie C. McGuire, Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary for Housing Assistance. Mrs. McGuire is a distinguished public servant with an enormous knowledge of her field. Her professionalism, patience, and dedication were recognized by all of the workshop participants, who were unanimous in their regard for her.

Mrs. McGuire addressed the gathering at the beginning of the workshop, and I am pleased to include her remarks at this point in the RECORD:

SPECIALIZED HOUSING PROGRAMS FOR LOW-INCOME FAMILIES

(Remarks of Marie C. McGuire, Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary, Department of Housing and Urban Development, at Housing Workshop, Greensburg, Pa., June 2, 1967)

I understand that today's workshop is one of a number that have been scheduled by Congressman John Dent over the past several years to acquaint interested constituents with Federal programs which may benefit his district. This is a most laudable undertaking because there are now so many ways in which the Federal Government may assist communities and the people who live in them that work sessions such as this one are a highly effective device for learning about those aids and how they may be applied locally.

Congressman Dent knows, as do those of us who administer Federal programs, that there is both a lack of information and much misunderstanding about how the government can be of assistance. Thus, these workshops can help clarify the picture and provide information and data on specific programs, as well as indicate how a locality can most effectively participate in them. I only wish that more sessions such as this were being held throughout this great nation of ours! You are surely to be commended, Congressman Dent, for scheduling them in your district.

As you know from your program, other representatives of HUD, including Regional Administrator Warren P. Phelan, will participate here today. Since they will discuss the specifics of our low-rent housing programs, I thought I could best contribute by simply reviewing some of them briefly.

The United States Housing Act of 1937 authorized the low-rent public housing program to provide decent housing to those who cannot afford such housing without assistance. Housing under this program is in most cases owned and operated by local housing authorities created by localities under State law. Federal loans and annual contributions are provided to the local authorities to assist in financing the construction, rehabilitation, acquisition, or leasing of this housing and for maintaining its low-rent character.

The low-rent public housing program rentals are based on ability of the tenant to pay. Rentals are established on the basis of family income rather than the size of the housing unit occupied. The program has proved to be the only feasible method of housing many low-income families, particularly those of above average family size. It has further helped materially in providing housing for senior citizens and handicapped citizens.

Until recently, public housing was geared primarily to new construction, specifically built for public housing. In 1965, however, Congress expanded the low-rent program and made it administratively more flexible. It also authorized local housing agencies to lease existing housing or privately built new housing for the use of low-rent tenants. In addition to this program, known as "Section 23 leasing," we have administratively developed the "turnkey" approach in both new and rehabilitated housing. This method promises savings in time and money and permits low-income families to live in more varied neighborhoods and housing.

The new leasing program permits local housing authorities to lease private dwellings for low-income tenants. The Federal contribution makes up the difference in rent that the owner receives and what the tenant-occupant pays.

To initiate a leasing program, the governing body of the community adopts a resolution specifically approving the application of the method to the community. After HUD approves the plan, the authority obtains listing of available homes and apartments from private owners or real estate companies. Generally, the authority and the property owner sign a lease which provides for subleasing by by the authority to eligible tenants. Other leasing arrangements are also possible. They include direct leasing by the owners to the low-income family within the framework of a contract with the local housing authority. The authority pays the Federal contribution to the owner directly or to the tenant. Under the later payment method, the tenant turns the contribution over to the owner together with the remainder of his rent.

The leasing program provides "instant" housing for low-income families in acute need; it permits federally subsidized properties to remain on the local tax rolls; it encourages property owners and their agents to participate more directly in meeting the low-rent need; it stimulates repair and better maintenance of properties; and it provides homes for families in neighborhoods that do not have project aspects.

The new turnkey method relies heavily on private enterprise. Under it, local housing authorities contract with private developers, builders, and rehabilitators to buy, upon completion, housing they have built or rehabilitated. Any member of the private building industry with an available and suitable site or structure, or option to buy, may approach an authority with a proposal to build or rehabilitate in accordance with his own plans and specifications. If the offer is attractively priced and meets acceptable design standards, the local housing authority may enter into a contract. The contract commits the authority to purchase the completed property, and it is purchased upon satisfactory completion.

HUD is now also encouraging greater use of rehabilitation of existing housing under other methods for use as low-rent public housing. The changed policy is in response to a growing public awareness that a great deal of the Nation's existing deteriorating housing stock and many of our declining neighborhoods can and should be preserved rather than torn down and rebuilt. The rehabilitation approach is paritcularly appropriate when communities combine it with urban rehabilitation programs or other actions leading to full-scale social and physical neighborhood improvement, like the model cities program. It can be faster and cheaper. It can keep existing large homes available for the use of large families. It can distribute low-rent dwellings in a number of locations. And it can utilize oversupplies of existing vacant housing created by population movements out of an area.

There are still other HUD programs which are designed to meet the housing needs of low-income families. One is the rent supplement program, administered by FHA. The housing is privately built, owned, and managed by nonprofit, limited dividend, or cooperative organizations. The FHA furnishes mortgage insurance at market interest rates. Tenants—who must qualify as elderly, handicapped, displaced by governmental action, or be living in substandard housing—will pay 25 percent of their income towards the rent. The difference between their payment and the market rental will be made up by a Federal rent supplement. A lease with an option-to-purchase permits a tenant to purchase a dwelling unit if his or her income increases.

The rent supplement program, as you may know, was recently denied funding by the House of Representatives for fiscal 1968. It is our hope, however, that the funding will be restored since it is our belief that this program is a vital addition to other housing programs for low-income families.

Now there are some families and elderly persons whose incomes are too high for public housing, but not high enough to compete for adequate housing in the private market. One HUD program designed to aid this group is the FHA "Section 221(d)(3)" below market interest rate program. To keep the rents within the means of the people for whom the housing is intended, the FHA insures mortgages on special terms. Property may be developed by public agencies (except local housing authorities that obtain their funds exclusively for public housing from the Federal Government) or by cooperative private nonprofit corporations or associations, limited distribution corporations, or other mortgagors approved by the FHA. Priorities for occupancy are given to families displaced by governmental action. Other families whose incomes are within the limits established by FHA also can qualify for occupancy, as can single elderly or handicapped persons.

Another source of housing for lower middle-income elderly and handicapped families and persons is known as the "Section 202" program. Here loans may be made by HUD to private nonprofit corporations, cooperatives, and certain public bodies and agencies, for the total development cost, to be repaid over a period not exceeding 50 years, with an interest rate of 3 percent. Section 202 elderly housing projects are also eligible for rent supplements. The provisions of the Section 23 leasing program are also available to Section 202 elderly housing projects where the nonprofit sponsor and the local housing authority arrange for this.

In addition to mentioning specific HUD programs for low-income and lower middle-income families and the elderly, I also want to comment for a moment, in more general terms, on public housing programs for the elderly and handicapped.

A few years back, Congress took note of the special housing needs of the low-income elderly and handicapped by authorizing the construction of new housing or the remodeling of existing housing to provide specially designed accommodations. Since such housing units involve fewer rooms, wider doorways, ramps for wheel chairs, special safety features, easily accessible equipment, etc., they are likely to have a higher average cost per room. The Congress, accordingly, provided higher per-room cost limitations for such housing.

Also, recognizing the very low income of a large number of elderly who are eligible for low-rent housing, the Congress authorized an additional subsidy to local housing authorities to keep rents within the means of these lowest-income elderly tenants in order to still assure financial solvency of their housing operations. With this help, it was possible to accommodate many more of the lowest-income elderly in regular developments, and it made it possible to provide many more projects specifically designed for the elderly.

Today, for example, of 645,000 occupied low-rent dwellings in the country, 200,000 are accupied by the elderly. Of these, 55,000 are specially designed. In addition, we have more than 130,000 dwelling units for the elderly in some stage of development.

The objective of our low-rent housing programs for senior citizens is to develop homes that will allow them to live more independently, in greater comfort and safety, and with a sustained interest in life. We want, in other words, to place them into the kind of environment which will, as President Johnson said recently, "enrich their lives and, through them, the lives of all of us."

It has been a pleasure for me to appear here today and tell you a little bit about programs of HUD that are designed to make living more pleasant for people in need of good housing. I hope, most sincerely, that as a result of this workshop, more communities in the Twenty-First Congressional District will participate in these housing programs. If this does happen, and I am confident it will, we will be taking another step closer toward the achievement of our Nation's housing goal of making available for every American a decent and dignified home worthy of a free and just society.

Thank you so much, Congressman Dent, for inviting me to be here.

Houston: Primer for Counselors of Older Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB CASEY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 1967

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, with the average age of the American worker becoming increasingly higher with the passage of each decade, it is vital to the national welfare that means be found to give older workers adequate opportunity for training, employment and advancement.

As the Representative from that area, I am proud to point out that Houston, Tex., has taken the leadership in developing new methods of increasing the employability of older workers through the older worker project of the Texas Employment Commission. I have unanimous consent that an article in the Employment Service Review which describes that fine example of State-Federal cooperation, be inserted in the RECORD:

HOUSTON: PRIMER FOR COUNSELORS OF OLDER WORKERS

(By Anna J. Metherd)

(NOTE.—Five cities—Houston, Kansas City (Kans.), Rochester (N.Y.), St. Paul, and Minneapolis—are currently conducting older worker demonstration projects, and at least 20 other cities are expected to take part in the program in 1967.)

Although Houston's Older Worker Demonstration Project has been in operation less than a year, progress has bene made in defining and evaluating the older worker's deployment problems—both general and specific. It was something of a revelation that the problem was not primarily the employer's age barriers, but a multiplicity of factors—limited and outdated education, physical handicaps, declining physical ability, disorientation with the realities of the employment market, the older applicant's inability adequately to appraise his own capabilities—that discouragement and frustration were debilitating for whatever job opportunities there were.

A special type of counseling and counselor is needed to work effectively with these older worker problems. The older worker counselor needs to sense some of the drama, and the poignancy, in the older person's years of living and to respect him, however minor or great his accomplishments may have been. Traditional counseling aids—aptitude tests, interest checklists, training information—are of less value to the older worker counselor than this sensitivity to the subtleties of the older applicant's personality—his sense of values, regard for his own capabilities, neighborhood loyalties, social involvements.

The older worker counselor needs the vision to develop his perspective, as well as the older applicant's, of a limited scope of job opportunities that may be available. For example, a motel clerk job may be the only type of work available to a handicapped older applicant but in the counselor's concept of the job, it can mean interesting contacts with travelers, pleasant relationships with coworkers, a sense of responsibility, and involvement in a necessary activity rather than a blunt, last-resort means to a paycheck.

The older worker counselor must realize that the older applicant's discouragement and frustration are a normal reaction to his situation. The counselor must work out ways to help the applicant regain enough self-assurance and composure to present himself for the job opportunities that do exist.

The older worker placement specialist needs some of these same qualities. To be successful in developing an employer's interest in his older applicant's capabilities, the specialist first needs a sincere interest in the capabilities of older people generally, and an understanding and respect for a particular applicant's special capabilities. He especially needs to develop his concept of the older applicant as a person with a unique set of human qualities that have developed along with the normal processes of aging, rather than as a person who has more or less outlived his usefulness in life—a has-been.

Houston began is Older Worker Demonstration Project on April 1, 1966, to determine the additional quality and extent of services that local Employment Service offices could provide to older workers when sufficient staff is available. The project grant allocated funds for the assignment of 15 persons to the 7 local offices in Houston.

The project's success or failure was vitally dependent on the ability of the older worker staff to utilize these already established resources of the employment offices, and the wealth of research material from the State office and the Bureau of Employment Security national office, and to incorporate the additional older worker services into the total Employment Service concept. Without this involvement in the establishment that already existed, no amount of dedication, sympathetic concern, or creative idea-development could have any substantial effect.

Close supervision would have impeded these developments. Staff members were given a general outline of what was expected on the project—intensive counseling of difficult-to-place older workers, depth interviewing, job development, screening the files for older applicants who weren't being referred out on jobs, and general coordination of older worker services within the offices. Other than this, the staff were left much to their own resources and ideas as to how to proceed.

A major difficulty was that such procedure simply didn't fit into the established routines of the offices. The idea of an employee developing his own job assignment, arther than being trained and closely supervised in a previously outlined work routine, was a somewhat radical innovation. But, it was the only way the project could operate—something of a last resort.

Older worker staff needed to learn to use their ingenuity, to develop ideas, and to forget about the time involved. They neded a lot of help from the regular office staffs in order to operate at all, but most of all, they needed to forget the negative aspects of the job they were trying to do and to develop faith in their own capabilities and resources. They had to learn to accept that unsuccessful ideas weren't necessarily failures, or "poor job performance," but rather, necessary steps toward the ultimate objective—jobs for older workers. And sometimes they simply needed time to fold their hands and think about what to try next.

New ideas did develop. As one older worker placement specialist stated, "You hunt around to get ideas, and eventually you come up with something that works." In offices where the older worker program has been most successful, everyone from the office manager to the janitor cooperated with ideas and suggestions, with the project specialists presiding as a coordinating force, as well as the older applicants' special representative.

Employment service review

The applicant himself is often the best source of information for job development ideas. Job development needs to be a cooperative venture, with the placement specialist and the applicant working together on the contacts. Also, the placement specialist, as a representative of the Employment Service, often has a better chance of reaching the employer than the applicant. And again, an intelligent and enthusiastic placement specialist may be able to present the applicant's qualifications more effectively than the applicant himself.

One older worker placement specialist had a 61-year-old applicant with a highly specialized skill she had never heard of. The man has been looking for a job unsuccessfully for several months.

"What kinds of companies would have such a job?" she asked the applicant. While he sat at her desk, she called some of the companies he suggested and was able to develop a job for him with a company where he had already been turned away at the reception desk as "too old." "He's exactly what we've been looking for," the company manager told the placement specialist.

Another placement specialist said, "When I'm job developing and an employer says he can't use the applicant, I always ask him if he knows of an employer who can. He usually can offer some suggestions." She was able to place a 59-year-old accounting clerk with a company that had been suggested by a CPA she had contacted originally in a job development attempt.

At the end of each month, such cases were included in the report to the State and National offices, with copies to the local offices. Persons working on the project were written up also in these reports: The kinds of things they were doing, ideas they had discussed—something of a general "progress report." Thus they could see themselves not just as employees working at a desk to earn a paycheck, but as individuals whose ideas and efforts and accomplishments were important and needed.

Project staff in the different offices kept in close touch with each other by telephone. Usually, an idea proved effective in one office was soon tried in other offices. Job information passed back and forth helped an older applicant in one office to be placed through a suggestion from the older worker specialist of another office.

Monthly staff meetings provided opportunities to thrash out ideas together, to ask questions, and to clarify operating procedures. When more professional assistance was needed, a representative from an agency was invited as a speaker or panel participant. These guests were eager to participate, and enthusiastic about the work that was being done through the Older Worker Project.

More effective working relationships also resulted with the agencies represented by the guest speakers. A speaker from an alcoholic rehabilitation agency assured the older worker group that his organization would continue working with the alcoholic applicant and his employer as long as the need existed. Welfare agencies were grateful for the assistance being given their applicants through the project, and reciprocated by speeding up emergency assistance needed by older applicants from the employment offices. The State rehabilitation agency provided hearing aids, glasses, dental care, and medical treatment for applicants whose employability was limited without this help.

Newspapers cooperated with editorials and feature stories on the project. They were asked to play down the "do-goodism" angle, and to try to project the idea of the value of age and experience in a new employee. When employers began repeating the ideas from the newspapers, it seemed evident that the articles were fulfilling their purpose—re-educating the hiring public that had been turning down the older applicants solely on the basis of age.

One local office manager arranged with the editor of the neighborhood weekly for a regular column on older workers to which the older worker counselor, the placement specialist, and the project supervisor contributed. This "So You're Over 45" column has become an established feature of the newspaper. An older worker staff member visited the senior citizens' recreation center regularly to discuss employment opportunities.

In some offices, the project has been effective. In a few, it is still in the growing stage. Project statistics are not showing remarkable results. But statistics could not tell the story of a 62-year-old who was placed as a stenographer, and did not have to resort to babysitting or companion work because she was "too old" to get an office job. And statistics can't tell of the 55-year-old accounting clerk, displaced by automation, who was placed as an accounting clerk, and did not have to swallow his pride and accept a job as a guard, as he'd feared he would have to do after being unemployed for several months.

Older workers in the Houston area are recognizing that help is available, that something can be done about their unemployment situation. They call in for appointments with the older worker counselors, and send their friends who are having similar problems.

Houston's Older Worker Project is the culmination of years of study and research and the concern of many dedicated people in the area who recognized as far back as 1948 that an older worker problem existed and that something needed to be done about it. The Texas Employment Commission is proving that it can work effectively with such problems that even within the established routines that are necessary in such an organization, new ideas can be forthcoming. Older applicants are no longer considered impossible cases; they are considered a challenge, and new ideas and techniques are being developed to meet the challenge.

Connecticut's Small Businessman of the Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 1967

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pride and pleasure that I announce the award of Connecticut's "Small Businessman of the Year" to Mr. Joseph J. Kovaleski. At a ceremony marking this event on May 24, Connecticut Gov. John Dempsey read from a citation accompanying the award which stated that Mr. Kovaleski, "exemplifies the imagination, initiative, independence, and integrity of the American small businessman."

The accomplishment which led to Mr. Kovaleski's selection was the conversion of a large abandoned chicken house into a bright, productive factory. This plant produced 2,880,000 pounds of wire in 1966. It employed 75 persons, had a 2.2 million dollar gross volume a year, and yielded a yearly profit of a quarter of a million dollars. The company, known as Wyre Wynd, Inc., is located at Jewett City in my congressional district.

I believe that the remarkable achievements of Mr. Kovaleski represent the highest traditions of the American free enterprise system and individual initiative. His efforts have not only brought him personal satisfaction and reward, but have made a substantial contribution to the local economy as well as providing a necessary and useful product for the Nation.

I extend my congratulations and best wishes to Mr. Kovaleski on this well-deserved recognition. He should be an inspiration to all small businessmen in the Nation. All of us who know him personally and those associated with him directly take great pride in the tribute paid to him for his business leadership and ability.

Mr. Speaker, in connection with this award, I insert in the RECORD the text of an announcement by the Hartford Regional Office of the Small Business Administration and also an article published on May 25, 1967, in the Bridgeport Post, which are as follows:

[From the Small Business Administration, Hartford, Conn.]

SBA NAMES CONNECTICUT SMALL BUSINESSMAN OF THE YEAR

"Joseph J. Kovaleski exemplifies the imagination, initiative, independence and integrity of the American small businessman", stated Governor John Dempsey on May 24, 1967, at 10:30 A.M., at a ceremony held at the office of the Governor. The words the Governor used are contained in a citation accompanying an award made to Mr. Kovaleski, naming him Small Business Man of the Year.

The feat which led to the selection of Mr. Kovaleski was the conversion of a large abandoned chicken house (the floor of which was covered by a five inch layer of dirt), into a bright, productive factory capable of producing 2,880,000 pounds of wire for various purposes, employing 75 persons, with a gross dollar volume of 2.2 million per year, and yielding a quarter of a million dollar profit yearly. Mr. Kovaleski expects to do twice as much during the coming year.

Joseph J. Kovaleski, President of Advanced Wyre-Pak Company and Wyre-Wynd, Incorporated of Bridgeport, has been associated with the wire industry for over 26 years.

He started his career as an apprentice tool and wire die maker for the Union Wire Die Company, now the Carboloy Company, in Worcester, Massachusetts. In 1939 he became associated with the Driscoll Wire Company of Shelton, Connecticut, a manufacturer of steel specialty wires. It was here that the payoff barrel for wire was developed in conjunction with the Continental Can Company. This novel method of packaging and paying off wire from fibre drums caused him to leave his position as Assistant General Manager of Driscoll and join the Coulter and MacKenzie Company of Bridgeport to promote the sales and application of barrel packaging and pay-off equipment.

Wyre-Wynd was incorporated on April 16, 1964, in Bridgeport, Connecticut, as a company to manufacture all types of wires. The location of manufacturing facilities in Jewett City, Connecticut, was made possible by the formation of the Jewett City Industrial Foundation, a group of local businessmen whose primary objective was to bring industry to Jewett City. The Foundation loaned Wyre-Wynd $300,000.00. Twenty per cent of this, $60,000,000 was obtained from over 300 residents of Jewett City. This allowed the Foundation to borrow $240,000.00 from the Small Business Administration which was the first 502 loan in the State of Connecticut.

Realizing the need for diversification, Wyre-Wynd sought to expand its product lines by the addition of stranding, multiple end, and annealing operations. Funds for this expansion, $138,400.00, were provided by obtaining the second 502 loan in the State of Connecticut. This time participation consisted of 10 per cent from the community, 10 per cent from the State Development Commission and the remainder from the Small Business Administration. The completion of this program will enable the plant to purchase a new capacity of 2,880,000 pounds per year with the eventual capacity of 5,800,000 pounds per year.

[From the Post, Bridgeport (Conn.), May 25, 1967]

AWARD IS GIVEN TRUMBULL MAN—GOVERNOR HONORS J. J. KOVALESKI AS "1966 SMALL BUSINESSMAN"

A Trumbull man's development of a company in Jewett City has earned him the title of Connecticut's 1966 Small Businessman of the Year.

Joseph J. Kovaleski, of 10 Garnet road, Trumbull, owner of Advanced Wyre-Pak company, 140 James street, this city, and head of Wyre-Wynd, Inc., of Jewett City, was presented an award today by Governor Dempsey in Hartford.

The Small Business Administration award cites Mr. Kovaleski for "exemplifying the imagination, initiative, independence and integrity by which the American small businessman makes a contribution to the nation's economy and the free enterprise system."

Bernard Boutin, administrator of the Small Business Administration, congratulated Governor Dempsey and the State of Connecticut for "providing the effort which helped make Mr. Kovaleski's appointment effective today."

AT AWARD CEREMONIES

Attending the award ceremonies today in Governor Dempsey's office were Thomas Higgins, regional director of the Small Business Administration's Hartford office; Richard McCusker and Dr. William Fisher, members of the SBA advisory council of Connecticut; John Burke, SBA Hartford staff; John McNally, SBA area staff of Boston; LeRoy Jones, managing director of the Connecticut Development commission; Stephen Jaskiwicz and James T. Simons, of Wyre Wynd, and Robert Fain, company counsel and secretary.

Mr. Kovaleski began his Jewett City project in 1964 with two SBA loans and a warehouse full of chicken manure, rented from a farmer in Jewett City, a labor depressed area. He was aided by the Jewett City Industrial foundation.

The Bridgeport industrialist met with about 20 residents of Jewett City in the town's high school to talk about raising the 20 per cent of $300,000 needed before the SBA would grant his long-term loan.

At that first meeting, $14,000 was committed. The Jewett City Industrial foundation, formed at that time, then supplied the remainder of the needed funds.

His plan was to acquire the fine wire department of Anaconda American Brass and he did so, using his own cash and that of stockholder.

SKELETON FORCE

A skeleton force was set up in October, 1964, with Mr. Kovaleski training all the employes. The company's early experience showed red ink.

In late 1965, the City Trust company of Bridgeport established a $200,000 revolving line of credit. Mr. Kovaleski negotiated with the Small Business Administration for a second loan in January, 1966. At this time, the Connecticut State Development commission, along with the Jewett City Industrial foundation, participated in lending to Wyre Wynd's progress.

Then the company started to make money. Mr. Kovaleski reported a $2.2 million gross and approximately one-quarter of a million dollars profit for the year 1966. He employs 75 persons.

He added more equipment, a national market area sales manager and sales force. Even Mr. Kovaleski knocks on industry doors to sell his wire products.

Wyre Wynd, Inc., has, at present 30 to 40 per cent priority orders from the U.S. government, most of which goes to the space program. The remainder of his production is sold to the electronics and electrical industries.

EYES $4.4 MILLION GROSS

Having just received a $150,000 expansion loan from City Trust company, Mr. Kovaleski projects a gross of $4.4 million this year.

Aside from Mr. Kovaleski's small business progress, he also is an inventor, builder, and developer of machinery. His Flyp Flange spool is the latest invention for winding wire, and he owns a patent on it.

Mr. Kovaleski knows every employe in the Jewett City plant by name. He offers these employees CMS, Blue Cross, and a profit-sharing program, Stock option is offered to middle management. On June 1, he will commence a life insurance program for all employes.

Mr. Kovaleski praised the Small Business Administration for its invaluable help in encouraging and developing his company. "Their main objective," he said, "is to help a small company grow and progress, and their procedure is simple."

He thanked also Congressmen William St. Onge and John Monagan for their interest and cooperation. Mr. Kovaleski expressed "deep appreciation" to the many Jewett City townspeople, the Connecticut State Development commission, the Jewett City Industrial foundation, and the many people who have made Wyre Wynd, Inc., the success it is today.

Mr. Kovaleski is a member of the Manufacturers Association of Connecticut, Wire association, New England Manufacturers association, and the Highland Golf club, Shelton.

Starting his career as an apprentice tool and wire die maker for the Union Wire Die company in Worcester, Mass., Mr. Kovaleski later joined the Driscoll Wire company, of Shelton, and became assistant general manager.

Mr. Kovaleski then joined the Coulter and MacKenzie company, leaving that firm to establish Advanced Wyre-Pak.

American Labor Behind President in Middle East Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1967

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, a paid advertisement appearing in the June 8 issue of the Washington Post contains a statement by George Meany, president of the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, entitled "The Grave Threat to World Peace in the Middle East." Mr. Meany very emphatically points out:

> In the present critical situation, Israel is the first target of Soviet aggression by proxy (Nasser). Clearly, Israel is not the only or last target of this aggression. The freedom and security of our country, of the entire free world, are the real and final target of the Communist aggressors.

George Meany's statement serves notice on the world that American labor is firmly behind the efforts of President Johnson in utilizing all diplomatic channels in trying to bring peace out of the troubles that beset us. Those who would divide the country in this hour of crises should take note of this statement. I include it as part of my remarks for those who did not have an opportunity to read it in the paper.

The advertisement follows:

THE GRAVE THREAT TO WORLD PEACE IN THE MIDDLE EAST

(A statement by George Meany, president, American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations)

JUNE 1, 1967.—American labor is deeply disturbed by the grave threat to world peace in the Middle East.

Soviet machinations over the past year are the primary cause of the dangerous deterioration of the situation in this pivotal area. Instead of striving for an Arab-Israeli understanding, the Soviet government has armed Nasser for aggression and led him to expel the UN peace-keeping force and to violate the freedom of the seas which is indispensable to world peace. On the very day (May 22) that Moscow notified Turkey that ten Soviet warships were to sail from the Black Sea through the Dardanelles and into the Mediterranean, the Egyptian dictator announced his closing of the Gulf of Aqaba to Israeli shipping.

Aided and abetted by the USSR, Nasser is frantically rallying all Arab countries for a war to destroy Israel. He has boasted before the Egyptian National Assembly that "the Soviet Union stands with us in this battle." We have here the voice of Nasser, but the hand of Brezhnev.

Realizing the gravity of the situation and the urgency of free world preparations to meet the crisis, American labor welcomes President Johnson's timely declaration that: "The United States considers the gulf to be an international waterway and feels that a blockade of Israeli shipping is illegal and potentially disastrous to the cause of peace." We support the President's unequivocal reaffirmation of the policy pursued by his predecessors, Presidents Truman, Eisenhower and Kennedy, that "The United States strongly opposes aggression by anyone in the area, in any form, overt or clandestine."

American labor favors the President's policy of utilizing all diplomatic channels, inclusive of the UN, and seeking combined efforts by the maritime powers to secure a just settlement of the present crisis in the Middle East. However, the Soviet government and its Communist bloc would make a fatal error to assume that our country's exhaustive diplomatic efforts for a just peace mean that the United States would, in the process, become exhausted and appease aggression by accepting actions which President Johnson has appropriately branded "illegal and potentially disastrous to the cause of peace."

Were Nasser and his masters permitted to succeed in their aggression, not only Israel but a number of other Middle Eastern countries—Arab lands—would also lose their national independence under the guise of so-called Arab national unity. Then the USSR would finally succeed in its drive to take over the entire Red Sea—Arabian Peninsula-Persian Gulf Region and to deny the free world access to its energy resources. Such a conquest would be the springboard from which the Soviet rulers could move to take over the mineral resources of South-Central Africa.

In the present critical situation, Israel is the first target of Soviet aggression by proxy (Nasser). Clearly, Israel is not the only or last target of this aggression. The freedom and security of our country, of the entire free world, are the real and final target of the Communist aggressors.

NOTE.—Since this statement was issued, the situation in the Middle East has taken the grave turn it has emphasized.

Postmaster Lambert

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSHUA EILBERG
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 8, 1967

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, on May 18 the Deputy Postmaster General, Hon. Frederick C. Belan, came to Philadelphia to attend a testimonial dinner for Postmaster Anthony I. Lambert, whom he described as "one of our finest postmasters."

The city of Philadelphia is proud indeed of the man who directs its postal service. He takes his place in an illustrious line of civil servants to fill his post that began with Benjamin Franklin. I know that he applies to his profession much of the strength and vision that Franklin brought to his Nation's service.

Anthony I. Lambert began his career with the Philadelphia post office in 1920, and served well in a variety of administrative assignments before he was appointed to his present office in 1961 by President John F. Kennedy.

A total familiarity with postal affairs and postal people has helped him to cope with the extensive changes in the nature of the postal service that have occurred over the past 6 years. The rapidly expanding volume of mail has dictated the adoption of new ways to handle the workload. Postmaster Lambert has been accorded special recognition by the Postmaster General for a smooth transition from manual to mechanized operation and for his very efficient administration of the Nation's fifth largest post office. President Lyndon B. Johnson has taken note of the simplicity and effectiveness of his proposal to precancel postal cards; its application on a nationwide scale saves $2 million every year. The Direct Mail Advertising Association has twice named him Postmaster of the Year.

More than a capable executive, Anthony I. Lambert is a friendly and sympathetic human being. He demonstrates a genuine concern for the problems of 12,000 postal men and women, and has consistently maintained an open office door and an attentive ear. He has earned the Special Award of Merit of the Philadelphia Citizens Selection Committee for outstanding service in the career development of Negro employees, the 4–8–2 Square Club has honored him for a "sincere and active interest in the problems of his fellow citizens," and the President's Committee for Employment of the Handicapped has conferred an Employer's Merit Award for selective placement in useful employment of handicapped employees. His support of the 1967 Allied Jewish Appeal has won him praise "for humanitarian service to the Jewish community."

An active citizen of Philadelphia, the postmaster has successfully chaired the Federal employees division of three United Fund torch drives and is a member of the fund's board of trustees. He serves with the executive committee of the March of Dimes, the board of governors of the Heart Association and the Philadelphia Hero Scholarship Fund. Among the mementos on his office wall are a statement of appreciation for his participation in the Variety Club's Old Newsboys Day and the American Legion's citation for meritorious service, presented by the post office's Lt. Wilbur B. Small Post No. 690.

He works with the Federal Executive Board to actively involve Federal agencies in the community's problems and has twice served as president of the Federal Business Association. He has just completed a term as president of the Pennsylvania chapter of the National Association of Postmasters.

The Treasury Department's Minute Man Flag will wave again over the Philadelphia general post office after a successful drive to enroll nine out of 10 employees in the payroll savings plan for the purchase of U.S. savings bonds. His desk displays a beautiful silver medallion as a personal recognition by the Treasury Department "for patriotic service" last year.

On May 18 I was privileged to be present when a thousand of Mr. Lambert's friends assembled to pay him tribute. John P. Cain, president of branch 35, National Association of Postal Supervisors, and the evening's host, presented a certificate of appreciation from Philadelphia's supervisors and credited the city's superior service to "an experienced postal supervisor at the top."

Regional Director James J. Doherty praised him for recent savings of more than a half-million dollars by putting into practice suggestions offered by Philadelphia employees. Philadelphia County council of the American Legion lauded his services to the community.

Then the Deputy Postmaster General conferred upon Mr. Lambert the title postmaster and regional adviser, an honor that will permit him to contribute his more than four decades of postal experience to the development of programs for the future of the postal service.

Mr. Belen, in discussing his Department's plans, said:

> We will be leaning heavily upon men like Tony Lambert. The last 6 years of his career are a prologue for him. He is a career man who has moved to the top of his profession. He has made great contributions to the postal service; he will make many more.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402, at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the Congressional Record, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H–112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the Record at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the Record should be processed through this office.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the Congressional Record, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the Record.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Appendix

Graduation Talk by Batesburg-Leesville Student

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 12, 1967

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, occasionally we learn about a speech which goes to the heart of the principles upon which this Nation was founded and espouses well the ideas for which we stand.

Such a speech was delivered by a young man from South Carolina, Lucius Griffith Drafts II, of Janer Drive in Batesburg, S.C.

Johnny delivered his speech during the exercises at Batesburg-Leesville High School in Batesburg, S.C., May 24, 1967.

His talk was entitled "Our Finest Hour" and indicated an unusual grasp of national and world affairs. I have always had great faith in our young people, and Johnny's talk indicates to me our graduates are capable of meeting the challenges that await them.

I ask unanimous consent his talk be printed in the Appendix to the Congressional Record.

There being no objection, the talk was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Our Finest Hour

During World War II, when Britain seemed to be doomed by the German blitzkreig, Winston Churchill, with a new spirit surging through his veins, urged the British people saying, "Let us therefore brace ourselves to our duties, comes the challenge, and so bear ourselves that, if the British Empire and its Commonwealth last for a thousand years, men will say, 'This was their finest hour!' "

These valiant words from the greatest man in the 20th century should be an inspiration to each of us in these trying days, when lesser men than the indomitable Sir Winston complain that man no longer governs his time, but instead is governed by it. Engulfed by wars and rumors of wars, plagued by racial tensions, and challenged by the infinite frontier of outer space—we Americans have but two choices: like a race of moral and spiritual pygmies, we can falter and fail in our moment of truths, thus writing for ourselves a chapter of infamy in the saga of civilization; or, in the same spirit of heroism that has distinguished our past, we can meet this, our challenge, with an ingenuity, a valor, a power, and a faith unmatched in the ancient annals of humanity.

Today we are engaged in a momentous Asian struggle; for the Vietnam War is more than a contest for control of an insignificant, impoverished, and uncompromising country. It is the initial phase of a Communist scheme to enslave the entire Eastern Hemisphere. America must prevail in Vietnam or the cancer of communism will spread to Malaysia, Indonesia, India, Japan, Australia—spread until America stands alone upon a hostile globe. In this, the afternoon of our civilization, listen well, you burners of draft cards. Listen well, apostles of pacification. Unless the spirit of 1776 flows through the hearts of 1967, the sun that rose upon American freedom will set upon America's enslavement. And the Statue of Liberty, like the Colossus of Rhodes, will be but an architectural marvel of the past.

Today, also, we are engaged in a momentous internal struggle. The long-festering sore of racial tension has recently erupted anew—in the Watts uprising of Los Angeles, in the Freedom March through Mississippi, in the Harlem and Chicago riots. An infection of the entire national system now threatens. That proverbial melting pot is angrily boiling, as racists and radicals alike abundantly feed the flames. In this the afternoon of our civilization, listen well, you sowers of discord. Listen well, all who disrespect order and brotherhood Unless our loyalty to the American ideals of freedom and equality transcends petty prejudices of race, all of us—both black and white—will sadly see those much discussed civil rights crushed beneath the red heel of Communism. As the wise and tolerant Lincoln said, "A house divided against itself cannot stand." Therefore, as worthy descendants of Lincoln, let us Americans of every race build together a home for freedom—a home as spacious as the sky, a home as strong as childlike faith, a home as free as Jesus' love.

Today, we are engaged in yet a third great struggle. Whereas, the first was against a foreign foe and the second against our own emotions, the third is against nature, itself. That age-old quest of Columbus, Magellan, Lindbergh, and Byrd for new frontiers has now soared beyond this earth to the very heavens. In blazing this ethereal trail, three brave Americans have given their lives. This supreme sacrifice was made so that man might gain knowledge, and perhaps, with it wisdom. It was not made so that the earth's past history of greed, jealousy, and destruction can ultimately assume a cosmic dimension. Such was not the lofty goal of Ed White, Virgil Grissom, and Roger Chaffee. So in this, the afternoon of our civilization, listen well, avaricious aggressors. Listen well, you heinous exterminators of whole races. Unless the mighty power that propels man through the endless reaches of space is directed into creative vistas, it will propel him into the abyss of annihilation. Man is now powerful enough to destroy himself. The fateful question is will he be wise and virtuous enough to merit survival.

Surely Great Britain had her finest hour in the heroism of war; but America's acme of honor will be reached when she has built a citadel of peace, brotherhood, and freedom where earth's war-weary masses can beat their swords into plowshares. This indeed will be our finest hour.

A Real Pioneer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. G. ELLIOTT HAGAN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1967

Mr. HAGAN. Mr. Speaker, Georgians were saddened recently to learn of the death of a beloved citizen and veteran newspaperman, Mr. Lassie Melvin Rhoden, of Reidsville, Ga.

As part of the Record I would like to enter an editorial from the Savannah Evening Press by Mr. Tom Coffey, which pays tribute to this fine gentleman:

This Weekly Editor Was a Real Pioneer

(By Tom Coffey)

Last week, we read of the deaths of three newspapermen—Lyle Wilson, Dan Parker and Lassie Melvin Rhoden.

All of you, I feel sure, recognize the first two names. Mr. Wilson was a United Press International columnist and executive for years and Mr. Parker was a New York sportswriter.

Not as many recognized the name of Mr. Rhoden, but among many south Georgians he was well known. He was a retired publisher of a weekly newspaper and the father of one of the best known newspaper families in the state. Moreover three of his brothers were in the newspaper business, including Vasco Rhoden of Savannah, one of our printers before he retired.

Mr. Rhoden was one of those rare combinations of editor-publisher-printer who have made the weekly newspapers what they are today. His paper was the Tattnall Journal in Reidsville, still going strong under the editorship of his son, Russell, in a competitive market where F. E. Phillips publishes the Glenville Sentinel in the same county.

Of Mr. Rhoden's seven sons, five founded newspaper careers. Besides Russell in Reidsville, Harry is in Lyons and Bill is in Jesup. Frank, an Augustan, has already retired and Jack is on a Houston paper. Russell, Harry and Bill all are editors and publishers.

Now, where a weekly newspaper is different from a daily is in its closeness to the people. Lord knows, we try to maintain that closeness, but in a big city it's impossible for an editor or his staff to know everyone in town.

Not so with a weekly editor. He comes to know everybody because he sees 'em all in the course of doing his job. If he's not writing something about a town activity, he's selling advertising, or taking an order for job printing or beating the bushes to help one of the churches raise money for a new sanctuary or finally consenting, after much urging by his friends, to run for a post on the town council or take a seat on the school board.

A weekly newspaper now is the only generally circulated publication that might find space to print photos of every member of the high school senior class. The weekly football game makes the front page. So does the appointment of a new Sunday school superintendent. Somehow, these items seem to find space on the same front page with a story about a new highway that's coming through town, or the decision of a Yankee industrialist to open a shirt factory on the outskirts.

The weeklies haven't knuckled under to mounting costs, either. They've simply adjusted to new processes. As a matter of fact, they've made more headway in that direction than the dailies.

The trend has been to a process called offset, an embellishment of the old lithographic process, involving paste-up and photography. Only eight of Georgia's 32 dailies have gone to offset but almost half of the state's 200 weeklies are now using that process. It's much more economical and it really has been the salvation of the small papers.

Mr. Rhoden's son Bill (the one in Jesup) operates an offset plant for his own Jesup Sentinel and on weekends prints 13 other newspapers from surrounding counties, whose editors bring their copy and photos to him on a designated day. Bill even prints Russell's Reidsville paper.

Bill's not the only one in the multi-newspaper printing business. There are several such plants in Georgia, including Roy Chalker's at Waynesboro, where about 17 publications are handled weekly.

Mr. Rhoden, who was 80 when he died, used the old letter press when he published the Tattnall Journal but he lived to see the change in process and he surely must have marveled. The marvelous thing is that the weeklies have been able to adjust to the changing times in a period when high costs have killed off some of the metropolitan dailies.

But my thinking is that if men like Mr. Rhoden hadn't kept the confidence of their readers back in the old days, there wouldn't be 200 weekly papers circulating in Georgia today. He was just as important a figure in the newspaper business as Lyle Wilson and Dan Parker.

Looking Ahead in Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES H. PERCY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 12, 1967

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, in a speech before the closing session of the 1967 delegate assembly workshop of the National School Boards Association's 27th annual conference in Portland, Oreg., Dr. Harold V. Webb raised many important questions which face education and educators in the future. He points out that the population explosion does not mean more of the old kind of problems we used to face—it means totally new problems and old problems with a totally new character.

Due to the importance of these remarks, I ask consent to have Dr. Webb's speech printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Dr. Ackerman, Members of the Board, Delegates, Executive Secretaries and distinguished guests: it is my pleasure and honor to speak to you today. What I wish to do on this occasion is to indicate what I believe are the important implications for public education and for the National School Boards Association in 1967 and 1968, arising out of the forces that are shaping our society.

During the course of the past year I have met with many of you, individually or in small groups, and I can truthfully say that I have always come away from these meetings better informed and more aware of how well the country's board members are serving the needs of the children in their communities. But this is the only time in the course of the year that I have an opportunity to address you all together. It is a rare opportunity and I am grateful for it. Perhaps it is not fair, but on this occasion it is you who do all the listening, and it falls on me to do the talking.

This being so, I want to put before you what I might term some "enabling" ideas. Not solutions, not the nuts-and-bolts of the Association's activities, nor the specific detailed needs of particular programs, but rather some thoughts which I hope will provide a perspective as you consider the real needs at local, state and federal levels; and some ideas, enabling, I hope for you as you consider various approaches for NSBA to the solution of these needs.

I want to remind you this morning that while the National School Boards Association has experienced extraordinary growth, particularly over the last five years, and has consequently changed its character and its method of operation to rise to the challenge created by this growth, our American society has been growing apace, whether the measurement be population, affluence or world involvement, and that the transition we are in as a people and a society is extraordinarily difficult to understand.

Our first task is simply to recognize that we are in transition and that the future is almost impossible to predict. If we can recognize this, we can give our attention to the nature of the transition and to some sort of determination as to what the role of a National School Boards Association ought to be within our changing society.

The end product that we deal with is the child of school years. Whatever we do, or whatever is done to us, at local, state and national levels, has its ultimate impact on the youngster in school.

And it is the youngster in school today who is our citizen tomorrow. We can talk all we want about federal encroachment, weak or strong State Departments of Education, well-guided or misguided State legislators, wise or foolish local boards, well-directed or poorly-directed State School Board Associations, and we can exert whatever influence we are able to to improve these agencies and institutions, the fact remains that if our efforts are not guided primarily by an overriding concern for the welfare of all the students in all the public schools, we will not be meeting our responsibilities.

So, obviously, this is the central premise which must underlie and guide all that the NSBA does, all that it stands for.

As we take an overview of what is happening today, it is evident that the two fundamental issues which are shaping and will continue to shape public education are, first, finding the money to pay for this vast enterprise and, second, gearing our schools to assume their vitally important role in preparing students to become effective citizens in every sense of the word.

These two issues are inter-related and all the other pressures on education, it seems to me, are subsummed under them. We can and will deal with specific federal programs, teacher militancy, national assessment, what you will—but we are not going to be successful if we do not meet the two major issues squarely. This, I hold, is the primary responsibility of NSBA and the primary responsibility of the State associations.

It is extremly difficult to separate the matter of money from the matter of the nature of our society and the role the schools should play in it, but I am going to make an attempt. I am going to deal with money first, not because it is easier, but because it is the root of all evil—it underlies the entire structure and thrust of public education.

The cost of dealing with the here-and-now problems that the country faces—the war in Viet Nam, water and air pollution abatement, and poverty programs—is enormous. These are costs that cannot be set aside. The country is determined to pursue these matters. Whether or not it appears that there is money enough to pay for these programs is beside the point. Make no mistake, money for these commitments will be found. One way which must concern us all is that of effecting cost savings by cutting back programs directed to lesser priority issues.

Education is always in danger of being placed in this category.

Your responsibility in the State Associations and NSBA's responsibility lies in two areas. First, we have an obligation to see to it that public education is properly financed. The federal involvement does not mean that we can lessen the pressure on local and state sources. If anything, we will need more money than ever before, and this, I believe, means broadening the tax base and increasing the rate.

I believe also that we must be prepared to fight in Washington for a continuing flow of federal monies, though we are all agreed that the manner and form of their distribution requires the most careful administration.

This task of assuring an adequate financial base has always been with us, but it seems that every year as the bills grow higher, the difficulties become geometrically more serious.

But our responsibility does not end here. We have a concommitant obligation to see that the monies we do have are wisely administered and intelligently spent.

I would say to you that this aspect of the problem may very well be the rock on which the concept of local control may founder.

I do not hold that there is greater wisdom in Washington, D.C., than there is at state or local levels, but the machinery when it breaks down visibly does not do so in Washington, but at the local level. And if it breaks down badly enough, then the easy solution to those who make policies is to remove the legal responsibility for spending monies from those who are actually responsible for the day-to-day operation of the schools, and give it to those who hold the purse strings.

Local boards are not going to improve this situation by shouting "state-ism" to their national representatives. The only clear last chance we have is to be so in control of the school operations and so responsive to the needs of the children that there can be no cause for the exercise of policy affecting the education of our youngsters any place but within the school systems in which that education is taking place.

Now, can our system of local control, supported by strong state school board associations and by an effective National School Boards Association accomplish this? I think it can. I think it must.

Let's put money concerns aside for a moment and look at the larger societal problem.

As the times grows more complex, it becomes increasingly evident that the strength of the free world stems from the strength and viability of its institutions. And of these, law, representative government and public education are the bedrock.

I would not argue with those who hold that our system of public education, set in a framework of local control, is the most important of all. We trace this system back to colonial times and we know that our future rests on an educated citizenry, products of a system which must be flexible enough to adapt itself in a changing society to whatever new challenges the times bring.

But today for one reason or another, all institutions are under pressure, are under attack. Because we have had 200 years of local control does not assure a perpetual continuation. What will assure the immediate future, I would posit, is the ability of this system to adapt, to be flexible, to meet and to provide new and better ways of educating our children.

And this is a task which falls squarely on school board leaders and on NSBA.

The great issues of our time, which public education must help prepare our youngsters to cope with are peace and social order, the population explosion, prosperity and poverty, and environmental pollution.

To the degree our system of education inculcates within our boys and girls understandings of basic values which can provide them guideposts in dealing with these issues, so to that extent do I believe we will be able to justify our existence and sustain our system of local control.

I know there is no disagreement among anybody here on basic values. I think we all might concede, however, that whether we like it or not, far-reaching changes in society do create pressures on our values and that some of the principles we hold fundamental are compromised by the force of events. We must not let this happen in public education.

If we are to keep this from happening, however, I think it is important for us to assure that the machinery of local boards and that board member leadership be up to the task of serving the enormous number of youngsters who constitute America's school-age population.

We talk a lot about the population explosion, but we don't always recognize that more people simply does not mean more of the old kind of problems we used to face—it means totally new problems and old problems with a totally new character.

Dr. Philip Hauser, who is Director of the Population Research and Training Center and Professor of Sociology at the University of Chicago summarizes the population explosion somewhat as follows: It took man most of the 2 million years he has inhabited this globe to produce a population of 1 billion, which is where we stood about 1825.

One hundred and five years later—1930—we reached 2 billion—1930, I think, is in the memory of most of us.

Thirty years later—1960—which I trust is in the memory of all of us, we were 3 billion.

We can project ahead, Dr. Hauser says: 17 years—1977, that is—4 billion; 1987, 5 billion; 1995, 6 billion.

Somehow, we are going to have to deal with this problem, but thank goodness this is not the job for school board members.

Well, looking at the population explosion in the United States in terms of local control, the picture looks something like this.

In 1790, when we took our first census, 95% of the American people lived in rural areas or in places having fewer than 2,500 persons. By 1960, 70% of our people lived in urban places, and 63% lived in metropolitan areas—that is in places of 50,000 or more.

This transition from an agrarian to an urban society has had extraordinary implications for school boards.

After all, the school boards system was established to meet the needs of an agrarian society.

When we talk agrarian versus urban, what do we really mean? Consider for a moment a circle with a 10-mile radius.

I suggest this size because there was a time in our history when this was the distance a person could walk from where he lived and return home at night in the course of a single day. Those of you who are dealing with the New Math will know that a circle of a 10-mile radius gives you an area of 314 square miles. Now, if this area contains one person per square mile, you will have 314 people living in it. This happens to be very close to what the population density was in this country when the American Indians lived here.

If the population density in this circle is 50 persons per square mile, which happens to be very close to the population density of the United States today, and incidentally, to the population density of the world as a whole, you would have 15,700 people in the circle.

Suppose the population density were 10,000 persons per square mile. This is not too far from the density of the average central city in the United States. Chicago is over 16,000 persons per square mile, and the average density in the five boroughs of New York City is 25,000 per square mile. Manhattan, that single, central Borough, which sometimes seems to be the source of all troubles in this country, is 75,000 persons per square mile.

Well, let me come back to my 10,000 persons per square mile, which is about what we live with in the big cities in the United States today; the population of our circle becomes 3,141,600.

Now, my point in all this is that the quality of life changes radically when you have more than 3,000,000 people living in an area which once upon a time contained 314 people.

In the small community of the 19th Century, or even in the small community today, the local population interacted well—the life of the individual was of concern to his neighbors. A school board operating in such a community drew its character out of the collective experience of the community as a whole over a reasonable period of time.

But more and more, there are fewer and fewer small communities in this country and our social institutions have become *enacted*—that is, they are created by government and administrators, not developed out of the common experience. Programs designed to meet the problems of poverty and of civil rights, for instance, which are or should be brought directly within the public school framework, are new and disturbing responsibilities for local boards created initially to take responsibility for a much simpler assignment.

I am not saying that the basic responsibility of local boards does not remain the nuts-and-bolts of education: this has not changed. But added to this responsibility are equally heavy burdens that cannot be given lesser priorities. You can't do the basic job of educating if you cannot bring your schools into the main stream of society's needs.

In the last few years, we have done a good deal of talking about the need for boards of education to gear up to incorporate the new federal programs into their operations. Somehow, I think this is a little too narrow. While gearing up to do this is a large job and must be done, it implies somehow that all that is required is a little more money and a little more staff with a little more know-how and it will be possible to bring into tandem a new junior partner on the education team. Well, it's not so simple.

What I think we have to talk about from now on is gearing up to provide the kind and quality of education that is in tune with the vast revolution that is taking place: social and technological—and violently interacting.

If local boards fail to do this, then I think it is the beginning of the end. But, they need not fail and they should not fail because the principle which underlies the machinery of local control—that is the idea that the citizens of the community shall have responsibility for the education of all the youngsters within their community—is fundamental.

This, then, I think is the challenge facing all of us: financing our schools—providing the kind of leadership that will make our schools viable social institutions in a time of national and international change and stress.

NSBA's over-riding purpose for the coming years must be to help achieve these goals. Under the wise leadership of the Delegates and the Board I am confident that we will move effectively and aggressively in this direction.

Cotton Land Rulings Are Eased by USDA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1967

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, the Department of Agriculture has acted promptly and with real understanding to prevent widespread economic losses in the Midsouth. This spring has been unseasonably cold and there have been excessive rainfalls across the Cotton Belt. Cotton has been planted as many as two or more times and rains have ruined the prospects for a crop. Farmers are faced with tremendous losses.

The Department has issued emergency amendments to their regulations in an effort to assist these farmers. The rules are reasonable and just, as they are to be applied to bring relief to worthy farmers who are faced with the second successive disastrous growing season.

The added income will aid growers and their farm communities throughout the cotton belt suffering from excessive rainfall and a cold spring. The relaxed regulations will permit the growing of needed soybeans and other grain crops which are not under acreage allotments. Farmers still will not prosper, but the emergency amendments to the regulations will enable them to carry through and hope that next year will be a better one.

I have written the ASCS Administrator a letter on this matter and it is a pleasure to incorporate it with these remarks. Also, I am making available a news aricle on this matter from the June 1 edition of the Evening Times of West Memphis, Ark.

The letter and article follow:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, June 12, 1967.

Mr. HORACE GODFREY,
Administrator, Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C.

DEAR ADMINISTRATOR GODFREY: This is to commend you and other Departmental officials for actions taken to issue emergency amendments to the cotton program regulations because of the disastrous Spring planting season in the Mid-South.

As you know, excessive rains and unseasonably cold weather caused many Arkansas cotton farmers to plant as many as two or more times, and many are now awaiting dry weather to see if any of the seed will germinate.

First the Department, in an effort to be helpful, advanced the date from June 1 to June 21 when farmers might change plans for planting cotton and seed other crops. Now, the Department has issued orders that, with the approval of the local A.S.C.S. Committees, the cotton grower may class land on which they had planted cotton and applied pre-emergent chemical weed-killer as diverted land.

This is most important, for land treated with these pre-emergents is not suitable for planting alternate crops such as soybeans. Thus, by issuing emergency regulations permitting the chemically treated acreage as diverted acreage, the grower can plant acres initially diverted to an income-producing crop.

Many a farmer will find it possible to carry on becasue you and the Department acted promptly and intelligently to provide them relief, and I appreciate so much your efforts.

With kind regards, I am,
Sincerely,
E. C. GATHINGS.

[From the West Memphis (Ark.) Evening Times, June 1]

COTTON LAND RULINGS ARE EASED BY USDA

More relief for Critenden County and other farmers, plagued with the loss of their cotton crop by rain and cold weather, came yesterday in the form of an announcement by the United States Department of Agriculture that cotton land regulations would be eased.

Under the revised order, cotton producers, with approval of their Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Services county committees, may be able to class land on which they had planted cotton and applied pre-emergence chemicals as "diverted" land.

In order to be eligible for price supports on cotton and small grains this year, Crittenden and other farmers had to agree to hold out of production specified minimum percentages of their cotton and feed grain lands.

In Crittenden County this diverted or held-out acreage amounted to approximately 30,000 acres or about 35 per cent of the county's 96,357.8 allotted cotton acres for 1967.

Because pre-emergence chemical weed killer has been applied to land on which county cotton producers were endeavoring to get a stand, and which, in some cases, had been planted three or four times, the land is not suitable for planting an alternative later crop such as soybeans.

Under the eased USDA regulations, land which originally had been classed as diverted acreage under the price support program now may be used for alternative crops not subject to government adjustment programs, the principal one of which is soybeans. The classification of diverted land will be placed instead on the chemically treated acres.

Earlier the USDA, in an effort to help Crittenden and other cotton producers had advanced from June 1 to June 21, the date by which farmers could change plans for cotton plantings and seed other crops.

Heavy rains during the past two days have made prospects for Crittenden County's cotton crop more dismal. Most farmers of the county have given up any further replanting plans and are watching fields this week in an effort to determine whether or not the seed already planted will germinate. If it doesn't, they likely will be plowing up the acreage.

Rains also stopped soybean planting which was in progress. Seeding of soybeans will be continued through most of June as farmers will be following wheat and small grain acreage with the beans. Wheat harvesting, which is well underway, will be resumed as soon as fields dry out sufficiently to move in heavy equipment.

An Inspirational Demonstration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 12, 1967

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, in this period of our history we are seeing and hearing about various demonstrations designed to influence the conduct of our national affairs, both foreign and domestic. Today I would like to call attention to a column by the esteemed writer, David Lawrence, which appeared in the Friday, May 19, 1967, issue of the Evening Star, here in Washington, D.C.

Mr. Lawrence's column is entitled "An Inspirational Demonstration" and calls to the attention of the public a program of music generally known as "Up With People." This dramatic appeal to patriotism is typical of the inspiration being provided by the majority of our young people and is the kind of "demonstration" that has a constructive impact rather than a destructive one.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous constant this editorial column by Mr. Lawrence be printed in the Appendix of the Congressional Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

An Inspirational "Demonstration"

There are some strange contrasts in the life of American youth today. This writer saw at Constitution Hall here on Wednesday night a "demonstration" which was utterly unlike any that has made the headlines in recent months.

More than 3,500 persons listened to two hours of singing by a cast of 150 young people, most of them between the ages of 18 and 20. In the audience were 1,000 young men in uniform from the Officers Candidate Regiment at nearby Ft. Belvoir, and they cheered heartily, along with the rest of the listeners. It was an inspirational evening—the emphasis being on what a spiritual influence can do in America and elsewhere.

This same kind of program—entitled "Up With People!"—has been given in the last 18 months to more than 2.2 million Americans, on 450 college campuses and schools, at the four service academies, and on 89 military bases in the United States and Canada. There are three fulltime traveling casts of 150 each, and 160 regional casts involving nearly 15,000 youths across the country.

The whole project was developed at a gathering of 7,000 students from the United States and 52 other nations who met at the Moral Re-Armament Conference Center at Mackinac Island in Michigan in the summer of 1965. The purpose was to launch "a new trend for the youth of the world."

Several foreign governments have sponsored tours by American casts in Europe, Asia, Africa and Latin America, and native "sing-out" groups have been formed by the youth of other countries, including Germany, Japan, Venezuela and Korea. "Harambee Africa" has a 140-member cast representing 14 African nations. All these in turn tour other countries, and this summer will hold a worldwide sing-out festival in the United States.

One American cast recently returned from a four-week tour of Panama as guests of the government. Receiving them at the palace before they left, the president of Panama, Marcos A. Robles, told the performers:

"The response that you have had right through the country is a demonstration of the gratitude and thanks which the whole people of Panama feel towards what you have brought. What you have done has contributed a great deal to the creation of a new understanding between two great nations, which must always march together in their aims towards producing order and progress for the whole of humanity."

At the conclusion of the performance at Constitution Hall, William Storey, a Negro leader from a college in California, declared that "the issue that is facing university America is not white power versus black power, but it is whether our generation has the guts to give heart power to a hungry and confused world."

In a recent article in the Reader's Digest, Storey is mentioned as having once been a member of one of the toughest youth gangs on Chicago's West Side before joining "Sing-Out," and is quoted as having said:

"The kids in 'Sing-Out' seem to have an answer to hate and violence. I decided to do something to help spread that answer."

The "Sing-Outs" within the United States have attracted huge crowds. The cast contains boys and girls of every race, every color, every creed and every class. Before each evening's program, they meet in prayer as they seek divine guidance in their work. The songs are inspirational, particularly when the chorus sings out "Freedom Isn't Free."

The purpose of the whole program is to present the image of a "disciplined, responsible, mature young America." The boys and girls are talented and well directed. The dances are decent and graceful. The boys have the conventional haircuts of yesteryear.

The stirring appeal by the young people who have joined this movement is significant. It is an example of what can be done by orderly assembly. It is indeed a contrast to what we have witnessed in many of the impassioned "demonstrations" by youth which have swept the land.

Poverty Funds To Destroy Police Departments?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1967

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, no one can be unaware of the serious crime situation in all parts of our Nation today. Much attention is being given to the subject, while demands are being made for massive expenditure of Federal funds to seek a solution.

I have long felt, and often stated, that the mere spending of huge sums of money is no guarantee of successful solution. An excellent example of poor judgment in spending in seeking crime abatement is contained in the recent grant of almost a quarter of a million dollars to what is known as the community alert patrol in Los Angeles.

Justification of the grant is advanced on the basis that some 20 youthful members of the patrol, many with prior criminal records, will now serve as models of morality and assist in the difficult problems of the police department in the Watts area, the scene of bloody riots a couple of years ago.

But in attempting such justification, juvenile delinquency officials of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare either failed to check with the Los Angeles police department or ignored their records, for on June 24, 1966, Rev. P. Seward stated "that some individuals of CAP were trying to coerce merchants into donating funds and offered protection." On May 23, 1967, after the award of funds, one of the leaders of these "models of morality," Brother Crooks—Ronald Wilkins—of CAP urged the crowd at a riotous situation to continue its unlawful acts.

As a result of my investigation of this project, I have protested the award of this money, and have urged that the grant be rescinde by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Mr. Speaker, I insert the following report by the police chief of Los Angeles, Thomas Reddin in the Record:

Background of the Community Alert Patrol (CAP)

On May 7, 1966, the Temporary Alliance of Local Organizations (TALO) was formed in Los Angeles. This group created the CAP on June 30, 1966. Their stated primary purpose was to observe, record, and document examples of police brutality. Since the formation of this group, not one report has been made by it to the Los Angeles Police Department of any instances of alleged brutality or misconduct on the part of members of the Department. In spite of this, the press release of H.E.W. announcing the grant states as follows: "The Patrol also acts as police observers to help confirm or deny alleged instances of police 'brutality.' "

At the time of its formation, the CAP was anti-police in its concept. Since the announcement of the funding by H.E.W., its leaders have stated publicly they do not intend to cooperate with the police in that they would not report crimes witnessed by their members nor would they be witnesses themselves.

Recent information obtained through police personnel assigned to Community Relations indicates a wide lack of acceptance toward CAP by the Negro community and its responsible leaders. This information may be adequately documented upon request.

VISIT OF HEW OFFICIALS TO LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT

On March 15, 1967, officials of H.E.W. called on Chief of Police Thomas Reddin in his office in the Police Building. At this time they presented details of the proposal for funding activities of the CAP through H.E.W. Chief Reddin expressed his position, that this Department was unalterably opposed to the proposed Patrol's announced intention of patrolling the streets and acting under an assumed color of authority. Chief Reddin and Deputy Chief Fisk had reason to believe that no decision would be made regarding funds by the Washington officials without further official consultations with the Los Angeles Police Department. Officials of the Los Angeles Police Department, to this date, have never received official notification that this grant has been made.

In attendance at this meeting were:

Al Neher, Legal Officer, H.E.W., Washington, D.C.; George Roemer, Chief Administrative Officer, H.E.W., Washington, D.C.; Dr. Melvin Herman, Member of H.E.W. Review Board; Emmett Briggs, Board of Directors, CAP; Ronald Leroy Wilkins (aka "Brother Crooks"), Board of Directors, CAP; Thomas Reddin, Chief of Police, Los Angeles Police Department; Deputy Chief James Fisk, Director of Community Relations, Los Angeles Police Department.

The proposal submitted to the Office of Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Development, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, as prepared by Mae Churchill, Ph. D., California State College at Los Angeles, Counseling Center, is dated January, 1967—*two months prior* to any consultation with local law enforcement agencies.

CAP PATROL—RESULTS

June 12, 1966: CAP patrol units were observed for the first time engaged in patrol of the streets in central Los Angeles, Members of CAP indicated that their primary purpose was "to observe, record, and document examples of police brutality."

June 26, 1966: Members of CAP stated to police that they had not seen any police brutality and were getting tired of a futile patrol.

August 2, 1966: CAP patrol ceased temporarily.

August 10, 1966: At a CAP meeting, the following statement was made by Robert Brock, President of Self-Determination Committee: "Well, we have definite evidence and pictures of police brutality."

February 7, 1967: Curtis Wright stated at a meeting of the South Central Area Welfare Planning Council that, "CAP activities had acquired the reputation of chasing cops for kicks."

May 8, 1967: CAP application to H.E.W. stated a goal of CAP as, "Maintenance of peace by regular patrol of area to observe potential disorder or law violations by either residents or police."

May 24, 1967: Search of Police Commission files and the files of the Internal Affairs Division of the Los Angeles Police Department disclosed no reports or complaints made from CAP or any known CAP member regarding conduct of police officers.

POLICE CONTACTS

June 24, 1966: Reverend P. Seward stated that some individuals of CAP were trying to coerce merchants into donating funds and offered protection.

June 29, 1966: Comment made to police by a citizen that, "When CAP shows up, there is trouble." Presence of CAP units appeared to encourage anti-police attitudes.

July 7, 1966: CAP units appeared to be inviting police attention by use of minor vehicle equipment violations and exaggerated poses for the purpose of providing subjects for photography.

July 10, 1966: Police Division received a petition from residents complaining of CAP units creating loud and boisterous noise.

July 13, 1966: CAP members appeared to be encouraging an altercation between police and arrestee and gave positive evidence that those involved were anti-police.

July 17, 1966: Citizens at Watts Festival made many statements regarding incompetency of CAP.

July 17, 1966: Ronald Wilkins stated to police that he had legal advice to plead not guilty to all traffic offenses whether he was in fact guilty or not.

August 10, 1966: CAP announced removal of the vehicle ID, stating that it hampered their observations of the police.

October 22, 1966: CAP members urged a violent crowd to assault police officers with clubs.

May 8, 1967: CAP application to H.E.W. stated, "Group also serves as law-abiding role model to younger boys . . ."

May 23, 1967: Brother Crooks (Ronald Wilkins) of CAP urged the crowd at a riotous situation to continue their unlawful acts.

REACTION OF PUBLIC OFFICIALS

Statement of Mayor Yorty

". . . This grant is typical of the politics in the war on poverty. Federal officials should have consulted with local law enforcement agencies before making the grant. If they (CAP) interfere with law enforcement, we will have to take action to curb their activities and possibly request withdrawal of the funds. The money could have been used better in a local youth program which was not funded." (Excerpt from L.A. Herald Examiner, May 24, 1967.)

Statement of position by police commission

"The Police Commission is greatly disturbed and extremely concerned that the Federal Government would grant nearly a quarter of a million dollars for the purpose of imposing a private police patrol on the streets of Los Angeles.

"The Commission is also disturbed that Federal funds are to be diverted to such a purpose in the face of strong opposition from our Police Department.

"This Federal grant of monies to fund the CAP comes at a critical moment when the Police Department is attempting to establish an atmosphere of mutual trust and confidence in the community.

"The prospect of untrained youths working outside constituted authority, with the implied sanction of the United States Government, is divisive and extremely dangerous. The proposal usurps a police function by the creation of a vigilante-type group that is not responsible to the citizens of this community.

"We are in accord with the concept of rehabilitation, but rehabilitation should be accomplished through techniques and activities in areas other than in the very sensitive and difficult task of enforcing the law.

"The activities of the Police Department are open to the view of the citizens of Los Angeles at all times. Police work is for the most part done in public view, visible to all concerned in the community. The members of this Department do not need the supervision of untrained youths to insure the quality of their performance. Local law enforcement is the responsibility of the Los Angeles Police Department. We are satisfied that the citizens of Los Angeles do not want us, as their civilian heads of that Department, to abdicate this responsibility." (May 24, 1967.)

Statement of Chief of Police Reddin

"At a time when the Los Angeles Police Department is striving to become closer to the community, the Community Alert Patrol proposes to function as a 'buffer' between the police and the community. Further, the CAP proposes to police the police and police the community. Such an important responsibility should not be in the hands of untrained and unskilled young men. I am opposed to any program that would attempt to usurp responsibilities that rightfully belong to the police. Observance of police activities is not needed, since we operate on the public streets and our every action is already subject to public scrutiny in the area where CAP proposes to patrol."

PUBLIC REACTION—ABSTRACTED FROM LETTERS ON FILE

The Los Angeles Police Department has received numerous letters regarding CAP and the Federal grant. A sampling of abstracts from these indicate the public reaction:

"We do not need such an idiotic patrol to check on our law enforcement officers in Watts or anywhere else."

"We, the taxpayers, are tired of seeing our money wasted in this way. What do we tell our children now about respect for our policemen?"

"The money . . . should have been awarded the police departments, who do such a fine job of rehabilitating the wayward youths."

"This is a grave insult to the greatest police force in the country and also an insult to the taxpayers of this country."

"How dare the Government interfere with a city government, using our tax money to pay for this absurd thing."

"The quarter of a million appropriated to further hamper your Department is shocking and hard to comprehend. I like the way you reacted with firmness and diplomacy, and you may rest assured the law-abiding citizens in this community are behind you."

"I am considering applying for a Federal subsidy so as to form a patrol to protect the public from these vigilantes. I have a lurking fear, however, that my request will be turned down—for I am not anti-police."

"The Federal Government, in effect, is creating the nucleus of a Federal Law Enforcement Agency."

". . . I deeply resent, and protest, the Federal Government's financial support of unscreened, untrained civilians to prowl the street and act as judge, jury and possible executioner, of my Police Department."

"How can a group whose sole purpose is to discredit and demoralize the Los Angeles Police Department receive the backing of our Federal Government?"

Criticism of Supreme Court Decision Overturning California Popular Referendum

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 12, 1967

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, recently I addressed this body with severe criticism of the Supreme Court's decision overturning the California popular referendum to repeal the odious open housing law of that State. Many distinguished observers are now calculating the imponderable effects which that reckless decision will leave upon the fabric of the Constitution.

The June 6 edition of the State carries two such sober appraisals of that action. The first is the lead editorial of the editorial page of the State, entitled "End of the Tenth." The second is a column appearing on the same page by the well-known national columnist, James Jackson Kilpatrick. Both articles point out that the 10th amendment has been beaten beyond recognition by the Supreme Court's astonishing decision.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that both these analyses be printed in the Appendix of the Congressional Record.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Columbia (S.C.) State, June 6, 1967]

END OF THE 10TH

That astute gentleman from Virginia, James Jackson Kilpatrick, offers a penetrating analysis of the U.S. Supreme Court's latest rape of the Constitution in his column printed on this page today.

In his view, the Court, in a California open housing decision, dealt a body blow to the Tenth Amendment, which reserves "to the states respectively, or to the people" all those powers *not* delegated to the federal government. Certainly the health of that much-maligned amendment was not improved by this decision.

The facts are these: California's legislature, in the early '60's, passed two acts which prohibited racial discrimination in the sale or rental of any private dwelling containing more than four units. In 1964, the people of California, in a popular referendum, voted 4.5 million to 2.4 million to nullify those statutes.

The voters approved a state constitutional amendment which simply gave each private property-holder the right to rent or sell or decline to rent or sell his property "as he, in his absolue discretion, chooses."

Putting this section in the California constitution merely put the property-holder back where he was before the passage of the anti-discrimination statutes. The people were simply trying to undo what the vast majority considered to be a legislative blunder.

The referendum was contested and the California Supreme Court, interpreting the U.S. Constitution, said that it violated the Equal Protection Clause of the 14th Amendment by "encouraging" discrimination. By a 5–4 majority, the U.S. Supreme Court, in effect, merely adopted the California decision as its own.

A powerful dissent by Justice John M. Harlan pointed up the ludicrous but damaging features of the opinion and showed how it could hamper the very cause which the liberal justices champion.

Said Harlan: "This (action) runs no more afoul of the 14th Amendment than would have California's failure to pass such anti-discrimination measures in the first instance . . . It must not be forgotten that the 14th Amendment does not compel a state to put or keep any particular law about race on its books. The amendment forbids only a state to pass or keep in effect laws discriminating on account of race."

So what we have here is a state, by vote of its people, trying to return to a "neutral" position whereby each citizen would be allowed a freedom of choice concerning the disposition of his property. All nine justices agreed that a state is not obligated to enact open housing legislation. But the majority said that, once a state passes such a law, it is violating the Constitution if it attempts to remove it, because the removal "encourages" discrimination.

Justice Harlan observed that this position could seriously damage attempts to deal with problems of race relations through the legislative process. Certainly he is right. Legislatures will move cautiously if the retreat routes from unsound and unworkable positions are blocked.

Of course, the Court's opinion will furnish ammunition to opponets of civil rights legislation at the state level.

And who is to say that the decision won't solidify the opposition to the national open housing bill, still pending in Congress. If that happens, even Mr. Kilpatrick may find something to like in the absurd decision.

[From the State, Columbia, S.C., June 6, 1967]

COURT SETS ITSELF ABOVE VOTERS—STRIKES DOWN CALIFORNIA HOUSING REFERENDUM

(By James J. Kilpatrick)

WASHINGTON.—The Tenth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution ordinarily is remembered, when it is remembered at all, as the "states' rights" amendment. The term is a misnomer. It ought properly to be known as the "reserved powers" amendment, but in the light of Supreme Court decision May 29, in the California case, we may refer to it henceforth simply as the Discarded Tenth.

Until then, many of us truly had believed that not even the Warren court could fail to honor the explicit meaning of the Tenth. What the amendment says is that all powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the states respectively "or to the people."

Those last four words strike to the very heart of popular government. Destroy them, and the structure falls. What the court held on Monday is that the people of California, exercising their ultimate sovereignty, no longer have the power to amend their own State Constitution in order to proclaim an elementary statement of property rights.

Five members of the high court—Warren, Douglas, Brennan, White and Fortas—substituted their own naked will for the expressed desire of more than 4,500,000 Californians. Government by the people yielded to government by the judges.

The facts in the case are well known. In 1963, the California legislature adopted the Rumford Fair Housing Act. The law, intended to reduce racial discrimination, took away from the owners of certain residential property their right to sell or to lease as they wished. The opponents of the law thereupon initiated a referendum, known as Proposition 14, intended to nullify the Rumford Act and to write into California's supreme law a positive statement of every person's right "to decline to sell, lease or rent (his) property to such person or persons as he, in his absolute dicretion, chooses."

Proposition 14 carried overwhelmingly in the 1964 election. Several Negro plaintiffs then brought suit to have the referendum declared void as a violation of the Fourteenth Amendment. The California Supreme Court upheld their position. On Monday, the U.S. Supreme Court affirmed by a 5–4 vote.

To describe the majority's reasoning as bizarre is to put a useful word to an inadequate purpose. The majority's reasoning was simply incredible. As the five justices saw it, California's constitutional declaration of a man's right to decline to sell his property amounted to "encouragement of racial discrimination by the state." Such a state power is prohibited by the Fourteenth Amendment; it therefore cannot be exercised by the people through amendment of their basic law.

How Proposition 14 could be read as "encouragement" of racial discrimination is beyond comprehension. As Harlan said for the four dissenters, "the provision is neutral on its face." Its effect is merely to restore certain private behavior "to the sphere of free choice."

The Rumford Act established a special privilege for buyers. Proposition 14 took that special privilege away, and left the law of property where it was before—in a condition where the buyer's right to buy is fairly balanced by the seller's right not to sell. If the people themselves cannot restore that right, how then is it ever to be restored?

The Supreme Court majority could not even find precedents to support its Olympian view. One cited case involved a railway; another involved a political party; a third involved a restaurant owned by a public parking authority in Wilmington; a fourth dealt with State statutes requiring segregation in restaurants.

Speaking for the majority, White feebly acknowledged that "none of these cases squarely controls the case we now have before us." The fact was that none of the cited cases remotely approached a California constitutional amendment dealing with free choice in the sale of private property.

In a concurring opinion, Douglas reiterated his alarming view that rights of free choice no longer exist in any area, such as the sale of real estate, that is handled through agents licensed by the state. He has not yet been able to rally a majority of his brothers to this extremist position, but one finds small comfort in the fact. By the decision, the high court carried its obsessive egalitarianism to lengths that the framers of the Fourteenth Amendment could never have conceived.

Harlan summed it up: By refusing to accept the decision of the people of California, and by contriving a new and ill-defined constitutional concept to allow federal judicial interference, "the court has taken to itself powers and responsibilities left elsewhere by the Constitution." This the high court had no right to do. But five of its members did it.

Local Participation in War on Hunger in Developing Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1967

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, involving the people at the local level in our foreign aid programs is essential to the success of these projects.

An excellent statement on the need for local participation in the war on hunger in the developing nations was made by Herbert J. Waters, Assistant Administrator of AID.

Excerpts from his speech to the Society for International Development are set out here in the Record. It is an important and forward-looking document:

PEOPLE AND HUNGER

(Remarks by Herbert J. Waters, Assistant Administrator for War on Hunger, Agency for International Development, before the Society for International Development, Washington, D.C., June 1, 1967)

I am not as pessimistic, perhaps, as the Paddock brothers in their new book, *Famine 1975*, but neither am I blind to the reality of the challenge ahead. We *are* in for serious trouble unless we make some sifinicant new breakthroughs on both sides of the hunger coin—stimulating far greater food production, and slowing down rates of population growth.

We know we must do far better than we have done so far.

You and I know that the developed world has the technological ability to win this War on Hunger. We know how to increase yields per acre or hectare. We know how to limit population growth to manageable proportions.

As difficult as it sometimes seems, we *can* mobilize the capital that will be necessary, from both public and private resources.

What, then, is the missing ingredient of greater success in this basic phase of development and progress?

I am convinced that it is human motivation—individual incentive, if you will, to make the individual decisions that will be necessary.

That brings us directly to the theme of this panel discussion tonight.

How can we bring the relatively by-passed millions of "little people" more effectively into participation in the food, population, and other political-economic-social programs of development?

We are far from alone in being concerned with this problem. World leaders have accented it in recent Asian and Latin American "summit" meetings, and our Congress has emphasized its concern in the "Title IX" amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act of 1966. The Vatican and the World Council of Churches and other religious and non-governmental organizations have been groping for practical solutions.

All recognize that external assistance is extremely limited in what it can accomplish without greater involvement of the people of the less developed countries themselves.

Most of us feel that such involvement is vital to *all* effective economic development. But tonight we are focusing on one vital phase of such economic development—the War on Hunger—and here, if nowhere else, such involvement is absolutely essential.

The United States alone will invest around $2½ billion in the War on Hunger this next fiscal year, in money and food—aimed at alleviating hunger now, and eliminating the causes of hunger in the future.

Yet, have you paused to think about how much the success or failure of this effort hinges on individual decisions of rural people around the world? On whether or not peasants will accept and try new farming methods? On whether or not they will risk borrowing to pay for production resource inputs such as fertilizer and better seeds to improve their farming yields? On whether or not husbands and wives will defer starting or expanding their families?

Decisions of this nature cannot be imposed from the top down. They cannot be ordered by governments.

They must be arrived at by the people themselves.

Please do not misunderstand me. Governments of the developing countries have a vital role to play in any development effort, including solving the world food problem. Their policies can *influence* individual decisions. Their farm pricing policies can influence a farmer's decisions—for good or for bad. Their health and education policies can influence decisions on family planning—one way or another. Their policies toward investment can attract—or discourage—necessary private capital for development.

* * * * *

Experience has certainly taught us by now that these individual decisions will more likely be the right ones if they are shared decisions—shared by the individual farmer with his neighbors, and with his community. Rural people, like all people, are more likely to take advantage of beneficial policies they had a voice in creating. Farmers, like everyone else, are quicker to participate in programs or projects they can help create—and help operate.

It should be apparent, then, that we must be just as concerned about stimulating indigenous, organized ways for involvement of people at the local level, as we are with influencing government policies at the national level.

* * * * *

We are going to encourage governments to seek involvement of their own rural people, through local organizations.

We want to see establishment of and strengthening of indigenous farm organizations, to gain a greater voice in their own destiny.

We see a vital need for producer-owned cooperatives to help fill a void in farm-supply and farm-marketing services, as well as in providing always essential farm credit.

We want to support, and create where necessary, local voluntary organizations for family planning programs.

We see an excellent similar opportunity for organized participation of mothers and wives in nutrition education and child feeding activities, and will aim at maximum involvement of people in such efforts.

We have done some preliminary exploration of the role mass communication might play in this entire broad field of stimulating farm production, educating mothers in family planning and nutrition, and developing a sense of local "participation" in winning the War on Hunger. We feel far more could be done along this line.

We are convinced that we need far more than our own A.I.D. employees to achieve the results that must be achieved. We have already made good use of the geat American cooperative organizations in helping overseas, but we want to make even greater use of this pool of talent and experience. We are convinced that our worldwide network of American Voluntary Agencies, such as CARE, Church World Service, Catholic Relief Services, and many, many others, are extremely valuable partners—and important foot soldiers in this war. They are getting to the people, and that is where we need to get. We want to—and will—work through them and with them in every way we can, and particularly want to encourage them to develop counterpart, indigenous groups to teach voluntarism abroad. We see an effective role for labor organizations in helping mobilize people, and particularly would like to involve them in support of family planning activity.

We are pleased to see increasing attention of the Peace Corps to rural development activity, as we see increasing needs for emphasis on middle-level manpower training, to which they seem ideally suited. We intend to work closely with them, providing technical back-up support and material assistance when it can render their fine work more effective. We hope they can become increasingly involved in stimulating local organizations in every community in which they are engaged.

The role of our own Land Grant Colleges and Universities will be more vital than ever, in support of institution-building and expanded adaptive research for modernizing agriculture abroad.

We have a vast array of professional organizations in this country that we hope to get involved in stimualting technical interchange and creating new, or supporting existing, professional bodies in developing countries, particularly in the fields of nutrition and fod technology.

We want to encourage closer working relationships with international agencies such as FAO, UNICEF, WHO, the World Bank, and similar groups sharing our objectives. The task is big enough to demand the best of all of us, rather than bog down in quibbling over rivalries.

We hope to exert our influence in the governing bodies of these agencies to support our twin objectives of modernizing government policies toward rural development, and getting rural people involved in participation in that development.

* * * * *

Working together, all of the diverse groups in the world showing a new awakening of concern over the food delimma can become a mighty force for progress that will not be denied.

No civilized nation, developed or underdeveloped, can turn its back on starving people—or even the threat of starving people.

It is regrettable that we have had to approach so near the brink of mass tragedy to mobilize the world's concern—but it may prove a blessing is disguise.

Everybody must eat—and everybody must be concerned about having something to eat.

Perhaps the world's awakening concern over the race between food and population will be the spark that lights a new surge of popular involvement in—and popular support of—economic and social development.

In the Name of the Lord

SPEECH

OF

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 5, 1967

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, supplementing the remarks which I made concerning the great sermon which our Chaplain, Edward D. Latch, D.D., gave when he finished his outstanding service at Metropolitan Memorial Church, I include for the benefit of all, the sermon itself, with the hope that it will be enjoyed by the readers as much as we who heard it given:

IN THE NAME OF THE LORD

(The farewell sermon of Edward D. Latch, D.D., on the occasion of his retirement after 26 years of ministry at the Metropolitan Memorial Methodist Church, Nebraska and New Mexico Avenues NW., Washington, D.C., June 4, 1967)

Well, at last it has come—my retirement after preaching in this pulpit for 26 years. I preached that first Sunday in June of 1941, with fear and trepidation. Today, I have no fear but a lot of trepidation.

I want to thank you for these years of fellowship and fun, of loyalty and love. You have been wonderfully good to us. If my heart speaks to loudly this hour, please forgive me.

Well, I've said that—now I want to preach.

When I was a young man—seventeen years of age—I delivered my first sermon in a little church in Hummelstown, Pennsylvania. My college roommate asked me to preach while he went somewhere else. I recall that day as though it were yesterday. I took for my text:

"Then David said to the Philistine—'you come unto me with a sword and with a sprear and with a javelin; but I come unto you in the name of the lord of hosts'"—I Samuel 17: 45).

That is all I remember about that sermon.

This story is one of the best known and most popular in the Bible. Since our early days we have heard about David and Goliath, and it is one of the favorite tales of the Old Testament. The Army of the Philistines was encamped on one hilltop, and across the valley was the Army of the Israelites. The Philistines had a mightly man of valor who came out of every day and taunted the Israelites to send the champion against him. Whoever won the personal combat would decide the national issue, but Israel had no champion who could stand against this mighty giant encased in armor and carrying a spear.

Day followed day and the morale of the Islarelites had an all-time low. Into this situation came the shepherd boy, David. His father sent him down from Bethlehem with food for three of his brothers who were fighting in the Army of Israel, and a gift to present to the Commander. He was to bring back news of the battle to his father. When David heard Goliath's taunt, he volunteered to go against him, but King Saul was reluctant to send him. Since there was no one else, the king agreed finally that he should go and outfitted him with his armor. The armor did not fit and David cast it aside. Picking up five stones from the brook he took his sling and went forth to meet the arrogant enemy.

Goliath was more amused than angry and cursed the shepherd lad. Then David replied:

"You come unto me with a sword and with a spear and with a javelin; but I come unto you in the name of the Lord of hosts."

Fitting a stone into his sling, he threw it at Goliath, pierced his forehead and killed him.

What I want you to think about for a little while is the great affirmation of David—"I come unto you in the name of the Lord."

This has been the keynote of my ministry. In the four churches that I have served, I have endeavored—all too imperfectly, to be sure—to make my people conscious of the presence of God. In other words: *I came in the name of the Lord.*

Four men were sitting in the locker room of a country club. They had just finished a game of golf to the delight of one and the disappointment of three. One man was especially despondent, and he had reason to be. He had met with business reversals, was confronting failure, and the outlook was altogether black. His friends, realizing the depth of his depression, had arranged this game to attempt to get his mind off his difficult situation. They hoped a few hours on the golf course might give him some relief. Now, he began to talk about his difficulty, and various suggestions were offered him. Finally, one of them men arose to leave. He, too, knew about difficulties and reversals because he had had many of them himself, but he had found an answer to his problem. He laid his hand on the shoulder of his friend and said:

"John, I hope you will not think I am preaching to you—really, I am not, but I would like to suggest something. It is the way I got through my difficulty. It really works if you work it. Why don't you try letting God have his way with you? Give yourself to Him and day by day endeavor to live with Him and let Him live with you. In this faith I found my way out, and by this same faith you can find your way out."

He patted his friend affectionately on the back and then left the room. The other three men sat mulling this over. Finally, the discouraged man said:

"I think I know what he means, and I wonder if he does not have something. I have tried everything else, and now I am going to try this. I am going to let God have His way with me. I will endeavor to live with His Presence in my heart."

This he did, and with the help of his friend and his minister, his own life was changed, and he became a happy and a most useful person. The secret was in his learning to live with God—to live in the name of the Lord.

This suggestion was very wise. There are many people today who are despondent and depressed, just not getting anywhere with themselves or with other people or with their work. They do not need to remain the way they are—really they do not. The secret of life—the secret of abundant living—the secret of a creative faith is to live with God. If they—and we—would only learn to do this, how much better and brighter life would become and how much better and brighter life would be for others.

There is a sense in which we cannot live without God. Although we may never think of him, we are nevertheless absolutely dependent upon Him. Who provides the air we breathe and without which we cannot exist? Who produces the conditions upon which life progresses upon this earth? Who causes the crops to grow, the sun to shine, the rain to fall? Who keeps the planets in their courses? Who creates and sustains this universe of law and order? It is not man but God—God the Father Almighty.

Politically, there may be two worlds—the East and West; actually there is but one world—God's world, and he is at work in every part of it—in the hearts of all people of all Nations. To those who have eyes that see, minds that think, and ears that hear, it is obvious that "someone is at work behind the scene." The universal desire for peace, the growing concern for backward people of the world, the awakening of conscience concerning man's relationship with men are evidences that God is at work.

And He is at work in every one of us. Every twinge of conscience, every feeling of shame and remose, every conviction of wrong within us is God at work in our hearts. Every pure and noble thought, every desire to do a good turn, every victory over evil is God at work within us.

Try as we will we cannot get away from God. The cry of the Psalmist can be echoed by many a man:

"Whither shall I go from Thy Spirit? Whither shall I flee from Thy Presence? If I ascent up into heaven, Thou art there; if I make my bed in hell, behold Thou art there. If I take the wings of the morning and dwell in the uttermost parts of the sea: even there shalle Thy hand meet me and Thy right hand shall hold me. If I say, surely the darkness shall cover me: even the night shall be light about me. Yea, the darkness hideth not from Thee; but the night shineth as the day: the darkness and the light are both alike to Thee."

God is with us, and we are absolutely dependent upon Him: We cannot live without God.

But there is a sense in which it is possible for us to live without God. It is possible to believe in the existence of a supreme being and not to make Him supreme in our own being. To live without prayer or worship or Bible reading or Holy Communion is to ignore God.

It is possible for a man to live his life from beginning to end without any conscious reference to the Almighty. All too many do. They go through life, from the cradle to the grave, with scarcely a thought about God. They have longings, yearnings, hopes and fears, but they battle their way through, never looking for the comfort and the strength and the insight which a living faith in the Almighty gives.

Sometimes when things are tough, they may try to pray, but at ordinary times they do not feel the need of prayer. They have never formed the habit of turning to God for help and guidance along the way. They never confess their sins and accept His forgiveness.

Sometimes they wish they were stronger and better, but they never relate themselves to God to become stronger and better. They are just living their lives without the sense of His Presence.

Why do we have so many differences and disagreements in the family circle? Why are men beaten down by alcohol? Why has gambling a fever-hold upon so many? Why do men and women play fast and loose with sex? Why are people proud, jealous, filled with resentment and hatred and ill-will? Is it not because men are living without the sense of the Presence of God? They are adrift from Him, and this is the reason why the world is in such a sorry plight today. If we keep on going as many people are now going, only doom and destruction await us. Well might we fear the atomic and the hydrogen bombs when we do not live with God.

God comes into our world, but our world neglects him and rejects Him, and if we keep on neglecting Him and rejecting Him, we shall suffer the consequences. We need to know that we belong to God and that life will not work without His guidance. We are made for Him and we cannot live our true lives apart from Him. *"Thou hast made us for Thyself and our hearts are restless until they find rest in Thee."* All the discontent and dissatisfaction we feel within us is God calling us home to Himself, and He will go on disturbing us until we come back to Him.

So there is a sense in which we cannot live without God; there is a sense in which we can live without Him. But there is also a sense in which it is possible for us to live consciously and confidentially with Him.

There is no more joyful experience in all the world than to know that you are at home with God, and that each day you are deliberately and definitely letting Him come into every part of your life. There is no more satisfying experience than to know Him personally—not as an idea, but as a person, as the Companion of your way. You may not always be conscious of "someone standing there," but you will be aware of something taking place in your life which lifts you up to higher levels of living.

There is a story of a little boy named Davy, who lived in Scotland. He could not see the trees and the flowers and the birds because he was blind. But he loved fun and he had a kite. One day two men from the city were walking past the home where Davy lived. As they were walking by, they saw, in a distance, a boy's kite, and there was Davy holding it at the other end. "But, why Lad," said one, "what's the good of your having a kit you cannot see." Then Davy, his face wreathed with happiness, gave you a very good answer: "No, sir, but I like to feel the pull."

Like Davy, you and I may not be able to see God, but we can so live with Him that we can know by the wonderful, warm tug in our hearts that He is real. There is all the difference in the world between people who try to live without God and those who strive to live with Him. That difference is quality—a quality of life.

For one thing, there is a new sense of purpose. It was H. G. Wells who said: "Religion is the first thing and the last thing. And if a man has no religion, he begins nowhere and ends nowhere."

There are too many people who are wandering aimlessly through life. They have no goal, no cause to which they give themselves completely, no dominating ideal which lifts them up. They give no reason for their being here on earth. As J. B. Phillips says: "So often they are waiting for something—waiting for the children to grow up, waiting until their ship comes in, waiting until they get more money, waiting until they can buy a cadillac, waiting for the time when they can retire. Waiting, waiting, waiting—but so often doing little good now." They do not have the sense of a purpose bigger and greater than themselves. Many of them are nice people, but if you ask them, "What are you living for?" They wonder and usually give you rather hazy answers. They can tell you where they live, whom they live with, but they cannot tell you what they live for. When people have nothing to live for, they become bored with life and boredom is a deadly disease. God has a plan for our lives and the real adventure of being alive is to find that plan and to achieve it.

A woman who had a vital experience of the Presence of God which sustains and strengthens her, told of a time when life went to pieces. She lost her husband and was left with a young child. One trouble followed another and she went down, down, down; and under the strain of it all suffered a nervous collapse. Looking back over that time, she said: "I do not know that I lost my faith, but I did lose my way." Then she turned to God and giving her whole attention to Him, she found a new life and a new purpose.

Living with God, we also have a new sense of power. Something greater than ourselves holds us up and keeps us up. A minister tells this story about himself—and what I am saying this morning is as true for ministers as it is for laymen. He was called to a large church in a university community. He wanted to justify the confidence placed in him and he worked very hard and began to feel the results of strain and stress. One day he called on one of the professors, a real friend of his. When this friend was not teaching, he would be out on a lake fishing—so the two went fishing. "But, what's the matter, son?" he asked with understanding, and the minister told him how hard he was trying and that it was getting him down. "I have no feeling of lift or power." The professor chuckled, "Maybe you're trying too hard." When they came ashore he invited him back to his house. Then he said: "Lie down on the couch. I want to read you something. Shut your eyes and relax while I find the quotation." The minister did as directed and thought he was going to hear some philosophical treatise, but instead his friend said: "Here it is—listen quietly while I read it to you and let these words sink in: 'Hast thou not known? Hast thou not heard that the everlasting God, the Lord, the Creator of the ends of the earth, fainteth not, neither is weary? There is no searching of his understanding. He giveth power to the faint; and to them that have no might he increaseth strength. Even the youth shall faint and be weary and the young men shall utterly fall. But they that wait upon the Lord shall renew their strength, etc. Do you know what I'm reading?" The minister replied: "The 40th chapter of Isaiah." "I am glad you know your Bible," his friend said, "why don't you practice it? Now, relax, take three deep breaths, in and out slowly. Practice resting yourself in God, practice depending upon Him for your support and power, believe He is giving it to you now and do not get out of touch with the power. Yield yourself to Him and let His power flow through you." Then he repeated the passage: "They that wait upon the Lord shall renew their strength."

The minister said he never forgot the experience nor did he ever forget the experience of the new sense of power which came to him as he lived with the sense of the Presence of God in his heart.

So can we. We, too can live with power, power to triumph over our troubles; power to conquer our temptations: power to comfort us in sorrow. When a man lives with God, it may not make him exempt from sickness or accidents or pain or bereavement, but it does mean that when trouble comes, he has an altogether adequate resource with which to meet it.

A student said he always liked to be at chapel when a certain man was preaching Said he: "He stands up there with quiet confidence like a man who holds four aces in his hand. He is unconquerable." As Paul says: "We are more than conquerors through Him." And when we finally face death itself, we can say: "Yea, though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death, I will fear no evil, for Thou art with me." The man who lives with God—in the name of the Lord—has not only a real purpose for living, he also has a real power for life.

A man living with God also takes a positive and constructive attitude toward his problems and toward people. In a world filled with suspicion and hatred and fear, the man who lives with God is confident that God is here working for good in the hearts of those who believe in Him. He believes that this is God's world and he is sure that though God's purposes may sometimes be delayed because of man's folly and wickedness, they can never be finally defeated. He has a message of hope for a world without hope. His message brings confidence to men and women who despair of themselves, for he says to them: "I know someone, someone greater than you and me, someone who has helped me to conquer trouble and temptation, and I know He can help you."

A man and his wife, in real trouble, came to see their minister. The man had had two heart attacks and his wife seemed to be in a steady decline. The question was put to the minister was this—"Can I get hold of some power that can help us recover ourselves and give us new hope?" The minister said it could be done and he gave them a simple prescription: They were to read the New Testament and the Psalms until their minds were saturated with the spirit there found. They were to commit certain affirmations to memory. Above all, they were to put their lives completely in the hands of God, believing that God was with them, that God was filling them with power and that He was guiding them even in the most commonplace details of everyday life. They were to picture the healing power of the great physician making them well.

And next spring the wife said: "I have never experienced a more wonderful springtime. The flowers this year are lovelier than ever. The leaves seem greener and I have never heard the birds sing with such melody. She gradually improved and regained much of her old-time strength.

As for the husband—there has been no more heart trouble. Physical, mental and spiritual vigor mark him as being extraordinarily vital. They moved into a new community and have become the center of its life and wherever they touch people they do it with a strange, uplifting force. What was the secret? To live with God and to let God have his way with them—in other words, to live in the name of the Lord.

How can we live confidentially with God? First, take out of your life everything that meets with God's disapproval. Face up to yourself—deliberately, thoughtfully, unflinchingly. This will be the hardest thing that you have ever done because not one of us wants to be fully known, even to ourselves. Ask yourself—is there any dishonesty in my life? Any impurity? any hatred? any bitterness? any evil? If so, remove it by saying in place of dishonesty there will be honesty; in place of impurity, purity; in place of hatred, love; in place of bitterness, sweetness; in place of evil, good.

Change the center of your life from self to God. Then yield yourself to God. Give yourself, surrender yourself to Him and let Him fill your life with health and happiness, peace and power. Toscanini was once preparing the New York Symphony Orchestra for a concert. They were playing Beethoven's Eighth Symphony. The conductor was not at all pleased with their performance and made them play it over and over and over again. Finally, he silenced them and after a long pause said: "Who am I? I am nothing. Who are you? You are nothing, but Beethoven; he is everything."

Likewise, in the presence of God, a man may say—"Who am I? I am nothing. Who are you? You are nothing. But Almighty God? He is everything."

Yield yourself to Him and finally go out to live with Him. You and God together, partners in the glorious adventure of remaking the world. Every minute of every hour of every day, learn to live with Him and henceforth be one of the glorious companions of those who live with God. And a new sense of purpose and power and a new positive attitude toward life will be yours. You will have discovered the secret of creative happiness.

One of the young girls of the church asked me last Sunday what I was going to say in my farewell sermon. When I replied I did not know, she said: "Say something that will last me the rest of my life."

This then is my closing word to you: Live with God. Let God live in your life. May God bless every one of you and keep you always.

Atterbury Job Corps Center

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1967

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, the Camp Atterbury Job Corps Center, near Columbus, Ind., is operated by the Westinghouse Electric Corp. In the June issue of the Westinghouse News, were several articles about the progress being made at the Indiana installation.

Mr. Speaker, I include these excellent articles, including a letter from Mr. D. C. Burnham, president of Westinghouse in the Record:

Why Westinghouse?

"What in the world is Westinghouse doing in the business of running Job Corps Centers?"

That is a good question and there are good answers.

First, Westinghouse sought and obtained contracts to operate the Atterbury Job Corps Center and the Capital Job Corps Center. We saw this as an opportunity to make a real contribution to the solution of a national problem. I say "national problem" because America's jobless youth is a problem that belongs not just to government, nor to education nor to charities.

Second, we accepted the challenge of operating Job Corps Centers because the economics of the program appealed to us. It costs, for example, about $5,500 a man/year to train a Corpsman at Atterbury. Not only does he pay back this investment in taxes, but more important he is a productive citizen instead of one who annually costs society about $1,968 to keep him on welfare or $2,448 to keep him in jail. That's good economic sense.

We are also in business to make a profit, and we do make a small profit on the operation of these Centers.

Finally, Westinghouse is no stranger to training people to do useful work. We have operated apprentice and other training programs for many years. Running a Job Corps Center is a business and is handled like one. The operation of the Atterbury Center is the responsibility of the Systems Operations people of our Defense and Space Center. The Westinghouse Learning Corporation has responsibility for operating the Capital Job Corps Center.

We are pleased to be associated with Job Corps and take pride in our efforts to help the school dropout find a useful place in society.

D. C. Burnham.

Job Corps—What Does It Do . . . What Does It Mean?

"Job Corps is a voluntary national residential training program for out-of-school, out-of-work, underprivileged young men and women."

Thus reads the first paragraph of a "fact sheet" distributed by the public affairs office of the government's Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO). What the fact sheet does not say (and could not say because the information was not available when it was written) is that:

About 80 percent of Job Corps enrollees never saw a doctor or dentist.

Almost 47 percent are not eligible for military service.

Some 45 percent come from broken homes.

Nearly 65 percent come from a home where the head of the family is unemployed.

One out of two comes from a family that is living on some form of relief.

Job Corps is one of the nation's major weapons in the war on poverty. It is aimed at reducing the waste of this country's human resources by taking youngsters headed toward the prospect of becoming economic liabilities and turning them into productive, tax-paying citizens.

Robert J. Hadden, Director of the Atterbury Job Corps Center which Westinghouse operates for OEO, points out that during the 1960's, it is estimated some 26 million young men and women will have entered the national labor force.

"Nearly eight million of them, almost one of three, will not have a high school education," he said. "As a matter of fact, it is estimated that 2.5 million of these boys and girls will have attended only eight years of formal schooling or less.

"Hundreds of thousands of these young people today are out of school and out of work. Hundreds of thousands more are working in low-pay occupations that may disappear within the next 10 years. They are tomorrow's built-in unemployment figures. And yet, every day, in hundreds of cities across the nation, jobs go begging for want of qualified applicants."

Basically, these are the factors that led to the national Job Corps program.

Nationally, the Job Corps program deals with young men and women, 16 through 21 years of age. They come into the program voluntarily with initial screening handled for the most part by state employment agencies. The seven regional offices of OEO assign the enrollees to 120 training Centers scattered around the nation.

Training programs for boys include courses in electronics, air conditioning and heating, automotive skills, construction, meat cutting and farm equipment operation. The girls can learn such things as practical nursing, food preparation and service, clerical and stenographic skills.

As of March 31, more than 69,300 young men and women had received training in Job Corps Centers. Surveys and follow-up studies indicate that more than 48,500 had been placed in jobs, schools or the military services.

Many of the young men and women who tried to enter the military services before their Job Corps training were rejected because they failed to meet either educational or physical standards.

William P. Kelly, Director of Job Corps, reported recently that an evaluation report showed the average gain in reading during training is about one and one-fourth times the public school norm. In mathematics, he said, the gains average about twice the public school expectancy, with an average reading gain of two grade levels.

In vocational training, there is no grade level measure and progress is charted by the number of job skill levels completed. A typical Corpsman who stays in a Center for nine months, Mr. Kelly said, completes about three skill units. In automotive training, for example, one unit includes front-end alignment and brakes; another, engine tuneup and transmission.

Every Job Corps enrollee is entitled to send home a portion of his living allowance up to $25 per month. The government matches this figure to the extent that Job Corps boys and girls are sending home money at the rate of $1 million per month.

Since the beginning of the Conservation Center program, the appraised value of the beautification and conservation work done by Job Corps in national parks, beaches, wildlife preserves, fisheries, forests, roads and highways amounts to $43 million.

They Come From Everywhere Looking for Another Chance

(NOTE.—*Taking a boy, forlorn and wtihout hope, and making a man—that's what Job Corps is all about. Here is what one "graduate" of the Atterbury Job Corps Center—a youngster from the Kentucky hills—wrote about his experiences: "I spent eight months in the Job Corps. In that eight months I saw my life beginning to change for the very first time. I was doing things I never dreamed I could do, and it was as surprising to me as it was to everybody. Before I joined the Job Corps, I felt like a castout. Now I feel I am a very big part of my community."*)

They come from everywhere—from cities and towns and back-hill farms. But they have one thing in common as they travel to Atterbury—they are joining Job Corps to improve their opportunities for the good life.

They are new enrollees and the first 30 days of this new experience will be the roughest.

The Atterbury Job Corps Center is housed in the former Wakeman Army Hospital complex, 30 miles south of Indianapolis, on a sprawling reservation that once trained some 50,000 soldiers at a time.

Now Job Corps dormitories cluster amid 42,000 acres of abandoned barracks. Fifth Army trucks patrol the streets. Jet-powered helicopters in formation make simulated attacks on wooded hills to the south. On clear days, jet fighters rake the ridges on the firing ranges and on week ends hundreds of Indiana National Guardsmen undergo training in the rugged terrain.

But the Job Corps is fighting another kind of war. It is, like all wars, a fight for survival.

Out of work, out of school, these young men have known a succession of failures. Atterbury means another chance.

Their first week is spent in Orientation—physical and mental examinations, lectures on everything, Center rules and regulations. They learn what courses of study and activities are available. There are consultations with teachers and advisers and trips to vocational shops.

On the eighth day, the new Corpsman is assigned to a dormitory. He meets the other young men who will share much of his life. They are Caucasian, Negro, Puerto Rican, Mexican-American and Oriental.

Before the first 30 days have gone by, between 10 and 15 percent of these young men will have found the challenges of Job Corps too much for them.

But the Job Corpsman who survives starts a program of re-education. If his test scores are high enough, a General and Related Education course will take him to a high school diploma.

The new recruit will never have a better opportunity to improve his general education and acquire a salable skill. Most Corpsmen recognize this, and they work hard.

Those 4,500 calories a day they serve in the dining hall are great for gaining weight, but the physical education program, the intra-mural and varsity athletics also help to build a young man's body.

There are many other opportunities for a Corpsman at Atterbury to develop his talents; there's woodworking, leatherwork, painting, music and singing.

An Atterbury Corpsman can join his own Civil Air Patrol Unit, the Scouting program or contribute his leisure time to tutoring school children.

There are other activities too, all supervised by staff members or townspeople willing to give their time.

Money? There's spending money for personal items—shaving cream, cigarettes, a candy bar. And $50 is put aside for the Corpsman each month. When he has a job this money—paid to him in two payments—helps him get a start in his new life. If he has dependents at home, half of that monthly stipend is sent to them; the federal government adds $25 to the amount. He also gets a basic $75 clothing allowance.

What are the results at Atterbury?

To date, some 1,500 young men have successfully completed the program and gone on to school, jobs or military service.

They won the confidence of Indiana citizens by being good neibhbors; helping a storm-wrecked community clean up the streets and repair damage; rebuilding an abandoned park in Columbus; and volunteering for scores of other projects.

Another 200 Corpsmen have qualified for hight school diplomas. Five have gone on to college.

At present, some 1,550 are in training, with new arrivals and departures each week. Nothing is static in the Job Corps program. It is neither routine nor dull. It is hard work for the staff and the Corpsmen, but each learns a great deal from the other, and both are richer for the experience.

"Another Step Up," a 26-minute, 16 mm color film produced at the Atterbury Center, is the story of three young men who came into Job Corps to improve their lot.

Copies of the film are available for showing in Westinghouse plants and at community meetings by writing to the Public Affairs Office, Atterbury Job Corps Center, Box 217, Edinburg, Indiana 46124.

OEO's Zany Zuni Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1967

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, this is an indication of more Government help:

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Globe-Democrat, Apr. 27, 1967]

OEO's Zany Zuni Plan

The Office of Economic Opportunity, ever-zealous to invade new territories in its escalating War on Poverty, has come up with what can be described best as the Zany Zuni Plan.

This is a scheme so irrational and irresponsible it does disservice even to the OEO, a federal agency frequently noted for lack of rational and responsible behavior.

Briefly, the program would cover production and marketing of the celebrated silver and turquoise jewelry made by the Zuni Indians of the Southwest.

The production end calls for, of all things, teaching the Zunis how to make Indian jewelry, a skilled craft they have excelled in for centuries. With further audacity, the OEO is arranging for the traditionally handcrafted jewelry to be machine-made. Presumably, it would be stamped "genuine" in the process.

Adding injury to its insult, the Office of Economic Outrage next proposes to set up a co-operative store to sell the products of the Zuni craftsmen, with an OEO "marketing expert" estimating that this will eventually result in sales by the Indians of $150,000 a year.

The Great White Father apparently is blinded by the brilliance in his own benevolence. Private stores in the area of Albuquerque and Gallup, New Mexico, already are buying more than $2,000,000 worth of the Zuni jewelry a year.

By even the simplest of arithmetic the federal intrigue would deprive the Zunis of $850,000 a year. The inane plan involves a grant of $208,741.

Like many other groups the Zuni Indians have done quite well by themselves. Left to their own resources they will continue to do so, without the officious assistance of Big Brother's bungling hands.

Lt. Gen. Harry J. Lemley of Hope, Ark.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1967

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, devotion to duty, zeal and determination spelled recognition and acclaim for Lt. Gen. Harry J. Lemley, of Hope, Ark. He is a soldier in the truest sense who did the job to which he was assigned and did it well. General Lemley is a scion of a distinguished Arkansas family. His father, Hon. Harry J. Lemley, Sr., served with great distinction for nearly two decades as U.S. district judge for the eastern and western districts of Arkansas.

It was my pleasure to be present on the occasion of the U.S. Army and Air Force ROTC commissioning exercises held at the University of Arkansas on June 3, 1967. The principal address was delivered by General Lemley, who is Deputy Chief of Staff for Military Operations, U.S. Army.

General Lemley graduated from the U.S. Military Academy in 1935, being commissioned as a second lieutenant of field artillery. During World War II he was attached to the VI Corps Artillery, serving in north Africa, Italy, France, and Germany. After the war he was assigned in Berlin as a member of the Armed Forces Division, Office of Military Government. After returning to the United States he was attached to the War Department General Staff, and later assigned to the 1st Armored Division as executive officer and subsequently promoted to commanding officer of the division artillery.

He saw service in Korea as executive officer and later commanding officer of the division artillery, 7th Infantry Division. Other tours of duty found him as assistant chief of staff of G–2 and G–3, and deputy chief of staff for operations, as well as commander of the 24th Infantry Division artillery, and later commander of the division and commandant of the USACGSC.

On September 1, 1966, General Lemley was promoted to lieutenant general and was appointed Deputy Chief of Staff for Military Operations for the U.S. Army. He holds the following citations and decorations: Legion of Merit with Oak-Leaf Cluster, Bronze Star Medal, Army Commendation Ribbon with Metal Pendant with two Oak-Leaf Clusters, Military Valor Cross—Italy, Croix de Guerre with Gold Star—France, Distinguished Military Service Medal—Ulchi—with Silver Star—Korea, Distinguished Service Medal and Cross of the Land Forces—Venezuela.

The commissioning exercises program consisted of:

Invocation: The Rev. Cannon David E. Johnson, Chaplain Episcopal Student Center, Fayetteville, Arkansas.

Introductions: Colonel Robert L. Utley, United States Army, Professor of Military Science; Dr. David W. Mullins, President, University of Arkansas.

Address: Lieutenant General Harry L. Lemley, Jr., Deputy Chief of Staff for Military Operations, United States Army.

Oath of office: Major Donald J. Soland, United States Army.

Award of commissions: Lieutenant General Harry J. Lemley, Jr., assisted by Colonel Robert L. Utley, United States Army, Professor of Military Science, and Colonel F. W. Nelson, United States Air Force, Professor of Aerospace Studies.

Benediction: The Rev. Cannon David E. Johnson.

Personnel commissioned included:

U.S. ARMY

Agee, Hubert Charles, Jr.
Ardemagni, Richard Moses, Jr.
Bennett, Robert Patrick.
Biggers, Calvin Dewitt.
Blanz, Robert Ernest.
Bowie, Terry Frost.
Butt, Thomas King.
Carter, William Grady, Jr.
Casey, James Robert, II.
Deal, William Allen.
Duncan, Donald Larry.
Fleischmann, George Paul.
Foster, Thomas Milton.
Gathings, Joseph Royston.
Green, William Eugene.
Henderson, Joe Boyd, Jr.
Hostetter, Jerry Waldo.
Hulen, Charles Michael.
Kirby, Elbert Richard, Jr.
Lee, Gary Owen.
Lindsey, Bart Rabb.
Marino, John George.
Martin, Jerry Wayne.
May, James Madison, III
Morgan, Jack Clark.
Olson, John Donald, Jr.
Parkes, Albert Charlton, Jr.
Phegley, Richard Lee.
Priest, Walter Lipsey.
Rash, Robert Warren, Jr.
Regan, George Douglas.
Reif, Mark Randall.
Sandlin, David Roger.
Serio, Robert Glenn.
Shepard, William Robert.
Smith, Raymond Lee.
Stickmon, John Richard.
Stubbs, William Robert.
Vassaur, Tommy Wade.
Wagoner, William Brewer.
Williams, Arthur Leland.
Willis, Fred Alan.

U.S. MARINE CORPS

Magness, Robert Morgan.

U.S. AIR FORCE

Baber, Thomas Mickey.
Cecil, Richard Lee.
Clark, Kenneth Jay.
Clements, Edward Paul.
Coleman, George Randall.
Mitton, David Edwards, III.
Fong, Gerald Wayne.
Hayes, Chester Odell, Jr.
Henry, Donald Howard.
Lane, Milton Julis.
Mayo, Patrick Manning.
Meredith, James Conley.
Miller, Michael Dale.
Nelson, Randall Williams.
Prichard, Joseph Robert.
Purdy, James Asa, II.
Remagen, Lawrence David.
Tatum, Gail Franklin.
Titus, William Edward, Jr.
Warren, Fredric Harvey.
Weaver, George Townes, Jr.
West, Neil Stewart.
Wilmoth, Harrington Lee.
Wooten, Clyde Woods, II.
Young, Dale Randolph.

General Lemley's inspiring, impressive, and provocative address follows:

REMARKS BY LT. GEN. HARRY J. LEMLEY, JR., AT THE U.S. ARMY AND AIR FORCE ROTC COMMISSIONING EXERCISES, UNIVERSITY OF ARKANSAS

Today, you become commissioned officers in the United States Army and the United States Air Force, having been especially chosen and trained to sustain the dignity, the strength and the integrity of the United States—within the profession of arms.

Today, the Armed Forces, as in ages past, are once more engaged on the battlefield in defending America's interests and in advancing the prospects for the freedom and dignity of all men.

As new second lieutenants you are to be engaged in this undertaking, and I heartily congratulate you on this accomplishment.

There is no public occasion more gratifying than one which recognizes achievement. The fact that you are here today is evidence of your achievements. This is the completion of your first and most significant step in becoming leaders.

It is an honor for me to share in this occasion—and to welcome you to the commissioned ranks of our Armed Forces.

Upon assuming your office, you incur an especial obligation to cherish and protect your country—and one would hope—with increasing wisdom, perseverance, and patriotic devotion. That device which you wear, that gold bar—your insignia—and that uniform which you have put on, identify you directly with the power and the integrity of the United States.

That is the meaning and thát is the purpose of your commission.

You are embarked upon one of the great callings of life. You are to be members of a great profession—the corps of Officers of the United States Army and Air Force, who, together with their sister services, are charged with the security of our country.

The military officer is considered to be a gentleman. Why? Not because Congress wills it nor because it has always been the custom of people to afford him that courtesy, but specifically because nothing less than a gentleman is truly suited to his particular set of responsibilities.

This is the core of his circumstance.

The military makes extraordinary demands on its officers, but it also provides the opportunity for rich rewards.

In peace, the officer must work hard to polish his trade for he knows that, in order to secure peace, he must be prepared for war, if he is to fulfill the purposes of his commission. But, also in peace, there is within the Army that wonderful opportunity for adventure and travel and widening outlook—through the window of the world. Few careers can offer this. Here the families join in the community of army life, in this country and abroad, making it fun; making it exciting; making it educational and meaningful and full of vitality.

I said earlier that the officer must prepare himself in peace for war, and that is his central aim, for war is not to be trusted to the untrained, nor can it be won by the poorly led.

In war, stress is put upon men such as they have never known, and the temptation to "get away from it" in time of danger would be impelling, if the spirit were not tempered to the ordeal. The test of the officer's character is that he will know how to be calm and patient in adversity and hard circumstance while, at the same time, continue to be effective through whatever discouragements beset him and his men. He will learn to steel himself to these ends. But in war, too, there is reward. It is that awareness that comes with the solid accomplishment of a necessary task—performed under stress and strain and sacrifice, a task beneficial to one's country and to one's people.

The officer is called upon to work on the widest of all frontiers—the frontier of freedom itself. For wherever people strive for freedom and human dignity, there the frontier is drawn. One such frontier is Vietnam, where the challenge to mankind's aspiration comes again.

Today the prime of our manhood labors on this frontier—the jungles and the highlands of Vietnam—men who fight the battle along the chaotic jungle trail and over the bamboo spike. Men who, as free men, understand that liberty must be earned; men who can harken back to Thomas Paine, in the years of the American crisis by the eighteenth century, and who understand today what he meant when he said in his own age:

"Those who expect to reap the blessings of liberty must, like men, undergo the fatigues of supporting it." These are men who understand, too, that "the keys to the future are not the laurels of the past." They are men who know that chaos may come quickly but that order takes time. They are stalwart men who do battle against a different sort of human being—one who has parlayed subversion to his own ends, seasoned in a hard school, who has mastered the tactics and techniques of guerrilla warfare; one who has perfected the methods of persuasion and terror.

We went to Vietnam to help stop the terror, to help stop the chaos, to help restore the country to the people who are its rightful owners, and to begin the slow process of building toward order, security and freedom. Fortunately today we are making strides toward that end and the Army and Air Force as a professional body have never looked better. They are well trained and superbly led, capable of innovation and fresh ideas. Our forces are engaged in a new type of war, where the enemy is at once anywhere and nowhere in a battle zone that knows no front lines and no rear areas., It is a struggle in which some of your contemporaries are meeting the grueling test and are brilliantly serving the cause of America, and the cause of mankind, in an effort larger than our Korean effort.

But whether it be Vietnam, Korea, or Europe, or elsewhere, the ramparts must be guarded. Thus we have many missions and global responsibilities—and you are an important part.

In this connection. General Maxwell Taylor once said.:

"I'm glad I'm in the Army, not only for the people in it, and for the breadth of experience which it offers, but because I have the feeling of belonging to an outfit which really matters, one which has a mission of tremendous significance."

I fully share his view.

You are becoming officers at an exciting and demanding time. You don your gold bars at a time when perhaps the only security is to accept insecurity as an inevitable part of life, but whereas the stakes are high, the prize is also great and, when the prize is thus, there, too, are the best citizens to contend for it. For history does not long entrust the care of freedom to the weak and to the timid.

As each of you begins your career I hope that you will not early trim your sails but that you will challenge the winds.

In your course you have been taught the principles of leadership, so as to prepare you to lead, and you have been made aware of the techniques of their application. When you reach your new unit, in Vietnam, or in any other part of the world, I would ask you to establish an aim in your leadership function for the days ahead; one that seeks responsibility and opportunity for growth; one that seeks excellence; that pursues dedication and develops a sense of mission; an aim that seeks to maximize team integrity; that recognizes the importance of, and that holds a deep affection for, the individual soldier and airman, who deserve the highest merit; an aim that seeks the strenthening of your own moral fiber; that seeks to be your own man, and that strives to improve upon him. If you set yourself a perspective of this sort, your period of service will be made fully satisfying and meaningful—to you and to your family. Then you, as an officer, will realize to the fullest degree the part you play on the Armed Forces team, in its historic mission. Then, that unit of spirit and of action, which is the essence of esprit de corps, will be the product between the leader and the led. It will come of the contribution of that leader who has a clear understanding that "unless the trumpet give forth a certain sound none shall prepare himself for the battle."

Throughout your career there will be men with fire and steel to rally. Be in their muster.

And so I say—gold bars shine bright with luster. Enjoy their sparkle. Gold bars are also heavy. Heavy with the responsibilities that they entail. Shoulder that load. True leadership is not complacent. Leadership is inspired. Leadership involves preparation and grueling test—and men with fire and steel are called to this.

This is your role in an age yet fit for heroes. Kindle the fire. Strengthen the steel. Light your lantern and hang it against the sky.

Who Will Save America?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1967

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, we hear a lot about inflation because, to a large extent, it has just about become a policy of Government. In the June 12, 1967, issue of the U.S. News & World Report there appeared a piece by Warner & Swasey, manufacturers of machine tools, textile machinery, and construction equipment. Because the article depicts inflation in a clear and unique manner, I insert it into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the convenience of my colleagues. The article follows:

HOW THE POPULAR DICTATOR PLAYED WITH INFLATION

A few years ago there was a Dictator (not so many miles to the south) who wanted to be popular (don't all government officials?) so he gave away money (sound familiar?).

This Dictator was fond of taking important visitors around his country in a private train. Just before reaching a stop-over he would distribute bundles of money just off the press in the baggage car. Everybody had fun, and the Dictator's popularity skyrocketed.

So did prices.

The guests hadn't *produced* anything; there was more money but no more goods—which of course causes Inflation. So the Dictator printed bigger bundles of money, which is also the way Inflation works.

But we're not doing anything like that in this country? Don't be too sure.

When this nation runs a deficit (31 of the past 37 years) in times of full employment such as now, the deficit has to be covered by increasing the debt (an annual event) and by putting more money into circulation, which we are doing by the bushel!

So, like the Dictator and his guests, we may have a good time, but the skyrocket of soaring prices has already started to hiss.

The Dictator's country went through the wringer, as such countries always do, and was saved by the United States as is also customary.

But who's big enough to save America?

We Will Never Forget, Say "Franklin D. Roosevelt" Sailors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1967

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, there are still repercussions from the ill-advised determination by Secretary McNamara to refuse to permit the members of the crew of the aircraft carrier *Franklin D. Roosevelt*, to debark in Capetown, South Africa.

People had come from all over that Republic to welcome the crew and to provide them with entertainment. It was not only disappointing to the crew but it was a regrettable insult to the people of a great and friendly nation. It is no wonder that the prestige of this country reaches a new low as the months roll by.

In this connection, under unanimous consent I include with my remarks an article appearing in the Cape Times—Capetown, Republic of South Africa—on April 13, 1967. The article follows:

[From the Cape Times, Apr. 13, 1967]

WE WILL NEVER FORGET, SAY "FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT" SAILORS

Five hundred crew members of the United States aircraft-carrier Franklin D. Roosevelt say in a letter to the Mayor of Cape Town: "Such hospitality must not, cannot, will not be forgotten."

Addressing the people of Cape Town and the people of South Africa, the letter says:

It is with deep and profound regret that we, the crew members of the USS Franklin D. Roosevelt, find such a writing in order. On our recent port call to your country, on February 4, 1967, we were given so freely such a hospitality, such a true and sincere warmth from the tens of thousands of Capetonians and countless other South Africans and heads of State as has never been shown us before, at home or abroad.

That we were unable to partake of this genuine friendship tore deeply at each of us.

The hundreds that came from far cities, the many preparations that were made in Cape Town expressly for our greeting, the many talented entertainers that came on board, all placed a monument in each of our hearts more lasting than bronze.

AMERICAN FLAG

To witness the American flag waving from Cape Town's piers at the USS Franklin D. Roosevelt put out to sea amidst the cheers of countless thousands of South Africans only served to further prove your greatness. We shall never forget. It will be told many times.

Truly inexpressible in words or writings are the feelings carried so deeply in the hearts of the crew members of the USS Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Many men said they would return one day to this country. Indeed, such hospitality must not, cannot, will not be forgotten.

We ask your acceptance of this as an infinitesimal payment of an inexpendable account.

We have the honour to remain.

Very respectfully.

The crew members of the USS Franklin D. Roosevelt.

One Chief Justice Speaks for Constitutional Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. RARICK
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 12, 1967

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, I am proud that in my State of Louisiana we have a member of the elected supreme court who speaks out "for" constitutional government.

This chief justice is not afraid to trust our people to run their lives—nor for the legislature and public officials, elected by the people, to plan their future under the constitutional system.

The Honorable Chief Justice John B. Fournet of the Louisiana Supreme Court has dedicated his entrusted powers to law and order under State and local government. He speaks out forthrightly in his warning to the people and is fearless in showing leadership in the way back to constitutional government, as best evidenced by his thought-provoking address delivered before the Louisiana State Bar Convention on April 27, 1967, alerting the American people to the dangers inherent in Senate bill 1026.

Mr. Speaker, I include Chief Justice Fournet's remarks in the RECORD:

THE CHIEF JUSTICE REPORTS TO THE LOUISIANA STATE BAR ASSOCIATION

(Remarks by Chief Justice John B. Fournet, at the annual convention in Biloxi, Miss., April 27, 1967)

I am happy to be back with you this year for your annual deliberations, and to bring you the greetings of my colleagues on the Louisiana Supreme Court, as well as all other members of the Louisiana judiciary. It is gratifying to find that despite many other appointments at the "bar" following last night's reception so many fellow lawyers are able to keep this appointment with the bar of Louisiana this morning.

On such occasions I have, in the past, given you a brief summary of the work of the judiciary during the preceding year. Inasmuch as a detailed account of the work of our courts for the year 1966 is included in the annual report of the Judicial Administrator which will soon be completed and distributed, I will treat this matter rather briefly.

During the court year 1965–1966, 197,164 cases were filed—an increase of 31,000 over the previous year. There were 173,979 termination—an increase of 22,000 over the previous year. Breaking this down another way, there were 2,215 filings per judge, with an average termination of 1,954 per judge, thus indicating a backlog is building up.

In all, 188 judges are now serving the state on courts above the level of Justice of the Peace. Seven of these are retired members of the judiciary who have consented to continue judicial duties in an effort to alleviate the heavy caseload. In addition, we were required to assign 22 judges from one district to another in order to equalize unusually heavy dockets. But for the willingness of these 29 judges to shoulder added duties over and beyond the call of duty in their present status, the report of the excellent work being done by our judges in keeping our dockets current would fall far short of the high mark reflected by these statistics.

I think much of the increase in the backlog of cases is due to the ever-increasing number of civil cases being tried by jury. I feel, therefore, it is well that I call your attention to the fact that if the present attack on the right of our appellate courts to review the facts in civil jury trials, now pending in the federal courts, is successful, the dockets of our district courts will be in the same condition that we find so many of our state and federal courts. Then too, the ever-increasing number of crimes in the state will, of necessity, take more and more of the time of our district judges.

It appears that despite the 14 judgeships created by the legislature in 1966, and the great assistance we are receiving from the retired and regular judges through interchangeable assignments, the caseload per judge in this state will soon become insurmountable—a matter I have long foreseen and brought to your attention on numerous occasions for consideration, as well as to the attention of our Judicial Council. It does not appear, however, that committees appointed by you and the Council to consider ways and means of alleviating the situation have reached any conclusive results. Accordingly, the revision of the judiciary article of the constitution is presently in the hands of the Louisiana State Law Institute pursuant to a directive of the Governor. In this work the Institute has been tendered and is receiving the full cooperation of the committees of the Judicial Council and of the bar.

It is my understanding that one phase of this contemplated revision, i.e., the selection and tenure of judges as sponsored by the bar's committee, is to be considered at a meeting to be held this morning at 10:30 in the Fiesta Room. The plan being recommended, I am informed, is comparable to the Missouri plan. I would urge everyone to attend this meeting if it is at all possible to do so.

Finally, I would like to discuss as briefly as possible the role you, as attorneys, should play in meeting the crisis that unquestionably faces our nation today, that is, the federal intervention and usurpation of the police and judicial powers that have, since the founding of our country, been universally recognized as having been unconditionally reserved in the states in the Bill of Rights.

This intervention and usurpation is occuring mainly through federal decision, executive fiat, and, in some cases, through congressional action. In areas where even these branches of the federal government fear to tread, they act through arbitrary bureaucratic directives, many of which are judicial in nature but issued without regard to the rules laid down by the judiciary for the protection of the rights of the people.

As you well know, beginning with the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in Mapp v. Ohio, the federal courts have, in effect, taken over the administration of criminal justice in the states. In more recent decisions our land's highest court has practically handcuffed the police in their investigation of crimes and made it impossible to secure convictions of criminals through the marshalling of evidence in state court trials. In fact, they have so reduced the functions of the state judge as to make him, for all intents and purposes, an automation. This was made more effective by a more recent directive of the Supreme Court that erected a curtain of silence around police officers, prosecutors, judges, and even the press. In its overzealousness to protect the individual rights of a small percentage of our population constituting the criminal element, this high court has completely disregarded the effect of the invasion of the rights of the vast majority of our lawabiding citizens who are the victims of this criminal element, i.e., their right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Tragically, these decisions are frequently maintained by a single vote of one judge in a 5 to 4 split.

Even federal judges on the lower levels are speaking out against this trend. Federal Judge George L. Hart, presiding in Washington, D.C. over the trial of a man who on three separate occasions voluntarily confessed he foully killed his wife and threw her body on a dump like a piece of garbage, felt compelled to say to the jury trying him: "Though it makes me almost physically ill, I must direct a verdict of acquittal. I feel I'm presiding not over a search for truth but over an impossible farce. We know the man is guilty, but we sit here blind, deaf, and dumb, and we can't admit what we know. Tonight felons can sleep better." Federal Judge Warren Burger felt impelled to say in a recent dissent that these decisions of the United States Supreme Court "stretch and strain to give the guilty not the same but vastly more protection than the lawabiding citizen," while ignoring the fact, as pointed out by Federal Appeals Judge Wilbur K. Miller, that "nice people have some rights, too!"

These decisions are given such publicity that it is commonly assumed today injustice is so prevalent in this country it is impossible to secure justice here, just as the headline publicity given isolated pockets of poverty minimize into nonexistence the unparalleled prosperity of almost all of the people of this great nation!

Lawyers, from time immemorial, have stood in the forefront of all movements seeking to establish government for the benefit of all of the people—not any particular person or segment of the population. They have also led out in preventing the usurpation of the rights of the governed by those who govern. With such a background I have high hope and faith the bar will rise to the occasion to the end that this tide of federal intervention and usurpation can be turned and our shores once again washed by the seas of freedom as envisioned by our founding fathers, and as guaranteed in that document upon which our republic was founded—characterized by Gladstone as "the most wonderful work ever struck off at a given time by the brain and purpose of man."

This morning I would like in particular to call your attention to a matter now pending before Congress in the form of Senate Bill No. 1026, one that is apparently little known to the bar generally, as I have only recently received a copy of the bill from the Chairman of the Senate Subcommittee holding hearings on it advising that although many members of the federal judiciary are concerned about its content and danger, "no reports have been received from national legal organizations" offering any protest, despite the fact this legislation is aimed at state and not federal court procedures.

According to the Chairman, this legislation assumes Congress has the same power over state courts that it has over federal courts, and if Senate Bill 1026 is adopted, it would establish the precedent that Congress has general legislative authority over the procedure and administration of state courts. As you well know, a mere perusal of the constitution and Bill of Rights readily discloses no such authority is conferred upon Congress. In fact, such legislation is inimical to the basic structure of our constitution.

The most offensive part of this legislation permits the federal government through the Attorney General to supersede state courts in any pending action on the mere complaint of a litigant, without the assertion of any fact upon which his complaint is based. As an example, upon receipt of a complaint, the Attorney General can appoint a Federal Master who will step in and supersede court officials for the purpose of investigating every person of voting age in the district or state and, through this investigation, compel these people to disclose the most minute and intimate details of their lives touching on their economic status, without regard to their qualification to serve on a jury under state law. This includes not only laborers and businessmen, but professional people as well, and, strangely, such an investigation is not limited to citizens or qualified voters.

Needless to say, such extensive investigations will not only consume hours and days of time, but the people of all of our state will have to submit to this investigation by the Federal Master and his underlings. Such a procedure will enure to the sole benefit of the one making the complaint for in this way he can tie up all the courts and secure an indefinite postponement of the trial of his case while this investigative procedure drones on.

Thus it may be seen that in the last decade or two we have not only witnessed the rewriting of a great portion of the constitution by the federal judiciary, but have also seen that august body usurp the prerogatives of Congress in legislating by judicial decision and decree. We now find Congress superseding and invading the rights reserved to the several states by permitting the Attorney General of the United States to take over state court systems upon the mere whim of a single individual with a personal ax to grind.

Finally, I would like to call your attention to the present activity of those who have heretofore sponsored theories that have been accepted by and incorporated in our federal governmental structure on all levels, and who now seek to bring to fruition a new theory that will pave the way for future legislation and judicial decision that will open the doors even wider for leniency in trying those charged with crimes, with the eventual result that even more criminals will be releaed into the normal channel of society. Those advocating this new theory seek to ignore law and jurisprudence in criminal trials and substitute therefore as standards for conviction sociological statistics, computerised data, and public opinion polls, none of which have any relation to reality, truth, fact, or law.

In closing, let me say that I have faith that our lawyers will lead us out of this crisis and I urge each and everyone of you to, at every opportunity, alert the people to the fact that their rights are being slowly but surely eroded. I hope you will also take the lead in urging the people of your immediate vicinity to raise their voices in expressing their sentiments to their representatives in Congress so they may know exactly how the people feel about this destruction of their rights. In addition, wherever the bar may be assembled—whether here, in individual communities and districts, or in annual assembly in Honolulu in August—I hope you will see that it takes a good look at Senate Bill No. 1026 and let the world know by appropriate resolution that the bench and bar of the several states are prepared to rise and defend their rights. I think, too, that individually and as an organization we should solicit the assistance of the press in this struggle. After all, their right as well as ours to speak and write are at stake.

A Job Well Done

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. G. ELLIOTT HAGAN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 24, 1967

Mr. HAGAN. Mr. Speaker, a distinguished native of Savannah, Ga., and one of our Nation's military leaders has retired. In tribute to him I would like to enter into the RECORD the following editorial from the Savannah Evening Press of June 2, 1967:

A JOB WELL DONE

Lt. Gen. William F. Train, a native Savannahian, has completed his military career. The high-ranking Army officer has retired in ceremonies at Fort Meade, Md., following 41 years in the military service of his country.

General Train had an illustrious career, entering the Army in 1926, earning a competitive appointment to the United States Military Academy, fighting with valor in World War II, and serving the Army with distinction in every assignment.

The former Savannahian attained the Army's second highest rank and in 1966 assumed command of the consolidated First and Second Armies. At one time he was commandant of the U.S. Army War College at Carlisle, Pa.

We wish General Train many years of happiness in retirement. He has earned it.

"Focus" a Fine Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1967

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the Bank of America has recently released their report on a special economic study, entitled "Focus on the San Francisco-Oakland Metropolitan Area." The excellence of this discourse prompted Mr. Abe Kofman, publisher of the Alameda Times Star and San Leandro Morning News, to recommend it to his readers.

I commend officials of the Bank of America for making available so fine a document, and Mr. Kofman for calling special attention to it by his editorial, which I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point:

"FOCUS" A FINE SERVICE

This is not advertising space. It never will be while this Publisher is at the reins.

Now and then, however, a commercial entity creates real and really important news. We feel duty-bound to present the facts as they stand.

We refer to "Focus on the San Francisco-Oakland Metropolitan Area," a special economic study just released by Bank of America.

Now, BofA is more than a strictly money-making concern. Consider its annual scholarship awards to outstanding high school students here. But the "Focus" report outdistances even that other gesture in terms of creative community service.

The document is thorough, well-made, fine to look at with its collection of quality drawings. It tells us where we stand as regards growth and dollar flow. Every mayor and city manager should have a couy in his desk. In short, "Focus" is one of the best things of its kind that we have ever seen.

The report tells us that very few areas in this country have an economic future as bright as the greater San Francisco Bay Region's. Our own area is included, of course.

Nice words to hear. Nice, too, that the words are backed up by a great deal of high-level research in San Francisco, Oakland, Alameda, Fremont, San Leandro, Hayward, and so on. An important quote:

"The area's economic structure is heavily weighted in favor of such rapidly growing industries as electronics, services, finance and international trade.

"It is one of the most liveable regions in the nation and its residents have a high standard of living. These factors will insure the continued immigration of the young, highly educated individuals who are often in the forefront of new ideas and technology."

The 60-page "Focus" predicts that we likely will be part of the nation's fourth most populous area by 1975. With such statements, we are presented a challenge—probably the study's most important effect. "Focus" inspires as well as informs. It is a truly valuable job of work.

We offer additional details in our news pages. And we thank Bank of America for the opportunity to do so.

Seed Business Plays Key Role in Conservation on Great Plains

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT DOLE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1967

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, the conservation of our soil and water resources is vital to a strong agricultural economy as well as our national economy. Over the years a lot of good work has been done in the Great Plains States through the Great Plains conservation program. Conditions in the western part of my district are much improved over what they were during the very famous "dust bowl" days.

An article in the June issue of Soil Conservation magazine was of considerable interest to me and I believe it illustrates a real effort toward the conservation of our soil resources. The article features M. B. Sharp, seedsman-farmer in Lane County, Kans.

This article illustrates the importance of adequate supplies of high quality seed for conservation uses in the Great Plains area. I believe this article illustrates what can be done with a little initiative and a desire to improve the farming and ranching in the Plains States.

I include this excellent article as part of my remarks in the RECORD:

SEED BUSINESS PLAYS KEY ROLE IN CONSERVATION ON GREAT PLAINS

(By H. Ray Brown and Robert D. Lippert)

A Kansas seedsman-farmer who saw the swelling need for high-quality grass seed in the Great Plains in the late 1950's and moved to meet the demand has built, with his sons, a thriving business and played a key role in the revegetation of eroding cropland.

M. B. Sharp of Healy, Kans., had been in the seed business since 1908 and with the help of his sons, Gerald and Gail, was also farming and ranching.

As Great Plains landowners sought to take part in the new Conservation Reserve Program—to convert low-grade cropland to soil-conserving cover, mainly native grasses—they swamped Sharp and other seedsmen with calls for grass seed and information on methods of planting.

A NATURAL HARVEST

In 1958, Gerald and Gail established the Sharp Brothers Seed Company and undertook the harvest seed from natural grasslands throughout the Great Plains.

The Sharps tried buying seed from other growers as it was needed. They traded seed, tried contract production, and bought on consignment in an effort to supplement their uncertain harvests from natural grasslands. There was also a need for specially designed equipment for seeding, harvesting, and cleaning seed.

The Sharp Brothers were soon convinced that if they were to have dependable supplies of needed varieties and strains of grass seed, they must grow themselves under irrigation.

They gathered information on potential seed needs from the Soil Conservation Service and the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service.

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

As cooperators with the Lane County Soil and Water Conservation District, they obtained SCS assistance in selecting fields with suitable soils near a dependable source of water and in planning the necessary conservation practices. SCS plant materials specialists advised them on seed production methods and suitable sources of seed for planting.

They leveled the land where necessary to provide water control by furrow irrigation. Grasses were planted in 40-inch rows to make irrigation and cultivation easier.

The Sharps concentrated their efforts on improved varieties of the grasses most urgently needed in their market area. They found that, through their soil conservation district, they could get foundation seed of improved varieties developed at SCS plant materials centers at Manhattan, Kans., and elsewhere.

Producing grass seed is not easy. It requires intensive treatment—fertilization, cultivation, and chemical weed control. Preemergence herbicides in combination with cultivation and hand weeding all are necessary to produce grass seed that meets State and Federal seed laws. Timely operations using specially adjusted equipment for harvest and seed cleaning are essential.

ON FORMER WHEATLAND

Sharp Brothers Seed Company was able to establish about 300 acres of improved strains of native grasses for seed production within 2 years. They also arranged for production of about 200 acres of grass seed by other farmers in western Kansas and other places in the Great Plains. All of it is on land formerly growing wheat and grain sorghum.

As of September 30, 1966, the 62 Great Plains counties of Kansas had 801,082 acres of grass in the Conservation Reserve, plus 150,296 acres of grass seeding for which Great Plains Conservation Program payments have been made. The Sharps have provided a significant share of the seed for this grass acreage.

Along with seed production, the Sharps have learned much about growing, harvesting, processing and seeding native grasses. Their modern processing plant is one of a few in the Great Plains especially designed to process native grasses. "We have learned how to improve quality and to save more pure live seed," says Gerald.

CONSERVATION RESULTS

But what of the land, landowners, and the Nation benefiting from the increased acreages of grass made possible by the increased seed supply?

A common rotation in western Kansas before the cropland retirement program was sorghum-fallow-wheat. Under the Conservation Reserve, many of these farmers have converted one-third of their acreage to permanent native grass. The remainder was alternated between crop and fallow.

As the demand for grass seed for the Conservation Reserve waned, new demand for seed was generated by the Great Plains Conservation Program and by new and expanded conservation uses.

It is estimated that more than half of the grassland acres of the 5- and 10-year Conservation Reserve contracts in western Kansas have remained in grass and are now being grazed. Nearly all land less suitable for cropland has stayed in grass.

The real benefits from native grass seed production and additional acres of cropland converted to grass are many and far-reaching. Water runoff, silting, flood hazards, and wind erosion have been reduced. The additional acreage of grass has helped to stabilize range livestock production. Soil along highway rights-of-way is held in place.

In addition, grass seedings have benefited recreational and wildlife areas. Prairie chickens and other upland game birds are on the increase. More recently, the national land beautification movement has benefited from the fact that native grass seed is readily available.

"Many manmade problems can be reduced, corrected, or controlled by maximum use of natural vegetation, especially grasses," according to Gerald Sharp. He and Gail are proud to have an important role in achieving the goal of good land use and resource conservation.

Congressman Hamilton Reports on Results of Questionnaire in Indiana's Ninth District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE H. HAMILTON
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 12, 1967

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, earlier this year, I mailed to the residents of Indiana's Ninth Congressional District a questionnaire setting out some of the dominant issues of the 90th Congress.

More than 9,000 residents responded, registering opinions on issues ranging from the Vietnam conflict to local problems. Another 500 or so residents also wrote letters expanding their views.

I am grateful for this kind of response. It is through mailings such as this that I plan to obtain from year to year a broad expression of opinion from the Ninth District.

The response also indicates to me that Ninth District residents are interested in their Government and concerned about the issues of our time. The response to the "local problems" category will assist me in assessing the need of Ninth District residents.

This year, there were 9,004 responses to the questionnaire. Last year, 8,974 residents responded.

Here are this year's results listing the number of votes and the percentage of votes for each choice on each issue:

	Number	Percent
Vietnam: The conflict in Vietnam continues to dominate the issues before Congress. The United States should—		
1. Continue the present policy	628	7.7
2. Continue the present policy, but halt bombing of military targets in North Vietnam	243	3.0
3. Continue the present policy, but increase bombing of military targets in North Vietnam	2,299	28.3
4. Make the concessions demanded by North Vietnam to bring peace	520	6.4
5. Make an effort, regardless of risk of a wider war, to end the conflict by using whatever military force is necessary to defeat North Vietnam	4,437	54.6
The administration: How well do you think President Johnson is handling his responsibilities?		
In foreign matters:		
Very well	948	10.9
Satisfactory	3,318	38.2
Badly	4,413	50.8
In domestic matters:		
Very well	919	10.6
Satisfactory	2,883	33.1
Badly	4,898	56.3
The economy: President Johnson has called for a 6-percent surtax on personal and corporate income to help ease inflationary pressures and to help finance the Vietnam conflict and our domestic programs. Are you—		
1. For	2,291	26.9
2. Against	6,321	73.1
Draft: Congress will review the present draft law this year. Should we—		
1. Continue the draft as it is?	1,629	18.6
2. Create a draft system on a strict lottery basis?	691	7.9
3. Require all young men of 18 to enroll for a period of either military or nonmilitary service?	3,879	44.2
4. Modify the present system with emphasis on more equitable deferment policies?	2,581	29.4
Social security increase: An increase in social security benefits of approximately 8 percent can be financed without an increase in the tax. Do you favor—		
1. No increase in benefits?	2,169	21.9
2. The 8-percent increase in benefits without a tax increase?	5,567	56.1
3. An increase in benefits of more than 8 percent with an increase in the taxable wage base (which now stands at $6,600 a year) and/or an increase in tax rates?	2,045	22.1
Crime: 2 major crime studies are being completed and Congress will be receiving proposals to curb the rising crime rate in the United States. Should the greater emphasis in Federal legislation be on—		
1. Strengthening our police departments with newer equipment and providing more training for our policemen?	2,478	27.0
2. Or improving our criminal laws, courts, prisons, and punishment methods to offer a greater range of programs to retrain offenders for society?	4,494	49.1
3. Or do you consider the problem of crime exclusively the concern of State and local government?	2,180	23.9
Postal service: Has postal service in your community been—		
1. Adequate?	6,998	78.1
2. Needs improvement? How	1,962	21.9

	Number	Percent
Local problems: In what areas can the Federal Government be of the most help to your community with technical and/or financial assistance? Check 2 categories:		
1. Water resources and control	2,742	18.5
2. Industrial growth	2,979	20.1
3. Hospital and nursing home facilities	1,960	13.2
4. Needs of the elderly, disabled, and poor	1,888	12.8
5. Improvement in education	1,725	11.7
6. Community facilities—roads, water sanitation, housing	2,404	16.2
7. Other	1,108	7.5
Your Congressman's job: As your Congressman, I should—		
1. Vote according to my own conscience and judgment	2,299	30.8
2. Vote according to the majority wishes of the district as I intrepret those wishes	5,175	69.2
1. Return to the district each weekend	350	5.0
2. Return twice a month	1,748	24.7
3. Return once a month	4,966	70.3
1. Consider individual problems my most important job	540	6.1
2. Consider district and community problems the most important	4,241	48.1
3. Consider voting on legislation the most important	3,439	39.0
4. Consider committee work the most important	598	6.8
1. Make study trips abroad or in the United States occasionally	511	5.7
2. Never make such trips	570	6.4
3. Make such trips whenever I think it will benefit my consideration of an issue or problem	7,822	81.9

Halpern Urges Realistic Borders, Massive Economic Aid for Israel

SPEECH

OF

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 1967

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, the settlement that must follow compliance with the cease-fire will pose the real test for the community of nations.

The United States must take the leadership in pressing Israel's aims, after that nation has won the gallant fight for freedom and democracy. The tiny nation, surrounded by arrogant and ever-threatening foes, has proved her ability to protect herself militarily, and overcome her enemy neighbors.

But that is not Israel's ultimate aim. Her goal is to live in peace and cooperation with her neighbors. Despite her military victories, she cannot alone achieve the permanent terms she must have to preserve her sovereignty and prevent continuing harassment.

To the dismay of many of us who believed so strongly in our repeated assurances of the past 20 years, the United States failed to come forth in unequivocal support of Israel immediately prior to the present bloody conflict.

Then, when war erupted, our State Department announced a neutral position "in thought, word and deed." Without any material help from any nation, Israel has been fighting a brave, heroic, almost unbelievable fight to push back her enemies.

Despite our so-called neutrality, the United Arab Republic has cut off diplomatic relations with us. I see no reason why we should not now at least fulfill our commitments to Israel of the past two decades by diplomatic means.

The world can no longer accept a diplomatic stalemate like the one of 1956, which contains the seeds of continuing incidents of aggression, and leaves the way open for an eventual flare-up of a hot war in the Middle East.

Israel must have the rights which have been denied to her during the past decade. If the Arabs expect Israel to leave the territory she has won, then Israel is entitled to a treaty of peace, signed by the Arabs. Israel can also expect guarantees of free, peaceful access to Suez and Aqaba.

She must have absolute acceptance by the Arab States of her full sovereignty as a nation. And in order for any peace to be firm and lasting, it must be based on realistic borders for the State of Israel.

Furthermore, now that Israel has fought the good fight for freedom and democracy, the United States should provide a massive emergency economic assistance program to help rebuild war-torn Israel.

Israel cannot win her goals for future peace alone. She needs the support of the United States and the support of the community of nations. Indeed, the entire world needs an assurance of peace in the Middle East. All the peace-loving peoples demand the assurance that Nasser and his Arab bullies will stop rattling the sword and stop blackmailing the rest of the world with the threat of Armageddon.

Hogberg Family Gives 132 Years of Service to the Rock Island Arsenal and the Federal Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM RAILSBACK

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1967

Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Speaker, it is always reassuring to be reminded that, even though they are often most conspicuously vocal and visible, today's flag desecrators and draft card burners who seem to be dedicating their efforts more to disruption than anything else, have not effectively replaced the Americans who are quietly and constructively dedicating their efforts to service to their Government. Such is the commendable example of Curt Hogberg, a constituent of mine in the 19th District of Illinois, who recently retired as director of Army Weapons Command Personnel and acting chief of the Rock Island Arsenal Personnel after 33 years of Federal service.

Often referred to as the grand old man of personnel, Mr. Hogberg started with the arsenal in 1934 as a machinist's helper and switched to the personnel career field in 1945 where he has been ever since. His outstanding contributions were recognized in 1957 when he was awarded the Commendation for Meritorious Civilian Service, one of the highest Department of Army citations that can be bestowed on a civilian employee.

Curt Hogberg's contributions are certainly worthy of note, but his 33 years of service are also indicative of what has become a family tradition.

Hogberg service to the arsenal began 69 years ago and totals almost 132 years. His uncle, William Hogberg, worked as a diesetter from 1898 to 1933, and his father, Hilbert, was a machine operator beginning in 1901 for almost 32 years. Another uncle, Harry Hogberg, gave 21 years of service to the arsenal as a patternmaker; and Hogberg's son, Pete, has maintained the tradition. He has been an industrial engineer in the Combat Vehicles Division since 1955.

I wish to commend the Hogberg tradition of dedicated Federal service to your attention and to insert an article which appeared in the Arsenal Target in the RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues:

CURT HOGBERG PLANS RETIREMENT AFTER 33 YEARS FEDERAL SERVICE

After 33 years of Federal service, all of which has been at Rock Island Arsenal, the "grand old man" of Personnel will retire next week.

Curt Hogberg, officially retiring April 28 as director of Army Weapons Command Personnel and Training, has been acting chief of Rock Island Arsenal Personnel since July 1966.

The 57-year-old Davenport-born division chief started here as a machinist's helper in Shop M in 1934 and rose to the position of production control chief by 1940. In 1945 he switched to the Personnel career field where he has been ever since.

A Personnel trainee in 1945, two years later Mr. Hogberg was the Personnel Director. Later in his career, the two-year syndrome appeared again when he was deputy chief of the Ordnance Command's Manpower division in 1955, and its chief in 1957.

That same year, Mr. Hogberg was awarded one of the highest Department of Army citations that can be bestowed on a civilian employee, the Commendation for Meritorious Civilian Service.

During his career here, he has lent his capabilities to many new programs. Among them are developments of tables of distribution, various manpower programs, cooperative education programs, the buildup of a number of apprentice programs and special training areas wherein agreements were negotiated with the Civil Service Commission.

In his career he has seen the establishment of the Management Science Office, which began as a function of the Personnel office, he was one of the Island's first advocates of air transportation utilization for civilian employees, and not only did the Army Management Engineering Training Agency (AMETA) complex have its beginning during his tenure, he was a part-time instructor there during its first year of operation.

Curt Hogberg says his plans for the immediate future are indefinite. His wife is an accountant and tax consultant in Moline and his son, Pete, is an industrial engineer in the Combat Vehicle project manager's office and president of the Moline Jaycees.

A daughter, Mrs. James Farra, lives in Studio City, Calif., and another son, Curt Jr., is employed at Moline's IBM Corporation.

American Hungarian Federation

SPEECH

OF

HON. DONALD E. LUKENS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1967

Mr. LUKENS. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a pleasure to join my colleagues in commemorating the 60th anniversary of the charter of a fine, loyal American organization devoted to the values of our way of life and individual freedom, the American Hungarian Federation.

During its 60 years of existence the Federation worked both for the adaptation of Hungarian immigrants into our society by acquainting them with our culture and a knowledge of our governmental and social institutions and for the preservation of the valuable aspects of Hungarian culture among the sons and daughters of these immigrants.

However, since the tragic fate of Hungary in 1945, and then in 1956, when Soviet Russian communism engulfed their native country, the leaders of the American Hungarian Federation did not shrink from the task of denouncing atheistic communism and its misdeeds and tyranny both in Hungary and in other parts of the world. They also pointed out to American citizens of Hungarian origin the pitfalls and dangers of communism in this country and also served as informal spokesmen for the people of Hungary deprived of its national self-determination and individual freedom.

Recently, the Federation has been active in publishing and disseminating studies on the various aspects of American policy and conditions in Hungary. The Foreign Affairs Committee headed by Prof. Emery G. Szekely, Temple University, Philadelphia, Pa., and Prof. Z. Michael Szaz, Seton Hall University, South Orange, N.J., produced excellent studies on the international law aspect of the continued Soviet occupation of Hungary, a memorandum to President Johnson on American policy toward East Central Europe in general and Hungary in particular which was received by high-ranking State Department officials, and one on the abortion laws of Hungary. They testified in favor of making the burning of the American flag a Federal crime and are slated to testify before the House Foreign Affairs committee on East-West relations.

The work and quality of the organization which comprises the two American Hungarian fraternal organizations, many of the American Hungarian clubs, associations and churches with a membership exceeding 120,000, is led by Judge Albert A. Fiok, from Pittsburgh, Pa., as national president and the Right Reverend Bishop Dr. Zoltan Beky, chairman of the board.

Today, when many subversive and misled elements consider patriotism as obsolete, it is well to congratulate this organization which quotes on his seal the saying of the Hungarian-born hero of the American War of Independence, Colonel Nicolas de Kovats: "Loyal unto death," and which organization has shown its loyalty to this country and to the values which made America the land of the free.

The Neighborhood Youth Corps—A Galveston Success Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK BROOKS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1967

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, the Neighborhood Youth Corps has changed the lives of thousands of young Americans since its inception in 1964. Through its guidance and inspiration young people have become productive citizens instead of remaining in the trap of poverty.

The story of a young girl afflicted with cancer from childhood exemplifies the effects the NYC can have on a youth's life. Frances Marie Odinot of Galveston, Tex, had undergone more than 40 operations that resulted in the amputation of her left arm and shoulder. When she came to NYC 6 months ago, Frances Marie was given her chance.

She asked the project director, Herbert E. Schmidt, to allow her to do something that would keep her active "so I can get some exercise." Schmidt first assigned her to handle the mail run in the Galveston County Court House where the NYC is quartered. "She did an outstanding job," declared Schmidt, "and everybody, including all the judges fell in love with her."

She moved on from this job to clerical work, where she perfected her typing skills. Again she performed extremely well, typing almost as fast with one hand as most people can with two.

However, the hardest task was finding her a permanent job. Although most of the companies Schmidt approached wanted to hire her, they were unable to because insurance companies refused to cover her in the general policies they carried on company employees. The Post Office in Galveston agreed to give her an opportunity to work full time. Schmidt reported that she is now happily employed there, operating duplicating and Xerox machines.

Frances Marie's fine achievement is an example to all youth. No other words convey her spirit and enthusiasm as well as her own, and I would like, therefore, to enclose her letter of appreciation and thanks to Mr. Schmidt and the Neighborhood Youth Corps for the helping hand into the world of economic independence:

HERBERT E. SCHMIDT,
Neighborhood Youth Corps, Galveston County Courthouse, Galveston, Tex.

DEAR MR. SCHMIDT: I just wanted to tell you how much I have enjoyed working for, and with, you and the Neighborhood Youth Corps and how sorry I am to be leaving such a pleasant association.

I also wanted to thank you, the NYC and all of the other wonderful people I have met through my work, for all of the kindness and consideration shown to me and for the help I have received from you all. Through this help, I have gained, not only experience in various jobs, but, also, a working knowledge of the business world and all that it entails. I feel I have learned quite a lot in the six months that I have been with the NYC but that it could not have been done without your guidance and counseling.

When all others had turned me away, the Neighborhood Youth Corps opened its doors to me and took me in. For that, I shall be eternally grateful. It is a foolish young person who has need of, and the chance to take advantage of, the opportunities that this wonderful organization offers and does not give of himself to be lead in the right direction. I shall always be a champion of the NYC and will be able to speak from experience—all of it good!

Again, let me say thank you for all that you and the NYC have done for me.

Sincerely,

FRANCES MARIE ODINOT.

Job Corps Results

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1967

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, the Job Corps camp at Collbran, Colo., was one of the first established in the Nation and, from the very beginning, this camp has been one of the most successful in the entire national complex. This did not come about by chance. On the contrary, the success of the Collbran Job Corps camp has been the result of enlightened and effective administration, a constructive program and the cooperation and understanding of the surrounding community. Recently, the Grand Junction Daily Sentinel published a series of articles describing activities at the camp, and I submit one of those articles—May 24, 1967—at this time so that my colleagues may know something of the work that has been completed and is planned for the future.

The article follows:

VOCATIONAL AS WELL AS ACADEMIC SKILLS TAUGHT AT COLLBRAN CENTER

(By Anis Kelley)

COLLBRAN.—The Job Corps Center here, which is under the supervision of the Bureau of Reclamation, is a 100-man conservation center.

It teaches construction and mechanical skills as well as reading, writing, and arithmetic.

At present the Collbran center has 85 corpsmen, 33 staff members, and an unofficial budget of $656,000 for fiscal 1967.

All the camp's expenses are included in the budget: food, clothing, wages, and equipment for the corpsmen; all the staff's wages; camp maintenance expenses; supplies for work projects; educational materials; transportation; and upkeep.

In the past two years the center has processed 432 young men.

Of those, 103 have graduated, 171 have resigned because of homesickness or personal problems, 45 have transferred to urban centers, and 28 have been discharged because of disciplinary problems, health, or withdrawal of parental consent.

The camp runs its own kitchen, laundry, commissary, and educational and vocational projects.

Corpsmen desiring to learn such trades work in many of the related positions. One of the camp's most successful training programs is its kitchen. Several graduates, and some non-graduates, have gone on to jobs as cooks or meat cutters.

Many of the corpsmen feel that they are at least in part paying their way by the work they do while learning various skills.

Center director Rex Miller says the value of the work already done by the corpsmen is considerable, but it is difficult to estimate. The intangibles involved—such as the corpsmen's attitudes and the number of lives improved—are also difficult to assess, he said.

In the past two years while in training the corpsmen have:

1. Cleared five reservoirs of debris and dead trees (Atkinson, Kitson, Silver, Neversweat, and Vega).
2. Built a chain link fence around the Molina Power Plant and access doors into the Cottonwood penstock which supplies the power plant with water.
3. Installed tables, grills, and water works at Cottonwood Campground.
4. Repaired low places in the dam of Cottonwood No. 1.
5. Packed the abandoned portion of Colo. 65 on Grand Mesa for a sled run the winter before last.
6. Built access roads on Grand Mesa, at the Rifle Gap picnic area, and into Lewis Wash in the Grand Valley.
7. Cleaned some Grand Valley canals.
8. Made sanitary fills on Bureau of Reclamation lands.
9. Repaired the Bonham telephone line.
10. Built walks, fences, water lines, and landscaped and boxed in around the bases of the center buildings. In addition they have built four of the camp buildings.
11. Picked tomatoes in the Grand Valley for 13 days when there was a labor shortage.
12. Assisted in the clean-up operations after the Lamar and Ouray floods.
13. Searched for several missing persons.
14. Assisted in the removal of bodies from a plane crash near Meeker.
15. Rescued hunters whose car went off a hill near Mesa last fall.
16. Rescued persons whose ski sleds became stranded on Grand Mesa.
17. Assisted in fighting several fires in the valley.
18. Conducted surveys on Cottonwood Creek.
19. Assisted with the maintenance of the Colbran dump.
20. Installed braille signs on a nature trail at Aspen.
21. Built 300 small plug dams in Lewis Wash.
22. Built 130 picnic tables to be placed on campgrounds this summer.

Plans for future works projects in the coming fiscal year include:

1. Completion of campgrounds at Rifle Gap, Vega, and Cottonwood reservoirs.
2. Completion of small plug retaining dams in the Lewis Wash.
3. Making and setting rustic type signs for Bureau of Reclamation projects.
4. Improving the camp's athletic field.
5. Building a Mesa Lakes nature trail.
6. Building a boat ramp at Cottonwood No. 1.

The most striking effect Job Corps has on the boys, Miller said, is the tremendous change of attitude most of the boys experience after coming to the center.

Most come with a chip on their shoulder or so discouraged they don't care about anything.

Through their work, their studies, and their talks with staff members they start to realize what they do is up to themselves, Miller said.

Disturbing Proposal by Mr. McNamara

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT V. DENNEY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1967

Mr. DENNEY. Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues know, the Secretary of Defense has recently proposed deactivating a number of Army Reserve units and 15 National Guard divisions. With respect to the National Guard units, the distinguished Congress from Oklahoma [Mr. JAMES V. SMITH], the other day on the floor pointed out the fallacies of this proposal. In addition to generally supporting his remarks, I would like to voice my criticism of Mr. McNamara's ill-considered proposal.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues are well familiar with the tremendous contributions that the Army Reserve has made to this country during both war and peace. I believe the reasons are best put out by a statement issued earlier this month from the national executive committee of the Reserve Officers Association of the United States. The statement is as follows:

STATEMENT BY THE NATIONAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE RESERVE OFFICERS ASSOCIATION OF THE UNITED STATES

The Reserve Officer Association of the United States for sometime has been deeply concerned about the persistent effort of the Department of Defense to reduce the Army Reserve, and to restrict and discourage its Citizen-Soldiers in their willingness and ability to serve their country in time of continuing and deepening crisis.

The plan, announced yesterday, intensifies this concern because its basic result is to abolish several hundred high-priority, highly trained combat units, composed of the most highly motivated experienced officers and men in the entire United States Army. More than 30,000 men are in these Army Reserve Units; by circumstance, if they are to continue to serve they must do so in the National Guard, and many of them must be retrained, and reassigned. The plan therefore is to carry out a merger of the Army Reserve, a fully Federal force, into the National Guard, with its responsibility to the respective Governors.

For these more than 30,000 men and their units, this is Merger by any definition.

Merger of the Army Reserve and the National Guard has been repeatedly rejected by the Congress as being opposed to the national interest.

Also involved in this plan is the deactivation of 15 National Guard divisions, strategically located throughout the United States and providing a vital element of the nation's mobilization base.

The Reserve Officers Association, with its record of 45 years' service to adequate national defense, cannot accept as sound military policy the destruction of any major part of the nation's military training and mobilization base. We view the plan as having been dictated largely by political expedience. We applaud those officers of the National Guard who frankly recognize and call public attention to the military weakness of this compromise; destroying 400 Army Reserve Combat Units and giving them to the National Guard in payment for loss of the Guard's 15 divisions.

ROA has been cautioned against strongly opposing this plan.

However, convinced as we are that it is unsound, and that the steps proposed might dangerously impair the combat readiness of both the Reserves and the National Guard—each a vital part of the One Army of the United States of America—we reject any self-serving position. Our concern is only for the safety of the United States, and the right of every Reservist to be ready by virtue of adequate training.

To carry out this plan of further reducing the Reserve strength in the light of the present situation in the Near East, as well as the Far East, seems little short of folly. Involved in the turbulence of these massive changes in the Army Reserve and National Guard are more than 170,000 soldiers.

We look to the Congress, in meeting its responsibilities under the Constitution, critically to review this plan of June 2.

In its review, we urge the Congress to obtain fully independent and professional military testimony, basing its final conclusions in the law.

As the vehicle for public hearings, to which we think this issue must be subjected, the Reserve Vitalization Bill (H.R. 2), passed by the House on 20 February by a vote of 324–13, and recognized publicly by many Senators as containing elements of law vital to a viable, responsive and ready Reserve, should be scheduled for consideration by the Senate at the earliest date.

Union-Industries Show

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1967

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, one of the finest examples of the fruits of cooperation between labor and management in this country is the annual Union-Industries Show, held this year in the Veterans' Memorial Coliseum in Phoenix, Ariz.

As the show opened, William F. Schnitzler, secretary-treasurer of the AFL–CIO, paid tribute to this splendid instance of industrial democracy. Under unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, the text of Mr. Schnitzler's address will appear in the RECORD at this point:

UNION-INDUSTRIES SHOW

One of the pleasant events I look forward to each year is the annual Union-Industries Show. For many years I have attended the openings of these exhibitions and each time I have been amazed anew by the uniqueness of this event and the story that is told here.

In the exhibits and in the men and women who represent the unions and the industries here is demonstrated what we have long said; that is, unions are people like yourselves and all employers do not dislike unions of their employees. In fact, as the show here proves, together they have produced a quality of goods and a level of craftsmanship in a volume that is a marvel of the world. It is all here. There is no pretense or facade and no hokum because the only product for sale is the demonstration that labor-management relations can be harmonious and mutually beneficial. After today I believe you will "buy" this thesis.

It is therefore a great pleasure to bring here today the greetings of the AFL–CIO, the family of 129 separate and autonomous unions that is the American labor movement. We are very proud of this show and what it demonstrates.

Let me point out that this show is not the convention of a mutual admiration society. This show has a direct importance to all Americans. The high wages and the strong contracts that unions have negotiated are of far greater benefit than to only the workers directly involved.

Union workers spend their earnings. They travel. Many come to Arizona on their vacations; many union workers move here when they retire on union-won pensions, and all union workers buy and own products made or grown in this state. It is the same story in every state. The wages of union workers provide in great measure the extra thrust of mass purchasing power that makes possible the goods you see today.

An impoverished worker cannot afford the goods on display here, though many items are what we consider absolute essentials in our daily life. The impoverished worker cannot afford a late model automobile or the gas to drive here today to just to see what is on display. Instead, it is the well-paid worker, enjoying the fruits of collective bargaining, who has brought about this miracle of goods and is able to purchase and enjoy these goods himself.

Here today you will not see a convention of trade unionists lambasting the bosses nor will you see a gathering of employers bemoaning the demands of unions. Instead you will see what is an eternal puzzlement to totalitarians of the left and the right. That is, a demonstration that labor and industry do seek—and in many instances have achieved—a working industrial democracy in their places of employment all over America.

It is therefore a great pleasure to be here; I hope that you will enjoy meeting us in labor and industry as much as we are looking forward to meeting all of you.

Hard Work Pays for Frink

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM D. FORD
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 12, 1967

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, many of the Members know Gary R. Frink, of Michigan, now serving as staff director of the Postal Facilities and Modernization Subcommittee of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, and legislative assistant to former House Member Wes Vivian in the 89th Congress. For this reason, I believe the Members will be interested in reading an article that Bob Hoving of the Booth papers wrote about Gary, which was recently published in the Booth dailies throughout Michigan:

HARD WORK PAYS FOR FRINK

(By Robert A. Hoving)

WASHINGTON.—Gary R. Frink helped work his way through the University of the Americas in Mexico City by collecting $10 a head for U.S. students he recruited.

He got through the University of Michigan Law School by drumming in a jazz combo and working in a gasoline station, graduating in 27 months.

The 34-year-old Frink's acumen and capacity for hard work led to his appointment Tuesday as director and chief counsel of the House subcommittee on postal facilities and modernization.

Headed by Rep. Joe Pool, D-Tex., this subcommittee will deal with such problems as whether the Post Office Department should be converted into a private nonprofit corporation and how to get your mail delivered on time as the blizzard of letters keeps piling up.

The fact that Frink has an affinity for wearing vests and knows his way around Washington (he was legislative aide to former Rep. Weston E. Vivian of Ann Arbor) also had a lot to do with his appointment.

Frink's vest is a badge that he is "solid"—and it also has earned him the nickname of "judge" in Washington.

Born in Rochester, Mich., Frink attended Michigan State University and was graduated from the University of the Americas in 1955.

At the latter school Frink got himself named director of alumni relations and worked out the $10 a head recruitment deal. In one package, he recruited 75 students from Michigan and used the $750 for tuition and to get married.

His wife is the former Sherry L. Rood, the daughter of Max E. Rood, retired chief of maintenance and buildings for the Flint Public Schools.

Before entering the U. of M. Law School in 1961, Frink sold school textbooks in South America and the Caribbean islands.

Knowing that Washington always can use a good, bustling lawyer, he came here for a job after graduating from U. of M. Law School. He pounded the streets for three weeks, then became a legal assistant in the general counsel's office of the Department of Commerce.

Frink wound up writing speeches for Mrs. Esther Peterson, who recently resigned as President Johnson's adviser on consumer matters. By the time the 1964 election campaign ended, Frink was writing Democratic speeches in the Executive Building next to the White House.

He went to work for Vivian after being introduced to the newly elected congressman by Robert Harris, U. of M. Law School professor.

When Vivian lost in 1966, Frink joined the Department of Health, Education and Welfare as special counsel to a task force on environmental health.

In his new post, Frink will have the opportunity to learn the congressional committee system from the inside. Committees can make or break legislation—and the postal subcommittee will play a key role in a proposed $1 billion modernization of the postal service within the next five years.

It also will have considerable to say about how much that service is going to cost in mail rates.

The subcommittee will set up detailed hearings not only on postal technological improvements, but financing postal operations. Organizing those hearings will be one of Frink's main responsibilities.

Frink lives with his wife and two sons in Alexandria, Va. "I get wonderful mail service there," he says.

But it could be that vest. He always has its pockets stuffed with letters and papers and apparently carries most of his mail home himself.

School Boards Seeks Innovation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 18, 1967

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, school board members across the country are constantly seeking new and better ways of educating our children.

An article in the June 1967 issue of Wisconsin School Board News reported the results of a recent poll of school board members, seeking their opinions on changes needed in American education.

Because I believe it will be of interest to the Members of this body, I include the article herewith:

SCHOOL BOARDS TELL GALLUP POLL: "WE WANT TO INNOVATE"

PRINCETON, N.J.—School boards are not dragging their feet in support of educational innovations, a new Gallup Poll showed. The 48 state study, sponsored by the Kettering Foundation's Institute for the Development of Educational Activities (Project IDEA), also recorded the views of school board members on changes needed in American education.

Purpose of the study was to "shed light on the readiness of those most directly concerned with the public school system—parents, school boards, and school administrators—to accept change and innovation." Two parts of the study, surveys involving parents and school boards, have been completed (see table). School administrators will be surveyed a little later on.

Pretested interviews lasting for at least an hour were used in the school board survey. One member from each of 566 school boards was interviewed "to provide an accurate cross section of the nation," the pollsters explained.

BOARDS WILL EMBRACE CHANGE

School board members, the Gallup Poll found, are willing "to embrace change." But unfortunately, the report said, "the nature of their responsibilities does not permit them to devote much time to the consideration of changes in curriculum or teaching methods. In most communities, school board members say they are overwhelmed by problems of immediate concern—finding enough money in the budget to meet school needs, trying to keep up with population growth with new buildings and classrooms, meeting the problem of teacher shortages, seeking able and experienced teachers within budget requirements. These tasks occupy most of the time of the nation's school boards," the report said. "But these operating problems do not crowd out all discussion of curriculum changes, new teaching methods, or practices in all instances.

"In many communities," the report added, "the local school board does not devote much time to the discussion of the curriculum or to innovative practices, since these are left largely to the judgment of the superintendent, principals and other members of the administrative staff. When some important change is made, or contemplated, members of the school board are informed and do have a chance to discuss the change. But the impetus for change does not come from school board members, except in a small minority of situations."

School boards are inhibited "to an important extent by college admissions requirements and regulations enforced by state boards of education," the poll reported.

Schools with high scholastic records can "get around" college admission requirements, the poll pointed out, "but the typical school would have trouble if it departed from the usual high school curriculum."

Requirements imposed by state boards of education lead to the same problem, the poll reported. The place to start improving current curriculum programs, the poll suggested "is with colleges of the nation. This does not mean that college entrance requirements should be lowered . . . It does mean they should begin to introduce greater flexibility into their requirements."

In the survey, members of school boards were asked: "To what extent do college admission requirements influence your curriculum?" More than seven in every ten said these requirements influenced their curriculums to a great extent or almost completely. The school board members were also asked: "Would you like it better if colleges exercised less influence on your curriculum?" A total of 70 percent said "No."

VOCATIONAL SKILLS NEED HELP

During the interviews, school board members were also asked to discuss the changes they thought should be made in national education patterns. The findings showed that of those who had suggestions to make, the largest number singled out vocational training as a subject that deserved more emphasis. "School board members," the summary stated, "would like to raise the prestige of those who do not go to college, and they would like to improve the quality of this training by bringing it more into line with current and future needs of business and industry."

The second concern of school board members was improved teaching staffs. Among the suggestions offered for achieving this: increased salaries to give the profession higher status among potential teachers, eliminating tenure, more use of audiovisual methods, smaller classes, more experimentation, adoption of new teaching methods, greater teacher freedom in solving discipline problems, use of teacher aides, volunteers and programed learning technics.

School board members were also asked to evaluate 13 educational innovations (see table). Commented the pollsters: "School boards of the nation are interested in innovations and are ready to adopt those that seem to offer an improvement over present practices."

School board members, said the report, "are almost unanimous in bellieving that schools should function as community centers for adult education, cultural and civic activities."

Approximately half of those interviewed said their communities were involved in team teaching. But these programs often were in the experimental stage or confined to a few classes, the report said.

Independent study time for students—an innovation approved by a two to one ratio—was regarded by many board members as an innovation that would be difficult to introduce into their schools. "Oddly enough," commented the pollsters, "parents give it a higher approval vote than do school board members, thus pointing out the likelihood that this plan may not meet as much resistance as school board members fear."

Another innovation strongly endorsed by both school board members and parents is instruction designed to teach students how to organize their work and thinking, how to analyze problems, and how to arrive at independent conclusions. School board members indicated they anticipate little difficulty in introducing this type of training in the curriculum. Noted the findings: "While much experimentation will be needed to prove the effectiveness of this type of instruction, and to determine the content of such a program, educators have undoubtedly overestimated the problems involved in developing such a course. People in the business world frequently have to concern themselves with this problem and they could be of great help in planning the content."

Another widely supported and easy to start innovation was the idea of guide books for parents. "The acceptance of this innovation among the least educated parents," commented the findings, "is ample proof that parents *do* want help in teaching their children discipline and respect for law and order, and in stimulating them to take greater interest in their school work."

NONGRADED SCHOOLS GET NOD

The report said that a "sizable majority" of board members (70 percent) approve of nongraded schools. "At the same time," added the report, "about half see difficulties in adopting this plan for their own school systems. A third of those included in the survey say they already are doing something about assigning students to classes on the basis of achievement rather than age."

Proposals for shortening summer vacations or lengthening the school day proved unpopular with both parents and board members. They were not asked to comment on four-quarter scheduling. Neither parents nor board members liked the idea of standard nationwide tests on the order of those that are presently administered in Great Britain.

Programmed instruction is more highly regarded by school board members than by parents, the report said, "possibly because school board members may be more familiar with this innovation."

Parents provided slightly more support than did board members for independent study time and for special vocational programs. But the study found that "the attitude of school board members to the 13 innovations proposed is very much the same as that of parents. Those highly favored are the same in the two lists, with only minor differences in the percentage of those who regard the proposal as a 'good idea' and those who think it is a 'Poor idea.' "

How boards and parents view 13 innovations (*ranked in order of approval*)

	Board members			Parents		
	Good idea	Poor idea	No opinion	Good idea	Poor idea	No opinion
1. Schools as community centers	96	3	1	93	6	1
2. Classes to teach students how to think	89	9	2	93	6	1
3. Team teaching	88	7	5	84	14	2
4. Movable partitions for classrooms	84	13	3	84	15	1
5. Guide books for parents for each grade	77	19	4	76	22	2
6. Programed instruction	72	17	11	70	27	3
7. Placement based on achievement	70	21	9	67	28	5
8. Special vocational training	65	29	6	63	34	3
9. More independent study time	59	30	11	59	34	7
10. Reduce summer vacation	44	51	5	45	53	2
11. Increase school day, reduce homework	31	60	9	30	67	3
12. Standard test for high school diploma	22	72	6	30	68	2
13. Eliminate competition with pass-fail marks	17	78	5	15	83	2

Cpl. Ralph Flint, Jr., Killed in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1967

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Lance Cpl. Ralph P. Flint, Jr., of Hagerstown, Md., was recently killed in combat in Vietnam. I wish to commend the courage of Corporal Flint and to honor his memory by including the following article in the RECORD:

RALPH FLINT, JR., MARINE IN VIETNAM

HAGERSTOWN.—A 19-year-old Hagerstown marine who had about 1½ months of duty to complete in Vietnam was killed in action Sunday, the Defense Department reported yesterday.

The marine was Lance Cpl. Ralph P. Flint, Jr., whom the Defense Department said was killed near Quang Tri when fragments from an enemy mortar struck him in the chest.

PREVIOUSLY INJURED

Corporal Flint had apparently just returned to combat after recovering from a wound received May 5. Mrs. R. Lorraine Flint, his mother, said the last letter she received from her son was dated May 16. It was mailed from a hospital ship.

The young marine had been in Vietnam since July 14, 1966. He was expected home in August, his mother said today. Corporal Flint enlisted in the Marine Corps in January, 1966.

Besides his mother, he is survived by a brother, Nelson Flint. Mrs. Flint and her son live at 9 Winter street, in Hagerstown.

Rejuvenation of St. Paris, Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1967

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I was proud to note recently an article by Mr. Howard B. Sturgeon, secretary of the Ohio Bankers Association, in that organization's May 1967 issue, concerning St. Paris, Ohio, in my congressional district.

Mr. Sturgeon, who hails originally from St. Paris, writes of the recent rejuvenation of that community through the efforts of a few enterprising young businessmen and bankers.

The article is as follows:

THE OBA CIRCUIT

(By Howard Sturgeon)

I guess it is no secret to at least some Ohio bankers that I originated in St. Paris, Ohio, and have a lot of pride in my home town.

Recently I was invited to attend, on a Sunday, an open house of the newly remodeled home town bank—First-Central National. My home town bank has done a tremendous job in modernizing and enlarging their main office, but the unique part of the Sunday open house was the fact that this occasion also stirred other merchants in the town to have open houses at the same time. When I arrived in town, it looked like the State Fair was going on or some similar large occasion, and I think there were more people in town at one time than at any date in the past.

St. Paris has been rejuvenated lately after going through several years of dying on the vine, so to speak. This has come about due to the efforts of a few young businessmen in town who formed a corporation and decided to do something about the empty store buildings up and down the main street. They purchased empty store buildings right and left, including one that I had an interest in. After renovating these buildings, they set out to attract some new businesses in town and their results have been more successful than they ever hoped for. They have torn down some old houses and buildings and provided parking lots. There is a new nine-hole golf course north of town, the public library has been renovated, etc., etc.

Another thing they did in St. Paris that is unique was due to the fact that there was so much criticism of the parking meters that it was driving business away. To offset this criticism, the town council compromised with the public by removing every other parking meter. In other words, here is a parking space with a meter, and next to it a parking space without a meter, then another meter, etc. The town treasurer told me that they are receiving more revenue from half the parking meters than they did when each space had a meter.

I hope you will pardon my rambling about my home town but, like anyone else, once again I am happy to say that I am proud to see what some enterprising young men and bankers can do to dress up an otherwise drab community.

International Social Justice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1967

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, "Development is new name for peace." These words of Pope Paul VI in his encyclical "The Development of Peoples" were the theme of the commencement address given by Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey, at St. Thomas College, St. Paul, Minn.

Vice President Humphrey challenged the graduates with the problems created by moving from a tribal to a global community. International social justice, he said, demands a revision of patterns of international trade, increased foreign assistance, and a rejection of political messianism.

The challenge is also made to this Congress and I place the Vice President's remarks in the Record at this point:

Remarks of Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey at the Commencement, College of St. Thomas, St. Paul, Minn., May 27, 1967

"We should live in our age, know it, be in touch with it . . . our work is in the present and not in the past."

Those words were not spoken last week, but in 1897 by the founder of this college, Archbishop John Ireland.

In Archbishop Ireland's time, the old frontier was fading before the new industrial revolution.

Individual relationships were yielding to struggle between capital and labor.

The industrial revolution, and the resulting urbanization of society, were destroying the bonds of human solidarity which had bound Americans together in a largely rural society.

Archbishop Ireland was among the first to see that the critique of industrial exploitation—and the plea for social justice—contained in Pope Leo XIII's encyclical "Rerum Novarum" applied to the United States as well as to Europe.

Monsignor John A. Ryan, a Professor at St. Thomas College, exposed the moral hollowness of the prevailing *laissez faire* philosophy, and played an important role in achieving a general recognition in the United States that social justice—not unrestrained profit-seeking—should be the guiding norm for society.

For Monsignor Ryan, and others, recognized that men needed each other, and that man's interdependence, increasingly a physical fact of life, was also a moral necessity.

Pope Leo XIII, Archbishop Ireland and Monsignor Ryan addressed themselves to the problem of social justice in a national context. Today we must focus on justice in a global setting.

Pope Paul in his new encyclical on "The Development of Peoples" has stated the situation clearly: "Today the principal fact we must all recognize is that the social question has become world-wide."

Yes, the world has become a "village planet."

But, regrettably, too many of our loyalities and institutions remain tribal, not planetary.

To replace the tribal community with a global community requires the growth of new loyalities . . . the establishment of new institutions . . . and the acceptance of new obligations.

In building such a global community, we face one clear and overwhelming challenge: The widening gap between the rich nations and the poor.

Everywhere we see people caught between soaring hopes and immovable traditions.

Everywhere we see a revolution against what Emmanuel Mounier called the "established disorder."

And we know that, in today's world, peace can be threatened by social and economic deprivation, by destitution and hunger as well as by armies crossinig borders and bombs falling from the sky.

How do we meet this threat? Pope Paul VI has rightly stated that "Development is the new name for peace."

But "development" cannot be limited to economic growth. It must promote the good of the whole man.

"Development" is not just a matter of eliminating hunger, or even of reducing poverty. The struggle against physical destitution is not enough.

It is a question rather of building a world where each man, no matter what his race, religion or nationality, can live a fully human life . . . a world where each man may be freed from the servitude imposed on him by other men or by natural forces he is unable to control.

It is a question, in short, of building a world where freedom is not an empty word.

In this striving for real development, we who live in the Western world have a special responsibility.

It was we who launched the technological revolution that has produced such dazzling wealth in the midst of squalor.

It is we who have spread it to the world at large.

And today we tolerate—by limited exertion if not by inaction—inconceivable and growing disparities of wealth and destitution.

The hard facts are these:

In this world, only some 800 million people have per capita income of over 750 dollars a year.

Another 400 million earn between 250 and 750 dollars a year.

The remaining 2.2 *billion* earn less than 250 dollars per year. (And almost half of these earn less than 100 dollars a year)

Does anyone think this disparity can continue without the eventual outbreak of serious violence and war—without new Cubas, Congos and Dominican Republics?

How are we going to close this gap?

It will require determined effort by local leaders to mobilize local resources.

And by "local resources" I mean not just material resources. I mean, also, resources of vision and will and determination on the part of leaders who would bring their nations into the 20th century.

But no matter how much the poor nations help themselves, we cannot evade the fact that they stand little chance of success without the help of those which are rich.

It is not necessary here to engage in a detailed analysis of the process of development. Once we recognize the existence of a universal common good and of international social justice—and show a willingness to commit ourselves to it—the technical problems of assistance can be solved. Not without difficulty—but they can be solved.

In the final analysis the most difficult questions which you and I must answer—are those stated bluntly by Pope Paul in his encyclical:

"Let each one examine his conscience, a conscience that conveys a new message of our times. Is he prepared to support out of his own pocket works and undertakings organized in favor of the most destitute? Is he ready to pay higher taxes so that the public authorities can intensify their efforts in favor of development? Is he ready to pay a higher price for imported goods so that the producer may be more justly rewarded? Or to leave this country, if necessary and if he is young, in order to assist in this development of the young nations?"

History has shown that man will pay a high price for the victories of war. It remains to be seen whether he will sacrifice for the development required for peace.

We are challenged, then, today to transfer the standard which has become an accepted norm in modern national societies to the international community. This is revolutionary doctrine.

It will entail, among other things, revision of the existing North-South pattern of international trade.

As Pope Paul's encyclical pointed out: "An economy of exchange can no longer be based solely on the law of free competition. Freedom of trade is fair only if it is subject to the demands of social justice."

The Pope's admonition has already been heeded to some degree in the Kennedy Round trade negotiation. In that negotiation the rich nations have agreed to a new program of food aid for the poor. And they are now considering the *immediate* extension of trade concessions to the developing countries which will not be fully extended to the developed for another five years.

But this is only a beginning.

As we prepare for the next meeting of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, to be held in New Delhi in 1968, we must re-examine many of our old basic premises.

For instance, President Johnson has already indicated that we are ready now to explore the possible benefit of temporary preferential tariff advantages for *all* developing countries in the markets of *all* the industrialized countries.

What about development assistance aside from trade?

The United States—and other developed nations—are contributing less than .7 of one per cent of their Gross National Product today. We stand guilty, just as others do.

I know there are experts who claim the poor nations cannot usefully absorb too much more.

But the World Bank estimates that developing nations *can* efficiently absorb twice the amount of capital today as a decade ago. Yet the trend in contributions continues downward.

Not only is the amount of financial assistance inadequate.

There is the obvious need for achieving a better balance between population and available resources.

Debt burdens have mounted to staggering heights.

And trained talent is steadily drained from developing countries—depriving them of not only technical talent but of their natural political and social leaders as well.

As we celebrate this June the 20th anniversary of the Marshall Plan, I believe the industrialized nations of the world must renew their determination to provide aid at the level that it is needed.

I say the World Bank is right. According to present rates of economic growth, the foreign aid contribution of developed countries could well be doubled.

As we look toward the next decade, we should not exclude the possibility that the Soviet Union and Eastern European countries can cooperate in carrying this burden.

The participation of the Soviet Union in the World Bank's consortia for India and Pakistan would be a welcomed first-step—which could lead to broader participation in the future.

If we are to meet this challenge in all its aspects, we must strengthen every economic institution we have—and develop new ones if need be. If our existing financial and development institutions—all formed two decades ago with the establishment of the United Nations—need to be supplemented or modified, we should not hesitate to do so.

To make the moral weight of the Church felt at the grassroots level, the Pope established in January of this year a Papal Commission on Justice and Peace.

Working with parallel national secretariats, and cooperating closely with the World Council of Churches, the Commission on Justice and Peace can do much to mobilize public support for the development of efforts ahead.

We know that basic social injustices will be corrected—whether the race problem in our nation, or the poverty problem in our world—*only* when public opinion has been aroused. Our experience has shown that justice has triumphed over injustice . . . the conscience of the present over the memory of the past, only after men and women of conscience formed in a Judeo-Christian tradition took their convictions seriously and translated them into action.

Closing the gap between rich and poor is not something to be achieved in a period of months or even years. We must avoid becoming what the poet Meredith called "too soon despairers." But we must close that gap—not just because it is in our own interest, not just because of the Communist challenge—but as President Kennedy said in his inaugural message: "Because it is right."

Finally, may I add this: We should be careful not to confuse a recognition of the moral unity and interdependence of mankind with the political messianism of a nation, class or race.

Our acceptance of the obligation to help the poor does not mean that we have either the obligation or intention to impose our political and social institutions on other countries or continents.

Our recognition of our responsibility carries with it no claim that power and virtue are synonomous, that the power of the most powerful must be harnessed to spread one version of virtue. It does not imply that any one nation can claim to be the engine that makes the moral universe go around.

It is the task of both the graduation class of 1967 and of our generation to convince the legislatures and the executives—of all developed nations—that moral imperatives as well as physical security require a substantial commitment to long-range economic and technical assistance to the developing nations of the world.

"Development *is* the new name for peace."

All men profess to seek peace. But peace is like a flower—it needs fertile soil in which to grow. It cannot grow in the rocks of bitterness and poverty, in the dry sands of backwardness and despair. It needs the fertile soil of education and food, and of health and hope.

The pursuit of peace resembles the building of a great cathedral. It is the work of generations. In concept it requires a master architect; in execution, the labors of many.

The pursuit of peace requires time—but we must use time as a tool and not as a crutch.

It is our task today, and it will be yours tomorrow, to bring men closer to the day when social justice for *all* is no longer a dream but a reality, all over this world.

Labor's Ally for 70 Years

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1967

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, the Jewish Daily Forward has been for generations one of the great American Newspapers. Founded 70 years ago, when immigrants flooded into America by the millions, this unusual newspaper helped Jewish people learn about their new country.

J. C. Rich, editor of the Hat Worker, weekly publication of the United Hatters, Cap and Millinery Workers, has also been on the editorial staff of the Jewish Daily Forward since 1922. In an article in the May issue of the American Federationist, monthly magazine published by the AFL–CIO, he observes that the paper was also a strong friend of struggling unions in New York's needle trades at the turn of the century.

Mr. Rich's story is of historic interest, Mr. President, and I therefore ask unanimous consent that it be reprinted in the RECORD.

FORWARD: LABOR'S ALLY FOR 70 YEARS

(By J. C. Rich)

The Jewish Daily Forward, 70 years old this year, has always cherished its labor credentials as its most valued asset. It began life on an issue of trade union allegiance and has maintained its close bond with labor through all the years of its existence.

This association consisted not merely of generally sympathetic leanings. Beyond all other libertarian strivings was the Forward's own direct, intimate and intense involvement with the cause of labor. The Forward is well-known in the labor movement as spokesman and protagonist of the apparel trades unions. What is less well-known, perhaps, is that it came into being in defense against an assault on the former American Federation of Labor by a coterie of leftwing fanatics grouped in the Socialist Labor Party of those days. Insufficiently defined also is its opposition to the International Workers of the World in the decade or two after its founding and, finally, the Forward's victorious struggle with the communists in recent decades in their effort to capture the needle trades unions and obtain leverage for dominance over the entire labor movement.

Beyond its immediate sphere of the garment unions, the Forward also mobilized the Jewish populace of the United States and Canada in behalf of labor's major struggles. In the strikes of coal miners, steel workers, textile workers and in other of labor's ordeals, the Forward contributed not alone its own fund but also aligned the entire Jewish community in and of the beleaguered strikers.

It is sometimes difficult for trade unionists to comprehend what a vital role the Forward played in the genesis and growth of the apparel trades unions. This total involvement with the cause of the workers was demonstrated in dramatic fashion in each of the huge strikes that brought the garment unions into being during the second decade of this century.

The first was the "uprising" of the shirtwaist makers in 1909–1910, an almost spontaneous explosion of some 20,000 workers, most of them young Jewish girls. Aside from agitational news stories and feature articles in the Forward, there had been no preparation for the strike that broke out toward the end of 1909 in the New York shirtwaist and "empress" dress shops. Unionists in the Forward camp maintained a moribund Local 25 of shirtwaist workers and had arranged a mass meeting in Cooper Union to simulate interest in the union and drum up sentiment for a possible strike. Chairman of the meeting was Benjamin Feigenbaum, a noted writer on the staff of the Forward. A featured speaker was Samuel Gompers, who came to demonstrate the solidarity of organized labor with the cause of the waistmakers.

It was at this meeting that a girl rose impatiently after many speeches and cried out in Yiddish, "Enough talk! I propose we strike now!"

The entire audience was galvanized by the call and the girl's motion was seconded. Moved beyond all caution and temerity, the chairman, Feigenbaum, called to the audience: "Do you mean it? If you do, then take this ancient Jewish oath: 'If I turn traitor to the cause I now pledge, may this hand wither from the arm I now raise.' "

The date was November 22, 1909. The strike was on and was to continue through a long, bitter winter against enormous odds. The girls got considerable attention and even more sympathy from well-meaning matrons in the women's suffrage movement, but strike relief in the form of bread, medical care and rent money came in response to appeals in the Forward.

Less than a half-year after the end of the waist-makers' strike came the "Revolt of the 50,000," the cloakmakers in New York's apparel industry. Unlike the first strike, this one was well-planned and well-staffed. Workers had been signed up in large numbers during the weeks preceding the strike, meeting halls had been rented, committees were appointed in advance for picketing, relief gathering, speaking arrangements—and, most important, for soup kitchens for needy strikers. With characteristic energy, Benjamin Schlesinger, at the time business manager of the Forward, took charge of strike operations and became president of the Internataional Ladies' Garment Workers Union after the strike.

An account of strike expenditures remains of that famous cloakmakers' struggle. Of $246,000 raised during the three months of the strike in the summer of 1910——an enormous sum for that time—$62,000 came from readers of the Forward in response to its appeals for strike aid.

In 1913 came the general strike of the men's clothing workers in New York, another mass upheaval of needle trades workers. It was backed by the Amalgamated Clothing Workers and supported with direct aid from the Forward in the form of money, manpower, full press coverage and even the operation of a soup kitchen.

The cap makers, millinery workers, fur workers, fancy leather goods workers and thousands of other workers found support in the Forward and stimulation without stint for their trade union activity.

The Forward came into being in 1897 in a ferment of conflicting ideologies. Then, as now, there were men who sought shortcuts to Utopia. The dictatorship of the few on the premise that it would benefit the many was a novel idea in the radical circles of the time, yet in effect it held dominance among them. Indeed, long before there were bolsheviks, the idea that all power must be vested in an elite group of radicals was already being advocated as a matter of right and of humanistic prerogative.

The anarchists fought it out with the socialists as the two chief contenders in the immigrant community of New York City at the turn of the century. Among the anarchists there were pockets of internal dispute as there were among the socialists. Single tax advocates of the Henry George School added populist flavor to the ideological brew. The Knights of Labor were on the decline, but still maintained vestigial unions here and there. The American Federation of Labor was rapidly supplanting the Knights, but suddenly found itself under attack from a source from which it never anticipated hostility—the socialists.

In addition to such ideological contentions, the economic and political climate of the time was one of hashness in the midst of depraved corruption and debasement in most cities, particularly in New York.

All industry in the United States was one huge sweatshop before the development of unions, but the apparel trades surpassed all others in the poverty, exploitation and indignity forced on its victims.

The young Jewish people who had torn up roots abroad in the expectation of finding justice and security in the new world found thelves thwarted and defeated at every turn. Tenement housing and general poverty were not the worst of their afflictions. These forms of disadvantage they had known all their youth and they managed to adjust to it in this country. What really rankled was the lack of justice and equality in a land that had been represented as the haven of liberty.

Wages were low and hours were long in the sweatshops and that was bad enough. But this became intolerable when added to it were the intimidation and indignity heaped on sweatshop inmates by master, foreman and strawboss. Shouted commands and physical assaults were ordinary measures of authority and discipline exercised by sweatshop owners who themselves were harried beyond endurance by the competitive stresses of the sweatshop economy.

As for the political venality that prevailed in those days, it was pervasive and flagrant in New York City. Present-day racketeering is mild by comparison with the rampant criminality of the period. The courts, the police, every agency of government was debauched by graft and rascality. The East Side of New York—to which Jewish arrivals from abroad thronged for their first homes—had become the red-light district under Tammany protection. Young girls suffering the poverty and drudgery of the sweatshop became the special prey of those who fattened on the profits of vice.

It was this boundless depravity of the governmental, economic and social environment that the Forward was committed to cleanse and regenerate.

An agonizing handicap rarely mentioned in connection with the hardships of the early immigrant days was the dreadful loneliness of the new arrivals in this country. These immigrants were mainly young people whom misery and injustice had driven out of their homes and familiar associations. Now, in the new land, the bewilderment of foreign environment and the longing for family and near ones were added tribulations. These harrassed and distressed people became an eager audience for a newspaper which spoke their language and understood their problems.

The spark that gave birth to the Forward was a revolt against the dictatorial rule that had fastened itself on the American socialist movement toward the end of the last century. The passage of time has dulled the edge of that conflict, but while it lasted it was as cathartic and as decisive as the one with the communists in which the Forward became engaged 30 years later.

In the 1890's, as in the 1920's, the war was an ideological one, but the battlefront was on the field of trade unionism. At that time, the leader of the then Socialist Labor Party was Daniel De Leon. He was a native of Curacao, a member of a wealthy family and had come to Columbia University to do graduate work. He was attracted to the Single Tax movement of Henry George and moved by rapid stages into socialist activity. Veterans still recall him as a man of considerable personal magnetism, forceful in manner and speech. His academic schooling and general knowledge made him one to look up to in the immigrant community. His presence flattered the members of the Socialist Labor branches on the East Side, a membership whose Jewish complement soon outnumbered the German socialists. An aura of superior attainments enveloped this leader, so excesses that would not have been tolerated in anyone else where condoned in De Leon.

De Leon, however, could not brook any sort of opposition or even criticism. This intolerance came to a head on the issue of trade unionism. A union that was not socialist and subservient to his direction was of not use to him. He had no compunction about destroying it, even if he had to send his disciples to act as strikebreakers.

In the period just before the founding of the Forward, the Knights of Labor were already on the decline but several of the early Jewish unions were still affiliated with it. De Leon had tried to infiltrate the rising American Federation of Labor but was thwarted by Samuel Gompers. Thereupon De Leon cast his lots with the Knights and tried to take over its national office in 1895. Defeated in this attempt, he created an independent labor federation, the Socialist Trade and Labor Alliance, in opposition to both the Knights and the AFL.

By that time, a Yiddish labor daily, the Ovend Blatt ("Evening Journal") was already in existence. Under De Leon's auspices, it was steeped in radical dogma and had a puny circulation. The one man who might have biven it vigorous editorial direction refused to assume the task. He was Abraham Cahan who later, as editor of the Forward, demonstrated creative genius as journalist, mentor and guide of the Jewish immigrant community in America.

The break came when De Leon attempted to force branches of the Socialist Labor Party to act as strikebreaking agencies against the AFL. To the Jewish workers this violation of union principle was unspeakable sacrilege and they refused to engage in strikebreaking. Finally, in January of 1897, De Leon's opponents felt sufficiently supported within the party to challenge his adherents, when an administrative committee was to be elected for the party's newspaper. At a long and exhausting meeting as riddled with parliamentary obstructions as any the communists invented in later days, the De Leonites were declared the winners by a vote of 50 to 48. Thereupon, 52 delegates broke away from the meeting and created a Press Federation of their own.

Three months of mass meetings and fundraising followed and in April the anti-De Leon, anti-dogmatic, anti-strikebreaking group had raised enough money to begin publishing a new labor daily in the Yiddish language. It was called Forverts ("Forward"), a not altogether idiomatic word in the Yiddish vernacular. The name was chosén when one of the active comrades argued that the most successful socialist daily in the world, the Vowarts of Berlin, bore that name. No one could gainsay the charm of that kind of appellation after that and Forverts it is to this day. The first issue of the paper appeared April 22, 1897.

Under Cahan's direction, the Forward became an organ of extraordinary power and persuasion. The Jewish immigrants who came to these shores in wave upon wave found in the Forward an instrument of education and enlightenment such as they had never known before. The paper brought them knowledge of the American nation and the modes and customs of the new way of life. It taught them an awareness of their dignity as human beings and their right to just treatment as working people.

While Cahan insisted on simple, lucid language and clarity of expression in the reading matter of the paper, he also insisted on the highest standards of literary merit in the serious works he offered the readers. Thus practically every master of modern Yiddish found ready acceptance in the Forward and most of them were on the weekly salaried list of the paper. It was as if an American newspaper had maintained Edgar Allen Poe, Stephen Crane, Theodore Dreiser and Mark Twain on its salaried staff during the days of their trial and hardship.

A number of these Yiddish literary lights are known in translation to English readers. Sholem Asch was one of them. Another was the late I. J. Singer, author of "The Brothers Ashkenazi." His brother, Isaac Bashevis Singer, whose most recent work, "In My Father's Court," has won wide acclaim in English, has an extraordinary literary work of merit, "The Certificate," now running serially in the Forward. Elie Weisel, author of "Gates of the Forest" and "Silent Jews," is on the staff of the Forward and published these works in Yiddish in the Forward in advance of their English, Hebrew and French translations.

Abraham Cahan died in 1951, but the tradition he established persists. It was carried on by his successor, Harry (Hillel) Rogoff, who for many years had been Cahan's managing editor and chief aide, and by Dr. Lazar Fogelman, who became managing editor under Rogoff. The present managing editor is Morris Crystal.

Ownership of the Forward is vested in a group of volunteers of the same labor orientation and the same social environment as those who founded the Forward. This group, about 100 in number at present, derives no profit from the paper and acts in much the same manner as the board of overseers of a college or the corporation of a social service institution.

The Forward to this day is a public institution devoted to the public good: It rejects sterile doctrine and daily renews the task of education and enlightenment which it assumed 70 years ago as its own commitment to the American democracy.

The Tragic Occupation of Lithuania

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1967

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, the week of June 12–16 again commemorates the tragic occupation of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia by the Soviet Union. Since June 15, 1940, when these nations were taken over by force of arms, they have suffered the terrors and anguish of slavery and captivity.

House Concurrent Resolution 416, which calls for freedom for Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, was adopted unanimously by the House in June 1965, and by the Senate in October 1966. Though this was a step in the right direction, it is not enough. We must now direct our efforts to carrying out the provisions of the resolution and effecting by peaceful means the withdrawal of Communist control over these brave countries, so they may be assured of the freedom and independence which are rightfully theirs.

Richard Gardner Proposes New Marshall Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 1967

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the 20th anniversary of the Marshall plan, which rebuilt war-torn Europe after the Second World War, is being celebrated this year.

One of the most constructive proposals for marking this occasion was put forth by former Deputy Assistant Secretary of State Richard N. Gardner, now professor of law and international organization at Columbia University, in his June 3 New York Times article.

As I believe Mr. Gardner's thought-provoking proposal deserves serious consideration by Members of the House, I include it herewith:

TIME FOR A NEW MARSHALL PLAN

(By Richard N. Gardner)

In this decade of the 1960's—a decade hopefully designated as the "Decade of Development" by the United Nations—the average annual increase in gross national product of the poor countries has been little more than 4 per cent. With rates of population growth in most countries averaging 2 or 3 per cent, there has been only a 1 or 2 per cent annual increase in individual living standards. Indeed, the average rate of increase in per capita income in the 1960's has actually been lower than in the decade of the 1950's.

NEW LEVEL OF EFFORT

To turn the tide, we need new forms of international cooperation and an entirely new level of effort on the part of *both* developed and less developed countries. The efforts of rich and poor countries alike are now grossly inadequate when measured against the problem to be solved—the achievement of standards of living in the less developed countries compatible with minimum human dignity.

Next Monday, June 5, is the twentieth anniversary of General Marshall's famous commencement speech at Harvard which launched the Marshall Plan. It is an appropriate time for the country which took this great initiative and the countries which were its principal beneficiaries to launch a new Marshall Plan for the benefit of the less developed countries.

The United Nations and other bodies have recommended an aid effort by the developed countries equivalent to 1 per cent of their gross national product. Despite rapid economic growth in the industrialized countries during the past few years, their foreign aid efforts have not expanded; thus, according to U.N. estimates, foreign aid as a proportion of G.N.P. has slipped from 0.83 per cent in 1961 to 0.69 per cent in 1965. This trend can and must be reversed.

The heads of state of the Western industrialized countries should meet at the earliest opportunity to chart a program of steady escalation of their foreign-aid efforts. The objectives should mean a doubling of the total foreign-aid effort of the United States and other countries, taking into account present rates of economic growth.

So far as possible this increased assistance should be made available through multilateral institutions or pursuant to multilateral arrangements such as the World Bank consortia.

As cold war tensions diminish, increasing efforts should be made to involve the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe in sharing the burden of economic aid. Development should be cooperative, not a competitive enterprise. The objective may not be realizable immediately in all parts of the world. But we can move toward it on a case-by-case basis. As a beginning, we might ask the Soviet Union to associate itself with the work of the World Bank consortium for India.

As an integral part of a new Marshall Plan, the industrialized countries should fashion a new trade policy toward the less developed world. The Kennedy Round helped reduce trade barriers among the rich, but produced very little in the way of practical results for the poor.

ONE-WAY FREE TRADE

The United States, in association with as many other industrialized countries as possible, should put into effect, in stages over the next twenty years, a policy of one-way free trade in favor of the less developed countries.

The old Marshall Plan succeeded because its beneficiaries carried out firm commitments to help themselves. In a new Marshall Plan, increased efforts of self-help must also balance increased efforts of aid and trade.

In return for a new level of effort by the rich, there must be a new level of effort by the poor to redistribute the land, to tax privileged classes, encourage competitive enterprises, and reduce waste and corruption in government service. And the poor countries must finally face the long-neglected problems of food production and population growth.

MONETARY REFORM

This program of accelerated trade, aid and self-help is unlikely to succeed without progress toward monetary reform. Eventually, we may have to link liquidity creation and development aid, employing national currencies paid in exchange for new monetary units for long-term lending in the less developed world. Until such a system is worked out, new devices will have to be found to protect the balance of payments positions of those rich countries that are bearing special aid and trade responsibilities for the poor.

Remarks of Commissioner George H. Hearn, of the Federal Maritime Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1967

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, on May 20, Commissioner George H. Hearn, of the Federal Maritime Commission, addressed the U.S. Propeller Club of the Port of Miami in Florida on the occassion of the national observance of Maritime Day. He addressed himself to one particular facet of the maritime industry, the provision of the Shipping Act of 1916 which allows carriers to enter into various anticompetitive arrangements with each other. His speech is very interesting and informative, and I recommend it to all interested Members.

The speech follows:

REMARKS OF COMMISSIONER GEORGE H. HEARN OF THE FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION, BEFORE THE U.S. PROPELLER CLUB OF THE PORT OF MIAMI, FLA., MAY 20, 1967

I am delighted to be here to address you on the occasion of the national observance of Maritime Day. As many of you know, I have had the opportunity to inspect and observe your great port, including Dodge Island, several months ago when I appeared here to discuss the recently enacted Public Law 89–777 commonly known as the Cruise Legislation Act, and the Commission's rules implementing it.

All over this great land of ours on this Maritime Day, public officials and representatives of industry, labor and commerce are addressing themselves to the present maritime situation and putting forth their solutions to the problem. I do not have the promotional responsibility of the American Merchant Marine and I leave to them the function of announcing their various positions. However, as a citizen who is deeply interested in the American Merchant Marine attaining the position of being the finest in the world, it is timely to acknowledge the merchant marine affiliated industries and the posture of our sea-faring men.

President Johnson acknowledged the importance of maritime endeavors when he said:

"International commerce and the ships which make it possible have contributed immeasurably to America's greatness. The sea and ships are an integral part of this country's past, present and future."

Shipbuilding and ship operating are very expensive undertakings in our country. Each of these endeavors, however is extremely important to our national well-being. When our shipbuilders and our ship operators compete with their much less costly counterparts in foreign lands in my opinion they are competing with much less valuable ships and services, whose nations have more limited goals. Our own builders and operators are second to none in the world. They are entitled to fair rates on their investments. No one in this country can carp with the comparatively meager dividends associated with shipbuilding and ship operating investments, vis-a-vis other commercial ventures. Each of these endeavors requires enormous capital investment. Each suffers more acutely from economic turmoil than do most domestic commercial undertakings. A vessel, for example with an economic life of about 20 years engaging in world trade subjects itself, in addition to economic fluctuations, to international political problems including trade and flag restrictions, the hazards of the elements and acts of God.

American terminal operations also are more expensive than their foreign counterparts. American terminals are constantly being brought up to date at considerable expense and the cost of operating terminals is also higher in this country than in others. But here in America where our standard of living is the envy of the world we must expect that these terminal operations will be substantially more costly than they are in less affluent ports around the globe.

American seamen, likewise, represent a national investment which we can ill afford to lose. All too often we hear how grandly they are compensated. All too often, however, their compensation is compared, to that of their foreign counter-parts—not to that of the white collar or blue collar workers in our own country. You and I know that American seamen possess special skills. We all know of the rigors of their lives and we are all aware, I hope, of the economic opportunities which are ever increasing shore side. I, for one on this Maritime Day, wish to salute those American seamen who are willing to serve our nation by foregoing, for long periods on end, the fruits of our American high standard of living here at home. I wonder how many of us would trade places with them. They enjoy the company of their families only sporadically, they are on call twenty four hours per day, and they are often imperiled by the elements. Let me assure you, that it is no longer fashionable to stroll on many of the port streets in other lands. American seamen in foreign lands are exposed to health dangers that are unknown to us here at home and orderly police protection in many lands does not approach that which we enjoy here.

This evening, however, I am going to take the opportunity to state for the record an area of shipping regulation that is a matter of serious concern to me.

We have a national business policy—an antitrust policy which, as the keystone of our business life, has served us well. Indeed, the Sherman Act has been referred to as our "Charter of Economic Freedom." Few will doubt that our antitrust policy has stimulated competition which in turn has triggered that business way of life which has caused man to "Build a Better Mousetrap." Indeed, our American initiative spurred on by the challenge and response theory, to borrow the sociologists' phrase, has spawned productivity of such magnitude and excellence, that we enjoy a standard of living hitherto unknown in the history of mankind. We are all aware, I am sure, that our friends across the sea have not subscribed, at least so religiously, to such a way of business life.

A great exception to our national antitrust policy, however, is contained in the heart of the Shipping Act of 1916. Through Section 15 of that Act carriers are allowed to enter into several species of anti-competitive arrangements with each other on condition that such arrangements are given prior approval by that Agency of our Government which administers the Shipping Act. That Agency is now the Federal Maritime Commission.

At the present time, concerted action by carriers in our foreign trades has become a way of life, and Section 15 agreements are becoming more and more sophisticated. They run the gamut from mere rate fixing associations to all pervasive pools. So complex has the system become, that on a single voyage, a vessel may be sailing under the aegis of a half dozen conferences, and at least three of our American Flag lines are members of thirty or more rate fixing combines. You will note that I have not included the many agreements between terminal operators or freight forwarders.

I think we should all be concerned about the entire spectrum of concerted action agreements, not merely because they represent a departure from our traditional way of doing business, but because, in the case of carriers, vis-a-vis shippers, they necessarily tend to create a seller's or carrier's market. In a word, they tend to give an advantage to a carrier in his dealings with a shipper. This is especially true in those trades where the shipper does not have the alternative of a dependable non-conference service.

Now, I want it made perfectly clear that I am not anti-conference, I am sure that, by and large, the conference system does, or should be able to, make a substantial contribution to the development of our foreign commerce. But I want it made equally clear that I view Section 15 approval as a license, and that the granting of the license must clearly serve our public interest. Section 15 approval, once granted, cannot lightly be taken away, but nevertheless it can be taken away. I submit that it should never be casually granted. And the more anti-competitive the device for which approval is sought, the more carefully must we determine whether it serves our public interest.

In every regulated business, monopolies or quasi-monopolies are countenanced on the premise that their existence is necessary for the benefit of the public. Utility companies, transit companies, and even taxi cabs fall into this category. Yet no one denies that the franchises of such entepreneurs require countervailing safeguards administered by public bodies. So too, in my opinion, it must be where quasi-monopolies in the ocean transportation world are permitted. Obviously, the overwhelming share of our international trade is carried by vessels, and a predominant number of these vessels are devoted to our extremely important liner or general cargo trades, and the vast majority of these liners are banded together, lawfully, into rate setting or price fixing conferences. It is unthinkable, I contend, that in the 20th Century, reasonable men would suggest that quasi-monopolies should exist without a public body's surveillance. In a word, the international commerce of the United States is far too important a matter to be placed, unbridled, into the hands of laissez faire business combines.

The plain facts are that our economy is freer than that of most of the international community; that our government policy, in international shipping, involves less home flag preference than does theirs; and most importantly, many nations, in this hemisphere and abroad, have taken steps not only to protect and enhance their own international commerce, but have promulgated rules and regulations regarding the vessels on which commercial cargo must be carried. In the final analysis, the Shipping Act, as an expression of Congress pursuant to a constitutional grant, is designed for the protection and growth of our foreign commerce. Simply expressed the situation is this: our foreign commerce is open to all, and all those who wish to participate in it do so under the ground rules that the Congress has laid down. Among those ground rules is the Shipping Act, which is administered by the Federal Maritime Commission. Carriers are free to engage or not to engage in our foreign commerce, but once having freely elected to participate in our trade they necessarily assume the obligations, as well as the benefits, which, under law is a condition of such participation.

I trust that I have made the point that the orderly, efficient and economic flow of our international export and import commerce is of prime concern to the Federal Maritime Commission: that carriers of all nations and conferences are welcome to participate in our trades, while observing the spirit of the Shipping Act, and that the Commission intends to use its powers, without fear or favor, without reckless or timidity, in meeting its public obligation.

In conclusion I compliment this port and the men who had the foresight to build it and the men whose expertise makes it operate. I want you all to do your utmost to think of a better way, a more competitive way, a less expensive way, to get your jobs done so that our own economy will continue to grow, so that we shall be able to meet our international commitments, so that we may be able to continue to assist friendly nations, and more importantly so that we might attain the "Great Society" which is within our reach.

I thank you.

An Excellent Book on Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD M. FRASER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 12, 1967

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, perhaps the greatest tragedy of our recurring foreign aid debates is our failure to spend more time reviewing our aid philosophy and the means of achieving the goals implicit in that philosophy. When the debate centers on dollar figures and the failure of aid recipients to show the required gratitude to the United States, we do ourselves and our Nation a disservice. The United States is going to live a long time in a worldwide community of nations. We cannot isolate ourselves from one another. Our aid programs represent one of the positive, constructive elements in these growing relationships among nations. We need to examine with more care how these aid programs are working, and subject our premises to continuing review.

An illuminating review of a first-rate book helps put us on the track. A recent book by Jacob Kaplan entitled "The Challenge of Foreign Aid" is a highly readable account of our aid programs and some of the dilemmas in which we find ourselves. Hans Landsberg reviews the book in the June 15 issue of the Reporter magazine. Because I agree so fully with the reviewer's comments, I insert the full review in the RECORD:

THE AID PROBLEM

(By Hans Landsberg)

"The Challenge of Foreign Aid," by Jacob J. Kaplan. Praeger. $8.50.

I have two quarrels with this latest and most useful discussion of foreign aid. The first concerns its conventional title, which may keep it out of the hands of those who would profit most from even a selective reading of the text—that is, those who consider the subject exhausted. The second is the heading of the introduction, "Why are we suddenly so fatigued?" which the author has borrowed from a remark made by President Kennedy in what turned out to be his last press conference. The fact is that even then we had been working ourselves into a state of chronic fatigue for many years.

While I am in substantial agreement with the reasons given for the fatigue, I suspect that the biggest one, which gets little if any publicity, is that public debate, associated almost solely with the annual Congressional review and appropriation, has tended to focus on the amount and on little else, unless one wants to include juicy failures or misdeeds. Yet the level of foreign aid is at once the most elusive and, within limits, the least crucial feature of the whole undertaking. We can have a good program at two, three, or four billion dollars, a bad one at ten, and vice versa. But one thing we cannot have is a debate on figures detached from specific purposes. Most of the public debate even today runs from statements that developed countries should set aside at least one per cent of their gross national produce for foreign aid to complaints that the United States cannot afford year after year to throw several billion dollars to people who cannot manage their own affairs—observations that are met with wails from the administration that any cut will ruin the program, though no proof of ruin has ever been successfully adduced. Who would not be fatigued in that atmosphere?

One of the few things that Kaplan mercifully leaves alone, because he knows better, is precisely this numbers game (he touches lightly and usefully on it in his chapter on burden-sharing). He has compiled a history of U.S. foreign aid, presented under appropriate subject headings rather than by chronology, and a critique of our foreign-aid policies. Both are rendered readable as well as intelligible by the author's ability to draw on concrete examples that come to him from his own long involvement with the program. There are few pages that do not contain a reference to Pakistan or Nigeria or Turkey or some other aid recipient to illustrate a point, more often than not in a successful attempt to demolish a myth or at least put it in proper perspective. Thus we are neither preached at nor flattened by mute masses of statistics. Instead we are treated to a dispassionate exposition of objectives and policies and to a trenchant evaluation of their worth and meaning, with a minimal use of professional jargon.

Nonetheless, no new book on foreign aid is justified unless it presents a new point of view, or at least a new wrinkle here and there. Kaplan's book qualifies easily. I would perhaps single out his treatment of what he calls the "economic development syndrome." Both philosophically and practically, he deplores the elevation of economic development to first rank among U.S. foreign-aid objectives, an event that he dates to 1961, the first of the Kennedy aid programs. He contends that it was then that both social and political development took second place, at least as goals, and he offers persuasive arguments in support of his thesis.

Economic development, Kaplan points out, has a number of aspects that recommend it as an objective to the foreign-aid policymaker. Above all, it can be made the subject of a "plan," detailed both in amounts and in timing, its progress measurable in terms of percentage increases in gross national product. By the same token, it can have a date of termination of aid.

The author deserves credit for looking beyond the simple notion that in the wake of economic development the recipient countries would reap social and political maturity and all the other attributes of stability that would make them viable allies.

"In the developing world," he comments, "an accelerated rate of economic growth is more likely to shake traditional value patterns to their core. New institutions and value systems will have to evolve to replace the old, and their character is at best highly unpredictable. Deviation from Western norms, not conformity to them, is more likely to result from imposing advanced technology and modern systems of production on the traditions of the less developed world. Moreover, a high rate of economic progress, achieved at considerable cost to the political and social stability of nations, may encourage and facilitate international adventures and jeopardize the peace."

Political turmoil in Nigeria, long picked as a showcase of success for U.S. foreign aid, and recent events in Greece vividly illuminate Kaplan's doubts on the score of economic development as the goal from which all other blessings will flow. Few countries can match Greece in growth of gross national product.

In reality, the author freely admits, the priority system is often ignored. Pakistan, which in recent years has had a fine growth record, should have found it easy to obtain badly needed aid funds in mid-1965, but its friendliness toward Communist China and its involvement in the Kashmir conflict proved stronger deterrents than a laudable economic performance could offset. What is at stake, therefore, is above all the unfortunate rationale of the program, the exposure to criticism when achievements fall short of goals, and above all, the illusory promise of automatic "compound" growth and release from foreign-aid ties as predictable certainties in the near future.

What Kaplan suggests is not a return to the gimmickry of the 1950's, when the foreign-aid program became encrusted with a multitude of objectives and policies, convenient as these were for accommodating different countries and awarding them aid without the total having to be justified under a single heading, and useful as they were in avoiding Congressional idiosyncrasies that developed from year to year. Instead, he argues for the association of economic development with equally significant—and sometimes perhaps even more significant—objectives in the social and political field. But here a long-term perspective is required of the sort granted to authors but rarely to legislators. The goal may be "nation building," for example, without which every economic development may remain an illusory objective. In such an effort, Kaplan observes, enterprises normally denounced as showpieces and therefore as wasteful uses of U.S. funds (stadiums, parks, palaces) may be fully justified. It is a useful thought, but it presupposes an educational effort of truly heroic proportions to drive home a point like this to men having jurisdiction over the expenditure of tax funds.

The point is of special interest because elsewhere Kaplan suggests that in the future, administration aid proposals should force Congress to approve programs that are cast in general aid categories but are also specific in terms of country allocations. (Ever since the beginning of the aid programs, administrations have submitted to Congress such data as "illustrative" only, in order to be able to adjust to changing conditions and to keep lobbying to a minimum.) If Congress were to have its say on the country allocation, it would do less sniping from the sidelines. It is only fair to add that this suggestion is rooted in Kaplan's belief that Congressional performance could not be much worst than it is now, so that little would be risked—an arguable point.

There are other portions of bright originality and commendable directness. Kaplan's discussion of the gimmick of "self-help" and the difficulties of defining such efforts in practice; his point that the *conditions* of granting aid are far less important than the measure of *influence* the aid-giving country can gain in the recipient country, in terms of being listened to and becoming a partner in the national debate at a useful governmental level; his dissection of the enduring interests of the United States in foreign aid—these are all subjects that need ventilation. If there is one regret it is that, although Kaplan's background in agricultural economics would have fitted him admirably for an intelligent discussion of what self-help means in the field of agriculture now that it has been made one of the formal conditions of food-for-peace shipments, he has failed to deal with the problem. And yet it may lead, especially in India, to sharp misunderstandings of the donor's interest and the recipient's capacity. One would have liked to watch Kaplan cut through the mystique and come to grips with the substance of this question, as he does throughout this intelligent man's guide to foreign aid.

The Middle East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1967

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, tensions in the Middle East, which burst forth last week in bloody battle, have begun to ease. Much of the credit for the cease-fire that has taken hold goes to the United Nations for its untiring efforts to restore peace.

However, it is plain to see that the President and his administration, through a firm and concise international policy, bolstered the U.N.'s efforts to bring about a truce between Israel and the Arab nations.

In his Sunday column in the Washington Post, Joseph Kraft has set forth his assessment of the President's action in this current crisis. I believe the report is an excellent narrative on the effects of the President's stand on the Middle East crisis, and I commend the article to the attention of my colleagues:

Air's a Little Clearer—Middle East Has Had Side Effect of Giving Washington an Easier Outlook on World

(By Joseph Kraft)

There is still Vietnam. But after Sinai and Aqaba, after Jerusalem and the hot line, is it the same Vietnam? No elixir has been distilled in the Middle East which can dissolve the obstinate solid of war on the other side of the world. But politically and psychologically, in ways easier to feel than to describe, the denouement in the Middle East has fostered in Washington a change of tone, an easier outlook on the world at large.

For one thing, the President has achieved a striking political success. Maybe he didn't head off a war in the Middle East, but he did something harder. He contained it in a way that preserves the most important American interests abroad while advancing the fortunes of his Administration at home.

The administration is embattled no more. The lie has been given in the most dramatic way to the charge that the President hankers for the role of global policeman. Even on Vietnam, no one here wants to hear, let along start up again, the old arguments. Thanks to the impact of the Middle East crisis, in other words, the President has far more room for maneuver on Vietnam.

Similarly with his most immediate advisers. For years they have been locked in adversary proceedings with harsh critics on the narrow range of well-worn issues generated by the Vietnamese war. Out of loyalty and a sense of logical consistency, they have had to suppress doubts and misgivings.

But the Middle Eastern crisis provided a new field for a kind of rerun. Officials, for once, were vouchsafed a semi-indulgence in the columnists' luxury of being wise after the event. The Middle East offered in an innocuous way a chance to bring to the surface suppressed feelings about Vietnam.

Consider, for example, the proposal that the maritime nations, including the United States, run the blockade of Aqaba which the Egyptians seemed to be imposing in the first days of the crisis. Even at this date, it is not clear that that proposal was not the preferred course. It might have averted the war.

But within the Administration, only one high-level official was enthusiastically for the project. And he was the one official closely involved in the Middle Eastern crisis who had had no part in the slow process by which the United States was drawn into the Vietnamese war. He was the new Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs, Eugene Rostow.

Everybody else in town brought to bear on the blockade proposal doubts which had a clear relevance to experience in Vietnam. Thus the White House and the great majority of Congress were prepared to run the blockade only when and if the United States was joined by a large number of other countries.

Secretary of State Dean Rusk, a seeming miracle of prolific fertility when it comes to finding American commitments to Vietnam, could find no obligation for this country to run the blockade. Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara and his aides, so unwary in the first stages of Vietnam, poured on the blockade-running project a barrage of withering criticism which practically killed it.

For all these officials, in other words, the Middle Eastern crisis offered an opportunity to blow cold instead of hot. Rightly or wrongly, many made the most of it. It will be that much easier to be flexible in the future.

The more so as there has been traced out in the Middle Eastern crisis a dim track for flexible dealing with the Soviet Union. The new duopoly, as I have called this dim track, does not require that each superpower try to impose rigid control over countries that will no longer be satellites or client states. It requires instead that the Big Two create a framework of understanding which permits free play to local forces in a way that does not endanger the rest of the world.

In every local particular, to be sure, Vietnam is different from the Middle East. But in both places, there is the joint Soviet-American interest in averting wider war Thus there is scope for the application of the duopoly arrangement. And in Washington, at least, the mood is favorable.

The Rotten Fruits of Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 17, 1967

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, an editorial from the Chicago Tribune of June 6 eloquently illustrates the folly of our foreign aid program. Under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including this editorial:

THE ROTTEN FRUITS OF FOREIGN AID

Whatever comes of the tragic flareup in the middle east, the implications are almost sure to be unhappy for the United States. And not the least of these is that once again military equipment which we have supplied to one country is being used against military equipment which we have supplied to another, this time in—of all places—the holy city of Jerusalem.

The fighting in Jerusalem is between Israel, which occupies part of the city, and Jordan, which occupies the remainder of it and most of its suburbs. To Israel we have given 27.6 million dollars in military aid, mostly for tanks, presumably to discourage an attack from Egypt or Syria. To Jordan we have given 66 million dollars in military aid in the hope of keeping Jordan out of the clutches of Nasserism.

On both counts, our effort has been in vain. Israel is at war with Egypt and Syria, and it doesn't matter, in this connection, who started it. Meanwhile King Hussein of Jordan has been unable to resist pan-Arab emotionalism, and his troops have joined those of Egypt and Syria.

If the fighting continues, it is likely to engulf Saudi Arabia, to which we have given 162 million dollars in military assistance. Indeed, the only Arab country which has received no military help from us is Egypt itself. Even Syria has received a small amount.

Our military aid to his enemies, both Israeli and Arab, has at least indirectly forced Nasser to turn to the Soviet Union for help, and the Russians have responded generously in return for what they hope will be a guiding hand in the affairs of the middle east.

It has been only two years since a war broke out between two other beneficiaries of American military aid, India and Pakistan. They attacked each other, over a dispute which should have been settled peacefully, with equipment which we had supplied to both to use against communism. Each denounced us for the aid we gave to the other, and now Pakistan is said to be receiving antiaircraft guns, tanks, and planes from Red China.

It is too late to avoid fighting in the middle east. But with all the military hardware which we have scattered and are continuing to scatter about the world, it is almost inevitable that other beneficiaries, too, will turn it to use against one another. What good does this do anybody? Here at home, we have learned not to put firecrackers into the hand of children; yet overseas we go blindly on shoving tanks and planes and guns and ammunition into the hands of shaky governments in turbulent areas. How much longer must we wait, and how many more useless and peripheral wars must break out before Congress puts an end to this nonsense?

The Electric Markette

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1967

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, while the minions of Government endlessly debate the feasibility of developing an electric car as a step in relieving air pollution and other urban problems, private enterprise has taken up the challenge and produced something tangible.

Last week the Westinghouse Electric Corp. announced its intention to market a city-oriented electric vehicle. Called the Markette, the Westinghouse vehicle is not a dull reproduction of the present electric carts that are now confined to the sidewalks of some American cities, and which are primarily for the use of the retired and elderly.

Just the opposite. The Markette is a finely styled, yet small and efficient, electric town car. Resembling the squared-off look of a miniature jeep this electric car is capable of a speed of 25 miles per hour, and a maximum range of 50 miles per charge.

Westinghouse reports that the initial model of the car will sell for under $2,000. The cost of maintaining the vehicle will be approximately 1 cent per mile.

As one of those who has urged development of alternative clean power sources to the smog-producing internal combustion engine, I welcome Westinghouse's announcement of its Markette.

There is little doubt that more serious national attention must be paid the present internal combustion engine car as a major source of air pollution. In Los Angeles, where despite the Nation's most effective pollution control program, smog is increasing, the automobile accounts for almost 90 percent of the pollutants which are daily dumped in the southern California atmosphere. Wide-scale acceptance of the electric car offers the promise of some relief from air pollution.

A small and efficient electric town car can also assist in ameliorating other serious urban problems. Congestion is seriously choking the physical, social and psychological environment of our cities. And although Professor Banfield, of Harvard University, has suggested that traffic congestion will exist as long as so many people from outside the central city need access to its environs; still a small, easily maneuverable, non-gas-burning automobile will go a long way toward relaxing congestion, unraveling nerves, relieving disgusting smells from fumes, and creating conditions that will result in less damaged fenders.

Land requirements for accommodating a small vehicle will provide urban planners with additional flexibility. We can also assume that with the acceptance of a small town car, present facilities for parking will be able to accommodate many times their present capacities.

One additional benefit accrues from the small electric town car. Noise will be reduced. Those who have had the opportunity to drive an electric car know there is no noise, other than the noise emanating from the tires meeting the pavement, connected with its operation. Simply turn on a switch and the only indication that the car is in operation is a light and the vehicle's forward or backward movement.

Limited research in the area of noise as an environmental irritant has precluded drawing many conclusions on the effect noise has in the urban environment. However, the scanty evidence we now possess suggests that the irritations caused by noise upon the inhabitants of the city is serious. And the source of a good deal of urban noise is the internal combustion engine.

As I suggested earlier, the extent of vehicular noise and its impact upon the urban resident has not been fully investigated. However, anyone living within the central city can testify to the existence, in varying degrees of volume, of vehicular noise. The electric town car may well assist in reducing the present volume of noise. Such a reduction, I am sure, will be a welcome relief to the millions who are now so conditioned to urban noise that little notice is taken of this increasingly serious pollutant.

Many of us who have been following, and have contributed to the dialog underscoring the obvious deterioration in our cities, view the electric car as a step toward solving a few of the problems aggravating the urban environment. In this brief essay I have only summarized those areas of serious urban irritation where, if wide-scale employment of an electric car, such as the Westinghouse Markette, is adopted, we may be on the road toward making the American city a much more tolerable place within which to live.

Westinghouse's announcement that it intends to build and market an electric car is encouraging. I am hopeful other corporations will enter the field, thereby producing the necessary competition needed to develop the electric vehicle to the highest performance level possible.

Westinghouse should be congratulated for risking a venture into a market that is untried and uncertain, although one that needs to be developed and serviced.

I wish success to Westinghouse and every other corporation that enters this field.

The Westinghouse anouncement of its Markette electric car follows:

WESTINGHOUSE MARKETEER—MARKETTE

The Markette is a small electric two-passenger vehicle designed by Westinghouse Electric Corporation to be driven on public streets. This special-purpose, battery-powered two-door sedan will be primarily a means of dependable, short-range transportation for urban dwellers.

Engineered from the ground up by Westinghouse, the Markette makes optimum use of today's readily available conventional components—including lead-acid batteries. It has a light, metal body with clean, contemporary lines. It runs quietly, with a rated top speed of 25 miles an hour and a range of 50 miles between chargings.

The new vehicle is being manufactured at the Westinghouse Marketeer plant in Redlands, California, where electrically powered, off-the-street vehicles have been made for a number of years. More than 20,000 golf, materials-handling, and personnel vehicles manufactured at Marketeer are in use throughout the world.

Initial sales of the vehicle wil be principally to community developers, electric utilities and governmental agencies who want to explore the possibilities of electric in-town vehicles under their own controlled conditions.

Early models of the Markette are expected to be priced under $2000. With an electric power cost of less than one cent per mile, low maintenance, and low depreciation (the vehicles should last at least 10 years with no major repairs), the Markette should be relatively inexpensive to own and operate.

VEHICLE DESCRIPTION

Power source

The Markette is powered by 12, six-volt, heavy-duty lead-acid batteries located under the rear package shelf. Each battery is rated 217 amp-hours. The batteries weigh 66 pounds each, for a total of 792 pounds. They can deliver 10 to 12 watt-hours per pound before requiring a recharge.

Each vehicle has a built-in battery charger with a retractable 12-foot cord that can be plugged into any conventional 110-volt, 60-cycle a-c outlet. When depleted, the batteries require about 8 hours for a full recharge. This would normally be done overnight.

Each set of batteries can usually take the equivalent of 600 or more recharges before requiring replacement, at a cost of about $300 for the 12-battery set. With proper care, a set of batteries will be good for two or more years of normal in-town driving.

Motors and power transmission

Two sets of six batteries in series supply up to 36 volts to the two series-wound d-c motors which drive the vehicle. The two six-battery sets are connected in parallel to equalize battery drain. The motors provide about 4½ horsepower each at top voltage. They give the vehicle a smooth, continuous acceleration to its rated top speed of 25 mph in about 12 seconds.

The motors weigh 45 pounds each and are located under the rear storage area, near the rear axle. Each motor provides mechanical power independently to one rear wheel through a silent chain drive of one-inch width and ⅜-inch pitch. The speed reduction ratio is 5 to 1. Motor speed is at all times proportional to wheel rpm; there is no need for a speed ratio changing device (gear shift or clutch). There is also no need for a mechanical differential, since d-c motors as applied in this case give ideal differentiation.

Control circuitry

Two types of motor speed control are offered, resistance and solid state.

The standard speed control uses reliable, resistance-type speed switches designed by Westinghouse for electric vehicles. This device has two 22-resistor switches in parallel which are operated simultaneously, providing voltage to the series-wound motors in 22 steps. The steps are so small that they give, in effect, a continuous acceleration.

Available as optional equipment in place of the resistance control is a solid-state control using thyristors. This more expensive control can increase mileage between charges by as much as 30 percent in applications that require frequent stopping and starting.

Other mechanical features

The chassis has a steel frame with a steel leaf spring, semi-elliptic suspension. The eight-inch demountable, stamped-steel drop-center wheels use 18 x 5.70/5.00–8 high-pressure 4-ply pneumatic tires. The wheel base is 76 inches.

The foot brakes are hydraulic and act on the two rear wheels only. The hand brake is the conventional orscheln brake lever used in many types of vehicles.

Body, interior, driver controls

The 1730-pound vehicle has a squared-off functional design that gives maximum interior space within the exterior dimensions of 116 inches long by 54½ inches wide by 60½ inches high. Streamlining is not required because of the low speeds the vehicle will travel. Current models have light, metal bodies with a two-tone finish of string gray and dark covent gray; other colors and color combinations will be available later.

The split bench seat accommodates two passengers comfortably on black vinyl upholstery. To the rear is a 48-by-16-inch carpeted storage shelf with a total of 33 cubic feet of storage space.

The interior and dashboard are quite simple. There are no window handles since the windows on each of the two doors slide open. The dash has a battery condition indicator, speedometer, and switches for lights, wipers, and selection of forward or reverse. A conventional steering wheel with horn and turn signals, floor pedals for acceleration and braking, and a hand brake complete the picture.

Performance

Tests were carried out up and down an average ½ percent grade with one stop per mile, followed in each case by acceleration right up to the 25-mph cruising speed. Under these conditions, vehicles required recharging only after a minimum of 50 miles of driving. More frequent stops and starts and steeper grades will have an effect on the number of miles that can be driven between recharges.

Milder climates will give better watt-hour performance from the batteries and also enhance total battery life.

The vehicle has exceptionally good traction on any kind of road surface in any kind of weather because of the weight on the rear wheels and the inherent positive traction of the d-c. drive system.

Its small size and small turn radius of 6½ feet (maximum turning circle is 11 feet) make the vehicle ideal for congested urban areas. Its low maximum speed would, of course, preclude its use on highways or freeways.

Safety features

The Markette has all the safety features and fixtures required by the California vehicle code, which is probably the most stringent in the country. These include turn signals, dual-beam headlights, parking lights, horn, and seat belts. With little or no modification, the vehicle should be able to meet the licensing requirements of other states.

Maintenance

In comparison to mechanically complex internal-combustion engines, maintenance of the two electric drive motors is quite simple. The carbon brushes on the motors should be checked every several thousand miles for wear. When worn, they can be replaced quickly and inexpensively by any competent mechanic or electrician.

The lead-acid batteries need the same periodic attention given to such batteries in gasoline-powered automobiles. Battery care as well as periodic lubrication and brake adjustments can be handled by any service station.

More extensive repair work, if required, can be performed by the locally franchised Markette dealer.

New power sources

As newer, more powerful batteries are developed for commercial use, they can be used as the power source for the current models of the Markette with no more than minor modifications to the vehicle.

The Greek Tragedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1967

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, we cannot allow other world crises to divert our attention from the Greek tragedy and lessons which should be learned from it. Paul A. Samuelson, in an editorial in the May 22 issue of Newsweek, reminds us that the economy of Greece was growing and that the government was backed by a majority of 53 percent.

Greece was not a banana republic or underdeveloped nation. I hope that the United States will take the time to analyze the roots of the Greek tragedy.

The article follows:

THE GREEK TRAGEDY

(By Paul A. Samuelson)

"Every man has two countries—his own country and France." This aphorism of Benjamin Franklin holds more true for Western man when we substitute Greece for France.

The glory that was Greece is our glory. To modern man the Greek gods are not Zeus and Athena but Plato and Aristotle. Our Greek heroes are not Hercules and Hector but Archimedes, Homer and Phidias.

The coup by the army colonels shows that it can happen anywhere. Greece is not a banana republic; nor an Asian nation yet to undergo the first birth pangs of industrial development. Why then the revolution?

Hitler came to power when Germany was paralyzed by the Great Depression. Mussolini's march on Rome was hailed by those who thought Italian society disorganized by the first world war. Lenin seized power when the Russian masses were fed up with a terrible, and terribly unsuccessful, war. The French crowd, exasperated beyond endurance by the *ancient régime,* stormed the Bastille and brought Louis XVI to the guillotine.

A SICK ECONOMY?

What are the truths about the recent Greek economy? Non-economists exaggerate the importance of economic factors in shaping the political history of a nation. (Karl Marx was no exception: he formulated his "economic interpretation of history" as a youngster, before he had served his apprenticeship in the British Museum boning up on economics.)

Still let us give the economic factor all the rope it can use. Was Greece stagnating? Was its economy on the verge of collapse, needing the cleansing command of a military Hercules?

The answers to these questions are a dramatic No. I have before me a thorough statistical study of Greek economic development in the 1960s. It tells a little-known story.

Greek output grew faster than in any other European country.

Last year alone, real gross national product grew 8.2 per cent.

Per capita living standards in Greece have climbed rapidly relative to Western Europe.

Greek growth puts both U.S. and U.S.S.R. growth in the shade. In the growth sweepstake, Greece belongs up there with the miracle nations of Japan and Israel.

Finally, this sprint has not been a flash-in-the-pan operation bought at the expense of price inflation. The Greek price index has been one of the steadiest during the period. Under General Franco, Spain's prices rose three times as fast.

DEMOCRACY AND STABILITY

The Center Union Party of George and Andreas Papandreou, which had been forced from office by King Constantine despite its 53 per cent majority, was no threat to economic prosperity. But Andreas Papandreou and the King were undoubtedly on a collision course with respect to the unilateral political powers that the Greek throne has in comparison with constitutional monarchs of the Dutch, English and Scandinavian kind. This enmity, plus the likely prospect that the Papandreou party would win an electoral majority, undoubtedly triggered off the revolution.

The dictatorship now says it acted in order to avert a Communist takeover. Andreas Papondreou has been charged with "treason," which is defined as conspiratorial action to purge the army of right-wing elements.

For a score of years, American economists have known the younger Papandreou, his numerous books, articles and lectures. Careful reading of them shows no trace of Marxist or totalitarian leanings. The many dispatches of C. L. Sulzberger to The New York Times appear to be as misleading on Andreas Papandreou as were the disastrously inaccurate appraisals of Fidel Castro by Times reporter Herbert Matthews.

I have before me the text of a February speech, written when Andreas Papandreou was riding high with no need to dissemble his true views. They mark him as one who believes in planning by the mixed economy, with allocation of function between public and private enterprise, and regulation of investment by foreigners.

To kill a man for such views would leave few men safe—certainly not de Gaulle, Lester Pearson or Franklin Roosevelt. Our government, and American public opinion, regard the new Greek Government as being on trial along with Andreas Papandreou.

Tyranny in Greece

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1967

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, according to famed biographer, Emil Ludwig, dictatorship is always merely an aria—never an opera.

In the case of the military dictatorship imposed upon the people of Greece, the failure of our State Department to know the score may result in yet another classic tragedy.

And that tragedy may be ours as well as that of Greece.

What must be understood, which seems to defy comprehension in the State Department, is that the basis of power in the new military regime in Greece rests almost solely upon the military weapons which we supplied to Greece in the past.

It is American tanks and guns and equipment which were used to topple the democratic government of Greece and to thwart a national election, armaments which we supplied in years past to help build the NATO shield around Communist Europe.

We have to understand that it will be American tanks and guns which will shoot down Greek civilians in the streets should civil war erupt in Greece.

This latest backing of a military government by the United States is but one of a series of such "military expedients" which have been made at the sacrifice of principle.

The situation in Greece is as dangerous to peace as a chainsmoker in a powder magazine. We could have avoided it by a firm stand, but we did not and we have not.

For the information of my colleagues, an editorial from the Christian Science Monitor, June 10, 1967, follows:

TYRANNY IN GREECE

"I was badly wounded fighting for Greece and did not begrudge it because it was for the country that I loved. It was not for this Greece that I fought." So said a serving Greek officer the other day—according to the correspondence columns of a British weekly. "This Greece," of course, is the Greece now in the firm and unimaginative grip of a group of authoritarian colonels. Many inside and outside Greece tried to put the best complexion on the junta's blatantly unconstitutional seizure of power when the civilian government was so rudely ousted in April. But the more the junta blunders on, the more ridiculous and oppressive it makes itself.

Beards, miniskirts, Tchaikovsky, Prokofiev—these were already on the colonels' proscribed list. Now there has been added to it the music from the movie, "Zorba the Greek," because its composer is on the left wing of Greek politics. All the songs of this young man, Mikis Theodorakis, have been banned, too, because they are "among other things . . . a means of liaison between Communists."

If that were all, one could dismiss it as irritating pettiness. But the stifling and brutal hand is wounding Greek democracy even more seriously. Newspaper publishers are still being apprehended. The press is still under fierce censorship. Politicians are still being arrested—and not only politicians of the left. Among those recently detained, according to some reports, are a former Foreign Minister and a former Minister of the Interior. More Aegean islands are apparently being turned into concentration camps. The implications of an announcement by a senior official just back from a visit to one of the main detention islands, Yaros, are clear. He said he had given orders that a new reservoir be provided so that the persons detained get an adequate supply of water.

Another official announcement is also full of implications. It came from the commander of the Greek gendarmerie, who said: ". . . Severity and firmness are not the same things as brutality and cruelty. Such acts are contrary to the law and constitute an abuse of power which could harm the work of the government."

Sooner or later, the kind of regime which the colonels are clamping on Greece produces a popular explosion. It is interesting therefore that there are already appearing the first outward signs of secret anti-junta activity. Foreign correspondents in Greece are beginning to receive bulletins from an organization calling itself the Greek Patriotic Front. (The leaders of this secret group are not known. The junta will almost certainly say they are Communists, whether this be so or not.) One of these bulletins calls on Greeks to bury their political differences and unite in "democratic resistance to tyranny." Such a word to describe the colonels' rule is at least apt.

Florida Jaycees Support Total Victory in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1967

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the Florida Jaycees unanimously adopted a resolution backing the Nation's efforts in Vietnam and urging that we take all necessary measures to bring the war to a successful and speedy conclusion.

I would like to commend the Florida Jaycees for their stand on this matter and for the faith and confidence they they have shown in our fighting men in Vietnam.

At this point I would like to enclose for the information and interest of my colleagues a copy of the resolution:

Whereas: The Florida Jaycees whole heartedly support the Constitution of the United States and the principles of Freedom and Democracy and,

Whereas: The Florida Jaycees endorse the United States envolvement in the Viet Nam war and,

Whereas: The American boys who have given their lives in this war have made the supreme sacrifice in defense of their Country and,

Whereas: The families of these boys have suffered immense personal loss and,

Whereas: The United States owes no less than Total victory in Viet Nam to these boys and their families so that their sacrifice will not have been in vain and,

Whereas: The Florida Jaycees earnestly believe that total victory is the only way to demonstrate to the communist .world that this Country will not tolerate communist aggression and that we believe that a firm stand in our foreign policy is the only way for this Country to regain its position of leadership and prestige among the other nations of the world and,

Whereas: Total victory cannot be accomplished with our Military Forces inadequately supplied and having their hands tied politically,

Now therefore be it resolved: That the Florida Jaycees in meeting this 14th day of May, 1967, go on record as urging the President and the Congress of the United States to take whatever steps are necessary to insure a rapid total victory in Viet Nam so that our dead will not have died in vain and to show to the world, the determination, the courage, the leadership and the conviction that our forefathers had in founding and building this Country into a naiton of Democracy and Freedom for its citizens.

And be it further resolved that copies of this resolution be sent to all Florida legislators, state and federal, and the news media, and that it be presented to the United States Jaycees for adoption.

Philanthropic Contributions by One American Corporation, the Polish National Alliance, Have Benefited American Education in the Amount of More Than $5 Million

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1967

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is generally agreed among the people of our Nation that our greatest single resource for the continuance of democracy is the intellectual capacity of our Nation's citizens.

We Americans have developed institutions of higher learning which not only manifest the culture of America but also are a source of inspiration throughout the world.

I am very proud to call my colleagues' attention to the fact that the Polish National Alliance, the largest Polish-American fraternal organization in the world, which has its headquarters in Chicago but which has local chapters in virtually every community of the United States, has contributed more than $5 million to Alliance College, which is supported by the Polish National Alliance, in Cambridge Springs, Pa.

This vast contribution by the Polish National Alliance to maintain an excellent institution of higher learning should be a source of satisfaction to all Americans. Through its efforts to help Alliance College, the Polish National Alliance manifests an abiding desire to help maintain educational standards in the United States unequaled anywhere in the world. These impressive contributions by the Polish National Alliance reflect again what a tremendous impact this imposing organization has exerted on the development of our Nation.

The Polish National Alliance stands as a beacon for Americans of Polish descent to help guide them to those attributes which have made America a citadel of hope for people throughout the world.

Mr. Charles Rozmarek, president of the Polish National Alliance, and Mr. Walter Dworakowski, censor of this fine fraternal organization, have worked arduously toward helping Alliance College become one of the finest institutions of higher learning in America. The entire membership of the Polish National Alliance joins these two dedicated officers in helping provide young Americans these impressive educational opportunities in a setting just south of Erie, Pa., which inspires great appreciation of nature's beauty.

Alliance College lies in a lovely valley of the Allegheny Mountains. Before World War II the free Government of Poland sent thousands of evergreen saplings which have grown into giant trees and transform the entire Alliance College campus into a virtual wonderland. It is in this beautiful setting blessed by nature that students pursue their intellectual curiosities.

Alliance College stands today as a living monument to the high ideals espoused by the Polish National Alliance and its membership. I am certain, Mr. Speaker, that the early Polish settlers who landed with Captain Smith in Jamestown in 1608 would have found great pride in knowing that some day their successors on the American Continent would make such an impressive contribution to the educational and cultural growth of America.

Following is a list of contributions made by the Polish National Alliance to Alliance College. From the time the college was founded until 1929, the Polish National Alliance had given the college $1,595,190.58. Annual gifts thereafter amounted to:

1930	$119, 985. 75
1931	124, 496. 28
1932	124, 377. 04
1933	116, 149. 70
1934	116, 995. 60
1935	110, 946. 34
1936	133, 449. 21
1937	126, 229. 58
1938	129, 032. 77
1939	122, 814. 03
1940	82, 240. 37
1941	76, 497. 72
1942	76, 143. 68
1943	80, 511. 33
1944	81, 486. 93
1945	83, 894. 03
1946	85, 588. 14
1947	83, 816. 48
1948	135, 208. 75
1949	78, 650. 07
1950	80, 515. 73
1951	92, 249. 08
1952	123, 079. 46
1953	119, 069. 70
1954	119, 161. 12
1955	115, 732. 92
1956	164, 026. 69
1957	113, 713. 40
1958	108, 363. 24
1959	109, 360. 24
1960	128, 765. 08
1961	126, 244. 50
1962	143, 027. 05
1963	140, 954. 50
1964	163, 796. 63
1965	150, 667. 50
1966	144, 851. 50
Total from 1912 through Dec. 31, 1966	5, 827, 282. 75

This impressive list of contributions clearly demonstrates how one American corporation, composed largely of the sons and daughters of immigrants from Poland, contributed to America's educational needs. I trust we can all agree that so long as private corporations such as the Polish National Alliance continue contributing toward the educational needs of this country, our future is secure. Only through intellectual achievement can Americans demonstrate to the people of the world that indeed our system of government offers the greatest degree of hope for mankind.

The Role Being Filled by Our Nation in Today's World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1967

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues an editorial on Memorial Day which appeared in the May 31 editions of the Associated Newspapers, which are published in my 15th Congressional District of Michigan.

It was written by Mr. Roger Turner, managing editor of the Associated Newspapers, and I think it sums up, admirably well, the role being filled by our Nation in today's world. It expresses the optimism and pride that every American should feel when he looks back upon the remarkable achievements of the United States.

As Mr. Turner pointed out:

> The United States has tried to do right as it sees right. And its errors are those of minor oversights, omissions and perhaps excusable bungling at time—but nothing that could honestly be considered tyrannical, oppressive or bullyish.

Too many Americans today are inclined to criticize our Nation's actions, without stopping to consider the alternatives, or the lessons of history. To such persons, and to very Member of this Congress, I recommend the reading of Mr. Turner's editorial:

AN EDITORIAL BY ROGER TURNER

If anyone were seriously interested in figuring just what could have been taking place this Memorial Day—instead of what it probably turned out to be—they could have done a lot worse than some introspective reflection on the price of success.

Phrased another way, the same thought could be: This country is courting a hell of a mess, but it isn't the first time. So, how did it happen and what did we do to shape things up before?

Just admitting the so-called problems and attempting to analyze them tends to help some. And recognizing the "mess" for the type of mess that it is lends encouragement that certain relief and solution are possible.

The "mess" takes in a lot of things—Vietnam, Egypt-Israel, inflation, taxes, racial strife, poverty, crime, aid to education and so on ad infinitum.

Yet the problems seem to have one common denominator: They stem from, are caused by, or are magnified by, American success. Cut it any way you like and use any criteria you choose, America is still No. 1.

And therein lies the problem.

Being No. 1 is never easy. It isn't easy to get there. It's even harder to stay. The role draws "friends" of the type who are prone to find it profitable to be friends or followers of No. 1. And it creates enemies, envy, second-guessing and general opposition from every "have not" who wants to hear his own bell ring.

Every individual and every country would like to be No. 1, either openly or otherwise. And the rules of the international "games" are what might be called poorly defined, or just plain non-existent. You do what you are big enough to do—as long as you can get away with it.

There is no game in which mistakes are not made by the participants. And heaven knows the United States has been far from infallible in its courses of action on numerous occasions.

Yet, in retrospective comparison, we have little need for apology. In the long haul, the United States has tried to do right as it sees right. And its errors are those of minor oversights, omission and perhaps excusable bungling at times—but nothing that could honestly be considered tyranical, oppressive or bullyish.

On this Memorial Day, we are where we are because of what we are—a success, the most unqualified success world history has probably ever known. The status was won honestly and should be accepted with no regrets or apologies.

As the international circumstance tightens, it is well to remember that it is grace and performance under pressures which reveal an individual or country's true innards. The practice field and spring training activity never count in the standings.

It is well, too, to remember that nothing of value ever came cheap—or without work and sacrifice. The price the United States will have to pay to retain its status—and we do want to retain it—is certainly as unknown as of today. The dilemma our leaders face as of now is that unknown price. And their daily decisions are no different than our own at home:

What are we being asked to buy? What is the price? Is it too much? Do we need it? Can we do without it? Is it more expensive not to buy now?

We have seen some of the answers. And whether we agreed or did not agree with the decisions is, in a sense, only academic. What's done is done. We are in Vietnam. We likely will be involved in what happens to Israel. Our grocery and tax costs are soaring out of sight. We still have poverty, crime and unsolved racial strife. We don't have enough money for education as we like to think of it.

So, the pressure is on. Our grace and performance ahead remain the true test. The rest to today is history. Realizing that we have had problems before make some of the current difficulties smaller. Realizing we have solved them before lends optimism that it can be, and will be, done again.

This sort of message could very well have turned in every man's mind this Memorial Day. It is somewhat more significant than Indianapolis or the pennant race.

And it may still be a very good year.

Preston Davie, Lawyer and Public Servant

SPEECH

OF

HON. THEODORE R. KUPFERMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 25, 1967

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, Preston Davie, a familiar figure in Republican politics in New York, and my constituent, died at the ripe old age of 86, but he will be missed.

Member of a well-known law firm, and public servant, his wife Eugenie Mary—known to all as May—joined him in his interest in government and politics, and later she served as cochairman of the New York County Republican Committee.

His obituary from the New York Times of Monday, May 22, follows:

PRESTON DAVIE, LAWYER, 86, DEAD—COLONEL ON GENERAL STAFF IN WORLD WAR I HELD D.S.M.

Preston Davie, a retired lawyer and a descendant of distinguished early American families, died last night in his home at 71 East 71st Street. He was 86 years old and maintained a summer home at Newport, R.I.

Mr. Davie's widow, the former Eugénie Mary Ladenburg of New York and Westbury, L.I., is chairman of the board of the Robert Taft Institute of Government, and former cochairman of the New York Republican County Committee.

Mr. Davie, a native of Louisville, Ky., was a descendant of Gen. William Richardson Davie of the Continental Army, founder of the University of North Carolina, Governor of that state and Minister to France.

His grandfather, Maj. Gen. William Preston of the Confederate Army, was a member of Congress and Minister to Spain.

GRADUATE OF HARVARD LAW

Mr. Davie graduated from Harvard College and from Harvard Law School. He later received an honorary LL.D. degree from the University of North Carolina, to which he had contributed an extensive library on the history of the state.

After a brief partnership in law with his father, George M. Davie, in Louisville, Mr. Davie became in 1907 a partner in the New York law firm now named Conboy, Hewitt, O'Brien & Boardman. He retired from practice in the nineteen-twenties.

In World War I, Mr. Davie served as chairman of the Remount Committee and as assistant director of the Council for National Defense. He then served as colonel on the Army's general staff. Later he received the Distinguished Service Medal, and from the Belgian government the Chevalier Order Crown and from Finland the Order of the White Rose (Grand Office).

He was a member of the Society of the Cincinnati, The Brook, the Knickerbocker Club and the Metropolitan Club.

Surviving, by an earlier marriage, are a son, E. T. Bedford Davie; a daughter, Mrs. Emily Davie Kornfeld, and two grandchildren. His first marriage, to the former Emily H. Bedford, ended in divorce.

Address of Representative W. S. (Bill) Stuckey, Jr., Before the Georgia Society of the Sons of the American Revolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. FLYNT, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 25, 1967

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, April 29, 1967, the Honorable W. S. "BILL" STUCKEY, JR., Member of Congress from the Eighth District of Georgia, made an address to the annual meeting of Georgia Society of the Sons of the American Revolution in Waycross, Ga.

The content of this masterful address so clearly states some of the problems faced by Americans today that I am pleased to commend his remarks to the attention of our colleagues:

It is a very great pleasure and an honor for me to visit here again in Waycross—and especially to meet with and pay my highest respects to the members of your great organization.

I appreciate this chance to be here with you today because I know . . . as I believe you know also . . . that we are gathering together at an important time in our history.

This crucial year . . . when segments of our society are thumbing their noses at our government under law which has cost so many patriotic Americans if the Sons of the American Revolution don't care . . . or don't dare?

When the some-front Vietcong wear so many masks as they do today, who will alert us if the sentries sleep?

I know people may ask "what's the idea behind the Sons of the American Revolution?" What is the star you steer by? What is the bond that's held almost 10 generations of dedicated men together? What keeps free men of all sizes and shapes and cultural backgrounds pulling in the same direction. . . saluting the same flag?

This is no small miracle in this age of compromise and accommodation and retreat. Some new organization or well-intentioned association of men is somewhere every day born only to fade away . . . and yet the sons of the sons of the sons of the American Revolution march on and on in an unending column across the decades of American history. So we have a right to ask "Why?" "How did this come about?"

You know, a great American President, Theodore Roosevelt, said many years ago that a man must be a good patriot of his country before he can become a good citizen of the world, and that we must lead by *example.*

Our example was set even before this great country became a nation. The ideal for which so many early Americans had paid so much in in arms and legs and eyes and lives was a divinely inspired concept that men must govern from the bottom up . . . that centralized governmental power corrupts.

This was what our forefathers fought for over 190 years ago . . . . and this is what our nation has fought to preserve in every war and every conflict ever since.

But shortly after the close of World War II, a new kind of war emerged—a cold war. And patriotic men throughout our land soon came to realize that they were not really out of the trenches yet—not would they ever be. For now . . . just as in the earliest days of this Nation . . . eternal vigilance must forever be the price of liberty.

Just within this century alone, in World War I and World War II, Americans fought once again shoulder to shoulder, seeking to defend those things which we hold precious—God and Country.

But even now we are fighting a battle right here at home—we are fighting those spokesmen of an alien, totalitarian philosophy who are seeking to subvert both our heritage of God and of Country.

And half-way around the world today American fighting men of yet another war are wanting to get it over and get home.

They don't quite understand it when they hear of American warplanes that are ordered to fly past an enemy missile base only to bomb a wooden bridge . . . and then fly home only to have to return again the next day.

They don't quite understand it when they are sent 2,000 miles away and are asked to die to repel Communism . . . when just 90 miles from our own shore we don't dare!

It is true that as a Nation our arms are mostly strong—but our hearts are becoming weak. And the precious heritage of our Country was born to live in the *hearts* of men.

I think we have a right to ask: Where did we get off the track?

Just look back.

I believe you and I will agree that it was the day we first began to drift away from reverence to God and loyalty to Country—the two basic traits which have always distinguished Americans as Americans.

God, as you know, has already been evicted from the classroom . . . and may soon be excluded from the courthouse and the halls of government . . . and even from his own churches.

And as for *Country?* . . . well, patriotism today seems to have been supplanted by a new, unworthy allegiance to a growing super-government. Preachers and Professors and certain self-styled national leaders are eager to join with enemy agents and hooligan student drop-outs who seek to subvert the international posture of our Country . . . while openly inciting disregard for the domestic laws of our land.

Too many Americans today have begun to subscribe to an "ism" alien to what ours once was. Too many Americans are urging now that Big Government force feed the poor and force bleed the rest.

Too many Americans demand now that Big Government administer their charity and prescribe their medicine and get them a job—and even pay them for not working at all! And for all these increasing services we are asked to pay with an increasing number of cheaper dollars.

Too many Americans have stood by too long and witnessed the Federal Government veto state and individual prerogatives in areas such as voting . . . education . . . employment . . . welfare . . . wage rates . . . and even our highway billboards.

I say that as government takes it upon itself to assume responsibility for our daily bread, then government seeks to become a religion—and the graveyard of history is already overflowing with governments of that type.

I believe that if we would live as a Nation it is your formula which must become ours again.

If we would lead . . . as Teddy Roosevelt said . . . we must lead by example.

Too many Americans don't seem to realize that the American Revolution was not an event over and done with in the past. Rather, it is a revolution which is continuing . . . and most continue for as long as there are those among us strong enough to fight and courageous enough to think.

We are a revolutionary people who are not afraid to meet or to make change—yet while never losing sight of our deeply-rooted foundations in Christianity and in a philosophy of constitutional government.

I say we are revolutionary enough to believe for example that progress can never be *legislated* . . . but rather that it must come . . . first of all . . . from the hearts of men and women who are *aware* . . . and who are *involved*.

As Americans in this modern age, we are all involved more deeply than ever before . . . and more dependent than ever before . . . upon the military might of our country . . . and upon the quality and devotion of our military men in uniform.

I believe all of us have a direct involvement, therefore, with one particular aspect of our military establishment which is coming under heavy fire today from concerned, patriotic groups all over this Country. I refer, of course, to the present system of military selective service—the draft.

In one way or another, I believe, the present military draft laws have an effect—and often place a burden—on almost every member of our society . . . regardless of age or sex or position in life.

Obviously, it places a burden on the young man who is drafted and thereby compelled to postpone the hopes and plans of his life for the period of time he serves in the armed forces.

But also it places a burden on our business economy when business firms are forced to be reluctant to hire capable young men in the 20-to-26 age group simply because the demands of military service might carry them away at any moment.

And then, too, it places a burden on the taxpayer who is forced to spend approximately $2.4-billion dollars each year to train those men who are drafted—92 per cent of whom are unwilling to re-enlist once their period of service is over.

I believe it can be said that our present system of military draft is *obsolete* . . . *unfair* . . . and plain *wasteful*.

It is *obsolete* because it was designed to meet the needs of twenty-five years ago.

It is *unfair* because thanks to the population explosion, the proportion of draft-eligible young men who are actually called upon to serve has steadily gone down. To illustrate this, the number of draft-eligible young men has grown from 20-million in 1951—when the present draft system went into effect—to almost 40-million today. As a result, the percentage of these men who are actually called upon to serve has declined from 70 per cent to 46 per cent in just ten years.

Finally, the present draft system is *wasteful* because the military services presently spend approximately $6,000 per man to train unwilling draftees in skills they are rarely able to use in later life . . . and skills which they usually forget once their tour of duty is over.

Now, if the draft is really as undesirable as this, and if it ought to be replaced, the obvious question is "what are we going to replace it with?"

Well, I for one, have always believed that the lessons of the past provide the best advice for the future. I believe that just as in the earlier days of this Republic we can and should man our armed forces with volunteers—just as the United States has traditionally done except in major wars.

I realize that those who oppose this idea will immediately reply that a volunteer army is not feasible because . . . at the present time . . . too few men volunteer.

I grant that this is true, but there is little wonder that too few men volunteer when the starting pay, including cost of keep, comes to about $45 dollars a week. In fact, the financial conditions are so bad that thousands of draftees are forced to go on welfare while they are in the service just to support their wives and children back home.

Ordinary common sense will tell you that more volunteers could be attracted—and in the same way could be persuaded to remain in the service—if we simply paid decent market wages.

Now, estimates of how much the total military pay would have to go up vary from $4 to $17-billion dollars a year. But though these may seem like high figures, we are presently paying a much greater amount under the present selective service system.

Not only are we virtually wasting billions of dollars to train men who don't want to be trained and who are eager to get out of the service and forget all their training as soon as they can . . . but we are paying a much greater tax in a concealed form.

When you look at it in terms of economics, conscription is a hidden tax. It is forced labor which the government collects from the men who serve involuntarily. The monetary amount of this hidden tax varies from individual to individual—depending upon how much the particular draftee would have made had he not been drafted.

My friends, as men with a respect for our Country's great heritage, we believe in basing our actions upon sound, proven experience. I believe this proposal for a volunteer army has a firm basis in the experience of history . . . and I hope to support this proposal in Congress at the earliest suitable opportunity.

But in the meantime, I want to assure each and every one of you that I have always had . . . and I shall continue to have . . . the most profound respect for the Sons of the American Revolution. And because we share so many of the same values and fundamental American beliefs, I invite your counsel and advice in my work as a member of the United States House of Representatives.

In conclusion, I just want to say that I have appreciated this chance to get together with you here . . . and I look forward to the chance to work together with you even more closely in the future.

I hope that I will soon be a member of your esteemed organization.

Founding of St. Andrew's Priory in 1867 Traced to Hawaiian Royalty's Interest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1967

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, the Reverend John Paul Engelcke, archivist of St. Andrew's Priory, Honolulu, Hawaii, has written a very interesting and scholarly article on the history of this outstanding school which has served the educational needs of the girls of Hawaii for the past 100 years.

The priory, which came into being as a result of the love and concern which King Kamehameha IV and Queen Emma had for their people, was dedicated on May 30, 1867, and the educational program now, as it was then, is as Queen Emma so wisely urged—one stressing excellence and equality, practicality, and the very best in Christian culture.

Under the leadership and the excellent administration of Episcopal Bishop Harry S. Kennedy, Sister Suprior Evelyn Ancilla, and Sister Lucy Caritas, I am confident that the priory will continue to represent quality education for girls in Hawaii for many years to come.

The centennial story of St. Andrew's Priory School for Girls, as so well written by the Rev. Engelcke for the May 28, 1967, issue of the Honolulu Sunday Star-Bulletin & Advertiser, is submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

QUEEN URGED PRIORY'S FOUNDING

(By Rev. John Paul Engelcke)

St. Andrew's Priory was born from the love which King Kamehameha IV and Queen Emma had for their people. And this school for girls, which begins its second century on May 30, remains—like the Queen's Hospital—a lasting reminder of their majesties' devotion to their people's welfare.

Concern for the education and well-being of the girls of Hawaii led the king's government to encourage by the Act of 1860 "family schools for the domestic training of Hawaiian girls, in which the English language shall be taught."

Queen Emma heartily agreed. Sickness and epidemics threatened to consume the Hawaiian people. It was of utmost importance, said the Queen, that Hawaiian girls "be trained in nursing the sick and as children's nurses, so as to prepare them to be wiser mothers and wives." The survival of the race depended upon it. Clearly for Queen Emma, an English doctor's adopted daughter, building a hospital was not enough. Hawaii's girls were to learn the new health ways as well.

But for Queen Emma, herself well-educated, there was more to education than hygiene and "domestic training." Championing the equality of women well ahead of her time, the queen insisted that girls deserved to have an education equal to that of boys "in the very best of Christian culture."

Educational excellence and equality, practicality and "the very best in Christian culture"—this was the queen's program for the education of the girls of Hawaii, and so it has remained for one hundred years at St. Andrew's Priory, the school Queen Emma founded. Indeed, the Priory's motto is Kulia i ka Nu'u—"Strive for the Highest."

Queen Emma labored long and hard, both in England and Hawaii, to make excellence of educatian for Hawaii's girls a reality. And she turned to her Church for help. By 1862, the Episcopal community in Hawaii had its first Bishop, Thomas Nettleship Staley, formerly a schoolmaster, and the Church's schools were begun.

By 1864, English Sisters of the Society of the Most Holy Trinity had come to Hawaii to assist the Queen in her educational endeavors and were stationed at Lahaina's St. Cross School, where educational needs were most pressing. Two of these sisters had been nurses with Florence Nightingale in Scutari and the Crimea during England's war with Russia.

PRIORY BEGINS ITS TASK

And on March 30, 1867, a second company of Anglican sisters arrived, led by their Reverend Mother Lydia (Priscilla Lydia Sellon), to build and staff the Honolulu school for girls that Queen Emma had long wanted and been promised on her visit to England.

On May 30, 1867—just two months later, on the Feast of the Ascension—St. Andrew's Priory, built waikiki of the present St. Andrew's Cathedral, was ready for dedication. And the Episcopal Church's educational work for the girls of Hawaii had new buildings, wide space, and a new start.

Eyewitnesses described the Priory on its first day:

"It is built in a quadrangle, open on one side to admit the mountain breeze . . . but entirely surrounded by a cloister of archwork. The Chapel of the School . . . with other buildings form . . . three sides of the enclosure.

"The middle is a nice plot of grass with some pretty young trees and flower beds. And in the center, Reverend Mother has had raised a very large and most remarkable looking cross made of blocks of coral. . . .

"There is a very pretty pointed porch and doorway, and more than an acre of field behind. . . ."

After the prayers and processions of the solemn opening and dedication, the Reverend Mother delighted the clergy and royalty, the crowd and the girls with a feast, "English style," which included ice cream.

SOLID ENGLISH EDUCATION

Until 1902 the English Sisters governed the Priory, boarded 90 or so girls from ages 4 to 18, maintained for a time a free English day school for all who came, and gave the education proper to a lady of the Victorian Era. This a visitor described in 1873 as "a solid English education . . . and a thorough training in all housewifely art and in dress, deportment and propriety of language."

In 1901, The Advertiser described the Priory's curriculum as "a thorough English course, all higher branches, French, German and music."

The paper also reported:

"The boarders rise at 6 a.m., breakfast at 7:30, and at 9 o'clock the bell rings for prayers, after which lessons for the day begin.

"The first recess is at 10:30 and a second one at 1 to 2 p.m. School then resumes and continues until 2:30 o'clock. From that hour until 4 p.m. the boarding pupils study."

The girls paid the now-unbelievable fee of $100 a year for room, board and teaching. But remember, then beef was 5 cents a pound. Indeed, the sisters' "principle was to refuse no girl who really needed their care, . . . and this irrespective of their ability to pay."

It was as Queen Emma wanted it. Throughout her life she brought children to the sisters for care and education, and she herself undertook to maintain and improve the gardens and grounds of the Priory.

To the sisters and girls, the Queen opened her homes. She regularly delighted to sew on Thursday afternoons at the Priory with the Eldress Phoebe and to take tea with the sisters following Sunday evensong at the cathedral. Sister Albertina said of her: "Dear Queen Emma, my dear friend, and the best friend the Priory ever had."

The Priory repaid the compliment of a Queen's enduring love. It protected her in the riots of 1874 at the election of Kalakaua (as it was later to protect Queen Liliuokalani in the riots of 1895). The sisters attended Queen Emma and cheered her throughout her life, as also in her last illness. And in 1885 the girls of the Priory were first among the public mourners to honor the dead queen.

AN AMERICAN ERA BEGINS

In 1902, Queen Victoria was dead, the Hawaiian monarchy was pau, American power was settled upon these Islands, and new breezes blew in education. After 35 years of teaching and caring for the girls of Hawaii, Sisters Beatric and Albertina turned the Priory over to the American Bishop Henry Bond Restarick, and retired to live out their long and useful lives in a cottage on the Priory grounds. Among those at the large and happy pauhana reception for the Sisters was Queen Liliuokalani.

Under Bishop Restarick, from 1902 to 1920, the Priory made the transition which the new times required. Miss Evelyn Wile, the school's first lay principal, formerly a parishioner of the bishop's San Diego parish, graded the school after the American manner and introduced American textbooks and methods.

Under the second lay principal, Miss Abby Stuart Marsh, formerly the principal of a girls' school in Los Angeles, the Priory was re-located mauka in the spacious new "English scholastic gothic" Main Building, completed in 1910. This building, the bishop claimed, was the first of Honolulu's steel reinforced concrete structures. It accommodated 200 girls, nearly 90 of whom were boarders. Renewed recently, it remains today a monument of the progressive school design of two eras.

And at the end of the school year in June, 1911, the Coral Cross was relocated in the courtyard of the Main Building. Amid the tears of many, the old Priory came down to make way for the Bishop's house. But the old was continued in the new. The third lay principal was Miss Jessie L. Madison who served from 1915 to 1918.

Sisters Beatrice and Albertina requested the Bishop in 1902 that an American sisterhood succeed them. Impossible then, both sisters came to see their wish realized when, in 1918, the Community of the Transfiguration of Glendale, Ohio, assumed direction of St. Andrew's Priory. Sister Beatrice died three years later in her 92nd year; Sister Albertina, in 1930 in her 91st year. What nuns had begun, nuns were to continue.

A NEW COMPANY OF SISTERS

The first company of Sisters of the Transfiguration arrived in 1918 to take over the Priory. The ground which Sister Olivia Mary, sister superior and principal from 1918 to 1930, prepared bore bountifully under Sisters Superior Clara Elizabeth (1931 to 1938) and Helen Veronica (1938 to 1948), and under principals Sister Paula Harriet (1931 to 1937) and Sister Rhoda Pearl (1937 to 1949).

The year 1920 saw the first graduates of the new four-year high school program. All went on to the university. In 1922, the Priory had 80 boarders and 104 day pupils, of whom 43 were in the high school. There were two sisters and eight other teachers.

Speaking of the Priory in 1922, James Thayer Addison remarked: "The girls study not only some stupid classical subjects like Latin, but also cooking and sewing and music. And they are well advanced in athletics, too, for the basketball team was soon to meet with the (Iolani) boys' team for a friendly (and unconventional) game."

Student government was instituted in 1927, and the alumnae organized in 1931. In the same year a kindergarten was begun.

The Main Building's Restarick Wing, now housing the high school library and a large classroom, was added in 1936. Sellon Hall, named for the Reverend Mother Foundress, was built in 1938, and—with the addition of a second floor and complete renovation in 1965—houses the elementary and intermediate grades. In 1940 the teachers' house, now the sisters' residence, was built.

PROGRESS SINCE THE WAR

With the war in the Pacific, the Priory ceased to be a boarding school. For 75 years girls had lived where they were taught, but after 1942 this no longer was possible.

In the same year, the Priory was among the select group of schools first accredited in these Islands. And accreditation has been continuous since then.

In the latest chapter of the Priory's hundred-year story, one finds Ascension Hall (housing the science department, plus English and mathematics classrooms) dedicated in 1957 to commemorate the 90th anniversary of the Priory's Ascension Day founding.

The new Centennial Building—added last year to provide student activity areas, offices, conference rooms, and a chapel with remarkable stained glass windows by Erika Karawina—anticipated the Priory's second century.

There now are 35 teachers and 26 staff serving the 620 girls enrolled in the school.

The Priory enters its second century under the leadership of Bishop Harry S. Kennedy, Sister Superior Evelyn Ancilla, and Sister Lucy Caritas, principal. Thanks to them and to a generous Hawaii which expressed its aloha and confidence in the Priory through the successful Priory Expansion Program, St. Andrew's Priory School for Girls enters her second century with new and renewed facilities.

The first century began with newly built wooden buildings; the second begins with new and renewed stone and concrete. But the educational program is the same. It is still Queen Emma's: Excellence and equality, practicality, and "the very best in Christian culture."

Resolution Regarding Draft Dodgers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK BRINKLEY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1967

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, the Atlanta, Ga., chapter of the Military Order of the World Wars has passed a resolution which eloquently sets forth the views of most Americans regarding the draft dodgers and draft card burners. I am taking the opportunity to commend and endorse this resolution which reads as follows:

Resolution

Whereas, there are now, and have been for some time, individuals and organizations, in this country who are openly, contemptuously and definitely engaged in urging men qualified for the draft, to refuse to report for induction into the Armed Forces of the United States; to burn their draft cards, or if they report when called, to refuse to take the oath required of all inductees, and to use any and all means to avoid military service, one particular rabblerouser makes a practice of making inflammatory, seditious speeches to college students all over this nation and leads these students in chanting, "We aren't going, Hell No!" and

Whereas, these despicable actions have caused a state of hot indignation on the part of all patriotic Americans and a world-wide loss of respect for, and confidence in, the strength, stability and integrity of the United States; are detrimental to the morale of our fighting men who are daily laying their lives on the line in Vietnam; and by their actions, giving aid and comfort to the enemy, furnishing them with reason to keep on with their aggressive war in the belief that a large segment of the people of the United States will force the government of the United States to capitulate and withdraw its forces, thus permitting them to enslave the people of South Vietnam, and

Whereas, when the House Armed Services Committee recently called upon the Justice Department to explain why existing Federal Laws were not used to arrest and prosecute these incitors of sedition, they were told by Assistant Attorney General Fred Vinson, representing the Justice Department, "no one has been prosecuted under the law because the department feels there have been no violations," and

Whereas, qualified lawyers, who are members of the Congress, state that there is an existing Federal statute, specifically Section 12(2) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, which provides severe penalties—imprisonment for up to 5 years and a fine up to $10,000 for conviction of persons who encourage others to evade the draft law, specifically declaring that "whoever evades or refuses registration or service in the Armed Forces or any of the requirements of this title, or who knowingly counsels, aids, or abets another to refuse or evade registration or service in the Armed Forces or any of the requirements of this title or who shall knowingly hinder or interfere or attempt to do so in any way, by force or violence or otherwise or who conspires to do so" is in violation of the provision of this act; further that Section 2388 of Title 18 of the United States Code also applies when properly construed in the light of the emergency which was declared in December of 1950, and

Whereas, it is apparent from the statements made by the Assistant Attorney General, Fred Vinson, to the House Armed Services Committee that the Department of Justice has taken upon itself the authority to determine what laws it wants to enforce and those which it does not want to enforce because it thinks enforcement might violate this or that amendment of the U.S. Constitution, notwithstanding the fact that it is not now, nor has it ever been, the responsibility of that Department to pass upon the validity of laws passed by the Congress before taking any action under them, and

Whereas, the duty of interpreting the laws, and testing their constitutionality, is both historically and constitutionally the duty of the courts and if the Justice Department is allowed to settled into a pattern of deciding what laws it wants to enforce and those it does not want to enforce then we have condoned the substitution of the rule of men for the rule of law in this nation.

Whereas, every qualified lawyer is well familiar with the rule that no right guaranteed under the Bill of Rights is an absolute right; that it is a cardinal principle that all of our rights must be exercised with due regard for the rights of others and the rights of society, now therefore

Be it resolved, by the Atlanta Chapter of The Military Order of the World Wars, which has always been dedicated to defending the honor, integrity and supremacy of our National Government and to the adoption of a consistent and suitable policy of National Security for the United States of America, at its regular quarterly meeting on this twenty-fourth day of May 1967.

That, it is definitely and strongly opposed to the action of all persons who evade or attempt to evade being lawfully drafted to perform their duty to the United States of America as members of its Armed Forces; who burn or otherwise destroy their draft cards, and who publicly and contemptuously denounce the United States, its laws and the officials of the government charged with the administration of the draft law, and

That, it strongly condemns those who make inflammatory speeches, counseling, aiding, abetting and inciting men, subject to being drafted into the Armed Forces of the United States, to refuse or evade registration or service in the Armed Forces; to burn their draft cards and to openly and publicly speak contemptuously and defiantly of the government of the United States and its officials charged with the administration of the draft law, and

That, it is unequivocately opposed to the existing policy of the Department of Justice to determine what Federal laws it will enforce and those it will not enforce based upon that Department's determination that enforcement might violate this or that amendment of the United States Constitution, such determination now being and has been both historically and constitutionally the duty of the court, and

That, the President of the United States of America be respectfully requested to direct the Attorney General to immediately proceed with the arrest and prosecution of all violaters of Section 12(2) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, and any other applicable Federal statutes.

Be it further resolved, that this resolution be immediately forwarded to the President of the United States, the Vice President, the Secretary of Defense, Georgia's two Senators, Richard B. Russell, Chairman of the Senate Armed Forces Committee and Herman E. Talmadge, the Chairman of the House Armed Forces Committee, the Chairmen of both the Senate and House Judiciary Committee, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, all Members of the House from Georgia, the National Commanders of the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Disabled American Veterans, the Presidents of the Retired Officers Association and the Reserve Officers Association and the news media, press, radio and television.

European Christian Democratic Youth Representatives Visit Nation's Capital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD D. McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 1967

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, some days ago I had the privilege of addressing several leaders of European Christian Democratic Youth organizations. The young political leaders' visit to the Nation's Capital was sponsored by the American Council of Young Political Leaders, and was, in my opinion, most profitable and enlighting for all concerned.

The exchange of questions and answers covered subjects currently affecting the entire world, as well as individual countries and cities. Much of the discussion focused on the United States, about which these young persons were already very knowledgeable.

They included: Fritz Koenig, Kurt Sörö and Walter Heinzinger, of Austria; Willy Laevaert and Leo Teugels, of Belgium; Mr. and Mrs. Bruno Coiraton, of France; Lothar Kraft, of Germany; Jean Spautz of Luxembourg; Piet Van Engelen and Rob Vermaas, of The Netherlands; Angelo Sferrazza, Alfredo De Pol, L. Faragui, Miss Gabriella Geniola, and Mrs. Franca Fagotti, of Italy; and Santiago Guillon, also of France.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend both the American Council of Young Political Leaders and the young persons I met with here for the valuable, encouraging work they are doing. I know my colleagues, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Brock] and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. William D. Ford]—who also met with the group—feel the same way.

Ex-Alcoholic, Drug Addict Writes Advice to Daughter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. G. ELLIOTT HAGAN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 24, 1967

Mr. HAGAN. Mr. Speaker, alcoholism and drug addiction are a growing menace in the United States. These problems are particularly alarming in their rate of growth among our young people. For the Record, I would like to submit the following poignant article, by Miss Celestine Sibley, from the Atlanta Constitution of May 31, 1967.

Ex-Alcoholic, Drug Addict Writes Advice to Daughter

A man who is a patient at a veterans' hospital let me see a copy of a letter he has written his daughter who is just emerging from junior college in her home town and preparing to enter a big university. His minister thought "it might contain a message that would be of some value to other young people."

Whether it will or not, I don't know. I have an uneasy feeling that the only people who pay attention to the errors of their elders and are deterred from trouble by them are the young people who are going to be all right anyhow. But as one man's pitch to help his child it is a poignant document and for that reason I offer it here.

"Dear Mary: Exactly 30 years ago in September I entered the university as a sophomore. I, too, had a year of junior college and was totally unprepared for the big, impersonal campus of the university. Desperately lonesome and confused, I wanted to be a part of the life that went on around me."

"The fraternities had parties with remarkable frequency and I managed to make a surprising number of these parties, regardless of which fraternity was entertaining. The nonfraternity men also had their parties and I made them, too. Alcohol was always present at these parties and it seemed to put me at ease and I soon became notorious for my ability to consume large quantities of it.

"World War II interrupted my education but I won a commission in the army, which put me in a position of almost being required to attend functions where alcohol was an important part of the festivities. You know the rest of the story. My drinking became such a problem that your mother wisely decided to raise the four of you without me around. In short, you were better off without me than with me, which is a poor recommendation for any parent."

After apparently a losing battle with booze the man took up drugs—"With Demerol, who needs liquor?" Drugs, he said, "don't just take hold" of you.

"They consume and destroy you, body, mind and spirit. They become your sole reason for, and means of, existence."

Newly freed of the drug habit, he has been reading about LSD with some trepidation and he worries that his Mary's generation, "as with all generations," has elements "that will be looking for kicks and defying authority . . . And laughing at anyone who disagrees with their point of view.

"You can't run to your mother every time you're tempted to try an experiment with a drug, whether it be alcohol or LSD," he writes. "Nobody can make the decision for you. If my life has just shown you the danger of these pitfalls and caused you to abstain . . . then I will not have lived in vain. True I've lived in a hell on earth, but if only as a bad example, I've saved you some misery, it won't have been a total loss.

"Thanks to the hospital in Lexington, I am now drug free. I hope I'll stay that way the rest of my life, but the percentage of drug addicts who do is very low. . . . I have the utmost confidence in you and your past life would make any parent proud. If you ever reach the point that the participation in campus parties overshadows your getting an education it will be much better to drop out of school and look for work."

There's more but the last line struck me as the most anguished and eloquent of all: "I love you, Daddy."

World Opinion and the War in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 12, 1967

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I have at various times taken issue with those who casually shrug off the voices of world opinion. Those voices of world opinion have been loud and clear with regard to our involvement in Southeast Asia. We should know by now, that respected and competent counsel from abroad has continually been proffered to our policymakers. In my humble opinion, we have not listened well.

It is only natural, of course, that the world's people should plead with one another concerning major conflicts such as that in Vietnam or, more recently, that in the Near East. Limited conflicts can rapidly get out of hand, involving many innocent parties. The plain truth is, national interests and actions soon take on an international interest and importance. Consequently, to an increasing degree, national actions are coming into international focus and being subjected to interventional scrutiny and solution.

I offer here, Mr. Speaker, two statements of opinion. The first comes to us from Prof. Edward Gerjouy, a visiting professor from France, presently at the University of Pittsburgh. The second, reflects the opinion of an impressive list of Japanese scholars in the field of physics:

AN OPEN LETTER TO AMERICAN SCIENTISTS ABOUT VIETNAM

DEAR COLLEAGUES AND FRIENDS: Many of us, French physicists and mathematicans, know you personally and your country very well through years of residence on American campuses and in American research institutions. All of us have been impressed by the sense of responsibility and the courage to face the hard facts about Vietnam displayed by a large part of the American scientific community. Moreover, we ourselves, have had a long and painful involvement in wars against newly-emerging countries in particular with Vietnam and Algeria. For all these reasons, we wish to let you know our feelings on the present situation.

Although they are no longer making headlines, the hideous methods used to strike an enemy who is hiding among and deriving support from the population, are afflicting every human conscience: napalm, chemical and gas warfare, burning of villages, torture. We have seen our own country doing the same sort of things and wish we had done more to oppose it. Now it is carried out with the aid of modern technology and on a larger scale. How far have we come from the 1924 Geneva Convention?

A dirty war in the South, and, for more than a year now systematic bombing of North Vietnam. The situation reminds us of the vain attempts of our own governments to fight the Algerian guerilla war outside Algeria, at its "sources," Egypt and Tunisia. Remember that achieving this purpose was the main French motivation behind the Suez expedition. Remember too, the bombing of the Tunisian village of Sakhiet: *one* school destroyed and a general uproar throughout the world, in particular, and justifiably enough, in the US! Given the number of air raids carried out over North Vietnam from above the clouds and with high speed bombers, how many Sakhiets can one estimate to be committed *every day now?*

One of the main stumbling-blocks on the road to a solution seems to be the insistence of the US government on dismissing the National Liberation Front as a responsible agent, a reminder of the position held for many years by French governments towards the Vietninh and the Algerian NLF. It would take too long to retrace the recent history of Vietnam, but we wish to assert that, from all the sources available to us, there emerges a picture of the NLF as a revolutionary movement enjoying the support of at least a large fraction of the South Vietnamese people. Another large fraction of the population, including representative religious communities, though not belonging to the NLF, oppose the successive governments which are supposed to control or represent them. Whatever our judgments may be on the past or future of Vietnam or on the political implications of a settlement there, we all find it hard to understand by what right a country can be brought to ashes in order to maintain in power a succession of puppet-governments.

The French wars in Indochina and Algeria lasted for seven years each. In Indochina we were beaten on the field, in Algeria we reached a sort of military stalemate. In both cases we had to sit down with the leaders of the guerilla movements, and our governments, after years of mistakes and uncertainty, found the wisdom to stop the fighting and eventually negotiated with the leaders of the Vietminh and the Algerian NLF. In the present situation also, we fear that a long time will be needed before the US government will come to terms with reality, if indeed the conflict does not escalate into a third world war. Hence, we appreciate all the more the inspired efforts of many of you American scholars to put an end to the war in Vietnam. And with this letter, we wish to convey our deep sympathy and express our active support for your endeavour.

SIGNATAIRES

(Signatures collectees de Juin á Septembre 1966)

Mathematique

Amice, Boughon, Cartier, Cerf, Chatelet, Chevalley, Choquet, Dixmier, Dolbeault, Douady, Eymard, J. Frenkel, J. Giraud, Guichardet, J. P. Kahane.

Labrousse, Lacombe, D. Lazard, B. Malgrange, Mandelbrojt, Martineau, M. Morel, Neveu, Parreau, Samuel, L. Schwartz, J. P. Serre, Tillieu, Zerner.

Ecole Normale Superieure

Benoit a la Guillaume, Brossel, Cernogora, C. Cohen-Tannoudji, Debever, Decomps, Descoubes, Fishman, Guthmann.

A. Kastler, J. P. Lehmann, Lemercier, J. L. Malgrange, Nozieres, Omont, Picard, Quentin, Rigaux, Simon, Thuillier.

Orsay I

Arnous, Arvieu, Becker, Benoist-Gueutal, R. Bernas, Bussiere, Detraz, Falk-Vairant, M. Jean, Klapish, Laberrigue, H. Langevin, M. Langevin, M. Lefort.

C. Marty, N. Marty, Michalowicz, Nataf, Radvanyi, Riou, Tarrago, Teillac, Veneroni, Vergnes.

Orsay II (Physique des Solides)

Blandin, Bonnerat, Burger, Cagnon, B. Caroli, Castaing, M. Cohen-Solal, Coqblin, P. Cyrot, M. Cyrot, Despres, Deutscher, J. Dixmier, Dupuis, Escaig, Farge, Fert, Fontaine, Friedel, Froidevaux, de Gennes, Guinier, Guyon.

Hartmann, Henry, Hurault, Jouffrey, Labbe, Lambert, D. Lederer, P. Lederer, Martinet, Merkouroff, Papoulard, Parodi, Perio, Perrier, Reich, Roussel, Toulouse, Veuleresse.

Orsay II (Théorie, Acc. Linéare, Plasmas)

Bizot, C. Bouchiat, Buon, Burq, J. L. Delcroix, D'Espagnat, Fitaire, Flamand, Gavoret, Ginibre, Gourdin, B. Grossetete, J. Haissinski, D. Isabelle, Jancovici, Kaplan, Le Bellac, P. Lehmann, Lurcat, Marin, Ph. Meyer, Perez y Jorba, Verlet.

Bellvue

Bailley, G. Cohen-Solal, Dormann, Duplex, Fatseas, Granger, Jamet, De La Cheisserie, Lancon, Le Gall, Lemaire, Pascard, H. Rodot, M. Rodot, Schneider, Suchet, Triboulet, Verie, Weill.

Astrophysique—Meudon G.R.I.

Bel, Blum, Boischot, Du Castel, Cayrel, Commes, Delannoy, Felenbock, Gaulou, Gendrin, Lequeux, Lesqueren, Michard, Pecker.

M. Petit, M. Pick, Schatzman, Souffrin, Spizzichino, Steinberg, Veron, J. Vigneron, Vila.

Saclay (Phys. Théorique et du solide)

Balian, Bergere, C. Bloch, Boccara, Brezin, Bros, Carlos, Cribier, Des Cloizeaux, G. Cohen-Tannoudji, Delrieu, De Dominicis, Froissart, Gaudin, Gillet, Goldman, Herpin, Iagolnitzer.

Itzykson, Jacob, Jacrot, Landesman, Mahoux, Meriel, A. M. Messiah, A. Morel, Moussa, Nifenecker, Poitrenaud, Raynal, Renardy, D. Saint James, Sarma, Signarbieux, Stora, Villain, J. Winter, Zin-Justin.

Saclay (Basses Energies)

Ballini, Beurtey, Catillon, Conjeaud, Cotton, Durand, H. Faraggi, Gastebois, Harrar, Imbert, Jullien, Lechaczynski, Levi.

Morgenstern, Mougey, Netter, A. Papineau, L. Papineau, Pages, Saunier, Schuhl, Tamas, Tzara.

Saclay-Orsay-Polytechnique-College de France (Htes Energies)

Abillon, Asteir, Badier, Baglin, Baton, Barloutaud, Bareyre, Bazin, Bezaguet, Bizard, Brisson, Bruneton, Chavanon, Clement, Cohen-Ganouna, Crozon, Daudin, Defoix, Deler, Della-Negra, De Rosny.

Detoeuf, Ducros, Fleury, Frenkiel, Goldzahl, Granet, Goldberg, Guillaud, Heyman, Jabiol, Jacquemin, Jauneau, Jouvet, Kochowski, Lagarrigue, Leray, Leruste, A. Leveque.

Lewin, Merlo, J. Meyer, Morellet, Mouchet, Narjoux, Neveu, Pascaud, Porte, Schiff, Sene, Six, Thibault, Tocqueville, Turlay, Valladas, Villet, Zylberajch.

Polytechnique

Fuchs, M. Levy, L. Michel, Renouard, Seneor, I. Solomon.

C. E. R. N.

Beillere, D. Bessis, Bonnel, Buhler, Charpak, Davier, De Bouard, Diu, M. Ericson, Favier, Fronteau, J. M. Gaillard.

J. Hogasen, Lassalle, Leonhardt, Ph. Levy, A. Martin, Montanet, Peyrou, Pham, Plouin, Prentki, Schneider, Sonderegger, Vivargent, Yvert.

Grenoble

Averbuch, Briere, Colominas, Dreyfus, Durif, Filippi, Gagnaire, Lajzusowicz, H. Lemaire, Maynard, Peretto, Pfister, Quezel, S. Quezel.

Autres Instituts Province

D. Kastler, Loupias, J. Mandelbrojt, Omnes.

A STATEMENT BY JAPANESE PHYSICISTS ON THE WAR IN VIETNAM

APRIL 1966.

The war in Vietnam is being escalated. Despite powerful opposition from world public opinion, the United States is continuing its bombing of North Vietnam, and is turning South Vietnam into a devastated land through the use of Napalm-bombs and poisonous gas. The war is thus expanding in scope and degree, making us feel keenly the danger that American-Chinese hostilities will break out.

The Government of the U.S.A. claims that aggression from the North is the cause of the war and that it has deployed its troops to Vietnam at the request of the South Vietnamese Government. However, despite all these assertions, we cannot but conclude that the action of the United States in Vietnam constitutes an unjustified interference in the civil war of another country and an outright violation of the 1954 Geneva Agreement.

The Geneva Agreement of 1954, which drew a line of demarcation along the 17th parallel, at the same time clearly stated that it was but a temporary demarcation line and never was to be a political or territorial frontier. The Agreement guarantees the unity and sovereignty of Vietnam and prohibits military interference by foreign countries. The South Vietnamese Government, backed militarily by the U.S. Government, sabotaged united, free elections in Vietnam and cruelly repressed the people who advocated unification of their country. It was to resist this repression and to achieve one Vietnam that the South Vietnam National-Liberation-Front (the so-called Vietcong) was organized. It is reported that NLF now controls three quarters of South Vietnam's territory.

It is to be deplored that, due to difference of opinion among the Vietnamese, a civil war has thus occurred in South Vietnam. However, the civil war is by all means the international affairs of the Vietnamese people. On no grounds is it tolerable that a foreign country arbitrarily intervenes in Vietnamese affairs, obstructs the unification of the nation, and destroys the life and culture of the Vietnamese people.

We are convinced that the Vietnam question should be settled by, and only by, the Vietnamese people themselves, including the NLF. We insist that to enable the Vietnamese people to settle their affairs, it is vitally essential that the United States should stop its belligerent action, including aerial attacks on North Vietnam, and withdraw all of its troops from Vietnam.

The Japanese Government, on its part, is playing the role of an accomplice in the present war, by offering, under the U.S.-Japan Security Treaty, Japanese territory as operational bases for U.S. troops. Such a policy runs counter to the will of the overwhelming majority of the peace-loving Japanese people. We demand, on the above mentioned grounds, that the Japanese Government immediately discards its present policy with respect to the Vietnam war.

We, Japanese physicists, urge our friends in the United States to support this statement and to take appropriate action to change the Vietnam policy of the U.S. Government.

(*The signatures of 1,300 Japanese physicists were appended to this statement.*)

Independence of the Legal Profession

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BASIL L. WHITENER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 22, 1967

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, a recent article by Hon. Al J. Cone, president of the American Trial Lawyers Association, relating to the independence of the legal profession has been brought to my attention.

As Mr. Cone points out, there are many threats on the horizon which tend toward bringing the practice of law under governmental control. I concur with him that we should all take note of this threat and be diligent in avoiding further inroads into the independence of the practice of law.

I believe that Mr. Cone's article, which appeared in the newsletter of the American Trial Lawyers Association in May 1967, is of importance and should be brought to the attention of our colleagues and the Nation by inserting it in the Appendix of the RECORD today, as follows:

Lawyers exist at the focal and friction points of society and aid society in making its internal adjustments by seeking to accommodate change within a framework of continuity. As society grows or changes, the relationship between various parts necessarily changes. It is the lawyer who helps to smooth this adjustment and make it tolerable. Up to now, the legal profession has never been endangered by change. To the contrary, we help to make change possible without dislocating or fragmenting society, while at the same time assisting in preserving the values of existing institutions. Lawyers profoundly believe with Burke that a legal order without the mechanism of change is without the means of its own preservation.

One characteristic of the legal profession, however, is essential to its survival. This feature is that of *independence*. The legal profession, in addition to being learned, accessible, and devoted to the commonweal, must be and remain *independent*. As long as lawyers remain free to choose clients ar reject them, to *represent* clients without becoming their economic prisoners, we can continue responsibly to serve our function in society.

For the first time in the last one hundred years, the American lawyer faces a grave threat to the continued independence of his profession, a threat which is posed by a combination of several different social developments.

One of the factors posing a threat is a series of recent Supreme Court decisions involving so-called "group-practice." This series of cases really began with NAACP v. Button, 371 U.S. 415 (1963), which invalidated Virginia's maintenance and champerty laws under the first and fourteenth amendments, insofar as they prevented the NAACP from seeking out prospective plaintiffs in desegregation cases. Having said "A", the Supreme Court felt compelled to say "B" in Brotherhood of R.R. Trainmen v. Virginia *ex rel.* Virginia State Bar, 377 U.S. 1 (1964), by upholding the principle that a labor union could solicit and refer cases of its injured members to particular attorneys. Much of the rationale sustaining this latter case vanishes if the principle of specialist certification, classification, qualification, and recognition of personal injury lawyers as trial specialists were established, since the most compelling justification of the Brotherhood's plan is a desirability of its members obtaining able and competent lawyers.

See 31 ATLA L. J. 411; and see *N.Y. Times*, Feb. 8, 1967 (certification proposed for personal injury trial lawyers).

The practical impact of this decision on the legal profession escaped or did not evoke the Court's attention.

Even if the enormous potential or incentive for corruption in such union lawyer reference plan be ignored (which is hard to do), the threat to the independence of the legal profession escaped or did not evoke the Court's attention.

Even if the enormous potential or incentive for corruption in such union lawyer refence plan be ignored (which is hard to do), the threat to the independence of the legal profession remains. Does anyone believe that in a conflict of interest between an individual member of the union and that of the union or the union business agent that the interest of the individual member would receive anything other than short shrift?

With the virtual incentive to corruption in the choice of the union lawyer and with the immense sums involved, does anyone believe that competition for this business will continue to be on the basis of the merit or skill of the lawyer involved? As a result of the decisions involving open "group practice," an effort has even been made in some quarters to organize entities, corporate in nature, to provide legal services in return for a fee to their subscribers somewhat similar to the way insurance companies provide protection to their policy holders. Does anyone believe that the lawyer who is employed by such an entity retains his independence? In the event of conflict of interest between the individual clients and the corporate entity, does anyone believe that the individual would receive the whole and singlehearted devotion to which the client is entitled from his lawyer?

The "house counsel" concept of a few insurance companies involves a similar problem. Not long ago, a major insurance company engaged a "lawyer" on a salary basis to handle all of its assureds' litigation in Florida, from negotiation to trial. Does anyone imagine that this "lawyer" maintains his independent status? "Service," "controlled," "hirling," "stall-fed," "subservient mercenaries," are all appellations that come to mind—but not "independent practitioner."

The Legal Services Division of the Office of Economic Opportunity involves a similar problem. Born of the desire of our society to improve the lot of its impoverished minority, the OEO's insistence on the "neighborhood law office" concept, as opposed to the "Judicare" concept, has created a new class of lawyers, servant to the State, a class which does not participate in the tradition of an independent bar with its whole-souled devotion to the interest of the individual client. Noble phrases of the OEO to the contrary, if a single source of income, then federally-financed, controls the purse strings, the lawyer employed by that source is no independent counselor—but a servant, and a servant of the state rather than an unalloyed representative of the client. The Legal Services Division of OEO has been tentatively allotted $27 to $31 million for fiscal 1967. Do not legal services programs contain a built-in conflict of interest because one group (program's contributors) is paying for services to another? And does not this place the legal services attorney in a conflict-of-interests position barred and denounced by Canon 6? And do not overlook the teaching of *In re* Community Action for Legal Servs., Inc., 26 App. Div. 2d 354, 274 N.Y.S. 2d 779 (1966), in which the N.Y. Appellate Division in rejecting the applications of three legal services programs discerned infringement and derogation of the Canons. In addition to rejecting the applications, because the holding company structure of the programs made court supervision impossible, the court significantly stated, "[L]awyer operations would be subject ultimately to lay control. This is not permissible." The court also faulted the proposals in their failure to prohibit "political lobbying and propagandistic activity," adding that "it would be one thing to allow neighborhood law officers to handle poor men's credit unions. It would be quite another thing to have them handle . . . organizations of social and economic protest."

Some may point to the function of the prosecutor and the public defender as examples of state-employed attorneys whose existence has not threatened the independence of the legal profession. These functions, however, are limited and have been largely confined to the field of criminal law. They have not invaded nor are they intended to invade those fields in which legal services could be provided by independent and private counsel.

To the traditional state-controlled practice in the criminal field, the threats of group practice, the use of house counsel, the OEO's neighborhood law Offices, add the threat posed by the dubious Keeton-O'Connell plan and we have a new combination and array of dangers to the independent existence of our profession. Whether we recognize with wisdom these threats, and react with courage and vigor, in mobilizing resistence to such disturbing developments, will determine the future existence and cherished independence of our profession.

Perhaps more significantly, if the legal profession loses its independent existence, our society may lose part of its capacity to authenticate and domesticate all overbearing power, whether public or private, and to adjust to change smoothly and with attention to the rights of all its members. A cardinal characteristic of our society, its concern for the sacredness of individual rights, will be endangered. It might then be said of America what a traveler once said of Germany, after Hitler had destroyed its Jews—"It was as though one ate unseasoned food. Truly, the 'salt had lost its savor' and the land some of its subtle richness."

—AL J. CONE.

Antisubmarine Warfare and the Soviet Submarine Threat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD T. HANNA
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 12, 1967

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, in two World Wars, German U-boats presented a formidable challenge to the Allied war effort, seriously threatening the sea lines of communication upon which the economic lives and military operations of the Allies were dependent. In World War II, this threat was mounted by a relatively modest U-boat fleet numbering some 57 boats at the outset of the war, of which only 39 were operational.

THE SOVIET THREAT

Today, the United States and its free world partners are faced with a substantially greater danger, both quantitatively and qualitatively. It is estimated that the Soviet Navy includes about 400 submarines, of which approximately 50 are nuclear powered.

In assessing the threat, it is necessary to recognize the changing character of this menace. Far beyond the traditional role of attacking targets at sea, the submarine has become a launching platform for nuclear-missile attack against land targets. It is estimated that the Soviet submarine fleet includes at least 40 boats, of which 15 are nuclear powered, each of which is capable of carrying three ballistic missiles. In his congressional statement for fiscal year 1968, the Secretary of Defense stated that the Soviet Union had 130 submarine-launched ballistic missiles as of October 1, 1966. The Soviets also possess an estimated 40 submarines, 12 with nuclear power, each capable of launching an average of four cruise missiles with a range of 300 to 500 miles.

Every indication is that the Soviet undersea warfare capability will improve, and that the nuclear-powered Soviet submarine fleet of the future wil lbe capable of undertaking long-range operations and operating quietly at great depths, armed with a variety of weapons for both land bombardment and attacks upon shipping, including longer range subsurface-launched ballistic missiles.

THE THREE DIMENSIONS OF OUR RESPONSE

Considering present and prospective Soviet submarine strength, the question becomes: Is the U.S. antisubmarine warfare program, ASW, sufficient to deal with the threat? Given the U.S. geographic position and overall strategic requirements, the antisubmarine warfare can be delineated into three dimensions:

First. Maintenance of sea lines of communication, to include projecting military power overseas.

Second. Control of the seas.

Third. Defense of the United States against attack by submarine-launched missiles.

Performance of these critical and equally burdensome tasks is heavily dependent upon finding a solution to the ASW problem. It is unnecessary to spell out the operational implications of this mission to recognize that the United States, in conjunction with its allies, must be able to conduct successful ASW operations over a vast portion of the world's seas, while at the same time engaging in other essential naval undertakings. In geographic terms, the mission requires a capability to cope with the submarine threat along the routes of sea access to the continents in both hemispheres. This is a formidable challenge, and demands a concerted national effort in which all elements of the Naval Establishment must be involved.

THE COMPONENTS OF ANTISUBMARINE WARFARE

There are two basic components of the ASW effort: First, hardware and facilities including submarines, surface ships, aircraft, weapons, sensors, and fixed systems ashore, some of which are multifunctional; second, research, development, testing, and evaluation. This program is directed toward improvement in hardware and systems.

Much progress has been made in recent years in managing the ASW program within the Navy and in improving the operational capabilities. Great strides have been made in developing and bringing to bear advanced equipment. However, the problem of conducting a fully effective research, development, testing, and evaluation program has been made peculiarly difficult because it cuts across many activities within the naval establishment. In my opinion, it is in this area that the present shortfalls are most serious. This area concerns me because it is the cornerstone from which we build our future programs, our efforts to counter somber spectre of the Soviet threat.

Let us focus on each of these areas to assess our progress.

HARDWARE AND FACILITIES

It is not at all clear that the current U.S. nuclear submarine building program is sufficient, either in total numbers or in rate of construction. Currently, approved programs call for 64 first-class nuclear submarines. A primary mission of these submarines is ASW.

Considering the potential Soviet threat alone, both in numbers and increased capabilities, and recognizing that undersea warfare is characterized by high attrition, it seems doubtful that the currently approved program of U.S. submarines is adequate to the task. Moreover, it is acknowledged that the present program is based on requirements other than those which might be attendant in the event of nuclear attack upon the United States.

As for the rate of construction, the program has been plagued by slippage. The program has also been stretched out. For fiscal year 1968, the Joint Chiefs of Staff recommended five new nuclear submarines, only three of which were approved by the Secretary of Defense.

Aircraft, both land- and sea-based, and both fixed and rotary wing, are essential to the ASW mission. One of the proven methods in ASW operations has been the so-called hunter-killer group, built around an aircraft carrier with embarked aircraft, escorting destroyer-type vessels, and attack submarines.

This role of the aircraft carrier is now being challenged as being less cost-effective than alternative approaches. The number of carriers in the active fleet was reduced from nine to eight in fiscal year 1967. The Secretary of Defense proposes to reduce the force further "when the conflict in Vietnam ends." The Joint Chiefs of Staff, on the other hand, recommend retention of nine carriers.

It may be that other surface ship programs are also deficient in meeting the true ASW requirement. It has long been recognized that large numbers of ships are required to cope with a massive submarine threat, and there is no evidence that ship construction is expanding, either to produce greater numbers of ships in the active fleet to meet a growing threat, or to permit modernization at a rate sufficient to overcome obsolescence. For example, the Joint Chiefs of Staff recommended in fiscal year 1968 one nuclear-powered guided missile frigate and two conventionally powered destroyers; the Secretary of Defense did not approve the request for the frigate in fiscal year 1968.

With respect to antisubmarine warfare aircraft, the basic issue is development of a new carrier-based aircraft to replace the obsolete S-2E. For fiscal year 1968, the Secretary of Defense disapproved a Navy proposal—concurred in by the Joint Chiefs of Staff—to proceed with contract definition for this improved aircraft. The Navy was also turned down on its proposal to develop a light airborne ASW attack vehicle, conceived as a manned helicopter to be operated from ASW ships and capable of carrying antisubmarine weapons.

This seeming reluctance to expedite development of ship-based aircraft ASW systems and surface vessels is, in light of the serious threat posed by the Soviet Union, difficult to understand. It can only be explained by an ambivalence, a lack of definition resulting from the fact that our antisubmarine warfare program has not in the past been fully coordinated and still today lacks, in a number of critical areas, either the capability or the disposition to move more decisively.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TESTING AND EVALUATION

There is even more serious doubt as to the adequacy of the current antisubmarine warfare program for research, development, testing, and evaluation. The Secretary of the Navy has expressed concern over the fiscal year 1968 research, development, testing, and evaluation budget generally, and had characterized it as "tight." On the basis of the congressional hearings on the fiscal year 1968 Defense budget, it appears that there were research, development, testing, and evaluation projects for antisubmarine warfare in the amount of $46 million which the Navy considers desirable but which were considered necessary by the Navy and left unfunded by the Secretary of Defense. This amount included both weapons and sensors. Among the programs affected were the undersea surveillance system—SOSUS—the MK-48 torpedo, increased technical support, a more comprehensive test program, and advanced surface ship sonars. Through the able effort of Chairman RIVERS and Representative STRATTON, chairman of the Special Subcommittee on Antisubmarine Warfare, the authorization for these needed funds has been restored.

SHORTCOMINGS IN OUR CURRENT EFFORTS

As I see it, the antisubmarine warfare research, development, testing, and evaluation effort suffers from two shortcomings: First, the lack of an integrated approach; and second, the absence of centralized authority and technical control. Since the designation of Admiral Martell as the director, antisubmarine warfare programs, much progress has been made, particularly in the development of short-term programs.

In spite of recent improvements there are many areas in which our efforts remain fragmented and piecemeal. If there is one, single shortcoming which—more than any other—threatens our undersea warfare capability and, therefore, our total superiority at sea, it is the fact that we are operating with antiquated facilities which are both costly and ineffective. It was in recognition of this fact that the Navy Department adopted the proposal of the President's Marine Resources Advisory Committee that a single center responsible for conducting technical and research activities be created on both the east and west coasts. This proposal, which is embodied in the administration military construction authorization bill, would provide funds for a west coast facility, with the east coast facility being brought into being through expansion of existing facilities. It seems to me that it is critical that this Congress move quickly to authorize this important west coast facility so that our Nation can, in the words of Admiral MacDonald, Chief of Naval Operations, meet the "increasing and imposing threat of our potential enemies—antisubmarine warfare effort."

Col. R. Wilson Neff Getting New Assignment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD D. McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 1967

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, before this month is up, Col. R. Wilson Neff—Buffalo's district engineer of the Army Corps of Engineers—will leave to take over a new assignment.

Colonel Neff, the second youngest district engineer to be assigned to Buffalo, has accomplished much since his appointment to the area in 1964.

I personally have had many pleasant encounters with Colonel Neff in our joint efforts to clean up Lake Erie and the polluted Buffalo River. We have disagreed at times, but ours always has been a friendly and amiable relationship. I have great respect for Colonel Neff as a man, an engineer, an officer, and a gentleman.

On Sunday, June 4, the Buffalo Courier Express ran a full article in tribute to Colonel Neff, citing his many services to the Buffalo area.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to include that article in the RECORD today:

BUSY PACE IS MAINTAINED BY NEFF

(By Francis J. O'Connell)

There is seldom a dull moment in the life of a district engineer of the Army Corps of Engineers.

Col. R. Wilson Neff, for example, second youngest district engineer ever assigned here, has had his hands full since coming to Buffalo in the summer of 1964.

The 47-year-old Army colonel is scheduled to leave late this month for a new assignment, but his remembrances of Buffalo's water and navigational conditions, plus progress of a study for an All-American Canal connecting Lakes Erie and Ontario, indicate his busy schedule.

An estimated 30 to 40 studies of harbor, river and lake conditions are underway in the extensive area the Buffalo District controls. It runs from Sandusky River Basin in Ohio to the international boundary on the St. Lawrence River.

With respect to these duties, Col. Neff is the contracting officer who has control of the award of all contracts.

"There are certain items I can delegate," Neff said, "but the responsibility for contract awards is all mine. The All-American Canal study is progressing, but ahead lies the most difficult task. That is determining the benefits to be derived.

"We have to look at the entire Great Lakes chain to accomplish that task with the help of a $1.8-million allocation for the study alone. About two-thirds of this amount has been spent in recent years and the 1968 budget calls for $100,000 to continue the study."

One of his main tasks in recent months has been to seek to improve water quality under a pilot program of which he is chairmain for the entire Great Lakes.

"There is a lot of laboratory work involved with respect to dredging samples and we are working constantly to find acceptable methods of eliminating pollution and improving water quality all over the lakes. We are hiring consultants to seek cost information and acceptable methods of doing the job."

In Buffalo, for example, bids for the dredging of the river and ship canal are being advertised. There could be a delay in the opening of the bids June 8 due to complications centering about the building of a dike near the small boat harbor to dump the dredged material and check samples.

Bids for further dredging are to be advertised soon in Cleveland; Green Bay, Toledo, the Rouge River and Calumet River. In each instance, the laboratory work involved will be extensive as the Corps seeks the answer to pollution if it can be found in the dredging programs.

One particularly large study is under way. It involves the Genesee River basin and includes "a plan for the best use or combination of uses of the water and related land resources of the Genesee Basin to enhance the well being and prosperity of all residents of that area.

Neff said this study, of which he is the co-ordinator, is designed to examine the anticipated growth and development capabilities of the basin in future years. The study should be completed this summer and recommendations sent on to Corps headquarters for final action.

Locally, the preliminary survey on Niagara Falls for the preservation and enhancement of that area's scenic beauty, has been completed. The Corps recommendation is for a more detailed study involving the International Joint Commission and that recommendation is now under study by headquarters.

The Corps has done a large number of small boat harbor and flood plain information studies in the anticipation that its concentrated information results will be utilized in future planning. In the words of Neff, particularly with respect to Cazenovia Creek, "We don't recommend improvements, but provide information on our studies that could prove useful to local interests."

A Wilson, N.Y., project was recently authorized and Corps studies involve several more on lakes Erie and Ontario. Purpose of these small boat harbor studies is to provide refuge for small craft to permit far more extensive use of the lakes for navigational purposes.

In short, the years ahead will see many more protective points for small craft in the event of sudden storms.

Under Neff's regime, the Smokes Creek flood control project in Lackawanna has been brought almost to a conclusion. Started in 1964, the project, designed to curb waters that have proven troublesome to the point of disaster in recent years, has one more contract to go.

Neff had anticipated this contract would be completed this summer. Complications have arisen, however, and it appears the project will be extended into 1968.

There are contracts under way in Warsaw, on Oatka Creek, on the Cayuga Inlet at Ithaca, and at Freemont, Ohio, where the Sandusky River improvement program is progressing.

Neff saw through the deepening of 27 feet of the outer Buffalo Harbor. He has similar deepening projects under way in Erie, Sandusky, Conneaut, Cleveland and one soon to start at Ashtabula. These are apart from the maintenance of breakwaters and channel dephts as well as soundings of depths, tasks the Corps is well equipped to do with its fleet of mechanized equipment, regarded as the finest in the world.

Of interest to Neff and the entire Niagara Frontier will be the first appearance in Buffalo about June 8 of the dredge Markham, pride of the Corps workhorse fleet.

The big ship, known as the "Queen of Great Lakes Hopper Dredges," will restore the outer harbor depth to 27 feet and will work around the clock to carry the task out as quickly as possible.

Neff, in his spare moments, has been called on for public hearings, for talks at luncheons and dinners and his main concern over the three years has been the progress of the Niagara Frontier. His work will be inherited by Lt. Col. Amos L. Wright, 42, presently on assignment in Washington.

Think Mink

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY C. SCHADEBERG

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1967

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, many of my colleagues, and I, have submitted bills into Congress which seek to hold imports of mink pelts at 40 percent of domestic consumption in an effort to help this industry now faced with disaster. In addition, I wrote to the President and asked his help for these people whose market is being swamped with cheap imports. Following is the reply I received and directly after this reply is my letter to his noble Office, reflecting my feelings:

OFFICE OF THE SPECIAL REPRESENTATIVE FOR TRADE NEGOTIATIONS,
EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
Washington, June 8, 1967.

Hon. HENRY C. SCHADEBERG,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SCHADEBERG: Your letter to the President of May 18, 1967, has been referred to this Office for further reply. In your letter, you urge that the President request the Tariff Commission, under section 332(g) of the Tariff Act of 1930, to make a study of imports of mink.

I frankly do not believe that the President would consider requesting such a study of the Tariff Commission without considerably more information about the nature of the problem. I might add that under section 332(g) the Ways and Means Committee or the House of Representatives may ask the Tariff Commission to undertake such a study.

In any case, however, we would be reluctant to consider the imposition of additional restrictions on imports of mink without a showing that such imports are causing or threatening serious economic injury to the domestic industry. This is especially true since the domestic industry already enjoys extraordinary protection through the total embargo on imports from the Soviet Union, which has been in effect since 1951. This embargo is provided for in headnote 4 of subpart B of part 5 of schedule 1 of the Tariff Schedules of the United States.

Sincerely yours,
WILLIAM M. ROTH,
Special Representative.

JUNE 12, 1967.

Hon. WILLIAM M. ROTH,
The Special Representative for Trade Negotiations, Executive Office of the President, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ROTH: Thank you for your letter of June 8th. Your frankness is appreciated.

I am deeply dismayed at your lack of concern over the plight of the American mink industry. Many a mink rancher in the United States has been forced out of business and many more will be forced out of business unless the Administration acts promptly in their behalf. Ten ranchers in my own district in Wisconsin have gone out of business in the past year and predictions are that 40% of the remaining ranchers will be put out of business by the end of the year unless something is done soon.

It is clear to me by your letter that the Administration will do nothing to help save the mink industry in the United States. I find this attitude very unusual, especially in the light of the facts that market averages have fallen off drastically from a gross level of $19.48 per pelt for 1965–66 to a current level of $15 or less and imports are entering this country duty-free at an $11.50 average, the lowest price on record. Since 1960, the American mink industry has lost over 40% of its ranchers because of price resistance on the world market. Foreign imports, meanwhile, have built up to 42 percent of domestic consumption and indications are that they will increase. Imports should be held at 40% or less.

Your attitude of "do nothing" persists despite the fact that in 1966 American expansion was only from six to nine percent when imports from Scandinavia increased 23 percent and from Denmark 28 percent—all in one year! Meanwhile, the Norwegians have announced that their 1967 production would exceed 1966 by 20 percent and that the United States is their main target.

Certainly, we owe something to the splendid people who have done such a fine job in building the mink industry, who have not sought government aid in any way, creating a profitable market for its product and built it, from scratch, into one of the finest in the world. The mink industry is an American idea and has, until imports threatened it, been a shining example of what free enterprise can do. It exemplifies the American way of life and yet your office wishes to ignore a very real threat to their very existence.

When I speak of an industry's future which is at stake, I do not appreciate being taken lightly. Not only an investigation but action as soon as possible is required if the best interests of the American industry are to be served. My request for action by the Administration is serious and realistic. I seek to protect the 1,000 ranchers in my state who employ 3,000 persons and whose payroll annually is $10,654,000. Their capital investments amount to $54,354,000 and their gross sales total $46,323,000. Certainly these are items worth keeping for Americans, especially for these Amercians who pay the taxes and who have helped make this nation what it is today.

Your statement in your reply of June 8th, that ". . . the domestic industry already enjoys extraordinary protection through the total embargo on imports from the Soviet Union, which has been in effect since 1951." is a classic example of a *non-sequitur*. Frankly, I cannot see how an embargo on Soviet mink has any bearing on this issue other than that the Administration has accepted the false premise that the Soviets have rights to our markets over and above the rights of our own citizens. When is it "extraordinary protection" to place the interests of our own industry over the interests of an industry abroad that supports the government that is helping to provide materials which are killing our men in Vietnam and that persists in its denunciation of the United States not only in its efforts to seek freedom and self determination for the Vietnamese but to stablize the deteriorating situation in the Middle East in a search for peace?

I do not think it is worthwhile to build bridges to the East if the spans are to be supported by foundations consisting of the dead bodies of the mink industry. This industry, the American mink industry is in trouble. I have met with many in my own district and heard their pleas first-hand. I do not irrationally seek assistance; I do not plead without cause; and I do not accept your temerity. I must insist that this "reluctance" on your part be replaced with a concern for that which is ours and that which must remain ours if we are to continue as the land of opportunity and of free enterprise.

Cordially,
HENRY C. SCHADEBERG,
Member of Congress.

Another Side to the Gun Question

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1967

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an excellent article in opposition to restrictive firearms legislation from the February issue of Presbyterian Life. It is entitled "There Is Another Side to the Gun Question." The article follows:

THERE IS ANOTHER SIDE TO THE GUN QUESTION

(By Gary L. Anderson)

It is because of guns that I am studying to become a minister. I never would have made this decision if it were not for my experiences in competitive target shooting. If this is what "an inordinate interest in guns" means, then I thank God that I have this interest.

When I speak about firearms, I make no attempt to conceal the fact that guns are used in crimes and that people are killed in shooting accidents. Because God is concerned with lives that are lost by accident or damaged by crime, the use and misuse of guns is the proper concern of Christianity. As a Christian, a gun-owner, and a competitive shooter, I welcome and encourage such concern. My hope in writing this article is to demonstrate that there is more than one side to this issue.

Because I love the sport of shooting and have gained so much from it, it disturbs me when I read magazine articles that feature the so-called "gun problem." Their attempt to link the shooter with the likes of Oswald, Whitman, and the Minutemen causes me to surmise that the articles' authors did not know the real sport of shooting.

Guns are usually publicized only when they appear in crime or accidents. When I think of the people whom I have known in shooting, I become concerned that their story, which represents the overwhelming majority of shooting activities, is seldom if ever heard. The variety of occupations of the people I have competed with illustrates how ordinary the typical gunowner is. Former Olympic shooting-team captain Emmett Swanson is a dentist in Minnesota. Women's national rifle champion Mrs. Inez Sargent is a Texas housewife. Former women's national champion Mrs. Lenore Lemanski was a college homecoming queen and now teaches English in Michigan.

World pistol champion Makhmoud Umarov of Russia is a physician. American Olympic gold medalist Lones Wigger comes from a wheat ranch in Montana. Another Olympic teammate and medal winner, Martin Gunnarsson, was an immigrant from Sweden. These are the people who I feel represent the real gun-owner.

Guns have been described as "murderous" or "lethal" weapons whose purpose is to kill. This description completely overlooks the existence of shooting as a sport. A gun as a weapon when it is used by a policeman or soldier. For the sportsman, the gun is an item of equipment just as a bat is used for baseball and a helmet for football.

Accounts of firearms accidents often characterize horseplay with guns as "target shooting." Various reports told how Lee Harvey Oswald and Charles Whitman practiced "target shooting." The attempt to associate the criminal or negligent use of guns with sport shooting cannot be made so easily. Target shooting is target shooting only when it is adequately controlled and is conducted on a safe range.

Rifle, pistol, and shotgun shooting events are included in the Olympic program. The worldwide popularity of shooting is demonstrated by the fact that of all the twenty Olympic sports only track and boxing had more participating nations in the 1964 Olympics at Tokyo. The 39th World Shooting Championships, held in West Germany this past summer, had more than one thousand competitors from fifty nations. Victories by the American teams in the last World Championships and Olympics have established us as the world's top nation in shooting.

In our own country target shooting is a popular participation sport with an unimpeachable safety record. There are more than 100,000 rifle and pistol competitors, 30,000 trap shooters, and 15,000 skeet shooters registered with their respective national associations. In my nine years of target shooting I have attended hundreds of competitions, but not one shooting accident has occurred. Trap shooting began in 1890 and has never had a single shooting fatality in official competition. Skeet shooting has recorded no fatalities and only one gun-inflicted injury since it began in 1929. How many other sports can point to such a safety record?

As a shooting sport, hunting is even more popular. In 1965, there were fourteen million hunting licenses sold and an estimated twenty million hunters. The rapid growth of hunting is confirmed by the 80 percent increase in these numbers since 1942.

The attempt to label the hunting gun a "killer" is equally unsuccessful. The hunter is no more a killer than the man who has hamburger for lunch. If anything, I believe the average hunter's contact with wildlife gives him greater respect for life and God's creation. If man has been given dominion over creation, then this obligation to preserve and enjoy nature must include sound hunting and conservation practices. The hunter has always been among the leaders in the conservation movement.

The hunter is also deeply concerned over hunting accidents and the abuses of the small percentage of hunters who have no regard for the rights of farmers and property owners. The efforts of sportsmen to enact hunter-safety legislation shows that he, more than anyone else, is trying to do something about this problem.

Another important shooting program is the National Rifle Association's junior rifle club program. Under qualified adult supervision, young people are taught firearms safety and are introduced to shooting competition. The value of this instruction in terms of accident prevention and the personal development which comes from competition is considerable.

In contrast to these legitimate and beneficial uses of firearms, several recent articles have been trying to show that guns are bad, that they should be feared, and that the only answer to this problem is restrictive legislation. These articles submit an imposing array of statistics, but they are statistics selected to tell only part of the story.

For instance, it is stated that 17,000 people are shot each year. It is not disclosed that this figure includes 9,500 who shot themselves as suicides. Blaming guns for suicides would be like blaming the Golden Gate Bridge for the deaths of people who have jumped from it.

The assumption is made that New York City's tight gun controls prevent murder since only 27 percent of that city's homicides are committed with firearms. No direct correlation between murder rates and firearms control emerges from homicides statistics, however. The San Francisco Bay area and Dallas both have less rigid firearms controls than New York, but the murder rate in San Francisco is much lower than New York's, while it is higher in Dallas. In New York the criminal has used other weapons. Forty-two percent of the murders were committed with knives and another 20 percent with plain physical force. Throughout the country, sharp instruments, blunt objects, and parts of the body all outrank guns as weapons used in aggravated assaults; yet we hear no outcry against knives, clubs, or fists. The real causes of crime lie much deeper than these considerations.

The big effort to establish a fear of guns is done by emphasizing accident figures, but the assertion that firearms accidents are commonplace is not borne out by all statics. Twenty-four hundred people were killed in firearms accident in 1965, but National Safety Council figures show that this was just two percent of all fatal accidents. Motor vehicles (46 percent), falls (18 percent), fires and burns (8 percent), drowning (7 percent), and railroad accidents (2.5 percent) annually kill more people in accidents than firearms, yet we hear no impassioned calls for greater legislative controls against cars, ladders, or boats. Significantly, the firearms accident death rate per 100,000 people has fallen from 2.3 to 1.3 in the last sixty years.

My purpose in quoting these figures has been to show two things. First, the case for the "menace of firearms" is overstated in order to evoke an irrational emotional response against guns. Second, firearms are only one of the tools used in crime and only one of many factors involved in accidents.

Nevertheless, no legitimate gun-owner wants to divert attention from the accidents and crime which do involve firearms. There is a problem here, but it is not a "gun problem." There is a crime problem and an accident problem, both of which may involve the misuse of firearms.

Unfortunately, the solutions to these problems which have been most publicized are the ones which have already proven themselves ineffective. The desire to ban all firearms is invalidated by our experiences with prohibition in the 1920's. Requirements for gun registration and licenses to purchase or carry guns have been unsuccessful. In March of 1965, Philadelphia passed an extremely restrictive firearms-control law. Yet FBI statistics indicate both the crime rate and the murder rate went up during its first year of operation. One city councilman who voted for this law now calls it "a joke." He says, "The answer to this crime problem is not to attack the gun; it's to attack the causes of crime."

Articles about Charles Whitman's murders in Austin, often cited as evidence of the need for increased control, do not mention that he was violating the National Firearms Act of 1934 by possessing a sawed-off shotgun. This already existing statute did not stop him, nor would any other existing or proposed firearms-control law in America have saved his victims.

The access which minors and criminals have to guns through the mail is one area where proper control could be successful. But the unreasonably restrictive Dodd Bill introduced in the 89th Congress is not the answer. The compromise Hruska Bill would have achieved the same objective without restricting the individual citizen. It required that a notarized statement attesting to the person's age and qualifications accompany the order for a gun and that this application be reviewed by a local or state law-enforcement officer. Persons under twenty-one would be prohibited from ordering a pistol. Destructive weapons such as mortars, bazookas, grenades, bombs, and mines would be included in the prohibitions.

When I prepare my rifles for competition, I often send them through the mail to have them repaired or altered. Under the Hruska Bill I could continue this, but under the Dodd Bill it would be stopped. Many legitimate shooting activities like this would be penalized by the Dodd Bill.

The vast majority of gun-owners support reasonable legislation and would willingly accept more stringent controls if they would actually reduce crime or accidents. But gun control does not reduce crime, and other measures have been more effective in preventing accidents.

The opposition of sportsmen to unreasonable gun controls has been substantial because there are so many people in America who are genuinely interested in guns. There has been a determined effort to discredit this opposition. This endeavor was characterized by one writer who described the National Rifle Association as having "lavish headquarters—within gunshot of the White House."

This play on emotion also focuses on the assistance which Congress provides NRA-affiliated clubs through the National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice. The allegations that this agency passes out "free guns" to NRA members is not true. The anti-gun articles also do not mention a study of the civilian marksmanship program which the Department of Defense commissioned Arthur D. Little, Inc., the largest management consultant firm in the country, to do in 1965. The conclusions of this study completely upheld the program as beneficial to the youths involved and to the national defense effort. It found no valid instance of the misuse of rifles and ammunition provided by the NBPRP and recommended that the program be expanded.

If one in every two American households owns at least one gun and 42 percent of our male high-school students own a rifle or shotgun, this does not say that something is wrong. This is not a "gun craze" but rather the demonstration of a massive fundamental interest. The most sensible thing we can do is to encourage a healthy interest instead of a dangerous negative curiosity.

Sportsmen and the NRA have accepted this obligation by initiating and conducting firearms-safety and hunter-safety courses. Thirty-eight states now have hunter-safety programs. Most of these programs are directed towards minors, but New York requires anyone getting his first hunting license to pass the course. A study made in New York compared the accident statistics of the twelve years prior to the start of the state's hunter-safety program with the twelve years the program has been in effect. Although there were 30 percent more hunters during the latter period, there was a 10 percent reduction in accidents and a decrease of 351 in fatalities. Utah began hunter-safety training in 1956 and consequently reduced hunting accidents from 128 in 1956 to 27 in 1963. The percentage of accidents caused by minors was decreased from 79 percent to 12.8 percent. Since making hunter-safety training mandatory for hunters under twenty-one, New Jersey has cut its hunting fatalities in half. This is the kind of effective gun legislation that the NRA and gun-owners support. Teaching a person gun safety reduces accidents. Teaching a person to fear guns increases the chance he will be involved in an accident.

The relevance of the shooting sport for the church arises because recreation and safety are two areas where Christianity can demonstrate its concern for all phases of life. Many churches have become involved in teaching young people how to shoot by sponsoring junior rifle clubs. If your church has one or two target shooters among its members, this may be one way to utilize their talents and at the same time promote sports participation and safety among the young people of your community.

There are other ways that churches and Christians can do something about these concerns. There were 115 church camps which sponsored rifle-shooting activities in 1965. Communities where hunting is done should zealously encourage hunter safety. When large numbers of young people receive guns for Christmas, for instance, there should be some kind of firearms-safety instruction for them. Housewives and people who never do any shooting should be encouraged to learn how to handle a gun safely, even if they never intend to shoot or own a gun. Home safety, which includes firearms safety, which includes firearms safety, should be a concern of every community.

Very recently, a man was holding a pistol which he thought was unloaded. His seven-year-old daughter playfully ran up to him and said, "Shoot me, daddy." A few hours later she was dead. What makes this so-called accident so tragic is that anyone who has been taught gun safety learns that a gun is never loaded except on the range or in the field and that *a gun is never pointed at anyone under any circumstances.* An accident involving a recklessly driven automobile would not be the fault of the car. This accident was not the fault of the gun.

Accidents like this would never happen if people were taught to use guns safely. The impressive safety record of shooting competition and firearms-safety instruction verifies that shooting can be among the safest of sports.

Inadequate Attention to American Travel Program Aggravating Balance-of-Payments Deficit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD T. HANNA
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 12, 1967

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, on the last day in January of this year I reintroduced legislation that, if passed, would create a national tourist and travel program equal to this Nation's resources to sponsor such an effort, and our acute need to promulgate such an activity. Little attention has been paid this proposal, and with the exception of a few in Congress, and even fewer in the Executive, the proposed intense tourist program has been the victim of only apathy and indifference.

Today's Wall Street Journal has on its front page a signed article by Mr. Sterling E. Soderlind that perhaps, if it is read widely, will shake the present pillars of indifference characterizing our concern in this area. The article provides us with a well done analysis of tourist and business travel, and its relation to a nation's payment deficits and surpluses.

The article reports two pieces of information which are particularly telling. The first piece of data, based upon preliminary American Express estimates, points out that our travel deficit has exceeded for the last 2 years our total international payments deficit. This would suggest that the major problem area in our balance-of-payments picture results from the unequaled expenditure by American tourists and businessmen traveling abroad, when compared to the dollars spent by overseas visitors and businessmen traveling in the United States. This is obviously punctuated by the disproportionately larger number of Americans who are attracted to spend their money and time in foreign countries than the number of foreign tourists who have the inclination, or more importantly, can financially afford to spend their vacations in the United States.

The other startling statistic suggests the emphasis which Congress and the President have placed on reversing what is apparently a trend counter to our national interests. Spain, with a 1966 gross national product of $21.6 billion, budgeted their tourist office $10 million for the last fiscal year. The United States, with a 1966 gross national product of $740 billion, in a pennywise and dollar foolish position, budgeted $3 million to the U.S. Travel Service. As a result Spain concluded her calendar year with a travel surplus of $1.1 billion, while the United States suffered a $1.8 billion travel deficit.

If the dollar mathematics of the present unfortunate and farcial situation are unable to catapult the appropriate officials and congressional leaders into meaningful and effective action our Nation will continue to be the victim of a disadvantaged, and unenlightened travel and tourist policy.

I commend Mr. Soderlind's well prepared article to the attention of my colleagues with the optimistic hope that it will act as a catalyst:

Appraisal of Current Trends in Business and Finance

World trade conjures up visions of ships laden with oil, steel and foodstuffs. And it's such commodities that often make business-page headlines. People headed to other lands are thought of in travel-page terms usually. So a news release from the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development startles one with this statement: "International tourism is today the largest single item in world trade."

Studies by the OECD and others show that the movement of people across borders—whether bent on pleasure or business—indeed is a mighty economic force. On the basis of official statistics from 60 important tourist countries, the International Union of Official Travel Organizations estimates international tourist receipts reached $13 billion in 1966. That's 7% of the value of total world trade. Even with the upheaval in the Mideast and war in the Far East, revenues from international travel this year are likely to match the annual growth rate of 12% sustained since 1961.

For many nations, such as Spain and Italy this spells bonanza in the form of high earnings of foreign exchange. But for the U.S. it means more painful economic headaches unless efforts to narrow the "travel gap" are successful. This gap, or deficit, is the difference between the amount spent by Americans who travel to other countries and the amount spent by visitors to the U.S.

The travel deficit poses a serious problem for the U.S. in its drive to wipe out the nation's persistent balance-of-payments deficit and to halt the drain on our gold reserves.

The table below indicates the scope of the problem. It compares the U.S. travel deficit with the total payments deficit. The total deficit figure, of course, includes the travel deficit. But it also reflects "surplus" factors such as the excess of our merchandise exports over imports. For 1966, the total figure is preliminary and the travel figure is an American Express estimate.

[In billions]

Year	Travel deficit	Total deficit
1966	$1.8	$1.4
1965	1.7	1.3
1964	1.6	2.8
1963	1.6	2.7
1962	1.5	2.2
1961	1.2	2.4

The U.S. is not alone, of course, in running a travel deficit. West Germany's travel-receipts gap in 1965 was a big $812 million and, somewhat surprisingly, the one-time star tourist attraction, France, posted a travel deficit for the first time that year.

But for many lands, tourism is a growing plus in their economies. Spain, which hosts one foreign traveler for every two of its citizens each year, had a whopping travel surplus of $1.1 billion in 1965. Italy matched that.

Some travel authorities argue that America's $1.8 billion travel gap is perhaps not as serious as it looks. They note that some of the spending is by businessmen whose mission to plants abroad help return profits to the U.S.—a plus for our payments position.

Also, it's argued, an American who plunks down $440 for a roundtrip ticket to Paris on Air France isn't hurting the U.S. payments position that much. Some of the fare, in a roundabout fashion, finds its way back to the U.S. to pay for the Boeing 707 jets Air France uses. Of the $5.5 billion sales of 1,000 Boeing jets in the past nine years, $1.5 billion has come from airlines outside the U.S., a substantial contribution to the U.S. payments efforts.

Some travel dollars leaving the U.S. come back in many other ways, too. The 278,000 Americans who will go to Spain this year won't drink only sherry and smoke only Spanish cigarets; they also will guzzle Coca-Cola and puff Pall Malls, thus adding to the U.S. trade surplus.

Still, says a Commerce Department official, "it is clear that by any method of calculation the nagging disparity between our travel receipts and our travel payments constitutes a grim problem for the United States."

Fortunately for the 16.5 million Americans who are expected to travel outside the U.S. this year (12.5 million to Canada), the Administration is tackling the travel-gap problem in a positive rather than restrictive way. There is no more talk of a "head tax" to discourage travel abroad. The push is to attract foreigners here. This should be accelerated once the Administration appoints the special Industry-Government Task Force called for by the President to develop major recommendations on ways to stimulate travel to the U.S.

One successful approach toward narrowing the travel gap is the bringing to this country of foreign travel agents who can "sell" the U.S. to their compatriots. Last November about 500 European agents and writers took part in this "See It for Yourself" program. Another group from Pacific areas will arrive on similar tours next year.

American travel authorities are convinced that rising standards of living in many foreign lands and declining jet fares make it increasingly easier for the U.S. to woo tourists. An American Express survey of 255 foreign travel ageents showed that 70% thought many of their clients could afford to spend $500 to $1,000 on travel here.

Many U.S. companies, recognizing the value of tourism to the economy, are aiding Federal programs to promote travel here. Under the "Busivisit" program of the U.S. Travel Service, such concerns as Singer and Hoover have helped bring their foreign employees to the U.S. for vacations. Another effort aims at luring more of the 800 yearly international conventions to these shores.

But in the hot international rivalry for travelers' money, the U.S. has one great disadvantage, travel experts say. Congress votes the U.S. Travel Service a tiny $3 million yearly to entice foreigners here. By contrast, the budget of Spain's national tourist office is $10 million. To put this disparity in perspective, our gross national product last year was $740 billion. Spain's GNP was only $21.6 billion.—STERLING E. SODERLIND.

Armed Forces Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 29, 1967

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege on May 19 to attend a dinner in Vallejo, Calif., at which Rear Adm. Edward J. Fahy, commander, Naval Ship Systems Command, was the principal speaker.

Admiral Fahy gave a stirring speech and I commend its reading to my colleagues:

ARMED FORCES REPORT TO THE NATION

(Remarks of Rear Adm. Edward J. Fahy, USN, commander, Naval Ship Systems Command, at the chamber of commerce/Navy League Council community dinner, May 19, 1967, Casa de Vallejo Hotel, Vallejo, Calif.)

"It is easy to be brave from a safe distance."

—AESOP.

Ladies and gentlemen, recently Secretary Cyrus Vance quoted St. Thomas: "Peace is the tranquillity of order."

Unfortunately, there is neither much tranquillity, nor much order, in our world. It is complex and tangled in its relationships, and strained in its tensions.

It is beset by a litany of problems.

There is the awesome presence of nuclear weapons: a somber hint of holocaust that hangs permanently as the backdrop to the tragedy of man's hostility.

There is the volcanic emergence of new nations around the world: some coming to term in violence; others born peacefully, but faced with severe pains of growth.

There is the problem of hunger hanging over half the human race; the grim certainty of disease; the paralysis of human poverty, that saps ambition and drains away hope.

There are the disheartening statistics of educational deprivation: the fact that after some 6,000 years of civilization, 6 out of every 10 human beings alive today cannot even read, much less enjoy the full fruits of learning.

There are all these problems—and more.

None is easily solved. None will simply fade away. None—out of any inner necessity—will cure itself.

What is man to do in this situation?

In the end, he has only two fundamental choices: he can attempt to withdraw from the issues of his time; or he can engage them.

Withdrawal often seems the more palatable course. The individual can readily rationalize away what seem to be obligations. The human mind is fertile in discovering reasons for doing what it fundamentally wants to do. Finding justifications for a withdrawal from difficulties is never in itself very difficult.

But if human history—even with all its failures—and if human nature—even with all its frailties—teach us anything at all they teach us that withdrawal from problems is a sterile and unrewarding—and in the end, an unavailing—course to follow.

It is a recurring dream of man that he can somehow escape into an inner insularity that will isolate him from the pain and stress of life. But like all dreams, it is unreal.

This is not to say that grappling with problems, with wisdom and courage, is easy. For it is not.

But there is yet another dimension to all of this. And that is that the complexity of the contemporary world now touches nearly everyone—however much he may wish to escape it.

Modern technology has seen to that. Few pockets of unawareness are left on the globe.

Indeed, technology is turning the globe into a neighborhood.

But neighbors—unhappily—do not always remain neighborly, and proximity in itself is no guarantee of peace.

What technology is guaranteeing is the psychological impossibility of moving out of the neighborhood. A person—or a nation—may still choose to ignore the problems. They can no longer pretend they are unaware of them.

Thus, Americans are fighting half a globe away from their homes. They fight on the plains and in the paddies and tangled jungles of South Vietnam.

Why are they there—side by side with the fighting forces of South Vietnam and with our dedicated allies from Korea, Australia, and New Zealand?

Many Americans across the sweep of our great nation ask that question. They ask it in a sincere and searching quest for understanding.

The issue in South Vietnam is a complicated one: complicated by history; complicated by suffering and subversion; and complicated most of all, perhaps for us, by its sheer distance, from the more familiar framework of our daily lives.

The war in Vietnam is a struggle we did not seek—but one which we could not avoid.

Why, then, are we there?

What are our objectives? And what is our strategy to achieve those objectives?

These are hard and honest questions, and they deserve hard and honest answers.

We are not in South Vietnam to secure resources. We do not need—and we do not desire—a single square foot of soil nor a single dollar's worth of wealth.

We are not in South Vietnam to acquire allies, or to build a permanent complex of military bases. We seek no ring of steel around Hanoi. We have no desire to destroy the North Vietnamese regime.

If, then, these are not the reasons we fight in South Vietnam, why are we there?

We are fighting in South Vietnam at the request of its government because we believe in the basic right to freedom for all mankind and because we have solemn commitments to help the South Vietnamese resist aggression. And mark well that peace in the world depends in large measure on the well-founded belief that when the United States has given such solemn commitments, it will fulfill them.

If we were to back away from our pledges to the people of South Vietnam simply because they entail great difficulty, cost and sacrfice, how much faith would remain in the strength of our commitments anywhere else?

South Vietnam is a victim of calculated aggression and we have solemn commitments to help the South Vietnamese overcome this aggression. The average South Vietnamese villager does not want to become a Communist—but neither does he want to be tortured and killed. What he really wants is the security to live his own life.

Our objective then is defined and limited: it is to provide the necessary security so that 16 million citizens of South Vietnam can freely choose their own future—rather than be the hopeless victims of Communist directed and supported subversion and attack and terrorism and torture.

How then are we carrying out our commitments in Vietnam? In support of the best trained, best equipped soldiers in the world, who daily are demonstrating to the world the determination of Americans to defend and if need be to die for freedom, we have an air and sea war being waged against a determined, cruel sadistic foe who is well supplied with munitions and weapons by the Communist nations who are all allied against us.

The air war waged in the North is inseparable from air and ground operations in South Vietnam, and the total pressure is one reason that a significant Communist offensive was not launched in 1966. Flying against anti-aircraft fire, which veteran pilots have stated was more intense and accurate than any encounters in World War II or Korea, Air Force attacks on North Vietnam increased approximately six-fold over the preceding year, delivering 112,000 tons of munitions on military targets which supported the aggression in the South.

The Air Forces request net has reduced reaction time for close air support of ground troops to 20 minutes or less. And in case where the need is urgent enough to divert airborne flights, response times or 5 minutes or less are common. Using special radar and flare lighting, Air Force strike response at night in South Vietnam now approaches that of daytime operations. By last July, night attack sorties against targets in North Vietnam were almost triple the rate shown by the end of 1965.

In World War II a "Red Ball Express" using trucks made logistics history in Europe. Today the Red Ball Express travels the airways instead of the roadways from Travis Air Force Base to Tan Son Nhut Air Base in Vietnam. In its first year of operation (ending December 7, 1966) the Red Ball Express moved 54,000 pieces (over 9,000 tons) of urgently needed cargo to Vietnam.

Also Military Airlift Commands' aeromedical operations brought 16,985 patients (about 6,000 of them battle casualties) to the United States from the Pacific area.

Turning now to the Navy and the Marines of the Department of the Navy, I would like first to say that the citizens of the communities represented here should be very proud of the real contributions they have made to the ability of our Navy to perform its mission when and wherever it is needed. Without communities of dedicated people like this one, whose people man the shipbuilding ways and the planning desks, the drafting boards and the various shops—all those people who shoulder the burden of the Navy's shore support—it would not be possible for the Navy to retain its unusual ability to respond to a variety of crises. This is an ability which clearly distinguishes the Navy from the other services. One of the reasons is that a naval ship, no matter where it might be, is as much a sovereign part of U.S. territory as the City of Vallejo is. But a naval ship is even more than that. It is self-sufficient; it has self-contained weapons systems; it can range far and wide on the oceans of the world and remain off a troubled area exerting force by its mere presence yet without the commitment of a landing. It can be friendly; it can even bring relief and aid to the stricken. Or it can react; and it can fight whenever and wherever our President directs, free of any conditions which might be imposed by other countries.

For these reasons, the Navy's capabilities are uniquely useful in what have become known as cold war incidents. I think these capabilities can best be demonstrated by considering some of the major contributions the Navy has made in meeting this type of challenge during the past 20 years. Probably the first positive move our country made in response to cold war Communist pressures was when we sent the battleship MISSOURI and the aircraft carrier FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT to Greece in 1946, when the Greek people were fighting against Greek and Balkan Communists in a struggle similar to the present Vietnam war.

Only a few years later the ships of the Seventh Fleet covered the evacuation of more than 29,000 Nationalist Chinese from the Tachen Islands and mainland China to Taiwan. The Navy alone among our armed forces was used in the Suez crisis, and the Navy and the Marines were the first—not the only ones, but the first—into Lebanon. As it turned out, the Cuban crisis was predominantly a Navy operation, and of course, the ready Navy and Marine forces were among the first to take part in the crisis in the Dominican Republic.

Then, when it became necessary to launch air strikes into North Vietnam, the first ones were flown from aircraft carriers. Why? Because they were *there;* they were *ready;* they were operating on the free oceans; and they could be used at the sole discretion of our President. And as the need for air power increased faster than we could build airfields, there was only one way to fill this need. More carriers. So we went from three deployed in the Western Pacific to four, and then to five. And we're still keeping five deployed, with three in continuous combat. During these last two years of combat operations in Southeast Asia, almost half of all the combat missions over North Vietnam have been flown from the decks of Navy aircraft carriers.

In many ways Vietnam provides a classic example of how we can use the seas to our advantage in fighting Communism.

Shortly after our forces were committed in combat, it was reported that large amounts of men and material were being infiltrated into South Vietnam from the sea, and the Navy was asked to organize an anti-sea infiltration effort. The Navy hadn't done this sort of thing for many years—since the Civil War, in fact. No one in the United States had ever been concerned with protecting any shore line but our own, and stopping illegal entry there has always been the business of the Coast Guard. However, once the size of the job was appreciated, there wasn't much question about getting into high gear, and this operation—which we call *Market Time*—expanded very quickly. Today the force includes several hundred ships and boats of all sizes, from 300-foot destroyer escorts to coastal minesweepers, Coast Guard patrol boats, fast patrol craft and continuous naval patrol aircraft coverage. This force, patrolling waters along the shore line, boards and searches literally thousands of junks and steel-hulled craft daily. They are proving to be a formidable foe to the Viet Cong and form an effective barrier from the 17th Parallel of the South China Sea clear around to the Cambodian border in the Gulf of Thailand.

Navy patrol aircraft are also on 24-hour duty each day in the area. These efforts are coordinated with a Vietnamese coastal force of patrol vessels of various types and about 600 motorized junks, many of which were built with U.S. Navy assistance. As a result of this effort, we believe very little is being infiltrated into South Vietnam from the sea.

Today, we're operating another force of a similar type on the rivers of Vietnam and in the Mekong Delta. The rivers, waterways and canals in those regions have always been major arteries for travel, and the taxation of boatmen engaged in legitimate water travel is a source of Viet Cong revenue. To interdict the VC travel and break up those tax collection efforts, we've built up another force which is engaged in operation GAME WARDEN, which in its first 6 months boarded and searched 42,000 river craft, captured junks with confirmed Viet Cong contraband, interdicted troop movements along the river banks, broke up troop crossings, detained curfew violators, captured more than a thousand documents and destroyed numerous enemy food and arms caches.

It's made up of over 100 fast, fiberglass boats, (PBR's to you experts) manned by U.S. Navy sailors and powered and steered by waterjets, rather than propellers or rudders, which gives them a very shallow draft. These river patrol boats—again in coordination with the South Vietnamese Navy—are operating in a pretty hostile environment and on their daylight patrols we usually try to provide them air cover from armed helicopters.

In addition to the river patrol boats and the SWIFT boats, we have deployed three armed air cushion vehicles and are also putting a new version of the Civil War Monitor on combat duty in the Mekong Delta. We have armored 60-foot landing craft medium (LCM) and will use them to transport troops safely and then support them with gun fire while they work their way in from the beach.

Operation GAME WARDEN also includes minesweeping boats (MSBs) from the Mine Force, Pacific. These 57-foot, wooden-hulled craft sweep the Long Tau River channel which leads to the port of Saigon. Their job is to find and destroy enemy mines which threaten both civilian and military shipping.

Like the PBR sailors, the minemen have to be alert against harassment from shore. They operate in an area heavily infested by Viet Cong.

Vallejo's ties to this riverine force are particularly close, since our *only* riverine warfare school is right here. Mare Island was selected as the best site for this new school because the terrain here—marshes, rivers, many small waterways—most nearly approaches that of the combat area, and because Mare Island had barracks and land area and facilities for this school support. Men who will operate and maintain these craft are trained right here, as you know. They get some counterinsurgency training, some Vietnamese history, and learn small boat and small arms handling. About 2,000 men will receive this training this year.

I've talked on riverine warfare because this is a unique operation. But, our other naval forces in Vietnam are also doing a terrific job in carrying out their missions.

Naval aviation continues to play an indispensable role in Vietnam. It is not uncommon for a carrier-based pilot to pick up 125 combat missions during a *seven-month* cruise in Task Force 77. A comparison with the 75 mission average of World War II carrier pilots speaks for itself. Since the beginning of our interdiction bombing, Navy and Marine Corps pilots have flown approximately half of all combat missions in North Vietnam.

Navy amphibious ships, with Marine Corps personnel embarked, continuously engage in amphibious warfare operations. These amphibious forces have conducted numerous raids and assaults since their initial landings in Vietnam in March 1965. Many have been supported by naval gunfire from cruisers, destroyers, and rochet ships and by tactical aircraft from carriers or land-based Marine air units.

The secret of sustained naval combat operations in Vietnam is the outstanding job of support accomplished by our underway replenishment froces. Approximately 38 auxiliary ships are currently operating in the Western Pacific. Replenishment at sea is provided 800 to 1,300 miles away from the nearest naval base.

An aircraft carrier off Vietnam consumes more than 200,000 gallons of jet fuel daily. Ten fleet oilers meet this demand for jet fuel, black oil and gasoline, provisions issued at sea now total almost 5,000 tons per month. A single refrigerator ship issued 775 tons of foodstuff to 45 ships in one 7 day period. Store issue ships now stock almost 30,000 different items and are able to fulfill 90% of the requests placed upon them. The expenditure of ammunition by the fleet, gun ammo, missiles, iron bombs, has increased by *1,700%* in one year—almost all of it is transferred at sea underway. One ammunition ship was commended for conducting 227 underway ammunition replenishments transferring 10,041 tons of ammo during her 6 month tour.

Other Navy ships are providing gunfire support. Cruisers, destroyers, and other types answer calls for close support from Corps commanders ashore. Gunfire teams coordinate and direct the fire. Some destroyers have responded to as many as 15 calls in a day. One destroyer used 48 tons of ammunition in one continuous 26-hour mission. On one occasion, projectiles were laid down within 100 yards of our infantrymen. Naval gunfire interdiction missions have been performed north of the 17th Parallel, against military and logistic waterborne coastal traffic, and those ships also keep an eye on *ocean* traffic to and from Vietnam.

There is another aspect about the sea and the war in Vietnam that should never be forgotten. It is not entirely a Navy operation, but it *is* Navy responsibility, and it is *very* important. I am talking about sealift—the unrewarding, backbreaking, frustrating, and often dull task of getting the equipment and supplies to the fighting men of the United States and her allies *wherever* they may be fighting. If we cannot do that we can no longer fight anywhere in the world except on this North American continent. That is a very simple, very fundamental fact, but *too* few people seem to appreciate it. 98% of the military equipment and supplies lifted to Vietnam are transported by the Navy's MSTS or the United States merchant marine under Navy charter. Navy MSTS troop transports sealift two out of every three fighting men in major combat units taken to Vietnam. The Navy's amphibious forces move additional cargo and troops to Vietnam. Tankers of the Fleet and the merchant marine are carrying practically all the aviation and other bulk petroleum products required in Vietnam and elsewhere in Southeast Asia.

Vietnam has resulted in a significant increase in the tempo of ship operations. This in turn has had a definite impact on the material condition of the Fleet and on the industrial facilities on the West Coast that support the Fleet. In short, we are running our ships longer and harder than ever before and things are wearing out at a correspondingly faster rate. We have activated older ships whose older equipment gives out sooner. The majority of our ships have been around since World War II and many of the systems and equipments are nearing the end of their useful lives.

The industrial facilities on the West Coast have borne the brunt of Vietnam operations. The private and naval shipyards on this coast have provided primary support to our Fleet operations in the Pacific. This has resulted in a rapid build-up of workload up and down the coast in naval and private yards alike. We've increased employment at the San Francisco Bay Naval Shipyard complex by nearly 3,000 people in the last year alone. This yard is providing vital shipyard support for many types of ships operating in Vietnam. I am sure you are all well aware of the contribution this yard is making to the Vietnam effort.

President Johnson has called our military establishment the mightiest arsenal of all time and stated further, "But it would give us neither peace nor security without the devotion to duty, the courage and sacrifice of the men and women who wear our country's uniform." I agree completely but would like to turn the spotlight away from ancient mariners like myself to focus on the youth of our Army, Navy, Air Force and Marine Corps.

Consider your neighborhood grocery boy or high school hot-rodder whom you do not trust with the vote except in one or two states, whom you barely trust with the family car, whom you won't legally allow to have a beer (in most states) until he is several years older—yet consider him in uniform—you the general public, the atavistic news reporters, the legislators, except him to be a professional gladiator, a highly skilled technician, a polished diplomat in a foreign country.

But there is nothing wrong with this young generation, these young men. They are intelligent, they are tough, they fight like tigers in the cause of liberty; they know, and are in full support of, why we are in Vietnam. And they are not "the soft generation." They endure worse fighting conditions—of swamp and jungle and heat and mud, of insects and poisonous snakes and tropical diseases, against a wantonly, ruthless and terroristic enemy—than any of our prior wars.

They bear their wounds and their maimings, the loss of buddies without a whimper. They demonstrate that greatest love—they give their lives, if need be, to perpetuate the ideals which made and preserve us as a nation.

With our Commander-In-Chief, I exhort you "Let our thoughts be with them this day—and let our prayers attend them, always, as they unflinchingly defend our legacy and our lives."

Job Corps Bases Gain Acceptance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1967

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, on April 5 I brought to the attention of this body an article by Joseph Loftus, of the New York Times, entitled "Job Corps Opens a Week Long Salute to Communities Where Its Centers Are Situated." Today I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues another article by Mr. Loftus on the subject of Job Corps community relations. I know that in addition to Job Corps Director William Kelly, all of us are interested in receiving the opinions of those who are most directly in contact with and affected by the Job Corps program. I think that Mr. Loftus' article points up the value of firsthand experience in judging the Job Corps operation. It seems that those authorities and local citizens who have had a chance to come into contact with the Job Corps members themselves have had their earlier apprehensions calmed by their own observations through personal contact. The majority who have experienced this contact have come away favorably impressed. Mr. Loftus has also mentioned the important effect of strengthened disciplinary policy and procedures in improving the Job Corps image. I include the article, "Job Corps Bases Gain Acceptance" as part of my remarks in the RECORD:

JOB CORPS BASES GAIN ACCEPTANCE—MOST AIDES OF COMMUNITIES NEAR CENTERS NOW APPROVE

(By Joseph A. Loftus)

WASHINGTON, April 15.—Most Job Corps centers are now rated as assets to their neighboring communities.

That is a change of opinion in many cases. Community relations had been one of the Job Corps most threatening problems.

William P. Kelly, director of the Job Corps, which is one of the training programs in the campaign against poverty, wrote to mayors, police chiefs, editors and Chamber of Commerce officers about a month ago.

He asked for a "Frank and honest appraisal" of how the center near them had benefited their community, how the young people participated in community affairs, how they engaged in community projects, and how the center had proved to be a good neighbor.

Mr. Kelly was pleased enough with the responses to make them available.

Camp Breckenridge, which virtually started off with a riot in August, 1965, and frightened a half-dozen communities in Kentucky and Indiana is one of the examples of improved community relations.

POLICE CHIEF IS PLEASED

Charles West, Police Chief of Henderson, Ky., wrote that the Breckenridge center "has benefited our community not only from the monetary standpoint, but it has brought to this city some of the finest people I have ever met and I sincerely hope they remain here. The center has definitely proven to be a good neighbor."

Mayor J. Earl Bell of Morganfield, Ky., wrote that Breckenridge "has added many fine citizens to our city who are to us now just home folks."

The responses of newspaper, executives and employes were, on balance nationally, favorable to the Job Corps centers, but in certain instances the newspaper people were sour minorities among the local observers.

In the case of Breckenridge, for example, Mayor Charles Pryor Jr., of Sturgis, Ky., wrote that "we have had no difficulty with corpsmen on their visits here." But E. C. Calman, Jr., editor of The Sturgis News, said "you got to be joking" about the center's good neighbor qualities.

"It's a classic example of Government waste, misuse of funds and poor management all the way. Should be abolished" he said.

Camp Kilmer, in Edison, N.J., had been in difficulty with neighboring communities, too, but John C. Beitz, Chief of Police in Piscataway, N.J. wrote that "since July, 1966, relations between this community and the Kilmer Job Corps center have improved tremendously."

NOT A "WELCOMING"

Kenneth W. Michael, editor of The Evening News in Perth Amboy, N.J. agreed that there had been improvement in local relationships since new disciplinary measures were adopted last July, but he commented that "presently, the attitude of the residents of Edison Township toward the center has been one of enduring rather than welcoming."

The corps has 120 centers. Opinions were solicited from four persons in each of 71 communities near 35 of these centers. These included all the urban centers then in full operation—10 men's and 13 women's—and 12 conservation centers.

The 284 requests for opinions brought 111 replies. Seventy-eight supported the program; one expressed strong opposition; six were generally negative without stating opposition, 26 were either simple acknowledgments of the director's letter or indicated that the community was too remote from the center to measure any impact.

There were no replies dealing with two urban centers, Camp Atterbury in Indiana and a women's center in Huntington, W. Va.

Of the 78 supporting letters, corps officials said 17 indicated that there had been apprehension or a negative attitude prior to the establishment of the center, and that present support was based on actual experience.

COMMUNITY WORK A FACTOR

The replies indicated that community relations had improved not only because of stricter discipline but also because of contributions the corpsmen had made to communities by cleaning up parks and other facilities, assisting in emergencies, repairing toys for children. A reciprocal social, recreational, and religious integration of corpsmen and local residents was also cited.

Walter E. Nolte, president of the Lincoln, Neb., chamber, wrote:

"The young people in the center have participated in community affairs to the limited extent that such groups are able to enter into the rather tight social and civic enterprises of a community like Lincoln.

"Suffice it to say that the instances in which the corpsmen have cooperated in such civic events as the centennial opening and their work with Lincoln Community Council agencies have made for themselves some friends and admirers where possibly there were objectors to the program before."

Tyler Mumford of the Urban County Advocate in Morganfield, Ky., wrote that the Breckenridge center "has been a tremendous aid to our local economy" because "many of our people are employed there."

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Code of Laws of the United States

Title 44, Section 181. Congressional Record; arrangement, style, contents, and indexes.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the Congressional Record, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the Congressional Record semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

Title 44, Section 182b. Same; illustrations maps, diagrams.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the Record without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the Congressional Record the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily Record as follows: the Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided,* That the makeup of the Record shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the Congressional Record, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the Record shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the Record issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the Record for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the Record of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the Record shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the Record style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the Record.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the Congressional Record any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent Record is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the Congressional Record the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the Congressional Record.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the Congressional Record shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the Official Reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the Official Reporters of the respective Houses.

The Official Reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the Official Reporters in the next issue of the Congressional Record, nor to Records printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the Congressional Record by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the Congressional Record which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402, at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided,* That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

Office Address: House Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20515

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Speaker: John W. McCormack

Abbitt, Watkins M., *Va*
Abernethy, Thomas G., *Miss.* 6278 29th St.
Adair, E. Ross, *Ind* 4000 Mass. Ave.
Adams, Brock, *Wash*
Addabbo, Joseph P., *N.Y*
Albert, Carl, *Okla* 4614 Reno Rd.
Anderson, John B., *Ill*
Anderson, William R., *Tenn.* 3006 P St.
Andrews, George W., *Ala* 3108 Cathedral Ave.
Andrews, Mark, *N. Dak*
Annunzio, Frank, *Ill*
Arends, Leslie C., *Ill* 4815 Dexter St.
Ashbrook, John M., *Ohio*
Ashley, Thomas L., *Ohio*
Ashmore, Robert T., *S.C*
Aspinall, Wayne N., *Colo* The Towers Apts., 4201 Cathedral Ave.
Ayres, William H., *Ohio*
Baring, Walter S., *Nev*
Barrett, William A., *Pa*
Bates, William H., *Mass*
Battin, James F., *Mont*
Belcher, Page, *Okla*
Bell, Alphonzo, *Calif*
Bennett, Charles E., *Fla* 3421 Rusticway Lane, Falls Church, Va.
Berry, E. Y., *S. Dak* 118 Schotts Court NE.
Betts, Jackson E., *Ohio*
Bevill, Tom, *Ala* 6224 N. 35th St., Arlington, Va.
Biester, Edward G., Jr., *Pa*
Bingham, Jonathan B., *N.Y.*
Blackburn, Benjamin B., *Ga.*
Blanton, Ray, *Tenn*
Blatnik, John A., *Minn*
Boggs, Hale, *La*
Boland, Edward P., *Mass*
Bolling, Richard, *Mo* 307 Warrenton Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Bolton, Frances P. (Mrs.), *Ohio.* 2301 Wyo. Ave.
Bow, Frank T., *Ohio* 4301 Mass. Ave.
Brademas, John, *Ind*
Brasco, Frank J., *N.Y*
Bray, William G., *Ind*
Brinkley, Jack, *Ga*
Brock, W. E. (Bill), *Tenn*
Brooks, Jack, *Tex*
Broomfield, William S., *Mich.*
Brotzman, Donald G., *Colo*
Brown, Clarence J., Jr., *Ohio.*
Brown, Garry, *Mich*
Brown, George E., Jr., *Calif*
Broyhill, James T., *N.C*
Broyhill, Joel T., *Va*
Buchanan, John, *Ala*
Burke, J. Herbert, *Fla*
Burke, James A., *Mass*
Burleson, Omar, *Tex*
Burton, Laurence J., *Utah*
Burton, Phillip, *Calif*
Bush, George, *Tex*
Button, Daniel E., *N.Y*
Byrne, James A., *Pa*
Byrnes, John W., *Wis* 1215 25th St. S., Arlington, Va.
Cabell, Earle, *Tex*
Cahill, William T., *N.J*
Carey, Hugh L., *N.Y*
Carter, Tim Lee, *Ky*
Casey, Bob, *Tex*
Cederberg, Elford A., *Mich*
Celler, Emanuel, *N.Y* The Mayflower
Chamberlain, Charles E., *Mich.*
Clancy, Donald D., *Ohio*
Clark, Frank M., *Pa* 220 C St. SE.
Clausen, Don H., *Calif*
Clawson, Del, *Calif*
Cleveland, James C., *N.H*
Cohelan, Jeffery, *Calif* 1202 Longworth House Office Bldg.
Collier, Harold R., *Ill*
Colmer, William M., *Miss*
Conable, Barber B., Jr., *N.Y.*
Conte, Silvio O., *Mass* 5619 Lamar Rd., Washington 16, D.C.
Conyers, John, Jr., *Mich*
Corbett, Robert J., *Pa*
Corman, James C., *Calif*
Cowger, William O., *Ky*
Cramer, William C., *Fla* 6215 Beachway Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Culver, John C., *Iowa*
Cunningham, Glenn, *Nebr*
Curtis, Thomas B., *Mo*
Daddario, Emilio Q., *Conn*
Daniels, Dominick V., *N.J*
Davis, Glenn R., *Wis*
Davis, John W., *Ga*
Dawson, William L., *Ill*
de la Garza, Eligio, *Tex*
Delaney, James J., *N.Y*
Dellenback, John R., *Oreg* 5911 Onondaga Rd.
Denney, Robert V., *Nebr*
Dent, John H., *Pa*
Derwinski, Edward J., *Ill*
Devine, Samuel L., *Ohio*
Dickinson, William L., *Ala*
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., *Mich*
Dingell, John D., *Mich*
Dole, Robert, *Kans* 6136 Beachway Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Donohue, Harold D., *Mass*
Dorn, Wm. Jennings Bryan, *S.C.* 2030 Laburnum St., McLean, Va.
Dow, John G., *N.Y*
Dowdy, John, *Tex*
Downing, Thomas N., *Va*
Dulski, Thaddeus J., *N.Y* 347 Cannon House Office Building
Duncan, John J., *Tenn*
Dwyer, Florence P. (Mrs.), *N.J.*
Eckhardt, Bob, *Tex*
Edmondson, Ed, *Okla*
Edwards, Don, *Calif* 9201 Fox Meadow La., Potomac, Md.,
Edwards, Edwin W., *La*
Edwards, Jack, *Ala*
Eilberg, Joshua, *Pa*
Erlenborn, John N., *Ill*
Esch, Marvin L., *Mich* 11754 Gainsborough Rd., Rockville, Md.
Eshleman, Edwin D., *Pa*
Evans, Frank E., *Colo*
Everett, Robert A., *Tenn*
Evins, Joe L., *Tenn* 5044 Klingle St.
Fallon, George H., *Md*
Farbstein, Leonard, *N.Y*
Fascell, Dante B., *Fla*
Feighan, Michael A., *Ohio*
Findley, Paul, *Ill*
Fino, Paul A., *N.Y*
Fisher, O. C., *Tex* Calvert-Woodley
Flood, Daniel J., *Pa* The Congressional
Flynt, John J., Jr., *Ga*
Foley, Thomas S., *Wash*
Ford, Gerald R., *Mich* 514 Crown View Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Ford, William D., *Mich*
Fountain, L. H., *N.C* The Westchester
Fraser, Donald M., *Minn*
Frelinghuysen, Peter H. B., *N.J.* 3014 N St.
Friedel, Samuel N., *Md*
Fulton, James G., *Pa*
Fulton, Richard, *Tenn*
Fuqua, Don, *Fla*
Galifianakis, Nick, *N.C*
Gallagher, Cornelius E., *N.J.*
Gardner, James C., *N.C*
Garmatz, Edward A., *Md*
Gathings, E. C., *Ark*
Gettys, Tom S., *S.C*
Giaimo, Robert N., *Conn*
Gibbons, Sam, *Fla*
Gilbert, Jacob H., *N.Y*
Gonzalez, Henry B., *Tex* 200 C St. SE.
Goodell, Charles E., *N.Y* 3842 Macomb St.
Goodling, George A., *Pa*
Gray, Kenneth J., *Ill*
Green, Edith (Mrs.), *Oreg*
Green, William J., *Pa*
Griffiths, Martha W., (Mrs.), *Mich.*
Gross, H. R., *Iowa*
Grover, James R., Jr., *N.Y*
Gubser, Charles S., *Calif*
Gude, Gilbert, *Md*
Gurney, Edward J., *Fla*
Hagan, G. Elliott, *Ga*
Haley, James A., *Fla*
Hall, Durward G., *Mo*
Halleck, Charles A., *Ind* 4926 Upton St.
Halpern, Seymour, *N.Y*
Hamilton, Lee H., *Ind*
Hammerschmidt, John Paul, *Ark.*
Hanley, James M., *N.Y*
Hanna, Richard T., *Calif*
Hansen, George V., *Idaho*
Hansen, Julia Butler (Mrs.), *Wash.*
Hardy, Porter, Jr., *Va*
Harrison, William Henry, *Wyo.*
Harsha, William H., *Ohio*
Harvey, James, *Mich*
Hathaway, William D., *Maine.*
Hawkins, Augustus F., *Calif.*
Hays, Wayne L., *Ohio*
Hébert, F. Edward, *La* 26 Cockrell St., Alexandria, Va.
Hechler, Ken, *W. Va*
Heckler, Margaret M. (Mrs.), *Mass.*
Helstoski, Henry, *N.J*
Henderson, David N., *N.C*
Herlong, A. S., Jr., *Fla*
Hicks, Floyd V., *Wash*
Holifield, Chet, *Calif*
Holland, Elmer J., *Pa*
Horton, Frank, *N.Y*
Hosmer, Craig, *Calif*
Howard, James J., *N.J*
Hull, W. R., Jr., *Mo*
Hungate, William L., *Mo*
Hunt, John E., *N.J*
Hutchinson, Edward, *Mich*
Ichord, Richard (Dick), *Mo.*
Irwin, Donald J., *Conn*
Jacobs, Andrew, Jr., *Ind*
Jarman, John, *Okla*
Joelson, Charles S., *N.J*
Johnson, Albert W., *Pa*
Johnson, Harold T., *Calif*
Jonas, Charles Raper, *N.C*
Jones, Paul C., *Mo* 1111 Army-Navy Dr., Arlington, Va.
Jones, Robert E., *Ala*
Jones, Walter B., *N.C*
Karsten, Frank M., *Mo*
Karth, Joseph E., *Minn*
Kastenmeier, Robert W., *Wis.*
Kazen, Abraham, Jr., *Tex*
Kee, James, *W. Va* 5441 16th Ave., Hyattsville, Md.
Keith, Hastings, *Mass* 5906 Harwick Rd., Woodacres, Md.
Kelly, Edna F. (Mrs.), *N.Y*
King, Carleton J., *N.Y*
King, Cecil R., *Calif*
Kirwan, Michael J., *Ohio*
Kleppe, Thomas S., *N. Dak*
Kluczynski, John C., *Ill*
Kornegay, Horace R., *N.C*
Kupferman, Theodore R., *N.Y.*
Kuykendall, Dan, *Tenn*
Kyl, John, *Iowa*
Kyros, Peter N., *Maine*
Laird, Melvin R., *Wis*
Landrum, Phil M., *Ga*
Langen, Odin, *Minn*
Latta, Delbert L., *Ohio*
Leggett, Robert L., *Calif*
Lennon, Alton, *N.C*
Lipscomb, Glenard P., *Calif.*
Lloyd, Sherman P., *Utah*
Long, Clarence D., *Md*

Appendix

The Johnson Administration War on Poverty Is Going Ahead Full Throttle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK BROOKS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1967

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, the annual battle against the Johnson administration's war on poverty is now underway. Once again the Republicans are trotting out their blunderbuss, taking wild potshots at everything our administration is doing to help our Nation's poor.

We have all heard these Republican laments many times before. It is the same sullen cry of defeatism, blind obstruction, and disregard of the people's welfare that they have been preaching since the days of Calvin Coolidge.

I am used to these Republican complaints. But I must say that I am surprised by some of the criticisms voiced by members of our own party that allege that the Johnson administration has not done enough for the poor.

These critics should know better. The record shows that we are spending 27 percent of all Federal cash payments—not including our national defense—on programs to help poverty-stricken Americans.

I think that most Americans would agree that $25 billion a year is not a piddling amount in any league. And that is the amount—$25.6 billion to be precise—that this Democratic Congress, as part of the Johnson administration, is spending in fiscal 1968 on a broad range of programs to help the poor.

These programs represent President Johnson's determination to combat poverty in ways that are most effective and meaningful to those citizens who are unable to share in our national prosperity. It represents this Congress' determination to program and fund these vital efforts. Included in these programs is the Office of Economic Opportunity, social security, public assistance, education, health benefits, employment and retraining, regional economic development, school lunches, and various food distribution programs.

No administration, no Congress has done more to help the poor. And certainly no administration has been more effective.

Today, we are spending 13 times more than we did in 1963 to provide sound educational programs for poor children. Health expenditures have quadrupled during this same period, and cash payments to the poor are up 40 percent.

These statistics clearly support the fact that President Johnson is pushing ahead to meet our commitment to the Nation's poor. The President has not retreated from this fight. He has clearly indicated that we in this Nation and in this Congress aim to eradicate poverty and the forces which perpetuate these social and economic inequities. And we shall continue this battle until it is won.

There is simply no justification to the charge that the Johnson administration has reneged on its commitment to the war on poverty. The facts—and indeed, the figures—prove otherwise.

President Johnson was the first Chief Executive in our history to declare an all-out war on poverty. Our programs are winning the first rounds in this difficult struggle and we are not going to quit before we have barely begun.

Let us not be misled by those sewing seeds of doubt or dissent: The war on poverty will continue to enjoy strong support and high priority as long as Lyndon B. Johnson is our President.

This is a fact. And any other speculation is misguided and false.

Mr. Speaker, I insert into the RECORD a breakdown of estimated Federal expenditures for the fiscal years 1960 through 1968 that will document the full extent of the Johnson administration's resolve to wage war on poverty on every meaningful front:

Estimated Federal funds for programs assisting the poor, fiscal years 1960–68

[Administrative budget and trust funds, billions of dollars]

Category	1960 actual	1963 actual	1966 actual	1967 estimate	1968 estimate
Education and training:					
HEW:					
Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965			1.0	1.1	1.3
Other	0.1	0.2	.5	.7	.7
OEO-NYC, Job Corps, CAP, etc.			.7	.9	1.3
Labor-MDTA, etc.		(1)	.1	.2	.3
Interior	.1	.1	.1	.1	.1
VA	.1	(1)	(1)	.1	.1
Subtotal	.3	.3	2.5	3.1	3.8
Health:					
HEW:					
Health insurance for the aged and disabled (HI and SMI)			(1)	1.4	1.7
Public assistance medical care	.2	.4	.7	1.0	1.2
Other	.2	.3	.6	.7	.8
VA-Hospital and domiciliary care	.3	.4	.4	.4	.4
OEO-CAP, etc			.1	.1	.1
Subtotal	.7	1.0	1.8	3.6	4.2
Cash benefit payments:					
HEW:					
OASDI	4.0	5.3	6.8	6.8	8.5
Public assistance	1.8	2.3	2.8	2.9	3.0
Railroad retirement	.3	.3	.3	.3	.4
Labor-Unemployment benefits	.5	.6	.4	.4	.4
VA-Compensation and pensions	1.6	2.0	2.3	2.4	2.4
Subtotal	8.3	10.4	12.7	12.8	14.6
Services, economic and community development, etc.:					
Agriculture:					
Food programs	.2	.3	.4	.4	.5
Other	.2	.3	.5	.3	.2
Commerce: EDA and Appalachia		.1	.2	.3	.2
OEO: CAP and other			.6	.6	.6
HEW: VRA, WA, etc	(1)	.1	.1	.1	.1
HUD:					
Public housing and rent supplements	.1	.1	.1	.2	.2
Urban renewal and other	.1	(1)	.3	.3	.8
Interior: Services to Indians, etc	.1	.2	.2	.2	.3
Labor: Employment, youth and other services	(1)	.1	.1	.2	.1
SBA: Economic opportunity loans					
Subtotal	.7	1.2	2.6	2.5	3.1
Total:					
Administrative budget	5.1	6.8	11.8	13.0	14.6
Trust funds	4.9	6.2	7.7	9.1	11.1
Grand total	9.9	13.0	19.6	22.0	25.6

[1] Less than $50,000,000.

Note.—Figures may not add because of rounding.

The Problems of Business and Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS

OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, June 13, 1967

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, a few weeks ago a conference was held in Bermuda by a most distinguished and representative group of successful financiers from New York City and surrounding areas. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss the Nation's economy, its problems, its relationship to Government, and its future. Among the distinguished speakers was Dr. Paul McCracken, former Chairman of the Board of Economic Advisers to President Eisenhower, and our own most knowledgeable and capable chairman of the Committee on Commerce, Senator WARREN G. MAGNUSON. As a fellow Senator, I was most proud to sit in the audience and listen to the senior Senator from Washington, my former chairman, lucidly and eloquently speak to this select group from the business community about the problems, not only of his committee with business, but the problems of the Government itself in seeking solutions to business problems and in fostering continued growth of business in our free enterprise system.

Regrettably, no record was made of the questions directed to Senator MAGNUSON and of the lucid and understanding answers with which he responded. However, I do have the text of his preliminary remarks, and I know that all Members of Congress would be benefited greatly by reading what this very wise man had to say. Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the speech recently delivered by Senator MAGNUSON.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SENATE COMMERCE COMMITTEE: A MEETING GROUND, NOT A BATTLEFIELD

Set in several niches in the walls of the Commerce Committee hearing room in the New Senate Office Building are models and exhibits symbolizing the Committee's jurisdiction. Taken together, they form a colorful backdrop for the almost infinite variety of Committee responsibilities.

Not surprisingly, the greater number represent modes of transport, both ancient—a square-rigged merchantman and a vintage steam locomotive—and modern—a passenger jet, a diesel locomotive, a great overland truck transport, and a trim replica of the nuclear merchant ship *Savannah*.

Other exhibits remind us that the Committee's jurisdiction extends to the interstate transporation not only of goods and people but, also, of words. So this modest collection necessarily includes a replica of the first telegraph key, an early network microphone and a glittering communications satellite.

The life and commerce of the oceans is richly represented: a 19th-century fishing schooner, with each carved fisherman standing in a wooden barrel lashed to the deck, secure from being washed overboard by an errant wave; and mounted fish from the great fisheries—a silver salmon from the Pacific, red snapper from the Atlantic, whitefish from the Great Lakes, and an enormous gulf shrimp.

These traditional matters continue to engage the energies of the Committee, whether in hammering out a legislative solution to a railroad work rules dispute, seeking an equitable and coherent national transportation policy—exploring measures to revitalize a weakened domestic merchant marine, or even ministering to the sorry plight of a South Carolina shrimper who, having purchased a derelict hull for a song, labors long and lovingly to rebuild it, only to discover that the vessel, having initially have constructed in Nova Scotia, is ineligible to engage in the U.S. fisheries.

But the work of the Senate Commerce Committee in the seventh decade of the 20th century ranges far afield from these time honored responsibilities: Satellite communications, the electric car, the meaningful dissemination of industrial technology, oceanographic research to meet the challenge and promise of the ocean's resources. And finally we find ourselves increasingly occupied with what some call consumer's rights and others dub "consumerism"—automobile and tire safety, cigarette labeling and advertising, protection against unsafe toys, confusing packaging and labeling, flammable fabrics, gas pipelines.

The other day at Hot Springs, Virginia, Charles G. Mortimer, of General Foods, keynoted the opening session of the Business Council by calling for 100% business opposition to anything Washington proposes which tampers with the free enterprise system.

I suppose, as a representative of Big Government, with the opportunity to keynote this smaller but no less distinguished assembly, I should counsel you with equal vigor to submit meekly to the Federal chopping block, and recognize humbly that Washington is the depository of all wisdom. Well, I'm not going to do that.

But I am troubled by Mortimer's attack, not so much because of the free enterprise solution which he offers to the nation's problems, but because he seems to deny the very existence of the problems. The failure of the automobile industry to subordinate styling to safe design was not a figment of Congress' imagination. Henry Ford has acknowledged it and others in the industry quietly and privately now grant that the safety law was needed to set the ground rules for competition which did not suboridinate safety.

At the same time, there is a disturbing tendency in some government circles to believe that the problems which we now face are the creations of business, and that harsh and punitive restrictions are the true solution. But exploding population, air and water pollution, urban chaos, cultural, as well as economic poverty, are products of the same underlying dynamic forces which have given us a great abundance and technological preeminence. We also face what the social scientists call the "shifting pattern of social demand"—the growing sophistication and impatience of the affluent citizens as consumer and voter.

Very simply the problems which now face us are the products of change. The fact is that neither business nor government going it alone can control the forces unleashed by such products of modern technology as nuclear power, satellite communications, exploitation of space, development of the supersonic transport, the fourth generation of digital computers and integrated transportation systems. Business, government, the universities, must all combine to the utmost their talents and resources if we are to reach the goals which such technology promises.

During the last several years we have tried to make the Senate Commerce Committee serve as a forum, not for the confrontation of hostile forces, but for the forging of new efforts based upon mutual interest—a meeting ground, not a battlefield.

Thus, the Committee which produced the Packaging and Labeling Law is the same Committee from which COMSAT was born. The Senate Commerce Committee is necessarily faced with forging solutions to social problems. But we are not less concerned with seizing those opportunities which can only be realized through the combined resources of business and government. COMSAT is perhaps a far more monumental Committee product than the Auto Safety or Packaging Laws.

No one in public life can fail to be aware of the growing social concern of the business community. No longer is a company's sense of social obligation limited to passing the hat at Community Chest time—when the American Plywood Association invests capital and resources in slum rehabilitation, when General Electric, RCA, Philco, IBM etc. breathe life into Job Corps centers, and the large corporations headquartered in New York initiate a new partnership to bridge the no-man's land of indifference between Wall Street and City Hall.

Let's take a modest example of this new spirit as it affects a matter now before the Commerce Committee. Probably no single issue has generated so massive a flood of mail to the Committee as warranty service problems. Initially, as we began to focus on this problem, we found evidence of misleading and confusing representations which led inevitably to consumer dissatisfaction. Early this year, we suggested the need for new legislation to require the uniform disclosure of the basic terms and conditions of guarantees and warranties. Yet, as we dug deeper into these problems, as we began to confer with the businesses affected, we began to see that what we had was not basically a disclosure problem, but a servicing problem. On a Saturday morning, the President of one of the largest corporations in America, on his own initiative, came to see the staff of the Committee to talk about the servicing problem, and what his company was attempting to do to meet that problem. When he was through, the staff reported to me that they saw the problem in a new light. They were convinced of the good faith and determination of the company to service the products it sold to the utmost of its ability. And out of that meeting has come a new effort to tap federal resources to aid rather than regulate the industry in meeting its needs. For example, to look to the National Bureau of Standards for assistance in developing new diagnostic equipment for locating product defects or to strengthen vocational training programs to attract and train sufficient mechanics for the demand.

Again, early this year, the Commerce Committee held extensive hearings on the future of the electric car. Last year, Secretary of HEW Gardner vowed that government and industry were on a collision course on vehicular pollution. But I see one role of the Commerce Committee as averting such collisions. It is my feeling that out of those hearings there has grown a determination on the part of both industry and government to work together in developing the technology to solve the problem, rather than to polarize government and business for the next round of debate.

This new spirit is nowhere more evident than in the growing concern of industry in the safety of its own products. The proposal which we made last year, and which the President is now strongly endorsing, to establish a National Commission on Product Safety is a case in point. This Commission would conduct a comprehensive study and investigation of the extent to which the unsafe design of household products constitutes a significant public health problem and a review of the scope and adequacy of present safeguards against the sale of hazardous products. The proposal for the Commission has been welcomed and openly endorsed and supported by industry, just as industry has done much to eliminate hazards from its products.

It has as its concern not only the protection of consumers against unreasonable hazards stemming from the unsafe design of household products but the protection of manufacturers and retailers against burdensome and conflicting regulation. Too often states and localities, and the Federal Government as well, have reacted hastily to a consumer problem illuminated by a tragic event such as a fire or explosion, enacting legislation which goes far beyond curing the problems to which it was directed and causes needless and useless burdens on industry. We must be equally concerned with eliminating this legislative "over-kill."

Our efforts, however, will not be limited to the shaping of new laws and the doctoring of old laws. We are actively exploring with business representatives new ways in which we can communicate with each other more clearly and freely. We are now exploring with industry representatives the possibility of establishing voluntary national, industry-wide *Ombudsmen*: industry-designated representatives to whom complaints can be directed on the national level, just as the Better Business Bureaus act as business *"Ombudsmen,"* on the local level.

Although it appears to some critics that the politicians have dug up the consumer as a political "mother lode," I want you to know that those of us who are concerned with, and responsible for, legislation affecting the consumer are not prepared to bury business in the empty hole.

Louisianians Speak for Rhodesia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1967

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, I am in possession of Louisiana House Concurrent Resolutions No. 65 and No. 66, both passed into law and expressing the feeling of my people and their concern over the economic sanctions by Executive order against our dear friends of the emerging, independent Republic of Rhodesia.

I include both resolutions in the RECORD for consideration and action by our colleagues:

H. CON. RES. 65

Concurrent resolution to urge the Congress of the United States, and especially Louisiana Members of that Congress, to act promptly and favorably and enact into law H.R. 5479 which would require congressional approval of sanctions imposed by the President under the United Nations Participation Act of 1945

Whereas in recent years the United Nations Organization has become increasingly dominated by certain "emerging nations" and

Whereas at the insistence of these nations the United Nations has acted illegally in contravention of Chapter 1 of its own Charter, which prohibits interference in the domestic affairs of sovereign nations, by ordering economic sanctions against Rhodesia, and

Whereas the Organization of African Unity, whose membership is composed solely of many of these "emerging nations" has given notice that it expects to present a resolution to the United Nations Organization demanding the use of force to remove the Rhodesian Government, which actions would be another irresponsible contravention of the United Nations Charter, and

Whereas the United Nations Participation Act of 1945 provides for the imposition by the President of the United States of certain economic and communications sanctions pursuant to actions of the Security Council of the United Nations under Article 41 of the United Nations Charter, and

Whereas the Congress of the United States is vested with sole authority to regulate foreign commerce under Article I, Section 8, Paragraph 3, of the Constitution of the United States, and

Whereas sanctions imposed against a foreign nation are matters of deep concern to the people of the United States and to their Representatives in Congress, and

Whereas approval of any sanctions affecting foreign commerce should be a matter for consideration by the Congress of the United States, and

Whereas the Honorable John Rarick, Representative of the Sixth Congressional District of the State of Louisiana, has recently introduced HR 5479 to amend the United Nations Participation Act of 1945 to provide for the imposition of sanctions by the President only with the approval by the Congress by appropriate Act or Joint Resolution,

Therefore, be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, the Senate concurring herein, that the Legislature of the State of Louisiana hereby urges the members of the Congress of the United States, and especially the members from the state of Louisiana, to act promptly and favorably and enact into law HR 5479 proposed by the Honorable John Rarick.

Be it further resolved that copies of this Resolution shall be transmitted to each member of the Louisiana Delegation in Congress, the chairman of the respective Congressional Committees before whom this proposed legislation will be heard, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives and the President of the United States Senate.

VAIL M. DELONY,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
C. C. AYCOCK,
Lieutenant Governor and President of the Senate.

H. CON. RES. 66

A concurrent resolution to urge the Congress of the United States, and especially the Louisiana members of that Congress, to act promptly and favorably on House Joint Resolution No. 111 which would authorize and direct the President of the United States to notify the United Nations that the United States will not honor United Nations sanctions against Rhodesia, and to rescind Executive Order No. 11322 which orders observance of the sanctions

Whereas the United Nations has acted illegally and in contravention of Chapter 1 of its own Charter, which prohibits interference in the domestic affairs of sovereign nations, in ordering economic sanctions against Rhodesia, and

Whereas the Congress of the United States is vested with sole authority to regulate foreign commerce under Article 1, Section 8, Paragraph 3 of the United States Constitution, while the only authority delegated by Congress to the Executive Branch to restrict trade concerns the control of trading with the enemy, and

Whereas the Executive Branch of the United States government has undertaken to honor the United Nations sanctions without seeking the advice and consent of the Congress, and

Whereas the United States has never sought economic sanctions from the United Nations against its enemy in Viet Nam, and Rhodesia has refrained from engaging in trade with North Viet Nam, and

Whereas the Rhodesian Declaration of Independence is in the same honored tradition as our own such Declaration, and deserves the full support of every American who is proud of our great national heritage, and

Whereas Congressman James B. Utt has introduced House Joint Resolution No. 111 which would authorize and direct the President of the United States and all other interested parties that the United States will not honor United Nations sanctions against Rhodesia and which also would rescind the provisions of Executive Order No. 11322, issued by the President on January 5, 1967, relating to prohibitions against imports of certain commodities from Rhodesia, and which would rescind all orders, regulations and other directives and all decisions promulgated or made under said Executive Order, and which would rescind all Executive Orders, Presidential Proclamation or other orders, regulations or directives promulgated or made under authority of the Export Control Act of 1949 which relate to the export of commodities to Rhodesia, and

Whereas House Joint Resolution No. 111 has been referred to the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, and

Whereas, eight additional and identical Joint Resolutions have been introduced in the Congress of the United States and also been referred to the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, namely:

H.J. Res. 151 by Rep. Younger of California;

H.J. Res. 159 by Rep. Gross of Iowa;
H.J. Res. 181 by Rep. Snyder of Kentucky;
H.J. Res. 184 by Rep. Edwards of Alabama;
H.J. Res. 195 by Rep. Herlong of Florida;
H.J. Res. 196 by Rep. King of New York;

H.J. Res. 276 by Rep. Roudebush of Indiana, and

H.J. Res. 308 by Rep. Abbitt of Virginia.

Therefore, be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, the Senate concurring herein, that the Legislature of the State of Louisiana hereby urges the members of the Congress of the United States, and especially the members from the state of Louisiana, to act promptly and favorably on the Joint Resolution introduced by Congressman Utt or any identical or similar Joint Resolution introduced in the Congress of the United States.

Be It Further Resolved that copies of this Resolution shall be transmitted to each member of the Louisiana Delegation in Congress, the chairman of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs and of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives and the President of the United States Senate.

VAIL M. DELONY,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
C. C. AYCOCK,
Lieutenant Governor and President of the Senate.

The 1967 Greenville Arts Festival

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT T. ASHMORE

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1967

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Speaker, recently, more than 35,000 people of the Piedmont area of our country were privileged to view, and participate in, the 1967 Greenville Arts Festival—the culmination of the creative and sacrificial efforts of hundreds of talented citizens of my district. Lucille Green, an outstanding newspaperwoman, has written a brief account of the exhibits and activities of that event.

Believing that it will be of interest to Members of Congress and that it will serve as an inspiration to communities, I include her article as an extension of my remarks:

(By Lucille B. Green)

The fourth annual Greenville Arts Festival—far and away the largest and best in calibre of exhibits and performances—drew a record 35,313 in attendance during the four days it was held in Textile Hall, tranforming the barn-like interior into a brilliant and colorful spectacle.

Thirty-two hundred persons attended the opening night ceremonies April 20, 11,020 came to the festival April 21, and Saturday's crowd swelled to 12,201. The final four-hour session on a Sunday attracted another 9,073 persons.

The event, entirely planned, executed and staffed by volunteers was held under cover this year after three years of fighting inclement weather in Cleveland Park.

The vast crowds swirled in kaleidscopic patterns through the maze of exhibit areas and formed a Standing Room Only crowd for the opening ceremonies and for many of the performances that were tightly scheduled during the next three days.

The normally drab industrial complex blazed in brilliant festival colors, achieved with hundreds of yards of pink, green and blue fabric draping, and hundreds of gallons of paint in those same vivid colors spread on all manner of decorative structures. Added to these were the thousands of colorful exhibits themselves.

J. R. Lawrence (A.I.A.) handled the layout and design of the Hall providing required space for each area of the performing and visual arts. The decor was coordinated with design throughout all festival areas.

The first night crowd for the event, open to the public without charge to bring "Arts Alive" to the community, exceeded expectations. By the end of the second day the degree of success began to scare the sponsors as they worried how the larger Saturday crowd could be handled.

True to the theme, art had come alive under the fingers of thousands who entered close to 10,000 works of art, displayed in many classifications. Hundreds of other persons patricipated in performances in the areas of music and drama, creating with true artistry both audio and visual entertainment.

During the formal opening ceremonies, Lt. Gov. John C. West brought greetings from the state and Gov. Robert E. McNair. He told those who had worked so diligently as volunteers to create the festival that "you have every reason to be proud of this festival.

"The state looks to Greenville as a leader in many fields, not just arts festival," he added, citing the Technical Education Center, the Community College program as well as the tremendous industrial expansion and the parade of new firms who continue to choose this area for plant sites.

"The effect of your Arts Festival has been felt on state level since its beginning four years ago," he told a crowd of approximately 800 in the auditorium area, while hundreds more toured the display and exhibit areas. The dull murmur of their feet and voices provided a backdrop of emphasis to his words.

Mr. West said that the creation of an Interagency Council of Arts and Humanities and the bill then pending before the South Carolina Legislature—"which I expect will be passed next week"—to create a South Carolina Arts Commission, both received impetus from "your Arts Festivals which has led the state in this area for four years."

Backing up the lieutenant governor's words was a resolution which was passed unanimously in both the Senate and House, lauding the Greenville Arts Festival "as the first of its kind in the state . . . providing art in every form for the free enjoyment of all people."

The resolution, submitted by Rep. Carolyn (Mrs. Holmes) Frederick, a former director of the festival, further brought best wishes for the success of the festival and the "citizens of Greenville in their volunteer roles who provide inspiration for the rest of the state."

Russell A. Graham, chairman of the festival, presided during the opening ceremonies and was called to the stand by Mr. West to receive the resolution, which also praised his leadership.

Further words of praise for the festival chairman were expressed by Mrs. C. Thomas Wyche, co-director with Mrs. Edgar Norris of this year's art event. Mrs. Wyche paid tribute to a "busy executive" of one of the nation's largest firms "whose interest in the arts has inspired him to give so freely of his time and abilities."

Mrs. Wyche also announced the winners in the Creative Writing division in the categories of poetry, short story, and one-act plays. Over one hundred entries were received in this year's event.

Mrs. Norris introduced Yancey S. Gilkerson who spoke briefly, as the president of the Greater Greenville Chamber of Commerce, in praise of the burgeoning festival, and Mayor David G. Traxler, who expressed his civic pride in both the festival and those who made it possible.

The official opening note of the festival, as in years past, was sounded by the Bob Jones University Brass which played the Festival Fanfare, written especially for the first such festival. Also following precedent, was the pops concert by the Greenville Symphony Orchestra.

Following the presentation of the light "Massaniello" Overture by Auber and the lilting Strauss waltz, "Voices of Spring," the orchestra was joined by the Rotary Civic Chorale in selections from Victor Herbert's "Naughty Marietta."

The standing ovation the crowd gave the Chorale and its soloist, Mrs. Ronald Rives, started an exodus by many who thought the concert was complete. But Conductor Peter Rickett called them back with the gentle reproof, "Those of you who are leaving, please go quietly. We have two more brief numbers which we are determined to play."

Those seats too quickly vacated were as quickly filled as the orchestra launched into the lively waltz, "Dance of the Tumblers" by Rimsky-Korsakov—setting little feet swinging gaily in every row as even the youngsters fell under the spell of the infectious rhythm.

The whole audience, young and old, listened enthusiastically to the perennial popular selections from Loew's "My Fair Lady." Mr. Rickett didn't name this final number, saying only "if you don't recognize this, you haven't lived." The applause left no room for doubt in Mr. Rickett's mind that his audience was alive, breathing and appreciative.

The Furman Theatre Guild's dramatic production of "Everyman," a medieval morality play, suffered badly from background noise as many of the audience joined those already touring other areas in the hall.

The situation was somewhat alleviated on the following nights by volunteers touring the beautiful theatre lobby area with signs that warned "Shhhhh, performance time."

Next year the festival directors are considering using the whole West Hall for exhibits and then putting a soundproof wall between the exhibit and performance areas.

Probably no visitor could do justice to the exhibits in a single visit, there very number making it necessary to go back again and again to see even the most of them. Over 5,000 paintings and bits of art work by elementary school age children were on display and another 1,500 by high school students were also hung.

The Advertising Club's Madison Avenue display area was thronged most of the time.

Serious art lovers toured in the amateur exhibit area on the main floor and the professional artists' showing on the mazzanine.

A true museum-like air had been created there by Greenville Museum of Art Director Jack Morris who displayed with professional flair the work of invited artists.

Hung on pegboard paneling with plenty of room to back off to get maximum effect of these works by recognized artists, the area offered an exciting view into the modern art world. This section was especially designed for the pleasure of the more sophisticated art lovers.

Professional museum layout and arrangement and the attractive display of art in all forms by the Bob Jones University exhibitors marked another area where art sophisticates paused to browse.

Bob Jones University's Unusual Films, showed trailers of their productions—"Products of Freedom," made for Sen. Strom Thurmond's use; "Red Runs the River," a prize-winning film of the War in the Confederacy; "Wine in the Morning;" and "Just Ask Jerry."

One of the biggest crowd stoppers in the exhibit and artists' demonstration area was Ouida Canaday of Atlanta, who literally painted the crowd. She put on a large canvas many of the folk who were key figures in the Arts Festival as well as some of the happy festival-goers themselves.

The do-it-yourself art areas appealed to both young and old with a photographer catching a memorable shot of "another Grandma Moses (?)." The children carried their artistic work on wet-painted smeared paper away with them, but those who chose clay modeling were forced to leave their creations behind them.

Even with crowds pushing behind them, arriving festival-goers paused to gasp in pleased surprise at the transformed lobby with its panoramic display, brilliant pink contrasting pleasantly with the bright red carpeting.

Biggest eye-catcher and a delight for small fry to tip-toe through, was the pink gazebo with its hanging baskets of pink miniature rose buds and the topiary trees of the same little pink blossoms.

Drapes of brilliant pink fabric alternated with more hanging baskets suspended from the mezzanine railing; a mobile that featured the components for this year's festival floated freely and breezily, suspended at mezzanine height from the ceiling.

Beautifully costumed hostesses in artists' smocks smiled a welcome and a booth staffed by the members of the American Association of University Women provided information on year-round cultural activities in the Greenville area.

Performances drawing SRO crowds the second night included the Bob Jones University Brass Quintet and Trombone Choir and the Greenville Civic Ballet's demonstration.

The latter was more than lovely and provided a splendid introduction to this art for the many who had not seen the corps perform previously. The corps' new maturity and poise were shown to advantage and the crowd was further swelled as youngsters sprawled on the floor between seating and stage. Still others filled the mezzanine.

The Chattanooga Boys Choir also got a "down front" crowd of youngsters. The boys offered a variety of choral numbers and then an operetta done with more boyish enthusiasm than artistic charm.

Biggest audience for a performance was that drawn Saturday afternoon by the Army Field Band, with the theatre lobby eliminated for this performance and another 400 chairs added. The heart-stirring throb of the army band echoed throughout the festival area for 90 minutes, much to the delight of thousands.

Throughout Saturday, music filled the hall, from the military band beat to the delicate arias of Mozart's "The Magic Flute" opera, performed during the evening.

Next to the Army Band in pulling maximum attendance were the children's performances during the morning, the one-act play, "The Terrible Prince with the Terrible Nose," and the puppet show, "The Magic Hat." Youngsters filled the seats, the aisles, sat on the floor and tried to squirm up on the stage.

For the Saturday night performances, Textile Hall personnel changed the auditorium setting back to the original plan, setting up the screening and restoring the ornate red-carpeted foyer with its landscaped borders, complete with sparkling fountain. Great hanging chandeliers, created with festoons of the festival-colored ribbons, added to the elegant decor.

The flower banked spacious area of the Cafe de los Artistsas—colorful beyond measure—wafted a welcome to those with weary feet and dry throats. Both food and drink were on sale and there was plenty of seating space in the most attractive of surroundings for those who paused.

Youngsters danced up and down the long aisles with picturesque designations, the color and flow of the crowds vying in brilliance with the festival colors and multiple bright exhibits.

On tip-toe with excitement, the young tugged on big balloons and darted hither and thither while behind them came the loitering adults, looking, looking and looking.

Saturday night's performances included a concert by the Greenville High School Chorus with the Crescent Little Symphony, presenting Schubert's Mass; the Furman Symphonic Band; and two superb productions by the Crescent Music Club—selections from the "Magic Flute" and from Menotti's "The Telephone."

Throughout the festival there was periodic entertainment in the cafe area, including organ music at noons, classical guitar, folk songs, a classical Spanish Dance and numbers by two handbell choirs.

During the final hours of the festival Sunday, SRO crowds heard more excellent music. They applauded particularly the 16 hands on four piano keyboards concert presented by the Music Club of Greenville who performed, several popular numbers by Schubert, Brahms, Prokofiev, Debussy, Lecuona and Anderson.

There was a large and enthusiastic audience, too, for the concert by the Furman Singers and the Furman Concert Choir. They gave several excerpts from their forthcoming production of Verdi's "Il Trovatore" under the direction of DuPre Rhame.

Only off-site program was the Sunday vespers program at Rhodeheaver Auditorium on the Bob Jones University campus with buses providing shuttle service for the many who took this opportunity to see the traditional Sunday afternoon performance. Many others went and returned to Textile Hall in their own cars.

Mr. Graham, commenting at the close of the festival, declared: "This year's festival's success has exceeded our fondest expectations. Standing here in the lobby every day, I've seen folk come in smiling and go out smiling. They've enjoyed it. This has made all our hard work worthwhile.

"The other thing that most impressed me is the wonderful cooperation of all the individuals and groups who have been participants in this. I guess enthusiasm has been the key word of both those who worked to put this thing on and those who came to see it."

"It's the best thing I know of that Greenville's ever done in terms of community organization and individuals working together to produce an event of this kind," Mr. Gilkerson added, speaking on behalf of the chamber.

Money raised for the festival, which operated on a budget of $9,515, was contributed by business and industry, as well as some civic-minded individuals. The funds went twice as far as could have been expected because of the many contributions of materials.

Nurserymen loaned hundreds of blooming plants, evergreens, etc., and the volunteers who created the hundreds of artificial floral arrangements worked for many weeks.

Obviously the 100,000 square feet of Textile Hall utilized this year is going to have to be greatly expanded next year. Success breeds success. Next year's festival will undoubtedly be one of the finest in the Southeast, if not the nation.

Address by Gov. Ronald Reagan, at the Marine Technology Society Banquet, San Diego, June 6, 1967

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED REINECKE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1967

Mr. REINECKE. Mr. Speaker, the following address by Gov. Ronald Reagan, given at the Marine Technology Society banquet, on June 6, 1967, in San Diego, Calif., is both timely and important to our entire Nation, and of special interest to our coastal regions.

The State of California is the unquestioned leader in the field of oceanography. It is indeed heartening that our new Governor has herewith restated the courses and means to keep California in the front of this field.

Therefore, I would like to take this opportunity to commend him for this effort. It is my hope that my colleagues will read Governor Reagan's thoughtful and perceptive suggestions as to how we can best utilize this vital, natural resource with the interest and enthusiasm they so richly deserve.

The address follows:

ADDRESS BY GOV. RONALD REAGAN, MARINE TECHNOLOGY SOCIETY BANQUET, SAN DIEGO, JUNE 6, 1967

I am not here tonight to speak as a would-be expert in a highly varied and highly technical field.

Neither am I here to look into what I am certain will be an exciting future rivaling or exceeding anything dreamed of by Jules Verne or even seen on television.

But I do want to look for a few moments at the many areas that encompass the broad field of Oceanography, to look at some of the challenges that face us and to tell you how we in California hope to face up to those challenges.

Oceanography has important long range implications to the U.S. and to the world, and especially to those areas bordering on the seas.

There is little argument that sea water, sea life, both plant and animal, and sea bottoms contain the potential vastly to expand our food production, our mineral production and in general the world's wealth.

And, of course, advancing technology makes it increasingly apparent that the oceans in the not too distant future can supply major amounts of potable water to our coastal areas.

Here in California where we have large water-short areas we are vitally interested in desalinization concepts and processes.

We have watched with deep interest the progress made in recent years in bringing down the price of desalinized water to the point where today it is becoming feasible to use it in our city water systems.

In fact if the off-shore plant which will function from a man-made island off Huntington Beach operates as expected when completed in 1972, we will finally have what is pretty close to a major breakthrough in the production of fresh water—20 cents for every thousand gallons, and 150 million gallons of water a day.

Since water is of such tremendous importance to California let me digress just a moment to mention that sea water is only one of several possibilities for furnishing fresh water to our growing millions.

Ocean-oriented engineers have also talked of bringing water to Southern California in huge pipes laid off our coast either from the mouth of the Columbia River or perhaps from the mouth of the Feather.

Many experts believe this is possible but certainly much more research and engineering study must be done before we can say it is practical. And of course at this end it must meet one of the same obstacles that desalinized water faces. It must be pumped from sea-level to those areas needing it.

If such a project is otherwise practical this one obstacle is not insurmountable. Our great California water project will pump water over the Techapis and into our arid areas south of the mountains. And, of course, water from the Colorado is pumped in also.

A third area is that of reclaimed water. A good share of our water is used only once and then is carried off to sea. While the subject of reclaiming water may not be a proper one for an oceanographic meeting, certainly the development of ways and means to reclaim waste water is vital to our future. There are indications that this not only might be the cheapest solution to our long-range water problems, but it is also evident that a successful solution would minimize the need for further importation of water.

Sometimes I wonder where we might be today had we had the vision to look at the sea and at water reclamation methods 30 or 40 years ago and had spent on these projects just a fraction of the amount we have spent in bringing water in from the Colorado and down from the north.

But the problem of fresh water is only one of the many problems facing California, the pacific coast and much of the world today that oceanographers can help solve.

The excitement and titillation of oceanography is the picture of the futuristic submarine and the man in the diving suit, it is the talk of distilling gold and other precious minerals from sea water, it is the vision of supplying world food needs from the sea.

But much of this futuristic world is already here. In fact, magnesium, bromine and potassium have been extracted commercially from the waters off America and one of California's major salt suppliers extracts its products solely from the sea.

New-type submarines and diving bells with arm-like mechanical claws are already exploring the oceans at great depths.

And aquaculture is becoming increasingly important in Japan including establishment of an oyster program in California which now produces 7610 million pounds annually. Small scale projects also are underway in the United States, but studies indicate there is much to be done in this area before sea-farming as differentiated from commercial fishing becomes an important source of the world's food.

While exploring the possibilities the ocean offers in new or exotic fields, we should not overlook these areas in which man has used the ocean since time immemorial—fishing and commerce.

Both of these fields are of vital importance to California, to the West Coast and to the entire Pacific basin.

Some of you may not be aware of it but for years San Pedro has been one of the world's major fishing ports and San Diego has been not far behind.

But irresponsible commercial fishing, primarily by other nations has cut into the world's supply of edible fish such as tuna. Both a research program and international agreements are needed to develop and control means of levelling out catches and insuring sustained yields of commercial fishes.

Already great strides have been made in converting some species of fish, once thought of as non-edible, into fish flour, but more can be done in this area. A 1964 study found that the amount of animal protein needed for the entire world could be obtained by a mere 30 percent increase in the world fish catch, provided of course the means of distribution could be found.

But distribution of goods and things by sea is an area where we in the U.S. are falling badly behind.

California harbors, for instance, cannot handle the superships now being built. Japan, for instance, has one ship with a capacity of 150,000 tons and a draft of 66 feet, seven inches. San Francisco's main ship channel has a depth of just 45 feet.

It is obvious that either harbors must be improved or new and economical methods of off-shore loading and unloading must be found.

Largely because of economic conditions the U.S. in general has fallen farther and farther behind the rest of the world in shipbuilding and in cargo hauling.

California shipyards now operate at less than half their capacity. America's share of ocean-going cargo is constantly decreasing.

Here are areas where American ingenuity, inventiveness and initiative can change the picture, especially if government, industry and labor are willing to cooperate with each other.

In California we hope and plan to have a major hand in that change. Just as we also plan to take a major part in studying the ocean itself, its effect on climate, and its resources.

We think California, with its 1200-mile coast line, with its research and technology oriented industries and universities, with its great numbers of qualified and brilliant engineers and scientists, should lead the way.

California has much to gain from a determined effort to orient itself toward the ocean.

Our rapidly growing population needs not only water; it also needs jobs. Heretofore we have been a state oriented to agriculture and defense industries. Agriculture must continue to play a major role in the state's economy, and defense will also be of vast importance in the foreseeable future.

But we should not depend on federal funds as the basis for an industrial economy and advancing technologies will continue to cut down the numbers employed in agri-business while at the same time increasing production.

Therefore, California must turn in other directions to prepare for the future. One direction is west and that way lies the ocean.

California already has a solid oceanographic foundation. In the area of research we have the Scripps Institution at La Jolla. A group of our state colleges has banded together for further research at Moss Landing on the Monterey Bay. Our department of fish and game operates two research vessels but these are pretty much limited in areas of commercial and sports fishing. They seek to establish fish immigration habits and find other information of importance in the two industries.

Industry has become more and more aware of the ocean potential. Lockheed Board Chairman, Daniel L. Haughton, for instance, has called for the aerospace and petroleum industries "to join forces in exploration and development of the Continental Shelves."

Certainly, similar arrangements might mutually benefit many of our industries.

This state administration feels it has an obligation to lead the way. Not to tell business and industry and research what must be done, not to dip deep into the taxpayers pocket to provide a kind of subsidized approach, but instead to encourage, to work with and to provide the kind of governmental climate in which the many facets of oceanography can become meaningful, can spur the economy and increase our progress.

We have already begun.

I have appointed an expert in the field, Col. T. R. Gillenwaters, as a special advisor to lead this effort.

We have re-activated the Governor's Advisory Commision on Ocean Resources. This is made up of top men in the oceanographic field, many of whom are here tonight.

I would like at this moment to salute them and thank them for their willingness to help in this effort.

This Commission, called GACOR, already has recommended creation of an interagency council for ocean resources. If our studies find this practical, such a council could well be the forerunner to a state office of Marine Resources.

Such an office could correlate interstate activities as well as coordinating federal-state activities and above all, offering support and help to the independent sector which, after all, must provide the main thrust if California is to develop as a major sea state.

But we envision looking beyond the borders of California, also, a sea-oriented state must look to others with the same interests and the same problems.

As soon as it can be conveniently done, I hope to meet with my fellow Governors from Washington, Oregon, Hawaii and Alaska to discuss the concept of a Pacific Basin Community.

Such a community eventually could look toward working with our neighbors of both the north and south, Canada and Mexico, in solving mutual problems, exchanging ideas and information.

A Pacific Basin Community of states could activate broad programs involving cooperation among the states, the federal government and the independent sector.

These programs could be as wide and varied as the field of oceanography itself.

These would include research into utilization of ocean resources, resolution of maritime legal questions; tax incentives; review and analysis of all related federal and state legislation, ways of improving maritime trade, fisheries research and development; ways and means of expanding mineral and oil exploration along the Continental Shelf, desalinization; pollution control in tidal and bay areas; improved weather and tide forecasting, and expanded recreational-facilities.

In an era of spending billions for space exploration and many billions more for defense and for social experiments, the oceans have been largely overlooked except as how they affect the military.

The time has come to end the oversight, the time has come to look to the seas as we build for the future.

In California, at least, we intend to do just that.

Open Housing: A Cure or a Cause?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1967

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the basic objective of the ultra leftwing extremist has been to destroy the American society and out of the ashes and ruin to rebuild the Socialist, equalitarian society.

Billions in American taxpayers' dollars are being funneled into programs to tear down our culture while being "explained" as in the public interest in order to rebuild for the promised future.

The biggest snag encountered is that many individual Americans love their homes and refuse to surrender themselves to living in the new look-alike, standard-conforming homes.

So to help push the individual property owner, the open housing—more appropriately term "destruction of housing"—philosophy has been borne of revolutionary necessity to lower the value of real estate by sending free men running into the suburbs and urban areas, surrendering their family homes and estates to the ravages of the planned ghetto.

Having attained their goal—planned ghetto—the bureaucratic theorists are then able to cry poverty and substandard housing. These theorists take, tear down, and rebuild, all at the expense of the same taxpayers whom the same bureaucratic dreamers had earlier run out of town.

And the American people, who take the time to study the situation, are becoming convinced that those who now talk about giving away were the same ones who had taken away. Those who created the problem are now the same dreamers who think that only they can solve the problem they have created. Besides it keeps them on the people's payroll, creates jobs, and is good for politicians.

The answer to our cities' problem and the ghetto is simple—but headed in the wrong direction.

Take off the pressure of forced race mixing in housing, schools, and neighborhoods, and let our people alone to balance their society by seeking its own levels. On our present course we will continue to build city after city, but in each instance the city will be vacated as free men seek to move on.

By now, it should appear obvious the American people only want to be left alone. The open housing threat against individual freedom solves nothing—it creates or aggravates the problem.

Mr. Speaker, I herewith follow my remarks with an article from the Washington, D.C., Sunday Star for June 11, captioned "Open Housing Called Bad Rights Issue":

OPEN HOUSING CALLED BAD RIGHTS ISSUE

Open occupancy is the worst issue the civil rights movement has ever settled on, a member of the Columbia University School of Social Work maintains, and "it is the ghetto that is paying dearly for this goal set up by the liberals."

Richard Cloward, writing in the current issue of "Center Diary," the publication of the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, said that it is not just the Negro who is suffering because of the "absurd emphasis on desegregation as the solution to housing problems . . .

"Every poor white family in America is also suffering because all the subsidies are going into middle-class housing and not into lower-class housing."

SUBSIDIES ON "TRICKLE"

Subsidies for low-income housing have been reduced "to a trickle because the issue of integration has been tied to the issue of low-income housing," Cloward asserted, adding:

"We don't have the troops to win both these fights simultaneously and so what has happened is that we have lost both.

"Integrated housing and open occupancy have gone down the drain, as well as the public housing program and rent supplements . . ."

Liberals, Cloward continued, have always claimed that the solution to the housing problem of the ghetto is to break it up, "but I think it is clear that the ghetto is not going to be broken up."

MUST REBUILD GHETTO

Liberals now must join with others seeking decent housing to develop a program "to rebuild the ghetto," Cloward said. They have to accept the ghetto, at least for now, and do what they can to improve the conditions of the epople living in it, he said.

Opening up housing in middle-class suburbs, which are not "in any ghetto man's future anyway," is futile as tenements are being razed in the city for highways and urban renewal, Cloward said.

"There are tremendous housing subsidies in our society, but the poor will not get them, whether they are Negro or white, as long as the issue of decent housing is linked to the issue of open occupancy.

"It is a hard choice, but it is at least a choice," Cloward said.

Old Enough To Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1967

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support legislation which would give our young people the right to vote at the age of 18.

The time is past due for us to give these young people the right to vote. We have talked about it long enough. It is time that we get serious and do something about it.

The group between 18 and 21 years of age is assuming more and more of the most important responsibilities faced by our citizens. They are asked to defend the policies of the United States throughout the world. They are making sacrifices in Vietnam, yet they do not have a role in helping to decide the course of policies which they are asked to defend.

I feel the great weight of evidence shows that 18-year-old citizens are ready, willing, and able to assume the responsibility of full citizenship.

If we expect those who reach their 18th birthday to wear the uniform of their country, to fight its wars, and sacrifice in its defense, then I believe we should grant them a voice in their government.

As President Eisenhower said:

> For years our citizens between the ages of 18 and 21 have, in time of peril, been summoned to fight for America. They should participate in the political process that produces that fateful summons.

A large number of American men who fought in World War I, in World War II and in Korea were between the ages of 18 and 21. The same holds true for those now fighting in Vietnam. When we called on them, we did not say they were too young and too immature to fight. I do not, in all honesty, feel that we can turn around and tell them they are too immature to vote.

At present there are about 900,000 New Yorkers between the ages of 18 and 21. The percentage of high school graduates is greater than at any other time in history. It is estimated that a least 50 percent more of our young people graduate from high school today than a decade ago. In our State of New York, high school graduates must have at least three full-year courses in American history which include a comprehensive study of Government at all levels.

With this preparation, there is no reason why they should have to wait 3 long years before they can take part in the affairs of your Government.

The young people of today, who are better educated and better informed than those of any previous generation, have a contribution to make.

Some would say that 18-year-olds are not "wise" enough to vote intelligently. Perhaps there are some who are not "wise." But the same can be said for any age group. I tend to agree with the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt, who said:

> We know that wisdom does not come necessarily with years, that old men may be foolish and young men wise.

Eighteen-year-olds graduate with a fresh interest in the affairs of government. Studies have shown, however, that young men and women between the ages of 18 and 21 often lose their enthusiasm because they are unable to put it into effect. America cannot afford to lose this enthusiasm; we cannot afford to lose this fresh viewpoint toward the problems which face us today.

And, finally, I think that by granting the vote to 18-year-olds we can provide a strong antidote to the vocal few who demonstrate, desecrate our flag, and burn their draft cards.

Many who participate in these acts are between the ages of 18 and 21. Their unspoken argument is often, "If we cannot have a say in our Government through the ballot box, we will make our opinions felt in demonstrations."

If we open the ballot box to them, we will give them a legal, peaceful way to express their opinions. More important, we will give the 99 percent, who would not think of participating in such acts, a chance to reaffirm and stengthen their faith in America.

Vice President HUBERT HUMPHREY once said:

> Our young people would be more than passive voters—they have the enthusiasm and idealism of youth; they are fresh from their schools and colleges, with a lively interest in politics and social affairs, and they would take on their responsibilities when they would be more apt to place the national interest above those particular interests they will later acquire.

Recently one of our leading newspapers in Buffalo, N.Y., gave its support for the 18-year-old vote.

With permission, I include the Buffalo Evening News' editorial of June 6 below:

18: OLD ENOUGH TO VOTE

Letting 18-year-olds vote—a reform we've long advocated—was the cause for which three young Kenmore West High School students spoke up at a Constitutional Convention committee hearing here the other day. And we must say their 16-year-old chairman, Leonard Hindus, served their cause very well with his reply to what was intended as a devastating remark by an unconvinced Con-Con delegate.

"How about giving the vote to teeny-boppers and hippies?" he asked the earnest young delegation.

"Bums and vagrants have it now," was Leonard's fast reply—and of course that was exactly the point that needed making: that all 18-year-olds should no more be judged by the "teeny-boppers and hippies" than all adults are judged by "bums and vagrants."

No one guarantees that voters of any age will use their franchise either maturely or wisely. But our feeling is that those between 18 and 21 would do as well with it, by and large, as those of any other age group. And our further feeling is that the responsibility of beginning to vote while they are fresh from the completion of their high school courses in history and government will have a desirable maturing influence on them.

Beyond this, moreover, is the point that still remains for us the clincher: that when a boy has reached the age where he must register for the draft and a girl has reached the age where the law lets her marry without consent, it is time to begin giving them a share in the rights as well as the obligations of adult citizenship.

We therefore hope the Con-Con will agree with the delegation from Ken West and vote to lower the voting age to 18.

President Johnson's Opportunity Campaign for Spanish-Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. S. JOHNNY WALKER

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1967

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, last Friday, in ceremonies at the White House, President Johnson welcomed to the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission its first Commissioner of Spanish-American descent, Vicente T. Ximenes of New Mexico.

I would like to point out at this time that I personally do not recognize a distinction whereby some Americans are referred to by hyphenated titles. I do so here advisedly to denote a specific group for identification only.

It was a proud day for the Spanish-American community in the United States.

It was a proud day for the United States.

Mr. Ximenes' appointment is a symbol of American achievement. Yet it is also a reminder of how much more we must achieve to attain first-class status for the Spanish-American—in jobs, wages, educational attainment, housing, and community facilities.

At the swearing-in ceremonies for Mr. Ximenes, President Johnson made public a special Cabinet committee report which detailed the Government's efforts of the last 3 years to give the Spanish-American the tools and resources and help he needs to take advantage of the full promise of American opportunity.

The report cited some of the statistics of accomplishments of the Johnson administration during the past 3 years:

Almost 34,000 Spanish American children enrolled in project Headstart programs last summer;

90,000 Spanish-American youths have enrolled in the Job Corps since 1964;

More than 60 percent of the $41 million going into migrant worker anti-poverty programs is devoted to Spanish-American workers and their families;

In my own State of New Mexico—in one town of Sandoval where the population is 40 percent Spanish-American—300 residents are receiving technical job training in a dozen different fields, while an additional 250 are enrolled in basic adult education programs sponsored by the Office of Economic Opportunity;

Individuals and cooperatives in the five Southwestern states of New Mexico, California, Texas, Colorado, Arizona have received $45 million in United States loans to build new housing, water and recreation facilities. Many of the beneficiaries have been Spanish-Americans.

I am deeply proud to be associated with a President and an administration which has not forgotten the second largest minority group in the country.

I am proud that President Johnson has moved quietly and effectively to encourage equal opportunity for Spanish-Americans in the public schools of the Southwest.

And I am proud that our Government believes that much more must be done, especially for the many hundreds of thousands of farmworkers who are now covered for the first time by a minimum wage law proposed by President Johnson and approved by the Congress.

President Johnson has not been hesitant in using the powers of government to fight discrimination and to train Spanish-Americans for new skills and careers. Private enterprise must do no less. The leaders of local communities in the Southwest must do no less.

This is a great human story. It is becoming one of the finest progress stories of the Johnson administration.

As a Congressman from the great Southwest, as a Democrat, and as an American, I pledge my full support to the President in his far-seeing opportunity program for the Spanish-American citizen.

Moves Mail With Snowplow Motor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1967

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, as all Members of this House are well aware, the State of New Jersey suffered a power failure 1 week ago. It is on these occasions that we realize how dependent we are upon electricity. Unfortunately, however, when electric power fails, there are many functions in our society which must, nonetheless, not be allowed to come to a halt.

Last week, when the Union City, N.J., Post Office found itself without electric power, building engineer George Clark, a very resourceful constituent of mine, was not content to wait until power was restored.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to include at this point in the RECORD a story which appeared in the Hudson Dispatch, a leading newspaper in the 14th District of New Jersey, on June 6, 1967, which points out the dedication to duty possessed by the employees of the Union City, N.J., Post Office.

I particularly commend building engineer George Clark and postmaster Frank Elia for devotion to duty which is in the finest traditions of the U.S. postal service.

The story follows:

MOVES MAIL WITH SNOWPLOW MOTOR

Someplace in that post office slogan they are going to have to add power failures.

During the failure yesterday, the Union City post office found a way to keep the mail flowing without missing a postage stamp.

Building Engineer George Clark of West New York seeing the complex machines go quiet when the power went off, decided he would keep things humming.

Using the motor of a gasoline-powered snowplow, and a little imagination, Clark kept the stamp cancellation machine going without let up.

Union City Postmaster Frank Elia said yesterday Clark would be nominated for departmental outstanding achievement award.

Enforce the Draft Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK EDWARDS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1967

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I have joined with some 20 other Members of the House in introducing House Resolution 489, which is designed to bring about the enforcement of existing laws regarding the Selective Service System.

The resolution cites two laws in particular which are being violated today. They are being violated, not secretly or quietly, but with considerable publicity and bravado.

We see no evidence that the Department of Justice has any intention whatsoever to enforce these laws.

In connection with this issue there follows here a newspaper column from the Birmingham News which seems to be right on the point:

FED UP WITH CARMICHAELS AND KINGS

(By Edward J. Mowery)

WASHINGTON.—The American people are about fed up with the near-seditious mouthings of one Stokely Carmichael, the West Indian Negro who preaches wholesale antiwhite hatred, disloyalty and defiance of the law across the land . . . at a reputed $1,000 fee per speech.

And citizens are also getting a little weary of the rabble-rousing tactics of Martin Luther King who has the gall to map city-by-city racist demonstrations to further Negro "rights."

Both citizens and members of Congress are asking some questions about the boiling, carefully contrived racial unrest stalking the nation. Are these malcontents—the Carmichaels and Kings—above the law?

Why isn't the Justice Department cracking down on advocates of noncompliance with the Selective Service Act?

SEND HIM THERE

And shouldn't Carmichael—who says "To hell" with the United States, white people and the draft—be sent pronto to the country of his choice?

Ten days ago, mutterings in Congress over the antidraft theme exploded into a resolution triggered by 20 members of the House demanding Justice Department enforcement of the draft law. There was no overt mention of Carmichael.

But his "To hell with the draft" exhortations to Negro youths were undoubtedly the target.

The congressmen urged President Johnson to force action by the attorney general against anyone "who knowingly counsels, aids or abets another to refuse or evade registration or service"—clear-cut but ignored stipulations of the draft law.

Who is this Carmichael who ridicules President Johnson as a "buffoon" and cabinet members as "fools" and "racists"?

Carmichael, classified 4-F by his New York draft board, is 26, and a native of Trinidad. His mother was a Panamanian. He derived U.S. citizenship from his parents' naturalization, entered the United States in '52, settled first in Harlem and later in the Bronx. His father, born in the British West Indies, is deceased. He has four sisters.

SEMIBEATNIK

A 1960 graduate of the Bronx School of Science, he earned a philosophy degree four years later at Howard University where he joined and later headed the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee (SNCC).

His affinity for Negro rabble-rousing during undergraduate days at Howard took him repeatedly to the South for participation in demonstrations, Freedom Rides, etc.

Slender, tall, in semibeatnik attire and wearing sunglasses, Carmichael goes for the spellbinder approach in appearances before young audiences, cleverly tailoring his texts to the literate or illiterate composition of his listeners who may number from 100 to 5,000 (October 29, 1966, at the Berkeley campus of the University of California).

He doesn't spare anti-American venom or invective when haranguing predominantly Negro assemblies. And they apparently love it.

On the rostrum, Carmichael—ignoring the soaring casualty toll of heroic GI's in Vietnam—bitterly denounces both the war and the draft. He characterizes Negroes fighting in Vietnam as "hired killers" and "black mercenaries."

This is "Lyndon Johnson's war" . . . a "white man's war," says the self-appointed Negro messiah.

ANTIWAR BRAVADO

Sometimes Carmichael's antiwar bravado reaches its screeching zenith. On a TV program last August 21, he boasted that he wouldn't fight in Vietnam and added: "I would urge every black man in this country not to fight in Vietnam."

Dallas: A City En Route to the Supersonic Age

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE R. POOL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1967

Mr. POOL. Mr. Speaker, the president of the Air Transport Association, Stuart G. Tipton, gave an interesting and thought-provoking speech recently in Dallas.

Mr. Tipton commented on the value of the supersonic transport, not only to the Dallas area but to every State in the Union. He did this by describing the new jobs that would be created and the bolstering of the national economy through the investment of billions of dollars in the construction of the aircraft. He also made a very good case for the value of speed in and of itself.

President Johnson has asked the Congress to move ahead and provide funds for the construction of the supersonic aircraft. This was a wise decision and one which I am sure will be endorsed by Congress.

There is too much at stake to let this tremendous technological improvement go by the boards. We have only to look at the recent and unfortunate experience in the Middle East to see just how important it is to have the speed of communication for face-to-face meetings which an SST will provide.

Mr. Tipton pointed out that regardless of what we do there will be an SST age, and at least three countries will be leading the way into it. The English and French are jointly producing the Concorde. It will be test-flown next February and offered for sale to the United States and other countries in 1971. Russia is in the competition, too, and a Moscow newspaper has said that their SST will be test-flown "within a few months."

Because of the importance of the supersonic transport program to the United States, and because Mr. Titpon's remarks describe the situation so well, I am including his remarks in the RECORD:

DALLAS—A CITY EN ROUTE TO THE SUPERSONIC AGE

(Remarks of Stuart G. Tipton, president, Air Transport Association, at the Rotary Club, Dallas, Tex., June 7, 1967)

I am always impressed when I come to Dallas because the impact of aviation is so clear to see. It starts at Love Field and I don't have to tell you what an asset that busy place is. Love is one of the most productive airports in the world and is already operating at a level that I am sure surpasses even the most optimistic Texas-style expectations that were advanced when it was acquired back in 1928.

Last year more than ten million passengers used the airport, just twice the amount of 1961. This means that Dallas traffic increased at a faster rate than the industry as whole and it is no easy task to pace the industry because during those five years, airline traffic in the United States increased 85 per cent.

Total airline employment in the area stands at 6,000 with an annual payroll of $48.2 million.

All of this reinforces the concept of Dallas a leading center of aviation and makes its aerial gateway, Love Field, a major part of the aviation picture. The field has almost 2,000 employees whose payroll last year was about $12 million making it one of the leading industrial plants of northern Texas.

More than that, the airlines, through the gateway at Love Field, brought in more than one half a million visitors and conventioneers last year and they spent more than $70 million in Dallas. The U.S. Chamber of Commerce tells us that each dollar brought in by a tourist generates seven additional dollars so it's easy to see the millions of dollars that flow through that gateway.

There are other Love Fields in the United States. That is to say: good, dependable, safe, productive airports.

Love Field, however, is different in one very important respect. The people in the Dallas area, along with their good neighbors to the west, in Fort Worth, realize that a new and improved airport is needed to handle the rising tide of traffic.

Both cities are to be praised for their achievement in joining together to develop a truly regional airport to serve both cities. It is just this sort of far seeing area planning which will make our cities useful places in the decades to come.

Despite the pressing need for increased airport capacity, only two other major metropolitan areas in the United States are now building new air carrier airports.

Houston and Kansas City will open their new airports some time early next year. There will be new facilities at Sacramento, Jacksonville and Hunstville but that is the sum and substance of it. Since major airport construction lead time is about seven to ten years, we will have, then, a net addition of six new airports by 1975. And by that time, traffic will have trebled.

One of the leading airlines of the world, Braniff, is headquartered here. Of the hundreds of airlines throughout the world, only nine are larger. Braniff is larger, for instance, than the airlines of such major nations as Italy, Japan and The Netherlands. Because Braniff is truly an international airline, it makes Love Field a key international air gateway. Braniff's recent merger with Panagra strengthens the air ties that Dallas has with all of Latin America.

There is a great potential in travel and trade between Texas and the countries south of the Rio Grande. With a new fleet of productive, and colorful, aircraft and with more to come, this Dallas-based airline, I am sure, will increase its position in the ranking of the world's airlines.

And, I don't have to tell you about the contributions to Dallas' aviation leadership that have been made by another major trunk airline which, while not headquartered here, is a busy and useful citizen. I mean, of course, American Airlines. And they go way back in Dallas' air history. In 1928, as Texas Air Transport, they operated the first regular air service in Texas. A good friend of yours, C. R. Smith, started his airline career with that company.

Now, of course, American is big business here and enplaned more than one million passengers last year.

Recently, American Airlines announced the construction of a $7½ million terminal at Love Field. Braniff is in the midst of an $8 million improvement program at the airport. These are just the improvements on the ground. The improvements in the air are even more startling and more significant. In the four-year period—1967–1970—the airlines will be spending more than $5 billion for new flight equipment and related facilities. Most of it is going for new jet aircraft. The re-equipment program through 1970 includes more than 716 new aircraft.

The U.S. airlines serving Dallas include American, Braniff, Central, Continental, Delta, Eastern and Trans-Texas. They account for 1.7 billion dollars of the over-all industry amount. Much of the new flight equipment will be used to improve Dallas service.

Just as Dallas' airport needs large amounts of money just to keep pace with current demands, and to anticipate tomorrow's requirements, so do all other metropolitan airports.

While the Federal government, working with the state and local government, hopefully will continue and even expand their financial support of the nation's airport system, it is becoming increasingly clear that additional funds for airport development must come from private sources.

One of the major sources of revenue has been the landing fee. Airlines, which last year contributed $80 million in landing fees at air carrier airports throughout the country, accept the fee as a normal cost of doing business. At current rates, they expect that they will be paying $250 million in landing fees by 1971.

With a new airport and with the new supersonic aircraft which will be introduced by the United States in 1975, Dallas will sit at the crossroads of trade between the U.S. and South America and between all parts of the world.

The Administration has taken an important step by recommending the construction of prototype SST aircraft. I have no doubt that the Congress will concur in this decision and will enable the U.S. to not only maintain but enhance their world leadership in aviation. With the competition for men's minds growing stronger each day, that nation which leads in technology, be it in outer space or inner space, has an important advantage. We can't afford to turn our back on the progress that is represented by the supersonic transport.

The development and production of the SST will stimulate significantly, through the creation of thousands of new jobs, our nation's economy and the economies of many local communities such as Dallas. It will create an average level of more than 50,000 direct jobs with an annual payroll of nearly one-half billion dollars among airframe and engine contractors and first level subcontractors. Employment multipliers indicate that for every direct SST job created across the land, four additional jobs will be created in the subcontracting manufacturing industries and in such nonmanufacturing industries as the wholesale and retail trade, business services, finance, insurance, real estate and local transportation.

Because the SST is so vast a job, it is being split up by Boeing to a number of companies throughout the U.S. A key member of the SST team will be Dallas' Ling-Temco-Vought Company. LTV will make the center section of the SST or about 10 per cent of the aircraft. The two center sections for the prototypes represent $21 million. Later, as production starts, hundreds of millions will flow into Dallas via LTV and other supporting firms.

But the multi-billion dollar investment will spread in other areas as well. Boeing estimates that up to 2,000 companies will eventually produce some hardware for use on the SST.

But more than the new jobs being created, more than the tremendous contribution that the SST will make to the economy, there is an overriding reason for its construction. That is speed.

I have had lots of discussions as to whether the building and putting into service of the supersonic airplane is a sensible thing to do. Usually, at some stage in the discussion, the questioner pops out with the very fundamental inquiry as to whether we should strive to travel at three times the speed of sound.

That's a good question and we might as well look at it. When looking at it, we have to accept the fact that the decision is not really ours to make. The British and French made it when they reached a decision to build a Concorde. At that point, the SST age was launched and we as a country were faced with the necessity of either excelling in it or deliberately turning our lead in air transport manufacturing over to foreign governments.

But for the sake of argument, let's assume that this is not the case and contemplate the question of whether or not speed of travel is good in itself.

The whole history of the air transport industry tends to prove that increased speed of transportation is good. During my time the cruising speeds of aircraft has increased from 125 miles per hour to 180 miles per hour to 220 miles per hour—then 300, then 400, and now a little less than 600 miles per hour. I don't know that I can say these increases resulted from a great public demand that air transportation be made faster, because the public really did not know what the speed potential of the airplane was. But one thing is quite clear. Once the public was presented with the opportunity to travel at greater speeds, they grasped that opportunity in ever-increasing numbers. Speed and dependability are what we are selling. Speed and dependability are what the public wants to buy.

As all of you can see at any time in reviewing the airline advertising in your daily newspapers, the airlines make every effort to make a journey as pleasant as they can. But no one doubts the passenger's purpose when he gets on an airplane. He wants to get to his destination, or if he is at his destination, he wants to return home. No matter how pleasant the journey is made for him, he has for all of these years demonstrated that he wants to get it over with as soon as he can.

I suppose it could be argued by the hypothetical questioner who doubted the value of increased speed, that just because the public wants something it does not justify the great expenditure of time, effort, and money in going beyond our present subsonic speeds. That leads us to the question as to whether there is value in this nation's interest to provide for vastly increased speed of transportation. I say there is—and that this value is great. I would go further and say that greatly increased speed of transportation is essential to the nation's interest.

Our country's present position of world leadership, its present strong economy, and its present great productiveness are based entirely upon human ability—upon human talent. You have all seen the vigorous search for able young people that our business enterprises have been engaged in for a number of years. This is a concrete manifestation of the prevailing conviction that the business which succeeds is the business which has attracted to its service the ablest young people available.

All this being the case, one of our national objectives must be to utilize the talent and capability which we have as efficiently as possible. And when I say this I am not talking about only young corporate executives. I am talking about everyone who works, because it is the combined efforts of all of them which make the country great. It being necessary to use our capability with the greatest of efficiency, it is of great national value to see to it that they move with speed—that their time, whether for business or necessary recreation, is conserved. It is in the achievement of this objective that the airlines have made their greatest contribution to the country. As speed has increased, more and more waste of time has been eliminated.

Now I come back to the original question. Having reached the point where subsonic speeds are an established part of the transportation system, should we go any further? Should we stop our progress, curb our campaign to eliminate waste of time? Since the state of the art clearly permits supersonic speed of transportation, I would put the question a different way. I would ask in view of aviation's responsibility to the country and its people how can we justify refusing to proceed into the supersonic age.

Dallas clearly sees the need. When the U.S. SST is introduced in 1975, I am sure this city will have a new airport, ready to receive it. Dallas thus will not be merely moving into the supersonic age, it will be leading the way.

New York—Second Congressional District's Annual Questionnaire Response

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES R. GROVER, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 13, 1967

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Speaker, for the information and convenience of my colleagues and my constituents, I am pleased to submit the percentage analysis of responses to my questionnaire on vital issues of the day.

This year my questionnaire was prepared by the students of the political science department of Suffolk County Community College under the able supervision of Prof. Ronald J. P. Lesko.

I am grateful to the college and its hard-working students, and wish to thank my constituents for their participation.

The difference, in those questions that do not add up to 100 percent, is that percentage which was left blank by those who completed the questionnaires. The percentage analysis follows:

[In percent]

	Yes	No	No opinion
FOREIGN AFFAIRS			
1. Do you feel that a far-reaching arms control agreement with Russia is practical and wise?	47	47	4
2. Do you feel that we have been too restrictive in terms of our trading policies with Communist-governed countries to date, and that we should expand trade with Communist countries now?	33	62	3
3. Do you feel that the United States is concerning itself excessively with problems in other parts of the world?	51	46	1
4. Is Asia within our range of interests?	73	20	4
5. Should the United States lessen its involvement in Europe?	50	45	3
6. Do you believe that military victory is possible for the United States in Vietnam?	70	25	3
7. Do you believe we can win the peace after a military victory?	49	39	7
8. In view of your feeling above, should we halt bombing and further escalation unconditionally?	18	75	4
9. Should the foreign aid portion of the budget be:			
(a) Increased?	7	38	3
(b) Held at present level?	27	25	3
(c) Decreased?	55	15	3
SPACE AND DEFENSE			
10. Do you feel that the cost of our space program is a deterrent to our national health, education, and welfare objectives?	34	60	4
11. Should we develop a more effective antimissile defense system?	65	22	10
12. Should the draft system be drastically revised?	55	34	7
13. Do you feel that our draft system should:			
(a) Use the lottery system?	40	31	8
(b) Consider national intellectual needs in postwar situations (educational deferements)?	42	30	6
BUDGET AND TAXES			
14. Do you feel that we can support both the domestic Federal projects and the Vietnamese war without reducing spending in either area?	22	71	5
15. Do you feel that the Federal Government annually should increase its support of the arts and humanities?	31	58	8
16. Do you feel that some Federal tax credit plan should be developed covering college and private high school education costs?	64	31	3
17. Do you feel the President's proposed 6 percent tax increase (surcharge) is necessary?	17	70	11
HEALTH AND WELFARE			
18. Should social security benefits be geared to the cost of living?	81	14	3
19. Do you feel that the Manpower Development and Training Act has been a success?	10	52	35
20. Do you favor stronger Federal controls over technological areas like air pollution and automobile manufacturing?	64	31	3
PERSONAL, POLITICAL, AND CIVIL RIGHTS			
21. Do you feel that positive advances have come about in the area of racial equality in the last 10 years?	79	16	3
22. Has Congress gone as far as it should in terms of legislating the morality of civil rights?	67	23	8
23. Should the Federal Government develop a plan for controlling campaigns expenditures?	71	22	6
24. Do you feel that Federal controls ought to be adopted relative to any computerized collection of all citizens' personal files now available in Washington, D.C.?	51	26	19
CRIME AND LAW ENFORCEMENT			
25. Do recent Supreme Court decisions respecting the rights of suspects and convicted criminals unduly hamper law enforcement?	79	16	4

[In percent]

	Yes	No	No opinion
LABOR AND TRANSPORTATION			
26. Do you feel that labor unions are insufficiently controlled under present Federal laws?	71	24	4
27. Should sec. 14-b of the Taft-Hartley law be repealed?	18	53	24
28. Should the Federal Government lend support to a major, multilevel transportation system along the northeast coast?	68	21	10
CONSERVATION			
29. Is the Federal Government doing enough regarding the conservation of valuable inland areas, wetlands, rivers, seashores, etc?	19	66	12

Reaction to Senator Percy's Housing Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. DELLENBACK

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1967

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker, the reaction to Senator Percy's housing bill, which I have been pleased to introduce on the House side, has been almost uniformly favorable in my State of Oregon. I am pleased to insert the following editorial from the Portland Oregonian—one of the west coast's leading newspapers—urging serious consideration of this important measure:

Percy's Housing Plan

Republican Sen. Charles Percy of Illinois wants to provide the county with "an important new tool for mobilizing the enormous resources of the private sector behind sound grassroots programs to make today's slum families the middle income home owners of tomorrow."

All Republican senators, have joined Sen. Percy as cosponsors of a bill he introduced last week which would make private money available for renovating slum or near-slum housing for acquisition at low interest by poor people. The federal government would pick up part of the tab, but only a small part in comparison with present low-cost housing programs.

The Percy bill would establish a National Home Ownership Foundation which would be authorized to sell $2 billion in bonds to private investors. It would lend the money raised in this manner to local non-profit organizations which would, in turn, buy, improve and resell houses to families now financially unable to purchase homes. The federal government would make up the difference between the interest paid by NHOF and the lower interest the home-buyers paid the local organizations. An appropriation of $10 million is proposed for the coming fiscal year for this purpose, jumping to $20 million the following year and $30 million in fiscal 1970.

Another $3 million in federal funds would be appropriated for a Technical Assistance Service which would help the local groups to plan their housing programs and to educate and counsel prospective home buyers in their responsibilities and problems.

Sen. Percy admits his plan may require amendment to perfect its machinery, as some of his more luke-warm cosponsors have indicated. One can foresee opposition from several directions. Democrats may hesitate to lend their majority support to a bill so overwhelmingly Republican in sponsorship and which would build up a freshman Republican senator who is considered a presidential possibility.

No doubt some will argue that the bill would tend to perpetuate racial segregation, although Sen. Percy has made it clear he is for open housing.

Regardless of the obstacles to passage, the proposal deserves serious consideration not only in Congress but by the public as well. This country should be able to solve its low-cost housing problem by means other than massive federal spending.

The Court, the Constitution, and the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1967

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable John B. Fournet, chief justice of the Louisiana Supreme Court, has presented a scholarly paper on the traditional role of the court as a defender of the people under a constitutional system of government.

His well-chosen remarks remind us of our duties as individual Americans to speak out and work to prevent further erosion of our laws by the maverick members of the Federal judiciary.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent of this body for Chief Justice Fournet's papers to follow my remarks in the Record.

The Court, the Constitution, and the People

(Remarks by Chief Justice John B. Fournet, at the banquet of the Pi Lambda Beta and Pi Gamma Mu fraternities, Lafayette, La., April 16, 1958)

Meeting with you tonight is but the continuation of a day that will linger long in my memory as it is relived again in future transient reflections. It furnishes abundant proof of the fact that one does not live long before he realizes how short is a lifetime and how many added lifetimes he will need to deserve the kindness the world shows him in the first. For this reason, I am thankful I enjoy good health. A weaker man might well be overcome by the kindness that has been showered on me on this day alone.

Many occasions arise that require me to speak to lawyers and judges—perhaps too many. For this reason I ask that my professional brothers bear with me as I address my remarks primarily to the student members of the host fraternities and to their faculty leaders. These teachers are, after all, the advance guard on the frontiers of human knowledge that is now forging for our students the vital link that will weld into their solution of the staggering problems of this space age the wisdom that has come to us from the ancients.

It is well known that when a Texan is asked to make a speech—in or out of Texas—the first subject that comes to his mind is Texas. I suppose it is almost as well known that when a judge is asked to speak, his mind turns automatically to the law and the courts. This is true in my case.

The judiciary was not originally my ambition in life. The advocacy of the cause of others and the political arena were more to my liking. But a man is not the architect of his own destiny, and, with the donning of the judicial robes, I turned from advocacy and politics and have made the law and the improvement of justice my life's work. To this end my paramount desire, outside of my regular court duies, has been to instill in our people a greater understanding of and reverence for the judicial branch of our government.

That desire finds roots in an abiding conviction that our American way of life depends upon public confidence in our courts and honor and respect for the men who wear the black robe upon its benches. This is so because under our system of government the courts occupy a unique position of extraordinary importance. Underlying their obvious function of reconciling the conflicts of individuals with themselves and with the state is the inherent task of keeping separated in their respective orbits of influence the state and federal governments, and of maintaining in proper perspective those delicate checks and balances that prevent encroachment by the legislative, executive, or judicial divisions upon the prerogatives of the others. To this end the courts enjoy the high privilege of interpreting the constitution under which we live and of judging the nature and extent of their own perimeter of influence. Judges are, consequently, with the exception of the people themselves, from whose hands alone can come the supreme law of the land, the final architects of our governmental structure. And the only restraint the constitution places upon their exercise of this high function is that of self-restraint.

Justice Story—the great author, educator, lawyer, and jurist—once emphasized the importance of the role of the courts in our lives in this way, and I quote: "Where there is no judicial department to enforce rights, the government must either perish by its own imbecility, or the other departments of govment must usurp power * * * to the destruction of liberty. The will of those who govern will become, under such circumstances, absolute and despotic; and it is wholly immaterial whether that power is vested in a single tyrant or in an assembly of tyrants."

Because, therefore, of a deep love of country, a consecration to our American way of life, and an empassioned belief in the God-given rights of man as set out in our Declaration of Independence and guaranteed in our constitution, I feel impelled tonight to comment upon the implications inherent in the recent trend of decisions in the highest court in our land that is causing much dissension and confusion among our people. This trend is not only undermining the confidence our people have long reposed in the court's ability to preserve the fundamental and essential elements of government under a written constitution, but is having a marked effect upon the solution of the many problems that face our way of life in all of its many aspects.

It is not my purpose tonight to review the decisions of the United States Supreme Court that are subjecting it to the most adverse criticism it has had to weather in its long and honored history, even though this criticism is unquestionably exciting widespread concern for the court's attitude to its proper governmental role and enveloping it with a thickening shadow of disrespect. Suffice it to say there is today a growing alarm among the people who feel this court is gradually arrogating unto itself legislative power and executive functions never surrendered to the judicial branch of the government or even contemplated by the leaders who moulded the original thirteen colonies into a united whole and which none of the illustrious and learned men who, until recently, graced that august bench, would have dreamed of exercising.

As a result, large segments of our people contend that something is happening to the law of our land and the supposed sovereignty of our states. Serious thinking and discussion by leaders in all walks of life is leading them to conclude that at no period in the history of our republic has this country strayed further from the sound philosophy and principles upon which it was founded. Many are convinced that the court is now—before nebulous public resentment can become hardened public resistance—engaged in reshaping the form of our government with a speed that will leave little recognizable in another generation. And, realizing that the easiest and quickest way our constitution can be destroyed is in the court, they read into this—whether rightly or wrongly—a suggested method whereby communism, reaching its deceptively paternal but erosive tentacles into even this high tribunal can, with confidence, undertake, in this vulnerable spot, its long range plan of wiping from existence our beneficient guarantees of individual freedom under law.

These expressions on the part of so many of our people evidence a growing fear that our republic will be destroyed if government under written law is permitted, unchecked, to give way to government of expedience dependent upon the will or whim of men swayed by shortsighted popular passions of the moment. To prove this fear is real and not imaginary, these dissidents point to rulings which they assert evidence the fact that the court—with the stroke of a pen and without a vote at the polls or in legislative halls—is tipping so crazily our structure of triple checks the symmetry of the whole is becoming the trepidation of the balance.

Almost daily we find commentators, authors, and speakers, reaching unfortunately, a wide audience that is not entirely sure of the exact meanings conveyed, asserting that these revolutionary and far-reaching decisions are casting into oblivion the constitutional barriers that have long shielded the states from the creeping paralysis of an encroaching federal government, thus depriving the individual states of their sovereign rights so meticulously reserved in the constitution. They say, further, that the court with an increasingly nationalistic attitude is creating a federal citizenship supposedly immune from state regulation and control, and also, in an over-paternalistic attitude, is, by resort to novel theories and unreasonable technicalities of construction, hedging individuals about with rights never intended by the constitution, with the result that law enforcement is breaking down and peaceful citizens find it dangerous to venture onto our streets, while criminals walk them without fear of reprisal. In the process they complain the court has unwittingly trespassed upon two of the most basic rights of the states, that is, the police power whereby they maintain law and order, and the right of state courts to try and punish those who contravene state laws.

Possibly the gravest concern is being voiced by those who feel the trend of the court's decisions shows a marked solicitude for subversives, and, in this way, furthers the cause of communism. The decisions evidencing this trend, it is asserted, are those that (1) hamstring legislative investigations, by denying the right of committees to question the communistic leanings and actions of witnesses; (2) strip from the Secretary of State his Congressional authority to discharge known communists in his ranks; (3) nullify the right of states to ferrert from their official family adherents to communistic ideologies under the pretext Congress preempted the field, although a contrary intention is expressed in the legislation itself; (4) compel states to admit to the practice of law known communists tainted with criminal backgrounds, despite the fact the state courts have, traditionally, been the sole judges of the moral fitness and character of those who would practice before them; and (5) prohibit the states from removing communists who have infiltrated strategically vulnerable positions in our educational institutions for the purpose of undermining—in their formative years—our impressionable youth, upon whose shoulders will rest the task of securing in tomorrow's world the liberties we have enjoyed in today's.

This alleged solicitude caused an Indiana senator to say last year, in proposing legislation to restrict within constitutional bounds the court's deflective wanderings from its judicial function, I quote that "No conceivable combination of votes in Congress could have done as much damage to our legislative barriers against communism and subversion as the Supreme Court of the United States has done by its recent opinions."

Particularly alarming to the members of the legal profession is the fact that studies being made by Congress, bar associations, and other organizations reveal this usurpation of power by the federal judiciary is being exercised without reliance on statutory law, constitutional mandate, or recognized legal principles developed in the jurisprudence, but, instead, upon books, treatises, committee testimony, articles, and pseudo legalistic papers that are without foundation in law and are, in fact inimicable to our entire concept of government. These are the product of intellectual agitators and propagandists that are paid to advance ideas and ideals that are not legalistic in fact or tenor and have no foundation in substance, cannot withstand the test of practical application to the problems of our way of life, and are disseminated by those whose purpose is to advance selfish objections and foreign ideologies detrimental to the people as a whole and to their long range interests.

This brings to mind the unusual vision and foresight of Edward Douglass White, the only Louisianian to sit on our land's highest court, when, first ascending that level in 1895 he pinpointed the danger inherent in a total disregard for constitutional precedents that had withstood all challenges for so many years. I believe his views in this respect, as well as his exposition of the function of the court in upholding the constitution, are well worth repeating, and I quote:

"My inability to agree with the court—in the conclusion which it has just expressed—causes me much regret. Great as is my respect for any view by it announced, I cannot resist the conviction that its opinion and decree in this case virtually annuls its previous decisions in regard to the powers of Congress on the subject of taxation, and is therefore fraught with danger to the court, to each and every citizen, and to the republic. The conservation and orderly development of our institutions rests on our acceptance of the results of the past, and their use as lights to guide our steps in the future. Teach the lesson that settled principles may be overthrown at any time, and confusion and turmoil must ultimately result. In the discharge of its function of interpreting the constitution, this court exercises an august power. It sits removed from the contentions of political parties and the animosities of factions. It seems to me that the accomplishment of its lofty mission can only be secured by the stability of its teachings and the sanctity which surrounds them. If the permanency of its conclusions is to depend upon the personal opinions of those who, from time to time, may make up its membership, it will inevitably become a theatre of political strife, and its action will be without coherence or consistency.

"There is no great principle of constitutional law * * * which has not been ultimately defined by the adjudications of this court after long and earnest struggle. If we * * * are to appeal to the writings of economists in order to unsettle all these great principles, everything is lost and nothing saved to the people. The rights of every individual are guaranteed by the safeguards which have been thrown around them by our adjudications. If these are to be assailed and overthrown * * * the Federal constitution is * * * of little worth. My strong convictions forbid that I take part in a conclusion which seems to be so full of peril to the country. I am unwilling to do so, without reference to the question of what my personal opinion on the subject might be if the question were a new one, and was thus unaffected by the action of the framers, the history of the government, and the long line of decisions by this court.

"The wisdom of our forefathers in adopting a written constitution has often been impeached upon the theory that the interpretation of a written instrument did not afford as complete protection to liberty as would be enjoyed under a constitution made up of the traditions of a free people. Writing, it has been said, does not insure greater stability than tradition does, while it destroys flexibility. The answer has always been that by the foresight of the fathers the construction of our written constittuion was ultimately confided to this body, which, from the nature of its judicial structure, could always be relied upon to act with perfect freedom from the influence of faction and to preserve the benefits of consistent interpretation.

"The fundamental conception of a judicial body is that of one hedged about by precedents which are binding on the court without regard to the personality of its members. Break down this belief in judicial continuity, and let it be felt that on great constitutional questions this court is to depart from the settled conclusions of its predecessors, and to determine them according to the mere opinion of those who temporarily fill its bench, and our constitution will, in my judgment, be bereft of value and become a most dangerous instrument to the rights and liberties of the people." [1]

My friends, while this warning apparently had a salutary effect, as the court for many years clamped upon itself a proper judicial restraint, as above stated, we find that within the last two decades the court is again, as the late Chief Justice Vanderbilt said, "fumbling at the task allotted it under the constitution," in that its members seem deermined to use the court, not as an agency for constitutionally shaping law, but as a forum for broadcasting individual theories and philosophies.

The really serious question all of this discussion, criticism, and confusion is bringing to the forefront is whether our government under a written constitution is breaking down: whether the American theory that tried and true principles of government may be enshrined in a written constitution and entrusted to the courts for protection is proving to be illusory. Upon the way in which that question is answered depends the future of our republic.

Let me hasten to assure you that although the conviction is growing the court has done much damage to our constitution and has strayed far from the sound philosophy in which it was conceived, this adverse criticism has not, as yet, done irreparable damage to the faith of our people in the court as a necessary institution of orderly government, and the court has not wandered so far from its assigned role it cannot be returned to its proper sphere. We do not, therefore, stand poised today in the center of such a crisis that hastily conceived plans must be accepted in the immediacy of the moment.

---

[1] Pollick v. Farmers Loan & Trust Co., 157 US at page 650.

Mr. Justice Frankfurter, in one of his concurring opinions,[2] very aptly pointed out that "The accretion of dangerous power does not come in a day. It does come, however slowly, from the generative force of unchecked disregard of the restrictions that fence in even the most disinterested assertion of authority." The converse is equally true. Dangerous power, once assumed, cannot be destroyed in a day, or corrected with the stroke of a pen. The solution does not, therefore, lie in a rash of impulsive and lighty considered measures. In such a course lies as great a threat to the equilibrium that maintains the proper checks and balances in our political triumvirate as do the present deflective tendencies of the so-called "runaway court."

The approach to the problem must, therefore, begin with confidence in the belief that enlightened and dispassionate public criticism of the court's decisions will, in time, cause its members to re-examine their assigned function of interpreting—not making—the law; and to interpret that law in accordance with the intention of its redactors, leaving law revision and amendment to the people and their elected representatives. Only if this fails should resort be made to carefully considered plans for restricting the court's jurisdiction in Congress within the authority vested in that law-making body by the constitution. This may seem a slow method to an impatient man, but the alternative is misrule and a return to the tyranny from which our forefathers fled.

For this action to be effective, however, today is the time to carefully study the court's traditional role in government. Now is the time to formulate the constructive criticism and carefully considered disapprobation of the court's departures from established constitutional doctrine that can, if voiced with sufficient force and volume, make itself heard in all three halls of government.

Because citizen indifference and lethargy often reflect lack of information, it should be the duty of the legal profession to afford some leadership in directing the public's attention to this threat and to assist in the formulation of wise public opinion. But this responsibility does not rest alone upon the shoulders of the lawyer and the judge. It rests upon all citizens. And it does not rest heaviest upon the old and the retiring. It rests equally upon the maturing generations—the seedbeds generating today those forces that will determine the harvest of tomorrow.

It may be felt I have chosen an inappropriate audience of young, unseasoned minds before which to place such a weighty matter. I do not think so. It is among such young students as we have here tonight that lies the nucleus of the minds that will, in the not too distant future take over the reins of government. In them, therefore, lies our hope for a return of the proper balance in our triumvirate of government and the preservation of our constitution if our way of life is to survive.

It is difficult for one generation to understand those who will one day supplant it, or for the newcomers, trying their strong young wings for the first time, to look upon their elders as capable of meeting on equal ground the foibles and complexities of a new age. Yet each succeeding generation seems to carve for itself its own special niche in the framework that has been built by those who have gone before; and, together, there is no task we cannot, with faith in our individual and collective resourcefulness and initiative, accomplish.

It is for this reason that I draw much comfort from the intelligent and courageous countenances of my audience, and particularly the younger members. My brief conversations today with these young college students has confirmed what I find everywhere. The youth of this nation are conscious of the precious legacy of constitutional government to which they stand in heirship. And they can be relied upon to accept their responsibilities as citizens in their search for guidance in the future in the tradition of our country's glorious past.

I would admonish them tonight, however, to guard against becoming so engrossed in the present-day emphasis on the Sputniks and the Muttniks, the brilliance of the atomic bomb, the speed of the guided missile, and the supposed progress Russia is making in the scientific field they will be weaned away from the erosions occurring in our constitutional government.

Instead, live closer to our constitution, and endeavor to fully understand its true meaning. Learn of the manner in which it was created, what its antecedents were, who wrote it, their philosophical and political aims, and how they devised this document as the necessary implement to the preservation of liberty as we know it. Recapture that meaning; revitalize the Spirit of '76, and make both an integral part of your educational heritage as free Americans. Let time increase—never diminish—their significance. Only when you fully know your rights under the constitution and your power to change or protect it, can you make it serve to safeguard your freedom.

Young ladies and young gentlemen, the future is yours, and the opportunities for service and distinguished citizenship were never greater. I have full confidence that you possess the vigorous, imaginative, and courageous leadership so vitally needed today for tomorrow's world. And I have every faith that, with your guidance, our glorious heritage of freedom under the constitution will be preserved, inviolate, for the generations that follow!

---

[2] Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co. v. Sawyer, 96 L ed at page 1170.

Freedom for Baltic States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. ALLEN SMITH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1967

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, this week, on June 15, marks the 27th anniversary of the Soviet Union's takeover of the Baltic States, Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, by force of arms. For 27 years, the unfortunate peoples of these countries have been enslaved by the despots of the Kremlin, and many thousands of them have been exterminated or exiled to Soviet slave-labor camps in Siberia and other places in Communist Russia.

Throughout this time, Lithuanian, Latvian, and Estonian refugees in our own country have toiled tirelessly and unceasingly in bringing the plight of their former countrymen to our attention. They are zealously dedicated to the cause of a return to freedom for their mother countries.

Mr. Speaker, Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia have a right to be free and independent, as they were for centuries before the Soviet occupation on June 15, 1940.

The United States demands freedom for all nations and peoples in Africa and Asia. We should do no less with respect to Europe. The Baltic States are more than 700-year-old nations and certainly have at least as much entitlement to freedom and independence as does any new country in any part of the world. The United States must not have a double standard for freedom with respect to any nations or peoples on the face of this earth.

The situation in the Baltic States becomes more intolerable with the passage of time. This is because exterminations and deportations still continue and there is a real danger of eventual decimation of the nationals of these countries, accompanied by ever-increasing occupations of the lands by people from the Soviet Union.

The people of the Baltic States and their relatives in our country are waging an heroic fight for freedom. They deserve the full sympathy and support of all freedom-loving Americans.

Congressmen Who Made It the Hard Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHALMERS P. WYLIE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1967

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, in its Sunday magazine of June 4, 1967, the Columbus, Ohio, Sunday Dispatch included an inspiring tribute to several of our colleagues in Congress. It is entitled "Congressmen Who Made It the Hard Way," with the subheading "How 10 Lawmakers Overcame Serious Physical Handicaps." In order that this deserved recognition may be shared by all Members of the Senate and the House and by their constituents, I respectfully submit it for insertion in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

CONGRESSMEN WHO MADE IT THE HARD WAY—HOW 10 LAWMAKERS OVERCAME SERIOUS PHYSICAL HANDICAPS

(By Frances Spatz Leighton)

When is a handicap an asset? When it makes you more determined to get ahead. That seems to be the consensus of Congress, as witness several handicapped lawmakers who not only got ahead but are an inspiration to all who suffer from a physical disability.

Some of them could easily have despaired of ever recovering from their crippling afflictions. Yet, through determination and great effort, they all managed to fight their way to success and into the halls of Congress.

Take Representative Robert Dole, Republican, Kansas, who spent 39 months in hospitals in Italy, Africa, Michigan and Kansas after a grenade shattered his body while he was platoon leader of the Tenth Mountain Division of the Army in Italy. His weight had gone down to 120 pounds, scarcely enough to keep his 6-foot 2-inch body alive. He was encased in a plaster cast from knees to ears. His neck vertebra was fractured, his spinal cord damaged, both arms and legs were paralyzed. Worst of all was the realization that he could no longer fulfill his life's dream—to be a surgeon.

It was then he made his grim decision—he would rise above this and help those less fortunate as a lawyer. His chances were very slim, even after his right arm was reshaped with the help of bone and muscle transplanted from his leg. Though finally, with the help of numerous operations, he was well enough to go to college, he could not take notes with either hand. He solved this problem by using a tape recorder to get the most coveted "notes" in class. His cheerful and determined attitude so impressed one of his hospital physical therapists that she ended up marrying him and taking his bar examination for him while he dictated the answers.

Today he is the same cheerful and determined man as he looks forward to several more trips to the hospital for still more operations. "I had the decision to make of whether to let well enough alone or try for greater use of my right hand and I've decided to take a chance. They're thinking of fusing my wrist to give it greater strength and my wife and I are excited about the idea."

Strangely enough, one of the men who bunked near Dole in an Army hospital at Battle Creek, Michigan, is also now on Capitol Hill. He was Col. Philip A. Hart, now the ranking senator of Michigan and a Democrat. Senator Hart also suffered a shattered arm and still has no feeling in some of the fingers of his right hand.

Another World War II casualty who has risen to the top is Representative Olin E. Teague, Democrat, Texas, known as "Tiger Teague" to the men who serve on his committees. He is a power to be reckoned with on Capitol Hill, holding chairmanships of the Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs, the subcommittee on Manned Space Flight and the subcommittee on Legislative Oversight. On his Space Flight committee alone, he keeps an eye on 3.5 billion dollars of the NASA budget.

A hunk of artillery shell took three inches out of his leg—including his ankle—when he was a lieutenant colonel in Germany commanding the First Battalion of the 314th Infantry, 79th Division. Medics grafted back the torn foot, but left the leg three inches shorter and minus an ankle. This was only one of Teague's war wounds. There were others—enough to keep him in a miltiary hospital for two years and to earn him 12 decorations including the Silver Star with two clusters and the French Croix de Guerre with Palm.

"Except in the morning when I put on my special shoe to raise my foot three inches, I never even think about being handicapped," says Teague. "I don't play golf because I can't do well without an ankle, but I do play handball—and I'm pretty darn good at it if I say so myself. I play about ten games a week in the Rayburn gym." Congressman Teague has his office, too, in the choice office building on Capitol Hill—the Rayburn Building.

Teague may not play golf, but Congressman Larry Winn Jr., Republican, Kansas, does play it well, and with one leg missing above the knee and the other badly shattered. He even plays tennis, although he lets the far balls go by.

Winn, a freshman on Capitol Hill, had his heart set on sports as a boy—he was All State on the high school track team when tragedy struck. It happened at Lake Lotawana, Kansas City, when he was pushing a motor moat away from shore. "I can laugh now and say I was run over by a boat," Winn says, smiling ruefully. "Someone didn't realize I was there and started the motor. It was nip and tuck whether I'd survive and I've had several re-amputations so an artificial leg could be fitted. But you would be amazed at what you can do if you must. When this thing happened to me and I was caught in the props and dragged down I rose up from the bottom of the lake, 18 feet, and somehow swam to shore before anyone saw me.

"I don't think there's anything you can't do if you make up your mind to it. It's old hat, but I believe there are too many people with handicaps who are too busy feeling sorry for themselves to have any time to concentrate on the challenge of a physical handicap.

"Sure, I'm sorry I didn't get to be the track star I'd dreamed of being, but I can dance, and by golly I still swim. And anything I can do, someone else can do, and maybe even better."

One of the most touching stores of disaster in childhood that was turned into a triumph is that of Representative John W. Byrnes, Republican, Wisconsin. At age three, a bout with polio left him so devastated that he had to brace his knee with his hand in order to walk because he was unable to lock his left knee.

As he grew up, he shunned sympathy and he refused to be stopped or embarrassed by his awkward gait, even playing baseball—but letting a stand-in run the bases for him. Before cars had automatic transmissions, he worked out his own way to drive a car. Now he wears a brace and instead of feeling sorry for himself, he is joyful and elated that he no longer must use his hand to help his knee in walking. "I have as much fun as anyone else. I have every blessing. I don't consider this little brace a cross and no one else who has a physical handicap should either. It's a great opportunity to use one's ingenuity and imagination."

His imagination and ingenuity helped him become chairman of the House Republican Policy Committee in the 86th, 87th and 88th Congresses and a member of the joint Senate-House Republican leadership. He resigned as policy chairman in 1965 to devote full time to his responsibilities as senior Republican member of the Ways and Means Committee, a post he still retains in the 90th Congress. Byrnes holds the American Good Government Society's Washington award for his "contributions to good government in the United States."

Representative Charles E. Bennett, Democrat, Florida, has a story that involved polio, too, but it was not contracted in childhood. By a quirk of fate it was contracted from a child, however, on July 4, 1945, in a native hut in northern Luzon, the Philippines, where he was staying while leading 1000 guerrillas in mountain and jungle fighting. He was told he would never walk again, but after two years, he walked out of a hospital on on two canes, determined to fight a different battle—a battle for a seat in Congress. His opponents said he was too puny—130 pounds, 5 feet 11 inches—to stand the rigors of office. He won the 1948 election, determined to prove he could have a good attendance record even when, as it sometimes happened, he was confined to a wheelchair.

Now Congressman Bennett holds the all-time voting record for a member of Congress. He has not missed a roll call since 1951. And he is acknowledged to be one of the hardest working members. His assignments place him in a strategic position—as senior member of the powerful House Armed Services Committee, he oversees the $60 billion defense budget. He is also chairman of the House Committee on Standards and Conduct, which was created by his legislation.

As for the effect of his handicap, it is said on Capitol Hill that "instead of making him bitter, it has made him an historian." He is the author of two history books. Perhaps what his colleagues most admire about Charles Bennett, however, is that he has refused to accept a single check of his veterans' disability benefits and has designated them—now more than $60,000—to good works in Florida. Small wonder that with his spirit he has been added to the Fort Benning Infantry Hall of Fame, or that he has now graduated to walking with only one cane.

Few people—unless they meet him—realize that Howard W. Pollock, the first Republican to be elected to the U. S. Congress by the people of Alaska, has a prosthetic hook instead of a right hand. They don't realize it because they always read of him winning another trophy as a big game hunter. He holds records in North American big game: Polar bear, grizzly bear, mountain sheep and caribou. He also engages in mountain climbing, pistol shooting, fishing, bowling, skiing and octopus hunting—and all of this after losing his right forearm as a result of a grenade explosion overseas during World War II. He was a naval lieutenant commander then. "It's very simple," the congressman says. "I always consider my ability and not my disability. If you lean on a disability and expect everyone to rescue, you are going to fall on your face."

Another "handicapped" congressman did fall on his face, however. And what did he do? He laughed. That's how Representative Al Ullman, Democrat, Oregon, overcame the handicap of the wooden leg he has had to wear since an auto accident lost him his own left leg in 1961.

"I'm completely insentitive about it, so I appreciated the full humor of it when I was hurrying down the hall to answer a call to the floor and, in making too abrupt a turn, my leg accidentally fell off right in front of a bunch of tourists and went skidding across the hall. I just lay there and laughed and said: 'Bring me my leg' and I put it back on, hoping I had helped them get over any sensitivity they might have in dealing with handicapped people."

So impressed is Ullman with the ability of amputees to compete with unhandicapped people that he introduced and fought to passage a bill which changed the Interstate Commerce Commission regulations to permit amputees to drive trucks in interstate commerce. "I'll tell you what this handicap has done for me," says Congressman Ullman. "Sure, I've suffered a lot of pain and I've still a little ways to go in getting a perfect fit, but it has made me a little more aware of my blessings and I'm really enjoying life more than I ever did. It has helped me know the fullest meaning of life."

Talking to Representative Edward J. Gurney, Republican, Florida, who must balance himself with a cane, is also an inspiration. Once wasted away to a skeleton of less than 100 pounds, this 6 foot 2 inch champion made a complete comeback from World War II wounds which kept him hospitalized for two years.

Gurney made a new start, going to Florida instead of back to New England where he was born and reared. Now he is called "the Voice of the New South," representing the fast growing district that contains Cape Kennedy. And he supports legislation aimed at helping the handicapped.

"When you have a handicap," he says, "you don't talk about it. You just try a little harder, work a little longer, do a little more. I have seen many men in the paraplegic wards come back from hopelessness to make a useful life. It takes a lot of courage but it's like it says in the auto ads, 'When you're No. 2, you try a little harder.'"

Gurney's "trying a little harder" to overcome the effects of the sniper's bullet that nicked his spine in Rheinberg, Germany, has resulted in another step up for him. He has now graduated to using only one cane instead of two.

But perhaps the greatest handicaps to election to the United States Congress were those of Daniel K. Inouye, Democrat, Hawaii, who not only was wounded four times in Italy during World War II, suffering many injuries and the loss of an arm—but who also rose above all odds to become the first man of Japanese ancestry ever to be elected to the Senate of the United States.

"As far as I'm concerned," he sums it up, "the lucky ones are the ones that have handicaps that show. The only real handicap is the handicap of the mind."

Hubbardston, Mass., Celebrates Its 200th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1967

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, the year 1967, and particularly this summer, will long be remembered by several communities in my district because it is the year when outstanding anniversary programs of events were held to mark noteworthy anniversary dates.

Today, Mr. Speaker, I am proud indeed to bring to the attention of the House the 200th anniversary of the town of Hubbardston, Mass., which was incorporated as a district 200 years ago today. This happy event of June 13, 1767, is the subject of a weeklong celebration in Hubbardston which will culminate this Sunday with a huge 2-hour, six-division parade, a drum and bugle corps competition, and a fireworks display.

The Hubbardston anniversary program is truly impressive. It began with a bicentennial ball on May 12 and this evening at the Center School there will be a speaking program marking the actual date of the charter. Tomorrow, June 14, there will be a tour of historic homes, and on Saturday there will be sports events, a firemen's muster, and a band concert.

One fact, Mr. Speaker, should be singled out for special mention: the Hubbardston anniversary program is a simple and dignified one, which might well be a duplicate of the program held to celebrate Hubbardston's 100th anniversary, a memorable celebration which is being relived in Hubbardston this week.

A century ago, at Hubbardston's centennial celebration, a long poem was read which included these lines:

> Some few within this audience know
> How this street looked long years ago.
> A tavern stood at either end,
> Where those who had some cash to spend,
> Or idle hours to pass away,
> Might wet their whistles any day;
> And it was said, we know not why,
> That whistles then were often dry.

Generally, though, much more serious things were said that day. The closing sentence of the centennial address by Dr. J. C. Gleason was:

> If, on the 13th day of June, 1967, our descendants shall be pleased to observe their centennial day, may the records of this coming century show as little to censure and more to admire than we find in that just closed.

His hope has been fulfilled. We find, on this day that seemed so far in the future to Dr. Gleason, nothing to censure and much indeed to admire. The last century has seen great changes as the generations have passed in Hubbardston. During all this time, this lovely community has preserved its traditions of patriotism and civic pride.

An account of that centennial summer's day tells us that:

> Thus passed the 13th day of June, 1867; a day long to be remembered in the annals of Hubbardston; a day which was closing without the happening of any accident to mar the pleasure of the occasion; a day that had brought together more people than had ever before been assembled in the town on any occasion; a day rendered pleasant by all its surroundings—a clear sky, a bright sun, pure air and gentle breezes; pleasant by the friendly greetings of old friends and associates, the returned sons and daughters of Hubbardston, returned to the old homestead for an affectionate embrace.
>
> Many had returned to meet aged parents or other relatives, others to meet no kindred or relative, but nevertheless to meet friends, warm friends, and revisit and revive the scenes, the haunts, and the memories of former years, the homes which they may have once left without casting one longing, lingering look behind, but to which they now turned with fond delight.

Mount Wachusett seems to have been the object which drew the attention of the first settlers of Massachusetts toward this region. As early as 1631, Governor Winthrop noted in his journal that he and others went up the Charles River about 8 miles above Watertown, climbing upon "a very high rock, where they might see a very high bill, due west about 40 miles." In 1635 an expedition crossed the area to the Connecticut River.

The first settlement in the region was at Lancaster, in 1643. In 1681, Stoughton and Dudley were appointed by the general court to negotiate with the Nipmuck Indians for the territory. The next year they reported that they had "purchased a track for £30 and a cart, and, for £50, another track, 50 miles long and 20 wide." The negotiators stated that, "The northern part toward Wachusett is still unpurchased and persons yet scarcely to be found meet to be treated with thereabouts."

Four years later, five Indians were found who claimed to be the owners of this northern section. Their names, or the names bestowed upon them for the occasion, were Puagastion, Pompamamay, Qualipunit, Sassawannow, and Wananapan. On the 22d of December 1686, they deeded a tract of land, swamps and timber 12 miles square for £23.

This deed, probably arranged in order to pacify the Indians of the area, was not regarded by its grantees as very valuable at the time. Twenty-six years after its execution, the heirs of the original grantees petitioned the general court for a confirmation of their title. This the general court did on February 23, 1713, on condition that, within 7 years, 60 families should be settled on the land, and a sufficient acreage be reserved for the gospel ministry and for schools.

New England's founders, Mr. Speaker, believed in first things first; those first things were provided for in the reservation of land in any township for the support of education and religion.

This tract was surveyed in 1715. It contained 93,160 acres, and included the area of what is now Rutland, Oakham, Barre, Hubbardston, a portion of Paxton, and more than half of Princeton.

In December of 1715, the 33 proprietors voted "to survey and set off into lots the contents of 6 miles square, to be granted to settlers, in order to secure the performance of the conditions in the original confirmation of title." They then laid out 62 lots of 30 acres each which they offered to permanent settlers, promising them that more land would be divided among them if 60 families were settled within the prescribed 7 years. This promise was kept. The proprietors gave up all right and title to a fourth of the original purchase in order to encourage settlement. That fourth eventually became Rutland and part of Paxton.

The remaining three-fourths were held in common by the proprietors until 1749 when the northwest corner was incorporated into a separate Rutland District, now the town of Barre, 6 miles square, a favorite size and form when the towns of the area were being laid out. What became Oakham was called the West Wing, and what is now the west part of Princeton was the East Wing. Hubbardston was then called merely the northeast quarter. The proprietors divided this quarter among themselves by laying out lots there in 1737. Provision was made for allocations of land for a minister and a school.

On June 12, 1767, the members of the general court and the Governor's council approved a bill giving the northeast quarter the status of an incorporated district, and the Governor signed the bill on June 13. A warrant was issued on June 25 for the election of local officers which was held on July 3. Town status was obtained by Hubbardston under a statute of March 23, 1786, declaring all places in Massachusetts incorporated as districts before January 1, 1777, to be "towns to every intent and purpose whatever."

The district and town were named for Thomas Hubbard, one of the early land proprietors of the area. Mr. Hubbard was a Bostonian who served as speaker of the Massachusetts House of Representatives. He was treasurer of Harvard College for 17 years, and promised the citizens of Hubbardston that he would give the glass for the first meetinghouse. A history of Hubbardston in those days tells us that, "To make Mr. Hubbard's liberality more conspicuous, the people planned for an extra number of windows. But he died in 1773, and his estate was so much involved that they received nothing, and were obliged to glaze their windows at their own expense."

Mr. Speaker, in recognition of Hubbardston's 200 anniversary celebration, I am introducing today a special resolution extending the greetings and felicitation of the House to Hubbardston on the occasion of this anniversary.

I know that my colleagues will be pleased to join me in paying well-deserved tribute to this progressive community in my district and its people who have contributed so much down through the years to the growth and advancement of our great country.

The text of my resolution reads as follows:

> Whereas the year 1967 marks the two hundredth anniversary of the incorporation of the town of Hubbardston, Massachusetts on June 13, 1767; and
>
> Whereas from the time of settlement in 1737 the people of Hubbardston have figured conspicuously in the founding and growth of this Nation; and
>
> Whereas the observance of the two hundredth anniversary of Hubbardston is being celebrated with impressive community ceremonies this week which will attract many visitors to central Massachusetts; and

Whereas Hubbardston is a progressive community rich in historic interest, distinguished for its fervent civic spirit, and faithfully devoted to American institutions and ideals: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives extends its greetings and felicitations to the people of Hubbardston, Massachusetts, on the occasion of the two hundredth anniversary of this community and the House of Representatives further expresses its appreciation for the splendid services rendered to the Nation by the citizens of Hubbardston during the past two hundred years.

Indonesia's New Laws on Foreign Investment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1967

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, one of the most heartening turn of events in recent history has been the change of policies in Indonesia.

In 1965, Indonesia seemed to be drifting into the Chinese Communist orbit. It had quit the United Nations, was menacing all Western investment in the country, and was engaged in a costly "confrontation" with Malaysia that threatened to spread into a larger conflict.

Today there is new and fresh thinking in Djakarta. An abortive Communist coup, inspired in Peking, opened the eyes of the Indonesian people to the dangerous course on which their country had embarked.

In the aftermath of the attempted revolt, President Sukarno and his pro-Peking advisers have been removed from power. In their place has come a government of military men and civilians dedicated to the development and progress of their country.

There is much to be developed in Indonesia. It is often said that it is one of the two or three most potentially rich nations in the world. But that potential must be unlocked in order to benefit the Indonesian people.

Today Indonesia's leaders are turning to the West for help in developing their country. As part of this effort, they are encouraging foreign investment in the economy of Indonesia.

To facilitate and promote such investment, the Indonesian Government has enacted a new law on foreign investments. Included in the law are concessions concerning taxes and other payments which should help make investment in Indonesia attractive.

Because I believe this new opportunity for investment of foreign capital in Indonesia deserves wide recognition, I am inserting in the RECORD at this point a summary of the new law, as well as information on the investment guarantee agreement signed between the United States and Indonesia last January:

THE LAW ON INVESTMENT OF FOREIGN CAPITAL

(Law No. 1 of 1967, legalized in Djakarta on January 10, 1967)

A SUMMARY

This Act has thirteen (13) chapters and thirty-one (31) articles of which some of the most outstanding are reproduced below.

Chapter I: Meaning of Foreign Capital Investment.

Chapter II: Legal Form, Domicile and Operating Area.

Chapter III: Fields of Endeavor of Foreign Capital.

Chapter IV: Labor.

Chapter V: Use of Land.

Chapter VI: Concessions Regarding Taxes and Other Payments.

Chapter VII: The Length of Time for the Investment of Foreign Capital, The Right of Transfer and Repatriation.

Chapter VIII: Nationalization and Compensation.

Chapter IX: Cooperation Between Foreign and Domestic Capital.

Chapter X: Other Duties of the Foreign Capital Investor.

Chapter XI: Other Provisions.

Chapter XII: Transition Regulations.

Chapter XIII: Final Provisions.

Chapter I, Article 1

Capital investment in this law is understood to cover only direct foreign capital investment made according to or based on provisions of this law and which is used to get into operation enterprises in Indonesia with the understanding that the owner of the capital directly bears any risks of the investment.

Chapter I, Article 2

The meaning of foreign capital in this law is:

(*a*) foreign exchange which does not form a part of the foreign exchange resources of Indonesia, which with the agreement of the government is used for the financing of an enterprise in Indonesia;

(*b*) the equipment for a business, including new inventions owned by foreigners and material supplies, which are entered into Indonesian territory from abroad, as long as the aforementioned equipment is not financed from Indonesian foreign exchange resources;

Chapter II, Article 3

(1) An enterprise as defined in Article 1 which is operated wholly or for the most part in Indonesia as an independent business unit must be a legal entity according to Indonesian law and have its domicile in Indonesia.

Chapter III, Article 6

1) Fields of endeavor closed to foreign capital investment exercising full control are those fields important for the country and upon which depend the daily necessities of the people, as follows:

(*a*) harbors;

(*b*) production, transmission and distribution of electric power for the public;

(*c*) telecommunications;

(*d*) shipping;

(*e*) aviation;

(*f*) drinking water;

(*g*) public railways;

(*h*) the development of atomic energy;

(*i*) mass media.

2) Fields which play an important role in national defense, among others: the production of weapons, ammunition, explosives, and war equipment; are unequivocally forbidden for foreign capital.

Chapter III, Article 8

1) Investment of foreign capital in the field of mining will take place in cooperation with the government on the basis of a contract of work or other basis which accords with valid legislative regulations.

2) The system of cooperation on the basis of contract of work—Kontrak Karya—in another form may be implemented in other fields of endeavor to be stipulated by the Government.

Chapter IV, Article 9

The owner of foreign capital has full authority to appoint the management of enterprises in which his capital is invested.

Chapter IV, Article 10

Foreign capital enterprises have the obligation to meet their needs for labor with Indonesian citizens except in the cases mentioned in Article 11.

Chapter IV, Article 11

Foreign capital enterprises are allowed to assign or to use foreign managerial and technical employees for positions which cannot yet be filled by Indonesian personnel.

Chapter IV, Article 12

Foreign capital enterprises have the obligation to organize and/or prepare regular and planned facilities for training and education in the country and/or abroad for Indonesian citizens with the aim of gradually replacing the foreign employees by Indonesian citizens.

Chapter V, Article 14

To meet the requirements of foreign capital enterprises land may be provided with the right of construction, the right of exploitation, and the right of use according to valid legislative regulations.

Chapter VI, Article 15

Foreign capital enterprises are given the following concessions concerning taxes and other payments:

(*a*) Exemption from:

1. Corporation Tax on profits during a specified period not exceeding five years from the time the company starts production;

2. Dividend Tax on that portion of profits paid to shareholders, as long as the profits are obtained during a period not exceeding five years from the start of production;

3. Corporation Tax on profits referred to in Article 19, sub a. which are reinvested in the business in Indonesia, for a specified period not exceeding five years from the time of reinvestment;

4. Import Duties at the time of entry of fixed equipment into Indonesian territory, such as machinery, tools, or instruments needed for the enterprise;

5. Capital Stamp Tax on the movement of capital originating from foreign capital investment.

(*b*) Abatements:

1. of Corporation Tax through a proportional rate that is at the highest 50 percent for a period not longer than five years after the period of exemption as specifies in (*a*) number 1. above.

2. by offsetting losses during the period of exemption referred to in (*a*) number 1., against the profits subject to tax following the period mentioned above.

3. by allowing accelerated depreciation of fixed capital assets.

Chapter VI, Article 16

1. The concessions concerning taxes and other payments mentioned in Article 15 will be given while keeping in mind the priorities for fields of endeavor as described in Article 5.

2. Besides the facilitations of taxes and other obligations mentioned in Paragraph 1 of this Article, additional facilitations may be given by government regulation to a foreign capital enterprise which is extremely necessary for economic growth.

Chapter VI, Article 18

In every permit for foreign capital investment there will be set forth the length of time of its validily which will not exceed thirty years.

Chapter VIII, Article 21

The Government will not carry out a comprehensive nationalization/revocation of ownership rights of the foreign capital enterprises nor take steps to lesses the right to control and/or manage the enterprises concerned, except if it is declared by Law that the interests of the State require such a step. (Note: Terminology implies Act of Parliament required.)

Chapter VIII, Article 22

1. In the event there occur measures as referred to in Article 21, the Government has the obligation to provide compensation, of which the amount, nature and procedures of payment are agreed to by both parties in accord with the principles valid in international law.

Chapter IX, Article 23

1. In the fields open for foreign capital cooperation may be carried out between foreign and domestic capital, keeping in mind the provisions in Article 3.

Chapter IX, Article 24

The profit obtained by a foreign capital enterprise as the result of cooperation between foreign and national capital as mentioned in Article 23, after subtraction of taxes and other obligations to be paid in Indonesia, may be transferred in the original currency of the foreign capital concerned in proportion to the share of foreign capital invested.

Chapter X, Article 26

Foreign capital enterprises must manage and direct their business in accordance with the principles of business economics without harming the interests of the State.

INVESTMENT GUARANTEE AGREEMENT SIGNED BETWEEN UNITED STATES AND INDONESIA

Presidium Minister for Political Affairs and Foreign Minister Adam Malik and United States Charge d'Affaires in Djakarta Jack W. Lydman, on January 7, 1967, signed an agreement providing for the guarantee of United States private capital investments in Indonesia. The agreement covers two main points:

1. The Agreement governs the procedures and regulations between the United States Government and the Government of the Republic of Indonesia concerning the administration of the investment guarantee and includes an undertaking by the United States Government that it will not issue guaranties unless the specific project in which the investment is being made has been approved by the Government of the Republic of Indonesia for guarantee purposes.

2. This guarantee agreement insures new investment against losses arising from the specific political risk of inconvertibility of currency, of expropriation and of damage resulting from war, revolution or insurrection. The agreement does not provide for special treatment by the Indonesian government of guaranteed investments. Guaranties are issued to the investor in the form of a contract between the investor and AID.

The Safety Valve

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1967

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reflecting the mood of Americans is an editorial in the June 8, 1967, issue of the Monett Times, Monett, Mo., entitled "The Safety Valve." I include the editorial with my remarks in the RECORD:

THE SAFETY VALVE

It seems that we have reached a time in history when our country should enjoy the respect of other nations of the world or suffer the consequences. During a period of more than 25 years, we have practiced "creme-puff diplomacy" in our State Department, along with a breakdown of communications with military and civilian rule of our country.

We have operated on the basic premise that our nation can buy "good fellowship" among the uncommitted or less fortunate nations of the world. The results have demonstrated that this policy has been a miserable failure.

If you will look at the world globe and point to the nations of the world who really like the people of the United States you won't find many. We have practiced a very foolish philosophy of trying to be helpful by thinking that we can gain their favor by shipping them free wheat and other commodities, and by extending loans which are never paid. Unfortunately through our entire history, we have managed to arrive at the short end of the horn with no loans repaid and, as a clincher, have been told, "Yankee Go Home."

Typical of this style of arrogance was that demonstrated by Premier Charles DeGaulle when he ordered the entire NATO complex, including Paris headquarters, out of France. The presence of NATO on French soil posed a challenge to his inflated ego and didn't sit well with the communists. How ironical it would be if again the French people were attacked by some European or Asiatic power. Again they would remind us that Gen. Lafayette came to the assistance of the American colonists during the 1770's. Hogwash! Both in World War I and World War II, the blood of thousands of American men was spilled on French soil in order to protect the weakling nation of France. The thanks that we have received in return has been numerous kicks in the pants, including default of loans, the French playing footsies with the communists, being diametrically opposed to our policy in Vietnam, and, in general, doing all they can possibly do to help communize what European allies we have left.

France is typical of about 90 percent of the nations of the world. They don't like America because it is a nation that practices free enterprise and one which has enjoyed economic success from its very birth.

I think that now is as good a time as any to let the nations of the world know that the people of America would like to have their long past-due debts paid up; that any attack upon any American embassy or consulate at any place in the world, is the same as an attack on the White House in Washington, D.C. Through the years we have demonstrated most generously a philosophy of comradeship and the filling of the empty stomachs of our less fortunate friends. In return, Uncle Sam has gotten a slap in the face.

America's policy of dealing with the nations of the world too often borders as one of being too cautious. During the Korean fiasco, communist MIG jet fighters could fly over any areas of North and South Korea and kill as many United Nations forces as was within range of their capability. The Dean Acheson philosophy was one that prohibited our jet fighters from penetrating one foot south of the Yalu River. This policy was opposite from that of the late General Douglas MacArthur and finally he was brought home. General MacArthur didn't like to be hamstrung by politicians. He wanted to go ahead and finish the job in a military manner. He was in command of military troops fighting a real war—not playing rugby or ice hockey. His philosophy was one which was not popular with the political hierarchy. The communist bluff was so impregnated in the minds of those who called the shots in the State Department that, despite our abundant supply of nuclear warheads, we were scared out of our wits at the communist regimes of China and Russia which supplied North Korea with weapons. Finally, with more American lives lost, an unresolved armistice was made in 1952.

Because America has its vast resources and capabilities to produce and progress. I don't think that we will ever win a popularity contest with the nations of the world. We might as well forget that we are "the good guys". Instead of continuing to play war in the future as if it were baseball or football. I am in favor of playing it for keeps, using if necessary, our large pile of nuclear warheads.

Along this line, I think that we could end the Veitnam conflict in short order if we would show some guts and let the communists know that we do not send our troops and materiel 8,000 miles from home just to play games.

I hope that sufficient strong federal legislation will be passed in Congress that it will become an act of treason, subject to death before a firing squad, for any American to burn the American flag. For the long-haired greasy demonstrators who burn their draft cards, I am in favor of stringent federal legislation which will give them a choice of:

(1) quarantine behind barbed wire in some desolate spot in Attu, Adak or other Alaskan Islands, or (2) becoming denaturalized and deported to a communist foreign nation of their choice.

I believe that draft dodgers should be deprived of their American citizenship and deported to a foreign country.

More than 10,000 of America's finest young men have been killed in the Vietnam struggle which is an unfortunate battle that we are engaged in to thwart the spread of communism in Southeast Asia. I think that it is a disgrace when the anti-American do-gooders listen to the banality of Rev. Martin Luther King as he berates our soldiers fighting in the Vietnam swamps. Between now and next summer, the weak-kneed sisters, who are afraid of their political hides, will be playing political games on both a domestic and an international scale. For the future of America, I hope that our leaders in the executive and legislative branches forget about their political futures and start acting like statesmen.

Mr. Average American doesn't want anything from the peoples of the other nations of the world except their respect. Since we cannot gain it through kindly and generous acts, then I am for gaining it by any means at our command. Unfortunately, the scared politician will shudder before taking that last step of calling the bluff of the communists, but the strong American statesman will go the last mile in demanding that this country receives the decent and fair treatment to which it is entitled.

While choas is rampant over the world, it would be an interesting experiment in our scheme of diplomacy to call the bluff of the communist coward and threaten to jam one good-sized nuclear bomb down his throat, I dare say.

Attorneys Sworn To Defend the Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1967

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the American lawyer is required to take an oath that he will preserve and defend the Constitution of the United States. By his oath, every attorney becomes a sworn defender of our Constitution—obligated to lead and speak on behalf of our citizens against any usurpations and infringements.

The runaway court decisions of the unelected Federal judges by now evidence such a clear-cut trend for destruction of our basic laws that the burden shifts to every American attorney to speak forth, loudly and strongly, to awaken and arouse our people into action.

For sure, no member of the bar relishes criticism of the judiciary and his fellow barristers. Yet, a black robe dignifies nothing that does not by act, deed, and word merit trust and confidence. Judges are but lawyers, and when they become destructive of their purpose they are every bit as dangerous and nondeserving of defensive support as any other immoral, unethical lawyer.

Mr. Ben R. Miller, a practicing attorney of high professional regard in Baton Rouge, a member of the Louisiana State Bar Association and the Board of the American Bar Association, readily acknowledges his role as a basic defender of American liberty under law.

Mr. Speaker, in the interest of encouraging more talks and papers from our legal profession, I ask that excerpts of Mr. Miller's speech on recent court rulings be here inserted in the RECORD:

TOP COURT RULINGS IN CRIMINAL CASES SCORED BY LOCAL LAWYER

EDITOR'S NOTE.—The following excerpts from a talk entitled "The Duty to Observe Law and the Duty to Criticize Judicial Decisions—Are They Reconcilable?" were delivered by local attorney Ben R. Miller recently before the Rotary Club of Baton Rogue:

"May one not or should one not criticize judicial decisions—particularly those of the United States Supreme Court, if convinced those decisions are themselves contributing if not in fact causing the alarming increase in crime and lawlessness as we see and read about daily? Some might say that a lawyer should not do so. For my part, however, I believe the lawyer has not only the right but the duty to criticize those decisions of even the United States Supreme Court which he considers erroneous and dangerous though obeying them of course until reversed or modified by the Supreme Court itself or overturned by the Congress.

"Unless the lawyers are critical the public might well consider the bar agrees, and moreover, an absence of criticism from their brother lawyers might well lead the Court to even greater imbalance favoring rights of the accused over rights of the public to be protected from the criminal.

"So I shall be critical.

"In my judgment the rights of the great mass of our people—of all races, colors and creeds—are being sadly neglected by the Supreme Court.

"What of the constitutional right of this great mass of our citizens to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness? Of their 'right' to be able to walk the streets their taxes have helped build, without dire danger of brutal assault, or of street riots and mob violence? What of their right to be protected from the criminal and the hoodlum; and to have their children protected from the purveyor of narcotics, and of obscenity? Of their right to even be safe in their homes from the rapist or insane murderer?

"These are the neglected rights—neglected by the 'Great Court,' the Supreme Court of the United States. It has done so by declaring the law to be what the Court at a particular time thinks it should be; by compelling the states to follow whatever 'policy' the Court at a particular time thinks is a proper or best 'policy' with respect to so-called personal or civil rights.

"It would be less a usurpation of power if the Court in these legislative, policy-making decisions were unanimous when they overthrow long-standing precedents. The fact is, however, in the first twelve years of the Warren Court (1953 to 1965) in 65.8 per cent of the full-opinion decisions there were dissenting opinions.

"In many of the most far reaching of these decisions, the Court itself was violently split and one swing vote determined the result. This of course gives great credence to the contention that we have become a government of men and not of laws.

"In a recent article by Professor Robert E. Hayes, entitled, "Common Fallacies in Criticism of Recent Court Decisions on Rights of Accused", he stated that such critics are fallacious and illogical in terming the imbalance resulting from recent decisions, as favoring rights of the 'criminal' over rights of the victim and of the public generally.

"But it is 'fallacious' and 'illogical' to term these persons 'criminals' (and not merely 'accused') who were nonetheless freed by, or as a direct result of, certain Supreme Court decisions:

SUPREME COURT DECISIONS

"Mallory vs. U.S. A woman was raped in the basement of her apartment house on April 7, 1954. A 19 year old man, against whom—says the official summary of the case—'the police had ample evidence from other sources than the defendant for regarding him as a chief suspect' confessed to the crime. His conviction set aside by the Supreme Court some three years later despite a unanimous jury conviction, affirmed by the U.S. Court of Appeals, because—said the Supreme Court—he was not told of his 'rights' to counsel and to keep silent.

"Culombe vs. Connecticut. The defendant was convicted of having murdered two men on Dec. 15, 1956 while engaged in one of a series of holdups and holdup killings 'that terrified the operators of gasoline stations, package stores, and small shops throughout the environing Connecticut Area.' The Connecticut higher court affirmed the conviction. Although the defendant had confessed twice, once on a Wednesday and again on the following Saturday, his conviction was set aside some five years later by a majority of the court of nine on the ground that the confessions were not in their judgment 'voluntary,' even though the jury, the Connecticut trial judge, the Connecticut highest court and even three justices of the United States Supreme Court thought the confession was entirely 'voluntary.'

"Mapp vs. Ohio. This woman was arrested in Cleveland May 23, 1957 for possession of obsene literature. Her conviction was set aside by a bare majority of the Supreme Court some four years later because the officers who found the obscene material in the premises did not have a search warrant.

"Townsend vs. Sain. Sheriff of Cook County, Ill. On New Year's Day, 1954, Townsend was arrested for robbery and murder. His conviction was set aside some nine years later by a sharply divided court—another 5 to 4 decision—and again the ground was that his confession had not been 'voluntary.' Four of the nine judges dissented.

"Fay, Warden vs. Noia. Twenty years after the crime of murder for which he was convicted, the Supreme Court freed him from prison on grounds so technical that the three dissenters said:

" '. . . But the Constitution comprehends another struggle of equal importance and places upon our shoulders the burden of maintaining it—the struggle for law and order.' I regret that the Court does not often recognize that each defeat in that struggle chips away inexorably at the base of that very personal liberty which it seeks to protect. One is reminded of the exclamation of Pyrrhus: 'One more such victory . . ., and we are utterly undone!' "

"Escobedo vs. Illinois. Escobedo was convicted of murdering his brother-in-law on Jan. 19, 1960. His conviction by a unanimous jury of twelve, affirmed by the Illinois Supreme Court, was set aside by the United States Supreme Court some four and a half years after the murder, by another 5 to 4 decision.

"Massiah vs. U.S. The conviction of a narcotic smuggler was reversed by a 6 to 3 vote of the Court on the ground, now so familiar, that the confession to the federal agents was not 'voluntary'.

"Jackson vs. Denno, Warden. On June 14, 1960, Jackson killed a Brooklyn policeman whom he encountered in fleeing from having robbed a hotel clerk at the point of a gun. Jackson was wounded too, but hailed a cab to take him to a hospital. He confessed orally shortly after reaching the hospital and again some two hours later. Despite the jury unanimously finding the confession to have been 'voluntary,' affirmed by New York's highest courts, and despite both the federal District Court in New York and the U.S. Court of Appeal refusing to set aside the conviction and sentence of death, the Supreme Court of the United States, by the swing vote of one man (this also being a 5 to 4 decision) set all this aside some four years after the crime.

"Miranda vs. Arizona. Miranda, 23 years old, had kidnapped an 18-year-old girl on March 3, 1963, and forcibly raped her. The victim identified him in a lineup and later he confessed orally and still later in his own handwriting he described and confessed the crime. His conviction was set aside under a 5 to 4 edict that police can't even question a suspect without first advising he doesn't have to answer and that if he wishes an attorney furnished him right then and there all he has to do is 'ask'. Justice Harlan expressed his dissent this way:

" 'There is, in my view, every reason to believe that a good many criminal defendants, who otherwise would have been convicted on what this Court has previously thought to be the most satisfactory kind of evidence, will now, under this new version of the Fifth Amendment, either not be tried at all or acquitted if the State's evidence, minus the confession is put to the test of litigation.

" 'I have no desire whatsoever to share the responsibility for any such impact on the present criminal process.'

"RESULTING DECISIONS

"Decisions of other courts, resulting from Supreme Court decisions:

"On Feb. 20, 1967, Justice Kern of the New York Supreme Court was forced by the Miranda decision to free a man who had admitted slaying his wife and four children. In doing so, Justice Kern said, 'It is so repulsive it makes one's blood run cold, and any decent human being's stomach turn, to let a thing like this out on the streets.'

"In January of this year a defendant charged with slaying a 31-year-old housewife was freed. His confession was thrown out not because he hadn't been first advised of his right to counsel, because he was so advised before the questioning, but because he wasn't also told that the state itself would provide him with free counsel.

"In Los Angeles, after a defendant had been freed on July 12, 1966, the presiding judge told the jury, 'I should like to have told you this defendant is a confessed killer. His confession could not be used because of Supreme Court decisions.'

"On June 30, 1966, in Connecticut, a defendant was freed of killing a 71-year-old hotel clerk during a robbery, despite having not only confessed but having also shown the police where he had hid the pistol.

"Because of the Miranda decision, a man was freed on Nov. 28, 1966 in Meridian, Miss., of the confessed murder of his 27-month-old son.

—"Six men, all with long criminal records and three of whom were in custody in other states at the time for subsequent crimes, were freed of attempted burglary in New Orleans last November despite having been found with an elaborate assortment of new burglary tools and two police radios. The technicality there involved the validity of the search.

—"A woman who had admitted killing her four year old son was freed last September because the only evidence the state had was her own confession. When she thanked the judge, Justice Kern of the Brooklyn court said, 'Don't thank me, thank the United States Supreme Court. You killed the child and should go to jail.'

—"Last September after intensive investigation, the district attorney in New Orleans conducted a raid on narcotic suspects and found three persons in possession of about a million dollars worth of heroin. They had a search warrant too, but because it didn't specify the exact room in the apartment building where these three persons were with the heroin and because it had been signed a little after midnight on a Saturday, and hence on a Sunday, the judge felt compelled to release them without even a trial because of the technicalities now favoring criminals.

—"A man was arrested for vagrancy late one night in October, 1965, in New Orleans. Contraband barbituates were found on his person. Some 30 minutes after having booked him his room was searched by the arresting officers and marijuana found. At the hearing on a possession of naroctics charge he admitted it belonged to him. Judge Oliver Schulingkamp held he was compelled, by virtue of the Mapp vs. Ohio decision to sustain a motion to suppress the evidence. But the Judge then expressed his true feelings, 'There is something repugnant to the sense of justice and logically incongruous in ruling in favor of a defendant when the facts reveal unquestionably that he was in possecession of a sizable quantity of marijuana and even further when the defendant himself took the witness stand and judicially admitted such illegal possession.'

"While in our country this imbalance has grown steadily greater, in England serious efforts are being made to bring the pendulum in balance. The Wilson government there last November introduced in Parliament a 'Criminal Justice Bill.' Among other things, this bill would require only a majority (generally) of 10 of a jury of 12 to convict. Instead of loosening the requirements as to intelligence and morality in the selection of jurors for grand juries and trial juries as our courts have themselves done and as is being proposed in Congress now, in Britain the jury selection process is to be made more restrictive to eliminate, as Lord Shawcross terms them, 'the man of lowest intelligence, occasionally one who is himself on the shady side of the law—standing out' against conviction.

"In England reforms can be effected by the Parliament since their judiciary has not stretched their 'Magna Charta' as our Supreme Court has stretched our Constitution. In this country, however, so powerful is the position our Supreme Court has seized, that without change in the personnel of that Court, or in the philosophy of the existing personnel, even our Congress would be powerless to end the existing imbalance with respect to the rights of the public.

"But as many other have said, the Supreme Court is not always impervious to public opinion. Perhaps by a strong enough protest from the bar, the lay public, and law enforcement officers, the Court itself will discover in the Constitution words or meanings convicing them of the error of their more recent decisions unduly favoring the accused.

"I hope I am not too optimistic, but I believe I see signs that the Supreme Court itself has begun to realize it has shifted the pendulum too far in favor of the accused and the criminal, to the great danger and detriment of the victim and the public. Just last month that Court did restore to law enforcement officers a much needed power to seize evidence from a criminal suspect's home and use it at his trial.

"But on the same day that Court again, by a 5 to 4 ruling, allowed the controlling judgment of but one human being to overturn the legislative policy of an entire great state, formulated by more than a 2 to 1 vote of the citizens of that state. I refer of course to the decision which struck down a California constitutional amendment granting its citizens the right to sell or lease their own properties to whom they pleased. For a court which has laid so much stress on a so-called one man-one vote principle, it is ironic that it nonetheless will allow a single swing vote of one of its members to override the overwhelming vote of a state legislature and its people."

Neighborhood Youth Corps Lowers School Dropout Rate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 25, 1967

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the dropout rate amongst needy students is one of the most crucial problems facing our educational system today. In the District of Columbia this problem has been successfully combatted through an excellent part-time work program conducted by the Washington school system and the Neighborhood Youth Corps. The success of this program represents a victory for the war on poverty. This victory is described in an article in a recent edition of the Washington Post.

The article follows:

Summer Jobs Lessen Student Dropout Rate

(By Susan Filson)

A significant reduction in the dropout rate among needy Washington students who have held summer jobs in the public schools was reported yesterday in a study released by Assistant Superintendent Joseph M. Carroll.

The study's conclusions were based on a sampling drawn from more than 1200 teenagers who have participated in the part-time work program during the past two years. The students hold jobs as assistants to teachers, office workers and custodians. Their $1.25-an-hour salaries are paid by the Neighborhood Youth Corps.

Of 287 students who worked at Cardozo, Dunbar and Eastern High Schools during the summers of 1965 and 1966, fewer than 2 per cent have since dropped out of school. The normal dropout rate in the three schools runs close to 20 per cent.

IMPORTANT FACTOR

"This is particularly significant," Carroll said, "because so many of the students in the program were identified as potential dropouts, because of factors like poor grades, spotty attendance records and a hostile attitude toward school. We would certainly expect the percentage of dropouts to be higher in this group than in the general student body."

The report suggests that the small amount of money the students earn may be an important factor in keeping them in school.

"Indications are that the program provides (the students) with funds necessary for school and personal needs," the report says, "and also seems to develop in them a sense of respect for work.

"This experience in the work scholarship program may also have helped the students to realize the advantages of finishing high school as a passport for better jobs."

Carroll's office made a survey of 518 participants in last summer's program to determine how they spent their earnings. More than 83 per cent said they spent part of their money for school supplies—the item mentioned by the largest number of students on the questionnaire.

About 82 per cent said they spent some money on clothes and 75 per cent said they saved part of their earnings for school lunches the following year. More than 46 per cent said part of the money went for books for personal reading (not textbooks).

The students were also asked how much money they would have had for personal needs other than food and clothes if they had not held the summer jobs. More than 43 percent said they would have had no money at all to spend. Only 13 percent said they would have had more than $5.

A BIG DIFFERENCE

"It's not hard to imagine that with kids who are in this severe financial need, the little bit they earn could make a big difference as to whether they stay in school," Carroll noted.

Many students also used the money for senior pictures, yearbooks and tickets to sports events and school plays. "Maybe these are frills," says a teacher at Cardozo, "but they're things that give the middle-class kid a sense of identity with the school and are denied to many poor kids."

The program will be continued for 600 students this summer under Neighborhood Youth Corps financing.

Canal Zone Sovereignty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1967

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, over a period of years, I have noted that the mass news media in the United States has, with rare exception, failed to deal with the Isthmian Canal situation in adequate and objective manner. Despite such neglect of this gravely important subject, information of what is transpiring as regards the Panama Canal has reached the people of our country through newspapers of limited circulation and publications of patriotic societies.

An example of such publicity is a recent newsstory by Maurice LaBelle in a Florida newspaper. Because of its pertinence to current discussions of the canal subject, under leave accorded to extend my remarks, I quote it as follows:

[From the Coral Gables (Fla.) Times, Mar. 30, 1967]

Administration Intent Upon Giving up Canal Zone Sovereignty

(By Maurice LaBelle)

Maj. Gen. Robert J. Fleming Jr.'s sudden and unexplained departure from the scene at Interama immediately after a long feature story about him was published revealing his passion for improving America's image abroad will lead many to wonder about the reasons.

The former governor of the Panama Canal's own image with those who want to retain U.S. sovereignty over the Canal was not too bright.

The general will be remembered for his carping criticism of the U.S. position at a time when the Communists and other internationalists elements combined with Panamanian nationalists to try to force the U.S. out.

Rep. Daniel Flood, in the Congressional Record, documents the long history of the Canal in which men like Fleming acted and talked in such a way as to erode our position and hasten the day when our stay there may be possible only through military force.

It was my privilege to know someone who worked closely with the governor of Panama during these days of crisis which led to bloodshed, more ill will and a tarnished image.

I once questioned him about the reasons behind the trouble. His answer, totaled up after a long monologue, was more amazing for omissions than for long list of real or alleged grievances against the U.S.

Never once were Communists instigators, long legend in Panama, cited as having played a part in the bloody riots.

The famous flag incident, of course, is cited for causing the trouble, though it actually simply served as a catalyst to signal the forces against the U.S.

As Congressman Flood points out, the agitation against U.S. control of the Panama Canal began with the Communists as long ago as post World War I.

Alger Hiss, who reached the highest diplomatic levels in the U.S. State Department and the United Nations before his exposure as a secret Communist agent by Whittaker Chambers, compounded U.S. troubles in Panama by listing the Canal Zone as a U.S. occupied territory in a post World War II report to the U.N.

Dr. Milton Eisenhower, Ike's brother, headed one of those conveniently created "study" groups that influenced the Eisenhower Administration to capitulate further to demands for greater sovereignty for Panamanians.

Further encroachments resulted during the Kennedy reign and the proposal to fly both flags, something endorsed enthusiastically by Fleming, actually led to the more serious strife and demands. Fleming's own Canal architect sued him in Federal Court to block this act of surrender, but eventually lost out.

Pvt. William Thomas Parker Killed in Combat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1967

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Pfc. William Thomas Parker III, of Salisbury, Md., was recently killed by enemy rifle fire in Vietnam. I wish to commend the courage of Private Parker and to honor his memory by including the following article in the RECORD:

SALISBURY, MD., June 6.—A 19-year-old marine from Salisbury was killed last week near the demilitarized zone of Vietnam, the Defense Department announced yesterday.

Pfc. William Thomas Parker, 3d, a radio operator in a search-and-destroy squad, was killed by enemy rifle fire Thursday near Quang Tri, a town about 30 miles northwest of Hue.

The only son of Mr. and Mrs. William T. Parker, Jr., Private Parker was born in Baltimore and lived there until the family moved to Salisbury when he was 5 years old.

"NEVER COMPLAINED"

His mother said today that her son "never complained. He never said he was sorry he was in Vietnam."

She added that he wrote his 13-year-old sister, Carol Lynn, that "he never knew how good he had it at home" until he arrived in Vietnam.

Private Parker volunteered for the Marine Corps, and was sworn in on his 18th birthday, January 19, 1966.

Before enlisting, he was a student at James M. Bennett Senior High School here.

ARRIVED NOVEMBER 3

He arrived in Vietnam last November 3, and was sent to a unit near the demilitarized zone in January. He was scheduled to complete his tour of duty in Vietnam next November.

He was a member of the First Baptist Church in Fruitland, Md., and participated in the church's youth organization.

The family lives at 166 Shelton avenue, Salisbury. Mr. Parker is a driver-salesman for a dairy products firm.

Besides his parents and his sister, Private Parker is survived by Mrs. Charles Sigafoos, his maternal grandmother, and by his paternal grandparents. Mr. and Mrs. William T. Parker, of Onancock, Va.

Engineering Challenge Reflected at Chico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1967

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago the new Herbert F. Langdon Engineering Center was dedicated at Chico State College, situated in the Second Congressional District which I represent.

The dedication of the new facility is indicative of the continuing expansion and development of what I believe is the most important school in the California State college system, a school which is attracting students from throughout our Golden State.

The principal speaker at this ceremony was a professional engineer, formerly a resident of Chico, Mr. James K. Carr, currently general manager of public utilities for the State, and county of San Francisco.

Mr. Carr is well known to my colleagues in that he served for many years on the staff of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives and most recently was Under Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. Len Steinberg, of the Chico Enterprise Record, has written a fine report on Mr. Carr's challenge to the engineering leaders in the decades ahead, a report which I would like to share with my colleagues:

LANGDON ENGINEERING CENTER IS DEDICATED

A challenge for engineers to become more involved in the "livability of the community" was issued Saturday at the dedication of the Herbert F. Langdon Engineering Center on the Chico State College campus.

The challenger was former Chicoan James K. Carr, who is now general manager of public utilities, City and County of San Francisco.

Carr delivered the principal address on engineering as the $2 million facility at West First and Warner Streets was officially opened.

The center contains a million dollars worth of equipment, not including leased machines in the computer center. It has 10 laboratories and two technical shops.

"It is the engineer's responsibility to use his knowledge of mathematics, material, money and men to improve the quality, the character, the livability of the community in which we necessarily exert our influence," Carr said.

"Unfortunately, too many engineers have become lost in mathematics and the mechanics of materials, the intricacies of the economics and have excluded the human ingredient."

"Too often, professional engineers permit themselves to be placed in demeaning positions as mere technicians. They become the hirelings of others.

"They leave the planning often to architects, urban planners, and politicians because they have too often forgotten that their works are being built for men—men that consist of body and soul, sensitive men."

Carr said that in many cases, engineers refuse to develop a sense of social responsibility because such conduct is now regarded as "unprofessional," and in fact may detract from their technical competence.

"This mentality overlooks the fact that engineering projects, structures and facilities should be part of a system of services that helps create an efficient, healthy, convenient and enjoyable environment where people can live and work and play," Carr said.

"I should like to place the emphasis on the new era and the new opportunities that engineering students will have at Chico State," he continued. "Here will be an engineering center situated in the center of a beautiful valley in a delightful city."

"Engineering students at Chico State will be free from the sterile, urban influences of some of our urban centers which have been described as asphalt jungles.

"Let us hope that . . . Chico State engineers from the Langdon Center will be a new breed, a new group of technically and professionally equipped engineers.

"They will be among the leaders in the decades ahead when this section of California will face the heavy burden of problems that come with continuing population growth."

In his opening remarks, Dr. Robert Hill, CSC president, said he expected great things of the engineering faculty and that the college would support the department in its contribution to the total college program.

Jim Farley Speaks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1967

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, one of this country's most distinguished citizens, the Honorable James A. Farley, has never been a man to mince words.

In a recent interview which was printed in the New York Times, May 27, 1967, Mr. Farley made some interesting observations on President Johnson's trip to New York on June 3.

I commend the article to the attention of our colleagues:

Farley Attacks Dinner Boycott—Calls Four Democrats Lacking in Loyalty to Johnson

(By Murray Schumach)

"Disgusting" and "selfish" were terms used yesterday by James A. Farley to describe the actions of four Reform Democrats who plan to boycott a Democratic dinner next Saturday in honor of President Johnson.

The former Postmaster General and national chairman of the Democratic party said such Democrats—he did not name them—were more interested in self-advancement than in the welfare of the country and the party.

Those who had said they would not attend the dinner explained that they were staying away because they objected to the Administration's policy in Vietnam. They favor a halt in the bombing of North Vietnam as a road to peace negotiations. The dissenters are State Senator Manfred Ohrenstein, Assemblymen Albert H. Blumenthal and Jerome Kretchmer and Councilman Theodore S. Weiss.

Mr. Farley made his attack during a televised news conference called to celebrate his 79th birthday, which will be on Tuesday. The session was held in the board room of the Coca Cola Corporation, at 515 Madison Avenue. Mr. Farley has been chairman of the board of the Coca Cola Export Corporation since 1940.

Tall and erect, Mr. Farley said he was in good health because "I inherited a good constitution and haven't abused it." Wearing a dark blue suit, with the points of a white handkerchief protruding from the breast pocket, he was an amiable host.

TRAVELS 60,000 MILES A YEAR

He said he usually goes to bed about 11:30 P.M. and gets seven hours of sleep. He expects to travel his usual 60,000 miles this year on business and expressed the hope "that the good Lord will give me many more years to vote the Democratic ticket."

Mr. Farley asserted that Mayor Lindsay "has gone as far as he can go, politically." He predicted that President Johnson and Vice President Humphrey would be reelected next year and that Republicans opposing them "will be running for the exercise." He called Richard M. Nixon, former Vice President, the front-runner for the Republican Presidential nomination.

Referring to the Reform Democrats who spurned invitations to the "Salute to Johnson" dinner, Mr. Farley said:

"Frankly, I am terribly disgusted with the actions of the Refomers who have refused to go to this dinner for the President. They don't know what loyalty is. They are not willing to accept the decision of the majority. I think it is disgusting. How silly can you get?"

He added later: "They are selfish and thinking only of self-advancement. Our country is at war and he's the President of the United States. I think they ought to be ashamed. If they don't want to support him they should at least keep their mouths shut. This is a disgraceful act. They are a selfish group of people."

Partners Help in Peru

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1967

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, soon to get underway in the northwestern area of Peru is a pilot people-to-people assistance project sponsored by the Texas Partners of the Alliance through the cooperation of Southwest Texas State College and the Agency for International Development.

Dr. James McCrocklin, president of Southwest Texas State College, has arranged for a team of agriculture specialists to go to Peru to work with the citizens of Puebla Nueva.

I am particularly impressed with this type of project since it provides grassroots assistance in areas of instruction vital to the day-by-day existence of this community. This is also a pilot program, which AID officials report to me that if it is successful, will be initiated in other Partners of Alliance areas.

Recently, Jerri Veidt, a radio commentator in San Marcos, Tex., and a special correspondent for the Austin, Tex., American-Statesman, wrote an article on the project and its participants. I commend this article to the attention of my colleagues:

[From the Austin American, June 5, 1967]

Research: SWT Farm Aid for Peruvian Town

(By Jerri Veidt)

San Marcos.—In a professor-to-people project, four San Marcos scholars will leave Wednesday to launch a studious attack on agricultural problems in northern Peru.

Southwest Texas State College agriculture professor Dr. Cecil Gregg, his wife and two graduate students will spend three months in Puebla Nueva, Peru, researching crops, soils and poultry with an eye toward improvement of all three.

The team is sponsored by the Texas Partners for the Alliance with Peru, a nonprofit Austin-based organization dedicated toward strengthening ties between the two countries.

Puebla Nueva, on the coast near the Ecuadorian border, is a destitute village of around 3,000 Peruvians. There are no paved streets, no running water and no lights. The town's single generator is inoperable.

Agricultural aid for the poverty stricken community was asked by Father Robert Rebert, one of three Roman Catholic priests working in the town. The Agency for International Development sent the request to the Texas Partners, who will foot travel, room and board expenses for the trip.

The Texas team was originally slated to be housed in a small adobe hut but improved arrangements have been made. The four will now spend 12 weeks in a two story adobe hut and have the services of a local cook.

Gregg's wife, Mrs. Louise Gregg, has been a public school teacher for 25 years. "She will be doing many things," her husband said. "Although neither of us speak Spanish I believe she can be of help in matters of education and health."

SWT graduate students Joseph L. Thompson and Juan Valera "will be of invaluable aid on the trip" according to Gregg. Valera is from Lima, Peru, and will graduate this summer, going on to Texas A&M next September for more post graduate studies. He plans to return to Peru in 1969 and teach in a Lima university.

"The big part of our summer's work will be surveying what is needed and giving a start to some of the things that might be effective right away," Gregg said.

"Even though the terrain is considered more or less desert there is considerable water coming from the rivers flowing out of the Andes. They are already doing some irrigation and perhaps we will be able to help some in teaching the people about planning and planting."

Gregg could find no published information about crops or poultry of the area. "We plan to take seeds for the crops we think might grow there to give an opportunity for comparison of the quality here and there. We have been assured that any time of the year is growing season so we feel that if we can carry enough seed of various crops to run tests plots the three months will give us enough time to begin the seeds."

Mrs. Gregg will be carrying large supplies of crayons and note book paper donated by her students at Crockett elementary school. These simple supplies are badly needed in the poor Puebla Nueva school.

Thompson said he will work mainly with poultry. "I hope we can improve the strains and I hope to increase the time they start laying or the time they can be taken off feed."

"Poultry is one of the cheapest things people can raise and take nourishment from. If we can get something the people can see growing rapidly they may take hope and perhaps go on and try it themselves. It's a start, anyway," he said.

Gregg, 60, said giving up his summer teaching salary to work in the dusty Peruvian fields "is not a mission. We just see it as a chance to help people. They asked for aid. We hope we can furnish it."

Congressman Paul Rogers Comments on the Fair Packaging and Labeling Act of 1966

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1967

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, on May 26, 1967, Representative Paul G. Rogers spoke before a special conference of the Federal Bar Association on the subject of the Fair Packaging and Labeling Act of 1966.

Representative Rogers' contribution in helping to shape this important consumer legislation is well recognized by his colleagues on the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. His thoughts and opinions on this subject, therefore, deserve special consideration.

In his address before the Federal Bar Association conference, Congressman Rogers stressed the fact that Congress, having enacted the Fair Packaging and Labeling Act of 1966, will closely watch the manner in which the bill is implemented by executive department agencies and complied with by industry, toward the end that the congressional intent of this legislation is followed.

Mr. Speaker, considering the importance of the subject of fair packaging and labeling to the American consuming public, I am including Representative Rogers' speech before the Federal Bar Association conference in the Congressional Record.

Congressman Paul Rogers' Speech Before Federal Bar Association, May 26, 1967

Our concern here is clear and precise—the status and figure of the Fair Packaging and Labeling Act which Congress enacted last year. But if we are to comprehend the present and from it measure the shape of the future we must first look back for a moment to understand what brought this legislation into being. In considering a bill as complicated as the Fair Packaging and Labeling Act, this entails a review of the legislative process and Congressional intent and how they influenced the enactment of this new law.

At least from the vantage point of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committees, I would say that this Packaging and Labeling Act is an example of the Congressional deliberative process at its best. It is legislation that was molded into shape by many months of thoughtful consideration, extensive discussion, and unlimited debate.

So this bill came out of the House Committee and Congress *not* as the Administration's bill, *not* as industry's bill, *not* as the bill of any specific interest or pressure, but rather as Congress' own bill—a bill reflecting what the people's representatives in Congress determined was needed to advance the interest of consumers in today's complex marketplace.

Of course, not a few—and some are here—would have preferred a different and possibly less onerous law. Some emphatically cried out for requirements far more severe. Others preferred no legislation at all. But to every shade of opinion our House Committee gave a full and fair hearing, and I am satisfied that this was so.

It was then, in this careful and reasoned fashion that the 89th Congress incubated and hatched out the Fair Packaging and Labeling bill of 1966. And having so carefully fashioned this legislative child, Congress has no intention of shirking its responsibility as the parent. This is to say, that we who labored long and hard to make this bill the law of the land are determined to have it enforced—and observed—in the manner and to the extent that we intended.

Congress, therefore, is going to carefully watch how the business community positions itself in respect to this new law.

The Fair Packaging and Labeling Act, as it finally emerged, was based on a major premise—that the overwhelming majority of the nation's consumer products manufacturers, processors and producers, are honest and responsible citizens who seek to deal fairly with their customers, the consuming public. It follows that this legislation presumes full compliance and cooperation on the part of the industries concerned. It would be grave error for these industries to misread this premise, and default on their responsibilities.

The need for federal regulation of certain packaging and labeling practices has been demonstrated.

This question now is "How much regulation is needed?" How much, however, depends on industry's reaction to the bill as enacted. The more successfully industry can get its own house in order, and can itself correct packaging and labeling practices which confuse or mislead consumers, the less need there will be for federal regulation or intervention. I hope that industry will clearly recognize this and will not delay in effecting the steps necessary to carry out the intent of Congress as expressed in the Packaging and Labeling Act.

But there is another side to the coin. Congress will be equally watchful of the manner in which the bill is implemented by the agencies charged with such responsibility.

I stress this here for a number of reasons, but especially because of the attitude—sometimes held by some departments and agencies in downtown Washington—that the legislative branch, once having enacted a bill, loses custody of the child as soon as it is signed into law. From that point on, according to this view, the law becomes a ward solely of the administrators charged with its implementation.

I would not mention this attitude if it were uncommon in official Washington. But a number of times in recent years the intent of a law passed by Congress has been so stretched on the rack of regulatory interpretation as to disfigure it beyond parental recognition.

Such an unhealthy tendency must not pervade the proposed administration of this new labeling and packaging statute. Where existing regulations are clearly adequate—where industry and various echelons of government have already acted responsibly and reasonably, and also, where experts in this difficult area have labored long and conscientiously to satisfy consumer need—then change *for its own sake* becomes worse than unnecessary; it becomes instead an unwarranted cost burden upon the consuming public, a needless imposition upon industry, a distortion of Congressional intent, and an indulgence of bureaucratic pettiness—as well as another case history of "Parkinson's Law".

I say this in the best of spirit and not to impugn motives. But I do give voice to a growing apprehension lest inter-agency relationships and a yen to blaze new consumer trails generate results harmful to objectives that everyone here shares in common. Indulged, they are likely to be directly at variance with the manifest intent of the Congress to help the consumer, not add to his financial burden.

Unfortunately, there are irresponsible elements in business as in all other human endeavors. But common sense suggests that if consumer product industries were as hostile to the public interest as some critics contend, our entrepreneurial system would long ago have failed.

The evidence is directly to the contrary. It demonstrates that we have the most successful consumer economy in the world. And I would be among the first to acknowledge that its success arises from the intensity of competition for consumer favor, not from Federal fiat and dictation.

Precisely for that reason I find an inner contradiction in the contention of some that massive Federal intrusions into the marketplace are needed to protect consumer interests. The implication is that the government must take over to bring rationality and order into the mounting "complexity" of the marketplace. Yet, this very "complexity" is the response of a delicately balanced, continually adjusting, consumer-oriented economy that is driven by its own internal forces to meet the ever-changing needs of American consumers.

This point is particularly relevant on the question of product proliferation. You will recall that early drafts of the bill would have required the federal regulatory agencies to impose mandatory solutions wherever problems of "undue proliferation" of package sizes, weights, etc. exist. After considerable testimony on this subject and careful consideration by the House Commerce Committee it became apparent that this was a much more difficult problem than had at first been supposed. The end result was to adopt a different approach and permit *voluntary* solutions to "undue proliferation", and to enable such problems to be solved more sensibly on a case by case basis. We trust therefore, that industry will move ahead expeditiously in developing voluntary and workable solutions to problems of product proliferation, thereby justifying our confidence in industry's ability to carry out Congressional intent in this area.

A final important point pertains to the requirement in the statute's "Declaration of Policy" that packages and labels should facilitate "value comparisons" by consumers. The change from the words "price comparisons" in the original bill to "value comparisons" in the final version again was made after lengthy testimony and careful congressional deliberation. Perhaps it would be well to briefly reiterate the reason for this change as explained by its author, Congressman Gilligan:

"It is designed to insure that the government agencies and officials charged with enforcing the law and issuing regulations thereunder do not exercise the powers conferred upon them, particularly section 5, for the sole purpose of facilitating a mathematical computation; that is, a price comparison, in the supermarket aisle. Price is only one element in a consumer value decision; other factors of equal or greater importance are product performance, the convenience of the package, and the suitability of the size or quantity of the product in satisfying a consumer's personal desire or need. Obviously what constitutes value is highly subjective."

The point here is that each value decision must be made by the *individual* involved—it is a personal judgment of the kind the federal government is ill-equipped to make and should not be—and is not—asked to make for the consumer. Thus it is important for all to remember that it is "value" *according to the judgment of the consumer*, which is here involved, and not "value" according to the judgment of the federal regulatory agencies. There has been some comment from the Senate Side revealing a misunderstanding of the intent of this House Amendment on this very point. The intent of the change was clearly stated by the author of the amendment himself.

In sum, I view the Fair Packaging and Labeling Act as a reasonable, balanced legislative instrument. It was created to apply additional safeguards in behalf of consumer interests, but without repressive regulation of manufacturing and marketing. We acted on the belief that since an informed and free choice is the goal of our consumer economy, it can best be achieved through industry cooperation, not Government decisions substituted for marketplace decisions.

What now of the future? I see it this way:

If the departments and agencies cleave to Congressional intent, the Fair Packaging and Labeling Act of 1966 is likely to become a legislative landmark in developing a climate in which government and industry can work together effectively and harmoniously to advance the interests of the consuming public. It is, as I have pointed out, the responsibility of both parties—government and industry—to produce the desired result. Time will tell whether or not they will meet that responsibility.

But this we can safely predict: If they fail this responsibility, Congress will act. We will not tolerate either an encroachment by the bureaucracy or intransigence on the part of private industry.

In conclusion, then, let me focus attention on three points:

First, Congress has not washed its hands of responsibility in packaging and labeling areas. We will continue to follow, with active interest, the manner by which this new law is implemented by both the agencies and industry.

Second, we in the legislative branch are determined to fulfill our duties and responsibilities in areas of consumer problems.

And finally, I am convinced that the Legislative Branch will continue to adhere to the principle that our political and economic system is based on the protection of the interests of citizen-consumers who have minds of their own, are capable of making intelligent decisions in the supermarket, and neither need nor want their decision making power turned over to Big Brotherism in Washington.

This then as I view it, is the sum of the philosophy behind the Fair Packaging and Labeling Act of 1966—a law enacted to protect the most basic consumer interest—the right to a free and informed choice in an abundant, free economy.

Congressman Horton Calls for Meaningful and Permanent Peace in the Middle East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK HORTON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 13, 1967

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, June 8, Mrs. Lester J. Berlove, chairman of an emergency meeting of the Rochester Jewish Community to raise funds for Israel through the United Jewish Appeal, invited me to speak at that meeting. I was committed to participate in hearings of the Select Committee on Small Business in Utah and Kansas and was not able to accept this invitation.

However, I did prepare a statement for the Rochester meeting, which Mrs. Berlove was kind enough to read in my absence. I should like to share with my colleagues the text of my statement on that occasion:

Statement of Congressman Horton, Prepared for Delivery at Emergency Community-Wide Meeting of the Israel Emergency Fund of the United Jewish Appeal, Temple Beth El, Rochester, N.Y.

It has been ten days since I addressed the emergency session of the Jewish Community Council by long-distance hook-up at Temple B'rith Kodesh. Much has happened since those tense days of concern for the lives and future of the Israeli people. In these ten eventful days we have learned two very important lessons:

First, that when the chips are down the people and government of the State of Israel are quite capable of standing on their own two feet in defense of their children and their future.

Second, that the United Nations, once the hope of the world at its creation, must travel a long, hard road back to regain the respect of peace-loving peoples, and to regain some measurable degree of effectiveness in solving international conflicts.

Those of you who watched or heard Tuesday evening's session of the Security Council, heard Abba Eban's words citing the widespread concern and support for the safety of Israel which swept the world during this crisis. Part and parcel of the support Mr. Eban was talking about was the kind of outpouring of spiritual, material and political support which has occurred in our own community of Rochester.

Your presence here tonight, the unprecedented gathering of 3,000 people at B'rith Kodesh, and similar meetings throughout the world, demonstrated to Israel, to the Arabs and to other potential military adversaries of Israel where the hearts of America really lie in this crisis. I think you would agree that these outpourings of sympathy and support suggest ties which are far stronger than any that can be described as "neutral in thought, word and deed."

Despite the unfortunate confusion in American policy statements earlier this week, I think that the Soviet Union, particularly, was convinced of our firm and standing commitment to come to the aid of Israel should the life or territory of that nation become imperiled. As I told the representatives of the Rochester Zionist Council and the Jewish Community Council yesterday in my Washington office, I believe that there is a definite parallel between Viet Nam and our commitment to the Middle East. On the one hand, the Arabs and the Russians hoped that we would avoid involvement in the Mid-East at all costs, in an effort not to overextend our military resources. On the other hand, however, during every moment of the fighting in the Mid-East, our presence in Viet Nam has stood as a living and breathing example that America stands behind her commitments and her word. The fact that we have precluded any military success for the Communists in South Viet Nam speaks loudly in the ears of those who would risk tampering with the territory and political integrity of Israel, to which we are also strongly committed. I do not say this in defense of the Viet Nam war, but only point it out as a significant factor which must have lingered in the minds of those who might have answered Arab cries for help.

Fortunately, Israel's military superiority made unnecessary any world-wide conflagration over the Middle-East. But without the additional deterrence of the firmness and the potential firmness of United States international commitments, the risk of such a conflict would be far greater.

In the face of Israeli successes, our Government and the United Nations must look toward permanent solutions to the situation which are more acceptable than the solutions arrived at after the Suez crisis 11 years ago. No one can expect Israel to relinquish its hard-earned successes without far-stronger assurances and conditions in her favor. No one can expect Israel to again leave her access to Africa and East Asia through Eilat subject to the whim of a hateful Arab dictator, or even to the whim of an official of the United Nations. Free international passage through all waterways in the area must be guaranteed to all nations, including the State of Israel.

Further, the perennial trouble spots in the Israel border areas must be re-examined The populous Gaza enclave, teeming with Palestine refugees; the divided city of Jerusalem and the Syrian hilltops overlooking the kibbutzim of Galilee must all be scrutinized in view of the events of the past few days.

One fact is crystal clear to me. Israel can suffer no loss as the result of any cease-fire agreement or peace settlement. Having faced three times in the last 20 years, the aggressive encirclement of hostile Arab forces, having twice been aggressively excluded from the use of crucial international waterways, Israel cannot, and I venture, it will not agree to be placed in a position where this tragic history can repeat itself again.

A great people and a great country has given everything it has this week to assure democracy in the face of the most serious aggression any country and its people has ever been called upon to face. Israel and her people have faced the test and won the victory. You in Rochester tonight are called upon to make a sacrifice to help those who plunged ahead. I urge each of you to do all you can within your means so that you can contribute and be a part of these great people and this great country of Israel.

Congress and the Railroads

SPEECH
OF
HON. DONALD M. FRASER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 1, 1967

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, this week the House is again asked to intervene in the railroad dispute.

Before taking this decisive step, the House must consider several possible objections. First, has the legislation been carefully considered, or has it been formulated in haste and without exploration of other possible solutions. Second, would intervention at this time stifle incentives for labor and management to proceed with serious negotiations. Third, will Congress be called more and more often from its legislative responsibilities to become unnecessarily involved in labor-management disputes.

The Minneapolis Labor Review had an excellent editorial on the dangerous position the principle of free collective bargaining now finds itself. I offer it for insertion in the Record:

Postponement No Way To Settle Rail Problem

It may be convenient for Congress to postpone railroad strikes by legislation, but it serves no useful purpose in achieving the goals of collective bargaining.

The Railway Labor Act provides sufficient time for management and labor to iron out its problems. And it certainly should not be necessary for Congress to adopt special legislation in 2 instances—barring a strike first for 20 days, and then for 47 additional days—because the railroads find it serves their purposes better to avoid serious bargaining.

To extend the strike even further would completely destroy the area for bargaining and would result in no less than compulsory labor for members of the 6 unions involved in the dispute.

Following the latest extension of the no-strike ban, Michael Fox, president of the AFL–CIO Railway Employes Department said "if Congress will only affirm our members' right to strike, the railroads will quickly settle with us and no strike will take place."

It is apparent that delay is the modern strategy employed by railroad management to avoid sincere contract negotiations with employes. Why should they bargain in seriousness when Congress can be relied on to come to the rescue?

No better example of management procrastination exists than that exhibited by the railroads in stalling negotiations with the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen for 4 years. Congress entered the scene in 1963 and passed the first compulsory arbitration law in peacetime history.

The net result was that sweeping decisions were made by that board to destroy the jobs of thousands of workers when railroads seized the opportunity to ride roughshod over the rights of employes who were under compulsion and legal restraint.

It was discovered by the union that railroads could not be forced to live up to decisions of the arbitration board without court action; and recourse in the courts was slow and disappointing.

The halls of Congress are too sanctified to be used for strikebreaking. Anything that smacks of compulsory labor surely should not have such a hallowed site for a springboard.

Panama Canal: Resolution by American Coalition of Patriotic Societies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 13, 1967

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, at its 38th annual conference on April 14, 1967, in Washington, D.C., the American Coalition of Patriotic Societies adopted a thoughtful resolution on the Panama Canal.

Under leave accorded to extend my remarks, I quote it as follows:

RESOLUTION 3.—PANAMA CANAL

Whereas, the joint statements of President Johnson of the United States and President Robles of Panama in September, 1965 announced negotiations of new treaties with respect to the existing Panama Canal and a proposed new "sea-level" canal; and

Whereas, The statements made clear the intention to abrogate the Treaty of 1903 and that the replacement treaty "will terminate after a specified number of years or on the date of the opening of the new sea-level canal whichever occurs first"; and

Whereas, Panama is demanding $80 million a year from the United States for permission to build a new sea-level canal; and

Whereas, There is no assurance as yet that a sea-level canal is feasible for economical and continued navigation; and

Whereas, There is no assurance that a satisfactory treaty respecting such a new canal can be secured with Panama so as to insure the rights of the United States to operate and protect it; and

Whereas, This situation jeopardizes the rights of the United States respecting the existing canal; and

Whereas, A long time Communist aim has been to wrest control of the Canal Zone from the United States and give it to Panama; and Whereas, The Panama Canal or any other new canal represents a key "narrow water" channel vital to the defense of the Western Hemisphere and our own shores;

Resolved, That the American Coalition of Patriotic Societies opposes any revision of the Treaty of 1903 at this time and reaffirms its support of the continued indispensable sovereign control of the United States over the Canal Zone; and

Resolved, That the American Coalition urges enactment of legislation such as the Bow-Flood Bills of The 90th Congress to establish an independent and broadly based Inter-oceanic Canals Commission to examine by aid of disinterested experts all tangible possibilities for improving and increasing trans-Isthmian transit capacity and to make appropriate recommendations; and

Resolved, That the American Coalition considers the future of the Panama Canal and Canal Zone Policy to be of such vital import, militarily and economically, that before there are any more treaty negotiations or talk of such there must be full and public discussion by Congress.

Defense in a Nuclear Age

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD J. IRWIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1967

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, among the most caustic critics of the President's Vietnam policy have been the editors of the weekly journal, the New Republic. In effect, they have excommunicated from the "liberal" fold all supporters of the administration, alleging that our intervention is a betrayal of liberal principles.

It is interesting, in the light of this accusation, to turn to the New Republic, November 24, 1962, and read the editorial entitled "Defense in a Nuclear Age." Among other observations, the editors argued:

In the Orient, while America's allies are neither as numerous nor as militant as the Chinese, there are severe limits on China's ability to transport and supply its troops beyond its own border. These limitations, coupled with American technological superiority, make it possible for the US to defeat the Chinese in a conventional war in Asia, or at least fight them to a standstill as we did in Korea.

But none of these things can be done unless America makes up its mind to do them. The President must have a firm determination to increase US conventional force, so that they, combined with those of our allies, can match Communist conventional forces on any likely battlefield. He must explain to the American people that this is an important step in reducing the risk of nuclear war, and he must resign himself to bitter criticism from Air Force generals, aircraft and missile manufacturers, and mothers who would rather see their sons employed as engineers in Santa Monica than as GI's in Fort Dix or Korea. So far, the President does not appear to have made such a decision.

Since the New Republic is still under the same management in 1967 as it was in 1962, the question naturally arises: who has drifted from those "liberal principles" of 1962? The President who adopted the policy of flexible response advocated by the New Republic in 1962? Or the editors who have grown fearful over the "conventional war" in Vietnam?

Mr. Speaker, I include this item in the Appendix of the RECORD:

DEFENSE IN A NUCLEAR AGE

During the six anxious days between the President's demand that the Soviets remove their medium-range missiles from Cuba and Premier Khrushchev's acquiescence, the possibility of nuclear war was never far from consciousness. Yet there was a discrepancy between the public image of what the disaster would be and the kind of disaster which officials talked about. The difference was that while the public feared a Soviet nuclear attack on American cities, most defense specialists seemed to believe that if nuclear war came, the US would start it—either by using tactical nuclear weapons on a battlefield somewhere, or by using strategic weapons against Soviet forces where they might be located.

This is not to say that military experts dismissed entirely the possibility of an initial Soviet nuclear strike. Some thought that if the US enforced its blockade against a nuclear-armed Soviet submarine, or bombed Soviet missile bases in Cuba without knocking them all out, or attempted an invasion during which the Cubans gained control of the missiles, US cities might be hit. Other experts feared that the Soviets, knowing the Strategic Air Command to be on maximum alert and ready to strike against the USSR, might misread their radar screens, think that US rockets and bombers were on their way, and launch their own bombers and missiles lest these be destroyed on the ground. There were even those who guessed that the Soviet stake in Cuba was so great, and Kremlin politics so unstable, that Khrushchev might be unable to back down without losing his job, and might therefore see a nuclear strike as his only "way out."

Yet a Soviet nuclear strike made no sense. The US can today drop something like four times as much megatonnage in a first strike at the USSR as the USSR can drop in a first strike at the US. If the Soviets had hit first and had used most of their bombers and missiles against SAC, they would have emerged from the first nuclear exchange little stronger, and perhaps even weaker, *vis a vis* the US than before the exchange. They would have used up most of their missiles in a first strike; the bulk of those remaining would have been destroyed on their pads by our missiles and bombers. Most of the Soviet bombers would have been shot down or destroyed on the ground; the rest would have had their refueling and reloading bases destroyed. The Soviet intercontinental armory would, in short, have been almost exhausted. In contrast the US, because it started with more numerous, more mobile and "harder" forces, would still have had a formidable striking force, probably capable of annihilating every living thing in Russia if ordered to do so.

Knowing they could not neutralize SAC, Russian generals might have decided not to waste missiles trying. They might have thrown everything they had at US cities. But to what end? They would simply have ensured that almost everyone in the USSR was killed in revenge. Humiliating as it no doubt was for Khrushchev to retreat in Cuba, most US officials felt fairly confident, even at the height of the crisis, that it would be neither so humiliating nor so dangerous to him as a nuclear war.

So why all the anxiety last month? The answer is fairly simple. Although military and diplomatic experts did not expect a direct nuclear attack on the US, even in the event of an invasion of Cuba, they did envisage the possibility—some said the probability—of a Soviet counter-move elsewhere. The Soviets might have tightened the noose around Berlin; they might have intervened on behalf of the Kurdish rebels in Iraq. In neither of these settings, military analysts noted, could the US have brought enough conventional power to bear sufficiently fast to halt the Soviets. If it chose to defend these areas, the US would probably have had to use nuclear weapons—either tactically against Soviet ground forces and air cover, or strategically against missile and bomber bases in the USSR itself. The US would have hoped for an equally "limited" Soviet reply—a nuclear attack on US forces in Iraq or Berlin, or else against SAC, but not against US cities.

That would have been the hope; but many strategists were afraid the hope would not be fulfilled. They feared that neither the Soviet arsenal nor the Soviet brass was sufficiently flexible to make a "limited" reply. Any nuclear attack, they said, especially against targets in the USSR, whether bases or cities, might have impelled Kremlin leaders to use 10, 20 and 50 megaton bombs against US cities.

HOW LIMITED A RESPONSE?

When Khrushchev caught the US flying U-2's over Russia, he threatened to use nuclear rockets to destroy the bases from which they flew and the nations which provided the bases. And yet if Khrushchev had killed millions of people in reprisal, arguing that he was merely "defending" the Soviet Union, it is unlikely that history would have vindicated him.

US threats of massive or limited nuclear retaliation fall in somewhat the same category as Khrushchev's threats against U-2 bases. If the Soviets were to attack Turkey and the US were to respond by triggering nuclear war, destroying not only the US and USSR but Turkey in the process, the judgment of history would not be kind to the US. In this instance, to escalate from conventional to nuclear war is like hanging a man for stealing a horse. The threat of hanging may or may not be an effective "deterrent," but the act of hanging for such an offense is an outrage. The strategy of a peace-loving nation would be to keep the level of violence as low, not as high, as possible; to meet soldiers with soldiers, tanks with tanks.

The New Republic is not here advocating a policy of unilateral nuclear disarmament. If, for example, the Soviet Union were to hit us with nuclear missiles, the very least the President could do to defend surviving Americans would be to destroy Soviet missile and bomber bases so they could not hit us a second time. But to build a second strike arsenal for this purpose, and to pledge to use it only in this way, is very different from building, a first strike potential designed to answer not only nuclear but conventional aggression.

Suppose our country were to adopt such a "second strike only" nuclear policy. Would this, as Administration officials argue, invite Soviet or Chinese aggression in areas near their borders where they enjoy conventional superiority? Would we then have to write off Berlin, Turkey, Iran and so forth as "indefensible"? Fortunately, this would not be necessary.

The answer is to mobilize enough additional army divisions, with enough mobility, fire power and air support, to meet our obligations without resort to nuclear weapons. This is not impossible, whether the challenger be Russian or Chinese. America has substantial advantages over the Soviet Union and will for some years to come. Although our population is 10 percent smaller, we have a surplus of young unemployed workers; the USSR has a shortage. We need far fewer men on our farms than the Russians do. We have surplus industrial capacity which can be used to build the best equipped and most mobile army in the world; the Soviet Union has a shortage of industrial capacity. By making our Selective Service System somewhat less selective we could match the Soviet army man for man. Our NATO allies have three times the population and five or six times the economic resources of the Soviets' Warsaw Pact allies. In the Orient, while America's allies are neither as numerous nor as militant as the Chinese, there are severe limits on China's ability to transport and supply its troops beyond its own border. These limitations, coupled with American technological superiority, make it possible for the US to defeat the Chinese in a conventional war in Asia, or at least fight them to a standstill as we did in Korea.

But none of these things can be done unless America makes up its mind to do them. The President must have a firm determination to increase US conventional forces, so that they, combined with those of our allies, can match Communist conventional forces on any likely battlefield. He must explain to the American people that this is an important step in reducing the risk of nuclear war, and he must resign himself to bitter criticism from Air Force generals, aircraft and missile manufacturers, and mothers who would rather see their sons employed as engineers in Santa Monica than as GI's in Fort Dix or Korea. So far, the President does not appear to have made such a decision.

John F. Kennedy came into office with a conviction that the Pentagon needed more of everything—more guerrillas, more soldiers, more mobility, more firepower, more missiles, more imagination. He raised everybody's budget. He did not announce at the outset any revisions in strategy, except to adopt somewhat tentatively the thesis that limited nuclear war could include attacks on Soviet strategic forces, such as ICBM's and long-range bombers, as well as attacks on Soviet battlefield forces.

THE CRUCIAL CHOICE

The President has not, so far as it can be determined, insisted to our allies in NATO or elsewhere that we must be able to meet conventional aggression with a conventional response. Only last week General Lauris Norstad, retiring commander of NATO, reiterated that if there is the slightest doubt about US readiness to resort to limited nuclear war when faced with a nonnuclear assault, "we have lost a great part of the deterrent effect."

Instead, he has told them, repeatedly, that the reason they should increase their conventional capabilities, as the US was increasing its own, was to assure a "pause" between a Soviet attack and our employment of nuclear weapons. During this "pause," the Administration argues, the Soviets might have second thoughts and pull back. The Europeans—and many Americans—are skeptical. So long as the Europeans believe that the US is ready and willing to "defend" Europe against the Red Army by nuclear means, they cannot be expected to order unpopular increases in their conventional forces—not when the purpose is merely to postpone nuclear destruction for a few days or weeks after war begins. If, on the other hand, US use of nuclear weapons were made contingent on their being employed first by the Communists, Europeans would have a much greater incentive to boost their conventional strength.

If the United States and its allies do not choose to mobilize sufficient conventional forces to meet their defense obligations around the world, then very serious thought should be given to reducing some of these obligations. If Berlin cannot be defended from conventional attack without resort to nuclear war, then one must ask whether it was wise to make the defense of that city, imbedded in Communist territory, the test of the West's willingness to fight. No great power can go to the brink every other month saying, in effect, "Don't push your advantage too hard, or we may blow up the world." The threat may work once, twice, three times. Repeated often enough, the threat is likely to be tested. To avoid this, the West must strengthen its conventional forces, and pledge itself not to use nuclear weapons first.

Overage at 35?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1967

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the fact that Robert I. Queen, of 144–45 35th Avenue, Flushing, Queens County, N.Y., has been nominated for the 1966 Lane Bryant Community Service Award.

I bring this to the attention of this House because many of my colleagues will remember Mr. Queen as a staff assistant to former Representative Alfred E. Santangelo, of New York, from 1960 through 1963.

This nomination is worthy of particular note because it cites Mr. Queen for his great work as a volunteer placement coordinator, in helping to find jobs for newspapermen displaced by recent newspaper closings in New York City.

In this capacity, he served as a liaison agent for the New York Newspaper Guild, the New York Reporters Association, and the Overseas Press Club.

Another citation mentioned in connection with the nomination is the fact that Mr. Queen helped capture two armed bandits who had just held up a jewelry store, and on another occasion, he disarmed a knife-wielding thug who had stolen a handbag from a woman at a subway station.

This good citizen of my home county has also waged a long crusade against age discrimination in employment—a problem which I consider of such importance that I have introduced legislation to outlaw such discrimination.

Along the lines of this effort, Mr. Queen recently wrote a bright and forceful article in a publication of the Newspaper Guild of New York. I bring this article to the attention of my many fellow Members who have indicated their deep concern over the gravity of such discrimination:

HOW TO BE OVERAGE AT OVER 35

(By Robert I. Queen)

"Things are seldom what they seem—
Skim milk masquerades as cream!"

These words from H.M.S. Pinafore, by Gilbert & Sullivan, capsule a devastating truth that must occur to any man, particularly one past 35, who finds himself looking for a job.

It starts early, almost immediately after the job hunt begins. You find your old resume and begin to bring it up to date. It seems to present the picture of a vigorous, responsible, well-qualified man who should be able to fit well into a number of higher echelon positions. But just to be sure, you discuss them with a few friends whose judgment you respect and who may be able to put you in touch with persons who may have a few choice vacancies.

At the end of a week, you find that they "would be happy to have a few copies of your resume to pass along" but they feel that you could profitably make a few changes in it.

"The resume is too long," "it's too short," "it's too specific," "not specific enough," "you must never mention your age," "you should only give your date of birth," "a graduate degree is the kiss of death," "list every course you've ever taken."

While your friends fight the battle of the resume, you do the rounds of the agencies, all of which are advertising the perfect job for you; a job that seems, in fact, never to exist outside the Help Wanted pages of The New York Times. Meanwhile, they have an excellent opening in New Delhi, if you're willing to relocate and have a fluent knowledge of Sanskrit.

You are also, of course, writing letters of application and sending out your current temporary resume to all and every opening advertised in the newspapers and such appropriate magazines as Editor & Publisher, Printers Ink and Advertising Age.

A satisfying number of responses arrive and your days begin to fill up with interviews, usually an hour apart at opposite ends of town. These interviews are never decisively positive, only decisively negative.

You soon find that what you considered your strong points are going to be held against you. Twenty years' experience is just what they need, only "unfortunately our pension plan makes it impossible for us to hire anyone over 35." You could do the job with one hand tied, which means you're overqualified and they won't insult you by offering it to you. You are "a gentleman and a scholar" but, a City College degree doesn't fit in with the corporate image. What a shame your father didn't send you to Harvard!

Should your interviewer decide to overlook your gray hair, your ability and even an Honor Fraternity, you then begin to run the gauntlet from personnel officer to vice-president, from psychologist to psychiatrist, from ink blot to personality inventory. At At the end of three months, they're tired of the whole thing and hire the president's nephew who just dropped out of college.

Meanwhile, your file fills up with letters expressing the writers' regret at not having a position for a man of your "unparalleled ability and experience" and assuring you that "your letter and resume will be kept in the active file should a position develop."

One such letter is from a "Mr. X," to whom you are introduced by a friend and who almost weeps when he hears that you are available. He had the perfect position for you but he filled it yesterday! If only you had sent him a resume for his file!

Apparently no man over 35 is supposed to be able to take instruction by reading or by any other means. You must find your economic niche in life early and spend the rest of your life carefully guarding it, or a similar neighboring niche, and never mind what lies over the economic horizon. Should your niche somehow be destroyed, you can easily find yourself economically homeless.

Take a man of 50 who has a family, owns his home and has roots in a community. He has spent all or most of his working life in the newspaper field and this field has been getting smaller and smaller in the past 30 years. Suddenly his job is gone and he is faced with the choice of destroying the roots of a lifetime in order to take another job in another community or finding another kind of employment.

Suppose he moves to another town, another paper, can he be sure that another merger, another bankruptcy might not move him on again and again? If he should decide to stay, can he start again as a beginner?

He may be willing, but no one else seems to think it possible. Over and over he will hear the words, "Yes, we have a job, but it's for a beginner, a younger man. You wouldn't be intrested in this position with your experience." But this "experience" doesn't count for any job, it seems—it's always the "wrong kind" of experience.

What the potential employer really means is that the applicant is "too old" although age is a word that is not mentioned. Instead, it is covered with euphemisms like "experience," "background," "training,"—a whole lexicon of words to cover the obvious but unmentionable one, a-e!

What is happening to the ex-New York Daily Mirror and Journal-American, World-Telly and Trib personnel is happening to many others in our city and our country. It is happening to elevator operators and coal miners, billing clerks and executives. Given a choice, industry seems to prefer narrow experience to broad experience, youthful inexperience to mature varied experience.

Why?

What does a man out of work do between age 35 and when he can start picking up his social security?

WETB in Johnson City, Tenn., Supports the Bill To Prohibit the Descration of Our Flag

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 5, 1967

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, WETB radio station in Johnson City, Tenn., recently broadcasted an editorial expressing its support of my bill to prohibit the desecration of the flag.

I am grateful for this expression of support, and in inserting this editorial in the RECORD, I urge that we proceed promptly to enact this legislation into law this week.

Representive James H. Quillen and several of his colleagues are pressing for Congressional action on a bill that would make desecration of the flag a federal offense. If the legislation passes, a prison sentence of up to a year and a fine of up to $1,000 could be imposed upon anyone who defiles the flag. *For the life of us,* we cannot see why there should be any hesitation in passing this bill, yet it was bottled up in committee during the last session of Congress. With beatniks and Vietniks burning, spitting upon, and otherwise showing contempt for the flag and what it represents; must patriotic Americans stand by with no recourse? We agree with Congressman Quillen that action is long overdue to protest the flag—and punish those who misuse it. Our only regret is that such legislation is necessary. It is deplorable that there should exist Americans who would spit upon and burn the banner which symbolizes their own rights and protection as citizens.

President Thomas J. Murray Outlines Legislative Goals of Illinois Conference of Building Trade Unions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1967

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Illinois delegation in Congress was privileged today to meet with more than 300 delegates from the Illinois Conference of Building Trade Unions who are in Washington to attend the 12th National Legislative Conference of the Building and Construction Trades Department, AFL–CIO.

Highlight of the meeting was an address by the very distinguished Thomas J. Murray, president of the Illinois Conference of Building Trade Unions, who outlined the legislative goals of the building trades for 1967.

Mr. Murray's eloquent remarks spelled out a progressive program to keep America moving forward and keep the ranks of organized labor effective so they can play their key role in the growth of our Nation.

His stern warning about the consequences of compulsory arbitration, coming on the eve when Congress will debate the railway strike, are particularly significant. I hope my colleagues will read Mr. Murray's remarks before anyone is tempted to foist any compulsory arbitration on the people of this Nation.

The legislative program outlined by Mr. Murray represents the highest ideals of the building trades for a better America.

I am privileged to place these remarks in the RECORD today.

It was especially pleasant for me to see so many members from the Chicago and Cook County Building Trades Council here in Washington, and, in particular, joining with Mr. Murray, who is also president of the council, Mr. Thomas J. Nayder, secretary-treasurer of the Chicago and Cook County council. Mr. Murray and Mr. Nayder bring the highest ideals of the American labor movement to Chicago and we are all grateful for their leadership.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Murray's inspiring remarks follow:

REMARKS OF THOMAS J. MURRAY, PRESIDENT, ILLINOIS CONFERENCE OF BUILDING TRADES UNIONS, DELIVERED AT THE WASHINGTON HILTON HOTEL

This is the Legislative Program of the Building and Construction Trades Department, AFL–CIO, for 1967:

1. First and foremost on our Legislative Program is the On-Site Picketing bill (H.R. 100) which is designed to restore to Building Trades workers the right to picket peacefully at construction sites without being held in violation of the secondary boycott provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act. The typical job in the building and construction industry is not carried forward by a single employer with different departments for different types of work. These are numerous contractors on the single job site performing the different types of work required to complete the building or project. Consequently, if the electricians' union pickets a building job site because of a dispute with the electrical contractor and the carpenters employed by another contractor concertedly refuse to cross the picket line, it has been held, in the *Denver Building Trades* case, that the Taft-Hartley Act is violated because the picketing is said to have as an object the inducement of the contractors on the job site to cease doing business with each other. Yet the employees in the electrical department of a factory can picket the factory site, even though the carpenters employed in another department concertedly refuse to cross the picket line. Picketing at a construction job site does not constitute a true secondary boycott. President Eisenhower first recommended the reversal of the *Denver Building Trades* rule in his Message of January 11, 1954. The President stated:

"The true secondary boycott is indefensible and must not be permitted. The Act must not, however, prohibit legitimate concerted activities against other than innocent parties. I recommend that the Act be clarified by making it explicit that concerted action against . . . an employer on a construction project who, together with other employers, is engaged in work on the site of the project, will not be treated as a secondary boycott."

Since that time two other Presidents have endorsed our On-Site Picketing bill and there have been numerous hearings before Senate and House Labor Committees on this subject. The representatives of the three million building tradesmen in the United States have come to Washington each year to petition the Congress for relief. Our case has been proved—convincingly and beyond all doubt—and we believe that it is a matter of simple justice that H.R. 100 should be enacted as soon as possible. The bill was favorably reported by the House Education and Labor Committee on May 4, 1967, and it is now pending before the House Rules Committee. We ask for the support of every Congressman from Illinois behind our On-Site Picketing proposal.

2. We are also seeking a further amendment to the Taft-Hartley Act which would assure the legality of joint labor-management trade promotion funds. Recent court decisions have ruled that employer contributions to product promotion programs administered jointly by trustees representing labor and management are outside of the scope of the exceptions to the Taft-Hartley Act. Product promotion programs are not unlawful. Collective bargaining on the subject of product promotion programs is not unlawful. But joint labor-management administration of such programs is unlawful because the courts have held that this is a restricted payment to employee representatives prohibited by Taft-Hartley. The bills which we endorse have been introduced by Congressman Roman Pucinski and they would add two more specific exceptions to the law:

a. Jointly administered product promotion programs, and

b. Jointly administered committees for the interpretation of collective bargaining agreements.

Hearings on these bills are to be scheduled by the Thompson Special Subcommittee on

Labor after the Situs Picketing bill is taken up by the House.

3. Our next legislative proposal would amend the Davis-Bacon Act to require compliance with the Davis-Bacon Prevailing Wage provisions in construction projects under lease-option agreements by the Post Office Department and other government agencies. The need for legislation in this field arises from a change in the Federal Government's method of obtaining new buildings for its use. Rather than build these structures themselves, the various governmental Departments now enter into lease and lease-purchase agreements with private contractors. While the Post Office Department, like most Government agencies, recognized that the Davis-Bacon Act applied when it constructed its own buildings, it has taken the position that the Act does not apply under such leasing arrangements.

The legislation which we are supporting would make it celar that the prevailing wage provisions of the Davis-Bacon Act would apply to all types of lease agreements entered into by the Federal Government.

4. The Building Trades Legislative Conference is also behind the Construction Safety bill introduced by Congressman James O'Hara of Michigan. The purpose of this bill (H.R. 2567) is to provide for the safety and health of all workers in the building and construction industry working on all Federal and Federally-financed or assisted construction projects. Except for mining, the construction industry has the highest and most serious injury rate of any major industry in the country, and statistics show that since 1945 this rate has been climbing. In 1965 alone, construction workers lost 22½ million work days due to injuries. We urge that you support this Construction Safety bill because it is clear from all of the facts that Federal Safety and Health Regulations in the Federally sponsored construction projects is vitally needed.

5. The last item among our major legislative proposals is H.R. 5710, the Administration proposals for increased benefits under the Social Security Act, introduced by Chairman Wilbur Mills of the House Ways and Means Committee. We are proud that our own Dan Rostenkowski is on this powerful Ways and Means Committee. The administration proposals for amending the Social Security law call for a 20 per cent over-all increase in the total amount of Social Security payments; an increase of 59 per cent for the 2½ million people now receiving minimum benefits; and a minimum increase of 15 per cent for the remaining 20½ million beneficiaries. We believe that the Social Security law needs improvement and we urge that you support the Administration proposals embodied in H.R. 5710.

These then are the major planks in our legislative platform. But together with all other labor people there are other legislative proposals which we endorse:

We are opposed to the cutback ordered in the Federal-aid highway construction program. We believe that this cutback in the expenditure of Highway funds should be rescinded with all possible dispatch.

We support the legislation which has been introduced to amend the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act so as to strengthen and improve protection for the interests of participants in and beneficiaries of employee welfare and pension benefit plans.

We endorsed the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1967, but we believe that the amendments adopted by the House prior to final passage seriously weakened the measure and impaired the effectiveness of the existing law.

We support whole-heartedly the Vocational Education Act Amendments of 1967, introduced by our own Roman Pucinski. This bill provides for area vocational training schools and an increase in authorized funds from $225 to $400 million.

We also endorse the Higher, Education Amendments of 1967 introduced by Representative Carl Perkins, Chairman of the House Education and Labor Committee.

The 12th National Legislative Conference of the Building and Construction Trades Department also supports various Health measures—amendments to the Clean Air Act, amendments to the Public Health Service Act to provide for the establishment of a National Eye Institute of Health, and other bills providing for the establishment of Health Facilities.

We urge that each of you study our 1967 Legislative Program and read carefully the material relating to Housing and Urban Development, Merchant Marine, Taxes, Appalachia, Equal Employment Opportunity, Truth-In-Lending, and Immigration.

We are, of course, opposed to any anti-labor bills, and there are many which have been introduced. As you know, the Building and Construction Trades Department strongly opposes any form of compulsory arbitration. We are convinced that the only thing now standing in the way of an early negotiated settlement of the current labor dispute involving the railroads and the unions representing their shop-craft employees is the belief by railroad management that compulsory arbitration legislation will be enacted to relieve them of their obligation to bargain collectively in good faith. We stand four square behind fiscal seizure—the impounding of their funds—as the only way to get the railroads to engage in real collective bargaining.

Briefly, this is our 1967 program. We know that each of you will give serious consideration to our proposals—because our legislative platform is designed to benefit all workers—all Americans—not just Building Tradesmen. We are grateful for your attendance and your attention.

Views of Thomas J. Mackell, District Attorney of Queens County on Proposed Merger of Criminal and Civil Courts in the City of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1967

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD I would like to include at this point the views of the Honorable Thomas J. Mackell, district attorney of Queens County, N.Y., voiced before the committee on judiciary at the 1967 State Constitutional Convention in Albany, N.Y., on June 6.

I believe this is a matter which would be of some interest to my colleagues.

District Attorney Mackell's statement follows:

VIEWS OF THOMAS J. MACKELL, DISTRICT ATTORNEY OF QUEENS COUNTY ON PROPOSED MERGER OF CRIMINAL AND CIVIL COURTS IN THE CITY OF NEW YORK

The job of settling disputes of the smaller magnitude in the City of New York is entrusted to two different Court Systems with inferior jurisdiction—Civil and Criminal. Although distinct in name and personnel, there are numerous similarities in judicial personnel: each Judge operates under the identical supervision of the Appellate Divisions, First and Second Departments; each Judge must have the identical qualifications of age (under 70) and experience at the bar (10 years); each serves ten year terms; and each receive identical annual compensation ($25,000).

Judges of either Court may be assigned by the Appellate Division concerned to the other Court.

To these similarities too must be added the circumstance that each Court is the product of a consolidation of other Courts within the past five years: the Civil Court, resulting from mergers of the City Court and the Municipal Court, and the Criminal Court from the consolidation of the old City Magistrates' Court with the Court of Special Sessions.

There, however, similarities abruptly end, and significant differences emerge. Briefly these differences are threfold and ought to be discussed briefly:

1) *Jurisdiction*. The Civil Court is concerned with totally different substantive law from that involved in the Criminal Court. The Civil Court is involved with an injury sustained in an accident where the damages are less than $10,000 (tort), a collision between vessels (admiralty), a landlord-tenant dispute; a tresspass to real property; or the failure of a debtor to meet his obligations. With such matters 95 Judges must make dispositions. From July 1, 1965 through June 30, 1966, there were more than 680,000 new actions and summary proceedings added to the Calendar. In addition, there were more than 63,000 added small claims and about 100,000 motions.

On the other hand, the Criminal Court is concerned with none of these fields of substantive law. The Penal Law presently in force and effect provides the only substantive law. Beginning September 1, 1967, Judges on the Criminal Court must master a brand new Penal Law, so that for some time after September 1st the Criminal Court will be applying two separate sets of laws—one governing conduct engaged in prior to September 1st, and the other conduct since September 1st.

Even the most enlightened law school graduate, with ten years' experience at the bar, and less than 70 years of age, might find the assumption of the additional obligation of mastery of practically all other fields of substantive law on the civil side a Herculean task.

Against this dissimilarity of subject matter, the only argument advanced is that Judges might prefer variety in their diet of cases and controversies. Such a variety presently exists in the Supreme Court. But that Court has 171 Justices in New York City compared to 95 in the Civil Court and has added only 58,000 cases to its calendars, compared with more than 680,000 in the Civil Court.

2) *Procedure*. Eight volumes containing numbered sections running to section 10,005 constitute a new Civil Practice Law and Rules adopted in September 1963. These—together with an additional statute, the New York City Civil Court Act, and Rules—govern procedure in the Civil Court.

Totally different statutes and rules govern the Criminal Court. Indeed, the present Code of Criminal Procedure supplemented by the New York City Criminal Court Act and Rules, will shortly be supplemented and replaced by a new Criminal Procedure Law.

Certainly, there is as little similarity in procedure in the two tribunals as there is similarity of substantive law. The quantum of proof required for a litigant to prevail in the Civil Court is merely a preponderance of evidence; in the Criminal Court, it is proof beyond a reasonable doubt. In the Civil Court, Juries are frequently employed necessitating a certain proficiency in applying exclusionary rules of evidence as well as ability to communicate in the form of instructions, and otherwise, with laymen who try the facts. In the Criminal Court, there are no juries and presumably no such requisite expertise.

3) *Method of Selection of Judges*. Criminal Court Judges are appointed by the Mayor; Civil Court Judges elected within certain districts. Neither System is ideal.

Take the Appointive System. One hundred men—quick and dead—have served on our highest Court in the 177 years of this nation's history. All were appointed by nearly all of this nation's 35 Presidents. Yet only a half-dozen Presidents have seen fit to name members of opposite political faith to our highest Court—the last, by Mr. Truman, twenty years ago.

The average of political qualification for members of the Supreme Court—94 percent—has been equalled by appointments to lower federal tribunals. Republican Presidents since McKinley have maintained the 94 percent average in selecting Republican lawyers as Federal Judges. President Wilson could find only one qualified Republican and 71 qualified Democrats for the Federal Judiciary during his eight years in office, and Presidents Roosevelt and Cleveland—in twenty years in the White House—could find not even one Republican lawyer worth designation to any Federal tribunal.

On the other hand, an elective system that restricts selection of candidates to particular districts and wards—leaves much to be desired. This is the regrettable system now in vogue for Civil Judges.

Obviously, the optimum method must combine both the opportunity of the electorate to participate in the selection or retention of judges, with the assurance of *qualified* judges.

The big question is "Who is *Qualified"?*

I think there are three requirements for a good trial judge: (1) Honesty; (2) Skill; and (3) Judicial Temperament.

1) *Honesty*. The trial judge must be an unusually honest man, a man of exceptional integrity financially, politically, and socially. This is usually put first in discussions of qualifications for judicial office, and rightly so. But honesty is hardly a sufficient qualification or even one unique to the judicial branch of public service. It has been taken for granted throughout our analysis of the trial judge's role that a judge who is susceptible to bribery in any form, or who favors his relatives, cronies, or political sponsors either in the conduct of litigation or in the award of lucrative commissions like guardianships, is unworthy of his post and, for that matter, unworthy of membership in the legal profession. The ugliest words in the administration of justice are "the fix is in" or any remote equivalent.

The stress on personal honesty in most discussions of judicial qualifications seems quite unflattering to the legal profession, and one searches for an explanation of the prominence of the theme. Certainly a list of qualifications for appointment as a superintendent of schools or director of a scientific laboratory would not put comparable emphasis on elementary probity as a sine qua non. There are several possible explanations. Insistence on personal integrity as an indispensable qualification, almost as *the* indispensable qualification, for judicial office reflects an apprehensive awareness in the legal profession of the immensity of the damage that can be done to the legal order by judicial corruption. If a physician or a professor or a businessman is discovered to be a thief or an influence peddler, the disclosure will not put medicine, higher education, or business into general disrepute. But judges are different and more representative; revelations of judicial corruption create suspicion and loss of confidence in legal processes generally and endanger public respect for law.

2) *Skill*. Only a good lawyer, a genuinely good one, is qualified for service on a trial court. Civic groups and bar associations have been far too generous, by and large, in their ratings of judicial candidates. Bar associations and other civic groups undertake from time to time to determine whether particular candidates for appointment to the bench are or are not "qualified"—variously, "well qualified" or "exceptionally well qualified"—for judicial office. No person or organization has yet "qualified" or even made an all-inclusive checklist of the attributes to be kept in mind in appraising the qualifications of a lawyer who aspires to join the company of the judiciary. "Qualified" has come to be used much as teachers use the C grade, as are characterized as "well qualified" and the A men as "exceptionally well qualified." If such in-group appraisals of judicial candidates are to have political value and influence, "qualified" must have the signification of professional excellence, a degree of intellect and technical proficiency equal to that possessed by the best members of the practicing bar. A man who is pretty good but not good enough is not "qualified" for appointment or election to the trial bench.

3) *Judicial Temperament*. In any sizeable community there will be many lawyers of complete financial probity and genuinely first rate professional skill and acumen. The demands and strains of his courtroom task require unusual emotional stability, exceptional firmness and serenity of temperament, and not infrequently great intellectual and psychic endurance. In his relations with jurymen, witnesses, and litigants, the trial judge has to be empathetic and endlessly patient. As a sentencing official, his action must be compassionate without being mushyheaded, and his demeanor must be at once sensitive and austere. These are not attributes that can be measured on a quantitative scale or in any precisely objective way. But they are essential to performance of the role in accordance with the best traditions of common law adjudication.

I would favor an adaptation of the familiar Missouri Plan—now used in a half-dozen states—but I should insist upon each and every Judge facing up to the electorate on the basis of his record a year or so after his designation.

With respect to the merger of Criminal and Civil Courts—no matter how interchangeable the Judges of each with the other may be—I can find no prospect that such consolidation would improve (a) the quality of either civil or criminal justice; (b) the speed of its administration, or (c) its cost. *I think that so far from providing judges with greater variety of diet in cases, it would present the community with a crazy cocktail.*

Veterans Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1967

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the continuing concern of this Nation for the welfare of its veterans is a laudable pursuit. We have gone through many stages of caring for our veterans, for assuring them that the sacrifices they have made in the defense of freedom will not be forgotten.

It was with great pleasure that I noticed the new concern evidenced in the message to Congress on January 31 from President Johnson. I feel the urgency that this message created has helped to expedite our actions in providing new and extended benefits to the fine young men who today are fighting in Vietnam in order to squelch the spread of communism to countries whose governments are opposed to this subjugation.

But, it is not enough that we merely extend old laws which have been in existence for many years. Many of the veterans programs have no doubt outlived their original intent, and there are new ideas which should be incorporated in the laws in order that the needs of our veterans in a changing society and changing economy may be met.

The President, in his message, asked that a complete reevaluation of the entire veterans benefits program be made. To implement this directive, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs named a special commission to travel throughout the Nation, meeting with interested groups and individuals, ascertaining what changes should be recommended.

This commission went to work immediately, and has already visited several different parts of the Nation to compile their findings. Boston was selected as one of the cities for these commission hearings, and veterans, citizens, and organized groups met with them on May 27.

Just as the news media of this Nation met the Presidential message on January 31 with much applause, these meetings are also receiving the editorial support and news coverage of the areas in which these meetings are held.

Typical of the response from the news media that is being awarded to these important meetings is an editorial which appeared in the Boston Traveler, of Thursday, May 21, 1967. I placed this fine editorial in one of Massachusetts' outstanding daily newspapers in the RECORD:

A PRESENT OBLIGATION

In his Jan. 24 Budget Message, President Johnson made a special point of the fact that, "This nation continues to recognize a particular obligation to those who have served in the Armed Forces." One week later, in a special message on Veterans Benefits, he stressed the need for new legislation "to fulfill our obligations to those who have borne the cost of conflict in the cause of liberty."

It is in line with this directive from the White House that Boston will be host city on Saturday and Sunday when the Veterans Advisory Commission conducts hearings at the Sheraton-Boston Hotel. The commission, appointed by VA Administrator William J. Driver, will offer to the public the experience and thinking of men who have held high national office in major veterans organizations and who will be ready to hear the proposals and testimony of group spokesmen from all over New England.

Boston is one of eight cities selected to gather opinions on present veterans' programs and future needs. When all the recommendations are in, Driver and his colleagues will sift them down and present the results to President Johnson next January for legislative requests.

There is no question that many changes are overdue, especially in the fields of medical care, insurance, labor and educational benefits. Old legislation needs updating to conform with the changing times. New legislation needs to be devised to meet our new standards of living.

But the obligation expressed by the Administration also bespeaks an obligation on the part of potential beneficiary groups—the obligation to make known their needs, attitudes, criticisms and suggestions.

The visit by Driver's commission will provide an opportunity for all to be heard. It should be used to the full.

Courage in a Time of Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. G. ELLIOTT HAGAN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1967

Mr. HAGAN. Mr. Speaker, an appallingly large number of our citizens are not appreciative of our American heritage. Two inspiring examples of the true realization were well expressed in a recent editorial in the Sylvania Telephone, a weekly newspaper of my hometown of Sylvania, Ga., as follows:

COURAGE IN A TIME OF CRISIS

In our days, one international crisis follows another. Before we have fully come to accept the fact of war in Southeast Asia, another war, potentially even more dangerous, breaks out in the Middle East.

Interspersed in our newspapers with these dramatic events is another kind of news: stories about Americans who burn their draft cards, demonstrate against the war effort, even desecrate the flag of the nation.

We do not share the concern of some people who put too much emphasis on the actions of the strange minority, and say that American character is weakening. In all wars, a few people have sought for one reason or another to shirk their patriotic responsibilities. But in all wars, the American people have responded with the courage and the determination to do what had to be done.

A crackpot who burns his draft card can get bigger headlines and more attention from the television cameras than a Charles Kelly or a Ray Nesmith who sacrifices his life for his country. But this only proves that the crackpots are scarce and the patriots plentiful in American society.

As the threat of involvement in a second war hangs over us, we are happy to publish here two selections brought in by readers who would like to see re-newed emphasis placed on American patriotism.

I DIDN'T WANT TO DIE

Millard Howard brought us a clipping of a letter written by an American soldier who was killed in Vietnam. "How many of us feel this way," Millard wonders. The letter was written by Pfc. Hiram D. Strickland, of Graham, N.C., to his parents and was found in his belongings after he died.

DEAR FOLKS, I'm writing this letter as my last one. You've probably already received word that I'm dead and that the government wishes to express its deepest regret.

Believe me, I didn't want to die, but I know it was part of my job. I want my country to live for billions and billions of years to come.

I want it to stand as a light to all people oppressed and guide them to the same freedom we know. If we can stand and fight for freedom, then I think we have done the job God set down for us. It's up to every American to fight for the freedom we hold so dear. If we don't the smells of free air could become dark and damp as in a prison cell.

We won't be able to look at ourselves in a mirror, much less at our sons and daughters, because we know we have failed our God, our country, and our future generations.

I can hold my head high because I fought, whether it be in heaven or hell. Besides, the saying goes, "One more GI from Vietnam, St. Peter, I've served my time in hell."

I fought for Sandy, Nell, Gale, Mom and Dad. But when the twins and Sandy's kids get old enough, they'll probably have to fight, too. Tell them to go proudly and without fear of death because it is worth keeping the land free.

I remember a story from Mr. Williams' English classes, when I was a freshman, that said, "The cowards die a thousand times, the brave die but once."

Don't mourn me, mother, for I'm happy I died fighting my country's enemies, and I will live forever in people's minds. I've done what I've always dreamed of. Don't mourn me, for I died a soldier of the United States of America.

God bless you all and take care. I'll be seeing you in heaven.

Your loving son and brother,

BUTCH.

"I AM YOUR FLAG"

The other contribution is a poem brought in by Mrs. Lloyd Pierce, flag chairman of the Brier Creek Chapter, DAR. Written by Dr. Poling in 1943, the poem is particularly appropriate this week because next Wednesday, June 14, is Flag Day.

"Hear me, Americans, Americans all,
I am your flag.
I am old;
I was old when the ice age shaped granite of New England;
I was old when waters forsook the middle continent;
I was old when the Creator conceived the Grand Canyon.
I am old;
I was waiting for you when you came.

"Hear me, Americans, Americans all,
I am your flag.
I am young:
I am younger than waters of your man-made inland seas;
I am younger than your highways and airways of travel;
I am younger than radio's shoreless ocean of song.
I am young.

"Hear me, Americans, Americans all,
I am your flag.
I am you.
I am mortal only in you; I can fail only from you;
Forever mine in your strength of differences, blended whole;
Forever divided you fall, but united you stand;
I am you,
Hear me, Americans, Americans all.
I am your flag!"

President Hails Operation Amigo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1967

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, misunderstandings between nations often are the result of misunderstandings between people. For the last 6 years the Miami Herald has sponsored a program designed to promote friendship and good will between the people of the United States and our Latin American neighbors.

The program, known as Operation Amigo, has been an unqualified success. Since its inception, approximately 5,000 young Latin American students have come to this country, met American families, and have gotten a taste of what the American way of life is all about.

Recently, President Johnson gave recognition to the outstanding job being done by Operation Amigo, and this is recounted in the following article by Mr. Robert H. Feldkamp of Knight Newspapers' Washington Bureau, which I call to the attention of my colleagues:

JOHNSON HAILS OPERATION AMIGO, SETS EXAMPLE WITH CHILEAN GUESTS

(By Robert H. Feldkamp)

WASHINGTON—"Operation Amigo" was of more concern to President Johnson for a time Friday than Defense Secretary McNamara.

The nation's defense chief sat quietly in the cabinet room at the White House, fidgeting with papers, waiting for his boss.

And where was Mr. Johnson? Strolling through the Rose Garden and chatting amiably about Operation Amigo with 22-year-old Jorge Frei, son of President Eduardo Frei of Chile, Chilean Ambassador to the U.S. Radomiro Tomic, and Miamian Stuart Morrison, director of the student program in hemispheric understanding.

While McNamara waited, the President—obviously in no hurry—welcomed young Jorge on his first visit to Washington. And Johnson told the youth: "Operation Amigo is one of the finest programs in the Western Hemisphere today."

Ambassador Tomic interpreted the President's remarks to Jorge who, when he heard them, broke into a grin.

Operation Amigo, begun by The Miami Herald and still given its major impetus by Knight Newspapers, along with other leading newspapers and corporations, was responsible for Jorge's visit here.

He is among a group of students from Chile winding up two weeks in this country as part of a program to see first-hand what the U.S. is all about.

As they shook hands in the President's office, Johnson told Jorge: "I met your father in Punta del Este a few weeks ago. He's a fine man."

Jorge again beamed and so did Ambassador Tomic when he heard the remarks about his boss.

Since it was begun Operation Amigo has been responsible for sending about 5,000 Latin American students like Jorge to this country for similar visits.

The program was largely the brainchild of Miami Herald Editor Don Shoemaker and Senior Managing Editor George Beebe in 1961. As they chatted one day with a Peruvian businessman, it became apparent that such a program was needed to negate communism's anti-America propaganda in Latin America.

What better way, they reasoned, than by showing tomorrow's leaders the truth about their North American neighbor. And as Operation Amigo became a reality, it was hailed by statesmen, newspapers, businessmen and host families as, as one put it, "an extraordinary new chapter in inter-American relations."

John S. Knight, editorial chairman and chairman of the executive committee of Knight Newspapers, has called Operation Amigo "a magic door to understanding."

Writing about the students who have taken part in the program not long ago, Knight observed: "What they have seen is truth. And in truth rests the harmony and hope of this hemisphere."

Those words were reflected by President Johnson Friday when he told his Chilean visitors: "Operation Amigo is an important contribution to understanding between our nation and our good friends and neighbors to the south."

While the President bade Jorge goodby, newsmen were ushered out another door.

As they passed the cabinet room, Secretary McNamara still sat there alone, twiddling his thumbs.

Active Community Organization Aids California Migrant Workers

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1967

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, I was very encouraged by recent evidence of how effective an organized campaign of community cooperation can be in helping to alleviate extreme human suffering.

The evidence is contained in the outstanding record of active citizen leadership, community participation, and cooperative effort to relieve an emergency food and housing shortage that developed this spring in Stockton, Calif., and affected some 500 migrant farm workers in that area.

To document this successful record of organized community activity, I would like to insert in the Congressional Record at this point two items, a short description of an emergency Federal food and housing loan program arranged through the assistance of the local Congressman, John J. McFall, and a very concise, and thought-provoking "Special Report" on the Stockton emergency situation published by the Farm Labor Committee of the Mexican-American Political Association.

The items follow:

Through the combined efforts of local groups and individuals, and the Federal Government, the plight of approximately 500 single male migrant farm workers in San Joaquin County who were without food or housing, was relieved this spring.

The migrants were unable to work in the fields due to heavy and continuous rain fall during recent months.

In addition to funds donated by the Catholic Bishop of Stockton, various Protestant churches and the Jewish community, the Federal Government granted $13,077 in the form of a loan to the local Community Action Council to purchase food and provide housing for the workers. Congressman McFall worked closely with the CAC and the Office of Economic Opportunity to insure receipt of the grant.

During the months ahead, a combined City, County and Federal effort will be made to provide adequate housing for the men. During a recent trip to his Congressional District, Congressman McFall met with local officials. Tentative plans were made to seek Farmers Home Administration grant/loan assistance. McFall will also attempt to obtain OEO funds to allow the men to undertake forestry work during the winter months which will provide the workers with stipends to support themselves during nonharvest periods.

EMERGENCY LOAN PROGRAM FOR MIGRANT FARM WORKERS

Grant made to: San Joaquin County Community Action Council, Stockton, California.

Amount of grant: $13,077.

Date of Award: April 28, 1967.

Purpose of Grant: to provide the cost of food and lodging for two months to migrant farm workers whose livelihood has been cut off due to extremely heavy and unusual rainfall.

Number of individuals to receive assistance: 500. Of this number, 350 will receive loans for food and lodging. Another 150 will receive assistance for food only.

How loan program will operate: Each migrant will receive a loan of $27.86 for the two month period. Migrants will start repaying loan on the day they start to work—$1.25 per day.

[Special report of the Farm Labor Committee, Mexican-American Political Association, May 12, 1967]

STOCKTON'S ANNUAL SPRING STARVING, 1967

Spring, the season of new life, is a time of lean rations for farm workers around Stockton. A time of waiting. Waiting for the rains to stop. Waiting for the fields to dry out. Hoping that Braceros—and Wetbacks—will not take their meager jobs. Some of the waiters and the hopers, people who live and work the Stockton area year 'round. Many are migrants. They have harvested the crops in California's warmer Valleys of Imperial and Coachella, and have come north. Or their luck has run out in Texas and Arkansas. They have been lured west to make a new start and have been steered toward Stockton for the spring action. To cut the asparagus. To prune the trees. But before the work, there is an indefinite and variable period of waiting and hoping. Many times the people run out of money before the work starts or before they run out of hope—or patience. When this happens, they move out of their flophouses into the weeds. Or if they have families, they check out of the camp and live in their cars along the river banks. Groups of families have been seen camped out—with the cars set up in a circle like wagon trains coming West 100 years ago.

This is spring in Stockton. Every spring in Stockton since man began injecting his rigid pattern of crops into the cycle of the rain and sun. Through the years the annual suffering by farm workers has been accepted as part of eternal rigor of moving from winter to summer. A couple of missions have supplied starving migrants one hot meal a day. Some surplus food has been available at the Welfare Department, otherwise, the community has paid no mind.

And so the rhythm of rain and starving in Stockton has continued, without fanfare. Until this year.

In 1967, Stockton was shaken with the revolutionary idea that rain and starving were not preordained as eternal brothers to be recognized and accepted without protest without sympathy, without action. Beginning in late March and through April into May, the annual Stockton Starving was the main item at several meetings of the City Council, the Board of Supervisors. Its temporary solution involved a number of local, State, even federal officials and agencies. The local daily newspaper, *The Stockton Record*, carried many articles and pictures on the starving problem plus various attempts to alleviate this perennial condition.

The Board of Supervisors granted public funds and property to feed and house farm workers. Local churches came up with $3,000; the Federal Office of Economic Opportunity granted $13,000 for rent, food and other expenses at a farm labor camp to meet the problem.

How did the annual Stockton Starving, ignored in years past, become a community issue in 1967? The answer to that question is the subject of this report. All the implications of the answer to that question should be carefully analyzed by all of us working in community affairs, because there are many other areas suffering from chronic and neglected problems as terrible as the annual Stockton Starving. A study of what focused community attention and community action in Stockton may help us do the same thing in our communities.

The Stockton Starving was developed in its annual way during mid-March of this year. Perhaps this year's starving was slightly aggravated by several factors, although local public officials differ on this point.

1. Usually heavy spring rains had virtually stopped all field work.
2. *Stockton Record* reported that in the last year over 1,934 lower priced hotel rooms and dormitories have been destroyed by urban renewal.
3. In the past two years the known use of Wetbacks has more than tripled. In the first three months of 1965, the U.S. Border Patrol picked up 111 illegal aliens; 1966, 241; and 1967, 343.

Even with these aggravating factors the starving would have proceeded without fanfare had not some 80 farm workers marched on the County Welfare Department March 22, 1967. The protestors, mostly single men, were demanding help because no jobs were available.

From this initial confrontation unfolded a chain of events and community self-revelations, some of which will be discussed below.

The key to all the community action was that march; the key to the march was the organizer. The Organizer was Adam Romero. Neither he nor any of the other marchers had any contact with established community organizations or agencies until after that initial action. Following that first day, the churches, MAPA, Manpower Opportunities Project, United Farm Workers Organizing Committee, California Rural Legal Assistance, and others jumped in to help carry the fight—after Romero and the 80 had taken the offensive.

It is clear that the annual Stockton Starving would have passed through the spring of 1967 unheralded had it not been for Adam Romero.

Romero is an itinerant farm worker. A drifter. A man unnoticed in a crowd. One of the thousands who can be seen on the skidrows of Fresno, Stockton, Salinas or wherever. Romero is one of thousands with major exceptions. He's a leader. He's been trained.

In the spring of last year, Romero organized a similar march of unemployed farm workers in Salinas. In that march he was working under the leadership of Manuel Chavez, then a field supervisor of the California Center for Community Development and now Organizing Director of the United Farm Workers Organizing Committee. Romero learned well the techniques of mobilization and the tricks of converting discontent, such as starving, into action, such as marching on the Welfare Department. Romero's natural traits of leadership, his training plus the fact that he is "one of the boys" made it possible for him to mobilize the men without any "expert" or "professional" or "community" leadership.

In the next few days came marches on the City Council and the Board of Supervisors—These succeeding confrontations organized in cooperation with more established leadership. Instrumental in these actions were MAPA leaders Richard Lopez and Genevieve Patron, Manpower Opportunities Project staff members Bill Murdock and Joe Talancon, Father Day of the Catholic Church and Manuel Chavez of the United Farm Workers Organizing Committee.

The Supervisors first agreed to pay for one hot meal a day to be served at the St. Mary's Dining Hall. When pressed, they offered use of barracks in the prison honor farm, three meals a day and bus service from town for a two week period. During this time, community debate continued. Urban Renewal's destruction of the 1,934 rooms and dormitories was thrown back and forth between the Supervisors and the City Council. The U.S. Border Patrol became more active in searches for Wetbacks in immediately surrounding rural areas. The incipient grower campaign to import Braceros for the asparagus harvest went down the tubes as it became painfully obvious that there was a surplus, not a shortage, of farm labor. Certain discriminatory practices against farm workers by the Farm

Placement Service were stopped when pressure was applied by the unemployed farm workers and community organizations in a group.

This discriminatory practice was the Agency's refusal to register farm workers who applied for work. With no farm workers officially registered the agency could support the growers' claims of a farm labor shortage and a need for Braceros.

Congressman John McFall met with the workers and promised to introduce Federal legislation to do something for them next year—a promise they rejected with a howl of catcalls.

As the two weeks of temporary board and room from the county drew to a close, the farm workers obtained the use of a private warehouse and tents for a short period before finally renting a farm labor camp which would house some 310 people.

The men obtained local cash donations totaling $3,000 plus some $13,000 from the Federal Offices of Economic Opportunity to operate the camp for four months. The local donations were: $1,000 from the Catholic Church, and $2,000 from a variety of sources.

The men are charged $1.25 a day for room and board while working. No charge when not working.

The farm workers have organized themselves into a Community Self-Help Corporation. They have hired staff with the money from public and private funds. The staff includes: camp manager, cook, maintenance, job developer. With the help of a citizens advisory group the men administer the camp. Only farm workers can become staff members.

The annual Stockton Starving hitherto a natural, unchallenged phenomena, this year was protested; and some temporary solutions have been found. Obviously an OEO Grant and donations from churches are not permanent solutions. Some firm structures must be built into the framework of our society to prevent such as the annual Stockton Starving. Their structures would include:

1. Adequate unemployment insurance for all workers.
2. Realistic minimum wage standards for all workers.
3. A strong union of farm workers to represent their interests in the community, in government and with the growers.
4. Change in operating regulations of urban renewal so that local controls rest in the hands of people directly affected, not in the hands of the speculators and local real estate promoters, as is now the case.
5. A rethinking and recasting of public and private community programs to cultivate active citizen participation at all levels—and prevent the manipulation of the poor as prevelant in all current programs including much of the War on Poverty and all of the model cities, demonstration cities and General Neighborhood Renewal Area proposals.

The Mexican-American Political Association will continue to join hands with all groups promoting these programs.

In the meantime, MAPA Farm Labor Committee offers this paper as a case study of how a community can be moved into action when oppressed people organize themselves into action.

The Trischool Plan Passes Its First Semester

SPEECH

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1967

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, we are making progress in public education in the District of Columbia. An indication of the progress is contained in an article from Sunday's Washington Post on the trischool system in Southwest Washington, which I include as part of the RECORD:

THE TRISCHOOL PLAN PASSES ITS FIRST SEMESTER

(By Ellen Hoffman)

"We are now ready to face the challenge of providing all children of this single, cohesive neighborhood the equality of educational opportunity."

With these words by the Board of Education, endorsed by white and Negro and by low, middle and upper income residents of Southwest Washington, a historic educational experiment was begun less than a year ago—the controversial tri-school plan.

Youngsters from Amidon, Bowen and Syphax elementary schools have been a part of tri-school since February. As the school year now comes to a close, their parents and teachers—many of whom were bitterly opposed to the plan at first—are relatively happy with what has happened.

The most controversial aspect of tri-school has not had the opportunity to prove itself yet. This is the integration of economic and social groups in the Southwest community.

Nonetheless, improvement of the quality of education is evident already in the three school buildings. One sees extra teachers and aides, new equipment, building improvements and new instructional programs. A spirit of excitement about the new program is more evident than pessimism about its future.

Because of a combination of public housing and higher priced apartments and townhouses, the new Southwest has a diverse group of residents.

The children from public housing formerly attended Bowen and Syphax schools, built in 1930 and 1901 respectively.

Additions were made to Syphax in 1947 and 1954.

Children of the more affluent Negro and white residents attended Amidon, the school where Superintendent Carl F. Hansen established his well-known plan of basic education.

Amidon, with 30 per cent white students, was the only integrated school. Bowen and Syphax were virtually all Negro. About 2000 elementary students are involved in tri-school.

Proponents of tri-school believed that by assigning each elementary school two grades plus kindergarten, children from all over Southwest would broaden their social contacts. They also hoped the Board of Education thus would be pressured to equalize facilities in all three schools.

A neighborhood controversy lasted several months when Amidon parents expressed fears that their children would receive an inferior education if transferred to one of the other schools. Many parents had anxiety about such conflicts as children fighting on the way to and from school and poor classroom discipline.

Tri-school children know that school has changed, but they appear unaware that they were the center of a controversy that divided their parents a few months ago.

At recent Parent-Teacher Association meetings, youngsters proudly demonstrated that they had learned to tumble, to sing and to play musical instruments, and to express themselves through painting.

On the playground, in the lunchroom and in occasional special activities, they have made new friends from different parts of Southwest.

Hansen, who originally opposed tri-school, said this week that in terms of organization "it has really been a graceful adjustment. We proved children could make the transition without anxiety."

When the schools were reorganized in mid-year, children were reassigned as complete units—with their classes, teachers and even their furniture. The result so far has been a limited—but apparently successful—amount of contact between youngsters from the three schools.

It was felt that a mid-year change of schools would be enough of a jolt to the children so mixing within individual classes was delayed to next fall. School staff prepared for the transition by inviting parents and children to the other schools and sponsoring programs attended by all children on a grade level.

Last fall Southwest residents were debating over coffee and at cocktail parties whether tri-school should exist. By this spring, the issue had become how students should be organized into classes in the fall.

The issue is crucial to the middle class parents who fear their children will not be challenged in a classroom with a majority of "educationally or culturally deprived" younsters.

School administrators have been meeting with parents and teachers and have come up with general principles for next year's grouping.

Children's former identification with one of the three schools will disappear. Each class will have students who formerly attended Syphax, Bowen and Amidon. Hansen says, however, that classes will be limited to a certain range of reading ability so that a teacher does not have to work with children with a wide variety of problems.

AN EMOTIONAL CHANGE

Dorothy Johnson, former Amidon principal who now heads the D.C. school's elementary education department, says the reorganization was "an emotional change" for teachers and principals who were suddenly confronted with many new students and co-workers in a new school.

But they have had a lot of special help to make the transition a smooth one. Among the helps:

Ful-time "special teachers of science, art, music and physical education asigned to each building.

Non-professional teacher aids.

National Teacher Corps. interns.

Arena Stage, the theatre located in Southwest, which set up a classroom program and trained teachers in helping yongsters to express themselves.

How do some of the new classes work?

At Amidon, a class of third graders who had moved from Bowen spent more than an hour one morning recently viewing and discussing photographs and famous paintings.

Art teacher Jane Kinsley flashed pictures on the screen—some of them abstract, cubist paintings—and the children vied to be called on to describe their subjects and discuss the use of color, form, texture and space in the picture.

NOT LIKE ACADEMICS

"They get to notice things," Mrs. Kinsley said, "and the study of art can extend into the children's lives. Art is important in tri-school because it's not like an academic subject where the children compete."

A class of Bowen fifth graders concentrate on the rythm of a canoeing song. Music teacher Sybil Erwin directs one youngster to play the beat on a big drum, another to keep time with a small drum. The rest of the class sings, and none of the youngsters looks bored.

Most District elementary schools are served by circulating teachers of science, art, music and physical education. These teachers are usually responsible for several schools, so any one child does not see them very often.

Syphax and Amidon have some extra rooms which have been converted for use by the special teachers. Youngsters can leave their classrooms and come to a room equipped for the study of art or science.

Bowen, however, houses some offices as well as upper elementary school classes and there are no spare rooms. Special teachers carry their equipment to each classroom, often cutting into class time to set up the apparatus or clean up after a session of finger painting or planting seeds.

MORE ATTENTION

With extra personnel in the building, children with problems get more attention. National Teacher Corps interns, work primarily at Bowen. They concentrate on helping small groups of students with math or reading problems so they can keep up with their classmates.

One day a week tri-school students attend "interest groups" in which they have a choice to study folk dancing, sewing, cartooning, or extra science and math.

The Arena Stage has trained teachers to use theatrical techniques to involve all of a child's senses—taste, touch and smell as well as sight and hearing—in the learning process. In a spelling lesson, for example, children "act out" words rather than memorizing them.

But there are signs that school officials are still edgy about the charges. Examples:

Amidon principal Virginia Miller commented recently, as she leaned over to pick a gum wrapped from the floor. "We've never had this problem at Amidon before, but we're working on it."

A reporter studying the tri-school was given a suggested schedule to follow during a day's visit at Syphax. Of five classes suggested on the schedule, four had come from Amidon.

NEIGHBORHOOD INCIDENTS

When asked about their opinions on the progress of tri-school, a number of teachers and administrators replied with resignation: "As an employe of the Board of Education, I'm carrying out the wishes of the Board."

Remaining objections to tri-school arise from neighborhood incidents—fights on the way to or from school, discipline problems in class and reports of shoplifting in local stores.

However, most school officials and parents emphatically deny there is a connection between such incidents and reorganization of the schools.

William C. Boyd, principal of Bowen, insists "we would have these problems no matter how the schools are organized . . . Many of these kids come to school with their problems. They have a bad day because they don't feel well or something happened at home."

Boyd's office is usually occupied by several students who have been removed from their classes for being disruptive. "These are not discipline problems," Boyd says. "They are adjustment problems."

Virginia Miller, the Amidon principal who has announced her retirement, says "we shouldn't say it's lovely, because it's not. There have been several cases of unprovoked attacks by children upon other children."

FEARS UNJUSTIFIED

Minetta Wheeler, head of the Southwest Neighborhood House education committee, says she found unjustified middle class parents' fear that "outbursts" and "incidents" would occur if their children had to cross Delaware ave. to go to school.

After four months, the focus in Southwest is turning from a neighborhood problem to the dilemma facing education all over Washington and other big cities.

This is reflected by the school staff's assessment of next year's needs in tri-school:

"Social adjustment" classes for youngsters with emotional problems.

Vice principals to coordinate the extra personnel and schedule new programs.

Pre-school classes.

A full-time psychologist.

More funds to finance field trips and other "enrichment experiences" for the youngsters.

Already planned for next year are a continuation of the Arena Stage program and, if it is funded by the U.S. Office of Education, a new educational television project.

It is not yet known how many teachers or students will transfer from tri-school. Even in September it will be hard to determine whether they leave because of tri-school or for other reasons.

ELEMENTARY DECLINE

By last week Amidon had received requests from parents to transfer 30 children; Bowen had requests for transfer of 33 children and Syphax had none. These figures compare with a total of 44 transfers from Syphax last year, and 32 from Amidon. No figures are available on transfers from Bowen last year. A number of teachers in each school will be leaving, but when asked about it, most cite personal reasons.

Total enrollment in Southwest elementary schools has been going down in recent years. It decreased by 37 students from 1964 to 1965 and by 90 students from 1965 to 1966.

Mrs. Miller said she had planned to retire as principal of Amidon before tri-school went into effect. A former Amidon teacher now at one of the other schools says "I'm not coming back next year. That should tell the story. No one asked my opinion last summer."

But most tri-school teachers did not take advantage of a recent opportunity to criticize or suggest changes in the program.

PARENTAL SUPPORT

Asked by the school administration to turn in unsigned evaluation sheets, most teachers praised the instructional program and suggested it be continued in the same way next year.

The middle class parents who originally supported tri-school have vowed not to send their children to private schools or move to the suburbs.

Jessie Tromberg, parent of a former Amidon student who now attends Syphax, has organized a group of volunteers to take children on field trips, assist in school libraries and special programs.

Theodore Cron, whose child also was transferred from Amidon to Syphax, helped draw up the original plan. He plans to continue to fight for improvements in tri-school.

He hopes tri-school will set an example for other neighborhoods in the District. "The kids know something good has been done in their school," he says, "and that their parents did it for them. This has to be done in other parts of the city."

Mr. Speaker, one of the lessons to be learned from the trischool success is that we should be very careful before condemning innovations in the District of Columbia schools. Another lesson is that additional resources can make great improvements in the District of Columbia schools. The special teachers, teacher aids, National Teacher Corps interns, and other additional personnel who are part of the three elementary schools in Southwest should also be available in schools in all sections in the city.

Western Electric Takes the Initiative in Pollution Control at Allentown, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED B. ROONEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1967

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I believe the history of Federal Government relationships with the business and industrial sectors of our Nation will bear out my view that governmental controls have been imposed on business and industry only when these sectors shirked some responsibility.

When business and industry have given attention to problems which were created or aggravated by their activity, it has not been necessary for Congress to impose limitations or set standards or enact regulations. On the other hand, when it has been necessary for the Federal Government to work in cooperation with business and industry to resolve some problem which neither could resolve effectively alone, the degree of cooperation necessary almost invariably has been exerted by each of the parties.

Undoubtedly, one of the most pressing problems facing our Nation and the entire world today is that of the progressive pollution of our air and water supplies. Obviously, if business and industry exert their initiative and deal with this problem, ways can be found to combat it. Congress can and must cooperate in this endeavor.

It is certainly worthy of attention when a business or industry accepts responsibility for controlling the pollutants which it discharges into our air or our streams. The effort of an industry in my congressional district, the 15th of Pennsylvania, represents the acceptance of responsibility to help fight pollution.

This industry is Western Electric. During a luncheon held last week, officials of the Allentown works of Western Electric disclosed that they were prepared to take the initiative in controlling stream pollution.

Mr. Donald P. Wilkes, general manager of the Allentown works, announced plans for a $1 million chemical waste treatment plant representing a second step in pollution control by this industry in Allentown.

It was my privilege to participate in the luncheon program, and I regretted that activity on the floor of the House required that I cut short my visit to the Western Electric plant and return to Washingon.

The distinguished Governor of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Raymond P. Shafer, was a guest and speaker. He, too, made note of the high degree of cooperation between industry and government evidenced in the initiative of Western Electric.

With industrial initiative of this kind, Mr. Speaker, we can control pollution of our water and our air. With the hope that Western Electric's action program will stimulate other businesses and industries to take similar action, I include the remarks of Mr. Wilkes announcing plans for this pollution control facility, in the RECORD:

> I am sure everyone knows why we are here today. We mentioned in our letter of invitation that Western Electric would announce plans to build a new facility which will provide additional and more comprehensive treatment of our industrial wastes.
>
> Each person present today is acutely aware—as a concerned citizen—that immediate action must be taken to restore and preserve our natural resources. We are constantly reminded that two of our most precious birthrights, our air and our water, have gradually become less and less wholesome. We also recognize the fact that the restoration of these birthrights is a task that must be jointly shouldered by private industry, and

the Federal, State, and local governments. There can be no lasting solution to these problems unless government and industry work hand in hand . . . with the cooperation of all private citizens.

As a concerned corporate citizen, Western Electric is proud to take another voluntary step in pollution abatement that is so vital to the Lehigh Valley and to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. We took our first step in this direction when we included a waste treatment system in our original building program in Allentown 20 years ago.

Our present waste treatment system was one of the first of its kind in Pennsylvania . . . and at that time was modern in every respect. Our new facility, which we are announcing today, will be housed in a new 10,000-square-foot building and will incorporate the very latest technological advances in waste treatment facilities. This new facility will cost approximately $1 million and we plan to start construction in the fall.

We believe our new system will be a major step on the part of private industry to abate water pollution . . . and at the same time help restore and preserve Lehigh Valley streams for public recreation and other useful purposes. It is this announcement—then—that provides the basis for this luncheon meeting.

I think you should know that pollution abatement is the concern of Western Electric in every city where we have manufacturing plants. Only recently plans were announced for the updating of waste treatment facilities at our plants in Indianapolis and Merrimack Valley, Mass.

Western Electric would like to acknowledge the leadership which members of government at all levels are providing in the fight against pollution. There are many outstanding examples of action. Hardly a day goes by when we are not reminded by the press, radio, and television of the many bills, programs, and studies that our representatives at all levels of government have initiated.

Each representative of government present today, as well as those who could not join us, should take legitimate pride in his involvement in pollution abatement.

Since water pollution may be termed as a problem of the highest priority to society, no significant step toward its prevention, control, or abatement can be made unless there is an effective joining of the community's total resources—all levels of government, industry, scientists, and most important of all—the individual citizen.

Our sole purpose in this new building program is to do our part to wage war on the stream pollution problem in Pennsylvania. We sincerely hope by doing so that the major waterways of the Lehigh and Delaware Valleys will benefit. Most importantly, we hope that this action will illustrate that we are concerned in establishing and maintaining a degree of water quality in Pennsylvania that will not only comply with established State requirements, but will also protect the health and welfare of our neighbors. We hope that others will be encouraged to take similar action so that by our collective efforts the State of Pennsylvania can again demonstrate that it is a leader and not a follower. Thank you.

U.S. Appeasement Aids Soviets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 13, 1967

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the on-the-spot commentaries of Copley Press Columnist Dumitru Danielopol, one of the great authorities on Communist activities, are especially valuable. His May 29 commentary in the Monrovia, Calif., Daily News-Post, on the dangers of appeasing the Soviet Union, deserves thoughtful study in light of the foreign policy blunders in the Middle East crisis.

The article follows:

U.S. APPEASEMENT AIDS SOVIETS

(By Dumitru Danielopol)

STOCKHOLM.—American appeasement of the Russians is beginning to pay handsome dividends, in Europe . . . for the Russians.

It started six years ago, says Arvo Horm, Estonian-born expert on Communist affairs.

As Secretary General for the Scandinavian section of the International Committee for the Defense of Western Culture, Arno has had more than 25 years in which to study Communist methods. He survived the Russian takeover of his country in 1940 and escaped to Sweden from a Nazi prison in 1943.

It was in 1961, says the former economic professor, when the Americans began to cut the subsidies to groups of refugees from Communist aggression—Estonians, Latvians, Lithuanians, Poles etc. Horm traces the decision to the Vienna Kennedy-Khrushchev meeting.

"In the last three years, these funds have ceased completely," said Horm.

"You mustn't think these funds were substantial. They were ridiculously low, 300,000 a year for all groups—a fraction of the cost of one warplane.

"But they were important funds for the exiles. This cut was catastrophic, as you can see from the progress Communist propaganda has made in Western Europe."

No one can argue about this progress.

There is plenty of evidence in virtually every West European capital.

The 1961 decision to "reduce tension" with the Soviet Union has been debated in the United States in an abstract sort of way. There's nothing abstract about the argument here. Not when a Swedish city votes to give 1,000 to the Viet Cong!

"The Americans lost at least 100,000 active friends in Europe," said Horm. "These were the most dynamic, the toughest adversaries of Communism. They had known it first hand and knew all its wiles and tricks.

"These were the people the Kremlin feared most. Did you get anything in return for this act of good will towards the Reds? Not a thing. The Russians have not disbanded their organizations."

The Polish Committee in Sweden, an active tough group of 2,000 was receiving 500 a year from American sources.

"This helped them to have a room, a telephone and an address," said Horm. "They worked for nothing. Without the subsidy, the Committee has disintegrated."

With the war in Vietnam as an excuse, Communist propaganda in Sweden and other European countries has increased enormously and there is no sign of any organized U.S. counterattack.

"You allowed them to work in vacuum," Horm said.

"All anti-war demonstrations in Europe," said one U.S. Ambassador in Europe, "are Communist inspired. They are financed by Moscow and Peking."

Anti-American activities in Sweden are particularly pronounced.

Sweden, together with Finland form a perfect platform from which the Russians can conduct psychological warfare against the United States and against NATO. Both are neutral countries. Sweden has the reputation of a democratic tradition and a highly valued freedom of speech. Finland has won Western respect for "its survival on Russia's doorstep," though many observers in Scandinavia fear the Helsinki is slipping into the Soviet orbit.

"It is not a mere coincidence," says Horm, "that most Communist inspired peace movements, students rallies or other 'world' demonstrations take place in these two countries. It gives them a kind of respectability and they enjoy wide press coverage and the use of Sweden's excellent communications system."

Any such movement taking place in a satellite country, say Czechslovakia, would be immediately recognized as Communist propaganda. Here it is "acceptable."

Communist aim in Scandinavia is to get Norway and Denmark out of NATO.

"They are working hard at it right here in Sweden," Horm said.

President Kekkonnen of Finland has already called several times upon the Norwegian and Danish Governments to get out of the Atlantic Alliance.

The Bertrand Russell war crimes tribunal took place in Sweden and emphasized Stockholm's importance as a starting point for Red propaganda.

It gives it plausibility.

"If you think this campaign is aimed at the 7 million Swedes, you are kidding yourselves," said Horm. "This is prepared for the millions who live in Asia, Africa and Latin America."

Every Communist or left wing paper or magazine will publish in full the resolutions adopted in Scandinavia by the Communist front groups and these will be widely distributed to the peoples of other continents.

"What is the Swedish government doing about it?" I asked.

"Nothing."

But a group of young pro-American Swedes is beginning to react.

Jahn Siegbahn, 21, son of a Swedish foreign office official, has organized the "Democratic Alliance" the only group which staged a pro-American demonstration during the Russell trials.

"We are organizing and are recruiting members," he said. "The Swedish people love America. Every one in three has a relative in America. But propaganda which goes on unanswered can sway people in the wrong way."

These young friends of America deserve help.

A Downward Turn for Trading Stamps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER L. WOLFF
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 13, 1967

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, three articles appeared in the June 12 edition of the Supermarket News which I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues. It would appear that my words about trading stamps and similar promotional gimmicks have not gone unheeded by the food industry.

One article reports a prediction by Lawrence W. Bell, publisher of Premium Practice magazine, of a 30-percent drop in the use of trading stamps in 1968. The second article shows the tangible benefits realized by supermarkets which adopt such progressive policies. In particular, the Waldbaum chain of food markets, which just last year dropped trading stamps, reported a 57 percent rise in net profit for the first 16 weeks of this year. In light of this sharp rise in profits it is especially noteworthy that the decision of this New York-based chain to eliminate stamps from its 77 stores was met with dire warnings by trading stamp advocates of a virtual collapse in Waldbaum's business.

And finally the third article describes a cash-or-trading stamps plan initiated by a Denver chain, Thrift-Way Food Markets. On June 14, this chain will start offering its customers a choice of stamps or a 3 percent discount on purchases. This chain is to be commended for taking this progressive step. The philosophy underlying their decision; namely, to allow the consumer to exercise his freedom of choice, is precisely what I have recommended in the truth-in-trading stamp bill which I recently introduced in the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to include these articles in the RECORD today:

[Supermarket News, Monday, June 12, 1967]

Publisher Predicts 30 Percent Decline in Use of Trading Stamps

CHICAGO.—A decline of up to 30 percent in the use of trading stamps in 1968 was predicted by Lawrence W. Bell, publisher of Premium Practice magazine, in an address prepared for delivery yesterdaw at a meeting of National Premium Sales Executives here.

He said in his speech the drop in stamp use would be accompanied by widespread but short-lived food discounting.

Saying that "discount pricing for any sustained period is pure fiction," Mr. Bell predicted a need for new types of traffic building premium promotions for retailers which drop stamps and then find discounting can not support profitable operations.

Mr. Bell has been closely associated with the stamp field for many years and was a founder of Trading Stamp Institute of America.

Mr. Bell cited the cash-register-tape redemption plan as an old technique likely to come back. The tape plan offers premiums in return for register tapes.

Waldbaum 16-Week Net Up 57 Percent, Sales Rise 18 Percent

(By Kevin M. Saviola)

NEW YORK.—For the first 16 weeks of 1967, Waldbaum had earnings of $550,000, up 57 per cent, on sales of $56,550,000, up 18 per cent, Ira Waldbaum, president of the chain, told a group of security analysts here Thursday.

On the basis of these figures, Mr. Waldbaum predicted that the Garden City-headquartered chain "will have sales of $190 million and earnings equal to 1 per cent of that figure for 1967." The company had earnings of $1,663,155 on sales of $165,075,000 for 1966.

With the financial picture looking so good, the company has decided to move into the New Jersey market area. "We will have three firm deal to build in New Jersey within the next three months," Mr. Waldbaum said.

Waldbaum, with 77 stores concentrated mainly on Long Island and in New York City, now has "two sites under option and three in the course of negotiation in Bergen County, New Jersey," Mr. Waldbaum added.

The move is the first in an aggressive building and expansion program contemplated by the chain.

Because last year was a good one financially, and "because of good cash flow, we are more aggressively looking for locations and acquisitions," Mr. Waldbaum noted. One problem for the chain is whether to own or lease stores.

But the problem is not money. "We would like to open seven to 10 stores a year, but this is dependent on the availability of locations, not on money," according to Mr. Waldbaum. Besides the New Jersey locations, the chain has six sites on Long Island's Suffolk County under consideration.

The chain also has a continuous program of remodeling. Presently, three stores are being renovated.

With regard to merchandising, the chain is beginning to equate bigness with profitability. On the basis of experience with a 28,000 square foot store on the north shore of Suffolk County, Mr. Waldbaum said that "we found that with more space we are able to stock more lines, and this seems to give the store more conumer appeal."

With more space, the firm is able to provide enlarged toiletries and drug sections and more nonfoods, housewares, plastic goods and garden supplies, which "contribute to a larger gross profit," according to Mr. Waldbaum.

The chain's private label baked goods line, supplied by Horn & Hardart, has had "exceptionally good movement," and the private label grocery line "now accounts for 20 per cent of the grocery volume and is continually growing," Mr. Waldbaum noted.

Mr. Waldbaum feels that "local chains will do better as time goes on because they have a feel for the individual consumer."

And it is among local chains that Waldbaum finds its stiffest competition. "Hills-Korvette, Shop-Rite and Big Apple are the most competitive in our trading area," stated Mr. Waldbaum. "Our price structure is 'rather similar' to Big Apple's," he added.

In an attempt to keep prices in line with the competition, the chain has moved to palletization of its store deliveries. There are electric forklimts in 15 stores, and "65 to 70 per cent of the stores can receive palletized loads," noted Mr. Waldbuam.

With this and other economies, he hopes that the chain will achieve "a 2 per cent pretax profit in the next two years."

The listing of Waldbaum stock on either the New York or American Stock exchange is "under consideration by the chain," Mr. Waldbaum said.

Stamps or Cash Thrift-Way Deal

DENVER.—The competitive situation, hypoed last week by two game introductions and anti-game advertising, is due to get another injection this week by the appearance on the scene of a cash-or-trading stamps plan.

Thrift-Way Food Markets will start offering customers a choice of stamps or a 3 per cent discount on purchases Wednesday.

Ads blasting games, stamps and gimmicks were run here last week following the introduction of television race games by King Soopers and Miller's.

King Soopers, division of J. S. Dillon & Sons Stores Co. and Millers' division of National Tea Co., introduced Let's Go to the Races and Post Time, respectively.

The games were attacked by local housewives' group leaders.

Mrs. Paul West, president of the United National Consumers Association, and Mrs. Gerald Blessinger, chairman of the Denver Housewives for Lower Food Prices, said they are receiving "hundreds of calls" from housewives on the games and are advising them not to shop in stores which run the campaigns.

Furr's Big Value Discount said in its ad last week, "You've protested costly promotions and games . . . show your approval at Furr's Big Value Discount checkstands. Furr's has no games or stamps." The protests refer to boycotts staged in Denver last fall.

K-Mart Discount Foods, operated by Allied Supermarkets, Detroit, in K-Mart discount centers, ran an ad saying, "No games, no gimmicks, means low prices every day."

The 28 Thrift-Way Food Markets are members of Associated Grocers of Colorado co-op.

John C. Sullard, president of the Thrift-Way group, said under the new cash-or-stamps program, Thrift-Way shoppers may choose either Mor-Value trading stamps or a 3 per cent Thrift-Check savings plan.

If the plan is chosen, the customer is given a special envelope in which to save her Thrift-Way register tapes. When $150 worth of tapes have been accumulated, she may exchange them for a 3 per cent Thrift-Check, good for $4.50 in cash or merchandise at any Thrift-Way store.

Mr. Sullard said the 3 per cent Thrift-Way check gives the customer "considerably more than the amount merchants normally pay for stamps.

He said the plan was worked out after a number of meetings with housewives revealed that many would prefer a cash discount rather than stamps. "Now we're offering a choice," he said.

George Welch, president of Apollo Thrift-Way, a member of the co-op, said it had offered a choice of stamps or cash previously at its Boulder, Col., unit with excellent response.

He said the new plan was not designed to combat games that have reappeared in the Denver market since the program was drawn up some time before the present games were made known.

Mrs. West and Mrs. Blessinger said they are pointing out that the games are bound to boost prices.

"Supermarket people themselves, last fall said games contributed to higher food prices, and dropped them to cut prices. Therefore, we were very surprised to see games come back," Mrs. West said.

"Reports are that the supermarkets have not gained back the volume lost last fall, so this looks like a move to bring in more business," Mrs. Blessinger said. "If the games pull in the volume at the two stores, all of the stores will start them."

About the CIA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1967

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the Central Intelligence Agency has, for a long time, been a weapon for fighting the threat of communism.

Thomas W. Braden, writing for the Saturday Evening Post, has dealt with the history of the International Organization Division of the CIA and the devices it has used to combat the threat of communism.

Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues this most informative article which appeared in the May 20, 1967, edition of the Saturday Evening Post:

I'm Glad the CIA Is "Immoral"

(By Thomas W. Braden [1])

On the desk in front of me as I write these lines is a creased and faded yellow paper. It bears the following inscription in pencil:

"Received from Warren G. Haskins, $15,000. (signed) Norris A. Grambo."

I went in search of this paper on the day the newspapers disclosed the "scandal" of the Central Intelligence Agency's connections with American students and labor leaders. It was a wistful search, and when it ended, I found myself feeling sad.

---

[1] Former president of California's Board of Education, trustee of California State Colleges and candidate for lieutenant governor, the author is editor and publisher of the Blade-Tribune at Oceanside, Calif. During World War II, he served with both the British infantry and with the OSS as a parachutist.

For I was Warren G. Haskins. Norris A. Grambo was Irving Brown, of the American Federation of Labor. The $15,000 was from the vaults of the CIA, and the piece of yellow paper is the last memento I possess of a vast and secret operation whose death has been brought about by small-minded and resentful men.

It was my idea to give the $15,000 to Irving Brown. He needed it to pay off his strong-arm squads in Mediterranean ports, so that American supplies could be unloaded against the opposition of Communist dock workers. It was also my idea to give cash, along with advice, to other labor leaders, to students, professors and others who could help the United States in its battle with Communist fronts.

It was my idea. For 17 years I had thought it was a good idea. Yet here it was in the newspapers, buried under excoriation. Walter Lippmann, Joseph Kraft. Editorials. Outrage. Shock.

"What's gone wrong?" I said to myself as I looked at the yellow paper. "Was there something wrong with me and the others back in 1950? Did we just think we were helping our country, when in fact we ought to have been hauled up before Walter Lippmann?

"And what's wrong with me now? For I still think it was and is a good idea, an imperative idea. Am I out of my mind? Or is it the editor of *The New York Times* who is talking nonsense?"

And so I sat sadly amidst the dust of old papers, and after a time I decided something. I decided that if I ever knew a truth in my life, I knew the truth of the cold war, and I knew what the Central Intelligence Agency did in the cold war, and never have I read such a concatenation of inane, misinformed twaddle as I have now been reading about the CIA.

Were the undercover payments by the CIA "immoral"? Surely it cannot be "immoral" to make certain that your country's supplies intented for delivery to friends are not burned, stolen or dumped into the sea.

Are CIA efforts to collect intelligence anywhere it can "disgraceful"? Surely it is not "disgraceful" to ask somebody whether he learned anything while he was abroad that might help his country.

People who make these charges must be naive. Some of them must be worse. Some must be pretending to be naive.

Take Victor Reuther, assistant to his brother Walter, president of the United Automobile Workers. According to Drew Pearson, Victor Reuther complained that the American Federation of Labor got money from the CIA and spent it with "undercover techniques." Victor Reuther ought to be ashamed of himself. At his request, I went to Detroit one morning and gave Walter $50,000 in $50 bills. Victor spent the money, mostly in West Germany, to bolster labor unions there. He tried "undercover techniques" to keep me from finding out how he spent it. But I had my own "undercover techniques." In my opinion and that of my peers in the CIA, he spent it with less than perfect wisdom, for the German unions he chose to help weren't seriously short of money and were already anti-Communist. The CIA money Victor spent would have done much more good where unions were tying up ports at the order of Communist leaders.

As for the theory advanced by the editorial writers that there ought to have been a Government foundation devoted to helping good causes agreed upon by Congress—this may seem sound, but it wouldn't work for a minute. Does anyone really think that congressmen would foster a foreign tour by an artist who has or has had left-wing connections? And imagine the scuffles that would break out as congressmen fought over money to subsidize the organizations in their home districts.

Back in the early 1950's, when the cold war was really hot, the idea that Congress would have approved many of our projects was about as likely as the John Birch Society's approving Medicare. I remember, for example, the time I tried to bring my old friend, Paul-Henri Spaak of Belgium, to the U.S. to help out in one of the CIA operations.

Paul-Henri Spaak was and is a very wise man. He had served his country as foreign minister and premier. CIA Director Allen Dulles mentioned Spaak's projected journey to the then Senate Majority Leader William F. Knowland of California. I believe that Mr. Dulles thought the senator would like to meet Mr. Spaak. I am sure he was not prepared for Knowland's reaction:

"Why," the senator said, "the man's a socialist."

"Yes," Mr. Dulles replied, "and the head of his party. But you don't know Europe the way I do Bill. In Many European countries, a socialist is roughly equivalent to a Republican." Knowland replied, "I don't care. We aren't going to bring any socialists over here."

The fact, of course, is that in much of Europe in the 1950's, socialists, people who called themselves "left"—the very people whom Americans thought no better than Communists—were the only people who gave a damn about fighting Communism.

But let us begin at the beginning.

When I went to Washington in 1950 as assistant to Allen W. Dulles, then deputy director to CIA chief Walter Bedell Smith, the agency was three years old. It had been organized, like the State Department, along geographical lines, with a Far Eastern Division, a Western European Division, etc. It seemed to me that this organization was not capable of defending the United States against a new and extraordinarily successful weapon. The weapon was the international Communist front. There were seven of these fronts, all immensely powerful:

1. The International Association of Democratic Lawyers had found "documented proof" that U.S. forces in Korea were dropping canisters of poisoned mosquitos on North Korean cities and were following a "systematic procedure of torturing civilians, individually and en masse."

2. The World Peace Council had conducted a successful operation called the Stockholm Peace Appeal, a petition signed by more than two million Americans. Most of them, I hope, were in ignorance of the council's program. "The peace movement . . . has set itself the aim to frustrate the aggressive plans of American and English imperialists. . . . The heroic Soviet army is the powerful sentinel of peace."

3. The Women's International Democratic Federation was preparing a Vienna conference of delegates from 40 countries who resolved: "Our children cannot be safe until American warmongers are silenced." The meeting cost the Russians six million dollars.

4. The International Union of Students had the active participation of nearly every student organization in the world. At an estimated cost of $50 million a year, it stressed the hopeless future of the young under any form of society except that dedicated to peace and freedom, as in Russia.

5. The World Federation of Democratic Youth appealed to the nonintellectual young. In 1951, 25,000 young people were brought to Berlin from all over the world, to be harangued (mostly about American atrocities). The estimated cost: $50 million.

6. The International Organization of Journalists was founded in Copenhagen in 1946 by a non-Communist majority. A year later the Communists took it over. By 1950 it was an active supporter of every Communist cause.

7. The World Federation of Trade Unions controlled the two most powerful labor unions in France and Italy and took its orders directly from Soviet Intelligence. Yet it was able to mask its Communist allegiance so successfully that the C.I.O. belonged to it for a time.

All in all, the CIA estimated, the Soviet Union was annually spending $250 million on its various fronts. They were worth every penny of it. Consider what they had accomplished.

First, they had stolen the great words. Years after I left the CIA, the late United Nations Ambassador Adlai Stevenson told me how he had been outraged when delegates from underdeveloped countries, young men who had come to maturity during the cold war, assumed that anyone who was for "Peace" and "Freedom" and "Justice" must also be for Communism.

Second, by constant repetition of the twin promises of the Russian revolution—the promises of a classless society and of a transformed mankind—the fronts had thrown a peculiar spell over some of the world's intellectuals, artists, writers, scientists, many of whom behaved like disciplined party-liners.

Third, millions of people who would not consciously have supported the interests of the Soviet Union had joined organizations devoted ostensibly to good causes, but secretly owned and operated by and for the Kremlin.

How odd, I thought to myself as I watched these developments, that Communists, who are afraid to join anything but the Communist Party, should gain mass allies through organizational war while we Americans, who join everything, were sitting here tongue-tied.

And so it came about that I had a chat with Allen Dulles. It was late in the day and his secretary had gone. I told him I thought the CIA ought to take on the Russians by penetrating a battery of international fronts. I told him I thought it should be a worldwide operation with a single headquarters.

"You know," he said, leaning back in his chair and lighting his pipe, "I think you may have something there. There's no doubt in my mind that we're losing the cold war. Why don't you take it up down below?"

It was nearly three months later that I came to his office again—this time to resign. On the morning of that day there had been a meeting for which my assistants and I had prepared ourselves carefully. We had been studying Russian front movements, and working out a counteroffensive. We knew that the men who ran CIA's area divisions were jealous of their power. But we thought we had logic on our side. And surely logic would appeal to Frank Wisner.

Frank Wisner, in my view, was an authentic American hero. A war hero. A cold-war hero. He died by his own hand in 1965. But he had been crushed long before by the dangerous detail connected with cold-war operations. At this point in my story, however, he was still gay, almost boyishly charming, cool yet coiled, a low hurdler from Mississippi constrained by a vest.

He had one of those purposefully obscure CIA titles: Director of Policy Coordination. But everyone knew that he had run CIA since the death of the wartime OSS, run it through a succession of rabbit warrens hidden in the bureaucracy of the State Department, run it when nobody but Frank Wisner cared whether the country had an intelligence service. Now that it was clear that Bedell Smith and Allen Dulles were really going to take over. Frank Wisner still ran it while they tried to learn what it was they were supposed to run.

And so, as we prepared for the meeting, it was decided that I should pitch my argument to Wisner. He knew more than the others. He could overrule them.

The others sat in front of me in straight-backed chairs, wearing the troubled looks of responsibility. I began by assuring them that I proposed to do nothing in any area without the approval of the chief of that area. I thought, when I finished, that I had made a good case. Wisner gestured at the Chief, Western Europe. "Frank," came the response, "this is just another one of those goddamned proposals for getting into everybody's hair."

One by one the others agreed. Only Richard G. Stilwell, the Chief, Far East, a hard-driving soldier in civilian clothes who now commands U.S. forces in Thailand, said he had no objection. We all waited to hear what Wisner would say.

Incredibly, he put his hands out, palms down. "Well," he said, looking at me, "you heard the verdict."

Just as incredibly, he smiled.

Sadly I walked down the long hall, and sadly reported to my staff that the day was lost. Then I went to Mr. Dulles's office and resigned. "Oh," said Mr. Dulles, blandly "Frank and I had talked about his decision. I overruled him." He looked up at me from over his papers. "He asked me to."

Thus was the International Organization Division of CIA born, and thus began the first centralized effort to combat Communist fronts.

Perhaps "combat" does not describe the relative strengths brought to battle. For we started with nothing but the truth. Yet within three years we had made solid accomplishments. Few of them would have been possible without undercover methods.

I remember the enormous joy I got when the Boston Symphony Orchestra won more acclaim for the U.S. in Paris than John Foster Dulles or Dwight D. Eisenhower could have bought with a hundred speeches. And then there was *Encounter*, the magazine published in England and dedicated to the proposition that cultural achievement and political freedom were interdependent. Money for both the orchestra's tour and the magazine's publication came from the CIA, and few outside the CIA knew about it. We had placed one agent in a Europe-based organization of intellectuals called the Congress for Cultural Freedom. Another agent became an editor of *Encounter*. The agents could not only propose anti-Communist programs to the official leaders of the organizations but they could also suggest ways and means to solve the inevitable budgetary problems. Why not see if the needed money could be obtained from "American foundations"? As the agents knew, the CIA-financed foundations were quite generous when it came to the national interest.

I remember with great pleasure the day an agent came in with the news that four national student organizations had broken away from the Communist International Union of Students and joined our student outfit instead. I remember how Eleanor Roosevelt, glad to help our new International Committee of Women, answered point for point the charges about germ warfare that the Communist women's organization had put forward. I remember the organization of seamen's unions in India and in the Baltic ports.

There were, of course, difficulties, sometimes unexpected. One was the World Assembly of Youth.

We were casting about for something to compete with the Soviet Union in its hold over young people when we discovered this organization based in Dakar. It was dwindling in membership, and apparently not doing much.

After a careful assessment, we decided to put an agent into the assembly. It took a minimum of six months and often a year just to get a man into an organization. Thereafter, except for what advice and help we could lend, he was on his own. But, in this case, we couldn't give any help whatsoever. The agent couldn't find anybody in the organization who wanted any.

The mystery was eventually solved by the man on the spot. WAY, as we had come to call it, was the creature of French intelligence—the *Deuxième Bureau*. Two French agents held key WAY posts. The French Communist Party seemed strong enough to win a general election. French intelligence was waiting to see what would happen.

We didn't wait. Within a year our man brought about the defeat of his two fellow officers in an election. After that, WAY took a pro-Western stand.

But our greatest difficulty was with labor. When I left the agency in 1954, we were still worrying about the problem. It was personified by Jay Lovestone, assistant to David Dubinsky in the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union.

Once chief of the Communist Party in the United States, Lovestone had an enormous grasp of foreign-intelligence operations. In 1947 the Communist *Confédération Générale du Travail* led a strike in Paris which came very near to paralyzing the French economy. A takeover of the government was feared.

Into this crisis stepped Lovestone and his assistant, Irving Brown. With funds from Dubinsky's union, they organized *Force Ouvrière*, a non-Communist union. When they ran out of money, they appealed to the CIA. Thus began the secret subsidy of free trade unions which soon spread to Italy. Without that subsidy, postwar history might have gone very differently.

But though Lovestone wanted our money, he didn't want to tell us precisely how he spent it. We knew that non-Communist unions in France and Italy were holding their own. We knew that he was paying them nearly two million dollars annually. In his view, what more did we need to know?

We countered that the unions were not growing as rapidly as we wished and that many members were not paying dues. We wanted to be consulted as to how to correct these weaknesses.

I appealed to a high and responsible labor leader. He kept repeating, "Lovestone and his bunch do a good job."

And so they did. After that meeting, so did we. We cut the subsidy down, and with the money saved we set up new networks in other international labor organizations. Within two years the free labor movement, still holding its own in France and Italy, was going even better elsewhere.

Looking back now, it seems to me that the argument was largely a waste of time. The only argument that mattered was the one with the Communists for the loyalty of millions of workers. That argument, with the help of Lovestone and Brown, was effectively made.

By 1953 we were operating or influencing international organizations in every field where Communist fronts had previously seized ground, and in some where they had not even begun to operate. The money we spent was very little by Soviet standards. But that was reflected in the first rule of our operational plan: "Limit the money to amounts private organizations can credibly spend." The other rules were equally obvious: "Use legitimate, existing organizations; disguise the extent of American interest; protect the integrity of the organization by not requiring it to support every aspect of official American policy."

Such was the status of the organizational weapon when I left the CIA. No doubt it grew stronger later on, as those who took charge gained experience. Was it a good thing to forge such as weapon? In my opinion then—and now—it was essential.

Was it "immoral," "wrong," "disgraceful"? Only in the sense that war itself is immoral, wrong and disgraceful.

For the cold war was and is a war, fought with ideas instead of bombs. And our country has had a clear-cut choice: Either we win the war or lose it. This war is still going on, and I do not mean to imply that we have won it. But we have not lost it either.

It is now 12 years since Winston Churchill accurately defined the world as "divided intellectually and to a large extent geographically between the creeds of Communist discipline and individual freedom." I have heard it said that this definition is no longer accurate. I share the hope that John Kennedy's appeal to the Russians "to help us make the world safe for diversity" reflects the spirit of a new age.

But I am not banking on it, and neither, in my opinion, was the late President. The choice between innocence and power involves the most difficult of decisions. But when an adversary attacks with his weapons disguised as good works, to choose innocence is to choose defeat. So long as the Soviet Union attacks deviously we shall need weapons to fight back, and a government locked in a power struggle cannot acknowledge all the programs it must carry out to cope with its enemies. The weapons we need now cannot, alas, be the same ones that we first used in the 1950's. But the new weapons should be capable of the same affirmative response as the ones we forged 17 years ago, when it seemed that the Communists, unchecked, would win the alliance of most of the world.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

Congressman Rees Announces Results of 1967 Congressional Questionnaire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. REES
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 13, 1967

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, this April I sent to my constituents in California's 26th Congressional District my annual congressional questionnaire. The response was immediate and enthusiastic, and I would like to thank the more than 15,000 citizens who were sufficiently concerned to take the time to complete and return this poll.

My congressional district is in the western section of Los Angeles County and includes the cities of Beverly Hills and Culver City; the Los Angeles City communities of Rancho Park, Venice, Mar Vista, Westdale, West Los Angeles, Cheviot Hills, Beverlywood, West Adams, and Fairfax Avenues; as well as the Los Angeles County areas of Marina del Rey, West Hollywood, and the Sunset Strip. Incomes range from lower middle to upper; a majority of my constituents are homeowners, and their educational level is higher than average.

The questions were written to reflect issues of particular concern to my district, as well as the current major national and international issues. In the multiple-choice questions many respondents chose several alternatives. Because of this some percentages add up to more than 100 percent.

Particularly gratifying was the high degree of respondents who further elaborated their views with notes and letters. I regret that space limitations make it impossible for me to share these comments with my colleagues as I can testify to the worthwhile nature of the overwhelming majority of the statements.

Knowing that my colleagues in Congress will be interested in the response of my constituents to the vital issues of the day, I include here the tabulated results of this poll:

Rees 1967 congressional questionnaire survey compilation

FOREIGN POLICY

1. Vietnam: Which policy do you favor for the U.S. in Vietnam?

(a) Continue the present policy of supporting the South Vietnamese, including limited bombing attacks in the north, while at the same time seeking a peaceful solution on the diplomatic front------ 22.7%
(b) Expand the war on all fronts to achieve a complete military victory- 38.8%
(c) Halt the bombing of North Vietnam in the hope that this will provide the necessary climate for peaceful negotiations------ 32.4%
(Write in) Withdraw immediately--- 7.6%

2. East-West relations: What policy would you favor in dealing with the Soviet Union and other East European nations?

(a) Relax tensions and begin to build "peaceful bridges" by such means as increased East-West trade and approval of the United States-U.S.S.R. Consular Convention------ 67%
(b) Continue the present policies of the cold war and rely on the military deterrent of NATO------ 12.6%
(c) Intensify the cold war, even to the breaking off of diplomatic relations, unless the Eastern bloc countries promise to cut off aid to North Vietnam ------ 20.4%

3. Foreign aid: We are now finding that the gap between the richer industrialized countries and the poorer underdeveloped nations continues to grow. As practically all of our aid programs are to underdeveloped nations, what should our future policy be?

(a) Continuance of foreign aid programs at their present level------ 13.9%
(b) Curtailing all foreign aid until we have "taken care of our own," or at least until the Vietnam war is solved------ 42.1%
(c) Expand aid programs with emphasis on helping underdeveloped countries to help themselves------ 41.8%

4. The Arab boycott: The Arab League nations have a trade boycott against all American firms doing substantial business in Israel. Which of the following alternatives would you favor?

(a) Continue the present U.S. compromise policy of requiring businesses to report to the Department of Commerce any Arab League actions, such as a request to fill out a questionnaire or to sign agreements, in furtherance of the boycott ------ 12.9%
(b) Attempt to break the boycott by passing new and stronger legislation which will flatly prohibit American firms from taking actions which would support or further this restriction on trade------ 37.6%
(c) Leave it up to the affected businesses to choose between Arab and Israel markets as outlets for their products ------ 36.7%

5. Red China: Despite the inner turmoil in Red China, we must continue to deal with the problem of recognition. Which would you favor?

(a) Continue U.S. policy of not recognizing Red China and opposing its admission to the United Nations--- 35.9%
(b) Extend diplomatic recognition to Red China and support Red China's admission to the United Nations-- 33.4%
(c) Initiate such programs as trade in nonstrategic goods, cultural exchanges of news reporters with the Communist Chinese, etc------ 31.3%

DOMESTIC POLICY

6. The Draft: The present draft law expires this June. Which of the following proposals would you favor?

(a) Universal program of two years of national service whereby a young man can choose at the age of 18 whether to join the armed forces, enter a CCC-type organization, or begin his college training (with the provision that after graduation he would serve his country in a capacity related to his academic interests through either the armed forces or such organizations as the Peace Corps or the Teachers Corps, etc.) ------ 56.5%
(b) The National Advisory Commission on Selective Service recommendation of drafting young men at 19 by use of a lottery, granting educational deferments only in unusual situations------ 20.5%
(c) Retain the existing system------ 10.9%

7. State of the Union proposals: Following are new measures proposed by the President in his State of the Union Message to Congress. Which do you favor:

Gun control legislation:

Yes	73.8%
No	22.3%

Stronger air pollution control laws:

Yes	92.1%
No	7.9%

Increase of social security benefits by 20 percent:

Yes	62.4%
No	28.9%

Step up in the war on crime:

Yes	88.2%
No	5.2%

Renewed attack on urban blight:

Yes	66.9%
No	16.8%

Federal support for educational television:

Yes	57.3%
No	34.2%

Establishment of a Redwood Park in California:

Yes	78.6%
No	12.7%

Sovereign Order of Cyprus Honors Prof. Oswald LeWinter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK J. BRASCO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 14, 1967

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert the highlights of the ceremony at which a high distinction was conferred upon one of our foremost educators in the United States, Prof. Oswald LeWinter, author of the widely praised book, Shakespeare in Europe, and other numerous distinguished works of criticism and scholarship. Professor LeWinter, I am terribly proud to add, is both an adviser and a friend. Mr. Speaker, the honor to which I am referring was the elevation of Professor LeWinter to the rank of Knight Commander of the Ordre Souverain de Chypre.

The ceremony during which Professor LeWinter was decorated with the historic cross of this venerable and preeminent order took place on May 25, 1967, in the chapel of the Order of the Holy Cross of Jerusalem in New York City, in the presence of a number of distinguished prelates and public officials. It was the most recent official act of the American branch of this order, since 1964 under a New York State charter in which its purpose is stated as follows:

> To strive for the maintenance of Christian ideals and Western humanism, the liberty and dignity of Man and to oppose all forms of oppression.

The Sovereign Order of Cyprus, one of the four oldest orders of chivalry, was founded in the year 1192, by Guy de Lusignan, King of Cyprus and Jerusalem, and confirmed by Pope Innocent III in the year 1200, who imposed upon it the dual mission of spreading the Christian faith and acting as a bulwark of Christendom in the eastern Mediterranean. The order was created on the model of the Hospitaller and military orders such as those of the Temple, and of St. John, installed in the Holy Land. Three hundred men of noble birth were inducted as knights in the new order and allowed to wear the red, eight-pointed cross of the order at the throat. They were obliged to defend the island route to the Holy Land and to prevent attack and infiltration by the infidels. The order also consisted of men-at-arms, chaplains, and serving brothers who, with the knights, were organized in commanderies. The distinguishing mark of the knights was a blue mantle with the red cross of the order upon it. The order attracted to its ranks some of the most vigorous nobles of Christendom, and these knights were to take an active interest in the affairs of the Holy Roman Empire and of the Byzantine Empire in addition to their defense of the pilgrims and their charitable works.

Under a succession of able grand masters, for more than three centuries, the deeds and influence of the Sovereign Order of Cyprus were enormous and its members played an important role as a stabilizing force in the political life of the Levant. After the annexation of Cyprus by Venice, the order entered a period of decline and its members dispersed throughout the Balkan States and Western Europe. More recently the order was reactivated by the descendants of some of its most illustrious knights with the blessings of the Holy See and dedicated to the unique values of Christian civilization and the spirit of ecumenism. Its reorganizers, like their famous ancestors, felt obliged, in the face of the many dangers which beset our culture and our institutions, to reestablish this venerable and tradition-laden order of chivalry, springing from one of the most respected shrines of Western thought, affirming in this way, the continuity of Christian effort against terror and injustice.

The Sovereign Order of Cyprus, today a modern organization, based on ancient principles and traditions, is dedicated to the building of schools, hospitals, churches and other charitable, spiritual, and educational institutions. It honors writers, artists, men of science, culture, education, and medicine; leaders of the free world from every walk of life, regardless of race, color, creed, or national origin. However, in its nearly 800-year history only 900 men have received this coveted knighthood and cross. For the propagation and spread of its principles, the order has created an Institute for the Study of Moral Philosophy and Social Sciences—Academie des Etudes Superieures—which it subsidizes.

Mr. Speaker, it gives me particular pleasure to inform this House that it was in recognition of the dynamic spirit of American patriotism, and the modern day crusade in which we Americans seek to bring freedom from oppression to the peoples of the world, that Michel Paul Pierre Count de Valitch, grand chancellor of the Sovereign Order of Cyprus, heir to the rich traditions of this ancient order, authorized the establishment of an American commandery of the order more than 3 years ago. Count de Valitch personally attended to its inauguration and has, since then, personally overseen its affairs.

At this point, I would like to enter in the RECORD the names of some of the outstanding members of this order both in the United States and abroad:

His Royal Highness Prince Louis de Bourbon.

His Imperial and Royal Highness Prince de Ligny Luxembourg.

His Excellency Paul P. Barrenechea, Minister for Foreign Affairs, Republic of Peru.

His Excellency Stephan Brunet, Secretary General, Union of War Veterans, France.

Mr. Francis Bellon, distinguished industrialist, Paris, France.

Archbishop Charles Brearley, Sheffield, England.

His Excellency Baron Francesco Caponera, Diplomat, Rome, Italy.

Dr. Charles P. Covino, Space Research Pioneer, New Jersey.

Archbishop Louis Canivet, Paris, France.

General James H. Doolittle, United States Army, Retired.

Right Reverend Monsignor Aloysius C. Dineen, New York City.

Honorable Joseph Eden, Diplomat, London and Paris.

Mr. Henry Evans, Author and Professor of International Relations, New Jersey.

Monsignor Patrick B. Fay, New York City.

Honorable Ludovic Huybrechts, Conseilleur de Commerce, Antwerp, Belgium.

Honorable Jean-Louis Jammet, LL.D. Professor of Law, Paris, France.

Dr. Serge Korff, Professor of Nuclear Physics at New York University and President of the Explorers Club of New York.

Dr. Hugh R. Kailan, Professor of Education, London, England.

Honorable Edward Thompson, Justice of the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

Dr. Pasquale Zaccara of New York City.

Mr. Monty Winslow, President of Transojet Tours of New York.

Mr. Lowell Thomas, Author, New York.

Honorable Enrique De Los Heros, former ambassador of the Republic of Peru in Spain.

Rear Admiral Gordon McLintock, Commandant, United States Merchant Marine Academy, Kings Point, New York.

Mr. Georges Leval, distinguished authority on Art, Paris, France.

Mr. Nicolas Alexandre Manic, industrialist and patron of the arts, Paris, France.

Colonel Le Baron R. Matyn de Lionel, Grand Chancellor of the renowned Royal Order of St. Georges de Burgogne of Belgium, Brussels, Belgium.

Rear Admiral Alfonso Navarro Romero, Republic of Peru.

Count Stephen Potocki, diplomat, Paris, France.

His Highness Prince L. Radziwill, Rome and London.

Reverend Frederick P. Erkhardt, D.D., New York City.

These distinguished contemporaries typify the caliber of men holding this high honor. And I wish to congratulate my esteemed friend Prof. Oswald LeWinter, at having been selected to join their company. I wish also to congratulate Count de Valitch and the members of the Sovereign Order of Cyprus and to wish them continued success in their efforts toward bringing about a better and more peaceful world.

Returns Scanty, but Foreign Aid River Rolls on

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1967

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Members of the House should be alerted to the fact that our Foreign Affairs Committee is commencing markup of the foreign aid bill. At a time when we are facing a record budget deficit and our image abroad is deteriorating it would be practical to take a good hard look at this program.

The famed Washington correspondent of the Chicago Tribune, Walter Trohan, performs a great public service by his timely analysis of the foreign aid program, which appeared in this morning's edition of that newspaper. I insert his commentary at this point in the RECORD:

RETURNS SCANTY, BUT FOREIGN AID RIVER ROLLS ON

(By Walter Trohan)

WASHINGTON, June 13.—In its 20th year, foreign aid is running the gantlet of congressional committees, which are expected to trim the multi-billion dollar program.

Foreign aid has cost American taxpayers about 130 billion dollars directly—or more than 185 billion if interest charges on borrowing for the great give-away are included.

"Dollar for dollars, our expenditures for the mutual security program, after we have once achieved a reasonable military posture for ourselves, will buy more security than far greater additional expenses for our own forces," President Eisenhower told Congress on March 13, 1959, in asking for military aid.

"To summarize, through the mutual security program, our friends among the free world nations make available to us for the use of our forces some 250 bases in the most strategic locations, many of them of vital importance. They support ground forces totaling more than 5 million men stationed at points where danger of local aggression is most acute, based on their own soil and prepared to defend their own homes. They man air forces of about 30,000 aircraft, of which nearly 14,000 are jets, 23 times the jet strength of 1950 when the program started. They also have naval forces totaling 2,500 combat vessels, with some 1,700 in active fleets or their supporting activities."

BUT ONLY TOKEN MILITARY HELP COMES BACK

Seldom has Eisenhower been wronger, but even so he is no wronger than many another supporter of foreign aid who made the same argument, altho without citing figures. The United States has received virtually no military return for its aid, except occasional token support, and that has not been due to aid.

The United States is engaged in war in Viet Nam. Australia, New Zealand, and South Korea are the only nations giving support, out of Eisenhower's estimate of 5 million supporting ground forces available under military aid. The Australian and New Zealand support is small and is not in return for military aid, but is based on the fact these nations have been virtually abandoned by Britain and need support in the area. South Korea is helping not because of foreign aid but because of aid received in the Korean war.

France has denied its bases and withdrawn its support from the North Atlantic Treaty organization. Our allies are trading, directly or indirectly, with the communist enemy in Viet Nam.

Foreign aid was launched in a speech at Harvard university June 5, 1947, by the late Gen. George C. Marshall, then secretary of state. He outlined proposals for rebuilding a war-ravaged Europe. Later the program was enlarged to include military aid.

FIGURES ZOOM TOWARD 130 BILLION TOTAL

From the beginning to the 1966 fiscal year ending last June 30, the official figures list total spending at 122.3 billion dollars. Aid spending in the current fiscal year will bring the total near 130 billions if spending continues at the 1966 rate. In 1966, the administration asked for 3.85 billion dollars for foreign aid but got 2.96 billions. However, it spent 6.75 billions or perhaps as much as 8.1 billions on items properly chargeable as aid.

While foreign aid was represented as being limited to 2.96 billions, Rep. Otto Passman [D., La.], critic of foreign aid, found that aid expenditures were an acknowledged record at 6.75 billions during the 1966 fiscal year. He estimated that, if all aid items were properly listed, aid spending in 1966 would total at least 8.1 billions.

There has never been a proper audit of the spending, even tho charges of graft and corruption have been numerous. Nor has there been any examination of policy, even tho the United States has given aid to both sides involved in the recent Israeli-Arab war. It has given a total of more than 13 billion dollars in the middle east area, if one includes aid to Turkey and Greece.

SNCC Representative on Taxpayers' Payroll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1967

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the report by Allen and Scott that a close associate of militant firebrand Stokely Carmichael, and former SNCC attorney, is on the Federal taxpayers' payroll is nauseating.

I include the Allen-Scott report in the RECORD:

CONGRESSMAN'S PAYROLL INCLUDES LEADING AGITATOR

(By Robert S. Allen and Paul Scott)

WASHINGTON.—One of the most brilliant anti-Vietnam war agitators has turned up on the congressional payroll.

William Higgs, a former attorney for the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, a close associate of firebrand Stokely Carmichael, and a leader in organizing and directing stormy protests against congressional committees, is on the payroll of Rep. Augustus Hawkins, D-Calif., member of the Labor and Education Committee.

Since being hired last January, Higgs' monthly salary has averaged around $285 as a part-time assistant to the Negro lawmaker.

In addition to staging anti-Vietnam demonstrations around the country, Higgs was spotted by Capitol police earlier this month with students protesting the draft hearings of the House Armed Services Committee.

Before playing a leading role in the anti-draft agitation, Higgs headed a so-called national committee of student, peace and Communist groups that sought to disrupt hearings by the House Committee on Un-American Activities on Communist influence in anti-Vietnam demonstrations.

The turbulent operations of Higgs and his anti-Vietnam war organization were cited by FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover in testifying before a House Appropriations subcommittee.

"The Committee on Un-American Activities scheduled hearings and subpoenaed several individuals who have been active in protests against U.S. policy in Vietnam," Hoover said. "Soon thereafter, the National Committee to Defend the Civil Liberties of the Antiwar group was formed in Washington, D.C., to organize demonstrations against the hearings.

"The committee was headed by William Higgs, a former attorney for the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee. Among the organizations sponsoring this committee were the Socialist Workers Party, the Young Socialist Alliance, the Progressive Labor Party, W.E.B. DuBois Clubs of America, Students for a Democratic Society and Women Strike for Peace.

"During the hearings, many demonstrators were arrested for causing disturbances."

More to Come—In recent weeks, Higgs is realiably reported to have conferred with Carmichael on the latter's announced plans "to take over Washington, lock, stock and barrel."

The ties between them are reputedly close. Sources acquainted with both describe Higgs as "one of Carmichael's principal braintrusters. Carmichael hardly makes a move without first consulting Higgs."

Other militant civil rights activists are quoting Higgs as predicting, "This summer and fall will be one of the most turbulent this country has ever seen."

No Cooperation—The House Judiciary Subcommittee on Immigration, investigating Stokely Carmichael's activities, has been unable to get any help from the Justice Department.

A subcommittee request, initiated by Rep. Arch Moore, W. Va., ranking Republican member, to examine FBI records on Carmichael was turned down.

In a letter to Moore, Director J. Edgar Hoover stated he was under instructions from Atty. Gen. Ramsey Clark not to make FBI files on Carmichael available to the committee.

Previously, in testifying before a House Appropriations subcommittee headed by Rep. John Rooney, D-N.Y., Hoover did comment on Carmichael, as follows:

"In espousing his philosophy of 'black power,' Carmichael has been in frequent contact with Max Stanford, field chairman of the Revolutionary Action Movement (RAM) a highly secret all-Negro, Marxist-Leninist, Chinese-Communist-oriented organization which advocates guerrilla warfare to obtain its goals, and has afforded Stanford assistance and guidance in forming a Black Panther party in New York."

In looking into Carmichael's admittance to the U.S. Rep. Moore has been informed that the "black power" advocate "became an American citizen in 1953 by derivation after both his parents had been naturalized."

Through this procedure, Carmichael did not have to take an oath to uphold the Constitution, as required of naturalized citizens. He was born June 29, 1941, in Trinidad, West Indies.

Riot Inciters—The Senate Internal Security Subcommittee is probing Carmichael's activities on college campuses where riots have erupted. Mayor Allen Thompson of Jackson, Miss., has told subcommittee members that "several of Carmichael's agitators" appeared on the campus before and during the outbreak of violence there. One of them was Willie Ricks, a top Carmichael aide . . . Rep. Wayne Hays, D-O., has asked the Justice Department for a report on why no legal action has been started against Carmichael for urging students not to register for the draft . . . Harlems' extremist Mau Mau Society that wears red helmets and carries bayonets, has formed an "honor guard" for Adam Clayton Powell. This "honor guard" plans to escort Powell to Washington when he returns in June—if he does.

Can We Wave the Flag Too Much?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER L. MIZE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1967

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, the Topeka, Kans., Daily Capital recently carried the reprint of a statement of Dr. Sidney L. DeLove, "Can We Wave the Flag Too Much?" It seems appropriate on this Flag Day, 1967, when the House of Representatives has been moved to arrange a special Flag Day ceremony to bring this stirring patriotic message to the attention of my colleagues. It is even more significant today than it was when Dr. DeLove first made it in 1966.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include this message in the Appendix of the RECORD:

CAN WE WAVE THE FLAG TOO MUCH?

(By Sidney L. DeLove)

Is it possible to wave the flag too much? Provided, of course, that you wave it with integrity? Is it possible to study Lincoln or Shakespeare too much? Is it possible to read the Bible too much?—The great, the good, the true, are inexhaustible for inspiration, example and strength. I believe that we are not waving our flag enough, not nearly enough—It seems to me that we are developing a tendency to be timid or even apologetic about waving the stars and stripes. Walk up and down the streets on July 4th and count the flags. It is our nation's birthday, a sacred day in world history, the most important day of America. Why isn't the flag flying on every rooftop and from every home and building? This complacent attitude is strong evidence of cancerous patriotic decay. The flag is a symbol of our national unity. It is the spirit of our undying devotion to our country. It stands for the best that is in us—for loyalty, character, and faith in democracy—Isn't our flag a synonym of the United States of America? Does it not represent man's greatest, noblest, most sublime dream? Is it not the zenith of achievement, the goal to which generations have aspired?

Ladies and gentlemen, I believe it is time for us—for the mad, rushing Twentieth Century American—to stop for a moment and think. Let us arrest our near reverential admiration of material success and return to the spiritual and ethical values. Let us imbue and rekindle in ourselves and our children the so-called old-fashioned way of patriotism, a burning devotion to the principles and ideals upon which our country was founded—Should not every home own and proudly display the colors on holidays and other such occasions? Isn't the flag Patrick Henry, Jefferson, Franklin, Washington, Nathan Hale, Gettysburg and Valley Forge, Paul Revere, Jackson and other great men and women who have given us our heritage? When you look at the flag can't you see the Alamo, Corrigedor, Pearl Harbor, The Monitor and The Merrimac? Lest we forget, isn't the flag Flanders Field, Bataan, Iwo Jima, Normandy, Babe Ruth and Davy Crockett? The great events of our past and present are wrapped up in our flag—It is a symbol of this blessed nation, a giant in industry, education and commerce. Millions of fertile square miles, wheatlands, coal mines, steel plants. Our great republic, the chosen infant destined to be man's last remaining hope for suffering humanity, a shining beacon of light, noble and glorious, the haven for the oppressed and persecuted and truly God's gift to mankind—That is what the flag means to me. Can we wave it too much? I don't think so.

(Note.—Reply of S. L. DeLove on the Know Your History Hour, Dec. 30, 1956, to a listener who wrote: Your programs are wonderful—but you are waving the flag too much." The above is reprinted and narrated annually in hundreds of national magazines, newspapers and radio stations and is a part of the Congressional Record. Dr. DeLove is the author of The Quiet Betrayal and president of Independence Hall of Chicago.)

A Rare Talent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1967

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, it is the mark of a successful manager, whether it be of a city, company or university, that he understand the nature of his function, its demands, the personal response which it evokes, and the unique responsibility of his task.

Dr. David Kurtzman, who has been acting chancellor and chancellor of the University of Pittsburgh for the last 2 years, is such a man, and he has guided the cathedral of learning through some difficult transitional days. It is the university's good fortune that he will remain as chancellor emeritus.

KDKA radio-TV in Pittsburgh carried an excellent editorial recently praising Dr. Kurtzman's leadership. I include the editorial at this point in the Record, along with my own best wishes to Dr. Kurtzman, and welcome to the new chancellor, Dr. Wesley Posvar.

The editorial follows:

A Rare Talent

Through the years of the renaissance, Pittsburgh has been blessed with the services of some very talented men. Dr. David Kurtzman, who has just retired as chancellor of the University of Pittsburgh, must certainly be counted among them.

In 1965, Dr. Kurtzman was working at the Fels Institute in Philadelphia when he was called to a far more strenuous job. The University of Pittsburgh was in serious financial trouble, and was embroiled in an unpleasant controversy. Dr. Kurtzman became vice chancellor for finance, and began helping Pitt through the momentous transition to the status of a state-related unversity.

That job is now finished, and Dr. Kurtzman said goodbye to Pitt at commencement exercises the other day. He takes with him the cheers and good wishes of nearly everybody on the campus, and considering all that Pitt has been through, that is quite an accomplishment. A member of his staff told us, quote "he was just plain honest. . . . honest and straightforward with everybody, and everybody liked him." unquote.

The chancellor's office is now in the hands of Dr. Wesley Posvar, an educator who comes here from the Air Force Academy with outstanding recommendations. It will be his job to guide Pitt along the course that was laid down in the turmoils of the past two years, and we wish him well.

As for Dr. Kurtzman, he can leave with the knowledge that Pitt is in better shape than the day he arrived. He has served the university, and the city of Pittsburgh very well, and he deserves the thanks of all of us.

No Room for Comfort

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1967

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following:

No Room for Comfort

(By Louis Stockstill)

To speed procurement of new military aircraft and to underwrite development work on an advanced manned strategic bomber, Congress has expanded and strengthened the shopping list approved by the Defense Department.

In authorizing a $21-billion program for procurement of major weapons and related research during fiscal '68, the House and Senate added more than $300-million not sought by DoD for a number of aircraft programs.

In the overall total, this is a small amount. And that portion of the add-on allotted to AMSA is still smaller—$25-million. But it is an important $25-million.

The funds, of course, still remain to be appropriated. And even then they won't be spent unless Secretary McNamara says so. But the action of the Congress again demonstrates that the legislature intends to listen to military advice even though it runs counter to the recommendations of the civilian leadership.

The Air Force had requested $51-million in the FY '68 program for the advanced manned strategic bomber. The program was fully backed by the Joint Chiefs of Staff. DOD, nevertheless, whacked the request down to $26-million.

Testimony taken behind closed doors by the House Armed Services Committee demonstrated, the Committee said, that $26-million was patently inadequate. The extra $25-million was restored.

If the program moves ahead and continues to be funded as required, the first operational aircraft still will not appear, however, until 1975. And it will be some time thereafter before the Air Force can build a meaningful or capable AMSA force. So we are still looking pretty far down the road.

Under the circumstances, Congress has every reason to be concerned about DOD's "continued procrastination" and the "snail's pace" at which the Department is moving in developing a follow-on bomber.

It would be helpful if one could believe that the Department is totally convinced of the necessity for holding the program back. But reviewing what has happened, we can find no such comfort.

Last year, $11.8-million not sought by DOD was appropriated for the AMSA program. Of this amount, $7.8-million has been OK'd for expenditure. Many would say this, in itself, is an admission by the Defense Department that it failed to properly fund the program in the first place. If the money wasn't needed, why was it spent?

With continued Congressional prodding, the aircraft may be built and flown. But if it ever gets in the air, we hope those who have had to be prodded will recognize how little they had to do with the accomplishment.

Department of Defense Appropriations, 1968

SPEECH

OF

HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1967

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 10738) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes.

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Chairman, the difficulty of arriving at an adequate appropriation figure which can be justified as neither wasteful nor penurious is well known and appreciated by every member of the committee. The military appropriation before us now is the largest, and necessarily the most delicate, we will consider this year because the safety of the country is involved. With this in mind, I wish to thank the committee for a commendable job in the reduction of budget requests which do not affect our combat effectiveness. While providing for such strategic hardware as a full-strength B–52 force, the FB–111, Minuteman III, Poseidon, and Nike X missiles, they have wisely recommended reduction in amounts requested for special studies and overlapping training programs, and reduction in many other requests which undoubtedly exceed needs.

One particular reduction should interest us all for its implications. The committee eliminated a $400,000 request for funds to dredge Kings Bay, Ga., which is an inactive ammunition loading depot. Despite the request for funds, the Army testified that there are no current plans to reactivate the depot. Why, then, were the funds requested in the first place? Who formulated the request and for what reason? How many more such indefensible requests in this enormous budget slipped by even the astute committee and its competent staff?

While my principal purpose is to commend the committee and to support the bill, I believe that this is an appropriate time to raise the question of unpunished incompetence. What happens to the man who inserted the Kings Bay proposal to waste $400,000? Will he be left unreprimanded, uncensured, unchecked to strike again when the next budget requests are made?

I am currently reviewing a naval aircraft usage audit which contains more than $100 million of unjustifiable waste for such things as the unnecessary purchase, operation, and maintenance of 135 aircraft beyond the needs of that part of one branch of the service, the transportation of passengers and cargo at a cost of up to 50 times that of commercial transportation, and the joyriding of pilots who fly home for the weekend in planes which cost in excess of $200 per hour to operate. To illustrate my generalizations, I cite the case of a plane being dispatched to return a naval officer to his base at a cost to the Navy of $666 when available commercial transportation cost only $12, and the case of the pilot who took an HU–16 from Norfolk to his home in Minneapolis-St. Paul for the weekend at a cost of $5,663.

I wish to raise many questions from the audit before the Armed Services Committee, but my purpose in mentioning this today is to suggest that we can still pare down the military budget by hundreds of millions of dollars by deeper probes in search of unnecessary requests. The censuring or removing from positions of responsibility those people who deliberately and wantonly waste tax funds and request money for purposes which they know to be unnecessary to the national interest or in amounts beyond the real needs of the services also ought to be considered. The waste weakens our country in a very real way.

Again I commend the committee and promise to give it my full support in future efforts to provide for the true needs of our defense forces while eliminating the inexcusable waste of tax resources.

Paterson, N.J., Celebrates 175th Birthday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. JOELSON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1967

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, the city of Paterson, N.J., is now celebrating its 175th birthday. A daylong program commemorating the anniversary is scheduled for July 4, and will be held in Paterson's Eastside Park.

The affair will also feature a free fireworks display at the park, an exhibit featuring Paterson's history, a folk festival, a sports program, the lighting of Passaic Falls, displays by the various organizations in the city, a motion picture on Paterson's history prepared by the film class of Mr. Donald Smith of the Neighborhood Youth Corps, and the simultaneous ringing of every available bell and whistle in the city at 2 o'clock. The Young Citizens for a Better Paterson will also hold a birthday ball on the evening of July 1.

The city of Paterson was founded at the suggestion of Alexander Hamilton, who first visited the site of the present city on July 10, 1778. Our first Secretary of the Treasury was impressed with Passaic Falls and its capacity to provide power for industry. Based upon Hamilton's recommendations, the State legislature granted a charter to the Society for Useful Manufactures in 1791. The city was named after Gov. William Paterson, who signed the charter.

With the growth of transportation facilities, Paterson became a major industrial center. Railroad cars were an important product in the early 19th century, but by the end of that century silk mills were the most important source of manufacturing in the city. In fact, Paterson was called the "Silk City of the World." It was also known, however, for many other things. The motor which propelled Charles Lindbergh's *Spirit of St. Louis* in its transatlantic flight was built in Paterson. Samuel Colt's revolver, John P. Holland's submarine, and Col. Andrew Derrom's system of prefabricated housing all originated there.

I look forward to attending the July 4 celebration which will be under the direction of the able president of the Passaic County Historical Society, Alfred P. Cappio.

The Cancer of Indifference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK BRINKLEY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1967

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I join my friends, Mr. C. W. Curry and Dr. Louie D. Newton, in applauding Mr. William R. Bowdoin on his address, "The Cancer of Indifference" in honor of a present-day Caleb, a man whose life, by example, is a great influence for good, Mr. Warren P. Sewell, Sr. I commend these thoughts to the American people because I believe they bring into perspective some of our opportunities for the betterment of mankind. The address follows:

THE CANCER OF INDIFFERENCE

(Address by Wm. R. Bowdoin, vice chairman, Trust Co. of Georgia, at a metting Honoring Warren Sewell, April 21, 1967)

Mr. Chairman, Mr. and Mrs. Sewell, and friends, It is regrettable that I do not possess the eloquence of diction to properly recount the many contributions made for the betterment of mankind by this wonderful individual we honor here this evening for his great leadership in the fight against cancer—Mr. Warren Sewell. Neither can I properly express in words my gratitude for the privilege you have accorded me to participate in this program, so I will just resort to two of the nicest words in the English language—thank you.

There are hundreds here who have known Mr. Sewell much longer and more intimately than I but there are none who admire him more. Unlike those who have allowed success to dim their consideration of others, the character, courage and capacity of this modest man we honor has served as a fuel that kindles within him the fires of compassion and understanding for those less fortunate. This has been accomplished by adherence to those Christian principles by which all men must live if the fruits of a good life are to be enjoyed.

That is why the example he set has been for so many a rallying point to build courage when courage seemed to fail. To regain faith when there seemed little cause for faith, and to create hope when hope became forlorn. The beacon light of hope in the war against cancer is one of is greatest contributions to his fellowman.

Our distinguished guest of honor has not always had an easy life. He began his illustrious career as a horse and wagon drygoods salesman in northwest Georgia in the days when people looked upon a willingness for hard work as a God-given asset, and ambition a virtue. He possessed an abundance of both and welded them together with dignity. Wherever he travelled, in daylight or dark, in fair weather or foul, he was always guided in the mind's eye by the lamps of integrity, opportunity, courage, sound judgment, pride in his accomplishments, and a desire for service both to his customer and society. He subscribed fully to that philosophy made famous by the great Sunday Lady of Possum Trot, Miss Martha Berry, founder of the great Berry Schools the pursuit of easy things makes us weak, the pursuit of the difficult makes us strong. That is why he stands today as a Samson in a weekend world.

Mr. Warren Sewell is one of our state's finest examples of what can be accomplished under the American system of free enterprise. A system that stands today in grave danger at the hands of those who, instead of encouraging the belief that government should do for man only what man cannot do for himself, they promote by any available means the new philosophy that man should do for himself only what he cannot get the government to do for him. All too many of us are becoming accessories to this new doctrine simply because it seems easier that way. Then we wonder why the powers in government appropriate your money and my money for every type project that can be conceived by man.

Just recently the government appropriated $500,000 to study the emotional reaction of a family whose loved one had been stricken with cancer. While the amount dollar-wise is small by comparison to other government spending, the implication is shocking. Any one who has had this horrible experience, and I lost both my mother and father with cancer, doesn't need some governmental expert to determine the emotional reaction. I use this merely as an example to show where we are headed, unless you and I are willing to support and fight for the private enterprise system which includes not just business, but the building of our communities, by providing a better life for our people through our own resources. Otherwise, we will come more and more into the clutches of a centralized government.

Our honor guest has given strong and tangible leadership toward fighting this creeping socialism.

Two years ago when my fine friend and distinguished associate, Arch Avary, himself a victim of cancer, talked to Mr. Sewell about a plan he had that would encourage individuals to recognize the basic weapon in the war against cancer—physical examination—his reply without hesitation was "count me as your ally and I will give a suit of clothes to every man who has a physical examination in accordance with the rules set forth by the American and Georgia Cancer Societies." Since then, many other business leaders of our state and beyond have followed Mr. Sewell's leadership. As a result, there are hundreds of fine citizens who detected their cancer infection and today are enjoying good health, meeting the demands of their business or profession, and discharging the responsibilities of good citizenship.

What if Mr. Sewell had said "No" to Arch Avary? Had been indifferent and ridiculed the idea of offering tangible inducement to obtain proper physical examination? We will never know what might have been because Mr. Sewell had faith and vision—faith in Arch Avary and his program, and a vision of what could be accomplished in the interest of those victims of this terrible disease.

But we still have many people in our country today who do not realize there are two general types of cancer. Mr. Sewell has provided leadership in the treatment of both. One is physical the other is moral. The physical cancer only destroys the tissues and organs of the human body, if not detected in time. The moral cancer, or cancer of indifference, is just as horrible and devastating because it destroys the soul of man and blights the communities in which we live. Those in the medical profession of our country, who already have performed so nobly and effectively, can provide assistance with one—only you can cure the other.

Medical science, and the thousands of wonderful volunteer workers can give you the symptoms of the physical cancer, but it is the symptoms of the cancer of indifference that I want to discuss with you this evening.

Marshal Petain, following the fall of France, observed, "Our spirit of enjoyment was stronger than our spirit of sacrifice. We wanted to have more than we wanted to give. We spared effort and met disaster."

The past quarter of a century has brought many changes in the philosophy and activities of our people. Some have been necessary, some have been an imposition.

Edmund Burke once said, "For evil to triumph, good men have but to do nothing."

There is mounting evidence everywhere that more and more good people are doing nothing to correct the attitude of indifference toward the preservation and proper expansion of those basic fundamentals upon which this nation was founded. Reverence for God, loyalty to country, respect for the law, and individual responsibilities.

During the past four years it has been my privilege to serve with six of Georgia's outstanding citizens on the Governor's Commission for Efficiency and Improvement in Government. This service afforded me unusual opportunity to observe the attitudes of individual citizens toward the various echelons of government and the community development programs. It was a pleasant and gratifying experience in many ways, but also disturbing for it focused attention on just how prevalent the cancer of indifference is in our state and nation. There was evidence on many occasions of how reluctant our business, professional and political leaders are to speak out in support of issues vital to the preservation of those principles upon which this state and nation was founded, and which must be expanded if we are to have a sound program of progress.

When we talk about indifference, what actually do we mean? Mr. Webster defines indifference as "lack of interest or concern." This is exactly what is infecting our nation today to the detriment of our physical, spiritual, and economical well-being.

There is much talk about rights, but little reminder of responsibilities.

Many years ago, John D. Rockefeller said, "Every right implies a responsibility, every possession an obligation, and every opportunity a duty.'"

Adhering to this philosophy hurls a challenge to each of us, and we cannot sidestep it in the hopes that someone will pick it up.

These who go about the countryside flailing and shouting for freedom should be reminded that a reckless abuse of freedom, so prevalent in their action, turns freedom into a terrible mockery.

That fair debate and honest opposition are the foundation stones of our democracy, but must never be supplanted with villification and bigotry.

That the privileges and pleasures we enjoy as free people do not necessarily in time become our inalienable rights.

All right-thinking individuals realize that regardless of our personal preference or opinion we must live within the law with the same dignity and pride that has been the mark of our people since the very beginning. If this is to be accomplished, we cannot sit in silence and surrender to unwarranted demands of the howling, screeching mobs who mock the law by acts of violence and spit on those who wear the uniform of authority.

We should present our highest commendation to those courageous men who are called upon to perform their duties under the most difficult of circumstances simply because of our indifference—the fine police officers of our nation.

One of America's most distinguished Federal judges, Judge Alexander Holtdoff, recently made this statement, and I quote: "I must say that I sometimes feel when I am trying a criminal case as though I am in a topsy-turvy world. I am not trying the accused—I am trying the policeman. Did he break any rules?"

It seems more and more of our laws and the interpretation of these laws are aimed toward maximum protection of those who violate and defy the law.

It is high time for us to wake up and let those administering the affairs of our government know the decent, God-fearing citizens of this country are entitled to some considerations, too.

This protection of thieves and murderers is nothing new. It has just been revived. One of the most pathetic characters in all history, to me, is Pontius Pilate.

All of you I am sure remember the story of how Pilate, anxious to rid himself of any responsibility for judging Jesus, although he knew Jesus was innocent, finally faced the frenzied crowd on a feast day when it was customary to release a prisoner to freedom during the celebration. The mob demanded that Barabbas, a thief and a murderer, be released. Pilate says, "But what shall I do with Jesus? I find he has done no wrong." They shouted, "Crucify him, crucify him." Despite the pleadings of his own wife, Pilate sent for a basin of water and in the presence of the howling mob dipped his hands and said, "I wash from my hands the blood of this good man," and turned Jesus over to the irresponsible throng to be crucified. How many are today washing their hands in the basin of indifference?

Just recently a man in New York City killed his wife and five children, admitted it, but was set free because he had not been meticulously informed of his rights in line with recent Supreme Court decisions. Some weeks ago, a national magazine carried four full-pages of pictures of murderers and rapists, most of them admitted, who had slipped out of the clutches of the law on a technicality.

Last year one out of every nine police officers of our nation was assaulted in the performance of his duty. For the last several years there has been an average of 65 policemen a year killed in the line of duty.

We are prone to shrug our shoulders and complacently say, "Well, that's too bad, but it will never happen here." It can and has happened here.

Last fall in the City of Atlanta, policemen had their uniforms torn and ripped from their bodies by a bunch of hoodlums picketing, of all places, the induction station of the United States Army. The favorite cry is "police brutality".

We have seen develop in this country a trend toward making a joke of patriotism. The courts ruled that a person does not have to stand when the flag passes, or when the Star-Spangled Banner is played. Every decent person should be proud to show this evidence of respect and appreciation for the privilege of living in this, the greatest nation on earth. Those who don't are a disgrace to decent people everywhere.

It is tragic when more than 50% of the young men called for military service in this country today are declined because of educational, physical and moral deficiencies. Thereby accepting for this great service the cream of our American manhood, and leaving behind many of the troublemakers—the unbarbered, unshaven, unwashed—whose actions are a disgrace to the concept of a Christian nation.

If an individual upon reaching the so-called age of maturity denounces his honorable parents, ridicules his friends, their acts of patriotism and ambitions for good citizenship, he is classified harshly in any decent society.

Why should we deal less harshly with those who damn the land of their birth, desecrate the flag that generations of loyal, Christian Americans have marched under to provide a better life of freedom for so many.

The vast majority of our people, I believe, are honest, basically God-fearing, respectable citizens. By sitting in silence we condone the acts of tha boisterous, unrepresentative group of individuals who argue that rioting and looting and disregard for human and property rights is the result of poor living conditions, social restrictions, and other absurd claims.

This human scum, preying like vultures upon the respectibility of our land, claims the right to freedom of speech and action that by their behavior they seek to destroy, and will destroy unless you and I have the courage to stand up and be counted on the side of right and justice.

We must put less emphasis on minorities and majorities and give more stress to the individual. This is the American way. America is based upon the concept of the individual whose personality is inviolate because he is created in the image of God. The rights of man come from the Creator, not through any government or organization to which he may belong. This sacred truth is proclaimed in the Declaration of Independence, and guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States, although some officials in high positions would have us believe otherwise. These documents intend that every citizen should be recognized regardless of his race, creed or color, for his individual worth and he must always have opportunities to improve *himself* and *his* lot in life, but must also discharge properly the individual responsibilities of citizenship placed upon him.

The key words in the whole American system are "individual" and "opportunity". These words can never be translated to mean mobs and demands. Individual opportunity never can be truthfully transposed to read "group guarantees."

The late Justice Frankfurter once said, "If a man can be allowed to determine for himself what is law, every man can. That means, first, chaos and then tyranny."

We all, regardless of race, creed or color, have a tremendous responsibility not just to preserve the great heritage that is ours, but to so nurture and improve upon it that we leave it to future generations richer in advantage, and opportunities and freedom than have been ours to receive.

One of the most glaring symptoms of this cancer of indifference is our failure to exercise the power of the ballot. Here in our own state, adjusted to the 1960 census, there are 2,700,000 individuals in Georgia who are qualified to register to vote. As of December 31, 1966, only 1,793,000 of that 2,700,000 had registered. In the last General Election, one of the most important in our state, 949,000 of this 1,793,000 voted. When we become too busy to take the time to cast a ballot for the candidate of our choice, we are entering the terminal stages of an inevitable end far worse than death itself.

I have had individuals say to me, "I didn't go to the polls because I am not familiar with the candidates and what they stood for." That is the worst excuse I know. With our modern system of communications and news media, there is no earthly reason why we cannot be informed about those who seek public office and desire to manage the affairs of our government. There is another excuse that to me is intolerable, that is, "Well, what can I do, I am just one person?" I remind all of you that it is better to light one candle than to curse the darkness. We should all light the candle of opportunity and progress and let its heat and light dispel the thought that anything with a long existence can get along in the future with what it has in the past.

There is an old Turkish saying, "Read new books but old proverbs." New books stimulate a vision of the future, and old proverbs contain the conviction from experience that men have lived by.

I urge you to develop strong convictions, be enthusiastic and energetic about your convictions, **and stand for *something*,** don't just sit idly by while the flames of misunderstanding, strife and discord envelop you.

Make it your business to be informed. Know what is going on in your community, your state and your nation. Get the facts. Communicate your opinions to those in whom you entrust the management of your government, your church, and your community affairs. You ask the impossible of these representatives when you don't give them the benefit of your opinions, and let them know what you stand for.

Every area is not as fortunate as yours to have a man of the character and ability of Lamar Plunkett to represnet you in government.

When you believe these representatives are right, support them. If you think they are wrong, tell them why you think they are wrong. They are entitled to that consideration.

My friends, I shall always remember with pride the honor of participating in the program this evening recognizing the outstanding works of a great American—Mr. Warren Sewell. No man has ever set a more inspiring example—he is worthy of honor not just for this one night, but for the years ahead.

This can be accomplished if you and I take our leave this evening pledging our full support and active participation in the medical and moral requirements for the cure and eradication of both forms of this terrible disease of cancer. As we march toward victory in both battles, we will gain strength for our mission by adherence to his philosophy: have courage tempered with humility; ambition tempered with moderation; judgment tempered with understanding, and above all, "Do justly, love mercy, and walk humbly with thy God."

The Schweppes Man Endorses California's Wines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LIONEL VAN DEERLIN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1967

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, in our hearts, we Californians have known all along that our State's wines are unsurpassed. Now our sentiment has been confirmed by no less an authority than that eminent British connoisseur, Comdr. Edward Whitehead.

The compelling logic which the commander brought to bear at a Rotary meeting in San Diego last week should demolish once and for all the contentions of that handful of scoffers who still insist that comparable bubbly is produced in other areas of the United States.

Is there anyone among us who can effectively argue with Commander Whitehead on this point? I doubt it, for the commander has spent most of his adult life sampling—and comparing—the best in food and drink offered by the various regions of the world.

Under unanimous consent, I will insert at this point an article from the San Diego Union for June 10, 1967, which describes Commander Whitehead's keen observations:

NOTED BRITISH PROMOTOR HAILS STATE'S WINES

(By Tim Shepard)

Britain's master tonic salesman said yesterday it's time the English were talked into buying California wine.

"I think California wines stand up to any but the very best French wines," said Cmdr. Edward Whitehead.

The distinguished English promoter with one of the best known beards in the world suggested California begin selling itself. He was the speaker at a luncheon of District 534 of Rotary International at Vacation Village.

SEES INACCURACY

"Southern California has not been projected accurately in Britain, or in Europe for that matter," he said. "As soon as Britain gets its balance of trade problem settled, California has a tremendous market potential in England and Europe."

Whitehead said California is unsurpassed in many fields, such as electronic technology. He suggested that California and the rest of the United States have not properly promoted the country for international tourism.

Whitehead said California is misrepresented in newspaper editorials throughout the world.

TRADE DELEGATION

"They talk about congested freeways, smog, the Watts riots, Hollywood and LSD," he said. "If these are the wrong impressions, why isn't California doing something to correct this?"

The Englishman recommended that California send trade delegations abroad to promote the attractive features of the state. He suggested that a trade and tourist office be opened in London.

A Great Editor Passes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM STEED

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1967

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, the death on June 4, 1967, of Ned Shepler, editor and publisher of the Lawton, Okla., Constitution and Morning Press, marked the passing of one of the greatest men of his profession Oklahoma has ever produced, and one of the true exponents of the newspaper business in the entire Nation.

It was my good fortune to count Mr. Shepler as a personal friend for most of the more than 50 years he engaged in newspapering in Oklahoma. He was unique in many ways, building his newspaper empire from a small, struggling little country newspaper to one of the State's commanding institutions. And for the half century he spent accomplishing this great business success, he was even more successful in his endeavors as a civic and political leader of his State and community. His passing is a loss that will not be replaced.

I think it can truly be said that he lived to become a legend in his own time. His good works will remain as his monument.

Two editorials, one from the staff he created at Lawton, and the other from the Altus Times-Democrat, pay eloquent tribute to this outstanding proponent of an American free press. They are as follows:

A TOWERING LOSS

The Lawton-Fort Sill community and this newspaper suffered a towering loss Sunday in the death of Mr. Ned Shepler, newspaper editor and publisher, civic leader and gentleman.

In his own quiet way, he possessed the rare qualities of greatness.

During the 57 years he lived here, his name became synonymous with the development of the Lawton-Fort Sill community.

He was involved in state and national affairs.

All his activities grew out of and were centered in his editorship of The Lawton Constitution and Lawton Morning Press.

He was widely recognized for the excellence of his newspapers and his dedication to the principle that a newspaper must be the voice and conscience of the community it serves.

Although quiet and softspoken, Ned Shepler was a man of great courage and strong convictions. He never hesitated to speak out through newspaper editorials when he believed the vital interests of the community were involved. He committed his life to making Lawton a better place in which to live.

He recognized the power of the printed word and the influence of the press. He used this power with restraint and insisted that others on his staff do the same.

Above all, he was fair minded and believed in giving others the benefit of the doubt. His concern for the rights of others and his sympathy for less fortunate individuals were characteristic of his life.

He was a newspaperman of the old school who believed power involves responsibility and work.

He spent more time at The Lawton Constitution and Morning Press than any other staff member. Several years ago, he toured Europe but could hardly wait to get back to his desk. He spent his last afternoon working in his office and supervising the editing of the Sunday edition.

He showed up at the newspaper at all hours of the day and night.

He was a good listener whose respect for the opinions of his fellow human beings was so great that his attitude was sometimes mistaken for shyness.

When The Lawton Constitution and Morning Press were merged, he wept because he feared that the larger newspaper would lose intimate contact with the people.

Under his leadership, the newspapers with the community have had phenomenal growth, and in his last days he was busy planning for another physical expansion of the newspaper plant.

The larger newspapers under Ned Shepler retained intimate contact with the people.

During business hours, he was almost always in his office, and his door was open to everyone.

He met and talked with all the visitors, from nationally known figures to beggars. To community leaders and builders, Ned Shepler represented strength and fair play. His knowledge, his judgment and his unselfish commitment to the public interest caused many to seek his views on vital issues.

Several years ago, soon after the newspapers moved to their present building, he employed a secretary. She quit, she said, despite his protests, because she sensed that he believed a secretary constituted a barrier between a newspaper editor and the people who wanted to see him.

Until his death, he continued handling his own voluminous correspondence and writing his own letters.

He read widely. The shelves in his office are lined with books, and his desk is still piled high with the newspapers from over the nation and with the magazines which he read every day.

He was a gentle individual. But he remained resolute even in the face of physical attack and personal abuse following editorial stands he had taken.

He considered the community a large family, and he was devoted to the ideal that all segments can live and prosper in harmony.

Any active publisher's editorial campaigns and policies through the years are bound to arouse controversy and some anger.

But even those who disagreed with his policies liked the man, and they would agree that whatever Ned Shepler did, he acted in what he believed were the best interests not for Ned Shepler but for the community as a whole.

When he received news of the present gigantic war-buildup at Fort Sill, he shook his head sadly. It is necessary growth, but not the kind of growth he preferred.

His generosity carried into his personal life. He was the first to congratulate friends in good fortune, and the first to offer aid in bad fortune.

He made numerous personal loans and gifts that few people knew about. The giving and the help pleased him. If someone thanked him, it embarrassed him.

When he and his wife, May, moved from their multistoried colonial-style home to smaller quarters in the Hotel Lawtonian, they conducted what they termed a "bazaar," and gave away furniture, antiques, keepsakes and practically every personal item they owned to their family, employes and friends.

Ned Shepler was always ready to participate in any public or private ceremony involving the community or his friends.

One of his last official acts was participation last Friday afternoon in the dedication of a plaque at Fort Sill's Post Field. He had been a cub reporter covering the airfield a half-century before.

He exemplified a trust in the integrity of others that is one of the marks of a true gentleman.

Always softspoken and conciliatory, he was like a father to many, including Army officers, public officials and newspapermen who were fortunate to have been associated with him.

Although he is not at his desk today, his influence will remain, and the institutions and personalities he helped to build will continue.

[From the Altus (Okla.) Times-Democrat, June 6, 1967]

SOUND WITHOUT FURY

Southwest Oklahoma hasn't had an easy life. It was born on a prairie where the winds howl and the trees are too few. But it has made its strides, and much of the thanks for that can go to Ned Shepler, editor and publisher of The Lawton Constitution and Morning Press for many, many years.

Ned Shepler died Sunday morning and a lot of the heart of Oklahoma's journalism went with him.

Not only Lawton will miss this man, but certainly all of Southwest Oklahoma will feel the void. And so will Oklahoma as a whole.

Mr. Shepler was a newspaperman's newspaperman. He was devoted and dedicated to his profession and never lost sight of its objectives. Also he was a community servant whose invaluable knowledge and energies spilled over for the benefit for this entire area and the state.

He served so unobtrusively in so many ways. He was a guiding light in Lawton's tremendous growth. Any good proposed for community, area, state or nation he supported it. His editorial pen held no fear on controversial issues but he supported his own convictions without malice, and on occasion that's difficult to do. He weathered a multitude of storms but never yielded to the temptation to meet their fury with his own.

Ned Shepler was a personal friend who could advise so well. We are truly sorry that tomorrow's young men in the newspaper business cannot call upon him for counsel. He always made life so much simpler for those struggling after him in the profession he so dearly loved and practiced with such dedication.

National Coal Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1967

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include last week's public service television and radio newscast, "The Kee Report." The subject discussed is National Coal Week, honoring the 50th anniversary of the National Coal Association.

NATIONAL COAL WEEK

This is Jim Kee—bringing you the Kee Report. President Lyndon B. Johnson has called upon the American people to observe the week beginning June 18, as National Coal Week to honor the 50th anniversary of the National Coal Association.

The Chief Executive took this action in response to a concurrent resolution passed unanimously by both Houses of Congress. The sponsors of National Coal Week had two purposes in mind—to recall what the industry has contributed to the national welfare in times past and to point up the vital role which the coal industry still plays in the nation's industrial life.

Half a century ago, this country faced a crisis of alarming proportions. The United States had just entered World War I and it was apparent that only American manpower and resources could bring victory to the Allied cause. At that time, American industry was almost wholly dependent upon the coal industry for its fuel needs. Unless there was a rapid expansion in coal production, this nation's industrial plant would be unable to produce the mountain of supplies needed to bring victory to the armed forces of the Allies.

President Woodrow Wilson intervened personally to meet this crisis. Through his Secretary of War, he asked the coal industry to mobilize to meet the energy demands of a nation at war. The response to this request was the formation of the National Coal Association just 50 years ago this month. The industry was mobilized so well by this Association that the coal industry set amazing production records. As a result it was said that World War I was won on the home front in America.

This wartime achievement was a proud moment in the history of the coal industry. It has been well said that America grew great on the coal of Appalachia. For nearly a century, this fuel supplied the energy for the nation's mills and factories and supplied the warmth for the nation's homes and schools.

Like all industries, coal was hard hit by the great depression. During World War II it surpassed even the great production record of two decades earlier. But after hostilities ceased, the competition of new fuels cut deeply into the markets for coal.

But now we are in the 1960's. The National Coal Association is still in existence and under its leadership, the coal industry is making a vigorous comeback. This is important to West Virginia—and especially to the Fifth District—which is the largest coal producing Congressional District in the United States.

The coal industry is expanding its export markets. The conversion of coal into steam energy is constantly being made more efficient. Experiments on a large scale are being carried on to test the conversion of coal into oil and gasoline. The use of coal in making plastics is under study. In short, the coal industry today is one of the most technically advanced in the United States.

The energy needs of the United States are constantly expanding. An alert coal industry can capture a fair share of the market. I am happy to report that the outlook for coal is improving.

Thank you for listening.

Baltic States Freedom Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM T. MURPHY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1967

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in June 1940, in blatant disregard of all its previous pledges, the Soviet Union invaded and occupied by force of arms the three independent nations of Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania. Even though the Soviet Government had renounced all sovereignty to the Baltic Republics and, in 1920, had signed treaties with each of the three states explicitly recognizing their independence from Soviet control "forever," Russian troops forcefully "incorporated" these free and sovereign nations into the Soviet Union.

But this was just the first act of the tragedy. On June 14, 1941, a wave of terror began which had no parallel in the histories of these tiny nations. Mass deportations of men, women, and children to the slave labor camps of Siberia were undertaken with ruthless efficiency. In the single night of June 14–15 it has been estimated that 15,000 Latvians and 30,000 Lithuanians were herded into waiting cattle cars for the long cruel trip into slavery. Under the pretext that these people were Nazi sympathizers, the Russians—themselves in secret negotiations with Hitler—gathered up thousands upon thousands of the peoples of these poor nations and sent them to Siberia.

Many years have passed since those tragic days. A whole generation has grown up which has never heard of the mass deportations of Baltic peoples into Russian slavery. Many do not even know that Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania ever existed on the face of the earth as independent and free nations. Thus it becomes our sad duty to devote this day as a day of remembrance. It is our hope that someday the Baltic States will again be able to resume their rightful place in the community of nations, and that the desire for freedom which so many of their peoples still cherish will be rewarded.

The British Run to Uncle Sam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1967

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, our Nation's Captial has been the host to numerous guests who, of late, seem suddenly to have awakened to the threat of the Russian Communist bear.

They come when personally affected, wanting our dollars and our sons readied for another war, or to recommend further negotiation to appease the atheistic godless Communists.

Strange that Mr. Holt, Prime Minister of Australia, should now come running to us. Our boys, exceeding 400,000, are in his backyard in South Vietnam fighting Communist shock troops and Soviet material, but Australia's commitment to the cause of a free Southeast Asia totals a mere handful of men.

And we beheld the great Socialist leader of Britain, Mr. Harold Wilson, come to counsel us that our Governments must now stick together.

Where has Mr. Wilson been basking while the international revolutionaries have whittled down the British Empire to the extent that Great Britain is but an island itself? Where has Wilson's Socialist government been hiding while 10,000 American boys have suffered their hearts torn out in Vietnam?

Has one Britisher died? Have we had even one word of moral support?

On the other hand, it must be noted, business with the enemy has been seemingly profitable for the English bull. Why should England have become upset at the blockade of Israel when this is precisely what Wilson and his party have done against little Rhodesia? The British Socialists not only instigated this oppressive embargo, but they recruited other nations, including our United States, to collaborate. Perhaps had Rhodesia possessed oil, she, too, could have received some consideration.

Our President, standing beside Prime Minister Wilson, is reported to have commented that the recent Washington dinner party was "an occasion for family and very close friends—not for pomp and circumstance. (And that) . . . together, we stand ready to support our common purposes, our mutual hopes for peace, with deeds. If we do that, no problem will ever be so great that we cannot overcome it."

Pray tell, what "common purposes" does America have with defunct Britain? What deeds? Certainly no reference to Vietnam. And the Rhodesian affair has turned so sour in public opinion that it is not discussed in good taste.

I fear that all is not good for America. The newspaper report of the Prime Minister testimonal dinner may prove most interesting.

Let us not sacrifice the life of one more American boy, for a weekend friendship and international flattery.

Mr. Speaker, I am inserting the article from June 3 Washington, D.C., Evening Star for our colleagues' perusal:

Prime Minister Dines at White House

(By Isabelle Shelton)

There was a feeling of high drama in the air as Britain's Prime Minister Harold Wilson came to dinner last night at the White House.

Several of the major figures in this period of major crisis were on hand.

Most notable, of course, were President Johnson and the Prime Minister, apparently the chief architects of the proposed declaration of maritime powers which is seen as one avenue to cool the explosive situation in the Middle East.

There was United Nations Ambassador Arthur Goldberg, who is on television more these days than Mr. Clean, as he seeks to talk through a rational solution to the Middle East crisis in the U.N. He flew back to New York late last night, for another Security Council session this morning.

There was Walt W. Rostow, the chief man of business on foreign affairs on the White House Staff.

There were Vice President Humphrey, Secretary of State Rusk and Secretary of Defense McNamara, all members of the National Security Council, and all involved in the currently tense situation.

There was trouble-shooting Ambassador Averell Harriman, and Democratic Sen. Wayne Morse of Oregon, probably the President's most vigorous foreign policy critic in the Senate.

There was Gov. Nelson Rockefeller of New York, regarded by many as the Republican most fitted to take over in this era of recurring crises, if the White House mantle is to pass to G.O.P. hands.

With such a cast of characters, at such a moment in history, action and excitement seemed inevitable.

But it was not to be.

President Johnson defused the atmosphere in his brief after-dinner toast, when he declared that this was "an occasion for family and very close friends—not for pomp and circumstance."

He and Wilson had "spent the day talking over the troubled state of the world," the President said, and "tonight, together, we stand ready to support our common purposes, our mutual hopes for peace, with deeds. If we do that, no problem will ever be so great that we cannot overcome it."

But he said nothing more specific than that, and Wilson, in his answering toast, made clear why.

He would be brief, following the President's lead, the British leader said. But even in long speeches these days, he added triumphantly, he manages to say "nothing."

Twice since the Middle East crisis flared he has spoken for 45 minutes on the subject, Wilson said, and "in both cases it was of paramount importance that I said nothing. In both cases I succeeded."

Of the Mid East crisis, he said simply that "in this grave situation it is of greatest importance that the U.S. and Britain work together," and that the two not work alone, but in concert with "likeminded friends around the world," in order to achieve multilateral action.

"We are committed to work toward a solution through the U.N. Security Council," Wilson added. He was "delighted to see your great U.N. Ambassador, Arthur Goldberg, at the dinner, he declared, but "those of us who believe in the achievement of peace through the U.N. know that we have a great task to restore the authority of the U.N., which has been sadly breeched."

He hoped the "system of peacemaking, which received a sad shock last week, can be revived," Wilson declared at another point.

Britain and the U.S. believe in majority rule, in their legislatures and in the U.N., the British leader said, "but I believe the lesson that comes out of the current crisis is that line expressed by your predecessor, "One man with courage makes a majority."

"I believe this is the attitude that your government and mine, and others, have to bring to the problems of the world today," he summed up.

Also during the dinner toast, President Johnson paid tribute to Britain's ambassador to Washington, Sir Patrick Dean, and this country's ambassador to Britain, David Bruce, as exceptionally fine counselors to their governments.

The President also had warm praise for some members of his Republican opposition. He singled out New York Gov. Rockefeller, Sen. Hickenlooper of Iowa, Senate Assistant Minority Leader Thomas Kuchel of California, and Rep. Bradford Morse of Massachusetts, all guests at the dinner.

Kuchel especially, he said, "is a dedicated leader of the opposition, one of those men who always put their country above personal political ambition." This was Kuchel's 25th wedding anniversary, the President noted, and "we are so happy, we could share it with him."

For after-dinner entertainment, the guests watched the "Salute to American Musical Theater," being shown for the second night in a row. Last night's audience saw it outside on the South Lawn, however, where the much larger stage gave freer rein to design and lighting wizard Abe Feder, whose still slides on a backdrop screen were much more effective than they had been in the East Room the night before.

Several guests, including the terrible-tempered Sen. Morse, were lyrical in their praise of the production and the stunning outdoor setting, which included a sweeping panorama that included the lighted White House fountain, Washington Monument and Jefferson Memorial, and the star-filled sky.

President and Mrs. Johnson and the Wilsons spent a final half hour by themselves on the White House second floor after the program ended.

Lynda Bird Johnson told friends she had no immediate plans to quit her job and return to school—"though I've always said I'd like to go back to school some day."

WHITE HOUSE GUESTS

Dinner guests of President and Mrs. Johnson last night at the White House were:

British Ambassador and Lady Dean
Sir Burke Trend, Secretary of the Cabinet
Sir Solly Zuckerman, Chief Scientific Adviser
Sir Michael and Lady Stewart, Minister, British Embassy
Adm. Sir Nigel and Lady Henderson, British Embassy
Economic Minister and Mrs. John M. Stevens, British Embassy
Mr. A. N. Halls, Private Secretary
Robin Wilson, Son of Prime Minister
Vice President and Mrs. Humphrey
Secretary of State and Mrs. Rusk
U.S. Rep. to the UN and Mrs. Goldberg
Justice and Mrs. White
Secretary of the Treasury and Mrs. Fowler
Secretary of Defense and Mrs. McNamara
Sen. and Mrs. Morse
Sen. and Mrs. Stennis
Sen. and Mrs. Kuchel
Sen. and Mrs. Randolph
Governor of New York and Mrs. Rockefeller
Governor of West Virginia and Mrs. Smith
Rep. and Mrs. Thomas F. Morgan
Rep. and Mrs. Peter H. B. Frelinghuysen
Rep. and Mrs. Dan Rostenkowski
Rep. and Mrs. F. Bradford Morse
Ambassador at large and Mrs. W. Averell Harriman.
Ambassador to Great Britain David K. E. Bruce
Chief of Protocol and Mrs. James W. Symington
Special Representative for Trade Negotiations and Mrs. William M. Roth
Special Assistant to the President and Mrs. S. Douglas Cater, Jr.
Special Assistant to the President and Mrs. Walt W. Rostow
Assistant Secretary of State and Mrs. John M. Leddy
Dep. Special Assistant to the President, Francis Bator
Associate Judge of the U.S. Court of Claims and Mrs. Philip Nichols, Jr.
Chmn. Democratic National Committee and Mrs. John M. Bailey
Mr. and Mrs. Forrest Boyd, Mutual Broadcasting System
Mr. and Mrs. Andrew M. Bradley, Harrisburg, Pa.
Dr. Richard F. Brown, Fort Worth, Tex.
Dr. and Mrs. Hilton C. Buley, New Haven, Conn.
Mr. and Mrs. Ben H. Carpenter, Dallas, Tex.
Mrs. Oscar S. Cox
Mr. and Mrs. Kenneth Crawford, Newsweek
Mr. and Mrs. Franklin W. Denius, Austin, Tex.
Mr. and Mrs. Frederic G. Donner, New York, N.Y.
Mr. David Dubinsky
Dr. and Mrs. Wilson H. Elkins, College Park, Md.
Mr. and Mrs. Judson Freeman, Jacksonville, Fla.
Mr. and Mrs. Ray Gilbert, Mrs.—actress Janis Paige.
Mr. and Mrs. Kermit Gordon
Miss Kay Halle
Mr. and Mrs. Edward K. Hamilton
Mr. and Mrs. Dorsey B. Hardeman, San Angelo, Tex.
Mrs. Rebekah Harkness, New York, N.Y.
Mr. and Mrs. Jack Hight
Mr. and Mrs. John H. Hill, Cypress Mill, Tex.
Mr. Sol Hurok, New York, N.Y.
Miss Lynda Bird Johnson
Mr. and Mrs. Harry Karl, Mrs.—actress Debbie Reynolds
Mr. and Mrs. Sol Kittay, Port Chester, N.Y.
Mr. and Mrs. Robert F. Lederer
Mr. and Mrs. Philip J. Levin Warren, N.J.
Mr. and Mrs. Roger Lewis, New York, N.Y.
Mr. and Mrs. R. C. McCurdy, New York, N.Y.
Mr. and Mrs. Dean A. McGee, Oklahoma City, Okla.
Mr. and Mrs. George Meany, Pres., AFL–CIO
Mr. and Mrs. Adolph P. Schuman, San Francisco, Calif.
Mr. and Mrs. David Schwartz, New York, N.Y.
Mr. John H. Sharon
Mrs. Elizabeth Shoumatoff, Locust Valley, N.Y.
Mr. and Mrs. Robert G. Spivack
Mr. and Mrs. Carl B. Stokes, Cleveland, Ohio
Mr. and Mrs. Robert Wagner, New York, N.Y.
Mr. and Mrs. Thomas J. Watson Jr., Armonk, N.Y.

Propagapda Serves Red Line in France

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 14, 1967

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, in 1960, candidate Kennedy placed special magnitude on the question of the U.S. image abroad. Since the administration's preoccupation with the image abroad is clearly seen in what passes for present foreign policy I believe an article by Copley Press Columnist Dumitru Danielopol, which appeared in the May 22 issue of the Elgin, Ill., Daily Courier-News, merits thoughtful consideration. I insert this article at this point in the RECORD:

PROPAGANDA SERVES RED LINE IN FRANCE

(By Dumitru Danielopol)

PARIS.—In America "propaganda" is a dirty word.

But I have heard it spoken more often in Paris, in the last few days than in years in Washington. Here there is no "Dr. Goebbels" complex about propaganda. It's an effective tool of government and it's being used to fan suspicion and outright hostility to the U.S.

Attitudes displayed on the government controlled radio and TV are shocking to many intelligent and cultured Frenchmen, political figures, diplomats and newsmen.

They have much to do with the present anti-American feelings.

One would think the United States had made the 1939 pact with Hitler and allowed him to conquer France. Propaganda here seems determined to wipe out all memory of France's debt to America.

"You must understand," said a high French TV official, "many of our writers are young, they don't remember what America did for France in 1917. They don't even remember what America did for France in World War II."

"Don't you teach history?" I asked.

He got slightly red, but said nothing.

Many French writers in the press, radio and TV are extreme left wing, like Emanuel d'Astier dela Vigerie, a former member of the Communist party and friend of Ho Chi-Min, whose broadcasts are repulsively biased against America. U.S. Ambassador Charles Bohlen recently lodged a specific protest against one broadcast.

These "new left" French intellectuals follow the Moscow and Peking line. Their attacks increase as the American stand in Vietnam hardens, hurting Communists all over the world.

Today their aim is to stop America short of victory.

These Frenchmen, like Vietnam critics at home, can conveniently forget that there is an anti-Communist side to the Vietnam question.

When they demand that America "stop the killing," they show no concern for the millions of South Vietnamese who would face massacre if the U.S. listened.

The moral question in Vietnam must be judged by what the majority of the South Vietnamese population wants, said one U.S. ambassador in Western Europe.

"It wants no part of communism," he said.

A recent private poll showed only 3 per cent of the population was pro-Communist.

But American counter propaganda is for all intents and purposes non-existent. U.S.I.S. men plead lack of funds but privately they will admit that Washington has frowned on any hard-hitting counter-attack.

U.S. policy seems determined to avoid a hard anti-Communist line in Europe in hopes that the Vietnam war will not upset President Johnson's East-West "bridge-building" program. As a result of this, virtually the only sound Europe hears from America is from those who oppose our policy in Vietnam.

"We only see the pictures of Americans in action in Vietnam," said a young French businessman trained in the U.S. "Why don't the American newspapers here show the pictures of the atrocities committed by the Viet Cong?"

The United States has left a "free field to the slanders," said former French Ambassador Andre Francois Poncet.

"Your cause is just," he said, "but you think that the truth is self evident. It is not. You got to fight for it, to proclaim it day by day foot by foot."

It's time Americans stopped shuddering at the word propaganda.

They forget that they are subjected to propaganda day after day under other names.

Public relations, advertising, salesmanship, lobbies all involve propaganda. It has become a key ingredient of business.

As Poncet put it, propaganda also is "an important weapon in the art of government."

The American head of a large international public relations firm suggests that the job of selling the U.S. policy in Europe should be turned over to trained Europeans.

"They know how to talk to their countrymen," he said. "Too much USIS material is designed to American tastes. It doesn't go down over here."

Whatever the solution, one must be found before the United States finds itself literally talked out of Western Europe."

President McKinley's Visit to Three Oaks, Mich., Remembered

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDWARD HUTCHINSON

OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 14, 1967

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, the village of Three Oaks, which is located in the Fourth District of Michigan, has chosen a unique method to call attention to its 100th anniversary.

I have been informed the village will reenact the visit which President McKinley made to the community 68 years ago.

Some residents of Three Oaks well remember the Spanish-American War President's visit on October 17, 1899. He came to dedicate the site for a cannon captured from the Spaniards in the war and presented to the community after its citizens raised $1,400 for a memorial to the men of U.S. battleship *Maine*.

This was the largest per capita contribution of any community in the Nation and it had won the coveted award for Three Oaks, plus the admiration of the entire country.

The naval gun became known as the "Dewey Cannon" for it had been captured from the Spanish at Corregidor by Admiral Dewey, the naval hero of the Spanish-American War.

President McKinley's visit will be remembered on the opening day of the centennial celebration, Sunday, July 9, and the reenactment will include the red carpet incident.

It seems that the village made every effort to treat the President in a manner befitting his high office, even going so far as to literally "roll out the red carpet" for him to walk on. President McKinley declined the honor, remarking that "God's green earth was good enough" for him.

I join with thousands of others who are familiar with this fine southwestern Michigan community in expressing "best wishes" on the occasion of its 100th birthday which will be marked—I am informed—by the firing of the famous "Dewey Cannon."

A Tradition of Duty: An Editorial From the Old Reliable, the Weekly Newspaper of the 9th Infantry Division in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER L. MIZE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1967

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, my office receives the regular issues of the Old Reliable, the weekly newspaper of the 9th Infantry Division—the Kansas Division—now in Vietnam. The June 10 edition of the paper carried a timely editorial on the significance of June 14 because it is not only Flag Day, but also the birthday of the U.S. Army.

This editorial has a message for all patriotic Americans, especially on this particuiar day. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include this editorial in the Appendix of the RECORD:

A TRADITION OF DUTY

The U.S. Army celebrates its 192d birthday Wednesday, still deeply committed to a mission that has remained unchanged since its first anniversary—the preservation of freedom and the defense of the United States and its allies.

June 14 also is Flag Day, a patriotic occasion celebrating the resolution of the Continental Congress on June 14, 1777, which established the Stars and Stripes as the national flag.

Both anniversaries mark events that began in troubled times, when brave men dedicated to revolutionary ideas of freedom and personal dignity struggled against incredible obstacles to preserve their new way of life.

Nearly 200 years later, another generation of Americans is called upon to protect the heritage of freedom from forces that would destroy it.

The Army personnel of this new generation represent a modern, powerful, highly mobile organization of well-trained, well-equipped, well-supplied soldiers.

Today's Army is the result of a constant effort by the United States to be prepared, a policy outlined in the early years of the country by George Washington:

"If we desire peace, one of the most powerful institutions of our rising prosperity, it must be known that we are at all times ready for war."

The high-powered, rapid-firing rifle has replaced the musket, but the June 14 anniversaries—for the flag and the Army—stand as a reminder to today's soldier that something more valuable and more effective than any material was handed down from the militiamen who saw the first birthday of the Army and later the birth of a new nation.

That something is the tradition of courage, duty and honor that has endured and been strengthened through years of strife and years of peace.

A Cumberland Gap Wilderness Will Serve Everyone's Interest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TIM LEE CARTER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1967

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial of interest to citizens of southeastern Kentucky, eastern Tennessee, and southwestern Virginia recently appeared in the Louisville Courier-Journal. This editorial concerns the development of the wilderness area contiguous to the Cumberland Gap National Park.

The scenic beauty and great historical value of this region will attract many tourists. It is hoped that divergent opinions regarding the development of the area will be unified, and that a large acreage of this wild, beautiful land will be included in the wilderness area, as pointed out by the Courier-Journal.

The editorial follows:

A CUMBERLAND GAP WILDERNESS WILL SERVE EVERYONE'S INTEREST

The Wilderness Act of 1964 directed the National Park Service to study roadless areas of 5,000 acres or more in the parks to see where wilderness areas, to be kept free of commercialism and development could be established. Now the Park Service and conservationists are at loggerheads over the Service plan for such an area at Cumberland Gap National Park. Because of the region's great natural beauty, and its role in Kentucky history, the argument has caused widespread interest.

Most of the park lies within a strip 18 miles long and from one to two miles wide atop the Cumberland escarpment, stretching from Cumberland Gap northward into Harlan County and Virginia. It is bordered by fine cliffs, dotted with caves, and contains two natural trout streams, old forests, and Misha Mokwa Trail, a 21-mile nature trail regarded as perhaps the finest stretch of unbroken hiking trail in the Eastern United States. On the edge of the park also lies Hensley Settlement, the only known surviving example of a frontier mountain village.

Broadly speaking, the Park Service wants to create a wilderness strip usually less than a mile wide down the center of this mountaintop section of the park. It also proposes to extend the Allegheny Parkway through and along the edge of the park, often bordering or touching the wilderness section. This proposal has the endorsement of local government and business groups, who see park development and a ridge-line route for the Parkway as features to attract tourists.

The conservationists favor a larger wilderness area (15,250 acres against 8,980 acres) completely free of roads, with the Allegheny Parkway routed through the valley below, outside the park. They point out that the Park Service plan would leave the wilderness strip surrounded by land which could be developed, destroying the purpose and nature of the wilderness area. They also contend that running the Parkway through and alongside the park, seldom more than a few hundred yards from the wilderness area, would spoil completely the sense of remote quiet so essential to wilderness and make the famed Misha Mokwa Trail little more than a roadside walk.

PARKWAY WILL BE A BOON

It is hard to see why the development cannot reconcile these two viewpoints, both of which seek improvement of the region. The Allegheny Parkway, a scenic road to run along ridge crests from Harper's Ferry, West Virginia to Middlesboro, will greatly benefit the Cumberland Gap area, and bring thousands of people annually into a region rich in scenery and history. The wilderness park will also be a boon; there are dozens of parks, scenic spots and recreational areas, but very few unspoiled wilderness regions available to the populous eastern U.S. There is no reason why the park cannot have both without one destroying the other.

It is also hard to see why the Parkway should not be routed through the valley outside the park, with access roads to Henaley Settlement and scenic overlooks (though these, too, should be carefully limited in size and number). A wilderness bordered by a road is no wilderness at all and a wilderness area only a half-mile wide would be ruined by the fumes and noise that come with road traffic.

Furthermore, building the Parkway through the park would almost certainly compel the state to reconsider its plan for tunnelling U.S. 25–E under Cumberland Gap in order to avoid carrying the expanded highway through the Gap, and consequently through the park. This tunnel is expected to cost at least $2,600,000. There is no reason to spend such an amount in order to spare the park, if the Park Service is planning a road directly through the park itself.

Fly It Proudly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1967

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, there have been a number of good articles and editorials printed recently in Sixth District newspapers commenting on respect and honor for the American flag.

Since today is Flag Day, I think it is particularly appropriate to reprint two of these here. One is an editorial written by Richard E. Higgen, editor of the Cosmos News. The other is a letter printed by A. J. Henle in his Lyon County Independent. Both articles appeared on June 8, 1967.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include these articles in the RECORD at this point:

FLY IT PROUDLY

(By Richard E. Higgen)

Next Wednesday, June 14, is again Flag Day all over America. It is a day set aside for Americans to show their loyalty to their nation by honoring their flag, the emblem of their country, and displaying it with pride.

This year Flag Day should have a very special significance to all of us. In recent months there have been many and frequent attacks on the flag, both in other countries, as well as in the United States. We have seen it dishonored and burned by those among our own nation who apparently are loyal only to foreign ideals and isms.

It is time that we, as Americans, begin holding our head up again and flying our flag with pride. Remember that familiar old song that goes "Your're a grand old flag; you're a high flying flag; you're the symbol of the land I love; the home of the free and the brave."

This Flag Day let us be proud of America again. Lets fly our flag high with pride.

LETTER TO A YOUNG DISSENTER WHO BURNED A FLAG

DEAR YOUNG SIR: I have just read your statement before the court where you appeared on charges of burning an American flag during the course of a "protest march" in which you took part. I have a few things I want to say to you.

First, I want to tell you that I support your right of dissent. If you feel you do not agree with the policies of your government, you have the right and the freedom to say so.

If you feel you want to join a protest march that does not violate specific local ordinances, you have the right and the freedom to do so.

In short, I will support your right of dissent because a democracy such as the one whose policies you do not agree with guarantees the freedom to criticize without fear of reprisal by the government.

But when you "progress" from protest and dissent to burning the flag of your country—and mine—you have lost me. And furthermore, as the judge told you, you have forfeited the right of dissent and the freedom of protest.

Here are a few truths that occurred to me that may not have occurred to you simply because you have not been exposed to enough of them:

The right of dissent must be earned first and cherished and protected from then on. Your right of protest was earned for you a long time ago. I do not feel you have earned your personal right just yet—not at 18 years old. You do not earn the right of protest by arguing with your dad about using the family car.

Your right of protest, young friend, was earned for you. And it has been protected for almost 200 years at a terrible cost in pain and blood and suffering.

You, my young friend, had nothing to do with this, but your right of dissent is just as strong and valid as if you had been personally involved.

A further truth: You have the freedom of dissent and protest but you must be prepared to offer an alternative superior to or as acceptable as what you protest. The fact that you protest your government's policy in Vietnam means nothing if you have none better to submit.

Also, you are not the only one who enjoys freedom of dissent and right of protest. I have as much right to differ with you as you have to differ with your college officials. I have as much right to protest your civil disobedience as you have to protest what you termed "police state action" in breaking up your "peace" march.

And the young veteran who knocked you down when you set fire to a flag had as much right to do so as you did to have him arrested. More, in my view, because the young veteran had earned his right the hard way. I mentioned that some of these "truths" occurred to me recently. They occurred to me while I was attending a Memorial Day observance. Let me sum up a bit here:

Young sir, I will defend your right of dissent and freedom to protest, right down to the last stop.

But when you burn your country's flag—my country's flag—that's where you and I split the blanket. And that's where I exercise my right of dissent and protest.

Now don't give me that old cough about being a "square" and a "super-patriot" about the flag. I am no super-patriot. And I can look at my country's flag without melting into maudlin sentimentality.

But I want to tell you this: my flag has cost me too much—me, personally—to allow me to sit silent when it is desecrated.

I have bled a little for my flag, although at the time I had not seen a flag for weeks.

I have a brother in the military cemetery at St. Mere Eglise in Normandy. He gave a great deal for his flag, at 24 years old.

I have two stout young friends, only a little older than you, in the military cemetery at St. Avold in Alsace. They were not "squares."

Those are a few of the costs I have paid for the right of dissent and freedom of protest, although I did not regard them as such at the time.

And part of those costs were paid to guarantee you your right of dissent.

But, young friend, I did not pay them to guarantee you the "right" to protest by burning my flag.

So whatever penalty the judge has ordered for you, I will not protest. Because, you see, he also has the right of dissent.

Our Flag Is Honored by the First Maryland Regiment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GILBERT GUDE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1967

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, last week in recognition of Flag Week, I had the pleasure of honoring in a Capitol ceremony the First Maryland Regiment Fife and Drum Corps. This historic unit today honors the First Maryland Battalion, which was originally mustered into service in late 1775, when it fought valiantly in the first major engagements of the Revolutionary War. The Marylanders so impressed General Washington with their spirited bayonet attack at the Battle of Long Island that he ordered them to keep their bayonets fixed at all times, thus earning the title, "The Bayonets of the Revolution."

The unit became the First Maryland Regiment with the reorganization of the Army in late 1776. After distinguished service in the northern campaigns from 1777 to 1779, they were detached to form the nucleus of the Army of the Southern Colonies. This task was given to the Marylanders because of the high esteem in which they were held by General Washington. They formed the backbone of the Southern Army in all campaigns until the independence of our country was assured. Washington's trust had been well placed.

The modern First Maryland Regiment was organized in 1964 with the express desire to authentically portray and perpetuate the memory of the common soldier of the original regiment. Many hours of painstaking research went into the achievement of this aim. Each item worn by the members of the unit has been carefully reproduced from originals in various museums and private collections.

The regimental fife and drum corps performs 18th century rudimental martial music. All selections have been thoroughly documented. All drill and ceremony is taken exactly from the American manual of General Von Steuben, first published in 1779.

At the present time, the unit is able to portray the First Maryland Regiment in its two distinct uniforms; the hunting shirt uniform of the period 1776–78, and the regimental uniform of the period 1779–83.

Do You Remember Me?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1967

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, I call to the attention of the Members of this House the following article which appeared in the editorial section of the West Haven Town Crier, on May 25, 1967. The Town Crier has served the community of West Haven, Conn., for over 30 years. Currently its editor and publisher is Mrs. C. Jane Sullivan, a brilliant and talented woman.

More important than the literary style of this essay, Mr. Speaker, is the significance of its message. Today, Flag Day 1967, we salute our national symbol. Our flag is a symbol of many things. It represents our institutions and our way of self-government. It stands for a belief in the dignity of every man and a code which insists that every man be treated with respect and consideration for his human worth. This following essay conveys the message of the flag:

"DO YOU REMEMBER ME?"

Hello, remember me? Some people call me Old Glory, others call me Stars and Stripes; also I have been referred to as the Star Spangled Banner. But whatever they call me, I am your flag or, as I proudly state, the flag of the United States of America. There is something that has been bothering me, so I thought that I might talk it over with you. Because it is about you and me.

I remember sometime ago—I think it was Memorial Day—people were lined up on both sides of the street to watch the parade. The town's high school band was behind me and naturally I was leading the parade. When your daddy saw me coming along, waving in the breeze, he immediately removed his hat and placed it against his left shoulder so that his hand was directly over his heart. Remember?

And you—I remember you. Standing there as straight as a soldier, you didn't have any hat but you were giving the right salute. They taught you in school to place your hand over your heart. Remember little sister—not to be outdone, she was saluting the same as you. I was very proud as I came down your street. There were some soldiers home on leave and they were standing at attention giving the military salute. Ladies as well as men all paying me the reverence that I deserve.

Now I may sound as if I am a little conceited. Well, I am. I have a right to be. Because I represent the finest country in the world, the United States of America. More than one aggressive nation has tried to haul me down but they all felt the fury of this freedom-loving country. You know. You had to go overseas and defend me.

What Happened? I'm still the same old flag. Oh, I have a couple more stars added since you were a boy. A lot more blood has been shed since the Memorial Day so long ago. Dad is gone now. The old home town has a new look. The last time I came down your street I saw that some of the old landmarks were gone, but in their place, shining majestically in the sun, were a number of new buildings and homes. Yes sir, the old town sure has changed.

But now I don't feel as proud as I used to. When I come down your street, you just stand there with your hands in your pockets and give me a small glance and then look away. When I think of all the places I have been, Anzio, Guadalcanal, Korea—and now Vietnam. Then I see the children running around and shouting. They don't seem to know who I am. I saw one man take off his hat and then look around. He didn't see anybody with theirs off so he quickly put his back on.

Is it a sin to be patriotic any more? Have you forgotten what I stand for? Have you forgotten all the battlefields where men fought and died to keep this nation free? When you salute me, you are actually saluting them.

Take a look at the Memorial Honor Rolls sometime. Look at the names of those that never came back. Some of them were friends or relatives of yours. Probably went to the same school with some of them. That's what you are saluting. Not me.

Well it won't be long until I'll be coming down your street again. So when you see me, stand straight, place your hand over your heart and you'll really see me waving back—my salute to you. And I'll know that you remembered.

Government by Guideline

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1967

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, all of us are keenly aware of the growing complexity and size of the Federal Government and many of us share the concern that in the implementation of many of the Government programs broad regulations and directives are being issued every day.

Much discussion has been held here in recent weeks with reference to the so-called guidelines being used by the Government agencies and it is frequently one of the major concerns of many of our people insofar as the administration of the Government programs is concerned.

There appeared in the June 7 edition of the Richmond News Leader in Richmond, Va., a very fine editorial entitled "Government by Guideline," in which the editor points out very cogently the problems being faced by States, localities, and the individual citizen by trying to keep up with what is being done and what is being required by the various guidelines.

It might be pointed out that many of these guidelines are not based upon law and statutes as was pointed out in the recent consideration of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and the appropriations bill for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Many of the local governments are in fact put to considerable strain in trying to meet the requirements of the guidelines and to understand the conditions upon which various Federal programs are activated at the local level.

Those of us who are called upon to vote for authorization and appropriations of existing and newly created agencies many times have no idea at all of the eventual requirements to be set up under the programs. Even less informed are those at the local level who are called upon to adhere to these requirements and to explain the situation to the local people. The individual citizen is caught in a maze of misunderstanding and confusion. I believe that this is one of the main reasons that so many of the Federal programs are now meeting with dissatisfaction and opposition at the local level.

I wish to include the text of the editorial together with my remarks and I commend it to the reading of the Members of the House.

The editorial follows:

GOVERNMENT BY GUIDELINE

In a recent speech to the New York Chamber of Commerce, Texas Governor John Connally described one of the most critical problems facing the States today: government by guideline.

He was alluding to the distasteful edicts that issue from Washington in increasing numbers. Each of these edicts carries an ultimatum to State governments: Comply with certain regulations or you'll lose any Federal funds to which you may be entitled. Strings are attached to every program that provides Federal funds, on a matching basis or otherwise, to implement State projects. Thus, as Governor Connally points out, Texas will lose not only $5 million in Federal funds for highway safety programs if it fails to comply with Federal regulations, but also $46 million it already is slated to receive for highway construction. One of these important guidelines calls for the removal of construction signs after completion of road work.

The impact of these guidelines may be seen in the constant proliferation of Federal programs that disburse aid to States under rigidly interpreted rules and regulations. In 1962, there were 45 Federal appropriations through which States were allotted Federal funds; today, there are no fewer than 399 such appropriations being disbursed through 170 programs administered by 21 U.S. departments, 150 Washington bureaus, and 400 regional offices.

For each sum of Federal money granted to a State, there are "terms" that must be met. Often, neither house of Congress has approved these guidelines, but each bureaucrat responsible for any phase of a Federal aid program obviously has his own ideas about desirable rules and regulations for the States to follow, no matter how arbitrary and unreasonable they may be. And the States must put up or shut up.

The difficulties engendered by the need to comply with Federal guidelines has caused much disenchantment to develop over the use of Federal funds, in State programs. This may account, in part, for the growing support for a plan to give the States block grants in Federal funds, with no strings attached. Better still, some congressmen are toying with the novel notion that the current system, whereby taxes flowing into the Federal coffers are redistributed after being reduced by administrative expenses, is impractical. Of course, by keeping a hand on the purse-strings, the Federal government maintains control.

Governor Connally is not shadow-boxing with fantasy when he voices fears that the republican form of government in Washington is being subverted by "government by guideline." His fears may be realized in the growing burden on State officials imposed by proliferating paperwork demanded by Federal Officials. Deadlines must be met, and supporting documents filed, or the money will be cut off. As Federal aid programs continue to increase, so will the ability of the central government to dictate terms. That is the crisis in destructive federalism that Governor Connally distrusts, and he is not alone.

Toward the Great Hope—World Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1967

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, in the atomic age the need for the establishment of some kind of world government has been evident—nowhere more glaringly so than in Vietnam, and more recently, in the Mideast. For the survival of the human race it is essential that the only two nations in the world with "second strike capability" move to eliminate war with each other and make it impossible for a third party to wage the big war. But moving toward this world order must be by mutual consent, and with mutual concessions.

A year ago the United States succeeded in having the problem of Vietnam placed on the agenda of the Security Council of the United Nations, but did not press for a vote. Noting the recent Soviet mood of restraint and cooperation in the Mideast crisis, it is my conviction that we should now seize this opportunity to move confidently into this new diplomatic climate, in the hope that our declared objective of moving from the battlefield to the conference table in Vietnam can be realized.

Mr. C. L. Sulzberger of the New York Times suggests a summit conference as an alternative technique to achieve the same objective. While it is my hope that the United Nations take up the Vietnam problem in the near future, I would personally welcome a summit conference where many of the other worlds' problems of arms, boundaries, trade can also be discussed.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with Mr. Sulzberger when he says:

> Through no fault of our own the world power balance has shifted suddenly in our favor and the time has come for decisive efforts to end the Vietnam war.

I would commend this thoughtful column in the June 11 New York Times to the attention of my colleagues and include it at this point in the RECORD:

FOREIGN AFFAIRS: AN IDEA FINDS ITS TIME

Through no fault of our own the world power balance has shifted suddenly in our favor and the time has come for decisive efforts to end the Vietnam war.

The United States can claim no credit for Israel's swift victory, but the fact of that victory was of strategic benefit to us although our role was confined to waffling.

We are assailed by Arab and Communist propaganda for having tipped the balance of a campaign in which we played no part. Therefore, despite ourselves, American prestige has risen. Conversely, because Moscow openly sponsored the Arab cause and failed to help it in the crunch, Soviet prestige has sunk despite its violent postmortem propaganda efforts.

A VIBRANT U.S.A.

Through the behavior of their client states the fate of both paramount powers was thus inextricably engaged. Thanks to Israeli toughness, the United States looks more vibrant; the Soviet Union looks less so. The triumph proclaimed as "inevitable" for revolutionary causes championed by Communism appears less inevitable.

The Arab armies, of course, were in no sense Communist, but Russia was their political and military arsenal. Now they are shattered. Russia is humilliated because its advocacy faltered when most needed. And once again China can sneer that Moscow works in cahoots with Washington because the two capitals joined in non-belligerency and in supporting a cease-fire—despite subsequent diatribes.

The Middle East puzzle remains insoluble and the furnaces of resentment have again been stoked but, in terms of burning world crises, one may hope we can soon revert again to only one: the Southeast Asian war. There the moment has arrived for an active American initiative.

Material factors haven't changed but psychological factors have. Because Israel was depicted as an outpost of the West and the Arabs boasted Soviet protection, the West today looks poised and vital and its adversaries faltering and divided.

For this reason President Johnson might find it desirable to make a dramatic attempt to end the interminable and indecisive conflict in Vietnam. The following formula presents itself:

(1)—After issuing a preamble stressing his interest in peace, the President could announce his intention of going to Geneva within a fortnight and remaining as long as necessary to consult with any and all other powers or movements concerned with producing a Vietnam settlement.

(2)—This hope would be accompanied by a proclaimed desire for a broadly based conference, at least as representative as that in Geneva during 1964 when, among others, the Peking Government was represented. An invitation might be extended to London and Moscow to resume their functions as co-chairmen. Furthermore, this time the U.S.A. would attend as a full member, not merely as an observer. There should be no quibbling about credentials for other participants, including the Vietcong.

(3)—To prepare the basis for negotiation the President might announce that he was promptly sending to Geneva a delegation of distinguished Americans to receive any visitors, delegates or communications concerned with procedures or agenda for a conference.

END THE BOMBING

(4)—Since the existing atmosphere is not favorable to negotiation, the President could announce that the United States feels so anxious for peace that he is ordering an immediate end to the bombing of North Vietnam—with no conditions and with no commitments.

(5)—This would be accompanied by an expressed hope; the American people expect their adversaries to take note of these developments and perhaps to make tangible moves of their own encouraging the prospect of talks. For example, Hanoi might curb southward dispatch of soldiers and supplies and invite the International Control Commission to inspect the main infiltration arteries. This would be a "hope" and an "expectation," not a *quid pro quo* demand.

(6)—Such a U.S. policy statement would emphasize its wish for a quick search for honest compromise. In the meantime, first an American delegation, then the President himself would—on U.S. initiative—arrive in Geneva and start a unilateral effort for peace.

ALTERNATIVE SOLUTIONS

(7)—If, however, after a reasonable period of waiting, there is no sign of response from the other side, the President should explain that he would be forced to contemplate other ways of ending the drawn-out conflict by less desirable means. He would then have to apply drastic surgery to a debilitating cancer.

This formula is not original; but its authors perfer to remain anonymous. It has been considered at high levels here and abroad. Until now certain people have argued the moment was not ripe for action. Today it is ripe and, as Victor Hugo said: "No army can withstand the strength of an idea whose time has come."

Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia Have a Right To Be Free and Independent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 14, 1967

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, the week of June 12–16 marks an infamous anniversary in the world's history. Twenty-seven years ago this week the Soviet Union took over the Baltic States of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia.

The tyrants took over these nations savagely, by armed might. Since then their stewardship has been that of oppression, suppression, and emaciation of national identity. There have been brutal mass transportations of citizens of these countries to slave labor camps, large-scale killings and the other atrocities which accompany Communist rule of any peoples.

Today these same Russians are sitting in the United Nations, attempting to spread their control through settlements and concessions in the Mid East mess. These same Russians are shipping arms, ammunition, and supplies to North Vietnam to kill our GI's.

Congress is not the administrator of foreign policy. The Congress cannot right some of our wrongs in foreign policy. However, Congress can suggest, and does reflect, the will of the American people in matters of foreign relations. House Concurrent Resolution 416, passed by the House on June 21, 1965, and by the Senate on October 22, 1965, calls for freedom for Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia.

I suggest that now would be a good time for our U.N. Ambassador, Arthur J. Goldberg, to bring before the U.N. the question of restoring the boundaries and free rule of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia—thus carrying out the intent of House Concurrent Resolution 416.

While we are actively engaged in securing freedom for the South Vietnamese, we should be no less determined to secure eventual freedom from communism for the enslaved of Europe. The plight of these people measures the basic difference between our approach to the world, and that of the Communists. While we seek to support, strengthen, and build other nations, the Reds seek only to weaken, divide, and conquer.

May I remind those who want to build bridges to the Russians in the Kremlin that these bridges must span the chasm of despair created in the hearts and minds of the millions who yearn to be free, and in the hearts and minds of their countrymen who now live in our land of freedom, and who seek action from their Government to restore freedom to the Baltic States, their original homelands.

Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD at this point a statement by the Americans for Congressional Action To Free the Baltic States, which describes fully the immorality of the Soviet actions in Eastern Europe.

Also, I wish to insert the text of House Concurrent Resolution 416, which was adopted unanimously by both the House and the Senate, and represents a clear-cut pattern of the American public's belief in freedom for all who seek it.

I urge my colleagues to read these documents, and join me in urging that our United Nations delegation put before that world body the question of freedom for the Baltic States.

Texts are as follows:

LITHUANIA, LATVIA, AND ESTONIA HAVE A RIGHT TO BE FREE AND INDEPENDENT

Since June 15, 1940, the Baltic States have been suffering in the Soviet captivity. The Soviet Union took over Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia by force of arms.

The Baltic States have never experienced in their long history through centuries such an extermination and annihilation of their people as during this Soviet occupation since June 15, 1940. During the last twenty-seven years the countries lost more than one fourth of their entire population. Hundreds of thousands of Lithuanians, Latvians, and Estonians were murdered by the Kremlin despots or died in exile in Soviet slave-labor camps and prisons in Siberia and other places of Communist Russia. At least 20 per cent of the present population of Soviet-occupied Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia are not the Balts, but the Soviet colonists. The genocidal operations and practices being carried out by the Soviets continue with no end in sight. Bearing in mind that all of the murdered and deported people have been the most educated, courageous, industrious, comprising the strongest elements of the countries, the losses in population become more terrible and almost fatal to the survival of the Lithuanian, Latvian, and Estonian nations.

But let us now return to the details of the Soviet occupation of Lithuania. At the same time that the forces of occupation were entrenching themselves and the mock elections were being carried out in 1940, leaders and active members of all non-Communist political parties and thousands of public officials were arrested. This was but a prelude to one of the most despicable acts of modern times, namely the mass deportations that ensued. Interrupted only by a temporary Nazi occupation of Lithuania from 1941 to 1944, when the Soviets re-occupied Lithuania, these deportations went on for about a decade. People from every walk of life, even old and dying people, were put on cattle freight cars for the three-week journey to Siberia or remote areas near the Arctic Ocean. The number of all the deportees amounted to about twenty percent of the population, or 600,000 Lithuanians. In two nights alone of June, 1941, 34,260 Lithuanians were deported to the horribly miserable conditions of the slave-labor camps. The consequent death toll of these deportees was very high.

With the increase of physical terrorization by the Soviets, a strong Lithuanian underground resistance organization was formed and fought the Soviets. It was an heroic and widespread resistance movement, but it was a costly one: after the war about 30,000 died in battles with Russian Communists.

If we demand for freedom for all nations in Asia and Africa, we should do exactly the same thing in Europe. The Baltic States (Lithuania, Lativa, and Estonia) are more than 700-year-old nations and they have the same (or even more) right to be free and independent as any new country in any part of the world. We should have a single standard for freedom. Its denial in the whole or in part, any place in the world, including the Soviet Union is surely intolerable.

H. Con. Res. 416

Whereas the subjection of peoples to alien subjugation, domination, and exploitation constitutes a denial of fundamental human rights, is contrary to the Charter of the United Nations, and is an impediment to the promotion of world peace and cooperation; and

Whereas all peoples have the right to self-determination; by virtue of that right they freely determine their political status and freely pursue their economic, social, cultural, and religious development; and

Whereas the Baltic peoples of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania have been forcibly deprived of these rights by the Government of the Soviet Union; and

Whereas the Government of the Soviet Union, through a program of deportations and resettlement of peoples, continues in its effort to change the ethinc character of the populations of the Baltic States; and

Whereas it has been the firm and consistent policy of the Government of the United States to support the aspirations of Baltic peoples for self-determination and national independence; and

Whereas there exist many historical, cultural, and family ties between the peoples of the Baltic States and the American people: Be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Sentae concurring), That the House of Representatives of the United States urge the President of the United States—

(a) to direct the attention of world opinion at the United Nations and at other appropriate international forums and by such means as he deems appropriate, to the denial of the rights of self-determination for the peoples of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, and

(b) to bring the force of world opinion to bear on behalf of the restoration of these rights to the Baltic peoples.

NOTE.—*House Concurrent Resolution 416* was adopted by the House of Representatives by a record vote of 298 yeas to no nays on June 21, 1965, and unanimously passed by the United States Senate on October 22, 1966.

Two Marine Officers Viet Casualties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1967

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, 2d Lt. Larry V. Chmiel, and Capt. James A. Graham, were recently killed during combat in Vietnam. I wish to commend the courage of these two young men and to honor their memory by including the following article in the RECORD:

A Marine second lieutenant from Baltimore who was a 1966 Naval Academy graduate and a Marine captain who graduated from Frostburg State College have been killed in Vietnam, the Defense Department announced yesterday.

They were identified as 2d Lt. Larry V. Chmiel, husband of Mrs. Larry V. Chmiel, of 801 Marigold road, Glen Burnie, and Capt. James A. Graham, husband of Mrs. Janice Graham, of Hubert, N.C.

Lieutenant Chmiel was born in Baltimore, graduated from Poly in 1959, and that summer joined the Marine Corps as an enlisted man. He was later admitted to the Naval Academy after nine months of preparatory school.

His father, Harry A. Chmiel, said last night that "Larry was a marine since he could walk and talk. He always read books on marines. He had pictures of marines plastered all over the walls. He was a marine—period."

Mr. Chmiel said his son "was happy wherever they sent him," although he wrote from Vietnam that some units were "taking pretty much of a shelacking."

Lieutenant Chmiel, who was 25, was married last November to the former Judy Lee Peoria, a first-grade teacher at the Glendale Elementary School in Glen Burnie. His wife said last night that he was an infantry officer and had wanted to serve in Vietnam.

DIED NEAR QUANG TRI

He arrived in Vietnam last January and was shot in the face May 8. A bullet was removed from his jaw, and he was returned to the field after being hospitalized less than a month.

He was shot in the chest and killed last Friday.

Lieutenant Chmiel was brought up at 3305 DuPont avenue. Last September, his parents moved to 222 Hilltop road, Riviera Beach.

Besides his parents and his wife, he is survived by a brother, Gilbert, of Baltimore, and by both his grandmothers, Mrs. Catherine Chmiel, of Baltimore, and Mrs. Clarence Dew, of Martina Ferry, Ohio.

Captain Graham, who was 26, was killed Saturday near Quang Tri, close to the demilitarized zone. He was shot in the head while leading a company of marines on a patrol.

He had been in Vietnam since December 10, 1966, and "would have felt less a marine had he not gone there," his wife said last night. Following his tour of duty there, he was to have studied applied mathematics at the Naval Graduate School in Monterey, Calif.

COMMISSIONED IN 1964

Captain Graham was commissioned in the Marine Corps in 1964, his fourth year as a marine. He first enlisted in the Army at the age of 15. His age was discovered two years later, and he was discharged. He graduated from Frostburg State College in 1963.

Although born in Wilkinsburg, Pa., he grew up in Accokeet, Prince Georges county. He completed his high school equivalency in Brandywine, Md. Since he enlisted in the Marine Corps, he had undergone parachute and Ranger training. He was sent to the Dominican Republic in 1965 during the political instability there.

Besides his wife, he is survived by a son and daughter, John C. and Jennifer L. Graham.

Flag Day, 1967

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. BATES

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1967

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege for all Americans to pay special recognition to our flag on this day, but we should not allow any other day of the year to pass without remembering and being grateful for what our stars and stripes represent.

In that regard, the ever-patriotic Anthony Cama presented a full-page tribute to the American flag in the Lynn Sunday Post, Lynn, Mass. I feel that this is worthy of reading by all Americans; so I am pleased to take this opportunity on Flag Day, 1967, to quote Mr. Cama's message in its entirety, as follows:

[From the Lynn (Mass.) Sunday Post, June 11, 1967]

SO PROUDLY WE HAIL OUR COUNTRY'S FLAG, FLY OUR STARS AND STRIPES ON FLAG DAY—A MOST SACRED AND GLORIOUS DAY FOR THE STAR SPANGLED BANNER OF THIS NATION: THE SYMBOL OF FREEDOM AND JUSTICE FOR ALL MEN IN THIS SPLENDID AMERICAN REPUBLIC WHERE THE TORCH OF LIBERTY ETERNALLY BURNS

(By Anthony Cama, Teacher, author, poet, and member of the New England Executive Council Freedoms Foundation, Valley Forge, Pa.)

These are the hours of great distress all over the world! In our own land, these magnificent United States of America, we have our anguished days when our fighting men in Viet Nam are so valiantly battling, sacrificing, and dying in the jungle battlefields, so that our Flag may fly unsullied and unstained before the eyes of the whole world!

Our Flag is the glorious symbol of a great nation born out of the suffering and battles of our American Revolution, when George Washington, the then general of the Army and later our first President, knew well the torments and anguish of Valley Forge, the crossing of the Delaware in midwinter, the battle of Brandywine, Bunker Hill, and Yorktown! It flew with great honor during the Civil War and knew the sorrow of state fighting state and the loss of the great emancipator, President Lincoln. In the Spanish-American War, World Wars I and II, the Korean conflict, and the Cuban crisis threat, it has raised its colors ever glorious and beautiful. Today, before the whole world, it gallantly waves over the rice paddies and jungles of Viet Nam, where young American boys fight and die in its defense and enhancement.

This writer is proud to present the dramatic writing of Sidney L. DeLove, author of "The Quiet Betrayal" and president of Independence Hall of Chicago, Ill.:

"CAN WE WAVE THE FLAG TOO MUCH

"Is it possible to wave the flag too much? Provided, of course, that you wave it with integrity? Is it possible to study Lincoln or Shakespeare too much? Is it possible to read the Bible too much? The great, the good, the true, are inexhaustible for inspiration, example and strength. I believe that we are not waving our flag enough, not nearly enough.

"It seems to me that we are developing a tendency to be timid or even apologetic about waving the Stars and Stripes. Walk up and down the streets on July 4th and count the flags. It is our nation's birthday, a sacred day in world history, the most important day of America. Why isn't the flag flying on every rooftop and from every home and building?

"This complacement attitude is strong evidence of cancerous patriotic decay. The flag is a symbol of our national unity. It is the spirit of our undying devotion to our country. It stands for the best that is in us . . . for loyalty, character, and faith in democracy.

"Isn't our flag a synonym of the United States of America? Does it not represent man's greatest, noblest, most sublime dream? Is it not the zenith of achievement, the goal to which generations have aspired?

"I believe it is time for us—for the mad, rushing Twentieth Century American—to stop for a moment and think. Let us arrest our near reverential admiration of material success and return to the spiritual and ethical values. Let us imbue and rekindle in ourselves and our children the so-called old-fashioned way of patriotism, a burning devotion to the principles and ideals upon which our country was founded.

"Should not every home own and proudly display the colors on holidays and other such occasions? Isn't the flag Patrick Henry, Jefferson, Franklin, Washington, Nathan Hale, Gettysburg and Valley Forge, Paul Revere, Jackson, and other great men and women who have given us our heritage? When you look at the flag, can't you see the Alamo, Corregidor, Pearl Harbor, the Monitor and the Merrimac? Lest we forget, isn't the flag Flanders Field, Bataan, Iwo Jima, Normandy, Babe Ruth, and Davy Crockett?

"The great events of our past and present are wrapped up in our flag. It is a symbol of this blessed nation, a giant in industry, education, and commerce—millions of fertile square miles, wheatlands, coal mines, steel plants—our great republic, the chosen infant destined to be man's last remaining hope for suffering humanity, a shining beacon of light, noble and glorious the haven for the oppressed and persecuted and truly God's gift to mankind.

"That is what the flag means to me. Can we wave it too much? I don't think so."

Let us honor our Flag and stand proud and erect when it passes us by. Let the Pledge of Allegiance be a rededication of our love and the singing of "The Star Spangled Banner" be our triumphant voice in our devotion to the flag, a glorious symbol of our invincible republic and our wonderful American way of life!

GOVERNOR'S PROCLAMATION

From the office of Governor Volpe comes this Proclamation:

"On June 14, 1777, John Adams of Massachusetts submitted to the Continental Congress a resolution which was adopted, giving to 'Old Glory' official status as the American Flag. George Washington once described our Flag in these words, 'We take the stars from heaven, the red from our mother country, separating it by white stripes, thus showing that we have separated from her, and the white strips shall go down to posterity representing liberty.'

"Our National Flag was first flown over the State House when Lafayette visited Boston in 1824; a ship from Boston, the 'Columbia,' carried it around the world for the first time; and a Massachusetts ship, the 'Bedford,' first flew the American Flag in a British port.

"In the many years since the Revolutionary War, the United States has been a symbol of the unity and solidarity of our democracy and an emblem of freedom to the oppressed peoples of the earth. The Star Spangled Banner remains to this day as the symbol of this great heritage, of the freedoms and principles of our country, liberties which we have defended stalwartly regardless of cost.

"The Flag of the United States is reflective of the strength of freedom, of justice and equality before the law, and of the individual spirit as it finds expression in the interest of all, representing love and loyalty for our country and for its basic principles of liberty, justice and brotherhood for all men.

"All Americans should take pride in displaying the American Flag whenever and wherever appropriate, not only on holidays but on every day in which we enjoy the freedom and brotherhood for which it stands.

"Now, therefore, I, John A. Volpe, Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, in accordance with the provisions of Chapter 6, Section 14 of the General Laws, do hereby proclaim as Flag Day, June 14, 1967, and urge all citizens of the Commonwealth to give full and fitting recognition to this day on which we honor our Flag, the symbol of our Nation, its history and its ideals, and do further urge the display of the Flag and other activities in harmony with the character of this day."

FLAG DAY: A PATRIOTIC POETIC HYMN IN HONOR OF OUR AMERICAN FLAG

(By Anthony Cama)

How bright and brave that Spangled Banner flies
A crown of stars that fill the heavens breast.
The valiant stripes that rainbow-span the skies
Where thousands of our hero spirits rest.
O, sacred symbol of our Valley Forge,
The anguished days when Washington once prayed,
That God bring Freedom from the tyrant's gorge
And that no song of freedom be dismayed.
From battlefields of death and pain
We hear the trumpets' patriotic roar.
O, Flag of Justice, none shall die in vain,
For Liberty shall guard your spangled door!
Let there be hearts of flame on this great day,
A humble prayer woven in man's cry,
That truly ours is the righteous way,
Stand proud and glad, the Flag is passing by!

Alliance for Progress Tie-In Is Boon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD W. RIEGLE, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1967

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Speaker, I have learned that an article appeared in the magazine, Administrative Management, last month describing the work that the Partners of the Alliance are doing to help develop the economy of the countries in South America. The Partners program has been instrumental in getting private corporations and groups within the United States to work with our neighbors in South America in developing their geographical and human resources. I would like to say that one of the outstanding supporters of this program has been Mr. Warren Huff, a resident of my home State, Michigan. Mr. Huff has more than esteemed himself through his great generosity in devoting extraordinary time and energy to this program. The article follows:

ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS TIE-IN IS BOON

American business is orienting itself in an international direction on an increasing scale, both through dealings with foreign firms, and through other quasi-governmental programs. One such program, called Partners of the Alliance, is an independent citizens' tie-in with the American government's Alliance for Progress. Business firms in 32 states and the District of Columbia, as well as a number of other organizations, are creating a fruitful role with unlimited potential for themselves through their efforts in the partnerships created by the program.

Partners of the Alliance is fundamentally a mutual aid organization among individual groups in the states and nations of the Americas. In the United States they are organized loosely in the state groups, each of which has as its partner a city, state or nation in Central or South America. Despite this state-level organization and the program's close connections with the Alliance for Progress, individual units work quite independently.

Often a single group has contacted another group in the partner state, discovered a problem and solved it before the state organization or Alliance officials, even learned of it, according to James H. Boren, director of the Partners program.

PARTICIPATION

All kinds of organizations participate in the Partners' programs—school groups, civic clubs, churches and individual citizens. Businesses are sometimes introduced to the Partners through Jaycee groups, which are taking a leading role in the program. At a Conference of International Jaycees last fall, it was announced that the group was exploring the possibility of taking up the Partners program as a nationwide project.

Business and industry make up one important area in the several covered by Partners' projects. Other areas include education, community development, public health and preventive medicine, agriculture and co-operatives, and cultural exchanges.

The administrative manager might be more interested in business and industry developments, since the full resources of his firm can be utilized here. At the second Inter-American Conference of the Partners of the Alliance in September, 1966, a permanent Inter-American Business and Industry Committee was established, and several projects developed by businesses in various partnerships were described.

One typical project involved a plan of the Texas Partners to bring several Peruvian businessmen to Austin to participate in a special industrial conference. The conference's purpose was to bring together representatives of Peru's banking and industrial community, and also allow Texas businessmen to learn of Peru's investment climate and discuss possible joint business ventures with Peruvian representatives.

A seminar between lending agencies in Alabama and Guatemala was proposed, to discuss the need for creating a financing agency for low-cost homes.

A number of banks and business firms in Boston decided to accept young South American executives for employment and training in U.S. business methods.

On an individual level, a Delaware businessman has made several trips to Panama to serve as a consultant to industrial development.

Several areas for work and development were recommended to the Inter-American Conference by its Committee on Business and Industry. Some programs the Committee proposed included:

1) Investigation of existing lending operations in the Americas which could serve as guides for setting up small loan companies or a central loan association under Partners auspicies.

2) Encouragement of each partnership to organize and direct trade missions.

3) Encouragement of private investment companies or development banks in all the Americas to raise capital for loans and equity investments.

4) Scheduling of business conferences in North, Central and South America.

5) Promotion of tourism as a major source of income production and industrial development.

6) Establishment of an economic center to assist the Business and Industry Committee in the collection and dissemination of pertinent information.

7) Authorization of a permanent Business and Industry Committee to facilitate the recommendations of the program.

PROLIFERATION

Since the conference, business activities among the Partners have proliferated. Three conferences to discuss business-to-business investment possibilities in three Latin American countries have been scheduled for the fall of this year by the Business Advisory Committee of the Partners of the Alliance.

California participants will meet with their counterparts from western Mexico in Los Angeles in September, and in the following month, prospective Florida investors will meet with members from Colombia.

In November, representatives from Pennsylvania, Colorado, Connecticut, New Jersey, Maine, Tennessee and Missouri will confer with delegates from six Brazilian states.

These proposed meetings grew out of the successful results of similar conferences held by Texas and Peru, Colorado and Minas Gerais, Brazil, and Michigan and British Honduras.

The Partners programs has flourished in all its diversified fields during the two and a half years of its existence, and it continues to expand. For managers and their firms, it offers an unusual opportunity for opening up new investment possibilities and business arrangements on an individual level.

For more information about Partners of the Alliance and how your firm can participate, write to: Partners of the Alliance, Agency for International Development, Washington, D.C.

For Free Men Everywhere

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB H. GILBERT
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 14, 1967

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, many tributes have been paid to the great spirit and high morale of the Israel forces as they moved with lightning speed against Arab enemies on all the fronts of their tiny, beleaguered land.

Many reasons have been given to explain the almost unbelievable way in which the Arab forces were overwhelmed, including especially the love for homeland instilled in a people who had been the victims of programs back through centuries, culminating in the mass genocide inflicted by Adolph Hitler. The AFL–CIO News, in an editorial in its current issue, pointed out one aspect of the character of Israel that has not been generally noted—the strength given by the labor movement that has been their backbone, Histadrut.

Mr. President, under unanimous consent I include this editorial in the RECORD so that we may all have the opportunity to read and consider it:

FOR FREE MEN EVERYWHERE

Israel's unswerving commitment to democratic freedom and its ability to muster the strength to defend that commitment is the key to current developments in the Middle East.

An important element in the building of Israel as a bastion of democratic freedom has been the country's free trade union movement—Histadrut.

Founded several decades before Israel became a nation, Histadrut provided many of the fundamental organizations, the know-how and the manpower that resulted in the birth of a new country in 1948.

Now its members are fighting for the third time to defend their nation's freedom, to repel the aggression made possible by the Soviet Union's arming and encouragement of Egypt. Histadrut, with most of its own members mobilized, is charged with the task of caring for the dependents, young and old. It has placed its health organization, its welfare and educational services on an emergency footing.

The American labor movement has had a long and cordial relationship with Histadrut. It has supported the Israeli federation's many programs to build a democratic society in Israel and Histadrut's assistance to newly emerging nations.

The Afro-Asian Institute created by Histadrut to help train leaders of free trade unions in the new nations has made an important international contribution. It has been assisted from its beginning by the AFL–CIO and its affiliated unions.

Now Histadrut is involved in the fight for free men everywhere against totalitarian-sponsored aggression, battling for the very existence of the nation which it helped create.

In its hour of crisis it needs the aid and support of the American labor movement, assistance that AFL–CIO unions have given to free trade unions and democratic nations throughout the world in their times of need.

At every turn of the struggle against totalitarian dictatorship, of efforts to infiltrate and subvert democratic institutions and free trade union movements, the American trade union movement has provided meaningful aid and assistance.

The present confrontation in the Middle East is but a continuation of a 20-year-old struggle by the forces of freedom and democracy—the forces truly dedicated to peace—to defeat totalitarian aggression in whatever form it takes.

In that struggle the free world trade union movement, organized into the Intl. Confederation of Free Trade Unions, has played a leading role. Histadrut is one of the members of the ICFTU. Now, in its time of struggle, it needs help.

American unions have come to the side of all ICFTU affiliates in the battle for peace and freedom, for bread and social justice. Now is the time to rally support for the Israeli labor movement.

Honor the Flag and Our National Holidays

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 14, 1967

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, I include herein a letter from my very able and distinguished friend, Maj. Eugene P. Riley, vice president for Massachusetts of the Association of the U.S. Army, urging public assistance in efforts of the association to have more people display the American flag on Flag Day, June 14.

I want to congratulate Major Riley and his association on this very worthy campaign to promote more widespread observance of Flag Day, to exhibit the flag, as it should be exhibited, with pride and patriotism for the men who are serving and dying in defense of our precious national emblem and with gratitude for what it stands for, and for the security and freedom of this Nation.

I have felt for quite some time now that there has been a decline and a deemphasis in the observance of national holidays.

We know that there may be some understandable reasons for this type of apathy, because there are many holiday attractions at the beaches, the mountains, the golf courses, and at other places of enjoyment and relaxation to which the people may be attracted.

However, there are, in some circles, something more than an apathy, and this could well be better described as a downgrading of the importance of national holidays, or even in some instances an insolent ridicule and opposition to the celebration of such days. We have experienced actual desecration of the American flag. This cannot be tolerated and violators must be speedily punished. It is for our people to realize the need for reawakened, lively interest and participation in public respect for the flag and celebration of our national holidays.

As we know, there are those in this country, who short of celebrating patriotic holidays are doing everything they can to discredit them. There is no way that we can change the ideas or reshape the ideology of those who do not believe in the American system. They will probably spend the rest of their lives lauding the merits of other systems that deny the spiritual freedoms, the civil rights, and the priceless opportunities of this Nation and that advocate the substitution of the centralized, radical police state for free government. In time, they will learn the error of their beliefs and ways.

Let us then, as Americans all, take heed and not be blinded by the blandishments and the trappings of those prattling against and denouncing the most cherished ideals of our American system.

Let us all come to the realization that, if this system is to survive, it needs the support of every loyal man, woman, and child in this country, of everyone who believes in the free way of life.

We cannot afford to be complacent or unconcerned about what is going on about us, or indeed about what is going on in this Nation and the world where the forces of dissension, crime, communism, rebellion, and revolution are organized on a widespread basis aiming to defeat and repudiate the free forces of the world, either by stealth, infiltration, deceit, or, if necessary, by actual force of arms and violence as they are doing in Vietnam, and other places.

Free Americans cannot allow that kind of thing to gain a foothold in this country. But the hour is late. We must all be aroused to the dangers and the realities.

We cannot allow our streets to be turned into shambles and ruin. We can not permit lawlessness and disrespect for law and order to stalk through the land.

In fact we must, at all costs, preserve and sustain law and order, which is the prerequisite to any form of government whether it be totalitarian, monarchial or democratic.

For these reasons, Major Riley's suggestions take on deepest meaning this year, and I hope the American people on the occasion of our celebration of Flag Day on June 14, will stop and ponder and think of the sacrifices that have been made for this flag, the blood that has been spilled in its name, and resolve to observe it in the traditional way with rededication to the cause of God and country and the protection of all the priceless freedoms that we enjoy as a free people to a greater extent than any other nation has ever enjoyed them.

Let us then all cooperate on Flag Day to display the American flag and resolve to celebrate all other national holidays, which are so dear to the hearts of the American people, and so important a part of their lives and aspirations for the future.

Let us join together regardless of race, class, or creed, to acclaim the richness, the glory, and the greatness of our heritage in song and story—with banners flying—and with joy and pride and gratitude in our hearts. Let us resolve again and again to pledge allegiance to our flag. Let all nations know that as in the days of glorious 1775, when liberty was born in this Nation to spread throughout all the world, like our proud forbears, we of this generation are fired by the will, the courage, the high purpose and the power and strength to defend and protect our country, regardless of any challenge that may be made against us. Let the world know that we propose to do it, even as we strive for peace, justice, and understanding in the world.

ASSOCIATION OF THE U.S. ARMY,
Boston, Mass., May 10, 1967.

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN,
Representative in Congress,
Clinton, Mass.

DEAR MR. PHILBIN: This is a personal appeal to you as an outstanding citizen of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts to assist The Association of the United States Army in its efforts to have more people display the American Flag on Flag Day, June 14th, 1967.

Briefly, The Association of the United States Army initiated a campaign four years ago to unite all groups, military, non-military, civic, educational, women's and men's clubs, fraternal, boys' and girls' organizations Chamber of Commerce, political, for the sole purpose of getting more people to display the Flag on the birthday of the Flag, June 14th each year. Four years ago I was selected and piloted a successful state wide program in Massachusetts which received national recognition and is now being copied in all 50 states.

In view of the incidents concerning the desecration of our Flag in Cuba, Panama, Ghana, Cambodia, Santa Domingo and only last week in France and Belgium we, in AUSA feel compelled as do many others to take a more active part in spreading proper display and encourage all to display the Flag on Flag Day each year.

Our Flag Day poster in the public school system through-out the entire state has been tremendously successful. The winner of the Poster Contest receives a Savings Bond and an American Flag which has flown over the White House. The Governor of the Commonwealth proclaims the city or town from which the winner comes from as Flag City for the coming year. Over one million children salute the Flag at the same time, 9:05 A.M. across the entire state each Flag Day.

This year, with the situation in Vietnam the way it is, we want to drive home, on this one day at least, to each and every American to display our Flag with pride and patriotism for the men who are serving and dying for the privilege of defending this banner.

Any assistance that will effect more individuals to take an active part this June 14th will be most appreciated. If you have any suggestions or recommendations please forward them to me at the above address.

Sincerely,

EUGENE P. RILEY,
Major, Infantry, Vice President for Massachusetts.

Appointment of Vicente Ximenes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. O. C. FISHER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 14, 1967

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, the appointment of Mr. Vicente Ximenes, of New Mexico, to serve as a member of the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, was an excellent choice. The background and record of Mr. Ximenes demonstrate his high qualifications for this post. This man, a war hero, has made a distinguished record as an economist and research specialist.

In the Southwest, an import element in our society is comprised of Americans of Mexican descent. In war and in peace these people have proven their value as citizens and have contributed substantially to community progress and also to their own improvement. There remains, of course, very much to be done. They need the education, the encouragement, and employment opportunities, and I am confident Mr. Ximenes will be able to contribute to the solution of those problems.

Again, I express my own commendation of the choice of Mr. Ximenes for a position on this important Commission.

Baltic States Freedom Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 14, 1967

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, this week we note a tragic anniversary in the history of the Baltic States of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania. Twenty-seven years ago Russia, gorged on her early and easy victories with her then ally, Nazi Germany, "annexed" the three states. There was little that the tiny nations, independent since the end of World War I, could possibly do and the rest of the world was too embroiled in its own woes than to do more than take note and continue preparations for the holocaust to come.

Almost 1 year to the day after "annexation" Soviet troops and secret police swooped down on the captive nations and began the systematic murder and deportation that was to continue for well over a decade.

In 72 hours—June 14–16, 1941—more than 34,000 Lithuanians alone were deported to Soviet slave labor camps. Many never made it to the camps and few of those who did survived. Baltic States experts estimate that more than 25 percent of the population of the three states was deported or murdered as the Soviets carried out their campaign to colonize the three countries.

The crime of those rounded up for exile or slaughter was simply being either a leader or an anti-Communist. In short, a patriot.

During the war, when the Baltic States were occupied by Germany, the deportations stopped, but on reoccupation by the Soviets they were once more viciously resumed. An underground movement fought pitched battles with the Red army and more than 30,000 Balts are believed to have died in those battles.

Mr. Speaker, it might be assumed that after a quarter century of this kind of oppression that the people of the Baltic

States would be ready to quit—to stop fighting and accept their fate.

But they do not quit. They will not accept the collar of communism. The people have nourished and kept alive a national spirit predicated on the dignity of man. This spirit is nowhere better exemplified than in the groups in this country that strive to support, encourage and help their loved ones at home. I have met many members of these fine organizations and a little over a year and a half ago was privileged to be able to address more than 15,000 people who jammed Madison Square Garden in New York for the Baltic States Freedom Rally.

There was a spirit and faith that really has to be seen to be believed.

Mr. Speaker, it is my earnest belief and I am sure that that belief is shared by every Member of this body that we must continue to support these fine people in their unceasing effort to make their homeland free once again. We must provide them with information in their own tongue, we must strive to keep open the channels for delivery of clothing, food and medicine and above all, we must never cease in our efforts to force Russia to release these nations from bondage.

Vietnam: The Time Is Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT TENZER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1967

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, the nations of the world have just experienced an unusual achievement in world diplomacy—a ceasefire without strings attached.

The peoples of the free nations of the world—those in high places and the man in the street—have had instantaneous news about the war which erupted in the Middle East and the cease-fire without strings which followed. Those in the Arab lands and those behind the iron curtain were not so blessed. They were fed only such information which their rulers wanted them to have.

What was achieved in the Middle East in hours and days—a cease-fire without strings—has eluded the belligerents in Vietnam—and has eluded the great powers, the cochairmen of the Geneva Conference, the International Control Commission, and the United Nations.

With the cease-fire in the Middle East now in effect, I call upon our Government, the President, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, and all of their advisers to use every instrument and technique of diplomacy to bring about a cease-fire in Vietnam and/or to immediately convene a Geneva Conference to negotiate a settlement to the Vietnam conflict.

We should do everything necessary to encourage the United Nations to adopt a cease-fire resolution in Vietnam similar to the resolution adopted in the Middle East crisis and/or to call upon the Cochairmen of the Geneva Conference to immediately convene a peace conference.

We must urge the United Nations, the Cochairmen of the Geneva Conference, the International Control Commission, and the available diplomatic channels, including the "hotline" between Washington and Moscow to bring about a cease-fire in Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, it is important to note the request of the Soviet Union on June 13, 1967, for an emergency session of the United Nations General Assembly on the Middle East crisis under the provisions of the "Uniting for Peace" resolution of November 3, 1950. This step represents the first acceptance by the Soviet Union of the use of the "uniting for peace" resolution for the determination by the General Assembly of a war and peace issue normally dealt with by the Security Council and subject to the veto power.

In light of this recent development, the United States has an opportunity to bring the Vietnam conflict from the battlefield to the conference table through the use of this U.N. special procedure.

Now is the time for us to move toward peace throughout the world.

Mr. Speaker, on August 31, 1966, I sent a letter to our President in which I included a seven-plateau program for peace in the Far East. The full text of the letter and the President's reply appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 6, 1966, page A4673 and September 14, 1966, page A4810.

On Sunday June 11, 1967, the distinguished commentator on foreign affairs, Mr. C. L. Sulzberger, in an editorial entitled "An Idea Finds Its Time" sets forth a formula for peace in Vietnam. The editorial also spells out a seven-plateau plan for peace with some variations on the theme. Hopefully some such plan can be implemented because the idea has found its time. The full text of the editorial follows:

[From the New York Times, June 11, 1967]

FOREIGN AFFAIRS: AN IDEA FINDS ITS TIME

(By C. L. Sulzberger)

Through no fault of our own the world power balance has shifted suddenly in our favor and the time has come for decisive efforts to end the Vietnam war.

The United States can claim no credit for Israel's swift victory, but the fact of that victory was of strategic benefit to us although our role was confined to waffling.

We are assailed by Arab and Communist propaganda for having tipped the balance of a campaign in which we played no part. Therefore, despite ourselves, American prestige has risen. Conversely, because Moscow openly sponsored the Arab cause and failed to help it in the crunch, Soviet prestige has sunk despite its violent postmortem propaganda efforts.

A VIBRANT U.S.A.

Through the behavior of their client states the fate of both paramount powers was thus inextricably engaged. Thanks to Israeli toughness, the United States looks more vibrant; the Soviet Union looks less so. The triumph proclaimed as "inevitable" for revolutionary causes championed by Communism appears less inevitable.

The Arab armies, of course, were in no sense Communist, but Russia was their political and military arsenal. Now they are shattered. Russia is humiliated because its advocacy faltered when most needed. And once again China can sneer that Moscow works in cahoots with Washington because the two capitals joined in non-belligerency and in supporting a cease-fire—despite subsequent diatribes.

The Middle East puzzle remains insoluble and the furnaces of resentment have again been stoked but, in terms of burning world crises, one may hope we can soon revert again to only one: the Southeast Asian war. There the moment has arrived for an active American initiative.

Material factors haven't changed but psychological factors have. Because Israel was depicted as an outpost of the West and the Arabs boasted Soviet protection, the West today looks poised and vital and its adversaries faltering and divided.

For this reason President Johnson might find it desirable to make a dramatic attempt to end the interminable and indecisive conflict in Vietnam. The following formula presents itself:

(1)—After issuing a preamble stressing his interest in peace, the President could announce his intention of going to Geneva within a fortnight and remaining as long as necessary to consult with any and all other powers or movements concerned with producing a Vietnam settlement.

(2)—This hope would be accompanied by a proclaimed desire for a broadly based conference, at least as representative as that in Geneva during 1954 when, among others, the Peking Government was represented. An invitation might be extended to London and Moscow to resume their functions as cochairmen. Furthermore, this time the U.S.A. would attend as a full member, not merely as an observer. There should be no quibbling about credentials for other participants, including the Vietcong.

(3)—To prepare the basis for negotiation the President might announce that he was promptly sending to Geneva a delegation of distinguished Americans to receive any visitors, delegates or communications concerned with procedures or agenda for a conference.

END THE BOMBING

(4)—Since the existing atmosphere is not favorable to negotiation, the President could announce that the United States feels so anxious for peace that he is ordering an immediate end to the bombing of North Vietnam—with no conditions and with no commitments.

(5)—This would be accompanied by an expressed hope: the American people expect their adversaries to take note of these developments and perhaps to make tangible moves of their own encouraging the prospect of talks. For example, Hanoi might curb southward dispatch of soldiers and supplies and invite the International Control Commission to inspect the main infiltration arteries. This would be a "hope" and an "expectation," not a *quid pro quo* demand.

(6)—Such a U.S. policy statement would emphasize its wish for a quick search for honest compromise. In the meantime, first an American delegation, then the President himself would—on U.S. initiative—arrive in Geneva and start a unilateral effort for peace.

ALTERNATIVE SOLUTIONS

(7)—If, however, after a reasonable period of waiting, there is no sign of response from the other side, the President should explain that he would be forced to contemplate other ways of ending the drawn-out conflict by less desirable means. He would then have to apply drastic surgery to a debilitating cancer.

This formula is not original; but its authors prefer to remain anonymous. It has been considered at high levels here and abroad. Until now certain people have argued the moment was not ripe for action. Today it is ripe and, as Victor Hugo said: "No army can withstand the strength of an idea whose time has come."

Mr. Speaker, Rome burned while Nero fiddled. Americans should not dawdle while death and destruction continue.

Now is the time to stop the bombing.

Now is the time for a cease-fire.

Now is the time for our President to lead us and the world on the pathways to permanent peace.

I concluded my letter of August 31, 1966, to the President with the following statement which I quote and repeat today:

> Mr. President, you now have an excellent opportunity for creative diplomacy and dynamic statesmanship. Let us hope and pray that North Vietnam and the National Liberation Front will recognize our good intentions and come to the peace table. If they do, both sides will have gained much. Should they fail to appear, let the eyes of the world behold the empty chairs and let the ears of the world hear the thunder of the silence from those invited—but unrepresented at the peace table.
>
> Lead us, Mr. President, in once again taking the first steps on the path of de-escalation and on the path towards peace. The world will recognize that you heeded the words of the Prophet Zechariah, 9:10, who said: "and he shall speak peace unto the nations".
>
> This act of courage and magnanimity will be applauded by the entire world and our citizens at home.

Baltic Peoples Freedom Day, June 11

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1967

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, June 11 marked the Baltic States Freedom Day, a day which in fact commemorates the most tragic moment in the history of the Baltic peoples, the date on which they were deprived of their freedom. We rise today to give a saddened tribute to a besieged people, who were among the first to fall prey to Russian Communist imperialism following the outbreak of World War II, whose fate should have served to forewarn the world of the cold war which was to emerge after that global holocaust.

The fate which was to befall the Estonian, Latvian, and Lithuanian nations was determined even prior to the outbreak of World War II. The secret nonaggression protocol concluded in August 1939, between Nazi Germany and the Soviet Union and its subsequent corollaries placed these three Baltic States in the Soviet sphere of influence. Poland was invaded by Nazi Germany in September 1939. Within barely a month the Soviet Union had forced each of the Baltic Nations to sign a treaty of mutual assistance, mutual assistance which meant each was coerced into accepting Soviet bases on their territory. These bases gave the Soviet Union a foothold for its invasion of the Baltic States in the summer of 1940.

The now familiar pattern of Soviet colonialization followed. The presence of occupation forces enabled the Soviets to impose Communist governments on these formerly independent nations. But the Baltic nations were not to enjoy even the limited advantages of a satellite status; the Soviet design for them was even more comprehensive. The Communist installed governments in the Baltic States "voted" for their incorporation into the Soviet Union. The U.S.S.R. "accepted" their incorporation. Today the Baltic States are constituent republics of the Soviet Union.

Today the Baltic peoples are enslaved. They have been deprived of their independence, subjugated to the Communist system, and find their nationalistic tendencies thwarted at every turn. From the very beginning of Russian occupation, the Soviets have conducted a stringent campaign to remove all traces of nationalism among the Baltic peoples. Within the first year following the Russian invasion over 100,000 Baltic peoples were deported to remote regions of the Soviet Union.

Despite the captivity in which they live, despite the tragedies they have endured, the Baltic peoples throughout the world remain dedicated to the restoration of the independence of their respective fatherlands. In recognition to the unsubmissive spirit of the Baltic people, we take this occasion to reassure them of our moral support. May they never despair, for surely their suffering will one day be rewarded and their homelands once again become their own.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I insert the text of my resolution (H. Con. Res. 25), which I introduced on January 10, 1967:

H. CON. RES. 25

Whereas the subjection of peoples to alien subjugation, domination, and exploitation constitutes a denial of fundamental human rights, is contrary to the Charter of the United Nations, and is an impediment to the promotion of world peace and cooperation; and

Whereas all peoples have the right to self-determination; by virtue of that right they freely determine their political status and freely pursue their economic, social, and cultural development; and

Whereas the Baltic peoples of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania have been forcibly deprived of these rights; and

Whereas it has been the firm and consistent policy of the Government of the United States to support the aspirations of Baltic peoples for self-determination and national independence; and

Whereas there exist many historical, cultural, and family ties between the peoples of the Baltic States and the American people: Be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the President of the United States should take such steps as he may deem appropriate to bring before the United Nations the questions of Soviet action in the Baltic States for the purpose of urging the United Nations to request that the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics—

(1) withdraw all Soviet troops, agents, colonists, and controls from Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia; and

(2) return all Baltic exiles from Siberia, prisons, and slave-labor camps in the Soviet Union.

SEC. 2. *It is further resolved*, That it is the sense of the Congress that the President of the United States should take such steps as he may deem appropriate to urge the United Nations to conduct free elections in Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia under its supervision.

AID Establishes Latin American Investment Center

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1967

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, yesterday it was my privilege to be present at a ceremony inaugurating a Latin American investment development center designed to stimulate the flow of private capital to Latin America and increased economic integration among American states.

Established by the Agency for International Development and operated by the Council for International Progress in Management—CIPM—the new institution will be called the Inter-American Investment Development Center.

The Hon. William S. Gaud, AID Administrator, and Mr. Earl W. Eames, Jr., president of CIPM, signed the agreement. The event was attended by United States and Latin American business leaders and government officials.

The center represents another of those important efforts, which have always been encouraged in Congress, to engage the American private sector in the job of assisting the economic progress of the less-developed nations.

Among the benefits anticipated from the center are these:

Acceleration of industrial and agricultural development.

Substantial increase in employment opportunities for Latin Americans.

Better understanding by U.S. investors of Latin America's needs for economic development.

Increase in two-way trade between the U.S. and the Alliance for Progress countries.

As one who long has been interested in the work of CIPM, I am confident that this new undertaking of that organization will significantly assist the flow of capital, management talent and modern technology to Latin America.

This is how the Inter-American Investment Development Center will operate—

The center will work directly with banks and other institutions in 20 Latin American countries. These affiliates will forward screened investment proposals to New York, each proposal accompanied by a $250 processing fee. I am told a considerable number of proposals are already set for submission.

The center will refer the proposals to U.S. banks, international auditing firms, and consulting companies for subsequent direct presentation to prospective investors.

At first the center will be supported three ways. It will receive processing fees from those originating projects, "finders' fees" paid to the center by investors in the United States, and an initial grant from AID, totaling about $1 million over a 3-year period.

The center is expected to become self-supporting in about 3 to 5 years, at which time the AID subsidy will be withdrawn.

Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that the new center will soon prove itself to be of great value in bringing new ideas together with the money needed to put them to work for the benefit of our Latin American neighbors.

In order to further acquaint my colleagues in the Congress with this new agency, I am inserting in the RECORD at this point the opening remarks at the signing ceremony, made by Carl D. Goderez, Chief of the Industrial Development Branch, Bureau for Latin America.

OPENING REMARKS BY CARL D. GODEREZ, CHIEF, INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT BRANCH, BUREAU FOR LATIN AMERICA

We are pleased and appreciate your attendance at this signing ceremony, particularly since you were all given such short notice. I know that many of you had to rearrange your schedules in order to be present here at this time, and your gesture of support and cooperation in what we believe to be one of the most significant activities ever undertaken by the Agency for International Development is very encouraging to us.

The Interamerican Investment Development Center implements basic recommendations of the Watson Committee report on Foreign Aid through Private Initiative. Through this Center or "clearing house" we intend to help stimulate a greatly increased flow of private U.S. capital, management and technology to Latin America.

The effort is inter-American in the true sense of the word—over 30 Latin American development banks and fomento institutions in 20 countries are affiliated with the program and will share in the cost of the operation.

Today's inauguration is a convincing expression of hemispheric cooperation in carrying out the goals of the Alliance for Progress. In addition, it represents the healthy government-private enterprise collaboration we all know to be a key to development. If we continue this cooperation between government and private enterprise in both North and South America, we cannot help but succeed.

Oil Shale in Focus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1967

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, in the continuing discussion that has surrounded the proposed development of one of this Nation's great natural resources, oil shale, I have been distressed at the sometimes reckless abandon with which quantitative figures have been used to paint an almost surrealistic picture. It may be pleasing to some eyes, but it has little relation to reality.

In a recent address before the Colorado Petroleum Council's Eighth Anual Meeting in Denver on May 25, 1967, Russell J. Cameron, president of Cameron & Jones, Inc., a widely known and respected firm of consulting engineers with many years experience in the field of oil shale development, addressed himself to this problem of meaningful information.

I recommend this speech to my colleagues with the thought that it will add to the general understanding of this complex subject.

OIL SHALE IN FOCUS

(By Russell J. Cameron)

I know of no topic on the public scene, unless it be Viet Nam, on which there is more ignorance, confused thinking and dogmatic opinion than oil shale—thus the title for my presentation. Maybe the title should be "Oil Shale Out of Focus" because there is no assurance that I can clarify the subject for you. One of the frustrations of those who deal with oil shale every day, is that its problems are many sided and so involved, that we so-called experts may be the most confused among you.

I might add that the confusion in the public mind is greatly compounded by all sorts of uninformed individuals and organizations joining the fray, each with some axe to grind or some real or imaginary dragon to kill.

As an example, on April 7, 1967, a press release from the office of the Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee began as follows:

"How and when to sell a national treasure—worth almost 20 times the annual federal budget—will be the topic of Senate hearings opening April 18.

" 'The government owns more than 80 percent of the 10 million acres of this land in Colorado, Wyoming and Utah,' said Hart. 'It contains two trillion barrels of shale oil which conservatively is estimated to be worth $2.5 trillion—or enough for $40,000 for each American household. Its market value may be twice that.' "

It is this type of sensationalism that needs to be brought into focus.

GEOLOGY AND RESERVES

The oil shales of importance in the United States are found in the Parachute Creek member of the Green River formation, and were formed as sediments in brackish lakes about 50 million years ago. The organic matter in the oil shale is called kerogen and is not an oil nor is the rock a shale, it is a marlstone. Oil is formed by heating the rock to about 800° F. The kerogen decomposes to an oil, gas and a coke-like residue that remains in the spent shale. About 30 percent by volume of average grade oil shale is organic matter.

Our major oil shale reserves are in Colorado, Utah and Wyoming. The areas are well defined and we are confident that the largest reserve is in Colorado's Piceance Creek Basin. Utah has some areas that may be developed at reasonable cost by open-pit mining but much of its oil shale is deeply-buried and cannot be economically produced with technology now available.

Wyoming has only marginal oil shale prospects despite a large area of Green River formation, but additional exploration is needed especially with regard to associated minerals. I will have more to say on these other minerals later.

A figure of 1.744 trillion barrels was given recently for the oil shale potential of Colorado, Utah and Wyoming.[1] This estimate is based on the 15–15 definition (at least 15 gallons per ton in beds at least 15 feet thick) but such a figure is meaningless since much of this oil is not now nor is likely ever to be economically recoverable. Dr. Wayland pointed out in his testimony that only "about 80 billion barrels of shale oil is considered recoverable by demonstrated mining and retorting methods", or less than 10% of the total reserve. According to Dr. Wayland's figures, 21.1% of the reserve is in private hands or a recoverable reserve of about 16 billion barrels.

Eighty billion barrels or even 16 billion barrels is a lot of oil, well worth going after, but these numbers are a far cry from the trillions of barrels that lead people to think in terms of paying off the national debt with oil shale royalties or of the oil shale owners hoarding hundreds of years of oil supply. I am confident that ultimate recoveries of shale oil will be higher than Dr. Wayland's figures but decades will pass before the leaner, less-accessible oil shales become a part of the "recoverable" reserve. Any figures that do not take into account losses and uneconomic low-grade zones are misleading and have done much to confuse the real issues of the oil shale problem.

THE TECHNOLOGY

I would like to dispose of the subject of technology without involving you in details of the various techniques for producing the oil. The two suggested approaches for the recovery of shale oil are (1) mining/aboveground retorting and (2) retorting inplace or *in situ*.

Shale oil has been produced for more than 100 years by mining/retorting and this is the only production method in use today. Russia and China both have sizeable industries. Current research and development in the U.S.A. is aimed mainly at improving these earlier mining/retorting techniques and apequipment to the job. Good results have been achieved, a sound technology is available and we are now in the prototype phase of testing some of our new ideas. This technology can and probably will be applied commercially by the early 1970's.

The *in situ* technique has many proponents, among them:

Oil people who would like to apply their background and experience to shale oil production.

Naturalists who look on mining as a despoiler of the aesthetic value of the landscape.

Proponents of nuclear technology who would like to develop peaceful uses for atomic explosions.

Engineers who think there ought to be a better way to get the oil from oil shale than to move hundreds of thousands or even millions of tons of rock every day.

All have some logic to support their position, but unfortunately research has not yet come up with a feasible *in situ* production method. The reasons are several but prominent among them are:

Oil shale has no permeability or porosity and in most areas little or no communication exists between holes even a few feet apart.

The rock must be brought to a high temperature to form oil before it can be produced.

The oil is waxy, viscous and flows with difficulty at ambient rock temperatures.

The nuclear concept that seeks by a massive explosion to create a rubble zone of broken oil shale is no cinch to work and the efficiency of oil recovery by a subsequent combustion phase is a question mark. There is a general misunderstanding of the $0.29 per barrel cost for the nuclear approach estimated by Dr. M. A. Lekas of the AEC.[2] Lekas took some highly optimistic assumptions and applied them to hypothetical situations to get some idea of the comparative economics of shale oil production by the nuclear method under various conditions. The lowest conceivable figure was $0.29 and even if achievable could be applied only to a limited part of the shale reserve in Colorado and not at all in Utah or Wyoming. Furthermore the costs would likely be considerably higher because ideal conditions are almost never encountered. This figure ($0.29/bbl) was used in congressional testimony to support the idea that oil shale royalties should be as high as possible,[3] a classic example of the misuse of information by those with inadequate background in the subject.

---

[1] Dr. Russell G. Wayland, Acting Chief, Conservation Division, U.S. Geological Survey, before the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly of the Senate Judiciary Committee, April 18, 1967.

[2] Lekas, M. A., "Economics of Producing Shale Oil by the Nuclear *In Situ* Retorting Method", Third Annual Oil Shale Symposium, April, 1966.

Before dismissing *in situ* retorting entirely let me make clear that an efficient economic *in situ* shale oil production method is a desirable objective and worthy of research effort. I have confidence that such a method can be developed but I am not optimistic that one will be available by the time we need shale oil. Therefore, it is my belief that shale oil will be produced first by mining and retorting using techniques already in an advanced stage of development and that these methods will be improved still further through commercial application. *In situ* methods of production may be in use within 20 years but they will not likely be more economical than the mining/retorting systems of that day.

THE NEED AND THE MARKET

Do we need shale oil now? Obviously with imports of 2,500,000 barrels a day, we have an adequate supply of oil for the present. The fact is that we cannot have shale oil in any significant quantity for at least 10 years. The more pertinent question is whether or not we will need shale oil by 1975 or 1980.

Take almost anyone's appraisal and you will find a prediction that domestic oil supply will fall short of demand by a wide margin by 1980 or thereabouts. Since we are now supplementing domestic supply with imports amounting to 20% of demand we obviously are going to have to find much greater quantities of oil, to increase imports or develop synthetic oil. Most likely we will do all three.

In this light, let me focus your attention on a regional situation. The Rocky Mountain area now produces about 1,000,000 barrels of oil per day from a proven reserve of less than 3 billion barrels. Both production and reserves have been static or declining in most of the producing states. Exploration also has declined significantly. Colorado is a striking example of production declining, with a decrease in 10 years from 160,000 to 90,000 barrels per day.

It seems to me that shale oil first will become a regional supply of oil making up the decline in production of conventional oil in the Rocky Mountains and this combined with increased demand for petroleum products in the area may take all the shale oil that can be produced for the next 10 to 15 years.

TIMING AND COST

Contrary to some expressed thought, oil shale will not emerge in a flood to drown the domestic oil industry. Many factors will see to this, not the least of which is the time required to build an industry and its cost. By the time the technology is proven to the degree needed to justify the large expenditures that are inevitable we may be into the 1970's. It has been stated that a 58,000 B/D oil shale plant using the TOSCO II system will cost $130 million.[4] If we round this off to $2000 per daily barrel, simple arithmetic tells us that 1,000,000 barrels per day wil cost $2 billion. If we add the power plants, pipelines and other similar industrial installations, and the expansion of highways, schools, hospitals, and municipal facilities, this cost could double. To build a 1,000,000 B/D industry by the end of the 1970's will be a monumental task requiring that no time be lost at any step. To build the industry faster probably is out of the question owing to the physical size of the effort and the political, technical and financial barriers to be surmounted. It seems likely that there will be a need for the oil about as fast as it can be developed.

COMPETITORS OF SHALE OIL

The importation of overseas oil is the most serious competitor of a shale oil industry as well as the domestic producer. Shale oil can no where near attain the present dollar cost of a barrel of imported Persian Gulf oil nor can any oil being found in North America today. I need not dwell on this point in a talk to oil men but it is worth mentioning in the following context.

There is, in my opinion, an urgency to bring oil shale, coal and tar sands into production as suppliers of a part of our North American oil needs. First, we must protect against interruption of overseas supplies. The current Egypt-Israel controversy is another example of the constant threat to mid-east oil. Second, but not less important, we should keep a strong bargaining position in the market for world oil. We may find Arabian oil much more expensive when we no longer have productive capacity in excess of normal demand. I would advance the thought that we should keep some of our shut-in capacity available for emergencies and use oil shale, coal and tar sands as a part of the "baseload" supply.

In respect to coal and tar sands, it seems to me that all will fit into our future oil supply, first as regional sources, later in the national oil mix of Canada and the United States. The technologies are remarkably similar, in that mining and materials handling and the up-grading of hydrogen-deficient hydrocarbons are involved in each. There is no reason that favorably situated "high-grade" deposits of all three sources—oil shale, tar sands and coal—will not be competitive with each other and with conventional petroleum.

OTHER MINERALS

The discovery of other potentially valuable minerals in some of the oil shale formations, while adding to the legal and administrative problems of the Federal government, already has had a beneficial influence. The minerals to which I refer are nahcolite (sodium bicarbonate), dawsonite (a sodium aluminum carbonate) and halite (sodium chloride). The more interesting of these may be dawsonite since if economically recoverable it could be a new source of aluminum. Bauxite, 90% of which is imported, is now our sole raw material for this strategically important commodity.

Will these other minerals be economically recoverable? How will they influence the shale oil future? These and other questions must await the detailed evaluation always necessary for nearly discovered minerals. Like oil shale itself there is no question but what the quantities are large—zones several hundred feet thick covering thousands of acres—but also like oil shale the economics of recovery must be established. At this time the potential is exceedingly interesting but no definite answer can be given. A number of companies, including chemical and aluminum companies, are making evaluations and will accelerate their efforts if lands containing these minerals can be obtained on a reasonable basis from the Federal government.

THE FEDERAL OIL SHALE LEASING POLICY

I was tempted, because this topic is in the news, to devote my whole presentation to it. The reason I have refrained is that its importance can be overstated.

There is no assurance at the present time, although we are hopeful, that the leasing regulations will be acceptable to industry when issued in final form. Certainly they are not workable in their present form. Another thing, an important fact that often escapes notice, is that shale development is proceeding on private lands, will continue to do so, and may even accelerate if development on public lands is discouraged by oppressive regulation.

I sincerely hope that Secretary Udall will modify his proposed leasing regulation to the extent that a healthy, competitive and ultimately profitable private industry can be developed on the public oil shale lands. This is his stated aim but in my opinion the regulations as written will not achieve the objectives he seeks.

While there are other questionable provisions of the regulations, it is basically unsound to require that a lessee make public all the know-how, and give up title to any patents, resulting from his research on public lands. Not only is this stipulation likely to discourage qualified applicants for leases but if followed would surely result in a mediocre technology. I cannot visualize a company using its always limited research budget and its top personnel to do research on this basis when there are always more opportunities than resources available for proprietary research.

I look at those parts of the regulation relating to patents and disclosure as essentially a negation of the patent system, which is in large measure responsible for the industrial and scientific progress of our country. A a reward for innovation, and for disclosing the nature of his invention to others by publication of a patent, the inventor is given a limited monopoly (17 years) on its use. In practice the inventor almost always has been willing to license his technology, under the patent system, but the chance that a competitor may devise a better mousetrap usually has spurred others on to research and innovation. Requiring that patents be assigned to the Federal government and that all results of research be immediately made public will remove the most powerful competitive force that can be brought into oil shale development.

It is suggested by the regulation, and by public expressions of the Secretary, that granting ownership of the technology to the public is a necessary compensation for the opportunity to use the publically-owned oil shale resource. I submit that royalties commensurate with the value of the product and its cost of production should be the means of direct compensation to the public.

I further submit that every means should be taken to insure the maximum degree of technological competition, for from this competition will flow the greatest benefit of all to the public—an ample supply of products at the lowest possible cost.

May Old Glory Wave Forever

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1967

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I recently received a heartfelt poem written by one of my constituents, Mr. Louis Valente. It was written in honor of Flag Day, and it is my pleasure to insert it in the RECORD at this time:

MAY OLD GLORY WAVE FOREVER

(By Louis F. Valente)

See her proudly wave on high,
silhouetted against the blue sky.

See her stripes of red and white,
shining in the bright sunlight.

---

[3] Paul H. Douglas, testimony before the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly of the Senate Judiciary Committee April 19, 1967.

[4] Morton M. Winston, Executive Vice President, The Oil Shale Corporation, testimony before the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly of the Senate Judiciary Committee April, 1967.

She is Old Glory, proud and true,
waving there for me and you.

It is certain that she will catch your eye,
so lift up your hat as she goes by.

To her we must pledge our love,
and may God bless her from above.

Let us show her that we care,
and will protect here everywhere.

Pray that she may never fall,
never to rise again at all.

God willing may she forever wave,
over the land of the free and the brave.

Flag Day, 1967

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JEFFERY COHELAN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 14, 1967

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, as we observe Flag Day, 1967 we cannot help but reflect upon the recent incidents, however repulsive and unfortunate they are to most of our citizens, in which our flag was publicly burned as a protest against Government policy.

We honor this symbol of our Nation today knowing that we will very shortly be considering legislation to make public desecration of the flag a crime.

This morning the Washington Post carried a very timely editorial pointing out that those who burn the flag cannot really desecrate the great principles which it represents. While these people fail to understand the indestructibility of these principles, no law can prevent them from pursuing their mistaken and childish antics.

Mr. Speaker, I call this editorial to the attention of our colleagues by including it in the RECORD at this point. I think it offers a broad understanding of the issue involved:

FLAG DAY, 1967

Flag Day, this year, comes at a time when disrespectful treatment of the national emblem has aroused concern and inspired legislation to punish the desecration of this symbol of the Nation. The legislation may be superfluous, given the existence of state laws that make this sort of misconduct punishable as a misdemeanor. But there does seem to be need for some broader understanding of the things for which the flag stands.

It is not, as many of those who defile it seem to think, the mere trademark of a current policy of one administration or one officeholder. It remains, through one administration after another, the flag of the Nation, the symbol of the country, the banner of all its people of all conditions and views. To deface it or to desecrate it as a means of reproaching passing policy, besides being an offense to every American, is an acknowledgment that the offender is ignorant of the nature of the symbol. It is besides an admission that the flag-destroyer lacks the verbal facility and intellectual capacity to articulate a political argument in terms intelligible to literate persons. And it is, in addition, an insult to all the great principles for which the flag stands, including the principles that shield those in a democratic society who avail themselves of the right to voice dissent.

No law can prevent, no punishment completely restrain, the few disturbed and unbalanced people who defile the flag; but fortunately, no desecration that they contrive can really debase the flag or its principles. What is defaced is a piece of bunting, a scrap of textile, a printed image. What is beyond the reach of the rancor of vandals and the obscenities of demonstrators is a flag not made of cloth—but an image that rises in the minds of Americans when they think of all that is good in their Nation and noble in their country and deserving in their countrymen. That is the flag that no irreverent hand can harm.

That flag never will be disfigured by anything but acts and deeds unworthy of the principles for which it stands. Vandals may trample upon a million copies of it, defile a million replicas, but it will fly as bravely as ever and stir as profoundly as ever the emotion and pride of American citizens.

Greeneville, Tenn., Elks Support Desecration-of-the-Flag Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 14, 1967

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, today we take time from our legislative duties to appropriately honor our flag on this Flag Day, 1967.

In light of the abuse that has been directed at the flag in recent months, it is particularly fitting that we conduct these ceremonies today.

Tomorrow we will continue in this spirit, and bring to the floor for consideration the bill that will make the desecration of our flag punishable by a year in prison and not more than $1,000 fine.

The passage of this measure will be a proper climax to our ceremonies today.

I am most grateful to the members of the Greeneville, Tenn., Lodge No. 1653, of the Benevolent and Protective Order of the Elks of the United States of America, for the resolution that they have adopted in support of my bill to prohibit the desecration of the flag, and I insert the resolution at this point in the RECORD:

Whereas, there have been committed increasingly numerous instances of burning, defacing, mutilating and other acts of desecration and degradation of the Flag of these United States of America, which Flag is the emblem of freedom and the symbol of unity in these United States of America and is the official and recognized Flag representing the People and Government of these United States, and

Whereas, these acts have been perpetrated, preformed and abetted within the borders of these United States of America by individuals or groups of individuals under the guise of protests against some real or imaginary wrong and with malicious and premeditated intent to so do, and,

Whereas, there appears to be no legal means of preventing or forestalling such acts nor any legal punishment for the commission of such acts, which loyal citizens regard as un-American, criminal and as much an attack upon this nation as an armed invasion by some foreign nation would be, and,

Whereas, the Honorable James H. Quillen, Congressman for the First Congressional District of Tennessee has introduced into the Congress of these United States a Flag Bill entitled HR 6385 which will afford a legal means of punishing those guilty of desecrating, degradation of, or dishonoring the Flag of this great Nation,

Now, therefore, be it resolved that Greeneville Lodge No. 1658 of the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks of the United States of America be on record as approving, endorsing and actively supporting this Flag Bill HR 6385 and that this resolution be spread upon the minutes of this lodge and that a copy of this resolution be sent to the Honorable James H. Quillen, Congressman for the First Congressional District of Tennessee and to all Members of Congress representing the State of Tennessee in both houses of Congress.

The American Flag: Symbol of Our National Heritage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. G. ELLIOTT HAGAN
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 13, 1967

Mr. HAGAN. Mr. Speaker, today is Flag Day and this year the occasion is marked by national concern for our country's emblem. For this reason I would like to submit an excellent editorial from Naval Affairs June issue:

One of the greatest strengths of our Nation is the right of dissent. This right was established by our Founding Fathers and must remain inviolate. However, the right of dissent from particular policies or with particular individuals was never intended to sanction the desecration of the American flag. The American flag is the very symbol of our national heritage and unites all Americans in their allegiance "To the Republic for which it stands".

If there was ever any doubt in anyone's mind that the American flag would, or could, be defiled and desecrated without some form of punishment being administered then actions of the past two months have removed those doubts. Recently, on the same day, in the same newspapers, pictures of American servicemen facing danger and death in Vietnam, and pictures of American demonstrators burning their Nation's flag in the protection of an American part were published. Certainly the Bill of Rights was never intended to protect those who would so contemptuously desecrate the very symbol of our freedom.

The love of Flag and Country are among the most precious things in life. Millions have fought under the Stars and Stripes and hundreds of thousands have died defending its very meaning. From the time of the birth of our Nation it has served as an emblem of our sovereignty. It is more than an emblem, however, it is a reminder to the peoples the world over of those ideals of freedom and liberty for which the United States has always stood. It is a source of pride and honor to all true Americans.

For these reasons it is very difficult to understand the outrageous defiance that has been allowed to take place with little or nothing being done about it. Why should the present day young people—the students who are supposed to take their rightful place in our society as responsible citizens, the beatnicks and others who take the attitude that the world owes them a living and that others should do their fighting for them—remain unpunished? Can they be so set against American foreign policy to undermine the very system that assures them the freedom they cherish?

Every state of the Union has laws prohibiting desecration of the flag, yet demonstrators—offenders—are not punished. Since the flag is a national symbol and should have national protection it remains up to the Congress of the United States to prohibit its desecration by statute. Some fifty bills have been introduced in the House of Representatives on this subject. Similar bills have been introduced in the Senate. Hearings are being held at this writing by the House Committee on Judiciary to provide for penalties, including prison and monetary fines for any person who publicly mutilates, defaces, defiles, defies, tramples upon or casts contempt, either by word or act, upon any flag, standard, colors, or ensign of the United States.

The Fleet Reserve Association applauds the action of the Congress in proposing legislation to punish offenders of such shameful and disgraceful deeds. It is hoped that Congress will act swiftly to insure those who insult the honor and dignity of our country are punished.

L. B. J. Brings New Opportunity to Mexican Americans

SPEECH

OF

HON. B. F. SISK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1967

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, last week, with great sympathy and understanding, President Johnson turned the attention of the Congress and the American people to the challenging question of equal opportunity for the Mexican American.

At a White House ceremony to swear in Vicente Ximenes as a member of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, the President established a special high-level Committee on Mexican American Affairs. That Committee will work to see that Federal programs are effectively reaching the Mexican Americans—in education, jobs, training, help for migrant farmworkers, health, and community facilities.

The President also released a significant Cabinet report which evaluated the Federal Government's efforts, during the past 3 years, to focus new attention on the needs of Mexican Americans.

I am particularly interested in this effort because there are large groups of Mexican Americans in my own congressional district, and I am pleased and proud that our Government is placing new emphasis on helping these people who have been neglected for too long.

I am exceptionally proud that the U.S. Government is investing millions of dollars in local California school districts—under President Johnson's Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965—to reduce classroom size, to provide modern instructional materials, and to add new teachers, and thereby improve the quality of education for hundreds of thousands of Mexican American schoolchildren.

In my own district of Fresno, antipoverty funds have enabled Mexican American families at Three Rocks to build new homes with a $113,000 loan from the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

I am proud that the Federal Government is continuing to invest millions annually in new health, education, housing, and training programs for the Mexican American migrant worker and his family, of whom there are over 30,000 in my congressional district.

I compliment the U.S. Public Health Service which, in a typical year, immunizes over 1.5 million Mexican Americans and their families from polio, diptheria, smallpox, and other diseases.

Comprehensive Government job training programs have benefited Mexican Americans, not just in my own State of California, but all across the southwestern area of the Nation.

The U.S. Office of Education has helped thousands of educationally deprived Mexican American students in project Headstart.

The University of Southern California has planned a program which, if funded by the Congress, will establish special institutes to train teachers who travel with Mexican American migrant workers, teaching their children both English and Spanish and relating them more closely to the community.

In short, the record of the Johnson administration is good concerning the Mexican Americans. And it is getting better.

Within a short time, the Congress will receive the President's new antipoverty recommendations from committee. Many of these programs hold potential for hundreds of thousands of Mexican-American citizens.

Let us not be misled into cutting these programs.

Let us continue and improve the Neighborhood Youth Corps, the Job Corps, Headstart, and Upward Bound, the health and migrant worker programs, and many other opportunity programs.

Let us join the President as he continues the solid program of accomplishment he has already initiated.

It is an accomplishment which reflects well on the Mexican American who seeks the benefits of full citizenship.

It reflects well on a Congress determined to wipe away the stains of deprivation and discrimination which have held back the Mexican-American citizen.

Our Government is now engaged in an unprecedented program to share the benefits of American prosperity and education, health and community facilities, job training and careers, with all willing citizens.

Let us support President Johnson in the fulfillment of this great ideal. As he said last week at the White House, what we do for any minority, we do also for the majority. What we do for any American, we do for all Americans.

Barriers to Fair Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 1967

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, segregation in housing is one of the most serious problems facing our cities today.

In an article in the June 1967 issue of the AFL-CIO American Federationist, Dr. Eugene Feingold and Robert J. Harris, of the University of Michigan, discuss some of the obstacles to fair housing:

THE OBSTACLES TO FAIR HOUSING

(By Dr. Eugene Feingold and Robert J. Harris)

This century has seen a great Negro migration from the rural South to the urban North. At the beginning of the century, almost all Negroes lived in the South; today, more than half live in the North.

During the past 25 years, while the Negro migration into the cities was taking place, the housing industry—and when we refer to the "housing industry," we mean those who are concerned with the financing, building, sale and rental of housing—with the subsidy, support and, in some cases, the leadership of the federal government, has encouraged and facilitated the movement of middle-class whites to the suburbs.

This movement to the suburbs, however, has been generally denied to those Negroes who have managed to fight their way into the middle class through all the burdens our society places upon them. The result is that Negroes have been replacing whites in our large cities. We now have at least two cities with Negro majorities and they will soon be joined by others. At the same time, the suburbs are almost entirely white.

The first attempts to analyze this almost total segregation of housing found a very simple explanation—concerted action by the home building, financing and real estate industries, supported and sometimes led by federal, state and local governments. Underlying this was a solid core of popular support or at least acquiescence. The explanation, that is, was the discrimination in the sale, rental and financing of housing which was, and still is, general throughout the nation.

Racial discrimination is one of the basic rules of the American housing market. As the United States Civil Rights Commission has pointed out, housing is almost the only commodity on the open market not available on equal terms to all who can pay for it.

There is, first of all, the question of justice, fair treatment, equal opportunity for the Negro who wants the same freedom of choice in housing that whites have. It is not just his access to housing which is limited; so is his access to employment. He can't work where he can't live, or at least he can't work unless he can live within commuting distance of the job. The segregated Negro's educational opportunities are also limited. Concentration of Negroes in one area encourages discriminatory law enforcement. Housing segregation is one of the major elements in limiting contacts between whites and Negroes, which in turn stimulates prejudice. These inequities are not just the Negro's problem—they are problems for all of us who are concerned with what happens in and to our society.

Almost every urban problem is bound up with and further complicated by housing segregation. Under the constant pressure of the expanding Negro population, the area within which Negroes are traditionally permitted to live in each city has expanded. This expansion has never been enough to keep up with the increased population. The resutling overcrowding has been a major cause of deterioration in the cities.

The center cities have also deteriorated because they are older; because they are more poorly maintained than the rest of the metropolitan area; because the new residents, to the extent that they are migrants from the rural South, are not accustomed to city life; and because some Negro residents take out their resentment and hostility toward whites in destructive behavior.

As the city has deteriorated, it has become a less pleasant place both for its residents and for those who no longer live there but who work there or may wish to occasionally go there to visit parents, to shop, to go to the theater, etc.

Today we have laws prohibiting discrimination in all or part of the private housing market in about a third of the states and in several dozen cities. In addition, President Kennedy promulgated an executive order prohibiting discrimination in housing built with federal funds or guarantees. These state and local laws and the federal executive order vary both in the kind of housing they cover and in the mechanism they offer for enforcement of the law. Although some have only been enacted within the past few months, others have been in effect for almost 10 years.

Yet if we try to evaluate their effect in eliminating or reducing housing segregation in the United States, we can only conclude it has been minimal. If anything, the extent of segregation is increasing rather than decreasing. This seems to be as true for those states and cities that have fair housing laws as it is for those which do not.

This is not to say that these laws and regulations have not had some value. First of all, a number of persons who have filed complaints under the laws have, as a result, obtained the housing in which they were interested. Moreover, the settling of a single complaint may result in the landlord opening up more than just the one unit complained about; he may open up all the units under his control.

In addition, there are landlords who, as a result of the law, voluntarily open their housing to Negroes without any complaint being filed. Some of these landlords might have wanted to do this before the law was passed but were afraid to do so without legal support; the passage of the law thus increases the freedom of action of those who, though they do not want to discriminate, are afraid not to discriminate for one reason or another.

At the very least, the landlord who continues to discriminate will not longer rudely turn Negroes away, but will treat them courteously in order that they not realize that he is discriminating. Inasmuch as we are talking about human dignity, this, too, can be considered a gain of sorts.

Another positive effect of the laws is that Negroes are encouraged to try to rent or buy in white neighborhoods. Without the law to reassure them, they might not make the effort and, therefore, could well miss out on housing that might have been available to them in the absence of the law.

It is also clear that the dire results predicted by opponents of fair housing laws have not materialized: the states and cities with fair housing laws have not been inundated by an influx of Negroes; there has been no drop in construction that is attributable to the law; and there has been no drop in housing values because of the laws.

Indeed, once they are in operation the laws are apparently accepted, or at least are not vigorously opposed, by their former opponents.

Campaigns to enact fair housing laws also have had a result significant apart from the law itself. That is, the efforts to enact such laws are educational in that they acquaint the community with the fact that discrimination exists. A related effect of the fight for a law is that it often brings into civil rights activity the clergy and other members of the community who have not previously been active. Because of this heightened consciousness, and perhaps because of the desire of the governing elite to stall off those who are pushing for the fair housing law, action is taken to alleviate some other civil rights problems.

Why, then, have the laws not been successful in alleviating housing segregation? First, they are not very widely used. One state, with more than 100,000 Negro residents, receives about 60 complaints a year. Other jurisdictions receive fewer complaints. The laws have not been widely used because most Negroes are not eager to be pioneers—to be the first of their race in a neighborhood.

Also, many Negroes do not know of the existence of a fair housing law in their area. Among those Negroes who do know of its existence, the reputations of the enforcement agencies are not very high—you have to travel downtown, or to the state capital, or somewhere else inconvenient, in order to file a complaint; after you file it, the commission takes its time investigating. If the matter gets to a hearing, the opposition's attorney will give you a rough going over; and in the end you won't get the apartment you want.

This poor reputation may not be wholly reserved, but in large part it is accurate. Specifically, it is true that enforcement proceedings take much longer than they should. A recalcitrant landlord will engage in all kinds of delaying devices in the hope that he will rent his apartment before the commission takes any action and he is very often successful. As a result, some jurisdictions have tried to find ways to prevent rental or sale of the housing unit in question while the case is being processed.

Some fair housing laws provide for temporary restraining orders to prevent such rental or sale. This is an old legal device, but it has only recently been applied in fair housing cases. To the extent that its limited application in such cases can be evaluated, it appears that this and other devices to prevent disposition of the housing unit have not been used with any great frequency. In general, enforcement agencies have been hesitant about exercising all their powers.

The fair housing commissions have worked almost entirely to obtain for the individual complainant the housing unit which he desires or a comparable one. If these efforts are successful, they consider the case settled satisfactorily; if the housing unit is no longer available, the agency drops the case; and if the complainant has found another place to live, they drop the case. It is apparent that the law cannot have any substantial effect because of the way it is administered.

If we turn our attention from the state and local laws to the federal level, we find a similar picture, which is made worse by the fact that the executive order covers only about two percent of existing housing and can be expected to cover no more than a quarter of the housing to be built in the near future, about half of which will be covered by state and local laws anyway. The executive order is narrow in its application and is not self-implementing, but has to be implemented by the various departments and agencies of the federal government. The Federal Housing Administration, the principal agency affected by the executive order, has issued regulations exempting one- and two-family housing that has been occupied by the owner, thus effectively eliminating all second-hand sale housing from coverage by the order.

If we really want to use fair housing laws to end housing discrimination, the enforcement agencies will have to do more than service the complaints that come to them. The agencies might well concentrate their efforts on the big people of the housing industry—those who control a substantial number of housing units. In the past, attempts to persuade and educate these people have been largely failures. These efforts need more money and more prestige behind them.

Wherever we have studied housing discrimination, the industry has been recalcitrant and has vigorously opposed any efforts to change its current practices. At the same time, here and there, local real estate boards and individual builders have been won over.

But even if these laws were more effectively administered and did cover all of the housing market, they would still not be able to materially affect the extent of housing segregation in our society. The reason for this is a simple one—fair housing laws, the executive order and similar regulations focus on only one cause of housing segregation. They focus on discrimination by the person who is in a position to transfer property—the owner or his agent. They do not concern themselves with what are, in the long run, more important causes of housing segregation.

Of these, perhaps the most important is the simple fact that the average Negro's income is about half that of the average white. This, combined with the structure and operation of the housing market, effectively keeps Negroes and whites segregated on an economic basis, without raising the question of race.

Another important cause of segregation is the fact that many Negroes and many whites have become conditioned to the housing market as it exists today. For example, the whites may be afraid of the loss in social status or housing value that they feel accompanies the integregation of a neighborhood; the Negroes may be afraid of hostility from white neighbors.

In other words, there is a circular effect. Not only does housing discrimination help limit the educational and employment opportunities of Negroes; not only does it, by promoting overcrowding, accelerate the depreciation of property; not only does it help to promote racial stereotypes by limiting contacts between people. Housing discrimination not only causes these things—it also results from them. That is, to the extent that limited education and limited job opportunities help to create poverty. Negroes are kept out of the middle-class housing market by their lack of income. To the extent that Negro neighborhoods are more rundown than white, whites leave these neighborhoods. To the extent that whites are familiar with the Negro only through stereotypes, whites don't want Negroes as neighbors.

Housing segregation and housing discrimination are different, although related phenomena. The attempts that we have made to end housing discrimination have not been successful and, even if they were, they would not end housing segregation. The fair housing movement has in the past concentrated on the goal of an open housing market—the idea that a Negro who meets the other qualifications for a particular housing unit should not be turned away simply because of his race. In addition to this concern for equality of opportunity, some whites are disturbed at the idea of living in a segregated neighborhood.

The principal effect of the fair housing movement that has emerged from these two concerns—justice for the Negro and the desire for integrated living—has been to make it easier for upper-class Negroes to move into some suburbs. But taking a token number of upper-class Negroes into the suburbs does not solve society's problem and does not really do justice to the great bulk of the Negro population.

We should take as our goals in this area those recommended by the Council of the recent White House Conference, "To Fulfill These Rights": "A decent home and a suitable living environment for every American family, freedom of choice in the selection of a home, racial and economic inclusiveness in all neighborhoods and the total absence of racial barriers."

The first of these, a decent home and a suitable living environment for every family, means that we need more and better housing for low-income and moderate-income people.

The private housing market is simply economically unable to take care of these people today. This means we need subsidized housing for low-income people outside the slums. The slums should then be rehabilitated or cleared after they have left, not before.

The second goal, freedom of choice in the selection of a home, is one which, we would argue, will not be achieved simply on the basis of providing equal opportunity. The existing patterns of segregated housing have conditioned the public to accept segregation. These psychological pressures prevent real freedom of choice and a special effort must therefore, be made to overcome them.

The third goal suggested by the White House Conference is racial and economic inclusiveness in all neighborhoods. Many who accept the idea of racial integration are unwilling to accept economic integration. But, given the pattern of distribution of income in the United States today, racial integration is impossible as long as we have economic segregation.

One way to alleviate this problem is to have a more effective anti-poverty program which would result in higher incomes for the poor. Once their incomes have been raised, they can choose housing from the market like everyone else. Until then, however, we need new ways of providing housing for low-income people. This includes small, scattered-site public housing—perhaps provided by government leasing of existing buildings, rather than massive super blocks which serve simply to ghettoize their residents.

The rent supplement program enacted last year by Congress is one illustration of an imaginative approach to this end. We need to expand the program and remove many of the restrictions added by Congress which will prevent it from being effective.

We need to provide new housing for low-income people on vacant land both within and outside the city. This housing should not be minimal public housing, but rather middle-income type housing, occupied by people of different income levels, with rents set at the level that individual tenants can afford.

We cannot carry on this kind of program on a community-by-community basis because the problems transcend community boundaries. For example, the center city cannot effectively desegregate its housing and put an end to deterioration so long as it is surrounded by suburbs that refuse to admit Negroes or low-income people. Yet, the suburbs have in the past shown themselves very reluctant to consider the broader interests of the entire metropolitan area.

How do we persuade them to change their view? The White House Conference had one approach: "Federal assistance to every local governmental unit should be conditioned on submission of a metropolitan-wide plan providing for the desegregation of housing and promotion of communities inclusive of all races and incomes. Zoning regulations, provision for low- and moderate-income housing, subdivision controls and the like must be applied to this end.

Enforcement mechanisms by the local government should be a requirement. The plan should indicate an overall program of housing, community facilities and services, and transportation to and from employment centers which would result in the free flow of residents to housing throughout the area without regard to color."

The use of federal funds to encourage such metropolitan planning can be enhanced if such planning is made the condition not only for housing assistance but for any federal assistance, including highways, airports, water pollution, sewage systems, etc. We live today in a society which is undergirded by a system of federal subsidies. If the granting of such subsidies were meaningfully tied to the preparation and carrying out of metropolitan plans, this would at the very least greatly encourage such plans.

It was easy for fair-minded Americans to oppose the denial of the right to vote to Negroes. It was easy for them to oppose discrimination in public accommodations. All the federal civil rights legislation that has been enacted could easily be supported by the fair-minded northerner because this legislation was directed at practices which were common and overt in the South but not in the North.

Today the picture has changed and the more subtle northern racism is being challenged. As this has happened, northerners have begun to shrink from their previous positions. As a result, even the inadequate proposal of the Johnson Administration for a fair housing law was defeated.

In an article in Commentary magazine, Bayard Rustin says that white liberals are responsible for the growth of the black power concept because they have not used their power to see to it that civil rights laws are enforced. Black power, he says, "is a slogan directed primarily against liberals by those who once counted liberals among their closest friends. It is up to the liberal movement to prove that coalition and integration are better alternatives."

Department of Defense Appropriations, 1968

SPEECH

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1967

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 10738) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, one of the foremost objectives of the training program of the armed services is the achievement of high standards in marksmanship. This is a necessesity for an effective infantryman.

The program against which the gentleman's amendment is directed is not directly a part of the military training program, but many military personnel participate in these matches. It helps to maintain a high espirit de corps among members of the Armed Forces to realize that some of their personnel are among the leaders in marksmanship in this country. The matches have a very fine effect in encouraging young people to engage in healthy, useful training instead of frequenting street corners.

Now, let us look a little further. These matches have been going on for many years. The best of our marksmen, following these matches, compete internationally. Because of these matches and the skills they develop, our marksmen, including a very substantial number from the armed services, have been able to outshoot marksmen from any other country and to win international matches.

That, to me, is a very important thing. The fact that American marksmen are still considered the best in the world is, to me, worth many times the money carried in this bill.

We would destroy this opportunity if the amendment were adopted, and we would be striking a serious blow at the entire military marksmanship program.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Is it not also true that the very existence of Camp Perry is an incentive for young people to learn how to fire a rifle and to fire it well? There may be 2,000 people who go to Camp Perry, but for every 2,000 who go, there must be any number of people trying, and in trying they acquire some skill with the rifle they otherwise would not have.

Mr. SIKES. The gentleman is correct. They are encouraged and stimulated by the example of Camp Perry.

Respect for the U.S. Flag Is Not Outdated Nor Unsophisticated

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD E. LUKENS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1967

Mr. LUKENS. Mr. Speaker, it has become fashionable in some circles to regard patriotism and respect for the U.S. flag as "outdated" and "unsophisticated." These people think that as the world grows smaller, loyalty to our country somehow becomes less important. The burning and desecration of the American flag, they view with indifference or even encouragement.

Events, however, demonstrate the continued and even growing importance of devotion to our Nation. These are troubled and critical times, indeed, when our enemies on every front seek to attack and destroy the foundations of our existence as a Nation and as a bulwark of freedom and democracy.

As long as there are powerful forces which are determined to undermine our liberty and prosperity, the shrinking of the world through faster communications and transportation make it not less, but more imperative that we rely upon our great Nation to defend us.

No nation, however, can protect a people which does not respect the nation itself. It is in the light of this principle that we must view the acts of profound disrespect for the American flag which have occupied headlines in recent months.

Mr. Speaker, the American system of government allows any citizen the right to criticize and disagree with the policies of the administration in power, no matter how severe his dissent may be. Indeed, it is this very feature of our system which we are striving so courageously to defend, and which makes the American way of life worth defending.

At the same time, Mr. Speaker, our American system of government presupposes a basic loyalty to and respect for our national institutions. We allow anyone to criticize the President, but were we to allow anyone to replace the Presidency with his own form of government, our democratic structure would collapse. Our citizens may oppose the passage of a law, and may seek to have it annulled by the courts, but they must still obey it; they must respect our legal institutions.

Our flag, adopted by the Continental Congress of the United States of America 210 years ago, is the supreme visible symbol of our Nation. To attack the flag, Mr. Speaker, is to attack and undermine the foundations of the American system of government, something quite different from an act of dissent from the policies of a member of that system.

Mr. Speaker, there are many fine and honorable men who are opposed to our defense of Vietnam: true pacifists who believe that a policy of pacifism would be a credit to the United States, and there are others who sincerely believe for other reasons that our stand in Vietnam is not in te best interests of this country. One can, while not agreeing with these positions, nevertheless respect them, for their advocates remain loyal to the United States itself.

Those who burn and desecrate our flag are of another breed. They are not dissenting from our policies, but from our system, our constitution, our Nation itself.

No nation, Mr. Speaker, can view such attacks with indifference. It is entirely fitting that on Flag Day, 1967, this House resolve to pass legislation designed to protect our flag. For the sake of the thousands who have given their lives and will continue to do so in defense of that flag, we can do no less.

Food Stamp Program

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 1967

The House in Committee of the Whole House of the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1318) to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964 for the purpose of authorizing appropriations for fiscal years subsequent to the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967.

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I would like to voice my support for the food stamp program recently passed by the House of Representatives. It is, I think, one of the strongest and most effective programs in the war on poverty.

Although New York State is just beginning to participate in the program, the early success is encouraging and many more areas of the State are expected to participate in the future. In New York City alone, it is anticipated that over 177,000 people will benefit from the program.

There are, I think, a number of reasons why the program has been a success. For one, it is both simple and private; the individual uses his own money to buy food, but the stamps enable him to get more for his money; because he buys food in a store, the somewhat humiliating system of "handouts" is avoided.

A second reason is that the program is almost foolproof in preventing abuses; unlike cash payments, the food stamps cannot be used for nonfood items such as tobacco and liquor.

Third, the program is most beneficial to the neediest families; that is, the poorer the family, the higher the food stamp value they receive.

Fourth, the program is beneficial to farmers as it increases domestic food consumption, and it helps the participating stores by increasing their sale of food.

It was for these reasons that I support the food stamp program. Not only will it provide needed assistance to poor people in my own district, but it will generally enable the poor throughout the Nation to improve their diets.

It was for these same reasons that I opposed the amendment requiring the States to share 20 percent of the cost of the bonus coupons. In my State of New York, the cost of the program is shared by State and local governmental units. If this amendment had passed, much of the 20-percent share of the cost of bonus coupons would have been passed on to the local governmental units, and as most local governments are already under considerable financial strain, they would have had to either curtail or terminate their participation in the program.

This problem would be even more serious for the poorer States, many of whom require the local governmental units to provide part or all of the expense of the program. The 20-percent cost-sharing amendment would, in many cases, have terminated the food stamp program.

It is significant to note that the 20-percent amendment carried in the Agriculture Committee largely with the votes of members who then voted against the bill even with the amendment. It is clear, I think, that the amendment was designed to cripple the program, and not to strengthen it.

In closing, I would like to pay tribute to the gentlewoman from Missouri [Mrs. SULLIVAN], whose dedication and energy over the years has made the food stamp program a reality. The opposition to the program has been considerable, and without her leadership it may have succeeded in destroying one of the truly successful programs in the war on poverty.

The Flag of the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1967

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit for inclusion in the RECORD an article entitled "The Flag of the People," written by Capt. P. A. "Dick" Horton of Los Angeles, Calif. He is a member of the Hollywood Post of the American Legion.

Captain Horton has been given a Freedom Foundation Award on February 22, 1967, for this stirring and patriotic article about our American flag. It seems most appropriate in connection with the special ceremonies which are taking place on the floor of the House of Representatives today, Flag Day, that this article be brought to the attention of the Congress.

The article follows:

THE FLAG OF THE PEOPLE

(By P. A. "Dick" Horton)

Throughout all history, mankind has pursued a contsant struggle for freedom. Excepting for favored individuals who in a small measure had a taste, real freedom for the people had never been obtained until the birth of our Nation.

Our Bill of Rights brought to the world a new era. It brought an example of a union more perfect, binding and effective than was ever before known to mankind. It gave us the right to enjoy the largest measure of human liberty consistent with orderly government. But it also brought to each of us, our very personal responsibility to preserve and defend those rights. We, who have and enjoy the benefits of freedom through the spirit and valor of generations who preceded us, are in honor bound to keep these priceless privileges, undiluted, unimpaired and properly protected for the generations who follow us.

Under our Constitution we are a government of the people, by the people and for the people. We have no graven images, signs or symbols that grant special privileges or rights to any individual. We have but one emblem, our Flag. The men who created it were as De Tocqueville said:

"The choicest talent and noblest hearts which ever appeared in the new world;—and distinguished as almost all were for their intelligence; they were still more so for their patriotism."

The patriotism and political wisdom of that generation and their successors to the present hour breathes in every stripe, every star and in every thread of our Flag. Yet as this Flag tells us by its traditions, by its very design, by its colors and beauty; the freedom we enjoy under this impressive emblem began in the dim ages of antiquity.

The religion of freedom that speaks so eloquently in its constellation of stars got its breath from the Bible. It got it from the ancients whose noble deeds and words brought mankind ever closer to ultimate victory. Not of Nation over Nation, but of man over his evils and weakness and of his ambition to rule, dictate and control the lives of others.

It represents the true spirit of Christian benevolence; its joy, its beauty, its hope and above all its abiding faith. It has never been the Flag of a dictator, potentate or king. It was born the Flag of the people representing the first Nation in all history dedicated to the personal and religious freedom of mankind.

It represents our Constitution, where for the first time rulers were placed under the restraint of law, and human dignity is respected and defended. For two centuries it has been an inspiration to the youth of our land. It brings to their mind, the character and deeds of George Washington, and many other patriots who made and preserved our beloved land to become the greatest of all the Nations of the world.

Youth, is the time of hero worship. The history of our Country is rich in inspiring stories of human endeavor and the accomplishments of our people; of Parker's "Stand your ground", at Lexington; of Patrick Henry's "Give me Liberty,"—of Nathan Hale's, "I regret that I have but one life to give to my Country" and of trumpeter Clavin P. Titus, "I'll try, Sir," as he volunteered to climb the great wall of China under heavy fire, where they raised the American Flag and turned the tide to victory.

These stories have been an inspiration for each generation of our youth. As the poets put it:

> "Lives of great men oft remind us
> We can make our lives sublime
> And departing, leave behind us
> Footprints on the sands of time."

Shortly after World War I, a Navy Doctor assigned to Washington lived a short distance from the Lincoln Memorial. Each afternoon just before dinner his wife and small son, Rex, would take a walk. As they passed the Lincoln Memorial on their return home little Rex would say, "Mommy, we must go in and say good-night to Mr. Lincoln." The years passed, the Doctor and his family served in many parts of the world. Little Rex had completed his schooling and was now a member of the Armed Services. The family was now again in Washington, at a time when Rex had reached the age when he was about to make the most serious decision of all young men, would he ask the girl? One evening, he asked his mother to take a walk with him. To her surprise he brought her to the Lincoln Memorial. It was there that he told her, he had come to get inspiration from Mr. Lincoln about his marriage.

The simple faith and hero worship of Mr. Lincoln by this little lad was but the result of seeing hundreds of people day by day respectfully visiting this statue of a great man.

One of histories sternest lessons is that the youth of the land must be given a hero. If not, then they will create their own hero. That is why it is of vital importance that these historic statements and inspiring stories be retained in the text books used by our children in our schools.

It is also important that the youth be taught the meaning and significance of the Flag of our Country. It is not only the Flag of our Fathers but the Flag of our children. As loyal citizens we will treat it with utmost respect for its glorious past and its signal of hope for the future.

It stands as a living affirmation that the precious dignity of the individual is a triumph soaked in the blood and sacrifice of countless Americans who preceded us.

With freedom threatened by world-wide despotism it was never a more important time to display it and signal to the oppressed of the world our great pride and love for the liberty for which our Flag stands.

The hour is late—the time is now! We must see to it that our youth select heros from the countless patriots who followed our Flag to preserve his freedom. If we do this—he will not make a hero of some beatnik draft card burner.

He will stand unashamed when tears come to his eyes as the Flag goes by. He will know that he will never have a more worthy emotion and willingly pledge allegiance to our Flag—to-day—tomorrow and always.

The "Star-Spangled Banner's" Home

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1967

Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, this week as we commemorate the 190th anniversary of the first flag of the United States of America, another ceremony is being held at Fort McHenry to honor the flag which inspired the writing of our national anthem.

The 15-stripe, 15-star banner which survived the bombardment of Fort McHenry on September 13–14, 1814, was designed and hand-sewn by a young widow named Mary Young Pickersgill, whose home was located at 60 Albemarle Street—now Pratt Street—in Baltimore. Her house has been restored and furnished to appear as it was in 1814 under the auspices of the Star-Spangled Banner Flag House Association, which has also helped promote and organize Flag Day ceremonies not only here in Maryland but across the Nation.

The Flag House Association, it president, Mr. Robert E. Michel, and Mr. Gordon M. F. Stick, national chairman of National Flag Week are to be congratulated and commended for their efforts to secure for our flag the honor and glory which it deserves as a symbol of "one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

Mr. John Dorsey, of the Baltimore Sun, has written an interesting and informative article about Mary Young Pickersgill and the house where the Star-Spangled Banner was born. I would like to include it in the RECORD so that my colleagues may become more familiar with one of the more important flags in our history:

The Star-Spangled Banner's Home—The Story of the Flag House, Where Mary Pickersgill Worked on the Emblem That Inspired Key in 1814

Mary Young Pickersgill was born in Philadelphia in 1776, a date that probably seemed less peculiarly appropriate to her parents than it does to us. Thirty-seven years later, Mary would make a flag that was to serve as a symbol of American independence from Britain, originally declared in her birth year. But that would be in a different town, in the midst of a different war.

At the time Mary was born her parents, William and Rebecca Flower Young, may have wondered whether American independence would ever become a reality. The following year, in fact, they had to flee from Philadelphia to Lebanon before the advancing British forces under General Howe. Mary's uncle, Col. Benjamin Flower, who was commissary general of military stores for Washington's forces, not only kept the stores from falling to the British but safely concealed the Liberty Bell, and the chimes of Christ Church as well.

In 1795, when she was just 19, Mary Young married John Pickersgill at St. Paul's Church in Baltimore. The couple had four children, only one of whom, a daughter Caroline, survived. John Pickersgill died in London in 1805 and two years later Mary, with her widowed mother and her daughter, came to Baltimore to live. Her sister Hannah was already living here.

The three took up residence in a rented house at 60 Albemarle street, at the corner of Queen street. It had been built in 1793. Queen street has since become Pratt street, and the Flag House is no longer as close to the harbor as it was then. At that time it is said to have been within 150 feet of the water's edge.

Probably one reason for living so close to the harbor was that both Mary and her mother were flag makers, and were often commissioned to make flags and banners for ships. They were well known at their craft. Rebecca had made the Grand Union Flag which George Washington raised over the Army of the United Colonies on January 1, 1776.

So when in 1812 Commodore Joshua Barney and Brig. Gen. John Stricker decided to order a giant battle flag for Fort McHenry, commanded by Maj. George Armistead, they gave the job to Mary Pickersgill.

The rest of the story is better known. Mary, helped by both her mother and her daughter, labored day and night to make the flag in the allotted time, finishing it by August 13, 1813, and being paid $405.90 for the job. The fifteen-star, fifteen-stripe flag was the largest battle flag in the world, 30 by 42 feet, so big it had to be assembled on the floor of nearby Brown's Brewery—later better known as Clagett's Brewery. It flew over Fort McHenry during the bombardment by the British on September 13–14, 1814, and Francis Scott Key, seeing it still there after the night of ferocious bombing, was inspired to write the poem that later became the national anthem.

Not much else is known of Mary. She lived in the house on Albemarle street (at one time it had a door in the Albemarle street side) until she died in 1857.

In 1820 she was able to buy the house, and shortly after added to the back of it a section that contained a kitchen on the first floor and what is called a boarder's room on the second. She had three servants, who were probably slaves. She appears in a local directory as president of the "Humane and Impartial Society, for the employment of destitute females" in the early Thirties, and in 1850 she was still (or again) president of it. It was then known as "The Humane and Impartial Society, for aged men and women," and survives as Pickersgill, Inc.

There is one picture of Mary, a drawing from the early Forties, 30 years after she made the flag. It shows a prim, and rather grim-looking, Victorian matron.

After Mary died the house passed to her daughter. Caroline married John Purdy, but never had any children. In 1864 she sold the Albemarle street house. For the next 63 years it belonged to a number of owners, and served as everything from a saloon to a warehouse to a cobbler's shop to a branch post office. In the process the front was altered to include a shop window.

In 1927 the house was bought by the city as an historical relic. Over the years since then some structural changes have been made. Steel beams were added under the first floor to make the house stronger. The store front on Pratt street was removed, and a door and two windows substituted. The partition between the dining and living rooms, removed when the house was a shop, was replaced. Two of the six mantels in the house are original, the ones in the kitchen and boarder's room. The other four, in the older part of the house, are from a house of the same period in the neighborhood. The only original floor showing is in Mary's bedroom on the second floor, known as the flag room.

In 1950 neighboring houses were torn down, and the area around the Flag House to the north and west became a square. For the first 25 years of its status as a public monument, the main house was used as a museum. In 1953 a dependency building was erected behind the main house and the mementoes of the War of 1812 were moved into it. Since then it has been the museum, and Flag House officials have given their attention to restoring the house to a semblance of the appearance it probably had when Mary Pickersgill lived there.

Judging from the possessions of hers still owned by the Flag House, Mary was a woman of taste, and piece by piece the house has been refurnished to reflect this. There are no reproductions.

The kitchen, the first room a visitor sees on a tour of the building, contains numerous utensils common in Mary's time, including candle molds, a soap mold, a butter churn, a toasting fork and a wooden plate used by a soldier in the War of 1812. Miss Marion Butterwick, assistant director of the Flag House, notes that schoolchildren are fascinated by the kitchen utensils.

The dining room contains a number of objects owned by Mary Pickersgill, including a matched paid of Waterford pitchers and a Waterford bowul (1800—all dates approximate). They, along with Mary's Chinese export meat platter, are on the Hepplewhite sideboard. On the mantel is her blue Spode fruit bowl, and in a cupboard next to the fireplace is her Liverpool transfer tea set.

In the parlor are four mahogany Sheraton chairs (1810), an English spinet (1790) and a Shiraz rug (1825). The cynosure of the room is the portrait of Colonel Flower by Charles Willson Peale, founder and, many think, best of the famous family of artists.

The hall has a Windsor bench (1800–1810), an Eighteenth Century Queen Anne wall clock with a Dutch case, a Hepplewhite table and an engraving of the British surrender at Yorktown. The rug on the hall floor was made by Mrs. Frank Martin on the third-floor loom at which she is shown in our cover photograph.

From the hall the original staircase, with its poplar rail and dado, mounts to the second floor. The boarder's room in the back has a Queen Anne attic bed, a pine schoolmaster's desk, a Maryland or Pennsylvania wardrobe.

The front room on the second floor is called the flag room because it was in her bedroom that Mary worked on the flag. The full-size reproduction, made in 1864 for the Sesquicentennial of the bombardment, sits on a table at the bottom of the cedar four-poster bed. The desk, a Pennsylvania one from about 1740, is of faded mahogany. It was one of Mary's possessions, as were the French Jacob Petit scent bottles on the Sheraton chest of drawers. Mary's possessions were passed down through her collateral descendants and friends of her family. Mrs. James K. Hinds and Dr. George L. Stickney are among the collateral descendants living in Baltimore.

Behind Mary's room was her mother's room, with its Queen Anne attic bed, its blanket chests, its silhouette of Betsy Ross making a flag and its sampler showing Pratt and Eden streets in 1830.

The third floor, where the servants slept, contains a recently mounted exhibition of twenty flags tracing the development of the American flag from the Grand Union banner to the present 50-star flag.

One of the two 48-star flags was made in Liege, Belgium, in secret during the Nazi occupation of the town. Mme. Edith Coart-Presart, who with her daughters made it, first flew it out her window on September 7, 1944, in full view of the Nazi soldiers as they retreated through the town before the advancing American forces. It was presented to the Flag House by Col. Arthur Tilghman Brice, 9th Army, great-grandson of Francis Scott Key.

If this description makes the Flag House seem large, it is not. The rooms are small and the furniture is in proportion to them. Mrs. Hugh MacDonald Martin, director of the Flag House, notes that furnishings are still needed.

Each year the Flag House sponsors National Flag Week, which this year begins today. Ceremonies to open the week will be held at Fort McHenry at 3 P.M. today. The principal speaker will be Gen. Bruce K. Holloway, deputy chief of staff of the Air Force. Gordon M. F. Stick, president of the Flag House from 1962 to 1967, is national chairman of Flag Week. The present president of the house is Robert E. Michel.

Floods Are Prevented

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1967

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, on June 10, I participated in the dedication of the Shady Valley watershed project located in the mountains of the west-central portion of Johnson County, Tenn. This project was authorized less than 5 years ago. Now it is completed. And about 150 Tennessee families are now protected from floods that used to plague them.

Prior to the installation of the works of improvement in the project, a 1½-inch rainfall in a 24-hour period would cause overbank flow up and down Beaver Dam Channel. Throughout the floodplain, land flooded so frequently that much fertile bottomland was abandoned. Now that channel improvement work is complete, much land in the floodplain that has been abandoned because of wet, swampy conditions is now dry and is being restored to production.

Land abandoned years ago because of flooding and that had grown up in bushes and scrub trees is being cleared and returned to the production of crops. The people are proud of the project and completely confident that their flooding problems are over.

D. A. Williams, Administrator of the Soil Conservation Service, in his remarks at the dedication called the project a major contribution to the agricultural program of Johnson County and placed it in the broad efforts of the United States and the world to attain economic stability and agricultural sufficiency.

He cited watershed projects as an important tool available to rural communities "to bolster their economy through resource development and to halt migration of young people who have been forced to seek employment elsewhere."

The Shady Valley watershed project, Mr. Williams told the group, is one of more than 800 such projects that have been completed or are being installed in the Nation. The projects, he said, "will prevent tens of millions of dollars in flood damages each year; and these savings alone, extended over the life of the projects, will more than pay for their installation and maintenance costs." He estimated that benefits for the Shady Valley project will be $36,000 annually.

Mr. Williams congratulated the people of the watershed for their many contributions to and for their leadership in the Federal-State-local partnership that made the project possible. He pointed to the need for continued and strengthened Federal-State-local team work in the resources conversation and development job.

In congratulating the sponsors of the Shady Valley watershed project, Mr. Williams paid special tribute to Argus Blevins, president of the Shady Valley Watershed District and Wiley Taylor, secretary of the watershed district and member of the Johnson County Soil Conservation District "for providing much of the driving force that has made this project a reality."

I want to take this opportunity to congratulate Mr. Williams and thank him for taking time out of his busy schedule to personally come down to the ceremonies.

I also extend congratulations to the directors of the Johnson County Soil Conservation District, Barton Hawkins, chairman; Tine Berry, Wiley E. Taylor, Lewis H. Willis, and Howard H. Smith; and the directors of the Shady Valley Watershed District, Argus N. Blevins, president; Ira Long, vice president; Wiley Taylor, secretary; I. C. Belvins, treasurer; Dennis Plummer, S. T. Gentry, J. C. Garland, R. B. Blevins, and Wayne Duncan. We are all greatly indebted to these men for their outsanding and successful efforts.

Let me also take this opportunity to express my appreciation to my good friend, Ralph Sasser, who directs the work of the Soil Conservation Service in Tennessee, Ray Bryant, local Soil Conservation Service technician, and the many other devoted SCS people that have had a part in this watershed program, and to all who had a hand in making this dream come true.

The Birthday of the U.S. Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. G. ELLIOTT HAGAN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1967

Mr. HAGAN. Mr. Speaker, today is the birthday of the U.S. Army. As a veteran of that branch of the military and as an American proud of the heritage of our Army, I submit the following article by Mr. Detmar Finke from the Stars and Stripes-The National Tribune, May issue.

The American Revolution was well under way when the Second Continental Congress met in Philadelphia on 10 May 1775. The battles of Lexington, Concord, Bunker Hill, Ticonderoga and Crown Point were past history. New England patriots were successfully maintaining a tight land seige, keeping the King's troops bottled up in Boston. It soon became evident to the Massachusetts Provincial Congress, which was bearing the brunt of the burden of supporting the New England Army, that weapons and supplies would have to be given by the other colonies if the British were to be resisted successfully for any length of time.

Massachusetts therefore on 16 May 1775 sent an emissary to the Continental Congress in Philadelphia to confer about "such other matters as may be necessary to the defense of this colony and particularly the state of the army therein." To gain support of the other colonies, the Continental Congress was asked to take over "the regulation and general direction" of the army collected at Boston "for the general defense of the rights of America." The Congress agreed and in the next few weeks ordered that needed flour and gunpowder be supplied to the "Continental" or "American" Army before Boston.

Two basic provisions were implicit in the Massachusetts request for the adoption of the New England Army by the Continental Congress—(1) that Continental Articles of War should be drawn up to provide a uniform set of laws by which all colonial forces might be governed; and (2) a Continental commander in chief, whom all the individual colonial commanders in chief would obey, should be appointed.

The Congress satisfied the first provision on 14 June 1775 when it appointed a committee to bring in "a draft of rules and regulations for the government of the army." On the same day it authorized the enlistment of riflemen from the Middle Atlantic states—men renowned as sharpshooters—to serve as light infantry under command of the chief officer of the army before Boston. The second provision was satisfied one day later when the Congress appointed George Washington of Virginia as the "General and Commander in Chief of the Army of the United Colonies." The earlier date, 14 June 1775, is the date we celebrate today as the birthday of the Army.

New Era of Trade in the Pacific

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1967

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, on many occasions in the past I have pointed out the need for encouraging developing economic institutions within the Pacific community. The future of this area of the world is directly dependent upon the creation of new, and the strengthening of present institutions that will develop and generate the great potential wealth that still largely remains untapped.

The May 29, issue of International Commerce reports some of the progress now being made in institution building within the Pacific community. I commend the article to those many people who are watching with increasing interest the positive and progressive efforts now so evident throughout the Pacific area.

New Trade Era in Pacific—Assistant Secretary McQuade Reviews Growing Signs of Economic Vigor

The nations bordering on the Pacific, which include some of the world's most-developed as well as least economically-advanced economies are destined to play a sharply increasing role in world trade, a leading Commerce Department official predicts.

"Most of the countries of the Pacific area are entering a new era of development," according to Lawrence C. McQuade, Acting Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Domestic and International Business.

"They have growing confidence in their own capacity to attain new and higher levels of economic accomplishment;

They seem determined to develop their natural potentials for a more prosperous future, and

They are moving away from the narrow nationalism of centuries past toward increasing cooperation in mutually beneficial regional projects."

Speaking at the San Francisco welcoming ceremonies for the ship carrying the Japan Industry Floating Fair at its first port of call in North America, McQuade reviewed the whole international trade picture in the Pacific area.

McQuade said it is no secret that some U.S. industries, notably textiles and steel, express concern about what they deem to be disproportionate increases in the share of Japanese exports which come to the U.S. market.

CAREFUL CONSIDERATIONS

These sorts of issues inevitably call for careful consideration in the real world of politics and economics. I hope, however, that they do not obscure the clear commitment of the United States to a more liberal international trade policy by all nations. For example, if barriers to Japanese exports can be removed throughout the world's trading markets, the share of Japan's exports to other nations should rise and the concern of U.S. industries diminish, he said.

Now that Japan no longer has balance-of-payments reasons to restrict the entry of foreign equity investment, and in light of its current high degree of economic development, the U.S. Government is hopeful that Japan will substantially relax its stringent restrictions on direct foreign investment, according to McQuade.

"Not only do we believe that they are not justified under today's conditions, but we also note that U.S. firms are increasingly reluctant to make available their technology without the additional advantages—for both countries—of U.S. equity participation whereby the American interest becomes more closely identified with that of the Japanese economy.

"Our concern about this has been expressed to the Japanese Government on a number of occasions and by various U.S. Government officials. We are looking forward to an announcement, as promised by the Japanese Government, in the next month or so, which will outline the capital liberalization measures that Japan intends to undertake," he said.

REGIONAL COOPERATION

He cited examples of growing cooperation as impressive evidence of the area's new vigor and cooperative outlook:

ECAFE—For some 20 years the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East (ECAFE), a regional body of the United Nations, has provided a means for cooperation in advancing economic and social progress in the area. ECAFE has stimulated cooperative projects for the development of the region's natural resources, transportation, industries, and agriculture. And it provides a driving force for regional studies, plans, and action.

One of the many projects sponsored by ECAFE is the Asian Highway, which eventually will tie together all the existing main roads from Viet-Nam and Singapore to Iran and provide a 34,000-mile highway network serving more than 700 million people.

The 20th annual meeting of ECAFE, held in Tokyo last month, closed with the unanimous adoption of a declaration which clearly reflects the growing strength of regional cooperation. New regional projects approved at the session include the establishment of an Asian Statistical Institute, an Asian Coconut Research Institute, an Asian Standards Advisory Committee, and new minerals surveys.

Asian Development Bank—A significant new event, this 32-member Bank is an Asian institution created by Asians for Asians, and 60% of its capital must come from Asian sources.

The United States became a member of the Bank and subscribed $200 million for its capitalization. Western Europe and Canada put in $150 million. Japan contributed $200 million. The developing countries in the area themselves put up $415 million.

Colombo Plan—Developed and developing nations are also associated in the Colombo Plan—a forum for examing development plans, problems, and policies and coordinating economic and technical assistance to Asian countries.

Asian and Pacific Council—Last June, nine nations formed the Asian and Pacific Council in Seoul, Korea. The Council's purpose is to foster cooperative projects in economic, social, and cultural fields. Plans include the formation of a pool of technicians and a fertilizer bank.

Association of Southeast Asia—The Philippines, Malaysia, and Thailand have created the Association of Southeast Asia, which seems to have revived after some difficult times a couple of years ago. This three-nation group is considering tariff reduction and looking into the possibilities for establishing a joint shipping line. Membership is open to other nations.

Hope Behind the Iron Curtain—II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1967

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, important economic reforms are taking place within the countries of the Communist bloc. These reforms are particularly evident in Yugoslavia, where, as I pointed out last week, economic liberalism has encouraged certain political and social changes.

The developments in Yugoslavia are heartening to us, but, unfortunately, as columnists Rowland Evans and Robert Novak pointed out in today's Washington Post, our U.S. policy is, in effect, discouraging and harming the future healthy development of these reforms.

Mr. Speaker, we should assess this carefully, and I call this excellent article to the attention of our colleagues by including it in the Record:

Belgrade, Washington, and Moscow

Belgrade.—By all odds the most curious political development in Eastern Europe this spring is the serious trouble that the United States is causing Yugoslavia's Western-style economic reform.

It's not merely that the United States is reneging on private assurances given the Yugoslavs to help the reform. Washington also is inadverently serving the purposes of Moscow, which makes no secret it wants the heretical reforms to die here before they penetrate more orthodox Communist countries.

Actually, the Yugoslavs do not want a repetition of the massive U.S. foreign aid handouts that followed Marshal Tito's split-off from Moscow in 1948. Belgrade was merely asking in 1967 more of what it got in 1966: additional postponement of debt payments due the U.S. Export-Import Bank and more long-term credits on wheat purchases from America. U.S. officials readily—and, as it turned out, prematurely—agreed.

The sad news was broken to the Yugoslavs a few weeks ago. The Export-Import Bank had flatly turned down any more debt postponements because it's "bad banking practice." Worse yet, the Findley amendment adopted by Congress last year absolutely prohibits the wheat credits because Yugoslavia has shipped medical supplies—but no arms—to North Vietnam.

The loss of the wheat credits hurt most. Forced to buy the wheat on a cash basis, using up precious dollar holdings, the Yugoslavs had to rewrite substantial portions of the economic reform. It comes as no surprise, then, that U.S.-Yugoslav relations today are no better than lukewarm.

Of course, errant actions by the Export-Import Bank and Congress scarcely constitute Johnson Administration policy. Yet, there is a widespread feeling in Belgrade that Washington, preoccupied with the Vietnam war and regarding Yugoslavia's heretical brand of communism as old hat anyway, does not appreciate the importance of success or failure by the economic plan.

Although Yugoslavs officially deny that their system is for export, one high official told us he believes the kind of socialism developed here might set a pattern for not only other Communist countries but parts of the underdeveloped world.

The Soviet Union is certainly aware of the possibilities inherent when a decentralized market economy consisting of individual Socialist business enterprises making their own management decisions is substituted for a centrally commanded economy. Just as it has in Yugoslavia, it erodes that keystone of Leninism: supremacy of the Communist Party. As preservators of Communist authoritarianism, the Soviets are appalled by the political liberalism developing in Yugoslavia.

That is not all that bothers Moscow. It did not care for Yugoslavia's opening of its frontiers to visa-free travelers and all Western publications and films. Last year's purge of Vice President Alexander Rankovic eliminated Moscow's best friend in Belgrade. Worst of all from the Soviet viewpoint is Yugoslavia's invitation for Western private capital to invest in and help manage Socialist enterprises here.

The result has been the first anti-Yugoslav polemics in seven years to come from Moscow. But they are restrained. Wanting no repetitions of Stalin's complete break with Tito in 1948, the Soviets are avoiding direct action and merely chortling over Yugoslav problems—unemployment and labor strikes, for example—resulting from the transition to a market economy. They also must be pleased by the noncooperation from Washington.

What makes the situation particularly ludicrous is that Yugoslavia's stand on Vietnam is demonstrably softer than that of any other Communist country. Its foreign policy chiefs even admit privately that they appreciate Vietnam's importance in the international balance of power and are aware of Hanoi's intransigence.

Yugoslavia is the most Washington can hope for in Eastern Europe; a nonrevolutionary Communist state whose leaders confide that they would prefer to have the Communists in neighboring Greece kept quiet if turbulence there threatens peace in the eastern Mediterranean.

In fact, Yugoslavia may be nearing the point where it will quietly enter the West—not, of course, as a military ally, but in terms of its politics, economics and world attitude. In this light, the non-help from Washington looks absurd.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Code of Laws of the United States

Title 44, Section 181. Congressional Record; arrangement, style, contents, and indexes.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the Congressional Record, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the Congressional Record semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

Title 44, Section 182b. Same; illustrations, maps, diagrams.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the Record without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the Congressional Record the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily Record as follows: the Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided,* That the makeup of the Record shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the Congressional Record, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the Record shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the Record issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the Record for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the Record of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the Record shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the Record style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the Record.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the Congressional Record any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent Record is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the Congressional Record the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the Congressional Record.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the Congressional Record shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the Official Reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the Official Reporters of the respective Houses.

The Official Reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations. which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the Official Reporters in the next issue of the Congressional Record, nor to Records printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the Congressional Record by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the Congressional Record which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

Office Address: House Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20515

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Speaker: John W. McCormack

Abbitt, Watkins M., *Va*	
Abernethy, Thomas G., *Miss.*	6278 29th St.
Adair, E. Ross, *Ind*	4000 Mass. Ave.
Adams, Brock, *Wash*	
Addabbo, Joseph P., *N.Y*	
Albert, Carl, *Okla*	4614 Reno Rd.
Anderson, John B., *Ill*	
Anderson, William R., *Tenn.*	3006 P St.
Andrews, George W., *Ala*	3108 Cathedral Ave.
Andrews, Mark, *N. Dak*	
Annunzio, Frank, *Ill*	
Arends, Leslie C., *Ill*	4815 Dexter St.
Ashbrook, John M., *Ohio*	
Ashley, Thomas L., *Ohio*	
Ashmore, Robert T., *S.C*	
Aspinall, Wayne N., *Colo*	The Towers Apts., 4201 Cathedral Ave.
Ayres, William H., *Ohio*	
Baring, Walter S., *Nev*	
Barrett, William A., *Pa*	
Bates, William H., *Mass*	
Battin, James F., *Mont*	
Belcher, Page, *Okla*	
Bell, Alphonzo, *Calif*	
Bennett, Charles E., *Fla*	3421 Rusticway Lane, Falls Church, Va.
Berry, E. Y., *S. Dak*	118 Schotts Court NE.
Betts, Jackson E., *Ohio*	
Bevill, Tom, *Ala*	6224 N. 35th St., Arlington, Va.
Biester, Edward G., Jr., *Pa*	
Bingham, Jonathan B., *N.Y.*	
Blackburn, Benjamin B., *Ga.*	
Blanton, Ray, *Tenn*	
Blatnik, John A., *Minn*	
Boggs, Hale, *La*	
Boland, Edward P., *Mass*	
Bolling, Richard, *Mo*	307 Warrenton Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Bolton, Frances P. (Mrs.), *Ohio.*	2301 Wyo. Ave.
Bow, Frank T., *Ohio*	4301 Mass. Ave.
Brademas, John, *Ind*	
Brasco, Frank J., *N.Y*	
Bray, William G., *Ind*	
Brinkley, Jack, *Ga*	
Brock, W. E. (Bill), *Tenn*	
Brooks, Jack, *Tex*	
Broomfield, William S., *Mich.*	
Brotzman, Donald G., *Colo*	
Brown, Clarence J., Jr., *Ohio.*	
Brown, Garry, *Mich*	
Brown, George E., Jr., *Calif*	
Broyhill, James T., *N.C*	
Broyhill, Joel T., *Va*	
Buchanan, John, *Ala*	
Burke, J. Herbert, *Fla*	
Burke, James A., *Mass*	
Burleson, Omar, *Tex*	
Burton, Laurence J., *Utah*	
Burton, Phillip, *Calif*	
Bush, George, *Tex*	
Button, Daniel E., *N.Y*	
Byrne, James A., *Pa*	
Byrnes, John W., *Wis*	1215 25th St. S., Arlington, Va.
Cabell, Earle, *Tex*	
Cahill, William T., *N.J*	
Carey, Hugh L., *N.Y*	
Carter, Tim Lee, *Ky*	
Casey, Bob, *Tex*	
Cederberg, Elford A., *Mich*	
Celler, Emanuel, *N.Y*	The Mayflower
Chamberlain, Charles E., *Mich.*	
Clancy, Donald D., *Ohio*	
Clark, Frank M., *Pa*	220 C St. SE.
Clausen, Don H., *Calif*	
Clawson, Del, *Calif*	
Cleveland, James C., *N.H*	
Cohelan, Jeffery, *Calif*	1202 Longworth House Office Bldg.
Collier, Harold R., *Ill*	
Colmer, William M., *Miss*	
Conable, Barber B., Jr., *N.Y.*	
Conte, Silvio O., *Mass*	5619 Lamar Rd., Washington 16, D.C.
Conyers, John, Jr., *Mich*	
Corbett, Robert J., *Pa*	
Corman, James C., *Calif*	
Cowger, William O., *Ky*	
Cramer, William C., *Fla*	6215 Beachway Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Culver, John C., *Iowa*	
Cunningham, Glenn, *Nebr*	
Curtis, Thomas B., *Mo*	
Daddario, Emilio Q., *Conn*	
Daniels, Dominick V., *N.J*	
Davis, Glenn R., *Wis*	
Davis, John W., *Ga*	
Dawson, William L., *Ill*	
de la Garza, Eligio, *Tex*	
Delaney, James J., *N.Y*	
Dellenback, John R., *Oreg*	5911 Onondaga Rd.
Denney, Robert V., *Nebr*	
Dent, John H., *Pa*	
Derwinski, Edward J., *Ill*	
Devine, Samuel L., *Ohio*	
Dickinson, William L., *Ala*	
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., *Mich*	
Dingell, John D., *Mich*	
Dole, Robert, *Kans*	6136 Beachway Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Donohue, Harold D., *Mass*	
Dorn, Wm. Jennings Bryan, *S.C.*	2030 Laburnum St., McLean, Va.
Dow, John G., *N.Y*	
Dowdy, John, *Tex*	
Downing, Thomas N., *Va*	
Dulski, Thaddeus J., *N.Y*	347 Cannon House Office Building
Duncan, John J., *Tenn*	
Dwyer, Florence P. (Mrs.), *N.J.*	
Eckhardt, Bob, *Tex*	
Edmondson, Ed, *Okla*	
Edwards, Don, *Calif*	9201 Fox Meadow La., Potomac, Md.,
Edwards, Edwin W., *La*	
Edwards, Jack, *Ala*	
Eilberg, Joshua, *Pa*	
Erlenborn, John N., *Ill*	
Esch, Marvin L., *Mich*	11754 Gainsborough Rd., Rockville, Md.
Eshleman, Edwin D., *Pa*	
Evans, Frank E., *Colo*	
Everett, Robert A., *Tenn*	
Evins, Joe L., *Tenn*	5044 Klingle St.
Fallon, George H., *Md*	
Farbstein, Leonard, *N.Y*	
Fascell, Dante B., *Fla*	
Feighan, Michael A., *Ohio*	
Findley, Paul, *Ill*	
Fino, Paul A., *N.Y*	
Fisher, O. C., *Tex*	Calvert-Woodley
Flood, Daniel J., *Pa*	The Congressional
Flynt, John J., Jr., *Ga*	
Foley, Thomas S., *Wash*	
Ford, Gerald R., *Mich*	514 Crown View Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Ford, William D., *Mich*	
Fountain, L. H., *N.C*	The Westchester
Fraser, Donald M., *Minn*	
Frelinghuysen, Peter H. B., *N.J.*	3014 N St.
Friedel, Samuel N., *Md*	
Fulton, James G., *Pa*	
Fulton, Richard, *Tenn*	
Fuqua, Don, *Fla*	
Galifianakis, Nick, *N.C*	
Gallagher, Cornelius E., *N.J.*	
Gardner, James C., *N.C*	
Garmatz, Edward A., *Md*	
Gathings, E. C., *Ark*	
Gettys, Tom S., *S.C*	
Giaimo, Robert N., *Conn*	
Gibbons, Sam, *Fla*	
Gilbert, Jacob H., *N.Y*	
Gonzalez, Henry B., *Tex*	200 C St. SE.
Goodell, Charles E., *N.Y*	3842 Macomb St.
Goodling, George A., *Pa*	
Gray, Kenneth J., *Ill*	
Green, Edith (Mrs.), *Oreg*	
Green, William J., *Pa*	
Griffiths, Martha W., (Mrs.), *Mich.*	
Gross, H. R., *Iowa*	
Grover, James R., Jr., *N.Y*	
Gubser, Charles S., *Calif*	
Gude, Gilbert, *Md*	
Gurney, Edward J., *Fla*	
Hagan, G. Elliott, *Ga*	
Haley, James A., *Fla*	
Hall, Durward G., *Mo*	
Halleck, Charles A., *Ind*	4926 Upton St.
Halpern, Seymour, *N.Y*	
Hamilton, Lee H., *Ind*	
Hammerschmidt, John Paul, *Ark.*	
Hanley, James M., *N.Y*	
Hanna, Richard T., *Calif*	
Hansen, George V., *Idaho*	
Hansen, Julia Butler (Mrs.), *Wash.*	
Hardy, Porter, Jr., *Va*	
Harrison, William Henry, *Wyo.*	
Harsha, William H., *Ohio*	
Harvey, James, *Mich*	
Hathaway, William D., *Maine.*	
Hawkins, Augustus F., *Calif.*	
Hays, Wayne L., *Ohio*	
Hébert, F. Edward, *La*	26 Cockrell St., Alexandria, Va.
Hechler, Ken, *W. Va*	
Heckler, Margaret M. (Mrs.), *Mass.*	
Helstoski, Henry, *N.J*	
Henderson, David N., *N.C*	
Herlong, A. S., Jr., *Fla*	
Hicks, Floyd V., *Wash*	
Holifield, Chet, *Calif*	
Holland, Elmer J., *Pa*	
Horton, Frank, *N.Y*	
Hosmer, Craig, *Calif*	
Howard, James J., *N.J*	
Hull, W. R., Jr., *Mo*	
Hungate, William L., *Mo*	
Hunt, John E., *N.J*	
Hutchinson, Edward, *Mich*	
Ichord, Richard (Dick), *Mo.*	
Irwin, Donald J., *Conn*	
Jacobs, Andrew, Jr., *Ind*	
Jarman, John, *Okla*	
Joelson, Charles S., *N.J*	
Johnson, Albert W., *Pa*	
Johnson, Harold T., *Calif*	
Jonas, Charles Raper, *N.C*	
Jones, Paul C., *Mo*	1111 Army-Navy Dr., Arlington, Va.
Jones, Robert E., *Ala*	
Jones, Walter B., *N.C*	
Karsten, Frank M., *Mo*	
Karth, Joseph E., *Minn*	
Kastenmeier, Robert W., *Wis.*	
Kazen, Abraham, Jr., *Tex*	
Kee, James, *W. Va*	5441 16th Ave., Hyattsville, Md.
Keith, Hastings, *Mass*	5906 Harwick Rd., Woodacres, Md.
Kelly, Edna F. (Mrs.), *N.Y.*	
King, Carleton J., *N.Y*	
King, Cecil R., *Calif*	
Kirwan, Michael J., *Ohio*	
Kleppe, Thomas S., *N. Dak*	
Kluczynski, John C., *Ill*	
Kornegay, Horace R., *N.C*	
Kupferman, Theodore R., *N.Y.*	
Kuykendall, Dan, *Tenn*	
Kyl, John, *Iowa*	
Kyros, Peter N., *Maine*	
Laird, Melvin R., *Wis*	
Landrum, Phil M., *Ga*	
Langen, Odin, *Minn*	
Latta, Delbert L., *Ohio*	
Leggett, Robert L., *Calif*	
Lennon, Alton, *N.C*	
Lipscomb, Glenard P., *Calif.*	
Lloyd, Sherman P., *Utah*	
Long, Clarence D., *Md*	

Appendix

Two Antihunger Plans Described in Grange

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT DOLE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 1967

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, two excellent proposals which would help overcome the mounting world food crisis are detailed in the June issue of Grange, the official publication of the farm-rural American organization, the National Grange.

In one story, David Dichter, who has served overseas with the major overseas agencies of the U.S. Government, proposes the establishment of a Center for Rural Development at which foreign trainee-farmers could receive training in modern American agricultural know-how.

In another article, Arthur J. Nohel, an expert in producing high-yield crops by methods adaptable to given areas, recommends a farmer-to-farmer program under which, for instance, Americans of Indian ancestry in California with a history of exceptional rice growing, could travel to India and instruct Indian farmers in their successful techniques.

I am greatly interested in this direct approach to aid countries in short food supply. In the 89th Congress I introduced an amendment to the Food For Peace Act to provide for a farmer-to-farmer program. The proposal was accepted and became section 406 of the act. I am hopeful it will be implemented by the Department of Agriculture at an early date, for it provides that American farmers with the know-how, experience, and practical capabilities would work directly with the farmers to help increase food production in developing countries. The comments of Mr. Dichter and Mr. Nohel indicate the urgent need for implementing self-help programs.

Mr. Speaker, I include both articles in the RECORD:

CENTER FOR RURAL DEVELOPMENT—WHY NOT?

(By David Dichter)

(NOTE.—David Dichter is an educational consultant with Garvey Grain in Wichita, Kans. He received a B.A. from Aligarh Muslim University in India and his Ph. D. from London University. He served with the State Department, the Agency for International Development, the Peace Corps and the United States Information Agency.)

The increase of the world's population is so awesome as to seem unreal. Nearly two-thirds of the people on our planet are underfed or hungry because the world's food production is not keeping up with the mouths to feed. The net growth in world population was approximately 180,000 babies every 24 hours during the harvest year, 1965–1966. Yet, despite the fact that the world's population increased by 65 million, total food production was at a standstill. It actually declined by 5% in countries of Africa, Asia and Latin America, where the population explosion presents the gravest problem. These are the grim conclusions of a study recently made by the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization.

The United States has effectively demonstrated that agricultural productivity can be increased enormously to levels far in excess of respective needs; and on an economically sound basis, through the use of superior seed, technological advances, fertilizers, efficient farming practices, harvesting, processing, storage, marketing techniques and skilled management methods. Whereas one of our farmers on an average feeds himself and 36 other persons, in most of the rest of the world a farmer is often unable to produce sufficient food for his own family.

Not only must this American record of agricultural achievement be substantially repeated in Asia, Africa and Latin America, but at the same time, it must be supported by equally dramatic advances in soil conservation and land rehabilitation programs. From the vantage point of today, it seems as if the farmers of these lands have done everything possible to speed the impoverishment of their productive lands.

Steep hillsides have been plowed—usually straight up and down the slopes. Ranges and pastures have been continually overburdened with great herds of unproductive cattle and flocks of sheep and goats. Fields have been planted—literally for hundreds of years—with the same crop without adequate protection or replenishment. Grasslands have been selfishly ripped open and exposed to the sweep of the wind, and canals for irrigation and drainage remain continuously filled with the products or erosion—transported soil.

Thus, nations which 50 years ago were able to feed themselves and even had a small exportable surplus are now living a precarious hand-to-mouth existence supported largely by imports given under various American food relief programs.

In essence, the problem is to export to the needy counties the know-how, drive and desire that paves the way to self-sufficiency. This means arming them with the spirit, techniques and equipment designed to make self-help a reality—self-help of a kind that would permit them to modernize their farms and grow far more food than they are capable of growing now.

The United States, whose grain surpluses have sharply dwindled over recent years, can no longer be regarded as a boundless source of food for shipment everywhere and anywhere. The developing nations must themselves create the necessary conditions for a veritable agricultural revolution, and they must do it very soon.

Without question, nations in Asia, Africa and Latin America have responded and have already initiated many great management and administrative changes on their agricultural scene. Impressive new irrigation schemes have been created, elaborate agricultural schools and testing laboratories established and huge tracts of land are now being brought under the plow for the first time.

But in spite of such tremendous gains, agricultural production is still falling way behing in its race to stay up with even current food requirements in these countries.

Most agricultural and land improvement efforts have had the fatal defect of not really reaching the small subsistence farmers who make up more than 75% of the population of the needy nations. Agricultural extension programs patterned after American counterparts reach large farm communities almost exclusively, and those experts who have been trained in U.S. schools and colleges of agriculture have difficulty in finding employment simply because they are too overspecialized to really communicate with the common people.

Yet there is very little training offered sub-professional technicians and rural youth leaders—especially men at the vocational field technician level—who can effectively bridge the gap between the college experts who are in senior administration and planning positions and the small farmers who so desperately need help.

The high rate of illiteracy among the small farmers has greatly limited their ability to adopt even the simplest kinds of new techniques which could substantially raise productivity. Furthermore, there are few, if any, really durable local farmer-citizen institutions and service associations through which agricultural programs such as technical assistance, credit, marketing and development projects can be conducted efficiently for the benefit of the small peasant farmer.

It is recommended that a Center for Rural Development be established in the United States for the purpose of training a whole new cadre of young rural leaders. This Center would seek to train men who not only possess the managerial ability and technical skills necessary to set urgently needed local food production and conservation programs in motion, but at the same time would sufficiently understand that problem of the needs of the average subsistence farmer in developing nations and could effectively communicate these new techniques and schemes to him.

The instruction offered would be as much directed at increasing the trainee's confidence in coping with challenging situations beyond the scope of his previous experience as it would help him to secure a whole host of new technical skills. Every effort would be made to have him come away from his training program convinced of his own ability to effect meaningful changes in his own society and as a leader.

The training offered would strive to inspire the individual with the kind of revolutionary zeal that democracy truly deserves; thereby giving him "staying power" and fortitude, which are necessary to cope with the normal debilitating effects of local indifference and bureaucracy.

The Center for Rural Development will become a *basic training center* for the sergeants and junior grade field officers who will be leading the attack on the war on hunger. The instruction offered will usher in a whole new concept of practical on-the-job training. From the first moment he arrives, the foreign trainee will learn basic skills which specifically relate to the most immediate agricultural and rural leadership needs of his own country.

Much of the learn-by-doing instruction will be carried out in the field on a project basis. Thus trainees will be expected to undertake such projects as making minor repairs on a tractor, laying out and constructing an irrigation canal, and proper methods of applying chemical fertilizer. The instruction will be handled so as to convince the foreign trainee: (1) that he can quickly acquire and apply basic skills; (2) physical labor is both dignified and rewarding; (3) that unskilled persons with only elementary tools can accomplish significant results.

Unlike the training programs which most foreign students are accustomed to taking part in the type of instruction planned here, would emphasize at the outset a respect for manual labor. Most students from Asia, Africa and Latin America look down on those who work with their hands, and hence they invariably aspire to land white collar jobs once they have completed even a grammar school education.

At the Center, a "getting your hands dirty" approach to all aspects of the training course will be emphasized. It is expected that this philosophy will help induce the kind of in-the-field leadership which these nations so desperately need. Considering the kind of physically uncomfortable outdoor way of life normally associated with land reclamation and food production programs, a respect for manual labor is essential.

Besides training these practical rural technicians basic techniques of agriculture, simple record-keeping and small-business management so that they can be immediately useful to large numbers of small subsistence farmers, the trainers will also learn about rural institutional development.

This model will serve as a demonstration center for a variety of pilot programs aimed at helping them to understand and develop effective grass-roots rural institutions. In this way such tried and proven rural institutions as co-ops, tractor repair and loan centers, "county extension agent approach," and 4–H clubs, etc., will be taught on a working basis with the model center.

In addition to drawing on top-level instructors from universities and colleges in the area, state officials as well as experienced USDA and Department of the Interior technicians, staff would also be recruiting for those developing nations sending trainees.

In this way a double-barreled effect would be achieved; it would both enhance and more seriously focus the nationalistic energies of both the trainees as well as the foreign instructors (thereby lessening the demoralizing effects of our overwhelming Western technology) and also develop a realistic corps of vocational agricultural instructors.

The foreign instructors would be brought over in advance of the trainees to allow for sufficient on-the-job training with their American colleagues. They will, as often as possible, work alongside competent American instructors thereby gaining the necessary intensive and practical teaching techniques which will so distinctively characterize the Center for Rural Development.

Such a Center is not only feasible, it may be the only way to do the job.

FARMER-TO-FARMER PLAN ADVANCED BY NOTED GRANGE MEMBER

(By Arthur J. Nohel)

(NOTE.—Arthur J. Nohel is a Grange member, native of Czechoslovakia and attended the University of Halle-on-the-Saale, in Germany, where he studied with many of the great agronomists of the time. Nohel is a specialist in quality production of wheat, barley, sugarbeets and seed. He has raised onion seeds for the Ferry-Morse Seed Co. in San Francisco, sugar-beets for the Spreckles Sugar Co. in Woodland, Cal. and tomatoes for the California Packing Co. in Sacramento. He has had a lifetime of experience in producing high-yield crops through the use of modern cultivation and selection of the most adaptable varieties for a given area. Since 1938 he has lived in the United States.)

Urgent requests from Nepal, Ceylon and Afghanistan for experienced U.S. farmers to train native farmers have been received by the Peace Corps.

"We cannot help—the 'trainers' are unavailable," a Peace Corps spokesman told me.

Production of rice (and wheat) in most of this area of the world is far below what it could be. The yield in India (of both rice and wheat), for instance, is about one-third present U.S. yield per acre.

This situation need not continue. Nearby Thailand, for instance, leads the world in rice exports (the United States is second), Taiwan, Japan and Korea lead the world in small farm yields. Giant strides are being taken at the International Rice Research Institute in the Philippines.

What is lacking is direct contact with the Indian farmer. He needs to observe down-to-earth, day-by-day expertise in the field by someone who can demonstrate to him how he can get the maximum yield from his plantings. Most developing-nation farmers need to develop a sense of pride through accomplishment.

I recommend that some way be found to finance a counterpart system of agricultural education that would help countries such as India boost its rice production to the highest feasible level.

It is my plan to enlist the know-how of the California rice growers with whom I was associated while I was a farmer in Woodland, Cal., and who are of Indian ancestry. Either we can sponsor them to their native land for the purpose of working with their Indian counterparts while at the same time demonstrating modern American know-how, or bring Indian "trainers" over here.

I greatly admire the skill of my Indian colleagues in the Sacramento Valley, and it is my belief that they can be of immeasurable value to the Indian nation, many of whose millions are starving, partly because of their lack of proper farming knowledge, methods, tools and insufficient irrigation and fertilizer.

Such a project is necessary because this kind of educational program is not being conducted today. The U.S. Agency for International Development is doing an excellent job throughout the world, but it does not supply American farmers to train foreign farmers in their fields. While the dedicated workers of the Peace Corps receive brief instruction in modern farming methods and later undergo orientation of their assigned country's agricultural idiosyncrasies before trying to help farmers improve their yields, such a process still does not substitute for a farmer-to-farmer program.

If this proposal proves not feasible, then perhaps farmers could be brought from India—possibly under the auspices of a major foundation—to undergo training in the United States and see what a well-cultivated crop looks like.

A third alternative would be to approach the Peace Corps with the suggestion that the Grange and other farm organizations join together and funnel agricultural experts to the Corps so that they can instruct the corpsmen at sufficient length in the fine art of agronomy.

Can the Grange get the cooperation of the national Indian government to bring together the American farmer know-how with the rice producing farmers of India?

Fairness Doctrine To Destroy Free Speech

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 1967

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the recent U.S. court of appeals decisions upholding the so-called fairness doctrine will, if upheld, prove to be the "unfairness doctrine" to all radio and television owners.

The eventual result can be but to deny free speech and airings of different views on issues of the day. For dissent can likewise be dissented against.

As it new stands anyone who listens to, monitors, or disagrees with a paid broadcast, program, or news release can—in fact, must—make it his duty to immediately demand that the radio or television station provide equal free time for the objecting party to take to the air or television and air his opposing views. Our radio and television programs must now take the appearance of a U.N. debating session. There must be no time for any "noncontroversial program" and the owner's investment must be denied without compensation. The only solution seems to be for the station owner to abandon all programs and simply offer music. But then, music also can be controversial—some like jazz, some operatic, other nostalgic.

I wonder if commercials boasting "first" and "best" cannot also be challenged for free fairness time by competitors. What about a segregationist dissenting with the use of mixed races and race-mix propaganda. Certainly it is controversial and against nature and religion.

What about multiple disagreeing opinions at variance on a single subject. Must the radio or television station now offer free time to each different and separate viewpoints? There could be 10 or 15. Almost no "controversial" subject has only two sides—standing diametrically opposed, but rather almost as many as there are listeners.

And what about the preacher behind the pulpit? Can the deacon or visitor now demand equal free time to refute the sermon?

And just wait until the "fairness doctrine" runs over into the newspaper field and editors must give equal space to answer editorials and controversial writings.

Time was when at least if you owned a radio or television station you had free speech. At the present developing progress, the Government will need to take over all stations with taxpayers' funds because no individuals can afford to own and operate a profit-free facility.

Some who talk free speech do not actually mean the same—they fear freedom of expression just as they fear for the public being informed. Likewise, the "fairness doctrine" is a minority tool to shut up the majority dissent by bankrupting the owner-operator who offers pro-American programs to influence minds and actions.

Not very fair? It is not supposed to be unless you agree with the new revolutionary mood.

Mr. Speaker, I insert the June 14 release from the Washington, D.C., Evening Star, and the June 8 article from the Baton Rouge, La., State-Times here in the RECORD:

[From Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, June 14, 1967]

EQUAL-TIME RULE OF FCC UPHELD BY APPEALS COURT

A three-judge panel of the U.S. Court of Appeals has ruled that the fairness doctrine of the Federal Communications Commission does not violate the Constitution.

The doctrine—on which the court ruled yesterday—was challenged by Red Lion Broadcasting Co., which operates radio station WGCB in Red Lion, Pa.

Under the doctrine, broadcasters are directed to give equal time to both sides when a station's facilities are used for discussion of controversial issues.

The case began when Fred J. Cook, of Interlaken, N.J., a writer, complained to the FCC that he had been denied free time by the station to answer what he said was an attack on him over WGCB in 1964 by the Rev. Billy James Hargis on the latter's "Christian Crusade" program.

[From the Baton Rouge (La.) State-Times, June 8, 1967]

Chaos Could Erupt From FCC Ruling on "Fairness Doctrine"

(By Richard K. Shull)

For all lovers of pure chaos, the Federal Communications Comission has opened a delightful new can of worms with possibilities for bedlam unlimited.

The broadcast regulatory agency ruled a New York City station, WCBS–TV, must start saying a few unkind things about cigarettes to balance out the morass of cigarette commercials.

The ruling, under the FCC's "fairness doctrine," extends to all radio and TV stations. It's the first time the FCC considered the content of commercials under its rules for balancing the points of view offered on a broadcast station.

The possibilities are unlimited:

Now the unwashed hippies can demand free air time to condemn Procter & Gamble, and herald their opposition to personal sanitation and soap.

All the bad-mouthed bosses of the land can protest against the mouthwash commercials.

He-men athletes who believe a little animal musk is attractive to women can now make their stand on the air—absolutely free—to counteract the deodorant commercials.

And the ladies who love to nuzzle a fellow with a stubble on his jowl now are free to talk back against all the sophisticated razors and shaving creams.

NO LIMIT

The fairness doctrine need not be limited to rebuttal to commercials.

Why not a major protest by all the bad drivers against broadcasting's incessant traffic safety messages?

And shouldn't the lawless, rioting elements have some air time to talk back against J. Edgar Hoover and his perpetual harangue against lawbreakers?

The new ruling could even extend to Joe Average out in televisionland, the poor guy who merely accepts what is piped into his living room without any desire to grind axes or conduct crusades.

Wouldn't it be great good fun to file a complaint about the lousy programming on network TV and demand a fair balance of good shows to offset "The Beverly Hillbillies," "Gilligan's Island" and such?

And haven't you ever had the desire to rip the microphone away from a hyena-like radio disc jockey and shove it up his epiglottis? (Don't say I told you to do it, but write the FCC and complain, demanding your favorite station balance its DJ shows with inspirational hours of readings from Percy Bysshe Shelley, or maybe Emily Dickinson.)

Of course, the FCC contends the cigarette commercials are a very special case in broadcasting. The commission recognizes the peculiar circumstances in this country in which the Congress has forced cigarette-makers to post health warnings on every package, yet the cigarette industry spends more than $150 million a year on the public's air waves to give the illusion that life isn't much worth living without a weed in hand.

And the broadcasters haven't done a whole lot to offset the impact of the cigarette advertising.

Back in 1965, when the Surgeon General of the U.S. issued a report stating smoking is something less than therapeutic, the American Cancer Society busied itself and created a series of anti-smoking public service announcements for use on the air.

How many have you seen lately? Ever?

As long as the American Cancer Society confined its little messages to addresses on where to send for tracts, or to enumerating the seven deadly danger signals, the broadcasters were obliging.

But when the ACS came up with a message featuring former basketball pro Bob Cousy warning youngsters against smoking, the silence was deafening.

Now, under the new FCC rule, Cousy may yet become a TV star with his anti-cigarette pitches.

Adult Education Program in Eight Central California Counties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. McFALL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 1967

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to call to the attention of the Members of the House that the Office of Economic Opportunity has now approved a $1.5 million grant for an adult education program for migrant and seasonal farmworkers in eight of California's central valley counties.

The rich educational resources of California, the talents and integrity of some of the valley's leading citizens, and the desires of farmworkers themselves have been brought together to initiate the educational program. The project has been built from the experiences of educational agencies and the lessons learned through several pioneering manpower programs for farmworkers.

In order to guide all aspects of the program's operation, a panel of leading citizens and organizations has volunteered its services on the governing board. All those groups which have a vital interest in farmworkers and adult education are represented. Serving as chairman of the board of directors is Sloan P. McCormick, a distinguished member of the board of supervisors of Fresno County. Paul Couture, of Stanislaus County, and Ronald H. Metzler, of Fresno County, two of the valley's most outstanding growers, have agreed to volunteer their services as members of the board. Among the educators to serve are James Ruesswig, superintendent of the Stockton Unified School District, and Albert Molina, a professor at Reedley College. As the program will be of service to many of our Mexican American and Negro farmworkers, it is fitting that the Community Service Organization, the Mexican-American Political Association, and the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People will each designate one representative from among their valley memberships. Organized labor will be represented by Manuel Lopez of the building trades council in Fresno. A representative chosen by the community action agencies of each of the eight valley counties will serve on the board, as will one farmworker from each county, to be selected democratically from among those participating in the program.

The University of California extension system will participate in designing the curriculum and training the teachers who will instruct the migrants.

The program will be conducted by a private nonprofit agency—the Central California Action Associates. It will provide both evening and daytime classes for adult migrant workers. Over 3,000 farmworkers are expected to take advantage of the classes after work, which will offer such subjects as basic education, citizenship, and consumer education. In addition, more than 540 farmworkers (approximately 60 in each of the eight counties) will be given the opportunity to participate during the off-season—November through February—in full-time classes designed primarily to provide literacy in English, a second language for many of our agricultural workers. Students in the full-time program will be reimbursed up to a maximum of $65 per week to enable them to attend classes and support their families at the same time, thereby possibly reducing the county welfare rolls in the winter months. The key financial aspects of the program will be administered by a major financial or public institutions, with the Crocker Citizens National Bank in Fresno having thus far submitted lowest bid for this work.

The community action agencies in the eight valley counties have played a major role in the development of this program. In their capacity as the official coordinating agencies for the war on poverty in their own areas, they will be able to provide a full range of services and referrals to other programs which have the capability of meeting special needs of the participants.

The full-time classes conducted under this program will all be held during periods of the year when little or no agricultural work is available. This feature serves to benefit both the farmworkers, who can earn much more during the work season than the stipend amount which this program can pay, and the agricultural economy which is dependent upon the workers' labor during the critical harvest and preharvest periods. Such class scheduling makes it possible to utilize productively the time when the worker is unemployed and without income to increase his educational achievement.

The need for this program in the San Joaquin Valley has been apparent for some time. The Department of Labor has recently estimated that there are nearly 50,000 migrant and seasonal agricultural workers employed in the eight counties. The experience of similar programs in California and other States indicates that a large number are vitally interested in helping to advance themselves educationally. Programs have repeatedly attracted five to 10 times as many workers as there are openings.

Moreover, the value of education to members of our agricultural work force has been demonstrated repeatedly by detailed studies. Special surveys of the U.S. Department of Commerce show that adult farmworkers who have between 5 and 8 years of formal schooling have incomes 25 percent more than those with less than 5 years of education. Farmworkers with more than a grade school education earn 85 percent more than those with less than 5 years of schooling. It is a fact that, despite tremendous advances in the educational attainment for our Nation's citizens, the average educational attainment for farmworkers remained the same for the 20-year period from 1940 to 1960.

I am particularly pleased to point out that this education program has been designed to complement the many fine public and private efforts already underway to improve the welfare of all our citizens.

Local government, private groups, the State of California, and the Federal Government have entered into constructive partnership to provide temporary housing to California and out-of-State migrant workers needed for peak harvest activity. The San Joaquin County Medical Society recently received a $72,000 grant from the Public Health Service to provide care for the workers in the county. Under the war on poverty and national housing legislation, farmworkers within the San Joaquin Valley have undertaken an experiment in self-help housing. Through our schools, remedial educational programs in Stanislaus and San Joaquin Counties have been launched for migrants' children. Cooperative efforts are now underway with the city of Stockton and San Joaquin County to obtain Federal funds to construct housing for single male migrant farmworkers. Headstart classes are widespread in the two counties.

The new adult education program will complement and strengthen all these efforts by providing needed services to adult members of farmworker families. In this way the many public and private agencies working so hard for the benefit of our disadvantaged citizens now have a new program to expand and intensify the activities in which they are already engaged.

I hope that the imagination and skills of our valley citizens, the wishes of those who harvest our crops, and these new resources made available by the Office of Economic Opportunity may make this a most successful one for all the people in the 15th Congressional District and the others within California's rich San Joaquin Valley.

The Cabinet Report—A New Focus on Opportunity for the Mexican American

SPEECH
OF
HON. JOHN YOUNG
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 13, 1967

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson has focused the American conscience on the needs and the potentials of the Mexican American citizen.

Last week in impressive ceremonies at the White House, on the occasion of the appointment of Mr. Vicente T. Ximenes to the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, the President released a Cabinet committee report outlining what Government had done in the past 3 years for the Mexican American citizen, what the Mexican American was doing for himself, and what our responsibilities were for the future.

The report clearly pointed out that the Mexican American has suffered low wages, limited opportunity, and partial education because he has been discriminated against.

The time has come, the President said, to undo the damage of the past.

The time has come to make opportunity: to create jobs, to offer training, to give compensatory treatment in education, to offer new hope and help to many millions who want to contribute to this society but have been held back.

The new focus of opportunity for Mexican Americans, which President Johnson has fostered, must be a focus of the heart and the mind and soul. It must result in a positive desire to help the Mexican American help himself.

The President has demonstrated to the people what he has done in 3½ years. We must now join him in a full opportunity program for all Americans.

Peace and Justice for the Middle East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER L. WOLFF
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 15, 1967

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, during the past weeks of concern and anxiety over the crisis in the Middle East, a voice of reason, right, and restraint has been consistantly heard throughout my district. On Monday night, June 12, at a rally sponsored by the Long Island Committee for Peace and Justice in the Middle East, once again the voice, the voice of our respected county executive, Eugene Nickerson, served as a beacon to show the light of way to those who sought wisdom. I include his remarks at this time so that my colleagues may share the benefit of his counsel:

REMARKS BY NASSAU COUNTY EXECUTIVE EUGENE H. NICKERSON AT RALLY SPONSORED BY THE LONG ISLAND COMMITTEE FOR PEACE AND JUSTICE IN THE MIDDLE EAST, MONDAY, JUNE 12, 1967

Out of the tragedy and heroism of the centuries, of the past twenty years, and of the past eight days, comes a new crisis and a new appeal. Israel stood alone in war. Now let us pledge that Israel shall have our absolute friendship in thought, word, and deed to win the peace.

It is true that Israel has answered once again the question of Hillel: "If I am not for myself, who will be?"

But it has also answered the second question: "If I am only for myself, what am I?"

Brave Israel fought alone and won alone. But it fought and won not only for Israel, but for democracy everywhere. The triumph of Israel, as Abba Eban put it well, is a "vindication and reassertion of Western democracy". And I say that democracy cannot survive anywhere if we allow Israel, which won a war for justice, to lose the peace.

Israel is an island of democracy in a sea of despotism. We must help Israel with our time, our energy and our resources to carry out justice in the Middle East.

Last week, at rallies throughout Nassau County, and in Washington, I called upon all citizens of Nassau, regardless of faith, regardless of national origin, regardless of political party, to help mobilize American opinion and world opinion behind Israel, to guarantee that the victor shall itself negotiate directly with the losers.

This cause is for all Americans. Israel did not fight only for Israel. And it has set a shining example for every American. No American, of any group, can be only for himself or only for one group. And every American, of every group, owes a great debt to Israel.

Israel has always sought peace in the Middle East. But there could not and cannot be peace without the right to self-defense and self-preservation.

Israel's enemies sought war. But now in victory, through the voice of General Dayan, Israel has shown its passion for justice and pledged its compassion and assistance to the same people whom Nasser and his puppets subjugated to squalor and rags.

Rarely in all human history has there been so just a victory and so gentle a victor.

Now let us answer with Israel the third question of Hillel: "If not now, when?"

If we do not support Israel now, in clear and certain terms, when?

If we do not support its right to negotiate its own peace, when will we?

If we do not support Israel's need to protect its borders, to guarantee that there shall no longer be blockades on the water and artillery on the mountains, when will Israel have to fight again?

A just peace in the Middle East means that Israel has the right to freedom from terrorism and harrasment by its neighbors.

A just peace means that no dictator shall refuse to admit the existence of the sovereign state of Israel.

The ancient land of Israel has been earned through centuries of sacrifices. It was earned through the courage and toil of the pioneers, through the bravery of the defenders of 1948, of 1956, and of 1967. Israel was earned by the death of six million human beings, who might have been spared had the great powers acted in time.

Israel has been more than generous with America. We have, right here in Nassau County, programs which began in Israel, which we have developed working with the Government colleagues I visited in Jerusalem and Tel Aviv. I owe a great personal debt to my friend Yehuda Erel and others who have come here to teach us.

Now we must help our brave sister nation to rebuild for peace, to feed the victims of war, to bind the wounds of a land of heroes.

Israel fought and Israel lives today for you and for me and for all who cherish democracy and love mankind. For such a nation as Israel, nothing we do can be too generous.

Oil Import Legislation: H.R. 10696

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT PRICE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 15, 1967

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the sentiment being expressed here that the

90th Congress owes it to the American people and to the security of our Nation to write specific guidelines into the law limiting oil imports is greatly encouraging. I join in and support the legislation here under discussion with deep conviction that we have no other choice.

I join in sponsoring this amendment because I do not want this Nation rendered into a "have not" position as to essential energy supplies.

I do not want this Nation ever to have to go cup in hand to anybody for vital oil supplies.

I do not want this Nation ever to be in the position faced by its ally, Great Britain, dependent for its oil on hostiles.

I do not want this Nation ever to be subject to political, or economic, or military blackmail for want of oil.

Fortunately, we have a choice in the matter. If we slough off and sell out our domestic petroleum industry and place ourselves at the mercy of the Arab bloc, or Venezuela, or any foreign power, it will be by choice, not of necessity.

I do not want history to say that the 90th Congress, by failing to make a choice, abandoned our domestic oil industry in the present sea of uncertainty and confusion which will have led to its extinction as a bulwark of our security.

Mr. Speaker, I wish we had oil sands 3,000 feet thick as they have in the Middle East. I wish we had wells that would produce 200,000 barrels daily as they have in the Middle East. But we do not because the Creator did not distribute the oil as we might have.

Now, by Middle East standards, we are "oil poor." Compared to the fantastic reserves there, our domestic petroleum industry can boast of little. But I am going to stick by our oil industry, because it is the best we have. And so far it has been good enough. It has seen us successfully through two World Wars, and it has seen us and our allies through the 1956–57 Suez crisis. It stands ready to do so again, though dwarfed by Arab oil as Israel was dwarfed by Arab armies.

And I am confident that if we do not sell it out the domestic oil industry will come through in the next emergency—and who among us believes there will never be one?—just as the dwarfed Israeli army came through.

It would help, Mr. Speaker, to put into economic perspective why we have no alternative except to protect and encourage our domestic oil industry if we are to protect our position of strength as to energy. I can explain by very few figures which clearly speak for themselves.

In the Middle East and north Africa at the beginning of 1966, there were 288 billion barrels of oil reserves. During 1966, there were drilled in the Middle East and north Africa a grand total of 560 wells. By drilling of these relatively few wells, the Middle East and north Africa increased their total reserves to 268 billion barrels—a jump of 40 billion.

Mr. Speaker, they added total petroleum reserves in the Middle East and north Africa in just 1 year—1966—equivalent to the total proved reserves in the United States.

By the drilling of 560 wells, the Middle East and African oil producing countries added 70 million barrels of new reserves for each well drilled.

How does this compare with the United States? In 1966, the domestic oil industry drilled almost 38,000 total wells. By the drilling of those total wells we added 3 billion barrels to our proved reserves. In other words, for every well drilled in the U.S. last year, we found and developed 80,000 barrels of new oil—compared to 70,000,000 barrels per well in the Middle East.

For every well we drilled, we found and developed one-tenth of 1 percent as much oil as was found for every well in the Middle East and Africa.

This illustrates, Mr. Speaker, why we must have effective oil import restrictions. In the jargon of the free trade advocates, we are told that the answer to import competition is to reduce costs and increase efficiency. No amount of cost reduction and efficiency seeking, however, can offset a 1,000 to 1 advantage conferred upon the Middle East by nature in the formation of those vast petroleum deposits.

Since we cannot hope to offset this almost unbelievable economic advantage by "competition," it can only be softened by reasonable and realistic limitations on oil imports. The alternative is clear and simple. They will drown us in foreign oil, extinguish our domestic petroleum industry and place our citizens and our security at the mercy of those who misguided motives have led them even as we speak here to deny us access to that oil.

Mr. Speaker, we should welcome the denial to us of Middle East oil which we fortunately do not need, and we should say a prayer that we will never need it. But as one of our famous country preachers said, players work best when helped by the hands and the head.

The time is here when we should put our minds and hands and the resolve of this Congress to work to see to it that this Nation never has to submit to anybody's blackmail for lack of oil.

We are a country on wheels, Mr. Speaker. Without oil we would be paralyzed more than any other nation. We have the greatest military machine on earth. Without oil, no tank can roll, no plane can fly, no ship can move. No nation, anywhere, has such a stake in preventing dependence on oil beyond its control.

No nation was ever looked to, Mr. Speaker, for the leadership and strength to which the free world today looks to us. Without oil, that position of strength and leadership would evaporate, we would stand as a Samson with his locks shorn and his strength stolen away.

The Soviet Union would, in that event, remain as the only major world power with adequate oil within its own control. The Soviet Union would surely delight if this country should choose a slipshod course leading to ever-increasing dependence on foreign oil.

While on this point, Mr. Speaker, may I point out that the Soviet imports no oil. It is not going to accommodate anybody by displacing its defense-vital industries. We, on the other hand, find ourselves with import levels of 2.5 million barrels daily of foreign oil. These imports, together with the tanker charges to bring them in, and added to our foreign military oil purchase, constitute a $1.8 billion a year drain on our dollars.

No other country in the world would permit displacement of its most vital defense industry on such a scale and to the undermining of its world monetary position. It is a folly into which we have blundered in the attempt to be the world's "good egg," a role with which we have burdened ourselves, I suppose, out of political motives. It has not been done out of necessity, and we may yet rue the day that we unnecessarily and yet deliberately permitted our country to become an oil importer.

But we have passed that bridge. What we must do now is to see to it that we do not aggravate and compound the folly. We can give ourselves such assurance only by legislative action. I, therefore, urge that we take such action before it is too late—before the present administrators of the oil import program, authorized by Congress to preserve our oil security—fritter away more of that security by use of the import control program to solve all manner of social, economic, foreign policy, and "environmental" problems not related in any way to our security.

The domestic producing industry has lost all confidence that the import program, as it is today constituted, will be resolutely and firmly administered to serve its basic security purposes. The Congress has reason to share that loss of confidence.

I urge that each of us read the handwriting on the wall that has been so apparent in the sound and the fury of the conflagration in the Middle East, and that we act now to see that we are never forced to our knees for oil in any similar crisis. To that end, I urge the honorable chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means to make early business of hearings on and the consideration of this legislation.

No Man Is Above the Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD FULTON
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 15, 1967

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, ours is a Nation of laws, and the vast majority of our people are law-abiding citizens. This has been and remains the strength of our Nation.

Recently, Judge Harry Phillips, U.S. Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals, was quoted in an editorial in the Nashville Banner, in which he restated the slogan of Law Day, U.S.A., "No man is above the law, and no man is below the law."

At a time when anarchy has erupted into violence in many of our cities, it is most appropriate that everyone of us be reminded that our democracy cannot function with half of us serving as policemen to compel the other half to obey the law.

Judge Phillips comments are dealt with most effectively in the editorial carried by the Nashville Banner, and I submit for inclusion in the RECORD the text of this editorial, entitled "No Man Above the Law."

JUDGE PHILLIPS STATED IT WELL: NO MAN ABOVE THE LAW

"No man is above the law, and no man is below the law." That statement of its uniform application—the slogan of Law Day, U.S.A.—bears repetition until it registers everywhere.

Its meaning was emphasized by Judge Harry Phillips, U.S. Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals, in an address here before the Civitan Club. It was accurately interpreted in terms of the citizen's reciprocal responsibility.

Note the language of a judicial warning: Democracy cannot function "if half of us have to be policemen to compel the other half to obey the laws." To put it another way, a civilized nation cannot survive as such in a state of anarchy, whether the line of digression—in defiance of authority—splits it squarely at the middle, or is of lesser quotient.

Constituents cannot decide for themselves which laws they will obey—and by option flout the rest, presuming to put themselves above statutory authority in any of its parts. Nor can a concerned constituency keep itself secure, and its country, without upholding the law, and backing its enforcement—at every level where transgression occurs.

The philosophy of anarchy, whatever its source or its pretext, is not the creed of an America founded on law and protective of all life and property.

It is no exaggeration to say, with Judge Phillips, that "the strength of this country is in the honesty and decency of its average citizens." Those average citizens are indistinguishable as to class, or race, or locale, educational status or economic circumstance. They are responsive to duty, and no less sensitive to responsibility than to rights. They burn no draft cards, defile no Flags, engage in no subversion, incite no violence.

They are the heart, soul and body of America—its solid, majority sinew—in behalf of whose welfare laws are drawn, whose enforcement to the letter warrants their total backing.

Judge Phillips stated it well, a judicial concept according with the highest principle implicit to public responsibility, evoking a like realization of individual responsibility. A breakdown at either point invites national disaster.

Peace Corps Socialists Oppose Freedom in South Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 1967

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, much has been offered in defense of the Peace Corps by seeking to justify their foreign travel as ambassadors of the United States.

But when 92 of our "peace ambassadors" in Chile sign a petition opposing an opportunity for freedom and dignity for the citizens of South Vietnam, their disloyalty to our country and the taxpayers requires action.

Certainly if our military men in combat cannot be free to talk and criticize their superiors, the Peace Corps kids can do the job for which they themselves, volunteered or come home.

Chile has a substantial anti-American element now in existence. Our taxpayers should not be called on to subsidize the spread of additional anti-American feelings in a foreign nation against our country.

Mr. Speaker, I insert an article entitled, "92 in Peace Corps in Conflict Over War" which appeared in the Washington, D.C., Evening Star at this point in the RECORD:

DISSENT IS HIT—NINETY-TWO IN PEACE CORPS IN CONFLICT OVER WAR

(By Jeremiah O'Leary)

A conflict of words has broken out between some of the Peace Corps volunteers serving in Chile and their headquarters here over freedom of political expression.

The controversy arose last month when 13 of the 439 volunteers in Chile decided they should take a stand against the war in Vietnam and circulated a petition among the others for signature. A total of 92 signed the petition although some later withdrew their names.

Peace Corps Director Jack Hood Vaughn said today the war protesters met with U.S. Ambassador Ralph Dungan June 2 and agreed to send a letter to Washington headquarters explaining their view on their right to political expression. Dungan, now in Washington on a visit, personally brought the letter to Vaughn.

VAUGHN'S REPLY

Vaughn replied June 7 with a letter to the volunteers in Chile restating the basic principle that has remained unchanged in the six years of the existence of the corps.

"The Peace Corps was established as an apolitical organization and it has been our firm belief that preservation of that character is essential to its effectiveness. This has meant that as an organization and as individuals, whether staff or volunteers, we avoid any official or seemingly official involvement in political matters whether those of the host government or our own."

To the extent that Peace Corps members are able to speak and act as private citizens, they are free to do so, Vaughn said. But this freedom is narrowly circumscribed where identification with the Peace Corps is inevitable, he wrote. And exploitation of the Peace Corps' status to enhance the words or actions of individual members is unacceptable, he said, because it threatens the ability of the corps to achieve its purpose.

Setting up guidelines by which Peace Corps members may express themselves, Vaughn wrote: "You may, as individuals, express your opinions to the President, the Congress and the U.S. press if you completely avoid public identification of your Peace Corps connections."

"Letters to the U.S. press for possible publication cannot include your Peace Corps connection or, if a number of you wish to join in a petition, your foreign address since the latter makes identification almost inevitable.

"These simple steps will allow full freedom of expression and will assure that your statements will be considered solely on the basis of their intrinsic merit rather than because of the here-extraneous circumstance of your Peace Corps service."

IMPLIED THREAT

He said those who are unable to accept the restrictions and insist on using their Peace Corps identification for these purposes should resign.

Vaughn implied that continued insistence on defying this policy would result in recall of such individuals whose "public pursuit of political effort is better conducted back in the United States" as private citizens.

Vaughn said he planned to visit Bolivia and Paraguay next month and offered to go to Santiago to meet with the protesters for an exchange of ideas if they wished. And he told an interviewer today, "We like them to do this as private citizens but when they get on the soap box as Peace Corps members it gets us into a political arena where we have no business."

Mr. and Mrs. Andrew Knodel, of Isabel, S. Dak.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 1967

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, today, as the present world conflicts call many young Americans to the service of their country, it is my great pleasure to acknowledge and pay tribute to the family of Mr. and Mrs. Andrew Knodel, of Isabel, S. Dak., for the tremendous contribution they have made to our Nation. As Mr. and Mrs. Knodel celebrate their 50th wedding anniversary in August, they may look back with a sense of pride on the service of 11 of their sons in the armed services of the United States. The spirit and service of these 11 boys comprise an impressive, seldom achieved record, a credit to themselves as individuals, to their family, and to their country.

The oldest son of Mr. and Mrs. Knodel, Edward A. Knodel, entered the Air Force in January of 1942. As a sergeant in the 441st AAF Bu Van., he served in the Marshall Islands during World War II. He was discharged in January of 1946 after 4 years of service for his country.

Ruben Knodel entered the Army in November 1941. He served with the 2d Division as a staff sergeant in Europe, France, and Sicily during World War II, and was discharged in October 1945.

Walter Knodel began his career in the Army on August 7, 1942. Serving in Company M, 3d Battalion, he has been in Europe, Korea, and Vietnam during World War II, the Korean war, and the war in Vietnam. He will retire after 25 years in the service in September of this year.

Floyd A. Knodel served in the Navy from June 1943 to April 1946. A seaman first class in the Coast Guard, his tour of duty was in the South Pacific during World War II.

Raymond H. Knodel entered the Army in September 1944, for 2 years. He served with the 1st California Division in Japan and the Philippine Islands during World War II.

Norbert Knodel began his career in the Air Force, as did his brother in the Army, in May of 1946. A staff sergeant, he served with the 5008th Supply Squadron in Japan, Germany, and twice in Alaska during the Korean war, and the war in Vietnam. He retired after 21 years of service in February of this year.

Erwin C. Knodel served in the U.S. Army for 1 year beginning in January of 1947. In the peacetime of that year he remained in the States with the 2d Infantry Division.

Donald L. Knodel entered the Army shortly afterward, in 1952. Sergeant first class with the 35th Infantry Division, he served in Hawaii, the Wake Islands, Japan, and Korea during the Korean conflict. Sergeant Knodel was cited for meritorious service in connection with military operations in Korea between Januray of 1953 and February of 1954. His outstanding leadership and courage under fire resulted in his receiving the Bronze Star. He was discharged from the service in 1954.

Dareld L. Knodel entered the Army in January of 1955 for 2 years. He served in Alaska during peacetime with the 37th Artillery.

Earl E. Knodel, still serving in the Air Force with the 683d ACNW Squadron has been in Japan, Korea, and Formosa since 1959. He has served in the Vietnam war and will end his tour of duty in December of this year.

Finally, Herman H. Knodel, currently completing his tour of duty in Vietnam with the 3345th Supply Squadron, will bring to a close his service in the Air Force, which began in August 1963, this coming August 1967.

This outstanding record of one family's unfailing service to their country is worthy of recognition and commendation by the Nation which they have served honorably over a period of 25 years. It is with a deep sense of pride and admiration for my fellow South Dakotans that I call the attention of my colleagues to this outstanding record.

District of Columbia Must Provide Security at Lorton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LLOYD SCOTT
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 15, 1967

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, the Manassas Journal Messenger, one of the fine newspapers serving the northern Virginia suburbs of the Capital, recently published an editorial which I believe conveys the feelings of many of the residents of the area around the District Alcoholic Rehabilitation Center at Lorton. I would like to direct the attention of my colleagues to these editorial comments, from the June 8 edition of the Journal Messenger.

[From the Journal Messenger, June 8, 1967]

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA MUST PROVIDE SECURITY AT LORTON

Last year, when it was first proposed that an alcoholic rehabilitation center be established by the District of Columbia at its Lorton facility, citizens of the area objected to the obvious lack of plans for internal security at the center.

Many area residents are long-time employes of the Department of Corrections and officers at the federal reformatory or the youth center, with years of experience in custodial work. Almost to a man they predicted trouble keeping the patients in the center. They based their predictions on an apparent lack of supervisory personnel and actual physical security.

District officials appeared at public protest meetings and generally poophooed the problem though they did promise to erect a fence. The fence was finally erected after pressure was brought to bear by the Fairfax Board of Supervisors and former Congressman Howard Smith.

The fence has not done the trick. Patients still "walk-away" with considerable ease, their actual numbers unknown, but a figure of 100 can be confirmed. They have been picked up in various parts of Lorton, Gunston Hall, Occoquan, and Woodbridge. Residents of these areas are concerned, and with good reason, as the recent apprehension in Occoquan of an escaped prisoner dressed as an inmate of the rehabilitation center attests.

We have no doubt that the retention of alcoholics in a rehabilitation center is much better than the old system of jailing them. We recognize alcoholism as a disease. But we also recognize the undeniable fact that a man who craves drink and doesn't have the means to obtain it legally will obtain it some other way. We also recognize that a man, befuddled by alcohol, loses any inhibition he may have had and is a menace not only to the community but to himself.

While we would not deny the right of District residents to be treated humanely when stricken with such a disease, we also feel the District of Columbia should respect the right of the citizens of Northern Virginia to be secure in their homes.

Enough is enough—this should be the last time citizens have to sign petitions and Virginia Congressmen have to protest to the District Commissioners. Action should be taken now to establish reasonable security at the Alcoholic Rehabilitation Center in Lorton.

Job Corps Center

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DON EDWARDS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 15, 1967

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to bring to the attention of my colleagues a very fine article by reporter Bud Kaye about the Parks Job Corps Center located in my district. As Mr. Kaye has so aptly stated:

> Every day at the Parks Job Corps Center is a personal happening for the 2,300 corpsmen and more than 700 instructors, counselors and professional employees . . . the Job Corps center at Parks is not just a trade-school—it can better be described as an attitudinal change center.

Litton Industries, which operates the center for the Office of Economic Opportunity, and other well-known industries realize that simply teaching a man a trade will not necessarily make a desirable employee out of him. What the Job Corps seeks to achieve is to provide its participants not only with a salable vocational skill, but also with the "world of work" and social skills that will make him the "whole man" Mr. Kaye talks about. To me, part of the effectiveness of Mr. Kaye's article is based on the fact that he seems to have been able to capture the sentiments of so many communities across the Nation who are at first apprehensive about a program for "high school dropouts, juvenile delinquents, and social outcasts" located in their own "backyard." Of course, once the centers are in operation, communities have learned to appreciate the sincere dedication of most of the enrollees and their willingness to help out in emergency projects and with such projects as local charity drives. Mr. Kaye also does a great service by describing the population at Parks, since much criticism of the program is based on lack of information or misinformation from scare stories and sensationalized reporting with a negative emphasis. Its effectiveness is also due to looking at the training from the point of view of the recipient of the training—the corps member. I include this article from the Alameda County Weekender in the RECORD. I regret that the fine photographs which accompany the article cannot also be seen by my colleagues. One photograph of a corpsman's hands shaping a piece of clay on the potter's wheel is captioned "These Fingers Are Wrapped Around a Lug Wrench in the Daytime." It illustrates the well-known quotation, "Man cannot live by bread alone." "Whole men" are being developed here.

FOR MOST—A LAST CHANCE

Recently two divergent Bay Area groups have become identified, with the word happening. Both groups readily agree with Webster's definition: A happening is an occurrence.

Here the similarity ends. The San Francisco Hippie's happenings are peaceful, sometimes fun, but hardly ever productive.

To find the other group which identifies with happenings, you have to drive east through Castro Valley, to the ramshackled wooden buildings which served as a World War II Seabee center, debarkation point and later an Air Force base.

Now, a couple of coats of paint later, the weatherbeaten buildings and fields of what was once Camp Parks are the site of one of the most productive and stimulating happenings known to man.

Every day at the Parks Job Corps Center is a personal happening for the 2,300 Corpsmen and more than 700 instructors, counselors and professional employees who have taken what was called a pork barrel and converted it into a social, intellectual and economic success.

The Job Corps Center at Parks is not just a trade school—it can better be described as an attitudinal change center. Within its self-contained educational environment, there has been proof positive that lost manpower can be recovered.

Operationally, vocational training, counseling and basic education are lumped into six self-contained clusters.

Instruction is offered in automotive maintenance, building maintenance and landscaping, culinary arts, electronics, general skills—which is a course that emphasizes retail sales—warehousing and general academic education, and finally office machine repair.

The men who run the six vocational clusters are responsible for all aspects of the Corpsmen's educational and vocational training programs within their areas, as well as counseling and recreation activities on a 24-hour, seven-day-a-week basis.

If the objectives of these daily happenings could be summed up in academic terms, the Job Corps aims to create "whole men."

Since creating "whole men" could also be termed the objective of any university, it must be remembered that the Parks Job Corps Center is not a university, but only a place where young men who have only experienced survival, may experience living.

One Center employee put it this way: "The name of our game is jobs; yes, that's the goal. But the ability to hold that job is just as important as the manual dexterity required to master it. Remember, in most cases we're starting from scratch."

These young men, between 16 and 21, come from the very bottom of society's barrel. The Job Corps is their last chance at becoming a person.

Starting from scratch means medical and dental examinations, for many the first they've ever had; an issue of decent clothing and a brief exposure to each of the vocational programs offered.

Based upon individual preference and a battery of aptitude tests, the trainees decide which vocation to pursue.

At Parks they don't aim at producing journeymen. After an average stay of nine months the typical Corpsman is ready for entry level employment at a figure somewhere higher than $2 an hour.

Mechanical agility is important, but just as important, and just as thoroughly taught is the ability to get along with people. "Once a Corpsman learns social skills—which is another way to describe maturity—he can pick up the mechanical knacks."

Parks Corpsmen apparently learn both. They're being placed in responsible jobs at the rate of 1,000 a year, and their job retention exceeds 90 per cent.

In the final analysis the happenings at Parks amount to giving a young man a sense of dignity and worth as a human being, and the skill to earn his own living. He becomes a man.

Corpsmen are afforded the very best in medical and dental care. Litton Industries has sub-contracted for these services at Parks.

Med-Cor, a private medical organization, provides Corpsmen with total health services 24 hours a day, seven days a week.

Outpatient services include emergency service, ambulance service, sick call, pharmacy, laboratory, x-ray, physiotherapy dental care and psychiatric evalution.

In-patient services include hospitalization for short term illness, and a complete psychiatric facility for management and treatment of all conceivable problems involving emotional instability.

A 40 bed hospital, soon to be expanded to 80 beds, is used for this inpatient care.

Med-Cor and a private dental facility, providing full dental care for Corpsmen, are both located at the Center.

Patients requiring major surgery or complex medical treatment are taken to specialists and hospitals in nearby San Francisco.

PORK BARREL PARKS PROVED ITS POINT

Picture this—you've dreamed of seeing a decaying World War II military post transformed into a $300 million nuclear accelerator, and all of a sudden this beautiful bubble bursts. Even your secret mirage of tract homes to replace the shambled barracks and mess halls has faded.

Your blood pressure is slightly higher than it should be—instead of doing something to get rid of one of the county's largest (4,000 acres) eyesores, people from Washington are urging you to smile and welcome a multiracial influx of 2,000 high school dropouts, juvenile delinquents and social outcasts.

You've read about the poverty program and plans for establishing a nationwide Job Corps and you think it is a fine idea as long as they don't locate it in your back yard.

The die is cast, however, and despite your grumbling and the moral support you offered the group protesting the outrage, Camp Parks is destined to become the Parks Job Corps Center.

On April 26, 1965, as the first Corpsmen, as you later learned to call them, arrived you didn't know what to think.

Remember, what you felt was a combination of panic—your wives and daughters must be protected from these people, and charity—someone has to give these kids a last chance.

Now that Job Corps has found its way into your vocabulary, and, like Corpsmen, is any everyday word you associate with Camp Parks, it's time to look at some Job Corps statistics as they related to your valley, your county and the Bay Area.

Today there are more than 2,000 Corpsmen at the Parks center, with Californians making the largest population dent (35.7 per cent). Only New Hampshire and Vermont are without representation at Parks.

Intellectually, the incoming groups of Corpsmen leave much to be desired. Their average reading level, on a scale of 12.8, is 6.8. Socially, many of them were referred to the Job Corps by juvenile courts or probation departments. Some were referred by high school guidance counselors who made it crystal clear that the Job Corps was a last chance for them. Almost all grew up in poverty stricken environments.

Ethnically, this is the Parks Job Corps Center population: 37.7 per cent Caucasian, 43.8 per cent Negro, 15.7 per cent Mexican or Spanish American, .66 per cent Orientals and 1.4 per cent American Indians and Eskimos.

For the first time in their lives, some 2,300 disadvantaged youths were living together without armed guards and barbed wire fences and with many self-imposed regulations which carefully skirted anything resembling regimentation.

Crazy? Sure, remember you said you were leary of what was going on out there. But crazy as it seemed, you were one of the first to break down and invite a Corpsmen into your home for dinner, and later on to spend a weekend pass with your family.

While the people of Pleasanton, Dublin and Livermore petitioned local government to use their influence to prevent Corpsmen from leaving the base, a few citizens began to take a wait-and-see attitude.

Some church groups softened up, then individuals began inviting corpsmen to their homes, and at that point the learning process became complete. The average Alameda County family learned, much to its amazement, that the Corpsman wants the same things they want: dignity, respect and normal every day comforts.

Within a few weeks nine Corpsmen skipped breakfast one day. They had appointments to donate blood needed for a critically ill and indigent Livermore family.

So, little by little the community came to realize Corpsmen were human beings, not a rat pack bent on rape, robbery and murder.

The neighboring communities are still off limits to Corpsmen on pass, but the young men of the Job Corps go to Livermore, Pleasanton and Dublin when they receive specific invitations to parties, dinners and meetings, and they'll file into the local community for organized recreational activities.

Corpsmen bowl in local leagues, their varsity teams compete against local softball, football, basketball and baseball teams, and their volunteer work has saved the small neighboring cities thousands of dollars.

The larger communities are better equipped for the Corpsmen and the center has established regular bus schedules to and from Oakland and San Francisco.

To date more than 2,000 Corpsmen have left Parks, for one reason or another. The majority, 1,700, have been placed in good paying jobs, thereby becoming living proof that the Job Corps objectives are sound. Some have been dismissed from the Corps because of serious disciplinary or legal problems, and a few have dropped out because of a lack of interest.

In the Bay Area alone, more than 200 Corpsmen have been placed in permanent jobs. This means the local economy benefits by more than $15,000 a week, or $780,000 annually, from the graduates' salaries alone.

In less than two years there has been a complete turnabout in community reaction to the Job Corps and the Corpsmen themselves.

The 3,806 man-hours—totally without compensation—put in by Corpsmen as volunteer fire fighters, the blood donations, church refurbishings, and volunteer library work, the crops saved, had something to do with the reversal—but not everything.

"I WAS AT THE END OF THE LINE, THEN I JOINED THE CORPS"

You really wanta know what the Job Corps is like? You want the truth? Well, you've come to the right guy—I'm a Corpsman!

First thing to understand is that Corpsmen have a respect and understanding for their own kind, and this is the thing that makes this place work.

Like for instance counseling or kangaroo courts. You know, Corpsmen only get $15 every two weeks, then they take taxes and social security out of that. What's left is ours.

Well, being a farm boy who grew up with farmers and factory workers, when I got here I guess I didn't pay much heed to the condition of my room.

Somebody complained and I was hauled onto the carpet at counseling. They warned me, but that didn't bother me much. Then they hit me with a $1.25 fine, and that shook me up. It meant I couldn't go on a pass.

And the counselor sat there and let the guys fine me. Well, I learned, and now I'll tell a guy he needs to be fined if he does.

Me, I'm not a great brain and I don't want to make radios and space ships. I came here to learn a trade and I'm gonna be a window washer. Sure, those electronic nuts will probably learn a lot more, but when we head out for work, a window washer who works above the second floor makes as much as a guy who puts televisions together.

Those guys in electronics, they're no better than us in building maintenance. They're Corpsmen too.

The other day we were sitting in the snack bar and I ran into this guy from home. Man, he was a worse troublemaker than me. I had lots of fights and I dropped out of school, but most of the time I saw him in juvie detention it was because he stole things.

This same guy works at the PX here. Handles money, and is gonna get a job in a store outside and he won't cop anything now.

Yeah, this is different from a school. For one thing all us guys in building maintenance, well we live together, and work together, go to counseling together, and when we aren't in class, well we're together. That means we talk shop a lot and learn a lot.

Next week I'm looking for Task Force duty. This is something new. We guys work weekends in town, you're sort of like cops to watch that some of the other guys don't get too smashed or get into beefs with outsiders.

When a Corpsman gets into trouble he wants a Corpsman to help him out of it. I guess he also wants us around to make sure he doesn't go too far in the first place.

Before we set up the Task Force people out there must've thought real bad things about the guys from Parks.

We're kinda like the Shore Patrol—they want us instead of the cops.

Everyone asks how us white guys and the colored boys get along—there's no hang up here.

Man, we don't sweat the color of a guy's skin. He's a corpsman. If you get into a fight with another guy it's because you're not tuned in with him, not because he's black.

Sometimes if you can't settle the beef yourself you talk about it at counseling or maybe it'll go to Corpsman Government for trial or review, but anyway it goes, you can bet Corpsmen will decide who's right.

You know, when I first got here and they told me Corpsmen even sit with the Center Review Board, and that's like a general court martial, I laughed but they got two guys from Corpsman Government who sit with the Center wheels.

I'm trying to get my high school diploma, but that's not why I came here. If I get a good job first, okay, I'll take it, but as long as I'm here, bein' back in regular school isn't too bad and my Mom would be awful proud if I could send her that diploma.

I may not talk too right, but this place did me an awful lot of good. When I came here I didn't know what I wanted to do. I just sort of sat around.

They feed us better than I was able to eat at home. I got good clothes and a lot of things to do. There are guys just like me, and we work together and I'm beginning to understand what it's like to live with people and have them look at you as one of them.

I'm a good window washer, but that's not all. Whatever else I am I got that way by being a Corpsman.

LITTON INDUSTRIES OPERATE PARKS

Parks Job Corps Center is part of a national residential training program for out-of-school, out-of-work, underprivileged young men, authorized by Congress under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, and operated by Litton Industries, Inc.

The goal of the Job Corps is to prepare young men for jobs in which they can earn a decent living. In the Parks environment Corpsmen not only learn job skills and basic academic subjects, they also earn a modest living allowance.

Corpsmen are paid $80 a month, but only given $15 every two weeks as a basic living allowance. The other $50 they are paid for each month of satisfactory service, is paid the Corpsman when he is ready to leave Parks.

Income tax and social security deductions are taken from the living allowance checks and readjustment allowance which is held for the Corpsman.

At Parks Corpsmen live in groups of 26, two to a room, with a counselor responsible for each 26-man living group. Groups are assigned to dormitory buildings according to their vocational groupings.

Shortly before graduation staff placement experts start helping the Corpsman find a job, then they keep in touch to offer follow-up service, if needed.

Venezuela Indicts Communist Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. RARICK
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 15, 1967

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, today our Latin American neighbor, Venezuela, is before the OAS accusing Castro's Cuba of aggressive Communist subversion against its country and people.

But we can expect little news leakage to launch an awakening of public opinion to the threat in our backyard.

The boycott of free countries against the bearded beatnik dictator will probably not materialize because it just might prove bad on business with our "friends"—Britain, France, Brazil, Argentina, and Chile.

They seemingly all want to feel grown up and sophisticated like other nations which refused to grasp the significance of a worldwide Communist conspiracy until too late.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert a release from the Washington Daily News for June 14:

Venezuela To Indict Cuba in OAS Tomorrow

(By Virginia Prewett)

Venezuela's action indicting Cuba for aggressive subversion before the Organization of American States, due to start tomorrow—almost completely overshadowed by the Mid East crisis—is expected to proceed in two stages.

The OAS ambassadors will meet initially, each representing his respective foreign minister. The are exepected to name a group to go to Venezuela and investigate that country's charge against Cuba based on the capture of Cuban soldiers trying to slip into Venezuela to aid subversion there.

Once a report is completed, the OAS foreign ministers themselves may come to Washington to discuss what to do about Cuba.

WHAT TO DO?

What to do is the tough nut. No considerable sentiment exists thruout Latin America at this time for collective armed action against Castro. Latin Americans realize this is about the last adventure the U.S. wants to start just now.

Most other measures also have drawbacks. The suggested boycott against Free World countries trading with Castro would hurt Canada, Britain, France and Spain—as well as Latin American economies. A tight naval patrol of Latin American coasts is being urged. To be effective, it would be costly.

Colombia has told Russia it will not do business unless Russia calls off the Moscow-backed Cuban subversion. But Brazil, Argentina and Chile all have dealings with Russia and would frown on this as a continental move.

Venezuela is in an awkward position, since it does not want to sacrifice its close relations with Chile in leading Latin America's democratic bloc.

FREI HANDICAPPED

Chile's President Eduardo Frei has won wide admiration for his effort to create a social revolution without overt dictatorship, but unfortunately for Venezuela, he is not entirely a free agent. In Chile's last presidential election, some 275,000 people were dissatisfied enough to vote the Socialist-Communist ticket and this counterweight lies heavily on the Frei administration. With conservative connivance, it was enough to keep President Frei from visiting the U.S. this spring.

And another counterweight exists in Chile, within the ruling Christian Democratic Party itself. When important Chilean leaders belonging to Dr. Frei's following, once called the Falangist Party, decided to become Christian Democrats, they also accepted ideology and substantial financial backing from German Christian Democrats.

Thru this connection, Chile's Christian Democrats have absorbed the European feeling that the OAS is to be restricted and made politically powerless. This feeling is part of a modern European psychosis that has grown up as Europe, weakened by its two great wars, has shrunk in importance.

In imagining they are avoiding the Yankee collar, the Chilean Christian Democrats in this respect have actually doomed the second-hand intellectual apparel of a self-weakened Europe.

Labor Costs for Homebuilding Decrease

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 15, 1967

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, all of us will be glad to know that the labor cost factor in the price of a new home has gone down sharply in the last two decades. This is the result of increased productivity and improved techniques of building trade workers.

M. A. Hutcheson, the general president of the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, reports on this subject in an editorial in the current issue of the Carpenter, the official monthly magazine of the AFL–CIO Union. Mr. Hutcheson cites testimony before a congressional committee by Leon Weiner, president of the National Association of Home Builders.

Mr. Speaker, because of the wide interest and importance of this subject, under unanimous consent I extend my remarks and include the editorial:

NAHB Executive Verifies It: Labor Portion of Total Sales Price for New Homes Has Actually Dropped!

There are a couple of badly shop-worn myths about the construction industry that the industry has never been able to shake off completely. One is that the industry is hidebound, lacking in progressiveness, and dedicated to retaining obsolete methods and techniques. The other is that the seemingly high hourly rates of building trades workers chiefly contribute to the high cost of housing. Both of these myths have been effectively disproved once more by the testimony of a man who ought to know whereof he speaks.

Leon Weiner, president of the National Association of Home Builders, declared in testimony on Capitol Hill that, from 1944 to 1964, the cost of labor entering into the price of a new home dropped from 29 to 18 percent of the total sale price.

How can this be, when, thanks to their union organization, carpenters have managed to keep their wages apace of the progress of inflation? Because of increases in productivity, off-site fabrication, etc. Traditional methods of carpentry, of measure-cut-fit-nail have been largely modified in an effort to keep pace with the nation's needs. We have not fought improved technologies. We have, however, insisted that carpenters share in the improved technology and increased productivity.

While labor costs were dropping, land costs in home prices jumped from 13 to 26 percent in 20 years, Weiner declared. Other costs, such as sales, equipment, financing, profit and services rose from 13 to 19 percent of the house's cost.

The home buyer of today gets a lot more in his home, too, even though he pays more for it. Air conditioning is fairly standard in all but the lowest-priced homes being built today. There is more open area, more bedrooms, more baths, more storage areas, all in response to demands from today's informed homemakers.

It seems inevitable that housing will continue to increase in cost, (as will everything else), as inflation continues. The principal deciding factor, according to housing economists, will be increased land costs. In our nation's capital, the average price of a building lot rose 61.6 percent in the four-year period of 1960–64, or better than 15 percent per year.

The housing professionals are predicting a welcome turnabout in public housing preferences insofar as carpenters are concerned. In the past five years, in most parts of the nation, there has been a large surge of enthusiasm for apartments. Now there is a discernible return to major interest in single-family dwellings. The emergence of new small towns and "satellite cities," together with development of more and better access roads, may have contributed to the return to single-family dwelling interests with the greater land demand. An increase in the amount of mortgage money available for single family dwellings, albeit at a higher rate, also will contribute to the increase in housing starts.

When the housing industry is in trouble, the country is in trouble. From here and now, it appears the housing industry is in an excellent position to bounce back from the 1966 doldrums. As public demand rises, the organized building and construction trades stand ready to meet the need.

June Newsletter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 1967

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in the RECORD my June newsletter, which contains my views on the Middle East war and other current matters.

The newsletter follows:

JUNE, 1967.

SHALOM

A lasting peace in the Middle East requires that Israel be: (1) recognized once and for all as a nation; (2) guaranteed use of the Gulf of Aqaba and the Suez Canal; and (3) provided strategic points against harassment and surprise attack.

Israel's victory did not come as a complete surprise. Following a visit to Israel last year, I reported: "Israel is outstripping its Arab neighbors. Their chances of catching up with Israel economically, or destroying it militarily, diminish every day."

Despite Israel's strength, it is still weak compared with Russia. We will have to stand firm against the Soviet Government, which has broken relations with Israel, insisted that Israel give up all its territorial gains, and threatened to re-arm the Arabs. Whoever controls the Middle East stands astride the major crossroad of the world and one fourth of its oil reserves.

PEACE UNDER THE NEXT STONE?

Peace in Vietnam! We all want it. But how to get it? Russia should be in a sober mood after having backed the wrong side in the Middle East; some believe it has long been anxious to get out of its expensive backing of North Vietnam and may welcome a face-saving opportunity for doing so. I have suggested to President Johnson a conference with Russia and other powers to seek peace in both Vietnam and the Middle East. My suggestion offers only slight hope, but no stone should be left unturned if the possibility of peace may lie under it.

MEET AMBASSADOR GOLDBERG

Susie and I were guests of Ambassador and Mrs. Goldberg during our visit to the United Nations.

JOBS, NOT JETS

Our military aid should be limited to the frontlines of Communist aggression. American arms contributed to wars in the Middle East and between India and Pakistan, to say nothing of military takeovers in Greece and Argentina. This aid bolsters military elites more interested in preserving privilege than improving the lot of mankind. Jobs, not jets, divert the hungry from Communism.

BRIDGE ANSWERS

Nine out of ten people don't want a parallel Bay bridge. My recent newsletter poll shows: Less than five per cent specifically want a parallel bridge and only four per cent approve Governor Agnew's bill for three bridges and a tunnel, rammed through the Legislature just five months after the people rejected the parallel span. Half voted against any new bridges or tunnels while taxes are rising.

NEW LAB AT EDGEWOOD

Construction of a $2.3 million Quality Assurance Laboratory at the Arsenal begins next month.

SOMETHING WRONG? SEE LONG

Saturday, July 1, at 10 A.M., Towson Post Office. No appointment needed; walk right in!

Hot-River Menace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 1967

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial from the Washington Post entitled "Hot-River Menace." This editorial explains some of the "profound and damaging" effects heated water has on the plant and animal life in the Patuxent River in Maryland.

Based on the report of the University of Maryland's Natural Resources Institute, the editorial points out clearly an example of the "wanton abuse of our natural resources."

"Hot-River Menace" appeared in the Washington Post February 25, 1967. The editorial follows:

HOT-RIVER MENACE

The report of the University of Maryland's Natural Resources Institute on the consequences of hot water in the Patuxent River are alarming. The heating comes, of course, from the Potomac Electric Power Company generating plant at Chalk Point. "There is a strong possibility," the report says, "that the heated water is modifying the populations of microscopic plants which are the basis of the food chain in the river." Some of the changes observed are described as "profound and damaging."

A great increase in green-colored oysters is traced to the increased heat from the power plant. Egg hatching for three dominant copepod species was noticeably reduced when they were pumped through the cooling system. Large numbers of dead crabs have been observed along the canal which takes the hot water back to the river. The white perch crop has been reduced since the plant began operating, although this has not been "unequivocally" traced to the warmer water.

These and similar findings must be coupled with a warning given by J. A. Mihurshy and V. S. Kennedy of the Natural Resources Institute in a publication of the American Fisheries Society. They concluded:

"In the previously described Patuxent estuary situation it appears certain that estuarine temperatures between 90 and 99.9, which are allowable under present Maryland laws, are going to suppress or eliminate certain species."

This would be an appalling price to pay for the privilege of dumping hot water into the river. Apparently the state itself has been negligent in permitting this type of pollution without any knowledge of what the consequences would be. In the light of this report the legislators at Annapolis need to get busy on the problem as well as the Maryland Department of Water Resources.

Fortunately, this menace to marine life can be greatly reduced by relatively simple measures. The first necessary step is to require Pepco and other power companies to let the water cool before it is returned to the river. Cooling towers or reservoirs for this purpose can be readily constructed. Maryland and all the other states should require that when water—a precious possession of all the people—is diverted from a stream it be returned no less pure or hospitable to marine life. The wanton abuse of our natural resources must stop.

Has Supreme Court Upset the Balance?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 1967

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest rewards of service in the Congress is the opportunity it affords to receive and be informed by the various points of view which are communicated by constituents.

Of particular interest in that regard is a letter I received from a distinguished attorney in Indianapolis, Mr. John G. Rauch.

Mr. Rauch has generously consented to have his eloquent statement of a widely held point of view concerning the Supreme Court appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The letter follows:

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.,
Cannon House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. JACOBS: I want to tell you how much I enjoyed our conversation the other day, when you were in Indianapolis, on some of the issues before our country. I should like to "extend my remarks" on what I consider to be the basic problem confronting us; namely, a disturbance of that delicate balance of the exercise of governmental functions by the Executive, the Judicial and the Legislative branches of the Federal government and of the several independent and sovereign States; which is the design and genius of our Constitution.

To govern any large, and independent nation of free people in our complex modern industrial society is an almost impossible task. When to the challenge of internal problems of enlightened social welfare we add the burden of foreign entanglements which we have assumed as the most powerful, idealistic and venturesome nation on earth, one can only marvel that the Federal Government functions at all much less succeeds as well as it does. One can only attribute this success to the political sophistication of the American people; their extreme tolerance of free speech, free press, and minority dissent; and to the genius of the Federal Constitution which has now functioned with spectacular virtuosity in government for one hundred and seventy-eight years. This is something new under the sun.

But bear always in mind that our constitutional system, brilliant though it is in design, is administered by human beings most of whom are motivated by emotional rather than rational considerations and all suffer from man's incurable propensity to exercise power and to abuse it. Vide: Plato, Aristotle, Cicero, Machiavelli, Montesquieu, de Tocqueville, Bryce, Lowell, and others.

Our system simply will not work unless each of the four great coordinates, namely: the President, the Congress, the Supreme Court, and the Sovereign States each exercises a reasonable restraint upon its own functions and observes a decent tolerance and forbearance for the functions of the remaining coordinates.

My concern is that in the recent past the Supreme Court has tended to encroach upon the powers of Congress and the several States. The nice balance which for so long has been preserved is now disturbed.

Congress and the States have suffered a loss of prestige and function. It is time to call a halt. It is irrelevant and of no consequence whatsoever that the Court has acted in good faith and the best possible motives in rendering decrees which were considered by it to be in the best public interest. "Hell is paved with good intentions." The Court under Warren has adopted a "holier than thou" attitude. It has presumed to "legislate by judicial decision" in areas of social reform in which it has considered Congress and the several States to have been dilatory and negligent. It has had the effrontery to mandate sovereign States in legislative apportionment and the constitution and elections of official State assemblies. There is no political thicket nor area of reform which the Court is not prepared to invade. It is defiant of all criticism of its authoritarian arrogance, even that of its own dissenting members. Some of the most bitter, caustic and frightening comments upon the Court's decisions may be found in the public reports of the "dissenting opinions" of some of the Justices themselves.

While the Executive and the Congress are sensitive and responsive to public opinion, the Court is impervious. Only the Congress can discipline the Court. I am not suggesting impeachment because I do think that the members of the Court are and have been honest and honorable men but they have deluded themselves in the conviction that it is their function to accomplish various social reforms by judicial ukase rather than await the slower but more orderly processes of Congress. This is an example of the corrupting effect of the exercise of naked power. The Court has been called with considerable justification "a daily constitutional convention".

It is my opinion that the Congress should adopt a joint resolution admonishing the Court to consider its limitations under the Constitution and to cease invading the functions of the Congress and the several sovereign States.

As a lawyer and a member of the Judiciary Committee of the House, I respectfully suggest that you address yourself to this problem.

Aside from the XIV Amendment, I suggest you call the Court's attention to Article I, Secs. 1 and 8, and Amendments IX and X which the Court has apparently seen fit to disregard.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN G. RAUCH.

Oklahoma Newspaper Sums Up Our Vietnam Position

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 1967

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, an excellent editorial appeared in the Wednesday, June 7, edition of the Pryor Times, in Pryor, Okla., that brings home a point that it would do us all good to recognize.

If all Americans would pause for a moment and consider the merits of this straightforward message, I think that they would find here an objective analysis of its present in Vietnam. I wish to express my thanks to the Pryor Times for stating so simply what has been made to appear so complex.

I want to insert this editorial in the RECORD now so that you may have an opportunity to see it:

THE STAKES ARE HIGH

Survival as a free country is the stake in the Vietnam conflict.

The United States cannot afford to withdraw from Southeast Asia and leave those nations and peoples an easy prey for Communist aggressors. We not only owe it to freedom-loving people everywhere, but to ourselves.

Self preservation. It is easier to do it there than here. We must contain the spread of Communism if Democracy is to mean anything other than a hallowed word.

If they are not stopped there, South America could be the next step. That is too close.

It is easy to gripe and second-guess the Administration in its conduct of defense of the liberty of the South Vietnamese, but those who are doing the loudest talking do not have the responsibility of acting. They can talk without suffering any consequence except giving aid and comfort to the enemy and arousing emotions in this country.

We do not profess to know if the President is doing right or wrong, but we do know he is the Chief Executive of this nation and we have confidence in his ability and his judgment. We trust him.

He is willing to sacrifice, "Peace in our times" for the future security of our children and our country. It is not a politician's decision but the judgment of a free man, an American, a statesman who believes in freedom; not just for now but for all time to come.

"Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty."

The stakes are high and the price is costly, but the alternative is even more costly.

Lithuania: A Tribute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 1967

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, 27 years ago this month the independent state of Lithuania was wantonly destroyed by one of the most ruthless powers of modern times, the Soviet Union.

The destruction of Lithuania was swift, as indeed was the destruction of her sister Baltic States, Estonia, and Latvia. The Soviet Army crossed the frontiers and seized control of the country. Forthwith, the Soviets destroyed all opposition, staged a Soviet-style election in an atmosphere of induced terror, and established a regime claiming to represent the will of the Lithuanian people. The final act of annexation came quickly when the new Soviet puppet government, dutifully obeying the desires of its mentors, "requested" that Lithuania be annexed to the U.S.S.R. as a Soviet Republic.

Thus it was that Lithuania which had existed as an independent state for over two decades lost her independence and became a subjugated state within the Soviet Union.

Today we pay tribute to Lithuania and her people. Both deserve a better destiny than that which has been assigned to them. Let us all pray for the day when the principle of self-determination will become a guiding concept for all peoples; for on that day we know that Lithuania will again be free.

Controlling Crime in the Streets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 17, 1967

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, one of the best articles I have read regarding proposed gun control legislation appeared in the April 5 issue of the Brookfield Enterprise. Lyn Daunoras' column is so full of logic and commonsense that I want my colleagues to have the benefit of it as they consider the pros and cons of a very difficult problem:

WILL A GUN CONTROL LAW CONTROL CRIME IN STREETS?

(By Lyn Daunoras)

We're very much opposed to the gun control law now being considered by the Illinois General Assembly.

There. We said it and we're glad. What is more, we are not a member of the National Rifle Assn. so that bit of "aha, no wonder you're against it" cannot be flung at us by zealous proponents of this asinine and meaningless bill.

Why are we against it? Simple. We're against any law which has no hope of solving the wave of shooting now going on. Why pass a law just for the sake of having another one to add to the voluminous accumulation of laws we now have?

If a gun control law would once and for all eliminate, or at least curb, shooting crimes, we'd support it to the hilt. But all it will do is serve as an imposition to law-abiding citizens. It wouldn't mean a thing to those persons with criminal intents. A gun-control law is merely a great revenue grabber for politicians, if they were honest enough to admit it. This is their main purpose in going gung-ho on such a bill—not the safety and welfare of their constituents. They know it can't possibly help them.

Take the proposed bill apart. First of all, it makes it illegal to sell firearms to those under 18. This is fine, but we know of no dealer who sells to minors now. Further, there is no reason why a doting parent or relative cannot give the minor a cherished rifle as a gift. Another possibility is using a father's hunting rifle—or even stealing. None of these methods can be dealt with simply by saying dealers must not sell to minors.

Let's take a look at the persons it will affect. Hunters and those purchasing guns for logical reasons will register them without pressure. Others who already have guns in their possession will conveniently ignore any new ruling. But let's assume a young man enters a store to purchase a gun. He has an excellent background with very impressive credentials. He is sold the gun and he gets it registered. Does this guarantee he will never use it against his fellow man?

A classic example was the Whitman case in Austin, Tex. Here was a man who was an Eagle Scout, a scoutmaster, a bright student, a popular and respected young man in the town. Who would not have sold him a gun? And at the time he purchased it, he was conscientious enough to get it licensed. But it didn't stop him from going berserk and shooting down some 14 persons from the loft of his university.

There is an area case of a man who purchased a gun for protection, had it registered at his police station then went home and killed several members of his family, including himself. He made it "legal." What could a gun-control law have done to prevent this homicide-suicide?

Is a gun necessary to the completion of a homicidal act, either premeditated or impulsive? The murder of eight nurses is considered to be the crime of the century by criminologists. Yet here is a man who apparently murdered eight girls, one after another in assembly line fashion, and shot nary a bullet. He used only his hands and a knife.

The airlines employee accosted and murdered in the loop was not shot. She was stabbed to death. Are we going to have knives registered, too? If a man is bent on homicide, he will find a way and no gun control bill is going to prevent him. If anything, it would probably prove an incentive.

Horrifying as some of these shooting crimes are, they don't even come in a good second to the crimes on the highway where our teens are slaughtered in their speeding hot-rods. But where is the politician who dares introduce a bill to up the age limit for driving? Parents would scream at the discrimination toward their children as they continue to turn over the family car with tongue in cheek and prayer on lip.

Of course, some teens are very mature and prove to be good drivers. It isn't fair to take the faults of a few out on the majority. But then, don't the same arguments pertain to guns? Aren't we controlling the majority in order to TRY to keep a few trigger-happy souls from spreading terror among all of us?

If we could eliminate some of these crimes, or at least if the courts would make the punishment pretty stiff for those who are caught with unregistered guns, we might change our stand on his position. But you can be sure that when someone is caught shooting indiscriminately at innocent people, they will merely be chastised, given a slap on the wrist, and put "on probation."

So what's the use? Why pass laws that sound good but actually do nothing?

Until the policeman's efforts are not belittled and rendered fruitless, until our courts stop coddling and protecting the devious among us, until punks are not given the space in newspapers that is usually reserved for heroes, we're stuck with more and more crime in the streets and there isn't a gun control law anywhere that will prevent it.

Sergeant Kane, Father of Five, Killed in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE D. LONG
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 15, 1967

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, S. Sgt. Charles W. Kane, of Baltimore, a 30-year-old father of five, was recently killed in Vietnam when his tank was blown up by a land mine. I wish to commend the courage of Sergeant Kane and to honor his memory by including the following article in the RECORD:

SERGEANT KANE, FATHER OF FIVE, KILLED IN VIETNAM

A 30-year-old father of five, Staff Sgt. Charles W. Kane of Baltimore, has been killed in action in Vietnam, the Defense Department reported yesterday.

Sergeant Kane, a tank commander, died last Monday night along with his three-man crew when their tank was blown up by a land mine.

Sergeant Kane was a career service man with twelve years to his credit. He enlisted at the age of 18 following some public schooling here and a year's work at Hill and Dale's shoe factory in the 2400 block Eastern avenue.

He completed his education while in the Army and less than two years ago received his college diploma, his brother-in-law, Robert Wright, said last night.

Sergeant Kane had been in Vietnam for ten months. He shipped out late last summer with the Eleventh Cavalry Division from Fort George G. Meade, Mr. Wright said.

Before that, he had spent several years in Germany and Panama and had served 1½ years in Korea.

He was seriously wounded last November 16 when hit by mortar fire in his right arm and right side. At that time he was hospitalized for six weeks.

BACK IN ACTION

Subsequently he was awarded the Purple Heart, but he was "sent right back to the front lines the day he got out of the hospital," Mr. Wright said.

"Why does a man get put back on the front lines the day after he gets out of the hospital? I'd like to know the answer to that," he added.

Sergeant Kane's survivors include his wife, Mrs. Olivia Kane, of the 3400 block Noble street, and five children, Lena, Eva and Theresa and Charles, Jr., and Edward, a 6-months-old boy whom his father had never seen.

Also surviving are two sisters, Mrs. Mary Katherine Wright and Miss Mary Barbara Kane, of Baltimore and four brothers, Joseph, John and Lawrence, of Baltimore, and George, who is with the Air Force, stationed in New Mexico.

Balkan States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 15, 1967

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. Speaker, 27 years ago today, the Soviet Union, led by Joseph Stalin, initiated the infamous occupation of the free countries of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania.

It is altogether fitting that on the anniversary of this disheartening event, we express our deepest sympathy to these enslaved peoples and express our sincere hope that in the near future these Balkan States will regain their self-determination.

This crime of Russian imperialism was not so much an aggressive act between nations, but more an international crime—a crime against humanity. The illegal occupation and reign of terror was directly contrary to treaties between the Soviet Union and the Baltic States. Furthermore, it was completely against the moral and political basis our great country was founded on, and the principles of freedom and sovereignty our Nation is supporting around the globe. If we can urge the nations of Africa to develop as democratic nations, if we can spend millions of dollars to support democracies in South America, if we can actively participate in an armed conflict on the continent of Asia to preserve the sovereignty of countries there, then certainly we must continue to aid and nourish the flame of freedom that still burns among the proud peoples of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania.

Even after Stalin's horrible answer to the Baltic problem—the mass deportation and execution of hundreds of thousands of people—the desire for the democratic way of life is very much alive. Although there has not been a free election there since before 1940, although all religious and political leaders thought to be dangerous to the Soviet regime have either mysteriously disappeared or been deported to Siberia, the Balkan peoples, both those in their native countries and those displaced around the world, still fervently cling to the hope of freedom and the promise of democracy for Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania.

We can do no less than pledge our full support.

VISTA'S Popularity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. J. PICKLE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 15, 1967

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, recently my hometown newspaper, the Austin Statesman, carried an interesting article regarding the appeal to students of this Nation's VISTA program.

The report, an Associated Press dispatch, reveals that a survey shows nearly 4 million students in this country are interested in signing on as volunteers in this most worthwhile program.

Personally, I am pleased at this strong approval of the program, and I believe it is indicative of the spirit that surrounds VISTA's activities.

At this point, I commend to my colleagues the substance of the survey as reported in the following article:

VISTA APPEALS TO STUDENTS

WASHINGTON.—College students are pictured as beatniks, peaceniks and Vietniks whose main interests are sit-ins, be-ins and love-ins. But a nationwide survey indicates a majority of them want to serve society through volunteer organizations.

A poll conducted by the Gallup Organization, Inc., indicates more than half of the 6.5 million college students in the United States show an interest in serving as volunteers to live and work among the poor in urban or rural depressed areas on either a fulltime or parttime basis.

And it shows more than 67 percent of the students favor creation of a national service corps in which all 16-year-old boys and girls would be tested and registered under the Selective Service System, as proposed in March by Sargent Shriver, head of the Office of Economic Opportunity—OEO.

"The results of the survey are very encouraging to us," Bill Crook, director of Volunteers in Service to America—VISTA—said in an interview Sunday after the survey was released by the OEO.

"It is something we have believed for some time but this is a scientific survey which confirms our views in black and white.

"It shows that the younger generation is a 'committed generation' and that young people reject the extremists," he said. "This is a here-and-now generation.' We no longer can continue to baby or try to buy off the younger generation. They want to get involved."

The Gallup Organization Inc., a marketing and attitude research firm, interviewed 1,098 students on 60 college campuses between April 14 and April 28. The over-all objective of the study was to measure current attitudes of the students toward VISTA.

Among the survey's findings:

—53 per cent of those interviewed expressed an interest in working in the VISTA program, either on a fulltime or parttime basis.

—College women—71.1 per cent—are more interested in serving in VISTA than men—41 per cent.

—Of the 53 per cent expressing an interest, 52 per cent preferred the 10-week VISTA Associates summer program.

—One in four expressed an interest in working on a parttime basis during the college year, and 18 per cent are interested in the normal one-year VISTA volunteer program.

—Nearly eight students in every 10 said they would consider giving some of their time as unpaid volunteers while in college.

"The survey shows that VISTA is moving in the right direction with its associates and citizens corps programs," said Crook.

Under the associates program, some 2,400 college juniors will work in poverty areas this summer. The program began last year with 500 paid volunteers working in Appalachia.

VISTA expects to have 30,000 persons working as unpaid volunteers in the citizens corps by the end of the current fiscal year, June 30. These people work with trained VISTA volunteers.

National Waterway Expert Answers Reader's Digest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 1967

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I have here a letter Everett T. Winter, consultant and former executive vice president of the Mississippi Valley Association, wrote the Reader's Digest following their slanted, inaccurate article on the Lake Erie-Ohio River Canal.

Mr. Winter, who draws on the knowledge he has accumulated after 22 years of distinguished service to an organization often referred to as "America's Voice in Water Resource Development," exposes the Digest article for what it is: an unfair, highly opinionated attempt to slander one of the most respected Members of this body, the Honorable MIKE KIRWAN.

Mr. Winter, certainly well qualified to speak on water development, does an excellent job of refuting the Digest article, and strips away point after point in this effort to discredit a great American and a sound project.

Since I doubt that this letter will ever be seen in print in the Reader's Digest, I insert it in the RECORD at this point so that we can all see what one of the Nation's leading experts in the field of water development knows about the Lake Erie-Ohio River Canal.

The letter follows:

MISSISSIPPI VALLEY ASSOCIATION,
St. Louis, Mo., June 2, 1967.

The EDITOR,
The Reader's Digest,
Pleasantville, N.Y.

DEAR SIR: "Indefensible from any standpoint, this billion-dollar boondoggle is one of the most brazen pork-barrel projects ever foisted on American taxpayers", the subheading on the William Schulz' "Mike Kirwan's Big Ditch" article in your June issue is the most indefensible story I have ever read in the Reader's Digest.

The Mississippi Valley Association was organized in 1919 and during the years following has strongly advocated the full development and the proper use of the soil and water resources of the United States. No one industry contributes more than seven percent of the organization's budget and about every industry and profession in the country is represented in the membership. The Association has never endorsed a boondoggle.

The Association endorsed the Lake Erie-Ohio River Canal as a great benefit to the economy of the Nation as far back as 1920. It is of great importance to Cincinnati, St. Louis, Pittsburgh, Memphis, New Orleans and many other communities. It is a part of a long planned national transportation system. Had it not been for the misguided opposition (mostly the railroads) this project would have long since been built and paid for at a cost much lower than the present price tag. We, the taxpayers, were entitled to this project years ago and at a much lower cost.

We are grateful to Mr. Kirwan and many other members of Congress who are and have been advocates of the multiple purpose concept of water resource development in America. This concept includes the development of our water resources for flood control, pollution abatement, stream stabilization, irrigation, recreation, incidental hydroelectric power as well as navigation. We believe that our tax money invested in sound water resource projects is one of the soundest investments the Federal Government can make.

During the recent hearings before the Senate and House Committees on Appropriations about 1600 witnesses appeared asking for money to make their local projects a part of the National program for the full development and proper use of our water resources.

These projects have been most carefully studied by the conservative Corps of Army Engineers using very restrictive criteria laid out by the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. Schulz' statement that the railroads "are fighting for their economic lives" is pure bunk. The most prosperous railroads in America are those that parallel a navigable river. Inland waterways move heavy bulk commodities to manufacturers along a navigable river at a low rate per ton and the rails and trucks carry those manufactured products to the consumers at a much higher rate.

In spite of Mr. Schulz' diatribe, in spite of nit picking by unknown college professors and others with selfish interests my experience of nearly a quarter of a century within a water resource development organization with members in forty-eight states, leads me to believe that we will always find in Congress enough sound thinking members—like Mike Kirwan—who will continue to invest the taxpayers money in sound water resource development projects.

Sincerely yours,
EVERETT T. WINTER,
Consultant and Former Executive Vice President.

There Must Be Some Action on District Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 1967

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my support for Reorganization Plan No. 3 which will provide a better government now for the District of Columbia. I would particularly like to join with my colleagues on the District Committee from both sides of the aisle who have already announced their favorable views on the plan. I believe the plan proposes a significant opportunity to improve the effectiveness of the District of Columbia government.

It seems to me perfectly proper that this needed change of government structure is proposed as a reorganization plan. This action is being taken under the authority of the Reorganization Act of 1949, which is, after all, an act passed by the Congress. Indeed, it is an authority which has been extended by the Congress several times since its original passage. This act itself directs the presentation of plans in order to speed up the process of administrative change. The plan does not restrict the prerogatives of the substantive committees of Congress since they are perfectly free to propose separate legislation bearing directly on the substance of the plan. Thus, the District Committee, now knowing the details of the plan, can report legislation affecting any or all sections of it. Under these conditions, I believe an appropriate course of action has been taken.

Turning now to the substance of the plan, I believe that Washington can no longer afford the inefficiency and ineffectiveness inherent in a commission form of government. As a member of the District Committee, I have closely observed the efforts of the District Commissioners to improve the quality of the government offered to its citizens. Recently, the District Committee took a most important step forward in supporting these efforts when it sponsored a bill to significantly increase the amount of Federal funding available to the District. These additional resources are necessary in the battle against urban problems being waged by Washington and other large cities throughout the Nation. To make headway against these obstacles—housing, unemployment, air pollution—requires marshaling the highest degree of financial resources of which we are capable.

Money alone, however, is not sufficient to achieve our goals. Efficient administration is equally important if funds are not to be wasted and dissipated. It is because of the urgent need for effective administration that I fully support Reorganization Plan No. 3.

As you know, the District Commissioners have divided among themselves responsibility for the District's departments and agencies, with each Commissioner responsible for certain areas. Yet, today's urban problems do not fit into rigid compartments. The crime problem, for example, with which we are all increasingly concerned, reaches out into areas such as employment and recreation, far beyond that of strictly the police department. Yet, in the District no Commissioner can be charged with responsibility for the overall crime reduction program because each Commissioner has only a part of the responsibility. It is inevitable that under these circumstances there will be overlapping, communication problems, and loss of efficiency.

The reorganization plan calls for a single responsible executive. It will be clear to the Congress and the citizens that this top administrative official will be responsible for all aspects of the fight against crime. He will clearly be in a position to make the necessary plans and decisions to carry through this effort.

I believe that there are a host of other areas, particularly those related to recent programs enacted by the Congress, such as model cities, which require much more effective administration than is now the case. The provisions of the plan which establishes a single Commissioner are vitally needed to insure that efficient administration can complement the increased financial resources which will be provided to the District. For this reason I believe plan No. 3 is urgently needed.

I would now like to turn briefly to the other major aspect of the plan, the creation of a nine-member Council. The nine-member Council will be an important move in bringing the views of the residents of the city to bear on key decisions, particularly as expressed in Council's activities in formulating the budget of the District. The three-man Board of Commissioners is obviously too small and too busy in its other duties to be able to adequately obtain the views of the city's residents. The Council, however, which is to be "broadly representative" of the community, offers a new means for the District to make known their needs and views.

The Council not only serves this vital function of citizen representation, it also is an element in bringing about increasingly efficient administration. Now the Commissioners spend a good deal of their time on rulemaking activities. Such time and effort must come at the expense of administrative effectiveness. Under the plan, the Council will be able to concentrate on quasi-judicial activities. The Commissioner will rightly be concerned with administration of the District's programs. The result will be a gain in effectiveness of both of these areas so vital to the residents of the area.

In conclusion, I believe that Reorganization Plan No. 3 offers a real opportunity to improve government in our Nation's Capital. I believe that such action should be taken at once. As I stated at the outset, if particular changes are desired in the plan, Congress should enact legislation to make such changes. In the meantime, however, let us get on with action for better government. I support the plan.

Soviet Crime Against Baltic Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 1967

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, the period of June 12 to 16 marks the 27th anniversary of the Soviet takeover of the Baltic States of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania. I believe this is a fitting time to review briefly some of the events connected with this blatant disregard of national sovereignty in order to serve as a reminder that the Soviet Union's seizure of these lands is illegal and amounts to nothing more than a de facto occupation.

In the first 12 months of Soviet occupation, more than 60,000 people of all classes and ages were killed or deported, and more than 10,000 were removed in a mass deportation in the night of June 13–14, 1941. After the German attack on Russia, Estonia was occupied and became part of what was referred to as the "Ostland Province." In 1944, the Russians again invaded and occupied all Estonian territory, however, about 30,000 Estonians escaped by sea to Sweden and some 33,000 fled to Germany. Many thousands perished tragically in the Baltic Sea in their haste to flee the oncoming Russian hordes. After the Soviet takeover, thousands of Estonians were deported, particularly those farmers who resisted collectivization.

All of the Soviet conquests and territorial violations of the Baltic nations from 1939 on were synchronized to within an hour of one another. Latvia and Lithuania suffered essentially the same fate as Estonia, and during the first year of Russian occupation, about 35,000 members of the Latvian intelligentsia were deported to Siberia.

Lithuania, too, was occupied by the Soviet Army in June 1940, and following a trumped-up election it was declared a Constituent Republic of the U.S.S.R. On the night of June 14–15, 1941, over 30,000 members of the Lithuanian intelligentsia were deported to Siberia. Counting other deportees and approximately 5,000 political prisoners executed at the time of the hasty pullback of Soviet troops, the country suffered the loss of about 45,000 people during the first Soviet seizure.

The German army entered Lithuania in June 1941, and shortly thereafter a German program of colonization began and during their period of occupation the Germans executed almost all of the Lithuanian Jewish population.

This brief recital of the patently illegal acts in opposition to the sovereignty of the Baltic nations should serve as a glowing reminder that we must redouble our efforts to keep alive the dream of eventual freedom which their citizens so dearly cherish. In addition to the outrages already specified, it has been estimated that during the last 27 years the Baltic countries have lost more than one-fourth of their entire populations. Hundreds of thousands of Lithuanians, Latvians, and Estonians were murdered or died in Soviet slave-labor camps and prisons in Siberia and elsewhere in Russia. At least twenty percent of the present population of Soviet-occupied Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia are Soviet colonists.

In his scholarly biography "Stalin's Russia," Francis B. Randall indicates that the distinguishing feature of Stalin's personality was his paranoia. We may fervently hope that the present leadership of Russia does not suffer from any such disability, and that they will come to realize that no people can long be denied their freedom. By accepting this basic reality, the Soviet Union will contribute greatly to their own stability and prosperity, as well as that of the world community. The time has come for the Soviet Union to correct the crime it committed against the Baltic nations 27 years ago.

Hung Court

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 1967

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, I have read with interest an article appearing in the Washington Post on Thursday, June 15, 1967, by Mr. Joseph Kraft entitled "Hung Court." He points out what has been happening in the Supreme Court of the United States recently. It is a real indictment of a majority of the members of the Court. I believe in all sincerity that the indictment is justified. The Court apparently is determined to foist upon our people the political and social philosophy of a majority of the members of the Court. Apparently they have no intention of interpreting the law but are hellbent on making laws. I know of no criticism of the President's latest appointment to the Court except that the new appointee will undoubtedly follow along the course now being taken by the majority of the members of the present Supreme Court. In few words, he will be part of the establishment and continue the present course in making law rather than interpreting the law. This fact is commented on cogently by Mr. Kraft. I just wished we could hope for a different philosophy from the new appointee. The Court has already shackled our police, contributed immensely to lawlessness, encouraged criminals, and rendered decisions causing confusion rather than clarity as to the law of the land and under present conditions I see no hope for a change for the better in the makeup of the Court.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the article by Mr. Kraft:

HUNG COURT

The appointment of Thurgood Marshall to the Supreme Court is an unhappily fit climax to a term that has shown the Court to be hung up on outworn liberal and moralistic doctrines of the past.

Mr. Marshall may not be a bad Justice. By all accounts, he has generous sympathies, common sense and a feel for the political issues that bulk so largely in the work of the Court. But Mr. Marshall will not bring to the Court penetrating analysis or distinction of mind.

Beyond any doubt, Mr. Marshall was appointed because he is a Negro; not just any Negro, not even the best qualified Negro. He was appointed because he is a Negro well known to the Negro community for action on behalf of Negro causes. He was appointed, in other words, on the outmoded principle of ethnic representation, and for years to come his seat on the Court will probably be a Negro seat.

Perhaps that is the price for generations of unfair treatment that find current expression in the case of Adam Clayton Powell and the wave of racial rioting. But it is not, at this particular time, as small a price as it may seem.

For the Supreme Court has recently suffered grievously from a shortage of penetrating analytic minds. More and more it has seemed to be ruled not so much by the internal logic of cases as by a desire to reach results in line with a sample good guys versus bad guys morality.

In the rare cases that present themselves in such simple terms, the Court speaks out with clarity and sweep. A good example is the ringing 9-to-0 decision last Monday that found "no doubt" that a state law against interracial marriage "violates the central principle" of the Constitution.

But most cases involve far more sophisticated issues. And here the Court has frequently followed its emotional bent to dubious results, often speaking with divided tongue and in obscure tone.

In the field of criminal procedure, the Court has been hung up between those who want a Mr. Clean image for the law and those who believe the police must be given sharper tools to do their work. In that vein, last Monday, by a curiously indecisive 5-4 ruling, the Court declared unconstitutional a New York statute that permitted court-authorized eavesdropping on suspected criminals.

The majority opinion by retiring Justice Tom Clark obviously left room for some kind of statute authorizing bugging. But at the same time it declared, in the best liberal rhetoric, that: "few threats to liberty exist which are greater than that posed by the use of eavesdropping devices."

In the field of libel, the Court has been divided on the claims of the right of privacy as against the freedom of the press. In that spirit last week it settled, by 5-to-4 votes with Chief Justice Warren as the swing man, two libel cases in exactly opposite directions.

Wallace Butts, the former Georgia football coach, was awarded a judgment against the publishers of the Saturday Evening Post. But Maj. Gen. Edwin Walker, the retired right-wing officer was denied a judgment against the Associated Press.

The ostensible distinction was the difference between a wire service and a magazine—a matter on which the Court has no special competence. It is very hard not to believe that the football coach, a good guy, prevailed over the right-wing General who would be, in the eyes of Chief Justice Warren, a bad guy.

Similar patterns of unresolved claims of principle eventually being decided on a good guy versus bad guy basis croped up last Monday in decisions concerning civil rights and antitrust. In the civil rights field, the Court, by a 5-to-4 majority seemingly rooted in dislike of "Black Power" techniques, approved a 5-day jail sentence meted out to Martin Luther King in Birmingham, Ala.

As to antitrust, in the Schwinn bicycle case, the Court appeared to hand down a ruling that moved two ways at once. It forbids big manufacturers to police the selling arrangements of their dealers. But it seems to authorize smaller manufacturers to prevent their selling agents from passing on products to the big discount houses.

To me anyway, this thicket of contradictions announces the need for a new rationale in the Supreme Court. But for that, the Court will have to wait at least until the President's next appointment.

Twin Trips to Venus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 1967

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, a remarkable event is taking place. American and Russian spacecraft are en route to possible discovery of new information about the planet, Venus. It is this same planet, Venus, which has given rise to mythology and legend and played such an important role in our literature. It may now potentially contribute to our science and technology.

The only jarring note in this venture is the attitude of those who view the dual-nation attempt as a race or competition and detract from the potential beneficial ends. Let us look forward to the day when such an effort may be truly a joint venture—in the fullest sense of that word—when international human and technical resources may be joined in even a finer and greater effort and contribute not only to science but also to the nations' efforts to live together in peace.

It was interesting to see this view expressed in the New York Times editorial today, June 15. The editorial also addresses another issue which is of some importance in assessing the question of future national goals in space. This is the insistance by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration that manned space flight is its most immediate and pressing program need. In the view of the New York Times editorial:

> One of the worst errors in this country's space program has been the stinting of funds for planetary probes in favor of excessive generosity to the more spectacular effort to land a man on the moon . . . the instrumented exploration of the solar system—which is comparatively cheap and involves no dangers to astronauts—deserves far more funds.

I think this view, which is widely held in the scientific community, is worthy of serious consideration. I commend this very sensible editorial to the attention of my colleagues:

[From the New York Times, June 15, 1967]

TWIN TRIPS TO VENUS

American and Soviet rockets are streaking across the enormous 200-million mile course to Venus, the brightest of the twinkling lights in the sky but there is no need to regard these missions as a race. Rational men will be cheering, of course, for both Moscow's Venus 4 and Washington's Mariner 5 to be successful.

Seen through even the most powerful optical telescope, Venus is merely a cloud-shrouded enigma. Considerations of national prestige are infinitesimal compared to the scientific importance of the new knowledge that both or either of these bold probes may yield.

Except for the moon, the planets are earth's nearest major neighbors in space. Yet they are sufficiently distant so that science is still abysmally ignorant about many of their important features. In this situation unmanned rockets carrying television cameras, radiation detectors and other instruments hold the promise of a historic new chapter in man's study of the solar system. The potentialities have already been made vivid by two of this country's most brilliant space research achievements: the 1962 measurement of Venus' temperature by Mariner 2 and the valuable close-up photographs of Mars taken by Mariner 4 in 1965.

One of the worst errors in this country's space program has been the stinting of funds for planetary probes in favor of excessive generosity to the more spectacular effort to land a man on the moon. Moscow has had a better balance in its expenditures, though bad luck has prevented it from gaining any major success comparable to the Mariner feats.

In the future, however, the instrumented exploration of the solar system—which is comparatively cheap and involves no dangers to astronauts—deserves far more funds. The beginnings made toward unraveling the secrets of Venus and Mars must be expanded, while other rockets must blast off headed toward those more distant neighbors: Mercury, Jupiter, Saturn, Neptune, Uranus and Pluto.

The Arab-Fascist Alliance in World War II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 1967

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, with the news of the Middle East being an intricate part of our daily lives, it is interesting to review the position of the Arab nations during the Second World War. It helps us to properly evaluate their conduct since then, as well as the motivation for their continued false and evil propaganda.

Meir Kahane has written a detailed analysis of the Arab-Fascist alliance before and during World War II.

I commend to the attention of our colleagues this most informative article which appeared in the June 2, 1967, edition of the Jewish Press.

The article follows:

THE ARAB-FASCIST ALLIANCE IN WORLD WAR II—PREWAR LINKS WITH THE AXIS

(By Meir Kahane)

That during the war there was a period of Arab collaboration with the Axis is generally, if vaguely, known. Yet—whatever the reason may be—most recent discussions of the Middle East omit or slur over that "unfortunate" period. Arab spokesmen have apparently come to believe that the true facts of Arab pro-Nazi activity have been forgotten. They are now actually claiming rewards for the help which they say the Arabs gave the democracies. In the fact of this rather amazing perversion of history, it would seem important to publish a documented account of the Arab war effort—material which otherwise would almost certainly never reach the general public.

No observer of conditions in the Middle East before the war could have denied that animosity towards the British and sympathy with the Axis powers were widespread among the common people of the Arab countries who were not enemy agents in any direct sense. These feelings permeated the majority of the population, while the leaders often cooperated directly with the Axis. Fascists and Nazi ideologies were not so much imitated as paralleled in the Arab world; they fitted into modes of thought already in being and were taken up by existing political clubs and associations. This leaning towards Fascism was strengthened by the "appeasement" policy practiced by the British in the Middle East even before Munich. British colonial officials seemed to believe that it was necessary to make every effort to win over dangerous and extremist elements among the Arabs: those moderate Arab leaders among whom were some real democrats (the late Dr. Shahbander of Damascus, for instance) could be safely ignored, since they presented no threat to British interests. Hence most of the money spent by the British with a view to gaining Arab sympathy went into the pockets of a few uncompromising extremist leaders, for the most part of Fascist tendencies. Little was done to gain the sympathy of the masses through improvement of health, education, housing, and it was only natural that the masses should come to believe in the infallibility and power of those extremist leaders whose favor the British were currying.

After the war began, the unpolitical masses were impressed by the propaganda promises and the military successes of the Germans, and they long remained convinced of the ultimate victory of the Axis Powers. The attempts Britain had made to meet what were considered legitimate Arab political demands were interpreted as symptoms of fatal weakness; and British propaganda on Nazi brutality only served to confirm Arab belief in Germany's strength and the wisdom of being on her side. Thus, even the few pro-British Arab leader's felt obliged to conceal their opinions and to pose as anti-British, in order not to forfeit the support of their following.

Significant evidence as to the way the Arab world felt during the war has been given by an Englishman particularly qualified to speak, Club Pasha, Commander of the Transjordan Arab Legion. He wrote, discussing the Iraqi revolt of 1941:

> The British of course always knew we were going to win the war, but at the time of these operations every Arab was perfectly convinced that Britain was finished for ever, and that it could only be a question of weeks before Germany took over Arabia. The Iraqis were perfectly sure of this or they would not have declared war on us . . .
>
> In brief, during the six weeks before the fall of Baghdad, every Arab was convinced that we were done for. Every Arab force previously organized by us mutinied and refused to fight for us, or faded away in desertions. The men of the Arab Legion alone not only stood firmly by us, but played a most active, energetic and valuable part in our little campaign.

Egypt, Saudi Arabia, Syria and the Lebanon did not declare war on Germany until February 1945, when the end of hostilities was imminent and victory had become absolutely certain. These declarations of war at the eleventh hour were merely formal, since none of these states took any direct part in military operations. The declarations were obviously aimed at securing seats in the United Organization in the establishment of which at San Francisco only those nations were permitted to participate which had declared war on the Axis before March 1, 1945.

One Arab principality did declare war on Germany as early as 1939. It was Transjordan which was under British mandatory rule and was not independent, having to rely mainly, as it still does, on grants-in-aid from the British Government, which also maintains the country's military force, the Arab Legion. Iraq declared war in January 1943, after the reversal of the fortunes of war at Al-Alamein had proved definite. This declaration was clearly motivated by the need to atone for the stab in the back Iraq had given the Allied cause in 1941.

The general attitude of the Arab States was a reflection of the long-standing relationship between certain Arab circles and the Axis Powers. The trips by Arab students to Germany and Italy, the visits of German politicians and agents to the Arab East, the flow to Arab countries of money and of Arabic newspapers and magazines from Germany and Italy, the propaganda broadcasts in Arabic by the radio stations of the Axis—all these activities had over the years created the state of affairs which was exploited during the war. In the case of Palestine, it is by now generally acknowledged that the Arab Riots of 1936–1939 were stimulated and subsidized by Nazi and Fascist sources. The Mufti of Jerusalem through his agent in Geneva, Emir Shekib Arslan, was in contact with Mussolini years before the war. Some of their intercepted correspondence was published as early as 1935 in Arab papers opposed to the Mufti.

In Syria and the Lebanon connections between certain groups of Syrian leaders and the Axis States were of long standing. There were a number of strong pre-war Arab-Nazi organizations—the Iron Shirts (led by Fakhri al-Barudi of the National Bloc, member of the Syrian Parliament to this day); the League for National Action (headed by Abu-al-Huda al-Yafi, Dr. Zaki al-Jabi and others); the An-Nadi al-Arabi Club of Damascus (headed by Dr. Said Abd al-Fattah al-Imam); the Councils for the Defense of Arab Palestine (headed by well-known pro-Nazi leaders, such as Nabih al-Azma, Adil Arslan and others); the Syrian Popular Party (led by the Fascist Anton Saade, who escaped during the war to the Germans and sent by them to the Argentine). The National Bloc, the principal party in Syria, and more particularly the Istiqlal group (headed by Shukri al-Kuwatli, now President of the Syrian Republic) had for many years been openly pro-Nazi.

Before the war Baldur von Schirach, leader of the Hitler Jugend, visited Syria on a special mission and established close contact with these circles, particularly the An-Nadi al-Arabi Club, and with the Arab youth organizations.

In Iraq, xenophobia has long been characteristic of the political mentality of the country's leaders, and even the so-called pro-British group is not entirely free of it. The Army plays an important part both in domestic and foreign policy, and it was entirely pro-Nazi before the war. In Iraq, as in Syria, there were a number of pro-Nazi clubs and associations which were in contact with the German Ambassador, Dr. Grobba. Among them may be mentioned the Al-Muthanna Club, founded by Dr. Amin Ruweiha, Said Thabit and others, and the Al-Futuwa Club, which sent delegates to the Nuremberg rallies. In the early part of the war, Iraqi politicians had relations with the German ambassadors in Baghdad and Ankara. Von Papen's top contact man with Middle Eastern Arab circles was the well-known Iraqi politician, Naji Shawkat.

At the beginning of the war there were a considerable number of political emigres in Iraq; most of them had come from Palestine, were violently anti-British and had close connections with the Germans. These included Haj Amin al-Husseini, Munif al-Husseini, Daud al-Husseini, Is'haq as-Salah al-Husseini, Amin Tamimi, Hasan Abu Saud, Fawzi Qauqji, Izz-ad-Din ash-Shawa, Is'haq Darwish, Dr. Amin Ruweiha, Salim Abd ur-Rahman, Darwish Maqdadi and many others. With the help of the Iraqi Government, some of them had become civil servants and teachers in Iraq, and were thus in a position to propagate their doctrines among the masses of the people.

Haj Amin al-Husseini, ex-Mufti of Jerusalem, was the central figure in the group. He had come to Iraq from Syria in mid-October 1939. Nuri Said, then Prime Minister of Iraq, received him with the state pomp and ceremony usually accorded a visiting hero. On October 22nd Nuri Said gave an official banquet in his honor, attended by members of the Cabinet, the Presidents of the House of Representatives and the Senate, Rashid Ali el-Kailani, and many other notables. This was the first of a series of similar receptions and celebrations, attended among others, by Taha el Hashimi, Minister of Defense, and Ali Jawdat el Ayyubi, at present Iraqi Minister to Washington.

The hospitality of the Iraqi Government did not end with these banquets. The ex-Mufti was voted £18,000 by the Iraqi Parliment and was further paid the sum of £1,000 a month out of the Iraqi Secret Service Funds in addition to the 2% attached at source from the salary of every Iraqi Government official, including the military and the police. Over and above these official grants, the Iraqi public responded to the appeals of the Red Crescent Society and the Palestine Defense Society by contributing considerable amounts in order that Haj Amim and his retinue might live in the lavish style to which they had been accustomed.

Haj Amin set out at once on a working program. His first move was to organize into an efficient and active pressure group the Palestinian refugees and Syrian reactionaries who crowded around him. He made his first inroads into the Iraqi Government by engineering into office his own Palestinian and Syrian followers. At the same time Haj Amin extended his influence to certain Iraqi nationalist organizations (some of which already enjoyed German support and money). Fascist in character, they were willing victims of his intrigue.

Immediately upon his arrivel in Iraq Haj Amin bent his efforts toward renewing and strengthening his contacts with the Axis agents. Authoritative sources report that he was paid £60,000 by the Germans and £40,000 by the Italians.

As later events proved, far and away the most important of the ex-Mufti's associations in Iraq, however, was with Rashid Ali el Kailani and the four commanding officers of the Iraqi Army—known as the "Golden Square." These officers now began to interfere quite openly in Government politics and make no secret of their anti-British pro-Axis bias. Their sentiments were soon shared by the majority of Army officers and official military opinion held that a German victory was inevitable. Increasingly convinced that Nuri Said's British associations would irrevocably compromise Iraq when the Axis finally emerged triumphant, this group forced Nuri Said to resign and on March 31 made Rashid Ali el Kailani Prime Minister.

This maneuver was the first open step in Iraq's active participation on the side of the Axis. Immediately the reins of Government were in their hands, the rebellion started. The revolt against the British was launched in April 1941.

THE IRAQI REVOLT

Up to the time of the Iraqi revolt the general line of the Arab governments had been the cautious one of avoiding any definite step which might involve commitment to the Allies or cause offense to the enemy, as long as the issue was in the balance.

At the beginning of hostilities, the Arab States did break off diplomatic relations with Germany. When, after attacking France, Italy entered the war on what seemed clearly the winning side, they were by no means eager to break off diplomatic relations with her. In the early years of the war, the Italian embassies and consulates in Cairo, Baghdad and other cities became centers of anti-British espionage and intrigue, and most Arab Governments connived at the activities of Italian diplomats and their Arab agents, despite repeated British protests.

The Iraqi revolt came when the outcome of the war seemed certain. In the spring of 1941 Britain's fortunes were at their lowest ebb. Neither Russia nor the United States had yet entered the war. The full fury of the Axis was directed against Britain. The British armies had just been driven out of Greece. In Syria the Vichy regime worked hand in glove with the Italo-German Armistice Commission, preparing footholds there for the German armies. In the Western Desert the Axis forces were already on the move. General Glubb's observations as to Arab confidence in an Axis victory, have already been quoted. The Iraqis, as he said, were perfectly sure of it when they rose against England.

The revolt had of course been planned as an integral part of German strategy. Had the Iraqi succeeded in attaching Iraq to the Axis orbit, the Allies would not only have lost their chief source of oil—Iraq and Iran—but even more crucial results would have come about. Hitler would have split the British Empire in two. The Western half would have been cut off from its source of raw materials (India), while the Eastern half, with its armies in the field would have been isolated and without supplies. Hitler might thus, at that time, have succeeded in beating each half separately. The Germans would have pushed for an immediate juncture with Japanese forces who had already started the Indian Subhas Bose revolt. The Russians could ultimately have been outflanked by an invasion from Iraq to the Caucaus. Alamein and Stalingrad would have been Axis victories.

It was indeed a critical moment that the Iraqi rebels, prodded and aided by the ex-Mufti of Jerusalem, chose for their uprising. For two months the fight hung in the balance. British troops were rushed to Basra from India. A column left Palestine and moved by forced march across the desert into Baghdad. For the rebels, German and Italian airplanes, refueling in Syria, were thrown into the fight. Trainloads of French arms were shipped to Iraq by General Dentz, Vichy High Commissioner in Syria and the Lebanon, upon instructions from the Italo-German Commission. At the call of Haj Amin and the Iraqi military, subversive elements throughout the Middle East were touched off into activity. (See story: Summons to a Holy War Against Britain elsewhere in this article).

Looking back, one sees that it was by sheer miracle, by the courage of the British columns converging on Baghdad, but most of all by the heroic Greek and British resistance in Greece and Crete—resistance which held until May 20, 1941, thus preventing the Germans from transporting reinforcements of men and material to Iraq—that the Iraqi revolt was quelled. ("The significance of all this was not of course, lost on General Smuts. Speaking at Bloemfontein, two years later, of this turning point in the war, when Hitler planned to strike at Russia through Syria and Iraq in 1941, concurrently with his attack from the west, he said, 'Who prevented this? Greece. Those precious six weeks altered the history of the world. They gave us time to get hold of Syria and save Iraq from rebellion'.")

In their impatience the rebels had struck just a bit prematurely. Without large-scale Nazi aid Iraq's army proved no match for two small British columns.

The Kailani coup d'etat was not, as is sometimes thought, the work of a small group of officers and politicians. A collection of documents published in Iraq under the name *Al-Wathba* shows that the leaders had the cooperation of officials, heads of tribes, workers and Beduin. The heads of the Moslem faith in Iraq. Sunnites and Shi'ites alike, called upon the faithful to take part in the rising and destroy the British, Muhammad al-Khatib, Director of the Supreme Moslem Theological Seminary in Karbala, published a fatwa on the duty of the Iraqi people to join in the fighting. The Chief Preacher of Baghdad addressed an urgent appeal to the Moslem world for assistance. Many others of the Moslem clergy did the same. The few Iraqi politicians who were opposed to the coup and the pro-Nazi regime had to flee. Under Kashid Ali, diplomatic and *de facto* relations with Germany were resumed. A treaty was signed giving Germany rights to the oil of Mosul, and the use of the railways and airdromes. In return Germany undertook to provide military help. Haj amin al-Husseini's letter to Hitler on the preparation of the revolt, dated January 1941, was later found in Germany.

The rising aroused deep enthusiasm in the Arab world. Outstanding personalities openly expressed sympathy and support. King Faruk of Egypt sent a telegram of congratulations to the rebel Iraqi Regent, Sharif Sharaf, appointed by Kailani after the Reagent Abdul Illah fled. Thus Egypt's official recognition of the insurgent regime was conveyed. In Syria and the Lebanon which which were under Vichy rule, sympathy for the Iraqi rising could be expressed more freely. Hashim Atasi, President of the Syrian Republic from 1936 to 1939 and one of the leaders of the National Bloc, sent congratulations and called upon the Syrians to assist the Iraqis. Messages of encouragement were received from Riad as-Sulh (Lebanese Premier in 1943–44 and member of the Lebanese delegation to U.N. in 1946); from Ihsan al-Jabri, a prominent leader of the National bloc; from the National Party in Aleppo.

Only the fact that the Kailani regime was short-lived prevented the Arabs of other countries from sending concrete assistance. Such assistance was prepared, and to a slight extent funds and arms were actually sent. In Syrian towns, committees were set up for the collection of funds, medical aid, and the recruiting of volunteers Students at the American University of Beirut informed the Lebanese Government of their desire to form a fighting unit. Some of the most active workers on behalf of the Iraqi rebels (like Adil Arslan, Nabih al-Azma and others) have recently returned from political exile in Turkey and Germany and are continuing their political activities. The majority have become heads and members of the Syrian and Lebanese Governments: Shukri al-Kuwatli, Riad as-Sulh, Habib abu Shahla, Emile Lahud, Sabri al-Asali, and Farid Zayn ad-Din.

SUMMONS TO A HOLY WAR AGAINST BRITAIN

(A "Fatwa" Issued by Haj Amin al-Husseini, May 1941)

In the name of Merciful and Almighty God.

I invited all my Moslem brothers throughout the whole world to join in the Holy War for God, for the defense of Islam and her lands against her enemy. O Faithful, obey and respond to my call.

O Moslems!

Proud 'Iraq has placed herself in the vanguard of this Holy Struggle, and has thrown herself against the strongest enemy of Islam certain that God will grant her Victory.

The English have tried to seize this Arab-Moslem land, but she has risen, full of dignity and pride to defend her safety, to fight for her honor and to safeguard her integrity. 'Iraq fights the tyranny which has always had as its aim the destruction of Islam in every land. It is the duty of all Moslems to aid 'Iraq in her struggle and to seek every means to fight the enemy, the traditional traitor in every age and every situation.

Whoever knows the history of the East has everywhere seen the hand of the English working to destroy the Ottoman Empire and to divide the Arab countries. British politics toward the Arab people is masked under a veil of Hypocrisy. The minute she sees her chance, England squeezes the prostrate country in her Imperialist grasp, adding futile justifications. She creates discord and division within a country and while feeding it in secret openly she assumes the role of advisor and trusted friend. The time when England could deceive the peoples of the East is passed. The Arab Nation and the Moslem people have awakened to fight British domination. The English have overthrown the Ottoman Empire, have destroyed Moslem rule in India, inciting one community against another; they stifled the Egyptian awakening, the dream of Mohammed Ali, colonizing Egypt for half a century. They took advantage of the weakening of the Ottoman Empire to stretch out their hands and use every sort of trick to take possession of many Arab countries as happened to Aden, the 9 Districts, the Hadramut, Oman, Masqat and the Emirates of the Persian Gulf and Transjordania. The vivid proof of the imperialistic designs of the British is to be found in Moslem. Palestine which, although promised by England to Sheriff Hussein has had to submit to the outrageous infiltration of Jews, shameful poiltics designed to divide Arab-Moslem countries of Asia from those of Africa. In Palestine the English have committed unheard of barbarisms; among others, they have profaned the el-Aqsa Mosque and have declared the most unyielding war against Islam, both in deed and in word. The Prime Minister at that time told Parliament that the world would never see peace as long as the Koran existed. What hatred against Islam is stronger than that which publicly declares the Sacred Koran an enemy of human kind? Should such sacrilege go unpunished? After the dissolution of the Moslem Empire in India and of the Ottoman Caliphate, England, adhering to the policy of Gladstone, pursued her work of destruction to Islam depriving many Islamic States both in the East and in the West of their freedom and independence. The number of Moslems who today live under the rule of England and invoke liberation from their terrible yoke exceeds 220,000,000.

Therefore I invite you, O Brothers, to join in the War for God to preserve Islam, your independence and your lands from English aggression. I invite you to bring all your weight to bear in helping 'Iraq that she may throw off the shame that torments her.

O Heroic 'Iraq, God is with Thee, the Arab Nation and the Moslem World are solidly with Thee in Thy Holy Struggle!

ADDRESS TO AMERICAN ARABS

(Excerpts from a Radio Speech by Haj Amin al-Husseini, March 19, 1943, in Rome)

The Arabs and Moslems will not be deceived by Britain once again because not only have they known its true intentions but they have also known those of Britain's allies—America—and I want to draw the attention of the Arab emigrants in America to this fact, reminding them of their glorious past when they supported the National movement. I would also like to remind them that their efforts will be wasted if, God forbid, America and her Allies may be victorious in this War because at such a time the Arabs will never rise again. I therefore know that those Arab emigrants in America will refrain from helping Roosevelt or taking part in a war which he brought on to his country.

If those Allies win this war the Jewish influence will be the arbiter in the world resources and one can thus imagine the future of the Arabs and Moslems, and the dangers which they are exposed to in their fatherlands and beliefs if the Jews and their

Allies dominate them and spread the latent hatred on to them.

Then the world will become Hell—God forbid: But Allah is too just and merciful to grant such murderous violators any victory. We are sure that victory will be ours and that of our friends. We have not the slightest doubt about that, we shall not slacken our struggle nor will we be deterred or quietened. Do not be deceived by the allegations of your enemies, because you know full well about their intrigues, and be sure that the nation which fights, sacrifices and awaits will be the victories one in the end.

A Strategy for a Livable Environment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1967

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, earlier this week HEW released a most enlightening and well-constructed report, "A Strategy for a Livable Environment." This report outlines many recommendations for immediate action to help eliminate the scourges of the physical environment—air, water, and noise pollution; solid wastes; crowding; radiation; traffic safety; and various other ailments. It is gratifying to note that HEW regards these problems as interrelated and urges an ecological approach in attempting to solve them.

Mr. Speaker, this is essentially the type of approach that I suggested last March in speeches before two California organizations which are very much involved with problems of environmental pollution and decay. I applaud the HEW report and will go into a deeper analysis of various specific points contained therein in the next few days.

.Right now, however, I wish to summarize the report. Briefly, the primary concern of the report included identification of environmental hazards in need of current action and the creation of a system for the formulation of new goals to help combat polluting forces before they have a chance to become too irksome—like air pollution.

Looking at "total man in his total environment, rather than taking a crisis or piecemeal approach to solving problems" is a most beneficial approach and I wholeheartedly concur with the report in that recommendation. It was a recommendation I outlined earlier in the year. The report also indicates the need for developing a sort of early warning system so that we may attack problems before they become too difficult. And the report outlines items which will require new congressional authority, urging the President to transmit to Congress a "single Environmental Protection Act."

It is my fervent expectation that this HEW report will stimulate the continuing dialog on environmental problems and hope that it serves as a catalyst for farsighted congressional action. Additionally, we must strive for increasing voluntary local and State government as well as private corporation in making our environment more livable. As the report states, these problems are not isolated, but rather are all interrelated and, therefore, require an integrated and combined effort by Federal, State, local, and private interests to successfully overcome these problems.

Our thoughts and actions must not be limited to just a few of the most publicized fields: most notably air and water pollution, but rather must incorporate all the polluting and decaying forces at work in our environment.

Mr. Speaker, it is fine to come out with periodic statements that we are against various forms of pollution, but time is getting short, and action, not words, is needed.

I am very hopeful that HEW's goal of coordinating the various current programs in these areas will be effective, and that Congress will support this effort.

To add to the current congressional debate on pollution problems, I am inserting a copy of the speech I gave in March. As I suggested earlier, the following statement closely parallels the theme of a "strategy for a Living Environment." The point of both papers suggests a "strategy" in dealing with environmental problems that will be more successful than the fragmented and often fractious current approach.

I am including my statement at this point so that it may serve as an introduction to further analysis of the HEW report:

CAN MAN SURVIVE HIS ENVIRONMENT?

(Congressman RICHARD T. HANNA's Statement of March 1967)

AND THE LORD SAID

"The Lord God planted man in a garden of delight, to dress it and to tend it" (Genesis 2:15).

Apparently the Bible suggests that God answered the question "Can man survive his environment?" with a qualified yes. The qualification: if man's environment is to be a "garden of delight" he must "dress it and . . . tend it." The circumstances of our present environment vividly shows that the dictim recorded in Genesis has not been heeded.

The question "Can man survive his environment?" is a most ironical one. At first glance, one would ordinarily think I am talking about the rough and raw environment of nature. Not so. Man has demonstrated through the ages that he is able to survive quite nicely as long as nature balanced what man altered. However, for the past fifty years man, through his technology, has more and more become the master of his own environment. The question, rightly interpreted, reads "Can man survive an environment of his own making?" The answer is not an optimistic one.

The layman as well as the expert can easily detect the deteriorated conditions of the present American physical environment. Air and water pollution, increasingly choking solid wastes, crowded traffic, rising decibels of ear-shattering noise, decayed housing, disappearing open spaces and concrete canyons are some of the symptoms that characterize the advanced civilizations of 1967. Our "garden of delight" is now a weed patch of murk.

HISTORICALLY SPEAKING

Western man's present lackadaisical concern over the deterioration of his environment is historically rooted in the industrial revolution and its philosophical categoricals that have permeated men's minds and dominated men's thinking for the past two hundred years. This does not suggest that the industrial revolution has been a total evil. In fact, it has been a mixed blessing. From it, the valuable gift of technology was delivered. Next to language and social organization, technology is the most valuable attribute civilization possesses.

However, the thinking of the age following the industrial revolution can be characterized by its emphasis on economic motives. Smith, Bentham, Mill and others set the stage for specialization, division of labor, and the imperative that if everyone produced for profit all would balance in the final sum.

Concentrating on producing a product that would return a decent profit is an important aspect of our present wealth. This attitude is one of the elements responsible for our Nation's technological progress. Technological ability can often make the difference in the margin of profit.

Problems, however, resulted from this attitude. The single-minded attention to producing a profit did produce a great technology. It also, however, produced social dislocation and labor problems that have not been fully solved to this day. However, and more important, today the productive ability that our technology allowed us to produce has created over a period of time a tremendous number of environmental problems.

The entrepreneur bent on making a better detergent was not asked, according to the thinking of the era, to concern himself with the pollutants his plant dumped into the water, or his chimneys belched into the sky. He was not asked to concern himself with the quantity of his plant's solid wastes, the noise of his machinery, the esthetic effect of the plant on the neighborhood, or the crowded traffic conditions created because his plant was located next to dozens of other plants. All this he did not have to consider, and until just recently did not.

Western man's approach in the era of the industrial revolution has been to concentrate, to divide his labors. The credo ingrained in us is that the off-shoots and by-products of our work are the problems of another specialist. If no one concerns themselves with the by-product, it is unprofitable and unimportant.

One of the by-products in the pursuit of wealth has been the poisoning and deterioration of our environment. It has been a by-product that we have not concerned ourselves with. By not concerning ourselves with any of the ramifications of our technology other than those meant to produce wealth, we find ourselves in the almost farcial condition of an immensely rich Nation whose environment is a horribly unplanned by-product of the technology that produced its treasure.

THE FOUR HORSEMEN

The Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse have haunted man and provide an appropriate analogy for an examination of our neglected environment. For 70% of the American public whose day-to-day activities are within the confines of an urban megalopolis, the modern Four Horsemen are pollution, crowding, noise and deterioration. These are the modern scourges bleeding the vitality of our environment.

The first modern Horseman, pollution, is taking a number of different forms. Air pollution is presently the most dangerous. Americans choke their atmosphere with 300,000 tons of wastes each day. Thousands of deaths each year are directly attributed to the poisonous materials in the air we breathe. It has been estimated that anyone born and raised in the City of New York since the end of World War II has breathed enough poisonous air to be equivalent to smoking nine cigarettes for each day of his life.

The car is increasingly becoming the major source of air pollution. While virtually every major city has serious problems with industrial air pollution, the emissions from the exhausts of an estimated 100 million cars by 1975 will be the overwhelming source of poisonous air.

In Los Angeles, where industrial air pollution is largely being controlled, 12,500 pounds of noxious emissions in the form of nitrogen dioxide, hydrocarbons, ozone, and peroryacyl nitrates are daily pumped into the Southern California atmosphere from the exhausts of 3.75 million area cars.

Water pollution, the President's Environmental Pollution Panel recently warned, is becoming acute. In 1965, Americans discharged into their rivers and streams enough effluents to equal the raw sewage of 50 million people. New York City hourly dumps one million pounds of untreated garbage into the Hudson River. On Lake Erie, six of thirty-two recreational swimming areas had to be closed because of pollution. In the Nation's Capitol you rarely find anyone swimming in the historic Potomac.

Each day Americans dispose of 800 million pounds of solid wastes. Some 1,420 pounds of garbage are collected yearly from each urban American. By 1980, the rate of solid waste disposal will be three times the present rate. Solid waste materials are increasingly becoming the Nation's most serious and costly pollutant. During this year the outlay for refuse collection and disposal will be $1.5 billion. However, even with this huge expenditure, less than half our cities with a population of 2,500 or more dispose of refuse by approved sanitary and nuisance-free methods.

Cesspools, industrial dumps, auto junk yards, open garbage dumps, large stockpiles of residue from stockyards, dairies, poultry and other animal farms, and other depositories of solid wastes, including our air, rivers and streams, strongly suggest a civilization that faces the almost unthinkable reality of suffocating itself in its own garbage. The Boston Herald recently printed the feelings of national frustration by saying that "a society so advanced that it can guide a space shot to the outskirts of Venus . . . still cannot find out what to do with the common day-by-day debris of living."

Air and water pollution, solid waste disposal, pesticide destruction and the myriad other forms of pollution to our environment are becoming increasingly acute despite spotty efforts at solution. Nationally, only in the last four years have we begun to concern ourselves about the effects of environmental pollution. Two air pollution control acts have been passed, a clean rivers bill is now law, in 1968 all new autos will be equipped with smog control devices that have not proven very effective, and a smattering of other local and Federal anti-pollution measures are receiving varying degrees of enforcement. We have not been successful at abating the pollution problem anywhere, let alone reducing it. In each succeeding year, despite what finally appears to be an articulate national concern, the problem of pollution becomes more acute. Our rate of spoilation is faster than our rate of solution.

Understanding the dimension and qualities of the enigma of pollution is our primary challenge. Sadly the total issue is being neglected. We have divided the problem into its many elements: air, water solids, pesticides, etc. and while we are gaining an understanding of each of the elements, no one has understanding of the problem in total. No one has an understanding of how the total problem of pollution relates to the other three modern Horsemen: noise, deterioration, and crowding. No one has a total understanding of how all the problems now existant in our environment relate to one another, effect one another, alter one another, produce one another. Until we understand that the Four Horsemen now permeating our environment must be dealt with as a whole, we will not have the success we seek by dealing with each individually. A new approach in dealing with our environmental problems is needed, and will be mentioned later. For the moment, let us continue with the outlining of the nature of the three modern Horsemen not yet discussed.

I have named the second Horseman of the modern Apocalypse, crowding. Our urban centers, a product of our technology, are analogous to a tight corset—virtually impossible to get into and equally difficult to get out of. Some interesting statistics have been developed by the Government giving us a glimpse of the crowding problems the American urbanite will face in the year 2,000.

By the year 2,000, the population of the United States will be 300 million. This substantially increased population will be concentrated more densely than today's population. We will have the same amount of rainwater then as now, but we will need twice as much water, and one third more food. Roads will have to be constructed for three times as many cars as we now have, and there will have to be housing for an additional hundred million Americans. We will have to dispose of about five times the present 180 million pounds of solid wastes each day.

Two hundred and seventy million of the population will crowd into the cities, and the cities will occupy about 2% of the total land space in the United States. Sixty percent of the Nation's population will be concentrated in only twelve States. The questions of crowding now are critical, and if the above statistical picture is correct, no relief is in sight. Traffic jams of the future will make us long for the good old days of 1967 when during peak rush hours it only took 2½ hours to go from downtown Los Angeles to International Airport, a distance of some 15 miles.

Planning for open spaces will be tremendously more difficult than today. Roads will increasingly take up more land, daming living and recreation areas into less space. Parking space will be at a premium and for many cities this will be disastrous. In Washington, D.C., there is no longer any room in the central city for parking lots let alone curb parking.

All social institutions, such as schools, libraries and essential public services will have to meet the much greater demand loads. Anyone now familiar with center city schools and hospitals and other public service institutions realize they are already badly overcrowded and understaffed.

No complete study has ever been prepared on what psychic effects crowding has on the individual. I am certain such a study would produce many surprises with what it tells us of the mental impact this environmental factor has.

Crowding in the urban environment has a direct relation and impact on pollution. The cause and effect is so inextricably connected, considering one without the other is an endeavor in futility.

The third modern Horseman is noise. No other by-product of our technological progress is so taken for granted. Noise has become such an integrated factor in our environment that it is the one blight most tolerated. As a result very little is known about the ramifications of or the solutions to the problem.

One certainly becomes more aware of it when a freeway is built adjacent to his back yard, or when his neighborhood becomes part of a landing pattern for DC8's and Boeing 707's. The noise in the urban environment never stops, it just varies in intensity.

The dangers, while subtle, do exist. Studies have indicated noise has an effect on human performance. Loud, distracting noise tends to make activities inefficient. Certain kinds of noise are very destructive. Sonic booms can and often break glass, shatter interior fixtures, and shake the psyche of all who hear them.

Once again, an adequate consideration of noise cannot be understood when isolated from the problem of crowding. As urban areas become more dense, the enigma of noise becomes more acute. And as an area becomes crowded and noisy the level of pollutants rises adding additional misery to an already aggravating environment. To understand the total physical environment in which most Americans now live we must continually gear our thinking to the full picture and the complex interrelationships within it. Three of those relationships have now been discussed. The fourth broad category is deterioration.

Deterioration is the fourth Horseman of the modern Apocalypse. The urban environment is breeding a center city that is now chronically suffering from physical, social and esthetic deterioration.

A casual observer can easily notice the physical decay. Slums are at the core of most cities. Urban renewal most often relocates slums rather than curing them.

In addition to physical decay the center city often suffers more acutely from inadequate educational facilities, recreational facilities, hospitals, and the other social and public services facilities. Social decay usually forces those who can pay for adequate services to the perimeter of the central city, while those unable to afford the services are crowded more densely into an increasingly less desirable environment.

Esthetic blight takes many forms. Sacrificing open spaces to roads, tasteless rows of tract housing built around a faceless suburban shopping center, traffic jams, miles of concrete parking lots, and example after example of auto and other junk yards, as well as undeveloped and ill cared for property are just a few of the esthetic sacrifices being made in order to accommodate our "progress." The idea that our architecture must conform to cold technology is at the root of the blandness and unattractiveness of much of our urban environment.

Washington, D.C. present an excellent example of what can be accomplished when tastes and values prevail over mindless expediency. Part of the Capitol was and is being carefully planned so that it will present a majestic and satisfying picture. All obstacles were overcome in achieving what has now become the famous and imposing Mall area of the City. However, little, if any, consideration was or is being given to esthetic values in the development of the rest of the City.

Few of the fifteen million visitors to Washington each year have little desire to see or spend much time outside the Mall section. With good reason! There is little or nothing to see, there is little or nothing that is appealing. In fact, the reverse is true. With the exception of a few wealthy areas, most of Washington outside the Mall is esthetically appalling.

Understanding the full nature and impact of the various forms of deterioration now evident within our environment is extremely difficult. No other factors is a complex or so directly tied to a combination of other elements in the total environmental backlash.

ECOLOGY: A WORD REDISCOVERED

In briefly reviewing the four modern blights of urban man, I have continually stressed the theme of the total interrelationship of each of these problems to one another and their combined effect upon our present and future environment. I stressed this theme because it so vividly runs to counter to the ideas and thinking that have marked Western man since the industrial revolution. As I pointed out earlier, the approach represented in thinking in components, or parts; having only a singleminded view or pursuit without concerning oneself with its ramifications, is largely responsible for the present environmental conditions.

What apparently is now needed to meet the challenge posed by our spoiled environment is a new kind of thinking. The approach I am suggesting has its roots in the science and philosophy of the Orient. Chinese science and technology originally approached the problems of men in terms of general harmony rather than dividing them into fragmented parts.

Ecology is a word that has long been in our language but has just recently been rediscovered. The word simply means putting living organisms in relation to their total environment. In 1962, before the word was common, I addressed the House of Representatives and asked the Members to put in perspective the environmental legislation that was then just first being considered. At that time, I stressed the ecological considerations.

We have not yet properly concerned ourselves with man's ecology. Granted we have passed some legislation and spent some money on attacking specific problems within the environment. But once again our approach has been divided and has paid little attention to dealing with our environment as a whole. If we can overcome the outdated notion that the problems within our environment do not fester in isolation of one another, as do segregated bacteria in a clinical laboratory, we will have taken a giant intellectual step forward.

Once we understand that pollution is related to crowding is related to noise is related to deterioration is related to pollution, and so on, we can then deal with the issue as it is, and not as we choose to break it down.

Our first step should be to determine the exact extent and nature of the entire interrelated issue. While we have specific knowledge about specific aspects of the problem, we know little about what the total impact the present environment has had on man. Do we know what kind of total environment we want? In our present rush to combat each individual problem in the environment, with little consideration for the ramifications of our solutions, are we actually going to produce the kind of environment we want?

For example, do we want all our water pure enough for drinking, or will it do to have some of it just clean enough for swimming or boating? Are we willing to sacrifice the esthetic values of some of our open spaces to relocate some industry from the central city thereby reducing crowding. There are an infinite variety of questions that can be posed—only the answers are lacking.

Our environment should be the product of our rationality, not the by-product of our technology. Our technology can and must be shaped to meet the conditions we want in our environment. Our technology has given us many tools such as systems analysis, computerization, sophisticated organizing programs and others that can be invaluable in helping determine and then realize a satisfactory physical environment.

We must understand that man must be the center point of his ecology. As natural environmental obstacles were overcome, we must overcome the environmental problems created by us and orient our environment to meet the needs of man rather than destroying him.

Our present environment presents us with a great lesson; a lesson rooted in blind history. Man will survive his environment if we have learned the lesson of considering all the ramifications of our actions before we enter into them. If we approach our present environmental problems in that context we may yet remake this earth into a "garden of delight."

Baltic States Freedom Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1967

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, Baltic States Freedom Day is a sad and tragic anniversary. It is commemorated by the Estonian, Latvian, and Lithuanian people as the beginning of their enslavement by Soviet authorities in June of 1940. By designating it as their freedom day they aim to keep alive the spirit of freedom among the peoples in these countries and hope to regain their freedom.

These three peace-loving, industrious, and gifted peoples were among the first to lose their freedom early in the last war. Under some absurd pretext that the Governments of these countries were agents of Western democratic imperialists, the Soviet forces treacherously attacked, invaded, and then overwhelmed these three countries early in 1940, and subsequently annexed them to the Soviet Government. Forthwith, Communist regimes were instituted there, and these minions of the Kremlin carried out their design of eliminating all forms of democracy and freedom. Many able-bodied men were arrested and deported, while the populace was terrorized. They all lived in fear of their lives, for none felt that he was safe from instant arrest and long imprisonment. In their once-free homelands they had thus become prisoners, subject to separation from their families and deportation to unknown parts of the Soviet Union. They endured such inhuman treatment in the hands of their overlords throughout the war, always hoping that the end of that war would bring freedom to them. But to this day, 27 years after their enslavement, they still suffer and work under Communist totalitarian tyranny. On the observance of this sad anniversary, let us all hope that they regain their freedom and live in peace in their homelands.

Days of Infamy; Days of Shame

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 1967

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, this week those who value freedom are observing in sadness two tragic anniversaries in history.

They are the 26th anniversary of the first mass deportations from the Baltic States on June 14, 1941, and the 27th anniversary of the Soviet occupation of Lithuania on June 15, 1942.

Truly, those were days of infamy, days of shame.

They trouble our hearts as historic examples of man's inhumanity to his fellow men. They plague our consciences as a reminder of Soviet perfidy and aggression.

The Baltic States—Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia—were national republics with a 700-year-old distinguished history before World War II. But geography had made them vulnerable: they were small states neighboring on a giant nation, Russsia.

Joseph Stalin, who must rank with Hitler as the most bloodsoaked dictator of all time, engineered the take-over of these three republics and eventually the mass deportation of the Baltic peoples.

Through the ensuing years it is estimated that Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia have lost about one-fourth of their populations.

Such treatment of peoples, Mr. Speaker, must be clearly seen as an act of genocide, an effort to snuff out the Baltic cultures and the love of freedom in the hearts of Baltic peoples.

The memory of these heinous acts should spur us to action in concert with other nations to prevent such a thing from ever again happening.

Let us strive to shape a world in which small nations may live in peace and security, protected from larger and expansionist neighbors.

Let us create the climate of international society in which peaceful self-determination will not be just words, but an accomplishment.

Let us establish workable world sanctions against nations that are guilty of genocide.

Finally, on these days of anniversary, let us extend our expressions of sorrow and concern to people of Latvian, Lithuanian, and Estonian ancestry in our own country and around the world. Let them know that though a quarter century has gone by, we have not forgotten.

Representative W. R. (Bob) Poage Explains Why Fair and Equitable Farm Policies Are Necessary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL C. JONES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 1967

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I have requested permission to extend my remarks and to include the text of an address given by our colleague, the Honorable W. R. (Bob) Poage, distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, at the annual convention of the National Plant Food Institute, held the past weekend at White Sulphur Springs, W. Va., because I feel that not only every Member of Congress, but as many of our citizens as possible, should have the opportunity to know and to better understand the work, the problems, and the needs of agriculture.

While I may be prejudiced, Mr. Speaker, because of my close association with Chairman Poage over the past 16 years that I have served with him on the House Committee on Agriculture, it is my honest opinion that Bob Poage is the best informed person in this Nation when it comes to the consideration of agricultural problems, including the agricultural economics of the world. And, unless one can understand the problem, including specifically its causes, he is in a poor position to prescribe a cure.

When Chairman Poage calls our attention to the fact that "prices received by farmers have this spring dropped to the lowest level in 33 years," and that the parity ratio now stands at the lowest figure for any month since 1934, I think it is time for the consuming public to understand that "Broke farmers cannot continue to produce our present abundance, much less increase production."

Throughout the length and breadth of this land Chairman POAGE has been carrying his message to the consumers, and I have the same objective in making a part of my remarks, the address given by Congressman POAGE:

REMARKS OF CONGRESSMAN W. R. (BOB) POAGE (D-TEX.), CHAIRMAN, COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, BEFORE THE NATIONAL PLANT FOOD INSTITUTE, WHITE SULPHUR SPRINGS, W. VA., JUNE 12, 1967

Some hundreds of years before the birth of Christ, a man named Aesop told a little story about a dog and a bone. The dog with the bone in its mouth was crossing a stream and saw the reflection of the larger bone in the water, and he lost the bone he had, he lost the substance while grasping for a shadow. The lesson of the Aesop fable is just as true today, probably more applicable today, in many aspects of our national life. We seem to doubt and neglect and drop those things that have made us a great people, and to reach for shadows.

But this morning I want to talk about only one aspect of what is going on in this country. This is about our Nation's agriculture. And I cannot do this without talking about you—you people in the plant food industry.

I am grateful to you for the opportunity. Since I became Chairman of the Agriculture Committee of the House of Representatives in Washington a few months ago I have felt that I had a special responsibility to present the farmers' case to the people of our country. I have spoken in New York City, in Houston, in Denver, in Florida, in Arkansas, in Louisville, and in Phoenix, and in other localities, saying about the same thing I'm going to say to you this morning.

But first I want to commend the plant food industry for the contribution you have made to the creation of food and fiber abundance in this great Nation of ours.

Moreover, I want further to praise this industry for the service you have rendered our farmers during years when agriculture generally has been subjected to a vicious cost-price squeeze at times when the remainder of the economy was enjoying unprecedented prosperity.

The country is entitled to know what you have done.

You have held your prices down. You have made a proud record of partnership with the farmer in his trying years.

Last week in gathering my notes for this appearance before you, I telephoned the Department of Agriculture and asked some specific questions. I was told that since 1932 fertilizer prices to farmers have increased only 52 percent. From the farmer's standpoint that is just 52 percent too much, but no other major item used by farmers in producing our food and fiber has increased so little in price. In comparison, during these last 35 years, the cost of farm machinery has jumped 213 percent, the costs of motor vehicles used in agriculture are up 242 percent, and farm building and fencing materials have gone up by 216 percent.

And I was happy, in the Department's response to another question, to learn that by the wise pricing policies you have followed, favoring our farmers, you too have profited. I was told that in 1932 your industry sold only $110 *million* worth of fertilizer to farmers, while last year, in 1966, you sold farmers $1,765,000,000 worth of fertilizer.

You have helped our farmers master the arts of abundance. But in performing his miracles and blessing this country with plenty, and in feeding hungry people over a large part of the world, our farmers have *not* done so well. They now are in desperate circumstances again.

This is where we get back to the dog and the bone. This is what I want to talk to you about.

Many people out to get votes in elections have read the census figures which show a steady increase in our urban population. They have too often decided that the way to get these city votes is to promise lower prices on food and fiber. Conversely, interest in the farmer, who produces the food and the fiber, is diminishing, and every decision of our Supreme Court, and every redistricting act of our State Legislatures forced by the Court tends to reduce the political influence of our farm people.

I, too, am interested in the well-being of consumers. A part of the City of Fort Worth has just been put in the District I represent, and I have long represented the 100,000 people of the City of Waco. But the trend of things raises a question which troubles me. A solid and prosperous agriculture is the substance, it is the bone, of the economy and well-being of this Nation. Are our politicians, since the size of the farmer vote has diminished now, in grasping for shadows of consumer favors and approbation, neglecting the ability of our farm people to continue to produce abundantly? If this is so, then the consumer as well as the farmer will suffer.

Let us consider one or two terribly disturbing facts.

Prices received by farmers have this spring dropped to the lowest level in 33 years, in relation to the rest of the economy.

These prices dropped 10 percent between last August, 1966, and April, 1967. This is the most severe drop in my recollection. The parity ratio dipped in April to 72 percent, and now stands at the lowest figure for any month since 1934.

In other words, the prices farmers received in April, in relation to the prices of things they must buy to produce their crops and livestock and to live on the farm, are right now at the lowest point in 33 years. Meanwhile, during the past 20 years the hourly earnings of industrial workers have increased by 123 percent and corporate dividends are up 232 percent. During the same period the average of farm prices is actually down 11 percent . . . that is, you heard me correctly, actual prices received by farmers in the marketplaces in April were 11 percent lower than the prices for a similar number of pounds, bushels or bales 20 years ago—in 1947.

Wheat, *including* the value of certificates under the wheat program, now returns the farmer $2.14 a bushel, compared with $2.29 a bushel the farmer received in 1947; corn now brings $1.26, compared with $2.16 twenty years ago; and cotton, *including* the government subsidy, has been bringing the farmer about 28 cents a pound, while in 1947 the price was about 32 cents.

I have been using every opportunity I have had since January to get out over the country to tell consumers, to tell everyone who would listen, that we simply cannot afford to let this condition continue. I think it is clear that our country and our world may soon need increased production. My message and my warning is this:

Broke farmers cannot continue to produce our present abundance, much less increase production.

Prices now paid to farmers are not sufficient to bring to and hold in agriculture the resources—people, land, plant foods and chemicals, machinery and other productive aids of science—to support the efficiencies essential to maintain abundant production.

Consumers in this Nation should understand that we might well be short of food at this very moment if our farmers had to depend solely on prices received in the marketplaces and if these prices in terms of parity with other prices had been as low in all the years since 1940 as they are today.

We have the greatest agricultural plant on earth, we have mastered the arts of food and fiber abundance. This did not just happen here. It came about because of the kind of people we have on our farms and because for a few years from 1942 through 1952, we did pay these people parity prices, and our farmer used this parity income to build the farm plant which is now turning out the miracles of plenty.

In December, I visited India, at the request of the President. I found, as we all know, that India suffers both from chronic and from a drought-induced shortage of food. From my firsthand studies in this hungry country, I am convinced that, basically, India cannot feed herself because her peasant farmers are unable to buy the fertilizer, the machinery, the improved seeds, the insecticides, etc., which they should use.

I mentioned earlier that I called the Department of Agriculture to get some facts and figures, as I was putting together my notes for this appearance before you. I got the Department to develop some figures on the use of inorganic fertilizer in the United States and in India, and to relate this to the population. The answer I got might tell the story in the shortest possible way why America is a land of plenty and India is near starvation.

In the United States farmers used in 1966 126 pounds of fertilizer for each person in the United States. In India the use of fertilizer in producing crops was a woeful 3.3 pounds per person.

Indeed, these figures tell the difference between plentiful food here and starvation in other areas of the world. They should tell you people also that yours is probably the most important industry in the world, and it is growing more important every day as exploding populations increase the demand for food and fiber the world over. The opportunities of your industry, its challenge, are tremendous.

The Indian peasants are not as ignorant as many of us suppose them to be. Many know what they could do to increase the productivity of their land, but without substantially higher prices for what they do produce they cannot buy those inputs that they realize are needed to increase productivity.

The policy of the Indian Government has been to hold down the price of cereals, with the thought that this would help their consuming masses.

This policy, which is not unlike the policy of governments in many underdeveloped, undernourished nations, has suppressed the incentive, and the ability, to produce abundantly. Their people go hungry.

I look at India, and I wonder about my own country.

Something occurred last year that frightened me. In mid-1966 when prices farmers receive for some of the food they produce advanced moderately, and prices at the grocery store got higher, a great hue and cry went up from consumers. Boycotts of grocery establishments were organized across the country. Housewives carried placards. Farmers were condemned for high food costs.

All this happened in the Year 1966, when prices farmers were getting for what they produced were substantially below what they got 20 years ago. And all this happened in a year when our people were buying their food for a smaller part of their income than any people anywhere, ever before, in all history.

Have we come to the place where people are unwilling to pay the farmer a fair price for what we eat? Was that the meaning of the housewives' demonstrations last year, and is this reflected in the level of farm prices today?

This concerns me deeply. It should concern those Members of Congress who represent urban constituencies as well as those who represent rural areas. I'm wondering how long we can continue to produce an abundance of food and fiber for our own people, not to mention food for starving populations abroad, if we do not act firmly to establish reasonable rewards for the people in agriculture who grow that food and those fibers—rewards comparable with the rewards of those engaged in other undertakings in our free enterprise economy. If we do not we are certain to see an even greater and continuing movement from the farm to what appears to be the greater security of the public assistance rolls of our cities.

Incentive is the key to abundance. It is the secret of free enterprise. Our people in the cities must know that this is as true on the farm as it is in the factory in the city. When I was in India I could not help but wonder how that underdeveloped nation might flourish if it would import our system of free enterprise. I cannot now but wonder what will happen in our own country if the incentives of potential profit in our free enterprise agriculture should vanish.

A central message I am trying to make clear here is that the productivity of agriculture is not now effectively limited by lack of technical knowledge, but that, unless as a nation we act wisely, this productivity may be severely circumscribed by economics, by the cost of applying this knowledge and the inability of our remaining farmers, with their poor prices, to meet this cost. In the future, low prices definitely will limit the productivity of agriculture.

The farmers' message must be directed to consumers. I think consumers will listen to our appeal on two grounds.

First, Americans are fair. They believe in letting everyone earn a reasonably good living. Look at their attitude toward wages. Most everybody knows that wages are by far the largest single factor in the rising cost of living, but almost all Americans agree that the wage earner should have a fair return for his labor. It took many years, and it took a lot of work, to get this understanding over to the American public. Agricultural producers have not presented their case nearly so effectively as has organized labor. Understanding of the farmers' problems does not, of itself, assure a solution. But I know that no solution is going to be forthcoming until we get this understanding.

Second, I think consumers will listen because it is in their self-interest to keep farmers producing abundantly. Certainly it is much better for consumers to have an assured and continuingly abundant supply of food and to pay fair prices for it than it is to have an over-supply at low prices for a time and then a shortage and skyrocketing prices while we go through readjustment.

So, I repeat, our effort must be to make consumers understand that our whole food supply will be endangered if we do not restore to agriculture prices which will enable our farmers to stay in business and produce abundantly.

The ultimate decisions will be made in the cities.

Ours is a democracy and the masses of our people now live in the cities, and as we seek remedies to insure continued abundance at reasonable prices we must recognize that the political power of our farm and ranch people has diminished. Henceforward, farmers must depend upon Members of Congress and upon administrators representing urban constituencies and populations for approval of farm policies which are fair and equitable.

This is why I am taking advantage of every opportunity to present the picture to city people and to ask their understanding and cooperation. I am here today because I want your help—the help of you people in the plant food industry—in delivering the message. I want you to help me tell the people in the cities that all of us will suffer, if we fail to understand the work, the problems and the needs of agriculture.

I know you will will help me tell the country that this is a land of plenty and that we want to keep it that way.

Fairplay for Otepka

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DURWARD G. HALL
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 15, 1967

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, according to the Government Employees Exchange, dated June 14, in an article entitled "State, CS's Macy Attacked Over Otto Otepka Appeal," the truth about the Otepka case becomes more and more obvious. My colleagues' attention is invited to the lack of fairplay accorded this most-maligned individual who is being denied due process.

Open hearings are being precluded, but the truth will eventually come out. It has finally become apparent that the "top dogs" have tried to smother this case, lest their own actions and instructions be disclosed. Time has overtaken events and proved the official position is a desire to bury, hide, and obscure the facts. A congressional investigation is indicated if the Attorney General does not act and due process is not afforded. Only public demand can result in justice and equity, and I commend the objective reporting staff of Government Employees Exchange.

The article follows:

BY CONGRESS—STATE, CS'S MACY ATTACKED OVER OTTO OTEPKA APPEAL

On June 6 the State Department dropped ten of the thirteen charges which it had leveled in 1963 against Otto F. Otepka, the Department's top security evaluator. Among these ten charges were the allegation that Mr. Otepka had "mutilated" certain classified documents allegedly "found in his burn bags" (for burning scrap classified papers).

The dropping of the ten charges was on the motion of Irving Jaffe, of the Department of Justice, who is prosecuting the case for the State Department. Mr. Jaffe's action had been previously cleared by him with Under Secretary of State Nicholas deB. Katzenbach who had obtained the consent of Secretary of State Dean Rusk.

Over the protests of Mr. Otepka and his attorney, Roger Robb, Edward Dragon, the Hearing Officer, ruled that the entire proceedings on the remaining three charges must be "classified".

The State Department action followed by a week the prediction of *The Exchange*, in its May 31 issue, that the ten charges would be dropped on Mr. Jaffe's advice. At the time *The Exchange* wrote as follows:

"Besides the controversy over the question of an 'open' or a 'secret' hearing, *The Exchange* has been authoritatively informed by a source close to Under Secretary of State Katzenbach that, on the advice of Mr. Jaffe, who formerly worked for Mr. Katzenbach at the Justice Department, the Under Secretary has recommended that the State Department drop 10 charges at the outset of the hearings. These 10 revolve around the issue of the alleged 'mutilation' of classified documents.

"The informant added that the reason for the recommendation is Mr. Jaffe's fear that Mr. Otepka obtained positive information regarding the identity of the persons actually involved in the 'mutilations' and, in the event the charges are maintained in their present form, he will be able to expose the persons at the hearings. In this event, the Department of Justice will have no choice but to bring criminal proceedings against the persons so exposed."

"In turn, these persons have already indicated they will reveal the identities of the 'top persons' in the Department of State who had instructed them to 'mutilate' the documents and to 'plant them' in Mr. Otepka's burn bags in such a way as to make it appear that Mr. Otepka had carried out the 'mutilations.'"

On June 1, 1967 Congressman H. R. Gross of Iowa inserted the entire *Exchange* article into the *Congressional Record*, pages H6511–H6512. Congressman Gross described the State Department's proposed action a "foul injustice piled on the many injustices that have been a part of this case from the outset."

Congressman Gross also attacked the Civil Service Commission, which has jurisdiction over protecting Mr. Otepka's rights as a civil service employees with veterans' preference. He said, "The inaction of the Civil Service Commission is shocking. It is an abdication to the political expediencey of the State Department."

On June 7, Congressman John M. Ashbrook of Ohio on the floor of the House quoted from the May 31 report of *The Exchange*, emphasizing Mr. Jaffe's reasons for dropping the charges. He said that "there is concern that Mr. Otepka will receive fair and just treatment. If the State Department thinks it will eventually slide this case under the rug and the whole affair forgotten, it is mistaken." Congressman Ashbrook's remarks appear on pages H6826 and H6827 of the *Congressional Record*, June 1.

Within the State Department and the Civil Service Commission, a mood of "consternation" exists over the May 31 article in *The Exchange*, it was learned from an informant close to Winson D. Trone, the State Department's Director of Management Planning. According to this informant, associates of Under Secretary of State Nicholas deB. Katzenbach and of Deputy Undersecretary of State Idar Rimstad are "alarmed at the continuing leak of accurate personnel information" to *The Exchange* despite repeated assurances from Marvin Gentile, the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Security that the "leaks" had been "plugged."

At the White House, the May 31 *Exchange* article and the June 1 and June 7 statements of Congressmen Gross and Ashbrook have "generated concern", an informant closely identified with James C. Falcon revealed. Mr. Falcon is listed at the White House as the Special Assistant there to John C. Macy, Chairman of the Civil Service Commission.

This source indicated that Mr. Macy has become "extremely irritable" about news reports of an early change in his own status at the White House and of rumors of the possibility of a congressional investigation into Mr. Macy's own role in the Otepka case. (In response to an inquiry, Mr. Macy had "no comment" to say about his changing status.—The Editor). According to the informant, the prospects of such a congressional investigation have been increased by the circulation of reports of the continued existence of the "Macy-Crockett" Camp, involving Marvin Watson, the Appointments Secretary of the President, Idar Rimstad, the successor to William J. Crockett as Deputy Undersecretary of State for Administration, and Mr. Falcon who is carried on the Federal payroll as a "domestic" Foreign Service Reserve Officer, Maximum U.S. Duty.

In anticipation of a possible congressional investigation, a special study has been undertaken at the State Department of Volume

17, pages 1325 through 1480, of the Hearings on State Department Security, *The Exchange* has learned. Within the Civil Service Commission, the Bureau of Inspections, it was stated, may be most vulnerable because of repeated allegations addressed to it in the past by State Department civil service personnel of discrimination in assignments, "make-work" jobs with false job descriptions; the failure of desk audits of positions; and the use of repeated "details," with Civil Service Commission consent, to perform meaningless tasks so as to punish civil service employees. In this connection, Mr. Macy's ardent espousal of the Hays Bill in 1966, which would have destroyed the civil service in the State Department, is cited as relevant.

Also cited against Mr. Macy for failure to uphold the rights of civil service personnel are the actions of the office of the Chief, Appeals Examining Office, of the Civil Service Commission which has invariably turned a "deaf ear" to complaints of State Department employees. Volume 17 systematically records and documents a series of cases of civil service employees who complained that they did "nothing" or merely read newspapers and books and magazines all day. Yet, in every instance, Mr. Macy replied that, "in justification of its own inaction to protect civil service personnel, the Appeals Examining Office of the Civil Service Commission had decided it had been unable to find any basis for holding that the Commission has jurisdiction for the appellate review." Thus, no hearing at all was granted the employees.

Shalom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 1967

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I salute Israel for her stunning win over Egypt, which reflects what can me accomplished through a combination of competence, ingenuity, and complete unity of spirit and resolve.

I have supported Israel since she was created as an independent Jewish state 19 years ago by the United Nations and I do so today. On May 25 I was among those who joined Congressman CELLER in pledging to take whatever action was necessary to resist aggression against Israel and preserve peace. But the elements of force, speed, and surprise which led to this military victory cannot necessarily insure her long-term future and security in the Mideast.

Israel cannot be expected to return to the status quo, nor should she be expected to; once and for all her territorial sovereignty must be recognized and guaranteed by all of the world, especially by the 14 Arab sister states; her access to international waterways unquestioned. But Israel and Egypt need each other. On her part Israel must be ready to face up to the refugee problem, one way would be to reconsider the recommendations of the United Nations to offer indemnity payments to the Arabs who do not wish to resettle in their homeland under Israeli rule.

I agree with the Near East Report of June 13, when it says, "Let there be peace—the Israelis have defeated the Arab States in military battle three times in the last 20 years. Now comes the hardest, and we hope, the last battle. It is to induce Arab leaders to enter into a peace settlement with Israel."

During the fighting, Marc Chagall, the noted Jewish artist, famed for his inspiring stained-glass windows, remarked, "Let Israel be safe, I will make you lovelier windows."

Let her be safe. Let there be lasting peace in the Mideast. Shalom.

East-West Friendship a Delusion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 1967

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Melchior Palyi is one of the most respected international economists and his column appears regularly in the Chicago Tribune. In view of the administration's determination to embrace the Soviet Union economically as well as diplomatically, Dr. Palyi's article which appeared in that newspaper on Wednesday, June 14, has special significance:

EAST, WEST FRIENDSHIP A DELUSION

(By Dr. Melchior Palyi)

Basic values, like economic freedom and communism, are "muted ideological shibboleths," according to the New York Times. It is a widespread belief among the American (and European) intelligentsia that we are foolishly maneuvering ourselves into east-west conflicts on the false assumption that a clash of basic principles is at stake. The implication is clear: Let us be friends with Russia [and with Red China] and no more dissension will remain than what is bound to grow out of conflicting economic interests under "competitive co-existence."

This is self-delusion of the most dangerous sort. The truth is that east and west are separated by an unbridgeable chasm, by whatever name it goes.

A prime aspect of the fundamental difference is that we are willing to tolerate a hostile system—which is determined to obliterate us. If you doubt their ingrained and in-eradicable hostility, consider a few of its manifestations.

1. The Bolshevist verbiage, addressed to "capitalism" in general, to the United States in particular, is as uncouth and rought as it ever has been. In their dictionary we are imperialists, exploiters, robber-barons, if not outright gangsters.

2. Only a few privileged Russians are permitted to travel abroad, to read western publications, or to listen to foreign broadcasts. People are so intimidated that most of them avoid contacts with foreigners. They are being systematically and constantly brainwashed—against us.

DAMAGE AT EVERY TURN

3. Openly or otherwise the soviets never miss an opportunity to damage America's reputation and prestige, to infiltrate and to subvert our institutions, and to arm our enemies.

4. Soviet foreign policy is notoriously hostile to America. They try to stymie our objectives at every turn. Together with their Chinese brothers under the skin, they foment and support peripheral wars which are very costly for us, from Hong Kong to Tanzania to Latin America. Their objective is always to expand the area of communist rule, using whatever means serve the purpose—provided they do not bring them to the brink of a deadly confrontation.

How can one ignore all these and many more hostile attitudes? The fellow-travelers tell us, echoing the Moscow line, that we are at fault. We are the aggressors. This takes some twisting of facts and logic. Who was the aggressor when we put pressure on Stalin to withdraw his troops from Iran and stopped him from occupying the Dardanelles . . . when our airlift broke the blockade of West Berlin . . .when our troops defended the independence of South Korea, and so on?

The most recent conflict follows the same pattern. Russia insists that Egypt has the right to close the Tiran straits, but would threaten with war if Turkey closed her "territorial waters," the Bosporus and the Dardanelles.

SIDES FAR APART

There is a fundamental clash, indeed, between two disputants whose concepts of truth and untruth are incompatible. They are as far apart as if they did not belong to the same species. Mediation, reconciliation, and truly peaceful co-existence are out of the question, unless one submits to the will of the other—or is subdued by force.

To the Bolshevists, submission to the rules of logic (and ethics) would mean political, if not physical suicide—for reasons that deserve further discussion.

Middle East Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENJAMIN B. BLACKBURN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 1967

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, because of the concern of so many of my constituents over the recent crisis in the Middle East, I felt constrained to write the President of the United States in their behalf.

The letter which I directed to the President sets out the position of many thousands of Americans; and I insert its content in the RECORD following my remarks:

JUNE 14, 1967.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: On behalf of many of my constituents in the Fourth District of Georgia, I am writing you in connection with the recent Middle East crisis.

It is the feeling of these citizens that our Nation, as the leader of the Free World, should consider it her responsibility to seek measures which will prevent a similar occurrence. The success Israel has had in her fight for national survival would be indeed shallow if another crisis is allowed to arise.

The Arab nations' refusal to recognize the inherent rights of other sovereign nations has been a primary cause of the present conflict. If a similar crisis is to be prevented, its cause must be eliminated. To this end, I urge that no further aid from this country to the Arab nations be given, unless and until those nations can grant assurance of their intention to recognize the rights of others.

Your consideration of this appeal is sincerely appreciated.

Respectfully,

BEN B. BLACKBURN,
Member of Congress.

"Design for More Effective Schools"—An Article by Walter G. Davis, June 1967 Issue of AFL-CIO American Federationist

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1967

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, the 89th Congress has been rightly described as the Education Congress because of the many legislative advances in programs for the support of education for the young people of our country.

One of the most thoughtful discussions of one aspect of our progress in education is contained in an article by Walter G. Davis, director of the AFL-CIO department of education, published in the June issue of the American Federationist, the official monthly magazine of the AFL-CIO.

Mr. Davis describes fresh approaches to our national effort to provide better education for disadvantaged children.

I include Mr. Davis' article at this point in the Record:

DESIGN FOR MORE EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS

(By Walter G. Davis)[1]

The 89th Congress rightfully deserves recognition as the education Congress. Federal programs now in force add up to a significant commitment to share in the financial responsibility for education at all levels. However, a variety of studies and research projects over the last five years have all pointed to specific, hard-core problem areas where financial resources alone make little impact, although they are important.

This becomes apparent when we begin to examine the implementation of this nation's commitment to provide every child, regardless of his race or neighborhood, an equal opportunity to share in the cultural and economic wealth of the country.

For the youngsters who has been subjected to a substandard school because of his race, programs are still grossly inadequate to meet the actual need in too many areas of the nation. Likewise, for the youngsters from families, while and non-white, who represent the perpetual cycles of ignorance identified with the poor, there is still a terrible lack of imaginative programs which already have shown promise.

Yet we are constantly reminded that in today's society it is imperative that one be prepared in order to enjoy some security in the world of work. This means that the acquisition of skills is more important today than ever before.

Even if the entire educational system was geared to meet the demands of industry and modern living, a significant number of young people could not meet the challenge because there would still remain the special problems of the poor and the minority group student for a long time to come.

There has been a meaningful beginning. Educators, government officials and concerned citizens now have before them a voluminous amount of data gathered in the last few years by competent scholars in the field of education.

Never before has there been the candid probing of the underlying causes of ignorance and educational deprivation as was produced at the request of the Congress and President since 1965.

Two significant studies sponsored by the federal governent have produced the best existing profile of the public education system as it relates to the poor and to the ethnic minorities.

I refer to "Equality of Educational Opportunity" by James S. Coleman of Johns Hopkins University, a study published by the U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and "Racial Isolation in the Public Schools," a report of the U. S. Commission on Civil Rights.

The Coleman Report examined the characteristics of the school, searching for the presence or lack of equality of educational opportunity. Together with his colleagues, Dr. Coleman probed for the tangible indicators of a quality school, i.e., laboratories, textbooks, libraries, etc., as well as the intangibles. On the latter, his survey covered such things as the characteristics of parents, students and teacher. Special attention was given to teachers with regard to their background, salary level, verbal abilities and attitude toward their jobs.

The socio-economic backgrounds of the students, the education of their parents and the attitudes the pupils have toward themselves and their ability to affect their own destinies, as well as their academic aspirations, also were assessed.

Great care has gone into the survey and the interpretation of its results. Whether the overwhelming majority of professionals in the field agree with the analysis of the data collected remains to be seen. In any event, we now have a frame of reference to make some judgments as we get on with the task of eliminating the dual standard and substandard schools of the nation.

The U. S. Civil Right Commission report zeros in on the racial aspect of education. Particular emphasis was given to:

1. The extent of racial isolation in the public schools and the extent of the disparity in educational achievement between white and Negro schoolchildren.
2. Factors contributing to school segregation.
3. The relationship, impact and effects of racial isolation on the attitudes and interracial associations of Negroes and whites.
4. Current programs designed to remedy any educational disadvantage and relieve racial isolation.

Unlike the Coleman Report, the Commission has made recommendations calling on the Congress to take additional legislative steps on the basic problem.

The basic problem, of course, is to make sure that the young people caught in the web of poverty and race discrimination acquire the basic tools to enable them to participate in the education and training programs designed to prepare them to hold their own in the competition for good jobs.

However, the concern should not stop there. We also value the cultural development of all the people. If we are ever going to complete the task of nationbuilding, the ideal of raising the educational level of all citizens means we must overcome the problems of the ghetto dwellers of all races—especially the very young now entering school. School quality has less effect on achievement than the student's family background and the social environment of the student body, according to the latest studies.

The Commission report stated that "In the few years which separate their infancy from entry into school, children are exposed to profound formative influence. During those years, verbal skills and styles of speech and thought are shaped, a child's view of himself develops and his aspirations begin to form."

Few programs exist which reach pre-school children and effectively address themselves to this point. The ghetto child, therefore, enters school with all the negatives acquired from his environment. These negatives must be overcome by the time he reaches the starting line in the race for educational achievement if he is to avoid carrying this burden through school life.

By now, none of this can be characterized as new information never discussed by the scholars and social scientists of America. Yet it seems incredible that current programs are not receiving fuller public support and attention. Meanwhile, the child born in the ghetto, of parents who themselves have been subject to the influence of the ghetto, continues on a collison course with what he often considers a hostile society which aims to keep him down. What incentive to learn can be exepected of these young people who, by best government estimates, number approximately 5 million?

The federal government also has taken some meaningful first steps to bring about a reorientation of school administrators. New functions have been thrust upon them as a result of new government commitments. Among these, two stand out in importance:

1. Remedial education for the children of illiterate parents and victims of deficient schools; and
2. Outreach programs designed to seek out the discouraged and undermotivated and to encourage them to participate in the available services.

Of the persent organized efforts now under way with regard to these two objectives at the local level, the Teacher Corps and the More Effective School program are proving themselves and deserve full support.

President Johnson has asked Congress to expand the Teacher Corps to five times its present size by 1968. Not only does this attest to its value and potential, but in a few short years it will have developed and trained teachers to take on the toughest job in the profession—trying to inspire children of the slums who now lack an incentive to learn.

Little known so far is the More Effective Schools program—popularly called MES. This program was first formulated by a committee of selected representatives from the American Federation of Teachers' Local 2 in New York City; the Council of Supervisory Associations and the office of the New York City Superintendent of Schools.

This group began on the premise that economically disadvantaged children, when properly challenged and given the means for growth and learning, can make remarkable academic and social progress. Accordingly, they felt a new design for education must be created.

From this point, they set out to design such a program for the elementary school levels—one which would be qualitatively different from that found in comparable schools. They established this format:

Limit school registers (in New York City, 1,000 or less pupils).

Set maximum class size at 22; kindergarten at 12 maximum.

Each group of three classes is to have an additional teacher. The "cluster" teacher is to share equally in the responsibilities of the cluster.

School secretaries are to be provided on the ratio of one per 250 children. This is to free the teacher from secretarial chores.

School guidance counselors are to be provided on the ratio of one per 350 children.

Each MES school should provide care for the seriously disturbed child.

Additional teaching positions are to be filled to work with the regular classroom teacher. This would permit individual attention to be given a child or a small group of children.

Provision is to be made for teacher aide time by parents at the ratio of 1 hour per day per 20 children.

Provision for a yearly special contingency fund at the ratio of $2.50 per pupil is to be used for special purposes as the need of the school require.

---

[1] Walter G. Davis is Director of the AFL-CIO Department of Education.

Additional special funds are to be budgeted for supplies above the rate established for regular schools. These funds represent a substantial increase over amounts allotted to regular schools.

Each MES school is to have a full-time psychologist, social worker, attendance teacher, speech therapist and community coordinator assigned to it.

At least one psychiatrist is allotted for each four MES schools. He serves as consultant to the regular school clinical team and to the teacher.

A full-time health counselor is to be provided for each school.

Additional medical and dental services are to be offered over the amount of services provided regular schools.

Special funds are to be set aside for staff orientation programs before the opening of each school.

Principals and assistant principals are to meet regularly with the staff for the purpose of evaluating practices and to exchange views.

These improvements may not appear dramatic but they are comprehensive in aiming at the basic problem of these special children. Most important is the simple proposition that the teacher be free to spend 100 percent of her time teaching and not acting the role of policeman.

At an early stage of the MES program, improved morale among staff, children and parents was clearly observable.

Program evaluators have stated categorically that the children in MES are achieving at a higher level than those in comparable schools not in MES programs. Also, they are making greater gains than many children in "normal" schools.

A keen interest in the program is developing among the regular, experienced teachers. Fewer than 20 out of 800 teachers left the program at the end of the first year, even though all had the privilege of leaving at the end of the year without prejudice.

The National Advisory Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children stated in its January report to the President and Congress that "The attitudes of teachers are crucial in improving the education of disadvantaged children."

It cited summer schools aided by Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act last summer, "the atmosphere of experimentation" and "fresh feelings of success with children" as instrumental in changing traditional teacher attitudes.

The AFT decided to expand the scope of this program and appointed Simon Beagle, a veteran teacher now beginning his 41st year in the New York City school system, to head a national program.

Beagle has so far encouraged interest in the program in a number of major cities. Using the experience gained in the 21 schools now operating in New York City, school boards in Baltimore, New Orleans and Denver have approved MES programs. The program is under consideration in the District of Columbia, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, Cleveland, Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Louis, Phoenix, San Diego, Los Angeles, and San Francisco.

Part of the problem is cost. Most school systems have already allocated their proposed budgets for fiscal year 1968. Any additional services required by the MES program would necessarily mean the resetting of priorities.

The job now is to somehow bring home to education and other public officials that not only is the increased cost an investment in human resources, but that at least part of the increase will be offset in a reduction in delinquency and other social ills plaguing America's cities. In-depth treatment of the problems of the ghetto youngster through vastly improved teaching techniques and services hopefully will lead to a clearer perspective of life for the youngster, thus making him more responsive to the opportunities now available to him.

This still leaves room for other programs. Office of Economic Opportunity projects such as Head Start can be coordinated with MES programs. Model city programs could eliminate the physical gloom of the ghetto and, through the construction of libraries and other facilities, truly create a new world and a decent start for today's disadvantaged children.

A significant area of present day discussion involves the serious question, "Shall the minority group community press for quality education in the existing systems or shall the main effort be directed toward integrated education?"

Among the pros and cons, there emerge two distinct trends. One argues it has been proven beyond a reasonable doubt that the only solution to the problem is to completely abolish the segregated school. The other argument says complete integration will not be achieved within the next decade and, therefore, we must not shortchange today's minority group youngsters any further; they must have quality education in the ghetto school now.

Fear of pursuing either course arises since it has not been made clear that both efforts can and must be vigorously pursued concurrently.

Before positions on this question become polarized, with little done in either direction, representatives of all positions should meet and try to agree to a common approach and with the single objective that the public schools are to provide the highest possible educational opportunity while moving ahead to end the segregated system as soon as possible.

The U.S. Office of Education appears to be the proper agency to give leadership on this vital question.

It would be tragic if differences over approach were allowed to contribute to any further delay in effectively working toward the common goal of providing quality education for all children in the United States.

Vicente T. Ximenes

SPEECH

OF

HON. OMAR BURLESON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1967

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, the action of the President in appointing Vicente T. Ximenes to the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, and at the same time creating a new Interagency Committee on Mexican American Affairs, to be headed by Mr. Ximenes, is most commendable.

The action of the President in appointing Mr. Ximenes not only fills a vacancy, but it fills a void. I would not assert that there has been willful neglect of efforts to provide greater opportunity for Mexican American citizens, but emphasis has been placed elsewhere for too long, and to ignore obvious needs is not doing the program for the betterment of all citizens any good. It reflects on the entire effort. But this appointment of a highly qualified man with an impressive background should provide a voice for Mexican Americans which has not been properly heard in the immediate past.

This is not assuming that Mr. Ximenes is expected to devote his attention in this direction only, because his former activities indicate a broad knowledge and experience in matters relating to equal opportunity and a desire for the betterment of the underprivileged. It does, however, bring into Government service an individual who is intimately acquainted with the existing situation and who can present a fresh and an authentic view heretofore lacking.

Leaders in the Mexican American community in my own district have experienced some frustration in being unable to present problems and conditions deserving attention under the equal employment opportunity program. I think we must admit that in all probability we have taken too much for granted and have assumed that problems would have a way of working themselves out to a solution, but the question is what degree of solution is satisfactory. Opportunity for employment and education are more basic in many instances with our Mexican American citizens than any other segment of our society. With such opportunities assured, these citizens will take their place of responsibility in our society as a whole. I believe that Mr. Ximenes, in this new capacity will afford better opportunities for these developments.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I lend my hearty support to the President's appointment of Mr. Ximenes, in order that his valuable service will soon be applied to the great problems involved.

Charles A. Russo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 1967

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, recently, I received a communication to the effect that in recognition of the death recently of a giant of my community, the Pennsylvania General Assembly passed a resolution honoring him and calling on the city of Philadelphia to name a playground for him.

The name I refer to is Charles A. Russo. Since the Pennsylvania resolution described him and his contributions to America very well, rather than repeat those words I will include the entire resolution at this point in the RECORD:

HOUSE RESOLUTION 32

(In the House of Representatives,
February 27, 1967)

Charles A. Russo, a native of Philadelphia and founder of De Val Corporation, De Russ Machine Products Company and Flite Engineering, left his mark on our lives and has passed on.

He was raised in the Tocony section of Philadelphia, in which he built his factories. Through his drive and belief in people he was able to create jobs for hundreds. To know and associate with him was both an honor and a challenge. He had faith in people. He helped them. And he loved children. The youngsters were able to enjoy Tocony Park to its fullest extent because, unknown to almost all the residents, he paid for the electricity used to illuminate the park at night.

Charles A. Russo served with distinction in the United States Navy in World War II. In peacetime, as an industrialist, he insisted that the products manufactured in his plants for our armed forces be perfect in every detail. Patriotism was a way of life with him. This legislative body should commend his humanitarian efforts and the City of Philadelphia should pay special honor to his memory; therefore be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives pause in its deliberations to pay honor to Charles R. Russo whose demonstration of interest in his fellowman we all could emulate; and be it further

Resolved, That the City of Philadelphia be requested to change the name of Tocony Park Playground located on the block bounded by Cottmas Avenue, Edmund Street, Bleigh Street and Torresdale Avenue to the "Charles A. Russo Playground" in his memory; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the City of Philadelphia, City Hall, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

Millionaires Aided by Tax Loopholes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 1967

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the loopholes in our tax laws have long been known to all of us, but action to close them has never been easy to achieve.

One of the most dramatic presentations of this situation appears in the current issues of the AFL–CIO News. I commend this article to the attention of all of us, Mr. Speaker, and insert it in the RECORD, as follows:

SOME PAY NOTHING: MILLIONAIRES AIDED BY TAX LOOPHOLES

There were 482 individuals who made $1 million or more in 1964—and 19 of these did not pay a cent of income tax.

In 1963, 20 millionaires of a total of 371 got off tax free.

This year, about 24 will have figured a way to avoid paying income tax for 1966.

Their secret is taking advantage of loopholes in U.S. tax laws—loopholes that exist only when you make lots of money.

Out of 65.4 million tax returns filed with the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) in 1964, 95.7 percent were for adjusted gross incomes of $15,000 or less.

About half of all returns, 33 million, were for incomes of $5,000 or less.

People who earn their living solely from wages and salaries are the victims of loopholes in the law.

How does a big money earner go about escaping taxes?

Here is a case of a person whose 1965 adjusted gross income was $2 million and who paid no taxes:

"Unlimited charitable deductions" is the key.

To qualify, the millionaire's charitable contributions, plus his income tax, had to exceed 90 percent of his taxable income for eight out of the preceding 10 years.

Most taxpayers, even if they itemize their deductions on the "long form," can deduct only up to 20 percent of their net taxable income as contributions to charity.

Once the millionaire qualified under the "unlimited charitable deductions" loophole, he started giving money away.

Total contributions by him totaled $1.9 million and he also paid $50,000 in state income tax. In other words, he paid out all $2 million of his income, and had nothing left to tax.

But his $2 million adjusted gross income did not include interest on state and municipal bonds, for example, and he has plenty of them.

Nor does it include write-offs for drilling and developmental costs in the gas and oil industry, nor one-half of capital gains.

He has thousands of dollars of income from all of these sources—and more—that he doesn't have to include in his $2 million adjusted figure.

Tax laws are so complex that just listing exemptions takes the Treasury Dept. 1,000 pages.

Some congressmen have been battling unsuccessfully for years to close the tax loopholes.

Until the holes are closed you can take cheer in the fact that nothing keeps you from taking advantage of some of the same breaks in the future providing you make a million.

Bristol, Va.-Tenn., Honors Hero of the Vietnam War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 31, 1967

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, May 28, I was privileged to participate in the ceremonies to dedicate a monument to Pfc. Fred L. Richardson Jr., of Bristol, who was killed in action in Vietnam.

I thank especially Mrs. Clarence Burley, whose idea the monument was, and whose determination made it a reality, and I point out in her own words the reason she strove to have this monument erected:

> I started this project to inspire youth of all races to become more active and participate in all phases of religious, patriotic, and civic organizations and to learn the value of helping others by working together for the common good of all people.

I congratulate Mrs. Burley and all those who participated in the realization of this memorial.

The following articles from the Bristol, Tenn.-Va., newspapers describe the events of that beautiful Sunday afternoon when in quiet and simple dignity a freedom's hero was honored by the people of his hometown:

DEDICATION SET TODAY—MONUMENT HONORS BRISTOL SOLDIER SLAIN IN VIETNAM

A monument honoring Fred Lewis Richardson, Jr., believed to be the first Bristol Negro killed in Vietnam, will be dedicated in ceremonies at 4 p.m. today.

On hand for the dedication at the Tenneya American Legion Post No. 87, 1040 Fifth St., will be a host of local, state and area dignitaries, including both Bristol mayors, Congressman James H. Quillen, Issac Freeman of Congressman William Wampler's Bristol staff, Mrs. Wampler and Col. and Mrs. J. K. Blankenbeckler.

Other honored guests will include Bristol Tennessee Police Chief Mack Godsey; W. H. Lane, supervisor of Jacobs Creek Job Corpsmen; Abe Thweatt, Job Corpsmen work leader; and Al Kelly, Job Corps Center director.

The dedication represents long months of untiring efforts of a citizens committee represented by Mrs. Mildred Burley, who first conceived the monument "as a tribute to Richardson and, hopefully, a source of inspiration to all Bristol youth."

The late soldier, son of Mrs. Fred Richardson Delaney and stepson of Fred Delaney, was one of the first Negroes to graduate from Tennessee High School. He later cut short a promising academic career at Tennessee Tech to enlist in the service.

A few months later, his body was returned to Bristol for a hero's burial with full military honors and he since has been posthumously honored by both the U.S. and South Vietnamese governments.

A highlight of the ceremonies will be the posthumous presentation to Richardson's family of two South Vietnamese war medals by Capt. R. J. Barrios.

The bulk of the manual labor in the creation of the memorial has been done by a contingent from the Jacobs Creek Jobs Corps Center and the corpsmen will lay a wreath at the foot of the monument following its unveiling.

In charge of the ceremonies will be Capt. Barrios, instructor of ROTC from East Tennessee State University in Johnson City. The actual unveiling of the steel-cut marble and stone edifice will be done by Mrs. Burley.

Prior to that, however, Bristol Tennessee Mayor Wesley Davis will read letters of acknowledgement praising the project from President Lyndon Johnson, the two city governments, and Sen. Albert Gore.

Isaac Freeman will read letters of acknowledgment from Rep. Wampler and from Tennessee Sen. Howard Baker.

Other pre-unveiling events will include the invocation by the Rev. Daniel L. Williams, newly appointed pastor of John Wesley Methodist Church; the national anthem performed by the Tennessee High School band under the direction of L. Howard Nicar; introduction of Boys' Club members by Bristol Virginia Mayor Fred Geromanos; and introduction of Jobs Corpsmen and Boy Scouts who will lead the pledge to the flag.

The monument represents a $3,000 fundraising project begun some months ago under the direction of Mrs. Burley. "This monument represents only the beginning of a memorial garden which we hope to complete at the Tenneva Post," Mrs. Burley said.

"We will also form a corporation and name a board of directors to help make an annual Fred Richardson cash award to an outstanding high school student," she said.

Financial assistance has come from throughout the Bristol area and from former Bristolians and distant relatives of Richardson from New York, Chicago, Colorado and other states.

The monument, a $1,500 stone affair, has a legend in memory of Richardson sand-blasted into the surface and is set off in a landscaped area with an inlaid marble walk and platform.

Family members from New York, Knoxville, Roanoke, Nashville, Ohio, Colorado, Kentucky and both Bristols are expected to be on hand for the unveiling.

Two permanent urns donated by the Albert King family will be placed beside the monument during the ceremonies.

Recent cash donations have come from Mrs. Karl Harrop; Mrs. Frank DePriece; Mr. and Mrs. Fred Delaney Jr., Denver, Colo.; Mrs. Pauline Bradley, Knoxville; the Monday Evening Club of the Twin City; Mrs. Doretha Boyd, Roanoke; Mrs. Debrea Rhea; Mrs. Catherine Rogers; the Bristol Beautification Foundation; and the 20th Century Club.

Recent donations of labor and materials came from Wood Howell Nursery; Edmonds Brothers Lumber Co.; Paty Lumber Co.; Roden Electric Supply Co.; Bristol Tennessee; and Gillespie and Robinson Funeral Home.

Monument Dedicated for Late Private First Class Richardson

(By Richard Boyd)

In yesterday's sun blazing afternoon, the late Pfc. Fred L. Richardson Jr. was made an official hero of Bristol.

And the things he died for on a battlefield in South Vietnam on May 3, 1966, were enumerated and praised by officials of both Bristols, spokesmen for the military, American Legion officials and First District Congressman James H. Quillen.

The spirit of Richardson prevailed at the occasion—ceremonies for the unveiling of a permanent monument in his honor at the Tenneva American Legion Post No. 87—and in the words of others, the portrait of a common man making the supreme sacrifice for his country was depicted.

Rep. Quillen, who rushed to the ceremonies from a wreath laying event at Mountain Home, Tenn., said Richardson exemplified the spirit of the American fighting man of all times.

"My heart here today is with all fighting men of all times who have given their lives for the great things for which America stands," Quillen said.

Rep. William C. Wampler of Virginia's Ninth District said, in a letter read by Issac Freeman, his Bristol field representative, that, "as a citizen of Bristol I share your pride in Pfc. Richardson, a pride that stems not from the fact he died in a war half a world away, but rather from the realization that his was the type of citizenship that recognized the need to defend the ideals of his country and help his fellow man." In the searing brightness of the sun, which seemed to symbolize the tone of the ceremonies, several members of the Richardson family, some from Colorado and New York, blinked through moistened eyes and kept their attention riveted on the draped monument.

Capt. Roy J. Barrios of the ROTC Department of East Tennessee State University, who was master of ceremonies, said "we who enjoy the privileges these war dead seek to preserve must do what we can to at least honor what they have done."

And this theme—recognition of the price Richardson and other war dead have paid and the duty of the living to see that the sacrifices are not forgotten—was echoed throughout in the remarks of those present and acknowledgments of others who could not attend.

Bristol Tennessee Mayor Wesley Davis, prior to reading letters of acknowledgment said Richardson's death was an example "that the men of Tennessee and Virginia are willing to do what is right so free men can assemble. This monument attests to the fact he did not die in vain."

Davis read letters from President and Mrs. Lyndon Johnson, Tennessee Gov. Buford Ellington, Tennessee Senator Albert Gore and Sen. Howard Baker Jr., the Rev. Harry Wright of the Veteran's Administration in Mountain Home, Tenn., and several interested persons throughout the two states.

Quillen, who made the main address, said it was a tragedy that some in America would burn, spit on, and destroy the American flag.

"Desecration of the American flag must be put to an end," Quillen, who recently introduced a bill in the U.S. House to make flag desecration a federal offense, said.

He predicted his bill would be passed during the present term of Congress.

But it was a day primarily to honor Richardson, the first Negro from Bristol to die in Vietnam, and honored he was.

Capt. Barrios cited his service record and said Richardson received the Purple Heart, the Military Medal and the Vietnam Cross with palms for gallantry from South Vietnam and the Bronze Star with V from the U.S. government.

Richardson, who was 20 when he died while leading a platoon attack on North Vietnamese gun emplacements, was the first Negro to graduate from Bristol Tennessee High School and cut short a promising academic career at Tennessee Tech to enter the armed services.

Brought back a few months later in the impersonal gray casket of the military dead, he was buried with military honors—but, largely through the efforts of Mrs. Clarence Burley, a drive was begun to assure that his memory would not be forgotten.

This drive, directed by Mrs. Burley and through the efforts of many Bristol citizens, culminated in the erection of the $1,500 monument on the grounds of the American Legion Post,

Much of the actual manual labor was done by members of the Jacobs Creek Job Corps Center and Job Corpsmen formed a color guard around the monument during the ceremonies and laid a wreath at the foot of it.

Decorative urns were donated by the Albert King family and R. C. Vance of Tri-City Monument helped secure the sand stone and marble ediface.

The Tennessee High School band, under the direction of George Wenger, assistant director, played several selections throughout the ceremonies and the Rev. Daniel L. Williams, newly appointed pastor of the John Wesley Methodist Church, gave the invocation.

With the piercing tones of "Taps" played by a THS band member, the approximately 250 persons in attendance gave a final tribute to Richardson—a salute of gratitude.

And the monument, then was left to reflect the sun's rays in the hot afternoon.

Ashby's Bicentennial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1967

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, this month the historic town of Ashby, Mass., in my district is celebrating its 200th anniversary with impressive community exercises.

Ashby was formed in 1667 from parts of Townsend, Fitchburg, and Ashburnham after a 2-year fight led by John Fitch, after whom Fitchburg was named, for separate status. The first town meeting was held on March 30, 1767, and the first selectmen were John Fitch, John Locke, and John Jones.

While Ashby has remained primarily a rural community, town records show that there was small industry as long ago as 1750 when James Locke operated a gristmill powered by water from Willard Brook. By 1850, there were several small mills. One of them is believed to be the first factory to make tubs and pails in Massachusetts.

Today farming is still conducted in Ashby, but most of its people commute to their employment in Fitchburg, Worcester, or Boston.

In recognition of Ashby's anniversary, Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today an appropriate resolution for the consideration of the House which extends greetings and felicitations to the poeple of Ashby on this historic anniversary.

Actually, Ashby began celebrating its anniversary on March 4 of this year with a bicentennial dinner, which I was greatly honored to attend, and I include as part of my remarks the address I gave at this opening event of the anniversary.

Earlier this month, as part of the bicentennial program, there was a firemen's parade and muster in Ashby. This first event of the extensive anniversary program was held on June 11 at Allen Field.

This Friday, there will be a tour of historic homes in the community, an exhibit of arts and crafts and an anniversary pageant in the elementary school auditorium. The pageant will be repeated on Saturday.

On June 24, an open air supper will be held in the evening on the town common, to be followed by square dancing in the elementary school auditorium. A nondenominational worship service will take place on Sunday, June 25, on the town common. This will be followed by a barbecue dinner at noon and a band concert in the afternoon.

Other events on the Ashby anniversary program include an oldtime band concert on the town common on July 12, a road race and field events at Allen Field on September 30, and a huge bicentennial parade on October 8.

This is a most impressive anniversary program, Mr. Speaker, and it was a distinct honor and pleasure for me to be able to participate in the March bicentenial dinner which initiated the 200th birthday of the fine town of Ashby. I was very much impressed with the dinner and the gathering, which was in the finest tradition of Massachusetts and New England.

Notwithstanding the tumult, the shouting, the agitation, and the signs of uneasiness which surround us these days, it was a most refreshing experience for me to attend this large anniversary celebration meeting of sincere, dedicated Americans and to join with them in starting so enthusiastically the program for the observance of the bicentennial anniversary of their town.

The program of the occasion was admirably arranged and conducted by the able master of ceremonies and spiritual leader, Rev. Lawrence M. Jaffa, and the invocation was given by the able, spiritual leader, Father Thomas F. Brosnan. The reading of the town charter by John F. Nash, town moderator, was extremely interesting and it vividly recalled the early days of the Nation.

The Ashby Oratorio Singers, led by their very brilliant, dynamic director, Mr. Clark Greene, accompanied by a most accomplished pianist, Connie Fanos, sang several musical selections of a spiritually inspirational nature, reminiscent of past days.

Distinguished public officials from town, county, State, and Nation were present, including the able, distinguished Senator John E. Harrington, Jr., of the Massachusetts State Senate and the able and distinguished Representative George W. Shattuck, of the Massachusettts House of Representatives.

Lovely, young ladies, who were candidates for bicentennial queen, were presented to the gathering and were received with great enthusiasm. They were all typically beautiful, young American girls and naturally were greatly appreciated and acclaimed by the audience.

Next on the program came a very remarkable bicentennial address by attorney John B. Matson, a native of Ashby, a prominent lawyer in Boston, and distinguished, learned former chief examiner of the Massachusetts land court.

Following Mr. Matson's fine speech the Ashby Oratorio Singers again entertained the audience, this time with the closing number, "America the Beautiful," and I have never heard this moving song sung with more feeling, sensitivity or better effect. Mr. Greene as well as his singers are to be complimented on their fine work.

To close out the program, benediction was offered by the able spiritual leader, Rev. Rollin E. Johnson, Jr., and that concluded a most impressive program which had been arranged by the dinner chairman, Mrs. George J. Thibault, and her group.

I am very happy, Mr. Speaker, to have the opportunity to make reference to this glowing, first event of the Ashby, Mass., bicentennial celebration in the Congress, and I heartily congratulate the leaders and the people of Ashby for the good beginning they made in commencing their 200th anniversary celebration. I feel sure that the rest of their program will be as noteworthy and successful as this dinner.

It is not any commonplace thing for a town or community to celebrate a 200th anniversary, and in this respect Ashby is indeed singularly honored. I shall never forget the wonderful, inspiring night I spent at the initial event of the bicentennial program, and I am much indebted to the members of the committee, who so kindly invited me and made possible for me such a memorable evening.

After the conclusion of the program, I was invited by my friends, Mr. and Mrs. Edwin Lyman, to visit with them and some friends in their lovely colonial home, not far from the center of Ashby.

My night with my friends of Ashby was an experience which I shall always gratefully remember. It was a pleasure for me in many respects, but I think I was impressed most with its projection in the total community of those values, ways of life and virtues that built the early foundations and sparked the advancement of the Nation.

It gave me the chance to think about the people who founded this Nation and their ways, the sacrifices they made carving a civilization out of a wilderness, and infusing it with life and splendor and progress that has been so much part of our country's origin, development, and growth.

These colonial people did not have the conveniences and comforts of the 20th century, but neither did they have the unsettlement, uneasiness and divisive elements of the present time.

They had purpose, ideals, high goals, and they worked together faithfully, industriously, doggedly, and without thought of self to reach them, and then turn their gains over to those who followed them.

The question is: Shall we, and the succeeding generations, be worthy of these invaluable legacies from our past heritage? Shall we, in our day, zealously preserve them, and transmit them untarnished and unblemished to those who come after us?

The answer to these questions will determine by and large the destiny of America and the destiny of freedom in the world. I have faith that Americans of this generation will take up their burden and their torch and sustin them for our own great Nation and the world.

Mr. Speaker, the text of my congratulatory resolution reads as follows:

Whereas the year 1967 marks the two hundredth anniversary of the incorporation of the town of Ashby, Massachusetts; and

Whereas from the time of its settlement the people of Ashby have figured conspicuously in the founding, growth, and defense of this Nation; and

Whereas the observance of the two hundredth anniversary of Ashby is being celebrated this month with impressive community ceremonies; and

Whereas Ashby is a beautiful community rich in historic interest, well known for its patriotic contributions, noted for its many famous sons and daughters who distinguished themselves in many fields of endeavor and many facets of American civilization: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives extends its greetings and felicitations to the people of Ashby, Massachusetts, on the occasion of the two hundredth anniversary of this community and the House of Representatives further expresses its appreciation for the splendid services rendered to the Nation by the citizens of Ashby during the past two hundred years.

REMARKS IN PART OF CONGRESSMAN PHILIP J. PHILBIN, ASHBY BICENTENNIAL DINNER, MARCH 4, 1967

My dear friends, it is a real privilege, pleasure and honor for me to be with you tonight upon the occasion of this fine kick-off dinner commencing the celebration of the bicentennial anniversary of the incorporation of the beautiful Town of Ashby.

First, I want to congratulate all of you—your outstanding Committee, your able and distinguished officials, your religious, civil and business leaders, and all the people of Ashby, upon this most unusual anniversary, commemorating your 200th birthday. Many happy returns of the day.

Just think of it, my friends, 200 years of history, starting with the primitive conditions of Colonial New England and spanning marvelous changes, progress and fabulous development that has taken place in the intervening years.

From very early days, this community has been noted for its religious and patriotic dedication.

This Town was founded by hardy, God-fearing people who never knew fear or doubt, determined men and women committed to belief in Divine Providence and resolutely determined, at all costs, to live under institutions of freedom, personal liberty and peace.

The story of Ashby is inspiring and thrilling. It is an American story, a story of problems, struggles and sorrows, but also a story of gains and victories, not only of the growth, well-being and happiness of this wonderful community, but also distinct contributions to the great, forward-moving lifestream of national strength, unity and prosperity that is represented by our country.

Thanks to the spirit and the labors, the loyalty and devotion of the American people throughout the years, this town is now part of a nation that is termed the giant of the North American continent, the most powerful, richest and most advanced nation in the world. Yes, rich beyond contemplation, powerful in ways that truly stagger the imagination, rich with accumulations of industry, the returns of commerce and labor and the highest standards of living that the world has ever known.

Our progress has not been confined to material progress. With it, has come unprecedented progress in the arts, science, civilization, religion, spiritual development—progress in every area, and all these blessings which the American people have received have their proud temples in this beautiful New England town, and in the towns, villages and cities spread from coast to coast, north, south, east and west all over this great nation.

It can be said that you people of Ashby, as well as our fellow citizens throughout this broad country, have recognized the responsibilities and duties that come with strength, and power, and the endowments of free government bequeathed to us by our dedicated ancestors and predecessors.

It can, and should be, said on this, and every other occasion, that you have shared the great, national sacrifices that have been made.

You have lived by the principles, ideals and values which have made this nation what it is.

You have recognized the most urgent need that has confronted us in the past, and that confronts us today, for protecting and guarding these great blessings of liberty, so that they may be assured in perpetuity for this nation, and for other nations that share our rich heritage of freedom.

In looking back tonight to the days of Ashby's founding in an uncharted wilderness 200 years ago, we can take real pride in the resolution, strength of character, goodness of heart, absolute fidelity to country and faith in God of Ashby's citizens from the beginning and throughout many generations of its history.

We can be thankful for the blessings bestowed by the Creator throughout all these years, and the marvelous work, patience, gallantry and determination of those who have preceded us, and whose cherished memory we shall always honor.

To a greater extent than some skeptics and ideologists of this generation may think, we have drawn strength and inspiration as a nation, and as a proud people, from our shining, historical past. Even as we recognize, with the eloquent poet, that "the moving finger writes, and having writ, moves on," that we can never turn back the clock, that the nation and the world must go forward, must go upward to broader higher goals, must adapt ourselves to the incredible changes that are taking place around us, which are made necessary by the inescapable demands and needs of the nuclear, jet age and the truly fabulous times in which we live.

What we must recognize with special emphasis is that each generation must labor to keep the lamps of freedom burning and, if necessary, we must struggle to preserve human liberty, and freedom, and the right to enjoy free, democratic government, free enterprise, that is the very basis of this nation, free, religious worship and individual rights that are so precious to all of us.

We are living in extremely unsettled, challenging times. In this dangerous world, where aggression and tyranny seek to destroy the rights of all free people, we must stand, as we have always stood, with courage and high purpose, unalterably committed to defend the safety, security, integrity and welfare of the nation, and uphold the principles of truth and justice and ordered liberty upon which our great, free system is based.

There are no easy solutions, no short cuts, no magical formulas by which we can settle the problems of this hour.

To do this, we must be determined, first, last and always, to preserve our own free heritage. We must, and I know we will, continue to strive with all our hearts and energies for a "rule of law", and for a just, enduring, honorable peace in Vietnam and in the world—a universal peace that will permit all human beings to live under the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man, free from Communist dictatorship, or any other kind of tyranny, and delivered from the dreadful scourge of nuclear war or any other war. Let us know that peace with freedom is the great question of our day.

As we celebrate, so meaningfully and with such true reverence and devotion, the founding of this typically American town, let us face without flinching the grave problems that are before us.

Let us never abandon the principles and the values that made us the great free God-fearing nation that we are.

Let us always remain firm without fear or doubt, in the spirit of those who founded this country, and those who preceded us, with real courage, faith and determination, to keep this nation as a secure dwelling place and sanctuary for those dedicated to human freedom and committed to peace and progress and amity.

Just a personal word. I want you to know how very proud I am of this town, and its faithful, devoted people, and of the great privilege you of this District have accorded me to represent you in the Congress of the United States, the greatest, deliberative body of its kind in the world.

As your Congressman, your friend, and a most sincere admirer, I am very happy tonight to bring the greetings and felicitations of our great District to all your leaders and your people, and to express the hope and prayer that in the time to come the good Lord will bring you all, each and every one of you, choicest blessings of good health, prosperity, happiness and peace for many years to come.

I express to you my deep gratitude for the encouragement and support you have extended me in my important official work, and for the many evidences of warm friendship that you have so wholeheartedly extended me.

Finally, in the happy trilogy of spiritual dedication, patriotism and zeal for achievement, always so typical of this Town, I am sure that you will go forward together, as you have in the past, to even greater heights of accomplishment, well-being and success, and that you will always maintain here the close ties of loyalty, mutual respect and affection which are so much a part of American community life, so invaluable in building the strength of the nation, safeguarding the fountainhead of enterprise and freedom and preserving the rights of the individual citizen and his family.

I am deeply grateful to you and your distinguished Committee, for giving me the very high honor of being with you on this memorable occasion. Command me when I can be helpful.

The Flag: Symbol of Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 1967

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, the House will soon consider legislation to make desecration of the flag a Federal offense. H.R. 10480 in large measure has been prompted by popular outrage at some of the actions taken by critics of Government policy in Vietnam. There is always a temptation to seek to legislate conformity at times when emotions run high. The proposed bill has put Members of the House in a position where, to defend the highest principles of the Republic, they may appear to vote against the flag.

An editorial in this morning's New York Times entitled "Protecting the Flag" speaks eloquently to the matter, and I offer it for the consideration of my colleagues. I hope that, when this matter is debated, devotion to our historic liberties will prevail.

The editorial follows:

[From the New York Times, June 15, 1967]

PROTECTING THE FLAG

The House Judiciary Committee has reported a bill making it a felony under Federal law for anyone to "cast contempt" upon the flag by publicly mutilating, burning, defiling or trampling it. Representative Celler of New York, the committee chairman, who has resisted this measure for more than two years, finally allowed it to be reported out because of strong pressure from the House Rules Committee. Even though he acknowledges that this bill is wholly unnecessary and probably unconstitutional, Mr. Celler did not oppose it: "Who can vote against something like this?", he asked. "It's like motherhood."

The bill is unnecessary because every state in the Union already has a statute making it at least a misdemeanor to misuse the flag. It is probably unconstitutional because it does not require that a specific intent to cast contempt on the flag be proved in court. Moreover, it wanders along the boundaries of, and may actually invade, the sanctuary of free speech protected by the First Amendment.

In its original version the bill made words as well as deeds punishable. Since that would clearly have been unconstitutional, the Judiciary Committee struck the reference to words. But the language of the bill remains uncertain. What does it mean to "defile" the flag? If defined as sullying or dishonoring the flag, this term could be construed as covering speech. Artistic "representations" of the flag are also specified in the bill, which thereby infringes the freedom of the artist.

Some sponsors of the pending bill have acknowledged that their purpose is to repress protests against the war in Vietnam. Such an act of intimidation would itself dishonor the flag. The flag is a symbol of freedom, not of herdlike conformity. Like motherhood, it is so deserving of genuine respect that empty mouthings and legal compulsions are out of place.

Hope and Promise: Americans of Spanish Surname

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 1967

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, one of the largest and yet least-known groups of people in the United States is made up of those with Spanish surnames. Concentrated in the Southwest, many of them are ill educated, ill housed, and ill fed.

One of the distinguished Members of this House, the Representative from Texas [HENRY B. GONZALEZ], told the story of these citizens of our Nation in the current issue of the American Federationist, official monthly magazine of the AFL–CIO.

Mr. Speaker, I insert this article at this point in the RECORD:

HOPE AND PROMISE: AMERICANS OF SPANISH SURNAME

(By Representative HENRY B. GONZALEZ)

If you are hungry, hope itself is a distant thing; and if you are defeated, promises of better things to come ring empty. If yours is a world of dirt floors and tin roofs, tomorrow holds no promises and your greatest ambition is to live through today. For 5 million Americans of Spanish surname, all too many live in such a world, far removed from the American dream.

Wherever there are people who are poor, there is tragic waste. The poor lead short lives and their hopes and dreams prove illusory. Society has never cared much about the poor because they have always been there, and there has never been much reason to believe that poverty could be or even should be eradicated. Somehow society decided, by and large, that a poor man is poor only because of his own failure and that he deserves his fate.

But in recent years there has been a happy change in this old attitude. We have realized that, in fact, the American dream is not open to everyone; we have been able to understand the terrible waste of poverty and that it can be ended. We have come to realize that some men are poor because society has denied them the chance to be anything else and that the poor should not and need not be despised and forgotten.

We have begun to try to find out why men are poor and what can be done about it. We have started to seek ways and means of giving poor men more in life besides a determination to survive against high odds.

One of the biggest and least known groups of poor people is concentrated in the Southwest. Only one-sixth of the population of this country lives in the five southwestern states, but one-fourth of America's poor live there. In Texas alone, there are 63 counties—a quarter of the state's total—where half the people live on incomes of less than $3,000 a year.

In Bexar County, which I represent in Congress, more than a fourth of the population is classified as poor; 115,000 people there live in substandard housing. The overwhelming number of these ill-housed, ill-clad, ill-fed people are of Spanish surname.

The official rate of unemployment in Bexar County is usually about 4 percent; but for the poor, for the Spanish-surnamed, it is twice that. The average educational attainment of the county population is 11 grades, but for the Spanish-surnamed it is half that.

In the poor areas of the city of San Antonio, where most of the Spanish-surnamed population lives, the Department of Labor estimates that half of the people who are employed earn less than $60 a week. Of those who work and who live in this poor part of the city, 20 percent work part-time only. The pattern in Bexar County is repeated again and again throughout the Southwest.

Seventy percent of the unemployed slum-dwellers of San Antonio in November of 1966 did not have a high school education. Forty-eight percent of them did not even have an eighth grade education. And 6.5 percent of the unemployed in the slums never went to school at all.

These people know all too well what their handicaps are; they know that even when opportunity comes along they do not have the education or the skills to take advantage of it. They need help and they usually want it. They have not necessarily failed society; society may have failed them.

Despite our knowledge of all this, the schools are still turning out people who lack marketable skills or even a good education. All too often in the Southwest, children of Spanish surname emerge from school illiterate in English as well as Spanish, and whose time and talents have been squandered, whose ambitions have been blunted and shorn away and who see in the future only an unskilled job, a tiny paycheck if any at all, and blessed relief in the neighborhood tavern.

Wherein lies the fault? What must or what can be done to arouse hopes, to build dreams and to bring into the realm of possible achievement the ambitions for tomorrow. Moreover, how are we to attack this problem which, in fact, we can understand only dimly? What should society set as its goals and what goals should the poor set for themselves? What should be the dream of the American of Spanish surname who finds himself trapped by discrimination, by poor education and by a poverty so abject that tomorrow is made too far away to see?

The Spanish-surnamed American has a unique problem and it demands unique action.

In the first place, there is the problem of definition. There is not even a generally accepted name for this minority group. Americans of Spanish surname are called Mexicans, Mexicanos, Latins, Latinos, Latin Americans, Mexican Americans and Hispanic Americans; not one of these labels is accepted everywhere. A name accepted in one place is enough to produce violence elsewhere.

I prefer to think of the group as Americans of Spanish surname because, after all, they are Americans and they all have Spanish surnames. Any other label would be inadequate because this group has such diverse origins. Some were born here and some have immigrated only recently. Some come from families that have lived in the Southwest for more than 200 years and are of Spanish descent. Others have origins in Mexico or parentage ranging from Indian tribes to English gentry. There is no term, perhaps even one so tentlike as Spanish-surnamed American, that adequately describes a group so conglomerate as this.

This group of people is so scattered about the land and so disparate in its origins that it has problems defining itself, just as the government has problems in defining it. No matter what you call this vast number of people, there is no doubt about one thing: they have common problems.

We can understand what the problems are, at least vaguely, by reciting the tragic statistics of poverty, unemployment, sickness and illiteracy, but these are only the tangible aspects of the matter and give us no real understanding of the political and psychic problems of the Spanish-surnamed American.

The Spanish-surnamed American group has problems in setting forth cogent goals, just as it does in finding an all-inclusive label. The group possesses no single program, no national goals and has not so far been able to coalesce into a single, meaningful whole, capable of speaking with a united voice. There is no national organization of Spanish-surnamed Americans that could be considered comparable to the NAACP.

There are organizations that consider themselves national and which, indeed, have members in several states, but not one of these has a full-time paid executive or staff devoted to looking out for its interests, defining problems, setting goals and otherwise acting as an effective national spokesman. There is always the possibility that a truly national and effective organization will come about, but there is no such group now. There have been many attempts to create a national organization, but they have failed for one reason or another: the time has been wrong, the leadership ineffective or a combination of problems has barred the way, preventing effective political organization of this far-flung minority.

I think this situation is both cause and result. There is no national organization because there is no national goal; and there is no goal because there is no agreement on so elemental a thing as what this conglomeration of people should call itself. Lacking cohesiveness, the group cannot establish goals; and lacking goals, it cannot bind itself together.

The Spanish-surnamed American is unique from other minorities in still other ways. His is not a single origin. He has come from different places, at different times and for different reasons. He is different from other immigrant groups because his homeland, his mother country, is not across the sea. There is no ocean between his cultural home of Mexico and America; Mexico is but a short drive away.

There are everywhere Spanish language movies, television stations and radio stations and Spanish is spoken throughout the Southwest. Up until 1957, there was a Spanish language daily newspaper in San Antonio and even today the daily papers carry sections printed in Spanish. In the Southwest, even the dominant Anglo community strives to preserve the culture of Mexico and Spain because it gives the area a certain charm and a cosmopolitan air that cannot be found elsewhere.

The result is that we have in the Southwest a community that is distinctly foreign and yet American; we have a group that is cast aside and discriminated against because it is foreign and different; and yet it is a group whose culture the majority find powerfully attractive. It is a group that the dominant Anglos have taken from and whose culture they would preserve, but which they discriminate against because of its foreign nature.

Here is a minority drawn between the powerful forces of conflict, the one demanding a preservation of its art, music, culture, language, architecture and dress; and the other telling it to get Anglicized or lose out in the race of life.

For if a man stays within his cultural minority and retains its customs, he has little chance to succeed in a world which expects him to adopt its ways. He cannot get a job with only Spanish as a language and he cannot expect anything but animosity if he fails to adopt the ways of the majority. So, caught between the powerful forces demanding assimilation and a tightly-knit and kept-minority status, assailed by demands to Anglicize and appeals for staying "foreign," the Spanish-surnamed American is attempting to find a modus vivendi—a way to live somewhere between the intolerable extremes.

The most crucial issue confronting any minority group is whether it should attempt to preserve itself as a cohesive and well-defined culture, or whether it should disband and its members assimilate into the majority, losing their cultural identity. Either a minority lives together, speaks its own langauge, maintains its own way of life, or it must break up and be absorbed into the community at large. In the case of the Spanish-surnamed American minority, there has been no decision.

In Africa, there has been considerable experience in decision-making of this kind. When the Europeans colonized Africa, they expected the Africans to adopt European languages and customs. Sometimes force would be used to break up traditional ways of life. For instance, to establish a mining operation in Katanga, the Belgians had to get Africans to change from hunters and farmers into industrial workers, a change which meant moving from a primitive life into the discipline of a complicated industrial order.

Changes like these are jarring and did not come easily, and the process was repeated time and again. New values were imposed on Africa, new languages, new governments and new boundaries. All of this meant hard choices for those who had to abandon their culture and among the Basuto people there is this proverb:

"If a man does away with his traditional way of living and throws away his good customs, he had first better be certain that he has something of value to replace them."

This is the dilemma every minority must face, Eric Hoffer, writing in his work, "The True Believer," put the problem in these words:

"A minority is in a precarious position, however protected it be by law or force. The frustration engendered by the unavoidable sense of insecurity is less intense in a minority intent on preserving its identity than in one bent on assimilating with the majority. A minority which preserves its identity is inevitably a compact whole which shelters the individual, gives him a sense of belonging and immunizes him against frustration. On the other hand, in a minority bent on assimilation, the individual stands alone, pitted against prejudice and discrimination. He is also burdened with a sense of guilt, however vague, of a renegade."

If the man with a Spanish surname elects to stay within his group, he can be sure that he has friends and he can be certain of having a place to go. But if he elects to compete with the majority on its own terms, then he must abandon all of this and he becomes an outsider both to his own group and to the majority. He has abandoned the one and is seeking to invade the other.

The choice facing the Spanish-surnamed American is not an easy one and it is only natural that he is seeking some middle way between maintaining a cultural entity that binds him to remaining outside the pale and rejecting everything in the hope of finding success in a hostile world. It is too much to expect that the group as a whole will make a decision on whether to take one part or the other, because the choices are so painful and radical that few men even care to contemplate them. The decisions must be made by individuals, alone and unaided, and it will take a long time to know the end result of their actions.

So the Spanish-surnamed minority, imbued with special circumstances, endowed with a rich and strong culture, and given a much to be desired and beautiful language, must decide, each and every one: is it best to keep what I have and love, and follow a way of life inherited from my father, or leave it all. It is a cruel choice and not one that many men will make willingly and most men will make no choice at all.

It is the responsibility of the majority to permit the minority to make its own decisions about what it will do. It is cruel and unthinkable to suppress or eradicate a culture in hopes of speedily eradicating the cruel dilemma of the Spanish-surnamed or other "alien" poor.

A culture is too precious a thing to destroy; it must be permitted to make its own contribution to society, especially one like ours. For Americans are many things and that is the secret of our strength. It would be a mistake to think that the diversity which the Spanish-surnamed people offer is anything other than a potential gift to our already rich heritage.

Educators especially must be aware of the problems facing the Spanish-surnamed. For it is the schools which are the first front in the war on poverty. It is the schools which turn out men and women who are either equipped for life or are not.

In the case of the Spanish-surnamed, the schools have been failing. Instead of leaving school well-equipped to face life, the Spanish-surnamed have been leaving school in droves because it offers nothing to meet their needs and these children have been finding that the dubious choice of no education at all is better than one which is meaningless.

Educators, happily, are beginning to understand this and do something about it. They realize that the child who enters school the first day represents a promise and their responsibility as teachers is to turn that promising child into a successful adult.

Up until now, though, the sad fact is that the schools have been losing the promise of the Spanish-surnamed child somewhere between the first grade and high school graduation; and all too many do not stay around long enough to finish high school because of it.

I do not believe that it is the place of the schools to force a choice of cultures on children or suppress their native heritage. Great injury is done whenever this is attempted and we know this all too well. In our history, the schools have ignored the achievements of the Negro and have presented him as a problem and a blight on society while ignoring his considerable achievements and contributions. Belatedly, this is changing. It is a mistake which should not be repeated with the Spanish-surnamed American, for he also has his heroes and he also has played a part in our history that cannot be overlooked. He lives and he exists and he knows it and the textbooks must recognize this fact; nothing left out of the books will eliminate what is real.

I believe the schools must make an effort to capitalize on the special talents and attributes of the Spanish-surnamed American. This will make his education meaningful and will do more than anything else to help him realize his full potential. His special educational problems need to be solved and his assets refined. After all of this is done, he will be ready to decide which way to go and what life to lead.

I believe that, more than anything else, improved educational opportunity will help the Spanish-surnamed American find his place in society and make his best contribution to it. From this will flow hope, ambition and the skill to realize it. Without better education, hopes kindled by the war on poverty will be shortlived and the promises made can never be turned into realities.

Everyone who knows about the Spanish-surnamed community knows that its condition is one of poverty, even abject poverty. They ask why, in the midst of all this misery, is there not more restlessness, more revolt? The answers are at once simple and complex. Simple because poverty and misery do not necessarily breed revolt; complex because this group is complex.

If a man is so poor that he must struggle to earn his daily bread, he probably does not have much time to conjure up visions of better things. His concern is whether he can eat today, not whether he can eat next week. His consuming passion is whether he can scrape up enough to pay the rent next week or the school fees to keep his child enrolled or keep the gas from being cut off.

His horizon is limited by the necessity of staying alive and his dreams, if he has any, will be of a good meal and a new pair of shoes. His future is so far away that he dares not think of it; it may be too grim.

Hoffer has written, "where people toil from sunrise to sunset for a bare living, they nurse no grievances and dream no dreams" and how right he is.

On the other hand, if a man lives in what you might call a state of bearable misery, he is free to see a little longer into the future and he can begin to think about a better way of life.

When a man's condition is improved to the point that he can see the ideal life ahead, he becomes restless with what he has and strives for tomorrow. For him, the present is not a happy time because the future, if he can but grasp it, is what will bring happiness.

Alexis de Tocqueville observed: "A grievance is most poignant just before it is redressed." The taste of better things is what breeds discontent and fires ambition.

The Spanish-surnamed community has, by and large, been so submerged in misery that hope has been too far away to fire many dreams. This may be changing. I believe the campaign against poverty will, in fact, give large numbers of people that essential taste of better things and lead to rising expectations.

I do not view the future as hopeless. It may be that the Spanish-surnamed community today is filled with poor and even some hopeless people but, after all, it was just such people who came to this country and filled it up and just such people who have given our land its strength and wealth. It was not successful people who came to these shores, but people who had failed elsewhere. They were driven here and they made this a mighty land. They had nothing to lose and everything to gain. This is still true. These poor people who today suffer innumerable and complicated problems and ills, and whose burdens we cannot imagine, will one day rise up and build for themselves a new world and, for all of us, a new Southwest.

In numberless southwestern shacks with tin roofs and dirt floors, along forgotten streets without water lines, in a world without comfort, is a people who have hope for tomorrow and one day they will claim it. Then ours will be a new and better world because these folk will have given their splendid best.

U.S. Citizens of Mexican Descent

SPEECH
OF
HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 13, 1967

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I have noted with pleasure and respect the remarks of my California colleague, Mr. Roybal, concerning the administration's recent actions designed to benefit U.S. citizens of Mexican descent.

The formation of a Cabinet-level committee to focus on the problems of the Mexican American community demonstrates the administration's sincerity of purpose, to assure that Federal programs are reaching Mexican Americans and providing assistance they so urgently require.

Mr. Roybal has adequately outlined the administration programs now underway which are directly elevating the status of our more than 5 million Mexican Americans. These programs include—

Manpower training and retraining under the Department of Labor.

Combined Federal agency campaigns against unemployment in our major metropolitan centers with substantial Mexican-American populations.

Massive immunization programs to wipe out diseases afflicting our Spanish-speaking citizens.

School aid programs under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, making possible the improvement of schooling for hundreds of thousands of Mexican-American children.

Special efforts to improve the health, wages, and education of migrant farmworkers, at least 1 million of whom are Mexican Americans.

For far too long, many of these citizens have been the forgotten minority, forgotten because their innate dignity and their pride of race and customs would not permit them to cry out for the help they need—help to overcome barriers of language and culture which have held them in the status of second-class citizenship.

This status could be a national disgrace, an ugly scar on the traditions of the United States as the one Nation where opportunities should be equal for all. For these citizens I speak of are not newcomers to these shores. In fact, as we sometimes forget, the Mexican American is more a native in his ancestry than anyone except the American Indian. And, like the American Indian, he has been exploited, cheated, and shoved aside in the past century by the "Anglos" who lusted for our Western States' wealth of natural resources.

The President's action in creating this Committee—comprised of the Secretaries of Labor, Agriculture, Housing and Urban Development, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity—is a new indication that we will no longer tolerate relegation of the Mexican American, or any other American, to any status except full, equal citizenship.

It is especially pleasing to me to know that an outstanding representative of the Mexican American community—the very able and distinguished Mr. Vincente Ximenes, of the great State of New Mexico, a newly confirmed member of the President's Equal Employment Opportunity Commission—has been designated Chairman of the Interagency Committee.

I note that Mr. Ximenes comes from a 20th-century background not unlike that of a most distinguished historical figure from my State. I refer to Mariano Guadalupe Vallejo, born in the first decade of the 19th century, a native son of

Spanish California who, like Mr. Ximenes, rose from humble beginnings to prominence as a military hero, then as a statesman highly influential in the submission of California to the United States. Mariano Vallejo was an important delegate to the State's constitutional convention, then a member of its first State senate. My own hometown, incorporated in 1868, was named for Guadalupe Vallejo and, more recently, the 40th nuclear Polaris submarine to join our Navy's fleet, built at our Mare Island Naval Shipyard, was commissioned in his name.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I would like to call attention to the extraordinary services rendered to this body by our colleagues of Mexican American heritage. I know their numbers will grow as those already among us grow in stature. I salute the President, and Mr. Ximenes, and pledge them my utmost support in their worthy efforts to upgrade the status of every American of Mexican ancestry.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Code of Laws of the United States

Title 44, Section 181. Congressional Record; arrangement, style, contents, and indexes.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the Congressional Record, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the Congressional Record semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

Title 44, Section 182b. Same; illustrations, maps, diagrams.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the Record without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the Congressional Record the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily Record as follows: the Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided,* That the makeup of the Record shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the Congressional Record, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the Record shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the Record issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the Record for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the Record of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the Record shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the Record style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the Record.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the Congressional Record any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent Record is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the Congressional Record the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the Congressional Record.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the Congressional Record shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the Official Reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the Official Reporters of the respective Houses.

The Official Reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the Official Reporters in the next issue of the Congressional Record, nor to Records printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the Congressional Record by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the Congressional Record which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the Congressional Record, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the Record.

Appendix

Lasting Peace and Economic Progress in the Middle East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 1967

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, time will surely record these past weeks as among the most fateful and momentous in the long history of the Middle East—that ancient and strategic crossroads of civilization.

The world has watched in surprise and amazement at the brilliant and heroic action—and spectacular accomplishments—of the sons and daughters of Israel in asserting the right to full international acceptance as a sovereign equal among the community of nations, in reclaiming the most holy of its sacred religious shrines, and in showing a ready willingness to work with others to establish a firm basis for true, lasting peace and progress in the Middle East.

Both President Johnson and our distinguished U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, Arthur Goldberg, have already begun the difficult task of initiating discussions aimed at exploring for agreed terms leading to an enduring and workable peace in this volatile area—based, as it must be, on a policy of reconciliation and mutual responsibility for developing a just, effective, and long-range settlement of all outstanding issues.

As Israel's scholarly Foreign Minister, Mr. Abba Eban, recently stated before the U.N. Security Council, we must now look "not backward to belligerency, but forward to peace."

With the cooperation of the freedom-loving nations of the world, we can begin to look beyond the present conflicts and tension toward a new, more hopeful era of greater stability—which can at last permit all the peoples of this vital region to enjoy the fruits of peace and prosperity.

As a member of the U.S. House of Representatives Committee on Foreign Affairs, and as Chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee Special Study Mission which surveyed the Middle East last November, I have maintained a keen personal interest in American efforts to exercise a stabilizing influence and to provide international leadership to help preserve peace and promote economic, social, and political progress in these historic lands.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the following five points may serve to outline some of the essential requirements of achieving these worthy goals—for which the proud men and women of Israel have again, for the third time in 20 years, fought and risked their lives—

First, immediate attention to: Establishing an effective cease-fire respected by all parties in order to stop the tragic killing and destruction of these past days; providing emergency relief for both civilian and military victims of the fighting; and, assuring humanitarian care for and early exchange of all prisoners of war.

Second, full international recognition and acceptance of the State of Israel's right to exist as a politically independent, sovereign nation, and to live, grow, and prosper without any outside interference or harassment from any source.

Third, ironclad guarantees, backed by the great powers, and enforced by a strong United Nations or other international presence if necessary, of Israel's national security and territorial integrity, so that its borders will be protected from further encroachment and terrorist attack, and so it will have an undisputed right of passage through the Suez Canal, as well as full freedom to use the international waterway of the Gulf of Aqaba, including unchallenged access to its entrance through the narrow Strait of Tiran.

Fourth, final resolution of the twin problems—refugee resettlement and military arms limitation—that have frustrated every attempt since the 1940's to find a permanent and equitable solution to the deep-seated conflicts in the Middle East. This will require active participation, and assumption of a share of responsibility, by each of the great powers, as well as by all the parties to the dispute, and by the United Nations organization on behalf of the world community.

Fifth, a bold, new regional development programs, supported by the United States and the other economically advanced nations, in cooperation with all the Middle Eastern countries, to turn the energies of this entire area, once and for all, away from conflict and war, and toward the work of fashioning a more prosperous region—emphasizing the development of precious water and agricultural resources, the widening of their industrial base, the expansion of trade and commerce, an all-out attack on the abject poverty, disease, ignorance, and human misery which have been the fate of so many for so long, and finally, the creation of conditions of long-range stability and genuine progress toward a better way of life for all of the peoples who live in this area—the historic cradle of Western civilization.

Mr. Speaker, because of my intense personal interest in the situation in the Middle East, and the position we here in America should take toward events in that part of the world, I would like to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point the text of my earlier remarks on this vital subject, which I made on May 24, 1967—nearly 2 weeks before the armed conflict erupted.

My earlier statement follows:

PEACE AND STABILITY IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, an extremely dangerous crisis of worldwide proportions has developed in the Middle East—directly threatening the territorial integrity of the State of Israel, as well as its vital and basic right of access through international waters to its only outlet south to the Red Sea and the Indian Ocean.

In addition to jeopardizing the peace and security of both Israel and her neighbors in that troubled part of the globe, this grave and highly explosive situation could escalate at any moment into a general military confrontation involving the major world powers—a catastrophe the full consequences of which are difficult to imagine.

As I stated nearly 4 years ago on June 21, 1963, during an earlier period of mounting tension:

"The vital interests of all Middle Eastern countries, as well as the expressed policy of the United States, demand the maintenance of peace.

"It is essential that existing conflicts and unstable conditions not be allowed to disrupt the tranquility of this important region and risk involvement in the current struggle between East and West.

"Such a development would be an utter disaster for all concerned, and play directly into the hands of the Soviet Union.

"As one of the leaders of the free peoples of the world, the United States has a strong and vital stake in keeping peace among all the nations of the Middle East.

"It is imperative that these nations begin to concentrate their energies and the energies of their people on fashioning a more prosperous region, developing their agriculture, widening their industrial base, and expanding trade and commerce.

"In this way, peace will become a reality, and the Middle East will no longer be the fused powder keg of the world, waiting for a spark to ignite it, and threatening to involve us all in a tragic and unnecessary war."

Today, however, Mr. Speaker, we are again faced—in this strategic crossroads of the world—with a perilous situation that could erupt at any time into armed conflict.

I would like to take this opportunity to commend the President on his firm and forthright statement on the Middle Eastern crisis, and for his strong stand in support of united action by the world community to preserve and protect the peace.

The President also deserves to be commended for his clear and forceful comment regarding the purported closing of the Gulf of Aqaba to Israeli shipping in an effort to seal off the vital southern port of Eilat—Elath—as a key commercial exporting and oil importing center:

"The United States considers the gulf to be an international waterway and feels that a blockade of Israeli shipping is illegal and potentially disastrous to the cause of peace.

"The right of free, innocent passage of the international waterway is a vital interest of the international community."

I am particularly gratified that the President pledged America's wholehearted and vigorous support for a continuing United Nations presence—as a matter of fundamental importance to the peace and stability of the entire area.

There can be no doubt in anyone's mind about the meaning and intent of Mr. Johnson's unequivocal White House restatement of—

"What three Presidents have said before—that the United States is firmly committed to the support of the political independence and territorial integrity of all the nations of the area.

"The United States strongly opposes aggression by anyone in the area, in any form, overt or clandestine. This has been the policy of the United States led by four Presidents—President Truman, President Eisenhower, President Kennedy, and myself—as well as the policy of both of our political parties."

Mr. Speaker, let no one mistake or misjudge this country's firm commitment to oppose aggression and advance the cause of lasting peace in the Middle East.

The Reasons for Israel's Victory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 16, 1967

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entiteld "The Reasons for Israel's Victory," written by Ira C. Eaker.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE REASON'S FOR ISRAEL'S VICTORY

(By Ira C. Eaker)

The first week of the Israeli-Arab war has revealed astonishing victories for little Israel. There two million people, completely surrounded by 40 million fanatical hostiles, raised the siege and ignominously routed the boastful enemy.

War colleges the world over will search this campaign with eager interest to catalog the reasons for Isreali success. Some of these reasons already are clearly apparent.

Israel's political leaders took their military leaders into their national councils and made the decision to take the offensive. Thereafter Israel turned the management of military operations over to the military leaders.

The Israelis made a bold plan to raise the seige of the Gulf of Aqaba by threatening the Suez Canal. They reckoned that Nasser would exchange freedom of passage in the Straits of Tiran to save his stolen Canal, Egypt's most profitable enterprise.

Then the Israelis, in the first hours of the conflict, gained air superiority by destroying Egyptian Air Force on the ground, the quickest and cheapest way to destroy a hostile Air Force (The White House Tuesday Luncheon Club now directing our Vietnam operation, please note.) Thereafter Israeli armor could proceed unmolested in its rush to Suez. Somebody in Israel remembered Rommel's desert campaign and what doomed the Afrika Korps.

Having made a bold plan, caught the enemy by surprise, gained air superiority and taken the offensive, the Israelis then went to Suez like the Germans went to Paris in 1940, with armored columns spearheaded and protected by fighter bombers and fueled and fed by air transport.

Despite their numerical inferiority, the Israelis had some things going for them. They were a united people, all determined to defend their country if need be to the death. No peaceniks, beatniks and draft card burners have demonstrated in Israel. There are no carping critics in their Knesset (Congress). As they demonstrated in 1948 and again in 1956, they are excellent fighting men far superior to the Arab enemy.

The principal adviser on national security to the President and Prime Minister of Israel is General Moshe Dayan, Israel's most experienced and respected soldier (a relation like that between President Roosevelt and Admiral Leahy or President Truman and General Marshall).

The Israelis were not palsied by fear of what Russia or Red China might do or of what world opinion would be. Their objective was quick victory, not prolonged stalemate.

The greatest satisfaction I personally have had from the Middle East war is the realization that little Israel brought might Russia to the Security Council of the United Nations. How? Not by entreaty, not by paying tribute or by building bridges to the East, but by kicking the daylights out of the Kremlin puppet, Nasser. Russia had two options. She could send Russian troops to save Egypt or join the U.N. Security Council in demanding a cease fire. She chose the latter. We shall always owe a great debt to Israel for demonstrating to our leaders that one negotiates successfully with the Reds only with fearless firmness.

There are some other lessons from the Middle East conflict which could be translated to Vietnam with profit:

A short war is preferable for all concerned.

Wars, general or limited, large or small, must be won. Wars are won by fearless leaders employing brilliant strategy, bold tactics and adequate forces always on the offensive.

When the shooting starts in a war, it becomes a military operation which can scarcely be concluded successfully without entrusting battlefield operations and the management of the war zone to men with military training, education and experience.

Settlement of the Current Railway Labor-Management Dispute

SPEECH

OF

HON. W. E. (BILL) BROCK

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 1967

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 559) to provide for the settlement of the labor dispute between certain carriers by railroad and certain of their employees.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER].

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, first of all, I would like to pay tribute to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee. I know he has given this matter a great deal of thought, and he has spent a great deal of time in research on it before coming to the conclusion as to what he believes should be done. I know the entire House respects him for being willing to take a stand on what he believes to be right.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot support this, and I told the gentleman that I cannot, and there are practical reasons why I cannot. Both management and labor are opposed to fragmentary settlements. I believe we can understand that. There are 154 standard railroads in the United States. I am talking about large railroads. This does not take into consideration short lines and others, of which I understand there are 70 or 80.

It would mean, if they were to bargain railroad by railroad, that there could be two or three on a strike, and the others not on strike. Going into a State, other railroads would be operating, with connecting lines into other railroads which were a part of the strike. Delivery might be made to the terminal of a railroad, and that railroad could not deliver the goods because of a strike on that railroad.

Those are the practical problems which are involved in a big industry such as the railroad industry, in which there are some 24 brotherhoods which to bargain.

It presents such practical limitations that both management and labor testified before our committee they did not favor doing so. They were sharply questioned on this point. Two members of the committee, on on my side of the aisle, deeply believe that this is perhaps a way to work out something, trying to get a settlement unit by unit.

I thought that both management and labor gave excellent reasons why this, at its very best, even though there might be some merit to it, actually would bring about an impossible situation for them to undertake.

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. BROCK. What is it that makes the railroads different from all the rest of the industry of the world? Are they so unique, they can find no way to bargain together, the management of each company and the employees of that company?

Mr. SPRINGER. I believe it is the fact which was referred to a moment ago. These lines are all interdependent and connected with each other.

That is not true of the automobile industry. If the Ford Motor Co. should shut down, I could buy a Chevrolet. If the Chevrolet production should shut down, I could buy another automobile.

In the industry of the railroads, that is not true. They are all connected.

I can send something from Seattle to Miami, and even though it goes over five railroads eventually it will arrive. Suppose that a connecting railroad somewhere in between Washington and Florida were on strike.

I believe we can see that bargaining unit by unit for an entire network, for the entire country, simply would not work.

Mr. BROCK. The point of the amendment is to protect the consumer, the general public of this country. We have to talk about providing an alternative source of supply.

Mr. SPRINGER. May I say in reply, if we were talking about the trucking industry I could not give such a positive answer, because in nearly every community there are two or three trucking companies. If one of them is on strike, the others will pick up and deliver whatever needs to be delivered to and from that community.

This is an industry to which we have given much consideration. This is not the first time the proposal has been up for consideration. It is not the first time it was asked for in our committee. As some Members know, it goes back to 1953, when I first went on the committee. We went into the problems of whether this could be done unit by unit. We came to the conclusion it was an impossibility.

Mr. BROCK. If the gentleman will yield further, the purpose of the measure today is to avoid a national emergency through a national railroad strike. The problem is created by the fact that there are no real pressures to enforce responsible collective bargaining, so we have a situation today of the need for pressure without compulsory arbitration. What I am trying to do is to bring competition back into play by putting each railroad on a competitive basis, so that it must try to solve its problems with its employees in order to stay in business.

In my home State there is the L. & N. and the Southern Railroad. If one railroad settles, the other had darned well better settle, or it will go out of business. Without my amendment this factor is missing. Without it, all sink or all swim—and only the public suffers.

If we allow free market economic pressures to work, the railroads and the unions will be more responsible. This would go a long way toward solving today's problem.

Mr. SPRINGER. Suppose that both of the railroads were on strike. Then how could we expect that community to be served?

Mr. BROCK. Of all the railroads and all the unions in the country, I am quite sure that someone in management and labor would accept their reponsibility to the American public. If one did, the rest would be forced to do so. All I ask is the reinstitution of free market competitive factors.

Mr. SPRINGER. I agree with the gentleman, insofar as his efforts are concerned. I commend him.

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to explain this amendment. I have been most interested in the debate today. There is a germ of truth in what almost everyone has said. I agree with the majority leader when he says that the country cannot afford a cessation of railroad operations. But I also agree with the gentleman from California [Mr. Moss], when he says that we cannot, in this Congress, allow expediency to override our principles.

I must say that I personally resent very deeply the utilization of the tragic situation in Vietnam as an emotional argument to pass a joint resolution which would impinge upon the very freedom for which those young men are fighting.

I agree with the gentleman from California [Mr. Holifield], when he says this bill, as written, represents compulsion on organized labor. I agree with the gentleman from Michigan, who said the argument for seizure represents the same problem for industry.

I would like to propose another alternative. The gentleman from Washington said he would like very much to have some other solution proposed which does not involve compulsion. I hope to propose such a solution.

The basic problem in this dispute is involved in the fact that under industry-wide negotiations we have two people, one representing all labor, and the other representing all management, dealing with an issue which involves the general public. This represents an intolerable concentration of power. There is no competitive pressure on these two people to be responsible, because they know full well that this country will never accept a railroad strike which destroys our national security.

We have seen the results of this kind of attitude. Since the 25th of April, both sides, while professing to want to negotiate, have not even sat down at the same table with each other—not one time since Congress extended the strike.

Now, how do we get back to the basic purpose of free collective bargaining, the purpose of creating a dialog between the management of a corporation and the employees of that company on economic issues involved, and take the general public out of the discussion and out of involvement?

I propose to do two things: first, to put off the strike for 90 days as is proposed in the bill, and second, during this period, to take an entirely different approach, based upon the problem, not the symptom that we are treating with compulsory arbitration. I would prohibit industrywide bargaining and require as an alternative carrier-by-carrier negotiations.

The obvious principle involved is to get the bargaining back down to the corporate level, the competitive level where collective bargaining really works.

Unless we do this, we never are going to solve the problem we are faced with today. I have heard people on both sides say that this just diminishes collective bargaining a little bit. That is like being a "little bit pregnant." The ultimate conclusion of this bill will be the destruction of freedom of the working man in this country. I do not believe this House can afford to take that step. I believe we have to find some alternative to compulsory arbitration. This responsibility was given each of us, and it cannot be refused.

Very simply then, my substitute is to extend the no-strike authority of the President for 90 days and fractionalize the bargaining. Only in this way can the corporation and its employees negotiate together and come to a common conclusion which is satisfactory to both. Only in this way can Congress maintain the security of this Nation while at the same time maintaining a very basic freedom on the part of the individuals involved.

Nature Reversed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT P. GRIFFIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 16, 1967

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, I invite the attention of the Senate to an article and an editorial which were published in recent editions of the Detroit News. The items outline a unique and original plan which could assist Canada and the United States to meet common problems of water levels, water pollution, and water conservation.

The plan, conceived and offered by two Canadian brothers, calls for reversing the flow of rivers now empting into Canada's James Bay and Hudson Bay to bring fresh water to southern Ontario and to much of the Midwestern United States. While such a project would be expensive and could only be treated now as an imaginative idea which deserves thorough consideration, I agree with the News' editorial assessment that the plan's potential economic benefits "appear substantial."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Detroit News article of May 28, entitled "Pollution Key Seen in Canadian Rivers," and the editorial of June 1, entitled "A Canadian Plan Worth Study," be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Detroit (Mich.) News, May 28, 1967]

Pollution Key Seen in Canadian Rivers

(By James L. Kerwin)

Washington.—Canada's mighty northern rivers may someday be harnessed to supply much of America's future water needs.

A proposal by two Ontario brothers that could cost billions of dollars and take decades of development would reverse the flow of remote rivers little used now by man to replenish the Great Lakes.

The water would be funneled into major waterways crisscrossing the Middle West, as well as being used to flush away pollution and stabilize the levels of Lake Michigan, Huron and Erie.

Ontario residents, the promoters envision, would benefit from the development of the sparsely settled north and the "retrieving" of water now flowing into the Hudson Bay "to be forever lost to the sea."

"Canada would benefit immensely from both the development and revenue possibilities, if our proposal is carried out," asserted Thomas W. Kierans, of Sudbury, attending the International Conference on Water for Peace here this week.

"It provides a basic yet flexible plan for our two nations in managing a North American continental water system, one that would provide new sources of hydro power, water supply and river transportation," he contended.

Kierans, a mining engineer, and his brother, Col. O. K. H. Kierans, a Canadian army officer acting on his own, surveyed much of the vast, 300,000 square mile northern watershed before drawing up the Grand Canal proposal.

Under the plan, fresh water from north-flowing rivers, many of them choice fishing streams and watering grounds for caribou, would be stored behind dikes at the mouth of James Bay, which is an arm of Hudson Bay.

From that point water would be pumped south through open channel or canals over the 950-foot elevation of the Canadian divide into the Ottawa River basin.

At the junction of the Ottawa and the Mattawa rivers, most of the northern water would be diverted west to Lake Nipissing and down the French River to Georgian Bay, at the northern end of Lake Huron.

The rest would flow on down the Ottawa to the St. Lawrence River and Montreal.

The Great Lakes would serve as a reservoir for storing the water and center of a continental water system.

Many Canadians have been less than enthusiastic over the plan, with some nationalists north of the border fearing their country would be giving away its greatest natural resource.

But the proposal has not been widely criticized, perhaps because its proponents are Canadians and a major portion of the benefits would go to Canadian Great Lakes and St. Lawrence River areas where the bulk of the nation's population and industry is located.

"We'd like to emphasize that we are merely recycling the water flow—not diverting it—for the benefit of people of both nations," insisted Kierans, who said the proposal could start with a simple treaty between the two nations.

"From a technical point of view and cost, Canada could never develop the proposal alone," Kierans added.

Further, he argues, the project would not flood any valleys nor impair fishing or recreation, and would solve the mounting problem of congestion at the Welland Canal near Niagara Falls by opening a new all-Canadian St. Lawrence Seaway route up the Ottawa River to the Georgian Bay.

Other points listed by Kierans included:

Canadians also would benefit from the fresh flow of water cleansing polluted rivers in areas which contain two-thirds of Canada's population and 80 percent of its industrial might.

For Americans, the fresh water would reduce pollution of the Great Lakes, and more important, permit efficient control of water levels that cause beach erosion and hamper navigation and recreation.

Further, it would forever end the dispute over Chicago's withdrawal of Lake Michigan water to flush wastes down the Illinois Waterway into the Mississippi River.

"They could have all they want—and handle," said Kierans.

The project, he added, could start now on a small scale and grow with demand.

Seveal U.S. officials and lawmakers, including Senator Philip A. Hart, Michigan Democrat, have expressed interest in the proposal.

The biggest obstacle for the two brothers will be to convince their countrymen to develop—and share—the water resource.

"But once they review the possibilities, we feel it would be hard for our government to be stubborn over the proposal," said Kierans.

[From the Detroit (Mich.) News, June 1, 1967]

A CANADIAN PLAN WORTH STUDY

The proposal of two Canadian brothers to divert rivers flowing north to St. James Bay to help solve navigational and water supply problems in both the United States and Canada deserves close inspection on both sides of the border.

Thomas W. Kierans, a mining engineer, and Col. O. K. H. Kierans, an army officer, have offered a plan which boggles the imagination. They would reverse the flow of a main tributary to James Bay, thus bringing enough water south to create a navigable waterway directly from Montreal to northern Lake Huron and stabilizing the level of the four southern Great Lakes.

By any standard it would be a vast project, both in time and money. But its potential economic benefits also appear substantial. Not only would Canada's industrial heartland benefit from development along new waterways, but her growing pollution problems would be more manageable.

Michigan and other Midwestern states would benefit from stable lake levels and new sources of water for all forms of development.

It is no small dream, the Kierans' vision of a mammoth new Ontario waterway. But in times when water is already in short supply, neither nation can be satisfied with small plans.

Another generation will see pressures for living space and adequate water resources steadily increasing. Naturally residents of northern border states look at Canada's huge rivers flowing unused to the Arctic and see an obvious answer to the problem.

Just as naturally, Canadians suspect and resent our covetous looks.

The Kierans' idea has the advantage of being proposed by Canadians and of working primarily for Canada's advantage. At the same time, it could yield benefits to the United States. Responsible planning authorities of both countries should give it serious thought.

How Many Physicians Charge the Patient for Telephoning a Change in Prescription to a Pharmacist?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 16, 1967

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I am wondering how many physicians charge the patient a fee for making a telephone call to a drugstore in order to change a prescription when the patient has suffered an adverse reaction from the medicine previously prescribed.

Strange as it may seem, this has become a matter of some controversy in the Federal Government.

According to the professional medical consultant group advising the Social Security Administration in connection with the operations of medicare, the general practice among physicians throughout the country is not to charge for telephone advice; in addition, the major private health insurance companies and Blue Shield apparently exclude charges for telephone advice from coverage. I would be inclined to think that a physician treating a patient would not be inclined to charge for such a thing as a change in a prescription he had already written out when the patient began to react to the medicine. However, I am raising the question now in this fashion in the hopes of calling it to the attention of the profession and the public for discussion purposes.

My interest grew out of a case involving a constituent who has had a series of very high medical bills, running into thousands of dollars. Unfortunately, many of his medical costs were disallowed under medicare on technicalities and in trying to help my constituent to get clarification on some of the points involving very large bills, I learned from him that one of the fees disallowed was for $4 for a telephone call the physician made to a drugstore. The patient had been taking a medicine to relieve pain and when this medicine caused nausea his wife called the physician at home at night to ask for help and the physician called the drugstore to substitute a different medicine. He then billed the patient $4 which was disallowed on the grounds that the service had not been provided in an office, home, or hospital visit. The medicare handbook, however, lists as a covered item "medical and surgical services by a physician wherever they are furnished."

As the patient wrote to me:

> This service was furnished to me at home by the quickest method known today, by telephone. I could not make an office call after hours and he (the physician) will not make a house call if the telephone will suffice.

I took this up with the Social Security Administration because it seemed to me that this was a legitimate complaint which might involve millions of persons participating in medicare. It certainly is not the most important problem we have in connection with medicare, but I felt that unless there were a uniform policy, matters of this kind would confront us continually and cause extra work for every Member of Congress and great annoyance for participants in the medicare program.

TELEPHONE CONSULTATIONS NOT COVERED

Mr. Speaker, I have now received a report from Commissioner Robert M. Ball, of the Social Security Administration, on the specific case I called to his attention which sets forth a general policy which has now been adopted covering telephone consultations. I think there will be widespread interest among the Members in this policy statement which I submit herewith as part of my remarks, deleting the individual's name, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION,
Baltimore, Md., June 13, 1967.

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. SULLIVAN: In your previous correspondence with us on behalf of Mr. ——— one remaining question was left open which we have reexamined. In your last letter you mentioned that you would like an explanation of the policy that caused the denial of reimbursement of his $4 claim for payment of the physician's services rendered by telephone.

As you know, physicians' services rendered to a beneficiary are covered under the supplementary medical insurance part of the medicare program. The term "physicians' services" is defined in section 1861(q) of the Social Security Act as the professional services performed by a physician, including surgery, consultation, and home, office and institutional calls. ("Consultation" is the professional service rendered by a second physician at the request of the attending physician and includes the consultant's examination of the patient, his recordation of the patient's medical history, and his written report to the attending physician.) However, neither the statute itself nor the committee reports make any reference to the coverage (as a physician's service) of telephone conversations for any purpose between a physician and his patient.

We believe there are sound professional, as well as program reasons for not including telephone conversations between physicians and patients, including those in which the physician provides advice or instruction to or on behalf of a patient, as covered "physicians' services" under the medical insurance program. We have, for example, been advised by our professional medical consultant group that there is no uniform practice among physicians with regard to charging for medical advice furnished in the course of a telephone conversation. While our consultants did indicate that some individual physicians in some localities charge patients for telephone advice, it is clear that the general practice among physicians throughout the country is not to charge for telephone advice. In addition, examination of the practices of some of the major private health insurance companies and the Blue Shield Plans reveals that the practice among private health insurance organizations is to exclude charges for telephone advice from coverage under these private plans. Accordingly, both physicians and patients could generally be expected to understand the distinction between covered physicians' services and the noncoverage of telephone charges.

We regret that there was a misunderstanding about the statement on page 18 of the booklet, *Your Medicare Handbook,* to which Mr. ——— referred. The statement "wherever furnished" is intended to point out that the physical setting in which the physician furnishes his professional services in person would have no effect upon the coverage of his services. It states in pertinent part as follows: "Benefits may be paid for the medical services you receive from a physician wherever they are furnished—in a hospital, in an extended care facility or nursing home, in his office, in your home, or in a clinic." When the Handbook is revised, an appropriate clarification of this statement will be considered.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT M. BALL,
Commissioner of Social Security.

PATIENTS MAY WISH TO DISCUSS SUCH CHARGES WITH THEIR DOCTORS

Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that it is somewhat rare, according to this report, for physicians to charge their patients for telephone advice, and in view of the fact that it is the general practice not to make such charges, and in view of the fact that they are disallowed by the major private health insurance companies, by Blue Shield, and now by Social Security under medicare, it would seem to me that when such a charge is made, the patient might mention these facts to the doctor.

At least I hope there will be some attention paid in the medical press as well as in the general press, to the facts in the report I have received from the Social Security Administration.

An individual who has had thousands of dollars in medical fees and hospital bills following major surgery is not going to find a $4 fee for a telephone consultation to change a prescription the difference between solvency and bankruptcy, but this $4 added to other items disallowed for one reason or another in a large bill is exactly the kind of thing which infuriates people. Under the circumstances, physicians making such charges might consider waiving them except in cases of real abuse or, if they feel the charges are justified, they should certainly work through their professional organizations to have the policy changed on the treatment of such charges by all of the various health insurance programs.

Russia and the Mideast

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, June 16, 1967

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Russia and the Mideast," written by Roscoe Drummond, and published in the Washington Post of June 15, 1967.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RUSSIA AND MIDEAST: EFFORTS FOR PEACE OR WAR?

(By Roscoe Drummond)

There is this theory on the Middle East crisis: the Soviets certainly helped avoid war at this time.

This, I am convinced, is dangerous and wishful fiction that will get us in trouble if we don't watch out.

The premise on which this wishful idea is being built is that the Soviets deliberately decided that they would rather work with the United States to contain the conflict than to help Nasser win.

The hope behind this view of Moscow's role in the Middle East crisis is that the Soviet government will join with the West in encouraging the Arabs to adopt a policy of peaceful coexistence with Israel.

It seems to me that what has happened thus far does not bear out this premise or give much substance to this hope.

I believe that the controlling facts are these:

1. By every device at its command—massive military aid, substantial economic assistance, plus total diplomatic support for the Arabs and total hostility to Israel—Moscow gave Nasser the go-ahead in his announced plan to destroy Israel. Was this detente? Was this Moscow's way of cutting back the cold war? Hardly. It was the most dangerous cold war venture since Khrushchev tried to secrete missiles in Cuba.

2. Was the Soviet Union holding any checkrein on Nasser and on what he would do with the help he was getting from Moscow? Was the Soviet Union thinking all along on how well it would cooperate with the United States to avert war or to contain it if it broke out? There is no such evidence. The evidence, as reported by Robert H. Estabrook, United Nations correspondent of the Washington Post, is that Soviet military equipment, especially spare parts, was being poured into Cairo on the very eve of the war, thus seeking to make sure that the Arabs would not run out of supplies as the fighting progressed.

3. Numerous news stories suggest that because Premier Kosygin told President Johnson over the Hot Line on the day the fighting started that he wanted to cooperate with the United States in restraining the belligerents, this meant that the Soviets put the highest premium on keeping the peace.

It is wiser to judge Soviet policy on the basis of its actions rather than on its words. The Soviets did not restrain the Arabs; only Israel restrained the Arabs.

Some suggest that because Moscow finally supported a U.N. call for a cease-fire without any Israeli pullback, this meant that the Soviets were acting with great prudence and eagerness to avert a spreading conflict.

This conclusion is unproved because the Soviets opposed the U.N. call for a cease-fire in the earliest stages of the war when it appeared that Nasser could win and accepted it only when it became clear that Nasser was losing.

The conclusion that Moscow was ready to work with the United States to contain the fighting is unproved because the necessity for doing so never arose. Israel won the war so quickly that the danger of the United States and the U.S.S.R. being drawn into it never developed and therefore the events of the past week cast little light on how prudently Moscow would have acted under different circumstances.

Obviously the Soviet Union wants no direct military confrontation with the United States and most certainly does not want world war. But the truth is that it helped start a war between Egypt and Israel, did nothing to contain it until Egypt was at the point of collapse, and therein showed that it was prepared to take the most perilous risk of starting a conflict it could not stop.

It would be a welcome dividend if Moscow decided to work for peace instead of conflict in the Middle East. But the record shows we had better not count on it.

Baccalaureate Address of Hon. Stanley S. Surrey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 13, 1967

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the baccalaureate address of the Honorable Stanley S. Surrey, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, delivered June 8 to the graduating class at the Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, Troy, N.Y.

Many of us know Stan Surrey for his preeminence in the field of tax law and policy. Secretary Surrey is also a gifted speaker. His remarks on the responsibilities and challenges of the future were well received by the 1,200 graduates at Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute.

Secretary Surrey's address had a particular significance for the Ullman family. Our son, Kenneth, was the grand marshal—president—of the class of 1967.

Secretary Surrey's speech follows:

BACCALAUREATE ADDRESS OF THE HONORABLE STANLEY S. SURREY, ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY, AT RENSSELAER POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE, TROY, N.Y., JUNE 8, 1967

This is a day of accomplishment for the class of 1967. The work of college years is over, the goal of membership in the society of educated men and women has been won, the bachelor's degree is yours for life. These accomplishments are laurels earned—but not laurels to rest upon. This is also a day of challenge—of an accomplishment swiftly turned into a question.

The question—and the challenge—is simply put: What will you do with your college education? It is a question neither easily answered, nor only put once. It will recur again and again as the years go by—What are you doing with your education, with your life? And over the years this challenge becomes even more insistent if one sees ahead that confrontation at the end when challenge turns to a summation—What have you done with your education, with your life?

But today is also a day of challenge for your speaker. What does he say across the years to your class, your generation? Can he communicate with you at all? Or the more painful question—has he anything to communicate about? Can his retrospection in any way have meaning and aid as you face forward? Can a recollection of things past be of any value in telling of the world of your future years?

Nor is my problem aided by the parallel to that refrain from the musical, "The King and I", where Anna watches the young couples dancing and, thinking through the years, sings "Hello young lovers, whoever you are . . . I've been in love like you." For I too once graduated from college and the years have not at all dimmed my memory of how I regarded speakers at my Commencement. I wondered then how can they help me—they have forgotten and do not understand what our problems and concerns are, they speak a different idiom and live in a different world. And so today I have the haunting doubts, fed by such past memories, that I may only be describing my present concerns and attitudes and in no way responding to your concerns.

But haunting doubts are not enough to dissuade me. For at least I feel that my attitudes and concerns—shared by many of my generation—should be a part of that challenge you face. I am selfish enough to want to make you think about the tasks I would like to set for you, and about some of the responses I would like to see made to that challenge. So if I do not directly address your concerns, remember I have set myself a different target.

Let me place my cards—and biases—upon the podium. I am a lawyer by profession. I have practiced that profession mainly in Government Service and teaching in law schools, but with tasks now and then that led me to other countries and to private consultation. My specific field is taxation and tax policy. Some may regard it as a dry, technical specialty—I find it a wonderful vantage point from which to observe the conflicts of interest in our society. It also brings me, in my present occupation, in daily contact with the Congress, which provides me with a vantage point to observe the ways by which our democracy solves its day-to-day problems and deeper issues. I have served more than twenty years in the Federal Government—and all of those years were under Democratic Presidents, in fact under all our last four Democratic Presidents. With these disclosures, I now come back to you.

We can start with material aspects. This is a splendid period for you to begin your professional careers. It is a period of material abundance for our nation unsurpassed in our history or that of any country. We are in our seventh straight year since 1961 of expansion in our economy—certainly one of the longest on record. Jobs are plentiful for persons with skills, and the salaries are inviting. Business profits are high. Unemployment is at a comparatively low level, under four percent. Moreover, our Government is pledged to keeping unemployment low and the rate of economic growth high, and to the affirmative use of all fiscal and monetary tools requisite for achieving these ends. You thus enter your careers with a commitment by society that you will lead a comfortable life as respects material goods. This is, by the way, quite a contrast to the outlook for my law school class which graduated in the depths of the Great Depression of the Thirties.

This is especially a splendid period for your choice of profession. For this is an age of science and technology. You are the golden boys. It is an age when society is proud of its abilities in these fields, and has limitless faith in the capacity of its scientists and engineers to make ever faster progress. Its confidence in you and your talents is greater, I believe, than in any other group. In keeping with these attitudes it showers abundance upon your activities. Funds for scientific research in universities are generous. Our large business firms are committed to ample research and development budgets that span the spectrum from pure research through technology to the end product. Small enterprises founded by independent spirits with a new idea or a new technology or a new product can flourish and grow.

And so I say you are the golden boys. But—and here one can see the first cutting edge of challenge—the hands that accept all these coins of the realm are entering upon a bargain with society. For society assumes that these same hands are offering a pledge of responsiblity in return. It is proud of you, generous to you, confident in you—but it wants, indeed expects, your talents to be used for the national good. You should not underestimate the depth and firmness of that expectation. But you are fortunate that opportunities lie all around you to meet that expectation.

For this is an age of excitement and glorious new opportunities for the role of science and technology in our national life. Many of the problems we used to catalogue under human relationships and to consider as local in concern have almost suddenly become great national issues. The human problems of race and civil rights and poverty and juvenile delinquency merge and join at countless points with the physical problems of urban life. Individual concerns intersect everywhere with urban building, urban housing and urban transportation. These are massive problems that can only be solved by the coordinated and systematic approaches that science and technology can offer. In education we are seeing the curtain opening on a wide expanse of new methods of learning and teaching as we seek to harness our burgeoning technology to this field. Nor can we speak only of the opportunities in this country, for this is also an age of global participation. The fruits of our technological knowledge spread inevitably through the less developed world, sped by the progress in communication and transportatoin. And then there is all of atmosphere and space and depth being opened to our exploration.

But clearly I need not go on, for to tell you of the glorious opportunities for science and technology is, if one can use a sixteenth century technological phrase in this modern context, surely to bring coals to Newcastle. Of, if you wish we could characterize it in terms of even an earlier technological age, and use the first century B.C. phrase of "carrying timber into a wood". You must have perceived all this and more here at school and are ready to show the world what awaits it.

But again, the cutting edge of challenge—you have the ability to contribute to removing the ills of society in so many ways. However, ability also begets responsibility, and rouses expectation. And yet once more you are fortunate, for that expectation can be met by following paths in the business world that many of you will take.

For this is an age of the involvement of business in our social problems. The involvement is not philanthropic and fortunately so, for if it were it would not be capable of success. It would lack the well-spring of the profit motive, the incentive that harnesses the energies of the private sector and drives it to overcoming tremendous obstacles.

The involvement is profit-seeking. It recognizes that in the search for solutions to our urban problems and our social ills lies major growth opportunities for the business sector. To say there are profits to be made out of curing poverty, urban slums, inadequate education, pollution, inadequate medical care, undernourishment in so many less fortunate countries—and this list could be still longer—is not in any way to detract from the participation of business. There were profits to be made out of spanning the continent with railroads when that was our national need, or out of clipper ships when they served a national goal. Those profits assured the success of the tasks. Business has generally earned its profits by meeting human needs. Today, with a large part of our material needs amply met for a great number of us, the goals must be in meeting the needs of those that are not so fortunate and in meeting the needs of the social order. That is where are action is and that is where business will inevitably become involved.

There is still another offering the world has for you at this time. This is an age of innovation, and innovation belongs most of all to the young in mind and heart and outlook. It is impossible for us to comprehend and absorb the unprecedented pace of invention and change that is all around us, for our daily life goes on with one day not remarkably different from its yesterday. We can look up and realize that an astronaut is whirling through space, yet our daily tasks continue in familiar form. So it must have been for men in Europe when Columbus discovered this continent, but we know how different the world became with the discovery. And so the inability now fully to grasp the effects of momentous events does not take away our feeling that we are living through a period of great change because of the rapidity of innovation.

An age of innovation should be an age of the open mind. For you who work in science this should be an obvious and agreeable precept. Science is necessarily revisionary in spirit and practice—it moves forward by questioning old truths and formulating the transient new truths that in turn inevitably yield their sway. I need not underscore all this for you. But—and once more the cutting edge of challenge intrudes—will these same minds be open to other challenges, to innovation elsewhere.

Your opportunities—and your responsibilities—I have said will lead you to applying science and technology to curing our social ills. You will, I have said, find your business associates in private enterprise engaged in the same endeavors. But you will also find men from other disciplines engaged in these fields—the social scientists, the economists, the jourialists, the lawyers, the clergy, the philosophers. Will your minds be open to them? It isn't as easy at it may seem—their learning is not of the same content or structure as yours. Their variables are far different and far less manageable.

Consider for a moment that we can easily pinpoint a target area on the moon, yet economists cannot forecast the state of our economy a few months ahead without the possibility of considerable error. We do not know what really motivates businessmen to invest in a project; what will be the reactions and consequences for work incentives if we provide people with a guaranteed income; what is the best way to achieve the education of the underprivileged; what is the best way to cope with criminal behavior—and on and on. These disciplines are struggling with man and his motivations and his goals. Will you be able to participate with them, see their hypotheses, understand their doubts? Our chances for success in solving our social ills turn on the answer.

You will meet with more than men of other disciplines—you will meet with Government. You will find that Government has a will of its own, the collective will of our society. At its best you will find it more innovative and daring and imaginative than you and your associates in private enterprise. Will you be able to accept its leadership with an open mind, and offer it your talents?

At its worst you will find it plodding and cautious and resistant to change. Will you be able to understand its weaknesses and know how to pull it forward?

Above all, you must recognize its responsibilities and its concerns. It seeks balance and fairness in our society. It seeks to make an age of abundance for some an age of abundance for all, lest the fruits of our science and innovation become social injustice and a cruel mockery for the deprived. Will your minds be open to its concerns?

Will you remember that innovation alters human and world relationships and thus creates its own problems, which become the problems of Government? The products of technology are manifold and dazzling—but they are intended for consumers and consumers may need protection in this world of rapid change and wide choice. The pace of technology may alter our needs for certain raw materials and nations far away dependent on supplying those raw materials, may falter in their stride. The policies of Government must provide the needed balance lest the progress be uneven.

But even here science and technology can aid Government in its formulation of policy. Policy is wisest and most responsive when the choice of policies is wide. If only one course is open to Government, then policy is simply map reading. Innovation enlarges the area of choice. While the issues and questions will increase, and the choice by Government may be difficult, it is nevertheless the luxury of a choice—and it is that luxury that marks the developed nations. And so when you apply your innovation to our urban ills and develop more paths for change and improvement, you enlarge the opportunities for our policy makers—and enlarge the role of Government. You must be willing to accept this process of action and interaction—and the consequent process of Governmental choice and decision.

And finally, this age of innovation must be an age of tolerance—tolerance for those with new ideas and new ways. There are many who take pride in being in the middle of the road—sane and responsible and prudent. But they forget that someone must mark that road for them and determine the boundaries that enable them to say: This is the middle. For how can one find the middle without seeing the edges. And those who set the markers at the edges—those who seek to pull the road in this or that direction—have their role in our society as well as those who desire to paint the white stripe down the middle. We must thus keep our minds open to the surveyors at the edges and seek to understand where they would plan the road. And we must be perceptive to distinguish those who truly offer to mark the edges from those who wittingly or unwittingly are setting their markers beyond the edges, in swamps and quicksands.

These then are the challenges that march in tandem with your opportunities. Both are splendid and exciting and offer much to you and to society. But I will hazard a guess at your reaction: This, you will be thinking, may be wonderful and glorious in the large—but we are not Olympians. We are but mortal holders of a Bachelor's degree. True—and yet not true. A few—a very few—of you may be touched with greatness and with fortune. These few will guide our great enterprises and institutions and will have the power and I hope the will to do all I have talked about and more. A few—a very few—may be touched with innovative genius and these also will shape the world to come.

But all of you—all you mortals with Bachelors' degrees—will be making decisions, not once but many times, that shape your careers and lives. For some the decision will come—at some time often and unexpectedly—in the answer to the questions: Shall I take this post in Government, be it Federal, State or local? Shall I take this job in a less developed country? Shall I take this offer to teach? All I have been saying can be related to your response to these questions. In an age of innovation, consider some innovation in your own life—some activity that is different from the steady pattern that so often is the alternative.

I do not argue that you must give all your years to Government—though that is surely worthwhile—or to these other possibilities. But I do urge you to remember that you have a long life to spend in your profession and some years devoted to an activity that is different and exciting and rewarding can make your whole career that much more meaningful. I am saddened, indeed, when I see young lawyers so solemnly weigh the pros and cons of an offer to leave their practice with a law firm to spend a few years with the Government. Each factor is so carefully weighed and measured—the cost of the move, the dollars he will earn compared to the dollars in the present job, how will his wife and children meet the inconveniences of the change, and so on. And all the time he is forgetting the all important factor of innovation in his own life—of a chance to take a step that will give him so much satisfaction throughout his career, that will permit him always to remember that he played a part in the Government of his country.

What I am saying is not confined only to public service. For others who remain in private enterprise the decision may come in the answer to the question: Should I work in this field of activity associated with meeting our social ills? Should I take this job that is involved in working on a solution to this problem in urban development? When this question faces you, I urge you if at all possible to take the step that will give you the direct opportunity to contribute your part to social progress. It will be a challenging and rewarding step, and impart a far richer meaning to your professional career and to your individual life.

But there are those of you who may be thinking I am still talking in romantic terms and forgetting the considerations that turn men away from such choices in their careers. They may have given too many hostages to fortune in family and children to take what may appear, at the time, to be a risky step. There will be countless other considerations that will arise to affect the choice. And, after all, one can say that some of us must help at turning out widgets if the world is still to need widgets. Perhaps so—but even here, if it is to be a widget, there will surely be ways still to play some positive role in advancing our national welfare. Even a widget factory can help through its attitudes toward hiring and training unskilled and disadvantaged individuals. Even a widget company can play its role in rehabilitating the neighborhood around it. And widget makers are free to participate in political life, to be guiding spirits in community affairs.

And so I am urging there should be none among you who can really claim a place of refuge where you can escape the challenge that your education and profession hold for you—except a refuge that is yours only by the deliberate choice of turning your back upon that challenge.

Let me close with two quotations that may help underscore these remarks. One, from the English economist Walter Bagehot, is relevant to your collective responsibility as a class of educated men. It was spoken of Parliament but it applies equally to the Class of 1967: "A great council of considerable men cannot be placed in the middle of a society without altering society. It ought to alter it for the better."

The second, from a recent novel "The Chosen" by Chaim Potok, is relevant to your responsibility as an individual. It is spoken by a father to his son: "A span of life is nothing. But the man who lives that span, *he* is something. He can fill that tiny span with meaning, so its quality is immeasurable though its quantity may be insignificant. Do you understand what I am saying? A man must fill his life with meaning, meaning is not automatically given to life. It is hard work to fill one's life with meaning. *That* I do not think you understand yet. A life filled with meaning is worthy of rest. I want to be worthy of rest when I am no longer here."

Vicente T. Ximines

SPEECH
OF
HON. ELIGIO de la GARZA
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 13, 1967

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues, I am very happy and very proud to have attended the ceremonies at the White House when Vicente T. Ximines was sworn in as a member of the Equal Employment Commission.

We very respectfully commend President Johnson for his wise selection, and also for his untiring and continuing interest in the welfare of all Americans regardless of their background or origin. His naming of a Cabinet-level committee with Mr. Ximines as Chairman to look into the possible ways to better aid a group of Americans was indeed a gratifying moment during the impressive ceremonies, for this we also respectfully commend President Johnson and pledge our cooperation to this committee. I have personally invited them to begin their study in the 15th Congressional District of Texas, which is only logical, since it is the beginning of the Southwest as the crescent winds up to New Mexico, Arizona, and California.

I do hope that they accept this invitation and visit our area to see how we live, what we are doing for ourselves, where we need help and how they can help us, so that working together as Americans we might have a better tomorrow. I was so impressed with President Johnson's remarks that I think it would be well if all of us read them and I hereby very respectfully include them in the RECORD. Thank you Mr. Speaker. The remarks follow:

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT AT THE SWEARING-IN CEREMONY FOR VICENTE T. XIMENES

Mr. Ximenes and his family, Senators Anderson and Montoya, Members of the Congress, Members of the Cabinet, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen:

We have come here today to honor Vicente T. Ximenes.

But we have come here also to reaffirm an ideal that I think all of those present in this room share: the ideal of full opportunity for every citizen in the United States of America.

Mr. Ximenes' life is a very vivid story of American opportunity. He is a distinguished public servant, a teacher, a war hero; a leader of the Mexican-American community. Today, he achieves another high honor as he becomes a member of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission of the United States Government. And we—as a nation—are honored by his achievement.

As President, I want to see his story repeated—again and again and again.

Because the promise of America is still unfulfilled for too many Americans among us.

Millions of Americans still are poor. They are without training. They are without jobs. They are without hope.

It is our responsibility as public servants and public leaders to correct that, to change that, and to get results.

Mr. Ximenes and I are both graduates of the first anti-poverty program in the 1930's. He was a member of the Civilian Conservation Corps and I was a member of the NYA. Both of those have since gone out of existence, but the need for the kind of training they gave is still here.

Before that, I taught school in the little town of Cotulla in South Texas. It was there in that school, at an early age, that my dream began of an America—my own land—where race, religion, language, and color didn't count against you.

And I made a decision then which I have reaffirmed every day since I have been in the White House—that if ever I had the privilege of holding public office, I would not rest—

Until every American, who wanted it, had a job to work at;

Until every child, who wanted it, had an opportunity to get all the eductaion his mind could take;

Until every family had an opportunity to get a decent home in a decent neighborhood;

Until every single American had entered the open door to full participation in the life of America.

That is what we have been working for in the past three and one-half years. That is what they refer to as the "Great Society". It is not great yet, but it has improved a lot in three and a half years—and it is going to improve a lot more, in whatever time we are allotted.

Some of our cynics will criticize us and some of our opposition will complain, but the record of these years in education, in jobs, in health, in civil rights, and in poverty marks more than just a proud beginning.

Today, our effort in the field of education is three times what it was three years ago. The budget this year has a little over $12 billion for education. Three years ago it had a little over $4 billion. Three times the effort in education than we had only three years ago. $12 billion for education.

That is twice as much money as Herbert Hoover had for the entire Federal Budget when I came to Washington.

In health—we must have sound bodies, if we are to have our minds take that education. We were spending a little over $4 million for health three years ago. The budget this year is over $12 billion. Three times as much for the human body—everybody's body—not just the rich man's body, or the poor man's body, the brown man's body, the white man's body, the black man's body. Three times as much for health as we were spending three years ago.

In civil rights we have passed three Civil Rights Bills that have made gradual progress, moving along the road until the day where the "emancipation" will no longer be a "proclamation", but will actually be a fact.

Today, I am releasing a special Cabinet Report which tells the story of new opportunities that have been created for more than five million Mexican-American citizens.

It shows how far government, business, labor, and community leadership still must go to turn the slogan of opportunity into the fact of reality.

Real opportunity—for all Americans—must grow out of the work of selfless public servants who are, really, to take the risk at all levels.

Real opportunity must grow out of a business community that is ready to use America's resources to create jobs for willing hands and minds.

I am going to establish today the highest level committee a President can create, a Cabinet Committee on Mexican Americans, that will be composed of Secretary Wirtz, Secretary Gardner, Secretary Freeman, Secretary Weaver, and Director Shriver of the Office of Economic Opportunity.

And the President and the Vice President will be around to serve ex officio, when they can be helpful.

Right here, now, I am going to sign an order creating that committee—and I am going to ask Mr. Vicente T. Ximenes to serve as the chairman of that committee.

I am saying to Mr. Ximenes, and to the Cabinet members who are on that committee, that I will expect from you not just reports, but I want some solutions. I may get too many of the former—but never too many of the latter.

Mr. Ximenes, we welcome you to the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. We believe that you will add a new image and new vitality to its fine work.

We value the historic tradition that you represent.

The State of New Mexico has sent many great men to Washington in the Senate and the House of Representatives, in the Cabinet, and at many levels. They will be looking to you with admiration and with pride. I am sure they will not be disappointed.

We today affirm this truth: that what we do for any minority, we do as well for the majority. After all, we do all of this for America.

Thank you very much.

In Defense of J. Edgar Hoover

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. LAUSCHE

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 16, 1967

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I invite the attention of my colleagues to an article entitled "Times' Blast at Hoover Is Intellectual Snobbery," by Alice Widener, which appeared on the editorial page of the Columbus, Ohio, Dispatch, on June 9, 1967 .

Mrs. Widener states:

> The worst form of snobbery is intellectual and it often springs from arrogance and ingratitude.

The article of Mrs. Widener condemns a recent New York Times editorial attacking J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the FBI, for publicly criticizing Dr. Martin Luther King's extremism and for commending U.S. Senator Edward Long's wiretapping inquiries and Senator Karl Mundt's outstanding defense of freedom by opposition to communism.

The Times editorial implies that the police are undemocratic per se, contends Mrs. Widener, and this is sheer nonsense.

> Furthermore—

States Mrs. Widener—

> J. Edgar Hoover is a unique statesman who has enjoyed the highest regard of six U.S. presidents and who has been much more often correct in his unusually perceptive intellectual diagnosis of national and international political and social events than has the New York Times.

Mrs. Widener continues:

> In light of certain current events, it is most appropriate for Americans to show our heartfelt appreciation to Mr. Hoover and the FBI for their remarkable accomplishments.

Due mainly to these feats, our Nation has never suffered from a major act of sabotage during World War II, the Korean war, or the Vietnam conflict.

By speaking out in a forthright manner, asserts Mrs. Widener, J. Edgar Hoover was protecting all Americans.

Mrs. Widener concludes her defense of Mr. Hoover by stating:

> No people can afford the degeneration of their outstanding public servants through intellectual snobbery. Its few practitioners reveal themselves as both undemocratic and ungrateful.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mrs. Widener's excellent article be placed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Undemocratic: Times' Blast at Hoover Is Intellectual Snobbery

(By Alice Widener)

The worst form of snobbery is intellectual and it often springs from arrogance and ingratitude, as it did in a recent New York Times editorial attacking J. Edgar Hoover, director of the FBI, for publicly criticizing Dr. Martin Luther King's extremism and for privately commending U.S. Senator Edward Long's objectivity in wiretapping inquiries and Senator Karl Mundt's outstanding defense of freedom by opposition to communism.

'"The health of democracy is not improved," says the Times, "when an influential policeman passes public judgment on members of the Senate and the opinions of private citizens."

How fatuous can the Times get?

Its editorial implies that the police are undemocratic per se. This is sheer nonsense. Law enforcement officers are citizens with right to freedom of speech like all others.

Furthermore, J. Edgar Hoover is a unique statesman who has enjoyed the highest regard of six U.S. presidents and who has been much more often correct in his unusually perceptive intellectual diagnosis of national and international political and social events than has the New York Times.

In light of certain current events, it is most appropriate for Americans to show our heartfelt appreciation to Mr. Hoover and the FBI for their remarkable accomplishments.

Due mainly to these feats, our nation did not suffer from a single major act of life-and-property-destroying sabotage in World War II and the Korean War. Our bridges, dams, ports, power plants, railroads and harbors remained intact.

Today, despite the anarchic degree of license permitted the avowed internal enemies of our country in the Vietnam War, there has not been any major act of sabotage here at home.

The tragic holocaust at the Brussels department store L'Innovation should be enough to persuade the Times that Mr. Hoover and the FBI merit appreciation, not denigration.

Yesterday my friend Marie Ange DuBois, cooking editor of "Femmes d'Aujourdhui" (biggest circulation European women's magazine) wrote to me in detail about the Belgian tragedy in which 348 persons were burned to death and hundreds were severely injured.

"It is impossible to state at this moment with absolute certainty that the fire was an act of criminal sabotage by the anti-American Communist Pekinists," writes Marie Ange, a Belgian living and working in Brussels, "but most of us have excellent reason to believe it was. The display of American goods, with American flags and decorations, drove mad the Pekinists."

Only two years ago, our FBI seized international Communist conspirators planning to dynamite several of our national monuments and the Statue of Liberty where there always are crowds of tourists.

In criticizing extreme predictions of summer violence made by Dr. Martin Luther King, the prudent FBI director was protecting all Americans.

No people can afford the denigration of their outstanding public servants through intellectual snobbery. Its few practitioners reveal themselves as both undemocratic and ungrateful.

Report From Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT P. GRIFFIN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, June 16, 1967

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of a June 1967 newsletter which is being mailed to constituents in Michigan.

There being no objection, the newsletter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATOR BOB GRIFFIN REPORTS FROM WASHINGTON

OUR FIGHT FOR CLEAN AIR

There is "overwhelming evidence" that air pollution is linked to lung cancer, emphysema and other respiratory infections, according to a report by the Surgeon General's office.

Some startling statistics gathered by the U.S. Public Health Service indicate the scope of this growing peril:

135 million tons of airborne "garbage" scattered into the nation's atmosphere yearly.

$11 billion in property damage annually as pollutants corrode metals and machinery, deface buildings and spoil crops.

In the next 14 years, the nation is expected to burn as much gas and oil as it has consumed in the previous 107 years.

It's no wonder Congress is searching hard for better answers to the pollution problem. But the battle is so big that vigorous efforts are urgently needed on the part of private citizens as well as public agencies at all levels.

On the Federal level, I believe Congress should give antipollution forces much needed strength and incentive by passing a bill, which I have co-sponsored, to provide a 20-percent tax credit to those industries which install effective pollution control equipment.

Another method for cutting air pollution is receiving widespread attention. I refer to the growing demand for a practical electric car. I believe our recent Senate hearings on this subject have spurred auto and battery manufacturers to new heights in the efforts to make the modern-age electric car a reality.

In addition, there is encouraging news that private industry is now working harder than ever to develop a gasoline-powered engine that will be pollution free.

VIET NAM AND VANDENBERG

Michigan's Senator Arthur Vandenberg, Republican architect of non-partisan foreign policy, stood behind a Democratic President and declared, "Politics stops at the water's edge."

When I was in Vietnam a year ago, 260,000 U.S. troops were committed to battle. Now there are 500,000, and the number of Americans killed has passed the 10,000 mark.

The conflict in Viet Nam is a confused, bloody, expensive and unpopular labyrinth. Casualities have continued to mount—and so have criticisms of the Administration and its policies.

Of course, any American can dissent from Administration policy. The right to disagree is what America is all about.

However, I believe that in time of war Republicans have a high responsibility to leave politics at the water's edge. For the most part, the Viet Nam debate in Congress has served the national interest because it has been non-partisan.

When Governor Romney spoke on Viet Nam at Hartford, Connecticut, leaders in both parties hailed his words. In saying—

"Let us pursue with strength the just peace in South Viet Nam that our prayers should so earnestly seek, and that may yet be within our grasp.

"So doing, we can fulfill our role as the 'last best hope on earth. . . .'"

—Romney spoke in the Vandenberg tradition: not as a politician, but as a dedicated American.

IS VICTIM "FORGOTTEN MAN"?—CONGRESS ZEROES IN ON CRIME PROBLEM

At long last Congress is giving the problem of crime the national attention it so sorely demands. A comprehensive Crime Commission report issued in February has documented these shocking statistics:

In 1965, there was 9,850 intentional killings, 22,467 forcible rapes, 118,916 robberies, 206,661 aggravated assaults and 1,173,201 burglaries in the United States.

In addition, 762,352 larcenies and 486,568 motor vehicle thefts were committed.

Michigan has not been spared. Last year, in Detroit alone, 131,777 known offenses were committed—40 percent more than in 1965.

The Commission's report proclaims the great need to combat not only "crime in the streets" but also the intricacies of organized crime and the spreading disease of narcotics.

Following publication of the report, a flurry of anticrime legislation has been introduced in Congress. Included are such bills as:

The President's Safe Streets and Crime Control Act.

Measures to modify recent Supreme Court rulings on the use of confessions.

Bills to outlaw wiretapping.

Legislation to provide more assistance for state and local law enforcement agencies, such as for the education of officers and the purchase of modern equipment.

These measures are receiving Congressional study. However, I have also been concerned about the forgotten man in the crime picture. I refer to the crime victim.

I have introduced legislation to permit an income tax deduction for all medical expenses incurred as a result of a criminal act and for theft losses. In addition, my bill would allow a tax deduction of up to $300 for amounts invested by an individual for certain crime prevention devices, such as locks and burglar alarms.

Incidentally, although the Administration has not yet indicated support for my bill, the President's Commission said in its report that "the general principle of victim compensation . . . is sound."

TAX FAX

The average American taxpayer spends two hours and 25 minutes out of each eight-hour working day just earning enough money to pay his taxes, according to the Tax Foundation.

Or, to put it another way, if he has worked steadily all year, the average taxpayer finally began working for himself about April 21. All the money he earned until then goes to pay his taxes.

Incidentally, if you paid as much as $4,281 in Federal income tax last year, you may be interested to know that your "contribution" was just enough to keep the government running for . . . one second.

Government statisticians say it takes $4,281 to fuel the federal machine every second of every day in the year, based on a $135 billion budget for fiscal 1968.

HELP FOR HOME OWNERSHIP

I have joined Sen. Charles Percy of Illinois and 35 other Senators in sponsoring revolutionary new legislation designed to ease the housing crisis in our big cities.

The proposed National Home Ownership Foundation Act has been developed as a way to help lower income families who want to help themselves.

Under the plan:

Prospective home owners would be called upon to make a down payment in one of two ways, either by a modest financial outlay or in the form of personal labor.

The Federal Government would set up a foundation, guarantee debentures, provide seed money, make technical assistance available and help carry out training and education programs.

The local community and private enterprise would be working partners on the team.

The concept of home ownership is basic to the American way of life. In my view, realistic policies which encourage home ownership (such as FHA) have done more to combat communism in America than the FBI, the CIA and the Un-American Activities Committee, all rolled together.

SOCIAL SECURITY RED TAPE

"Surely eight months is too long to wait."

Such a comment is all too familiar in the flood of mail I have been receiving about slow processing of Social Security and medicare claims.

A student who applied for dependents' benefits complained that she had received no payments from the time of her filing, in September, 1966, until April, 1967.

One Michigan resident was not only eight months behind in receiving reimbursement under medicare—but in the confusion, his Social Security retirement benefits were cut off and his wife started receiving widow's benefits.

Social Security is the major source of income for about one-half of the beneficiaries over 65. A delay of a month—or even a week—is a serious blow to those who have nowhere else to turn.

I have joined with several other Senators in calling for a Senate investigation to dig out the causes of such delays and to find ways for improving the administration of Social Security and medicare programs.

WHY TAX SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS?

When the Administration submitted its Social Security program to Congress, it included a proposal to tax Social Security and railroad retirement benefits. Such a move would penalize retirees by imposing double taxation on their efforts to build a retirement income. For this reason, I have joined Senator Everett Dirksen and others in sponsoring a resolution to declare that "Social Security and railroad retirement benefits shall not be made subject to Federal income taxes."

Russia and the Mideast: Efforts for Peace or War?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 16, 1967

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, a very significant column appeared in this morning's Washington Post entitled "Russia and Mideast: Efforts for Peace—or War?" by the noted columnist Roscoe Drummond.

Mr. Drummond calls "dangerous and wishful fiction" the theory that the "Soviets certainly helped avoid war at this time." He traces the actions and the attitude on the part of the Soviets prior to and during the several days of war and concludes that the Soviet Union "helped start a war between Egypt and Israel, did nothing to contain it until Egypt was at the point of collapse, and therein showed that it was prepared to take the most perilous risk of starting a conflict it could not stop."

Quite right, I think, Mr. Drummond points out that "it is wiser to judge Soviet policy on the basis of its actions rather than on its words."

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert the very penetrating column by Roscoe Drummond in the RECORD at this point:

RUSSIA AND MIDEAST—EFFORTS FOR PEACE—OR WAR?

There is this theory on the Middle East crisis: the Soviets certainly helped avoid war at this time.

This, I am convinced, is dangerous and wishful fiction that will get us in trouble if we don't watch out.

The premise on which this wishful idea is being built is that the Soviets deliberately decided that they would rather work with the United States to contain the conflict than to help Nasser win.

The hope behind this view of Moscow's role in the Middle East crisis is that the Soviet government will join with the West in encouraging the Arabs to adopt a policy of peaceful coexistence with Israel.

It seems to me that what has happened thus far does not bear out this premise or give much substance to this hope.

I believe that the controlling facts are these:

1—By every device at its command—massive military aid, substantial economic assistance, plus total diplomatic support for the Arabs and total hostility to Israel—Moscow gave Nasser the go-ahead in his announced plan to destroy Israel. Was this detente? Was this Moscow's way of cutting back the cold war? Hardly. It was the most dangerous cold war venture since Khrushchev tried to secrete missiles in Cuba.

2—Was the Soviet Union holding any checkrein on Nasser and on what he would do with the help he was getting from Moscow? Was the Soviet Union thinking all along on how well it could cooperate with the United States to avert war or to contain it if it broke out? There is no such evidence. The evidence, as reported by Robert H. Estabrook, United Nations correspondent of The Washington Post, is that Soviet military equipment, especially spare parts, was being poured into Cairo on the very eve of the war, thus seeking to make sure that the Arabs would not run out of supplies as the fighting progressed.

3—Numerous news stories suggest that because Premier Kosygin told President Johnson over the Hot Line on the day the fighting started that he wanted to cooperate with the United States in restraining the belligerents, this meant that the Soviets put the highest premium on keeping the peace.

It is wiser to judge Soviet policy on the basis of its actions rather than on its words. The Soviets did not restrain the Arabs; only Israel restrained the Arabs.

Some suggest that because Moscow finally supported a U.N. call for a cease-fire without any Israeli pullback, this meant that the Soviets were acting with great prudence and eagerness to avert a spreading conflict.

This conclusion is unproved because the Soviets opposed the U.N. call for a cease-fire in the earliest stages of the war when it appeared that Nasser could win and accepted it only when it became clear that Nasser was losing.

The conclusion that Moscow was ready to work with the United States to contain the fighting is unproved because the necessity for doing so never arose. Israel won the war so quickly that the danger of the United States and the U.S.S.R. being drawn into it never developed and therefore the events of the past week cast little light on how prudently Moscow would have acted under different circumstances.

Obviously the Soviet Union wants no direct military confrontation with the United States and most certainly does not want world war. But the truth is that it helped start a war between Egypt and Israel, did nothing to contain it until Egypt was at the point of collapse, and therein showed that it was prepared to take the most perilous risk of starting a conflict it could not stop.

It would be a welcome dividend if Moscow decided to work for peace instead of conflict in the Middle East. But the record shows we had better not count on it.

A Missile Crisis in Vietnam?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 16, 1967

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unaimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "A Vietnam Missile Crisis?" written by Rowland Evans and Robert Novak, and published in the Washington Post of June 11, 1967.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A VIETNAM MISSILE CRISIS? UNITED NATIONS OFFICIALS WARN U.S. THAT RUSSIA PLANS TO ESCALATE WAR WITH MEDIUM MISSILES

(By Rowland Evans and Robert Novak)

Worrisome evidence is building up that the Soviet Union has decided to escalate the Vietnam war by introducing medium-range missiles, possibly triggering a Vietnamese missile crisis.

Officials at the highest level in the United Nations are going out of their way to warn the United States informally of Soviet intentions. These officials—obviously talking from knowledge—say North Vietnamese technicians are being trained in Russia to handle and fire medium-range ground-to-ground ballistic missiles.

Furthermore, United States intelligence, using highly sensitive airborne cameras, is all but convinced that recent Soviet cargoes into North Vietnam contained such missiles.

Expert photo-analysts made this judgment by scrutininzing blow-ups of the configuration of the visible part of the cargo—just as they accurately identified missiles on Soviet vessels during the Cuban missile crisis of 1962.

When fully operable, the intermediate missiles could be fired from north of the 17th parallel, the North-South Vietnam border, into Saigon. No one, however, knows when that time will come. It depends on whether the Soviet Union would permit Russians to handle the monstrous weapons, or insist on waiting until the North Vietnamese became trained.

A footnote: A possible explanation for Poland's anti-Israeli stand may be its increasingly firm alliance with East Germany, which has been currying favor with the Arab states.

U.S. Responsibility in Winning the Mideast Peace

SPEECH

OF

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 1967

Mr. HALPERN, Mr. Speaker, the brave and valiant Israelis—men, women and children of all ages—have amazed the world with their determined might. They not only have thrown back their enemies, but have pushed them far into the Arab's own territories.

Israel prowess, her will and her determination have won the admiration of freedom-loving people everywhere. And there is no question but that Israel has even won the respect, begrudging as it may be, of her bitterest enemies.

Unlike the Arabs, whose repeatedly stated objective has been one of destruction, a vow reflected so vividly by the Nasser crisis which brought war to the Middle East, Israel seeks only to live in security and peace, and in cooperation with her neighbors. In this war, as in the hostilities of 1956, Israel sought only to defend her land, protect her people and their freedom. .

The fundamental issues remain unchanged.

In obvious desperation, as a cover for the devastating Arab military defeats, Nasser and his stooges claim the United States secretly fought much of Israel's battle. We know only too well this is not so. We have proved it is not so. But Nasser keeps repeating it—typical of his Hitler-like big-lie technique, and typical of his wild and blatant irresponsibility.

Then the Egyptian dictator compounded his belligerence and vindictiveness by cutting off diplomatic relations with the United States.

All this is quite ironic, to say the least, because, to the dismay of many Americans and contrary to our long-standing legal and moral commitments, reiterated repeatedly by four of our Presidents—and no nation could have been more reassured by our pledges than Israel—our State Department had announced a policy of neutrality.

The Department's official position was that the United States would be "neutral in thought, word and deed." How ridiculous was this statement. Oh yes, it was later modified to say they meant "nonbelligerence."

Israel did not ask us to be belligerent, but we owed it to her to be steadfast in our allegiance, to be unequivocal in our support, to be true to our commitments.

When the showdown came, there was too much quibbling as to the exact language, the real meaning, of our commitments—as if there should be any question of its application. Then, to top this, came the startling State Department statement. Israel was left standing alone. All of us were left frustrated, bewildered.

But Israel stood up to its greatest challenge, met it bravely, and right prevailed. And now, we hear wild acclaim for Israel's armies—how great the victory was. How magnificent those Israelis are on the battlefield. You have got to hand it to those Jews. We even hear how the United States ought to retain Moishe Dayan to run our Defense Department.

All this is well and good. But where do we go from here? Is this admiration and newly won support just to be superficial, or is it to have real meaning?

Is our Government going to heed our voices, the voices of the vast majority of the American people?

Or are we going to crawl back into the State Department shells and let the striped-pants boys continue to guide U.S. policy?

We should have learned our lesson a long time ago. You cannot appease Nasser or his stooges, nor can you reason with stubborn resistance to reality by assuming a weak position and maintaining a policy lacking in firmness.

The time has come when our Government should forget about currying favor with the Arabs. Instead, we should take the leadership in the community of nations to insist on a settlement on terms that will not leave the way open for further threats to Israel and to world peace; that we must have a settlement that will not bring a new crisis, another war, and another cease-fire.

There must not be just another armistice. Two armistices, those of 1947 and 1956, have failed. A third, leaving the basic disputes unresolved, would stand no better chance. In any league, three strikes are out. The world cannot risk a third strike in the Middle East.

The mistakes and failures of 1946 and 1957 must not be repeated.

In 1957, after the Sinai campaign, Israel's withdrawal of forces was based on her acceptance of four major assumptions, reinforced by recognized principles of international law.

First, the Suez would remain open to Israel's shipping.

Second, the Strait of Tiran and the Gulf of Aqaba would be international waters, guaranteeing to all nations the rights of free passage.

Third, the Gaza strip would not be under the United Arab Republic, but would be protected by United Nations Emergency Forces.

Fourth, efforts would be made to move toward a relaxing of tensions and peace.

We all know only too well the synthetic meaning of those agreements Israel accepted in good faith in 1957.

The simple fact now remains that Israel cannot be expected to go back to the status quo—where there has been no peace and the declared design of her neighbors has continually been to destroy her.

Now the Israelis doubtless are not going to evacuate the Arab areas they hold without firmer assurances than they had before, underwritten by international guarantees to protect Israel's sovereignty as a nation, to secure normalized and realistic borders and free passage through the Gulf of Aqaba and the Suez Canal.

Israel must also have more satisfaction and cooperation in dealing with other issues, such as the refugee problem, water rights and meaningful restoration of international peacekeeping forces.

No withdrawal can be expected of Israel without these completely new conditions of peace and stability.

The United States is committed to resist aggression and defend freedom. How often have we heard that. I won't even bring up the question of whether Saigon is more sacred than Jerusalem. But I do maintain we can still give meaning to these words. We can yet redeem our pledges to Israel. What we did, or failed to do, is behind us. We now have the opportunity to fulfill our commitment to Israel by standing up for Israel's rights in the peace settlement to come.

Despite her glorious victories, despite her peaceful goals, despite the enthusiastic support of people throughout the world, the fact remains Israel can still lose on the diplomatic front.

She desperately needs the unqualified support of the United States and most of the other big powers to help win a settlement that will bring a lasting peace.

She must have strong allies. She must have the United States at her side in the struggle for diplomatic achievement of her goals for survival and for the future economic and social development of her neighbors.

Israel has the right to expect from the community of nations a new era. But this new era can only be consummated by statesmanship leading to the general peace settlement. That is when the expert skill and power of U.S. diplomacy is needed so badly and must be forthcoming.

We can take immediate leadership in the world community by moving our embassy from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem. This simple change can be a symbol of our support for a future with no false boundaries, no divided cities, no built-in points of crisis and tension.

And there must be a satisfactory resolution of the confused questions of boundaries. The solution should include realistic territorial adjustments in keeping with historic and strategic requirements.

All of Jerusalem must remain within Israel's borders.

There must be inclusion within Israel's boundaries of the Syrian and Jordanian hills overlooking Israel's previous shaky borders.

There must be transit rights for Israel ships and the ships of all nations through the Suez Canal and the Gulf of Aqaba.

There must be guarantees for these territorial and shipping rights through meaningful international authority.

There must be direct talks between the nations involved, and especially there should be direct attempts to find agreeable solutions to the refugee problem. And, in this regard, the United Nations could cooperate toward the peaceful resettlement of the Arab refugees in lands where they can find opportunities. I would like to see a concept of a confederation of Arabs and Israelis to work toward finding solutions of their time-worn problems and toward mutual regional goals.

There must be serious, high-level talks between the United States and the Soviets. Surely, the Soviets must now recognize that their $3 billion worth of arms to the Arabs has hardly been a good investment and its repetition would not offer the most likely means to stabilize Soviet influence in the Middle East. There must be recognition of the fact that renewal of the Mideast arms race would be inconsistent with the efforts the United States and the Soviets are making toward a nonproliferation agreement.

And of paramount importance to the peace settlement, there must be Arab recognition of Israel's sovereignty. No settlement with the Arabs could be effective unless it embodies acceptance of Israel's statehood and rejects the fiction of its nonexistence.

An important challenge for our country is its promotion of stability through assistance to the Middle East as a region, through encouragement of cooperation among all the nations of that area.

We are thankful for Israel's military might in repelling cruel forces of hatred and aggression. But Israel can achieve its true destiny only through reconciliation with the Arabs and achievement of their mutual destinies in the Middle East. A future in which Israel's development techniques, in making the deserts bloom, in medicine and education are shared with its neighbors.

The Arabs must overcome neurotic resentments. Perhaps the shock treatment of defeat will bring them to accept the performance of Israel and to develop jointly a new relationship for mutual welfare and progress.

Any other course will lead to new bitterness, new tensions and more war—perhaps a less controllable, more destructive war, one involving the entire world.

American diplomacy must arrive at a working arrangement with Russia to prevent a new confrontation. The Soviet Union must be made to understand the consequences of seeking domination of the Middle East by using Israelis as the scapegoats and the Arabs as tools.

And the United States on the other hand must help to bring reform and progress to the Arab world by encouraging democratic elements, rather than working through bigoted, despotic, and feudalistic rulers.

I strongly believe that our Government should announce a broad emergency economic assistance program for Israel to help rebuild the devastation the war has caused within its borders. And, if the Arabs show a willingness to work toward regional cooperation, then in the name of humanity we should consider assisting their countries in the reconstruction that lies ahead.

Mr. Speaker, it is not surprising that the Arab antagonists have pursued a course at the diplomatic level designed to overcome their losses at the military level. They must not succeed, for the sake of Israel, or the sake of the United

States, for the sake of freedom, for the sake of humanity. The United States must stand by Israel steadfastly, to win the realistic diplomatic victory that is so vital for a lasting peace. Our Government must be unequivocal toward this objective.

Condemnation of Army Sanction of Unofficial Rituals Involving Use of Alcohol

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 16, 1967

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the people of South Carolina and the Nation were shocked and saddened to learn recently of the death of Lt. Ronald Greer Reeves, of Charleston, S.C. This young officer's death was the direct result of an Army initiation event involving the use of alcoholic beverages.

All of us recognize the value of various rituals in building esprit de corps in military units, but I feel that very few of us would feel that the use of alcohol in such rituals would serve any useful purpose at all. There are many tests of manhood, and it appears that Lieutenant Reeves had met them all. The very fact that he had abstained from the use of alcoholic beverages made him the more vulnerable to them.

Mr. President, I feel that the Army as well as other Departments of the armed services should immediately take whatever steps are necessary to remove sanction, official or otherwise, to events of the type which occurred at Fort Bragg, N.C., and resulted in the death of Lieutenant Reeves.

An editorial which goes right to the heart of this matter was published in the June 3, 1967, issue of the State newspaper in Columbia, S.C. Editor William D. Workman entitled his editorial "Measuring Manhood." His succinct treatment of this tragic event should be posted on every troop information board in the U.S. Army. Moreover, such counsel on conduct should be coming from the commanders of our men in uniform. The Army is walking a tightrope in this entire matter, and I think it is past time the responsible officers at the top levels of command go on record in this area without any equivocation in opposing the use of alcohol in events of this nature.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial by Mr. Workman and an article entitled "'Prop Blast' Party Said Cause of Officer's Death," published in the May 4, 1967, issue of the Fayetteville, N.C., Observer, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Fayetteville (N.C.) Observer, May 4, 1967]

"PROP BLAST" PARTY SAID CAUSE OF OFFICER'S DEATH

(By Pat Reese)

A six-man coroner's jury Wednesday night held that a 23-year-old Army lieutenant died in April as the result of drinking too much champagne and vodka at a "prop blasting" party at Ft. Bragg.

The jury also ruled that evidence shows no probable cause for criminal charges against anyone connected with the traditional Airborne party.

The inquest had been ordered by Coroner Alph Clark into the death of Lt. Ronald Reeves who died in his room at a Hay St. apartment house.

HEARING LENGTHY

The hearing lasted five hours as Superior Court Solicitor Doran Berry painstakingly questioned witnesses about that April 14th party at the Castle Hill Annex.

Members of Reeves' family sat behind Berry and Lumberton attorney John W. Campbell, employed as private counsel to aid the solicitor in the hearing.

Lt. Joseph Patrick O'Connor III, executive officer of a battery of the 320th Artillery, 82nd Airborne Division, was first to testify and he said he had been named in an "order" from the 320th headquarters as "sponsor" for Reeves, a fellow artillery officer, at the party.

He explained that a "prop blasting" was a traditional ceremony for membership in an unofficial club for officers who "become Airborne."

TWENTY-THREE TOOK PART

There were 28 officers who were eligible for the "prop blasting" and they were named in the order. Col. Harry Rusham, 320th commander, later testified that only 23 actually participated in the ceremony.

O'Connor, a West Point graduate, said the "blastees" wore fatigue uniforms for the party while the sponsors, the members of a mock board and other persons involved were clad in Class A dress uniforms.

The initiates wore helmets and mock parachutes as they were ushered one by one into the room where the initiation took place. There was a simulated "jump" from a plane and the "blastees" reported to the president of the board (Col. Rusham).

The blastees then picked up the "blasting cup" (a GI bucket) and held it to their lips and drank while the members of the board counted: "One thousand, two thousand, three thousand, four thousand."

The initiates were supposed to begin drinking of the mixture of vodka and champagne and continue without stopping until the count ended.

SPILLED SOME

O'Connor said Reeves spilled a considerable amount of the liquor on his uniform as he drank the first time and the group present voted for him to repeat the procedure. He returned to the end of the line.

When his turn came again, O'Connor testified, he once again drank from the blasting cup and once again spilled some of the liquid on his uniform. But this time, according to the lieutenant, the board decided to pass him and let him sign the prop blasting book which would make him a member of the club.

However, "someone" in the partly pointed out that Reeves' chin strap was not proper. O'Connor said that the young officer insisted that he repeat the procedure because he "wanted to be sure he was 100 per cent correct." The board gave him permission.

He drank from the cup once again and then signed the book. Seconds later, according to O'Connor, the initiate was led from the building by several officers, including O'Connor.

O'Connor said Reeves was unconscious when they arrived outside and that those officers helping agreed that he should be taken to Womack Army Hospital.

O'Connor and an artillery captain put Reeves in a car and started to the hospital with him. However, O'Connor said, they stopped on the way and Reeves became sick.

"He appeared to be getting better . . . and we decided the best thing for him was a good night's sleep," O'Connor stated. He and the other officer, a Capt. King, drove on to Reeves apartment where he was undressed and placed in his bed.

O'Connor said he returned to Ft. Bragg and then went back to the apartment where he decided to spend the night to be sure Reeves would be all right.

FOUND HIM DEAD

The next morning, O'Connor said, he discovered that Reeves was not breathing. He ran for help and ambulance attendants said the officer was dead when they arrived.

Maj. Robert E. Jones, pathologist at Womack Army Hospital testified that Reeves died of aspiration resulting from material and water that clogged the air tubes in his lungs.

Maj. Jones said there was an unusually high content of alcohol in the dead man's blood, that the content found in the examination indicated that the lieutenant was in a "stupor" at the time of his death.

He said normally the reflexes of persons in the "stupor stage" failed to function properly. He said he believes that the valves that close the air tubes failed to respond properly as Reeves was regurgitating and that the material from his stomach was sucked into the tubes.

NOT OFFICIAL ORDER

Col. Rusham testified that the "order" announcing the prop blasting party was "not an official order."

The 320th commander said the order was prepared in the division artillery headquarters but it was not "official," that the persons named did not have to participate if they did not wish to.

Col. Rusham said seven bottles of champagne and five bottles of vodka were mixed together in a 10-gallon GI slop bucket for the blasting drink.

The colonel said he did not know Reeves "personally" but that he does remember the young officer because of his "spirit and esprit de corps" during the ceremony.

Rusham said the prop blasting parties have been held in the Airborne since 1940 and that they have become a tradition. He testified that no man was required by the Army or by any individual officer to participate in the ceremony.

Lt. David J. Odom, a Medical Services officer who testified that he was named in the prop blasting order to serve as a mock medic, said he felt the pulse of Lt. Reeves when the officer was first taken from the building.

"It was weak," he said, "and his complexion was pale. I felt that he should go to the hospital."

Members of Reeves' family including a psychiatrist, Dr. J. M. Bennett, testified that the 23-year-old Clemson College graduate had never been known to drink or smoke in his hometown of Charleston, S.C.

"In fact," Dr. Reeves said, he had told me last Christmas that he had "tasted" liquor but that he did not like it.

"The family just would like to know what caused this young man, who only last Christmas said he did not like liquor, that it held nothing for him, could four months later be dead as a result of drinking too much liquor."

The jury deliberated less than 15 minutes before returning its verdict of "no probable cause."

[From the Columbia (S.C.) State, June 3, 1967]

MEASURING MANHOOD

The Army, more's the pity, still has its quota of individuals who feel that the measure of a man lies in his ability to "hold his liquor."

It was just that sort of attitude which seems responsible for the tragic death re-

> cently of a young South Carolina paratrooper at Fort Bragg. Lt. Ronald Greer Reeves of Charleston, a 23-year-old Clemson graduate and a non-drinker, died in his own vomit after taking part in a drinking ritual which passes as the initiation ceremony for certain paratroop elements at Fort Bragg.
>
> Army Chief of Staff Harold K. Johnson and Army Secretary Stanley Resor have expressed regret over the incident, but their professions of sorrow took on a hollow ring when they added that such rituals "serve a useful role in developing esprit and a sense of unity within military units."
>
> Hogwash!
>
> Any outfit—be it military, collegiate, fraternal or otherwise—which finds it necessary to build morale by boozing it up is sadly lacking in integrity and in self-sufficiency. The swilling of liquor is no sign of strength, of character, of fortitude, of intellect, or of any of the attributes which go toward the making of a man.
>
> The individual who can look his tempters in the face, spit in their eyes, and declare: "I need none of your lousy liquor to prove my manhood," is the stronger, not the weaker, for it.
>
> The United States Army has had the unqualified support of this newspaper and of this editor for as many years as either can remember. But if the military establishment continues to tolerate drinking sprees of the sort which cost the life of Lt. Reeves, then it will forfeit much of the esteem which it has enjoyed, not only from this source, but from the public.

Frustration at United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 16, 1967

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the United Nations is off course, has apparently abandoned its peaceful purpose and now looms more as a threat to free men than refuge against tyranny.

Out of control of reasonable men, it has demonstrated its unreliability in the Arab-Israel matter by withdrawing a peacekeeping force and conversely in the South-West Africa matter, it reaffirms its frustration by trying to invade and take over a peaceful country.

Its respect has disappeared and beneath the wearing shimmer of its gold-plated promises, most people are awakening to the U.N. being used as greatest threat to world peace and free men.

Under unanimous consent I include with my remarks a Washington Post editorial of June 16:

HOW TO HURT THE U.N.

> By electing a council and commissioner to run South-West Africa, the United Nations ends one of its most foolish and least necessary chapters. South Africa, which administers South-West Africa under a League of Nations mandate, simply refuses to let the United Nations have it. The General Assembly lacks the power and procedure to implement its will, as it knew before undertaking this exercise in diplomatic surrealism. Since the great powers have no heart for tackling South Africa on the issue, there was and is no chance for Security Council implementation.
>
> The responsible course for the third-world countries interested in South-West Africa would have been to launch an amendment of the United Nations Charter in order to compel all old League mandates to come under the United Nations. Currently the holder of a League mandate has a choice whether to relinquish it; South Africa has chosen not to. That is the legal basis of the United Nations' frustration.
>
> The small states in the world body also have a choice. They must decide whether to use it to unlimber their vanities and vocal cords, and thereby condemn it to damaging displays of impotence and irrelevance. Or they can use it for the serious and effective pursuit of their various national goals, thereby dignifying the United Nations and strengthening it for its many difficult tasks. The performance of the small states in the Middle East crisis can comfort no true friend of the United Nations. Nor can their performance on South-West Africa.

Irene Parsons Honored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 1967

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, we are very familiar with the phrase that "actions speak louder than words," and, regardless of how many words are issued on the equality of the sexes in employment, it takes firm action to see that these are implemented. Under the present administration these words have been transformed into actions, and we now have many high-ranking positions in the executive branch being administered successfully by women.

One of the most outstanding examples of women in Government is Miss Irene Parsons, the Assistant Administrator for Personnel of the Veterans' Administration. She has become a living example that efficiency and achievement are not limited to men.

Much recognition has been given to Miss Parsons for her outstanding Government work, but the old adage that a "prophet is not without honor save in his own country" went by the wayside on June 4 when Miss Parsons' alma mater extended outstanding recognition of her contributions by presenting her with an honorary doctor of laws degree.

In presenting the doctorate, Chancellor James S. Ferguson, of the university, had this to say:

> Irene Parsons, the recognition of your administrative abilities, your superior achievements, and your outstanding service to the government of the United States has brought honor to North Carolina, your native state, and to the University of Greensboro, your Alma Mater. Your appointment by President Johnson in 1965 to the position of Assistant Administrator of the Veterans Administration—the highest personnel post in federal government held by a woman—acknowledged a unique record of accomplishment during an eighteen-year-long association with the federal government's third largest agency. Your consciousness of the equal rights of women and minority groups in matters of employment opportunity has been influential and has brought honor to you and to your agency. For distinction in government service, for a career accomplishment which is unique among women, and for an influential belief in equality of job opportunity, Miss Parsons, by vote of the Faculty and that of the Trustees of the University of North Carolina, I confer upon you the honorary degree of Doctor of Laws with all its rights and privileges.

Miss Parsons' contributions to Government serve as an incentive to all women throughout this country, proving that devotion to duty and preparation for service through study and experience are the prime prerequisites for accomplishment and success.

Miss Parsons has achieved many "firsts" in her career. She was the first woman to receive such a high personnel appointment directly from the President. On August 5, 1965, in a White House ceremony, President Johnson appointed Miss Parsons to her present position. It was the highest position ever held by a woman in the Veterans' Administration and the highest personnel position held by a woman in Government. The Veterans' Administration is the third largest Government agency, having 170,000 employes, 60,000 of which are women.

This appointment became a challenge to Miss Parsons. She attacked the problems of this high office with vigor and determination. The results of her administrative abilities, recognized prior to her appointment, verified the confidence exhibited by the President in her appointment. She has implemented procedures and has made the VA personnel operation one of the most successful in Government.

Her subsequent successes have served as the basis for proof that accomplishment is not restricted to any one sex. Her list of activities and accomplishments are numerous, proving that for those who aspire to success the door is open in America.

Miss Parson's appointment came about when the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs William J. Driver submitted her name to the President following a request for the names of outstanding career employees for consideration in the staffing of Presidential appointments.

Miss Parsons is a native of North Wilkesboro, N.C., and graduated from the University of North Carolina. She received a master of science degree in public administration from George Washington University in Washington, D.C. During World War II, she served with the Coast Guard, attaining the rank of lieutenant. She was employed by the Veterans' Administration in 1946, and progressively was given increasingly responsible positions. She has received many awards and commendations for the outstanding quality and effectiveness of her work, including the Federal Woman's Award as one of the outstanding women in Government in 1966. She is recognized as a strong influence for efficiency and economy in Government. Her personal efforts to advance equal employment opportunity have been cited as contributing greatly to the Veterans'

Administration's exceptional accomplishments in these programs.

Miss Parsons is a member of the executive committee of the President's Study Group on Careers for Women, which was established by President Johnson on February 28, 1966.

It gives me great pleasure to commend this outstanding American woman for her achievements, and to congratulate her on receiving the doctor of laws degree of which she is so deserving from the University of North Carolina.

History Must Not Repeat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 16, 1967

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, last week Israel stood alone in her battle for survival and won a stunning victory over the Russian-backed Arab forces. This week the United States must stand with her in the diplomatic struggle to guarantee her borders and her safety. To win the war and lose the peace is an old familiar refrain, and we cannot let this occur again. In reference to this, I commend to my colleagues this excellent editorial from the June 8, 1967, issue of the Long Island Press:

ISRAEL'S NEXT CAMPAIGN

Israel has scored one of the most astonishing victories in military history. This tiny land, with less than half the number of people who live on Long Island, took on the entire Arab world of more than 100 million and in three days destroyed their air forces, ran through their armies and stands triumphant at Suez, Sharm el Sheikh and Jerusalem. What makes this so utterly remarkable is that the Arabs were backed by the Soviet Union with billions in military and economic aid.

But now Israel faces the even more crucial struggle to secure her military victories. Russia, smarting from her humiliation, has already begun to salvage what she can of her hypocritical investment in the world's last major feudal leaders, the repressive and reactionary regimes of Arab colonels and kings.

Israel did the militarily impossible by herself. In the emerging diplomatic compaign she must have the full support of the United States and the other major Western powers.

Her military victories, as she said, were not for conquest, but for survival. She must shown now that the land and installations she captured are not booty, but simply the means she did not previously possess to drive effective bargains.

Israel must use those gains until she has unequivocal guarantees that her real aim—peaceful coexistence with the Arabs—will be honored. She doesn't want acreage or canals. She wants to remain alive with fear-free borders and the same rights as other nations to sail international waters. The United Nations has failed to provide such guarantees. That is why Israel had to go to war. As Foreign Minister Abba Eban asked the other night, "What is the effect of the UN presence if it is an umbrella that is taken away as soon as it begins to rain?" Russia and the UN do not have the right to ask Israel to move back unless they guarantee an umbrella will remain until it stops raining insane Arabs.

The Blue Ridge: Nature and the Human Spirit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN O. MARSH, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 1967

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, last weekend, it was my privilege to attend the dedication of the Harry F. Byrd, Sr., Visitors' Center in Shenandoah National Park, on the crest of the Blue Ridge Mountains of Virginia.

This center represents the addition of another major interpretive facility in the National Park System, in a park which has a phenomenal public visitation rate, primarily because the Skyline Drive runs through it, giving the motorists a magnificent view of the Valley of Virginia and the Virginia Piedmont.

Among those present for the dedication was our colleague, the Honorable WAYNE N. ASPINALL, Representative from the State of Colorado. Our distinguished colleague, as chairman of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, enjoys a nationwide reputation for his active interest in our national parks and public lands. He has been the author of much hallmark legislation enacted into law.

The principal speaker of the dedication ceremonies for the Harry F. Byrd, Sr., Visitor Center was Gov. Mills E. Godwin, Jr., of Virginia, and I was impressed by his recollection of the consistent manner in which the late Senator Byrd found inspiration, and restoration of his resolve in public service, through his communions with nature in the Shenandoah National Park, in the creation of which he played such a prominent and effective part.

Harry F. Byrd, Sr., loved the Blue Ridge, but the visitation record in Shenandoah National Park makes plain that his affection for these mountains has been shared by millions of his fellow citizens from all parts of the Nation.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, Mr. Speaker, I include the address of Governor Godwin, as follows:

REMARKS BY GOV. MILLS E. GODWIN, JR., MEMORIAL DEDICATION OF THE HARRY F. BYRD, SR., VISITOR CENTER, SHENANDOAH NATIONAL PARK, JUNE 10, 1967

Today, Harry Flood Byrd, Sr. would have reached four-score years, and without doubt he would have been with us in the flesh as he surely is in the spirit.

But had that been so, the crowd would have been somewhat thinner, for his way would have been to lead us on foot up the mountainside. At the top, his ruddy face slightly flushed as the only sign of exertion, he would have smiled benignly at the straggling followers stumbling up after him.

The greatest of biographers could hardly have captured Harry Byrd on paper, and the most silver-tongued of orators could not have paid him proper tribute, although he would have acknowledged their efforts with a gracious smile and an occasional nod.

And yet, when that honor today fell on me, there was no hesitancy, there was no discussion of the pros and cons. I simply had to come and to try.

The Harry Byrd the world knew was first a man with virtues respected in him for their scarcity in an urbane and sophisticated world, a man of his word always, a gentleman even in the white heat of political conflict, a public figure whose sincerity was never suspect, even by the smallest minds.

Never in serious contention for national office, he was nonetheless a national figure, around whose example men rallied in many states far removed from his own.

Among his own constituents, he could, and not infrequently did, refuse requests for his influence from powerful quarters, and yet he rarely made an enemy by these actions. Even though they might be unsuccessful, those who went to him came away knowing he had taken his position out of conviction, and their respect for him multiplied.

There were few wiser judges of Virginia's public temper than Harry Byrd, but in all his years of campaigning, he had no need for pretentions, and little sympathy for those who felt that need.

But when trials of his long and often lonely battle in Washington threatened to engulf him, he had a sure remedy. He would go climb a mountain.

As he reminisced in his later years, Senator Byrd liked to recall that he had climbed Old Rag on his fifteenth birthday, a year in which he took command of the family newspaper at Winchester, already wise far beyond his years.

It was typical of him that instinctively he devised for himself in climbing mountains a health program that might have been prescribed by physical fitness professionals, the exercise of his heart, lungs, and body, even as he freed his mind from the cares forever carried with him.

But it was hardly to maintain a super human energy that he returned so often to the mountain trails. It was purely and simply that he loved these hills. Here he found a strength akin to that which the Old Testament prophets drew from their desert slopes.

But for him it was not enough to make the climb alone, above the troubles that beset lesser men, and which so often surrounded the man himself.

He was content only if others could share what he found here, if a great sweep of nature's handiwork could be preserved for all time, and for all people.

And again, history has proved his judgment. Consistently in recent years, Shenandoah National Park has been second only to a sister region to the south in the number of visitors from all over this nation who have found peace upon its craggy heights.

Officially and privately, this was the province of his concern. As Virginia's governor, he argued its location and persuaded the Congress and the Park Service that this spot in Virginia was ideal for their purpose.

As U.S. Senator, his budgetary vigilance was relaxed only where the Park Service, and Shenandoah National Park in particular, were concerned.

And as a citizen, still concerned for the comforts and enjoyment of others, he provided, in sequence, four shelters which bear his name.

His feeling for the mountains came not purely in a search for a refuge. From his earliest days, they were one of the many traditions held secure and deep within him.

As a boy, he walked the narrow mountain trails with his father. Having all the world to choose from, he spent his honeymoon on one of these hilltops.

Countless times he climbed these mountains, joining his companions from the valley below and the mountain men themselves, in the enjoyment of its rough and open spaces.

We will never know how many of Virginia's, and the nation's, courses of action were determined on these slopes, or in what were then the isolated cabins nestled among the trees.

We do know that here was to be found a Senator Byrd at rest, one who appeared to have left the cares of the nation back along the trail, to become the jovial and friendly companion who could name the trees about him or mark the passing of a deer, the chattering of a squirrel, or the scream of a bobcat.

And we could be certain furthermore that his mind would still be planning, but this time for still greater public use of the Park.

And so it is fitting beyond measure that this Visitor's Center be built as a memorial to him.

Doubtless he would have wanted a place where those who came could be given in pictures an insight into these hills that the uninitiated could hardly have discovered for himself, and a museum where they might see what they could easily overlook, or never be aware of at all.

For all his steadfast stands against what he thought to be the excesses of innovation, he wanted for this Park what would best serve future generations.

And yet, in the midst of this relative splendor, I see Harry Byrd, not in the white suit that was his trademark and which he would have worn today had he been able to be with us, but Harry Byrd with his hair blown askew, in his khaki pants and tennis shoes, sitting on the porch of a rough-hewn cabin, smiling the smile that so often softened his granite resolve, gazing upon his handiwork—and finding it good.

Brotherhood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD J. IRWIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1967

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, in some parts of our Nation today racial strife continues to plague—and perhaps weaken—the efforts to extend civil rights to Americans of all colors, creeds, and beliefs.

This strife is unfortunate and a constituent of mine, Joseph N. Nathanson, of 26 Morgan Avenue, Norwalk, Conn., believes strongly that this is not the way to achieve brotherhood.

So strongly does Mr. Nathanson feel about this subject that he has written a stirring and inspiring poem entitled "Brotherhood."

I would like to enter this poem in the RECORD so that my colleagues may read what one American thinks is the key to real civil rights:

BROTHERHOOD

Black and white and red and yellow
Mix the colors up together.
Aren't all men created equal;
Children of a single Father?

Creatures on a tiny planet,
A speck in vast and endless space.
No room here for fear and hatred
Of creed for creed and race for race.

All paths lead in one direction,
Why so many rifts, divisions?
Why can't all men live as brothers?
Races, colors, faiths and regions?

Mix the colors all together:
Black and white and red and yellow.
Let us understand each other;
Let each man respect his fellow.

Let us use our brief existence
To pledge to do our very best,
To foster our country's welfare
For North and South, for East and West.

—JOSEPH N. NATHANSON.

NORWALK, CONN.

"The Duty of Dissent": Lindenwood College Commencement Address by Ambassador Patricia Roberts Harris

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 16, 1967

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, it was my great pleasure and privilege on June 3 to be present at the commencement exercises of Lindenwood College in St. Charles, Mo., when the Honorable Patricia Roberts Harris, U.S. Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Luxembourg, delivered an outstanding address on the subject "The Duty of Dissent."

This charming American woman, who has demonstrated in her own remarkable carrer that unlimited opportunities are available to those who work and study and prepare themselves for challenging leadership roles in a democracy, represents this country with honor and great effectiveness not only in Luxembourg but also in numerous international conferences to which she has been assigned.

As an attorney and a former member of the law school faculty of Howard University, Mrs. Harris recognizes in American democracy the role of dissent not only as a privilege of the minority in any controversy, but a duty which the minority must exercise in order to assure progress and reform.

> Just as each of us has a duty to defend that majority position with which we are in total agreement, those who may disagree have a responsibility to provide the spur to an examination of that position—

She said in her excellent address at Lindenwood College—

> If both duties are met, the two-way street of debate will be kept open and any errors into which we have fallen are likely to be corrected. It is this correction of society's mistakes which is the real justification of democracy. As citizens in a democracy, we must never fear, regardless of the initial hostility we encounter, to start this corrective machinery.

Ambassador Harris proposed in her address the return in American political life to the town meeting concept to provide a structure under which all groups in the community can make their voices heard on the issues which confront the community and the country.

As a Member of Congress, I am proud of the scholarship and insight of one of our few women serving in a high diplomatic post. I am happy to associate myself with Ambassador Harris' remarks on the subject of dissent in a democracy.

Under unanimous consent, I submit herewith for inclusion in the Appendix of the RECORD the commencement address by the Honorable Patricia Roberts Harris at Lindenwood College, St. Charles, Mo., on June 3, 1967, followed by the biographical sketch of Ambassador Harris, which appeared in the program of the commencement exercises at which she was awarded an honorary degree of doctor of laws.

The material referred to is as follows:

THE DUTY OF DISSENT

(Commencement address by Hon. Patricia Roberts Harris, Lindenwood College, St. Charles, Mo., June 3, 1967)

As one who has been overseas during recent months representing the United States, I have been required to consider many times and under many circumstances the nature and role of dissent in a free society. It is clear in reading newspaper commentators that this concern is shared by those who have been at home. We read of marches, of strong disagreements. Overseas those to whom we are accredited ask what the strong differences of opinion mean. At a time when our country must grid its loins to fight critical battles abroad and to right past wrongs at home, it often seems that energies are wasted through noisy and provocative debate and demonstration. Understandably, one is tempted to yearn for unanimity and quiet acceptance of what many of us believe to be the best approach to solving the problems with which our country is faced.

However, this temptation must be resisted regardless of the sensitivity of the times and the critical nature of the problems with which we are confronted. Those of us who profess a commitment to democracy must never permit our concern for the achievement of specific goals to lead us to a rejection of the very essence of that democracy. Despite the fact that continuing and widespread dissent gives the appearance of disorder and lack of support for that to which many of us are devoted both philosophically and practically, we must remember that it is the essence of the system which we would protect which requires us not only to tolerate, but also to encourage the presence of dissent in that society.

We must remind ourselves that all societies, democratic and totalitarian, despite simplistic views to the contrary, are faced with the problem of dissent. Totalitarian and other nondemocratic systems mask or eliminate the dissent by either imposing conditions of fear which prevent the emergence of the dissent, or by procedures such as imprisonment or execution which result in the elimination of the dissenters. Other nontotalitarian systems, based usually upon societies whose members have a low level of comprehension of issues, institutionalize dissent in the ruling group and defer decision by that group until there is consensus.

The democratic system is built on an acceptance of continuing dissent. A two- or multi-party political system assumes that reasonable, intelligent, patriotic men may disagree about the goals of their society and the means by which these goals are to be achieved. A democratic society prepares for and welcomes dissent by providing regular choices between or among differing groups. The choice is made not necessarily on the basis of which position is right, but instead on the basis of a show of hands which indicates which position is preferred by the largest number at the time the choice is made. The decision by the majority is a decision based upon power conferred by the system itself to make a choice at a given moment. There is no doctrine which says that the choice so made is necessarily the best choice, or even a good choice. The show of hands makes it possible for the system to move forward on the basis of the choice until another show of hands makes a different decision.

It is assumed in a democratic system that the making of the choice will not end the debate, but will simply permit those preferred by the majority to implement the policy which has been accepted. The debate may continue in an attempt to convert members of the majority to the minority position. In modern times we have seen this process most sharply represented in Great Britain, where immediately after the war the Socialist Party, with its policy of nationalizing major industries, was brought into office by majority vote and, once in office, implemented its policy with respect to the economic organization of the national community. Not too long afterwards, the debate having continued, the Conservative Party, apparently diametrically opposed to the Socialist Party, was again returned to the majority position and reversed some of the actions taken by the Labor Party when they were in power. Today we see the same process continuing in Great Britain.

This opportunity that a democratic society provides for those who disagree with its leadership, to continue to make clear the nature of the disagreement, permits the majority to either change its mind or to correct major or minor errors in its past judgment. Thus it is not necessary in a democratic system for those who disagree strongly with community leadership to resort to violence in order to change what they believe to be untenable conditions. Instead of violence, debate and dissent are the means by which leadership and policy are changed.

We in the legal profession have good reason to be convinced of the efficacy of dissent. We have seen majorities in our greatest courts decide issues of utmost importance, involving the most basic questions of American life, with one or two lonely voices, often running counter not only to the court's majority, but also to the majority of their fellow countrymen, disagreeing in that classic legal form, the dissent. These dissents have often been of more ultimate significance than were the decisions of the majority. Two such cases come immediately to mind. The first is the Dred Scott decision of 1857, which declared that neither Congress nor a state could make the Negro a citizen. Mr. Justice Curtis and Mr. Justice McLean dissented from the decision of the majority, believing it to be a misreading of the requirements of the Constitution.

This dissent was echoed later by Abraham Lincoln in the Lincoln-Douglas debates of 1858 in which Lincoln said: "I have expressed heretofore, and I now repeat, my opposition to the Dred Scott decision. . . . If I were in Congress, and a vote should come up on a question whether slavery should be prohibited in a new territory, in spite of that Dred Scott decision, I would vote that it should. By resisting it as a political rule, I disturb no right of property, create no disorder, excite no mobs. . . . We propose so resisting it as to have it reversed if we can, and a new judicial rule established upon this subject."

Later, when the Supreme Court of the United States decided in the case of Plessy against Ferguson that the words of the 14th Amendment that "No State shall . . . deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws" permitted the exclusion of Negroes from railroad cars reserved for whites, there was a prophetic dissent by Mr. Justice Harlan, grandfather of the present Justice. He said, in opposing the majority decision: "Our Constitution is color-blind, and neither knows nor tolerates classes among citizens. It is, therefore, to be regretted that this high tribunal, the final expositor of the fundamental law of the land, has reached the conclusion that is competent for a State to regulate the enjoyment by citizens of their Civil rights solely upon the basis of race. In my opinion, the judgment this day rendered will, in time, prove to be quite as pernicious as the decision made by this tribunal in the Dred Scott case."

Patently the dissenters on these two issues were more accurate in their judgment of the future of the United States than were the members of the majority. Clearly, had their positions prevailed at the time, we might have avoided the Civil War, and the present dangerous position which has resulted from past deliberate mistreatment of Negro citizens.

Thus, we lawyers learn to respect and to encourage the utterance of legal dissent as a device for pointing out what we believe to be the majority's error.

In fact, it is not unusual for a majority of a court later to change its mind and adopt the essentials of what was only a short time before the dissenting opinion. Such has occurred in recent years in the area of legislative apportionment, search and seizure, and use of confessions. The past dissenters, by their disagreement with the majority, provided the legal community with material with which to continue the debate although the majority position was the law of the land. Even as we obeyed the law, we who disagreed with it and who believed the majority to be in error continued to seek to persuade the majority of the court to change its position, which it ultimately did.

In recent years there has developed in many of our communities an understandable notion that there should be at least one exception to this continuing debate and expression of disagreement. The notion that disagreement on foreign policy should be muted, on the theory that "politics stops at the water's edge" has led many of us to question the wisdom of a continuing debate on the nature of our confrontation with the rest of the world. But it is easy to see in this context that when foreign policy appears to take a new turn and to involve both a new external orientation and the establishment of different internal democratic priorities, the proscription against debate in this area will not be effective. Under such circumstances it is not foreign policy that we debate, but instead the very nature of our national life and posture. Therefore no matter how uncomfortable the debate may make us, it is as essential as any other debate to aid in rational determination by those who are concerned about whether the course we follow is indeed the course which the majority wish us to adopt. In a foreign policy debate, as in others, the dissenters will not make the decision. However, the dissent will lead us to an extended discussion of where we are and where we want to go. As President Johnson said on May 2nd to the newly selected White House Fellows: "Freedom of speech can never harm us if we remember that freedom of speech is a two-way street. We must guard every man's right to speak; but we must defend every man's right to answer."

It is this two-way street that is open and must be kept open through the utilization of dissent in our society. In my judgment, therefore, dissent is not only a right to be tolerated by our society but also a duty imposed upon each of us who may question any part of our social organization. The beginning of a trip down this two way street of discussion has led in the past and will continue to lead in the future to that correction of society's mistakes which is the hallmark of every democratic society.

From Socrates to Jesus Christ and from Martin Luther to Martin Luther King, dissenters have troubled us and frequently antagonized us. Yet each, including Karl Marx, who was both factually and philosophically wrong, has begun a debate that often led to the rejection of much of what the dissenters would have had us adopt, but which also led to a call for reconsideration of the directions in which we were going. The debate resulted in the development of new philosophies and practices which improved the world in which we live.

Men and women who feel strongly about any issue and who believe the majority wrong have a duty to aid the majority to correct itself. This correction only results from beginning, extending and deepening the debate about the issue. Whether it be a question of one-way vs. two-way streets or a question of the deepest philosophical significance, the quality of the life each of us leads may be affected by whether we think critically of the implications of what we are doing and how we are doing it.

Failure to share our concerns and to spark others to equal concern about today and tomorrow is to break faith with the democratic process, which assumes that its citizens care enough to give of both mind and heart to achieve the best that our times can offer.

The temptation to be quiet is great, because those who disagree with the majority will suffer the consequences of initial rejection by that majority. It is the nature of human beings that men believe they are right until they are required to rethink the bases on which they made the decision which they defend. But those in the minority who feel they are right must always accept the fact that they may be right and that the majority may be wrong. Thus the dissenting minority has the duty to aid the majority, regardless of that majority's initial rejection, to reorient itself in order that it may make the right decision. How great must have been the joy of the initial Christians, standing as they did as a persecuted sect in their Jewish society and later in Rome, to see the gradual adoption of their doctrine with respect to the relationship of the individual to other individuals and God. How great the place in history of Martin Luther, whose 99 Theses still agitate the Christian world as all our religious bodies continue to look to the question of their responsibility internally and externally. And today even the diabolical Christian heresy of Karl Marx continues to remind us of our responsibility to the disadvantaged of our time, and to require us to justify our democratic solutions over and against those of the radical totalitarianism of Marx. That Marx was wrong in the substance of his dissent does not change the fact that we are pressed to deal with the conditions to which his system offers a siren song of quick solution.

Even though we may never agree with the theories advanced by the dissenter, we may find that he helps us identify the flaws in our position, or to augment the strengths of the system to which we become more committed when it is attacked. As has been demonstrated by the debate on Vietnam, when a decision is criticized, those who have not before committed themselves find that they must stand firmly with those who have been attacked. Thus the dissenters, by beginning the debate, often strengthen the very position which they seek to destroy.

Just as each of us has a duty to defend that majority position with which we are in total agreement, those who may disagree have a responsibility to provide the spur to an examination of that position. If both duties are met, the two-way street of debate will be kept open and any errors into which we have fallen are likely to be corrected. It is this correction of society's mistakes which is the real justification of democracy. As citizens in a democracy, we must never fear, regardless of the initial hostility we encounter, to start this corrective machinery.

It would be easier for us to exercise our duty of dissent if our society were structured in a different way. In the old New England town meeting a man with minimal courage had an opportunity to disagree with his neighbor on a policy matter, and to explain to his entire community why he felt as he did. In today's urban society it is difficult to find a way to let one's neighbor know that one exists, much less to inform him of one's position on any issue. There is no Town Hall today for most of us, and as a result we are remitted to joining the massive, anonymous marches with those with whom we agree more than we disagree. Even letters to the editor seem to be an exercise in how to deal with a major issue in twenty-five words or less, scarcely a way to begin a useful debate.

Bizarre manifestations of disagreement such as we have seen in recent months are no doubt a reaction to the fact that it is very difficult for most of us to persuade people to listen to what we have to say. Our opinions are depersonalized in the for, against, and no opinion columns of George Gallup and Lou Harris. Is it not frightening to think that our future president, or the issue of war or peace will be decided not by a reasoned discussion but by a percentage point in an opinion poll?

What we need is a new consciousness of the value of debate, and new institutions which make such debate possible.

The University has both the opportunity and the responsibility for revitalising public debate. More important, it has the experience and the resources with which to do it. The special focus of the institution of higher learning is the mind and its products. As the transmitters of the experience of the past, we have the habit of relating past to present. More important, we have as part of our experience the eliciting of differences of opinion in order to utilize the opinions of our faculty and students in order to derive a more complete understanding of our institutions and values.

This experience might well be transferred by the University to non-academic discussion. Neighborhood town meetings, at which people are encouraged to discuss issues which concern them, could be organized by student teams. Such meetings might deal with, but ought not be limited to neighborhood problems. Anyone who has visited a barber shop knows that simple individuals have opinions about the most complex issues. The experience under the Poverty Program, in which such groups have been formed for the purpose of dealing with community problems, shows that there will be some initial receptivity to such a program. However, it also demonstrates that there may be consequences which will make some people unhappy, if the discussants decide to act as well as to talk.

But in my judgment, the fact that people can move from discussion to action in such programs is the greatest justification for beginning a dialogue. People learn that they can be effective as citizens by beginning to talk about themselves and their interests. Discussion, debate is the beginning of action.

Such neighborhood town meetings ought by no means be limited to low-income communities. Suburban communities have perhaps an even greater need for a sense of competence, largely because the competence exists.

In addition to neighborhood town meetings, there ought to be on every college campus a free and open discussion forum, in which any subject can be discussed, limitations being only those of time.

Each of these discussions ought to be limited in structure, with a discussion leader-moderator who understands his role as that of encouraging discussion and seeing to it that as many people possible have an opportunity to express themselves. There should also be reporting machinery which provides a summary of what occurred during the discussion.

Even as these Town Meetings, in neighborhood and on campus proceed, there ought to be a stronger effort made to use television and radio more effectively in encouraging debate among our citizens. We need more and better discussion by experts on subjects of concern to us all. But in addition, we need a public dialogue between the experts and the ordinary citizen. Experts often talk to each other and talk down to the rest of us. By encouraging discussion between the man with special preparation and therefore special influence in a field of general concern, on the one hand, and the non-expert on the other, the understanding of both is improved. The expert sees directly what is troubling the non-expert and identifies areas in which he has not communicated effectively.

The non-expert comes to understand the special approach and the specific factors which have led to the expert's position. Both are strengthened in the interchange.

Also, there is virtue in providing opportunity for non-experts to express and share their ideas with their community. We ought to investigate the possibility of community television town meetings. These would require careful planning to avoid the falseness that too often pervades such activities.

There is no doubt that television and radio have not been properly used in improving the quality of debate in our communities. The University ought to be experimenting with ways to improve both private and educational radio and television.

And above all, we must not permit that *bete noire* of mass society, the head count, to either determine or dampen our enthusiasm for enterprises which encourage debate. If there are four people deriving a meaningful experience from a program, the program is not a failure. We must use the process of crystallization and build our activities slowly often one person at a time. It has been a long time since people felt comfortable in debate. It will be a long time before large numbers of people desert the soporific television comedy for a Town Meeting. But some will, and these are the people whom we need to reach. They are the concerned.

If we do not find ways to revitalize the dissent of personal debate, we will find more and more the dissent of demonstration, violence and even the choking off of discussion with which the dissenters disagree. Dissent is too valuable for us to permit it to be destroyed by these tactics. Nonetheless, dissent will be discredited unless we find devices for making it more reasoned and more productive of the debate which it seeks to provoke.

Without dissent and its expression, we have either Utopia or the destruction of democracy. I see no signs of Utopia, and therefore, we all have the duty to encourage the dissent which will lead to the development of the Great Society to which we all aspire. If we do not encourage the development of responsible dissent, disagreement will degenerate into obstruction.

Our interest in preventing the bizarre and frustrated response is clear. Therefore, we must recognize our duty of responsible dissent. We must find ways to establish and maintain a forum in which that responsible dissent can take place. If dissent is respected, we need have no fear for democracy. If it is not, there will be no difference between our society and those totalitarian systems which we oppose.

Let us commit ourselves to the expression of our dissent, and to the acceptance of the dissent of others. The vitality and future existence of our democracy depends upon such acceptance.

[Excerpt from commencement program, Lindenwood College]

THE HONORABLE PATRICIA ROBERTS HARRIS

Mrs. Harris is a native of Mattoon, Illinois, and grew up in the midwest. She enrolled in Howard University in Washington, D.C. where she was awarded a research assistantship during her junior and senior years, was elected to Phi Beta Kappa, and was graduated summa cum laude.

After completing her undergraduate education, Mrs. Harris returned to the midwest where she pursued a graduate program in industrial relations at the University of Chicago and worked as a program director for the YWCA. In 1949 she again went to Washington, D.C. and continued her graduate studies at American University while working as Assistant Director of the American Council on Human Rights.

She served as executive director of her sorority, Delta Sigma Theta, for six years. In 1955 Patricia Roberts married William B. Harris, a Washington attorney and member of the law faculty at Howard University. As a lawyer's wife with an inquiring mind. Mrs. Harris decided to learn more about law herself, and enrolled in the law school of George Washington University. She graduated at the top of her law class and was awarded the Juris Doctor degree in 1960. She spent a year as an attorney with the Justice Department, but then moved back to the college community she enjoyed so much, as Associate Dean of Students and a lecturer in Law at Howard University.

Mrs. Harris had not been back on the campus long, when President Kennedy appointed her co-chairman of the National Women's Committee for Civil Rights. In 1964, President Johnson appointed her to the United States-Puerto Rican Commission on the Status of Puerto Rico. Meanwhile, at Howard University, she had given up her deanship and had been promoted to Associate Professor of Law. Then, her country called again. In 1965 Mrs. Harris was appointed Ambassador to Luxembourg. She has since represented the United States as the chairman of our delegation to the 22nd Plenary Session of the Economic Commission for Europe, served as a delegate to the Third Committee of the 21st General Assembly of the United Nations, and continued her service on the Commission on the Status of Puerto Rico.

Great People and Great Societies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 16, 1967

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, Chuck Dancey, editor of the Peoria Journal Star, wrote a very timely editorial on June 13, entitled "Great People and Great Societies," and under unanimous consent I include it at this point in the RECORD:

GREAT PEOPLE AND GREAT SOCIETIES

(By C. L. Dancey)

Several years ago, when he was vice president, Lyndon Johnson made an extensive, world-wide trip. On his return, he made a speech which, like so many vice-presidential speeches, was largely ignored.

It was an important and revealing speech. In it, he said plainly that he had been under the presumption most of his life that we in the United States were just plain lucky in that we had inherited a rich land, and these natural resources had carried us to a unique prosperity.

Then, he added, that he had discovered that this concept was wrong.

He pointed out a number of extensive areas in the world richer in natural resources where those resources have not been as developed, and some with such rich potential where large scale U.S. aid and planning has still failed to bring about their development.

And then he pointed out that the most modern and developed states in the vast continent of Asia are at either extremity—Israel in the "Near East" or "Asia Minor", and Japan right off the Far East coast.

Neither, he said, had the natural resources and advantages of their neighbors.

What they have that is the only way to account for their amazing progress is intelligent, virile, vigorous people.

As a consequence, they have done more with less.

The war in the Middle East is a theater in which, whatever else may be involved, the Israeli have proven on the battlefield what they had already proven in the development of industry, of agriculture, and of housing conditions—as well as in battle, before.

They proved that a smart, prepared, and dedicated people can accomplish more than hordes of uneducated, ill prepared and trained, fanatic people.

Emotion is no substitute for genuine dedication and the earnest preparation and application involved.

Conditioned by thousands of years of history, embracing Torquemada in Spain and Hitler in Germany, the surviving Jews in Israel again faced the familiar overwhelming threat to their existence.

Today's Israelis are people whose entire lives have been lived with the most elemental of human problems staring them in the face—survival.

The Arabs faced difficult, inflammatory, embarrassing, and sometimes unacceptable choices by normal terms, but the Israeli have constantly faced a situation with no choice at all if they were to think in terms of actual survival. And how could they possibly think in any other terms?

Under this pressure, there has been forged a unique population.

There is more variety, more difference of opinion, more conflict among Israeli than almost any people on earth on a thousand subjects—but on the matter of survival, of course, they think and act with total unanimity.

Israeli businessmen in the 45 age group have consciously kept themselves in good physical condition—because they never knew at what moment they might have to fight. They only knew that when such a moment came it would probably come quickly.

A tiny, exposed country with a narrow base and long borders, every Israeli could not help but know (and the Arabs constantly reminded them), could not survive a long war, a war of attrition, or a guerrilla situation that would nibble away their capacities.

Every man knew that if the challenge came, there would be no alternative but to "go for broke"—win it all, and win it quick—or lose everything.

Every soldier knew that to lose a battle was to lose everything—his own life and also that of family, friends, home and country.

As we pointed out before the fighting started, this makes very tough soldiers.

We met Israeli workers and professional people, who not only kept in physical shape because of this constant threat but also constantly studied military skills and military tactics.

Surely, there is a lesson for anybody to learn from the performance results.

The most powerful force in the world is people without which neither money, nor machinery, nor fine plans, nor even brilliant leadership is worth much.

We have played the "numbers" game far too much in recent years, when numbers are not the vital element. It is strange, because history has proven this over and over again.

There are but two and one half million Israeli men, women, and children. They have received less assistance by far in money than their Arab neighbors. In terms of military aid, we gave more of that to two Arab states in recent years than we gave Israel—and the Russians gave the Arabs many times over what we gave—and the Russians gave Israel nothing.

Nor did the Israelis have the foreign exchange income of either a Suez canal or of oil.

They had people who knew how to use what they had to work with, and the fantastic spirit that comes from having no choice—and hence no fragmentation or weakening arising from endless debate and discussion about the most elementary decisions.

The real test of policy must be not only what material effect does it have—but does it make better, stronger people, or worse and weaker ones.

Israelis applied that test to every policy decision—from welfare to education. They knew that a "Gimme society" wouldn't survive.

They considered more than statistics, more than sentiment.

Matters of the spirit are important. They are more real and more vital a force in any society than anything else.

Isn't it time we all began to realize that in building our own "Great Society?"

Lyndon ought to review his own study and speech of several years ago.

Community Leadership Conference on World Problems—III

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1967

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, as mentioned earlier, a community leadership conference on world problems, which I had the privilege to cosponsor with New York University, was held on February 22 in my district. At the conference, distinguished authorities were brought together to discuss such areas of potential and actual crisis as Vietnam and Southeast Asia, the Middle East, Rhodesia, Southern Africa, and Europe.

The following is a summary of the remarks made by speakers on the panel on Vietnam and Southeast Asia, which I moderated:

PANEL ON VIETNAM AND SOUTHEAST ASIA

The Second Plenary Session was on Vietnam and Southeast Asia. The speakers were Leonard Unger, Deputy Assistant Secretary of East Asia and Pacific Affairs and Senator Vance Hartke of Indiana. The commentator was Mr. Phillip Geyelin, Author of Lyndon B. Johnson and the World and writer for the *Washington Post* and *Times-Herald*.

Mr. Unger said the problem of Vietnam should be viewed in the context of Southeast Asia. The nations in Southeast Asia are not protesting the American presence or condemning American actions. The heads of Malaysia, the Philippines, Singapore and Thailand all have recognized the Communist danger and the fact that the U.S. is protecting all of Southeast Asia. Their concern is whether the U.S. will see the struggle through to the end. Even the neutral nations understand why the U.S. is fighting and see their basic interests in the same terms as the U.S. Several nations have sent troops, including Thailand, Korea, the Philippines, Australia and New Zealand. Many others are giving aid.

The provision of security is not an end in itself, Mr. Unger said, but is a means to reach the goal of nation-building, of allowing the economic, political and social development of the area. The countries of Southeast Asia have been doing well in meeting their own problems, including Malaysia, Singapore, Thailand, the Philippines and Indonesia. Several countries have come together to develop the Mekong River. Also, a 10-nation Asian Council has been established extending from Japan to New Zealand. An Asian Development Bank has been created.

Of course, all the problems are not near solution and regional cooperation is in its early stages. Great problems exist in Laos, Vietnam, of course, and Cambodia in enforcing respect for the Geneva Accords of 1954 and 1962. But a new sense of confidence and of forward motion exists.

To continue development Mr. Unger explained, security must be established. If the U.S. didn't aid South Vietnam, the atmosphere of security wouldn't exist in the area. The U.S. will see the struggle through to allow the area to decide its own future.

South Vietnam has both problems and aspirations. It has been frustrated by insecurity and by the need to use important resources to fight. In the past its government has been unstable and has failed to offer leadership and constructive programs. Today it has improved greatly.

The nation building which is now going on in South Vietnam has been called "the other war." Through these programs the government is attempting to establish social justice and a constructive relationship with the people.

The government depends on the people for support. So do the guerrillas. If the government can maintain and expand the support of the people, the guerrillas will not be able to operate effectively.

To develop the needed goodwill and to assure a lasting independence, the government must create a sound economy with a stable currency, orderly budgeting and proper safeguarding of the expenditure of public funds. The government is taking steps to achieve these aims.

The government, Mr. Unger said, also must move towards a representative, constitutional form. Since January 1966, many steps have been taken in this area. A written constitution is being drafted to meet the nation's needs. A government will be elected in the late summer. Many differences need to and can be resolved.

The "revolutionary development program" is also a step in the right direction. Once security is established, cadres work with the people to strengthen local government and to meet the people's needs. They help with the building of schools and roads and the securing of good water supply. Over 25,000 cadres are now working in the villages and over 5600 self-help projects chosen by the villages have been completed. A close relationship between the people and the government is being established. There are still shortages of trained personel and material in most areas, but educational and other projects are being developed as quickly as possible.

American programs are no good except as they aid and support those of the South Vietnam government. This fact limits the U.S.—we can help in many ways, but nothing can create the nation unless the major part of the load is carried by the South Vietnamese. Further, it is to assure that those we help are working to create a responsive and representative system in South Vietnam, a government which is for the people and not for a small elite within the nation. Stability is not enough.

The U.S. responsibility is also to show that people can depend on treaties and commitments which have been made. The U.S. has a responsibility to its own people also—to work for world order and law, to stop aggression and to protect its own interests and develop a world of peace and prosperity.

Senator Hartke began his remarks by quoting from Professor Bernard Fall's description of Operation Cedar Falls, during which bulldozers levelled a village of South Vietnam. The people voluntarily went to what they thought were temporary shelters without being informed that their village would be burned. This, said Senator Hartke, is the type of "rebuilding" that is going on today in Vietnam.

The time for argument is long past, but we need to understand the facts. The greatest danger comes from half-truths which appear to be correct.

What is our commitment in Vietnam? When did it start? Harry Truman first committed the U.S. to Southeast Asia, and escalation has taken place every year since then. People say that the Eisenhower letter created a firm commitment, but its contents don't justify that claim. Indeed in 1965 President Eisenhower stated that the only aid he had referred to was economic.

Nor does SEATO furnish the commitment, said Senator Hartke. There is nothing concerning unilateral action in SEATO, and the treaty states that when taking action the countries will follow their constitutional processes. In the U.S., that should mean a Congressional declaration of war.

What are the positions of the SEATO members? France is opposed to our policy. The British Government would be in serious domestic trouble if it offered to send troops. Pakistan is pro-Chinese and anti-American. Australia has sent 4500 men, but are they draftees? New Zealand has sent 150 men. If they believed the domino theory they would have sent many more troops. The Philippines have sent 1000 men in construction batallions but have not sent any fighting men.

India and Japan are at the doorstep of the turmoil but neither has sent troops. What about the Geneva accord? Did we allow the 1956 elections to be held? We justified our policy by saying we hadn't signed the accord. The U.S. should follow the principle of Geneva now, as we once said we would.

Is this an aggression from outside or a civil war? It seems to be a civil war. It is true that North Vietnam is infiltrating men, but they seem to be accelerating only as we do so.

What of the South Vietnam leaders? Ky is a worshipper of Hitler. The other generals all fought with France until 1954, and 9 of the 10 are from the North.

Have we turned the corner militarily? Secretary McNamara said we had in 1963 and again in 1967. Hoover said we turned the corner in 1931.

What are the economics of the situation? Last summer the American people were told the cost would be $10 billion and he was criticized, Senator Hartke said, for saying it would cost $20 billion. He had been right.

The conflict has cost the U.S. 7,000 killed and 42,000 wounded. There are even greater casualties in the thoughts of our young people and in the lost opportunities in the U.S.

Senator Hartke proposed that the U.S. stop the bombing of the North. Secretary McNamara has admitted, he said, that the bombing hasn't significantly reduced the actual flow of men and material to the south. A Civilian Review Board Bombing Team, such as existed in World War II should be established to allow others than those who claim the bombing is effective to determine whether it actually is effective.

There was no certainty that the North Vietnam government would respond if we stopped, but they seem to have indicated that they would.

The U.S. should also move our unilateral actions into the international arena. We should revive the application of the two Vietnams for membership in the U.N., which we blocked when Russia suggested it. The Senate should ratify the 1925 Geneva protocol forbidding the use of chemicals against crops and personnel. We should recognize that the real struggle is between the Viet Cong vs. Saigon, not the U.S. v. Hanoi. We should try to establish a neutral regime. Finally, we should deescalate and stage a phased withdrawal with the U.N. policing the settlement. We should give our assistance through international organizations to avoid American dominance in the area.

Mr. Geyelin commented first on some of Mr. Unger's statements in assessing the feelings of the people in Southeast Asia. He said he was not impressed that the four heads of the Asian states referred to by Mr. Unger should be supporting the U.S. policy since they stood to gain by that same policy. Also, the U.S. seems to be bearing more and more of the load, rather than the South Vietnamese. Finally, he pointed out, "the basic mission, if it is correctly interpreted as that of rendering South Vietnam safe and secure to determine its own future, is probably beyond our capabilities. We may be able to stop this particular Communist threat and give the South Vietnamese a reasonable opportunity to run their own affairs without outside interference. But it is not a reasonable task for us to try to guarantee that they will run them well forever, or even that in time they won't do themselves in. The public should not be lead to expect that even a successful solution will be foolproof."

As for Senator Hartke's remarks, Mr. Geyelin noted that the President did go to Congress in 1965 and get approval of his actions. The number of troops sent by various nations varies with political problems as well as beliefs. Australia would probably have sent no men at all if they didn't worry. That's even more true of Korea. Many of the countries not willing to give direct aid would be very shocked if we left Vietnam.

It would be a mistake to stop bombing the North unilaterally. We should avoid bombing areas where civilians are likely to be, but we should bomb the infiltration routes. Also, the bombing has a psycholigical impact. Our bombing is a form of the game of chicken and the government should be allowed to play out its hand. If they stop now it would sabotage the entire policy. This is not an argument for having started the game.

Our Manila offer to withdraw in 6 months still exists, but has never been replied to.

There is a great difference in the war talked about in Vietnam and the one we discuss in the U.S. The bombing is rarely discussed since it doesn't relate to the day-to-day fighting. Nor is peace discussed. Peace is not likely to come in the near future.

Even if there were a cease-fire, it wouldn't be a peaceful one due to the guerrilla warfare. We can look for more of the same to continue in the future, but perhaps a little better for our side.

We have been successful in one of two wars. We have destroyed the capacity of large North Vietnam units to overwhelm the South. However, we probably have created a larger guerrilla war by winning the main force war and probably haven't brought the end much nearer.

The "other war" is the real war said Mr. Geyelin. Neither the bombing nor the main force victory will lead to peace. But if the South Vietnam government can destroy the Viet Cong infrastructure and show that it can effectively administer the local governments, then North Vietnam will opt for peace. The South Vietnam government must do this work alone without massive U.S. aid. To do this we need elected officials as soon as possible.

It is possible that we can create a politically tolerable situation in the U.S. by dividing the war. If we state that we have guaranteed that North Vietnam cannot win the war, and that this is our basic mission, then we can allow South Vietnam to take over the second part of the war. The South Vietnamese must create the security of a stable government themselves. Division of the war into two distinct problems, one that we can hope to handle, and one that only the South Vietnamese can be expected to handle, might be the best position, politically, that the Democratic Party could take in 1968; by redefining and limiting the mission in these terms, it might be made to look more promising and more feasible as far as our contribution is concerned. We should do the same thing throughout Southeast Asia, including Thailand. We should redefine our goals to more modest and realistic ones.

As moderator, I asked if there was anyone in the audience who wanted to ask a question from a "hawk" point of view, since no speaker had presented that view. There was no response.

Q: What is our national self-interest in the war?

A: Secretary Unger answered that our aid to South Vietnam is like that given to Korea or Greece or our aid in joining World War II. We need to find a way to establish peace and order. Whenever a country tries to impose its system on another, U.S. commitments come into effect. If we didn't act, the appetite of the aggressors would grow and eventually directly endanger the U.S.

Q: Would the U.N. be receptive to Senator Hartke's proposals?

A: Senator Hartke answered that the U.N. is still the best hope for peace in the world, and that we ought to use it. We should try to use it, although we don't know for sure how it will act. A resolution offered the day we resumed bombing isn't using the U.N. The U.S. should start by action on the application of both Vietnams and both Koreas for membership in the U.N.

Q: Does the U.S. want to take over North Vietnam?

A: Mr. Unger answered that the U.S. wanted to let both sides of Vietnam decide their destinies for themselves. We didn't support a vote in 1956 because we did not believe it would be fair and open unless under U.N auspices and supervision. Today we believe the question of reunification is one for the South and North to work out as soon as they can act free of outside pressures.

Q: A question was asked of Secretary Unger: If a Congressman votes against the appropriation of additional funds for this purpose, do you think he is working outside the sphere of legitimate protest.

A: Mr. Unger responded that this "is a very tricky constitutional question which has been faced many times in the U.S. Congress before where people have tried through the appropriation avenue to frustrate things they weren't able to accomplish through the authorization of a certain kind of legislation or the basic law itself. I would say that this issue has been clearly faced by the Congress in the Tonkin Gulf Resolution and elsewhere. Then it seems to me that taking action by the appropriation avenue to frustrate what has been the express will of the majority of the Congress is certainly unethical in our system."

Herman Robert Buchser Retiring

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 16, 1967

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to associate myself with the sense of a resolution, coauthored by the entire membership of the California State Assembly, which commends Herman Robert Buchser, a respected educator who is retiring from his position as president of San Jose City College. Mr. Buchser has devoted a long and energetic career to the betterment of education in California. It is with pride and appreciation that I submit the resolution for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

Resolution Relative to the Retirement of Herman Robert Buchser

(Assembly, California Legislature, 1967 Regular Session)

By Honorable Earle P. Crandall, 25th District; Honorable George W. Milias, 22nd District; Honorable Robert E. Badham, 71st District; Honorable William T. Bagley, 7th District; Honorable E. Richard Barnes, 78th District; Honorable Frederick James Bear, 79th District; Honorable Carlos Bee, 13th District; Honorable Frank P. Belotti, 2nd District; Honorable W. Craig Biddle, 74th District; Honorable Yvonne W. Brathwaite, 63rd District; Honorable John V. Briggs, 35th District; Honorable Carl A. Britschgi, 26th District; Honorable Willie L. Brown, Jr., 18th District; Honorable Robert H. Burke, 70th District; Honorable John L. Burton, 20th District; Honorable William Campbell, 50th District; Honorable Eugene A. Chappie, 6th District; Honorable Charles J. Conrad, 57th District; Honorable Kenneth Cory, 69th District; Honorable Robert W. Crown, 14th District; Honorable Mike Cullen, 44th District; Honorable Pauline L. Davis, 1st District; Honorable Wadie P. Deddeh, 77th District; Honorable James W. Dent, 10th District; Honorable Gordon W. Duffy, 21st District; Honorable John F. Dunlap, 5th District; Honorable Edward E. Elliott, 40th District; Honorable Jack R. Fenton, 51st District; Honorable March K. Fong, 15th District; Honorable John Francis Foran, 23rd District; Honorable Joe A. Gonsalves, 66th District; Honorable Bill Greene, 53rd District; Honorable Leroy F. Greene, 3rd District; Honorable James A. Hayes, 39th District; Honorable Harvey Johnson, 58th District; Honorable Ray E. Johnson, 4th District; Honorable Walter J. Karabian, 45th District; Honorable William M. Ketchum, 29th District; Honorable John T. Knox, 11th District; Honorable Frank Lanterman, 47th District; Honorable Ken MacDonald, 37th District; Honorable Patrick D. McGee, 64th District; Honorable Lester A. McMillan, 61st District; Honorable Charles W. Meyers, 19th District; Honorable Ernest N. Mobley, 33rd District; Honorable Robert T. Monagan, 12th District; Honorable Carlos J. Moorhead, 43rd District; Honorable Bob Moretti, 42nd District; Honorable Don Mulford, 16th District; Honorable Frank Murphy, Jr., 31st District; Honorable David Negri, 41st District; Honorable Alan G. Pattee, 34th District; Honorable Carley V. Porter, 38th District; Honorable Walter W. Powers, 8th District; Honorable Paul Priolo, 60th District; Honorable John P. Quimby, 72nd District; Honorable Leon Ralph, 55th District; Honorable David A. Roberti, 48th District; Honorable Newton R. Russell, 62nd District; Honorable Leo J. Ryan, 27th District; Honorable Peter F. Schabarum, 49th District; Honorable Winfield A. Shoemaker, 36th District; Honorable Alan Sieroty, 59th District; Honorable Kent H. Stacey, 28th District; Honorable John Stull, 80th District; Honorable Vincent Thomas, 68th District; Honorable L. E. Townsend, 67th District; Honorable Jesse M. Unruh, 65th District; Honorable John Vasconcellos, 24th District; Honorable John G. Veneman, 30th District; Honorable Victor V. Veysey, 75th District; Honorable Floyd L. Wakefield, 52nd District; and Honorable Charles Warren, 56th District. (Coauthored by Senator Alfred E. Alquist, 13th District; and Senator Clark L. Bradley, 14th District.)

Whereas, It has come to the attention of the Members of the Assembly that Herman Robert Buchser, the noted educator, is retiring from his position as President of San Jose City College; and

Whereas, Mr. Buchser was born in San Jose in 1902, attended San Jose State College, where he received his Bachelor's degree in chemistry and education, and attended Stanford University, where he earned his Master's degree, also in chemistry and education; and

Whereas, In 1929 he began his long service to the San Jose Unified School District as a counselor at Woodrow Wilson Junior High School, and from that point he progressed to the positions of Vice Principal at Roosevelt Junior High School, Principal at Willow Glen Elementary School, Principal at Edward Markham Junior High School, Principal at Willow Glen High School, Assistant Director at San Jose Junior College, and, since 1955, President of San Jose City College; and

Whereas, Mr. Buchser has contributed his valuable time and energy to worthwhile educational organizations by service as the Bay Section Council representative to the California Teachers' Association, representative to the State Committee of the California Teachers' Association, Vice President and President of the San Jose Teachers' Association, President of the San Jose School Men's Club, President of District 6A of the California Association of Secondary School Administrators, and President of the San Jose Building Administrators Association; and

Whereas, He has also been awarded an honorary life membership in the California Parent-Teachers' Association, in addition to being a member of the California Teachers' Association and a life member of the National Education Association; and

Whereas, It is because of the dedication of persons like Herman Robert Buchser that San Jose City College and the entire school system in San Jose has attained the degree of excellence it now possess; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly of the State of California, That the Members take this opportunity to commend Mr. Herman Robert Buchser on his long career in the field of education and to extend their best wishes on his retirement; and be it further

Resolved, That the Chief Clerk of the Assembly is hereby directed to transmit a suitably prepared copy of this resolution to Mr. Herman Robert Buchser.

House Resolution No. 231 read and adopted unanimously April 25, 1967.

Signed:

JESSE M. UNRUH,
Speaker of the Assembly.

Attest:

JAMES D. DRISCOLL,
Chief Clerk of the Assembly.

Creative Federalism: A Full-Fledged Partnership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AL ULLMAN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 13, 1967

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, much has been said and written during the past 3 years concerning the meaning and goals of creative federalism. Some statements have been confusing; some of the interpretations have been misleading; and some of the commentators have had little working experience with the day-to-day relationships that constitute intergovernmental relations in practice.

As a Member of Congress and as one of the House members of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations—along with the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOUNTAIN] and the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. DWYER]—I am deeply concerned that the American public gets a clear picture of the real problems facing contemporary federalism, and of the efforts at this level to overcome the obstacles hindering its effectiveness. The Advisory Commission, in its eighth annual report and through its many other activities, is helping to bridge this information gap; yet, all of us have a responsibility here.

Mr. Speaker, in this connection I commend to my colleagues an excellent article based on a speech delivered before the Birmingham convention of the Alabama League of Municipalities on April 10, 1967, by Mr. Neal D. Peterson, a staff assistant to the Vice President of the United States. In it, Mr. Peterson deals with specific ways that officials at all levels are beginning to develop a more effective working partnership, which in essence is the paramount goal of creative federalism. Factors that impede more constructive relationships are identified and efforts to overcome these obstacles are described.

I commend this article, which appeared in the May issue of the Alabama Municipal Journal, to all who are genuinely interested in achieving a full-fledged partnership between the Federal, State, and local governments.

Something New and Quite Profound

(By Neal D. Peterson)

"We began as a nation of localities. And however changed in character those localities become, however urbanized we grow and however high we build, our destiny as a Nation will be determined there."

Let me express my appreciation for your giving me my first opportunity to visit the State of Alabama. Although I have not been here before, I certainly have felt a close kinship to your state because, for the first three years that I was in Washington, I worked for Senator Sparkman on the Senate Small Business Committee. Senator Humphrey was then a Subcommittee Chairman and carried on many activities under the direction of Senator Sparkman.

FEDERAL-LOCAL LIAISON

Now, let me tell you a little about why I am here. In March of 1965, the President asked the Vice President to be his liaison with local government. This has involved the Vice President an, in turn, me—as his Staff Assistant—in a whole range of activities in connection with local government. I might say in this connection that I detect something new and quite profound taking place at the Washington level. The essence of this is a much better working relationship between all levels of government. I think that in some small way our continuing efforts have played a part in bettering this relationship.

We have, for example, held a series of conferences in Washington to which every mayor coming from a city with a population of 30,000 has been invited.

In addition to this we have held two regional conferences for mayors from towns between 1,000 and 30,000.

We have held conferences with your State League Directors; we have had meetings with all of the City Managers in the United States, and have worked closely with the County Boards.

But more important than all of this, the Vice President's office has maintained a daily contact with the National League of Cities, your parent organization. All this is borne out of a conviction held by President Johnson and Vice President Humphrey to carry out the great overriding charge set forth in the Preamble to the United States Constitution; namely, the promotion of the general welfare of the American people.

This is the concern of all levels of government and we in Washington, as we must be, view ourselves only as partners in this great task.

There was a time—and many of us still vividly remember it—when the federal government failed to meet its share of this responsibility, and our problem was to get it moving to do so.

We have won that battle; that era is over. We have established firmly the principle that the federal government has this positive duty.

CREATIVE FEDERALISM—A PARTNERSHIP

Now, we are in a new era—the era of a working partnership among all levels of American government, the era of what President Johnson has called "creative federalism."

Creative federalism means more than just cooperation. It means that we are developing an active alliance among governments and private groups—an alliance in which all levels of government, along with industry, labor, agriculture, the universities, the foundations, and the public service organizations, are principal partners.

We have achieved this partnership in our space effort, with outstanding success. We are increasingly carrying on the war against poverty and the battle against air and water pollution in the same way. We shall have this partnership in the Model Cities program and in the programs of the new Department of Transportation.

The federal government's role is not to dominate—but to stimulate, cooperate and coordinate. Its role is to work with others to set higher standards in meeting human need.

Put in the negative, creative federalism does not tolerate an all-powerful federal government.

The duty of modern American government demands a full partnership of effort. So right off the bat, it means "better" state and local government—public officials better paid, and better staffed.

Creative federalism means programs and policies which are locally inspired; locally developed and locally administered. But wherever necessary, this local initiative is aided by broader design for state and regional development, stimulated and supported by federal skills and resources.

Under this active partnership, we will be satisfied that federal aid is effective only if it results in achievements of quality, not just projects in quantity. Now, Washington, D.C. can't do all of the job. We have to do it together. We need a renaissance of state governments, a revitalization of local governments and the rededication of private initiative. Let's make sure that each partner is not only able to carry his share of the load, but strong enough so that he is respected.

This revitalized control does not say that the federal government should dominate; it says all should cooperate. This is the heart of our renewed concept of American government.

The problems of the cities are the problems you have as mayors. We can't get at them at the nation's capital. That is the point. We can get at them in part from Washington. We can give grants-in-aid. We can set standards for their use. We can train technicians. But ultimately, if there are going to be, for example, better schools, they won't just appear from nowhere. They will be in your state and in your town, and they will be there only because of your leadership and your initiative. If there is going to be better housing, you will have to want it *where your people live* and *where you live, in your state* and *in your town*. And if the air is to be cleaned, and if the water is to be pure, you will have to fight the pollution where you live.

ANSWERING COMPLAINTS

Now, let me say a word about our efforts at the federal level on some of your specific complaints. We are continually told that:

Federal officials ignore local government or do not understand it.

Federal programs are so numerous and complicated that they are of little use.

Federal planning requirements overlap and are completely uncoordinated.

The shortage of trained personnel has become acute.

With the country crying for mayors and other local government officials to rebuild their cities, there is a complete lack of appreciation of the limited supply of funds and the lack of revenue sources available to the cities to do the job.

These are the complaints we receive, and I must say there is a great deal of truth in all of these observations. The Vice President and his office know this, first of all, because he has been a mayor of one of this country's large cities; and secondly, because he was one of the original members of the Kestnbaum Commission. This latter Commission was the forerunner of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. Thus, with regard to the first point, (that federal officials ignore local government) the Vice President set out to bring together representatives of the national organizations of local government with federal officials. A series of conferences was held between representatives of the Bureau of the Budget and the following organizations: the National League of Cities, Conference of Mayors, National Association of County Officials and the International City Managers' Association.

The result of these meetings was a memo sent by the President to Department heads. It is sufficiently important so that I will read it to you.

"The basis of creative federalism is cooperation.

"If Federal assistance programs to state and local governments are to achieve their goals, more is needed than money alone. Effective organization, management and administration are required at each level of government. These programs must be carried out jointly; therefore, they should be worked out and planned in a cooperative spirit with those chief officials of state, county and local governments who are answerable to their citizens.

"To the fullest practical extent I want you to take steps to afford representatives of the cheif executives of state and local governments the opportunity to advise and consult in the development and execution of programs which directly affect the conduct of state and local affairs.

"I believe these arrangements will greatly strengthen the Federal system at all levels. *Our objective is to make certain that vital new federal assistance programs are made workable at the point of impact.*"

TWO SIGNIFICANT ACTIONS

From this memo we have gone on to implement it by two significant actions. The first was to have each Cabinet Secretary designate a person at the level of an Assistant Secretary to be responsible for intergovernmental relations. Secondly, the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations will act as a conduit. All significant policy changes and changes in regulations will be sent to the Advisory Commission. It will be their responsibility to get written comments and opinions and to resubmit them to the Department in question. All of this is in process and I venture to say that local government working through their own organizations, will really begin to help shape national policy.

Let me move on to the second point: that the grant-in-aid programs are too numerous and too complex. There are now over 400 grant-in-aid programs, depending upon how you count them. Washington is consumed with a debate on the usefulness of these programs. I submit that the fact that most of them run out of money well before the end of the fiscal year, and because the backlog of applications are all quite large, the need is there.

But the President has recognized the difficulties. In his State of the Union message he said, "Every program will be thoroughly evaluated. Grant-in-aid programs will be improved and simplified as desired by most of our local administrators and our governors. *Where there have been mistakes, we will try hard to correct them.*" Following this provision in his State of the Union message, on March 20, the President sent a message to Congress entitled, "The Quality of American Government." Scholars of this problem such as Senator Muskie have indicated this may be one of the most important messages of the last several sessions of Congress. With regard to the grant-in-aid programs, the President indicated he would follow up with last Session's great success in the field of health. He pointed out: "Beyond administrative and financial consolidation, an even more fundamental restructuring of our grant-in-aid programs is essential.

"Last year's 'Partnership for Health' Act pointed the way. With that measure Congress combined into a single package a number of health grants. It established for these activities a single set of requirements, a single authorization and a single appropriation.

REVIEW OF FEDERAL PROGRAMS

"I have requested the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to review the range of federal grant-in-aid programs to determine other areas in which a basic consolidation of grant-in-aid authorizations, appropriations and statutory requirements should be carried out.

"As that review is completed, I will seek the necessary legislation to combine and modernize the grant-in-aid system, area by area."

In addition, the President directed the Bureau of the Budget to create a task force which had on it representatives of state and local government. This task force will be asked to develop a plan to simplify the administration of grant-in-aid programs, particularly in instances where a governor and a mayor may wish to develop a program which uses several of the programs all at one time. At the present time it is usually necessary for the governor or mayor to submit separate applications and follow separate financial and administrative procedures for each such federal grant.

Initially, we should make it possible, through general legislation, for federal agencies to combine related grants into a simple financial package thus simplifying the financial and administrative procedures—without disturbing, however, the separate authorizations, appropriations, and substantive requirements for each grant-in-aid program.

The development of a workable plan for grant simplification will demand careful preparation. The statutes involved are varied and complex.

If we are successful, this will help us stop what is called the bandaid approach to municipal problems. For I believe it is generally agreed that for our broad municipal problems, the subject matter of health, welfare, education and physical development must be attacked in a coordinated way all at the same time.

REGIONAL PLANNING

In connection with the third point relating to the overlapping of planning requirements: This is one of the most complex of all, but we will have taken a long step forward with the housing legislation which was sent to Congress last week. In that bill the Department of Housing and Urban Development will be given authority to fund planning requests from districts composed of groups of rural counties and to regions which include a metropolitan area and the surrounding rural areas.

The Department of Agriculture will utilize its resources to give technical advice to these new regions and districts, the idea being that the forces within each state should delineate the geographical boundaries for planning purposes. This will make it easier to carry out a recent Presidential directive which demands federal departments to minimize the inconsistencies among federal administrative and approval requirements placed upon state, regional and metropolitan development planning activities.

In this recent memo, the President called for the fullest coordination in fixing the boundaries of multijurisdictional planning units, assisted by the federal government. He stated that such boundaries should be consistent with established state planning districts and regions. The key is now to have the states and local government exercise their prerogatives to set up such regional and district planning agencies.

Again, I will say this is only a start because dealing with such complex governmental activities, progress cannot be made overnight.

PUBLIC SERVICE EDUCATION

In connection with the fourth point, the Administration has placed before Congress the Public Service Education Act. The need is great.

Between 1955 and 1965 employment in state and local governments increased from 4.7 million to 7.7 million, or four times the rate of growth of employment in the economy as a whole.

By 1975, state and local government employment will grow to more than 11 million.

Each year, from now through 1975, state and local governments will have to recruit at least one quarter of a million new administrative, technical and professional employees, not including teachers, to maintain and develop their programs.

One out of every three of the Nation's municipal executives, and one out of every two municipal health directors will be eligible for retirement within the next 10 years.

There will be two vacancies for each new graduate of a university program in city and regional planning.

This particular bill will provide money for research into new methods of education for government service. But it will more specifically provide fellowships to state and local government employees and provide for grants of up to 75 percent to help state and local governments develop and carry out comprehensive training plans and strengthen their personnel administration systems.

THE REVENUE PROBLEM

This brings me to the last point which relates to the lack of finances and the revenue raising problems of cities. I find in looking over the report done for the National League of Cities that if one projects the trends in city spending and the expected revenues between now and 1975, there will be a gap of $262 billion. No one really knows how this gap will be overcome, or whether it might not even be larger than found by the National League of Cities. After examining all of the revenue raising possibilities, the report concludes that the money should come from the federal government. It points out that with a four percent growth rate in our national economy, and with no increase in taxes, for every dollar that our G.N.P. goes up, we receive 20 cents more in federal revenues. Thus, over a ten year period, the federal government will receive an additional $365 billion. One might say that this emphasizes the need for a continuing and steady growth rate in our economy.

Several observations are pertinent here relating to the cooperation between all levels of government in solving this acute problem of raising revenue to meet the needs of cities.

First, increased attention *has* been given the fiscal needs and problems confronting urban areas. In fiscal 1968, total federal aid to urban areas will reach $10.3 billion—nearly three times the 1961 figure.

Second, federal assistance directly to all local governments has soared during the past few years—partly in response to urgent local demands and partly in an attempt to inject greater flexibility into the grant structure. In this fiscal year, $3.8 billion out of the total $14.6 billion fell in this category—more than double the figure for 1965.

Third, nearly all of the recent joint action programs recognized the variety needs and unequal fiscal capacity of recipient states and localities. Apportionment formulas emphasize fiscal capacity and program need, while matching requirements generally weigh the differing abilities of jurisdictions to support the aided functions.

The President pointed out in his State of the Union message that during the past three years we have returned to state and local governments $40 billion in grants-in-aid. This year alone, 70 percent of our federal expenditures for domestic programs will be distributed through the state and local governments. With federal assistance, state and local governments by 1970 will be spending close to $110 billion annually.

At this point, the President in two simple sentences got to the crux of the matter. He said, "These enormous sums must be used wisely, honestly and effectively. We intend to work closely with states and localities to do exactly that."

REVENUE SHARING

A great deal is being said across the country today about revenue sharing. We hear of the Heller plan, the Pechman plan, the Melvin Laird plan and many others. I submit from the figures I have just quoted to you it is obvious that we are already sharing revenue in large amounts—the real question is how revenue sharing will be accomplished in the future. All of these plans are being studied carefully. There are those who feel, however, that the best way is to gradually evolve a system by consolidating the programs, as we are, and simplifying the administration of them. The really important point is the one made by the President that the money be spent honestly, wisely and effectively and that we work together to accomplish this.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, let me say our federal system is strong. It is the best instrument we have, or any nation has ever had, for joint action.

No nation so great as ours can develop the society its people need if the federal government evades its responsibility. This government has not and will not. But neither can such a nation hope to succeed on the strength of federal action alone.

We began as a nation of localities. And however changed in character those localities become, however urbanized we grow and however high we build, our destiny as a Nation will be determined there.

Just as the effectiveness of every law must be gauged by its administration, many programs must succeed—or fail—in the local health department or school board or urban renewal office or community action agency which turns it from plan to performance.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402, at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

Appendix

First Annual West Virginia Collegiate Alumni and Development Conference Hears Hon. Philip H. Des Marais, Deputy Assistant Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, at Mont Chateau Lodge, Morgantown, W. Va., Discuss "Your Federal Government—Junior Partner in Higher Education"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 19, 1967

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, although a prior commitment prevented my attending the first annual West Virginia collegiate alumni and development conference, held at Mont Chateau Lodge, Morgantown, W. Va., on June 17, it was my privilege to have been associated with the conference in obtaining Philip H. Des Marais as the banquet speaker.

Mr. Des Marais, Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, delivered an address which, while reviewing much of the progress made by the Government and our colleges and universities in the field of higher education, points to the exciting challenges of the future.

He avers, in discussing equality of educational opportunity, that—

> Like all great ideas, this notion of opportunity is as yet only imperfectly realized in our institutions, in our social structure, among all our people. But the foundations have been laid and the great testing ground lies ahead of all of us in the coming years.

Mr. President, the remarks of Mr. Des Marais are indeed noteworthy, and in order that Senators may read them, I ask unanimous consent that his speech, entitled "Your Federal Government—Junior Partner in Higher Education" be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address by Philip H. Des Marais was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

YOUR FEDERAL GOVERNMENT—JUNIOR PARTNER IN HIGHER EDUCATION[1]

(By Philip H. Des Marais, Deputy Assistant Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare)

It is a real pleasure for me to participate in this Centennial Conference on development of higher education resources in the Mountain State of West Virginia.

I believe it is very appropriate for you to consider what your Federal Government can contribute to the supremely important task of the development of educational services of the colleges and universities of this State. No one of our national resources is more significant to the future development and strength of our Nation than our institutions of higher education. Being so central to the continued strength and vitality of American society, they deserve and are now receiving financial assistance from the Federal Government.

Nevertheless, I believe your Federal Government should be looked upon as a junior partner in this great enterprise to which we are all committed. American colleges and universities received about $18 billion from all sources this fiscal year. Less than one-quarter of that, $4.6 billion, came from Washington—much of it for sponsored research—and nobody whom I know in the Government foresees that the Federal responsibility will ever be much more than that. The States, local governments, and voluntary and private sources should continue to be the senior partners.

The increased complexity of postwar American life, a thirst for knowledge on the part of young people, and a growing demand for college graduates have had a profound effect upon the higher education system. College enrollment has doubled in the last decade. There are now nearly 6 million students in American colleges. By 1975 enrollment is expected to reach 8.6 million. Freshman enrollments for 1966–67 are 15 percent above those of the previous year. The number of colleges and universities rose from 866 at the end of World War II to almost 2,200 in 1966, and there is every indication that this spectacular growth will continue.

Concurrent with the rapid expansion of the higher education system at the undergraduate level, there has been growth in demand for postgraduate education. Students with bachelor's degrees are seeking to go on to graduate school. Colleges, vocational and technical schools, business, and industry are requiring professional employees to have postgraduate education as a prerequisite for work in an increasing number of specialized fields. Ten years ago, approximately 240,000 students were enrolled in graduate school. Last September, that number had increased to 570,000. The demand for graduate education is not expected to abate. Projections indicate that by 1974 there will be almost 1.1 million graduate students. It is estimated that an additional 40 strong graduate centers are needed to meet the Nation's manpower requirements.

Cost of living increases, better teachers' salaries, and the cost of improving the quality of education have resulted in a rapid increase in the cost of going to college. In public institutions, college cost in 1940 were approximately $850 a year. By 1965, that cost had almost doubled—$1,560. It is estimated that the average annual cost of attending a public institution will be $2,400 in 1980. In private institutions, the costs have risen from $1,100 in 1940 to $2,370 in 1965—by 1980 it is estimated that the average annual cost will be $3,640.

It is possible that the most significant development in higher education in our time has been the awakened interest of the Federal Government in providing support for our colleges and universities and assistance for students.

Congress has recognized that the vital role of higher education in national affairs has created a need for a national effort to assist both institutions of higher education and students. In 1958, the National Defense Education Act, established to improve education at all levels, included the popular National Defense Student Loan Program. In 1963, Congress passed the Higher Education Facilities Act to assist in construction of libraries, laboratories, and classrooms. The Higher Education Act of 1965 authorizes support for a broad range of higher educational activities.

A great deal has already been accomplished under these laws to provide additional academic facilities; train more college teachers; and assist students and their families in paying for the cost of college education. Here are some instances:

Under the Higher Education Facilities Act, grants of more than $690 million were made in fiscal 1965 and 1966 for the construction of undergraduate academic facilities, with an appropriation of $453 million for this purpose in 1967.

Grants for the construction of graduate facilities amounted to $120 million in fiscal 1965 and 1966, with an additional $60 million appropriated for use in fiscal 1967.

Loans for facilities construction totaling more than $220 million have been made since 1965, with a fiscal 1967 appropriation of $200 million for this purpose.

In addition, fiscal 1967 appropriations of $4 million for comprehensive planning grants, and $3 million for the administration of State plans have been made.

In the two years of program operation, grants and loans together have generated more than $3 billion worth of construction across the country.

Some 17,500 fellowships for prospective college teachers in all disciplines have been awarded under Title IV of the National Defense Education Act, and we expect to award approximately 6,000 more for this academic year. Fellows receive an average of about $3,000 per year, and the institutions they attend receive $2,500 toward the cost of their education.

About one million students from low-income families have received over $800 million in loans under the National Defense Education Act, to enable them to enter or remain in college. During the current academic year, 435,000 students received loans totaling $245 million.

During the current academic year, some 190,000 students in over 1,500 colleges and universities are participating in College Work-Study programs to help them pay for their education; and over 134,000 needy students are receiving their college education at over 1,400 institutions with the assistance of Educational Opportunity grants. Students across the country are also benefiting from the Guaranteed Loan program provided by the Higher Education Act, and from the similar loan program for students in vocational education programs.

Obviously the impact of these new programs is considerable, even now. But of even greater significance is the fact that they are there. These laws mean a great deal to the future of America, but they will succeed only to the degree that we translate their provisions into a genuine commitment to regard the improvement of education as first on our list of paramount national problems.

To perform this translation will not be easy. Before we can do it we must come to grips with, and dispose of, some *nagging and persistent issues.*

Let me share with you my list of so-called persistent issues, in the full knowledge that each of you would identify others and probably place a different emphasis on those that I am about to suggest.

---

[1] Presented at First Annual West Virginia Alumni and Development Conference, Mont Chateau Lodge, Morgantown, West Virginia, June 17, 1967, 6:30 p.m.

First is the issue of, to put it quite baldly, "keeping the Federal Government in its place." Historically, American higher education has been able to deal quite confidently with the Federal Government. The basic reason for this, in my judgment, is that the academic community knows in its heart that the competence for higher education resides on the campuses and not in Washington. The problem is to keep it that way, to make sure that Federal resources are used to strengthen and improve and to encourage innovation in higher education without impairing either its freedom or its diversity. There is no easy answer, but we do have now a national consensus that we leave no stone unturned in our efforts to provide every qualified student with an opportunity for education of excellence to the fullest limit of his abilities. And we do have a commitment that it is in the national interest to regard higher education—both *public and private*—as a single great national resource.

Next on my list of persistent issues is the need to *improve teaching and the preparation of teachers*. Here, as I am sure you would insist, we must constantly keep assessing and reassessing our performance in the three great functions of higher education—research, teaching, and service to the community.

It is important that universities not allow undergraduate teaching to be overshadowed by graduate instruction and research, or by community service, but the Federal Government has a large responsibility to assess its own behavior in order to assist colleges and universities in this respect.

Another challenge we are going to have to face, and increasingly, as time goes on, is the problem of our cities. They are only immense. Their resolution will demand the full support of our colleges and universities because they are best equipped to serve as the base for that struggle—a struggle that is going to near the top of the national agenda for the next decade. To help these institutions with this job, Title I of the Higher Education Act encourages and assists colleges and universities to turn their attention to the problems of urban people, in much the same way as our Land-Grant institutions have been assisting rural people for something over 100 years.

A fourth persistent issue is the matter of holding down the rising costs of education to students. This past academic year the average cost at private colleges had risen to about $2,500, at public colleges to about $1,600. By 1970, we expect these figures will go close to $3,000 and $2,000.

During the period 1956–61, for example, tuition charges increased 47 percent at public institutions and 64 percent at private institutions. This during a period when the consumer price index rose but 11 percent and family income of parents of college-age children rose 33 percent. Despite these increases, the gap between student charges and actual instructional costs continues to widen. But of even more pointed concern to all interested in the strength and diversity of our higher education enterprise—public and private—is the alarming rate at which the ratio of student costs (board, room, tuition) between public and private institutions is widening. Remaining quite constant at about 1.5 to 1 during the 25-year period from 1930 to 1955, the ratio has increased sharply during the past ten years and now stands in excess of 2 to 1. One does not have to be an economist to see that that spells trouble.

The various student aid programs provide much needed assistance, but a larger responsibility rests on the colleges and universities to take a searching look at their present practices so that through higher efficiency, including the full use of resources on a calendar year basis, and the more effective use of technological advances they can at least slow down the rate of increase in college costs to students.

In addition, the Federal Government must continually assess its interest to determine whether the required mix of Federal and institutional funds does in reality help to hold back the rising costs to students.

What then are some of the options open to the Federal Government in assisting States and colleges and universities in their efforts to deal with these and other issues facing higher education?

1. Return Federal Tax Revenues to States—to be used as States decide. Equalizing advantage/private higher education disadvantage.

2. Federal Tax Credits to Parents of College Students. Encourage tuition increases/regressive nature of subsidy.

3. General Aid Grants to Institutions Based on Per Student or Some Related Basis. Morrill Act precedent.

4. Aid to Improve Quality of Instruction. Project grant/institutional planning.

5. Direct Aid to College Students or Their Parents through Grants, Loans, or Work-Study.

6. Expansion of Present Programs of Categorical Aid. Research/Facilities/Student Aid.

CONCLUSION

In his Message on Education to the 89th Congress, President Johnson stated as an ambitious goal for the future "full education for every citizen to the limits of his capacity to absorb it."

The 88th and 89th Congresses have moved toward these goals. During the past three sessions, Congress has enacted 19 landmark measures in education and increased the budget for the Office of Education more than 500 percent.

These achievements of the past three years promise a dramatic enrichment of American life.

Let me hasten to acknowledge that the challenges before us are tremendous. Congress has built a legislative foundation and provided the tools and materials with which we can improve our education programs. But the most difficult tasks are still ahead. For unless these new programs are well administered—unless the dream of freedom of choice and of opportunity is translated into living force in our society, we will have only the appearance of accomplishment.

As the philosophy underlying the big changes ahead of us has come to be articulated through discussion and interpreted through recent legislation, the concept of equal educational opportunity has emerged as one of the great political ideas in the Nation's history.

As I see it, this concept represents a forward movement from a legalistic view of political and civil rights to a broader, more dynamic concept of human dignity and opportunity. It is a policy that must include a vital role for all levels and sectors of our pluralistic system of education: Federal, State, and local governments; and both private independent and publicly-controlled institutions—all must share in this great enterprise.

Like all great ideas, this notion of opportunity is as yet only imperfectly realized in our institutions, in our social structure, among all our people. But the fundations have been laid and the great testing ground lies ahead of all of us in the coming years.

Extension of the Capitol Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 1967

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in my remarks, I include certain important information in relation to the extension of the west front of the Capitol given to me by the Office of the Architect of the Capitol, which I am sure will be of interest to Members of both branches of the Congress.

EXTENSION OF THE CAPITOL PROJECT

The Thompson and Lichtner Company of Brookline, Massachusetts, which has been in existence since 1896 and is an engineering firm that specializes in structural materials and stone masonry construction and has served as consultants for such important projects as the reconditioning of the historic Trinity Church in Boston, the historic Park Street Church in Boston, and the State prison in Boston constructed in the early 1800's and whose President is Doctor Miles N. Clair, was engaged by contract, March 13, 1964, by the Architect of the Capitol, at the direction of the Commission for the Extension of the United States Capitol, to make a survey, study, and examination of the structural condition of the west central portion of the U.S. Capitol, extending from the House connection to the Senate connection, and of adjacent terrace walls, including examination of test pits, soil borings, and cores of wall construction to be made by firms competent to make such test pits, borings, and cores.

Under its contract, this company was required to submit a report of its findings to the Architect of the Capitol and, based on its findings, to recommend such remedial measures as deemed necessary, including recommendations as to (*1*) *whether* the existing wall, if found deficient, can be repaired in its present condition; (*2*) *whether* the existing wall can be refaced with marble in its present location; (*3*) *whether* remedial action requires extension of the west central front and its reconstruction in marble; or (*4*) *whether* any other means of preservation is deemed feasible.

This company made a thorough and extensive examination of the west central front structure, including examination of the soundness of its foundation, condition of the exterior and interior of the westerly walls, extent of weaknesses, construction deficiencies, and deterioration of the structure, and the hazards involved if the structure is left in its present condition. To determine the condition of the foundation of the exterior walls below grade, 17 test pits were excavated and 18 core holes were drilled in the walls; to determine the condition of the exterior walls above grade, 47 core holes were drilled in the walls. A survey and examination of all cracks and other visible defects in the walls was made; measurements were made of deflections in the walls; Doctor Clair personally made an extensive study of the exterior and interior of the building, examining the type of arch construction in each room and on all floors at or near the west walls, as well as a good part of the remainder of the building. Every core and every part of the interior or exterior of the walls that were exposed were carefully examined by Dr. Clair. After removal of the core, the inside surface of every core hold in the building walls was examined by Dr. Clair, using a boroscope—an instrument similar in principle to a cystoscope used in the medical profession.

When Dr. Clair completed his studies and examinations, the Thompson and Litchner Company submitted *a 5-volume report* to the Architect of the Capitol, *containing his findings and remedial measures recommended.*

Volume 1 contains a detailed account of the survey, studies, and examinations made of the west front structure, together with drawings and other detailed illustrations. In addition, *it contains* a letter from Dr. Clair, summarizing his findings, and recommending the Extension of the West Central Front of the Capitol and its reconstruction in marble. In this letter, Dr. Clair recommended against repair, refacing, or restoration, as a remedial measure to correct the conditions he found to exist.

Volume 2 contains drawings showing general plans of work, location of borings, test pits, cores, and similar detail, soil profiles, test pit detail drawings, wall sections, deviation of wall facing stones, and a view of the East-West section through the Capitol.

Volumes 3, 4, and 5 contain photographs of various conditions found, including, in general, views of the building, major cracks and displaced stones, exposed surface of walls in test pits and hand holes made in walls above grade, both inside and outside of the building, and detail pictures of all cores as removed from the walls.

Contrary to allegations made by others, the *Thompson and Lichtner Company's studies and report were not directed to or aimed at the extension* of the West Central Front of the Capitol, *but were directed to a determination of the condition of* the West Central Front *and what measures*—repair, refacing, restoration, or extension—should be taken to remedy conditions in a permanent manner.

The report did not devote any more time or space to the extension of the west front, than it did to the repair, refacing, or restoration of the west front! The report was devoted, instead, to the *condition* of the west front *and to the conclusions* reached by the Thompson and Lichtner Company as a result of their studies and examinations.

In addition to the findings and recommendations contained in this report, Dr. Clair, in testifying on the Extension Project before the Commission for the Extension of the United States Capitol at a public hearing, June 24, 1965, enlarged upon the report and, after discussing various conditions, findings, and considerations, stated (p. 10) "What is needed here is to, in my opinion, protect this whole wall, *enclose it just as you did on the east side by another structure.*"

In evaluating opinions, it should be emphasized that Dr. Clair has a first-hand knowledge of deficient structural conditions, acquired through a boroscopic examination of the interior construction, made through the holes from the corings removed from the walls and later replaced, whereas other engineers or architects are limited to a visual examination of the structure and a study of Dr. Clair's report.

Restoration, if done, would have to be done on a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee basis, at an indeterminate cost. Dr. Clair has stated, in his opinion, such cost could range anywhere from Ten to Fifty Milion Dollars, depending upon the extent of work found necessary in the course of the restoration, following the removal of stonework and exposure of the interior structure. Extension of the west central front and its reconstruction in marble, under competitive bid contracts, is, on the other hand, estimated to cost Thirty-Four Million Dollars.

Restoration, if done, would require the entire west central section of the Capitol, between the two rings, to be vacated, from the basement to attic, for a period ranging anywhere from 5 to 10 years. Extension of the west central front would, on the other hand, not require vacation of any part of the Capitol, except the section of the terrace between the Senate and House wings.

Beyond a doubt, in the entire history of the Capitol Building, no one has ever heretofore made as extensive or meticulous examination or observation of the construction and condition of the wall structure of the Capitol on the west side, as was made by Dr. Clair.

If the west central front of the Capitol is restored, and not extended, then space occupied by the following activities would have to be vacated for all or part of the 5 to 10 years period:

BASEMENT FLOOR

Office of the Architect of the Capitol.
Office of the Coordinator of Information.

FIRST FLOOR

House Branch Post Office.
An office of the Clerk of the House.
Office of the Doorkeeper of the House.
House Enrolling Clerk.
Several offices occupied by Doctor Pearson.
Subcommittee Hearing Rooms, House Committee on Appropriations.
Joint Committee on Printing.
Office of Secretary of Majority—Senate Joint Committee on the Reorganization of Congress.
Senate Barber Shop.
3 Senators' offices.

SECOND FLOOR

Statuary Hall.
House Document Room.
House Foreign Affairs Committee.
1 Congressman's office.
Office of the Minority Leader of the House.
6 Senators' offices.
Senate Disbursing Office.
Senate Minority Leader.

THIRD FLOOR

House Document Room.
House Administration Committee.
8 Senators' offices.
Secretary to the Minority—Senate.
Senate Library.
Part of Senate Document Room.

ATTIC FLOOR

House Document Room.
Law Library.
Senate Library.

A Not-So-Benevolent Uncle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 19, 1967

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unaminous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial published in the Wall Street Journal, dated June 13, 1967, entitled "A Not-So-Benevolent Uncle."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A NOT-SO-BENEVOLENT UNCLE

In the past decade Federal aid to cities has been rising so rapidly and recklessly that no one knows just how much has been spent, let alone what has been accomplished. Some guesses put the 10-year outlay at $100 billion.

Now, however, the Federal budget deficit is growing to fantastic proportions; at last it frightens Congress and, now and then, even the Administration. One result, as Mr. Karmin reported in this newspaper recently is that the cities aren't getting quite all the money they want, or all that Washington's politicians had led them to look for.

With somewhat less cash to hand out than expected, Federal urban-aid men are developing a new interest in efficiency. "You've got to do something besides just sitting back and letting the programs run themselves," says one official.

Some cities, of course, are not taking kindly to the idea, having grown accustomed to seeing Federal dollars poured down the drain. Yet Washington's interest in better management, if it somehow survives, could actually benefit everybody.

Consider Cleveland, an early target of the Federal crackdown. The Ohio metropolis has started 6,000 acres of urban renewal projects in the last decade, nearly twice as much as any other city in the nation. Only one of a dozen projects has ever been finished.

Along the way large amounts of land were taken off tax rolls and many families were pushed out of their homes, with the city often having no idea at all where they went. Under its be-kind-to-all policy, the Federal Government went right ahead helping to finance the fiasco.

But change came to Cleveland in January, when Housing and Urban Development Secretary Weaver withdrew $10.4 million that had been earmarked for the city's Erieview II renewal project. That particular project had been in the planning stage for almost six years, and no plan had been produced.

Other cities have felt a Federal nudge. When San Francisco refused to get moving on a $20 million urban renewal project, the Government retrieved the money. "We're trying to get in a position where our management record is improved," is the way one Federal official puts it.

It isn't especially surprising that many cities have simply taken on more projects than they could handle. With overlapping aid programs scattered around Washington, Government units for years have been falling over one another in their efforts to be first in handing out the cash.

In that sort of atmosphere, a lot of cities came to see "free" Federal funds as the solution to all their problems, or at least as something nice to have around. They often grabbed for the money before they had even figured out very clearly just what the problems were. One indication of the slapdash nature of much of the spending is the sad fact that the cities have continued to deteriorate.

With the Government turning somewhat less openhanded, local governments may try harder to mobilize their own resources. It's conceivable, too, that at least some of them will evidence more interest in revision of antiquated tax structures and management methods, in intelligent control of welfare and other spending.

It's also possible, to be be sure, that this is little more than wishful thinking; the change in Washington can hardly be called an economy wave. At best it affects only a relatively small portion of the Government's huge and growing domestic outlays. A number of cities, moreover, have become so used to loose living that they might not follow even a larger Federal switch toward efficiency.

Nonetheless the new urban-aid attitude is welcome. If it spreads, it could show that an uncle not quite so eager to be benevolent is in fact being kind.

Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 1967

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few brief observations on the situation in the Middle East. First, I hope that the administration will make up its mind where it stands. I believe that administration indecision helped to bring on the recent conflict, and I feel that the administration should state the U.S. position clearly.

I believe that the recent hostilities must be terminated by a peace treaty in which the Arab States recognize at least the existing territorial boundaries of Israel. Provision should be made for the internationalization of Jerusalem, which is sacred to all faiths. Israel should be given the right of ship passage through the Suez Canal, and right of passage through the Straits of Tiran into the Gulf of Aqaba. In return, I believe Israel has an obligation to the Arabs uprooted from their former Palestinian homes. Israel's compliance with these obligations, also a prerequisite of Middle East peace, should likewise be written into any peace treaty.

Last year, I urged the President to stop the Middle East arms buildup and bring U.S. influence to bear on behalf of the creation of a Middle East Development Bank. The President did not do so. In the last week, others have echoed my request—the New York Times, for one. Now more than ever; the Middle East needs a development bank to sow peace and not war—to help beat swords into plowshares. I hope the President will listen.

High-Temperature Gas-Cooled Reactor Goes to Full Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 1967

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, within recent weeks the United States has quietly, but with technical competence, added a new type reactor to its shelf of proven nuclear hardware. It is the high-temperature, gas-cooled reactor. This new entry into the nuclear electricity generating field proved itself when Philadelphia Electric Co.'s 40,000-kilowatt plant at Peach Bottom, Pa., went to full power. It is notable that this particular station was the only one not shut down by the surge of power demand which blacked out electricity generation recently throughout Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Delaware. Details of the Peach Bottom plant, a joint technical development by the AEC and General Atomics, as well as information and prospects for high-temperature gas-cooled reactors are found in the following item published June 4 in the New York Times:

A HIGH-TEMPERATURE REACTOR GOES TO WORK FOR PHILADELPHIA

(By Gene Smith)

Frederic de Hoffmann has been smiling the big smile of satisfaction for the last 10 days. And he has every right to be proud.

Dr. de Hoffmann, a vice president of the General Dynamics Corporation and president of its General Atomic division, has been the champion of the high-temperature, gas-cooled reactor (H.T.G.R.), a concept that provides the highest efficiency nuclear reactor to date. The initial H.T.G.R. Peach Bottom power plant on the lines of the Philadelphia Electric Company system began full power production of electricity on May 25. It ran two days at the 40,000-kilowatt level and was shut down to make adjustments on the non-nuclear portion of the plant. Full power operation will be resumed as soon as these adjustments are completed.

The importance of Peach Bottom lies in the fact that it utilizes high-efficiency steam conditions of 1,000 degrees Fahrenheit and pressure of 1,450 pounds a square inch. Up to now, most of the nuclear stations operating in this country have been limited to 500 to 600 degrees Fahrenheit.

Dr. de Hoffmann explained that Peach Bottom operated at a net efficiency of about 35 per cent, which is higher than that of any of the 13 other nuclear plants that have gone into regular operation in this country.

"The H.T.G.R.'s higher operating temperatures give more energy to each pound of steam, thereby enabling the plant to make better use of modern turbine-generator technology," Dr. de Hoffmann added. "This high-temperature operation, combined with improved nuclear performance, opens the way to significant reductions in generating costs and to the assurance of low-cost power from the atom for many years to come."

Dr. de Hoffmann, who almost single-handedly has championed the H.T.G.R. in competition with the breeder reactor concept, expects to see 1-million- or even 2-million-kilowatt H.T.G.R. power plants operating in the early 1970's. He pointed out that an H.T.G.R. plant of 1-million-kilowatt capacity would require the mining of about 500 tons of natural uranium to produce the enriched uranium for its start-up. A conventional nuclear power plant of the same size would require about 1,000 tons for its start-up and would consume about 100 tons of uranium a year compared with the H.T.G.R.'s consumption of about 50 tons.

He predicted that if, after 1975, half of all the additional nuclear generating capacity installed each year in the United States were to be H.T.G.R. plants instead of low-temperature reactors, power cost savings for the nation in the first 10 years could amount to as much as $1-billion.

"First, we must understand that there is no such thing as a uranium shortage," Dr. de Hoffmann said in a recent interview. "There are at present about 200,000 tons of known United States reserves of uranium ore in a region below about $5 to $10 a pound of ore. The quantity of ore known even now between $10 and $15 or so a pound would double or triple this number. This illustrates that the uranium supply situation, as with all other commodities, is innately tied to the price of the commodity.

"One cannot simply talk of a shortage of ore—one can only talk of a possible shortage of ore below a given price. However, the H.T.G.R. can use far more expensive ores than the existing water reactors without increasing power costs beyond the ceiling set by coal. Thus, from the resource point of view, it is true that water reactors could lead to a 'shortage' of uranium ores but the use of H.T.G.R. reactors can alleviate this picture and make the 'shortage' disappear."

COMPARISON OF COSTS

Dr. de Hoffmann has argued for a long time that his H.T.G.R. has been put in the wrong position in the continuing battle over the type of reactor that will be tested for the next generation as an operating power maker. He insists that capital costs for the H.T.G.R. would be "equal to lower" than costs for water reactors of the type now being built.

"Furthermore, the fast breeder reactor should be forced to meet the tests and records of the H.T.G.R. and not of the water reactors," he said. "Fast breeder reactors, just like slow thermal reactors, will have to compete in terms of power costs or they simply will not be built in any free economy.

"If fast reactors can be built with cheap enough capital costs and good enough fuel-cycle costs to be able to utilize plutonium and give cheaper power costs than water reactors and, more importantly, than the lower cost H.T.G.R.'s, then and only then would there be justification for building fast breeders for plutonium use. This does not mean that the building of low gain breeders can be justified through the fallacious argument that a 'home for plutonium' must be found."

In this argument, Dr. de Hoffmann sought to dispute those backers of breeder reactors who claim that breeders would be required to use up the plutonium that would result from the thermal reactors and would have the plus of providing additional fissionable material that would then be in short supply. Dr. de Hoffmann contends that if H.T.G.R.'s were given the go-ahead now, the nation could assure itself that by 1985 it would have no need for more than 250,000 tons of uranium.

General Atomic is building a 330,000-kilowatt H.T.G.R. for the Public Service Company of Colorado under the A.E.C.'s power reactor demonstration program. The plant, known as the Fort St. Vrain nuclear generating station, is scheduled for operation in 1970 and is expected to have an efficiency of about 40 per cent.

This is in line with Dr. de Hoffmann's planning. He has called for a consistent national program that would have these three elements:

Recognition that the H.T.G.R. actually exists and should be given heavy weight in planning the over-all atomic energy effort.

Immediate emergence of gas-cooled technology as a real cost savings, to be encouraged by the Government for rapid introduction of thermal gas-cooled systems.

The chance for developing "truly useful breeders" by means of gas cooling, combined with the emergence of the gas-cooled technology capitalized by both the utilities and the Government.

Historic Whitewater Waterway: Canal Memorial Expanding

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 1967

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, in Franklin County, Ind., we have an example of historic and modern-day technology existing practically side by side.

I speak of the Whitewater Canal State Memorial, a restoration of a century-old transportation system, and the new Brookville Reservoir, now under construction.

On the one hand is the attraction of a tranquil canal and lock system which was for a short time, an important artery of trade in the early 1800's. Fourteen miles of the ancient 76-mile-long waterway have been restored and today carry tourists on a replica of the old canal boats.

Less than 8 miles away, huge earth-moving machines are creating a 7,790-acre multipurpose reservoir on which modern high-powered pleasure craft will be carrying visitors in the future.

An account of the history of the Whitewater Canal and the development of the State memorial on a part of that waterway appeared in a recent issue of Outdoor Indiana, which is published by the State department of natural resources.

The memorial, near Metamora, Ind., already is attracting hundreds of visitors to the area. The Brookville Reservoir, when completed, will attract many hundreds more.

The historic Whitewater Valley, once the center of the State's transportation system, now promises to become a center for tourism.

I include this excellent article:

HISTORIC WHITEWATER WATERWAY—CANAL MEMORIAL EXPANDING

(By Herbert R. Hill)

Steadily increasing popularity of the Whitewater Canal State Memorial at Metamora, in Franklin County, has prompted plans for expanded facilities there. The improvements, now being made by the Indiana Department of Natural Resources, will permit more extensive and safer parking by those who wish to inspect the canal and its unusual facilities and to stroll through historic Metamora itself.

When Indiana came into the Union in 1816, the subject of internal improvements was foremost in the minds of the settlers. They wanted to develop their own farms and they wanted more advantageous ways to market their crops and send them back East or down the Mississippi.

Public pressure for these improvements mounted rapidly as more and more of the Hoosier hinterland was opened for settlement. The menace of British-incited Indian terrorism had practically ended with the winning of the War of 1812. Opening of the Erie Canal in 1825, the first operation of railway trains out of Baltimore beginning in 1830, and projection of the Cumberland Road (the National Road) westward through central Indiana beginning in 1829 had demonstrated the great economic value of more adequate transportation.

In 1828 the Michigan Road was started to Lake Michigan via Versailles, Greensburg, Shelbyville and Indianapolis. A short demonstration railroad was built at Shelbyville in 1834 to promote the sale of railway stocks. The people of the Whitewater Valley, at that time the most populous part of Indiana, were determined to construct their own transportation artery to the Ohio River, and they were foremost in pushing the great Internal Improvements Act which was passed by the 1836 Indiana Legislature.

This very ambitious program called for statewide construction—simultaneously—of numerous new highways, railways and canals. The state was to encourage private investment by putting up much of the money at the outset. The appropriation totalled one-third of the value of all taxable property in the young state.

Construction costs invariably exceeded estimates. Hard times discouraged private investors from buying bonds as rapidly as had been expected. Engineers hadn't figured on all the hazards of terrain and weather and construction superintendents were not always experienced or efficient. The inevitable result was that Indiana went bankrupt because its credit had been greatly overextended. The debacle resulted in the provision in the new Indiana Constitution of 1851 (still in force) that the state government could not again contract debts.

This provision, virtually unique among the several states, has kept Indiana on a pay-as-you-grow basis and it has spared Hoosiers the great cost of taxing themselves to pay the interest on past obligations.

Advocates of the Whitewater Canal lost no time after the 1836 Legislature acted. They projected a barge canal which would extend from Lawrenceburg on the Ohio River northward to at least as far as the National Road (now U.S.-40). Contracts for the first section, from Lawrenceburg to Brookville, were let Sept. 15, 1836. The final cost was $66,665, which was a lot of money in those days.

The first canal boat reached Brookville on June 8, 1839. Next day, two more arrived. This was sensational news throughout the New Frontier. Communities farther north along the proposed route, as well as farm folk and villages for 50 miles on both sides of the route, were unprecedently excited. A group of Cincinnati business men promptly proposed another leg of the canal to extend to their community, thus trying to maintain its stature as the Queen City of the Ohio Valley.

There were repeated washouts, dike collapses and traffic tieups. The tonnage was not nearly as great as along the Erie, and since there were fewer boats there were fewer brawls and fights among the boat operators than along the Buffalo-Albany ditch. Despite incidents and setbacks, work was pressed forward and the Brookville-to-Laurel segment was completed in 1843, including the present Metamora stretch. In 1847 the canal was extended on past Connersville and Cambridge City to Hagerstown.

Thus the canal was 76 miles long, with a fall of 490 feet. There were 56 canal locks. Seven feeder dams supplied water at intervals from the west fork of the Whitewater River.

The canal boats, towed by 6 to 8 horses or mule which were hitched tandem and which were changed every 10 miles or so, attained a speed of 3 miles per hour for freighters and up to 6 miles per hour for passenger carriers. Freight rates were far less than anything ever before heard of. Formerly drovers had walked as they herded their animals to such meatpacking centers as Cincinnati, Madison and Louisville. Now they could find a loading dock every few miles and boat ready to take their stock and produce aboard.

The round-trip fare for a passenger from Cincinnati to Hagerstown was $3. The east-west stage coaches continued along the National Road, but the canal shared heavily in the traffic along the old Brookville Road (now U. S. Highway 52).

But canal superiority was relatively short-lived. Completion of the Madison & Indianapolis Railroad in 1847 and the construction of numerous other railroads put the steam cars ahead of all other transportation by the end of the Civil War. For instance, produce from Rush County, Hancock County or Henry County, which formerly had gone by canal now was put aboard cars at Rushville, and then moved southwestward via Shelbyville to Columbus, then it was then headed southward through Vernon to Madison.

In 1866 the Whitewater Railroad Company, now a part of the New York Central System, bought then canal property (except for certain water supply rights for Brookville). The old tow-path was converted into a railroad bed. Today, below Metamora, you can see sections of highway, railway and canal running parallel toward the south.

Whitewater Canal State Memorial is comprised of 14 miles of the original canal. The Laurel feeder dam above Metamora has been restored and it is the starting point for canoe trips down the canal past Metamora. There are several short portages before the canal arrived at "The Tumble," a waterfall at the old Metamora grist mill. Then canoeists may proceed right through Metamora, with its old houses lining both banks of the canal, to operative Millville Dock, whose restoration permits the same sort of passage that carried canal boats up and down stream through the various locks.

Several low bridges which were built across the canal after it was abandoned are now being eliminated. This will permit easier passage for canoes and small boats. One of these bridges is at the lower end of Metamora. A turnaround is being built for motorists using the south bank of the canal for sight-seeing through Metamora and past the restored canal aqueduct. Dismantling of this bridge also will eliminate a hazardous upgrade approach to busy U.S. 52, which is a few rods north of Metamora and above the town's level.

Plans call for the grist mill to be developed into a canal era museum of sorts. At present the old mill, and the waterfall beside it, are favorites of camera fans. So is the wooden aqueduct, originally built in 1843, which carried the canal above a small stream. The aqueduct, thought to be unique in America, was restored in 1948 and includes some of the original timbers.

Hiking and fishing as well as boating are popular along the canal. A canal-side rest park and picnic ground have been built along U.S. 52 a mile below Metamora.

Beginning May 30 and throughout the season, a motorized launch—simulating a canal boat—will operate daily. The one-hour trip includes passage up-canal to the town of Metamora and then back again, which means of course two trips through Millville Lock. Boat rides cost 50 cents for adults and 25 cents for children under 12.

Metamora's old canal-front houses also merit foot-tour inspection. The town was a thriving shipping point during canal-boom days, and numerous structures have survived.

Metamora is 68 miles southeast of Indianapolis and 45 miles northwest of Cincinnati. Whitewater State Park, south of Liberty, is 20 miles from Metamora on the east fork of the Whitewater. That park has good facilities for camping, swimming, boating and horseback riding.

Between Whitewater State Park and the historic and scenic Franklin county-seat of Brookville is the new Brookville Reservoir. When completed it will open up another large new public recreation area in eastern Indiana.

Also, south of Metamora, via State Highway 229 and then U.S. Highway 421, is Versailles State Park. This is all some of the most beautiful country in southeastern Indiana.

Flag Protocol

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 1967

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I believe all Members of the House were justly proud to take part in the Flag Day ceremonies in these Chambers last week. However, in looking at some of the pictures taken in the House Chamber during the presentation of the colors, I notice that some Members were uncertain as to the proper response when the flag is passing by. I rather suspect that this uncertainly about whether to stand at attention or place the hand over the heart is not limited merely to Members of Congress. Therefore, I believe it might be helpful to list at this point in the RECORD an excerpt from Public Law 829—77th Congress, popularly known as "The Flag Code." It is the only Federal law dealing with the display and use of the flag of the United States by civilians and civilian groups. As the excerpt shows, civillians, not wearing any headdress, should place their right hand over their heart when the flag is passing in a parade or in a review.

Section 5—Public Law 77–829

That during the ceremony of hoisting or lowering the flag or when the flag is passing in a parade or in a review, all persons present should face the flag, stand at attention, and salute. Those present in uniform should render the military salute. When not in uniform, men should remove the headdress with the right hand holding it at the left shoulder, the hand being over the heart. Men without hats should salute in the same manner. Aliens should stand at attention. Women should salute by placing the right hand over the heart. The salute to the flag in the moving column should be rendered at the moment the flag passes.

Urban League: The Guilt Sickness of Intellectual Morons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 1967

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, so that our colleagues can better understand the sick type of people who are working against our society—its morals and standards, and in favor of riots and bloodshed, I insert the following article from the Sunday Star for June 18 in the Record. Noting further that McLean, Va., is miles from the District of Columbia and certainly not a ghetto—or even a middle-class neighborhood.

Try Out Ghetto Values, Urban Leaguers Urged

(By Paul Delaney)

Washington Urban League director Sterling Tucker yesterday described rioting as a "low form of communication by people who seek to get a response from a society that seems to be deaf to their needs."

He delivered the keynote address at the annual institute of the board, staff and committees of the league, held in the open air at the McLean, Va., estate of board member Mortimer C. Lebowitz.

Repeatedly interrupted by low-flying jets, Tucker told the 200 Urban Leaguers that society needs to help provide the four basic drives for ghetto-dwellers—needs for response, recognition, security and new experiences.

He urged society to tackle the problems of the troubled by adopting for awhile the values of these problem people.

REVISE VALUE SYSTEM

"I would like for society to throw away the middle class value system for 10 years—it'll get along without the constant reminders—and adopt the value system of persons in trouble and build upon the laws and morality of this group and see what happens," Tucker said.

"Let us build strength within their own system and see what happens. We talk about maintaining strong family ties on the one hand and outlawing common law marriages on the other.

"Let us look first at what common law marriages can do. If we outlaw them we would destroy a substantial part of a family system; we will pull out from some families the only male figure a boy has ever known, and we will pull out from some the only economic support they have.

"We won't reduce welfare rolls but increase them."

Tucker said riots once were regarded as weapons of change, but are now tools of seeking response. He said he once thought riots were spontaneous, but now feels they can be started.

"I view rioting as a tool of communication that more and more people will accept. Man needs to be heard, needs people to respond to him.

"The Urban League's new alert system seeks to determine if it is possible to build a higher form of communication to some people in our society who make decisions."

CONTRIBUTIONS IGNORED

Regarding the need for recognition, Tucker indicated that society has failed to recognize the contributions made by troubled people, and only now is it doing so, but "in a ritualistic fashion.

"We have made the value of life in the ghetto very cheap. And when the ghetto responds in relationship to this evaluation, responds in the way we expected it, society becomes very upset.

"We're confused. We look at the ghetto in the way we want it to respond."

Tucker's keynote set the tone for a series of workshops that followed his opening remarks. Participants were concerned about the problems of Negroes in the fields of housing, health and welfare, employment and education.

Workshop leaders were Hal Levine, chief planner, National Capital Downtown Committee, on housing; Mrs. Patricia Wald, member of the President's Committee on Crime in the District, health and welfare; Frank Hollis, manpower director of the United Planning Organization, employment; and Mrs. Marguerite Seldon, assistant to the superintendent of schools and head of the Urban Services Corps, education.

Reactor Grade Extruded Zircaloy Tubing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 1967

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I am making these remarks because I know that various United States and foreign interests in the nuclear reactor field usually monitor what is said in Congress.

A new method to manufacture zircaloy tubing by the extrusion process has been developed by one of my constituents. He claims the tubing produced by this process has a crystalline structure reorientation which results in a slower corrosive and deterioration rate; also that the process produces a thinner wall tube. The former quality would permit longer life reactor fuel elements and the latter quality would work toward neutron economy. Both qualities would tend to improve reactor economics.

The difficulty with the process is that a large investment is required for suitable extrusion machinery. I am told that, although test reports by the Du Pont Co. under contract with the AEC in part support the above claimed advantages, the patent holder has been unable to interest tubing manufactures because of these costs.

Perhaps some company who scans these pages might be looking for just such a process. If so it may contact Vernon R. Powell, 35 59th Place, Long Beach, Calif. 90803. Frankly, this is about the only way I can think of to help him with his problem.

Castro's Export of Violent Revolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK EDWARDS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 1967

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I have made reference recently to Venezuela's request to the Organization of American States that some form of OAS action be taken in response to Castro Cuba's organized subversive effort against Latin American countries.

In this connection I request that a newspaper item by Mr. Carl T. Rowan, appearing in the Sunday Star of Washington, D.C., June 18, be reproduced here for the attention of our colleagues, as follows:

Cuba's Active Subversion of Latin America

(By Carl T. Rowan)

Some weeks ago Mexican security police swooped down on Victor Hugo Martinez and arrested him for arms smuggling. Martinez, a member of Guatemala's Communist Party, had been shipping arms from Mexico to rebels in Guatemala.

Mexican police staked out at Martinez's house and were soon rewarded with an interesting visitor.

Julian Lopez Diaz, third secretary and cultural attache of the Cuban Embassy in Mexico City, came to call on Martinez. Mexican police grabbed him and found that he had $6,000 in small bills in his pocket.

Lopez, a former Cuban intelligence agent in Chile, had been directing the entire Cuban arms smuggling program from the embassy in Mexico. The Mexican government ousted him. But not before Mexican agents learned that Lopez's wife was Irina Trapote, the daughter of Victor Trapote, a Soviet undercover agent.

And Irina is the ex-wife of Ramiro Valdez, Cuba's minister of the interior and the boss of both the secret police apparatus inside Cuba and the agents and other machinery designed to "export revolution" to other countries.

Three weeks ago, four Cubans were surprised delivering men and supplies to the shores of Venezuela. Two who were seized alive confessed to being military officers and members of a special commando unit in Cuba's General Directorate of Intelligence (DGI).

The two commandoes were carrying $10,000 in United States bills. Castro confirmed that they were "Cuban volunteers" and said he was "proud of 'em."

In Bolivia four days ago, the army claimed that 17 Cubans are fighting with a guerrilla group that has killed 30 Bolivian soldiers in recent jungle clashes. Bolivians claim Cuban-trained Brazilians, Argentinians and Peruvians are also in the rebel group—and that the whole band is financed by Castro.

I have been told by authoritative sources that Cuba's DGI is now spending $1.1 million a month to support stepped-up guerrilla warfare in Latin America. Most of the money is to train insurgents, with some 3,000 latinos already trained in Havana and returned to their native countries since Castro came to power.

If Cuban subversion worsens, as many diplomats say it will, a name to remember is Manuel Piniero, known as "Barba Roja," or "Red Beard." Piniero (educated at Columbia University and married to a Connecticut girl, Lorna Birdsell) is director of the DGI and as such heads a Cuban espionage apparatus far more elaborate than either United States citizens or Latin Americans realize.

A half-dozen Soviet advisers are attached to the DGI and the Russians clearly are financing Piniero's operation, directly and indirectly.

Castro has publicly listed Bolivia, Colombia, Guatemala and Venezuela as targets for revolution.

Bolivia appears to be the area of prime concentration now, primarily because it is militarily weak and its political structure is fragile and beset by rivalries.

But the apple of Castro's envious eye is Venezuela. He would like her oil to give Cuba the strong economic base with which to carry out what Castro thinks is his role as saviour of Latin America.

But Venezuela is also the prime target because it is the best example of a democracy in the area and the Communists feel it cannot be permitted to thrive.

Orthodox Communist parties in Latin America used to complain about the Fidelistas coming into their countries and stirring up trouble "prematurely." The orthodox Communists now are cooperating, in intelligence and other programs, with Castro's forces. This suggests that the Russians may no longer be restraining Castro, and may even have authorized the party apparatus to cooperate.

Interestingly, Cuba recently made public a proposal, supposedly written by the long-missing Ernesto (Che) Guevara, to open up major rebellions in Latin America so as to take the pressure off Vietnam.

Meanwhile, the DGI is busy spreading agents all over Africa. Some 700 uniformed Cubans are now in Congo Brazzaville. Another 700 Africans have been trained in Havana and returned to their home countries.

Significantly, all the Cubans sent to Africa by Castro are Negroes.

Very clearly, the little Caribbean island of Cuba looms large in Soviet plans for the expansion of world communism.

Clifton, N.J., Celebrates 50th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES S. JOELSON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 19, 1967

Mr. JOELSON. Mr Speaker, the city of Clifton, N.J., is celebrating this year the 50th anniversary of its chartering.

Clifton was incorporated as a city on April 26, 1917, although it had existed as part of the township of Acquackanonk since 1693. The area in northern New Jersey had been settled by the Dutch in 1684. The Clifton section of Acquackanonk Township was concerned primarily with farming and saw and grist milling in its early days. The magazine, Ladies' Home Journal, was founded here.

Since April 1917, the city has had a period of uninterrupted progress. There is a remarkable diversification of industry in the community and there is virtually no slum problem. The family income from 1960 was the highest of any large municipality in the State and the per capita cost for municipal services is the lowest in the State.

I am happy to wish Clifton and its mayor, Joseph Vanecek, and its city manager, William Holster, another 50 years of continued progress in this, its golden jubilee year.

Riots Must Be Stopped

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT E. JONES
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 19, 1967

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the distressing reports of violence, riots, and disrespect for the law are flaring again in widely scattered parts of the country. The same groups of agitators, however, appear to be connected with these terrible outbreaks of chaos, confusion, and outright criminal activity.

We have condemned foreign dictators who seek advantage with threats to disrupt peace among nations and subject neighboring peoples to harassment and subjugation. To avoid open warfare, our Nation has properly sought to settle these problems within the framework of international law and justice. On occasion, this Nation finds it necessary to assert authority and enforce the law in terms of power which can be understood by the lawless.

In our own communities, we must not condone that which we condemn abroad. Just as we seek to bring the force of world opinion to bear against aggressors who would flaunt the rule of law among nations, responsible citizens at home must demonstrate beyond any doubt that public order and law will prevail. To do less is to erode the very foundation of our civilization.

Regardless of the participants, there is absolutely no reason for the strife to which so many communities are being subjected. There is no contention by the rioters which could merit the destruction resulting from this lawless activity.

The loss of life, injury, and damage resulting from riots are tragic enough, but it is far worse that the rioters ignore and disavow the most basic principles of our civilization. Clearest among these is that law and order must prevail for the fulfillment of freedom, and that responsibility is the handmaiden of liberty. And when you consider that means exist for lawful protest and redress of grievances, the riots seem even more futile.

When the disorder is ended, the dead are buried, the fires extinguished, and the rubble removed from the streets, the original contention or problem remains. This lawless action builds no playgrounds; provides no job training; alters to no degree our Nation's commitments; enlarges in no way academic freedom; erases not a single word from the law of the land. Moreover, as the damage is counted, those who incited the mobs will have moved elsewhere to new violence, in many cases.

Thoughtful and responsible citizens must still seek to resolve the problems and contentions through lawful process and hard work.

Within the family of nations it has long been clear that the appeasement of aggressors is a self-defeating road which leads to greater deterioration of law and international order. Within our communities responsible citizens must make clear to the lawless that threats and disorder will not be rewarded by concessions. Appeasement gives sanction to unlawful action, leads to greater demands, and strengthens the hand of lawless elements in the community.

To capitulate to the rioting mobs weakens the very foundations of our system of government by law. It demonstrates to the lawless that violence has a reward. It intimidates the weak and uncommitted. It attracts to future lawlessness those who want to be on the winning side. It creates more problems than it solves in the present or future.

The time to suppress riots and disorders is before they start. This requires a considerable show of solidarity on the part of the responsible elements of each community—a solidarity for law, order, and progress. It must be clear to all that peace will prevail.

When lawless elements do gain control of a community or an area, outbreaks must be brought promptly under control. No civilization can tolerate violence and mass crime.

Both prevention and control of these outbreaks require improved support for police forces—support stronger than embrace of a slogan. As the very guardians of peace within a community the police merit greatly increased moral support as well as improvements in number, financial incentive, and equipment.

Ironically, the moral support for the police seems weakest in many areas which have the most to gain from a stable, orderly community. The abuse to which policemen have been subjected in many areas is appalling. In far too many cases, the policeman, the most convenient symbol of the community in a complex society, has been used as a scapegoat for personal, social, or economic failures. To these malcontents, it is easier to blame their problems on someone else than to engage in constructive activity to better their plight.

Although the destruction of the lawless is appalling, we must remember that a relatively small portion of the total community is engaged in this activity at this time. An even smaller number is involved in the promotion of this discord. For every individual who throws a brick, many thousands in like circumstances do not become involved in this lawless action.

Those who are preaching anarchy and violence, who advocate violation of certain laws, are out of step with the majority of the community and any substantial segment of it. Their annointment to leadership is not from the people but rather from their own hand. It is enhanced by the exposure they receive in framing their appeals in terms which irritate, shock, or upset.

It is hard to believe that they are sincerely interested in the causes they avow. Their very method of operation through violence, division, and destruction so alienates a vast majority of the people as to be counterproductive.

Those who foster mass crime do nothing to eliminate the deplorable conditions of poverty and ignorance to which they link their calls to violence. That even the link is false is indicated by the vast number of the poor and unschooled who are still good citizens.

Because the violence and mob action and threats is more serious than would be indicated by the total of dead and injured and the value of property destroyed, it is imperative that every responsible citizen make his position clear in support of law and order. Failure to do so gives encouragement to the lawless elements.

Respect for the law is the very heart of our civilization and freedoms. This respect must be demonstrated in more than words and slogans. It must be backed up by action which includes a strong personal commitment to respect and obey the laws, proper support for law enforcement agencies, and full acceptance of a citizen's responsibility to cooperate with the police in maintaining peace in the community.

It cannot be stressed too strongly that each individual is the first line of defense against lawlessness and criminal acts.

Other segments of the community—schools, churches, organizations, and governments—have direct obligations in building greater respect for the law. But in the final analysis the individual is the most important factor in preserving law and order.

The support for law and order must be unequivocal. Selective compliance with the law, whether by individual or community, weakens the entire fabric of our civilization because every man's selection for compliance will differ.

Likewise, the total support for law and order is undermined with appeasement of lawless elements. Appeasement abridges the lawful process for change and gives evidence of society's willingness to deviate from full support of law and order. It enhances the position of those who would bring total chaos to our civilization in an effort to have their will prevail.

The end result is that no law survives save the law of the jungle—the will of the strongest or largest group prevails.

The Queen of Angels Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 1967

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, one of the outstanding institutions in Los Angeles, Calif., is the Queen of Angels Hospital.

In the 40 years this hospital has been in existence it has provided care to many thousands of people in the area. The hospital was founded in 1926 by the Franciscan Sisters of the Sacred Heart.

In commemoration of the 40th anniversary of its founding a book has just been published about the hospital entitled "At 40: The Queen of Angels Story."

The book contains a most interesting and informative account of the hospital's founding and growth. It tells an inspiring story of years of dedication, work, and the hopes and dreams of many—from the first efforts of the devoted Franciscan Sisters to the present-day staff.

A dictionary definition of a hospital is: "An institution where the sick or injured are given medical or surgical care." With regard to the Queen of Angels Hospital such a definition is woefully inadequate. It must be expanded to cover the love, tenderness, and devoted care provided to the many patients to whom it has opened its doors during its 40 years.

To Dr. Robert L. Blackmun, president of the hospital, and his capable and devoted associates, including Mr. Dan M. Gann, of the hospital staff who authored the book, and all those whose work has gone into founding and operating Queen of Angels Hospital over the years I want to express my sincerest congratulations and gratitude.

U.N. Peacekeeping: Does It Help or Hurt?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 1967

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, it is time that the U.N. face up to the facts in the Mideast situation. A realistic approach demands that both parties in this issue come face to face in reaching a decision. Intermediaries will only delay a solution. The Israelis and Arabs must reach an agreement which they can "shake" on.

On Thursday, June 15, Mr. Chuck Dancey, editor of the Peoria Journal Star, wrote a fine editorial which illustrates this point very succinctly. Under unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, I include the editorial at this point in the RECORD:

U.N. PEACEKEEPING: DOES IT HELP OR HURT?

(By C. L. Dancey)

The United Nations has for twenty years carried on magnificent humanitarian works in backward countries that could not have been done by any other instrument.

It was a device for funneling American aid to places that wouldn't take it from America, directly. Its humanitarian function has been very real.

However, as a peace-keeping agency, there is now a very solid question of whether over all it has not done more harm than good—with an excellent chance that it is presently functioning to set the stage for war, again, in the Middle East instead of permit a real settlement.

The political arm of the UN has been political indeed. Its business has not been peace, but an arena for playing cynical international politics.

Thus, the UN largely invented and created a series of "new nations" that were not "nations" in any meaningful sense of the word, and gave each of them a vote. (Several are smaller than Peoria and its immediate environs, with tribal societies and tribal loyalties rather than national, to boot).

Then, to curry their favor, the UN, itself, embarked not on peace but a "war of aggression" with UN troops in the Congo to impose a political solution there that would fit the prejudices of the other African states.

Meanwhile, in the Middle East, the UN stepped in to rescue the Arab states from any necessity to negotiate with Israel or to reach any settlement in which they bore a responsibility.

This constant UN intervention made it possible for Nasser and company to persist for 20 years in the attitude, propaganda, and invective involved in claiming that Israel did not exist, in refusing to recognize or negotiate or accept any responsibilities in relation to Israel, and to maintain that a "state of permanent war" in fact existed with Israel.

None of these positions would have been possible had it been necessary for the Arabs to deal directly with the Israeli, and find a settlement, and accept responsibility for it.

Thus a climate for war has been maintained through the agency of UN interference and the play of international politics in the area—indeed, according to Arab claims not only a climate but a formal "state of war."

The Israeli have done very well for themselves and were totally dedicated to peace and urgent and eager development of that land, but they are so small and in such a vulnerable geographic condition that they simply cannot tolerate or exist in a permanent condition of either war or semiwar.

Semi-war is unbearable. It has to be all or nothing for them.

And semi-war carries with it the constant danger of war—not only in the Middle East.

Thus the UN has repeatedly stood in the way of a genuine stabilization of the Middle East, which can only come by Arabs and Israeli sitting down with each other and figuring out how to live together.

The Arabs say they will never accept the existence of Israel, and the UN says, "We'll keep you from having the embarrassment of having to!"

When existence is constantly denied and threatened, how can there be a solution? A climate for peace?

And the Arab peoples are not intransigent. One look at the civilians in Israeli-held territories or the Arab troop masses demonstrates that all too well.

Today, it is obvious that the Israeli would make a generous settlement in direct negotiations with the Arabs in exchange for direct Arab responsibility and permanent peace in the area—as they wished to do and sought to do ten years ago.

Again, the UN steps in to take the decision away from the responsible parties, to relieve the Arab states of any future responsibility, and to make it possible for Nasser to continue to propagate and maintain a stated policy for the eventual destruction of Israel.

The war is over, but the war is being kept alive, instead of settled by the busybody activities of the UN, and the conditions for new war needlessly maintained . . . because it suits the aims of the Soviet Union and some others in the swirl of world politics to have it so.

The tragedy of the Middle East is that they have never been in a position requiring them to solve and settle their dilemma by mutual compromise—that the issues and enmity have been allowed to stand after three tests of arms, and that this unique position has been possible through the political manipulations of the UN.

U Thant's abrupt removal of UN forces, in a move that was not merely unilateral, but uni-personal, triggered this war. But that irresponsible "UN" action in creating this war is but a symptom.

The other conditions for war had also long been maintained, also, by the international political manipulations of the outside powers through the UN agency.

The UN has been a noble dream, but one begins to wonder how long we can hold up this international farce, and this dangerous instrumentality, on the basis of the dream, alone.

The Honorable Ralph Harvey Honored at Purdue University

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAGE BELCHER

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 1967

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted, I wish to insert in the Record the following remarks. A former colleague and a dear friend of mine has received a great honor from Purdue University. I had the privilege of serving with Ralph Harvey from 1951 to 1966 in the Congress of the United States and on the Committee on Agriculture. Ralph was a very valued member of this committee, and I congratulate Purdue University upon recognizing his ability and conferring this honor upon him. His citation reads as follows:

Since his graduation from the Purdue University School of Agriculture in 1923, Ralph Harvey has compiled an outstanding record of achievement in the advancement of scientific agriculture. Not only has he been a leader in agriculture, but throughout his career as teacher, farmer, and public servant, he has given understanding support and constructive leadership to broad educational programs, particularly programs in higher education.

After his graduation from Purdue he taught vocational agriculture for five years. He then devoted full time to farming and the production of certified seeds. He was active in the Indiana Corn Growers Association and the Indiana Seed Certivication Association.

Ralph Harvey's career as a public servant in government began with his election to the 1943 Indiana General Assembly. He served in this body until his election to the Eightieth Congress in 1947. Elected to fill an unexpired term in the House of Representatives, he served an additional eight full terms until his retirement in January 1967. During his tenure in the Congress he was a member of the important House Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and helped to write some of the significant agricultural legislation of the last two decades. Throughout his terms in the Congress, Ralph Harvey actively supported higher education and university research. He was particularly concerned with the educational programs in which Purdue University and the State of Indiana has a substantial interest.

Today he lives near New Castle, Indiana, on the family farm where he was born. Through his business and community affairs, he continues to provide astute leadership in the field of scientific agriculture.

Mr. President, for his personal accomplishments and their attendant public benefits, Enoch Ralph Harvey is presented for the award of academic honors by Purdue University.

The Case for Government-Sponsored Regional Centers for the Treatment of Rheumatoid Arthritis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BUCHANAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 1967

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, the city of Birmingham, Ala., which it is my privilege to represent in the Congress, is most fortunate to possess one of the finest medical centers in the United States, that of the University of Alabama in Birmingham and related facilities.

A distinguished physician and professor, Dr. Howard L. Holley, is director of the Medical College of Alabama's Division of Rheumatology.

I commend to the attention of the House the following article by Dr. Holley:

THE CASE FOR GOVERNMENT-SPONSORED REGIONAL CENTERS FOR THE TREATMENT OF RHEUMATOID ARTHRITIS

(By Howard L. Holley, M.D.)

The recent institution of the governmental program for care of cancer, heart and stroke patients will do much to alleviate suffering, and, indeed, prevent death in a large part of the sick population of the United States.

However, there is also an urgent and compelling need for the establishment of Regional Centers for the diagnosis and care of patients with rheumatic diseases, particularly those with rheumatoid arthritis. These diseases usually are not killers but the victims are faced with a lifetime of disease. Although there are many crippling diseases that plague the human race, few, if any, are accompanied by the constant pain suffered by those with rhumatoid arthritis. Most of us can understand and conceive the pain for a short duration, but the fact that these victims have almost continual pain day in and day out is difficult indeed for us to comprehend.

The age of individuals with cancer and strokes is usually past middle age, but rheumatoid arthritis usually occurs in the productive years of life, 20 to 40 years of age. Indeed, when this disease occurs in a family it can wreck havoc with their economic and sociological status.

Unfortunately, many of the newer methods of treatment of these diseases are not yet available to most victims of this disease. Certainly today with our new methods of treatment, much of the dreaded crippling effects of the disease can be prevented. We know now that much can be done for the well-being and comfort of these unfortunate individuals and often they are able to return to a normal place in life. Of necessity, such a a treatment program is often of long duration and private financing is easily exhausted.

It is estimated that in the United States today there are approximately 70 cases per 1,000 people with definite arthritis. This gives a national total of over 13,000,000 victims of the disease. Many of these are not able to carry on their usual occupation and are pitiful, painful cripples with little expectation for the future but a lifetime of suffering.

The establishment of regional centers would make available the latest in diagnostic and treatment techniques for these patients. Such Centers would provide not only specialists for the care of these diseases but modern facilities for physical medicine and rehabilitation as well. This program could constitute a concerted attack against the greatest crippler known to mankind. It would bring the best research knowledge and the best trained people to the aid of every person in the nation suffering from this disease in an effective and efficient manner.

Unfortunately, there has been considerable public apathy concerning the care of patients with rheumatoid arthritis but it seems timely that an expansion of the Regional Treatment Centers program by the Congress should be initiated to offer relief to these unfortunate individuals.

Regulating the Allowable Harvest of Timber on Federal Lands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. DELLENBACK

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 1967

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker, the timber products industry provides the backbone of the economy in southern Oregon, and indeed in much of Oregon. I am therefore pleased to bring to the attention of my colleagues on behalf of Congresswoman Green, Congressman Ullman, Congressman Wyatt, and myself the following memorial from the Oregon Legislature:

OREGON LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY—1967 REGULAR SESSION—ENROLLED HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 1

(Sponsored by Representative Robert Smith, Senator Cook, Representatives Bedingfield, Ouderkirk, Wilson, Senators Fadeley, Hallock)

To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled:

We, your memorialists, the Fifty-fourth Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent as follows:

Whereas the economy of this state is heavily dependent upon timber harvests, and employment in the forest industry represents not less than half of all employment in manufacturing in this state; and

Whereas this state is the leading timber producer in the United States, and a robust forest industry in this state contributes greatly to the economic well-being of the entire nation; and

Whereas a majority of the timber reserves in this state stand upon lands now under the jurisdiction of the National Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management; and

Whereas the Oregon Legislative Interim Committee on Public Lands has reported to us that in the course of its studies of policies regarding the harvest of timber on federal lands, reliable specialists stated that the natural mortality rate of old timber on such lands is approximately equal to the rate of harvest allowed on such lands; and

Whereas the interim committee has concluded that an accelerated program of harvesting old-growth timber not only will reduce loss through natural mortality but also will encourage the developing of reserves of vigorous, youthful timber; and

Whereas reputable scholars have asserted that the even-flow concept governing timber harvesting practices may in some instances impound vast capital resources; now, therefore, *Be It Resolved by the Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon:*

(1) The Congress of the United States is memorialized to cause a study to be made of practices and policies of federal agencies regulating the allowable harvest of timber on federal lands administered by such agencies. It is urged that this study be conducted on a priority basis, in view of the urgency and gravity of the question, and that it consider especially whether the concepts employed in deriving timber-harvest allowances are best suited under contemporary circumstances to produce the highest ultimate sustained yield of timber products, while benefitting to the greatest extent practicably those localities economically dependent upon the forest industry.

(2) The clerk shall cause copies of this memorial to be sent to the presiding officer of the Senate and of the House of Representatives of the United States and to each member of the Oregon Congressional Delegation.

GOP Committee on Nuclear Affairs Statement re Red China H-Bomb

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 19, 1967

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, for the information of all Members of Congress, the following is today's special report of the chairman, GOP Committee on Nuclear Affairs, regarding the Red China H-bomb:

RED CHINA NUCLEAR PROGRESS

From: Rep. Craig Hosmer, Chairman, GOP Committee on Nuclear Affairs.
To: House GOP Conference.

TESTS CONDUCTED

Test No.	Date	Yield	Delivery	Remarks
1	Oct. 16, 1964	20 kt.	Test tower	U^{235} rather than Pu indicated greater sophistication than predicted.
2	May 14, 1965	"Around 40 kt."	Air drop	Signaled good yield-to-weight ratio (device small enough to be airborne).
3	May 9, 1966	"Over 200 kt."	Test tower	1st thermonuclear ingredients detected (H-bomb objective indicated).
4	Oct. 27, 1966	None announced	400- to 500-mile missile	Excellent improvement in yield-to-weight ratio in U^{235} bomb.
5	Dec. 27, 1966	"A few hundred kilotons"	Test tower	2d evidence of TM ingredients (probably proof test of H-bomb "trigger").
6	June 17, 1967	2 to 7 mt.[1]	do	H-bomb proof test.

[1] U.S. Minuteman warhead popularly tabbed at 1 mt. yield.

CONCLUSIONS

1.—Red China spends about $1½ billion annually on its nuclear weapons program and possibly an equal amount on development of delivery systems. This totals some 4% of GNP. The two efforts require at least 7½% of available scientific and technical personnel and seem not to have been interrupted or delayed by current disturbances within the country.

2.—Red China is anxious to achieve a flexable nuclear weapons capability, including solid fuel rockets. It has tested aircraft and intermediate range nuclear deliveries and is known to be able to fire medium-range missiles from submarines. Undoubtedly it will test successfully an ICBM prior to 1975, the date predicted by Defense Secretary McNamara. It can be expected to launch a satellite as soon as possible to prove its missile capabilities. This can be expected within 12–18 months.

3.—Red China may have an existing arsenal of around 30 A-bombs in yields of 200 KT and below—still small compared to US and USSR arsenals. Thus it can be expected to continue Mao Tse-tung's line that "atom bombs are paper tigers" until its capabilities enlarge.

4.—Red China's haste to develope nuclear capability reflects its need for a "deterrent" against the US and USSR as well as a desire for greater influence in international affairs. It also wants to make military developments a springboard for general industrial and technological development, as did the USSR. It believes huge resources and sacrifices are justified on both military and industrial grounds.

5.—Red China's swiftly evolving nuclear capability constitutes a major threat to other nations. Many Kremlinologists believe it underlies deployment of the USSR anti-missile system to a greater extent than US power. Despite Secretary McNamara's obstinacy, it will dictate deployment of a US system. Already it is causing India to think in terms of a nuclear weapons arsenal and undoubedly Japan soon must re-evaluate its non-nuclear defense posture.

6.—Some feel that, over the long term, Red Chinese technological and industrial progress stimulated by the nuclear effort may create a need for expanded foreign trade and thus a more relaxed attitude toward the world at large. However, the more likely result is that the Chinese concept of the "Middle Kingdom or Celestial Empire"—the idea that China is superior to any other nation and always is right—will inspire an increasingly blatant aggressiveness based on naked nuclear blackmail.

7.—It is clear that Red China aims at the same "nuclear superpower" status enjoyed by the US and USSR. It can be expected rather quickly to overtake and surpass British and French capabilities. Saturday's H-bomb demonstration can be expected to cause nations who "can be" nuclear powers to take a dimmer view of signing any treaty which would pledge them not to become so. On the other hand, the "can't be" powers—those without the scientific and other resources to go nuclear—may now regard such a treaty more favorably if it is accompanied by US guarantees against aggression.

The Supreme Court Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. RARICK
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 19, 1967

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, now that the nonelected Supreme Court is the leadership for legislation to pervert constitutional government, the American people should well ask "Why?" and what final goal is their planned objective.

As more and more Americans awaken to the continued Court-ordered erosion of our basic liberties, we find their reaction typical—extremely emotional. They want to be heard—to fight back.

And the planned rebuttal by those who have caused this reaction is to indict and smear the midstream of aroused citizens by labeling them extremists, haters, rightists, and the like. Yet all the time the revolutionary leaders know full well that it is they—and not the citizens, that are extremists, the reactionaries, the haters, and the police state promoters.

Those who have set the overthrow in motion are the "antis."

By their own words and deeds they are against the people, against the constitutional system, and against God. How much do they believe they can destroy before they are exposed?

The May 3 Wall Street Journal carried a full-page advertisement directed to the American people. Under unanimous consent, I insert the full advertisement in the RECORD following my remarks:

[From the Wall Street Journal, May 3, 1967]

THE TIME HAS COME FOR ALL AMERICANS TO ASK: DOES THIS PLAN HAVE ANYTHING TO DO WITH SIX RECENT DECISIONS OF THE SUPREME COURT?

SOVIET PLANS FOR THE USA—SURRENDER OR DIE BY 1975

(As extracted from official Senate Document No. 46—87th Congress, first session)

1. The traditional goal of communism, the conquest of the entire world, is not only reaffirmed but is held far more strongly and hopefully than in the past. It is "unthinkable" that the Communists will abandon their goal of world domination regardless of the price they have to pay. They are willing to pay any price to attain their objective.

2. The Communists probably are honestly convinced that they are invincible

a. because of the alleged predetermination of history,

b. because of their combined military-political strength,

c. because of their anticipated military superiority, and

d. because of the anticipated demoralization of the free world.

3. Communist strategy has become more sophisticated than it was under Stalin.

4. The Communists believe that the final decision in the world struggle, and specifically the victory of world communism, will be attained in the persent era of history. In their conception, this era seems to extend to 1975, approximately.

5. Armed struggle is inevitable. Such specific forms of armed struggle as liberation wars, uprisings, and "pressure from below" also are inevitable.

6. A global thermonuclear war is not entirely inevitable. If the free world, and especially the strongest democratic countries like the United Staets capitulate, then such a war may be avoided. However, while preferable, such a development is unlikely.

7. The Communist parties in the free world and their sympathizers must do everything in their power to facilitate nuclear blackmail by the Soviet Union and to prevent military resistance by the free world.

8. The Soviet Union and the Soviet bloc must not leave any stone unturned to increase their military power in order to fight the probable albeit not inevitable) world war and to win a global thermonuclear conflict.

9. For the time being such conflict must be avoided. The turning point in history will come when the Soviet Union overtakes the United States, some time between 1965 and 1970. The great turning point in history will come when the Soviet Union, irrespective of per-capita production in industrial goods, achieves technologically superior armaments and attains a military force which, qualitatively and quantitatively, will

be superior to the military forces of the United States. If necessary, this force will be employed in the second phase of the current era.

10. In the first phase, the armed struggle will mostly take the form of liberation wars and uprisings, plus deterrence by nuclear blackmail, on the part of the Soviets, of any military initiatives undertaken by the free world.

11. Also in this first phase the struggle must be intensified on the "active fronts in the underdeveloped areas." In particular, it must be pushed in Latin America.

12. In this phase, strong efforts will be made to improve the effectiveness of uprisings. Henceforth uprisings will be planned as major military undertakings. The insurrectionists will be properly trained and be armed with strategic support and power by Soviet nuclear long-range forces under a coordinated strategy. International crises, such as threats of war and war alerts, may be exploited to launch insurrections.

13. The achievement of a military, political and psychological paralysis of the free world is a paramount objective of Soviet strategy.

14. This objective can be attained by such means as peace propaganda, Pavlovian conditioning, infiltration, threats and diplomatic negotiations.

15. Propaganda on disarmament, specifically nuclear disarmament and disarmament negotiations, are an integral part of the Soviet strategy aimed at paralyzing the free world and strengthening the power of communism.

16. Soviet strategy is based, on the one hand, on achieving optimal military power and building and strengthening Communist political armies throughout the free world. On the other hand, Soviet strategy utilizes massive deception to bring about, through

a. the unilateral military weakening of the free world,

b. the moral paralysis of free world governments, and

c. the demoralization of public opinion

the capitulation of the United States.

17. Failing in this strategy, the Soviet intends to destroy the United States by nuclear weapons.

The official document can be obtained by sending 30c to the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402. Ask for Catalog No. 87-1: S. doc. 46.

HERE ARE THE DECISIONS—WHY?

I. Ban on School Prayer—June 25, 1962 and June 17, 1963: In June, 1963, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled it was unconstitutional for the State of New York "to prescribe by law" a simple non-denominational prayer for schoolchildren.

Senator Dirksen, in response to demands by many citizens, has proposed a constitutional amendment permitting voluntary participation in prayer in public schools. Is it not fantastic that the American people and Congress must attempt to amend the constitution to restore a cherished right nullified by the U.S. Supreme Court?

Lenin, author of Communist strategy said: "Our revolution will never succeed until the myth of God is removed from the mind of man."

What is the U.S. Supreme Court trying to do?: (See item 2(d))

II. We Must Carry the Mail for Moscow—May 24, 1965: The U.S. Supreme Court has given Communist political propaganda unrestricted access to our domestic mail system. With this decision, the Court has opened wide our domestic mails to Communists, thus encouraging a constant flow of foreign propaganda to an unsuspecting American public. This propaganda is well calculated to create, foment and direct racial, social, political and religious disorders in our country.

Less than 5% want it—why should the other 95% be forced to get it.—(See items 7, 13, & 14)

III. A Communist Can Hold Office in a Labor Union—June 7, 1965: After years of Congressional effort to prevent Communist subverison of the labor unions, the U.S. Supreme Court has denied Congress the power to prevent Communist party members from holding union office. Both labor and management have cause for concern over the effects of this decision, permitting subversives to influence the economic health of our nation by fomenting strife at the behest of an enemy of the United States.

Lenin, author of Communist strategy, said: "Resort to all kinds of cunning, schemes and stratagems, employ illegal methods, evade and conceal the truth in order to penetrate (U.S.) labor unions, to remain in them and conduct the Communist work . . ."

George Meany, AFL–CIO President, threw out all Communist-led unions. The Seamen's Union has boycotted loading supplies for North Vietnam and wired President Johnson saying they will boycott ships of all countries supplying the Communists. American labor wants no part of Communism.

What does the Supreme Court want? (See items 7, 13, & 14).

IV. Communists No Longer Need Register with the Government—November 15, 1965. With this decision, we may have lost the ability to protect ourselves by means of registration statutes. Even at state level there appears to be little possibility that registration laws against the Communist Party can be enforced.

The Communist Party USA has become more bold, as evidenced by a stepped-up schedule of speeches by Party leaders on U.S. college campuses.—(See items 7, 13, 14, & 16(c))

V. Soft Handling of Criminals—June 13, 1966 (Miranda Decision): The U.S. Supreme Court's "Miranda Decision" continues to be a boon for criminals. Confessed criminals are being freed without trials because they were not informed of their constitutional rights before confessing. Police officers are hamstrung and the crime rate continues to soar as the effect of soft Supreme Court decisions in matters of interrogation, confessions, detaining of suspects, right of attorney and searching, filter to the lower courts.—(See items 2(d), 13, 16(c))

VI. Communist School Teachers Protected Against Dismissal—January 23, 1967: Laws aimed at keeping subversives off the faculties of public schools have been declared unconstitutional by the U.S. Supreme Court. Justice Clark in his dissent, said "The majority has by its broadside swept away one of our most precious rights, namely, the right of self-preservation."

(See items 2(d), 13, 14, 15, 16.)

I strongly disagree with Supreme Court decisions which I have circled and urge steps be taken to reverse them. I II III IV V VI

1. Please send this page to my Congressman and Senators with a note expressing my deep concern over the item(s) I have circled at the top of this coupon. Check here ( ).

2. Enclosed is my contribution to help spread this message: $1,000——$500——$250——$100——$50——$——.

3. Please send this page to the names and addresses attached. I enclose 25c per name to cover the cost. Check here ( )

4. Please send me —— copies of this page. For which I enclose $——. Prices: 1 Copy 25c; 10 Copies $1.00; 100 Copies $5.00; 1,000 Copies $25.00.

Name ------------------------------------
Address --------------------------------
City and State --------------------------
Zip -------------------------------------

(*Return this coupon to: Constructive Action, Inc., 7946 Ivanhoe Avenue, Suite 316, La Jolla, California 92037.*)

We do not wish to impugn the motives of the Supreme Court in its solicitude for the constitutional rights of the minority but its decisions must not infringe upon the rights of the majority or endanger national security.

"We want a state of things which allows every man the largest liberty compatible with the liberty of every other man."—Ralph Waldo Emerson.

"Little Detroit" of Indiana: Connersville

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE H. HAMILTON
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 16, 1967

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, a recent issue of Outdoor Indiana, a publication of the State's department of natural resources, featured an industrial history of Connersville, seat of Fayette County.

This excellent article pointed to Connersville, one of the oldest cities in Indiana, as the "Little Detroit" of the country in the early days of automobile production.

Some of you may remember such automobile makes as Cord, Auburn, Lexington, and McFarlan. They were manufactured in this community on the Whitewater River.

As glamorous as the past has been, however, Connersville has moved to keep pace with the future. As the automobile industry flagged, then floundered in the depression, industry turned to other products.

Today, Connersville is a center of appliance production and is a thriving industrial community.

"Big Detroit" continues to be the automotive center of the world, while Connersville remembers the "classic age" of the car.

The article follows:

"LITTLE DETROIT" OF INDIANA: CONNERSVILLE

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The author, a fifth-generation Hoosier, grew up in his father's Model T rebuilding business. A former supervisor at Central Mfg. Co., he has spent 40 years in assembling the automotive data and library from which the facts in this article are drawn. He is chairman of Historic Connersville.)

(By Henry H. Blommel)

One of the oldest cities in the State, Connersville is a relatively small county seat today. Few would guess that it once was a booming auto center that well justified the title "The Little Detroit" of Indiana.

Founded with the location of an Indian trading post on the banks of the Whitewater River in 1808, Connersville was well-established as a buggy manufacturing business well before the Civil War.

From this business which kept expanding through the 1800's, the transition to manufacturing automobiles and auto parts was only natural. At least 10 makes were manufactured in the city during the early 1900's and parts for most of the well-known autos were manufactured as well.

To old-timers and today's antique car buffs names of some of the Connersville-made cars spell pure magic. For instance: Cord, Auburn, McFarlan and Lexington. Some antique car experts place Cord as the classiest, sportiest car of the thousands of makes ever manufactured in America.

From John Conner's Indian Trading Post in 1808 until 1845, when the Whitewater Canal was dug through town to connect with Cincinnati and the Ohio River, Connersville was a typical Hoosier village. From Oxford, O., in 1846 came Alanson Roots and Sons, to set up woolen mills on the canal at Sixth Street.

By 1854, while trying to replace their worn water wheel, they hit upon the principle known throughout the world today as the Roots Positive Blower.

John B. McFarlan, Sr., came to Connersville in 1856 to purchase several small buggy and carriage firms and organized the McFarlan Carriage Co. The next 20 years saw four large furniture companies shipping their products throughout the country.

John McFarlan saw the need for industrial expansion, and in 1886 he opened a large industrial park through his newly created Connersville Land and Improvement Co. He was the first to build a large four-story building, in this vast area. McFarlan, Connersville, Rex and Yale buggies and carriages were shipped by the trainload just before the turn of the century.

McFarlan had natural gas piped in from Carthage at the southern edge of Indiana's gas belt, and asked E. W. Ansted to bring his Ansted Spring Mfg. Co. to the Industrial Park by 1891. The Rex Wheel Works joined the area in 1900. George R. Carter was next with a building to make buggy leather accessories in 1903. E. W. Ansted built the Indiana Lamp Co. in 1904 next to his Ansted Spring & Axle Co.

The Central Manufacturing Co. had its start in 1898, building buggy seats, then turning to automobile bodies with an early Cadillac rear entrance model. The Wainwright Engineering Co., started in 1903, entered the auto field early with rings, pistons, and engines in all power-driven fields.

Connersville people early in the 1900's saw that they had too many industries tied up in the buggy and carriage field that was giving way to the new horseless carriage. During the fall of 1909, John McFarlan's grandson, Harry, started work on his new McFarlan 40 horsepower Six. The next year the town investors brought the infant Lexington Motor Co. from Lexington, Ky. The Empire Automobile Co., of Indianapolis, decided in 1912 to build its cars in the idle Rex Wheel Works rather than ship Connersville-built parts to Indianapolis.

The Connersville Buggy Co. tried the Kelsey Cycle Car first, but the Cycle Car fad ended before production in 1914. Their next venture from the Van Auken Electric Co. of Chicago, was a parcel post van, but electric vehicles were not too practical at this time, and the venture was short-lived. Lexington built a larger Howard car during 1914.

Among the many World War I projects were General Motor Trucks from Lexington.

Post-war Connersville industry was tied to the automobile as much as was the turn-of-the-century tie to buggy and carriage, from the wheel up. The Rex Buggy Co. had turned to Rex "California Tops," "One Man Tops," and enclosures and side curtains for all automobiles.

Rex was 30 years ahead of the hard top convertible.

The Central Manufacturing Co. had contracts from Lexington, Stutz, National, Premier, Cole, H.C.S., Moon, Gardner, Wescott, Davis, Auburn, Elcar, Haynes, Apperson, Paige, Overland, and others. Ansted Springs and Carter leather and trim had changed to the auto trade. Indiana Lamps, Inco Ryan lamps and Ryan driving lamps were made by the Indiana Lamp Co. The Tractor Train Co., as many Model T gadget makers over the country were doing, had a line of Moore Auxiliary Transmissions and Lincoln Brakes.

The Stant Mfg. Co., organized in 1898, had started a line of gas and water closure caps to add to their radiator ornament and plating business.

Frank B. Ansted waited until the New York auto show opened on Jan. 12, 1920, to announce the new Ten Million Dollar United States Automotive Corp. The units being united were the Lexington Motor Co., Ansted Engineering Co., the Connersville Foundry Corp., the Teetor-Hartley Motor Corp.

He would later add the Ansted Radiator Co., the Ansted Spring & Axle Co. and the Fayette Paint & Trim Co. Lexington short-wheel base cars with the new Ansted Engine set the pace at Pikes Peak on Labor Day, 1920, for the record time of 22 minutes 25 2/5 seconds, and they returned with the $10,000 Penrose Trophy. The trophy was theirs after the 1924 victory. This time the trip up the 2,200 foot hill was made at a blistering 18 minutes 15 seconds.

General Motors founder, William C. Durant, after a second go at trying to keep the giant firm solvent, had organized Durant Motors. His Durant car, to be built in Muncie, was to have Central bodies, Ansted springs and the new Ansted engine. Billy Durant would also join Frank Anstead as a director of Ansted Engineering.

Over at McFarlan Motors, their Rolls-Royce type cars, priced from $2,000 to $10,000, were built to order with air starters, pneumatic shift, and heated steering wheels, tilted for easy entrance, a common custom-built car specialty. One order arriving in late 1922 called for a $25,000 gold plated design No. 154 Town Car. This car had their standard engine, a T-head, 24 valves, 18 spark plugs, 6 cylinders with triple ignition that was the largest and most powerful motor of its day. The company's body building division was also busy with contracts from Marmon, Locomobile, Auburn and others.

McQuay Norris, of St. Louis purchased the Wainwright Co. during 1921 and the local plants today make water pumps, cylinder sleeves, piston pins and pistons for original equipment and replacements.

The early twenties were hard on all of the automobile companies. Only Ford was safe and his Model T went merrily on. Dupont took over General Motors. Walter P. Chrysler came to the rescue at Willys-Overland, then Maxwell. Lexington failed in 1926 and McFarlan in 1928.

Here in Indiana only Studebaker, Stutz, Elcar, Marmon, Auburn and Duesenberg made it through this period.

The Chicago-based backers of the Auburn Automobile Co. called in Super-Salesman E. L. Cord to bolster up the company. During the next 5 years, Auburn sales increased 1,300 per cent. Auburn bodies were built at Central Manufacturing at this time. Cord, looking for more room to expand, purchased the Lexington and Ansted Engine plants in 1927, the Central in 1928 and the McFarlan in 1929.

The first Auburn, a 690 sedan, came off the Connersville assembly line on Jan. 15, 1929. Cord spent $2,000,000 on the Connersville plant and had 20 modern buildings so arranged that all materials went through the entire factory in a regular forward movement with 1,500,000 square feet of floor space, available for production of 400 bodies and 250 completed cars a day. Seventy-five per cent of the corporation's cars were built in Connersville until December of 1933. Cord then put all his final assembly in the 82-acre auto production center—until the end in 1937.

Auburn's biggest year was 1931. He had 2,500 people on the local payroll and produced 225 cars a day during that Spring and Summer. The Central Division had a night shift and many overtime days were spent trying to make up to 7,000 unfilled orders.

The Cord Model L–29 was in production three years, 1930 to 1932. Nearly 4,500 units were built. After this time there was a hole in the corporation's line of cars, and a new car was being designed by Gordon M. Buehrig, first as a baby Duesenberg in 1934. Then in the Fall of 1935, Cord ordered the car built as a Cord Model 810 for 1936.

The 100 cars needed for the auto shows were hand-built. The new Cord 810 was an overnight sensation at the shows. The company received 7,639 requests by mail for more information on this revolutionary car. As Hupmobile and Graham found out later, this body was never meant for production. About 3,000 cars were built in the two model years. Nearly two-thirds of these cars are now restored by auto buffs around the world.

Ab Jenkins built his Mormon Meteor II at the local Central Division just weeks before the sad news came on Aug. 6, 1937, that E. L. Cord had sold to Emanuel & Co. or Avco as we know it today.

Auburn Central rose from the Cord ashes. The company continued its line of American Steel Kitchens, that it had started earlier. Auburn Central bought the PacAgeCar line of delivery trucks from the Stutz Motor Car Co. and built them until World War II. Howard Darrin also built his Packard Darrin convertible body at the Central at this time.

March 10, 1941, Willys Overland awarded Auburn Central the first contract for Jeep bodies. Until 1946, all the Jeep bodies were built at A.C. for Willys and Ford. Today Sears dishwashers and American Kitchens come down these assembly lines.

The Rex Mfg. Co. changed from tops and enclosures in 1927 to refrigerators and after World War II became a division of Philco.

Blowers are still built at Roots-Connersville, now 113 years old. Connersville the "Little Detroit" of Indiana, still has thriving industries, but the days of its automobile glory are mostly a memory.

Neighborhood Youth Corps in Alameda County, Calif.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 1967

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, as my distinguished colleagues well know, solutions to the problems of poverty and human misery are not easy to find. Intelligence, commonsense, resourcefulness, and imagination are needed if we are to erase the ugly blots of poverty from our landscape.

In recent years, we have been fortunate in having antipoverty campaign leaders who possess these qualities. They have realized that the disadvantaged—the poor, the undereducated, the minority group members—need hope, not handouts. They need the skills and education which will allow them to gain economic independence.

I am very proud that my own district has realistic, civic-minded residents who have uncovered the root of the poverty problem and are now administering a very practical, very viable attack upon poverty among our youth. The central labor council there is sponsoring a Neighborhood Youth Corps project—the Labor Department program for providing disadvantaged youths between 16 and 21 with education and skills—in a manner which best meets the needs of the youngsters it is designed to help.

All of the enrollees are dropouts; many are on probation or parole. In sponsoring the NYC project, the council is providing training in a manner designed to help these youngsters both economically and psychologically. The council has also devised a unique three-part program with emphasis on work-experience, training in skills marketable in the area, and placement.

The program is a realistic one; the council shuns approaches which are idealistic but unworkable. The program methods are also practical. They are structured to fit the youngsters they are aimed toward.

I feel that this project is one which could be of great value as a guide to antipoverty projects in other parts of the country. For this reason, I insert this East Bay Labor Journal article into the Record:

Poverty Program in High Gear

The Central Labor Council's new precedent-setting anti-poverty program is getting into full swing.

The three-phase U.S. Neighborhood Youth Corps project—first of its kind in the nation—has more than 250 youths in training.

Its work experience phase is at peak strength, with 12 crews of a dozen youths each learning good work habits and procedures engaged in community-service-type jobs throughout the county.

WELDING SHOP

The project's second phase, training in marketable job skills, is picking up speed.

Two instructors are training youths in the welding shop at 1820 E. 12th St.

A work experience crew has been getting another part of the same building ready for the carpentry shop, which was scheduled to open later this week. And the auto repair shop is expected to open in about a week at the same address.

For girls, the office machines and procedures training center in the top floor of the project's headquarters, 411 15th St., will be open within a week or two, according to the project's co-directors, J. W. Gaines and Robert Heffley.

OUTSIDE JOBS

Some youths have already moved on to full-time outside jobs. And the third—or placement—phase of the project will begin as soon as a substantial number have completed their training.

There will be no fixed training period.

According to Gaines, it'll be up to the individual to move ahead as fast as he can.

The $1,579,800 NYC project will last 52 weeks and is the first to win approval under a new Experimental and Development Program.

The Neighborhood Youth Corps is a division of the U.S. Labor Department to provide job training for 16 to 21-year-olds from low income families in poverty target areas.

FIRST IN NATION

In 1965, the Alameda County Central Labor Council became the first local labor central body in the nation to sponsor a federal anti-poverty program.

The new project is an outgrowth of that one and is based on experience from it and last year's project.

It's new approach to the related problems of fighting poverty and juvenile delinquency is based on the fact that training is useless aimed at decent jobs that are open locally.

Leaders of the Labor Council have felt that some anti-poverty programs have failed for this reason.

THE REALISTIC APPROACH

The CLC leaders are determined to make the Labor Council's program an effective contribution to lowering Oakland's unemployment rate among teenagers and easing racial tension by helping youths help themselves. A large proportion of the youths in the program are members of minority groups.

But just exposing untrained youths to job training won't be enough, those who planned the project realized.

Many of the youths are on parole or probation, and all are school dropouts.

A key element is to restore self-confidence destroyed through repeated failures since early childhood.

FULL-TIME COUNSELORS

In addition to its three main phases, the project has full-time counselors to cope with problems arising on jobs. The counselors also plan to follow through on youths who complete training and obtain outside work to be sure things are going smoothly.

One part of the project is designed to assure competency in outside employment by providing informal training in job related writing and number skills.

The traditional classroom atmosphere will be avoided as much as possible.

As Gaines points out, this is what youths who have dropped out of school have already rejected.

In the work experience phase, youths are assigned in crews of 12 under supervision of skilled union craftsmen.

NONPROFIT AGENCIES

They work on jobs provided by non-profit charitable community and local government agencies. In each case, the NYC project makes this work possible, for all the jobs are ones the agencies could not afford otherwise.

At present, the youths are working on the following work experience projects, listed with their foreman and his union affiliation:

Oakland USO, painting and remodeling, Phil A. Bethel, Carpenters 36.

Twenty-third Avenue Community Center, extensive remodeling, Willie J. Harwood, Carpenters 36.

Oak Knoll Naval Hospital, painting, landscaping and grass control, Thomas J. Butler, Sam Sweeney and Sam Tweedle, all Carpenters 36 (three crews).

Port of Oakland, demolition of old docks, Thurston Castain, Carpenters, 36.

Leona Park trout pond, cement flood control work, James L. Green, Laborers 304.

Union City Little League Park, landscaping and spectator facilities, Alex E. Parrott, Carpenters 36.

Project welding shop, remodeling, Walter E. Hill, Laborers 304.

Treeview Little League Park, Hayward, fencing and landscaping, John King, Steelworkers 1304.

D Street Park, Hayward, building demolition, Tad Tweedle, Carpenters 36.

Opportunities Industrialization Center, interior remodeling and painting, Roy M. Van Horn, Carpenters 1473.

UNIONISTS HELPING

Other unionists working as supervisors and foremen include:

Dave Arca, Steelworkers 1304; Roland J. Maples, Insurance Workers 30; Eula de Cordova, Patricia A. Noland, Annette Anderson, Ada Irene Gibbs and Dorothy Young, Office and Technical Employees 29; and Burl Fluornoy, Carpenters 36.

The two co-directors, Gaines and Heffley, are both veteran unionists.

Gaines, a member of East Bay Municipal Employees 390, was an adult and juvenile probation officer in Alameda County for 12 years before joining the project.

Heffley, of Carpenters 36, was a superintendent on major construction projects for 20 years and was also chief coordinator of training schools for Bethlehem Shipbuilding Corp. and the U.S. Maritime Commission.

EARNING MONEY

The youths receive $1.35 an hour during the work experience phase, except for leadmen, who are paid $1.50.

During training, leadmen receive $1.60 and others $1.50. In both phases, youths work four days a week.

The 1967 Delegates to Boys' State in Delaware

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM V. ROTH, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 1967

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, this week 93 Delaware high school juniors will be in our State capital, Dover, as delegates to the 1967 Boys' State.

This program, sponsored by the department of Delaware, American Legion, is intended to give students the opportunity to learn about their State government through actual experience. During the week, the delegates will stay at Delaware State College and conduct their business in the chambers of the Delaware General Assembly.

The students will form two political parties, Nationalists and Federalists, and elect party leaders. They will name a slate or candidates for top executive offices and hold an election to fill State posts from Boys' State governor on down.

In order to recognize their efforts, hard work, and achievements, I am placing in the Record the names of delegates to Delaware Boys' State, along with the schools they represent and their party affiliation—N for Nationalist and F for Federalist:

Alexis, I Du Pont, David Manchester (N); Archmere Academy, Dennis Quill (F) and William S. Ostan (N); Brandywine High School, Mr. Duncan Grant (F) and Jerry A. Williams (N); Bridgeville High School, Jeffrey E. James (F) and Daryl E. Speicher (N); H. Fletcher Brown Technical High School, Michael J. Callahan (F) and William J. Smyth (N).

Caesar Rodney High School, Ronald G. Hosterman, (F) and John W. Noble (N); Christiana Senior High School, Daniel Ratchford (F) and Garry Semers (N); Claymont High School, Walter Coleman (F) and Dennis Whitford (N); John M. Clayton High School, Wayne C. McCabe (F) and Robert B. Wilgus (N); Henry C. Conrad, David Ingold (F) and James Trost (N).

Corpus Christi High School, Donald Hutchison (F) and Joseph Mangini (N); De La Warr High School, Albert Lebo (F) and James Shipe (N); Delmar High School, David Harder (F) and Ronald Rash (N); John Dickinson High School, Christopher D. Huber (F) and James R. Pletcher (N); Dover Air Force Base High School, David Martin (F) and Dick Petty (N).

Dover High School, Frank Evans (F) and Peter M. Wilson (N); Felton High School Thomas Goerger (F) and John A. McDowell (N); Friends School, Stephen W. Burns (F); Georgetown High School, Darryl Hudson (F) and James G. Sloan (N); Greenwood High School, Norman K. Hamstead (F) and John G. Hollis (N); Gunning Bedford High School Michael McDowell (F) and Charles Toliver (N).

Harrington High School, Nicholas C. Morris (F) and Terry L. Yoder (N); Holy Cross High School, Stephen J. Harbourne (F) and W. Douglas Varn (N); Howard High School, Tony Garcia (F) and James Odom (N);

Laurel High School, Alexander L. Alvarez (F) and Robert Dickerson (N).

Lewes High School, Barry B. Lambertson (F) and Michael J. Sing (N); Lord Baltimore High School, Glenn Timmons (F) and Roy Warrington (N); Thomas McKean High School, Thomas D. Campbell (F) and Charles Grassie (N); Middletown High School, John R. Combs (F) and Raymond J. Filasky (N); Milford High School, Byron E. Phillips (F) and Scott Sipple (N).

Millsboro, Gerald L. Bunting (F) and Ronald E. Timmons (N); Milton, Frank Hitchens (F) and Dale Scott (N); Mount Pleasant Senior High School, Frank Fry (F) and Richard Harley (N); Newark Senior High School, Robert P. Moroz (F) and Jeffrey W. Purcell (N); Pierre S. Du Pont High School, David Ewing (F) and Scott Wolpert (N); Rehoboth High School, Glenn Lee Cox (F) and W. Roger Truitt (N).

Salesianum School, William E. Kirk (F) and David J. Szaroleta (N); Sanford Preparatory School, Jay R. Allen (F); Seaford High School, Dale Larrimore (F) and Ralph Palmer (N); Selbyville High School, C. Coleman Bunting (F) and John E. James (N).

Smyrna High School, Ralph Weis Jr. (F) and George Dunning Jr. (N); St. Andrews School, John C. Buck (F) and James A. Davis (N); St. Elizabeth High School, John Forester (F) and Richard Kirk (N); St. Peter's High School, Joseph R. Breen (F) and David Waselefsky (N); Tatnall School, John B. Frick (F) and David C. Helms III (N).

Tower Hill School, Ellis L. Anderson (F) and John G. Middleton (N); William Penn High School, Charles W. Byrnes (F) and David Lodge (N); and Wilmington High School, Edward Di Sabatine (F) and Peter Luce (N).

U.S. Embassy Protests Follow Same Pattern

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 1967

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

[From the San Diego Union, May 26, 1967]

U.S. EMBASSY PROTESTS FOLLOW SAME PATTERN

(By Dumitru Danielopol)

COPENHAGEN.—The sign said "I protest this protest."

The young girl in the thin green dress shivered as a cold wind and first pellets of rain swept down Dag Hammarskjold St., past the front of the American embassy.

But Julie Szabad stood her ground. She was waiting for about 1,500 anti-Vietnam protesters who were marching toward the embassy. The protest group, made up largely of beatniks and what the Danes call "professional students," had come from a rally at Helsingfors, 30 miles away.

Like everywhere else in Europe, United States embassy officials in Copenhagen were convinced that a small hardcore of Communists, financed by Moscow, was responsible for the march, although they emphasized that the great majority of marchers could not be described as Communists.

And like everywhere else in Europe, embassy officials appeared resigned to the fact that pro-American elements are basically made up of hard-working, responsible people who have better things to do than carry signs.

That's why Julie was different.

The 19-year-old daughter of a Hungarian painter, Julie was born in Denmark. Her father, who has built a small reputation in Danish art circules, fled Hungary in 1945, came to Denmark and married a Danish woman.

"He has never tried to influence me about politics," said Julie. "He says every generation must decide for itself.

"He knows all about communism, but he never talks about it. He wanted me to make up my own mind. I did. I think it's rotten. This is the first time I have ever tried to demonstrate, but I think more people who think like I do should come out. We shouldn't leave all these anti-U.S. charges go unanswered."

The first trickle of anti-American demonstrators began to appear on the sidewalk in front of the embassy and one of the half dozen policemen on duty walked up to Julie and spoke rapidly in Danish.

The girl shook her head vehemently.

"He wants me to move away from the embassy," she explained. "He's afraid there might be trouble. I'm going to stay. I have as much right be here as they have."

As the crowd grew, the Danish police moved forward and ordered the anti-American group to the opposite side of the street, putting about 40 feet between them and the tempting plate glass windows of the modern embassy.

Julie was allowed to remain on the embassy side of the street and she stood defiantly under a big tree that gave her some protection from the rain that was falling heavily now.

The protestors stood closely packed on the sidewalk. Several unfurled huge Viet Cong banners. A huge poster featured a skull-like caricature of President Johnson and the accusation "assassin." About half of the crowd wore paper Viet Cong flags pinned to their lapels as they listened to one speaker after another harague the United States from a small platform on a public address truck.

"It looks like they're going to behave themselves," said one of the embassy's Marine guards. "They talked prety rough earlier today at the ambassador's residence, but this rain will take the starch out of them."

The speeches droned on and the rain kept falling and dusk began to creep over Dag Hammarskjold St. We left the embassy by a side door at the suggestion of Marine guards, but one last look showed that Julie Szabad was still standing her ground.

That girl is a real freedom fighter.

Postal Service Improvement Sought

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 1967

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, recently the Iowa General Assembly passed a concurrent resolution which asked for improved mail service in Iowa.

The disenchantment with the present quality of mail service is widespread. It is time that we do something about it. One way we can improve the service is to take it completely out of politics. I, along with others, have introduced legislation to accomplish this purpose.

The text of the resolution follows:

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 38

Whereas, the economy of the State of Iowa and the well being of its citizens are highly dependent on the delivery of mail of the United States Postal Department, and

Whereas, studies and surveys by the Postal Department show that mail service is deteriorating, and

Whereas, the citizens of the State of Iowa are becoming increasingly concerned about this deterioration of mail service; Now therefore,

Be is resolved by the Senate, the House concurring: That the President of the United States and the Postmaster General of the United States be urged to take whatever immediate action is necessary to improve mail service for the citizens of the State of Iowa.

Questionnaire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 1967

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I have completed the tabulation of a questionnaire that I mailed to the registered voters of my congressional district in Contra Costa County, Calif.

We mailed 140,000 questionnaires and received 20,000 returns, or a substantial sampling of approximately 14.3 percent.

There are many interesting and confusing conclusions that might be drawn from these results, Mr. Speaker, but the result that gives me greatest concern is the indication that the public has overwhelmingly lost confidence in the Congress as a body of responsible men of integrity. I do not know whether this public attitude is a reflection of a too-common American tendency to distrust "politicians" in general, or is a reflection of a deeper, more ominous loss of confidence in our basic institutions of government. Whatever the reason, Mr. Speaker, it is a matter to which we should address ourselves with increasing diligence.

The tabulated results of this questionnaire follows:

1. The President has asked for a 6% surtax on both corporate and individual income taxes. If this tax is enacted, an individual would pay 6% of his total income tax in addition to his usual tax. The President justifies this tax because of increased Vietnam war expenditures. Opponents argue it is really an anti-inflationary measure and since the inflationary aspects of the economy are subsiding, might cause the reverse to occur—a recession. They also argue a balanced budget is not required when the Nation is at war. The increased tax would raise $4.5 billion toward an anticipated deficit of $8.1 billion. Do you favor the proposed 6% surtax?

Yes	20%
No	74%
Undecided	6%

2. The President has proposed an increase in Social Security benefits including specific increases of minimum benefits from $44.00 a month to $70.0 a month, plus a monthly payment of $100.00 to workers with 25 years coverage. These benefit increases would be financed by increasing employer and employee payroll deductions.

Those favoring the proposal allege that Social Security recipients are hard-hit by price increases when their income remains minimal and constant. They further claim that this portion of our population, the elderly and the widowed and orphaned are generally found to be the least privileged of our society.

Those opposing claim that the productive, wage-earning portion of our population is becoming more and more hardpressed with the Governmental demands on their limited resources to finance programs for persons other than themselves. They further contend that during their employable years they will contribute far more than they will ever draw in retirement.

Do you support the proposed increase in Social Security benefits and the necessary increase in withholding required to pay for these benefits?

Yes	54%
No	39%
Undecided	7%

3. The deficit in this year's Budget amounts to $8.1 billion. By far the largest portion of the Budget of $136 billion goes for payment of past and present wars as well as keeping our defense system throughout the world intact. For these purposes, we spend $81.6 billion. In addition, we spend $14.1 billion in interest on money the Nation has borrowed over the years, and finally the remainder of the Budget, $39.3 billion, is allocated to programs such as agriculture and natural resources, health, education, conservation, FBI, public works, etc.

Do you believe we should cut back on our Defense Budget?

Yes	41%
No	53%
Undecided	6%

4. Of the Defense Budget of $81.6 billion, $22 billion is proposed for the Vietnam war. Do you believe we should reduce expenditures in Vietnam?

Yes	36%
No	56%
Undecided	8%

5. A controvesial domestic program involves the effort to restore the deteriorating resources, both physical and human, of our Nation's huge cities. This program is commonly known as the "War on Poverty." Its critics maintain it is wasteful and its resources do not get to those in poverty, but are wasted on inefficient programs. Its supporters maintain that programs such as Operation Head Start, Uob-Upgrading, Neighborhood Youth Corps and VISTA represent a needed change in welfare-oriented assistance programs by requiring some effort to improve their capabilities from the recipients rather than simply doling out support money to the impoverished.

This year's Budget proposes to spend $1.9 billion on this program—about the cost of 3 weeks of the Vietnam War. Do you believe:

(a) We should abolish the entire "War on Poverty"?

Yes	36%
No	56%
Undecided	8%

(b) We should transfer proven programs from the Office of Economic Opportunity to regular Federal Agencies, e.g., Operation Headstart to Dept. of Education, not thereby reducing expenditures, but perhaps increasing efficiency.

Yes	79%
No	9%
Undecided	12%

(c) Do you believe we should materially reduce the "War on Poverty" program?

Yes	49%
No	41%
Undecided	10%

6. A major portion of the Budget involved investment in public works and recreational area—for example, the purchase of a California Redwood National Park and the construction of the Kellogg Project in Contra Costa County designed to provide supplemental fresh water to our area. Do you believe these projects, and similar investments in developing and preserving our natural resources, should be postponed until the Vietnam war is concluded?

Yes	25%
No	69%
Undecided	6%

7. $1.2 billion of the deficit stems from the fact that present postal rates do not produce sufficient revenues to pay for the operations of the Post Office. First-class mail not only pays its own way, but produces a surplus. Second-class mail—magazines, newspapers and educational material, does not pay its own way, nor does Third-class mail, commonly known as "junk mail." Some have argued that the mail service should not be required to "pay its way"—that it is a Governmental service such as education, police protection, and defense, and should be a general Governmental expense.

Do you believe:

(a) We should not expect users of the mail service to entirely "pay their own way" by postal rate increases:

Yes	36%
No	58%
Undecided	6%

(b) We should increase rates sufficient to balance the "postal deficit" on:

First-class mail	5%
Second-class mail	64%
Third-class mail	87%

8. Senator Mansfield, Majority Leader of the Senate, has said the 90th Congress should not enact new and extensive programs, but should primarily concern itself with a review of the mass of legislation enacted the past two years and determine if those programs are effective or worthwhile. The President's State of the Union Message generally hewed to this philosophy. Do you agree?

Yes	84%
No	9%
Undecided	7%

9. Do you generally concur the Nation's interest demands we continue the war in Vietnam?

Yes	64%
No	26%
Undecided	10%

10. Do you believe we should escalate that war militarily?

Yes	56%
No	32%
Undecided	12%

11. Do you believe we should intensify our efforts to bring about a peace conference?

Yes	81%
No	13%
Undecided	6%

12. The President has urged that our Nation should encourage a better relationship with Russia. It is the belief of many that Russia has a greater interest in a peaceable relationship with America now, than at any time in recent history, partially because of the militaristic attitudes of China and partially because the Russian people are now becoming more and more consumer conscious. Others maintain Russia is as militant in her desire to defeat American as she ever has been, and that we should make no effort to improve relations between that country and our Nation.

The President has urged adoption of a Consular Treaty with Russia as one step in improving relations. This will mean an additional 15 Russians in our Country over the 452 presently staffing Russian consulates. In addition, it would mean an equally greater number of Americans in Russia. Opponents allege this will increase opportunity for subversion. Supporters allege the 15 additional Russians present no major increase in this critical area and the additional Americans will permit better service to those 18,000 citizens of our Nation travelling in Russia yearly. Do you believe the Senate should ratify the Consular Treaty?

Yes	69%
No	22%
Undecided	9%

13. The Powell case in the House of Representatives, the Dodd case in the Senate, and the Bobby Baker case, have all reflected greatly on the integrity of the Congress. Do you believe these cases indicate only a "surface" problem, and that, in reality, the problem of ethics is far greater than these cases indicate?

Yes	80%
No	12%
Undecided	8%

The Dixie Division

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

Hon. G. V. (SONNY) MONTGOMERY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 1967

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial, which appeared in the Meridian Star on June 12, 1967, expresses my grave concern for the continuation of the 31st Dixie Division, and I would like to bring this to the attention of my colleagues:

THE DIXIE DIVISION

It appears that the 31st Infantry Division, Mississippi and Alabama's own National Guard division, has fought its last shadow foe and marched its last parade. The Defense Department has sentenced the famed old Dixie Division to death.

In a time when our country is threatened with continuing wars on many fronts, the government has made a move that has been a dream of Pentagon minds for many years. The end of the state militias has been a frustrated hope so far. Now it appears that something is going to be done about it.

There have been promises already that local National Guard units will be revamped and cities and towns in the two states will not lose their armories. Reduction in force, under the suggested changeover to a brigade attached to somebody else's division, would not be great, we have been told.

But it won't be the old 31st, not any more. And if its not the 31st, then it's not the Dixie Division and it's not Alabama's and Mississippi's own.

The Pentagon, with all its vast store of facts and figures and military ingenuity, can say that the 31st is no longer needed, but we can't quite believe it. We have learned to distrust the vast store of facts and figures and the military ingenuity of the Pentagon before. Maybe they're wrong this time, too, and maybe they'll recognize it. A lot of people are trying to convince them.

No matter what happens, we are proud of the Dixie Division and of the Meridian boys who are a part of it. If ever they are needed, and we hope they are not, the Pentagon will learn that you can kill the name and furl the colors, but the spirit and patriotism that built a reputation just doesn't die.

Steven C. Rockefeller Comments on Hungary, Israel, and Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THEODORE R. KUPFERMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 1967

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, on June 7, Steven C. Rockefeller, son of New York's outstanding Governor, spoke at the Marymount College commencement.

His comments on the situations in Hungary, Vietnam, and Israel, as reported in the New York Times, of Thursday, June 8, 1967, so well accord with mine that I thought I would bring them to the attention of my colleagues.

The New York Times article follows:

Marymount Hears Rockefeller's Son

(By Merrill Folsom)

Tarrytown, N.Y., June 7.—Steven C. Rockefeller, the 31-year-old son of New York's Governor, declared today that he had been outraged by this nation's failure to intervene in the Hungarian revolution of 1957 and that he would "certainly support whatever we have to do to defend the rights and independence of Israel."

But, he added, if he were in Vietnam, "I would be haunted by the questions as to the justice and intelligence of United States policy."

"Much of the evidence indicates," he said, "we are interfering in a civil war and denying a people the right of self-determination."

He called for an immediate halt of the bombing of North Vietnam and for negotiations to end the war.

COMMENCEMENT SPEECH

Mr. Rockefeller spoke for an hour, as an invited neighbor, to an audience of 1,000 at the Marymount College commencement here. It was his first commencement speech and one of the few ever given by a Protestant in the Roman Catholic college. The Rockefeller home is just over a ridge in Pocantico Hills.

After talking to the audience about social, political, civil rights and economic changes in the world, Mr. Rockefeller said a new spirit had been born that "is in possession of the young—or perhaps one should say the young at heart."

"Many people," he went on, "are opposed to the war in Vietnam, especially the bombing of the North and constant escalation because it seems to be a contradiction of the new sense of meaning and purpose that they were beginning to find in this country and the world.

"It does not seem possible that we will win any significant victory over the real problems that face our nation and mankind by what we are doing. The world cries out for new life and new creation, and we are expending our resources in hideous destruction."

Saying that "the majority of those who oppose our current war policy are not pacifists," he continued:

"They are not afraid to fight, but they are afraid to betray their consciences and unwilling to abandon their intelligence. They are not unpatriotic, but rather they are devoted to the finest traditions of this country.

"There is no guarantee that our fighting in Vietnam will mean we won't have to fight elsewhere," he declared. "As long as the underdeveloped countries are in crying need of economic and social reform, subversion and guerrilla wars will inevitably continue."

Asked later if he intended to enter politics, Mr. Rockefeller responded: "Not as a candidate for public office." Then he added that his goal was to teach and write in a nonsectarian college. A graduate of Union Theological Seminary, he is working for a philosophy doctorate in a program of the seminary and Columbia University.

In the Marymount graduating class were 171 women from 18 states and eight foreign countries. They received bachelor of arts, bachelor of music, bachelor of fine arts and bachelor of science degrees. The highest academic honors went to Catherine McKenna of Douglaston, L.I., who also received a Woodrow Wilson Fellowship for graduate study.

Twenty Years of Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 1967

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remark in the Record, I include the following editorial from the Topeka, Kans., Daily Capital, which poses several important questions regarding this Nation's future foreign aid policy. The editorial discusses the contributions of the foreign aid program on the occasion of the 20th anniversary of the Marshall Plan. I call the editorial to the attention of House Members because we soon will be faced with critical decisions concerning the foreign aid program. The editorial follows:

Twenty Years of Foreign Aid

"It is logical that the United States should do whatever it is able to do to assist in the return of normal economic health in the world, without which there can be no political stability and no assured peace."

These words, spoken by Secretary of State George C. Marshall in addressing the Harvard graduating class of 1947, signaled the beginning of what was to become known as the Marshall Plan, a vast program whereby this country elected to share its wealth with the less fortunate. European recovery, economists since have said, began the day after the speech.

Certainly it held out hope for reviving the economic fortunes of war-torn Europe which received $17 billion in U.S. grants and loans over the following four years. And the steady flow of American aid has continued ever since.

Today, at Bonn, West Germany, a series of observances of the 20th anniversary begins. The exact 20th anniversary of the Marshall speech at Harvard falls on next Monday. On that day, the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) will have a memorial meeting and dinner in Paris.

But reports from Europe note that a much more significant meeting will be at Brussels on June 7. There a committee of eminent Europeans, including all of those still living who signed the original Marshall Plan agreement, will meet to discuss the question: "How Can the Principles of the Marshall Plan Be Applied to Today's Problems?" Among the Americans present will be Paul Hoffman and Averell Harriman, both of whom served as chief U.S. administrators of the Marshall Plan.

Now it is 20 years and about $120 billion dollars later and foreign aid has become a way of life in Washington. There is no gainsaying the fact that the aims of the Marshall Plan were noble indeed. Never in history has one nation extended such mammoth assistance to other countries as has America. But we do so at a price—not just in the billions loaned or given away but in the costly deficit financing which has marked our fiscal policy for years.

We are but 6 per cent of the world's population. Can we safely keep on with the foreign aid handouts to 130 countries? What about the balance of payments deficit? What about the enormous interest load the government carries on borrowed money?

These questions occur as we reach the 20th anniversary of the Marshall Plan. The various observances in Europe will be watched with interest by Americans, a considerable number of whom, are probably saying it's time we approached our foreign aid policy in a more economic and realistic manner.

Ward Just's Critique of U.S. Role in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 1967

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, one of the most analytical observers of the Vietnam war is Ward Just, formerly of Waukegan, Ill., and more recently a foreign correspondent for the Washington Post in Vietnam. Ward Just has now returned from Vietnam and has written a thought provoking and challenging article entitle "A War That's Not Being Won".

This article should help open the eyes of Members of the Congress and more particularly leaders in the administration who are charged with developing political and military policies in connection with the Vietnam war. I commend this article to their attention as well as to the careful scrutiny of my colleagues in the Congress:

"A War That's Not Being Won"

(By Ward Just)

Saigon.—This war is not being won, and by any reasonable estimate is not going to be won in the foreseeable future. It may be unwinnable. Frustrated at the resiliency and resources of the enemy, the administration revises its rules of engagement and widens the war. South Vietnam, unstable at best, sags, becomes bloated, threatens to become unmoored altogether.

The Americans and the Saigon government have not been able to dispel what one official calls "the revolutionary atmosphere" that is the property of the Communists.

Non-Communist Vietnamese refuse to place themselves in the center of the struggle.

Vietnamese may willingly die for an illusion, but there are few illusions left in Vietnam. The Viet Cong may not be regarded as marauders, but they are no longer saviors, yet the roots of revolution are deep in the peasantry. Thirty-billion dollars and thousands of dead men have not brought a better illusion, one around which the population can wholeheartedly rally.

The middle class sees the country being torn apart by a war machine fitted not to counterinsurgency but what Gen. William C. Westmoreland correctly calls a war of attrition. To Vietnamese, it seems a case of killing a man in an auto accident to save him from cancer.

Among the Americans, what is missing is a sense of purpose and a sense of priorities. No one can agree on what the situation in Vietnam is, except that it is surely unsatisfactory. No one can say with any certainty that the allies are a quarter or a half or three-quarters down the road, or, indeed, whether units of time have relevance in Vietnam.

Verbs in the Vietnamese language have no tense changes. The verb is the same whether past, present or future, and is modified by a second word. This says something for the Vietnamese sense of time.

But for Americans here it is a tertiary matter. Only a handful understand the language well enough to use it in sophisticated discourse.

No one can understand the shooting war in Vietnam because the correspondents have not devised a calculus for measuring it as a continuum. The military is worse, professing to find significance in the corpse count and mistaking valor for progress. The war is now reported by correspondents as Broadway is reviewed by drama critics. Each operation is a production of its own, unrelated to its predecessors. It is reviewed on its own merits, because there are no other standards of judgment.

Battles erupt, small ones in the delta, larger ones in the highlands, the largest of all in the First Corps area up by the demilitarized zone, and none of them battles for terrain or control of population but for men and supplies.

"If we keep going at it like this," said a young marine lieutenant at the DMZ, "my kids are going to be fighting this war."

He had been in Vietnam for nearly a year, and was asked what progress he saw. "We're sure kicking hell out of Old Charlie," he said, "but Old Charlie sometimes kicks hell out of us. I guess I don't see the progress because I'm too close to it."

Frustrated, angry, bewildered at the inability of American firepower to contain "Old Charlie," ever more incredulous schemes are considered: Invade the DMZ. Bomb Hanoi. Mine Haiphong harbor. And none of them bears on winning the war in South Vietnam except as they marginally impede the ability of the enemy to send men and supplies south. These are sideshows, introduced by authors who sense that the main plot is slipping and incapable of enough velocity, to hold the attention of the electorate.

The insurgency seems incapable of being beaten back, so you invade the DMZ. Half the province chiefs are corrupt, half the Vietnamese army won't fight, so you bomb Hanoi. A former prime minister of South Vietnam sat at lunch at the Caravelle Hotel the other day, sipped an American beer, and pronounced sadly, "The problem isn't the North Vietnamese army, it's the South Vietnamese government."

But tell that to the marines fighting in Quang Tri Province or the 4th Infantry Division 30 miles west of Pleiku. They are fighting North Vietnamese infantry, splendidly equipped with modern Chinese weapons, well-disciplined, fanatically dedicated. They have come down from the north, and somehow the flow must be stopped.

Bombing of the trails from the north was supposed to stanch the flow, but it failed. Now the planners want to dig a ditch from the South China Sea to western Laos. These planners make a plausible case for it—you can make a plausible case for anything in Vietnam—but somehow common sense throws up its hands. Is a ditch really the answer? Perhaps it is.

Intelligent men have been wrong before.

They said that American troops would not fight well in Vietnamese jungles. They have.

They said a jet aircraft was useless against the guerrilla. It isn't.

They said B-52 strikes were inconsequential, no more than junglebusters. They aren't.

The heavy weaponry, the tanks and aircraft, more often than not make the headlines, but it is the long, slow slog that makes the war.

The level of leadership in the Vietnamese government, both in Saigon and the provinces, is low. The problems are corruption and lack of dedication.

The top jobs in the provinces and districts are often for sale. In the opinion of some observers here, the corruption problem will not be solved until all the money is gone. And at the rate Americans are putting money into Vietnam, that millennia is some distance away.

Deeper than corruption, though, is the capacity of the Vietnamese to absorb Lyndon Johnson's Great Society, a concept not exactly rooted in Asian tradition nor especially congenial to it.

In Washington, the President can ask why there aren't more schools. In the provinces, the problem is more complex. Are there books? Teachers? Who will build the school? Does the village need one? How much graft must be taken off the top?

The bewildering variety of American programs, from advisers in tax collection to experts in animal husbandry to projects involving health, auto repair, and journalism, is beyond the capacity of the Vietnamese to absorb. The Americans are trying to stuff 10 pounds of sugar into a 5-pound bag. And the bag, more often than not, is made in America.

What the Vietnamese want is not bigger rice crops or handsomer schools, but social justice and security.

Vietnamese intellectuals, particularly young ones, are not always easy to follow. They appear to want the Americans to dispose of the generals, win the war, liquidate all holdings in Vietnam, and exit as quickly as possible—all with as little dislocation to Vietnamese society as possible.

It comes easy, after a year and a half of watching the money-grabbing cyclo drivers and bartenders, the insistence of the street vendors and the massive indifference of much of the armed forces, to place the blame for the inertia in this war principally on the Vietnamese, or at least the Vietnamese leadership.

But it's not that simple in Vietnam. Nothing is.

The most attractive Vietnamese is in many ways Prime Minister Ky. Since he began to regard himself as presidential material, he has become crafty, which has detracted some from a kind of blitzkreig honesty that once permitted him to say, "In Vietnam, 85 per cent of all rumors are true." The principal rumor at the time was an outrageous story about himself.

Americans, particularly military officials, tend to forget that the Vietnamese are laughing most of the time, that they embarrass easily, and have a highly developed sense of the ridiculous.

The war, or as many of them call it, "The situation in Vietnam," strikes many of them as intrinsically mad, an East Asian theater of the absurd where, almost without realizing it, a full-scale war has erupted, and no one can quite say what is being fought for, or over.

Saigon must demonstrate that the war is worth winning and that life will somehow be better when it is over and the Communists are defeated.

Most educated Vietnamese believe that the war is worth winning, but for the average man it must strain credulity. Not that the Viet Cong are to be preferred.

But the war has gone very far. Anything would be better.

The situation in this country is Washington's responsibility as much as it is anyone's.

The Johnson administration has got its priorities badly out of joint in this war. Pressed by the generals and other traditionalists, it has attempted to win the war on the cheap, by "forcing Hanoi to the bargaining table" by destroying her means of production. This strategy has its corollary in the South with the indiscriminate use of artillery fire at night, and literally hundreds of air strikes a day.

The most severe side effect of the first is that it diverts attention from the essentials to a notion that somehow the war in the south can be won in the north. In the second it argues that machinery is a substitute for hard slogging. Anyone who has watched how hard the slogging is knows the compulsion to substitute machinery.

But it won't work.

If the effort and money spent dropping bombs were put into retraining the South Vietnamese army, reforming the bureaucracy, and forcing the generals to prosecute corrupt colleagues, there is more than a fair chance that the Americans could pull it off.

But in Vietnam, the Americans also have a leadership problem.

There are men of immense ability and dedication here, but there are not nearly enough of them. Many of the best go unappreciated by the American establishment, which is in its way as opaque as the Vietnamese establishment.

The war can only be won by the Vietnamese. It is still the Americans' to lose, by misapplication of power or by impatience or sheer unwillingness to do what needs to be done. The administration ought to decide it is in the war for keeps, and victory is not to be bought by bombing a power plant in Hanoi. What it is going to mean is more dead men, both Americans and Vietnamese.

It means fighting the war on the Communists' terms. It means a definition of war aims, so far not supplied by the administration, and most of all a careful explanation of the kind of casualties that can be expected.

A Medical Conspiracy Against Mississippi

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 1967

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, it is said that to let an intellectual talk long enough he will begin to believe his own expert opinions and trap himself.

But for a medical man to unequivocally declare that an entire State is in a conspiracy to eliminate the Negro is preposterous. This blast carries the imprint of a self-designed genocide blueprint. I wonder if the good doctor legally understands the term "conspiracy"?

If refusing to pay or feed people who no longer work or are unproductive is conspiracy, then perhaps this report should include the real cause of the problem, that is, Washington bureaucrats, poverty corps, welfare and political carpetbaggers who encourage nonproductivity and parental shiftlessness.

And what significance does the good doctor attach to the word "eliminate." Can it be "migration" as a result of a breakdown in racial harmony brought about in great part by just such agitation as his? Is he afraid for disenchanted people to move north to his hometown? He's on a Ford grant—why does he not promote the rich Ford Foundation outfit to move his specimens to Detroit and give them a free home and a job? That is, if he is genuinely concerned and not just blowing off more hot air to provoke additional racism and sectionalism.

Certainly if he looked, he could find the same medical symptoms and problems existing in his purported home town of Charlotte, N.C., in Washington, D.C., Chicago, and New York. That is, if he is sincere and really looking for the truth rather than some more political hogwash to smear Mississippi.

What an obvious misrepresentation for a medical doctor to say "In every child we saw evidence of etc." One knows he did not see or examine every child in Mississippi. How many did he see and who arranged for him to see the few he possibly did examine? We could go to any city, U.S.A., or world, and get a doctor to examine several children, hand selected because of their physical ailments and utter forth a like emotional statement.

The reported medical diagnosis may not be completely false to the point of outright lies, but they obviously do not give all the facts to arrive at the truth.

I would hope that the American Medical Association would take notice of the grave injustice being provoked by these professional agitators hiding behind a time-respected title of respect such as medical doctor. If the Ford Foundation sinks so low as to spend its tax-free fortune to perpetrate these falsehoods, all America will know there is a conspiracy—and not in Mississippi.

I ask that the AP release of June 17, as it appeared in the Washington, D.C., Evening Star follow my remarks:

NEGRO STUDY SAYS MANY ARE STARVING

Many Negroes literally are starving in Southern states, with the crisis worst in Mississippi, says a panel of six physicians in a study for the Ford Foundation.

"I was told before I went there that there was a conspiracy to eliminate the Negro. I didn't believe it before but I do now," Dr. Raymond Wheeler told a news conference yesterday.

Wheeler, a Charlotte, N.C., internist said, "It is still difficult for me to believe that this could exist in this nation of ours."

The news conference came after the physicians talked with Department of Agriculture officials and members of a Senate poverty subcommittee.

In their report to the Ford Foundation, the doctors wrote:

"In every child we saw evidence of vitamin and general deficiencies; serious untreated skin infections and ulcerations; eye and ear disease; also unattended bone disease secondary to poor food intake."

Other physician members of the survey team were Joseph Brenner on the Massachusetts Institute of Technology Medical Department; Robert Coles, Harvard University Health Service; Alan Mermann, assistant clinical professor, Yale University Medical School; Milton Senn, professor at the Child Study Center, Yale; and Dr. Cyril Walwyn, medical adviser to Friends of the Children of Mississippi.

A Modern David and Goliath

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 1967

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, since the beginning of the crisis in the Middle East, countless articles have been written about the bravery of the small State of Israel. Few articles, however, have contained the heartfelt emotion of the one that follows.

I commend to the attention of our colleagues this moving article written by Yvette Scharfman, which appeared in the June 10, 1967, edition of the Kings Courier.

The article follows:

POLITICAL PATTER

(By Yvette Scharfman)

We wrote our column for this issue, engaging in the usual "political patter." But upon reading it, we suddenly found it to be fatuous and banal amidst the blood and thunder rampant in our planet today! We tore it to shreds. We are outraged at man's inhumanity to man, and we pass on our outcry.

It is inconceivable in our day, with so highly civilized and sophisticated an instrument as the United Nations, that one country dares to speak openly of destroying another country! Let us go back to 1956, when three-quarters of a million Israelis won a miraculous victory over the dictator Nasser (and 40 million arabs) and might have saved the Suez Canal for western civilization, but for pressures exercised against them by the then President Eisenhower and Secretary of State Dulles. The latter forced them through threats of sanctions, boycotts and "our displeasure," to surrender the spoils of war. Messrs. Eisenhower & Dulles picked Nasser up off his back and placed him again upon the backs of his subjects. And the monster Nasser, like the creation of Frankenstein, is now venting his spleen against the America who saved him. He and his arab henchmen openly lick the Russian boot! In 1956, however, in exchange for returning the dictator Nasser to his country and his throne, the victorious Israelis were told by the then President Eisenhower that our country was committed to a promise of freedom of the seas for all nations. (Actually, we gave them nothing they had not already won through blood, bravery, sacrifice and suffering matched only by the Irish during their rebellion against England.)

But the Israelis, neither boastful nor bragging, went back to their little country, about the size of Rhode Island, and began to build while other nations were seeking to destroy.

Today we ask who are these 2 million Israelis who would dare to fight back against an aggressor who comprises 80 million in manpower, together with the superior strength of mechanized armaments furnished by communist Russia? We shall try to present a picture. They are (1) a band of idealistic pioneers; (2) a handful of concentration camp graduates and (3) a group of comparatively recent refugees. The first group, the idealistic pioneers, felt that the Jew should have a homeland like any other group of nationals; that this homeland was his from time immemorial; that the old testament, upon which our Judeo-Christian western culture is based, promised him this bit of soil in the beginning. He wanted to implement the promise and the prophecy connected with it, and he endured hardships comparable with our own early pioneers in settling the land.

The concentration camp survivors went to Israel because no other country would accept the blind, the lame, the sick and the halt. They did not go by choice. They had been well integrated (or so they thought) in the social fabric of Germany, until the little house painter from Austria decided to eliminate first the Jew and then all non-nazis. These camp survivors have known a living death. Nothing can frighten them now!

The recently arrived refugees have fled from arabic countries where they have been persecuted, and from countries behind the iron curtain where they have escaped at the peril of their lives, rather than live under the terror of communism. They have worked and slaved to build their tiny country. They have made the desert green. They have given full representation and equal rights and pay to all arabs who remained in Israel (which is far more than arabs are now granted in arabic lands.) Israel wishes only to be left in peace (their word for "hello" and "goodbye" is Shalom, which means peace.) But there is no peace!

What about the sanctimonious great powers who would fight communism in one part of the world but would declare their "neutrality" when the 2 million are faced with the aggression of 80 million supported openly by the communists? Our country gave Jordan millions of dollars in armaments only recently "in order to achieve a a balance of power against Egypt in the middle East." And now Jordan has signed a pact with Nasser to stab little Israel in the guts with these very weapons! But little Israel is fighting her own fight—not only against the arab world, but against the communist world. Her people will fight for democracy unto the death. And the Jews in other parts of the world, ashamed that they stood impotently by while Hitler destroyed six million of their brethren, will now give generously of their material goods; for the Israelis ask not that we fight their battle, but that we help them care for their indigent refugees so that they may purchase arms which all their enemies receive free of charge!

The world will not be treated to a modern David-Goliath confrontation. We are an incurable romantic, to be sure, but we believe God is on the side of the Israelis; for despite insuperable odds, these people have breathed life and hope and faith into the magic words emblazoned upon our own Statue of Liberty, written by the Jewish poetess Emma Lazarus:

"Give me your tired, your poor;
  Your huddled masses yearning to breathe free;
 The wretched refuse of your teeming shores;
  Send these, the homeless, the tempest-tossed, to me."

Yes, the State of Israel will endure!

Arlington County, Va., Cultural Center Proposed by Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 1967

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, at the May 13 meeting of the Arlington County Board, in my congressional district, Mrs. George Green, chairman of the Arlington Cultural Heritage Commission, reported on the findings of her commission with regard to the need for a cultural center in the county with a full complement of facilities for the performing and audiovisual arts.

Mrs. Green's study was most detailed, and represents long hours of devoted effort on her part as well as on the part of the members of her commission. I believe the Members of this House might be interested in knowing of the activities of her commission in a community in which many of my colleagues reside.

The Arlington County Board, upon receiving Mrs. Green's report, advised her that the board will be considering a bond referendum for this fall and will consider the possibility of including the center she recommended, or at least a beginning on the center in the referendum.

Mrs. Green's report was as follows:

Report of Cultural Heritage Commission on Proposed Cultural Center

Mrs. George B. Green: Chairman Casto and Members of the Arlington County Board, as Chairman of the Arlington County Cultural Heritage Commission, it is indeed an honor and privilege for me to appear before you today. I am here to turn over to you the results of the Proposed Cultural Center Study made by our Commission at your request. During the course of this study, our 14-member Commission has given unlimited hours of time, dedicated interest, and complete cooperation to this project. We have searched out answers to the broad questions: "Is a Cultural Center needed in Arlington? If so, where should it be located, what should it contain, and would it have public support?" Commission members have been objective, impartial, and as thorough as time and individual capabilities have permitted. From the outset of the study, Commission members have been aware that their recommendation must include the fact that, if in the affirmative, the Board and citizens of the County would be asked to consider a multi-million dollar proposition, an extremely costly project, to be used not only by our present citizens, but by generations into the future. Because of the magnitude and importance of this long-range project, and the grave responsibility the decision will place upon the Board, we opened the subject to public hearings. We have studied and discussed the materials and information that was brought to our attention. We sought information by announcements to clubs, organizations, and individuals, through the press, radio and television, by notices on Library bulletin boards, Park and Recreation department and the two public hearings and two tours. We sought both affirmative and negative suggestions and reactions. No one appeared before us or has submitted materials in opposition to a Cultural Center. Our study will show you that there are minor differences regarding size of rooms, number of auditoriums, number of seats, multi-purpose rooms and the use of technical equipment by amateurs. However, the hope of seeing a Center become a reality in the County appeared to be a great compromising factor, for performing groups are willing to adjust requirements. Frankly, the public response was greater than we anticipated necessitating two, rather than the one public hearing we had originally scheduled. We believe much valuable information has been assembled in this study. In terms of cost to the County, all participants were volunteers with the exception of limited clerical help and County transportation for two tours willingly furnished by the County Manager's office. We are most appreciative and wish to thank Mr. Johnson and his fine staff. In contrast to the cost of this Study, I should like to point out that our neighbor, Fairfax County—with an $80,000 Federal Study Grant—is moving ahead rapidly in considering a site and plans for building a Cultural Center. I really believe you must give very serious consideration to the subject of how the Federal Government would react to requests for matching funds from neighboring counties for similar projects at the approximate same time, if Federal assistance is to be sought. Fairfax is thinking in terms of multi-million dollar figures. Springfield has already announced plans for a half million dollar Center to be built, hopefully, with assistance of Federal funds. Incidentally, I have just received a letter from Congressmen Joel T. Broyhill, expressing his interest in learning the findings of our study as soon as we can make them available to him. He has offered to cooperate in any way possible, once decisions have been made, with Arlington County. Through the kind offices of Senator Harry Byrd, Jr., we have received helpful material relative to the available Federal participating fund programs. This you will find in our reference material.

If funding can be accomplished in Arlington, the consensus is that neighboring centers or the various performing arts facilities springing up along the Beltway between here and Baltimore, or the attractions of Washington, would certainly not rob an Arlington Center of year-round near-capacity use during daytime and evening hours. The Arlington County School Board is sharing a $75,000 study grant from the Federal Government with Alexandria and Falls Church, to assess the performing arts and cultural requirements in the public schools. This only emphasizes the wide-spread interest in the need for improving cultural facilities generally. Our Commission made two extremely worthwhile inspection tours—one within the County of existing public and private facilities; the other into nearby Virginia and Maryland. Our intent was to avoid recommending facilities that would duplicate any that are already filling the needs. As reported in the Study, the County tour strongly emphasized the need for adequate facilities within the County. Let me assure you, from the standpoint of cultural facilities for the performing and audio, visual arts, Arlington County is definitely not equipped to fulfill the demands. We do not have a public art gallery. There is not an adequate stage in the County for the proper performance of dramatic productions. There is not an adequate stage in the County for the proper performance of opera. There is not a music hall large enough or with proper acoustics for the presentation of symphonic music that an ever increasing county audience demands. Clubs and organizations are hard put to find meeting rooms. The projection for classic and documentary films is make-shift. The presentation of dramatic productions becomes a test of ingenuity and often an exercise in futility for school auditoriums are overworked and available for community activity only on short notice. Scenery and costumes must be made and stored in poor and isolated places that can only be termed barely better than nothing. A Cultural Center would serve to unite the citizens of a very transient community. It would prove to be a great tourist attraction of a high order. It would prove to be a great educator—not only of the performers in the arts, but of audiences in the county. It would be premature, indeed, to tell you the exact number of square feet a building should contain, the actual dollars it should cost, the style of architecture, type of material, or kinds of specific equipment it should acquire. I can say this: It would be a multi-million dollar structure, well-planned outside in a park-like setting, with a full complement of proper facilities for the performing and audio-visual arts use. It must be planned with the people who will use it—planned from the inside out—a monument equal to Arlington's size potential, demanding esthetic taste, and conservative pocket book.

Only a structure and facility that both pleases the eye and fulfills the needs of the community should be considered. Our Commission is furnishing you with an analysis of the needs of a Center that could very well serve as the basis for an architectural plan or program. Many people have displayed interest in an Arlington Center, including a number of architects who have indicated their interest in working on the proposed Center. The Northern Virginia Section of the American Institute of Architects has offered to provide assistance to the County Board. They would provide members to serve on an interim advisory committee set up by the Board until the "program" and architect have been determined; advise on how to establish the architectural program, and advise on methods of selecting an architect. In my opinion, the selection of an architecural firm, preferably by a judged competition, capable of handling such a specialized project with the ability to call in highly experienced and specialized technical consultants in the fields of the arts, is paramount. You will find a report on suggestions for an Architectural AIA Advisory Committee in the Study. If properly planned, such a center, in addition to a theatrical consultant provided by the architectural firm employed, the project would require acoustical experts, radio and television specialists, motion picture technicians, lighting and specialized electrical workers, to mention a few. As has been pointed out in our study, it is not only better, but less costly in a specialized "custom built structure such as this to build into the plan all the highly detailed needs from the very beginning. The Cultural Heritage Commission would be available and should be utilized from the outset as a liaison between the groups that will use the center and those planning the architectural program, developing and building the Center. Thus, the very necessary requirements of the performing and visual arts users will not be overlooked or badly compromised. We share with you a desire to serve Arlington taxpayers—to see that tax money buys the best it possibly can in the areas it should be spent, without waste, to serve the best interests of all the citizens of this great, important, growing community. There is enough need for a Cultural Center and there are deficiencies that exist to such an extent that present facilities are inadequate to meet the needs. Therefore: The Cultural Heritage Commission recommends that action be taken to proceed with the planning and construction of a Cultural Center at Quincy Street, Washington Blvd. County Property Site as soon as practicable. Gentlemen, this is a long-range project. It is not to be thought of in the same light with annual budget items. It will serve the future as well as the present. Our decision was predicated on this fact. It is the sincere hope of this commission that our study and the affirmative recommendation given to you today will be of significant assistance to you in your responsible decision in this matter. I take pleasure in presenting to you the Study material including tape recordings of the public hearings, statements, letters, reference and all other material that came to our attention.

Politics From the Inside Up

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 1967

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, in a well-known newspaper's book review section a famous historian complained recently that politicians rarely write good books. This was caused, he said, by the politician's constant activity, whether in or out of office. So, he concluded, books were written by the observers of politics and government, and rarely by those intimately involved.

Now, I do not wish to take issue with this historian, but I have here a book, on politics, written by politicians, that I consider to be better than anything ever written by observers of politics. The name of the book is "Politics From the Inside Up," and the authors are Walter J. Reum, former township committeeman in Illinois, and at one time an important member of my State's general assembly, and by Gerald C. Mattran, a precinct captain. Both are constituents of mine. It is probably fair to note also the Mr. Reum is an attorney and Mr. Mattran is a historian. But, what is more important is that their book is written from the point of view of political participants, not observers. Moreover, as pointed out in the introduction "Politics From the Inside Up" is a book that shows the inside of politics as it operates practically, not idealistically. It presents, not the headlines, but the goings-on that never make the news at all. I recommend its reading to my colleagues and to students interested in political science. By so doing, the book becomes an explanation of the politician, rather than an apology for or an indictment of him The authors have chosen satire as the vehicle for their message, and thus have brought into clearer light the many insights that might otherwise be lost to the casual reader.

I quote briefly from the book:

RULE 2. REPLACE YOUR MOTHER, WIFE OR MISTRESS WITH POLITICS

The time you devote to your family is time away from politics. If there isn't somebody to see, there's somebody to call, or somebody seeing or calling you. In fact, if a day passes without your phone ringing busily, you've lost your support. If you can do nothing else at the beginning, go to the bar where the local pols hang out. Let them educate you.

The session leader is a rare political personality: he does not want to be President; he wants to be Chief Justice.

He'll say: "The majority party is doing everything wrong. Taxes are too high; schools are not good enough; the people are losing control of the government; our party is the only hope of mankind."

In fact, the majority party must be doing *something* right, or it wouldn't be the majority party.

He'll continue: "The people have to be convinced that they are in trouble, and to do this we have to know the issues and have answers for all their objections."

Fine. But don't try to tell the plumber next door—who has two cars and central air conditioning—that he is in trouble. You'll do better to tell him he'll be able to buy two cars very year and air condition his garage if he votes for your man.

"People," the session leader will insist, "are different now. The Precinct Captain can no longer serve their personal needs down to bread and coal. He must appeal to their new interest in the issues and the more complex concepts of government."

He's right. People are different now; they're less interested in politics. At the turn of the century, politics was a diversion. Now it is an intrusion. People don't want to be bothered with troublesome decisions, such as whom to vote for. So you help them. You make it possible for them to vote for you instead of for individual party candidates.

Grasp first this essential: Politicians never retire; they always envision themselves in higher office. The easiest way to move an office-holder out is up. To make a place on the ballot for yourself as State Senator, then, you must plant a seed and see that it germinates and comes to bloom.

The direct primary, which pits party members against each other, is a biennial bloodletting that was designed by reformers around the turn of the century to do away with politicians. With their usual adaptability the politicians soon came to achieve the same results with the primary as they did before it. They merely moved the selection process from large, smoke-filled convention halls to small, smoke-filled hotel rooms.

RULE 17. DEVELOP THE RIGHT IMAGE

There is no real secret about the kind of image you need. The mold was begun by George Washington, filled in by Andrew Jackson and Abraham Lincoln, and brought up to date by Dwight D. Eisenhower. You must appear to be trustworthy, loyal, helpful, friendly, courteous, kind, obedient, cheerful, thrifty, brave, clean and reverent. You're panicking now. We didn't say you had to have all those qualities, just so long as you seem to have them.

RULE 22. ALWAYS USE THE BALANCED SENTENCE

You know, of course, that a balanced sentence is one that neatly straddles both sides of a question and can be used backwards or forwards, as required. For example, in the answer to that last question, if your audience is a PTA group, you will say: "It's the just duty of the government of this state to protect our mothers and children from conditions that existed in the Middle Ages. Yet private enterprises must be allowed to flourish and the government should do only what the people can't do for themselves."

Chances are that some well-meaning citizen will ask what he thinks it an honest question: "Senator, you sponsored a bill putting control of the state parks in the Auditor's office. Couldn't they be run more economically by the Conservation Department?"

There will be no applause here.

"I'm glad to hear from a thoughtful voter. The state parks are the property of the people and should be open to them at any time, consistent with maximum safety and reasonable operating expenses."

Good work. Not only have you mastered the balanced sentence, but you've applied to it the indirect answer.

You're making remarkable progress. You're ready now to return to the Capitol as the leader of the Senate and . . . but we're jumping a little ahead.

Thus, you can see that with wit, certainly, and with a fine feeling for human experience, but, with the intimate knowledge that comes only from total involvement, they have produced a work that neither condones nor condemns, but explains politics. I commend this book to you, and more important, I suggest that more of us try our hand at telling people what our positions are really like, not what they seem to be from the outside.

Six Church Representatives Deplore Congressional Draft Action

SPEECH

OF

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 1967

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, a distingished group of churchmen released a statement last week pointing out that "Congress did not adequately discharge its responsibility" in regard to fully reviewing our military manpower situation during action on the extension of the Selective Service Act.

They feel that the military draft should not "now be forgotten for another 4 years", and urge an early and thorough review both by Congress and by private groups.

I concur in the feeling that we might tend to wash our hands of legislative consideration in this matter once the extension of time has been authorized. We should certainly examine fully the entire manpower situation and explore thoroughly whether or not there are alternatives to the draft. The most feasible continuation of these efforts under present circumstances are, of course, forays into the area of attracting volunteers. Successful procedures toward this goal could bring about an end to the need for the draft and end the problems that arise therefrom.

The statement is as follows:

SIX CHURCH REPRESENTATIVES DEPLORE CONGRESSIONAL DRAFT ACTION

The Congress had a major responsibility this year to make a fundamental review of the military manpower situation and to reexamine the foreign policy which requires a standing army in excess of 3 million men.

We can only conclude after witnessing the way in which the legislation was handled in Committee and on the floor, especially in the House of Representatives, that Congress did not adequately discharge its responsibility.

The operation of the military draft is now literally a matter of life or death for thousands of young Americans. It has been described as discriminatory along racial, economic, and social lines. Yet almost nothing was done to make its operation more equitable. Even proposals to shorten the four year extension were turned aside, though the pace of events in the United States and around the world is so rapid that each Congress should have an opportunity to review it at least once during its two year session.

There is moral ferment among the younger generation about participation in war. A number of religious and other groups urged expansion of the conscientious objector provision to include the sincere, non-religious objector to all wars and the sincere objector to participation in particular wars. Yet Congress, instead of moving ahead, turned back the clock on conscientious objectors. The House Committee at first proposed inducting all C.O.s into the military forces before assigning them to civilian work, but decided even before bringing the bill to the floor that this could not be sustained. The Congress did, however, remove from the law a constructive provision which had been in operation since 1940 which enabled the Department of Justice to review the sometimes arbitrary decisions on C.O.s by local Selective Service Boards. The fact that under this appeal procedure local boards were reversed and C.O. claims sustained in two-thirds of the cases indicates that it was of substantial importance from the standpoint of justice and should have been continued. In a positive step, the Congress removed the requirement that a conscientious objector must believe in a "Supreme Being."

We do not believe the military draft should now be forgotten for another four years. We urge the reexamination of its operation by citizen groups looking toward Congressional reconsideration at an early date. We urge that such review recognize that the draft is used to implement a particular foreign policy and that any thoroughgoing examination of the draft must take a very critical look at U.S. military commitments around the world and the entire conduct of U.S. international relations in the nuclear-space age.

JOHN H. EBERLY,
Washington Representative, Church of the Brethren.

ROBERT E. JONES,
Director, Washington Office, Department of Social Responsibility, Unitarian Universalist Association.

LEWIS I. MADDOCKS,
Director, Washington Office, Council for Christian Social Action, United Church of Christ.

EDWARD F. SNYDER,
Executive Secretary, Friends Committee on National Legislation.

JOHN W. TURNBULL,
Associate Director, Washington Office, National Council of Churches.

HERMAN WILL, JR.,
Associate General Secretary, Methodist Board of Christian Social Concerns.

[Titles and organizations for identification only.]

Vietnam Demands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. MOSS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1967

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, General Ky, in his premature campaign efforts, has now called for a great increase in the troop strength of Americans in Vietnam. As one who has consistently supported the policy of the administration based upon restraint, I must express now my increasing concern that we not accept the demands of the Ky regime as the measure of our commitment in Vietnam but rather continue the course which I think is set forth very precisely in the following editorial of the Sacramento Bee of June 13, 1967:

VIETNAM DEMANDS TIME, TOIL, NOT RAGE, TEMPER

Those who are urging what amounts to total war in Vietnam ought to look at the price tag, in terms of lives and dollars, total victory would cost. It is stupendous.

At the time of President John F. Kennedy's death the United States had fewer than 15,000 "advisers" in Vietnam. Today, the United States has 450,000 men in the field in Vietnam.

At the time of Kennedy's death, the United States was spending approximately $6 billion a year in direct military support for both the US and the South Vietnam efforts. In 1967, the United States will spend at least $23 billion and perhaps $27 billion.

Now Gen. William C. Westmoreland is saying that if the United State is effectively to press its military effort it will have to increase its commitment to 700,000 troops—which could hike the annual cost of fighting the Vietnam war to $35 billion.

In terms of casualties, in the last week in May 2,941 dead and wounded were reported; and at the rate of United States wounded and dead in the months of January through May, American casualties could total 100,000 for 1967.

This is the price the United States is paying for its commitment to Vietnam. It has been engaged in locked warfare for more than two years; and at the moment there is not the faintest light at the end of the tunnel. As a matter of fact, the more troops we pour into the Far East, the more North Vietnam sends down from Hanoi. The best estimates are that Ho Chi Minh still has 2 million men he could commit to the engagement.

So when that easy solution, "total war", is encouraged, as it is being encouraged widely, the nation must out of a sense of its own solvency and its own interest think through the cost a total war would entail. And one of the cost items in that calculation would almost certainly include the inevitability of war with Russia and Red China.

What the United States will have to do in the end is to borrow from the Asian example of patience in coming to important judgments on the prosecution of the war and in working through the levels of diplomacy for peace.

Paraphrase an old axiom, by time and toil we may gain what strength and rage can never produce: A reasoned resolution. This will demand thoughtful pursuit, not thoughtless reaction.

Project Upward Bound: A Huge Success in Chicago

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 1967

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, one of the most original and successful of war on poverty programs is Project Upward Bound. Recently described by Time magazine as the "antipoverty program's teenage counterpart of the preschool Headstart program," Upward Bound is designed to motivate non-college-bound high school students, from low-income families, toward college.

Presently there are 243 upward bound projects involving more than 22,000 students. Each student involved represents a reservoir of talent and intelligence which, but for this unique office of economic opportunity program, might have been lost both to the individual and to his community.

The Chicago Daily News has recently described the successes of the Upward Bound program at six college campuses in the Chicago area. I commend this article to the attention of my colleagues. I call their special attention to the notation at the end of the article that this most worthwhile program must be kept from expanding to meet the need simply because of cutbacks in antipoverty funds. Surely programs such as Upward Bound, which benefit not only the student but society as a whole, merit even greater support than we in the Congress have yet shown.

Under unanimous consent heretofore granted, I include the Chicago Daily News article to which I refer in the RECORD:

WINNERS OUT OF LOSERS: A PROJECT STILL - UPWARD BOUND

(By Jerry Lipson)

Project Upward Bound, a lightly publicized but highly successful federal program to turn high school losers into winners, will be repeated here this summer.

An eight-week, full-time taste of college life on six Chicago-area campuses is in store for 460 students from dead-end neighborhoods. The program, financed by a $700,000 grant from the U.S. Office of Economic Opportunity, is part of a national $25,000,000 project embracing 30,000 youngsters.

"To be eligible, a kid must be a loser," said Charles E. Johnson Jr., supervisor of the Chicago project. "We want the potential dropout, the one who has brains, but seems on the way toward wasting them."

The students, drawn from 55 Chicago public, private and parochial high schools, find their way into the program largely through referrals from teachers, counselors, and friends. Prospective participants are first screened at one of the nine OEO Urban Progress Centers in Chicago and then interviewed by campus directors of the program.

Each college makes the final decision on participants, said Johnson, who noted that 500 applicants already are in line for the 460 slots.

Participating schools are Northwestern, Roosevelt and Loyola Universities, the University of Illinois Chicago Circle, and Barat and Mundelein Colleges.

The teenagers will live on campus at all but Roosevelt and the U. of I., which have no dormitory facilities.

Besides living accommodations, the program includes free counseling, medical care, books and $10 a week spending money for each student.

In addition, the Chicago Commission on Urban Opportunity, the local OEO agency, has created "Upward Bound" clubs of the nine neighborhood centers.

The nine "Upward Bound" clubs are: Midwest Community House, 135 S. Central Park; South Parkway, 33d and Indiana; Lawndale, 2710 W. Ogden; Halsted, 1935 S. Halsted; Montrose, 901 W. Montrose: Woodlawn, 1030 E. 63d St. Cabrini Green, 1161 N. Larrabee, and Emerson House, 645 N. Woods St.

Here, participating students during the regular school year study, work on special projects such as participating in debates, and get extra tutoring help where they need it.

Johnson praised the encouragement teachers have provided, noting that one English instructor at Harrison High School agreed to include club work on themes when making up grades.

A science teacher at Marshall High, he added, has been giving twice-weekly science courses at the club at the Midwest Community House.

While designed primarily for those who have spent summers on campuses in "Upward Bound" courses, the clubs are open to "guests," Johnson said. He noted that 150 new students have come around, and many of these, of course, get first crack at new openings in the summer program.

Studies show an average of eight per cent of graduates from inner-city high schools go on to college, Johnson said.

But, he said, graduates with "Upward Bound" time behind them knock that average into a cocked hat.

Of last year's crop of 380 students, 104 will graduate from high school next month, and dozens already are planning to attend colleges that have admitted them.

Two others are going to Yale University's Transitional Year Program—a competitive non-credit project designed to help poverty-stricken students adapt to college life.

Students last summer received hefty doses of motivational subjects, such as creative writing, along with academic sessions and cultural enrichment programs.

This year, Johnson said, instructors will "lean a little harder" on language arts and math, and go lighter on motivation courses.

For the first time this year, he added, the Chicago Board of Education has agreed to give as many as two units of credit to students attending the summer program.

This will go, however, only to those who successfully complete courses they previously had failed, and would have to make up in the future to graduate.

The purpose of such credit, Johnson said, is to enable students to join the project who otherwise might not because of fears of falling behind their classmates.

Besides the regular classroom work, the program provides for guest lecturers, tours and some special side-trips.

Because of cutbacks all along the line in the anti-poverty war, this summer's program is restricted to those high schools that participated last summer.

The Way of Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 1967

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the recent nomination by President Johnson of Thurgood Marshall to the Supreme Court, has been a wise choice for two very important reasons. The first being that Mr. Marshall is abundantly qualified for this position, and the second is that the appointment of a Negro to the Bench of the highest Court in the Nation is indeed a landmark.

The most significant effect of this action will hopefully be that the Negro will look more often to the courts and to the law to achieve his goals.

Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues an article written by Erwin D. Canham, which appeared in the June 15, 1967, edition of the Christian Science Monitor, concerning this nomination:

THE WAY OF LAW

(By Erwin D. Canham)

It is utterly appropriate in the week when the Supreme Court of the United States told civil-rights leaders they must live by the law that the Negro who has most effectively utilized the law to achieve social gains should be elevated to the Supreme Court. President Johnson and Thurgood Marshall have made history.

Mr. Marshall has proved in a score of cases that the law is the Negro's greatest tool in the struggle for civil rights. Now he can help uphold the law on the bench before which he has so often pleaded.

Let us hope that the appointment will awaken those Negroes who have preached defiance of the law, and that they will find few supporters. The tragic affirmations of self-made law now may diminish. Lawlessness is rampant at the hoodlum level, on the hot streets of American cities. But this is not the great danger. The trouble comes from righteous men who set themselves up as sole judges of what is right or wrong. Thus they undermine the fabric of law.

EFFECT HINTED

In the specific case which the court decided this week—the case of the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. and his seven friends—Mr. Marshall might well have found himself with the four-justice minority, and thereby have converted it into a majority. Probably most of the time he will vote with the liberals. This will have a profound effect on the decisions of the next few years.

And yet it is always dangerous to forecast too positively how justices will vote. Lifetime appointments breed independence of thought and action. The law is not simple to categorize. Nor is liberalism. The issue is really the power of federal government, and whether or not the court should intervene in matters it has often ignored before.

Mr. Marshall should be an activist, since his whole career has been built on the power and effectiveness of the law in the social realm. But we must wait and see how all this comes out in the wash. If Thurgood Marshall has any quality in abundance, it is the quality of plain common sense.

DUTY FULFILLED

President Johnson's decision in this appointment is a landmark. He did not have to appoint a Negro. He has done his duty by the civil-rights clause long since, full and overflowing. But he has gone the last bit of the way.

He has done it at a time when some of his oldest friends, Southern colleagues, legislators whom he loves and to whom he is deeply indebted were yearning for this appointment. He has resolutely turned his back on them all. And there may not even be political profit in it for him. Southern votes he may have alienated could mean more to him, in the Congress and at the polls, than the Negro vote in the great Northern cities, which he probably would have had anyway.

A Negro in the Senate. A Negro on the Supreme Court. Both well qualified for their posts as men, without regard to race. This is as it should be. One a Republican, the other a Democrat.

PATH CLARIFIED

And so, as the riots continue their evil way in cities from Boston to Tampa, the example of Negroes high in offices of state should give the rioters pause. Much has been achieved. More is coming. The way to progress is not with guns and bricks and knives, not with incitement to riot and arrogant preaching of black power and hate whitey.

The way is through the law.

Tom Clark, whose appointment was not so dazzling when first made, has served the court well. He leaves his son in the office of attorney general. He has aided good works not only in the judiciary, but in many patriotic enterprises. He has risen above many old prejudices, like the fellow Texan who now appoints his successor.

But to say that the way is through the law is not to say that everything can or should be accomplished through the courts. Whatever the courts may say, the ultimate achievement of brotherhood will come in hearts and consciences, and it is coming there.

The fact that a Texan President could make this appointment shows how far the United States has come, not in politics, not in law, but in simple justice which transcends law and is based on an awareness of the brotherhood of man under God.

Far Right and Reds Agree

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1967

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, many of us have long recognized that the far right and the Communists frequently take the same position on national and international affairs. The Middle East crisis is another example of their shared hatred for democracies.

The Soviet Union has seen its allies, the Arab States, suffer a disastrous military defeat at the hands of Israel. Russia's response has been a tirade of vituperation which included the absurd allegation that Israel wants to commit genocide against the Arabs. Obviously, no honest person could accept this charge in the face of Israel's consistent attempts to establish a peaceful relationship with her Arab neighbors and the fact that there are Moslem Arabs serving in Israel's Parliament, the Knesset.

Nonetheless, the June 1967 edition of The Cross and the Flag, the magazine produced by the notorious anti-Semite, Gerald L. K. Smith, asserts that "if they [the Jews] had their way a million Arabs and a million Germans would be slaughtered tomorrow."

The Peace Corps Retains Its Effectiveness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 1967

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, I have an integral interest in the Peace Corps. Personally I have often expressed my great respect and admiration for the work that this group has accomplished, and the invaluable asset it is to the United States. Once again I would like to acknowledge their valuable contributions both to underdeveloped countries and to the United States by submitting this article from the Washington Post written by Staff Writer Anthony Astrachan.

The article is based on Mr. Astrachan's own reporting and reports by correspondents John M. Goshko, in Latin America, Donald H. Louchheim, in Africa, Warren Unna, in India, and Roberta Roth, in Thailand. I feel that it is an excellent answer to the criticism directed at the Peace Corps by a few accusing it of becoming so entangled in bureaucracy that it has lost its dedication, initiative, and effectiveness. Some of the first methods of organization and action have matured, but the original goals have not been ignored, denied, or changed. Quite to the contrary, this active, effervescent group has realized new ways that their goals can better be accomplished, and as a result, the Peace Corps has increased its enthusiasm and dedication.

The first section of the article follows:

[From the Washington Post, June 11, 1967]

THE PEACE CORPS IS "RECHANNELING ITS BUBBLES"

The Peace Corps was one of John F. Kennedy's most sparkling ideas. Rumor has it that six years of reality have made it go flat.

In Washington, you hear that it's no longer an adventure to work for the Peace Corps. Abroad, you hear a man like President Julius Nyerere of Tanzania say that the Volunteers seem to have lost their idealism. Everywhere you hear that the Peace Corps is becoming bureaucratically musclebound.

When you look at the evidence, you get a different picture—one that agrees with the

Peace Corps official who says, "We haven't lost our effervescence. We're just rechanneling the bubbles."

Reports from every area in which the Peace Corps operates agree that while much of the flamboyance of the early days is gone, the Peace Corps is still exciting—and it works. The reports say:

The 28,189 Volunteers who have been sent out since 1961 represent America's potentially most effective instrument for social change and economic development.

There have been plenty of failures, but they are outweighed by the successes. In addition, the Peace Corps learns more from its trials and errors than most Government agencies and many private ones.

A host of problems remain, but the Peace Corps makes a continuing effort to recognize and solve them.

A NEW HELMSMAN

The comparative blandness of the Peace Corps today is denied by many PC veterans who insist that their palates are just as sensitive as they were in 1961. So far as blandness does exist in contrast to the early days, it has three discernible causes.

One is the contrast between Jack Hood Vaughn, now director of the Peace Corps, and his more charismatic predecessor, Sargent Shriver, now head of the Office of Economic Opportunity. Vaughn is a quiet-spoken man who has spent more than half his adult life abroad for the Government. To him, the field is the basic reality.

Some Peace Corps veterans simplify to the point of saying that Vaughn is concerned with the substance while Shriver was concerned with the image that he sold to the country and Congress in a whirlwind of activity. One of Vaughn's favorite aphorisms is to say that he wants to make the Peace Corps as good as Shriver said it could be.

Vaughn himself puts today's blander flavor down to the second cause: the Peace Corp's working experience. "It's always more exciting when you don't know what you're doing and plunging into the unknown," he says. "Now we do know what we're doing, how to get from point X to point Y. If I were flying by the seat of the pants, it would be more exciting."

He adds, "When you lose the status of being controversial, you lose some of your zip."

TRYING FOR DIVERSITY

The third reason why the Peace Corps seems less flamboyant is that there is a little less diversity among Volunteers and staff. Most Volunteers have middle-class backgrounds; 85 per cent have college degrees and 96 per cent have attended college. Most come fresh from the campus and there is less age difference than in the early days.

Special efforts are made to recruit from other backgrounds, however—such as Negro colleges. Labor unions are finally being asked to help recruit blue-collar workers. In all categories, the selection teams look for what they call "high-risk, high-gain" candidates—the oddballs who, if they make good, will make the Corps better.

The staff here and overseas is a bit less diverse because it has more veterans and is less flamboyant because these veterans' imaginations are constrained by what they have learned. Yet it retains an amateur spirit.

PC staff is recruited from lawyers, doctors, teachers, newspapermen and businessmen. Many would be making more money on the outside. Their common denominator is that they are more adult versions of the Volunteer (and are frequently former Volunteers): restless, idealistic, a bit romantic. They combine qualities of the missionary, the Boy Scout leader, the social worker, the army staff officer, the executive—an unlikely mixture held together by a talent for existing on a shoestring.

A 5-YEAR LIMIT

The Peace Corps has a rule that nobody may work for it in a salaried position for more than five years, which may prevent it from ever becoming fully professional. It is also a rarity among Government agencies in having the power to get rid of misfits who elsewhere are protected by Civil Service.

While the number of Volunteers has increased 150 per cent since 1963, the overseas official staff has increased a bit more than 100 per cent and the Washington staff has actually decreased since 1963. The ratio of overseas staff to Volunteers has always hovered in the neighborhood of one to 30.

More staff usually means more bureaucracy. Vaughn tries to avoi dthis by such measures as eliminating all his associate directors and maintaining a high degree of decentralization. Peace Corps staffers say they have a lot of autonomy in planning programs.

A career Foreign Service officer on loan to the Peace Corps as a country director says: "I like the Peace Corps better than anything I've done in the Foreign Service. They let me run things the way I want to. I can finally do what nobody ever let me do before: delegate responsibility and tell a man it's up to him to make good or fail."

The Washington guidelines are felt, however. For one thing, the Peace Corps has become cost-conscious. Countries compete in reducing unit costs. Vaughn talks about saving nearly $8 million by such devices as substituting charter flights for commercial flights. The Corps says the cost per Volunteer was cut from $7865 in 1966 to $7400 in 1967 this way.

Washington also makes PC country directors plan programs up to five years in advance, a real change from the seat-of-the-pants days. Like other Government agencies, the Peace Corps must follow the budgetary system ordered by President Johnson: identify what you hope to accomplish, quantify it and estimate its cost.

Estimating the cost isn't too hard, but the field people tend to snicker at "quantification." Arthur Purcell, PC director in Bolivia who is now taking over the Philippines, said, "We reported we had vaccinated so many people in the public health program, our teachers had so many students in English classes. In Bolivia, we said, we had affected 125,000 people. But we don't know how much we've affected them or whether it's a good or bad effect."

The effect depends partly on the people of the "host country" but primarily on the Volunteer. In the Peace Corps, the emphasis is always on the Volunteer.

His continuing idealism has been questioned. But reporters who talk to the Volunteers and see them at work say the dedication, the sense of service, the idealism are still there.

Today's Volunteer may be younger; he may be unused to working for a large organization. But a former PC evaluator who interviewed more than 1000 Volunteers in Africa sums is up for all regions: "The new Volunteer is better qualified, better trained and for the most part gets more satisfaction out of his tour than his predecessor."

A CRITICAL CREW

The Volunteers complain, of course. They gripe about the Peace Corps' defects, about host country defects, about American policy, about "creeping bureaucracy" and "big brotherism." Most of all, they criticize their own shortcomings. Almost every one you meet feels that his personal performance has fallen short of what it should have been.

The Peace Corps is apolitical by design, but the Volunteers have opinions. Most tend to join as liberals, "the sort that thought Jack Kennedy was the greatest," as one put it. Some PC officials think that Volunteers become more conservative as a result of their experience, perhaps because they learn that change does not come overnight. A few decide that revolutions against the established order might be a good thing.

Volunteers in Latin America have reputation for being more outspoken than those elsewhere. They tend to dislike Latin dictatorships and U.S. support for them. Volunteers in the Dominican Republic during the 1965 civil war tended to side with the rebels and condemn the U.S. intervention.

Volunteers tend to be doves about Vietnam, but paradoxically or perversely, those closest to the scene—in Thailand, Malaysia, the Philippines—seem to have the least to say about the war there and the U.S. role in it. There is no Peace Corps in Vietnam.

But the Volunteers have a lot to say about the American military presence in a country like Thailand. They don't like it. Everything about the military style conflicts with the PC style.

The military believes in materiel; the Peace Corps in people. The military tries to help civilians through counterinsurgency from above; the Peace Corps through community development by self-help from below. The soldiers' PX style of living contrasts with the Volunteers' efforts to fit in with the Thai way of life, and girl Volunteers usually refuse to date GIs, provoking charges of snobbery.

AGAINST "GOING NATIVE"

The way the Volunteers live is a key to both image and reality in the Peace Corps. Many do live in mud huts and wear "native" dress. But the prevailing standard is for Volunteers to live in the same style as their "counterparts"—host-country citizens doing the same kind of job. This can mean anything from a dirt-floored house and a distant well to running water in a concrete building.

Gary Brennaman of Okland, Calif., who works in a poultry project in India, says: "The Indians know I am not an Indian and there is no sense trying to pretend it by going without window screens and so on. I can make my impression in other ways."

The Peace Corps, however, has always wanted Volunteers to show their hosts that there is no loss of status in working with your hands, a real problem among the intellectuals of developing countries. Thomas Quimby, the PC regional director for Africa, says: "We'd like to devalue the elitist attitute. It's not a question a living like counterparts, but of living simply." Window screens, however, are a health measure, not an elitist gimmick.

A decision connected with this idea caused a celebrated incident in Nigeria last year. Jack Vaughn decided to get rid of PC hostels—houses rented by the Corps in 26 large countries where traveling Volunteers could stay overnight at minimum cost. Vaughn had two objections: this was the kind of fringe benefit that the Peace Corps shouldn't provide itself, and it encouraged the Volunteers to seek each other's company and get away from their villages.

THE LAST STRAW

When the decision reached Nigeria, some Volunteers there threatened to strike, and press reports made it seem as though the supposedly idealistic Volunteers were preoccupied with their personal comfort.

There was a lot more to it than that, however. Two bloody army coups had put a severe strain on the Volunteers' relations with the Nigerians. In addition, most Volunteers in Nigeria were teaching and in the throes of a major debate about the realtive value of classroom work and community development. Also, the Peace Corps had cut other fringe benefits and basic living allowances.

To many Volunteers, the hostel decision was just one more proof that Washington didn't know what was going on in the field.

The stew had two more ingredients: the PC staff in Nigeria in 1966 was inexperienced and undermanned. It either did not know how the Volunteers felt or did not make Washington understand it. And the hostel directive, PC officials now admit, was one of the most tactless instructions ever sent out. Among other things, it called the Volunteer-run hostels "colonialist."

The outcry from the field was so great that Vaughn flew to Nigeria to explain things and find out how the Volunteers really felt. He succeeded in persuading them to accept the elimination of hostels and prevented the threatened strike. A further proposed cut in living allowances was canceled.

"The Nigerian 'revolt' was probably the most important thing that ever happened to the Peace Corps," say a PC official who was involved in it, because it embodied the problems that will determine the ultimate success or failure of the Peace Corps: Host-country expectations and the effect of host-country politics; what kind of programs the Peace Corps should follow in working for development, and how to focus on the Volunteer.

Congressman Horton Salutes Job Corps Sports Advisory Council; Cites Success of Breckinridge, Huntington Job Corps Centers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK HORTON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 19, 1967

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago it was my pleasure to attend a luncheon for the National Job Corps Sports Advisory Council. The Council will advise the Office of Economic Opportunity on sports programs for Job Corps enrollees.

These programs will be designed to bring to the disadvantaged the same benefits that athletics have brought to young men and women from more affluent environments.

The Council is fortunate to have the participation of a number of prominent men and women from the ranks of our Nation's greatest athletes. They include former heavyweight boxing champion Rocky Marciano, pro basketball coach Alex Hannum, Washington Redskins standouts Bobby Mitchell and Scooter Scudero, Olympic star Wilma Rudolph, Tennessee A. & I. State University track coach Ed Temple, 1968 Olympics coach-designate Payton Jordan, of Stanford, and Amateur Athletic Union executive director Col. Donald Hull.

On June 15, in the Washington Post, sports columnist Bob Addie, himself a member of the Council, brought his readers an excellent view of what the Council program will involve.

Mr. Speaker, in sharing Bob Addie's column with my colleagues, I might also take the time to again make known my belief in the Job Corps. I recognize it has problems; but, I also recognize—for I have seen with my own eyes—that the Job Corps is turning its promise into performance.

Two of my prominent corporate constituents, Graflex, Inc., and Xerox Corp., operate Job Corps centers: Graflex at Breckinridge, Ky., and Xerox at Huntington, W. Va. I have visited both of these Job Corps centers, talked personally with the administrative and instructive staffs as well as the young men and women who are being trained by these staff people, and generally made myself familiar with the program. I am impressed with the people building I have seen.

Mr. Speaker, at this point, I include Mr. Addie's column with my remarks:

JOB CORPS ENTERS SPORTS

(By Bob Addie)

That Peculiar product of our times, the Office of Economic Opportunity, which embraces the Job Corps, is branching out into athletics.

The OEO gathered some sports experts (at no expense to the Government) over the weekend to formulate a program. Unlike some of their filibustering countrymen, the National Job Corps Sports Advisory Council whipped together a fast program.

The idea is to have a national sports competition for the Job Corps. There are track meets scheduled for July and August to be followed by boxing tournaments and baseball and basketball games and clinics. It's a good start.

On hand to meet with Scooter Scudero, the former Redskin back who is the committee coordinator, were some fair names in the sports world. Rocky Marciano, looking as durable as ever despite a paunch, flew in from his Fort Lauderdale, Fla., Eden to make the scene.

Tall, articulate Alex Hannum, whose Philadelphia 76ers won the National Basketball Association title and broke the monopoly of the Boston Celtics, was present. Wilma Rudolph, the triple gold medal winner of the 1960 Olympics, also attended along with her old mentor, Ed Temple, still the track coach at Tennessee A&I State University, and Redskin star Bobby Mitchell.

Payton Jordan of Stanford University, coach-designate of the 1968 U.S. Olympic track team, was there along with Col. Donald Hull, executive director of the Amateur Athletic Union, and Milton Holt, director of athletics at Idaho State University.

The group met for lunch at the Rayburn Building with Sargent Shriver, OEO director, and three Congressmen—Rep. Richard H. Fulton (D-Tenn.), Rep. Bernie F. Sisk (D-Calif.) and Rep. Frank J. Horton (R-N.Y.). Horton was president of the Rochester baseball club and also served as vice president and counsel for the International League before coming to Congress.

The Job Corps offers a unique opportunity in our affluent society when you consider that of the 38,387 young men and women enrolled in 120 Job Corps centers, 30 per cent of the group could not read when they entered the program, 60 per cent came from broken homes and 80 per cent had never had dental or medical care.

The sports committee will try to uncover some athletic talent among these young people (the Job Corps age span is from 16 to 21) and channel these skills. Marciano will conduct boxing clinics while Hannum plans to have his pro basketball players work with the corpsmen in summer programs. Perhaps there are a few potential big league baseball players among the hungry young people.

Many of the underprivileged youngsters enrolled in the Job Corps program have never had a chance. Their frustration, anger, resentment and the spiral of ignorance and unemployment have made them an incomprehensible and almost insoluble problem for the fat cats of our society.

The Job Corps, one of the most realistic pieces of legislation ever to come out of the Congress, has taken away the cripple's crutch of poverty—the dole, the handout, the welfare check.

Marciano has done considerable work in community projects since abandoning his heavyweight boxing title. He still is the soft-voiced, pleasant man he always was. He is in public relations work now and his various jobs take him all over the country.

Marciano saw that fight in Los Angeles last week when Floyd Patterson fought a draw with local favorite Jerry Quarry.

"I don't know why Patterson keeps fighting," sighed Marciano. "If Floyd keeps it up, he's going to get hurt, Patterson has lost his speed and his punch. The only thing that carries him now is his experience. He's a proud man and I guess that's why he doesn't quit. But Patterson is a loner, a strange man who seems to be constantly haunted."

Marciano doesn't see much in the present heavyweight crop, including Philadelphia's young Joe Frazier.

"Frazier seems too mechanical to me," Marciano confessed. "He's a strong boy and willing. But I'm not sure he has that certain something that makes a champion."

Shriver asked Marciano: "How many rounds do you think you could go now, Rocky?"

"About three," replied Marciano, "against anybody."

Shriver examined Marciano's huge fist and commented: "That's the first hand I ever saw with muscles."

Marciano grinned and said thoughtfully: "These hands were good to me. I was just born a little too soon. These hands would have made me a millionaire many times over."

As an afterthought, Marciano added: "I hope I find a kid in the Job Corps who wants to be a fighter. I think handling a champion is almost as much of a thrill as being one."

Tribute to the U.S.S. "Grayling" and Its Heroic Personnel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 19, 1967

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call special attention to the recent christening of the submarine, U.S.S. *Grayling* at Portsmouth, N.H.

The event has special and sentimental significance for my district, particularly to residents of Park Ridge, Ill.

The original *Grayling* operated with efficiency and heroism in waters of the South Pacific during World War II. Its skipper then was Lt. Comdr. Robert M. Brinker, a native of Park Ridge and a graduate of Maine Township High School in my district.

Christening the new *Grayling* was Mrs. Lorna Brinker Cullen, daughter of Lieutenant Commander Brinker. I want to cite the Navy Department for its thoughtfulness in remembering the *Grayling's* and her skipper's valorous service by naming Mrs. Brinker as the sponsor of the new submarine.

The original *Grayling* went to a watery grave off the Philippines almost 25 years ago. In addition to Brinker, others from my district who served on the old *Grayling*, and who were with her when it was sunk, include Manson E. North and Vice Adm. I. J. "Pete" Galantin, now Chief of Naval Material.

I wish to commend Galantin as one of our true naval heroes. He is a veteran of 38 years of Navy service; holder of the Navy Cross and three Silver Stars. Before rising to his present position, he served with distinction as projects officer of the Navy Polaris program.

The Nation owes much to such Navy men—past and present. May the luck of the ocean ride with the new *Grayling* and its crew.

Letter From William James D. Hunter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 1967

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. News & World Report on May 8, 1967, and the Washington Post of May 30, 1967, presented an exchange of poignant correspondence between Mr. William James D. Hunter, of Arlington, Va., in my congressional district, and the President of the United States, following the death of Mr. Hunter's son, 1st Lt. James D. Hunter, in Vietnam. My friend and colleague, the Honorable BURT L. TALCOTT, included the text of these letters, together with his very pertinent comments, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 1, 1967.

Mr. Hunter has written to me concerning the correspondence he has received from many Americans since publication of his letters, and I believe many of our colleagues who were interested in the points he made originally will be equally interested in the response he has received from others.

Mr. Hunter's letter reads as follows:

ARLINGTON, VA.,
June 9, 1967.

Hon. JOEL T. BROYHILL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JOEL: You know very well how I feel in regard to the way the war is being conducted in Vietnam. However, I want to go on record and say that it is time for this Country to advise the rest of the world that we are going to fight this war to win, to use every available means to protect our boys now in Vietnam and to bring them home alive.

It is time that we started to fight on our own terms and not on the terms set by Ho Chi Minh and his Communist stooges.

It is time that we destroyed every supply line in North Vietnam including Haiphong Harbor.

It is time that we stopped furnishing supplies, materials and money to any country, friend or enemy, who, in any way, trades with our enemies in North Vietnam.

It is time for us to tell everyone who uses Haiphong Harbor that we are going to destroy the Harbor as a supply line; that they have at the most twenty-four hours to remove their ships or else they must bear the consequences.

We can expect civilian casualties in any aggressive action. Stop explaining! Stop apologizing! Show our enemy that our one purpose is to end the war.

If we continue on our present course, in a few years we will be bled white and will hardly be in a position even to defend ourselves. If taking positive action in North Vietnam means that we might have to go to war with Russia or China then let's do it now while we are strong and have a chance to win. Certainly both of those countries have advertised openly that their intention is to destroy us and conquer the world, why shouldn't we believe it? Why should we continue to trade with an enemy whose avowed intention is to destroy us and who has never honored any agreement except when it was to its advantage to do so?

This was once a brave and courageous country. Are we still brave and courageous or are we becoming a cowardly nation?

We should all take heart from what has happened in the Mediterranean in the last three or four days. A brave little country, outmanned, outgunned and completely surrounded by countries whose avowed intentions were to destroy it and push its people into the sea, has carried the fight to its enemy and has shown the world what can be done when there is real will to fight to win.

Israel has shown the rest of the world that the Russians have no intention of committing their men to fight anywhere. The Russians have much more to lose in the Middle East than they have to lose in North Vietnam and if they did not fight in the Middle East, I am more convinced than ever that they will not go to war over North Vietnam.

Since my letters to President Johnson and Phil Goulding were published, I have received many many letters commenting on them and all with the exception of one or two have been in complete agreement with me. These letters show me that a vast majority of pople in this country want nothing less than a real victory in Vietnam. They want this war ended in the shortest possible time and they want their boys home alive.

I only wish there were some way to make our majority a vocal one but maybe they will act before it is too late. However, the time is now for our representatives in Congress to take all necessary steps to win a real victory in Vietnam and bring our boys home.

With kind personal regards, I am,

Sincerely,

WILLIAM JAMES D. HUNTER.

Four Marines Killed in Action in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 1967

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, four marines from Maryland were recently killed in Vietnam. I wish to commend the courage of these young men and to honor their memory by including the following article in the RECORD:

Four more Marines from Maryland have been killed in Vietnam, the Defense Department reported yesterday.

They were identified as: Lance Cpl. James J. Deasel, 20, of 3316 Garnet road, Parkville; Lance Cpl. Robert W. Mazza, 19, of 7403 Knollwood road, Towson; Lance Cpl. John J. Chase, 20, of 303 Brock Bridge road, Laurel; S. Sgt. Lawrence H. Donnell, 31, of 20 Nabell avenue, Annapolis.

Corporal Deasel, a radio man in a 1st Marine Division rifle platoon, had been in Vietnam seven months. He was killed by rifle fire while on patrol near Quang Tri June 3, according to a Defense Department telegram to his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Jerome A. Deasel, of Parkville.

Corporal Deasel graduated from Parkville Senior High School in June, 1965. He worked as an apprentice plumber for a while but joined the marines in April, 1966.

OTHER SURVIVORS

Besides his parents, Corporal Deasel is survived by four sisters, Mrs. Dorothy Polumbo, of Tucson, Arizona, Mrs. Patricia Keane, of Baltimore, Miss Linda Deasel and Miss Debra Deasel, both of Parkville; and two brothers, Michael and John G. Deasel, both of Parkville.

Corporal Mazza, a machine gunner in the 3d Marine Division, was wounded by schrapnel June 1 and died Saturday in a naval hospital at Da Nang. He had been in Vietnam 10 months.

He was a student at Towson High and left school to join the Marine Corps in March, 1966.

Other survivors include two brothers, Colin and Peter Mazza, and two sisters, Margurita and Annette Mazza, all of Towson.

Corporal Chase, who grew up in Dundalk, was a member of the 3d Marine Division and had taken part in the action at Vietnam's Hill 881.

He was killed Wednesday when he was shot in the chest near Khe Sanh, his mother, Mrs. Edward J. Chase, of Laurel, said last night.

He is survived by his parents and a brother, James Chase, of Laurel.

Sergeant Donnell, a career marine, was wounded Thursday by mine fragments and died Friday in a hospital at Da Nang.

He is survived by his mother; his stepfather, William Wright, Sr.; a brother, James Donnell; and a stepbrother, William Wright, Jr., all of Annapolis.

New Talks in Rhodesia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 1967

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, with the imminent breakup of Nigeria and signs of further disarray in other African lands it would be practical for the British and our State Department to take a careful look at the situation relative to Rhodesia. Therefore, I consider the following editorial, which appeared in the Chicago Tribune on Saturday, June 17, especially appropriate:

NEW TALKS IN RHODESIA

It is encouraging to learn that Prime Minister Wilson has sent a new emissary, a Tory, down to Rhodesia to reopen negotiations with the "rebellious" government of Ian Smith. Rhodesia is one problem that Mr. Wilson would be happy to do without, and he apparently has decided that it isn't going to go away by itself.

The economic sanctions imposed by the United Nations with such fanfare last year have probably hurt England as much as they hurt Rhodesia. It is increasingly clear that they are not going to bring Rhodesia crawling back to the colonial fold, and it is equally clear that nobody is going to provide military forces to do what the trade boycott has failed to do.

The longer the stalemate goes on, the sillier Mr. Wilson will look. And the more insistently some of his more garrulous colleagues in the commonwealth [such as India and Kenya] will accuse him of failure and demand measures more radical than the British people will support.

Obviously it is better for him to take the initiative and to seek some sort of settlement which will get him off the hook. True, Mr. Wilson insisted that his emissary, Lord Alport, will have "no authority" to back down on Wilson's refusal to grant independence as long as the white minority is in control. But this statement may have been for the sake of appearance. What is more significant is that Wilson said he would reconsider his position if there were "substantial changes in circumstances." This is a conveniently elastic phrase which can be adapted to fit pretty much what he wants it to fit. Perhaps he will fit it to some sort of settlement which will be agreeable to the Smith regime.

To prolong the Rhodesia dispute is as senseless morally as it is economically. Turning the government over to African nationalist leaders under existing conditions is not going to bring Rhodesia one inch nearer that "one-man-one-vote" utopia of which the Africans dream. On the contrary, the recurrence of revolutions in one African country after another suggests that it would bring a good deal less democracy than now exists and would forfeit Rhodesia's economic well-being in the process. The crisis-ridden world will be grateful if Lord Alport's mission succeeds.

Journal of Housing Article Details the Many "Ifs" in Duplicating the Remarkable Success of St. Louis' Low-Income Homeownership Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 16, 1967

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I have just read an excellent and comprehensive article on the low-income homeownership plan instituted in St. Louis several years ago by the Bicentennial Civic Improvement Corp., a nonprofit organization composed of dedicated and unselfish civic, religious, community, and business leaders who have changed a deteriorating neighborhood into an area of optimistic excitement for scores of poor families.

The article, written by Michael J. Mazer, deputy director, and Richard S. Granat, director of housing programs in the office of program planning, community action program, Office of Economic Opportunity, describes how the Bicentennial Civic Improvement Corp. approached and solved a multitude of social as well as economic problems in making home purchasers out of families which otherwise could never have hoped for this status.

The title of the article summarizes in a few words the bases on which the remarkable success was achieved: "St. Louis Combines Nonprofit Rehabilitation Financing With Community Organization and Social Services to Bring Homeownership to Low-Income Families."

The social services and community organization activities were and are the key to the housing plan. The program does far more than turn over a decent and habitable home to a poor family to purchase at a price it can afford; it selects the families carefully, it works with them and counsels and trains them in the skills needed to maintain a home and meet the routine or unexpected obligations of homeownership, it utilizes the resources of the entire community to provide volunter guidance and help.

THE MANY "IFS" OF A SUCCESSFUL PROGRAM OF HOMEOWNERSHIP

There were many factors which made the unique and impressive St. Louis experiment a success. The neighborhood selected had a large number of older but solidly built houses which could be purchased at an average cost of $1,500, rehabilitated without gutting the interior, and sold for $6,500 to $7,000; the selection process for the purchasers was not only careful but entailed a significant demonstration of motivation and self-discipline in the accumulation of the necessary downpayment for closing costs; the relocation problems were not difficult; and the volunteer support as well as informed and knowledgeable direction were unselfishly provided.

The experience of the St. Louis community organization which initiated this effort—

According to the two men from OEO who wrote the article for the Journal of Housing—

indicates what neighborhood corporations can do with rehabilitation programs that are effectively tied to community organization and social services. If the land and labor prices are right, as they have been in St. Louis; if community assistance is forthcoming; and if funds to hire a good staff are available, other communities can clearly follow BCIC's lead in this exciting urban direction.

RECEIVED FIRST 221(h) BELOW MARKET INTEREST RATE FHA LOAN

The Bicentennial Civic Improvement Corp. was the inspiration for the bill I introduced in February 1966, which became section 221(h) of the Federal Housing Act, which permits 3-percent FHA loans for nonprofit organizations rehabilitating older homes for sale to families whose incomes are in the same range as those eligible for public housing or rent supplements. Deservedly, therefore, BCIC received the first award under the 221(h) programs, an award which was made after this article in the Journal of Housing was written but before it appeared in issue No. 4 for 1967.

The article refers to BCIC's application for such financing assistance, so, in submitting the article for inclusion in the Appendix of the RECORD, I want to bring up to date its reference to FHA financing assistance.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure every one who is interested in finding solutions for the housing problems of our poorer families will find this article worth reading, and will be impressed, I am sure, by the vast amount of local effort and unselfish guidance and direction such a project requires in order to succeed. It is not merely a simple matter of providing financing; one must also fit the family to the responsibilities of purchasing a home.

The article referred to is as follows:

ST. LOUIS COMBINES NONPROFIT REHABILITATION FINANCING WITH COMMUNITY ORGANIZATION AND SOCIAL SERVICES TO BRING HOMEOWNERSHIP TO LOW-INCOME FAMILIES

(By Michael J. Mazer and Richard S. Granat)

NOTE.—Mr. Granat is director of housing programs in the office of program planning, Community Action Program, Office of Economic Opportunity, Washington, D.C. Mr. Mazer is deputy director of housing in the same office.)

The Bicentennial Civic Improvement Corporation (BCIC) is a neighborhood organization working on the Near North Side of St. Louis. The neighborhood, across the avenue from one of America's largest public housing projects (Pruitt-Igoe—almost 2900 units), consists of nine essentially residential blocks, containing 308 dwelling units. It is a neighborhood of brick rowhouses substantially built but deteriorated, with a number of vacant plots where houses have been demolished. There are also a number of vacant, boarded-up houses. A few industrial buildings, some of which are abandoned, dot the nine-block area.

As in many other, similar urban neighborhoods, blight and decay, once set in, have developed a momentum of their own. These influences continued unabated until 1963. In 1963, a large Negro family about to be evicted from Pruitt-Igoe came to a neighborhood parish priest for help in finding a house. From this first informal "find and fix-up" grew a larger but still informal effort to find people houses and make them habitable. Then, in late 1964, it became clear that a more systematic effort, both in acquisition and in rehabilitation procedures, would be necessary. BCIC was formed in November 1964 to meet this need.

BCIC has proceeded simultaneously with a housing rehabilitation program and with wide-ranging community services. The rehabilitation has been done in row, semi-detached, and free-standing structures. The more typical are the free-standing and semi-detached units, which have separate flats on each floor. Access to the upstairs flat is by a wooden outside staircase in the back of the building. The flats, both upstairs and down, have neither hot water nor bathtubs.

Until recently, BCIC has been buying houses one at a time, averaging about $1500 for a two-unit free-standing structure. The houses, though deteriorated, are essentially sound and it has not been necessary to gut. The usual procedure is to rip off the outside stairway, drop a new one inside, put in a new furnace and new plumbing and wiring, remove the upstairs kitchen, expand the bathroom, improve the walls and floors with spot repairs and refinishing, put on a new roof, and put up a fence outside. Improvements have run about $5000 per building, so that the average cost is $6500 to $7000 depending on building size.

The houses are comfortable and substantial. On the ground floor, there is typically a large living room, dining room, and kitchen, with two large bedrooms upstairs and upstairs inside space that can be used as an extra room. There is a toilet and washbowl downstairs and a bathroom upstairs. The ceilings are 10 to 12 feet high and the windows very large.

HOME FINANCING PLAN

Until now, the houses have been financed through a local savings and loan association and a downtown bank. The savings and loan association has given the maximum permissible 80 per cent mortgage. In order to create a 100 per cent loan, BCIC has deposited the 20 per cent downpayment, due to itself as seller, in a savings account with the association, to be held as security until 20 per cent of the 100 per cent loan is paid off. The money for these security deposits was borrowed from a downtown bank. The downpayments have thus cost BCIC the difference between their borrowing costs downtown and the interest their security deposits earn. Each deposit is returned to BCIC after 20 per cent of the mortgage is paid off, which will take about seven years.

This financing device, in effect, has provided poor people with 100 per cent financing at approximately 6 per cent over 15 years. Their only costs have been a closing fee of approximately $250. Carrying charges, taxes, and homeowner and mortgage redemption insurance have averaged about $10 per thousand, or $70 for a $7000 house. At those rates, poor people can take advantage—and have—of the opportunity to become homeowners. Sixty-two have purchased homes.

Under these arrangements, BCIC has assisted the savings and loan association in collecting its mortgage payments. Its neighborhood workers have put pressure on their neighbors when they fell behind (after Christmas, this was particularly important). Further, the savings and loan association has helped by accepting one lump sum payment for principal, interest, taxes, and insurance. Taxes and insurance payments have been held in escrow accounts until they become due, thereby freeing the new home owners from the responsibility of remembering to save money themselves for these annual expenditures. This simple device undoubtedly has been crucial in assuring that some of the residents, all in their first experience as property owners, do not default on these payments.

BCIC was unable to interest the local Federal Housing Administration insuring office in any of its prospective buyers. A Congresswoman from St. Louis, Mrs. Leonor Sullivan, did become interested, however, and modeled an amendment to the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1966 upon their experience. This amendment created FHA Section 221(h), which makes available below-market-interest-rate mortgages to nonprofit groups that rehabilitate homes and sell them to poor people. This program became operative with the President's authorization in March of the use of Federal National Mortgage Association take-out funds and BCIC is now applying for financing of its next units through 221(h). It will also refinance a number of its completed homes under 221(d)(2). Under these more liberal programs, BCIC will be able to include in the monthly payments small sums to cover the maintenance of neighborhood play and parking areas and to begin building a reserve fund for necessary major repairs, without raising monthly payments.

NEIGHBORHOOD PLANNING

BCIC's experience in rehabilitating scattered residential properties soon indicated that the future of the neighborhood depended upon additional physical planning. Because Missouri statutes permit delegation of eminent domain powers to limited-dividend private urban renewal corporations, BCIC formed a sister corporation, the Mullanphy Urban Renewal Corporation. This sister corporation received recognition from the city planning commission and had a master plan for the nine-block area prepared for it. This plan includes the conversion of dead spaces and vacant lots into play areas, the provision of parking areas, and the reversal and alteration of traffic flows to minimize rapid cross-flowing traffic. These plans have been approved by the planning commission and the traffic plan has been approved by the city fire department. Until now, however, BCIC's limited financial and administrative capabilities have made it impossible for it to utilize these eminent domain powers for further renewal of the neighborhood.

COMMUNITY ORGANIZATION

While pushing its housing-rehabilitation program, BCIC has also created the rudiments of an effective and important community organization. Its informal placement program has gotten jobs for over 200 poor people. It has developed an adult education program, stressing self-improvement, saving, and responsible citizen behavior. It has run a homemaker service project, training mothers receiving assistance under the Aid to Families with Dependent Children programs, as well as other welfare recipients, in the use of vacuum cleaners and other home cleaning devices and then placing them in jobs as domestics and cleaning women in office buildings. In cooperation with Webster College, it has begun a pre-school program. It has formed a credit union and runs a series of consumer programs that bring food into the neighborhood at lower prices and takes people to less expensive market areas. It publishes a community newspaper. It operates a neighborhood meeting place, called "Gasthaus," which includes a coffee house and an informal gathering spot for a neighborhood otherwise devoid of such facilities.

BCIC FINANCING

Until recently, BCIC administered its entire program with funds raised locally through personal and industrial contributions. A board of directors composed of prominent bankers, realtors, construction company presidents, and businessmen has provided important linkage with the larger community and has helped to generate enthusiasm and funds for the program. The largest single grant came from the Union Electric Company, which donated $33,333 on a one-to-two matching basis. The remaining money came from other corporations, businesses, charitable groups, and individuals. In all, some $100,000 was raised.

This impressive fund-raising effort was still clearly inadequate for the job to be done. It supported a skeleton paid staff of three, who performed a multitude of tasks and coordinated a large volunteer effort. Poor women in the neighborhood, for instance, served as volunteer neighborhood workers, doing crucial organizing and outreach work, for which they ought to have been paid.

OEO

This spring, BCIC was put on sounder financial footing with a $101,830 demonstration grant from the housing division of the Office of Economic Opportunity. The largest portion of this money is for staff expenses. Under the grant, the staff will be expanded to include a director of housing programs, a director of human services, a community organizer, nine part-time neighborhood workers to be recruited in the neighborhood, a construction supervisor, and the part-time services of an architect, a real estate specialist, a lawyer, and a crafts instructor. The construction supervisor and the crafts instructor will run a home repair and training school, with programs directed both at new home owners and residents who want professional training for jobs in construction trades.

In addition to the OEO grant, FHA help for rehabilitation, as mentioned earlier, is expected to be available under 221(h), with some additional funds for refinancing under 221(d)(2). Although BCIC is still in the process of making applications, it expects to finance more than 2 million dollars worth of mortgages under these programs. This amount of money wil make it possible for BCIC to exercise its eminent domain powers for the fisrt time. Until now, it simply has not had the capital to do so.

As a sidelight, BCIC's plans for picking the first eminent domain block reflects its attitude toward neighborhood participation. The neighborhood workers to be hired under the OEO grant are to be elected democratically in a neighborhood-wide election. The block that turns out the most votes will be the first one in which eminent domain acquisition and extensive rehabilitation takes place.

Resources at this level, both for administration and financing, are essential to the success of the neighborhood corporation as a delivery mechanism for low-income housing. In general, a housing and community organization program makes at least the following demands upon a neighborhood corporation: (1) maintenance and management of properties during the acquisition and rehabilitation period; (2) coordination of physical and human renewal, should relocation of present occupants be necessary; (3) supervision of a construction and financing program; (4) management of properties or supervision of mortgage collection upon completion of construction; (5) stimulation of additional community resources by providing a framework within which private enterprise may operate; (6) provision of catalytic services to complete and augment neighborhood facilities. These services are expensive and, if they are to be administered effectively, specialized and competent staff must be available.

OEO demonstration grants are supporting neighborhood corporations like BCIC for a variety of activities. The housing approach typified by BCIC is thus a variant on a general neighborhood theme, not an isolated program. This emphasis on the neighborhood is not in any way an attempt to recreate a romanticized past. Rather, it is a simple recognition that there are geographic areas that correspond to common needs and common wants. The neighborhood is, in effect, a market of consumers with needs for housing improvements, economic development programs, and social services. Because of its ability to gather on-site information and to create community enthusiasm, the neighborhood corporation may well be the best device for attacking these problems and satisfying the demands of these consumers.

JOBS, INCOME

BCIC is also demonstrating that the neighborhood development corporation can effectively utilize a housing rehabilitation program to intervene in the total cycle of poverty. By attacking an important problem like housing, which creates constant grievances among poor people, the neighborhood corporation creates enthusiasm for its work, which facilitates its expansion into other needed services and program areas. Thus, the BCIC housing rehabilitation program is also an income generation program. One of its principal by-products is the creation of jobs for local Negro contractors and craftsmen. The BCIC program has also begun to elicit resident participation in social service programs and the total result will be to strengthen its capacity as a resource for further community programs.

The impact of the program is highlighted by the data about families who have bought homes. Their mean income upon entering the program was approximately $2500 a year. About 80 per cent had been public housing residents at one time or other. For many of them, the BCIC program has been part of new success in employment as well. One family, occupying a $6500 home, had an annual income of about $3000 when it bought its home. The husband now has a better job and an income of about $5000. More dramatically, the husband in another family now occupying half of a $9100 home, had no job at all. He was in jail. He now works for the Metropolitan Sewer Department and makes about $4500 a year. All in all, residents of BCIC homes now pay the city of St. Louis more than $5000 a year in property taxes.

The BCIC program is providing useful information about the effectiveness of home ownership programs for poor people. Poor people, by and large, face demanding and unresponsive absentee landlords in the housing market. In some instances, the landlords are private persons; in others, they are public agencies. The resulting alienation from property often leads to poor maintenance efforts, at best, and outright destructiveness, at worst. The widespread vandalism of public housing projects is a symptom of these feelings, which had their most explosive expressions in the rioting of the last two summers. Home ownership is clearly one antidote for these problems.

EFFECT OF HOMEOWNERSHIP

To date, the performance of home owners under the BCIC has been impressive. BCIC has maintained careful records about home improvement and care on the part of the new owners and information to date indicates a concerned and conserving attitude toward property. No properties have been lost by default, although a very few have changed hands. There are also indications of greater job reliability and a sense of having a stake in community affairs, as measured by participation in new community programs. Although further data is necessary, the program does indicate that a home ownership program can be a major tool for intervening in the poverty cycle.

SPECIAL BCIC FACTORS

BCIC has been remarkably successful in achieving its goals. Before any general conclusions are drawn, however, some specific features of the program should be underlined, lest the experience mislead others who try to duplicate it.

1. The program has been successful in large measure because of low acquisition and rehabilitation costs. The St. Louis real estate market in general, and in this area in particular, is characterized by very low land values. Downtown elevator buildings can be bought as inexpensively as $20 a square foot. In the BCIC area, acquisition costs for single-family units have averaged $1,500 a unit. Thus the high cost of acquisition which has helped drive costs up in other rehabilitation programs, has not hampered BCIC.

2. Gutting has not been necessary. Thus rehabilitation costs themselves have been much lower than in many other programs. BCIC has been its own general contractor, which has also cut costs, but has been possible only because of the construction experience of the program director. BCIC has, however, paid prevailing wages, so that labor costs have been the same as those of other programs in St. Louis.

3. The selection process for home owners, although admitting very poor people, has been rigorous on other counts. Families have to have $250 in the credit union—to cover closing costs—before an application can be accepted and they must have legal marriages. In cases where ability to pay is uncertain, title is not transferred to the owner until payments have been made for a full year. In some instances, agreements have been made with employers to deposit paychecks directly in the credit union, where mortgage payments are deducted and the balance passed on to the individual.

4. Extensive vacancies in the BCIC neighborhood have made relocation problems insignificant thus far. In more densely populated neighborhoods, this could be an important issue. BCIC's rehabilitation has generally converted smaller units to larger ones.

If it had been necessary, or if it becomes necessary, to administer an extensive relocation program, the difficulties, of course, increase immensely.

5. BCIC has mobilized an impressive amount of volunteer time and effort. In addition to individual assistance, St. Bridget's Church, the Sisters of Loretto, Webster College, the American Jewish Congress, the League of Women Voters, and a local Jesuit group have provided volunteer help. Involvement of the larger community and the evocation of widespread support take a certain kind of skill. This is clearly possible elsewhere but has not been forthcoming on this scale in very many instances.

The BCIC experience indicates what neighborhood corporations *can* do with rehabilitation programs that are effectively tied to community organization and social services. If the land and labor prices are right, as they have been in St. Louis; if community assistance is forthcoming; and if funds to hire a good staff are available, other communities can clearly follow BCIC's lead in this exciting urban direction.

Our Government Loses a Good Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 16, 1967

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, with the resignation of Cyrus R. Vance as Under Secretary of Defense, the Government is losing one of its most dynamic and dedicated public servants. It has been my pleasure and honor to work with Mr. Vance as I served as a member of the House Armed Services Committee. He has been an enlightened spokesman for the administration and the Department of Defense. He has served his country well and to the best of his ability, and no man could do more in his lifetime. I commend to the Members of the House of Representatives the following editorials from the Washington Post and the New York Times:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, June 13, 1967]

A HARD MAN TO LOSE

Secretary McNamara often spoke of his longtime Deputy, Cyrus R. Vance, as his alter ego, and to a remarkable degree, that is how it worked. Mr. Vance was as qualified as a number two man could be to take over from his chief, either in an emergency or as a permanent replacement, if the Secretary had, for one reason or another, moved on. To a considerable extent, the two men were interchangeable and Mr. Vance was ever the faithful advocate of established policy.

But to say that he was a carbon copy of his boss—a mere echo of Mr. McNamara's views—does not do justice to this extraordinarily competent official. While serving as a back-up man, he also brought his own special talents to the Pentagon. He was especially effective on Capitol Hill; he played an important role during the crisis in the Dominican Republic, a role which required some flair for diplomacy as well as for military matters; his touch as a civilian leader of military men was adroit.

And all this he managed to do tirelessly and cheerfully despite a painful back ailment which immobilized him for long stretches during his distinguished service over nearly seven years in one of the most taxing jobs in the Government. It is easy to understand the President's "deepest reluctance" at losing him. As Deputy Secretary, he will doubtless be ably replaced by Mr. Paul H. Nitze, a tested veteran of the Washington scene. As a devoted and talented official, he is the kind of man any government can ill afford to lose.

[From the New York Times, June 16, 1967]

DEFENSE'S DEPUTY SECRETARY

"Cy" Vance—as he is universally known in Washington—is a man to whom public service is part of life. His resignation, after three and a half years as Deputy Secretary of Defense, robs the Pentagon of a warm and honest human being who served without fanfare or undue aspiration for personal advantage.

Power has exhilarated, but it has never corrupted him; he has remained always conscious of his obligations. His last months in office were marred by a back injury that caused him constant pain—a pain he bore with stoicism and good humor. He will be missed; but when he has rested and recovered we trust he will return to Government service.

Mr. Vance's successor Paul H. Nitze a man of quick mind and intellectual vitality has many years of experience in Washington to commend him—most recently as Secretary of the Navy in the midst of the undeclared war in Vietnam. He, like John T. McNaughton who succeeds Mr. Nitze as Navy Secretary, knows his way around the Pentagon.

Long Island Chapter, Appalachian District, Tennessee Society of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution, Support Legislation To Prohibit the Desecration of the Flag

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 1967

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I am honored and grateful to the Long Island Chapter, Appalachian District, Tennessee Society of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution for the resolution that they adopted on June 6, 1967, in support of my bill to prohibit the desecration of our flag.

This resolution was passed unanimously, and I feel that it is another strong indication that our people want this legislation passed without further delay.

I hope that tomorrow will see the passage of this bill, and I again urge all Members to support this measure.

The resolution follows:

"Whereas the Long Island Chapter of the Daughters of the American Revolution has as one of its primary purposes the preservation and promotion of patriotism, it was with interest and approval that the Chapter's members learned of the bill (HR 6385) introduced in the House of Representatives by Congressman James H. Quillen, proposing prohibiting the desecration of the American flag, and

"Whereas such legislation would serve the people of the United States of America as a reminder of the respect due this noble symbol of their allegiance and the proposed law should help to stop acts of abuse and contempt shown toward the American flag.

"Therefore, be it resolved that the Long Island Chapter, Daughters of the American Revolution, give Congressman Quillen a vote of confidence in this, his endeavor, to inspire more consideration for the banner which signifies the unity of our country whose brave and worthy men are ever seeking to deserve the many blessings God has bestowed upon it.

"The Chapter also appreciates Congressman Quillen's cognizance of the authority of the National Society DAR's Flag Code in his selection of a guide in meaningful interpretation of duty and allegiance to the American Flag."

The above resolution was adopted unanimously by the Long Island Chapter, Appalachian District, Tennessee Society of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution, at their meeting on June 6, 1967.

What Happens to Detente?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 1967

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, when we look back upon the cold war, we find that in every instance the first step toward detente was made by the West, and in particular, the United States. Recent developments in the Middle East are an indication of how unreceptive the Soviets have been to our continual efforts.

I commend to the attention of our colleagues an editorial which appeared in the June 8, 1967 edition of the Wall Street Journal. The editorial analyzes the effect of detente upon the Soviets, and suggests a new policy of detente for the future.

The article follows:

WHAT HAPPENS TO DETENTE?

An unfunny thing happened on the way to detente. Though some apostles of accommodation have been proclaiming an end to the cold war, the world woke up to find the Soviet Union dabbling in if not sparking the crisis that led to the Middle Eastern war.

In the long run, the most important upshot of the war will probably come in its effects on Soviet-American relations. So what attitude should the United States now take toward the Soviet Union? Specifically, should it change its policy of trying to improve East-West relations?

A great deal depends, of course, on what the Russians do next. Perhaps their belated agreement to vote for a UN cease-fire resolution will grow into a tacit willingness to promote a sound settlement. This would be a welcome sign of accommodation.

So far, though, it seems the Soviets dropped their opposition to the resolution merely to cut Nasser's losses. And they continue to press for return not to the status quo ante, but to the situation in which Nasser could enjoy the fruits of belligerence he grabbed prior to Israel's counterstroke. It still seems, in short, the Soviets are interested not in peace but in cold war maneuvering.

If events continue to bear out that conclusion, we do not think the Western drive for detente should be reversed or even necessarily stopped. But it should be slowed down.

The drive should not be stopped because in the long run no other outcome to the cold war seems as hopeful. The hot opponents of detente never suggest what alternative the United States should hope to promote instead; neither Armageddon nor permanent hostility at the brink appeals to us. The best hope is that the Communist powers will gradually evolve into something less threatening, and conceivably careful attempts at mutual accommodation may help promote such evolution.

The drive should be slowed down if the current Soviet attitude persists, though, so that its most ardent supporters will have a little time to absorb the lesson of Soviet policy in the crisis so far. It is still not apparent, at least, from the public reports available, whether Russia deliberately unleashed Nasser or merely reacted to the opportunity he created. Certainly it has given strong diplomatic support to Nasser's provocativeness, and its naval movements were pointed.

The advocates of detente should take note. Too often they reason that since accommodation is a sound eventual goal, the U.S. must rush to take any step proposed in its name. Indeed, we already hear arguments that the U.S. must proceed with such steps as the outer space treaty and liberalization of East-West trade despite the latest "aberration" in Soviet behavior.

We think each of these steps must be weighed on its individual merits; they should be neither rejected nor accepted merely for the sake of detente. In the meantime the lessons of Soviet involvement in the current crisis are relevant in two ways.

Regardless of what happens next, for one thing, Soviet actions so far demonstrate that Russian leaders have few inhibitions about heating up a crisis when they conceive that it suits their purpose. Regardless of how far the movement toward detente proceeds, the Communists are likely to retain a residual enmity that can break out at any time.

That being so, the United States must not allow the urge for some symbolic agreement to outweigh the necessity of protecting its own national interests against an outbreak of Russian hostility. Do we really have adequate protection, for instance, against the Russians' secretly breaking agreements on nuclear weapons in outer space?

Any realistic hopes for detente, for a second thing, rest on Soviet recognition that in a nuclear age their own interests dictate a relaxation of tension. Yet if the United States presses its eagerness to accommodate despite provocation, the Soviets will naturally conclude that being provocative involves nothing to lose and just possibly something to gain.

Not only would that eventuality lead to stormy international politics, but it might have a profound effect on the shape of any detente that eventually might merge. To reach anything like equity in the compromises necessary to a detente, America's attitude must be related fairly closely to the other side's willingness to reciprocate with its own steps to reduce tension.

With regard to Soviet relations, then, the lesson of the Middle East crisis so far is that the United States' posture must be truly flexible. It must be willing to take initiatives at certain times. But when the Soviets precipitate trouble, the U.S. must be equally willing to back off and trim its enthusiasm.

Clean-Air Needs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD D. McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 1967

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, one of the axioms of democratic government is: Public interest yields public action.

Testimony to this was the International Forum on Air Pollution sponsored by Niagara University, Niagara Falls, N.Y.

This conference evidenced support of measures to control air pollution. It also showed what a high degree of knowledge and expertise small but interested groups possess in grappling with this problem of international importance.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following editorial from the Buffalo Evening News, commending this forum, in the RECORD:

CLEAN-AIR NEEDS

The first of a series of international air pollution forums to be sponsored by Niagara University and the State Senate was an excellent demonstration of how smaller universities can make significant contributions to public enlightenment and community service.

While the forum reached no final answers to the growing menace of contaminated air, speakers underscored a number of important needs.

For example, though Erie County's current clean-air efforts won merited praise, support was voiced for establishing a single air pollution control agency for Erie and Niagara Counties. This certainly should be studied as a logical extension of metropolitan co-operation in a region over which air pollutants blow without regard for county boundaries.

The forum also heard appeals for support of proposed legislation in Washington to establish federal emission standards in various major industries.

The News believes that as much as possible of anti-pollution control and enforcement should remain in state and local hands; we are increasingly impressed, however, with the argument that a region like the Niagara Frontier is economically handicapped in trying to impose higher emission standards on its industries, present and future, than those prevailing in many other states and localities. Certainly, the danger of runaway industries seeking pollution havens in planning new investment should not be discounted.

"Strong state and local standards—essential to pollution control—cannot be effective if neighboring states and cities do not have strong standards of their own," said President Johnson in a message to Congress last Jan. 30. "Nor can such local standards gain the support of industry and the public, unless they know that plants in adjoining communities must also meet standards at least as strict."

There are signs that some major industries may, in fact, prefer a national approach. Thus Congressional Quarterly recently cited "the reported willingness of many industries to accept uniform federal emission standards as a lesser evil than a bewildering complexity of state and local regulations which could upset the competitive balance, within an industry, by requiring more pollution control equipment in some sections of the country than in others."

At the same time, there should be tax incentives to encourage and speed the installation of air (and for that matter water) pollution control facilities by industry. Administration opposition to proposals granting such induceemnts is unfortunate.

A special problem for the Niagara Frontier is to what extent international controls may be required for air pollution passing between the U.S. and Canada along the Niagara River. This subject would seem a fruitful one for further exploration at coming sessions of the Niagara University forum series now so well begun.

India Speaks From an Almost Fatal Madness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. MOSS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1967

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, all Americans have great sympathy for the almost insoluble problems confronting the nation of India. Each of us recognizes the heavy burden borne by Prime Minister Indira Gandhi. The American people have done more than merely evidenced their understanding and their sympathy; they have given unselfishly of their resources in an effort to aid this unfortunate nation. I am confident we will continue doing so, but one would expect a measure of reciprocity from the Government of India at the very least. That we have not had;

and I commend to my colleagues the following editorial from the Sacramento Bee of June 14, 1967:

India Speaks From an Almost Fatal Madness

India has seemed to suffer from self induced hallucinations ever since it attained its independence in World War II. Its neutrality on the side of communism has been nothing short of a compulsive death wish.

This pathological state of the Indian mind never was more vividly symptomized than in the recent attack by India's Prime Minister Indira Gandhi in her hysterical blast at the United States and her praise of Egyptian President Gamal Abdel Nasser as "a force for progress".

She lamented what she depicted to be the niggardly aid of the U.S. Yet this aid has amounted to nearly $10 billion since World War II. America has done more to assist independent India than any other nation in the world in the last 20 years.

Minister Gandhi turns on America, however, in a pur-blind disregard of the record, incensed mainly because the US also has aided Pakistan, which, she says, has used some of the American assistance to kill Indians.

Yet India might have sought peaceable resolution of its troubles with Pakistan. Indira Gandhi disregarded the truth that US aid to Pakistan is in line with well known American policy to support in some measures those nations which resist communism.

Her encomiums for Nasser are even more perverse and hallucinatory. Nasser "a force for progress". This "progressive" man has just led the Arab world to its worst and most humiliating defeat at the hands of Israel.

His economy is a mess and the masses, poor and without real political freedom, face possible famine.

Both abroad and at home Nasser has been the very epitome of undemocratic backwardness. Still this well educated daughter of a great and wise father finds one of the most disastrous and autocratic national leaders to be a "force for progress".

And at the same time she bites the hand of the nation which has given her country enough to rebuild 50 American cities. Is this the rabies of racism?

Premier Ky's War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 1967

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, the New York Times for June 16 carries an editorial which should make our policymakers pause and think. Premier Ky of South Vietnam has decided that U.S. troops should be increased in Vietnam from the present level of 462,000 to 600,000. Who is making the escalation decisions anyway? It is time to deescalate this undeclared war and negotiate a settlement.

The editorial follows:

[From the New York Times, June 16, 1967]

Premier Ky's War?

Premier Nguyen Cao Ky of South Vietnam has pronounced judgment: 600,000 American troops are needed to win the war in Vietnam. He calmly, and with apparent confidence, made his desires known a few hours after the Pentagon announced that Secretary of Defense McNamara, Under Secretary of State Katzenbach and others are flying to Saigon Sunday.

The United States seems on the verge of one more major escalation of the Vietnamese conflict. General Westmoreland's recent trip to the United States, coupled with seemingly inspired reports from Washington and Saigon, reinforces the belief that an American force of 462,000 men plus other forces at sea and in Thailand is considered insufficient.

All this even though President Johnson said again and again in his 1964 electoral campaign that he had no intention of sending "American boys 9,000 or 10,000 miles away from home to do what Asian boys ought to be doing for themselves."

Unfortunately, Premier Ky's soldiers have not even shown the determination needed to defend their own people in the pacification program. As a result the defensive work as well as most of the offense has had to be taken over by American soldiers. This is aside from the fact that the pacification campaign has, to date, been a failure; its promised revitalization has not occurred.

It would stretch credibility to detach Premier Ky's figure of 600,000 American soldiers from the fact that he is a candidate for the Presidency of South Vietnam and has been conducting an open drive for the post even before the official opening of the campaign. He is apparently running on a program of outpromising any other candidate, with American troops and supplies as his promissory notes.

Escalation on the ground and in the air has merely extended the scope of the war and the casualties without bringing any discernible progress toward an end of hostilities. The sole effect of each increase in forces is to provide the imeptus for yet another increase and multiply the risk of world holocaust.

The quest for a military victory in Vietnam has perhaps been spurred by the speed of the Israeli victory in the Mideast. If so, it would be well to consider the enormous and baffling problems that now face Israel, the Arab states and the great powers as a result of a military success that the United States could not at this late stage duplicate in Vietnam.

The longer the Vietnam war goes on the greater the costs on both sides, the more intractable the obstacles to a negotiated settlement will become. In any case Marshal Ky should be told that the war is not being fought to advance his political career.

Destination Nowhere

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 1967

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the plight of the American merchant fleet is one of the real tragedies of our time. I do hope the Congress will be motivated to do something about this problem. In the meantime, I should like to insert in the RECORD today an excellent article on the subject written by Mr. Mel Barisic, who is vice president of the National Maritime Union of America.

The article follows:

Destination Nowhere—Odyssey of a Panamanian Rustbucket

(By Vice President Mel Barisic)

The problems we had a short time ago regarding the SS Good Eddie and the SS Good Willie were bad enough. But that's not all. There is also the problem of American shipowners and American-built ships registered under the runaway flags, foreign-crewed, which are starving their crews, abusing them, stranding them and abandoning them all over the world. And these ships are carrying U.S. government relief cargoes!

Our NMU representative Dave Smith who is stationed in the Philippines had an assignment in Guam and brought to my attention a real atrocity story about a ship named the SS Galveston Navigator.

As a Union official, I have heard many sad stories about runaway shipowners but I think our membership and government officials should be made aware of the story of this present day blood ship.

The SS Galveston Navigator, owner by the Galveston SS Co., left Orange, Texas on November 17, 1966 with 4,700 tons of U.S. Government foreign aid rice destined for Saigon. She was under Panama flag, commanded by a Greek-American captain, Lee Tamerlane. The crew consisted of 32 men from Ecuador, Panama, Mexico, Columbia, England and Honduras.

A short distance out in the Gulf, the freighter developed engine trouble. She limped along and finally arrived at Panama after 9 days at sea. There, five crew members deserted the ship because of miserable conditions and the company's refusal to pay decent wages and overtime. No attempts were made to repair the ship's engines at Panama and the vessel departed again enroute to Honolulu, minus her bosun, oiler, radio operator and 2 messmen.

Engine trouble continued to plague the crew throughout the trip to Honolulu. When the ship docked at Honolulu after 30 days at sea, the chief engineer, first and second mates all deserted the ship. According to crew members who remained on board, the officers decided the fregihter was no longer seaworthy, and were disgusted at the company's indifference to their problems.

Captain Tamerlane, evidently believing it was important to deliver the cargo to Saigon, decided to continue on to the Philippines. The ship sailed out of Honolulu and the engines broke down again. They had a broken down ship and were seriously shorthanded. But, working day and night on the machinery, they were able to crawl into Wake Island.

Seven more of the crew deserted there. Now they had only half a crew but the Galveston Navigator set out again for the Philippines. Four days out of Wake, the engines broke down completely. She drifted helpless for 12 days and it was not until she drifted within 300 miles of Guam that the owners called for a tug to go to her aid. She was towed into Guam February 1.

Tied up at the docks at Apra Harbor, two more members of the crew deserted. In a statement to the Pacific Journal, a Guam newspaper, the ship's chief cook said: "We, the crew of the Galveston Navigator are very unhappy here. All of us would like to get back to our home towns. We don't want to continue with this ship because we don't trust the company. We are here without wages and also we are almost out of food, we are here with this rotting cargo and we almost cannot stand the smell of it."

According to the men they ran out of drinking water and the Captain himself, out of his own pocket, had purchased enough water at Guam to last for about 24 hours.

NMU has been busy on the case. We demanded an investigation of the situation with the object of protecting the crew and also the good name of the United States. Curiously, no official inquiry has yet been made as to the condition of the ship's cargo which consists of United States relief cargo—Agriculture Department or AID—for Vietnam. The Attorney General at Guam has wired the Department of Agriculture and Interior about the situation.

The owners of this ship have abandoned it. According to reports, they are three fast operators from Texas who obviously don't know anything about ships and don't give a damn about seamen but who know a good thing when they see it. Maybe the word is going around Texas that there are easier pickings in U.S. relief shipments than in oil. The owners are not recognizing any responsibility either to the crew, the ship or the government.

In the meantime charitable organizations in Guam and the port are doing what they can. The commercial port authority there is continuing to supply the freighter with water, even though the operators of the vessel have refused to pay even the regular port fees.

The skipper said the company has sent him just $1,000 of the $5,000 he requested for payment of debts and purchase of provisions. The company is not even forwarding the crew their personal mail.

Fortunately, the local chapter of the American Red Cross stepped in and furnished the poor, abandoned crew with essentials such as food, water and clothing.

This, brothers and sisters, is just to give you an idea of what is happening and how some of these fly-by-night American shipowners under runaway flags are making bundles of money on U.S. relief cargoes, sweating their fat profits out of the hides of foreign nationals.

If this is an example of the American free enterprise system, we may as well give up in the world. The agencies in Washington such as Maritime Administration, Labor Department, Coast Guard and other government agencies must make sure this kind of thing can not happen with the relief we give to foreign governments. These profiteering runaway operators are doing more damage to our country's cause around the world than a thousand communist saboteurs.

There are two things that should be done to stop this rotten racket. One, more U.S. relief cargoes should be shipped in U.S. ships manned by U.S. documented seamen. Two, any foreign operator, before he is permitted to carry any of this cargo, must prove that his ship is seaworthy, that it has decent working and living conditions for the crew and that the owners are financially responsible. They should have to post a bond to guarantee the crew will get their wages, transportation, etc.

This is the least our country can do to make sure American interests are protected in the billions of dollars of relief we send around the world. We should be ashamed to have anything to do with some of the rustbuckets carrying our cargo. We want the racketeering and profiteering in government aid cargoes investigated and stopped.

Speech by Robert W. Galvin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 19, 1967

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I had the high privilege of attending the annual banquet of the Air Force Communications and Electronics Association recently at which Mr. Robert W. Galvin, president of Motorola, Inc., was the principal speaker.

Dr. Galvin is a successful industrialist who is concerned with the future of this country and the people who go to make it up.

He has probed deeper than most into the thinking of the young men who will be the leaders of this country in the generations immediately ahead of us. I commend his speech to you and place it as part of these remarks in the RECORD at this point:

Throughout this scholastic year, I have engaged in a stimulating intellectual exercise. This exercise was in the form of a letter exchange dialogue with six selected college students. The subject of the dialogue was the students' attitude towards business and my response. Each of the six dialogues were printed in the student's campus paper plus others. In total, we published in some 30 of the larger student campus newspapers at least twice monthly throughout the year.

Early in our printed exchange I invited our readers to correspond directly with me. As time passed, many hundreds of students wrote extensively expressing their convictions about business in addition to personal and social values. Scores of professors took up the dialogue as well. Almost all were answered personally.

The relevance of this experience related to my talk today is that it provided me a firsthand written insight into the attitudes and viewpoints of many students and instructors regarding certain claims and questions they pose.

The overriding assertion voiced by a large percentage of today's youth is their claim of a greater desire for individual involvement in the achievement of higher ideals than prior generations. I hope that this would always be true—that each new generation could enthuse to that claim. Although the gradient of degree voiced by certain of the more zealous of my correspondents may not be, in reality, as great as they believe it to be, I do not question some higher sense of the idealism they espouse.

The thrust of my comments today are directed to related questions. The first is posed by many of the students themselves in their letters to me. After laying claim to a desire for greater personal involvement, they ironically inquire, "How can an individual be involved in, be identified with, be recognized for his personal contribution to the achievement of higher ideals in a society that is so big and so complex?" They point to the pressure of population, the intensity of urban life, the contest among races, the sophistication of technology, the impersonality of institutions and organizations, and the babble of world affairs and ask, "How can the individual be effective in such a society?" They plead that the increasing size and complexity is forcing greater constraints to which the individual must conform.

To respond we must ask and answer other questions. What is society?

Society is a grand and dynamic system of people and institutions—grand because of its size and order—dynamic as a result of innovation and procreation plus the recurring exercise of open options and free choices. It is divided into sub-systems like government, education, medicine, each in varying states of maturity. It is made up of these sub-systems such as business, which provides goods and services and creates the wealth that permits us to afford government that referees, education that trains, medicine that cures, agriculture that feeds, military that defends, etc. Each is good. Each is essential. Each is human. Each can be improved.

Certain of my correspondents pointed to the imperfections and the complexity of society, and then appeared to turn in a spirit of rejection. Many left more than just an impression that they "wanted out", or at least meant to circumvent or avoid the principal elements and responsibilities of the system in quest for their ideals. Yet, it is with that society and in that society that we as individuals must live and work. We can desire independence, but should not cast ourselves aimlessly adrift. Further, if we are to improve it, we can do so only from within its structure. So, as a place to start we must accept the reality that it is within the framework of society that we must and can mold our ideals.

Although it is incidental to the balance of my theme, it is in this system via its many institutions such as churches, clubs, associations, corporations, agencies, etc., that there exists more opportunity for individual recognition than is either realized or comprehended by those who have yet to set both feet firmly into its arena.

As well they should, our correspondents voiced their greater interest in the high ideals of peace, prosperity, justice, and freedom. One can only applaud the desire of the emerging intellects for involvement in the accomplishment of these ultimate ideals. But here I wish to interject a question of my own as a companion to the students' question. "Do those of us who hold to ideals do an adequate job of selecting the right mix and balance of ideals for which to strive? Further, we are seeking by direct effort to achieve an ideal which can also be accomplished better by purposefully selecting ideals that indirectly but more surely may lead to the ultimate?"

As an approach to these questions, I request that you accept my simple description of who we are as human beings. I suggest that we are four persons in one. We are first a solitary person. Next, a family person. Third, a community person. And finally, a useful person.

As a useful person, we have a duty to serve. We must work to contribute to those about us and support ourselves. Our psychological make-up is such that we gain self-satisfaction only as we perform a real duty. Indeed, this is the very point that the students press so hard. They have this sense of duty. They do want to work to make contributions to those around them, and they are struggling to find a place where their work will achieve a worthy impact. But, too many limit their search only to those positions at the direct interface to the obvious problems—the Peace Corps, the doctor who ministers to the sick etc. These are most laudable selections and objectives. However, in the student's search, too few have yet to recognize or are unwilling to acknowledge, the essentiality of every function and sub-system in our society. The vision and tolerance to see the interdependence of one to the other, and the interrelationsihp of each to the achievement of the big ideals is blurred.

Let us take as an example of these higher ideals victories in the war on crime. My associates and I, as useful people, do not have to wrestle a thief to the ground in order to feel a sense of personal involvement in the ideal of law enforcement. We feel a keen sense of pride and satisfaction each time we ship a high quality two-way police radio system to a local constabulary. We know that our effort and our product is important, just as is the toil of the courageous men who pound the police beats of America.

Some time ago business friends of mine were having breakfast in a crowded Washington hotel. Typically, this is a harried and hectic experience. They were not seated long before they came to realize that there was something very different about this experience. The waitress who was handling their station had a most pleasant demeanor. Her service was impeccable. Her conduct in good grace and good taste. When it appeared that a brief lull developed in her workload, one of my friends called her over and said, "Miss, we want you to know that we consider your service superb, and we cannot help but ask do you have a philosophy about your work?" She replied, "As a matter of fact, I do. You see, I am a widow, must work to support myself, and I know of no other profession that I can follow. For a long while I saw nothing but drudgery in my outlook. Finally, I got to thinking who am I serving?

I got to thinking that most of the men are away from home, possibly a bit lonesome, maybe even a bit scared at the prospect of having to deal with their government or congress because what they are doing is so important that they must not fail. I got to thinking that some of these men are doing something very important for me through our government. Maybe if I could start their day a bit more pleasantly, relieve their anxiety, they might get their job done a little easier and a little better, and we would all be the beneficiaries. So I tried it. I really don't know if I have helped anybody along these lines or not, but you know what, I certainly enjoy my work more and I guess that is little enough repayment."

There are few among us who would select refuse collection as a career. Yet, no group of workers is more involved in the ideals of sanitation, community health, or the cosmetics of our countryside. So it is, through every agency of government or institution in the private sector, each is directly involved. We need only open our eyes and minds to the interdependence of each to the whole.

But within the ideal of being useful, to what degree have our students, or for that matter others of our citizenry, adopted the ideals referenced by James Russell Lowell who said: "Being forced to work, and forced to do your best, will breed in your tolerance, self-control, diligence, strength of will, content, and a hundred others virtues. . . ."? I ask, where then is our sense of high ideals if we do not strive for these virtues as well? And how do we expect to earn them, except by earning them? From some of my private correspondents I either heard directly or gained the impression that hard work was for the drones and computers and not for one of their training. My guess, and hope, is that their views will change for if they select their mix of ideals well, they must certainly include a dedication to effort, perserverance and perfection on the job.

And then we are a community person. Yes, if we choose to be a physician very directly involved in the ministrations to the ill and the saving of life, we may also serve in other ways. Membership on the school board, active on professional committees, fund raising for an inner-city charity, or efforts in behalf of the local garden club to replant a corner of the village park. As a community member, you will deal with neighbors near and far. What then about those basic virtues of courtesy, friendship, respect for the law, loyalty, and patriotism, each of which is itself the basis of a high ideal. We have used, and maybe abused, old sayings like, "If everyone sweeps in front of his house, the whole village will be clean." Yet, within such statement is an ideal that leads to the accomplishment of the grand design.

We are a family person. Among the listing of the almost countless high ideals manifest by my correspondents, I cannot recollect one mention of family ideals. In one sense it is understandable for we were basically absorbed in the questions of business as a career and its role in society. Yet, one would think that out of many hundreds of letters calling for social responsibility, an occasional reference would be made to the ideals of family life because the family is the basic unit of our society. All too few people have adequate ideals when it comes to family life. The broken homes that have shattered the existence of so many millions are violent testimony to this.

It is as a family person that you will be required to display the most direct personal involvement.

So what about the ideals of selflessness, thoughtfulness, and love? Are not they the kind of virtues to which we seek perfection—the ideals in which one can become dearly involved and achieve to a greater measure than the prior generations?

Finally, we are a solitary person. As such we are first a spiritual being, a creature of God with a soul to be saved. There is enough of an ideal associated with that to conjure for a whole lifetime. But if that is not enticing, one can still enthuse to his role as a separate being who must live with himself. Each of us must meet ourselves in the privacy of our own home where we will feel, or fail to feel, self-respect based on our own efforts, standards, and contributions.

To enjoy satisfaction of self-respect, we must be the personification of honesty and morality. I have focused on the ideal of morality with a few of my private correspondents, a couple of whom have bit back and said, "But, wait, that affects my freedom!" To some freedom is license to do whatever the individual chooses. These students seem to forget that the freedom to which they refer is also a function of the free will given to them by God to choose between right standards and wrong standards. We don't have to waste much time struggling over a difference of what is right and wrong. The Ten Commandments have stood the test of time and there is rather general agreement on what most of them mean. Why not a personal dedication to the personal involvement in the achievement of the highest ideals of the application of these standards?

Certain of the personal ideals that I have referenced like duty, hard work, excellence, thoroughness, courtesy, friendship, respect for law, loyalty, patriotism, selflessness, thoughtfulness, love, honesty, morality, and the saving of one's soul may not be exciting, but they are the root and the way to all other ideals. We must be committed to the preservation of such values or the individual's role is surely doomed.

I think we can safely single out freedom as one of the paramount issues and ideals of this generation. Here I use the term in its national connotation—the freedom endowed us by our Constitution, not the license to do any irresponsible act. If today's generation wishes to preserve and enhance that freedom, then it must embrace the truths that have come down through the ages. One of the earliest observers of the American scene, DeTocqueville, proclaimed over 125 years ago that a free country cannot exist without a high level of morality and a strong sense of order. It may be that the student who demonstrates for freedom contributes to its existence, but it is no less true that the student who is the living example and proponent of morality and order contributes as much, or more.

I am sure that you have learned that the person who gets up in the morning and says, "This day I will seek happiness", is not likely to find it except by coincidence. Yet, the next day when he arises and says, "This day I will do my duty courteously, loyally, purposefully", it is likely, if he fulfills his promise, that he will go to bed happy. So may it be in our individual desires to contribute to the achievement of the big ideals of peace, prosperity, justice, and freedom. Although it is often desirable and possible to confront them directly, it is certainly true also that they are unattainable in the absence of allegiance to personal ideal values.

Sometimes I wondered when I read the private letters from particular students why they were such strong advocates of the public ideals, while in that same missile they made other deprecating references to those who seem to be performing an ordinary duty. I wondered if they selected these large and virtually unobtainable goals because they cannot be personally tested by the achievement or the failure to achieve these ideals. When on a few occasions I would press back at these certain students regarding their ideals on private virtues, I would occasionally hear a rationale to avoid. Could it be that they are unwilling to be personally put to the test and that their idealism is not as deep-rooted as they voiced?

The personal ideals, of which there are many, are those against which each of us can be personally tested and can be directly involved. It is through them that we can come closer to the accomplishment of the ideals of peace, prosperity, justice, and freedom. Indeed, how can we expect to achieve public ideals if we cannot first achieve private ideals?

Ideals are perishable. The fact that there is a continuity between the ideals of yesterday and today is not the result of their inherent immortality. Each generation must redefine and recommit to their perseverance and enhancement.

So it is not a question of whether there can be greater personal involvement in the achievement of high ideals. Such opportunities are unbounding. It is a matter of selection and recommitment to the hard ideals—particularly those that are truly personal which will permit each new generation to out achieve the last.

An Alternative to Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1967

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, Alan Cranston, former controller of the State of California, has written an outstanding article about politics and government. The article, which was printed in the Los Angeles Times on May 22, 1967, is concerned with what the attitudes of the voters, students, and teachers are toward "politicians." The general opinion seems to be that all politicians are bad and are out to get your money. Mr. Cranston repudiates this idea successfully in his article. I would like to quote from the article:

> It is through politics that the people of a democracy exercise their options, and make their decisions.

Mr. Cranston is a man of high morals, integrity and stature. His outstanding record of service to the people of California proves his sincerity and dedication to government and the welfare of the people. I highly recommend that my colleagues read this article and under unanimous permission place it in the RECORD at this point:

THERE IS AN ALTERNATIVE TO POLITICS—DICTATORSHIP

(By Alan Cranston)

A matron in San Francisco refused to let her garage be used as a polling place because, she told city hall, "Voting attracts the wrong kind of people."

A California schoolteacher conducted a poll in her fourth grade classroom, and a majority of the children used words like bad, dirty and dishonest to describe politicians.

A Stanford professor defined politics as the art of getting money from the rich and votes from the poor on the pretext of protecting each from the other.

These and other signs and tokens indicate that politicians may presently rank somewhere above hippies but below teen-agers in popularity in California.

Mr. Gallup keeps finding the same sort of thing nationally. According to one of his polls, most parents hope their children won't go into politics because, they think, it's too corrupt, and politicians lack opportunity, security and prestige.

Mr. Webster of dictionary fame has his doubts, too. He defines a politician as one versed in the art or science of government. But he adds an optional definition, "One primarily interested in political offices from selfish or other narrow, usually short-run interests."

The belief that politics amounts to little more than the conduct of public affairs for private advantage leads to the oft-heard chant: "Let's take politics out of government."

It seems to me that's like saying we should take oxygen out of the air, or the engine out of the automobile. There are many nonpolitical governments in this world of ours. They are usually called dictatorships.

I once heard a member of the anti-Nazi underground describe the Hitler regime as one under which everything not prohibited was compulsory. The first step in achieving this state of affairs came when the Nazi government outlawed politics, banning all parties except the Nazi party. The Communist governments of Russia and China did likewise, outlawing all opposition parties and politicians.

It is through politics that the people of a democracy exercise their options, and make their decisions.

All sorts of forces play a part in the process. The great religions of our world play a major role. So do concepts of philosophy, ethics and morality. So do uses of education, science and sociology. But after these and countless other forces have made their contributions, the final decisions are reached through the intricately intertwined and inextricably interlocked processes of politics and governments.

The decisions are influenced by those who don't vote, for they delegate responsibility to those who do. The decisions are made by those who vote, and by those for whom they vote. The latter, for fleeting moments, occupy the places of power. But their authority lies always in the hands of the people.

The politicians and the parties present to the people their programs, policies, and personalities. The people are free to pick and choose among them. If they choose unwisely, they can always throw the rascals out at the next election.

And so when the people decry politics and politicians, they decry themselves.

By no means are all politicians seedy and selfish. I know many in both parties of strong convictions and unimpeachable integrity. Many are constructive and creative. Yet, it's obvious that there's room for vast improvement—and it's up to the people themselves to make politics more responsive to their needs and hopes and dreams.

Never in all history has it been more important for the people to know their own power, and to exercise it wisely. For ours is the first generation of man possessed of the power to wipe out ignorance, poverty, hunger, disease—and war. Ours is also the first generation of man possessed of the power to wipe out the human race.

The chóice is ours, and it will be made through politics and government.

Middle East Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 1967

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I should like to include in the RECORD three letters written to the editor of the Washington Evening Star on June 10, 1948, June 19, 1948, and June 5, 1967, by a friend and constituent of mine, Mr. Sidney Koretz, of Arlington, Va.

I commend these letters to the attention of my colleagues, as I feel they are both interesting and thought-provoking, and reflect a full understanding of the Middle East situation in 1948 and at the present time:

ARLINGTON, VA.

SIR: Ambassador Arthur Goldberg points out that the United States has been "even-handed." The U.S. called the Security Council meeting in the Suez crisis of 1956 to deal with an Israeli-British-French attack on Egypt and voted against its traditional friends. Last November the U.S. joined in a Security Council vote to censure Israel for an attack on Jordan.

This may be a good time to recall that on July 15, 1958, the U.S. had to send Marines into Lebanon to defend Arab against Arab. Lebanon had formally accused the United Arab Republic before the Security Council of instigating and aiding a rebellion against the government. On July 14 a seemingly pro-Egyptian coup overthrew the Iraqi Government, assassinating the King and the Prime Minister.

When the Lebanese Government asked for help, the answer from the United States was prompt. Said President Eisenhower: "If it is made an international crime to help a small nation maintain its independence, then indeed the possibilities of conquest are unlimited."

SIDNEY KORETZ.

JEWISH CLAIM TO PALESTINE

To the EDITOR OF THE STAR:

The assumption by "Internationalist" in a letter appearing in The Star of June 5 that American policy with regard to Palestine is based on "blind advice" is highly presumptuous, though his call for more education on the subject is not to be gainsaid. Equally presumptuous is his reference to the British Declaration of November 2, 1917, the so-called Balfour Declaration, "in favor of the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people" as nothing more than a "beau geste." In effect, this is mockery of the judgment of the highest international authority, namely the League of Nations, which on July 24, 1922, formally approved the Palestine Mandate embodying this Declaration, with the concurrence of all the enlightened nations of the world.

Are we to understand that President Woodrow Wilson was simply ignorant when he approved of the Balfour Declaration, and added, as reported in the New York Times of March 3, 1919, that he was "persuaded that the Allied nations, with the fullest concurrence of our Government and people, are agreed that in Palestine shall be laid the foundations of a Jewish commonwealth"? On September 21, 1922, President Harding signed a joint resolution of Congress expressing support of the Jewish national home in Palestine.

Our "Internationalist" friend thinks that he disposes of Jewish "rights" in Palestine simply by referring to the fact that the Jews lived there over 2,000 years ago, while maintaining "the Arabs were there not only before the period of Jewish control, but for centuries after were in uninterrupted possession." But what are the facts?

THE ROMAN CONQUEST

The Jews were the indubitable sovereigns of the land for more than 1,000 years, until the destruction of the Jewish state by the Romans in the year 70. Palestine never has since constituted an independent political entity. The Romans perished without leaving a legal successor. The Arabs, who conquered it in 634, remained in possession for a relatively short time, when it passed successively to the rule of the caliphs of Damascus, the caliphs of Bagdad, the Tulinide governors of Egypt, back to the caliphs of Bagdad, then to the Egyptian Ikshidi princes, and finally to the Caliphs of Cairo. After 1071 Palestine was subjected to non-Arab conquerors, the Kurds, the Crusaders, the Mamelukes, and finally the Turks. In 1923, by the Peace Treaty of Lausanne, the Turks surrendered their rights to the Allied Powers.

According to the principles of international law, the Jews never have lost their rights. Although the Romans conquered the country, international law admits the legality of conquest subject only to certain conditions. One of htese conditions is that the conqueror must have been "in continuous and undisturbed possession" for a considerable time but that "as long as other Powers kept up protests and claims, the actual exercise of sovereignty is not undisturbed." (Oppenheim, International Law, 5th edition, London, 1937, Volume I, Page 456.) Since the Jews were conquered after bitter resistance and continuously, by word and act, have asserted their claim, we must conclude that the Roman conquerors never established a clear title to Palestine. The old Jewish claim, moreover, has received renewed vitality through the Balfour Declaration and the Palestine Mandate of the League of Nations, the Preamble of which states: "Recognition has thereby (the Balfour Declaration) been given to the historical connection of the Jewish people with Palestine and to the grounds for reconstituting their national home in that country."

The well supported Jewish claim could be overcome only if the Arab claim proved to be a stronger one. But this is not the case. The Arab claim by conquest is imperfect for a number of reasons. No Arab state can pretend to be the legal successor of those who conquered Palestine in 634. The Arabs ruled Palestine for a relatively short period (437 years). During the past 877 years, i.e., from the year 1071, there has been no Arab rule in Palestine. Moreover, unlike the Jews, the Palestine Arabs never struggled for their independence; they submitted to every conqueror and thus acquiesced in their domination. Even in 1917, when the Arabs of the desert revolted against Turkish rule, the Palestine Arabs took no action and the majority continued to fight for the Turks.

ARAB RIGHTS DISPUTED

It is a myth that the Arabs were in uninterrupted possession of Palestine for centuries. The present-day non-Jewish inhabitants of Palestine are not in the main the descendants of the ancient inhabitants of the land. They are a highly mixed group continuously replenished from the tribes of the Arabian desert; the Greeks, Romans and Crusaders have made their contribution to the racial make-up of the Holy Land; in modern times the Turkish governors and Egyptian conquerors introduced large contingents of foreign soldiers and settlers. An analysis of available statistics has brought an estimate that in 1882 no more than about 106,000 settled Moslems had more than a half-century's connection with the country. Calculations have been made showing that only some 228,000 descendants of the 1882 Moslem settled population were living in Palestine at the outbreak of World War II. It should be noted that waves of immigration of Arabs from neighboring countries were prompted by the fact that a higher standard of living was possible for them as a direct and indirect result of Zionist development. Far from being the settled population of Palestine, according to a prevailing misconception, 75 per cent of the Arab population there have been either immigrants themselves or descendants of persons who immigrated into Palestine during the past 100 years, for the most part after 1882.

It is flying in the face of plain common sense to compair the Jewish claim to Palestine with that of some hypothetical Indians who might lay claim to America. It was not an arbitrary act when the League of Nations with the concurrence of 52 of the leading nations of the world and with the formal approval of the United States recognized the Jewish claim to establish a national home in Palestine. It is not the single fact that the Jews once occupied Palestine, but a whole complex of facts, that makes the Jewish claim acceptable to the international conscience. The historical connection consists not only in the physical facts of former occupation and in the continued presence of at least a remnant of the Jewish community up to modern times but also in the fact that all Western thought, Christian as well as Jewish, connects the Jews with Palestine.

PALESTINE NEGLECTED

The establishment of a national home for the Jews in Palestine is not, as alleged by anti-Zionist propaganda, "at the expense of another people's existence." While Palestine has a certain importance for Arab culture and for Islam, the significance that it has for the Arabs is relatively less than it has either for Christians or for Jews. Indeed, the Arabs have not used it too well, so that the world today is presented with the glaring contrast of centuries of stagnation and neglect of the Holy Land and a new burst of constructive achievement towards making a wilderness flower again.

Ways must be found for a satisfactory adjustment with the Arab world, which has a civilization of its own which in the past has shown itself to be of a very high order. It is decidedly a responsibility of Israel to learn to live in peace with the Arbs and to help them to develop their own potentialties and be helped by them. At present, blind forces of violence and aggression amidst the Arabs are the prime hindrance. I am sure that among the Arabs there are more moderate and more civilized elements who today fear to show themselves.

After this necessary adjustment has been made, the final justification of Israel as a nation among nations may well be that it will give an example of that flexible and yet planned society, that balance of liberty and order, which at present we associate with Moses and the prophets and with the people of Israel 3,000 years ago, rather than with their modern successors.

SIDNEY KORETZ.

WANTS "TRUE PICTURE" OF ARABS

To the EDITOR OF THE STAR:

In a letter to The Star of June 12 C.L.A. complains that "the American public is being stuffed with propaganda" favorable to Zionism and consequently prevented "from making a realistic appraisal of a situation to which this country's welfare is closely tied." If this is the case, we certainly should welcome more information from the Arabs' side as a possible corrective. Instead, we get from them slander not only of the Zionists but of the American press and of the American penchant for having policies influenced by election returns. The particular American policy attacked, namely, that favorable to Zionism, is made to appear as if it were just developed yesterday. Completely ignored is the fact that this policy is almost old enough to be called traditional. Furthermore, it represents a concurrence with decisions made by both the League of Nations and the United Nations.

But let us hear what the Arabs have to say for themselves. By all means, give us information concerning the workings of Arab democracy, if that, indeed, is what we must rely upon. We should welcome some convincing statements by Arab spokesmen to counteract the widespread reports that not only is there no democracy worth speaking of in any Arab state, but that the prevailing situation is one of grinding poverty for the illiterate masses of the people, with a small moneyed class on top desperately resisting any influence likely to disturb their control.

We are told that "certainly the establishment of an independent Jewish state cannot be regarded as setting up an outpost of American democracy." It is well known that not all Jews are of one mind. There are Jews who are opposed to Zionism, and among the Zionists there is a wide variety of opinion which does receive public airing. It is easy for the malicious to stress extremist views and deeds in an attempt to discredit and defame. But the more fair-minded see in this an example of democracy in action.

Will some spokesman for the Arabs give us an account of the Arab showing in the battle for democracy?

The Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry found cases of Arabs who secretly expressed views friendly to Zionism. Yet we know of no case in the Arab world where such views were publicly expressed. Will some one please explain this in such a way as to counteract the compelling impression that totalitarian terror rules among the Arabs?

Those who wish us to reappraise our stand on Palestine have the obligation of presenting us, not with propaganda, but with a true picture of Arab life and Arab performance. It is there where the most darkness lies and where the light of knowledge is indeed "devoutly to be wished for."

SIDNEY KORETZ.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402, at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H–112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

The Role of a Diplomat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT DOLE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 20, 1967

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, June 5, 1967, the Honorable Dr. Purnendu Kumor Barnerjee, Minister, Embassy of India, delivered a commencement address at Kansas Wesleyan University in Salina, Kans.

The title of his most interesting address was "The Role of a Diplomat," and Dr. Banerjee discussed the history of diplomacy in his native country and the changing role of a diplomat in today's world.

He was, I would add, awarded an honorary degree of doctor of humane letters by the university.

Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of my colleagues, I include his excellent address in the RECORD:

THE ROLE OF A DIPLOMAT

I consider it a privelege to be invited to join the new graduates and to participate on this auspicious occasion—the Commencement Ceremony of this great institution. I am greatly honoured to receive the Honorary Degree of Doctor of Humane Letters and I am proud to call myself an alumnus.

I feel especially happy to be here as the guest of Wesleyan University because I remember with gratitude the many valuable humanitarian and educational services rendered to my country by the missionaries, particularly by members of the Methodist Church. India, like many other developing countries, was denied by the Western countries the benefit of the Industrial Revolution; but it was the Western missionaries and educationists who helped India, in large measure, to regain her place in the mainstream of modern education and technology even before she became independent. I also recall with warm gratitude the contribution made by Rev. Zook, father of President Zook, in the field of education and social service, to Bengal, my home State in India. In fact President Zook was born in Calcutta, which is also the city of my birth, and he spent his early years in Bengal.

I wish to speak today about the role of a diplomat. I have selected this subject because the diplomat's principal aim is and must be the achievement of international stability and cooperation. As graduates of this great institution, you are entering today not only your own society, but also the international community where you, as American nationals, are representing a great and leading nation which is playing an important and constructive role in the world.

The reader of fiction, dealing with stories of ancient civilizations or the histories of modern states, may easily confuse the stress on "cloak and dagger" methods with the art of diplomacy. It is not long ago that diplomacy used to be described as the art of "lying and spying". This confusion is not helped, and is indeed compounded, by modern day happenings, fortunately rare in occurrence, when one "diplomat" or the other is expelled from a country for espionage or spying activities of a varied nature. The question that ultimately arises, therefore, is: What is diplomacy? Is it a secret art that conceals unsavoury acts like disseminating suspicion or distributing bribes? Is it the action of forging alliances, of waging wars, or the mysterious hatching of sinister plots to overthrow governments? Or is it simply a world of colourful figures whose glamorous lives we find are incessantly splashed in the society columns?

In attempting to answer this question, I would say that diplomacy is none of these and yet it may, in some degree, be comprised of all of these and more when the situation so demands. The celebrated British authority on Diplomatic Practice, Sir Ernest Satow, described diplomacy as "the application of intelligence and tact to the conduct of official relations between the Governments of independent States." In brief, it is the conduct of business between independent States, preferably by peaceful means.

The origin of diplomacy can be traced, like most human relations, to the dawn of history. Imagine the world five thousand years ago when man had just organized himself into tribes and was faced with the problem of safeguarding the "territorial integrity" of his hunting land. Each tribe must have realized that the overlapping of their respective hunting territories may some day cause unneccessary bloodshed. Therefore, it would be advisable to delineate their respective territories to prevent poaching by outsiders. But to negotiate such boundary agreements, representatives of one tribe must necessarily go to the land of the other tribe. It must have been realised soon that unless these emissaries were given immunity from molestation of any kind, the negotiations could not reach a satisfactory conclusion. Diplomatic immunity, therefore, must have been one of the first principles to be evolved in the now bulky collection of conventions and rules of diplomatic practice. The principle of immunity is followed in the diplomatic practice of today so that members of foreign embassies are not subject to harassment from local officials.

What I am concerned with today is the role of a diplomat, in implementing his country's policies, in helping to formulate them, and in generally working towards world peace. As you probably know, the diplomat is so called after the official document, originally termed "diplomas," emanating from sovereign authority conferring a privilege or granting the right of representation. A diplomat is generally known as a representative of a country when doing business in a foreign country or, more simply, a member of the diplomatic mission. However, the word "diplomat" today is meant to cover a far wider variety of government officials. In fact, all public servants employed in diplomatic affairs or in the affairs of nations, whether serving at home in the Department of Foreign Affairs or abroad, in the Embassies or other diplomatic international agencies, can be termed "diplomats." In strict terminology, so also is the Foreign Minister or the Secretary of State in a country a diplomat insofar as he functions as a responsible statesman conducting the relations of his country with other nations.

In India, we have a long diplomatic tradition. The diplomatic history of India dates back to the third century B.C. It was Kautilya, a Minister in the court of Emperor Chandragupta Maurya—a contemporary of Alexander the Great—who wrote a scientific study on state craft and diplomacy called *Artha Sashtra*. Artha Sashtra described the art of administration and prescribed definite rules of relations between State and State, nation and nation, in war and in peace. His *Mandala* theory described modalities to be employed by an ambitious king to conquer and consolidate new territories. But it was Emperor Ashoka, grandson of Chandragupta, who was the first in India to employ the technique of persuasion in international relations. He was a great champion and patron of Buddhism who sent his daughter, Sanghamittra, as India's Ambassador to the Court of the King of Ceylon.

The practice of diplomacy, which in a broad sense, covers the main functions of a diplomat, is a constantly evolving process that has changed beyond recognition over the last five hundred years. While it would be futile to identify the exact date of change at every stage of its evolution, it could be said that the transition from the old diplomacy to the new began in the 19th century and culminated in the 20th. By "old diplomacy" is meant a body of convention and practices that was built up and followed during the Middle Ages.

Some of the main ingredients of the old diplomacy were the conception that Europe was the centre of gravity in international affairs; the establishment in each country of a professional diplomatic service on a more or less identical model; the axiom that negotiation "must always be a process rather than an episode and that at every stage it must remain confidential". There was also the assumption that great powers were more important and more responsible than the small powers, which led to the generally accepted principle of joint intervention by the "Concert of Europe in a dispute between the Small Powers". Old diplomacy, therefore, was an unobstrusive and unpublicised process; without hindrance from legislative advice or consent; unimpeded by public curiosity; and unaffected by the press or television. It was in the 19th century that the new diplomacy really took roots with the expansion of colonial administration, commercial competition among great powers, and improvement in the media of mass communication. The two World Wars brought about the end of this period of transition and the new diplomacy of the nuclear age was evolved. The colonial bonds were being threatened; new and independent States were taking their rightful places in the course of world events; regional groupings were loosening the hold of big powers; and rapid developments in technological fields had brought about an unprecedented expansion in the mass media of communication. These dramatic changes completely transformed the practice of diplomacy and necessitated a further readjustment of the role of diplomats to changing conditions.

Take negotiations for instance. In days gone by it took months for instructions to be received and an envoy abroad was expected to use his own initiative and judgment in carrying out the policies outlined to him by his Government when he left home months before. In effect, then, the envoy or ambassador on many occasions became the country's policy-maker. Some profited by this latitude in order to pursue their personal policies. As Lord Malnesbury wrote, "I never received an instruction that was worth reading". Today, the situation is entirely different. On any question of great importance, an envoy can get in touch with his home Government in a matter of minutes to seek instructions before taking a course of action that would commit his country. While change may have altered the concept of practising diplomacy, it has by no means reduced its necessity. For the basic function of the envoy or ambassador to execute, explain, and clarify his country's policies is as valid today as ever. As M. Jules Cambon wrote, "Expressions such as old diplomacy and new diplomacy bear no relation to reality. It is the outward form—if you like, the adornments—of diplomacy that are undergoing a change. The substance must remain the same, since human nature is unalterable; since there exists no other method of regulating international differences; and since the best instrument at the disposal of a government wishing to persuade another government will always remain the spoken words of a decent man". In inter-State relations consent, and not command, remains the tool of governments.

The envoy in a foreign capital must always be the main source of information and above all, the interpreter of political trends and opinions in the country to which he is accredited. In a country with a democratic setup (like yours or mine) the formulation of policy is generally in the hands of the executive branch of Government at home, and the suggestions and opinions of the envoy, based on a first-hand knowledge of the affairs of the country to which he is accredited, are of invaluable help in the final outcome of the policy deliberations. In every democracy, there are a few individuals who are powerful and influential and who control, in a large sense, the formulation of the country's policies. It is only the resident envoy who would be able to assess the interplay of opinions of this influential group of individuals and who could, therefore, conceivably influence their thinking. In order to arrive at a policy that is most practicable at the moment, the Government must base its decision upon the reports it receives from its envoy. This in itself is the most important function and responsibility of the diplomat. Nevertheless, it is not the only function. The envoy also functions as the most effective channel of communications between his government and the government to which he is accredited. He alone can decide at what moment and in what terms his instructions can best be executed. As Demosthenes remarked, "It is he who is in control of occasions and to a large extent, of events. Moreover, he remains the intermediary who alone can explain the purposes and motives of one Government to another. If he be foolish, ignorant, vain, or intemperate, great misunderstandings may arise and damaging indiscretions be perpetrated." Thus, while the primary function of a diplomat is to translate and implement the policies of his own government and thereby to effectively safeguard the interests of his country, it is no less important for him to constantly acquaint the home government with the policies, thinking, and attitudes of the country in which he is in residence. He cannot arrogate the power to formulate the policies of his country, but by performing this latter function efficiently he contributes to the decision-making process of the deliberative bodies of his government.

It is obvious, then, that over the last five hundred years there has been a perceptible curtailment in the initiative of freedom of a diplomat in carrying out his country's policies. His job, nevertheless, continues to be an important and delicate one. He can either improve or imperil the relations of the two countries by his actions. To perform his formidable job efficiently, therefore, he must possess qualities and attributes that would normally not be essential for other professions. Demosthenes had said, "Ambassadors or Envoys have no battleships at their disposal or heavy infantry or fortresses. Their weapons are words and opportunities. In important transactions, opportunities are fleeting; once they are missed they cannot be recovered." Sound judgment and discretion are pre-requisites for a successful diplomat. Recently, Ambassador Goldberg complained that modern diplomats approached every problem with an open mouth. In my opinion, what the modern diplomat should have is an open mind and a disciplined mouth!

About 250 years ago, the author of a great manual in diplomacy, de Callieres wrote: "The good diplomatist must have an observant mind, a gift of application which rejects being diverted by pleasures of frivolous amusements, a sound judgment which takes the measure of things as they are, and which goes straight to the goal by the shortest and most natural paths without wandering into meaningless refinements and subtleties. The diplomatist must be quick, resourceful, a good listener, courteous and agreeable. . . . Above all, the good negotiator must possess enough self-control to resist the longing to speak before he has thought out what he intends to say. . . . He must have a calm nature, be able to suffer fools gladly, and should not be given to drink, gambling, women, irritability or any other wayward humours and fantasies. . . . He should also have some knowledge of literature, science, mathematics and law." Fellow Graduates, I may add he must have knowledge of economics and languages.

These qualities do not exhaust the list of fields with which a diplomat should familiarize himself. Another look at them would probably lead you to conclude that a diplomat has to be a superman. But it must be remembered that all these qualities cannot be learned or acquired in one stroke. While some of his education must necessarily be of a formal kind, a lot of his education is a continuing, evolving process acquired through experience and example, rather than from schools or colleges. His span of diplomatic service should be a period of continuous growth, his knowledge expanding as his responsibilities increase. For these qualities have to be acquired through hard work and adaptability. Yet, many years of useful experience thus acquired may result, if care is not taken, in intellectual stagnation and the stifling of initiative. There are many who may wrongly deduce that time is the best answer to most problems and thereby get into the habit of unproductive procrastination. A diplomat may have the aptitude and the necessary skill, but unless these natural gifts are developed in the midst of daily labour, he may tend to develop into a "routine man," impairing his imagination and reducing his usefulness.

In these times of non-silent diplomacy, public relations in the country of accreditation has become an important weapon in the armoury of a diplomat. Often, in democretic societies, influencing or appealing to the people who are potential voters is an useful adjunct to the functions of a diplomat in safeguarding and promoting the interests of his country. While an envoy would certainly find it physically impossible to reach every individual, his sociability, his relations with leaders of the community, and his handling of the press and other media of communication (whose influence in the formulation of ideas and policies is most significant) will go a long way in achieving his purpose.

At the same time, in order to be able to execute his government's policies abroad, he should command the full confidence of his government. Without such confidence, his advice would carry little weight with his home government and in turn he will be unaware of the precise thinking in his own country. He should also keep himself informed of the political trends at home and the mood of the people at any given time on a given issue.

Sometimes an envoy fails to do his job objectively because he associates himself emotionally with the country of his accreditation or because he is afraid to report to his home Government the real facts and his interpretation of them. His reports to the home government may be tailored as to what his own government would like to be true, rather that what is really the case. This happens in a democratic society as well as in a totalitarian society, but may occur more often in the totalitarian society.

Diplomacy today has acquired new dimensions. The technological revolution has affected the conduct of diplomacy. Today a diplomat can receive instructions from his home government in a matter of minutes. This has reduced his decision-making burdens. But there are new problems and new procedures resulting from improved communications. Diplomacy has scaled the wall of sovereignty to cultivate public opinion in the host country. In this the envoy is assisted by a retinue of diplomats. Every Embassy has a political section which is its main. The political section deals with the host government in political matters of both bilateral and multilateral importance. The Consular section is responsible for issuing visas, passports, care of nationals, etc. Then there is a cultural section which projects the culture of the country. Diplomats go around the country and speak to audiences to explain the viewpoint of their governments. Every embassy, all over the world, maintains an information department to influence, to educate and to enlighten the people. It tries to have itself photographed from the right angle and put the best foot forward. This is an art and involves hundreds of trivialities which, though in themselves unimportant, assist the cause it seeks to serve. The information wing of the Embassy answers hundreds of letters from students, teachers and prospective tourists. It publicizes the viewpoint of the home government by distributing books, official documents, film strips and posters. The Service Attachés—Army, Navy and Air—also form an important section of an Embassy. These Service Attachés have two functions: the collection of military information and intelligence, and arrangement for procurement and/or supply of military hardware. In a large Embassy, the administrative section employs a sizable staff to look after such needs as housing, medical attention, staffing and day to day operational activities.

Another important activity of an embassy today is in the economic sphere. Economics is playing an increasingly important role in both bilateral and multilateral relations. Foreign aid and foreign trade are in the mainstream of international relations. Ideally, foreign aid should emphasize the concept that poverty anywhere threatens prosperity everywhere, but we must realize that political motivations may sometimes be a factor. In fact it is often difficult, in a given situation, to say where politics ends and economics begins and vice versa. Politics tends to mingle with economics. It is no longer considered inappropriate for an Embassy to directly promote the commercial or economic interests of its country and its people. On the other hand, economic activity lies in the centre of diplomatic work. Governments have increasingly expanded their activity in economic and commercial spheres. A seventeenth century diplomat would have been shocked to see the gamut of work of a modern diplomat.

In the political sphere, there are new techniques in vogue. Summit diplomacy and parliamentary diplomacy are among them. Summit diplomacy played an important role during the last decade and converted diplomats to technocrats. Heads of State and Governments met directly and negiotiated the terms of their relationship. The glare of publicity proved to be a double-edged sword. The diplomat continues to play his role in the silent, but not secret diplomacy of today.

The United Nations is the best example of parliamentary diplomacy. The open diplomacy of the U.N. General Assembly does not provide a particularly congenial atmosphere for traditional tasks of private diplomacy. The debates serve as a useful "barometer" of the diplomatic climate of opinion, though they sometimes easily generate into exercises in forensic propaganda. There is a well-known tale of one delegate's speech which was annotated in the margin: "Weak point. Shout!"

But parliamentary diplomacy has its advantages too. The U.N. General Assembly provides a forum for personal contacts, private meetings, and casual discussions; exchanging viewpoints and exploratory soundings. The resolutions generally represent "open agreements privately agreed upon!" This has given a new dimension to modern diplomacy. Diplomacy has two facets today—multilateral and bilateral. Many of the Afro-Asian States, for example, take a position in the United Nations General Assembly which, if considered bilaterally, is perhaps not in their national interest. The group psychology is at variance with the individual psychology. Many diplomats in the United Nations may support a position, but they dare not do it publicly for it may clash with the declared positions of the groups of which they are members. The problem of "saving face" is still an important factor in dipomacy.

In the nuclear age the heavy burden and responsibility of the diplomat is the pursuit of peace and the saving of the world from nuclear holocaust. War, in the ultimate analysis, is a failure of diplomacy. Diplomats must not only look after the national interests, but also the welfare of the international community. The diplomat's dedicated vigilance is not only our hope for survival but also the promise of a better world.

The Baltic States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM A. RIBICOFF

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 20, 1967

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, June 15 marked the day—27 years ago—when Soviet control of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia began.

On that day in 1940, the Red army invaded Lithuania and surrounded the Lithuanian troops. Under Russian control, elections were then held in the three Baltic States. The elections resulted in Soviet control of these nations under the cloak of legality, and paved the way for Russian annexation.

Since that time, the three Baltic States have been scarred by occupation—an occupation that has violated the principles cherished by free people everywhere.

On this anniversary, all of us wish to express our admiration for the courageous people of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. The unfortunate events whose anniversary we observe this month should remind us once again that the hopes and dreams of these peoples are also our own. They should remind us that we must continue to strive for a free and peaceful world in which all people will have the opportunity to live their lives as they choose.

Advise and Consent: H.R. 6111

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1967

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives, by a vote of 229 to 98, has just passed H.R. 6111 setting up a Federal Judicial Center with the Chief Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court as the Chairman of the Judicial Board.

The bill creates an Administrator and a staff to revolutionize the courts of the land to the use of efficiency experts and electronic machinery—mechanial justice.

Considering the uniform control the Supreme Court now has over the courts and passage of new laws, one might think the Congress would start resenting their powers being usurped and the responsibility of their duties as elected officials to their people being suppressed. But apparently not. As is par for the day, the unelected minority leads and directs the elected majority. The legislative branch has now perfected the machine by which it may obtain advice and consent from the judiciary.

The separation of the powers of our Government into the three divisions of executive, legislative, and judicial has been basic for survival. The balance is further eroded by H.R. 6111.

Under H.R. 6111, section 622(c)—

> The Board is authorized to request from any department, agency, or independent instrumentality of the Government any information it deems necessary to carry out its functions under this Act; and each such department, agency and instrumentality is authorized to cooperate with the Board and, to the extent permitted by law, to furnish such information to the Board, upon request made by the Chairman. The Board shall utilize insofar as possible the services or facilities of any agency of the Federal Government, and without regard to section 10 of the Act of March 2, 1861, as amended (41 U.S.C. 5), of any appropriate State or other public agency.

Under any reasonable interpretation, the Judicial Center is authorized to now obtain information and records from every department of our Government which places it in a unique position of power control over the other branches.

If you think not, remember that it is the judiciary that will make the interpretations and, by now, every American should know the judiciary votes for the benefit of its own power extension.

This is a dangerous bill and must be considered the foundation for the control and guidance of Congress by the tax-free foundations and their intellectual theorists.

Under the same section 622(c) we find no limitation on size or loyalty of staff but rather this provision:

> The Board may, without regard to section of the Act of March 2, 1861, as amended (41 U.S.C. 5), utilize the services or facilities of any private agency, organization, or group, or such individual, and between the head of such agency, organization, or group, or such individual, and the Board. Payment, if any, for such services or facilities shall be made in such amounts as may be provided in such agreement.

This may provide the intent and purpose of the bill since by this provision tax-free foundations, universities, and organizations such as the National Lawyers Guild, ACLU, NAACP, and the like, can now supply personnel, programs and even facilities all camouflaged under the front of acting for the Federal Judicial Center. No other reasoned operation or intent can be garnered but that this provision establishes a National Court Review Board.

Not only will our judges and police be now barraged with directives, guidelines, and like compulsion for a national uniform fact and justice program from the beatnik crowd but, we in Congress, can well expect to feel the pressure from the new occupation forces on the Hill in the way of prepared materials and lobbying.

And what a perfect vehicle for legalized blackmail from the special interest group. Consider, if involved in litigation, the gift of a large tax-free grant by a wealthy litigant to one of the contributing organizations or foundations aiding the Judicial Center. With the Chief Justice as Chairman of the Board, would he not be expected to curry favor?

And poor little old Congress, if they get mad or feel belittled, they cannot even cut off the finances, which under the bill at present is a blank check and reads, "such sums as may be necessary to supplement funds and services accepted by the Board"; for section 622(b) provides:

> For the purpose of carrying out any function of the Board authorized by this chapter, the Board may accept donated funds and services, both public and private, and the use of such funds to pay the salaries of the officers or employees of the Center shall not be subject to the provisions of section 209 of title 18, United States Code.

The newly created monster of Congress belongs to the judiciary and is self-sufficient and self-perpetuating.

Congress can have but one recourse and that is to repeal H.R. 6111.

The extent to which the Judicial Center anticipates its bureaucratic tentacles is best described in a portion of the committee report from the minority leader:

> I believe the last few weeks of debate on title I of the Civil Rights Bill of 1966 clearly demonstrates that the Federal courts could use such machines to effectively and economically comply with the strictures of *the jury selection procedures defined by that title should it become law.*" (Reference is to S. 1026 and H.R. 5700).

By the committee's own admissions, this bill envisions plans to take over our State courts, judges, and personnel—the danger warned against by Chief Justice John B. Fournet, of the supreme court, in my remarks of June 12, 1967, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD A2927. The pending take-over bills are S. 1926 and H.R. 5700.

This can be the beginning of the end of constitutional government. An extent beyond which the foundation has been so damaged there can be no recovery. We cannot let it slip by the Senate unnoticed. An informed and responsive citizenry can still prevent the unelected judiciary and its guiding lights from establishing a judicial oligarchy.

Ben Massell Memorial Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 20, 1967

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, it was recently my privilege and pleasure to address the Ben Massell Memorial Award banquet in Atlanta, held in honor of Isidore Alterman, the president of Big Apple Stores and one of Atlanta's most outstanding and civic-minded citizens, who was this year's recipient of the Massell Award.

This was indeed a splendid occasion and well-deserved recognition of a fine man. An article on this dinner was written by the editor and publisher of Dixie Business magazine, Hubert F. Lee, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the Record, as follows:

BEN MASSELL AWARD

My wife and I had the exciting pleasure of seeing Isidore Alterman receive the coveted Ben Massell Memorial Award on the evening of June 11, 1967, at the swank Switzerland House.

Sidney Feldman, the MC, said it was the largest Israel Bond dinner ever held in Atlanta . . . because of the Honoree Isidore Alterman, . . . Senator Herman Talmadge, the speaker, and the Victory June 5 through 10 in Israel.

No wonder more than $644,200 Bonds For Israel were bought faster than Max Rittenbaum and Sidney Feldman & others could read off the names on the hundreds of checks.

It was a great bond buying Jubilee last lasted until after 11 o'clock.

Practically every Jewish family and their friends were there or sent in their checks from this area.

Atlanta's Fulton National Bank, represented by President Gordon Jones, got a $100,000.00 Bond . . . the record.

Ben Massell, Jr., presented the Ben Massell Memorial Award to Mr. Isidore Alterman, recalling his years of public and humanitarian service.

"I know your father would have been proud of you receiving this award named in his honor," Ben, Jr., said.

In accepting the Award, Mr. Alterman said he was grateful to be honored ". . . for dedicated efforts on behalf of the Atlanta Jewish Community and the State of Israel."

"I am humble to be singled out as a symbol of the spirit of my brethren here and over the world who have had a part in investing their money for Bonds for Israel at such a Victorious time in history.

He told Ben Massell, Jr. how proud he was of him and of the honor to receive the award from his hands.

"Ben Massell built our first Big Apple store in 1939 and our contract was the handshake of two old friends."

Abe Goldstein introduced Senator Talmadge as a "Great American, Friend and Statesman."

Senator Talmadge said he and Betty were honored to join in paying tribute to their old friend Isidore Alterman on such an historical occasion.

"Isidore and his brothers make up a family team that is unmatched in chain grocery store history.

"Their 64 Big Apple stores average around $2-million a store in sales, I am told.

"Isidore's dynamic leadership was seen in 1963, when he and Dr. Irving Greenberg, spearheaded the drive for funds to build the half-million dollar Hebrew Academy.

"At camp Barney Medintz, the Alterman Brothers have provided an auditorium which is called the Alterman Lodge."

Isidore's brothers, George, Sam, Dave and Max are associates in Alterman Bros., while Abe owns Bilt-More Foods.

Ben Massell in 1950 was named to the South's "Hall of Fame for the Living," by the editors of Dixie Business.

Mr. Massell was one of Atlanta's top leaders present when I presented the first "Public Service in Reporting" to Keeler McCartney in 1952 in the Atlanta Constitution city room.

I was Mr. Massell's guest on November 18, 1953 when then Governor Talmadge presented him with the award for "Distinguished Service to the Economy of Israel," saying:

"Mr. Ben Massell for nearly a third of a century has been in the foremost ranks of those who have worked to build Atlanta as a mighty city."

"It is an especially fitting climax for him to now be working with might and main to insure the future stability and strength of the relatively new state of Israel."

Israel celebrated her 19th Independence Day on May 15, 1967.

Isidore Alterman is the fifth to receive the Ben Massell Award. Past honorees were Joseph Jacobs, 1963; A. J. Weinberg, 1964; Max Rittenbaum 1965; and Sidney Feldman, 1966.

Mr. Alterman is one of America's outstanding business men.

A Standing Menace to Individual Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. E. (BILL) BROCK

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1967

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, at a time when so much effort and expense is being spent in the pursuit of individual rights, one serious threat to these rights has been overlooked by many in Government. The experience of Mr. Maurice Carroll of Natick, Mass., is a case in point. Mr. Carroll has been harassed, discriminated against and deprived of the right to work. His only crime was expressing the belief that unionism should be voluntary in a free society. Although a union member himself, he believed in the rights of nonmembers as well.

The results of Mr. Carroll's brave stand are described in the following editorial, which appeared in the July 18 issue of the Chattanooga News-Free Press. I include it in the Appendix of the Record:

HE'S STANDING FOR YOUR FREEDOM

Everybody's for "freedom" in general. Are you really for it in particular? Look at the case of Maurice Carroll of Natick, Mass., who has been denied a basic freedom—the right to work.

Mr. Carroll is a railroad baggageman, or he was for 20 years. He also was a union member. But he spoke for the right of men to voluntarily choose to join a union or voluntarily choose not to, without being punished for their deicsion either way.

Mr. Carroll has filed suit in Federal court claiming the International leadership of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen and the management of the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Company took away his job and benefits because he favored voluntary unionism.

His suit says he has been out of work for 16 months and without a union card for a year as a result, despite the unanimous vote of his fellow union lodge members that he retain membership, and that there be an investigation to find out why he was kicked out.

"With power like this," Mr. Carroll said, "no wonder the union bosses fought so hard in the last two years for the 'right to coerce' union membership in all 50 states! Until compulsory unionism is eliminated the individual rank-and-file union member simply does not have any recourse against ineffective or corrupt union leadership."

Mr. Carroll is fighting for your freedom. Nobody ought to tell an employe and an employer that they can't get together if they both want to. But union dictatorship exercises veto power over workers in 31 states.

A History of English Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP A. HART

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 20, 1967

Mr. HART. Mr. President, there appeared in the American Bar Association Journal of April 1967, an article occasioned by the appearance of volume 16, which completed "A History of English Law," the monumental work undertaken by Sir William Holdsworth in 1901. The reviewer is Frederick Bernays Wiener. Mr. Wiener, a distinguished member of the District of Columbia bar, describes the final volume, and then proceeds to summarize the entire history. Not only lawyers, but all students of history and of the Constitution, will benefit from Mr. Wiener's marshaling of the many parts of the immense story. Through the reviewer's labor and skill, the reader is given a clear and simple guide through the vast range of English law and political history.

I ask unanimous consent that the article, entitled "Holdworth's History Finally Completed," be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

HOLDSWORTH'S HISTORY FINALLY COMPLETED

(NOTE.—In this survey of Sir William Holdsworth's *A History of English Law*, Mr. Wiener discusses its origin and scope and evaluates its strengths and weaknesses. As the final fair test of its value, he asks: "Where would lawyers be if it had never been written?")

(By Frederick Bernays Wiener, *of the District of Columbia Bar*)

With the publication last September of Volume 16 of the late Sir William Holdsworth's *A History of English Law*, a slim and hence somewhat sad little affair containing only 170 pages of text, that monumental classic is finally completed, some sixty-five years after the author commenced work and more than twenty-two years after his death.[1] Fortunately, by reason of the reprinting of the hitherto unobtainable earlier volumes, American lawyers are now able to obtain the entire set.[2]

Footnotes at end of speech.

An event so significant deserves a summing up to place the completed work in its setting—first, to indicate how it came to be written; second, to give at least a general survey of its scope and contents; and, finally, to essay some evaluation of its qualities.

ORIGIN

The irony that extends throughout all of history was not absent from the production of this first comprehensive account of the law of England from Anglo-Saxon times down to the present day.[3] For the writing of what became Holdsworth's history was originally suggested to another. Professor Edward Jenks, then a reader in English law at Oxford, whom the publishers asked to produce a one-volume work. Jenks was otherwise engaged, and suggested instead young Holdsworth, also an Oxford teacher. So, in 1901, at the age of thirty, Holdsworth started on his task.

The one-volume limitation proved unrealistic, and three volumes appeared at the outset, the first in 1903, followed by two more in 1906 and in 1909. Even these initial attempts reflected the author's qualities and won praise from acknowledged masters. Maitland wrote appreciatively of the first volume,[4] Sir Frederick Pollock and Mr. Justice Holmes of the two following.[5]

But the glowing terms employed by reviewers of such eminence did not satisfy Holdsworth, who set his own sights higher. He knew that what he had already written required revision and expansion, and he proceeded past his original limit of 1485—the date of the accession of Henry VII, the date beyond which Bishop Stubbs's *Constitutional History* did not extend—to continue into the Tudor and Stuart periods.

In 1922–1923 he republished his first three volumes in a revised version, and by 1926 six additional volumes saw the light. They covered all of English law down to the year 1700 and carried the development of particular doctrines down to the time of publication.[6] But the author paused only for second wind; he was already hard at work on the legal hostory of the eighteenth century, the first ever written covering that period, and in 1938 published three more volumes, 10, 11 and 12.[7] Thereafter Holdsworth undertook to bring his history down to 1875, the effective date of the Judicature Acts. A thirteenth volume was in typescript at his death in January, 1944, and was duly published in 1952 by Professors Goodheart and Hanbury, his literary executors. What was then projected as the final volume was still in manuscript; more precisely, it remained in the author's extraordinarily difficult hand.[8] This gave more trouble and required more editing and so was not published until much later, not in one volume but in three, numbered 14, 15 and 16. Those last appeared over a three-year period from 1964 through 1966. Only a very little of the history as planned, the portion involving "The Rules of Law" in their later development, was never completed.[9]

Meanwhile Holdsworth had gathered many honors as the qualities of his great work came to be more widely known—and appreciated. He was named in 1922 to the chair first occupied by Blackstone, the Vinerian Professorship. In 1929 he was knighted, then unusual recognition for an English academic. Honorary degrees came to him from near and far, and in the last year of his life, when already stricken with his terminal illness, the Order of Merit was conferred upon him. Somewhat earlier he had received two deeply cherished professional distinctions, appointment as King's Counsel in 1920 by the Earl of Birkenhead, then Lord Chancellor, and, in 1924, election as an Honorary Bencher of Lincoln's Inn.

And what of Edward Jenks, originally selected as the man to write the history? Here there was irony indeed, painful in character; let Professor Goodhart tell the story:

"It is not certain how much truth there is in the various traditions concerning the relationship between Jenks and Smith. It is said that at the viva voce examinations Jenks asked Smith a question concerning the *Rule in Shelley's Case* which the latter was unable to answer, and that Jenks then advised him to improve his knowledge of Real Property Law. Smith is said to have replied, 'I came here to be examined and not to receive unsolicited advice.' Thirty years later when F. E. Smith had become Lord Chancellor, Professor Jenks applied for silk. He received a letter from the Lord Chancellor's secretary advising him that it was not the practice to give silk to academic lawyers. Jenks, who was nothing if not combative, wrote back pointing out that silk had been given to such lawyers as Dicey, Holland and Pollock. Thereupon the secretary replied that he apologised for his error: what he should have said was that silk was only given to distinguished academic lawyers. Lord Birkenhead showed no such hesitation when he made Holdsworth a King's Counsel in 1920." [10]

SCOPE

Holdsworth planned his history in five books. The first, in Volume 1, "The Judicial System", is a survey of the juridiction of the several law courts in England from the beginning, through all the stages of there development down to their reorganization in the Judicature Acts and thereafter. Just as the early law must be looked for in the interstices of the forms of action, so Holdsworth realized that much substantive law reflected the competing and often conflicting jurisdiction of the proliferation of variegated courts of law. And so Volume 1 has become a classic—but developments since Holdsworth died required by 1956 not only three pages of *addenda et corrigenda,* but also extensive explanatory comments by Professor Chrimes to the tune of a seventy-seven-page preface.[11] For law and courts do not stand still; both are living organisms and hence subject to constant changes, altering what a few years earlier had been considered immutable. How many American lawyers today whose legal education preceded World War II, for instance, are aware that the old privilege of peers to be tried only in the House of Lords was legislatively abrogated in 1948? [12]

The second book deals with "Anglo-Saxon Antiquities", the third with "The Medieval Common Law. The latter includes a classic discussion of the early legal profession, presenting all that was known of it through 1922 and a full treatment of the literature of the law, including the Year Books. Naturally, this latter portion does not consider the later discovery by Yale's Professor Dunham of the "slips of parchment", which proved that the Year Books were indeed written originally as courtroom notes before they were transcribed.[13] These volumes also now need a prefatory portion to deal with new matters uncovered since their last publication.

Up to this point, Holdsworth was synthesizing the work of others. But with his treatment of the Tudor and Stuart periods, he began branching out on his own, and from that point onward the work reflects his own concepts and those alone. The fourth book, entitled "The Common Law and Its Rivals", is not only a history of legal doctrines, it is a history of the political institutions and of the times out of which those doctrines arose; and it is supplemented and clarified by a consideration of professional developments and professional literature and, pre-eminently, by comprehensive and perceptive biographical studies of the judges and the lawyers who shaped the law.

To mention even a few of the matters covered by the fourth book would simply compress—and dilute—the tables of contents of no less than six volumes. It will suffice, therefore, to note that Holdsworth's seventy-page-long biography of Sir Edward Coke still stands unsurpassed today, forty years later,[14] and that only a consummate lawyer could have dealt with all the rules of law in so many varied fields—land law (two thirds of Volume 7), personal property, contract and quasicontract, the law merchant, crime and tort, status, evidence, procedure and pleading. Simply to list the topics covered suggests the breathtaking scope of the venture.

After Volume 9, which ended generally with the year 1700. Holdsworth proceeded in the same manner through the eighteenth century, calling his fifth book "The Centuries of Settlement and Reform". First there is a complete political history of the 1700's, which another distinguished English historian has called "the best brief survey", "a masterpiece in miniature, buried in this vast and important work".[15] Then follow discussions of the machinery of local government and the agencies of the central government; the relations of Great Britain to Ireland, the colonies and India; an extensive study of the enacted law; and consideration, as before, of professional developments during the period in question. The treatment of the doctrines of equity includes sixty pages of biographical matter on Lord Chancellor Hardwicke; [16] that of the common law incorporates nearly one hundred pages on Lord Mansfield and his associates.[17] This portion of the history, comprising Volumes 10, 11 and 12, concludes with a chapter on Blackstone and his *Commentaries.*

The history is concluded with similar treatment, following the same pattern, of the period 1793 to 1832, "From Settlement to Reform", and of the final years 1833–1875, "The Age of Reform". During those eighty-odd years the medievel excrescences on the law and the legal system of England were, one by one, pruned away—to take two extreme examples, trial by battle was abolished in 1819,[18] and the real actions were finally swept away in 1833 [19]—and, effective in 1875, there was created the modernized judicial structure and procedure that characterize English justice today. These last America for the most part copied only afterwards.

The biographies in these final portions are still fascinating, though hardly unique; Holdsworth here dealt with relatively modern figures, already noticed by others. Perhaps the most significant treatments are those of Bentham, whose ideas so greatly moved the reformers,[20] and of Lord Eldon, whose long tenure as Lord Chancellor did so much for the rules of equity—and so little for its litigants.[21]

EVALUATION

Sir Christopher Wren's epitaph in St. Paul's Cathedral admonishes the visitor to look around for the man's monument.[22] So it is with Sir William Holdsworth: his monument consists of the sixteen volumes of his *History,* and anyone inclined to minimize its scope should read consecutively the table of contents introducing each volume.[23] With only rare exceptions, no subject remains untouched, and the principal corrections now required in the earlier volumes, forty or more years old today, are those required by subsequent development and subsequent discoveries. Therein lies the strength, the massive strength, the enduring worth of the *History.*

Its weaknesses? Eminent medievalists will point out that all the sources on which the earlier volumes are based are printed materials, that Holdsworth never went to the manuscripts. But the *History* could never have been written if Sir William had gone beyond synthesis. Even with the collation and editing of medieval manuscripts left to others, Holdsworth was sufficiently master of the early law to be joint editor of three Year

---

Footnotes at end of speech.

Book volumes in the Selden Society's series.[24] Moreover, when one pauses to reflect on the fantastic bulk of the surviving legal records of medieval England, it is obvious that, if Holdsworth had directed his efforts there, he simply could not as a physical matter ever have reached the later centuries.[25]

Another weakness sometimes assigned, though actually it is more of an idiosyncrasy, is Holdsworth's extreme Toryism, much of it still remaining in the work despite valiant efforts by Dr. Hazel to tone it down.[26] Holdsworth's constitutional ideal was the "balanced constitution" of the eighteenth century, and his pages are full of regrets over the Reform Act of 1832 that emphasized the popular elements of government thereafter.[27] His lack of sympathy with governmental development in the twentieth century will doubtless strike a receptive note among all who look back nostalgically to the simpler days of old,[28] but now and again Holdsworth emits some Toryism that will startle even the most conservative of Americans.[29]

Finally, a good many modern lawyers who have turned to Holdsworth for light on particular topics are heard to complain that his treatment is not always satisfactory or entirely thorough, that it is only a good starting point.[30] There is of course some validity in this view, which could easily be documented. But no multivolume work can cover every conceivable topic in the full detail that the enthusiastic specialist demands, nor supply on every question an answer that will forever stand as the last word upon it. Even in a work extending to sixteen volumes there are bound to be some matters not treated with the fullness that those who have concentrated on those very points might prefer, nor can the author of a comprehensive survey, no matter how learned or painstaking, ever be certain that every last one of his conclusions on controverted questions will win universal acceptance. For, in legal history as in substantive law, close issues bring five-to-four decisions that do not invariably show the majority to have been absolutely, much less everlastingly, in the right.

A fair test of the value of Holdsworth's *History* would seem rather to be this: Where would lawyers be if it had never been written? And where would general historians be? The obvious answer to both questions is that both groups would be floundering—and far less capable of even starting on their problems.[31] On that basis Holdsworth's *History* stands not only as a monumental but as an incomparable work, quite without any competitor. And surely it is no denigration of its scope to recognize that there will always be ample scope for future monographs to deal with what Holdsworth omitted or with what he did not in every respect sufficiently or definitively cover.

Nearly eighty years ago, Maitland entitled his inaugural lecture as Downing Professor of the Laws of England, "Why the History of English Law Is Not Written".[32] Today that history *has* been written, superbly written, packed with much learning simply unavailable elsewhere, clearly delineating over nearly a millenium and a half, from A.D. 449 to A.D. 1875, the progress of the common law and of those strands of civil law that it absorbed. In 1938, Holdsworth wrote that "Five books stand out preeminently in the history of English law—Glanvill, Bracton, Littleton, Coke, and Blackstone." [33] By 1966 Holdsworth's completed history has increased the number of the preeminent books to six.

We in the United States do not shink from superlatives; modesty has never been one of our outstanding national failings; we like and admire bigness. It is, therefore, peculiarly appropriate for the lawyers of America to pause briefly in tribute at the completion of the largest, the longest and incomparably the finest comprehensive legal history ever produced, *A History of English Law* by Sir William Searle Holdsworth, O.M., K.C., D.C.L., LL.D., sometime Vinerian Professor of English Law in the University of Oxford.

---

[1] Many of the facts below are drawn from the several appreciations of Holdsworth published after his death. *See In Memoriam—Sir William Searle Holdsworth*, 60 L.Q. Rev. 138–159 (1944), tributes by Viscount Simon, Lord Wright, Dr. Stallybrass, and Professors Hanbury and Goodhart; Professor Plucknett's obituary notice in Selden Society Volume 61, *Year Books of 11 Edward II, of which Holdsworth* was coeditor; 30 Proc. Br. Acad. 411 (1944), tributes by Professors Lee and Winfield; and Professor Goodhart's memorial address, the Selden Society Lecture for 1954.

[2] Volumes 1–15, $14.65 each; Volume 16, $8.25; the complete set, $210. The Carswell Company of Toronto is the sole American agent.

[3] Reeves went only through the reign of Elizabeth I, Hale died in 1675, and Blackstone's historical passages are uniformly unreliable.

[4] 19 L.Q. Rev. 335 (1903).

[5] Pollock, 25 L.Q. Rev. 233 1909); Holmes, 25 L.Q. Rev. 412 (1909), reprinted in *Collected Legal Papers* 285 (1921).

[6] For reviews readily accessible to American lawyers, see Plucknett, 38 Harv. L. Rev. 698 (1925), and 40 Harv. L. Rev. 333 (1926). Professor Plucknett's own one-volume Concise History of the Common Law (5th ed. 1956) was characterized by Holdsworth's as "the best short History of English Law", 55 L.Q. Rev. at 235 (1939).

[7] See the long review of these volumes by Professor E. C. S. Wade in 55 L.Q. Rev. 250 (1939). The *Index to Legal Periodicals* does not disclose any other reviews of Volumes 10, 11 and 12 in a legal journal.

[8] Compare the manuscript passage appended to Professor Goodhart's memorial lecture, *supra* note 1, with the ultimate text at 15 Holdsworth 1.

[9] See prefaces to Volume 13 at page viii and to Volume 14 at page v.

[10] Professor Goodhart's memorial lecture, *supra* note 1, at 11.

[11] 1 Holdsworth (7th ed. 1956).

[12] Criminal Justice Act, 1948, 11 & 12 Geo. 6, c. 58, § 30.

[13] *Casus Placitorum* (Seldom Society, Vol. 69) xlix-lvi, xc-xciv; see 46 A.B.A.J. at pages 614-615 (1960).

[14] 5 Holdsworth 423–493.

[15] J. H. Plumb, England in the Eighteenth Century 215 (Vol. 7 of The Pelican History of England, 1950).

[16] 12 Holdsworth 237–297.

[17] 12 Holdsworth 464–560.

[18] 59 Geo. 3, c. 46.

[19] 3 & 4 Will, 4, c. 27, §§ 36–39.

[20] 13 Holdsworth 41–133.

[21] 13 Holdsworth 595–638.

[22] *Si monumentum requiris, circumspice.*

[23] Of Holdsworth's other volumes, perhaps those of most enduring significance are Some Lessons from Our Legal History (1928), The Historians of Anglo-American Law (1928), Some Makers of English Law (1938), and, preeminently, his delightful classic, Charles Dickens as a Legal Historian (1928). For a perceptive review of the last-named work that captures much of the flavor of the original, most lawyers must rely on Professor Chafee's engaging comments at 42 Harv. L. Rev. 286 (1928) because the book itself is out of print, and because the publisher, with that perverse stubbornness that so often infects university presses, has never seen fit to reprint.

[24] *Year Books of 10 Edward II* (Selden Society, Volume 52) and *Year Books of 10 Edward II* (Selden Society, Volume 54), joint editor with Miss M. D. Legge; *Year Books of 11 Edward II* (Selden Society, Volume 61), joint editor with Professor J. P. Collas.

[25] Arthur Agarde read the early plea rolls of the Court of King's Bench during the reign of Queen Elizabeth, the last man to do so until Professor George O. Sayles three centuries later. The latter has published six volumes of *Select Cases in the Court of King's Bench* under the first three Edwards (Selden Society, Volumes 55, 57, 58, 74, 76 and 82) and has a seventh in the press, to extend through the end of the reign of Henry V in 1422. See 52 A.B.A.J. 859 (1966). The records of the Court of Common Pleas are even more voluminous; see M. Hastings, The Court of Common Pleas in Fifteenth Century England (1947).

[26] ". . . many of the ultra-blue passages in the manuscript were modified (though some purple patches of political Toryism remain) as a result of the tactful criticism of Holdsworth's great friend, Dr. Hazel, who read the proofs of the whole twelve volumes." Dr. W. T. S. Stallybrass, 60 L.Q. Rev. at 151–152 (1944), Dr. A. E. W. Hazel was at first All Souls Reader in English Law at Oxford and then Principal of Jesus College there, dying less than a year after Holdsworth.

[27] "It is the greatest of the blots upon the system introduced in 1832 that it substituted uniformity for variety, and threw away the greatest of the safeguards against the gradual introduction of a democratic representation which, in effect, disfranchises the most enlightened classes, and thus introduces a vulgarity of tone into the discussion of public business, which tends to lower the political ability of the nation." 10 Holdsworth 565-566. For other passages to the same effect, see 10 *id.* 602–603, and 13 *id.* 257–258.

[28] "The attempt which all democracies make to attain socialistic ideals necessarily makes the machinery of government far more complex; and at the same time the decline in the abilities of many of those whom democracy accepts as its leaders makes them less competent to control it. For these reasons the trained bureaucracy, who alone know how to work it, tend to gain more power. In fact, unless they took this power and kept it the realization of the socialist ideals of a democracy would be impossible." 14 Holdsworth 138. "Nor has elementary education proved to be a remedy; for it has produced an electorate which is sufficiently literate to be deluded by specious argument, and is not, as a rule, sufficiently literate to discriminate between arguments which are specious and those which are sound." *Id.* at 159.

[29] "It is true that, even in these democratic days, distinguished descent and noble connections confer advantages. The son, or even the grandson, of a great statesman or a distinguished peer, starts political life with many advantages over a man of equal or even greater abilities and undistinguished descent. And it is probably good for the state that this should be so; for to the advantage of ability is added the advantage of education in an environment which, by reason of its contact with affairs, can convey, almost insensibly, an education in the art of their practical conduct." 10 Holdsworth 613.

"[The House of Lords] can still criticize, amend, and delay; and because the abilities and experiences of many of its prominent members are superior to those of the politicians whom a democracy accepts as its leaders, its debates are often more instructive than those of the House of Commons." 14 *id.* 152; and see 13 *id.* 259, *accord.*

[30] "For the researcher in law, the *History* will nearly always be found useful as a starting-point. For several reasons it cannot be either exhaustive or conclusive of the matter in hand." Professor P. H. Winfield, 30 Proc. Br. Acad. at 420 (1944).

[31] "No one can appreciate so well the magnitude and difficulty of this achievement as those who undertook research in law before Holdsworth had begun the publication of these twelve volumes." *Ibid.* at 419.

[32] 1 Collected Papers 480 (1911).

[33] Holdsworth, Some Makers of English Law 56 (1938).

Legislative Questionnaire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN

OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 20, 1967

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, for the third consecutive year I have invited constituents of the Second Congressional District of Tennessee to participate in a legislative questionnaire. Though it is impossible to list all important legislative questions on such a poll, I try to choose those which I feel are of greatest concern both to my district and to the Nation.

I am pleased with the response this questionnaire meets. Last year about 12,000 individuals returned the questionnaires, and this year some 18,000 persons participated.

The basic reason behind the poll is to find out the opinions of the citizens whom I represent in the Congress.

I would like to place in the RECORD the results of the 1967 questionnaire. Compilation was done by an independent electronic data processing company, and as can be noted, the company has worked out the answers on a percentage basis:

[Answers in percent]

1. Do you think we should continue our spending on the "war on poverty?"

Yes	25
No	69
No opinion	6

2. Should we do away with the House Committee on Un-American Activities?

Yes	15
No	68
No opinion	17

3. Do you think President Johnson's new domestic programs have helped the people of this country?

Yes	22
No	65
No opinion	13

4. Would you favor lowering the voting age from 21 to 18 years?

Yes	47
No	50
No opinion	3

5. Do you favor combining the Departments of Commerce and Labor into a single Department of Business and Labor?

Yes	40
No	31
No opinion	29

6. Do you favor increasing Social Security benefits providing it does not require an increase in Social Security payroll deductions?

Yes	70
No	22
No opinion	8

7. Do you favor an increase in Social Security benefits which would increase your payroll deductions for Social Security?

Yes	26
No	64
No opinion	10

8. The present draft law expires June 30 of this year. Do you feel that the Selective Service law as it now operates is fair to all persons?

Yes	27
No	62
No opinion	11

9. Would you favor Federal legislation to regulate the sale of firearms?

Yes	43
No	51
No opinion	6

10. Do you favor expansion of East-West trade between the United States and the Soviet Union and other Communist countries?

Yes	26
No	65
No opinion	9

11. Do you favor limiting foreign imports of certain agricultural products such as dairy and meat?

Yes	72
No	20
No opinion	8

12. Concerning Vietnam President Johnson said in his State of the Union Message on January 10: "We have chosen to fight a limited war in Vietnam in an attempt to prevent a larger war. I wish I could report to you that the conflict is almost over. This I cannot do. We face more cost, more loss, more agony. For the end is not yet. . . ." *Which of the following courses of action do you favor?* (check one)

(*a*) Withdrawal of U.S. forces?	7
(*b*) Continue our present course?	6
(*c*) Increased ground, air and naval forces sufficient to insure complete control of Soputh Vietnam in the shortest possible time?	52
(*d*) Cessation of bombing in North Vietnam?	1
(*e*) No increase in ground forces, but increased use of air and sea power against North Vietnam and supply routes to the South?	20
(*f*) No opinion?	14

Senior Citizens' Day in Shrub Oak, N.Y.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, June 20, 1967

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, on May 5, 1967, the senior class of Lakeland High School in Shrub Oak, N.Y., held its second Senior Citizens' Day. On that occasion, various senior citizens who are members of the community appeared at the school and took part in classroom discussions with the students. This year and last year the occasion was a great success and did much to promote understanding between the older and younger generations.

I ask unanimous consent that two press releases concerning Senior Citizens' Day is printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the press releases were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENIOR CITIZENS' DAY AT LAKELAND HIGH SCHOOL

"Why should older people complain about short skirts worn by teenagers today? Or about 'wild' teen dances? Didn't you have a 'swinging' time in the 20's with short skirts, wild parties, and zany dances?"

Thus went the exchange between a Lakeland High School senior in Room 205 at the high school today as she questioned one of the Senior Citizens visiting her classes.

Today was Senior Citizen's Day at the school and seventeen of the "older" citizens from the Lakeland community and surrounding areas appeared in the twelfth grade American history sections. Mr. Paul Leith, President of the Senior Citizens' Club of Crompond, worked out the visitation in cooperation with staff members Mr. Michael Lane, Mr. James Walker, Mrs. Julia Bradley, Mr. Roland O'Neal, and the principal, Mr. Merritt Lindsey.

"I think seniors in high school are old enough to decide for themselves as to the length of skirts," said one of the visiting ladies.

When asked what type of life a retired person led, Mr. David Gordon noted that he was on the go from slightly after 6 a.m. to 11 p.m. Several of the seniors were amazed at the vitality of their guests, a point that was re-enforced when Mr. Leith remarked "you can be 70 years young, or 40 years old."

The graduating class was challenged to review the stereotypes of what it means to be elderly and to face the candor of several Senior Citizens. Mrs. Chester Rick asked her youthful hosts not to be set in their ways, but to be active in community affairs, "so you won't leave the world with as many of the problems as you've inherited from us."

In evaluating the second annual Senior Citizens' Day at Lakeland, Mr. Paul Leith observed that "there was great interest displayed in all classes by both students and Senior Citizens. The history department is to be praised highly for arranging this Senior Citizens Day. I hope that other school districts will establish a similar discussion next May during Senior Citizens' month."

Mrs. Paul Leith, Secretary of the Senior Citizens' Club of Crompond, concluded that she "was pleasantly surprised at the students' understanding of the problems of older people."

Approximately 200 students participated in the program with the 17 Senior Citizens. Miss Eleanor Coccocia, Chairman of the Homemaking Department, served coffee and cake to the guests between classes with the assistance of students in the home economics courses. Those Senior Citizens in attendance were:

Mr. and Mrs. Paul Leith, Mrs. Chester Rick, Mr. David Gordon, Mrs. William Vulcan, Mr. Louis Levy, Mrs. Mary Slater, Mr. Philip Shindelman, Mr. Joseph Rincione, Mrs. Lee Shankman, Mr. Charles Terr, Mrs. Charles, Mrs. John Baluff, Mr. Max Halpern, President of Mahopac Seniors, Mrs. Max Halpern, Mr. Lee Shankman.

"What Can Teenagers Look Forward To by the Year 2000? What is Old? How can we close the gap between the Young and Old?" These are some of the questions that will form the basis of discussion in nine twelfth grade American history classes on Friday, May 5th at the Lakeland High School between students and senior citizens. The discussion is being held in recognition of national Senior Citizens Month.

Mr. Paul Leith, President of the Senior Citizens Club of Crompond, and the Lakeland teachers, Mrs. Julia Bradley, Mr. Michael Lane and Mr. James Walker, are working out the details for the visit by senior citizens. Over 200 students and about a dozen senior citizens will participate in the exchange of views about old and young. A mimeographed five-page outline prepared by Mr. Leith will be given as background material to each student and visiting senior citizen prior to May 5th.

This is the second year for such an observance. Last year a similar discussion took place on May 24th in ten 12th grade history classes, with splendid results. Congressman Richard L. Ottinger inserted in the Congressional Record of June 20, 1966, news stories on the discussion from the Peekskill Evening Star and the Patent Trader. The Congressman called it "One of the most unique observances of Senior Citizens Month throughout the United States" and "a highly successful program."

On the morning of May 5th, discussions will take place in two classes from 8:02–8:44; three classes from 10:20–11:02; and one class from 11:40–12:20. In the afternoon, one class from 1:08–1:50; and one class from 1:54–2:36.

Any senior citizen, retired or employed, whether or not they be members of the Crompond Club, who wish to participate or attend, should contact Mr. Paul Leith at LA 8–9549.

Mr. ROLAND FAUCHER.

Draft Reform and a Volunteer Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BROCK ADAMS

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1967

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

DRAFT REFORM AND A VOLUNTEER ARMY

(Remarks delivered by Congressman BROCK ADAMS, University of Washington, April 21, 1967)

The present Selective Service Act will expire on June 30, 1967. Nearly everyone agrees there will be an extension in some form or other of the Government's authority to draft men for military service. I want to discuss this with you today since I expect to introduce legislation to refom the present draft laws and I am hopeful that Congress will reform the draft rather than simply extend the present law.

I suggested some general principles of draft reform in February of this year and today I would like to make some specific proposals. Each of you is deeply involved with this problem today and in the near tomorrow you will be responsible for someone else's future.

I. AMERICA'S FUTURE MILITARY STRUCTURE

I would like to outline today a two-step program starting with draft reform and culminating in the creation of a combination Army. America's future military structure should not be determined by past inertia but instead by examining our foreign policy goals against a background of the presently existing nuclear confrontation between the Soviet Union and the United States.

One of the great problems in dealing with the draft and the future of American military forces is the tendency of the military structure in a democracy to run along on inertia rather than planned development. In relatively peaceful periods, Americans have not wanted to develop or plan an orderly military structure since we have not been interested in conquest and our whole tradition has been to avoid professional militarism as a nation. We have relied upon the oceans and our allies to give us time to create the citizen-soldier for defense. In periods of emergency, we generally found that our existing peacetime military system was outdated. We generally tended to fight the "last war" during the early stages of a war. This obvious type obsolescence of past American armies has been avoided in the last few years because of the continued confrontation in the cold war.

The lack of obvious obsolescence (such as outdated guns, tanks, planes, etc.) has obscured from the American public the fact that parts of our military system are in fact still moving to a great degree on inertia, and we should carefully examine what we need as well as what we have.

The draft is the most glaring example of a part of the system being overlooked and becoming outdated and inadequate.

First, let us discuss correcting the present draft system, and second, the creation of a new system for the future.

Why do we need a new system? The struggle in Viet Nam has shown the necessity for having military force available. We have met this by equipping, moving and maintaining a conventional World War II-type subscription Army into the field. This expense has been incredible; the drain on our economy severe. We are learning new military techniques but our structure is based on World War II concepts. The stresses and strains of the NATO alliance show that most of our allies no longer believe that we will be faced with a conventional military invasion in Europe and that deployment of large numbers of troops in a standing army is outmoded in an age where nuclear weapons are available. I doubt if there is a single military strategist on either side of the Iron Curtain who believes it would be feasible to mobilize and strike with a conventional military force of men, tanks, planes, etc. against a country or group of countries that had available nuclear weapons to use against such a force.

Therefore, it seems to me that we who will be involved in America's future for the next two or three decades should start planning today to develop a realistic defense force for America. The nuclear confrontation is an established fact.

The non nuclear military forces necessary to defend America and meet the commitments required by our foreign policy should be examined in terms of what is needed and how to produce it. Obviously this force's size and skills should change through the years as the world (hopefully) improves and our goals change. So where do we start?

II. THE NEED FOR DRAFT REFORM

Our first task is to modernize the draft law system and apply it to today's population and problems. At the present time 4,084 draft boards classify and select under broad, uncertain guidelines 340,000 men a year between the ages of 18 and 26 to serve in the Armed Forces.

Each year 2 million young men reach the age of 18 and register for the draft. The first point to be considered is that our annual draft calls during the massive Viet Nam buildup are only 340,000 men, and these calls are expected to fall to 200,000 men at the most once the buildup for Viet Nam is completed. This means only 1 man in 5 is needed.

Under the present system each State is allocated a quota based not upon its population, but upon its percentage of the Nation's eligible men classified available by the local boards for induction. A State with inefficient draft boards which have not promptly classified its registrants will obviously have relatively fewer men classified and therefore will receive draft calls for fewer men.

The State quota is divided among the local boards in the State and they decide whether the registrants meet certain mental and physical qualifications (which have remained restrictively high because of the reluctance of the military to spend time on more difficult cases), and determine student and occupational deferments on a "crazy-quilt" basis. The test for an occupational deferment is any work "found to be necessary for the maintenance of national health, safety or interest," and the student deferments are determined by the local board applying the test of whether the college deferment was necessary in view of the "national health, safety or interest." The tests instigated March 31, 1966, can be a guideline to put you in but don't have to keep you out.

As might be expected, this system has produced some very bad results. A man when he registers retains his original board even though he may move, and this can produce a result whereby two men holding identical jobs, living in the same neighborhood, may find one being drafted with the other being deferred because of his work. For example, recently a young pilot for an airline which carries substantial cargo for the Department of Defense was classified eligible for the draft by his local board, whereas two other pilots for the same airline, each with less experience than the first pilot, were given deferments because their work was deemed critical to the national interest by their local board.

The problem is further compounded by the fact that certain draft boards have sufficient volunteers that they only need to draft a very few, and therefore deferments are freely given and no married men, fathers or older men are required to serve, while in other areas, such as ours, we have found recently that married men were being drafted.

Without belaboring the point, it should be pointed out that the educational deferment is treated by General Hershey as being just a deferment, since the man who receives one remains eligible for the draft after age 26 and until he reaches the age of 35. The statistics show that of the 26-year-olds (both college and noncollege) registered with the Selective Service in 1964, just under one-half of the total had not done any military service, but of the college graduates, three out of five had missed the service, while of those with high school educations, only two out of five had missed.

I have set forth these examples to demonstrate a few of the inequities existing in the present draft law. This is not meant as criticism of those who created the original law nor the local boards which have worked so hard to make it operate for many years, but simply to point out that we are continuing a system that was developed during an emergency period when it was necessary to process everyone and make them available for service, whereas now we have more men available than we need and must establish a new system for selecting those who will serve.

III. A DRAFT FORM PROPOSAL

I would propose the following steps to modernize the draft:

1. All men would register at the age of 18, and the present men registered would be placed in 8 pools—18½ to 19½, 19½ to 20½, etc., through those men 25½ to 26½.

2. After a period of two years, the period of draft liability should be cut from the present 7-year span (age 19 to age 26) down to four years (from 18½ to 22½).

3. The first group of men drafted should be 18½ year-olds, reversing the present policy of taking first the oldest men under 26.

4. College students whose draft deferments expire should be placed in the same top priority groups as the 18½ year-olds regardless of their age. When the system becomes fully functional and all selections can be made at 18½, a man will know immediately if he is to be called and can choose whether he wants to serve immediately or after deferment.

5. College students if they are chosen and receive deferments to complete their studies would not be further deferred because they have become married or become fathers while in college.

6. Separate draft calls by the 4,084 local draft boards would be abolished and a national manpower pool of 1–A men established.

7. Men would be chosen at random from a national pool of 1–A's through use of a random sample computer. At first this would apply to all men 18½ to 26½, but it is contemplated eventually this would be mainly the 18½ year-old class.

8. Local draft boards would be required to apply national standards in deciding which students receive deferments and which civilian jobholders are deferred because their work is "critical." Local draft boards should be compelled to reopen the case of a man classified 1–A if he submits new facts which if true would entitle him to another draft status, and he should be entitled to appeal this classification within 15 days.

The establishment of a "youngest-first" policy will as the system goes into full operation mean that basically the entire manpower needs will be met from the 18½ year-old class, and a man would know prior to entering college or looking for employment whether or not he had been chosen.

I am flexible at this point on how this particular "in-take" should work, but believe in principle that a man should know at 18½ whether or not he will be required to serve, and he can choose whether or not to apply for a deferment.

A pool of men large enough to produce the 340,000 men needed would be drawn each year from the 2 million men reaching 18. A random sample would be used to select on a fair basis the total pool, with a uniform national standard being used to provide for the deferments or exemptions from service as are in the best interests of the Nation. The remainder of the men would remain eligible for four years in the event of a national disaster, but then all of us are probably "in" anyway.

IV. THE COMBINATION ARMY

From this point forward, we should consider the creation of a combination Army of highly-trained, career combat troops supported by our nonvolunteer conscripted force.

We would continue a draft-supported Army pool which would train and supply volunteers to the combat force and would make available men to handle the supporting roles for the combat force and provide training for a significant number of men throughout the United States who could later serve in military Reserve units to be used in times of national disaster or emergency in much the same manner as National Guard units are presently available.

We must seriously consider our foreign policy goals and the amount of military force we are willing to use. We should determine in advance our military commitment to another country for explosive "brush wars." If we are going to be required to commit more than 100,000 combat troops, perhaps we should renegotiate our position. This, of course, contemplates our having available highly-trained combat units that are particularly directed toward specific military situations, such as guerrilla warfare.

For comparable costs, you will find that to maintain our present Army of 1.4 million men it will cost about 4.3 billion dollars in basic pay in fiscal year 1968. On the other hand, a smaller combination Army of 600,000 men in general support and a highly-skilled combat force of 100,000 men would cost less (approximately 3.6 billion dollars—$2.3 billion for the support force and $1.3 billion for the combat force). This would contemplate, for example, that the volunteer combat troops would be paid at much higher basic pay rates. For example, a private in pay grade E–1 could receive $5,000 a year as compared with about $1,500 a year now. An army private first class could receive $12,000 a year as compared with about $2,200 a year now. A sergeant in pay grade E–8 could receive $19,000 a year as compared with about $5,400 a year now. Basic pay for officers could be increased also, but need not be as significant as the increases for enlisted men. Quarters allowances and subsistence (food) allowances would need to be increased only slightly. The only really significant increase in costs would be in an individual's basic pay.

As you can see, I am talking about a true career Army where men will be receiving salaries commensurate with the risks and the life which they expect to lead. I believe we would obtain these volunteers mainly from those trained in the drafted Army. The numbers can be flexible as America's population and goals change but the principle would be established.

It was a pleasure to return today to the university, and I look forward to spending the rest of the afternoon with you.

Commerce Committee Chief Clerk To Leave Senate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 20, 1967

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, we of the Senate Commerce Committee who have so long worked with Edward Jarrett, known to us all as "Eddie," will miss his efficient work as its chief clerk when he retires from his post after serving continuously in that position for 25 years. His plans to retire were announced at the beginning of this Congress, but he was persuaded to stay on until a successor might be secured and have an understanding of the duties of the post.

The New York Times earlier this year carried an Associated Press dispatch setting forth the background of Mr. Jarrett's service and his work on the committee with three Senators who became Vice Presidents and two of them President of the United States. I ask unanimous consent that this account may appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the Article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE PANEL CLERK SINCE 1942 RETIRING

WASHINGTON, January 6.—One of the men who has kept the wheels of the Senate turning for many years has decided to retire.

He is Edward Jarrett, who came here from Roundup, Mont., in 1933 and who has been chief clerk of the Senate Commerce Committee since 1942.

Known on Capitol Hill as the dean of the Senate clerks, Mr. Jarrett has won high regard for the efficiency with which he has served as the committee's top administrative officer.

He has supervised the committee's professional staff, set up its hearings, handled the scheduling of witnesses, arranged for the printing of its documents, kept the records of its executive sessions, prepared its budget, handled press inquiries and attended to other duties.

Mr. Jarrett became chief clerk of the committee when Senator Burton K. Wheeler, Democrat of Montana was chairman. Although he as a Democrat has served under a succession of Democratic and Republican chairmen since then.

He first came to Capitol Hill in 1933 as executive secretary to Representative Roy E. Ayers of Montana. His salary was $1,800 a year. Now it is about $23,000 a year.

Red China Nuclear Mystery Seeks Solution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1967

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the Anglican is an unofficial publication of the Church of England in Sydney, Australia, with, I understand, quite liberal oriented editorship. On April 27, 1967, it published an article entitled "Nuclear Plant in China." The authorship was attributed to "a special correspondent recently returned from China." Due to the manner in which the author bobbles some elementary matters of nuclear physics I would assume either that he is a nonscientist or that a nonscientist rewrote the piece before publication.

A stringer for McGraw-Hill Publications in Sydney clipped the piece and sent it to Nucleonics Weekly. That publication made it available to me. I turned it over to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy staff with the request that AEC and other Government agencies be queried for information. Thus far I have received nothing meaningful in response. It appears that this line of inquiry is proving fruitless. I am obtaining unanimous consent to have the article printed at the conclusion of these remarks in the hopes that some enterprising news service with worldwide connections will make a rundown on the story, which story is now spiced by a totally unofficial report that at some unspecified time subsequent to publication of the item the office of the Anglican was burgled and the original copy of the article stolen. Information also has reached me that the Australian Atomic Energy Commission is "quite unconcerned" about the whole matter.

The article follows:

NUCLEAR PLANT IN CHINA

(By a special correspondent recently returned from China)

The Chinese Atomic Energy Commission has perfected a new gas centrifuge process for separating Uranium 235 and lighter isotopes from Uranium.

The plant where the new process is employed has been in full-scale operation for six months. I was permitted to inspect most sections of the plant, which is situated in a remote Chinese Province and is completely undetectable from the air.

The process has proved much more efficient than that earlier employed at the enormous gaseous diffusion plant at Lanchow, which consumes enormous amounts of electricity specially generated by a hydro-electric plant situated upstream in a gorge of the Yellow River.

Some sections of the Lanchow plant are now redundant, and are to be closed down. The generating capacity which will then be made free is to be used for other purposes.

The new process resulted from the work of Dr. Chou Pei Yuan (who was a post-graduate research scientist at the University of California at Berkeley some years ago); and a colleague who took his doctorate at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Their collaborators on the theoretical side included Dr. Tsien San Tsiang and his wife, Peng Tse Fri. Dr. Tsien is a former colleague of Professor Joliot-Curie.

Two further processes in large plants on which have been in operation for nearly a year are an electromagnetic.

Experimental work on a large scale is still proceeding on an electromagnetic process. A plutonium-producing process, however, is stated to have been in full operation for nearly a year. I did not see this plant.

A new plutonium-producing process, however, has been in full operation for nearly a year in a 1,500 million watt reactor in another concealed and remote area. This process is fundamentally different from that used in the three old reactors near Paotaw, Inner Mongolia.

I was not able to see the new plutonium plant. However, it was stated that its production is sufficient now for the manufacture of enough enriched uranium to make several fusion type bombs each year. The first such bomb is expected to be tested this year, and certainly before the end of 1968.

The "Cultural Revolution" has had no effect on rocket development work, some of which I was able to see in western Kansu, near Chiuchan. The major part of the experimental work, however, it carried on in an even more remote area to the North West, under the direction of Dr. Chien Wei Chang, who trained at the California Institute of Technology. Dr. Wei Chang Hua, who trained at M.I.T., Dr. Chien Hsueh Shen and Dr. T. Y. Shao, who returned only last year from Russia.

FEAR OF UNITED STATES

The discovery of the new uranium ore deposits in 1965, together with concentrations of other minerals which had previously to be imported, makes China now wholly self-supporting and self-contained in the nuclear field.

The Advanced Institute of Theoretical Physics and Mathematics has been completely untouched by the "Cultural Revolution". It is now under Army control.

The justification given on all sides for the diversion of so much of the national income to nuclear research falls into two categories. The first is that much of the research and work being done will increase electricity generating capacity and provide the increasing amounts of power demanded by industry.

The major reason given, however, is fear of an attack with nuclear weapons by the Americans, the need to have a ready reply, and the national refusal to bend to "nuclear blackmail".

Rightly or wrongly, the fear of America is widespread and deep. It is reflected not only in the controlled newspapers, but even in technical journals.

Conference at Geneva

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. LAUSCHE

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 20, 1967

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I wish to commend Mr. William Buckley, Jr., for his article entitled "Conference at Geneva," published in the Washington Daily News of June 6, 1967.

Another of those international conferences called by Robert Hutchins to celebrate the injunctions for peace contained in the papal encyclical, "Pacem in Terris," was held in Geneva recently, Mr. Buckley informs us. Like the one organized by Mr. Hutchins in New York several years ago, this conference developed primarily into a forum for criticizing the United States.

Incredibly, at this meeting, however, reports Mr. Buckley, a pro-American, Porter McKeever, penetrated Mr. Hutchins' security arrangements and actually defended U.S. policy in Vietnam.

Mr. McKeever said:

> Let's grant that bombing North Vietnam is of doubtful military value and is clearly a political liability. But grant also that no fairminded person can doubt that we want to get out of Southeast Asia as fast as we can.

My gratitude and respects go to Mr. Porter McKeever.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Buckley's article be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Conference at Geneva

(By William Buckley, Jr.)

Somebody put one over on Robert Hutchins. Incredibly, a pro-American penetrated Mr. Hutchins' security arrangements at Geneva and actually defended United States policy in Vietnam. Apparently Mr. Hutchins was left speechless. Tho not for long. He retaliated by accusing the pro-American of having imputed hypocrisy to the members of Mr. Hutchins' International Conference to Hate America, and he lodged a "formal protest."

It is not clear to whom this formal protest is directed. Formal protests from Robert Hutchins are usually directed to God, since no lesser being could possibly remake the world in such a way as to satisfy the exacting Mr. Hutchins. This was another one of those international conferences, called to celebrate the irenic injunctions of the papal encyclical, Pacem In Terris. Like the one in New York a couple years ago, also organized by Mr. Hutchins, it developed primarily into a forum for criticizing the United States.

The American who finally couldn't stand it any longer is Porter McKeever, executive vice-president of the United Nations Association of the United States.

"I have sat here" said Mr. McKeever, "and heard words like 'savage,' 'brutal', 'uncivilized,' applied to a country which has poured its human and material resources into the hands of others on a scale for which history has no precedent." Let's grant, said Mr. McKeever, "that bombing North Vietnam is of doubtful military value and is clearly a political liability." But grant also that "no fair-minded person can doubt that we want to get out of Southeast Asia as fast as we can."

But where do you find fair-minded people? They do not tend to congregate at Mr. Hutchins' zoo in Santa Barbara, Calif., where at the taxpayers' expense, he collects the cranks, and publishes their misgivings about the United States. Who, for instance, do you suppose Mr. Hutchins selected to head the panel of scientists at the conference in Geneva? None other than Dr. Linus Pauling, the Stakhanovite fellow traveller.

Dr. Pauling condemned "the murder of tens of thousands, hundreds of thousands of men, women and children in the war in Vietnam." He means, of course, men, women, and children "murdered" by the United States. Men, women and children murdered by communists don't figure in Dr. Pauling's moral arithmetic. The United States, Dr. Pauling explained in the exact scientific language which has won him two Nobel prizes, is "carrying on a cruel and vicious attack on a poor, small, weak people on the other side of the world."

Vietnam does that to people, makes educators simpletons, scientists sloppy, rhetoricians clumsy.

Europeans who conclude that the United States is quite mad, or quite right. Who—except Americans—would countenance Mr. Hutchins and his epigoni, at a moment when our casualty lists mount to three thousand dead and wounded in a single week. Silence him? Certainly not, and anyway how do you turn off the Niagara Falls? But surely other countries would show a more universal contempt for the character of such criticism as Mr. Hutchins sponsors, which requires, in order to humor it, the explicit conviction that Lyndon Johnson is a witless sadist.

Clearing the Air

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. WYDLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1967

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, a full page advertisement recently appeared in the New York Times with the headline "We'd Like To Clear the Air." The ad, of course, deals with the serious and far-reaching health problem facing each of us today—air pollution. Naturally, there are many companies who have attempted to develop or who are currently developing commercial devices designed to lessen the pollutants emitted in the air by automobiles, one of the major culprits in the air pollution problem. However, one man with a highly developed sense of public service has manufactured such a device and has offered a number of them absolutely free of charge to such agencies as the police department, the fire department, Con Edison, and the like for their motor vehicles.

That man is Mr. Abe Shikes, president of Aurora Plastics Corp. of West Hempstead, Long Island, N.Y.

I had occasion to personally visit with Abe Shikes, president of Aurora, to investigate and check on this new anti-smog automobile system. In checking the technicalities involved, I found that Vac-U-Tron was a permanent and fully sealed crankcase emission control system and that chemically it was the only system that reduces the emission of oxides of nitrogen, the substance that does most of the damage.

But the important thing to know is that Mr. Shikes and his company are discharging their responsibilities not just to their stockholders, but to the public at large. It is for this reason that I feel that Mr. Shikes should be applauded by all good citizens and our government for his enlightened concept of public service in foregoing any commercial reward in order to make it possible for this important new concept in smog control to be fully tested by various civic and private automobile fleets.

This is the kind of public spirited action which has often made the United States the focal point of free enterprise and it is typical that this patriotic citizen is a 20th-century Horatio Alger.

Born in Russia in 1908, Mr. Shikes went out into the world at age 13, and today he heads the world's largest manufacturer of hobby products.

If we are to succeed ultimately in literally clearing the air, it will be because of the efforts of men like Abe Shikes and our free enterprise system.

Espionage Hearings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN E. WILLIS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1967

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, the House Committee on Un-American Activities, which I have the honor to chair, has just completed the third in a series of public hearings on the conduct of espionage within the United States by agents of foreign Communist governments. The three witnesses who have testified thus far have all had first hand knowledge of Communist espionage operations, gained by direct contact with Soviet agents. Each one, after completing his testimony, has made a statement concerning what we in the Congress and the American people could learn from his experience.

The first witness, Mr. John Huminik, is a scientist and businessman who has been associated with the defense industry in and around Washington, D.C. He is knowledgeable in the field of metallurgy and in various technical aspects of the U.S. space and rocketry programs. Mr. Huminik was contacted at least 75 times by various Soviet agents who offered him "very good prices for any information that you could give to our Government." He worked hand in hand with the FBI in uncovering the clandestine espionage activities of a highly trained Soviet spy ring.

When asked what might be learned from his experiences, Mr. Huminik said:

> I have come here today at the request of this committee and have tried to relate accurately my experience with the Soviet diplomats and consular officials during more than 5 years. This experience came to an end only 8 months ago—and I would hope indicates to this committee that the Soviet Union intends to continue their espionage activities in this country. It is obvious to me that the Soviet Union is using its embassy and consulate, located only a few miles from here, to conduct extensive espionage activities. I am sure that this is not news to this committee. J. Edgar Hoover, the eminent Director of the FBI, has testified many times to this effect.
>
> My personal lesson indicates to me that there is danger to the small businessman, the scientist, and the engineer. The Soviets want technology more than anything else, and it is their plan to get it from technical people. In addition, they seek out technical people of Slavic descent—in other words, people that come from Czechoslovakia, Russia, Poland, or any of the countries that are now the Iron Curtain countries—because they feel they can blackmail them, or they will be more receptive or susceptible to their requests. They will use money, promises of business, and many other ploys to entice Americans to work for them. They often strive to achieve such a firm grip on an individual that he would be afraid to go to the FBI for fear of what he already might have given them unwittingly. In my case, I went to the FBI immediately, but there are probably people who unknowingly get involved and then are afraid to go to the FBI and in some way continue to work for them. Some of these people, of course, are caught.
>
> The Soviets proved to me that they will penetrate our country as far as possible and by any means. They wanted data necessary to become employed in the U.S. Government—and they wanted to know how to start a corporation, presumably to operate an illegal apparatus in this country.
>
> The lesson I learned is deeper than I can put into words before this committee. Espionage is a complex business and sometimes hard to detect—but it is there, and I am sure that the Soviet Union will not slow down because I am speaking here today. They will continue with their efforts in spite of the FBI. The FBI is the guardian of this land, and through its vigil we are guaranteed a good measure of protection. The job they do is legend and known by almost every school boy. As citizens we have to give the FBI maximum support. They should be informed any time anything suspicious is around. I think diplomatic license plates in residential areas should be reported more frequently.
>
> Further, I want it to be known today that I came here as a citizen—a plain American citizen; that I am not a representative of any group, I am not here as a Democrat or as a Republican. And I want it known that I have the highest respect for this committee which often times alone is battling elements that affect the internal security of America. This committee will always have my support and help, if it is requested.
>
> "I think that we could say that the country at large should become more aware of the problems and that they should look closely at their elected officials, the ones that in some cases are naive to the problems that the Soviets are causing us and they should learn what the Soviet Union is trying to do here. And suitable legislation should be passed if it is inadequate now, I just don't know about that. The Soviets are doing nothing to reduce the cold war. Their espionage, terrorism, and blackmail operations are, if anything, more intense and more sophisticated than ever before.
>
> The Soviet Union has not changed its policy regarding espionage in this country for at least the last 20 years, and there is not a single indication to me or any other informed American that a different Soviet Union exists in 1967."

The second witness, Leonard I. Epstein, earns his living buying, retrofitting, and reselling machinery and machine tools. Mr. Epstein told the subcommittee that the U.S. machine tool industry is years ahead of the Soviet Union and the rest of the world. It was because of his knowledge of—and access to—its advanced equipment that he was befriended by a Soviet UNICEF procurement officer who wanted to purchase and send equipment abroad under diplomatic pouch. The Soviet officer was interested in various technical items which are restricted from shipment to Communist countries and which are for the most part directly related to this Nation's space program. The witness, who sees the critical need of the Soviet Union for United States advanced technology, commented on his experiences, stating:

> I will say this: I feel that they are behind us, in their technology. I don't know how many years behind, but they definitely need the advanced technology that we have, and I feel that selling them this type of equipment, giving it to them, or in any way dealing with them in this type of item, is just endangering our own future positions with the people.
>
> I was very much upset on learning here, about a month ago—and you probably saw it in the newspaper—that General Dynamics was going to sell a submersible to the Russians—you probably saw it—for a million dollars.
>
> I don't feel that this country should give up our advances just to make dollars. What we have, I think we should keep. I think that we should not make the task any easier for them at all.
>
> I happen to feel that the increasing trade relations with them and the opening of consulates throughout the United States is just going to make it that much more difficult, and make that many more people susceptible to their approaches.
>
> That is my own opinion. But I definitely feel that the job is going to get difficult, more difficult for the FBI. More people will be approached, strictly for this industrial espionage.
>
> I am not talking about military secrets, I am just talking about technological secrets. The ones that we have, I don't feel we should share it with them, I don't feel we should sell it to them.
>
> Let them go develop their own, especially when it comes to missiles or satellite vehicles.

The third and most recent witness in the espionage hearings, Mr. Frank John Mrkva, is currently chief of the Field Services Branch of the Passport Office in the U.S. Department of State. Mr. Mrkva came into contact with agents employed at the Czechoslovakian Embassy in Washington, D.C. These agents attempted to purchase classified State Department documents from him and use him to conceal a highly sophisticated listening device in an important State Department office. Mr. Mrkva, working with his superiors and the FBI, performed a valuable service by providing them with information about the methods being used by agents of Communist Czechoslovakia who were trying to obtain classified U.S. material. Commenting on his experience, Mr. Mrkva said:

> In reflecting on the activities, I have had a great deal of time to think about this, and I believe the American public should be made aware of the activities of some of these Communist agents, who are now serving in this country, under the guise of diplomats. I also believe the American public should know how easily and innocently they can be duped by these people into furnishing them information which in many cases could be very detrimental to the security of the United States.
>
> I am convinced that even at this moment, Communist agents are on the prowl here, right here in Washington, and elsewhere in this country, keeping prearranged rendezvous, setting up arrangements for future meetings, familiarizing themselves with select areas that they plan to use for meeting places, and as drops, and it should be a matter of concern to all of us.
>
> When you start seeing them, and start meeting them practically in your own backyard, as it was in my case, it kind of jolts your complacency.

Mr. Speaker, in this day and time when fictional and highly romanticized spy novels, spy television programs, and spy motion pictures are in superabundance, we tend, at times, to underestimate the seriousness of the espionage that goes on right in our own backyard. The fact is that agents of foreign Communist governments are continuously hard at work gathering not only governmental and military secrets here in the United States, but our most treasured technological advancements as well, in order to destroy our country.

We owe a debt of gratitude to these witnesses for their dedication and their loyalty. We need their alertness, their courage, their personal sacrifice. With their help, and the help of other Americans who place honor, integrity, and valor above personal gain, we can continue to successfully combat the unscrupulous efforts of Communist agents who tempt our citizens on their very doorsteps.

There is a lesson to be learned from the parallel testimony of these men who have given us the facts about present-day Communist espionage operations in the United States: While making overtures for "peaceful coexistence" and "bridge-building brotherhood" to our faces, our Communist enemy is brazenly fumbling in our breast pockets for the advanced technology and military superiority of a capitalistic society he hopes one day to bury.

This is a lesson we should not forget.

Farmers Try Harder

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY C. SCHADEBERG

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1967

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, many of us have concerned ourselves, and rightly so, with the plight of the farmer. Perhaps we felt, at times, that the farmer was getting more attention than he deserved, or than we all realized. Naturally, I disagree because the sad state of affairs within the agriculture community cannot be overdone.

Yet we often pause to ask: What is the farmer doing about it? Oddly enough, they ask themselves the same question and often come up with answers, as can be seen by an editorial which follows and which was published in the highly regarded Cheese Reporter, printed in Madison, Wis., and serving the entire Cheese Industry. The article follows the question: What can the farmer do to solve his problem?

[From the Cheese Reporter, June 9, 1967]

The only solution is that a farmer needs, yes, must have, an education in business to be successful.

Few successful business ventures do not require two very basic elements: 1. Knowledge of the skills of the trade involved; and, 2. Knowledge of business methods and efficiencies by which those skills may be successfully used.

The number of businesses that go broke annually varify sufficiently the need for both skills working together, to produce success in all business.

Briefly stated from the agricultural side, to get into most agriculture today a strong back with a knowledge of how to perform the agricultural operation involved is still the only real requirement.

There are no requirements for training or aptitude for management of income, labor efficiencies, income investment, capital assets and management, return on investments, operation growth or cost per unit production limitations.

What is perhaps most painful of these realizations is that without an awareness of any need for such education, the frustration of continuing less-than-rewarding labor only continues and eventually turns to irritation and disgust.

Where good, strong farm boys may know and love the operation they have chosen, without knowing how to manage it, they only repeat the cycle of frustrated operators regardless of intelligence.

The same demands apply to the dairy product industry. How many of our young and eager men learn a product trade but will remain continually handicapped simply due to the need for business method knowledge?

Even those in our industry who are fully trained for management find it difficult to keep up with the demands of business. What chance have those who are untrained to operate a business successfully?

Aren't we selling agriculture short by not providing business management training equivalent to the technical training and assistance available?

Why cannot agriculture use today's technique of the sit-in and the teach-in by offering one or two day intensive business management seminars? Let's bring in business method trainers to give a grounding of understanding beyond which the individual can study on his own or seek additional training?

Such training facilities would not be limited by age or occupation, but would provide an opportunity for building toward success and improvement with business knowledge.

You wouldn't knowingly operate your car without both gas and oil; why should we expect successful agricultural operations with only the fuel of interest and labor, but without the lubrication of business knowledge for successful management?

First Lt. Clarence D. Long III

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 29, 1967

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, America is justly proud of all of its sons in uniform and of their contributions at whatever level they serve. All of us are particularly pleased, however, to note when heroism of those best known to us is officially recognized. I hold in my hand citations for bravery of First Lt. Clarence D. Long III, son of our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Maryland, the Honorable CLARENCE D. LONG. And I am certain that every Member of the House will be thrilled to read this account which I submit for reprinting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

FIRST LT. CLARENCE D. LONG III

Lt. Long, the son of Rep. CLARENCE D. LONG (D., Md.), is a Ranger and a Paratrooper. He volunteered for combat duty in Vietnam and has been fighting with the 101st Airborne Division there since July of last year. In November, 1966, he was wounded in the leg by a Russian AK-47 when his platoon was ambushed. After several weeks in a field hospital, he returned to combat. Lt. Long has been cited for heroism in action, and been awarded the Soldier's Medal and the Silver Star.

AWARD OF THE SILVER STAR

HEADQUARTERS,
I FIELD FORCE VIETNAM,
APO San Francisco, March 29, 1967.

[General Orders Number 307]

1. TC 320. The following award is announced.

Long, Clarence D. O5230970, First Lieutenant, Infantry, United States Army, Company C, 2d Battalion (Airborne) 502d Infantry, APO San Francisco 96347.

Awarded: Silver Star.

Date action: 31 December 1966.

Theater: Republic of Vietnam.

Reason: Gallantry in action: First Lieutenant Long's platoon had just moved to the vicinity of the weapons platoon to receive a resupply and assume a defensive position during the forty-eight hour New Years truce. As the second helicopter to arrive delivered the resupply, the landing zone was hit by numerous rounds of mortar fire. This was immediately followed by an intense volume of automatic and small arms fire. Lieutenant Long was supervising the unloading of the helicopter when the first rounds fell. He shouted for his men to take cover in a ditch and to return the fire. Lieutenant Long ran back and forth along the ditch exposing himself repeatedly to direct the fire of his men. One of his troops was hit by a burst of automatic weapons fire and was lying exposed to enemy fire in the middle of the landing zone. Lieutenant Long, with complete disregard for his personal safety, ran forward firing his M–79 at enemy positions until he reached his fallen comrade. With the help of a noncommissioned officer, he moved the wounded man to cover. He then ran across an open area to put his machine gun teams into action in better positions. When the initial fire was suppressed, he caled for artillery fire and directed gunship strikes. He also requested an air strike and exposed himself to sniper fire to better observe and adjust the strike. After the battle Lieutenant Long reorganized the two platoons and supervised the evacuation of the wounded. Lieutenant Long's outstanding gallantry in action and avid devotion to duty are within the highest military traditions and reflect great credit upon himself, his unit, and the United States Army.

Authority: By direction of the President under the provisions of USARV Message 16695, 1 July 1966 and paragraph 27, AR 672–5–1.

For the Commander:

LINTON S. BOATWRIGHT,
Colonel, GS,
Chief of Staff.

Official:

WILLIAM H. JAMES,
Colonel, AGC,
Adjutant General.

AWARD OF THE SOLDIER'S MEDAL

HEADQUARTERS,
I FIELD FORCE, VIETNAM,
APO San Francisco, February 11, 1967.

[General Orders Number 150]

1. TC 320. The following award is announced.

Long, Clarence D., O5230979, First Lieutenant Infantry, United States Army, Company C, 2d Battalion, Airborne), 502d Infantry, APO San Francisco 96347.

Awarded: Soldier's Medal

Date action: 24 October 1966

Theater: Republic of Vietnam

Reason: Heroism not involving actual conflict with an armed hostile force: First Lieutenant Long was give the mission of finding the whereabouts of an artillery spotter plane that had crashed at about 0930 hours on 24 October 1966. Upon reaching the site of the crash, he found the plane in a steep gully, burning and wrecked beyond repair. Immediately, Lieutenant Long ordered litters made and with disregard for his personal safety ran towards the burning plane with some of his men and carried the two trapped, injured men free of the burning wreck. After placing the injured men in a safe location, Lieutenant Long retturned to the burning wreckage and supervised the unloading of the ordnance aboard the plane. Two weapons and one 2.75 inch rocket were recovered. Immediately after he left the burning wreckage for the second time, the remaining gasoline in the plane exploded covering the area with fire. Lieutenant Long's courageous actions, in complete disregard of his own safety, reflect great credit upon himself, his unit, and the United States Army.

Authority: By direction of the President under the provisions of USARV Message 16695, 1 July 1966 and paragraph 30, AR 672-5-1.

For the Commander:

LINTON S. BOATWRIGHT,
Colonel, GS,
Chief of Staff.

Official:

WILLIAM H. JAMES,
Colonel, AGC,
Adjutant General.

DEED OF HEROISM

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY, HEADQUARTERS 1ST BRIGADE 101ST AIRBORNE DIVISION,
APO San Francisco, November 30, 1966.

[General Orders Number 1257]

1. TC 999. The following individual is hereby officially cited for valor in action during counterinsurgency operations in the Republic of Vietnam.

Long, Clarence D. O5230970 First Lieutenant Infantry USA Co C, 2d Bn, 502d Inf, 1st Bde, 101st Abn Div, APO 96347

Reason: On 27 September 1966, near Tuy Hoa, Republic of Vietnam, Lieutenant Long, although pinned down by heavy enemy automatic weapons fire, skillfully directed artillery fire on the insurgents' positions.

Authority: By direction of the Commanding General 1st Brigade 101st Airborne Division.

For the Commander:

J. G. BROWN,
Major, AGC,
Adjutant General.

WILLIAM E. GROVES,
2d Lt., AGC,
Asst. AG.

AWARD OF THE PURPLE HEART

HEADQUARTERS,
8TH FIELD HOSPITAL,
APO US Forces, November 20, 1966.

[General Orders Number 78]

1. TC 320. The following Awards are announced.

Award: Purple Heart

Date Action: As Indicated in Standard Name Line

Theater: Republic of Vietnam

Reason: For wounds received in connection with military operation against a hostile force.

Authority: By direction of the President under the provisions of AR 672-5-1 and Department of the Army Message 749390 Dated 3 February 1966.

Burgos, Jose A. RA29153792 SFC E-7 Co C 2d Bn 502d Inf 101st Abn Div APO 96347 12 Nov 66.

Kadow, John RA19814397 SP4 E-4 HHC 1st Bn 327th Inf 101st Abn Div APO 96347 12 Nov 66.

Johnson, Larry RA19476271 SSG E-6 Co A 320th Inf 101st Abn Div APO 96347 7 Nov 66.

Long, Clarence III 05230970 1LT Co C 2nd Bn 502d Inf 101st Abn Div APO 96347 7 Nov 66.

For the Commander:

LINDSAY E. FERGUSON,
Major, MSC,
Adjutant.

White Man Speak With Forked Tongue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. W. E. (BILL) BROCK

OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 20, 1967

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, we are constantly being told how much the Federal Government is doing to improve our lives in every way. Recently, the Quinault Tribe of American Indians in Washington State came athwart of some well-intentioned bureaucrats who wanted to help them "live better electrically." The tragi-comic results were recounted in a June 18 editorial in the Chattanooga News-Free Press, which I am inserting at this point in the RECORD:

THE "ALL-ELECTRIC" INDIANS

Perhaps no other group in America has been so mistreated as the American Indians. We know something about that right here in Chattanooga because Indians in our area were involved in the infamous "Trail of Tears," after they were gathered at a camp near the present Riverside High School on Third Street to begin a march to the West that was fatal for many of them.

As racial issues have been raised in recent years, the neglect of the Indian has been explained because he doesn't represent a significant voting bloc that politicians feel a need to cater to. But there have been some efforts to give consideration to Indians—and even these sometimes have not worked out well.

Nation's Business tells that Uncle Sam wanted to bring the Quinault tribe of Washington State's Olympic Peninsula into the light of the 20th Century, both literally and figuratively, by bringing electricity to the tribe.

"The Bureau of Indian Affairs last year launched a $200,000 project to provide some 20 all-electric homes for the Quinaults that would be the envy of any Indian," the magazine reported. "The first units, completed this winter, boast the latest in gracious, all-electric living—electric ranges, electric refrigerators, electric baseboard heating, electric washers and driers and electric hot water heaters."

Indians who had lived in run-down shacks began to move into the new homes last February. Surely, they must enjoy their new houses—but they aren't using their fine electric appliances. It's not really their fault. It's not that they are too backward.

The trouble is that an electric power line wasn't brought in to serve the all-electric homes.

The nearest electric power line is 15 miles away.

"Four federal and three state and county agencies," *Nation's Business* says, "have been fighting since early last winer, trying to pass the buck to one another for the oversight. The Bonneville Power Administration is involved. So is the Rural Electrification Administration which has had the money available for some months to extend the power line to the Indian village. National Park Service still can't decide whether to let the line go overhead or underground (the line would cut across the Olympia National Park)."

The Indians, resourceful as the original Americans were reputed to be, bought kerosene lamps and gasoline heaters and stoves and are living quietly in their "all-electric" homes while waiting for the electricity to come.

Mr. J. K. Lilly, Jr., of Indianapolis, One of the Great Collectors of His Time

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 20, 1967

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Josiah K. Lilly, Jr., of Indianapolis, Ind., was the grandson of the founder of Eli Lilly & Co., one of the Nation's major pharmaceutical firms. He was known as a good businessman, but not until his death in May 1966, did it become known that he was also one of the great collectors of the 20th century.

The following story from the June 19, 1967, National Observer describes the hitherto-unknown activities of a most unusual and talented man:

SECRET LIVES OF J. K. LILLY, THE MILLIONAIRE—EXECUTORS ARE TURNING UP SUPERB COLLECTIONS OF JUST ABOUT EVERYTHING

(By Lawrence S. Connor)

INDIANAPOLIS.—Ordinary men may lead lives of quiet disperation, but wealthy men occasionally lead lives of quite isolation, choosing to avoid the mainstream of events and the demands of the public on their time, wealth, and family names. So it was with the late Josiah Kirby Lilly, Jr., grandson of the founder of the vast Eli Lilly & Co. pharmaceutical house and former chairman of the board of the Indianapolis-based corporation.

A shy, retiring man, Mr. Lilly had the reputation of being an enlightened and progressive businessman, sometimes stern, but in his personal life always an enigma. Rarely seen at public functions, he took great pains to avoid publicity, a trait of the Lilly family. Although the Lillys over the years have given away millions of dollars, it would be difficult to find any public monuments to them in Indianapolis.

Mr. Lilly might still be an enigma had he taken the care in preparing his will that he did in conducting his family's business and his other activities. But he didn't. Unaccountably, his will leaving the interest accumulated by his enormous estate to, his two children, six grandchildren, and the Lilly Endowment completely failed to take advantage of the tax-saving features of the estate laws. In settling the estate, the executors have had to sell his possessions to pay the enormous tax bill, which may total $40,000,000, and in the process have learned the secret of how this mysterious and self-contained man spent his isolated hours and a portion of his great wealth.

HOURS IN THE MUSEUM

As his possessions were cataloged and sold it turned out that J. K. Lilly, Jr., was one of the great collectors of his time. In the lonely 12- and 14-hour days he spent in his private museum he systematically, and with the love of the hunt of the dedicated collector, assembled great collections of rare books, stamps, jewels, gold coins, guns, maritime artifacts, paintings, and, of all things, toy soldiers. Some of these collections are unequaled anywhere in the world.

His methodology reflected his love of collecting and his retiring, secretive nature. Unlike William Randolph Hearst, he seldom purchased another's entire collection, or even bought in large lots; he preferred to painstakingly select choice items and build his collections step by step. Nor did anyone else have an inkling of the diversity of his interests. Stamp dealers knew nothing of his coin collection and his book buyers were ignorant of his interest in jewels. His collections were acquired by tight-lipped agents who were as discreet as their employer and neecssarily so because, as one of the estate's executors puts it, "anyone who revealed Mr. Lilly's identity would have been dropped immediately." The assembly of his gold coin collection, one of the most extensive ever, which the Smithsonian Institution hopes to acquire through special legislation in the 90th Congress, is typical of his canny, systematic technique.

A MYSTERY IN GOLD

About 12 years ago Dr. Vladimir Clain-Stefanelli, chief of the division of numismatics at the Smithsonian, realized that someone was collecting a vast amount of gold coins. But, despite many attempts, he never learned who it was until Mr. Lilly died in May 1966, at the age of 72.

"I was given the opportunity to examine and analyze the scope of his collection and I can only say that it surpasses any other collection of gold coins ever assembled by one person," he says. "There is no museum in the United States, or for that matter in the entire Western world, that has a comparable collection." It consists of 6,113 gold pieces dating from the age of Pericles through the Roman and British empires up to modern times, and the 1,227 U.S. pieces includes one of every gold coin minted by the United States except one—a $3 piece minted in San Francisco in 1870. Even the U.S. Government doesn't have such a collection of its own coins. The collection also includes colonial, territorial, private, and Confederate gold coins and 1,232 Central and South American gold coins.

Until the collection is appraised, a difficult because of the rarity of many of the coins, the estate's executors can only speculate on its worth. Estimates range from $3,500,000 to more than $7,000,000. The legislation authorizing the acquisition of the collection by the Smithsonian would permit the Lilly heirs to escape paying Federal estate taxes on the coins and result in a reduction of the tax levied on the entire estate.

"DISCRIMINATING TASTE"

The collection, according to Mr. Clain-Stefanelli, shows "unusual historical and numismatic knowledge as well as a most discriminating taste, obviously supported by practically unlimited means." The same, apparently, could be said of his other collections. Not content to simply accumulate objects, Mr. Lilly made himself an expert in whatever avocation he was pursuing.

"He asked me many years ago if I knew of any list of '100 Good Sea Novels,'" recalls David A. Randall, a confidant of Mr. Lilly's for 40 years and now librarian of the Lilly collection at Indiana University. "I told him, 'No, of course not, and if you want one you will have to make it yourself.' Later I asked if he had decided on his list and his answer was: 'No, not yet. I've only read 1,100 and I'm sure there are some good ones I've missed.'"

Always introverted, Mr. Lilly was nearly a recluse in the last half-dozen years of his life because of a serious heart condition. He didn't go to his office in his last three years and saw only a handful of friends, but his health didn't prevent him from working 12 or 14 hours a day on his collections.

If his physical resources were limited, his intellectual energy apparently was not. In the last year of his life he reread most of Stevenson and all of Conrad, a form of activity not unknown to gentlemen of cultivation and leisure, but he also had time for less common interests. Six months before his death, a friend learned that Mr. Lilly was reading the Encyclopedia Brittanica. "He told me he was up to the Gs," the friend recalled. Late in life he also became interested in painting, and by most accounts became an excellent craftsman with a sharp eye for detail.

RARE-BOOK BONANZA

But primarily he was a collector. In 1926 Mr. Randall, then manager of the rare-books department for Charles Scribner's Sons publishing house in New York City, sold Mr. Lilly his first rare book. Thirty years later, in 1956, the public first learned of his interest in rare books when he donated his 20,000-volume collection to Indiana University, a collection described at the time as the most important of its kind ever given to an American educational institution.

It included first editions, original manuscripts, and drafts of famous documents, the whole valued now at $10,000,000. There are first editions of Twain, Hawthorne, and Poe as well as British and European authors. There are scientific books and manuscripts, and such memorabilia as two letters written by Christopher Columbus in 1493, four Shakespeare folios, a first printing of the Declaration of Independence, and an original draft of the Thirteenth Amendment, signed by President Lincoln. "There are more important collections of its segments," says Mr. Randall, "but taken as a unit it is by far the greatest assembled by anyone in his era."

Similarly, his stamp collection has been described as one of the "greatest collections of unused stamps in the history of philately." It contains 77,000 postage stamps in 250 volumes and includes some of the rarest in the world. Nearly all the valuable U.S. stamps with inverted centers are represented, including a corner margin block of four 24-cent 1918 airmail stamps valued at $80,000 a single stamp, a misprinted 15-center with an inverted center commemorating the landing of Christopher Columbus, has been sold for $35,000. Three of 10 planned auctions of the collection already have brought the estate $1,100,000, the stamps netting between 25 and 50 per cent over their catalog price.

THE MINOR HOBBIES

His jewel collection, a minor hobby begun late in life, was sold last September for about $560,000. It consisted primarily of matched sets of stones—diamonds, rubies, and sapphires ranging from 1 to 10 carats each. His collection of swords, antique hand guns, rifles, and other weapons included one of the first Colt revolvers and a sample of what he believed was every type of Kentucky rifle ever manufactured.

But some of his collections were of his own creation. His collection to toy soldiers began with European standards, from medieval knights extending up through Napoleon and his marshals to modern times. He learned, however, that no such miniatures of Americans existed and so he contracted the exclusive services of a toy manufacturer for several years. In that time the toymakers turned out a complete set of miniatures of every regiment (more than 600) that served in American armies from colonial times to 1900, complete with uniforms, flags, insignia, and arms.

In vacationing at his summer home at Falmouth, Mass., Mr. Lilly became interested in sailing, but a collection of ship models, and compiled an extensive library on maritime subjects (all of his more than 200 paintings are of sea and maritime subjects). When he became interested in the America's Cup series and was unable to find precise information on the subject that he wanted, he ordered a complete set of every American cup winner built in exact miniature scale from original plans.

SOURCE OF THE FORTUNE

The fortune that enabled him to carry out this incredible spread of projects was begun 91 years ago by his grandfather, Eli Lilly, who started a pharmaceutical manufacturing concern with $1,400 cash and some supplies he had acquired as a pharmacist. By 1966 the company employed 16,277 persons, had net annual sales of $336,746,000, and net annual profits of $49,847,000. The sale of 310,000 shares of Lilly stock held by the estate brought $26,272,500 to apply against the $40,000,000 estate tax bill.

It was Mr. Lilly's father, however, who was responsible both for the firm's fantastic and profitable growth and for Mr. Lilly's interest in collecting. J. K. Lilly, Sr., was with the company from its founding in 1876 until his death in 1948 and he had only one interest outside the business: The music of Stephen Foster. He managed to collect nearly everything connected with the composer that could be found, and his collection was eventually donated to the University of Pittsburgh. His sons inherited both his business acumen and interest in collecting; the oldest son, Eli, 82, who is presently chairman of the board, is a student of prehistoric antiquities and was president of the Indiana Historical Society from 1933 to 1946.

The family's philanthropies have been considerable. In the 1930s J. K. Lilly, Jr., bought 3,500 acres of land northwest of Indianapolis, reforested it, and later gave it to Purdue University, a gift valued at $5,000,000. Indianapolis has since bought the land and is turning it into a park.

A LAVISH ESTATE

Despite his Spartan work habits Mr. Lilly lived in lavish surroundings. His Oldfields home, a 43-acre estate, has been given to the Art Association of Indianapolis. It includes an Eighteenth Century French chateau stocked with period furniture, draperies, rugs, art objects, a library, and paintings by Gainsborough, Goya, Boucher, Nattier, Copley, Raeburn, Fragonard, Watteau, and Reynolds. The association plans to spend $7,000,000 on the estate for a museum, theater, lecture hall, auditorium, art library, and arboretum with a specimen of every tree indigenous to Indiana.

It is probably typical of Mr. Lilly, however, that his favorite philanthropy was sponsoring the "Bibliography of American Literature," a monumental work begun in 1943 by Jacob Blanck and which is still in progress for the Bibliographical Society of America.

AN ESCAPE FROM STRAIN?

The revelation of the scope of Mr. Lilly's collecting has inspired considerable speculation about why he did it. Some believe that it provided a shy man with an escape from the strain of business and the unpleasantness of the world, particularly people who sought him out because of his wealth. Others note that he shunned civic and social activities and preferred the generally solitary intellectual challenge of his collections.

For any collector, however, there is simply the thrill of possessing something no one else has plus the enjoyment of the search. Before World War II, Mr. Randall recalls that Mr. Lilly was offered what was claimed to be a complete collection of the works of the Nobel Prize winners in their original state and original languages. "Mr. Lilly turned down the collection, although not the idea, with the remark: 'Let's not buy this, but go after them individually and have the fun of getting them ourselves," Mr. Randall says. "And so, indeed, he did and thus secured in due course many of them."

The fun was in the acquisition, not the possession. After he gave Indiana University his books, he never returned to look at them nor did he attach any strings that would have prevented the university from selling any of them if it wished. Maybe the best explanation was once uttered by Mr. Lilly himself: "You have done something worth-while when you have taken something that is ugly and replaced it with something beautiful."

Measuring Educational Progress—University of Minnesota Professor Reports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD M. FRASER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 20, 1967

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, an excellent paper on the question of national assessment of educational progress was presented recently by Dr. Jack Merwin, professor of educational psychology at the University of Minnesota.

With unanimous consent, I wish to have it set out in full for further reference:

NATIONAL ASSESSMENT—A PROGRESS REPORT

The goal of a program for periodically assessing the progress of education is to provide the intelligent lay public with census-like data on educational levels of important sectors of our population in order to furnish a dependable background of information about our educational attainment, the progress we are making and the problems we still face in achieving our educational aspirations.

We do not have such information today, though education has become a necessity for everyone as a basis for participation in our complex social, civic and vocational life. There are increasing demands on the public to support programs for extending both the quality and quantity of education. However, due to our present lack of comprehensive dependable data on progress we have made and the difficult problems we face, decisions are frequently made on hearsay and widely publicized generalizations rather than a reasonably clear picture of the educational situation. It was concern about this situation that led to the appointment of the Carnegie Corporation Exploratory Committee on Assessing the Progress of Education in 1964.

The way in which the Exploratory Committee is proceeding in developing a sound assessment has been reported in a number of articles. Dr. Ralph Tyler, Chairman of the Committee, described the project in the December 1965 issue of *School Boards*. The Association of School Administrators last spring issued a brochure on the project including a brief description of the procedures and expressions of opinions pro and con. The *Nation's Schools* has published two articles, the most recent of which was in November of 1966. An article in the *Science Teacher* in September, 1966, described the objectives and plan of assessment in the field of science. A similar report on the plan of assessment in the field of music will soon appear in *Music Educators Journal*. Other such statements and brochures are in preparation and will be appearing from month to month.

Since most of this audience has probably read one or more of the reports that have appeared, I shall only summarize events leading up to the Exploratory Committee's activities and the steps it has followed in its exploratory efforts. I would then like to devote attention to procedures currently under consideration as the basis of a periodic census-type survey of educational outcomes.

It was in the summer of 1963 that a number of leading citizens who had grown increasingly conscious of the need to expand our educational efforts were asking questions about the current educational status of our children and adults and the progress we are making. They found that we do not now have comprehensive and dependable data about the population as a whole. We have reports on numbers of schools, buildings, teachers, pupils, and about the moneys expended, but we do not have sound and adequate information on educational results. Because dependable data are not available, personal views, distorted reports and journalistic impressions are the sources of public opinion and the schools are frequently attacked and frequently defended without having necessary evidence to support either claim.

Some of these concerned men and women asked the Carnegie Corporation of New York, a private foundation, to call conferences of school people and experts in measuring educational results to see whether it was now possible to meet this need for dependable information. Two such conferences were held in the winter of 1963–64 and the general opinion expressed by the conferees was that such data could be obtained although it would require new appraisal instruments and new procedures.

Professor John Corson, of Princeton University's Woodrow Wilson School was then asked to prepare a statement on administrative considerations that might be involved in exploring, developing, and conducting a periodic survey. Professor Corson, after consultation with many people, concluded that a new venture of this type would best be approached in two steps: First, there was the need for an exploratory committee to investigate procedures that might serve as the basis for an assessment. When this Committee had identified procedures deemed workable and acceptable, these procedures might then be recommended for consideration by a "broadly representative, distinguished Commission on the progress of education."

To initiate the first step, the Exploratory Committee on Assessing the Progress of Education was appointed by the Carnegie Corporation of New York. The Committee's assignment was to confer with teachers, administrators, curriculum specialists, assessment specialists, school board members, and others interested in education to get advice on how a periodic census-type survey of educational outcomes could best be structured to provide useful information and avoid possible injuries to our educational efforts in this country. The Committee was also asked to develop instruments that might be proposed for use in such an assessment.

The Committee first held a series of conferences involving teachers, curriculum specialists, administrators, and school board members during the academic year of 1964–65. From these conferences came a general recognition of the need for comprehensive data on the progress of education and identification of a number of dangers of a poorly developed program, including the misuse of information that could come from such a program. The question then was how to go about evolving procedures that can provide the desirable information and at the same time minimize the potential dangers. The conferees had a number of recommendations on this.

They recommended that assessment instruments be developed in cooperation with teachers and be tried out in the schools.

They clearly recommended that the initial assessment include more than the 3R's and that it ultimately cover the range of important educational tasks of the modern school. In harmony with this suggestion, instruments have been constructed by four leading test development agencies in the fields of reading and the language arts, science, mathematics, social studies, citizenship, fine arts, and vocational education. In subsequent years, other important areas will be included.

A major question considered by the conferees was the auspices under which an assessment could best be conducted. The consensus was that an assessment should be under the direction of a commision of one sort or another and not be a project of federal or state government. This would be the Commission mentioned earlier as Part II of Professor Corson's proposal. These groups also recommended that the initial support for the present Committee's exploratory work be obtained from private sources.

In line with this latter recommendation that at least the initial efforts of the Committee should be supported by private funds, the Committee sought, and subsequently obtained, additional funds from the Carnegie Corporation for its work. Later, the Fund for the Advancement of Education joined in funding the project. The Committee has thus continued its work on private funds and now has sufficient funds from these two private foundations to complete its exploratory efforts and make its recommendations to the Carnegie Corporation which appointed it.

Because the purpose of the assessment is to provide helpful information about the progress of education that can be understood and accepted by public-spirited lay citizens, some new procedures are being developed. The Committee's initial work in exploring these procedures was the identification of educational objectives to serve as a basis for instrumentation. The Committee established three criteria for these objectives: 1) that they must be goals the schools are currently seeking to attain, 2) that they must be considered by thoughtful American adults as important for American youth to learn, and 3) that they be considered authentic to the discipline by scholars in the various fields. The Committee then contracted for the initial development of objectives with four test development agencies. The contracts called for these agencies to work with scholars and teachers on the identification of objectives being taught for in the schools and authentic to the various disciplines.

In the spring of 1965, the University of Minnesota approached the U.S. Office of Education with a proposal that this important educational project needed the broad perspective that could only be provided by the widespread involvement of subject matter experts, assessment specialists, and thoughtful laymen who are actively interested in education. The University subsequently received funds to conduct the review and critique of materials developed for the Committee by these agencies.

To identify thoughtful, public-spirited citizens, actively interested in education, contact was made with state and national officers of many organizations. In addition to the National School Board Association, the list included the National Congress of Parents and Teachers, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the National Education Association, the National Catholic Education Association and many others. These groups were asked for nominations of people who might be involved in this review.

During December of 1965 a total of 99 such persons from around the country met in 11 panels to review and critique the objectives identified by the scholars and teachers as important educational objectives currently being taught for in the schools. Each of the 11 panels were asked to review the objectives for all areas. Each panel met under the chairmanship of one of its own members and had as a resource person Dr. Tyler, Chairman of the Committee, or a member of the staff who came armed with the full reports from the contractors to elaborate and clarify the major objectives which had been set forth in a workbook for the panels. I think you may find of interest some of the objectives that resulted from this overall procedure.

In reading there were such objectives as: Comprehend what is read, reason logically from what is read, and have a lively interest in reading for pleasure and information.

In citizenship: Show concern for the welfare and dignity of others, respect individual rights and freedoms, and seek school and community improvement through active democratic participation.

In mathematics: Efficiency in performing arithmetic calculations, and ability to solve problems that involve measurement.

And in art: Perceive and respond to aesthetic elements in art and form reasoned critical judgments about the quality and significance of works of art.

These are, of course, only a few illustrations. The complete listing of these objectives appear in the November, 1966 issue of *Nation's Schools*. To be sure that the objectives were not so broad and undefined as to make them open to various interpretations, the contractors and their scholar-teacher consulting groups were asked to spell out each objective in terms of subcategories and provide illustrations of how students might demonstrate achievement of an objective. This breakdown was made available to the panels reviewing the objectives and you might be interested in an example of three of these:

Under science, nine-year-olds might be asked to show that they understand the operation of the lever as it relates to such things as a teeterboard or scissors while seventeen-year-olds might be asked to show that they understand that science depends on relevant and accurate observations and experiments.

Under reading, thirteen-year-olds might be given a newspaper article and asked, "What does it say?" Seventeen-year-olds might be asked to arrive at a general principle after examining a series of details.

And under citizenship, thirteen-year-olds might be expected to be able to give reasons for having government and understand the idea of limited government. Adults might be expected to understand the values of our traditional freedoms and of due process of law.

Most of the concerns about a national assessment have been addressed to the characteristics of an assessment. One of these that has appeared many times is the concern with the relationship between a national assessment and curriculum control. The Committee's use of objectives that the schools are currently seriously seeking to attain does away with external imposition of curriculum. On the other hand, if we assess educational progress over the years through a periodic survey-type census of outcomes, there is the question as to whether the instrumentation might tend to retard and hold back innovations, changes and needed improvements in the curriculum. If a census were to be taken, say, every five years, the proposal would be that one year prior to each census there should be a survey taken of what is being taught for in the schools at that time and instrumentation should be adjusted accordingly. Thus, if a census based on instrumentation currently being developed were to be conducted during 1967–68 and a second census were proposed for, say, 1972, in 1971 there should be a survey of the objectives being taught for at that time. In this way periodic assessments would reflect rather than restrict curriculum changes.

Another concern that has been expressed is that the teachers might feel pressured to "teach for the test" rather than devoting themselves to things they consider more important. With instruments built on curriculum currently being taught, there should be no need for them to change what they are doing for an assessment.

Since most of the objectives that were developed by teachers and scholars were considered important for American youth to learn by the lay review panels, the Committee contracted with the four independent agencies to develop large numbers of exercises to sample the behavior set forth in the objectives. As the exercises are being developed, they are being submitted to two types of critique and review. First, though the contractors are using subject matter specialists in the original construction of the exercises it was deemed desirable that they be reviewed for their validity in sampling the objectives by subject matter specialists not involved in their construction. Thus, national organizations of subject matter specialists were contacted and asked for nominations of members of their associations who might be involved in this review. Nominees from each of the ten areas currently under development have agreed to participate in this review. In addition, it was deemed most important that exercises used in an assessment be no way offensive to thoughtful citizens or groups in the country. For this reason, a series of conferences have been held to have thoughtful laymen review exercises that have been proposed for use in the assessment from the standpoint of the questions, "Would you object to having this exercise used with your child?" and "In your opinion would any important group in your community object to the use of this exercise?" The panelists at these meetings were those nominated for review and critique of materials by the officers of national and state organizations.

This brings you up-to-date on the status of instrument development at this time. These reviews of the exercises are nearing completion. The next step is carrying out the recommendation of the early conferees that instruments be tried out in the schools prior to any recommendation for their use. Such tryouts have started, and a good portion of them should be completed this spring.

I thought you would be interested in procedures for a national educational assessment that are currently under investigation by the Committee. I feel it's important to share these with you because it is the best way to explain the Committee's efforts to take into account the concerns that have been expressed by various individuals and groups regarding possible negative aspects of a national educational assessment.

The recommendation of persons attending the early conferences was that more than the three Rs be used initially, and that other important educational areas be included as rapidly as possible. The Committee accepts this as an important recommendation to be followed. Instruments currently under development cover the ten areas of reading, writing, mathematics, science, social studies, literature, music, art, vocational education, and citizenship.

These instruments are being developed for administration at four age levels. Private school students and youth of a given age not in school at all, in addition to public school students, are to be included in the sample. This proves to be not only an efficient and technically sound approach to a national survey but also a desirable approach from the standpoint of people whose concern has been with invidious comparisons of school systems.

The four age levels are: Age 9, by which time students have had an opportunity to complete most of the primary level work. Age 13, near the end of the elementary level. Age 17, the last age at which there are large groups of youngsters still in school, and, adults, currently being considered as a group in the general age range of 27–30.

It is considered desirable that there be three reports for each age level. First, it is proposed that there should be an attempt to describe what practically all of the students of a given age level can do under each objective. Secondly, that there ought to be a description of what about half of the students at the age level can do. And thirdly, that there should be a description of what the most advanced at a given age level are able to do. Thus, when we look at progress over a matter of, say, a five-year period, we will have an opportunity to look at progress in terms of the demonstrated achievements of students at three different levels of group performance. That is, we could compare what the most advanced, say, 10 percent, of nine-year-olds in the country in 1972 do, with what the top 10 percent of the 1967 nine-year-olds are able to demonstrate that they can do. You will notice that the emphasis is on describing what broad groups demonstrate they can do.

If one were setting out to develop a massive national testing program that would test all children as a basis for evaluating individual students or schools, tests would be administered so that each student would receive a score, which could serve as the basis for evaluation. It is not efficient, practical, nor necessary to resort to a national testing program, as opposed to a national assessment, to get the descriptions at the three levels that I have described. And, indeed, many would consider such an approach undesirable. The Committee has at no point considered its assignment that of developing a national testing program.

There are two major aspects of national assessment that point up how it differs from a national testing program aimed at evaluating individuals, schools or school systems. The first of these is that the participation of a student in the assessment would bring him in contact with only a small portion of the exercises, and different students would be taking different pieces of the total set. Thus, while there might be 10, 20, or even 30 hours worth of exercises, it now appears feasible that it would only be necessary to involve each person in the sample group for a matter of 30 minutes to an hour. For example, with 10 hours of mathematics exercises, 20 students each spending 30 minutes would produce one response to each exercise from that group. With the involvement of a sample of 10,000 students, we would have 500 responses to each exercise as a basis for describing what that group can do. Obviously, this does not provide data for comparing the performance of individuals.

A second major difference between a national testing program and a national assessment is that only a small sample of students would be involved in an assessment. The Committee's technical advisory group, headed by Dr. John Tukey, Chairman of the Statistics Department at Princeton University, believes that it is possible to get the descriptions being sought with acceptable accuracy by involving only a small sample of people at each age level. It now appears that such a sample might take the form of that used by poll takers. For example, a city block or census tract might be identified as a sampling unit and all seventeen-year-olds living in that area, whether in public school, parochial school or not in school at all, would become part of the sample.

It's been proposed that in addition to national figures by age level, there are certain subdivisions in the country that ought to be considered separately in an assessment. The importance of such groups for separate consideration may well change over the years, but are presently identified in terms of sex, region of the country, type of community, and socio-economic level. The present proposal is that the country would be divided into four regions; that four types of communities, large cities, smaller cities, suburban areas, and rural small town communities would be considered. Also, it is proposed that those coming from a background that falls below a poverty level index and those from enviornments above such a level should be considered separately. The varying combinations of these breakdowns, along with four age levels, provide 256 subpopulations of the country that would be sampled.

A report might include such things as: For the sample of thirteen-year-old boys above the poverty level index from small cities in the Midwestern region it was found that: 91 percent knew ⅔ of the following important ingredients in a person's diet; 52 percent could plan an appropriate experiment for testing hypotheses like the following; 16 percent indicated that they would like to spend more time doing arithmetic in schools; 53 percent were able to identify their congressman and 65 percent indicated that within the last month they had taken part in a community project to help out their school or community.

In this way then a survey might well show that only the most advanced thirteen-year-olds, say the top 10 percent or so, from across the country, can apply simple algebra to a practical problem while over 30 percent of the suburban thirteen-year-old boys from the Midwest can do this. It may be that while about half of the seventeen-year-olds in the country have taken specific steps toward plans for their employment or further schooling the following year, 80 percent of the seventeen-year-old boys from small town-rural areas of the Northeast have taken such steps.

You may well ask if data based on subgroupings of this type provide the most useful information that might be obtained. You might further ask if it might not be more helpful to obtain data on specific school systems. The procedures I have just outlined grew out of a number of recommendations the Committee has received. First, there are many people who are concerned about the possibility of unjustified comparisons being made if there were results on individual schools and school systems. The general proposal has been that the reports should not be for any educational group that is the responsibility of a board or a specific administrator. The second matter is simply one of economy. To obtain a large enough sample on the instruments to be able to say something about specific school systems would simply be prohibitive on an economic basis. The general position has been that individual school systems need to do research on their own outcomes, and assessing the outcomes of individual school systems will not be part of the national assessment.

The national assessment data will provide valuable information as a background against which individual school systems can interpret the results of their own studies.

To see how such data might be useful to the local school system I would like to briefly discuss just one example using hypothetical results. Let us suppose that your school system covers a city of middle size; that is, with a population between 50,000 and 200,000, located in the central west. In the report of the recent national assessment, you note the following data on reading achievement for males in the central-west region among cities of middle size. (The data for males only are presented to conserve space.)

1. *Comprehension.*—(Percent who can get the plain sense of a simple newspaper paragraph).

[In percent]

	9-year-olds	13-year-olds	17-year-olds	Adults
Upper socioeconomic levels	73	86	96	90
Lower socioeconomic levels	21	32	45	31

2. *Interpretation.*—(Percent who can bring the necessary supplementary information to bear on expository material like that in "Spock").

[In percent]

	9-year-olds	13-year-olds	17-year-olds	Adults
Upper socioeconomic levels	41	58	68	64
Lower socioeconomic levels	13	24	36	21

3. *Interest in Reading.*—(Percent who devote two hours or more a week to voluntary reading).

[In percent]

	9-year-olds	13-year-olds	17-year-olds	Adults
Upper socioeconomic levels	64	89	83	76
Lower socioeconomic levels	41	46	42	26

The report shows that for your region and the nation at large, most children from upper socio-economic levels learn to read and maintain their interest in reading. But, for children coming from lower socio-economic levels where they have less encouragement and less chance to develop reading interest and skills in the home, only about a third of them reach the level of competence and interest in reading characteristic of most persons from upper socio-economic levels.

Depending on your particular local situation, you might conclude, "Our continuing appraisal of the progress of our children in reading shows the same situation as exists in the region and in the nation. Children from upper socio-economic levels are achieving competence and interest in reading, but the majority from lower socio-economic levels do not. This is a serious problem in the nation, and it is a serious problem for us. It is not an easy thing to solve."

On the other hand, if the local appraisal shows that substantial reading progress is being made by children from lower socio-economic levels as well as those from upper levels, you might conclude that "Fortunately, we do not have a major problem in reading to solve in our school, but do need to give greater attention to another area."

Because the national assessment will provide background data, the public will have a broader perspective from which to view the local problems, and there will be less tendency to attack the local schools groundlessly because the public will see that most difficult educational problems are not localized.

By way of summary, let me simply list the major procedures for a national assessment which are currently under investigation by the Committee. First, there would be a large number of exercises and each student in a small sample would spend 30 minutes to an hour taking only a portion of them. Secondly, instruments are based on objectives currently being taught for in the schools. Third, the students from public schools, private schools and youth not in school at all, are to be included in the sample. Fourth, reporting would be in terms of what groups have demonstrated they can do, with no reports on individual students, schools, or school systems. Fifth, periodic assessments would be designed to reflect curriculum changes in the school.

At this point in its explorations the Committee is encouraged in its belief that a survey-type census of educational outcomes can avoid negative aspects about which people have expressed concerns and can provide information about our educational successes, strengths, weaknesses, problems, and needs as a basis for informed public understanding and support of educational efforts in the country.

Blood Discrimination

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. RARICK
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 20, 1967

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, who ever heard of blood discriminating or being denied equal opportunity?

Billions of taxpayers' dollars are controlled by Federal bureaucrats for aid to our hospitals and clinics.

For relief to our sick, suffering, and injured? No; for racially mixing blood. If blood is labeled or identified by race, all Federal funds—even from segregated taxpayers—can be cut off and denied. And the sick, suffering, and injured must do without the needed services and space.

Does blood now have rights paramount to the medical patient? The possible shock to an ill or dying person that he is receiving racially mixed blood does not deprive him of his right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness? Could this not be better left to the attending physician and not a role or decision of government?

What happens if a patient rejects plasma and demands live blood donors? If all live donors are of the same race, must the hospital protest and refuse its services lest it loose its taxpayers subsidy? Sounds like the establishing of a thriving bootleg operation in blood. For we know the doctors oath and duty is to his patient—not to a bunch of political theorists.

Mr. Speaker, I insert a letter from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, dated June 2 and its guidelines under the Civil Rights Act here in the RECORD following my remarks:

JUNE 2, 1967.

Hon. JOHN R. RARICK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. RARICK: This is in reply to your letter of May 18, 1967, regarding the policy of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare pertaining to the segregation of blood for purposes of transfusion.

The following policy was issued to our Regional Offices on March 8, 1967, for their guidance in administering Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. It has not been issued in the form of a notice to all hospitals because most hospitals do not segregate blood and neither does the Red Cross or the Military Services:

"Any separation or identification of blood or blood derivatives based upon race, color or national origin, or any racial distinction in the source of blood used for transfusions, constitutes discrimination prohibited by Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

"This policy explains one aspect of Item Number 6 of the Guidelines for hospital compliance and applies to any hospital that is a recipient of Federal financial assistance and any hospital providing service to beneficiaries of a Federally-assisted program in the capacity of a vendor with respect to the procurement, maintenance or use of blood or blood derivatives for purposes of transfusion."

Enclosed is a copy of the guidelines for hospitals referred to in the above cited policy. Our field staff have not been provided with any checklist to be used when they visit a hospital although they may develop their own to facilitate the recording of information.

In November 1959 the Committee on Blood and Related Problems of the National Research Council's Division of Medical Services reexamined the problem of racial segregation of blood in light of all pertinent facts then available. Responsible medical scientists, national organizations and Government agencies serving the needs of medicine, had before that time repeatedly reviewed the evidence for racial separation of blood and consistently concluded that the practice would add nothing to the safety of transfusion procedures. The Public Health Service knows of no new scientific information developed since the review in 1959 which would change their conclusion that there is no scientific justification for the racial segregation of blood for transfusion.

I hope that this will assist you in responding to mail you may receive from constituents who may write to you as a result of recent news items concerning this policy.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT M. NASH,
Office of Equal Health Opportunity.

GUIDELINES FOR COMPLIANCE WITH TITLE VI OF THE CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1964

Hospitals in compliance with the Act are characterized by absence of separation, discrimination or any other distinction on the basis of race, color, or national origin in any activity carried on in, by or for the institution affecting the care and treatment of patients.

Specifically, the above would include (but not be limited to) the following characteristics:

1. The hospital provides inpatient and outpatient care on a non-discriminatory basis; all patients are admitted and receive care without regard to race, color, or national origin. Declaration of an open admission policy may not be sufficient to effectuate compliance in some instances, particularly where the hospital has previously served only or primarily patients of one race. Where there is a significant variation between the racial composition of patients and the population served, the hospital has a responsibility to determine the reasons and to take corrective action if they are due to discriminatory practices.

2. All patients are being assigned to all rooms, wards, floors, sections, and buildings without regard to race, color, or national origin. In communities with non-white population, this results in bi-racial occupancy of multi-bed rooms and wards and use of single bed rooms on a non-discriminatory basis.

Patients are not asked if they are willing or desire to share a room with a person of another race. Transfer of patients is not used as a device to evade compliance with the Act.

3. Employees, medical staff and volunteers of the hospital are assigned to patient services without regard to the race, color, or national origin of either the patient or employee. Courtesy titles (Mr., Miss, Dr.) whenever used, are being used throughout the hospital including patient care areas and news releases announcing admissions, births, deaths, etc.

4. The granting of permanent or temporary staff privileges is carried out in a non-discriminatory manner. Staff privileges are not denied professionally qualified personnel on the basis of race, color, or national origin, or on the basis of non-membership in an organization which discriminates on the basis of race, color, or national origin. Removal of staff privileges and other disciplinary actions shall not be based on race, color, or national origin.

5. Non-discriminatory practices of the institution include all aspects of training programs, and require recruiting and selection of trainees at both predominantly white and Negro schools. The same recruiting procedures are used at all such institutions. Third parties are not permitted to select trainees on a basis which, if done directly by the hospital, would be violative of the Civil Rights Act. These requirements apply to interns (medical, dental, OT, PT, dietician), residents and training programs such as graduate nurse, practical nurse, medical technology, x-ray technology, etc.

6. All services rendered by the institution, its employees or vendors to patients or others are provided without regard to race, color, or national origin. This would include:

A. Administrative services (admission, medical records, fiscal, etc.).

B. Medical and dental care for inpatients and outpatients (all specialties-clinical, diagnostic and other pathology services).

C. Paramedical care and ancillary and supporting services (food, pharmacy, social services, laundry, toilet facilities, waiting rooms, entrances, exists, snack bars, gift shops, visiting hours, doctor's lounges). Patients and visitors are using all cafeteria facilities without regard to race, color, or national origin, no dining facilities are used only by non-whites by "custom" or "preference".

D. Ambulance services.

7. Employees and medical staff have been notified in writing of the hospital's policy for compliance with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act.

8. Hospitals which have recently changed from discriminatory practices have taken steps to notify those who previously had been excluded from hospital services (e.g., letters to Negro physicians or physician organizations and Civil Rights leaders, notices to newspapers, posting of signs in hospitals, etc.).

9. Hospital which have had dual facilities to effect racial separation have either converted one of them to a different purpose or have taken steps to change the traffic flow so that they are actually used bi-racially.

And this is called progress connived by using our tax money by bureaucrats who are salaried on our tax dollars. By enforcement who ends up being undiscriminated against—the patient? the donor? or the blood?

Resolution on Congressional Standards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL E. BUTTON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 20, 1967

Mr. BUTTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a resolution passed by the general board of the National Council of Churches, on June 1, 1967, which points out a disparity in the handling by the Houses of Congress of disciplining its Members.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION ON CONGRESSIONAL STANDARDS

(Approved by the general board, National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A.)

The churches have contributed historically to the enlargement of man's understanding of justice. They have a continuing responsibility to see justice clearly realized in the affairs or men. In the tradition of the prophets and the apostles, they are obliged to call attention to injustice and to seek its rectification.

Recently, two members of the Congress of the United States have been charged with breaches of ethics and each has been investigated by a special committee of the house of which he was a member. While the General Board of the National Council of Churches is not a tribunal competent to determine the truth of the charges against either man, it does not condone the acts which they are alleged to have committed.

However, the disparate recommendations of the two investigating committees do raise serious doubts that justice has been realized in either case. The contrast in the handling of the two cases may be attributable to differences between the House of Representatives and the Senate, or to differences in the reputation, personality, race, or private conduct of the two men, but these cannot justify the following results.

One is denied his seat in Congress during the investigation, while the other retains his. One is stripped of his chairmanship before investigation, the other remains chairman of three subcommittees while under investigation.

One was found to have misused public funds, for which the investigating committee proposed that he be fined $40,000, stripped permanently of his seniority and publicly rebuked; but this punishment was not deemed severe enough by the House, which excluded him altogether. The other was found to have misused both public and campaign funds, for which the investigating committee recommended only that he be censured. It was not proposed that he be fined or compelled to make restitution of the misused funds. It was not proposed that he lose seniority or his subcommittee chairmanships. It was not proposed that he be expelled from the Senate.

Whatever the reasons for this difference of treatment, the contrast is obvious. The outcome of the cases was certainly rendered more uncertain by the absence of clearly defined standards of ethical conduct for members of the legislative branch of our government.

Moreover, allegations of serious abuses of legislative prerogatives by one of the two men were never investigated. The people deserve to know whether or not the charges can be substantiated, and the accused should be afforded an opportunity to exonerate himself. Justice must not be covert. Justice must not only be done; it must be seen to be done and seen to be just.

Believing that the Congress should adopt an explicit code of ethical conduct for its members, covering the raising and disposition of campaign funds, conflict of interest, public accounting for committee expenditures, travel at public expense, and public disclosure of personal finances, which should be impartially enforced, the General Board—

Affirms the right of citizens in each case to be represented in Congress by a person chosen in a fair and noncorrupt election, provided he meets the constiutional tests for office, except when he is unable to serve because he is prevented by proper judicial processes or by expulsion by a two-thirds vote of the house of which he is a member, after due process according to the rules of that house applied without discrimination; and

Urges the Congress of the United States to adopt and enforce a code of high ethical standards for the conduct of its members to the end that the misuse of public trust shall be clearly outlawed, and that provision be made for continual, impartial review of members' practices covered by the code, and for vigorous enforcement of its requirements; and

Recommends the adoption by Congress of legislation that members of Congress, candidates for Congress, staff members of Congressional committees and officials of the executive branch earning more than $15,000 per year, be required to file reports covering amounts and sources of income, liabilities, and assets and transactions in commodities and property, and making such reports freely accessible to the press and the public; and

Directs that this resoution be communicated to the member communions of the National Council of Churches and to the members of Congress.

Small-Plane Accidents Cause for Concern

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD E. LUKENS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1967

Mr. LUKENS. Mr. Speaker, I was very much interested in the remarks yesterday of my friend and colleague, Congressman Brown of Ohio. Along with all other Ohioans, I was deeply disturbed only a short time ago when the mid-air collision between an airliner and a private plane over our State claimed the tragic total of 26 lives.

And I believe, Mr. Speaker, this might be the time to correct some of the common misconceptions which have arisen over the frequent number of small-plane accidents in this country over the past few years.

There has been a great deal written about the skies being filled with small planes and about the airways beginning to reach the saturation point. There also has been much discussion about poorly made planes and mechanical failures leading to small-plane crashes.

But at least one recent study reveals that of all the millions of takeoffs, and landings made by small planes in this country during the past year, there were only 13 collisions and 18 fatalities recorded. It also disclosed that small-planes engines very rarely fail, and that mechanical failure is a very small factor in the small-plane crash total.

Nevertheless, there are approximately 5,000 accidents involving more than 1,000 deaths every year involving small planes. This is a staggering and unnecessary loss of life.

And, I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the major cause lies in human frailty and in poor judgment on the part of the people flying these small planes.

Investigation discloses, for example, that many crashes result because pilots forget to have their gasoline checked before they take off, or because they disregard weather warnings. Others exercise extremely poor judgment by flying while under the influence of alcohol, or when they have taken tranquilizers or other drugs which adversely affect their reflexes and reaction time.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the record will show abundant evidence that human judgment, rather than mechanical failure or overloading of the airways, is the root cause of the vast majority of these tragic accidents. I believe greater efforts must be made to impress upon people who obtain private pilots licenses that they have a responsibility to themselves and to others to exercise extreme caution when they take to the air.

Mrs. Carter F. Henderson, President of Citizens for Clean Air, Receives New York County Medical Society Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THEODORE R. KUPFERMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 1967

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Carter F. Henderson, my constitutent, is a public-spirited citizen who has given a great deal of her time to civic and community activities.

As president, now chairman of the board, of Citizens for Clean Air, Inc., she has been in the forefront of the battle for pure air in New York City and throughout the United States.

Hazel Henderson recently received the Citizens Award of the New York County Medical Society for her work on air pollution, and I am happy to bring to the attention of my colleagues a summary of her remarks on May 22 at the presentation of the award at the New York Academy of Medicine:

Summary of Remarks of Mrs. Carter F. Henderson, President of Citizens for Clean Air, on Receiving the Citizen Award of the New York County Medical Society

Our national air pollution control program stands today at a crossroads. After many years of disinterest in the problem of air pollution and environmental health, suddenly in the last two years there has been a tremendous outpouring of concern from all segments of our society, including the American Medical Association, and other voluntary health groups.

At the same time that our nation's doctors and medical scientists are becoming increasingly concerned about air pollution, and its effects on man in terms of health, there is ironically, pressure being exerted on the Congress to *remove* the National Center for Air Pollution Control from the protective jurisdiction of the U.S. Public Health Service . . . because some feel that air pollution is an industry problem, rather than a health problem.

An amendment introduced by Senator Jennings Randolph of West Virginia to the proposed Air Quality Act of 1967, would largely remove air pollution from consideration within the spectrum of environmental health, and make more a technical concern of industrial engineering and economic planning.

I raise this point at this time, because it seems to me, and the over 20,000 New Yorkers who are members of Citizens for Clean Air that *if we as a nation are not concerned with what air pollution does to people . . . then what else are we concerned with?*

We know that it does about $11 billion of property damage each year. We know that there is a fortune to be made by the companies getting into the business of cleaning the air. We know too that if the air were clean, we would come out with a national *saving* of about $8 billion a year on lowered cleaning and replacement costs. *But these considerations do not move us to work for clean air*. What air pollution does to *things* is secondary in our minds.

It is what it does to *pople* that we care about. What it may do to our respiratory systems, our cardio-vascular systems, and our spirits: and most of all to *our children* who are being exposed to ever higher doses of pollution each year.

This is what we care about . . . and I'm sure, as physicians, this is what you care about too. Of course air pollution has technical and economic aspects . . . but surely all must be weighed against only one standard . . . and that is the health and welfare of the individual citizen. The World Health Organization states "Health is a state of complete physical, mental and social well-being, and not merely the absence of disease or infirmity."

So it seems indeed ironic, that just at a time when medical experts are becoming more interested and more vocal on the topic of air pollution and man's health . . . that this avenue of enquiry is to be *downgraded* at a time when it should be stepped up. As physicians, your findings will be considered less relevant and less important than those of sanitary engineers and cost benefit analysts, and the voice of the medical profession will have lost much of its influence in this critical area of national decision. Therefore we as laymen, can only hope that doctors will reserve to themselves *the right to consider air pollution as a proper, primary and continuing concern of the medical profession.*

No Truce in Poverty War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1967

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following:

[From the New York Times, June 18, 1967]

No Truce in Poverty War

As violence and the threat of violence mounted last week in a number of American cities, the Federal program that most directly attacks the root causes of civic strife—the war on poverty—was beginning an ordeal in Congress that threatens its survival.

A House committee opened hearings on President Johnson's proposal to spend $2 billion on the poverty war this year and other Administration proposals designed to correct operating deficiencies in the Office of Economic Opportunity (O.E.O.). Also before the committee are Republican proposals to slash antipoverty spending and dismantle O.E.O. From the tenor of Congressional questioning, it is evident that O.E.O. is headed for a tough fight.

The agency is not without faults, but the war on poverty at least represents a serious Federal effort to come to grips with the problems of discrimination, ignorance and neglect that have driven millions of Americans to the brink of desperation. O.E.O. provides coordination for this effort and an innovative flexibility impossible if the whole campaign is left to old-line Federal bureaucracies.

This is no time to scuttle O.E.O. It is time, if anything, to step up the war on poverty under a strengthened, unified command. Under the best of circumstances, the war will be a long one. It will be even longer if it is deprived of funds, imagination and effective leadership.

Randall Jacobs, Retired Admiral, Chief of Naval Personnel in World War II, Dies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN T. SCHNEEBELI

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1967

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, Adm. Randall Jacobs who was born and raised in Danville, Pa., passed on earlier this week. His great contribution to the Navy manpower needs in World War II is highly respected by our Defense Department, and an accounting of his fine service is outlined in the article from the New York Times which follows:

WASHINGTON, June 19.—Vice Adm. Randall Jacobs, who was described as the man who furnished the men for the Navy during World War II, died today in Bethesda (Md.) Naval Hospital after a long illness. His age was 81.

Admiral Jacobs, known as the father of the Naval Reserve V-7 training program, was placed on the retired list in 1946, but continued on active duty until 1952 as governor of the United States Naval Home in Philadelphia.

He gained a reputation as a champion of Navy independence in 1944, when he strongly opposed unification of the armed forces.

"I am convinced," he told a House Committee on Postwar Military Personnel, "that no paper reorganization of the War and Navy Departments could effect a unification of training that is different because the jobs the men will be asked to do are different."

OPPOSED MERGING SCHOOLS

He also said he was opposed to merging facilities at the West Point and Annapolis academies.

Admiral Jacobs did not stand in the way of change in military operations. He was one of the leaders in recommending that women serve in the armed forces during World War II, pointing out that they could also be used to replace men on duty in foreign ports.

A frequent advocate of universal military training, Admiral Jacobs once explained:

"I hope the need for universal military training will not become obscured by heat and passion. I hope it will be faced as a simple fact, a circumstance of life in the 20th century, not to be contended over, but simply to be recognized."

SERVED ON SEVERAL WARSHIPS

Admiral Jacobs was born in Danville, Pa., and was appointed to the Naval Academy in 1903. He served on the Kentucky, Franklin, Indiana and South Carolina until 1913, when he became aide and flag secretary on the staff of the Commander in Chief of the Atlantic Reserve Fleet.

He commanded the Jouett in 1916, with additional duties as Commander of Division 4, Destroyer Force, Atlantic Fleet. Two years later he was given command of the Henley and an anti-submarine detachment. He began a three-year hitch in the Bureau of Navigation in 1923.

In 1927, Admiral Jacobs served in the Asiatic Fleet in command of the Monocacy, and was in charge of the evacuation of Americans in the Upper Yangtze Valley. He returned to duty in the navigation bureau in 1929 and two years later became director of enlisted personnel.

Admiral Jacobs was Assistant Chief of the Bureau of Navigation from Sept. 1, 1929, until early in 1941, when he was ordered to sea with the Atlantic Fleet.

Surviving are a daughter, Mary Jane Jacobs of Seattle, and a son, Col. Randall Jacobs Jr., a retired Air Force officer who lives in Alaska.

A funeral service will be held at 1:30 P.M. Wednesday in Arlington National Cemetery.

It was my good fortune to have known the admiral and his brother Sam, who still resides in Danville. The Nation mourns the passing of this fine gentleman who "gained a reputation as a champion of Navy independence."

Living and Dying

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPEEDY O. LONG

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1967

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, the Natchitoches Times, published in Natchitoches, La., a part of the Eighth District of Louisiana, recently published a poem by an unknown author, which will give us some idea of the attitude of our troops in South Vietnam in respect to those who protest our defense of the South Vietnamese. I offer it here for the record:

[From the Natchitoches Times, June 15, 1967]

(Captain Richard Rahm, who served with the Army in Vietnam prior to being assigned last fall as an ROTC instructor at Northwestern State College, has submitted the following poem by an unknown author for publication in the Times.)

LIVING AND DYING

Take a man, then put him alone,
Put him 12,000 miles away from home.
Empty his heart, of all but blood,
Make him live in sweat and mud.
This is the life I have to live,
And why my soul to the devil I give.
You "peace boys" pent from your easy chair,
But you don't know what it's like over here.
But you don't know what it's like over here.
While over there the boys are dying.
You burn your draft cards, and march at dawn,
Plant your flags on the White House lawn.
You all want to ban the bomb,
There is no real war in Vietnam.
Use your drugs and have your fun,
Then refuse to use a gun.
There's nothing else for you to do,
And I'm supposed to die for you?
I'll hate you to the day I die,
You made me hear my buddy cry.
I saw his arm, a bloody shred,
I heard them say, "this one's dead."
It's a large price he had to pay.
Not to live to see another day.
He had the guts to fight and die,
He paid the price, but what did he buy?
He bought your life, by losing his,
But who gives a damn, what a soldier gives?
His wife does, and maybe his son,
But they are just about the only ones.

Vicious Personal Attacks on President Johnson and Other Government Leaders Only Tear Down Public Confidence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD J. IRWIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1967

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, recently Merriman Smith, United Press International White House correspondent and one of the most respected newsmen in Washington, delivered a speech in which he said, in part:

It would seem that vicious personal attacks on government leaders could have only one motivation that would make any sense at all—and that is to tear down public confidence in the establishment—and by establishment, I mean authority on almost any level.

Mr. Smith delivered his speech at the annual breakfast meeting of United Press International editors and publishers at the Waldorf-Astoria in New York and because what he said makes so much sense, I would like at this time to reproduce his address in the RECORD:

President Johnson these days is the object of some of the worst vilification—even obscenity—that I've seen or heard in more than 25 years on the White House assignment.

When I was in New Orleans not long ago looking into the so-called Kennedy assassination plot, I saw for sale in variety stores metal auto license plates vividly associating the President with barnyard filth.

Driving down the Southeastern coast last Winter, I saw for sale in roadside stands allegedly clever but actually quite dirty sayings about the President, his wife and their two daughters. These were lapel buttons.

At the so-called peace demonstration in New York's Central Park the other day, there were grown men carrying signs which openly and plainly challenged the President's normalcy, mentally and sexually. There were the same sort of senseless placards about Dean Rusk.

Furthermore, some of the more active demonstrators—would have us believe in signs and songs that Johnson and McNamara are deliberately burning Asian babies with napalm.

Furthermore, there have been buttons and printed placards around the country saying, "Lee Harvey Oswald, where are you now?"

Also, there are in print pamphlets, books, newspapers of a sort and even recorded tapes alleging that Johnson engineered the death of President Kennedy.

This is not enlightened social change, or legitimate dissent or revolution. It is anarchy, born of a highly permissive atmosphere in this country; a strangely paradoxial, pejorative atmosphere in which freedom, at times, seems to be working against the very things for which freedom supposedly stands.

We live with certain verities which a million kookie men with bananas around their necks cannot change—which Martin Luther King and Stokely Carmichael cannot change—which Doctor Spock can't do very much about.

One of these facts is that President Johnson, Secretary Rusk and Secretary McNamara cannot throw up their hands in dismay and say to Doctors King and Spock, "Here, take over, you run things for a while." Neither can General Westmoreland hand over his command to Dick Gregory or Richard Goodwin.

Like it or not, Johnson, Rusk, McNamara and company are piloting an enormous ship with a human cargo of nearly two hundred million Americans, to say nothing of many millions in other lands depending on us for guidance, protection and a certain amount of assistance.

It is open to legitimate public debate whether these leaders are embarked on a wrong course, but under our system they cannot be dumped overboard and furthermore, they're running things, at least until January, 1969.

Thus it would seem only natural to ask what these rather open merchants of filth and utterly unfounded innuendo hope to accomplish. Run Johnson out of office? Not a chance. Are they starting a political teardown aimed at 1968? This is most unlikely. We're not talking here about the political opposition of Republican versus Democrat. This is something different, slimey and at times, irrational.

So, it would seem that vicious personal attacks on government leaders could have only one motivation that would make any sense at all—and that is to tear down public confidence in the establishment—and by establishment, I mean authority on almost any level.

If successful, this then could lead us to a sort of rudderless society of irresponsibility to the group, amorality for the further erosion of the family unit and finally the confusion of anarchy.

I paint a picture which undoubtedly seems extreme to some of you, but I do so to show something of what a President must view when he comes to work every day—and by every day, I mean seven days a week.

Lyndon Johnson knows that much of the venom directed against him and members of his government is symptomatic of a natural, justified concern about the war, symptomatic of inequities long overdue in their correction in such a lush society as ours, and symptomatic of the futility which haunts a great many of our young people in a thermonuclear age.

We sometimes forget, however, that leaders of a government are human; that even the toughest hides thickened by years of political abrasion can be punctured.

President Johnson has been around politics long enough to have the hide of a walrus, but he has chinks all through this armor. Senator Fulbright can denounce him in the Senate and Johnson may do nothing more than shrug, but he can boil up in cow country anger over a story that he bought some red, white and blue boots.

Taking his high degree, even a painful degree of sensitivity into consideration, I am amazed at the punishment he can take without heading for the ranch and locking the gate. Some of this he brings upon himself by paying far too much attention to what is said, written and broadcast about him and those around him.

He contributes to his own credibility gap by an almost eccentric insistence on not disclosing his plans until the last possible moment. It is no myth that he gets sore when he is scooped on his own stories. Any politician who makes as many public statements as Mr. Johnson does is bound to contradict himself on occasion, and when this is brought to public attention, his reaction has all the charm of a bull in an electric fence.

The fact that Johnson's image—his standing with a great many of his fellow countrymen—is in poor shape is, I think moot. He is trying to do something about it by being a little less large and over-powering.

But there are certain things he cannot lick. One of these is Texas. Because of the Kennedy assassination in Dallas, the wild shooting spree of that crazy man at the University of Texas, the fact that the Chicago killer of those eight nurses came from Texas—these things have created in the minds of many Americans an ugly, violent image of Texas and anything having to do with the state.

This attitude, of course, ignores the fact that violence takes place every hour in every state of the country; that millions of us stay up late every night watching murder shows on TV.

Because Texas has been connected with the biggest crime of this century; because the killing of Kennedy was attributed to an atmosphere of political hatred in the state and because the state, after all, is Southern, then Johnson must be hung with what amounts to three nooses.

The Black Power Negroes refuse to believe any man—any white man—with a Southern accent. The liberals look down their noses at almost anybody with a drawl. And the intellectuals sniff at the product of a teachers college in San Marcos, Texas.

My point here is that no section of the country has a monopoly on crime and unbridled hatred. Not many of the people who demonstrated against Johnson in Central Park in daylight ten days ago would dare walk through that same park at night.

Hate and villification warp judgment just as heat buckles steel beams. If you tear down confidence in established authority, then those in public office blame a lot of this on the newspapers for reporting it. They say we are not doing enough reporting in-depth. Then when we do burrow beneath the government's bright public face of fresh handouts and self-serving background conferences not for attribution, they yell at us again for distorting their purpose or trying to second guess Dean Rusk.

So, what do we have—an effort to destroy confidence in government plus an effort to pull down confidence in the press. Then if both efforts are successful, who do you believe—Doctor Spock?

Believe me, this is the time for the American public to take some responsibility for its own image and stop blaming everything on either Lyndon Johnson or Drew Pearson.

Mr. Johnson—in fact, no president—deserves the indignities being heaped upon him these days in the name of peace or civil rights. Criticism and challenge have their rightful place in our political system, but not the scrawls from rest room walls.

There are those in our trade who wonder at times whether the President, along about the middle of next year, will decide that he's taken about all the slings and arrows he cares to endure and decide to step out.

But unless his standing in the polls drops to a minus position, unless his health starts to crack and there's no current indication of that, my hunch today is that in 1968, if Lyndon Baines Johnson can walk, he'll run.

All of us should be able to see the situation with more clarity when we meet again next year. But meantime, L.B.J. is in for much more punishment at the hands of the name-callers unless the squares who raise kids, mow their lawns and pay their taxes decide to involve themselves by getting off their patios and telling the dirty-mouths to shut the hell up.

Parents' Song of Protest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1967

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend to the attention of our colleagues a poem written by Evelyn Karaban, the editor of a community newspaper in Brooklyn. The poem expresses her dissatisfaction with those youths who continually protest, but never realize just how good they have it.

The following poem appeared in the May 1967 edition of the Luna Spark:

PARENTS' SONG OF PROTEST

(NOTE.—Because of the hopeless attitude of some of today's beatnick teenagers, I was inspired to write this poem. However, this does not apply to the majority of today's youth who live in a normal manner despite the many pressures of this jet age.)

(By Evelyn Karaban)

Our Grandparents came from over the sea
To make a new life for you and for me.
They came by steerage herded like cattle,
To a strange land where they had to battle
For a living in sweatshops, by night and by day.
Little to eat, no fun and poor pay.
They struggled to send their children to school.
Neatness and cleanliness was their golden rule.

Education was their goal and here it was free.
Doctors, lawyers and teachers, their children would me!
They lived in cold water flats and took in boarders
No beds of their own, hall toilets shared with others.
Once a week at public baths, each a dime,
Everyone was forced to stand in line.
Call this living?
They never had it so good
But they vowed to God their children would!

Their children had a depression to fight,
C.C.C. for boys who worked with all their might.
No handouts then, there was the W.P.A.
Which had men digging ditches, no child's play.
From East side to West side, with great pride
To better themselves, they always tried.
From coal to gas stove, they did improve.
From ice box to fridg. they made the move.

No work no food was the general rule.
You kids don't even want to go to school.
Yes, we parents are guilty of being too good
And spoiling you rotten, as no parent should.
Yes, we never had it so good,
Clothes on your backs, steaks on the table
Given as long as we parents are able.
We are the ones who are misunderstood.

Taking all and never giving
Call this living?
Destroying and never building
Call this living?
Shirking while parents are working
Call this living?
Say, are your heads made of wood?
We never had it so Good.

Inaugural Address of Gen. Anastasio Somoza Debayle, of the Republic of Nicaragua

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1967

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, on May 1, 1967, I was privileged to attend the inauguration of Anastasio

Somoza as President of the Republic of Nicaragua. Also attending the inauguration was Hon. ARMISTEAD SELDEN of Alabama. It is well to note that Anastasio Somoza was educated in the United States, having attended La Salle Military Academy, Oakdale, N.Y. where he and his brother studied for 7 years. He returned to Nicaragua and then was appointed to the U.S. Military Academy and graduated with the class of 1946. He returned to his country and served as special assistant to his father who was at that time President, and after long service to his country, became Chief of the Guardia Nationale.

President Somoza has been dedicated to his country, to Central America and to the development of close and productive economic and political relationships between the United States and Latin America.

His inaugural address embodies the principles for which he stands, particularly his close friendship with the United States. His references to the April meeting at Punta del Este are indicative of the impact all Americas—Central, South and North, have on this momentous meeting.

During the inaugural period I had the opportunity to travel throughout the country of Nicaragua and I found the people prosperous, diligent, and happy. The potential for great development and use of the natural resources of Nicaragua are recognized by the new President, and the economic, social and political gains for Nicaragua are outlined in his inaugural address. It is a pleasure for me to include pertinent extracts from that address here today:

> It is with great satisfaction that I respectfully welcome the Honorable Members of the Legislative, Judicial and Electoral branches of the Government of Nicaragua, all persons of renowned integrity. Within these three constitutionally established branches of government, I will look for the sources of wisdom and cooperation with which to fulfill my aims of leading Nicaragua in democracy, peace, liberty and prosperity.
>
> For the People and the Government of Nicaragua, it is very gratifying to have present the Special Missions which friendly governments have cordially accredited, thus demonstrating their solidarity with Nicaragua. Such a friendly gesture calls for my appreciation and strengthens even further the traditional relations Nicaragua has maintained with the peoples of the free world who are guided by ideals of democracy, peace, justice and international friendship.
>
> Also satisfying to me is the presence of internationally renowned personalities who, as honored guests, are showing their appreciation of our Country.
>
> As a graduate of the Military Academy of the United States of America, I warmly welcome my classmates who, in demonstration of their friendship to the people of Nicaragua, are present today at the Inauguration of the third graduate of West Point to be elected to the Presidency of his Nation. They, as myself, have been inspired by, and live by, the motto of our Alma Mater: "Duty, Honor, Country".
>
> This Transmission of Power is of the greatest importance in national life. Because having exercised representative democracy by means of the popular vote, and with the participation of all political parties, Nicaragua continues to mach firmly forward along the paths of peace, democracy and constant progress, guided by the Nationalist Liberal Party.
>
> Let us celebrate, the Nicaraguans, without distinction of political color, the triumph of our Country, which in this election has ratified his faith in democracy as the only method of government of the civilized peoples.
>
> Now I wish to express my gratitude to that person who has no more identity than that of being a Nicaraguan citizen, to that person who has the privilege of having been born in Nicaragua—a rich country, a beautiful country, a country forged by a noble and virile people.
>
> On proclaiming that the triumph of Nicaragua has been the triumph of Democracy, I wish to declare to my countrymen that I have always believed the vote is worth more than anything else in the world. With his vote the Nicaraguan citizen expressed the confidence that he has in his Country and has confirmed his faith in its system of government and leaders. I shall therefore know how to honor the trust that has been bestowed upon me by my fellow citizens.
>
> This vote for which I thank from the bottom of my heart all the persons who had that conviction and went to the polls to ratify their faith in the ideals of the Nationalist Liberal Party; this vote which is the fundamental law in the free and democratic countries will inspire me to carry out my program and to apply the laws that will strengthen democracy and augment the economic and social development of Nicaragua.
>
> I have arrived at the Presidency with a popular support unparalleled in our political history. It is very gratifying to me and heartening to the members of the Nationalist Liberal Party that the government program that I proposed to the Nicaraguan people at my party's convention on July 30th, and during the election campaign, from which I will permit myself shortly to quote, coincide fundamentally with the six points of the Agenda which became "the Declaration of the Presidents of the Americas," signed the last 14th of April in Punta del Este, Uruguay.
>
> At the convention I declared: "I am one of the color bearers of Central American Integration, not only for reasons of idealism, but also for practical purposes. Practical purposes, because I know that Central American integration will bring direct benefits to our population. Before the integration of Central America the installation of industries depending on a local market was doubtful, but now, that the opportunity is before us, I will support existing industries in order to raise them to the Central American Market level, and encourage the establishment of all those industries that will consume raw materials from our natural resources". This declaration reflects the aims of the first resolution announced at Punta del Este, which is: "The Economic Integration and Industrial Development of Latin America".
>
> On October 2nd, 1966, in the department of Rio San Juan, I said: "If Nicaragua and Costa Rica coordinate their efforts and finances to canalize adequately the San Juan River, Central America would have its own seaway similar to the St. Lawrence Waterway". This is in accord with the second resolution at Punta del Este, which contemplates: "The Multi-national action for Infrastructural Projects".
>
> At the Liberal Party Convention I said: "Nicaragua finds itself between two markets: the world market and the preferential market of Central America. But the market that must be our yardstick is the world market and therefore each and everyone of the actions of the government will tend to place our people in the best competitive position". What I announced then is in accord with the third resolution of the agenda signed by the Presidents of the Americas, which is: "Measures to improve the conditions of the International Latin American Trade".
>
> On September 4th, 1966, to the people of Masaya, I stated: "Accustomed as you have been to the generosity of the land and climate, very little consideration has been given to modern methods of cultivation", and I affirmed my determination "to guide them towards increased production and employment".
>
> Similarly, at our convention I stated: "Within the capitalistic system under which we live, I will see to it that the Nicaraguan common man enjoys such credits and facilities as the nation can offer in order to stimulate his existence and adequate participation in the national wealth. I understand that for this purpose banking entities play a role of great importance, and therefore, I hereby commit myself publicly to change the mentality and the attitude of those banks in the sense that they shall be at the service of the people and not the people at the service of the banks".
>
> On September 25th, 1966, at Esteli, I emphasized: "It is necessary to produce more food for the people and the livestock selling the over supply to the local market, the Central American Common Market and finally the World Market". And on July 30th, 1966, at our party's convention I stated: "It is of manifest urgency to legalize the right of possession of those who, because of their misfortune or because of their pioneer spirit have been pushed toward virgin land, and who because of their precarious possessions, cannot enjoy the facilities offered by the state to increase their production and therefore to improve their standard of living".
>
> On January 29th, at the end of my campaign in Managua, I stated: "The national programs to modernize our agriculture, require the use of improved seeds, fertilizers and insecticides; the increasing of production through the installation of grain dryers and granaries; the establishment of mobile units for rural credit, the opening of agricultural schools in those places where they are necessary, so that our children can learn to develop agriculture with increased efficiency. Wherever it is economically feasible, through the expansion of electrical power networks, my administration will establish irrigation systems in order to make agriculture a year round industry, assuring permanent employment to the great majority of Nicaraguans.
>
> The above mentioned quotations, are in complete accordance with the fourth article in the Agenda of Punta del Este, referring to the "Modernization of rural life and increase in agricultural productivity".
>
> At my party's convention, I stated: "Our children deserve a basic and practical education. Therefore, I hereby solemnly pledge that by the year 1972 there will be enough classrooms and teachers to educate our children. And to complete our industrial development I will create more technical vocational schools and apprenticeship schools thus starting a real industrialization and at the same time readily fulfill the needs of our present industries".
>
> On August 28th, before an audience of three thousand school teachers I expressed: "Only through a good education that stimulates the social and economic transformation in our country; only through an educational reform which promotes the training of the individual in the technical advances of the modern world, and that makes possible the socio-economic revolution that we are determined to accomplish, only then can we win the battle against poverty, ignorance, disease and prejudice".
>
> Along the same lines, in Masaya, I pointed out: "We are in the midst of a dynamic, modern world in which we all have a transistor radio. I am going to use this system to establish through our State Broadcasting System an understandable technical assistance, to allow the farmers to cultivate their land by methods that will yield better crops". As I stated before at my party's convention: "I declare that the sacrifice of the urban population during the highway building process was not in vain, because with the

present infrastructure the social economic development of Nicaragua is assured".

I refer to the cities and villages located in different farm districts: "for this reason it is of great importance for the voters of the municipalities to elect councils capable of administrating their municipal corporations in such a way that will permit the central government to cooperate with them in the installation of water supply, sewerage and fluvial systems, electricity, pavements and schools".

These statements reaffirm the fifth article of the Punta del Este Agenda, which pertained to "the educational, scientific and technological development and improvements of health programs."

In reference to the sixth article of the Agenda concerning the "elimination of unnecessary military outlays," I announced at our party's convention: "The National Guard deserves a very special consideration from all Nicaraguans, because it is the armed corps that has maintained the peace for us, has respected the laws that guarantee our public liberties, and has remained conscious of its historical mission in this country by cooperating unconditionally in the socio-economic development of our people."

The aforementioned presentation of my ideas to Nicaraguan people during the campaign is in accordance with the basic purposes of the "Declaration of the Presidents of the Americas," which was signed on behalf of our Country by the outgoing President and prominent member of the Nationalist Liberal Party, Dr. Lorenzo Guerrero, to whom I wish to express again my congratulations for his patriotic efforts at Punta del Este.

In this manner I affirm that my administration will endorse the said Declaration and my words bear evidence that the principles of the great Nationalist Liberal Party have interpreted well, before the Presidents meeting at Punta del Este, the wishes of political and socio-economic evolution of the people of Nicaragua, which are now the same throughout Latin America.

Because of this I am proud to be a liberal. And today I am proud to be the President of the people of Nicaragua, since with complete freedom, in a peaceful and democratic environment, all the citizens without political discrimination can forge their own future and cooperate to the greatness and security of our own Nation.

When the principles of a political party are not consequent to the people's attitudes and realities, economic chaos is unavoidable. Hence, I want to announce today to the people of Nicaragua that in order to maintain unchanged our monetary stability the development of my administration will be within the possibilities of our productivity.

Because of the plans formulated and the governmental programs initiated under the administration of Luis A. Somoza Debayle, Nicaragua has been an example of economic growth and development in Latin America.

However, the fall in the export product prices has altered the rhythm of our economic growth in the last two years. My administration for the first two years will devote its efforts to readjusting state expenditures, in order to prevent an unbalance in our national life. The conditions of international trade and two unfavorable cotton crops did not allow us to have the necessary revenue for our budget in these last years.

That is why it is my firm decision to maintain a program of governmental austerity, so that free enterprise, the worker and the farm hand may maintain a climate of confidence and faith in the future endorsed by the Nationalist Liberty Party for the welfare of our Nation.

My administration will be one of constant evolution. In order to continue our development, and to insure our production growth, the necessary changes in the structure of Ministries will be accomplished and my Administration will look for adequate financing for its program through a just taxation system and international cooperation. These measures will allow us to continue our economic growth, even higher than the goals established in 1961 at Punta del Este, thus fulfilling our aspirations of better standards of living, and to give the youth greater opportunities in the future.

I will advocate all liberties that our laws and Constitution contemplate and will support them with all my democratic convictions. By doing so, we will continue strengthening the great barrier against the penetration of communism. Because under these circumstances the well known violent actions of the communists will find no echo; and I am positive that the Nicaraguan people will back me up to keep and maintain the order which is the basis of any government. If any persons or isolated groups, would ever start violence this would evidently be a product of those who do not wish to live within the laws of democracy, and especially under the protection of a government that has proved to have the largest popular backing in our history.

The present labor and social welfare laws, all of them a product of the liberal governments, shall not be left shelved in official publications, but should become effective and sound as an essential part of our nation's daily life, not only for labor but also for capital. And I hereby declare that based on the labor's legislation, I will join the representatives of labor and management, to see this become a reality. Let us all comply with our labor legislation. On my part it will be my pleasure to support all the working men that will do so.

It gives me great pleasure to declare that, during my Administration, Nicaragua will continue its support of the Organization of the Central American States, the Organization of the American States, the United Nations and all the world organizations that are vigilant for the development of a free mankind, for the maintenance of peaceful international relations. I will make the Free Determination of nations a banner of Nicaragua's foreign policy.

People of Nicaragua, the responsibility of casting a ballot does not end with the act of depositing the vote at the polls, but it extends also to the efforts that I require of each citizen, through the backing of all Government programs that I proposed to you during the political campaign, so that Nicaragua may truly become a more progessive country, a country where all may enjoy a better way of life, a country where any man can develop his life in complete liberty and happiness.

In order to better serve you, it is necessary that each and every Nicaraguan assumes with integrity their responsibilities as good citizens. I ask all Nicaraguans, with their democratic fortitude and conviction, to be with me during my administration so that peace may reign in our country and dialogue becomes the best road to the solution of all our problems.

I want you to know that I will exercise authority with righteousness as chief of state. I want you to know that I am determined to build the future, a future of happiness, well-being and hope for all Nicaraguans.

No one can doubt the sincerity of my purposes. Because all and everyone of my acts have been based on the law and on a life dedicated to work, justice and liberty.

Under the guidance of the Divine Providence, and with the support and understanding of each and every Nicaraguan, we shall start to march in peace, to strengthen our republican system of government and to enhance even more the greatness of our country.

On this historical day for our country; on this glorious day for the Nationalist Liberal Party; on this day of Hope for all Nicaraguans, I fervently invoke the protection of God.

A. Somoza D.

Managua, D. N., *May 1st., 1967.*

Case for Nuclear Ships Gains Steam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1967

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to place in the Appendix of the Record an article which appeared on Sunday, June 18, in the Los Angeles Times.

This article is entitled "Case for Nuclear Ships Gains Steam." It was written by Mr. Ted Sell, a specialist in military affairs on the Washington staff of the Times.

The article is well written and, in my opinion, contains some facts supporting nuclear propulsion for firstline naval ships which cannot be refuted by those who oppose nuclear propulsion. I wish to compliment the Los Angeles Times and their reporter, Mr. Ted Sell, on the excellence of this timely article on a most important subject.

The aforementioned article follows:

Arabs Shut Off Oil Supply—Case for Nuclear Ships Gains Steam

(By Ted Sell)

Washington.—Arab moves to cut off U.S. oil supplies in the Middle East during the war with Israel underscore the U.S. Defense Department's failure to press ahead with nuclear power for its naval vessels.

Ships operating off Vietnam and in the Western Pacific have been fueled with oil from the Persian Gulf. With the Arab action, these needs will now have to be met from sources on the Gulf Coast and West Coast and in the Caribbean.

There is no lack of petroleum resources, the Pentagon hastens to say. But the cost to move the oil from the more distant sources to Vietnam will zoom upward to cost an additional $252 million a year. Instead of 25 tankers, which were sufficient on the shorter haul from the Arab countires, 60 will now be needed for the long runs from the Western Hemisphere.

TOTAL OIL SUPPLY

These ships handle not only Navy needs but the total U.S. petroleum requirement in Vietnam—Army bulldozers and tanks on land, jet fuel for aircraft and helicopters, as well as the huge demands of the Navy's ships.

This latter requirement could have been reduced if the Navy had been permitted to move more quickly to nuclear power.

The Defense Department had to be pushed into accepting nuclear power for submarines. No one thinks of building conventional electric-powered submarines now.

Defense Secretary McNamara has even reversed himself and accepted nuclear power for aircraft carriers—after fighting it and ordering the nation's last two carriers fueled with oil burners although the nuclear-powered USS Enterprise had already proved its worth.

But Pentagon cost analysts adamantly refused to accept nuclear power for the escort vessels which accompany aircraft carriers, beyond reluctantly agreeing—and then, only because Congress insisted—that one nuclear-powered escort will be authorized for each nuclear-powered carrier.

The possible consequences, which could be particularly damaging in wartime, were set forth in usual waspish style last month by Vice Adm. Hyman G. Rickover in testimony before the House Defense Appropriations Committee.

Rickover, known as the father of the nuclear submarine, made it clear be was speaking against the policy established by the Navy Department. He not only made it clear, but he presented instructions he had received from Secretary of the Navy Paul Nitze requiring him to say that he was dissenting from the established policy.

PENTAGON COSTING CRITICIZED

He then proceeded to point scornfully at the Pentagon cost analysis process which has resulted in the decision against nuclear destroyers.

He presented charts and graphs showing how the combat capability even of the nuclear-powered attack carrier Enterprise had been seriously limited while it was operating off Vietnam because its escort vessels had to leave the protective screen for continual refueling. The statistics, unfortunately, were deleted in the process of security review. But the conclusions drawn by Rickover and committee members left little doubt that the figures showed a dramatic decline in combat effectiveness because carriers relied on oil-burning escorts.

A Navy request to build a gasturbine destroyer—at present nonnuclear destroyers are driven by steam turbines—also drew scorn from Rickover as more statistical gimmickry by the cost analysts.

Not only will the gas-turbine use a more expensive fuel, the admiral noted, but in order to achieve the range the Navy seeks, the new type of destroyer must be built bigger than present steam-turbine vessels.

If steam-turbine types were the same size, they'd have equal range with the gas-turbine model, he noted. So the only result—although Rickover didn't point it out—was to have a larger destroyer using a fuel different than its companions.

Why bother, the admiral seemed to be saying. If range is the objective, why not go nuclear and achieve what is for all practical purposes unlimited range—with a new nuclear fuel core needed only once every 10 years.

Until last month, the Navy had only three nuclear-powered surface ships—the Enterprise, the cruiser Long Beach and the frigate Bainbridge. The fourth, the frigate Truxtun, was commisisoned at Camden, N.J., May 27, the same day that what is probably the last conventionally powered aircraft carrier the nation will ever build, the USS John F. Kennedy, slid down the ways at Newport News, Va.

Off Vietnam, the nuclear ships were assigned tasks conventionally powered ships could not handle, primarily because of refueling problems.

On Pacific crossings, conventionally powered ships could not even carry sufficient fuel to provide a reserve for avoiding bad weather, a problem which hardly bothers nuclear ships.

Thus, Rickover noted, when the Enterprise completed a tour of duty off Vietnam last year and started home, initial planning indicated that fuel problems would force her conventionally fueled escorts to remain in close range instead of dispersing as an antiaircraft warning network. This was true, the admiral said, even though it is known that Russian reconnaissance planes conconstantly fly over the Pacific to track U.S. ships. To guard against surprise attack, missile-armed U.S. planes usually intercept them and escort them while in the area.

When the Enterprise started home, it was accompanied only by the Bainbridge, which could keep up with the carrier without refueling. With only one escort, the commander placed the Bainbridge in the most likely direction a Russian plane would approach. But this time, a Russian long-range reconnaissance bomber happened to approach from a different direction and was not picked up until it entered the area covered by the radar aboard the Enterprise itself.

In a war situation, this could have been disastrous.

Nuclear destroyers cost about 50% more than those burning oil. But in defending the added cost, Rickover and other officials have said it is difficult, short of war, to decide the value received for the added money. It is hard to put a numerical value on survival.

As he has before, Rickover referred to a famous comment by Winston Churchill concerning naval vessels. The Royal Navy had, as early as 1908, built oil-burning destroyers which could travel at a speed of 35-knots, but finding them far more expensive than 27-knot coal-burning ships, the Navy reverted to coal.

Shortly before World War I, Churchill was named to head the admiralty and learned of the decision. He reversed it, saying he would rather have fewer but faster ships.

"Building slow destroyers!" Churchill said. "One might as well breed slow race horses."

The Peace Corps Retains Its Effectiveness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1967

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, this is the second and concluding section of the article concerning the Peace Corps and its actions today. As I said yesterday, this article is an excellent description of the Peace Corps' enthusiasm and dedication.

The article follows:

[From the Washington Post, June 11, 1967]

THE PEACE CORPS IS "RECHANNELING ITS BUBBLES"

AN OVERRIDING RESULT

The Peace Corps, by law, has three goals: to help underdeveloped countries meet their needs for trained manpower; to help promote better understanding of the American people in those countries; to help promote better understanding of other peoples by the American people.

The third goal is often transmuted into another: to make the Volunteers better people and better citizens. "Better" can mean more mature; better equipped to face human or institutional challenges; better equipped to help solve America's problems.

To many Volunteers, the last goal seems more important, and more often achieved, than the first. David Elliott, PC director in India, says, "At our completion of service conferences, the Volunteers are unanimous in saying, 'We've learned more than we've taught.' "

Vaughn agrees: "The Peace Corps is now confident enough to say that what happens to the Volunteer as a person, as a citizen, as a professional, is the most important goal. He has to be the main winner."

To some Volunteers, this is an admission of defeat. They feel that they haven't done enough to get their village or their country on the road to development. But any significant change takes from two to 50 years to become visible, so most Volunteers are bound to leave before they see the effect, if any, of what they have done.

TWO DIFFERENT GOALS

The corps has not fully resolved the question of what kind of effect it intends, a physical change or an attitude change. The first is measurable in terms of the number of wells dug, children taught, people vaccinated. The second is hard to measure, but people do develop ideas about changing their environment, their social structure, themselves.

PC directors in Africa see the fundamental role of the Volunteers as ending the colonial-inspired divorce between an instructor and his students, an official and his "clients." They tend to consider the Volunteers' performance off the job as important as his development role in working hours.

In Latin America, Volunteers say that the physical accomplishments, while important, are only the visible part of the much bigger iceberg known as community development. To melt the whole iceberg, they feel that they have to create a new frame of mind and set examples that will be followed long after they are gone.

The same feeling is found elsewhere in the world. It is a big reason for the discernible shift in Peace Corps programs away from classroom teaching, though that is still the major activity in many areas, and toward work in agriculture, public health and community development.

An example is India's shift in priority from education to food production and family planning at the village level. In Peru's urban slums, the trend is away from day nurseries and construction efforts to things like vocational education, to give rural adults who flock to the cities the skills they need to cope with urban life.

A PRISTINE CANVAS

Of course, there are still many areas where the emphasis remains on the physical and institutional.

Most countries, however new, have some kind of institutional base for development and some reasonably qualified officials, but not such a place as the U.S. trust territory of Micronesia, a scattering of Pacific Islands. This makes it attractive to Ross Pritchard, the PC regional director for East Asia and the Pacific.

The Volunteers, operating in a near-vacuum, can do more and innovate more than they can elsewhere—not merely to change attitudes, but to create services, institutions and such physical facilities as health centers. In short, they can create an administration.

In Bolivia, a Volunteer came up with an idea for a school to teach construction laborers how to build roads, buildings, electric plants and other needed facilities. He talked AID into financing the equipment and got the Bolivian army, the La Paz municipality and the local community to agree. The Volunteers for it will come from labor union recruiting, the Peace Corps hopes.

Even such a "physical" program has its attitude-changing side. Changing the host individual as well as the host country means understanding how people's minds work, gaining their trust, working on projects they are eager to have, foreseeing the consequences of one's actions in a society whose logic may be different from yours.

In the fertile Casamance region of Senegal, for instance, Volunteers worked with a tribe that grew rice but refused to market it because it had religious significance. The Volunteers tried to break down the religious aspect to help end Senegal's need for imported rice. But they discovered that once they succeeded, the tribesmen stopped growing rice. They no longer had the motivation.

A HANDY SACRIFICE

A different kind of culture-gap problem faced a Volunteer in Kenya. He was present at a village meeting where much resentment against government policies was expressed. Several villagers suggested that the best way to demonstrate discontent would be to kill a white man.

The Volunteer, who spoke a smattering of Luo, looked around the room, discovered he was the only white man there and tried to fade into the mud wall. Cooler heads prevailed, however, and the villagers decided to dramatize the protest in a different way.

The shift to attitude-changing and "rural transformation" can make it more difficult to work with local officials, who find still more reason for dismay at the intangible nature of PC goals and at what they consider the loss of status from working with one's hands.

At higher levels, host governments may be skeptical of the value of community-involved programs, or unable to finance their share. Some are also skeptical about the Volunteers' technical qualifications for this kind of program. Several countries have asked for higher technical skills in these fields than the Peace Corps feels it can or should provide.

In India, director David Elliott thinks that the Volunteers make good catalysts because of their enthusiasm and dedication. "They don't come over here with 30 years experience in agriculture" he says. "But our point is that it's not what you know about agriculture or family planning, but what you can impart . . . Getting people with more technical qualifications might be our downfall. Why transform us into another AID when we have done so much better in many ways?"

Generally, the Peace Corps feels that its vaunted "BA generalists" can learn enough in three months training to understand what the technical expert has discovered and then do what the expert cannot: translate it into terms that the peasant—even more of a layman than the Volunteer—can understand.

AN AID SYNDROME

As Elliott suggested, the desire for higher technical skills can be part of an "AID syndrome," since many host-country officials are more familiar with foreign aid concepts than with the Peace Corps programs.

Under a presidential directive for all Government agencies overseas to work together, the Peace Corps is trying to have Volunteers use AID equipment or spread knowledge provided by AID experts. The problem is that many Volunteers feel that when AID provides "goodies," it tends to devalue the Volunteer himself in the eyes of the host country.

In Ethiopia, for example, AID provided typewriters for a vocational training school and a Volunteer was sent in to teach typing. The host government did nothing to maintain the machines and within six months they stopped working. The Volunteer feels that his job is pointless. If the government had really been interested in training typists, he says, it would have bought the machines itself and kept them in repair.

Resentment of a program initiated by the donor rather than by the host country is an old bgaboo of foreign aid. The Peace Corps, like AID, officially responds only to host country requests, but such initiatives can be stimulated.

In India, for example, the number of Volunteers shot up from about 750 to 1271 as a result of an announcement by President Johnson during Prime Minister Indira Gandhi's visit to Washington last year. The Peace Corps insists that the President was only responding to a request by Mrs. Gandhi, but the influx came as a surprise in New Delhi, where the PC staff was hard put to handle the growth in terms of both logistics and programs.

Director Elliott insists that the Volunteers work "on ongoing Indian programs. We don't develop our own." But a Peace Corps evaluator told Warren Unna that was not strictly true, certainly not in the case of the programs devised to occupy last year's spate of new people.

A LUXURY PROGRAM

The Corps went into French-speaking Africa with heavy programs for teaching English, a third language that few students needed or wanted, giving the impression that the main desire was to establish a Peace Corps presence. Later, the programs in many of these countries were reconsidered.

In Niger, C. Payne Lucas went in as director and showed the government officials their need for help in agriculture, public health and community development. The Niger program is now considered a roaring success both by Americans and the people of Niger.

In Bolivia, director Arthur Purcell went into tin mining areas that had produced two revolutions and found several needs the Peace Corps could fill to help the Indian miners recover and develop. He stimulated the Bolivian vocational education, athletics (which the people love) and public health, using unions and other community groups as agencies rather than the government mining corporation.

Washington planners objected to this program, which had revolutionary implications since the miners had long left-wing traditions. Vaughn overruled them and approved it. Asked if the military-dominated Bolivian government was not alarmed, Purcell said, "Hell, no. Some officials like it, and the ones that might not don't take the Peace Corps seriously enough to worry about it."

A CIA TAINT

Another kind of taint has attached to the Peace Corps, however—the CIA smear. It has been a serious problem in India. Pakistan, Tanzania, Kenya and a few other countries, though it has never appeared in Latin America.

In India, much of the CIA sensitivity grew out of the recent exposure of the CIA connection with the National Student Association here and with the defection of Svetlana Alliluyeva, Stalin's daughter.

The concern is widespread. An Indian businessman, for example, started a conversation on a plane by asking, "What do you think about the CIA and the Peace Corps?" He then provided his own answer: "I know about 12 Peace Corps people here and I don't think they are CIA. But one of them told me even he thinks there may be CIA in the Peace Corps, not among the Volunteers, but maybe among the staff."

The Indian government says there is no evidence to support the CIA charges. So far as the U.S. Government is concerned, the CIA is forbidden by law to use the Peace Corps in any way. PC officials say they check repeatedly to make sure the CIA is sticking by the rules.

The CIA fear was, however, an explicit element in the decision of the Indian state of Kerala to ask for the withdrawal of 28 Volunteers working in poultry development. Kerala and Pakistan, which has also ended its Peace Corps program, also said they wanted higher skills than the Volunteers have, but the official American community thinks both cases were political.

Other countries that have asked the Peace Corps to leave for political reasons include Ceylon (where a new government has invited it back); Indonesia under Sukarno, and Mauritania in the current Middle East crisis.

A FAIRER IMAGE

In a way, it is their loss, but in another way, it is America's. What Donald Louchheim said about Africa is true of the world as a whole:

"Where the image of the United States is a composite of scraps of Technicolor celluloid and sleek, usually irritable expatriates, the Peace Corps Volunteer is the only tangible sign that the United States is more than a remote, glittering stage set with big cars, washing machines and broadloom carpets, peopled with cowboys and women with cardboard hair.

"Throughout the continent, there is no concept that the developed world is as frail as the developing world, or any awareness that it ever developed itself. The European and American presence in Africa merely reinforces this ignorance and lack of confidence. The U.S. Information Service and AID are unwittingly the worst offenders.

"The Peace Corps, at least, holds out the possibility of showing another, and perhaps the most important, dimension of the United States."

Eulogy to Hawaii Newspaperman Allan John McGuire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1967

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, the State of Hawaii and the Nation have suffered a great loss in the death of newspaperman Allan John McGuire, a beloved and respected citizen of the Island State for the 64 years of his full and productive life.

The American poet-philosopher, Ralph Waldo Emerson, once said:

> Nothing great was ever achieved without enthusiasm.

The enthusiasm and dedication of Allan John McGuire produced many great contributions to the economic, civic, and recreational life of the 50th State. Among his proudest achievements were his service on the Commission which produced Honolulu's present city charter and his prominent role in the achievement of statehood for Hawaii.

We mourn the loss of this esteemed citizen, and Mrs. Matsunaga and I extend our deepest sympathy to his bereaved family.

I wish to submit for inclusion in the RECORD an editorial from the pages of the Honolulu Advertiser, paying a warm and moving tribute to Mr. McGuire—whose newspaper career spanned a half century with that paper—from its issue of Monday, June 12, 1967:

ALLAN JOHN MCGUIRE

Allan John McGuire was intimately and faithfully a part of The Advertiser for more than a half-century, beginning as a newsboy in 1910 vending the paper at Liliha and Kuakini Streets, then making home deliveries in the surrounding neighborhood.

In 1920 he became a clerk at the paper, rising to a director in 1932 and to treasurer and business manager in 1951, posts he held until retirement in 1963.

Allan McGuire was a man with warmth, a large heart and a liking for people. His work at the paper and with the radio-TV and commercial printing interests it formerly held brought him a wide circle of friends throughout the community.

To him the aloha spirit meant doing things for others. He enjoyed the old "boat days," when he could meet Mainland friends in and out of newspapering, show them around the Island and entertain them.

At Punahou he was a great sports figure in that class of '21 which made a clean sweep of major interscholastic athletics. He captained the football team, played forward in basketball, and in track he broad-jumped, sprinted and hurdled. Years later he was a member of the Territorial Boxing Commission.

He was also an enthusiastic fisherman and, on vacation, enjoyed going after salmon and rainbow trout in Canada.

In the field of civic service, Mr. McGuire was especially proud, as he should have been, of serving on the commission which produced Honolulu's present City charter.

Allan McGuire loved these Islands, where he was born and lived so fully during his 64 years. In company with ever so many, we extend our deep sympathy to his loved ones.

Commerce Department Discusses Details of American Selling Price Agreement in Comment on Monsanto Official's Criticisms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 16, 1967

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, the Department of Commerce has given to me a long report, dated today, on the issues involved in the Kennedy round negotiations and agreement on the controversial American selling price tariff procedure. This report, from Deputy Assistant Secretary for Trade Policy Robert L. McNeill, was in reply to my request for comments on a letter sent to me on May 18 by Mr. D. E. Munie, plant manager of the J. F. Queeny plant of the Monsanto Co., headquartered in St. Louis.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the controversy over American selling price—ASP—particularly as it relates to benzenoid chemicals, will eventually come before the Congress for implementation and possible changes in the law, it is my feeling that this exchange of correspondence will be of great interest to many Members of Congress. I had earlier sent a copy of Mr. Munie's letter to me to the Honorable Wilbur D. Mills, chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, feeling that the points made would be matters which the committee undoubtedly would review.

Under unanimous consent, I am therefore placing in the Appendix of the Record for the information of the Committee on Ways and Means, of other Members of Congress interested in this issue, and of the many specialists who read the Record, the texts of these two letters on benzenoid chemicals and ASP, as follows:

Monsanto Co.,
Organic Chemicals Division,
St. Louis, Mo., May 18, 1967.

Hon. Leonor K. Sullivan,
House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

My Dear Mrs. Sullivan: On Monday evening, May 15, our tariff negotiators finally reached an agreement after four years negotiations. Our negotiators agreed to reduce tariffs on benzenoid chemicals 50% while the tariffs in the other countries on this type of chemical would be reduced 20%; and I understand the remaining 30% would be withheld until we surrendered the American Selling Price (ASP) system of valuating chemical products for tariff purposes.

Authorization to surrender the American Selling Price (ASP) must come from the Congress, and, therefore, I expect you will be called upon to cast your vote on this issue some time in the near future.

Our plant is located at 1700 South Second Street in St. Louis, and we manufacture about 150 different chemical products. Every product we manufacture is classified for tariff purposes as a benzenoid chemical; therefore, every product we manufacture will have 50% reduction in tariff due to the negotiations which were concluded Monday evening.

Of course, every product we make is not currently being imported, but if we apply the 50% reduction in tariff to those products which currently have foreign competition, and assume the reduction in tariff will result in an identical reduction in price (and this is a very reasonable assumption), the cost to us in price attrition will be $3,250,000 based on last year's production. (If the price is eventually reduced on every chemical we make, this would be $12,700,000 based on 1966 production.) This in itself will be crippling, but, if on top of this we allow the tariff to be based on foreign selling price, the combined effect could be a disaster for us at the Queeny Plant.

The problem is this. If we presently have a chemical which sells for 50¢ per pound, American Selling Price, it may enjoy a tariff of 2½¢, plus 25% of ASP. The tariff thus would be 2½¢ plus 12½¢, or 15¢ per pound. If we have present foreign competition on this chemical, this must mean that it is currenty being delivered from the foreign country and deposited on our shores, presumably at a profit, at 35¢ per pound. The present 50% cut would lower the tariff to 7½¢. The foreign producer would then be able to deliver the product in this country at 42½¢ at the same profit he has enjoyed in the past. If the ASP is abandoned the tariff would be based on the 35¢ per pound, which, presumably, is the foreign selling price. We are told we have nothing to worry about, that percentages, based on 35¢, would be raised to say 1¼¢ + 18%, so that 42½¢ per pound price would prevail.

This sounds quite fair on the surface, but if we surrender the American Selling Price the control of the amount of tariff paid is put into the hands of the foreign competitor. These foreign companies merely have to band together, lower their prices, which also reduces the tariff, for a sufficient length of time to drive us out of the business and come back with an almost free hand. Thus, if they dropped their price 10¢, from 35¢ to 25¢, the tariff would drop from 7½¢ to 5¾¢ and the price would drop further from 42½¢ to 30¾¢. Our total price reduction then would be 50¢—30¾¢ or 19¼¢, or 38½%. When we make progress against rising costs, it comes in 0.1¢ increments and a 38½% cut is more than most of our products could stand over a five year period.

What does this mean to us at the Queeny Plant? We occupy the site where Monsanto was founded and which comprised the whole company for 23 years after its founding. In 1921, the then Monsanto Chemical Company was in receivership, the business being in the hands of a New York bank. This was the result of competition primarily from the German chemical industry. Mr. Queeny, our founder, had been in financial trouble for many years prior to World War I; and it was not until World War I cut off the supply of German chemicals into this country that Monsanto prospered. When World War I ended, the German chemical industry came back and put Monsanto into the condition it was in 1921. That same year, the American Selling Price was adopted as a basis for evaluation of benzenoid chemical tariffs, and I believe it is significant that Monsanto and many other chemical companies began to prosper at that time and have grown ever since.

Has the situation changed any since 1921? Yes it has. Today we are a large company, and the Queeny Plant is a large plant employing 1,800 people, most of whom are residents of St. Louis or St. Louis County. Our business has been very competitive in that today we are selling chemicals for less than 80c that would have sold for $1.00 in the 1947–1949 period. Our wages and many other costs have risen 2½ times in this period.

During 1966, we lost three products due to competition and with them went 65 jobs. Of our 150-plus products, some are very strong, but because of years of competition some are quite weak. Also, because of this competition, we produce these chemicals in relatively small batch type operations because the market available to any one company is not large enough to support a larger, more efficient operation.

We have been said to need the tariff protection we now have only because we are inefficient. Technically, I believe this is true. Much of our foreign competition divides the available market (you make this product, we'll make that one) and thus achieves larger and more efficient plants. American antitrust laws would never allow anything like this. The wages we pay are at least three times higher than those of our foreign competitors, and in the case of France nearly five times higher. Benzenoid imports have grown 118% in the period 1960–1965. The growth from 1964 to 1965 was 65%; the bulk of it being in the type of benzenoid chemicals we make. Imports of intermediates, one of the types we make, grew 102% in one year from 1964 to 1965. All of this has occurred under the old higher tariffs.

Currently, we are faced with greatly increased expenditures for air and water pollution abatement. Local taxes are rising. Employment costs are rising even faster than wage rates, and we are undertaking more projects of a social nature in the community in which we live as our part in trying to preserve the community. We think this makes good business sense. All these things place an increased burden on our products and the weaker one *can* be lost as was demonstrated in 1966. If we do not find new products which are more profitable to take their place, the burden of our centralized utilities, offices, building, streets, employe facilities, falls more heavily on the remaining products; and we set up a "row-of-dominoes" effect which can destroy a plant like ours.

In the interest of preserving our plant and the possible loss of jobs of its 1,800 employees, I am asking that you vote against the abandonment of the American Selling Price method of evaluation of benzenoid chemicals when the opportunity arises for you to do so.

Respectfully yours,

D. E. Munie,
Plant Manager, J. F. Queeny Plant.

The Assistant Secretary
of Commerce,
Washington, D.C., June 16, 1967.

Hon. Leonor K. Sullivan,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mrs. Sullivan: This is in further reply to your letter of May 23 to Secretary Trowbridge concerning questions on our chemical tariff raised by Mr. D. E. Munie, Plant Manager, J. F. Queeny Plant, Monsanto Company, 1700 South Second Street, St. Louis, Missouri.

The U.S. Delegation in Geneva is now putting into final form the results of our agreements on the thousands of tariff classifications which were subject to negotiation in the Kennedy Round. Drafting the schedule of concessions to be granted by the United States is underway. Schedules of concessions granted by other countries are being checked as soon as they are received. These schedules will have to be approved by all participating countries before the U.S. can release details of the Kennedy Round agreement. According to present expectations, it will not be possible to release details of the agreement before June 30. Even then, more time may be needed to assemble data for public release since the legal documents for signature by governments are not too informative as to the significance of the agreement.

Though the Executive Branch is not able now to release details of the agreement, it is possible to provide some comment that may be useful in replying to Mr. Munie's inquiry and in considering the issues involved. In doing so it is necessary to place the issues on chemicals in perspective so that the significance of the Kennedy Round agreement can be fairly assessed.

U.S. domestic shipments of all chemicals were valued at $33.6 billion in 1964, the statistical base year for the Kennedy Round negotiations. U.S. exports totalled $2.4 billion while imports amounted to $710 million. (Of the latter amount, 52 percent entered duty-free.) Our exports were therefore more than three times the value of imports. Imports amounted to slightly more than 2 percent of domestic sales.

In the part of the industry making benzenoid chemicals, which is the area subject to the American Selling Price (ASP) system of valuation, domestic shipments were valued at $3.4 billion, exports at $285 million and imports at $53 million. Thus, as a percentage of all chemicals, the benzenoid area accounts for about 10 percent of domestic production, 12 percent of exports and 7 percent of imports. However, imports of benzenoid chemicals amounted to only 1.5 percent of domestic sales of benzenoids. Further, since only $25 million of the $53 million of imports were classified as "competitive" by the Bureau of Customs, and therefore subject to ASP, the ratio might be considered lower than one percent. The remainder, or $28 million of benzenoid imports, were entered chiefly by 13 U.S. subsidiaries of foreign manufacturers. Since these were classified as "non-competitive" because there was no similar domestic production, they were not subject to ASP.

As you may know, the ASP system was adopted in the Tariff Act of 1922 to assist what was then an infant chemical industry. This system, which is highly restrictive to imports, has come under extremely harsh criticism of our trading partners abroad in recent years in light of our heavy export surplus in chemicals, particularly in the benzenoid area. Rightly or wrongly, our trading partners made the ASP system a central issue in the Kennedy Round, and it became clear several years ago that if the U.S. was to obtain tariff concessions for our chemical and other industries, it would have to do something about the ASP system. With that background the Tariff Commission in December 1965 instituted an investigation of the ASP system at the request of the President's Special Representative for Trade Negotiations. In late July 1966 the Commission filed its report (Tariff Commission Publication No. 181—July 1966). After much study and consideration by the agencies concerned in the Executive Branch, a request was made to the President seeking his authority to enter into negotiations for eliminating ASP. After obtaining the President's authorization the U.S. entered into intensive negotiations with the European Economic Community, the United Kingdom and Switzerland, the countries most concerned about ASP, with the clear understanding that any agreement entered into would provide a quid pro quo and be subject to legislation by Congress insofar as elimination of ASP was concerned.

The negotiation was extremely difficult in that other nations did not want to enter into an agreement which would be subject to approval or disapproval by the U.S. Congress. U.S. negotiators insisted that if any agreement was to be concluded, it would have to be in two self-balancing packages since (1) the U.S. could not obtain overall reciprocity if chemicals were excluded from the Kennedy Round settlement; and (2) any package to be presented to Congress on ASP would have to be one which could be accepted or rejected independently of the Kennedy Round settlement.

Briefly, the agreement reached at Geneva on chemicals entails two agreements. The first, which is incorporated in the Kennedy Round, will stand regardless of Congresional action on ASP. In this first agreement, the U.S. will reduce its duties on chemicals by an average of about 43 percent while other countries will reduce by about 25 percent. This latter figure is a preliminary estimate of the numerous reductions made by other countries and includes reductions ranging from 20 to 50 percent. Canada, negotiating as a country with special trade problems in accordance with agreement of other developed countries, will make cuts of varying degrees on a vast array of chemical products.

In the second package, which is subject to Congressional action on ASP, the U.S. would eliminate ASP and reduce duties above 20 percent down to that level except for coloring agents (dyes, pigments and azoics), sulpha drugs and several other products. The EEC, the U.K. and the U.S. would place in effect the remainder of the 50 percent reduction withheld in the first package, with the U.K. reducing some rates by over 60 percent. The EEC, the U.K. and Switzerland will take action on a non-tariff barrier to reciprocate for the elimination of ASP.

All countries, including the U.S., will except some chemical items from the full 50 percent reduction. Exceptions of other countries were made chiefly to balance off the U.S. maintenance of rates above 20 percent on coloring agents and sulpha drugs.

The effect of both agreements on chemicals would be to reduce sharply the rates on chemicals in major world markets. With the execption of items subject to ASP, U.S. rates in most cases were already relatively low and were no bar to imports. On the items subject to ASP, the U.S. will in either package, still retain the highest rates of duty of any industrialized country. The rates of other countries on U.S. exports will be reduced to very low levels, probably to a maximum of 12½ percent for the EEC and U.K. if the second pacage goes into effect.

The first package is a compromise which favors the EEC and the U.K. in regard to depth of reduction and the U.S. insofar as trade coverage is concerned. We estimate a significant positive balance in favor of the U.S. in the first package because the varied nature and heavy volume of our exports provide more opportunity to benefit from the 25 percent tariff cut than does the 43 percent reduction on our imports. Moreover, ASP will be retained.

The second package provides benefits in the U.K. and EEC markets which should provide further impetus for our exports. Our part of this package—elimination of ASP—is an action which was recommended in 1951 by the Treasury Department when Congress was considering customs simplification. In the last Congress, ASP was eliminated from protective rubber footwear and the Senate Finance Committee late in 1966 asked the Tariff Commission to study and report on ASP as well as other valuation problems. The Commission report has been sent to the Committee but has not yet been made public.

The chief criticisms of the ASP system are its uncertainty and the very high rates of duty that result from its application. U.S. importers are not sure whether their shipments will be subjected to ASP, and even if they are, they do not know the amount of duty which will be assessed until the shipment is processed through Customs. Duties can and do run over 50 percent and in some cases over 100 percent. In the trading world of today, such a system of valuation is generally considered obsolete and overly restrictive to trade. In this respect this Department and the Foreign Service are constantly trying to obtain fair and equitable trading conditions for U.S. industry abroad and we believe that the success of our efforts is contingent to a large extent on our own willingness to remove similar barriers. We therefore support elimination of the ASP as a part of the second agreement on chemicals in the Kennedy Round.

In general, we do not expect any serious dislocations in the chemical industry from the Kennedy Round agreements. All concessions will be made in five equal installments over a period of four years and one day, and while there will be adjustments as prices change when tariffs are reduced, we expect that U.S. industry will have time to take such adjustments in stride. Moreover, we expect that gains from exports will offset any increase in imports.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT L. MCNEILL,
Deputy Assistant Secretary for Trade Policy.

Middle East Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JACOB H. GILBERT

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 20, 1967

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, recently our distinguished colleague from New Jersey [Mr. HOWARD] stated his feelings on the situation in the Middle East before an audience in Asbury Park, N.J.

Mr. HOWARD articulated the feelings shared by many of my colleagues and fellow Americans. At this time I would like to submit his remarks for insertion in the RECORD:

SPEECH BEFORE ISRAEL SOLIDARITY RALLY BY CONGRESSMAN JAMES J. HOWARD AT ASBURY PARK, N.J., JUNE 7, 1967

We meet tonight in a somber time in history and although we meet in a free city in a free nation, freedom is being once again placed under seige on our planet. The eyes of the world are tonight focused on the Middle East and most particularly on the tiny country of Israel. Once again this Jewish State is facing a threat to its independence and its very existence, a threat that comes from the hostile Arab world which encircles it.

We know that adversity and hostility are not new experiences to the Israeli people. From as far back as Biblical times the kingdoms of Israel and Judah were set upon time and time again by hostile neighbors, Syria, Babylon and ironically enough Egypt. We know and have sympathized with the fact that through the pages of history have been recorded aggressive acts against the Jewish people, burning, killing, plundering, which led up to dispersal. For centuries the Jewish people wandered the globe, ridiculed, tormented and unaccepted. But through those years a hope and a dream persisted, a nation of Israel. Efforts toward this end and the concept of such a return to Jerusalem was exemplified in Zionism which has been embedded in Jewish thought since the early years of the Diaspora. Progression from the idea of Zionism to the reality of Israel began about 100 years ago. We are all familiar with the names of Moses Hess, Peretz Zmolenskin and Judah Pinsker, and the founder of the Zionist movement as we know it, Theodor Herzl. Herzl's organiization of the first Zionist Congress in Switzerland in 1897 was followed by slow, but measured, steps which led to the creation of Israel in May of 1947. So for over 19 years we have seen the growth of democracy in the Middle East. We have proudly watched it become the model nation of the area, a model in education, in health, in economic progress and perhaps most importantly, a model for all of its neighbors to see that the best way to live is through the means of a democratically organized parliament and government.

Just a few weeks ago I had the honor of visiting this justifiably proud nation and people. I felt a pride myself, which I knew I shared with the Jewish members of this area in visiting the modern city of Tel Aviv, in watching its people, well fed and happy, and determined to do everything necessary to combat the clouds of Arab animosity that were forming over their very heads. I was proud to visit the city of Herzlia, where I spoke with the physician who operates the clinic built mostly through funds gathered and donated by the Histadrut and other concerned citizens of our own central New Jersey. The modern hospital on the hill behind Herzlia is an inspiration to all who visit it, especially when we realize that not many years ago the hospital served tuberculosis patients from only the immediate area, but now needs to devote only one wing of it for all the tuberculosis patients in the entire nation. Through hard work and cooperative effort Israel has become a island of hygiene in the ocean of disease that is known as the Middle East.

On the eastern shore of the Galilee or Lake Tiberius, I visited the Kibbutz of Ein-Gev. Here, at Ein-Gev, the animosity of the Arab world had already been felt, for less than two weeks before, the Syrian guns located on the hilltop a few hundred yards away had wantonly shelled this tiny communal colony. I saw the bomb craters in the playground, the schoolroom half blown apart, and visited an underground area that has one of the most discouraging names I have ever heard. It was called the Kindergarten Bomb Shelter, not a rusted relic of World War II but a necessary piece of "physical equipment" in Israel today. I spoke with Jack Steinberg, one of the leaders of the Kibbutz, and met his young daughter, who stood only a few feet from where one of the bombs landed but miraculously escaped injury. I was informed just this afternoon by the Israeli Embassy in Washington that little Ein-Gev received massive shelling from the Syrians yesterday but they had no report as to the number of casualties, and I can only wonder and hope concerning what remains of Ein-Gev and the condition of Jack Steinberg and his daughter.

These are but just a few of the memories I have of Israel in May of 1967, but what impressed me most and will live with me for the longest time was the air and attitude of the people of Israel. They are a young nation, actually a teenager in years. They are filled with national pride, pride in what they have accomplished and confident of their future. This generation of Israelis may indeed be called "the chosen people." For centuries fathers told their sons, and they in turn their sons, that some day the Jewish people would have and build their own nation. This generation of Jews has been chosen to accomplish that mission. They have done well although harrassed by the Arab nations around them and have no intention of being dispersed again.

One year ago, speaking in Lakewood on the 18th anniversary of Israel's Independence, I stated "Currently there are scant indications that her neighbors are willing to accept Israel as a reality but it is also a reality that Israel is here to stay." What I told the people of Lakewood last year, the nation of Israel is showing the world today. As Abba Eban said last night at the United Nations: "Egypt has openly proclaimed that Elath did not form part of Israel and had predicted that Israel itself would soon expire. That proclamation was empty. The prediction now lies in ruins." As Israel moves forward against its aggressors, let no one in or out of the United Nations nor in or out of the United States point a finger of condemnation upon her. Never before in history has a nation taken so much abuse for such a long period of time before insisting upon their rights as free people in a free world. A hard and bitter lesson was learned ten years ago in assuming that Nasser, after his bitter defeat, would allow Israel its territorial integrity. Let us not permit the lesson of the past ten years to reoccur in the next ten.

Let the people of the world know that when a free people are threatened our President, our government, and your Representative in Congress will stand on the side of justice. . . . and in the Middle East, the word "justice" is pronounced Israel.

Mistake To Dismember OEO

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL E. BUTTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1967

Mr. BUTTON. Mr. Speaker, last Sunday Major John V. Lindsay, of New York, a former Member of this House and a Republican, appeared on "Meet the Press." David Broder asked him the following question:

> The House Republicans are trying to completely revamp the poverty program and in the process abolish Sargent Shriver's poverty agency. Do you think it's a good idea?

The mayor of the Nation's largest city made an answer which, I believe, merits the close attention of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle. He said:

> We have had good luck and success with Mr. Shriver's OEO office and we find that in New York, at least, that it is wise to have a single office with which to deal in this enormously complicated program. It is a difficult program to administer at both ends of the stick, both in a locality and here in Washington, D.C. To dismember it and to put its various functions scattered about in five or six Federal agencies, I think would be a mistake. I fear that it would compound the problem of administration that not only exists in Washington but in all of the cities today.

In his column "Political Parade" in today's Washington Post, Mr. Broder has also analyzed John Lindsay's stature among his fellow American mayors and commented trenchantly on various Republican responses to the almost overwhelming problems facing our cities. I am sure that this column, excerpts of which I at this point include in the RECORD will also be highly interesting to every Member of this House.

[From the Washington Post, June 20, 1967]

THE OUTSIDER

(By David S. Broder)

HONOLULU.—After less than two years in office and still a very junior member of the club, New York's Mayor John V. Lindsay has established himself in the eyes of his fellow mayors as a spokesman and leader in the fight for urban America.

He emerged unmistakably at this week's meeting of the U.S. Conference of Mayors here as one of the strong men of municipal government. His was the dominant voice on the six-mayor "meet the press" panel, and his was the most influential viewpoint in the deliberations of the conference platform committee.

A veteran of these mayors' meetings rated Republican Lindsay among the "big three" of the organization, along with the two top Democrats, Detroit's articulate Jerome P. Cavanaugh and Chicago's Richard J. Daley, a four-term veteran almost universally regarded as America's most effective mayor.

Much as his victory in 1965 was cheered by the GOP as an early symptom of the recovery from the Goldwater disaster, Lindsay as mayor, it must be said, has made almost no effort to turn himself or his administration into a model or showcase of specifically Republican concern for city problems.

Still, when one sees the prestige Lindsay enjoys among his fellow mayors, it remains almost unbelievable that the Republican Party, obstensibly interested in the big city vote, lets an asset like him go to waste.

His constituency is the most important political prize in the country. Lindsay himself has more political glamour than any other Republican east of Ronald Reagan. Tall, broad-shouldered, good-looking, he stops traffic among the tourists and is probably the one Mayor in the country who is recognized by residents of a city other than his own.

Lindsay has an able staff, and he does his homework. He appeared to be the best-briefed man among the two dozen mayors on the resolutions committee.

He is still not a polished public speaker, but he has learned to make his points more clearly and succinctly than he did in the House. He carried the majority of mayors with him on the key policy statements on urban needs, welfare, crime, the antipoverty program and housing.

Politically, however, much of what Lindsay was promoting here runs directly contrary to the record his own Party is writing in Washington. Lindsay joined the unanimous vote in the resolutions committee for continuation of the model cities program, which most House Republicans opposed. Where House Republicans are currently trying to dismember Sargent Shriver's Office of Economic Opportunity, Lindsay argued for continuation of centralized administration of the antipoverty program, which he (unlike most Republicans and some mayors) pronounces a success, at least in New York City.

Most pointedly, Lindays offered and had endorsed a resolution which "deplores" the action of the House of Representatives—claimed as a great victory by House Republicans—in cutting off further funds for the rent-supplements program.

In short, what Lindsay is asking of his fellow Republicans is a commitment to finance city programs on a top-priority basis with every dollar that can be spared from the Vietnam war. And that is a commitment the congressional Republicans from their rural and suburban districts do not seem prepared to make.

Mr. Speaker, the war on poverty is at least as crucial to the United States as a major military engagement. It has always been a wise tradition of this body to forgo partisanship when the future of the country is at stake. This body has also been reluctant to radically alter legislative programs that have only been in operation a short time. We followed that tradition last month by retaining the important features of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, passed into law just 2½ years ago. This is as it should be, and Mayor Lindsay does not believe, and I do not believe, that one has to prove one's Republicanism by trying to obliterate the one agency that, despite some false starts and the inevitable mistakes that accompany any bold experiment, has come to grips with the harrowing reality of poverty in America. Responsible Republicanism, in my view, is that which looks to constructive solutions, not interminable agitation.

A View of H. H. H.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1967

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Vice President of the United States, has had a long and most distinguished career in the Congress. I commend to the Members an article about the Vice President by Elmo Roper in the June 17, 1967, issue of the Saturday Review. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include that article in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

A VIEW OF H. H. H.

(By Elmo Roper)

Since this article just might be construed by some as an attack on "liberals"—or at least self-proclaimed liberals—perhaps it would be an act of discretion on my part to present my credtentials.

I have been favorable to labor unions since my college days and have several highly esteemed friends—such as Jack Potofsky—in the labor movement still. I was the first national fund-raiser for the Urban League, was on its board for many years, and have been a member of the NAACP since the days of my Redding friend and neighbor, Walter White. For eighteen years I served as a member of the Connecticut Commission on Civil Rights, and for a time was its chairman. I voted for Al Smith, Norman Thomas, Franklin Roosevelt, Harry Truman, and Adlai Stevenson, in that order. Add to that, current membership on the board of the Fund for the Republic, Freedom House, and the Population Crisis Committee, and decide for yourself whether that adds up to a generally liberal or a general conservative position.

I have gone to the trouble of listing this information because I am very unhappy today with a large segment of people who vigorously proclaim themselves liberals, and yet scream when some other liberal disagrees with them on *anything*. It seems to me that the ability to tolerate dissent without abusing the dissenter is—or ought to be—the cornerstone of any liberal philosophy.

And yet today a good many of my friends who insist they are liberals are heaping abuse on Hubert Humphrey because he happens to disagree with them on the virtues and vices of the war in Vietnam. I believe everyone has a perfect right in this country to a viewpoint on Vietnam; all I am insisting is that Hubert Humphrey has that right, too—and that includes the right not to be regarded as "an ex-liberal" or a "traitor to the cause of liberalism" by those who disagree with his viewpoint—however right they may be in opposing that viewpoint.

For twenty-five years Hubert Humphrey has acted as the spearhead of liberal causes and has probably done more to push the liberal cause forward than all of his current detractors put together. But since so many of the self-proclaimed liberals seem to have short memories, let's list here—as a reminder—some things for which Hubert Humphrey was, in large part, responsible:

Human Rights: Mr. Humphrey's record in human rights hardly needs recounting. Under his leadership as mayor, Minneapolis adopted the first municipal Fair Employment Practice ordinance in the nation in 1947. At the 1948 Democratic National Convention his work in drafting a strong civil rights plank and his subsequent speech before the convention brought him to national prominence. Once elected to the Senate, Mr. Humphrey began to introduce bills to protect and strengthen the rights of all Americans. In March 1949 he sponsored an anti-lynching bill. In April he introduced a bill to establish a Commission on Civil Rights. In June 1951 he introduced a federal Fair Employment Practices bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, or national origin; a bill to outlaw the poll tax in national elections; a bill to provide equal access to and use of public interstate transportation; a bill to protect existing rights guaranteed under the Constitution or federal law; and a bill to protect the right of political participation.

Virtually all of these Humphrey human rights proposals, so "extreme" and "impractical" in the early 1950s, have since been written into law. The passage of the historic Civil Rights Act of 1964 climaxed Hubert Humphrey's sixteen years as chief civil rights spokesman in the Senate.

Food For Peace: Mr. Humphrey's concern with utilizing American food stocks to aid hungry people dates back to his earliest Senate days. In 1950 he introduced a bill to send wheat to India and Pakistan. His Food for Peace proposal, which authorizes the use of foreign currencies obtained from sales of surplus U.S. food for promoting local economic development was introduced on February 25, 1954. All subsequent Food for Peace and Food for Freedom programs have been based on Mr. Humphrey's 1954 bill. Senator George McGovern has said "Humphrey was the Congressional father of the Food for Peace program."

Medicare: In 1949 one of Mr. Humphrey's first proposals was to establish a program of health insurance for the elderly, financed through social security. Congress, however, refused to act on it. Mr. Humphrey reintroduced the bill himself in the 82nd and 83rd Congresses, then asked Senator Anderson to sponsor it in 1955 and in subsequent years. The King-Anderson Medicare Bill passed in 1965, sixteen years after Hubert Humphrey first introduced his original measure.

Aid to Education: Hubert Humphrey was an early and constant supporter of federal aid to education. In 1949, his first year in the Senate, he introduced legislation authorizing federal assistance for the construction of elementary and secondary schools. In 1952 he co-sponsored with Senator Murray a bill to establish a federal scholarship program for college students. In January 1957 he introduced three measures providing for 40,000 federal scholarships coupled with grants to colleges for facilities, loans to college students, income tax credit for college tuition payments, and federal assistance to states for school construction. These bills were virtually ignored until the Soviet Sputnik of October 1957 prompted President Eisenhower and Congress to seriously consider the need for federal contributions to general education. Mr. Humphrey pushed vigorously for the inclusion of scholarships in the National Defense Education Act of 1958, although the final bill authorized student aid only in the form of loans and graduate fellowships.

Arms Control and Disarmament: Although Hubert Humphrey had voiced the need for disarmament in Senate speeches beginning in 1950, his substantive accomplishments date mainly from the work of the Disarmament Subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. In April 1955 he sponsored the resolution to establish the subcommittee which was approved in January 1956. Mr. Humphrey was made subcommittee chairman.

Nuclear Test Ban: The groundwork for the nuclear test ban of 1963 also was laid in the Senate Disarmament Subcommittee (Hubert Humphrey, chairman) during the late 1950s. In October 1956, Mr. Humphrey's subcommittee released a report on the technical aspects of nuclear weapons testing and urged that the United States pursue the negotiation of a test ban among the nuclear powers. By 1958 Hubert Humphrey was speaking frequently on the floor of the Senate for a test ban and was receiving strong support in Congress and from the public for his efforts. In 1959 he introduced a Senate resolution to "support the efforts of the United States to continue to negotiate for an international agreement for the suspension of nuclear weapons tests. . . ."

A "limited" nuclear test ban treaty was signed by the United States, Great Britain, and the Soviet Union on July 25, 1963. Mr. Humphrey then led the Senate to ratify it on September 24, culminating more than seven years of personal effort for a ban on nuclear weapons tests.

Peace Corps: On June 15, 1960, Mr. Humphrey introduced the first bill to establish a program to send young American volunteers overseas for teaching and economic development programs. This was four months before Senator John Kennedy espoused the idea in his Ann Arbor campaign speech. After John Kennedy was elected, Mr. Humphrey introduced the Administration Peace Corps bill which became law in 1961.

To disagree with Hubert Humphrey's stand on the Vietnam war is one thing; but to heap the opprobrium, to hurl the invectives that many "liberals" are loosing today is quite another. Too many times in the past forty years have I seen the effectiveness of good liberals destroyed by the carping criticism of other so-called liberals who seem to insist on conformity to their viewpoint.

Many years ago my good friend Estes Kefauver asked me how I reconciled being a frequent critic of some of his methods and yet was one of his three or four best campaign fund-raisers. I gave him an answer that I still wouldn't change much today:

"Roper's Law for judging U.S. Senators goes like this: If a Senator votes as I would have voted had I been a Senator 40 per cent of the time, I'm disappointed in him. If he votes as I would have voted 60 per cent of the time, I'm pleased with him. But if he votes as I would have voted 80 per cent of the time, I begin to worry because he probably can't be reelected."

I suggest that philosophy is worth the consideration of those self-proclaimed liberals who argue loudly for the "right to dissent" and then show by their actions that what they mean is *their* right to dissent—not the right to dissent *from them.*

Story of a Dropout Who Would Not Quit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1967

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, America's often cited role as the land of opportunity was graphically described last week by the valedictory speaker at Harvard's commencement exercises.

I feel that such a tale represents the essence of the American ideal and therefore I respectfully insert it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

STORY OF A DROPOUT WHO WOULDN'T QUIT

(By Robert B. Kenney)

Horatio Alger stories somehow seem incongruous coming out of Harvard University, but a classic was revealed there Thursday.

It was the story of Joseph N. Sorrentino, 30, of Brooklyn—former street gang leader and four-time high school dropout—recited by him on his graduation from Harvard Law School.

It was a story every school-age kid in the country should hear.

It was a story the U.S. Office of Education should record, so every kid in the country could get its message—the word the office spends millions each year to impart.

It was a wild, sometimes horrifying, totally beautiful story; a tale of, and with, spirit as big as a ballpark.

Sorrentino told it in Harvard's Tercentenary Theater, where he had come to receive his law degree and deliver the valedictory address to an audience of 15,000.

Poverty, failure and spirit were prime ingredients of the story woven by the obviously outgoing, demonstrative New Yorker who still bears a trace of his Brooklyn accent.

His audience, for the most part, mistakenly thought they were being entertained.

They laughed at the funny monologue, not distinguishing humor from pathos. But the sobering message finally came through.

And his listeners sat spellbound as Sorrentino told this story, which, he said, "is not what the social scientists would have predicted:"

"I failed out of Fort Hamilton High School in Brooklyn. Not long after, I enrolled in Bay Ridge High School at night. I failed there also. I tried a third time at Bay Ridge, but could not last the term. Then I attended Washington Irving at night, and again could not finish."

"During this period I was also out in the business world and achieved a record of distinction for failing which even surpassed my scholastic career. I started in a bleach factory at 14. On the first day, trying to impress my employer, I attempted to carry ten gallons of bleach to a truck we were loading.

We lost all ten.

"At 16 I worked in a sweater factory, where I had the embarrassing experience of being awakened from a nap by the president of the company.

"After that incident I became a longshoreman. My next opportunity came through a furniture company's ad in the New York Times which read: 'Want ambitious young man who seeks responsibility.' After a month of aligning the wheels on tea carts I got tired of responsibility. Then I became associated with a Wall Street firm—in its messenger department. A shoe factory followed. Here I was so low in the company that even the office girls wanted me to address them by their last names.

"Discontent, I moved on to a printing plant, warehouse, cement crew, a Rockefeller Center mailroom, the Erie Railroad, the Washington Market.

"I even had an exposure to glamor, becoming an office boy at 20th Century-Fox. One of my duties was to send complimentary tickets for premier performances to New York's dignitaries. I now would like to apologize to former Mayor Wagner, whose ticket I gave to my grandmother, and to the other celebrities whose tickets went to the poor.

"This was also a period of wildness. I was a leader of a street gang in a tough neighborhood. At 18 came the first of two enlistments in the Marines. The first time I could not endure the severe authority and rebelled; fighting with recruits, rioting in the mess hall, trying to run away through the swamps of Parris Island. Within a short time I was released with a general discharge.

RESUMED BOXING

"Having done well before in the Golden Gloves, when I returned from the Marines I resumed boxing, preparing for a professional career, but after a year gave it up because a part of me would not accept it.

"At 20 years old, realizing that my only chance for a better life was through education, I went back to high school at night a 5th time. I finished 3 years at Erasmus while working days hoisting steel. My grades were good enough for admission to the University of California despite inferior college boards.

"At the university I was elected a student body president and graduated magna-cum laude. After graduation I reenlisted in the Marines. This time I became platoon leader, highest scorer in athletic competition and changed my general to an honorable discharge.

"And now, after 3 years at its law school, I have the honor of being a valedictory speaker at Harvard University.

"Do not look for love, tragedy, or trauma to explain this change; it was simply a resolution from within.

"I come here today not just to tell my story, but to emphasize that in America such things are possible."

The Headstart Project Is for Parents, Too

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1967

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, many of us are aware of the success of the Project Headstart for pre-school-age children, but I think we all should equally be aware of the impact this project has had on the parents of Headstart children.

One project I refer to specifically is in my district and is sponsored by the Catholic Diocese of Cleveland. As many Members may know, a primary reason for the administration's decision to preserve Headstart within the structure of the community action program, under direction of the Office of Economic Opportunity, is to insure that privately sponsored projects such as the one I refer to will be able to continue on a successful basis.

Under leave granted, I submit a newspaper story from the Cleveland Plain Dealer of June 4, which highlights the effects of the Project Headstart on the parents who have children participating in it:

HEADSTART PROJECT IS FOR PARENTS, TOO

Is Headstart for parents, too?

Sure, says Mrs. Ermelda Cooper, director of one of the Headstart programs operated by the Council for Economic Opportunities in Greater Cleveland.

Her program, Project Peace, sponsored by the Cleveland Catholic Diocese, aims at involving parents in its basic purpose of giving children from poverty areas some cultural and health advantages most other youngsters have.

Parental involvement brings these cultural advantages home.

While their youngsters, aged 3½ to 4½, receive pre-kindergarten training at 11 Project Peace centers, parents learn of various health, cultural and legal services available.

Mothers are urged to bring their babies along when they escort their pre-kindergarten children to the centers. Some moms assist in the training by leading songs or telling stories.

Field trips and social activities help draw parents into the program.

All this gives parents "a sense of self esteem and accomplishment," said Mrs. Cooper.

Recently parents have been busy with an art and handicraft project—making paintings, hats and handbags, lamps and bedspreads.

Their work will be displayed this week at Higbee's 10th floor gallery in a POP'n Mom art show.

City and diocesan officials will be present to open the show at 10:30 a.m. Tuesday.

The free show will remain through Saturday.

Drastic Gun Law Cuts Legal Sales, Tax Income

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. HAMMERSCHMIDT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1967

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Frank McGuire, which was brought to my attention by J. David Tucker, secretary, Northwest Arkansas Rifle and Revolver Club, Fayetteville, Ark.:

DRASTIC GUN LAW CUTS LEGAL SALES, TAX INCOME

(By Frank G. McGuire)

"I was in Philadelphia once, but it was closed."

That well-known wisecrack very nearly sums up the situation on legitimate gun activities—but not crime—today in the City of Brotherly Love.

Two years after City Council passed the most drastic gun control law in the nation, legal sales of firearms to reputable citizens have slumped about 90%, to judge by tax returns, but criminal misuse of guns has resulted in more killings than before the law was enacted.

Philadelphia officials claimed their touted "model" gun law, aimed at criminals, would not unduly inconvenience the city's several hundred thousand hunters and target shooters. Yet it has driven a third of Philadelphia's licensed retail firearms dealers out of town or out of business; and their businesses did not cater to the underworld but to sportsmen.

No official statement as to the cost of enforcing the firearms regulation was forthcoming, but opponents of the measure estimated that it cost the city $15 per investigation. The application fee for a firearms permit, $1, leaves the balance to be borne by taxpayers.

Mayor James H. J. Tate, who went into office not long before the new law was proposed, announced a highly publicized program to bolster police protection for citizens. The program was cut back considerably after it developed that it would cost as much as $15 million a year. Yet the city administration found funds for its gun control program.

One year after the new law took effect, the *Philadelphia Bulletin* quoted various authoritative sources as estimating that it cost the city, all told, $3 million to $10 million—enough to have financed a good part of the extra police protection. Figured in these estimates, which came mostly from sporting goods dealers and a few public officials, were the admitted 90% drop in receipts from firearms sales taxes, the taxpayer-borne cost of police investigations, and taxes lost through nonsale of hunting accessories and the like.

Well over a year after the enactment, the *Philadelphia Inquirer* in a Page One series entitled, "Violent Crime—A City's Problem," hit upon a truism: "You can't very well pass a law against crime, since it's illegal by definition."

The newspaper also noted:

"Laws can operate to prevent crime only if people themselves are going to obey them or if police can be on hand to prevent lawbreaking before it occurs. . . .

"Not long ago the city passed a firearms registration ordinance to keep firearms out of the hands of gangsters and psychotics. Yet the figures of crimes invloving firearms have remained just as high as before. Approximately the same number of people shoot and are shot by each other as before the law was passed."

During the 3 years prior to the new Philadelphia gun law, police there apparently weren't too much troubled by pistol ownership. For the number of applications to buy pistols under the then existing law increased by a third while the percentage of applications denied by the police went down.

Here are the figures, suggesting that the Philadelphia police, far from tightening up because they were plagued by pistols, permitted more and more citizens to buy handguns:

Before the new law: Pistols only	
1962:	
Total applications to buy	4, 605
Percent rejected by police	2. 9
1963:	
Total applications to buy	5, 497
Percent rejected by police	2. 4
1964:	
Total applications to buy	6, 070
Percent rejected by police	1. 8
After the new law: Includes rifles and shotguns	
1965:[1]	
Total applications to buy	3, 157
Percent rejected by police	2. 9

[1] April 15, 1965–April 15, 1966. Figures for 1966 are not yet available.

Figures for the first year under the new law reveal that it not only reduced pistol sales but cut sharply into local sales of rifles and shotguns, for the total of 3,157 included all 3 kinds of firearms. Thus the total of the 3 is scarcely half the sales of pistols, alone, before the new law took effect. The law's sponsors obviously consider this good, although, just as obviously, it must interfere drastically with sportsmen who are the principal buyers of rifles and shotguns.

Philadelphia has a sizeable, efficient police department with many intelligent and articulate law officers. Some of them undoubtedly hold opinions regarding the new gun law. During several weeks in Philadelphia, I made persistent efforts to interview a city police official who would discuss the effect of the law for publication. I was politely shunted from one to another, in a genteel version of the old run-around. They couldn't have been nicer—or more tightlipped. Never did I get an interview.

From District Attorney Arlen Specter, a former staff member of the Warren Commission who took office as Philadelphia's principal prosecutor after the law was passed, I got a definite comment that the law attacks the crime problem from the wrong end. Specter said it puts concealment at a premium and penalizes the law-abiding citizen.

City Controller Alexander Hemphill, a leading mayoral candidate in the next primary, described the law in his outspoken way as:

"A politicians' sop for calming down the hysterical citizens who, legitimately, want to cut down crime. The sportsmen who fought gun registration the way they did were just as silly as the people who thought that the registration was going to do any good."

Because I had heard repeatedly that City Councilmen supporting the measure (all of them did) got nasty, threatening letters from sportsmen and other opponents, I went through correspondence files (by permission). There were some emotional, strongly-worded letters, but the most menacing merely said they would never again vote for said Councilmen if they supported the bill. The truly significant thing, however, was the almost total absence of letters favoring the measure.

The backers of Bill 560, as it was known before enactment, claimed the support of "hundreds of thousands" of women. At a public hearing on whether 560 should become law, exactly 8 of these clubwomen appeared. So I made the rounds of several Councilmen's offices to see if the city's conscientious housewives and bustling businesswomen had deluged City Hall with feminine notes professing to want Bill 560.

In one Councilman's office, I was graciously permitted to go through the entire file on the subject. I personally checked and double-checked every letter received. There were approximately 125. Without exception, they opposed Bill 560. Not a solitary letter favored it. I turned to the Councilman and said, "I understand there was a lot of support for this bill. Is there another file?" The Councilman assured me that was the "complete" file. "What about letters from those hundreds of thousands of women?" I asked. The Councilman replied, "I guess we didn't get many." "Any," I corrected.

At another Councilman's office down the hall, the Councilman's assistant told me, "We got about a hundred letters on it, I guess." I asked, "What was the ratio of those for and against?" "Oh, about 90 opposed it and the rest thought it was all right."

From a third Councilman's office I got the same story.

The "several hundred thousand women" represented by club officers as being ardently in favor of the law apparently failed to write even a postcard in favor of it. As Councilman Gaetano Giordano remarked to me, "There was a lot of phony support."

I asked a woman community leader why she supported the bill.

"The opponents of the bill kept saying they had to defend their homes," she said indignantly. "Now, I ask you, in this day and age? This isn't the frontier any more." In her next breath, the lady said: "By the way, did you know that during those riots we had here a couple of years ago, that the rioters stole 3,000 guns from pawn shops and sporting goods stores?"

The Philadelphia City Council totals 17 members and it is virtually impossible, for one reason or another, for an individual to poll the entire membership. The Councilmen voted unanimously for the gun law. If any of them have changed their minds, the only one who said so to me was Councilman Giordano, a delicatessen operator representing the city's 2nd District. He now thinks the law is "a joke" and would vote "No" if he has another chance.

Address to American Legion of Kings County and Richmond County, N.Y.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1967

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, June 16, I had the honor of addressing the 49th annual convention of both the Richmond County and Kings County American Legion. It was a welcome opportunity to pay tribute to two outstanding groups of dedicated American citizens and to their retiring leaders; Pasquale Bifulco, county commander of the Richmond County American Legion, and George P. Gaffney, county commander of the Kings County American Legion. The day following my address the conventions elected their new leaders for the coming year; George Gallo, the new county commander for the Richmond County American Legion, and S. Michael Oliva, the new county commander for the Kings County American Legion. I wish both men the best of luck in their new position and I am sure that under their leadership the American Legion will continue its record of achievement in Richmond County and Kings County. I include the text of my address:

TEXT OF REMARKS BY THE HONORABLE JOHN M. MURPHY, U.S. CONGRESSMAN OF NEW YORK, BEFORE THE AMERICAN LEGION, KINGS COUNTY, N.Y., AND THE AMERICAN LEGION, OF STATEN ISLAND, JUNE 16, 1967

It is always a great pleasure to appear before any group when you have good news to convey, and today I am especially happy that I am able to bring you a message that is good news for all veterans of this nation, I feel that we have entered a new era of thinking about the American Veteran.

For the first time in many years, the veteran has the formidable position of having a friend not only in his Congressman, but also in the White House. This combination can achieve many of the long-desired results of the nation's important veterans' organizations.

As a step in the right direction—the first indication that the year 1967 was going to be the year of concern for the veteran, Congress received the President's budget message which requested $6.6-billion for the Veterans' Administration. Of this, over $4.2-billion was for direct benefits—another large amount—$1.475-billion—was to be directed for medical expense fundings—and the usual 2.8 percent for administration . . . this includes the 163-thousand persons in the vast facilities of the VA all across our nation.

This 1968 budget request is the largest ever submitted to Congress—with the exception of the two years following World War II when hundreds of thousands of G.I.'s were returning to college. But the significance of this large budget request is pointed out by the fact that this represents an increase of over $692-million over the initial 1967 budget request.

But the budget request was just the beginning. On January 31st a momentous occasion took place. For the first time in the history of this nation a President sent a special message to Congress on Veterans Benefits. Most of the items listed by the message came about as the result of consultation between the President and the heads of veterans organizations. Therefore, the President has agreed to the recommendations of the veterans, and asked us in Congress to pass laws providing needed benefits. This was something new—it was encouraging—a president not only signed bills sent down to him by Congress concerning veterans—but a President had initiated the request for new legislation to benefit the American Veterans. A noticeable change—the President asked for an increase in the pension rates for our disabled veterans—an increase of 5.4 percent.

Of course, there were other provisions too—and an important one was a veteran drawing a pension would not lose the pension because he receives an increase in other federal benefits such as an increase in social security. Then, there were the provisions for our fine fighting men of today—those men who are carying on where you left off—to secure freedom and defend the rights of free people. It is only fair and just that these men—who have been called some of the finest ever to bear arms in the name of this nation—have the same treatment that other veterans have. Their war is no less a war—simply because we choose to call it a conflict or a police action instead of a full-fledged war. But the bullets are just as deadly—the hours are just as long—the danger is just as imminent as it ever was for any man who fought an enemy of this nation.

And Congress—reacting to the requests of the President and the urgency of the situation—has already got most of the recommendations into bills. The ball started rolling when the Senate passed Senate Bill 9, The House took action and passed similar legislation, and the number of the House Bill was changed to coincide with a recently passed Senate Bill 16. The bill then went back to the Senate where Senate Bill 9 and Senate Bill 16 were combined to include not only the President's suggestions, the House changes, but even more additions and changes. As the bill now stands, it is all combined in Senate Bill 16. There are a few things that have to be worked out between the conferees of the House and Senate, but both Houses have passed the major parts of the bill now and we can expect the House-Senate conference to take place in just a short time. I am sure that the President will sign this important legislation—legislation that he helped to initiate—into law immediately.

Some of the outstanding provisions are that veterans who became eligible under the new G.I. Bill passed last year, will now receive one and one-half months of eligibility for college training where they formerly received only one month for each month served. Another important part is the provision that young men who are educationally disadvantaged may now go to high school and finish there—collecting benefits from the VA—and still have their eligibility for college with VA benefits unaffected.

We have provided that the veterans of the Viet-Nam Conflict—dating from the Gulf of Tonkin—will receive full disability and pension benefits, the same as any other veteran. We have made some new methods of determining eligibility for widows of veterans—which your organization has been asking for some time. We have enlarged exemptions for persons drawing pensions, and written in the presumptive clause of complete disability for pensions at the age of 65. We have provided disabled veterans, as the direct result of service, with the opportunity of securing special autos for their use. We have made provisions that social security increases will not reduce pension payments. We have relieved the veteran of the responsibility of reporting training and placed it with the training facility or institution—much as it was for World War II and Korea veterans. We provided funds for this reporting, and we have raised the educational allowance. There are other provisions, and I am sure that the House and the Senate will reach an easy settlement on the differences in their two bills, and the end result will be a new law—coinciding with the requests of the President and the many veterans organizations.

Of course, the new thinking on veterans benefits started last year when Congress passed—and the President signed—the new G.I. Bill. This recognized all of the men who had served in the services since the conclusion of the Korean Conflict. This new law made it possible for the thousands of young men—whose education was interrupted because of military service—to enroll and return to college. Our experience from the G.I. Bills of World War II and the Korean Conflict has proved that these laws more than pay for themselves.

The increased revenues that are paid in taxes over a period of years far exceed the initial cost of educating veterans—because of their increased earning power due to their education.

There were some 4-million veterans who became eligible immediately for educational benefits—for home loans—for medical care in VA hospitals. The Department of Defense says there are approximately 50-thousand men being discharged each month—or an additional 600-thousand a year added to the veterans' rolls.

By 1969 we expect the total veteran population to reach 28-million. In the state of New York there are already 346-thousand post-Korea veterans who became eligible for these benefits. In the 16th district alone, there are 6-thousand veterans who are eligible for the new benefits including the new G.I. Bill—that were passed during the 89th Congress. Of course, this total is growing daily as the men from Viet-Nam service return for discharge. During the first eight months of the new law for educational benefits, 11-hundred veterans from this district had taken advantage of the educational provisions. The benefits paid for schooling and training allowances during that period exceeded 683-thousand dollars.

This new G.I. Bill—plus the other significant legislation from last year's Congress—brought in almost 54-million dollars in added benefits to the state of New York during the first year—in the 16th District, the benefits increased by 1.1-million dollars.

But, in addition to all of these monetary and tangible benefits—I believe one of the most outstanding functions of the Veterans Administration is in providing medical care for our disabled veterans. There was a time—I'll admit it was a long time ago—when we didn't go around bragging about our medical facilities provided for veterans. But a new concept took over some 12 or 15 years ago. We became of age in America when we realized that it wasn't charity we were extending the veteran—it was just paying part of our debt to him. These veterans had paid in advance for any treatment or benefit that their grateful government could provide for them.

Finer doctors—finer facilities—the latest in drugs and equipment—the latest in treatment—plus a research program that was to develop into the world's most extensive—began to take over the old system and the old ideas.

Today, the greatest and most extensive medical system in the world has developed within the Veterans Administration. There are 165 hospitals scattered throughout the country—there are 211 outpatient clinics—16 domiciliaries—and a new system whereby the veteran can go to his own doctor for treatment—at VA expense.

Here on Staten Island in the Public Health Service Hospital 30 beds have been set aside for veterans; today all 30 are being used.

In the Fiscal Year 1966, 742,000 veterans received medical treatment in VA facilities—the largest number ever treated in one year. Another 4.8 million sick and disabled veterans used the outpatient treatment facilities provided by the VA—and 1.2 million veterans visited their own physicians on a fee basis paid for by the VA. The average daily patient load in VA hospitals, domiciliaries and nursing home care facilities was 135,000 in 1966—and is expected to increase to 138,000 in the upcoming fiscal year of 1968.

To provide outstanding medical care for all these veterans, the VA employs more than 5,000 full-time physicians—about four percent of the nation's total. These VA doctors are aided by more than 10,000 consultants and attendants, interns, residents and part-time employees. In addition, 15-thousand registered nurses, supported by a staff of 30-thousand practical nurses and attendants, serve the veterans.

The VA's medical care program is conducted in affiliation with medical and other specialized schools. The VA is formally affiliated with 74 of the nation's 88 medical schools, with 44 of the 47 dental schools, and with all 56 accredited schools of social work; with 58 universities approved for graduate training in clinical and counseling psychology—and with 145 basic nursing programs.

Yes, there has been a change in attitude toward VA medicine. Because of the affiliations, the VA helps train and provide clinical experience for almost one-half of the graduating physicians in the nation each year and for 18 percent of all nurses. In this way, the veterans program benefits the entire country by contributing to its medical manpower resources.

From the beginning of 1963 to the end of 1966, eight new or replacement hospitals with 5,300 beds, have been completed at a cost of $133-million. During the calendar year 1967, two replacement and two relocation hospitals will be completed—four new research additions will be dedicated—a group of psychiatric buildings—and eight remodeling and modernization projects are on the agenda. Total construction costs for these projects authorized by Congress exceed $96-million.

In the 1968 budget request—there is a call for $52 million more for construction—with $34 million going for four more new or replacement hospitals. I assure you that I shall certainly support this legislation to provide the funds for these improvements for our veterans.

Congress has authorized considerable expenditures for research in the VA. In 1966, $41-million was allocated for this purpose—$44-million is budgeted for 1967—and another $46-million has been requested in the 1968 budget.

These are some of the programs which have been expanded during the past few years—and which we hope to provide even more for in the future.

There is a tremendous amount of credit due for these advances to the members and officers of your organization. They have fought long and hard—they have spent many hours and much of their own money—to wage their battle for equitable benefits for the American Veteran. I think that you can now see the "light at the end of the tunnel." You have made much progress. I have worked with many of you in promoting programs that were equitable to the veterans. The fight is not over—nor will it ever end as long as we have veterans—but when achievements are made—when accomplishments can be seen in tangible results—then we realize that our fight has not been in vain.

The Administrator of Veterans Affairs has named—at the request of the President—a special advisory commission to travel throughout the nation this year consulting with veterans and civic groups. The object is to determihe if the present veterans benefit program is equitable—if in the words of the President—the American tax dollar is being spent in the best way for our veteran program. Meetings have already been held in Seattle, Chicago, Boston, Las Vegas and Minneapolis—more will be held this fall. From this consensus a report will be made—whether new programs are needed, whether old programs need readjusting—or if some of the programs have outlived their original necessity and should be changed or abolished. In all of the areas visited, your members have taken a very active part—have made some excellent suggestions.

The chairman of the 11-member study group named by Administrator Driver is Robert M. McCurdy of Pasadena, Calif., who has long been active in veterans affairs and served for more than 20 years as chairman of the American Legion's National Rehabilitation Commission.

After the scheduled meetings are held—there is a possibility that we might get a special meeting of this commission in Brooklyn. There is nothing definite on this as yet, but I am working on this and encouraging that a meeting be held here where we have so many veterans.

This close communication—this bringing together of all veterans groups in order that they can compare their ideas, is of unestimable value. The civic groups—the individuals—are joining to give their ideas. I am looking forward to much accomplishment from this nation-wide study.

I am certain you will be highly pleased with the progress that will be made by the 90th Congress in making the adjustments to our veterans program which you have long desired. You have achieved much—there is still work to do—and working together we will certainly win the battle which will give the veteran the honored place in our society that he so richly deserves.

Sour Grapes of Losers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1967

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, a recent editorial in the National Observer has perhaps expressed precisely the Soviet's purpose in attending the present General Assembly meeting at the United Nations.

I commend the editorial to the attention of our colleagues. It appeared in the June 19, 1967, edition of the National Observer, and follows:

SOUR GRAPES OF LOSERS

Kosygin's trip to the United States has raised a lot of speculative chatter about its possible impact—on everything from the Arab-Israeli mess and the Vietnam War to President Johnson's imminent expectation of becoming a grandfather.

Lest too much is made of this excursion, it's important to keep in mind precisely why the Soviet premier and his entourage found it expedient to come here at this time. They are here for only one purpose: To try to recoup some of their losses in Russia's Mid-East venture. They are choosing to do this by using the U.N. General Assembly as a propaganda forum in which to spread the Big Lie that the United States aided and abetted Israeli aggression.

It's a preposterous line, but the Soviets are stuck with it. When Nasser was moving his troops up to the Israeli border and blockading the Gulf of Aqaba, the Soviets failed to see *that* aggression. It was only when the Israelis made hash of the Arab forces that the Russians decided that peace, territorial integrity, and mutual respect were even worth talking about. When such principles have been prostituted in practice, it's incongruous at least for the practitioner to belatedly begin preaching morality.

Nonetheless, given the proclivity of many people to see duplicity and evil in everything the United States does, the Russians' words may find an audience. Too bad, because the fact is the United States emerges in the Mid-East muddle with its integrity intact. The Johnson Administration diligently worked within the hapless U.N. to prevent the war. It used uncommon good sense in being restrained during the fighting. And it has maintained a credible posture of strength without belligerence in seeking a solution to the problem. Whether this was mostly due to wisdom in Administration councils, the wizardry of Israeli arms, the blunders of Cairo and Moscow, or just plain luck really doesn't matter. The result is the thing.

Kosygin's a loser and he'll be spouting the sour grapes of losers from time immemorial.

Nassau County's War on Poverty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT TENZER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1967

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, the war on poverty has been auspiciously started. In many sections of the country individual projects have made an impact on the community by offering economic opportunity to individuals who were previously deprived of such a chance. Projects are successful in direct ratio to the skills, experience and dedication of the individuals who are in charge of implementing them.

Nassau County, N.Y., is most fortunate to have a county executive who has a compassionate understanding of the problems of the poor and the underemployed. Mr. Nickerson also showed a continuing interest and dedication to the task of providing economic opportunity to all who applied on an equal basis, and free of politics. Eugene Nickerson has the rare ability of finding the jugular vein of a problem and then proceeding to solve it. In a speech before the Health and Welfare Council of Nassau County of May 25, 1967, the distinguished county executive made some significant observations and recommendations.

In this county, with a population of 1.45 million, the excellent results of EOC's well-managed, well-directed, nonpartisan program to combat poverty and eliminate unemployment, deserves widespread attention.

Mr. Speaker, that is why I want to bring Mr. Nickerson's speech to the attention of my colleagues. He tells what is wrong with welfare program philosophy and what the Nassau County Welfare Department and the EOC is doing to correct these wrongs. Finally, the county executive calls for increased Federal assistance, not less, especially at this time when the programs are making progress and results are within reach.

Mr. Speaker, I have ofttimes said that restoring to a family breadwinner the dignity which comes from employment in a job which challenges his capacities, is one of the great gifts which a nation can bestow upon its unemployed citizens. Retraining programs to upgrade our employables, thus increasing their family incomes, removing many from the supplementary welfare rolls, is one of the most useful of all EOC programs. Converting taxeaters into taxpayers must be a continuing process.

With the rising costs of welfare cases to State, county, and other political subdivisions, it is of utmost importance that those economic opportunity programs which have proven successful, be continued and expanded. On the other hand, those which have not proven successful should be reexamined and if the projects can be salvaged by change of personnel, such changes should be made, if failure was due to other factors then the projects should be discontinued.

Mr. Speaker, I insert the full text of County Executive Nickerson's remarks at this point in the RECORD:

REMARKS BY COUNTY EXECUTIVE EUGENE NICKERSON AT MEETING OF HEALTH AND WELFARE COUNCIL, MAY 25, 1967

I am delighted to be here with you and to see so many familiar faces—the faces of friends and colleagues who have devoted many years to a great mutual endeavor—improving the quality of life for all of the people of Nassau.

We have worked through these years at common purposes and have sought common goals—sometimes by different routes, but always in the same direction.

We have not yet reached our goals—although surely we have advanced. I think today of three years ago when we began the war on poverty in Nassau—and we determined that the generals in that war would not be armchair strategists in government—but front-line commanders in the Health and Welfare Council.

There were a number of reasons for that decision. We were seeking full mobilization of community resources. We were seeking to cut across all political, ethnic, and economic lines. We turned to this independent organization which had worked devotedly for so many years in close league with the social agencies, with the business community and labor, with churches, civic groups, civil rights groups, schools and universities.

I also believed it was important to establish sound program-planning-program audit and fiscal controls as central functions, handled by a central agency under the Health and Welfare Council. And so the Nassau Economic Opportunity Commission came into being—to make available the great reservoir of talent and experience and concern which is in this room today—and to represent the neighborhoods and concerned groups.

But the responsibility for implementing and administering the programs was vested in the local communities themselves—and this is vital—that our community centers be of, by, and for the local people.

And so through these two techniques—local control and central coordination—we established at the outset that partisan politics would find no place in the Nassau war on poverty.

I am satisfied that in this we have succeeded. We have kept the program away from political influence, and we intend to keep it that way.

This has not been so, as you know, in some other parts of the nation. There is, for example, a mayor in a small southern city, who shall be nameless, who looks upon community action centers as political clubhouses. I heard a story about this man recently—let's call him Mayor Claghorn.

It so happened that the President, the Vice-President and Mayor Claghorn found themselves stranded in a lifeboat far at sea, and the combined weight of the three men threatened to sink the boat. Obviously, one would have to jump overboard to save the other two.

The President said, "I would go, but unfortunately my high office prevents me." The Vice-President said, "I'd be happy to sacrifice myself, but I have to be around in case anything happens to the President."

But Mayor Claghorn, an experienced machine politician, said, "Why not do it the democratic way? Let's take a vote." They all agreed—the vote was taken. Claghorn won 8 to 2.

The war on poverty has some stormy seas ahead, and there's no room in the boat for the Claghorns.

When we need resources for this war from Washington and Albany, we count our friends there, and we note those who are slow to move, without caring what their party label is. All we know is that this war needs help—it needs it badly and it needs it now.

There is no question that Federal aid for this program and for many others is grossly inadequate. We are dealing with national problems. Poverty and despair have no respect for county lines and state lines. This is a national emergency, and I refuse to believe that Washington does not have the resources to deal with that emergency.

When I hear that said, I am reminded of a question posed by Alfred E. Smith 45 years ago. He was running against the incumbent, Governor Nathan Miller, and the Governor was claiming, with much fanfare, that he had saved the State 25 million dollars.

Al Smith waited while Miller continued to refer, day after day, to the 25 million dollars. Then one day Smith spoke out—"If Governor Miller says he saved the State 25 million dollars, I ask him two questions, "Where is it—and who's got it?"

With all the deeply troubling news from many parts of the world today, I would ask that no one forget America's number one domestic challenge—the war on poverty being fought right here on the battleground of peace. It must be a total war with the goal of unconditional surrender.

And I ask this question: Is America more interested in swelling the welfare rolls than in training people to hold jobs and pay taxes?

The war on poverty is not only an humanitarian cause. It is a matter of self-interest to every taxpayer. There must be, nationally and locally, a greater effort to tie in the two programs which are crucial to the future of this country and this nation—the war on poverty and public assistance.

We seek to give people the opportunity and the incentives to leave the welfare rolls, and to prevent them from going on in the first place.

But to break the welfare cycle, there must be basic changes.

The welfare system is a product of the depression and it is still geared to depression psychology. In 1938, there were more people on public welfare in Nassau County than there are today. There were 25,000, eight percent of our population.

Today there are 21,000—and today that is less than one percent of our population.

And in spite of the generosity and dedication of all the people in this room, What this means is that today there is less public concern for the disadvantaged, less public pressure on the public agencies to help the poor.

In fact, the pressure is now coming from the other direction. The taxpayer wants to know why welfare is so costly—and it's a good question.

It's costly because it's an antiquated system, overly defined and overly regulated by rules and regulations born of the depression. The arbitrary eligibility category for welfare recipients require so much red tape and investigations that we estimate that we could save in Nassau County $800,000 if Washington estabilshed a single category based solely on need.

Now, I have opened myself up to the question that A. Smith asked Nathan Miller. My answer would be that we could use that money further to reduce welfare costs by putting it into job-training and referral programs.

Those services are already underway in your community action centers and in the work of the Job Development Center, under the Human Rights Commission, which in less than three years has placed more than 4,000 young men and women in jobs and job-training programs.

It can be done—and it must be done. If it is not, ten years from now the social and economic cost of poverty and unemployment—when jobs are available—will be higher than we would care to imagine.

We *can* prevent a high number of people on welfare, if we are given the resources to do it. But what about those who are already on welfare? We know that only a tiny percentage are employable—although you would be surprised at how many people are unaware of the high percentage of children and their mothers and the aged and disabled on public assistance today.

But we con do more. In our Welfare Department, Commissioner Barbaro has a program underway—in cooperation with our Commissioner of Labor and others—to make sure that every employable becomes employed.

This, too, is a central part of the war on poverty—and it must receive full support from Washington. Our communities must have more day care centers to enable mothers on public assistance to be freed for employment.

Yet we now face the possibility of being penalized for taking the very approach, through the Health and Welfare Council, which has made the war on poverty in Nassau a sound, responsible and effective program. Next October, under regulations to take effect July 1, unless Washington heeds our pleas, local financial support must be raised from 10 to 20 percent because the Nassau Economic Opportunity Commission will be 32 months old.

Yet, as we know well, many of our community programs are just getting off the ground, for example, in Rockville Centre, Port Washington, Hempstead and Freeport. Just two weeks ago, I attended the opening of the multi-service center of the Roosevelt Economic Opportunity Council. This Center will be barely five months old when federal support is cut from ninety percent to eighty percent.

I know that many of you are working on this problem and that Steve Angell is prevailing upon the OEO to recognize the situation in Nassau. Earlier this week, I pointed out in my testimony to Senator Clark's committee that in effect, the Federal government is asking you to fragment the program.

What would happen if Nassau's Economic Opportunity Commission were abolished. It would deny the professional help of the Health and Welfare Council to the community action programs.

Or, it would mean that such experts in manpower, education, housing, consumer protection, and so on, would be needed in each individual agency. Rather than advising and coordinating, the whole concept would be changed, and neighborhood leadership would be discouraged from developing its own programs.

At stake here are the lives and hopes of people. We know already that this program can raise standards of living and provide opportunity for fulfillment in employment, education and housing.

The Federal commitment to the war on poverty must be wholehearted. The promise of the Economic Opportunity Act has not been fulfilled. Expectations were raised to great heights by the Congress three years ago. It means that the Federal government must do *more*—not less.

It means that we need the resources to show solid results to the people. It means that concepts must be broadened—welfare and economic opportunity programs must be coordinated. It means that we must continue to make both programs in Nassau County efficient and effective. And it means that we must continue to insist, as we have insisted, that both the war on poverty and the Welfare Department in Nassau County be under professional leadership and removed from politics.

All of us should be encouraged by the start we have made, the generous support we have had in our communities, and the widespread participation which makes this program worthy of Washington's full attention.

Now let us join together in demanding that promises be kept in full, so that our communities can build on the strong foundation that you have laid for the future.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to consider the views expressed by County Executive Nickerson. At this time when the Members of the 90th Congress are concerned about reducing nonessential expenditures I urge my colleagues to exclude from the category of nonessential expenditures those programs designed to meet human needs in the fields of health, education, and the war on poverty. These programs enacted by the 89th Congress must be reexamined, improved, and the good ones extended.

U.S. Foreign Policy Shown Sadly Lacking

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1967

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is necessary that we continually reappraise foreign policy decisions since the effectiveness of administration moves in foreign affairs is of such a dubious nature. Columnist Henry Hazlitt, writing in this morning's Chicago Tribune points out the need for such a reappraisal of our foreign policy.

The article follows:

U.S. FOREIGN POLICY SHOWN SADLY LACKING

(By Henry Hazlitt)

Is it too much to hope that the Arab-Israeli crisis will at last cause Washington to reexamine its foreign policies of the last quarter-century?

Here are three of the policies in most urgent need of reappraisal.

1. "Building bridges" to communist countries, as reflected in the recent consular treaty and in Lyndon Johnson's plea for east-west trade.

Under present conditions this policy makes no sense whatever. In Viet Nam, the Russians are supplying our enemy with the arms and munitions to kill and maim our fighting men. They are constantly engaging in provocative actions—bumping and systematically harassing our warships in neutral waters, calling us bandits and liars, vilifying us every night in their short-wave broadcasts. They openly encouraged Gamal Abdel Nasser in his aggressive actions.

It profoundly divides and confuses American opinion to be asked to carry on a costly and bloody war against communist aggression on the one hand and on the other to extend credit to and trade and talk sweetly with the communist enemy.

2. The foreign aid program. We have poured out a staggering total of some 136 billion dollars in foreign aid to some 100 nations around the globe. At least 1 billion went to Egypt, hundreds of millions to the other Arab countries.

AID PROGRAM FAILS

Among the major arguments made for the preposterous aid program is that it would buy friends and allies, stop the spread of communism, and prevent wars. There is no evidence that it has done a single one of these things. On the contrary, Nasser [who, incidentally, had been saved only by our intervention in 1956] declared us his great enemy. Our other Arab beneficiaries broke off relations with us.

Last February the Citizens Foreign Aid committee calculated that since July, 1962, riotous foreign mobs had made 66 violent demonstrations against the United States, stoning our embassies, tearing down our flag, setting fire to our libraries.

Yet this foreign aid program has increased if not created our balance-of-payments deficit, helped to drain our gold reserve from 24 billions in 1949 to 13 billions today, increased our inflation, and undermined the dollar.

3. The United Nations. The hope of most of those who met in 1945 to form the United Nations was that it would substitute peaceful discussion and settlement of differences for resort to war. Instead, it seems to have done more to inflame differences than to reconcile them. Nations have used it mainly as a propaganda platform to denounce their neighbors. The communist dictatorships have used it to defame the capitalist democracies and to obstruct cooperation.

U.N. DISPLAYS RELUCTANCE

The U.N. role in the present middle east crisis has not been reassuring. U Thant, who had shown no reluctance to intervene against Tshombe in Katanga, or against South Africa or Rhodesia, precipitately pulled U.N. troops out of Egypt at the request of Nasser. Russia was able to block any U.N. action that might have prevented the Arab-Israeli war from breaking out. She only agreed to a cease-fire resolution when it became necessary to save the Arabs from still greater disaster.

Whatever we decide to do about the United Nations, let us at least stop putting our political conscience in its hands, treating its majority decisions as sacrosanct and refusing to veto anything. As Dean G. Acheson, former secretary of state, reminded Congress more than 10 years ago, the United Nations is but "a forum. And if a great nation like the United States looks to the United Nations to form American policy, instead of fighting in the United Nations for what the American government believes should be done, then we have committed an unprecedented abdication of responsibility and power."

High School Seniors Turning to Aviation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1967

Mr. MORSE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, it is not surprising that in this jet age, many of our young people are turning to aviation as a career. One interesting program has been developed by the Bryant-McIntosh School of Business in Lawrence, Mass. It involves a 2-year program for professional pilots, the only one of its type in the northeastern region of the United States. I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD an article by George J. Cullen of the Lawrence Eagle-Tribune describing the program:

[From the Lawrence Eagle-Tribune Jan. 18, 1967]

BRYANT-MCINTOSH PLANS 2-YEAR COURSE—HIGH SCHOOL SENIORS TURNING TO AVIATION

(By George J. Cullen)

Greater Lawrence high school seniors, taking part in Career Day programs this year, have come face to face with a new career opportunity—aviation.

It's the sonic-booming industry in which wages are high, hours short and the demand for skilled workers is great.

High school students across the country are showing an unprecedented interest in making aviation a career.

In the past, the airlines depended upon the military for trained personnel. This supply is drying up and the expanding industry must look to civilian sources for a continuing flow of experienced workers.

Greater Lawrence high schoolers who want to train for high paying jobs will find the opportunity right in their own back yard. Beginning in September, the Bryant-McIntosh School of business, 175 Haverhill Street will inaugurate a two-year professional pilot course, the only one of its type on the eastern coast north of Florida.

The course will be for those who will go into aviation as a career and still want to obtain a good two-year education.

The training will be given in cooperation with Four Star Aviation, Inc., based at the Lawrence Airport in North Andover. It will be there that students obtain their flying instruction.

During the first year of the Bryant-McIntosh course, students will be prepared for a private pilot's license. During the first semester of the second year they will be taught to qualify for a commercial license while during the second semester the instruction will concern instrument flying.

The school has been engaged in giving courses in aviation for the past year.

Up to now the curriculum has been one fitted to provide ground training for those who seek private pilots licenses at private flying schools, such as Four Star in North Andover.

The student body has been made up of men and women whose school days are behind them and who are interested in flying as a hobby or in connection with their private businesses.

COMPLETE PROGRAM

The day course to begin in September will be a complete training program for high school graduates who wish to make a career of flying passenger and cargo planes or taking a place in some other phase of the industry.

Joseph W. Benkert, director of the Ground School Training Center at Bryant-McIntosh, will supervise the course to be initiated in September.

A veteran pilot, he will also oversee the equipment to be used in the planes in which the students will fly during their two-year course.

TWENTY-MEMBER CLASSES

Classes in the two-year aviation course will be limited to 20 members. The courses have been approved by the Federal Aviation Authority (FAA) and all of the instructors are holders of government-approved teachers' licenses for advanced instruction.

"Careers in aviation were never so attractive," Benkert says.

He attributes this to the fact that more and more jets are flying longer and carrying more passengers and cargo than ever before.

In addition, the number of planes used in private industry is growing at an unprecedented pace. In this respect, according to Benkert, young men who learn to fly in the north with its variables of weather will have an advantage over those trained in the south where the climate is warm.

He said that it is in the highly industrialized northeast that most of the business flying is done and where the most job opportunities are to be found.

Since the opening of the school year last fall, Benkert has talked with more than 1,000 high school seniors advising them of the opportunities offered in aviation. He says the interest displayed was surprisng. He has been invited to talk on aviation at 32 Merrimack Valley schools during the next three months.

Aviation-mindedness is growing among young people in all parts of the nation, according to surveys made by the industry.

Introduction to Aviation courses have been established in hundreds of high schools. Every student taking such courses does not of necessity become an aviator anymore than every student studying chemistry becomes a chemist.

While the demand for pilots is great, so is the demand for other jobs in aviation such as are filled by the personnel at airport terminals, according to Benkert.

THE CURRICULUM

The curriculum outlined for the two-year Bryant-McIntosh course in aviation is made up of the following:

First semester, subjects and credits, Accounting I (4), English I (3), Mathematics (3), Introduction ot Aviation (2), Aviation Science (3). Total 15.

Second semester: Accounting II (4), English II (3), Air Transportation (2), Air Navigation (basic) (1), Aircraft Operation I (2), Public Speaking (3). Total 15.

During the second year of the course the students would follow this course:

First semester, Economics I (3), Psychology I (3), Air Navigation II (2), Federal Air Regulations (1), Aircraft Operation II (1), Introduction to Management (3), Typing I (2). Total 15.

Second semester, Airline Management (3), Air Publications, Communications (2), Radio Navigation I (2), Air Traffic Control I (3), Introduction to Marketing (3), Physiology for the Pilot (2). Total 15.

During the summer months, the school is planning an accelerated course for high school seniors and college students who may wish to become private pilots. The Ground Training Course will be geared to a morning of study at Bryant-McIntosh and afternoon flying at the airport in North Andover.

Benkert says that girls will be enrolled in the two-year course. Their objective may be employment as an airlines stewardess or in the private aircraft industry where a knowledge of aviation would be an important asset.

At the last meeting of the Municipal Airport Commission, the group voted to approve an Aviation Career Day program at the airport on a Saturday in April which will be open to all high school seniors in the area.

The request was made by Edward C. Bryant, president of Bryant-McIntosh, who pointed out that it would not only be a service to the students but also emphasize the importance of the municipal airport to the economic life of Greater Lawrence.

Free Expression Was Never Intended To Be the Creator of Insurrection

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENJAMIN B. BLACKBURN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1967

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, for 3 days now, one young man has exerted his every effort toward inciting riots in the city of Atlanta, Ga. Citizens across the Nation are asking "Why?"

A recent editorial in the DeKalb New Era, a weekly newspaper published in Decatur, Ga., has also asked "Why?" More importantly, it depicts the need for an inquiry; and I request that the text of the editorial of Thursday, June 8, 1967, be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD following these remarks.

CREATOR OF INSURRECTION

Some years ago a man wandered up from the country of Trinidad. He took sanctuary in this country. His name is Stokely Carmichael.

Soon after he arrived he stumbled upon the word "freedom." He knew not what it meant. He has never learned. He has never seen in it the real meaning our fathers gave it with their toil, sacrifices, tears, blood and death. For him there is no sanctity encompassed within its history in America. But he took it unto himself, received its blessings, bathed in its benefits and then brazenly disgraced its hallowed meaning. For him it was a license to say and do anything his hate-infested mind concocted.

He goes around the country preaching his doctrine of sedition, hate, insurrection, anarchy, murder and arson. He decries the ghettos, and at the same time creates mental ghettos in the uneducated, the discontented. He exhorts to lawlessness. He encourages civil chaos. He advocates violence. He espouses a "kill and burn" method. He tramples upon the graves of hundreds of thousands of Americans who have died for freedom. He smears and insults every man in uniform, regardless of race. He reviles this country's flag. He solicits a total defiance of our laws.

Such is the character of the unwanted stranger from Trinidad. Nothing in American history parallels his sojourn here. Never has there been such an amazing apathy of true Americanism. If his tirades represent freedom of speech, if his treasonable doctrines are liberty, if his planned advocacy of violence is public order, security and lawfulness, then America should start all over again in learning the meaning of those words.

Another thing is alarming in this connection. Not only are we apathetic toward the man, but, in many areas he is actually invited to deliver his diatribes. This we can not understand. One can tell from its odor the presence of garbage. No one has to take its contents. Free expression was never intended to be the creator of insurrection.

"GI No. 1," He Gasped, Then He Died

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON FUQUA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1967

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, some messages speak for themselves.

Sp4c. Aaron M. Clemons, Jr., of Gainesville, Fla., spent a year in Vietnam. More than half that time was spent in combat areas. The following article was written for the Gainesville Sun, and appeared in that newspaper.

In his remarks, Aaron mentions a heartrending scene of a youngster mortally wounded by terrorist Vietcong. The lad died in the arms of a U.S. serviceman, sent to Vietnam in the hope that peace and freedom could come to this ravaged area by halting aggression.

I know not how history will record our efforts. I only know that I can take pride in the young Americans who have served so nobly in this conflict.

Reprinted below are the moving words written by Specialist Fourth Class Clemons:

NEXT TO HIS RIFLE, A GI'S BEST FRIEND IS SUPPORT

During my year in Vietnam, I heard a lot about the marchers and demonstrations by people who are opposed to the war. I've heard the names we GIs are called for fighting over there, and I heard of their signs reading; "It's Their Fight, Let Them Fight It!", "Get Out of Vietnam!" "Don't Get Involved!"

It's a shame that these kind of people get most of the publicity. For there are, however, many fine people in this world who give us their full support, and do all they can to make all the hardships of war seem more bearable. Next to his rifle, a supporter at home is a GI's best friend.

I've received letters of gratitude from all sorts of wonderful people. Once I received a large, brown envelope from a church here in Gainesville. When I opened the envelope, I found it filled with several little notes from a lot of young children of a Sunday School class. The notes were written on pieces of paper bag, offering slips, just anything the children had handy on which to write. They didn't care how it looked, they just wanted to say, "Thanks." If they only knew how good those kind words made me feel. Actually, it should have been me saying "Thanks."

These are the kind of people who make GI's feel proud of doing our part in this fight for freedom. They help us to realize that we don't stand alone, that through them, we are backed by two of the most powerful weapons in any war, prayer and hope.

Then, there's the people in Vietnam who need our help so badly. Before the United States went to the aid of that country, the poor people over there were afraid to cough out loud for fear of being silenced—permanently. They had hardly any freedom at all. But now, they can smile real big and feel free, and they can even cough as loud as they want.

There are other things that make me feel proud of doing my part in Vietnam. Once we were on a mission a few miles north of Tuy Hoa. We came across a little village that had been hit by terrorists. There was a crowd gathered in the center of the street, so we went to investigate. Once we worked our way to the center of the circle, we saw what the commotion was all about. I took the small boy in my arms, and said, "It's okay son, we are here." He couldn't see me through his mangled eyes, so he lifted a bloody little hand from his torn belly, and felt of my face, my eyes, my mouth, my nose, my hair. Then he said, in almost a breathless gasp. "GI, GI number one." Then with a hint of a smile, he laid his head against my chest and died.

I know I wouldn't stand a chance in trying to convince all the objectors that we have a cause in Vietnam. That, indirectly, we are protecting the very rights they are exercising every day, and we're trying to prevent the same thing from happening in the United States, that happened in that little village, to that small boy.

I just want to say that I'm proud of the way I feel, I'm proud to have been able to do my part, and I'm proud of all the great people who are continuously doing all they can to help.

People think what they want to think, and feel what they want to feel. Nothing I could say would change that. I just want to express a word of praise to all the great people who realize why we are in Vietnam, and who do all they can, in their own little ways, to help win the war.

For time immemorial, some foreign power has always thrust its powerful jaws at the United States. Yet, America has always put its best foot forward, and proudly stood firm for what we believe in; the right to speak out and say what we want, the right to worship freely, without fear of being imprisoned by a dictatorial country, and most of all, the feeling of being Free.

However, we've been strong enough to suppress those totalitarian powers, and in doing so, we have gained their respect, and have shown them that the United States is the most powerful country on earth.

If you'll notice, I said, "America proudly stood firm," and this is true. America has always stood firm. This is why I can't understand what is wrong with a lot of people today. I can't see what these sign carriers get out of trotting up and down the street, stabbing our boys in the back.

Instead of giving the boys in Vietnam their support, these people are cutting them down at every chance they get.

The fighting men in Vietnam have radios, they hear a lot of what's going on at home, and believe me, I know from experience, that some of the things they hear over their radio hits them harder than an enemy mortar round could.

Don't get me wrong, I know there are a lot of great people in this country, who give the boys in Vietnam their full support.

As I mentioned, during my tour in Vietnam, I received letters, packages, and notes of gratitude from a lot of fine people. Some of whom I've never met, and probably never will. I could never hope to give these people the praise they deserve. But then again, they don't expect any praise. They give their support because they want to, because they are proud to, not because they want a pat on the back. When all of this is over, we can pat each other on the back. That is, the ones who deserve it.

I'm amazed that these sign carriers carry signs telling the President to stop the bombing so we can live in peace. The time has come for these people to realize that we aren't playing a game in Vietnam, we're fighting a war.

We've tried stopping the bombing many times in the past—five days early in 1965, thirty-seven days in December and January of 1965–66, and six days just a very short time ago. During these pauses in bombing and ceasefire, the Communists continued to take advantage of the situation and infiltrate more men and arms into South Vietnam. We leave the door to peace open, only to get it slammed in our face.

We aren't playing a checker game, where we can afford to give our opponent his choice of moves. We have to make all the moves, and make them count.

We've tried every way there is to gain peace in that country, and every time, we've gotten out throats cut. Now we're doing the only thing there is to do. Military pressure on North Vietnam offers the only hope for peace, and freedom for the people of South Vietnam.

Sure the bombing may cost money, but look at the American lives that are saved because of the major Communist bases that have been bombed.

The Vietnamese ambassador to the U.S. once said, "If it were not for the bombing, there would be infiltration beyond our capacity to resist."

The great people who give the boys in Vietnam their full support know what I'm talking about, and I'm sure agree with me 100 per cent.

I wish the people against the war would stop, and give it some thought. Think of why we're in Vietnam. Talk to a mother who has lost a son in Vietnam, to a wife who has lost her husband, or better still, to a child who has lost her daddy. Ask them if they feel their loved ones died for nothing, or if the died for a cause. Then if you still feel against the war—well, I guess that is your privilege. That's all part of being free. You have the right to think what you want to think, and feel what you want to feel.

It's a good feeling to be free isn't it? Wouldn't it be nice if everyone in the world could have that feeling? Think it over.

The Kennedy Round Versus the Nontariff Barriers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BASIL L. WHITENER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1967

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act of 1934, and the amendments thereto, the United States has consistently lowered foreign trade barriers through the years. Lack of adequate protection against excessive imports has resulted in the American textile industry, and other industries basic to the economy of the Nation and our national security, suffering extensive damage.

While the United States has consistently lowered trade barriers, overseas nations have found ways to impede U.S. exports. In the June 15, 1967, issue of Forbes magazine an article entitled "The Kennedy Round, Versus the Nontariff Barriers" points out the various methods used by foreign countries to prevent American products from being sold overseas.

I believe my colleagues in the House will find the article to be most interesting and informative, and I insert it in the Appendix of the RECORD:

THE KENNEDY ROUND VERSUS THE NTB

The deal was all set; the U.S. exporters and the German importers could almost smell the money. They had discovered that beef from the Chicago stockyards could be flown very cheaply to West Germany because they wouldn't have to keep it under refrigeration; the high altitudes would take care of that. They expected to make a killing.

At the very last minute they were forced to cancel the deal, and the dream of all those fat profits vanished. The reason: West German customs and health officials had ruled that any U.S. shipments of fresh beef would have to include the heads and innards as well so that "we can give a satisfactory inspection for possible diseases."

The incident dramatized a fact that was almost universally overlooked in the elation over the success of "the Kennedy round" of tariff negotiations in Geneva last month: Tariffs are not the only barriers to world trade. There are nontariff barriers, too. And these NTBs are preventing somewhere between $20 billion and $40 billion in trade every year.

Almost every nation, including the U.S., has them.

The U.S. would be shipping coal to Newcastle were it not for NTBs, because U.S. mines can lay down a ton of coal in Newcastle more cheaply and English mines can. The United Kingdom doesn't have a tariff on U.S. coal; it simply bans the importation of coal from the U.S. completely.

Other European nations have quotas on U.S. coal. The result: According to industry estimates, the U.S. is losing approximately $150 million a year in sales of coal abroad.

La Belle France. The French and other Europeans make it difficult to sell U.S. cars abroad by a system of road taxes based on horsepower. Since U.S. cars are far more powerful than all but a few European models, the road taxes discourage sales because they make cars expensive to drive.

The French government discourages sales of U.S. and Canadian Whiskies by prohibiting anyone to advertise them. This ban on advertising naturally does not extend to wine and brandy which the French make.

Germany prevents the sale of U.S. canned and bottled foodstuffs by declaring that U.S. additives are "a health risk." (German additives, of course, are not.) Canada has an even neater scheme for preventing the sale of U.S. canned and bottled foodstuffs. It prohibits certain can sizes which, by coincidence, happen to be standard in this country.

In many parts of Western Europe, and especially in France, clothing manufacturers prevent the sale of American clothes by inducing the clothing stores not to handle them. The unions have proved an effective pressure group for the manufacturers.

Throughout most of Western Europe, the electric-power companies are owned and operated by the government. They won't buy U.S. equipment, no matter how good, or what the price, unless they have to.

We're Guilty, too. Americans can't really complain about the foreign NTBs because this country has some dazzlers of its own. Ornamental shrubs cannot come into the U.S. from Canada, Japan or the Scandinavian countries unless every trace of dirt has been removed from the roots. Which means they rarely can come in.

U.S. oil companies can't use foreign dredges for offshore drilling because dredges are considered ships, and foreign ships are forbidden to operate inside the three-mile limit.

The roughest U.S. NTB of all is the ASP (American Selling Price) system. This provides that duties on synthetic organic chemicals (dyes, for example) must be based, not on the price the U.S. importer pays, but on the U.S. wholesale or catalog price. Whenever a foreign company puts out a new synthetic organic chemical, its U.S. competitors instanly get a sample, analyze it, make up a batch and list it for sale. The European Common Market contends the list price usually is much higher. This had the effect of making the foreign chemical too expensive to import.

Nothing infuriates the European Common Market more. It has offered to lower its own tariffs on chemicals and to eliminate NTBs that discriminate against U.S. cars if the U.S. will eliminate the ASP system. The Administration would like to but Congress would have to agree, and the chances of this are not good.

The success of the Kennedy round was a boon to international trade. As Mark S. Massel, a senior member of the staff of the Brookings Institution says, "the fetters on international trade cannot be removed as long as there is . . . a neglect of nontariff barriers."

Hawaii Celebrates June 11 as King Kamehameha Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1967

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, June 11 is celebrated as Kamehameha Day in Hawaii. It is observed as a holiday by the people of the 50th State in memory of King Kamehameha the Great, who successfully united the islands in 1810 under one rule.

This great monarch welded the discordant elements of the scattered islands into one kingdom, and thereafter ruled his unified people with legendary brilliance and benevolence.

For generations, Hawaiians and visitors to Hawaii from many lands have viewed with awe the magnificent plumed statue of Kamehameha the Great which has dominated the area in front of Hawaii's Judiciary Building. This same likeness of King Kamehameha will soon grace Statuary Hall in the Capitol of the United States, for the first sovereign of all Hawaii has been selected by the people of the 50th State as one of two illustrious representatives worthy of national commemoration.

Statues of marble and bronze, however, are not needed to remind the people of Hawaii of the first ruler of the Hawaiian kingdom. Firmly planted in their minds and hearts is the living memory of Kamehameha the Great. This is reflected, for example, in the writings of one of Hawaii's sons, Samuel Amalu. Under his nom de plum—Kapiikauinamoku—this chronicler of Hawaiian history has written an engrossing account of King Kamehameha and other rulers of Hawaii, who helped bridge "the abyss that separated their own ancient culture from a new and overpowering civilization. The alii bridged this abyss and led the Hawaiian people safely across into a new world, and they did this in less than 50 years. They did this by accepting all the New World had to offer and yet retaining all that was precious and lovely of the Old—a feat not matched in the history of man."

During the month of June, when Hawaii remembers an eventful period in its history with colorful pagentry in honor of its renowned monarch, Kamehameha the Great, I take pleasure in inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the very interesting and nostalgic article by Mr. Amalu, "Today Honor Kamehameha, All Hawaiians," which appeared in the

Honolulu Advertiser on Monday, June 12, 1967:

TODAY HONORS KAMEHAMEHA, ALL HAWAIIANS

(By Kapiikauinamoku)

June 11 has been set aside to honor the memory of one of Hawaii's greatest sons, King Kamehameha the Great. It also honors the entire royal race, the princes and sovereigns who ruled these islands for so many generations.

But, in its broadest sense, June 11 also honors the Hawaiian people. (Kamehameha Day is being celebrated today because June 11 came on a Sunday.)

It was King Kamehameha who, as conqueror after winning battle after battle on all the major Hawaiian islands, said: "The spears of Kamehameha will not cross the waters that separate us . . ."

And with these words spoken, the Hawaiian Kingdom was born in 1810.

It was Kamehameha who refused the infamy of the apostate. They came to him and preached the doctrines of Christianity, of the new God from over the seas.

Kamehameha listened to them, and then he answered: "The Gods of my people have befriended my house and my throne. They have delivered many kingdoms into my hand, and under their ensigns, I have conquered. Would you turn from such Gods to embrace an untried stranger?

"The Heavens are wide, and there is enough room for many Gods, surely enough for yours as well as mine."

These words Kamehameha offered to his great and good friend, George Vancouver, and the issue was never brought up again.

On this day we must also remember the sovereigns who followed the great Kamehameha and the other princely members of the royal dynastics and the chieftains of Hawaii's ancient nobility who loved these islands so deeply.

There was Liholiho, the second Kamehameha, who had the singular courage to turn his back upon all the traditions and beliefs of his people, to take that one irretrievable step, to issue that command that changed forever the lives and days of his people—"Burn the temples! Tear down the Gods!"

There was Kauikeouli, the third Kamehameha, who voluntarily limited his own absolute powers, who gave to his people a legislature and a constitution. The first monarch, and perhaps the only monarch, ever to do so willingly and freely.

And more than this, he gave to his people his own lands for them and their descendants to hold and to enjoy forever.

That was Alexander Liholiho, the elegant fourth Kamehameha, who founded the Anglican Rite and Community in these islands. It was he who sponsored the Iolani School and the St. Andrew's Priory. And there was the consort, the beautiful Emma Kaleleonalani, who, with her royal husband, founded Queen's Hospital.

There was Lot Kapuaia, the fifth Kamehameha, who first sent Hawaiian youths to Europe for training and education, who restored the authority of the throne, and who gave of his own personal wealth to found the famed leprosarium at Kalaupapa.

There was Lunalilo, who gave all of his great wealth to his people to found a shelter, the Lunalilo Home, where they might live in the hours of their age and infirmity.

There was the great Liliha, the daughter of Hoapili, who gave her lands to found the famed Punahou Schools; Pauahi who gave her vast wealth to educate the youth of Hawaii and to found the Kamehameha Schools, and her husband, Charles Reed Bishop, who founded the great Bishop Museum as a memorial to his wife.

There was the second Kapiolani, the Queen of David Kalakaua, who founded the maternity and gynecological hospital that bears her name.

There was Leleiohoku, the young and romantic Heir-Apparent, who left us so many of our loveliest songs and melodies—compositions still popular almost a century later.

There was David Kalakaua, the most magnificent of his kingly race, who gave stature to his kingdom and to his people, who opened the proudest doors of the world to his race, and who brought a romance to his Islands that has never yet departed.

And there was Liliuokalani, Hawaii's last sovereign, who gave her people courage in their hours of darkest despair and who gave to the world the never forgotten songs of her Islands.

There were the three queens of Hawaii—Keopuolani, Kaahumanu, and Kalakua—and there were the first Kapiolani and Kinau and Piia Namahana and the indomitable Kapule of Kauai, courageous women who turned away from everything they knew to open their hearts to the hope of Calvary and who did the most to establish the universal acceptance of Christianity in Hawaii.

Not only in the past but in our own living generations, the princes and the chieftains of Hawaii have not forgotten these Islands and their people.

The John Aimoku Dominis children practically gave their royal grandmother's home, Washington Place, as a residence for Hawaii's governors.

Prince Kuhio almost single-handedly achieved the benefits of the Hawaiian Homes Commission for his people and labored in the American Congress for years to insure the continued prosperity of these Islands.

Emma Kauikeolani Wilcox of the Nakoolani branch of the House of Moana, with her husband Albert Spencer Wilcox, gave of their great wealth to found the Kauikeolani Children's Hospital of Honolulu, the Samuel Mahelona Hospital on Kauai, and numerous educational benefits and scholarships.

Muriel Kuaihealani Amalu of the Lunalilo Dynasty, with her first husband, Robert Witt Shingle, founded Molokai's first hospital at Hoolehua.

The brothers George and Francis Brown of the Kaneikolia branch of the House of Moana gave the lands and building of the new Lunalilo Home as a memorial to their mother, the gracious Irene Kahalelaukoa Holloway.

Mary E. Foster of the Kahanamalani branch of the House of Moana gave her famed gardens to the people of Hawaii.

And there were those others of the Alii who struggled in an ever-changing world to preserve the unity of their people and the integrity of their race.

They did this by founding and leading the various societies, organizations and orders to maintain Hawaiian traditions and to keep intact the best of the ancient days.

There was again Prince Kuhio who founded the Order of Kamehameha and the Hawaiian Civic Club. There was his wife, such people as Emma Ahuena Taylor, Lokalia Blaisdell, William Bishop Taylor, Kilauea Gumpfer, and Matilda Norton—all of the alii caste—helped to found the Daughters and Sons of Hawaiian Warriors.

There was Abigail Wahiikaahuula, the Princess David Kawananakoa, who maintained throughout her life, the gracious hospitality so typical of Hawaiian royalty.

There were Lucy Peabody and Kalani Henriques, the chiefly descendants of Issac Hueu Davis, who founded the Kaahumanu Society and who never forgot the traditions of the alii.

Only an outstanding few of the alii have been named here; there were numerous others who gave freely of their wealth, time and efforts to make these Islands what they are today and to help their people traverse the abyss that separated their own ancient culture from a new and overpowering civilization.

The alii bridged this abyss and led the Hawaiian people safely across into a new world, and they did this in less than 50 years. They did this by accepting all the new world had to offer and yet retaining all that was precious and lovely of the old—a feat not matched in the history of man.

It is right that we should remember Hawaii's monarchs and chieftains on this day; it is also right that we should remember the Hawaiian people for this is their day.

More than to anyone else, June 11 belongs to them. Our own childhood memories recall this day as it was in years gone by—the parades, the nostalgic orations, the pa'u-riders, the long plumeria leis draping the statue of Kamehameha, the Holoku Ball, the entire colorful pageantry of yesterday.

We can still see John C. Lane and William Chun Hoon with silk hats, frock coats and walking sticks parading the many blocks from Aala to Iolani.

We can still hear Kano chanting the Koihonua of Kamehameha from the little coronation stand at the palace. We can still see the warriors grouped at the base of Kamehameha's statue and the Hale-o-na-Alii standing on the steps of Iolani.

We can remember Eben Parker Low as the perennial parade marshal and, in later years, my own father. They are good memories, colorful memories, and they help to keep us warm in the chill nights of today.

Kamehameha Day does indeed belong to the Hawaiian, and it also belongs to everyone who lives on these islands for the Hawaiian tempers everything and everyone he touches. You come upon the Hawaiian, and you find that you are a little bit less of what you were and a little bit more of a Hawaiian.

Of whatever race or color you be the love for these Islands has bred into you the blood of Hawaii, and Kamehameha is your king, and the alii are your chieftains, and the Hawaiians are your people, and Kamehameha Day is your day.

This is home. This is Hawaii.

Women Wage Anticrime Crusade in Indianapolis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1967

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, the increase of crime throughout our Nation is a problem which demands the time and effort of every segment of our society.

In that connection, 5 years ago a small group of women in Indianapolis decided to lend their efforts to the fight against the city's "streets of fear."

Those women began, under the direction of Mrs. Margaret Moore, on the staff of the Indianapolis News, to organize the anticrime crusade.

The crusade now involves 1,000 women's organizations, with a total membership of 50,000. Crusaders ride in police squad cars, observe court procedures, counsel public and parochial school students on the importance of abiding by the law, and conduct a program to reduce the number of high school dropouts and encourage dropouts to return to school.

The record and accomplishments of the anticrime crusade in Indianapolis have been detailed in an article which appears in the June 23 issue of Time magazine.

I believe this program merits the attention not only of the Members of the Congress but of concerned citizens in general. Accordingly, I am inserting the article at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

CRUSADING IN INDIANAPOLIS

Crime and public apathy toward it were on the rise in Indianapolis the night that Dr. Margaret Marshall, a 90-year-old retired psychologist and teacher, stepped from her doorway into a darkened street. Without warning, a mugger lashed out at her head with a blunt weapon and snatched her purse. When Dr. Marshall died of her injuries, the Indianapolis News was deluged with letters from infuriated women. Assistant Publisher Eugene S. Pulliam asked one of the paper's staffers, Margaret Moore, 56, to help 30 prominent civic-minded women to decide on a course of action.

That was in March of 1962. Since then, President Johnson's Crime Commission has decided that "the most dramatic example in the country of a citizens' group that has addressed itself forcefully and successfully to the problems of crime and criminal justice is the Anti-Crime Crusade in Indianapolis." To man the crusade, Margaret Moore mobilized the 50,000 members of more than 1,000 Indianapolis women's organizations. "The first six months," says Mrs. Moore, a widow, "we went to the power structure and listened to all their problems in crime prevention. Then we listened to outside experts explain ways of dealing with them." The view was the same from the male side of the fence: "They were around here for months asking questions before they made a move," says Police Chief Daniel T. Veza.

DOWN WITH DARKNESS

Even then, the police did not take kindly to the prospect of having a bunch of women tell them how to run their business. Crusade Coordinator Moore and a co-worker camped at police headquarters for 48 hours, explaining in plain language at every roll call that they were there to help, not hinder. They prove their point by using the News to lobby for—and help get—raises for patrolmen. As the women rode along in squad cars for full eight-hour shifts, their determination helped win over the cops.

On one of these rides, a Crusade volunteer learned that a high percentage of violent crimes were committed on dark streets. "The worst," says Mrs. Moore, "were the semicommercial, semiresidential neighborhoods near the downtown area." More lobbying followed, and more newspaper stories; since 1962, about 9,000 new streetlights have been installed, at a cost of nearly $1,000,000. Police figure that crime has dropped as much as 85% in the newly illuminated areas.

SHAKING UP COURTS

At the end of 1962, the women began a "court watcher" program. Some 3,000 women have sat in on more than 70,000 cases, filled out reports on the defendant, the charge, the plea, the verdict, the proceedings. Was the judge punctual? Were the attorneys prepared with their cases, or did they ask for a continuance? Was the arresting officer present to testify? Some attorneys disapproved, but court efficiency increased. "It's the only honest evaluation we get," says Judge William T. Sharp. "It shakes everybody up and makes us analyze our decisions."

As a by-product of court watching, the women learned that many youthful offenders were unaware of the laws they were breaking. The Crusaders translated 18 Indiana statutes that apply to minors into layman's language, published a booklet entitled *What Is the Law?* and distributed it last spring to 2,600 public and parochial schools. Learning that 90% of juvenile crimes were committed by school dropouts, Crusade volunteers contacted the youngsters, found donors to provide them with everything from tutoring to lunch money.

Of the 4,000 dropouts and near-dropouts that the women have dealt with, 2,000 have been persuaded to stay in or return to school. There they get the additional benefit of Crusade-sponsored lecturers on juvenile law and crime by half a dozen police officers who tour the schools. The Crusaders also work with youths paroled from detention homes and sponsors seminars on shoplifting for merchants.

UNDER THE UMBRELLA

All the effort has produced concrete results. In 1965, total crime in Indianapolis dropped 2.2%, while rising at a rate of 6% throughout the nation. Last year, although crime rose in the city by 5.2%, that was less than half the national surge of 11%. Meanwhile, Margaret Moore, former editor of a small-town Indiana weekly, who joined the News in 1952 after nine years as director of the Franklin (Ind.) College journalism department, keeps on working. The News, which pumped $6,000 into the Crusade last year, refuses to take credit for her accomplishments. Says Editor M. Stanton Evans, who is also Mrs. Moore's son-in-law: "We provided the umbrella for this at first, and we will continue to support it. But the ladies run the Crusade."

Judge Wright Abuses Little Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1967

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, so that our colleagues may better understand the thinking and motivation of Judge J. Skelley Wright, author of yesterday's judicial move to take over public education, I insert in the RECORD an editorial from the Times Picayune of New Orleans dated April 8, 1962:

POLICYMAKING BY COURT DECISIONS

We were glad of the opportunity to report the "reflections," of Federal Judge J. Skelly Wright, on leaving New Orleans—subject of a parting address at Tulane university center.

The most significant part of his speech, in our opinion, was quoted as follows:

"Judge Wright said he believes the best combination for the nine justices (of the supreme court) would be three former judges with judicial experience on the lower court level, three college professors and three lawyers out of political life.

"'These working together might provide the best prospect of giving the court the type of perspective I think this policy instrument needs. The supreme court is more than a law court—it is a policy court, or, if you will, a political court.

"'It is an instrument of government, and while most judges have the habit, through long years of precedent, of looking backward. the supreme court must look forward through a knowledge of life, of people, of sociology, of psychology.

"'The supreme court is the final interpreter of the constitution, a living document. It should not be interpreted with reference to the time in which it was written but rather in reference to the present or, better still, the future.

"'The supreme court must interpret the constitution not as if we were still living in the horse-and-buggy age but rather with the knowledge that we are approaching the space age.'"

Policy-making is a power not given to the supreme court in the constitution, in any form whatever. For it to be given such power is not a new idea: In the United States it goes back to the constitutional convention of 1787. At that convention, this very principle was rejected-overwhelmingly on a record vote.

Not being written in the constitution, not being an utter novelty, and being expressly contrary to the intent of the founding fathers, how then has this credo become established, if it has been established; how can it be made valid, if there is desire for and agreement with it?

Constitutionally speaking, the only answer is through amendment to the constitution—a procedure that, to our knowledge, has not even been talked about.

Would we want the constitution to say the supreme court may interpret the laws, constitution and treaties according to its judgment as to the best policy for the nation at particular times?

Unconstitutionally speaking, the only answer is usurpation—usurpation, to our mind, of the gravest and most far-reaching kind, transcending attempts on the part of other branches of our government in the past, or in the present, to encroach upon each other, or upon the supreme court.

Judge Wright speaks of the "policy credo" as though it were a fact accomplished, not one to be proposed or voted on. It is unnecessary to remark that many others have said as much, mostly in bitter disapproval, in connection with the segregation decisions; that one or two high justices have intimated, to random audiences, that they considered the court should be in last analysis a policymaker; that the court itself in one of its Little Rock decisions came near saying it, in a manifesto as to what the "supreme law of the land" is.

The history of the initial rejection of supreme court participation—let alone domination—in policymaking is set forth in "United States: Formation of the Union," Government Printing Office, 1927—dealing in large part with the constitutional convention proceedings, as reported by various participants.

What we know as presidential veto was referred to in debates as "revisionary" power. On a proposal for a council of "revision," made up of the President and some justices, only three states out of 13 were in favor. A proposal that both the court and President have the "negativing" power, independently, subject in either case to congressional override, also lost, this time 3 to 8. The veto was then, of course, vested in the President alone.

In connection with this rather limited exercise of "policy power," the discussions pro and con were both broad and pointed enough to leave no doubt as to the fundamental objection: participation by the judiciary in any way in law-making, by veto or by initiation or by collaboration.

These were, to be sure, horse-and-buggy days; but wisdom, prudence, foresight, are among the virtues that remain valid whatever the new speed or mode of transport. And supposedly constitutional process, in respect to change, remains valid through all periods and types of changes.

Thus, it can be seen that Judge Wright is not a jurist. He is a policymaker for his team. He is not an educator—he is an integrator. He is not a constitutionalist—he is a revolutionist.

This decision clearly demonstrates his bond of loyalty to the intellectuals of the so-called National Crime Commission, and his permissive use of his office to take over all schoolchildren under the emotional theory he is serving humanity by preventing juvenile delinquency before it occurs.

Suffer little children, guinea pigs for the experimental dictates of the intellectual heretics. Reading, writing, and arithmetic have gone out of style and only race mixing and training to be a subservient puppet to the political court is the judge's interpretation of what is necessary for the public's best interest.

Mr. Speaker, I follow my remarks with a partial text of the court ruling and another news release from the Washington, D.C., Evening Star of this date:

Partial Text of the Ruling of U.S. Court of Appeals Judge J. Skelly Wright in the District de Facto Segregation School Suit

The basic question presented is whether the defendants, the superintendent of schools and the members of the Board of Education, in the operation of the public school system here, unconstitutionally deprive the District's Negro and poor public school children of their right to equal educational opportunity with the District's white and more affluent public school children. This court concludes that they do.

In support of this conclusion the court makes the following principal findings of fact:

1. Racially and socially homogeneous schools damage the minds and spirit of all children who attend them—the Negro, the white, the poor and the affluent—and block the attainment of the broader goals of democratic education, whether the segregation occurs by law or by fact.

2. The scholastic achievement of the disadvantaged child, Negro and white, is strongly related to the racial and socio-economic composition of the student body of his school. A racially and socially integrated school environment increases the scholastic achievement of the disadvantaged child of whatever race.

3. The Board of Education, which is the statutory head of the public schools in the District, is appointed pursuant to a quota system which, until 1962, for over half-a-century had limited the Negro membership of the nine-man board to three. Since 1962 the Negro quota on the board has been four, one less than a majority. The city of Washington, which is the District of Columbia, presently has a population over 60 percent Negro and a public school population over 90 percent Negro.

4. Adherence to the neighborhood school policy by the school board effectively segregates the Negro and the poor children from the white and the more affluent children in most of the District's public schools. This neighborhood school policy is relaxed by the board through the use of optional zones for the purpose of allowing white children, usually affluent white children, "trapped" in a Negro school district, to "escape" to a "white" or more nearly white school, thus making the economic and racial segregation of the public school children more complete than it would otherwise be under a strict neighborhood school assignment plan.

5. The teachers and principals in the publice schools are assigned so that generally the race of the faculty is the same as the race of the children. Thus most of the schools can be identified as "Negro" or "white," not only by reference to the predominant race of the children attending, but by the predominant race of the faculty as well. The heaviest concentration of Negro faculty, usually 100 percent, is in the Negro ghetto schools..

6. The median annual per pupil expenditure ($292) in the predominantly (85–100 percent) Negro elementary schools in the District of Columbia has been a flat $100 below the median annual per pupil expenditure for its predominantly (85–100 percent) white schools ($392).

7. Generally the "white" schools are underpopulated, while the "Negro" schools generally are overcrowded. Moreover, all of the white elementary schools have kindergartens. Some Negro schools are without kindergartens entirely, while other Negro schools operate kindergartens in shifts or consecutive sessions. In addition to being overcrowded and short on kindergarten space, the school buildings in the Negro slums are ancient and run down. Only recently, through the use of impact aid and other federal funds, have the Negro slum schools had sufficient textbooks for the children's use.

8. As they proceed through the Washington school system, the reading scores primarily of the Negro and poor children, but not the white and middle class, fall increasingly behind the national norm. By senior high school the discrepancy reaches several grades.

9. The track system as used in the District's public schools is a form of ability grouping in which students are divided in separate, self-contained curricula or tracks ranging from "Basic" for the slow student to "Honors" for the gifted.

10. The aptitude tests used to assign children to the various tracks are standardized primarily on white middle-class children. Since these tests do not relate to the Negro and disadvantaged child, track assignment based on such tests relegates Negro and disadvantaged children to the lower tracks from which, because of the reduced curricula and the absence of adequate remedial and compensatory education, as well as continued inappropriate testing, the chance of escape is remote.

11. Education in the lower tracks is geared to what Dr. Hansen, the creator of the track system, calls the "blue collar" student. Thus such children, so stigmatized by inappropriate aptitude testing procedures, are denied equal opportunity to obtain the white collar education available to the white and more affluent children.

Other incidental, but highly indicative, findings are as follows:

a. The June 1964–December 1965 study by the Office of the Surgeon General, Army, shows that 55.3 percent of the 18-year-olds from the District of Columbia failed the armed services mental test, a higher percentage than any of the 50 states.

b. The average pupil expediture in the District's public schools is only slightly below the national average. The 1964-65 Bureau of the Census Report on Governmental Finances shows, however, that the District of Columbia spends less per capita on education generally than all states except Arkansas and Tennessee.

c. The same report shows that the District of Columbia spends more per capita on police protection than all states without exception. In fact, the District of Columbia spends more than double any state other than Nevada, New York, New Jersey and California.

The inferences, including those bearing on the relationship of the quality of education to crime, which arise from these findings are obvious. Indeed, the National Crime Commission's Task Force Report: Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime indicates that the very deficiencies in the District's public school system noted by the record in this case—prejudging, through inappropriate testing, the learning abilities of the disadvantaged child as inferior to the white middle class child; placing the child in lower tracks for reduced education based on such tests, thus implementing the self-fulfilling prophecy phenomenon inherent in such misjudgments; placing inferior teachers in slum schools; continuing racial and economic segregation of pupils; providing textbooks unrelated to the lives of disadvantaged children; inadequate remedial programs for offsetting initial psychological and social difficulties of the disadvantaged child—all have contributed to the increase in crime, particularly juvenile crime.

In sum, all of the evidence in this case tends to show that the Washington school system is a monument to the cynicism of the power structure which governs the voteless capital of the greatest country on earth.

REMEDY

To correct the racial and economic discrimination found in the operation of the District of Columbia public school system, the court has issued a decree attached to its opinion ordering:

1. An injunction against racial and economic discrimination in the public school system here.
2. Abolition of the track system.
3. Abolition of the optional zones.
4. Transportation for volunteering children in overcrowded school districts east of Rock Creek Park to underpopulated schools west of the park.
5. The defendants, by Oct. 2, 1967, to file for approval by the court a plan for pupil assignment eliminating the racial and economic discrimination found to exist in the operation of the Washington public school system.
6. Substantial integration of the faculty of each school beginning with the school year 1967–68.
7. The defendants, by Oct. 2, 1967, to file for approval by the court a teacher assignment plan fully integrating the faculty of each school.

The United States is invited to intervene in these proceedings to assist in implementing the decree, to suggest changes in the decree, and to take whatever other steps it deems appropriate in the interest of public education in the District of Columbia.

Decision on School Appeal Expected in Next 2 Days

District Corporation Counsel Charles Duncan says he expects a decision in "the next two days" on whether to appeal the verdict of Judge J. Skelly Wright in the de facto school segregation case.

"The decision will be reached by school board members, Supt. Carl Hansen and other District officials," Duncan said.

Julius Hobson, buoyed by the decision following his defeat in the attempt at organizing a school boycott May 1, hailed the verdict.

"It should completely revolutionize education here and elsewhere and end track systems wherever they exist," he said.

WANTS APPEAL

He said he wanted the schools to appeal, expressing confidence the Supreme Court would make the decision the "law of the land."

Members of the school board, defendants in the case, differed sharply in their reactions to the decision.

John Sessions, the Rev. Everett A. Hewlett, Benjamine Alexander and Board President Mrs. Euphemia Haynes all expressed approval of the decision and said they would vote not to appeal it.

Mrs. Louise Steele, Irving B. Yochelson and Mrs. Ann Stults reserved their decisions.

Only Col. West Hamilton and Carl C. Smuck urged appeal. "The court has no competence in these matters," Hamilton said.

HANSEN WAITS LEGAL COUNSEL

"I will be guided by the advice of counsel," said Dr. Hansen. "Judicial questions should not be debated in the press."

Informed of the decision in Morgantown, W. Va., by phone yesterday, Sessions said, "I'm glad to find this judicial sanction of what I have been saying ever since I've been on the board. It is substantially an endorsement of the Passow group to desegregate faculties and abolish tracks."

Though he had planned to be in West Virginia all week on business, Sessions made plans to return immediately for the debate on whether to appeal.

Mr. Hewlett endorsed the present system of allowing teachers with seniority transfer to the schools of their choice when possible, but added, "It is unfortunate that we have not made more progress in desegregating faculties."

"An excellent decision," said Mrs. Haynes, who twice was defeated on motions to end the tracks system during the last three years. "I am very pleased that both the court and Dr. Passow have said the tracks system should be abolished."

ALEXANDER AGAINST APPEAL

"I'm going to do everything in my power to prevent an appeal of the decision," Alexander said. "The small people, the poor people have won. I think the decision bolsters the Passow report."

William Simons, president of the Teachers Union, praised the decision in the case which it supported in a brief. However, he withheld comment on the decree compelling desegregation of faculties.

"We will issue a statement after a union board meeting Thursday," he said.

"The superintendent has always had the power to assign teachers where they are needed," said Miss Elizabeth Griffith, president of the D. C. Education Association. "But the reality is that 77 percent of the teachers are Negroes—there is a limit to the amount of teacher integration possible. I think there has always been an effort to have racial balance on staffs."

Albany's Legal Aid Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL E. BUTTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1967

Mr. BUTTON. Mr. Speaker, one of the most effective arms of the war on poverty in the Albany area is the legal services program being operated by the Legal Aid Society of Albany. This program has reached a caseload of about 240 civil cases a month, as reported in an article which appeared on May 28 in the Albany Times Union. The article, entitled "Albany's Legal Aid Society: A Helping Hand for the Underprivileged Before the Law," should be of substantial interest to many of my distinguished colleagues as they consider the many programs launched by the Office of Economic Opportunity, and with unanimous consent I include the article at this point in the RECORD:

ALBANY'S LEGAL AID SOCIETY: A HELPING HAND FOR THE UNDERPRIVILEGED BEFORE THE LAW

The Legal Aid Society of Albany has reached a case load of about 240 civil cases a month, according to Lawrence Klepper, the group's executive director who sees more of the same to come as the Society's acceptance by the underprivileged and the legal profession continues to grow.

Klepper noted the cases cover a wide range of legal problems but are concentrated in the areas of economic, housing and family problems.

As an example of the type of problems with which his staff deals he described the plight of a man who had co-signed a note with his brother at an area finance company.

A short time later the man's brother obtained a bankruptcy discharge which left him responsible for the note at a time when he was supporting himself, his wife and five young children on $83 per week. In addition, his family was receiving supplementary assistance from the Welfare Department.

LITTLE KNOWN PROVISION

Research by Society attorneys and senior law students at Albany Law School, who assist the organization, turned up what Klepper said was a little-known provision of the state Social Welfare Law which provides in essence that a person's wages are not subject to attachment if he receives welfare or is in imminent danger of becoming a welfare recipient if his wages are attached.

As the case developed, Klepper said, the finance company took action to attach the man's wages; the Society attempted to persuade the finance company to remove it—in the process being accused of manufacturing laws—and finally obtaining certification under Section 137–A of the Social Welfare Law that the family received welfare aid. The certification was sent to the man's employer and the attachment was summarily removed and returned to the finance company.

Klepper said that he has had a number of cases involving loans by finance companies to persons of inadequate means, but that many cases of landlord-tenant difficulties are also referred to the Society.

One case, he said, was referred by Rev. Frederick Heleine, director of the Methodist Church Mission Society and a member of the board of directors.

Klepper said the case involved a woman who rented a three-room apartment in Albany during the winter of 1966.

He said the woman found the roof in such poor condition that she was forced to spread pots and pans throughout the apartment to prevent the rain and snow from collecting in pools on the floor. In addition, a Society report on the case stated, "during rain storms she walked around the apartment with an open umbrella."

Klepper said investigation revealed the apartment had been decontrolled by the landlord because of owner occupancy. He said proceedings were started for re-control. A hearing was held, he said, and the apartment was placed under rent control, repairs made and $75 was returned to the woman by the landlord because at the hearing it was determined she had been overcharged.

These cases, he says, are typical of the difficulties faced by people with low incomes. They are problems with which "the average middle class family" is not familiar.

240 NEW CASES

In April, the Society opened 240 new cases involving economic, housing, administrative and family problems.

Economic issues including bankruptcy, consumer matters, loan and sales contract problems, wage claims, garnishments and other questions were involved in 50 of the cases; housing situations including questions of landlord-tenant relationship, public housing matters, sales-mortgage difficulties and violations made up 18 new cases that month; there were 11 cases concerning administrative questions; 20 which were classified as miscellaneous; and 134 relating to adoption, annulment, divorce, custody, non-support, separation, paternity and other family problems.

In a report to the board of directors commenting on paternity cases, Klepper said, "In general, among our clients, who are girls of low economic levels, it is quite rare for the girl to place a child for adoption." The report states the reverse is usually true of middle class girls and concludes, "this situation is one we can ponder at length since it is difficult to determine which girl's decision is the more morally defensible."

Klepper said the Albany Legal Aid Society is an integral part of the Legal Services Program of the Federal Office of Economic Opportunity.

An article on the LSP in the current issue of "The Reporter," magazine describes it and notes, "(it) has set aside funds for 250 local projects around the country."

In Syracuse, Klepper said, where the LSP and the local Legal Aid Society unit operate independently of each other, there is a high degree of duplication and the potential is unrealized because of peculiar local conditions.

Albany and its problems, he says, is an almost perfect microcosm of New York City where he once served as an assistant corporation counsel—but he finds his dealings with courts, social agencies and other local attorneys much more rewarding and he has a higher sense of accomplishment.

LAW EVICTS THE POOR

In a speech to LSP attorneys and others, U.S. Supreme Court Justice William Brennan—citing a statement made by his colleague Justice Abe Fortas—who said, "It is the law that evicts the poor from their homes; the law that repossesses their furniture; the law that seizes their children and spirits them away; and the law that withholds their social welfare payments."

Klepper pointed out the speech and the quotation and said this is the type of condition and resulting attitude the Society is intent upon changing. But, he says, this will require much time and diligent effort on the part of Legal Aid Societies all over the nation.

He said that in spite of criticism by some members of the legal profession of the principal of free legal service there is a growing trend toward an attitude which was expressed by Orison Marden, president elect of the American Bar Association, in the April 1966 issue of the New York State Bar Journal.

"To the extent that the Anti-povery Program is successful in lifting people from our relief roles to more useful lives, the potential number who will one day seek our services as paying clients will be increased. Success of the program will be of economic benefit to our profession and to the public at large." The Society has established a rapport with many of the social agencies, public officials and other administrative personnel it deals with in the Albany area.

He says that the social workers, court officials, police officers and the Society attorneys have gained a high degree of respect for each other's objectives.

Castro's Export of Violent Revolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK EDWARDS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1967

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, over the past 4 or 5 years Fidel Castro's Communists of Cuba have been busily engaged in training Latin American guerrilla fighters in the arts of subversion and terrorism.

The guerrillas have then been sent back to their native Latin American countries to engage in violent revolutionary struggles with the objective of overthrowing the established government.

All of this was set forth as part of a worldwide Communist effort, supported actively by the Soviet Union, at the Tri-Continental Conference in Havana in January 1966.

The program will be further organized in another Havana meeting set for July 28 of this year.

To indicate partially as to how this plan is being implemented in Bolivia, I request that an article from the New York Times of June 19 be placed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks:

SMALL GUERRILLA BAND IN BOLIVIA CONTINUES TO PLAGUE THE ARMY—ABOUT 60 REBELS HAVE WON ALL THE VICTORIES SO FAR IN 3-MONTH CAMPAIGN

(By Paul L. Montgomery)

LA PAZ, BOLIVIA, June 18.—A small and elusive band of guerrillas, outnumbered by at least 10 to 1, is proving more than a match for Bolivian Army counterinsurgency forces.

Since the beginning of the hunt for the well-trained, well-armed group in the southeastern jungles three months ago, the army has had nothing it could call a victory. The guerrillas, operating exclusively from ambush, have killed at least 30 soldiers while suffering only a handful of casualties themselves.

Because of its small size and isolated position, the band does not yet constitute a military threat to the nation. But it has caused serious instability in the Government of President René Barrientos Ortuño by showing its weakness, encouraging action by entrenched centers of opposition such as the Government-owned mines.

Soon after the guerrillas were discovered on March 23, General Barrientos declared a state of emergency and outlawed the Communist parties. On June 7, after a demonstration by secondary-school students and disorders in the Government-owned mines, the President declared a state of siege.

It is estimated that the Government has arrested 60 radical politicians and labor leaders under the emergency measures.

The only known manifesto of the guerrillas is nonpolitical. The movement, which calls itself the National Army of Liberation, asks for a popular front against the nation's "pro-vanqui military dictatorship." It pledges to establish a government of "social justice in which our country's natural riches will be exploited equally for all the people".

The leadership of the band has still not been determined. However, two brothers, Guido Peredo (Inti) and Riberto (Coco) Peredo Leigue are believed to be in the top ranks. Both defected from the Moscow-line Bolivian Communist party several years ago because they felt that it had not been taking an active enough stance against the Government.

BELIEVED TRAINED IN CUBA

The armed forces announced this week that they had killed Guido Peredo in combat, but no proof was offered. The announcement was greeted with skepticism here.

The guerrillas are estimated to number 60, made up of about 30 young Bolivian leftists and Communists and 10 foreign professional fighters. All are assumed to have had training in Cuba.

Three months ago, Gen. Alfredo Ovando Candia, the armed forces commander, said that it would probably take three months to eliminate the guerrillas. The figure being used now is a year or more.

The army has about 600 troops in the battle zone, most of them trained under the United States military assistance agreement. The United States trained units have largely replaced the untrained recruit companies that fell easy prey to ambush in the early days of the campaign.

Edward P. Morgan and the News

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AL ULLMAN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 13, 1967

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, since our college days when upper classman Edward P. Morgan received me into our fraternity, I have followed with great admiration and pride the remarkable career of this talented journalist. The personal integrity, the innovation, and the talent he has brought to his profession has earned him a place in the front ranks of news broadcasting.

On Friday, June 16, Edward P. Morgan made his final radio broadcast on the ABC network under the sponsorship of the AFL–CIO—ending an association that began over 12 years ago—and is now embarking on a challenging new assignment that may well earn for him an even greater niche in the history of broadcast journalism.

Along with all others throughout the country who will miss his daily news commentary and analysis, I want to take this opportunity to wish him well in his new and important endeavor.

I insert his June 16 broadcast at this point in the RECORD:

EDWARD P. MORGAN AND THE NEWS

Well, the time has come. Unlike the walrus, though I like shoes and ships and especially sealing wax, I don't need to talk of many things. A few urgent matters are on my mind. First I want to try to describe how it feels to be free. Not that I am being liberated tonight. I am afraid I can say, without fear of contradiction, that never in the history of broadcasting has a journalist been so free to speak his mind, to exercise his own editorial judgments, to make his own mistakes, as I have been in the 12½ years of this gorgeous assignment which ends, or at least is interrupted, with this evening's broadcast.

Never in all the 35 years I have plied the reporter's trade have I enjoyed such a rare experience. So this might be an occasion for personal celebration. But I am not jubilant. I will be everlastingly grateful to my sponsor, the AFL–CIO, for its patience and record longevity of sponsorship despite my repeated biting of the hand that helped feed me, by criticizing organized labor, its leaders and its policies, when I felt such criticism warranted. I am grateful, too, for the tolerant flexibility of my employer, ABC News, which with unthreatening grace not only absorbed my public complaints here of the irresponsibility of broadcasting in general and, on occasion, ABC in particular, but which also absorbed threatening protests from affiliated stations, and others, about my broadcast comments. So why don't I bubble like a just-opened bottle of champagne in personal triumph? Precisely because I feel so alone and disturbed out here in the rarefied atmosphere of my journalistic glory.

Don't kid yourself, Morgan. There are others who could have fulfilled this or similar assignments better than you. The painful point is they have not had the similar opportunity. I have detected, through these years, envious looks from respected colleagues and I am certain I have interpreted their glances correctly. They were not saying "Boy, what a Pulitzer-prize-winning piece you did last night!" They were saying silently, "Boy, what we could do if we had the same unfettered freedom on our beats." This is a terrifying condition for the freest press in the world to find itself in.

I am deeply concerned about the conditions and moods now rampant in this, my native land. Amid the most incredible riches and the most terrifying power any nation has ever accumulated in the history of man, we are plunged into divisive turmoil. Instead of trying to solve our problems we organize hate groups to blame the other fellow. Or we flee to the beaches of frantic leisure only to be sunburned by the guilt of our wanton negligence. There is no miracle drug or magic ointment to cure or quiet this situation. But there is an instrument of devastating effectiveness which we have only superficially, often hypocritically, employed. It is called the power of the press.

Let's fact it. We in the trade use this power more frequently to fix a traffic ticket or get a ticket to a ball game than to keep the doors of an open society open and swinging, by encouraging honest controversy, or, if you'll pardon the term, crusading for truth and justice. There is enough wrong in this republic to merit a full-scale expose daily, if not every hour on the hour. But newspapers run prize contests to lure readers or keep the ones they have. Broadcasting is driving thoughtful citizens away in droves by fertilizing the wastelands of the airways with the manure of utter mediocrity. The situation is so bad the commercials, even in their saturation, are often better than the programs they support.

Why? I think I know why. Nothing in life is free. But in our obeisance before the altar of profit and free enterprise we have let the lust for material things get the better of us. Nothing is so important as people. But instead of the sacred dignity of the individual human being, too many of us worship dividends and private property more.

It is not the policy of General Motors to kill or maim people. But that became its operating policy in order "to protect its investment," when instead of correcting flaws it knew its cars had, it set a gumshoe detective on the trail of Ralph Nader, hoping to discover some sexual or other deviation that would discredit Nader's now vindicated expertise in revealing that few cars are safe at any speed. And where were the Detroit reporters, incidentally, before Nader came along?

It is not the policy of the newspapers and broadcasting stations of Connecticut to suppress vital news. Yet where was the press of that state when the shocking revelations about Senator Thomas Dodd were coming out? Has it occured to an editor or broadcaster, in Connecticut or out, that the senator's tortured employes might not have passed the incriminating documents over the transom to Drew Pearson if they had believed the Connecticut press would have responded to any first friendly tips with the enterprising courage Pearson did? Where were the press and the rest of the power structure, including labor leaders, in the disgraced and bleeding city of Cincinnati before its black citizens exploded their frustration in savage fury?

I go now to a Ford-Foundation-financed experiment in non-commercial broadcasting where I may execute the biggest pratfall in the history of journalism. That's my problem.

The nation's situation is not hopeless. It simply begs for responsible, sustained attention. My most painful duty tonight is to take leave of a loyal, thoughtful listening audience. If I have been emboldened to speak out in this corner it is because I know I have not been talking to myself. The honestly concerned citizens, right, left and center, are the nuclei, not of black power or white power but positive power which can make representative government work. But their power has not been sufficiently turned on because the press has been too busy neuterizing the news to clear comfortable, non-controversial space for the full-page ad and the singing commercials.

This is Edward P. Morgan saying good night—and goodbye for now—from Washington.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Code of Laws of the United States

Title 44, Section 181. Congressional Record; arrangement, style, contents, and indexes.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the Congressional Record, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the Congressional Record semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

Title 44, Section 182b. Same; illustrations, maps, diagrams.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the Record without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the Congressional Record the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily Record as follows: the Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided,* That the makeup of the Record shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the Congressional Record, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the Record shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the Record issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the Record for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the Record of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the Record shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the Record style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the Record.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the Congressional Record any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent Record is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the Congressional Record the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the Congressional Record.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the Congressional Record shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the Official Reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the Official Reporters of the respective Houses.

The Official Reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the Official Reporters in the next issue of the Congressional Record, nor to Records printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the Congressional Record by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the Congressional Record which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the Record.

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20515

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Speaker: John W. McCormack

Abbitt, Watkins M., *Va*	
Abernethy, Thomas G., *Miss.*	6278 29th St.
Adair, E. Ross, *Ind*	4000 Mass. Ave.
Adams, Brock, *Wash*	
Addabbo, Joseph P., *N.Y*	
Albert, Carl, *Okla*	4614 Reno Rd.
Anderson, John B., *Ill*	
Anderson, William R., *Tenn.*	3006 P St.
Andrews, George W., *Ala*	3108 Cathedral Ave.
Andrews, Mark, *N. Dak*	
Annunzio, Frank, *Ill*	
Arends, Leslie C., *Ill*	4815 Dexter St.
Ashbrook, John M., *Ohio*	
Ashley, Thomas L., *Ohio*	
Ashmore, Robert T., *S.C*	
Aspinall, Wayne N., *Colo*	The Towers Apts., 4201 Cathedral Ave.
Ayres, William H., *Ohio*	
Baring, Walter S., *Nev*	
Barrett, William A., *Pa*	
Bates, William H., *Mass*	
Battin, James F., *Mont*	
Belcher, Page, *Okla*	
Bell, Alphonzo, *Calif*	
Bennett, Charles E., *Fla*	3421 Rusticway Lane, Falls Church, Va.
Berry, E. Y., *S. Dak*	118 Schotts Court NE.
Betts, Jackson E., *Ohio*	
Bevill, Tom, *Ala*	6224 N. 35th St., Arlington, Va.
Biester, Edward G., Jr., *Pa*	
Bingham, Jonathan B., *N.Y.*	
Blackburn, Benjamin B., *Ga.*	
Blanton, Ray, *Tenn*	
Blatnik, John A., *Minn*	
Boggs, Hale, *La*	
Boland, Edward P., *Mass*	
Bolling, Richard, *Mo*	307WarrentonDr., Silver Spring, Md.
Bolton, Frances P. (Mrs.), *Ohio.*	2301 Wyo. Ave.
Bow, Frank T., *Ohio*	4301 Mass. Ave.
Brademas, John, *Ind*	
Brasco, Frank J., *N.Y*	
Bray, William G., *Ind*	
Brinkley, Jack, *Ga*	
Brock, W. E. (Bill), *Tenn*	
Brooks, Jack, *Tex*	
Broomfield, William S., *Mich.*	
Brotzman, Donald G., *Colo*	
Brown, Clarence J., Jr., *Ohio.*	
Brown, Garry, *Mich*	
Brown, George E., Jr., *Calif*	
Broyhill, James T., *N.C*	
Broyhill, Joel T., *Va*	
Buchanan, John, *Ala*	
Burke, J. Herbert, *Fla*	
Burke, James A., *Mass*	
Burleson, Omar, *Tex*	
Burton, Laurence J., *Utah*	
Burton, Phillip, *Calif*	
Bush, George, *Tex*	
Button, Daniel E., *N.Y*	
Byrne, James A., *Pa*	
Byrnes, John W., *Wis*	1215 25th St. S., Arlington, Va.
Cabell, Earle, *Tex*	
Cahill, William T., *N.J*	
Carey, Hugh L., *N.Y*	
Carter, Tim Lee, *Ky*	
Casey, Bob, *Tex*	
Cederberg, Elford A., *Mich*	
Celler, Emanuel, *N.Y*	The Mayflower
Chamberlain, Charles E., *Mich.*	
Clancy, Donald D., *Ohio*	
Clark, Frank M., *Pa*	220 C St. SE.
Clausen, Don H., *Calif*	
Clawson, Del, *Calif*	
Cleveland, James C., *N.H*	
Cohelan, Jeffery, *Calif*	1202 Longworth House Office Bldg.
Collier, Harold R., *Ill*	
Colmer, William M., *Miss*	
Conable, Barber B., Jr., *N.Y.*	
Conte, Silvio O., *Mass*	5619 Lamar Rd., Washington 16, D.C.
Conyers, John, Jr., *Mich*	
Corbett, Robert J., *Pa*	
Corman, James C., *Calif*	
Cowger, William O., *Ky*	
Cramer, William C., *Fla*	6215 Beachway Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Culver, John C., *Iowa*	
Cunningham, Glenn, *Nebr*	
Curtis, Thomas B., *Mo*	
Daddario, Emilio Q., *Conn*	
Daniels, Dominick V., *N.J*	
Davis, Glenn R., *Wis*	
Davis, John W., *Ga*	
Dawson, William L., *Ill*	
de la Garza, Eligio, *Tex*	
Delaney, James J., *N.Y*	
Dellenback, John R., *Oreg*	5911 Onondaga Rd.
Denney, Robert V., *Nebr*	
Dent, John H., *Pa*	
Derwinski, Edward J., *Ill*	
Devine, Samuel L., *Ohio*	
Dickinson, William L., *Ala*	
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., *Mich*	
Dingell, John D., *Mich*	
Dole, Robert, *Kans*	6136 Beachway Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Donohue, Harold D., *Mass*	
Dorn, Wm. Jennings Bryan, *S.C.*	2030 Laburnum St., McLean, Va.
Dow, John G., *N.Y*	
Dowdy, John, *Tex*	
Downing, Thomas N., *Va*	
Dulski, Thaddeus J., *N.Y*	347 Cannon House Office Building
Duncan, John J., *Tenn*	
Dwyer, Florence P. (Mrs.), *N.J.*	
Eckhardt, Bob, *Tex*	
Edmondson, Ed, *Okla*	
Edwards, Don, *Calif*	9201 Fox Meadow La., Potomac, Md.,
Edwards, Edwin W., *La*	
Edwards, Jack, *Ala*	
Eilberg, Joshua, *Pa*	
Erlenborn, John N., *Ill*	
Esch, Marvin L., *Mich*	11754 Gainsborough Rd., Rockville, Md.
Eshleman, Edwin D., *Pa*	
Evans, Frank E., *Colo*	
Everett, Robert A., *Tenn*	
Evins, Joe L., *Tenn*	5044 Klingle St.
Fallon, George H., *Md*	
Farbstein, Leonard, *N.Y*	
Fascell, Dante B., *Fla*	
Feighan, Michael A., *Ohio*	
Findley, Paul, *Ill*	
Fino, Paul A., *N.Y*	
Fisher, O. C., *Tex*	Calvert-Woodley
Flood, Daniel J., *Pa*	The Congressional
Flynt, John J., Jr., *Ga*	
Foley, Thomas S., *Wash*	
Ford, Gerald R., *Mich*	514 Crown View Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Ford, William D., *Mich*	
Fountain, L. H., *N.C*	The Westchester
Fraser, Donald M., *Minn*	
Frelinghuysen, Peter H. B., *N.J.*	3014 N St.
Friedel, Samuel N., *Md*	
Fulton, James G., *Pa*	
Fulton, Richard, *Tenn*	
Fuqua, Don, *Fla*	
Galifianakis, Nick, *N.C*	
Gallagher, Cornelius E., *N.J.*	
Gardner, James C., *N.C*	
Garmatz, Edward A., *Md*	
Gathings, E. C., *Ark*	
Gettys, Tom S., *S.C*	
Giaimo, Robert N., *Conn*	
Gibbons, Sam, *Fla*	
Gilbert, Jacob H., *N.Y*	
Gonzalez, Henry B., *Tex*	200 C St. SE.
Goodell, Charles E., *N.Y*	3842 Macomb St.
Goodling, George A., *Pa*	
Gray, Kenneth J., *Ill*	
Green, Edith (Mrs.), *Oreg*	
Green, William J., *Pa*	
Griffiths, Martha W., (Mrs.), *Mich.*	
Gross, H. R., *Iowa*	
Grover, James R., Jr., *N.Y*	
Gubser, Charles S., *Calif*	
Gude, Gilbert, *Md*	
Gurney, Edward J., *Fla*	
Hagan, G. Elliott, *Ga*	
Haley, James A., *Fla*	
Hall, Durward G., *Mo*	
Halleck, Charles A., *Ind*	4926 Upton St.
Halpern, Seymour, *N.Y*	
Hamilton, Lee H., *Ind*	
Hammerschmidt, John Paul, *Ark.*	
Hanley, James M., *N.Y*	
Hanna, Richard T., *Calif*	
Hansen, George V., *Idaho*	
Hansen, Julia Butler (Mrs.), *Wash.*	
Hardy, Porter, Jr., *Va*	
Harrison, William Henry, *Wyo.*	
Harsha, William H., *Ohio*	
Harvey, James, *Mich*	
Hathaway, William D., *Maine.*	
Hawkins, Augustus F., *Calif.*	
Hays, Wayne L., *Ohio*	
Hébert, F. Edward, *La*	26 Cockrell St., Alexandria, Va.
Hechler, Ken, *W. Va*	
Heckler, Margaret M. (Mrs.), *Mass.*	
Helstoski, Henry, *N.J*	
Henderson, David N., *N.C*	
Herlong, A. S., Jr., *Fla*	
Hicks, Floyd V., *Wash*	
Holifield, Chet, *Calif*	
Holland, Elmer J., *Pa*	
Horton, Frank, *N.Y*	
Hosmer, Craig, *Calif*	
Howard, James J., *N.J*	
Hull, W. R., Jr., *Mo*	
Hungate, William L., *Mo*	
Hunt, John E., *N.J*	
Hutchinson, Edward, *Mich*	
Ichord, Richard (Dick), *Mo.*	
Irwin, Donald J., *Conn*	
Jacobs, Andrew, Jr., *Ind*	
Jarman, John, *Okla*	
Joelson, Charles S., *N.J*	
Johnson, Albert W., *Pa*	
Johnson, Harold T., *Calif*	
Jonas, Charles Raper, *N.C*	
Jones, Paul C., *Mo*	1111 Army-Navy Dr., Arlington, Va.
Jones, Robert E., *Ala*	
Jones, Walter B., *N.C*	
Karsten, Frank M., *Mo*	
Karth, Joseph E., *Minn*	
Kastenmeier, Robert W., *Wis.*	
Kazen, Abraham, Jr., *Tex*	
Kee, James, *W. Va*	5441 16th Ave., Hyattsville, Md.
Keith, Hastings, *Mass*	5906 Harwick Rd. Woodacres, Md.
Kelly, Edna F. (Mrs.), *N.Y*	
King, Carleton J., *N.Y*	
King, Cecil R., *Calif*	
Kirwan, Michael J., *Ohio*	
Kleppe, Thomas S., *N. Dak*	
Kluczynski, John C., *Ill*	
Kornegay, Horace R., *N.C*	
Kupferman, Theodore R., *N.Y.*	
Kuykendall, Dan, *Tenn*	
Kyl, John, *Iowa*	
Kyros, Peter N., *Maine*	
Laird, Melvin R., *Wis*	
Landrum, Phil M., *Ga*	
Langen, Odin, *Minn*	
Latta, Delbert L., *Ohio*	
Leggett, Robert L., *Calif*	
Lennon, Alton, *N.C*	
Lipscomb, Glenard P., *Calif.*	
Lloyd, Sherman P., *Utah*	
Long, Clarence D., *Md*	

the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

H.J. Res. 654. Joint resolution creating a Joint Committee To Investigate Crime; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BROWN of Michigan:

H. Con. Res. 376. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress with respect to an investigation and study to determine the potential of railroad passenger and mail transportation in the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TAFT:

H. Con. Res. 377. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress with respect to the establishment of peace in the Middle East; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McCLORY:

H. Con. Res. 378. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the establishment of peace in the Middle East; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois:

H. Res. 657. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to the establishment of permanent peace in the Middle East; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CLEVELAND:

H. Res. 658. Resolution expressing the sense of Congress with respect to the establishment of permanent peace in the Middle East; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KARTH:

H. Res. 659. Resolution expressing the sense of Congress with respect to the establishment of permanent peace in the Middle East; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WHALLEY:

H. Res. 660. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to the order of the Secretary of the Army restricting eligibility for burial in Arlington National Cemetery; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BURTON of Utah:

H. Res. 662. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 421; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BENNETT:

H.R. 11079. A bill for the relief of Angel Aguilus and his wife, Lydia Solomon Aguilus; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H.R. 11080. A bill for the relief of Helen Zammit; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KASTENMEIER:

H.R. 11081. A bill for the relief of Rashida H. Tejani; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KYROS:

H.R. 11082. A bill to provide for the consideration under the War Claims Act of 1948 of certain claims arising out of the sinking of the U.S. fishing vessel *Snoopy*; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACHEN:

H.R. 11083. A bill for the relief of Demitrios Exis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATHIAS of California:

H.R. 11084. A bill for the relief of Francisco Campos-Gonzales; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEPHENS:

H.R. 11085. A bill for the relief of Dr. Gomez Rafael Pascual and his wife, Santa Maria de Pascual Yolanda del Carmen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Appendix

Educational Leadership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1967

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker it has been the custom at a number of our larger institutions of higher learning in recent years to grant the title of president to men who have been prominent in business life, or to businessmen with many contacts in the affluent world. I can find no fault with this practice, for in our society it behooves educational institutions as well as businesses, governmental units, and households to conduct themselves on the soundest financial basis possible.

I have been pleased, however, to be associated with a university which has decided—for the second time in a row—to choose as its president a man distinguished as an educator. I am pleased as an alumnus. I am pleased as a representative of the people who live in the area it largely serves. And I am pleased as one who worked long and hard for that institution to achieve a special status. For Temple University in Philadelphia has truly become a very special place in the last few years.

Mr. Speaker, the reason for my comments at this time—to get back to the naming of a new president—is the announcement by the board of trustees that Dr. Paul R. Anderson, currently vice president for academic affairs, has been chosen as Temple University's new president.

Before I discuss Dr. Anderson's background, let me relate some of the university's circumstances leading up to this appointment.

Temple University is in every sense a large, urban educational center. Like many institutions of higher learning, its enrollment since World War II has mushroomed. It currently has more than 35,000 students. From its beginning it has served largely the urban student, the commuter, the serious and academically-minded offspring of families which could not meet the price tags of the more prestigious centers of learning.

Perhaps the biggest measure of its success has been its contributions in the form of distinguished alumni who have become leaders of the Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, and other communities.

Despite the traditional financial problems Temple shared with other oversized but underendowed urban universities some years ago, it decided, upon the retirement of the university's then-president—a nationally prominent Republicant by the way—that even more than its need for new sources of revenue it needed as its president a man who understood academic problems. The man it chose from its own staff at that time is the man who now will retire from that post, a lifelong educator, Dr. Millard E. Gladfelter.

Under an educator's reign, the university grew and thrived, too. And new concepts were worked out—in which I was proud to be able to help—that established a formula for financial existence in Pennsylvania not only for Temple University, but for the University of Pittsburgh and Pennsylvania State University as well. We established a partnership of private and governmental financing to allow student tuitions to be substantially reduced. Such fine institutions as Temple, then could continue to serve thousands of students who otherwise might not be able to afford a higher education. Yet the integrity and fiscal structure of each institution could remain unblemished.

So well does this system appear to be working, and so well has the University thrived in recent years, that on Dr. Gladfelter's pending reretirement the trustees of Temple have decided they could again afford—indeed they could again do no better—than to find the very best man to head the university. Again they reached into their own ranks for a distinguished educator. Mr. Speaker, as someone who has worked with Dr. Anderson in the past, I assure you he will be neither a mere fund raiser nor an academic figurehead.

As the fifth president of Temple University, Dr. Anderson brings a record of 15 years of service as president of Chatham College before becoming Temple's vice president for academic affairs in 1960.

Dr. Anderson is a native of Akron, Ohio, who received has bachelor of arts degree from Ohio Wesleyan University and his doctor of philosophy degree from Columbia University. He also did postgraduate work at the Union Theological Seminary and the New School for Social Research.

He has been teaching since 1928. He taught at the American University in Beirut, MacMurray College, Lake Erie College, Oberlin, Lawrence, and Chatham. He has visited India twice as a U.S. State Department lecturer. He has been a special consultant to the American Council on Education. Dr. Anderson is a past president of the Pennsylvania Association of Colleges and Universities and the Pennsylvania Foundation of Independent Colleges.

Currently he is a trustee of Beaver College and a member of the board of directors of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences. He is also a member of the American Philosophical Association, the American Association of University Professors, and the American Association for the Advancement of Science.

Most of all, Paul R. Anderson is a warm human being who will help Temple University prove to the Nation that academic excellence is thoroughly compatible with—can pioneer and initiate—such innovative financial flexibility as partnerships between the private and governmental segments of the society it serves.

Encore, Judge Friebolin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1967

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, the only exception I take to the Plain Dealer editorial I am inserting in today's RECORD is the headline, "Judge Friebolin Bows Out."

Carl Friebolin is, indeed, leaving the bench. We are sorry to see him close a career which has demonstrated his excellence as one of the Nation's greatest authorities on bankruptcy law. Over half a century of achievement in his field, however, more than entitles him to rest on his laurels.

What is not acceptable to those of us who esteem him as a good friend and companion and a great wit is the inference that he is "bowing out." Nothing can persuade us that the judge will bow out as Cleveland's master of satire and delightful deflator of egos. He has been a much needed leavening in our community, particularly in the field of political give and take, keeping us all on the qui vive against pomposity or pretension.

As one who has enjoyed his high humor for many years, I endorse the contents of the editorial which follows, and underscore it with an, "Encore, Judge Friebolin," of my own. I hope that his new leisure will permit him to do some writing, so that he can permanently share with us his wit and wisdom.

The editorial follows:

JUDGE FRIEBOLIN BOWS OUT

Retirement of Carl D. Friebolin is a sad note in a career that produced so much laughter for so many generations of Clevelanders.

For nearly 50 years, Judge Friebolin has been known as the city's resident wit and his quips stabbed into tough political hides while audiences rocked in high glee.

The veteran federal referee in bankruptcy is not much of a penman in the area of legibility but between the years of 1917 and 1965 he wrote 48 City Club Anvil Revues, each one a masterful job of deflating notables of the stuffed shirt variety.

Satire is his forte and his peppering guns raked the political and business communities with a devastating fire power that never strayed from the bounds of good taste.

His targets remain his warmest friends.

Friebolin's native skill as a fashioner of witty lines has overshadowed his reputation as one of the nation's nimblest legal minds.

Early in his 51-year career as a referee, he became a national authority on bankruptcy law and taught a course on the subject at Western Reserve University.

As he prepares to close out this brilliant career, we salute him as a faithful and remarkable servant of his government and as a valued personality whose observations, we hope, will continue to titillate the community for many years to come.

Another Round for Otepka

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. McCLURE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1967

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. Speaker, Otto Otepka is finally getting a hearing on the charges leveled against him by the State Department. Because of the continuing interest in this matter by many Members of Congress, I call to my colleagues' attention an excellent analysis of the Otepka case by the Richmond News Leader of June 8.

The editorial follows:

ANOTHER ROUND FOR OTEPKA

After 43 months, Mr. Otto Otepka got his chance Tuesday to defend himself against charges of "conduct unbecoming a State Department officer." But with a catch: His hearing before a department panel is being conducted in secret.

Otepka was fired Nov. 5, 1963, from his post as chief of the evaluations division of the department's office of security. Shortly thereafter, he was rehired and given a job clipping the *Congressional Record* in a Foggy Bottom cubicle at $20,435 a year, pending the outcome of the current hearing. Readers may recall the events leading up to his dismissal:

Otepka insisted that full security proceedings should be followed in appraising the cases of such prize State Department errors as Alger Hiss, William Wieland and John Stewart Service. Back in 1961, for example, he had the names of some 800 department employees who had derogatory information in their files because of Communist or sexual involvements. He was so conscientious and impartial in his work, refusing to bend personnel records around the rules, that he got in the way of some State Department biggies.

As a result, his superiors bugged his phone, ransacked his files and fine-toothed his "burn bag" of classified trash. Concerned about the carryings-on of certain persons in the department, Otepka went to the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee. He named names and gave pertinent data. Otepka was entitled to do this, for the United States Code reads: "The right of persons employed in the civil service . . . to petition Congress . . . or to furnish information to either House of Congress or to any committee or member thereof, shall not be denied or interfered with." But Otepka got the pink slip.

Subsequently, three of his superiors were dismissed when they were caught lying in the case, but have been transferred to other high-paying government posts. Otepka, who puts truth and loyalty to his country before his loyalty to the State Department, hired a lawyer and kept demanding the right to be heard. Now that he has his chance, the department has ruled that secrecy must cloak the current proceedings for "protection of the employee" and because classified documents will be introduced during the testimony. In this case, Otepka doesn't want to be "protected," and all the documents have been made public by the Senate subcommittee.

The State Department's vendetta against Otepka constitutes a challenge by the executive branch to every committee of Congress that seeks information from public servants employed by the taxpayers. If the department panel upholds Otepka's discharge, Otepka says he will appeal to the Civil Service Commission and then, if necessary, to the Federal courts. Only there, in the courts, would he get a chance to air publicly how far the State Department has gone toward wrapping itself in immunity.

Vietnam and the Middle East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1967

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, seldom have writers so brilliantly analyzed the two current crises of Vietnam and the Middle East in the manner in which writer Emmet John Hughes clearly does in the following article. All of us have read and heard much about both subjects but few have reduced the vast amount of information on both to such a concise, intelligent comparison.

I can think of few instances in which so broad and detailed a subject matter has been boiled down to such a ready and readable summary. I commend his comparison of the two struggles to everyone's attention:

A MUDDLED TALE OF TWO WARS

The flash of Israel's lightning victory in the Middle East did more than lay brutally bare the incapacity of Arab generals to grasp the nature of modern war. The same bolt of light lasted long enought to make dismayingly clear the inability of many American leaders to grasp the nature of modern politics. For as passionate debate began to bracket the fates of Israel and Vietnam, the babel tended to betray, on many sides, narrowness of perspective and confusion of principles.

The liberal critics of the Johnson Administration—whether appalled by Israel's peril or exhilarated by its triumph—got themselves snarled in various troubles. On the eve of war, the gifted historian, Barbara Tuchman, sounded like the most steely GOP critic of the U.N. as she assailed its "futile fiddling" and ridiculed the Security Council as "a cynical farce." But within a mere fortnight, only the Arabs were picking up that bitter lament. And in the wake of war, the usually reflective editors of The New Republic attained a state of exaltation that impelled them to hail Israeli victory for having "changed the world balance of power more decisively than anything . . . since World War II," as they astonishingly reported "the ruin of Soviet prestige in the Middle East and everywhere else."

Yet all such quirks of judgment paled beside the attempt of Washington to confound all critics of its Vietnam war by equating it with the struggle of Israel. The Administration apologists argued that any citizen calling for U.S. action to support a political commitment in the Middle East had to recognize the same obligation as binding in the Far East. But the historic natures of the two conflicts bear as much similarity, of course, as sand and jungle. And since the analogy reflects such blurred official thought, its most obvious errors need noting . . .

1. The State of Israel is a unique phenomenon—equally by the terms of ancient history and modern history. It has been born of massive human tragedy defying all comparison. Its land populated and its life guarded by men from 100 nations, it stands as a triumph of moral unity and political creativity. By such reckoning, no modern state in the world may offer such stunning contrast to the wracked and primitive political life of South Vietnam.

2. The root natures of the U.S. commitments in the two arenas sharply differ. The bond to Israel is essentially moral. By any criterion of strict self-interest, the overriding U.S. concern would be for the Arab lands where U.S. oil companies have invested $1.5 billion. By contrast, the commitment to the struggle in Vietam has been overwhelmingly a calculation of self-interest: the containment of Chinese power.

3. Far from being commitments of matching weight and logical affinity, the two involvements could be at deadly odds. It has always been a reasoned fear of critics that the war in Vietnam could drain the U.S. of power to act in another arena. And the validity of this fear may be judged by a grim imagining of the events of the last fortnight—if the Soviets had been far more militant and the Israelis far less.

4. There are vast quantitative distinctions between the two wars, both militarily and economically. The total Israeli casualties in routing all Arab armies barely totaled 3,000—almost exactly the losses suffered by U.S. forces in Vietnam in a single week. Over the years, Israel has received help from abroad generally considered quite huge; some $2 billion from worldwide Jewry and some $1.6 billion in U.S. aid. These sums cover all the years since World War II. They are matched by what the U.S. spends in Vietnam each month.

5. The two lands differ utterly in terms of simple sovereignty—its exercise and its defense. In the Middle East, Israel has proved its sovereignty, within and beyond its borders. In Vietnam, the U.S. is struggling to build true sovereignty where none has ever existed. With dazzling irony, one powerful journalistic apologist for U.S. policy in Vietnam has reported a "first lesson" of the Arab debacle thus: "No amount of foreign hardware can make a military victor of a nation that lacks effective leadership and the will to win." Such a depiction of Russian failure in Egypt reads like a precise warning to American fantasy in Vietnam.

6. There could scarcely be clearer difference between the regions in which Israel and Vietnam must live their futures. It is an axiom of U.S. policy that peace in the Middle East demands reconciliation between the 2.5 million Jews and the surrounding mass of 50 million Arabs. But the American dream for Vietnam approaches the dramatic opposite; a kind of little Israel with its capital in Saigon, a people of some 16 million, stoically rebuffing the 800 Chinese millions on its borders.

These confusions of thought are not academic abstractions. A government that thinks in a disorderly way can only likewise act. And if two such arenas of historic danger stay muddled in its mind, it can perform with wisdom in neither.

Wednesday, June 21, 1967

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Senate continued on proposed censure of Senator Dodd, rejecting a substitute proposal.

House passed bill to increase the public debt limit.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S 8556–S 8627

Bills Introduced: Seven bills were introduced, as follows: S. 1977–1983. **Pages S 8557–S 8558**

Bills Referred: Eight House-passed bills were referred to appropriate committees. **Page S 8529**

Bill Rereferred: Committee on Banking and Currency was discharged from further consideration of S. 1971, to authorize loans to certain cooperatives serving farmers and rural residents, and the bill was then referred to Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. **Page S 8562**

Censure Resolution: Senate continued its consideration of S. Res. 112, recommending censure of Senator Dodd, rejecting by 2 yeas to 92 nays, Long of Louisiana amendment (in the nature of a substitute) for the resolution. Senator Dodd was excused from voting on this substitute. **Pages S 8530–S 8556**

Railway Labor Dispute: Senate disagreed with House amendment to S.J. Res. 81, providing for settlement of the labor dispute between certain railways and certain of their employees, asked for conference with House, and appointed as conferees Senators Yarborough, Morse, Randolph, Pell, Nelson, Kennedy of New York, Williams of New Jersey, Javits, Prouty, Fannin, and Griffin. **Page S 8563**

Gold Certificates: S. 1983, to remove gold coverage for Federal Reserve notes, was introduced today and was referred to Committee on Finance, order being entered that when the bill is reported by that committee it then be referred to Committee on Banking and Currency. **Page S 8561**

Nominations: Senate received nomination of Benjamin H. Oehlert, Jr., of Georgia, to be Ambassador to Pakistan; and numerous Public Health Service nominations. **Page S 8628**

Quorum Calls: Four quorum calls were taken today. **Pages S 8530, S 8531, S 8538, S 8539**

Record Vote: One record vote was taken today. **Page S 8556**

Program for Thursday: Senate met at 10 a.m. and, as a mark of respect to the memory of Representative Younger, recessed at 6:03 p.m. until noon Thursday, June 22, when it will continue consideration of S. Res. 112, recommending censure of Senator Dodd. **Page S 8627**

Committee Meetings

(*Committees not listed did not meet*)

SOCIAL SCIENCES

Committee on Government Operations: Subcommittee on Government Research continued its hearings on S. 836, to create a National Foundation for the Social Sciences, with testimony from Dr. Wex S. Malone, president, Association of American Law Schools; Gwendolen M. Carter, Northwestern University; Dean Louis Pollack, Yale University Law School; Stewart P. Blake, Stanford Research Institute, Menlo Park, Calif.; Richard Carrigan, legislative consultant, National Education Association; and Vincent Davis, University of Denver.

Hearings continue on Tuesday, June 27.

COMMITTEE BUSINESS

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service: Committee, in executive session, ordered favorably reported S. 271, to provide additional group life insurance for Government employees (amended); S. 1028, extending certain benefits to employees of the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service; and 270 postmaster nominations.

Appendix

Ted Yates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1967

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, 3 years ago this month a tall, rugged, purposeful young man, who was to direct an NBC documentary on Congress, strode into my office and I met Ted Yates for the first time. That was the beginning of one of my most cherished friendships.

I have lost that cherished friend. I find this a very hard fact to accept. On the day war broke out in the Middle East Ted Yates was killed by machinegun fire in Jerusalem, where he was on the ground producing another of his fine documentaries. The burst of gunfire that took the life of Ted Yates snuffed out the life of a brilliant young journalist, television producer, and director.

Ted Yates was a young man when he died. This in itself is a tragedy. Ted was one of the finest young men I have ever known. It not only was a pleasure to be in his company, but an education as well. He was a professional newsman-historian, a devoted husband and father, and a loyal friend. Many will mourn his death, but none more than my family, my staff and myself.

Ted died performing a truly professional job as a news reporter. According to his associate producer, Bob Rogers, Ted and his crew of four, including Bob, had been filming the fighting from a hill, but abandoned the hill and the camera when fighting became too fierce. They were seeking cover when, according to Bob Rogers, someone sought them out and machinegunned them, killing Ted. It can only be assumed that Ted's assailant thought the cameras were weapons and the crew enemy soldiers. I point out these facts because it would grieve me and others who knew and respected him, if the last report about Ted made him appear to be a foolish man instead of the competent individual he was. Ted's courage does not need to be proved.

Ted Yates was the most dedicated man to truth in journalism that I have ever known. It is impossible to report combat from any place except in the midst of combat, and that is where Ted was, trying to give the people the truth. Some others may be content to sit back in a hotel and report what someone else tells them, but Ted had to be an "eyewitness" to what he reported, and because of this he was the epitome of journalistic excellence. Would that we had more like him in all fields.

Many others have put their thoughts into words and have paid tribute to the unique qualities of courage and bravery of Ted Yates. Out of my admiration, respect and affection for Ted, I submit these tributes by his colleagues, and other stories of his life, as an inspiration to all of us, no matter what our particular pursuits.

The material referred to follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, June 7, 1967]

TED YATES

SIR: If as Scotty Reston likes to say, this is the age of the reporter, then Ted Yates added a new dimension and distinction to his profession and to his times.

In the broadest and best sense of that word, he was a reporter. But he was also a producer, an editor, a world traveler, and adventurer. He dealt in the new journalistic medium—television—and his efforts were seen and appreciated by millions of Americans.

Ted Yates of NBC died covering the Middle East crisis. The obituary writers can tell about the formal aspects of his career, of the shows he produced, the awards he won, and of his wife and three children. His friends can fill in the more personal side, if they wish. I can only tell you, as another reporter, what a superb professional he was.

Ted Yates had one great quality which never goes out of style in the news business. He had enthusiasm. Unlike some of his less talented colleagues, he did not affect a cynical air. He loved his work, and he never was too blase or too sophisticated to let other people know that he was enjoying his life.

In the old days, the great "stars"—the Richard Harding Davises and the Edwin C. Hills—wore fancy clothes ordered at Abercrombie and Fitch when they went to war. They often wore spats when covering a domestic event. Ted Yates, when I last saw him covering a war, was wearing a sports shirt.

It is a vivid memory: Yates, standing in the darkened lobby of the Embajador Hotel in Santo Domingo in the spring of 1965, holding a notebook in his hand, and telling a circle of fellow correspondents about what had just happened.

Two colleagues, Al Burt and Doug Kennedy of the Miami Herald, had been shot accidentally by American Marines that day. Typically, Yates had been the first to reach the wounded pair. Before he was carried off, Burt passed on his notebook to Yates. He hoped Yates might be able to file for him; he knew he was putting his material in the right hands.

Yates, as was his fashion, generously filled in the other reporters on what had happened. Then he went back to his own work of covering the war, and taking more risks.

From Santo Domingo he went on to Saigon, and finally—and naturally—to the Middle East.

The first reports yesterday said he had been wounded by a mortar shell. To those who knew him, that seemed all too possible. The last—and final—report was different: he had been hit by machine gun fire. That was even more typical of Ted Yates. He was always the closest one could get to the action.

HAYNES JOHNSON.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, June 7, 1967]

TV PRODUCER TED YATES, 36, DIES OF WOUNDS IN MIDEAST

(By Lawrence Laurent)

Television producer-reporter Ted Yates, 36, died yesterday, the first electronic journalist killed in the Arab-Israeli War.

The Associated Press reported that Mr. Yates, whose Washington home is at 3200 Highland pl. nw., was wounded in the head by machinegun fire on Monday, soon after the fighting began. He was just inside the lobby of the Intercontinental Hotel in the Jordanian sector of Jerusalem when a burst of machinegun fire hit the hotel.

Others dived to the ground but Mr. Yates remained standing to watch, his colleagues said.

Three employes of the hotel carried him inside the building. "Their act of mercy," Reuters reported, "was at considerable danger to themselves."

He died yesterday in a government hospital in the Jordanian sector of Jerusalem.

Mr. Yates had gone to the Middle East with a film and sound crew two weeks ago to prepare a three-part documentary. He had gone to the Jordanian sector of Jerusalem as soon as fighting began Monday.

Mr. Yates had earned a reputation as a bold, fearless reporter. He had filmed combat in the Congo, Vietnam and with guerrillas in South America. He had ridden in the back seat of a fighter plane attacking the Ho Chi Minh Trail and had been stoned by rioters in Java.

He won the Overseas Press Club's Ed Stout Award for reporting the troubles in Santo Domingo and in 1965 won the George Polk Award for reporting on Vietnam. The U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce chose him "one of the 10 outstanding young men of the year" in 1963.

Mr. Yates's wife, the former Mary Olberg of La Crosse, Wis., attempted to fly to his bedside. She got as far as Athens when she was informed of her husband's death. Visas for entry into the war-torn Middle East have been canceled.

Mr. Yates often said that a broken neck turned him into a reporter. He was working as a professional rodeo rider in the summer in Wyoming when he was 18. "If I hadn't broken my neck," he would say with a smile, "I'd still be a rodeo rider."

He was born, Oct. 1, 1930, in Sheridan, Wyo. His father, Frederick, was a stockbroker, publisher and rancher. His mother, Haydie Eames Yates, was one of the New Yorker's first editors and author of a best seller, "70 Miles From a Lemon." Both are dead.

Mr. Yates spent a year at the University of Virginia before he began working for a weekly newspaper in Florida. He learned about television as a handyman for "New York Close-Up With Tex and Jinx" (McCrary).

He was a Marine combat correspondent in the Korean War.

Mr. Yates created TV's first "tough interview" program, "Night Beat," with Mike Wallace and produced Dr. Albert Burke's "A Way of Thinking." He collaborated with Ben Hecht on a Broadway musical, "Underworld" and worked with Hecht in Hollywood.

He settled in Washington in 1961 as a producer of "David Brinkley's Journal," which won two Emmy Awards and a Peabody Award.

The distinctive Yates documentary, for which he was producer-director-reporter-narrator and co-author, began about four years ago. He developed a style, one critic wrote, "that sheared away the middle-age paunch of predictable and bland documentary thought."

His full name, which he never used, was Frederick Langdon Yates. He and Mrs. Yates had three sons—Eames Hamilton, 10; Frederick Langdon, 8; and Angus Forbes, 6.

YATES: A SUPERB TV REPORTER

(By Bernie Harrison)

Too many news-documentaries are forgotten a few days after viewing. Not so the shows of Ted Yates, the superb NBC reporter who died yesterday of wounds suffered while covering the war in Jerusalem. I still remember scenes, vividly, from a half-dozen of his various projects, which took him from Santo Domingo, to the jungles of Guatemala, Vietnam, the Congo, and wherever there was a story that had to be covered.

I still see that French planter in his special on the Congo, sadly contemplating the poignant welcome of the natives, his former workers, on his return to his ruined plantation in the interior. Yates could not have improved on the casting had he used Jean Gabin for the role. The tragedy of the Congo, "Victim of Independence," was perfectly illustrated.

Did you see his show on "Laos: The Forgotten War?" Yates took the viewers to a building where the Communist troops of the Pathet Lao were permitted to live. When it came to taking a closer look at the enclave it was Yates who went out to engage the soldiers in talk:

"How do you do? Ca va? Do you speak English? No parlez Anglais? Are you a Pathet Lao soldier? What we're trying to do, you see, is show the American public . . . get a good look at the enemy. And I thought perhaps you'd come out here and pose for our camera. Do you speak English, my friend?"

(Yates was before the gate of the compound in Vientiane, angry Communist guards shaking weapons at him.)

"I just wanted to take some pictures . . . for American television," he continued. "Let them see the Pathet Lao soldier. The point that we're trying to make here is that this is a Pathet Lao. These are our enemies and they have in the last year killed 14,000 Laotian soldiers and civilians. They've practically cut the country in half. They have, in addition to all that . . . I'm sorry, sorry right. They have turned the Ho Chi Minh Trail, with the help of the North Vietnamese regular soldiers into a boulevard, but, nonetheless, they enjoy the comparative security of these buildings . . . Okay? What's wrong? . . . Can't we . . ."

(A Pathet Lao commissar grabbed a sentry's rifle and pointed it at him.)

In his report from Indonesia ("The Troubled Victory," Feb. 19 last), Yates went to film the plight of the 7,000 Chinese who—to prevent their slaughter by anti-Communists—were packed into makeshift camps. They reacted strongly.

"You can hear they aren't very friendly," Yates reported. "They are very short of food. Their cry, as you can hear, is 'ganjang American—ganjang neocolim,' which means crush America, crush the neocolonialists. Watch out, Julie, here come the rocks. They are throwing rocks at us here. There are five other camps like this one . . . What was that? The sentries firing their rifles over the heads of these people to keep them suppressed. The people are beginning to get out of hand . . ."

It may seem, from all of this, that Yates spent most of his time in the no-man's-land of trouble and tension. Lately, he had been. But there were other documentaries, like "The Journals of Lewis and Clark," two years ago, in which Yates traced the historic path of the explorers from St. Louis to the Pacific. He did a fine job on the unenviable task of picturing (with David Brinkley) the plight of Congress trying to do a job in an electronic age with horse-and-buggy management methods and techniques. By concentrating on the activities of one congressman, veteran Democrat Olin Earl Teague, of Texas, with an admirably varied selection of revealing pictures, the point was brilliantly made.

This was not Yates' first association with Brinkley, of course. When Yates, who had worked with Mike Wallace, now with CBS, to develop the popular "Night Beat" interview series, came to NBC, he went to work with Brinkley on the latter's short-lived but still remembered "Journal." I still remember that first show of theirs; the camera photographed a variety of abandoned autos and junk yards across the country while a band played "America, the Beautiful."

DRAWN BY GUNFIRE

Because Yates office was here, I got a chance to know Ted and discuss his shows, generally after a screening. It would be easy to go along with his biography, which includes the line that "Yates is drawn to the sound of gunfire—anywhere in the world," but somehow that rings wrong. He was young, 36, intelligent, filled with zest for what he was doing. He had grown up with the medium, learned what it could do, and how to do it, and he set out to report those stories that he felt had to be reported—on the scene.

Several of his colleagues tried to dissuade him from going on this latest assignment. There may have been a touch of the Hemingway mystique in his confidence—and ours—that he would return with the story.

AHEAD OF NEWS

One of his colleagues, NBC producer Stuart Schulberg, said yesterday he would ask the TV Directors' Guild to establish a memorial award in his honor—for the kind of reporting he did so well. Oddly enough, Yates—after a good start (an Emmy for "Night Beat," plus a Robert Sherwood award) in the award-collecting category seemed to be overlooked when judging time came. One reason for this, I think, was that many of his documentaries were ahead of the news and were followed, later, by controversies, as in the case of his report from Central America on "The Science of Spying."

I remember—once—snapping at an awards list and writing that they should have given Yates the awards, closed the nominations, and gone home.

What might be even better, than an award, would be a book about the Yates career and shows, with plenty of pictures and quotes. He was one of the first of the TV reporters, and he will be remembered.

Where Do We Grow From Here?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1967

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, Central Michigan University is celebrating its 75th anniversary this year. Senator ROBERT P. GRIFFIN, a distinguished alumnus of this great institution, delivered the commencement address.

I commend this excellent address to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress:

WHERE DO WE GROW FROM HERE?

President Foust, distinguished officials and guests of the University, members of the faculty, graduates of this 1967 class and ladies and gentlemen:

As a proud son of this University—and as the husband of one of its daughters—let me say that no honor could be more meaningful or more satisfying than the honor of participating in this significant commencement program.

At the same time, I want to assure the graduates here that I have not forgotten what it's like to be on *your* end of a commencement exercise.

I realize full well that I now stand as the last obstacle between you and your diploma. I promise that I shall be reasonably brief. At least, I pledge that there will be no filibuster.

Of course, this is a very important day in your life. It is also an important day in the life and history of Central. This impressive number of graduates is testimony to the remarkable growth that our university has experienced in the 75 years of its existence.

I suspect that there are few people around today who remember when the "Central State Normal School and Business Institute" was established in 1892—when 13 students and two instructors began operations in Mt. Pleasant, in second floor rooms over what was, for many years, the Smith Drug Store.

It has been said that a school consists of a teacher surrounded by his pupils. While this is essentially correct, we know that a school can do a much better job if adequate facilities surround the students and teachers—and if a school has able administration and leadership.

In addition to those who receive their diplomas today, I wish to salute the distinguished President of our University, Dr. Foust, and such distinguished predecessors as Dr. Anspach. They deserve not only recognition but great credit for the remarkable progress of this institution, and for the impressive stature it has attained in the academic community. Throughout the 75 years of its existence, Central has been fortunate to have had outstanding leadership provided by able and courageous presidents who have been dedicated to the task of building a great institution—this University from which you, justifiably, can be proud to graduate.

From our limited human vantage point, the span of three-quarters of a century seems very long. And yet, on reflection, we realize that a period of 75 years is but a moment on the clock of history.

On an occasion such as this, it seems altogether appropriate to pause and briefly turn the clock back over the years during which this University has grown to maturity. For though "all things change, nothing perishes" (Ovid, Metamorphoses) and, as the general theme of Central's 75th year proclaims . . . "by long seeking, mortals make progress in discovery."

Not many years ago, when the former British Prime Minister, Sir Winston Churchill, acknowledged a resolution by Congress making him an honorary citizen of the United States, he spoke of the future in these terms:

"Our past is the key to our future, which I firmly trust and believe will be no less fertile and glorious. Let no man underrate our energies, our potentialities, and our abiding power for good . . ."

This message has been put in simpler terms. A story makes the rounds in Washington about a tourist who has out to see the sights of the Nation's Capital from a taxi cab. As he went by the Archives Building, he happened to notice these words carved in marble: "What is Past is Prologue". He asked the cabbie what those words meant, the cabbie scratched his head for a moment and said: "Well, I'm not exactly sure—but I think it means 'you ain't seen nothing yet.' "

Only 75 short years ago the Central State Normal School and Business Institute was born in a nation still buzzing with excitement about the surrender of Geronimo (two years earlier) in the last major battle with the Indians.

Grover Cleveland was campaigning against Benjamin Harrison for the Presidency.

China was in the headlines then, too—charged with persecuting foreigners, mostly missionaries; and many voices were urging outside intervention.

Cholera was killing 300,000 Russians.

In 1892, a boat carrying railroad cars across Lake Michigan began operations between Kawauee, Wisconsin and Frankfort, Michigan.

In Detroit, dreams about a horseless carriage were beginning to materialize.

But then, some of the concerns of 1892 were of a more timeless variety. For example, the women's section of one national magazine lamented that half of civilized humanity was being dictated to in the choice of wearing apparel by "so-called fashion—instead of common sense."

A few years later, the Mt. Pleasant paper carried a story that Central's Dean of Women had appealed "to all young women living in apartments with outside stairways to vacate them and take rooms with families interested in their welfare."

In 1892, Americans were shocked to learn that Congress, for the first time, had appropriated more than *one billion* dollars. Who would have predicted then that, 75 years later, the President of the United States would be calling upon Congress for appropriations of *135 billion dollars?*

The world in which you graduate today is not only different than the world of 1892—but the contrast would appear fantastic to those who first cracked their text books over the Smith Drug Store.

In our world of 1967, women not only vote, but they hold high public office—one is the Prime Minister of India, and another is the senior U.S. Senator from the State of Maine.

Our space program has achieved a soft landing on the moon; and despite serious setbacks, I believe Americans will be on the moon's surface before you bachelor degree graduates can earn your doctorate.

Our world includes Beatles, soul music, trans-world television programs, "black power", student protest demonstrations and mini-skirts.

Our world of 1967 is all this—and much more.

In the seventy-five years since Central's birth, the United States has not only become a world power, but its influence is so enormous that decisions made each day in Washington bear directly or indirectly on the lives of billions of people all around the globe.

With good reason, the world is on edge today, and every day—anxiously awaiting the next move by the United States with respect to the situation in the middle east.

Throughout history there have been times which tried men's souls; and recent events in the area of the Mediterranean and Red Seas, compounded by weary frustrations on Vietnam, leave no doubt that you are graduating into such a time.

As we meet today, the wisdom of some of our basic policies as well as the effectiveness of institutions, on which we have relied so heavily to maintain hope for world peace, are being severely tested.

To be sure, graduating classes as far back as anyone can remember have shared a concern about the future. But the class of 1967 is entitled to an uncommon concern because you graduate in uncommon circumstances.

Somehow, despite wars and threats of war, our Nation has managed not only to survive, but to thrive on the changes of the last 75 years. Of course, there are pessimists today who question whether we can possibly survive the next 25.

Looking toward the future, we are challenged not only by the perplexing problems of war and peace, but also by the rapidly accelerating pace of change itself.

It has been reported that the creator of Buck Rogers quit drawing his famous comic strip because his imagination could no longer stay ahead of actual scientific accomplishments.

We stand in the midst of an explosion of science and technology. Engineers are told today that they must expect to be retrained as many as four times during their working years.

Rapid changes are taking place in the make-up of our population. Earlier this year, while attending a meeting at the White House, I listened to Secretary of State Dean Rusk discuss the difficulties we face in structuring a durable peace in the world. At one point Secretary Rusk referred to the lessons we learned during World War II. Then he paused in his presentation and called attention to a fact which those in my generation too often tend to overlook—the fact that almost half of the population today can't even remember World War II.

Think of it—those who are being born today will live *most* of *their* lives in the 21st century.

By 1970, a majority of American people will be 25 years of age or younger.

Is it any wonder that many businessmen and politicians beam their public relations efforts toward the young people?

During the last campaign I used the slogan, *"Youth and Experience."* For some reason my wife seems to delight in reminding me that I won't be able to use *that* slogan six years from now.

Although we do face an awesome array of problems and challenges in our world of 1967, like Robert Browning, I'm an optimist. You'll recall that Browning wrote: "Grow old along with me: the best is yet to be."

I'm convinced that there is plenty of reason for optimism so long as our system and our institutions continue to produce, in the ranks of our young people, potential *experts* and potential *leaders* of the quality we honor here today.

If history is a race between education and catastrophe, then we can take heart from the fact that important team strength is being added by this outstanding class.

On the other hand, I believe it is important to sound this note of caution: education that is limited to the more accumulation of facts and knowledge will never win such a race.

Recently, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Dr. John Gardner, expressed his concern that, although our system is producing a wealth of technical experts in almost every field, we tend to immunize a high proportion of our most gifted young people against any tendency toward leadership.

More and more, our highly complex society seems to demand the sort of intense specialization that leads gifted young people away from broad leadership roles.

We are educating the technical expert who will advise the leader. We are developing the intellectual who will stand off and criticize the leader.

But Dr. Gardner is concerned about whether we recognize the importance of producing leaders.

My generation produced scientists who have created bombs and missiles which are capable of destroying the world. Will your generation be able to produce leaders with the perspective, vision, and wisdom to guide those who already have their finger on the triggering mechanism?

Thomas Jefferson once said that "if a nation expects to be ignorant and free in a state of civilization, it expects what never was—and never will be." But I suggest that it is important to add this advice from Dr. Arthur Umschield:

"Human freedom can perish as readily in a classroom . . . as in a nuclear holocaust. . . . A more profound mastery of science and mathematics will not avail a people who loose the ability to govern themselves."

It is this ability to govern ourselves, dependent upon an enlightened sense of direction and purpose, which our educational institutions must help to develop if our system is to survive.

Those of us who have inherited freedom—who have been born and reared in an atmosphere of liberty and Constitutional rights—would do well to recall frequently that freedom has not been the natural order of things throughout the history of mankind. Indeed, for every decade in which man has enjoyed a measure of freedom, there have been centuries when he lived in economic and political bondage.

Toynbee has reminded us that great civilizations usually commit suicide. And the clear implication is that our civilization will follow historical precedent.

"But," Toynbee has said, "we are not doomed to make history repeat itself, it is open to us, through our efforts, to give history some new and unprecedented turn . . . It is up to us."

When he received the Nobel Prize in 1950, William Faulkner said, "I decline to accept the end of man." He continued, "I believe that man will not merely endure: he will prevail. He is immortal, not because he alone among creatures has an inexhaustible voice, but because he has a soul, a spirit capable of compassion and sacrifice and endurance."

Someone has said that education is "a controlling grace to the young, consolation to the old, and ornament to the rich."

The challenge today is before you. We stand, a great nation, in the midst of changes unimagined a short time ago." Much more than a controlling grace to ornament your lives, your education is the very basis of hope for the future.

Shortly before he died, General Douglas MacArthur expressed to members of another graduating class the hope that their educational experience had been more than a mere accumulation of facts and knowledge. (With a paraphrase or two) he said, I hope your education—

". . . has molded you for your roles as custodians of the Republic;

That it has taught you to be strong enough to know when you are weak, and brave enough to face yourself when you are afraid;

That it has taught you to be proud and unbending in honest failure, but humble and gentle in success;

To learn to stand up in the storm but to feel compassion for those who fall;

To have a heart that is clear and a goal that is high;

To master yourself before you seek to master others;

To learn to laugh, yet never forget how to weep;

To reach into the future, yet never neglect the past;

To be serious, yet never to take yourself too seriously.

And, finally—in all these ways—that it has taught you to be a good citizen of your country and the world.

What's More American?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 21, 1967

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, one of my esteemed constituents, Kadish Millet, has written a song which might readily take a place with the most popular of our patriotic songs.

Copies of the words and music may be obtained from the Mourbar Music Corp., in New York.

The lyrics are as follows:

WHAT'S MORE AMERICAN?

What's more American than corn flakes?
The Fourth of July and Uncle Sam.
What's more American than baseball?
I am! I am! I am!

What's more American than tooth paste?
Rock and roll, peanut butter, toast and jam.
What's more American than "O. K.?"
I am! I am! I am!

The Stars and Stripes, George Washington,
The Capitol Dome, and bubble gum.
There's General Grant and Robert E. Lee.
But most of all you can count on little old me, me, me.

What's more American than ice cream?
Chow mein, pizza pie, Virginia ham.
What's more American than bingo?
I am! I am! I am!

Ours is a heritage second to none.
We are a nation united as one.
Our Founding Fathers gave us that start,
And their love for our country lives on in every heart.

What's more American than football?
And T.V. and mighty Superman.
What's more American than Swanee?
I am! I am! I am!

The Bill of Rights and Betsy Ross.
The Liberty Bell and Paul Revere's horse.
Old Santa Claus and a Chirstmas tree.
But most of all you can count on little old me, me, me.

What's more American than praying in a church of your choice across the land?
Whats' more American than saying,
"I am! I am! I am!"

What's more American than saying,
"I am! I am! I am!"

Desecration of the Flag

SPEECH

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1967

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 10480) to prohibit desecration of the flag, and for other purposes.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I support H.R. 10480, to prohibit desecration of the flag, and trust that it will be passed by a practically unanimous vote. Along with a number of my colleagues, I introduced a similar bill.

Recently we saw on the same day in the same newspapers pictures of American young men facing danger and death in Vietnam and pictures of other American young men burning their Nation's flag in the safety of an American park. In the last Congress we passed a law making the burning of draft cards a Federal offense. Should not the burning of our flag by Americans be as much a crime against our Nation and our people as the burning of draft cards?

One of the greatest strengths of this Nation is the right of dissent. The right was established by our Founding Fathers and must remain inviolate. However, the right of dissent from particular policies or with particular individuals never was intended to sanction the desecration of the American flag, which is the symbol of our national heritage and unites all Americans in allegiance to the Republic for which it stands.

Secretary Fowler, Chairman Patman Present Views on Cancellation of $45 Billion in U.S. Securities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1967

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], recently circulated a letter to Members taking the position that $45 billion in U.S. Government securities held by the Federal Reserve System should be canceled or retired.

In an effort to obtain the Treasury Department's position, I asked Secretary Fowler his views on the matter, and he takes the position that it would not be wise to dispose of the securities.

This is a most interesting and informative presentation of opposing views on this matter, and in view of the interest of my colleagues and the Nation in this most important financial matter, I am inserting the letters from the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] and from Secretary Fowler in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The letters follow:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., May 31, 1967.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: Some facts about our monetary policy are so shocking that many good citizens have difficulty believing them.

This is particularly true of the facts surrounding the $45 billion worth of U.S. Government bonds that are sitting in the vault of the New York Federal Reserve Bank as part of the Federal Open Market Committee's portfolio.

These bonds have been paid for once through the use of Federal Reserve notes. One form of Government obligation—Federal Reserve Notes—have been exchanged for another Government obligation—interest-bearing U.S. Treasury bonds.

The shameful facts are that these bonds were not canceled or retired despite the fact that they were paid for in full. Instead, the American taxpayers are compelled to continue to pay interest to the Federal Reserve on these paid-up bonds to the tune of $1.9 billion each year.

Why should the American taxpayers be compelled to pay interest on bonds that have already been paid for in full?

Why should the American taxpayers be required to pay for these bonds again?

Why should these bonds continue to be charged against the national debt when they have already been paid in full?

The U.S. Congress should answer these questions in the public interest. These bonds should be retired now and subtracted from the national debt.

In a few days, H.R. 10328—a bill to increase the ceiling of the national debt—will be coming up for Floor action. This bill should be amended to provide for the cancellation of the paid-up bonds, thus reducing the national debt by about $45 billion.

Please give consideration to supporting such an amendment on the Floor.

With best regards.

Sincerely,

WRIGHT PATMAN.

THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, D. C., June 12, 1967.

Hon. JOE L. EVINS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. EVINS: This is in reply to your request for a comment on a letter dated May 31, 1967, which you received from Congressman Wright Patman.

In his letter, Mr. Patman recommends cancellation of $45 billion of U.S. Government securities held by the Federal Reserve System in order to reduce the national debt and save the interest payments now being made on these securities.

We would question, however, whether the proposal would accomplish these objectives. And we believe that it could have undesirable effects which it would be much better to avoid.

First, as to the proposed saving of interest payments, it should be kept in mind that the Federal Reserve returns to the Treasury most of the interest payments it receives on its portfolio of Government securities. In calendar year 1966, for example, the Federal Reserve received $1,851 million in interest on Treasury securities; and returned to the Treasury $1,649 million—89% of the amount received.

While the Federal Reserve used some of its interest receipts to cover operating expenses in 1966, those expenses would have to be met in some other way if the Federal Reserve held no Government securities. Thus it is not clear to me that the present arrangements cost the taxpayer any more than the proposed alternative.

As for reducing the public debt, the proposed cancellation of Government securities held by the Federal Reserve raises some serious problems. One is the question of providing backing for Federal Reserve notes—the nation's main form of currency in circulation. Federal Reserve notes outstanding are the number one liability item in the Federal Reserve's balance sheet ($40.2 billion out of total liabilities at the end of 1966 of $70.3 billion). The main asset item for the Federal Reserve is their holding of Government securities—$44.3 billion at the end of 1966.

If $45 billion of Federal Reserve-held debt were to be cancelled, the Federal Reserve would not hold sufficient assets to back its liabilities in the form of currency. In this case, the Federal Reserve notes could be considered as a primary obligation of the U.S. Government rather than of the Federal Reserve. It could follow from this that Federal Reserve note currency in circulation would be part of the gross debt of the United States, although not subject to the debt limit under existing statutes.

Besides, I do not believe that the cancellation of existing debts is the kind of policy that our Government should pursue. While the move has been suggested only in regard to the Federal Reserve's holding of Treasury issues, even in that limited area a move of this kind could tend to impair confidence in our debt obligations, our currency, and our national financial management.

While Mr. Patman's letter says that the bonds purchased by the Federal Reserve have been "paid in full" when the Federal Reserve buys them, it does not seem to me that this payment is the same as the repayment that occurs when the Treasury pays off a debt at maturity. The Federal Reserve, as established by the Congress, keeps separate accounts from those of Treasury, and that arrangement seems appropriate to me. There is no more reason to cancel the Federal Reserve's holdings of Treasury obligations than there would be to cancel the holdings of Treasury securities in Federal Government trust accounts such as the Social Security or Unemployment trust funds.

In short, we see no significant advantage to the proposal that the Treasury debt held by the Federal Reserve be cancelled, and believe instead that such a step could be harmful.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY H. FOWLER.

Northern Michigan Helped To Establish Reindeer in Alaska 60 Years Ago

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP E. RUPPE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1967

Mr. RUPPE. Mr. Speaker, northern Michigan, which I represent in the House of Representatives, played an important role in the establishment of the reindeer industry in Alaska 60 years ago. This is our 50th State's centennial year. I am happy to insert a letter I have received from Mr. E. A. Jasberg, from Calumet, in northern Michigan's copper country. Mr. Jasberg tells about eight Finnish Americans, originally from northern Finland, who traveled from northern Michigan to Alaska to help the Eskimoes learn how to keep reindeer herds. Our largest State, now so ably represented in the House of Representatives by our friend and colleague, the Honorable HOWARD W. POLLOCK, has come a long way in the last 60 years. We in northern Michigan are proud of the small contribution our people made to Alaskan development. I know all Alaskans must be proud of the tremendous contribution they have made to the United States.

The letter referred to follows:

DEAR MR. RUPPE: I am writing to you with reference to the Alaska Centennial this year. You undoubtedly are unaware of the fact that the Copper Country played a role in establishing the reindeer industry in the territory of Alaska some 60 years ago. Dr. Jackson, Commissioner of Bureau of Education, contacted your predecessor, H. Olin Young, 12th District Congressman from Ishpeming for assistance in finding capable herders to teach Eskimos how to manage reindeer herds. Mr. Young, in turn, contacted my late father, J. H. Jasberg of Hancock (Michigan), a personal friend of his, for information. My father had no personal experience with reindeer in Finland, but advertised in Finnish language newspapers for men capable of handling them. Numerous applicants appeared and eight men—all Finns—from the Calumet district were selected. The Government shipped the men to outlying islands off the coast of Alaska on Bering Straits. Reindeer from Russian Siberia were purchased and shipped to these islands where Eskimos spend a period of training in herding and were then allotted a limited number of animals to start them off in the business. They, in turn, paid the Government from the natural increases until they owned their herds free of encumbrance. You may be interested in calling attention of Alaska Senators and Congressman to the fact that your district contributed materially to the success of this project.

Complimenting you on our aggressive and positive activity in all phases of Upper Peninsula and Northern Michigan progress, I remain

Sincerely,

E. A. JASBERG.

Community Leadership Conference on World Problems—IV

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1967

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, as previously reported, at the February 22 community conference in my district, a panel discussion was held on the world problem area of the Middle East. Such distinguished authorities as H. E. Avraham Harman, Ambassador of Israel to the United States; Kemal Karpat, associate professor of comparative governments and interntional relations at New York University and a citizen of Turkey; and Rabbi Israel Miller of the Kingsbridge Heights Jewish Center, former president of the American Rabbinical Council and currently chairman of the American Zionist Council, participated in the panel which was moderated by Hon. William L. Cary, professor of law at Columbia University and former Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission. Their remarks, which are of particular interest in the light of recent events, are summarized below:

PANEL ON THE MIDDLE EAST

The moderator of the panel discussion on the Middle East was Hon. William L. Cary, professor of law at Columbia University and former Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission. The first speaker was H. E. Avraham Harman, Ambassador of Israel to the United States.

Ambassador Harman stated that the Middle East is, and has always been, an area of great diversity. This diversity has created several sources of conflict.

One of the sources of conflict relates to the attempts to impose on a section of the area, if not the whole of it, a dominant hegemony. In the world the search for international unity has proceeded along two paths. There have been attempts to impose a world order by a hegemony of a country, a race or a language. This path always leads to world conflict since military methods are used and they are resisted. The other path is that followed by the U.N. This path recognizes diversity and allows different peoples to express their own personality as they choose. This path is one of peace and harmony.

The Middle East is not a monolith, with its many nationalities, religions, and languages. A hegemony cannot be established there.

There are two historic forces at work within the Arab world, Ambassador Harman went on to say. There is the historic desire for Arab unity. But there is also the insistence on the separation of Arab statehood. State consciousness resists the idea of an overriding political unity. Attempts to impose a hegemony within the Arab world will continue to result in armed conflict. Yemen is an example of this fact.

A second conflict engendered by a desire for hegemony is the Israel-Arab conflict. The Arab States do not recognize Israel as a state, do not want to do so, and envisage a future without Israel. Israel will not accept this policy and will use force to resist force.

In 1947, the U.N. began to examine the problem of Palestine. There then existed two national communities, each with a right to self-determination, and each mature enough to govern itself and also all of Palestine. Neither side was completely satisfied when the U.N. attempted to follow a path of peace through partition. Israel did not like the partition, but cooperated since peace was worth the price. By December 1947, the Arabs used force to resist and continued to fight until the middle of 1949. In 1949, four armistices were established. These form the legal and political basis for today's reality and a future peace. All the armistices say that the countries will work peacefully to solve problems. The agreements also set the boundaries and state that the territory of each country will not be used as a base for warlike acts.

However, hostility still exists; hostility of the Arabs to Israel, but not vice versa. Israel's policy is one of peace and Israel would like to work with the Arab nations on common policies and problems.

In today's U.N. the members cannot tolerate a doctrine of hostility. A state of war is incompatible with the U.N. Charter and the armistices. It is the duty of the Arabs, as members of the U.N., to terminate the state of war. The desire of the Arabs to change the borders or destroy Israel by force is also against the precepts of the U.N. The great powers agree that this doctrine is unacceptable. They also recognize, as does the entire U.N., that a conflict in the Middle East could spread throughout the world.

There are no basic problems not capable of speedy resolution once the state of war ceases and the Arabs acknowledge that change can only be through peace and mutual agreement.

Another basic problem is created by the social and economic reality of the Middle East. The area has been greatly lived in, and has been much used and abused through history. Today, it needs a process of renewal—of land, of water resources, of economy—in order to advance the interests of its people.

The regional effort needed to effect the renewal is now diverted by the conflicts mentioned before. However, these conflicts could be eased by disarmament, especially if a world disarmament occurred. The lethal weapons are all imported, and a world disarmament would cut off the supply.

Ambassador Harman concluded by saying that all the peoples of the Middle East have a great stake in cooperation. The end of conflict would release much energy to help the region and let the area again become as important to civilization as it once was.

The next speaker was Kemal Karpat, associate professor of comparative governments and international relations at New York University, and a citizen of Turkey.

Professor Karpat stated that he would discuss the Middle East's problems and the U.S. interest there. It is necessary to understand the internal forces working in the area today and the possible impact of those forces on foreign policy to understand the Middle East.

Most important internal forces are two ideologies—nationalism and socialism.

Nationalism has had both internal and external implications. Internally, the first phase of Arab modernization has been a search for a modern political life and a political apparatus capable of meeting the aspirations of the peoples. The establishment of several Arab States was the immediate result of those aspirations. The external manifestation of Arab nationalism is seen in the attempts to secure and maintain internal sovereignty and to promote self-interest by pragmatic policies.

The final goal of Arab nationalism is to establish one Arab State.

As used in the Middle East, socialism is a loose generic term for economic and social reform. The Arab nations desire to achieve economic sufficiency. They also wish to rearrange group relations within society so as to best use all resources. The ultimate goal in this area is to achieve social justice. It should be explained that Arab "socialism" is basically non-Marxist.

In the United Arab Republic, due to socialism a workers group has been established, a large civil and military bureaucracy has come into being and the peasants have been mobilized. Aspirations and material expectations have been created far beyond the capacity of the system to fulfill. The United Arab Republic will soon be faced with the problem of choosing either full state control or other political alternatives to solve economic problems. Some Marxists want to create an integral socialist system as an alternative.

Basically, however, the United Arab Republic is a pluralist society. It is not prepared in its ideology and its structure for full Marxist socialism. It would probably prefer a relaxation of controls and assurance that the socialist system will not destroy its way of life.

President Nasser is an important force in this regard, Professor Karpat stated, but he is probably a nationalist using socialistic means to further his nationalistic aims. If Nasser could be forced to choose today, he would probably follow the pluralistic course with its implications for policies with regard to the West.

Relations among Arab States have been affected by socialism. Socialism has disrupted much of the unity orientation created by Arab nationalism. Socialism has laid bare the social and political differences among various Arab societies. It has undermined various interests based on those differences.

A cleavage has developed between the monarchies and the republics based on social differences. Also, a cleavage has occurred among the republics reflecting the social differences in various nations. Syria has recently swung to the left, but it is likely to be forced back to the right. Syria seems unable to develop a stable government or unifying philosophy and has become unpredictable in its policies.

Iraq also was unpredictable, but now it seems to have properly appraised its own heterogeneous society and taken a midway course based on self-interest.

Strong Arab organizations, such as the Arab Socialist Union, seem to have had their immediate chances of success destroyed by emphasizing socialism to the detriment of national unity. But unity and Nasser's leadership are still alive, though faced with great obstacles.

The civil strife in Yemen, where the United Arab Republic is alined against Saudi Arabia, is likely to have lasting impact. The situation includes an intervention in the internal affairs of another state, and an attack on other states. It ignores Arab brotherhood and has created a government by force without sufficient support. It is an attempt to modernize a traditional society by force, and appears to be more costly than it is worth.

The development of a modern political structure in Saudi Arabia may have a very important effect. Saudi Arabia is the center of Islam and contains the purest Arabic element. But it had failed to exert leadership so far because failure to create a modern bureaucracy and military organization until Nasser's challenge forced it to adopt new methods of military and civilian administration. It had relied on sheer religious identification, which was not enough. Potentially it is a great power in the Arab world, and the consequences of its political development could be great: it would eliminate competition in the Arabic peninsula and create a new political subsystem which may determine the political fate of Yemen and Aden; it would make the peninsula and its oil resources relatively immune to the vicissitudes of Arab policies. But political modernization in Saudi Arabia would create a military and intellectual group sharing the nationalist-socialist aspirations of other Arab intellectuals and speed up the establishment of a republican regime.

Turkey is different from the rest of the Middle East. Turkey's intelligensia are today moving away from the West. The new large and aggressive middle class with political power has replaced the old elite, who now look to socialism as a means to regain power. Also, the Cyprus crisis has influenced the intellectuals greatly. Turkey was not allowed to enforce its binding treaty rights and found that NATO restricted its freedom, while Greece was free to aid President Makarios. The West exaggerated the military and economic dependence of Turkey. As a result, Turkey has moved toward an accommodation with Russia and is attempting to improve her relations with the Balkan nations. Turkey's relations with the other Arab nations have improved also.

Turkey is still committed to the West through NATO and CENTO, but an effective partnership in these bodies depends on restoring Turkey's confidence in the West and the United States in particular.

Internally, Turkey is growing quickly and has achieved better civilian-military relations than existed in the past.

The Middle East, in general, seems destined again to become a playground for the great powers. Though Chinese influence has been minimal so far, a detente between the United States and U.S.S.R. might cause the Arabs to support China as an alternative to any agreement the two great powers may reach to the detriment of the Arabs.

The Middle East is important for Soviet-Sino relations. It should be remembered that the central Asian regions disputed by the U.S.S.R. and China are actually inhabited by Turkic people. Both sides will try to neutralize or use the appeals of Turkey and Iran to the peoples of central Asia who have linquistic, religious and cultural ties with Iranians and especially the Turks.

The United States should review its Middle East policy in the light of the changes I have outlined and in light of the Soviet-Chinese dispute.

The commentator on this panel was Rabbi Israel Miller of the Kingsbridge Heights Jewish Center, former president of the American Rabbinical Council and currently chairman of the American Zionist Council.

Rabbi Miller based his remarks on the idea that the world is diverse and yet one. The large powers have interests in the Middle East which are frequently in conflict.

The U.S. interests are those of all people of good will, to help develop the area and help it achieve its own fulfillment. Peace is needed to accomplish these goals.

We should look at values as well as events, especially in relation to the Arab-Israel conflict. Israel and the United States have an identity of values—freedom, democracy, self-fulfillment, and the government as the servant of the people.

The basic U.S. interest is peace. The United States should use all diplomatic means to brings the two sides to a peace conference. Such a peace settlement would allow the resources of the Middle East to be used for the benefit of the people of the region. The United States should give aid only to be used for development. It should try to achieve a rapport with the U.S.S.R. to allow peaceful development of the area.

QUESTIONS

As the Arab States reach a more mature phase, will their attitude toward Israel change?

Answer. By Ambassador Harman:

A change will occur when the Arab states realize that their top priority problem isn't Israel, but internal problems that won't be solved by destroying Israel. Also, when the

Arabs realize that it isn't possible to destroy Israel, then an accommodation can occur. This change will be a gradual process and will take a long time.

What is the U.S. role with respect to armaments in the Middle East?

Answer. By Ambassador Harman:

The United States doesn't like nations spending resources on competitive armaments. Neither does Israel. Israel has never introduced a new element of weaponry in the Middle East. Its defense policy is not military superiority but to maintain a minimum sufficient to deter aggression. Russia supplies most of the Arab arms and a U.S.-U.S.S.R. disarmament agreement would help lead to an Arab-Israeli disarmament. Until that goal is reached, however, Israel cannot allow imbalances to develop.

What compensation has Israel offered to refugees? What is the Arab counter-demand?

Answer. By Ambassador Harman:

The Arabs originally wished to talk about refugees as an independent issue, but Israel wished to speak about it as part of the peace problem. Israel has been flexible and has made many efforts to discuss the issue. The Arabs insist that the refugees be allowed to return to Israel and hence make Israel an Arab country. But Israel won't accept likely fifth-columnists. Rather it is willing to compensate the Arabs whose property was taken, while the Arabs absorb the refugees. This absorption process is occurring today, and if resettlement in Arab countries were allowed, the process would go faster. Also, Israel would expect that the property left behind by the 800,000 Jewish refugees from Arab nations it has accepted would be considered in the final account. However, as of now no one is willing to discuss any of the alternatives Israel has raised.

Contribution of a Proud Family

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. S. JOHNNY WALKER
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 21, 1967

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to bring to the attention of my colleagues an outstanding contribution by a very proud family. I have here a news release which was brought to my attention by Mrs. Mary E. Chavez of Santa Fe, and which explains why this family is justifiably proud.

The news release follows:

One of the most outstanding contributions of manpower in the defense of this country has been that of six mothers, daughters of Mrs. Senaida Rodriguez and the late Eduardo Rodriguez of Santa Fe, New Mexico, and Alamosa, Colorado.

These six women have a total of ten sons actively serving in the war effort at present, as follows:

L/Cpl. John I. E. Chavez is at an undisclosed overseas destination. He is the son of Mrs. Mary E. Chavez and the late Louis Chaves of Santa Fe, N.M. Immediately upon graduation from St. Michael's Cpl. Chavez enlisted in the Marine Corps. He has just turned 18 years of age.

Mr. and Mrs. John B. Martinez of Albuquerque, N.M., have two sons in the Service: S/Sgt. John B. Martinez is in the Air Force stationed at Omaha, Neb; Anthony Martinez, A2C, is stationed at Heester AFB, Miss.

Jose A. Romero, A2C, is stationed at Homestead AFB, Fla. He is the son of Mr. and Mrs. Manuel L. Romero of Albuquerque, N.M.

Mr. and Mrs. John B. Romero of Denver, Colorado, have three sons in the Service: Lt. John Romero, stationed at Whiteman AFB, Mo., is Deputy Missile Combat Crew Commander there; S/Sgt. Raymond Romero is stationed overseas; David Romero, A2C, is also stationed overseas.

Daniel De Herrera, A2C, is stationed overseas. He is the son of Mrs. De Herrera and the late Joe De Herrera of Alamosa, Colorado. Another son by a previous marriage, S/Sgt. James Martinez, is also overseas.

Bill Handlin, son of Mr. and Mrs. Rex Handlin of Sublette, Kans., is serving overseas in the Navy as Flagship Quartermaster.

Carl Lewis Estes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY ROBERTS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 21, 1967

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to pause for a moment to remember a great American and mourn his passing. On Monday, May 29, Carl Lewis Estes of Longview, Tex., was suddenly taken from this life. Surviving him are his wife; two brothers, U.S. District Judge Joe E. Estes, of Dallas, and W. Neal Estes, of Stanton; and a sister, Miss Mary Lou Estes, of Dallas, and several nephews and nieces.

Mr. Estes was no ordinary man. He was a newspaperman who used his paper as a voice crying out for whatever was needed to benefit his people. But he did not stop with the printed word. He would personally go to bat for the cause of the moment—and usually win.

The Carl Estes story relates one accomplishment after another. During his third of a century in Longview, Publisher Estes initiated and championed many civic and industrial campaigns that benefited the people of the entire east Texas region.

He went to St. Louis and got the Union Station and a modern underpass approved. He came to Washington in search for a new post office and Federal building. When he was told an appropriation of $65,000 would be made, he turned thumbs down, notifying local civic leaders that he was holding out for at least $300,000, in keeping with Longview's needs. This amount, and more, was later provided.

Many east Texas highways have been built because of the push given for them by Estes. He came to Washington and Longview got the $5 million Harmon General Hospital to take care of the sick and the wounded from World War II. Later, it was Estes who blocked the attempt to dismantle the hospital, and eventually turned the site into a technical school. As an outgrowth of this, Longview is now the site of the vast LeTourneau operations.

Returning home after World War II, the publisher with Mrs. Estes covered many thousands of miles in search of industry for the Longview area. He was successful, so successful that Longview now has the Texas Eastman Co., as well as many, many more plants and industries.

One of the chief benefactors of this colorful crusader is the independent oil operator. Carl Estes was the founder of the Texas Oil Journal, a monthly magazine devoted to the petroleum and associated industries with national circulation. He had published it in Longview since 1934, the early boom days of the huge east Texas oilfield.

His newspaper career began in Denison, Tex. Later he went to Commerce, Tex., where he attended East Texas State University and also worked for the Commerce Journal. Prior to acquiring the newspaper properties in Longview, he was general manager of the Tyler, Tex., newspapers owned by the T. B. Butler Publishing Co.

Whatever benefited people, interested Carl Estes. The people across this land, big and little, mourn his passing and offer their sincere sympathy to his family and to those who were closest to him.

Man Chooses Best of His Kind for Slaughter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 21, 1967

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, the Memphis, Tenn., Commercial Appeal for Sunday, June 18, carried on its editorial pages a column by the noted writer Jenkin Lloyd Jones, entitled "Man Chooses Best of His Kind for Slaughter."

The article deftly points out that it is the ablest and the best who have found life to be toughest—not the ungifted, the disorganized, the listless, and lazy.

Members will find the article thought provoking.

The article referred to follows:

Man Chooses Best of His Kind for Slaughter

(By Jenkin Lloyd Jones)

We are in an era when it is fashionable to commiserate with the ungifted, the disorganized, the lazy and others who, for a variety of reasons, can't cut the mustard. So perhaps it is well to remind ourselves that the world has been tough on the able, too.

To this end we are indebted to an article by Nathaniel Weyl in The Intercollegiate Review in which he explores "aristocide," or the periodic slaughter of the smartest.

He points out the vast difference between natural aristocracies composed of people of intrinsic worth from either side of the tracks and prescriptive aristocracies based on hereditary position. These latter have a way of running out of gas before they run out of ermine, as witness the Hapsburgs and the Bourbons.

Aristocide is as old as history. It was the common result when a primitive people overran an advanced people, and there was a measure of self-preservation in it. The brutish conquerors butchered the leading citizens, knowing well that these harbored the seeds of rebellion and would make restive serfs.

The Mongol conquests did the job so well that the creative capacity of the Middle East was destroyed for generations.

In ancient and medieval times, ambitious and energetic people tended to flock into cities. Conquerors didn't bother much with chasing fleeing herdsmen into the woods. But they put the cities to the sword. Plagues hit the cities hardest.

Only the Romans were smart enough to treat their brilliant slaves well and sit at their feet as pupils. Tamerlane and Genghis Khan knocked off all the teachers and philosophers they could find.

The Russian Communists encouraged technicians and scientists, but they looked with great suspicion on artists, poets and other independent minds. Even the old Bolshevik "intellectuals" were pretty well eliminated in the various purges, and the Russian arts, which had flourished in the climate of the Czars, have suffered badly.

In hustling the Jews to his gas chambers, Hitler killed off a creative minority that had stood at the forefront of German medicine, philosophy and science for generations.

No one has a close estimate of the number of Chinese aristocrats and "exploiters" whom Mao butchered after the Red takeover—the most quoted figure is 20 million. If true, he must have bagged a good proportion of those Chinese smart enough to take a pinch of salt with the words of Mao.

The level of national ability takes a licking in modern war. The slack jaws and dim bulbs stay at home to breed while the boys who can pass the exams suit up. Often, the higher one's aptitude, the more dangerous the combat job. Half the RAF came from the best schools of England. No wonder what was left sat around bawling for free toupees and cradle-to-grave security.

Even without war or massacres or plague there can be progressive deterioration. The welfare state is designed to remove the privations which have been the penalty of incompetence, but it cannot remove the taxes necessary for subsidy. Thus, two classes of people can have all the children they wish—the rich who can afford them and the poor who can call on public aid to support them.

But the vigorous, rising middle class, which provides most of the reservoir of national talent, is inclined to limit births in order to provide educational advantages for its children. This tendency will increase as the tax burden grows. The future of the national IQ in those nations which oversubsidize low competence and overpenalize high competence is cloudy.

If man had not spent 200 generations selectively slaughtering and discouraging his ablest representatives, perhaps there would be by now no audience for bullfights, no screaming crowds trying to catch sight of The Animals or yoicking off after Twiggy.

The War on Poverty Must Go On

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1967

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the New York Post expresses precisely my view on the necessity for renewing our commitment to the Office of Economic Opportunity as the principal coordinating agency in the war on poverty. The editorial follows:

THE HOMEFRONT WAR

As alarming new communiques pour in from the ghetto battlefronts in Tampa, Cincinnati and Los Angeles, the House Education and Labor Committee resumes hearings tomorrow on the Administration's poverty war—specifically, on the $2,000,000,000 program for 1968.

Republican strategy at this stage is to abolish the Office of Economic Opportunity and to scatter about $1,700,000,000, among federal agencies.

If there is one thing the poverty campaign does not need, it is further fragmentation of top authority and administration. We urge New York's Congressional delegation to bear that in mind. On the outcome of this GOP-Administration battle may hinge the outcome of the poverty war.

Flag Desecration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1967

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include last week's public service television and radio newscast, "The Kee Report." The subject discussed is desecration of our flag.

The report follows:

This is Jim Kee, bringing you the Kee Report.

Recently, there was an outdoor meeting in New York sponsored by those citizens who oppose American participation in the Vietnamese war. There was nothing illegal about this meeting because the right of dissent is as old as the Constitution itself. Even in time of war, the citizen has a right to express his views—provided he is not guilty of giving aid and comfort to the enemies of our country.

But suppose we take a closer look at what happened at that New York meeting. This gathering went far beyond the mere expression of protest. What happened there will shock every American who has pride in his country and his flag. The speakers at this anti-war meeting denounced, in the strongest terms, the President of the United States and the Secretary of State. They denounced the policy of our Government in the most violent and offensive terms they could think of. And then they went beyond the mere expression of opinion.

A few young men were invited to burn their draft cards publicly, which they did. As a final act to this shabby drama, the flag of the United States was burned to the jeers of thousands of onlookers.

The newspapers reported that on the day this sorry event took place, several American lads were killed defending this same flag in the far-off jungles of Asia. Yet these flag burners escaped bodily harm at the hands of indignant citizens because under the American system, even flagrant wrong-doers are protected against mob action.

This incident in New York revealed a glaring weakness in our legal system. There is no Federal law against desecrating or defiling the flag of the United States. The punishment for that offense is left to the individual states. Unfortunately, the punishment in most states is inadequate and too often, there is no prosecution at all. The reason is that the practice of flag burning is of very recent origin.

To fill this gap, I introduced legislation during the 89th Congress and in this Congress, the 90th Congress, which, it is my earnest hope, will be enacted into law at this Session of Congress. I am pleased to report that the appropriate committee granted me an opportunity to testify in behalf of this proposed legislation. This proposed law says this:

"Whoever publicly mutilates, defaces, defiles, tramples upon, or casts contempt, either by word or act, upon any flag, standard, colors, or ensign of the United States shall be punished by imprisonment of not more than five years and a fine of not more than $10,000."

The foregoing statute is necessary because the flag does not belong to any individual state. To millions of our citizens, our flag is the sacred emblem of our political rights. In this century alone, millions of young Americans have fought under our flag at the four corners of the globe. Since the United States became a nation, nearly one million young Americans have died in wartime to keep our flag floating in the skies.

The motive of the flag burners, of course, is to outrage the patriotic feelings of their fellow Americans. Too often, in the past, they have been able to get away unpunished or by the payment of a small fine. But the threat of five years in prison should be enough to discourage the flag burners.

Thank you for listening.

Indiana Veterans of Foreign Wars Speak Out on Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1967

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the Indianapolis, Ind., News of June 19, 1967, is certainly correct. The Indiana Veterans of Foreign Wars are much more representative of what Americans think than the noisy, unwashed minority that seems to get all the headlines.

THE VETERANS SPEAK

The Indiana Veterans of Foreign Wars, in calling for military victory in Vietnam, has given what we believe to be the authentic American answer to peacenik agitation against the war.

The VFW consists of men of varied backgrounds and differing political views whose common experience is that they have fought in the foreign wars of this century to keep sworn enemies away from America's gates.

They came to Indianapolis on the weekend from the cities, the small towns, and the byways of Indiana to elect officers and formulate a position on issues confronting the nation. Consequently, when they speak they should be considered more representative of American thinking, and more deserving of a hearing, than the minority of campus radicals that holds public attention with its noisy antics.

The assembled veterans don't like war any more than the peace marchers do. They want it ended in victory—a victory that will do honor to the Americans who have already given their lives and that will deter the enemy from new adventures.

Their resolution calls for "whatever action is required to conclude the Vietnam war with victory" and opposes "any kind of truce, ceasefire, standfast, pull-back or coalition government that could impair achieving the full victory."

As a measure to speed victory, the veterans urge "immediate establishment of a blockade to prevent the delivery of war-sustaining material to the Communists in Vietnam."

The White House, in considering the next steps in Vietnam, would do well to listen to the veterans. It would be a tragic mistake to dismiss such authentic expressions of American thinking and worry too much about what the peacenik brigade will do.

Graham Rockley Research Academy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. BRASCO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1967

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to your attention the developing activities of Dr. Graham Rockley, of Long Island, N.Y., and the Graham Rockley Research Academy. He has developed a concept and seminar instruction in the area of human relationship called power communication. It involves a time and motion study of the personality with far-reaching effects. The broad perspective of the program is a social one, but it has significant effects in business and professional development. His concept of communication reaches below the surface of the ordinary and fills a definite gap in personnel training and it helps people to like people.

The fundamental theme of power communication is the need to appreciate and understand the other's viewpoint as a basis for more effectively projecting your own. The process for appreciating the other viewpoint tends to expand the personality of the individual concerned and therefore increases their susceptability to a greater association with people. This has the effect of automatically increasing social contacts by making each contact that much more effective. Of course, in the business world it will have the same effect; consideration of the individual will move into consideration of the group. And then more effective communication with the group will result in an expanded group, and so business develops in a somewhat indirect, yet solid fashion. Peoples lives are changed; when they appreciate the other's viewpoint, they make several changes in their own.

The whole program of power communication has the subtle and powerful effect of making people react differently to situations and environment. They become more willing to be honest in their self-scrutiny, and in this way improve every aspect of their life; at home, in in the office, and in social contacts. It teaches how to reach more people and reach them more effectively, and develops consistently high levels of enthusiasm and precipitates conditions for greater rewards. In the business world money is recognized as the byproduct of service but service is understood with a communication foundation, so that people are not superficially satisfied but internally happy. As a result, consumer associations are more lasting and the development of further associations with the particular business or individual is encouraged. It also has a place in the development of charitable activities. People will become more increasingly conscious of others' needs and will recognize a value to themselves in the support of others.

Principles have an application in all phases of our society—business, professional—from the highest to the lowest level. They have the effect of greatly increasing the overall efficiency of any group, no matter what its size. The Rockley program is attracting the attention of educators and newspapers in various sections of the country. There is a fundamental simplicity in the program, and yet outstanding results follow from an application of the personal communication principles. Already, there has been much evidence of many changes in family perspectives, and business and professional activities have not only made more profit, but have gained increased pleasure from the process.

Dr. Rockley is a native of New Zealand and came to this country specifically to further the ideas established in his native country. He has taught seminars in many States and has seen much evidence of considerable progress where his principles are being followed. He is very anxious to make a significant contribution to the national welfare, not only through the seminars he teaches, but with the dissemination of the principles of stronger, broader and deeper personal communication. Educators need it and students profit from it. It involves the development of doctor/patient, business/client rapport and the understanding of the psychological and physiological principles that are identified with the customer/patient/client betterment. Practical application of these techniques will be helpful to persons in every activity that deals with people.

Coming from another country, he feels that he can look more objectively at the personal communication problems we have, and hopes that in some small way, he can contribute to the public good.

Mobile: A Showplace of Growth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK EDWARDS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1967

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the port city of Mobile in Alabama is becoming a showplace of growth for the Nation.

The area has attracted $275 million in new and expanded industry just in the past 3 years.

This story has been told recently in an article appearing in the Journal of Commerce of June 19. I insert the text of the article at this point in my remarks:

MAJOR INDUSTRIES LOCATE IN BOOMING MOBILE AREA

(By Sheldon Morgan)

Mobile, Alabama's seaport gateway is a city of 408,000 in the metropolitan area. This growing port city serves the Southwestern region of the state, a region that is growing rapidly industrially, having accounted for a third of the state's industrial growth in 1963 and has continued to share in the sizeable capital expansion of industry in the state's economy.

Major industries located in the area include shipbuilding, cement, manufacturing of wood, pulp and paper products, steel fabricating, foundries, alumina, rayon fibers, naval stores, oil refining, clothing manufacturing, furniture manufacturing, pulps, batteries, paints, and chemicals.

A vast transportation network links the ocean carriers to the heartland of the nation through four major railroads, 100 steamship lines, 39 trucks lines, and an extensive river and canal system. The State of Alabama owns and operates a modern ocean terminal in Mobile which accommodates 30 vessels.

PHENOMENAL GROWTH

The surging Mobile area has attracted a phenomenal $275 million in new and expanded industry in the past three years.

Leading the list was the huge $55 million expansion at Scott Paper Co., completed in 1966. At the same time, International Paper is currently building a new corrugated box plant plus modernizing its huge Mobile mill. Geigy Chemical recently completed three new plants in its nearby complex.

Courtaulds, located in the northern part of the county, has added 50 per cent to its rayon capacity and completed a new Nylon-6 plant. Stauffer's, next door neighbor to Courtaulds, is now completing a carbon-tet plant alongside its new caustic chlorine facility and has begun construction of a new agricultural organic chemical plant.

EXPANSION PROGRAM

Union Carbide, a new industry for Mobile with a completely new product—molecular sieves—went into production here in May, 1965. Soon after that date the plant started on expansion program.

During mid-1966, Continental Motors Corp. of Detroit, Michigan leased one million square feet in the Brookley Air Force Base industrial complex for civilian use to remanufacture aircraft and motor vehicular engines.

The 3,000 acre industrial park at Theodore is under development by the Alabama State Docks and the Industrial Board of the City of Mobile. The first plant to be located there is McWane Cast Iron Pipe Co., iron ore reduction facilities. A $200 million industrialized complex is forecast in this area.

Other blue-chip industries have improved their plants in this area: Alcoa, National Gypsum, Ruberoid, Olin Mathieson, Kaiser Aluminum & Chemical Corp., and Ideal Cement.

In the wake of this growth among large industries here has followed an increase in small industry and distribution facilities. Much growth has been registered in poultry processing facilities, metal fabrication, textiles, seafood processing, manufacture of plastics, and distribution of soft goods.

To undergird this rapidly growing industrial complex, the community has stepped up programs to develop its highways and educational facilities.

The Mobile Area Chamber of Commerce initiated the establishment of the state's first public institution of higher learning in 70 years, the University of South Alabama. This school opened its doors to almost 1,000 students two years ago. And all indications point to a student body of more than 5,000 by 1970.

To complement the university, a move is under way to develop a medical center here.

NEW POST OFFICE

On the north side and near the International Trade Center which in itself contributed greatly to the re-vitalization of downtown, is a new $5 million post office covering a block and a half.

Nearby in place of the old post office two blocks away will rise a new Federal Building costing approximately $8 million.

In regard to highway development, a $118 million program is under construction, principally on Interstate 65 and I–10 which juncture in the middle of the county.

Much credit for the continually rising economy of the area must go to Task Force 200, industrial development arm of the Mobile Area Chamber, which was established in 1964 with a five-year goal of $200 million in new and expanded industry.

Operating on an annual budget of about $70,000 and headed by General W. K. Wilson, Jr., Task Force 200 is meeting every challenge.

According to Mr. Wilson, "Prospects appear large enough to more than surpass our five-year goal."

Railway Labor Dispute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1967

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, what is happening today in our Nation with regard to the impending rail strike can only be referred to by historians as "An American Tragedy." We may all be writing the beginning of the last chapter of free collective bargaining in the United States—a chapter which no one wants to write but to which everyone has contributed by this abdication, individually and collectively, of the responsibility which each participant has in this tragedy. I know not where the greatest guilt lies, but it must be shared by management and labor, the executive and the legislative branches of Government and the American people at large.

Responsibility must be shared by both railroad management and railroad labor, not only for their failure to bargain effectively but for their failure to give up any of their intransigence in order to salvage free collective bargaining, or even to salvage some voluntary kind of binding arbitration.

The union leaders are trapped in economic and political circumstances. They claim skilled railway labor frequently is paid less than the high rates being earned by labor with similar skill titles in other national industries. But these rail union leaders for years have encouraged compression of wage rates by winning across-the-board increases of so many cents an hour for all workers, whether skilled or unskilled. The leaders now find themselves obliged by restlessness within the ranks of skilled rail union labor to reverse their field and go into negotiations asking for wage differential increases that seek for the skilled higher increases in wages than for the unskilled. Otherwise, their own leadership or the solidarity of their union membership may be threatened.

But the unions are intransigent in their resistance to management insistence that a complete evaluation of industry skills must be made to determine which railroad workers should be paid for real skills and which for skills more honored in the title than in the responsibility. This is not a new problem for railway labor leaders, who hold their jobs at the pleasure of the union members who covet the security of their individual jobs. They have fought for years against the elimination of jobs which management claims have been made obsolete by modernization of equipment and methods. Job evaluation raises the question of "featherbedding"—a word which raises blood pressure and reduces reason in minds that are public-oriented as well as those oriented to management or labor.

And on their side, too, the rail industry management has been intransigent by insisting upon nationwide collective bargaining that attempts to hold down on wage increases and get evaluation of job skills. After all, in this highly regulated privately-owned industry, cannot the management obtain relief on rates and services from Uncle Sam's Interstate Commerce Commission so as to virtually assure a reasonable profit margin wherever wage rates wind up?

Such an oversimplification is given the lie by the fact that a number of railroads face serious operating difficulties under present circumstances. And a substantial portion of those difficulties come from competitive means of transportation—many of which are also federally regulated. Higher rates or reduced services, as a result of higher wages without resulting operational efficiencies, might price the railroads further out of the competitive market. With reduced services and high costs, the passenger market has already flown—or motored—away along with a part of the U.S. mails. To be uncompetitive in freight hauling might further degenerate the rail system of our Nation.

And it is precisely because it is a system made up of many lines that the small and large, the weak and strong, have joined together to bargain with the unions which are also nationwide. A strike against a small line, even one that is not an integral part of a through system, could permanently lose customers to competitive means, just as a nationwide strike might lose customers to competitive haulers or to the economic havoc that a protracted nationwide strike could create.

So both parties to the collective bargaining process have contributed their share of intransigence to this "American Tragedy." But it is the American people who will suffer the most should there be a rail strike, and their elected leaders must assume their responsibility for this impending tragedy.

The prospective failure of collective bargaining to function in this case has been apparent since the first of this year; but it was predictable long before that. Our President did predict it and called national attention to the fact in his state of the Union message of 1966—that something must be done about strikes which would be damaging to the national economy or the national interest.

And make no mistake, the railroads are not the only industry which has such an impact. A national truck strike, a national dockworkers' strike, a national communications strike, a national coal strike, a national steel strike, a national auto workers' strike and many more, could have such a deleterious effect on the national economy that the national interest and economy might be adversely affected to an extent that those who feel personal responsibility for maintaining the Nation's economic health might feel obliged to act.

So, what has happened and will happen in connection with this rail strike has a direct bearing on all labor negotiations in our Nation, make no mistake.

But legislation to deal with nationwide strikes apparently is not easy to write without endangering votes. And so, no proposal of a substantive nature to prevent the kind of crisis in which we now find ourselves has ever been presented by President Johnson or any spokesman for his administration or his political party. The leadership responsibility incumbent upon the officeholder best equipped by the array of advisers available to him has not been exercised. Either in the naive hope that the problem would not have to be faced, or in the sincere hope that it would encourage the exercise of responsibility by labor and management at an early stage of the crisis, the President has apparently preferred to deal with one crisis after another, rather than to seek a permanent legislative means to avoid the crisis. The Republican leadership in Congress reminded him of this deriliction in its 1967 state of the Union message when they sought a balanced commission of experts to make recommendations on national emergency strike legislation.

The only real proposal the President has come up with has been House Joint Resolution 559 which his spokesmen have dubbed "mediation to finality" to meet the instant strike threat and defer it until safely after the 1968 presidential election. But "mediation to finality" is only a credibility gap for compulsory arbitration. And it is only supposed to be applicable to this one dispute—in spite of the fact that it could become a backdoor method of getting Congress to share the blame for setting a precedent that will become binding as the years go by.

In spite of that obvious danger and the personal repugnance of what is clearly compulsory arbitration in this case—no matter how temporary it would hopefully be—many Members, including myself, have been willing to support the President's proposal based on the clear and desparate statements from his administration concerning the national emergency crisis our Nation would face were there to be a rail strike at this time.

Within the last hours of the consideration of this legislation, the administration has even had the temerity to have various Cabinet officers call Members of Congress to advise them of the desirability of resolving this crisis temporarily, according to the President's suggestion. But, sadly, the urging has not always been with reference to the national interest. Occasionally, it has been with reference to the political interest of the individual Member of Congress because of the economic dangers to his particular District.

The responsibility of the Chief Executive, it seems to me, should not be merely to resolve the day-to-day crises of his own administration with reference to his own popularity or the political dominance of his own party. His responsibility should be broader-gauged and larger in view than that. It should be to seek lasting solutions to continuing problems.

If the President has avoided that responsibility, the Congress has abdicated its responsibility in this regard, also. Rather than bemoaning three miserable choices, leadership in the Congress should have been able to undertake consideration of some kind of legislation to provide a method for resolution of this continuing problem.

But this is a political hot potato Democratic Congresses and administrations have steadfastly avoided since the Wagner Act. Only the Taft-Hartley Act, born in a Republican Congress, and the Landrum-Griffin Act, born in a Congress with a slim Democratic majority under a Republican Administration, attempted to deal with our Nation's growing labor problems on a permanent basis. Attempts were made after the passage of both pieces of legislation to establish them as political issues, but both have stood the test of time and changing political winds. Sooner or later we must have the courage to tackle a permanent answer of some kind. While the substitute amendment of Representative Bill Brock, of Tennessee, was properly ruled not to be germane to this immediate emergency measure, the germ of a solution may be found in it which could prevent such emergency legislation. Whether it is found in Mr. Brock's legislation or not, it must be found. Today's congressional politicians seem reluctant to get involved in such touchy problems. But as a result, they find themselves facing sooner or later in this crisis, the impossible political choices of compulsory arbitration, seizure, or a nationwide rail strike.

With the most natural of human tendencies—unwillingness to face up to unpleasant choices—the House of Representatives Thursday did what it has twice before done, put off a decision in the hope that intransigent management and intransigent labor would somehow get together and revive collective bargaining which, if it was ever really alive in this case, died on April 25. I should be happy to be proven wrong, but after listening to weeks of testimony before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, I am convinced that neither side will bargain in this case.

The obvious impossibility of segregating defense materials in our complex economy for handling during a rail strike which would halt everything else, makes a "partial strike" an impossibility. And, on the testimony of administration experts about our defense needs for Vietnam and other possible international commitments, a strike of even brief duration might be unduly damaging to our national interest in the world. It is easy to say that such statements are overdrawn, but this attitude is too risky a doubt to tolerate, in my view.

It is also easy to say, "if the Congress does nothing, there will be no strike"; but such assurances have no shred of evidence to back them and much to argue against them in the hearings before my committee.

Finally, to provide for seizure is to judge the case and penalize only the railroads for their intransigence. It does not even penalize the management much, because they are employees, too. Rather, it penalizes the owners of corporate stock throughout the Nation. It is a solution which presumes that arbitration in this case would be unfair to labor or antilabor and promanagement. No evidence of this has been substantiated. For Congress to feel that arbitration would not be as fair to labor as it is to management in view of the complex problems facing both rail management and labor in this industry is to presume that the case of labor is the only case for consideration. To make such an irresponsible decision in the Congress is as much an abdication of responsibility as to make no decision at all.

But if there has been an abdication of congressional responsibility, there has also been an abdication of public responsibility on the part of the average citizen. Few letters will come in from the Main Street merchants on this strike until after the strike has begun and the goods for their stores fail to arrive. Few objections from the locals of the unions of other industries will be heard until after a record vote has been cast for compulsory arbitration. And few objections from management leaders of other industries will be heard until after the record vote for seizure is cast and they decide that if the U.S. Government can seize the rail industry it can seize their businesses, too, in the name of national interest.

And so, a portion of the abdication of responsibility must be borne also in this situation by the average American citizen and the public information media. The latter has sent more of its membership to Europe with the late President's widow on her vacation that were found in the Gallery at the moment the House voted on House Joint Resolution 559.

A brief strike could so clog the flow of needed supplies to Vietnam that some Americans will die there as a result of the accumulated irresponsibility of railroad labor, railroad management, the administration, the Congress and the people of this country.

If future historians write of the decay of the free American system, they will certainly not leave out a footnote about this crisis. If they write about the maintenance of free collective bargaining in America through this time of the growing complexity of the national economy, they can only do so if someone finds a permanent solution to such crises as this.

Labor, management, the administration, the Congress, and the American people must seek a solution, or this crisis will indeed have been an "American Tragedy."

Partridge School for Mentally Retarded Children Awards Posthumous Citation to John E. Fogarty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1967

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following statement concerning posthumous award to late John E. Fogarty by the George Everett Partridge Memorial Foundation:

Mr. Chairman, our former colleague, the late John E. Fogarty of the 2nd District of Rhode Island who served in this body for 27 years before his death from a heart attack on January 10 of this year, received many awards, honorary degrees and citations for his dedicated and effective efforts to improve the health of people of this Nation and in particular those who suffered from mental handicaps. All of you are familiar with these accomplishments and with the fact that he was awarded honorary degrees and citations from many of the great institutions of higher education, organizations and foundations.

Last month, on May 27, a citation was given posthumously to Congressman Fogarty by the Partridge School and Rehabilitation Center located at Gainesville, Virginia, a relatively small (about 80 pupils in residence), nonprofit residential center for brain damaged children. This citation was different from many of the others Mr. Fogarty had received. It was given by a grateful group of parents and sponsors who are beginning to realize what might be called the indirect benefits of research and demonstration in the rehabilitation and training of the retarded. The school has not received large Federal grants for research, construction or operation. It has not in the past received any Federal grants for its operation or provision of facilities. Its staff members have found out that, with patience, skill and hard work, the retarded can be trained to be dependable, effective employees. They now are finding also that with companies willing to hire the retarded they can and do become useful and productive members of their communities. These are concepts which Mr. Fogarty tried so hard to get generally accepted. The citation was accepted by Mary Fogarty, a college student in Washington, D.C., on behalf of her Father. B. Alden Lillywhite, Assistant Commissioner of the U.S. Office of Education and a parent of a child attending the school, made the following statements in presenting the citation:

Few men have done so much for so many of the less fortunate as Mr. Fogarty. His dedicated efforts have given hope, self respect, dignity through accomplishment, yes, and even life itself, to thousands of sick, handicapped and disadvantaged people. His efforts have helped to rescue from what we once thought of as our human "scrap-pile," thousands of people who are now living satisfying lives as productive members of their community.

Mary Fogarty, we are pleased that you could be with us to receive this citation in honor of your Father. We of the Partridge School do not compare with the great institutions or organizations that have honored your Father. Rather, we are a small organization of those people who have felt the bewildering impact of the mental afflications he tried so hard to alleviate. What we lack in size and influence we make up in appreciation and gratitude. We hope that it will be an inspiration to you, in whatever you undertake to do, as your Father was to all of us who are working to help handicapped children.

In her brief response Miss Fogarty said she was sure her Father would have appreciated receiving the citation because the school was doing what he had worked so hard to make a reality: providing education and training for the mentally retarded.

The citation follows:

The George Everett Partridge Memorial Foundation is proud to confer its Eighth Annual Citation on the late John E. Fogarty, Congressman from the Second District of Rhode Island, who died on January 10, 1967. For more than three decades, John Fogarty was a powerful force in mobilizing the support of the American public to search for the causes and cures of crippling and killing diseases and handicaps and in bringing to reality intelligently formulated programs to help the physically or mentally disabled. Due in a large measure to his inspired leadership as chairman of a subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations, increasing amounts of Federal financial assistance were made available to help the young, the aged and the disadvantaged, as well as to teach the handicapped, train the retarded and improve the overall health of the Nation.

The Partridge Schools have a special interest in those public and private programs designed to determine the causes of and ways of preventing mental illnesses and for the training and care of the mentally retarded which John Fogarty so ably helped to create and implement.

This citation is an expression of the grateful appreciation of our entire membership for the vision, the dedication and the force of greatness with which Congressman Fogarty was endowed and which he used in full to aid the less fortunate. His efforts helped to remove some of the bleakness from the lives of the handicapped and put within the reach of many of them some measure of independence and self-fulfillment which they would not have had without this great, devoted and dedicated man.

On the same occasion, the Partridge School presented an Employer of the Year citation to the Marriott Hot Shoppes, Inc., "in grateful recognition of their policy of employing the handicapped." This citation was presented by James Garrett, Assistant Commissioner of Vocational Rehabilitation, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. This award was, in a sense, a confirmation of Mr. Fogarty's conviction that the retarded could become productive, contributing and sometimes self-supporting members of their communities if given the proper training and the opportunity to work. It also was a testimonial to the value and effectiveness of program of vocational training which Mr. Fogarty helped to establish and strongly supported.

Mr. Foster M. Kunz, Vice President of Hot Shoppes, in accepting the citation on behalf of Hot Shoppes, stated as follows after thanking the Foundation for the honor:

We of Marriott Hot Shoppes accept with pride and gratitude the honor which you have given us this day.

We are deeply grateful for the recognition you are giving us, but we are even more grateful for the services we are receiving from the young men and women from your school and other groups sponsored by the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

It is not easy to find employees today who are interested in their work, who are on the job every day and who apply themselves diligently to some of the lesser, yet essential, tasks required in our business.

We now have working for us in the Washington area, 17 mentally handicapped young people, under the sponsorship of the Department of Vocational Rehabilitation—and we would be glad to have many more. In fact, I was told a few days ago that we could place several times this many.

You will be glad to know, as we have been, that our managers are *very* well pleased with the work being done by the students from this school. In fact, it is a *delight* to hear management speak so warmly of these young people.

Mr. Chairman, in concluding my remarks I want to say that the success the Partridge School is having in training retarded children for useful employment is not only a tribute to the vision of this Congress in making available vocational and job training for the retarded, it also demonstrates clearly the need for broadening and strengthening Federal programs for assisting the States in providing more comprehensive and essential service for the retarded. The Partridge School is an example of the effective work that can be done. Because of its limited resources, it reaches less than 100 such children a year. It demonstrates how far we still have to go. If this Nation had in effect programs that reached all the retarded, it would add materially to our manpower assets, greatly improve the sometimes bleak lives of those that are handicapped and help mitigate and alleviate the hardships and anxieties of the families who have this problem.

Down With Draft Reform

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1967

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the House failed to pass a fair and equitable draft law. The legislation adopted did not utilize the studies and recommendations of the panels and commissions which have recently examined our Selective Service System. A great injustice has been done to the 10 million American men who will reach draft age during the next 4 years.

I hope that the discussion and debate that have surrounded the Selective Service System for the past 2 years will not die. The inequities in the draft must be corrected.

The New York Times and Minneapolis Star have run excellent editorials on the draft bill. I place them in the Record at this time:

[From the New York Times, June 21, 1967]

Backward Step on the Draft

The draft bill that Congress has now sent to the President is a small but regrettable victory for Representative Rivers of South Carolina and the know-nothing sentiment prevailing in the House Armed Services Committee.

With the recommendations of the Presidential study commission headed by former Assistant Attorney General Burke Marshall available as a guide, Congress this year had an opportunity greatly to improve the Selective Service System. Instead, after only the briefest consideration on the floor it inserted language into the law intended to put the President on the spot, to block proposed reforms and to indulge itself in various mean whims.

The bill makes college undergraduate deferments mandatory unless the President formally declares that the needs of the armed forces require the drafting of college students. It also requires the President to obtain specific approval of Congress if he wishes to introduce any random selection plan for choosing inductees. Yet more nineteen-year-olds are coming of age each year than the armed forces require, and there is no equitable method for choosing which of them will serve.

At the insistence of the House Armed Services Committee the bill denies draft-exempt status to doctors who serve the Peace Corps overseas and who process the huge backlog of new drug applications for the Food and Drug Administration. The vindictive provision has more to do with Congressional dislike of these two agencies than solicitude for the care of military men in Vietnam. The same is true of the new restrictive language introduced in the section governing conscientious objectors.

By administrative dexterity, President Johnson may lessen the harmful effects of some of the rigid new provisions. But nothing can undo the pettiness of Congress in yielding to the ugly spirit of some of its least enlightened members.

[From the Minneapolis Star, June 19, 1967]

Down With Draft Reform!

The 1967 revision of the draft law now looks like disaster. The ambitious reform effort this year—based on the indictment of the Selective Service system laid out in the report of the commisison headed by Burke Marshall—has been completely frustrated by the old men who run the Armed Services Committees of Congress. Sen. Edward Kennedy may well be right that the new act, now all but adopted, will be worse than what we have had so far.

The trouble is that nobody . . . nobody who *counts* . . . really cares very much about the inequities in the draft. Selective Service Director Gen. Lewis B. Hershey does not even admit a problem with the way he has been doing things since 1940. The Armed Services Committees listen mainly to Gen. Hershey. And the Defense Department itself is interested really in the manpower, not in the method by which it is procured.

The Marshall commission saw the problems, and cared. But now its recommendations have been overridden, and the President specifically forbidden to institute a new, and fairer, method of deciding the crucial question: Who goes?

This is critical, because the military services appear to have succeeded in their effort to get the draft changed around so that the younger, rather than the older, men will be called first.

Under the "oldest first" arrangement the choice was almost made automatically for the local boards. Deferments, exemptions, marriages, fatherhood all drained away large parts of the pool of draft-eligible men: Those that remained, at age 26, were the ones that went.

Now men are to be called at age 19 . . before many of them have begun their education, career or family, and when the manpower pool therefore holds far more available men than the services require. How local draft boards will decide "who goes?" in this situation—and do it equitably—is beyond understanding.

Desecration of the Flag

SPEECH

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1967

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 10480) to prohibit desecration of the flag, and for other purposes.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Chairman, this bill would prohibit the desecration of the American flag.

It provides that anyone who casts contempt upon the national emblem by publicly mutilating, defacing, defiling, burning, or trampling upon the flag shall be punished for such contemptuous acts.

There is in this bill no restriction of the right of free speech or lawful protest, no intent to deny to any person any of the rights guaranteed by the first amendment to the Constitution.

The bill would not deprive any State of its present jurisdiction over any offense against the flag which is now State law. It provides for concurrent jurisdiction by the several States and the Federal Government over offenses against the flag of our country.

I do not wish to speculate upon the motives of those who practice contemptuous actions against the flag, whatever form or shape that irreverent, most reprehensible conduct may take.

To me, the right and duty of Congress to enact this law is elementary and fully justified by the Constitution. In fact, we would be unresponsive to the will and demand of our respective constituencies and the American people, if we fail to pass this law.

The Nation is facing serious problems at home and abroad that require the unity, loyalty, and unquestioned allegiance of all Americans, regardless of race, class, or creed.

This is a time when, above all, we must support, sustain and uphold the national purpose, security, safety and freedom.

We cannot stand by idly while violence, civil strife, disorder, and disloyalty threaten the Nation, and cast contempt and hatred upon the symbol of our liberties.

The passage of this bill is necessary and well justified, and I hope the House will enact it by an overwhelming vote.

Watertown, Mass., High School Commencement Address by John J. Carver

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1967

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the following address which was recently delivered at the commencement exercises at Watertown High School, Watertown, Mass., has been brought to my attention.

The speaker on this occasion was my close personal friend, John J. Carver, general public affairs manager of the New England Telephone & Telegraph Co. To my mind, this exceptional gentleman personifies the finest qualities of the American civic tradition.

A vigorous athlete in his youth, John Carver, during his entire adult life, has involved himself in constructive community affairs. He formerly served on the Cambridge City Council and School Committee and upon moving to Watertown, Mass., became a member of that school committee.

An intimate of our late, beloved President, John F. Kennedy, Mr. Carver was chairman, personally appointed by the late President, to explain the significance of his proposed medicare legislation to the people of Massachusetts.

At this time I insert John Carver's address in the RECORD:

Dr. Kelley, Reverend Clergy, Graduates of the Class of 1967 of Watertown High School, Ladies and Gentlemen.

I am certain that both graduates and parents will want me to pay tribute to the teaching force of this school. Doctor Kelley has moulded a teaching force that has met the challenge of a changing world. Under his leadership this school has kept pace with new developments in education and today stands as a monument to his vision, foresight and wisdom. To you, Dr. Kelley, I extend thanks and appreciation for what you and your teaching force have accomplished.

To you graduates, may I say that you are included among the 3,000,000 students receiving high school diplomas this month. You, like the others, are possibly puzzled and bewildered by the state of the world, since it seemingly contradicts practically everything you have been taught. But before mental depression overwhelms you, reflect for a moment on your history lessons.

There have been many black days in the past. History is replete with armed violence, injustice, bigotry and fanatic ambition. Yet these things have all passed and they will pass again. No day was blacker than that day at Calvary, or when Cromwell crushed Ireland, Napoleon pillaged Europe, Joan of Arc burned at the stake, Lincoln assassinated, Pasteur repudiated by men of science, priests and nuns killed in Mexico, Jews slaughtered in Germany and Austria, and Poland laid in ruins. Then, more recently, we have had Pearl Harbor, The Korean Conflict, The Berlin Wall and the Assassination of President Kennedy.

In other words, for every light day in history there has been a black day. For every hero there has been a tyrant, for every martyr there has been a Judas, for every Easter there has been a Good Friday, for every act of generosity there has been an act of insatiable selfishness. It is in this fashion that nature seems to achieve balance.

Apparently we learn only from black days, for following tragedy and ruthlessness, world opinion suddenly recognizes the fundamental truths incorporated in the Ten Commandments.

What I am attempting to tell you is not the maudlin musings of a male Pollyanna. Read your history. The places, the characters may be different, but the results are always the same.

Now the world is shocked by the uprisings in Africa, the Berlin Wall, riots in Central America, the Castro takeover in Cuba, Civil Rights violence in America, the Vietnam Conflict and China's desire to dominate Asia. Look again at your histories!

Instead of Hitler the name might well be Attila or Caesar, or Napoleon, or Alexander or Castro or Mao. But, remember that history has numerous examples of might triumphing over right, but right usually wins the last battle.

At a time like this you graduates are probably saying "So this is civilization". The answer is that it is one of the trials of civilization. Civilization triumphs in the long run, but its chief trial has been unpredictable human beings and Hitler, Stalin and Khrushchev, Mao, Castro and their band of international gangsters are very good examples of what I mean.

A generation ago, "Fifth Column" was a popular catch phrase. A more personal application may be made of this phrase even today. You might identify the "Fifth Column" in your own character for oftentimes success is sabotaged from within. Selfishness is a Fifth Column that has destroyed many who had everything else. Lying, bigotry, cheating, tactlessness, impatience—locate your own Fifth Column and destroy it before it destroys your own fortifications.

You have also been reading of powerful secret weapons! In life you will learn that there are no secret weapons to achieve success. Hard work generally is a secret weapon because it is a secret to most people.

Many of you will matriculate to four-year degree granting colleges to prepare yourselves for positions of responsibility. I congratulate you on your acceptance by these colleges which are so demanding of academic excellence.

Most of you, however, will not attend a degree-granting college. However, the future is extremely bright for you if you will take the opportunity to attend one of the many excellent schools that train you to specialize in an occupation. This can be done on a full-time basis, or, on a part-time basis in conjunction with your new job. The business and industrial world is in desperate need of specialists and is willing to pay them, in many cases, on an equal basis with college graduates. I urge you to consider seriously the importance of being outstanding in whatever job you select.

Bear in mind, however, that the diploma you are to receive tonight is not a season pass to success. It certifies that your studies have taught you to think and how to measure values. Your success depends on your ability to apply those two things. Don't be outflanked by the new ideas and sudden changes. Tactics have changed but you will still find that the world is a place where there is room on the top for those with the dogged determination to get there.

Just this week President Johnson sent a letter of congratulations to all high school graduates. In closing I quote his felicitations by stating "You have my every wish for a lifetime of success and achievement."

Do We Realize We Are at War?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1967

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, a recent editorial in the Jacksonville Journal-Courier, I feel, merits thought and attention by all Americans as they take stock of the blessings they enjoy, while a war is being waged. The text of the editorial follows:

DO WE REALIZE WE ARE AT WAR?

The average citizen today goes about his business as usual. He has a good supply of money. He spends it. In the store he finds everything he wants, provided he has the credit cards, charge account and or money to pay for it. He enjoys TV, a new automobile every year or so. He is the beneficiary of a wide assortment of clothes. The supermarkets are heavily stocked with all sorts of foods.

Downtown the people hustle with a bustle. The suburban shopping centers are busy. There is no rationing. Sugar is plentiful.

Auto tires manufacturers are begging people to buy whole sets of tires with no money down.

We are frankly having a ball.

Little do most of the people today realize we are at war. We pause occasionally to read about it or listen to bulletins on the radio and we exclaim how awful it is.

Ask the average man on the street how many of our young men have been killed in Vietnam and he doesn't have any idea. Tell him that more than 10,000 boys have died and he looks puzzled, shocked.

Perhaps never before in our history have we taken such a nonchalant viewpoint of a war. There are no parades, no shortages, no rationing, no flags flying, no war bond campaigns.

And yet we are at war.

It takes a visit to the airport of a large major city to fully realize that we are fighting a major war. Just stand at a loading area and one can see sailors, marines, soldiers, and airmen, waiting patiently to get on planes for a visit home, probably the last one before heading overesas. We give it little thought; we are perhaps too busy.

The airport lobbies are full of these servicemen and frequently one sees one go by with a limp, or a crutch under his arm, maybe one less an arm or a leg, and then one begins to realize what had never been fully realized—unless there's a son over there.

To see these hordes of servicemen at airports is sufficient to jar one's insides a bit, and it takes a while to recover, as one leaves the airport and heads back into town where people are going about their everyday ways, seemingly unaware that thousands of miles away American boys are being shot at and killed.

Negro From Helena Hailed as Hero of Riot in Tampa Last Sunday Night

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1967

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, cities throughout the Nation have been torn by riots, disturbances, and looting. Daily the newspapers of the country print headlined stories of these atrocities. The radio and television commentators speak of the unrest and the animosities.

But, Mr. Speaker, too often the public does not learn that throughout this strife there are many who decry such actions on the part of their own people and work to maintain order and good relations.

One such citizen is John Campbell, of Helena, Phillips County, Ark., a constituent of mine, who recently found himself in Tampa, Fla., and in the midst of a riot. The ensuing news article from the Helena, Ark., World of June 18, and the Tampa, Fla., Tribune relates the experience of this young man from Arkansas who was helping in the fruit harvest. It is heartening to know that there are John Campbells in this Nation who do not believe in mob violence.

I commend these articles to the Members of the House:

NEGRO FROM HELENA HAILED AS HERO OF RIOT IN TAMPA LAST SUNDAY NIGHT

A Negro from Helena was hailed as a hero in the riots that hit Tampa, Florida, last Sunday night. A three-column story on Page 1 in Wednesday's edition of the Tampa Tribune told the story of John Campbell.

Mrs. Walter Carter of Tampa, a former Helena resident, sent the clippings to her sister, Mrs. Jim Walden, and said in a letter that she was a neighbor of the white couple rescued by Campbell from a Negro mob.

Here's the story as it appeared in the Tribune:

(By Eleanor Jordan)

"Tampa's riots had at least one hero.

"John Campbell quietly told his story to The Tribune Monday night from his hospital bed at Tampa General Hospital.

"Campbell was the man in the crowd who prevented further harm to Carl and Joyce DeWitt, the Tampans so badly beaten by the mob late Sunday night. His story coincides with that told earlier by the DeWitts.

"The 19-year-old Negro youth was admitted to the hospital around 2 a.m. Monday with deep lacerations on the right forearm.

" 'I had just left the Black and Tan Bar on Nebraska Avenue when I noticed a lot of people gathered around looking at a fire down the street,' he said.

A native of Helena, Ark., Campbell said he had no idea that a riot was taking place.

" 'I saw a white man and woman drive past me in a station wagon. (This was the DeWitt's car. The couple drove down Nebraska to investigate the fire they saw from Interstate 4 en route home from St. Petersburg.

" 'Some men stopped the car and dragged the man out. Then they started beating on him.' Campbell estimated 20 to 30 men were involved in the incident.

" 'I ran to the car and started yelling for them to stop beating the man but there were just so many of them' he said.

" 'Then I saw a couple of men pull the woman out of the car and push her around.

" I broke between the men and the woman and asked her if she could drive. She said yes and I told her to get in the car and get out of there."

"(Mrs. DeWitt's story of escape told of a man who helped her in the riot.)

"Campbell said he pushed the woman into the car and guarded the door while she started the car motor.

" 'As she drove away the men kept throwing bricks and bottles at the car.'

"(Mrs. DeWitt drove up to a police car in the area and was taken to the hospital where she was joined by her husband minutes later.)

" 'Then I went back to where the man was and told the crowd they had beaten him enough. I helped him to his feet and told him to get out of there,' Campbell said.

" 'I carried him along to the area where I knew the police were and left him because I was scared that they were going to put me in jail.'

"Campbell said throughout the incident the men were calling him 'White folks lover.'

" 'I noticed my arm was bleeding and started asking people to help. A man in a panel truck came by and took me to the hospital.

" 'When I got here (hospital) I saw the white man and woman and knew that they both got out all right. I was sure glad to know that they did not get hurt any worse than they did,' Campbell said.

"The Negro youth has been living in Tampa working for an independent fruit picker.

"Campbell's family was notified of his injuries Monday morning soon after he was admitted to the hospital. He underwent surgery at 4 a.m. to repair damages to his arm and is expected to be discharged within the next few days.

"When asked if he plans to return home in Arkansas he gave a quietly determined 'Yes'."

National Gallery of Art Calendar of Events for July

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1967

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the calendar of events of the National Gallery of Art for July 1967.

As usual, the schedule is an outstanding one and I feel sure that anyone visiting the gallery will enjoy every presentation.

Our Nation's Capital is fortunate to have such a fine Gallery of Art. Visitors to Washington have always enjoyed spending time in the gallery, and I heartily recommend that my colleagues take advantage of the gallery for moments of relaxation in the quiet and inspiring surroundings of the National Gallery.

The calendar follows:

NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART—CALENDAR OF EVENTS, JULY 1967

New exhibition: *Gilbert Stuart (1755-1828), Portraitist of the Young Republic.* Central Gallery. June 29 through August 20.

New publication: Catalogue. *Gilbert Stuart, Portraitist of the Young Republic.* 120 pages, 8½" x 9¾", with foreword by Edgar P. Richardson, 58 illustrations, catalogue notes, and index. $2.00 postpaid.

New reproductions: *Color Collotype Reproductions* (unframed): Dufresne, *Still Life,* 32⅛" x 39½", $16.00; Monet, *The Houses of Parliament, Sunset,* 32" x 36⅜", $20.00; Turner, *Keelmen Heaving in Coals by Moonlight,* 27" x 36", $20.00; Rogier van der Weyden, *Saint George and the Dragon,* 6" x 4⅜", $7.50.

Continuing exhibition: *Ginevra de'Benci* by Leonardo da Vinci. New acquisition. Lobby B.

Recent publications: *Ginevra de'Benci* by Leonardo da Vinci. Booklet illustrated in color and black-and-white, with text by Perry B. Cott. 10¢. Mail orders under $1.00, add 25¢ handling charge.

The Portrait in the Renaissance by John Pope-Hennessy. (Twelfth volume of the A. W. Mellon Lectures in the Fine Arts.) 330 halftone illustrations, 10¼" x 8". $12.50 postpaid.

Daily films: *The American Vision:* Weekdays, 2:00 and 7:00 p.m.; Sundays, 1:00 p.m. *Art in the Western World:* Weekdays, 4:00 p.m. In the auditorium. Each film, in color, runs about one half hour.

Gallery hours: *Summer Hours.* Through September 4: Weekdays 10:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. Sundays 12:00 noon to 10:00 p.m. Admission is free to the Gallery and to all programs scheduled.

Cafeteria: *Summer Hours.* Through September 4: Weekdays, Luncheon 11:00 a.m. to 2:30 p.m.; Snack Service 2:30 p.m. to 5:00 p.m.; Dinner 5:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m. Sundays, Dinner 12:00 noon to 7:30 p.m.

MONDAY, JUNE 26, THROUGH SUNDAY, JULY 2

Painting of the week: Frederic Edwin Church. Morning in the Tropic (Gift of the Avalon Foundation), Gallery 65; Tuesday through Saturday, 12 and 2; Sunday, 3:30 and 6.

Tour of the week: American Painting. Rotunda; Tuesday through Saturday, 1; Sunday 2:30.

Tour: Introduction to the Collection. Rotunda; Monday through Saturday, 11 and 3; Sunday, 5.

Sunday lecture: Gilbert Stuart; Guest Speaker, James Thomas Flexner, author, Lecture Hall 4.

MONDAY, JULY 3, THROUGH SUNDAY, JULY 9

Painting of the week: Puvis de Chavannes. The Prodigal Son (Chester Dale Collection), Gallery 93; Wednesday through Saturday 12 and 2; Sunday, 3:30 and 6.

Tour of the week: The Exhibition of Gilbert Stuart, Portraitist of the Young Republic. Central Lobby, Wednesday through Saturday, 1; Sunday 2:30.

Tour: Introduction to the Collection. Rotunda; Monday through Saturday 11 and 3; Tuesday (Independence Day), 1; Sunday, 5.

Sunday film lecture: Thomas Jefferson and Early American Architecture. Speaker: John Brooks, Staff Lecturer, National Gallery of Art, Lecture Hall 4.

MONDAY, JULY 10, THROUGH SUNDAY, JULY 16

Painting of the week: Master of Flémalle and Assistants. *Madonna and Child with Saints in the Enclosed Garden* (Samuel H. Kress Collection), Gallery 35; Tuesday through Saturday, 12 and 2; Sunday, 3:30 and 6.

Tour: *Introduction to the Collection*. Rotunda, Monday 11 and 3; Tuesday through Saturday, 11, 1, and 3; Sunday, 2:30 and 5.

Sunday film lecture: *The Impressionists*, Speaker: Carleen Keating, Staff Lecturer, National Gallery of Art, Lecture Hall, 4.

MONDAY, JULY 17, THROUGH SUNDAY, JULY 23

Painting of the week: Juan van der Hamen y Leon. *Still Life* (Samuel H. Kress Collection), Gallery 49; Tuesday through Saturday, 12 and 2; Sunday 3:30 and 6.

Tour: *Introduction to the Collection*. Rotunda, Monday 11 and 3; Tuesday through Saturday, 11, 1 and 3; Sunday, 2:30 and 5.

Sunday film: *The Art of the Conservator*, Lecture Hall 4.

Inquiries concerning the Gallery's educational services should be addressed to the Educational Office or telephoned to 737–4215, Ext. 272.

MONDAY, JULY 24, THROUGH SUNDAY, JULY 30

Painting of the week: Morisot. *The Mother and Sister of the Artist* (Chester Dale Collection), Gallery 89; Tuesday through Saturday 12 and 2; Sunday, 3:30 and 6.

Tour: *Introduction to the Collection*. Rotunda, Monday 11 and 3; Tuesday through Saturday, 11, 1 and 3; Sunday, 2:30 and 5.

Sunday film lecture: *Art in Exhibition*, Speaker: Ann Watson, Staff Lecturer, National Gallery of Art, Lecture Hall, 4.

The End of UNEF

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. SCHEUER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1967

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to put in the RECORD the following report from the Independent Observer, which is published and edited by Mr. and Mrs. Edward W. McVitty. I believe this report is a significant analysis of the results of the United Nations Secretary General's actions on the 18th of May:

THE END OF UNEF

At noon on the 18th of May 1967, the United Nations Secretary General was informed that the Government of the United Arab Republic had "decided to terminate the presence of the United Nations Emergency Force in the territory of the United Arab Republic and Gaza Strip." On the evening of that same day, U Thant cabled the UN Commander in the field to withdraw UNEF.

The day before formal notice was received from the U.A.R., the Secretary General had held "an exchange of views" with representatives of governments having contingents in the Emergency Force. U.A.R. armed forces had already sought to remove UN personnel from their posts along the Armistice Demarcation Line. There seems to be little doubt that the usefulness of UNEF, if not the actual security of its men, was jeopardized by the advance of the United Arab Republic's Army.

The views that may have been expressed in the informal consultation on May 17th have not been disclosed, but U Thant did not refer the matter to the UN General Assembly or to the Security Council. Instead, he took executive action to withdraw the Force as soon as the U.A.R. made its demand.

In his Reports to the General Assembly and Security Council the Secretary General stated that the reasons for the U.A.R. decision "have not been officially stated." U Thant explained his own action by saying it seemed "fully clear" to him that "since United Arab Republic consent was withdrawn it was incumbent on the Secretary General to give orders for the withdrawal of the Force."

"The consent of the host country is a basic principle which has applied to all United Nations peace-keeping operations," he said.

The principle of consent is certainly one of the features that distinguish peace-keeping operations from UN military enforcement action. Host country consent is essential to the *deployment* of a UN Peace Force. There is, however, a question as to what happens thereafter with respect to *maintenance* of the Force in the territory for the fulfillment of its agreed purpose. It does not seem to have been intended that "instant" withdrawal of consent would be matched by "instant" withdrawal of UNEF.

When the U.A.R. consented to the deployment of UNEF, that Government and the UN Secretary General signed "good-faith" declarations. The host Government pledged itself, "when exercising its sovereign rights on any matter concerning the presence and functioning of UNEF," to be *"guided in good faith by its acceptance"* of the General Assembly resolution outlining the purposes and role of the Force. The Secretary General, on behalf of the UN, declared "that the activities of UNEF will be guided in good faith by the task established for the Force."

In 1958, Dag Hammarskjold, in a report on UN peace-keeping experience, discussed the meaning of these "good-faith" declarations to which he had been a party. According to Hammarskjold,

"The consequence of such a bilateral declaration is that, were either side to act unilaterally in refusing continued presence or deciding on withdrawal, and were the other side to find that such action was contrary to a good-faith interpretation of the purposes of the operation, an exchange of views would be called for towards harmonizing the positions."

The niceties of such "good-faith" agreements may have little relevance now that UNEF is out, and the Arabs and Israelis are again at each others throats. The pity is that the Secretary General did not thus seek to gain a little time for "an exchange of views" in Cairo before, rather than after, the withdrawal of UNEF. The situation may have seemed hopeless, but the UN has saved other well-nigh hopeless situations by keeping its own foot in the door for a few days.

The pity is that Israel has not seized the opportunity to invite UNEF onto its side of the Demarcation Line. A more constructive and popular move could hardly be conceived for that Government in present circumstances.

The pity is, that precedents set by the United Nations tend to be invoked on all similar occasions. UN peace-keeping capabilities were weak enough before the United Arab Republic demonstrated that the Organization would not challenge the breach of a good-faith agreement with respect to a UN Force.

Editorial Voices Concern of Many

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1967

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, many Members of Congress and thousands of interested citizens are increasingly concerned with the alarming growth of the Federal Government and the resulting erosion of personal freedoms with this advent of bureaucratic control. At this time, there are approximately 400 grants-in-aid programs administered by no less than 21 different Federal agencies and 150 Federal bureaus. Perhaps this is the reason that Arnold Toynbee, noted British historian, said the United States now is encumbered with a semi-socialistic form of government.

Herein lies a very real and grave danger to the existence of this Nation as a democracy under a republican form of government. I commend to our membership an excellent editorial, written by Mr. Philip Foster, publisher of Foster's Daily Democrat in Dover, N.H. What he says makes good sense and the following editorial entitled "Growth of Federal Government" represents the convictions of many of us:

GROWTH OF FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

The rapid growth of the federal government in the past decade continues at an accelerating pace and represents a condition of deep importance to every person making the United States his home. Many people fear that if the present trend continues historians of the future will record that the people of the United States and their elected representatives gradually lost the power to control their government, and as the bureaucracy expanded, the people also lost their freedom. But, no one can predict what the reaction of some 200 million people will be to developments now taking shape. Up to this point, evidence suggests one of three things—either the people have not been paying too much attention, they are confused by events, or they approve of the trend.

Ten years ago, when President Eisenhower proposed his 1958 administrative budget of $71.8 billion, the public reaction was definite. Irate taxpayers demanded reductions in the budget in a flood of letters to congressmen. The officials of government, including the President, the Democratic majority in Congress, and the Secretary of the Treasury condemned the upward trend of federal spending and joined in calling for substantial cuts. When Congress adjourned that year, it had succeeded in cutting the proposed budget by almost $5 billion. Since 1960, the population of the United States has grown by 10 per cent, but the civilian bureaucracy of the federal government has increased by 25 per cent and administration requests for $144 billion of new spending authority in fiscal 1968 have hardly caused a ripple of public concern.

Some of the facts of growth in the federal establishment speak for themselves. First of all, the national debt presently carries a $14 billion annual interest charge—10 cents out of every tax dollar. A $300 billion budget is in prospect for 1980. New government welfare programs multiply, increasing from 239 in 1966 to about 450 in 1968. A great many of these have been started on a shoestring with unlimited potential for increased spending requirements. Forty-two million people now receive regular checks from the federal government, and this number is destined to grow every year. Since last year, spending authority in the fields of health, labor and welfare has risen nearly 28 per cent. The Secretary of the Treasury has requested a $29 billion increase in the national debt ceiling. In the past, the debt ceiling has been raised on a "temporary" basis. This fiction is being dropped in the current request for a "permanent" debt ceiling of $365 billion—up from the "permanent" ceiling now set at $285 billion.

One of the fundamental myths arising out of the depression years that any problem can be solved by spending enough federal money seems still to be with us. Prolonged prosperity, with little painful inflation until recently has unquestionably dulled critical public appraisal. Various levels of government now purchase 30 per cent of the goods and services produced in the nation and the penalties of centralization are beginning to show up in the form of bureaucratic red tape, waste and duplication.

Some see a stirring of concern at the grass-roots level and among intellectuals and administrators in government itself. There is evidence of a growing recognition that many problems to be solved or dealt with most effectively, must be handled at the state and local level. There is much to suggest that the American political system may be entering a decisive period when the ability of central government to handle an ever-increasing share of the peoples' affairs and responsibilities in a country as large and diverse as this is to be questioned. In all this, it should not be forgotten that Congress possesses the power to control money appropriations which determine the size of government—and, in the final analysis, the people still control the Congress.

Situation in the Middle East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1967

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I bring to the attention of my colleagues a letter recently written to the President by Dr. Karl Applbaum, of Flushing, Queens County, N.Y., giving his reactions to the situation in the Middle East, and his suggestions for action by the United States.

Dr. Applbaum, a Rabbi for the past 30 years, is also a lawyer practicing in New York State and Federal courts, and a lieutenant colonel in the U.S. Army Reserve. He was an Army chaplain during his active military service in World War II, and has served as a chaplain with various units of the Jewish War Veterans, the American Legion, and the Reserve Officers Association.

He was Queens County chaplain of the Legion in 1961–62, and has been Queens J.W.V. Chaplain since then. In 1965–66 he served as national chaplain of the ROA, and in 1948–49, he was State chaplain of the VFW.

Dr. Applbaum holds two bachelor's degrees, two master's degrees, two academic doctorates, two honorary doctorates, and a third honorary doctorate is pending.

In a busy spiritual and professional career, he has found what seems to be unlimited time for all manner of good community, philanthropic, social welfare, and fraternal services.

I offer his letter for the attention of this House as being the reaction of a highly educated, dedicated leader in many fields of National, State, and local endeavor.

JUNE 8, 1967.

Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President, United States of America, White House, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: "These are the times which try men's souls." I know that the affairs of State weigh heavily upon your shoulders. My prayers include you and members of your family. May the Giver of Life bless you with health, long life and strength. May He endow you with the wisdom of a Solomon, the faith of Job and the strength of Samson to bear well the difficult affairs of the world which must weigh heavily upon your shoulders.

I write to you at this time as a leader of American Jewry, as a Rabbi who has served this beloved country in War and Peace, and as one to whom the American way of life is dear and meaningful.

I am respectfully asking that you review the whole attitude of our country towards the whole world and more particularly as it relates to the State of Israel. No country in the world has shown its love and respect for the American way of life and has been as devoted to our country as has the little State of Israel—small in size but large in stature. The State of Israel has been standing as a bastion of Democracy practicing the principles of life as enunciated by our Declaration of Independence, as taught by American History, and as set down by the Founding Fathers of our country.

In observing the proceedings of the United Nations it is easy to see the difference in caliber between the representatives of the State of Israel and the Arab. The presence of the Arabs in this country is a disgrace; dangerous and insulting. Their treading on American soil desecrates the ground for which thousands of American men and women have given their lives on the far flung battlefields of the world.

Mr. President I propose to you the following steps:

1. Recognition of the fact that the Arabs are the aggressors.

2. Recognition of the right of Israel to exist and to retain whatever new lands they acquire.

3. Complete discontinuance of any help to the Arabs as long as they maintain ties with the communists.

4. No help to the Arabs as long as 5% of the leaders are billionaires and 95% poverty stricken.

5. Internationalization of the Suez Canal and the Gulf of Aqaba.

6. Expulsion from this country of Fedorenko and his communist cohorts. They have used the United Nations as a base for spy operations and as a platform for spreading venom. Thank God that the American people realize this and ignore them. However, they are dangerous.

7. Trial of Nasser as a war criminal.

8. Help to rebuild the economy of Israel which has been practically destroyed by the ignorant Arabs.

9. Continued help to the people of the State of Israel.

10. Break off diplomatic relations with the Russians and Arab countries.

With kindest personal regards to you and the family,

Yours in the Service of God and Country,
Rabbi Dr. KARL APPLBAUM,
Chaplain (LTC) USAR.

Partners of the Alliance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP E. RUPPE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1967

Mr. RUPPE. Mr. Speaker, the Partners of the Alliance, consisting of 32 U.S. States and 31 Latin American counterparts, is an outstanding program of international understanding with concrete results. Michigan is fortunate to have developed under the leadership of Gov. George Romney and former Congressman Alvin M. Bentley, a flourishing partnership with British Honduras. The following success story, written by Mr. Bentley, deserves the attention of every Member of Congress. Mr. Bentley's article appeared in Michigan Challenge, the official publication of the Michigan State Chamber of Commerce.

The article follows:

PARTNERS OF THE ALLIANCE

Although the United States sends large sums of financial and technical assistance to the independent Latin American Republics each year through the Agency for International Development, a new concept has been born under the Alliance for Progress of the U.S. Department of State—the concept of direct assistance or, put more succinctly, private foreign aid.

Direct assistance, or private foreign aid, is the operating philosophy behind the partners of the Alliance programs which are currently functioning between 32 U.S. states and 31 Latin American counterparts. Rated as the foremost among these partnerships is the one between Michigan and British Honduras, soon to be the independent nation of Belize. And, it might be added, it is the only Latin American partner that does not receive AID funds or Technical Assistance.

The Michigan Partners of the Alliance was organized on February 24, 1966 at the invitation of Governor George Romney and under my chairmanship. The governor had called the organizational meeting after receiving a letter from Premier George Price of British Honduras expressing his country's interest in a partnership with Michigan.

Although privately incorporated in the State of Michigan, the organization operates in conjunction with the Partners of the Alliance Program under the auspices of the Alliance for Progress, Agency for International Development, U.S. Department of State.

British Honduras is located on the east coast of Central America facing the Caribbean Sea and bounded on the north and west by Mexico and on the south and west by Guatemala. The total land area is 8,866 square miles including a number of picturesque cayes which lie off the coast and are protected by the world's second largest barrier reef.

With a population of slightly over 110,000 British Honduras boasts a 90 per cent literacy rate with English being the official language. The country functions under a Constitution and enjoys nearly full internal self-government with a ministerial system. Not only is the government stable, but it is actively encouraging and promoting the Partnership. Like Michigan, British Honduras has established a Partners of Alliance group with a Chairman and committees operating along similar lines.

When first organized last year, the Michigan Partners determined that a survey trip had to be made to British Honduras for an on-sight investigation of attitudes, problems, and needs. A nine member program development team was appointed and consisted of Hugh W. Brenneman, executive director of the Michigan State Medical Society; Mrs. Modesta R. Gamble of Dearborn; Warren Huff, then chairman of the Board of Trustees of Michigan State University; Blaque Knirk, chairman of the Michigan Agricultural Commission; William C. Marshall, executive vice president of the Michigan State AFL–CIO; Mrs. George Mosher of the American Association of University Women; Win Schuler, restaurateur from Marshall; Victor F. Spathelf, president of Ferris State College; and, Leonard White, secretary of the W. K. Kellogg Foundation.

The program development team made the on-sight survey and came back to Michigan with a number of recommendations on projects in which the Michigan Partners of the Alliance could be of assistance in helping British Honduras gain social and economic maturity and independence.

Unlike most Latin American countries, the team discovered, British Honduras has an excess of land in proportion to its population. The team also discovered that British Honduras had already instituted a program of land reform which makes it advantageous to put idle land to work.

Although many would think it difficult to find similarities between Michigan and British Honduras the team discovered that in three areas there was much similarity. Agriculture, food processing and tourism, the team concluded, had the greatest economic potential for British Honduras. Michigan is rated high among the leaders in the United States in these three fields.

This same conclusion has been reported in a special Tripartite Economic Study of British Honduras conducted by representatives of Canada, the United Kingdom and the United States.

The program development team also reported that British Honduras, like many emerging nations, faces a trade deficit. To correct this situation, the government of British Honduras has enacted a special Development Incentive Ordinance to encourage the establishment and expansion of development enterprises. The ordinance makes provisions for the granting of certain relief from custom duties, entry tax and income tax to persons which the government feels can contribute materially to the economy.

For example, if a group were to build a major hotel complex, which incidentally is desperately needed, the government of British Honduras would allow a total tax holiday period of 13 years. A special publication has been issued by the government which outlines the areas that would fall under this special Development Incentive Ordinance.

Since its inception some 15 months ago, the Michigan Partners have contributed positively in many areas. Most striking among the projects of the partnership is the scholarship program currently being conducted. There are 10 British Honduran students attending Michigan colleges and universities under the auspices of the Michigan Partners of the Alliance. These scholarships provided for full room, board and tuition and are renewable each year for the full degree period.

The people of British Honduras are required to provide each student with roughly $500 per year. Of the $500 some $250 per year is for incidental expenses and the remaning $250 provides a round trip tourist class airline ticket from Detroit Metro Airport to Belize City. In addition, these students are required to return to British Honduras for at least two years following graduation.

In the health and medical education area a request has been forwarded for the services of a hospital administrator, public health official and a public health educator. It is hopeful that once the details of the requirements have been worked out the Michigan Partners will receive the support of one of the leading Michigan foundations to help finance the project.

Another project request approved by both partnership committees has been the assignment of a Michigan agriculturist or extension agent to live in British Honduras for at least a year to assist in developing a program similar to the agricultural agent operation so familiar and successful in Michigan.

Another project under investigation at this time is assistance in the field of special education and rehabilitation for the handicapped. University experts in these fields from Michigan State, Wayne State, and The University of Michigan have all volunteered their time toward a program in British Honduras. Once again, it is hoped that a Michigan foundation or service group would assist in providing the necessary travel expenses and equipment for these experts in establishing such a school in Belize City.

Another exciting project just getting started is the forthcoming oceanography survey to be conducted off the British Honduras coastline. Experts in this area believe that British Honduras might be a perfect location for a research center for an institute of oceanography.

Although the above projects are vital to British Honduras, their immediate needs fall in the area of investment capital. Last March the Michigan Partners of the Alliance sponsored an unusual investment conference on British Honduras. Over 250 potential Michigan investors attended the meeting and met with leaders of the government and the private sector of British Honduras who had traveled to Lansing for the conference.

In the party from British Honduras were Premier George Price; A. A. Hunter, Minister of Natural Resources and Trade; Rudy Castillo, Chief Information Officer, and Raphael Fonseca, Permanent Secretary to the Minister of Finance.

The private sector delegation, consisting of seven persons, was headed by Ismael Gomez, president of the British Honduras Chamber of Commerce.

At the investment conference potential investors had the opportunity of meeting with these officials of British Honduras and querying them in regard to investment possibilities in that country.

It is interesting to note that since the conference was held in March the formation of a development bank for British Honduras has been announced with initial capitalization of $250,000. In addition, several investment trips are being planned where people from Michigan are to go as a group to British Honduras for their own on-sight survey.

All the activities of the Michigan Partners are not of this magnitude. Other projects such as sending used band instruments to a youth hostel group have taken place. Another project is the collection of old-fashioned treadle type sewing machines for sending to people in the bush country of British Honduras.

Located only 850 miles from Miami or New Orleans, Belize City is just an hour and a half by jet to American tourists. Mayan ruins, outstanding fishing in the sparkling off-shore waters and jungle hunting are jewels for the American tourist who wants something different, exciting and beautiful.

In fact, some of the best bone fishing and tarpon fishing in the world is located in the coastal waters of Belize.

The Michigan Partners of the Alliance sincerely believe that it can help British Honduras to achieve its independence by the end of 1968. Innumerable projects are being brought to light in which every citizen from every walk of life in Michigan can participate and truly show that Michigan is dynamic in world progress.

It is a program in which any private individual or any representative of a civic group, school, system, college or university, student group, business, industry, labor union, project group or any other private, non-governmental group can actually assist. The choice of projects is limited only by the interest, ability and judgments of the groups involved.

As Governor George Romney, Honorary Chairman of the Michigan Partners of the Alliance, stated at the organizational meeting in February 1966, "I am confident that the new, direct relationship will be mutually beneficial and projective of heightened understanding between the people of British Honduras and our State. For I believe that such people-to-people efforts are one of the surest roads to lasting peace."

Sixth Grade Class of Chinquapin Elementary School of Bluff City, Tenn., Attains Perfect Attendance Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1967

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I am real proud of one of the sixth grade classes in my district, and I want to take just a minute to tell the Members of the House of the outstanding record that the 22 members of this class of Chinquapin Elementary School in Bluff City, Tenn., achieved.

During the 1966–67 school year, these 22 students and their teacher, Mrs. Betty Combs, attended every class day, which totaled 3,850 days of perfect attendance. This broke any previous national record that has ever been set.

As a reward for their efforts, the 22 students came to Washington for a weekend, and I was happy to arrange many tours for them.

I again congratulate Principal Worley F. Glover, Mrs. Combs, each of the students, and their parents, and I hope that they will be back in Washington next year as seventh graders with another perfect attendance record.

Mr. Speaker, under unanmious consent I include at this point in the RECORD the article from the Washington Evening Star on the class' trip to Washington, together with a letter from Principal Glover explaining the tributes paid to the class, my telegram of congratulations, and a list of the students who set this outstanding record:

[From the Evening Star, Washington, D.C., May 22, 1967]

Entire Class Scoring Perfect Attendance

Bristol, Tenn. (AP)—The countdown has started for Mrs. Betty Combs' sixth-grade class at Bristol's Chinquapin Elementary School. "R-Day"—that's "Record Day"—is Saturday, June 3, when the school year ends.

Miss Combs' 22 pupils hope to finish the entire session without a single class member having missed so much as one day of school. As of Saturday, the streak was 164 days—with 11 school days remaining.

Can they make it? The folks at Chinquapin Elementary think so. They are, in fact, so confident they're holding a special awards program for the sixth-graders Wednesday—10 days before "R-Day."

TRIP TO WASHINGTON

Letters hailing the feat have been mailed in advance—to President Johnson and Vice President Humphrey, among others.

The Parent-Teachers Association has raised enough money in a fund campaign to send all 22 members of the class to Washington, D.C., for a tour.

Naturally, good luck has figured in the kids' achievement. That, and lots of determination.

Only a few days ago one of the sixth-graders fell and suffered a severe hand cut after school hours. The children held their breaths—but he showed up next day with a big bandage on his hand.

PARENTS AFFECTED

The youngsters' parents have been affected, too. Many called off out-of-town trips for pleasure or business because the kids insisted they didn't want to miss a day in the classroom.

One sixth-grader, Alan Owens, had an extended visit from his grandmother because of the attendance streak. She came down from Springfield, Ohio, planning to stay a few days. She stayed on and on because Alan's mother and father couldn't leave town to drive her back home.

Principal Worley Glover says if Miss Combs' class finishes the year with perfect attendance "it will be an unparalleled distinction. We don't believe it could have happened before."

Chinquapin Elementary School,
Bluff City, Tenn., May 16, 1967.

Hon. James H. Quillen,
Representative,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Representative Quillen: Knowing that you are interested in and concerned about the school drop-out problem facing the nation, I felt you would appreciate the fact that one class has had perfect attendance for an entire school year. The twenty-two members of the Sixth Grade class of Chinquapin Elementary School, Bluff City, Tennessee, and their teacher, Mrs. Betty Combs, have attended school all this 1966–67 school year. This makes a total of 3850 days of perfect attendance and breaks any previous national record that has ever been set.

A special recognition program for this class and their teacher is to be held on May 24 at 1:00 P.M., in the school cafeteria with lunch being served. Educational and governmental representatives will be present to participate in the presentation of awards. All proceedings are to be covered by newspaper, radio, and television personnel. The school P.T.A. is awarding the class a trip to Washington, D.C. on May 26 and 27.

We extend to you a special invitation to be with us on this occasion. If you can possibly work it into your schedule we would be extremely honored and the children will be overjoyed, for they are counting so much on your presence. Your outstanding work as a Representative has been kept before the students here and there is definitely a special feeling for you in their hearts and great respect from the patrons of our school and citizens of our community. This is magnified especially at this time because of your present efforts relative to the Bill that would bring to the Flag of our country the respect to which it is due. We are thankful for one who sees the Flag in its proper perspective, a living symbol of our country.

In Washington the class will be staying at the Airport Motel, Arlington, Virginia. We plan to take them on tours during the two days that would prove advantageous to their growth in knowledge of government procedures and places of historic significance in the District. Any help that you could give in facilitating these tours and providing passes to places they would profit in visiting would be deeply appreciated. Thank you for any consideration and recognition that you may give to this class for their outstanding achievement.

Yours truly,
Worley F. Glover, *Principal.*

May 22, 1967.

Sixth Grade Class,
Chinquapin Elementary School,
Mr. Worley Glover, Principal,
Bluff City, Tenn:

Even though I cannot be with you on Wednesday to express my congratulations in person on your perfect attendance record, I want you to know that my thoughts and best wishes are with you all.

Each and every one of you are certainly to be commended, and I join your teacher, your principal, your parents, the other members of the faculty, and the officials of your school in extending my very best on this very memorable occasion.

You, your teacher, and your school have accomplished a record which will be the envy of every other class in the State of Tennessee and throughout the Nation.

As your Congressman, I want each and every one of you to know that I am proud of you. I look forward to seeing you in Washington Thursday so that I can tell you in person the things that I have mentioned in this telegram.

James H. Quillen,
Member of Congress.

STUDENTS

Perry Aldridge, Glenda Baker, Vickie Black, Lydia Caudill, Bradley Cross, Lewis Combs, Donald Dye, Vickie Glover, Norman Graybeal, George Gross, Jackie Hyatt, James Lane, Joann Malone, Vicki Malone, Lynn Morrell, Edna Nickles, Lynn Nickles, Allen Owens, Harold Reed, Norma Cox, Karen Dunn, Loyd Ealey, Ellen Jenkins.

PRINCIPAL

Mr. Worley Glover.

TEACHER

Mrs. Betty Combs.

Ohio Savings and Loan League

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT TAFT, JR.

OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 21, 1967

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, the Ohio savings and loan industry is a vital, growing business that helps the stability and economy of the State of Ohio. More important, savings and loan associations help Ohioans attain some of life's most cherished goals.

On this the 100th anniversary of the State's first savings and loan association, I am proud to extend best wishes and congratulations to the Ohio Savings and Loan League and the many savings and loan associations in the Buckeye State. The industry has come a long way since the first savings and loan charter was issued on February 20, 1867. It has grown to have assets totaling $10,450,000,000. During 1966 owners of some 3,850,000 savings and loan accounts received cash payments or credits to their accounts of more than $400 million in earnings. Twenty-two of the top 150 savings and loan associations in Ohio are located in Hamilton County.

The Ohio savings and loan industry, through the Dayton plan, has made an outstanding contribution to the Nation's savings and loan community as a whole. The Dayton plan has come to be the pattern of savings and loan operations practiced throughout the United States today.

The Kamehameha Schools: A 19th Century Institution Meets Modern Educational Challenges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 21, 1967

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, the role of education in a free society is one of ever-increasing importance, and I am sure that my colleagues in the House will find of interest a recent article describing how one of Hawaii's oldest schools is rising to meet this new challenge.

In a recent feature story on the Kamehameha schools, Honolulu Advertiser staff writer Jane Evinger discusses in a highly knowledgeable fashion how the institution's administrators and teachers have successfully coped with the impact of larger enrollments and coeducation on the 500-acre campus, which is situated on impressive heights overlooking Pearl Harbor and much of the westerly section of Honolulu. The suggestion of plurality found in the name of the institution is a carryover from the long period of years when there were two separate schools, one for boys and another for girls.

Miss Evinger's report attests to the dedication and diligence of the school officials at Kamehameha who have infused a desire to seek broader vistas in education into the boys and girls of Kamehameha, and I take pleasure in inserting in the Record the article, "Kamehameha: Old School With New Spirit," which appeared in the May 28, 1967, issue of the Sunday Star-Bulletin & Advertiser:

Kamehameha: Old School With New Spirit

(By Jane Evinger)

Parents everywhere find the schools their children attend much changed from the ones they went to, but perhaps nowhere in Hawaii have things changed so much, in less than a generation, than at Kamehameha Schools.

The most visible changes involve a vastly increased enrollment coeducation.

With the graduation of the Class of 1969, a total of 6,550 students will have been educated by Kamehameha Schools since its founding in 1887.

Almost half of the total—3,000—will have been graduated during the decade of the '60s, a dramatic illustration of the Schools' rapid growth in recent years.

Besides the big increase in the number of students, an alumnus returning to the 500-acre Kapalama campus also finds high school boys and girls attending classes together.

Until 1965, the high school students were strictly segregated by sex. Now, although the Boys' School and Girls' School still exist for administrative and dormitory purposes, all classes are coed except physical education, military science, and similar courses.

But despite the impact of larger enrollments and coeducation, change of another sort, not likely to be spotted by someone making a brief visit to a Kamehameha office, is even more significant.

In brief, both the Schools and students have lifted their sights.

For most of its history, Kamehameha concentrated on turning out students equipped to embark immediately on jobs.

Boys were trained in agriculture (now no longer even offered) or in trades, such as carpentry and auto mechanics, and went right to work after graduation. The curriculum for girls was designed mainly to turn out graduates who would be good wives and mothers.

In 1946, only 8 per cent of Kamehameha's 74 graduates went on to college.

By 1957, the figure rose to better than 40 per cent going on for post-high school education, and in 1965 it was 80 per cent. It dropped to about 70 per cent last year only because many more boys went directly into the military than had done so in earlier years.

INTERESTS BROADER

Frederick C. Gros, Kamehameha's director of financial aids, puts it this way:

"The Schools' own product, the well-trained and well-informed graduate, is finding his or her niche in community life in a way not seen since the early days of the Schools, when graduates took their places in responsible positions within the community in the area of politics, the professions and teaching.

"Michener's (author James Michener) concept of the high school graduate garbage collector and chamber maid is being replaced by higher numbers entering law, medicine, social services, business administration, nursing, education and other areas, after completing master's and even doctoral programs."

R. Burl Yarberry, director of secondary education and principal of the Boys' School, emphasizes, along with other administrators, that Kamehameha is still definitely a comprehensive high school, not just a college preparatory school.

But with coeducation, which puts the enrollment in grades 9–12 at more than 1,400, "we're large enough so that we can be comprehensive," he says.

"Our goal is to sustain a comprehensive high school which gives the student an opportunity for a broad general education, so that he can continue his education in the appropriate way—college, technical school, whatever—after graduation from Kamehameha," he says.

"We will certainly continue to push our students to go beyond Kamehameha in one way or another."

Yarberry thinks that the change at Kamehameha is primarily "based upon the way you look at a student. If you look at him as having a given and limited potential, then you design a program for him like that.

"But if you feel he has potential beyond what you can see, you design a program that allows him to make decisions, to solve problems intellectually."

PARENTS IN APPROVAL

Yarberry says parents are envious of their children's new opportunities, and favor the change, although "sometimes they fear it's a little too open.

"But if a program allows kids to think, you must open it up, and you can't have regimentation.

"This presents problems, because it is less easily controlled and it means we must more highly motivate our students, but there's no alternative in our present society."

Yarberry says students are taking advantage of stepped-up offerings.

"Sixteen units are required for graduation and in earlier years, it was usual for a student to have only 16 or 17," he said. "Now, most have 20 and 21, and it's not unusual to have 22 or 23.

"It's a rare student this year who has a study hall. They're not required to take more work than in the past, but they elect it.

"If students expect limited things of themselves, this is what they do, but now they expect more and more of themselves."

In addition to more students going on to college, Yarberry notes a change in where they go to college.

"Four years ago, they almost all went to the West Coast, and tended to go to a few little schools where they formed little Hawaiian huis, stuck together, had a luau every month or so, and came home. Today, they are in colleges and universities throughout the country," he said.

A large number go to U.S. military academies. Five graduates of the Class of 1966 won such appointments.

Although Hawaii has only eight appointments available to senators and representatives, the military academies themselves make special appointments, due to Kamehameha's classification by the military as an "honor military institute" because of its outstanding performance, Yarberry said.

Gros says military training also benefits Kamehameha graduates who don't go to the academies.

"Whether the lad aspires to officer status or not, his Kamehameha training invariably holds him in good stead, and he quickly finds himself the platoon leader even in the group of draftees going to Ft. Ord in the all-Hawaii company each year," he says.

SELECTS WHAT'S BEST

Dr. James W. Bushong, president of the Schools, says Kamehameha "makes decisions on the basis of what's best for boys and girls, not on what's easiest for the schools."

Asked why changes have come about, he says "good education is good education, and we need the best possibly prepared boys and girls."

Bushong says that "there's no question but that coeducation, academically, has strengthened us. Instead of two good science departments, for example, we have one excellent science department.

"When you can pool your resources, both material ones and teachers, you can utilize their strengths."

Jack Darvill, assistant to Bushong, notes that "a high school of 700 doesn't have too much opportunity to have a lot of teachers in any one discipline, so they can't specialize as much as when you combine two schools of 700 and get one of 1,400."

Bushong says that "it was much easier when we had the boys and girls in separate schools. It was easier to schedule, and easier to manage. It was all military at the Boys' School, so that when anybody stepped out of line, the military handled it.

"Now, the military can't step in, and the classroom teacher must handle it, but the academic advantages of the program and the conservation and use of human resources are such that there's no comparison."

Yarberry says coeducation has had "a tremendous impact on the faculty. Before, there were separate departments at the Boys' School and the Girls' School for every field. There was not the present cohesion and coordination."

Mrs. Gladys A. Brandt, principal of the Girls' School agrees.

"Departments are stronger in depth and quality, and teachers can teach more in their areas of strength," she says.

MORE LANGUAGES

Like most schools, Kamehameha has been stepping up the academic content of its offerings in recent years.

Until three years ago, for example, students could take only two years of language. The choices were Latin, Spanish, French and Hawaiian.

Latin has since been dropped, but students can now begin Spanish or French in seventh or eighth grade and take five or six years of a single language.

Russian and Japanese have been added to the curriculum, and next fall a fourth year of each will be offered. Three years of Hawaiian also are available.

Both science equipment and course content have been greatly improved, and calculus has been added to the math offerings.

Although honors seminars are offered outstanding students in such fields as English, even those not in the honors program are getting involved in things that once were considered college-level.

One group of senior English classes, for example, studies the historical development of English, including the forces which have produced changes in grammar and vocabulary, and then studies Chaucer in Middle, English, rather than the modern English used previously in most high school classes.

Independent study, with students pursuing a topic of interest to them largely outside the framework of organized classes, but working under the guidance of a faculty member, is becoming more common in such areas as social studies.

And even within the framework of regular classes, seniors may elect a social studies course which is an introduction to philosophy, or may take one semester each of psychology and anthropology.

Changes in requirements are very evident at the Girls' School, which in the past required four years of homemaking for girls. Now, only one year is required, although girls may elect more.

ALTERS COTTAGE LIFE

Until three years ago, all senior girls were required to live nine weeks in one of three housekeeping cottages on the campus. Their duties included taking care of a borrowed baby.

The program is now elective, and this year only 37 of 186 senior girls have chosen to participate.

When the program was required, says Mrs. Brandt, "one girl had to stay home from classes the entire week to care for the baby, and got homework assignments from other students.

"This is still done, but it is a bit more relaxed, since the housemother and the teacher living in the cottage help out by babysitting when exams come, or in similar situations."

Since only one of the three cottages is now needed for the family life education course, the other two have been put to use in new programs open only to the one-third of Kamehameha's students who are boarding students.

One has been turned over to the senior seminar projects, where six senior boarding girls at a time live five to six weeks with a faculty member, discussing in depth whatever current topics interest them.

"It may be politics, art, sociology or some other field, and the group may focus on one topic the entire time or may consider a number of topics," says Mrs. Brandt.

"They draw upon the community for guest speakers, and go out in the evening with faculty members to operas, plays, ballet, the East-West Center, and other places," she said.

The other cottage is an extension of Kamehameha's guidance program, which has been stepped up throughout the Schools.

Six boarding freshmen live for a month at a time in the cottage, meeting evenings with the counselor, who lives there with his wife.

Changes have even occurred in course offerings not traditionally considered "solids."

Yarberry says Kamehameha has "one of the best physical education programs in the country, with everything from scuba diving to golf, bowling and archery.

EXTENDS MUSIC STUDIES

And music courses, which in the past featured mainly some of the loveliest choral singing in the Islands, now include offerings in theory (including writing music) and experience not only in large but also small instrumental ensemble playing.

"Hawaiians are gifted in the whole field of music, entertainment and human warmth, and we're trying to extend these areas, not just turn out lawyers and engineers," Yarberry says.

Gros says that a 1962 decision of the Attorney General has enabled Kamehameha to provide financial help to better than half the 650 graduates now enrolled in advanced schools. Before that, all income from the Bishop Estate, which supports the schools, had to be spent on the Kapalama campus.

Last year, $105,000 in scholarship aid went to Kamehameha graduates. About half of that came from the estate, and the rest came from a carnival sponsored by the alumni and PTA, and from the Kamehameha Activities Assn.'s athletic profits.

Among the many changes Gros notes during his 10 years at Kamehameha is "a marked improvement in the whole oral communications program during the decade.

"Kamehameha students speak up more readily, and often participate in very animated discussions with considerable substance in both the content and method of presentation."

Crime Study Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD D. McCARTHY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 21, 1967

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, in the past 7 years, the United States has witnessed a 35-percent increase in the crime rate. This means that crime is increasing six times faster than the population.

To combat this rise, there is now a great need to collectivize and coordinate the investigative resources of the Congress to remove some of the burden from the shoulders of the Executive.

Mr. Speaker, I have, therefore, today introduced a bill to establish a joint committee of the House and Senate to investigate crime throughout the United States.

This bill was first introduced by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], and I believe it will effectively implement the necessary collation of efforts in studying the elements, causes, extent, and effects of crime, crime prevention, and crime control.

The Sincere Soviets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 21, 1967

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, a recent editorial in the Wall Street Journal discussed the sincerity of the Soviets in regard to their interests in the Middle East.

I commend to the attention of our colleagues this informative editorial which appeared in the June 20, 1967, edition of the Wall Street Journal.

The editorial follows:

THE SINCERE SOVIETS

The theorizing persists: Despite their obvious differences, the U.S. and the Soviet Union are capable of fundamental accord on outstanding world issues. The time may be ripe for breakthroughs. Or so the argument runs. It had a rough time yesterday.

That the interests of the only two great powers should occasionally coincide is hardly remarkable. The U.S. Government, for its part, is actively wooing the Kremlin, as President Johnson again made clear in his speech yesterday. But we think it important to understand the nature and limitations of such meeting of minds as may be possible.

The Middle East war seems especially revealing. The Soviets aggravated the trouble in the area by heavily arming the Arabs, particularly Egypt, over the years; it was not exactly a benign policy or one conducive to improved East-West relations. The crucial point is that only when their clients were plainly losing the war did the Soviets develop a passionate devotion to peace.

So the question turns on what constitutes Soviet "sincerity." The answer evidently is that they will "sincerely" favor peace, or even a better Russian-American climate, if they consider it in their interest at a given time or if the alternatives appear worse from their point of view.

Yet even that generalization has to be qualified. The Soviets reportedly are prepared to rearm Egypt and Syria, and in the United Nations Premier Kosygin demands that Israel abandon the territorial gains of its "aggression." Not so incidentally, he blames the U.S. for the crisis and the war.

In other words, the disastrous Arab defeat, and the resultant black eye for Soviet policy, seemingly has not slaked the Soviet thirst for a dominant political influence in the Middle East. Should it ever turn to a more peaceable course, we may be sure it will be only because Moscow has become convinced that the quest is impossible.

Much the same, we suspect, applies to Vietnam. There, as in the Middle East, the Soviets are strongly supporting North Vietnam and the Vietcong. Indeed, without the huge arms supply from Russia, it is doubtful the Vietnamese Communists could have continued the fight this long.

Assuming—the only safe assumption—that the Soviets consider it in their interest to have the U.S. bled in Vietnam or anywhere else, they may well view the war in Southeast Asia as a plus for them. Yet at some point, again as in the Middle East, they might conclude that they are backing the losing side. That consideration conceivably could outweigh the benefit they believe they are deriving from causing mischief for the U.S., and they might "sincerely" seek to bring about peace.

Such, we should remember, has been the pattern of the cold war all the way through. Stalin grabbed everything he thought he could get away with in Eastern Europe, and he wasn't really being as reckless as he seemed, since American policy mistakes had indicated that he would not be opposed. Only when Washington, London and Paris finally realized the enormity of the danger to Western Europe did they build an effective opposition, and it did deter the Soviets from attacking.

On the broader front, it strikes us as beyond question that the Soviets would not have hesitated to fight the U.S. itself were it not for the so-called balance of nuclear terror. So far, at least, they have figured their interests were best served by not inviting that kind of desrtuction. But that is scarcely proof that their basic attitude has grown more amicable.

We don't contend that partial accommodations, from time to time, in specific circumstances, are incapable of being realized, any more than we mean to suggest that Soviet communism is incapable of radical change. All we are saying is that Premier Kosygin's scorching denunciation of the U.S.—as the cause of every trouble everywhere in the world—is probably a more accurate measure of Soviet sincerity at the time than the dreams of detente.

Americans would welcome a genuine detente. Mr. Kosygin certainly got it off to a great start yesterday.

Japanese Business Leaders Visit Midwest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 21, 1967

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, a number of midwestern States, including my great State of Ohio, are playing hosts this month to a delegation of Japanese business and industrial leaders, here to discuss with their American counterparts ways in which our two nations can further expand trade and economic relations.

This is an interesting venture, which it is hoped will not only lead to increased financial benefit to both our nation and Japan, but will further enhance the friendship which exists between our countries. As the following article from the Journal of Commerce points out, exports to Japan from our midwestern States has doubled since 1960 and as the Japanese economy flourishes are expected to step up Japan's demands for American industrial and agricultural products even further in the next few years.

At this point in the RECORD, I wish to insert the Journal article:

JAPANESE TRADE MISSION TO VISIT MIDWEST AREA

TOKYO, June 11.—A high-powered 14-member economic mission at the weekend departed from Japan for the industrial and business areas of the American Midwest on behalf of the Japanese government.

Chairmanned by Kazutaka Kikawada, president of the Tokyo Electric Power Co.

the mission will visit Illinois, Minnesota, Wisconsin, Indiana, Ohio and Michigan. The group will disband on June 30 in Washington, D.C., after meeting Vice President Humphrey.

The Japanese business leaders plan to discuss with their counterparts in the United States ways in which trade and economic relations can be expanded between the two countries. The mission expects to seek advice of American businessmen in drawing up plans for increasing two-way trade.

"NEW ERA" IN TIES TO UNITED STATES

Mr. Kikawada told newsmen before his departure that Japan feels "we are entering a new era in our relations with the U.S. following the successful conclusion of the Kennedy Round negotiations." He said the mission intends to exchange leaders which will lead to widening of economic cooperation, dening of economic cooperation, particularly with regard to trade in agricultural products.

"Now is the time to reappraise where we stand," Mr. Kikawada said. "We want to emphasize the ultimate gains that will be derived from free trade which is our common goal."

He said the Japanese mission members do not contemplate any specific request for lowering of tariffs or raising of quotas for Japan's products in the United States.

The deputy chairman of the mission, Tatsuzo Mizukami, president of Mitsui and Co., told the press Japan is greatly interested in future developing trade with the American Midwest because this region is the heart of the U.S. economy.

1966 2-WAY TRADE $1.5 BILLION

It is estimated that exports from 12 Midwestern states to Japan reached $680 million in 1966. Two-way trade amounted to $1.5 billion in the same year. Mr. Mizukami pointed out that Japan's demand for industrial and agricultural products is the area most likely to increase sharply as the nation's economy expands in the next few years.

Mission leaders predicted that by 1975, sales of the Midwestern states to Japan will exceed $1.5 billion, or more than twice as much as last year. Agricultural product exports to Japan from this area will approach $1 billion, the Japanese said.

They estimated that manufactured goods, mainly machinery and transportation equipment, shipped to Japan from the Midwestern states will exceed $500 million.

DOUBLED IN 1960–66 PERIOD

Midwestern exports to Japan doubled during the 1960–1966 period, rising from $353 million to $683 million. Japan's imports from the 12 Midwestern states accounted for 30 per cent of the nation's total imports from the United States.

Leaders of the mission noted that Midwestern exports of agricultural products to Japan in 1966 amounted to $438 million, about 46 per cent of Japan's $949 million imports of such products from the U.S. The ratios of Midwestern agricultural exports to such exports from the entire U.S. to Japan were as follows: corn, 84 per cent; soybeans, 75 per cent; raw hides, 65 per cent, and wheat, 50 per cent.

Soybeans topped all other export items at a total of $156 million, the mission chiefs said, adding that during the 1960–1966 period, exports of feed grains registered the most outstanding growth, a 12-fold increase from $12 million in 1960 to $148 million in 1966.

MANUFACTURED GOODS

The Japanese businessmen explained that Midwestern exports of manufactured goods to Japan increased from $129 million in 1960 to $221 million in 1966, accounting for 27 per cent of all exports from the U.S. to Japan in 1966. Machinery exports in that year came to $142 million, about 64 per cent of total exports of manufactured products from the Midwest to Japan.

The growth rate of exports of transportation equipment showed the most remarkable gains. Sales of such equipment reached $17 million, approximately 2.3 times as much as in 1960. Exports of automobiles to Japan rose from $6,561,000 in value in 1960 to more than $11,886,000 last year, the mission leaders pointed out.

It was explained that Midwestern imports of Japanese goods cannot be easily compiled because a considerable portion reaches the Midwest states via New York, the Pacific Coast or Gulf ports. However, Midwestern imports from Japan are estimated at about one-third of the U.S. total purchases from Japan.

$40 Million Lost in Blackout

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1967

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced a bill to enhance the Federal Power Act by assisting the electric utility industry to better cope with the problems it faces.

The power failure of June 5 brought activities of commerce and industry, as well as the simple running of households, to a standstill in a 4-State area whose center is Philadelphia.

This blackout, which lasted little more than an hour, caused considerable trouble where it struck. In Philadelphia alone, the damage to industry and business was an estimated $30 million to $40 million. I am submitting an article from the Sunday Bulletin of June 18 which describes the extent of the losses.

I understand that Philadelphia had another close call on Friday when places of business and households were urged to cut down their use of air-conditioning units in order to conserve power.

In an age when we are becoming more and more dependent on electric powered units for all facets of our living, we need the security of knowing that the power will not fail. Clearly, enactment of the Electric Power Reliability Act will be a step in the right direction.

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Bulletin, June 18, 1967]

Business Lost $40 Million in Blackout Here

Business and industry lost an estimated $30 to $40 million when the lights went out in Philadelphia and parts of four states on June 5.

The estimate was given yesterday by economists of the Federal Power Commission in Washington.

The losses reflected the curtailment of production, sales and services during the blackout. Included were the loss of power sales by the Philadelphia Electric Co. and other utilities.

Philadelphia Electric itself has not yet made its own assessment of the impact it felt, a spokesman said.

ANOTHER THREAT

The FPC economists said they based their estimate on the length of the blackout, which varied from place to place; the level of economic production in the area, and their past experiences.

Past experience includes the big power failure in the Northeast of Nov. 9, 1965, which caused a loss estimated at $100 million.

Philadelphia Electric and other power companies in the Northeast were on the alert yesterday against the danger of another power blackout as a result of the heat wave that moved into this area.

The intense heat and high relative humidity brought air-conditioners into widespread use in private homes, business and industrial establishments. A PE spokesman said that more private homes than ever before are now using electric-powered air-conditioning.

DEMAND RISES

This has created a heavy demand on electric power, and whenever that happens there is always the danger that the overload would cause a breakdown in production, he said.

Such a danger developed on Friday after the temperature shot up into the 90s and the humidity reached steamy proportions.

To meet the emergency, Philadelphia Electric, instituting a plan made last February, telephoned 100 of its biggest industrial users, asking them to shut down their air-conditioning and lights wherever possible.

The PE spokesman said that the company received excellent compliance between 1:30 P.M. and 7 P.M.

The spokesman explained that PE itself did not face any undue drain on its production. The peak power demand came at 2 P.M. Friday with a new record load of 3,687,000 kilowatts.

BREAKDOWN AVERTED

"We were putting out over 4,000,000 kilowatts at the time," the spokesman said.

The kilowatts saved as a result of the voluntary cooperation by the 100 firms were fed into the Pennsylvania-New Jersey-Maryland power interconnection. Thus a possible breakdown was averted in other parts of the interconnection, which could have been felt over the entire system.

There was no danger of any overloading yesterday, the PE spokesman explained, because most industrial plants were shutdown for the week-end.

PE engineers will repeat their alert when full industrial production resumes.

Representative Stafford of Vermont is Honored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1967

Mr. MORSE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, recently our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. Stafford], was honored by the award of an honorary degree of Doctor of Laws by St. Michael's College. Mr. Stafford has been a public servant on behalf of his native State for three decades, serving as a local official, and as attorney general, Lieutenant Governor, and Governor of his State before coming to Washington as Vermont's only Member of Congress. He is a respected member of the House Armed Services Committee, and has this year been selected to serve on the new Committee on Ethics. I am sure we will all join in congratulating Mr. Stafford on this honor from such an outstanding institution of higher education. I include in the

RECORD the citation accompanying the degree and a newspaper article from the June 5 edition of the Burlington Free Press describing the ceremonies and the commencement address of former Presidential Assistant Bill D. Moyers.

ROBERT THEODORE STAFFORD

Robert Theodore Stafford needs no introduction to any assembly in his native State. For the past thirty years the people of Vermont have entrusted him with public offices on ever higher levels of responsibility from city to county, to state, to Congress.

He was Rutland City Grand Juror from 1938 to 1942; Rutland County State's Attorney from 1947 to 1951; Vermont Deputy Attorney General from 1953 to 1955; Attorney General 1955 to 1957; Lieutenant Governor 1957 to 1959; and Governor of Vermont from 1959 to 1961. Since his election to the United States House of Representatives in 1960 he has been reelected to the 88th, 89th and 90th Congresses.

His service to the Nation in time of peril has been equally distinguished. He was on active duty in the United States Navy as a Lieutenant Commander during World War II, and again in the Korean conflict. He is presently a Captain in the Naval Reserve, and in Congress is respected as a most knowledgeable member of the House Armed Services Committee, and its Research and Development Subcommittee, the Airlift Subcommittee, and the Special Subcommittee on Anti-Submarine Warfare.

Because you, Congressman Robert Theodore Stafford, embody the virtues making for high public trust, and because you have served your constituents and your Country with exemplary devotion and honor, Saint Michael's College is proud to confer upon you the degree Doctor of Laws, *honoris causa*.

ST. MICHAEL'S COLLEGE COMMENCEMENT—HONESTY NEEDED IN INTELLIGENT DEBATE ON VIETNAM, MOYERS TELLS GRADUATES

There would be more intelligent debate on United States policy in Vietnam if both the hawks and doves were more honest about the issue of power, Bill D. Moyers, former aide and longtime friend to President Johnson, declared Sunday in a commencement address at St. Michael's College.

The hawks should confess that power has its limits and the doves should concede that power has its place, said the 32-year-old Moyers who resigned his post as presidential assistant last year to become publisher of a Long Island newspaper, Newsday.

Moyers, whom many predict is preparing a political base in New York so he can seek office himself in future years, delivered a 25-minute speech in which he demonstrated his articulateness, wit, and winsome personality.

A lady who identified herself as "a New Yorker," said after the speech, "I'd vote for him anytime he wants to run."

Moyers who received an honorary doctor of laws degree from the Roman Catholic College at Colchester, said debate over Vietnam is meaningless when both sides become intoxicated with their own righteousness. There have been moments when debate over Vietnam has descended to the level of "the virtuous versus the villainous" and as heaven would have it, the villainous are all on the other side, he said.

"The debate has created deep divisions in American life because proponents and opponents alike have become intoxicated with the sense of their own righteousness," he said.

Moyers said it should now be apparent to those who want more done in Vietnam that the fire power of the finest air force in the world is not enough to settle the war.

"What do they have to lose by admitting, in fact, that it has come pretty close to the limits of its usefulness against targets of marginal military importance? Surely they know by now that Moscow has plenty of MIG's to replace the ones we shoot down, that airfields can be repaired rather quickly, that storage tanks can be dispersed, and that a point can be reached when the unabated use of power produces diminishing returns.

"In fact, two years have proven that bombing can handicap a country like North Vietnam, but it cannot drive it beneath the subsistence level. In their hearts the hawks know this is right, but in public, they have yet to admit," Moyers said.

On the other hand, Moyers said the doves could clear the air by recognizing what in their hearts they know is true, that the United States is using its power out of a sense of responsibility, not a sense of opportunity.

"You may believe that the use of force is almost immoral, that is, inconsistent with our understanding of man as a creature of God; but it does no good, given what we have done to this world, to claim that the use of force is always unnecessary," he said.

"In this imperfect state of existence, the failure to use power can be as irresponsible as the willingness to abuse power.

"Nations with the capacity to act have to be careful not to act without cause, but in a world where the rule of law does not yet prevail, they must also be wary of failing to act with cause," Moyers added.

The ex-presidential aide said there will be more fruitful debate if there is a recognition of the purpose of dissent. "We are not trying to help the President and his advisers to decide which is the easy choice and which is not. No, we are trying to assure that the choice they make is the wisest choice.

For this reason, more information, not less, and more debate, not less, are essential," he said.

Moyers declared that a democracy calls for the continuing adjustment of differences and people with alternatives must be heard.

Also receiving honorary degrees were Vermont's congressman, Robert T. Stafford, the Rt. Rev. William J. Shannon, coordinator of the National Catholic Office for Radio and Television; and Dr. Thomas P. Melady, president of the Africa Service Institute of New York.

Some 300 seniors received bachelor's degrees from the Most Rev. Robert F. Joyce, bishop of the Roman Catholic Diocese of Burlington. At the bishop's side was the Very Rev. Gerald E. Dupont, president of the college. Richard Joseph Beaulieu of Highgate Center, received the award for achieving the highest scholastic standing.

Thirty-eight of the graduates received their Air Force ROTC commissions.

Longshoremen Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 21, 1967

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, longshoremen from Maine to Texas are to be represented by their delegates at a convention being held next month. Anthony Scotto, president of local 1814 in Brooklyn, has written an article explaining the goals which they hope to achieve as a result of this convention.

I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article which appeared in the June 1967 edition of the Brooklyn Longshoreman.

The article follows:

LONGSHOREMEN CONVENTION

The longshoremen from Searsport, Maine to Brownsville, Texas, through their elected representatives, are to meet in convention next month.

Each delegate will come to the convention prepared to act on behalf of the men he represents—to set the goals for the union during the next three years—to determine a course of action toward the realization of the goals—to elect officers dedicated to the achievement of the goals.

Sounds impressive, doesn't it? Hundreds of men gathered together making plans, formulating programs, adopting resolutions which will affect the lives of 100,000 union members.

But it all boils down to the individual dock worker—what he needs—what he wants—what will serve his best interests.

The individual dock worker is the only reason for the union's existence. The union's only purpose is to serve him—by providing the best possible wages and working conditions and job security—by protecting him from exploitation of any kind, from loss of income due to technological changes in the industry—by making available to him and to his family benefits which will protect them in times of illness and on retirement—and by keeping him informed at all times of conditions which can have an impact on his personal welfare.

What can every dock worker expect of his union?

First and foremost, that the union protect the individual member's job rights, security and a fair measure of economic justice. This, of course, includes realistic appraisals of existing conditions and changes that can be foreseen with reasonable proposals for meeting them.

Second, that the union be a representative democracy in all its operations. A member must know that he can make his fears and frustrations known to his fellow workers and his elected officials as easily as he does his needs and his desires. The leaders must be able to stand firm in the face of opposition for what they believe is right, against what may be a more popular position at the time. But the union's democracy makes all leaders subject to the support or rejection of the membership.

Third, that the union be completely honest in all its dealings. This is a responsibility that extends far beyond mere finances. The union must be a model of integrity—in its relations with employers—in what it says to its members—in the plans it makes—in the policies it adopts and supports—in the evaluation of its own activities.

Fourth, that the union be ready and willing to undertake responsibilities in the community at large. Projects that will provide better schools and hospitals, prevent further pollution of air and water, support neighborhood improvement, park development—all these must be undertaken in some measure by the union for the benefit of the member.

Fifth, that the union maintain constant vigilance for the member's welfare. Everything which might affect the union member—from on-the-site studies of job performance, employer transfers, portwide development and improvement, international trade and foreign policy—must be the union's ultimate concern.

So, as we move into convention, each of us must re-examine his individual responsibility in and to the union, as the union must re-examine its responsibility to and for the member.

Working with true trade union solidarity we can be assured that our efforts will be rewarded with the prosperity, the progress and the pride that come with being individual dock workers and members of the International Longshoremen's Association.

Henry Awa Wong Retires as Honolulu Caterer to the Elite

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1967

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, when Henry Awa Wong "hung up his hat" on his last day on the job at Wo Fat Chop Suey House, a Honolulu landmark, he was hanging up just one more of the many hats worn by this 71-year-old self-made Hawaii millionaire and entrepreneur.

Following a delightful interview with Mr. and Mrs. Wong at the restaurant recently, Special Correspondent Bob Krauss has written an engaging profile about Honolulu's well-known "Mayor of Chinatown," and I know my colleagues will read the article with the same sense of appreciation and enjoyment that I did.

Mr. Wong's retirement after 10 years as president and general manager of Wo Fat Chop Suey House culminated a career which began in 1911 when the eighth-grade graduate went to work as a clerk in Hofgaard's General Store on the island of Kauai. Since that time, his business activities have encompassed a variety of enterprises, including owning the first 5-and-10 store in Honolulu, and serving as a bank director and insurance executive.

Henry Wong's career is a shining example of the time-honored adage that hard work and perseverance are still the keys to success, and these qualities, combined with his warmth and genuine regard for his fellow man, have brought Mr. Wong to the forefront in the business community of the Island State.

This "Caterer to the Elite," however, found particular enjoyment supervising the preparation and serving of the exquisite Chinese cuisine which earned Wo Fat Chop Suey House its international reputation, and it is a role he reluctantly relinquishes. His island customers, and those celebrities who frequent the famed restaurant, are also reluctant to see him retire from the active scene. His friendly presence will be missed.

As one of Mr. Wong's many friends, I wish him a fond aloha and good health and happiness during his well-earned leisure years.

The article by Mr. Krauss, "A Caterer to Elite Hangs Up His Hat," which appeared in the June 1, 1967, issue of the Honolulu Advertiser, follows:

A CATERER TO ELITE HANGS UP HIS HAT

(By Bob Krauss)

He was wiping dishes in the kitchen of Wo Fat Chop Suey House, the man who has made and lost fortunes, confidant of governors and mayors, host to Jacqueline Kennedy.

It was Henry Awa Wong's last day on the job.

He's a little stooped at 71. He shuffles as he walks and his hand is a bit unsteady when he's chopping onions. But his eyes are alive with humor and his voice has the old bark.

They don't make 'em like that anymore.

He's been known as the "Mayor" of Chinatown for the past 40 years. He owned the first five and dime store in Honolulu. He was the first Chinese director of a haole bank in Hawaii. He helped start the Narcissus Festival. He's been director of Pacific Insurance Co., vice president of Liberty Bank. He's the major share holder in Wo Fat Chop Suey, Ltd., and probably a millionaire several times over.

When the bus boys get rushed, he helps clear tables and scrape the plates.

Yesterday he retired after 10 years as president and general manager of Wo Fat's restaurant. Frank Sinatra is a regular customer. Jackie Kennedy and Doris Duke ate there during Mrs. Kennedy's stay in Hawaii last year.

Henry put down his dish towel and said, "Let me show you the kitchen."

It's a fantastic place. Three chefs worked at the enormous range against the far wall, steam billowing from the huge woks (Chinese cooking pan) they were stirring. An old-fashioned ceiling fan labored to clear the air.

Two juicy, golden-brown roast ducks hung at a table loaded with bowls containing 25 different cooking ingredients—green pepper, Chinese peas, broccoli, several kinds of onions, bamboo shoots, mushrooms, bean sprouts.

Half a chicken bubbled and sizzled and crackled in a big pan of hot grease.

Everywhere there was the clatter of dishes, the roar of the fan, the scraping of stirring spoons on metal, the babble of voices in Cantonese.

And the aroma—rich, tangy, overpowering!

"Here's the freezer," said Henry.

He hauled back on the heavy door and we stepped into the chill box. There we saw bowls of fresh pork, plucked chickens, pans of fresh frozen shrimp, a big platter of icy red kumu, the most tasty fish of all.

Mrs. Wong stuck her head inside. "What's going on here?" she scolded. "Henry Awa Wong, you'll get a chill. Come out of that cold!"

We both emerged meekly, like school boys caught sampling the dessert. Then we took the elevator up to the second floor dining room where practically every important person in Hawaii has eaten at one time or another.

It was quite a while before we reached our table because Henry had to stop so many times to greet his friends. He seemed to know every customer in the place by his first name.

"When I started I had this much," he explained, holding out his empty palm. "My father came from China to work in the banana plantations in Waikiki. In 1895 when I was 4 months old, we moved to Hanapepe, Kauai where my father opened a grocery store."

In 1911, after finishing the eighth grade in Honolulu, Henry went to work at Waimea, Kauai for the C. B. Hofgaard general store.

"I didn't know anything about merchandise when I started," Henry said, spearing a mouthful of noodles with his chopsticks. "But in two years I had learned all of the departments. I could find things the other clerks couldn't."

As a result, the boss made him head clerk.

After five years, a Honolulu businessman, George B. Curtis, talked Henry into moving to Honolulu where he bought half interest in first five and dime in Honolulu. That was about 1919.

Since that time he's branched out into so many businesses that even his wife has lost count. They had a lively argument about the Aala Dry Goods Co., an outfit which Henry insisted made military uniforms before World War II. Mrs. Wong said she doesn't remember any such firm.

One of the reasons I found the interview so delightful is because Henry gets as much enjoyment telling about his failures as his successes.

Directly after the repeal of prohibition, he and three other local businessmen decided there was big money to be made in okolehao.

"There weren't any oke distilleries in Hawaii," Henry said. "When we formed the company all sorts of people wanted to buy in but we wouldn't sell. We knew we were going to make a lot of money.

"We brought over a distiller from California and began distilling 40, 50, 60 barrels a day. It had to be aged in charred barrels. The distiller charred the barrels himself. But he used a kerosene fuel torch.

"After six months, we started selling the aged oke. For the first week sales were brisk. Then the bottom dropped out of the market. We couldn't sell a drop. People said the oke tasted of kerosene. We brought over a chemist from the Mainland to see if he could fix it. No good!"

Henry and his partners managed to sell the stock for 5 cents a barrel which barely paid the Federal taxes.

Out of the failure came one of Henry's most profitable businesses, Hawaiian Oke and Liquors, organized to try to sell the okolehao that tasted of kerosene.

In the meantime, he has operated a finance company, a curio store, and became a shareholder for a time in Waikiki Lau Yee Chai.

His interest in Wo Fat began in 1938 when "they formed a new corporation and they needed money. They asked me to buy in. I'm the biggest shareholder."

Ten years ago, Henry became manager of the chop suey house. Since that time he has arrived at 7 a.m. every day to help chop the vegetables. The only days the restaurant is closed are New Year's and Chinese New Year.

"I come to work on those days too because that's when we paint the kitchen," Henry said.

He said in 1938 the company put up a new building, the present one at a cost of $58,000. In 1955 the place was remodeled at a cost of $168,000. Today the building is worth $400,000.

Even so, Henry is not one to spend money unnecessarily.

In 1938 he paid the painter who put the colorful design on the ceiling and walls $1 a day. When the building was remodeled in 1955, the same painter asked $4.50 an hour.

"Forget it," said Henry. He got one of his cooks to touch up the dining room.

Another money saver is tablecloths. A table having a $10 dinner will get linen. But if you're having a $1.25 plate lunch, don't expect such luxury.

During the past few years, Henry has been giving up his many positions one by one. The job he held onto was running Wo Fat.

"He likes to come down to chop the vegetables and meet the people," said his son, David. "But his health isn't good. It's too much. I think he'll still have his old desk across the street at the liquor store, up on the balcony."

And so it will be this morning for the first time in 10 years, that Henry Awa Wong won't be running the kitchen at Wo Fat.

But it is likely that he will still be on duty as Mayor of Chinatown in the old wooden chair at Hotel and Maunakea where he got the job, gossiping with cronies, helping his friends, advising politicans, and making money.

Semblance of Balance Abandoned

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1967

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, the recent nomination to the U.S. Supreme Court has drawn much comment in the press of the country. This appointment is significant because of the fact that it has again altered the balance of the Court insofar as social, welfare, and criminal cases are concerned. Much of the comment is quite appropriate but one of the finest articles which I have seen is a column by James J. Kilpatrick which appeared in the Saturday, June 17, issue of the Richmond News-Leader and other papers throughout the country. Mr. Kilpatrick is an avid student of decisions of the Court and he has given much careful study to the long history of the decisions of the Supreme Court as they have affected our national history.

I do not believe that there is any question that the recent appointment heralds a more liberal approach to many of the issues of our time. Aside from any racial connotations that can be placed on the appointment, it is a foregone conclusion that we are in store for more liberal pronouncements from the so-called Supreme Court. The Constitution clearly set up the Court as an interpreter of the law and not as a maker of law. In recent years, we have been treated to a growing tendency on the part of some members of the Court to arrogate unto themselves powers never intended by the Constitution.

Mr. Kilpatrick in his article has set forth very cogently the crux of the issue and I recommend his statement to the reading of the Members of the House. The article follows:

SEMBLANCE OF BALANCE ABANDONED

WASHINGTON.—The nomination of Thurgood Marshall to the U.S. Supreme Court has produced cries of jubilation within the liberal left. On the conservative side of the fence, the prospect produces only a sharp dismay. Where goes the Constitution now?

The big news in Marshall's nomination, of course, is that he is the first Negro ever to be named to the court. In the larger view, the matter of his race is immaterial. The overriding fact is that in choosing Marshall to replace the retiring Tom Clark, President Johnson deliberately has moved to upset the rough balance of liberalism and conservatism that recently has prevailed upon the high tribunal. Next term, the forces of judicial restraint will be represented only by Harlan Stewart, and White, with an occasional vote from Black. The judicial activists will be in full control.

To either view—conservative or liberal—the consequences of this replacement cannot be emphasized enough. When the founding fathers created the Supreme Court in the Constitution of 1787, it was widely supposed that the court always would be the weakest branch of the central government. The driving force of the court's first Mr. Justice Marshall—Chief Justice John—changed all that. By a process of evolution culminating dramatically in the Warren Court, the tribunal has become the most powerful authority in the whole of our Federal system. Its members, serving for life, are in a commanding position to shape national policies as they please. These days, they often are pleased to turn the Constitution into wax.

Nothing that is said here is intended as criticism of Thurgood Marshall, the man. He is an immensely attractive fellow, as charming as his predecessor of 150 years ago. During a decade of bitter litigation on civil rights issues, Southern attorneys developed an abiding respect and affection for him. At one time, it might have been possible to oppose his nomination by reason of Marshall's total concentration on the narrow field of Negro rights, but his service on the U.S. Second Circuit and his experience as Solicitor General have removed that objection. Beyond cavil, he is qualified for the high court—more qualified, in truth, than many of his predecessors.

Neither is this intended to say that Clark was a wholly consistent conservative on the bench, or that members of the high court in every case follow predictable lines. Clark had his activist relapses, as in the reapportionment cases; he was not above using his high office to vent his personal spleen, as in the Toilet Goods Association case of May 22. Most judges jump the philosophical traces now and then.

Nevertheless, the briefest glance at key cases of this past term will make the point.

In Adderley v. Florida, Clark was one of five who voted to sustain the convictions of 32 Negro students who undertook to trespass upon the Leon County jail in the name of civil rights. The opinion put a brake on some of the excesses of racial demonstrations. How would Marshall have voted in that case?

This past Monday, in Walker v. Birmingham, Clark was one of five who voted to sustain the conviction of Martin Luther King for putting his own view of the law above the order of a court. Would Marshall have voted to send Martin Luther King to jail?

In Fortson v. Morris, Clark was one of five who upheld the power of the Georgia legislature to name a Governor when no candidate obtained a majority in the popular election. Nothing in the Fourteenth Amendment, said the majority, prevents a State from so ordering its own affairs. But Marshall's whole record demonstrates a doctrinaire view of the Fourteenth; he reads into "equal protection" all sorts of provisions the framers of that amendment never intended.

In Cooper v. California, and again in McCray v. Illinois, Clark was one of five who voted to strengthen the hand of police officials in securing evidence of crime. The two decisions served to bring some common sense back to the law of Fourth Amendment searches. How would Marshall have voted in these critically important cases? It is a fair surmise that he would have voted with Warren, Douglas, Brennan and Fortas to reverse.

What the court and country will be getting in Marshall will be a more congenial Fortas, a less truculent Goldberg, a more disarming Brennan. The appointment is a great tribute to Marshall's own skill and industry; he is the grandson of a slave, the son of a Pullman waiter. No critic would wish to take away from the heart-warming success story that came to its climax Tuesday. All the same, in any conservative view of the workings of the court, the nomination is something worse than net no-gain. This was bad news—almost disastrous news—and we shall be living with it for the next ten years at least.

Federal Law Should Halt Interstate Riot Peddlers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. EVERETT

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1967

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, there recently appeared an editorial in the Nashville Banner, one of the leading newspapers of this Nation, whose publisher is James G. Stahlman, relative to legislation that has been introduced by our distinguished colleague, Representative RICHARD FULTON, of Nashville.

The editorial is so outstanding and to the point that I feel it should be brought to the attention of the Congress. The editorial follows:

RIGHT REPRESENTATIVE FULTON OF TENNESSEE—FEDERAL LAW SHOULD HALT INTERSTATE RIOT PEDDLERS

Rep. Richard Fulton is on solid ground in proposing a federal law prohibiting the crossing of a state line to incite a riot. It would invoke the same interstate authority by which the Federal Government enforces other statutes bearing on crime.

In this era of widespread civil disorder, mob violence, and wholesale assault on city after city, the explosion hardly ever is triggered by local hands. In case after case, the record shows, the incidents of community nightmare have been deliberately planned. As Congressman Fulton states it, "They have followed a distinct pattern. Almost invariably an individual known for his call to violence, or one of his followers, has arrived on the scene and shortly afterward another community has been torn by rioting mobs."

They are itinerant trouble-makers, fanning out from home base, and crossing state lines, for the specific purpose of fomenting war in the streets. As in the case of Stokely Carmichael, their battle cry is "Kill and Burn!"

The tracks are there, crossing and crisscrossing the nation in an odessey of tireless excursion in which federal authority would indulge no other bracket of criminal conspiracy. From Florida to Tennessee they lead; from Alabama to California; from Boston to Cincinnati to Chicago to Cleveland—instigators from out of state, riding the riot circuit, sowing sedition, and leaving cities in shambles.

As Dick Fulton put it, "My own city of Nashville has been the victim of such an invasion of mob leaders and has experienced the nightmare of burning and looting. In Nashville's case the catalyst was the hate-venon espoused by Stokley Carmichael."

But his further definition, it is an organized wave of terror, and the need for legislation to curb it becomes more critical each day.

Is Congress listening? If so, it will hear the confirmation from America's grass-roots—the united voices of decency raised by a law-abiding people demanding some elementary law and enforcement by federal authorities. The state and local governments are not defaulting at their own levels of responsibility; but a material assist can be given by the federal law sought, forbidding interstate operations by these characters of subversion.

A kidnaper who crosses a state line is grabbed by Uncle Sam. So is a car thief. So are other dealers in commericalized vice.

Why no anarchists and kindred imported seditionists whose intent is to overthrow all authority and burn down the nation?

Congressman Fulton is right. The enabling legislation he has introduced to supplement existing devices of community protection should be enacted into law, and enforced to the letter.

Title III Cultural Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1967

Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, last year we approved a $164 million appropriation for the Title III Cultural Program of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. This year, as the 1966–67 school year comes to an end, schools across the Nation are terminating their evaluations of the program.

In a recent meeting, the advisory committee to Federick County's title III cultural program concluded that the success of the program and it's impact on Frederick County students warranted the filing of an application with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for a comprehensive cultural program for the school year 1967–68.

I wish to commend Dr. John L. Carnochan, Jr., superintendent of Frederick County schools, Mr. T. Meade Felton, supervisor of Federal programs, Mr. Robert L. Pitts, director of title III cultural programs of Frederick County, and the teachers in the Frederick County public schools for their interest and concern in making this program a meaningful and integral part of the daily educational lives of 21,865 Frederick County students.

At this point I would like to place in the Record an article from the Frederick Post which mentions the program activities of the past year and other details resulting from the advisory committee's evaluation. The article follows:

[From the Frederick Post, June 12, 1967]

21,865 Children Participated in Title III Program

The Advisory Committee to Frederick County's Title III Cultural Program, sponsored by the Board of Education, met recently in the Conference Room of the Board of Education.

The purpose of the meeting was to evaluate the past year's program with the pilot teachers and to view an exhibit of work by the 21,865 participating children of Frederick County.

Upon entering the meeting, guests viewed displays of evaluation letters, newspaper clippings and commemorative photographs taken at performances. This was followed by the Program's Director, Robert L. Pitts, narrating a ten minute slide-presentation of the cultural series' objectives, and specific activities of the past school year, including scenes from: the talk and exhibit of of the Ambassador of India, Madame Nehru; commentary-piano recital by Evelyn Swarthout; historical memorabilia from the Smithsonian Institution; the Harkness Ballet of New York; and a program of classical music and display of Renaissance instruments by the University of Maryland trio.

Folders were given to each member of the Advisory Committee containing: reports from teachers, pilot groups, and evaluation letters. A total of 21,865 Frederick County children from every school in Frederick County participated in this first year's cultural series.

Reports from schools throughout Frederick County were that attendance by students at the cultural events had increased their desire to read supplemental informational books, and newspapers, participate in creative activity in the class-room, and through observation at these cultural events had improved their manners.

It was announced by the director that the Board of Education had filed an application with the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, for a Comprehensive Cultural Program for the school year 1967–68.

Community organizational representatives and guests attending were: Donald H. Campbell, Dr. Dorothy Elliott, Mrs. Peg Fields, Sister Gertrude and Sister Jane Marie, Mr. and Mrs. Darl Hinkle, Mr. and Mrs. Donald E. Leatherman, Mrs. E. Lewis Peters, Mrs. August Seickmann, and Mrs. Richard Summers.

Supervisors from the Board of Education, in addition to Pitts, were: T. Meade Felton, Mrs. Louise F. Thompson, Robert Hess, Thomas Silliman and William Luzier.

Pilot teachers, representing grades one, four, six, eight and ten, were: Mrs. Frances Crum, Miss Anne Lovell, Miss Joanne Runkles, Miss Ruth Stull, John Tweedy, and Mrs. Charlotte Woodrow.

Following the meeting a reception was held commemorating the first year of Title III programs with Mrs. Louise Hammell and Miss Kay Staley acting as Hostesses.

Taxpayers OEO Funds Defend Rioters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1967

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the acknowledgement by Sargent Shriver that our tax moneys were being used through his OEO program to defend rioters and looters can but confirm the American people's opinion of the poverty program.

Obviously, we are not helping poor folk to help themselves—we are helping criminals and revolutionaries attack and destroy decent society and in effect subsidizing the corruption of our country.

Who ever heard of civilized, educated people being forced by their government to pay out of their paychecks blackmail money to subsidize a revolution to destroy everything we hold dear in life?

Charity begins at home—ask anyone who fights poverty by working.

I include with my remarks the news stories from the Evening Star of June 21, 1967:

Funds Used in Riot Case Defenses, Shriver Says

Sargent Shriver has acknowledged that federal antipoverty funds sometimes financed legal services for poor people arrested in riots or demonstrations, but he says that local community action groups decide when to use such money for this purpose.

He told the House Education and Labor Committee yesterday that Office of Economic Opportunity lawyers and other federal attorneys here do not take part in such cases.

Shriver added that federal anti-riot legislation soon to be considered at House Judiciary Committee hearings might end involvement of OEO funds for defense of persons charged with offenses of that kind.

ABOUT 250 PROGRAMS

This discussion developed at the Education and Labor Committee hearings on the OEO's request for $2.06 billion for the coming fiscal year. The hearing dealt mainly with the agency's legal services operation in local community action programs.

Shriver and Earl Johnson, director of the legal services program, said that about 250 such programs with 1,500 lawyers currently help poor families throughout the country. Approximately 15 percent of the cases involve divorce and related problems, they said.

Johnson explained that OEO funds could become "involved" in riot and similar cases if a judge in the local community appointed an attorney to represent a defendant lacking funds, or if the defendant's family requested aid from the community action program.

Such instances have been rare and have been confined to state and local courts, Johnson said. He recalled one in the Watts section of Los Angeles, and a more recent case in Cincinnati. Like Shriver, he emphasized that use of federal antipoverty funds in which instances was not directed from Washington and hinged on decisions by local community action groups and their advisory committees made up of attorneys in the community.

CITES LEGAL CANONS

"The legal services program of OEO would be violating canons of the legal profession if poor defendants in need of legal counsel were separated according to the kind of case they were in," Johnson said.

He called attention to public defenders laws in the District and elsewhere and noted that federal money is used in such instances to pay legal expenses of indigent defendants in federal courts.

In response to other questions by Democratic as well as Republican members from northern and southern states, Shriver declared that cities which have experienced racial disturbances were neither favored nor discriminated against in antipoverty programs or money. He said there has been "no cause and effect" relation between antipoverty programs and the occurrence of riots in various communities.

Program Shriver Bosses Is One Big "Come Get It!"

(By Henry J. Taylor)

Sargent Shriver has made baby-sitting a function of the federal government (taxpayers' money), but I didn't know until I heard from Denver that he's busy there in ways also as out of place as a tuna fish in a trumpet.

His Office of Economic Opportunity, invading the health field at public expense, has tossed into Denver alone $805,000, with a prospective $3.3 million in 1967, for free health centers.

The Medicare law is already creating more problems than it is solving. Meanwhile, its cost is far beyond the estimate Washington stated to the voters. But as our government spreads its bureaucracy across the land in the name of the Great Society, Shriver has succeeded in compounding the mess.

Handing our money to what's called "Denver Opportunity," the Office of Economic Opportunity provided the initial center in a Negro area. But the Mexican population apparently applied enough pressure to have another opened at the opposite end of town. A third is planned for the city's southeast section.

Other centers are already in New York City and Boston, and I assume that, true to form, these will be expanded around the country unless the taxpayers learn the score.

The centers provide free (taxpayer's money) doctor care and examinations, nursing, prenatal care, dentistry, dental bridgework, X-rays, psychiatric services, all drugs and prescriptions and what-have-you.

At the moment 51 full-time specialists are on hand in the initial Denver layout, another 20 work part time and 72 more work as switchboard operators, custodians, and chauffeurs for visitors unable to get to the center. That totals 143 people on the public payroll one way or another.

Residents within eight areas qualified to get any or all of this free assistance are supposed to fall into five categories:

Anyone earning less than $3,000 a year; any family of two earning less than $5,000; any family of three, less than $6,000; of four, less than $7,000; of five, less than $8,000.

Accordingly, any family consisting of a man, his wife and three children earning less than $8,000 per year is in clover for all these services, drugs, etc., free.

Well, the Bureau of Labor Statistics tells me that 85 per cent of all the nation's families are represented by incomes up to $10,000 a year. Only 1 per cent earns more. Fourteen per cent earn $10,000 to $7,500; 26 per cent less than $3,000.

On an expanded basis, Shriver might as

well shout to the entire United States, "Come and get it!" And, in a large measure, it looks like that's what he's up to.

At first, the Denver center checked the visitors' statements regarding their incomes, a ridiculous idea because it might save the taxpayers some money. That alarming precaution was promptly called "an invasion of privacy"—a complaint for which most politicians have no more stomach than to eat a panther's paw. Local observers insist that the precaution, to no one's surprise, has been largely discontinued.

The center is now filling prescriptions free at a reported rate of around 350 per day, and the estimated cost for each and every person who has come in averages $87 per person.

This charge is borne by both the federal taxpayer and the local city taxpayers—thus generally twice—on the basis of 90 per cent out of the national till, 10 per cent locally.

The merchandise given out is obtained from the Denver General Hospital at that institution's cost, and the taxpaying local druggist, of course, is providing 10 per cent of this cost to help himself go out of business. Nor is this all.

University of Maryland Prof. H. H. Hinricks, who analyzed the costs, estimates that it costs the nation's retailers (like druggists) at least $300 million a year out of their own pockets to account for the federal, state and local taxes the retailers must collect.

The taxpaying wholesale druggist (an indispensable man for efficiency in a health society) loses out to the centers at the same time while he, too, helps himself go out of business.

Big Brother plugs for a "truth in packaging law." Big Brother should also sponsor a new "truth in government" law requiring honesty and full disclosure in government programs' packages for those who foot the bill.

Unions Get Legislative Powers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1967

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, in a recent ruling, the Supreme Court has told the workingman that he better obey the rules of the union or accept the consequences which the union can enforce through the courts.

If a man has the free choice of whether he will or will not join an organization, it is up to him to decide whether he can live with the rules of membership. If he finds after joining that he was mistaken, he has the right to resign. So it is with chambers of commerce, the "union" of the businessmen. They can make any rules they want but, if a businessman does not like them, he simply refuses to pay dues or just does not join in the first place.

But not so with the laboring man's union. The worker has a free choice in most instances; that of either joining the union or of changing his occupation to one in which union membership is not required. Then, if he feels that eating and paying rent are important and that his chosen occupation is the only one in which he is capable of earning enough to do that, he joins the union whether he likes their rules or not.

It will, therefore, be interesting to see, when a union member-victim of an arbitrary rule or an act of discrimination to which he objects is fined therefor, what liberal organizations will rush to the defense of his "rights."

The column by David Lawrence, appearing in the Washington Star on June 14, explains the additional opportunity for coercion that has been granted to labor leaders through the misguided sense of justice displayed so often by the Supreme Court.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the column in the RECORD.

RIGHT OF DISSENT SEEN CURBED

(By David Lawrence)

In Russia a person can't get or keep a job unless he conforms to the rules and discipline of the trade unions set up by the Communist party. There is no "right of dissent." In the United States a judicial oligarchy of five men has just taken away from members of trade unions this same right, and placed them under the discipline of labor organizations. The Supreme Court of the United States by a 5-to-4 decision has ruled that, if workers do not abide by union rules, they may be punished by the union. They can no longer assert their right to work and to cross a picket line. To do so means risking heavy financial penalties.

This sensational decision overrides the provisions of the National Labor Relations Act itself wherein Congress forbade either an employer or a union to "restrain or coerce" workers in the exercise of their right to "refrain from" concerted activities.

The majority of the justices held that, since the union was the designated bargaining agent for employes, it should set up rules that bound all of them. Yet the union is itself not the employer. It is merely the agent of the employes and, when it makes a contract, it does so on behalf of the employes, who can ratify or reject it. But the new Supreme Court ruling says a union group has the power, when a strike starts, to decide that an employe cannot continue to work for his employer even if he wishes to do so.

Much has been heard lately about the sacred "right of dissent." Some individuals, to be sure, have misused this right as a justification for the disregard of statutes governing law and order. When protests are merely expressions of individual opinions and no public law is violated, the principle of dissent is recognized as a constitutional privilege. Apparently a labor union now can make its own laws on a parity with public legislation.

The "right of dissent" has been vehemently espoused by "liberals," but, oddly enough, most of them have never taken a stand against the arbitrary action of unions in depriving a worker of his individual rights. There are 30 states, for instance, which permit labor unions to deny a job to anyone who isn't willing after 30 or 60 days to join the union. The worker may have conscientious objections to unionization and may wish to do his own bargaining with the employer, but such individual freedom is denied. In fact, the "right to work" is taken away from the citizen unless he accepts the system of conformity by coercion.

Even Justices Douglas and Black, who often have been found on the "liberal" side in decisions of the high court, joined this time with Justices Stewart and Harlan in declaring that the latest ruling, in effect, extinguishes the right of dissent by individual labor-union members. In the view of the four justices in the minority, the "real reason" for the majority's ruling is its "policy judgment" that, in order to increase their strength, labor unions need the power to impose fines on dissenters who are unwilling to join a strike and to "enforce those fines in court." The minority opinion says in part:

"It is one thing to say that Congress did not wish to interfere with the union's power, similar to that of any other kind of voluntary association, to prescribe specific conditions of membership. It is quite another thing to say that Congress intended to leave unions free to exercise a court-like power to try and punish members with a direct economic sanction for exercising their right to work."

There is plenty of criticism over the high court's tendency to legislate in disregard of the will of Congress and of the principles of freedom imbedded in the Constitution. Justice Michael A. Musmanno of Pennsylvania's Supreme Court said recently:

"I am not being disrespectful when I say that the Supreme Court of the United States has become a super-Congress. . . . .

"I do not mean to say that the Supreme Court has not at times legislated wisely. . . . But as a student of law, I would say that the Supreme Court has no right to legislate at all."

It seems ironic that, with the hue and cry currently about the "right of dissent," the words of the First Amendment to the Constition which guarantee "freedom of speech" have been summarily brushed aside by a majority of the highest court in the land.

Crime in the District Rises 41.1 Percent During May

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1967

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, of the many problems foreign and domestic facing our Nation today, probably none is more directly worrying to Americans of all walks of life than the frightening growth of crime.

Now—in the Nation's Capital which should be a showcase for the Nation—it is no exaggeration to say that law and order are fast vanishing. When the Washington Post headlines on page 1 that "Crime in the District Rises 41.1 Percent During May," as compared with the same month a year ago, it is obvious that a bad, not a good example is being set. The increase in murders was an unprecedented 171.1 percent.

I have said before, and I say again, no civilization can exist without law and order. Everything else aside, the administration has allowed to be created in the Federal District an atmosphere in which the "smart" policeman looks away when a crime is being committed. The police power is stultified in the District of Columbia. No number of Presidential commissions to investigate crime in the National Capital can hide the fact that there is no apparent will to come to grips with a crime situation which has gradually gotten completely out of hand. No amount of Federal spending as proposed in the proposed Presidential crime bill is going to take the place of that lack of will. Federal spending is not the answer to everything and certainly not to this problem for the District of Columbia has more police per capita than most other cities.

By unanimous consent, I introduce in the RECORD the Washington Post report to which I have referred:

CRIME IN DISTRICT RISES 41.1 PERCENT DURING MAY

There were 880 more serious crimes reported in Washington last month than there were in May, 1966, an increase of 41.1 percent.

Police Chief John B. Layton's regular monthly report showed that only aggravated assaults decreased among the seven crime index categories listed. The 255 of those reported last month represented a decrease of 18.8 per cent from May of last year.

The 3022 crimes reported last month compared 2142 recorded in May, 1966, and with 2673 reported in May, 1965. The increase last month over May, 1965, was about 13 per cent, but the reports two years ago were differently classified—as Part I offenses instead of the crime index offenses now in use for statistical purposes.

Thus, the 13 homicides reported in May, 1965, included negligent homicides involving traffic accidents.

The biggest increase last month was registered in criminal homicides, with 29 of them reported compared with 7 in May, 1966—an increase of 171.4 per cent.

The next largest increase was in robberies, with 414 reported last month and 220 in May, 1965—an 88.2 per cent increase. The 414 robberies would have represented an increase of about 44 per cent over May, 1965, when reported robberies included pickpocket thefts and purse snatchings.

Burglaries were up 53.8 per cent over the May, 1965, figures and auto thefts rose 55.2 per cent. Crime index larcenies were up 20.8 per cent last month over the May, 1966, report.

Results of Questionnaire Survey of the 19th District of Illinois

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM RAILSBACK

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1967

Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Speaker, the last week in April I mailed to my constituents in the 19th District a questionnaire on 12 of the important issues facing the 90th Congress. The enthusiastic response has been most gratifying, and I am very pleased about the interest and discussions which have been engendered by this questionnaire.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include the results of this survey of my district, since I am sure these views will be of interest to other Members of Congress.

The following percentages are based on the approximately 17,500 opinions of those responding. It will be noted that on nine issues there was 63 percent or better agreement.

In summary, more than 80 percent of the respondents favor greater efforts by the Federal Government to solve water and air pollution problems, and believe legislation is needed to allow greater police freedom in law enforcement. About this same percentage of respondents opposes the President's proposed 6 percent tax surcharge.

A large majority also favors a tax-sharing plan to return certain revenues to the States without Federal controls; would like to see the United States do more militarily in Vietnam, while at the same time would favor a more vigorous effort toward peace and negotiation in Vietnam. On the other hand, a substantial majority favors less Federal involvement with respect to State and local problems; feels that present farm programs do not serve the best interests of U.S. agriculture and the Nation, and thinks the war on poverty has been unsuccessful so far in improving the condition of the poor.

Those issues on which respondents are most evenly divided are: the increase of social security benefits, legislation to regulate the sale of firearms, and the proposal for a national lottery system in the military.

The complete tabulation is as follows:

[Results in percent]

Do you believe legislation is needed to allow greater police freedom in law enforcement?

Yes	81
No	11. 5
Undecided	7. 5

Do you believe that a national lottery system would be better than the present way the Selective Service drafts men for military service?

Yes	33. 5
No	45. 5
Undecided	21

Would you favor Federal legislation to regulate the sale of firearms?

Yes	43
No	50. 5
Undecided	6. 5

Do you favor the President's proposal for an increase in income tax through a 6-percent surcharge?

Yes	8
No	81. 5
Undecided	10. 5

Do you favor a plan whereby a percentage of Federal taxes would be returned to the States with no strings attached?

Yes	64
No	23
Undecided	13

Do you favor greater efforts by the Federal Government to solve water and air pollution problems?

Yes	81
No	12
Undecided	7

Do present farm programs serve the best interests of U.S. agriculture and the Nation?

Yes	8. 5
No	66. 5
Undecided	25

Do you favor increasing social security benefits?

Yes	43. 5
No	46
Undecided	10. 5

Do you think the War on Poverty has been—(a) very successful; (b) slightly successful; (c) unsuccessful—so far in improving the condition of the poor?

A	2
B	31. 5
C	64. 5
No answer	2

Concerning U.S. military activity in Vietnam, would you like to see the U.S.—(a) do more; (b) do less; (c) about the same?

A	69
B	13. 5
C	13. 5
No answer	4

Concerning U.S. efforts toward peace and negotiation in Vietnam, do you favor—(a) a more vigorous effort; (b) less than we are doing now; (c) about what we are doing now?

A	63
B	8
C	26
No answer	3

Do you favor—(a) greater; (b) less; (c) about what it is now—Federal involvement with respect to State and Local problems?

A	7
B	72
C	19
No answer	2

Rhodesian Peace and Progress in Africa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1967

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, while many recipients of the foreign aid deduction from our tax dollars suffer revolutions and revert backward in civilization, free Rhodesia, under the guiding hand of Mr. Ian Smith, continues to prosper and prove its leadership in the causes of peace and progress in Africa. Rhodesia receives none of our tax subsidies; she has made her record by the work and cooperation of her people and earned the respect of all free nations.

Mr. Speaker, I insert the story by John Worrall from the London Guardian of June 1967 in the RECORD for our colleagues to study:

RHODESIA LAUGHS AT SANCTIONS 18 MONTHS AFTER

(From John Worrall in Salisbury)

The time has come, 18 months after the Smith rebellion, to take another hard look at Rhodesian sanctions. It can give little satisfaction to anybody concerned, least of all to Britain.

President Kaunda of Zambia recently described sanctions as "piecemeal," "half-hearted," and "inept." His speech was reported with some satisfaction on Rhodesia's television and radio. He was probably just having another knock at Britain, but he does have a special interest in the Rhodesian situation and is certainly in a better position than most to know what is going on in the sanctions field, which affects Zambia almost as much as Rhodesia.

MORALE SOUNDER

The awkward fact must be faced by Britain that up to the moment the combined brains, knowhow, and political, financial, and diplomatic power of Britain, America, and the United Nations have clearly failed to defeat this community of a mere 220,000 whites settled in the middle of Africa.

With comparatively meagre resources in money, skills, and brains the Smith Government has maintained a successful holding operation and there are no signs whatever that it is weakening. In spite of the serious hurts inflicted on tender areas like tobacco, the Rhodesian economy is still in one piece. The Rhodesian way of life and White supremacy are going strong. White morale is sounder than ever. Mr. Smith's political image remains untarnished. The Rhodesians even have time to engage in internal squabbling.

Offered one splendid deal, Mr. Smith rejected it and is now holding out for the lot—

recognition of independence on Rhodesia's terms. Britain is plainly being challenged to the uttermost. This certainly does not indicate weakness.

Where is the promised collapse of the Smith regime? Where is the hoped-for takeover by a moderate administration which was to put the famous six principle into being and conduct Rhodesia by gradual stages back to majority rule?

I believe that it is still dangerously wishful thinking to believe that sanctions are producing anything near collapse, or that they will do so this year or next year. It is not inconceivable, in fact, that Mr. Smith will get away with his rebellion on more or less his own terms if African and world events continue to play into his hands.

Most impartial business men who are prepared to talk will tell you that sanctions are doing a great deal of damage in many key areas and that the economy is slowly running down. It is difficult to see that it could be otherwise in the circumstances. The effects, however, are skillfully contained by antisanctions Government agencies, a group of clever civil servants, and the large community of bankers, financiers, industrialists, and business men who are not necessarily with the UDI movement but whose very survival depends on beating sanctions.

Government propaganda, of course, tells the Rhodesians every day that they are winning. Care is also taken to warn the public of sacrifices and austerity to come. But the Rhodesians can look round for themselves: they see changes, but certainly no evidence of approaching ruin and disaster.

NEW HOUSES

The busy Salisbury streets swarm with cars. There is plenty of petrol to go round and, while father is at the office, mother takes the children to school in the second car and collects them. Shop trade is brisk. Gone are the glamorous imports and you can mostly only buy Rhodesian, which is good and patriotic.

There is a rash of expensive new houses going up all over Salisbury, more than at any time since the end of Federation. The swimming pool boom is genuine. This, of course, means there is an unhealthy lot of spare money around, but at the same time it does indicate confidence.

Restaurants, hotels, and cafes serve much the same food as always, although whisky and imported wines are scarce. Weekend sport goes on as usual, and the races draw thousands of punters. The housewife faces less variety and its all much more expensive, but most white families still live much better than their relatives in Britain—or South Africa.

AFRICANS HIT

The greatest pressures, and this is the supreme irony, are on the Africans who have not the resources to stand rising living costs. They are hit more than the Whites by sanctions-created unemployment and their only way out is to go back to the tribal reserves to live with their families on subsistence.

Is it all a colossal bluff? Has this unremarkable Government, with its remarkable leader, managed to deceive all the people all the time? Can they magically make the abnormal look normal? I don't believe it, and no journalist working here believes it either, however hard it may be to get at the true facts.

It is difficult to say in detail why sanctions are not working as intended because of the impenetrable secrecy which surrounds the whole operation. But here are a few pointers. The most important, perhaps, is the resilience of the Rhodesian economy, largely a heritage of the Federation, which has been able to absorb, albeit painfully, the known casualties and the severe economic strictures.

The obvious casualties have been the closing of the car assembly plants, the paralysis of the Feruka oil refinery and the Beira pipeline, the collapse of the sugar export trade, the virtual abandonment of manufactured exports to Zambia, the cessation of the key £20 millions tobacco trade with Britain, the seizure of part of Rhodesia's financial reserves, the strictures on mineral exports, the drying up of foreign investment capital, and the cutting of financial ties with the London money market.

These attacks were met by stringent Government economies to conserve foreign exchange for refined oil purchases from South Africa and Mozambique, to buy in successive tobacco crops from the farmers, and to import essential raw materials and commodities. Dropping exports have been balanced by heavily pruned imports, thus maintaining a favourable balance of payments.

The Rhodesian manufacturers then rallied round with import substitution on an impressive scale. This has been a great success, has made some quick fortunes, kept domestic and industrial consumers happy, created for the first time a healthy home market, and kept money turning around. At the same time the farmers have been going over heavily to food crops such as maize, and the beef industry is booming.

EXPORT CHANNELS

Import substitution has absorbed unemployment, produced hidden skills, kept morale high, and in fact has led to a minor industrial revolution. Never have the Rhodesian manufacturers, automatically protected, had it so good.

Meanwhile, business men, using cloak and dagger methods, have been skillfully exploiting every possible underground channel for the export of primary and secondary goods to the continent and even to Zambia and Malawi. South Africa is proving a very good customer indeed. Everybody knows somebody who is doing business with Britain and America and there is a constant flow of dollars. Swiss francs, Deutschmarks, and rands through British and South African banks to keep the reserves in good order.

Through mysterious channels (Trieste? Las Palmas?) and those not so mysterious (Mozambique? South Africa?) Rhodesian beef, chrome, and asbestos are still being exported in unknown quantities, and at least a proportion of tobacco is steadily leaving the country, but not enough to diminish appreciably the growing stockpile.

REAL CRISIS

Nobody seems to have much trouble in importing (mostly through South Africa) raw materials, machinery, tractors, and other essential equipment. It is all immensely costly and Rhodesia is in the dreadfully weak position of having to buy dear and sell cheap. It is at the mercy of sharp practice, costly deals, and crooked agents.

The real crisis will come in July when the Government decides how much tobacco the farmers may grow. If it is the same as last year, 200 million lb. and the Government can find the money—£25 millions—to pay for it the farmers can breathe again. If it is less, more farmers may go to the wall and the present unrest in the tobacco trade may become a political issue. If the Government can weather this tobacco crisis it will be yet another indication of strength, but Rhodesia still must export her tobacco, which has always been her main source of foreign exchange

Two major factors contribute to the weakness of sanctions. One is the "business as usual" policy of South Africa and Portugal and their secret cooperation in many financial and trade dealings. Most important of these, of course, is oil, which keeps Rhodesia going. Rhodesia is getting so much petrol now that it is able to stockpile, and there is evidence of this in the storage tanks going up in many parts of the country. The irony is that although Britain has closed the crude oil pipeline and blockages Beira, the British oil companies, Shell and BP, are supplying a big proportion of Rhodesia's needs through Lourenco Marques, from which it travels to Rhodesia by rail. No wonder the pipeline company is mad!

The second factor is Britain's sanctions policy, which is designed to keep up just enough pressure to force political change and not to damage the economy irreparably. This leads to inhibited action, a lot of laughs from Salisbury, and suggests most powerfully that sanctions do not really work unless they are directed against an enemy in a shooting war.

Political change is undoubtedly taking place in Rhodesia, but not the way Britain wants it. There are, it is true, opposition rumblings and more people are beginning to question the Government's actions. But the main reaction in the all-powerful Rhodesian Front has been to move to the republican and racialist Rightwing and dig in against any kind of liberal concession whatever.

FOUR OPTIONS

Britain now has four main options: concede defeat; use force; move towards another compromise agreement; or go on plugging away with intensified sanctions in the hope that they will one day make Rhodesia sue for peace.

The first option is clearly not a starter for Britain, and the second is plainly out of the question. The third would seem to be sensible if there were any hope of substantial concessions from the Rhodesians. What is likely to happen, if the noises from Britain are anything to go by, is that Britain will go on battling in the hope either that the Rhodesian spectre will go away, or that Smith will somehow collapse. Not really satisfactory for anyone.

Need for Approval of Debt Limit Increase Legislation

SPEECH

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1967

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 10867) to increase the public debt limit set forth in section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act, and for other purposes.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I am growing increasingly anxious about the fate of legislation to increase the debt ceiling. We will soon be voting on this legislation again, and I would like to remind my colleagues of the crucial importance of this proposal.

Unless we approve an increase in the debt ceiling, the U.S. Government will not be able to pay its bills or repay all of its maturing debt after June 30, 1967. As you all know, under existing law the temporary debt ceiling of $336 billion reverts, after June 30, to $285 billion. As a result, the Treasury would be unable to borrow money to meet its lawful obligations. In short, Mr. Chairman, without an increase in the debt ceiling, the U.S. Government would be in a position tantamount to being bankrupt.

I am well aware that many of my colleagues are at odds with the increase in the debt ceiling that has been proposed by the administration because there are real differences over budget and spending forecasts.

I am sympathetic, to be sure, with some of the points raised by some of my able colleagues in debate last week over the proposed debt ceiling increase.

But the point I want to make today is that the way to resolve these differences is not by courting financial chaos and untold hardship for the millions who rightfully expect to be paid or to receive benefits from the Government.

As you might imagine, I am particularly concerned about what would happen to our veterans and our space work if the debt limit is not increased by June 30. As chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee and chairman of two subcommittees of the Science and Astronautics Committee, I have endeavored to find out what would happen.

What I have learned is disheartening, to say the least.

According to current projections, the Treasury expects to have about $7 billion, or somewhat less, in cash on hand on July 1 and will be able to pay its bills only through July 13. Much of that cash would have to be used to redeem maturing Treasury bills. The $285 billion debt limit would not permit a refinancing of those maturing Treasury securities.

Thereafter, there would be no more money.

Veterans' pensions and benefits are paid at the beginning of each month—the monthly total is about $500 million—and these would be paid promptly on July 1. But before the next payment date, August 1, the Treasury would be out of cash, and veterans and their widows and families would not receive benefits from then on.

Contractors in our space program would be affected even earlier. The contractors probably would not receive any more Government checks after July 13 for their work. Involved, at first, would be the Treasury's inability to pay about $225 million, due for the latter half of July, or about half of the $450 million the Treasury pays every month to these contractors.

Needless to say, the failure to pay for space work and veteran benefits would be very serious and terrible, not only for all individuals concerned, but the country as a whole.

Such a development has to be avoided. We must increase the debt ceiling—and do so with dispatch, before the June 30 deadline that is rapidly approaching. We also must avoid temporary expedients that would keep such people as veterans and space contractors worrying from month to month about the danger that their payments from the Government would suddenly be cut off.

I would be the first to admit that I have not consistently supported increases in the debt limit. Moreover, I certainly do not endorse all of the programs of the Great Society. The administration of some of these programs urgently needs improvement, and some might best be abolished.

However, the way to deal with those issues is in the authorization and appropriation process—not by precipitating a Government financial crisis. In addition, I do not think that there is enough time between now and June 20 to make constructive and worthwhile decisions on where money can be saved—although I certainly hope that those decisions will be made.

I cannot resolve a vote against this measure in my own good conscience. As I have said, I have voted against the debt limit increase before. I have not, however, voted against it when so many men have been committed to combat in other parts of the world and when this country must be constantly prepared to meet crises in all parts of the world.

Mr. Chairman, I asked the Bureau of the Budget what would happen to veterans' compensation and pension and to the VA medical services if the Congress failed to increase the debt limit. On this specific question I received a letter from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget which I include at this point as a part of my remarks:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT, BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D.C., June 15, 1967.

Hon. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. TEAGUE: You asked the question: "What would happen to veterans' compensation and pensions and to veterans' medical services if the Congress fails to increase the debt limit?"

Without action by the Congress, the debt limit falls to $285 billion on July 1, 1967. At that time the actual debt outstanding will be approximately $327 billion. No Treasury securities could be issued—even to pay off maturing issues—until the debt fell below $285 billion.

On July 1, the Treasury will have perhaps $7 billion cash on hand. This would be used up within two weeks in order to pay the owners of securities which mature during that time, and to meet other obligations in excess of current revenues. Each week, for example, some $2.3 billion of Treasury bills come due, whose repayment would quickly absorb Treasury cash, since new Treasury bills could not be issued for that purpose.

After its cash balances were exhausted, by mid-July, the Treasury would have to cease all payments for veterans' benefits, defense supplies to Vietnam, and all other Federal activties, in order to use the incoming tax revenues to pay off the holders of maturing U.S. Government securities. Alternatively, it would have to default on the payment of Government securties in order to meet current expenditures for Government operations and to make payments under prior contract.

In short, failure to extend the debt limit would require either a wholesale default on Government securities or a cessation of practically all Government activities, including payments to veterans and support of our troops in Vietnam. This is obviously a choice which no Government should ever have to make.

This country has never defaulted on its obligations. Surely no responsible person would fail to support action which makes it possible for the United States to honor its commitments.

Sincerely,

CHARLES L. SCHULTZE,
Director.

Mr. Chairman, the veterans' organizations—the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and the Disabled American Veterans—all support the enactment of an increase in the Federal debt limit. This is evidenced by the following telegrams which I include as a part of my remarks.

Hon. WILBUR D. MILLS,
Chairman, House Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

The American Legion is apprehensive that the controversy surrounding the public credit limit will adversely affect vital programs such as national security, including the war in Vietnam, and veterans benefits.

The cost of war, and veterans benefits—a delayed cost of war—are essential obligations of the government. The meeting of these obligations is not a political question. The American Legion urges that timely action be taken to guarantee the future and integrity of the programs of national security and veterans benefits.

JOHN E. DAVIS,
National Commander, the American Legion.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
June 21, 1967.

CONGRESSMAN OLIN E. TEAGUE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Disabled American Veterans respectfully urges your favorable vote or passage of H.R. 10867 to increase Federal debt limit. Bureau of the Budget has expressed opinion that "failure to extend the debt limit could require cessation of payments to veterans." In view of this your active leadership on behalf of this legislation is a matter of urgent necessity for seriously disabled war veterans who rely on compensation payments for their very livelihood.

CHARLES L. HUBER,
National Director of Legislation, Disabled American Veterans.

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D.C., June 21, 1967.

Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Speaker of the House,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Among the high purposes of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the U.S. are service to veterans, their widows, and children and support of an adequate national security for this Nation. The Director of the Bureau of the Budget, Charles L. Schultze, has advised that if the debt limit is not increased one of the possibilities is the cessation of veterans compensation and pension payments and a sharp reduction in the support of our troops in Vietnam. By virtue of our national charter, it is mandatory that I urge all Members of the House to take appropriate action to make sure that the debt limit is increased so that there will be no default on the part of our Government to meet its obligations .to veterans and national defense, as authorized by Congress. Your support of debt increase legislation, which will insure that the needs of our veterans and national defense will in no way suffer, will be deeply appreciated by the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the U.S.

LESLIE M. FRY,
Commander, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

Redwood National Park

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DON H. CLAUSEN

OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 22, 1967

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, next week the House Interior Committee will hold its initial hearings on the legislation pending to create a Redwood National Park in my congressional district.

On June 14, 1967, the Times-Standard, the leading daily newspaper in the area where the park would be established, carried a very concise and revealing editorial.

This editorial provides current information that I believe should be of great interest to all Members of Congress considering this legislation and this prompts me to place it in the Record for the information and edification of my colleagues, as follows:

Conversation Pieces

Two events occurred this month, illustrative of society's dilemma over growing population and shrinking natural resources. Since both concerned the redwoods of the North Coast, they can be useful in sparking discussion of the future.

The first event was adoption by the State Board of Forestry of a set of revised forest practice rules for the redwood area. The changes were recommended by the Redwood District Forest Practices Committee, a group of professional foresters. They tightened up erosion control and cutting practice regulations for loggers.

The second event was the weeklong visit of a Sierra Club group here, for a look at what the club likes to call "the last redwoods." The trip focused on the club's vast national park proposal.

Almost simultaneously, men who regard redwoods as an agricultural crop and men who say that redwood logging is a sin against some divine nature were pursuing their goals. Who is right? This is the dilemma of society as population confronts resources.

We don't know which horn society wants to be gored on, but we do know that the bull doesn't have to triumph in the redwoods. Because of the foresight of loggers and conservationists of past generations, we can have our cake and eat it, too. We can have our redwoods and cut them, too.

We aren't talking just about the state parks, outstanding as they are. The conservationists and loggers can compromise on a national park, based on the Don Clausen framework. The preservationists can recognize redwood forestry as a legitimate profession. And man, the greatest resource, can exist.

A Mural by a 16-Year-Old Girl

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1967

Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, as our thoughts are directed daily to the battlefronts of Vietnam and the deserts of the Middle East where men sacrifice their lives as a result of misunderstanding and failure of communication we tend too often to overlook or fail to recognize those whose efforts have created a better understanding of our foreign neighbors.

One such effort currently being realized here in Washington is that of the Brazilian American Cultural Institute headed by Mr. Vitor da Silva. A nonprofit organization, the institute is designed to promote a better knowledge and understanding of Brazilian culture amongst American citizens.

The success of such an endeavor is dependent, in part, on the participation and interest of Americans. Two Americans, both residents of Hagerstown, Md., have made significant contributions to the institute and thus have furthered a closer relationship of the United States of America and the United States of Brazil. They are Mr. Harold E. Wibberly, Jr., of Baker-Wibberly & Associates, and Miss Marty Sager, a student at North Hagerstown High School.

Mr. Wibberly donated the fixtures and equipment for the library of the institute where one may read Brazilian magazines and newspapers and borrow books and films on Brazil.

Miss Sager's contribution to the institute came after the institute moved to its present quarters on Connecticut Avenue. At the suggestion of Mr. Wibberly, a contest was conducted to select an original design for a mural to be placed in the library. Miss Sager's entry depicting the mingling, and thus the friendship, the understanding and appreciation of Brazilians and Americans toward each other was selected as the most appropriate for display in the institute.

At this point I would like to include in the Record an article which appeared in the Sunday Baltimore Sun describing in detail the history of the institute and the contributions of two responsibile citizens.

The article follows:

A Mural by a 16-Year-Old Girl: Marty Sager's Work Is in a Washington Library

(By F. de Sales Meyers)

This spring 16-year-old Marty Sager, of Hagerstown, witnessed in Washington the unveiling of a mural she created which in her own way and words depicts the mingling of two American cultures, those of Brazil and the United States.

"The wall," as Marty refers to it, illustrates the ties between Brazil and the United States and indicates that when these people work together they are as one people—a united people.

The wall graced by "the wall" is that of the library of the Brazilian American Cultural Institute on Connecticut avenue. The library is named the Harold E. Wibberly, Jr., Library in honor of another citizen of Hagerstown. Mr. Wibberly, of the building firm of Baker-Wibberly and Associates, has been called a "good friend of Brazil." He donated the fixtures and equipment for the library.

He was also responsible for the eventual appearance of the mural done by Miss Sager. The Institute formerly was farther downtown in Washington and when it was moved to larger quarters on Connecticut avenue and the library furnished, Mr. Wibberly suggested to Brazilian officials that a contest be held to select an original design for a mural.

He further suggested that the contest be conducted by the Art Department of North Hagerstown High School for its art students. The officials agreed, and junior and senior students submitted designs. Eleven were sent to Washington, and the one by Marty Sager was accepted as most suitable.

The original sketch she presented was 8 by 7½ inches; the completed panel is 8 by 7½ feet. "I want to say that I had a lot of help on this," Marty says. "The first design was mine, but on the completed panel I had others helping me. There was a deadline and I had to hurry."

After her design was accepted, the manual arts shop at North High finished and stained sections of wood for the background. The figures of the mural, Brazilian and American adults and children clasping hands, were cut from heavy paper and painted and applied to the board with acrylic glue by the collage technique. The entire surface was then given a plastic overcoating and permanently encased.

The work is predominantly in brown and white and presents a striking effect on all persons who enter the library. At a reception in April attended by Marty, her parents, grandparents, Mr. Wibberly, other North Hagerstown art students and Brazilian officials, the mural as officially made a part of the Institute.

Alfonso de Ouro-Preto, assistant director, relates that the Institute was created in 1964 as an American nonprofit organization. The Brazilian Government gives financial assistance and the staff is made up of Brazilians, but the Institute is not directly a part of the Brazilian ambassadorial mission.

"We here are similar to your American cultural exchanges in foreign countries," he says. "Our aim is to make Brazilian culture known in America. To that end we wish to acquaint the people of the United States with works of Brazilian authors and to promote a better knowledge of Brazilian music and art in the United States.

"We have close ties with American universities and can provide lecturers, books, slides and films. We lend these materials to any one in this country and will assist intellectuals and students who wish to learn about our country or who even desire to go there. Also we arrange concerts of Brazilian music and art exhibits.

Right now we have 105 people studying Portuguese at the Institute and can provide other courses on various aspects of Brazilian culture. So you see how we feel about such things as having Mr. Wibberly and Miss Sager associated with our efforts.

"Mr. Wibberly, who has done a lot of work in Brazil, was introduced to the Institute by Vitor da Silva, who is a director of both the Inter-American Development Bank and the Institute. Mr. Wibberly has been a good friend of Brazil, and helpful to us."

Marty—who prefers this to her given name of Martha Louise—indicates realistically that although the acceptance of her work by the Institute has been the highest point in her 16 years, life is far from being at its peak for her. Her interests, moreover, tend toward direct and full association with people. "I intend to go to a college somewhere in North Carolina," she says. "I'm not sure which one, but I want to major in social work and minor in art."

Her life represents the typical whirlwind of high school activity. She is captain of North High cheerleaders, sings alto in North High's Concert Choir, and will serve as a student counselor at Washington county's outdoor school for sixth graders in the Catoctin Mountains. She is a member of the school Honor Club and a charter member of both the Junior Achievement Program in the county and the American Field Service Chapter at the high school.

James P. Irion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. EVERETT

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1967

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, recently we were certainly shocked at the untimely death of Rev. James P. Irion, one of the leading members of the Methodist Conference in west Tennessee and west Kentucky.

Reverend Irion, although a young man, had served many charges for his church in our congressional district, and every community in which he served was a better community when he left than when he arrived.

There was an excellent editorial relative to the Reverend James P. Irion in the Paris Post-Intelligencer, one of the leading dailies of the Nation, whose editor is W. Percy Williams, and publisher is W. Bryant Williams. The editorial follows:

JAMES P. IRION

Funeral services were held in Paducah this morning for a man who was loved by many people in Paris and Henry County. Rev. James Irion was pastor of First Methodist Church here for nearly seven years before he went to Broadway Church in Paducah. He died unexpectedly and peacefully in his sleep at his home last Friday evening.

"Jimmy" Irion was a man of kind and gentle personality, an excellent speaker and preacher, who wore the cloth with dignity. The son of a Methodist minister, he came to Paris 12 years ago to guide First Church in its ministry and remained for more than 6 years, an unusually long tenure in Methodism.

He was known and loved by many people outside his denomination in this community, who were shocked and grieved to learn of his death. Our deepest sympathy goes to his family and to his many friends throughout the Memphis Conference of the Methodist Church.

Welcoming Annual Convention of Kiwanis International to Houston, Tex.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE BUSH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1967

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to highlight the fact that Kiwanis International will hold its annual convention in Houston, Tex., June 25–29, 1967. I am proud that this distinguished group chose my congressional district for the site of their meeting and I only wish that all 272,000 Kiwanians in the United States could attend the convention. I commend this great organization for its efforts to make this world a better place in which to live. I would ask that the following article, from the Kiwanis Scene, be made a part of this RECORD:

ANNUAL KIWANIS CONVENTION

A formidable array of top-flight speakers and show personalities will enlighten and entertain Kiwanis conventioners in Houston June 25–29. Backing them up will be many talented groups and individual performers appearing under the auspices of their home town Kiwanis clubs.

Reverend Abraham Akaka will lead off the Sunday evening session with an inspirational message on the brotherhood of man. On Monday morning, after welcomes by Governor John Connally and Mayor Louis Welch of Houston, Larry Wohlford, president of Key Club International, will address the delegates. Then Charles Gould, publisher of the *San Francisco Examiner*, will discuss the role of communications in today's world.

On Monday evening International President Dr. R. Glenn Reed, Jr., will report to the delegates on his year in office. Then Shirley Temple Black, remembered by most Kiwanians for her moppet roles in the movies, will receive a special award.

Carl Gerstacker, chairman of the board of directors of Dow Chemical Company, will speak on the role of today's businessman in society on Tuesday morning. Jim Smith, president of Circle K International, will precede Gerstacker to the rostrum.

The Wednesday evening feature entertainment, traditionally the convention's biggest attraction, will this year feature Columbia Records' songstress Anita Bryant ("Till There Was You," "In My Little Corner of The World"). Also starring are Gerard Soules and his performing Poodles of Paris, Wes Harrison, known to TV audiences throughout the US and Canada as "Mr. Sound Effects," and Jerry Murad and his unique Harmonicats. Music will be provided by Ed Gerlach and his Show Orchestra.

Special entertainment exclusively for the ladies is scheduled for Monday and Wednesday. On Monday afternoon they will hear a talk by Mrs. George Romney, wife of Michigan's colorful governor, and be entertained by Betty Lynn Buckley, Miss Fort Worth, and the sixty-voice Boys' Club Choir from Rome, Georgia, directed by William Dixon. On Wednesday there will be musical matinees featuring the Houston Summer Symphony Orchestra under the direction of A. Clyde Roller at 10:30 AM and 2 PM.

The Rome, Georgia, Boys' Club Choir will also appear on the Sunday evening program. This group, typical of Kiwanis-sponsored talent, was judged the best Boys' Club choir in the United States in 1963. The sixty boys range in age from 9 to 17, and represent every school in Floyd County, Georgia. Almost all of the necessary $3700 for their trip to Houston was contributed by Floyd County Kiwanians.

Other Kiwanis-sponsored groups appearing during the convention include the Robert E. Lee High School Concert Band, Baytown, Texas; Dearborn High School Dance Band, Dearborn, Michigan; Marietta High School Band, Marietta, Georgia; Wichita, Kansas, Kiwanis Chorus; Huntsville, Texas, High School Dance Band; Texas Boys' Choir, Fort Worth, Texas; The Pathfinders, Dearborn, Michigan; and the Rocky Mountain Stars of Tomorrow, sponsored by the Rocky Mountain District.

Other Kiwanis-sponsored entertainment include young Otto Stroup, a blind pianist from Baltimore, Maryland; singer Eugene Conley of Denton, Texas; and baritone William Peterson from Pleasant Grove, Utah.

Inmates Forgo Parole for Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT J. CORBETT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1967

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I hereby am happy to make available to my colleagues and to readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD everywhere, an article which appeared in the Washington Star of June 19, 1967. The article dramatizes the fine work done by the National Committee for Children and Youth at the Lorton Youth Center. The article follows:

CHALLENGE AT LORTON—INMATES FORGO PAROLE FOR TRAINING

(By Donald Fitzhugh)

A man serving time at a correctional institution who waives his parole date so he can stay on the inside and finish barber training must want a job pretty badly.

Two men at the Lorton Youth Center who did just that recently are among 153 inmates who have been part of an experimental education and job training project run by the National Committee for Children and Youth at the center.

The District Department of Corrections, which runs the Youth Center, has been impressed enough with the experiment to offer all the instructors jobs when the program ends in August. And the work of five VISTA volunteers in the experiment is being evaluated to see how this, too, will fit into the department's regular program.

Ray Nelson, the department's associate director for planning, thinks the 14-month experiment called "Challenge," has achieved several of its goals:

It has shown the value of vocational training—not just for teaching a skill—but as a medium to reach the inmate and teach him self-esteem, Nelson said.

And the program demonstrated that VISTA (Volunteers in Service to America) has something to offer in a correctional institution.

The men in the training also think the project, especially VISTA, is a good thing. William Phifer, 22, trained as a barber, says a VISTA worker still comes by to see him, several months after his release.

The "Challenge" staff signed up 219 of the 300 men at the center and let them choose one of seven training areas. The men were then enrolled in classes as their parole or release date approached.

CHOICE IMPORTANT

Being able to pick their training is important to the men, explained Reginald Baker, 22, who was a member of the painting class. "I wanted it. I can kick nobody but me if I fail."

Few have failed. The staff has found work for 34 of the 36 men who have been released since their training ended. Three of the 36 have been convicted of crimes since then, all within two weeks of their release.

The "Challenge" project was started after the end of a Manpower Development and Training Act job program, which was criticized by an evaluation team from Catholic University and not refunded after an 18-month demonstration period ended last June. The evaluation suggested more community support for the men and fewer departmental restrictions during experimentation.

"Challenge" has received outstanding support from business, according to Leon Leiberg, project director. The Northern Virginia Steel Co. donated two arc welding machines in trade for first pick of the "graduates," he said.

On the other hand, Nelson thinks the department may substitute data processing for painting because there was some difficulty getting the men into the union and having them work on government contracts with prison records.

Nelson feels that VISTA's work with the men and their families has been valuable. "They have been able to establish very significant relationships with the inmates," he said.

The VISTA workers tutored the men individually at night, visited their families at night, visited their families and ran a varied program outside of class, including group discussions, films and classes in Negro history.

They even organized an art show of welded sculpture, 15 pieces of which sold for $457—which went to the men—during a week-long showing in the lobby of the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Essentially, the project raised the morale of the men at the Youth Center, according to Dr. Reuben Horlick, center director, who said: "There has been a change in the men—they are self-assured and they have some staying power."

The Corrections Department now plans to ask Congress for permission to juggle its budget to take over when the experimental program ends in August.

Current National Issues Questionnaire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DELBERT L. LATTA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1967

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, every year I send a questionnaire to my constituents wherein I solicit their views on current national issues. I have found that most of the people in the district like this method of expressing themselves and not only do they complete the questionnaire but they use the back side to comment on other matters not specifically listed. I have just finished tabulating this year's returns and I would like to call them to the attention of the Members of the House. They are as follows:

[Results in percent]

1. Do you favor the President's recommended 6 percent surtax on all incomes?

Yes	8
No	92

2. Do you believe the administration's poverty program is making progress toward the elimination of poverty?

Yes	11
No	89

3. Do you favor a meaningful cutback in "Great Society" spending programs?

Yes	88
No	12

4. Would you favor the enactment of legislation to require the registration and licensing of firearms by the law-abiding citizens as well as by the criminal?

Yes	50
No	50

5. Do you favor legislation to return a portion of the tax revenues to the States to be used for State purposes?

Yes	86
No	14

6. Do you believe the "credibility gap" in Government has reached such proportions that it is now cause for concern by the American people?

Yes	91
No	9

7. (*a*) Do you believe that the Congress should judge the qualifications of its own Members?

Yes	88
No	12

(*b*) Do you agree with the action taken by the Congress against ADAM CLAYTON POWELL?

Yes	89
No	11

8. Do you favor (check one):

(*a*) retaining the present draft system?	28
(*b*) the drafting of young men by lottery?	19
(*c*) universal military training?	31
(*d*) abolishing the draft and attempting to secure volunteers through increased pay?	22

9. Do you favor (check one):

(*a*) an 8-percent increase in the social security benefits without a tax increase?	66
(*b*) a 20-percent increase in social security benefits with a tax increase?	34

10. Should the President order increased bombing of strategic targets in North Vietnam provided he is convinced this will hasten the end of the war?

Yes	92
No	8

11. Should the President insist that our allies stop shipping supplies to North Vietnam?

Yes	93
No	7

12. (Check one):

(*a*) Should the United States maintain troops in Vietnam until the safety and independence of South Vietnam is secure?	69
(*b*) Should we withdraw our troops from Vietnam unconditionally?	31

Will the Imperialists in the Kremlin Be Hitler's Heirs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1967

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Roland I. Pritikin recently delivered a talk entitled "Will the Imperialists in the Kremlin Be Hitler's Heirs?" The thought-provoking comments by this prominent Rockford, Ill., physician came to my attention and it occurred to me that they were worthy of being shared with my colleagues. They are particularly timely in view of recent events that have transpired in the world. I commend to the attention of my colleagues the doctor's words of wisdom, his words of caution, and his words of advice.

I think we can pay special attention to and profit by the admonition of Dr. Pritikin to beware the wedge technique and the divide-and-rule system still so rigidly adhered to by the Communist power structure in the Kremlin, and his suggestions for thwarting their grand design. His prescription for world peace follows:

WILL THE IMPERIALISTS IN THE KREMLIN BE HITLER'S HEIRS?

(By Roland Pritikin)

"The prelude to military aggression by totalitarian dictators is a campaign of Jew-hatred. In this respect the Kremlin today is no different than Hitler was yesterday." (Gen. George C. Marshall.)

"We have sold the same land twice over to these refugees of Russian pogroms and Nazi concentration camps. Now we want to take it away from them. We have created the Palestine refugee problem. Now we blame them." (King Abdullah of Jordan, on the eve of his assassination.)

"In making this contribution to Israel, I know that I am helping the Lebanese Christian Arabs, who feel that the presence of Israel, gives them security against being massacred by their own countrymen, for the first time in 1,000 years. This will help end the Palestine refugee problem, and put an end to that which the Imperialists in the Kremlim wish to perpetuate for their own ends, viz. feudalism, totalitarian dictatorial rule, and antagonisms. They don't want Israel to remain an example of what work, education, and free and democratic institutions can accomplish. They don't want Israel to be in a position of helping end starvation, poverty, and illiteracy in the Middle East. In making this contribution, I feel that I am striking a blow against the Imperialists in the Kremlin, and preventing World War III." (Bluma Saval.)

EPILOG

The greatest threat to world peace today are the immoral imperialists in the Kremlin. For twenty years, they have been able to hold the upper hand, because we have been on the defensive. In that time, they have committed hundreds of deeds of deception, and broken pledges around the world. There are three methods by which we can take the offensive, and put them on the defensive.

1. A daily complaint for censure by the U.N. Example: Everytime Soviet or satellite arms and equipment are found in the hands of subversive organizations in the newly emerging nations of Africa or elsewhere, a complaint should be lodged.

2. A daily diplomatic note of protest or proposal. Example: When the Hapsburg empire was dismembered after W. W. I, Czechoslovakia, Austria, Hungary, and Yugoslavia were created. These countries were not satisfied with their national boundaries, because at some time in history they all overlapped each other. Furthermore, they all suffered economically by the partition. One of the many examples is the following: Czech lumberjacks would float down the Danube on their rafts and work in the wheat fields of Hungary all summer and fall. Thus, they were employed the entire year. Hungarian factory workers, when unemployed, would go by train to Czechoslovakia and frequently have a job immediately. Thus, all were employed the entire year. This was impossible after partition, and resulted in great unemployment and poverty. Our proposal should be to form a Danubian confederation based on the provincial boundaries, which have not changed during the centuries. This would be a federal union consisting of Bosnia, Herzegovnia, Croatia, Montenegro, Albania, Wallachia, Moldavia, Slovakia, Ruthenia, Bukovina, Bohemia, Moravia, Transylvania, etc. etc. The people living in that area would consider this plan a god-send, but the imperialistic dictators in the Kremlin would consider it a calamity for them, but would not dare oppose this openly.

3. The Soviet constitution guarantees liberty of conscience, but only Jews are still persecuted, because of their religion. Furthermore, people persecuted for religious reasons in the past in every country on earth, have been free to leave. This is not the case with the imperialists in the Kremlin. They will permit no one to leave. We should protest vigorously the cold pogroms of today, in the same manner that presidents Arthur, Cleveland, Harrison, McKinley, Theodore Roosevelt, Taft, and Wilson protested the hot pogroms of the Czars.

Some of our problems in combating the immoral imperialists in the Kremlin has been apathy, and lack of knowledge of what they are doing around the world. They are exponents of the "wedge-technique," and the "divide-and-rule" system, which they call "the-balance-of-power," or "support-of-the-weaker" of two antagonists. Many of these antagonistic situations have been their own creation. They want two of Germany, China, Viet Nam and Korea. They want disputes and friction to continue in North and South America, Africa, Asia, the Middle East, the Caribbean, and Oceania.

To overcome the enemies of peace and freedom a contemporary Moses would give us these ten commandments.

1. Give strength to America by accepting your responsibilities and privileges, whether it be jury duty, military duty, or voting.

2. Be healthy and alert. Overcome the "wedge-technique."

3. Be strong for education.

4. Support freedom from corruption.

5. Support freedom from crime.

6. Support freedom from want.

7. Support freedom of communication.

8. Support freedom of conscience. Remember that if there is no religious freedom for one, there is no religious liberty for all. Overcome prejudice no matter how difficult.

9. Support absolute justice for all internally (in the U.S.A.).

10. Support absolute justice for all externally (in our dealings with other countries).

Respice—look back in history, and learn from it.

Aspice—behold the historic facts unfolding in the space and nuclear age.

Prospice—look forward, remembering that the heresies of yesterday are the facts today, and that some of them will be the sophistries of tomorrow, and the superstitions of the day thereafter.

Will the immoral imperialists in the Kremlin be Hitler's heirs?

Will they be permitted to continue in their immoral, sinful, criminal, and illegal behavior?

The quickest way to prevent them from accomplishing their despicable aims is to carry out the program outlined above. If we are alert and determined, all that is necessary is that we will it. If the world is to have Peace and Freedom, we must stop them on their evil path.

UAW Executive Board Urges Direct Negotiation by Mideast Nations—Asks U.N. Economic Drive To Aid Region

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1967

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, the following statement was adopted, unanimously by the UAW international executive board at its quarterly meeting in Toronto, Ontario, Canadia, on June 16, 1967:

UAW Executive Board Urges Direct Negotiation by Mideast Nations, Asks U.N. Economic Drive To Aid Region

In the tragic area of the Middle East, the guns are now silenced and a precarious cease fire is in effect. If hostilities are not to recur, there must be a frank facing up to the underlying and unresolved problems and of the hard realities which now exist in the region, and a concerted and determined effort must be made to find a peaceful solution to these problems.

While the major responsibility for dealing with these issues rests with the Arab states and with Israel, the world powers and other nations have an obligation to help create a climate of trust and cooperation in the region, without which there can be no substantial progress toward a lasting peace.

For many years there has been a drumbeat by certain Arab leaders and nations inflaming passions by a call for a "holy war to annihilate Israel and the Jews." For 20 years the blind hatred and irrational passion of certain Arab leaders have inflamed relations in the Middle East. These leaders have refused to recognize the existence of Israel and its right to live as a sovereign and independent nation and as a member of the community of nations. Instead of accepting Israel in a spirit of cooperation and coexistence, these Arab leaders have continued their propaganda of a holy war directed at the destruction of the State of Israel. The present crisis in the Middle East is the product of this reckless and indefensible attitude and triggered the unprovoked action demanded by the United Arab Republic for the withdrawal of U.N. forces from the Gaza strip and the Straits of Tiran and the closing of the Gulf of Aqaba to Israeli ships.

These actions followed by the full mobilization of Arab military forces surrounding the border of Israel and the open threats by Arab leaders to wage a holy war of annihilation against Israel and its people constituted, by any rational standard, an act of aggression against the State of Israel.

It certainly does not serve the cause of peace or coexistence for leaders of the Soviet Union and the Arab nations to further inflame these passions by making deliberately wild and malicious charges which seek to equate Israel's defense against these calculated efforts to annihilate her with the brutal military aggression of the Hitler regime. What is needed is reason, not recrimination.

As is always the case in war, it has many innocent victims. Thousands of civilians have been injured and many more have been uprooted from their homes and swell the already large numbers of displaced refugees. It is of the highest priority that the United Nations, through its appropriate agency and backed by full support of the UN members, move with all speed and compassion to provide adequate emergency care for the injured and aid the homeless. In addition, the UN should call upon Israel and each of her Arab neighbors to enter into direct negotiations in an effort to settle not only the basic issues in conflict but also to find a just, equitable and compassionate resettlement of the thousands of refugees.

There can be no basis for peace between Israel and the Arab nations without a firm and open acceptance by all of the right of each nation and its people to exist. Basic to this fundamental and elemental principle is the right of each nation to free and innocent access to and passage through international waterways essential to world commerce and national survival. This specifically includes access and passage through the Suez Canal and the Gulf of Aqaba.

The right of a people not to be strangulated is not a negotiable matter. It must be an uncontested right underscored and guaranteed by the community of world nations.

The world anxiously awaits an extension of the current precarious cease fire into a negotiated and durable peace treaty among the nations of the Middle East. If this hope is to be achieved, it must be anchored in agreements directly entered into through voluntary negotiations between Israel and each of her Arab neighbors. Tempting as it may be to certain world powers, history, none-the-less, tragically reveals that the terms of a just and lasting peace cannot be imposed from without.

It is also equally clear that a return to past formulas on the terms of the 1949 or 1956 settlements which have demonstrated their own weakness and unworkability and finally ended in hostilities is not the answer. Such difficult issues which involve questions of national security, boundaries and borders, resettlement of refugees and other matters can best be settled through direct negotiations. In such direct confrontation there can evolve a realization that each has more in common than in conflict.

To achieve this will require a turn away from an ever escalating and devastating arms race, which has been encouraged by the major powers, and a turn toward a common effort to develop the vast economic and social resources of the entire region and its people. The desert thirsts for water which can make it bloom. Parched and rocky hillsides can become lush with orchards and vineyards. Disease and illiteracy, which have been the historic legacy of vast areas of the Middle East, can be eliminated. It is toward these tasks of economic development and a common effort to raise living standards that each nation in the region should devote its energies and resources.

The war has disrupted and seriously threatens the economies of many of the countries of the Middle East. If chaos and political instability are to be avoided, substantial external economic assistance must be mobilized and diverted to the region. The United Nations, rather than become embroiled in fruitless recriminations which can only further inflame passions in the area and further divide people and nations, should concentrate its energies and efforts on the creation of a special UN Economic and Social Development Authority for the Middle East to spearhead the urgent tasks confronting the people of the entire region. Such rewarding peaceful efforts should command the generous and wholehearted support of all nations.

The need is for a sustained period of calm and serious and direct negotiations pointed toward a settlement of major issues and regional economic cooperation to stimulate growth and a drive toward improved health, education and higher living standards.

This region, which has contributed so much to the cultural heritage of civilized man, can and must find its way to contribute equally to man's search for peace and justice.

Quad-City Marine Corps Reservists Win National Rifle Championship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM RAILSBACK

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1967

Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Speaker, much as we dislike sending our young men to the battlefield, we have done so four times within the memory of many of us now living. So long as our citizen armies are expected to do a soldier's job with a soldier's skill, there is a definite need for markmanship training and excellence.

This is the philosophy, in part, of our Armed Forces Reserve program—and a necessary one. One of the most valuable contributions that can be made by this branch of our Armed Forces is to develop this skill of our young men so that they will be prepared and ready to assume the responsibilities, if need be, of our citizen armies.

Such is the example of four members of the Marnie Corps Reserve unit in my hometown of Moline, Ill. These young men have become the championship rifle team in the entire Marine Corps Reserve by winning the national matches at Quantico, Va., recently.

This is the second year that the rifle team of the local Reserve unit has won the 9th Marine Corps District Championship—Midwestern States—and barely missed capturing the national championships last year as well.

My congratulations to S. Sgt. Lowell Delp, Sgt. Dan Ritter, Cpl. Tom Ritter, and Cpl. Leslie Koberg for their proven skill and outstanding performance. I commend the attention of the Congress to this fine achievement.

Judge Wright's Wrong Pleases Anti-American Crowd

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1967

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, an editorial of the left of center Evening Star has taken Judge J. "Smelly" Wright to task over his revolutionary attack against education in favor of race-mixing.

To the judge, forced mixing of the races is far more important than education. According to his wishes, if they do not mix, leave them equally illiterate. The problem is that only 10 percent of the District's schoolchildren are white and the judge does not have enough to spread around. Perhaps he can compel some of his libertine friends, fellow travelers, and colleagues to offer up their children from the "ghettos" of Virginia and Maryland as socialistic pawns to participate in his controversial experiment.

What a mess. Judge Wright is a most likable intellectual, a learned man of the law, but he just refuses to take second place with the Warren Court. He, too, wants to be remembersd in history—and it is safe to say he will never be forgotten.

The judge's children? Well, his son is different—he is of royal stock and tucked safely away from Dad's experiment, attending a good private school in Connecticut. Now the judge wants his decision made the law of the land—not by an act of Congress or any elected body representing the American people, but by his policymaking ideal, Earl Warren.

Mr. Speaker, I insert the editorial of the Evening Star followed by recent releases from the Washington Post:

[From the Washington Evening Star, June 21, 1967]

WRIGHT'S WRONG WAY

Near the end of his blistering attack on the District school system, Judge J. Skelly Wright observed that the preferable place to seek a better balance of educational opportunities in Washington schools would be in some "political arena" other than the courts. It is a great pity that the judge gave this sensible thought only passing attention.

His decision arrives, ironically, almost on the eve of the completion of the $240,000 Passow study. This year-long investigation, conducted on the basis of education expertise, not socio-legal theory, is evolving practical new ways to cope with precisely those school conditions, found in the midst of de facto segregation and socio-economic deprivation, which Judge Wright now has ruled to be unconstitutional. The preliminary proposals of the Passow group seem to us thoroughly encouraging. From all accounts, the District school board is delighted. Had Judge Wright exercised more restraint, in his own role, it is possible that he might have abetted the healthy community effort already begun.

Restraint, however, is not Wright's style—on this subject, at least. Having expressed his revolutionary views as to what is legally wrong with the District school system, the judge proceeded to appoint himself the sole arbiter of what is educationally as well as legally right.

Thus, the track system "simply must be abolished"—with no encouragement for any type of alternative ability grouping in our schools, although total abolition would surely lead to total chaos. A "substantial" integration of the District faculty, ordained the judge, is to begin in September—and never mind how many of the 23 percent of District teachers who happen to be white are still left, when that job is finished, to integrate. A further erosion of the sound concept of neighborhood schools, through new means of pupil assignment, is likewise to begin in the fall.

We will be commenting further on the impact of these and other provisions of the decision in the days ahead.

One thing which seems to us perfectly clear at the outset, however, is that Judge Wright's ruling should be speedily appealed. If his unprecedented interpretation of the Constitution is to stand up, its validity should be established, and its impact clarified, as soon as possible, for the sake of school districts not only in Washington, but everywhere. Judge Wright's strictures as to the weight which schools must give "economic segregation" introduce a far-reaching new line of legal thought. As to de facto racial segregation it is conceivable, we suppose, that he may have been looking beyond the District of Columbia. For any effort to achieve integration in meaningful terms through the schools in Washington today is simply farcical. Dr. A. Harry Passow summed it up very well by saying that to try to integrate a school population already 93 percent Negro, by busing or any other method, would amount to token integration at its worst.

Let us restate our own position. We are convinced that the most extraordinary efforts are required to upgrade schools in poor neighborhoods. This means allocating to the worst schools specialized services of all kinds, and spending on them far more money than is spent in affluent neighborhoods. It means atracting to those schools the best possible teachers. But it also means attracting them on the basis of such positive incentives as extra pay—and the assurance of an atmosphere of innovation. It means attacking the problem where it is—not following Wright's will-o-the-wisp theories of educational equality, which could well lead, under conditions existing in the District, to nothing more than an equality of mediocrity.

Judge Wright's decision, in all its interminable, demagogic splendor, comes as no great surprise. The judge had personally dedicated himself, on the record, to the concept of court intevention in situations of de facto school segregation long before he heard this case. The District government should, by all means, seek a judicial review of his remarkable line of reasoning.

[From the Washington Post]

BUSING IS NO ANSWER IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, PASSOW SAYS—SCHOOLS STUDY CHIEF CITES RACIAL RATIO, ALSO DISPUTES FINDING ON SPENDING

(By Ernest Holsendolph)

To try to integrate the District's schools by busing or any other method when only 10 per cent of the students are white would be token integration at its worst, Dr. A. Harry Passow told a press conference yesterday.

He spoke two hours after Judge J. Skelly Wright released his decision indicting "de facto" segregation in the public schools here.

Reporting his findings in detail for the first time since the $240,000 Columbia Teachers College study began a year ago, Passow also took issue with findings in the Hobson case that the District consistently spends less per pupil to educate Negroes than whites.

Racial integration of schools is important, but quality education can be achieved without it in the District through proper instructional materials, specially trained teachers and cultural enrichment, he said.

BACKS END OF TRACKS

Passow concurred with the court opinion in Hobson vs. Hansen that the track system should be abolished, to be replaced by flexible grouping which would make teaching easier and more effective.

"Young children should not be grouped until we have found some substantial basis for it," Passow said. He urged that during the early years stronger efforts be made to identify retarded boys and girls and children with physical defects so they may be provided special education.

Passow urged that a research unit on new buildings be established in an effort to design structures particularly for young children.

He denied the assertion in the Hobson case that there is a pattern of socio-economic discrimination in educational expenditures in District schools.

"POORLY EQUIPPED"

"We found that schools, some in poor areas and others in middle-class neighborhoods, were poorly equipped," he said.

Passow urged that there be a staff development center for more in-service training for teachers to equip them to serve inner-city schools.

He reiterated recommendations made earlier that the paresent Head Start program for 650 children be expanded to include 14,000 youngsters aged 3 and 4 as part of the regular school enrollment.

Passow noted Dr. John Fischer, president of Teachers College, heads a special task force which will report on long-range policy on racial integration, presumably on a metropolitan basis as recommended in the Hobson case.

In a paper written for the U.S. Civil Rights Commission's report, "Racial Isolation in the Public Schools," Fischer discussed a metropolitan school park system, with school parks arranged in a ring around the periphery of the city. The educational parks would draw Negro children from the inner city and white youngsters from adjoining suburbs.

Elsewhere in the report, Fischer wrote that attempts to desegregate schools often end in resegregation, but he concluded:

"The discouraging sense that desegregation won't work leads to the conclusion that the ghetto child's only hope lies in improving his segregated school. For the immediate future this may, indeed, be the only course open in some situations. But for the long run, neither school management nor public policy can be based on any assumptions so completely contrary to the principles of an open society."

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SCHOOL RULING BEGAN IN BOSTON

(By John Mathews)

Louise Day Hicks, the Boston school committee chairman who has warred with civil rights groups over de facto segregation, is directly responsible for the Hobson vs. Hansen court case which was decided in the U.S. Court of Appeals yesterday.

Pat Saltonstall of the Boston Saltonstalls (first cousin once removed of former Sen. Leverett Saltonstall), upper Northwest mother of three boys, United Planning Organization official, former newspaper reporter, friend of Julius Hobson and supporter of his militant ACT organization put it this way:

"In December, 1965, I was nursing my mother at her (Beacon Hill) home and reading in the papers about Louise Day Hicks who had been re-elected. She (Mrs. Hicks) was saying what's wrong with black schools is the black child. She kept harping on what amounted to economic differences—the kids came from poor families, their parents were unemployed . . ."

Miss Salstonstall, who uses her maiden

name since her divorce from a Miami lawyer, said civil rights groups were countering Mrs. Hicks, saying Negro de facto segregated schools were inferior because they were overcrowded, books and equipment were deficient and teachers were less qualified.

SUGGESTED A SUIT

"So, I thought this kind of discrimination was as unjust as discrimination according to blackness," Miss Saltonstall said during a recent interview in the parlor of her comfortable Klingle Street home, near Foxhall Road. "I telephoned Julius from Boston and told him we should bring a suit on the basis of economic differential treatment."

At the time, the Negro community in Washington had been seething over schools for most of 1965. In June, Dorothy L. Johnson, a white administrator, was named an assistant superintendent to replace a Negro, producing an angry reaction from a wide range of Negro leaders.

In late June, Mordecai L. Johnson, a prime antagonist of School Supt. Carl F. Hansen was not reappointed by District Court judges to the school board. In July, Hobson and two supporters sat-in at the school board.

And in October, partly at the behest of Hobson, Rep. Adam Clayton Powell named a subcommittee of his House Education and Labor Committee that began an investigation of District schools, leading to a highly critical report some months later.

ACTED QUICKLY

Hobson and Miss Saltonstall moved fast.

"I wanted a black lawyer in this case," Hobson recalled, but a talk before a Negro fraternity, with many lawyers present, proved unproductive. "Some said it was silly, you couldn't make a case," he said. "And, I remember one guy said he didn't want to get tied up in such a case—'I got to live in this town,' he told me."

Hobson turned to William L. Higgs, an exile from his home state of Mississippi, former counsel for the Mississippi Freedom Democratic party, lawyer for the local Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee's January, 1966 boycott of D.C. Transit, and at 31 a senior citizen of the New Left student movement.

"Ole Miss" Class of '55 graduate, tutor in algebra and English of James H. Meredith, who integrated the University of Mississippi, Higgs went up to Cambridge and his second alma mater, Harvard Law School (Class of '58). With advice from some prominent law school professors and aid of senior students, Higgs drafted the first complaint.

Higgs could not try the case, since his disbarment in 1963 in Mississippi, the result of what he calls a "trumped up" morals charge for which he was tried in absentia. The charge followed a long succession of civil rights activity for which Higgs in 1963 received the national Lasker Award from the American Civil Liberties Union.

Higgs brought in William M. Kunstler, prominent civil rights and civil liberties lawyer, to help prepare and try the case.

Later, Herbert O. Reid, a Howard University law professor, teaching in Puerto Rico when the court suit was being formulated, joined the case as a cocounsel. Jerry D. Anker, a local lawyer, who is white, also participated.

DRAW ON CORE-ADA PAPER

The initial complaint drew heavily on a March, 1964 CORE-ADA paper, co-authored by Hobson and John A. Sessions, now a District Board of Education member and a party to the suit.

The CORE-ADA paper charged "differential treatment of students in the school system based on the economic level of the neighborhood," showed inferior supplies of books and equipment and more temporary teachers and greater overcrowding in predominantly Negro schools. The paper also said the track system "stigmatizes the students and almost writes them off as academically lost from the beginning."

When Hobson saw the initial draft of the complaint, he was furious. But he eventually calmed down.

"I wanted to push economic discrimination. I wanted to see a new body of law created, but the lawyers told me you had to use the language of prior cases, the language of race. In Washington, it happens that race and poverty are congruent—the poor are mostly black. And, the case makes the double point all the way through."

A MARXIST SOCIALIST

Hobson, who declares himself a "Marxist-socialist, but not a Communist," reconciled himself to the indirect economic thrust of the case, and he and Pat Saltonstall extended their credit to borrow some $6,000 (which is gradually being repaid through contributions to the suit) to get the case underway. Negro businessman Billy Simpson also contributed early financial aid to the suit, Hobson said.

The plaintiffs on the initial complaint included Hobson, his son Julius Jr., whom Hobson had tried to enroll at a segregated white school in 1953, and his daughter, Jean Marie, who was taken out of Amidon School and placed in a private school because her father thought her track placement was harmful.

Other plaintiffs included three fathers, three mothers, all ACT members, and eight children.

One of the plaintiffs, Willie Davis Jr., a supervisor of parking meter collections for the District government, recalled recently that he had moved twice within Washington to find better schools for his three children.

"Ronald's class had 4th, 5th and 6th graders in one classroom at Noyes, just like it used to be when I went to school in Louisiana," Davis said. "Reginald was in a basic class where the teacher was absent every other day and he came to think she was a substitute."

Davis moved from the District to Glenarden Woods, Md., where his children attend a predominantly Negro school. "You know, when it rains and snows, we can't keep those kids home from school now," Davis said. "In the city they would look for excuses to stay home."

SUIT NAMED JUDGES

On Jan. 13, 1966, Higgs filed the complaint suing the District school board, school administrators, the District Board of Commissioners and in an ingenious thrust, the District Court judges.

Chief Judge David L. Bazelon of the U.S. Court of Appeals named Appeals Judge J. Skelly Wright to hear the de facto segregation aspect of the case and a three-judge panel to consider the charge of the unconstitutional appointment process.

In February, the three-judge panel, with Wright dissenting, upheld the constitutionality of the District Court judges naming of school board members.

In May, the plaintiffs suffered another setback when Judge Wright denied an injunction asked to halt the Passow study of the schools, which the plaintiffs said was a device to blunt the court case. Ironically, the study, released in preliminary form this week, makes many of the same points of Judge Wright's decision.

So far, it has cost about $13,000 to finance the case, Pat Saltonstall, unofficial treasurer for the plaintiffs, said.

MANY ANONYMOUS

Most of the contributors prefer anonymity, Hobson said, adding that if he could disclose the names of two donors "you'd fall out of that chair." None of the established civil rights organizations has contributed to the suit.

Among contributors willing to be identified are the national body of the United Church of Christ, $2,000; Rt. Rev. Paul Moore, Suffragan Bishop of the Washington Episcopal Diocese, $500; the American Federation of Teachers, AFL–CIO, $500; Bishop Smallwood E. Williams, Bible Way Church, $100; a fund-raising party at the home of the Rev. Phillip R. Newell, Jr. of New York Avenue Presbyterian Church, $900, and a forum on the case at Temple Sinai, organized by the Rev. Channing E. Phillips of Lincoln Temple, $900.

A HIGH POINT

For Pat Saltonstall the case was a high point in her progression from a disinterested observer of social issues as a society columnist to a militant activist.

The starting point was in 1964 when out of curiosity she attended the signing of the Civil Rights Act. Former Florida Gov. Leroy Collins asked her to join the Community Relations Service set up under the act.

She worked for the office a year, traveling about the country and getting immersed in the civil rights struggle, both in the South and in Washington. She is now the local antipoverty agency's director of volunteer services, an $11,560 post.

Walter Deubener, the Vanishing American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ODIN LANGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1967

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, our Nation grew and prospered because of the personal industry and devotion to principle exhibited by individuals across our vast land. One of those individuals is Walter Henry Deubener, of St. Paul, Minn. I was reminded of this last Sunday when an article by Gareth Hiebert appeared in the St. Paul Pioneer Press. I commend the article and its pertinent comments on Walter Deubener to my colleagues.

The article follows:

WALTER DEUBENER HAS WORLD ON A STRING

(By Gareth Hiebert)

Watching Walter Henry Deubener whipping his wiry, 83-year-old frame down Fourth st., a friend remarked:

"There goes the vanishing American!"

The only thing wrong with the statement is that Walter Deubener is far from vanishing.

But in the connotation meant by the phrase, the bystander is perfectly correct.

He was observing, as those on city streets do, the receding figure of an amazing personality. Walter's achievements have matched his determination; his spontaneous charity has touched millions of people and that inventive genius has done more to bring the cornucopia of plenty to American homes than the automobile or any electronic computer you care to name.

There is an Horatio Alger flavor about him. A wry sense of humor tempers his obsession that fiscal ruination will turn America into an economic desert before the Communists do it.

Walter belongs to that fraternity of Teddy Roosevelt's reign who believed that a man is entitled to keep what he earns and work for what he gets. Quaint as the notion may seem in 1967.

The abomination of our century, he feels, was the passage of the income tax amendment and resulting "dole" systems have become, in his mind, sinful.

Uncle Sam, in Walter's lexicon, is the biggest pickpocket in history.

He has a fetish about physical culture. This accounts for his frequent invitation to those he meets along the streets to join him for a steam bath and salt rubdown, followed by a swim in the Athletic club pool.

Walter's compassion is boundless for people, birds, animals, Indians and the younger generation which will have to inherit the mess of its elders.

His pockets are filled with everything from candies and straight-edge razor letter openers to vials of perfume, and occasionally small change—which he hands out as he goes like a perpetual "Saint on 34th Street!"

This has earned him the title of "Good Humor Man!"

Walter abhors two things: cigarets and alcohol.

He has been known to remove cigarets and cigars from the open mouths of businessmen and executives along his route and applaud those who abstain by sending them morale-boosting letters, supplemented by cash.

On his letterheads and at the entrance to his "Walden" on Lake George, he has posted his motto:

"No Stinkweed . . . No Firewater!"

Among the handful of personalities in the city's tapestry, who weave the most vivid color in the 80 to 100 age group, Walter takes his place alongside such contenders as Joe Supornick, 85-year-old fire adjuster philosopher and good deed-doer, Joseph (Old St. Paul) Shiely Sr., the cement and gravel king, and Louis Villaume Sr., last of the fighting Frenchmen.

It is not unusual to find two or three of them salting each other down in the fog of the Athletic club steamroom.

While each owes his present vigor and stamina, albeit financial acument to a variety of causes, Walter Deubener can claim the most eccentric beginnings of them all.

A piece of string!

With it, he and his wife, Lydia, invented the modern shopping bag with handles.

They worked this miracle of merchandising on E. Seventh st. in Downtown St. Paul, in a 10-cent store where Walter operated the grocery concession and his wife ran the cash and carry department on the balcony.

It has always been the general consensus that the Deubener shopping bag, still the sturdy item it was then, paved the way for the modern supermarket.

But in 1918 the concept hadn't even developed into the notion stage.

Walter and Lydia, as they watched the shoppers, noticed that women limited their purchases by their arms rather than their pocketbooks.

And, in the personal struggle of the "Have Nots" to become the "Haves," Walter and Lydia decided that the best way was to provide some means of permitting housewives to carry more merchandise.

Walter tried a couple of experiments—tying parcels together in one package . . . using shopping baskets. Both were failures. One night, as he tried to sleep, Walter mentally took a paper bag and punched two holes in each side near the top and two near the bottom. Then he passed a strong double cord through the holes and around under the bottom and extended it upward to form handles at the top.

Next morning, Walter hurried to the store, got a paper sack and went through the same procedure. He filled the sack with 50 pounds of groceries and carried it around the store.

It held without strain.

Walter and Lydia didn't go into production that day. Instead they went to see their lawyer and established patent rights.

Back at the store, Lydia cut pictures out of magazines and pasted them on the sides of the new-style shopping bags to make them more attractive.

"By noon," Walter recalls, "we had made 25 bags."

And sold them for 10 cents a piece.

Two girls were hired to produce shopping bags and Walter rented space in a basement for his factory. The first 125 bags sold like gold. Pretty soon the dime store chains stocked them for sale in stores throughout the country. In Canada. In Europe.

Walter and Lydia moved the factory out of the basement into a storeroom. Walter quit his job as grocer and became sales manager, shipping clerk, machinist, factory superintendent and janitor.

As Walter says: "In 1918, the shopping bag with handles was an idea. In 1919 we sold a million."

A Philadelphia company built a bag-making machine to speed production and Walter moved his factory to Indianapolis, Ind.—a more central location.

How many billions of Deubener shopping bags have been sold defies even the arithmetical mind of Walter Deubener. Other bag makers have copied—within an inch of Deubener patents. But none has the luxurious stability and appearance of the Deubener bag, with its picture designs on the sides.

That simple piece of string has strung itself into the Deubener legend. And its profits were parlayed into vast real estate holdings in St. Paul.

Deubener Properties became a popular sign on buildings and apartments.

But never without the human touch of Walter's personality. His benevolence as a landlord is known by tenants, whom he never forgot on Christmas. If he learned of family problems, he stepped in to help.

He has shared his wealth with countless thousands. Nay millions. Without abandoning his precepts of "a dollar's work for a dollar earned," he has a broad compassion for those whom he feels are unfortunate because of circumstances beyond their control.

He is almost the first contributor to any cause publicized in the Oliver Towne column. Apprised of some family misfortune, he delights in sending out—anonymously—turkeys, huge sacks of peanuts, potatoes, candies, cash, hams and vegetables and fruit.

His benevolence toward the Indians of Minnesota nets huge carloads of clothing and supplies, which he personally hauls to the reservations.

These days finds Walter and Lydia in their wilderness retreat at Lake George, near Itasca State park where they swim each morning as "nature intended!"

Their refuge is a huge acreage, filled with bird feeders, cabins, myriad gardens, exquisite lawns and a log cabin filled with memorabilia Walter has collected on nature, government, finance, physical fitness, and life in general.

On a Sunday last year, Walter and Lydia shared this Shangri-la with my family. And while the others became acquainted with birds and animals romping the lawns, Walter took me to his office in one room of their home, where he explained that "I am now putting my house in order."

He has sold his real estate holdings in St. Paul. He is liquidating his other properties and getting ready for the eventual and ultimate conclusion of those who know they are not immortal. Though I'd expect he'll live past 100.

Walter contemplates, from his vista overlooking placid, picturesque Lake George, a world he wishes he could leave in better hands and estate.

"It is too late for preaching about the kind of economy and philosophy Americans must have," he said sadly. "A man hasn't got a chance anymore to do what I did. Everything is 'free, free, free'—but it really isn't. Nobody will listen. Somebody has to pay. . . . And it will be your children playing out there on the grass."

Unconsciously he picked up a piece of string from the desk.

The War on Poverty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL D. ROSTENKOWSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1967

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, during the last decade social scientists have clearly documented the inability of many city welfare agencies to help the urban poor rise out of their impoverishment. These social dropouts have continued, often for several generations within the same family, to subsist on welfare handouts. In a nation as affluent as ours, we cannot allow this situation to continue.

It is with great pleasure, therefore, that I read about the success of the Office of Economic Opportunity in making a significant impact on the plight of the Nation's poor. As a recent review of our antipoverty program in the Chicago Defender points out, after years of merely treating the symptoms of poverty through various temporary, emergency expenditures, our Federal Government has finally embarked upon a crusade to eradicate the underlying causes of poverty in America.

Nowhere have the beneficial results been more evident than in the city of Chicago. As this article indicates, the Chicago office of urban opportunity has been one of the most successful in the country. Under the astute direction of Dr. Deton J. Brooks, a professional administrator of proven ability and competence, this city's poverty problems are being tackled for the first time on a scale that will really help the indigent poor break out of the cycle of poverty.

So that my fellow colleagues might learn of the progress being made in Chicago, I have asked that this article be republished in the Record:

THE WAR ON POVERTY

Those who take an objective, detached view of the work of the Office of Economic Opportunity are unanimous in their praises. They see in it a sincere attempt to try to bring the great American dream within the grasp of the common man. The social measures that were initiated during the administration of President Franklin D. Roosevelt, such as WPA, NYA, CCC, and others were a temporary stop-gap. They were emergency innovations intended solely to meet the stress and strain of the moment. They were never meant to be permanent aspects of the nation's economy.

The Office of Economic Opportunity is the first long range effort on governmental scale to grapple with poverty at its source and bring a measure of hope and comfort to the nation's indigent citizens. R. Sargent Shriver, who oversees the operation of the OEO has poured every ounce of his kinetic energy into the program. The results, by and large, have been eminently successful. True, there have been sharp criticisms here and there. But invariably the critical observations have been inspired by partisan politics.

The wailing about the poor not being given a voice in the organizational structure of the program has been effectively silenced by the simple expedient of inclusion of the poor on a decision-making level.

Never before in American social, economic or political history has there been so deep a concern for the plight of the underprivileged, the neglected and the hungry as it is today. Rather than enlarging an already cumbersome army of public aid recipients, the Federal government employs its resources to train men for skilled jobs, and close the educational gap among children of school-age by providing a Head Start program.

It is gratifying to know that the national consensus is that the Chicago Office of Urban Opportunity is the most efficiently administered sector of the War on Poverty. Even unconscionable politicians have found no fault with it either in the application of the principles for which it was created or in the treatment and participation of the poor. Much of the credit for this belongs to Mayor Daley whose selection of Dr. Deton J. Brooks, a trained administrator, as director of the Chicago program, was made not on the basis of partisan politics, but strictly on ability and proven competence.

The Otepka Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VERNON W. THOMSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1967

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my fellow Members a matter of considerable concern to all Americans. I refer to the case involving Otto Otepka, currently being heard in secret hearings at the State Department. In light of the Department's unprecedented decision to withhold all testimony from the public, including that covering questioning, the following resolution by the Committee on Foreign Relations of the American Legion takes on special significance:

THE OTEPKA CASE

(Resolution of the 48th annual national convention of the American Legion, Washington, D.C., August 30, 31–September 1, 1966)

Whereas, Mr. Otto F. Otepka, Chief, Division of Evaluations, Department of State Office of Security, for the past five years has been subjected—on the part of his superiors in the Department—to undue duress, harassment, insults, and threat of dismissal; and

Whereas, on September 23, 1963, Mr. Otepka was advised that the Department proposed to remove him from his appointment with the Department of State on charges that he had violated Department directives governing classified documents, specifically, that he had furnished certain classified documents to the Chief Counsel of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee; and

Whereas, Mr. Otepka met these charges, and appealed the dismissal notice, on grounds that the documents in question were turned over to the Senate Subcommittee during its investigation of the administration of the Internal Security Act in order to establish the verity of his testimony to the Subcommittee—concerning lax security practices in the Department of State—as opposed to contrary evidence offered the Subcommittee by his superiors; and

Whereas, the documents in question upheld Mr. Otepka's testimony, and subsequent hearings by the Subcommittee brought out the fact that certain of his superiors and other employees of the Office of Security had otherwise misled or misinformed the Senate Subcommittee; and

Whereas, the Code of Ethics for Government Service, expressed in House-Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 175, 85th Congress, Second Session, requires that any person in government service "Put loyalty to the highest moral principles and to country above loyalty to person, party or Government department;" and

Whereas, The American Legion believes that the security program of the State Department must be of the highest possible order; and

Whereas, the Otepka case involves not only loyalty to the United States, it also involves the matter of the dignity of an individual human being; and

Whereas, at stake in Mr. Otepka's appeal is (a) whether or not dedicated professional security officers in government will be permitted to be so intimidated in the conduct of their vital work that the internal security program of the United States will be placed in jeopardy; and (b) whether or not the Congress—consisting of the elected representatives of the people—will preserve its right to oversee the behavior of officials in the Executive Branch; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by The American Legion in National Convention assembled in Washington, D.C., August 30, 31–September 1, 1966, That The American Legion deplores the treatment which Mr. Otto F. Otepka has received at the hands of his superiors in the U.S. Department of State, and commends the action of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee in its thorough investigation of the Otepka case and related matters, and in its bringing to the attention of the public the true circumstances surrounding Mr. Otepka's dismissal from his important position in the Department of State.

Representative McDonald of Michigan Addresses Young Republicans at National Convention in Omaha, Nebr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK EDWARDS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1967

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, last night Congressman JACK McDONALD of Michigan, spoke before the national convention of the National Federation of Young Republicans in Omaha, Nebr. It was an honor for one so new to the Halls of Congress to be invited to address this group. And I believe that his remarks are of interest to all Members of the House:

SPEECH GIVEN BY CONGRESSMAN JACK McDONALD, 19TH DISTRICT, MICHIGAN, AT THE YOUNG REPUBLICAN NATIONAL FEDERATION CONVENTION ANNUAL MEN'S LUNCHEON, OMAHA, NEBR., JUNE 21, 1967

Just the other day an historic event took place. It happened in Alexandria, Virginia, a city across the river from Washington, D.C. A new city council was elected. And for the first time in seventy-six years a Republican was elected to a seat on the council.

It was an historic event in Alexandria, to be sure. But, such events are becoming more commonplace throughout the country. In fact, the resurgence of Republicans in city councils and State houses, town halls and gubernatorial mansions, has given rise to a very real belief that we can win control of both the White House and the Congress in 1968.

But, to do this, we must adhere to two principles. First, and most obvious, we must be united and continue to work together to win the election. This, despite any bitterly contested primaries or nominating conventions that may occur.

Second, we must have a progressive platform which offers a viable alternative to the Great Society. Toward that end, we in the Congress have made a start. Under the leadership of Jerry Ford and Ev Dirksen, Republicans in the Congress have approached the problems of pollution, crime, housing, education, and job training, to name a few, with a view toward presenting positive programs which offer the electorate a clear choice.

Rather than accept the tired notion that the Federal Government must solve every problem that faces our Nation, we have proposed solutions which would tackle the problems at the local level. The essential distinction here being that we have not merely *opposed* one solution—we have *proposed* another. Or as Jerry Ford is fond of pointing out—we will disdain the role of "nay-sayer" in preference to the role of "yea-sayer" for alternative approaches.

In the field of elementary and secondary education, for example, the party supported the alternative offered by Congressman Albert Quie of Minnesota. The Quie amendment to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act would have accomplished several things. To begin with—the Quie amendment would have eliminated 30 separate Federal programs with their 30 separate sets of guidelines, 30 different filing dates, and 30 conflicting sets of regulations and in their place substituted one Federal program with one set of guidelines, one filing date and one set of regulations.

Beyond that, the Quie Amendment would have eliminated the "Czarlike" powers of the United States Commissioner of Education and the sweeping authority of the United States Office of Education over the direction of school programs throughout the country. Had we been victorious on the floor of the House, the control of elementary and secondary education in this Nation would have been returned to the State and local boards of education, which until 1965 had managed to educate millions of thinking Americans for nearly 200 years without the interference of the Federal Government.

And to the contrary of all the propaganda you may have heard—the Quie amendment would *not* have excluded aid to private institutions. Safeguards were written into the legislation to assure continued support for all schools with, I must add, a distribution formula which would have assured some 39 States of a more equitable share of the Federal dollar for education.

In the field of housing, another bold innovation has been designed by Republicans. The chief architects are Senator Charles Percy of Illinois and Congressman William Widnall of New Jersey. Their plan is a blueprint for eliminating the slums and ghettos of our cities by providing the residents of these blighted areas with the opportunity to rebuild their neighborhood and own a decent home.

The Percy-Widnall proposal establishes a mechanism whereby mortgage assistance can be provided to lower income Americans unable to afford and obtain conventional mortgage financing. Beyond that, their bill provides funds to provide these people with budget counseling and job training in order to assist them in their endeavor to become and remain a home-owner.

Essentially, the plan works at the local level. Neighborhoods seeking to improve themselves would establish corporations composed of local business, civic, professional, religious, and labor leaders. They would borrow funds from a national foundation to loan neighborhood residents who are willing to purchase a home that has been rehabilitated.

The advantages of such an approach are obvious when one reflects upon the merits of home-ownership. Chief among them is the fact that the home-owner generally tends to have a measure of self-respect which is evident in his care for both his own property and the property of others.

The home-owner is also, as a rule, more stable, less likely to pick up and move. Thus, he tends to become more involved in community affairs, and to be concerned with the proper development of his neighborhood. He wants good schools, safe streets, clean parks. And he is willing to commit both his time and resources to achieving these goals.

This Republican endorsed proposal stands in sharp contrast to the Great Society programs of rent supplements, public housing, and model cities which, by their very nature, tend to produce the ghettos and to perpetuate the self-defeatism such ghettos generate. For so long as lower income citizens are denied the opportunity to own the property on which they live, they will lack the motivation to improve themselves or to take a more active interest in the welfare of their neighborhood.

In the area of job training, I am proud to have joined with many of my Republican colleagues in sponsoring the human investment bill. Our proposal would provide incentives to industry to train the disadvantaged. The advantages to this approach are numerous.

First, it would eliminate the obvious inefficiency of Government-run programs in which we have innumerable examples of training programs which bear no relation to industrial needs. We have discovered, for example, that the Office of Economic Opportunity has wasted funds on such inconsequential projects as having men chop brush along the banks of streams.

The response to this proposal from the corporate community has been gratifying. Chief among the reasons for the businessman's support is the fact that he will train men for jobs which actually exist. Thus, employment will be assured upon completion of the training program. I think, however, that we should also consider the added plus of utilizing industry's efficient methods and "know-how" to attacking one of our basic problems. My own belief is that combining the talents of the corporate officer with the techniques of efficient business practice will result in a quicker victory in our war on poverty than any army of VISTA volunteers could ever hope to accomplish.

Republicans have adopted a similar position with respect to pollution. We have sponsored legislative proposals which would encourage industry to police pollution by offering incentives for the development and use of devices to eliminate industrial waste. The renaissance of such cities as Pittsburgh was brought about primarily by the efforts of local business and political leaders—not by Federal decree. We would hope that similar efforts to purify the water and air in major industrial areas could be carried out by incentives rather than imposition, by persuasion rather than prescription. And I, for one, believe that the tax break stimulates such action by corporations.

Further, there is no denial that some form of regulation will be needed to insure against water and air pollution, but the question arises as to whether we will establish such guidelines at the national level or at the State and local levels. Once again, the example of cities such as Pittsburgh suggests that it can be done at the local level—and far more effectively.

The effectiveness of programs at the local level is, of course, hampered by a lack of funds. And this argument has been used by the administration to expand the number of grant-in-aid programs and to call for more Federal dollars to assist our local communities. But, Republicans have countered by suggesting that we could eliminate one entire level of red tape if, instead of sending the money to Washington for redistribution to the States and cities, the money was retained at home where it will wind up anyway. This proposal is known as "tax-sharing" and has been proposed in many forms, most notably by Congressmen Melvin Laird of Wisconsin and Charles Goodell of New York. Essentially, one plan would permit the retention of funds in the cities and States by providing for Federal tax reductions for city and State taxes. The other plan calls for Federal collection of the tax dollars followed by a disbursement of "block grants" to the cities and States.

In each instance, the programs would provide local people with the funds to carry out local programs in accordance with local needs. But, without Federal interference.

At the moment, the only real program which remains in the hands of local authorities is the power of law enforcement. But, at this time, we are witnessing an attempt on the part of the Federal Government to take control of local authority and establish national policies for crime prevention. We should certainly employ the most effective means to combat crime in our country. But, if the Attorney General continues to preach as he has before the Judiciary Committee that "wiretapping is not necessary to catch criminals" despite all of the evidence of State attorneys general and metropolitan district attorneys to the contrary, then I suggest that the most effective forces against crime remain at the State and local level. I, for one, am in favor of the national entry into this fight. But, I believe our role should be to give local law enforcement officers the modern tools they need to do their job—implements which have been stripped by recent court decisions—by passing legislation which would, within the boundaries of constitutional rights, permit wiretapping.

In this area, as well as other areas I have mentioned, the importance of the Republican Party's legislative approach cannot be underestimated. Two reasons emerge. The first, of course, is the fact of the alternatives themselves. They are clear alternatives. Either the American public can continue to send millions of their tax dollars to Washington and, in turn, receive regulations on how to run their lives, or they can retain a portion of their tax dollar for local purposes and have some say in the management of their own affairs.

The second is that this legislative approach offers viable and progressive alternatives. Too often in the past our party has been viewed in a negative light. Conservatism has been misinterpreted by the electorate. It has appeared as a "do-nothing" or "naysayer" approach. We have been pictured as being obstructors rather than constructors, *against* solving any of the problems of our society rather than *for* a different approach to their solution.

In this regard I am proud of the legislative accomplishments of the Republican Party in the Congress to date. We have begun to forge a platform of responsible, constructive alternatives to the administration's proposals for more of the same Federal involvement in every sphere of human activity, alternatives which are positive approaches to the solution of our problems. They will stand us in good stead in 1968. For as more people become frustrated with the insensitivity of the administration's approach and educated to the significance of our party's, I believe the choice will be clear.

Our Inconsistent Supreme Court

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1967

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, for vacillation and inconsistency there are few organizations which can surpass the Supreme Court of the United States. Even the Congress, the National Legislature, which can be expected to vacillate in its lawmaking, does not exert any greater influence on the lives of all our people than the Supreme Court.

Their one-man, one-vote decision is inconsistent with our Constitution which accords the same two votes in the U.S. Senate to the State of Nevada as it does to the State of California, which has some 50 times Nevada's population.

They rule rightfully that the State shall not decide who shall marry whom, but at almost the same time rule that the State shall decide to whom the owner of private property shall dispose of it.

Richard Wilson's editorial appearing in the Washington Star on June 14, entitled "The High Court and Freedom of Choice" clearly delineates the danger of the unconstitutional legislative activities of the judicial branch of our Government.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following editorial with my remarks at this point:

THE HIGH COURT AND FREEDOM OF CHOICE

(By Richard Wilson)

The Supreme Court has recognized what must seem to most people—at least to most people in most of the states—to be an undeniable human right. If a Negro and white wish to marry who is to say they shall not? Certainly not the state.

Then why is it not a human right to dispose of private property as the disposer wishes? Why cannot the owner of private property sell to whom he wishes for any reason that pleases him?

The Negro woman and the white man who chose to marry and live in Virginia contrary to its now invalid laws exercised freedom of choice. They wished to live together legally, not being concerned with social conventions against racial intermarriage.

Does it follow that an owner of a house shall be compelled to sell to them if they make a bona fide offer? Or, does the owner of the house himself have the freedom of choice involved in waiting for an offer from a buyer he considers more desirable.

In non-legal terms, it can be forecast that the answer to be found in the Supreme Court lies in the majority opinion by Chief Justice Earl Warren in the marriage case.

The reasoning in that case was that freedom to marry or not to marry a person of another race resides with the individual and cannot be infringed by the state.

Freedom to own property, however, can be infringed by the state. Property cannot be used for illegal purposes such as gambling or prostitution.

It can be surmised that the court would rule that property also cannot be used to thwart "the principle of equality at the heart of the 14th Amendment," which is the law of the land.

The decision in the marriage case was unanimous, as it was in the school cases a decade ago. But where freedom of choice, and by inference freedom of association, is concerned the court is not unanimous. It stands 5-to-4, or did until the retirement of Justice Tom C. Clark.

The latest case involving freedom of choice, wherein there was a 5-to-4 split, was the invalidation of California's constitutional provision known as Proposition 14. This proposition voted by a 2-to-1 majority of California's voters became Section 26 of Article 1 of the California Constitution and provided, in part:

"Neither the state nor any subdivision or agency thereof shall deny, limit or abridge, directly or indirectly, the right of any person, who is willing or desires to sell, lease or rent any part or all of his real property, to decline to sell, lease or rent such property to such person or persons as he, in his absolute discretion, chooses."

The majority of the court held that this was not a neutral position by the state (a state is not compelled to have an act on discrimination) but a positive encouragement by the state of discrimination in the sale and rental of housing. This contravened the 14th Amendment. The minority of four held that the amendment was neutral and required no affirmative governmental enforcement of any sort, and therefore did not violate the equal protection clause of the 14th Amendment.

But all that was probably merely the legal facade behind which lies the broader issue of freedom of choice by private citizens. This came out most strongly in conflicting opinions by Associate Justice John Harlan and Associate Justice William O. Douglas.

Harlan wrote that the equal protection clause of the Constitution (invoked in the school case, Brown v. Board of Education) "does not undertake to control purely personal prejudices and predilections, and individuals acting on their own are left free to discriminate on racial grounds if they are so minded."

Douglas has another view. He sees a highly sophisticated conspiracy wherein property owners' prejudices are magnified by real estate brokers and money lenders to keep neighborhoods "white" or "Caucasian" as the dominant interests desire.

He finds that urban housing is in the public domain and clearly marked by the public interest. Since real estate brokers are state licensed, they must be dedicated, like the telephone companies and hotels and motels, to service to all without discrimination, in the Douglas view.

The court is evidently moving toward new definitions limiting on racial grounds freedom of choice in such common acts of everyday life as the selling of a house, but not limiting this freedom in such common acts as the choice of a wife or husband.

Welfarer's Union To Destroy Welfare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1967

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the American people were shocked to learn that they are taxed of their hard-earned wages and profits in the name of charity for nonworkers who claim hardship and disability, yet can be active enough to organize into unions, march in protests, and file lawsuits claiming a vested right to receive welfare doles is guaranteed under the U.S. Constitution.

Let the exploiters of the poor who would use welfare recipients for political advantage and their fellow travelers go to Moscow or Cuba and carry on their devilish plots to hurt those who are in dire need of welfare assistance.

If these agitators do not like what they are getting, they can always go to work selling Daily Workers or, in protest, burn their welfare checks.

Next thing we may experience will be a protest for appointment of a welfare recipient to the U.S. Supreme Court—and it might well be an advantage over some of the illiterates now serving.

The race war is now being abandoned in favor of the true Communist objective—a class war. It will not work in America, but many innocent, needy people may suffer because of the party discipline and leadership of a bunch of intellectual morons who seek to divide our people.

Mr. Speaker, I am inserting news articles from the June 21 Evening Star, the June 18 Sunday Star, and June 16 Evening Star:

DEMONSTRATIONS SLATED BY WELFARE RECIPIENTS

(By Paul Delaney)

Plans for protest demonstrations by welfare recipients in 37 cities, including Washington, were announced today by the National Welfare Rights Movement.

Dr. George A. Wiley, director of the movement's Poverty-Rights Action Center here, said "recipients in the thousands will march, protest and demonstrate for bread and dignity" on June 30.

He said national demands will be for more money and easing of "barbaric regulations and government-sponsored poverty." Locally, each demonstration will be geared to local problems. Plans are for recipients to protest in front of welfare offices in their cities.

Wiley said details of the march here in Washington have not been concluded but that recipients will march on the Department of Public Welfare. The local action will be organized by the Citywide Welfare Alliance, he said.

Wiley described the planned protests as the "opening round" of more and more action by welfare recipients to pressure national and legislatures to overhaul the system. He said the principal demand is that average annual welfare benefits be raised above the $3,000 poverty level. He said $4,000 would be acceptable.

Wiley contrasted the planned action to civil rights activity.

"There has never been similar civil rights planning," he stated. "There have been no nationwide, rationally conceived and organized demonstrations by civil rights groups."

He said his organization is made up of 250 "loosely federated" groups within the states. He could not estimate the number of individuals, either nationally or locally.

Wiley cited a federal court ruling in Connecticut yesterday that struck down that state's residency requirements for welfare recipients. He said it is the first time a recipient has won a major constitutional case and declared they will be going to court more in the future.

TWO COURTS AT ODDS ON WELFARE RULE

A federal court in Connecticut yesterday ruled that that state's one-year residency requirement for welfare payments is unconstitutional. At the same time, a U.S. District Court judge was dismissing a similar challenge in a Washington case.

The 2-to-1 decision in U.S. District Court in Hartford said the state law is unconstitutional because it violates the right of free travel between states.

Both cases were brought in behalf of welfare recipients by attorneys of the federally financed Neighborhood Legal Services, which was originated through the Office of Economic Opportunity.

MOVED HERE LAST YEAR

In U.S. District Court here, Judge Alexander Holtzoff refused the request of Mrs. Minnie Harrell, 28, that a three-judge panel be convened to rule on the constitutional challenge.

Mrs. Harrell, the mother of three, moved here from Bay Shore, N.Y., last September after undergoing an operation for cancer, she related in her suit filed two weeks ago.

Holtzoff said that welfare payments are a grant "and not a matter of contractual right." Congress has the right to make "reasonable requirements" and residency is such a reasonable requirement," he said.

ISSUE TOO REMOTE

Holtzoff also said that without the one-year residency requirement, Washington would face "an influx of indigents" and could become a "Mecca" for such persons.

Mrs. Harrell's counsel contend the requirement is an abridgement of freedom of travel. Holtzoff rule the issue was "too remote to be considered."

The Hartford case was filed on behalf of Vivian Marie Thompson, 19, who moved from Boston to Hartford with her two children to be nearer her mother, United Press International reported.

Six months after arriving in Hartford last year she applied unsuccessfully for funds under the Aid-to-Dependent-Children program.

Her attorney said after the ruling that, if it is upheld on appeal by the state, it would mean "no state would have a residence law in the area of welfare."

The majority opinion said the Connecticut law infringes on the constitutional right to travel freely because it has the effect of discouraging interstate movement, UPI reported.

The opinion pointed out that the Connecticut statute states openly that the residency requirements are aimed at preventing persons entering the state solely to seek welfare aid.

DISSENTING OPINION

The majority opinion also said that the state had failed to show that "any significant number" of persons had, in fact, entered the state for that purpose.

In a dissenting opinion, Judge T. Emmet Claire said the residency stipulation did not prohibit travel between the states as such and described the law as a legitimate protection of the state's financial interest. He said the fact that such legislation existed in about 40 other states was indicative of its validity.

The states without a residency requirement in welfare payments are Alaska, Georgia, Hawaii, Kentucky, Maine, New Jersey, New York, Rhode Island and Vermont, according to the Federal Welfare Administration, an advisory group to the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. More than a year ago, this group recommended that all residency requirements be abolished.

In the case here, attorney Lawrance Silver said he planned to appeal the ruling.

He said, however, that the Neighborhood Legal Services may first petition Holtzoff for a rehearing because no one here was aware of the Hartford ruling at the time Mrs. Harrell's case was being argued, and the Connecticut case might provide a precedent.

Silver said that the Connecticut decision would not be binding here because the courts are of identical authority, but he said the Hartford decision would have "excellent precedental possibilities."

WELFARE RECIPIENTS FORM UNION TO PRESS DEMANDS

(By Fred Barnes)

A group of District welfare recipients yesterday announced formation of a union to press their demands for "more money now" from the Welfare Department and to end "the rule" of Sen. Robert C. Byrd, D-W. Va.

The new union consists of members of the City-wide Welfare Alliance, an organization of welfare recipients. The union will use the name of the alliance.

Leaders said it already has 175 members who have paid a $1 initiation fee. They come from seven welfare recipient committees in the District, Mrs. Annie McLean, chairman of the group said.

She said the union "will represent us against the Welfare Department in our efforts to get more money now." On June 30, she said, the union will present its demands to the department and ask for recognition as the "legitimate bargaining tool" for the city's welfare recipients.

A WHITE HOUSE CALL

The hopes of the union were buoyed by a phone call from the White House "asking what can be done to meet our demands so that our demonstration will not end in riots," as in Boston, Mrs. McLean said. But she would not disclose who called from the White House or who received the call.

Contacted at the White House, Stephen Pollak, special assistant to the President on District affairs, said he had "had no conversation on the subject" with the group. "I don't know who might have called," he added.

Mrs. McLean said, "we are sending them (the White House) a list of demands which we feel must be met." But the only demand she would disclose was that of the need for recognition of the new union.

"We're here to say to the Welfare Department and Sen. Byrd that we're not going to stand by and let them take over," Mrs. Etta Horn, vice chairman of the union, said. Several times she repeated the slogan, "More investigators? Hell no!"

Byrd, chairman of the Senate District appropriations subcommittee, called last Saturday for more investigators. He has been a long time foe of suspected welfare cheaters, and has opposed direct welfare aid for children with unemployed parents.

While not saying how much more money will be demanded, she said welfare grants should rise "at least to the poverty level," a figure she pegged at $3,600 annually.

Mrs. McLean said the union is allied with the National Welfare Rights Movement, whose headquarters are at R St. NW. This group is trying to organize welfare recipients throughout the nation.

In addition to the 25 members in each of the seven committees, she said the union is "in the process" of getting members in seven other welfare-recipient committees. She said the committees already in the union are from Barry Farms, Knox Hill, Friendship House, Near Northeast, Southwest, Congress Heights and Defrees Street.

Representative Smith of New York Calls for Early Congressional Action on Social Security Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY P. SMITH III
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 22, 1967

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply concerned over a matter that affects the welfare of thousands of my own constituents and literally millions of other American citizens. From all outward appearances, current efforts to provide increases in social security cash benefits, coupled with automatic cost of living increases, have stagnated.

With the steadily increasing cost of living, hundreds of thousands of our social security retirees are finding it difficult, if not impossible, to make ends meet. The many financial and administrative problems that have arisen as a result of the implementation of the medicare program have contributed further to the burden placed upon our retired citizens.

Mr. Speaker, if we are to fulfill our dutybound responsibility to the millions of Americans who contributed to the growth and prosperity of our great Nation, we must act now. I am deeply disturbed by suggestions which indicate that the increase in social security cash benefits and the cost of living increase clause will be deferred until 1968, a presidential election year. We cannot and must not play politics with the lives, fortunes, and welfare of our needy senior citizens. I urge all of my colleagues to speak out in favor of early House and Senate action on this most necessary social security legislation.

Mr. Speaker, a recent editorial in the Buffalo Evening News addresses itself to the views of our distinguished colleague, Representative CHARLES E. GOODELL on this very subject. I commend the Buffalo Evenings News and Representative GOODELL for adding their own strong voices to this most worthy cause. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the Buffalo Evening News editorial be printed in the RECORD at this point.

ACT NOW ON PENSIONS

We hope that Rep. Charles E. Goodell (R., Jamestown) is wrong in sensing a "quiet plot" among administration leaders in Congress to "delay any social security increase until the election year 1968." But if he turns out to be correct—if this all-too-familiar game of timing social security cost-of-living adjustments to do the in-party the most good at the polls is being cynically played once again—then we are as mad about it as Mr. Goodell says he is.

Mr. Goodell and the House Republicans, for whom he is one of the leading spokesmen, are entitled to take a burn on this issue. For ever since last June—when the President began talking grandly about what he would ask Congress to start doing this year on social security—they have been clamoring for an immediate cost-of-living adjustment in pension benefits. Beyond that, they have called repeatedly—and we have repeatedly endorsed the case—for an escalator clause to keep benefits automatically adjusted to future living-cost inflation.

For years, Congress has kept playing the cruelest kind of politics with social security—generally letting the pensioners suffer for inflation during non-election years and finally coming through with political trumpets and flourishes proclaiming a great "liberalization" on the eve of the next presidential election.

It is the Goodell-Republican view, which we emphatically share, that whatever scale of benefits Congress adopts as a matter of policy, that level should surely be fixed in terms of real buying power and protected—by a cost-of-living escalator clause—against loss through either creeping or galloping inflation. With living costs having already risen about 8 per cent since the last social security increase, this protection is emphatically needed now, not "manana."

Federal Grant Makes Law Enforcement Degree Program Possible in Tarrant County

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JIM WRIGHT
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 22, 1967

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, with the assistance of a grant of $14,444 by the Department of Justice under the law enforcement assistance program, the Tarrant County Junior College District of Fort Worth has been developing a 2-year degree program in law enforcement.

The following excerpt from the Fort Worth Star Telegram of June 17 reflects that Tarrant County is taking a major step forward in the nationwide fight against crime. As reported in the Star Telegram, this fall Tarrant County Junior College embarks upon its program for law enforcement officers leading to an associate in applied sciences degree.

The people of Tarrant County can be justly proud of the fact that while many talk about how terrible crime is, they have undertaken to do something about it.

The article follows:

POLICE PROGRAM OF TCJC OUTLINED FOR LAW GROUP

(By John Tackett)

Denny F. Pace, head of Tarrant County Junior law enforcement program, outlined the program's curriculum Friday, noting the college's two-year course will be the only one of its kind available in this part of the state.

Pace, a 20-year veteran of the Los Angeles police department, detailed the course to the local law enforcement advisory committee at a luncheon in Worth Hotel.

The program, leading to an associate in applied science degree, includes everything from sociology to physical education and will cost about $350, plus books.

Pace said, however, with some departments paying tuition of police officers and with governmental grants, the cost will be low.

"It is a potentially free education for any law enforcement officer who is enthusiastic," Pace said.

The first semester begins in September with the opening of the junior college district's first campus.

Both Fort Worth and Hurst already have enrolled men from their departments, Pace said.

The courses include communications, juvenile control, criminal law, criminal investigation, government, traffic planning, algebra and patrol operations.

Psychology and sociology, also are offered, and physical education is required in each of the four semesters.

Police internship is included in the final semester. Pace said several students will qualify for this when the school opens in September because they have had junior college training elsewhere.

Pace said he expects some Fort Worth police cadets who have had junior college experience will be in the first group of interns, initially, he said the group will be limited to 10.

Many police departments are requiring some college training now for rookies, and with the ever-rising crime rate, more will do so in the future, Pace noted.

(Federal Bureau of Investigation figures released Thursday showed Fort Worth and other cities its size have experienced a 24 per cent increase in crime for the first three months of 1967).

Pace said he hoped the college can obtain instructors who "can apply a little ideology of their own."

Pace is considered one of the nations more qualified law enforcement educators. In addition to his experience as a police officer, he holds a master's degree in public administration from the University of Southern California. For the last two years, he has taught criminology at Palm Beach State College.

History of the Imperial Valley Reflects Man Controlling His Environment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. TUNNEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1967

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to place in the RECORD the following excerpts from a special edition of the Calexico Chronicle, which appeared on May 18, 1967.

I consider it a very interesting edition and commend it to the attention of all my colleagues:

HISTORY OF THE IMPERIAL VALLEY REFLECTS MAN CONTROLLING HIS ENVIRONMENT

(By Fredricka Phillips)

Today California's Imperial Valley remains a desert in many respects. One will see flora and fauna typifying desert environment, from thorney ocotillo, lizards zigzagging beneath withered sagebrush and greasewood plus vistas of drifted sand. The Imperial Valley is also an oasis of residences expansive (and expensive) ranches and farms, cattle feedlots, dams, vineyards, feathery date groves and perfumed citrus orchards, and a "world" of vast recreational potential, fine winter playground and sand piles for those seeking the warm desert sunshine and dry semitropical climate.

The Imperial Valley much of it below sea level, is a wedgeshaped area, with its base resting on the international boundary and apex extending into the Salton Sea in the center of the Colorado Desert in southeastern California.

Seventy years ago, it was a hot, dry, barren desert: today nearly 650,000 acres are under cultivation and it has become one of the richest valleys in the United States.

When the first explorers came-to-the desert, they saw alkali flats, sand dunes, and mile after mile of barren waste. It was first named the Colorado Desert by Professor V. P. Blake, a geologist who accompanied a government surveying party through this region in 1853.

The Colorado River emptied into the Gulf at a point not far south of Yuma, Arizona bringing melted snow and a tremendous quantity of silt from the western mountains. Sediment was deposited in the Gulf at the mouth of the river, and during the spring floods the accumulated sediment grew higher than the level of the river. Over many thousands of years, it formed a fan-shaped delta which eventually stretched the width of the Gulf and cut that body of water in two. More mud, sediment and of course debris piled up each year at the mouth of the river. Floods continued, emptying now north, now south of the delta. During the dry periods, about every five hundred years, when the lessened flow of the Colorado returns to its southern course, the salt water in the upper limits of the captive Gulf evaporated. Fresh water from the Colorado River flowed into the newly formed desert basin, covering the salty bed. Yearly floods leached the alkali from the floor of the desert and left a layer of rich sediment containing nitrogen, potash, and phosphoric acid. The waste water drained to the lowest point of the basin and formed a fresh-water lake. Over the centuries, time and again, the area has been both lake and desert. We know from A. D. 900 to 1400 it existed as a fresh-water lake. Indians called the lake "Cahuilla", and made their encampments along its shores.

As the main channel of the Colorado River deepened, less water flowed into the basin. Water, filtered by the shattered rock strata, seeped through the level of sediment and the salt bed. At last the lake evaporated.

The first inhabitants of the Colorado Desert were four Indian tribes living in this area when Francisco de Ulloa, under orders of Hernando Cortez, the Spanish conquistador and conqueror of Mexico, sailed up the Gulf of California in 1538–39. Until Ulloa's exploratory voyage, the Spanish believed the Indian legends that California was an island—it is not known whether Ulloa and his party reached the mouth of the Colorado River. Had they disembarked, they would have found the Yuma Indians living near the site of the present city of Yuma; the Mojaves, further north along the Colorado River; the Cocopahs, living nearer the Gulf on land that now belongs to Mexico and the largest of the tribes, the Chuillas, on the western edge of what is now the Coachella Valley. Francisco Vasquez de Coronado was the next explorer to venture near the Colorado Desert. In 1540 his party journeyed overland with the intention of meeting Hernando De Alarcon, who had crossed the southern tip of the desert in Mexico and was to bring supplies by ship along the Gulf coast to a point near the head of the Gulf, following the route described by Ulloa. Alarcon's group, credited with the discovery of the Colorado River, left their ships at the mouth of the river and moved up stream in small boats.

Not until the 18th-century were there any serious attempts to explore the desert west of the Colorado River. In 1701, Father Eusebio Francisco Kino, a Jesuit priest appointed royal cosmographer for the expedition which was to colonize Lower California, returned to Mexico with the report that they had discovered a land route that proved California to be not an island but a part of the mainland . . .

In 1774, Bucareli, the Spanish viceroy to Mexico, sent Juan Bautista de Anza to California. Bucareli was alarmed by the number of Russians and British colonies which had come into being along the coast of northern California. Anza commandant of the presidio at Tubac, was to find the most direct route from that settlement to the chain of missions in California. The most direct route to California lay across the Colorado desert.

In 1771, Father Francisco Garces, missionary and explorer, had come to the desert to confirm the findings of Father Kino. Now he was asked by the viceroy to help Anza prepare for the journey overland. The group assembled at the Mission San Xavier Del Bac and Father Garces marched at the head of the column, followed by soldiers on horseback and by muleteers. Because Father Garces was there to plead for the expedition, the Yuma indians were not hostile. The explorers presented gifts to the Yuma chieftians, who guided them across the river and told them where they might find watering places on the desert. At San Francisco, Anza choose the site of a new presidio.

In 1776 Anza escorted a second expedition, settlers for California who were immigrants from Sonora and Tubac, Anza's "army" of thirty soldiers led some two hundred colonists past Pilot Knob and across the bleak and desolate Yuma Plain. His last encampment on the desert was made at the juncture of San Felipe and Carrizo Creeks, now called Harper's well, at the foot of the Santa Rosa, Mts.

Capt. John Fremont, who aided in the establishment of the Bear Flaf Republic at Sonoma in 1846, was commissioned by the federal government in 1848 to scout passages through the coastal mountains so that a transcontinental railroad could be built. His explorations of the desert were of importance in the linking of east and west.

The discovery of gold in California brought hordes of miners and adventurers along the route through the Imperial Valley, Gold was actually discovered in the Picacho mining district, on the banks of the Colorado river in the eastern section of the desert.

Nearly twenty years passed before a transcontinental railroad was completed. In 1875 the Southern Pacific was building a mail line east from Los Angeles. Trains were operating to Colton, Calif., in 1875 and to Indian wells (indio) in 1876. The railroad extended as far as the west bank of the Colorado River, opposite Yuma in 1877. With the establishment of the railroad, the last stage coach line was abandoned.

DEVELOPMENT RECLAMATION OF IMPERIAL VALLEY

Development of the Imperial Valley began about 1900, but its potentialities were recognized in 1849 when O. M. Wozencraft crossed the dry sink by mule on his way from New Orleans to San Bernardino. He noticed, as did William Blake, a geologist and mining engineer, that the rich silt deposits in the ancient lake bed would offer fine soil for farming. It was their opinion that the shallow basin of the desert could be irrigated from the Colorado River.

During the next ten years, Wozencraft arranged for a survey of the desert and urged the building of a canal to bring water from the River. He was able to convince the California legislature and in 1859 the legislature asked Congress to grant the state 1,600 square miles of desert land. Congress hesitated, the outbreak of the civil war delayed further discussion, and despite Wozencraft's efforts to revive interest in the development of the desert after the war, the project was dropped. Wozencraft spent the remainder of his life attempting to convince Washington officials that his scheme was worth their attention.

In 1895 Charles Rockwood an engineer, decided to investigate Wozencraft's extravagent claims. He explored the desert and proved to his own satisfaction that water could be diverted into the desert from the Colorado river.

In 1896 with A. N. Heber as his partner, Rockwood formed the California Development Company together they managed to overcome a great number of legal, financial and engineering obstacles in order to acquire the right to channel a portion of the river's flow. They proposed to build a canal from the river near Yuma to a point near Mount Signal west of the present Calexico, another key man C. N. Perry, laid out the complicated irrigation system.

HOW CALEXICO CAME TO BE

Calexico, which derives its name from a combination of California and Mexico, simply happened. The engineering headquarters of the company were first established at Cameron Lake, but I decided for permanent quarters to erect the company buildings at the International line on the east bank of New river. When the buildings were established at this point we knew that we would build a town on the line, but its exact location was not fully determined upon.

Mr. Chaffey laid off the townsite of Calexico at the point where it is now established, in the fall of 1901, and placed the property on the market, but it was soon withdrawn from sale for the reason that the Southern Pacific Railroad, in building the branch through the Valley, desired to run straight south from Imperial to a point near the International line, from which point they would swing eastward toward Yuma.

The railroad would have been built so and the town of Calexico would then have been located west of New river and about two miles west of its present location but for the fact that it would have thrown a portion of the townsite on a school section which was held by a lady living in Los Angeles, who refused to listen to what we believed to be a fair offer for her property, and, as we were unable to obtain the lands necessary for our uses, we got the Southern Pacific to run the road from Imperial straight to the present location of Calexico.

HOW BRAWLEY CAME TO BE

The townsite of Brawley was not, in the first place, controlled by the Imperial Land Co. The Imperial water company No. 4 had been organized and the major portion of its stock sold in a block to J. H. Braly, a banker of Los Angeles, who had undertaken the colonization of this tract of land. In the agreement with him, he was to have the right to locate a townsite within the tract. Afterward, before the town was started, the properties owned by Mr. Braly were repurchased by the Imperial Land Co. and the Oakley-Paulin Co., and the town was laid out in its present location.

Mr. Heber desired to name the town Braly in honor of Mr. J. H. Braly, but as the latter refused to have his name used in connection with the town, it was named Brawley in honor of a friend of Mr. Heber's in Chicago.

The townsite of Holtville was selected by Mr. W. F. Holt and laid out by him under an agreement between himself and the Imperial Land Co.

The history of El Centro is so recent in the minds of the people that it is not necessary to refer to it here except to say that these lands were originally selected as a townsite by Mr. W. F. Holt, and he gave at that time to the town the name of Carbarker. The Imperial Land company, realizing that the establishment of a town at this point would not only injure its property in Imperial but also would injure the investment of many people who had already purchased property at that point, made a contract with Mr. Holt whereby it then agreed to buy from him the lands on which Carbarker was located and the townsite of Holtville as well.

The Imperial Land Co., after paying many thousands of dollars on this contract found that is was unable to carry out its contract on account of the depression due to the agitations in the year 1904–1905, and it made a new contract whereby it agreed to turn back to him the townsite of Holtville and the lands on which Carbarker had been located on conditions that the establishing of a town at the latter point was abandoned.

The townsite of Heber was named in honor of Mr. A. H. Heber.

FIRST WATER, MARCH, 1902

Water was turned into the No. 1 main canal for irrigation in March, 1902, and we succeeded in obtaining some funds so that the work on construction continued actively during that season, but, confronted as we were with the tremendous load of the Chaffeys, the fact that our bonds had been removed without sufficient consideration being placed in the treasury to allow rapid construction, we were greatly hampered through all the years 1902 and 1903, and it was impossible to obtain sufficient money to keep up the work of construction rapidly enough to meet the demands for water, notwithstanding the fact that we were willing to sacrifice, and did sacrifice, our securities and our water stock in order to obtain funds to meet the pressing needs.

We had a great deal of trouble with the wooden head gate which had been built by Mr. Chaffey at Hanlon's, the floor of which, unfortunately, had been left several feet above the bottom grade line of the canal as originally planned by me. When this gate was built by Mr. Chaffey, it wasn't considered as permanent, but as a temporary expedient placed there to control the entrance of water into the canal during the summer of 1901, and it was Mr. Chaffey's intention to replace this by a permanent structure as soon as time and finances would permit. This gate was well and substantially built and had its floor been placed five feet lower the probabilities are that it could be used safely today for the control of all water at present required in the valley.

Due to the fact that the floor was left above grade, we found it necessary, in the fall of 1902, 1903 and 1904 to cut a by-pass around the gate to the river, and it was through this by-pass then, during these three years, that water was obtained at low water for the irrigation of the valley.

I'M AN OLD TIMER, TOO!

By golly! I am an old-timer!

When our illustrious editor first mentioned the possibility of a progress edition to commemorate 70 years since the first development company came into the valley or 66 years since Calexico came about by accident, I naturally began to cast about for pictures from the earliest days. I thought of some of our elder citizens who might talk with me of how they survived the hardships and, in their struggle, made our town what it is today.

Those who have lived here continuously for the past 50, or even 40, years are fewer every year. Talking with Vivian Parker Cole and her husband, Jim, with Alice Marie Rice, and with Marie Gastelum Sayles reveals very interesting bits of lore. However, I cannot identify with their stories because Calexico was a modern city when I moved here nearly 15 years ago.

We drove into the valley from Yuma on Highway 98. At that time the highway ended on the other side of Calexico at Mount Signal, but I did not know that at the time.

The sand dunes gave way to scrubby desert and that in turn to the lush green fields of October crops in sharp definitive lines.

In that year, Calexico Hospital was only two years old and was the first building in sight. It was pretty well surrounded by fields and vacant lots that have since been filled with residences.

To drive on into town we turned onto Heber Avenue and the homes looked pretty much like houses anywhere else. Well, there were exceptions. The old Binder home, now occupied by the Stepplings, and the Polkinhorn home, now the Britton's were delightfully Spanish. There were a few strange, screened structures in back yards. These were rooms on stilts raising them to second floor level. Many of the houses had one screened-in room as a second floor, vaguely reminiscent of the widow's walks atop many old New England homes.

Before the days of air-conditioning, indeed before the days of desert coolers with their straw matting, these were the sleeping rooms for summer. At the higher level sleepers could have the benefit of any stray breeze from the mountains on the miserably hot nights.

Now the stilted rooms are gone and the screened garrets are enclosed and electrically cooled.

The Library, City Hall, and the Woman's Improvement Club have not changed too much since October 1952. Perhaps the landscaping is updated. They were sure signs of modern government and culture.

A drive down Second Street that year would be strange to those who have come in the past 5 or 10 years.

Starting at Heber and heading west I remember on the right, Womack's agency on the corner and an empty building that still carried the old Dessert Feed sign that is now Thrifty Drug. Was Penny's next but only half its present size? I know Safeway was next to the bank that is now a dress shop.

On the left there was no Coronet. Yes, the movie was there, but the whole corner as I remember it was a restaurant. Later a radio repair shop, a beauty parlor, and Rollie's shoe store took their turns where Bud's is now.

I drank many a coke at the high soda fountain in the old International Drug Store where Rollie's is today. Mr. Charles Balderas was behind the prescription counter and Bud Sayles behind the soda fountion.

Lou Berk's yard-goods store was in there close by and Kress closed their door to remodel shortly after we came. That was excitement enough, but the real shock came during the end of the year holidays when the Kress building, incomplete, went up in flames that could be seen from miles around. Sidewalk superintendents gaped at the basement of water and debris until the boards went up again.

Sam Ellis and Popular Drug were where they are, but we used to drive between them to go to Mexicali. During Christmas shopping days and after school hours the cars lined up all the way back to the hotel corner many an afternoon. The policemen had a real job keeping the east-west lanes open to traffic. There was no traffic.

We have not yet hit 10,000!

So what?

I must have driven a thousand miles a month getting acquainted with this strange new land in that first year. I think I wanted to find a hill so I could see all of it at once.

My driving criss-crossed the streets of town as I watched the people who took all of this strangeness for granted. Musical conversation that I could not understand even after months of night classes flowed around me and the liquid brown eyes of the predominantly latin population looked at our fairness, accepted us, and moved on to important business. I don't seem to hear as much Spanish spoken in town as I did then.

A great part of the East side of town has been cleared away and rebuilt. I was not appalled at the poverty evident residences because I had seen many equally depressed areas in the South. However, it is more pleasant to drive now between the neat homes with carefully tended yards where once weeds fought soda signs and cardboard walls.

Calexico has grown several thousand in population since 1952. Annexations take it to the canal on the north, beyond the railroad to the west and almost solidly to Andrade to the East. We are catering to tourists and industry without forgetting the agriculture and animal husbandry that brought us here. We stock items large and small in the millions of dollars to woo the purchasers from Mexico. We have razed and raised school buildings to accommodate our youth. There is no standstill here.

All of this I have watched and known for almost a generation of change and progress. I was not even born when Calexico became a fortunate accident and yet I am an old timer to many of our thousands. I feel like an old-timer, because I belong to our town as my knowledge of it belongs to me and as my family and I have grown with it.

Tax-Free Brainwashing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1967

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the coming revolt against private ownership and operation of television and the airwaves called nonprofit educational TV is the ultimate in fully nationalized thought control and education. In many definitions it is known as the symbol controlled Socialist state.

Nonprofit, advertisement-free newspapers echoing the party line of the political ideology in power may be next.

Mr. Speaker, I include the release, "The Parasitic Network," from the March 8 Review of the News in the RECORD:

There is a very strong, concerted campaign afoot on the part of the Liberal Establishment to saddle the American people with subsidized, noncommercial television. Until now noncommercial "educational" TV has depended on foundation grants, viewer contributions, and government subsidies from the Health, Education and Welfare Department for its subsistence. However, these sources of income do not provide educational TV with any degree of financial stability or security. A foundation may or may not renew a grant, viewer contributions may fall off, and Congress may not appropriate funds to the HEW for such TV subsidies. And so, the would-be educators—those liberal-totalitarians who would like to mold and control the minds of Americans—have worked out a much more elaborate plan which would release the educators from having to worry about money, secure the financial stability of non-commercial TV, and even enable it to compete with the commercial system. The plan, conceived by the Carnegie Commission on Educational Television—a group of private visionaries financed by a Carnegie Foundation grant—was put forth to the public in late January.

As everyone knows, motion pictures, radio, and television are the technological children of capitalism. Their growth and development were possible only because they had commercial value. What is commercial value? Commercial value, as distinct from personal or individual value, is a value desired by large numbers of people, thus making it possible for other large numbers of people to earn their livelihoods by supplying this value to others. A value, in the most fundamental sense, is something a person desires to obtain or keep. We all want different things, and therefore we all have different values. Some values, of a sentimental nature, are so personal as to be of no value to anyone else.

On the other hand, there are some things which all of us want. Primary values concern our basic needs which we must satisfy in order to live. Of these, not all of them require an expenditure of energy to obtain. The phrase "the best things in life are free" refers to these particular values. They include sunshine, water, air, rain—all of which are abundant in nature in certain parts of the globe. In situations of scarcity, however, even these "free" values cost money. People fly south in the winter for the sun; they buy fresh spring water in bottles; they condition air; they irrigate soil when there is no rain.

There is also the popular notion that love is a "free" value. But as we all know, love requires tremendous expenditures of nervous energy to obtain and sustain—not to mention the other costs which go with love in the form of gifts, insurance policies, etc. Thus, there are virtually no values which do not require an expenditure of energy to obtain. But some needs we must satisfy; others we do not have to. For example, we need food in order to live, and therefore, it is a primary value. We do not need television in order to live, and therefore it is not a primary value. However, in an industrial civilization which has provided the consumer with hundreds of new values, we want TV because it gives us pleasure, enlarges our view of the world, and enables many of us, particularly the old and retired, to enjoy the passing hours instead of being bored to death.

And so, people buy television sets in order to enjoy the delights which come through the picture tubes. Naturally, it is not possible for the TV networks to satisfy everyone at every hour. But it is possible for them to satisfy many people much of the time. The viewers pay for this entertainment in two ways, first by their purchase of the television set, and second by buying the products which sponsor the programs. Since the cost of the product includes the cost of advertising it over TV, the consumer pays for this entertainment, but in such an unobstrusive manner as to be hardly aware of it. In terms of cost, the consumer gets a tremendous amount of entertainment over TV for very little.

Much has been said about the poor quality of commercial TV, that its programs are geared to the lowest common denominator. This indeed may be true some of the time. However, it should never be forgotten that television owes its growth and development to the interest shown in it by large numbers of consumers. Because it was a value to them, they purchased the TV sets, bought the sponsors' products, and made the networks rich. It is *their* medium of entertainment, developed to serve *them*. But it is a costly system of entertainment which can only be profitable to its developers if it serves and satisfies large numbers of people.

Now, there is in our country, as in other countries, a small number of people—belonging to a kind of snobbish cultural elite—who look down on television because of its mass appeal. These are people who read difficult novels, attend avant garde cinemas, enjoy modern dance and non-objective art. They usually don't like anything with a happy ending. To them, if it isn't tragic, it isn't deep, and if it isn't deep, it isn't of value. Television is clearly not their medium. Such a medium could have never been developed to satisfy their narrow tastes.

Some cultural snobs refuse to buy television sets. Few, however, boycott the products advertised on TV. If they do own television sets, it is in order to enjoy specific programs which suit their taste. But, it is obvious that people who read books, visit art galleries, go to the theatre, and see avant garde films do not have much time for television anyway. The people who watch television most are those who do not read books, go to the theatre, see avant garde films or visit art galleries.

But because television is so successful a means of reaching large numbers of people in an almost effortless manner, the totalitarians among us have long coveted the instrument, not as a means of entertaining people but as a means of controlling them. A great deal of such control is already exerted in commercial television through news programs, documentary features, and other so-called "public service" programs. Also, in the field of drama such control is very obviously exerted. For example, "The Man From Uncle," an adventure series in which an American and a Russian work together to maintain their twisted version of world law and order, is clearly an attempt to condition people into accepting an eventual partnership between the Soviet Union and the United States now being pushed by the world-government power clique. However, a great deal of this brainwashing is mitigated by the commercial necessities of television. And so the networks must limit their brainwashing for fear that too much of it will turn the viewers away from their sets, and thus destroy their commercial success. The consumer is still king in commercial television. His letters can persuade a sponsor to support or drop a particular program, for commercial TV must answer to the consumer.

This situation has long irked the liberal-totalitarians who dislike the idea of Joe Consumer being the final arbiter of what goes on TV. They know that TV belongs to the consumer, but in their view of things TV is much too valuable an instrument for mind control to be left in the hands of the consumer. In addition, commercial television, by its very nature and regardless of the prevalent socialist influences of the Trojan horses who run it, still generates too much implicitly pro-capitalist, anti-collectivist ideology to suit the tastes of the totalitarians. And so, the liberal-collectivists have had to work very hard to figure out a way to steal a large chunk of television away from the consumer. The main problem, however, was how to transmit hours and hours of uninterrupted brainwashing without having to worry whether or not it would be commercially successful. Leave it to the liberal educators to find a way. Their report states:

"The Carnegie Commission on Educational Television has reached the conclusion that a well-financed and well-directed educational television system, substantially larger and far more pervasive and effective than that which now exists in the United States, must be brought into being if the full needs of the American public are to be served."

The report never explains what it means by "the full needs of the American public." As we observed earlier, television is not a primary need to the viewer. However, it is a primary need to a clique which would want to control the minds of the viewers. The report continues:

"The programs we conceive to be the essence of public television are in general not economic for commercial sponsorship."

In other words, these programs are of limited value, for a sufficient number of people do not exist who would voluntarily support them. Therefore, there is only one solution to the problem: *force* people to support them. The report states:

"We recommend that Congress act promptly to authorize and to establish a federally chartered, non-governmental corporation, to be known as the "Corporation for Public Television." The corporation would be empowered to receive and disburse governmental and private funds in order to extend and improve public television programing. . . .

"We recommend that Congress provide the federal funds required by the corporation through a manufacturers' excise tax on television sets (beginning at 2 per cent and rising to a ceiling of 5 per cent). The revenues should be made available to the corporation through a trust fund.

"In this manner a stable source of financial support would be assured. We would free the corporation to the highest degree from the annual governmental budgeting and appropriations procedures: the goal we seek is an instrument for the free communication of ideas in a free society."

What the liberal-totalitarians want is something of great value for nothing. When they say that they want an "instrument for the free communication of ideas in a free society" what they mean is that they want free of charge and free of any control by the taxpayer, a valuable instrument whereby they can freely brainwash the nation. What kind of a society is "free" in which the taxpayer is *forced* by law to pay for the "free" communication of ideas? Who is getting the freedom? The term "free," as hypocritically used by the Carnegie Commission, can only mean "free of charge."

Also, please note that the Congress, which represents the American people and would force the public by law to pay the excise tax, would have no control over the public television to be imposed on the nation. The control would ultimately lie in the hands of the Executive Branch, for the report further proposes that the corporation be run by twelve directors—six of whom would be appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate—not the House of Representatives—and the other six directors would be selected by the first six. Their terms of office would be for six years. Thus, the public television network, supported by the buyers of television sets, would be controlled by a select group of liberal-totalitarians whose job it would be to conceive of TV programs to serve the "full needs of the American public," whatever that means. That some of the programs will be of some value to some people is beyond question, but the very means of financing the program—by taxation, which is one of the government's most obnoxious and irritating uses of force—suggests that the network will not serve any pertinent needs of the American public, for if it did, it could easily find commercial sponsors to back it.

It is typical of the liberal-totalitarians that they should resort to force to impose their supposedly superior concept of television on the American people. Therefore they appeal to government to do for them with the stoke of a pen what three decades of private investment and development did for commercial TV.

What will "public television"—or, more appropriately, the Parasitic Network—transmit to the American people? James Reston, an articulate spokesman for the totalitarians, wrote in his column of January 26, 1967:

"They [the Carnegie Commission] are saying that while Jackie Gleason may be more amusing than Senator J. William Fulbright of Arkansas, and the battle between the Kansas City Chiefs and the Green Bay Packers more popular than the struggle for China, nevertheless there may be a difference between what is amusing and what is important.

"In short, the Carnegie Commission is suggesting that there is a difference between what sells on television and what endures, what takes people's minds off the troubling issues for decision in a democracy, and what keeps their minds on those decisions."

In other words, the proponents of "public television"—overly interested in the *minds* of the viewers—are telling the American people that their values are all mixed up. What they are saying is that the American people should want to listen to J. William Fulbright more than to Jackie Gleason, that they should be more interested in the struggle for China than in a football game. What the educators are saying is that the American people are a bunch of children who have to be instructed in what to want, in what to value. But please note that these arrogant, self-conceited instructors expect to be comfortably subsidized by the very consumers they despise and look down on but who are responsible and smart enough to earn the money to pay the taxes to support the parasitic educators, but not smart enough to know what they should want.

Of course larceny on so grand a scale requires conmanship of an inordinately high caliber. The Commission's report itself is a good example of such conmanship. But an even better example is the editorial which appeared in *Life* magazine of Februrary 17, 1967. After opening on the theme of the "vast wasteland" and giving the Carnegie Commission a puff, the *Life* editorialist wrote:

"The commercial networks are both creators and the victims of the pressure for uniformity. Squeezed by ratings, they choose to appeal to the widest possible audience. Despite the magnificent job they can do, there is little room in their schedule for the new or the unique—for the item that has great appeal if its audience is limited."

Life forgets that TV, like itself, is a mass medium, that it owes its entire success to the fact that it serves a mass audience. No one has suggested that the federal government subsidize a magazine similar to *Life* free of commercial pressures "to serve the full needs of the American public." So why should the cultural elite require television as a means of expression? Also, since when is the new or unique excluded from commercial TV *if it is any good?* But if the cultural elite want a TV network of their own, why don't they pay for it themselves? Why must they become parasites and demand that those whom they consider culturally inferior and despise subsidize them.

They don't like what their supposed inferiors like, but they do like their money. *Life* writes without flinching an eyelash: "a massive financial transfusion from the federal government for noncommercial television is the only way to give the viewer a real choice when he turns on his set."

What is this "real choice" and why must the taxpayer be compelled to subsidize it? He doesn't have much of a free choice if he is *forced* to support it. The viewer now has as much free choice as he will ever have in the selection of programs. What guarantee does he have that Public TV will actually offer a real choice? None, of course, He will be offered whatever the educators think is good for him. *Life* states:

"A basic concern, held by many, on any large-scale undertaking of noncommercial television is the fear that it will develop into a "Big Brother" voice of the government or of some cultural Establishment. To avoid this possibility, the Carnegie plan would establish a nongovernmental nonprofit corporation as the core of Public TV. The corporation would act as a buffer between the sources of funds—tax revenues, foundations or private donors—and the creative producers who should be shielded from the influence that financial support often demands."

In other words, the "creative producers"—a new species of sacred cow—will be shielded from economic reality, which all of us plain folk must face in our daily lives. They will be insulated from the harsh economic realities of the outer world. What kind of "creativity" will come out of such a group remains to be seen. Supposedly, this detachment will make these creators free agents, beholden to no power clique or Big Brother. Thus, according to *Life*, they will be a power unto themselves, in positions to mold tastes, influence millions, and push their favorite writers and actors. Why should any group be given such power on a silver platter with no strings attached? Why should such a privileged group exist at all in a free country?

Life, of course, would hardly be expected to ask such legitimate and fundamental questions. Its main concern is in seeing that the Parasitic Network gets an expanded tax base. It writes:

"A tax on sets would fall directly on the consumers—the audience. It would seem more logical to insist that those who are profiting most should share the burden. That could be arranged by imposing a franchise tax on commercial television channels, or a tax on the advertising billings that support them."

The parasite knows just where to put the bite. The commercial developers made television possible. They are profiting from something they themselves nurtured, invested in, and developed. Yet, the impression *Life* gives is that they are profiting from something which is not really theirs. The editorials elaborates, and here his conmanship reaches its epitome:

"Commercial television stations have a priceless stock in trade—monopoly control of an air channel that belongs to the public. The public has never been paid for it. A tax on commercial operations to support Public TV would be a means of extracting revenues from the airwaves owned by all, to reach that part of the audience that is now substantially ignored."

It would take a book to disentangle the incredible fallacies jammed into that paragraph. In the first place, no air channel was ever owned by anyone, let alone the public. TV stations are assigned air channels in much the same way that airplanes are assigned a flight path. The problem is one of traffic, not ownership. The public, which is a loose term used to designate "everybody," never expected to be paid for the use of the air. Such a concept is so incredible that only an intellectual Svengali would even want to make use of it. Using the same logic, one could argue that the public owns the English language and that *Life* magazine, which has earned a huge fortune using it, ought to pay a special tax to the public just for using the language. But *Life*'s twisted logic knows no limits. First, it puts forth the notion that the public owns the air channels. However, it doesn't then suggest that the commercial networks send dividend checks to every living person in the United States. It suggests that the commercial networks subsidize a group of educators who will be using the same air channels—supposedly owned by the public—free of charge. If the commercial operators owe something to the public, it is hard to fathom how they can square themselves with the public by paying for the upkeep of a parasitic noncommercial system.

Just because the Carnegie Commission calls their system "Public TV" doesn't mean that the public will own it. *Life* magazine stressed the point that the corporation would be a power unto itself, answerable to no one, including the public. And so, the *Life* argument holds as much water as a sieve. As for "that part of the audience that is now substantially ignored," we have seen no polls or surveys to indicate where that audience is or what that audience wants which it is now not getting from TV. Everyone has his own pet interests, but no one expects a television network to put on TV specials for the benefit of bird watchers, button collectors, and devotees of Sanskrit poetry.

All of these arguments notwithstanding, the totalitarian juggernaut just keeps rolling along. According to the *New York Times* of March 1, 1967:

"President Johnson asked Congress today to create a corporation for Public Television that could channel both public and private funds into noncommercial television and radio facilities and programs . . . .

"Mr. Johnson said the board of directors would be appointed by him from the fields of education, communications and the creative arts, subject to confirmation from the Senate. It is thought that these should be men and women of sufficient stature to protect the corporation from interference by the Government, even though it may become dependent on sizable Federal subsidies."

And so the Great Swindle goes on.

Let There Be Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1967

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the Near East Report is an informative periodical which concentrates entirely upon the events of the Near East. In its most recent issue, this magazine reflected upon the problems facing the Arabs and Israelis in reaching a peace settlement, and discussed the roles of the East and West in this settlement. In addition, a calendar of events describing the day-by-day activities on both sides of the crisis has also been included.

I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following editorial and chronology which appeared in the June 13, 1967, edition of the Near East Report, as follows:

LET THERE BE PEACE

The Israelis have defeated the Arab states in military battle three times in the last 20 years.

Now comes the hardest, and, we hope, the last battle.

It is to induce Arab leaders to enter into a peace settlement with Israel.

Arabs and Israelis should meet for face-to-face negotiations. There is no realistic alternative. But it will be difficult to convince the Arab states, because, in the past, world statesmen have spared them bilateral political confrontation with the Israelis.

They have permitted the Arab states the luxury of remaining in an illegal state of war with Israel. This has not been a favor to Arab leaders or the Arab peoples. That "state of war" has cursed all the peoples of the Near East—with an expensive arms race that has sapped their economies; with a propaganda of hatred which has poisoned Arab minds; and now with a devastating war that has taken the lives of thousands of people.

For years the Arabs have kept Israel in a state of siege—with boycotts and blockades, threats and terrorism. They have prepared for the final day, intoxicated by their battle cries. In the last month, the Arabs moved to carry that war to a conclusion—their "final solution" for the 2,650,000 Israelis.

They struck because they were emboldened by military and political support from the Soviet Union and by U.S. preoccupation with the war in Viet Nam. They believed that the United States would not move to stop them and that Israel was isolated and surrounded. They called for a holy war.

On Saturday, June 3, the Commander of the Egyptian forces on the Sinai frontier, Gen. Abdul Mortaji, issued this proclamation:

"The eyes of the whole world are upon you in your most successful war against imperialist Israeli aggression on your fatherland, in the expectation of seeing successful results of our holy war to achieve the rights of the Arab nation. The outcome now is of tremendous historical importance to our Arab nation, and our holy war will restore the Arab rights stolen in Palestine. You will reconquer the stolen land with the help of God, the power of justice, the strength of your arms, and the unity of your faith."

Next day, on June 4, Nasser declared on Cario Radio:

"The whole Arab nation has moved. We are facing Israel in the battle and are burning with desire for it to start in order to get revenge for the 1956 treachery."

Next day, on June 5, Egyptians began an attack to cut Israel's Negev in two.

The Israelis struck back swiftly.

Within six days, the armies of Egypt, Jordan and Syria were smashed.

Much will now depend on the statesmanship of the great powers.

The Arabs have been able to maintain their political and military siege for the last 20 years because of the cold war.

Moscow gave the Arabs all-out diplomatic support at the UN, as well as more than $3 billion in military and economic aid.

Washington always hesitated to mount any offensive for peace lest it alienate oil-rich Arab states which profess friendship for the West but which threaten oil embargoes should the United States take initiatives to help Israel.

When the fighting began, both Moscow and Washington stayed out and the war was contained.

If they can now keep the cold war out of the struggle for settlement, perhaps now—once and for all—the peace can be obtained.

The great powers should now propose that the sovereign states of the Near East—Israel and the Arab states—work together to write the terms of their future cooperation and peace, free from cold war pressures. This is not the time for great power intervention for great power advantage.

Nor can the UN, always frustrated by the Soviet veto, play an effective role. The Near East should not be regarded as a permanent ward of international trusteeship. Instead of bringing the parties together for a final peace settlement, the UN machinery has served to perpetuate an intolerable and indefensible stalemate in which one side has been allowed—illegally and immorally—to remain indefinitely in a state of war.

The crushing Arab defeat has changed the map of the Near East. It has altered the balance of power and opinion. It has created a power vacuum, which should be filled by the peoples who live there—not by outsiders.

LESSONS FROM THE PAST

The great powers should now burn discredited and obsolete position papers.

The West has learned that the Arab leadership meant to carry out its frenetic threats. Washington can no longer delude itself into believing that "the words are substitutes for deeds." The words have proved to be lethal—against those who screamed them. Appeasement has not paid. No matter how hard Washington has worked to reassure the Arab states of American friendship, the United States is bitterly denounced as Enemy Number One.

Ironically, this U.S. decision to refrain from unilateral action to support Israel turned out to be a disaster for Nasser and his allies. If the United States and other powers had joined Israel in a move to break the blockade, the war might have been averted and the Arabs might have been spared their suicidal adventure.

It should never be forgotten that in 1956 we might have brought about a peace settlement if we had insisted on direct negotiations—if we had challenged the Arab aggression against Israel and if we had not taken the one-sided position that Israel had to withdraw forthwith without the blessings of a permanent peace settlement.

THE BIG LIE

Yet however scrupulously the United States avoided intervention, however ardently and vigorously the United States may have worked to preserve relations with the Arab world, our country has been the victim of the Big Lie. Facing disastrous defeat, President Nasser and King Hussein conspired to accuse Britain and the United States of providing air cover to assist Israel.

Did the Arab leaders hurl this reckless lie to provide an alibi for defeat?

Was it a desperate strategem to force the Soviet Union to enter the war on the Arab side and precipitate World War III?

Whatever its purpose, the effect has been to inflame Arab peoples against America and to rupture U.S.-Arab diplomatic relations in six capitals. It has also injured the Soviet's position, for Arabs now believe that the Soviet Union let them down at the very moment when the West was allegedly moving against them.

Moscow's bellicose Arab protegees have been exposed as paper camels. Russia has lost a vast investment in arms, economic aid and political support.

NO CONFRONTATION

At a critical time, Washington was unable to carry out its commitment to support Israel's right to use the Gulf of Aqaba for her shipping. The Arab attack came before President Johnson's promised declaration could be signed by the maritime powers and before a way could be found to give effect to that declaration.

Later—when war came—the President worked to prevent the dreaded great power confrontation. There was an exchange of hot line messages—the first time the hot line was used—between President Johnson and Premier Kosygin.

Thus, neither the Soviet Union nor the United States emerges with any credit in the Arab world. This explains the Soviet Union's cynical bid for Arab favor, the severance of relations with Israel, and the brutal and vicious attacks in the Security Council. As in 1956, the Soviet Union has been trying to bully Israel into retreating and surrendering the territory she gained in the fighting.

Unwilling to repeat the tragic blunder of the past and eager to push forward toward a peace settlement, the United States thus far has refused to enter into a partnership with the Russians in an anti-Israel offensive which would rehabilitate Moscow's shattered clients.

UNAIDED VICTORY

Israel had to act alone to defend herself from Arab attack. She has paid a huge price. Newspaper headlines report that the casualties were "slight" (679 dead and 2,563 wounded). But that is a high proportion of a total population of 2,650,000. We Americans would not consider our losses slight if we lost a similar percentage of our population—if we had suffered 51,000 deaths and more than 192,000 wounded (slightly less than American casualties in World War I).

[We do not know the extent of Arab casualties. But preliminary reports put them much higher than Israel's. Arabs have paid for Nasser's holy war.]

It is not surprising that the Israel government has announced that it will not return to the UN armistice lines which offered no defense against Arab snipers and terrorists in the past. It will insist on direct Arab-Israel talks to achieve frontiers that ensure life for its people.

Problems like the resettlement of Arab refugees, boundaries, the future of Jerusalem and the Holy Places—all these issues can be resolved within the context of direct negotiations.

NEW U.S. STAND

Significantly, the U.S. resolution introduced at the UN contained no references to ineffective pacts and agencies of the past. The United States called for "the establishment of a stable and durable peace in the Middle East." Ambassador Arthur J. Goldberg said that U.S. policy aimed "to provide for movement toward the final settlement of all outstanding questions between the parties which the U.N. envisaged nearly 20 years ago."

That resolution happens to be a milestone. It is the first time that the United States has called for *peace* in the Near East in many years. For a long time U.S. diplomats took the line that it was "unrealistic" and "counterproductive" to urge negotiations. Back in 1961, in a deplorable lapse from principle, the U.S. delegation voted against a UN resolution calling for direct negotiations.

THE WEST IS STRENGTHENED

It is now widely recognized that the defeat of Nasser and the Syrian military junta has strengthened the position of the West. The Soviet Union has suffered a setback and the West has gained. Nasser menaced Israel. Nasser damned and vilified the United States. He threatened every Western interest in the Arabian Peninsula, the Persian Gulf and the East Coast of Africa.

Now Nasser's threat has been blunted and no American diplomat could justify pressure to roll back Israel, for this would mean rolling Nasser forward to a vantage point from which he could renew his war against the West.

There is no longer any valid reason to withhold full support from an Israel which has changed the balance of power in the Near East and which has encouraged and strengthened every regime willing to resist Soviet pressures.

Israel's victory is more than a military triumph. Indeed, Israel's victory may suggest to other nations that the democratic system promises freedom and survival. Soldiers fight best when they have a stake in the society they seek to defend.

CALENDAR

Monday, May 29: Washington sought the support of maritime nations to end President Nasser's blockade of the Gulf of Aqaba and appealed to Egypt in the UN. But the Soviet Union refused to cooperate.

Nasser announced assurances from Premier Kosygin "that the Soviet Union stands with us in this battle and will not allow any country to interfere." He said his aim was "to restore the pre-1948 state of affairs." And Syria's President Noureddin Attassi flew to Moscow.

Tuesday, May 30: The Soviet Union rejected a French proposal for a Big Four conference and moved ten warships to reinforce her Mediterranean fleet.

King Hussein flew to Cairo, embraced Nasser and signed a military alliance which put Jordan's 55,000-man army (and its American weapons) under Egyptian command—a blow to U.S. policy. Once again, as in 1956, Israel was encircled, facing the threat of a four-front war.

Patrick Seale commented in the *London Observer* that Nasser "has raised his sights from the Gulf of Aqaba and now thinks of settling the whole Palestine problem once and for all by force."

Wednesday, May 31: Iraq sent troops to Egypt and Jordan. Yemen, Kuwait, Morocco and Algeria promised the same.

Thursday, June 1: The Administration sought signatures of maritime nations to a declaration on the freedom of navigation in the Gulf of Aqaba.

Following criticism of his "procrastination," Premier Levi Eshkol broadened his coalition and named Moshe Dayan Defense Minister. Columnist Joseph Alsop recalled the return of Churchill in 1939.

PLO Chairman Ahmed Shukairy, now reconciled with Hussein, told reporters in Amman that he expected war, that Jordan might start it and that the Arab would win. "The Jews in Palestine will have to leave," he said. "Any of the old Palestinian Jewish population who survive may stay, but it is my impressioan that none of them will survive."

Friday, June 2: Foreign Minister Mahmoud Riad said that Egypt would close the Suez Canal to any country which tried to break the Aqaba blockade.

Nasser refused to meet Charles Yost, a special U.S. emissary sent to Cairo.

British Premier Harold Wilson came to confer with President Johnson. There were only "one or two days left to solve a tense situation," Wilson said.

Diplomatic efforts to lift the blockade were deadlocked.

Saturday, June 3: Dayan told newsmen that he "wouldn't like American or British boys getting killed here in order to secure our safety."

Sunday, June 4: Iraq joined the Egyptian-Jordanian defense pact, while Egyptian officers and artillery were airlifted to Jordan.

The concentration of Arab forces on Israel's frontiers became a greater threat than the blockade itself.

Monday, June 5: The war began. Egypt moved armored columns north of Eilat to slice the Negev in two and to link up with Jordan's forces. Simultaneously, there was shelling of villages from the Gaza strip. Israel repulsed the attack and swiftly moved to bomb major Arab airports, eluding radar defenses by flying low from the Mediterranean. Egypt, Saudi Arabia, Jordan, Syria, Lebanon, Iraq and Sudan declared war.

Egypt accused Israel of starting it and claimed to have "wiped out" huge Israel forces in Sinai.

Eshkol notified Arab governments that Israel would not touch any other state, "as long as it does not wage war against us," and sent a personal note to Hussein urging him to keep out. But Jordan attacked Jerusalem with heavy arms, and the New City was shelled for 36 hours. More than 1,000 buildings were hit.

Eban said that Israel's war aims were "to frustrate the attempt of the Arab armies to capture our land, to break their wall of encirclement."

Nasser announced that the Arab objective was the "liquidation of the shadow of Zionism from Palestine."

Washington called for a cease-fire.

A State Department spokesman said that the United States was "neutral in thought, word and deed." Secretary of State Dean Rusk softened the statement by calling the U.S. position "non-belligerence."

Britain announced that she would not take sides.

Moscow condemned "Israel aggression."

At the UN, the Soviet Union and Egypt rejected a call for unconditional cease-fire, insisting that it include a demand for a withdrawal of Israel forces.

Tuesday, June 6: Israel forces took the Old City, reached half-way across Sinai and repelled a Syrian attack on Tel Dan. Israel announced destruction of 389 Arab planes in the first 48 hours of the fighting. Israel lost 19.

Egypt hurled the Big Lie, charging U.S.-British air cover for Israel.

Israel forces intercepted and taped the conversation during which Hussein and Nasser agreed to launch this allegation.

Arab mobs sacked and burned several U.S. and British missions. Egypt ordered U.S. citizens to leave immediately.

Egypt severed diplomatic relations with the United States and Britain; so did Syria, Algeria, Iraq, Sudan and Yemen.

At the UN, Soviet Ambasasdor Nikolai Fedorenko agreed to a call for a cease-fire, giving up the demand for an Israel rollback. The Council was unanimous. Israel accepted but the Arab states were silent.

"Our neighbors would wish to turn the clock back to 1947," said Eban in an historic UN address. "The fact is that most clocks work forward, and not backward . . ." And, he added, "the clock of the Middle East should move not backward to belligerency but forward to peace."

India's shrill anti-Israel stand at the UN surprised observers. Premier Indira Gandhi charged that U.S. resentment of India's position was responsible for withholding some aid shipments.

Wednesday, June 7: Israel completed occupation of Sinai including Sharm el Sheikh, reached the Suez Canal and captured the West Bank of Jordan. Israelis prayed at the Wailing Wall for the first time since 1948 and Dayan told his troops that Jerusalem will not be relinquished.

A new unanimous UN resolution called for immediate cease-fire. Israel again accepted and by evening Jordan concurred. Egypt and Iraq rejected the appeal.

President Johnson pledged efforts to transform the new Near East situation into a lasting Arab-Israel settlement. He announced the formation of a special task force headed by McGeorge Bundy to draft a Near East peace plan.

Communist China called on Arabs to continue fighting and accused Soviet leaders of stabbing Arabs in the back.

Thursday, June 8: Egypt accepted the cease-fire but Syria fought on.

Israel jets and torpedo boats mistakenly attacked a U.S. Navy communications ship using electronic equipment, which was 12 miles north of El Arish on the Mediterranean coast of the Sinai Peninsula. Israel apologized for a tragic blunder in which nine sailors were killed and 75 wounded, with 24 listed as missing.

Later Israel officials were amazed by an absurd report published in *Newsweek* which suggested that someone in Washington held "a top-level theory that Israel armed forces ordered the *Liberty* sunk." Israelis pointed out that Israel ships offered help as soon as Israelis realized their mistake. And they recalled that they were the first to flash word of the error to the United States government.

Friday, June 9: Nasser resigned and accepted responsibility for Egypt's "grave setback." He said that "the peoples of the entire Arab nation . . . struck an attitude of manhood and dignity" in fighting "magnificent and honorable battles," but he omitted Saudi Arabia from the list of the countries be praised.

In Cairo, thousands roamed the streets screaming for Nasser's reinstatement. They attacked the Russian embassy. Apart from an unsuccessful attempt of Egyptian forces to break out from Sinai, the cease-fire was observed by Egypt. There was only sniper fire on the Jordanian front. Jordan reported her casualties as 15,000.

Algerian mobs denounced the cease-fire and demanded arms to fight Israel.

Syrians kept shelling 16 Galilee settlements. Israel air force, armored and infantry units knifed into Syria, capturing the Hagolan range, silencing the batteries and reaching Quneitra, 35 miles from Damascus.

Saturday, June 10: Nasser agreed to yield to "the people's will," after the one-party General Assembly voted to reject his resignation. Most diplomats believe that Nasser was maneuvering to stay in power.

Israel declared victory over Syria. After 30 hours of fighting the UN cease-fire went into effect.

Israel announced she would not return to the 1949 armistice lines.

The Soviet Union severed diplomatic relations with Israel. So did Czechoslovakia and Bulgaria. Rumania declined to sign a six-nation Communist statement which branded Israel as the aggressor.

Washington declared an oil emergency and told the U.S. oil industry to deal with the shutdown of Arab pipelines—a blow to Arab economies, but only a discomfort to the West.

Fedorenko, seconded by his Bulgarian and Syrian colleagues, launched a vociferous campaign for an immediate Israel withdrawal.

Sunday, June 11: Nasser replaced 11 top army commanders. Marshal Amer, who had resigned with Nasser, was not asked to reconsider.

Algerian President Houari Boumedienne flew to Moscow to ask the Kremlin for arms for the Arabs and to adopt a tougher line against Israel.

Public opinion polls show that the great majority of Americans sympathize with Israel and not with the Arab states, although most Americans want to see the United States remain out of the conflict.

Monday, June 12: Eshkol suggested direct negotiations which Arab envoys at the U.N. rejected.

Here Are the Facts of Life About East-West Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1967

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

[From the Joliet (Ill.) Herald-News, May 29, 1967]

HERE ARE THE FACTS OF LIFE ABOUT EAST-WEST TRADE

(By Dumitru Danielopol)

BONN.—If you want facts, not fantasy, about East-West trade ask the Germans.

Ever since Bismarck, the Germans have sent their merchants east and south in search of markets. Twice they sought by war what they couldn't gain peacefully.

Here in Bonn, I spent hours talking to top experts on German trade with the Soviet satellites.

The picture is not reassuring for Washington's bridge-builders.

"These countries are short of hard currencies to pay for their imports," said a speaker at the Ministry of Commerce. "They do their best to pay with goods, but their best is not good enough."

For example, Romania's trade deficit with Germany is snowballing.

In 1965 it was 170 million German marks. (There are four marks to the dollar.) The deficit in 1966 was of 200 million marks ($50 million).

"In the first quarter of 1967 it grew by another 200 million marks," said Dr. H. Neudorfer, the ministry's expert on Romanian trade. "It is now 570 million, and it is bound to grow. There is little the Romanians have to sell."

The same situation has developed in Germany's trade with Bulgaria.

A deficit which stood at 60 million marks in 1965 has grown beyond 300 million and will go higher as Bulgarian credits come to maturity.

The German government is beginning to worry. The credits extended to Iron Curtain countries by German firms are all state guaranteed.

This is done through the private Hermes Insurance Co., which itself is guaranteed against loss by the government. The firm grants insurance only on credits approved by Bonn.

In other words, it is the German taxpayer who will foot the bill in case of default, just as the American taxpayer will do when President Johnson's policy of granting Export-Import Bank credit collapses.

The German trade patterns to the East are not uniform.

Poland and Russia are exporting more to Germany than they import from this country.

"What kind of goods do you get?" I asked.

"From Romania about one third is composed of agriculture products, but Bucharest is running into trouble with the new Common Market restrictions. Romania also sells Germany some chemicals and some machinery.

"Romania no longer has oil products nor timber in any substantial quantity for export," said Neudorfer.

These were the country's prime natural resources before Soviet exploitation began.

From Bulgaria Germany imports mostly tobacco and some food products.

What can these two satellites do to meet their trade deficits?

"Well, there is of course the tourist traffic which brings these countries some hard currencies," said Neudorfer.

How much?

"Romania tourism brought in 30 million marks in 1966 from Germany alone," he said. "But Bucharest can spend this money anywhere. It doesn't have to be applied to our deficits."

With a trade deficit which might reach one billion marks by the end of this year, 30 million marks is a drop in the bucket.

The Romanians are also offering steel on the international market, which they sell at a price far below cost of production.

What are the prospects for American trade with the Soviet bloc?

The German trade experts are cautious because they understand the political aspects of the question, but one said:

"I don't see very much that America can buy from them, and in any case the volume of goods they would be able to export to the U.S.A. is infinitesimal. The American market would not tolerate the shoddy workmanship."

The quality of goods produced by the satellites is so poor that even the Soviet Union is beginning to complain.

Dams and the Floods That Didn't Happen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LARRY WINN, JR.

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1967

Mr. WINN. Mr. Speaker, the Kansas City Times recently printed an editorial concerning the success of the flood control projects in Missouri and Kansas. The rains came to our part of the country this spring, and one cannot help but wonder what damage would have been done had it not been for the outstanding flood control program. I would like to draw the attention of my colleagues to this editorial:

DAMS AND THE FLOODS THAT DIDN'T HAPPEN

With at least a temporary halt in the relentless rains and an easing of the area flood crests, it is pertinent to note where it flooded and where it didn't.

The Missouri river, soaring to above bankfull stage for the first time in years, was two feet above flood level at Kansas City—but still 18 feet below the tops of the levee and floodwall system. Again this sturdy, 41-million-dollar network of disaster barriers, rebuilt and strengthened after the 1951 flood, paid off in averted flood losses. Below here, where the proposed federal agricultural levees still are not in place, the Big Muddy broke through small, inadequate farm levees and poured over thousands of acres of cropland.

At Smithville, the rain stopped just in time for the town to escape a third bad flood in four years. There is $200,000 in planning funds for the Smithville reservoir in the current federal public works budget, but money in a budget can't contain the Little Platte river—not yet. Another notorious floodmaker, the Marais des Cygnes, flowed almost peacefully between the levees at Ottawa—but the Pomona reservoir level a few miles west was up four and a half feet.

Despite nightly downpours reminiscent of 1951, the Kaw failed even to reach predicted below-banks crests. How come? The answers are to be found at such places as Tuttle Creek, Milford and Perry. Last fall water sports enthusiasts were glum because Tuttle Creek had been drawn down 12 feet below normal level to sustain river flow through a severe drought. Many doubted that Tuttle Creek lake would come back this summer. She did that and then some. Swollen by flood flows of the Blue river from Nebraska, the reservoir is eight feet above conservation stage and still rising.

Milford, placed in operation last January near Junction City, has been filling slowly. With rises on the Republican river, it now has jumped up nine feet in the last four days. Perry, northwest of Lawrence, is only 65 per cent completed. But the contractor and the Army engineers rigged an emergency power setup and closed the gates on the dam. Now 179,000 acre-feet of Delaware river water is temporarily trapped behind the embankment. This action, needless to say, proved highly popular downstream at Lawrence, where the long-planned levee system still is on paper.

At Topeka, these storms surely would have put tough old Soldier creek out in the streets in the old days. But Soldier creek has a new, manmade bypass channel, a strait jacket of stone and concrete that scooted the high water out of town in a hurry. Again, the public works budget includes the first money for the Pattonsburg dam—but this week the Grand river was way out of its banks from Chillicothe on down.

So far this year, a Vietnam-conscious Congress has been reluctant to invest in river projects at the usual rate. When the full figures are available on the floods that didn't happen in soggy Missouri and Kansas these last few days, they just might change their mind.

"Operation Yorkville" Speaks Out Against Obscenity and the ACLU

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1967

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, whenever there is a just and moral cause which cries out for an exponent, Operation Yorkville is never far away.

On May 8, 1967, the U.S. Supreme Court handed down yet another of its cryptic decisions in the area of obscenity striking down the will of the people as expressed through their elected representatives in their State legislatures. While the fuzzy thinking of the Court's majority in support of obscenity is shocking to say the least, many have grown used to this outrage and have merely acquiesced with but a disapproving nod.

Not so with Operation Yorkville, the courageous New York organization dedicated to the defending of our children. As usual Operation Yorkville has taken a valiant stand against the murky confusion disseminated by the members of this Nation's highest tribunal.

Again, when Life magazine carried an article championing the infantile antics of the American Civil Liberties Union, Operation Yorkville was among the first of the organizations to speak out.

It is with a great deal of pleasure that I associate myself with the remarks of Operation Yorkville in the following articles:

Interfaith Statement on the May 8 Obscenity Decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States

(By Rabbi Dr. Julius G. Neumann, chairman; Rev. Rodney N. Usher-Wilson, chairman clergy committee; Rev. Morton A. Hill, S.J., secretary; Rev. Constantine Volaitis, representative, the Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of North and South America)

The Supreme Court yesterday put its stamp of approval on 10 girlie magazines and two trashy paperbacks and further opened the door to complete license and irresponsibility in publication.

In still another vague and unclear decision, the Court compounded the confusion it had already created in setting down a series of unworkable tests. It refused to open its sleeping eyes to the fact that the problem of obscene material exists, that it is growing and dangerous, and that it is eating away at the moral fiber of American society.

In upsetting these convictions the Court has taken another long step toward usurping the legislative function. It apparently approved State legislation dealing with juveniles, ignoring the fact that 75% of all obscene material sold trickles down to the young, even though not purchased by them. Even this concession in the matter of juveniles is no mitigation of the fact that the Court is and has been usurping the function of legislative bodies.

It is now all too obvious that the great majority of the American people who live by Judeo-Christian moral standards must organize themselves and make their voices heard, or government by the Court will continue to be the order of the day.

Letter on a Life Article

Four OY clergymen prepared the following in reply to a 'Life' article on the ACLU:

It is ironically significant that Life would use a lawsuit protesting the desecration of the American flag as a peg on which to hang the American Civil Liberties Union as American heroes.

The American Civil Liberties Union is a well-organized, highly vocal minority which, many believe, has succeeded in imposing its will upon the silent majority of the American people, in the name of "individual liberties." Individual liberties are sacred to all Americans, but "liberties" can be defended with complete disregard for overall effects, and to such a point that a climate of license and irresponsibility prevails and society has very little liberty left.

Does not the highly publicized defense of the rights of a convicted pornographer, for example, become a factor in the breakdown of society's moral climate? Or the defense of the rights of sex deviants? (cf "Civil Liberties in New York," the Affiliate's monthly publication, November, 1964: ". . . the Civil Liberties Union has moved to protect the rights of sex deviants . . . and ACLU has urged a relaxation of security regulations which bar persons from government solely because of homosexual behavior.") Does not the defense of the draft card burner encourage open defiance of the law? Does overemphasis of the alleged criminal's "rights" (opposition to "Stop and Frisk" statutes, for example) possibly contribute to the growing crime rate? These are some of the ACLU's legal activities which are open to question.

The articulately vociferous Civil Liberties Union, working skillfully through the courts, the mass media and high pressure lobbying, has played, intentionally or not, a part in contributing to an atmosphere of license and secularism in which such activity as flag desecration, abhorrent as it is, seems mild.

In a fanatically absolutionist, doctrinaire reading of the Bill of Rights, the CLU contends: 1. Nothing is obscene (i.e., not unless it creates a "clear and present danger of causing, in a normal adult, behavior which has been made criminal by statute") 2. Children in church-affiliated schools are not entitled even to bus rides provided by public funds ("Your increased support for 1967 is needed to meet: . . . Convictions for Publishers of 'obscene' materials . . . Public funds for parochial schools." from a 1967 fund-raising appeal to New York members, 3. Police cannot detain a suspected narcotics offender for body search because this constitutes "illegal search and seizure," and "Stop and Frisk" statutes substitute "reasonable suspicion" for "probable cause." (American Civil Liberties' Union publication, September 1966).

This rigid reading, which our Founding Fathers certainly never intended, has strongly influenced courts and legislatures and thus the public.

In 1965, the New York Civil Liberties Union began, in its own words, to "push for" passage of ombudsman legislation. An ombudsman is an office to investigate citizens' complaints against state agencies. It is interesting to note in LIFE that Union head Pemberton sees his CLU *as* ombudsman, which would considerably increase the Union's already considerable power.

Perhaps the silent, responsible member of the majority should take a second look at the words of an ACLU national committeeman in a 1964 speech: "The Supreme Court of the United States has served valiantly, at least in recent years, as a bulwark of individual liberty against . . . the impatience of majorities . . . one can hardly fail to feel grateful to founders who gave the Court some degree of power to curb majority rule . . . what we have to remember above all else as a self-governing society is that it is we, the people, who must be controlled."

We, the people, who wrote our own Constitution must be controlled! Until we recognize the ACLU as control-hungry, we, the people, are actually accepting the intellectual slavery the ACLU is offering us in substitute for the self-government which is the essence of the American way. Courts should consider this each time an ACLU *amicus curiae* brief is submitted. What is needed is an antidote organization to the ACLU to act as *amicus patriae.*

Rabbi Dr. Julius G. Neumann.
Rev. Rodney Usher-Wilson.
Rev. Constantine Volaitis.
Rev. Morton A. Hill, S.J.

Editorial in Support of Wiretapping Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM V. ROTH, JR.
OF DELAWARE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 22, 1967

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Evening Star published on Tuesday, June 13, 1967, a welcome and thought-provoking editorial in support of legislation on wiretapping and eavesdropping. I feel that electronic surveillance under stringent safeguards is a necessary weapon of law-enforcement officials in stemming the rising tide of both organized and unorganized crime.

It is my feeling that carefully drawn legislation can meet the requirements set out by the Supreme Court in the Berger case, adequately protect the rights of the individual citizen, and also preserve electronic surveillance as a useful tool of law-enforcement officers. Several Republicans, including myself, have introduced such a bill—H.R. 10037. We are presently modifying it in a few critical areas to meet these objectives. The editorial support of our efforts by the Evening Star is welcomed and appreciated by all concerned with this vitally important matter:

Eavesdropping Decision

Justice Clark's opinion in the Ralph Berger bugging case is not going to be of much help in drafting legislation to permit the supervised use of wiretaps and electronic devices in "the war on crime." For he seemed in one breath to be saying that the New York law under which Berger was convicted of a bribery conspiracy was unconstitutional because it was "too broad in its sweep." In the next breath, however, he appeared to spell out requirements for a valid law which would be impossible to meet.

If this latter is correct, as some of the dissenting justices contend is the case, then the court, without saying so in as many words, has moved toward banning all eavesdropping by law-enforcement agencies.

Justice Black, who was joined in dissent by Justices Harlan and White, ripped the Clark opinion up one side and down the other.

The majority ruling, he said, despite Berger's "obvious guilt," makes it impossible to try and convict him again. And this despite the fact that the banned evidence shows Berger to be "a briber, a corrupter of trusted public officials, a poisoner of the honest administration of government upon which good people must depend to obtain the blessings of a decent orderly society."

Eavesdroppers, Justice Black went on to say, may be obnoxious. "But they are assuredly not engaged in a more 'ignoble' or 'dirty business' than are bribers, thieves, burglars, robbers, rapists, kidnapers and murderers . . ." Nor, he went on, can it be denied "that to deal with such specimens of our society, eavesdroppers are not merely useful, they are frequently a necessity."

Justice Black noted that some people say the prosecuting authorities should use more scientific measures than eavesdropping and that others talk vaguely of some unspecified new means of apprehending and convicting criminals. But, he added, the fact is "that crimes, unspeakably horrid crimes, are with us in this country, and we cannot afford to dispense with any known method of detecting and correcting them unless it is forbidden by the Constitution or deemed inadvisable by legislative policy—neither of which I believe to be true about eavesdropping."

Needless to say, we are in whole-hearted accord with these sentiments, and it surely is of some significance that this expression of them comes from a justice whose dedication to protection of our constitutional liberties is not open to question.

In this situation, we hope Congress will go forward with legislation, as recommended by a majority of the President's own crime commission, to authorize, under careful supervision, the use by the authorities of modern techniques in dealing with crime.

This most recent majority ruling, while it certainly creates problems, does not necessarily raise an insuperable barrier (to legislation).

For one thing, Justice Stewart said he did not agree that the New York law was unconstitutional, and he indicated that he would have voted to uphold Berger's conviction if the affidavits supporting the request to bug his office had been in better order. For another, Justice Clark, after 18 years on the court, is now stepping aside because of the designation of his son as Attorney General.

Obviously, in this situation, a great deal depends upon the President's choice of a successor to Justice Clark. It is by no means assured, however, that a newly-constituted court would strike down a carefully drafted eavesdropping law. Congress, in any event, can hardly do less than give it a try—unless all of the fine speeches about stamping out crime are devoid of substance.

Twentieth-Century Miracle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 22, 1967

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, since the beginning of the Middle East crisis, American sympathy and admiration has been with Israel. It is not difficult to see why this brave, small state has won the hearts of so many of our citizens.

Yvette Scharfman has expressed this very idea in an article written for a Brooklyn newspaper.

I commend to the attention of our colleagues her column which appeared in the June 17, 1967, edition of the Bay News & Kings Courier.

The article follows:

TWENTIETH-CENTURY MIRACLE

(By Yvette Scharfman)

At this writing one week ago we heard that war had broken out in the Middle East. We wrote our column with heart-sick outrage at man's inhumanity to man. We saw Israel, the only bastion of democracy in the area, surrounded on all sides by those who openly threatened to annihilate her, the international tribunal notwithstanding. Enforcing the threats of the bully Nasser were hundreds of Russian communist "technicians and advisers" plus thousands of tanks, planes and other armaments costing millions of dollars. We write that only a modern David-Goliath confrontation; a veritable miracle would be needed to save Israel; but that the little country has proven herself worthy of a miracle.

Let us remind our readers that after the Hungarian revolt against Russia some ten years ago there were conferences at summit level by the western world as to the absorption of some 80,000 refugees over-running Vienna. The civilized world looked to our country to lead the way in welcoming the brave group who escaped the communist hordes. The then President (American history has shown that good generals make bad presidents) consented to the admittance of 35,000 Hungarian refugees—each of whom was submitted to a rigorous health examination, besides requiring a bond posted by an individual or organization testifying that said immigrant would not become a public charge. Let us compare that with the new little country, Israel, which could then comfortably fit into the state of Rhode Island. The Israelis, newly arrived, were themselves struggling for survival. But from the time they beat the Arab world in 1948 they declared an open-door policy for any Jew who wished to enter. Israel admitted one and a half-million people since she became a state! There are no health or medical qualifications here; no bonds required. On the contrary, she has welcomed the sick, the lame, the blind, the ignorant, and the penniless. She has sheltered them, fed them, healed them, clothed them, educated them, and at great sacrifice has tried to absorb them into the economic and social fabric of the country. In all the world there has never been a people so responsive to the needs of others! Is she not then worthy of the miracle which we in the sophisticated, skeptical, cynical latter-half 20th century have been privileged to witness? For those of us who still believe in miracles, no explanation is necessary; for those who do not, no explanation is possible. Suffice it to say that the two million have conquered the whole Arab world (eighty million) and their communist henchmen who fed their vanity and their coffers.

But the Israelis have also lost; besides too many young brave soldiers, close to ten million dollars in their gross national product. Their economy, at a complete stand-still, has been set back ten years. Persecution of Jews in Arab countries and in the communist satellites is expected to be accelerated. Jews will attempt to flee to Israel, although the escape is fraught with peril. We Americans must help to take over the task of caring for the anticipated immigration and for the indigent refugees already in the country. Emergency meetings have been called for every night in the week since the war began! It is a great thrill to relate that some of the most successful of these meetings have been called by our Christian neighbors.

Al Hesterberg, President of the Flatbush Democratic Club, called one on Monday night. President Lester Sachs presided, and did much of the spade work behind the scenes. Al Hesterberg is no stranger to the mid-east situation. He read a resolution which he, in the company of Congressmen Rooney and Multer, presented to the State Department way back in 1956 when the situation was much the same. Congresswoman Edna Kelly reminded the audience that the only reason she didn't accompany the mission of mercy was because she was not our representative at the time. Her pithy remark that the Israelis were fighting the world's fight against communism was well taken; she will so state in a resolution she plans to offer in Congress. We don't know how much money was raised at the club, but we understand it was quite substantial.

Yes, it seems decent people of all faiths are indeed rallying to the side of Israel, who has exposed the evil forces in the world today. Let us support our President in his honest and sincere effort to stop the spreading of their tentacles!

Peace Is Still Possible

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 22, 1967

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, the recent tragic events in the Middle East are only part of a long history of Russian supported Arab aggression against Israel. In the June 20 issue of the Long Island Press an editorial on the cooperation needed for a permanent peace in the Middle East struck at the heart of the problem. This clear and eloquent editorial displays the deft hand of editor David Starr. Under leave to extend my remarks I wish to include that editorial, which follows, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

If words and reason were bullets and bombs, Abba Eban did to the Soviet Union yesterday what Israel's armies did to the Arabs the week of June 5.

The eloquent Israeli foreign minister hurled battalions of logical arguments against the entrenched positions of Soviet Premier Alexei N. Kosygin in the opening debate in the United Nations General Assembly.

The Russian quit the field, outclassed. But before he left the Assembly Hall, he heard Mr. Eban—in rolling, Churchillian oratory, never once lapsing into a cliche—demolish the narrow, legalistic Russian attempt to pin the blame for the Mideast mess on Israel.

Mr. Eban traced the "sad and shocking story" of 14 years of Soviet aid and encouragement to the Arabs. He ticked off in overwhelming detail the numbers of tanks, fighter planes and bombers, mortars, field guns and rocket launchers—the entire $2 billion in Russian arms now either in Israeli hands or rotting in the desert. He exposed the fabric of Arab provocation that sparked the war Russia is trying now to pin on Israel. And he outlined, too, a blueprint for the cooperation that will insure the road to a Mideast peace.

The man from Moscow, true to the absolutist tradition of his country, could not get away from words like "categorical," "irrefutable," "without any condition," "restitute in full," "inadmissible," and so on. Israel was black, the Arabs, white. And back in Moscow, television carried Premier Kosygin's speech in full and live, but cut the sound and ended the transmission as Mr. Eban took the rostrum.

But beyond style and words are facts. Israel stands at Suez, at Sharm el Sheikh and on both banks of the Jordan. The Arabs are in disarray—militarily, politically and economically. If the Russians are deficient in style and words, they're sharp about facing facts. They know today, as they knew two weeks ago, that to make their demands in the Mideast stick they would have first to cross nuclear swords with the U.S. This has not changed.

There is a way out of this blind alley, if Russia wishes to take it. President Johnson made it abundantly clear that the U.S. stands ready to tackle substantive issues that lie at the roots of world turmoil. His speech was clearly designed to create an atmosphere in which constructive moves would be possible—for all sides and with honor. The opportunity for peace is here. It simply must be seized.

Law Needed To Curtail Incitement to Violence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 22, 1967

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the violence and anarchy in our streets are corroding our country—eating away at the basic principles of law and order that are the foundation of our great Nation.

In this connection, Mr. David Lawrence, the nationally syndicated columnist, has written an article emphasizing the need for legislation to make it a Federal offense to travel between States for the purpose of inciting violence and insurrection.

I have joined other colleagues in sponsoring such a bill and because of the interest of my colleagues and the Nation generally in this matter of law and order, I ask unanimous consent that the article written by Mr. Lawrence be reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The article follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, June 19, 1967]

Law Needed on Inciting to Violence

(By David Lawrence)

The most pressing problem that faces the American people is not the friction in the Middle East but the friction inside the United States—the violence in the streets of many cities involving personal injury, bombings and destruction of private property.

More than 90 bills have been introduced in Congress designed to make it a federal crime for persons to travel from state to state for the purpose of fomenting disorders. But up to now proposed legislation has not been acted upon, though within the last few days efforts have been made to get a bill before the House of Representatives for action.

One of the principal reasons for delay is the attitude of the administration and some of the Democratic leaders in Congress. Their feeling is that such legislation might be misused by local authorities to interfere with legitimate protest. This excuse could be applied as a barrier to almost any legislative proposal. The whole judicial system, however, was established to differentiate between abuse of the law and its proper enforcement.

The issue is not as fuzzy as some of the procrastinators in Congress would have the people of the country believe. For the Supreme Court of the United States has plainly stated again and again in many an opinion that it is a crime to incite to violence. In a recent case Justice Black, speaking for the majority of the high court, rejected the idea that in propagandizing protests people "have a constitutional right to do so whenever and however and wherever they please."

There are, of course, plenty of places for orderly demonstrations, not only in auditoriums and stadiums but also through properly conducted parades or marches. The key to the current trouble is the tendency of the agitators to harangue crowds, flinging insults and accusations, and too often this results in physical clashes and violence of all kinds.

Does "free speech" immunize from punishment a person who incites others to maim or kill or riot? While the laws of all states prohibit disorder, can it be argued that incitement to violence cannot be punished because "free speech" is impaired?

Last year the House of Representatives, by a vote of 389 to 25, approved a measure, sponsored by William C. Cramer, R-Fla., which would make it a federal crime to travel between states, or use interstate facilities, with the purpose of inciting riots, violence, arson, bombing, or any other felony under a state or federal law. This was an amendment to a civil-rights bill which later died in the Senate. Similar proposals have since been pigeonholed in the House Judiciary Committee, with the approval, of course, of the administration.

When will Congress act? The states have been struggling with the problem, and occasionally have to use their National Guard to intervene and prevent further violence. But the issue is whether the states and cities should be obliged to wait until a riot breaks out or whether the federal government will step in to investigate the plots and conspiracies when groups meet to select "target" cities for "demonstrations" which inevitably lead to outbursts of violence.

The federal government, through its machinery of investigation, could quickly put its finger on the individuals who are responsible for "demonstrations" that lead to disorder. Many of those who are behind the big "demonstrations" openly predict violence and indicate in advance that they will do things which are plainly provocative. This can be dealt with by federal law but not always by the states and cities. The difficulty is that the states do not know what is being plotted outside their borders where the arrangements are usually made for the provocation of disorders.

Congress, therefore, is the starting point for corrective action. Once a federal law is enacted making it possible to arrest and punish individuals who incite others to violence, it may be anticipated that those who wish to express themselves freely on controversial questions will find ways of doing it in an orderly fashion.

Voice of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1967

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, one of the obvious failures of the administration is its unimaginative operation of the U.S. Information Agency and more specifically the Voice of America.

The Voice of America is an operation of minimum effectiveness since policy decisions have rendered its messages meaningless. However, there is growing concern developing across the country over the ineffectiveness of the Voice of America and I insert in the RECORD at this point a copy of a resolution adopted by the Slovenian Women's Union of America, at their recent national convention in Washington, D.C., which is self-explanatory and recommends a course of action which would be a practical step in the Voice of America's operations:

Resolution of the Slovenian Women's Union of America

Whereas, the Republic of Slovenia, in the northwestern part of Yugoslavia, is the only cultural and progressive nation of 2 million persons without the direct services of a United States Consulate or Information Service post; and,

Whereas, Members of the Slovenian Women's Union of America continue to receive complaints from their relatives and friends in Slovenia, concerning the time of broadcast and lack of medium wave lengths for the Slovenian broadcasts over the Voice of America; and,

Whereas, Two evening programs in Slovenian were replaced a year ago by two early morning programs of only 15 minute duration; and,

Whereas, For many listeners who have indicated their desire to listen to the broadcasts, this time is very inconvenient; and,

Whereas, The two early morning programs are not transmitted on medium length waves; and,

Whereas, Since the Voice of America program is the only direct American contact with the people of the Yugoslav Republic of Slovenia; now, therefore,

Be it known, that the Delegates convened at the 14th National Convention of the Slovenian Women's Union of America make this appeal to the Director of the United States Information Agency to re-establish the Voice of America programs in Slovenian language to the former, traditional broadcast time and to be transmitted over medium wave lengths.

Approved by unanimous decision of the 14th National Convention of the Slovenian Women's Union of America.

ANTONIA TUREK,
Convention Chairman.
MARIE A. FLORYAN,
Resolution Chairman.
ALBINEA NOVAK,
Convention Secretary.

Dated: May 26, 1967, in the City of Washington, D.C.

Boycotts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1967

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, the question of boycotts has produced some rather heated arguments in recent years. In my own district it was raised most directly and most recently when I received a letter from a large manufacturing plant in Philadelphia asking my interest in legislation "to assure continued innovation and improvement free of artificial barriers to progress".

As is my habit when one side of an obviously controversial issue is presented, I actively sought an opinion on the other side. The opinion I received was, I felt, so learned and interesting that I think it would be appropriate to enter it in its entirety in the RECORD so that other members faced with similar problems may gain some insight into the matter. I would like to pay tribute to Robert H. Gray the secretary Treasurer of the Metropolitan District Council of the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America. When you learn of his arguments you may well want to join many in thanking him.

The replies follow:

ENVIRONMENTAL PRODUCTS DIVISION, INTERNATIONAL TELEPHONE AND TELEGRAPH CORP.,
Philadelphia, Pa., May 19, 1967.

Congressman JOSHUA EILBERG,
Philadelphia, Pa.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE EILBERG: The U.S. Supreme Court ruled, on April 17, 1967 that unions have a right to boycott products shipped into areas of their jurisdiction if the major purpose is to protect workers' jobs. This decision arose from the complaint of the National Woodwork Manufacturers Association to the National Labor Relations Board concerning the refusal of the Metropolitan District Council of Philadelphia and Vicinity, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America to hang prefabricated doors at the Navy's Capehart Housing Project. The far-reading potential effects of this decision were recognized by the Court in "holding back progress;" however, they advised the Manufacturer's Association that this argument was "addressed to the wrong branch of government," and indicated that legislative relief would be required. It is for this reason that I address this letter to you.

This Division operates two plants in Philadelphia and one in Mercer, Pennsylvania employing a total of 1300 people, with bargaining units at each plant represented by the United Steel Workers of America AFL–CIO. Our products are heating and air conditioning equipment, featuring prewired and preassembled piping arrangements following the "packaged" concept of design. While we recognize the desire of the construction workers to preserve their historic areas of work, we also recognize that in today's labor market there is limited availability of skilled "job site" assemblers for the types of quality equipment we manufacture. Further, the direction of design is toward more sophisticated equipment in which this availability will be more critical.

In a broader sense, the public has proven to be best served by the lower costs and inherently higher quality of factory-assembled equipment and components. The trend of design today in our industry continues, as it has been for some years, toward the development of better performance, lower costs, easier installation and serviceability, and smaller over-all size to accommodate the needs of an ever-expanding market serving a more demanding public. Factory assembly of this type of equipment is essential if we are to continue to meet the demands of the public for these lower costs and this better performance.

This broadly based demand should not be stifled by the preservation of the prerogatives of a few at the expense of the many by maintaining outmoded work rules that are counter to the trend of progress and technology.

The country is urgently in need of legislation to assure continued innovation and improvement free of artificial barriers to progress. We respectfully request your support for this legislation, which would result in lower costs and more reliable equipment in our buildings of the future.

Very truly yours,

FRED E. WELDON,
President.

METROPOLITAN DISTRICT COUNCIL,
UNITED BROTHERHOOD OF CARPENTERS AND JOINERS OF AMERICA,
Philadelphia, Pa., June 16, 1967.

Hon. JOSHUA EILBERG,
Philadelphia, Pa.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN EILBERG: Please accept my very warm thanks for your kindness in sending me a copy of the May 19, 1967, letter to you from the Environmental Products Division, International Telephone and Telegraph Corporation.

The Corporation's letter is typical of the thoughtless attitude of so many of our citizens, which leads them, whenever they are irked by something, to bellow, "There ought to be a law . . ." The Corporation's letter apparently intends to request you to sponsor or support legislation prohibiting both employers and unions to enter into collective bargaining agreements that contain provisions whose purpose is to protect the opportunity of workmen to earn a livelihood by requiring that the employer shall continue to use those workmen to perform any work that traditionally has been assigned to them. Since the U.S. Supreme Court only two months ago decided that such provisions do not violate any presently existing statute, the Corporation joins the chorus of other carping critics of that Court who would have Congress nullify any progressive or humane decision of the Court in the fields of labor relations, civil liberties, political equality, etc.

There is much reason for suspicion concerning the good judgment and thoughtfulness of persons or interests indulging in these hysterical attacks on one of the three constitutionally established arms of our government. In this instance, however, the Corporation's letter gives reason for more than a mere suspicion that its author is thoughtless and has poor judgment; I believe you will agree that the analysis of the Corporation's letter which follows demonstrates that it is quite clear that the proposals contained in the Corporation's letter are the result of thoughtless, poor judgment.

The Corporation's letter proposes restrictive legislation on the ground that the contractual provisions I have referred to above are "out-moded work rules" which are contrary "to the trend of progress and technology." We thus have, as the basic characteristic of the Corporation's letter, an emotional appeal based on the Corporation's ascription of progressiveness to itself and of devotion to obsolete notions to labor unions. I believe that one piece of evidence—aside from your own objective analysis—will dissipate such an emotional appeal as the quoted phrases of the Corporation's letter may have. All of our District Council's collective bargaining agreements have for many years contained the following provision:

"There shall not during the life of this agreement be any restriction on the use of machinery or labor-saving devices used in carpentry work on the building. If any machinery or labor-saving devices are used, the same shall be furnished by the Employer and operated by the employees."

Aside from demonstrating our District Council's realization of its duties to the public at large not to obstruct technological advances and reduced costs in the building construction industry, the above quoted provision of our agreements demonstrates our basic philosophy that the benefits of technological progress to the community at large shall not mean the unemployment and impoverishment of a large sector of the community, namely, the men and women who perform the community's work. The sanctimonious concern of the Corporation's letter for giving the community the benefit of technological progress is not coupled with even that kind of concern for affording the opportunity to earn a livelihood to that vast majority of the community who will not be able to enjoy the fruits of technological progress if they are unemployed or if their earnings are diminished. Until such time as some panacea can be found for the frequently injurious consequences of automation and technological progress, I believe that it is in the best tradition of our country to permit employers and their employees freely to negotiate and agree upon compromise methods of preserving work opportunities and a decent standard of living for employees who would otherwise be made tragically useless to our society by automation and technological advances. The contractual provision of our collective bargaining agreements which the Supreme Court held to be lawful and valid is the result of just such free and voluntary negotiation and agreement between employers and our Union and has precisely that humane and economically desirable objective.

The Corporation's letter gives two additional, though subsidiary, reasons for asking you to be the sponsor of the legislation proposed by the Corporation. Both of these reasons are so generalized and may be so far from the realities of our industrial society as to furnish no support for the proposed legislation.

The first of these subsidiary reasons is the alleged "limited availability of skilled" workmen at the job site. The Corporation's letter gives no supporting data for—and the public media of communication seem to contradict—this allegation. In any event, all modern thought is that retraining of the skilled work force in new methods and training of the unskilled or semiskilled work forces for skilled work is the economically and socially desirable procedure, rather than further restriction on employment opportunities for the work force by unbridled, thoughtless and precipitate introduction of technological advances.

The second subsidiary reason in the Corporation's letter in support of its proposed legislation to outlaw contractual provisions reserving to workers on the job site the work they have traditionally performed there is that the performance of such work away from the job site would result in lower costs. That this generalization is far from being a universally true economic axiom is demonstrated in the very Supreme Court to which the Corporation takes exception. The contractor in that case himself testified that upon the Union's protest against the use of pre-cut and pre-finished doors, he installed a small machine under a shed on the job site, which enabled the job site carpenters to cut and finish the doors at a minimal cost to the contractor. In other words, the use of the same resourcefulness to preserve employment opportunities for workers as is used to deprive them of such opportunities can readily solve the employers' problems in connection with automation and technological advances without either increasing costs or creating the equally undesirable, if not the greatly more undesirable, consequences of unemployment.

Finally, the Corporation's letter says nothing directly about, but leaves to inference, the question of whether the alleged savings in cost to the employer will be passed on to the consumer. We know all too well that in the vast majority of instances savings in costs of production are not passed on to the consumer for many years; they are, instead, used to inflate to their notorious portions the corporate profits of already gigantic and extremely profitable industrial enterprises. It might be enlightening to inquire of the Corporation whether, as an analogue and companion to its proposed legislation, it would favor your sponsoring and promoting legislation requiring that the lion's share of any reduction in production costs must be passed on to the consumers and the workers engaged in the production whose costs have been reduced.

I hope that you will forgive my imposing on your valuable time at such great length. It seems to me, however, not only as the official of a labor union but as a citizen sensitive to the needs of the community as a whole rather than to the needs of any particular segment of the community, that the very troublesome questions and problems underlying the Corporation's facile proposals for the solution of what it deems to be its particular problem should be given profound thought, both by our country's citizenry as well as by its enlightened and patriotic legislators.

Respectfully and cordially,

ROBERT H. GRAY,
Secretary-Treasurer.

Elderly in Indianapolis Not Deaf to Community's Needs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 22, 1967

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, recently an article appeared in an Indianapolis newspaper noting that many elderly persons seem to expect to have things done for them and take little interest in their communities.

The article by Robert Peterson, which appeared June 1 in the Indianapolis Star, did not go unanswered for long.

On June 11, a letter to the editor from Alexander Monro, executive director of the Indianapolis Senior Citizens Center, Inc., was printed in the Star.

The letter from Mr. Monro cites facts and figures to make it clear that the elderly in Indianapolis have not turned a deaf ear on the needs of their community.

The accomplishments of these senior citizens in Indianapolis deserve the widest possible recognition. Accordingly, I insert the text of Mr. Peterson's article as well as Mr. Monro's letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

[From the Indianapolis Star, June 1, 1967]

LIFE BEGINS AT FORTY: SENIOR CITIZENS FAILING TO HELP COMMUNITIES

(By Robert Peterson)

Maybe the time has come to remind older people that they should take a keener interest in others and their communities, instead of sitting back and expecting things to be done for them.

Over the years many splendid programs have been created for older people. Social Security is a bonanza providing nearly everyone past 65 years old with a monthly check that may not be big but that covers the grocery bill and then some.

There's also our new Medicare plan that enables elders to escape the shattering costs of lengthy hospitalization and medical care.

At the local level in most cities one finds day centers and golden age clubs and special recreational facilities for elders. There are meals-on-wheels programs for elders who are shut-in, and low cost housing developments.

Yet it is very difficult to find any specific projects which have been launched by older people themselves as a distinct contribution to their communities.

Quite a few letters have come to this column from organizations which have made definite appeals for volunteer help to groups of older people, only to be met with complete indifference.

One letter was from an officer of the famed St. Jude Children's Research Hospital at Indianapolis, Ind. This hospital is entirely supported by funds raised privately by young people and adult groups in cities across the nation. The officer writes:

"In one city we were having difficulty getting volunteers to staff the office during the daytime to answer the phone and sign up teen-agers being recruited for fund raising. Someone suggested that maybe senior citizens could help staff the office. There was no manual work involved and the chore consisted simply of answering the phone when it rang and taking down necessary information.

"We asked the local Senior Citizen's Club to publicize our plight to try to get us some volunteers. We also had the local radio stations broadcast an appeal asking older folks to help us out.

"What absolutely floored me is this: Not one—not even one older person in that community responded to our appeal and volunteered to put in so much as a single hour. It seemed incredible considering all we hear about old folks wanting some way to pass the time in useful occupations.

"The young folks running the campaign were a bit embittered by this experience, for they had put on several parties for senior citizens in the community, and had rented buses to take them on short trips.

"The indifference seemed particularly odd as most elders have grandchildren and it would seem they'd welcome a chance to perform a useful service for an institute as well known as ours which is dedicated to child health. It also seemed they'd welcome the chance to meet new people and pass some pleasant hours in a different atmosphere."

Let's hope that was just an isolated case where the message somehow did not get across to older people in the community.

Let's also hope that older people everywhere will make a special effort to keep their ears and hearts open to opportunities for useful and humanitarian service.

[From the Indianapolis Star, June 11, 1967]

Senior Citizens Center Does Significant Work With Elderly

To the Editor:

Robert Peterson's column on June 1, 1967, left an unfortunate impression that the older adults of Indianapolis have turned a deaf ear and a cold heart to the community's need for volunteer service. While I can not quarrel with his premise that older people have a vital role to play in serving their community, and accepting the idea that perhaps not as many older adults are willing to share their skills, time, and interest to meet the many pressing needs for volunteer workers in Indianapolis, I feel it is an unfair indictment of the Senior Citizens of our town to say they are "failing to help."

At the Indianapolis Senior Citizens' Center, during the 57 months it has been in operation, our members have contributed over 45,000 hours of volunteer service. About ⅔ of this time has been given to the Center in a variety of ways that makes it possible to more fully serve older adults. This is, in reality, service to the community, since their efforts mean fewer paid staff are necessary to operate this vital and important community agency. Their giving of self, time, energy, and love have made significant contributions to the happiness and well-being of all senior citizens.

The other third of the 45,000 hours has been given to many community health and welfare agencies. The obvious importance of this contribution needs no elaboration.

And, our Center is only one of many groups of old adults giving to and helping their community in a wide ranging volunteer service. One could cite the many church groups, community centers, and park department groups of older people who give so much—and have already given so much to their community.

It also seems important that our community take a look at why more older people aren't responding to the request and need for volunteers. We have done some preliminary exploration of this with our members, and some questions are being formulated that will require answers.

For instance, have we explored how realistic the expectation of performance requirements might be; have we considered the expenses of being a volunteer; have we wondered about the attitudes of younger staff and volunteers toward older people—and how this affects the desire to serve; have we recognized that for too many years the younger community has implied that older people should find a comfortable corner and stay out of the way? Surely, the answers to these questions present a better indication of why older citizens haven't been as responsive to requests to serve.

It is important to remember, also, the many older people who have so genereously—and quietly—given of themselves to the community, and who continue to do so.

I feel there is a vast reservoir of skill, time and wisdom that our older citizens can give. Perhaps it is up to the community to work toward making volunteer service more attractive and desirable.

ALEXANDER MONRO,
Executive Director, Indianapolis Senior Citizens' Center, Inc.
INDIANAPOLIS.

The Great Debate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 22, 1967

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the United Nations debating society is in full swing again.

An article appearing in the Washington Evening Star and an editorial written for the Christian Science Monitor, indicate what we are to expect from these talks, and specifically from Soviet Premier Kosygin.

I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article written by Richard Wilson for the June 21, 1967, edition of the Washington Evening Star and the editorial which appeared in the June 21, 1967, edition of the Christian Science Monitor.

The articles follow:

[From the Washington Evening Star, June 21, 1967]

Kosygin, Failing at U.N., Needs Johnson Talks

(By Richard Wilson)

UNITED NATIONS, N.Y.—Alexei N. Kosygin didn't defiantly walk out of the United Nations; he sort of ambled out absentmindedly in protest against the scathing attack of Abba Eban, the foreign minister of Israel.

Eban had by far the better of the argument and it was no wonder Kosygin didn't care to sit through to the end. This kind of instant histrionics sets the tone of the Russian-sponsored emergency meeting of the U.N. General Assembly, a kind of diffident and desultory attempt to condemn Israel and push her back to her old borders.

Kosygin knows his effort will fail and so does everyone else. What he needs now is a meeting with the President of the United States and a start of talks with about the whole range of problems that divide the super powers, from the Sinai Desert to the DMZ in Vietnam.

Once Moscow's Arab clients have been placated by a repetition of the tired old cliches of Soviet diplomacy, and now that they have witnessed a poor imitation of Khrushchev-type behavior, it will be possible for Kosygin to get down to the real business at hand. This business, President Johnson has made crystal clear, cannot be conducted in the haphazard forum of the United Nations. It is too serious for that.

Everything taken into consideration, Kosygin was quite reasonable, from his point of view, in his attacks on the United States. Johnson, by the same token has adopted his blandest come-let-us-reason-together tone, not insisting on anything in the Middle East except the exercise of a little reasonableness. So there is as yet no barrier to their having a nice long talk, which everyone, except possibly the Arabs, would welcome.

Kosygin put everything in one package in his address to the United Nations—Germany, the Middle East, Vietnam. The fact that Ambassador Arthur Goldberg does not want to talk about anything in the United Nations except the Middle East does not change the fact that Johnson would be glad to talk about other subjects outside the United Nations.

As every day of the emergency session passes, it becomes clear that Kosygin, who really is not a politician but a technologist, feels compelled to establish himself as a world leader in the tradition of Stalin and Khrushchev, and he is not well equipped for it. This is all to the good. It will make it easier for Johnson to talk with him when the time comes.

Faced by a prospective defeat in the United Nations, Kosygin cannot wisely go back to the council of ministers in Moscow with nothing but press clippings of his early morning tours around Manhattan. He needs to see Johnson as much, if not more, than Johnson needs to see him. The odds are about 60–40 against the United Nations adopting any kind of a resolution condemning Israel, much less the censure, reparations and withdrawal demanded by Kosygin on behalf of his confused and frantic Arab clients.

Watching once again the charade on the floor of the General Assembly, one wonders if it is good for anything except the entertainment of the world's TV watchers. The United Nations could not prevent the war from starting; it could not stop it before Israel had reached its objectives; and now it has no effective way to find a consensus on what to do about Israel and the Arabs, or enforce a consensus solution if it could be devised.

Then what good is the United Nations? It is good for just what is happening now, the uninhibited and bitter expression of national animosities in words rather than gunfire.

In spite of all Kosygin's stylized invective, he recognizes the use of the United Nations in a nuclear age when war between the super powers is impractical.

Maybe now he has said something else of great importance. Local wars, he says, cannot be permitted because they may enflame the world in a general war. That sounds quite different than the old idea that wars of national liberation are OK, and will give Peking added cause for widening the breach with Moscow.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, June 21, 1967]

THE GREAT DEBATE OPENS

It will be a sad day for the United Nations, the Middle East and for world peace if Soviet policy rather than American policy prevails in the General Assembly.

The speech of Soviet Premier Alexei Kosygin was hard, unyielding and clearly designed to restore the tension, animosity, and uncertainty which has so long prevailed at the troubled eastern end of the Mediterranean. Its aim was patently to harden Arab intransigeance, however much this might increase Arab suffering.

In demanding that Israel be condemned by the United Nations, immediately withdraw from its present positions and make financial and physical restitution for all Arab losses, Moscow was—and knew it was—asking for what it is extremely unlikely to get. Note must, however, be taken of Premier Kosygin's reference to Israel's right to exist and to the need to avoid nuclear war and to find a common language for peace. These are interesting and hopeful hints.

Although President Johnson's own statement on the Middle East can be criticized for generality and impreciseness at some points, it laid the basis for constructive criticism and action by the General Assembly and the Security Council. The assertions that each nation in the Middle East has the right to exist free from threats, and that the political and territorial integrity of each must be inviolate are policies upon which any peace-seeking nation can agree. We equally applaud his demand that something constructive be done about the vast tragedy of the Arab refugees, about ending the fruitless and impoverishing arms race, and about guaranteeing free waterway passage for all "innocent" cargoes.

Whether or not the American policies are adopted as guidelines for a Middle Eastern solution, they have the great merit of moving in the right direction.

But perhaps the greatest merit of the Johnson proposal, and the one which distinguishes it most sharply from Premier Kosygin's, is Washington's realistic realization that there can be no partial or piecemeal moves towards peace. Israel, as Foreign Minister Abba Eban made clear, will not agree to a proposal such as Russia's which asks Israel to surrender all with no compensating guarantees. The Arabs on the other hand, and if they can be brought to any sort of an agreement, will certainly give none until Israel has surrendered the territorial fruits of its military victory and something major and constructive is done for the refugees. Washington recognizes these conflicting viewpoints and, we believe, seeks to harmonize them.

There would be no greater tragedy for the Middle East, and first and foremost for the Arabs, then if the Soviet Union were again given free rein to play any deliberately and self-seekingly disruptive role in the area. It has now become clear that such a role can only be a harmful and hurtful one. Now is a moment for a constructive and pacifying step forward. We deeply hope that the world will not let this opportunity slip.

National Arts Endowment Grants to States Are an Example of High Statesmanship by the Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1967

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, my distinguished colleagues in the House and the Senate should have been very pleased this past week by some obsrvations printed in the New York Times related to the great success of the National Endowment for the Arts and its program of assistance to the States.

The column, written by an honored critic-at-large, Howard Taubman, contains an excellent review of the progress most of our States have been able to make in the field of the arts.

When we remember that less than half a dozen States had full-scale councils or commissions for the encouragement of the arts when the Congress approved the National Foundation for the Arts and Humanities in 1965, it becomes clear that the seed money provided through the Arts Endowment has produced a remarkable harvest.

Mr. Taubman's article presents the case far better than could hope to do and I hope that all of my colleagues will read it. Under leave to extend my remarks, I ask that it be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

[From the New York Times, June 12, 1967]

ARTS ENDOWMENT GAINS—MATCHING GRANTS PROVIDED 2 YEARS AGO HAVE SEEDED PROGRAMS IN MANY STATES

(By Howard Taubman)

When Congress acts out of political motives, it is not necessarily narrow in its vision. Note the manner in which its imprint on the National Arts Endowment legislation has worked out. In 1965, when the endowment was enacted into law, Congress added a section authorizing matching grants of $50,000 each year to each state and to the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico. If the intention was the prudent one to take care of the home folks, the outcome nevertheless has been beneficial. An examination of the states' applications for matching funds for the fiscal year beginning July 1 reveals that many are moving forward, that they are taking careful stock of their resources and needs, and that they are devising programs that not only answer urgent requirements but also have imagination and validity.

A summary of applications, prepared by the Arts Endowment staff, has been circulated among state arts councils and commissions. It was not meant for publication, because revisions and modifications are still being made. But the changes are not likely to be great, and the quality of many of the projects are so impressive that they deserve analysis and comment.

FORTY-TWO STATES SEEKS GRANTS

Forty-two states have put in for the entire $50,000, or nearly all of it. Only Alaska, Delaware, Nebraska, Nevada, North Dakota, South Carolina and South Dakota have asked for substantially less, and Idaho's application had not arrived when the summary was sent out.

Alaska's situation is instructive. The state formed its arts council last March, and there was hardly time to forge a full program. Other difficulties were the state's limited arts resources and problems of transportation. But the council was undaunted. Although it submitted a series of modest projects, requiring matching funds of $25,683, it intended to file a supplemental request. For the present its plans include tours of performing and visual arts, help for several festivals, technical assistance and some work in arts education.

The most sophisticated proposals, not surprisingly, come from the states that have had the most experience in the arts and their public support. New York expects to use its entire Federal grant to assist in the establishment of a board program of residencies at various campuses of the State University for individuals and arts organizations like A. P. A.-Phoenix, the Merce Cunningham Dance Company, the Dorian Quintet and Danny Nagrin, the choreographer. The Federal contribution will cover only about 20 per cent of the program's total cost, but then New York has been notably forward looking in its allocation of funds to its arts council.

Illinois, Missouri and North Carolina have drawn up ambitious programs. The total cost of the Illinois projects, which have been planned for a period of two years, is $847,000. What is especially striking about the plan is its emphasis on technical assistance and artists in residence.

The state has budgeted $110,000 to pay experts stipends plus travel costs, to provide local arts organizations, at their request, with guidance, evaluation and instruction in such areas as administration, community relations, organizational techniques and artistic and technical problems of production. A total of $187,000 will be used to send professionals in the various arts on stays of a year in a community, to live and work.

Among the proposals that catch the eye are a plan in Georgia to establish a low-interest emergency loan fund for writers, composers and artists; a project for environmental design in Hawaii; the continuation of Missouri's program of bringing students from rural areas into metropolitan centers for a wekend of exposure to the arts; North Carolina's seminars for art teachers, the Texas plan to conduct an intensive training program for string players and the blueprint to expand the availability of Virginia's four artmobiles.

TECHNICAL HELP POPULAR

Technical assistance recurs frequently in the state planning. Another commendable development is the readiness of neighboring states to turn to one another for art and artists. Thus Delaware counts partly on Pennsylvania, Vermont on New York, Kansas on Missouri, Montana on Utah. Maryland declares that it will cooperate with neighboring states, and the Virgin Islands is inviting New York's Theater-in the Street to play in Spanish and English.

It would be too much to expect all the states to be equally balanced and adventurous in their planning. Some, indeed, have so few cultural resources that they must almost begin at the beginning. For them the stress on state initiative may be a handicap. For the temptation is always there to use matching funds for local projects, no matter how uninspired they may be.

One assumes that the National Arts Endowment's staff will insist on minimum criteria. The objective must be to raise standards where they most need raising, not merely to give the appearance of abundant activity. If the Federal matching funds continue to be applied with increasing creativity, the Arts Endowment and the state's arts councils will make the original Congressional decision look like high statesmanship. Wouldn't that be nice for a change?

Well Deserved Honor for Congresswoman Leonor Sullivan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1967

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, I read with great interest in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for Friday, June 16, an insertion by our colleague, the gentlewoman from Missouri [Mrs. SULLIVAN] which included the text of an address delivered at commencement exercises at Lindenwood College, St. Charles, Mo., on June 3, by the Honorable Patricia Roberts Harris, U.S. Ambassador to Luxembourg. According to the information placed in the RECORD by Congresswoman SULLIVAN, Ambassador Harris received an honorary degree of doctor of laws at that commencement. Mrs. SULLIVAN stated in her remarks in the RECORD that it was her privilege to hear Ambassador Harris make an excellent address on the subject "The Duty of Dissent." With characteristic modesty, however, Mrs. SULLIVAN failed to indicate in her statement how she happened to be at Lindenwood College commencement exercises that morning.

I happen to known why she was there. Congresswoman LEONOR K. SULLIVAN, the ranking member of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, of which I am privileged to be chairman, and a ranking member of the Committee on Banking and Currency—one of the outstanding Members of the House of Representatives, and the foremost Member in the field of consumer affairs—was present at Lindenwood College on June 3 in order to be honored, as was Ambassador Harris, with the award of an honorary doctor of laws degree.

For this fine Member of Congress who is one of the hardest working Members in either body, the event was of more than routine significance, for it marked the award of her very first honorary degree. This undoubtedly will be something of surprise to most of our colleagues—that is, that after nearly 15 years in the House of Representatives, where she has served with such distinction and effectiveness, this would be her first honorary degree. I recently noted in the press that Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH of Maine had received her 50th honorary degree.

All I can say is that Lindenwood College, which is not in Mrs. SULLIVAN's congressional district, deserves the thanks of the entire House of Representatives for having the perspicacity and imagination to single out the gentlewoman from Missouri for this honor which I know Mrs. SULLIVAN will always treasure.

In noting the honor paid on that same day to Ambassador Patricia Roberts Harris, Mrs. SULLIVAN, in her remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on June 16, included a biography of the Ambassador as it appeared in the program of Lindenwood College commencement exercises. It occurred to me, Mr. Speaker, that it would now be appropriate for me to place in the RECORD a biography of Congresswoman SULLIVAN to round out the documentation on the award of honorary degrees by Lindenwood College on June 3. I have obtained such a biography, brought up to date from an official publication of the Women's Bureau of the U.S. Department of Labor, "Women of the 89th Congress."

The information contained in this biography makes it even more of a surprise to us that the degree which Mrs. SULLIVAN received on June 3 was her first such honor. The gentlewoman from Missouri has been the chairman of the Subcommittee on the Panama Canal since 1957, and has done a truly outstanding job in that important responsibility; she also servies on the Subcommittee on the Coast Guard and on the Subcommittee on the Merchant Marine.

On the Banking and Currency Committee, she is chairman of the Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs, the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Housing, and a ranking member of the Subcommittee on Small Business. She has carried out all of her tasks and duties with conscientious care and great diligence, and we are all proud of her. Furthermore, she has taken an active role in the consideration and passage of every piece of legislation which is of vital interest to consumers, and has initiated action in a great many areas of national legislation.

I think every Member of the House joins Lindenwood College at St. Charles, Mo., in applauding the achievements of this outstanding Representative from the city of St. Louis, who has played a great role in the transformation of her own city as sponsor of the legislation which led to the construction of the Gateway Arch and the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial, and also through the changes for which she has been repsonsible in the laws dealing with housing and urban development.

And every poor person in the United States owes her a particular debt of gratitude for her indefatigable work over the last 14 years in making a reality of her proposal for a food stamp program to assure adequate and nutritious diets for our low-income families. She deserves every honor which as been accorded her over the years, including her first honorary degree.

Her biography is as follows:

BIOGRAPHY OF REPRESENTATIVE LEONOR K. SULLIVAN, DEMOCRAT, THIRD CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT, MISSOURI

Mrs. Leonor K. Sullivan, now serving her eighth term, is the only woman to have served in Congress from the State of Missouri. She is the widow of Representative John Berchmans Sullivan, who was serving his fourth term in the Congress at the time of his death in 1951.

A native of St. Louis, Mrs. Sullivan represents a district located wholly within the borders of that city. She resigned as training executive for a St. Louis business machines corporation when she married the Congressman in 1941, and later served as his administrative assistant. In 1952, after a special election had filled the vacancy in the 82d Congress caused by her husband's death, Mrs. Sullivan decided to run for his former seat and won election to the 83d Congress. She was subsequently reelected to the 84th, 85th, 86th, 87th, 88th, 89th and 90th Congress.

Known throughout her career in Congress for her strong interest in consumer issues, Mrs. Sullivan is a senior member of the House Committee on Banking and Currency and chairman of its Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs, with primary legislative responsibility for the "truth in lending" bill which she introduced, and for other consumer issues within the committee's jurisdiction. As a member of the Subcommittee on Housing, she has played a leading role in the preparation of all housing bills passed by the House since 1955—sponsoring, particularly, housing for the elderly and a new FHA loan insurance program for non-profit organizations to rehabilitate inexpensive homes for sale at 3% mortgage financing to low-income families. She also helped draft a series of major measures to bolster national economic conditions, including the Area Redevelopment Act, the Small Business Investment Act, the Export Credit Insurance Act, the Mass Transit Act, and the Community Facilities Act. A ranking member also of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, Mrs. Sullivan has served as chairman of its Subcommit on the Panama Canal since 1957, directing numerous studies into the operational problems and activities of the Panama Canal Company.

Besides her own committee responsibilities, Mrs. Sullivan has actively participated on legislation of consumer interest before other committees, and was instrumental in the passage of the Poultry Products Inspection Act of 1957, establishing for the first time compulsory Federal inspection of poultry in interstate commerce; a series of annual increases in the appropriations for the Food and Drug Administration (Health, Education, and Welfare Department) and of the Meat and Poultry Inspection Divisions (Agriculture Department); the Food Additives Act of 1958, requiring pretesting for safety of all chemical additives used in or on foodstuffs; the anticancer provision—dealing with artificial coloring used in foods, drugs, and cosmetics—of the Color Additives Act of 1960; the Hazardous Substances Labeling Act of 1961; the far-reaching Drug Control Act of 1962, including the major provisions relating to prescription drugs first proposed by her 18 months earlier as part of an omnibus bill to rewrite the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of 1938; and the Drug Abuses Control Act of 1965, dealing with "pep" pills, barbiturates, LSD, etc., also taken from her omnibus measure. Other provisions of the omnibus bill, H.R. 1235, not yet enacted, call for pretesting for safety of all ingredients in cosmetics; premarketing clearance of all health devices; a ban on flavored aspirin; stronger factory inspection standards for all products subject to the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act; stricter labeling requirements, and many other consumer protections. She has worked also for automobile safety and the regulation of hazardous materials in industry.

Congresswoman Sullivan was the author of the food stamp law enacted in 1959 for the distribution of surplus agricultural commodities to needy Americans through regular grocery stores. A modified food stamp plan was instituted by the late President Kennedy. This led to her introduction in the 88th Congress of an administration food stamp bill which was enacted on August 31, 1964, and now assures good nutrition for 2 million needy Americans.

In 1957 Mrs. Sullivan drafted and introduced for the first time the exceptional children educational assistance bill to encourage experienced teachers to take advanced training in the skills of teaching gifted children or those with physical or emotional handicaps. In subsequent Congresses, parts of this program were enacted to establish fellowship programs for teachers of mentally retarded children and those with speech and hearing defects. Congress finally broadened the program to include teachers of all categories of handicapped children. Mrs.

Sullivan cosponsored the Equal Pay Act of 1963, and introduced bills to provide full social security benefits for women retiring at age 62 and deductibility for income tax purposes of all educational expenses.

Educated in public and private schools in St. Louis, Mrs. Sullivan also attended night classes in vocational psychology at Washington University there.

She is a member of the League of Women Voters and of the Auxiliary of the first American Legion Post established in the United States.

She is secretary of the House Democratic Caucus, an elective post she held also in the 87th and 89th Congresses, and is the only woman serving (and was the first woman to serve) on the Democratic Steering Committee of the House.

Mrs. Sullivan was the senior House member on the National Commission on Food Marketing, which conducted a two-year investigation from 1964 to 1966 into all aspects of food marketing from farmer to consumer.

One-Man, One-Vote Population Representation Does Not Apply to United Nations—Many New Mini-Nations Have Impact on World Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1967

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the United Nations has its shortcomings but it certainly again has proved its worth in bringing an end to the fighting in the Middle East.

However, this crisis again has underlined a major problem: the proliferation of small, mininations in the United Nations, many of which do not have a population approaching that of the city of New York or the State of Tennessee—the one-man, one-vote principle does not prevail in the United Nations.

In this connection, the noted columnist, Mr. Clayton Fritchey, has written a most revealing article which, because of its interest to my colleagues and to the American people, I ask unanimous consent that it be reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The column follows:

[From the Evening Star, June 19, 1967]

MINI-NATIONS: U.N. AILMENT IN NEED OF A CURE

(By Clayton Fritchey)

UNITED NATIONS, N.Y.—The Middle East crisis has revived a number of old complaints against the United Nations, but it has particularly turned the spotlight on a growing ailment for which there seems to be no cure—namely, the influx of small countries which is converting the U.N. into the M.N., or Mini-Nations.

When the U.N. was organized in 1945 there were 50 members, but 72 have been added, including 46 newly independent states from former colonial areas. Out of a present total membership of 122, there are 69 with populations smaller than New York City. Yet, and here's the rub, each country has one vote in the General Assembly, the same as the United States and the Soviet Union. This has aroused all kinds of fears, the chief one being that world power is no longer accurately reflected by the voting power of the institution.

The prominence of the small nations extends even to the enlarged and august Security Council. When the Arab-Israeli debate began, the delegate from the island of Taiwan was in the chair. The new president of the council is the delegate from Denmark (population 4,758,000).

In the earlier stages of the crisis there also was a marked reluctance on the part of some of the smaller nations to involve the Security Council. All of this recent small nation prominence has enlarged the concern over the mini-nation problem.

The situation is aggravated by the prospect that even scattered atolls in the Pacific, like the tiny enclaves of Africa, may soon be demanding membership. It is estimated that over 60 new applicants could be knocking on the U.N door in the next few years.

What will happen when Pitcairn Island (pop. 79) becomes a member? Maybe it won't happen, but the Maldive Islands (pop. 97,000) is now a full member. Even if every resident of Pitcairn became an ambasador there wouldn't be enough to fill the world's embassies.

"We have reached a danger point in rampant self-determination," in the view of Prof. Urban Whitaker, a member of the Commission to Study the Organization of Peace. "Confidence in the U.N. has been seriously undermined," he says. "The very capacity of the organization to act responsibly and efficiently has been reduced at an alarming rate."

In a brief in War/Peace Report, Whitaker says, "The town meeting of the world is too big." Many, including some representatives of the mini-nations, would agree with him, but what to do about it? When—or what—is a nation? The U.N. charter doesn't say. The big powers deplore the proliferation of the minis, but they always make sure that their own former colonies obtain membership after attaining independence.

The charter says membership is open to all peace-loving states that accept the obligations set forth in it, and are "able and willing to carry out these obligations." Some of the new states, while willing to meet the obligations, simply don't have the means to do so.

This has inspired suggestions that no such country should become an individual member, but that several together should be given a group membership. Another idea is to grant admission, but not the right to vote except possibly on matters of direct interest. Whitaker wants to create "associated members" with limited voting rights.

There has been recurring talk of "weighted" voting, so that each state's power would be related to population, gross national product, etc. This sounds plausible at first but careful studies show that the U.S., for instance, would not necessarily be better off in the long run.

Since any change would require two-thirds approval in the General Assembly, no change is in sight. Hence about the only action possible at the moment would be a moratorium on mini-nation admissions. It is conceivable that the U.N. might pass a resolution declaring a transitional freeze on new members while the larger question of representation is being studied.

Ambassador Covey T. Oliver

SPEECH

OF

HON. ELIGIO de la GARZA

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1967

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, while the world is involved in great turmoil, and there is great concern, properly so, for the people and the areas in conflict, many of us, nonetheless, feel that we should not diminish our concern for the future of this, our own hemisphere. In which endeavor, a great part will be played by our sister countries of Latin America. It is gratifying to see that this concern is shared by President Johnson, and although, I do not think that there is any proof needed of his interest in this area, he once again has demonstrated it by the recent appointment of Ambassador Covey T. Oliver, as Assistant Secretary of State for Latin America.

Ambassador Oliver brings to this post many splendid qualities, outstanding qualifications, indeed a very impressive background for this position, but above and beyond all this, he brings a profound understanding of Latin America, a love for its people and a desire to work with them for this better tomorrow, this future with peace and prosperity that they and we their friends would work for. All this has been so ably expressed by a newspaper woman who herself, has a great understanding of Latin America, Virginia Prewett of the Washington Daily News. I would like very much to share with my friends and colleagues her recent article on Ambassador Oliver:

OLIVER SHOWS A GRASP OF LATIN ISSUES

(By Virginia Prewett)

"Every interest of mine is firmly to nurture and support the basic principles of democracy."

Ambassador Covey T. Oliver, who in early July will be sworn in as the new Assistant Secretary of State for Latin America and hemisphere AID Co-ordinator with this statement reveals his approach to his immense new tasks.

He sees constitutional government as the only defense against "the multiple dangers" of dictatorship.

HUMAN FREEDOMS

"We in the hemisphere must show where we stand in the real understanging of the basic values of free elections and respect for final human freedoms," he told me in an interview.

In specific situations, Ambassador Oliver told me he devoutly hopes that "common standards of value" accepted thruout the hemisphere may be increasingly applied. To illustrate the point, he cited the agreement made at Rio de Janeiro in 1965 under which hemisphere governments agreed to consult on the recognition of new de facto regimes.

More importantly, for recognition, these regimes must respect human rights and Alliance for Progress principles of social justice.

Mr. Oliver approaches his new tasks with calm confidence, but no illusions about their complexity and urgency. He feels that development in Latin America is no longer racing only against its traditional foe, the coup by selfish cliques or sectors. Today, hemisphere leaders must shore up defenses also against the possible collapse of national societies into anarchy.

"BOGOTAZO"

Mr. Oliver described this new danger as that of a large-scale "Bogotazo ,"or a "hemisphere Watts." "Bogotazo" is a term derived from the prolonged rioting that leveled much of Colombia's capital in 1948. Fidel Castro was a dynamite-squad expert in these riots.

Ambasador Oliver brings to his new tasks a thorough background in international law, in government and in economics. In each of these areas, he boldly applies a humanistic touch. In discussing Latin America's needs, he is an innovator only in placing fresh accent on goals that are already implicit in the region's drive for modernization, but that usually become blurred in a sea of technology.

For example, he willingly backs the two most cherished goals of the "pure" technicians—improved productivity and monetary stability. But he also stresses three needs that bring the problem back to the human and individual level.

He highlights the need of workers to have jobs, and at adequate pay. Complementing this, Ambassador Oliver is not afraid to say that in Latin America business needs an opportunity to invest under just and equitable laws.

Finally, he calls for an opportunity for all to stand equally before the law.

In bringing these three points out of the obscurity in which they too often languish, Ambassador Oliver reveals a profound understanding of Latin American needs.

Penalties for Desecration of the Flag

SPEECH

OF

HON. EARLE CABELL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1967

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 10480) to prohibit desecration of the flag, and for other purposes.

Mr. CABELL. Mr. Chairman, in supporting this legislation, I call to the attention of all members the dire necessity for such action.

This is in opposition to the statements, made, however sincere in some instances, by those opponents who question this necessity.

In the first place, there is a growing element which is disdainful of all proprieties of conduct, and which is openly contemptuous of our American institutions and of the flag as a symbol of these institutions. This misconception must be corrected. While this bill, when finally enacted, will not change the thinking of all involved, it will at least provide punishment for those who display such contempt in public.

Another need, and an important one, is to prove to the vast majority of the American public that the Congress does not condone such actions and will not tolerate their continuation.

While it is true that all 50 States and the District of Columbia have similar laws, the fact remains that this is a matter of Federal concern, thus meriting Federal prosecution.

In many States the trial jury not only determines guilt, but also fixes the penalty. This is done without the jurors having full knowledge of the record or prior convictions of the accused. Thus in many cases there is a miscarriage of justice by the assessment of either too light or too severe a penalty, as the case may be.

Under the Federal judiciary, the judge is in possession of all the facts concerning the accused, and can tailor his sentence accordingly.

Should the accused be a "misguided kid" as so many would have you believe, the fine and/or jail term can be tempered and will still be a deterrent to further such acts and an admonition to choose different companions.

On the other hand, the judge can assess the maximum fine of $1,000 and/or the maximum jail sentence—1 year—against the professional agitator and anti-American.

There were many who considered the maximum penalty far too lenient. This would appear to be true, but as has been pointed out by both the authors and floor managers of the bill, stiffer penalties might well result in the courts ruling them too severe for the crime involved and thus strike down the act itself.

It is inconceivable to me that this could happen to the bill as written.

It is my considered opinion that this bill in no way abridges the rights of freedom of speech, peaceful demonstration, or right to dissent.

To the contrary, it protects those rights by preventing abuses of them by those who would destroy our democracy by tearing down its institutions.

Antiriot Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1967

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, in recent days we have heard much discussion concerning the antiriot bill, H.R. 421, now pending in the House Judiciary Committee. A number of us have joined in supporting our colleague from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] in trying to force action on this bill through support of House Resolution 517.

The House Rules Committee has now set a hearing on the bill for next week and I would hope that some action will be taken either by the Judiciary Committee or by the Rules Committee in order to let the House vote on this important matter.

It will be recalled that the antiriot provisions were attached to the civil rights bill which passed the House in 1966. Unquestionably these provisions meet with the support of the majority of the Members of the House. In recent months and years, we have seen a growing tendency toward protest and rioting in many of our cities. Recently we passed in the House the bill to ban desecration of the American flag. It seems to me only just and reasonable that we should go further and enact this important legislation.

It seems inconsistent to me that many proponents of civil rights legislation are so much concerned about the rights of the individual and yet ignore the rights of the majority of our citizens who are beset by riots and disorders on the part of the small minority. We were successful in adding the antiriot provisions to the civil rights bill last year in the House, but now that the issue stands by itself there are those who do not want to bring the matter to a vote.

The time has come when right-thinking, patriotic Americans need to strengthen our defenses against those who would desecrate our flag, pervert our Constitution, and demean our national honor.

It is high time that we stop ignoring the truth that these people who start the riots and create the disturbances are not so much concerned about the betterment of our national society or individual rights but are simply trying to cause trouble. If we are to follow the advice and the philosophy of some members of the so-called Supreme Court, we should abandon our national institution and the sacredness of our community rights in order to allow hoodlums, beatniks, peaceniks, and Vietniks to create disturbance at will. I do not read the Constitution as giving a blank check on such things, and I believe that the vast majority of the American people do not so interpret the Constitution. However, if these people are ever to be brought into line, if this disgraceful conduct is ever to be stopped, we need to make it crystal clear what their legal position is.

I urge the Members of the House to get behind the antiriot legislation and to bring reassurance to the American people that this Congress will safeguard the rights of the overwhelming majority of peace-loving, patriotic Americans who seek only to maintain our national honor and to protect the rights of all of our citizens.

Penalties for Desecration of the Flag

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN C. CULVER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1967

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 10480) to prohibit desecration of the flag, and for other purposes.

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Chairman, like the great majority of Americans, I am dismayed by the extremes to which an irresponsible and immature minority have carried their disagreement with American policy. Burning or desecrating the flag is a particularly offensive means of expressing dissent, because the American flag is the truest emblem of the United States and, as such, deserves respect.

However, in considering such ill-tempered and indecorous behavior, it is better not to lose our temper, but to temper our response, lest we only serve to aggravate the very condition we seek to remedy.

With this in mind, I voted against the so-called flag-burning bill, because in my judgment it is unnecessary, unconstitutional, and unwise.

UNNECESSARY

First, it is unnecessary, because all 50 States have adequate laws to punish the desecration of the flag. In my own State of Iowa, the statute has been on the books since 1917, and the need has not yet arisen to prosecute an offender.

The Federal Government does not have the necessary national police force to enforce such a law, and I do not think that we need to go to the time, effort, or expense to create concurrent jurisdiction over so rare and local an offense.

UNCONSTITUTIONAL

Second, as a lawyer, I agree with the 11 law professors and the chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, who believe that the law is unconstitutional.

The first amendment specifies:

> Congress shall make no law . . . abridging the freedom of speech . . . or the right of the people . . . to petition the government for a redress of grievancy.

The courts have consistently held that this guarantee extends to include symbolic forms of expression—picketing, demonstrating, gesticulating, and the like.

Free speech and symbolic dissent may be restricted in the case of clear and present danger to national security. The witless action of a misguided flag burner scarcely holds that threat.

Additional constitutional questions are raised by the vagueness of the bills language. There is no provision requiring the demonstration of "specific intent" to "cast contempt upon" the flag. And the law is so written as to include not just the flag but representations of the flag as well.

As a result, a citizen could be found guilty even though he did not intend the consequences of his action.

Further, an individual could be punished in a State court and later in Federal court for a single act, and it would not be in violation of the double jeopardy clause of the fifth amendment.

UNWISE

Finally, I strongly feel that this legislation is unwise, and in fact cheapens rather than strengthens the values which our flag and this great Nation represent.

Totalitarian nations must rely on coercion to command the respect and maintain the loyalty of its citizens. The police state is forced to admit to other nations the weakness and instability of its regime by refusing to allow free speech or open dissent.

To its unique credit, the American Government has retained the allegiance of its citizens without force or threat for 176 years. To compel that loyalty now under law would only confess to ourselves and to the world a fear and lack of confidence in the flag and the Nation it represents.

The Soviet Union found it necessary to enact similar legislation 7 months ago. The United States does not need it.

To make a Federal offense out of isolated incidents is to magnify the cause of the irresponsible and inconsequential dissenter, and may very well result in increasing such occurrences, by promising false martyrdom or by provoking litigation to test the constitutionality of the law.

I have generally supported the U.S. position in Vietnam, and I have the highest respect, admiration, and gratitude for the heroic young Americans who are fighting there in defense of freedom.

It would be the greatest tragedy of the war if our patriots were to accomplish their mission in the battlefield in Vietnam, only to discover that politicians had legislated away their freedoms here in the House of Representatives.

I am persuaded by the argument of a young soldier in Vietnam, which appeared in Time magazine, page 5, May 26, 1967:

> We soldiers realize that dissent may be lengthening the war, or at least reducing any inclination the North Vietnamese might have to negotiate. But Congressmen . . . and others who try to stifle dissent, are seeking to destroy one of the very freedoms we're defending. We'd rather [have] the abuse [of] these freedoms than have our Congressmen limit and destroy them.

Congress and the American people must rise above the emotionalism and provocation of the moment, to preserve long-term constitutional principles over momentary patriotic fear.

Congressman Horton Cites Catholic Standard Support of District of Columbia Reorganization Plan

SPEECH

OF

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1967

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, as one who has strongly supported the concept of modern government contained in Reorganization Plan No. 3 for the District of Columbia, I am pleased to call my colleagues' attention to a June 3 editorial in the Catholic Standard supporting the plan. The Standard, Washington's archdiocesan newspaper, expresses the view of a large number of civic, religious, and educational institutions in the metropolitan area which are solidly behind the reorganization plan.

> We urge the Congress to allow the President's plan to become a reality—

The Standard declares.

> It will give the District a much better local government. And, it is an important step in preparing for home rule, something which the Capital of the free world needs and deserves.

I urge my colleagues to heed the words of the Standard. The reorganization plan is vital to the welfare and progress to the residents of Washington. The 90th Congress must support this proposal that is so right and so necessary to the concept of modern, democratic government for all our people.

In light of the great importance of this issue now before the House I would like to share this fine editorial with my colleagues:

PRESIDENT'S DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA PLAN

> President Johnson's proposal for a new form of rule in the District of Columbia offers the nation's capital a more modern and more effective local government. The District's present form of government, introduced as an experiment in 1874, has very little leadership. When a sudden crisis arises, the city often is unable to act, as witnessed by the current trouble over the summer project funds. The present weak form of local government is one of the causes of the city's constant financial problem. The next fiscal year will see the District budget exceed half a billion dollars and yet the District, unlike other large American cities, has no one official who is in control of the entire budget.
>
> The President's plan will change much of this. He proposes to replace the three Commissioners with one, which will strengthen the currently weak executive power in the city. The consolidation to one Commissioner should bring greater efficiency to the actual day by day governing of the District.
>
> The nine-member council also is an important step, since it will give the citizens of the District a voice in their government. Although the President will appoint the members of the council, he has served notice that he will take into consideration such factors as geography, population and race. This will bring not only public representation but also a responsiveness to the needs of the public. The President proposes that the council have the authority to set the real estate tax and to pass the annual city budget.
>
> We urge the Congress to allow the President's plan to become a reality. It will give the District a much better local government. And, it is an important step in preparing for home rule, something which the capital of the free world needs and deserves.

Where O-T-E-P-K-A Spells "Secrecy"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1967

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, the strange case of Otto Otepka has aroused interest in the Nation's press and the following editorial from the Chicago Tribune, June 13, 1967, will be of interest to the Members of Congress.

The article follows:

WHERE O-T-E-P-K-A SPELLS "SECRECY"

> Otto Otepka, the state department security officer who was dismissed for unbecoming conduct in November, 1963, is at last being given the hearing to which he was entitled more than three years ago. But the nearer he

comes to vindication, the thicker becomes the cloak of mystery which has shrouded the department's behavior from the beginning.

The background, briefly, is this: In late 1960, Mr. Otepka was assigned to prepare a security report on state department officials for the incoming Kennedy administration; he was chosen because of his superiors' high regard for his capacity and judgment. But as time went on, it turned out that he was putting more effort into his work than was desired under the new administration. He found derogatory information about some officials favored in "liberal" circles.

Mr. Otepka was called off the project in 1962. There were shifts in assignments, and an effort was made to ship him off to the war college—an assignment which he declined. Harassment continued. At the request of the Senate subcommittee on internal security, Mr. Otepka gave it information regarding lax security procedures, some of which was confidential. He also told of his harassment. One of his superiors, summoned to explain the charges, made statements which he later acknowledged were false. Mr. Otepka was removed from his job in November, 1963, ostensibly for having given the information to Congress. He appealed for a hearing, but it had been put off until now.

The first thing, the department did upon opening the secret hearing, oddly enough, was to drop 10 of the 13 charges which it had made against him. The 10 apparently include all of those that might bear on the department's security procedures. The three remaining charges involve only the giving of information to the subcommittee. This means, in effect, that the department is abandoning its personal charges against Mr. Otepka and confining itself to what it calls the main issue—the right of Congress to ask for and receive confidential information from a department employe.

It also means that Mr. Otepka has, in large measure, obtained the personal vindication which he sought. Yet the hearing remains under an unprecedented cloak of secrecy; indeed, the department's lawyer called attention to "leaks" to the press about the proceedings and said he had been "requested to apprise" Mr. Otepka's lawyer of executive orders safeguarding information in the interests of the safety of the United States.

All of this seems to confirm what has been fairly clear all along: that there was never any legitimate ground to criticize Mr. Otepka's performance; that his troubles arose only because he was trying to do his job too well; that his complaints about security procedures were justified; and that the department is concerned more about its own reputation than about the national safety. If the department is to make its remaining charges stick, it will have to find some way to get around the 1948 statute giving civil service employes the unqualified right "to furnish information to either house of Congress or to any committee or member thereof."

Poles Ignored in Museum Plans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 1967

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, people of Polish birth have, for over three centuries, made substantial and worthwhile contributions to the American way of life. From colonial times, during our struggle for independence, and all through the years of our growth from a small nation to a mighty world power, among the most loyal Americans have been those of Polish ancestry.

It was with surprise and dismay that I learned that the Poles, as well as other immigrant groups, who have enriched America by their dedication to liberty and constitutional government, are being largely ignored in the planning for the Museum of Immigration which is to be built at the base of the Statue of Liberty. An article in the June 17 issue of the Polish American gives the details, which I want to call to the attention of my colleagues, many of whom are the descendants of Polish immigrants. The article follows:

[From the Polish American, June 17, 1967]

OVERSIGHTS NOTED IN U.S. IMMIGRATION MUSEUM PLANS—PROJECT MINIMIZES HISTORICAL FACTS; IGNORES POLES, OTHERS

The United States Department of the Interior is planning to spend several million dollars to build a Museum of Immigration at the base of the Statute of Liberty in New York city. A project for this museum has been prepared by the Walter Dorwin Teague Associates of New York, and was submitted to the Department of Interior on Jan. 27. On the basis of this report, with some modification, the museum is to be built and organized.

According to Dr. Eugene Kusielewicz, vice president of the Kosciuszko Foundation and first vice president of the Polish American Historical Association, there are many oversights in this report, "perhaps none greater than those concerning the Poles."

In his observations on the report, he writes:

One of the purposes of any museum is to give a balanced picture of a particular field. I am afraid that any person passing through the Museum of Immigration, as projected in the report of the Walter Teague Associates, will come away with a distorted picture of the immigrant in American history.

"Generally, the period of early immigration is well covered, with the exception of the Spanish, whose contributions to the development of the American Southwest surpass those of any other immigrant group. Yet no mention is made of them. With respect to the immigrants of the 20th century, a visitor would leave the proposed museum with the impression that two of the largest immigrant groups presently in the United States, the Italians and the Poles, virtually do not exist.

POLES IGNORED

"In the preliminary script, the Chinese and Japanese receive an entire display area of their own, the description of which required almost two full pages in the script. Yet the Italians are not represented in any display of their own, and scarcely receive 10 lines of mention in the script. The same is true for the Czechs, who receive a display area of their own, while the Poles are almost completely ignored.

"In reading the report, one feels that the primary philosophy governing the preparation of the script has been the presentation of that which is colorful or eye appealing, rather than that which would present an accurate and balanced picture of American immigration.

"With respect to the Poles, the following observations are made:

"On page three of the report, reference is made to the English at Jamestown: Directly ahead are three Jamestown dioramas depicting the introduction of English Technology to America." One can debate what is meant by English Technology at that date, but one cannot deny that among the first to establish the industries mentioned in the script were Poles and Dutchmen. The diaries of Captain John Smith give details for this point.

FIRST STRIKE

"Another contribution of the Poles to the early history of the Virginia Colony that could be mentioned in our Civil-Rights-conscious world, was the first strike for civil liberties recorded in our history.

"When the Virginia House of Burgess was organized in 1619, the Polish workers at Jamestown, not being native born Englishmen, did not receive the right to vote, despite the fact that they contributed greatly to the economic viability of the colony. To secure the right to vote, they closed the factories they established.

"The strike so crippled the economy of the infant colony that the authorities in London granted them their demands in order to reopen the factories.

"On page six of the report, in the section indicated as 'American Revolution' we presume that among those European officers who came to the United States to assist in the American Revolutionary War, Thaddeus Kosciuszko and Casimir Pulaski will be included, though their names are not mentioned.

"On page seven, under 'Reasons for Leaving Europe,' mention is made of the French, German, Italian and Hungarian revolutions. No mention is made of the Polish revolutions of 1830, 1846 and 1863, which brought a larger number of immigrants to the United States than did the Hungarian Revolution of 1848. In fact, it was due to the large number of Polish immigrants from these revolutions that some 5,000 Poles were to participate in the American Civil War.

"On page 14 the first mention of the Poles is made. On a large map of the United States, the Poles are to be indicated as settling in Western Pennsylvania. There are large numbers of Poles in the region of Western Pennsylvania, but these are insignificant when compared to those who settled in Eastern Pennsylvania, or in the major centers of Chicago, Detroit and Buffalo.

"On page 18, under 'The Civil War,' mention is made of various foreign groups that participated in the War Between the States.

CIVIL WAR PARTICIPANTS

"Nowhere is there any mention of the 'Polish Legion' (58th New York Infantry) organized by Colonel, later General W. Krzyzanowski, the 31st New York Infantry, organized by Major Alexander Radzewski, which bore the traditional Polish quadrangular caps of red and white during the early phase of the war, until the question of the Union Army's uniforms was regulated, or of Gaspard Tochman's Polish Brigade, the 14th and 15th Louisiana Infantry (Confederate).

PADEREWSKI DISREGARDED

"On page twenty-one there is a section entitled 'Industrial Expansion.' In it are mentioned "personal memorabilia pertinent to some of the Eastern European notables such as Rachmaninoff or Stravinsky . . ." Now, really! Were Rachmaninoff or Stravinski immigrants? Their visits were brief and their contribution to America no greater than the impact of their music on the Brazilians or Mexicans.

"Much more significant, though overlooked in the script, was Paderewski, though not an American citizen, concertized here for almost fifty years, being one of the first figures of international repute to bring serious music to the American frontier towns.

"His relations to Wilson and other great figures in American history together with his services to many American institutions have won him the right to be buried in Arlington

National Cemetery, one of the two non-American citizens to be so honored.

SCIENTISTS NOT MENTIONED

"Among other Polish items that could be included in the museum are the almost unknown but unsuccessful attempt of the Poles to establish a utopian community in California, one of the most interesting such experiences in America. When the colony collapsed and the participants were faced with the need of supporting themselves, Helena Modjeska learned English to become the foremost Shakesperian actresses of her times, while Henry Sienkiewicz devoted himself to writing, to win the Nobel Prize for Literature.

"Mention might likewise be made of Casimir Funk, who invented the vitamin; Stanislaw Ulam, one of the fathers of the hydrogen bomb; Tadeusz Sedzimir, whose inventions are revolutionizing the steel industry today in much the same manner in which Bessemer did years ago."

Dr. Kusielewicz suggests that should any readers wish to express their views on the matter, they could contact The Hon. Stuart Udall, Sec. Dept. of the Interior, Washington, D.C., or Mr. Henry Schmidt, (who is in charge of the museum), National Park Service, 28 E. 20th St. New York, N.Y.

Those wishing to receive a copy of the report of the Walter Teague Associates should write to Mr. Schmidt.

Columbia, S.C., R.S.V.P. Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT W. WATSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1967

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, just recently I brought to the attention of the House news of a remarkable and novel program initiated by the city of Columbia, S.C., to help our servicemen in Vietnam. It has been designated by citizens of Columbia as the R.S.V.P. Vietnam adoption program. Through the efforts of various civic sponsors, items are contributed to our troops for their personal use but, additionally, supplies are donated to the Vietnamese people to enable them to rebuild their war-torn country.

Mr. Speaker, not only is this a noble and humanitarian concept, but it is actually working. Over 100 different civic clubs, church groups, business firms, professional associations, schools, and other organizations in the Columbia area are spreading good will and enhancing American prestige throughout South Vietnam.

I think it very appropriate to honor these many sponsoring organizations in Columbia who are giving of their time and resources for the cause of peace in Vietnam. Although it would be impossible for me to adequately describe the many wonderful contributions they have made, I would like to include their number as a part of my remarks:

Honor Roll of Columbia, South Carolina, "RSVP" Units of 1st Cavalry Division (Air Mobile) and Sponsoring Organizations

Hq and Hq Company: Republican Women's Club.

15th Administration Company: VA Regional Office, Small Business Administration, Columbia Jaycees.

545th Military Police Company: Cardinal Newman High School.

13th Signal Battalion: Columbia and Cayce Kiwanis.

8th Engineer Battalion: Columbia High School, Seibels-Bruce Co.

1st Squadron, 9th Cavalry: Dreher High School, Brookland-Cayce High School.

191st Military Intelligence Detachment: Columbia Optimist Club, Cayce-West Columbia Optimist Club, Breakfast Optimist Club, North Trenholm Optimist Club, Dutch Fork Optimist Club.

1st Battalion, 5th Cavalry: National Association of Internal Revenue Employees, Federal Housing Administration.

2d Battalion, 12th Cavalry: Columbia Commercial College, St. John's Episcopal Church, Kathwood Baptist Church, Trinity Episcopal Church.

1st Battalion, 7th Cavalry: S.C. Employment Commission, Business Machine Center, Veterans Administration Hospital, Clemson Jaycees, Zonta Club.

1st Battalion, 77th Artillery: Lexington County Methodist Youth Council, Olympia High School.

1st Battalion, 21st Artillery: Carolina Vagabonds, Dentsville High School.

2nd Battalion, 19th Artillery: Pilot Club, Columbia Business & Prof. Women's Club.

85th Evacuation Hospital 96238: S.C. Tax Commission, C.C.I. Jaycees, East Columbia Lions.

An Khe Army Command: Capital Sertoma, Dentsville Lions.

27th Maintenance Battalion: U.S. Post Office, Park Street Baptist Church.

2nd Battalion, 20th Artillery: Social Security Adm., Bur. Pub. Roads, Reg. Sub. Hqrs., Columbia, U.S. Forest Service.

11th Aviation Group: Richland County Dental Assoc., Washington St. Methodist Church, U.S.C. Student Body, Winnsboro, S.C. Girl Scouts, Centennial Associate Reform Presby. Church, Ft. Jackson Civilian Personnel, Columbia Rotary Club, Va. Wingard Methodist Church.

227th Aviation Battalion: Traveler's Protective Association, Irmo High School, Eau Claire Station Post Office, Tree of Life Temple, Edgewood Station Post Office.

229th Aviation Battalion: Richland Sertoma, Columbia College.

15th Supply & Service Battalion: Y.W.C.A., Blue Triangle Business Women's Club, St. Andrews Women's Club, Cayce Women's Club.

15th Medical Battalion: Alcorn Junior High School, Eau Claire High School, Jr. Women's Club of Columbia, Crane Creek Elementary School.

Battery E (Aviation), 82nd Artillery: Cayce Rotary Club, Cayce Civinettes.

2nd Battalion, 7th Cavalry: Medical Society of Columbia, Richland County Pharmaceutical Assn.

2nd Battalion, 5th Cavalry: Amer. Bus. & Prof. Women's Assn., A. C. Flora High School.

213th Aviation Battalion: Exchange Club, Painted Daisy Garden Club, Civitan Club of Columbia.

2nd Surgical Hospital: Springwood Lake Night Garden Club, Morale Booster Columbia, District Office of Independent Life Ins. Co., Morning Glory Garden Club, Medowgold Garden Club, Poinsettia Garden Club.

288th Aviation Battalion: Boy Scouts of America (Capital District); Girl Scouts of Congaree Area; Luther League of Columbia, Incarnation, Christ The King, Resurrection, St. David's, Mt. Herman, Christ, Ascension, Good Shepherd, Gethsemene, St. Luke's, Mt. Tabor, Transfiguration, Redeemer, St. Andrews, Faith, Emmanuel, Our Saviour, Ebenezer, St. Paul's, Reformation.

570th A.P.U.: East Columbia Jaycees.

7th Surgical Hospital: St. Andrews Jaycees.

Tribute to Daylin, Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. REES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1967

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, in recognition of the meteoric climb by Daylin, Inc., in 7 years to one of the Nation's largest drug-retailing chains in the field of prescription and drug sundries, as well as medical supplies and equipment, we pay special tribute to this nationwide firm, a true example of the American way in action.

Daylin, Inc., is a publicly held corporation with 161 units in 13 States—Alabama, California, Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Iowa, Nevada, New Jersey, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Carolina, and Virginia. In addition, Daylin operates two retail outlets in London, England, and maintains importing offices in England, Italy, Denmark, Switzerland, Hong Kong, Japan, and Israel.

With corporate offices based in the Daylin Building in Beverely Hills, Calif., California remains the operational base for most of the firm's outlets—113 of Daylin, Inc.'s 161 units, including 25 free-standing MDX Purity Pharmacies in southern California and five Disco Discount Stores in northern California.

Heading a family of enthusiastic employees, which has grown to more than 800 individuals, are three dyanmic young executives—Amnon Barness, 42, chairman of the board of directors; David Finkle, 51, president; and Max Candiotty, 44, secretary-treasurer. All are cofounders of the company.

Mr. Barness is a recognized pioneer and authority in modern volume merchandising concepts with extensive experience in corporate organizations. His 20 years of world travel and multilanguage fluency contribute to Daylin's International Mercantile Corp., an importing firm now a subsidiary of Daylin.

Mr. Finkle holds a degree in pharmacy and has had more than 30 years' experience in every phase of drug and sundry merchandising. He founded Daylin Medical and Surgical Supply, Inc., now a subsidiary of Daylin, offering equipment for the medical field as well as a complete line of some Daylin private-label "prescription quality" vitamins and health aids.

Mr. Candiotty is both a certified public accountant and attorney-at-law. He has had 18 years of experience as a financial consultant and as corporate counsel.

Each of the founders have expressed their concern for their fellow man in a multiplicity of civic activities and undertakings for beyond the scope of their expanding business enterprise.

Mr. Barness is the chairman of the Fund for Job Corps Graduates, a group which he helped to organize after consultations with Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey. The fund has provided meaningful books as gifts for thousands of graduates of the Job Corps and is now exploring a scholarship program as a means of further encouraging the young people of America. He is also a member of the board of directors of Brandeis Institute, a 27-year-old leadership-training institute founded by Dr. Shlomo Bardin, still its director, with the sponsorship of U.S. Supreme Court Justice Louis D. Brandeis. It has won national acclaim for its program of helping college students, adults and young children find meaningful Jewish identification.

In addition, Mr. Barness has headed the Los Angeles effort of the Israel bond sales. He also was extended an unusual honor when, upon the nomination of Eugene Cardinal Tisserant, he was named knight commander of merit of the Roman Catholic Equestrian Order of the Holy Sepulchre of Jerusalem.

Mr. Barness also serves as a member of the President's Youth Opportunity Council.

Mr. Finkle was awarded Israel's Freedom Medal for exemplary service to the State of Israel in a colorful ceremony in which U.S. Senator WILLIAM PROXMIRE participated.

Mr. Candiotty's civic activities include membership on the Los Angeles County Citizens Economy and Efficiency Committee. He effectively used his talents as an attorney and CPA to play a key role in improving the efficiency of county government at a great savings to the taxpayers. A pillar of the Sephardic Jewish community, Mr. Candiotty is also a leader in Jewish community religious, civic, and charitable programs.

Other directors of Daylin, Inc., are Charles Watt and Richard Wessler, both vice presidents and Directors Robert M. Arnold, M.D.; Bernard Jacobs, M.D.; Joseph D. Shane, and Donald R. Stroben.

During fiscal 1966 Daylin pharmacists compounded more than 2,500,000 prescriptions, placing them fifth in the country among publicly held companies reporting. Company officials anticipate this figure will grow to more than 3,500,000 this year.

The advent of medicare brought about an entirely new area for the rapidly expanding enterprise. Daylin Medicare Centers have been established in pharmacies throughout the nationwide chain. Here information on medicare is available to eligible senior citizens and there are expanded areas for the sale and rental of convalescent aids and sickroom supplies.

Daylin, Inc., pioneers in the low-price drug field, and each of its subsidiaries can expect tremendous growth with their great contributions to commerce and industry throughout the country in a field of service to the public, particularly the ill.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the membership of this honorable body to join me in extending greetings to the Daylin, Inc., executives and all its personnel as this expanding enterprise enters into its seventh year of busines. These men and women deserve the commendation and respect of all of us for their dedication to their community and for the example they have shown in contributing to the industrial leadership of the United States of America.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402, at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

Memorial Day Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM B. SPONG, JR.
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, June 23, 1967

Mr. SPONG. Mr. President, I have obtained a copy of an outstanding Memorial Day address, which I wish to share by having it printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The address was delivered by Wilbur C. Hall, a prominent attorney in Leesburg, Va., on the courthouse lawn in Leesburg. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Hall's address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEMORIAL DAY ADDRESS BY WILBUR C. HALL

The first thing I want to do is to commend you for being here. How easy it is for many of us to find other things to do on this day! How difficult it becomes for many of us to find the time, to make the effort to observe this day in a manner keeping with its nearly century-old tradition. So . . . at the outset of my remarks, let me urge you to continue to treasure this occasion. . . . to continue to participate in the *observance* of Memorial Day as we are doing here. I implore you always to find time to remember that we owe so much to so very many.

This May 30th finds me deeply concerned . . . deeply disturbed. I am grieved that America's finest young men are once more spilling their life's blood on distant battlefields, and that the threat of more war hangs heavily over us. I am saddened that the row on row of crosses are lengthening, even as we are gathered here.

But loss of American lives in Viet Nam is not my only concern, nor perhaps even my *greatest* concern of this day. I am a Veteran of World War I, and I have seen my countrymen march off to others. I have come to accept the fact that our nation has a self-imposed commitment to protect for others the freedom we so jealously cherish ourselves. I believe that our men in Viet Nam are fighting and dying for the freedom of many peoples, just as surely as Americans fell for liberty and human dignity in the trenches of the Meuse-Argonne or on the beaches of Normandy and Iwo Jima.

Perhaps what disturbs me most on this occasion is that so many of our basic attitudes as Americans are now being questioned and challenged. As a people, in so many ways, our values seem to be different than they were only a decade ago. I am concerned, too, that these attitudes and values appear to be changing at a quickened pace.

After the atomic explosions at Hiroshima and Nagasaki changed forever our concepts of waging war and preserving peace, we quickly learned that there still existed the necessity for what we call "Limited War." In Korea, and now in Viet Nam—and to a somewhat lesser dergee in Santo Domingo—we have found ourselves caught up in struggles of necessity. We find it possible to justify these limited wars on many grounds of national policy and national security, but perhaps no justification is as compelling as the firm belief that by meeting Communist aggression and subversion boldly and openly, we can forestall and avert the catacylism of total war . . . the certainty of Armageddon.

As we have come to accept the concept of limited war, so we have come to accept other attitudes of limitation. Some of us find ourselves limiting the extent to which we are willing to support our nation's policies. We may agree that it is necessary to fight, but there is something less than agreement over who should do the fighting. Far too many Americans possess an attitude of "Let George do it" when it comes to participation in a limited war. We may agree that our fighting men must have the material and weapons they need, but we can't agree what luxuries and conveniences, what domestic programs we may have to sacrifice in their behalf. We seem more than willing to fight a limited war abroad, so long as there is little or no limitation on life as usual in this country.

And, of course, we now have among us—to our growing consternation and the great peril of our men in Viet Nam—those who do not agree at all with our national policy. And it is a fact that the ways in which they express their disapproval give comfort and encouragement to our enemies and prolong the war.

I am shocked at the protest being voiced. I am like Henry Clay who said, "My Country, may she always be right, but right or wrong, my Country." The spectacle of law breaking, the burning of draft cards, the desecration of the American flag, the shouting down and reviling of our elected leaders and the spectacle of drug ridden withdrawal into stupor and squalor in the name of peace and love. These things have no place in America.

I grant you that relatively few Americans—a loud, clamorous few—have participated in the anti-war protest marches or the draft-card burnings. But others of us, who would never resort to such overt treason, are also susceptible to changes in our attitudes and values. We have differing views toward patriotism, national traditions . . . such things as an appropriate observance of Memorial Day.

For many years we have had our attentions diverted from the hallowed aspects of May 30 by the motor spectacle at Indianapolis Speedway. More recently May 30 has also become National Golf Day. For many Americans . . . too many, in my opinion . . . Memorial Day is no longer a respite for patriotic introspection, a day of solemn honor and remembrance. Instead, it is a holiday of travel, enjoyment and recreation.

So . . . that is why I am so pleased to have this opportunity to talk with you today . . . so pleased to make what small contribution I can to the preservation of Memorial Day in the finest American tradition.

Perhaps there are some here today that are unfamiliar with the history of Memorial Day, the reasons why this day of all others is set aside for honoring our dead of many wars.

There are two chapters to the story.

One takes place a century ago in Columbus, Mississippi, a quiet town of simple, hard-working Christian citizens who sent forth the cream of their youth to fight for the Confederacy. Few of them returned. Because many bloody campaigns swirled about Columbus, the cemetery there became the resting place for hundreds of Confederate Soldiers and some 40 men who wore the Federal Blue. On a spring day, much like this, in the 1860's . . . after the guns were silenced . . . three young women of Columbus began carrying flowers to the graves of husbands and sweethearts. A fourth young widow joined them, and her campassion for the fallen warriors extended beyond her personal and profound grief.

"Why don't we break our bouquets and place a flower on each grave?" she suggested. The other women hesitated, but then quietly they untied their bouquets. So long as the blossoms lasted, they were shared among the fallen heroes. Others, in time, learned of this floral tribute, and soon the women of Columbus all joined in a procession among the crosses . . . and on that day, every grave—Confederate and Union—was decorated with loving care.

The ceremony at Columbus became a yearly custom, and its practice spread to other towns and cities. News of this gesture by southern women was heard in the North, and their compassion struck a responsive chord among those who so recently had been the enemy.

The second chapter of the Memorial Day story takes place in the North. The idea of a national observance originated with General John A. Logan, Commander-in-Chief of the Grand Army of the Republic. In 1868, he issued an order that every post of the GAR should hold suitable annual exercises and that the graves of dead comrades were to be decorated with flowers. Gradually, after the New York legislature designated May 30th as a veterans holiday in 1873, this date became the day when virtually all of our states honor their war dead. In some, it is known as Decoration Day, in others as Memorial Day. No matter the name, its purpose is noble and sacred and may it always be so.

As years passed, Americans once more died in battle for causes they held dear. These men, too, came to be remembered when the nation would pause and reflect on May 30th. Today, our tribute is made to the gallant men who fell in all our wars.

We honor here the men who lost their lives at the first and second battles of Manassas, in Antietam's cornfield and those who perished on the breastworks at Cold Harbor. We remember those who died on the Maine and at San Juan Hill, and we pay homage to the dead of St. Mihiel and Chateau-Thierry. Our thoughts dwell on the sailors who knew briefly the confusion and horror of Pearl Harbor, and those who stood fast in the face of the *Kamikaze* in 1945. We remember our air crews who failed to return from flights over Hamburg and Tokyo; we can never forget the sacrifices of Corregidor, Guadalcanal, and Mt. Suribachi, or of Cassino, St. Lo, or Bastogne. Even fresher are our memories of Korea, where men too young for World War II came briefly of age at places like the Chosin Reservoir, Chipyong-Ni, and Heartbreak Ridge.

And now, our roll call of honored dead is heard from a new land, and the names grow dreadfully familiar—Pleiku—the Ia Drang Valley—Hill 881. The casualty lists from Viet Nam last week recorded the 10,000th American Battle Death in that far-off, little-understood corner of our world . . . a fact for sober contemplation.

No . . . the time is not yet come when the prophecy of Isaiah is fulfilled:

"He shall judge between the nations, and shall decide for many peoples; and they shall beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruning hooks; nations shall not lift up sword against Nation, neither shall they learn war any more."

We have fought two wars that were to end all war. Still, we send our sons off to do more battle. The young man of 20 years who perished yesterday in Viet Nam's jungles was just a tiny tot of four when another young man of two-score years was breathing his last on the shell-seared slopes of a Korean Mountain.

We look to the future and ponder what conflict awaits the children of a new generation. And as we ponder, we remember our dead, and we pray that they have found a peace that is not yet ours.

On this hallowed day, all of our fallen are heroes in our eyes. Not all died leading the assault squads in a victorious charge, nor did all die with the heat of battle coursing in their veins. For many, death came quietly, unexpectedly. But all are heroes in the memory of this day. By their sacrifices, however made, they helped assure that this nation would endure . . . that life here would remain so precious that others would always stand ready to give *their* last full measure of devotion to preserve this land for other generations of free men to follow.

There are no more poignant words in literature than those written by John McCrae, during World War I, in the poem we know by the title "In Flanders Fields."

"In Flanders fields the poppies blow
Between the crosses, row on row,
That mark our place, and in the sky,
The larks, still bravely singing, fly,
Scarce heard amid the guns below.

"We are the dead; short days ago.
We lived, felt dawn, saw sunset glow,
Loved and were loved; and now we lie
In Flanders Fields.

"Take up our quarrel with the foe!
To you from failing hands we throw
The torch; be yours to hold it high!
If ye break faith with us who die,
We shall not sleep, though poppies grow
In Flanders Fields."

We must not break this faith—not with those who died a hundred years ago . . . nor fifty, nor twenty-five, nor fifteen years ago . . . nor with those who died yesterday. Our quarrel is, as ever, with the enemies of freedom . . . those who would destroy the dignity of the human soul, limit its aspiration, remove all hope. But we have another quarrel . . . with those who *would* break . . . by their action or by their inaction . . . this sacred trust *we* endeavor to keep.

God grant us the strength . . . the qualities of mind and spirit that will enable us to live in a manner worthy of the sacrifices of those who gave their *lives* for us.

Ted Yates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 19, 1967

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the war in Vietnam and the more recent outburst in the Near East have brought death to a number of radio and television newsmen. That is not only because more newsmen are getting to the front, but also because covering a war with a camera is extremely hazardous. One television newsman who was killed recently has been where the action is all over the world. He was Ted Yates of NBC News.

Edward P. Morgan, whose news and commentary program was sponsored each weekday night on the American Broadcasting Co. radio network by the AFL–CIO, recently paid a tribute to Mr. Yates that I feel should be printed in the RECORD at this point.

EDWARD P. MORGAN AND THE NEWS

JUNE 13, 1967.

People are always dying. That's life. But the pain of sudden loss makes a blur of reason and the wounded heart cries out in startled grief, why this one, why not some lesser person now? Fate, of course, is not a computer and human tragedy does not fit into the Pentagon economy of cost effectiveness. So somebody of sterling worth is struck down while a rascal may be assured longevity. There is little logic or justice in this plan, or so it appears especially in times of private crisis, but it is just as well that man himself is not licensed to fool around with the console of destiny in terms of separating out the worthy from the duds. Hitler tried it in his mad dream of a master race and scientists in molecular biology are getting excruciatingly close to the secrets which may basically influence life if not death. But not even these explorations can eliminate the incidence of accidents and their consequences. The Lord giveth and the Lord taketh away; Blessed be the name of the Lord, the Scriptures say. This may be of small or large comfort, depending on the intensity and devotion of belief. Whatever one's faith, it is hard to deny a higher harmony and rhythm to the universe than man himself has been able to devise or divine.

But none of this makes easy or even understandable, in the blinding darkness of hurt and anger, however momentary, the loss of a gifted and courageous colleague.

A week ago today Ted Yates of NBC News died in a Jerusalem hospital. The day before—the very day the Arab-Israeli war began—he had been hit in the head by a burst of machinegun fire as he stood in the lobby of the Intercontinental Hotel on the Mount of Olives in the then Jordanian sector of the ancient city. The news accounts said that others present flung themselves to the floor when the firing began but he remained standing to try to see what was happening. That was Yates.

A funeral service was held for him at noon today in an Episcopal church in Washington's Georgetown and there was time to ponder in a pew his fate. I wish that he had taken cover but he was not one to duck. His reputation as a reporter, director, producer and most recently as a combination of all three for NBC television, was built on a fierce determination to see really what was happening. This brought him many near brushes with death in such places as Vietnam, Java and the Congo. He was a combat correspondent with the Marines in the Korean war. He was fascinated and horrified by the cruelties of "little wars." Indeed when he was killed he and his camera crew had just started a long, hot summer assignment in the Middle East which was to have included the savage, little-chronicled war in Yemen at the boiling southern end of the Arabian peninsula, for a series of special reports in depth.

It would be easy to romanticize the journalistic exploits of this 36-year-old native of Sheridan, Wyoming, who was wired for sound and sight in effort to bring some meaning to the violence that explodes daily on the television tube in your living room. But it is not the purpose of this essay to produce a documentary epitaph for Ted Yates. The excellence and integrity of his work are the proper monument to him.

As a matter of fact it is a little presumptuous of me to imply an intimacy with his career because though we were both in the same electronic channel of the reporting trade and more than vaguely knew that each other existed, I first met Yates personally only a few months ago. We found, over lunch, that we had some sharp differences of opinion about some aspects, for example, of the war in Vietnam. But there was something beyond argument in the attitude of the man that made you know instinctively that here was a dues-paying member of the human race, committed to searching for the answers to its triumphs and tragedies, large and small.

Ted Yates stood—stands—for something far bigger than the carload of plaques and other prizes he has won for his television reporting and documentaries. And this, ironically enough, is what bothers me. That is to say I am bothered by the fact that the press as a whole, the information media, as we are now institutionally labeled, do not begin to measure up to the restless integrity of this journalist who was killed in action, (Within hours two other newsmen were killed, four injured in the same war.) It is one thing to mourn Yates' death in gallant pursuit of duty in the highest traditions of the Fourth Estate. It is another to admit how unkempt those traditions have become through neglect, and the pursuit of profit more than the pursuit of truth.

Ted Yates did not duck and he lost his life. The freest and most profitable press in the world, every major facet of it, not only ducks but pulls its punches to save a supermarket of commercialism or shield an ugly prejudice and is putting the life of the republic in jeopardy thereby.

This is a legacy unworthy of a brave blonde widow named Mary Yates. And it is a legacy, I suspect, which the flesh and blood of Ted and Mary Yates, their three tow-headed sons, Eames, 10; Frederick 8, and Angus 6, will not accept.

This is Edward P. Morgan saying good night from Washington.

The U.S., U.N., and U.K.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, June 23, 1967

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a column written by Raymond Moley, published in the Newsweek, June 12, 1967, entitled "The U.S., U.N., and U.K."

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PERSPECTIVE—THE U.S., U.N. AND U.K.

(By Raymond Moley)

Now that a real threat to peace has erupted in the Middle East, Americans might well review their commitments in quieter but potentially dangerous involvements elsewhere. We have 60 commitments which involve our military assistance outside this continent. Most of them are in areas more than 3,000 miles from our shores and concern roughly one-third of the world's population.

The most unnecessary and indefensible involvement is our participation in the U.N.'s economic sanctions against Rhodesia imposed in December 1966. This is the second time that the U.N. has dragged us into an African adventure, the first one being the cruel suppression of Katanga.

The Wilson government in the United Kingdom in effect brought in a number of other nations to break by economic force an impasse between two governments speaking the same language and tied by the same political traditions.

No doubt for the purpose of enlisting American interest which at home is dedicated to the principle of one man, one vote, the British centered their case against Rhodesia in the fact that 200,000 whites hold sway over many times that number of blacks. This was gross hypocrisy because traditionally British policy has supported the white minorities in its multitude of colonial possessions.

SHADOWY AUTHORITY

Since Rhodesia for more than 40 years enjoyed substantial self-government under the Crown and for some time had assumed that along with many other British possessions it enjoyed the right to declare itself independent, the Smith regime in 1965 proclaimed that independence. Then there ensued a long and noisy controversy followed by British economic sanctions. Finally, a conference between Prime Ministers Wilson and Smith on the warship Tiger broke down and the British Government appealed to the Security Council of the U.N. Rhodesia was not permitted to participate in that debate, which ended in invoking economic sanctions in which the U.S.A. joined. In order to bring a shadow of legal authority under the charter, our Ambassador Goldberg argued that an independent Rhodesia which denied votes to the black population was a dangerous and inflammatory threat to peace.

Influential voices were raised in the United States in opposition to American participation. One of the critics was former Secretary of State Dean Acheson, who denied vigorously that the U.N. had any authority to interfere with the internal affairs of any nation. He pointed out that since 1923 Rhodesia had, by British consent, been responsible for its own defense and security; that for Rhodesia to declare legal as well as actual independence was not a transgression, and that our Fourteenth Amendment was not yet international law.

SANCTIONS ARE INEFFECTIVE

In February of this year a group of Americans known as the American-African Affairs Association arranged a visit to Rhodesia by three responsible observers. These were René Wormser of the New York bar, Prof. William D. Jacobs of the University of Maryland and James J. Kilpatrick of The Richmond News Leader. Their report, which was published May 16 in the National Review, is an account of their observations and conclusions as well as a history of British-Rhodesian relations.

They found an utterly calm and peaceful Rhodesia firmly in support of the regime of Prime Minister Smith. It has, they say, the substantial support of the black Council of Chiefs. The white government and the black leaders do not advocate "the immediate extension of 'one man, one vote'." They do not urge school integration. They regard the process of change as "evolutionary." The mission concludes that economic sanctions will not "topple" the Smith government. But the longer the sanctions prevail, "the more holes will appear in the fabric of the U.N.'s artificial curtain."

In short, this ill-conceived effort to support Wilson's government will weaken, not Rhodesia but the United Kingdom and the U.N.

Finally, the mission suggests a number of steps to break the impasse and extricate the U.N. and the United States from a position they never should have taken. Meanwhile, the Wilson government itself is tottering on the brink of dissolution.

Support for H.R. 10480—Bill To Protect U.S. Flag

SPEECH

OF

HON. CARL ALBERT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1967

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 10480) to prohibit desecration of the flag, and for other purposes.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I wish the RECORD to reflect the fact that I am numbered among those who support the passage of the bill, H.R. 10480, being legislation meant to protect the flag of the United States, and to prevent its desecration. It is true, as some have contended, that those who have publicly mutilated, burned, or scorned this glorious emblem of the Nation cannot thereby injure this great and powerful country, beloved by the vast overwhelming majority of its citizens. But, Mr. Chairman, that is not the point. The purpose of this legislation is to express in a forceful way, by providing criminal punishment for those who desecreate the flag, the massive disapproval of the great American people for the criminal behavior of those persons who would dishonor a banner of such beauty and glory, a symbol of the courage and sacrifice of those who have followed its colors and who have held it high in every generation and on every American battlefield.

Mr. Chairman, this flag, displayed in these congressional halls, was the flag of the patriots who under General Washington, at Trenton, surprised and defeated the trained Hessian soldiers fighting the battles of the British King. That flag inspired them, though their forces were small, their weapons antiquated, their powder supply inadequate, their armies poorly fed and poorly clothed, to endure 8 years of unmitigated warfare against the most powerful empire of the 18th century. It was the flag of those dauntless Americans who wrecked the rule of Tripoli's pirates to whose monarch all Europe had contributed ransoms of silver and of gold. It was the flag of Jackson and his southern riflemen, endowed with the same spirit of liberty, who drove the British back to their ships in the battle of New Orleans. It was the flag which emerged from the cauldron of civil war, a fratricidal struggle between those of equal bravery, to become the banner of a nation then united, and united now and forever. It was the flag of those who with Theodore Roosevelt stormed the heights of San Juan Hill, and won the independence of Cuba. It was the flag of Dewey, of the flotilla of American battleships as they drove the Spaniards from the harbor of Manila. It was the flag of the battalion of death when it met God in the Argonne on the battlegrounds of international carnage. It was the flag of soldiers brave and true who died in the invasion of Normandy, and restored the liberty of France. It was the flag raised above Iwo Jima. It was the flag of the heros of Heartbreak Ridge who fought and died in Korea. It is the flag of courageous and loyal Americans who for us, for liberty, for democracy face death in Vietnam. Mr. Chairman, the legislation before us upholds and honors the flag of the United States of America, the flag Americans adore. And may God bless and preserve the purest, greatest flag in all the world.

The Divine Power of Abraham Lincoln and the Vast Legacy He Left for Mankind

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 23, 1967

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, Dr. Herman Blum, senior vice president of the Lincoln-Civil War Society of Philadelphia, delivered before that organization an address entitled, "The Divine Power in Abraham Lincoln and the Vast Legacy He Left for Mankind." I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE DIVINE POWER IN ABRAHAM LINCOLN AND THE VAST LEGACY HE LEFT FOR MANKIND

(An address by Dr. Herman Blum before the Lincoln-Civil War Society of Philadelphia, Feb. 11, 1967)

As a preamble, let me say that the Lincoln we cherish today was not the Lincoln who calmly gathered his robes about him, waiting for the people to call him. He sought opportunities for his advancement, calculated his prospects, and steadfastly planned ahead. "His ambition was a sturdy engine that knew no rest," wrote his law partner Herndon.

Lincoln actually failed in everything he tried, the first time he tried to do it. But he kept on trying long after an ordinary man maybe would have quit. And in the end he overcame the whims of fate that chain ordinary men to ordinary success. He was sustained in his darkest hours by the conviction that Divine guidance was an essential element in his drive for success.

Books and books have been written about our Abraham Lincoln, but has everything been told about him yet? Let's just see.

On this 158th anniversary of his birth, it is magnificently comforting and inspirational to examine the record and mystery of this 16th president of the United States.

When a man runs for public office, the first question the voters ask is, "What's his record, what has he done before?" If he runs for governor, they want to know, "Has he had experience as a Lieutenant Governor, a State Senator or Congressman?" This, of course also applies, but more importantly to a candidate for the Presidency.

In 1952, when Dwight D. Eisenhower ran for the Presidency, he had been a Four-Star General, a Supreme Military Commander of the Allies in World War II and a national hero. In 1960, with Kennedy and Nixon running a very close race, Kennedy had been a P.T. boat hero in World War II, a Congressman and a United States Senator. Nixon had served as a Congressman, United States Senator and a Vice President. In 1964, Lyndon B. Johnson had been a Congressman, Majority Leader of the United States Senate and a Vice President. Barry Goldwater had been a Congressman and a United States Seantor.

In the campaign of 1860, however, we elected Abraham Lincoln as our only president (among the 36 we have had) who had never been a Governor, who had never been a United States Senator, a Cabinet Minister, a Vice President, an Ambassador, a military leader or war hero.

The significance of this paradox in the experience of our beloved Lincoln has never been adequately explained. As we study his life, there is much more than this mystifying lack of public service and political experience to marvel at. One of these aspects of his life is the degree of poverty that he had to survive at the start of his career. The other, more or less crowded out of our history books, was his religion. There is relatively little known about it, yet Lincoln's religion had a tremendous influence on his career and the fate of our country.

As has been recited time and time again, Lincoln was born in a log cabin, deep in the wilderness of Hardin County, Kentucky. It was the year 1809, and his father, described as "an illiterate, poverty-stricken, wandering laborer," had just built a rickety shack out there in that rugged frontier country.

Young Lincoln had no high school or college education. He never received a diploma or a degree. "Readin', writin' and 'rithmetic" were taught him by his devoted stepmother, by the light of the fireplace.

By the time he was 21, Lincoln had been a rail-splitter, a roustabout deckhand on a river raft and a drifting odd job handyman on nearby farms. In 1831, at 22, when he arrived in Illinois, he was utterly friendless, penniless, ragged and struggling for the bare necessities of life. It was in New Salem that he eagerly accepted the most menial kind of work in a miserable country store. Later, after a brief service as a village postmaster, he managed to get elected to the Illinois State Legislature and for one term as a Congressman, but he was beaten for the U.S. Senate by Stephen A Douglas, after a series of spectacular public debates.

Did this defeat discourage him? Absolutely not, for he immediately launched his campaign for the Presidency. Who backed his candidacy? Certainly he was not handpicked by political bosses who met in a smoke-filled room, nor by influential newspapers or multi-millionaires and he had plenty of detractors.

During the campaign, Lincoln was called upon to withstand calumny of the most disheartening kind, an example of it being the *New York World* which had this to say about him: "The age of statesmen is gone. The age of rail-splitters and buffoons, boors, and fanatics, has succeeded. In a crisis of the most appalling magnitude, the country is asked to consider the claims of a boorish, third-rate, backwoods lawyer for the highest station in the Government."

Beyond that type of billingsgate, Lincoln calmly went on to fulfill his destiny.

After his inauguration, as he faced the storm of secession and dedicated his life to saving the Union, Lincoln was confronted with these problems:

He found traitors, defeatists, and incompetent generals barging in on the White House; there was bad morale on the home front; the Union armies were discouraged; the North was divided and the South united; there were draft riots, profiteering, and currency troubles and a depressed and fatigued people.

With so much at stake, how was it that these bleak prospects did not discourage Lincoln?

How was it that this self-taught backwoods lawyer, inexperienced in foreign affairs or diplomacy, and untrained in military science or war economy, was able to face the perils of his day and make sound decisions? How was he able to carry out his staggering assignments so efficiently?

What caused him suddenly to generate inspiring leadership which he had not shown before entering the White House? Was it the awesome responsibility and pressure of circumstances, or was it something else?

Let us pause and reflect. Is it possible that Divine Providence, every now and then, intervenes in the affairs of nations, to pick a man to meet a particular crisis?

Are there not a number of these mystic occurrences recorded in history—events for which there is no other explanation than that Almighty God, in his wisdom, had chosen a man as his instrument to avert disaster that threatened his people.

Prophetic faith today is met with scorn and skepticism: Communists refuse to see the hand of God in history, yet people who suffer from dictatorship and exploitation know that faith alone points the way to their redemption.

As we look upon our world, up to its ears in nuclear bombs, torn asunder by distrust and fear, and living in the shadow of these totally destructive weapons, perhaps we had better conclude that Lincoln's power, endurance, wisdom, courage, and compassion came from a divine source.

This one challenging phase of Lincoln's mystery and contradictions revolves around his religion.

It was in 1846, while a candidate for Congress that Lincoln felt impelled to state his position on the subject of religion which became an issue in his campaign. Accordingly he published the following letter:

"To the voters of the Seventh Congressional District of Illinois:

"Fellow Citizens:

"A charge having got into circulation in some of the neighborhoods of this district, in substance that I am an open scoffer at Christianity, I have by the advice of some friends concluded to notice the subject in this form. That I am not a member of any Christian church is true, but I have never denied the truth of the Scriptures, and I have never spoken with intentional disrespect of any religion in general, or of any denomination in particular.

"I do not think I could, myself, be brought to support a man for office whom I knew to be an open enemy of, and scoffer at, religion. Leaving the higher matter of eternal consequences between him and his maker, I still do not think any man has the right thus to *insult* the feelings and *injure* the morals of the community in which he may live. If, then, I was guilty of such conduct, I should blame no man who should condemn me for it, but I do blame those, whoever they may be, who falsely put such a charge in circulation against me.

"(signed) A. LINCOLN.

"JULY 31, 1846."

As he said in his open letter during his campaign for Congress, he was not a member of a regular church. In Illinois he once rented a church pew, but it was Mrs. Lincoln who usually sat in it. He was never baptized nor made a formal profession of faith. This had caused some to conclude that since he was not a member of a church, Lincoln could not be considered religious. Some of his political enemies raised the religious issue and insisted on calling him an infidel. This did not dismay Lincoln, for he was not an unbeliever. He was not opposed to creeds, but he did say this:

"I cannot without mental reservations assent to long and complicated creeds and catechisms. If the church would ask simply for acceptance of the commands 'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart and with all thy soul and thy neighbor as thyself'—that church I would gladly join with."

Beside his own statement, there is other evidence that Lincoln had deep religious convictions and constantly sought Divine guidance. Leaving Springfield for Washington, for his inauguration as President, he said, "Without the assistance of that Divine Being . . . I cannot succeed. With that assistance I cannot fail." Enroute, he said, "I shall be happy indeed if I shall be a humble instrument in the hands of the Almighty."

Shortly before the Battle of Gettysburg in 1863, according to the report of a guest in the White House at that time, low tones were heard coming from a private room near President Lincoln's sleeping quarters, although the hour was far past midnight. The door was partly open, and the guest saw Lincoln kneeling in prayer and heard these words:

"Oh thou God that heard Solomon in the night when he prayed for wisdom, hear me. I cannot lead our people without Thy support: I cannot guide the affairs of this nation without Thy help . . . Oh, God, who didst hear Solomon when he prayed for guidance, hear me and save this nation."

The guest added in his report of the incident: "I think from that time on the clouds which long had lain threatening over the affairs of our government began to roll away; the skies were brighter; the smile of Heaven was upon our President; God heard his prayer and sent deliverance."

The key to Lincoln's eternal position in history was the depth of his spiritual feeling.

He truly symbolized the passage in the Bible which makes clear the nature of true religion: "What doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?"

To Senator Lot M. Morrill of Maine, Lincoln remarked: "I do not know but that God has created some one man great enough to comprehend the whole of this stupendous crisis from beginning to end, and endowed him with sufficient wisdom to manage and direct it. I confess I do not fully understand and foresee it all. But I am placed where I am obliged to the best of my poor ability to deal with it. And that being the case, I can only go just as fast as I can see how to go."

Lincoln memorized long passages from the Bible. Perhaps no President who occupied the White House ever read the Bible as much as Lincoln. The White House guards used to find him, before he had breakfast in the morning, turning the pages of his Bible in the small room he used for a library. His two great speeches, the Gettysburg Address and Second Inaugural, are filled with the rich words and poetry of the Bible. He prayed daily and called prayer "talking with God." In the Washington Cathedral, the beautiful bronze statue of Houck's kneeling Lincoln, recalls Lincoln"s remark, "That man is tallest who is on his knees."

William Wolf, in his *The Almost Chosen People* wrote: "No American President, before or since, had as profound an understanding of the Scriptures as Lincoln." He also said, "Lincoln is one of the greatest theologians of America—not in the technical meaning of interpreting and conforming to a system of doctrine—certainly not as a defender of any one denomination—but in the sense of seeing the hand of God intimately in all affairs of nations."

Reinhold Niebuhr, the eminent theologian, saw Lincoln carrying on like a *Hebraic prophet*, fulfilling a duty he wished had not been thrust upon him, and in doubt always as to whether he was performing God's will. According to Niebuhr, Lincoln refused to say God was on the side of the North, just as he refused to equate his own purposes with that of Divine wisdom. He had, in Niebuhr's words, "Humble religious reservations" about the claim that America exclusively was God's instrument on earth.

In my mind, there isn't any doubt as to the source of Lincoln's wisdom and power. If he was not inspired of God, then there is no man who ever lived on earth who was so inspired.

From Caesar to Napoleon, from Socrates to Albert Schweitzer, men have risen step by step, according to well known principles. That is not what we call being a man of destiny. They are men of time, men of talent. The inspired men are fewer. Whence they came, from whence they get their power, by what rule they get that power, we know not. They arise from the shadow and vanish in the mist. We see them, but we know them not. Where did Shakespeare get his genius, Mozart, his music, Burns, his poetry—where but from God? And from the same source came Lincoln's power to carry out his awesome mission to make America a new and united nation. It was from this same Divine Source that Lincoln derived his courage, endurance, judgment and mercy.

In conclusion what can I say about Abraham Lincoln that has not already been said in the thousands of books which have been written about him?

Only this: I am not ashamed to use the word *love* to express my feelings about him. Respect is too cold, admiration too distant, affection completely inadequate to indicate the depth of our feeling about him.

I might give you just three of the reasons for this extraordinary esteem and reverence for the man. They are:

First: The surpassingly simple words of Lincoln's Gettysburg Address have been described by some as a masterpiece of eloquence for which history affords no model "except perhaps the Scriptures." More than 100 years have passed since its delivery, yet that memorable address is still the trumpet call for people who yearn to seize the burden and glory of freedom, wherever there is oppression and tyranny.

Second: Among the treasures of humanity is Lincoln's second inaugural address. It projected the great future of our country as a united nation.

Third: His Emancipation Proclaimed inaugurated a new and important period in American history. It was this edict that abolished forever the evil curse of slavery. Today, a century later, freedom is still the great unfinished business of the world. The civil rights explosion now going on merely reaffirms our determination to extend equal opportunity to all Americans, regardless of race, color or creed. The fight for civil rights is the final tribute to Lincoln's life which has taught us that freedom and human rights must inevitably crush bigotry and discrimination wherever it raises its ugly head. This glorious dream is about to be realized.

Let us therefore emphasize and proclaim to the world Lincoln's basic philosophy, that ours is a nation "conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal."

These words of Lincoln are particularly meaningful to people behind the Iron Curtain. They are easily translated into the language of these suppressed millions for whom there is one symbol of American friendship—the name of Abraham Lincoln—to them the Great Emancipator!

In today's psychological warfare (the cold war), Lincoln is our formidable secret weapon against international intrigue. Lincoln's *image* is, by far, the best asset we have in our diplomatic pouches. His sorrows and joys, his faith in people, his gentleness, his strength and weakness—these are the elements that challenge the propaganda of our enemies and provide our best defense against them.

If America is to remain a great power, it must return to *faith in God,* as did our forefathers. In addition to our dedicated Lincoln, among others, there was George Washington, who said, "Our people know it is impossible to rightly govern without God and the Bible"; Patrick Henry, "The Bible is worth all other books which have been written"; Andrew Jackson, "That book (the Bible) is the rock on which this Republic rests"; William Penn, "Men who are not governed by God will be ruled by tyrants."

In the epic that Lincoln lived, every man saw him in a different light and has read into him the contradictions and passions of his own mind and soul. But to *deprived people,* handicapped by poverty and brutally unfavorable social status, Lincoln symbolizes the truth that *Democracy is a way of life* in which every citizen can, *by his own effort,* achieve the best of which he is capable and, what is equally as important, that he can rely on Divine Guidance as the decisive element for his success.

Statement on the Public Debt Limit

SPEECH

OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1967

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, through an error, the following statement was omitted in the Record of June 21. I include it in the Appendix on this date and am assured that it will be printed with the other material on the public debt debate in the permanent Record:

Mr. Chairman, the fiscal discipline imposed upon our Nation's finances by periodic review of the public debt limit is, in my opinion, a worthwhile objective. It has been recognized as such since the Second Liberty Bond Act became the law of the land 48 years ago.

However, the exercise we are engaged in today is more mischief than responsibility.

The legislative process provides for authorizing expenditures and further review in the appropriation process. The hearings, reports, and consideration in committee and then in both Houses of Congress give ample opportunity to draw the line on spending for the defense and nondefense needs of the United States. But once the contracts are let and the salaries earned, it is unconscionable to tell the Treasurer of the United States that he cannot pay the bills.

As I told the House 2 weeks ago:

> . . . our military expenses, dollarwise, are at the peak of World War II. We are in crisis today, and we are living a world where crisis piles upon crisis. If we are going to tie the hands of an Administration during these times by refusing to let them pay the bills that we authorized and appropriated, in my judgment we are failing the American people in our responsibility to them.

That is exactly what will happen if this bill is defeated today. Today is June 21. The new fiscal year begins in 9 days. As the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means warned yesterday before the Rules Committee, a failure of this legislation today will result in "chaos—in the stock market and everywhere else."

The financial integrity of the U.S. Government—based on our great wealth and our great prosperity—is at stake today.

This is the third time this year we have interrupted the business of Congress to consider the statutory limitation on the public debt. If the view from across the aisle prevails, it will be followed by two, three, and maybe four more debt limit bills before the end of the year. This provides ample opportunity to publicize the so-called conservative view toward Federal spending, but it accomplishes little else.

The alternative proposed in the recommital motion might satisfy the needs of the Treasury until September. I emphasize "might" because of the volatile demands for defense expenditures. The sudden Middle East crisis a fortnight ago shows just how fast our defense commitments could change. The Treasury requires an adequate debt limit cushion to meet our Nation's commitments swiftly and surely.

The committee's bill provides this cushion. We recommend a permanent ceiling at $358 billion—including sales participations. We grant the Secretary some flexibility in his debt management through a $7 billion temporary authority beginning in fiscal year 1969 and by extending the definition of "note" from 5 to 7 years. The Secretary and the Director of the Budget estimate that this limit will carry us through fiscal year 1968, providing that Vietnam or other defense commitments do not escalate rapidly.

Two weeks ago I stated on the floor of the House:

> . . . I do not agree that we can have guns and butter. I believe there are a lot of things we should be cutting down on, but this great Nation can afford guns and bread. We have great problems here at home, and we cannot kick them under the rug. If we delay their consideration, they are only going to pile up on us.

Every Member of this House believes in economy in government—as I do. The appropriations process gives the Congress the authority to determine where and when to hold the line on expenditures. We have the responsibility for seeing that our moneys are wisely spent.

The recommital motion in effect surrenders this responsibility. It shifts the responsibility for fiscal decisions to the executive branch. I, for one, am not willing to surrender these congressional prerogatives.

Let us look at our administrative budget of $136 billion for fiscal 1968. Already committed is $80 billion for defense, $14 billion for interest on the public debt, $4.9 billion for veterans' insurance and benefits; $4.2 billion for public assistance grants, $1.6 billion for the Commodity Credit Corporation, and $15.3 billion in payments on prior contracts and obligations.

This leaves about $20 billion in relatively controllable civilian expenditures. What does this include?—$1.8 billion in "food for peace"; $1.1 billion for the Elementary and Secondary Education Act; $0.75 billion for higher education grants and facilities; funds for operating the FBI, the regulatory agencies, the National Park Service, et cetera. We must not waste our resources on inefficient or undesirable expenditures; but we cannot deny our people essential services or security.

Mr. Chairman, economy in government does not consist of "demands for a new budget" or groaning about domestic spending. Economy in government represents instead what our Nation can afford during this period of international crisis. This Congress is capable of making these hard decisions in the traditional manner—through the authorization and appropriations processes.

Since 1950, our public debt has grown by 28.4 percent. In the same period, personal debt grew by 448 percent, State and local government debt by 348 percent, and corporate debt by 219 percent. In terms of percentage of our Nation's ability to produce, the national debt, as a ratio of gross national product, has declined from 133 percent at the end of World War II to 45 percent today. These figures offer the basis for a realistic appraisal of the national debt burden today.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to make one final comment before concluding my remarks. The sequence of temporary debt limits, as provided in current law, has served to set the debt limit in response to the budget, a case of the tail wagging the dog. The correct order—the order consistent with true fiscal responsibility—is to establish a permanent debt limit which will, in fact, be considered when the budget is prepared. This is what the committee's bill, H.R. 10867, does. It asserts our congressional prerogatives for real fiscal discipline.

The American people are prepared to tighten their belts in this critical period of our Nation's history. But they are tiring of the cant and rhetoric which have surrounded these repetitious and unnecessary debates on the debt ceiling. The advocates of the recommittal motion assume some sort of "gullibility gap"—but I caution them that the public recognizes publicity stunts in the name of fiscal responsibility.

We cannot afford to risk the "chaos" which our distinguished chairman has outlined for the sake of pointless opposition, or phony fiscal arguments.

I recommend H.R. 10867, as adopted by the majority of the Committee on Ways and Means, for immediate passage.

"Victory" Without Peace?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 23, 1967

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a column written by David Lawrence, published in the U.S. News & World Report, June 26, 1967, entitled "'Victory' Without Peace?"

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"VICTORY" WITHOUT PEACE?

(By David Lawrence)

We have heard during past wars pleas from nonparticipants calling for a "peace without victory."

We have just witnessed the military triumph of the Israeli armies over the combined forces of Egypt, Syria and Jordan. But will this turn out to be a "victory" without peace? If so, it will be due almost entirely to the mistaken policy of the Soviet Government in encouraging the Arab countries to adopt an uncompromising position toward the issues that must be realistically met if there is to be peace in the Middle East.

The new adversary that Israel faces is the Soviet Government. In insisting on a resolution in the United Nations Security Council for a "cease-fire," did not Moscow know full well that, while this would stop the fighting, it might not bring a settlement of the basic controversies which caused the war itself? Do the Soviets want an unsettled Middle East for the same reason they have helped to prolong the war in Vietnam—to make trouble for the United States?

By severing diplomatic relations with Israel and compelling Communist-bloc countries in Eastern Europe to do the same, the Soviets have lined up a formidable group to prevent any settlement except on terms favorable to the losers on the battlefield.

The game of the Soviet Government apparently is to perpetuate in the Middle East the hold that it had vainly hoped would be strengthened by the $2 billions of armament supplied to Egypt. Defeat of the Arab armies, however, doesn't seem to have shaken the confidence of the Soviets that they can still gain their ends by progaganda maneuvers and by intensifying the antagonism of the Arabs toward the people of Israel.

The fundamentals of a peace settlement are not difficult to outline. Passage to the seas by way of the Suez Canal and the Gulf of Aqaba must not be left to the whim of a dictator in Cairo or elsewhere who can open or close these waterways at will. There must be an international agreement and a readiness to set up a United Nations peacekeeping force to resist any move toward the reestablishment of such barriers to peace. As for territorial boundaries, these can be adjudged to conform to the principles of self-determination of peoples.

The significant fact is that Israel has won on the battlefield her right to independence. This nation should long ago have been recognized as a state by the surrounding peoples. Acceptance on all sides is now even more essential to an era of peace.

Also, some formula of international supervision should be devised to assure Israel's continued possession and control of the entire city of Jerusalem. This means more sentimentally to the Israelis than retention of much of the additional territory they have just won.

But of what avail are constructive peace proposals if the Soviet Government is hostile to them and seeks to keep the Middle East in confusion? Certainly the economic sanctions which have been recklessly imposed on American and British businesses by the Arab governments can only delay the reconstruction of the area as a useful entity in world commerce.

It is true, of course, that defeated peoples do not easily give up their feelings of bitterness and resentment. Since this is a time for reconciliation, the process will not be helped if spokesmen for the Soviet Union in the United Nations forum continue to insist on charging the United States with having actually participated in the war and given direct assistance to the Israelis.

The Soviet Government has made a grievous mistake in publicizing this falsehood. There is no more effective way to alienate American public opinion than to accuse the United States of having started or engaged in the Middle East war. Whatever chance there has been of developing a better understanding between Moscow and Washington could be summarily wiped out if this line of policy is maintained by the Soviets.

The Soviet Union should understand, moreover, that if it interjects its power to keep the Arabian countries in a state of continuous belligerency, the United States may find it necessary to send supplies and in other ways support the Israelis.

Israel can afford to be patient and even magnanimous. It can join with neighboring countries in programs of rehabilitation and relief, especially for the refugees who have been driven from their homes by past friction and the latest war.

As for the United Nations, it is faced with a severe test. The outcome can well mean either the disintegration of that body or its attainment of a truly influential role in world affairs.

Peoples everywhere want peace between Egypt and Israel, and they hope and expect moderation by the victors as well as sensible readjustment by the defeated. There can be peace only when the major powers use wisely their skills of mediation and join together in a reasonable compromise that will enable the peoples of the Middle East hereafter to live amicably with their neighbors.

Schlitz Works for a Beautiful America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 5, 1967

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the Joseph Schlitz Brewing Co., of Milwaukee, is showing commendable initiative in keeping our country beautiful.

In the thought that it will be of interest to Members of this body, I include a description of the Schlitz antilitter program:

"How would an empty beer can look here?"

The question, posed alongside an unsullied wooded lakeshore scene, is not exactly the one you'd expect a brewing firm to bring up in a national advertisement. But that's the candid anti-litter approach the Jos. Schlitz Brewing Company is taking in an ad addressed to the millions of Americans who will take to the great outdoors this Fourth of July holiday.

The message Schlitz hopes to get across is: "Leave that special spot of yours as beautiful as you found it."

The full-page ad is scheduled for Life (June 30) issue, Look (July 11) and Sports Illustrated (June 26).

Robert A. Uihlein Jr., Schlitz president and board chairman, said the company felt that "brewers and others who package consumer products in disposable containers should help convince people that it's in everyone's best interest to keep our beauty spots clean.

"While we have no control over the use or misuse of the products we make, we feel we have a duty to campaign against the ugliness of litter. After all, we enjoy a beautiful America, too," Uihlein declared.

The ad asks: "How would an empty beer can look here? Or old soda pop bottles? Or watermelon rinds? Don't answer. We all know. . . .

"It's not that people are messier today than they used to be. It's just that today there are a lot more people. And the mess adds up mighty fast."

Enjoy the great outdoors this Fourth of July, the ad urges, but then—"leave that special spot of yours as beautiful as you found it. You'll feel good about it all the way home."

The ad was created by the Leo Burnett Company of Chicago, agency for the Schlitz brand of beer.

Big Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE HANSEN
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 6, 1967

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, conservatives have been concerned for some time about the direction in which our Government was leading us. We have been concerned that our Government was getting too big. We have been concerned that it was attempting to do things not within its purview and not within its capabilities.

Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, our protests and criticisms, voiced over a period of many years, are beginning to bear fruit and are being listened to by our liberal friends. Or, perhaps, it is just that some liberals, through their own observations and studies, are becoming convinced that a paternalistic, all-powerful, centralized Federal Government, taking unto itself the task of providing all things for all people, is not the answer to our problems.

Two articles, pointing up this switch, have recently come to my attention. One, by Henry Hazlitt, appearing in the June 17, 1967, edition of Human Events, tells of the doubts Richard N. Goodwin, former aide and speech writer for both Presidents Kennedy and Johnson, now has as to the effectiveness and desirability of many Government programs.

The other, an editorial appearing in the June 19, 1967, edition of the Chicago Tribune—and condensed in the June 20 Press Summary, produced by the American Enterprise Institute—tells of the apparent disenchantment of the well-known NBC news commentator, David Brinkley, with Great Society programs.

The articles follow:

DECISIVE ISSUE OF 1970'S: EVEN LIBERALS NOW WORRY ABOUT BIG GOVERNMENT DANGERS

(By Henry Hazlitt)

The most astonishing article of the year—and one of the most hopeful—has just appeared in *Commentary* magazine.

What is most astonishing about it is not its message but its authorship. Its message is that decentralization of government will be "the decisive issue of the 1970s." But its author is Richard N. Goodwin, once law clerk to Supreme Court Justice Felix Frankfurter, former aide, idea man and speechwriter for both Presidents Kennedy and Johnson and the very model of a leftist.

And now he warns, quite bluntly, that the swift growth of federal power is diminishing the significance of the individual citizen. Here are a few excerpts:

"One need only look at the fantastic labyrinth of welfare programs, the monstrous incapacities of the Department of Health, Education and Welfore . . . as well as the foreseeable futilities of the new Departments of Housing and Urban Development and Transportation to realize that something is wrong with the old approach.

"Antipoverty and job retraining programs should be increasingly handed over to the community groups instead of being drawn, as they now are, closer to the federal government. Aid to education might well be administered to a far larger degree by local boards.

"Sharing in the general euphoria of power, the nine justices of the Supreme Court make major political decisions, unresponsive to the democratic process, in secret meetings on Friday afternoons. Both the number and scope of such decisions steadily mount.

"We can see today how the concentration of power over foreign affairs in a single man—long a goal of that liberal thought which was contemptuous of congressional conservatism—has dissolved the normal checks of our institutional structure. . . . It is possible that conservatives have something to teach about the value of institutional arrangements and the unwisdom of sacrificing them to immediate desires."

What is so hopeful about all this is the evidence that American liberals are at last awakening to the threat to individual liberty of the increasing centralization of power.

Let us hope that they will go on to ask themselves what has brought this increasing centralization of power. It has been the increase in government power itself.

And this power has been increased by the liberals' own insistence that wherever there is any problem of any kind to be solved, government should step in to solve it:

Government lawmakers or bureaucrats should say just how much oil or sugar should be imported, just how many acres should be planted to what crops, just how foodstuffs should be packed and labeled, just how steel and copper and drugs should be priced, just how automobiles should be made, just what kind of artificial eyes should be permitted, just what one group of people must do and another group must not do, just what groups should be subsidized and by how much and just what groups should be forced to subsidize them.

As the Swedish economist Gustav Cassel warned more than 30 years ago: "The leadership of the state in economic affairs, which advocates of planned economy want to establish, is, as we have seen, necessarily connected with a bewildering mass of governmental interferences of a steadily cumulative nature.

"The arbitrariness, the mistakes and the inevitable contradictions of such a policy will, as daily experience shows, only strengthen the demand for a more rational co-ordination of the different measures and, therefore, for unified leadership. For this reason planned economy will always tend to develop into dictatorship."

[From the Chicago Tribune, June 19, 1967]

GREAT SOCIETY

One by one, the herald angels of the Great Society are disassociating themselves from it. One of the latest defectors is David Brinkley . . . who did so much, in his own genial way, to vilify Barry Goldwater three years ago. Now he seems to be out-Goldwatering Goldwater.

"In about three years we have seen the beginning and the end of another period of social experimentation in this country, the beginning and the end of another phase of the American flirtation with Utopia. And when I say Great Society in this context I do not mean merely a series of bills proposed by the President and passed by Congress. Instead, I mean the whole breadth and depth of the American social attitude over the last few years.

"What we see this year is a Congress . . . trying to undo some of what was done in the two years before. And our flirtation with Utopia is over, at least for now."

As for the troubles of the cities, Mr. Brinkley said that "if all the bureaucrats had done everything right for 50 years and had spent 10 times as much as they have, we would still have slums and crime."

Governments can help, Mr. Brinkley said, "but about all they can do is furnish a floor, a framework, a system of fairness, protection, and order; and within that it is still up to every person to find the rest of it for himself. The government cannot produce a Utopia."

New Renewal Policy Welcome

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. VANIK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 22, 1967

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, recently the Plain Dealer published an editorial entitled "New Renewal Policy Welcome." The editorial began:

> Credit the federal Department of Housing and Urban Development with recognizing the validity of criticism of its past policy and taking courageous action to correct the situation at no small political risk.

I would like to join with the Plain Dealer in commending HUD for recent actions which show that they do listen to valid criticisms directed at the Department and that they do act upon such criticism. Such action is more rare in the Federal Establishment than we would like to believe.

As noted in this editorial the Department announced that priority for Federal funds would be given to projects for residential rather than business area renewal; that priority would be given to low and moderate income housing and the development of new employment opportunities. These specific goals complement the broad national goals set forth by the President and by the Congress during the past few years.

I would like to share this informative editorial with my colleagues by inserting it into the RECORD:

[From the Plain Dealer, June 15, 1967]

NEW RENEWAL POLICY WELCOME

Credit the federal Department of Housing and Urban Development with recognizing the validity of criticism of its past policy and taking courageous action to correct the situation at no small political risk.

Under a new policy effective July 1, HUD will give priority for federal funds to projects which hew to the line of national goals relating more to residential area than business area renewal.

The goals set forth by HUD include the conservation and expansion of urban housing supply for families with low and moderate incomes, the development of new employment opportunities and the renewal of areas where the most cirtical and urgent need is shown.

This new policy will be greeted with protest from many of 253 cities seeking shares in the $750-million urban renewal fund available July 1. The complaining cities will be entitled to protest because their plans, prepared and submitted in good faith at a time when there was no requirement to relate to national goals, now will fall to the bottom of HUD's priority list.

It is very likely that complaints of the cities will be echoed by some congressmen who were among the very ones who demanded change in HUD policy because of bad urban renewal experience in Cleveland and elsewhere.

The fact remains, however, that HUD's declaration of new policy answers a demonstrated need for more concern with renewal as it affects the lives and living of people in urban areas.

More good news from HUD is the announcement that it is releasing $900,000 withhheld from a Cleveland construction project because of alleged job discrimination by building craft unions.

With the $900,000 restored, work on the Federation Towers apartment project now may proceed. The money was restored because HUD found itself unfair in holding back on a commitment made prior to issuance of an antidiscrimination order.

Fairly and correctly also, HUD warned the AFL-CIO sponsors of Federation Towers that there will be no additional federal money for the $3.3-million project until there is compliance with the anti-discrimination order.

This is good attitude on the part of HUD, allowing a worthwhile project to move forward while at the same time giving those involved a fair opportunity to remove causes for complaint.

Chicago Sun-Times Puts Vietnam in Proper Perspective

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 19, 1967

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Chicago Sun-Times has performed a notable service in presenting to the people of Chicago and the wide range of circulation which this publication covers, a penetrating analysis of all the factors concerning our Nation's involvement in Vietnam.

This series of four editorials carries a great deal of information previously not available to the average citizen. I am placing these four editorials in the RECORD today because I believe them to be an excellent analysis of the entire situation.

The Chicago Sun-Times series of editorials on Vietnam is journalism at its finest and I believe the management of the Sun-Times deserves the highest commendation for providing the research and the writing skill to make these editorials available.

I am sure my colleagues will want to read the four editorials that follow:

[From the Chicago Sun-Times]

VIETNAM—I

(NOTE.—Russia has said it would welcome a summit conference of world leaders while Premier Alexei N. Kosygin is at the United Nations. If such a conference is held the agenda should include Vietnam. We begin today a series of editorials to inform our readers on Vietnam's history, the U.S. presence there, the dissent to the U.S. Vietnam policy, and what can, or should, be done there.)

Vietnam suffered its first military aggression in 111 B.C., when the Chinese invaded and took the kindgdom of Nam-Viet, less than 100 years after it was founded. China ruled Vietnam as a province until 939 A.D., when the fall of the Chinese Tang dynasty gave the Vietnamese a chance to throw out their Chinese rulers.

After the Chinese, at intervals, came the Siamese, the French, the Japanese, and the French again, to rule over Vietnam. In the few periods when Vietnam was free of foreign dominance its three subcultures, led by rival princes, fought each other.

France, the last colonial overlord of Vietnam, began its rule in 1883, when it used military force to respond to the slaughter of French and Spanish Catholic missionaries by Buddhists. France ruled Vietnam until the Japanese swept through Southeast Asia, early in World War II.

During World War II, Ho Chi Minh, a Vietnamese Communist and nationalist, who had fought against French colonial rule, added to his following by fighting the Japanese. He received U.S. aid in his fight. When Japan surrendered, Ho Chi Minh declared Vietnam an independent nation and took over the government of Vietnam. Earlier, however, the United States, Russia and Britain, anticipating Japan's surrender, had divided Vietnam into two parts at the Potsdam Conference. Nationalist China was to disarm and intern all Japanese troops north of Vietnam's 16th parallel. Britain would do the same in the south.

Nationalist China accepted Ho Chi Minh's government in the north as legal. The British, moving into the south, did not. Although welcomed by the Vietnamese, the British declarêd martial law, armed the French soldiers they found in prison camps and assisted the French in throwing the Vietnamese out of office. The Vietnamese fought back. Outnumbered, the British then rearmed the defeated Japanese troops in Saigon and used them against the Vietnamese. Later, the British thanked Japanese Gen. Terauchi for his "co-operation."

The British action in using Japanese soldiers to overthrow Ho Chi Minh's government shocked Gen. Douglas A. MacArthur, in Tokyo. He termed the use of Japanese troops to reconquer the "little people we promised to liberate," as the "most ignoble kind of betrayal."

Ho Chi Minh then launched a war against the French that was to last eight years. Much of the popular support he received from the Vietnamese people had been solidified by Britain's policy of using Japanese soldiers to regain Vietnam as a colony for France.

The United States first became involved in Vietnam in 1949, according to testimony given by Sec. of State Dean Rusk in the 1966 Senate Foreign Relations Committee hearings. Rusk said the United States agreed to give aid to France with the understanding that France would restore independence to Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia. Between 1950 and 1954, the United States gave France about $2 billion in aid.

Rusk also said that the aid that the United States later gave directly to South Vietnam was obligated under the terms of the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization, signed in 1954. "The underlying legal basis for the assistance is the right of the individual and collective self-defense against an aggressor, and there is clearly an aggression from the North."

The aggression of which Rusk speaks has been both political and military. The Communists, under Ho Chi Minh, have been active in Vietnam since 1930.

In 1939, the scattered Communist groups in Vietnam merged into the "Vietminh." The National Liberation Front, the political arm of the Communist Viet Cong, is the South Vietnamese arm of Ho Chi Minh's Vietminh organization, which is now centered in North Vietnam. Most of the NLF leaders are native South Vietnamese.

U.S. aid helped the French to keep Ho Chi Minh's forces in check for several years. After the cease-fire in Korea in July, 1953, Communist advisers and equipment began to flow to Ho Chi Minh in plentiful amounts. Faced with a heavy drain on manpower and resources, pressures began to build in France for a negotiated end of the war. During the Bermuda Conference of 1953, President Eisenhower, Premier Joseph Laniel of France and Prime Minister Winston Churchill decided to discuss the Indochina problem at the foreign minister level with Russia. The meeting was held in Berlin in February, 1954, and it was announced that a meeting would be held in Geneva in April to discuss the reunification of Korea and a means of ending the war between France and Ho Chi Minh's forces.

The announcement of a pending peace conference on Vietnam was a signal for North Vietnam's Gen. Vo Nguyen Giap to mount his massive attack on the fortified valley of Dienbienphu, held by the French. The agony of Dienbienphu's resistance dominated the Korean talks in Geneva and did much to turn those talks into a stalemate. Only hours before the Geneva Conference turned to the Indochina part of the agenda, Dienbienphu fell, and the stage was set for the drafting of the Geneva Accord, which was to end the fighting between France and Ho Chi Minh.

In a subsequent editorial we will examine the provisions of the Geneva Accord, how it has been violated and the escalation of the war in Vietnam.

[From the Chicago Sun-Times]

VIETNAM—II

Broadly speaking, the Geneva Accord of 1954 was a cease-fire document that ended the fighting between France and the Vietminh forces of Ho Chi Minh in Laos, Cambodia and Vietnam. The Accord deals primarily with Vietnam. Separate peace documents were drawn for Laos and Cambodia.

The United States did not sign the Geneva Accord. It issued its own pledge to respect the provisions of the Accord and said it would view any renewal of aggression as a "serious threat to international peace and security."

The Accord's major pronouncements were few, but weighty. Vietnam was partitioned at the 17th parallel, pending elections which were to be held in 1956 for the purpose of reunifying the nation. No increase that would add to the military strength of either side was permitted. North and South Vietnam were to co-operate to bring about a peaceful economic and political union.

While the Geneva talks were going on, Bao Dai, the then acting chief of state of Vietnam, was persuaded by a group of Americans to ask Ngo Dien Diem to become premier of South Vietnam. Diem was a former province governor who had chosen voluntary exile in 1933, rather than join in Ho Chi Minh's anticolonial fight against France. Diem accepted and promptly disposed of Bao Dai, by means of a rigged election in 1955.

Diem renounced the Geneva Accord. He cut off food supplies to North Vietnam and halted postal service. North Vietnam replied with its own violations of the Geneva Accord, chiefly by activating its guerrilla forces in South Vietnam.

Under this Communist pressure, Diem asked for U.S. economic aid and military advice. President Eisenhower extended the aid, with the provision that Diem begin a program of political and economic reforms. Diem promised to do so. He broke his promises, once the aid began flowing, and followed a program of political and religious repression that made him, in every sense, a dictator.

Diem pointedly ignored the Geneva Accord requirement to hold elections in 1956, to reunify Vietnam. The elections would have been a popularity contest between Diem and Ho Chi Minh. There was little doubt that Ho would have won an easy victory. He was by far the more popular man in Vietnam than Diem, due to his resistance against the French and Japanese.

North Vietnam replied to Diem's failure to hold elections with a campaign of guerrilla terrorism in the south. The National Liberation Front, an outgrowth of North Vietnam's Vietminh, was formed in South Vietnam. Forty of its top leaders were native South Vietnamese. Its platform was open war against Diem.

Diem's army could not cope with the Communists. U.S. aid was increased to shore up Diem's regime, despite advice from many quarters that Diem's government was too corrupt to last for long.

Diem's dictatorship was no secret. It was documented in editorials on this page, which said Diem ran a "police state without the efficiency of a police state." We criticized the increase in U.S. aid to support Diem on Aug. 18, 1963, saying Diem's despotic methods were horrifying and "there is no diplomatic or humanitarian reason for supporting Diem."

On Nov. 1, 1963, a military junta overthrew Diem. The following day Diem and his brother Nhu were assassinated.

In the next 18 months South Vietnam had a half-dozen governments. Premier Ky, an air force general, took over in mid-1965. During this period of political upheaval the Communist attacks escalated tremendously. American forces were increased to respond to the growing Communist threat and to prop up the ineffective South Vietnam military forces. The U.S. military commitment rose from 25,000 in July, 1964, to more than 500,000 now in South Vietnam. The scope of the U.S. effort increased from a role as a military adviser to the assumption of the responsibility for defending all of South Vietnam.

In a subsequent editorial we will review the dissent to U.S. policy in Vietnam that has grown in the United States and abroad.

[From the Chicago Sun-Times]

VIETNAM—III

The dissent that swirls about U.S. policy in Vietnam began to take shape in 1955. The argument then was whether the South East Asia Treaty Organization (SEATO) obligated the United States to give direct military aid to South Vietnam to help it resist guerrilla attacks mounted by North Vietnam. Sec. of State Dean Rusk has said, as did John Foster Dulles before him, that the United States is so obligated.

The area of dissent broadened when U.S. military support was given to shore up the dictatorial regimes of South Vietnam's President Diem. The steady escalation of the war has added dimension to the protest, as has the increasing cost of U.S. lives and resources. Those involved in the dissent—key members of both political parties, university professors and students, civil rights officials and others, add to the political pressures felt by the administration as the war continues.

The administration's policy in Vietnam has been consistent since 1949. Four U.S. Presidents have followed a single course, that of the Truman Doctrine of 1947, which was successful in using military force to curb the spread of communism in Europe. Critics of this policy say the effort to contain communism in Southeast Asia should have been made on a political level as well as, or even instead of, the military level.

President Eisenhower's decision to support Diem, come what may, was consistent with the policy he inherited. Earlier, in 1950, John Foster Dulles (who was later to be Mr. Eisenhower's secretary of state) he said, "There is a civil war (in Vietnam) in which we have, for better or worse, involved our prestige. Since that is so, we must help the government we back." Presidents Kennedy and Johnson followed suit, through several changes of government in South Vietnam.

The alternatives to the policy the United States has followed for 17 years in Vietnam have not been numerous. Each posed risks that are difficult to assess. France could have been refused the aid it asked for in 1949. However, at that time, France's cooperation was needed to make NATO an effective alliance.

President Eisenhower could have insisted that the elections called for in the Geneva Accord be held in 1956. Without doubt, as Mr. Eisenhower wrote in his memoirs, Ho Chi Minh would have been an easy winner and the "domino theory," that of one nation falling before another as communism spread, might have resulted.

The various attempts made by the United States and other nations to find a way to bring Hanoi to the bargaining table have been as variously rebuffed. The argument that the United States should have stopped bombing North Vietnam until Hanoi made favorable reply cannot be resolved. The bombing respites have been tried. One lasted for 37 days without favorable response from Hanoi. North Vietnam has consistently refused to negotiate for peace unless the United States first meets its demands—namely—that all U.S. forces get out of South Vietnam.

The United States has as consistently refused to accept this as a precondition to negotiations. What lies ahead will be discussed in a subsequent editorial.

[From the Chicago Sun-Times]

VIETNAM—IV

The overriding question concerning Vietnam is not whether the United States has a vital interest at stake in Asia. Since 1945 every American government has answered that question in the affirmative.

The major questions about Vietnam are these: Is the present U.S. policy there valid? What should it be in the future?

Since 1950, the U.S. policy in Vietnam has been to offer military and economic aid to contain the spread of communism in South Vietnam and Indochina. It is a policy founded in the Truman Doctrine of 1947, which prevented the post-war spread of communism into Western Europe.

That policy has involved this nation in the Vietnam war far deeper than any American ever expected. The United States is winning the war, as Gen. William C. Westmoreland said, in his appearance before Congress on April 28. But, Gen. Westmoreland said, the war will go on for a long time, and cause much suffering.

Gen. Westmoreland's prediction is a reminder that no military solution to the problem of Communist infiltration into South Vietnam has been found in 20 years. Despite more than two years of heavy bombing attacks against North Vietnam's supply dumps, power plants, railroads, bridges, roads and infiltration routes into the south, there are more North Vietnamese troops in South Vietnam than ever before. Despite strenuous efforts to pacify the South Vietnamese countryside, the Communist guerrillas control at least 60 per cent of the land, levy taxes on its citizens, and collect tolls for the use of its roads.

South Vietnam's army has not fought well in its own defense, except on rare occasions. The argument is made that the army is weary after 20 years of combat. But the Viet Cong, Communist guerrillas recruited mainly from South Vietnam still fight with vicious efficiency.

Since President Diem's fall, in 1963, a half-dozen governments have come and gone in South Vietnam, each dutifully supported by the United States. None was a government of or by the people. None was popular. It appears that the United States is about to support yet another unpopular government. Premier Ky, the military leader of South Vietnam, has changed the rules for the election in September to favor his own candidacy for the presidency. He has forbidden the press to criticize him or his military regime. Ky is plainly following the same tactics Diem used in his theft of the 1955 elections, and gives evidence that his ideas of "democracy" may run similar to those held by Diem.

The failure of U.S. policy to come to grips with the situation in Vietnam was illustrated by Sec. of State Dean Rusk, who said, in 1966, that he did not know "where, when, and how this matter (of Vietnam) will be resolved," and that "the nature of a struggle of this sort is, of course, substantially determined by the other side."

As a foreign policy this reflects futility, rather than purpose. It has led to frustration in Washington, to a serious challenge of the administration's credibility by a rising number of citizens, and to a point where dissent with that policy is a matter of national concern .

Had a summit meeting between the United States and Russia been held this week, it might have forced the United States to consider a compromise of some sort that could have led to peace in Vietnam. Failure of the summit meeting to come off still leaves Washington with the obligation to re-examine its policy.

Is it, for example, in the best interests of the United States to continue to support Vietnamese governments whose only redeeming feature is that they are anti-Communist, even when those governments are repressive?

Is it wise to pursue a policy of military containment of communism in South Vietnam that could, if mishap occurred, bring the United States into a land war with Red China?

The United States has computed the costs in money, equipment and time needed to reach the moon. Why does it not compute the eventual, or maximum, cost of the Vietnam operation? Or if it has, why haven't the taxpayers been told?

The Sun-Times believes that the time has come for a serious review of America's foreign policy in Southeast Asia. The review should be made publicly and with candor. It should recognize the facts of 12 years of struggle. It should consider the ideas and suggestions of those who dissent out of their deep concern for what America is doing and where it is going.

Whatever else is said, the United States *is* in Vietnam. It gave its word to protect South Vietnam from Communist aggression—provided, as President Eisenhower plainly said when he began helping South Vietnam—that South Vietnam make an effort to create a viable, representative government. The United States has spilled its blood and spent its treasure to keep that promise. The hope that South Vietnam's leaders will honor that sacrifice made in their nation's behalf by creating a representative government worthy of the name has yet to be demonstrated.

Is the present policy in South Vietnam sound and irrevocable? Or should it, in the light of history and the realities of the present, be changed. If so, how?

These will be painful questions to ask and to answer. They must be asked. They should be answered. With a new cold war developing over the Middle East crisis, the time is especially appropriate for the United States to reassess all its overseas commitments, and to unify the nation behind them. Americans are firmly committed to protect the free portions of the world from Communist takeover. They are entitled, however, to know what the future holds in Vietnam—and elsewhere—and what it may cost.

Mills College Expressionists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 1967

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, located in the Eighth Congressional District of California is an outstanding and well-known institution of high learning, Mills College. The young ladies who attend this school display a high degree of individuality and express themselves in many and varied ways. It is not so much a dissent on their part but, rather, an effort to establish communication between the students and faculty. An article appearing in a recent edition of the Oakland Tribune illustrates their attempts along this line. I congratulate the "new expressionists" and commend the reading of this article to all who are interested in our colleges and the young people who attend them today:

[From the Oakland (Calif.) Tribune, June 18, 1967]

MILLS: THE NEW EXPRESSIONISTS

(By Nancy Turpin)

They talk a lot at Mills College. When the girls are dissatisfied with their classes, they say so. When the professors want work from their students, they call a meeting and say so. When the girls have new ideas about the kinds of rules that should influence their lives, they say so.

Several Mills girls gathered for an interview on the lawn recently and described the kinds and quality of exchange on their campus.

Discussion happens in the weekly campus paper "The Millstream," which some of the students claimed has become a gadfly press during the past two years.

The Associated Students of Mills College, headed this year by Dusty Waller, is another place where the talking continues. All meetings are open to interested students.

But the student government is sometimes considered too close to the administration, so an informal group of student ombudsmen, the Pondering Ten, was commissioned last year to represent student problems and student complaints to the administrators.

The group was suggested by President C. Easton Rothwell, the original ten were chosen by the student council president, and within two months the Mills students were taking their dissatisfaction to the Ponderers, who communicated it to President C. Easton Rothwell.

Lorna Brown was in the first group of ten, and said she enjoyed being able to articulate her own opinions in that position. She relinquished her membership in it this year when she was elected president of her residence hall and said that in the new office she is sometimes forced into a "hypocritical position."

As president, Lorna feels she must often live by rules she thinks are trivial or wrong, to set an example to the girls in the hall. Lorna admitted her attitude presumes that a certain percentage of her hallmates are impressionable and unable to act for themselves.

When she accepted the office, she didn't realize the complications that would ensue. But now that they have, she is trying to change the "offensive" rules. This year she campaigned among the girls in her house to end the dress-up rule.

The discrepancy between personal beliefs and official duties is one that is felt by other student leaders. Dusty Waller said that the study body president can be thankful for the Pondering Ten, because that group can be an indirect means of revealing her opinions to the college president.

And Susan McKenna, new chairman of the Associated Students' judicial committee, said that she and her committee must help the administration "enforce the law, even if we don't like the law."

In the coming year Susan will be working with other students, faculty members and the new Mills president, Dr. Robert Wert, on an evaluation of the Mills honor system. The deadline is Feb., 1968. And the subject is gigantic.

A major criticism of the honor system, which applies to students' academic and personal lives, was expressed by Lorna Brown: "It covers too much."

She added that when the honor system includes such supposedly minute items as the hours when hair dryers may or may not be used in rooms, it is not difficult to break the rules.

Another dissatisfaction comes from the honor system premise that girls will turn in their friends for transgressions. Official procedure at this time calls for the person observing an infraction to speak to the girl at fault. If she doesn't respond to this "treatment," she should be referred to the judicial committee—or the dean of students. Students balk at following these instructions.

Lorna said she didn't think students should make themselves responsible for reprimanding one another. "What a girl does is her business."

Dusty favored keeping the criticism on a girl-to-girl basis but believed certain situations might warrant outside help. And Mona Yazdi remembered the time three years ago when she knew a student was considering suicide. Mona wasn't sure how to handle the problem and finally discussed it with a discreet administrator who worked with the girl.

What some of the girls favored was a personal honor system that would allow girls to live by their own values.

Later, in the president's office, Dr. Rothwell smiled benevolently and called the kind of relative honor system requested "a utopian state of anarchy. It is hard to have a community without a unified code," he explained.

Then he added, "If you don't agree with the code of the community, change it. These girls are quite effective at this."

The honor code isn't the only "sacred cow" Mills girls are stalking. They're also going after the rule that undergraduates must live on campus. Evelyn Smith is a member of the student-faculty committee formed to study the problem. "It's been in committee for a year," she said with fatigue.

The girls who resent the on-campus requirement say the college is trying to protect them by keeping them in the residence halls. "It always goes back to in loco parentis," Curs Robb said.

But Curs didn't want the college to "replace" her parents and said she thought her parents didn't want it, either.

Dr. Mary Woods Bennett, Mills provost and dean of faculty, explained the official rationale for on-campus living. "I suppose in 1852 it was 'in loco parentis', but it isn't now and hasn't been for years.

"The description of the college includes 'residential' because of the conviction that there is an educational value in living together. Also that there is a freedom from distraction. But the matter is under study." It seems that it's difficult for an administration spokesman to make a statement without concluding with "but this is under study."

Even the quality of the "study" is being scrutinized by some of the Mills girls. They discussed the student conferences that President Rothwell held so frequently. "He took a lot from us in terms of misinformation, and he had a tremendous amount of patience," Dusty Waller said.

But about President Rothwell's approach to opinions he thought were incorrect, one girl recalled: "You were squashed between two down pillows and you didn't know you had been squashed."

Mimi Dye and Cindy Duncan, the new editors of "Millstream," complained of a "secrecy" in the student administration discussions.

"I'm afraid I'm for dramatic confrontation that will bring the whole campus into issues," the editors said.

Dr. Rothwell was surprised at their reaction and did not know of any basis for their objection. He said he thought communication between himself and students was good and that problems received proper attention.

Campus affairs do not occupy all of the attention of Mills students, however, and Dr. Rothwell and the girls are proud of the speakers program that has included Stokeley Carmichael, Saul Alinksy and Max Rafferty, this year. In May, half the student body, 300 girls, went with their dates to a faculty panel on the Vietnamese war. Then, a week later, they heard the Air Force general who has coordinated the Vietnamese air strikes. The girls listened politely and cornered him with questions.

During the very inconvenient pre-final exams time, a group of girls organized a Saturday car caravan in support of the Delano grape pickers' strike.

On June 11, more than 100 Mills seniors were graduated. Approximately half of them will enroll in a graduate school, according to past statistics. Within five years a majority of them will be married and beginning their families, according to Mills alumnae statistics.

And a percentage of them will be equipped to evaluate their communities and work within the existing power structure for the necessary changes.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402, at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H–112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

Appendix

Wise Words From President Johnson on the Best Ways To Fight Crime

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK BROOKS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 26, 1967

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson last week spoke about a matter of vital public concern—the rising crime rate. He noted that two important pieces of legislation—the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention Act and the Safe Streets and Crime Control Act—are now before Congress.

The need for this legislation is obvious—and I am sure my colleagues will promptly and positively enact both of these bills.

But as the President noted in his remarks to the National Council on Crime and Delinquency, "the problem of crime is embedded in the conditions of society itself. It involves the question of how people live, and what kind of stake they have in the life of their Nation."

What is this stake? It is based on full opportunity, on adequate schooling, on a decent home and neighborhood, on the chance for a good job and a good future.

And the President rightly noted that vital programs to provide these opportunities are now pending before Congress.

It is clear, as the President said, that we cannot do our duty to the thousands of young Americans who want a chance at a decent future by objecting to such programs as the model cities, the war on poverty, or to the Teachers Corps.

We are against crime. But that is not enough. We must be for progress—progress or bettering the human condition, for improving the economic and social standards of our people, and for expanding the boundaries of opportunity for all Americans.

The 90th Congress must keep faith with the people's needs.

Under unanimous consent I insert into the RECORD the text of the President's remarks to the National Council on Crime and Delinquency:

TEXT OF THE REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT BEFORE THE NATIONAL COUNCIL ON CRIME AND DELINQUENCY

I welcome you here as companions in concern for America's future.

Maintaining public order is the basic need of society. Your concern for that basic issue—as citizens, as leaders of the business community—is a promise that this Nation's attack on crime and delinquency can succeed.

The work of the National Crime Commission—just completed this spring—threw light on some dark landscapes. One lesson became clear: if we can reduce juvenile delinquency, we will have the key to reversing the rising rate of crime.

The facts are tragic:

400,000 American boys and girls were behind bars last year awaiting trial. 100,000 of them were locked up with hardened criminals—in jailhouses instead of schoolhouses.

One out of every six boys in our land will go to juvenile court before his 18th birthday.

The rate of repeated crime is highest among criminals who began as juvenile delinquents.

These are confessions of failure. The day a boy appears before the bar of justice to answer for a crime, he has failed. But on that same day, we have failed, too—as a society—because we did not prevent that confrontation.

Before the Congress now is a major Juvenile Delinquency Prevention Act. For the first time, it will enable communities to plan their own assaults on delinquency—to prevent careers in crime, not just to punish them.

Before the Congress now is the Safe Streets and Crime Control Act—a proposal to strengthen the police forces, the correctional systems and the courts of this country. The House Judiciary Committee this morning reported the Safe Streets and Crime Control Act of 1967. This is a major step forward in Crime Control and Safer Streets for every citizen.

America needs that legislation now. I urge the House and Senate to promptly complete action on that measure.

But the problem of crime is imbedded in the conditions of society itself. It involves the question of how people live, and what kind of stake they have in the life of their Nation.

Most juvenile delinquency—although not all—is rooted in poverty.

Most careers in crime begin in a world without hope.

The most urgent picture of delinquency is of a boy, trapped in that world, who cannot find his way out.

He is surrounded by America's abundance—but he feels failure in his own heart.

Before he is a man, he faces his future over the point of a knife or the end of a gun.

We can never conquer delinquency until we can break that cycle of failure.

That is why the problem is more than improved courts and correctional systems and police procedures—fundamental though these are.

Our task is to build a ladder for the young Americans born into that dark and hopeless world.

For most boys and girls in this nation, the rungs of that ladder are normal conditions of life:

Medical care to provide health for the body.

Adequate schools with competent teachers.

A decent home to live in.

The opportunity to train for a good job at a good wage.

Programs to provide these are now before the Congress.

But we are hearing again old voices of fear and distrust, which have always blocked progress.

They object now to the Model Cities Program. They object to the War on Poverty. They object to the Teachers Corps.

The voice of the people—willing to plan and invest in the future of this Nation—must be louder than that tired old chorus of objection.

I hope you will go back to your communities and inspire your neighbors with a new understanding. Help them to see that we can stop careers in crime before they begin—and convert them into careers of promise and productivity.

Thank you for coming here today.

Barrel of Suet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 26, 1967

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the public attitude toward taxes might at times might require us to paraphrase Mark Twain, "Everybody talks about taxes, but nobody does anything about them." Suburban Life, an independent chain of newspapers serving southwest suburban Chicago, attempts to do something about it in a very timely and concise editorial in its Thursday, June 22, edition. The impact of Federal involvement and cost are dramatically emphasized in the editorial, which I insert in the RECORD at this point:

BARREL OF SUET

Of recent vintage is a trend by lawmakers at the federal and state levels to introduce proposals to share the federal income with the taxpayers.

The proposals range from providing for a federal tax credit to persons who pay state income taxes to returning to municipalities federal money on a per capita basis.

A number of federal legislators have sent inquiries to their constituents asking a question similar to this:

"Do you favor a tax sharing plan which would return a certain percentage of federal tax revenue to the states with no strings attached?

"Yes" was the overwhelming answer.

But some congressmen asked a companion question: "Would you favor such a program if it made necessary an increase in federal taxes?"

An even larger majority said "No."

In other words, yes, give us the money, but no, we don't want to pay for it.

What it all boils down to is that more and more states are finding themselves in financial trouble and are looking for an easy way out.

But there is no easy way out. All it amounts to is that the states would then be picking up funds from the federal government at a taxpayer cost higher than most are paying now.

Furthermore, the suburban areas would be the big losers. The taxpaying ability is greater in the suburbs than in most sections of the big cities. But the suburban taxpayers would receive little benefit from the added expenditures because most of the do re mi would be sent to the central areas of the cities.

And then there's the matter of control. While the federal government constantly proclaims that its dole is to be used at local discretion the opposite is true.

Look to the number of road projects that are held up because federal standards are not met, even though local requirements may be as stringent, if not more so.

Look to the schools which accept federal money and you will find federal controls. The Head Start program is a good example of what the schools are being required to do.

If the lawmakers are really interested in giving the taxpayer a break they should start talking seriously about reducing the cost of government at the local, county, state and federal levels.

Budgets at all levels of government are skyrocketing. For instance, the Illinois budget for the next biennium is a record $6 billion, $1.5 billion over the last. It will cost the state of Illinois $2,000 per family.

All levels of government should put their houses in order. Let them cut out the frills, knock off the unnecessary patronage jobs, maintain more efficient and economical housekeeping and administrative operations, eliminate the tax eating, nonproductive bureaus and insist on a full day's work for a full day's pay from the employees.

The lawmakers know where the fat is; let 'em trim it.

Let's Be Correct

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 26, 1967

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, whenever foreigners are exposed to Americans, they become convinced that Americans are a very friendly people. Perhaps the impression of this fact on Soviet Premier Kosygin can be considered the biggest gain we derived from the Premier's visit to the United States. Mr. Kosygin can return to Russia reflecting on the very fine treatment he received in the United States, remembering that Americans are both friendly and rational.

While it is well that we show our true friendly nature when we are entertaining guests—as we did when Premier Kosygin visited us—it would be well, in dealing with international affairs, if we were to be more firm than friendly.

Jenkin Lloyd Jones has an interesting article in this respect in the June 24 issue of the Evening Star, a piece which I am inserting into the RECORD for the convenience of my colleagues. The article follows:

IT'S TIME TO BE STIFFLY CORRECT

(By Jenkin Lloyd Jones)

The time may have arrived when the American people should quit trying to be so puppy-dog friendly to the world and assume a more dignified posture of "correctness."

Americans are, perhaps, the friendliest people on earth. Part of it comes from our bigness and isolation. At home we see few foreigners. An alien accent intrigues us. In any erudite cocktail party the crowd is generally thickest around the foreign visitor.

We have, for a long time, suffered from a missionary guilt complex. It's an interesting combination of smugness and concern. We are proud of the "American way." We feel sure that our outlooks and techniques are superior to those of most other countries. We would like to share our wisdom. Hence, the missionary. On the other hand, we are easily guilt-ridden because of our relative opulence. So we give, often lavishly.

Our British cousins in their great days were somewhat like us, but not much. They were eloquently and sometimes arrogantly proud of the empire. They wept a little for the heathen. They had their heroic missionaries and teachers who went forth into the pools of ignorance and fever to discourage infanticide, stop cannibalism and outlaw suttee. But hard on their heels came the flag and the traders.

As the Basuto chief bitterly told one of my old anthropology professors, "When the white man came here he had the Bible and we had the land. Now we've got the Bible and he's got the land."

Among the more recent colonial powers you might classify, in descending order of humanity, the French, the Dutch, the Belgians, the Germans and the Japanese. The Russians were never well enough organized in the 18th and 19th centuries to seize distant lands from primitive peoples. But in their conquest and treatment of the European satellites they would go to the bottom of the list.

Only the Americans were haunted by their strength and nervous about their prosperity. Only the Americans set forth wistfully to make the world love them.

Funny thing. The Israelis bombed a U.N. force in the Gaza Strip and nine Indian and two Brazilian soldiers were killed. The diplomats in the U.N. Security Council all tried to top each other in expressions of regret and and grief. But 54,000 Americans died in what was billed as an official U.N. action in Korea. How much weeping did the United Nations do for our boys?

There is the human inclination to make the friend of your enemy your enemy. All our largesse to India was forgotten the moment we gave arms to Pakistan. And the Pakistanis damned us for our aid to India.

For many years Americans tried to make themselves loved in the Near East. The American University in Beirut has educated generations of Arab leaders. We were lavish with Fulbright scholarships. We poured tremendous aid funds into Arab nations, including those whose oil-rich sheiks bought Cadillacs by the shipload and rented whole hotels in Switzerland.

But because America has promoted Israel we were hated. And when Gamal Abdel Nasser, in the bleak early hours of June 6, tried to alibi the collapse of his air force by claiming that American and British planes had shot it down, the whole Near East bought it immediately. Mobs converged on the American embassies. The American libraries went up in flames.

Maybe we ought to relax. Maybe we should quit trying to be loved. Maybe we should assume that we will be spit on. America is a complacent dragon, a fine beast on which to beat with wooden swords and have one's picture taken standing on its back. Hatred of it is a huge convenience for a government entangled in its on stupidity.

So be it. If we expect to be hated we will be freer to do intelligent things. We won't have to keep shoring up corrupt regimes in the hope that they will become reliable friends. We can spend our foreign aid more wisely. We can seal off some famous rat holes.

We can say, "Look, your excellency. Your mob burnt our free library, which happens to be the biggest and best in your country. If you want it back, jail the leaders and build us a building. We'll just replace the books."

Or, "See here, your highness. We figure you'll gut us the first time it's convenient, but in the meantime we'd like to help your people. If you've got a sound plan and a way to keep your gang from cracking the safe we may bankroll it."

This kind of talk will make more sense to more people than our past habit of turning the other cheek with a sickly grin. Everybody's pal—hell! It just didn't work. Let's be stiffly correct for a change, and maybe they'll conclude we're not so crazy after all.

Sharing Federal Income Taxes With the 50 States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 26, 1967

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, on May 3 of this year the Senate of the State of Illinois drafted a joint resolution calling upon the Congress to adopt a system of sharing Federal income taxes with the 50 States. The funds for this venture would be provided through the elimination of the Federal grants-in-aid program. Presently, the grants-in-aid program in Illinois appears to be hopelessly stymied within the clutches of a bureaucratic bearhug. In short, it seems it is incapable of rolling out anything but the redtape for the would-be recipients of Federal funds. State Senators Arrington, Peterson, Coulson, and Merritt have presented a tightly reasoned argument, and I heartily recommend that my colleagues give it every consideration as a possible solution to this problem:

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 63

(Offered by Senators Arrington, Peterson Coulson and Merritt)

Whereas, To provide the kinds of services the people need and the financial and technical assistance the State and local governments need, the States must be made into a viable force for constructive change and progress; and

Whereas, Rapidly increasing costs of health, education and welfare programs, coupled with dynamic expansion of population have placed financial burdens upon the States and local governments beyond the capacicty of their traditional tax resources to bear; and

Whereas, The Federal government dilutes potential sources of State revenue by extracting billions of dollars from the several States through the process of imposing burdensome and inhibiting Federal taxes upon the individual taxpayer; and

Whereas, the individual States, which are directly responsive to the people, are in a more effective position to provide solutions for their own particular problems if the Federal government were to share these tax resources with the States; and

Whereas, The Federal grant-in-aid system has not alleviated the tenuous financial condition of the States, but rather it has devolved into an unfortunate program of confusion, duplication and overlap. The resultant impenetrable administrative entanglement has in many cases caused the administrative costs to absorb more than half of the available funds; and

Whereas, The Federal government is too far removed from the individual problems of the States to manage state programs efficiently; and

Whereas, The severe financial condition of the States could be rectified by implementing a system of partnership, whereby the Federal government would share its revenue resources by returning to the States each year a portion of the Federal income taxes collected therein with a simultaneous phasing out of restricted Federal grants; therefore, be it

Resolved, By the Senate of the Seventy-fifth General Assembly of the State of Illinois, the House of Representatives concurring herein, That we respectfully petition the Congress of the United States to provide, without restrictions, a system for the sharing of Federal income taxes with the several States out of funds provided both by cutbacks and elimination of existing and projected expansions of Federal grant-in-aid programs, and from the increased revenue provided by our burgeoning national economy, so as to facilitate the capacity of our State and local governments to provide a more meaningful response to the needs of the people; and, be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this Resolution be forwarded by the Secretary of State to every member of the Congress of the United States from the State of Illinois, and the Governor and the presiding officers of the Legislatures of each of the other forty-nine states.

Adopted by the Senate, May 3, 1967.

SAMUEL H. SHAPIRO,
President of the Senate.
EDWARD E. FERNANDES,
Secretary of the Senate.

Concurred in by the House of Representatives, June 15, 1967.

——— ———,
Speaker of House of Representatives.
FREDERIC B. SELCKE,
Clerk of House of Representatives.

FCC "Fairness" Rule on Cigarettes Seems Ominous

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 26, 1967

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

FCC "FAIRNESS" RULE ON CIGARETTES SEEMS OMINOUS

There's no particular panic among broadcasters over the Federal Communications Commission's recent statement on cigarette advertising, but there is plenty of long-term concern. It isn't the statement itself that has them worried, it's the questions posed by the extension of the so-called "fairness doctrine" into the area of advertising.

TV already carries specials on smoking and messages from such groups as the American Cancer Society. The immediate requirement, presumably, can be met by expanding these. Up to now, however, the "fairness doctrine" has functioned purely in the field of radio and TV editorializing. In effect, the FCC now has tagged commercials as controversial broadcasts within the meaning of the "doctrine," and this raises some very involved questions.

A primary question, of course, is the possibility that this ruling may be further extended to other advertising—beer commercials, for example—which some viewer may consider controversial. For the present, at least, the FCC's intention apparently is to limit the ruling to cigarettes on the grounds that they have been rated a possible health hazard. But the precedent has been set.

Second, what it adequate airing of the other side? Unlike the "equal time" provision, the "fairness doctrine" does not require a minute-for-minute rebuttal—it lets the station decide what's "fair." When it comes to commercials, this may be difficult to assess.

Finally, there's some feeling that the commission may have staged an end-run around Congress, which had the option of laying down conditions for broadcast advertising for cigarettes and didn't exercise it.

All these points have to be weighed before the broadcasters deliver their comments, but they will deliver them and probably at a high level.

Thurgood Marshall—Cheating Pays

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. RARICK
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 26, 1967

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, whatever platitudes and praise that can be dug up to justify Thurgood Marshall's appointment to the U.S. Supreme Court, the truth remains that he is dishonest—and his deeds against the American people have never been repudiated or corrected.

There are, I am certain, many Negro lawyers—and every American Negro, all who can trace their lineage back, are of slave ancestry. There are many who worked their way through college and law school as have many whites.

But there are also Negro lawyers who are morally and professionally honest and dedicated to the American constitutional Government under which the United States will survive, or without which our country will perish. Marshall's appointment must, then, have been for some other consideration than that he was a deserving Negro.

The record of Thurgood Marshall as a scamp, a cheat, and user of false evidence in the Brown case was restated in the June 26, 1967, U.S. News & World Report at page 13. What a minute shade of difference between Marshall's demeanor in the Brown case from the crime of bribing judges, or the use of a bought witness with perjured testimony at a trial. Is not the witnesses' oath to "tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth"?

He bought his verdict and now the American people are asked to reward a dishonest man by giving him a lifetime appointment to the Supreme Court. Cheating dare not prosper—for if it prosper none dare call it cheating. His record and past deeds offer more basis for removal from office than for elevation to the bench.

Mr. Speaker, I include the U.S. News & World Report article following my comments:

AN INSIDE STORY OF THE MARSHALL ROLE IN THE SCHOOL-DESEGREGATION DECISION

Insight into the attitude of Thurgood Marshall toward the Constitution and the law is revealed in a speech that was made on Dec. 28, 1961, by a history professor.

This speech is getting attention of Senators. It was made by Alfred H. Kelly, professor of history at Wayne State University, Detroit, before the American Historical Association in Washington, D.C.

In July, 1953, Thurgood Marshall, as counsel for the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, had asked Mr. Kelly—among others—to prepare a research paper on the intent of framers of the Fourteenth Amendment with respect to constitutionality of segregated schools.

FOR A "PLAUSIBLE" CASE

The paper, according to Mr. Kelly, was to be used by NAACP lawyers preparing a brief for argument before the Supreme Court. Aim of the brief, said Mr. Kelly, was to provide a "plausible" historical case for ruling that the Fourteenth Amendment was intended by its framers to forbid racial segregation.

Mr. Kelly joined the research group, which included 125 historians, political scientists, constitutional lawyers and educators. Their conference was held in September of 1953.

"Ten days later, early in October," Mr. Kelly told the Historical Association, "I was surprised to receive a phone call from Thurgood Marshall. . . . My help, he said with careful flattery, was needed very badly on the brief. My vanity thus touched to the quick, I came."

This time there was a group of 12. The result of their work was a paper based, Mr. Kelly said, "on the theory that it would not do to get too far involved in specific historical detail with respect to framer intent, and that the association's case might best be cast in very generalized terms with a deliberate avoidance of the particular."

Mr. Kelly continued in his address:

"This tactic, Marshall now informed us, might get past two or three of the Justices, but it would darn well never get past [Justices] Frankfurter or Douglas. 'I gotta argue these cases,' Thurgood said, 'and if I try this approach, those fellows will shoot me down in flames.'

"I am very much afraid that for the next few days I ceased to function as a historian and, instead, took up the practice of law without a license. The problem we faced was not the historian's discovery of the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth; the problem instead was the formulation of an adequate gloss on the fateful events of 1866 sufficient to convince the Court that we had something of a historical case. . . .

"It is not that we were engaged in formulating lies; there was nothing as crude and naive as that. But we were using facts, emphasizing facts, being down on facts, sliding off facts, quietly ignoring facts, and, above all, interpreting facts in a way to do what Marshall said we had to do—'get by those boys down there.'

"There was one optimistic element in all this, as Marshall pointed out: It was obvious that the Court was looking for a plausible historical answer. . . .

"In other words, Marshall said, we didn't need to win a historical argument hands down—all we needed was a face-saving draw. 'A nothing-to-nothing score,' Marshall put it, 'means we win the ball game.' I believe, by the way, that this was a correct interpretation of the Court's mood. . . .

"gradually, in the next three days, we hammered out a strategy. . . .

"The Fourteenth Amendment, we told ourselves, had been necessary to accomplish a vast sweep of purpose far beyond the Civil Rights Act. Here we came down hard on [Senator Jacob Merritt] Howard's announcement that the purpose of the Amendment had been to abolish all class and caste in the United States. And we pounced on a phrase Jay Graham [a constitutional historian] had dug up: Bingham [Representative John A. Bingham], in defending the Amendment in the House, had indeed said Congress now was writing a constitutional provision, not drafting a statute; that statutes are writ sharp and narrow and specific but constitutions are writ broad for ages yet unborn. . . .

"This is the argument, essentially, that you will find incorporated in the historical portions of the NAACP brief as it went to the Court. This is the argument Marshall used in oral argument in answer to questions from the Justices. . . .

"I am convinced now that this interpretation, which we hammered out with anything but historical truth as our objective, nonetheless contains an essential measure of historical truth.

"History is art as well as fact; everyone in this room knows that the facts do not automatically arrange themselves without the historian's creative leap, which occurs in our craft as well as in the exact sciences. . . .

"In May came the now-historic decision in Brown v. Board, in which Mr. Justice Warren, speaking for a unanimous Court, threw out Plessy and announced that henceforth State statutes supporting school segregation were declared to be unconstitutional under the Fourteenth Amendment. . . ."

DISAGREEMENT ON INTENT

"Warren's opinion noted briefly," Mr. Kelly continued, "that there was a general disagreement among opposing counsel and historians about what the Amendment as of 1866 had been intended to mean, and thereupon proceeded to junk the historical approach entirely and instead to settle the question of segregation on straight-out sociological grounds: Racial segregation in the schools, in the context of the twentieth century, bred social inferiority for the Negro and must, therefore, be outlawed. . . .

"This does not mean the historical argument was without meaning in the Court's opinion. It seems probable, at least, that had historical inquiry resulted in a general inability on the part of the NAACP to make a plausible case—shown, in short, that the Fourteenth Amendment clearly and obviously had not been intended to touch segregation—the Court's embarrassment would have been great enough to cause it to put over the critical decision to discard segregation under the Amendment, at least for a time.

"But the historians had produced at least the 'draw' that Marshall and his colleagues had asked for. It was all they needed in order to win.

"So we historians can assure ourselves, I think, that we had something to do with the victory. Thurgood Marshall, at all odds, presently wrote some of us letters of thanks, assuring us that enlisting the history profession on his side had been the NAACP's smartest move in the whole complicated case."

United Nations: A Slight Gleam of Hope

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 26, 1967

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, the talks just ended between President Johnson and Soviet Premier Kosygin apparently produced little by way of substantive agreement between them, but they demonstrated that there are links between the problems in Vietnam, the turmoil in the Middle East, and the continuing issue of arms control.

In a column in the New York Times of Sunday, June 25, Mr. James Reston stated that—

> Secretary of State Rusk has been saying lately that there was "no organic link" between the problems in Vietnam and the problems in the Middle East and the problems of arms shipments and control.
>
> But organic or no, the problems are obviously linked politically and psychologically. Each is poisoning the entire body of world politics.

Because of the scope and complexity of these problems, Mr. Reston explained:

> The question now is not whether Johnson and Kosygin have been able to deal with the details of these questions—obviously they have not—but whether they can get at the heart of the problem, which is the dominion and fear on both sides, and whether they can keep the dialogue going at the highest levels of decision.

Mr. Reston states that as a result of the Glassboro meetings, "there is a chance—probably no more than that—to continue and expand the talks."

Because of the potential for peace in even the chance for continued and expanded talks, I urge my colleagues to read Mr. Reston's column with care.

The article follows:

[From the New York Times, June 25, 1967]

UNITED NATIONS: A SLIGHT GLEAM OF HOPE

(By James Reston)

UNITED NATIONS, N.Y., June 24.—The importance of the Johnson-Kosygin talks is that they have linked the major problems of Vietnam, the Middle East and arms control, and changed both the level and the scope of the East-West discussions.

As long as each of these questions was discussed separately, and as long as they remained in the propaganda pit of the United Nations, the outlook was bleak. Both sides were locked into hopelessly contradictory positions on Vietnam and the Arab-Israeli war; both had taken commitments to their embattled clients; and the public recriminations over television merely envenomed the debate.

SAFETY IN NUMBERS?

Now, however, there is a chance—probably no more than that—to continue and expand the talks. Usually, it is better to deal diplomatically with one practical problem at a time, but occasionally it is easier to reach agreement on very large objectives, and this may be such a time.

For example, the two sides have reached an impasse on the single issue of stopping the bombing of North Vietnam and going to negotiations to end that war. The political lines have been drawn tight on this narrow but important issue within the United States. But if President Johnson and Chairman Kosygin were to formalize the search for a general settlement of world issues, it would be much easier to end the bombing during such an inquiry.

Already, the preliminary conversations between the two leaders have influenced at least one policy decision in Washington on the war in Vietnam. Secretary of Defense McNamara was just about to start for Saigon when Chairman Kosygin arrived in this country. His purpose was fairly clear. President Johnson had committed himself to give General Westmoreland whatever troops he requested. The general is understood to have requested another 100,000 men and Mr. McNamara was going to Vietnam to make a recommendation to the President on this issue.

When Premier Kosygin arrived here at the United Nations, the McNamara trip was postponed. The Secretary found himself, much to his surprise, not in Saigon but at the summit talks at Glassboro State College in New Jersey. Obviously it would be awkward to send another 100,000 American troops to Vietnam if serious conversations for a wider East-West accommodation were in process.

MOSCOW'S PROBLEMS

The Soviet Government is in a comparable position in the Middle East. While Mr. Kosygin was talking to President Johnson, President Podgorny of the U.S.S.R was in Cairo talking to President Nasser of the United Arab Republic about replacing the two or three billions of dollars worth of arms lost in the Israeli war.

In an atmosphere of mounting tension, with Moscow and Washington divided and Peking trying to replace Soviet influence in the Middel East, the military escalation was likely to continue in both places. It still may go forward anyway, but the Johnson-Kosygin talks have at least given both sides a little time to discuss whether it is in anybody's interest to continue along this same costly military journey.

Similarly, Moscow and Washington are on the verge of a spectacular new phase of the arms race. The President and particularly Secretary McNamara have been extremely reluctant to get into the development of an anti-balistic missile system, which would cost about $60 billion in the next seven years, but the more the tension mounts and spreads from Vietnam to the Middle East, the more likely it is that this upward spiral of rearmament will continue.

The question now is not whether Johnson and Kosygin have been able to deal with the details of these questions—obviously they have not—but whether they can get at the heart of the problem, which is the dominion of fear on both sides, and whether they can keep the dialogue going at the highest levels of decision.

These talks cannot safely be left to Johnson and Kosygin and their foreign secretaries. Europe, the Middle East, Southeast Asia and China have all been apprehensive that the two most powerful nations, the United States and the U.S.S.R., would make a deal to follow parallel policies that might not be in the interest of other nations in other parts of the world.

Accrodingly, the need to enlarge the scope of the talks to include President de Gaulle of France and Prime Minister Wilson of Britain is fairly obvious. De Gaulle proposed such a Big Four meeting at the height of the Middle Eastern crisis, but it was turned down by Moscow, and it is still not clear that Kosygin is ready yet for such ambitious negotiations.

THE CONNECTION

Secretary of State Rusk has been saying lately that there was "no organic link" between the problems in Vietnam and the problems in the Middle East and the problems of arms shipments and control.

But organic or no, the problems are obviously linked politically and psychologically. Each is poisoning the entire body of world politics. Each problem is frozen by itself, but for a general accommodation and easing of world tensions, concessions might be made that are impossible in the narrow context of Vietnam itself.

No doubt this is reaching well beyond the present phase of the Johnson-Kosygin talks. If left where they are, the summit meeting at Glassboro State College could go down in history as little more than an amusing insult to Princeton, but if continued and expanded, they could provide more freedom of diplomatic maneuver than exists today.

Commencement Address by the Honorable Gladys M. Dorman, at the Second Commencement Exercises, Kingsborough Community College

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 26, 1967

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on June 12, 1967, I had the pleasure of attending the second commencement exercises of Kingsborough Community College.

Of special note was the commencement address given by the Honorable Gladys M. Dorman, chairman of the Kingsborough Community College committee of the board of higher education.

Mrs. Dorman dealt specifically with the ever-widening gap between today's younger generation and the generation of their parents. She also suggested how this gap may be narrowed so that parent and child may once again understand each other.

I commend to the attention of our colleagues Mrs. Dorman's remarks to the graduates of Kingsborough Community College, as follows:

THE BRIDGE BETWEEN GENERATIONS

(Commencement address by the Honorable Gladys M. Dorman, chairman, Kingsborough Community College Committee of the Board of Higher Education, second commencement exercises, Kingsborough Community College, Monday evening, June 12, 1967, Whitman Auditorium, Brooklyn College)

President Hartstein, Chairman Porter Chandler, Mr. Iushewitz, Borough President Stark, graduates and parents.

"Now is the time the walrus said to talk of many things, of shoes and ships and sealing wax and cabbages and kings and why the sea boils so bright and whether pigs have wings."

Five years from now none of you graduates will remember *who* spoke at your commencement. But I am hoping that some of the parents in the audience will remember not *who* I am but something of *what* I said.

Commencement speakers generally offer fatuous advice about the future and what a glorious part you graduates are going to play. What does the future hold for you? LSD? Picket lines? Vietnam? War? Peace? I do not know the answers!

I do *know* the answer to this. Why don't newspapers write about the 97% of the young people who are clean, decent, thoughtful, involved young men and women who work for a living, go to school, get good grades, take advantage of their opportunities and become good citizens? It's very simple. That would not sell newspapers!

The vocal 3% who commit crimes, use drugs, refuse to work, slam their hot rods into each other—that's the kind of news which boosts the circulation of the newspapers!

Therefore the parents cry out indignantly that this is a generation without manners, decency or consideration. Are they right? Before we answer that accusation perhaps we should look at the other side of the coin!

Parents are indicted for income tax frauds, Senators are investigated for pay-roll padding, judges are removed from the bench for unprofessional conduct, governmental aides are bribed, scoflaws walk the streets unafraid.

Children cry out "Your generation is pragmatic, materialistic, dishonest, selfish and immoral! Are *they* right? Did they, too, forget about the 97% of the parents, who are industrious, moral, self-sacrificing, and decent and whose names never get into the newspapers?

As Al Smith used to say "Let's look at the record." I am a parent and also an attorney. Therefore, let me plead my cause without belittling the claims of your generation.

The parents of today are the products of the depression and World War II. We have lived through those years and our lives are permanently scarred by the battles. To you those years are only printed pages in a history book.

Perhaps you do not like ancient history? You will never have any rapport with your parents if you do not understand the events which molded them.

In the 1930's young people with education, talent, initiative and ability could not get any job—let alone, a job for which they were fitted—and there was no hope for the future! At that point fear became a controlling factor in their lives. They sought a steady job which insured them the necessities of life. They *were* materialistic and pragrmatic! This was a fact of life as we lived it. But was this all there was to their lives? No, there was under this facade, idealistic involvement. There was the "Scottsboro Boys", the "Abraham Lincoln Brigade," the "W.P.A. Theater," the close family relationships and mutual aid. There was the self-denial of early marriage and the self-denial by birth control of the right to raise families. Your parents were involved in the issues of their *own* youth.

Then came World War II and most people were emotionally involved in what they felt was an idealistic war. Many sacrifices were made and for us, who survived, we left our *youth* behind.

After the war a steady job was not only available but was spurned by many who sought and obtained richer rewards in more adventuresome fields. Not all were so fortunate—there were some who did not fit into our highly technological society and had to continue to live on the fringes of want and hunger. There were others who because of their race, color or ethnic background were denied the full achievement of their capabilities.

With the coming of the affluent society, several factors appeared. People, who had arrived, had a guilt complex and started to work in community activities to benefit the less fortunate. Society, itself, took its own measure and found that certain segments of our population were not part of our "Great Society." However, the individual involvement was not complete because the measure of security for them was *not* absolute.

All segments of society have a common aim. The children of the future should have more than their parents. Exactly what does that mean? More cars? Larger houses? More money? Better jobs? More education? Essentially it should mean that each of the younger generation shall to the best of his own ability be given the opportunity to work for his own standard of achievement in a society, without the fear of want, without the fear of ridicule, and to know that he can walk with dignity.

There are often side effects of any philosophy.

Parents became afraid of their children. They were afraid to deny them anything because it might have a traumatic effect on them. They gave them toys, allowances, cars and privileges, and by these concessions they tried to buy their love. They forgot that children need a certain amount of discipline not only for the particular act involved but as an expression that the parents care about them. Most important they forgot that nothing creative is ever achieved without self-discipline.

Now your generation is in revolt. You say that my generation has failed you and that you must find your own place and you must identify—NOW! That's fine!—but when did you become a hermit in a forest? Living in a civilized society necessitates the concession of giving up absolute freedom. If you do not want civilization then you must give up the following: (a) law and order, (b) fire protection, (c) food and clothing which has to be transported, (d) money, which has to be earned, (e) health protection and (f) transportation, etc., etc.

I cannot bridge the gap between generations but if we start with mutual respect we may achieve a better understanding.

I will start by respecting the symbols which may be important to you. Let us take "Rock and Roll music". To some one who has been brought up on Beethoven, Tchaikovsky and other classical masters, Ravel is a modern composer. At first when I listened to "Rock and Roll", it sounded awful. Then I started to listen to the words and I found that many of the songs had an involvement for the younger generation—a total involvement in making this a better world! Such music could not be all bad and after a while I began to like the beat. I do not say it "sends me" but I can understand its appeal to you. Parents should also remember that the typical popular songs of our generation were "Love for Sale", "The Big Apple" and "Black Bottom" which our parents thought were decadent. Frank Sinatra was as repulsive to our parents as the Monkees may be to us.

Take the beard, long hair, "Mod" clothes, and the general dirtiness as typical signs of revolt. The beard is really an anomaly. In the past it implied intellectual learning particularly among European scientific or religious men. Today it is used as a symbol to express an aversion to conformity but paradoxically by its widespread acceptance it has become a conventional form of protest.

Long hair worn by men used to denote artistic types particularly musicians who were poor and could not afford haircuts. If you think it makes you look handsome, wear it that way—it is your privilege and I will respect you. Just give me the same privilege and respect if I honestly think you look moronic.

There is nothing wrong with "Mod" clothes. It only becomes wrong when middle aged people wear them in a ludicrous attempt to appear eternally young. It is distinctive and creative and should be encouraged as a symbol of the younger generation's wish to express its own individuality.

What do dirty, filthy jeans, dark shirts without collars, unkempt hair—signify? Revolt? Revolt against what? Revolt against the values of your parents' generation?

The obvious difference is that creativity and initiative are worth while but lack of cleanliness is a universal fault and reflects a lack of *respect* for yourself as an individual. How can the world respect you if you do not respect yourself?

This is the crux of the problem.

Every younger generation wants to be *respected*—not only by their peers but they want the world to concur with them and agree that their ideas are right. They do not want to be humiliated by laughter or to be told that they do not have sufficient experience. It is unfortunate that experience can not be transmitted by osmosis and that each new generation has to make its own mistakes in its own way.

How do you earn respect? It does not come as a gift all wrapped up in a box with silver ribbons. The first step is to give mutual respect to the ideas of others—including your parents! Their problems and their frame of reference are different than yours but perhaps you really can learn a little by listening to them. Recognition by your parents that a problem exists is the first step that they must take. They must also learn to listen to you. Once you have cleared the barriers of mutual distrust and emotion you may be able to discuss matters objectively. The goals which you seek are fundamentally the same aims that most parents have for their children—their ultimate happiness! The means of achievement may be different because this is a different generation. Patience is a virtue which youth shoult *not* possess—youth should be daring, inventive, and skeptical! There is no point to your getting an education if all you do is to repeat facts by rote. New insights, new methods, new philosophies should challenge the rigidity of your background and environment. You should go forward but you can never achieve independence without either *self-respect* or *mutual* respect for others. This is the way of the world and even if you want to remake the world a better place to live in you have to start with this premise. This is the challenge to youth!

I think this younger generation is wonderful! They are bright, well-informed, committed to social justice and willing to work for their ideals. I do not doubt that they can make this a better world! Perhaps my generation will live to see it.

I cannot give any advice to your parents except to remind them that some day in the future, you, too, will be parents!

I would like to conclude by quoting from the late President John F. Kennedy:

"I look forward to an America which will not be afraid of grace and beauty, which commands respect not only for its strength but for its civilization as well. And I look forward to a world which will be safe not only for democarcy and diversity but also for personal distinction."

Freedom for the Baltic States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 26, 1967

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, last Friday and yesterday, President Johnson met with Soviet Premier Kosygin in Glassboro, N.J. Presumably they discussed such substantive matters as the Middle East, Vietnam, a treaty to bar the proliferation of nuclear weapons, and the possibility of an agreement regarding antiballistic missiles. According to the White House press secretary, "each side could raise issues of interest."

Certainly all these matters are important, not only to the peoples of the great nations represented by the two leaders, but also to hundreds of millions of other people throughout the world. I am confident that President Johnson did his best to forcefully present the viewpoints of the United States and to let the Soviet visitor know in no uncertain terms that America will protect its interests in the Middle East and simultaneously prosecute the war in Southeast Asia to victory.

One subject that the Chief Executive should have brought up was the restoration of de facto independence to the Baltic countries. Although the annexation of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania occurred on July 14, 1940, the incorporation of these three nations into the Soviet empire has never been recognized by the United States. While the policy of nonrecognition is commendable, it appears to me that it is too passive. We should do more than merely pass by on the other side when an international brigand steals the territory of his neighbors. Under present-day circumstances, a policy of nonrecognition amounts to acquiescence.

Mr. Speaker, not only should President Johnson have raised the question of independence for the Baltic nations during his conversations with Premier Kosygin, but Arthur Goldberg, our representative in the United Nations Organization, should likewise have brought up the subject during the Soviet leader's appearance at the United Nations.

The Soviet Union and its satellites have frequently used the international organization as a sounding board to spout Communist propaganda and to insult the United States, its leaders, and its people. The Soviet representatives have abused our hospitality by their vicious tirades in the United Nations, which is located in our largest city and is financed largely with money paid by American taxpayers and loaned by American bond purchasers. The Soviet leaders have forgotten how American blood was spilled and how American funds were expended during World War II to save the Soviet Union and its satellites from defeat.

While the Soviet Union's chief weapon is the use of lies, America does not need to retaliate by employing such a weapon. All America needs to do is tell the truth about the Communist empire. The independence of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania should be restored and those who speak for the United States and its people should constantly reiterate this truth by shouting it from the housetops whenever the opportunity presents itself. Why not start in the United Nations?

Beware of the Free Handout

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 26, 1967

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, Government paternalism is not an unmixed blessing, for as the Government can give, so can it also take away.

A unique and vivid account of how this can happen has been illustrated in an article written by Dr. J. G. McDaniel. This piece is entitled "Whose Bread I Eat—His Song I Sing," and it was originally published in the November 1961 bulletin of the Fulton County, Ga., Medical Society.

I insert this article into the RECORD and commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

WHOSE BREAD I EAT—HIS SONG I SING

(By Dr. J. G. McDaniel)

I remember, as a small boy in knee britches, going with my father to hear an address given by the Honorable Stephen Pace, then Congressman from the old Georgia 12th District. It was on the banks of the Ocmulgee River. There was a barbecue, and citizens, especially farmers, from all the counties gathered. This was before the First World War.

It seemed that someone in the Congress had introduced a bill that would give the farmers some money provided they did something. The Congressman vigorously opposed it. I had no idea what it was, because I was watching a "dirt dobber" making a ball of mud. The Congressman snapped me back to attention, however when he said, "I'm going to tell you a true story about the wild hogs that once lived about 40 miles down the river".

"Years ago," the Congressman said, "in a great horseshoe bend down the river, there lived a drove of wild hogs. Where they came from no one knew, but they survived floods, fires, freezes, droughts, and hunters. The greatest compliment a man could pay to a dog was to say that he had fought the hogs in Horseshoe Bend and returned alive. Occasionally a pig was killed either by dogs or a gun—a conversation piece for years to come.

"Finally a one-gallused man came by the country store on the river road and asked the whereabouts of these wild hogs. He drove a one-horse wagon, had an ax, some quilts, a lantern, some corn, and single-barrel shotgun. He was a slender, slow-moving, patient man—he chewed his tobacco deliberately and spat very seldom.

"Several months later he came back to the same store and asked for help to bring out the wild hogs. He stated that he had them all in a pen over in the swamp.

"Bewildered farmers, dubious hunters, and storekeepers all gathered in the heart of Horseshoe Bend to view the captive hogs.

"It was all very simple", said the one-gallused man. "First I put out some corn. For 3 weeks they would not eat it. Then some of the young ones grabbed an ear and ran off into the thicket. Soon they were all eating it; then I commenced building a pen around the corn, a little higher each day. When I noticed that they were all waiting for me to bring the corn and had stopped grubbing for acorns and roots, I built the trapdoor. Naturally, said the patient man, they raised quite a ruckus when they seen they were trapped, but I can pen any animal on the face of the earth if I can jist get him to depend on me for a free handout".

We have had patient men in our Central Government in Washington for years. They are using our own dollars instead of corn. I still think about the trapdoor and the slender, stooped man who chewed his tobacco deliberately, when he spat and turned to the gathered citizens many years ago and said, "I can pen any animal on the face of the earth if I can jist get him to depend on me for a free handout".

The Story of America's Unknowns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 26, 1967

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, in its May 1967 issue, Navy magazine, the publication of the Navy League, appropriately recognized Memorial Day with a moving article describing the manner in which the unknowns of World War II and Korea were selected and buried. The article is by a talented writer, John Neubauer. It follows:

THE STORY OF AMERICA'S UNKNOWNS OF WORLD WAR II AND KOREA—DRAMA OF CEREMONIES AT SEA OFF VIRGINIA AND AT ARLINGTON IN MAY 1958 RECALLED AS NATION AGAIN PREPARES TO HONOR HER FALLEN FIGHTING MEN

(By John Neubauer)

The seas were grey and choppy and the rain was beating down steadily and had been all morning and there was a chill bite to the air though it was going into June.

We braced against the spray sweeping in across the fantail and watched as the guided missile cruiser USS Boston heeled close alongside while the destroyer USS Blandy and the Coast Guard cutter Ingham rode easy on station in the white-capped waters nearby, escort vessels for the occasion.

We were aboard the guided missile cruiser USS Canberra east of Cape Henry, Virginia. Soon we were to be witness to history; the selection of an Unknown American fighting man who would represent all of the country's dead for World War II.

The Canberra and Boston were running abreast of each other now and highlines has been rigged between them in a great criss-cross pattern. Over the lines, from the Boston, were to be transferred two caskets, one containing the body of an Unknown American slain in the fighting in Europe, the other of an Unknown of the Pacific campaigns.

The caskets were brought over with speed and precision. No other highline transfers had ever been made with such dignity.

They were placed at the foot of two Terrier missiles on the after deck of the Canberra, along with another also highlined from the Boston, which contained an Unknown selected 10 days earlier to represent all of those Americans who died fighting in Korea.

It was May 2, 1958, and it was high noon. Soon, one of the two Unknowns of World War II would be selected as the Unknown to represent all the American dead of the war. The other would be burried at sea with full military honors.

From the Atlantic Fleet's Cruiser Force Navy Band came the somber strains of Chopin's Funeral March. The dirge pulsed solemnly over the ship, across the flag-draped caskets, then got caught up in the gusts of wind and rain and fell off in silence in the distance.

Rear Admiral Lewis S. Parks, commander of the Atlantic Fleet Cruiser Force, began the ceremonies, and noted:

"It is not necessary that we know their names. It is enough that they were our comrades and our shipmates. They were also our sons, our brothers, our fathers, our friends, and for all of us they gave 'that last full measure of devotion'."

A wreath of red and white carnations rested inboard of the caskets. It would serve as the badge of distinction to denote which of the two Unknowns would be selected for the singular honor being bestowed that day.

PICKED BY NAVY HERO

The choice was to be made by William R. Charette, a Navy hospital corpsman first class, who won the Medal of Honor for supreme heroism on the battlefields of Korea.

There was high drama in the air as Charette came forward and picked up the wreath with deliberate precision.

He walked slowly with it back around the three caskets, then stopped facing the one in the center, the one holding the body of the Unknown of Korea.

Which of the World War II Unknowns would be selected to represent them all?

For several moments Charette stood absolutely still, almost rigid, as though he'd been painted there by some great artist preserving a moment in time no one wanted repeated.

Charette was contemplative, tight-lipped.

The rain that had pocketed the day in grey suddenly lifted and the seas around us quieted somewhat.

The moment had come. The choice was made.

"I DON'T KNOW WHY"

Charette turned, then gently, with reverence for the occasion, placed the wreath on the casket on the right. He had started to place it on the one on the left, but suddenly changed his mind. "I don't know why, I just turned to the right," he said later.

Now, for the first time since World War II ended 13 years earlier, Americans could honor one fallen son as representing all of them who died in that war.

And now, too, Americans were to honor three Unknowns—of World Wars I and II and Korea.

Following the selection ceremony, the caskets holding the bodies of the World War II and Korean War Unknowns were transferred by highline to the Blandy which would take them to Washington where they were to lie in state in the Capitol Rotunda until May 30.

Meanwhile, aboard the Canberra, the body of the Unknown not selected by Charette was still to be buried at sea.

THE BURIAL AT SEA

At 1:40 p.m. that afternoon, as the Canberra rode the seas 33 miles east of Cape Henry, the word was passed, "All hands bury the dead."

The body of the Unknown waited aft on the starboard side of the ship, flanked by an honor guard of six sailors. With them, representing all services, since no one knew which branch of the armed services this Unknown had served in, were Admiral Jerauld S. Wright, Lieutenant General Herbert B. Powell, Major General William L. Kennedy, Lieutenant General Edwin A. Pollock and Read Admiral Harold C. Moore, representing the Navy, Army, Air Force, Marine Corps and Coast Guard respectively.

Prayers were said and scriptures read. Chaplains of several faiths took part; Navy Lieutenant Boris Geeza, Eastern Orthodox; Air Force First Lieutenant Nathan M. Landman, Jewish; Army Major Henry L. Durand, Roman Catholic, and Navy Captain J. Floyd Dreith, Protestant. For as the identity and service of the man was unknown so was his religion.

Chaplain Dreith intoned: ". . . for as much as it has pleased Almighty God, in His wise providence, to take out of this world the soul of our departed unknown comrade and friend, we therefore commit his mortal remains to the deep."

The honor guard of six sailors lifted the pallet on which the body of the Unknown reposed, wrapped in a canvas shroud and weighted down with 200 pounds of lead and sand. It slid away easily to meet it final resting place.

DRAMA AT ARLINGTON

Eight Marines of a firing squad fired three volleys in rapid succession in final salute. Then James W. Howard, musician seaman, played the nostalgic notes of Taps.

The committal ceremony was over.

This day's drama had ended, but it was only prologue to the drama to unfold four days alter.

At 1 p.m. on Memorial Day 1958 the caskets containing the bodies of the Unknowns of World War II and the Korean War were taken from the Capitol Rotunda. There they had lain in state alternately on the catafalque that had held the body of Abraham Lincoln and an identical one made especially for this historic occasion.

The Unknowns were placed on caissons drawn by two teams of six grey horses each and taken to Arlington National Cemetery to be interred in twin crypts carved into the marble plaza in front of the Tomb of the Unknown of World War I.

The funeral cortege proceeded from the Capitol down Constitution Avenue, around the Lincoln Memorial and across the Arlington Memorial Bridge to the amphitheater at Arlington Cemetery.

Air Force F–101 jets flew overhead in salute in the "missing buddy" formation.

EISENHOWER GIVES MEDALS

The day's ceremonies, from the time the bodies were carried down from the Capitol Rotunda until they were buried, lasted some 200 minutes, and for every one of them cannon boomed in salute from a sloping hill overlooking the Potomac River.

Inside the marble columns of the amphitheater at Arlington, President Eisenhower, Vice President Nixon, Supreme Court Justices, congressmen, foreign dignitaries, and more than 200 winners of the Medal of Honor took part in special ceremonies before the final interment. The President placed Medals of Honor on black pillows near the casket heads of each of the Unknowns. The citations were brief.

That to the Unknown of World War II was bestowed for ". . . exemplifying the selflessness of all our fallen heroes of the Second World War who, in courageous defense of the ideals of democracy against aggression, gave their lives to preserve our noble heritage."

The other called the Unknown of Korea ". . . symbolic of the gallantry and intrepidity above and beyond the call of duty of all members of the armed forces of the United States who gave their lives in the Korean conflict while defending the ideals of freedom and democracy."

As the Unknowns were taken from the amphitheater to the marble plaze, a salute of 21 guns was sounded, then three final volleys after they had been committed to their crypts. A bugler sounded Taps.

The drama that had begun hours earlier had ended.

Preservation of the Oregon Dunes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. DELLENBACK

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 26, 1967

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker, the preservation and recreational development of a beautiful stretch of Pacific coastline called the Oregon Dunes has been a continuing concern of public-spirited citizens in southern Oregon for many years. While there has been some disagreement, occasionally heated, over the best method of attaining these goals, few dispute the desirability of reaching them.

The Oregon Legislature has gone on record in favor of establishing "an Oregon Dunes National Recreation Area under the administration of the U.S. Forest Service." Since I support this concept and have been developing legislation to bring it about, I am pleased to introduce Enrolled House Joint Memorial 7 of the 54th Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon.

HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 7

(Sponsored by Representatives Elder, Bedingfield, Gwinn, Hanneman, Kennedy, Leiken, McKenzie, Martin, Richards, Skelton, Wilson, Senators Husband, Stadler.)

Whereas establishment of an Oregon Dunes National Recreation Area under the administration of the United States Forest Service would end a controversy over the proper treatment of this area that has continued for nearly a decade; and

Whereas establishment of such recreation area would avoid condemnation of private property and the absorption of tax-paying lands by the Federal Government, which would deprive local government and schools of part of their support; and

Whereas establishment of such recreation area would permit continuation of revenues received by the United States Forest Service from the sale of timber therein, which would be discotinued if such area were under the jurisdiction of the National Park Service; and

Whereas establishment of such recreation area at an early date would permit the United States Forest Service and the State of

Oregon to proceed with plans for additional campsites and other tourist facilitiies now delayed because of the uncertain future of this area; and

Whereas establishment of such recreation area would stabilize conditions in the Florence-Reedsport-Coos Bay area by removing uncertainty as to the future ownership of lands in and near the dunes; now, therefore,

Be It Resolved by the Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon:

(1) The Congress of the United States is memorialized to enact legislation placing under the United States Forest Service the area to be known as the Oregon Dunes National Recreation Area, located south of the Siuslaw River and north of Tenmile Creek. The Congress is memorialized further to insure the unqualified continuation of domestic and industrial water supplies within such area.

(2) A copy of this memorial shall be sent to the presiding officer of each chamber of the Congress, to the Secreary of Agriculture, to the Secretary of the Interior and to each member of the Oregon Congressional Delegation.

Everybody's Pal?—It Doesn't Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK EDWARDS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 26, 1967

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, in matters of foreign policy, we as Americans have been advised that we must "think the unthinkable" as a means of breaking new ground in the solution of great and grave problems.

Perhaps one of the assumptions we should challenge is the assumption that we must be everybody's pal—that U.S. foreign policy must be geared to popularity on a comprehensive worldwide basis.

This has special significance at this time in the wake of the Johnson-Kosygin meeting and the maneuverings relating to the Middle East. And at this point in my remarks I want to call attention to a newspaper column by Jenkin Lloyd Jones of June 24, 1967:

IT'S TIME TO BE STIFFLY CORRECT

(By Jenkin Lloyd Jones)

The time may have arrived when the American people should quit trying to be so puppy-dog friendly to the world and assume a more dignified posture of "correctness."

Americans are, perhaps, the friendliest people on earth. Part of it comes from our bigness and isolation. At home we see few foreigners. An alien accent intrigues us. In any erudite cocktail party the crowd is generally thickest around the foreign visitor.

We have, for a long time, suffered from a missionary guilt complex. It's an interesting combination of smugness and concern. We are proud of the "American way." We feel sure that our outlooks and techniques are superior to those of most other countries. We would like to share our wisdom. Hence, the missionary. On the other hand, we are easily guilt-ridden because of our relative opulence. So we give, often lavishly.

Our British cousins in their great days were somewhat like us, but not much. They were eloquently and sometimes arrogantly proud of the empire. They wept a little for the heathen. They had their heroic missionaries and teachers who went forth into the pools of ignorance and fever to discourage infanticide, stop cannibalism and outlaw suttee. But hard on their heels came the flag and the traders.

As the Basuto chief bitterly told one of my old anthropology professors, "When the white man came here he had the Bible and we had the land. Now we've got the Bible and he's got the land."

Among the more recent colonial powers you might classify, in descending order of humanity, the French, the Dutch, the Belgians, the Germans and the Japanese. The Russians were never well enough organized in the 18th and 19th centuries to seize distant lands from primitive peoples. But in their conquest and treatment of the European satellites they would go to the bottom of the list.

Only the Americans were haunted by their strength and nervous about their prosperity. Only the Americans set forth wistfully to make the world love them.

Funny thing. The Israelis bombed a U.N. force in the Gaza Strip and nine Indian and two Brazilian soldiers were killed. The diplomats in the U.N. Security Council all tried to top each other in expressions of regret and grief. But 54,000 Americans died in what was billed as an official U.N. action in Korea. How much weeping did the United Nations do for our boys?

There is the human inclination to make the friend of your enemy your enemy. All our largesse to India was forgotten the moment we gave arms to Pakistan. And the Pakistanis damned us for our aid to India.

For many years Americans tried to make themselves loved in the Near East. The American University in Beirut has educated generations of Arab leaders. We were lavish with Fulbright scholarships. We poured tremendous aid funds into Arab nations, including those whose oil-rich sheiks bought Cadillacs by the shipload and rented whole hotels in Switzerland.

But because America has promoted Israel we were hated. And when Gamal Abdel Nasser, in the bleak early hours of June 6, tried to alibi the collapse of his air force by claiming that American and British planes had shot it down, the whole Near East bought it immediately. Mobs converged on the American embassies. The American libraries went up in flames.

Maybe we ought to relax. Maybe we should quit trying to be loved. Maybe we should assume that we will be spit on. America is a complacent dragon, a fine beast on which to beat with wooden swords and have one's picture taken standing on its back. Hatred of it is a huge convenience for a government entangled in its own stupidity.

So be it. If we expect to be hated we will be freer to do intelligent things. We won't have to keep shoring up corrupt regimes in the hope that they will become reliable friends. We can spend our foreign aid more wisely. We can seal off some famous rat holes.

We can say, "Look, your excellency. Your mob burnt our free library, which happens to be the biggest and best in your country. If you want it back, jail the leaders and build us a building. We'll just replace the books."

Or, "See here, your highness. We figure you'll gut us the first time it's convenient, but in the meantime we'd like to help your people. If you've got a sound plan and a way to keep your gang from cracking the safe we may bankroll it."

This kind of talk will make more sense to more people than our past habit of turning the other cheek with a sickly grin. Everybody's pal—hell! It just didn't work. Let's be stiffly correct for a change, and maybe they'll conclude we're not so crazy after all.

New Chamber Chief

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 26, 1967

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, recently Bob Waterman assumed the presidency of the Davenport Chamber of Commerce. He will provide forward and constructive leadership in a growing and rapidly developing community.

A writer for the Davenport Times-Democrat interviewed Mr. Waterman and wrote the following story about him:

RIVER IS A TREMENDOUS ADVANTAGE—CHALLENGES AHEAD FOR CHAMBER CHIEF

(By Julie Jensen)

The first mountain Robert Van Patten Waterman ever climbed was the Matterhorn, and this response to challenge augurs well for the Davenport Chamber of Commerce, which has elevated the Davenport attorney to its presidency.

Waterman stands out in a crowd with an imposing height of six-foot-three. Brown-eyed with silver-touched dark hair and a robust complexion, he radiates elan.

He is a general partner in a law firm of nine partners and associates, including his two older brothers, Larned, and C. D. Waterman Jr. His father and grandfather were lawyers before him.

His executive duties for the Chamber will be demanding, and Waterman says, "I'll have to find more hours in the day. I don't want to reduce my time in the legal profession, so I suppose it means less leisure and more weekend work."

"I have been involved with the Chamber of Commerce for about eight years," he says. "The Chamber is commiting itself to some form of urban re-development to make Davenport competitive with other cities. This takes money—either private or public funds—and there is a departure from earlier thinking that federal funds are tainted per se.

"The philosophy now is that federal funds for a useful purpose are acceptable, and there is nothing morally wrong with attempting to regain some of our tax dollars."

Rebuilding the city's sewer system, dealing with substandard housing problems, and providing an expressway from Interstate 80 to the heart of downtown are Davenport's priority concerns, Waterman believes.

"Cities of lesser size are making great strides in development," he says, "and we cannot lag behind. We do need help. There isn't enough private capital, and we're paying such high taxes that we should have some of that money back. If we make plans, we can maintain local control.

"We are in a fact-facing era, and the philosophy of the past is changing to the practical idealism of the present."

The downtown business area faces slow strangulation without a quick, convenient ingress to its core, Waterman holds.

"Enlightened self-interest calls for some kind of an expressway to the downtown area," he says.

Keeping up with the working of 21 Chamber committees may keep the new president off the golf course, but he says he really doesn't mind.

"I played my best game between the ages of 16 and 18," he says, "and I've never recovered my former glory!"

Waterman praises the recreational opportunities of the Mississippi and regrets that he has not time personally to enjoy "3,000 miles of front yard on a houseboat."

"The river is a tremendous advantage to us here," he says with true Chamber of Commerce exuberance.

The Watermans and their older children have taken up skiing after a 16-year hiatus, for the head of the house and they find the sport a wonderful means of taking a 48-hour break from a busy routine.

Though Bob Waterman has been active in Republican politics for many years, he views the non-political nature of the Chamber of Commerce as one of its greatest strengths.

"The representatives of varying political views are combined for a common purpose," he says, "a better business climate and a better community."

Waterman was born in his family home in Bettendorf and now lives with his wife and five children at 600 Riverview Terrace, Bettendorf.

Mrs. Waterman is the former Catherine Arp of Moline, the daughter of Dr. and Mrs. A. Henry Arp. They met while she was a student at St. Katharine's School and were married in 1953. Their children are Catherine Mary, 12; Robert Jr., 11; Thomas Dana, 7; Elizabeth, 6; and James, 2.

After attending Davenport schools, Bob Waterman was a student at Lake Forest Academy, Lake Forest, Ill.

His post-prep school stint in the Navy at Great Lakes Naval Training Station was a short one. "They dropped the atom bomb when I was in boot camp," he says. "The closest I came to going to sea was rowing a boat on Lake Michigan."

At Dartmouth, Waterman majored in political science and minored in philosophy, earning a Phi Beta Kappa key, as his father and brothers had done at the same school.

"We didn't have a lot of rules of conduct," he says, "but dad insisted that we get good grades. If you do that, the conduct takes care of itself. Its an interesting way to raise a child."

After graduating from Dartmouth, he toured Europe for a summer and considers that time spent in Britain and on the continent "a real academic adventure—worth a year or more of college."

Discussing his ascent of the Matterhorn, he says, "I'll bet I'm the only man who ever climbed it in gray flannel pants!"

That fall he entered Harvard Law School, and after graduating with the class of 1953, he came back to Davenport to practice in the family firm.

Since then, his community activities have included board membership in the Tri-City Symphony Orchestra association, of which he is now president; the Bettendorf Planning and Zoning commission; the Bettendorf Board of Adjustment, of which he is now chairman; the Salvation Army advisory board; the Scott County Bar association executive council; trustee for the Davenport Development company; and board of governors, Davenport Country Club.

He has been a director of the United Fund and of the Exchange Club and has served the Davenport Club as president and secretary. He has also been a member of the choir at St. Peter's church, Bettendorf.

The Flag Speaks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER L. MIZE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 26, 1967

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, in view of the impressive Flag Day ceremonies held in the House Chamber on June 14 this year, preceding the action of this body on legislation to punish those who would knowingly desecrate the American flag, I found the commentary of John Doremus of radio station WAIT, Chicago, "The Flag Speaks," a fitting tribute to the Stars and Stripes for which we seek new respect and honor.

These remarks are part of a "Thoughts on the Fourth of July" broadcast which Mr. Doremus made on the American Forces Network. This excerpt was printed in the July edition of the Army Digest. Under leave to extend my remarks, I ask that "The Flag Speaks" appear in the Appendix of the RECORD. The tribute follows:

THE FLAG SPEAKS

I stand for a world-shaking idea that is creating a new earth, putting kings to flight, bursting the shackles of slaves, making men gods, glorifying human personality and lifting all humanity to a higher plane of more abundant living. I stand for a new experiment in the laboratory of life which has exploded old theories of government and set men free. I have kindled, and kept burning in the hearts of men, the first of liberty, unity, justice and brotherhood. Men have lived and toiled and died to keep alive the things I symbolize. A great host of heroes, with the help of God, have kept me gallantly flying in the face of every threat and challenge to the democratic way of life which I represent. The blood spilled at Valley Forge, Gettysburg, San Juan Hill, Chateau Thierry, Bataan, Pork Chop Hill, Da Nang, and in all the other great battles for freedom on land and sea, is in my red stripes. The shining white light of concentrated sunshine penetrating the blackest night is in my white stripes, which in the nation's darkest hours are radiant with eternal hope. The vast sweeping infinity of the heavens is in my stars, inspiring mankind to continue climbing courageously up the spiral staircase of history to a world of gleaming promise. I am the emblem of man's finest dream. I am the standard of the "last best hope of earth."

I am the American Flag.

A Housewife Speaks Out

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES M. TEAGUE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 26, 1967

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I have received a letter from a housewife constituent that I should like to share with my colleagues. This lady, who describes herself as an average American citizen, speaks pointedly of her belief that her Government, like her household, should be operated on a sound financial basis. She cannot understand why her Government should be allowed to run into the red, to the tune of billions, and she believes we should forgo expenses that are beyond our means, as she and her husband must.

I wholeheartedly agree with her and, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting her letter at this point in the RECORD:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN TEAGUE: I suppose you could say we are an average-low middle class family.

My husband earns 480.00 a month. We have one twenty month old boy, and one due very soon.

We own our own mobil home and are not in heavy debt. I vote in almost every local election and never miss voting in a general election.

My husband and I are high school graduates and we have never been arrested. I guess you might say we are just plain every day people in a plain every day city with a plain every day family.

I have told you all of this for one reason. So that you might understand that even though we are so plain and not rich, nor politically astute, we and millions like "us" are the backbone of this nation. It is our plain unencumbered little vote that you work hardest to get.

Mr. Teague, why does the United States have a natoinal debt of over $300 billion?

Mr. Teague, why does my husband pay out every month $80.00 for Federal Income Tax and still you want more?

Mr. Teague, why must taxes go up, up, up?

You know, I can't even comprehend how much just one billion dollars is, much less $100 billion or more.

It would seem to me, speaking from the viewpoint of the average, uniformed, stupid, housewife that with all that money you could manage to at least keep the debits and credits in their proper spaces. Can't the Federal government spend its money without going in the hole? You know, Mr. Teague, the bank where I keep our little checking account gets very perturbed when I write checks I can't cover. It costs two dollars every time I do it, too. I can say this for sure, I don't do it often, Mr. Teague, because it's far too costly for us. We can't afford to run our checking account in the red. How come the United States does?

Mr. Teague, I realize there are matters of Gross National Product and Gold Standards and economic Jibberish, etc., etc., etc., and complicated questions, but still the fact remains you and *my* government are not doing what is quite right.

I am not in favor of spending one more penny, and I do mean *penny*, for any reason, for any program that we can't afford. That is That! ! !

I do hope when you vote in *my* Congress next time for some "program" that as one of your constituents you will remember, please, this letter from this uninformed, stupid, tax paying, housewife, who would love to see the Federal government "set the record straight" and stop some of these programs.

This, Congressman Teague, is my first letter. It will not be my last letter.

Sincerely,

——— ———.

About Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 26, 1967

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Lansing Journal, an independent community newspaper serving Lansing, Ill., is noted for its thoughtful editorial commentary. Its Thursday, June 22, 1967, issue carried a very pertinent editorial on Vietnam, which I consider of special interest and insert in the RECORD at this point:

ABOUT VIETNAM

The mass protests against United States involvement in the Vietnamese war, which drew 125,000 people to New York and some 50,000 to San Francisco a few weeks ago, stirred debate concerning the purpose of the peace movement, the character of the participants and the effect of their actions on the course of the war in which this country is now engaged.

In the first place, there seems little doubt the general effect of peace activities is to prolong and intensify the war in Viet Nam. Such demonstrations are reported as a matter of news in the U.S. press as well as by news media throughout the world. Not understanding the workings of a free press, the daily newspaper in Hanoi, the official government voice, has observed, "The thunder of protest is rumbling from one (U.S.) city to another. . . . This clearly shows that the movement against the aggressive war in Viet Nam has become a mass movement which is drawing millions of people into a resolute struggle. It really has become a second front against U.S. imperialism right on U.S. soil."

Although few in numbers, there is apparently no question but what communist party members have provided much of the leadership for the hard core anti-Viet Nam campaign. The vast majority of the participants in the movement are not communist and are either idealistically ignorant of or determined to ignore the character of their associates. Communism, whether it be Russian, Chinese or North Vietnamese has a common interest in preventing military or political victory against its objectives in southeast Asia. Russian interest in an early end to the war has been lessened by Chinese agreement to permit free passage through Chinese territory of Russian arms and supplies destined for North Viet Nam. This has assured the military ability of Hanoi to continue the war and lessened the danger of Russian shipping running head on into the U.S. Navy should a coastal blockade be established. As a result of this new flow of military assistance and the false encouragement which Hanoi has gained from peace protests in the United States, any realistic hope of ending the war this year is gone.

It now seems clear that the communist purpose of prolonging the war is to extend the conflict if possible into the election season of 1968 on the theory that this would afford greater opportunity to wring concessions from the Johnson Administration. But, as many authorities point out, there could be an opposite reaction—U.S. escalation of the war compelled by the fact that any settlement resulting in U.S. political or military retreat in southeast Asia would destroy American prestige and influence in that area of the world and be rejected by the vast majority of people in the United States. It appears that North Viet Nam, as well as our peace marchers in this country, have become pawns at this stage in history to be used at will by the strategists of international communism in their long term struggle to triumph over the civilization and democratic philosophies of the Western nations, most notably the United States.

This struggle, focused now in Viet Nam, comes against the backdrop of genuine American success in Asia. Since World War II, this country's capital and guidance have resulted in the redevelopment of Japan, soon to rank third in industrial power and now established as a stabilizing force in a large part of Asia. Taiwan is a self-supporting nation prospering and running its own affairs. Thailand, a strong U.S. ally, has entered a period of rapid development. Indonesia without Sukarno and rid of communism has the way open to move ahead. Even India, still spinning its wheels and resisting change, may yet have to take hold of its problems and help itself. The American record in Asia should be more generally recognized. Stabilization of Viet Nam would open the door to real Asian progress, and there is no question but that the tactics and the timing of the U.S. presence in that country holds vast import for hundreds of millions of Asian people.

Even a Divided U.N. Serves a Vital Need

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 26, 1967

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, in the wake of the Middle East crisis, the United Nations has come under the fire of critical observers from all sides. This editorial, which appeared in the June 25 edition of the Washington Star, seems to outline the proper perspective from which to view the operations of that organization. In the course of his remarks, the author makes it quite clear that the U.N. is still our best chance of substituting the conference table for the battlefield. The editorial follows:

EVEN A DIVIDED U.N. SERVES A VITAL NEED

The performance of the United Nations in the current Middle East crisis has plunged that organization into another of the periodic crises of confidence that have marked the 22-year history of the world council of governments.

No amount of rhetoric, no high-sounding phraseology or ringing declarations of purpose, can camouflage the fact that the exhibition staged by the United Nations, quite literally before the eyes and ears of millions the world over, was largely an international exercise in futility.

As the Arab tanks rolled eastward across the Sinai, President Nasser ordered the United Nations peace-keeping force to clear the way between his troops and the Israelis. Without any attempt at consultation or discussion, Secretary General U Thant started pulling out the 10-nation force. Thus the United Nations dramatized its inability to prevent the outbreak of hostilities.

During the first critical hours of the war, the Security Council was unable to agree on the wording of a simple cease-fire resolution.

With the cease-fire finally in effect, the Security Council was unable to agree on a resolution concerning permanent peace and the political reconstruction of the area.

And now, in the General Assembly, all indications are that the current debate will in the end produce nothing more meaningful than a multi-volumed record of tedious propaganda. No effective resolution will pass the polarized assembly. The first steps that could lead the world out of the shadow that has darkened the Middle East for 20 years will not be taken.

What has taken place over the past few weeks is a classic demonstration of a well-established fact of international life. When the Soviet Union and the United States agree—as they belatedly did on the advisability of calling for a cease-fire—the United Nations can take action and can exert considerable pressure on member nations to heed its resolutions. When the world's two superpowers clash—as they apparently do now over the political reconstruction of the Middle East—the United Nations is approximately as functional and effective as a beached whale.

Again and again the necessity for Russian-American cooperation in United Nations peace-keeping operations has been demonstrated. With varying degrees of success, the United Nations has intervened positively in Greece, Indonesia, Kashmir, Palestine, Suez, Lebanon, the Congo, West Iran, Yemen and Cyprus, always with backing—or at least the lack of active opposition—of the Big Two. The United Nations' most ambitious undertaking to date, the intervention in Korea, was made possible only because of Russia's inadvertent cooperation. The Soviets were boycotting the Security Council when the vote, amounting to a declaration of war on the North Koreans, was taken.

On the debit side of the ledger, in the list of United Nations' failures, are those cases in which the direct interests of the two major powers were involved. Thus Russia, in 1956, shrugged off a total of five resolutions condemning its invasion of Hungary to crush the anti-Soviet revolt. And thus the United States, in 1965, in effect told the United Nations to keep its nose out of the Dominican Republic; that the American intervention was strictly a hemisphere matter to be handled by the United States with an assist from the Organization of American States. Thus in the Middle East in 1948, in 1957 and again in 1967—following wars between Israel and the Arab states—a divergence of United States and Soviet aims has prevented the United Nations from making any contribution toward a permanent peace in the area.

Of what use, then, is the United Nations? If it is effective only in those areas where the United States and the Soviet Union have interests in common, does it follow that those two powers, acting in concert through regular diplomatic channels, would have been able to get results comparable to those achieved through the U.N.?

The most positive answer that can be given is perhaps. Perhaps the United Nations is an expensive, expendable luxury. Perhaps the brushfire wars that have sprung up in the past two decades would not have spread into humanity's funeral pyre. Perhaps. But the world cannot possibly afford to put that possibility to the test.

The fact is that, however divergent the long range interests of the United States and Russia may be both nations are ultimately guided by the same immediate interest: The avoidance of a nuclear showdown. That fact was clearly demonstrated once again by the essential restraint shown by both powers while the fighting was in progress between Israel and the Arab world.

The United Nations—for all its shortcomings—provides the basic machinery to implement the policy of avoiding direct, armed confrontation. Propaganda speeches aside, it is also a private forum for direct, informal contact between representatives of opposing nations in which changes in policy and alterations in international bargaining positions can be instantly and authoritatively signaled. It is a public forum where all the nations, great and small, must adopt a posture that indicates the thrust of national policy.

These varied aspects of the United Nations' role in world politics have already come into play in the current crisis. Removed from the kleig lights of the public Security Council sessions, Ambassadors Goldberg and Federenko were able to agree on the wording of a cease-fire resolution that won the council's unanimous approval and finally brought a halt to the fighting. Now, through the bombast of the General Assembly circus, it becomes clear that the Arab world longs not for peace but for revenge. And, unless there is more to the Johnson-Kosygin talks than has met the eye, it appears that Russia is interested not in stability but in recouping prestige by backing Arab claims and rearming Arab forces. Israel and the nations willing to back Israel's right to survive are thereby clearly and inescapably forewarned about what lies ahead. They can react accordingly. And if their reactions—military and diplomatic—are the proper ones, a renewal of the fighting and of the danger of World War III may be avoided. If so, the decades of expense, effort and frustration will be well repaid.

The United States, in our view, should accept the United Nations for what it is—something half way between a world government and a world propaganda platform. We should continue to support it. We should encourage an expansion of the United Nations' peace-keeping capabilities.

We live, the late Adlai E. Stevenson said, "in a world which no longer dares to use absolute military power and, on the other hand, is not yet prepared to accept absolute law in the settlement of military differences."

In such an interim world, the imperfect United Nations is, perhaps, the best international forum that can be devised. And for all its foibles, it is a luxury this planet cannot afford to be without.

Hospitals for Social Education, Not Medical Treatment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 26, 1967

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, time was when a sick person could be admitted to a hospital by his physician because he was ill, injured, or in need of medical attention. No one considered the "must" worry of Government redtape and so-called racial balance. But that was when hospitals were for treatment, not education and indoctrination. Today the social mechanics seek to make hospitals a tool for race mixing—treatment is secondary and incidental.

The American Medical Association's House of Delegates passed a resolution recently which comments poignantly regarding the Federal Government's stricture of hospital patients and their physicians.

So that our colleagues may be better apprised of this situation, under unanimous consent I insert in the Record the Associated Press release of June 23, 1967:

AMA Hits Government Asking for Negro, White Totals

(By Alton Blakeslee)

Atlantic City, N.J. (AP).—The American Medical Association protested Thursday the government's request for the percentages of Negro and white patients admitted to hospitals.

The government seeks the information to determine which hospitals qualify for federal funds for Medicare and hospital construction, the AMA said.

"Using sick people to carry out social reforms is to the detriment of good medical care," the AMA's House of Delegates declared in a resolution passed without audible dissenting votes.

The resolution said the regional director of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare has requested and received information from hospital administrators in Louisiana, Alabama and Georgia.

The information included the names of staff doctors, the percentage of Negro and white patients admitted to each hospital and the patient's physician.

It said this was done under title six of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

"This attempt to set hospital admissions by a race quota system could effectively deny the patient the free choice of physicians and hospitals, the resolution said. "When the physicians quota is full for a particular race in the hospital where he practices, the patient would have to change physicians to continue treatment."

The AMA asserted it stands solidly behind hospital and medical staffs "in refusing to establish such a race quota system."

The resolution also deplored "the use of discriminatory practices as evidence by quota systems or other mechanisms whoever employs them and thereby deprives patients regardless of race, creed or color of adequate care."

Speech Before Veterans of Foreign Wars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JIM WRIGHT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 26, 1967

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, our able and distinguished colleague, Hon. James Kee, spoke last Saturday in Clarksburg, W. Va., to the Annual Department Convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

His remarks are so timely and so inspiring, and were so enthusiastically received by those who heard them, that I have sought this privilege of having them printed here in the Congressional Record. I commend them to all Americans:

Remarks of the Honorable James Kee, of West Virginia, Before the 46th Annual West Virginia Department Convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars at the VFW Post Home, Clarksburg, W. Va., on June 24, 1967

Mr. Chairman, Department Commander Williams, reverend clergy, delegates, and guests, it is with humility that I accept your kind invitation to address the 46th annual department convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

It is an honor to have this opportunity to visit with you in the VFW Post 573 home here in Clarksburg.

Your organization received its charter from Congress a little more than 3 decades ago. But there were veterans of foreign wars in this country long before that. In fact—since its inception as a nation—the United States has been blessed by brave men who did not hesitate to fight for their country on foreign seas and foreign shores.

Much of the fighting during the revolution took place outside the territorial limits of the 13 colonies. Our country was only a few years old when United States Marines were first dispatched abroad to protect the lives of American citizens. In the early days—our naval forces were often sent to foreign ports—*when local authorities were unable—or unwilling—to guarantee the safety of American lives or property.*

But it was during the 2 world wars that American soldiers and sailors first learned what it meant to battle for freedom and democracy at the 4 corners of the globe. There are now cemeteries for our heroic dead on three foreign continents. And even as we meet here—*our servicemen are once again proving their valor on jungle battlefields—nearly 10,000 miles from their homeland.*

I have discussed this brief historical review for one purpose only—to remind you once again that if there were no foreign war veterans—*there would be no United States of America.* The price of liberty comes high today—*just as it did in the time of our forefathers.*

The primary aims of your organization may be summed up under three headings:

1. To care for disabled veterans and their families;

2. To care for the widows and orphans, and;

3. To preach the basic creed of Americanism as expressed in the Bill of Rights.

You have performed the first 2 duties exceedingly well. From experience I know your interest in the veteran in need and his family will never slacken.

But today, the 3rd point, *the need to explain Americanism to the young people, is the overriding duty of our times.*

The people of the United States today are enjoying an abundant prosperity never before seen on this earth. And they are enjoying something infinitely more precious, the right to order their own lives under a democratic government. They have free speech, freedom of assembly, and freedom of worship. In contrast to conditions in Communist countries, there is no despotic government to tell them where to live and where to work, what to do or what to think.

It would seem that democracy has proved itself as the finest form of government ever devised by man. Unfortunately—there are disquieting signs that an organized campaign is underway to downgrade the worth and value of democracy among the young citizens of our country.

The right of protest is a sacred right guaranteed by our Constitution. The Nation's young people in our colleges and universities have as much right as the rest of us to express their views. *But the right of protest is strictly limited by the rules of fair play and by the absolute duty of loyalty to one's country.* The news reports of recent months indicate that in too many instances—those who claim the right of dissent have over-stepped these boundaries.

At one university a prominent official was howled down when he attempted to deliver a scheduled address. At another a speaker was threatened by mob violence and had to be rescued by police. On too many occasions young men have been encouraged *by those who know better,* to burn their draft cards in public.

A well known cartoonist said these current mobs are acting like the brown shirts of Hitler, and the black shirts of Mussolini, *who brought Europe to disaster in the 1930's.*

The Honorable J. Edgar Hoover—Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation—has warned his countrymen that the Communists have an organized campaign to corrupt the students in our colleges and universities.

There was a meeting in New York City a few weeks ago which illustrated the shocking tactics employed by those who claim they are merely expressing the right of dissent. The purpose of the meeting was to protest the participation of the United States in the war in Vietnam. One speaker denounced President Johnson as a buffoon and Secretary of State Rusk as a fool. There was the usual burning of draft cards by publicity seeking young men. And then came the crowning act of outrage, the burning of an American flag. The only purpose of this act was to wound the most sacred feelings of the American people. You will be scandalized to learn that the wives of several prominent Americans went up to New York by special plane to witness this ceremony.

After reviewing the dark side of the picture let us see the bright side. Along with several of my colleagues I have introduced a bill to make it a felony, punishable by heavy penalties of fine and imprisonment, to desecrate the flag of the United States. I am pleased to be able to report to you that on Tuesday, June 20th, the House of Representatives passed this measure by a vote of 385 to 16. We have just entered the 191st year following the official adoption of our flag by the Continental Congress.

According to reliable witnesses, the vast majority of young people today are hardworking, serious about their duties, and intensely patriotic.

One of the most effective answers I have seen to the placard wavers and the draft card burners was written by Mr. Ray Cromley of the Scripps Howard newspapers. His story appeared under the appealing headline, "In Viet Nam They Protest With Their Lives." His remarks were so good that I am going to quote a couple of paragraphs:

"In the past 5 months more than 15,000 officers and men who completed their year's tour of duty in Viet Nam volunteered for an additional tour of duty.

"Of the 441,000 troops in Viet Nam, 335,000 are there because they volunteered for service or extra service in the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marines—most realizing they'd likely be sent to Vietnam.

"More than 85 percent of the Americans killed in Viet Nam volunteered for service or extra service at a time when it was certain they'd serve in Vietnam.

"These American protesters in Viet Nam are laying their lives on the line. We read many battle stories about their bravery. We hear much less about their beliefs or the things they're doing for Viet Nam when they are not fighting."

I believe the foregoing by Ray Crumley constitutes an inspiring and moving tribute to the decency, the bravery, and the patriotism of this generation of young Americans.

Now I would like to quote another tribute to these young men from a soldier who should know, General Earle G. Wheeler, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. To tell the story properly it is necessary to use a few more figures.

General Wheeler pointed out that until mid-December of last year some 29,000 servicemen had recevied awards for valor in Viet Nam and more than 40,000 had received the Purple Heart. During that period, 11 had received the Medal of Honor, the highest of all decorations, and more than 200 had received the Distinguished Cross.

How good is the American fighting man today? Some feared that too much prosperity had made the average youngster too soft for the harsh demands of the battlefield. To such misgivings General Wheeler gave this reply:

"When aroused he is tough, resourceful and tenacious. Above all he is a confident fighter, confident that he is well trained, that he fights for a nation whose cause is worthy and that his Nation supports him.

"I am a member of your generation—and this may be an admission against interest—but I am convinced that all in all our fighting men today are better than any we have ever produced in the past. They prove themselves on the battlefield."

So you experienced and older veterans should be on the alert because General Wheeler says the next crop of candidates for admission to your organization are the best fighting men Uncle Sam ever had. I believe you will be proud and delighted to know that.

We all know that if the American flag ever stops flying, liberty will disappear in this country. A newspaper in Australia—surveying the present world scene—gave us an additional thought. This newspaper pointed out that, except for American military might, the whole free *world would fall into the hands of the Communists like a ripe plum.*

In other words, *if the American flag ever stops flying, liberty will disappear from this earth.*

I hope these thoughts will prove a fresh inspiration in your campaign to teach the young folks what Americanism really means.

Some Changes in Flood Danger Since 1951

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 26, 1967

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, earlier in this session of Congress I appeared before one of the congressional subcommittees on appropriations to point up the importance of water conservation and flood control projects supported by the Federal Government. We are faced with establishing spending priorities and flood control, and soil and water conservation deserve high priority.

In my statement to the subcommittee, I said:

> We should not turn our backs on important national needs, especially in those areas where the Federal Government has assumed long-standing responsibility in partnership with local and State governments.

In recent weeks serious flooding has occurred in Kansas and Missouri. Needless to say, there has been property damage and great personal loss for many citizens. However, even greater losses have been prevented by the planning, cooperation, and investment of resources into flood control projects over the years. The Kansas City Star recently published an editorial outlining the differences in the flooding of 1951 which brought great havoc and that which threatens areas of the Midwest today.

The editorial refers to the benefits provided by existing flood control projects stating:

> In unprotected areas, damages are estimated by the Army engineers to have reached more than 23½ million dollars with the cost still rising. But the corps figures that an additional 190 million dollars in flood damages would have occurred without any protection projects in place.

Much remains to be done and in the coming weeks I am confident the Congress will act wisely and effectively in providing necessary appropriations, on a priority basis, to make possible further progress in flood control.

Under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Kansas City, Mo., Star. The editorial follows:

SOME CHANGES IN FLOOD DANGER SINCE 1951

The serious flooding that has already occurred in this area inevitably turns concerned thoughts to the billion-dollar Kaw river tragedy of 1951. Certainly we are not out of the woods yet, and additional damage is probable before the flooding ends.

But there are, fortunately, two important differences between 1951 and now. The weather pattern is one: In 1951, a stable front over this area dumped rain almost nightly for 40 days before the flood deluge. What we have been getting recently is more a series of rain-triggering fronts, the weather bureau explains. It may seem that it has rained every night, but there have been significant breaks in the storm sequence. And this type of pattern is more likely to break up at any time, bringing dry relief. "More likely" we say, knowing how perverse weather can be when a change is urgently needed.

The second and much more tangible factor is the existence of numerous flood protection reservoirs and levees which were not in place in 1951. Such dams as Tuttle Creek, Milford and Perry—the latter not yet completed—have performed heroically in trapping hundreds of thousands of acre-feet of rushing floodwaters.

In unprotected areas, damages are estimated by the Army engineers to have reached more than 23½ million dollars with the cost still rising. But the corps figures that an additional 190 million dollars in flood damages would have occurred without any protection projects in place. This is an enormous and, to be sure, hypothetical figure. With this area's flood history, it would be unthinkable to have no projects built by now. And many industries and homes would not now be located on flood plain land except for the protection of dams and levees. Still, this is a rough measure. of where we would be without those projects—and a reminder of the importance of getting on with others proposed but not yet built.

Storms such as we have been having are going to flood basements and yards and block streets, causing some local damage. No project can stop this. But a design plan of tributary reservoir storage, plus levees to pass the remaining flow safely past high-value municipal and industrial areas, can handle the cumulative superflood rolling down a major stream.

Missouri river bottomland farmers already have been badly hurt by this flood. Their small local levees couldn't contain the Big Muddy on the rampage. Certainly the 400,000 acres under water along the Missouri re-emphasize the value of the big federal agricultural levees, only a few of which have been built from Sioux City to the mouth. This program has been delayed too long by doubts and surveys.

The list of streams now flooding where the reservoirs still are on paper makes sad reading: The Wakarusa (Clinton dam), the Grand (Pattonsburg and others), the Marmaton (Fort Scott). Pottawatomie creek (Garnett) and so on. Back in Washington the House public works committee is preparing to report out the public works appropriations bill. The June floods in Missouri and Kansas—and they're not over yet—should provide them a healthy reminder that, for all the burdens on the federal budget, flood protection still rates a high priority.

Commissioner Tobriner Strongly Supports President Johnson's District of Columbia Reorganization Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 26, 1967

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, the President of the District of Columbia Board of Commissioners, the Honorable Walter N. Tobriner, performed a valuable public service by speaking in support of the

President's reorganization plan for District of Columbia government.

Among other facts, Commissioner Tobriner pointed out that—

> The necessary activities of the District government, like governments of all cities, have become so diversified that three co-equal Commissioners have inadequate control over many of them.

The Commissioner said that the President's plan "offers a significant opportunity to strengthen and modernize the government of the District of Columbia and to make it as efficient, effective, and responsible as possible within the current balance of powers between Congress and the city."

He also voiced the hope that a single individual "will be provided with the means to meet the objective expressed by President Johnson earlier this year, that of making the District 'a city in which all Americans can take pride.'"

I commend Commissioner Tobriner for his forthright statement.

Certainly, few men have more intimate knowledge of the problems and needs of the District than does Walter Tobriner. His strong statement of support for the President's reorganization plan indicates, I believe, that it is a well-conceived and effective proposal for the modernization of District of Columbia government.

I include in the RECORD the statement by Commissioner Tobriner on the District of Columbia reorganization plan:

STATEMENT BY COMMISSIONER WALTER N. TOBRINER, PRESIDENT, BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, BEFORE THE EXECUTIVE AND LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee: I appreciate the opportunity to appear today to express my support for Reorganization Plan No. 3. This support represents my considered judgment based on my service of over six years as a Commissioner of the District. In all candor, the task of the Board over the past six years has not been an easy one. I know that the chief executive of any large American city has not had an easy time in recent years. However, I believe that the Commissioners of the District have been handicapped to an extra degree by an archaic and cumbersome form of government. This has been over and above the problems of chief executives of most American cities.

I am sure that I do not have to detail to members of the Congress the host of issues which we face in Washington—a rising crime rate, unmet educational needs, unemployment, and housing shortages. I believe the Board of Commissioners has been diligently and conscientiously seeking answers to these and similar public problems. I think we have been doing a good job. Yet I must say that the results are not good enough. A major reason for this, I think, is due to the fact that the governmental framework in which we work is not adequate. For a city of the size and complexity of Washington, the concept of a Board of Commissioners is an outdated remnant of a bygone era. It does not meet the needs of today's world.

Many individuals, including members of Congress, have asked the questions "What is wrong with a three-man Board of Commissioners? Why should we change?" Clear answers to these kinds of doubts are necessary if the plan is to be supported.

My answer to these questions is that, based on my experience, a three-man Board cannot provide the kind of executive and administrative leadership which is required. As you know, the District Commissioners have divided their jurisdiction over the various agencies of the District among the Board members. Thus, we have (1) a Commissioner of Public Health and Welfare, (2) a Commissioner of Public Safety, and (3) a Commissioner of Public Works. Each supervises the agencies assigned to him.

Unforunately, today's urban problems do not fall neatly into these categories. The provision of services to the public to meet the complex problems of today often involve many agencies under more than one Commissioner. There is, however, no single individual to resolve disputes, clarify policy conflicts, or provide overall leadership. Thus, as President of the Board, I have no administrative authority superior to those of the other Commissioners. There is no provision for a "strong Chairman" to provide administrative leadership as in the case of many of our Federal regulatory agencies. Under the current system decisions must be made in a collective fashion which is often slow and cumbersome and sometimes precludes clear resolution of the issues. The effort involved in getting together the three Commissioners, all of whom have heavy schedules, for a special meeting or to meet an emergency situation, is in itself defeative of efficiency.

Today the necessary activities of the District Government, like the governments of all cities, have become so diversified that three co-equal Commissioners have inadequate control over many of them. Some current examples may help illustrate the problem.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA ALCOHOLIC PROGRAM

The District's program for the rehabilitation of alcoholics has been criticized by the President's Commission on Crime in the District of Columbia for failure to deal effectively with this widespread social problem. Several District agencies share in carrying out the programs designed to meet the problems of alcoholism. For example, the Health Department reports to one Commissioner; the Police Department reports to another Commissioner; the Corporation Counsel's Office reports to the Board as a whole; and the Department of Buildings and Grounds, responsible for facilities, reports to still another Commissioner. While each agency attempts to carry out its responsibilities as seen from its perspective there is no single Commissioner at the top who can take an overview of the problem and provide the concentrated drive which is necessary to full success.

YOUTH PROBLEM

The District's programs for preventing juvenile delinquency and rehabilitating youth have also been criticized by the President's Crime Commission as being inadequate to the demands. The Commission pointed out that many of the District's youth do not receive adequate treatment and follow-up, particularly in cases where more than one District Agency should be involved with a single youth. Here again, the division of responsibility for various elements of the city's government between the Commissioners has contributed to this problem. In this case, the Welfare Department and the Corrections Department are responsible to one Commissioner, the Police to another. Once again, no Commissioner can be held responsible for the whole range of elements involved in delinquency prevention programs. This is particularly unfortunate because some important agencies concerned with youth, such as the schools and the courts, are not under the direct control of the Commissioners.

NEIGHBORHOOD CENTERS

Problems of a different type are seen in the accelerating movement within many programs to decentralize government activities in order to bring services quickly and conveniently to neighborhood residents. For example, two of the District's major new programs designed to cope with the overwhelming urban problems of blight and poverty—community renewal and model cities—have as an important element the construction and provision of services from a number of neighborhood centers constructed close to the residents being served. At the same time, other neighborhood centers are also being considered or opened by the Welfare Department, the Health Department, the Recreation Department, and the Corrections Department. Other agencies, such as the Police Department, are also reviewing their pattern of decentralization.

It is difficult for the three Commissioners, however, to make sure that these various centers are placed in the optimum locations so that there is no duplication and overlap. Each Commissioner is responsible for his particular department, but none is really responsible for city government as a whole, or in this case, for insuring the maximum effectiveness of the desirable movement to make the government closer to the people.

These examples, I believe, are illustrative of the fact that despite long hours of conscientious effort, and I think I can state for all of the Commissioners that this has been the case, it seems to me that the Commission form of government is not geared to meet our problems. By its very nature, the multi-headed executive is inefficient and time-consuming. Some interesting examples of this may be seen in an analysis of the time spent by the Commissioners during the calendar year 1966. Some 17% of my time was spent in scheduled and unscheduled meetings with the Board. With the single Commissioner, as proposed in the reorganization plan, much of this time can be spent on substantive administrative decision-making rather than meeting with one's fellow Commissioners to achieve a group consensus of administration. Another 14% of my time was spent on ceremonial duties which, under the plan, will be shifted to the Council.

I think it is clear that it is preferable for the residents of the District, the President and the Congress to be able to hold a single individual responsible for effective administration within the District. This can be done only if one individual is the head of the District's administrative structure, not three individuals.

If a single Commissioner is to be truly responsible and responsive, he must have the authority to move the personnel and resources of the city government into positions which will maximize their effectiveness in resolving the city's ever-changing problems. This he will have under the provisions of the plan which allow him to establish appropriate agencies and offices and transfer personnel and funds. To my mind, this is one of the most important provisions of the plan. Currently, the Commissioners are heavily circumscribed in their ability to shift organizations and functions to meet these changing needs.

Improvements in organization, if at all, can now be made only after a cumbersome, time-consuming, and somewhat hazardous procedure. A proposed interdepartmental reorganization, even one involving shifting a small function performed by a few persons and positions, ordinarily are carried out through the budgetary and appropriation process. Such changes are subject to a point of order in the appropriation process in Congress.

Under the plan, however the Commissioner will have authority similar to that which Congress has afforded the heads of most executive departments—Justice, Interior, Commerce, Labor, Treasury, Agriculture—that is, authority to organize as seems appropriate to carry out the functions of the District. It will be possible to meet the demands for strengthened organization brought about by Congressional action, such as the model cities program, with greater speed and effectiveness.

I would now like to turn to the other major feature of the plan, the creation of a nine-member Council. The Council represents a significant advance in good government for the citizens of the District.

First, it places in a collective body, functions which are now inappropriately lodged in a three-man executive. The making of rules and regulations and other related activities authorized by the Congress would be carried out by a group which can concentrate on such functions without the distraction of executive responsibilities.

Secondly, the new Council offers a broader opportunity for the representation of the many different interests which make up this city. Thus, Section 201(b) of the plan, provides that the Council shall be made up of citizens who have been actual residents of the District for three years prior to appointment; that it shall be nonpartisan with no more than six members adherents of any one political party; and that appointments to the Council shall be made with a view toward achieving a Council membership which will be "broadly representative" of the District community. In this respect, the present structure of the District Government suffers from a double disability—three Commissioners are too small a group to represent adequately the wide range of citizen interests, yet, as I have stressed earlier, three is too large a number for executive leadership.

An important part of the Council's task will be to keep informed of the needs of the District's residents. This will require establishing and maintaining open channels of communication with its citizens. It would, I am certain, wish to hold public hearings on needed regulation and budget matters. In view of the plan's requirements that the Council members be District residents for at least three years and that the Council membership be broadly representative of the District of Columbia community, such channels would operate from the beginning of the Council's work.

The representative role of the Council, is as the President stressed, not a substitute for home rule. But it is a significant step toward responsible democratic government. Until Congress votes home rule for the District, the Council will afford Washington's citizens a greater opportunity to voice their views to citizen officials who have actual responsibility for making local ordinances and for proposing a budget to meet the city's needs.

In summary, I feel that the plan offers a significant opportunity to strengthen and modernize the government of the District of Columbia and to make it as efficient, effective and responsible as possible within the current balance of powers between Congress and the city. I know that I and the other Commissioners have striven during the past years to achieve this goal. In many ways, we have moved toward it. Yet, much more remains to be done. I hope that our successors can be a single individual who will be provided with the means to meet the objective expressed by President Johnson earlier this year, that of making the District "a city in which all Americans can take pride." I believe the plan is a good one—a strong and a needed step toward better government. I hope that the Congress will allow it to take effect.

Agnes Meyer—Practicing Citizen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 26, 1967

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, the people of the city of Washington are fortunate to have living among them a lady who has enriched their cultural and intellectual climate in countless ways for many years—Mrs. Agnes E. Meyer.

But Mrs. Meyer's activities are not confined to Washington. Five years ago, she founded and funded the National Committee for the Support of the Public Schools, to expand the dialog between educators, businessmen, and politicians on the problems of public education.

In an article in the June 10 edition of the Christian Science Monitor, Josephine Ripley justly states that Mrs. Meyer's committee "has become one of the most viable, vibrant forces in the country for school betterment."

Mrs. Meyer "has been a doer since 1921," Miss Ripley says, and her activities have given her "a special insight into the problems of education."

I urge my colleagues to read Miss Ripley's article about Mrs. Meyer, whose energy, capability, and generosity have contributed so much to the people of this city and this Nation. The article follows:

AGNES MEYER—PRACTICING CITIZEN

(By Josephine Ripley)

WASHINGTON.—If the whole country is "in a ferment today over the problems of education," it is due in part to the proddings of Agnes E. Meyer and her National Committee for the Support of the Public Schools.

Founded and funded by this wealthy owner of the Washington Post five years ago, this committee has become one of the most viable, vibrant forces in the country for school betterment.

Long a crusader for better schools, Mrs. Meyer felt that "a national effort was necessary to keep the whole country in forment about this problem of education."

She wanted to bring educators, business men, parents, civic leaders, and others from all over the United States together to compare notes, share ideas, discuss problems.

Interviewed at her embassy-size home here, she deplored the inhibitions of educators who say education must have nothing to do with politics.

"That's just nonsense," in her opinion. "They are dependent on politicians for their budget!"

To prove that the two groups have interlinking interests and responsibilities, Mrs. Meyer broke tradition by boldly inviting state legislators from all over the country to a Washington conference with the committee to talk about education and its related money problems.

It was a different kind of education conference because, as she told those who attended, "It is frankly political."

Mrs. Meyer is not a woman to beat about the bush or approach issues timidly. She has a commanding presence. She is tall, amply built—the kind of a person to whom people turn for advice, and get it, unadulterated. She is forceful and fervent in her espousal of causes.

She doesn't get around as much as she used to, she admits. But that doesn't limit her contacts with people all over the country.

She has been a doer since 1921, when a politician asked her bluntly, "Young woman, what are you doing for your country?"

That remark, she says, "drove me out of being a no-good intellectual and into becoming a practicing American citizen."

As a reporter for the old New York Sun, she was one of the first women to work in the city room of a metropolitan daily. Later she crusaded for education and social betterment through the columns of the Washington Post, then owned by her husband, and from the lecture platform.

All this has given Mrs. Meyer a special insight into the problems of education. She sees what many educators do not—that politicians and politics cannot be separated from educational progress.

"The pretense on the part of some members of the educational world that it can remain simon-pure only if it emphasizes its aloofness from politics has always been sheer nonsense," she sputters.

The success of her round-up of state legislators last December proved it. A number of legislators have now joined the committee. Many are asking for another meeting.

She is planning a conference in the fall to which business leaders will be invited.

"The leaders of industry really want to help with education because it is in their own interest," she pointed out.

"But they often do not understand the problems of the schools. Also, school people are suspicious of the industrialist for fear he will try to dictate."

So she plans to bring them together "and show them that their interests mesh."

Many improvements are taking place in the public schools, but on a piece-meal basis, she notes. "What we need is a general improvement—nationwide."

"How can we call ourselves a democracy if we don't give each child the same opportunity to develop his capacity to the utmost?" Mrs. Meyer asks.

"We have failed in this because we have been so much a middle-class nation, with the view that only the middle classes were interested in going to college.

"Only," she continues, "if you educate all your people can you tap all the latent talent that is now being missed because we have neglected the lower-income class."

Mrs. Meyer doesn't mean merely the Negro, she quickly adds. "I am sure there are poor whites but they don't have a spokesman."

One of her great ambitions is the establishment of community schools.

By community schools, she means a school that would be open morning, noon, and night. A school where there would be recreation as well as study. A school where older people would come and see what their children are learning, and what they themselves can learn.

From this she thinks would gradually come "a real culture that will demand of all our citizens new ideals and a new society which will deserve to be called a democracy."

The National Committee for Support of the Public Schools has members in all 50 states, more than 1,300 in all. It holds an annual conference to which members come at their own expense.

The committee keeps in constant touch with members, sending them outlines of conference speeches. Says Mrs. Meyer, "There is no use listening to speeches and not doing anything about them."

A constant stream of informative literature goes out from the Washington headquarters, including reports of factual research, either by the committee or by other people.

"We keep in touch with them throughout the year, either by telephone or letter, and encourage them to have meetings of their own to spur the local district of action," says the chairman and founder.

Asked what she feels the committee has accomplished in its five years, she replies quickly:

"A new ferment in enthusiasm. A new sense that other people in other states are working together. Better relationship between lay people and teachers. Between the community and the school."

Her parting reminder as the reporter leaves:

"Don't forget to mention my community school!"

Is the United Nations Still Useful?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 26, 1967

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, due to recent actions taken by Secretary General U Thant in the Middle East crisis, the usefulness of the Secretary General and of the United Nations itself, has come into question.

Two columns recently appearing in the Washington Star, dealt with, first, U Thant's illegal assumption of authority to unilaterally remove the Emergency Force from the Middle East, and second, the future of the United Nations as an effective peacekeeping organization.

I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following columns written by David Lawrence and Ralph McGill, which appeared in the June 21, 1967, edition of the Washington Star.

The articles follow:

THANT'S USEFULNESS QUESTIONED

The usefulness of U Thant as secretary-general of the United Nations has come into question. Without placing the matter before the U.N. General Assembly, he granted promptly last month President Nasser's request that the U.N. peace-keeping force be withdrawn from the armistice line on the Israel border. This led to the outbreak of hostilities in the Middle East.

Two pertinent documents now have been made public. One plainly sets forth the views of the late Dag Hammarskjold, who, as secretary-general in 1956, arranged with President Nasser for the U.N. force to go on duty at the armistice line and stay there "until the task of the force was completed." The other is the reply just made by Thant to the Hammarskjold memorandum.

It is clear that Hammarskjold knew there was a delicate point involved, and he left for future guidance a carefully written record and analysis of the whole subject. Thant now brushes this aside as an interpretation not binding upon him.

But there is a difference between an argument over the right of Egypt to ask for the withdrawal of the U.N.'s peace-keeping force and the obligation of the secretary-general to submit the whole matter to the General Assembly for its consideration and decision.

The real issue is what Secretary-General Thant should have done about Egypt's request. He consulted on May 17 with the members of the advisory committee of the United Nations Emergency Force—representatives of India, Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Brazil, Yugoslavia and Canada. Some of these envoys warned him that he should take the matter up with the General Assembly.

Unfortunately, however, the secretary-general had already advised Egypt that, if it formally requested withdrawal of the peace-keeping force, this would be granted. It was really not too late even then for a special meeting of the General Assembly to be called to deal with the problem, but Thant took no such steps and said that "it is not within the competence of the General Assembly to act." He felt that he himself had no choice but to grant the request from Nasser for the withdrawal. This he did on May 18.

The Hammarskjold memorandum of August 1957, on the other hand, argued these same points and emphasized that Egypt had made a "good faith" agreement not to withdraw its "consent" to the presence of the peace-keeping force without submitting the matter to the General Assembly. The late secretary-general wrote:

"My starting point in the consideration of this last-mentioned problem—the limitation of Egypt's sovereign right in the interest of political balance and stability in the United Nations Emergency Force operation—was the fact that Egypt had spontaneously endorsed the General Assembly resolution of Nov. 5, 1956 (creating the force) and by endorsing that resolution had consented to the presence of the United Nations Emergency Force for certain tasks. They could thus not ask the UNEF to withdraw before the completion of the tasks without running up against their own acceptance of the resolution on the force and its tasks."

Hammarskjold also mentions that he put squarely to President Nasser the necessity for an "agreement on withdrawal" with respect to the peace-keeping force, and told him that, "unless an agreement of this type was made," the secretary-general would recommend to the General Assembly the immediate withdrawal of troops which had just been sent in to police the armistice. Egypt's president was so anxious to have the peace-keeping force established that he acquiesced in the agreement.

The present secretary-general now says that, while he was aware of the Hammarskjold memorandum, it was not an "official document." But the points made cannot be erased. For the duty of the secretary-general is not to resolve such an important issue himself but to leave this to the United Nations, of which he is merely an administrative official.

The making of vital decisions is the function of the Security Council or of the General Assembly as set forth in the Charter itself. As it turned out, the one-man ruling gave encouragement to Egypt, which promptly mobilized its forces on the borders of Israel, and war ensued. Certainly the United Nations should provide against a recurrence of such blunders.

FUTURE OF UNITED NATIONS SEEN IN PERIL

What is the future of the United Nations?

Is the Middle Eastern crisis the beginning of a renaissance? Or is the U.N. sun setting?

The Soviet Union has been making much use of the U.N. Security Council. It was a somewhat abrasive and critical Nikolai Fedorenko who demanded a hurried, immediate "emergency" session of the council on that fateful Wednesday, June 7, when the Israeli successes in the Sinai desert and against Jordan were confirmed.

Yet, this was the same Fedorenko who on Monday before that Wednesday brusquely had refused the U.S. recommendation that a cease-fire be sought.

Again, on Thursday, June 8, the Security Council was summonded back. Once more the pleasant-looking, bow-tie wearing, pipe-smoking Fedorenko used the session to condemn the United States, and to demand the Israelis return all they had gained in war.

It was possible, sitting there in the press section of the council chamber to feel the almost tangible irony, the cynical brazenness of the situation.

It is chiefly the Russians, though not entirely so, who have not paid their financial allotments due the United Nations. It is largely their financial neglect, followed by others in their block, that has kept the United Nations close to the abyss of bankruptcy and substantially reduced the organization's prestige and potential for action. That the Russians should have so vigorously sought to use the United Nations—only when, and after the Arab allies had made their war thrust and been defeated—serve merely to etch deeper the irony of that neglect.

With the U.N. prestige and potential thus minimized, the international arena was, of necessity, reduced to power operations.

The Middle East buildup was open. There was no secret about it. Nasser mobilized his troops. Nasser demanded that United Nations security troops be withdrawn from the Gaza strip. The alacrity with which Secretary General U Thant complied has damaged him and the United Nations. The Israelis are uncomfortably right in charging that U.N. actions had encouraged the Arabs to war.

There was undenied escalation of raids into Israel by Shukeiry's "Palestine Legion" and by the Al Assifa (the Storm) guerillas of Syria. It is members of these groups who have maintained sniping since the acceptance of the cease-fire.

The Soviet Union holds the solution to the future of the Middle East. The Russians can proceed to rearm the Arabs with tanks, MIG aircraft and weapons. They can, in and out of the United Nations, promote discord rather than a settlement the Arabs can reluctantly accept. The Israelis will not want to keep the Sinai. They have a right to hold the high ground along the borders of Syria from which came the mortar and shell fire aaginst valley and villages—and, of course, against the guerilla raids of Al Assifa. The Gulf of Aqaba must be open to all shipping. The United Nations—and the Russians—were silent when Egypt blockaded Aqaba as a part of the prewar preparations by Nasser.

Jerusalem might be internationalized—if the United Nations is made viable by Soviet support and cooperation.

Soviet "interest" in Africa remains higher than commitment to the United Nations. Nasser had Soviet aid in Aden, at the entrance to the Red Sea. The Somalis had Soviet help across from Aden at the Red Sea entrance. Algeria is the latest "interest" in Africa—and the Middle East.

The outlook is complex and, at best, hidden by intrigues, feuds, angers and ambitions. The United Nations could be entering a new phase of usefulness. Or, it could be undergoing cynical "use" for non-peaceful objectives. If so, the United Nations, God forbid, may be on its way out.

Reason and Restraint in a Democratic Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD J. IRWIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 26, 1967

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, in a commencement address last month to the graduating class of the State University of New York at Buffalo, President Kingman Brewster, Jr., of Yale University, discussed dissent in a democratic society. The newspaper coverage intrigued me and, now that I have read the speech in its entirety, I find my curiosity well rewarded.

Seldom have I seen a more succinct analysis of the politics of polarization and accommodation; or a more eloquent plea for the restraint and tolerance which permit a democratic society to enjoy freedom and grow through diversity.

President Brewster advocated no easy solution to our involvement in Vietnam, which is the subject of much of today's agonizing debate. But he emphasized that the terms of that debate are of critical importance to the institutions of free government and to the integrity of our academic traditions.

I believe that this warning against the antirational tendencies of suppression and disruption merits a wide audience, and under unanimous consent I include it in the Record:

Commencement Address at State University of New York, at Buffalo, by Kingman Brewster, Jr., President, Yale University, May 28, 1967

Screaming journalism makes it fashionable these days to engage in the game of gap spotting. Whether in ladies swimming garb or White House communiques—its the gap that counts. Then there is the "generation gap." Such is the perversity of social history that the well rounded boy of a generation ago is the square of today. Then there is the ancient gap between the academy and the market place measured by the holier than thou scorn of the academics; more than reciprocated by the "you can't change human nature" realism of the businessman.

Whatever the differences of political taste among us, however, our common ground is more important. I would like to dwell here for a moment on the importance of holding that common ground against the invasion of suppression from the right and disruption from the left.

On the far left there are some few so disillusioned with things as they are that they would tear the house of freedom down by pulling the props of all self restraint. On the far right are some few so panicked by the prospect of any change that they would suppress all social criticism and all striving for broader freedom. Both would pit hate against hate so that all of us, liberal and conservative alike, would be consumed in a violent civil war of extremes.

The liberals among us, especially the academic liberals, are sometimes tempted to rationalize and excuse a call to hate or violence if it is uttered in the name of the victims of poverty or discrimination. Conscience stricken quiet acquiescence in slogans of hate and destruction; rationalization that "you can't blame them," or a cynical defense that "it's the only way to call attention to the problem" each loosens one more stone to start the avalanche of counter hate, counter violence, whose burden will fall hardest on any minority which can be made the scapegoat. Its cruelest victims are always the minorities in whose name violence unleashes counter violence.

We of academic privilege who are supposed to be our brothers' thinker and dedicated to rational persuasion must repudiate this deliberate mongering of racial hate and willful incitement to violence.

The conservatives among us, especially the business conservatives, are sometimes tempted to rationalize and excuse the witch hunt and the suppression of civil rights. They march toward oppression under the banner of maintaining civil order. Repudiation of violent change spills over into rejection of all change. Distaste for the implications of hateful slogans like "black power" recoils into the subtler, more polite forms of "white power" and almost unconsciously permits racism to become respectable again.

Those of commercial, financial and industrial privilege who are supposed to symbolize the world's greatest accomplishment of material welfare and economic opportunity must repudiate this deliberate scapegoat politics and the appeal to "white power."

If we are not to be forced into a choice between radicals and reactionaries, then liberals and conservatives must defend their common faith in progress through ordered freedom. Neither molotov cocktails nor police barricades can make dignity and decency and opportunity a living reality for everyone's children. The urgent task of those gathered here, young and old alike, is to demonstrate that the promise of the freedom we take for granted can made real for the whole society.

And now, to the age old strain which gross economic, educational, and social inequality have always put upon the processes of ordered freedom, is added the strain of a war we wish we were not in, which we cannot totally win, and which we dare not lose.

Five years ago this month, President Kennedy resolved to multiply vastly the armed American presence in Vietnam. It was then plausible to say that there was no other way to prevent the balance of communist world power from shifting from the Soviet counsel of coexistence to the Chinese prophets of aggression.

The American commitment in Vietnam proved irreversible; and, being irreversible, could only vindicate the forebodings of those who predicted vast expansion of the initial commitment when it was made. But this hindsight does not alter the plausibility and possible correctness of that decision.

To allow a war of national liberation to succeed in 1962 might have vindicated Chinese aggressive doctrine, and encouraged a worldwide rash of sponsored wars; civil in form, but imperial in global pattern.

There were differences then, plausibly, rationally debated. Disagreement, however, did not then fester into distrust; opposition did not erupt into demonstration, let alone disruption.

Now, five years later, our military commitment has reached almost the exact level gloomily predicted by those who counselled President Kennedy against the initial move. While the military situation is less desperate in terms of possible United States defeat in South Vietnam, it is apparently no better in terms of bringing a peace which might outlast our presence. It is vastly worse in terms of the risk of larger war.

Even though history will probably never put the matter so clearly each one of us should perhaps answer the question: if the Chinese were to give us an ultimatum to withdraw or to face their hordes as in Korea, do we stand or should we retreat. On this question the division in this country would not be evenly divided but there would be a deep gulf between fellow citizens.

Several in number, but a minority, I think a very small minority, would say that to resist, not to withdraw, would condemn the world to nuclear destruction.

Many many more, an overwhelming majority I believe, would say that to fall back in face of such threatened Chinese intervention would surely condemn the world to nuclear disaster.

The alternative lines of reasoning are each quite plausible.

One would say that to confront the Chinese, especially now that they have nuclear power, would be inevitably to invite us to use whatever force, including the weapons of frightfulness, would be necessary in order to prevail. The dikes of our self restraint would be breached beyond repair.

The counselors for withdrawal would say no stakes in Vietnam would begin to be worth this price.

The bigger voice, the more popular voice, would say: to back down in the face of Chinese ultimatum would forever vitiate our capacity to deter aggression or to prevent attack on our more vital interests. Nuclear war would ultimately be invited. In some future West Berlin or South Korea a confident enemy who thought he could call our bluff would find, too late, that he was in fact pushing us beyond our exasperation point.

To stand firm now when we might at best deter or at worst prevail without resort to nuclear weapons would be the only way to prevent a later global holocaust.

When differences are plausible and the stake for which disagreement wagers is the survival of civilization itself, the confrontation generates a passion whose height or depth knows no limit. Let one spark of distrust fall from the torches of those who are not of good will and disagreement may flare into a conflict between those who would suppress and those who would disrupt the processes of democracy.

You know and I know that there are among us a few who would positively welcome a preventive war against China. Happily their voices are so few and their prescription so noxious that they will rarely avow their views in public.

You and I also know that there are some few, a very noisy few, who would like to see not only the Chinese prevail in Asia and world revolution spread, but who would welcome the destruction of the American society.

You and I also know friends of the right who are panicked by the threat of disorderly dissent, who assume that all objection to official policy is communist inspired. General Trudeau's testimony a few days ago reeks with this fearful invitation to suppression. And there are those, like Congressmen Rivers and Hebert, who are bold enough to imply that the first amendment to the Constitution, the first of the Bill of Rights, is an obstacle to the order they would seek.

You and I also know friends of the left whose impatience with the processes of democratic society urges recourse not only to protest and demonstration but to the threshold of violence and sabotage in the name of their own convictions.

Statements by some who seek to rally a following for a summer of protest against the Vietnam war have revealed a yearning for violent disruption, in callous disregard for the claims of ordered freedom and the democratic process.

It makes me unhappy that I have no confident prescription for a peace which would not invite an even more frightful war.

But I am confident that our chances of discovering such a path, and our chances of enduring and surviving this time of anguish depend upon convincing rejection of the counsels of suppression *and* disruption.

Freedom requires both boldness and patience.

To those who would suppress dissent I say you are of little faith, unworthy of those who have risked the unknown shores and the unknown frontier because they believed that no idea or way of life was good enough to be imposed.

Of course freedom is risky. The majority might be wrong. But freedom also requires patience. Somehow in the fullness of time people seem to be able to come out right, if censorship does not defraud them of a chance to make up their own mind.

To those who would disrupt the orderly processes of government in order to call attention to their convictions, I say you forfeit the consideration of a society which relies on rational persuasion as the arbiter of its destiny.

Of course the processes of a free society are often tedious and sometimes corrupt. But the ways of democracy are preferable to the dictate of even the most righteous; whether that dictation be imposed by the coercion of authority or the blackmail of disruption.

The dread is that these two monsters, suppression and disruption wil feed and fatten each other. Each is, in fact, justified by the other.

If suppression is the mandate of official power, then indeed disruption may be the only recourse of those who believe in freedom.

If disruption is the counsel of those who disagree with official policy, then suppression may be the only recourse of those who believe in order.

What has this to do with you.

A very great deal. For you here have been privileged to struggle for knowledge and judgment and purpose in a place which has fortified you—and fortified itself—against suppression in the face of visible provocation. And this place, too, has fortified you, and itself, against the anarchy of disruption in the face of equally visible provocation.

If either disruption or suppression had triumphed, your University would not be worthy of these days of celebration.

The vast majority of your fellow Americans want neither to suppress dissent nor violently to disrupt the civil order. But tolerance and patience are easily exhausted.

In the swirling tempest of anguish of a Vietnam your job is to keep tolerance and patience alive. The privilege of your education puts upon you the obligation to protect reason against the strident arrogance of both the tyrant and the anarchist.

No matter how deeply held your own policy convictions may be, you must remember and remind your country that it is wise restraint which makes men free.

Communist-Free World Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 26, 1967

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, there is continued debate over Communist-free world relations. We note the persistent attempts of the administration to paint Communist dictatorships in Eastern Europe in friendly hues. Therefore, I deem it of special interest to insert in the RECORD at this point the following newspaper article and editorial commentary from the Copley Press reporting on an interview with exiled King Michael of Rumania, and on the situation in that Iron Curtain country.

The material follows:

[From the Aurora (Ill.) Beacon-News, June 8, 1967]

TIES BETWEEN KING MICHAEL AND RUMANIANS BEING CUT

(By Dumitru Danielopol)

VERSOIX, SWITZERLAND.—Slowly, inexorably, the ties are being severed between King Michael and the people of Communist ruled Rumania.

This year, for the first time since 1950, the exiled king was not allowed to address a new year message to Rumania over Radio Free Europe. RFE said it would only accept excerts or a report, not a speech.

To Michael, this is another link in a chain of appeasement to Communist Europe.

The British Broadcasting Corporation was the first to drop the king's new year's message. This station, being the official voice of the British government, reflects policy changes in London.

But for RFE the change is less understandable. It is supposed to be independent. Washington's policy is reflected by the Voice of America. Radio Free Europe was created specifically to "fight communism" in Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland and Rumania. It raises considerable money in the United States on the basis bringing the truth behind the Iron Curtain.

The king's annual broadcast was an important part of this fight. It was reassurance that Rumanians were not forgotten. It was a reminder about the illegality of their government. It was not a bid to restore the monarchy.

The Reds in power didn't like it, and they said so.

Cancelling the broadcast is a feather in their cap.

Radio Free Europe officials admit they have altered their strategy. They say they have abandoned outright hostility to communism for "more practical" efforts to encourage liberalization inside the Communist framework.

The change is not welcome among exile groups in Germany and other West European countries.

An American hears exiles complain that the American station in Munich no longer interprets the ideals of the captive peoples.

"We do not use the old exiles anymore," John Richardson Jr., chairman of the Free Europe Committee, told Alfred B. Gielen of the exile organization CIAS in Bonn, "they are too reactionary."

RFE is now using some newly arrived nationals from the satellite countries to augment the older exiles still employed.

They are used as technicians, announcers and writers, the general policy line being determined by Americans.

But, remarked Gielen, anybody who survived for 20 years in eastern Europe and was allowed to write must have accepted at least some Communist propositions.

"Some of them couldn't get a visa into the United States," said one exile. "They couldn't take the required oath that they were never Communists. But they can work as anti-Communist propagandists."

According to the Rev. Vasile Zapartan of the United Romanian Catholic Church in Munich, there is great anxiety among eastern European exiles over the change in tone of RFE broadcasts. They no longer constitute a fight against communism, they claim, but offer a controversy over what brand of communism suits each country best.

"Many people are discouraged," said the priest. "They wonder whose voice they are listening to."

(By Ray McHugh, Copley News Service)

VERSOIX, SWITZERLAND.—A tricycle on the lawn, a mini-station wagon in the carport, a mother worrying about her dinner and her five daughters and a father whose hobby is to keep a World War II jeep in top condition.

It's not a very regal scene, but it's home for King Michael and Queen Anne of Romania.

Here in a quiet rented house on the shore of Lake Geneva, the king pursues a career as a stockbroker and his queen says, "I'm just a housewife."

The throne in Bucharest is only two hours away on one of the silver jet airliners that roar overhead, but it's 20 tortured years away from the tall, still-handsome king who once staged a coup to take his country out of an alliance with Nazi Germany, only to have it overrun and overcome by Communist Russia.

As the sun blazed down on the blue lake and green lawns and a cooling breeze blew in through open doors, the king and queen presented a picture that was more "American Suburbia" than European royalty.

The slip-covered living room furniture is old, but sturdy—the kind families need to withstand five daughters and three playful puppies. Obviously homemade shelves hold the king's "treasure"—a fine collection of records and tapes that leans heavily to classical music. The paintings and watercolors on the wall are pastoral scenes.

There is nothing in the room to suggest that the host once ruled a country of 20 million people and traces his ancestry to queen Victoria, czar Nicholas and Kaiser Wilhelm or that the hostess was once a Danish princess.

Nothing, that is, until the couple begins to speak—the king in quiet carefully chosen words; the queen in a more relaxed, almost rushing fashion, perhaps a reflection of World War II days when she worked in Sak's Fifth Avenue during the Nazi occupation of Denmark.

The conversation quickly turns to the broad range of East-West issues with particular emphasis on Romania and the other Soviet satellites in eastern Europe.

There is no note of wishful thinking. This couple is not siting in Versoix dreaming of some faroff day when they might be invited back to Bucharest.

"That is behind us," said Anne, "but our concern for the people of Romania is not behind us. We live with that everyday. Michael was raised with a sense of responsibility for their well-being. The Russians could drive him from his country, but they couldn't kill his love for it.

"We only hope that some day those people will be free again to make their own choices."

The king receives regular reports on conditions inside the country.

"I'd rather not say who sends them," he said.

Until last December, he made annual Christmas broadcasts to Romania, but when Radio Free Europe refused to transmit the full text last year, Michael withdrew his speech.

The Communists have imposed a curtain of silence between the king and his people. He has not received a letter from inside Romania in 20 years.

"If any of the people did try to write," he said, "it would probably be dangerous for them. The Communists would undoubtedly intercept the message."

The king favors East-West trade so long as it does not involve credits that might bolster the Communist regimes. Cash or barter deals can help raise the standard of living, he says, but he suggests that the West should demand "respect for human rights" as the price of such trade.

The King rejects the reported "liberalization" behind the Iron Curtain.

"The police power is still there," he insists. "It's hidden in a velvet glove so the tourists they need so badly aren't too aware of it, but the Romanian, or the Czech or the Hungarian doesn't have any doubts."

The one essential difference between communism and a free society remains unchanged, he said.

"We believe that a man is born with certain inalienable rights. The Communists say all rights are given by the state, and therefore can be taken away by the state.

"This is the basic point. It's the root of all the cruelty and oppression in communism."

In Vietnam, the King said, the United States is involved in "a dirty war that many people do not understand, but you must persevere and win. Otherwise, we will have wars everywhere."

In Europe, he warned, "the Russians are making great psychological gains. They are lulling the Europeans into a false sense of security. The United States must not take Europe for granted. It must not become so preoccupied in Asia that it forgets the North Atlantic Treaty Organization."

The King's pale blue eyes seemed to grow more intense and he leaned forward in his chair.

"You know, the Russians are playing this chess game according to a carefully drawn plan. Vishinsky (former Soviet Foreign Minister) outlined it for me right after the war. They have made minor detours, but it's amazing how they have stayed on course.

"The world made the mistake of not believing Hitler. It must not make the same mistake about the Soviets."

Then he relaxed and the mood was gone.

That intensity seemed to belong to a king. When it passed, Michael was once again a businessman ejoying a Saturday afternoon at home.

The Queen who had listened intently rose as if she, too, knew the moment had passed.

"Excuse me," she said, "I have to see to things in the kitchen."

Build Our Ships Here

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY C. SCHADEBERG

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 26, 1967

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, the June 9, 1967, issue of the Seafarers Log, a publication for men in the business of building and operating seagoing ships, contained an editorial by the International President of the Seafarers International Union of North America, Atlantic, Gulf, Lakes, and Inland Waters District, AFL–CIO. This gentleman, Mr. Paul Hall, brings out the very points we here must concern ourselves with: Jobs for Americans and keeping some $1 billion in business right here in this country.

However, Mr. Hall brings out the points which I feel every Member of the House should realize and remember when the time comes to consider appropriations for this very vital, and very necessary program. The editorial reads as follows:

REPORT OF INTERNATIONAL PRESIDENT

(By Paul Hall)

Hardly a day has passed in recent months without some mention in the press of the desire on the part of Administration officials to allow a percentage of American ships to be built in foreign shipyards.

Proponents of the so-called "Build Abroad" program declare that there is a simple logic in the idea as they claim that a ship can be built in a foreign shipyard for about half what it costs in the United States. All things being equal, this simply is not true. A more realistic picture is drawn from a recent instance in which a British shipyard was underbid by 19 per cent by an American yard until the Department of Defense relaxed quality standards to a point where the British firm was able to undercut the U.S. price by a mere 4.5 per cent. That is a far cry from 50 per cent.

Those who favor building abroad, however, insist that there would be substantial savings through such a program and fail to look beyond the actual cost of a vessel on paper to the many disadvantages involved.

The arguments against foreign construction of American Ships far outweigh the weak case that is presented for it.

It has been estimated that Transportation Secretary Alan S. Boyd's proposal to build U.S. merchant ships abroad would result in the loss of thousands of Americans' jobs and deprive U.S. industry of close to $1 billion worth of business annually. That in itself, together with the adverse effect such a program would have on this country's balance of payments, should be reason enough to abandon the plan.

The facts are clear. In order to realize appreciable savings by building abroad, the Administration would be forced to sacrifice the high calibre of quality and safety standards which are expected in American ships as a matter of course.

Much of the money, saved because workers in foreign yards have a lower standard of living than we have here and can work more cheaply than American workers, will be taken directly from the pockets of our own labor force by depriving vast numbers of our citizens of jobs. This may provide a windfall for some American businessmen but it can't help but prove costly to the economy of the nation as a whole.

A U.S. worker who loses his job to a foreign worker doesn't pay taxes on his income because he has no income. He can't buy American goods and services because money he might have earned is being used to pay workers abroad who, in their turn, are buying goods and services in their own countries. The forcibly idle U.S. worker is then forced to turn to his government for assistance through unemployment insurance.

It is not just the shipyard workers who would lose their jobs because of foreign shipbuilding, either. Steelworkers, electrical appliance manufacturers and many more would also be affected.

The SIU and unions affiliated with the Maritime Trades Department are vigorously opposed to any concept which will allow even a small percentage of American merchant vessels to be built abroad.

Those who would preserve our high living standards and American way of life would do well not to take the possibility of building American ships abroad lightly. If the Congress establishes a precedent by authorizing such a program, the way would be paved for other corporations to follow the shipping companies overseas. Cheap labor and lenient working conditions are no less attractive to big business today than they were before the labor movement in the United States won for American workers the high standards they enjoy today.

Simon A. Miller Winner of High Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENJAMIN B. BLACKBURN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 26, 1967

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, it is with a deep sense of pride that I pay tribute to an outstanding young man from the Fourth Congressional District of Georgia, Simon A. Miller, 1624 Briarcliff Road NE., Atlanta, who recently was declared the winner of one of the highest and most distinguished educational awards in our country.

Mr. Miller has been presented with the top cash award of $5,000 in the fourth annual educational fund awards program, sponsored by Great Books of the Western World. The worldwide competition, with thousands of participants, involved a series of preliminary examinations and essays on the great books.

The presentation was made to Mr. Miller by the eminent philosopher and literary authority, Dr. Mortimer J. Adler, at a recent Decatur Rotary Club meeting.

As Dr. Adler so aptly pointed out:

> Education is the largest single enterprise in this country.

This is a profound truth, and certainly it behooves all of us to encourage our young men and women to pursue learning as avidly as does Mr. Miller—to enable them to realize and use their full potential for the development of their own lives, and in the best interests of our Nation.

Simon Miller has brought special honor to himself and to his family, to Druid Hills High School, where he is a student, to our State of Georgia, and indeed to our country. He can well serve as an inspiration to all young people, and as an example of ability and intelligence developed to the highest degree. His future promises to be a brilliant one, and I look forward to following his progress with great personal interest and gratification.

Going Deeper Into Hock but Getting Out of Debt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 26, 1967

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, John B. Battistella, associate editor of the Suburban Life newspapers, which are published in my district, recently wrote an article that I believe my colleagues will enjoy reading. Mr. Battistella's subject was "Going Deeper Into Hock but Getting Out of Debt." He demonstrated the absurdity of the spenders' slogan, "We owe it to ourselves." The article follows:

GOING DEEPER INTO HOCK BUT GETTING OUT OF DEBT

(By John B. Battistella)

Citing a stack of statistics, one Willard Johnson, of San Diego, Calif., extolled the virtues of deficit financing; specifically the national debt. What triggered his views was a story by a Chicago newspaperman who said the United States debt exceeds $1.5 trillion. (The legal national debt limit is $336 billion.)

Johnson, Willard, that is, argued among other things, that in 1945 the federal debt was equal to 120 per cent of the gross national product. In 1965 it was 45 per cent of the GNP. That is a very real improvement, Johnson maintained.

Continuing, Johnson said that the per capita of our national debt in 1945 was $1,850 but by 1965 it was reduced to $1,650. Johnson, who must be an Alexander Hamilton, J. P. Morgan and Maynard Keynes, all rolled into one, could support his theory by citing that in 1945 the national debt was $258 billion while the population rose from about 140 million to approximately 195 million in 1965, or that the ratio between the increase of the national debt and the drop in the per capita was generally maintained.

By the middle of this year we are expected to reach the 200 million population mark, meaning of course that the federal obligation will be "shared" among millions more.

Everything else being equal, and if Johnson's argument were logical, our per capita debt will have been liquidated in 160 years; based on the $200 cut from 1945 to 1965.

Also, paradoxically, by the year 2125 when our per capita national debt will have been "eliminated" our federal debt will have jumped from $336 billion to $960 billion.

Based on the $14 billion annual interest bill by the year 2125 we will be paying about $42 billion annually in interest on the federal debt alone.

Demographers say that by the year 2015, 48 years hence (these are the latest figures from federal authorities), our population will have reached 482 million. A proportionate increase by the year 2125 would put our population at about 1.19 billion, still far lower than the 2.48 billion if our population, including Alaska, were proportionate to Japan's.

If by the Utopian Anno Domini we have the paradox of "no" per capita federal obligation but a staggering national debt of

$960 billion, the obvious beneficiaries will be the investors who will be collecting the interest bonanza.

Obviously, too, Johnson, Willard, that is, is a disciple of the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt who believed that deficit financing was something of a blessing. He said, "We owe it to ourselves."

Willard must also believe that what we need is more people to "share" the federal debt. Oh, we might be starving by then but we "won't" be owing money tô anybody except ourselves.

By that time we'll not only not have two cars in every garage; a couple of televisions in each home; a radio in each room, but we won't even have a bicycle in every basement.

Also, Mrs. America won't be throwing away as garbage 400 pounds of food annually.

Uneducated as my parents were they always said: "Don't buy anything on time if you can avoid it."

Weeklies Are a "Vital Forum"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 26, 1967

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, weekly newspapers are the most direct means of communications for people within individual communities. Weeklies are able to define local issues and give local meaning to larger questions. Community progress is often directly attributable to the diligent and courageous editorializing of weekly newspapers. Because of the important and articulate role weekly newspapers play in Nassau County, Long Island, it is appropriate that the week just past was proclaimed "Weekly Newspaper Week in Nassau County." Under leave to extend my remarks I am including the following editorial in the Record. This editorial was printed last week in all five of the Community Newspapers, a chain of weeklies that exemplifies the high standard of weekly journalism in Nassau County. The remarks in this editorial, however, can be said to apply to all of the more than 50 weekly newspapers in Nassau County. They do their job and they do it well.

False modesty almost kept us from telling you that this is "Weekly Newspaper Week in Nassau County." However, upon reflection, we felt you might be interested in what County Executive Eugene H. Nickerson had to say in issuing the proclamation:

"Whereas, the growth of weekly and suburban papers throughout Nassau County has contributed immeasurably to better informing the citizens of Nassau County, and

"Whereas, the weekly publishers and editors have assumed new roles as pioneering community leaders to lead as well as serve the million and a half residents of Nassau County, and

"Whereas, the Nassau County weekly newspapers have contributed to the growth, beauty, prosperity, culture and the arts of Nassau County, and

"Whereas, the weekly newspapers are providing a vital forum in which public discussion on all sides of all issues can be heard.

"Now, therefore, I do hereby proclaim the week of June 19–25 as Weekly Newspaper Week in Nassau County."

California Leaders Ask Support for S. 8 and H.R. 4769

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 26, 1967

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, the news media is replete with information these days regarding the organizational efforts of agricultural workers. Although much of the American labor force is organized and presently enjoying the benefits accruing to them as a consequence of their being organized, such is not the case for millions of workers on the farms and in the fields.

The task of organizing workers in the rural areas of our Nation is not an enviable undertaking. One need only witness the reports describing the well-entrenched opposition—some of it in the form of local officialdom—and obstruction, to realize this.

Although my particular district is not directly affected by this particular problem, I know that a large number of my constituents maintain a close affinity—as I do also—with the struggle of their compatriots in the rural areas of the Southwest and elsewhere. Moreover, I share the deep concern of those who seek a just solution to the problems and, also, maintain that justice will not be furthered by law enforcement agencies partial to either side.

Mr. Speaker, I insert the following statement, relevant to this issue, released by a distinguished group of citizens from my home State of California:

(Statement by group of Mexican-American leaders of California-based state and national organizations: Albert Pinon, national president, Community Service Organization; Phillip Ortiz, state vice-president, Mexican-American Political Assn.; Edward Moreno, chairman, assn. of Mexican-American Educators; Jess Vela, representing the California state director of the League of United Latin-American Citizens; Bert Corona, state president, Mexican-American Political Assn.; Judge Alford J. Hernandez, national president, League of United Latin-American Citizens; Dan Campos, state chairman, American GI Forum)

Last week a group of Mexican American leaders were in Washington to attend the swearing-in ceremony at the White House for new EEOC Commissioner Vincente T. Ximenes, and to meet with Congressmen and government officials. They wish to make know the following pressing concerns:

1. *Farm Worker Rights.*—The farm workers who put the fruit and vegetables on America's tables are desperately poor, exploited, and victimized. Their hard labor in the fields is made all the more difficult because so many of them must live under terrible disadvantages of filthy labor camps, unsafe transportation, poor health care, inadequate education. But one issue is more important than any other for the farm workers, most of whom are minority-group Americans: Mexican, Filipino, Puerto Rican, Negro, and former poor Dust Bowl Anglo-Americans. As the cultural and literal brothers and cousins of America's farm workers, we demand for them the same federal protections and rights that almost all other American workers have had for 30 years—the right to organize into labor unions.

Our people have begun such organizations repeatedly for a century, but have always been beaten down by harrassment, beatings, unjust imprisonment, and all the other powers in the hands of the highly organized, affluent and powerful agricultural businessmen who control both our employment and our local governments in the rural parts of this country. This same vicious pattern is being repeated now on the farm workers of the Rio Grande Valley by the corrupt local government, the selfish growers and the Texas Rangers used as strikebreakers by Governor John Connolly. This unfair, undemocratic and dangerous situation, duplicated wherever farm workers attempt to organize, can only lead to chaos in rural America.

The only wise solution is for the 90th Congress to pass S. 8 and H.R. 4769, amending the National Labor Relations Act to include agriculture so that both workers and employers will be required to bargain and will be protected when they do so. We urge the Administration to work together with all members of Congress to pass this legislation.

2) *Rio Grande Valley and President's Commission.*—We have strongly urged the President immediately to send his new Cabinet-level Committee on the Problems of Mexican-Americans to the tragic lower Rio Grande Valley where a critical and explosive situation prevails. We have also asked him to personally intercede and instruct Attorney General Ramsey Clark to send federal marshals to protect the civil and human rights of farm workers which have been violated by the Texas Rangers, who have been behaving like the 19th century company detectives who took the lives of so many poor workingmen.

3) *Rio Grande Valley and Senate.*—We call upon the members of Senator Harrison Williams' Subcommittee on Migratory Labor of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee, who have demonstrated their concern for farm workers, to come at once to Texas to investigate and help correct the injustices there.

Our Flag Is Flown in Victory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 26, 1967

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Harold Colee, the executive vice president and general manager of the Florida State Chamber of Commerce, delivered a most inspiring Flag Day speech on June 14, 1967, in Jacksonville, Fla.

Mr. Colee was president of the Florida State Chamber of Commerce before becoming its vice president and general manager in 1939. He has served the interests of the State of Florida in an admirable manner, helping to bring to the State many new business interests and earning the title of "Mr. Florida." During his years of public service, Mr. Colee has served as a trustee of Jacksonville University, as chairman of the State campaigns for the USO and Infantile Paralysis, and in 1960 as the chairman of the State advisory council of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights.

His Flag Day speech is deserving of the consideration of all House Members, and I am including it in the Congressional Record:

Flag Day Remarks by Harold Colee, Executive Vice President, Florida State Chamber of Commerce and Past President of Florida State Elks Association, Dallas Thomas Park, Jacksonville, June 14, 1967

Ladies and gentlemen, today is Flag Day . . . Flag Day 1967.

The spirit of 1777 which contributed to agreement on the design for a national emblem should soar with each American flag rippling the free air.

Our flag has never known dishonor or defeat. It has always flown for the rights of man and the freedom of the world.

In these times of strife and discontent—not just in other nations of the world but here in our own country—it is fitting that this day should be set aside to honor the symbol of the United States.

Today is Flag Day because it was on June 14, 1777 that the Continental Congress passed a resolution which established the Stars and Stripes.

General George Washington—when the Star-Spangled Banner was first flown at the head of the Continental Army—described its symbolism as follows:

"We take the stars from heaven, the red from our mother country, separating it by white stripes, thus showing that we have separated from her, and the white stripes shall go down to posterity representing liberty."

It frightens me to think what this First American would say were he here to witness the desecration of the world's greatest symbol of liberty by individuals and groups right here at home.

American citizens burning their own flag! And the Supreme Court of the United States deciding by a narrow margin that no man regardless of his treasonous or unpatriotic actions can be relieved of his rights as an American citizen.

It has been nearly two years now since the Florida State Chamber of Commerce took official notice and action regarding the deterioration in our citizens' respect for law and order.

Aid was enlisted from the Council of State Chambers and local chambers of commerce in Florida, and several other state chambers—especially that of Illinois—are taking positive action to return this nation to a saneness and balance which is absolutely necessary in this dangerous era.

The Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks cannot be commended too highly for this project which annually reminds us of our debt to this nation by honoring the nation's emblem.

It has been brought home to me in so many ways that our country needs Elkdom. It needs the unqualified spirit of patriotic devotion that Elkdom inspires and teaches. This ceremony tonight gives reality to this spirit.

America needs Elkdom's faithful devotion to the principles of decency, honor and personal integrity.

It has become obvious everywhere that our nation is in the grips of mass lawlessness and violence which is spreading like a rash. This can no longer be denied.

In large part I believe that this disorder is planned and willful. It seems to be designed to destroy our very civilization. It certainly is seriously threatening—if not destroying—law and order.

Favorably commenting on the Florida State Chamber's program among others were J. Edgar Hoover and former United States Supreme Court Associate Justice Charles E. Whittaker.

From a legal point of view, I would like to quote briefly from some recent remarks by Mr. Justice Whittaker.

He said that this current outbreak of violence has been termed—wrongly termed—"civil disobedience." He continued:

"The conduct that we have to deal with is *not* civil in nature nor is it 'passive resistance' or disobedience like that preached and practiced by Ghandi and Thoreau. Instead, what we are confronted by, and must deal with, are active, overt acts willfully committed in violation of criminal laws which are criminal violations—not civil disobedience."

This is the opinion of one of the nation's most eminent lawyers and jurists. I cannot agree with him more fully.

There are means which were carefully formulated by our forefathers and which have been kept up-to-date by our fathers and by our selves of making and of modifying our laws.

The foremost reason for this well-thought-out system has been to insure that our nation will remain a nation of law. Only in a nation of law can society be orderly. Only in a nation of law can society be enduring.

There is NO end—regardless of how good that end may seem to some—that can ever justify the use of forceful methods to bring about changes in our Constitution or in our laws.

In 1964 Mr. Justice Black of our Supreme Court said:

". . . the Constitution does not confer upon any group the right to substitute rule by force for rule by law. Force leads to violence, violence to mob conflicts, and these to rule by the strongest groups with control of the most deadly weapons."

Ladies and gentlemen, history is filled with the proof positive of Justice Black's position in this case. Will we learn nothing from the lessons of history?

It has been traditional at Flag Day events to review the glories of our nation and to identify our flag with those glories.

The fact that I have felt it necessary to deviate from this custom and comment on our present sad situation is a distressing illustration of events of our times.

The Stars and Stripes always has represented man's highest ideals. There are those in the sweaty jungles fighting and dying for these ideals.

The American flag represents tonight what it represented in 1777, in 1917, 1941 and 1967.

The flag of our country is the symbol of unity and spirit of freedom. As long as it flies our soldiers march, our ships sail and our planes provide us with special protection. As long as it flies we are a free, free country.

Those who do not like it, those who would desecrate it, those who would burn it, those who would betray it, forget what it has and does represent. If there be a man or woman in this country who does not love and does not respect its power, its dignity, its influence, let them go to other lands where oppression exists and learn through painful experience what they have forsaken.

There is pain in the hearts of fathers and mothers in the knowledge they have brought into this world children who have never learned our great history, and who refuse to spend a drop of blood in defense of a nation that has bled so freely to give them life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

We must still uphold the traditions and loyalties for which this flag flies, by respect for constituted authority, by unmasking the skulking traitors and subversives who threaten our institutions, by loyal service in teaching and practicing the precepts upon which our liberties are founded.

If we have the courage and the determination to face the future with the humility and the dedicated sacrifices of our founding fathers, then the Star Spangled Banner shall continue to fly over this—our home of the free and the land of the brave, and it is our prayer that "freedom fighters" in other lands may eventually secure these blessings which are ours. This is the goal of the American ideal.

It is not a requirement that tribute be paid to the flag. It is not required, but love, admiration and respect demands it.

Those born to hurt, to harm, and to destroy their homeland would not be tolerated anywhere else on the globe.

We have given much. We ARE giving much. We are a proud people, not willing to place ourselves under the heels of an oppressor. Our people, our lives, our liberty, our welfare, our destiny are wrapped up in this flag.

In closing I repeat that the spirit of Flag Day 1967 must reflect the spirit of 1777 when agreement was reached on this design. Our spirits should soar with each American flag rippling the free air.

And I re-emphasize that our flag has never known dishonor or defeat. It has always flown for the rights of man and the freedom of the world.

Compliment for O'Hare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 26, 1967

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Chicago Sun-Times, in an excellent editorial, has quite properly paid public tribute to a group of Federal Aviation Administration employees who, in my judgment, are the most skillful Federal employees in this country.

These are the men who man the control tower at O'Hare Field. The tribute paid to them by the Sun-Times is most appropriate and most deserving.

I hope the Federal Aviation Administration will note the public acclaim bestowed upon these dedicated and loyal Federal employees. They set a standard of excellence which should be emulated by Federal employees throughout the Government.

O'Hare Field is the world's busiest airport. It is a miracle of our time that the men in O'Hare tower who guide the arrivals and departures of aircraft have been able to perform their duties with such spectacular precision.

I have often said that these employees should have some form of access to an early retirement, if they so desire, because of the great strain under which they perform their duties every day.

It would be my hope, also, that the FAA will note the public acclaim for these employees and find some way of properly rewarding their spectacular achievement.

I would like to add one footnote to the excellent Sun-Times editorial and that it is to include in this high praise not only the Federal employes who work in the O'Hare control tower, but also all those employees who man the radar control center which has performed feats of precision beyond the call of duty.

The personnel in the radar control center, which handles the traffic for O'Hare Field, constitute the eighth wonder of the world because day in and day out they have to closely oversee vast numbers of aircraft in holding patterns during peak rush hours and also during bad weather.

The high degree of perfection that these talented people bring to their jobs daily is truly one of the inspiring achievements of our time.

While millions of passengers come to and from O'Hare Field and marvel at the modern aircraft, these silent Federal employees who live virtually in total obscurity, seldom receive the tribute which they have so richly earned.

It is for this reason that I include the Sun-Times editorial today and wish to publicly acknowledge all of the dedicated Federal employees who control the destiny of so many people in the air and on the ground at O'Hare Field.

Mr. Speaker, the editorial follows:

COMPLIMENT FOR O'HARE

The men who man the control tower at O'Hare Field received a nice compliment recently. It was in a long story by Glenn Mapes, reporter for the Wall Street Journal, telling of his experience riding 29 hours in a United Air Lines plane, N7408U.

"Approaching Chicago's O'Hare Field," wrote Mapes, "N7048U got a taste of air traffic congestion. The world's busiest airport, O'Hare lands or takes off an average of nearly one plane a minute around the clock. Delays of 30 to 40 minutes are common; sometimes they add up to an hour or more. Yet pilots rate O'Hare one of the best-controlled airports in the nation. In fact, many fliers say they would rather land there than brave the less crowded skies at other airports with less experienced Federal Aviation Authority controllers."

At the next stop, San Francisco, Mapes had a chance for comparison and to learn why pilots rate Chicago so well. On the descent an outbound DC 6 came toward his plane but passed under closely. The San Francisco controllers hadn't mentioned it. Mapes' pilot didn't rate it a close call but to Mapes it was uhnerving.

So to the men in the O'Hare control tower, nice going and may all your planes continue to take off and land safely.

Report No. 2: "A Strategy for a Livable Environment"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1967

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, as I indicated I would do in my initial favorable comments on the HEW task force report regarding "a strategy for a livable environment," I am today offering more specific comments about the report. In upcoming days, I intend to continue this practice.

It is my sincere hope that my colleagues will see fit to add their thoughts on this most pressing and serious topic; the improvement of man's environment.

The task force has produced a highly intelligent report, most deserving of careful attention by each Member of Congress, by members of the executive branch, and by all citizens interested in resolving environmental problems.

Unfortunately, time is against us. Every day we delay, every day we wait to see if nature will resolve man's pollution problems, is a day lost in one of mankind's toughest battles. Had there been foresight and concerted action years ago, perhaps many urban dwellers would not be faced today with periodic smog alerts. Perhaps rivers would be conducive to swimming, rather than dangerous to life. It is now incumbent upon us to act speedily by giving prompt and serious consideration to all proposed legislation in the fields of air and water pollution, lest we be completely inundated by manmade wastes—the destroyers of nature's balanced environment.

As I mentioned previously, we must not focus exclusively on the most obvious and publicized problems. We cannot afford to ignore the more subtle elements of deterioration, such as noise, crowding, and urban decay, among others. These forces are growing more dangerous daily. Radiation hazards and traffic congestion are too often conveyors of death to innocent bystanders. Land has shown a propensity to sink radically in places as diverse as Long Beach and the San Joaquin Valley in California. These are among the many challenges which we should now begin meeting earnestly rather than waiting for the problems to become so overwhelming that we must adopt a "crisis approach," much as we are being forced to act in air pollution.

To help pinpoint potential problem areas as well as to begin developing possible solutions for environmental maladies which are yet not overly publicized, I am in firm agreement with the task force report's suggestion of establishing a Council of Ecological Advisers. The Council would "provide an overview assessment of activities in public and private sectors affecting environmental change." Hopefully, the Council would be able to arrive at a coordinated, nationwide environmental policy. It seems to me that the Council of Ecological Advisers would resemble the President's Council of Economic Advisers. By making recommendations ahead of crises, by attempting to foresee potential problems, and by providing direction for an integrated national effort in overcoming environmental problems, the Council can serve a critical need which is not being adequately met.

Perhaps one of the greatest contributions that a Council of Ecological Advisers could provide would be the publication at regular intervals of an extensive bibliography of current articles and books relating to the environment. At present, there are a large number of fairly specialized publications which do a respectable job in recapitulating major developments in their specific fields. What I have in mind is a rather ambitious project, an attempt at listing as many relevant articles pertaining to all aspects of man's environment as is possible. I am fully aware that to list every conceivable journal, magazine, or newspaper article; every book; every pamphlet; every academic dissertation would be a hopeless task. But this does not mean that we should abandon attempts at forming a "Bibliography of Current Environmental News." Modern computer technology could be most helpful in making such a bibliography fairly comprehensive and inclusive, a handy guide for people interested in being fully aware of the "happenings" in man's environment.

As you have undoubtdely noticed, Mr. Speaker, I have not been very specific in this proposal. But this is only a proposal at this stage. I welcome comments from my colleagues on this subject and also hope to receive suggestions from professionals who are actively engaged in environmental research. At some later date, I hope to produce a specific, coherent proposal along these lines.

A second major administrative proposal enunciated by the report is the establishment of an HEW Office of Assistant Secretary for Research and Development. The purpose of this office would be to insure that HEW activities are integrated into a total systems approach, thereby a concentration and intensive coordination of research developments in the department being assured. This would undoubtedly be a constructive and ultimately a money-saving goal, as needless duplication of effort would be avoided.

Finally, in the administrative suggestions of "A Strategy for a Livable Environment" there is one section which distresses me. Perhaps I am misreading the report at this juncture, but it seems to plainly state that HEW should establish liaison offices in other governmental departments to coordinate environmental programs and research. It seems to me that this would eventually lead to proliferating demands from other government departments involved in aspects of man's environment for their own liaison offices in other departments. Parkinson's law would quickly be implemented and we would be faced with a morass of interdepartmental liaison offices.

In my humble opinion, the proposed Council of Ecological Advisers should be entrusted with such a task. The Council would be in an ideal position to coordinate the various activities relating to man's environment by being entrusted with the task of keeping informed of what all departments are doing in this field. Each department would be in charge of the actual implementation of programs that they are entrusted with.

But the Council would be able to pinpoint quickly and accurately who is doing what. In other words, it could serve as a "clearinghouse" on governmental activities relating to the environment. In fact, ideally, the Council would be able to keep abreast with all activities pertaining to man's environment—be they Federal, State, local, private, or nonprofit foundation programs.

Funds for the training of manpower to help combat environmental problems is one of the high priority items of the report. Additionally, public awareness of various environmental hazards is imperative. An aroused public is one effective catalyst for congressional action. While I would not support the establishment of a gigantic executive propaganda agency to coordinate public pressures on Congress, I would say that public education is most important.

In my next comments about the task force report, I will delve further into the areas of manpower training, public awareness, and most importantly, the need for intensive school education in environmental health.

NLRB's Failures Make Labor Court Necessary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 26, 1967

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, the National Labor Relations Board has been weighed in the balance and found wanting. The time has come when it should be replaced by a labor court. With that in mind I have introduced H.R. 8640. Under this bill the court would be composed of 15 members, appointed for terms of 20 years, with staggered terms.

The need for this change has become quite apparent in recent years. In this industrial age it is imperative that we update our means of coping with problems growing out of labor-management relations. There is too much involved to continue to treat this issue lightly, and leave in irresponsible hands the solution of problems which deserve the best solutions that this enlightened age can provide.

Mr. Speaker, hardly a week goes by when we do not hear of one or more instances of the failure of the NLRB to measure up to its responsibilities. It is utterly lacking in the exercise of judicial conduct. That fact has become well known. The simple and undeniable fact is that the Board, and its subordinates, have become stacked with people who consistently show a callous indifference to the legitimate rights of buiness enterprises and constant bias in favor of labor unions. These charges are well founded and can be thoroughly documented.

The American people can hardly comprehend the awesome power of the NLRB. By delays, arbitrary decisions and contradictory actions, designed to hamper business, this agency can detroy a thriving business and subject thousands of enterprises to intolerable and inexcusable expenses. And this has happened in many instances.

The NLRB should be investigated. Instances of its pattern of unfairness have mounted to the point that something should be done to protect business, workers, and the public interest against the exercise of arrogant and arbitrary power, such as is now lodged in the NLRB.

STEVES SASH & DOOR CO. CASE

Mr. Speaker, a score of cases have recently been called to my attention, which originated in the area I represent, wherein the NLRB has been tested and found wanting. I shall take the time to cite but a few of them, with respect to which I have sought and obtained some facts.

In the case of Steves Sash & Door Co., of San Antonio, a 2-year contract was agreed to after a harrowing experience by management, covering a period of more than a year of negotiations. I shall not detail them here. During that period the union changed chief negotiators six times, and repeatedly reneged on agreements previously reached. And during that period the record is replete with evidence of all sorts of acts of coercion and intimidation applied to the company by those inspired and directed by union negotiators.

A number of what appears to have been wholly unwarranted complaints against the company were issued by NLRB's Houston regional office, many of which were obviously done for the sole purpose of helping the union. I defy any fair-minded person to read the record and come to any other conclusion.

The record in that case also reveals that charges against the union were filed in several instances. But, although supported by the strongest of evidence, they were either dismissed or no action was taken on them by the regional director.

It is significant that in every instance where the union filed a complaint against the company, the Houston office ruled the complaint had merit, irrespective of the facts to the contrary.

The record of this case, which is voluminous, reveals a sordid pattern of complete unfairness toward the company on the part of the regional office. Yet, under the present system the company was helpless. Its only recourse against this exercise of autocratic power was to hire lawyers and file appeals, at intolerable cost.

PATIO FOODS, INC., CASE

Mr. Speaker, on last May 19 I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an instance of utter unfairness exhibited by the NLRB's Houston office in the case of Patio Foods, Inc., also of San Antonio. I there documented a most remarkable case of repeated instances of utter disregard for the rights of the company in the course of negotiations with a union.

Again, I defy any fairminded person to examine the record of that case and not agree, without reservation, that the regional director arbitrarily and repeatedly ignored the legitimate rights of the company and resorted to extreme measures in favor of the negotiating union. It is a record that is lopsided with bias and completely devoid of any evidence of efforts to make decisions which were fair and reasonable.

LONE STAR TEXTILES, INC.

Another instance of this pattern of unfairness was the case of Lone Star Textiles, Inc., of Halletsville, Tex. In that case three relatively small cotton mills which were about to be closed were bailed out by a family, which then undertook to keep the workers employed and make the plants succeed. But since the acquisition the company has been plagued with a long series of union demands, slowdowns, intimidations, and severe economic losses.

Here is another case where the union's repeated charges of unfair labor practices were on every occasion upheld by the NLRB's Houston regional office. And, in keeping with scores of other cases, every charge filed by the company was summarily disallowed.

This is another record that is replete with a pattern of repeated and consistent bias in favor of the unions involved. The company's grievances were brushed aside, and the NLRB's Houston office entered into a virtual partnership with the unions and showed no evidence whatever of fairness in resolving the issues. This office has repeatedly aided and abetted in pursuing efforts to harass, intimidate, and coerce—in case after case.

A fair and impartial investigation will confirm everything I have said about this case.

B. & W. ENGINEERING MANUFACTURING CO.

Mr. Speaker, I shall refer to but one other instance of misconduct on the part of the NLRB and its personnel. This one relates to the B. & W. Engineering and Manufacturing Co., of San Angelo, Tex., a foundry which employs about 40 people. Although the company paid good wages and enjoyed pleasant relations with its employees, it found itself suddenly beset by a strike called by a visiting union organizer who claimed he had authority to represent a majority of the plant's workers. There had been no election by the employees, no official determination, to support this claim.

Almost immediately after first making the demand for recognition, the organizer ordered a strike, and on the same day filed a large number of charges against the company, even though the company had not declined to discuss the matter with the organizer. The organizer then employed the most ruthless forms of lawlessness, threats, and coercion in bringing pressure upon the company to yield.

The next day the company filed a formal request to have an election held, insisted the visiting organizer did not have authority to represent a majority of the workers, and agreed to abide by the results of an election which it requested the NLRB to hold. The organizer did not want that. And the NLRB's regional office in Fort Worth held that no election would be allowed while charges against the company were pending.

The question of the validity of the charges was submitted informally to NLRB's counsel in Washington, at the request of the company after the regional director had indicated the charges would stand. After a few weeks the company was notified that the charges would be dismissed. Following that the union filed an appeal to the NLRB with respect to the dismissal. Weeks later the NLRB counsel reversed the prior finding and ruled that the charges of unfair labor practices would not be dismissed. That brings the case up to date.

This presents a case of utter disregard for the rights of a small, struggling business. Here the NLRB has condoned an unwarranted assumption of authority on the part of an organizer who would not dare agree to a fair, supervised election to confirm his alleged authority. Why? Obviously because he knows he would lose. That in itself serves to prove the bad faith of the organizer.

The case will now go to the Federal court of appeals, and perhaps to the Supreme Court. Hundreds of man-hours will be wasted. Production at the plant has been retarded. Many thousands of dollars will be expended by the company in protecting its legitimate interests—which the NLRB was created to respect and protect.

Mr. Speaker, the conduct of these people who act for the NLRB, whose salaries are paid by American taxpayers, smacks of totalitarianism. A complete NLRB housecleaning is overdue. The substitution of a labor court seems to be the best answer.

Girard P. Clark Resigns as Head of Office of Contract Compliance

SPEECH

OF

HON. PHILLIP BURTON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1967

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, recently we learned in the press that the Department of Defense has placed the contract compliance program under the control of the Defense Contract Administration Service. The effect of this is to remove the war against racial discrimination in defense employment from civilian control and place it under military command. It is a move I personally view with concern and believe should be reversed.

More recently I have learned that the Office of Contract Compliance for the Western region has been ordered to move from San Francisco to Burlingame on July 1. Such a move, placing this office in an almost totally white suburb of poor accessibility to the urban workers who most need its services, is outrageous.

I have asked the Department of Defense to reconsider both these matters: The transfer of this function from civilian to military control and the physical transfer of the Office of Contract Compliance from San Francisco to Burlingame.

These actions by the Department of Defense have caused much consternation and drawn much criticism from concerned citizens in my district. The placement of the compliance program under military command has resulted in the resignation of the director of the program, Mr. Girard P. Clark.

This is regrettable, inasmuch as Mr. Clark has performed admirably in this position, and his effectiveness is generally recognized in the area. At this time I would like to enter his letter of resignation into the RECORD, and also a column on this same subject by James A. Wechsler which appeared in the New York Post on June 5, 1967:

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT
SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
CONTRACTS COMPLIANCE OFFICE,
Washington, D.C., June 2, 1967.

Hon. THOMAS D. MORRIS,
Assistant Secretary of Defense,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: This is written to further explain to you my reason for resigning from the Federal service. Were I in any way to blame for what I see happening to the Equal Employment Opportunity Program for Defense contractors, I would be content with a quiet and graceful exit. Since this not the case, I will be frank.

I am well aware of my transfer of function and retention rights guaranteed by the Civil Service Commission. I decided to leave because I could not bring myself to preside over the further erosion of this program. I regard what is happening to be a major betrayal of both the President and the minority group soldiers who are bearing such a disproportionate share of sacrifice in Vietnam. One day the Department of Defense will be made answerable to both, and I refuse to be part of the team responsible for that betrayal.

During the past four years I have developed and operated the largest, toughest and most productive contract compliance programs in government and I have no regrets. Under Navy I had the full cooperation, encouragement and support of my superiors. Three times during that period I took part in successful campaigns to block consolidation of the four Defense programs because I foresaw the results of such a merger.

When the consolidation finally developed, I had a choice between operating the kind of low key program that would not disturb Defense or running the kind of aggressive program I had run at Navy. In the fortunate absence of any kind of policy direction from your office, I chose the latter course.

I submit that there are only two measures of the success of my program, neither of which were used or even touched upon by the management study you used as a vehicle to restrict the program and divest yourself of responsibility in the area. They are: the statistical gains of minority group people employed by Defense contractors and the endorsement and support of minority group leaders interested and involved in the Equal Employment Opportunity aspect of Civil Rights.

Attached to this communication is a suggested statistical sampling which would be useful only if you should have any interest in verifying the accuracy of my claims. Part I suggests a comparison of Navy contractors with comparable non-Navy Defense contractors based on the 1966 submission of Standard Forms 100. Part II invites a comparison between certain non-Navy Defense contractors before and after they were treated to my brand of program, based on their 1966 and 1967 SF–100 submissions. I challenge you to make these comparisons.

As for the second yardstick, I imagine you have become aware in the past few months of the high degree of support and respect I enjoy among the leadership of the Negro, Mexican-American, American Indian and Jewish communities.

When you brought my program to a standstill on February 20, 1967, you ended the President's last chance to implement a substantial part of Great Society Program under a war-time economy. While many Defense contractors, I know, applauded your action, and some may have even influenced it, the over-protective staff of the President kept the facts from his ears even as word was prevented from reaching Secretary McNamara.

By this same action, and the raw and relentless power of the Defense Department which was exhibited, you cracked and crushed the thin veneer of aggressiveness previously displayed by the Office of Federal Contract Compliance which is supposed to exert policy control over the government-wide programs. The OFCC, in its confusion and trepidation, failed to apprise the Secretary of Labor of the true implications of your actions. It is now apparent that the force and direction of the OFCC since early 1966 were predicated primarily on the actions of my program prior to its suppression.

Your subsequent move, contrary to all of the pledges and pronouncements emanating from your office, to turn over my people not only to military control, but to the control of the hardware merchants who are largely concerned with attaining an industrial sinecure after retirement firmly sealed the fate of the program.

While Defense has lost and will continue to lose several of the outstanding people in the program, enough will remain, in spite of all that is being done, to insure a relatively better contract compliance program than all but a few of the other contracting agencies and certainly a better Equal Opportunity Program than any your office has permitted to be developed in the military or civilian fields.

I have remained at my post for over three months since you ordered the program paralyzed. Now, with all hope for a reversal clearly exhausted and the ultimate fate of the program clearly in sight, I must depart. I am not leaving your program; rather you have left my program and those of us who were committed and dedicated to its success.

Sincerely,

GIRARD P. CLARK,
Director.

POTOMAC COUP

(By James A. Wechsler)

A long, undercover struggle for control of the war against discrimination in defense employment has ended in a triumph for military rule—and a disastrous defeat for the equal-opportunity movement.

A hitherto unpublicized directive signed many weeks ago by Deputy Defense Secretary Cyrus Vance and scheduled to take effect on July 1, places the civilian-dominated contract compliance offices under the command of the Defense Contract Administration Service.

The unmistakable impact of the move is to give regional military potentates dominance over civilians in regional offices throughout the nation who have been waging a serious if far from wholly successful fight to obtain corporate compliance with executive orders of the federal government.

Details of the shift are camouflaged to some degree in bureaucratic gobbledygook but men in and out of government concerned with the anti-discrimination effort view the decree as a crucial turning point.

In concrete terms the new setup means that in key defense areas throughout the nation colonels and other brass whose primary concern is "production at any price"—and whose passion for equal opportunity programs is rarely intense—will now have large new authority to soft-pedal the anti-discrimination effort. Many of these officers have long been apathetic to prejudiced practices in the employment offices of the multi-billion dollar defense contractors; too often such men are grooming themselves for places in the industries with which they are doing business for the government.

The independent operations of spirited men in the Defense Dept.'s Equal Opportunity programs was the major counterweight on the side of fair hiring and corporate compliance. They are now destined to become subordinates to military figures who administer the contracts and procurement policies of Defense and are unlikely to welcome critical scrutiny of their labors.

Actually the order climates a long, internecine conflict; the casualties are unheralded men like Girard Clark, who long led the Navy's EEO drive and was widely recognized for tenacity and dedication above and beyond routine calls of duty. In the reorganization process that began some months ago, his services have been gradually reduced and now terminated.

No doubt there will be others down the line who become expendable as the military takeover is executed.

The deterioration in fair employment procedures' has been discernible for many months. Richard Clark, who runs the Hallmark Employment Agency here and has devoted himself to Negro employment breakthroughs, reports that there has been "a feeling for many months that the heat is off. "Some defense contractors in flagrant defiance of federal policy have been unmolested, and their immunity has emboldened others, he says.

In part, the changed climate may be the predictable result of the deepening pressures of the Vietnam war; in part it may be ascribed to the "backlash" atmosphere. The danger is that these regressions will be given new stimulus by the formal emergence of military supremacy in the contract compliance field.

With the preoccupation created by the Middle Eastern crisis, there may be further disposition to brush off the questions stirred by these retreats at home. But no military considerations justify the surrender. During global World War II the first great advances in the battle against discriminatory hiring were registered—under the prodding of A. Philip Randolph. This is hardly a moment to sound retreat.

The story has been buried too long. But as word of the Vance order spreads, there remains the chance that a storm sufficient to halt this process will blow up before the July 1 deadline. Herbert Hill, labor secretary of the NAACP, said he was unaware of the shift when I first reached him; soon thereafter he reported that independent inquiry had confirmed the story and he commented:

"This is a further example of the administrative nullification of civil rights laws and federal executive orders. The NAACP has filed many complaints against private companies operating with billion-dollar contracts from the Defense Dept. Even though there have been interminable delays and awkward administrative procedures, it was possible to achieve some relief for aggrieved workers.

"Now it appears that even the limited machinery that existed in the past is to be severely crippled by turning over enforcement responsibilities to those often responsible for the discriminatory patterns. The NAACP will make the sharpest protest and every effort to transform this into a major national issue."

It is late in the day, but it may not be too late for Defense Secretary McNamara to take a long look at the nature of the coup staged in his bailiwick amid the distractions of war and crisis. The new order professes to assure "improved direction" of the contract compliance program. It is in fact a capitulation to military mindlessness and ancient industrial custom.

Parents and Teachers Urging Support for Headstart Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JULIA BUTLER HANSEN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 26, 1967

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I recently received a number of letters from parents and teachers urging support for a Headstart program in Yelm, Wash. The letter writers show a deep concern and appreciation for the program, and I would like to include some of their comments in the RECORD:

One mother wrote:

> Headstart has done so much for my two children. My daughter, 5, was in kindergarten but was recommended to go back to Headstart as she wasn't ready. It has helped her immensely. She is now ready and has learned to be independent. . . . My son, 4. . . . has grown up a lot since going to Headstart. I do hope this program will continue in Yelm. I only wish it was larger so more children could go.

Another mother wrote:

> We have seen the improvement in skills and sociability of these youngsters during the school year. It has also extended to the parents and involved them in their children's education and other programs of the antipoverty effort. This is a worthwhile program and I hope that it can and will be expanded.

A father wrote:

> I feel that Headstart has done a great deal of good for my son. It has helped him in many ways. I feel that without Headstart he would have had quite a few problems in school. I know of many other families that feel the same as I do on this.

Said a kindergarten teacher:

> When the children (from Headstart) entered kindergarten, it became quite apparent to me that these children had had some exposure to group activities. They were not unsure of themselves when entering the room for the first time. . . . They contributed new songs and games to the group, and were ready to socialize immediately. This enables me to begin a readiness program in the kindergarten room much earlier than in past years, and the children seem eager to learn. I feel a lot of this success can be attributed to the Headstart Program.

Another teacher wrote:

> I would like to thank you and your colleagues for maintaining a project that shows concrete evidence of improvement of learning both for the child and the family. I consider it a privilege to work in this program and am interested in further expansion in the kindergarten and primary grades. The follow-through of the Headstart youngsters in the primary grades is necessary to continued health and intellectual growth.

Cape Cod National Seashore

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HASTINGS KEITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 26, 1967

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, during the last few weeks a number of people have called my office asking for information on the Cape Cod National Seashore and the nearby islands of Martha's Vineyard and Nantucket, one of our Nation's finest vacationlands and an area I am fortunate enough to represent.

As our colleagues leave their offices today and step out into Washington's summer weather, I hope they will reflect upon Cape Cod and the islands—summer nights are breezy and cool, summer days are perfect for swimming, sunning, and golf. Cape Cod, Martha's Vineyard, and Nantucket have facilities for everything from horseback riding to rocking on the front porch.

They may—during the July 4 recess—want to visit the Cape Cod National Seashore with its magnificent beach and heavy surf, or the artists' colony at Provincetown. The picturesque towns of Truro, Eastham, Wellfleet, Chatham, Hyannis, and Falmouth are on your way. If they are curious about sea life, the Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution's museum is located conveniently near the Martha's Vineyard and Nantucket ferry wharf.

Not far from the Cape is Plymouth, site of the Pilgrims' landing. Nearby New Bedford, the old whaling port, is replete with historic sites. Here, one can still buy the same kind of pickled limes the whalers took to sea to prevent scurvy. The seafaring town of Fairhaven pays tribute to our State and national flags during their Festival of Flags, July 5 to 9.

How would you like to get away from the sultry Washington summer with its blue and orange heat haze? As you drive through tonight's rush hour with hot pavement radiating the day's heat under your tires, think of the cape and islands.

If you would like more information on the cape, the islands, Plymouth, or New Bedford, you are invited to contact my office. My staff will be delighted to help you.

James B. Conlisk, Jr.: Chicago's New Police Chief

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 26, 1967

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, June 23, Mayor Richard Daley announced the appointment of James B. Conlisk, Jr., as the new police superintendent of the city of Chicago, effective August 1.

August 1 will mark the end of a 7-year period of leadership on the part of O. W. Wilson. During that period and under that leadership Chicago has acquired the best police force of any major city in the United States. The police department facilities, such as the extensive and rapid communications system and the large number of constantly cruising police vehicles, have been greatly expanded and improved under the leadership of retiring Superintendent Wilson.

With the retirement of O. W. Wilson, the city's police force will be headed by a man who has served the city and the force for over 20 years. James Conlisk, like so many other Chicago policemen, comes from a family who have long been members of the department. His father, James B. Conlisk, Sr., was a policeman for 46 years and served as administrative assistant to three commissioners. The newly designated superintendent has two brothers that are with the force. And one of his two sons has expressed the desire to become a policeman.

The new superintendent's credentials indicate the wisdom of the choice made by the mayor after reviewing the names of potential replacements submitted by the Chicago Police Board.

Mr. Conlisk joined the department in 1946 and by 1959 had risen to the rank of captain. In 1960, Superintendent Wilson named Captain Conlisk as deputy superintendent for field services. In that capacity, Mr. Conlisk acted as Superintendent Wilson's top aide.

On the announcement of the appointment, the retiring superintendent said of Deputy Superintendent Conlisk: "No man in or outside of Chicago is as well qualified."

I am certain that the men and women of the department and the people of

Chicago are pleased with the appointment of this most qualified and dedicated Chicago police official. I take a special pride in that James Conlisk resides in the 11th District of Illinois and therefore is one of my constituents.

James Conlisk has been named to a formidable job but he brings to it formidable credentials. Deputy Superintendent Conlisk, shortly to be Superintendent Conlisk, said:

> I pledge a continuation of the leadership that has brought Chicago to the forefront as one of the eminent police departments of the world.

All of Chicago wishes the new superintendent well.

U.S. News Report on Bond Dialog

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1967

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, the June 12, issue of U.S. News & World Report summarizes the present status of the bond battle. The magazine article's preface summary suggests:

> Steam is building up behind a plan to prevent States and localities from selling tax-exempt bonds to build factories for private companies.

On a more pessimistic note the article indicates "industrial-aid bonds, though, may have too many friends to be stopped now."

I sincerely hope this second comment is not the case. The rapidly proliferating use of public industrial revenue bonds is perverting the market, causing serious dislocation, encouraging pirating of industry from one area to another, and seriously disadvantaging certain areas of the country who are unable, because of State law, to compete.

Those supporting reform in this abused area are asking for a hearing on the merits of the issues involved. Such a hearing would clearly demonstrate the need to alter present practices.

I commend the U.S. News & World Report article to the many Members of Congress who have been involved in the various phases of the debate over abuses in using public industrial revenue bonds:

A Tax Incentive That's Coming Under Fire

Steam is building up behind a plan to prevent States and localities from selling tax-exempt bonds to build factories for private companies.

Even some States that use the practice want it banned.

The Johnson Administration, too, wants early action.

Industrial-aid bonds, though, may have too many friends to be stopped now.

A long feud between the Federal Government and State and local governments appears to be coming to a head now.

The issue is a rush by communities to sell their tax-exempt bonds to finance construction of industrial plants for leasing to private corporations.

Officials in Washington regard that growing practice as an "abuse" of the tax-exemption privilege that permits States and localities to finance public projects at lower rates of interest than they otherwise would pay.

Support now appears to be building up rapidly for Administration efforts to stamp out such activities by denying tax exemption for future issues of municipal industrial-aid bonds. Some evidence of that growing support:

On May 31, the Investment Bankers Association issued a new policy statement saying that "the situation is rapidly deteriorating" and that "abuses of tax exemption have expanded to alarming proportions."

For the first time, the IBA adopted a resolution backing the Treasury plan to prevent this kind of bond.

On May 24, nine U.S. Senators and 16 Representatives joined to demand an end to industrial-aid bonds, which, they said, are being used by many States to pirate industries from other States.

On May 23, North Carolina's legislature, acting, as it said, "reluctantly as a defensive measure and with reservations," adopted a bill to permit the use of such bonds by communities.

In doing that, the legislature also adopted a resolution denouncing the practice it was authorizing and calling on the President, Congress and its "sister States" to stop it.

Governors of a number of States, particularly Northern States, have recently demanded action from Congress. One such State, Pennsylvania, is going ahead to adopt its own law authorizing industrial bonds while it waits.

Spreading practice. The use of tax-free bonds to finance private plants has been spreading rapidly.

Already in 1967, three States—in addition to North Carolina—have authorized their issuance. The three are Texas, Colorado and Utah.

This brings to 35 the number of States seeking to attract industry with this lure. Several others have authorized use of industrial-aid bonds on a limited basis.

In addition, a number of other States are in the process of adopting bills to authorize them. Wyoming's new law will be ready for use after a court test.

The chart on this page shows the big rise in offerings of these bonds.

Not until 1959 was as much as 15 million dollars' worth issued in a year. Last year, a tally by the IBA has just disclosed, the volume of new industrial-aid bonds going to market exceeded half a billion dollars.

So far this year, the volume is running well ahead of last year's, and the IBA says it estimates "conservatively" that the 1967 total will be at least three quarters of a billion dollars.

The biggest users of tax-free industrial bonds in most recent years have been Southern and Border States, though the practice has become widespread since it was first used in Mississippi in 1936.

Last year, for example, nearly two thirds of the half-billion-dollar total was offered by communities in Kentucky, Alabama, Georgia, Arkansas and West Virginia. Sizable offerings also came from Delaware and Iowa.

Pros and cons. Those States are not the only friends which industrial-aid bonds have now.

Many members of the IBA itself are among the investment banking firms that underwrite new issues of these bonds.

Proponents of tax-free industrial bonds say they offer low-income, labor-surplus areas an effective method of attracting new industry, particularly corporations that lack capital to build new plants or credit to finance them at reasonable cost.

Administration officials, however, contend that communities now are getting further and further from that idea. Treasury Secretary Henry H. Fowler, in a recent speech, had this to say:

"Now, more and more, this device is being used by corporations which are financially strong and quite capable of obtaining their funds through normal market channels.

"When they turn to the local issuing agency for these funds they—and the local agency—are getting into an arrangement which distorts the tax-exemption privilege and which, in the long run, simply forces the federal tax system to support their financing."

Cases in point. The IBA, on May 31, gave these examples of recent issues sold or scheduled:

82.5 million dollars in bonds by Middletown, Ohio, for Armco Steel Corporation.

20 millions in bonds by Nevada, Mo., for Minnesota Mining & Manufacturing Company.

30 millions in bonds by Warren County, Ky., for Firestone Tire & Rubber Company.

80 millions in bonds by Wickliffe, Ky.—population 917—for West Virginia Pulp & Paper Company.

60 millions in bonds by Ford Madison, Ia., for a subsidiary of Sinclair Oil Corporation.

Other large companies for which substantial issues of tax-free bonds have been sold recently included American Can Company, Skelly Oil Company, Phoenix Steel Corporation, Rockwell-Standard Corporation and Air Reduction Company.

Objections to these bonds are offered by members of Congress who are pressing bills to apply income taxes to such issues in the future. In a May 24 statement they listed these arguments:

"Municipal industrial-development bond issues use public credit for essentially private purposes. . . .

"These bonds encourage the pirating of industrial plants . . . causing economic dislocation in the area abandoned. . . .

"These bonds hurt legitimate municipal borrowing. . . .

"These bonds cause unfair competition."

Matter of self-interest? The IBA itself bases its opposition on what it regards as the self-interest of its members and of State and local governments.

Its fear: that resentment against industrial-aid bonds will rise to a point that will endanger tax exemption for all future issues of State and local bonds.

Is Congress likely to ban industrial-aid bonds? Officials decline to make any prediction.

However, there is this note: The most powerful friend these bonds have is Representative Wilbur D. Mills, chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, which would have the job of writing the legislation. Mr. Mills' State, Arkansas, is a user of these bonds and issued 131 million dollars' worth of them in the four years 1963–66.

Pvt. Curtis Harman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 26, 1967

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Pvt. Curtis J. Harman, a young soldier from Maryland, was recently killed in Vietnam. I wish to commend the courage of Private Harman and to honor his memory by including the following article in the Record:

Curtis Harman, on Guard Duty in South Vietnam

A 21-year-old Baltimorean, Pfc. Curtis J. Harman, has been killed in Vietnam, the Defense Department reported yesterday.

Private Harman, a graduate of Poly who

lived at 319 Audrey avenue in Brooklyn was killed about 3 P.M. last Saturday by small-arms fire while guarding an outpost somewhere in Vietnam, his father, Curtis C. Harman, said last night.

ENLISTED IN ARMY

His son had enlisted in the Army in June 1966, after finishing his second year at Loyola College, Mr. Harman said.

Although he was in the ROTC, he "couldnt wait and enlisted. He volunteered for Vietnam . . . said he wanted to get in it before it was all over."

Mr. Harman said his son "read constantly, all about the military," had majored in political and military science while at Loyola and "wanted to make the military a career."

In addition to his parents, Private Harman is survived by a sister, Mr. Joyce Filipiak, of Munich.

The American People Support the President's Middle East Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 26, 1967

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to report that the Nation's press is paying a deserved tribute to President Johnson's handling of the Middle East crisis. There is almost unanimous agreement that our President has followed a responsible, prudent, and reasonable course in the Middle East—a course that certainly contrasts sharply with that of the Soviet Union.

I believe this editorial opinion reflects the overwhelming support the President's policy enjoys with the American people. As the Baltimore Sun noted in an editorial:

> President Johnson's statement of the American position was one that can be subscribed to by anyone who genuinely wants a peaceful Middle East.

It is clear that President Johnson can look to the future with the knowledge that the American people stand solidly with him on our Government's policy in the dangerous and turbulent Middle East area. This fact will give the President enormous strength and confidence.

I insert into the RECORD two editorials that represent the kind of positive reaction that the President has received on his enunciation of American policy in the Middle East:

[From the Baltimore (Md.) Sun, June 20, 1967]

THREE SPEECHES

The state of the world was pretty well set forth yesterday in three speeches, one in Washington, by President Johnson, and two in New York, where Premier Kosygin of the Soviet Union and Abba Eban, Foreign Minister of Israel addressed the General Assembly of the United Nations. The state of the world is not hopeless, but it is not good. Specifically as to the Middle East:

President Johnson's statement of the American position was one that can be subscribed to by anyone who genuinely wants a peaceful Middle East. The points are quite clear. As the "first and greatest principle," every nation in the area has a fundamental right to live. International maritime rights must be respected: the President said that "if a single act of folly was more responsible for this explosion than any other," it was the Egyptian announcement of the closing of the Strait of Tiran. The need, he said, is for recognized boundaries and other arrangements that will guarantee all countries security against terror, destruction and war.

On those propositions Mr. Johnson may have seemed to be accepting the Israeli point of view. On the other main points he warned against letting military success blind a victor to the legitimate rights and interests of others; and he charged the nations of the region, not excluding Israel, with joint responsibility for at last doing something about the Arab refugees, of whom there are now more.

If the weight of the President's statement still falls on the Israeli side of the scales, why, that is where it falls.

Mr. Eban in the General Assembly gave Israel's case in full, and eloquently. Speaking after Premier Kosygin, he laid upon the Soviet Union a heavy responsibility for the war its proteges lost, and rejected as totally inacceptable to Israel a return to the situation of June 5, as called for by Russia and the Arabs. To return, he said, would be to try to "reconstruct a broken egg." Beyond that, he suggested concessions to the Arabs, with Jordanian access to the Mediterranean as an example, but made it plain that peace in the region Arabs and Israelis are "destined to share" would depend on face-to-face negotiations which alone, he said, could effectively remove the Middle East from the scope of global rivalries.

In the sense that Mr. Eban failed to propose that Israel roll over and die, it was a hard-line speech, but it did hold out some hope for a better era ahead.

And Mr. Kosygin? Did he recognize, in any slightest phrase, that the Arab cause was anything but impeccably pure? Did he to any degree at all join President Johnson in wishing to enlarge the arena of Russo-American common action? He did not. Mr. Kosygin's appearance, his first in this country, had been anticipated as an opportunity for Soviet statesmanship, no matter what the Soviet spokesman in the Security Council may have said in the immediate wake of the Israeli triumph. Instead, his address was a sterile echo of that spokesman's false charges and intemperate villifications.

Mr. Eban, speaking of the Arabs, expressed a willingness to perceive "any glimmer of reality and moderation in the Arab mind." At another level of power, the United States would welcome a similar sign from the Russians. Yesterday, at least, no such sign was forthcoming.

[From the Boston (Mass.) Herald, June 20, 1967]

A POSITIVE MIDEAST PROGRAM

President Johnson and Israeli Foreign Minister Abba Eban, in agreement on several points, have offered constructive approaches to peace in the Middle East. What Soviet Premier Aleksei N. Kosygin has offered is no approach at all, but a retreat from peace.

Besides inflaming the question of who was the aggressor, Kosygin's demand that Israel withdraw from Arab territory immediately and pay full war damages to the Arab nations would merely set the stage for renewed conflict. Kosygin is asking nothing less than a return to the status quo—back to the old boundaries, back to the old tensions, back to a situation in which the Arabs can rearm. In short, back to the conditions that led to war in the first place. Kosygin's demands are inconsistent with his warning that conflict in the Mideast could lead to nuclear war.

By contrast, President Johnson, in his five principles for peace, recognizes that a key need is limiting the "destructive arms race." Eban recognies it, too, and further realizes that the arms race is a "fearful waste of economic energy" in the Mideast. Rather than encouraging a situation in which the arms race might be stimulated, the major powers should foster peaceful programs of economic and social development that would help Arabs and Israelis alike.

Mr. Johnson also echoed what Israel had said earlier—that the Arabs and the Israelis bear the main responsibility for establishing a long-range peace for their peoples. This is the only realistic appraisal. The United Nations failed before to preserve peace in the Mideast. The U.N. and the major powers should, of course, do what they can to reestablish peace, but their role in a settlement can be only supportive.

It is perhaps a small base from which to build a useful dialogue, but Mr. Johnson and Kosygin did agree on one point: that Israel has the right to a national life. Kosygin's U.N. speech was not constructive, and his walkout during Eban's reply cannot be ignored or excused. Yet the speech was delivered in a restrained manner, without any shoe-banging or other pyrotechnic effects. Some think Kosygin's comparative restraint left the door open for a meeting with President Johnson. Perhaps it did. And possibly talks between the two men could be of value at this time.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402, at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

Appendix

Manpower Development and Training Act, a Supplement to Traditional Concept of Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 27, 1967

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, the Manpower Development and Training Act offers an important supplement to our traditional concept of education. In today's fast moving world with its changing economy and ever-growing automation, we must assiduously strive to provide educational opportunities for those who find themselves unemployed through lack of technical skill.

Our strength as a nation depends upon our utilization of the potentials of our human resources. Therefore, I am encouraged by the report recently received from Mr. Jess C. Fletcher, director, Montana State Employment Service. Mr. Fletcher informs me that more than 87 percent of those who trained in Montana and who responded to his questionnaire now have jobs related to their MDTA training. Mr. Fletcher was also kind enough to send copies of the replies from the trainees. These letters overwhelmingly indicate satisfaction with the program.

One wrote:

> I would have never been able to qualify for the job that I have now (secretary with IBM training) had it not been for the program. When you suddenly become the head of the household, an ordinary job would not support three children and give them the education they will need to grow up to be useful citizens.

Another reply included these words:

> Through my training I have acquired a new respect for myself in being able to really achieve something by helping people.

Other letters included the following:

> I just don't really know what I would have done if this program had not accepted me. I felt so completely helpless at the time, and this did give me some confidence in myself.
>
> I have been steadily employed by the Boeing Airplane Co. since graduation from the MDTA school . . . I find my work challenging and my job rewarding. Year around employment has introduced stability into my life.
>
> I would like to thank everyone involved . . . I have often heard that life begins at 40, I have found that it also can begin at 54.
>
> I was immediately employed by American Bridge as a welder and in 6 weeks was promoted to a Foreman.
>
> I am sure that apart from the training course I would never have been offered this employment (accounting clerk) nor could I have capably filled it had I been offered it.

Mr. President, these brief statements indicate, I believe, the importance of this program. Through the Manpower Development and Training Act we can help a vast segment of our society to reestablish themselves. The retraining and education of our citizens should be of concern to each of us. I also take this opportunity to commend Mr. Fletcher for the fine job that he has done in Montana with this program which is helping Americans to help themselves.

A Tribute to Speaker McCormack

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK BROOKS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 1967

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, the Boston College Club of Washington paid tribute to a great American on May 3, 1967. I had the pleasure of being present with the alumni of Boston College and their friends, many of whom are our colleagues here in Congress. We had all come together to honor our distinguished and beloved Speaker, JOHN MCCORMACK.

That evening, President Johnson said of our Speaker:

> There has been no person . . . who has more devoted, who has been more courageous under fire, and who has been more compassionate for his fellowmen.

These words are an expression of the esteem we all have for our beloved Speaker.

In his response, Speaker MCCORMACK recalled his 39 years of service in this House and at the same time looked to the future. Knowing that his remarks would be of interest to my colleagues, I include them at this time, as follows:

> Mr. MCCORMACK. My very dear friend, and at least slightly pleasant exaggerator, Tom O'Neill, Your Excellency Most Reverend Patrick A. O'Boyle, my dear friend, Archbishop of Washington, Father Walsh, president of Boston College, Father Graham, who is the Provincial in the Western Province of the Dominican Order, other reverend clergy who are present, my very good friend, Postmaster General and Mrs. O'Brien, Mrs. Albert, Mrs. Boggs, my dear Mrs. McCormack, my distinguished colleagues of both branches of the Congress, ladies and gentleman and friends, with your permission and by unanimous consent I have a speech here that I will not make.
>
> I do not know whether Tom O'Neill or someone else will try to get it put in the Congressional Record. If they do you may read it there.
>
> I am deeply honored and deeply touched. Like you, I am a human being, and I have all the emotions of a human being. One of the uppermost thoughts in my mind that has always actuated my life, and always will, even as a youngster, is a deep feeling of friendship on my part toward others, and on their part toward me.
>
> Gerry Ford made some very sweet statements about me, as did also Senator Kennedy, Carl Albert, Hale Boggs, and Father Walsh. I value every word that they have said.
>
> In connection with what Gerry Ford said, I think it is a very laudable ambition to be Speaker of the House of Representatives. If the people through some misguided influences should elect a Republican House, there is no one I would rather see Speaker of the House of Representatives than Gerry Ford. I will not go into that any more.
>
> But my association with the Republican leader has been very close and friendly. The middle aisle means nothing to me in my friendships. I like men and women who can disagree without being disagreeable, and I try to be of that school. The friendships that I have in the House transcend the middle aisle.
>
> One of the most valued friends I have is Gerry Ford. He is a great American. We disagree, but we do not disagree on foreign affairs. Gerry Ford's views and my views are basically the same, and it was only this afternoon at an important meeting in the White House with the President that I again saw evidence of his dedication to public service. To make any extended remarks about the presence here tonight of the President of the United States would be subject to a point of order.
>
> I did not know the President was going to be here. His coming was a complete surprise to me. I saw somebody put an extra chair here and I attached no significance even to that. It was only when the President was about to come on the platform that I saw him. This afternoon when we were with him, Gerry, he made no indication that he was going to be here tonight. I had many obligations in the House, that is, visitors and conferences. About 3 o'clock my secretary came in and said, "The President wants you down at the White House at 4:30." And this dinner was coming on tonight. Thus from unexpected calls arise duties which prompt you to respond.
>
> As I have said, I deeply appreciate the remarks made about me, although I do not feel that I deserve them, by Senator Kennedy, my dear friends Carl Albert, Hale Boggs, Father Walsh, and, again, Gerry Ford. It is difficult for me to understand why anybody should praise me. I simply do what I think I ought to do. To me, what I do is just natural. In the performance of my duties I have certian things to do. I realize I cannot please everybody, but I try to do the best I can and to make the right judgments and the right decisions. Above all, when I assume the rostrum, I assume the rostrum as Speaker of the House, and at all times I am going to protect the rights of every Member without regard to party under the rules and, above all, I am always going to protect the rights and prerogatives of the House of Representatives. [Applause.]
>
> I am deeply honored by this tribute that is paid to me by the Boston College Club of Washington. When Tom O'Neill and Eddie Boland called upon me several weeks ago to see about my attending or being a guest of honor at the Boston College Club of Washington meeting which they have each year, and which I have attended several times, I assumed there would be three or four hundred persons in attendance. I never expected this wonderful tribute. I am deeply touched

today by the presence of each and every one of you, coming from all parts of the country as many of you have, and I find my ability inadequate to express the feelings in my mind and in my heart.

The action of the Boston College Club of Washington in selecting me for the award of "Man of the Year" is something that I deeply appreciate and which I shall always treasure, because in doing this the Boston College Club of Washington represents Boston College. Boston College is one of the great institutions of higher learning of our country. Steeped in the moral and educational teachings of the Jesuits—and the word "Jesuit" is synonymous with "education"—Boston College is one of the outstanding institutions of its kind, not only in America, but in the world. I am proud that I am an alumnus, through honorary degree, of that great institution.

Boston College has grown tremendously, particularly in recent years, due to the outstanding leadership of men like Father Walsh, president of Boston College, and his predecessors, and due also to the student body. Particularly I want to pay the tribute which is due also to the alumni, to the president and the faculty of Boston College with their farseeing minds. They recognize that the world of tomorrow is going to be a markedly changed world from the world of today. The younger generations face great scientific progress. The changes that will result in consequence thereof will affect the national economy of all nations. Individuals will be affected when the question arises as to whether or not they can get employment. Boston College is a leader in trying to educate its students to make their contributions and to avenue those changes so that they will serve the people. Otherwise they could frustrate our people.

Boston College is a great institution. Tonight I accept the honor bestowed upon me in the name of Boston College, past, present, and future.

What I say about Boston College should apply to all institutions. They should look ahead into the future as far as mere human beings can and try to see the way the world is likely to go or can possibly go.

I can see great changes, and unless we look ahead and guide those changes to serve our people under our free government—legislators, business, educational institutions, financial institutions, everyone making a contribution to the maximum extent that we can—unless we influence these great economic changes that are going to take place to serve our people, then through frustration they could instead master our people. I have every confidence that the people of America and our educational institutions realize the task that confronts not only America but the world of tomorrow along educational and other lines.

Mark what I am saying now extemporaneouly. I am not camparing Boston College with any other institution of a sectarian nature or a nonsectarian nature. But confining my remarks to Boston College, I know the students leave the college with a complete education, both moral and secular. They leave the institution imbued with the discipline of the Founder of the Jesuit Order 400 years ago. They leave there with learnings and teachings connected with truth. They are imbued with a way of life that has its origin in truth as contrasted with the ideology of a life that has its origin in falsity. They leave there with a love of God and a love of fellowmen—a love of neighbor. They realize that by the manner in which they carry out the Second Commandment, "Love Thy Neighbor," they, without regard to religious convictions, show their love of God in the First Commandment.

They leave there with the knowledge that the clash in the world of today can truly be represented by two words, both four-letter words. To me they are the most meaningful words in any language: one love, the other hate; one uplifting, exalting, and affirmative, the other degrading and destructive; one leaving in its wake a feeling of refreshment in trying to make one's contributions to living a decent life, the other leaving in its wake destruction, disaster, and darkness instead of light.

Love of God, love of neighbor.

The grave is not the end. There is accountability for our trust in the hereafter. I am not delivering a sermon. I am talking about a way of life. I am speaking of the dignity of the individual. Government is the servant and not the master.

Consider the communist ideology of hate. The communists are not only atheists but they are atheists plus. They hate God. They not only deny God but they hate God. How can you hate God and love your neighbor? You certainly cannot hate God and love your neighbor.

We might talk about the ideology which proclaims that might is right; that the grave is the end—not only within the Nation, but from nation to nation—and the dignity of man is destroyed. The individual becomes a part of the great wheel of state, a government of men and not of laws. We are a government of laws and not of men. If we take those two words, love and hate, and apply them to the world of today, we will have a basic understanding of the real differences that exist betwen the way of life in which we believe, based upon truth, and an ideology of life that the communist world believes is best—a world of hate with its origins in hate.

I have studied those words for my own assistance in making up my mind as a legislator and a human being. I have studied their meaning and significance in relation to the difficulty of the struggle to be good, the difficulty in the fight to follow out those things in which we believe, the meaning and the significance of what that word "love" means in the lives of human beings everywhere, the meaning and significance of what the word "hate" means in the minds of people everywhere.

Boston College, through its president, its Fathers, and its faculty, have always inculcated in its students the meaning and significance of love of God and love of neighbor, and the meaning and significance of the way of life in which we believe based on truth and centered around the dignity of the individual. Those two words mean everything. If you analyze them, you will agree that they mean everything in guiding us in those directions and in adopting policies that will be for the best interests of our country and for mankind in light of the challenges that exist in the world today.

So with the President's appearance and his kind remarks and the other nice things said about me, I wished to depart from the remarks that I had prepared and to speak extemporaneously of some thoughts that run through my mind and have run through my mind throughout the years.

Our country is greater than any one of us. The national interest of the United States is paramount. There should be in the minds of all of our citizens, and particularly in the minds of those occupying responsible positions, the question: What course of action is consistent with the national interest of our country? We must realize when we make decisions that there is a calculated risk of action.

I sat in on all of the decisions since 1940 made by any President. I remember the decision made in relation to Cuba by the late President, who was my dear and valued friend, and the Cuban confrontation. That decision meant a calculated risk of action. If the late President did not make that decision. what do you think would have flown from a nondecision, and the calculated risks of inaction?

With every decision made requiring action, of course, there are calculated risks. But with every decision for inaction, where inaction is decided upon, there are calculated risks. Both sides of the coin should be viewed and must be viewed in the making of any decision, particularly one of paramount importance to the national interest of our country.

Whenever I am in those meetings I am viewing both sides. What is likely to flow from a decision that we make? Then I say, "What is likely to flow if we do not make a decision?"

I found during the 1930's, during the days of Hitler, that inaction on the part of Britain and France brought about a result that led to World War II. As human beings we do not know whether the decisions that we make are right or wrong. We hope they are right. As human beings all we can do is the best we can. We must make the best judgment we can in accordance with the gifts God has given us. But we have got to have the courage to make the decision in deep faith on the part of all without regard to our religious convictions. That is of vital importance at all times, but particularly in the world of today when extreme tensions exist. I find that the great majority of persons who are possessed of a deep faith, no matter how dark things look, retain their confidence in themselves more so than those who are lacking in deep faith. I am now talking not alone along Catholic lines, but I am talking about the deep thoughts of our Protestant friends and our Jewish friends also. I am talking about anyone who believes in God or a supreme being, because the way of life we believe in comes from Him through His natural law, and we can bank on Him being on our side in the long run.

So, ladies and gentlemen, I am talking longer than I had intended to, and I am probably getting into a subject that I feel very deeply about, but leaving a little thought here and there. I have every confidence. I have no fear of the outcome, because I have confidence in the American people. I have confidence in our people because the great majority of them are possessed of deep faith. I have confidence that, no matter what crisis might confront our country, we will meet it not only in the best interests of our country but in the best interests of future peace.

So in conclusion, again I express my deep thanks to the Boston College Club of Washington, and also to you, Father Walsh, as the president of that great institution that we all admire and love, Boston College. [Prolonged applause.]

"My Flag"—Poem by Harold F. Mohn, Myerstown, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 27, 1967

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, Harold F. Mohn, a constituent from Myerstown, Pa., sent to me a poem entitled "My Flag," which he wrote in tribute to the American flag as a symbol of our free Nation. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the poem

was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MY FLAG

(By Harold F. Mohn)

I love the flag of my country,
  With a passion deep and rare.
I promise I will defend it,
  Anytime, anywhere.
It is the symbol of freedom,
  In all its colors bright,
And in the quest to gain a peace,
  It is a shining light.
The blue in it stands for valor,
  By those who serve so well.
The red portrays the blood that flowed,
  By those who fought and fell.
The white is the peace we strive for,
  We cherish and revere.
This, is the flag of my country,
  I hold so close and dear.

Uncommon Valor Was a Common Virtue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 26, 1967

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, Gen. William Sherman said, "War is cruel and you cannot refine it." The war in Vietnam is no exception. The cruelest aspect of this war, as in all other wars, is the destruction of the lives of the most fit and able young men of a nation.

The decision is made in Washington must be made with the full awareness that it is the soldier in the field who must implement them. We must make certain that the policy of the United States is to attain our stated goals with the least expenditure of lives. That is why I have called for a serious reconsideration of the "search and destroy" tactics presently being used.

Mr. Speaker, I read into the RECORD a list of the men who gave their lives in Vietnam from June of 1966 to May of 1967 who resided in the 11th District of Illinois. I do this, to provide due recognition and respect to these men and their families and to emphaside that I have always been aware of the personal nature of war.

It was said many hundreds of years ago that "War spares not the brave." Mr. Speaker, the names of the brave of the 11th District are:

Army Pfc. Gerald Warzecha, 18, of 4533 North Meade Avenue.

Army Sp5c. George L. Gavaria, 21, of 4925 North Oriole.

Navy Hospitalman Donald J. Rion, 24, of 5931½ Northwest Highway.

Army Sp4c. James Wendolowski, 21, of 5102 West Ainslie.

Marine Cpl. Donald W. Bollman, 21, of Norridge.

Marine Cpl. James W. Lohrey, 22, of 5306 North Mulligan.

Navy Corpsman John Rapey, 31, of 6555 West Addsion.

Army Sp4c. Kenneth Wells of 4248 North Odell.

Army Sgt. Michael J. Kotulla, 21, of 5728 North Oleander.

Marine Pfc. Neil J. Cacciottolo, 20, of Norridge.

Marine Pfc. John E. Cronin, 20, of 5043 North Kostner.

Army Sp4c. Kevin T. Gorman, 22, of 5930 North Kolmar.

Army Pfc. Richard P. Hilgart, 22, of 4407 North Winchester.

Marine Pfc. Stephen M. Lee, 19, of 4621 North Winchester.

Army Sp4c. Peter J. Niccolini, 21, of 6907 North Owen.

Army Pfc. Walter A. Wilks of 4825 North Oak Park.

Writers Group Honors Bards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 27, 1967

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, each year the Birmingham Festival of Fine Arts spring celebration, the conference of the Alabama Writers' Conclave, and the 'Bama Writers' Club's fete honor the outstanding young poets and artists of our Alabama high schools and colleges. This year the 'Bama Writers' Club paid tribute to 25 students from Montgomery and south-central Alabama who had been awarded both State and National prizes during the 1966 nationwide celebration of Poetry Day Week.

State poetry writing contests were conducted under the auspices of Montgomery poet and musicologist, J. Mitchell Pilcher, who is to be highly commended for his many fine contributions and who has been an inspiration to budding young poets and writers throughout our State. Certainly this program and the recognition these young people have received is a fitting tribute to Mr. Pilcher's unceasing efforts to instill a spirit of enthusiasm for creative writing among our young people.

Mr. Pilcher is also Alabama chairman for the National Poetry Day Committee. Serving with Mr. Pilcher on the committee are Hon. Morton D. Prouty, Florence, Ala.; Dr. Clyde H. Cantrell, Auburn University Library; Mary B. Ward, Birmingham; Elizabeth W. Sheehan, Montgomery, and Corrinne Demetropolis, Mobile. Frances Clark Handler, Miami Beach, Fla., artist and poet, serves as national director of the National Poetry Day Committee, Inc., whose stated aim is "To secure the annual observance on October 15 of a National Poetry Day."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the newspaper article announcing the Alabama student prizewinners be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Montgomery (Ala.) Journal, June 15, 1967]

WRITERS' GROUP HONORS BARDS OF MONTGOMERY

Statewide poets and authors attended the 'Bama Writers' Club's Sixth Annual Summer Tea and Book Fair, June 10, in the Birmingham Museum of Art.

The featured speaker at the tea and book fair was J. Mitchell Pilcher, Montgomery poet and Alabama Chairman for National Poetry Day Committee, Mr. Pilcher is an executive board member of Alabama Writers' Conclave, an Honorary Penguin of the Alabama Pen Women, and a founder-member of the Academy of American Poets.

Speaking on "Our Alabama Campus Poets: The New Poetry," Mr. Pilcher programmed published prize-winning verse by campus student poets attending Florence State College, Birmingham-Southern, Samford University, Auburn University, Huntingdon College, Lee and Lanier High Schools, Montgomery, and University of Alabama, and Spring Hill College, Mobile.

Montgomery students honored were Nancy Bonner, an alumna of Huntingdon College; Mary Lou Light, Lanier High School; Michael O'Bannon and Katharine Anderson, Lee High School.

The Montgomery student poets were awarded State and National prizes, in the annual student poetry contests, in the mid-October, 1966, 50-state celebration of National Poetry Day-Poetry Week. They are among the 25 high school and college students, in Montgomery and the central Alabama area, who were awarded State and National prizes in the annual observance.

The Alewife: An Eye and Nose Witness Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1967

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, in recent days photos and stories have appeared in newspapers across America about the heaps of dead fish piled on beaches in the Chicago area.

The dead fish are alewife, a cousin of the herring which has entered the Great Lakes from the Atlantic Ocean only in the past decade, but which has found an environment suitable to a titanic population explosion.

It is estimated that there are billions of these 6- to 8-inch-long fish in every one of the Great Lakes, with Lakes Michigan and Ontario having the heaviest populations.

Since as much as half the population dies off annually, the alewife has become a major problem of the Great Lakes and a principal source of pollution.

The dead bodies of these fish litter beaches, clog water intakes, and cause an odor problem in or near the business districts and harbors of cities like Chicago and Milwaukee.

Believing that the time has come to undertake a crash program of control for this pest, I have introduced a bill, H.R. 4793, which would authorize a coordinated Federal-State attack on the problem. This proposal currently is pending before the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee.

In view of the increasingly serious proportions which the alewife problem is assuming, it is my hope that action can be taken in the near future.

In order to acquaint my colleagues further with the alewife situation, I am including hereafter a story from the New York Times on the Chicago beach inundation and excerpts from my recent testimony before the House Appropriations Subcommittee on the Interior:

[From the New York Times, June 22, 1967]

Dead Fish Cover Beaches in Chicago; Bulldozers in Fight

Chicago, June 21 (UPI).—A hundred park district workers fought a losing battle today with millions of dead fish that were being washed ashore along 20 miles of beaches faster than they could be removed by bulldozers.

Four men worked around the clock with shovels to keep the intakes of the city's municipal water department pumping stations free of dead fish.

Arthur Stewart, assistant landscape supervisor for the park district, said, "I've never seen a condition like this in 22 years."

The small white fish, each about six inches long, are known as alewives, a variety of salt water herring that invaded the Great Lakes with the construction of the St. Lawrence Seaway. Alewines multiply by the millions in fresh water, where they have no natural enemies.

The alewives apparently die when subjected to sudden temperature changes in the water.

Willard Barry, general supervisor of Chicago's parks and beaches, said that as long as the northeast winds prevailed, millions of alewives would continue to be washed ashore. The Weather Bureau said that northeast winds would continue for at least one more day.

Mr. Barry said he had received no complaints that the dead fish had created a health problem.

Fish removal crews were using bulldozers, tractors, 15 sand-cleaning machines, a $20,000 beach sanitizer and 10 trucks to haul away the fish.

Alewife Control in the Great Lakes

Mr. Zablocki. Mr. Chairman, I am indeed grateful for this opportunity to make a statement on the proposed budget of the Interior Department.

My particular interest is in obtaining adequate funding to permit control of the alewife, a herring-like fish which now exists by the tens of billions in the Great Lakes.

With controls, this fish could be a valuable commercial species and serve as forage for more desirable fish, such as the coho salmon, lake trout and whitefish.

Uncontrolled, as it is now, the alewife is a pest. It is estimated that about half the adult alewife population may die off annually. The dead bodies litter beaches, clog intakes, cause odor problems in or near the business districts and harbors of cities like Milwaukee and Chicago, and further pollute the Great Lakes.

Further, this species, which seldom grows more than nine inches long, is preventing the fishing resources of the Lakes from recovering from the losses caused by the lamphrey eel scourge, which now is under control.

Alarmed by the magnitude of this problem, last year I wrote to Secretary of the Interior Udall asking that the federal government undertake a "crash-program"—similar to that used against the lamphrey—to control the alewife and restore an ecological balance to the Great Lakes.

In his reply the Secretary recognized the seriousness of the problem and acknowledged that the alewife now has the upperhand. Control, he stated, would require a "massive and sustained effort."

Believing that such an effort might best be undertaken through cooperation and coordination between the Great Lakes States and the federal government, I introduced H.R. 4793 on February 2, 1967, a bill which would authorize the Secretary to cooperate with the affected states in conducting research into the problem and carrying out action programs of control. The measure authorizes a $5 million federal appropriation which would be expended on a matching basis with the states acting individually or together in an interstate compact to combat the alewife.

This proposal now is pending before the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee.

I believe, however, that the Department of the Interior, through the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, should intensify its own efforts at combatting the alewife.

According to figures provided me by the Bureau in 1966, expenditures on alewife control, principally in Lake Michigan, are about $200,000. In the budget request which you of the committee now have before you about the same amount—$200,000—is slated for alewife control.

This amount falls considerably short of being the massive and sustained effort which Secretary Udall admitted would be necessary if any headway is to be made against the alewife.

Just how much is necessary—or in what form aid should come—is a matter of some dispute among interested groups.

Local health officials and water pollution specialists are interested in an immediate and effective end to the problems caused by the alewife die-off, even if that means elimination of the species from the Great Lakes.

State conservation officials, on the other hand, see the alewife as a good food source for the desirable game fish they are stocking in the Lakes. To them, the most effective use of federal funds would be for purchases of trout, whitefish and salmon fingerlings with which to "seed" the Lakes.

Commercial fishermen, on the other hand, are interested in federal programs directed toward the commercial use of the alewife.

Because of the conflicting interests involved and the multi-faceted nature of the alewife problem, I believe a coordinated federal-state attack, as envisioned in H.R. 4793, remains the best hope of a satisfactory solution.

Pending the enactment of this proposal, it is my hope that this subcommittee will increase the amount of funds designated for alewife control.

Celebration of the Gandhi Centenary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 27, 1967

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, on January 17, 1967, the Government of India presented to the American people, through our educational institutions, 50 sets of the collected works of Mahatma Gandhi in connection with the celebration of the Gandhi centenary. I ask unanimous censent that there be placed in the Appendix of the Record the text of Ambassador B. K. Nehru's speech presenting the sets to Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey, and the text of the Vice President's response.

The celebration of Mahatma Gandhi's centenary is being observed not only in India, but in many countries, including our own. Paul F. Power, of the University of Cincinnati, and Dr. Joan Bondurant, of the University of California at Berkeley, are cochairmen of the Ghandi Centennial Committee of the Association for Asian Studies, which is charged with the planning of programs and other activities appropriate to the commemoration in the United States. This committee will coordinate its activities with the Indian Committee in New Delhi. Symposia will be conducted at many universities and associations for the purpose of studying Gandhi's thought and the nature of his influence.

Dr. Power was present at the ceremony at Washington and deserves congratulations and credit for the active part he played in the preparation of this ceremony, and for his work in encouraging the establishment of the Centennial Committee in the United States.

There being no objection, the speeches were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Text of Ambassador B. K. Nehru's Speech Whle Presenting 50 Sets of the Collected Works of Mahatma Gandhi to Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey at a Ceremony Held in Washington, D.C., on January 17, 1967, in Connection With the Gandhi Centennial Celebration

Mr. Vice President and friends, I am most grateful to you for giving me an opportunity to thank the American people, on behalf of the Government of India, for their spontaneous and generous decision to join us in commemorating the Birth Centennial of Mahatma Gandhi, the Father of our Nation, in a fitting manner. The centenary itself falls on October 2nd, 1969, but a Committee has been set up already in India headed by the President of India, and, I am happy to say, in the United States also, to plan the celebrations in a way Gandhiji would have wished.

A Gandhi Centennial Committee, set up by the Association of Asian Studies in the United States, has been working in close cooperation with the Committee we have formed in India and with our Embassy. Today's ceremony perhaps marks in a sense the inauguration of the programme in the United States.

Mahatma Gandhi belonged not only to India but also to the world, and your great country, Mr. Vice President, has always upheld the principles which he cherished so deeply himself—this man of peace who waged an unceasing war on ignorance and sloth, disease and suffering and most of all on "Man's inhumanity to man." By stressing the lot of the underprivileged, he taught us to strive for social justice but he was never tired of reminding us that ends were never more important than means.

He was essentially a man of peace but a revoluntionary who worked with unflagging persistence for freedom from all forms of tyranny and oppression. It is fitting that his great contribution to this century, and indeed to all time, be remembered.

Some years ago, we set up an Editorial Committee to compile the Collected Works of Mahatma Gandhi. Of the fifty-five volumes planned in the series, eighteen have so far been published. I have great pleasure in presenting to you, Mr. Vice President, as a gift from the Government of India to the American people, fifty sets of these volumes which carry Gandhiji's philosophy and his undying message.

I should like very much to take this opportunity to thank Senator Cooper, who has been closely associated with this project, and Dr. Paul F. Power, of the University of Cincinnati, who is Co-Chairman of the Gandhi Centennial Committee in the United States. I also thank my honourable friends who have graced this ceremony today with their presence.

Remarks of Vice President Hubert Humphrey at the Presentation of Collected Works of Mahatma Gandhi, Washington, D.C., January 17, 1967

Ambassador Nehru, ladies and gentlemen, on behalf of the people of the United States, I thank the Government of India most warmly for the gift of these many sets of Mahatma Gandhi's collected writings which Ambassador Nehru has just presented to me.

On such occasions as this, the peoples of India and the United States reaffirm their desires to disseminate widely the teachings of the Mahatma. This reminds us again of the heavy responsibility our two democracies bear for sharing with the world those concepts about man in all his many relationships with society which we have been privileged to inherit from our great men of the past, and which we consider to be of universal applicability.

In his remarks, the Ambassador referred to the timelessness and universality of Gandhi's mission to the world and to the particular reverence with which we Americans recall Gandhi's message of equality, freedom and love for man everywhere. Gandhi's humble, direct simplicity touched our hearts as it touched the hearts of all those throughout the globe who would, in some small measure, seek to be their brothers' keepers. His signal contribution was in reminding the 20th Century of what other "Great Souls" in centuries past had told a weary and, too often, strife-ridden world—that the brother for whom we bear responsibility is every man on whom we look, in whatever community, race or nation we may find him.

I have often reflected on the remarkable degree to which the interaction of certain aspects of the Indian and American philosophical traditions came into focus in Gandhi's person. Many of America's early writers and thinkers—for example, Ralph Waldo Emerson, Henry David Thoreau and Walt Whitman—were challenged and inspired by the writings of the Hindu seers who had spoken of God's immanence and universality. For these Americans the ancient Hindu writings furnished a most persuasive philosophic and religious base for man's political, as well as spiritual, equality and freedom to argue that in the practical everyday world the free man, when he is convinced that right is on his side and that principle is at stake, must passively resist the entire weight of his society, if necessary to protect that principle.

In his nonviolent campaign to free India from British rule, Mahatma Gandhi acknowledged his own debt to Thoreau's example and writings of a century before. Today leaders of minorities in the United States seeking social and economic gains for their groups express their appreciation for Gandhi's example of struggle against evils which he felt divided men from each other and debased humanity as a whole.

For more than a century and a half, India and America have been discovering each other and, in the process, rediscovering their own best selves through great men like Gandhi.

While I am pleased at the great interest being shown in the Gandhi Birth Centenary by many groups here in the United States, I am even more gratified at learning of the extent to which the international community will share with India many of the commemorative events scheduled in connection with the Centenary during the next two years.

In recalling that Gandhi belonged to all mankind, the peoples and nations of the world could do nothing better in the closing years and this decade than to affirm resolutely that the principles of concern for others by which that great yet humble man lived should motivate and guide us all in our relationships with one another.

Institution Building and the Alliance for Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1967

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, few men in public service bring to the position they hold the great depth of understanding, the expertise, and the breadth of experience that Mr. Covey T. Oliver will bring to the office of Assistant Secretary of State of Inter-American Affairs.

I recently had the opportunity to travel to a number of States in Latin America. I was impressed by the progress in many areas, yet dismayed by the frustration resulting from the lack of achievement in other endeavors. I became more acutely aware of the commonality of problems in this area, yet I also became more sensitive to the diversity of the 19 Republics of Latin America. The experience would have been invaluable if no other impression during the trip was imprinted on my memory than the vivid understanding that U.S. policy in this area of the world must be as flexible and diverse as the complicated and ever changing face of Latin America.

Mr. Oliver's long experience with Latin America eminently qualifies him as our custodian for U.S. policy in inter-American affairs. In a recent speech to the Philadelphia World Affairs Council Mr. Oliver pointed to the need to understand the diversity of Latin America. He also made clear the direction the Alliance for Progress is taking in light of firm realities.

My recent trip confirms much of what Mr. Oliver told the Philadelphia Council. His prescriptions for improvement and his announced methodology for achieving progress are reassuring and realistic.

Although the complexities of Mr. Oliver's new position are formidable, his understanding of the politics, culture, society, language, and history of the 19 Latin American Republics with which he must deal will provide U.S. policy with the depth of understanding and direction so critically needed.

I applaud Mr. Oliver's appointment. It is recognition of the positive and constructive role the United States wishes to play as a participant in improving the circumstances of the Western Hemisphere.

I commend Mr. Oliver's speech at the Philadelphia World Affairs Council to all Members of Congress interested in inter-American affairs:

"INSTITUTION-BUILDING AND THE ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS"

(An Address by Ambassador Covey T. Oliver, Assistant Secretary of State-designate for Inter-American Affairs, at the World Affairs Council, Philadelphia, Pa., June 7, 1967)

I am delighted to have this opportunity to share with my fellow members of the World Affairs Council of Philadelphia a few thoughts on Latin American development and the Alliance for Progress.

When we think of Latin America and the Alliance, the characterizing word is "change"—urgent, basic, needed "change." The Alliance was created to answer the needs of swiftly changing times, and indeed the Alliance already has been the engine for vast and sweeping changes in this Hemisphere.

Sometimes, changes are completely unexpected: when, on May 16, 1967, I accepted the invitation to talk here, I certainly did not foresee the rather substantial change that has since occurred in my own relationship with Latin America!

The nature of the change between my former professional responsibilities and my new official ones recalls to my mind an experience of more than twenty years ago, when I was a member of the American delegation at the Paris Peace Conference. During one session, I, as a government "expert," sat directly behind a distinguished Congressional member of that delegation, Senator Arthur Vandenberg. The Soviet bloc was blocking. There were long speeches repeating endlessly the same dreary Marxistese (we were just learning how dully repetitive the Red delegates could be). During most of the long, boring, irritating session Senator Vandenberg, smoking cigar after cigar, listened quietly and kept his pencil moving—working on an elaborate doodle of the Great Seal of the United States, with fine draftsmanship and beautiful shadings. As the session droned on, the Senator finally pushed his chair back, and as he rose to his great height to leave, briefly turned to me and said, "Young man, life was a lot simpler for me when I was an isolationist."

Life was simpler for me as a professor speaking on what ought to be done about development than ever it will be as U.S. Coordinator of the Alliance, trying actually to get things done.

But I look forward to these new duties with optimism and with sober awareness of our country's interests and opportunities in helping the New World to become a better place for all its people to live in. It has been my good fortune to have spent some memorable years in various roles in the Alliance area and to have worked closely with our good neighbors to the South. I am happy that so many of these good neighbors are also good friends, whose aspirations I believe I understand, whose views I respect, whose *amistad*—even *cariño*—I cherish.

Thus, with considerable development-oriented field experience with one of the larger AID programs, with familiarity with the languages and cultures of Alliance countries, with a firm belief in the need for development, I approach with a measure of confidence the big and difficult job of directing the United States' programs in support of the Alliance. So while there are ties that will always link me fraternally with this City and with the University, I could not have let go by this unexpected opportunity to return once again for awhile to Government service—particularly at this time, when a spirit of change characterizes inter-American affairs.

It is clear that we are entering a new era in the Americas—an era of renewal of expectations, of sighting new horizons, of moving on toward them. The Summit Meeting of the Presidents of America, focused world attention anew on the Alliance for Progress. It will stand historically as a milestone in Hemispheric history. It marks the turning point between what might be called the first phase of the Alliance, and this new, second phase we have now embarked upon in the "Decade of Urgency," as President Johnson has called it.

Standing where we are today, looking back to where we have been and ahead towards where we must go with the development, I see three phases of the Alliance for Progress:

First, there was the organization, mobilization, and correction (or "feed back") phase. The hemisphere had to agree on the nature of the problems and the goals of our Alliance. It had to mobilize its efforts—in money, manpower and will. But it also had to deal with serious distortions which impeded economic and social growth—rampant inflation that robbed middle and lower income groups of initiative, heavy debt burdens that could not be amortized with current income; currency, balance of payments and other difficulties that made economic and social growth almost impossible. These problems are still with us, but Latin America has a much better grip on them and they now seem manageable.

The adjustments which Latin American countries have made in the early years of the Alliance have been painful, demanding in personal and political courage. As I participated in the development and execution of Alliance policies from 1964–1966, I can attest that the task of development is not easy for them. But I can also attest that our neighbors truly want to better themselves in lasting and self-reliant ways. They are too much men and women attuned to human dignity to be satisfied with doles and relief. For them and for us the goals are the same, and we move together along the road to them, helping each other over the rough places. As we travel this road, we come to places from which, across the valleys ahead, we also see the peaks we would attain, glimpsed suddenly in such splendor as not to be forgotten as we move on.

The Summit meeting was such a place on the road. There the Hemisphere's highest political leaders met, assessed our modest but encouraging progress, and gave direction for vigorous new steps forward.

Thus, to leave my metaphor, while we are still working in many places on the first phase of the Alliance, the Presidents clearly outlined both the second and third phases: a major effort on institution-building and concrete measures to achieve a Common Market by 1985.

While we should never lose sight of the ultimate goals tied to hemispheric unity, it is the new intermediate phase that I want to discuss with you.

Latin America has many dreams but probably none that its people more passionately seek to fulfill than those of democratic growth and social justice. We share that dream, for nothing is more precious to us than human dignity, the worthwhileness of the individual person as a child of God; free and democratic institutions; and, as our great Declaration bravely given in this City of Brotherly Love puts it, the pursuit of happiness.

We must, therefore, help create, strengthen modify and build institutions that provide:

The opportunity for all to share equitably in the cost of building their country with the assurance that their contributions are used wisely and honestly.

The opportunity for the farmer to own land, to obtain credit, and to market his production at fair prices.

The opportunity for youth to obtain an education and to make an intelligent and meaningful contribution to society while preparing also to lead it within short years.

The opportunity for the worker to get work and to be rewarded properly for his labor.

The opportunity for business to invest under just and equitable laws and earn fair returns.

The opportunity for all to stand equally before the law without fear or favor and to live out their years in peace, honor, and social effectiveness.

Let me be specific: Improved productivity and greater monetary stability alone are not enough; there must be modernization of existing institutions and the development of new ones. Many of these changes there, as here, require state action—legislation, law, public administration. There must be changes in distribution, in the processes for meeting the expectations of various groups in the social structure.

As we move into an intermediate stage of the Alliance, wherein human needs and hopes, institution-building, and modernization will be principal themes, we note with satisfaction that our Alliance-oriented operations in the first, or stability-seeking, phase have themselves had important relationships to social and politico-cultural goals. A good example is taxation. The development of fair, effective, and respected systems of taxation is a major objective of existing development programs in a number of countries. From one point of view, "Technical Assistance" is involved, as we have made available experts and tax technology. Technical Assistance is an original and still useful aspect of development help—at one time the only civilian kind we offered to Latin-America. The "tax projects" are also related to fiscal stability—a short-range, or "precondition," goal—and to a number of middle-phase goals, ranging from distributive justice to more local currency resources for social service budgets related to education, health, and the like.

We of the Alliance community have done and are doing well with "tax reform." Improved revenue-raising is a mutually recognized development objective. We all talk to each other (now through our experts mainly) about tax matters, and as to tax issues and ideas we deal with each other in ways that in a more traditional era would have been regarded as improper even for dialogue between different nations.

Land-reform is another example. Here we of North America have had to disabuse ourselves of our tendency to generalize about land-holding conditions as if they were the same throughout the rest of the Hemisphere, and we have had to reconsider some of our simplistic, though well-intentioned, notions about the per se virtues of small-holdings, regardless of their relationship to the subsistence needs of owners and to national productivity. But here again we have been working intimately with our neighbors; and as part of our programs to increase agricultural production the land-ownership, land-development, colonization problems are getting intelligent, frank and continuous attention.

Land utilization, on the other hand, is hardly in the realm of discourse between us. Regardless of who owns them, what should the good lands—those that are capable of bountiful production of a wide range of crops—be used for? What is the relationship of land utilization to nutrition and dietary habits; between governmental policies and incentives for increased agricultural production?

The Presidents called at Punta del Este for modernization of the conditions of rural life. It may be that much that needs to be done along lines I have just mentioned, can be related to this Presidential support for further study and work. Additionally, in most countries there lie ahead:

(a) the development of food processing and food storage

(b) improved physical facilities for urbanrural exchanges of goods and services

(c) institutional changes in the marketing process itself.

The first two of these are mainly the business of private enterprise, whose role in development is exceedingly important especially in this second stage of the development process. The international agencies and the United States can help with ideas, feasibility-study financing, and the supplying of marketing experts under Technical Assistance. Much of the capital, most of the risk-taking and innovating initiatives must come from the private sector, in a combination that is suitable to the times and the fair needs of all groups involved. Also, the United States seeks constructive opportunities to help in the financing of more cooperatives for both production and marketing, more agricultural credit mechanisms, and more private investment funds which can help agro-industry. President Johnson has stated he will seek new funds to help the modernization of agriculture in these ways.

The Program of Action agreed by the Presidents at Punta del Este emphasized the need for "multi-national infrastructure projects" as steps toward economic integration and the Common Market. One essential for modernization of the market process in Latin America is roads—and more roads. Although water-way improvement is important in some countries, it is roads, from through highways to rural access routes, that is the greatest single need for increased velocity and efficiency in the exchange of goods and services within a country and, indeed, for export and regional trade improvement as well. Intensive road-building programs, moreover, give jobs to unskilled and semiskilled labor in countries where far too few of those seeking work can find it.

The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development has been doing laudable development work of this nature in particular countries. At the Summit, the Presidents endorsed the leading role of the Inter-American Development Bank in studing and financing multinational projects in such fields as transportation, telecommunications and hydroelectric power.

Institutional changes in the market process itself are parts of social change. This means that, first attitudes and, ultimately, the legal order must guide the developing countries into modern patterns of distribution. In the developing countries there must be more awareness of free world experience with the "mix" between laissez-faire, enforced competition, countervailing power and public regulation that charactertize developed free economies—and societies—today.

No single, all-countries, all-times, mechanical adjustment of public-private sector relationships is possible. Each country, each community, has to work out its own "mix." But for that to happen in the less-developed world there has to be (in that world) more awareness and evaluation of these problems than there has been. Note, for example, that unlike the Treaty of Rome creating the European Economic Community, neither the LAFTA nor the Central American Common Market arrangements deal with monopoly problems.

Does this mean that our AID missions in Latin America should become involved with "antitrust" in about the same manner as they have been with tax reform? My tentative view is that our bilateral involvement should be limited to developing a dialogue, giving information and sharing research techniques, because in this field (unlike taxation) there is now such a wide variety of models in developed country experience as to encourage caution in putting forward our own antitrust system as if we thought it the only approach to coping with restrictive trade practices and monopolies. But Latin America must assure competition in the national marketplace if the area is to develop and compete in world markets.

And we should consider more effective encouragement for cooperative and community development movements, because these are "of-the-people" programs that hold promise for wide popular involvement in all aspects of development—social and political, as well as economic.

Institution-building is now a national process, and must eventually become a community process. The dynamism, the know-how, for social schange, has to come from within the system. This means, above all, *education* of the decision-makers-to-be. All education is an Alliance goal, but good university education is an immediate, absolute necessity for the articulate, dissatisfied young people who through their own energies and frequently over very great difficulties have made theiy ways to the public universities of Latin America with eventual public leadership in mind. These public universities are, right now, turning out the decision-makers of tomorrow. They are the major civilian engines of social mobility in Latin America—the only way a poor but energetic and determined young person can rise in society without joining the military services. Communists and other extremists know this quite well. The public universities are prime targets of the extremist elements. I consider public university betterment very urgent.

The greatest substantive needs of the universities as I now see them are (a) more full-time teachers, better trained and with more time to give to students, and (b) more extensive and more modern social studies curricula. Students should have opportunities to study and appraise *all* the roads to social justice, not just the illusory (and outdated) Marxist one. As a result of lack of information as to how societies really work in developed countries (including even the USSR), far too many young Latin Americans tend to choose some brand of "marxism" over free-world systems, which they mistakenly assume to be something these systems never were—completely dominated by heartless, mechanistic concepts of pure laissez-faire capitalism. The students should be led to inquiry: factual, scientific inquiry. The universities themselves should be enabled to undertake socio-cultural, self-discovery research projects (such as "attitude studies"), for greater understanding of how total development may occur.

Inter-American studies need almost everywhere in Latin America to be developed, especially now that economic unification is specifically foreseen. In universities in the United States, Latin American studies is a standard field for teaching and research, and President Johnson promised his colleagues at Punta del Este that he would seek further enlargement of university work here in this sector.

But for the future we all want, we must make sure that scholarly study and teaching of inter-American relations is truly a Hemisphere-wide matter, and not one confined to the United States.

University development along the lines that I have described should not be delayed until the country has "taken off" in the economic sense, thus being able to support the improvements needed out of increased social capital. Many of these should come sooner by additions to university operating budgets to support properly planned changes in teaching, curriculum, libraries, and research.

After some years as a universitarian, I know how delicate and difficult university changes involving faculty and courses can be! They will be so in Latin-America in part because in some quarters there is satisfaction with present ways of doing things. But every day there are more intelligent Latin-Americans coming to see that their universities must be modernized as to the substance of what they teach and how they teach it. In such a delicate area as this, a bilateral approach is not as promising as a transnational one, provided tht the latter is vigorous, scientific, and effective. We must, all of us, look around for the right institution or institutions to spearhead the important work of university substantive modernization—and if we do not find it (or them) among our existing hemispheric agencies, we must create one adequate to the task.

Latin-America cannot modernize democratically without modernized political leaders, administrators, businessmen. And the modernization of men should be mainly a national and regional process, not one that relies too heavily on sending the leader-to-be off to the United States or Europe to be educated, valuable though such experiences are. One danger of the latter course is that he might not come home—the "brain drain" problem. Another is that he will not have lived through—grown up intellectually with—the change of his own country and thus be too remote from change under way when his generation assumes leadership.

As President Johnson has pointed out, there is no exact science of development yet. All of us in the Americas are learning development on the job. We have learned that hemispheric development is not a short-term matter, and our plans and policies have now recognized that it is not. We know that the Alliance, although it springs from past development operations elsewhere, has a highly differentiated spirit and purpose—very special neighborhood characteristics—of its own. In this country, our appreciation of the special nature of the Alianza is visible in the broad, bipartisan support the program has always had from Congress. Again, a welcome and significant development was the addition to the Foreign Assistance Act of 1966 of a section known as Title IX—which directs that, as to the Alliance for Progress, "emphasis shall be placed on assuring maximum participation in the task of economic development *on the part of the people* of developing countries. . . ."

As we enter a new phase of the Alliance for Progress, the spirit and mood of inter-American affairs is encouraging, exciting and challenging. The Presidents of America at Punta del Este laid out a wide-ranging but specific program of action, based on careful factual studies that required many months and high and dedicated talent.

All of us recognize—especially following the meeting of Presidents—that the burden of solving these problems falls mainly upon the Latin Americans themselves. The helping hand that we of the United States can and do offer represents only a small part of the effort required of the hemisphere if we are to move forward together towards the ultimate Alliance for Progress goal of bringing a better life to all the peoples of the Americas.

Throughout the Americas there is renewed activity, new confidence. Many and difficult are the tasks ahead of us. The war on poverty and underdevelopment in the neighborhood is not yet won. But the strategy for victory has been given us by our Presidents. The challenge of great opportunity is before us. Let us all give in our respective ways the best we have to give.

As I approach my new role in a Great Emprise, I recall great words from a towering American figure, Justice Louis D. Brandeis:

"If we would guide by the light of Reason, we must let our minds be bold."

A Strategy for Quality Growth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD P. HANSEN

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 27, 1967

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech I delivered to the Sigma Tau Engineering Honorary at the University of Wyoming on April 28. I believe that the speech, entitled "A Strategy for Quality Growth," might be relevant at this time in view of the legislation now before Congress concerning economic development. I wish to acknowledge the assistance of Dr. Franklin P. Huddle, of the Library of Congress, and thank him for his helpful contributions in the preparation of this speech.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"A STRATEGY FOR QUALITY GROWTH"

(Remarks prepared for delivery at banquet meeting of Sigma Tau Engineering Honorary, University of Wyoming, Laramie, Friday, April 28, 1967)

About two weeks ago, a study was released by a statistical office of the Department of Defense that revealed the dollar amounts of defense contracts and sub-contracts received by the 50 states.

Wyoming was very close to the bottom of the list in every category;

With the bulk of federal funds going today into defense, it is the states with big aerospace companies and heavy industry that receive the lion's share of the business:

Of course, it is obvious at the outset that there is no industrial company in the state of Wyoming large and experienced enough to manage a prime contract for a multi-million dollar Nike-X system or a supersonic transport.

In the second place, a large part of the supplier contract work to manufacture the hardware for these new systems, is performed in shops in the heavily industrialized areas.

The people who live in these areas, I have observed, do not get all this business for free. They pay for it in many ways: In air pollution, filthy streams, in hillsides and fields littered with trash and scrap heaps, in race riots and a high crime rate, in degredation of many of the values that make life in Wyoming worth living.

Clearly, the industrialized society of the twentieth century is a mixed blessing. We have yet to design the ideal urban culture.

In the third place, I observed that we could not make Wyoming into a new Megalopolis, even if we wanted to. Many forces operate to concentrate enormous populations in congested areas. Some of these are beyond our reach.

The great urban centers have gradually assembled over the years an enormously costly network of railroads, gas and power systems, schools, libraries, roads, sanitation facilities, hospitals, and so on. Evolution of the great super-cities is a century-long process, and—as I say—I do not admire the result.

In fact, I think that great Wyoming gentleman, former Governor Jack Gage, hit the nail on the head when he observed not long ago that there is nothing inherently wrong with lots of clean, empty, open space in our wonderful state.

But of course, on balance, we must combine our streams and mountains with job and income producing facilities or lose our most precious asset: our people.

It is not enough to change. We must progress. We must preserve the great values we have today, and build on them to achieve a richer and more prosperous society while taking care to avoid the needless social costs that New York and Chicago or Los Angeles have had to endure.

We want Wyoming's change to be what Roy Peck has called, "Quality growth." We want to preserve the best that we have and build from it a healthier and more productive state economy.

There are a number of states that are right now carrying on aggressive programs to bring in new industry.

They conduct intelligence campaigns to learn which companies are looking for a new plant site. They invest their own dollars in the construction of new plants on speculation, hoping that they will be able to find a tenant.

They offer tax concessions to lure companies to move in. They make deals to accommodate municipal planning and ordinances to the need of the company they are wooing. They donate land, highways, water systems.

The attitude in some areas seems to be: We can put up with any discomfort or cost because all our statistics are going up and, man, that's progress.

In Wyoming, we have one pattern of resources that few, if any, states can equal and none can surpass. Our clean air, our pure snow-fed streams, our forests and upland flats, our open plains where hardly a fence can be seen.

Our people are accustomed to an open society; our standards are not arrived at in desperate reaction to the dirt, the pressures, and the dangers of urban traffic and slums. Ours is an environment where a man can think and create.

Such an environment is becoming rare in our world and our century. Let us not compromise it in the name of change for the sake of change.

And let us not overlook the rich industries which are at our doorstep and which can be lucrative and beneficial beyond measure—if the federal government will be kind enough to let development occur.

I have been sitting on Senator Hart's Anti-Trust and Monopoly Subcommittee during the hearings, which are continuing, into the broad question of oil shale potential and policy.

If the states of Wyoming, Colorado and Utah can make peace with Washington, and if the vital and equitable role of private enterprise can be accepted by the Interior Department as having a proper place in oil shale development, then this industry can be one of the most massive in the history of our western states.

That change will depend largely upon Washington; the other changes will depend on Wyoming.

To begin with, I believe that the rate of Wyoming's progress is less important than its direction. Better to advance soundly, on a quality basis, than to achieve a high rate of change for the sake of change. Wyoming is one state where the older generation still plants fruit trees for the next. To define what I should like to propose as a goal for our campaign of quality growth, let me take just a moment to analyze a category that has been expanding very rapidly in the last two decades and looks as though it will continue to grow. This is what is rather loosely referred to as the "think factory."

Some are tied to the large universities, some are independent and non-profit, and some are supported by the larger business corporations—especially those in the aerospace industry.

The function of these institutions is to devise new and better ways of doing things, to conduct research in "far out" ideas, to apply new techniques of systems analysis, to bring together experts from different disciplines to concentrate their attention on common problems.

This category of industrial activity is today the fastest-growing and most productive segment in our entire national economy. It is the source of such great new ideas as the "planning-programming-budgeting" method of executive control of business and government operations, the PERT method of scheduling construction of large systems, the Surveyor project, Polaris, and many others.

The "systems approach" itself grew out of this environment.

As we work to industrialize Wyoming, it would not be sensible to concentrate entirely on luring some company or other to put up a branch plant in our state.

One such plant may not pay, in taxes, enough to cover the costs of improvements that would be necessary to lure it in the first place.

Nor would it be sensible for us to aspire to erect a complete industrial complex in Wyoming. To start from our present meager base—economically speaking—would involve us in an impossibly large requirement for capital, management experience, resources of technologically skilled labor, and the development of adequate markets to sustain the enterprise.

In other words, to operate on a too-small scale isn't practical; to operate on a too-large scale isn't feasible.

Accordingly, I suggest that it would not be unreasonable for us to have as our long-range goal the building over the next few decades of a science city in Wyoming.

Such a concept could evolve gradually out of an accumulation of highly trained scientists and technologists brought into the state or trained within the state, and concerned with a succession of specific scientific programs or national science objectives.

Late in 1966, the Atomic Energy Commission made a site selection that directed national attention to the desirability of attracting science centers into new economic areas. A small prairie community 30 miles outside of Chicago was selected to be the home of a $375 million national accelerator laboratory.

The studies and analyses undertaken by the AEC before making this choice were the most extensive in its history. It received offers from 46 states, including Wyoming, with more than 200 sites suggested.

What were among the criteria? The focus was mainly on people! According to the AEC, the final decision was made on the basis of its prospect for enabling the new facility to mobilize and maintain the staff required to build and use the facility most effectively.

In part, this meant accessibility to the world and in particular to the scientific community; the interaction between the staff of the National Accelerator Laboratory and the University community was of great importance.

It meant equal treatment locally of scientists and technologists, without regard to their race or ethnic origin. It meant good schools and attractive housing.

It meant the availability of sources of the technologically-skilled labor needed to construct and maintain the large facility. It meant cultural and recreational facilities. It meant engineers.

To me, it seems apparent that the further we in the United States proceed on our programs of scientific exploration, the less important it becomes to locate these research complexes near our industrial centers or centers of population. Some of the most important criteria that influenced the AEC had to do with the quality of the environment of the site. This factor will operate increasingly to the benefit of Wyoming. We ought to be preparing ourselves to take advantage of this leverage.

Another factor that is certain to operate to our advantage in the future is the direction being taken right now in the development of the computer. This device will revolutionize our way of life, of that there is no doubt.

As we become more proficient in the use of the very large computers, the geographical accessibility of libraries and centers of technical data will be of no consequence; a teletype console will operate as effectively in Laramie as at MIT.

We can confidently rely on the advancing state of the computer art to make the physical location of a research facility irrelevant to its effectiveness. This fact definitely benefits Wyoming.

If the "think factory" of the next generation can be released from the necessity of being located close to libraries, universities, industrial centers, and so on, it seems to me it will then be possible to have the best of both worlds. That surely means Wyoming!

Our science city could be spread out over an entire state.

In closing, I suggest that four principles should govern our campaign for the scientific and technological development of Wyoming.

Most important of all, we should put quality before quantity.

Next, we should aim to achieve steady progress rather than rapid change.

Thirdly, we should turn to our account the longer term trends in evolving science and technology, rather than seeking to import industry or projects already established elsewhere.

And finally, we should give greatest encouragement to those enterprises which show creativity and drive.

I think Wyoming's assets—from her environment to her university, to her people—far outweigh her liabilities with respect to self development. I believe, though, that there are many areas of development that exceed in potential the creation of a massive industrial complex—at least at the outset.

But let us resolve to make Wyoming's change a truly creative experience that respects her values and beauty while creating a stronger economy.

Only then will our change be truly called progress.

Massachusetts Committee, Catholics, Protestants and Jews, 30th Annual Dinner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 27, 1967

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the Massachusetts Committee, Catholics, Protestants and Jews, in existence for at least three decades, is a great American organization for the furtherance and strengthening of understanding among our people, and in the bringing of justice to our people. The committee operates without paid quarters or any paid help, and with funds derived solely from voluntary contributions by its members and many friends and supporters.

On the evening of May 18, 1967, at the Statler Hilton Hotel in Boston, Mass., this splendid organization held its 30th annual dinner. On the occasion of each annual dinner, the committee confers awards and citations upon three persons selected principally because of their "nobility of character."

At the recent banquet, Hon. Jacob J. Spiegel, justice, Massachusetts Supreme Judicial Court, was the toastmaster, and H. D. Hodgkinson, an outstanding citizen, was general chairman.

The recipients of the awards and citations at this year's banquet were—

First, U.S. Senator EDWARD M. KENNEDY.

Second. Sandy Koufax, triple winner, Cy Young Award.

Third, Ralph Lowell, trustee, Lowell Institute.

The banquet, one of the outstanding events of Massachusetts, and in particular, of the Greater Boston area, was attended this year by at least 1,200 persons.

This is an organization which other sections of our country might well emulate.

The members of this constructive organization are outstanding men in all walks of life—religion, government, law, medicine, finance, business, in the field of science, and in all other human activities.

The members of this splendid organization are too numerous to mention, but there is one who richly deserves mention—whose dedication to this committee is recognized by all and whose untiring work and leadership has played a most important part in its success. I refer to Ben G. Shapiro, its secretary since its inception.

For 30 years leaders in the Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish faiths have worked together in this committee to improve group relations. It engages in many outstanding activities, too numerous to mention, but among which are—

Good citizenship program of the Boston Park Department.

Tufts University civic education project.

Brandeis University Three Chapels program.

Human Relations Center at Boston University.

Massachusetts Department of Education.

And, in addition, the committee has distributed many thousands of copies of educational material to schoolteachers and heads of educational institutions throughout the United States. For the last 16 years it has conducted an annual junior good will dinner, bringing together boys of the Boston public and parochial schools, which has created favorable comment by leaders in human relations throughout the country.

The general aims and purposes of this splendid organization are—

First, to sponsor good will work in the general community of Greater Boston;

Second, to serve as a medium through which representative citizens can endorse the basic democratic principle of good will among men of different faiths and different racial origins;

Third, to bring out and emphasize the many fine things which citizens of different faiths have in common; and

Fourth, to encourage and support those forces in the community which generate in the individual a respect for the validity and dignity of each other individual's particular religious faith, with no qualifications or reservations based upon racial origins.

Fifth, the committee is a separate, independent association, not connected with any other local or national organization.

In my extension of remarks, I include—

First, introductory remarks of Oscar W. Haussermann, chairman of the committee;

Second, remarks of Hon. Jacob J. Spiegel, toastmaster;

Third, remarks of Hon. John F. Collins, mayor of Boston;

Fourth, excerpts from the remarks of Hon. Francis W. Sargent, Lieutenant Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts;

Fifth, remarks made by Ben G. Shapiro, secretary of the committee;

Sixth, remarks made by Joseph M. Linsey in introducing John J. MacMillan;

Seventh, remarks of John J. MacMillan of Boston College High School;

Eighth, remarks of Ralph Lowell, trustee, Lowell Institute;

Ninth, remarks of Sandy Koufax, triple winner, Cy Young Award;

Tenth, remarks of Hon. EDWARD M. KENNEDY, U.S. Senator;

Eleventh, citation and testimonial presented to Mr. Ralph Lowell;

Twelfth, citation and testimonial presented to Hon. EDWARD M. KENNEDY;

Thirteenth, citation and testimonial presented to Sandy Koufax.

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS OF OSCAR W. HAUSSERMANN, CHAIRMAN, MASSACHUSETTS COMMITTEE OF CATHOLICS, PROTESTANTS, AND JEWS, MAY 18, 1967

Reverend Clergy; Your Excellency, Lieut. Governor Sargent; Your Honor, Mayor Collins; Distinguished Guests; Ladies and Gentlemen:

To all of you I extend, on behalf of our amorphous organization, a hearty welcome to this, the Thirtieth Annual Senior Good Will Dinner of our Massachusetts Committee of Catholics, Protestants and Jews.

I say "our amorphous organization" because that's what our Massachusetts Committee is. We have no charter, no by-laws, no bicameral set-up of rulers, no hired quarters and no paid help. But we do have Ben Shapiro and we do have a truly American and an increasingly important purpose. That purpose is to bring the day-in and day-out practices of our democracy closer to its preachings through the lessening of group prejudices and the promotion of good will and understanding among our fellow Americans of different faiths and racial origins. We have reason to believe that our thirty years' war on prejudice and bigotry has improved the social climate of this old community. And we know that the friendly backing which we've always received from thoughtful, representative citizens, such as you who are here tonight, has encouraged us to carry on.

My assignment this evening is to present to you your Toastmaster. As most lawyers in these parts know, after his graduation from the B. U. Law School he engaged for a goodly number of years in the practice of the law as an active trial lawyer. Thereafter he served in turn as a Municipal Judge, as the Legislative Secretary to Senator Henry Cabot Lodge, as First Assistant Attorney General of Massachusetts, as counsel of the Port of Boston Authority and as general counsel of the Massachusetts Health Research Institute. In the course of his impressive career he's received honorary degrees from institutions of learning and awards from civic associations for distinguished public service. In 1961 he was appointed to his present position of Justice of the Supreme Judicial Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

Ladies and gentlemen, your Toastmaster, Mr. Justice Jacob J. Spiegel.

REMARKS OF HON. JACOB J. SPIEGEL

It is a warm and satisfying feeling for me to be here this evening and to actively participate in honoring the three notable gentlemen who are to be the recipients of the Committee's citations.

All of us are aware, I am sure, of the extraordinary era in which we live. In the midst of massive scientific achievements we have yet to resolve the conflict between the tortuous and obscure philosophy which enslaves mankind and the philosophy which upholds the dignity of the individual.

Scientists tell us that from 1496 B.C. to the present time—a period of some 3500 years—there was only a comparatively brief period of some 230 years of peace in the so-called civilized world. During my own lifetime I cannot recall a single period when some part of the world was not engaged in bloodshed. However, we need not look beyond our own shores to witness evidence of man's inhumanity to man.

In our own country—we are today witnessing a social revolution in which an oppressed minority is crying out for simple justice. Whether we agree with the methods employed is not the issue. The fact is that too many of us remained silent when we should have spoken. To that extent we bear a substantial portion of the responsibility and a substantial portion of the guilt.

I realize of course that there is no simple, magical formula for the elimination of bigotry and intolerance. Ideas can be conceived but to be effective they must be given life. We must make imaginative use of the instruments at hand.

When we are asked—"Am I my brother's keeper"? The answer must be "Yes." An overwhelming "Yes." For if our society is to be maintained and strengthened we must have a common faith in the dignity of man, regardless of his race, his color or his religion. Every human enterprise depends on it. Indeed, the peace and freedom of all mankind depends upon it.

Wherever bigotry and intolerance exists as part of the archaic pattern in the human mind it must be uprooted by education and replaced by warmth and understanding.

This committee of Catholics, Protestants and Jews is a perfect illustration of what thoughtful men with a creative ideal can accomplish. It has been, and still is, in many ways, a dramatic and historic adventure, for it recognized the indisputable fact that man was created free even though born in chains. This committee put into action forces that helped to sever the chains of bigotry and racial intolerance. It has become a strong and effective instrument of social policy, setting an example for others to follow.

I know that we shall continue to keep our standards high—striving—at all times—to reach the altruistic goal of a true "brotherhood of man" and the promise of a glorious future so that we in America may remain a free people under "one flag, one land, one heart, one hand, one nation, evermore."

REMARKS BY HON. JOHN F. COLLINS, MAYOR OF BOSTON

It is with a sense of pride and deep appreciation that I extend to this fine audience and the outstanding men we honor tonight, a most sincere welcome in behalf of the citizens of the city I have the honor to serve.

To their felicitations I heartily honor my own.

Boston—as everyone is aware—is a city rich in priceless American tradition. This wonderful occasion marks the 30th annual meeting of the Massachusetts Committee of Catholics, Protestants and Jews. I feel privileged to salute an organization which has now become one of those proud traditions.

Years hence, the work to which this committee has now devoted three long and fruitful decades will serve as a hallmark to designate the appreciation of this city and this state in the vital recognition of the Ecumenical Spirit.

You know and I know that if this nation is to attain the true measure of its unlimited potential for greatness—human understanding, in its truest sense—must prevail.

Back in 1936 when this organization was born the phrase—"Ecumenical Spirit"—had not yet become a part of our everyday language. At that time our nation was gripped by a most acute economical depression. Yet, even as we suffered the punishing ravages of

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

those years of despondency and crisis we became more united.

In Boston today "Ecumenical Spirit" is not merely an inspiring phrase. Nor is it a phrase serving only to define some worthwhile goal to be attained at some hazy time in the future. It is here today. It will remain with us in the days ahead. Due in no small measure to organizations and individuals such as yourselves—the "Ecumenical Spirit" is a real and vital part of the climate of our city and our state. In such a climate—hate and deliberate misunderstanding cannot survive.

Your organization has served to enrich our knowledge of the most complex of all God's creatures—man himself. You have underscored heavily the age-old truth that no human is born with a soul tainted by the venomous poison of hatred—of malice predicated on the race in which a man is born or the altar at which he worships. That hatred and malice must be created by himself.

Once again tonight we honor three men who stand in sharp contradiction to any conviction that the seeds of true achievement are only afforded those who come within the narrow sights of the bigot's microscope.

To most of us, Sandy Koufax[1] is known in this part of the baseball-loving world principally through the picture tube, the sports page and the record books. I share with everyone here the fervent wish that the fates and shrewd scouting reports which made him a member of the Los Angeles ball club had been working instead for the Boston Red Sox.

We would have welcomed him here. Indeed, he might have been elected Mayor of our city. Looking at him tonight I would say that even if that good right arm has retained only a fractional part of the strength and magic of his recent world series years, he would be welcome here right away. I'd be glad to ask Tom Yawkey to give him a job, tomorrow.

Our senior Senator preserves for our Commonwealth the courage of which his gallant brother, our late President, wrote so inspiringly. His concern for the so-called minorities is not limited to words. He recognizes the capacity of that now steadily shrinking segment to bully and exploit those on whom they would stamp the brand of inferiority.

He has put into action the prestige of his office and the power of his vote to further the just aims of those he represents—not as Catholics, Protestants or Jews—but as members of a community which derives much of its strength from the brotherhood of man.

When we were yet a very young nation moving into the fields of commerce and trade there were bars on the windows of most of our banks and the austere office of the merchant was not only dull and gloomy but forbidden to all but a few.

Mr. Ralph Lowell has seen many changes come to the world of business. He has seen the roll-top desk hidden away in a stern corner office give way to the newest in lighting and cheer. He has seen the cold isolation of the business world dissolve before a recognition of the merchant's proper place in the community.

He has not only witnessed the change. In his long career of service he has been a motivating influence in achieving the change.

In the distant future when historians will be assaying the 20th century—particularly as it concerns this old City of Boston, his name will be mentioned often for the role he has played in our progress.

His love of Boston and its best interests are exceeded only by his devotion and unselfishness to that progress.

Jew, Catholic, Protestant . . . We honor tonight three outstanding men of achievement. They stand as symbols of a unity that must be constantly enhanced in our daily lives.

Tonight the Massachusetts Committee of Catholics, Protestants and Jews deserves a universal accolade. It has not only served to make our City and our State better for its existence. It has helped all of us to better citizens.

Excerpts From the Remarks of Lieutenant Governor Sargent

I bring to this gathering tonight the Greetings of the Commonwealth and the deep regret of Governor Volpe that he is unable to be here because of a mandatory trip to Washington. The unforeseen is the inevitable in public life, but the Governor wanted me to say particularly how deeply disappointed he was to miss this event. . . .

For myself, I would like to say that I look forward to the day when gatherings of this kind will be obsolete—because we will have reached our goal of making brotherhood a way of life and not a sought-after hope, when brotherhood will be a commonplace and not an aspiration. . . .

Religious co-operation and fellowship have made great strides in very recent times. . . .

This Protestant was a deep admirer, for example, of the Roman Catholic Pope John, whose spirit, warmth, vision and, not least, sense of humor, generated better understanding among men and women of all creeds. . . .

The ecumenical movement he sparked will have effects that will transcend even his own expectations and hopes. . . .

Here in Massachusetts, it is my hope that every day brings us closer to transforming his philosophy, the philosophy of the basic brotherhood of man, closer to a living reality. . . .

Remarks by Ben G. Shapiro

Gentlemen of the Clergy, Lieutenant Governor Sargent, Mayor Collins, our guests of honor, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, tonight is a milestone in the history of these dinners—for tonight we celebrate the thirtieth anniversary of these dinners. In 1937 the dinner was symbolic to that of a candle flickering in the darkness of social relations. Tonight it is a burst of light showering upon the city and the commonwealth. For over the past three decades something wonderful and great has happened in the area of brotherhood and understanding among men of all religious beliefs, for men and women of all national origins, for the community that has transcended from the old Boston to the new Boston.

We all know that cities are much more than bricks and mortar, expressways and skyscrapers. It is now, and always will be, people. And more than that, it is the climate and the atmosphere in which people live and work, play and plan together for the common good.

The Massachusetts Committee Catholics, Protestants, and Jews first assembled when there was, indeed, much to be desired in the climate and atmosphere of Boston. We can, unashamedly, point with pride to our efforts in creating and forging a climate of brotherhood that is cited as an example around the country.

We started off with some general aims and purposes to which we still cleave and cling. I would like to recite them again, for they are permanent in our policies:

"To sponsor good will work in the general community of greater Boston;

"To serve as a medium through which representative citizens can endorse the basic democratic principle of good will among men of different faiths and different racial origins;

"To bring out and emphasize the many fine things which citizens of different faiths have in common; and

"To encourage and support those forces in the community which generate in the individual a respect for the validity and dignity of each other individual's particular religious faith, with no qualifications or reservations based upon racial origins."

My memories are full of the sunlight of the help that people of good will have given us through these past three decades. On every frontier was—and is—the beloved Richard Cardinal Cushing. His help has been limitless. There were the pioneers—Charles Francis Adams, Victor Friend, Oscar Haussermann, Judge Abe Pinanski, Hon. John W. McCormack, Governor John A. Volpe, Justice Paul G. Kirk, H. D. Hodginkson, Ralph Lowell, Mike Kelleher, Sidney Rabb, and Ralph Eastman. Oh, I could mention an almanac of names. There have been so many! Boston and our community is better because of these men. I salute them—one and all—with all my heart.

Your committee, during the past year, has continued its interest in the human relations activities of our fine colleges and universities. We have supported the Tufts University Civic Education Center and the school of human relations at Boston University. We support the functioning program of the Catholic, Protestant and Jewish chapels at Brandeis University. We are involved with the Institute of Human Sciences at Boston College. Tonight, as in years past, we have as our guests students from Greater Boston colleges and universities.

One of the highlights of the year is the junior good will dinner at Fenway Park, where youths from public and parochial schools have the teen-age version of this dinner. Youths are gathered together in the spirit of friendship and brotherhood—just as we have it in evidence here tonight.

I must not forget our cooperation with the honor certificates for playground leadership, awarded by the mayor to boys and girls of the elementary schools in recognition of their good citizenship.

These 30 years have been memorable years for me. And there seems to be a golden cord that links all of us together. I believe the chief characteristic of the people gathered here tonight is "responsibility." People who are responsible. People who know, first of all, that the cancer of prejudice is the disease of unthinking men, of unfeeling men. Prejudice, as you know, is made up of two Latin words. They mean pre-judge. To pre-judge a person, an institution, an idea, without looking for the facts, the arguments on the other side of the coin, the other points of view, the numerous other possibilities—all of that is nonsense.

There are people with prejudices still being studied by the psychologists, sociologists, and moralists. But, for me, right here in this hall is a living laboratory that shows when people of good will get together, sit down and break bread with one another, have respect and regard for other people—the rocks of prejudice are crumbling, and being reduced to dust. Let us continue chipping away at this rock.

Thank you very much.

Cardinal's Residence,
Brighton, Mass., May 10, 1967.

Mr. Ben G. Shapiro,
Boston, Mass.

Dear Ben: Learning of the 30th Anniversary of the Massachusetts Committee, Catholics, Protestants and Jews, I am taking the liberty of offering you and those interested in the Committee my congratulations.

Over the years you have done much to create a friendly atmosphere in this area among all groups. It is essential that in these changing times we should all be united in a bond of unity, love and esteem. The problems of the future will be great but if we are united they can be solved in a very effective way. It takes a long time to inaugurate social justice on every level. Patience, therefore, is a very essential asset towards mutual love, respect and esteem.

---

[1] By now everyone who didn't know it before knows that Koufax was one of the best southpaw pitchers in National League history.

But, be he right-handed or left-handed, Boston would be proud to call him its own.

You, yourself, have done much over the past three decades to keep alive the Massachusetts Committee, Catholics, Protestants and Jews and I commend you for your efforts. I doubt if the Committee would have survived without you.

With affectionate greetings and highest esteem, I am

Devotedly yours,
RICHARD CARDINAL CUSHING,
Archbishop of Boston.

REMARKS BY JOSEPH M. LINSEY, INTRODUCING JOHN J. MACMILLAN

Mr. Justice Spiegel; Reverend Clergy; Senator Kennedy; honored guests; ladies and gentlemen: The hope and prayer of today is that we shall be able to build for a better world tomorrow. The fulfillment of that hope lies with our youth, our boys and girls who will be the leaders of tomorrow. The future of our Country will be shaped and molded by them. So we look to our young people for a sign of what the future world shall be.

Annually, in January, our Massachusetts Committee conducts a junior good will dinner, in the Press Room of the Boston Red Sox at Fenway Park. These junior dinners are sponsored by outstanding citizens, and are attended by several hundred students from the public and the parochial schools. This junior event was started sixteen years ago by Michael Kelleher (of blessed memory), and Ben Shapiro, in order to foster a sense of community cooperation and brotherhood in our young people. Since the beginning of this junior event over 2500 boys have been our guests, and pretty much all of them have gone forward with credit to themselves and to the community.

At each of these annual junior dinners four boys, previously selected by their Headmasters, give talks on what brotherhood means to them. It is my great pleasure and privilege tonight to present one of these youngsters to you.

John J. MacMillan is one of the four young men who spoke at the most recent annual junior dinner held on January 25, 1967. He is a Junior at Boston College High School; where he has achieved honors, in the Classics. He is a member of the Sophomore Honor Society. He is exceptionally gifted as a debater. As recently as this past May 6th John J. MacMillan, together with his partner Richard Lewis, placed first and won the National Debating Championship of the National Catholic Forensic League Tournament at Atlantic City. This is a brilliant boy, exceptionally gifted, who exemplifies the best of our youth. In him, as in all youngsters of such ability, dedication and high-mindedness, we read the promise of a better world, free of bigotry, and filled with decency, understanding and cooperation.

Let me give you one of our best. I take great pleasure in presenting John J. MacMillan.

REMARKS BY JOHN J. MACMILLAN, BOSTON COLLEGE HIGH SCHOOL

Good evening, and thank you. I'm very honored to be speaking here tonight, and very grateful to those who have made this opportunity possible. But I'm also a bit surprised at being asked to come back, because the last time I spoke on "Brotherhood," I was against it. And I'm still against it.

Because I believe that "brotherhood" has done more harm to individual relationships, organized religions, and world peace than anything else I know.

Perhaps I should explain . . .

The problem is this: We're asked to love one another in the name of brotherhood, but "brotherhood" is an abstraction, and you simply can't love an abstraction. You can't love "the Negro," "the Vietnamese," "the Catholic," "Protestant," or "Jew." Love must be directed toward an individual person. But we fail to associate these abstractions with real people.

On the other hand, most of the hate and prejudice in the world is aimed at these abstractions. White men seldom hate an individual black man, they simply hate "the Negro." Men of one religion are seldom intolerant of an individual man of another faith. They blindly direct their animosity toward "Jews," "Catholics," or "Protestants." And even in war, a soldier's hate is aimed at an abstraction—"the enemy." Men find it very easy to hate an abstraction; but hating isn't so easy when you're standing face-to-face with another man.

Erich Maria Remarque, in his classic war novel *All Quiet on the Western Front,* illustrates the notion I'm trying to express in a very graphic scene.

Those of you who have read the book will remember the scene well. The time is World War I. The main character is a German boy, taken from his high school classroom and impressed into the defense of the fatherland against the hated French. For three years he fights "the enemy", amidst mud and fifth and hunger and death. For three years he scrambles from trench to trench, firing endless rounds of ammunition at an enemy he never sees. Then one day he meets "the enemy". Crouched in a shell-hole in the middle of no-man's land, the boy feels the weight of a soldier toppling down on him and sees the uniform of the enemy. With no thought except survival the boy thrusts his knife into the enemy—recoils in horror—and watches the enemy die. It is at this point that the young German boy meets the enemy for the first time. And what he meets is not an enemy at all, but a man, a plump, rather jolly-looking man, with large, saucer eyes and a comical black mustache. He meets a man—a person. And as he watches his fellow-man die, the young German boy begins to speak. And he says to his fellow soldier:

"Comrade, I did not want to kill you. If you jumped in here again, I would not do it. But you were only an idea to me before, an abstraction that lived in my mind and called forth its appropriate response. It was that abstraction I stabbed. But now, for the first time, I see you are a man like me."

In our world today, many similar meetings are taking place. And, thanks to organizations like this one, these meetings can take place more frequently, and less tragically. Because of these meetings many men *are* realizing—some for the first time—that there are no walking abstractions, but only men like you and me. There is no such thing as "the enemy," "the Negro," "the Catholic," "Protestant," "Jew." And there is no such thing as "Brotherhood"—unless, of course, it exists between a brother and a brother, between a person and a person, regardless of race or religion. This banquet tonight, among Protestants, Catholics, and Jews, is giving us all a chance to meet one another. But when you do meet, don't look for brotherhood, look for a brother.

SPEECH BY RALPH LOWELL

Gentlemen of the Clergy, His Excellency Lieut. Gov. Sargent, His Honor Mayor Collins, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, this is the 30th annual dinner of the Massachusetts Committee of Catholics, Protestants, and Jews; and for 25 of these years I have been a member of its Executive Committee.

You already know from the program the scope of this committee's activities and the progress that has been made in interfaith brotherhood, a progress that has, I believe, been in great part due to this committee's quiet, unassuming work and to the efforts of Ben Shapiro, the man who started the committee and who has guided its policies for its thirty years.

Several years ago I presided at one of these dinners and took for my text *Differing in Creed, in Spirit One;* and as we gather together each year to renew friendships, to break bread, and to weigh the progress of brotherhood, I think that the text continues to be appropriate—*Differing in Creed, in Spirit One.*

Many years ago when Reverend Theodore Parker was asked what his Unitarian Church stood for, he replied, "The Fathethood of God, Brotherhood of Man, the Neighborhood or Boston." As we all know, we have come a long, long way on the road of brotherhood since then.

To mention a few milestones on this road: there was Cardinal Cushing's attendance at Temple Ohabei Shalom's annual Good Will dinner in 1946; there was the time that the Very Reverend Michael J. Walsh, S.J., President of Boston College, invited the Temple to hold its annual dinner at Boston College when the Temple's dining hall was being renovated; and there are the three chapels at Brandeis. There are Protestants and Jews on the Board of Regents of Boston College. There are Catholics, Protestants, and Jews on all the governing boards of our great universities, of our museums, and of our Boston Symphony board. Priests, ministers, and rabbis share each other's pulpits. These advances in brotherhood have also been seen in the business world, in our banks, and on our charitable boards. I have served or am serving on many boards and I have seen no distinction on any of them between our three groups.

Massachusetts has led the nation in this respect, as it has in many ways; let us look at the record. Massachusetts gave the nation its first Catholic president; the forebears of our third-term governor came not so long ago from Sunny Italy; our Junior Senator is the first of his race to grace the Halls of Congress since the Civil War. What is more important, these men attained their high office as men and not because of their race, color, or religion.

Yes, great progress has been made; but we cannot rest on our laurels—there is still much to be done. Our stress during the past thirty years has been primarily on religious intolerance; to a really remarkable degree I believe that this has been almost entirely wiped out. There remains before us the great area of intolerance toward our Negro citizen, an intolerance that has led to grave injustice. I believe every person in this hall knows that it has been undeniably proven that an educated Negro is fully qualified to rank equally with an educated man of any other color. The problem then is to see that every Negro child has an education of the highest quality, yet all reports from our state surveys show that in many instances the educational facilities now offered to our Negro children are inferior. This must be corrected, and I am happy to say that our School Committee in Boston is gradually coming around to this point of view.

I feel that our work toward Brotherhood has brought forth fruit undreamed of 30 years ago; let us continue to bring friendship and understanding to every citizen of our land. This is not a simple matter. There is great intolerance of the Colored man—there is still a large hidden "white backlash," but it seems to me that those of us who believe strongly that every citizen of our country should have equal rights must stand up and be counted.

In the matter of education alone we have severe problems. Many Negro children are handicapped by broken homes and ghetto living conditions, and often the children from such homes never catch up to those who have had more fortunate early years. So that even the problems of these handicapped children who will be our adult citizens in a few years must be given special thought and action.

We must look closely at all of the schools in the Negro neighborhoods and see that the

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

teachers there are of the same high caliber as those in the while schools; we must encourage speedy integregation of these schools, for the benefit of both the white and colored children. All of these things must be done and many more.

Time is running out for my generation and we must hand the torch of brotherhood to younger men, men such as you are honoring here tonight, confident that they will hold high the torch and hand it to their sons and they to theirs that generations yet unborn may hand it to their heirs. Thus, through better understanding of brotherhood, peace may come to the world.

REMARKS OF SANDY KOUFAX

Mr. Cronin, Justice Spiegel, Reverend Clergy, honored guests, ladies and gentlemen, I too would like to thank the Mayor for my good right arm. I can only say that if there is any talent at all in my right arm I'd probably be in Chicago tonight instead of Boston. I've been told that some of the recipients of this coveted award include such distinguished people as Bernard Baruch, Eleanor Roosevelt, Gen. David Sarnoff, who incidentally works in the same building that I do, the Under Secretary of State Nicholas Katzenbach, Supreme Court Justice Abe Fortas, who may or may not have spent as much time on the bench as I have in the past, and the Lord Mayor of Dublin, Mr. Briscoe. Looking at that starting line-up I sort of wondered why anybody would see fit to give this great honor to a retired Brooklyn baseball player with an arthritic elbow. I must admit that I am totally unaware of what I may have, or may not have done to be considered to deserve such an honor. As far as I can remember, I have never done anything specific to further the cause of brotherhood. I only live my life as I felt and thought was best. If I have been worthy of an award such as this it can only be attributed to my mother and father, who were charged with the responsibility of providing a sense of values. A baby is born blind and cannot see or does not know the outward differences in people. This difference must be planted, taught, developed and carefully nurtured. I think if brotherhood and equality is ever to exist it will not be brought about through the courts, through force. I think that true equality can only exist in the minds of people and in the minds of man. And I think this is the responsibility of this generation to the next. I am forced to admit when I was notified about being chosen for this award and asked to come to this dinner, tonight, I was asked to speak for 20 minutes. I wish I could say that time I was seized with an immediate sense of brotherhood. Fortunately, the request was later reduced to 10 minutes.

I immediately felt my compassion for my fellow man returning. And now when I've reached a point where I really have nothing more to say and have again chopped the allotted time in half, I begin to look upon speaking this evening as not so nearly an unpleasant task. I will always remember this evening with great pride and affection. During my career in baseball I have been fortunate to receive my share of awards, but none could mean nearly as much to me as this brotherhood award. To be chosen a valuable player is fine; to be considered a valuable human being is truly an honor. I hope I can always live up to it. I want to thank you all very much and add my congratulations along with yours to Mr. Lowell and Sen. Kennedy for also being recipients of this award. Thank you all very much.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR EDWARD M. KENNEDY

I am very grateful for your award. I have concerned myself with the issue of human rights, in Massachusetts and in the Senate of the United States, because I feel it is the great unfinished business of the nation. But I could not have done it if I did not represent a state in which human rights are sacred principles. When I made my maiden speech in the Senate in support of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, I had in my pocket a telegram from Cardinal Cushing that said, "On behalf of the two million Catholics of this state, I support this bill." The clergy of Massachusets have shown us that the great issues of human rights are moral issues, to be resolved through political institutions. Men like Reverend James Reeb have borne witness with their lives.

The people of Massachusetts believe this as well. We have the highest percentage of foreign born and first generation Americans of any state in the union. We know the evil of discrimination from the hard experience of our own forebears. Any award I receive must be accepted on behalf of all of them for their support on these issues.

Henry David Thoreau wrote in 1846: "I please myself with imagining a state at last which can afford to be just to all men, and to treat the individual with respect as a neighbor." I am proud to represent a state that has come so far toward this ideal.

Far—but not far enough. We should not intoxicate ourselves with self-congratulation. Harmony between religions may be at its highest point in our history. Prejudice against people remains. We see it in the patterns of housing in the suburbs, the promotion policies in some businesses, the veiled utterances of a few of our public officials, and in the hearts of men.

The greatest barrier to brotherhood today is not prejudice. It is apathy. It does not come from the aggressive bigot. He is shunned. It comes from the man who is for legislation which protects human rights—but he speeds in and out of the city on the great highways without looking at the ghettos he passes by. It comes from those who think civil rights demonstrations are caused by some agitator, instead of by broken families, hungry children and lives without hope. It comes from those who obey the law themselves, but do nothing about a bail system which lets the wealthy go free before trial, and keeps the poor in jail. It comes, most of all, from men of goodwill who are just too busy with their own careers and their own families to spend time fighting evils in the world around him.

We see a drift in our land which is pulling us apart into separate societies, of the rich and the poor, the white and the black, the haves and the have nots, with most of us concerned solely with keeping our own priviliges and increasing our own comforts. All we have achieved in goodwill between religions and races could be destroyed unless we once more become one nation. Pope Paul was speaking to us, in "Populorum Progressio," when he said, "If today's flourishing civilizations remain selfishly wrapped up in themselves, they could easily place their highest values in jeopardy, sacrificing their will to be great to their desire to possess more."

Recently there was a study of pregnant mothers at the Columbia Point Project. Half of them had received no medical care at all during the most dangerous months of their pregnancy. The infant mortality rate in some slum areas of Boston is double what it is in the rest of the city. There are still 22,000 families here in Massachusetts of both races who live in poverty. The Negro in the Roxbury slum, or the hill section of Sprinfield, still goes to a segregated school, holds an inferior job and lives in the worst part of the city. We have passed many laws and started many programs. But can we really say we have done enough? Have we taken brotherhood out of the churches and synagogues and onto the streets? Thousands of Massachusetts boys fight bravely in Vetnam tonight. Two hundred and seventy-one have died there. Can all of these boys, drafted to fight for the freedom of the people of Vietnam, come back to their own country and be sure of full freedom and opportunity as American citizens? I don't think all of them can. That is the shame and the challenge of our life in 1967.

We cannot ignore the poverty and discrimination of today. It will affect our lives and those of our children.

What we do about it will decide whether crime and violence continues to rise in Massachusetts. There has been a very dangerous increase especially in juvenile crime throughout the Commonwealth. And more police are not the only answer. Our streets will not be fully safe until the streets of the slums are paved with more opportunity.

What we do will decide whether or not we lose the $1 billion productive potential of human beings that poverty creates in Massachusetts today.

What we do will decide whether the riots that have scarred the streets of Watts and Harlem and Cleveland will come to Boston. For there is one emotion more bitter than prejudice: the hate in the hearts of those who are the *victims* of prejudice, and feel violence is their only out.

Our actions today are investments for our own security. Our failure will mean trouble for decades to come.

And so it is our responsibility not merely to attend a dinner, or accept an award, and then go home, but to make brotherhood a practicising part of our lives.

Not merely to *think* without prejudice, but to go out and work on the streets of the neighborhoods where the results of prejudice fester today.

We must do this because we are from Massachusetts. We have always been the leader. The eyes of the nation are always on us.

Lord Tennyson once said: "Come, my friends, 'tis not too late to seek a newer world."

Come let us expand tolerance into the broader form of active brotherhood that will make us what we want to be.

CITATIONS AND TESTIMONIALS

The Massachusetts Committee of Catholics, Protestants and Jews, at its Thirtieth Annual Dinner, presents this citation and testimonial to Ralph Lowell, civic leader who has won the respect and gratitude of good citizens within and beyond the confines of our Commonwealth. For more than half a century he has exemplified the enlightened spirit of his distinguished forebears, working effectively, albeitly quietly and modest, for the welfare of his fellow men.

Since the start of his crowded career as a magna cum laude graduate of Harvard in 1912 and as a Lt. Colonel in World War I, we have come to know him as the President of the Boston Museum of Fine Arts; President of TV's WGBH Educational Foundation; head of the Lowell Institute; a Harvard Overseer; a member of the governing boards of such outstanding educational institutions as Boston College, Boston University, Massachusetts Institute of Technology and Northeastern University; Treasurer of the Massachusetts United Negro College Fund; and the recipient of numerous honorary degrees. We also know him as a trustee of the Massachusetts General Hospital, Deaconess Hospital, New England Medical Center Hospitals, McLean Hospital and the Vincent Hospital. Recently the press acclaimed him as a banker and businessman who today serves on more boards of directors than any other American.

In recognition of his wise and helpful service to our community, his colleagues who comprise the Massachusetts Committee of Catholics, Protestants and Jews present to their fellow member, Ralph Lowell, this citation and award.

Dated at Boston, Massachusetts, this eighteenth day of May, 1967.

The Massachusetts Committee of Catholics, Protestants and Jews, at its Thirtieth

Annual Dinner, presents this citation and testimonial to Hon. Edward M. Kennedy.

The Senator Senator from Massachusetts is a national symbol of youthful energy and idealism, combined with mature judgment and broad experience. He proudly bears an illustrious name, but it does not overshadow his personal talents and accomplishments which make their own distinctive contribution to a noble tradition. He is in the forefront of that ceaseless combat which engages our loyalties; the battle to end man's inhumanity to man. He is the vigorous enemy of discrimination, deprivation and degradation wherever they appear, it is one thing to have a heart to which these scourges are abhorrent. It is another thing to have the perception which uncovers these evils, the stamina to battle their malice, and the faculties of intellect and imagination which are competent to devise the strategy for national and global victory over them. Senator Edward M. Kennedy has this total endowment of heart, will and mind and a total personal commitment to Justice as well. For to him the Constitutional mandate "to establish Justice" means to take practical measures in a massive effort, public and private, to eliminate the enforced ignorance, deprivation and segregation which perpetuate social and economic injustice. We single out this particular aspect of his many accomplishments in public life as we award him tonight this Citation from the Massachusetts Committee Catholics, Protestants and Jews.

Dated at Boston, Massachusetts this eighteenth day of May, 1967.

The Massachusetts Committee of Catholics, Protestants and Jews, at its Thirtieth Annual Dinner, presents this citation and testimonal to Sandy Koufax, world-famous athlete who is acclaimed by the followers of our natonal sport as baseball's greatest pitcher; American whose character has earned the respect of his fellow men of every race and creed; and since December 1966 a national broadcaster on the television network of N.B.C., facing a new and challenging career that presages increased usefulness in the broad field of public service in the years to come. Today Sandy Koufax, by virtue of his conduct on and off the baseball field, is a national hero who has won the esteem and affection of good citizens throughout our land.

In recognition of his exemplary sportsmanship throughout his ten years as a baseball star and of his never-failing, enlightened and intelligent civic sense, the Massachusetts Committee of Catholics, Protestants and Jews presents to him this citation and award.

Dated at Boston, Massachusetts this eighteenth day of May, 1967.

The 100th Anniversary of Rich's Department Store, Atlanta, Ga.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 27, 1967

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, Rich's Department Store in Atlanta, Ga., is celebrating its 100th anniversary this year. This is truly an historic occasion for both Rich's and the city of Atlanta, for it is very often said with great truth that a person cannot think of one without thinking of the other.

Over the past years, Rich's has established itself as more than just a department store. It is, in fact, a great institution which stands as a symbol of the economic progress of Atlanta and the vitality of the free enterprise system in this country.

The June 23 issue of Time magazine contains a business section article which traces the history of Rich's, both as a department store doing an annual business of almost $150 million and as a civic-minded institution which has done so much and benefited so many in Atlanta and throughout Georgia.

I invite the article to the attention of the Senate and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STORE WITH ITS HEART IN ITS WORK

Hungarian Immigrant Morris Rich was a naturalized optimist. Who else would have opened a dry goods store in devastated Atlanta, Ga., in the grim postwar year of 1867. Yet even Rich would be amazed to see how far his "M. Rich Dry Goods Store" has come. Last week, presiding over its centennial-year annual meeting. Grandson Richard H. Rich, 65, the present chairman and chief executive, ticked off statistics. Rich's last year rang up sales of $148 million for a 12.9% gain over the previous year (*v.* 3% for U.S. retailers in general) and showed earnings of $14,450,000. Return on equity was a solid 13.6%. And with operations outgrowing its main store and five branches, Rich's is about to undertake a ten-year $115 million building program, in which it will enlarge three branches, build four more and open for business in Macon and Augusta.

With the new stores, Rich's within the next decade expects to double sales that have already doubled in the past ten years or so. Rich's now outsells any department store south of New York City and east of St. Louis. "We do a big high-fashion business and a big bargain-basement business," says Dick Rich, "and we try to catch everything in between as well." "In between" represents about 60% of the purchases made by the 75,000 customers who crowd into Rich's stores on an average day. Although most are Atlantans, Rich's considers nine Southeastern states as its secondary market; it is not unusual for housewives from Tennessee or North Carolina to fly in for a day's shopping.

DESPAIR OF OTHERS

Rich's forte, and the despair of other merchants, is the lavish credit and exchange policy that has made it as much an Atlanta institution as Scarlett O'Hara. "The customer is never wrong," is a Rich's policy, and on that friendly basis the store goes to the improbable length of accepting any merchandise returns—even if they were bought at another store. Once, for example, Rich's exchanged hundreds of pairs of defective nylons of a brand it did not stock. A clerk at a rival store, according to a popular Atlanta story, was arrested for buying merchandise on an employee discount and exchanging it at Rich's at full price. A bride's mother who complained that a Rich's wedding cake came with yellow layers instead of the white she had ordered got another cake, even though her guests had already consumed the first. Not surprisingly, Rich's return rate is 14% of sales, the highest in the country.

Similarly, Rich's seldom duns its 450,000 charge customers for payment. "Our theory," explains Rich, "is that 95% of the people are honest, and we're not going to discommode 95 people to root out the other five." Established in the days when Southerners paid their bills once a year when the cotton "came in," Rich's credit department patiently lets people pay when they can, never tacks on service charges. In 1951, when Georgia's peach crop was ruined by cold weather, the store ran a full-page ad in the Atlanta Constitution. It showed an empty peach basket and noted: "Rich's understands. Rich's can wait."

GENEROUS TO EACH OTHER

The store takes such attitudes, says Dick Rich, because "this community has been very good to us." Rich's is rather generous to the community in return. When Atlanta had to pay its schoolteachers in scrip during the Depression, Rich's exchanged the scrip for money. When the Winecoff Hotel burned in 1946 with the loss of 119 lives, Rich's handed out free clothes to survivors and provided shrouds for the dead. Atlanta's biggest Christmas tree is a 60-footer atop the four-story Forsyth Street bridge connecting Rich's two downtown buildings. Last year 200,000 people turned out for the lighting ceremonies.

Like his store, Chairman Rich works hard for Atlanta, spends a third of his time on civic projects. Fittingly, for a man who keeps in trim with swimming and tennis at his Northwest Atlanta home, Rich helped build the new Atlanta stadium that lured major-league baseball and football to the city. He is currently chairman of the Metropolitan Atlanta Rapid Transit Authority and chairman of a group erecting a new cultural center. The Rich Foundation, which he supervises, has so far spent $1,500,000 on good works around Georgia. "We hope," he says simply, "that Rich's stands for a very human attitude." Atlantans agree that it does.

Jay Drydyk Wins Essay Contest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 1967

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, each year as part of its Americanism program, the American Legion Auxiliary sponsors an Americanism Essay Contest.

The winning essay this year for group I, which includes grades 10, 11, and 12, was written by Jay Drydyk, of Cedarburg, Wis., in the sixth district.

The essay written by Jay is excellent, and for the information of my colleagues I include it as part of my remarks:

AMERICA'S FUTURE: BOTH EXCITING AND CHALLENGING

(By Jay Drydyk, Grade 11, Cedarburg High School)

"I marched against the war in Vietnam . . . A mob broke through the police lines, threw eggs and red paint on me and called me a coward . . . the president said I wanted to scuttle and run, questioned my manhood, and called me a nervous nelly . . . The next march . . . I broke through the police lines, threw eggs and red paint, beat up the marchers, and called them cowards, sissies and nervous nellies. The consensus is I'm a man."

Is this Jules Feiffer caricature becoming a true picture of Americans? Can man be so poisoned in the land of the free, the home of the brave? When teen-agers begin to wear decorations of the Reich and adults crowd suburban streets to display their bigotry, it can only seem that freedom has been lost in a morass of prejudice. The challenge of America's future lies before us: bigotry and intolerance have dared Americans to accept each other and to create a truly free society.

The job will not be easy. To build a society that neither imposes nor ostracizes will de-

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

mand a sudden and complete wave of free and tolerant thought—a veritable crusade of moral non-imposition.

The first step will be separating out legal and moral ethics, which have become piteously intertwined in the past years. The effects of tradition and docile compliance to it must be destroyed—we must take moral value judgment out of the law and leave to the legal ethic only what concerns it; regulating the interaction of individuals so that no group may suffer because of another. We must create a new legal ethic that will regulate interaction without imposing moral restrictions, customs or habits.

Next we will have to adopt for ourselves and spread among our neighbors the spirit of complete acceptance and tolerance. We must follow Jesus and the other great spiritual leaders, teaching each American to "love his neighbor." The spirit of freedom and tolerance must so pervade the renascent society that there will be only one ubiquitous ideal—total freedom and acceptance.

At last will America be prepared for the final phase of its transition to a free, heterogeneous society! Americans allayed of the plaguing fear of provoking violent opposition, will identify with groups and individuals that have assumed moral codes similar to their own. Men of coinciding social and moral values will be drawn together by the sheerly human need to identify. Moreover, no single such group will seek to destroy its opposition, no matter how great be the disparity of opinion. The land of the free will be re-emancipated.

Americans have long been lauded for their hospitality and friendliness to visitors from abroad. Why, then, can the people of the United States not learn to accept each other in the same way? Nothing could possibly be more exciting than the prospect of complete hospitality among all Americans. Nothing could be more challenging than the cultural revolution for freedom that will lead America to it.

Peripheral Canal and Kellogg Units Approved by California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 1967

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced H.R. 10297 to authorize the Peripheral Canal and Kellogg units of the delta division of the Central Valley project. This legislation has the firm support of the State of California as indicated by the following letter to me from its director of the department of water resources, William R. Gianelli:

STATE OF CALIFORNIA RESOURCES
AGENCY, DEPARTMENT OF WATER
RESOURCES,
Sacramento, June 8, 1967.

Hon. CRAIG HOSMER,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CRAIG: We are most happy that you have introduced H.R. 10297, a bill to authorize the Peripheral Canal and Kellogg units of the Delta division of the Central Valley Project. This Department's main interest, of course, concerns authorization of the Peripheral Canal.

The Peripheral Canal represents a vital link in the California Water Plan. Its necessary as a vehicle to conserve the waters of the Central Valley and preserve their quality is no longer open to debate. We are doing all we can to mold the concept of the Peripheral Canal into a reality. The arduous task of effecting federal authorization so that the Bureau of Reclamation can participate with us in the construction of this joint-use facility lies ahead. Your bill provides the necessary starting point to accomplish this task.

We look forward to cooperating with your office in any way we can to effect federal authorization of this project. If we can be of any assistance, please feel free to call upon us: the entire resources of this Department are available to forward this important authorization.

Sincerely yours,
WILLIAM R. GIANELLI,
Director.

District of Columbia Crime

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 26, 1967

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, the proposed District of Columbia crime bill, H.R. 10783, is unconstitutional. I opposed the omnibus District of Columbia crime bill, as offered by the District Committee in 1965, as unconstitutional. I was greatly heartened by President Johnson's veto of the bill last fall. Though the sponsors of this bill claim it is a compromise between last year's crime bill and the bill proposed by the administration, it is, in fact, still unconstitutional and quite objectionable, just as was the bill that the President vetoed.

I only have a short time allotted to me to discuss this bill. I would like to summarize my objections to the bill by reading from the statement on the bill prepared by the Washington Bar Association, on my request, which is an excellent and exhaustive analysis of each section of the bill.

First of all, the bill tramples on basic constitutional rights by overriding the Mallory rule, which requires that an arrested person be taken immediately before a court. This bill instead allows a 4-hour delay.

Second, the bill drastically alters the Durham rule requiring plea of insanity as a defense against criminal charges. The Durham rule is clear and well defined, and requires that a defendant must prove by the substantial body of the evidence that he was not responsible for his conduct. This bill would instead put upon the defendant the much greater burden of establishing his innocence of the criminal charge on the basis of a preponderance of the evidence. This extreme and unusual burden upon the defense in a criminal prosecution certainly goes against the entire basic tenets of American justice, which requires that the major burden of proof be laid upon the prosecution and not upon the defense. The Durham rule was established some years ago and has proven that it promotes justice and does not result in any extreme burden upon law enforcement.

Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, I cannot stress too much that this bill will not cure the crime problem in the District of Columbia. The basic problems of crime can only be dealt with by meeting the basic causes of crime. What this bill does is attempt to eliminate injustice against some Americans, the victims of crime, by perpetrating injustice against those who happen to be accused of crime.

Because of the very short time allowed me during this debate, I am inserting the complete statement of the Washington Bar Association opposing this bill, as prepared by its president, Attorney Alexander Benton, a distinguished member of the District of Columbia bar, be inserted in the RECORD immediately following my remarks. This statement is an excellent and thorough analysis of the bill and I commend it highly to my colleagues:

THE WASHINGTON BAR ASSOCIATION,
INC.,
Washington, D.C., June 26, 1967.

Hon. JOHN CONYERS, Jr.,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CONYERS: Pursuant to your request, enclosed please find a statement on behalf of the Washington Bar Association in opposition to Crime Bill H.R. 10783.

If and when it becomes advisable a representative of the Association will be available to appear before the appropriate Congressional Committee and testify in opposition to the bill.

Very truly yours,
ALEXANDER L. BENTON,
President.

STATEMENT OF ALEXANDER L. BENTON ON BEHALF OF THE WASHINGTON BAR ASSOCIATION IN OPPOSITION TO THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CRIME BILL REPORTED BY THE HOUSE DISTRICT COMMITTEE—H.R. 10783

As early as 1963, at the time the Senate District Committee was holding hearings on the omnibus crime bill, the Washington Bar Association went on record as opposing the bill. More recently, the Washington Bar Association had occasion to forward a special letter to the President expressing opposition to the crime bill passed last year and urging him to veto it.

The bill just reported out by the House District Committee is essentially the same at the Omnibus Crime Bill, although its sponsors claim it is a compromise between last year's crime bill and the bill proposed by the Administration. Be that as it may, an examination of key sections merits special comment and because of the objections raised thereto the bill as a whole becomes unacceptable. In considering the bill one cannot help but note the ostensible purposes of the bill, the backgrounds of the sponsors, the racial constituency of the District of Columbia and the people who are most likely to be affected, in a direct manner, by operation of the bill.

The specific titles objected to and the reasons therefor are set forth herein below.

TITLE I

Sec. 101. This section of the bill extends the arrest authority of police officers of the Metropolitan Police Department to cover certain situations and offenses not previously covered under existing sections of the District of Columbia Code but at the same time it takes away a basic constitutional right of the arrested person, a right which is recognized in the current corresponding section of the D.C. Code, that is, the bill eliminates the requirement that the arrested person be taken immediately and without delay, before the proper court or a judicial officer.

TITLE II

This title is objectionable in several respects.

It substitutes the American Law Institute test of insanity for the Durham Rule, as clarified and supplemented by McDonald.

Because the Durham Rule, as it is known in the District of Columbia, is the product of case law developed by the courts in a number of decisions, it's dynamic and viable and has some flexibility and elasticity. Accordingly, to put it in static statutory form at this time would be a grievous mistake. Moreover, the American Law Institute test shifts emphasis in the test from a focus of disease-offense to one of conduct-law requirements, with no substantial difference in ultimate results in the event the defendant is in fact mentally ill.

Sec. 201(c)(1). This section not only requires the defendant to affirmatively plead the insanity defense but it also requires that the insanity defense be established by a preponderance of the evidence. This is contrary to the Federal due process presumption of innocence and the prosecution's burden of persuasion and truth. Moreover, it flies directly in the face of the Supreme Court test applied in the Davise case to the effect that if there is "some" (emphasis supplied) evidence supporting the defendant's claim of mental disability, he is entitled to have that issue submitted to the jury.

Sec. 201(j). This section would prohibit the court or counsel for the government or the defendant from advising the jury as to the consequences of a verdict of not guilty on the ground of mental disease or defect excluding responsibility. This is an ill-conceived and arbitrary provision. It can only result in many sick, mentally ill and diseased and defected persons being found guilty and being sent to prison when they should be sent to a hospital for treatment. This is true notwithstanding other provisions in this title designed to safeguard against such by providing for post-trial and conviction machinery, via hearing and receiving evidence of mental illness prior to imposition of sentence. Furthermore, for those that do not escape the attention of the court and enjoy the benefits of the post-trial hearing it can only mean a duplication of effort on the part of the court, the prosecutor, the defense attorney, with attendant additional costs and expense and consumption of time to do what could have been done at the time of the trial on the merits, simply by advising the jury as to the consequences of a not guilty by reason of insanity verdict.

TITLE III

Title III is particularly troublesome and obnoxious. It is dangerous. This title would empower any officer of the Metropolitan Police Department to detain any person abroad whom the officer reasonably believes is committed or has committed a crime. Moreover, this title would deny that a person is arrested when in fact the person is arrested. It would require a citizen to answer questions upon the demands of a police officer when he has not been arrested, contrary to the Fifth Amendment to the Constitution and despite Miranda. Under this title the police are clothed with too much authority, and it makes the police officer both judicial officer and prosecutor.

This title can only lead to widespread, dragnet arrests without probable cause and serve as a vehicle for harrassment. In addition, the obvious objection to this bill is that under this title police officers would be provided with an open sesame to resort to third degree tactics; and would be further provided with pseudo short cuts to solving crimes, at the risk of sacrificing the Constitutional Rights of citizens. The foregoing factors become increasingly important when consideration is given to the fact that the citizenry of the District of Columbia is more than 62% Negro while the composition of the Metropolitan Police Department is approximately 90% white and the vast majority are nonresidents. Therefore, it would appear that the bill should have a concomitant provision for improving the standard of training and calibre of the constituents of the Police Department, requiring members to be residents of the District of Columbia, and providing machinery for improving police-community relations.

Excerpts from an editorial in the Washington Post under date of October 24, 1966 in connection with last year's crime bill are particularly apropos:

"Title III of this bill empowers any Metropolitan policeman to 'detain any person abroad whom (sic) he has probable cause to believe is committing or has committed a crime.' It empowers the police, in their absolute and unchecked discretion and without requiring any judicial determination as to whether probable cause existed, to detain and interrogate suspects for a period of four hours. It says expressly that 'such detention shall not be recorded as an arrest in any official record.' And it neglects to say anything which would forbid the police to rearrest suspects and detain them for another four hours over and over again when the initial detention period has expired.

"Make no mistake about the purpose and effort of this bill. It is meant to reinstitute arrests for investigation. The detention and interrogation can have no other intent. They are designed to circumvent the courts and give the police an absolute power. But the situation would be even more dangerous than under the old system of arrests for investigation outlawed by the District Commissioners. For, by pretending that detention does not constitute arrest, the bill would permit police to hold suspects indefinitely without any record of their incarceration—without affording relatives or friends or lawyers any means of finding them.

"This is the very definition of a police state. Such police power existed in Nazi Germany and in Fascist Italy; it exists today in the Soviet Union and in Communist China. But it has never, until now, been countenanced in the United States. To say that such power is not dangerous is to deny the whole of the American experience."

TITLE VI

Sec. 602—Burglary.

Sec. 603—Robbery.

Sec. 605—Committing Crime when armed—Added punishment.

This title divides burglary into two degrees, with different penalties for each. First degree burglary carries a penalty of "not less than five years nor more than thirty years." Second degree burglary carries a penalty of "not less than two years nor more than fifteen years."

The crime of robbery has been made more serious in the sense that the penalty has been increased with respect to the minimum sentence. Under the bill it is "not less than four years."

The penalty for the offense of committing crime when armed has been made more severe and the offense broadened. The bill provides that the additional punishment to that provided for the crime may be "an indeterminate number of years up to life as determined by the court." And if convicted more than once of the offense "the court shall not suspend his sentence or give him a probationary sentence." The existing Code has been broadened to include a number of weapons and instruments other than a pistol or firearm and to include any and all items falling in the category of "or other dangerous or deadly weapon."

The harsh provisions of this title are sheer tyranny and smack of savagery. While it is safe to assume that the mandatory minimum sentence provisions of the bill are designed to deter crime, it is equally safe to say that such assumption is contrary to the facts based on years of experience compiled by noted penologists. On the contrary, experience has demonstrated quite conclusively that mandatory minimum sentence provisions are self-defeating. Not only do they fail, quite miserably, to deter crime but they also create additional and special problems for the courts, the prosecutors and the law enforcement officials. The harsh mandatory provisions can only result in injustices because it leaves no discretion to the judge to make distinctions between the nature of the circumstances surrounding different offenses.

Currently, the District of Columbia is not only sending more persons to prison with respect to percentage of population but also imposing stiffer sentences than other jurisdictions for the same type offenses.

Mandatory minimum sentences create special problems for prison officials. Persons confined to prison under such sentences are almost always recalcitrant and difficult to deal with. They feel that they have nothing to lose, they have very little hope, and rehabilitation is almost impossible because such persons can perceive no goal to obtain.

The present provision of the District of Columbia Code dealing with additional punishment for committing a crime when armed is sufficient. It has served and will continue to serve its purpose. The proposed amendment will not serve as a crime deterrent. On the contrary, the additional phrase, "or other dangerous or deadly weapon" is constitutionally vague in the face of the absence of the requirement of specific intent with respect to the crime.

The crime problem in the District of Columbia will not be solved by H.R. 10783. The most effective way to solve the problem has already been made clear and pointed out and that is by the implementation of the President's Crime Report.

Respectfully,

ALEXANDER L. BENTON,
President.

Iowans in Maine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED SCHWENGEL
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 27, 1967

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, recently the tourism division of the Iowa development commission sponsored a caravan that went from Des Moines, Iowa, to Bangor, Maine.

The caravan was a great success, as stated in the story which appeared in the June 4 edition of the New York Times:

IOWA STEAK MEN INVADE YANKEE LOBSTER LAND

(By John T. Fenton)

SALEM, MASS.—A well-provisioned band of Iowans invaded this ancient seaport recently, encamped for the night and left enough tourist literature to start a travel bureau. The group, numbering 66, captured Yankee imaginations, to be followed by who knows how many Yankee dollars. They traveled in 20 self-contained motor homes.

Not the least of the impressions they left was that Iowa prime steaks were a serious challenge to Massachusetts Bay lobsters for tenderness and succulence. Those Salemites who were invited to dine on steaks in Forest Park, overlooking the harbor, discovered that, as promised, they could cut the Iowa-grown beef with plastic forks.

But the good impressions were mutual. Vincent Caudle, chairman of the Sell-See Iowa Committee of the State Development Commission, said that he would not be satisfied until he could return with has family to do some sailing along the New England coast.

The promotion project was perhaps the first of its kind. The Iowans paid $200 apiece to travel 1,500 miles from Des Moines to

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Bangor, Me., in the motor homes, and they promoted all the way.

The Tourism Division of the Iowa Development Commission spearheaded the caravan, but individuals and communities paid the freight. This was an eye-opener to some Easterners, including representatives of the Massachusetts Department of Commerce, whose promotion initiative is limited chiefly to buying space rather than promoting ideas.

The motor homes, constructed by Life Time Manufacturing, Inc., of Mason City, Iowa, were left in Bangor, where they will be picked up by New England dealers for their Yankee customers. Appurtenances in the homes included ranges, toilets, showers, refrigerators, bunks and wall-to-wall carpeting.

TRUCK WITH 1,400 PRIME STEAKS

The caravan traveled almost exclusively on the new Federal Highway System as part of President Johnson's "Discover America" program. In the entourage was a refrigerator truck loaded with 1,400 prime steaks and other Iowa products, such as cheese, edible soybeans, eggs, butter, corn and specialty meats.

A cattle-trailer with two live steers, one a Black Angus and the other a white-faced specimen, also was part of the entourage. The steers were dropped off at a restaurant in Waterville, Me., and will be served to customers later.

The night before they left Des Moines, the Iowans dined on clams and lobsters flown from Maine as a gesture of goodwill. The caravan was on the road five days, beginning May 15. It made stops in Moline, Ill.; Indian Dunes, Mich.; Maumee, Ohio; Lake City, Pa.; Batavia, and Schenectady, N.Y.; Holyoke, Mass., and, finally, Salem and Bangor.

So busy were the "roving ambassadors" passing out literature that only in Salem did they take time for a sightseeing tour. Roy Kimmel, a transplanted Indianan who is executive secretary of the Salem Chamber of Commerce, arranged a bus trip around the city. Later, the steak supper was served in Forest Park.

The Iowans included state officials, plus representatives of such organizations as the Iowa Swine Producers Association, the Iowa Restaurant Association, the Iowa Poultry Producers, the Iowa Soybean Association and the State Conservation Commission. Several private enterprises also were represented.

The communities included Jefferson, Audubon, Cedar Rapids, Clear Lake, Boone, Fort Dodge, Oskaloosa, West Bend, Burlington, Red Oak, Spencer, Perry and Waterloo.

VEGETABLES FOR SALAD

Llye Kreps, who handled all food supplies as a representative of the Marketing Division of the Iowa Department of Agriculture, acknowledged that fresh vegetables for the salad were bought along he way.

"But the rest of it was all Iowa," he said.

The secret of cooking steak, according to Frank Herstein of Burlington, Iowa, one of the traveling chefs, "is to start with a good steak, prime Iowan, naturally." He recommended using steaks aged 9 to 10 days.

A Volunteer Military?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 1967

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Kansas Free Lance, a weekly newspaper published in Topeka, Kans., which deals with the idea of a volunteer army.

In the extension of selective service, voted by the House last week, the House-Senate conference committee expunged from that bill a simple statement of purpose included by the House that the Government would attempt to meet its military manpower needs through adequate voluntary enlistment before it would resort to compulsory conscription.

It is unfortunate that this law, which affects every American family, does not clearly state the purpose of maximizing voluntary enlistments and minimizing draft calls. I believe the following editorial correctly cites growing interest among responsible Americans in the idea of a volunteer army. The editorial follows:

A VOLUNTEER MILITARY?

While Cassius Clay—Muhammad Ali—is being persecuted for refusing to be drafted, and while the U.S. attorney general's office is saying it won't prosecute Stokeley Carmichael and others who advocate avoiding the draft, there is another movement aborning which deserves watching.

This movement is headed by the Council for a Volunteer Military. Its headquarters are at 1212 E. 59th St., Chicago, and it has a group of directors and sponsors of just about every political persuasion.

James Powell of the University is the national director; Henry Regnery, the book publisher, is treasurer, and Warren L. Coats Jr., of the Illinois Institute of Technology is executive secretary.

Some of the sponsors include Yale Brozen and Milton Friedman, conservative professors of economics at Chicago U.; Bruce K. Chapman, author of "The Wrong Man in Uniform"; James Farmer, founder and former director of the Congress for Racial Equality; Karl Hess, a speech writer for Barry Goldwater; David Franke of Young Americans for Freedom and editor of the New Guard, and—hold your hats—old socialist Norman Thomas.

This group is not objecting to the war in Vietnam. As far as we can tell from reading the literature, the members are not even anti-militaristic. They are only opposing the idea of involuntary servitude—in the drafting of persons to serve in the military.—Marysville (Calif.) Appeal-Democrat.

The Free Lance publishers wholeheartedly subscribe to the idea of a volunteer army for all the reasons listed by (of all people for us to be agreeing with) Sen. Mark Hatfield in the July 1 issue of the Saturday Evening Post. The draft is one of the most inequitable, inefficient, costly, regimentist methods of maintaining an army that is imaginable. An all-professional military order is the answer. There is a growing movement for such.

Postal Rates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 1967

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to submit an excellent statement made before the Postal Rates Subcommittee, of which I am a member, on June 22, 1967, by Mr. Harry J. Maginnis, president, Associated Third-Class Mail Users.

I recommend the reading of Mr. Maginnis' statement by the Members, as I believe he effectively refutes the arguments of the huge lobby who would prefer to destroy this important means of communication.

Perhaps a rate-increase bill will come before the Congress in the near future and Members will not have the time to study the lengthy hearings and testimony for and against the rate increase bill. I do urge as an alternative that each Member read the Maginnis statement, which I believe to be one of the more serious and objective statements relative to third-class mail users ever presented.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT OF HARRY J. MAGINNIS, PRESIDENT, ASSOCIATED THIRD-CLASS MAIL USERS, BEFORE THE HOUSE SUBCOMMITTEE ON POSTAL RATES, JUNE 22, 1967

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, for the purpose of the record, I would like to state that my name is Harry J. Maginnis. I am the President of the Associated Third Class Mail Users, and my office is located at 100 Indiana Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. The building, I might add, belongs to the National Association of Letter Carriers, whose members have so often, and so *falsely*, been described as hating third class mail.

I want to thank you, Mr. Chairman, and also the Members of your Committee, for having permitted me to come here and testify before you on behalf of my membership, who feel they are fighting for their lives because of an organized and, in some ways, an irresponsible attack upon their livelihood.

The irresponsibility, I hasten to add, has nothing to do with this Committee—or directly with the Congress, or even with the legislation under consideration today. We oppose the legislation under consideration, but we certainly don't think it irresponsible. We do deem irresponsible, however, the proposed amendments to the present bill which have been widely discussed in various media of advertising—such as the newspapers, radio and television—media which would, for their own commercial benefits, dearly love to see third class mail receive a death blow from the Congress of the United States.

On June 18th, Mr. Chairman, the New York Times carried a story, written by Robert B. Semple, Jr., which discussed the Administration's Rate Bill in considerable depth, if not with considerable wisdom. After itemizing certain provisions of the bill, and estimating the revenues likely to be realized from these provisions, Mr. Semple predicted that Congressman Ken Hechler, of West Virginia, would present an amendment which would create action on the floor that would be "a good deal more lively than anything that has occurred before the sub-Committee in the last six weeks."

The Times Story then repeats, as gospel, the much-disputed figures on the cost recovery of third class mail: "Under the Administration bill the users would be paying 80.1% of the full cost of handling, instead of the present 61.2% and some members believe that this is increase enough."

Naturally, like everyone else who has studied the Cost Ascertainment system with any objectivity, we dispute those cost figures strenuously. But, before discussing Semple's bland assurance that the Congress is going to accept the Administration's Rate Bill as is—or something immeasurably worse—I would like, if I may, to get some pertinent thoughts off my chest.

Third class mail is in trouble—and the trouble is not of its own making. The propaganda barrage that has been raised against third class mail during the past six months or more has made the recent phony charges in the Middle East look like child's play by comparison. If a majority of the Members of Congress believed this propaganda and voted on that basis, the third class mail industry in the United States would be dead by next January 1.

Now—who is responsible for the barrage? Who has been making the munitions and firing the guns? Who else but the competitors for the advertising dollar—the users of second class mail and their docile subsidiaries, many of them wholly owned by newspapers—the television and radio stations of the country!

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that newspapers enjoy the largest and the oldest subsidy in the history of the Republic.

It goes even further back than the birth of the Nation. When the revered Benjamin Franklin accepted the position of Postmaster of Philadelphia, under the British Crown in 1737, he was persuaded primarily by the fact that the position would permit him to send his newspaper—the Saturday Evening Post—through the mails free under his frank. Newspaper publishers in those days scrambled mightily to become Postmasters because of this privilege which, of course, put their competitors at a serious disadvantage.

To his credit, when Franklin became the Deputy Postmaster General for the Colonies in 1753, he extended the right of free postage for newspapers to all publishers. If you will forgive an anachronism—since this was seventy years before the advent of the railroads—thus was initiated the most luscious and sanctimonious gravy train in our history.

The great Ben Franklin swung the lantern and blew the whistle, and the publisher-politician-postmasters stoked the boiler and away they went!

I mention this, Mr. Chairman, because the present propaganda barrage has a very ironic undertone to it. The publishers declaim against third class mail as if it were something sinful and obnoxious. They beat their chests and wail to heaven *pro bono publico*—but their real motive is to eliminate the competition and clasp their own greedy, clammy, monopolistic hand around the entire advertising dollar.

Since the users of third class mail have no media of communication capable of combating these *self-interested interests* I want these facts to be permanently imbedded in the public record.

I feel the sub-Committee, Mr. Chamberlain, should take judicial notice of several basic facts which, if accepted, will save us all a great deal of time. They are as follows:

(1) The United States is a capitalistic nation. Our burgeoning population has enjoyed the fruits of the free enterprise system. The free enterprise system constantly seeks an increased Gross National Product and full employment. It is also fundamentally opposed to a monopoly in any basic endeavor.

(2) The word "profit" in a free society has a favorable connotation. It is an ugly word only in a Marxist-oriented society.

(3) Advertising is a typically American development in our western civilization. It has been primarily responsible for the movement of goods produced by American labor not only in this country, but throughout the world.

(4) Direct mail advertising, as the second largest advertising medium in the world, makes very substantial and significant contribution to the free enterprise system.

(5) Third class mail users are not certifiable moron. They are not spending money profusely on a form of advertising which does not produce results sufficiently satisfactory to justify its cost.

(6) The Postal Policy Act of 1958 (as amended in 1962) is the basic statute which governs the Congress, the Executive Branch and the Judiciary as far as the financial operation of the Postal Establishment is concerned. This may come as a surprise to the Bureau of the Budget and to the Post Office Department, but I—and I am sure you—firmly believe that the voice of the people, as manifested in the laws of the Congress, must override the decisions of non-elective bureaucrats in the other Branches.

In regard to this last point, the American public is woefully unaware of the decision of their elected Representatives in the Congress in regard to postal policies. The press, for its own reasons, has done a pitifully poor job of explaining the philosophy behind the Act. The average person—and, I'm afraid, the average Congressman who did not happen to be engaged in the actual shaping of the Act—suffers under a tremendous burden of misunderstanding about the Postal Establishment and the manner in which postage rates must be, from time to time, appraised and readjusted.

The average American—and a great number of the Members of the Congress—are unaware of the history of third class mail: how it came into being, and why.

Prior to the Administration of Calvin Coolidge there was no such thing as bulk third class mail. There was, up until 1925, a charge for circular matter of 1¢. That rate had been in existence for four decades. In 1925 the Congress increased the rate by 50%, to 1½¢, and the volume of advertising literature dropped off so precipitously that postal officials of that day came to the Congress begging them to return the rate to 1¢. The Congress, at the almost tearful request of the Department did so but added a new feature to the law. It provided for an entirely new category of mail: bulk third class. Under that law the mailer was required to obtain a permit and to pre-sort his mail in accordance with instructions of the Postmaster General, to justify the lower rates by performing many basic functions of the Post Office.

For all practical purposes that was the beginning of the direct mail industry. As members of the sub-Committee know, that wise decision by Congress (at the request of the postal authorities) created a needed category of deferred mail which would keep valuable postal employees busy during slack periods. The overhead of the postal establishment is constant and its principal function is monopolistic—the processing and delivery of first class mail matter. The bulk rate remained at 1¢ until 1952 when the Congress legislated an increase to 1½¢. The non-profit rate was added to the rate structure at that time, remaining at 1¢. Every Postmaster General thereafter—including Messrs. Donaldson, Summerfield, Day and Gronouski, has sought rate increases in all categories of mail. Some attempts were successful. Suffice it to say that the third class bulk rate went to 2¢ then to 2½¢ and under the terms of the last rate act, in three further steps to 2⅞¢. The total increase in these rates since 1952 has totaled 188%. Very few industries in our economy have been forced to survive such a drastic increase in their most basic cost.

Postmasters General and individual legislators made strenuous efforts to make the third class rate increases even higher but the Postal Committees of the House and Senate, ever conscious of direct mail advertising's contribution to a healthy economy, refused to stifle the industry by too-burdensome increases. At the time the last Rate Act was being considered, Congressman Hechler of West Virginia was successful in getting the House to approve a 3½¢ rate for bulk third class mail over the Committee's recommendations. His amendment failed to gain approval in the final version of the bill. If it had been enacted into law, the third class mailing industry would not occupy its present healthy position in the national economy.

On a previous occasion, the House of Representatives came very close to adopting an amendment (advanced by Representative Frank Smith, of Mississippi) which would abolish third class mail altogether. This was during the Eisenhower Administration and Postmaster General Summerfield—who had been less than helpful to the users of third class mail in his public utterances—came storming up to Capitol Hill to persuade the leaders of Congress to reject the Smith amendment. He was willing to make a convenient political whipping boy of third class mail but he was *not* willing to face the distastrous consequences of legislation which would throw his Department into chaos by (a) depriving it of about $500 million a year in revenues and (b) diverting into first class, hundreds of millions of pieces of first class mail which would have to be treated carefully, meticulously and expensively, instead of in the informal and almost cavalier manner in which most third class mail is habitually treated.

How we are at the barricades again. We are all fully aware of Congressman Hechler's announced intention of pressing for a floor amendment to the Administration bill which would increase the third class bulk rate to 4½¢. If the Congressman should succeed in that effort, he will also succeed in achieving the assassination of the third class mail industry and of third class as a useful class of mail. His proposal is just as deadly as the proposal of Congressman Smith in the 1950's. Congressman Hechler's proposal would, as a by-product, give the press an absolute monopoly in the printed field of advertising.

Congressman Hechler bases his arguments on an almost superstitious belief in the validity of the Department's Cost Ascertainment figures. I do not share this superstition. Neither do most of the informed and objective authorities who have examined the process. Neither do knowledgeable postal employees who know from experience the haphazard methods by which these most precise-sounding conclusions are reached. The best that can be said of the army of Cost Ascertainment experts in the Department is that, though they sometimes dive deep, they invariably come up muddy.

When I have finished with my statement, Mr. Chairman, an acknowledged expert in the field, Mr. Emanuel Cohen, of Syosset, Long Island, will give a graphic demonstration of the differences in the cost and handling of preferred first class mail and deferred bulk third class mail.

This is necessary because the press has led one and all to believe that, just because a third class piece of mail looks like a first class letter, it is virtually the same thing.

Such, of course, is not the case. Appended to this statement is a chart which shows the many handlings accorded first class mail and which are denied third class mail. The cost ascertainment figures claim that it cost 5.383¢ to handle a piece of first class mail and 5.126¢ to handle a piece of third class mail. We shall expand on these figures and add to the mountain of evidence that the entire cost ascertainment system is as phony as a wooden nutmeg.

It is fairly easy to demonstrate that, at 2⅞¢, bulk third class mail is actually paying its way in the postal service at the present time. The proposal of the Administration that the bulk third class mail rate be increased by a drastic 32% is unsound and we hope that the Committee will reject it. The extremely low second class rates would, under this bill, be raised 21% in three equal increases of 7% a year. We have no objection to our friends in the newspaper field enjoying a gigantic subsidy if the Congress decides that the information they disseminate is useful to a free Republic. We would only urge that the Congress amend the Postal Policy Act and state affirmatively that newspapers are getting a large subsidy and that this subsidy should be paid for out of general tax revenues and not assessed against other mail users. As I pointed out in a recent advertisement in Roll Call, the within-county per piece rate on newspapers is presently ⅛¢. This means that 23 newspapers can be mailed

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

for the price of one direct mail circular at 2⅞¢.

Moreover, many newspapers are getting into the third class field by including unrelated third class mail circulars with their product. Also, because many newspapers cannot provide the coverage desired by many merchants there is a growing tendency by the press to get into the shopping guide field as an adjunct to their paid circulation.

After operating in the postal field for seventeen years, I know, of course, that the pricing of postal services must be made on a logical basis. Any intelligent person must take a philosophical viewpoint about the postal establishment. Because it does charge fees for identifiable users, the Post Office is the constant whipping boy of the press because it does not show a profit.

On the other hand, the Post Office is the only Agency of Government outside of Internal Revenue which makes any serious effort to recover its costs and I believe at the present moment it is recovering approximately 85% of its costs. This is not a bad record when measured against the other services provided by other agencies to identifiable customers.

At a previous appearance before this Committee I submitted a statement prepared by the legislative research section of the Library of Congress which enumerated the services to the general public performed by other agencies of Government without charge or at charges far below cost. That document consumed 59 single spaced pages. It would be interesting if the Congress had a similar survey made by the Library so that you might have positive proof that no other major agency adheres to the principle that identifiable customers should pay a break-even rate for services performed on their behalf.

I would like now to destroy several constant and irritating myths about bulk third class mail.

Myth One: It is often said that nobody wants this mail and that most people throw it away. This, of course, is just silly. There are almost 300,000 permit holders in America. Permits are held by every level of Government from the States on down. No corporation is without one; tens of thousands of civic groups including PTA's and civic organizations like Rotary and Kiwanis hold permits. Political candidates all have them. Tens of thousands of neighborhood merchants depend upon them. These permits are the lifeblood of our charities. They are the faithful standby of the little businessman—and the faithful standby also of such organizations as the National Association of Manufacturers and the American Medical Association. It is ridiculous to sugegst that all these people, large and small, are suffering under a delusion and are throwing their money away on a type of mail that nobody reads, nobody wants, nobody responds to.

Now, Myth Two.

Congressman Hechler and others claim that third class mail is an invasion of the privacy of the citizen. Why third class more than first class? Is a letter with a 5¢ stamp less of an invasion than a letter that comes through third class mail? Third class mail is sneered at as being "unsolicited mail." How many first class letters are solicited? Does the Congressman suggest that the payment of just a little more money for postage justifies what he considers to be an invasion of the privacy of a household?

Extend this reasoning a little to its logical extremities and what liberties could an advertiser expect to take with a household if he were to pay a fee of a couple of dollars!

No, Mr. Chairman, the cost of postage has nothing whatsoever to do with the fact of whether a mailing is or is not an invasion of privacy. Just a couple of weeks ago Mr. Hechler himself sent out a rather large mailing to his own constituency to sound out public opinion regarding the location of a projected new jet airport in his District. Certainly these pieces of mail were unsolicited. Were they therefore an invasion of the privacy of the householders who received them? Of course not. They elicited valuable information and I am certain that most of the people who received them were grateful for the opportunity of expressing their opinion on the subject. The mailing performed a public service. It happened to be a first class mailing. If it had been a third class mailing would it have been automatically evil? Of course not.

I might add parenthetically that many of the most vociferous opponents of third class mail are its most persistent and effective users. The same newspapers which use the dirty phrase "junk mail" in their editorials, employ this same class of mail to increase their subscriptions. Television and radio stations are large users of third class mail. In fact, several of the major networks are expanding their holdings by buying control of direct mail firms—the same firms they are so constantly attacking. I might add that both major political parties are among the largest users of third class mail. The Federal government is the largest user.

Myth Number Three: We are told that postal employees—letter carriers and clerks—dislike third class mail. There is no need for me to explode these myths. I need only quote the leaders of the National Association of Letter Carriers and of the United Federation of Postal Clerks:

"THIRD CLASS MAILERS RESPOND TO MISINFORMED CRITICS

"By reading some segments of the nation's press, the average person would think that Third Class Mail has no friends at all. No one would guess that approximately 300,000 American business men, small merchants, churches, charities, and others, find this class of mail an effective way to get their message across to the public.

"This is not an accident. Those who attack Third Class Mail most bitterly, do so, not because it is a *useless* form of advertising, but because it is a *useful* medium. Third class mail has become an aggressive competitor for the advertising dollar and is therefore a convenient target for editorial attack.

"As Senator Daniel B. Brewster (Democrat, Maryland) wrote, in a recent letter to the New York Times: 'A good many people are offended by all forms of advertising, but the fact remains that the 20 billion pieces of bulk third class mail dispatched annually, account for sales in excess of $35 billion, proof positive that Americans do read and respond to this sales literature . . .'

"Third Class Mail, in fact, is responsible for 28% of the total mail volume each year, and produces 16% of the total postal revenue. Second class mail is responsible for 12% of the total volume, and produces only 3% of the revenue.

"If there were no third class mail, the Post Office Department could eliminate about one-quarter of its clerical employees, and about one-fifth of its letter carriers. During the Great Depression, third class mail did dwindle away to a whisper of its former self because merchants didn't have the money to advertise, and customers didn't have the money to respond to advertisement. The result was massive cuts in the postal employee force.

"Harry J. Maginnis, President of the Associated Third Class Mail Users (and an annual contributor of a scholarship to the William C. Doherty Scholarship Program), in a recent letter to the Washington *Star*, explodes many of the malicious myths that have been built up around Third Class Mail. He points out that the revenues from this class of mail are sufficient to pay for the salaries of around 110,000 postal clerks and carriers. He also points out that third class mail is a deferred class which is denied at least 18 benefits which are, as a matter of course, afforded first class mail. This latter fact, of course, justifies the lower rates which third class mail enjoys. (The rates on third class have been raised 188 percent in the past 15 years.)

"The ironical thing about third class mail is that those who attack it the most are among those who use it the most. When the magazines and newspapers who most loudly declaim against "junk" mail embark on a circulation promotion program—they use third class mail, the very same type of mail that their editorialists decry as being useless and an unnecessary burden on the postal service.

"Third class mailers, of course, are used to having their mail deferred but most of them thought the threat of burning their mail in Chicago recently was a little excessive. The Post Office generously returned the postage on the delayed mail but, did not defray the expense that went into printing and preparation of the material.

"Despite great improvements after the notorious autumn crisis, mail problems still abound. We reproduce, in part, a circular sent out recently (November 14) by St. Mark's Episcopal Church, in Palo Alto, California:

" 'Dear Brethren in Christ: Last week I was puzzled by our mail delivery. As late as four o'clock I was assured by local postal authorities that our man was just late that day—a real feat when one considers that we are about the tenth stop from the beginning of the route, and usually get our mail reasonably early in the morning . . . A little later, a neighborhood survey revealed that no one had received any mail . . . late in the evening the mail authorities grudgingly agreed that something was wrong. The carrier was contacted and said he had delivered all his mail, but he hadn't even seen a church. Onward creaked the machinery. One postal authority told me the Palo Alto Post Office was hiring "anybody we can get" because there is a current ruling against paying regular postal employees overtime. One postal agent said he didn't think some of the new fellows could read . . . In the meanwhile, part of the mail (the last half of the route) was discovered, but the first part, including our own which can run as high as fifty pieces a day, is still missing . . . Up until the "Great Mail Call-It-What-You-Wish" we had been receiving cards making reservations for this week's men's luncheons (and for other parish functions) . . . Now we are going to have to call up almost everybody to find out what they might have said.'

"And so it goes.

"Or, rather, and so it does *not* go."

"WHAT ABOUT THIRD-CLASS MAIL?

"Every so often we come across either an article or an editorial dealing with third-class mail. For the most part they either deal with the alleged 'nuisance' of 'junk mail' or the alleged failure of third-class to 'pay its own way.'

"One recent article that came to our attention contained 'quotations' from several postal people (none of them clerks) who seemingly were not happy because they had to handle and deliver this class of mail. Perhaps they have given thought to the fact that the elimination of third-class mail might also eliminate their jobs, along with thousands of others? Or do they imagine that they would be retained on the pay-roll if this volume disappeared?

"Third-class mail provides work not only for postal people but for hundreds of thousands of other people who not only do the work involved in printing and mailing this type of mail, but also those who produce and distribute the many products advertised. Take that volume of business out of our economy and we would have a first class depression on our hands.

"So far as third-class rates are concerned, there has never, to our knowledge, been a really scientific effort to determine what a proper rate should be for a service that is largely only a by-product of first-class mail. The fact is that even if there were no other class of mail we would still need buildings and trucks and equipment, as well as people, to sort and deliver first class mail and, these buildings, equipment and people would be standing idle for long periods of each day. A proper third-class rate should take into account that this is a deferred service, used as a "fill in" when men and machinery would otherwise be standing idle and regulations should be written to guarantee that it receives only a deferred service. Working such mail at times when premium pay is paid for night work and for Sunday and holiday service is just plain nonsense. Third class mailers who demand (and receive) such special services are hurting their own case.

"As we have said on other occasions, all of the shouting about third-class mail comes as a result of competition for the advertising dollar. Publishers, as well as the T.V. and Radio people all reason that if the competition of the third-class mail advertisers were eliminated they would be bound to pick up a larger share of the advertising dollar.

"So far as we are concerned the Congress has the duty and the responsibility to determine all rates of postage, third class included. We have the duty and the responsibility to work and deliver the mail at whatever rate the Congress sets, and we are not going to take sides in arguments involving the advertisers' money. They are fully capable of looking out for their own interests. We have enough work on our hands trying to persuade the Congress that postal clerks are entitled to decent pay for the work they do regardless of rates and revenues."

Myth Number Four: It is claimed that third class mail gets the same treatment as first class mail. That simply is not so. Even I, the head of the principal third class mail association in America, use first class mail whenever I issue bulletins to my 800 members. On the rare occasions that I have made a test mailing via third class, I find that it takes 28 days for the bulletin to the West Coast, 15 days to the Mid-West and about 12 days to Long Island. Some of the largest direct mail companies constantly make such surveys and inevitably find that it takes an awfully long time for third class mail to reach its destination.

Myth Number Five: Rarely a day goes by that some newspaperman or even a legislator does not describe me and my office as the "powerful third-class lobby." In order that you might know the full extent of this powerful lobby, I would like, if I may, to introduce to the sub-Committee today my total legions. I ask Mr. George Miller to rise. A young lawyer, he joined me three months ago. Mrs. Blair Brophy has been with me for nine years and is my office manager. Miss Kathy Riley performs the secretarial chores for my office. We occupy a three-room suite in the Letter Carrier's Building at 100 Indiana Avenue, N.W. and our total budget for the year is $80,000 including postage. If we are so powerful, then how could we have lost so many battles along the legislative road? No other category of mail has suffered as high an increase in rates as has third class mail since 1952. As I pointed out earlier, the total increase in 15 years has been 188%. That averages out at about 13% a year. Boy, what power! Seriously, I think that in any discussions of rates, the Congress should be required first to ascertain the possible *impact* on users of the mail as required under the Postal Policy Act. This question arose in 1957 when I was testifying on another rate bill. A member of the Committee asked how much goods and services we sold annually. I replied that I did not know. I pointed out, however, that not one stick of information existed in the Federal Government about this large and growing industry. The Committee of that day felt that the Commerce Department and particularly the Small Business Administration, should have some data on the subject. Both agencies were directed to conduct a bulk mail survey. This was done by the Commerce Department at a cost of a quarter of a million dollars over an 18 month period.

To the surprise of Commerce Department officials, the survey found that direct mail did indeed contribute quite a bit to the gross national product and provided employment to two or three million people. It was estimated that total sales generated by direct mail in 1958 were approximately $29 billion. One can only guess what those sales are now because no survey has been made by government in the interim years. We do know that the volume of third class mail has had a healthy rise since that time and that in the coming fiscal year approximately 20 billion pieces of third class will be poured into the postal stream. As I stated earlier, the rates proposed by the Administration would reduce the volume of third class sales literature and lead to a corresponding reduction in sales. The Hechler amendment would, of course, drive most mailers to the bankruptcy wall and deprive the Federal Government of billions of dollars in taxes now paid by a healthy direct mail industry.

Many semi-skilled and handicapped workers owe their livelihood to direct mail advertising and they would lose their jobs and become battlefield casualties in the war against poverty. Extensive capital investments have been made in the direct mail field because of the clear language of the Postal Policy Act of 1958. The industry expects Congress to live up to its commitments and apply differential pricing techniques to this category of mail. Since the inception of bulk third class mail in the late 20's, the cost recovery on such mail matter has averaged about 70%. Postal officials have said many times that a 75% cost recovery (based on figures loaded heavily against third-class mail) would place third class mail on a profit-making basis. Inasmuch as the Administration's bill would take the cost recovery up to a figure of about 80.2%, third class mail would, therefore, by their own calculations be overpriced, and particularly so since Zip Code sorting has added about ½¢ per piece to third class mailers' costs. The Hechler approach is, of course, to make third class mail pay almost the same rate as first class. He would throw the differential pricing technique out the window.

I have discussed differential pricing many times before this Committee and elsewhere but I should like to do so briefly again. The following chart will explain how the telephone company and telegraph company, the airlines and others price their services to attract additional business in off-peak periods:

DIFFERENTIAL PRICING

Telephone rate

(Station to Station to L.A.): day, $2.00 plus tax for three minutes; evening (6 p.m. to 8 p.m.), $1.50; night (8 p.m. on), $1.00.

Western Union

Day wire to Los Angeles, $3.14 for 50 words; night wire to Los Angeles, $1.90 for 50 words.

National theater

Prices vary with Show: present price structure for "The Owl & Pussycat," orchestra, $4.95; balcony, rows 1–4, $4.50, rows 5–8, $3.90, rows 9–12, $3.00, all above this are $2.25.

Transportation

Air fare to Los Angeles via TWA: first class, $160.39, includes taxes only one way; coach, $144.11; excursion, $210.00 round trip, 30 day limit—min. must leave one calendar wk. return beginning of following wk.

Bus fare to Los Angeles, $84.65.

Train fare: coach $103.14; first class rail fare, $142.76, additional charge for sleeper, $49.06.

Radio advertisement

WTOP, CBS affiliate: Sec. 1 rate, AA $70/min., A $63/min. single rate, B $47/min. Maximum impact, 30% off single rate, 10–50 spots/wk.: 10 spots $345, 2–AA min. 6 to 10 a.m., 2–A min. 3 to 7 p.m., 2 min. 10 a.m. to 3 p.m., 2 min. after 7 p.m., 2 min. Saturday or Sunday; 50 spots in package $1,250.

There is no mystery about this pricing technique. Overhead is constant and it is better to use expensive facilities at a lower rate than not to use them at all.

The best way to determine whether or not third class mail is paying its way is to ask the Post Office Department how much would be saved if third class mail were eliminated all together. Current revenues from third class mail are $700 million annually. In my judgment, if third class mail were eliminated the Department would lose approximately $500 million a year in revenues and it would be necessary to raise the rate on first class mail to ten or eleven cents an ounce. The loss in tax revenues are incalculable. The letter carrier must make his daily rounds and if it is possible for him to "piggy-back" some free enterprise advertising mail on monopoly first class mail, that additional revenue is pure gravy for the Department. Third-class mail generates a vast quantity of first class mail. That volume would be lost.

The Chairman of this sub-Committee, Mr. Olsen, conducted quite extensive and useful hearings when Mr. Gronouski announced his mandatory Zip Code order a few years ago. Those hearings demonstrated clearly that bulk mailers would be required to spend $250 million to put Zip Code numbers on their mailing lists. We have absorbed this tremendous cost in recent months and believe that the pre-sorting of bulk mail by Zip Code sequence will save the Department from $200 to $300 million annually. Heretofore, we presorted our mail by city and state. As Mr. Cohen will later point out, we must now sort our mail by 551 sectional centers and also to the 6,000 zones within the multi-coded cities. It has been estimated that this added sortation requirement will cost bulk third class mail users $6.00 a thousand. That extra cost must be viewed as a rate increase. Postmaster General O'Brien said as much when in a letter dated April 17th addressed to Speaker McCormack he stated, "As a result of that change these mailers are absorbing additional costs which, for them and for the Department, produce the same effects as an increase in rates."

In closing permit me to observe that I have participated in many many rate hearings and have always found that Members of the House and of the Senate who dig into this complex subject recognize the factors which must be considered if the business segment of our great economy is not to be harmed. One has to be exposed to the vexing problem for several years before ever beginning to grasp its enormity. Those who desire a headline and a brief moment of glory need only characterize third class mail as "junk" or "trash." The press is quick to report that kind of catch phrase about a vigorous competitor, while ignoring the hard facts of the postal system. We who work with third class mail are caught up in a propaganda campaign which we can only answer with facts.

Very often, however, the facts are ignored and the myth is given credence.

As I have said, we recognize that third class mail is in trouble. Too few people realize because we are in trouble, the entire postal service is in trouble too.

If third class mail should be priced out of existence—and this is a distinct possibility—there will be agonized screams for help from 12th Street and Pennsylvania Avenue, from the White House itself and even from the corridors of Capitol Hill.

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Should this happen I would like you to take some small comfort from the fact that the so-called "powerful third class mail lobby" which you met this morning, hopefully will still be operating at the same old stand in the Letter Carriers' Building at 100 Indiana Avenue ready and available to cooperate with the Department and the Congress in putting the pieces back together.

At a time when a healthy economy is essential if we are to continue our aid to India, meet our commitments in Viet Nam, support the Poverty Program in Appalachia, and help to underwrite our social and international program, the small businessman who, through his ingenuity, helps make it all possible, should not be shot down by unwise or punitive legislation.

I thank you.

Kristin Williams Is New "Alice"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 1967

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the Sixth District of Wisconsin has been honored with the selection of Miss Kristin Williams as the new Alice in Dairyland for Wisconsin.

This is an honor in which all of us in the Sixth District of the Nation's dairyland take a great deal of pride. Miss Williams now becomes the State's No. 1 salesman for its No. 1 product.

I include for the information of my colleagues, a recent article about Kristin from the Oshkosh Daily Northwestern:

Colgate Girl New "Alice"—Kristin Williams, 21, Is WSU-Oshkosh Student

(By Emilie Russert)

Green Bay.—Colgate, Wis., may be a small town but for the next year it will have metropolitan status thanks to the success of one of its native daughters, lovely Kristin Williams, 21, who on Saturday night—before a wildly cheering crowd in Brown County Arena, Green Bay—was crowned the 1967–68 Alice in Dairyland.

Some of the glory which now belongs to Colgate has spilled over onto Oshkosh since the new "Alice" is a student at Wisconsin State University-Oshkosh, and a popular one at that.

Winning of titles is no new experience to the petite brown-haired, brown-eyed beauty. She was a title holder before she came to Oshkosh, where last fall she walked off with coveted Homecoming Queen honors.

But not all of Miss Williams' time has been devoted to the social aspects of college life. She is a good scholar and was further honored two weeks ago when she was named one of "Fifteen Outstanding Senior Women at Wisconsin State University-Oshkosh."

Miss Williams, who will spend the next year touring the state and country as "Ambassador of Good Will" for the Wisconsin Agricultural Department, received her crown and congratulations from Miss Jo Ann Cupery, Markesan, the retiring Alice. Only in recent years has the post been a full-time one with the winner receiving a $4,800 salary.

First runner-up in Saturday night's Pageantry, witnessed by a dinner crowd of some 600 persons plus the thousands who viewed the finals on TV, was Miss J. Beverly Stelzel, 20, Dorchester, and second, Miss Barbara Ann Berg, 20, of Plain.

Others who made the top five were Miss Jeanellyn Desmarais, 20, Kenosha, and Miss Carol Kay Robnett, 20, Milwaukee.

Present for the ceremony, "emceed" by Carol Jean Anderson, a former Alice, were Gov. Warren Knowles, who extended well-wishes and congratulations from the capitol, and Gov. George Romney of Michigan, speaker for the evening.

The latter repeated much of the talk which he had given earlier in Wauwatosa and Appleton.

No sooner was the announcement of the winner made than the residents of Colgate were on the town's streets and soon had a red and white banner stretched across the driveway at the Williams' home to greet the new Alice, a twin, on return home.

She began her new duties today with a press conference; on Tuesday will be in Madison to meet officials of the Department of Agriculture and then will start shopping for her tour wardrobe.

"I'm looking forward to it with great expectations and anticipation," said Kristin, who needs 12 credit hours as a practice teacher before completing her college work. She plans to be a high school English teacher.

Her twin sister, Robin, a former high school homecoming queen, looked on as Kristin, wearing a pale yellow gown with a square neckline, was named the Pageant winner.

So did Stephen Grishaber of Menasha, a WSU-O junior, who is Kristin's "boy friend."

Kristin, he said, was "excellent. She's all-around-perfect."

The new "Alice" said she hadn't yet talked to Stephen about his reaction to her victory. She said she realized that the job with the travel it entails will apparently mean periods of separation.

A Thoughtful Poem of Interest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVID PRYOR

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 1967

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct the attention of my colleagues to a thoughtful poem written by Robert Bosley, of Odenton, Md. This work was composed on the occasion of his graduation from the Arundel High School and was published in the school yearbook. Robert is the son of Capt. and Mrs. Harold Bosley. Mrs. Bosley is a former resident of El Dorado, Ark. I include this poem with my remarks in the Appendix:

(By Robert Bosley)

A phase of life is ending,
And now, if never before,
It's clear—that the future is unclear.

Here we are, being ushered from all that is familiar;
Being swept into the vast future.

We are nearing the scholastic turning point . . .
No garlanded gate will swing wide open
To let us pass onward to certain success,
No flower-strewn path awaits us
Our hardships to erase . . .
In fact, no one can abate the problems which are sure to come—but ourselves.

Life can be unkind,
But it isn't so by nature,
Life is impartial where we're concerned.
If we meet our obligations
We'll have a friend in life
And life will respond to our endeavors.
Wisely lead and guide yourselves in the right direction . . .
For who better deserves your help?
Take the road to prosperity.
But don't take a detour from happiness.
Be kind to yourselves,
And give yourselves the best of everything.

There's no "free ride" to the top.
(Rest on your laurels and you'll stop)
But there is a steep and winding stairway
Made of sweat and blood and tears . . .
Step by step and hand over hand
We'll make the grade.

Day by day and year by year
We'll pull our weight.
We'll each fill a slot
In this melting pot.

Commencement Address by the Honorable Charles McC. Mathias, Jr., at Walt Whitman High School, Bethesda, Md.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES HARVEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 1967

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, on June 19, 1967, it was a great pleasure and, I must add, a most proud moment for my wife and me to attend the commencement exercises of Walt Whitman High School. Our daughter, Diane, was a member of the graduating class.

Of special note, too, was the commencement address given by our colleague, the Honorable Charles McC. Mathias, Jr. In a sense, it was "homecoming" for Congressman Mathias, who formerly represented Montgomery County here in the House of Representatives, before Maryland congressional redistricting took effect in 1966.

I recommend the remarks made by Congressman Mathias, as he challenged the graduates to rise above mediocrity. His address follows:

Remarks of Representative Charles McC. Mathias, Jr., at the Commencement Exercises of Walt Whitman High School, Bethesda, Md., June 19, 1967

It is a real pleasure for me to be back with my friends and neighbors in Montgomery County, and to see so many people I have talked with, worked with, corresponded with, and sent high school debate materials to.

Our acquaintance does have one drawback for me tonight. Because we know each other well, and because so many of us are partners in the great business of government, it is harder for me to gain the kind of insulating distance and perspective which might make my remarks seem imaginative and inspirational.

In fact, I feel somewhat as Adlai Stevenson did when he addressed the Class of 1954 at Princeton. Stevenson said:

"I've been at a loss as to what to say to you, and having just read over what I have prepared rather hastily, I have concluded that I have resolved my uncertainty by saying nothing. This will take me approximately 40 minutes."

Since I would be flattered to be considered half as articulate and eloquent as Governor Stevenson, I will only impose on you about 20 minutes.

Actually, I do have one advantage over Governor Stevenson. Since you are not yet college graduates, you have not yet heard your full quota of commencement speeches.

I can assure you, though, that such addresses have basically changed very little since the first students, Adam and Eve, dropped out of the Garden of Eden.

It's traditional at such mileposts to reflect briefly on the state of the world in which we find ourselves. Generally such a commencement glance produces a capsule description which echoes, without improving on, the classic summary by Charles Dickens at the beginning of *A Tale of Two Cities*:

"It was the best of times, it was the worst of times; it was the age of wisdom, it was the age of foolishness . . ."

This can of course be said of any year, and has been said of most. It is not a statement of facts, but rather a sketch of a state of mind—a state of mind which we can now sense in this country.

This is the best of times for many of us. Surely it is for you. As a group and as individuals, you have many reasons for pride in the present and confidence in the future.

As a group, you are part of the largest and best-educated graduating class in the nation's history. You and your classmates around the country have the best opportunities in our history for more education, better jobs, a high lifetime income, and all of the material comforts which American ingenuity can produce.

As individuals, you have enjoyed great good fortune—in the circumstances of your lives, in the knowledge you have gained, in the advice and counsel you have been exposed to. As you move ahead into greater personal freedom and greater responsibility, you have every reason for confidence.

But I would caution you to be sure that your confidence is based not on your situation, but in yourselves. For we are now finding out, as a nation, that confidence based on circumstances is not durable, when circumstances change.

In this sense, this is the worst of times. We do not face disaster or immediate destruction. But we are now suffering from, if not a total loss of confidence, surely a lessening of our national self-assurance. We used to believe, with some justification, that God would protect small children, dumb animals, and the United States. Now we are not so sure.

After World War II—about the time that you were born—my generation had to adjust to an entirely new world, one dominated by a massive confrontation between two ideologies, clouded by devastation and distress in many lands, and overshadowed by the nuclear power in our own hands. Gradually we did adjust to these new circumstances, and to the great obligations thrown upon us by our new stature as the strongest nation in the world. But now—just when we are beginning really to understand the postwar era—the echoes of a hydrogen bomb, exploded last weekend in the depths of China, tell us that the post-war world is gone, and that a new, more complicated, and even less understandable era has arrived.

We know—or we are quickly finding out—that it is no longer accurate to see the world clearly and simply as a battleground between the forces of freedom and the cadres of Communism. It is no longer enough to pin our hopes for peace on the United Nations. It is no longer possible to sort the nations of the world into those who are with us on every issue and those who are against us on every issue. And in an era when world war would mean worldwide destruction, and when hunger may prove to be a greater long-range threat than bombs—in this new world, it is no longer very helpful to think in the simple, familar terms of "victory" or "defeat."

Yet as a nation, we don't know what else to think, or *how* to think about the last third of the cenutry, now that it has begun.

Our uncertainty has been compounded by doubts about the health of our republic itself. Our politics have always been noisy, somewhat violent, and cheerfully confused. But now there is an alarming note of urgency, suspicion and aggressiveness.

Some are rejecting our traditional concepts of debate entirely.

Others—too many others—question the sincerity and motives of every position except their own.

Still others have concluded that, despite our strength and our prosperity, despite our basic common sense and stubborn good will, our problems have gotten so big that they can be resolved only at the price of abandoning our fundamental concepts of government and society.

And some, frustrated and alarmed by the same problems, seem to have concluded that the only course left is to take refuge in cliches—and to demand enough protection so that it's safe to turn our backs.

Is this an age of wisdom? Possibly—but only if you make it so. This year, and in the coming years, there is a special assignment for you, for all members of the one-half of the United States now under 28 years old. You have already changed our language, our music and our styles. Now your task is nothing less than to modernize the ways we think about the nation, and the world, and the nation *in* the world.

As the truly post-war generation, you are best equipped to bring us up to date. You are not tied to the thought patterns of the depression and World War II. You are not tired. You're not still fighting old battles. You can understand the changes which have taken place during your lifetimes, and can go beyond the history books . . . books which, I understand, still generally stop about the time when you were born.

It would be tragic if, as you advance, you just echo your elders. It would be equally unfortunate if you reject them out of hand. I suspect that you will notice soon, if you haven't already, that as you get older, your parents get smarter—or at least less stupid. And while you do have the freedom to make your own mistakes, I trust that you will also have the good sense to decide that some perennial mistakes are not really very worthwhile.

I do want to make one thing clear, and that is that you don't *have* to do anything at all. You have gained some momentum now, and can just coast along indefinitely if you want. The heavens are not likely to fall in if you waste time, or wander down a few blind alleys, or simply enjoy yourself without feeling too conscientious for a while, In short, you have the most tempting and subversive of all freedoms: the freedom to be irresponsible.

This is, indeed, an age of foolishness. America has always been a light-hearted, cheerful nation, and a certain amount of foolishness has kept us and our economy moving. Yet today it seems that we are far too earnest about being frivolous, and too serious about having fun. When you add together all the fads, all of the styles and mass culture, I suspect that what you get is mediocrity—the highest level of mediocrity in the world.

The great trouble with our foolishness is that we lack the wisdom which gives it perspective. One symptom of that lack is that, while we have countless jokes and countless comedians—professional and amateur—we have so few great humorists. We have not yet gained the maturity to laugh at ourselves without feeling nervous doing so.

I am not advocating pessimism. On the contrary, I think that this immense country of ours has finally progressed almost to the point of being civilized, with all of the sense and tolerance and education which the term involves. Further, I think that it will be your generation which the term involves. Further, I think that it will be your generation which determines whether we take the plunge, or hesitate too long in a kind of anxious dependence on the place where we stand now. The choices that you make, consciously or not, will determine whether you personnally and we generally, can preserve the best of the times, can respond to the worst, and can separate the wisdom from the foolishness.

I hope that you will choose to move ahead.

Illinois General Assembly Honors Victor Failla

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 1967

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to call to the attention of my colleagues a resolution passed recently by the House of Representatives of the Illinois 75th General Assembly. This resolution pays tribute to Victor J. Failla, one of the great labor and social leaders in the Chicago area, and an outstanding American citizen.

I have been associated with Victor Failla in the labor movement for over 25 years, and during this span of time, I have watched Victor work tirelessly and unceasingly to better the life of the workingman, and to contribute to the economic and social advancement of his fellow citizens. He has done much to fight the inhumanity of prejudice which has been focused on many ethnic groups, and he has always stood ready to help the members of the Italo-American community as well as all others who required his assistance.

Victor was born and reared in Chicago, and as a patriotic American, he served his country in the Armed Forces during World War II, and fought and was wounded in the European theater of war.

Over the years many organizations have benefited from his leadership, including the Chicago joint board, which is made up of seven local unions, the Vizzinese Society, Amerital Unico, American Committee on Italian Migration, the Joint Civic Committee of Italian Americans, and the Columbus Day Parade Committee.

In recognition of his service in behalf of mankind, Victor Failla was recently awarded the Star of Solidarity, one of the highest awards given by the Italian Government to outstanding individuals of Italian descent. No man is more deserving of this high honor than Victor Failla, and I extend to him my heartiest congratulations and my best wishes for continuing success in his future endeavors.

The text of the resolution paying tribute to Victor Failla follows:

HOUSE RESOLUTION NO. 167

Whereas, the Star of Solidarity, that high award given by the Italian government to its both stellar and solid descendants, has been presented to Chicago's own outstanding and militant worker for the highest ideals of the laboring man, the Italian-American people and all people who have felt the inhumanity of prejudice, that great labor and social leader, the esteemed Victor J. Failla; and

Whereas, his life is a book of the advancement of the labor movement and the social

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

relations of the Italian-American Community, having worked in and for each with a real heartfelt devotion and sustained mental and physical effort which can only be generated by a zealous spirit in behalf of worthwhile and dignifying causes in human relations exemplifying compassionate understanding; and

Whereas, he was born and reared in Chicago, that great ethnic and racial melting pot, and he received special formal education in the labor field, his graduate school however has been experience, that great uncompromising teacher which is the first arbiter of all knowledge; and

Whereas, he is a patriotic American as well as a patriot to the Italian-American people of his heritage and of which he is justly proud, having taken the step forward for his country in World War II and seen action all over the European theatre including Omaha and Normandy beaches and receiving physical but not spiritual wounds; and

Whereas, he has been accorded leadership recognition time without number in both labor and ethnic organizations as best exemplified by his presidency of the Chicago Joint Board, IUDTPN&AP which is made of 7 local unions, President Emeritus of Vizzinese Society, past president of Amerital Unico, President of the Chicago Chapter, American Committee on Italian Migration and first Vice President of the Joint Civic Committee of Italian Americans as well as having been chairman and co-chairman of the Columbus Day parade in Chicago and having been invited by President Lyndon B. Johnson to his Inaugural Ball, for receiving numerous awards from his ethnic groups as co-ordinator; therefore, be it

Resolved, By the House of Representatives of the Seventy-fifth General Assembly of the State of Illinois, that we warmly congratulate our outstanding citizen, Victor J. Failla for having been awarded the highly coveted Star of Solidarity from the Italian Government and extend to him, along with the Italian-American community, not only this memorial to our pride in his recognition df service in behalf of mankind's social enlightenment and progress but also extend our sincere hope that his present plateau of accomplishment will only be a foundation of Solidarity on which he will build for the future; that this preamble and resolution be spread upon the Journal of this body; and that a suitable copy thereof be presented to Victor J. Failla.

Mrs. Orville L. Freeman Speaks on "Feeding Seeds of Progress"—Receives National Garden Clubs' Award for Youth Guidance, Civic Beautification

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 27, 1967

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I am appreciative of the opportunity to call attention to the fact that Mrs. Orville L. Freeman, wife of the Secretary of Agriculture and an effective member of the First Lady's Beautification Committee, recently received the Gold Seal of Merit, the highest award made annually by the National Council of State Garden Clubs. Her award was for "Youth Guidance in Civic Beautification."

A few days prior to receiving the Gold Seal of Merit and citation at the Council of State Garden Clubs' convention in Milwaukee, Mrs. Freeman addressed the 37th annual convention of the West Virginia Garden Clubs at Wilson Lodge in Oglebay Park, Wheeling, W. Va. The West Virginia Garden Clubs, Inc., whose president is Mrs. C. Manning Smith, wife of the postmaster at Charles Town, W. Va., also was honored at the national council convention in Milwaukee, having received a number of awards for outstanding services and programs.

Mr. President, Mrs. Freeman's speech to the Garden Clubs of West Virginia convened in the beautiful Oglebay Park at Wheeling was received with real appreciation and enthusiasm by the ladies of the Garden Clubs and their guests. I join them in thanking Mrs. Freeman. Her address was a significant and informative discussion, the theme of which was "Feeding the Seeds of Progress," and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEEDING THE SEEDS OF PROGRESS

(Speech of Mrs. Orville L. Freeman, wife of the Secretary of Agriculture)

I am delighted to be here today at the 37th annual meeting of Garden Clubs of West Virginia, and to bring to each of you greetings from Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson, the First Lady of Beautification.

I have enjoyed knowing your national president, Mrs. Fred Mauntel, and working with her on numerous beautification programs. I also know many members of the National Capital Area Federation of Garden Clubs, and have observed first hand much of the fine work they are doing. They are providing thousands of hours of volunteer work annually at the National Arboretum. They are involved in many community projects to help beautify public housing projects, sponsoring our National Capital Flower and Garden Show, working with the physically and mentally handicapped, and many other activities.

I have read and heard a good deal about the work of the West Virginia Garden Clubs, and I congratulate you for having one of the most active groups of garden clubs in the country.

I only wish I could be here to go with you on your annual Wildflower Pilgrimage. I love your State flower—Rhododendron—and would especially enjoy going to Blackwater Falls State Park to see the rhododendrons there.

I was very much impressed to learn of your Conservation Camps for teachers, leaders, and young people, and of your work with agencies of the Department of Agriculture—the Soil Conservation Service, the Forest Service, and with the 4–H Clubs in the State.

I am also deeply impressed with your Civic Development programs to involve all of your affiliated clubs in various projects to improve your communities. The reports of these projects was most impressive. I am glad, too, that you included both rural and urban beautification programs. Too often people forget about the roadsides and the areas between the towns. Can it be possible that you had 100% participation by your Clubs in these Civic Improvement projects? That is really splendid. You surely have followed your theme "Planting Seeds for Progress."

Your State has also done well. I understand that West Virginia's Governor is the first governor to hold a *second* State Beautification Conference as a follow-up to the White House Conference on Natural Beauty in June, 1965. I know that Governor Hulett Smith and his State Departments of Natural Resources and Commerce have really worked at maintaining and developing West Virginia's beauty.

You can also be proud of your Senator Jennings Randolph for his fine leadership on Highway Beautification legislation. It is imperative that our highways be made safer and more pleasant. Highway beauty has a distinct effect upon the driver's mental attitude. As our country grows, within the next ten or twenty years, we will probably double the number of automobiles we have today, and all of us will be spending more and more time on the roads and highways. And what a difference it is when we have scenic highways to drive on! A half hour's drive to work can be pleasant or hectic, depending on what we see as we drive—trees and shrubs, or neon signs.

Another area where all of you in West Virginia are to be complimented is in the work of your State Department of Natural Resources and the Sears Roebuck Foundation, with young people's groups on conservation programs. I am told that some 400 clubs participate in these conservation projects and training.

And this is the area—working with youth—where you can truly "Feed the Seeds of Progress"—the seeds which you have been planting lo these many years in your programs. It is the young people who must grow up with a concern for conservation and an eye for the beautiful, if our country is to have any loveliness left, especially as we double and triple our population. In the process of working with the young people on beautification, civic anti-litter projects, tree planting and developing recreation areas, we will sow seeds of progress in other fields, too. When we work constructively with young people, we help toward solutions to many of our social problems of juvenile delinquency, school dropouts, narcotics, boredom, lack of patriotism and general carelessness.

Last June in Washington, D.C., a National Youth Conference on Natural Beauty and Conservation was held. It was attended by 500 young people from the 50 states, representing 11 national youth organizations and 20 million young people. The conference was planned by a committee of young people with the counsel and assistance of adult advisers. It had the active support of President and Mrs. Johnson. My husband and I sponsored a program for the delegates at the National Arboretum, where we tried to give practical instruction and experience in beautification and conservation. You never saw such enthusiasm, such energy, and so many ideas as these young people had. They pledged to return to their homes and to work for more beautiful communities and a more beautiful nation.

In the past year there has been much follow-up work. I believe that beautification and conservation follow-up has been reported in some 27 states on the State, community or organization level. But there is still much to be done, particularly in the states where no follow-up activity has been reported.

There were eight delegates from West Virginia to the Conference. One of the delegates reported that on her return she spoke to many groups, but without achieving any really tangible results. She was discouraged. But then she got the help of an adult group in her town and with their assistance organized a variety of young peoples' groups to participate in a major anti-litter campaign—distributing anti-litter bags, educating people not to scatter litter, and even persuading the city fathers to provide more trash cans. It's a small example, but an important example, of what young people and adults—with their wider experience and know-how—can do together.

I know that some of the other delegates and their organizations in the State have been active in beautification and conservation programs, but I don't believe that West Virginia has yet held a *state-wide* Youth Conference for Natural Beauty and Conservation. Perhaps you can assist in organizing such a conference. Most young peoples' groups need and welcome some adult assistance—especially on a state-wide program. So I hope you will make real plans to give leadership and assistance to some of the youth groups.

In your work with young people—as in your other programs—the Department of Agriculture is ready to assist you. The Department can provide a wide variety of pamphlets, bulletins and program aids on beautification and conservation. And we can help refer you to other sources of information.

I have brought along several publications which may be of interest and assistance to your clubs. One is a Lassie Anti-Litter poster. As you know, Lassie in her TV series has joined forces with Forest Ranger Corey Stuart to help protect our National Forests. One of the programs last winter concerned the litter problems in our National Forests. From it, Lassie received the greatest amount of junior fan mail she's ever had. The interest was so great that the Forest Service of the Department of Agriculture joined with Keep America Beautiful to develop an anti-litter poster showing Lassie picking up litter and depositing it in a trash receptacle. This special anti-litter drive had its opening at the White House and Lassie presented Mrs. Johnson with the first poster.

Lassie's campaign began to have immediate impact on the small fry. I took several posters to Rosemary Hills Elementary School in Silver Spring, Maryland, the following day for the dedication of the new beautification program at the school. I stressed to the youngsters the importance of keeping their grounds, which they had worked so hard to beautify, free and clean of litter. An entire class wrote me afterward, and almost every letter said things like "we're listening to Lassie and not throwing our paper cups and chewing gum wrappers on the ground."

One of the most effective publications which we have developed at the Department of Agriculture entitled *Windowsill Greenhouse* shows a simple method of plant propagation. It is not only fun, helps provide new plants and flowers at minimal cost, but is a great help to youngsters in learning about growing. We have also developed a slide series on *Windowsill Greenhouse.* The pamphlet and slides have been used with excellent results with both elementary and high school students. Even the severely handicapped boys and girls of Sharpe Health School in Washington have their own small courtyard garden full of flowers, which they themselves propagated with the *Windowsill Greenhouse.* Garden Club members, teachers and other adults have found it useful—in their work with young people—and for their own gardens as well!

One of our newest and most useful USDA publications, "Color it Green with Trees" is a calendar of what to do each month in the planting and maintenance of trees. Garden Club members will find it especially helpful in the knowledge it contains on what to plant—when to plant—where to plant—and maintenance after planting. You and I know that we can't stress maintenance too much—proper maintenance saves disappointment.

Finally, I brought along a copy of the report of the National Youth Conference for National Beauty, which I think you will find of interest and which will be useful to you in your work with young people in your state.

Before closing, I want to describe briefly three examples of how adult groups have cooperated with young peoples and other organizations in beautification projects with wonderful results.

The first is known as "Mission Marigold" and was sponsored by the Girl Scouts. The Board of Visitors of Children's Hospital in Washington sponsors a small garden in a tiny courtyard of the hospital. It is enjoyed not only by the young patients and their parents who come to the clinic, but also by the doctors and medical staff. There were trees and shrubs and a fountain, but the garden lacked color. Two Brownie troops from different sections of Washington, and representing several races, joined together to plant flowers in the courtyard—marigolds which they had raised from seeds. I was invited to help dedicate the planting, and it was a great joy. It is a ceremony which I will long remember as the epitome of service projects—helping the sick, helping the disadvantaged who have little beauty, helping in the integration and education of children and adults, and beautifying an area.

One of the most heartwarming experiences of the Georgetown Garden Club was in assisting residents of public housing to beautify their homes and thus generate pride in them. In one of the developments, inhabited mostly by Senior Citizens, the Garden Club members undertook to beautify a large, barren courtyard. They brought along the plants, cuttings, fertilizer, and tools.

The occupants helped in the planting, in the watering and in caring for the plants. Both volunteers and tenants gained from the cooperative effort. Firm friendship were established—pictures of grandchildren were exchanged as well as recipes, and books, and magazines were loaned.

The third example I want to talk about concerns a public spirited business firm, the Reliance Insurance Company of Philadelphia, which decided to celebrate its 150th Anniversary by providing funds for trees in 150 schools in fifty cities throughout the nation where the company had offices. It was not only an appropriate anniversary memorial, but a tremendous help to schools that have no shrubs or trees or flowers—in the neediest areas, where the school may be the loveliest, the cleanest place a child sees all week. You may want to encourage your husband—or local business firms—to sponsor school projects, similar to the Reliance Insurance Company program. Wives of several of that company's executives are members of your clubs. Don't underestimate your influence at home!

As you well know, with cooperation, you can continue "Feeding the Seeds of Progress."

You can also use your influence to help end pollution of air and water—to get new laws passed—and to work for strict enforcement of present laws. Or, you can use your persuasion to get old junkyards cleaned out, covered up or screened in. In one South Dakota community, old cars were carted to a gravel pit, crushed, and covered with earth. Then flowers and shrubs were planted, turning an eyesore into a park.

You can do so much to make this naturally lovely State even more beautiful. In the process you will enjoy it more. You will attract more tourists, you will attract more industries and plants to supply jobs, and you will make West Virginia a state where bright young people want to stay and to build their homes. Surely, in the years ahead, West Virginia will feel and enjoy and thrive upon the Civic Development efforts of your West Virginia Garden Club members. Good luck to all of you!

The Thin Blue Line

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 1967

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, on June 7, 1967, Mr. James S. Copley, chairman of the corporation, Copley Newspapers and Copley Press, Inc., gave an inspiring talk at the Federal Bureau of Investigation National Academy graduation exercises in Washington, D.C.

Mr. Copley stressed that "Freedom from fear is just as necessary as freedom of speech," and that the "victim is entitled to greater protection than the criminal." I hope that the Supreme Court will take to heart these comments.

Our FBI has made a great record in law enforcement; one of which all Americans who love their country and the freedom it represents can be proud, and Mr. Copley's talk well befitted the graduation ceremonies.

There are 17 Copley newspapers located in the States of California and Illinois. In addition, there is a Copley News Service which serves more than 100 newpapers in the United States, Latin America, and the Far East.

Mr. Copley is to be commended for his policy of keeping the public informed on all of the news of law enforcement and the courts, and urging that the law-enforcing officers be given every support.

Mr. Speaker, I insert the text of this address in the Appendix of the RECORD:

THE THIN BLUE LINE

(Remarks of James S. Copley at the Graduation exercises of the 79th session of the Federal Bureau of Investigation National Academy, Washington, D.C., June 7, 1967)

In talking with groups, it is natural to relate one's thoughts to his profession. So, I would like to recall a young writer who became famous as a war correspondent for the London Times during the Crimean War of 1854 and 1855.

After witnessing tremendous valor and degrading atrocity, William Howard Russell sat, exhausted, on a discarded saddle to report for his newspaper the Battle of Balaklava.

He used his knee for a desk. A candle stuck in a bottle provided flickering light. He wrote until the candle fell into the bottle.

Some of his words became imperishable when he told of Englishmen who formed "a thin red line, tipped with steel" and, with "courage too great for credence," threw themselves against an overwhelming foe.

He described how the Russian foes committed "atrocity without parallel" by firing cannon into their own troops to wipe out most of the pitiful remnants of the attackers.

Today, in our times, we also have examples of courage almost too great for credence, and atrocities that seem to have no parallel.

We have these in the war across the seas and in another which is being waged daily across our nation, in our cities and our countryside.

Here at home, it is the war against crime.

Sadly, some of the gallant men in both these wars face criticism and slander on the home front. They also must overcome grave and mounting restrictions on their operations against the foe—*our* foe, as well as theirs.

Young Russell's story of the gallant British charge was to inspire Rudyard Kipling's poem, "Tommy." Kipling used Russell's words in praise of the "thin red line" of heroes serving their beloved England at a time when the sun never set on the Empire's outposts.

Kipling's poem also offers insights to modern as well as older heroes. Today we have a thin *blue* line of men who also battle seemingly impossible odds.

These men, and women too, are our law enforcement officers. They are known traditionally for their uniforms of blue. Whatever the color of the modern uniform, we know our lawmen as true blue to their calling. Blue is the color for gallantry.

Kipling's poem told how Mister Tommy Atkins, the typical British soldier, was scorned in quiet times by those "making mock o' uniforms that guard you while you sleep."

But suddenly, Kipling said, Tommy Atkins is the "savior of his country when the guns begin to shout."

Tommy Atkins first is scorned, but then, "when there's trouble in the wind," he is suddenly expected to march to the front to face the danger.

As Kipling said, "Its Tommy this, and Tommy that, and Tommy, how's yer soul? But it's a thin red line of 'eroes when the drums begin to roll."

Were Kipling alive today to assess our thin *blue* line of law enforcement, he would find many who are ready to make mock of the policeman, or the soldier, or the sailor.

He also would find the same many who are very eager to walk close behind the uniform when danger lurks near.

Kipling also would find the financial and other rewards "starvation-cheap" for the work, dedication and skills required.

It is the lawmen whom we particularly consider today.

Too few people recognize that this thin blue line protects us against the criminal element and is also the line that is vital to preserve our individual and national freedom.

Certainly one of the individual freedoms which this protection secures for us is freedom from fear in our everyday lives.

Although law enforcement as we know it today goes back little more than a century, the yearning for this great freedom from fear was reflected in the common law of ancient times.

The way it was said then was that public safety is the supreme law.

We do well to remind ourselves of this today when the larger issue of public safety is too often trampled underfoot.

While many of the aspects of a restless era are important, certainly they are not as important as the overall public safety—the public's freedom from fear, freedom from danger in the streets, freedom from threats of violence and anarchy.

Freedom from fear is just as necessary as freedom of speech, freedom of religion, freedom of press, and the *right* of peaceful assembly.

We cherish all of our rights, and must remember that one right can't be trampeld asunder to achieve greater realization of another.

The victim is entitled to greater protection than the criminal, and, just as emphatically, the victim is entitled to protection *equal* to that given the accused.

Those who would champion a cause, regardless of how popular or unpopular, must not do so in an unlawful manner.

The demonstrator who interferes with the conduct of government, or who, with menacing guns, invades the floors of our legislatures, cannot be tolerated. Neither can we tolerate the demonstrator who disrupts any peaceably assembled meeting.

Most of us favor the lawful parade. There are ample ways for the demonstrator to champion his cause without our having to tolerate unlawful sit-ins and sleep-ins.

The right to dissent does not include the right to defy; it does not include the right to undermine our national defense. Neither does it include the right to burn flags and draft cards, or to disrupt the operations of Selective Service.

In a republic, the right of dissent is important. But the rights on opposing sides of a viewpoint are equally important, and we depend on our lawmen to help protect those equal rights for all.

As the great Teddy Roosevelt said, "No man is above the law, and no man is below it; nor do we ask any man's permission when we require him to obey it."

Admittedly, at times we expect much of the man whom we charge with law enforcement. He must be a Solomon and a Samaritan, and as patient as Job, sometimes under the most adverse and difficult conditions.

Not only do we expect wise law enforcement, but we depend on it for protection from fear.

We depend on you graduates and your fellow officers and leaders throughout our land to provide protection, and to make wise decisions that will give justice for all.

Without our confidence and your faithful presence, nights would be darker, and doors and windows would be less secure.

To maintain our confidence we need efficient, well trained and free officers of the law.

At the same time you are entitled to our support. You—and the same is true for the soldier and sailor—must not feel alone. You must not be persecuted or isolated from society for doing a job that is absolutely vital to that society.

Our nation must be more aware of our need to support you in your public duties. It also should acknowledge the many heroes among you in our major cities who dedicate themselves and their lives to our protection.

It is a degrading shame for our agents of law enforcement to be the objects of hatred and the victims of home-front traitors.

Is there no common law on treason in both these wars? Is there no penalty that can be invoked against those who give aid and comfort to the enemy, whether that enemy is in our streets or overseas?

We cannot and will not give up or retreat in this war against crime any more than in the war against the Communists in Viet Nam.

Here at home we must support those whom we trust for our protection. To you graduates of the 79th Session of the FBI National Academy, I pay my respects. I pledge the support of the Copley Newspapers.

Director Hoover has told me that those attending this session of the "West Point of Law Enforcement" are the cream of the law enforcement profession.

It is heartwarming to know that the students here represent 45 states, Puerto Rico and the District of Columbia, as well as the United States Park Police, the White House Police, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the United States Army and the Air Force.

Attesting to the merit of the Academy are the additional students from other lands.

You graduates are joining a select group of more than 5,000 alumni from whose ranks dedicated men provide a nucleus for even better law enforcement.

At the Academy you have been equipped to teach, and qualified to lead. The lessons learned in techniques, scientific crime detection and law administration will add greatly to the safety of our homes.

I am especially pleased to note that among you graduates are nine from Illinois and California, where the Copley Newspapers are published.

Our newspapers and all of the others throughout the country must help each citizen realize that only national disaster can result if we fail to give you support and to help reverse our increasing record of crime.

We must help dispel the shocking disrespect for authority and private property.

We are ever hopeful of raising our nation's basic moral values necessary to overcome discontent.

We of the Fourth Estate must be the helpful ally to the agencies of law enforcement. We have an equal responsibility, but you lawmen have the leadership of nobility.

Since World War II, there has been an enormous growth in the metropolitan areas, until more than two-thirds of the population now reside in the cities.

We also have had an explosive increase in the number of young people. Unfortunately, this has been accompanied by their growing involvement in serious crime, more than twice their proportion of the population.

In 1965, more than 70 percent of arrests for serious crimes were young people from 15 to 25 years of age.

Looking ahead ten years, if we assume a continuation of the same crime trend of the last five years, we can anticipate a 91 percent increase in serious crime in the United States.

Assuming the same rate of criminality, we can expect a 53 percent increase in arrests of those in the young group. This young group also is expected to have a population increase of 29 percent.

Thus, it is an absolute certainty that the future will bring increasing demands for service in the law, and will place even greater responsibilities upon enforcement.

At the same time, enforcement cannot go it alone, because crime is not merely a police problem. Crime is a social problem, and as such it must be the concern and responsibility of the entire community—yes, a responsibility including that of the hometown newspaper.

J. Edgar Hoover must not be the sole voice sounding warnings against decadence and disrespect for the law. He must not be alone in calling for righteous indignation against the underlying causes of crime.

I subscribe fully to Mr. Hoover's declaration that the press must give greater news coverage to crime, to law enforcement, and to the performance of the courts, instead of less as advocated by many members of the bar and judiciary.

The public has the right to know and to be assured. It has the right to depend on protection, and expect the preservation of our home security by the courts.

In order for the public to feel this security, it must have access to all the news of law enforcement and the courts.

Not only because he agrees with me that a fully informed public can give greater support to law enforcement, but because of his dedication to law enforcement, I salute J. Edgar Hoover as the greatest leader of that thin blue line.

This year marks his 50th anniversary in his profession and in his service of helping to uncover and identify the subversives in our midst.

One can only contemplate which enemy—crime or communism—would have conquered us first without the vigilance of J. Edgar Hoover and the other officials with whom he has worked on national, state and local levels for those many years.

Among you graduates there are also many who will achieve greatness in law enforcement.

The responsibility placed upon you as peace officers is awesome. You must be courageous in the fact of danger, yet compassionate and helpful even toward those who resist your efforts to maintain obedience to law.

You will be maligned, obstructed, accused and attacked.

But, please be assured: You will not be standing alone.

There are many millions more of us in your support than those who would make trouble for all.

As keepers of the peace, you will never be wealthy. More than likely, you will be underpaid.

But your work will have its compensations. You are a great fraternity; you are among those who spend their lives in the service of fellow men. You will be the friend in need, the angel of mercy, and the comforter of the unfortunate.

These opportunities for service to mankind are the fringe benefits that aren't listed in the police manual.

You can be proud of your calling.

Because of you, my fellow Americans and I know that our communities are better and safer.

Because of your service as part of the *thin blue line*, ours is a greater United States of America.

Thank you.

U.S. Department of Agriculture Adds Outdoor Recreation Areas—Assistant Secretary John Baker Reviews Advances in Program

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 27, 1967

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, a recent announcement by the U.S. Department of Agriculture and a significant speech by USDA Assistant Secretary John A. Baker to the National Recreation and Park Association accentuate the concentrated efforts which are being made to increase outdoor recreation areas throughout the United States.

In a press relase issued June 20, 1967, the Department of Agriculture called attention to the fact that—

> Recreation users of National Forests will collect another bonus this summer as they set out to discover America.

Its reference was to the opening of 195 new recreation sites by the U.S. Forest Service.

In his address to the National Recreation and Park Association, Assistant Secretary Baker appropriately reviewed the expansion of recreation activities and discussed plans for the future.

Increased emphasis on public outdoor recreation assuredly is appreciated by the citizens of this country. And it is attested to by the fact that the use of public recreation sites is significantly increasing. The available sites are in growing demand by both rural and urban Americans and their families.

Mr. President, I commend both the USDA press release and Assistant Secretary Baker's speech, and so that they may be more widely available for the attention and information of Members of the Congress and others having access to the RECORD, I ask unanimous consent to have both the USDA release and Mr. Baker's remarks printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks and release were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANOTHER BONUS FOR VACATIONERS, USDA ANNOUNCES

WASHINGTON, June 20, 1967.—Recreation users of National Forests will collect another bonus this summer as they set out to discover America.

Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman announced today that the Forest Service is opening 195 new recreation sites across the country in its continuing effort to meet the nation's growing recreation needs.

Forest Service estimates new camp, picnic, swimming and boating facilities, observation sites and visitor information centers will serve as many as 32,600 people at one time. New sites will add to capacity of developed recreation facilities in the National Forests an additional 3 million visitor days. (A visitor-day is a new Federal unit of measurement of use equivalent to 1 person staying 12 hours in recreational pursuits.)

The new facilities reach from coast to coast. They include:

West Virginia—A 50-unit Big Bend Campground within the Spruce Knob-Seneca Rock National Recreation Area; a new swimming beach to accommodate 500 persons, 20 camp units and 56 picnic units at Todd Lake on the Monongahela National Forest.

Pennsylvania—A total of 265 new camp and picnic units, 3 swimming beaches, 2 boat ramps, interpretive trails and signs on the Allegheny Reservoir in the Allegheny National Forest.

Indiana—A recreation complex, including 150 camp units, 125 picnic units, interpretive trails, swimming and boating facilities at Monroe Reservoir in the Wayne-Hoosier National Forest.

Texas—One hundred new camp units, 2 swimming beaches, a boat ramp and parking facilities at the new Sam Rayburn Reservoir in the Angelina National Forest.

Montana—An 84-unit campground, boat ramp, swimming beach and parking facilities at the Hungry Horse Reservoir on the Flathead National Forest.

Utah—An additional 139 camp units, 2 new boat ramps, parking facilities and interpretive signs adjacent to Flaming Gorge Reservoir on the Ashley National Forest.

California—A total of 249 camp and picnic units, 2 new boat ramps, parking areas and interpretive signs at the Whiskytown-Shasta Trinity National Recreational Area.

Many other more modest new developments are dispersed through other National Forests and Grasslands in other States, Secretary Freeman said.

In addition, 3 new visitor centers are opening this summer for National Forest visitors in Oregon, Montana and West Virginia. The Cape Perpetua Visitor Center in the Siuslaw National Forest in Oregon will provide a panorama of the Pacific Ocean. Earthquake phenomena will be seen and described from the Earthquake Visitor Center in the Gallatin National Forest in Montana. Beauties of West Virginia will be unveiled at the Cranberry Mountain Visitor Center near the Cranberry Glades on the Monongahela National Forest in that State.

Visitors will find 55 new interpretive trails, as well as new vista points and amphitheaters, and auto tours have been readied to acquaint vacationing America with its outdoor heritage.

In efforts to develop the many resources of the 187 million acres of National Forests, the USDA's Forest Service now includes an inventory of 12,000 developed recreational sites.

REMARKS BY ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE JOHN A. BAKER, TO THE NATIONAL RECREATION AND PARK ASSOCIATION-FEDERAL ASSISTANCE INSTITUTE, JUNE 20, 1967, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Today, in the city, in the country, almost everywhere, the American is demanding more to do in his leisure time.

Man, with all his ability to adapt, for all his domination of the "lesser" species, is still a child of the seas, the mountains, the open spaces. He wants to spend his spare time in such places.

He wants to relax; he wants recreation.

We know this. Now we must act accordingly. We must *use* what we *know*.

Later in the day, you will be hearing from the top USDA people concerned with recreation and administration. They will outline the wide-ranging Department recreation programs in detail. Question them closely and carefully, for we can help you. And you can help us in our efforts to operate our programs more imaginatively and effectively. You can help us use what we know.

Over a period of many years, law by law, Congress granted authority which brought USDA more and more into the recreation business.

The Forest Service has been in the business since it was founded in the early 1900's, because of the nature of the lands it administers and because of the foresight of some of its early Chiefs.

Long before the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962 was passed, the Soil Conservation Service, Farmers Home Administration, and the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service had limited authority to foster outdoor recreational development, and did much with what they had. The 1962 act greatly expanded this authority. It amended Public Law 566 to include recreation in small watersheds, it allowed us to include planning and technical assistance for recreation on public and private lands, and gave us authority for Resource Conservation and Developments Projects and Rural Renewal Areas.

Then came another boost. The Food and Agriculture Act of 1965 provided for recreation and wildlife conservation measures under the Cropland Adjustment Program, and for parks under the Greenspan program.

Last year, Title III of the Bankhead-Jones Act was amended to allow FHA rural renewal loans to be made to local non-profit organizations engaged in recreation.

We are really just getting under way now. But we have already accomplished a great deal under these programs.

We have put idle acres—those not needed for crop production—to work producing recreation, or providing cover for wildlife, rather than lying in a sterile soil bank. We have put several hundred thousand acres of water to work providing recreation—in addition to flood control. And we have launched 26 Resource Conservation and Development Projects, and 5 Rural Renewal Areas all with major recreation development features.

Many of these RC&D and rural renewal projects wrap up water based and shoreline recreation, municipal water and flood control into one package. All are planned in a comprehensive manner, one in which physical development is keyed into an overall community development plan, and recreation is given a prime spot. Also, many RC&D and rural renewal projects provide a tangible example of how soundly planned recreation resources can help a community attract industry by providing the kind of physical environment that plant-location experts demand.

Recreation facilities can attract industry. For example, a recreation area at Scotland's Neck, North Carolina, was recently credited with helping attract two plants—one at Scotland's Neck and another at nearby Enfield. These plants will initially employ 100 people each.

USDA has leaned heavily on the multiple-use concept, pioneered by the Forest Service. In the National Forests, the same public land that provides a timber harvest, also provides recreation, serves as a watershed, conserves the soil, and perhaps grazes cattle.

On private land, an acre of cropland taken out of production in the national interest can continue to serve the national interest by providing cover for game, or perhaps open space for the enjoyment of city residents. The dam that protects us from floods can also impound water for boating, picnicking, fishing, and can boost the local economy by attracting a new factory.

And so, bit by bit, over the years, USDA has hammered out viable recreation programs. Then, more than a year ago we decided to mold a Department-wide, unified policy for recreation development—a policy that would program recreation as a primary USDA mission.

The result is a recreation policy that encompasses both public lands in the National Forests, and the three-quarters of United States land area in private hands.

As for the public lands:

Forested America must continue to play a major role in furnishing outdoor recreation opportunities to meet the growing demands of an affluent, mobile, and active public.

Recreation visits to National Forests are literally exploding. So, as part of the policy we plan to triple the capacity of National Forest recreation facilities to keep pace with the expanded use.

As it says in a new USDA publication, *Resources in Action/Agriculture 2000,* "Natural beauty and wilderness are among the finest attractions of forest lands; the trees, meadows, and waters of the forest are the natural home of big game species, small mammals, birds, and fish. This habitat will be improved by our intensified efforts."

We are well on the way toward completing studies of the National Forest portion of the Wilderness Preservation System, and by next fall we will have proposed that 12 more wilderness areas totaling more than a million acres be included in the system.

USDA has strongly supported both the proposed Scenic Rivers and National Trail System legislation, and is planning to provide major segments of both systems within the National Forests, when and if they become law.

The Department was an early proponent and is now an active supporter of the Land and Water Conservation Fund—the Golden Eagle program—an act which allowed us to acquire the 18,000-acre Sylvania tract in Michigan, and that has funded other badly needed recreation lands in the East.

I mentioned a moment ago that recreation visits to National Forests are literally exploding. To be more specific, last year they received some 151 million visitor days of use—43 percent of the recreation visits to *all* Federal lands.

If we use the Mississippi River as a dividing line, some 66 percent of our population lives east of the river. Yet only little more than 8 percent of our National Forests lie in the East.

The population center of the United States—the point on which the U.S. would balance if every person in it weighed the same—is in Illinois.

The National Forest centerline—the line on which there is as much National Forest acreage to the east as to the west—runs through western Wyoming, somewhere near Rock Springs.

This means simply that the public lands *are* where the people *aren't*. This has important ramifications in the Department's recreation policy. While we are bending every effort to upgrade the National Forests' recreation potential, we also are making plans to put recreation where the people are.

On May 3, Secretary Freeman gave the highlights of our new policy. These highlights, he said, are:

"1. More emphasis on recreation developments on private lands in rural areas, for those landowners who want to build them, and have the capacity to manage them, with a view toward providing the recreational opportunities needed and desired by the American people.

"2. USDA agencies have been directed to provide the research, technical, educational, and financial help needed to strengthen existing programs for private land recreation. A high priority has been assigned to these programs.

"3. Special attention will be devoted to income-producing recreation in low-income rural areas as a means of creating more jobs and new sources of income.

"4. USDA will seek to establish recreation development in connection with each watershed project carried out with public help.

"5. Recreation research activities will be greatly expanded to catalogue private lands suitable for recreation, to determine what the recreation-consuming public wants, and to discover the thousand-and-one items that spell success or failure for the individual enterprise."

As for the private lands facet of the new policy, the goals we hope to achieve are:

First, to create a geographic pattern of development that puts more recreation facilities where the people are; and, second, to provide a proper "mix" of outdoor recreation, so families on all economic levels—rich or poor—can satisfy their individual needs; one that provides for the varying recreational tastes of the Nation.

Peoples' taste in recreation varies as much as their taste in houses, automobiles, clothes, or ice cream. A proper mix of recreational facilities—from a farm-based vacation, swimming in an RC&D lake, skiing in the National Forests, golfing on an FHA-financed course, to the solitude of wilderness—is vital.

And all of this requires planning, comprehensive planning. Without such planning, recreation is all too often ignored or overlooked, or occurs only as an afterthought rather than a prime consideration.

As Secretary Freeman has pointed out, "a good blueprint requires a good draftsman." But too many rural and urban areas today lack the trained, professional recreation planners to prepare comprehensive programs of community development. Because of this, requests for Federal assistance are often rejected as unsound or are subject to frustrating and time-consuming delays.

Planning must be done at the local level—not in Washington. Unless the people plan for programs—Federal, State or local—these programs have very little chance of getting off the ground.

Today we hear much about the hostility between man and his environment. We hear that there is a basic antipathy between the nature of man and what he has fashioned for his domain. We hear that modern man is living in violation of biological law, and that this unnatural existence is taking its toll in bleakness of spirit and mental disease.

When did it come about, this hostility between man and his world? Some say within the last generation.

In 1910, most Americans still lived in the countryside. The 2,300 towns in existence then had average populations of less than 10,000, and were separated from one another by miles of open land and virgin forest. Whatever the hardships in those days—and they were considerable—there was at least the compensation of natural beauty . . . of plenty of beautiful open space or forest land to relax or play in.

But by 1960, most Americans lived in 6,000 urban concentrations. Twenty-five of these had populations of more than 500,000, and were spreading into one another.

Space photographs discern what appear to be single cities stretching 500 miles from Chicago to Buffalo . . . or 800 miles from Richmond to Bangor.

Today, 35 million Americans are jammed into a narrow strip of Eastern Seaboard running from Washington, D. C., to Boston, Massachusetts.

Each year, another 3 million Americans pour into the biggest cities. And with each incoming wave of humanity, a million more acres of fields, woods and hills near urban centers are swallowed up by asphalt, concrete, shopping centers, and housing developments.

And while the suburbs too often are sprawling without grace, rhyme or reason, the inner cities too often are rotting with decay.

Billboards, garish neon signs, undisguised trash depots, rundown housing, parking lots instead of parks, waterfronts cluttered and defaced with concrete plants, railroad spurs and elevated expressways. These are the sights too many harried city workers see as they go to work and return home in bumper to bumper traffic.

They breathe not fresh air but noxious fumes. They hear not the meadowlark but the cacophony of auto horns. They see not vistas of natural beauty but skylines of ugliness.

Where—in all this—is man to find the relief and solitude he is seeking, and in fact demanding?

First we must do whatever is necessary to make our cities livable. But we must do more.

Second, we must help city man to find this relief and solitude in vistas of open green space, in beautiful, well-planned recreation area—both rural and urban.

And thirdly, we must make rural America an attractive and prosperous enough place to live and work that a higher and higher proportion of our population will reside there.

Happily, the outlook is not as bleak as it once appeared. We have it within our power to bring about these needed improvements in man's social and physical environment.

Yes, more people must be enabled to live in the countryside where recreation is and recreation areas must be put where the people are. They must be attractive recreation areas. They must provide a change of scenery, so to speak, for those who live in rural as well as urban areas.

In *The Prince,* Machiavelli wrote that "There is nothing more difficult to take in hand, more perilous to conduct, or more uncertain in its success, than to take the lead in the introduction of a new order of things."

Maybe so, but that is just what we—all of us—must do. We must take the lead in introducing this new order of things in the field of recreation—because if we don't, I fear we will eventually face a situation far more difficult, far more perilous, and far more uncertain than now—a situation that will literally endanger the survival of man by not giving enough attention to his natural habitat.

We can't attack this problem of a lack of recreation opportunities in a piecemeal manner.

With our new policy, we are seeking to join together the pieces which I referred to earlier.

The National Forests and their tremendous public recreation resources which includes most of the wilderness areas in this country.

The Soil Conservation program, reaching every farm virtually in this Nation with a skilled technician and program in every single county in the U.S.

The ASCS, where hundreds of thousands of acres of land are rented out of production each year—that land now largely moving into related recreation uses, some of it permanently as a part of Greenspan in the development of local parks.

The Farmers Home Administration, which loans more than $1.3 billion a year—probably the greatest loaning institution in the country. Incidentally, the FHA—with an office and technical people, trained supervisory people, in every single county in the U.S.—can loan to associations, to small towns and to individual farmers.

And the Extension Service with people in every single county in the U.S., many trained in recreation work of various kinds.

These are functions we are trying to pull together with related research into the seamless web of a total systems approach to a Department program in which all of these agencies will not think in terms of their agency, and their programs, but in terms of the total target, the total goal which is the recreation program, both public and private, which will be designed to reach the needs of this day.

We are not, nor can we be, sitting idly at anchor, drifting aimlessly with the tide—not any more. You are involved in the most important work that any American can be involved in: the work of saving and building an environment fit for man.

I hope you will press our people who meet with you today for practical answers to your most stubborn problems.

I hope the Department of Agriculture can be of increased help to you in this most important task in future years.

Thank you.

The U.S. Constitution Versus U.N. Usurpation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 1967

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Constitution and Bill of Rights are a divinely inspired foundation for a government of limited powers controlled by the people.

A reading of the document negates the idea of an all-powerful government with full control in the granting or guaranteeing of all rights to its subjects. Rather, conversely, since our governmental benefactors were God fearing men who acknowledged that man's rights and gifts are endowed by the Creator—not government—they sought to protect these individual rights by prohibiting interference from the Federal Government in our individual lives, futures, and rights.

For no government or earthly power can guarantee an individual the right to speak, the intellect to write, or create, the stamina or strength to work or be healthy—these are God-given rights. Government can take away or curtail, but it cannot create or guarantee.

The oppressive theory of a Socialist, Communist, or other central government is that such government has obtained the full ownership of all personal liberties and can, by the royal decree, permit such rights as it—the government in power—desires.

Such thinking and planning can only be patterned by those who deny the existence of God and fear the power and liberty of individual people.

The one-world intellectuals, by whatever name and front they label themselves, are hard set at capturing every individual liberty and concentrating full mastery and power over the masses in the U.N.

A short, but thorough, appraisal of the erosive action underway to capture the individual liberties of the American people by destruction through misuse of the U.S Constitution was delivered by Mr. T. David Horton of Pioche, Nev., to the Colorado State Legislature.

Mr. Speaker, I insert Attorney Horton's speech following my remarks:

ASK STATE SOLONS OUTLAW U.N. TREATY

(A statement addressed to the Legislature of the State of Colorado by T. David Horton [1])

Federal agencies created by the constitutional compact are attempting to change and destroy that Constitution by exercising powers that were not delegated to them, and which they do not have.

State legislators are aiding and abetting this subversion of the Constitution by failing to clarify the law and enforce the provisions of the Constitution within their respective States.

The failure of the State to act creates a presumption which law enforcement officers cannot overturn, this presumption is that the enaction of the State is tacit approval of the unauthorized attempt by the agent to exercise power beyond the authority granted.

The ordinary citizen also lacks the capacity to overturn the presumption. Failure of the State to clarify the law by statute allows the limits of authority placed upon the Federal agencies by the Constitution to become dimmed, and in this confusion usurpation flourishes.

The action proposed for the Colorado legislature discharges the duty that rests upon every State officeholder: To stop the overthrow of the constitutional compact agreed to between the States, and the subversion of the government of the State by the usurpation of its powers.

The so-called United Nations Treaty agreement, if valid, would surrender to foreign governments rights and liberties retained by the People under the Constitution. The President and Senate have purported to agree to this treaty, but they lack the power to do so.

These federal agents have no authority to exceed the limited and enumerated powers delegated by the States in the Constitution of the United States.

No federal agent has the power or the authority to modify or change the Constitutional Compact.

The proper Party to challenge the validity of the purported acts which exceed the authority granted is a party to the Constitutional Compact.

Only a State, acting in its highest sovereign capacity, can repudiate an attempt of its agents to change the Constitution, such as the purported membership in the United Nations Organization. And, this repudiation may not be done by any judicial proceeding. There is no court competent to determine this matter, or having the legal authority to do so.

The sovereign power of the State, through its legislative apparatus, can, however, legally clarify this question of attempted usurpation of governmental power.

The sovereignty of the thirteen Nations that later entered into the Constitutional Compact was established by the Treaty of Peace at the end of the Revolutionary War. Years passed before this sovereignties contracted with one another in the Agreement known as the Constitution of the United States.

"It is by so understanding the subject," wrote Martin Van Buren, eighth President of the United States, "that the Preamble (to the Constitution) is reconciled with facts, and that it is a Constitution established by 'the people of the United States,' not as one consolidated body, but as members of separate and independent communities, each acting for itself. It was in this form," he said, "that the Constitution of the United States was established by the people of the different states . . . ."

In so doing, the people of the different States acted in "their highest sovereign capacity." It is in this capacity, says Van Buren, that each State is a party to the Constitutional Compact.

"It is well established," he observed, "that, in that sense, the Constitution was submitted to the States; that, in that sense, the States ratified it. It is in this sense, of the term 'States' that they form the constituency from which the Federal Constitution emanated and it is by the States, acting either by their Legislatures or in Convention, that any valid alterations of the instrument can alone be made."

Under this Constitution so established by "The People of the United States" are fixed three separate and distinct agencies of Government, each with clearly defined and strictly limited powers.

The action which is proposed for the Colorado Legislature is to clarify the confusion that arises from the attempt by the agencies created by the agreement between the States to exercise a power which was not delegated, and which, therefore, these agents do not have.

The Constitution was binding on the thirteen original States when approved and ratified by the People of those States, and the States that have since joined in the contract, share in its privileges and obligations.

Each has the same obligation to the others to insure that the provisions of the Contract are enforced within its borders. All state officeholders are sworn to achieve this result.

Attempts by Federal Agents to exceed the limited powers of the Constitution are void and in law, are no acts at all.

However, when the State fails to repudiate the unauthorized act of its agents, a presumption arises that the State has approved. The vitality that is thus given to the purported act of the agent arises from the power of the State in question. The power does not come from the limited agents who had no power to act.

The farmer, who sends his hired hand to market to sell part of his potato crop, is in the same position when the hired hand sells the team and wagon. Other hired hands can deplore his conduct, but they are powerless to correct it. Only the farmer, the principal, can correct the excess of his agent. He must do this by an affirmative act of repudiation. If he acquiesces in the unauthorized act of his agent, he will be bound by it. It is not his agent's act, but his own, that makes it binding upon him. If he either does nothing, or affirmatively ratifies the agent's act, then he is bound by what the agent did. Only an affirmative repudiation of the agent's act can correct the situation.

To discharge their obligation to their People and to the other parties to the compact, state officeholders, both legislative and judicial alike, have an affirmative duty to enforce the provisions of the U.S. Constitution. This is a continuing obligation. It cannot be met merely by an empty oath taken upon entering into a state office. This is the reason for the language in the Constitution: "shall be bound by Oath or Affirmation, to support this Constitution"—thus imposing a continuing and subsisting duty upon these officeholders so long as they continue in office.

The socalled United Nations "Charters," and other matters arising under the purported authority of the United Nations Organization, are neither executing the laws passed by Congress, as the Chief Executive is obligated to do, nor are they judicial. They are attempts to exercise powers which can be made lawful only by the affirmative action of three-fourths of the States. Because these purported acts seek to have general application within the State, they are legislative in nature and require legislative power to correct.

Judicial power only is accorded to Federal Courts by the terms of the Constitution. Such authority is confined to the application of the law to a particular controversy as it affects the particular parties before a Court. A court is denied authority to exercise any form of legislative power. The assumption that the Supreme Court, in Marbury vs. Madison, declared a statute of Congress "unconstitutional" is a misunderstanding.

The Supreme Court has no such power. It can exercise only the judicial power conferred upon it by the Constitution. Judicial power does not include the right, or the ability, to declare an act of Congress "unconstitutional."

The confused understanding of this case arises from a failure to see what the Court did. The Court decided that as far as concerned the case before it, there was no act of Congress. What was before the Court was an unauthorized, and ultra vires, and therefore void act of the members of Congress.

---

[1] T. David Horton, Atty, Pioche, Nevada, member District of Columbia, Virginia, and Nevada Bar; member United States 9th Circuit Court of Appeals, California; member United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia; Chairman Executive Council, Defenders of the American Revolution, Inc.; Publisher, Square Dollar Series; Professional witness before numerous Congressional Committees in matters pertaining to Constitutional inquiries; Graduate Ohio State University, American University, Washington, D.C., Catholic University, Washington, D.C. and Hamilton College, Clinton, New York.

To strike down a legislative act requires legislative power. No court has such power.

But, in the exercise of its judicial function, it is the right and the duty of the Court to determine what is, and what is not, evidence in the case that is before it. In the case of Marbury vs. Madison the Court did not declare an "act of Congress unconstitutional." It exercised, in that case, judicial power, not legislative power. The Court examined what was claimed to be an act of Congress and found it to be beyond the authority granted by the Constitution, and therefore, void. There was no act of Congress. Thus, in excluding, as void, the purported act of Congress as evidence in the case before it, the Court exercised its judicial power, not any legislative power which it did not have.

In exercising its judicial power, the Supreme Court could no more un-make an act of Congress than it could make one. To do so requires the exercise of legislative power, and all legislative power granted by the agreement between the States is given to the Congress, not to the Supreme Court. However, since there was no legislative act of the Congress, the Court proceeded without recognizing as evidence in the case before it the attempt of the Congress to exceed its powers.

Similarly, in providing criminal penalties for attempts to enforce acts that have no authority under the U.S. Constitution, the State Legislature of Colorado is not declaring "unconstitutional" a treaty that is made with regard to the United Nations. It first inquires into the question of whether there was authority to enter into such a treaty, and upon finding that there was not, the Colorado Legislature provides criminal sanctions for attempts to enforce, in Colorado, that which was never in legal existence.

The reason that, heretofore, the people of the State of Colorado have been burdened with the purported acts of Federal Agents is because the State of Colorado has not repudiated, as unauthorized and void, the attempts of its agents to act beyond their authority. These purported acts have had effect in Colorado, not by reason of a non-existent authority of the Federal Agents, but because of the authority that the principal, the State of Colorado, gave to these purported acts by failing to repudiate the attempted acts of its Federal Agents.

Therefore, in conformity with the duty of the State of Colorado to its People and to the Sister States, and in consonance with the oath of office taken by the Governmental officials thereof, certain citizens of the sovereign State of Colorado have now petitioned their Executive and Legislative agents to find:

a. That the purported United Nations Treaty was beyond the authority granted to the Executive and Legislative Agents of these United States by the principals which formed and which now constitute the United States of America.

b. That the said United Nations Treaty is, therefore, void and of no force or effect in the State of Colorado.

c. That any attempt to enforce any provision of said United Nations Treaty within the limits of the State of Colorado is a felony.

The States, as sovereigns, can never be bound by their failure to act. However, they will be unable to correct such mischief as occurs by their acquiescence in the unauthorized acts of their agents, during the time when they fail to act.

The Legislature of the State of Colorado, by adopting the proposed statute, will clarify and make definite the law in the State of Colorado and will discharge the State's obligation to insure that the limits of the United States Constitution are respected within its borders.

Our Italian Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 1967

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, in the history and growth of America, few others have established a record of industry, integrity of patriotism to match Americans of Italian descent in this country. Few others have contributed so much to the arts, music, or agriculture of the United States as these fine citizens of many generations who now share our pride and loyalty for this great Nation.

Yet, Mr. Speaker, in the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice, Americans of Italian descent are inexcusably maligned in a paragraph which, in effect, labels Italian-Americans as the perpetrators of the bulk of crime in the Nation. This is ridiculous on the surface.

The Federal Bureau of Investigation, the CIA, the Treasury Department, the Secret Service, and the police forces in city after city in this country contain not only thousands of rank-and-file agents, and officers but many heroes against the very forces they are accused of abetting because of their race.

The President's report, which contained this libel against our fine American citizens of Italian descent, had much to deplore about so-called racial injustice and its relation to crime in the country. It then proceeded to bracket those of Italian derivation into the same statistical corner it deplores. If this is an example of justice and fairness sought by the President's Commission, Mr. Speaker, it is obvious we have wasted a lot of our taxpayer's money in permitting the study to be conducted.

In all of our wars, Mr. Speaker, including the present one, Italian-Americans have fought with bravery and honor. They send their sons and daughters into battle because they love this country and its freedoms. They save and scrimp and sacrifice to send their children to our finest schools and those children today as in the past serve in law, medicine, science, and the arts with intelligence and distinction.

To equate these great Americans with gangsters is to reduce reality to the absurd or worse. I doubt, Mr. Speaker, if there are anywhere in America, more law-abiding citizens in the main than those found in our Italian-American communities. In my own community most youngsters of Italian parentage are leaders in their schools, churches, and social activities. They are industrious, almost from birth; they are trustworthy, devoted and happy people, by birthright and by nature and they are proud to be Americans.

Many are serving with distinction on our courts, in the Congress and in our administrative agencies. And I would wager, Mr. Speaker, that the percentage of those who do stray from the straight and narrow road of honor and decency their parents train them to travel on is far less than that of most other ethnic groups.

I urge, Mr. Speaker, that by some appropriate means we recognize the injustice done to the Italian Americans by the President's Commission. Certainly in the hearts of the Members of Congress and their fellow Americans, our Italian friends, both here and abroad, deserve far better treatment than accorded them in this official document prepared at the President's behest. Certainly any official recognition of the report by this Congress should express full reservations of the unfairness and injustice of the conclusion regarding these friends and neighbors of ours. We cannot combat crime, Mr. Speaker, by racial indictment or blanket accusations irrespective of how high the authority may be that utters them. Crime, Mr. Speaker, in its growing proliferation and savagery, is an American problem, not an Italian-American problem. Certainly those assigned to the President's Commission must have recognized this fact. I do, and I am certain that this Congress, with equal conviction and with equal abhorrence for unfairness or slander against any of the good citizens in this country, will do so as well.

Congress Grandstands and Raises Debt Limit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HERBERT BURKE

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 1967

Mr. BURKE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I wish to draw the attention of the Congress to an editorial which appeared in yesterday's Miami Herald. This article expresses my sentiments very clearly, and I believe it merits close study by my colleagues in the House of Representatives. The editorial is as follows:

CONGRESS GRANDSTANDS AND RAISES DEBT LIMIT

An about-face by the House pinpoints the blame for our suffocating national debt.

Only two weeks ago, the House made a stunning gesture against deficit spending. Republicans, Southern Democrats and some congressmen who oppose the war in Vietnam carried the day. By only 13 votes, they slapped down the administration's request for a hike of $29 billion in the temporary debt limit.

The addition would have pushed the cost of debt service above $13 billion a year—more than the total being spent for several federal domestic projects.

Arm-twisters got busy. They changed the minds of several Southerners. They also brought onto the floor Northern Democrats who had been absent for the previous roll call.

The result was a margin of 21 votes to raise the debt ceiling by $29 billion over the next two years.

The compromise, if it can be called that, is that the increase on July 1 will be "only" $22 billion. The other $7 billion will come next year.

The announced purpose of those who originally rejected any addition to the debt was to force President Johnson to cut his budget. As we said at the time, the vote was a victory "for those who believe the steady spiral of debt must be checked and irresponsible spending must be brought under control."

Yet Congress shares that responsibility with the executive branch. The administration proposes; Congresses disposes—theoretically, at least. Government departments can spend only what Congress authorizes.

Yet the House has finished work on five-sixths of the President's $144-billion budget for the year starting July 1. Only $2.8 billion has been shaved from money bills passed by the House, and many of the "cuts" are likely to be canceled later with supplemental appropriations.

The paring of a mere 2.5 percent from that whopping $144 billion is no way to balance the budget and hold down deficit spending, which adds to the national debt.

If they really mean business, Republicans and economy-minded Democrats could combine their votes to slash funds for specific items. Otherwise, the final blame falls squarely on Congress, and its pirouetting over deficits is little more than grandstanding on the debt limit.

The House Armed Services Committee—Its Leader, Its Work, and Its Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 1967

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, the June issue of the Naval Reserve Association News contains an outstanding article on the achievements of our Committee on Armed Services, and in particular, of our distinguished chairman, MENDEL RIVERS. The article is the work of the Naval Reserve Association News' capable editor, Allen Scott. I am sure it will prove interesting reading for my colleagues and I include it here as part of my remarks:

THE HOUSE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE—ITS LEADER, ITS WORK, AND ITS RECORD

In the past several years, the Congress has written an enviable record in the depth and thoroughness of its work in the field of military legislation. This is true not only in the manner in which it has provided the necessary missiles, aircraft and ships, but in its concern for all military personnel, including the Reserves, and in its determination to fill a responsible role in regard to broad military strategic policies.

A careful study of the Congress reveals that the Armed Services Committee of the House of Representatives, under the leadership of L. Mendel Rivers (D., S.C.) has provided much of the impetus in the area of military legislation.

The Committee has 41 members—the largest legislative committee in the House—and they work in a completely nonpartisan manner. Spurred on by Mr. Rivers, the Committee maintains a work record perhaps unequalled by any other Committee in the Congress. In addition to four standing subcommittees, there is a permanent investigative subcommittee. And, at last count, the Committee had 12 special subcommittees covering everything from Anti-Submarine Warfare to Enlisted Promotion Policy.

In the 89th Congress, the Committee and its subcommittees held 396 meetings, produced 102 printed hearings and special reports, running more than 11,800 pages.

And at the rate the Committee is working in the present year, its efforts are likely to result in a new record in the 90th Congress.

Members of the Committee who might be tempted to complain about the pace of the work are faced with the realization that their Chairman is not asking any more from them than he is performing himself. Mr. Rivers is one of those members for whom the House is both a vocation and an avocation. Because of this, he operates on a schedule that has become well-nigh legendary on Capitol Hill.

He is in his office by seven o'clock every morning and it is a rare evening on which Mr. Rivers is not still at work at 7 P.M.

Newsmen seeking an interview with the Chairman are put to the test when they're told that a convenient time will be about quarter of seven—in the morning.

In addition, the Chairman maintains a busy speaking schedule, confined largely to addresses on military matters.

All of this effort by the Committee has produced a tremendous amount of legislation and at the same time, a marked upsurge in the morale of members of the armed forces.

Both Regulars and Reservists are aware of the achievements of the Committee and the role it has played in insuring a better way of life for all service people. And the armed forces are aware of where the leadership has come.

Although Mr. Rivers has been Chairman of the Committee for less than three years, he has become known as the champion of the servicemen and women, primarily because of his demonstrated leadership in the field of personnel legislation.

Under Mr. Rivers' leadership in 1965, Congress passed a pay bill more than double that recommended by the Administration. When the measure was first introduced, many people claimed the Chairman was merely "showboating" and that he had no real hope of getting so large a bill through the Congress.

It was passed with very little change and signed by the President. Since then, Congressional observers have been reluctant to predict that Mr. Rivers won't get what he sets out to secure.

To use his own most-quoted statement, one of the things he wants is to provide "a standard of living for the members of the armed forces as good as the standard of living they are defending." In pursuit of this goal, he has, in the past four years, shepherded four military pay bills through the Congress and has another poised for passage in the near future.

He led in 1963, while still a subcommittee chairman, the fight to gain a limited retired pay computation for those officers and enlisted men who retired in the early 1950's and before, when military pay was considerably below the present-day rates. Last year, he persuaded his Committee to approve a program of medical care from a civilian hospitals for retired personnel and their dependents and secured a broadening of the medical care program for the dependents of active duty personnel, including care from civilian doctors and, for the first time under a government sponsorship—aid for families with retarded children. The bill grew out of the recommendations of a subcommittee which Mr. Rivers had chaired in 1964. This year he appointed a special subcommittee to consider a dental care program for service dependents.

In addition to pay and the vital medical care benefits, Mr. Rivers and his Committee have supported additional military housing and a variety of other fringe benefits to provide a better way of life for all members of the armed forces. What is important, observers point out, is the attitude the entire Committee brings to the battle to improve the service standard of living—an enthusiasm that goes beyond any particular bill or group of bills. The Committee's efforts in taking the lead to provide new benefit programs have been recognized by the men and women of the armed forces. This is borne out in one statistic—an increase of more than 800 percent in the military mail received by the Committee since Mr. Rivers took over as Chairman.

In the field of Reserve legislation, the Committee's actions have reflected both its determination to have a meaningful voice in the formulation of policy and its recognition of the importance of people. It was characteristic of the Committee's outlook that when the Department of Defense's famous—or notorious—proposal to merge the Army Reserve and the National Guard was brought to light, the Committee did not merely block the merger. It dealt with the matter in great depth and wrote its own bill on the organization of the Reserves. This bill involved such fundamental policy decisions of the Reserve that it has been referred to as the "Reserve Bill of Rights." It affects not only the Army Reserve but the Reserve components of all services, strengthening the civilian and military leadership of the Reserve forces, guaranteeing minimum strengths and assuring sufficient combat-quality equipment.

This measure is the work of Subcommittee No. 2, chaired by F. Edward Hébert (D., La.), acknowledged as one of the foremost authorities on Reserve legislation.

In the area of broad weapons policy, the Committee has been willing to take the lead in attempting to force action in a number of areas where it felt the Department of Defense was making faulty decisions or unnecessarily delaying action on projects. Some of these areas, such as the anti-ballistic missile system, the continuation of manned strategic aircraft and others, have been extensively treated in the press and are familiar to all who follow military legislative developments. It should be mentioned, however, that the Committee supports the Defense Department and the individual services in the over-whelming majority of cases and does an outstanding service in mustering Congressional support for the Defense establishment.

The Committee has been especially attuned to the needs of the Navy. Mr. Rivers himself has been close to Naval matters since his early days in Congress during World War II when he was a member of a highly sensitive submarine warfare subcommittee.

In recent times the Committee has concentrated on two particular phases of Naval warfare.

The first is providing an adequate number of ships. In 1962, Mr. Rivers headed a special subcommittee on "Composition of the Fleet and Block Obsolescence of Naval Vessels." This subcommittee produced a formula by which the increasing obsolescence of the fleet could be judged and showed that the rate of shipbuilding would have to increase markedly if severe block obsolescence was to be avoided in the future. The study provided some impetus to increase ship construction but the Committee is not completely satisfied with the result and has continued to push for a faster rate of construction.

The second major area of concern is conversion to nuclear power for the surface fleet. This year the Committee forced through legislation to assure that two new guided missile frigates would be nuclear powered. The Administration had requested non-nuclear powered destroyers. The Committee is thoroughly convinced of the great advantages of nuclear power for surface ships and is firmly on record that nuclear power should be used in all new surface construction where it has proven to be feasible. Mr. Rivers has often pointed out that the arguments used to oppose the building of nuclear-powered surface vessels are the same as those used to oppose the building of nuclear-powered submarines in the early 1950s.

The Congress has always taken extraordinary pride in the leadership it assumed in the development of nuclear power for submarines which in turn led to the development of the Polaris missile which most Members of Congress concede is the Number 1 strategic deterrent in the world.

The great advances made by the Navy and all of the armed services are by no means accidental. Each step forward has been the result of effort and foresight on the part of leaders whose primary interest is the stature of the nation's defense and of the people who man this line of defense. Much of this credit goes to the House Armed Services Committee and its dedicated leader, Mr. Rivers.

Edge of Angry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE D. WAGGONNER, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 1967

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, bombarded as we are by a constant barrage of crisis, fear, and dissension, many of us are pummeled into a sense of resignation that this, after all, is just the way our Great Society works and there is nothing we can do about it. But Paul Harvey has for years been in the foreground of those who have repeatedly pointed out the absurdities that are being forced on the American people.

Last fall he wrote a short piece called "Edge of Angry" that summed up the growing frustrations and indignations of a large segment of the American public—frustrations bred not out of too little Federal help, but from too much.

The November elections showed that many people felt like he did—they were fed up. Indications are that more and more Americans are on the "edge of angry," and are just biding their time until they can show their resentment, not in the streets, but at the ballot box.

Paul Harvey's "Edge of Angry" is just as relevant as it was a year ago, and may be even more so next year. I include it for all to read:

EDGE OF ANGRY

(by Paul Harvey)

There is a time to be calm and there is a time to get angry.

There was a time when even Christ, His patience exhausted, found it necessary to storm into the temple with a short length of rope in one hand and start smashing up the furniture.

I am saddened when anybody walking down any road in Mississippi is shot from ambush.

But I'm on the edge of angry when Mississippi is castigated nationwide for the conduct of a Memphis, Tennessean.

And when Time, Life, Newsweek, The New York Times and TV hurl their editorial epithets of Mississippi for one shooting. . . .

And look the other way from a murder a day in New York, Los Angeles, Chicago.

I'm on the edge of angry when one man wounded in Mississippi crowds from the front pages and the nation's conscience 2,000 dead Americans in Vietnam.

I'm on the edge of angry when kookie college kids can demonstrate for peace at any price, but can't find time to shave and take a bath.

And when my government protects those who break the law and intimidates those who try to enforce it.

I am on the edge of angry when a college professor can limelight himself by proclaiming "God is dead."

While a free press ignores the greatest demonstrations of all, when 126 million Americans march every week to church!

And when Government tells me that I must sacrifice the fruits of my labor to support those who do not labor.

I'm on the edge of angry when the tax man says I get an allowance of only $600 a year to rear my legitimate son.

Yet the ADC welfare people would pay me $900 a year if I were an illegitimate one.

I am on the edge of angry, realizing that every baby is born into this one-time land of the free $1,700 in debt.

I am on the edge of angry when we make a big domestic to-do about saving on electricity and groceries in our White House while we dump millions into thankless foreign ports . . .

When we regulate and regiment and overtax and tyrannize our own countrymen while defending "freedom" for foreigners.

I'm real close to the edge of angry when I hear our hypocritical breast-beating over the urgent rights of one minority while we ignore the Amish and the Indians.

When we Judas-kiss our sons goodbye because we own weapons adequate to end any war, yet lack the guts to use them . . .

When we have everything going for us to create a Golden Age of arts, culture, sciences—and let unfriendly friends and friendly enemies siphon away this glorious opportunity.

Between now and November I may move "over the edge" . . . if the best either party can offer is a perpetuation of this sad circus, this pusillanimous political game of crisis—after crisis—after crisis—after crisis . . .

Indonesian Background Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 1967

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent article on Indonesia, written by a distinguished California attorney, Barry Brannen, who is also a captain in the U.S. Navy Reserve.

For those who are interested in knowing more about Indonesia and what has gone on under Sukarno, I strongly recommend this most informative article:

INDONESIAN BACKGROUND REPORT

(By Barry Brannen)

It may not be realized generally how anti-Western and particularly, how anti-American, by 1965, the regime of President Sukarno of Indonesia had become. The visage it had turned toward the United States was lowering and full of menace. But since the events of September 30, 1965, the changes have been profound. Sukarno remains, but the substance of his administration is gone and he may go soon. Nevertheless, the new rulers of Indonesia are proceeding cautiously.

A change in the country's relationship with the United States will come about, but it will come obliquely and gradually, as understanding and good will are demonstrated on both sides. And to assist in this process is an urgent and important function of American foreign policy.

Sukarno withdrew his country from the United Nations in January, 1965. There was no precedent for his action and he received applause only from Communist China. His foreign policy had become increasingly Chinese-oriented. He proclaimed that his policy of nonaligned neutralism was obsolete.

The struggle, as he saw it, was not between Communist and non-Communist nations, but between "newly emerging forces" and the "old established forces." In the former, he included not only the new nations of Africa, Asia and Latin America, but also all countries in the Communist bloc. All these he pitted against the established governments in Western Europe and the United States and called for an unremitting struggle against them.

He used familiar Communist terms to attribute to the Western Powers "imperialism," "colonialism" and "neocolonialism." All these policies he grouped under the acronym "NEKOLIM" which, as a matter of national purpose, he proposed to destroy.

So he attacked United States assistance to South Viet Nam and the landing of American troops in the Dominican Republic. These, he considered, were outstanding illustrations of "NEKOLIM." He rejected United States aid in the most uncompromising terms. He turned aside when the U.S. Information Agency at Jakarta was seized and the Consulate at Medan, Sumatra, was attacked.

American citizens who owned private property were increasingly harassed and, in the early months of 1965, the rubber plantations of the U.S. Rubber Company and the Goodyear Tire and Rubber Company were taken over by government decree. It became necessary to withdraw the Peace Corps and, except for some slight assistance at the university level, all United States aid came to an end.

This was the situation when, on September 30, 1965, the Communists, as they had done twice before,[1] attempted, by armed insurrection to seize political power in Indonesia. Six senior generals, including the Army commander, Lieutenant General Achmad Yani, were kidnapped from their homes and brutally murdered. The Minister of Defense, General Nasution, although wounded, escaped and, together with the head of *Kostrad* (Strategic Reserve Command), Major General Suharto, instituted stern counter measures. Order was restored and it became evident, almost immediately, that the attempted *coup* had failed.

At first, there was a welter of charges and countercharges and the picture was greatly confused. On October 1, the government radio at Jakarta said that the President was safe and remained in control. But it was apparent that the delicate power balance had been upset. Sukarno had attempted to combine the nationalist, religious and Communist elements into a political movement he called "NASAKOM," but the term served merely to gloss over the real conflict, in the body politic, between the officer corps (particularly of the Army) and the leaders of the Communist Party of Indonesia (PKI).

Once committed, the Army continued to react strongly against all Communist elements in the population. Sukarno sought to maintain the balance by deprecating the Communist motivation for the attempted *coup* and suggesting that the Communist movement in Indonesia could be given a nationalist complexion.

But a great upsurge of resentment against the Communists, and their putative supporters, the Chinese, swept the country. There were demands that the PKI be dissolved. The Secretary General of the Party, D. M. Aidit, went into hiding and wholesale arrests of Communists and their fellow travelers commenced in Jakarta.

Suharto was named Commander of the Army and Nasution, Hamengku Buwono, the much-respected Sultan of Jogjakarta, and Rusland Abdulgani were named to a Supreme Operation Command. On October 21, the Cabinet ordered the suspension of

---

[1] 1926 and 1948.

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

all Communist-affiliated organizations and, by the end of the year, the PKI was banned in most of the military districts.

Meanwhile, Moslem youth organizations had joined with other student groups to attack Communist Party headquarters and the Chinese-sponsored university at Jakarta. The students appeared to be surprisingly well led and gave evidence of prior, and militant, organization and control. The depth of anti-Communist and anti-Chinese feeling was unsuspected as violence spread to the outlying provinces. A quarter of a million Communists, fellow travelers and their Chinese supporters may have been killed and the count could reach half as much again, when all the facts are known. No such violent purge of a political party has been recorded in recent history.

On March 18, 1966, a *de facto* change of government took place. Fifteen members of Sukarno's cabinet, including Dr. Raden Subandrio, the Foreign Minister, were taken into custody and a new Cabinet was formed. The President remained the Chief Executive and Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces.

But an inner cabinet, or so-called Presidium, was formed to govern the country. It was composed of six members, of which three, viz.: Dr. J. Leimena, the first Deputy Prime Minister, Idham Chalid, the second Deputy Prime Minister, and Abdulgani, the third Deputy Prime Minister, appeared to be the choice of the President.

But these three were not given government functions or portfolios. Thus, the actual power rested with the other Deputy Prime Ministers: Buwono, Adam Malik and Suharto, for they were placed in charge, respectively, of finance and economy, foreign and political affairs and defense and military matters.

And emergency powers were given to Suharto to take, in the name of the President, necessary action to preserve the security and tranquility of the State.

The stature of the ruling triumvirate is impressive. The Sultan is popular throughout Indonesia. His integrity has never been questioned. Malik has been left of center in his political inclination, but so has the whole Indonesian revolutionary movement. He was never a follower of Peking or Moscow. Suharto is the hero of the events of September 30. Behind these three, and in full agreement and support, is Nasution who was given, also on March 18, high military command. It is possible that he was excluded from the inner cabinet because of the strong opposition of the President.

The new Presidium succeeded in bringing to an end attacks on the Communists and their fellow travelers. It authorized conferences, at the foreign minister level, to discuss the confrontation with Malaysia. The door to re-entrance into the United Nations had not been closed and the new Government walked through it.

Now all of this does not mean that Indonesia in its foreign policy has opted, necessarily, for the West. In the first place, it must be remembered that the country still has a revolutionary government. Its political motivation has always been strongly anti-colonialist. Any deviation from this concept would be considered counter-revolutionary and would not be accepted throughout the country.

Nevertheless, for many reasons, principally economic, the approaches to the West will be opened. Indonesian debts abroad are an astonishing $2.4 billion. Internally, the economy is catastrophic. Inflation, which Indonesia has had for 20 years, has gotten completely out of hand. Shortages are everywhere. In the last half of 1965, prices rose 500 percent and rice today costs 20 times what it did in prior years. The cost of living may have quadrupled during the first six months of 1966.

Immediate steps were taken by the new Government to acquire supplies of rice to feed the population. Otherwise, notwithstanding the urgency of the economic crisis, it has been required to move slowly. But once its power is consolidated, and it has a firm constitutional basis, it can be expected to institute a number of broad economic reforms.

The underlying strength of the Indonesian economy is apparent for all to see. Its production of crude petroleum in 1955 was 46 percent higher than in 1938. Its exports of rubber, petroleum and tin have always been huge earners of foreign exchange. These islands have all the basic resources: what is necessary is to administer and manage them efficiently.

The first requisite would seem to be a stable government supported by a consensus of the people. Because the present rulers of the country recognize this, they are making every effort to return their administration to a constitutional basis. What, in effect, they have proposed is a return to the system established by the Constitution of 1945.

Under that document, Indonesia is declared to be a democracy and the basic repository of the people's will is the People's Consultative Congress. It elects the President, but the President's power, as Chief Executive, is not unlimited, particularly in relation to fiscal legislation and the vital questions of war and peace. The powers of the executive are checked by an elective Parliament to which the President is not directly responsible, but which he cannot dissolve. The judiciary is declared by the Constitution to be independent.

The present Congress is appointive and provisional, but it was reconvened by the government in June, 1966. It remained in session for a month and, before adjourning, undertook to re-establish constitutional authority in the land. Thus, it:

(1) terminated the lifetime presidency of Sukarno, (2) revoked any authority on the part of Sukarno to issue individual decrees, (3) confirmed the emergency powers given to Suharto in March, (4) put an end to any form of communism in the State, and, of great importance, (5) it directed that national elections be held within two years.

The reconvention of an elective Congress will be followed by the assumption by newly elected executive and legislative authorities of their constitutional functions. In this way the inordinate powers heretofore wielded by the Executive will disappear, and, if the constitutional provisions are followed, will not return.

What, then, is to prevent an orderly return to constitutional forms? There is first the Communist Party. It is true that all members of the party have been removed from the provisional Congress, that the party is banned in most of the districts, that its leaders are dead, in jail or in exile and that there has been an extraordinary liquidation of the rank and file.

But it should not be thought that the Communist threat has perished. In 1926, and again in 1948, it was stricken down and yet revived to pose a massive threat in 1965. The Communists in China were utterly routed by the Kuomintang in 1934 and driven into the remote regions of North Shensi. But they came back after 15 years to take over the country.

In Indonesia, the party appeared to be politically bankrupt in 1952. But the Communist leaders succeeded in establishing a party which claimed in 1965 three million members and perhaps five times that many followers in various front organizations. The direction of its leaders, Aidit and Njorno, was extraordinarily skillful. Like Ho Chi Minh, in Indochina in 1946, they claimed their party represented a national movement without foreign ties and without foreign control of its ideology. And it was quite true that the PKI did not follow, entirely, either Russian or Chinese political doctrine.

Prior to September 30, 1965, there was little evidence that the latent militancy of the Communists was high. They did not appear to have forces militarily trained or equipped. What they seemed to be doing was building up a mass movement rather than creating and training effective combat units.

In the cities, the PKI presented the party as a cultural force and as a patron of the arts and sciences. And, increasingly, it turned its attentions to the villagers. That the PKI had become a major political force was evident when Indonesia held its first general elections in September, 1955. For the PKI obtained approximately 16.4 percent of all the votes cast.

Apart from the Communist Party, there is also the question of Sukarno. There is little doubt that he assisted greatly in the party's revivification, after 1952. He denounced those who pointed up the evils and dangers of communism. Constantly, he advocated a government of national union based upon the cooperation of nationalist, religionist and Communist political forces; and he stifled free political discussion and debate.

He banned the major enemies of the Communist Party, the MASJUMI and PSI parties, and he restrained the growing antagonism of the Army. He gave the PKI leaders ministerial offices, although he refrained from giving them executive control of any department of government.

Many groups, particularly of students, accuse him of clandestine cooperation with the Communists in the 1965 *coup*. They demand his trial and the Suharto government may take this important step this year.

This was not Sukarno's relationship to the Communist Party in the beginning. At the time of the Communist rebellion in September, 1948, he was compelled to ask the Indonesian people, in an emergency radio broadcast, to choose between the PKI leader, Musso, and himself. Thereafter, he was continuously attacked by the leaders of the PKI.

It is difficult to explain the change. Ideologically, to Sukarno, there are not Communists and anti-Communists in the world, but rather "haves" and "have nots." And he appears to include the Communists in the "have nots," to whom his fundamentally revolutionary principles are attracted. After the strong showing of the Communist Party in the 1955 elections, it is possible that he saw in the PKI the potential of a revolutionary mass party on which, in a politically turbulent future, he could fall back for support.

Sukarno remains an enigma and a problem. To many, he is still regarded as Bapak (father). He has a strong following in East and Central Java. But the political leaders who were jailed some four years ago have now been released. Hence, political opposition to Sukarno can be expected to grow.

He is an orator of great eloquence and force and a masterful politician. But, in the present circumstances, his past support of the PKI and his pro-China policies are substantial political liabilities. His present duties are largely ceremonial. Meanwhile, the Army has moved solidly into the power vacuum.

The speed and decision with which the Army took over control of political affairs in Indonesia should not be too surprising. For these officers have long been a major source of political and administrative power. Their number is relatively small, but they are well educated and highly trained. Some were educated by the Dutch. Others were trained by the Japanese. Some began their military career during the struggle for independence which commenced in 1945.

The military first clashed with the politicians over the strategic negotiations with the Dutch. Since independence in 1949, they have been involved almost continuously in the political struggle for power. In 1956, a number of senior officers believed that the parliamentary system was not working in Indonesia. There was great disaffection in the outer islands and little confidence in the capacity of the central government to solve the country's pressing problems.

Early in 1957, a "State of War and Emergency" (Keadaan Darurat Perang) was proclaimed by the Government for all of Indonesia. Opposition to this decree was immediately voiced by the military commanders throughout Sumatra and in Eastern Indonesia, although under the decree these same commanders received the status of military administrators of their regions and took jurisdiction over all economic and financial affairs. Dissatisfaction continued to grow until the dissident commanders, together with political leaders in sympathy with them, met on September 7 and 8 to formulate the Palemburg Charter.

The Charter attacked communism as internationally controlled and as contrary to three of the five principles of the *Pant Jasila*,[2] the basic political philosophy to which all Indonesians subscribe. It called for the prohibition of communism as a political movement. When they felt that their objectives were not being realized, they proclaimed, in 1958, the Revolutionary Government of the Republic of Indonesia. Thus, began a civil war which was to last for a period of three years.

Many of the dissident commanders returned to the fold in 1961, but meanwhile, the influence of the Army in Jakarta had been greatly augmented. In 1959, martial law was declared, and, in a new Cabinet, the Army received one-quarter of all Cabinet posts. At the same time, Nasution took over the prestigious office of Minister for Security and Defense.

Now the question arises inevitably: since the changes initiated on September 30, 1965, will not the Army retain its power and, ultimately, take over complete control of the Government? Certainly its senior officers have the power. But, a number of countervailing considerations would have to be considered.

In the first place, the military would not like to take upon itself the onus of destroying the progress of democracy in Indonesia. Moreover, the Army itself is composed of heterogeneous elements which, in the past, have not endured without controversy. Senior officers fought on opposite sides in 1958.

Perhaps, the most persuasive factor is the elite quality and character of the officers themselves. They believe in the future of Indonesia as a democracy. They believe in the essential principles of the *Pant Jasila*. And they eschew dictatorship whether it is in the person of an all powerful executive or in a social class. This feeling has been expressed by Suharto, who has publicly reiterated that Indonesia is a state based on law and not power. Before the People's Consultative Congress he did not press for authoritarian control, but for a return to Constitutional procedures.

Of course, the members of the officers corps are ardent nationalists. No pro-Chinese movement could enlist their support, today, on ideological or other grounds. But, there remains the ominous military liaison with the Soviet Union.

Since Sukarno negotiated the first line of credit in Moscow in September, 1956, Communist aid has almost equalled the aid from the West, but it was provided, largely, for the purchase of military supplies. In 1958, the first MIG–15 fighters appeared. In addition, a few IL–28 bombers, manned by the Indonesian Air Force, were observed. Thereafter, Soviet aid was extended to include MIG–21 fighters, armed with air-to-air missiles, and TU–16 medium bombers carrying air-to-surface missiles. Moreover, the Army obtained amphibious tanks and antillery and the Navy, a cruiser and a number of submarines and destroyers. By 1962, Soviet military instructors were attached to all services and Indonesian officers were receiving intensive training in Moscow.

It is idle to suppose that all of this has not given the Soviet Union a substantial interest and stake. But the disastrous effect of militarization on this scale has not been lost on the new Government. It was one of the vital factors that destroyed the Indonesian economy. In 1960, military expenditures amounted to at least one-third of the total regular budget and in 1961, to one-half. The result was that budget deficits were created and the country's foreign exchange supply was exhausted in the servicing of foreign debts. Moreover, it left Indonesia's exports, including good earners of foreign exchange such as rubber and tin, pledged to the Soviet Union for security.

In July 1966, the Congress approved the Government's efforts to end the war in Malaysia. The Philippines also brought its conflict with Malaysia to an end and the winds of peace are currently blowing strongly in the area. As Indonesia seeks to shore up its economy, the emphasis will not be on the need for arms and the influence of the Soviet Union may, already, be well past its peak.

The changes now taking place in Indonesia are of enormous significance to the Western Powers. In the first place, a number of developments have underscored the strategic importance of these islands. Of particular importance, are the increasing involvement of the United States in Southeast Asia and the evident inability of Great Britain to retain strategic responsibility in the Indian Ocean.

It is quite true that what in happening in South Viet Nam is not an isolated action. Strategically, what the Communists would like to do is what the Japanese succeeded in doing temporarily: to control the entire Southeast Asian peninsula and break into the Indian Ocean at will.

China has applied pressure from the north on Laos and Cambodia. Before September 30, 1965, the Communist-oriented Sukarno government applied pressure from the south on Malaya. Singapore, on the western tip of the peninsula, controls the Strait of Malacca, and, thus, the water corridor between the Pacific and Indian Oceans.

The departure of the British has created a power vacuum in the Indian Ocean. And there are many who suggest that the United States should fill it by establishing there a balanced Indian Ocean fleet. But this would not be possible, if control of the Strait were lost. And even a cursory glance at the map will show the strategic importance, in this respect, of the adjacent Sumatran littoral.

Secondly, it is possible that Indonesian political life will swing full circle. In the beginning, republican institutions flourished and democratic processes were free. In 1959, the parliamentary system collapsed and Sukarno governed the country with the support of the Army and of the Communist Party. Political parties were banned or they functioned without prestige, authority or power. The present trend is away from a personal dictatorship and toward a free society. And this is the type of society with which the West can reach accommodation on political and economic terms.

Hence, if the present leaders of the country turn West for support they should be able to find it. It should be recognized in the United States that although the military is in present control, it is exercising political power with great restraint. The world can now look forward to the free election of a permanent People's Consultative Congress and the time when the various departments of government—executive, legislative and judicial—will exercise their constitutional functions.

Indonesia is returning to a parliamentary system, with free political parties, and the democratic processes that characterized the early years of its independence. And it is the military that seems to be pointing the way. The West should view their efforts with sympathy and consideration and lend whatever assistance it can.

---

[2] The three: devotion to God, nationalism and democracy. The remaining two: devotion to humanity and social justice. For an account of the dissident movement, written when the issue was still unresolved, see the writer's article "Strength and Weakness in the Asian Littoral," in the December, 1958, issue of the United States Naval Institute Proceedings.

Minority Views of Hon. John Conyers, Jr., on the Conference Report on H.R. 2508, the Congressional Districting Bill

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 1967

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, to be a conferee on a bill, particularly a major item of legislation, is a great privilege. I was honored to serve with distinguished colleagues who have attempted to fashion an acceptable compromise between the House and Senate versions of this bill. Unfortunately I regretfully find that I must dissent from the report of my fellow House conferees and instead report to the House my dissenting views.

I felt that there were some provisions in the original House bill which, at best, would result in great confusion and much litigation, and, at worst, were unconstitutional and promoted gerrymandering. The Senate bill corrected these defects though it contained some provisions that I thought could reasonably be delayed until the 1972 elections in order to promote stability of congressional districts. After months of publicity and discussion of this matter, both in the Congress and throughout the country, I had hoped that the conference committee could fashion a compromise between the House and Senate versions which would satisfy the constitutional requirements of equal representation, but still reduce confusion, litigation, and instability of congressional districts. Unfortunately the conference report, in my opinion, raises more questions of unconstitutionality than did even the original House bill and it also could result in even more confusion, litigation, and delay than would be true if there were no bill at all. Finally the conference report could possibly result in a majority of the House of Representatives having to run at-large in the 1968 elections.

Because neither the House nor the Senate has held any hearings on their different versions of this bill, nor have hearings even been held on the overall question of congressional districting, many questions and items of confusion have developed regarding this bill. This conference report unfortunately adds to the confusion and questions since it eliminated provisions contained in both the House and Senate versions and substituted provisions contained in neither version. Of the many questions and problems that might possibly arise from this conference version, there are some particular points which I feel deserve special mention.

MANDATORY DELAY OF REDISTRICTING UNTIL AFTER THE 1968 ELECTIONS IN MOST STATES

Section 2 of both the House and Senate versions established specific standards for congressional districts for the 1968 and 1970 elections. Those provisions were completely eliminated from the conference report and the following language was substituted:

> SEC. 2. No State shall be required to redistrict prior to the 19th Federal decennial census unless the results of a special Federal census conducted pursuant to the provisions of the Act of August 26, 1954, as amended (71 Stat. 481; 13 U.S.C. 8), are available for use therein.

The statement of the managers on the part of the House states that—

> It is to be emphasized that nothing in the conference report prohibits a State from redistricting prior to the 93d Congress if it so elects.

However, the statement goes on to say that "The only requirement is that current census data be used if the redistricting is to be undertaken." From other references in the statement it seems to be clear that in almost all States current census data will mean that obtained through special Federal statewide censuses. Such special censuses can only be obtained upon a State's specific request and if it agrees to pay all costs. And according to the director of the bureau of the census, data from special Federal statewide censuses will not be available in most of the States, particularly the larger ones, in time to be used for drawing new districts for the 1968 elections. So though the bill itself states that no State shall be "required" to redistrict, the statement of the managers would seem to mean that, with almost no exceptions, no State legislatures would be able, even on its own initiative, to draw new districts for the 1968 elections.

PROHIBITION OF AT-LARGE ELECTIONS FOR THE 1968 AND 1970 ELECTIONS WAS ELIMINATED

The elimination of all provisions relating to the establishment of districts for the 1968 and 1970 elections and the substitution of the above language becomes particularly disturbing when it is noted that the prohibition of at-large elections contained in both the Senate bill and the House bill—with the exception of Hawaii and New Mexico—has also been eliminated.

What then is the effect of this bill on those nine States—New York, Tennessee, Massachusetts, Indiana, Texas, Missouri, North Carolina, New Jersey, and Illinois—whose congressional districts have been found to be unconstitutional and who have been ordered to draw new districts to be used in the 1968 elections? The bill specifically makes it impossible for the courts to "require" new districts to be established since it requires the use of special Federal censuses but which will not be available in most cases in time for the 1968 elections. The only way for the courts to both uphold their decisions enforcing constitutional rights but still attempt to uphold the guidelines established by this bill would seem to be the requirement that the Congressmen from each of these States run at large in the 1968 elections. Though new Federal special statewide census data would be available to create districts for the 1970 elections, the requirement that the 156 Congressmen from these nine States must run at large in the 1968 elections would seem to be quite extreme and unjustified.

Presumably the same situation could develop in Florida and Ohio where final adjudication of court suits regarding congressional districts are still pending. These two States have a total of 36 additional Congressmen.

Also would not the same situation develop in other States if court suits are now filed? Presumably this would be particularly revelant in those five States where no court suit is now pending but which were required to redistrict by the original House bill because the population deviation between the largest and smallest districts were more than 30 percent. The presumed assumption underlying that requirement of the House bill was that these States districting plans were clearly violative of the Constitution and should therefore be required to redistrict without even the necessity of a court suit. These States include California with a 95.1-percent variance, West Virginia with 39.2 percent, Georgia with 38.2 percent, Pennsylvania with 35.1 percent, and Nebraska with 31.1 percent. These five States are represented by 83 Congressmen. Would they possibly have to run at-large?

Since most of these 16 States I have mentioned are rather large States there is small chance that the Bureau of the Census could compile special Federal statewide census data in time for the 1968 elections. This would mean that possibly as many as 275 Members of the U.S. House of Representatives, a rather large majority, would have to run at-large in the 1968 elections.

Now, of cousre, the courts do have one other option, instead of trying to conform with this bill, and that is simply declaring that enforcement of rights guaranteed by the Constitution cannot be delayed because Congress prefers that up-to-date census data be used in drawing congressional districts, however preferable that might be.

Though some might suggest that the courts would then probably allow the current districts to be used I would suggest that is quite unlikely, to say the least. In nine States Federal court decisions have been handed down, many of them confirmed by the Supreme Court, holding that these current congressional districts are unconstitutional. That determination, and any possible future determination, was based and would be based on what the Constitution requires and Congress cannot by legislative act make constitutional what is not.

In my own opinion the courts will probably declare these provisions of the bill unconstitutional if they do not declare the whole bill unconstitutional. Certainly it would be far better for the conferees to meet again and attempt to fashion an agreement between the Senate and House versions which, while still reducing litigation, confusion and the constant reshuffling of congressional district lines, would still be constitutional, reasonable, and equitable.

The Debt Limit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 1967

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, 2 weeks ago the House of Representatives voted to reject attemps to raise the permament national debt limit from $285 to $365 billion. At that time I joined in voting against the proposed raise. In taking this action, I clearly stated that I felt it was vital to serve notice that expenditures for nonessential programs cannot continue their virtually limitless spiral. One of the best places to start, while showing the people of the United States that this House is serious about fiscal responsibility, was to defeat the increase in the permanent national debt limit so that a more realistic limit could be offered.

My personal concern for limitations on Federal spending is sincere and well established. I have voted for many reductions in Government expenditures. One such vote was for better management of agricultural incentives and a decrease in agricultural subsidies. The current agricultural subsidy program, over recent decades, has been a prime example of Federal excess and mismanagement. We simply cannot continue handouts to, and spoon feeding of, the farmers to the extent that they become dependent and no longer continue to make their own way. In this, as in other areas, we must make every effort to insure that the American people get a dollar's worth for every tax dollar spent.

One of the most potent ways of reinforcing this effort is support for the Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN's proposal to require the Treasury Department to cease annual interest payments of $1.9 billion on $45 billion of bonds held by the Federal Reserve Bank of New York. These bonds, according to Mr. PATMAN, have been paid for in full. Yet the United States continues to collect almost $2 billion a year in interest on these bonds. In addition, these bonds, which should have been retired, are included in the national debt. This practice and the collecting of interest should be halted immediately.

When the rule for the debt ceiling came to the floor no amendments were allowed. I voted against the rule in order to permit Mr. PATMAN's important proposal to reach the floor. Unfortunately those of us who voted for amendments were defeated. However the $365 billion permanent limit was also defeated.

More recently the national debt ceiling was presented to the House again with a permanent limit of $358 billion—$7 billion less than the rejected limit. This was a significant cut and was clearly a response to the House's interest in a limit to nonessential spending. Notice had been served and cognizance of it registered. We must cut back on nonessential programs. We in the Congress must exercise constant and continuing prudence.

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

With the proposed national debt ceiling reduced $7 billion, we must now, in the words of the distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, "Turn to the business of insuring the financial stability of our country." We must recognize that the essential needs of our Government are great and the permanent debt limit must be raised in accordance with those needs. The ceiling must be raised from time to time to keep pace with the growth of this great Nation. Much like any business which is undergoing tremendous growth, the Nation's debts necessarily increase with expansion.

Our gross national product—the sum of all goods and services produced in the United States—is rising constantly. Our population is rising—there are more people to feed, clothe and house. Our per capita income is rising—we have more money to spend. Consequently, our debt must also rise.

But how far has the national debt really gone? Has it increased 500 percent since 1950, as has personal debt? No it has not. Well then has it increased 350 percent since 1950, as has State and local debt? No it has not. Well then has it increased over 200 percent since 1950, as has corporate debt? Again, it has not. The national debt in 1967 is but 28 percent higher than it was in 1950. I do not mean to confuse matters with extensive statistics. However the subject is complicated and hopefully some statistics will serve to clarify this issue. Perhaps the most significant statistic is that the national debt at present is only 42.9 percent of our gross national product. Seven years ago it was 57.8 percent of the gross national product. Moreover, after World War II, the national debt was greater, one-third again greater, than the total output of our goods and services.

In 1946 the national debt comprised 58 percent of the U.S. total indebtedness—today that figure is 22 percent. Twenty years ago per capita Federal debt—the debt figured for each person in the United States—was over $1,900—today that figure is $1,628. Thus, in a broad perspective such as this subject demands, the proportionate impact of the national debt has declined steadily in the past two decades.

Therefore, I joined with my colleagues in a responsible solution to this problem and voted to pass the reduced debt limit. We have achieved much of what was desired when we first voted 2 weeks before. Our point was made; our message conveyed. We then had to act promptly to pass the reduced debt ceiling to prevent the chaos that would have surely ensued had we not.

Social security payments would have lapsed and veterans on pensions would have lost their sole means of support. Letters have poured in from the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars warning us of the potential disaster. Our national credit would have become imperiled and we would have been forced to pay a greater rate of interest on our indebtedness. If this had been allowed to occur this great Nation simply could not have met its myriad financial obligations.

Most importantly, even after this issue is settled, let us not relax our vigilance to achieve and maintain responsible fiscal policy. Let us not cease in our determination to take real and meaningful action to decrease nonessential spending and increase our financial credibility.

AFL-CIO Urges Government To Ease Political Curbs on Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 1967

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, Thomas E. Harris, associate general counsel of the AFL-CIO, recently stated his views concerning the outmodel Hatch Act.

Mr. Harris pointed out that the Hatch Act may have been necessary decades ago, but today it is outmoded, misunderstood, and misinterpreted.

Not only do I fully agree with Mr. Harris' views, but I introduced on January 16, 1967. H.R. 2346, a bill which would amend the Hatch Act to permit all officers and employees of the Federal Government to exercise the full responsibility of citizenship and to take part in the political life of our country. I have been sponsoring similar legislation since 1957.

Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article stating Mr. Harris' views, which appeared in the June 9, 1967, edition of the Seafarers Log, a publication of the Seafarers International Union.

The article follows:

AFL-CIO URGES GOVERNMENT TO EASE POLITICAL CURBS ON EMPLOYEES

WASHINGTON.—An AFL-CIO spokesman has urged greater freedom for government employees to be active in partisan politics.

The broad bans of the Hatch Act may have been necessary decades ago, but today they are outmoded, misunderstood and misinterpreted, declared Thomas E. Harris, associate general counsel of the AFL-CIO. "Surely the country is more politically mature than that now," he said on Labor News Conference, a weekly network radio interview, Tuesdays at 7:35 p.m. EDT on the Mutual Broadcasting System.

"Nearly all federal employees and an ever-increasing number of state and local employees' are affected by the Act, he said, and most of them want the right to be politically active "of their own choice and of their own volition."

Harris proposed three basic changes in the law and its administration:

Clearer definition of federal jobs whose incumbents influence policy and "should be continued under restrictions—at least with respect to running for federal political jobs."

Give all other federal employees fredom to "be politically active—to be active in parties—even to run for federal office."

Turn back to the states and municipalities the right to determine which of their employees should be restricted.

"Nobody questions the desirability" of prohibiting government employees from using their "official authority or influence for the purpose of trying to affect the results of an election" and protecting them from political pressures from their superiors, he declared.

But, Harris pointed out, the jobs of "the great bulk of federal employees" involve neither administration of policy nor "any sort of political discretion whatever." Further, he declared, "there are criminal statues" that safeguard workers from political pressures, and "we certainly have no intention of altering or in any way weakening those."

Private American Fund Gives $50,000 to the U.N. Trust Fund for South Africa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 1967

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, as member of the National Committee of the American Committee on Africa, I have noticed that our Government has yet to make a contribution to the 1965 United Trust Fund for South Africa, although our representative did support its establishment. There is finally a request in the fiscal 1968 budget of the State Department for up to $150,000 for U.N. activities in South Africa. I hope this sum is approved and that a sufficient portion of it is allocated to the Trust Fund.

Under unanimous consent I insert in the Appendix of the RECORD, a text of a letter from Mr. George M. Houser, Secretary of the African Aid and Legal Defense Fund, to the U.N. Trust Fund chairman, His Excellency Mr. Sverker C. Astrom, and a press release from the Defense Fund in respect to its $50,000 grant to the U.N. Trust Fund for South Africa:

PRIVATE AMERICAN FUND GIVES $50,000 TO THE U.N. TRUST FUND FOR SOUTH AFRICA

George M. Houser, secretary of the African Aid and Legal Defense Fund, announced today that the Fund had just made a grant of $50,000 to the United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa. In making the grant the Trustees of the AALDF were conscious of the fact that the United States Government has not as yet made any contribution to the U.N. Fund, although it voted for its establishment in 1965. In a letter to Sweden's Ambassador, Sverker C. Astrom, the Chairman of the U.N. Trust Fund, Mr. Houser said, "We realize that . . . the contributions come primarily from the governments of U.N. member nations, not from private groups such as the African Aid and Legal Defense Fund. . . . We would hope that our contribution, coming from a private American fund, would motivate the U.S. Government to respond by giving to the U.N. Trust Fund for South Africa in the near future."

The U.N. Trust Fund will use the money to assist the victims of South Africa's policy of apartheid and the dependents of the many imprisoned opponents of that white supremacist regime through legal defense, family relief, education and refugee aid. The African Aid and Legal Defense Fund was established in 1966. Its purposes are to defend human and civil rights of needy Africans by providing or financing legal assistance; to provide medical relief and educational funds to Africans, particularly refugees; to render aid to indigent Africans suffering from economic, legal or social injustice; and to inform the American public about the needs of Africans for charitable and educational assistance. The Trustees of the Fund include: Theodore Tucker, Chairman; Edler Hawkins, Vice-Chairman; Andrew Norman, Treasurer; and George M. Houser, Secretary. Other trustees are: Daniel Bernstein, Edward Gray, Marvin Harris, Sophia Yarnall Jacobs, William B. Landis, Allan Morrison, Israel Mowshowitz, and Mason Sears. (See Enclosed Letter)

AFRICAN AID AND LEGAL DEFENSE FUND,
New York, N.Y., June 9, 1967.

H. E. Mr. SVERKER C. ASTROM,
Chairman, United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa Permanent Mission of Sweden to the United Nations, New York, N.Y.

DEAR MR. AMBASSADOR: This letter is to inform you that the Trustees of the African Aid and Legal Defense Fund have voted to contribute $50,000 to the United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa. This amount is a concrete manifestation of our wholehearted support for the purposes of the U.N. Trust Fund. We firmly believe in the U.N. Fund's aims and activities in providing legal defense for the victims of apartheid legislation, in giving relief aid to the families of political prisoners and in granting aid to the many refugees from South Africa.

We realize that the needs of the recipients of U.N. Trust Fund aid are great and that contributions come primarily from the governments of U.N. member nations, not from private groups such as the African Aid and Legal Defense Fund. But our Fund is particularly glad to make this grant in view of the fact that our own government has not yet contributed to the U.N. Fund. We would hope that our contribution, coming from a private American fund, would motivate the United States Government to respond by giving to the U.N. Trust Fund for South Africa in the near future.

Sincerely,

GEORGE M. HOUSER,
Secretary.

The 100th Anniversary of an American Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN E. WILLIS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 27, 1967

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, this year is a special occasion for the people of the Third Congressional District of Louisiana, which I have the honor to represent in Congress.

One hundred years ago, one George W. Dunbar, a Louisianian, succeeded in canning shrimp near the island of Grand Terre, making this valuable and delicious food available to the public for the first time.

The year 1967, therefore, marks the 100th anniversary of an American industry which is vitally important to our economy.

In commemoration of this century of shrimp canning, the American Shrimp Canners Association will conduct ceremonies to mark the event at Grand Terre, Wednesday, July 12, 1967.

Mr. Speaker, the shrimp industry is one of the most important in my district and I want to salute the American Shrimp Canners Association for their recognition of the 100th anniversary of its beginning.

Foreign Aid Exposed as Glaring Failure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 27, 1967

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the House Foreign Affairs Committee is laboriously struggling through a markup in the 1968–69 foreign aid bill. The taxpayers will have little relief when the majority on the committee hammers out this latest spending authorization.

Despite irrefutable evidence of the program's failure it has been, through its entrenched bureaucracy, a permanent international boondoggle. However, there are penetrating and objective comments from knowledgeable sources exposing the failure of the program. One such article appeared in this morning's Chicago Tribune in a special column by Mr. Henry Hazlitt. I insert this article in the RECORD, at this point:

FOREIGN AID EXPOSED AS GLARING FAILURE
(By Henry Hazlitt)

The middle east crisis has exposed more glaringly than ever the futility and bankruptcy of our foreign aid program.

That program has certainly not served the interests of the United States. On net balance it has even hurt most of the foreign recipients.

We have spent the incredible total of some 136 billion dollars in foreign aid to some 100 nations around the globe. Among the major arguments made for this program is that it would buy friends and allies, stop the spread of communism, and prevent wars. What evidence is there that it has done any of these things?

In country after country, month after month, riotous mobs in nations receiving our aid have stoned our embassies, torn down our flag, set fire to our libraries.

Since the beginning of the program the United States has given the Arabs 3.8 billion dollars, of which more than one billion went to Egypt. Yet the Arab countries call us their real enemy, and half of them have broken off diplomatic relations with us.

INDIA CRITICIZES US

We have given India nearly 6 billions. We have poured in food as has no other country to try to save the population from famine. Yet the Indian government has sided with Yugoslavia in supporting the Arabs and criticizing us. This is notwithstanding the fact that Egyptian President Nasser's closing of the Suez canal is threatening a break in the American food pipe line to India.

So much for the gratitude, friends, and allies that our foreign policy has got us.

Has it prevented wars? The billions in aid that we gave the Arabs for peaceful purposes have made other funds available for war. Israel bought mostly French weapons; but, as the Citizens Foreign Aid committee has pointed out, the billion dollars we gave Israel in economic aid facilitated the purchases.

The point is even more clearly illustrated by our direct military aid. As reported in the Chicago Tribune, we gave 27.6 million dollars military aid to Israel to discourage attacks from Egypt or Syria. We gave 66 millions in military aid to Jordan, presumably to keep Nasser from taking it over. But just as Pakistan and India used United States-given military equipment to fight each other, so have the middle east nations.

Has our aid on net balance even helped the countries to which it has gone? No doubt in some cases, in which the aided governments in the main encouraged free enterprise, it has. But in India, for example, our aid has been used to subsidize socialistic "planning" policies that have tended to prolong and intensify the poverty and famine.

AID ACTUALLY HURT

If most of the countries that have been getting our government-to-government handouts without conditions—or, worse on condition that they embrace socialist "planning"—had instead tried to encourage domestic private investment or to attract foreign private investment, they would have had to adopt internal reforms that would have made them far better off economically than they are today.

Our foreign aid program has not merely been a complete failure abroad. It has helped postpone our own capital development, to unbalance our federal budget, to create chronic deficits both in our own budget and in our balance of payments, to bring inflation at home, and to undermine confidence in the dollar abroad. If as a result we are finally forced to suspend gold-convertibility of the dollar, that will hardly contribute to the economic stability of the rest of the world.

Deepening Resignation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD M. FRASER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 27, 1967

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson's reorganization plan is designed to provide more effective administration for the government of the District of Columbia.

There is considerable evidence that this reorganization comes none too soon. The Federal City has recently lost several high-quality administrators as a result of resignations. This is only one indication that something is seriously wrong with the District of Columbia government.

I include an editorial from today's Washington Post with my remarks:

DEEPENING RESIGNATION

The city of Washington is now suffering a desperate shortage of administrators capable of running the massive new Federal social programs. Within the past year, there has been an almost complete turnover among the officials who run the city's war on poverty, its welfare department, and its housing authority. One went off to Mayor Lindsay's New York, another to the Federal Government. Others simply got fed up and left. Wherever the action is, indisputably it is not at the District Building. Now, with the resignation of George W. Grier, the city loses the man who is chiefly responsible for drafting Washington's plan for Demonstration Cities aid, for organizing the city's part of the children's summer programs, and for connecting the city government to the new neighborhood councils.

Unlike other cities, Washington is not developing a corps of sensitive and sophisticated administrators to handle the new Federal-urban ventures. To the contrary, the best men are leaving. One reason is a power struggle between the civilians and the Army officers in the District Building; the civilians are losing. Another reason is congressional harassment and eccentric appropriations.

President Johnson talks of making Washington a model of the Great Society. But, as the administrative requirements of these programs are made tighter and more demanding, the city's ability to meet them is steadily declining.

Amending and Extending Title V of the Higher Education Act of 1965

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN N. ERLENBORN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 26, 1967

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 10943) to amend and extend title V of the Higher Education Act of 1965.

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 10943, the bill now under consideration. It is my opinion that it is obvious this bill represents a vehicle for the continuation of the Teachers Corps. However, I further believe it is more than that. It also represents an attempt—and I believe a successful attempt—to coordinate the programs for providing the educational personnel that we need for the schools of this country.

Mr. Chairman, I believe all of us remember the recent history of the Teachers, Corps program. It is a rather thorny history which weaves itself through the course of the last Congress. In addition earlier this year the administration attempted to divide the authorization for the Teachers Corps, placing a part of it in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and leaving a part of it in the Higher Education Act.

Mr. Chairman, this House very firmly rejected that approach and now we are back with what I believe is a more responsible approach designed toward coordinating the programs for providing additional educational personnel, rather than the fractionalization of these programs.

Mr. Chairman, I support this legislation because I am satisfied it is designed to expand somewhat the present programs in teacher education, without in any way interfering with the responsibility of local or State school boards or colleges and universities.

Mr. Chairman, the changes made in the Teachers Corps, for example, leave the recruitment, selection and enrollment of teachers and teacher interns entirely at the local level in cooperation with institutions of higher learning. The State educational agencies would have approval powers over the disposition of Corps members and of their training. The financial arrangements now provide for substantial local contributions for the cost of the Corps. The whole focus of the program is shifted from Washington to the States and the communities.

The Teachers Corps in this bill bears little resemblance to the Corps as constituted now, and it is significantly changed from the Corps as proposed by the administration, which seems to have a fixation on centralism and Federal dictation as the only way of doing things.

Mr. Chairman, there are other, many other, changes throughout this bill which move away from the administration position of unlimited discretion in the hands of the U.S. Commissioner of Education and toward the concept of a creative Federal role without Federal domination.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Quie] has expressed the intention to discuss those changes in considerable detail. Therefore, I shall merely indicate their general effect.

This bill also, Mr. Chairman, moves in the direction of a consolidation of Federal programs in education. In our study of the Office of Education last year our special subcommittee held hearings all across the country, and almost without execption, educators, and school administrators expressed concern to us about the growing tangle of Federal programs.

There are so many separate although similar authorizations that all but the largest and most sophisticated of our school systems are having difficulty keeping up with them. The very number of Federal programs in itself has come to be a burden on our educational system. This bill is a small step in easing that unnecessary burden.

While I support this bill I feel there may be additional ways in which we can tighten up its language and sharpen the congressional intent to limit the Federal role in teacher education. With this in mind, we should give very careful consideration to amendments offered to this bill.

In particular, it would be well I believe to give close attention to the authorization levels established by the bill. They are suggested by the administration in lieu of the open-ended spending power that they originally sought, and I am not satisfied they are completely justified.

For example, title V, part C, currently carries an authorization of $275 million for teacher fellowships for fiscal 1968. The bill reduced this to $195 million for fiscal year 1969, and $240 million for 1970. However, the President has only requested $35 million for this purpose for next year. It is apparent to me that $100 million could be cut from this authorization for each of 2 years and still leave room virtually to triple the program in 1969 should the budget situation permit, and to quadruple it in 1970.

In practical terms it is doubtful that the program can accommodate even this enormous expansion in such a short time, and retain its high quality.

These enormously exaggerated authorization figures tend only to confuse and to mislead the academic community as to the Federal intentions on funding. I personally am much opposed to the "wild blue yonder" approach to authorizing appropriations when everybody in the Government knows that the money will not be appropriated. Our authorizations should match our realistic appraisal of the rate at which the programs are to be funded.

Therefore I suggest that we review these authorizations right here on the House floor in the Committee of the Whole House.

I also want to enter a note of caution for my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. While I support this bill in its present form, I cannot and shall not support it if the other body changes it back to the original administration-sponsored form with vast and loosely defined discretionary power for the U.S. Commissioner of Education. The very fact that the administration constantly requests such delegations of authority for the Commissioner of Education, knowing of the determined opposition to such grants on both sides of the aisle in this House, leads me to be more than a little suspicious of their ultimate design for this legislation.

In my judgment we have a very good bill now before us thanks in large part to the perception and skill of the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. Green], and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Quie], and the administration I believe will be well advised to leave it alone.

Procedure for Control of Mob Violence Will Have To Be as Threatening as the Crime

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. McCLURE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 1967

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. Speaker, the serious problems of our time often seem to defy solution. This is particularly true of the mob violence that flares with increasing frequency on our city streets. While we ponder solutions, a small town editor in my district, far removed from big city violence, has come up with the most thought provoking statement I have seen on this subject.

The editor is Chris Christensen, and his paper is the Lewis County Herald published in Nezperce, Idaho. Believing that Christensen's comments on mob violence will be of interest to all Members, I include his editorial in the Herald's June 15 edition as a part of my remarks.

> Many years ago, a powerful king captured a large and wealthy city. While the burning and looting was going on he said to his captured rival, "Do you hear what my soldiers are doing to your city?"
>
> The conquered king replied, "No, They are doing it to your city."
>
> So clear was the wisdom of that reply that the conquering king ordered the needless destruction stopped.
>
> Many years ago, in other words, the people in power at the time had sense enough to put a stop to needless destruction of property in their cities. Today, we seem to lack the wisdom of those of many years ago who lived in a world of much less cultural knowledge than our present one.
>
> Day after day we pick up the daily press or turn on the electronic media and are appalled at the needless destruction going on

in our nation as a result of mob violence and activity. Property is burned and looted, people are killed and injured, and still we do nothing constructive to put an abrupt end to this senseless activity.

When these acts are allowed to continue in our large cities we are weakening the organization which provides and assures us a livelihood in a democratic state.

It's about time some drastic steps were taken in opposition to the mob violence that flares up in our cities. This action will have to be severe, as our leaders have allowed the situation to get out of hand. The action will have to be severe enough to threaten the life of those participating in mob activity. Sounds like a drastic step, but those participating in the mob actions are threatening the life of our citizens, so the procedure for control will have to be as threatening as the crime.

Leaguers Honor George Haney, William Payne

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 27, 1967

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, the Leaguers, Inc., a Newark, N.J., organization dedicated to the advancement of youth, has long received my personal admiration for its dedicated service toward helping young people to help themselves. The work of the Leaguers, which was founded in 1949 by Mrs. Reynold E. Burch, has greatly aided various cultural and educational programs in Newark.

On Friday, June 16, two of my constituents were among those honored by the Leaguers for their meritorious service in numerous civic and political programs. I have long respected the fine work of both these men and I would like to make their achievements a matter of record.

The Citizen of the Year Award from the Leaguers went to Mr. George J. Haney, who has greatly served his community in numerous capacities. At present, Mr. Haney is the resident manager of the Newark Office of Auchincloss, Parker & Redpath, members of the New York Stock Exchange. He is also a lawyer, having received his prelegal training at Georgetown University and his L.L.B. degree from Rutgers University Law School at Newark, N.J.

Among his many affiliations are the following:

Member of the Securities Advisory Committee of the Attorney General's Department of the State of New Jersey by appointment of the Governor.

Chairman of the Mayor's Advisory Committee of Transit and Transportation in Newark.

Secretary and member of the executive committee and board of directors of the New Jersey Region, National Conference of Christians and Jews.

Vice president and member of the board of directors of the Arthritis Foundation of New Jersey.

Chairman of the John F. Kennedy Memorial Library Fund of Northern New Jersey.

Member of the board of directors and executive committee of the Leaguers, Inc.

Vice president of the executive board, Robert Treat Council, Boy Scouts of America.

Chairman of the Ballentine Award Committee for hero policemen and firemen in Newark.

Honorary member, American Finance Association of Seton Hall University.

Mr. Haney has been honored by the following: the Newark Star Ledger in 1963 as one of the State of New Jersey's outstanding citizens for his achievements in finance; the New Jersey Region, National Conference of Christians and Jews as its Brotherhood honoree in 1965; and one of the 25 persons selected by the Prudential Insurance Co. of America as Newsmaker of the Week in 1966.

As a result of his service in World War II and the Korean war Mr. Haney was awarded the Bronze Star, Purple Heart, Combat Infantry Badge, and the Army Commendation Ribbon.

The Leaguers Merit Award was presented to Mr. William D. Payne, who was born and raised in Newark. He too has been active in numerous civic and charitable programs in the city. He received his B.A. degree in political science from Rutgers University.

Mr. Payne is presently employed in the extrenal affairs department of the Prudential Insurance Co. of America where he is assistant manager of community relations.

He has been affiliated with the Leaguers Inc. for many years. Mr. Payne is a former president of the organization's board of trustees and he is presently vice president of the board. He was chairman of the Leaguers 1965 fundraising dinner which realized sufficient moneys to complete payment of the group's new building.

He has participated in many local and national civil rights programs for the past 15 years. He is a founder and presently a trustee of the United Community Corporation, Newark's central antipoverty agency, and a member of the UCC's personnel committee. He was formerly the president of the NAACP's Youth Council.

He has long been a leader in the fight to gain equal opportunity for all citizens of Newark. He has especially been active in programs to improve the quality of education in Newark's schools. Among some of Mr. Payne's other affiliations are: a member of the Governor's Citizens Council for the Office of Economic Opportunity; and a member of the NAACP; the editorial board of Newark Commerce Magazine; and the Business and Coordinating Council.

The numerous achievements of these two men should serve as an example to the citizens of our cities to strive toward more active participation in the affairs and operations of their neighborhood. It is my hope that others will follow in their footsteps.

Payoffs and Bribes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 27, 1967

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, much has been said recently by many people who are interested in the welfare of our Nation regarding recent decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States as well as the cause for these decisions. Apparently it is generally agreed among those that keep up with the decisions of this Court that the majority of the Justices are not interested in interpreting the law or the Constitution, but desire to foist upon our people their own political philosophy and notions of what the law should be. Some people had high hopes that in future appointments the Chief Executive would attempt to place on the Supreme Court men who would endeavor to bring some order out of the maze of chaotic decisions which have recently been made. Apparently this has not been done in the most recent appointments to the Court.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial which appeared in the News of Lynchburg, Va., on Thursday, June 22, 1967, which points out rather cogently the situation now confronting us so far as a majority of the Supreme Court is concerned:

PAYOFFS AND BRIBES

President Johnson's nomination of Thurgood Marshall for the U.S. Supreme Court points up again that appointments to that court—the dominant power in the land—are not made on the basis of personal and professional qualifications but as political payoffs and bribes.

For Mr. Marshall was nominated primarily because he is a Negro. That was the overriding consideration. He was selected because of his race, and not in spite of it.

Both the President, who nominates members of the court, and the Senate, which confirms them, must bear the blame for these appointments made for political reasons. Both betray the American people by placing their own political gain above the nation's welfare.

In recent years, the judicial power vested in the Supreme Court has been twisted into an assault upon those principles which form the foundation of the Constitution. And this has come to pass largely because of Presidential misuse, and Senate endorsement, of the power of appointment to the court.

Dwight D. Eisenhower has rendered his country great service. But his appointment of Earl Warren to the court, as a payoff for Warren's help in electing him President, has done the country far more harm than all of Eisenhower's long and honorable military service has done good. Mr. Warren's concept of America and American institutions is far different from that of the men who wrote the Constitution which Mr. Warren took an oath to uphold. More than any single American jurist since John Marshall, Earl Warren has subverted that Constitution, twisted it to reflect his own "social preferences", to create an America diametrically opposite to that which the framers of the Constitution had in mind.

Other recent appointments to the court have followed the same trend; all were political payoffs or bribes.

As U.S. News and World Report noted this week, William Brennan was appointed mainly because of his religion. He is a Catholic.

Arthur Goldberg was appointed because he is a Jew. Abe Fortas was appointed to succeed him in the "Jewish" seat on the Court.

Byron White was appointed because of his political help in electing John F. Kennedy.

And now, Thurgood Marshall has been nominated because he is a Negro.

Some of these men are more qualified professionally than the others. But their professional qualifications were not taken into consideration until after they met the religious, ethnic, racial and political criteria. Men far better qualified were passed over—because they did not meet these other, political, considerations.

Harsh words. But that's the way it comes out, any way one looks at it. No recent appointments to the Supreme Court have been made on the basis of professional qualifications, but on the basis of the man's race, ethnic origin, religion, and political ideology—to solidify the political power of the man in the Presidency.

And it is these men who are warping and reshaping the character of American life and American institutions, according to their own sociological and ideological preferences. They do not uphold the Constitution; they "interpret" it to sanction their destruction of it.

The Honorable Sam Yorty Speaks to Jewish Rally

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED REINECKE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 1967

Mr. REINECKE. Mr. Speaker, the following topical remarks were made by the mayor of Los Angeles, the Honorable Sam Yorty, on Sunday, June 18, during a Jewish rally of more than 20,000 people at the famed Hollywood Bowl. It is my privilege and pleasure to share them with my colleagues at this time:

Mayor Sam Yorty told a jam-packed Hollywood Bowl audience of more than 20,000 people that "although Israel has won the military fight, there is still great danger ahead as the Communists try to salvage something out of this war."

Speaking Sunday afternoon before a Jewish rally for Israel, Yorty warned that the issues are not completely settled and that just because the Soviets have had the mask of deceit torn from their faces, the Russians will still try to win at the conference table.

"Israel," said the Mayor, "needs the support of right thinking people from all over the world."

Yorty said that during his visits to the Arab countries in 1954 and again in 1964 he found them unwilling to accept resettlement in Arab lands. "We must," said Yorty, "disband those Arab refugee camps as they have been and are still a constant threat to peace!"

"The Arabs," said the Mayor, "would not listen to reason but instead reaffirmed their hate for the people of Israel and are having their sons take blood oaths to drive the Jews into the sea!"

Yorty reminded the crowd that the U.S. has paid 70% of the cost of keeping these professional refugees at a cost to our government of $25 million per year while the Communists have paid nothing.

"Yet, the Communists are working among these refugees building up a hate for the U.S., toward the very hand that is feeding them," said the Mayor.

Yorty said it is "perfectly obvious, no matter how people fiddle around with the question, this war started when Nasser closed the Gulf of Aqaba."

"The Gulf must never be closed again . . . ever," he said . . . "and the makeshift borders of Israel must be corrected, straightened out and made defensible."

"Arab neighbors must recognize Israel, sign a peace treaty and start economic and cultural exchanges which will benefit the whole area." "Technical aid from Israel can be a tremendous benefit to the Arabs whose country is backwards when it comes to technology," said Yorty.

"I would like to see Arab students at the great university in Haifa learning this technology so they can bring its many benefits back to the Arab countries and help their people. The Arabs must rid themselves of the constant inflammation and influence brought to them by the Communists."

"People like Nasser and the others who have brought about this war must not be permitted to hide behind the Russian conference, asserted Yorty, but they must be made to face the Israelis at the conference table."

"The cause is not over and the fight is not won . . . much danger lies ahead," concluded Yorty.

Elkins Park, Pa., Youth Serves as Volunteer to America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 1967

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. Speaker, much is heard today about the activities of our young people and sometimes what we hear and read is not too heartening. But the vast majority of our youth are, in their own ways, making important contributions to our society.

I felt my colleagues would want to learn of the activities of one of the latter, a constituent, Harris Neuman, of Elkins Park, Pa., who is working as a Volunteer in Service to America. The Jewish Exponent recently told of Mr. Neuman's activities and I am taking this opportunity to bring the article to the attention of our colleagues:

VISTA VOLUNTEER LETS CONSCIENCE GUIDE HIM

When Harris Neuman, 23, graduated from the American Academy of Dramatic Arts and then went on to study at the American Mime School, and various other theatrically-oriented institutions, his future seemed clear.

Until his conscience caught up with him.

Neuman, son of Mr. and Mrs. Nathaniel Neuman, of Elkins Park, was a third-year dramatics student when he decided to join Volunteers In Service to America. "Although my parents would like me to lead a more conventional existence, I know that they are proud of what I am doing. I decided that I have a whole life ahead of me to do the other things, and I am really wrapped up in this."

The youthful volunteer is now assigned to Project Challenge, a rehabilitation program for convicted felons at the Youth Center at Lorton, Va., 20 miles outside of Washington, D.C.

Neuman teaches math and algebra and anything else open to him. He operates about 14 hours a day, six days a week. Three evenings of his week are devoted to meeting with 10 men for a socio-drama session, where fears and hostilities towards families, law authorities and employers are acted out.

"It's like a rehearsal for life," Neuman said. "The men can see alternative ways of dealing with a situation or a person."

And once a week the VISTA volunteer meets with a creative drama group at the center. "The men feel strongly about things," he said. "If I could get them to react on the stage the way they do off stage, they would be terrific actors."

Neuman's evenings are also filled with conducting similar sessions in socio-drama with parolees of the District of Columbia court, and with patients at St. Elizabeths Hospital, a mental institution.

Prior to joining VISTA, Neuman taught emotionally disturbed children at the Greentree School in Germantown.

His new life among the inmates at the center is not always easy, but Neuman seems to have found the answer. He sometimes finds himself under fire for the way he dresses; sporty tweed jackets and pin stripe shirts. But he's determined to maintain his identity. "I can't pretend to be something I am not, and I think they end up respecting me more for it," he said.

According to Neuman, enough dishonesty already exists towards inmates in reformatories. "The philosophy of the youth center is to rehabilitate, not to punish," he pointed out. "It is therapeutic. But often, the promise is far greater than the fulfillment, and then the trust is lost."

Working with Neuman in the ambitious experiment at the institution, is another volunteer, Peter Howell, 21, also of Philadelphia. The two boys have introduced art, music, literature and dramatics into the lives of junkies, assaulters and thieves.

But when 90 inmates, of their own volition, show up for a performance of a special dramatic show, Neuman knows he's getting through.

Viewing a performance of a play dealing with drug addiction, one addict, who had never seen a play before in his life told Neuman. "This is where it's at! We can really see what you're into! I never knew that that people like you existed."

But with all the activity, Neuman is anything but stagnant. He's already hard at work planning for the future.

The conscientious volunteer plans to enlist for a second year in VISTA, working with drug addiction in New York City.

Then he wants to finish his college education, hopefully at New York University, then enter into a career as an acting teacher.

Pfc. Curtis Harman Killed in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 1967

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Pfc. Curtis J. Harman, a young soldier from Maryland, was recently killed in Vietnam. I wish to commend the courage of Private Harman and to honor his memory by including the following article in the RECORD.

CURTS HARMAN, ON GUARD DUTY IN SOUTH VIETNAM

A 21-year-old Baltimorean, Pfc. Curtis J. Harman, has been killed in Vietnam, the Defense Department reported yesterday.

Private Harman, a graduate of Poly who lived at 319 Audrey avenue in Brooklyn was killed about 3 P.M. last Saturday by small-arms fire while guarding an outpost somewhere in Vietnam, his father, Curtis C. Harman, said last night.

ENLISTED IN ARMY

His son had enlisted in the Army in June 1966, after finishing his second year at Loyola College, Mr. Harman said.

Although he was in the ROTC, he "couldn't wait and enlisted. He volunteered for Vietnam . . . said he wanted to get in it before it was all over."

Mr. Harman said his son "read constantly, all about the military," had majored in political and military science while at Loyola and "wanted to make the military a career."

In addition to his parents, Private Harman is survived by a sister, Mrs. Joyce Filipiak, of Munich.

Increased Social Security Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 1967

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege along with many other Members of the House recently to introduce legislation to update and strengthen our social security laws to provide among other things a 20-percent increase in payments to those of our older Americans who are eligible, and indeed to enlarge the percentage of our population eligible to take part in our social security program.

The Council of the City of Philadelphia, one-fifth of which I represent, recently saw fit to adopt a resolution memorializing this House to support that 20-percent increase. I present the text of that resolution at this time:

RESOLUTION NO. 315

Resolution memorializing the members and chairman of the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives of the United States to support the proposed increase of twenty per cent in Social Security payments

WHEREAS, The Senior Citizens of our Nation include a great majority of elderly men and women who rely solely upon the Social Security payments they receive for their subsistence, care and shelter; and

WHEREAS, Living costs under present conditions make it difficult for these elder citizens to meet their financial needs without a realistic increase in Social Security payments; and

WHEREAS, President Johnson's proposal that Social Security payments be increased to not less than twenty per cent is unanimously endorsed by the members of the Senior Citizens' Central Association of Philadelphia; therefore

Resolved, By the Council of the City of Philadelphia, That we hereby memorialize the chairman and members of the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives of the United States to favor and support the proposed increase of twenty per cent in Social Security payments.

Resolved, That certified copies of this Resolution be forwarded to Chairman Wilbur Mills and the members of the House Ways and Means Committee as evidence of the sincere sentiments of this legislative body.

Certification: This is a true and correct copy of the original Resolution adopted by the Council of the City of Philadelphia on the eighteenth day of May, 1967.

PAUL D'ORTONA,
President of City Council.

Attest:

NATHAN WOLFMAN,
Chief Clerk of the Council.

Resolution on Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 1967

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, it is time that the United States took stock of its stand on foreign aid.

Today the United States is the wealthiest nation in the world, yet since 1949 the percentage of our gross national product which we devote to foreign aid has steadily been decreasing. Considering the phenomenal increase in the number of nations requiring economic assistance since that date, this decrease is even less justifiable. We cannot continue to isolate ourselves from this growing problem.

The General Board of the National Council of Churches has offered a resolution to this effect which I now submit for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

RESOLUTION ON FOREIGN AID ADOPTED BY THE GENERAL BOARD OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL OF CHURCHES, JUNE 1, 1967

The General Board of the NCCCUSA affirms its support of governmental foreign aid, especially development loans and technical assistance.

The General Board, however, does not consider that the present governmental expenditures adequately discharge the responsibility of the USA for economic aid and technical assistance, and therefore records the following convictions.

The moment has come for a renewal of American commitment to international development. Public indifference and governmental retreat must be overcome. New attitudes, new policies, and new actions are required. The poverty of two-thirds of the human family is the starkest economic fact of our time. It is more than a material condition: it is a moral outrage. The sufferings and the degradation of the poor have been made intolerable in our generation, because the nations together now possess the technological capacity to lift the burden of poverty from the backs of every people. Everywhere poverty has become a seedbed of social and political revolution.

Those who know God in Jesus Christ discern afresh that His love seeks justice in the very midst of the revolutions of the disinherited. As the gap between the rich nations and the poor nations tragically expands, the imperatives of our faith cry for justice and for compassion. These imperatives require not merely inner attitudes. They call for action. They confront the United States with special force because it is of all nations the richest and most powerful. This nation has done much to develop the science and technology which provide the promise of triumph over world poverty and which have persuaded us to launch a war on poverty at home. But our very affluence tends to muffle the cries of human need and to stifle our response to them. We in the richer nations are failing to fulfill our obligations to the two billion children of God who are poor, our brothers and sisters who bear His image and are beloved of Him as much as any one of us. We are failing morally, and we are failing politically. The policies of the United States government reflect this failure. As the costs of international development have mounted, the Executive has proposed and the Congress has voted successive decreases in the American (dollars) commitment. In 1949, during the Marshall Plan, the United States provided 2.78 per cent (approximately $7.5 billion) of its gross national product as economic aid primarily for European reconstruction. By contrast, the US in 1967 provided only 0.57 per cent (approximately $3.8) of the G.N.P. for economic aid throughout the world. It is true that aid to Europe and economic and technical assistance to the developing nations have called forth unprecedented funds from the United States government and have made substantial contributions to human welfare. Yet it is also true that United States development policy is in retreat at the very time that the wisdom of experience is ripening, the fruits of scientific study are becoming genuinely significant, and the opportunities for acceleration in development are rising. It is patricularly unfortunate that the shrinking of American vision and support comes at a time when bitterness and despair are growing in the poorer nations.

The General Board notes with gratitude that these and other matters of far reaching importance concerning development have been put before the world in the Encyclical "Populorum Progressio" ("On the Development of Peoples"), and heartily commends to its member churches the study of the Encyclical together with the thought of Protestant and Orthodox churches on these matters. In particular the General Board expresses its gratitude at the prospect of collaboration with Roman Catholic brethren and pledges its own efforts toward this end.

The General Board recognizes that development in the complex world of the 1960's involves economic, political, cultural, and psychological matters that go far beyond governmental financial aid and technical assistance. Therefore, it is of the most immediate urgency that present governmental aid, especially in the form of development loans and technical assistance, be continued and increased. Any aid program should be correlated with a trade policy helpful to developing countries, lest the USA contribution in these areas diminish to the vanishing point. Funds for increased aid in agriculture, family planning and education are of particular importance.

We stress the necessity of greatly increased emphasis upon multilateral provision and administration of aid through the UN, its Specialized Agencies, and other international institutions. Any process of sharing or providing of aid from rich to poor is difficult. Multilateral international channels reduce these hazards by providing a framework in which unilateral pressures are reduced, and the dignity and freedom of both receiving and giving nations are enhanced. In this connection, furthermore, it is important to make increased provisions for aid funds to be less dependent upon their being spent within the U.S. economy.

The General Board directs that this resolution be communicated at once to the appropriate members of Congress, and requests the member churches take immediate steps to register similar convictions on their own part, and on the part of their individual members, to the members of Congress.

The General Board requests early completion, for its consideration and action, of the study of international justice and development now under way in the Department of International Affairs.

Its Time To Be Stiffly Correct

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 1967

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, with the recent performance at the United Nations, in which diplomats of many lands pounded the propaganda drums, using the United States as a whipping boy in far too many instances, it is well to evaluate the attitude that we ought to maintain in dealing with foreign lands. A very penetrating and imaginative article by Jenkin Lloyd Jones in the Washington Star on Saturday, June 24, is worth pondering and, therefore, I place it in the RECORD at this point:

IT'S TIME TO BE STIFFLY CORRECT

(By Jenkin Lloyd Jones)

The time may have arrived when the American people should quit trying to be so puppy-dog friendly to the world and assume a more dignified posture of "correctness."

Americans are, perhaps, the friendliest people on earth. Part of it comes from our bigness and isolation. At home we see few foreigners. An alien accent intrigues us. In any erudite cocktail party the crowd is generally thickest around the foreign visitor.

We have, for a long time, suffered from a missionary guilt complex. It's an interesting combination of smugness and concern. We are proud of the "American way." We feel sure that our outlooks and techniques are suprior to those of most other countries. We would like to share our wisdom. Hence, the missionary. On the other hand, we are easily guilt-ridden because of our relative opulence. So we give, often lavishly.

Our British cousins in their great days were somewhat like us, but not much. They were eloquently and sometimes arrogantly proud of the empire. They wept a little for the heathen. They had their heroic missionaries and teachers who went forth into the pools of ignorance and fever to discourage infanticide, stop cannibalism and outlaw suttee. But hard on their heels came the flag and the traders.

As the Basuto chief bitterly told one of my old anthropology professors, "When the white man came here he had the Bible and we had the land. Now we've got the Bible and he's got the land."

Among the more recent colonial powers you might classify, in descending order of humanity, the French, the Dutch, the Belgians, the Germans and the Japanese. The Russians were never well enough organized in the 18th and 19th centuries to seize distant lands from primitive peoples. But in their conquest and treatment of the European satellites they would go to the bottom of the list.

Only the Americans were haunted by their strength and nervous about their prosperity. Only the Americans set forth wistfully to make the world love them.

Funny thing. The Israelis bombed a U.N. force in the Gaza strip and nine Indian and two Brazilian soldiers were killed. The diplomats in the U.N. Security Council all tried to top each other in expressions of regret and grief. But 54,000 Americans died in what was billed as an official U.N. action in Korea. How much weeping did the United Nations do for our boys?

There is the human inclination to make the friend of your enemy your enemy. All our largesse to India was forgotten the moment we gave arms to Pakistan. And the Pakistanis damned us for our aid to India.

For many years Americans tried to make themselves loved in the Near East. The American University in Beirut has educated generations of Arab leaders. We were lavish with Fulbright scholarships. We poured tremendous aid funds into Arab nations, including those whose oil-rich sheiks bought Cadillacs by the shipload and rented whole hotels in Switzerland.

But because America has promoted Israel we were hated. And when Gamal Abdel Nasser, in the bleak early hours of June 6, tried to alibi the collapse of his air force by claiming that American and British planes had shot it down, the whole Near East bought it immediately. Mobs converged on the American embassies. The American libraries went up in flames.

Maybe we ought to relax. Maybe we should quit trying to be loved. Maybe we should assume that we will be spit on. America is a complacent dragon, a fine beast on which to beat with wooden swords and have one's picture taken standing on its back. Hatred of it is a huge convenience for a government entangled in its own stupidity.

So be it. If we expect to be hated we will be freer to do intelligent things. We won't have to keep shoring up corrupt regimes in the hope that they will become reliable friends. We can spend our foreign aid more wisely. We can seal off some famous rat holes.

We can say, "Look, your excellency. Your mob burnt our free library, which happens to be the biggest and best in your country. If you want it back, jail the leaders and build us a building. We'll just replace the books."

Or, "See here, your highness. We figure you'll gut us the first time it's convenient, but in the meantime we'd like to help your people. If you've got a sound plan and a way to keep your gang from cracking the safe we may bankroll it."

This kind of talk will make more sense to more people than our past habit of turning the other cheek with a sickly grin. Everybody's pal—hell; It just didn't work. Let's be stiffly correct for a change, and maybe they'll conclude we're not so crazy after all.

How the Extreme Left Reacted to the Middle East Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 1967

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, almost everyone is now aware of the false accusations which the Communist world has repeatedly lodged against Israel and the United States.

In a recent article, Meir Kahane, of the Jewish Press, analyzed the reaction of the extreme left throughout the world and the Nation, to the Middle East crisis.

I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article which appeared in the June 23, 1967, edition of the Jewish Press.

The article follows:

HOW THE EXTREME LEFT REACTED TO THE MIDDLE EAST CRISIS

(By Meir Kahane)

The international Marxist network was unanimous in its condemnation of Israel as an "aggressor" and as a "tool of imperialism." None, not one, saw any justification for Israel's actions. All saw the war as an outgrowth of American "imperialism" and an "oil lobby plot" with the Israeli government as a willing lackey of the United States. All backed the United Arab Republic and the other Arab states in their struggle against the "imperialist aggression."

There was, however, a certain difference between the line taken by the Communist parties of the West and others. In general, the stand taken, not only by the Chinese Communists and their allies, but also by the Soviets and their East European satellites was extremely harsh, with not a word concerning Israel's right to exist. The Western communists, however (aside from the Peking-oriented ones) were caught in a dilemma. They were perfectly willing to go along with the Communist line but they were faced with the fact that the vast majority of citizens in the free countries were solidly behind Israel and looked in horror at anyone who tried to seriously suggest that the Jewish state was an aggressor. In addition, they realized that their Jewish members would be disturbed, if not worse, at any such action. They, therefore, swallowed the line—with some hedging. Let us analyze this in specific terms.

CHINESE AND SATELLITES

The Chinese, of course, dedicated to a policy of extermination of Israel, spoke out early in the crisis on behalf of the Arabs. Indeed, some days before Nasser began the sabre-rattling that led to the war, Peking had celebrated "Palestine Day" in pomp. The "holiday" which is celebrated every May 15, led the official Chinese organ Renmin Ribao to exclaim: "As long as the Palestine people and the other people persist in the struggle they will finally defeat . . . U.S. imperialism and its tool for aggression, Israel, and the aspiration of the Palestine people to return to their homeland will surely be realized."

By May 25, as Nasser's troops were mobilized along the borders of Israel, a Reuters report from Peking stated that Kuo Mo-jo president of the Academy of Sciences, said at a rally of 100,000 that "China stood with the Arab countries against what he called United States and Israeli aggression." He also blasted those who were "struggling the just struggle of the Palestinian people." With the outbreak of hostilities and the swift advance of the Jews, rallies were held, daily, in Peking to support the Arabs and a government statement declared: "The 700 million Chinese people absolutely will not allow United States imperialists and their collaborators to ride roughshod and commit aggression everywhere."

The Chinese allies, North Vietnam and the Vietcong, added their complete backing of the Arabs. President Ho Chi Minh, of North Vietnam on June 6, condemned the attack on the Arabs (it might be noted that the following day, South Vietnamese Premier Nguyen Kao Cao Ky, declared: "I'm for Isreal.") The Vietcong Liberation Radio, on June 8, broadcasting from its secret jungle base in South Vietnam, promised to "step up the war against the Americans" as a way of backing the Arabs in their struggle "against imperialism."

In the United States, the pro-Peking Marxists echoed the Chinese line. Thus the fanatical Youth Against War And Fascism outfit, through a spokesman, Deirdre Griswold, declared that "Israel, in fact, is acting as a pawn of Western interests. Our people, with their sympathies, are for the Arab revolution . . . Israel is artificial." (Let it be noted here that many of this group's members are Jewish and—as they back Communist policy in the Middle East—so do they in Vietnam).

The Students for a Democratic Society, an increasingly radical group which has taken stands that parallel more and more the Chinese line, said, through its Jewish president: "Our people do not believe that the U.S. should be the policeman in the Mideast or the Far East." Naturally, the Arabs answered with a loud Amen.

Thus, the Chinese and their allies, as far as the Soviets are concerned, they and their Bulgarian running dog, clearly showed the media of television, radio and the press, their fanatic hostility toward Israel. The other East European Communists colonies joined the Russians in bitter condemnation of Israel and in thinly veiled threats against the Jewish state. None of them had a word to say against the violent Arab threats to destroy Israel; none of them declared that Israel had a right to exist.

On the other hand, the Western Communist parties were forced to twist and turn to satisfy both their masters in Moscow and the liberals they were trying to attract. This led to attacks on the Israeli Government cricles (rather than on Israel itself) and a description of the Israelis as tools of Washington who, nevertheless, had a right to exist if only they would abide by the Communist book. All this, however, could not disguise the fact that the Western Communists agreed fully with the general Marxist assessment of Israel:

THE AGGRESSOR

This, for example, is how the Worker, the Communist Party's newspaper, re-wrote history in its description to its readers of the background of the Mideast crisis even before hostilities began:

"The present Middle East crisis had its beginnings last November, when the Israeli government, using the excuse of raids by Palestine Arab refugees, invaded Jordan and destroyed three villages . . . Most of the Arab states immediately began to develop mutual military relationships in preparation for further attacks by Israeli military forces.

"This uneasy situation prevailed until May 12 of this year when Premier Eshkol, impatient at the lack of reaction, threatened strong military action against Syria . . . It was three days after this Israeli threat that UAR President Nasser put his country's troops on the alert to warn Israel against what he considered to be an impending invasion of Syria. At the same time, he requested the United Nations to withdraw its troops from the Gaza Strip and the entrance to the Gulf of Aqaba both UAR territory.

When the Israeli regime continued its belligerent attitude toward the Arab states, Nasser ordered a blockade to the entrance of the Gulf which is the Strait of Tiran.

"It is this blockade, which is being used as the excuse for the Johnson Administration for its threat of military intervention. (Ed. Note: The reader should note that during this same period UAR forces had been mobilized and sent to the border, a Jordan-UAR military pact had been signed, Syria had pledged to attack Israel and the Worker ignored all these things and attempted to show that the sole problem was Aqaba which they immediately proceeded to downgrade and over which they backed Nasser completely. We continue the Worker's distortion:)

"The Strait of Tiran is at no point more than 5 miles wide. It is entirely UAR territory. The Gulf of Aqaba in its entire 125-mile length, is bordered by the UAR and Saudi Arabia. The only Israeli territory on the gulf is the small port of Elath at the extreme northern end.

"Despite all this Washington claims that the Straits of Tiran and the Gulf of Aqaba are international waters and must be free to ships of Israel. The only basis for this is a unilateral statement by (U.S. Secretary of State John Foster) Dulles to Israel. . . .

"But neither the UAR nor Saudi Arabia ever agreed to the declaration. As a matter of fact the UAR has contended that it has been in a state of war with Israel since 1948 and can therefore exercise belligerent rights.

"The Israel regime however is pressing the issue . . . to the limit, continuing to threaten war if the UAR does not capitulate. Yet the Gulf of Aqaba is not essential to Israel's world trade. Elath is a small port with a population of 13,000. Shipments from that port can be directed to the Mediterranean.

"Fewer threats to the Gulf of Aqaba would undoubtedly reduce tension."

Thus, the American Communist's Party interpretation of the events that led to the hostilities. It amounts to a complete backing of Nasser's stand. It amounts to a complete sellout of Israel. It coincides fully with international communism's declaration of war against the Jewish State.

In only one way, did the American Communists differ—publicly—from their Moscow masters. Of necessity, because of tension among some of their Jewish members and the fear of alienating the liberal community, the long harangue just published above is followed by ONE short paragraph which reads:

"At the same time belligerent statements by Arab governments calling for Israel's destruction aggravate the tension and play into the hands of Wall Street imperialism." Finis. That is the extent of Gus Hall's compromise with liberals. He protests against Extermination of Israel since this is too crude for sensitive liberal stomachs. Dismemberment of the country by a return to the impossible 1947 borders is fine; the total return of more than a million Arabs dedicated to wiping out of Israel is demanded; the ending of Jewish immigration is advocated; only Extermination should be eliminated—because it plays into Wall Street's hands.

The fact that Nasser was in no mood to listen to the Worker's advice and would surely have exterminated Israel had force not been used against him hardly bothered the Worker. The only real purpose of the traitors on West 23rd Street is to follow the Party Line totally and the little, cynical bone thrown to their more sensitive Jewish members and the liberal community is a small price to pay in the battle against imperialist freedom.

Danish Petition To Stop the Bombing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 1967

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, yesterday's New York Times carried a full-page advertisement announcing the petition of 227,000 Danish citizens to the President of the United States to stop the bombing of North Vietnam and to pursue the three-point peace program outlined by Secretary General U Thant of the United Nations. These 227,000 persons whose names were voluntarily gathered, represent only a portion of Danes who, according to public opinion polls in Denmark, are opposed to the war in Vietnam. This petition reveals the concern of the population of a nation traditionally friendly to America and makes a sincere and fervent appeal to our country to take that first and essential step which could break the existing stalemate for negotiations.

This is especially significant as the movement begins within our own Nation to make a similar appeal through similar means to obtain negotiations now. A national effort to collect signatures is now underway and in every major city in the United States, offices are being set up to coordinate the drive. Sponsors of negotiations now share the conviction that there is no hope for a negotiated settlement as long as bombing of the north continues. I include the content of this advertisement from the New York Times in the Appendix of the RECORD:

MESSAGE FROM 227,000 DANES TO PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON: STOP THE BOMBING

Over a two-month period, from the 7th of February to the 7th of April, 227,000 Danes including some 10,000 high school students signed this petition to the President of the United States to stop the bombing of North Vietnam. They took their lead from UN Secretary-general U Thant's first three-point peace program stressing the fact that an end to the bombing is the first step to negotiations. It was emphasized that this was not an anti-American move. On the contrary: the signers consider their appeal also as a greeting to those Americans, including people from all walks of life, in and out of government, working for an immediate end to the war in Vietnam. They were moved by their grave concern about the development of the war in Vietnam.

TO MR. KRAG

Representatives for the signers went to Christiansborg Castle on the 27th of April and delivered the signatures to the Prime Minister of Denmark, Mr. Jens Otto Krag, asking him to make the lists available to all members of the Danish Parliament. And then to have Parliament make it quite clear to the Government of the United States that an influential section of the Danish people want the bombing stopped unconditionally as a first step towards negotiations and peace.

FEAR

Public opinion polls conducted in Denmark have shown about 50 percent of the population against the war in Vietnam with only about 15 percent for it. The rest don't know. The men and women collecting the signatures by pressing doorbells found only about one third of the people contacted dared to sign. The rest expressed either fear, or doubt about the effectiveness of this kind of action.

THE ROYAL THEATRE

Besides pressing doorbells, some of the 4,000 Danes active in collecting the signatures circulated lists at offices, factories, theatres, etc. At Copenhagen's Royal Theatre 287 members of the staff, the actors and the Royal Ballet signed the petition.

TEN MILLION AMERICANS

Taking the size of the two countries concerned into consideration, the number of signatures collected in Denmark would by comparison correspond to 10,000,000 American signatures. So it has been quite some work to get the 227,000 signatures together and of course only part of the country has been covered. People are not equally active in matters of foreign policy everywhere. Naturally enough most of the signatures come from the capital, Copenhagen, and Denmark's second largest town, Aarhus on the mainland.

WHO PAID FOR THIS AND 60 OTHER ADVERTISEMENTS

During the two months in which the signatures were collected, many different groups of Danes inserted advertisements in more than 40 daily newspapers and more than 20 periodicals. And they also paid for *this* advertisement. Split up according to professions the ad sponsors include: 488 professors, university teachers, doctors and other profession, 264 teacher, 4 bishop, 51 deans and other clergymen, 210 trade union spokesmen, 112 workers, 340 architects, 92 businessmen, 321 public servants and office workers, 79 students, 387 actors and artists, 121 housewives, 53 members of Parliament and Town

Councils. Thus several thousand contributions are paying for this ad.

It was decided from the beginning that it was very important to have many small contributions, to make clear that this is not an action sponsored by any specific political party or group.

Nobody has been paid as much as a dime for his work in collecting signatures. The work has been done entirely by volunteers.

The extreme right in Danish politics, voted out of Parliament by the last election, has tried to make the signers appear to be Communists and Communist sympathisers. There are in fact Liberals, Conservatives, Social Democrats, Peoples Socialists, Communists and members of Venstre, the farmer's party, among the 227,000. As the paying group covers all professions, the signers represent nearly the whole spectrum of political life in Denmark.

The appeal to the President of the United States is in other words the appeal from one democratic people to another. And the making of such an appeal is a compliment to the United States and its form of government. Because if the 227,000 Danes had seen the United States as an isolated and completely single-minded society without any regard for its allies and their opinion, they would have taken neither the trouble nor the expense.

(On behalf of the signers.)
Poul Nielson.
Kirkedammen 13.
Arhus C.
Carl Scharnberg.
Vraa.
Henrik Sidenius.
Naesby.
Fyn.

(The text signed by more than 227,000 Danes: Stop the Bombing

(We, the signers, agree to this demand on the United States government.

(We want the Danish government and parliament to repeat it again and again.

(The appeal carried a picture of U Thant and mentioned his grave concern at the escalation in Vietnam. First step to negotiations must include an end to the bombing of North Vietnam.)

Conversation With Dulles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 1967

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, as a general rule, there can be no accurate evaluation of men who hold high public office until some time after their tenure of office has ended. One of this country's greatest Secretaries of State, the late John Foster Dulles, was also one of the most controversial figures of his time, and the effects of his policies are still being debated.

History must frequently depend on character sketches, vignettes, anecdotes, and personal observations that come from those who were professionally and personally close to such men. Louis Jefferson spent 5 years with Mr. Dulles as his personal security aid, and had an opportunity to know him that was granted to very few.

The following article by Mr. Jefferson, from the June 27, 1967, issue of National Review, is an interesting footnote to history. Mr. Jefferson's account of a private conversation with Mr. Dulles, held in February 1957, plainly shows that Mr. Dulles was fully aware of the grave problems still to be faced in Southeast Asia. Secretary Dulles knew the Red Chinese would continue to press into the area, and he knew they must be stopped. He also knew that unless our enemies understand our intentions, and believe in our will to act, they will move against us at every opportunity. That is exactly what has happened, and we are now paying the price for not following Secretary Dulles' advice.

CONVERSATION WITH DULLES

(By Louis Jefferson)

I spent nearly five years on assignment to the late Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, as his Personal Security Aide. During his last three years in office I was rarely away from him. We logged something over 300,000 miles together and I got to know him well. In the words of his widow: "Lou, you knew him better than most."

During those years with Dulles, I not only witnessed his participation in many of the events and decisions which have shaped our times, but had the opportunity to talk with him, often in unguarded moments, about his private views and deepest feelings. One of the most unusual of those conversations occurred one night over a drink in a small hotel room in Georgia.

History has been described as a series of long, dull intervals between great dramatic moments, but by February of 1957 the reverse was becoming more and more true. The scene of most immediate crisis then was around Suez. President Eisenhower, still not fully recovered from his first heart attack, was resting at Treasury Secretary George Humphrey's plantation and shooting preserve near Thomasville, Georgia. One winter-gripped Washington evening, when the need for Presidential counsel and decision on Suez was urgent, I flew down to Thomasville with Dulles to see the President. Our then Ambassador to the UN, Henry Cabot Lodge, accompanied him.

There was a chill in the air, even as far south as Thomasville, but we were whisked out to Humphrey's plantation in a well-warmed limousine. Eisenhower was reportedly playing bridge when we arrived, but quickly closeted himself with his Secretary of State and Ambassador to the United Nations.

After the talk with the President, we went into Thomasville to spend the night at a place improbably called the Three Toms Inn. I had a bottle of Dulles' favorite whiskey—Old Overholt rye—in my brief case (along with Top Secret—"Eyes Only for the Secretary"—papers, ammunition, drafting pads, assorted pills, a blackjack, phone directories, and the Secretary's favorite detective stories). Knowing that he was not just tired, but tense and troubled over Suez, I suggested a nightcap.

Sitting on the edge of a squeaking old bed in the plain, but sanitized and quite functional, room which had been assigned to him in the Three Toms, coatless and tieless, sipping Pennsylvania rye on the rocks, trying to break the hard combination of tension and fatigue, the patrician Foster Dulles peered at me that night through his heavy spectacles, and expounded pent-up feelings about the constant application required to keep peace.

Dulles had an aura of power about him. For most of his adult life he had been a man of great affairs and a participant in great events, living in the rarefied atmosphere of those whose everyday work has its effect on large numbers of people. It was a world of richly paneled partners' rooms, of elegant private clubs with the hallmark of enormously expensive simplicity, of town houses and country homes, a world of certainty, confidence and continuity. But the aura took on a different hue that night in Georgia.

THOUGH FATALISM SUSTAINED DULLES

I was startled. With his white hair and sagging gothic features, Dulles looked like some ancient patriarch in modern shirtsleeves. His conversation was filled with both the tough fatalism which so often sustained him, and his deep conviction that the struggle for peace was just that, a struggle. His voice was gravelly, with a touch of the pulpit in it, as the words came slowly out. There was a noticeable twitch in his eyes, but they were bright. I recall wondering in one of those odd mental flashes if John Calvin drank rye whiskey.

Just a little more than two months after his own first cancer operation, Dulles was far more preoccupied that night with the President's health than his own. He talked about how the President needed rest—how press secretary Jim Hagerty and everyone around the President told him this. He said that that made it tougher for him because he had to be very careful about taking to the President only matters which had to have the President's attention, or a Presidential decision, but that he welcomed it in a way. He mentioned Vice President Nixon's role during the period of the President's first heart attack, and said that he thought that Nixon had "handled himself very well." He rambled a bit, mentioning how hard it was to "go against old allies and dear friends" over Suez, and then went back to President Eisenhower's health. He said that Walter Lippmann "raises the President's blood pressure" but that, his eyes lighting up momentaritly, he had told the President to "let the Secretary of State do the reading of Walter Lippmann." He kept going back to the President's need for rest. His feeling for Mr. Eisenhower was deep, and very genuine.

I mentioned that the President was resting at Secretary Humphrey's plantation, and that the Secretary of State needed some rest too. Dulles shrugged this off as a statement of no consequence. He crouched forward and began stirring his nearly empty glass with his forefinger. He was silent for a while. Then he said that many people did not understand his position on Suez, but that this had been true in other areas, that he had not become Secretary of State to seek public acclaim, and that we just could not "condemn aggression in one area and condone it in another." This led him into the difficulties of "waging peace" and how sometimes you had to "take chance to get peace."

After another moment or two of silence, he handed me his glass, asking me for a light one. I poured another drink and, referring to his remark about taking chances to get peace, asked him if we had really been at what had been termed the brink of war over Indochina (Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia) in 1954. He thought for a moment, and then sort of reared back on the funny old bed and said: "Well, the important thing was that we kept the pressure on the Communists—they were never altogether sure just what we might do, or how far we might go. They leaned, I think, to the view that we were bound to do more than we were probably prepared to do. I guess you might call that a 'brink.' But if they had thought we would do less than we were prepared to do, they might have pushed for more, or all of Vietnam. That would have really been dangerous. It could have meant war for us, war of unpredictable proportions."

I pointed out that we had not intervened at the crucial battle between the French and Ho Chi Minh at Dienbienphu, and that the war had resulted in the Communists' taking over part of Vietnam.

"Yes," Dulles replied, "they [the Communists] were all out for victory at Dienbienphu. They were totally committed there. And when it was over, they had finished off the French. But they were never quite sure how far they could go past that, just what would bring the United States in, short of overt Red Chinese intervention, which they knew would bring up in *in force*. [This was a recurrent theme with Dulles.] All this contributed I think to limiting their goals and a better settlement at the Geneva negotiations than many expected."

I mentioned the fact that the United States had not been a party to the Geneva agreements to partition Vietnam, and he came back quickly: "I did not feel that the United States should be a party to turning over any territory to the Communists. But our presence was felt in those negotiations."

I then asked him just how far he had really been prepared to go to save Dienbienphu and hopefully all of Vietnam. Stirring his drink slowly with his forefinger, his voice strident but his words measured, he said: "Well, in spite of French demands and others, I was never committed in my own mind to what might be termed unilateral intervention on the ground. It would have had to have been massive to be effective, and I did not feel that we could afford to become tied down alone in a ground war on the great land mass of Asia. The question was whether anything else—an air strike—would do any good."

He paused for a moment. The old radiator was sputtering and the room seemed very hot. His heavy head slouched slightly forward, his craggy features showing the strains of office, his eyes still twitching but alight with interest as he thought back from Suez to an earlier crisis, and then went on: "I don't believe an air strike would have saved the French position. Even if it had, it might have created a new, and for us even worse situation. After all, the French legacy to those people was one of colonialism. Whatever we did, I felt that we must act in concert with allies other than the French. We just could not put ourselves in the position of fighting for French colonialism, or of trying to replace it with some brand of our own. That, to my mind, would have been as bad as a Communist takeover of the whole country."

With his then very recent difficulties with Anthony Eden and the British over Suez in mind, I asked him if he felt Eden and his British colleagues had betrayed him when, after he thought they had agreed to "united action" at Dienbienphu, they refused to participate and insisted on going to the Geneva conference table first.

The thing that had worried him about Indochina and Southeast Asia as a whole, he said, and still worried him, was that the "Red Chinese will feel they have to go that way. Unless we can make it unattractive for them, it will keep drawing them like a magnet. They have swallowed a large bit. We must not allow them to feed on that area any more."

"The Chinese, you know," he continued, "have ancient skills in diplomacy and negotiation. They are skillful in reading an adversary's intentions. They have had thousands of years' experience, and are always looking for signs and signals. I remember when I was out in China in 1938 and talked to Chiang Kai-shek and I felt that he wanted to talk to me because I represented an opportunity to test the wind in the United States—to get some signals. We must be very careful with the Red Chinese that they get the right signals."

DULLES ON SEATO

The steam-heated room had become stuffy. I opened the window a crack, and indicated that I thought that I had better leave and let him get to bed. He waved me down, saying, "Finish your drink first."

I sat down again and recalled earlier conversations we had had on his theories on the need for "mechanisms for peaceful change" so that we could "institutionalize peace." Noting that he had been credited as being the architect of the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization (SEATO), which had grown out of the Indochinese crisis, and that some observers had described it as being merely a "symptom of Dulles' 'pactomania,'" I asked him if such an organization could do much else than give some support to the status quo?

He chuckled from way down deep in his throat, as if he was gargling, and, after a long pause, said: "Well, an organization like SEATO can give us a mechanism which we did not have, say, at Dienbienphu. That situation was certainly a contest to effect change, and it was anything but peaceful. But a treaty such as SEATO gives us a basis to act—and, unless we give them [the Communists] reason to *question* our commitment, it serves notice that we will act. This belief in your will to act, whether it's one country or a whole alliance, is central. It can mean the difference between peace and war, and save you some hard decisions such as the one Truman had to make over Korea when the enemy misjudged our intentions."

Prize-Winning Essay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1967

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues the prize-winning essay from a contest sponsored by the Midstate Electric Cooperative of La Pine, Oreg.

The winner is one of my constituents, Miss Patricia Collister, who has just completed her junior year of high school in Gilchrist, Oreg., and she writes with sincerity and clarity.

WHAT DOES LOCAL OWNERSHIP OF RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVES MEAN TO OUR COMMUNITY

(By Patricia Collister)

I think that the best way for me to discuss this question is to first counter it with another: Where would my community be without this electricity source? or: What would my community be without this source?

Although this community is not really large, it has definitely increased in size since the installation of the cooperative in our area. The community has expanded and increased greatly. Not only did the population expand, but new businesses rose as a result of a local power source. New mills went in at Chemult and far-out areas were cultivated and developed. But these were not the only changes. Farms and small, isolated communities were able to thrive with a new power source that enabled them to modernize and improve not only their businesses, but their every-day life. With the establishment of the rural co-op, people were able to limit personal expense that had previously been necessary in order to enjoy the benefits of electricity. Before the cooperative began serving our area, the people had to employ their own diesel generators to provide electricity for one family or small groups of families. The cost was a good deal higher than the amount now paid to employ the use of the local power source.

Although the town of Gilchrist receives its electric benefits from the Gilchrist Timber Company mill, this area also benefits from local ownership of the cooperative in LaPine. During the summer shut-down, Gilchrist switches over to REA for electricity. Previously, the Company had been forced to keep one small turbine going. If this had gone out, the whole village would have been without light or any electrical power. Now it is possible for the mill to shut down completely, thanks to the firm in our area.

Aside from electrical advantages, our community also enjoys benefits of a slightly different nature as a direct result of local ownership of the cooperative. The establishment in LaPine has been very generous in allowing high school classes to earn money for their treasuries by various projects. This may seem to be a rather curious point to suggest, but those classes are most certainly grateful for the thoughtfulness and the money that they received from the co-op.

Because of a local power source, our community has grown and prospered greatly in the last few years. The LaPine cooperative has bettered our community with not only electricity, but also with their consideration of the needs and abilities of our community. I repeat: What would this community be like without such a local power source?

Gifts, Gains in VISTA Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 1967

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, recently there appeared in the Kansas City, Mo., Star an interview with four VISTA volunteers who have been working in Kansas City, Mo. The interview, by Rosalind K. Ellingsworth, clearly reflects both the commitment and sensitivity of these volunteers and the valuable work they are engaged in as part of the federally assisted antipoverty program.

I include the article as part of my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD:

GIFTS, GAINS IN VISTA YEAR

(By Rosalind K. Ellingsworth)

After six weeks of training in Baltimore, Miss Dolores Honig, Miss Carolyn Cobb, Miss Susan Spragg and Gary Johnson felt they were prepared to meet any problems they might face in a poverty area.

But when the four VISTA (Volunteers in Service to America) volunteers arrived here August 3, 1966, with six others, it took only a few hours to discover their lack of preparedness.

TAKES MORE THAN DAY

"We thought we could clean up the world in one day," said Miss Cobb, 24 years old, of Brooklyn. "But it didn't work that way."

"I think the people of the areas we were assigned to thought we were here to save them and the poverty program," said Miss Honig, 27, of Chicago.

VISTA volunteers usually are called the domestic Peace Corps. Similar to members of the Peace Corps, they live in the areas in which they work and their goal is to help persons help themselves.

"So often all these people need is just encouragement," said Miss Spragg, 23, of Westfield, N.Y. "You can't ever do things for them—most of them are very capable adults. It's just that they need someone to reassure them that they're capable."

THEY OFFER IT

During the last year encouragement is just what the VISTA workers have been offering the persons living in poverty areas. Miss Honig has been working in area 1 helping the residents of the West Bluff housing development organize community action groups. Miss Cobb has been working in the area of Twenty-fourth and Forest streets organizing children in scouting troops, taking them on short sightseeing trips around the city, visiting the aged and the invalids.

Miss Spragg has been working helping to form a tenants association in the Guinotte area and also helping to form a city-wide tenants association council to meet with the Kansas City Housing authority. Johnson, 23, of Duluth, Minn., has been trying to organize a city-wide tutoring program to serve all of the poverty areas.

"We're just now getting our feet on the ground," said Johnson. "The programs are just beginning to function smoothly."

A VISTA volunteer's tour of duty lasts a year. So within the next two months all four will be phased out and new volunteers will take their place. But the four believe they have had a successful year despite the fact that the programs they have started and now, are working smoothly soon will belong to someone else.

AS EXCITING TASK

"I think the best way I can say it is that it has been exciting," said Miss Spragg. "If I've given a third or half of what I've received, I've contributed a lot. If we hadn't been there I don't think people would have ever gotten together. I think they now really have a feeling they are going to make some changes—that they're going to have some say in how the housing developments are run."

"I've learned a lot of teaching techniques that will be helpful when I go back to a classroom—if I do," said Johnson.

"Much of what we have done is simply to lay groundwork for the volunteers who will follow," said Miss Honig. "I think we have a few tangible results—but if I had to do it over again I would work with individuals more first."

"I've found out it's taken a few years for things to become the mess they are and it's going to take quite a few years to straighten them out," said Miss Cobb. "The most important thing is just to show you care, that somebody cares. I think more than anything I've become a bigger person myself. If you can accomplish one thing others will see something can be done. I just hope it isn't too late for everybody because for some people it has been."

The Air Force's Brown, One of a New Breed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 1967

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the Sunday Star of June 18 carried an article, "The Air Force's Brown, One of a New Breed," by Benjamin Forgey, Star staff writer.

In this article, Mr. Forgey relates how Harold Brown has risen in his own profession and in the Government to high office by virtue of his own ability.

Those of us who have the privilege of knowing him recognize in his a product of modern technology in which leaders are called to manage huge and complex organizations both in and out of Government.

I am intensely proud of the fact that Harold Brown has his roots deep in Alemeda County, Calif.

The article follows:

THE AIR FORCE'S BROWN, ONE OF A NEW BREED

(By Benjamin Forgey)

It's like Harold Brown is sitting on top of the world in his big office on the Pentagon's E ring.

The Pentagon doesn't bother him.

It is "one of the most bleakly depressing anthills in the world," said Theodore H. Whyte, and even Eisenhower got lost in its layrinthine corridors shortly after becoming chief of staff in 1945.

Brown is the trim 200-pounder with the lively oblong face who is Secretary of the Air Force and he laughs and says he can't even remember the first time he visited the building.

It's characteristic that he does not stop to tell his own Pentagon anecdote. He's not a non-stop bore but he's serious, hardheaded and serenely self-confident about his enormously complicated management job. During the typical 12-hour day he attends to essential and forcibly forgets the rest.

MAN OF REASON

Like others in the power jobs in Lyndon Johnson's Washington, and more particularly in McNamara's Pentagon, Brown is an accomplished, even polished, wielder of power, a man of reason to whom any problem is reducible to its logical parts and hence, if not always solvable, at least manageable.

Brown typifies in many ways the kind of brainy analyst who came to Washington in the early '60s. He was appointed director of Defense Research and Engineering (DDR&E) in May, 1961, by President Kennedy, and elevated to the Air Force slot in October, 1965, by President Johnson.

He practices and preaches the theories of the McNamara revolution and is convinced "they've made a permanent imprint on the department." And he is a young, vigorous, determined and at times abrasive activist. Or abrasive he must seem, at least, to the slow of mind or to the recalcitrant old-line Air Force officer.

His management philosophy is clear: "The job is not one for a passive manager. Perhaps one of the secretary's most important roles is that of innovator. He must be an active participant not only in reviewing proposals but also in the development of major studies and initiatives."

The kinds of decisions an Air Force Secretary is called upon to make are similar in many ways to those required of top executives of the big corporations, though, as Brown points out, with the Air Force the end product is "combat capability." Brown deals with the procurement and development of weapons (mainly aircraft and missiles) on a massive scale—the Air Force will buy approximately $7 billion worth of equipment in fiscal 1968—and with the considerable variety of operation, maintenance and personnel problems of an organization budgeted to spend about $25 billion annually.

His is the kind of thinking that has informed the McNamara revolution, redesigned the strategic and tactical forces of this country in the last six years, and created a new way of making decisions in the Department of Defense.

Brown's appointment to the department's top weapons research and development post in 1961 was a natural step. When selected, at 33, he was director of the mammoth nuclear weapons research compound at Livermore, Calif. Both his predecessor, Herbert F. York, and his successor, John S. Foster, in the DDR&E post, also were directors at Livermore at the time of their appointments. "It's a pretty well-worn grove by now," Brown quips.

The two jobs have much in common: They both require a man of proved scientific caliber with intensive background in nuclear weapons problems and a man with established managerial energy and talent.

WEST END KID

Brown has, if anything, a surfeit of each of these rare qualities. Born in New York City in 1927, Brown was a brilliant boy, a prodigy, reared in New York's upper West Side. When he graduated, in 1943 (age 15½) from the Bronx High School of Science, he won virtually every honor the school could bestow, including prizes for excellence in French, English, mathematics, social studies and the physical sciences.

When the young student matriculated at Columbia University, quite naturally he lived at home with his parents in their spacious apartment at 103d Street and West End Avenue. Harold's father, Howard Brown, who died while Harold was still in college, was an attorney with a general law practice, but the son, a mathematics whiz, "never was attracted to the law."

Even though he switched his major from engineering to physics, a change requiring the make-up of a semester's work, Harold completed his A.B. requirements in two years and was graduated in 1945 with honors in physics and math. He got his master's degree from Columbia in 1946, and in 1949, received his Ph. D. in physics.

In 1950 Brown went out to the Lawrence Radiation Laboratory up in the Berkeley hills. Lawrence Lab, named for the inventor of the cyclotron, at the time acted as a kind of magnet for brilliance. Lawrence and the Atomic Energy Commission decided to form the weapons design and research complex at Livermore, and Brown soon switched to the new, 700-acre complex, part of what has been called a "new breed of task force scientists."

TYPICALLY METEORIC

It was at Livermore that Brown began to shown his extraordinary administrative skills. He became first a group leader in physics, then division leader, then associate director and, in 1959, deputy director to Dr. Edward Teller. Though Brown's rise by most standards would seem meteoric, an associate once said that for Livermore, it was just a little more than typical. He succeeded Teller as director in 1960.

As Brown describes it, his inclination and energy gradually led him away from direct involvement with design problems. "You start off with a small chunk of work," he comments, "but by the time you get up to 50 people working under you, you're mostly a manager. By the time you take over a laboratory—that's some 3,000 to 4,000 people—well, that's clearly a management job."

Even before Brown came to Washington full-time in 1961, he was fairly familiar with the ways of the Pentagon. He was a senior science adviser to two U.S. delegations at Geneva test ban talks, and furthermore, a member of several high-powered defense science advisory committees during the Eisenhower years. "I learned what the problems are," he remarks. "But there's an enormous difference. As a consultant, you seem to be giving advise that when you get here, you find is irrelevant."

OBVIOUS BREAK

If Brown's accession to the DDR & E post was an obvious move, his promotion to the Air Force job was an obvious break with his primarily technical past. Nevertheless, such a move, he comments, "is aligned with gradual shifts in both industry and government—with an increasing influence by technically trained people who serve in advisory and managerial positions."

His scientific background has its advantages. For one thing, Brown remarks, "it's certainly harder for them to snow you. People can't easily tell me something about a likely performance of a new piece of equipment and think that I won't even know what the words mean."

Brown came into the Air Force job just about the time the American air war over North Vietnam was building to its height. As one of the prime movers in the change in strategic concepts—the change from a policy based on massive retaliation to one based on controlled and graduated response—Brown is an articulate spokesman in support of the administration's war policies. As he correctly pointed out in a recent speech, the Vietnam war "is one kind of war for which we have been equipping and training our military forces with increased emphasis since 1961."

Recently, in testimony before a congressional appropriations subcommittee, he asked himself the obvious, rhetorical question: "Why hasn't airpower won the Vietnam war?"

And he stated his case in this way: "In one sense, airpower has, with ground and sea power, had such an effect . . ." The Vietcong and North Vietnamese main forces, he said, have lost "every major unit action initiated by either side during the past year."

FIREPOWER

This is due, he said, to the enormous firepower provided by close support aircraft in South Vietnam, and to the tremendous limitation on reinforcement imposed by U.S. air strikes on the north.

"But airpower has not prevented all flow of men and materiel," he continued. "And it has not caused the North Vietnamese to give up their aggression. Could it? Certainly attacks on additional targets could hurt them more. In fact, destruction of North Vietnam is one effect which airpower could achieve, without the use of nuclear weapons, were it in our national interest. I do not believe it is.

"The effects of airpower in Southeast Asia must be considered in terms of our national objectives. These are straight-forward and limited: To stop aggression against the Republic of South Vietnam and permit self-determination for the South Vietnamese people. Our objectives do not include destroying North Vietnam or dictating its form of government."

Brown is the kind of man who at least seems to carry such immense responsibilities with ease. Obviously, he enjoys his 12-hour days, though he does not like to overdo the impression of overwork. "Except when there's a crisis on, only occasionally—occasionally—do I take work home."

The secretary and his attractive wife, the former Colene McDowell, live in a 30-year-old colonial-style home at 416 Argyle Drive in Alexandria. Their two daughters, Debbie, 11, and Ellen, 9, attend St. Agnes School.

STANDBY SPORT

Mrs. Brown, born in San Francisco, attended Mills College in Oakland and received a bachelor's degree in home economics from Purdue University. The couple met on a skiing trip, and were married in 1952.

Tennis has become their standby Washington sport, though it took some earnest application in the early going. Vacationing with friends at Martha's Vineyard in the summer of 1962, Brown recalls, he and his wife were embarrassed ("and it almost killed me physically") by the friends on the tennis court. With assiduous practice through the winter, they were able to return in 1963 and deliver a sound thwacking to their friendly antagonists of the previous summer.

The secretary himself plays almost every day at the Army-Navy Country Club, before going into the office during the summer, at noon when it isn't so hot. "One thing," he says, "you work harder when you get a little exercise."

There's no question that the secretary is serious about that hard work.

But his manner is generally easy, assured and winning. As when an impatient squint breaks up his regular, sharp, rectangular features, and he says things like:

"Saturday used to be a pretty dull time around here. We work a lot harder than they did six years ago. Though at times I get the uncomfortable feeling that a good deal of this hard work is work we make up for each other with all the hard work."

Welfare State May Yet Avoid Tragedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1967

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, the Newport, Tenn., Plain Talk is to be commended for the fine editorial which it printed recently entitled "Welfare State May Yet Avoid Tragedy."

The article concluded with the statement that there is encouragement "that the American welfare state may yet be able to avoid following the tragic pattern of pursuing the ideal of social justice with the big stock of conformity and oppression," and I would comment that it is our duty to act in such a way so that our people will not only be encouraged, but they will know for certain, that we will never use the big stock of conformity and oppression.

We will uphold individual responsibility and initiative; we will do all that we can to foster it; and we will always persevere in these endeavors.

The editorial follows:

WELFARE STATE MAY YET AVOID TRAGEDY

The concept of the federal government having the responsibility to provide in some degree for the financial security, opportunity and physical well-being of the citizens of the United States has been established. It has been implemented by the Social Security System, medicare, educational assistance, pensions and subsidies to various groups of citizens, business enterprises and programs to aid training and employment.

The ways in which federal funds are now transferred to private citizens are many. Their number and the amounts of money involved grow larger with every session of of Congress. This adds up to the fact that a U.S. welfare state now exists—the only question is how far is it to go in shouldering the individual's responsibilities and to what extent will the nation accept federal control of states, local communities and private citizens.

The President has recommended enlargement of programs dealing with urban and rural poverty. Congressional resistance to these requests is mounting. A 20 per cent increase in social security benefits has been asked along with higher levies on employers and employees.

The mood of both Republicans and Conservative Democrats on the House Ways and Means Committee now indicates there will probably be increases in benefits and taxes but on a substantially more modest basis than the Administration has suggested. Requested expansion of poverty programs will run up against the disposition to examine the efficiency and effectiveness of activities and spending already authorized in these areas.

One of the most hotly debated welfare issues will arise over the President's plans to expand the federal-state public assistance programs that now provide monthly cash payments to 7 million people at an annual cost of around $7 billion. Administration proposals would increase the cost some 10 per cent by 1969 and split it between the states and the federal government.

A recent Wall Street Journal article reports, "Federal financing of welfare would be substantially enlarged in the poorest states. Federal control would be tightened in all states by requiring every state welfare agency to pay the needy the full amount of money calculated as necessary to cover essential living costs: Shelter, clothing, food and other basic."

Resistance to the plan will develop over the latter point, because at present, state welfare payments are not required to meet these essential living costs if state revenues are not adequate. The Journal article observes, ". . . many states impose dollar limits on monthly relief payments in order to save money and avoid complaints of too much liberality. Only 17 states, including New York, Connecticut and New Jersey pay 100 per cent of their own standards for needy families; Alabama, Alaska, Florida, and Mississippi, by contrast, all pay less than 40 per cent."

Many feel that the federal government has no business establishing standards for the states and then telling them how much more they will have to spend to meet them. If the measure passes, there will undoubtedly be heavy pressure to enlarge federal financial participation and with this in all likelihood would come a corresponding increase in federal control of state welfare programs.

Apparently, there is to be little slackening in the tug of war between the philosophy of paternalism and the tradition of individuality which has been the leavening force in the economic and political development of the United States. The debate goes on, and this offers encouragement that the American welfare state may yet be able to avoid following the tragic pattern of pursuing the ideal of social justice with the big stick of conformity and oppression.

Coffee Countries Boycott U.S. Textiles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1967

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, James C. Self, president of Greenwood Mills, very kindly permitted me to share a letter he received and his answer with my colleagues in the Congress.

I commend this correspondence to your very earnest and careful study:

SCARSDALE, N.Y.,
April 25, 1967.

Mr. J. C. SELF, Jr.,
President, Greenwood Mills Co.,
Greenwood, S.C.

DEAR MR. SELF: Each five years the Pan-American Coffee Bureau conducts a survey of United States exports to the coffee producing countries of Latin America, Africa and Asia. The purpose is to show the many towns and cities in the United States which contribute to this export market and which benefit from it in jobs, manufacturing wages and farm income.

As a participant in international trade, you will realize the link between exports of coffee from the coffee producing countries and their ability to purchase goods and services from the United States. We hope that the findings of this survey will reinforce and bring up to date the local area impact of this vital connection.

Would your company kindly indicate on the enclosed form the 1966 volume of its exports to the coffee producing countries, together with some indication of the area sources of these goods?

Any data that are supplied will be held in strict confidence and used only to compile composite totals for the states and areas in the United States engaged in this trade.

Your cooperation is deeply appreciated. A postage paid return envelope is enclosed.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN MCKNIGHT,
Economic Forecasts, Industry Studies, Area Studies, Surveys.

GREENWOOD MILLS,
Greenwood, S.C., June 7, 1967.

Mr. JOHN MCKNIGHT,
Scarsdale, N.Y.

DEAR MR. MCKNIGHT: Your letter of April 25 has gone unanswered for several weeks because we were trying to discover why it was that we did so little business with the coffee-producing countries.

We actually shipped goods to only eight of the countries which you listed, and the total for all eight in the year 1966 amounted to $44,000—an infinitesimal fraction of one per cent of Greenwood's total volume of business.

We started to investigate the situation with the five largest coffee producers who send us, combined, some 60% of our coffee imports.

Brazil sends us 31% of our coffee, but takes no American textiles. Their system requires import licenses. These are virtually unattainable. Should anyone finally obtain a license, they would be up against a 100% ad valorem duty for cotton cloth, and a 120% one on synthetics.

Colombia supplies us with some 15% of our coffee imports. They permitted entry of less than 1/10 of 1% of America's very small total of cloth exports. They, too, have a licensing system of imports which makes licenses almost impossible to obtain, but when obtainable the importer must deposit in advance 120% of the value of the license. Customs duties are by comparison modest—35%.

Mexico shipped us 5½% of our 1966 coffee imports. They bought almost one-half of one per cent of our small total of textile exports. They, too, have difficult-to-obtain import licenses. Duties, however, range from a low of 100% ad valorem on denims to almost 300% on synthetic cloth.

Guatemala. Exchange controls are in effect, but not too difficult to work through. Duties, however, are again from 100% to 150% ad valorem.

El Salvador. Import licenses are required, and exchange control prevails. The duties are relatively low—from 35% to 70%—but there is an increase in duty coming soon.

We went no further. On the basis of reciprocity it looks as if the citizens of Greenwood should give up coffee, not buy more. It is easy to see the results you hoped for, and the use to which you expected to put them. However, in view of the fact that they turned out so dramatically opposite, I am taking the liberty of sending them to the representatives of all cloth and cotton producing states.

Sincerely,

J. C. SELF.

Improved Social Security Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 27, 1967

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the strong support for improved social security benefits was dramatized recently in Minneapolis. As we all know, the AFL–CIO has been arranging meetings in cities all over the country to inform the general public about the proposed amendments now before the House Ways and Means Committee. All these sessions have attracted huge crowds, so many in the Minneapolis-St. Paul area that the meetings had to be held in six different halls at the same time.

The recent issue of the AFL–CIO News reports on the Minneapolis-St. Paul meetings and since I know that all of us are interested in this issue, one of the most important before Congress this year, I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that the article appear in the RECORD at this point.

SIX-SITE RALLY SPURS 1967 CAMPAIGN FOR STRONGER SOCIAL SECURITY LAW

MINNEAPOLIS.—A citywide rally for improved social security benefits was not only on the move here May 20—most of the time it was virtually at a gallop.

That is literally as well as figuratively correct. Because the rally was held at six—not one, but six different sites, all at the same time.

Reason for the multi-site location was twofold:

A meeting place large enough and conveniently located for a large gathering simply was not available.

Most of the senior citizens, who constituted the bulk of the attendance at all the rally sites, preferred locations near their homes.

But the principal speakers who came here for the rally solved the problem neatly. Each managed to appear at three different rally sites within the space of two hours, with the aid of experienced car drivers and split-second timing.

Dividing the speaking assignments were Bert Seidman, director of the AFL–CIO Dept. of Social Security, and Thomas Parrott, assistant to the director of the Social Security Administration.

Rep. Donald Fraser (D–Minn.), who is a sponsor of social security legislation, also was able to appear at three of the rally locations, and an administrative assistant staged audio-visual presentations at the other three locations.

Seidman and other speakers emphasized the importance of demonstrating strong public support in order to enact meaningful increases in social security benefits during the current session of congress.

"What is going to be done in Congress will depend to a large extent on how we feel about it back home, and what we do about expressing the way we feel," Seidman declared.

"Our voices must be heard."

Those attending the rallies, cosponsored by the Minnesota state AFL–CIO and the Community Services Committee of the Minneapolis AFL–CIO Central Labor Council, also were informed of what Pres. Johnson's proposals for a 20-percent increase in social security benefits would mean in terms of dollars and cents each month to retired individuals.

MINIMUM, $76

For example, they were told the 20 percent average increase proposed would mean an actual increase of 59 percent more a month for those now receiving the lowest benefits. It would raise the present minimum payment of $44 for an individual to $76, and the current income of couples now receiving only $66 a month would go to $105.

Another important point emphasized repeatedly by the various speakers was the fact that improved social security benefits are important to Americans of all ages—not just those 65 or over. Cited as an example was the fact that 25 percent of those now drawing benefits are not on retirement, but are widows, orphans and the disabled.

"The so-called poverty level of $1,500 a year for a single person and $1,900 annually for a couple is really a sub-poverty line," Seidman declared. He said in 1965 some five million senior citizens were living "below the sub-poverty line."

Maritime Trades

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 27, 1967

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, it was my pleasure the other day to accept an invitation to speak before a luncheon of members of the maritime trades department here in Washington.

While the subject I discussed at that time obviously was of particular interest to those engaged in the maritime trade, I think there may be some interest, too, among the Members of this House. For a completely modern merchant marine very much effects our national economy as well as our national defense.

In that spirit I present a copy of those remarks for inclusion in the RECORD at this time:

I appreciate the kind invitation of President Hall and Secretary-Treasurer McGavin to take part in this Maritime Trades Department program.

I can think of no group which is performing a greater service to the nation in these very critical days than the unions affiliated with the MTD—and, of course, the overwhelming majority of maritime management which has joined with you in your efforts.

What you are doing is to try to strengthen our national economy and bolster our national defense by advocating a greatly enlarged, and completely modern, merchant marine.

Of course you are being criticized in some quarters because of the stand that you are taking—but I guess that's part of the democratic process—that the group which does the most to serve its country often has to put up with the most abuse.

As I see it, most of the criticism you're getting is over your insistence that we keep the laws the way they are—and that we not build a single U.S.-flag ship in a foreign shipyard.

To me, the most important part of your program is this very legitimate demand that our ships be America-built—it's important to our defense, and it's important to our economy.

Sure, the Administration—and some of the ship owners—make a very strong argument about how much cheaper it is to build our ships in foreign shipyards—and if price were the only consideration, perhaps I could go along with them.

But there's a lot more here than just price—and so I stand shoulder-to-shoulder with you in opposition to *any* foreign building—and I mean *any*—of American ships.

If the shipping companies were to build their vessels overseas, whose steel would they use? Whose propulsion equipment would they use? Whose electrical wiring would they use? Whose hardware, and lumber, and equipment would they use?

You can bet it wouldn't be American—in fact, it *couldn't* be American—because these are the things that contribute to the higher costs of ships built in this country.

You know, it has always struck me as silly, the way people complain about the fact that shipyard workers in this country make more money than shipyard workers overseas—but nobody complains about the fact that carpenters and steelworkers and machinists and clerical employees—every worker in the United States—is better paid than his opposite number in some other country.

Our shipyards aren't unique—they're just like any other American industry—and the fact of the matter is that our workers are better paid in all industries because we just happen to have the highest standard of living in the world.

So why take it out on the shipyard worker—or the American sailor?

The trouble with the plans of the people in the Administration to build ships in foreign yards is that they just plain refuse to look at the whole picture.

They look at the price of a single ship—and they say it's too high.

Don't they realize what could happen to the American economy if we stopped building ships in this country—and turned to foreign yards to do the work?

Sure, it would throw shipbuilding workers out of their jobs—but it would also hurt our basic industries—metalworking, mining, and the like—because they rely on the shipbuilding industry for a good share of their business.

I have seen figures which indicate that if American shipping companies could build all the ships they want in foreign yards, it would cost the American economy several billions of dollars a year—and I'm just talking about the *private* sector of the economy.

It would also have a devastating effect on the *public* sector.

Shipyards that aren't productive aren't going to pay corporate profit taxes—and unemployed shipyard workers aren't going to be paying income taxes—so right away, the government loses a healthy share of its income.

And that's not all: Because people who are unemployed receive all kinds of public funds—unemployment compensation, public assistance, retraining allowances, poverty-war assistance, and the like—so, in addition to losing their status as tax-*payers*, these people will become tax-*users*—and that's not good for the economy.

In addition, of course, building foreign will hurt our balance of payments—and we certainly have heard enough from this Administration, and from other Administrations over the past ten years, to realize that any outflow of gold of the magnitude that would be involved in foreign building of U.S.-flag vessels is something we simply can't afford—not if we hope to keep our economy healthy.

The ship operators who seem so dead set on building abroad try to make an argument that the shipping industry is being penalized by this insistence on building at home.

Apparently the ship owners think the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 is fine, as long as it gives them operating subsidies so that *they* can compete with low-wage foreign shipping lines—but that there's something wrong with the same law because it protects our shipyards against unfair competition from these very same low-wage countries.

The operators can't have it both ways—and, even more important, the country can't have it both ways.

We've got to continue to protect the *entire* maritime industry—that's why the 1936 Act was passed—and the only way to protect the whole industry is to keep the law unchanged.

I'd like to go even further—I'd like to increase the federal investment in our shipyards for the next five years or so, to make sure that they modernize as rapidly as possible—because I think money put into streamlining our shipyards *now*, will pay off in terms of lower costs—to the government and to the industry—in the future.

History has already shown us what American dollars can do for the shipbuilding industry.

Under the Marshall Plan, the U.S. invested over a billion dollars to rehabilitate war-torn European shipbuilding facilities—and we poured huge sums of our tax dollars into rebuilding the Japanese ship yards after World War II.

These funds enabled them to modernize their yards so completely that they are now competing with our own ship building facilities—and that's the irony of the whole situation—that we put up the funds to help these yards put our own shipbuilding capability in peril.

Can you imagine what would have happened if we'd invested the same amount of dollars in our *own* shipyards—the yards that made victory in World War II possible, by turning out thousands and thousands of vessels for the great convoys that carried men and materiel to all of the war theaters?

Had we spent the money at home, we'd be top dog in shipbuilding today.

Now, I'm not arguing against the decision to help put these countries back on their feet after the war—but I sure do think it's wrong to help somebody else and to neglect our own needs.

But this isn't just an economic question.

We have to be assured of having shipyards available and fully capable of expanding to meet any emergency—and we're certainly not going to have that kind of capability if we turn to foreign yards now to build our merchant ships.

In time of war, we have to be assured of quality, of quick delivery, and of prices that won't skyrocket simply because some shipbuilder in another country sees a chance to make a fast buck at America's expense.

So we have to commit ourselves to the most efficient, powerful shipbuilding capability that is consistent with our resources—and constructing more merchant vessels in American yards will help achieve this goal.

I remain convinced that one of the surest ways of getting this maritime problem solved is to give the Maritime Administration back its independence—to free it from the bureaucratic jungle of being part of another Executive Department.

Certainly no independent Maritime Administration is going to come into being to preside over the dissolution of the merchant marine—as the present Secretary of Transportation, who's fighting so hard to get maritime into his Department, seems intent on doing right now.

An independent agency will have a direct line to Congress—and we're already trying to make it easier for this agency to operate by giving the House and Senate merchant marine committees authority to pass on the annual maritime budget.

This will mean that the Congressional committees responsible for the *program* will also have something to say about the *money* for that program.

An independent agency—working with a Congress that is prepared to move in the proper direction—can do a lot to get us moving—can devise a program for ship construction and ship operation that will insure that we have a new, fast and efficient fleet that can compete with the other maritime powers.

Our defense is at stake . . . our economy is at stake . . . and our national prestige is at stake.

I'm confident we can get the job done—and done this year—as long as we all work together toward the same goal.

Thank you very much.

Community Leadership Conference on World Problems—V

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1967

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, set forth below is the last in a series of reports on the panel discussions held during my district's February 22 Community Conference on World Problems. At this final panel to be reported, the problem of European Security was discussed by Bohdan Tomorowicz, Ambassador of Poland to the United Nations; Thomas K. Finletter, former U.S. Ambassador to NATO; and Prof. Thomas M. Franck, director of the Center for International Studies at New York University. The moderator was Theodore Kheel, noted labor mediator. A summary of the discussion follows:

PANEL ON EUROPEAN SECURITY

The first speaker was Bohdan Tomorowicz, Ambassador of Poland to the U.N.[1]

Ambassador Tomorowicz described Poland's continuous involvement in the postwar problems of European security. He then analyzed the essential elements of these tensions and reviewed the Socialist approach to their solutions.

The Ambassador noted that during the Second World War every fifth person in Poland was killed and that approximately 40% of Poland's national wealth and almost all of her capitol industry and transportation were destroyed. From 1945 on, the task of re-building Poland was literally a matter of national life and death. The key to Poland's reconstruction was—and remains—European security.

In Europe, the Capitalist and the Socialist worlds are in direct and immediate contact. As a result, pure power politics in this area is rendered obsolete. At the same time, the opportunity for great economic achievement is present, not only through East-West co-operation and co-ordination, but "North-South" as well. To bridge or reduce the gap existing between the level of the highly developed countries of the world (the "North") and the underdeveloped countries (the "South") is a major task.

---

[1] The summary of Ambassador Tomorowicz' remarks was sent to him for editing on April 19, but because of the pressure of other work at the U.N., he was not able to give it his attention. Accordingly, this summary has not been approved by him.

The elements of political and economic security which Poland required after the war are necessary today in order to achieve these goals.

Ambassador Tomorowicz rejected the construction and maintenance of military blocs as a solution. He criticized also the manner in which European tensions are used by some nations as a tool of their foreign policy. He cited in this respect the German Federal Republic which "from the very beginning based its policy upon the contention that the stronger position a country has within NATO, the greater is its influence in Western Europe," Since lessening European tensions decrease NATO's importance, the paradoxical result is that it is in the interest of the West German Government to maintain the tensions in Europe.

The Socialist solution to these problems is the creation of a European system of collective security; and, in fact, Article II of the Warsaw Treaty provides that upon the creation of such a system, the Warsaw Treaty will lose its effectiveness.

Poland first presented this concept to the General Assembly of the United Nations in October 1957 in the form of the "Rapacki Plan". The first step was to be the creation of a denuclearized zone in Central Europe. After extended international debate a final version of the Rapacki Plan was submitted to the 18 nation disarmament conference in Geneva in 1962. In February 1964 a more modest proposal calling for a freeze of nuclear and thermo-nuclear armaments in Central Europe was presented. These proposals still stand.

Presently, Poland advocates a conference dealing with all of these aspects of European security. The proposed agenda for such a conference would deal first with economic problems, second with scientific, cultural and technical exchanges, and only lastly with political problems and the question of divided Germany.

Ambassador Tomorowicz said that the so called German problem, with all its complexity, must be subordinated to European security. It can be solved "as a final result of a historical process in the conditions of lessened tension, rapproachement of the two German States and the normalization of relations in Europe as a whole."

The next speaker was Thomas Finletter, former U.S. Ambassador to NATO.

Ambassador Finletter reviewed the history of the post-war United States involvement with the problems of European security. He then referred to the fluidity of the present situation and briefly discussed the alternatives for the immediate future.

Mr. Finletter noted that in this century the United States has twice been involved in World Wars resulting from European conflicts. After the Second World War, the existence of atomic weapons prevented a return to a policy of isolation. The only possible policy for World War Three is to not have it happen.

This policy of prevention was originally formulated by President Truman in 1945. Prior to the first meeting of the United Nations General Assembly in January 1946, the Truman-Attlee-King Declaration proposed an enforced disarmament by all nations of all weapons of mass destruction, atomic and otherwise. This declaration was accepted word for word by all the great powers, including France *and Russia*, and later by the General Assembly of the United Nations. The Truman-Attlee-King plan, however, was never successfully implemented.

President Truman's second initiative was two-pronged. First, the United States determined to construct an air-atomic force so powerful that its very existence would serve as a deterrent to any potential aggressor. Secondly, this air-atomic protective umbrella was extended specifically to our European allies. The result, in 1949, was the creation of the North Atlantic Alliance and NATO.

The key to NATO is the principle of automaticity which in effect says that if any member nation is attacked the full weight of the U.S. air atomic force will automatically be used against the aggressor. The effectiveness of this preventive stance is attested to by the fact that to the present it has kept the peace in Europe.

But things have changed recently, and the existing structure of NATO and the Atlantic Alliance are under attack from two quarters. The first of these may be called the depressing effect of time and fading memories. The pattern of the settlements of the great wars of the past has been that the post-war determination to actively preserve peace relaxes as peace is actually achieved, and this relaxation in turn leads to the next great slaughter.

The second attack on the NATO structure is a serious and sad difference of opinion. The essence of an alliance is the reconciling of such difference, and so they must be examined.

The political philosophy of NATO, and in particular the principal of automaticity, by its very nature implies the surrender by the member states of certain aspects of their sovereignty. Refusal to accept this, has prompted France to withdraw from NATO although remaining in the alliance itself. Further, as a result of this reliance on the United States air-atomic force, the U.S. has acquired a degree of influence within the alliance which is unusual.

So far, Mr. Finletter continued, the damage has been held in check. The fourteen other member states are carrying on their NATO business quite well even without France. But consideration must be given to the future.

At the Alliance Ministerial meeting in Paris last December it was agreed to make a general study of the political changes which have taken place in the world since the Treaty was signed in 1949 in order to determine "the steps which should be taken to strengthen the Alliance as a factor in achieving a durable peace."

Three alternatives seem to present themselves, said former Ambassador Finletter.

(a) Carry on as at present without France.

(b) Enlarge the Alliance into an organization actively and collectively concerned with political and economic co-operation in order to search for agreement among the world nuclear powers.

(c) In effect, dissolve the Alliance.

Mr. Finletter supported the second alternative outlined above based on his belief that" . . . despite the efforts of the United Nations and its Secretary-General, there is no other collective organization (other than the North Atlantic Alliance) in the world which is capable of bringing the collective influence of the Western leadership to bear on this, the most important question before the world today.

The commentator on this panel was Professor Thomas M. Franck, Director of the Center for International Studies, New York University.

Professor Franck examined three of the traditional assumptions on which America's European foreign policy is based. He concluded that all three are outmoded, if indeed they were valid originally.

1. *Traditional Assumption Number One* is what we have called the NATO theory; that European Communism is an expansionist ideology which can only be stopped by a coordinated and integrated European military establishment; and such a grand alliance should be led by the United States.

Professor Franck noted several challenges to this assumption:

1) There is no longer one definable entity called European Communism.

2) Militant Communist expansion in Europe requires superior strength and total concentration of forces. So long as the Soviet Union is occupied on its Asian frontier and the United States retains superior nuclear retaliatory power, neither of these conditions are met.

3) Resurgent European nationalism in France as well as elsewhere in Europe makes total integration and acceptance of American leadership no longer attainable.

All of this would seem to suggest that Western Europe must be expected to move further away from us as the price of a closer unity among itself.

2. *Traditional Assumption Number Two* is what might be called the "roll-back" theory. Dr. Franck pointed out that this has already been largely abandoned due mainly to the fact that it has failed.

The reason for this failure is that life under Communism has failed to become so unbearable that revolutionary movements to which the U.S. would offer military assistance would spring up. Indeed the Eastern European governments have demonstrated a certain independence of Russia and they appear eager to become even more so. In the Yugoslav province of Macedonia a government has been defeated in a Communist Parliament. In Poland, land has been returned to private peasant tenure. Rumania is eager to do business with the West; and from various places we hear tentative proposals for private capital investment from abroad.

Professor Franck concluded from the above that liberalization rather than liberation of Eastern Europe is the more appropriate goal; and for historical reasons as well as political reasons, Western Europe rather than the United States is the better liberalizer.

3. *Traditional Assumption Number Three* is that Europe can be saved from De Gaullism and neutralism by getting Great Britain safely tucked away inside the Common Market. The major thing wrong with this theory is that it can't happen.

The re-awakening of European nationalisms has very little to do with General de Gaulle. It has far more in common with the African and Asian trends. That Western Europe will seek its own destiny, self-respect, self-determination, identity and role suitable to the nations of the great continental Roman system of civilization is by now a foregone conclusion. This role need not be hostile to ours, but it will not *be* ours. And this may be a good thing if it succeeds by peaceful means in helping Eastern Europe back into the light—even if not exactly *our* light.

Professor Franck pointed out, however, that the above re-evaluation left it far from clear that Britain's entry into Europe is any longer in our interest. If Britain goes in, she neither could nor should prevent the development of a new Europe with a role and style of its own. But if this is the case what is the advantage to us of shedding the most permanent and trusted ally we have? What is the point of our creating a situation in which we will have to pick up the not insignificant British East-of-Suez role and the responsibility for a leaderless Commonwealth? What is the point of pushing 55 million more consumers behind what we now realize will be a high European tariff wall? And, does Britain, whose style of government, whose system of commerce, whose laws, customs and culture so closely resemble ours and so totally vary from Europe's, really want to be the odd man out in a continental system dominated by others?

Professor Franck asked whether Britain also was suffering from a surfeit of old assumptions. In particular, he noted that she still believes that the good Europeans of Italy, Germany and France with their

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Christian Democratic entente are eagerly waiting for the kingdom come of Her Majesty's Labour Government.

In conclusion Professor Franck wondered whether in light of all the above it might not be wiser for the U.S. to reconsider becoming a part of some more pragmatic non-regional association of trade and policy to include Great Britain, Canada, Japan, those EFTA states which so opt, as well as Latin America.

EUROPEAN SECURITY

Question. Would you like to see Germany unified, and how? Ambassador Tomorowicz, is fear of a strong Germany holding back European security?

Answer. (By Ambassador Tomorowicz.) What I have said in my address here was that we believe that a divided country in the heart of Europe is not normal and thus is bound to create political unrest. We fully recognize, apart from human aspects, the necessity and historical right of the German nation to unify. However, if we start unifying Germany today, we shall be immediately confronted with a whole series of problems which are not soluble.

In order to unify a country you must have two parts. West Germany does not recognize the existence of the other part of Germany. In order to have two parts united and not have one part swallowed by the other, you must have some political recognition. But Western Germany clams to represent the whole German nation; that the other part does not really exist. The problem of unifications of Germany is very often put forward as the one with which Europe is expected to start, but this can only be resolved as a result of a slow process which eventually will make it possible for the two parts to adopt one another under international supervision.

Question. Would it not be possible for the two parts to come together if the citizens of the Eastern part were given self determination; and would it not be better for Poland to advocate freeing Eastern Germany, and having a neutral Germany, guaranteed by both NATO and the Warsaw powers, following the lead of Austria and Finland?

Answer. (By Ambassador Tomorowicz.) On the whole, and speaking as a European who sits in the very midst of the problem, I prefer a country with a government which would recognize the territory of my own country, which would recognise its rights. Instead we are confronted with a country whose War Minister only a few days ago said that he will never recognize these territories; the only thing he is ready to recognize is the fact that one should not use force in *restoring* those territories to Germany.

Question. If the purpose of NATO has been to some extent by-passed on the military side by events, should we not reduce military commitments in Europe?

Answer. (By Mr. Finletter): It depends in part on your evaluation of the ability of Europe to defend itself. If the European countries were to have confidence in their ability to defend themselves without the support of the United States, one could remove all of the American troops from Europe. However, if the judgment of the Allies is that the power of the United States is needed to defend, or better yet, deter a Russian attack, we would have to have enough American troops stationed in Europe to achieve the automatic response of the American Atomic-Air of which I spoke a few moments ago. There is no magic number of American troops in Europe necessary to achieve this result, and so some reductions might be safe. The danger is that the withdrawals will start a trend which would go so far as to leave Europe, as a practical matter, without the automatic support of the American atomic power. Militarily and politically, that would be extremely dangerous.

Ron Nowland Discusses Area Farm Situation at Meeting in South Hill, Va.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 1967

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, recently Mr. Ronald Nowland, public affairs director of the Virginia Farm Bureau Federation, gave a most interesting as well as an enlightening presentation of the farm situation in our area when he attended the so-called shirtsleeves meeting at South Hill, Va., recently conducted by officials connected with the Department of Agriculture.

Ron Nowland is a most knowledgeable person when it comes to our farm problems. He has the welfare of our farm people as well as the entire Nation foremost in his mind. He is dedicated to his work and I hold him in the highest esteem.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith the statement of Mr. Nowland, made June 2, 1967, before the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service Committee at South Hill, Va.

The statement is as follows:

STATEMENT OF VIRGINIA FARM BUREAU FEDERATION BEFORE THE STATE AGRICULTURAL STABILIZATION AND CONSERVATION SERVICE COMMITTEE, JUNE 2, 1967, AT SOUTH HILL, VA.

Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen of the Committee. My name is Ronald Nowland, Public Affairs Director for the Virginia Farm Bureau Federation. I want to thank you for your kind invitation to present some of our thoughts relative to farm programs and policies, the cost-price squeeze and other areas of interest to Virginia farmers.

We want to commend the state ASCS Committee for the excellent job you have done in adapting the federal farm policies to Virginia agriculture. We believe that you and the county committees (many of whom are members of our organization) and the staffs that you employ have kept the best interest of Virginia agriculture in mind as you have applied federal farm policy to Virginia farmers.

Most of you know that the farm families who compose the Virginia Farm Bureau are not always in agreement with all the farm policies that has been sent out from Washington. In some instances, the members of our organization have been in very strong opposition to some of the policy promulgated by the officials of the USDA. Nevertheless, our farmers have been greatly impresses with the attitudes of you on the state ASCS Committee and our county committees are not pressing against the will of Virginia farmers when their attitude differed from that of the Washington officials.

We urge you now, as we will throughout this paper and in the days ahead, to continually and relentlessly impress upon the Secretary of Agriculture and his staff, the need to build and keep a closer contact with the practicing farmers across this state and nation before embarking upon future farm policy.

We do not believe that he and his advisors have been listening to the grass-roots farmers and their representatives across this country. If he had been listening he would have heard a very clear and loud plea from Virginia farmers that they cannot continue to survive under the existing farm economy. An economy that has dragged farm prices to 72% of parity, the lowest since depression days. We are seeing in Virginia an out-migration in excess of 3,000 farmers per year from the farms. This, at a time when direct government expenses and payments in agriculture are at the highest in our history. We do not mean to say that the out-migration would not have happened anyhow, but we are concerned that the government is spending unbelievable sums to stem a tide that apparently cannot be slowed.

If you will allow me, I would like to discuss with you more specifically first, some of the farm programs that are disadvantageous to Virginia; second, some that are helpful; and thirdly, make some general recommendations.

You gentlemen know that Virginia is a feed-grain deficit state. We also are a livestock deficit state; especially, in swine and beef. Because of the strategic location of Virginia to the great market areas of the east, access through our port and air terminal facilities to potential world markets, and the ever expanding Virginia population needs, Virginia agriculture in many fields could have an unprecedented opportunity to help fulfill these needs. However, we find ourselves in a deficit position, so far as many of the necessary agricultural commodities go. It will be impossible to develop a large livestock industry unless, and until we expand our feed-grain production. We have potential feed grain markets if we can produce it. However, we find ourselves with a wheat and feed grain program imposed upon the state, making our deficit position even more critical.

It is our position that it is impossible to justify a wheat and feed-grain control program in Virginia. Both from the point of desire to build a healthier and expanding agricultural economy and from the desire of a majority of the farmers, as witnessed by the wheat vote of 1963.

We are even more amazed to find the Secretary of Agriculture, in the name of these programs, dumping government storage wheat and feed-grains at the time our farmers are harvesting their grains. This has a price depressing impact that is uncalled for and totally without precedent. This practice most assuredly cannot benefit farmers. It is an unconscionable misuse of a farm program. It is inconceivable to us that this practice is followed with the advice and consent of any group of farmers or their representatives. We cannot, for instance, believe that you of the state ASCS Committee ever advised such a thing. We know that the 20,000 farmers in our organization did not advocate it. We, therefore, raise the question, who advised such a disastrous course of action? Please bring this to the Secretary's attention.

In light of the ever growing world tension and our growing global committments; in light of the apparent serious shortage of food-stuffs, world-wide and our own diminishing domestic supplies of wheat and feed-grains; and because, as we have pointed out, the wheat-feed-grain program places Virginia farmers in a disadvantageous position, we respectfully request that you gentlemen of the Virginia ASCS Committee urge the Secretary of Agriculture to terminate as expeditiously as possible the wheat-feed-grain programs. We further urge you to advise the Secretary that as long as the wheat-feed-grain program does exist that he desist from dumping CCC stocks at harvest time or other such times when the open market price begins to rise. We believe the termination of these programs will enhance farmers' ability to produce for the market; develop new and more substantial markets; allow our livestock and poultry industry in Virginia to expand and cut transport cost of importing grain; give Virginia farmers an opportunity to share in the export market for feed grains and curb government payments and cost considerably during the current crisis period. It is our position that nation-wide farm programs of more recent times are becoming, or are being used as, a price depressant to the disadvantage of farmers. We are concerned about the attitude of top government officials who apparently feel that the goal of government programs is to supply the consumer with inexpensive food. Adverse statements in the past year by both the President and Secretary of Agriculture, at a time when fam prices were beginning to rise, had a most alarming impact upon agriculture. The impression was left among consumers that the rising cost of retail food was to be blamed mostly on the farmer. Our farmers did not appreciate this attitude, especially on the part of the Secretary of Agriculture, who is supposed to be chief spokesman for agricultural interests. We urge that you remind the Secretary that the farmers of Virginia would greatly appreciate his setting the record straight in this instance. It would also appear from certain practices that farm programs are going to be used to hold food prices down at the farmer's expense. We have already discussed this with the dumping of wheat and feed-grain. More recently we have seen the USDA refuse to raise support prices for Virginia peanuts, even after a unanimous appeal by the grower organizations for a much needed increase for our type peanuts.

The peanut program has generally worked to the best advantage of our Virginia growers, but recent action would indicate, at least, that it is possible to use the program to the disadvantage of growers, despite their pleas.

Farm labor has become a vital area of concern for farmers in this state. Farm Bureau has done everything in its power to help curb the labor shortage and find ways to slow the ever growing cost of farm labor. Mr. Chairman, you mentioned the cost-price squeeze in your letter to us, and we submit that the cost of farm operation is the major crisis facing Virginia agriculture today. The projected and planned increases in farm labor costs are not going to improve the situation. Our organization has been working directly with top Labor Department officials in Richmond and Washington to help find relief for the farmers in this situation. Little help appears likely. We have been overwhelmed by the silence of the Secretary and the USDA on this matter.

In my travels across this state, nothing in recent times has drawn more comment from farmers than the apparent disinterest of the Secretary of Agriculture relative to the farmers' plight with farm labor. It is hard to convince a farmer, as some have tried to do, that he will be better off by having his farm labor cost rise.

We would like to commend the Secretary for his support of the tobacco programs and the inclusion of poundage for flue-cured tobacco. The Virginia Farm Bureau, some eight or ten years ago, endorsed a poundage program for flue-cured tobacco, at a time when most everyone else, including other state Farm Bureaus, thought we had taken leave of our senses. If poundage had been accepted back then, Virginia tobacco producers would probably be much better off today. Nevertheless, we are glad that there is full support for the program now.

Further, we want to commend the Secretary for his support of the pending anti-discrimination farm marketing legislation. This legislation, in effect, extends the "right-to-work law" to farmers and farm processors. This vitally needed legislation has the full support of the Secretary and nearly every segment of Virginia and American agriculture. It will go a long way toward helping farmers develop their own marketing programs with less emphasis in the future needed on government control programs.

Again, we want to commend the rapid action of you gentlemen and the Secretary in releasing in our critical drought periods, the reserve acreage for pastures and providing grain under certain conditions to livestock producers in drought emergencies. These actions have been most beneficial to many of our farmers and would constitute a very able and acceptable use of farm policy.

I stated at the beginning, that we would also make certain recommendations on issues of concern to agriculture.

1. We recommend that the wheat-feed-grain program, which places Virginia agriculture at a decided disadvantage, be terminated as quickly as possible.

2. We recommend that the Secretary exert every effort to help remedy the burgeoning farm-labor cost problem.

3. We recommend that the Secretary become totally committed to the expansion of American agricultural interests in foreign trade. We strongly recommend that the concept of International Commodity Agreements as promulgated by our government in the recent GATT Conferences on international trade be forthwith dropped. In their stead, we recommend the development of, and committment to, a program that will enhance the flow of American agricultural products in world trade. We count it a blessing that the European Economic Community rejected the Commodity Agreement concept as proposed by our government.

4. We recommend that the USDA strongly support necessary action to reduce or eliminate the variable levy system used by most European countries against many of our agricultural products. This is a limiting factor against our potential export program.

5. We recommend that greater emphasis be given farmer-to-farmer contact between U.S. and foreign countries in trade development.

6. We recommend that the Secretary use every authority at his command to bring within reason the amount of imported dairy products coming into this country. We do not believe our domestic market should be used as a dumping ground for any product. We commend the Secretary for taking action on the dairy import matter through the Tariff Commission. We would further recommend on the dairy matter, that the loop holes in existing law be closed to stop circumvention of the dairy import laws.

7. We recommend that the Secretary review the beef import situation immediately, and where possible, stop circumvention of the Beef Import Act of 1964.

In conclusion, let me say that it is Farm Bureau's position that today's agricultural policy is in dire need of new direction. We believe that the day of devising programs to hinder and curb production are past. A reorientation to a policy of developing new and better markets and products is a must. We cannot afford in this day to waste talent, opportunity, and money on outdated concepts of supply-control. We are told from all sources that the world is on the brink of a major famine. We know that our world commitments demand more food stuffs. With these factors in mind, the United States cannot continue to spend billions to curb production while the world cries out in hunger. If we do this, we will destroy the moral fiber of our society. We possess the world's greatest weapon—food. We must use it to an advantage.

We trust the day is dawning when all who are interested in a healthy agricultural society in America will recognize that yesterday's answers will not necessarily solve today's problems. When this happens, then perhaps we can all, working in concert, devise an agricultural policy position that will give to our farmers an opportunity to achieve their proper position in an expanding domestic and world economy.

Ky Offers Political Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 1967

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, in introducing House Concurrent Resolution 382 last week, and again in an extension of my remarks yesterday, I expressed deep concern that the people of South Vietnam may not have the opportunity to freely elect their Government in the elections scheduled in that country in the fall of 1967.

Thus I have introduced House Concurrent Resolution 382 to send six Members of the House of Representatives and three Members of the Senate to South Vietnam to observe the elections to protect the South Vietnamese people's right of self-determination.

A dispatch from Saigon by the United Press International dated June 23 has given me reason to believe that some of the political problems connected with the proposed elections in Vietnam may be eased. According to the dispatch, Premier Ky has offered to provide his rivals for the Presidency with the necessary money and media exposure to make certain the elections are fair.

I welcome this statement by Premier Ky and hope sincerely that it means the fall elections in South Vietnam will be truly free.

However, even if official censorship is lifted and it becomes effective public policy to provide for free elections, there remains Vietcong terror and harassment against the people who exercise their right to vote.

Thus, it may be said that the freedom of the South Vietnamese elections is not assured. This, combined with the fact that censorship, forbidden by the South Vietnamese constitution, continues, once again moves me to urge passage of House Concurrent Resolution 382.

The presence of a team of congressional observers from the United States at the time of the election would work to protect the South Vietnamese people's freedom of choice. The people of South Vietnam must have the opportunity to work their will; this will not happen if censorship and terror are present.

Mr. Speaker, Under leave to extend my remarks I respectfully request permission to include the June 23 UPI dispatch in the Record:

Ky Says Other Candidates Will Get Government Help

Saigon, South Vietnam, June 23.—Premier Nguyen Cao Ky said today that his Government would give candidates running against him for the Presidency money, radio time and anything else they need to conduct their campaigns. He also said he would invite them to his political rallies if they wished.

The Premier told newsmen that if he was elected President this fall he would go to the United Nations to present South Vietnam's case if the issue should be debated by the world body.

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Federenko and the Facts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 1967

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, anyone who has been following the recent U.N. proceedings, can easily detect the obvious stream of lies and deceits which have ben continually uttered by the Soviet delegation.

Sheldon David Engelmayer, in a recent article, has listed eight remarks made by Soviet Ambassador Federenko which are in complete disagreement with the facts.

I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article which appeared in the June 23, 1967, edition of the Jewish Press.

The article follows:

FEDERENKO AND THE FACTS

(By Sheldon David Engelmayer)

If there is one thing lacking in the United Nations speeches of Soviet Ambassador Nikolai T. Federenko, it is truth. Not one word that he has uttered over the last few weeks had any semblance of truth to it. He has used the Security Council as a forum for his own bitter deceit and invective, and now he has turned the General Assembly into the newest arena for his dangerous game in the current Mid East crisis; he has even added Soviet Premier Kosygin to his list of players.

It is time for us to clear the air of Mr. Federenko's lies and deceits. The best method of ridding ourselves of this verbal air pollution is to equate the Soviet ambassador's remarks with the facts.

Fact 1: The United Nations Security Council was called into emergency session by Canada and Denmark on May 24, 1967, to discuss the military build-up in the Middle East. The United States delegate, Arthur Goldberg, declared that the situation was critical, and called for an immediate resolution urging restraint on all sides. Only the Soviet Union stood in the way of this resolution. Meanwhile, Nasser and his band of Arab cutthroats were able to mobilize fully for their "Holy War" to destroy Israel.

Fact 2: After the outbreak of hostilities on June 5, 1967, it took two days for the Security Council to vote a simple cease-fire resolution. The Soviet Union wanted to see how the war was going. When it became painfully obvious to Federenko that Israel had totally defeated her attackers, he swiftly agreed to an unconditional cease-fire.

Now, Federenko, his Bulgarian stooge Tarabanov and India's Parthasarathi, took on a new plan of attack. They had to brand Israel the aggressor, and demand that she withdraw her troops to positions held prior to the outbreak of the war on June 5th.

Fact 3: The Soviet Union began by accusing Israel of having planned its "aggression" of June 5th "for years." Mr. Federenko declared that the Arabs mobilized their troops only after Israeli forces had begun taking up positions on the Syrian border. Federenko made this charge despite the fact that U.N. observers reported to Secretary-General U Thant that no such Israeli build-up had taken place.

Mr. Federenko told the United Nations Security Council that "the United Arab Republic, Syria and other Arab States had no aggressive designs or desires whatsoever, that they were not preparing to attack and that it was precisely Israel which feverishly went ahead with its piratical attack on the Arab States."

Fact 4: On May 18, 1967, Egyptian President Gamal Abdel Nasser reimposed the blockade of the Gulf of Aqaba. Israel declared that this was an Act of War against her. For nearly 3 weeks, Israel exercised restraint, while the U.N. talkathon continued. Meanwhile, Nasser and his fellow Arab leaders called upon their people to wage a "Holy War" against Israel, until "Israel no longer exists." Instead of mouthing similar war-cries, Israel Premier Levi Eshkol called for restraint, and extended the olive branch of peace to his Arab neighbors.

Federenko attacked the United States for helping Israel prepare for war against the Arabs:

"Surely everyone knows that it is precisely Washington which, by its dollar generosity and assistance, has been supporting the Israeli aggressor and which, over a number of years, has been pursuing a notorious policy of acting from a position of strength against other States . . . This is all a chain of a single imperialist plot against the peace-loving peoples who have risen to the sacred call of the struggle against the colonial oppressors in the great cause of national freedom."

Fact 5: Mr. Federenko apparently forgot the heroic citizens of Hungary who rose in October of 1956, to shake off the yoke of the Communists and restore parliamentary democracy to that land. And, perhaps, he also forgot that Soviet troops and tank divisions rolled through the streets of Hungary, killing innocent and unarmed citizens by the thousands, and maiming countless others in order to restore dictatorial rule to that hapless land.

In his speeches to the Council, Mr. Federenko pleads for justice and mercy, while he condemns the "hypocricy" of Israel and the Western Powers.

Fact 6: If any nation has no right to talk about justice and mercy, it is the hypocritical Soviet Union. The bloodsoaked pages of Soviet history ably demonstrate the Russian idea of "justice and mercy." Between 1936 and 1938, the Soviet Union conducted a series of trials in which prominent revolutionaries were sentenced to death for treason. Among the victims of the Soviet justice were former Premier A. I. Rykov, two former Presidents of the Communist International, the former dreaded head of the Secret Police, and numerous cabinet officials. Marshal M. N. Tukhachevsky, one of Russia's most gifted military leaders during the Revolution, and seven of the Red Army's top generals were killed in June of 1937, after an alleged secret trial. This, too, was an example of Soviet "justice" and "mercy." Throughout this period many secret executions took place, and the subsequent purge caused many to be placed in forced labor camps. This, too, was "justice" and "mercy." And Russia's ruthless intervention in the Hungarian Revolution was also just and merciful, at least in Mr. Federenko's eyes.

Mr. Federenko has continuously referred to the Arab States as "peace-loving" and "friendly." He charges the United States with flaming the fires of the Middle East by militarily supporting Israel.

Fact 7: The Soviet Union has practiced anti-Semitism within its borders since 1917. They have constantly attempted to destroy Judaism by cultural strangulation and annihilation. On numerous occasions, official Soviet publications have printed cartoons and stories with definite anti-Semitic overtones. The Soviet Union has consistently held to a policy of anti-Semitism. Their actions in the United Nations are a direct extension of this anti-Semitic policy.

The Soviet ambassador has even gone so far as to accuse West Germany of aiding "the aggressive nature of Israel" by supplying her with gas masks.

Fact 8: Gas masks have yet to be used as weapons of aggression. Only a warped mind can charge that a defensive item such as a gas mask can be used to destroy tank columns. It is common knowledge that the gas masks were for use by Israel to protect herself from the hideous use by Nasser of chemical warfare, as he did against Yemen.

These are facts which Mr. Federenko blatantly and unashamedly ignores. But, Mr. Federenko has never really cared for facts. He enjoys his fiction better.

Fascist Threat to United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 1967

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, "you can fool all of the people some of the time, some of the people all of the time but you can't fool all of the people all of the time."

Clever words and phrases may camouflage aims and objectives, but eventually the mask is removed. Socialism, under any subterfuge just cannot be kept secret when it starts hurting the people.

I include "Analysis—America's Fascist Threat," by Hans F. Sennholz, from the June 28 Review of the News following my remarks.

Perhaps those who appeal and work to subvert the people under liberty-denying laws in the name of peace, progress, and prosperity are in the true sense not liberals, but are furthering the police state controls, recognized by many as national socialism or fascism.

AMERICA'S FASCIST THREAT

(By Hans F. Seenholz)

At one time or another most conservatives and libertarians have been called Fascists, although their principles of society, government, and economy are diametrically opposed to the tenets of Fascism. But it is a curious fact, ascertainable by every objective observer, that American liberalism evidences numerous similarities to the manifestations of Fascism. In particular, the economic policies of Fascist dictators are surprisingly similar to the economic programs of our liberal administrations. President Johnson's "Great Society," for instance, evidences characteristics which in other places were called Fascist.

In his *Autobiography* (Hutchinson & Company, Limited, Paternoster Row, E.C. 4, The Mayflower Press, Plymouth, England) Italian dictator Benito Mussolini explained what Fascism is all about: "I think that Italy is advanced beyond all the European nations: in fact, it has ratified the laws for the eight-hour day, for obligatory insurance, for regulation of the work of women and children, for assistance and benefit for afterwork diversion and adult education, and finally for obligatory insurance against tuberculosis. All this shows how, in every detail in the world of Labour, I stand by Italian working classes. All that was possible to do without doing an injury to the principle of solidity in our economy I have set out to do, from the minimum wage, to continuity of employment; from the insurance against accidents, to the indemnity against illness; from income for old age, to the proper regulation of military service. There is little which social welfare studies have appraised as practical to national economy or as wise for social happiness which has not already been advanced by me. I want to give to every man and woman so generous an opportunity that work will be done, not as a pain, but as a joy of life. . . . But beyond the State's labours, is Fascism, harmonizer and dominator of the Italian life, standing as the inspiration." (pp. 254–255)

The Fascist Italian Dictator spared no effort or expense to promote Italian education and culture. Also recreation and sports were developed at government expense. A decree of May 1, 1925 established recreation as a government project, the expressed aim being "the healthy and profitable occupation of the worker's leisure hours, through institutions for developing the worker's physical, intellectual, and moral capacity." This project (Dopolavoro) provided inexpensive vacations and excursions; courses in adult education and public library facilities; lectures and theatrical performances.

In the words of the Dictator: "One of the reforms which I have promoted, following it closely in all its successive developments, is the reorganization of schools. . . . The gravity and importance of school problems cannot escape the attention of any modern statesman mindful of the destiny of his people. The school must be considered in all its complete expression, Public School, Intermediate Schools, University Institutions, all exercise a profound influence on the trend, moral and economic, of the life of any nation. From the beginning this has always been on my mind. Perhaps my early experience as a schoolteacher added to an inescapable interest in youth and its development." (Page 259.)

Mussolini was also proud of his many Fascist achievements in the field of public works. "The policy of public works in Italy," he asserted, "had always had an electoral character; works to be done were decided here and there, not according to an organic plan and to any plain group of voters. I stopped this legalized favouritism. I instituted Bureaus of Public Works, entrusting them to persons in whom I have complete confidence, who obey only the central powers of the State, and are immune from pressure by local interests. In this way I was able to better sensibly the conditions of the roads of the south; I mapped out a programme for aqueducts, railroads and ports. All that is just, finds in the Italian bureaucracy an immediate comprehension. All the offices of governmental character have received a new impulse and new prestige. The great Public Utilities of the State, railroads, mail, telegraph, telephone, the monopolies, function again." (Page 268.)

"Today the State is not an abstract and agnostic entity; the Government is present everywhere, every day. Who lives in the ambit of the State, or outside the State, lives and feels in every way the majesty of law. It is not a thing of small account that all Public Utilities are conducted with an efficiency which I might call American, and that the Italian Bureaucracy, proverbially slow, has become eager and agile." (Page 269.)

Compare these Fascist programs of aid to education, labor legislation, social security, public works, and roads and ports with the economic programs of the Great Society. And, if you please, compare Mussolini's remarks with President Johnson's Economic Report: "Education will not cure all the problems of society, but without it no cure for any problem is possible. It is high among my own concerns, central to the purposes of this Administration, and at the core of our hopes for a Great Society." (Page 94.) President Johnson's Great Society legislation also provided for job training and work experience for young and inexperienced workers. It created out-of-school programs such as the Neighborhood Youth Corps, the Job Corps, a Work Experience Program, an Adult Basic Education program, a Manpower Development and Training program, and many others.

In matters of public health President Johnson points at his achievements as proudly as Mussolini—and they are again the same achievements. In the words of his 1966 Economic Report: "Among the most important actions of the 89th Congress was the provision of health insurance for the aged under Social Security. Medicare will protect families against the economic risk of major medical expenses in old age. Benefits for 17 million Social Security beneficiaries, plus benefits from general revenues for almost 2 million additional elderly persons not covered by Social Security, will amount to about $3.5 billion in 1967 and will cover at least 40 per cent of the total medical costs of the aged."

The President also says he is proud of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 which is "to promote investment in the health, education, training, and work experience of the poor which will enable them to contribute more effectively, and thereby to earn incomes more comparable to those in the rest of society." (Page 111.) Regarding housing, roads, and harbors the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 and other legislation "constitute a major Federal effort," the President said. His numerous other programs deal with transportation, agriculture, research and technology, natural resources, and many others.

Generalissimo Francisco Franco's Spain is now marching in the Great Society footsteps. During the 1940's when Italian Fascism and German Nazism were still in vogue, General Franco imitated their economic policies. But the near-bankruptcy of the Spanish state and the wretched living conditions of the people after more than ten years of orthodox Fascist rule caused Franco to set a new course. Retreating from radical socialism—though remaining a vigorous and effective anti-Communist—he began to imitate the New Deal, Fair Deal, New Frontier, and the Great Society of the United States. In economic policy Generalissimo Francisco Franco has become a faithful disciple of Presidents Kennedy and Johnson. In fact, the economic program of what the liberals call "Fascist Spain" differs little in substance from the Great Society program of Lyndon Johnson in everything except awareness of the Communist threat (a vital instance in which the attitudes of Generalissimo Franco are by far to be preferred).

On October 20, 1963, Franco introduced a 4-year national development plan. This new economic and social plan is indicative of the new appearance of the Franco regime. In substance, the Spanish government embarked upon a planned economy fashioned after the Great Society of Lyndon Johnson. As its central objective, Spain's plan for economic and social development sets out to achieve, as rapidly as possible and in conditions of economic stability, rising standards of living, advancement of education, and greater welfare for all Spaniards of the present generation and those to come. Three fundamental intentions form this objective: *social integration*, which is the progressive leveling of individual incomes; *social mobility* through equal opportunities and social advancement; and access to *higher levels of training and education*, as well as ownership and social and economic leadership.

The plan defines very broadly the policies to be followed: It acknowledges that financial stability is vital to success and that official price guidance is required. To maintain the over-all equilibrium of the economy (a) total public expenditure is to be covered by ordinary revenue; (b) external equilibrium is to be achieved through higher earnings from invisibles, capital inflows, and the expansion of exports; (c) appropriate short-term policies are to be pursued to prevent an over-extension of demand; and (d) an incomes policy is to be elaborated. An Incomes Commission will submit semiannual reports to the government on the current distribution of incomes, and prepare measures to implement a more equitable distribution.

Government enterprises are also to be promoted in Spain through rationalization of accounting procedures and official subsidies and credits. However, the plan does not touch upon the many privileges of state enterprises and does not propose to limit their highly privileged position. In fact, the government offers its "public sector" new privileges, called incentives, in an attempt to stimulate more economical operation. And, in an attempt to remove the sectorial and geographic differences that exist in Spain, the government is even organizing "growth centers" to aid the underdeveloped regions and spur local industrial development.

In 1965 Spanish costs of living rose 9.4 per cent, and more than 4 per cent in 1966 despite "corrective measures—including massive food imports. The impact of these imports was reflected in the balance of trade: imports rose by 34 per cent and exports by 10 per cent in 1965. The 1965 trade deficit of 2 billion dollars was not fully absorbed by revenue sources, and the over-all balance of payments showed a negative result, which reduced Spain's gold and foreign exchange holdings precariously.

Most of Spain's inflationary problems sprang from chronic budgetary deficits. In 1965 the Gross National Product was calculated to have risen 7.8 per cent in real terms, and a similar rate was achieved in 1966. The per capita income rose rapidly in 1965 reaching 35,600 pesetas or $600. The daily minimum wage for unskilled worker was raised by 40 per cent to 84 pesetas of $1.40 a day. And finally, to restrain the level of demand created by inflation and credit expansion, the government resorted to austerity measures which included restricted bank loans, cuts in allocations to official institutions, and a guideline for wage increases.

This short description of the Spanish economy and Spain's economic policies could be taken directly from an official report on the American economy. In both countries the planners are proud of their 4-year national developments that are to bring greater abundance and opportunity to their subjects. Rising standards of living for the poor are promised in both countries. The three fundamental objectives of the Franco regime—social integration, social mobility, and higher levels of training and education—are also, we are told, the most important objectives for the Johnson regime. While both leaders talk a great deal about financial and monetary stability, both employ monetary depreciation and economic instability. Both promise over-all equilibrium of the economy, and both deliver instability and insecurity. In their fiscal policies both promise balanced budgets and subsequently suffer huge deficits. Both endeavor to raise wages through minimum wage legislation and seek a more equitable social integration. While both occasionally talk about individual enterprise, both are promoting government enterprises through public subsidies and credits. And in an attempt to remove the the sectorial and geographic differences that exist in both countries, both governments are building "growth centers" or "model cities" that are to aid the underdeveloped regions of their countries. Both promise more.

This is not to imply that the political regimes of Francisco Franco and Lyndon B. Johnson are identical in form and substance: merely that the economic policies are similar and that the inevitable effects are identical. Certainly the government of Premier Franco has taken a far more realistic attitude toward the dangers of International Communism—an area in which he is much to be admired. We realize that the Spanish form of government constitutes military rule, and

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

the American republic a representative form of government. The popular General Franco rose to power, and continues to maintain it, as leader of the military; the American president was elected by popular vote and is staying in power until expiration of his term through Constitutional authorization. But we must not overlook the fact that political leaders use public funds to enhance their popularity with their subjects.

A comparison of Lyndon Johnson to Francisco Franco will surely infuriate American liberals. Yet the fact is that it was liberal American presidents who pioneered Generalissimo Franco's new economics. The General, deeply committed to the West, has but followed America's lead. There can be little doubt that he would now be a liberal favorite if it were not for his courageous and outspoken anti-Communism. Generalissimo Franco employs liberal economics out of what he thinks is commitment to the West; Lyndon Johnson can offer no such justification. Nonetheless, if Premier Franco is a Fascist as the liberals contend, what is President Johnson? Witness our president's current moves:

Just now the Johnson Administration is getting ready for a new burst of election inflation. To give Lyndon Johnson a marked advantage over any opponent in 1968, the spending of federal billions, benefitting special groups of voters, will be accelerated between now and the election. The Administration proposes to spend some 58 billion dollars on social welfare and related programs: $25.8 billions for social security, $3.9 for medicare, $4.2 billions for public assistance, $3.4 billions for federal assistance to elementary, secondary, and higher education, $1 billion on various subsidies to cities and urban areas, $1.9 billion for war on poverty, $6.7 billions for war veterans, *etc.* And for greatest political impact on the election a great number of benefits to special groups of voters are to be increased just before the election: social security benefits are to be raised 20 per cent, which from the outset will cost $4.1 billion. Some 5.4 million civilian and military employees of the federal government are to receive raises costing $1 billion, veterans are to receive new benefits, including higher pensions, medicare benefits for disabled persons are to be extended to people under age 65, poverty funds are to be raised 28 per cent, a new fund of $412 million is to rebuild slums under the "model cities" program, *ad nauseam*.

The number of people affected by this federal largesse could be enough to swing the 1968 election. The beneficiaries alone comprise the majority of the American electorate. After all, there are 24.3 million retired or disabled persons drawing social security, 5.5 million over 65 getting medical benefits, 7.4 million drawing relief under programs aided by federal funds, 8 million medically indigent persons to be helped by the medicaid program, 1.2 million persons in various poverty programs, 20.1 million school children (along with their parents and teachers) receiving the benefits of federal school funds, 2 million college students getting federal grants or loans (or work-training assistance), 4.6 million veterans or survivors, and uncounted millions of relatives, merchants, and other groups benefitting indirectly from federal handouts.

Who are the Fascists? Can they be found in the camp of American conservatives who are dreaming about a rebirth of individual freedom and Constitutional Government? Or do they crowd the camps of American liberals and socialists who are denouncing their opponents while preaching the messages of an omnipotent, omnipresent government? The answer is far too obvious to justify further comment.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402, at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Appendix

President Johnson and the First Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK BROOKS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 28, 1967

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, President Lyndon Johnson yesterday addressed the national convention of the junior chamber of commerce meeting in Baltimore, Md. The main import of his remarks was a defense of the first amendment to our Constitution and the basic right of free speech which all Americans enjoy.

The President told the Jaycees that criticism to be effective must be constructive. He stated:

> It is good that we have a system where we can freely talk about what is wrong because when we have the proper information, we make the proper judgments. We can only get information by communication.

He assumed that his listeners had heard some of the things that are supposedly wrong with our country. He then took the opportunity to tell them some of the things that are right with America.

The President further stressed the importance of communication by citing his recent discussion with Chairman Kosygin at Hollybush. In the spirit of communication, I include the text of the President's remarks, which highlight some of the right things about our country, in the RECORD at this time:

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT AT THE NATIONAL CONVENTION OF THE JUNIOR CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, BALTIMORE, MD.

President Suttle; Governor Agnew; Senators Brewster and Tydings; Congressmen Garmatz, Fallon, Machen, Long, and Friedel; Mayor McKeldin; Mr. D'Alesandro; Mr. Shriver; distinguished J.C.'s and your ladies, I am glad that you asked me to come here today and I am so happy that I could come.

Someone said recently that "I am for the future. I expect to live the rest of my life there."

So all of us here this morning are going to live the rest of our lives in the future—most of us in this country. Not only are we going to live our lives in the future, what is more important, our children and our grandchildren are.

We can give them a country where crime is commonplace, where strife is certain, where free enterprise is frowned upon, where the state is everything—or we can invest our money and our efforts wisely enough to make the next generation freer and happier than ours has been.

A former President of the United States once said—when he was speaking about our living under the First Amendment and exercising the freedoms that go with it—that "Criticism is no doubt good for the soul." But we must beware that it does not upset our confidence in ourselves.

You would hardly expect a man who has had an automobile for sale to tell you that the motor heated, the wheels had not been put on properly, the horn wouldn't blow, that the automobile itself had a very short life—and then expect you to buy it.

But we hear other nations say so many things about our own in criticism—and we say so many things ourselves—that I sometimes wonder if the rest of the world hears only what is wrong with America.

It is good that we have a system where we can freely talk about what is wrong because when we have the proper information, we make the proper judgments. We can only get information by communication.

Proceeding on the assumption this morning that you young leaders of America have heard some of the things about what is wrong with this country, I am going to assume that I may be permitted to talk about some of the things that are right with America.

I should like to ask each person here to engage in a little introspection for the next few minutes I am privileged to be with you. I would like you to ask yourselves to count your own blessings—to ask yourself "What do I have to be thankful for; what do I have to appreciate; what do I have to be proud of; what do I have to look forward to? What do I have that my grandfather did not have—or that my father did not have—or that my brother did not have?"

Let us compare some of the present day conditions to—and I quote—"the good old days".

Or if we could—and still be polite—we might compare some of our conditions in America to some of the conditions in other countries that we have had pointed up to us from time to time.

Let us look at our educational system—because the very basis of a great nation is an educated mind, a healthy body, and a free enterprise system.

50 years ago in our educational system, only 10 percent of our boys and girls graduated from high school. Today that figure is not 10 percent. It is 75 percent. That is more than double that of France or West Germany, Italy or Great Britain.

50 years ago only about four percent of our young people went to college. Today that figure is about 40 percent. Only 10 percent of the young people of Great Britain and France go to institutions of higher learning.

Let us look at some other education we are getting from protesting and expressing dissent in this country. During a week a short time ago, our newspapers and our T.V. programs, our radio commentators, informed us fully about the protesters and the "peace-niks" who invaded the Pentagon.

They came there to stay—they walked over the tulips; they sat down on the steps; they slept in the halls. After we had analyzed it all carefully and the reports had been given—sometimes dramatically and occasionally emotionally—the "sleep-ins" numbered 12, a bare dozen.

During that very same week, there were 10,000 young Americans who voluntarily—on their own—walked into the military enlistment centers directed by the Pentagon and volunteered their services and their lives for America.

Let me repeat, there were over 10,000 first term enlistments in one week.

Unfortunately, a student carrying a sign or protester wearing a beard, or an attention-seeker burning a draft card in front of a camera can get more attention—and more billing—than all 10,000 of these volunteers.

So we will continue to have those visit the Pentagon to speak their mind. We will continue to have those visit the enlistment stations to give their lives—but let us keep the two in perspective.

In exercising our freedoms, let us check on them as we go along—and be sure that we never abuse them.

Americans are the best fed, the best paid, and the best educated people in the world. That is something we ought to be proud of in America. I know what we do when we are not the best fed, or the best read, or the best paid.

All we have to do is look back to the situation in Washington when I first came there in 1931—when the Bonus Marchers were driven down Pennsylvania Avenue—and look back to the emergency legislation which was required in the days following.

The banks had to be closed—and reopened again. Our farm commodities were being burned, and our soup kitchens stretched for half a mile in some of the main centers of our towns.

So much for our employment and our education. What about our health conditions?

Deaths from the dread diseases have been cut in half in the last 50 years. Life expectancy has doubled in the last 100 years. Infant mortality rates have been cut in half in the last 30 years. Artificial kidneys now in use soon will be joined by the artificial heart.

Measles have been retired in the pages of history. Polio is no longer the fear of every mother in the land—thanks to our great medical profession, and thanks to a country which has concentrated on trying to do what is right—and correct what is wrong.

Medical care has recently forged an extraordinary partnership. We have almost 20 million elderly persons. We have over 200,000 doctors working with this group. Under the Medical Care Program, over five million Americans in the last year—and the first anniversary is coming up very soon—have received physician services. Almost three million have received hospital care.

I have not come here to say to you that all is right and perfect. We still have many problems. We are facing up to them. We are recommending measures to deal with them. We won't get them all. We may just get a fraction of them—but we are not ignoring them—we are not running away from them—and we are not cutting out on them.

I saw in some report from some great university yesterday something about how we had cut back on our Poverty Programs, and how we had denied our people education programs and health programs because we were defending our country.

Well, that is just not true. That is just not so.

A little over three years ago—when I became President—we had no poverty program. We were in Vietnam, but we had no poverty program. We started one—and we have increased it every year since.

This year, we are increasing it by 25 percent—without tucking tail and running in Vietnam.

More money will be spent on poverty in the United States in trying to do something about it this year by the Federal Government than we spend in Vietnam.

In our educational program—when I became President a little over three years ago—we were spending $4 billion a year. This year our budget is $12 billion—three times as

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

much for education in three years—and we are still doing our duty in Vietnam.

In our health program three years ago, we were spending a little over $4 billion a year in the Federal Government for health needs. This year our budget is a little over $12 billion—three times as much for health in three years as we were spending three years ago.

We still have many problems of unemployment and poverty. Even though America's poorest housing is in a luxury class for the masses of some other countries, we do have slums. We want to do something about them. We are doing something about them.

We passed our Model Cities program this year. That is the most far-reaching step in that direction that this nation has ever taken.

Today there are seven million fewer people living in poverty than there were seven years ago. The unemployment rate has dropped from 5.7 to in the neighborhood of 3.7. Operation Head Start has already given three-quarters of a million children from the poor families a leg up on education. It is growing every day.

More than a million persons are receiving job training under Federal programs compared to none seven years ago.

Almost one million people are going to college this year because of higher educational programs enacted under our Administration and passed by our Congress.

We all owe a debt to the Congress which has enacted this legislation for us.

So when you go back and talk about something that went wrong—how a motor failed—or how a red light stuck—or how someone looked on television—or how long they spoke—or what they didn't say—ask yourself to remember some of the good things that you have produced.

Our educational system—summarizing—is second to none anywhere in the world. Our prosperity is second to none anywhere in the world. Our standard of living is second to none anywhere in the world.

We produce more goods; we transport more goods; we use more goods than anyone in the world.

We own almost a third of the world's railroad tracks. We own almost two-thirds of the world's automobiles—and we don't have to wait three years to get a new one either.

I shouldn't be surprised—if you are anxious enough right now—but what some people on this very floor will take your orders.

The Baltimore New Car Dealers Association had better be careful or they will get outfigured. Someone will make you a cut rate proposition.

We own half the trucks in the world. We own almost half of all of the radios in the world. We own a third of all of the electricity that is produced in the world. We own a fourth of all of the steel. Our health conditions rank favorably with those of other countries in the world. Although we have only about six percent of the population of the world, we have half of its wealth.

Bear in mind that the other 94 percent of the population would like to trade with us.

Maybe a better way of saying it would be that they would like to exchange places with us.

I would like to see them enjoy the blessings that we enjoy. But don't you help them exchange places with us—because I don't want to be where they are.

Instead, I believe we are generous enough—I believe we are compassionate enough—and I believe we are grateful enough that we would like to see all of them enjoy the blessings that are ours.

I say to you young business leaders of America, there never has been a time when the business groups of this country—the young leaders of this country—the employees and the labor leaders of this country have cooperated with their Government more than now. Your President is grateful for it.

I want to leave one thought with you. If you forget everything else I say, please remember this when you go back to your own community to provide them with the leadership that I want to provide you—that I am trying so hard to provide you.

You say to them that it is not absolutely essential—it is not a prerequisite—and it is not required that you tear our country down, and our flag down, in order to lift them up.

I want to conclude now by just quietly saying a word to you about this larger world that we all live in. I think it is on your mind and in your heart—as it is on mine and in mine.

We are in South Vietnam today because we want to allow a little nation self-determination. We want them to be able to go and vote for the kind of leaders they want and select the type of Government they want. We want them to be free of terror and aggression in doing that—as we want it for ourselves.

We made a contract. We had an agreement. We entered into a treaty that was confirmed by our Senate, 82 to 1, saying that in the face of common danger, we would come and help.

We came. We are helping. We are doing our best. I solicit the cooperation of each of you to the extent that you can give it.

We Americans are deeply concerned about the recognition of the right of self-determination. That is what each of you demands for yourself. So let us help your fellowman in other parts of the world enjoy it, too.

Self-determination is really the right to live. That is what we ask for all of the nations of the Middle East—not just for some of them.

We believe that for the peoples of the 122 nations of the world, speaking now of the under-developed nations of the world specifically, real self-determination only comes when hunger and disease and ignorance and poverty are overcome. We believe that the peoples of all of these nations are entitled to that self-determination. They won't have it until we can conquer those ancient enemies—illiteracy, ignorance, disease and poverty.

Just as it is here in our home, we believe in the First Amendment, in free speech and in a free press. We believe in the Bill of Rights. We believe what matters abroad is also freedom from fear and freedom from want—the freedom to make choices and not just to submit to a brutal destiny.

Two days ago, not very far from here, I met with Chairman Kosygin of the Soviet Union. The nations we spoke for are two of the most powerful nations in all of the world. In the family of nations, two of the strongest have two of the greatest responsibilities.

For my part, and for your nation, that responsibility involves helping other nations to choose their own futures as they see it.

We seek as well maximum understanding between these two great powers. For 10 hours we looked at each other with only the interpreters present in a very small room.

Though our differences are many, and though they run very deep, we knew that in the world's interest it was important that we understand, if we could, the motivations as well as the commitments of each other. We religiously, dedicatedly, and determinedly worked at that assignment for those two days.

That is why we met in the house called Hollybush. To bring about better understandings, and to discuss respective goals and commitments, we came there.

When we left I believe we had achieved that. We agreed we would continue to maintain contact through diplomatic channels, through other means of communication, and direct contact.

In Saigon, in Sinai, at Hollybush in New Jersey, in the slums of our cities, in the prairies of our land, in the hollows of Appalachia, in scores of underdeveloped countries all around the world where men struggle to make their own future and to secure their little families, that is what we are about.

If the young leadership of our country supports us over the long hard pull that lies ahead, if you can endure the tensions, if you can understand that the air is going to be rough and the road is going to be bumpy, you can, in the words of your own creed, "Help us unlock earth's great treasure—human personality."

Then the cussers and the doubters will be relegated to the rear; the doers and the builders will take up the front lines.

Now you are going to return to your homes. You have engaged in looking at yourselves and at your country. I have been able to discuss it for only a very brief time.

I am going back to attend a one o'clock meeting with Secretary Rusk and Secretary McNamara and others who are giving everything they have to your country. We are not only going to talk and plan and work and pray to develop ways and means of keeping your country and your families secure, but we are going to do our dead level best to bring peace to every human being in the world.

Our problems are many. Our solutions are few. I am not as concerned about the individual differences which we have with other nations—because with few exceptions I think those can be reconciled—but I am concerned that every boy and girl, that every man and woman who enjoys citizenship and freedom and prosperity and the blessings of this land know what they have and are determined to build upon it, to improve it—and by all means to keep it.

Education Can Be Criminal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1967

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the "educated guess" theory that crime is somehow blamed on poverty and lack of schooling was jolted last week with the arrest of 16 members of the violent Revolutionary Action Movement—RAM.

Among those arrested were an assistant school principal, Navy management analyst, public school teacher, board of education custodial engineer, a transit authority clerk, a department of welfare clerk, a grocery store owner, and a foreign exchange student at New York University and his wife from Guinea. The latter perhaps came to the United States of America to study revolutionary methods.

Possibly our intellectual policymakers will want to reevaluate their ground rules since it becames more and more obvious that education is being used in many instances to teach crime, riots, looting, and bloodshed. It all depends on who and what is being taught.

With yesterday's passage of the National Teachers Corps bill, let us hope that the Corps does not recruit anti-American theorists and Socialists who, subsidized by tax dollars and enjoying the dignity of a Federal title, will now be turned loose to plant their poisonous seeds of strife in the minds of our precious little children.

Oh, Columbia—how long before our people awaken.

Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD following my remarks, an article by Emanuel Perlmutter which appeared in the New York Times on June 22, 1967:

SIXTEEN NEGREOS SEIZED; PLOT TO KILL WILKINS AND YOUNG CHARGED

(By Emanuel Perlmutter)

Twelve men and four women, described by the police as members of a Negro revolutionary group, were arrested yesterday on charges ranging from plotting to murder Roy Wilkins to burning a subway station and advocating anarchy.

Whitney M. Young was another alleged murder target of the group, members of which were indicted Tuesday night by a Queens County grand jury.

Fifteen of the accused were arrested in pre-dawn raids in Brooklyn, Queens and Manhattan, the 16th in Philadelphia. Rifles, shotguns, carbines, other weapons and more than 1,000 rounds of ammunition were seized.

Maxwell Stanford, 33 years old, of that city. The Federal Bureau of Investigation has described him as the national leader of the revolutionary group.

Two of the defendants were charged with conspiring to kill Mr. Wilkins, the executive director of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, and Mr. Young, the executive director of the National Urban Lague. Both organizations are considered moderate in civil rights affairs.

The two men charged with conspiracy to commit homicide were Herman B. Ferguson, 47, assistant principal of Public School 40, 109–20 Union Hall Street, Jamaica, Queens, and Arthur Harris, 22, described as having no occupation of 122–08 153d Street, Jamaica.

WEAPON SEIZED HOME

District Attorney Thomas J.. Mackell's office said that 10 rifles, a machine gun, three carbines, a shotgun, four knives and three metal arrows had been found in Mr. Ferguson's home at 129–39 157th Street, Jamaica.

Affidavits in support of the indictments, which were handed up by a Queens grand jury Tuesday night, said that all the defendants were members of the Revolutionary Action Movement, also called RAM. The Federal Bureau of Investigation has described the group as pro-Red China and openly committed to the overthrow of governments by violence and assassination.

The 16 suspects, all Negroes, were charged with advocating criminal anarchy and conspiring to advocate criminal anarchy. Thirteen were accused also of conspiracy to commit arson and seven with possession of dangerous weapons.

Fifteen of the accused were arrested in predawn raids in Brooklyn, Queens and Manhattan. The sixteenth, Maxwell Stanford, 33, of Philadelphia, was arrested in that city. The F.B.I. has called him the national leader of the revolutionary group.

Seized with the prisoners were more than 30 weapons, more than 1,000 rounds of ammunition, explosive materials, 275 packets of heroin, radio receivers and transmitters, walkie-talkies and subversive literature.

The indictments charged that in December, 1966, the defendants had formed the Jamaica Rifle and Pistol Club "to be used as a cover and front for legal possession of weapons."

Mr. Mackell said that the defendants had become "sharp-shooters," holding target practice in National Guard armories in Brooklyn, Queens and Long Island.

At a news conference in the Queens prosecutor's office, Mr. Mackell and Chief inspector Sanford Garelik of the Police Department said that other unnamed civil rights leaders, both Negroes and white, and Government officials also had been chosen as future targets of violence by the RAM members.

Mr. Garelik said that the group had been under surveillance for two years by police undercover agents. Mr. Mackell said that planned assassinations of Mr. Wilkins and Mr. Young were to have taken place this year.

The two officials said that the defendants planned to commit arson at gasoline stations, a subway station and a lumber yard.

The homicide conspiracy charges against Ferguson and Harris alleged that they had checked the offices of Mr. Wilkins and Mr. Young to familiarize themselves with the movement of the civil rights leaders and that they had checked the vicinity of Mr. Wilkin's home in Jamaica to establish the best roads for getting there and leaving without becoming snarled in traffic.

All of the defendants except the Philadelphia man were arraigned later in Queens Supreme Court before Justice Anthony Livoti. He set tomorrow for hearings and held them in a total of $207,500 in bail, ranging from a low of $2,500 to $40,000 each for Ferguson and Harris.

THOSE ARRAIGNED HERE

The 90-minute arraignment was interrupted frequently while several of the defendants tried unsucecssfully to call lawyers. Others were represented by counsel in court.

The 15 men and women stood in a semicircle before the bench while the charges were read and their bail was set. Some wore neat attire, others were clad in sports shirts and slacks. Several looked sullen, some looked confused and others glum.

Those ararigned, in addition to Ferguson and Harris, were the following:

Merle Stewart, 46, a civilian management analyst for the Navy, for 111–29 179th Place, Jamaica.

Ursula V. West, 28, a public school teacher, of 195 Willoughby Street, Brooklyn.

Milton C. Ellis, 33, a mechanic, or 170–09 107th Avenue, Jamaica.

Abraham C. Taylor, 39, an art gallery employee, of 97–06 Northern Boulevard, Corona, Queens.

Fred Fernandez, 23, unemployed, of 94–17 32d Avenue, Corona.

Hampton W. Rookard, 38, a Board of Education custodial engineer, of 8 Stanhope Street, Brooklyn.

Harriet Noel, 26, of 1070 Anderson Avenue, the Bronx.

Al Haynes, 43 of 6 Raleigh Avenue, Roosevelt, L.I., an aircraft mechanic.

George Samuels, 40, owner of a grocery at 120–03 New York Boulevard, Jamaica, and a clerk for the Transit Authority.

Mariki Kaurouma, 24, of 25 West 132d Street, an exchange student from Guinea who is tsudying accountancy at New York University.

Michelle Kaurouma, 24, wife of Mariki Kaurouma.

Mandola Gale McPherson, 38, a Department of Welfare clerk, of 200–16 120th Avenue, Jamaica.

Hawaii Adults Earn Cherished High School Diplomas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 1967

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, the theme of the commencement exercises of the Oahu adult education class of 1967, held at Honolulu's Farrington High School, was "Move Forward." It was a source of considerable pleasure for me to read that among the 512 graduates moving forward to accept their diplomas were many adults who had returned to school to complete their high school education.

Heartiest congratulations are in order to these adults who did not have the opportunity to obtain their diplomas in their youth, but who, despite current heavy responsibilities, had the determination and the intellectual capacity to win their diplomas and achieve this cherished goal. They are a credit to their families, to our State, and to the Nation.

Honolulu Advertiser Reporter Maile Kearns recently interviewed six of the graduates from the Oahu Adult Education Centers—Mrs. Mary Tanabe, a proud grandmother of nine from Waimanalo; Mrs. Germaine Tavares; Mrs. Carmen Souza; Mrs. Evangeline Golden; Mrs. Antje Goode; and Mrs. Theresia Lee—and I commend her informative article, which appeared in the Thursday, June 1, 1967, issue of the Honolulu Advertiser, for the attention of my colleagues in the House:

GRANDMA TANABE NOW A GRAD

(By Maile Kearns)

Mrs. Mary Tanabe, 49-year-old grandmother from Waimanalo, is among proud graduates who will receive a high school diploma at Farrington High School auditorium Sunday.

Mrs. Tanabe is one of 512 graduates of six Oahu Adult Education Centers receiving diplomas in the ceremonies which begin at 4 p.m.

She works a night shift at the Hawaii State Hospital and thought that her chances of improving her education were slight.

Then the daytime Kailua Center for Independent Study opened this year and she enrolled.

"I've always liked to learn," she said. "I like to study and I think having a high school education will help me advance on my job."

Mrs. Tanabe has worked for eight years at the State Hospital as an aide. She recently was reclassified as a paramedical assistant.

Mrs. Tanabe, who is the mother of seven and grandmother of nine children, credited her husband with helping her achieve a cherished goal.

"He encouraged me to do this," she said "and he helps at home so that I can have time to do my studying."

Three Windward Oahu sisters also will get diplomas which they never had a chance to obtain in their youth.

They are Mrs. Germaine Tavares, 34; Mrs. Carmen Souza, 33, and Mrs. Evangeline Golden, 36.

"When I found out there is no tuition charge because of Federal aid and that we only had to buy books," Mrs. Tavares said, "I told my sisters about it and all three of us signed up."

Mrs. Tavares has five children, ages eight to 14.

"My kids think I'm pretty intelligent now," she said. "But I didn't want them later on to think, 'Oh, Mom can't know much. She didn't even finish high school.'"

Mrs. Tavares, who is good with figures, found that her job chances were limited because she didn't have a high school diploma.

Now she feels she can get a better job. She's thinking of applying at a supermarket, where she can use her math skill as a checker.

Mrs. Souza, also the mother of five, said she dropped out of school because there wasn't enough money in their large family.

"This may sound impossible these days," Mrs. Souza said, "but at the time my father was trying to raise 10 children alone because my mother had died.

"I was always sorry I wasn't able to finish high school and when this chance came I took it."

The third sister, Mrs. Golden, said she enrolled for personal reasons.

"I always felt cheated that I hadn't finished high school," she said. She enrolled in classes at Hauula Elementary School.

There are several foreign-born graduates-to-be among the adult education class, including Mrs. Antje Goode, 27, secretary at the Boy Scouts Aloha Council.

Mrs. Goode is a native of Frankfurt, Germany, and is married to an Air Force captain. She attended school in Germany for eight years and had a year of business school.

She qualified for her high school diploma by taking the Standard California Achievement Test, enrolling for a semester of French, an passing the General Educational Development test.

Another German-born graduate is Mrs. Theresia Lee, 37, of Kaneohe. Her husband is a civilian aircraft mechanic at Hickam Air Force Base. They have two children.

"I like going back to school," Mrs. Lee said, "I always felt bad when I had to say I didn't have a high school education."

Mrs. Lee said she took modern math and contemporary math in the adult school and passed all the tests.

In addition to the 512 graduates receiving high school diplomas, there will be 13 others who have completed adult basic education which is equivalent to an eighth grade level.

Theme of the commencement excerises is "Move Forward."

Civil Service Chairman Macy Plans To Explore Creation of a Summer Employment Program for Social Science Teachers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 28, 1967

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I have always found Civil Service Commission Chairman John W. Macy, Jr., interested in suggestions and ideas for improving the Federal service, and in attracting citizens into the Federal service who can contribute special skills or who can derive from such service experience valuable to them in other activities in the public interest.

Thus, when I received several inquiries earlier this year from social science teachers in St. Louis, wondering how they could qualify for summer employment in the Federal Government—in positions which would enable them to obtain some practical experience which they would pass on to their students—I wrote to Chairman Macy after determining that there was, at present, no centralized program for summer employment in the Federal service for high school and college social science teachers.

COULD BE INSTITUTED NEXT SUMMER

The answer, which I have just received from Mr. Macy, leads me to have high hopes that such a program can be instituted next summer.

One of the inquiries I received was from a young Jesuit doing graduate work in political science. I was under the impression that having a member of a religious order try to qualify under regular Civil Service procedures might stump the Commission staff, but I am pleased to see from Mr. Macy's reply that this would not be a problem.

Mr. Speaker, because of the widespread interest among Members of Congress in the subject matter of this exchange of correspondence, I submit herewith for inclusion in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, copies of my letter to U.S. Civil Service Commission Chairman John W. Macy, Jr., and of his reply dealing with summer employment in the Federal Government for social science teachers, as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., May 1, 1967.

MR. JOHN W. MACY, Jr.,
Chairman, Civil Service Commission,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MACY: We receive many inquiries about summer job opportunities in the government for students, and I know how interested you have been in the establishment of government efforts to provide such employment. But, as a result of several inquiries I have received from school teachers seeking to work in government for the summer, I am wondering what thought is being given to the creation of a separate program to provide working experience in the field for high school and college teachers of history, political science, civics, etc.

Apparently there is no present program of this nature. To teachers who have inquired, I have suggested that they contact the Regional Civil Service Commission office in St. Louis to apply for any open examinations, but on an individual basis, it may be quite difficult for them to find an opening just for the summer. Yet, I think they would bring to the government an interest and a zeal far exceeding that of the average employee. Perhaps some foundation might be willing to undertake the screening of applicants and the matching of temporary Federal job openings with teachers who could fill them for the summer.

I recognize the practical difficulties. For instance, I have just received a letter from a young Jesuit doing graduate work in political science who feels that his ability as a teacher would be enhanced by some practical experience in the government. On the other hand, having a member of a religious order try to qualify under regular Civil Service procedures for a position for only one month might well stump the Commission staff. I just don't know. That is why I am writing to you, convinced that if the idea has merit, you will find a way to work it out. May I have your thoughts on this?

Sincerely yours,
LEONOR K. (MRS. JOHN B.) SULLIVAN,
Member of Congress.

U.S. CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C.

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. SULLIVAN: This is in further reply to your letter of May 1 concerning the creation of a program to provide working experience in the field for high school and college teachers of history, political science, civics, etc., during the summer months.

I heartily agree with you that the degree of interest and zeal displayed by these individuals makes them highly desirable temporary employees. Not only are they very good workers while they are with us, but when they return to their regular working jobs in the fall they often continue to provide valuable service as missionaries on our behalf. By achieving a better understanding and appreciation of day-to-day activities in Government, they certainly are better equipped to interest able students in a career in Government.

We do not have any separate program at this time to provide work experience for this group, but we do have machinery whereby Federal agencies can hire individuals for summer jobs in grades GS–5 through GS–7 with a minimum of red tape. Once teachers are matched with jobs at these levels, they can be appointed without examination. The only requirement is that they rank high compared with other qualified persons who may have applied for the same jobs. For jobs in grades GS–1 through GS–4 most summer appointments are made from the Office and Science Assistant Examination. Incidentally, at any of these levels an application from a member of a religious order would be as welcome as any other.

I know that substantial numbers of teachers are employed in the Government every summer. Many are in the National Park Service and there is good representation in other agencies too. I don't know, however, how many other teachers wanted Federal employment but couldn't get it. I don't know either how many more jobs might have been made available if special effort had been made in a program aimed directly at jobs for teachers. These are some of the questions I would like to look into.

I must emphasize that in summer jobs we are dealing with a very complex area. These jobs are highly coveted and there generally are far more applicants than there are jobs. I think agencies are sold on the idea of utilizing teachers when they can, but tight budgets often keep them from hiring as many summer employees as they would like.

What all this adds up to is that many teachers are hired during the summer even though we have no program specifically directed towards them. We don't know the extent to which agencies would be able to appoint more social science teachers if we established special procedures, but we will explore this possibility when we plan next summer's employment programs.

Thank you for your very thoughtful suggestion.

Sincerely yours,
JOHN W. MACY, JR.,
Chairman.

Congressman Hamilton Introduces Virgil I. Grissom National Lakeshore Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE H. HAMILTON
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 28, 1967

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I have hoped for some time that the Congress would be able to honor in a permanent manner the memory of a courageous American and Hoosier—Lt. Col. Virgil I. Grissom. To that end, I now introduce a bill to rename the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore the "Virgil I. Grissom National Lakeshore."

I believe the association of the late astronaut's name with a national park facility located in Indiana is a fitting tribute.

Col. Gus Grissom was first, and foremost a national hero of the space age. Not only was he one of the seven original astronauts, he was command pilot of the first manned Gemini space flight as well. His tragic death this year mutely testifies to his dedication to America's program for the peaceful exploration of outer space.

I am proud to add that this much-admired American was also a Hoosier. Raised in Mitchell, Ind., and graduated from Purdue University, Colonel Grissom's identification with his home State became complete when he married his hometown sweetheart.

Therefore, I hope the House will pay homage to the dedication of a great American; and a beloved Hoosier by renaming the Dunes National Park the Virgil I. Grissom National Lakeshore.

Congressman Horton Introduces Bill Creating Mid-Atlantic States Air Pollution Control Compact

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1967

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to introduce a bill which will create an air pollution control compact between two States, New York and New Jersey, and the Federal Government. The farsighted creation of a regional airshed by these two States sets an example of regional cooperation in combating air pollution that I hope will be duplicated in all areas of the country.

On the first day of the 90th Congress I introduced H.R. 698, which was among the first proposals designed to attack the nemesis of air pollution on a regional basis. My bill authorizes the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to create regional airsheds and establish air pollution control standards within these airsheds. It is gratifying to me that these two States are following the precedent of regional action which was established by H.R. 698 and similar bills which have been introduced during this Congress. I applaud the initiative that these States and their Governors, Nelson Rockefeller and Richard Hughes, have shown in this regard.

At the time I introduced H.R. 698, I stressed the vital importance of the regional approach to air pollution control, and I again stress its importance today. While participating last summer in the eastern Great Lakes water pollution hearings held by the Natural Resources and Power Subcommittee of the Government Operations Committee, I saw much graphic evidence of the necessity for interstate action to control water pollution. Because airborne pollutants move far more rapidly and traverse far greater areas than do water contaminants, the importance of concerted interstate action to combat atmospheric pollution is even greater.

I am pleased to join the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. Celler], the dean of the New York delegation, in sponsoring this most necessary legislation which will make New York, New Jersey, and the Federal Government partners in progress.

Federal Land Bank System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1967

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include last week's public service television and radio newscast, "The Kee Report." The subject discussed is the "Federal Land Bank System":

Federal Land Bank System

This is Jim Kee—bringing you the Kee Report.

This year marks the 50th anniversary of the Federal Land Bank System, one of the most successful programs ever undertaken by the Federal Government.

It has been pointed out many times that our country started out as an agricultural country. In the early days, most American citizens were farmers and public men. Like Thomas Jefferson, they believed that the wisest coures was to keep the United States a rural nation.

Farming is an independent way of life. There is a deep satisfaction in growing things. But the truth is that before the Federal Government stepped in to lend a helping hand, the American farmer was usually buried under a mountain of debt. There was no ill will against the farmer. It just happened that the individual farmer was a victim of forces beyond his control.

Until recent years, the American economy went through periods of good times and bad times which came to be known as the cycle of boom and bust. The farmer might prosper for a few years during good times but during the depression which came after, he often found that crop prices had dropped so low he was unable to meet either tax payments or mortgage payments. He was in danger of losing his land.

There was some credit available in those early days. But rural banking was poorly organized and quite often these rural banks experienced dire financial distress precisely because they had loaned to farmers in distress.

Besides contending against the business cycle, the farmer was also at the mercy of the weather. A severe winter usually meant a serious financial setback. An extended period of drought or flood could put him out of business entirely.

These were the conditions which prevailed when Uncle Sam decided it was time to establish a line of credit for the farmers. The Federal Farm Loan Act of 1917 set up 12 land banks, each one serving a different area.

The banks were originally capitalized at about $9 million each—nearly all of it supplied by the Federal Government. It was hoped that eventually the farmers would buy enough stock in these banks to retire the Government loans. That came to pass. Today, the banks are farmer owned and farmer directed.

This land bank system was the first stable source of credit for American agriculture. The System was so successful that eventually private investment firms extended loans on the same basis.

Fifty years ago, the average farmer needed credit to meet his tax and mortgage payments as well as to carry him through the growing season. In our present era of mechanized farming his credit needs are larger than ever. This means that the land banks are just as vital to the nation's well-being today as they were half a century ago.

The land banks helped millions of farmers to stay on the land. At the same time, they helped make American agriculture the most productive in the world. Food surpluses may be a burden at times—but constant food shortages would be a far greater problem.

The land banks have performed a splendid service for the whole nation, as well as the farmers.

Thank you for listening.

The Credibility Gap

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1967

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, ever since Orville Freeman taught a few green Democrats how to "slip, slide, and duck," the credibility gap has been a viable Republican issue. The following guest editorial which appeared in this morning's edition of the Chicago Tribune suggests that the "slip-slide craze" may have finally seeped through the supposed air-tight security setup at the Pentagon. At a time when many Americans vehemently oppose the efforts of their Government in Vietnam, you would think the top brass in the Defense Department would make a special effort to keep America accurately informed, and thereby prevent this highly contagious discontent from becoming even more widespread.

The Credibility Gap

The defense department now concedes that United States warplane pilots may have fired upon a Soviet ship in the North Vietnamese port of Cam Pha on June 2, altho United States officials earlier had denied this.

It is reassuring that the Pentagon will correct an incorrect report. But this incident was badly mishandled by Pentagon officials and inevitably will result in decreased confidence in official statements.

The soviet government charged on June 2 that American planes had hit the Soviet merchant ship Turkestan. The immediate United States response was that the United States did not have information which would confirm the Soviet charge but that an investigation had been ordered. This was a proper and appropriate response.

However, the next day the state department formally rejected the soviet charge. The Pentagon statement in connection with the note said the investigation of the charges had been completed and "the conclusion of the investigation is that no United States aircraft bombed or strafed the soviet ship."

It is obvious now that a thoro investigation had not been made. The Pentagon's statement Sunday—16 days after the soviet protest—said that new information indicated that the Turkestan was hit by cannon fire from United States air force jets. The Pentagon also said that the investigation is still continuing.

The continuing investigation should cover not only the strafing of the merchant ship but also the mistakes of the Pentagon and the state department in their announcements.

It is important to avoid such mistakes as an attack on a soviet merchant ship.

It is equally important, or more important, to avoid mistakes that deceive or misinform the American public. In this case, those mistakes could have been averted by not rushing to give the lie to soviet charges.

The Government's Role in Sales and Marketing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1967

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, what is the proper role of Government toward business, particularly that of sales and marketing?

An interesting and thought-provoking article on the subject appeared in the October 1966 Sales and Marketing Today magazine.

Mr. Speaker, so that our colleagues may study these timely comments, I include this article following my remarks:

Business Government, and the Consumer Economy

(By Walter H. Johnson, Jr.)

In this age of mounting complexities, one of the most vital elements of business life—and one with which salesmen and marketers everywhere should be deeply concerned—is the relationship between business and government.

In recent months we have witnesses an extraordinary series of events within the confines of government, which will sharply alter the roles of the salesman and marketer. Indeed, unless tempered and controlled by moderate forces recognizing the American marketing system's impact on the affluence of our people and on the living standards enjoyed everywhere in North America, these governmental activities will surely affect the future of our entire business community.

In effect, government has discovered that the consumer is a political force and has assumed the role of "consumer protector," embarking upon a course of activity that in the long run may actually curtail the consumer's freedom of choice, his ability to express his own tastes and preferences and his right to buy on the basis of desire rather than need.

This new consumer-protection crusade is characterized in the United States by such moves as the Hart Packaging Bill, the President's Commission on Food Marketing, FDA head Dr. James L. Goddard's outspoken pressures against the drug and pharmaceutical industry, Assistant Attorney General Donald F. Turner's speeches about the monopolistic force of advertising and marketing in the hands of large corporations and governmental hearings on automobile safety.

These various measrues have created an atmosphere in which business, by implication, is cast in a predatory role, and the consumer as a defenseless individual who must be protected at all costs by government.

In actual practice, the consumer demonstrates little interest in his own protection. Studies made to determine the extent of consumer interest in this subject have revealed widespread indifference. While this fact may be surprising to government, it should be no surprise to the marketing world. Effective marketers know that the finest kind of consumer protection is provided by the time-honored principles of competition. The freedom of choice offered the consumer allows him the prerogative of final judgment of any manufacturer or processor which he considers unfair, dishonest or a distributor of inferior products.

For some 200 years, this proven ability to enact the role of ultimate arbiter of goods and services has made the consumer an invaluable contributor to the growth and success of the American economic system.

The sound marketer, the successful salesman, indeed, all businessmen of repute, view the consumer—not merely as a client to be served—but as the very source of his income: one who provides the opportunity for honest profits, and who, with each buying decision, holds within his grasp the success or failure of the company.

America owes much of its strength, influence, power and affluence to the great innovation it gave to international economics—this consumer economy. Much of our way of life is based on the premise that the average citizen-consumer has a right to spend his income for what he *wants* as well as *needs*—a philosophy in which the choice between a variety of products and services allows the consumer the all-important option of buying whatever he chooses.

The motivating force behind this philosophy has led our economy from the rather primitive state of merely being able to satisfy the basic needs of the public, to the present, highly-sophisticated marketplace where the consumer is in a position to exercise his powers of decision on an unprecedented scale.

The extremists who oppose this system of free enterprise and selection would have us believe that a reduction in the number and varieties of goods and services now offered would somehow channel additional funds toward social progress by solving some of the major social ills of our times.

This, of course, is an unrealistic theory, and the controlled economies of the world clearly demonstrate its ineffectiveness. Furthermore, it is distressing to see newly socialist-oriented economies move away from the principles of freedom of consumer choice through such measures as eliminating certain products from television advertising, restricting advertising and promotion of detergents and increasing taxes on consumer products which contribute substantially to better living.

Conversely, the nations of the world which have enjoyed the sharpest increases in national prosperity and greatest upswings in living standards—like West Germany, Japan and Mexico—are all countries where the consumer's ability to fulfill his motivating ambitions through freedom of choice in the marketplace have been deliberately encouraged.

Despite our many economic advances, however, poverty still remains one of the world's gravest problems. Hundreds of millions of families continue to face substandard levels of subsistence. One sociological approach to solving this problem is removing the drab dullness of daily routines. And poverty *can* be alleviated—as some astute marketing minds have pointed out—by introducing spending options into the lives of the under-privileged, options to spend their time and money for personal development, additional food or clothing—in essence—options for more than a narrow existence.

The fact that many of the world's poor are unable to exercise what should be the unalienable right of discreditionary choice when disposing of their incomes, however limited, denies them improved living conditions and robs them of the motivations which have traditionally kept the American public upwardly mobile.

Placing this right of choice in the hands of the underprivileged—perhaps with techniques as yet undefined and methods still undiscovered, but with tools common to us all—is poverty's real challenge to marketers.

We must give these people something beyond the bare hope of more bread and beans, a tighter roof and warmer winter. We must give them what millions of others have already found: the ability to rise above an impoverished background, a tenement environment and working merely for bread. We must help them gain the freedom of choice that permits them to enjoy those small but vitally important options.

This situation presents a problem too difficult to solve at a governmental level, because it is one that rests on motivation. Therefore, much of the responsibility for its solution should be shouldered by business and, in particular, by marketing. After all, what other group of professionals in the world is better equipped to employ the techniques of motivation than marketers?

For example, we are continuously told that food shortages are of major significance. We know that while there is a food surplus in the northern hemisphere, there is an inadequate supply in the southern hemisphere. Although diets are substantial in the 30 nations north of the equator, two-thirds of our fellow human beings suffer substandard food consumption.

One answer to this pressing problem is to increase exportation of the skills and practices of food processing and distribution which created the unique consumer-oriented approach found in more advanced countries.

The success of this system is based on the development of food processing and transportation methods which enable the people to move off the land, into the cities and into the mainstream of business and industry, thereby boosting the entire economy.

We will never enjoy industrialization, urbanization and improved living standards on a truly global scale, until the means of producing, processing and marketing foodstuffs are sufficiently improved to release the peoples of the world from their bondage to the land.

Perhaps the best way to reach these many goals is to protect and promote our consumer economy. As a result, there is a need for today's marketer to fiercely, tenaciously uphold the principles which developed that economic structure.

There is a need, too, to be articulate about the business of selling and marketing; to pledge support to its benefits and defend its values against those who seek to reduce or limit the consumer's right to choose freely, buy intelligently and, in so doing, protect *himself*.

It is patently evident that the greatest safeguard for a continuing and better consumerism is the competitive system that pits manufacturer against manufacturer, distributor against distributor, retailer against retailer, making each a watchdog who constantly polices the quality of his own wares. The system works because its penalty for using illegal, illicit or deceptive practices is an economic one, paid for in loss of sales and market shares.

In the hands of men of honesty and integrity, the marketing principles which have created our consumer psychology will represent the most powerful forces behind our future economic success.

Volunteer Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1967

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, citizen participation and involvement is vital to the successful solution of many of the problems facing our Nation. A recent editorial in the Chicago Tribune comments on a survey of the 16,000 employees of an industrial firm as to how they spent their leisure hours. The heartening number of hours spent by these employees in volunteer civic and charitable work demonstrates the unselfish dedication of Americans to the improvement of our society.

I offer for the RECORD the "Volunteer Society," appearing in the Chicago Tribune of June 27:

VOLUNTEER SOCIETY

A survey of the 16,000 employes of one large industrial firm shows that they spent a total of 400,000 hours last year on volunteer civic and charitable work. This works out to an average of 25 hours apiece and it represents everything from aiding in voter registration drives to transcribing books in braille for the blind.

The survey was conducted by the Worthington corporation, a manufacturer of equipment for service industries such as food sanitation, and transportation. Frank J. Nunlist, chairman of the company, said he was surprised at the amount of time the employes gave to volunteer work and certain that the same results would appear in other companies.

"This shows the vigor," he said, "of the American free enterprise system, for I know of no other country where so many people have the financial security and leisure time to look beyond their immediate families and to help others."

It shows something else, too, and that is the feeling that we, as individuals, still bear some responsibility for making society function properly. To the foreigner who is accustomed to letting the government worry about the needy, it may seem appalling and wasteful to find such a multitude of charitable agencies in this country, many of them dedicated to causes which seem to overlap.

Yet it is this sense of individual responsibility which leads members of a free society to dedicate themselves to their jobs in order to provide for themselves and, hopefully, have some time or money left over to help others. This dedication translates itself into increased production, and it is production which determines a people's standard of living. The most lavish welfare state in the world is of no use if the workers of the country are not producing the wealth that it has promised to distribute. Yet when the state undertakes to provide for everybody, then what incentive is there to produce? Very little, as the Communists themselves have begun to learn.

So we should be grateful that we have a system that gives us the wealth to distribute, even tho there may be some overlapping and inefficiency in the method of distribution. It is better than a system which is efficient at distributing poverty and promises.

Mrs. Suna Maneki Retires After 42 Years With Hawaii Public School System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA
OF HAWAII
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 27, 1967

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Suna Maneki, vice principal of the Pearl Harbor Elementary School, is one of the scores of retiring school principals and teachers being honored at this time of year by their colleagues, students, former students, and PTA groups throughout Hawaii, and the Honolulu Advertiser paid special note of these events in a recent news article. It is my distinct privilege to join in honoring Mrs. Maneki and the other teachers and administrators of our island State, by paying tribute to them on the occasion of their retirement following years of dedicated service in the public school system of Hawaii.

Mrs. Maneki's career in education has spanned 42 years, and prior to her appointment as vice principal at the Pearl Harbor Elementary School, she served as a classroom teacher at all levels from the first grade through high school. Mrs. Maneki has long been recognized by her associates and students as a teacher and administrator of exceptional ability. Among her fine qualities is her sense of concern for the individual student, as indicated in the observation made on the eve of her retirement that—

> Essentially the foremost job of a teacher remains the same and that is to really try to understand each child as an individual and to try to help him meet his individual needs.

It gives me great pleasure, Mr. Speaker, to include in the RECORD the news article summing up the long and distinguished teaching career of this outstanding American, which appeared in the June 14, 1967, issue of the Honolulu Advertiser:

MRS. SUNA MANEKI: VICE PRINCIPAL RETIRES AFTER 42 YEARS

Mrs. Suna Maneki, who has been with Hawaii's public school system for 42 years, reflected on the eve of her retirement.

"Children today are much more advanced, much more sophisticated . . . not as naive because of all the new types of stimulation . . . the many influences in our complex world today.

"But, essentially the foremost job of a teacher remains the same and that is to really try to understand each child as an individual and to try to help him meet his individual needs."

She believes the job of a teacher has grown more demanding today than forty years ago because "there are so many more angles to be aware of in the world today."

Mrs. Maneki, who will be 65 on July 1, 1967, has been vice principal at the Pearl Harbor Elementary School for the past decade.

Prior to her administrative appointment, she was a classroom teacher, serving all levels—from first grade on up through high school.

Her first teaching assignment was at Pahoa Elementary and Intermediate School in 1922. From there, she served a string of other Big Island schools, including Kapiolani, Hilo Union, Olaa Elementary, Hakalau and Konawaena.

Her moves were mostly necessitated by the changing assignments her husband, the Rev. Tsumika Maneki, was called upon to handle.

Maneki retired two years ago as principal of the Honpa Hongwanji Mission School. The Buddhist minister, ordained in 1953, was one of Hawaii's pioneer teachers of vocational agriculture. He was an assistant county agent for the University of Hawaii's Agricultural Extension Service and also served as a county supervisor of the Federal Farmers Home Administration.

When her husband was appointed to head the Hongwanji school here, Mrs. Maneki, too, left her Big Island home and taught at Kauluwela school until she was named vice principal in 1957.

Because her first love is working with youngsters, she agrees that perhaps she should have remained a classroom teacher.

"I missed the direct contact with the children, but I found that as vice principal I was able to get ideas across to a greater number of people," she said.

As one with a wealth of experience behind her, she was asked what advice she would offer to teachers.

"I think the most important thing is for a teacher to try to understand that each child is an individual with different needs," she said.

"A teacher has to keep herself physically and mentally well in order to help children. And a teacher should look for the beauty that is all around us, despite the turmoil that exists."

Mrs. Maneki, herself, is a picture of good health. Aside from an edge of grayness to her hair, she does not look like a person ready for retirement.

One of her co-workers said, "It's hard to believe she's retiring. She really has so much energy and she's so good at everything that needs to be done."

Last month, for instance, in addition to her usual duties, she donned her "work clothes" and helped youngsters string leis for Memorial Day services at Punchbowl.

Her retirement plans call for a rest first and then a Mainland trip when her husband's schedule as a substitute minister allows it.

They plan to visit with their daughter, Mrs. Joel Determan, in Minnesota and a son, Arthur, in New York. Mrs. Maneki is also leader of Girl Scout Troop 185 and a veteran teacher at the Hongwanji Mission Sunday School.

Reflecting on her long school career, she said, "You know, the thing that makes me happiest is to have some adult come up to me and say 'You taught me in second grade and I'll never forget.' "

Private Health Insurance Programs Can Reduce Hospital Overuse for Diagnostic Tests

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 28, 1967

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare John W. Gardner has called a conference on the costs of medical services which is taking place at this time in Washington, D.C. One of the issues it is considering is the sharp increae in hospital costs.

Recently, a constituent of mine, Miss Trude G. Dougherty, of 6305 Murdoch Avenue, St. Louis, Mo., wrote to me at some length on the needless waste of hospital bed capacity, at a time of "terrific hospital bed shortage" because medical insurance policyholders cannot receive reimbursement for diagnostic workups unless they have been admitted to hospitals. Miss Dougherty wondered if Congress could pass legislation to require the insurance companies to pay for the services on an outpatient basis, as one of the best means for reducing hospital costs and overuse.

She based her comments and suggestions on 12 years of experience as the admission officer in a hospital. I thought she made an excellent point and I relayed her suggestion to the U.S. Surgeon General. The reply I have received is most interesting and indicates that at least one medical insurance program, the Illinois Blue Cross program, is proposing a coverage of clinical laboratory tests on an outpatient basis for nonemergency surgical patients prior to an operation.

And, as I said, the Conference on the Costs of Medical Services now meeting in Washington is also considering this issue.

EXCERPTS FROM CORRESPONDENCE

Mr. Speaker, because of the importance of this matter to so many millions of our citizens who are covered by health insurance, I submit herewith the relevant excerpts from the letter I received from Miss Trude G. Dougherty, as follows:

> No doubt you are somewhat familiar with the fact that medical insurance is so written that when tests such as diagnostic workups, upper and lower gastro intestinal films, basal metabolism, and numerous other laboratory tests are ordered by one's physician, the policyholder is not reimbursed for the cost involved, or any part of it, unless he is an admitted patient in a hospital. I might mention here that the term policyholder as I used it is synonymous with the term "patient."
>
> It is only normal that the patient who has been paying for medical insurance should want to use this insurance to defray the expenses of the tests involved, hence his only alternative is to be admitted as a patient to the hospital. Now this creates an even bigger problem, because even though they may have to wait several weeks for the hospital bed they do so and actually take beds that could and should be given to the patients who are so acutely or severely ill that they must be hospitalized. This procedure is the biggest cause of the shortage of hospital beds today and is constantly creating a problem of vital importance.
>
> One hears comments from time to time that we don't have enough hospitals to take care of all our sick people; really I don't think there is a shortage of hospitals but I do think the use of the beds could be helped a lot if the people hospitalized just for tests to be run so their insurance pays for them, could be eliminated.

In forwarding these comments to the Surgeon General, I said I did not think Federal legislation would be very practical in solving this problem because it is not a problem insofar as medicare is concerned—those on medicare can receive reimbursement for most of their diagnostic tests whether in hospitals or not—but I was sure the Public Health Service would be interested in pursuing the issue. In my letter to the Surgeon General I stated:

> I know how deeply the Public Health Service is involved in the question of hospital capacity under the Hill-Burton Act. I am wondering if any studies have been made of the issue of hospital bed utilization merely for diagnostic tests which could be made on an out-patient basis.
>
> Has anyone looked into this? Is there any task force at work with the health insurance underwriters to try to have this situation changed?
>
> I can see where a person who is going to need several hundred dollars worth of diagnostic tests would either hesitate to have them made unless absolutely imperative if they were not covered under his health insurance program, or else would persuade his doctor to have him admitted to a hospital so that the tests would be covered under his insurance. I would appreciate having your comments and suggestions and any information you can give me bearing on this issue.
>
> Sincerely yours,
>
> LEONOR K. (Mrs. JOHN B.) SULLIVAN,
> *Member of Congress,*
> *Third District Missouri.*

REPORT FROM BUREAU OF HEALTH SERVICES

Mr. Speaker, I have now received a report from Dr. John W. Cashman, Director of the Division of Medical Care Administration in the Bureau of Health Services in the U.S. Public Health Service, which refers to the proposal of the Illinois Blue Cross plan to provide coverage for diagnostic workups.

I am not sure that Congress is precluded from legislating in the field of insurance, as Dr. Cashman implies, but I certainly see no need for Federal legislation to solve this problem if there is a will to solve it.

The letter from the Public Health Service is as follows:

> DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, BUREAU OF HEALTH SERVICES,
> *June 23, 1967.*
>
> Hon. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN,
> *House of Representatives,*
> *Washington, D.C.*
>
> DEAR MRS. SULLIVAN: The Surgeon General has asked me to reply to your letter with its enclosure from your constituent, Miss Trude G. Dougherty. Miss Dougherty expresses well a problem which many people have recognized.
>
> In preparing a reply to Miss Dougherty you may wish to make the following points to her.
>
> The regulation of all forms of insurance rests with the several States so that it would not be possible for Congress to enact legislation along the lines she has suggested. It would be a violation of States' rights.
>
> However, the possibilities of recognition by voluntary insurance of the value of paying for diagnostic work-ups on an ambulatory basis is well worth pursuing. Only today my office received a press release from Blue Cross-Blue Shield calling attention to such a proposal on the part of the Illinois Blue Cross Plan. Two copies are enclosed so you can forward one to your constituent.
>
> The New York City Blue Cross Plan is in the process of analyzing differences among the city's hospitals in the average length of time elapsing between admission and surgery. The evidence they have collected points to the same misuse of hospital days that Miss Dougherty has observed.
>
> Secretary Gardner is, as you may know, calling a conference on June 27 and 28 on the costs of Medical Services. One of the five sessions will focus on hospital costs and another on health insurance provisions. Some of the recommendations that the conference should generate may be expected to call for more efficient and effective use of our health facilities.
>
> I hope these comments are helpful in replying to your constituent.
>
> Sincerely yours,
>
> JOHN W. CASHMAN, M.D.,
> *Director, Division of Medical Care Administration.*

BLUE CROSS-BLUE SHIELD

A plan to reduce hospital expenses for presurgery patients has been proposed by the Blue Cross Plan for Hospital Care of Hospital Service Corporation. The proposal has the support of leaders of the Chicago Medical Society, Chicago Hospital Council, Illinois State Medical Society and the Illinois Hospital Association.

The suggested plan of Blue Cross will make more hospital beds available. It will make it possible for the patient scheduled for an operation to have needed clinical laboratory tests performed on an outpatient rather than an inpatient basis prior to an operation.

Blue Cross will make benefits available for these tests under its various certificates, just as it would if the patient were having the tests as a hospital bed patient prior to surgery.

Under the plan, the non-emergency surgical patient will report for tests and examinations as directed by his surgeon. Instead of being admitted to the hospital as a bed-occupying patient, he will simply go to a predetermined area in the hospital, be tested, then return home or to work before entering the hospital for the operation. The development of new techniques in pre-surgery testing has made it no longer necessary for many surgery patients to stay in hospitals to be available for pre-operative tests and examinations immediately prior to surgery.

The patient, the hospital and the doctor can all benefit from this program. By reducing the length of a hospital stay, it could save surgery patients as much as $47.33 daily, which is the average daily cost of hospital care for Blue Cross members in Illinois.

Howard F. Cook, executive director of the Chicago Hospital Council, had this to say about the proposal, "This new plan developed by hospitals, Blue Cross and medical staffs working together, will allow hospitals to schedule laboratory tests on days throughout the week . . . instead of having them bunched up on certain days, such as Monday and Tuesday. It will allow better utilization of hospital beds with lower costs to the patient."

"The proposed pre-admission testing program, in addition to reducing unnecessary hospital bed-time for many surgery patients, will help surgeons greatly in scheduling patients for hospital stays and in utilizing hospital services to their fullest extent," according to Warren W. Young, M.D., president of the Chicago Medical Society. "Pre-admission testing, of course, would be determined in each case by the attending surgeon," Dr. Young said.

"Soaring salaries and a rapidly expanding technology make it hard to find places where the brakes can be applied to rising hospital costs." David M. Kinzer, executive director of the Illinois Hospital Association, explained. "The Blue Cross plan for pre-admission testing will open up one of those places by allowing shorter hospital stays in many cases, thus relieving bed shortages."

"Everyone is talking about the rising cost of hospital care and Blue Cross is doing something about it," John C. Troxel, M.D., vice president and medical director of Blue Cross, stated.

"This Blue Cross proposal will result in lower hospital expenses to many surgical patients better utilization of hospital facilities and improved services to patients and the community," Dr. Troxel declared.

In commenting on the plan, Caesar Portes, M.D., president of the Illinois State Medical Society, stated, "Emergency procedures and testing of presurgical patients requiring hospital bed care for such tests, of course, would not be altered. And, the implementation of this new concept depends entirely upon the judgment of the patient's surgeon. But, in cases in which the 'outpatient' test-examination procedure is applicable, we are convinced that great benefits will accrue to all concerned."

Discussions of the plan are being held with medical staffs and hospital administrators throughout Illinois. Reactions from those contacted indicate that the new plan will receive widespread acceptance.

The "Why" of Memorial Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1967

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, as casualty reports mount, our citizens are

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

searching their souls for ways and means to make the terrible sacrifice of young American manhood strengthen their own resolve that this sacrifice shall not be fruitless and that all of America must work to become a better nation as a memorial to these gallant young fighting men.

Mrs. Dorothy Stuck, who is editor of the Marked Tree Tribune of Marked Tree, Ark., wrote with great feeling on this resolve recently just prior to Memorial Day and shortly after notice had been received of the loss of one of the fine young men of Poinsett County, Ark. Mrs. Stuck's comments on the loss of Pfc. Teddy Talley in her column, "A Word in Edgewise" is included:

The "Why" of Memorial Day

The "why" of Memorial Day stood out in third dimension for Marked Tree this week and a limp flag at half-mast in our Memorial Park was mute testimony to a community's first bitter taste of a conflict that is gradually spilling its cup of sorrow over into every American community.

The loss of a native son in battle is always a source of pain to his friends and neighbors and when it is a son who still seemed but a boy to most of us the pain is two-edged. Teddy Talley will be remembered in many ways by the many people who knew and loved him. I'll remember him best on a football field, first as a hardworking junior gridder, more feet than anything else and all grit and determination—then as a high school player who earned a letter all three years and who played sometimes with physical hurts that would have slowed a lesser man. He found relish in football's contact, fun in its horseplay, strength in its discipline and thrill in tasting the fruits of victory with a rare group of boys who made up the better part of a team for the better part of their high school years. He will be remembered by others as a devoted elder son and older brother, who tried hard from little boyhood on to fill the place of his lost father in the lives of his mother and brothers and sister.

There will never be a way to answer "why", when the loss of a Teddy Talley in battle is considered. Time should be spent considering the challenge his death in the line of duty offers to each of us—the challenge to so live within the tiny, self-contained orbits of our own lives in a way that will pay tribute to the enormity of his sacrifice and that of other young men. That is a way bound up with the difficult task of being truly honest, sincerely dedicated and thoroughly unselfish in the matter of citizenship and daily living. Until we can find the courage to make the sacrifices such a pattern of life would entail, there will be conflicts that reach out and demand the sacrifice of human life, indeed many fine lives in the horror of war.

We owe it to Teddy to face up to that challenge. It will be the only true tribute we can pay him.

The Challenge Facing America's Food Producers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT DOLE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1967

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, impending hunger and starvation in various parts of the world continue to be the subject of discussion and speculation among world leaders, and to command much space in our newspapers.

One of the Midwest's finest and most capable reporters on agricultural matters is Mr. Roderick Turnbull, agricultural editor of the Kansas City Star. He has just written an article appearing in the June 25, 1967, issue of the Star, entitled "Our Role in Helping Feed a Hungry World" which I commend highly to the attention of my colleagues. I insert it in the RECORD at this point:

[From the Kansas City Star, June 25, 1967]

Our Role in Helping Feed a Hungry World

(By Roderick Turnbull)

For the first time, except in those periods when this nation was engaged in a world war, wheat was planted last fall and now is being harvested for the specific purpose of helping to feed hungry people around the world.

Previously, our grain for aid came from government surpluses. These surpluses now are down to workable reserves and our shipments of wheat to such countries as India must come from production.

To make sure that the United States would have sufficient wheat for domestic use, dollar exports and its aid program, the Department of Agriculture increased acreage allotments by 32 per cent for 1967.

The wheat crop this year in this country will total, according to the latest official estimate, about 1.5 billion bushels, a new record. Present estimates indicate about 700 million bushels will be used within the United States. Probably a little more than 700 million bushels will be exported, either for dollars or under the federal aid program known as P.L. 480.

The figures suggest what Kansas and Missouri farmers, now in the midst of the harvest, must realize that every time they make two rounds in their fields with their combines, the production of one round goes to the export trade.

Putting it another way, the yield from one acre out of two is shipped overseas. Last year (1965–66 fiscal year) far more than half the production was exported. For this fiscal year, which ends next Friday, total wheat exports have been estimated at 735 million bushels, and, as mentioned, the prediction for the year just ahead, starting July 1, is something in excess of 700 million.

A major portion of the corn, milo and soybean crops now growing in the fields also is destined for export, in most cases for the dollar trade.

U.S. wheat, feed grains and soybean exports each have hit an annual billion dollar mark.

When exports of all U.S. farm crops are bulked together, they account for the production of one out of every four harvested acres and about 17 per cent of farmers' market income.

Exports obviously are extremely important to U.S. agriculture and they form the greatest potential growth factor. With exports totaling 7 billion dollars in value this year, the indications are the value in 1970 will be 8 billion and trade experts are estimating from 10 to 12 billion for 1975—a tremendous figure.

But, ironically, as of today world turmoil has the export picture for the immediate future tragically confused.

An expanding demand for more and better food in the industrial countries of the world, coupled with the needs of burgeoning populations in the hungry nations, almost certainly assures a growing U.S. farm export trade. This is the basis for the predictions of the higher export totals in 1970 and 1975. It just seems to be an obvious thing.

Yet trade authorities planning for the seemingly obvious expansion at the same time must try to assess all the complications that lie ahead, both in international controversies and in competitive production. We are alone, however, in seeking to tailor our productions to demand.

Curiously, amid all the talk about the additional millions of mouths to be fed in the world every day, possible mass starvation in 1975, 1980 or any other future date, this country in 1967 may produce more than it can dispose of, either for dollars or in concessional (donations) sales.

This is a year of confusion and of serious decisions for government policy-makers when it comes to food supplies, production and exports. Obviously, any decisions made will affect farmers and the Kansas City trade territory in particular because we are in the heart of the wheat, milo, corn and soybean belt—the greatest grain production area in the world.

For agricultural products in total, the domestic market is by far the largest for U.S. farmers. For example, virtually all the beef, pork and lamb produced in this country is consumed here. In fact, the U.S. is the world's largest importer of beef.

It is wheat, feed grains, soybeans, cotton and tobacco which dominate the U.S. farm export trade. Three of these products, wheat, feed grains (corn and milo) and soybeans are primary crops in this area. Missouri grows cotton, too, in the Bootheel area. Even tobacco is a minor Missouri crop.

Exports cannot be figured as a certain percentage of each farmer's crop, for obvious reasons. For instance, many farmers feed all the corn they raise to livestock and buy more. Much of the milo produced in Western Kansas and Nebraska goes to big feedlots in Colorado, Arizona and California. But each year a part of all grain produced reaches the terminal markets and the exports originate from these centers.

The economic impact of exports affects every farmer, whether his crops are used at home or shipped abroad. Likewise, exports account for a percentage of the business of the farm machinery manufacturers, the producers of fertilizers, pesticides and herbicides and the other "inputs" that contribute to farm production.

The exports utilize that portion of production not consumed domestically. The important economic point is that the foreign demand has been growing appreciably in recent years and therefore accounts for a bigger proportion of the total.

The export business does not climb each year on each product, but the longtime trend is upward. For this reason, our country feels justified this year in producing (if the weather co-operates) record crops of wheat, feed grains and soybean crops.

Cash receipts from farming in both Kansas and Missouri last year approached 1.4 billion dollars. Undoubtedly, a substantial portion of this money came from exports since Kansas is the No. 1 wheat state, and third in grain sorhgum. Missouri is No. 3 in soybeans, is a big producer of corn and substantial in wheat.

Now to some of the potentialties, the problems and imponderables on the future export trade as they are analyzed by agricultural authorities.

Dr. D. Gale Johnson, professor of economics at the University of Chicago, said recently that the projection of 8 billion dollars in agricultural exports by 1970 and 10 billion by 1980 or sooner seemed reasonable to him.

However, he, as other authorities, sees the increases almost entirely in dollar sales rather than boosts in exports under the P. L. 480 (foreign aid) program. This prediction, while favorable to the U.S. in total and in particular to our balance of payments problem, has certain bearish implications on wheat. Wheat has been the big item under Public Law 480. Up to 70 percent of wheat exports annually have been for soft currencies. The aid program has been running

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

at about 1.5 billion dollars annually for several years.

This fact was noted by Dr. Johnson.

"Much of the increase in our share of world exports has been due to the rapid growth in world trade in feed materials, the feed grains, soybeans and oil meals," he observed. "I believe that the world market for these products will continue to expand in the years ahead and that the U.S. will continue to dominate the international trade in the products.

"The United States has relatively favorable conditions for the production of feed grains and soybeans. I see no reason why this position will not be maintained in the years ahead. Canada and Australia do not have the climatic conditions to permit them to become effective competitors.

". . . The competitive situation with respect to wheat is much less encouraging. Output has increased significantly in Australia and Canada in recent years and this trend is expected to continue."

Dr. Johnson, as do other authorities, doubts that the U.S. will greatly increase its overseas donations of wheat—despite all the talk about future starvation in India and elsewhere.

And since he feels that the U.S. will run into stiff competition in the world's commercial market, he doesn't see a substantial increase in wheat exports.

An import factor is the Soviet Union. Should this huge nation continue to buy grain from Canada, Australia and Argentina, obviously this will account for part of the production of those countries. But should Russia get to the place where it again takes care of all its own needs, then the wheat from Canada, Argentine and Australia will be looking for a market elsewhere.

Johnson also pointed out, as do others, that if this country is to increase its exports, it must also equally boost its imports so that the foreign countries will have something to pay us for what they buy.

Reciprocal trade does not require that nations exchange like products, but the fact that trade is a 2-way street carries an ominous note for farmers of this country seeking to boost exports at the same time they are complaining about imports of dairy products and beef, as Johnson implies.

Orville L. Freeman, secretary of agriculture, points out that the gap between the actual need of the less developed countries and what they can buy will continue to exist. In fact, the unmet needs are growing.

It soon will be beyond the capacity of the more developed nations, such as the United States, to fill the growing food gap in these that are hungry.

What the secretary of agriculture is emphasizing is that these hungry nations simply must supply more of their own needs.

The United States the last few years has been shipping about one-fifth of its wheat crop to India alone. This doesn't improve diets in India; it just prevents famine, Freeman comments.

Just a few days ago Freeman said:

"U.S. grain shipments today are feeding 60 million people in India."

Where does increased production come from in a nation which already is using all its cultivable land?

It comes, Secretary Freeman said, from the use of more fertilizer, pesticides, implements, improved varieties and other kinds of inputs, plus services, research, credit, transport and marketing facilities. Virtually everything he mentioned is sadly lacking in the developing of hungry nations.

Speaking recently in Chicago, Freeman made two observations that businessmen should find highly pertinent. He said that U.S. farmers in 1965 spent 12½ billion dollars for the inputs that go into production. These were purchased in farm supply centers, such as Kansas City.

Production expenses, which are constantly growing and are such a huge item to be subtracted from the farmer's gross, are at the same time a measure of the business being done by suppliers.

The second comment Freeman made was this:

"In contrast with the less successful countries, the United States government never has engaged in agricultural production as such, nor in the producing and distributing of any of the multitude of inputs that modern agriculture requires. We have seen fit to leave that job to private industry in this country."

In other words, free enterprise, capitalism, the profit system, or whatever you want to call it, actually results in more production, and this is a lesson that needs to be learned in the hungry nations. Virtually all authorities agree on this.

Vice-President Hubert H. Humphrey indicated this when he said in a recent speech, "The developing countries which have made the best progress are those in which private initiative and enterprise have played a vigorous role in national growth."

He said also:

"The present food crisis is without parallel in the history of mankind. International cooperation backed by self-help is imperative. We in America can provide only a small margin of the human and material resources needed for food development. The major effort—the will—the leadership—the labor—and, indeed even most of the resources—must come from the low-income countries themselves."

By 1980, the vice-president said, there probably will be another billion people in the world. If this becomes true, then the Food and Agriculture organization of the United Nations estimates that the cereal deficit in the hungry countries will be around 42 million tons by 1975—which is more than this year's U.S. wheat crop.

At this rate, the deficit would exceed 80 million tons by 1985, which would be greater than the U.S. capacity if all conceivable acreage were brought back into production and if technological improvement continued at its present rate.

This emphasizes, Humphrey said, why the hungry nations absolutely must do more to increase their own food production and, at the same time, look to family planning to curtail the population growth.

At the same time, he urges greater production in this country both to help fill growing commercial markets overseas and to help feed the hungry people of the world. He opposes a policy of agricultural scarcity.

In this respect he probably goes farther than Freeman, who has the responsibility, as secretary of agriculture, of seeking to maintain farm prices. Unless some system is developed to change the situation, farmers find themselves penalized when they produce more than the market will absorb. It is a delicate balance which the secretary seeks to obtain as between supply and demand.

Fortunately, as most authorities seem to agree, demand grows gradually in the industrial countries which can pay the dollars for what they want. This is the major bright spot in the farm export picture.

Demand grows also in the countries with the underfed millions of population, but there may be a limit on how much this country will or can continue to give to them in the way of food grains. So much is involved, including what efforts these countries make to help themselves. The role of international politics also cannot be predicted.

The imponderables include national disasters. What would be our guidelines, for instance, if India or any other country experienced another drought which would threaten starvation to millions?

Also, all future plans or predictions go out the window in case of a world war.

The only thing certain seems to be that always there will be more people wanting to eat.

Hippies Among the Clergy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1967

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the free love, LSD, revolutionary hippies now are coddled by so-called ministers of the Gospel.

Why send missionaries to Africa—we need them here among the men of the cloth.

Mr. Speaker, I insert the staff article from the Sunday Star for June 25 following my remarks:

MINISTERS PLAY IT COOL IN REACHING THE DUPONT HIPPIES

(By Betty James)

"This is the gentlest rebellion I've ever seen in my life."

The minister was talking about the hippies, the long-haired, sandal-shod youth who symbolize Dupont Circle to an uncertain and disquieted city.

Embarked on a ministry that is as unconventional as the tide of unconventionality that brought them there, he and fellow clergymen with parishes in the area are adding a new dimension this summer to the colorful, controversial circle.

Any night they can be found on a bench chatting with anyone who cares to talk, or sitting on the grass discussing religion with earnest young people, or enjoying companionably the throbbing drums that are the best outdoor show in town. They even drop in at the nearby bars on occasion.

As one of the ministers, the Rev. Henry H. Breul puts it, "If by being there we can say non-verbally 'Someone who takes God seriously takes you seriously' we've accomplished what we've set out to accomplish." Mr. Breul is rector of St. Thomas Episcopal Church at 18th and Church Streets NW.

The ministers wear clerical collars because they want to be spotted easily, Mr. Breul said.

"This is not a headlong assault, not a preaching kind of thing," he added.

PART OF HIS PARISH

Each is involved because the circle is in his parish, and so is a part of the life of his neighborhood. Mr. Breul is president of the Dupont Circle Clergy Association, which since winter has invited guests to talk about the circle, including young people, police, narcotics experts, and users of LSD, the hallucinogenic drug.

The Rev. John E. Schramm, pastor of the Lutheran Community of Christ at 2107 N Street NW, says, "I would no more assume that when I go to Dupont Circle I am some way entering a sick world, a group of 'alienated people,' than when I go to a PTA convention. In fact, if alienation is at all closely tied up with materialism there are many very respectable groups where I'm sure that, at least spiritually, you could assume more sickness than among the people at Dupont Circle."

The Rev. Tom Murphy, who commented on the hippies' "gentle rebellion," is associate pastor of the Presbyterian Church of the Pilgrims at 22nd and P Streets NW, and the church's minister at large to the Dupont Circle area. He has been active on the circle and in the area since last January.

QUOTES CUMMINGS

The hippies remind Mr. Murphy of a line from e. e. cummings that goes "Kisses are a better fate than wisdom, lady, I swear by all flowers."

As he sees it, the kids are reacting against the "popular wisdom" that says a man is worth what he has. "That's right central," he said. "These kids are the voluntary poor."

Mr. Murphy, who is 32, added: "Kids are always more free-thinking, questing, searching than their parents have been. I think the ones who are really serious, not just coasting along for kicks, are trying to find some way to be more human than they have been in suburbia."

"The ones I know at this point are by the process of natural selection the most serious and the most open. They're the ones who would respond to me soonest. The ones who are bitterest and the most closed probably wouldn't have anything to do with me now. Most of the ones I know come from solid middle-class homes."

Over and over on one way or another, he has heard the kids say, "I could go to school. My dad's got the money all put aside for me to go to a college of his choice."

One night recently Mr. Murphy was invited along when about 50 hippies met at twilight on P Street beach and talked about founding a hippy community. A major objective was sharing food and shelter with each other and with anyone else in need.

The next day Mr. Murphy saw the kids on Dupont Circle at lunchtime handing out dishes of oatmeal, and back at P Street beach at suppertime ladling stew.

Two policemen were invited to have some lunch. "Where would this country be if nobody worked?" the policemen asked. "Where would this country be if nobody loved?" the hippies replied.

Mr. Murphy knows that almost all of the kids have experimented with marijuana or LSD. As to stopping them, he said, "I don't conceive of my job in any sense as a policeman in moral or legal terms."

MUST MAKE OWN CHOICE

Each person should make his own decisions, even if the decisions are wrong, he feels, and adds, "Whatever heaven is, it is not heaven for me unless I decide to go there. If somebody makes me go there it's not where I belong."

The ministers were struck by the evangelistic fervor of the youth who met with them and described LSD as a mind-expanding religious experience. Their conviction that their way is the way of God reminded Mr. Bruel of an old-fashioned revival tent meeting, but "they were not negative people," he said. "They had a special concern and a concern with one another."

LSD has important medical values in the treatment of alcoholism and mental illness which will be realized in the future, he feels. He would tell any youngster who asked him that he doesn't think it's a good idea to use LSD casually. "We don't know enough about it," he said. "Furthermore, the real danger now is that it's being used in uncontrolled ways, and being manufactured in bootleg fashion, and passed around contaminated with other substances."

AWARE OF OUTRAGE

The ministers are aware that Dupont Circle outrages the sensibilities of many respectable residents.

"The basic resentment felt by at least part of the community is that there are interracial relationships and companionships, and interracial groups sitting around on the circle," Mr. Bruel said. "I have not been there when I didn't see mixed couples holding hands."

Some of the friendships are real, some are not, he feels. Some are "kicking momma and poppa," with Dupont Circle an extension of the front porch.

He and his colleagues feel no overtones of violence on the circle as far as the hippies are concerned. If trouble comes it will come from visitors from outside, he predicted.

Mr. Bruel, who is 43, has found the hippies much more theologically oriented than his own generation, although not necessarily to organized religion.

"They take the idea of God, dead or alive, quite seriously," he said.

Homeownership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN N. ERLENBORN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1967

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Speaker, the National Home Ownership Foundation Act got a big boost in the June issue of a leading publication, House & Home. It reported a speech made by Senator CHARLES PERCY, the act's principal sponsor, before the National Housing Conference, champion of public housing.

The thinking of those of us who are cosponsors is that private endeavor can do much to cure the Nation's ills. Under unanimous consent I insert this House & Home article as a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

WATCH CHUCK PERCY AND HIS HOMEOWNER PLAN

Minutes after Senator Percy spoke to the National Housing Conference last month, a deep-dyed Democrat said:

"The Democrats had better hope the Republicans are stupid enough not to put this fellow on their ticket in 1968."

All Republican Percy had done was walk into a gathering of housing's far left—NHC is the unabashed champion of public housing—and bring the certified liberals to their feet for a one-minute standing ovation with a speech that may rank as one of the most significant ever delivered about the housing industry.

Almost everyone in the audience knew that Percy had come to plead for a homeownership plan for slum dwellers. That was what the former president of Bell & Howell had proposed last fall during his successful campaign for a Senate seat from Illinois. They knew, too, that although the proposal now contains many holes, it has captured the interest of Washington's politicians far beyond any Administration proposal this year.

What they hadn't expected was the persuasive Percy personality that accompanied the plea. From the moment Percy opened his 10 a.m. speech with a crack—"I am happy to take part in your sunrise service today"—to an impassioned closing line—"You have a disciple in your efforts for better housing, because I have religion"—he dominated his audience.

Straight off, he told the public housers, "Housing is *the* field in which I hope to make my contribution to the nation. In my opinion, housing and urban renewal are the most serious problems confronting America today."

Then Percy, now many times a millionaire, related how much home ownership had meant to his family, how his family had moved 19 times during his youth, how "my father was evicted eight times during the depression, and each time the quarters got a little smaller, until we finally ended in a three-room apartment. When my father died at the age of 73, he had never accumulated enough money for a down payment on a house, even though he wanted to own one."

Touring the slums of Chicago, East St. Louis and Rockford during his unsuccessful 1964 campaign for the Illinois governorship, Percy found that same pride of ownership manifested in a different way: "You see people polishing their cars and then going to their apartments and throwing their garbage down the front step.

"So when I awakened . . . to the fact that I wasn't going to be governor, I decided that I would do my best to fulfill my campaign pledges as a private citizen."

Then, he told NHC, he helped form a New Illinois Committee; it sponsored a "Call for Action" radio program that station WVON in Chicago beamed to slum dwellers. Listeners were advised of their rights under city housing laws and invited to report code violations to the committee.

Finally, Percy got to his plan to extend home ownership to slum dwellers. Essentially, he proposes setting up a national home ownership foundation as a private organization to make low-cost mortgage loans available for renovating slum dwellings, which would then be resold to slum dwellers. Percy wants to depart completely from the time-tested (and tortuous) FHA–FNMA financing. The foundation would raise money by issuing bonds (just as FNMA now does) and would lend the proceeds to local nonprofit groups for the repair and resale of dwellings. The federal government's role would be to guarantee the Foundation's bonds, thus letting the Foundation raise capital at far lower rates than those generally available.

The fundamental question asked by everybody in Washington is why the federal government should lend its credit rating to a private organization. Percy's answer to NHC: "Why not? What good reason can there be for the federal government not to stand behind the capital issues of a blue-ribbon national foundation dedicated to the improvement of slum housing and the diffusion of home ownership among the poor?"

His critics have also been pressing for assurances that the private foundation would operate in the public interest. Percy's answer: The foundation's charter could be changed at will by Congress; it would have to report to the President annually and would be subject to General Accounting Office audit; and the President would appoint one-third of its board members. All these safeguards, said Percy, would put the foundation "under closer public scrutiny than even so established an institution as the Federal Reserve."

What's more, Percy sees this mixture of private and public efforts as "the beginning of a trend—a trend toward other specialized institutions that operate through private initiative to solve public problems but that are under the close, continuing and effective review of the Congress and the American people."

When Percy introduced his home-ownership plan in the Senate ten days after the NHC speech, the New York Times said it "received more fanfare than is usually accorded to proposed legislation from the White House." All 36 Republicans in the Senate endorsed the measure. So did more than a hundred GOP members of the House, where it was introduced by Rep. William Widnall.

Despite all the drum beating, Percy's proposal faces a rocky, if not impassable, path in Congress this year. The Democrats still hold top-heavy majorities in both the Senate and House and aren't about to have their own housing plans upstaged by a freshman Senator.

The Administration indicated more than routine opposition when HUD Secretary Robert Weaver took the rare step of denouncing the Percy measure in a nine-page attack. Weaver said the plan "would not reduce housing costs enough to enable low-income families to afford home ownership . . . Despite glowing statements of good intentions and a bewildering maze of financial juggling, it provides a wholly inadequate subsidy."

But the Percy plan cannot be buried that easily. It clearly represents a major Republican effort to "do something" for the nation's increasingly numerous city dwellers. For many years now the GOP has been losing presidential elections in the big cities with hardly a murmur of protest. When Ray Bliss took over as national party chairman in 1965, one of his first jobs was to make the Republicans more attractive in the Democrats' big-city strongholds. The nearly unanimous party support for the Percy plan indicated that party chieftains hold high hopes for it in their quest for big-city strength. As such, the plan could well become a hotly contested issue in the 1968 Presidential race, whether or not Percy is running.

Anent that question, Percy at this point has to be rated an outside choice. He has less public-service experience than any Presidential aspirant since Wendell Willkie. And at age 47 he is younger than most other frequently mentioned hopefuls:

But since arriving in Washington he has impressed some oldtimers with his ability to learn and react in a non-doctrinaire manner. The NHC speech was a case in point. Before the convention Percy sent a draft of the speech to two NHC elders—Nat Keith, the organizations' president for more than a decade and the nation's first urban-redevolpment director, and Washington attorney David Krooth—along with a request for their frank comment. They responded with detailed criticisms. Percy studied their comments, then invited both men to his Senate office for more give-and-take on the points at issue.

Percy has used the same approach with almost every housing organization in Washington. So it was no surprise to hear one NHC veteran remark: "He's young, but he's open-minded, and he learns fast."

KENNETH D. CAMPBELL.

Literate as Well as Merely Skilled

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 1967

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, a distinguished journalist, Mr. Orr Kelly, who formerly was editor and publisher of the Berkeley Review and reporter for the San Francisco Chronicle, is now serving as reporter and columnist with the Washington Evening Star. In his column yesterday Mr. Kelly discussed the delicate and demanding role of the military man in our free, democratic society.

As Mr. Kelly reminds us:

> We make of him one awesome demand: That he be prepared to die for us. In return, we give him great power, putting into his hands our youth, much of our wealth, and many of our society's hopes for the future.

The need for careful and constant attention to the proper development and restraint of our Nation's military power is well presented in Mr. Kelly's article, which with pride, I call to my colleagues' attention:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, June 27, 1967]

LITERATE AS WELL AS MERELY SKILLED

(By Orr Kelly)

The war in Vietnam—certainly our most unpopular war of this century—has raised anew the question of the proper place of the military man in a free society.

The demands of his chosen occupation make the military man unlike the rest of us.

He must be alert for attack from abroad. But he may be tempted to see danger where there is none or to see great danger where there is only a little.

He must be prepared to destroy in our defense. But he may be tempted to destroy more than should be destroyed.

He must be prepared to kill. But he may be tempted to kill more quickly or kill more than the circumstances demand.

We make of him one awsome demand: That he be prepared to die for us. In return, we give him great power, putting into his hands our youth, much of our wealth, and many of our society's hopes for the future.

In all of this, despite the careful restraints of the Constitution, which are designed to make the military the arm of the civilian government, there are dangers. The dangers derive not only from the fearful power of modern arms but also from the growth of a corps of truly professional military men who are now fighting their third major war. Never before has our unmilitaristic society had this combination of power and experience.

There is little apparent reason to fear the kinds of problems so vividly portrayed in such recent films as "Seven Days in May," "Fail Safe," or "Dr. Strangelove or How I Stopped Worrying and Learned to Love the Bomb."

But what the next generation of military leaders . . . and the next . . . and the next? How can we be sure that they will not somehow warp the very foundations of our society?

John D. Rosenberg, an associate professor of English at Columbia University, was asked recently to speak to the cadets at West Point as part of an effort to make them "aware of the bearing of literature on the continuing problems of humanity." He adapted his lecture as an article, which appears under the heading, "A Sermon to Soldiers," in the current issue of the Columbia University "Forum."

The best hope that the military man can carry out his role of protecting our society without destroying it, he told them, lies in his becoming a truly literate man.

"Literature has so developed his moral imagination that he can feel his way into cultures other than his own, and momentarily become someone other than himself, someone perhaps the antagonist of himself, or perhaps the twin of one of his several contradictory selves," he said.

"Being literate, he also knows history, which means he knows that good causes and bad have been fairly constantly afoot in the world, that there are innumerable ways in which good men mistake the one for the other, and that some ways of combatting evil nourish the very menace they seek to uproot.

"It may be," he continued, "that the temperament I have described is incompatible with the virtues of the professional soldier. My own deep conviction is that it is not. Liberal knowledge, exactitude of expression, imagination, humanity can harm the soldier only if his cause is served by ignorance.

"In the past his power reached no farther than the tip of his sword. Today that power has been extended almost infinitely; yet our notion of him remains curiously antiquated and schizophrenic—as a kind of glamorized Dr. Strangelove mounted on a horse.

"That single horseman can now ride the world to its doom. How vital, then, that the soldier learn more than horsemanship or computer circuitry, especially when all he may ever see of the enemy is a blip on the radar screen. Here, it seems to me, is the urgency of the soldier's becoming literate as well as merely skilled. For he will not only know the value of what he must defend, but he will feel as keenly the value of what he may destroy."

Such sensitivity to values is overwhelmingly important in Vietnam, where military power is being used in an attempt to achieve goals that are essentially political and social—and where there is the terrible danger that military power, even if successful, may make it impossible to reach our real goals.

It is encouraging that West Point was sensitive enough to ask a professor of Victorian literature to speak to its cadets. It would be a great comfort to know that they, and their successors, will heed his advice to become truly literate men.

South Africa Defends Itself Against Revolutionaries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1967

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, in what must be recognized by many as protection of her people from the Communist riots, looting, and disorders such as we are forced to suffer here in the United States of America, South Africa has begun to undertake positive action.

The great disappointment of many Americans is that some of those now being rounded up for export were products of our free society here in the United States. We can hope that the South African people do not feel all our people are of the same stripe as the troublemakers deported as undesirable maintenance of law and order here.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following remarks, two articles of recent date from the Washington, D.C., Evening Star:

SOUTH AFRICA EXPELLING ANTIAPARTHEID BISHOP

JOHANNESBURG (UPI).—The Rt. Rev. Edward Crowther, an American-born Anglican bishop who called racial separation "a wicked and evil system," said last night he has been ordered to leave South Africa by Friday.

Bishop Crowther, 38, a former Episcopal chaplain at the University of California at Los Angeles, said in a tense sermon at St. Cyprian's Anglican Cathedral in the diamond mining city of Kimberley that he had no idea why he was being deported.

He said he would leave Kimberley a few hourse before the deadline. He declared he would not resign as bishop of Kimberley and Kurnman, the largest Anglican diocese in South Africa, which he has headed since 1965, but would exercise authority from wherever he settled in exile.

Bishop Crowther earned the disfavor of South African authorities by his strongly liberal view on race problems. He frequently took up the cause of non-whites whom he believed were being victimized by South African government officials.

He is the second Anglican bishop to be ordered out of South Africa for attacking the government's apartheid (racial separation) policies. Bishop Ambrose Reeves of Johannesburg was ousted last year for supporting non-white causes.

Sen. Robert F. Kennedy, D–N.Y., made a special trip to Kimberley to talk with Crowther when he visited South Africa in June 1966.

In last night's sermon, Bishop Crowther leveled a charge of "shallowness" against those who said he was getting what he deserved.

While at UCLA, he was an active leader in civil rights and urban renewal efforts.

He first stirred the wrath of the South African government in 1965 when he called international attention to the plight of hundreds of blacks dispossessed from their homes at Mamuthla.

Despite repeated warnings that the government would not tolerate further "embarrassment," he continued to speak his mind about its policies of rigid racial segregation.

Bishop Crowther said his wife and three children would follow him from Cape Town on July 11 by sea, accompanied by his personal chaplain, Father Peter Beech, who will stay in exile with him.

He said the dean of Kimberley would act as vicar general in his place.

South Africa Charges Five in Move Against Press

(By Gordon Lindsay)

JOHANNESBURG.—The South African government may well have struck a death blow to the English language press yesterday.

Two of the country's most respected editors, a reporter, a managing director of a newspaper company and a lawyer have been served with summonses to appear in court Thursday on charges of publishing for two years false information about prison conditions.

The five men face the possibility of a year in jail and it is the general opinion among newsmen here that if the five are jailed, South Africa will no longer have a free press.

The two editors and the reporter are outspoken critics of the South African government. They are Laurence Gandar, 50, editor-in-chief of Johannesburg's Rand Daily Mail; Joel Mervis, 58, editor of the Johannesburg Sunday Times, and Benjamin Pogrund, 33, a reporter for the Daily Mail.

The others summoned are Leycester Harris Walton, 45, managing director of the South African Associated Newspapers which owns the Sunday Times and Daily Mail, and Kelsey Stuart, 37, legal adviser to the company.

DETAILS NOT SPECIFIED

It is alleged that the men have published "false information concerning prisons." The summonses did not specify details.

There is little doubt here that the move is aimed directly at the English-language press.

There is freedom of the press in this country, but the government is often annoyed by the stand taken by a number of English newspapers. The Afrikaans papers invariably toe the line on government policy.

The government waited two years to issue the summonses. The articles in question were published in June and July of 1965.

The South African prison issue, which reverberated around the world in 1965, was seen by many as a David and Goliath clash between a crusader and an authoritarian regime.

The crusader was Gandar. The authoritarian regime was the white Nationalist party that has held absolute control in this country for 19 years.

TOLD OF BEATINGS

The articles were written by Pogrund and strongly supported editorially by Gandar. Mervis gave full backing to the articles and Stuart came into the picture by taking affidavits from former prisoners. Walton, apparently, has been summonsed as managing director of the newspaper group.

The prison scandal erupted when Harold Strachan, an ex-convict, told the Daily Mail of brutal beatings and of prisoners going berserk in solitary confinement. Strachan's story was printed in a three-part series.

The Mail's report made world headlines and South African prison conditions were under international scrutiny.

Then, a warden at one of the prisons, Johannes Andries Theron, gave a sworn statement in which he said he had seen prisoners being tortured by electrical shock.

JAILED FOR 32 MONTHS

Theron was later charge dand convicted of giving false information about prisons. He was jailed for 32 months earlier this year.

Shortly after Theron made his statement it was substantiated by another warder, Gysbert Van Schalkwyk and ex-prisoners who said they had received electrical shock treatment in jail.

Van Schalkwyk was arrested and appeared in court on perjury charges. He was sentenced to three years in jail.

In August 1965, Strachan was arrested and charged with making a false statement under oath and giving false information about prisons. Strachan was released on June 11 this year after serving a year of his 18-month sentence.

He is now back with his wife and 5-year-old daughter in Durban on the south coast, but is still subject to a five-year banning order under the Supression of Communism Act. This confines him to his home between 6 p.m. and 7 a.m. He also has to report daily to a police station.

It is felt that the main attack will be against Gandar, who says he always liked to think of The Daily Mail as a "paper of social protest with a natural bias toward the underdog whoever he may be. If we are sickly humanists for seeking betterment in the quality of human life, then sickly humanists we are."

OPPONENT OF APARTHEID

This type of thinking has brought him a pinch of acclaim—most of it overseas—and a load of censure at home.

His complete rejection of South Africa's apartheid (segregation by law) has cast him as a villain in the minds of many white South Africans, not the least of them members of Premier Balthazar J. Vorster's all-white government.

Pogrund was served with the court order less than 24 hours before he was to leave South Africa forever. Pogrund's passport was confiscated in 1965, but he had applied to the minister of the interior for permission to leave South Africa on a one-way exit permit. He had planned to leave for Britain on a plane last night.

He had intended to go to London to complete a book on South Africa commissioned several years ago by Stanford University of California. His trip has been delayed indefinitely.

Salaries of Federal Government Employees and Issue of Comparability

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERVEY G. MACHEN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1967

Mr. MACHEN. Mr. Speaker, the following extraneous material is an in-depth study on legislation dealing with salaries of Federal Government employees and the issue of comparability. The study was researched, prepared and written by Edward J. Guss, of 4245 58th Avenue, Bladensburg, Md., and Robert E. Harney, of 5623 Ellerbie Court, Lanham, Md., both of whom are employees at the Bureau of Hearings and Appeals in the Social Security Administration here. They are also active members of the American Federation of Government Employees.

Mr. Speaker, I think that in congressional consideration of Federal pay raises and comparability this year our colleagues on the Post Office and Civil Service Committee will find this a very valuable study and certainly buttress my longstanding support for comparability in pay for Federal employees. The material follows:

Congressional Action on Legislation Dealing With Salaries of Federal Employees Since 1962

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Introduction ---------- 1

Legislative History ---------- 1

Requisites of a Federal Pay System ---------- 2

1965 Pay Proposal ---------- 16

1966 Pay Proposal ---------- 22

Prospects in the Future ---------- 25

Employee Reactions ---------- 27

Conclusion—Suggestions ---------- 33–34

Footnotes ---------- 35–36

Bibliography ---------- 37

It is the purpose of this paper to clearly present a brief legislative history of the major legislative enactment, and properly focus attention on the happenings and events that have transpired since enactment, present views expressed on the subject, and to make a final analysis of the results thus far attained.

Among the Congress' most formidable powers exists the power of appropriations. Appropriations for social programs receive much attention and are paraded before the public by the news media announcing what these programs will cost and what it will do for the American people. In the past, invariably neglected in computing program budgets was the linking of the current and equitable administrative costs, namely, salaries of the Federal employees who administered these programs. Monies were appropriated on the basis of what material costs at the current prices and if it was an aid program money was appropriated on the basis of how much should be given to accomplish the desired result at the current prices in the particular area. But the salaries of the people who administered these programs were not considered in the same way. They did not keep pace with going rates. There came a point in time, however, when there was hope that Federal salaries would also be considered at the "current prices" so to speak, or more accurately termed, at *comparable* rates. It is from this point forward that this paper seeks to discuss the Statutory Pay System for Federal Classified Employees.

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

The 1962 Federal Salary Reform Act

In 1962 President John F. Kennedy proposed a broad salary reform and strongly urged the adoption, by Congress, of the "comparability principle" as the standard for Federal salary levels. The Congress, after having studied the President's message, declared that this was one of the most far-reaching, comprehensive and complex measures ever reported and would have an effect on the welfare of every Federal employee both at home and abroad.[1]

The pay provisions of the bill, as reported, were the result of long studies by previous administrations followed by extensive hearings extended over a period of many months.

The bill put into effect to the extent "deemed appropriate" [2] by the 87th Congress the principal aspects of President Kennedy's recommendation for needed reforms in the major statutory pay systems in the Federal Service. Part II of the bill reforms and increases salaries for those under the Classification Act.

The need for immediate and sweeping reformation of the major statutory pay systems for civilian employees of the Federal Government was found in and supported by extensive studies carried out in the executive branch over a long period of time. Altogether the findings were the product of more than 5 years of virtually continuous study. The years of study, the President's message, and the hearings held in Congress developed the rather lengthy justification which follows:

REQUISITES OF A FEDERAL PAY SYSTEM

The functions of a public salary system are to control payroll expenditures, with equity to both the employee and the taxpayer, and to support recruitment and retention of the high quality personnel required to carry out government programs. To meet its responsibility to the public, the salary system must pay enough to permit competent staffing in order not to endanger the national security nor to degrade public service; but it must not pay more than is necessary for this purpose and to provide equity for the employee. To assure fair treatment for the public employee, the salary system must provide equity among Federal employees and between Federal employees and those in private employment. To be adaptable to changing conditions and to stimulate peak performance, the system must provide for executive discretion to meet individual and special needs, to use pay for motivating employees, and to initiate general adjustments as required.

These are underlying objectives which the salary provisions of the bill are designed to meet.[3]

Prior to 1962, statutory pay systems had failed to meet the needs of the Federal service. Absence of an accepted standard for Federal salaries and a procedure for periodic review and adjustment coupled with rigid statutory rules of pay administration, deprived the systems of the adaptability so essential in a period of rapidly changing conditions.

Major inequities existed between the Federal employee and his equals throughout the national economy. With this new bill, comparison could now be made directly between private salaries and those in the Classification Act, which has a broad occupational coverage having many counterparts in private employment. Findings of the Bureau of Labor Statistics' national survey of professional, administrative, technical, and clerical pay reported in 1961 provided the data. This annual survey clearly shows that the greater the level of difficulty and responsibility, the greater the gap between public and private pay. From grade GS-4 upward, private salary averages consistently exceed Federal salaries. The difference is quite noticeable. For example:

Classification Act rate range			National average rate in private enterprise
Grade	Minimum	Maximum	
GS-7	$5,355	$6,345	$6,648
GS-9	6,435	7,425	7,776
GS-13	10,625	11,935	13,152
GS-14	12,210	13,510	15,362
GS-15	13,730	15,030	19,348

Further evidence of this trend was furnished by the Civil Service Commission's 1960 study of salaries paid in 21 large nationwide firms for personnel, finance, research and development, law, and plant management positions with responsibilities equivalent to those of Federal positions in grades GS-16, GS-17, and GS-18. This study showed these serious disparities:

Federal Government		21 firms, major—Salary clusters
Grade	Salary range	
GS-16	$15,255-$16,295	$20,000-$30,000
GS-17	16,530- 17,570	27,500- 37,500
GS-18	18,500	[4]32,500- 45,000

The Act, as finally written, contained two basic principles. Sec. 5022 stated in part that "Federal salary fixing shall be based upon the principles that:

(a) There shall be equal pay for substantially equal work, and pay distinctions shall be maintained in keeping with work and performance distinctions; and

(b) Federal salary rates shall be comparable with private enterprise salary rates for the same levels of work.

Salary levels—shall be set and henceforth adjusted in accordance with the above principles.

To effectuate a thorough understanding of the bill's language, intent, and proposed procedures it is imperative to set forth the Congressional interpretation of the two principles cited. Senate Report No. 2120 declared:

Adoption of this [comparability] principle will assure equity for the Federal employee with his equals throughout the national economy. Its use will improve the Government's ability to compete with private firms for qualified personnel.

Comparability with private enterprise salary levels provides a long-needed logical and factual standard for setting Federal salaries. It includes the effects of such legitimate pay considerations as cost of living, standards of living, and productivity as those factors are resolved into the going rate over bargaining tables and other salary determining processes throughout the country.

The principle has a history of wide acceptance. Within the Federal Government, it has been used for certian positions over the past 100 years; first applied to Navy Yard workers, it is now applied to virtually all Federal trades and craft workers, to employees of the Tennessee Valley Authority, and to Government work contractors through the Walsh-Healey and Davis-Bacon Acts. It is widely accepted in industry, although many leading firms have adopted the modification of paying better than the competition. State and local governments, as well as some other national governments (such as Canada and the United Kingdom), rely on this principle.

Until recent years, the principle of comparability could not be applied on a nationwide basis because there was no broad, acceptable source of comparative salary data from private enterprise. Now, however, the Bureau of Labor Statistics national survey of professional, administrative, technical, and clerical pay provides annually the requisite data on private enterprise pay. It is the only comprehensive and authoritative survey of its kind, and there are technically valid and established methods for translating the BLS data into Federal comparability pay levels.

Pay comparability would be established between the same levels of work in private enterprise and Government—that is, between levels of work having substantially the same degrees of difficulty, responsibility, and required qualifications.

Although survey techniques require ascertaining private enterprise rates by occupation as well as work level, the survey is so designed that the occupational rates at a given work level can be combined into a single rate representing the general level of private enterprise salaries for a work level equivalent to a Classification Act grade.

To maintain Federal salaries at levels comparable with private enterprise levels and to assure that other features of statutory salary systems are corrected and improved as experience shows the need, the bill provides that the President shall require an annual report, from an agency he designates, on the relationship of Federal salaries to those in private enterprise and shall submit an annual report to Congress recommending the adjustments in salary schedules, structure, and policy he considers advisable. This provision is a fundamental feature of the reforms proposed. It establishes a procedure for annual review of salary schedules and for annual adjustment when necessary to maintain the prescribed relationship to private enterprise pay levels. A systematic review of this kind is essential to prevent Federal salary schedules from relapsing to their present conditions.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics survey furnishes private enterprise salary data for occupations which are representative of the Classification Act.[5]

We would do well to illustrate what the Federal salary structure looks like, to give a reference point and basis for comparison before undertaking further discussion.

The following is the Federal salary rates as they stood prior to the enactment of the Pay Reform Bill of 1962. As will be noted the salary spread encompasses a grade system ranging from Grade 1 through Grade 18, and within each grade, increases or steps for years of service. Effective July 1960, the Federal salaries were as indicated on the following page.

Footnotes at end of speech.

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Classification Act salary rates (authorized by the Federal Employees Salary Increase Act of 1960)

Grade	a	b	c	d	e	f	g	Longevity		
								x	y	z
GS-1	$3,185	$3,290	$3,395	$3,500	$3,605	$3,710	$3,815	$3,290	$4,025	$4,130
GS-2	3,500	3,605	3,710	3,815	3,920	4,025	4,130	4,235	4,340	4,445
GS-3	3,760	3,865	3,970	4,075	4,180	4,285	4,390	4,495	4,600	4,705
GS-4	4,040	4,145	4,250	4,355	4,460	4,565	4,670	4,775	4,880	4,985
GS-5	4,345	4,510	4,675	4,840	5,005	5,170	5,335	5,500	5,665	5,830
GS-6	4,830	4,995	5,160	5,325	5,490	5,655	5,820	5,985	6,150	6,315
GS-7	5,355	5,520	5,685	5,850	6,015	6,180	6,345	6,510	6,675	6,840
GS-8	5,885	6,050	6,215	6,380	6,545	6,710	6,875	7,040	7,205	7,370
GS-9	6,435	6,600	6,765	6,930	7,095	7,260	7,425	7,590	7,755	7,920
GS-10	6,995	7,160	7,325	7,490	7,655	7,820	7,985	8,150	8,315	8,480
GS-11	7,560	7,820	8,080	8,340	8,600	8,860		9,120	9,380	9,640
GS-12	8,955	9,215	9,475	9,735	9,995	10,255		10,515	10,775	11,035
GS-13	10,635	10,895	11,155	11,415	11,675	11,935		12,195	12,455	12,715
GS-14	12,210	12,470	12,730	12,990	13,250	13,510		13,770	14,030	14,290
GS-15	13,730	14,055	14,380	14,705	15,030			15,290	15,550	15,810
GS-16	15,255	15,515	15,775	16,035	16,295					
GS-17	16,530	16,790	17,050	17,310	17,570					
GS-18	18,500									

NOTES

GS-1 to GS-10 step increases effective every 52 weeks. GS-11 to GS-17 step increases effective every 78 weeks.

Yearly salary divided by 2,080 counting a fraction of a cent as the next higher cent will give you the hourly rate. Hourly rate multiplied by 80 will give you the biweekly rate.

The first pay raise after the Federal Reform Pay Act was effective with October 1962. Without detailing at this point regarding every aspect of the new rates, it should be noted that the new scales were raised on a graduated basis running from approximately 2 percent to 7 percent, which was consistent, at least as far as it went, with the facts brought out in the Bureau of Labor Statistics (hereafter referred to as BLS) survey that the higher the grade the larger the pay gap. It also provided for a change in the "within grade" raises of each step with the time interval between each step starting at 52 weeks, then 104 weeks and finally 156 weeks. Although a step in the right direction, the new scales did not achieve comparability. On the following page is the salary chart effective with October 1962.

Compensation schedule I (through Jan. 4, 1964)

Grade	Waiting period 52 weeks			Waiting period 104 weeks			Waiting period 156 weeks			
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
GS-1	$3,245	$3,350	$3,455	$3,560	$3,665	$3,770	$3,875	$3,980	$4,085	$4,190
GS-2	3,560	3,665	3,770	3,875	3,980	4,085	4,190	4,295	4,400	4,505
GS-3	3,820	3,925	4,030	4,135	4,240	4,345	4,455	4,580	4,705	4,830
GS-4	4,110	4,250	4,390	4,530	4,670	4,810	4,950	5,090	5,230	5,370
GS-5	4,565	4,725	4,885	5,045	5,205	5,365	5,525	5,685	5,845	6,005
GS-6	5,035	5,205	5,375	5,545	5,715	5,885	6,055	6,225	6,395	6,565
GS-7	5,540	5,725	5,910	6,095	6,280	6,465	6,650	6,835	7,020	7,205
GS-8	6,090	6,295	6,500	6,705	6,910	7,115	7,320	7,525	7,730	7,935
GS-9	6,675	6,900	7,125	7,350	7,575	7,800	8,025	8,250	8,475	8,700
GS-10	7,290	7,535	7,780	8,025	8,270	8,515	8,760	9,005	9,250	9,495
GS-11	8,045	8,310	8,575	8,840	9,105	9,370	9,635	9,900	10,165	
GS-12	9,475	9,790	10,105	10,420	10,735	11,050	11,365	11,680	11,995	
GS-13	11,150	11,515	11,880	12,245	12,610	12,975	13,340	13,705	14,070	
GS-14	12,845	13,270	13,695	14,120	14,545	14,970	15,395	15,820	16,245	
GS-15	14,565	15,045	15,525	16,005	16,485	16,965	17,445	17,925		
GS-16	16,000	16,500	17,000	17,500	18,000					
GS-17	18,000	18,500	19,000	19,500	20,000					
GS-18	20,000									

Note.—Yearly salary divided by 2,080 counting a fraction of a cent as the next higher cent will give you the hourly rate. Hourly rate multiplied by 80 will give you the biweekly rate.

The second and third raises promulgated after this reform act are shown on the following pages. Although promised by the Act, these raises too, did not achieve comparability.

Compensation schedule 11 (effective Jan. 5, 1964)

Grade	Waiting period 52 weeks			Waiting period 104 weeks			Waiting period 156 weeks			
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
GS-1	$3,305	$3,410	$3,515	$3,620	$3,725	$3,935	$3,935	$4,040	$4,145	$4,250
GS-2	3,620	3,725	3,830	3,935	4,040	4,145	4,250	4,355	4,460	4,565
GS-3	3,880	3,985	4,090	4,195	4,300	4,405	4,525	4,650	4,775	4,900
GS-4	4,215	4,355	4,495	4,635	4,775	4,915	5,055	5,195	5,335	5,475
GS-5	4,690	4,850	5,010	5,170	5,330	5,490	5,650	5,810	5,970	6,130
GS-6	5,235	5,410	5,585	5,760	5,935	6,110	6,285	6,460	6,635	6,810
GS-7	5,795	5,990	6,185	6,380	6,575	6,770	6,965	7,160	7,355	7,550
GS-8	6,390	6,600	6,810	7,020	7,230	7,440	7,650	7,860	8,070	8,280
GS-9	7,030	7,260	7,490	7,720	7,950	8,180	8,410	8,640	8,870	9,100
GS-10	7,690	7,945	8,200	8,455	8,710	8,965	9,220	9,475	9,730	9,985
GS-11	8,410	8,690	8,970	9,250	9,530	9,810	10,090	10,370	10,650	
GS-12	9,980	10,310	10,640	10,970	11,300	11,630	11,960	12,290	12,620	
GS-13	11,725	12,110	12,495	12,880	13,265	13,650	14,035	14,420	14,805	
GS-14	13,615	14,065	14,515	14,965	15,415	15,865	16,315	16,765	17,215	
GS-15	15,655	16,180	16,695	17,210	17,725	18,240	18,755	19,270		
GS-16	16,000	16,500	17,000	17,500	18,000					
GS-17	18,000	18,500	19,000	19,500	20,000					
GS-18	20,000									

Note.—Yearly salary divided by 2,080 counting a fraction of a cent as the next higher cent will give you the hourly rate. Hourly rate multiplied by 80 will give you the biweekly rate.

Federal Employees Salary Act of 1964 (effective July 5, 1964)

Grade	Waiting period 52 weeks			Waiting period 104 weeks			Waiting period 156 weeks			
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
GS-1	$3,385	$3,500	$3,615	$3,730	$3,845	$3,960	$4,075	$4,190	$4,305	$4,420
GS-2	3,680	3,805	3,930	4,055	4,180	4,305	4,430	4,555	4,680	4,805
GS-3	4,005	4,140	4,275	4,410	4,545	4,680	4,815	4,950	5,085	5,220
GS-4	4,480	4,630	4,780	4,930	5,080	5,230	5,380	5,530	5,680	5,830
GS-5	5,000	5,165	5,330	5,495	5,660	5,825	5,990	6,155	6,320	6,485
GS-6	5,505	5,690	5,875	6,060	6,245	6,430	6,615	6,800	6,985	7,170
GS-7	6,050	6,250	6,450	6,650	6,850	7,050	7,250	7,450	7,650	7,850
GS-8	6,630	6,850	7,070	7,290	7,510	7,730	7,950	8,170	8,390	8,610
GS-9	7,220	7,465	7,710	7,955	8,200	8,445	8,690	8,935	9,180	9,425
GS-10	7,900	8,170	8,440	8,710	8,980	9,250	9,520	9,790	10,060	10,330
GS-11	8,650	8,945	9,240	9,535	9,830	10,125	10,420	10,715	11,010	11,305
GS-12	10,250	10,605	10,960	11,315	11,670	12,025	12,380	12,735	13,090	13,445
GS-13	12,075	12,495	12,915	13,335	13,755	14,175	14,595	15,015	15,435	15,855
GS-14	14,170	14,660	15,150	15,640	16,130	16,620	17,110	17,600	18,090	18,580
GS-15	16,460	17,030	17,600	18,170	18,740	19,310	19,880	20,450	21,020	21,590
GS-16	18,935	19,590	20,245	20,900	21,555	22,210	22,865	23,520	24,175	----------
GS-17	21,445	22,195	22,945	23,695	24,445	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------
GS-18	24,500	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------

Note.—Yearly salary divided by 2,080 counting ½ cent and over as a whole cent will give you the hourly rate. Hourly rate multiplied by 80 will give you the biweekly rate.

We have stated that the last three raises have not achieved comparabiltiy, but we have not shown any figures on what this comparability is supposed to be up to now. No purpose would be served in listing numerous pages of figures on each raise but it is believed a good insight into this problem can be achieved in a thorough analysis of the 1965 and 1966 pay proposals and the results that followed.

President Johnson's communication to Speaker McCormack serves to show the responsibility the President now has to annually report to the Congress on Federal salaries and indicate who prepares the report. On May 17, 1965, the transmittal of the report was made:

"DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Supplementing my message on Federal Pay, and as required by the Federal Salary Reform Act of 1962, I transmit herewith to the Congress the attached report, prepared by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget and the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, comparing Federal statutory salary rates with the salary rates paid in private enterprise for the same work levels, as reported in November 1964 by the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

"A similar letter is being sent to the President of the Senate.

"Sincerely,

"LYNDON B. JOHNSON."[6]

Shortly we will look at these figures but first it should be stated that this report compares the then present Federal statutory salary rates with average salary rates paid for the same levels of work in private enterprise as reported in November 1964 in the National Survey of Professional, Administrative, Technical, and Clerical Pay, conducted by the BLS.

At grades GS-1 and GS-2 of the Classification Act, but in no other salary sysetm, the then current rates were set above 1963 private enterprise rates. At all other grades through GS-5, the current rates approximated those paid in private enterprise in 1963. From GS-6 upwards, the current rates dropped progressively further in arrears of 1963 private enterprise; and from GS-12 upward the rates were below the *1962* rates of private enterprise.

It should be noted that the figures shown in the following charts are actually even further behind because of the time lag in the compilation of the figures and the approximate 3% average gain in private salaries each year.

The following chart compares the 1964 pay line with the 1962 pay line (a pay line is the fourth step of the salary schedule) which was the basis for the salary adjustment recommended by the President in April 1963, and with the fourth rates of the grades in the then present Classification Act schedule which became effective in July 1964. The 1964 pay line shows a uniform increase at all grades of approximately 6.6 percent over the 1962 pay line. Because Congress adjusted the President's 1963 salary proposal so as to add 3 percent at the first five grades and to reduce the rates for the upper grades by progressively larger dollar amounts, the differences between the current schedule rates and the 1964 pay line vary from 3.5 percent at most of the lower grades to about 11 percent at the top grades.[7]

Comparison of Classification Act pay line derived from BLS 1964 report with 1962 pay line and with present Classification Act schedule

Grade	Pay line derived from 1964 report	1962 comparability pay line	Difference, 1964 over 1962 pay line (percent)	Current Classification Act schedule (4th rates)	Difference, 1964 comparability pay line over current Classification Act schedule	
					Amount	Percent
GS-1	$3,630	$3,400	6.8	$3,730	[1]	----------
GS-2	4,075	3,820	6.7	4,055	$20	0.5
GS-3	4,565	4,280	6.7	4,410	155	3.5
GS-4	5,105	4,785	6.7	4,930	175	3.5
GS-5	5,690	5,335	6.7	5,495	195	3.5
GS-6	6,335	5,940	6.6	6,060	275	4.5
GS-7	7,020	6,585	6.6	6,650	370	5.6
GS-8	7,770	7,290	6.6	7,290	480	6.6
GS-9	8,580	8,045	6.7	7,955	625	7.9
GS-10	9,440	8,850	6.7	8,710	730	8.4
GS-11	10,380	9,735	6.6	9,535	845	8.9
GS-12	12,435	11,665	6.6	11,315	1,120	9.9
GS-13	14,750	13,835	6.6	13,335	1,415	10.6
GS-14	17,315	16,240	6.6	15,640	1,675	10.7
GS-15	20,120	18,870	6.6	18,170	1,950	10.7
GS-16	23,140	21,700	6.6	20,900	2,240	10.7
GS-17	26,330	24,695	6.6	23,695	2,635	11.1
GS-18	[2] 27,200	[3] 25,270	6.7	[4] 24,500	2,455	10.0

[1] Present rate above pay line.
[2] Entrance rate for grade (in lieu of pay line 4th rate, $29,650).
[3] Entrance rate for grade (in lieu of pay line 4th rate, $27,805).
[4] Single rate.

Based upon the BLS survey of November 1964 the entire Federal salary scale for 1965 should have been as illustrated on the next page. However, even though this scale showed what was needed for comparability on figures that were already over a year old, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget and the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission concurred in the recommendations which were submitted by the Special Panel on Federal Salaries.

The Panel's recommendation was for an increase of a 3 percent *across the board raise* in the statutory salary schedules even though the figures clearly indicated a graduated raise of between 3.5 and 11 percent was needed. The 3 percent recommended did not allow for the lag in compiling the figures and therefore the Federal salaries slipped to an approximate range of 4 to 11.5 percent behind the private remuneration. The salary scale as enacted is illustrated on page 17 which amounted to a raise of 3.6 percent.

Footnotes at end of speech.

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

1964 comparability schedule, Classification Act

	1	2	3	Pay line 4	5	6	7	8	9	10
GS-1 [1]	$3,385	$3,500	$3,615	$3,730	$3,845	$3,960	$4,075	$4,190	$4,305	$4,420
GS-2	3,700	3,825	3,950	4,075	4,200	4,325	4,450	4,575	4,700	4,825
GS-3	4,145	4,285	4,425	4,565	4,705	4,845	4,985	5,125	5,265	5,405
GS-4	4,640	4,795	4,950	5,105	5,260	5,415	5,570	5,725	5,880	6,035
GS-5	5,180	5,350	5,520	5,690	5,860	6,030	6,200	6,370	6,540	6,710
GS-6	5,765	5,955	6,145	6,335	6,525	6,715	6,905	7,095	7,285	7,475
GS-7	6,375	6,590	6,805	7,020	7,235	7,450	7,665	7,880	8,095	8,310
GS-8	7,065	7,300	7,535	7,770	8,005	8,240	8,475	8,710	8,945	9,180
GS-9	7,800	8,060	8,320	8,580	8,840	9,100	9,360	9,620	9,880	10,140
GS-10	8,585	8,870	9,155	9,440	9,725	10,010	10,295	10,580	10,865	11,150
GS-11	9,435	9,750	10,065	10,380	10,695	11,010	11,325	11,640	11,955	12,270
GS-12	11,310	11,685	12,060	12,435	12,810	13,185	13,560	13,935	14,310	14,685
GS-13	13,315	13,860	14,305	14,750	15,195	15,640	16,085	16,530	16,975	17,420
GS-14	15,740	16,265	16,790	17,315	17,840	18,365	18,890	19,415	19,940	20,465
GS-15	18,290	19,900	19,510	20,120	20,730	21,340	21,950	22,560	23,170	23,780
GS-16	21,040	21,740	22,440	23,140	23,840	24,540	25,240	25,940	26,640	--------
GS-17	23,930	24,730	25,530	26,330	27,130	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------
GS-18	27,200	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------

[1] Retained salaries.

Federal Employees Salary Act of 1965 (effective Oct. 10, 1965)

Grade	Waiting period 52 weeks			Waiting period 104 weeks			Waiting period 156 weeks			
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
GS-1	$3,507	$3,626	$3,745	$3,864	$3,983	$4,102	$4,221	$4,340	$4,459	$4,578
GS-2	3,814	3,943	4,072	4,210	4,330	4,459	4,588	4,717	4,846	4,975
GS-3	4,149	4,289	4,429	4,569	4,709	4,849	4,989	5,129	5,269	5,409
GS-4	4,641	4,797	4,953	5,109	5,265	5,421	5,577	5,733	5,889	6,045
GS-5	5,181	5,352	5,523	5,694	5,865	6,036	6,207	6,378	6,549	6,720
GS-6	5,702	5,894	6,086	6,278	6,470	6,662	6,854	7,046	7,238	7,430
GS-7	6,269	6,476	6,683	6,890	7,097	7,304	7,511	7,718	7,925	8,132
GS-8	6,869	7,097	7,325	7,553	7,781	8,009	8,237	8,465	8,693	8,921
GS-9	7,479	7,733	7,987	8,241	8,495	8,749	9,003	9,257	9,511	9,765
GS-10	8,184	8,464	8,744	9,024	9,304	9,584	9,864	10,144	10,424	10,704
GS-11	8,961	9,267	9,573	9,879	10,185	10,491	10,797	11,103	11,409	11,715
GS-12	10,619	10,987	11,355	11,723	12,091	12,459	12,827	13,195	13,563	13,931
GS-13	12,510	12,945	13,380	13,815	14,250	14,685	15,120	5,555	15,990	16,425
GS-14	14,680	15,188	15,696	16,204	16,712	17,220	17,728	18,236	18,744	19,252
GS-15	17,055	17,645	18,235	18,825	19,415	20,005	20,595	21,185	21,775	22,365
GS-16	19,619	20,297	20,975	21,653	22,331	23,009	23,687	24,365	25,043	--------
GS-17	22,217	22,994	23,771	24,548	25,325	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------
GS-18	25,382	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------

NOTE.—Yearly salary divided by 2,080 counting ½ cent and over as a whole cent will give you the hourly rate. Hourly rate multiplied by 80 will give you the biweekly rate.

The Special Panel on Federal Salaries invited Federal employee organizations to present their views in writing on the pay raise question after having been supplied the BLS survey report. Thirty-two employee and professional organizations presented their views and they were nearly unanimous in endorsing the comparability approach.

John F. Griner, the National President of the American Federation of Government Employees on March 10, 1965, made the following statement:

"The recommendation I desire to submit for your consideration is that an overall increase of 3.5 percent be added to that provided in the 1964 pay line, with the further stipulation that there be a minimum increase of 7 percent beginning with Grade GS-1 and rising to 14.6 percent in GS-17. I make this recommendation, which I believe to be conservative, because the lag between salary surveys and legislative enactments has prevented employees from benefiting from needed salary increases as early as they should have been able to benefit. This lag began with the survey of 1960-61 on which the 1962 salary Reform Act was based. From then until the latest salary survey of 1963-64 the lag was continued with the result that the 1964 law was enacted approximately a year and a half after a large portion of the 1962-63 survey had been completed. I do not mean to say that the lag in each of the four surveys from 1960-61 to the latest survey of 1963-64 is in each instant additive, but only to point out the fact that the raises were delayed each time and would not fully reflect the higher rates in industry which prevailed during the preceding period. Thus it is that we suggest the additional increase of 3.5 percent with the provision of a 7 percent minimum increase in GS-1. However, we are of the opinion that it will still not be sufficient to bring rates in all grades into line with salaries in private industry as indicated in the most recent BLS survey.

"The increase which I am recommending and which coincides with that approved by the Government Employees' Council, would provide fourth-step rates for the various grades in the table below. The range of recommended rates is compared with 1964 pay line.[10]

Grade	Percent increase of 4th rate	
	Based on CSC and BOB 1964 pay line	AFGE recommendation
GS-1	--------	7.0
GS-2	0.5	7.0
GS-3	3.5	7.0
GS-4	3.5	7.0
GS-5	3.5	7.0
GS-6	4.5	8.0
GS-7	5.6	9.1
GS-8	6.6	10.1
GS-9	7.9	11.4
GS-10	8.4	11.9
GS-11	8.9	12.4
GS-12	9.9	13.4
GS-13	10.6	14.1
GS-14	10.7	14.2
GS-15	10.7	14.2
GS-16	10.7	14.2
GS-17	11.1	14.6
GS-18	10.0	13.5

In the last few pages we have discussed the 1965 pay legislation and the effect it had upon the issue of comparability. Little more need be said on how the Federal employee fared. The figures speak for themselves. With this in mind we move to 1966 and the opening statement to the Congress by the President of the United States in transmitting the message of the Budget Director and Chairman of the Civil Service Commission.

Among the many blessings which Americans can count is a corps of Federal civil servants that is unequaled anywhere in the world. Honest, intelligent, efficient, and—above all—dedicated, these men and women represent a national resource and a national asset.

America expects much of these public servants. We have made vigorous demands on their time and energy. We have exacted from them high standards of work and conduct.

In recent years, we have moved steadily to compensate these men and women equitably and competitively for their quality performance in the public interest. To that end, the administration prepared and the Congress enacted, the Federal Salary Reform Act of 1962. We established the principle that Government workers are entitled to a pay scale which compares favorably with pay in private industry.

Such a pay scale is as much in the national interest as it is in the interest of Government employees. I said when signing the Government Employees Salary Reform Act of 1964:

> America's challenges cannot be met in this modern world by mediocrity, at any level, public or private. All through our society we must search for brilliance, welcome genius, strive for excellence.

We have been true to the principle of comparability.

Since 1961, the pay of Federal employees has increased by over 16 percent.

In the brief period since I have been President, employees of the Federal Government have enjoyed pay increases amounting to

---

Footnotes at end of speech.

nearly 12 percent. These increases have done much to close the gap between compensation for Government employees and those in private enterprise.[22]

The President went on to explain that he was asking for Federal compensation amounting to a total of 3.2 percent, 2.85 percent being a cash raise, to comply with the Administration's guidepost for *all* to follow as a hedge against inflation. The President requested a graduated raise ranging from 1 percent to 4½ percent.

As a public matter it is easy to realize that the President must set an example if he asked others to restrict wage hikes but it's the epitome of irony to make those Federal workers, who by statistics gathered by an arm of the executive office itself, are shown to be trailing up to 11% or more behind the rest of the labor force.

In analyzing the President's message anyone who has followed the legislative history would most likely find themselves somewhat at odds with the declaration that "we have been true to the principle of comparability."

However, if we go further into the Joint Annual Report we find the members stating that the 3.6 percent adjustment authorized as of October 1, 1965, did give comparability *but* only to the lower grades, GS-1 through GS-5, which as we have previously noted, were the grades that either did not trail comparability or trailed by only a small amount. The Report went on to say however, that at GS-6 and higher grades the 1965 adjustment permitted Federal salary rates to trail the 1964 private enterprise rates. At several of the highest grades the Federal rates were approximately comparable with 1962 private enterprise rates. "True comparability"? I guess we'd have to allow for interpretation.

In computing the statistics for this survey the method was changed from previous methods in that the survey was extended to include nonmetropolitan areas as well as metropolitan. Consequently, the differences shown between the 1965 and 1964 rates cannot be compared figure for figure, but for the purposes set forth in this paper the figures are more than adequate.

The survey this time showed that the salaries Federal employees should have been getting in 1966 to be as follows:

1965 comparability pay schedule—Classification Act

FSS	Pay line									
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
GS-1	$3,265	$3,375	$3,485	$3,595	$3,705	$3,815	$3,925	$4,035	$4,145	$4,255
GS-2	3,710	3,835	3,960	4,085	4,210	4,335	4,460	4,585	4,710	4,835
GS-3	4,195	4,335	4,475	4,615	4,755	4,895	5,035	5,175	5,315	5,455
GS-4	4,730	4,885	5,040	5,195	5,350	5,505	5,660	5,815	5,970	6,125
GS-5	5,305	5,480	5,655	5,830	6,005	6,180	6,355	6,530	6,705	6,880
GS-6	5,925	6,120	6,315	6,510	6,705	6,900	7,095	7,290	7,485	7,680
GS-7	6,595	6,815	7,035	7,255	7,475	7,695	7,915	8,135	8,355	8,575
GS-8	7,310	7,555	7,800	8,045	8,290	8,535	8,780	9,025	9,270	9,515
GS-9	8,090	8,360	8,630	8,900	9,170	9,440	9,710	9,980	10,250	10,520
GS-10	8,915	9,210	9,505	9,800	10,095	10,390	10,685	10,980	11,275	11,570
GS-11	9,810	10,135	10,460	10,785	11,110	11,435	11,760	12,085	12,410	12,735
GS-12	11,765	12,155	12,545	12,935	13,325	13,715	14,105	14,495	14,885	15,275
GS-13	13,970	14,435	14,900	15,365	15,830	16,295	16,760	17,225	17,690	18,155
GS-14	16,465	17,015	17,565	18,115	18,665	19,215	19,765	20,315	20,865	21,415
GS-15	19,295	19,940	20,585	21,230	21,875	22,520	23,165	23,810	24,455	25,100
GS-16	22,525	23,275	24,025	24,775	25,525	26,275	27,025	27,775	28,525	
GS-17	26,210	27,085	27,960	28,835	29,710					
GS-18	30,490									

The salary scales as finally enacted effective July 3, 1966, are shown on the chart on the next page.

Federal Employees Salary Act of 1966 (effective July 3, 1966)

Grade	Waiting period 52 weeks			Waiting period 104 weeks			Waiting period 156 weeks			
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
GS-1	$3,609	$3,731	$3,853	$3,975	$4,097	$4,219	$4,342	$4,463	$4,585	$4,707
GS-2	3,925	4,058	4,191	4,324	4,457	4,590	4,723	4,856	4,989	5,122
GS-3	4,269	4,413	4,557	4,701	4,845	4,989	5,133	5,277	5,421	5,565
GS-4	4,776	4,936	5,096	5,256	5,416	5,576	5,736	5,896	6,056	6,216
GS-5	5,331	5,507	5,683	5,859	6,035	6,211	6,387	6,563	6,739	6,915
GS-6	5,867	6,065	6,263	6,461	6,659	6,857	7,055	7,253	7,451	7,649
GS-7	6,451	6,664	6,877	7,090	7,303	7,516	7,729	7,942	8,155	8,368
GS-8	7,068	7,303	7,538	7,773	8,008	8,243	8,478	8,713	8,948	9,183
GS-9	7,696	7,957	8,218	8,479	8,740	9,001	9,262	9,523	9,784	10,045
GS-10	8,421	8,709	8,997	9,285	9,573	9,861	10,149	10,437	10,725	11,013
GS-11	9,221	9,536	9,851	10,166	10,481	10,796	11,111	11,426	11,741	12,056
GS-12	10,927	11,306	11,685	12,064	12,443	12,822	13,201	13,580	13,959	14,338
GS-13	12,873	13,321	13,769	14,217	14,665	15,113	15,561	16,009	16,457	16,905
GS-14	15,106	15,629	16,152	16,675	17,198	17,721	18,244	18,767	19,290	19,813
GS-15	17,550	18,157	18,764	19,371	19,978	20,585	21,192	21,799	22,406	23,013
GS-16	20,075	20,745	21,415	22,085	22,755	23,425	24,095	24,765	25,435	
GS-17	22,760	23,520	24,280	25,040	25,800					
GS-18	25,890									

Note.—Yearly salary divided by 2,080 counting ½ cent and over as a whole cent will give you the hourly rate. Hourly rate multiplied by 80 will give you the biweekly rate.

Let us make an analysis of this latest (1966) pay scale from a different approach and then compare the results of the 1965 pay scale.

A sampling of four different grades will give the spectrum desired and be compatible for comparison to past pay scales to determine what progress has been made. The following chart will illustrate.

1966 comparability pay	1966 actual pay	Gain (+) or loss (−)	Approximate percent of comparability	Approximate true percent of comparability due to time lag	Trailing percent
GS-1, $3,595	$3,975	+$380	110	106.5	
GS-6, $6,510	6,461	−49	99	95.5	−4.5
GS-13, $15,365	14,217	−1,148	93	89.5	−10.5
GS-17, $28,835	25,040	−3,795	87	83.5	−16.5

Grades 1 through 5 have achieved better than comparability. Beginning with Grade 6 and above the classified wrokers start to fall below the comparability line with the percentage ranging from a loss of 4.5% to a loss of 16.5%. The 1965 raise trailed by approximately 4 to 11.5%, an increase in the percentage loss of approximately .5 to 5% over the previous year. Will the story continue in the same VANE, or in VAIN?

Prospects in the future

As in most legislation the hard work on a bill or resolution is done at the Committee level. The Committee can use the hearing as a method of gathering information, points of view, and as a public information

---

Footnotes at end of speech.

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

outlet. At present hearings are being held by the House Civil Service Committee on the 1967 pay proposals. In spite of the figures showing the graduated gap in comparable pay, the Administration has proposed an *across the board* raise of 4.5% this year but then proposed two successive raises of a slightly higher amount on a *sliding-scale* in 1968 and 1969, with the ultimate effect promising comparability in 1969. Those that recall the promise of comparability in 1962 might be pessimistically skeptical on that score. However, there may be some basis for cautious optimism. Hearings conducted on April 25, 1967, reportedly "produced surprisingly-strong backing for a two year plan and equality by mid-1968.[13] Additionally, a change in the timing of the BLS survey will lop off 3 months of the time lag and will result in figures being only 12 months old instead of 15 in the future surveys.

But getting back to reality, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget in testifying before the House Civil Service Committee put into the record the Proposed Classified rates and the comparability figures including percentage of comparability. Following is the chart: Note how it compares to my own figures worked up for the 1966 raise and it is easy to conclude what progress will be made if these scales are enacted.

Proposed classified rates[14]

	Comparable salaries	Proposed salaries	Percent of comparability	Sample percent comparison of 1966 scales using survey scales
GS-1	$3,745	$4,154	110.9	110
GS-2	4,255	4,519	106.2	----------
GS-3	4,810	4,913	102.1	----------
GS-4	5,415	5,493	101.4	----------
GS-5	6,075	6,123	100.8	----------
GS-6	6,790	6,752	99.4	99
GS-7	7,555	7,409	98.1	----------
GS-8	8,380	8,122	96.9	----------
GS-9	9,270	8,861	95.6	----------
GS-10	10,215	9,703	95.0	----------
GS-11	11,235	10,623	94.6	----------
GS-12	13,470	12,607	93.6	----------
GS-13	16,005	14,857	92.8	93
GS-14	18,870	17,425	92.3	----------
GS-15	22,115	20,243	91.5	----------
GS-16	25,810	23,079	89.4	----------
GS-17	30,040	25,850	86.1	87
GS-18	31,760	25,990	81.8	----------

Note.—Virtually no progress.

The story would not be complete unless we considered in the legislative process the feelings of the employees themselves.

Employee reactions

Those directly concerned with this matter of Equal Pay for Equal Work must certainly have feelings on the matter. In part the following pages reveal what some have indicated in writing to their representatives.[15]

In the first instance the thought being conveyed seems to be a rebuttal of the excuses given that a comparable wage cannot be paid because of budget problems and especially because of the Vietnam war.

THE PLIGHT OF THE FEDERAL EMPLOYEE

Today we are engaged in many wars. An extremely hot war in Vietnam, at home we are fighting a war on poverty, another is the cold war throughout the world, races in technology space programs, others in moral questions of individual rights. Each is costly, far more costly than people wish them to be, but nevertheless just as costly in human lives, suffering, tensions, anguish, and inevitably the most calculable, money.

Each of us fights his own little war of trying to be victorious in acquiring more of this calculable commodity for our own basic needs and then some for that better life, just as collectively we all strive to be victorious in all these wars, simultaneously. All, it appears to me, can conclude that the more that is attempted or necessary, the higher the aggregate cost will be. And, assumingly, the higher the cost to all as equally as is feasible. All Americans are involved in these wars, as individual citizens, groups, etc., and among those groups, is a particular group, and the subject of this message, the Federal employees. It might be mentioned that from one point of view, Federal employees, as a whole are to a degree more deeply involved in these wars than other citizens and taxpayers, by the additional privilege of actively and directly working in these endeavors. As a Federal employee and an advocate of their causes, and plight to attain individual and collective goals the following is offered for consideration by all those with a degree of control or influence over their fate.

It is a fact and necessarily so, that the Federal employee is handicapped in his bargaining position as opposed to other groups of employees, when seeking just benefits or wages, by the inability to strike or exercise other coercive means to drive home his views. Moreover, virtually the *only* means of effecting his goals is obtaining the sympathy of the nation's legislators and Chief Legislator, the President of the United States. It is to this group that this appeal is directed.

In all fairness we should be and are, in full understanding and sympathy with the overwhelming decisions that are burdening our Chief Executive and legislators. How do we accomplish all things to all people, and do it now? I do not wish to answer this. What we do ask, is that we give nothing less than any citizen is asked to give, whatever be decided by our elected representatives. What we further ask, however, is that we are not asked any longer to bear more than what is asked of every citizen and taxpayer. If everything Americans wish to accomplish will cost more than we are paying now, let all be assessed the same.

In 1962 President Kennedy instituted a policy of "Comparability" of remuneration for comparable jobs in government and industry, as manifested in the 1962 Federal Reform Pay Act. This was a giant step for the cause of the Federal employee, and more than that, a major step to change the attitudes of the more qualified to enter and stay in the Federal service instead of turning to private industry because the remuneration is higher. Since that time the Department of Labor through the Bureau of Labor Statistics has conducted studies to determine this comparability. The paramount point here is that Comparability became a reality! Positions and salaries could be compared and the difference could be seen! It was easy from there on. All that had to be done from that point was to pay the difference (or detract, but this has not been the case) because it was obviously an injustice to ask anyone to work for less wages than another person was getting at a comparable job. But was it done? The answer should be clear.

It was lately explained that comparability could not be promulgated now, because of the cost of the war in Vietnam, but as soon as the war was over comparability would be carried out. If you stop to think about it, this puts the Federal employee in the position of a second class citizen or to put it another way, subjected to a double standard. Consider that the Federal employee pays the same taxes as all other employees. These taxes are used to pay for the war in Vietnam, the Cold War, the Great Society programs (guns and butter, if you will). Yet, the Federal employee cannot receive as much salary. To any thinking being it becomes obvious that these Federal employees, in effect, are paying more than their share. Certainly, the Federal employee is willing to pay equally for everything the American people wish. After all, he is also one of those people, he is not unique. He has expenses of every day living, food, clothing, shelter, he pays equally other taxes, state, county, sales, etc. He has children to support and desires to provide the best he can for his family the same as anyone else. The former Postmaster General, J. Edward Day was recently quoted in the Washington Star as saying:

"We must give up the idea that public employees can be treated as second class citizens when it comes to pay and working condition. . . . When we undertake public programs we mustn't later decide that the public employee must bear the brunt of the budget problems. The federal government in my opinion is going to have budget problems every year so long as you and I are around. But the pay check of the public employee should not always be the first thing sacrificed when the budget squeeze is on."

Should the cost of the Administration's programs operating today, exclude the salaries of the employees engaged in them? Should payment of prices (excluding salaries) for all other aspects of the Great Society programs be the going rate, while salaries lag behind?

Inequities have been perpetrated by both the Administration and the Congress. The last raise proposed by the Administration was within its so called 3.2% guide line that *everyone* was supposed to follow. Others, of course, did not but the Federal employee salaries did, making things further lopsided. Incidentally, Federal employees got 3.2% in 1966 as the cost of living rose 3.3%. Committee reports have shown the greatest lag in salaries is in the middle to upper grades. Knowing this the Administration proposed a graduated raise (although still not enough) to make the gap more uniform, at least. Congress ignored this aspect and voted for an across-the-board increase, again violating what was shown to be needed.

It seems fitting here to be practical and realistic in this discussion. As referred to above, each of us strives for his own place and betterment. Legislators are no exception. Re-election, understandably, is important to most as is the needs of their constituency. As a practical matter there is little doubt that there are more employees in the lower grades and it follows that there are more voters found in these areas also. To further illustrate, Administration has seen the need to ask for substantial increases in social security benefits to our older citizens *now*, regardless of a costly war or not, it recommends these benefits (approximately 20%). There are nearly 20 million recipients of social security. There are only 1.2 million Federal employees. This is perfectly understandable and is not, herein the intention to condemn anyone, but rather to provide a base for the following summation and suggestion. 15A

The paper goes on to suggest that the pay for Federal employees being on an automatic basis from year to year based on the BLS surveys.

The second spells out in a more emotion evoking attempt to clarify in basic terms the problems encountered by the employee because of a lag in pay.

This refers to the Federal Employee Pay Legislation now pending action by your Committee. I wish to go on record as being in favor of legislation designed to eliminate the "comparability gap" for *all* employees *now*, and to request your support of any such measure. We believe particular attention should be given to those grades in the Federal service which the Bureau of Labor Statistics studies show have suffered from the "comparability gap" in the greater amount and for a longer time and that such action should not again be postponed.

1. If a system can be established whereby comparability can be measured, which was accomplished in the 1962 Federal Pay Reform Act, then paying anything less is a gross injustice to the Federal employee.

Footnotes at end of speech.

2. The Federal government would not be able to pay a less than comparable wage, and price for material, to a private organization in a contractural agreement, and tell them that "well this year work for less but in the future we will pay you a comparable wage."

3. Time is money. Federal employees are no exceptions to the cost of everyday living. He pays the same prices for goods and services as other Americans. As admitted by Administration officials, Congressional leaders and as shown by the Bureau of Labor Statistics surveys Federal employees in the middle and upper grades have been short changed by a far greater margin than employees in the lower grades for all these years. in the middle grades, to take a *conservative* example, an employee has been underpaid at least $1,250 (much more at the higher grades) each year since comparison was possible. If comparability was instituted *today* the Federal employee would still be behind, not only due to the lag of 15 months in the Bureau of Labor Statistics surveys but because (a) since 1962 he has already lost $6,250 in hard cash as a basic figure. An amount that could have been just what he needed for that downpayment on a home for his family, a start for his children's education, a newer automobile than the clunker he has been putting up with, etc. (b) he has lost potential interest on that $6,250 if he could have saved some of it for the future. On $6,250 the interest would have accumulated over another $1,250 which multiplies the injustice even further. The interest is lost forever, and so is the interest on the interest, which at this point totals a loss of over $7,300. (c) Had he received that extra $1,250 a year he might not have had to borrow so much money to buy the things his family needed, and thus avoiding being submerged deeper in the financial muck and mire forced upon him. These things are realistic. This is really the plight of the Federal employee. Amounts of money mean nothing in themselves, it is only the relative value that counts. If the employees do not receive equal salary for equal work they are placed squarely in the position of *second class citizens*. They are expected to do comparable work for less than comparable pay. Budgetary excuses are invalid for prolonging any further postponement. There will always be budgetary problems. If this be the case let all citizens bear the brunt equally. A Federal employee cannot be expected to subsidize all the public programs that the Government undertakes. Cost factors must include the *just* pay for those administering the programs. If the cost of the additional programs is too much, then the program should be cut, not the salaries of the employees. In recent years proposals by the Administration and Congress have been incongruous. In 1965 the President asked everyone to follow the now defunct wage guide post of 3.2%. Government salaries did, while private salaries leaped further ahead. In 1966 the Administration proposed within the guidelines a graduated increase while Congress saw fit to make it across the board and this year the Administration has proposed an across the board increase. As hearings are now in progress it is imperative that these views be brought to the fore.

Figures show that 11.6% is needed *now* to achieve this long overdue and just raise. Only the sympathy of key members of Congress showing strong determination to effectuate this now long established principle will the plight of the Federal employee be finally and justly remedied.[16]

In more general terms and not specifically aimed at the comparability scales the following article (in Part) by Vance Packard, illustrates from an outside point of view the problems that exist:

Business consultants rationalize such relatively low pay by suggesting that public servants are more interested in "psychic" rewards. But a recruiter offers this explanation:

"Executives in private companies or industries are judged by company stockholders on profits the company makes and by its growth. If things are going well, no one bothers much about executive salaries being high."

However, university presidents, Government officials and military officers are running institutions owned by the people, and "it is very difficult for taxpayers to justify salaries considerably higher than their own earnings or earning capabilities." In short, a philosophy of egalitarianism is, apparently, more likely to influence the pay of leaders in situations where the people have an effective vote, with power of protest or veto.

In relating comparisons with leaders in industry verses governmental leaders he (V. Packard) points out the hazard is not simply that some leaders make high six-figure incomes. Rather the hazard is in the fact that many leaders—in Government, universities and other public or service institutions—make low-five-figure incomes; skilled natural leaders are not available in abundance. If most of the available supply gravitates to the private areas where we offer the greatest material rewards, then the leaders who will help us face the urgent social challenges of the coming years will have to be responsive to nonmonetary motivation including the indubitable appeal of public notice, prestige and power. Meanwhile, most Americans will continue to be upward strivers in a largely dollar-dominated society.[17]

The acceptable procedure in a presentation such as this would be to effectively summarize what has been stated in a well founded conclusion. In this instance, however, it would be idle to make a further conclusion since the information has already imparted an ample denouement.

A more appropriate and constructive ending to this disquisition would be to suggest possible solutions to the problems rather than leave the matter in a criticized state, as is so often done.

Of primary concern to any group desiring legislation to embrace their cause is the conveying of these desires to the Nation's legislators in persuasive petitions. As Stephen Bailey states "more legislators respond favorably to group interests because they find themselves 'simpatico' with them than ever respond to threats of reprisal."[18]

Suggestion: Federal employees should make use of employee organizations, their elected representatives, and take a little time to express their views where they will be most effective, and urge those apathetic individuals to do the same.

Labor groups have requested that because statistics have shown the private salary scales have risen a certain amount in the past, and the fact that the statistics are lagging about 15 months behind, that that percentage be included in the compilation of comparable salaries. Congress has not agreed with this approach because it is unknown what the future rates will do and if industry scales do not rise as expected Federal salaries could end up ahead.

Suggestion: As a practical matter the time lag should be cut as close as possible. It is apparent that it can be cut substantially from what it is now. When this has been accomplished a simple bonus system could take care of any inequities the surveys show to exist. For example, if the lag is 12 months and the percentage difference shows a certain grade to lag by 1%, a bonus of 1% for the past year could make up the inequity without the fear of overpayment.

Donald Matthews, in describing committees in "U.S. Senators and their World," terms the seniority system of committee selection, the *Committee Caste System*. He observes one indication of the differences in committee prestige is the continual movement of senators from one committee to another during the course of their careers and that it is a rare senator, indeed, who is content to sit on a committee to which he was initially assigned during the entire length of service. Each senator normally serves on two standing committees; a few receive a third seat on a minor committee as well. (A footnote in the book states "the minor committees, as stipulated in Rule XXV, are the committees on the District of Columbia, Government Operations, and *Post Office and Civil Service*.) In a chart showing committee member movements the Foreign Relations Committee gained sixteen members and Appropriations fifteen, while the Post Office and Civil Service suffered the highest loss, nineteen members. Ergo, "When compared with the high ranking committees, those which are less desirable are often woefully weak in parliamentary skill, prestige, and experience. Moreover [the] members rarely hold other positions of power in the Senate.[19]

So, besides other disadvantages such as apathy of some Federal employees themselves, the usual adamant public opinion against raises for public servants, the cause for comparable Federal salaries is championed, by a committee whose members, for the most part, serve their apprenticeship and move on as quickly as possible, and understandably so, to more important committee assignments.

Suggestion: Since there has been a start in the 1962 Pay Reform Act toward annual review of salaries, the trend should be expanded even further by additional laws with the purpose of making comparable salary adjustments on an automatic basis. As the BLS surveys show that salaries have changed the salary scales of the Federal employees should be adjusted to comply with the new rates. There are thousands of bills introduced each session of Congress and much work to be done that could be better handled by those now concerned with the perennial chores of the pay raise bills. If our Federal employees are unequaled anywhere in the world, honest, intelligent, efficient and above all, dedicated as President Johnson has stated, why not take care of them and pay them an equal wage? Why not make the Federal service attractive to all Americans and by doing so attract the best possible people to serve the country? Why not help Americans to help America?

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. *Senate Report No. 1187*, 89th Congress, 2nd Session, May 26, 1966.

2. *Senate Report No. 910*, 89th Congress, 1st Session, October 18, 1965.

3. *Public Law 89–504*, (89th Congress, H.R. 14122) July 18, 1966.

4. *Public Law 89–301*, (89th Congress, H.R. 10281) October 29, 1965.

5. *Public Law 88–426*, (88th Congress, H.R. 11049) August 14, 1964.

6. *Hearings on H.R. 11049*, Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, U.S. Senate, 88th Congress, 1st and 2nd Sessions, September 1963 and May 1964.

7. *Hearings*. Before the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, U.S. Senate, 89th Congress, First Session on Legislation Pertaining to Federal Employees Compensation, August, October 1965.

8. *Playboy Magazine*, Vol. 14, No. 3, "Executive Salaries" March 1967 by Vance Packard.

9. *The Washington Daily News*, Wednesday, April 26, 1967, by John Cramer.

10. House Document No. 402, 89th Congress, 2nd Session, March 1, 1966.

11. House Document No. 174, 89th Congress, 1st Session, May 17, 1965.

12. U.S. Code Congressional and Administrative News, Vol. 2, 87th Congress, 2nd Session, 1962.

13. Senate Report No. 2120, To Accompany H.R. 7927, 1962.

14. *U.S. Senators and Their World*, Donald R. Matthews, Vintage Books, A Division of Random House, New York, 1960.

Footnotes at end of speech.

15. *The New Congress,* Stephen K. Bailey, St. Martin's Press, New York, 1966.

INTERVIEW: Assistance and Direction for Source Material Provided by Mr. LeGrand A. Rouse, II, Professional Staff Member of Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

NOTE: Opinions, inferences, analyses and conclusions, except where footnoted, are those of author.

---

[1] *Senate Report No. 2120,* 9-24-1962 to accompany H.R. 7927.

[2] *U.S. Code Congressional and Administrative News.* Vol. 2, pg. 3035 87th Congress Second Session West Publishing Co., St. Paul, Minn. and Edward Thompson Co., Brooklyn, N.Y.

[3] *Ibid* pg. 3036–3037

[4] *Ibid* pg. 3037–3038

[5] *Ibid* pg. 3039–3041

[6] *House of Representatives Document No. 174,* 89th Congress, 1st Session Communication from the President of the United States transmitting Joint Annual Report on Federal Statutory Pay Systems, Pursuant to the Federal Salary Reform Act of 1962. May 17, 1965.

[7] *Ibid* pg. 14

[8] *Ibid* pg. 14

[9] *Ibid* pg. 15

[10] *Ibid* pg. 17–18

[11] *Ibid* pg. 18

[12] *House Document No. 402,* 89th Congress, 2nd session. Message from the President of the United States transmitting the Joint Annual Report of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget and the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission and the Report of the Cabinet Committee on Federal Staff. Retirement System dated March 7, 1966.

[13] *The Washington Daily News,* Wednesday, April 26, 1967, by John Cramer.

[14] *Ibid* pg. 24

[15] Source material contributed by Federal employees who had taken time to express their feelings regarding pay comparability.

[15A] Source material contributed by Federal employees who had taken time to express their feelings regarding pay comparability.

[16] *Ibid*

[17] Vance Packard, "Executive Salaries," Playboy Magazine, Vol. 14, No. 3, March 1967, page 167.

[18] Stephen K. Bailey, "The New Congress" (New York, St. Martin's Press, 1966)

[19] Donald R. Matthews, "U.S. Senators and Their World" (New York: Random House, 1960) p. 148–149.

Unified Federal Bank Supervision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1967

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, since 1962, I have been sponsoring legislation to unify the Federal bank supervisory agencies. On January 10, of this year, I introduced H.R. 969, a bill to establish a Federal Banking Commission to administer all Federal laws relating to the examination and supervision of banks.

In a recent article written for the Christian Science Monitor, David R. Francis discussed the views of Gov. J. L. Robertson of the Federal Reserve Board, regarding the establishment of such a Commission.

I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article which appeared in the June 26, 1967, edition of the Christian Science Monitor:

UNIFIED FEDERAL BANK SUPERVISION?

(By David R. Francis)

NEW YORK.—At one time, bankers used to refer to the three basic C's of lending—character, capacity, and collateral. With sardonic humor, federal bank regulators refer to the three C's of consultation, cooperation, and coordination.

J. L. Robertson, a governor of the Federal Reserve Board, cities this "inside" whimsy in an article in a Duke University journal "Law and Contemporary Problems."

In it, he argues for the unification of federal bank supervision, Mr. Robertson has been advocating this since 1962. But it has been successfully opposed by the powerful banking community.

Bankers prefer the present division of authority between the Federal Reserve Board, the Comptroller of the Currency, and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. The Department of Justice and even the Securities and Exchange Commission get into the act in some ways.

RELUCTANCE TO CHANGE

"Bankers," said a spokesman, "want to avoid one very powerful, hard-to-control agency, which would tend to become autocratic."

Writes Mr. Robertson, "If the question were the initiation of a system of federal bank supervision, no one would suggest dividing the authority among multiple agencies.

"But since we have a tripartite system, by historical accident, and since it has operated without obvious harm to the public welfare, the soundness and reasonableness of the proposal has been so far overcome by lethargy, by mankind's reluctance to change things, and by those who have a self-interest in maintaining the status quo."

During the years when James J. Saxon was Comptroller of the Currency, the inharmony between the agencies became so serious as to require presidential attention.

Most bankers believe that Mr. Saxon brought a blast of fresh competition and modernization into banking. But they often criticize his methods and various specific actions.

COMPETITION GROWS

In any event, his replacement last winter by William B. Camp has greatly eased the conflict between the regulatory agencies. But the problems arising from divided responsibilities remain. Indeed, it is likely they will become more important.

When bankers and regulators were primarily concerned with stability, and the memory of the 1930's bank failures still most vivid, the dividend regulators had less in the way of change with which to contend.

Starting in the 1950's, however, bankers gradually dropped some of their conservatism. Today they are a more venturesome lot, more competitive. They are vigorously searching for expanded areas of business, such as credit cards, consumer loans, and data processing. They have developed new techniques and devices—for instance, certificates of deposit.

They have actively branched and merged where possible. They moved with their customers overseas by establishing foreign branches or making new alliances.

Change brings the need for new regulation. In turn, new regulation results in conflicting views. The banks then shop around for the most lenient supervisory agency.

In the opinion of the editor of the Duke Law School journal, Clark C. Havighurst, the best explanation for "the decrepitude" afflicting banking regulation lies in history.

REVISION PROPOSED

"Each of the major legislative events in the history of federal bank regulation, in 1864, 1913, 1927, 1933, and 1935, merely built upon an existing framework of regulation without overhauling the whole."

If the President or Congress tackles this overhauling job, it will be a great surprise to the banking industry.

The legislative branch shows a little sign of enacting Mr. Robertson's proposal. It is incorporated in a bill that would create a federal banking commission composed of five members appointed for 10 years on a staggered basis.

This commission would take over the full functions of the FDIC and the comptroller, and the regulatory side of the Federal Reserve Board. The board would be left with the responsibility of monetary authority.

Mr. Robertson holds that the governors should devote their full time to monetary policy, considering its significance. In addition, it would remove any temptation of the monetary body to use supervisory powers to implement monetary policy by appraising loans with a more critical eye in periods of tight money.

Regulatory unification also could be accomplished by a reorganization plan submitted by the president for tacit congressional acceptance. Once submitted, the plan would take effect in 60 days unless one house of Congress passes a resolution against it.

Since Congress has little time to devote to reorganization, the executive route merits more serious consideration, states Mr. Robertson.

REACTION EXPECTED

It is certain, however, that should the President act, he could expect a crash campaign by various bankers to have Congress block the reorganization. They might well succeed. Their legislative influence was demonstrated dramatically in their ability to have Congress pass a law in 1966 that reversed some Supreme Court of the United States decisions barring specific bank mergers.

Nor have there been any major banking abuses that might light a fire under Congress. The present system works, though with the inefficiency and creaks of an ancient wooden wagon.

Mr. Robertson retains his optimism that reform will occur.

"Let us home," he writes, "it will not take a catastrophe or a series of them, to develop the necessary momentum.

"Sooner or later a reformation of federal banking regulation will become even more obviously essential, and will come about."

Congress Still Controls Money

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1967

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit for inclusion in the RECORD an editorial from the June 15, 1967, San Marino, Calif., Tribune.

The Tribune editorial contains perceptive and timely observations concerning the growth of the Federal Government and the significance of such growth.

It very correctly points out that Congress possesses control over the purse strings and that this control should be effectively utilized in the interest of avoiding overgrown bureauracy and preserving freedom in our Nation.

CONGRESS STILL CONTROLS MONEY

The rapid growth of the federal government in the past decade continues at an accelerating pace and represents a condition of deep importance to every person making the United States his home. Many people fear that if the present trend continues historians of the future will record that the people of the United States and their elected representatives gradually lost the power to control their government, and as the bureaucracy expanded, the people also lost their freedom. But, no one can predict what the reaction of some 200 million people will be to developments now taking shape. Up to this point, evidence suggests one of three things—either the people have not been paying too much attention, they are confused by events, or they approve of the trend.

Ten years ago, when President Eisenhower proposed his 1958 administrative budget of $71.8 billion, the public reaction was definite. Irate taxpayers demanded reductions in the budget in a flood of letters to congressmen. The officials of government, including the President, the Democratic majority in Congress, and the Secretary of the Treasury condemned the upward trend of federal spending and joined in calling for substantial cuts. When Congress adjourned that year, it had succeeded in cutting the proposed budget by almost $5 billion. Since 1960, the population of the United States has grown by 10 per cent, but the civilian bureaucracy of the federal government has increased by 25 per cent and administration requests for $144 billion of new spending authority in fiscal 1968 have hardly caused a ripple of public concern.

Some of the facts of growth in the federal establishment speak for themselves. First of all, the national debt presently carries a $14 billion annual interest charge—10 cents out of every tax dollar. A $300 billion budget is in prospect for 1980. New government welfare programs multiply, increasing from 239 in 1966 to about 450 in 1968. A great many of these have been started on a shoestring with unlimited potential for increased spending requirements. Forty-two million people now receive regular checks from the federal government, and this number is destined to grow every year. Since last year, spending authority just in the fields of health, labor and welfare has risen nearly 28 per cent. The Secretary of the Treasury has requested a $29 billion increase in the national debt ceiling. In the past, the debt ceiling has been raised on a "temporary" basis. This fiction is being dropped in the current request for a "permanent" debt ceiling of $365 billion—up from the "permanent" ceiling now set at $285 billion.

One of the fundamental myths arising out of the depression years that any problem can be solved by spending enough federal money seems still to be with us. Prolonged prosperity, with little painful inflation until recently has unquestionably dulled critical public appraisal. Various levels of government now purchase 30 per cent of the goods and services produced in the nation and the penalties of centralization are beginning to show up in the form of bureaucratic red tape, waste and duplication.

Some see a stirring of concern at the grassroots level and among intellectuals and administrators in government itself. There is evidence of a growing recognition that many problems to be solved or dealt with most effectively, must be handled at the state and local level. There is much to suggest that the American political system may be entering a decisive period when the ability of central government to handle an ever-increasing share of the peoples' affairs and responsibilities in a country as large and diverse as this is to be questioned. In all this, it should not be forgotten that Congress possesses the power to control money appropriations which determine the size of government—and, in the final analysis, the people still control the Congress.

Delinquency Prevention Proposal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 26, 1967

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, recently the North American Newspaper Alliance distributed an article which I had written regarding the growing problem of juvenile delinquency.

Here in Washington, the Washington Star carried the article in its entirety. I take the privilege of placing this article in the RECORD today, as follows:

DELINQUENCY PREVENTION PROPOSAL

(By ROMAN C. PUCINSKI)

Congress is on the doorstep of a move to cool the annual crises in long hot summers and it seems to be acting just in the nick of time.

With continued support from local communities, the House of Representatives should vote within a month on one of the lowest-cost programs in its history, and one that offers the first hope of solving the dilemma of juvenile delinquency.

The nation-wide cost of delinquency is about $4 billion annually. Of more interest—it may soon involve about one-quarter of our population.

The beginning can be made with the legislation known as "The Juvenile Delinquency Prevention Act of 1967." I emphasize "prevention" because the measure has been drafted to provide incentives which would require communities to combine their resources and best talents in one plan of action.

As the chairman of the General Subcommittee on Education of the House Education and Labor Committee which is considering the legislation, I have been startled and rudely awakened by the nature and extent of juvenile crime as unfolded by witnesses who have endeavored for years to stir public concern to this danger.

COMMISSION FINDINGS

Need for this legislation has been bolstered by the year-long study made by the President's Crime Commission. Let me state some of the more important findings of the report:

1. Juvenile arrests increased 9 percent in 1966.
2. Youths between 11 and 17, comprising 13 percent of the population, were convicted of 50 percent of all burglaries, larcenies and car thefts.
3. Half of all crimes against property were committed by minors.
4. Of all ages from cradle to grave, our 15-year-olds are arrested more frequently.

Attorney General Ramsey Clark sought to bring home the problem even more clearly in his testimony before my subcommittee when he stated:

"Today we know that four out of every five felons, before committing their more serious crimes, had been convicted of misdemeanors, generally as youths. We know that most of this could have been prevented. We know that four out of every five juvenile courts have no psychiatrist or psychologist available, and one-third have no probation officer or case worker.

"Of the 400,000 youths in jails last year, 100,000 were imprisoned with hardened criminals."

ACT HOLDS HOPE

To this distressing report, the President's Crime Commission added, "America's best hope for reducing crime is to reduce juvenile delinquency and youth crime."

I believe the "Juvenile Delinquency Prevention Act of 1967" holds that hope. It has the strong support of the Administration and, although it authorizes a modest $25 million initial expenditure, I am hopeful that—based on compelling evidence of need—Congress will increase the initial authorization by at least another $25 million.

While the initial authorization is modest, it escalates sharply in the next four years providing a total of $475 million for Federal and local community programs in the next five years.

The legislation would provide Federal grants up to 90 percent to states and their communities to develop comprehensive plans to prevent delinquency. It also offers Federal aid to carry out projects designed to prevent lawlessness, for some construction projects and for increased research in this area.

To be eligible, an applicant must first submit a comprehensive plan for work on juvenile delinquency.

This means that our schools take an active role in combating and preventing delinquency, as well as juvenile courts, probation officers, prosecuting attorneys, law enforcement officers and all community service groups.

A NEW RESOURCE

Out of this combination of talents should evolve a new resource—a coordinated service in the community to which other agencies can refer problem youths and upon which families and youths can call for help and assistance.

If nothing else, it will show our young people that we are interested in them.

A recent decision by the U.S. Supreme Court overturning the conviction of Gerald Francis Gault by an Arizona juvenile court now places added responsibilities—with resulting higher costs—on local communities to guarantee the rights of minors who must appear in courts.

The High Court said, in effect, that juveniles who are charged with offenses which may be punishable by some form of detention, must be given the right to be represented by counsel, to cross-examine witnesses against them and to have full protection against self-incrimination.

I believe the court had the duty to define these protections and the effect of this landmark decision will be to force communities to bend every effort to prevent delinquency, rather than pay the increased cost of providing attorneys for juveniles and taking the added time of judges, law enforcement officers and prosecuting attorneys after a youth commits a criminal act.

COMMUNITY ACTION

If we ignore this crisis among our youth, there is every reason to believe that the Gault decision may cause more distress in many communities than the historic 1954 school desegregation ruling. The demands made upon the communities to protect the rights of juveniles can be vastly more costly than providing adequate schools for all.

The Children's Bureau of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has many reports that stress the need for more community action for youngsters.

In its spot checks of delinquency care around the country, it has uncovered routine practices of placing juveniles in jails and detention homes for a "cooling-off" period of up to seven days. This is done without any order of the court but merely on the choice of law-enforcement officers. Undoubtedly, it is a violation of human rights and a matter of community concern.

The "Juvenile Delinquency Prevention Act of 1967" should force us to look at all practices affecting our young people. It is what we need to meet this responsibility.

There are now 48,500 youngsters in state training schools throughout the country, costing taxpayers $144 million annually for upkeep alone. There are another 220,000 youngsters throughout the U.S. under some form of court supervision, costing taxpayers another $70 million annually for supervisory personnel.

With these figures destined to grow, and grow, and grow, it is time we Americans realized that juvenile delinquency prevention is a wise investment.

Stephen Vincent White

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1967

Mr. MORSE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, on June 4, Lowell State College in Lowell, Mass., conferred its first two honorary degrees. This occasion has both climaxed the unusual and interesting history of Lowell State, and provided the keynote for further development and progress. The college was first established in 1897 as a 2-year institution for the training of teachers for the Merrimack Valley area in northeastern Massachusetts. It expanded its program first to 3 and then to 4 years in the 1930's. Today it is a respected school with the power to grant bachelor of arts and science degrees and master's degrees.

It became the first college in the Massachusetts State college system to award honorary degrees this year. Its first honorary awards were conferred to Margaret Agnes Mullen of the class of 1916, who has served as teacher-principal of the Margaret A. Mullen School, named for her by the residents of Falmount, Mass., and to Stephen Vincent White, the octogenarian teacher and athletic coach of South Boston High School. I include the citation accompanying their degrees in the RECORD:

STEPHEN VINCENT WHITE

The State College at Lowell is delighted to honor Stephen Vincent White, graduate of Princeton University, Class of 1911, the octogenarian teacher-coach who for generations built manly character and winning teams at South Boston High School. Winning coaches build champions. Losing coaches build character. The great ones do both. Through you Lowell honors the Teacher-Coaches of our high schools whose influence in strengthening the physical and moral development of young manhood is the prelude and prophecy of future performance in far flung fields from Boston to Berlin, from Washington, D.C., to the DMZ in Viet Nam, from Lowell to the Gulf of Aquaba.

"No printed word nor spoken plea
Can teach young hearts what men should be
Not all the books on all the shelves
But what the Teachers are themselves"

The Board of Trustees of the State College at Lowell hereby confers upon Stephen Vincent White the degree of Doctor of Science in Education, Honoris Causa.

MARGARET AGNES MULLEN, CLASS OF 1916

Today, your Alma Mater takes pride in awarding you her first Honorary Degree. Teacher-principal, serving today, as for the past 51 years, in the Margaret A. Mullen School, renamed in your honor by the town of Falmouth, Massachusetts, through you Lowell honors our alumnae and the legion of unheralded school teachers who sow unseen harvests in the minds and souls of generations of children.

"Only a lot of boys and girls?
Only the tiresome spelling, writing, ciphering classes?
Only a public school?
Ah more, infinitely more."

The Board of Trustees of the State College at Lowell hereby confers upon Margaret Agnes Mullen the degree of Doctor of Science in Education, Honoris Causa.

Time To Move on Nike X

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1967

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, the Los Angeles Times has spoken out forcefully in an editorial entitled "Time To Move on Nike X," concerning the need for action toward deploying our antimissile defense system.

Noting that Communist China's June 17, 1967, hydrogen bomb explosion was conducted "under circumstances which suggest that it was mounted on a missile," the Times calls upon President Johnson to deploy at least a "thin" anti-ballistic-missile system to protect the United States.

The editorial states:

> The diplomatic effort has produced no visible results, and at last report, Moscow is going right ahead with installation of its own system. Even if the Russians were to agree, however, the Chinese threat would remain.

The results of recently concluded and highly publicized meeting of Soviet Premier Kosygin and the President underscores the relevancy of this observation.

Under leave to extend my remarks I submit the editorial for inclusion in the RECORD and commend it to the reading of the Congress:

TIME TO MOVE ON NIKE X

President Johnson should not delay any longer the decision to deploy at least a "thin" anti-ballistic missile system to protect the United States against potential nuclear attack.

All doubts on this score were removed—or should have been—by Communist China's successful explosion of a hydrogen bomb under circumstances which suggest that it was mounted on a missile.

There is nothing particularly surprising about the Chinese feat in exploding a thermonuclear device as such, since it had long been predicted by Western experts.

However, Japanese scientists say their monitoring devices indicate the H-bomb explosion occurred at an altitude of 18 to 31 miles above the ground.

If this assessment is correct, it presumably means that the device was carried aloft by a missile. This, in turn, means that the Chinese have succeeded in packaging a thermonuclear warhead for missile delivery far more quickly than American experts had expected.

Rep. Craig Hosmer (R-Long Beach), as a ranking member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, has access to intelligence sources. And he agrees that what the Chinese tested was an actual hydrogen bomb—not just a test device.

Hosmer also estimates that Peking may already have an arsenal of 30 small fission-type A-bombs. Bomber and medium-range missile systems for their delivery have been tested.

The Chinese are known to be working on a missile with intercontinental range, and it is quite conceivable that they will have a handful of operational ICBM's by 1970.

This country cannot afford to gamble that Peking's weapons program will ultimately fall victim to the strife between Mao Tse-tung and elements of his bureaucracy. Nor can we afford to pretend that a growing Chinese nuclear arsenal will not alter the power balance in Asia.

When the day comes that Chinese rockets can hit Los Angeles and New York, for example, will even the United States be as zealous about "containing" China?

Elementary prudence dictates that the Johnson administration should now go forward with at least limited deployment of the Nike-X anti-missile defense system. Considering the lead time involved, the hour already is late.

Mr. Johnson's budget for fiscal 1968 contains money for a start on Nike-X. But the administration has held off in hopes the Soviet Union could be persuaded to join in a Big Two moratorium on expensive anti-missile systems.

The diplomatic effort has produced no visible results, and at last report, Moscow is going right ahead with installation of its own system. Even if the Russians were to agree, however, the Chinese threat would remain.

A full-scale ABM system might cost $40 billion or more. But the United States can build a "thin" system capable of warding off a crude Chinese attack for $4 or $5 billion.

The time has come to proceed from debate to action.

Curtis Harman, on Guard Duty in South Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1967

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Pfc. Curtis J. Harman, a young soldier from Maryland, was recently killed in Vietnam. I wish to commend the courage of Private Harman and to honor his memory by including the following article in the RECORD:

CURTIS HARMAN, ON GUARD DUTY IN SOUTH VIETNAM

A 21-year-old Baltimorean, Pfc. Curtis J. Harman, has been killed in Vietnam, the Defense Department reported yesterday.

Private Harmon, a graduate of Poly who lived at 319 Audrey avenue in Brooklyn was killed about 3 P.M. last Saturday by small-arms fire while guarding an outpost somewhere in Vietnam, his father, Curtis C. Harman, said last night.

ENLISTED IN ARMY

His son had enlisted in the Army in June 1966, after finishing his second year at Loyola College, Mr. Harman said.

Although he was in the ROTC, he "couldn't wait and enlisted. He volunteered for Vietnam . . . said he wanted to get in it before it was all over."

Mr. Harman said his son "read constantly, all about the military," had majored in political and military science while at Loyola and "wanted to make the military a career."

In addition to his parents, Private Harman is survived by a sister, Mrs. Joyce Filipiak, of Munich.

Editorial Praise for a Wise and Courageous Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1967

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Culver] showed great wisdom and courage last week when he voted with the minority in opposition to a piece of improvident legislation making desecration of the flag a Federal crime. Two Iowa newspapers have since written editorials praising Mr. Culver's vote and calling attention to weaknesses of the bill.

Following is the editorial from the June 23 Des Moines Register:

LOSING THEIR HEADS ABOUT THE FLAG

The flag desecration bill passed overwhelmingly (385–16) by the U.S. House would be funny if it were not slightly frightening. The bill would make desecration of the American flag an offense punishable by a $1,000 fine and a year's imprisonment.

The plane on which the half-day debate was conducted amply demonstrates the irrationality an emotional issue, emotionally considered, can engender. One of the bill's sponsors, Rep. John Quillen (Rep., Tenn.) went so far as to contrast photographs of a flag-raising on Iwo Jima and the flag-burning in New York's Central Park.

The botched job of steering the measure through debate to passage makes clear the inability of veteran legislators to function when the House temper is raised past the point of reason. The bill, aimed at preventing flag burnings, did not contain a provision on that point. An amendment defining flag burning as a specific sin was inadvertently dropped in a wrangle over the definition of desecration.

The fact that burning is prescribed—by both the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars—as the preferred method to dispose of a tattered flag, was not a consideration. Also dropped was a proposal that would have made the bill apply only to knowing desecration of the flag.

Reason dictates that the Congress should not make a statutory sacred cow of the flag. Beloved as the American banner should be and is, it is but a symbol. Flag-burning is not an acceptable pastime. Neither is legislation to suppress it a worthy matter for the Congress. As any wise college president knows, demonstrations, including those of the flag-burning ilk, will burn themselves out when they are not accorded undue attention and overzealous counter-reaction.

We are proud that Representative John Culver (Dem., Ia.) was one of the handful of 16 with enough courage and sense not to vote for this bill.

We hope the Senate will place flag-burning and the flag desecration bill in perspective and refuse to consider either.

Following is the editorial from the June 23 Cedar Rapids Gazette:

FLAG PROTECTION

Mainly as a slap at the kooks who have burned American flags in protest to the Vietnamese war, the U.S. house of representatives passed a bill this week making it a federal crime to desecrate the flag.

Rep. Culver was on the short end of a 385–16 vote and may have stuck his neck out pretty far, but common sense and constitutionality were on his side. If the senate now lets wisdom overrule angry haste, it will give this thing the burial it needs.

One flaw lies in vagueness. The bill outlaws defacing, defiling, mutilating or trampling on the flag—or any representation of it—but doesn't mention burning. To "defile" is to dirty or befoul. If this is taken also to mean sullying or dishonoring, free-speech interference clouds the picture.

Thus another flaw is shaky constitutionality. Can talking against the flag earn someone a year in prison or a thousand-dollar fine? Does the law's inclusion of flag "representations" infringe on freedoms of the artist?

But the measure's plainest defect is its superfluity. Every state already has a desecration statute of its own. Iowa's imposes maximum penalties of $100 or 30 days on anyone who may "publicly mutilate, deface, defile or defy, trample upon, cast contempt upon, satirize, deride or burlesque" the flag.

"We have survived the test of 179 years with ever-increasing strength," says Attorney General Clark. ". . . Until this time a general federal law has not been found necessary."

Such a law is still unnecessary. The dangers in it overweigh the paltry gains. As a symbol of freedom, the flag remains bigger, stronger and more durable—without the crutch of federal support—than all the petty fools who never can truly besmirch it, however they try.

Resolution in Memory of Congressman Younger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1967

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, our beloved colleague, the late J. Arthur Younger, was appreciated by his constituents and undoubtedly many expressions of that appreciation will be made in the future.

One of the first resolutions to be passed was submitted by Mr. John Hix, president of the California Young Republicans, at the National Young Republican Convention, immediately after Congressman Younger's passing.

I am pleased to insert the text of that resolution in the Congressional Record as one expression of the profound respect in which Congressman Younger was held:

Whereas, Congressman J. Arthur Younger has served as a Member of Congress from the 11th District of California for eight terms, and during this time has become a highly-respected, admired, and popular member among his collegues in Washington, and

Whereas, Congressman Younger has faithfully served his constituents of San Mateo County, California, and

Whereas, Congressman Younger has consistently shown a concern for the interests of all citizens of the United States in limited Federal government in domestic policies and necessary protection of America's interests abroad in resisting Communist aggression, and

Whereas, Congressman Younger had many close friends in the Young Republicans, some of whom are delegates to this Convention,

Now, therefore, be it resolved, that this Convention extends its condolences to the family of Congressman Younger and to his many friends in San Mateo County and in the Young Republicans on this sad occasion.

Stories of the Victims

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT TAFT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 1967

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, the Cincinnati Post & Times-Star, Monday, June 26, 1967, contained an interesting editorial on the problems of crime and law enforcement. It touches on the question of the lack of public information about the victims of crime and the need for balancing the rights of the accused and the rights of society. I commend the editorial to all of my colleagues. The editorial follows:

STORIES OF THE VICTIMS

In nearly all of the court decisions which have made so much news in recent years, the chief "credibility gap" has developed from how little has been said about the victims of crime.

The victims of crime largely have been forgotten.

In an attempt to regain some balance in this frightful picture, Richard Starnes has written a striking series of articles for The Cincinnati Post and Times-Star and other Scripps-Howard newspapers. Mr. Starnes reports on only four cases, but they are as typical as they are sickening.

There are thousands of other stories just as representative of the tragedies which come out of the rising and alarming crime wave.

Mr. Starnes tells of a stickup hoodlum who brutally shot and maimed for life the manager of a gasoline station, of a pretty girl who was repeatedly raped by sadists, of the battle of a family of shopkeepers to fend off robberies and assaults, of a policeman maimed by outlaws.

In addition, you can think of the 4-year-old tot dead of 28 stab wounds from a sex maniac who had been released on other similar charges. You can think of Andrew Mallory, a confessed rapist, let off by the Supreme Court on the ground he had been overly detained by the police. Of a 17-year-old girl raped at knife point by a man later released because the police, in arresting him; lacked a formal search warrant. Or of many others.

We would not strike one word from the Bill of Rights. But it has to be recognized that some of the courts have been stretching its provisions to protect warped minds which are a constant menace to society. Some of our criminals are sick, some simply uninhibited lawbreakers. Some may need medical treatment, for some the only hope is complete isolation from society.

But what has been too much overlooked is that little girls and older women and shopkeepers and gas station attendants and policemen trying to do their duty also have constitutional rights. In the stories related by Mr. Starnes you can read about a few of such people who have been savagely deprived of their rights.

U.N. Troops in Mideast: Forces Without Teeth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1967

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, Rev. John B. Sheerin is a thoughtful writer who discusses the Middle East conflict in a very penetrating fashion in the following article which appeared in the June 23 edition of the New World, the Archdiocese of Chicago Catholic newspaper. I insert his commentary at this point in the RECORD:

SUM AND SUBSTANCE—U.N. TROOPS IN MIDEAST: FORCES WITHOUT TEETH

(By John B. Sheerin, C.S.P.)

The Middle East conflict, at this moment of writing, is quite unclear. The U.N. Security Council has been unable to pinpoint blame for the shooting war. The uncertainty as to who fired the first shot is, however, not the only unanswered question.

One haunting query is: Why did U Thant pull his U.N. force out of the Gaza Strip? President Johnson has adverted to this "hurried withdrawal" and British Prime Minister Harold Wilson has said "We played our full part to . . . urge that this peace-keeping force should not be dismantled. But the decision was taken and new dangers inexorably followed."

It is noteworthy that Prime Minister Wilson spoke of UNEF as a "peace-keeping force." It seems probable that U Thant did not conceive the role of the UN force to be that of "peace-keeping." Judging by the chain of events just before the withdrawal of the force, it appears that he did not have a clear idea of precisely what its purpose was.

Apparently the Arabs considered the U.N. force as an army of occupation. The Russians had been calling it a "military intervention" and the Arabs undoubtedly believed it was. U Thant wanted to disprove this notion and he felt that the quickest way to do so was to affirm that the force was on Egypian soil at the sufferance of Egypt, and that it could be removed as soon as Egypt so desired.

If that were true, UNEF could not be considered a "peacekeeping" unit at all. It would have been nothing more than a group of invited foreign guests.

Some have said that U Thant submitted to Nasser's demand because he realized it would be futile to ask UNEF to stand up to the Egyptian threat.

Again, some say that he knew that India and Yugoslavia would not for a minute allow their troops in the U.N. force to remain on Egyptian territory against the will of Nasser.

The puzzling fact, however, is that U Thant must have known that Nasser would make his demand and yet he made no personal plea to him to change his mind. Instead he made it crystal clear to Nasser that he was ready and willing to pull out the U.N. troops at a nod from the Egyptian dictator.

I do not mean that U Thant was deliberately betraying the cause of peace by conspiring to hand the Gaza Strip to Egypt and give Nasser a green light for an invasion of Israel. In his message announcing he would take UNEF out, he told Nasser his misgivings: "I believe that this force has been an important factor in maintaining relative quiet in the area of its deployment."

The source of the trouble, as I see it, is that U Thant was not at all sure that UNEF was designed to be a "peace-keeper." The original mandate for the force did not empower it to "enforce the peace."

It was designed with the noblest aspirations for peace but a mandate of this kind has to have teeth in it—if it is to be effective. Without a mandate to "enforce" peace UNEF was hardly more than a symbolic presence.

The whole episode may have the salutary result of clarifying the role of any future UNEF force. It should have power to enforce and preserve the peace—even if the country on whose soil it is stationed should decide to demand its removal.

A symbolic presence is no presence. The Middle East conflict should teach us that the decisions of the U.N. need to be enforced if we are ever to have world peace, and this means that the policemen must have the right as well as the fire-power to suppress disturbers of the peace.

East-West Trade—The Dangerous Illusion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1967

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I submit for inclusion in the RECORD the article entitled "East-West Trade—The Dangerous Illusion," by John E. Davis, the national commander of the American Legion.

Writing in the American Legion magazine for July 1967, Mr. Davis sets forth the objections, both short range and long range, which the American Legion has to the concept of broader trade relations between the United States and the Communist bloc nations. I commend his comments to the attention of the Congress.

The article follows:

EAST-WEST TRADE—THE DANGEROUS ILLUSION

(By John E. Davis)

A proposed "East-West Trade Relations Act" is receiving serious consideration in the Congress, and is backed by the Administration. It would encourage and simplify much broader trade relations between the United States and the Communist-bloc nations. The American Legion is officially opposed to this concept, and we have both short-range and long-range objections.

In our short-range objections, our National Executive Committee this May called on Congress to prohibit further trade between the United States and any Soviet-bloc country "which is providing North Vietnam with assistance of any form that can increase the war-making potential of the enemy. . . ." We need explain nothing further to justify that objection. Any such trade amounts to trading with the enemy in time of war. In the short run, we can only express amazement that East-West trade should be advanced while hostilities backed by the entire Communist world continue in Vietnam, and have since taken on a new dimension in the Near East.

Our long-range objections are better reflected in the action of our last National Convention, which opposed trade with the Communist bloc *except* in specific cases in which concrete advantage to us could be spelled out. So long as the Cold War continues, even in the absence of armed conflict, we believe that should be the absolute limit of trade agreements with the Communist bloc. Here we recognize that trade *might* be used as a means of weakening the cohesiveness of the Soviet bloc, that our trade *might* be helpful in causing a member country of that bloc to weaken its ties with the Soviet power centers.

We have, for instance, engaged in limited trade with Communist Poland and Yugoslavia in such hopes. In the case of Poland, even Senator Fulbright has had to admit that its leaders have actually drifted toward a greater reliance on the Kremlin while enjoying favorable U.S. trade relations.

We have *possibly* made some headway in encouraging Yugoslavia's visible spirit of independence from Soviet domination with some small trade, though that isn't conclusive yet. Whether we succeed or fail in such ventures, they are at least tied to a very clear purpose, in which we are trying to use trade instead of bullets as a weapon in the Cold War.

But the proposals for a general broadening of our trade with the Communist world totally escape any practical purpose. They prevent us from using trade as a weapon, by simply extending it freely in broad terms. The very arguments in favor of broader East-West trade are dreamy and generalized. The commonest one of all is that we would be "building bridges of friendship." On the record, trade is a game of advantage, not friendship. Right up to the eve of war, Hitler and the Japanese Empire traded with those they attacked in WW2, and as we well know, they traded most earnestly in whatever would best strengthen them for the coming conflict.

Last December, Assistant Secretary of State Katzenbach argued that proposed East-West trade would be in consumer goods, therefore it could not be expected to bring any advantage to the Soviet military thrust. He went on to cite an Italian Fiat agreement to build a compact car plant in the Soviet Union as an example of the kind of profitable trade we are losing in the absence of an East-West trade agreement.

I find such argument to be frightening. When our own President is embarrassed by burdens that military operations in Vietnam impose on his domestic program, how can our government argue that the same principal does not apply in the Soviet Union? *Anything* that *we* do to provide consumer satisfaction in the Soviet Union frees Soviet energies and resources for their aggressive external policies. The point is so obvious that I am not really arguing it, but simply pointing out the bankruptcy of the rationales in favor of broad East-West trade. Even in the case of the Fiat plant, *we* now have been approached to lend Fiat the money for machine tools through the Import-Export Bank. Obviously, the Soviets will not release sufficient capital from their offensive programs even to acquire such an asset. They will be happy instead to see us help capitalize this plant in Russia for the benefit of Russia and Italy, while they save what capital they can to foot war in Vietnam, the Middle East, Latin America, etc.

The present move toward East-West trade traces to a report in favor of it by the Committee for Economic Development issued in May 1965. A minority report in the same study, drafted by committee member Robert E. Kleberg, should have received more attention. Wrote Kleberg, in part: ". . . it would be unrealistic to hope that mutually useful trade could be developed with the Communist countries under present circumstances. We would receive little benefit from such trade and would expose the Western world to some or all of the following hazards:

"(1) An increase in Communist propaganda and subversion in Latin America under the guise of trade.

"(2) An opening of the trade barriers

which we have attempted to impose around Cuba.

"(3) A further detriment to our balance of payments position as a result of the credits which we would have to extend to Communist countries.

"(4) An increase in the flow of our technical information and know-how to the Communist world.

"In short, Communist governments look upon trade as a political weapon and use it as such. So long as this is true, we should attempt to deny it to them."

These are hard, demonstrated facts, none of which are met by saying "Bridges of Friendship."

The Model State Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 13, 1967

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD I include therein an excerpt on the subject of pollution from the monthly magazine, Industry, published by the Associated Industries of Massachusetts, by my valued friend, the able and distinguished State senator from my district, Hon. Joseph D. Ward, of Fitchburg.

Senator Ward, chairman of the special commission on the problems of water pollution in the Commonwealth and the laws thereof relating to water pollution, and author of the Massachusetts Clean Waters Act of 1966, has labored over a considerable period of time on pollution problems in Massachusetts. Under his leadership, the special water pollution commission has come up with a splendid, far-reaching, most significant report touching very comprehensively upon the very serious problem of pollution in our State. This study is one of the finest contributions to the subject matter of pollution.

Senator Ward's informative article is not only ably done but very interesting and enlightening. It is extremely relevant on the nature, extent, and severity of the problems of pollution and points out the need for massive public attention on a cooperative basis at every level of government to insure that the most vigorous attacks will be made on this very challenging problem, the solution of which is so necessary to the well-being of our Nation.

The article follows:

THE MODEL STATE PROGRAM

(By Sen. Joseph D. Ward, of Fitchburg, Chairman, Special Commission Studying Water Pollution and Water Supply in Massachusetts)

The year 1966 can be marked as one establishing the fusion of an effective Federal-state partnership in Massachusetts in attacking one of the most serious and intractable problems of our time—water pollution.

The President had already signed into law the Federal Water Quality Act of 1965. This law, in effect, prescribed an Eleventh Commandment in the United States. "Thou shalt not pollute." In essence it provided that beginning on July 1, 1967, no one might pollute the major streams of this country below established water quality standards. The states, however, were given the responsibility of establishing these standards for the rivers within their respective jurisdictions.

In 1966 the Congress passed the Clean Rivers Restoration Act that provided a substantial part of the money to aid the states in carrying out its mandate. This law offered the states various economic incentives for water quality control depending upon the nature of the control action taken to implement Federal policy.

Late in 1966 the Massachusetts Legislature moved decisively to effectuate the 1965 Federal directive and to take optimum advantage of the 1966 Federal aid program. During the last hours of the legislative year, the General Court passed, and the Governor signed, one of the signal accomplishments of the session—a comprehensive state water pollution control program.

The new law, popularly known as "The Massachusetts Clean Waters Act of 1966," has been acclaimed as one that incorporates the most advanced thinking on water pollution control measures in the nation. It could well be used as a prototype for other state programs because it has the range of features considered as vital by experts in the matter of water pollution control. Those at the state level who worked long and hard at the problem were gratified to learn that Secretary of the Interior Udall on his inspection trip to Massachusetts characterized it as a "model State program."

The chronology of action in 1966 leading up to its passage follows:

On March 23 the Senate established a special committee to study and investigate water pollution in the Commonwealth and make its recommendations to the Legislature. Senate President Maurice A. Donahue named me chairman of the group including Senators Harrington of Lowell, Nuciforo of Pittsfield, Rurak of Haverhill, Hammond of Westfield, and DeNormandie of Lincoln. Our committee surveyed the waters in Massachusetts, examined a variety of public and private treatment facilities, discussed the problem with municipal and industrial officials, traveled to Washington and conferred with a variety of high Federal officials, and held a day-long public hearing on pollution at the State House. The committee actively sought data, views and recommendations during its study from knowledgeable private groups such as university officials. League of Women Voters and the Associated Industries of Massachuetts. It met with the AIM's Water Resources Committee in coordinating its study with industry. It also consulted with the Department of Public Health, the Department of Natural Resources and the Water Resources Commission on matters relating to anti-pollution legislation and enforcement, as well as other agencies and officials.

On April 5 the Senate President called for a $100 million bond issue to aid the cities and towns in the construction of additional needed treatment facilities.

On April 14 Governor Volpe submitted a program asking for a $100 million bond issue to aid the local communities in constructing treatment facilities under the supervision of the Department of Public Health.

On April 21 the House of Representatives established its own special committee to make an investigation and study of water pollution, headed by Representative Raymond F. Rourke of Lowell. Other members were Representatives Lombard of Fitchburg, Smith of Lawrence, LaFontaine of Gardner, Zoll of Salem, and Dolan of Ipswich. So that there would be no duplication of work between the Senate and House committees, the House unit agreed to direct its study to the laws of other states.

On August 16, following months of study and investigation, the committees announced their findings and unanimous recommendations at a joint press conference. The recommendations made by the two groups were enacted into law without substantial change and became the new state program when Governor Volpe affixed his signature on September 6. Both committees judged it was necessary to enact a program that complemented as much as possible the Federal program to make maximum use of available Federal aid. Accordingly, their recommendations comprehended three basic elements: adequate treatment plants; efficient administration and enforcement; and accelerated research. The program that Massachusetts enacted embodies all three essential facets.

Chapter 687 of the Acts of 1966 provides for a ten-year 150-million-dollar bond issue to complement available Federal construction aid to assist the local communities construct the required treatment works. As of the moment, because of this feature of the state program, local communities can now qualify for up to 80% of the full cost of the construction project in state and Federal funds. This part of the program is, without question, the most important. It offers the only practical long-term solution to the problem of municipal and industrial pollution in Massachusetts. Up to $15 million of this money may also be used to augment available Federal funds for vital research and development purposes. This research and development feature of the state plan is a clear recognition of the importance of developing the technology of control to find new and improved waste treatment and water purification methods. In this area lies the greatest hope of ultimately reducing the costs of pollution control.

Chapter 685 sets up a new state agency, the Division of Water Pollution Control, in the Department of Natural Resources to administer and enforce all the requirements on water quality control. Before this law was enacted, the responsibility for water quality control was vested in the Department of Public Health, Division of Environmental Sanitation. The Legislature felt, however, that water quality control merited intensive attention in a separate agency in conjunction with the variety of other water programs administered by the Department of Natural Resources. The rationale for the transfer of this authority was the same as for the comparable shift at the Federal level when President Johnson transferred responsibility for water quality control from the Department of Health, Education and Welfare to the Department of the Interior. One often overlooked, but important, aspect of this law allows the Water Resources Commission from the proceeds of the bond issue to construct off-site reservoirs to provide both sources of pure water supply and low flow augmentations in time of drought and in such other times as rivers and streams may require additional water flow to carry off treated effluents.

Chapter 700 provides for a workable exemption from the local property tax for any real or tangible personal property used for waste treatment purposes by industry. The exemption would be total if the property is used entirely for control purposes. If it is only partially used for control purposes, the exemption would be prorated.

Chapter 701 allows an accelerated depreciation allowance for state corporate tax purposes for the capital investment made by a corporation in an approved waste treatment facility. The corporation may write off the capital investment made for treatment facilities against the net income of the corporation allocable to Massachusetts in the year that the investment was made rather than over the life of the facility.

The Legislature was firmly convinced of the intrinsic merit and appropriateness of tax incentives to industry for water quality control purposes. This becomes clear when it is considered that expenditures of large sums of money in nonproductive assets such as water treatment facilities would work severe hardships on most industries. Also, such incentives were considered essential to the overall success of any pollution prevention by state and local officials, conservationists, industrialists and other citizen groups. Together with the full utilization of the public treatment works wherever possible, these tax incentives will do much toward achieving the elimination of industrial wastes.

Chapter 110 of the Resolves of 1966 sets up a special oversight commission comprised of 19 members to perform a continuing study of the water pollution problem in Massachusetts. This group, which I also chair, is comprised of Senators Harrington, Rurak, Nuciforo, and Hammond; Representatives Rourke, LaFontaine, Bernashe of Chicopee, Downey of Brockton, Burke of Worcester, Coffey of West Springfield, and Rosenfeld of Milford; Commissioner of Natural Resources Robert L. Yasi, ex officio; Professor Bernard Berger of Amherst; Stephen Ells of Concord; Harold Toole of Framingham; Thomas Flint of Concord; Mrs. Bernard Flood of Lenox; Allen Morgan of Wayland.

This committee has the unique function of overseeing the implementation of the new program and performing a continuing surveillance of the pollution problem in Massachusetts. It is presently actively discharging this responsibility. It will recommend further as needed.

The Legislature also memorialized or formally requested the Congress to increase Federal aid to the states and municipalities for water quality control purposes. This was done in recognition that massive amounts of money would be necessary to clean up the nation's waters—amounts much beyond the economic capabilities of the states and municipalities to provide.

Because of the action taken in Massachusetts last year, we have the machinery to face the enormous task ahead—eventual clean water. Enactment of our program was a constructive beginning. By it, we refused to be stymied by the wastes of our civilization and became masters of our environment. It was a positive beginning. Together, we must all make it an unremitting continuing commitment.

The Crime Rise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 1967

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the Bristol, Tenn.-Va., Herald Courier on the staggering rise in our crime rate contains some statistics which I believe will be of interest to all my colleagues and the readers of the RECORD.

I ask unanimous consent to insert this article at this point in the RECORD.

WHY THE CRIME RISE?

FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover finds it difficult to explain the sharp rise in crime the first quarter of this year for which statistics are now available. He could only say that the increases had been found in all parts of the country and in cities and towns of all sizes.

In reporting that the number of major crimes during the first quarter was 20 per cent higher than in the first quarter last year, the federal investigator said it was the biggest quarterly rise in the decade since these statistics began to be kept. Robbery rose by 32 per cent, murder by 23 per cent and auto theft by 20 per cent.

One thing the statistics show is that crime is more or less seasonal. Most violations against property occur in the fall. Most murders are committed in November and December. Most rapes and assaults occur in summer. This is the time of year to beware of them.

The crime rate rose 22 per cent in suburban communities, 20 per cent in cities and 16 per cent in rural areas. The most that can be deducted from them is that it is still somewhat safer to live in the country than in the city or suburbs. That is little comfort to most of us.

Radio Alert for Truckers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1967

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I call to the attention of the House an article published in May 6 issue of Business Week magazine on a radio alert employed by truck owners in the State of New York to recover valuable cargoes being stolen by hijackers—and this is such a depiction of how a vital American industry is utilizing modern facilities, with such heavy meaning to the American consuming public.

In the Greater New York area highly professional hijackers as of late last year had moved in and were lifting truck cargoes at the rate of two to three a day—and these were the most valuable cargoes being shipped in trucks in a metropolitan area where some 80 percent of all trucking in the Nation is concentrated. Stealing these loaded rigs, the thieves were driving the trucks immediately to "fences," disposing of the cargoes within an hour, then abandoning the rigs. Truckers were confronted, therefore, with this difficult problem: if they wanted their cargoes recovered in the vast metropolitan area, they had to do so within an average time of 60 minutes.

They now are recovering these cargoes—and hijacking in the New York metropolitan area—as reported by the Empire State Highway Transportation Association, which inspired and organized this "radio alert" system—has dropped to the point where "if two to three rigs are lifted a week it is unusual." Bringing New York metropolitan police, the FBI, and the port of New York Authority, guarding tunnels and bridges, into cooperation, the Empire State Highway Transportation Association and the truck owners have set up an "alert" built around the two-way radio systems operated by the trucking companies. Through this organization, an alarm, when any truck is stolen, is spread by telephone in a "chain letter" fashion through the trucking companies operating two-way radio-equipped trucks, each company notified in turn notifying three others, and so on. In the New York area, truckers are now able to have as many as 4,000 truckdrivers notified of the exact description and on the lookout for stolen rigs within a matter of 20 minutes.

Stolen rigs are accordingly being sighted, word flashed over the two-way radios installed in the trucks, and police brought in to capture the thieves. Valuable cargoes—and the value runs as high as $50,000 to $150,000—are being recovered before they even can get to the "fences." The Empire State Highway Transportation Association now has informed trucking associations in every other State of the country of this "radio alert"—and we may shortly see its spread across the United States—an example of an industry successfully combating a major crime problem, with very great value to the American public whose goods—going to wholesalers and to retail stores—are moving by thousands and thousands of trucks. Already this "radio alert" system has been adopted in New Jersey and the big Philadelphia-Camden area.

The American trucking industry is heavily equipped with the modern facilities of two-way radio. Their radio alert against hijackers, using these communication facilities, is saving insurance costs, saving shipping costs, saving costs to manufacturers, saving—ultimately—the American consumer money, with a direct bearing on the cost of living for every housewife and businessman in the United States.

In the public interest, I call this alertness of today's truckers to public attention, and I include this article in Business Week, summarizing this situation, as a part of my remarks:

SPREADING A NET FOR HIJACKERS—A RADIO-CONTROLLED SYSTEM TYING TRUCKERS TOGETHER IS HELPING CUT THEFTS OF TRUCKS, CARGOES

Forced at gunpoint from his cab at a lonely stoplight, a truckdriver is blindfolded and driven around the city while his semitrailer is stripped of its $100,000 load of liquor. Dropped off later on a dark road, he's told: "Keep walking for 15 minutes and you won't get hurt." By then, the liquor is headed for parts unknown. So is the truck.

Hijacking in the roaring twenties? No. Hijacking in the affluent sixties. Today it's a multi-million dollar racket. Last year, New York alone had 1,300 truck thefts and hijackings with losses totaling $5-million. Only $1½ million was recovered.

ACTION

Now, however, something is being done to foil the thieves. Chicago truckers, who lost $4-million to hijackers in 1963, have seen that figure drop by 60% since then. The credit goes to Operation Alert, an industry radio-warning system. It was first organized in 1964 in the Chicago area by the Central Motor Freight Assn., and shows promise of spreading along the Eastern Seaboard—perhaps nationwide.

Reason for the spread, say the truckers: Operation Alert makes things so hot for hijackers that they are persuaded to move elsewhere, forcing other areas to adopt the system. This is apparently what happened after Chicago's success. In the two years after Operation Alert started in that city, hijackings from Maine to New Jersey soared.

"The whole region was hit at once" says Henry Savin, of Savin Express Co., New London, Conn. "There was a fantastic increase."

As a result, New York latched onto the system last December, and incidents dropped from three a day to three a week. New Jersey followed suit about a month ago, and Robert Lytel, managing director of the New Jersey Motor Truck Assn., says the operation is "going great. We had four alerts in the first 10 days and we recovered two of the trucks." Now New England and Philadelphia truckers are ready to deal themselves in.

CALLING ALL TRUCKS

The aim of Operation Alert is to put truck drivers on the lookout for hijacked or stolen vehicles. A fringe benefit is the rapport being established in an industry noted for its fiercely competitive atmosphere.

A victimized driver calls the Federal Bureau of Investigation, local police, and a member trucking company (there are 104 in Chicago). The company calls two or three other companies, which each call two or three others, and so forth until all members are notified.

The companies—most of which have radio-equipped vehicles—alert their drivers and salesmen. (Some keep in touch by phone.) Within 15 minutes of the original alarm, nearly 5,000 truckers in the Chicago area and about 6,000 around New York are on the lookout for the vehicle and its cargo, and ready to alert police. Frank Mack, controller at the Empire State Highway Transportation Assn., predicts that eventually the Easter Seaboard will be united in a system that will include 15,000 to 20,000 radio-equipped trucks.

TWO SPEEDS

With swift notification, the police can pounce quickly. "Once we start making arrests, we completely destroy the organization," says a top officer of New York's Safe, Loft & Truck squad. A convicted hijacker-kidnapper can get life in prison, while vehicle theft sentences run from five to 10 years.

The trouble has been that the notification and pouncing have not always been swift. Take New York, for example. As the hijacking waned in Chicago and mounted in the East, everybody talked about it but nobody did anything.

The carriers and police knew what the thieves were after: easily disposable goods such as liquor, toiletries, cigarettes, and household appliances. They also knew how the thieves operated, and that most of the jobs were prompted by leaks from company employees. "Some of the thefts are because of careless talk by the drivers and can be cleared up with stricter internal security," one detective says. But everyone tried to fight the fight alone.

The truckers complained that the police were uncooperative. "They told our drivers to come into the station and fill out a report. Sometimes it took eight hours before word was out about the hijacking," says one trucking official. But the blame lay in both camps. Says Savin: "There was . . . no real coordination of reporting thefts."

IN GEAR

So New York—with 100,000 trucks on its streets—decided to follow Chicago's example, and quickly. Operation Alert, originally planned for debut in 1967, went into action a year earlier, under the auspices of the New York Assn. The FBI and New York police cooperated.

City police now send a squad car to pick up every stricken driver immediately after he calls. Crime reports are expedited and information about the crime is on the road before the thieves can unload the contraband to their fences, or middlemen.

Not all is sweetness and light. For one thing, truckers and police disagree about who is behind the hijacking. The industry says it is the Mafia, and this is why operations could so easily be shifted from Chicago to New York. Police have stated publicly that this is not the case. But the top security officer for one national trucker, himself a former New York detective, says: "There are no ifs, ands, or buts about it. This is Mafia controlled."

THE BLOTTER

But arrests are being made. Hijackings and thefts are being both solved and discouraged. For example:

Edward Griffin, security chief for U.S. Freight, Inc., cites the case of a $120,000 cargo stolen from a New York trucking yard recently. The disappearance was noted at 3 a.m. and the load located at 6:45 a.m. by an Operation Alert truck driver. He passed the stolen vehicle and notified a nearby policeman, who made the arrest.

Lytel, of the New Jersey association, recalls that one company salesman spotted a stolen truck and followed it (which violates a precept of the system). The thief recognized the salesman's car, leaped from the truck, and ran away. The vehicle was recovered with the goods intact.

Joseph R. Schuhmann, regional manager of Wilson Freight Co., of Elizabeth, N.J., speaks of the time recently when two New York area truckers, alerted to a stolen vehicle, spotted it and hemmed it in from the front and back with their own trucks. The driver escaped, but the stolen truck and its cargo were recovered.

Moreover, New York truckers are moving to strengthen their system. In Chicago, Central Motor Freight set up a terminal security and personnel screening division with 25,000 names to file to provide companies with a quick check on job applicants.

New Yorkers are doing much the same thing. They have formed a group composed of security officers from various trucking companies. The association is working on a system for making quick clearance checks of prospective employees. Security officers are exchanging ideas and methods for combating pilfering and information leaks.

"We're not competing, our companies are," quips U.S. Freight's Griffin. And he boasts: "Our program will be better than Chicago's." His peers in the East agree. Says one boldly: "We've got the mobsters on the run."

Still, the run, all predict, won't be very far. Probably only to the nearest unprotected big city.

The Young Republicans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD J. IRWIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1967

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, I should like to place in the RECORD, with almost no comment, an editorial in today's New York Times on youth and the Young Republicans. If history does repeat itself, as many people aver, then the editorial should be carefully considered by those Republicans responsible for the nomination of their presidential candidate in 1968.

THE YOUNG REPUBLICANS

Youth, it has been said, is a condition that is almost always outgrown. As the more responsible leaders of the Republican party contemplate the recent convention of the National Federation of Young Republicans, they can only hope that this is true.

Once again, the Young Republicans have pointed the party down the road to disaster. They provided the loudest claque and most convinced band of missionaries for Mr. Goldwater's nomination in 1964. Having learned nothing from that debacle, they have now transferred their enthusiasm to Governor Reagan of California.

If Mr. Goldwater was unpersuasive in the role of a future President, Mr. Reagan is downright implausible. Inexperienced in foreign affairs and ignorant of their complexity, he is quick to offer "solutions" that are dangerously simple. Whether his demand is for mining the harbor of Haiphong or for a settlement in the Middle East "without dependency on the United Nations," Governor Reagan does not sound like a man to be entrusted with the foreign policy of the world's greatest power.

But his appeal to the young is readily understandable. In politics, the characteristic attitude of young people is not liberal or radical, conservative or reactionary. Rather, it is militant, uncompromising, emotional. In this respect the well-tailored young conservatives and reactionaries who controlled last week's convention have more in common with the readers of Ramparts and the "black power" romanticists than they realize. Only the hard lessons of maturity and experience can soften their common harshness.

Governor Reagan, who politically was only born yesterday, is naturally at home with the fanatical young Republicans despite his comparatively advanced age. But the wise men of the Republican party had best emulate their party symbol, the elephant, and never forget the lessons of 1964. Above all else, that election proved that the candidates and policies most favored by the young militants are least likely to appeal to the independent voters.

Texas Legislature Favors Tax Sharing With the 50 States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1967

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include a resolution which was approved by the recent session of the Texas Legislature. It calls for a constitutional amendment which would require 5 percent of Federal income taxes to be remitted to the several States each year. The stated objective is to prevent restrictive Federal grants from becoming entwined with a State's freedom of movement and give States and localities more freedom of choice, more opportunity to express their own initiative which reflects their particular needs and preferences—without strings attached.

The resolution follows:

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 12

Whereas, The relationship that exists between the Federal Government and the government of the states is a matter of vital concern; and

Whereas, The states play an indispensable role in our Federal system of government; and

Whereas, Unless the trend toward restrictive categoric federal grants is reversed, these grants will so entwine themselves that a state's freedom of movement will be significantly inhibited; and

Whereas, There is a need and a justification for broader unfettered grants that will give states and localities more freedom of choice, more opportunity to express their own initiative which reflects their particular needs and preferences, all within the overall direction of national purpose; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, By the Senate of the State of Texas, the House of Representatives concurring, that this Legislature respectfully petitions the Congress of the United States to call a convention for the purpose of proposing the following Article as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

"ARTICLE

"Beginning with the first full fiscal year after ratification of this amendment by the requisite number of states, there shall be remitted to all of the states of these United States, an amount determined by the Sec-

retary of the Treasury to be equal to not less than 5% of the aggregate total of individual and corporate income taxes paid to the United States during the preceding calendar year.

"Such funds shall be remitted to the states without restriction and this remission of funds shall be in addition to any other federal grant programs which may be enacted by the Congress.

"Each state shall share in such remission in proportion as the population of such state bears to the total population of all of the states, according to the last preceding Federal Census".

Five-Ton Capacity Refrigerated Truck Presented to Fishermen's Co-op in Chile

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1967

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, last month some 50 representatives of the Northern California Freedom From Hunger Committee, representing church, high and junior high schools, organized labor, United Nations association chapters, business, professional, and community groups, assembled in Alameda, Calif. The occasion was the commemoration of the departure of a 5-ton-capacity refrigerated truck aboard the MS *Brimanger*, a gift of the people of California to the 125 members of the Valdivia Fishermen's Cooperative in Valdivia, Chile.

Over $7,000 was raised in less than 2 years from an active campaign launched by the Santa Clara County chapter of the Northern California Freedom From Hunger Committee in the spring of 1966. The purpose was to share our technical facilities with fishermen of Chile who have never been able to utilize their labor and skills to reach the large consumer markets or metropolitan Chile.

Among those distinguished guests at the ceremonies was the Honorable Hector Burr, consul for the Republic of Chile, who accepted the 5-ton-capacity refrigerated truck. I would like to include the remarks of Mrs. Grace McDonald, executive secretary of the Northern California Freedom From Hunger Committee, at the ceremony:

NORTHERN CALIFORNIA FREEDOM FROM HUNGER COMMITTEE PRESENTS TRUCK

(Statement of Mrs. Grace McDonald, executive secretary, Northern California Freedom from Hunger Committee, Monday, May 15, 1967, at presentation and loading ceremonies at berth No. 4, Encinal Terminals, Alameda, E. Bay, Calif., MS *Brimanger* (Westfal/Larsen) Gen'l SS Corp., at release of refrigerated truck, purchased by the California Freedom from Hunger Committees, to be donated to the Valdivia Fishermen's Cooperative, Valdivia, Chile)

Honorable Hector Burr, Consul, Republic of Chile, officers of the Freedom from Hunger Committees, the People to People Program, farm, labor, church donors, business contributors, our High School and Junior High School Supervisors and Student Body representatives, all the more than 100 organizations such as the United Nations Association Chapters North and South, Mayors and City Councilmen, and just plain dedicated people who have made possible this symbol of understanding and the sharing of our technical opportunities with our fellow citizens, the 125 members of the Fishermen's Cooperative of Valdivia.

This is a long introduction to a simple act of faith in human beings which has brought to fruition the dream of the Valdivia Fishermen's Cooperative received by us three years ago. The subsequent campaign launched by the Santa Clara County Chapter of the Northern California Freedom from Hunger Committee in the spring of 1966, was carried through from responses from all over California and from supporters in New York City, and from Harold A. Vogel, North American Representative of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations in Washington, D.C.

To raise over $7,000 in less than two years for a little-understood experiment in sharing our technical facilities with fishermen who have never been able to utilize their labor and skills to reach the large consumer markets of metropolitan Chile, was no easy task. Three times the sailing date to get this modern, 4 to 5 ton capacity refrigerated truck on the high seas had to be postponed until we had every penny of the coset paid so we could transfer ownership to the Valdivia Fishermen.

As people began to realize that "Fish From the Sea" was an immediate assurance of high-protein food for those previously unable to afford what in too many areas is still a luxury, support came in each day's mail.

Probably the most gratifying result of our hard-hitting educational campaign has been the response of our high school and junior high school youth. They are sharing, Not Giving. The Chilean fishermen themselves have assumed the cost of transporting the truck by commercial ship and relieved us of a considerable additional cost, which we might not yet have been able to raise.

This is the fourth project undertaken by the California Freedom from Hunger Committee in carrying out, step by step, a blue print drawn up in Rome by the Food and Agriculture Committee of the United Nations, accepted by us in consultation with the FAO in Washington, D.C. and in Chile, and allocated to us by the American Freedom from Hunger Foundation.

Our first project to provide compressor and reserve tank and "Frogmen's suits" for the striving shell fishermen of Southern Coastal Chile was followed by a duplicate supply so that each of these fishermen's organization in Ancud could improve their incomes. They themselves matched our donations.

There followed the storms and floods of August 1965 and the request from the Chilean Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries for seeds to replace root stock for some 55,000 Chilean family farmers.

Finally, we were able to answer the plea of the Valdivia fishermen for a truck.

What next?

Probably the consolidation of our own new friends in Northern and Southern California into a continuing, functioning body, county by county, with a fixed purpose. Hunger will not go away. We must meet its dire threat world-wide as our own scientific and industrial strides blaze new trails which we are privileged to share with our fellow men. As we recognize our responsibilities and our strength through the various agencies of the United Nations, as our agents, we will gain new satisfactions and enthusiasm. Sharing our tools means sharing a higher standard of living for all the people of the world. We will benefit materially as well as idealogically.

In closing I want to thank Jim Wilson for "carrying the ball" with the last-minute arrangements which he assumed through his position as Director of the "People to People" movement of San Francisco.

But especially, I want to read to you the message which will be sent with our personal greetings to the 125 fishermen in the Valdivia Cooperative:

From the Chilean Embassy in Washington, D.C., our esteemed friend the Honorable Radomiric Tomic has sent this message in Spanish, which we have translated for you in English: Referring to the refrigerated truck, Senor Tomic says:

"In this way, your fishermen will be given a step forward in their efforts to increase the value of the fruits of their labor.

"This truck then, represents a double symbol. On the one hand, it will enable the fishermen of the Valdivia Cooperative to get better prices for their honest and hard efforts. On the other hand, it repersents a gesture of human solidarity between men and women of two nations; a gesture of solidarity not provided by selfish interests.

"As Ambassador of Chile, to the United States, I am happy to express my appreciation for your initiative in this project and hope for the greatest stimulation of your efforts to continue this program with my countrymen who are members of the Cooperativa de Pescadore Valdivia . . ."

Friends of the United Nations and co-workers in its many fields of endevor, of which the Food and Agriculture Organization is a most challenging sector!

The nation we are privileged to work with in this joint venture is a great nation. Its Ambassador is a man of deep understanding, as expressed not only in the short message I have read to you, but in his eloquent address on the ocassion of the 20th anniversary of the United Nations commemoration ceremonies in San Francisco in June 1965.

Here is his conclusion:

"Where shall we find the symbol most representative of the prodigious times in which we have the privilege of living? Perhaps in the atomic lightning which has placed in the mortal hands of man the mysterious power of original matter?

"Or in the rockets that cross the unfathomable space and allow God to see for the first time shining in the sky, stars that were not made by His hands? Or in the final conquest of nature, until yesterday the enemy of man and tomorrow his slave?

"The signs are many that announce the new world. And nevertheless, this new world will not come into being as the exclusive work of the intelligence of man, but rather, of his heart.

"We will not have a new world, and we cannot even save the old one, if we do not make a reality in our own days, the so simple and beautiful symbol of the American poet (Carl Sandburg) who wrote:

" 'There is only one man on earth and his
name is . . . All men!
There is only one woman living in the
world and her name is . . . All women!
For one child alone does Mankind exist,
and the name of this child is . . .
The children of the whole world!!!'

"(From *The People Yes!*)"

Our Flag

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1967

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, on June 20, 1967, when H.R. 10480 to prohibit desecration of the flag, was debated in the House of Representatives, I had intended to insert in the Record a poem entitled, "Our Flag," which was written by Rev. Edward Lodge Curran, Ph. D., who was formerly pastor of St. Joseph's Roman Catholic Church in the 12th Congressional District, Brooklyn, N.Y.

I want to insert it today, for the attention of my colleagues, as follows:

Our Flag

(By Rev. Edward Lodge Curran, Ph. D.)

Dipped in the blood of fearless men.
White with the foam of the sea
That washes round our lovely shores
In rhythmic liberty.

Blue as the skies above our hills:
Each State, a shining star
That floods the world with freedom's light
And heals the tyrant's scar.

Dear flag, the earth is blessed in thee:
On hill, o'er sea long wave!
Our lives, our deaths we pledge to thee:
Sweet symbol of the brave!

Gilbertville Water Supply System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1967

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, with the help of a grant from the Farmers Home Administration, Gilbertville, Mass., in my district recently completed construction of its new ground water supply system, thereby assuring its residents an adequate water supply for many years to come.

Gilbertville is one of the first Massachusetts communities to benefit from this kind of Federal grant made available under a special program of the Farmers Home Administration to provide grant and loan assistance to rural areas for the development of water systems and waste disposal plants.

I want to commend and congratulate the Government officials and civic leaders of this outstanding community for their perseverance and foresight in bringing this badly needed project to a successful completion.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Congressional Record the remarks in part which I made at the dedication of the Gilbertville water supply system on April 16.

Remarks of Congressman Philip J. Philbin at the Dedication of the Gilbertville Water System, April 16, 1967

Mr. Chairman, Senator Quinn, Representative Cole, Chairman Plouffe, and the Board of Water Commissioners, Director Ward, Mr. Sewall, Mr. Howe, Mr. Gleason, Mr. Dana, Mr. Riding, Distinguished Board of Selectmen of Hardwick and New Braintree, Commissioner Nowak, Commissioner Kolsa, and all distinguished guests and friends.

It is a special honor, privilege and pleasure for me to be with you at this very happy, meaningful dedication of your new, water supply system for the Gilbertville district.

First, I want to express my heartiest congratulations to the various individuals and groups, to the Water District, and to the Community itself, for the fulfillment of this urgently needed exceptionally useful project.

There are many people, whom we can thank, for the realization of this great day, and for the wholehearted co-operation they extended to make it possible.

Your able, distinguished Commissioners, Chairman Plouffe, and his associates, Mr. Nowak and Mr. Kolsa, deserve highest credit and appreciation, not only for rounding out this fine, water program and this project, but for their capable, persistent efforts that were never abated until this project was assured and completed.

I think that very special credit is also due to our great Farmers Home Administration of the Federal Government, some of whose outstanding leaders are here today, for their exceptionally persevering work, guidance, direction, and crowning achievement in providing the federal grant which has been such and important factor in working out the new water system.

As I mentioned, there are many leaders and officials, indeed, who contributed most wholeheartedly to the results secured. In fact, they are too numerous to enumerate here.

But I want them all to know of the very deep gratitude that I personally feel for their warm interest, their unbroken faith, their personal concern and efforts that have unquestionably made possible the history-making event we so proudly celebrate today. And I should compliment and also thank the faithful, loyal and devoted people of the district and the community who had the foresight, the generosity and the good sense to make necessary basic funds available from their Town Treasury.

As most of you know, this project did not come in an easy way. Back in 1963, our good friends, Paul Plouffe and the Commissioners brought to my attention their desire and intent to apply for federal assistance for the project under the accelerated, public works program.

Since these funds had been exhausted, after some struggles and wait, we turned to the Department of Agriculture under its new program for the development of water and disposal systems.

This time, I am very happy to say, we hit pay dirt, thanks to the wisdom, judgment and efficiency of the Department, and the co-operation of some of our great federal leaders who are here with us today.

Senator Kennedy and other members of Congress helped us, and we all pitched in, but the road was long, hard, and filled with obstacles, and we can all be relieved and very grateful that after some delay, after painstaking engineering evaluations of the Commission, and official departmental reviews, the Farmers Home Administration came up with the concrete answers we were seeking, and it was my truly great pleasure last June 24th to dispatch a wire from Washington to the Board here that a substantial federal grant had been approved.

From then on, I am happy to say, the course of progress was relatively smooth. With its own funds, plus the federal grants, the Gilbertville Water District was soon able to get construction under way.

Today, the town has a brand new water supply system with estimated, adequate well capacity, which should be sufficient to meet the areas water requirements for some time to come.

As we all realize, our nation has many problems pressing us for solution these days, which are in some respects very challenging, and in other respects grave and totally unprecedented.

Our greatest task is to preserve our own freedom and security, and bring peace and order to the nation and in time hopefully to establish universal peace.

No one can predict what course Communist tyranny will take, but we hope and pray that all concerned in this crisis, the principals and the puppets, will listen to our earnest pleas for peace, and will agree at an early date, to stop their aggressions against the weak and the helpless and yield to the earnest pleas and prayers and sustained efforts for peace that have been made by our own great nation and so many other great nations of the world.

Meanwhile, Americans will remain firm, resolute and loyal in our high purpose of protecting our liberties, striving for freedom and total peace in the world.

Finally, may I say that this town can be proud today for the excellent work of its Water Commissioners, the sound judgement and public spirit of its people, and of its fine new water system.

It should last you for many years to come. But if for any reason, it should not and your growth and prosperity requires further action, I think you know where to come, and let me assure you that we of the federal government will always be eager and willing to assist you in every way we can. I am very proud to be here.

Thanks and best wishes for the future.

Public Law 480 and the School of Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1967

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend to the attention of Members of Congress an address delivered by C. R. Eskildsen, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Agriculture for International Affairs, at Purdue University, Lafayette, Ind., on June 14.

Eskildsen's remarks, delivered at the third annual conference of the university directors of international agricultural problems, relate to Public Law 480 and to this country's agricultural colleges.

In his speech, Eskildsen discussed the benefits of the export program under Public Law 480 to both the farmers in this country and the recipients abroad. He also told of the contribution which can be made by agricultural colleges through their graduates in the fields of commercial farm exports and agricultural development abroad.

I am including Eskildsen's address in the Record at this point:

Public Law 480 and the School of Agriculture

(Remarks by C. R. Eskildsen, Deputy Assistant Secretary for International Affairs, at the third annual conference, university directors of international agricultural programs, Purdue University, Lafayette, Ind., June 14, 1967)

When the history of this period is finally written, Public Law 480 unquestionably will stand out as one of the most important measures ever enacted by the Congress. Most people would agree that programs carried on under this legislation have been in the best interests of the United States. Most would also agree that they have been in the best interests of all the world's people. But it would be difficult to reach a consensus on what precisely is responsible for this rather unusual public support for a long period of time.

Certainly it is a big program.

Under Public Law 480 we exported $15.7 billion worth of food and fiber between July 1, 1954, and December 31, 1966. An additional $2.2 billion worth was shipped under Mutual Security (AID) programs. Over this period, our food aid exports represented 30 percent of our total agricultural shipments. They went to some 115 countries—most of them less developed—having a combined population of some 1.7 billion.

But statistics don't begin to tell what the food aid program has meant to the people of other countries—and to us.

Overseas, our shipments have helped vastly in preventing malnutrition, hunger, and, as in the case of India right now, even famine. Our shipments have helped to further economic growth of the less developed countries—a point I'll discuss in more detail a little later. Our shipments have helped weak countries reduce the tensions that arise from food shortages and have given them strength to resist subversion and aggression.

Our shipments have demonstrated in Asia, Africa, and Latin America that, when it comes to agricultural production, the American free family farm system has it all over the regimented systems of Communist countries. All of these benefits promote the overall foreign policy of the United States.

And we have derived substantial economic dividends from P.L. 480 right here at home. P.L. 480 shipments have given farmers an additional outlet for their products—and additional income. These shipments have kept surpluses from becoming unmanageable. They have given employment to labor and profits to business in U.S. enterprises functioning in the storage, processing and transportation field. They have even given us important balance of payments help. In the calendar years 1960–1966, we saved $1.8 billion by using foreign currencies instead of our own to pay embassy and other expenses overseas, and by bartering farm products for foreign goods and services.

Nevertheless, time goes by. Situations change. In recent years it had become apparent that the U.S. food aid effort needed some reorientation. This proves, I suppose, that any program, regardless of how good it is, can be improved.

The new direction has been provided by the Food for Peace Act of 1966. This legislation amends and extends P.L. 480 for two years; that is, through December 31, 1968.

The most important change in the new legislation is its call for the food deficit countries to do more to help themselves. Self-help was stressed by President Johnson when he presented the Administration's program. As the food aid bill progressed through the Congress, both the House and the Senate added provisions to strengthen the emphasis on agricultural development within the recipient countries. The act mentions self-help 14 times.

Why is self-help being emphasized so strongly?

By insisting that our food aid be accompanied by a major self-help effort on the part of those who receive it, we restrain the tendency of some developing countries to use our food aid as a "crutch"—to depend on us for food while they divert their energies and funds to other purposes. For the people of a developing country that is short of food, *nothing* is more important than making sure that they, themselves, can meet the bulk of their basic requirements.

Back of this judgment lies the recognition, which I imagine most of us share, that a nation cannot really be independent unless it has command of its own ability to produce or acquire something as basic as food. Lack of food makes nations as well as individuals do strange things. Nor is it wise to assume that the simple ability to supply food to hungry people will necessarily command the affection and support of those who need it.

In recent months there has been widespread discussion of how much aid the United States could supply the developing countries assuming certain trends of food production and population. This discussion has given economists and demographers a better recognition of what can and cannot be done. It also has done much to dispel apathy and complacence here and abroad on the important matter of whether food aid, because it has been on time and in adequate volume up to now, will continue to be so indefinitely. Nobody should count on that.

As Secretary Freeman said just the other day, "Our USDA projections show that *if* recent trends in food production and population growth are not changed, and *if* we were to attempt to provide the developing countries of the free world with enough food aid from the United States to meet even minimum caloric standards, *our capacity to provide such food aid under present patterns and policies of agricultural production would be reached within 18 to 20 years.*"

Production, of course *could* be expanded far beyond current levels, and well beyond levels implied in putting back to crops the acres recently taken out of production. But, as with all resources, it becomes a matter of what we are willing to pay for this production. I feel sure that the people of the United States and of most of the world would be willing to pay a very high price for food to keep people from starving. But that is not the same as saying that they would be willing to pay this price indefinitely, if there are better alternatives available. For all practical purposes we come back to the conclusion that the right approach is to encourage the kind of development in the world which will permit countries to purchase what they cannot or choose not to produce. The self-help provisions of the food aid act are designed to encourage that development.

The new act lists nine criteria that are to be considered by the United States in evaluating self-help programs of aid recipient countries. These include shifting use of land from nonfood to food crops; developing chemical machinery, transportation, and other essential industries; training farmers; constructing storage facilities; improving marketing and distribution systems; encouraging private enterprise and investment; giving agriculture incentives to produce.

Food is only one factor in the world food problem; the other is population. At the present rate of increase, by the year 1985, there will be one billion more mouths to feed in the world. India's population is increasing by about 12 million a year. That's equal to adding the combined populations of Indiana and Michigan every 12 months.

The new act makes family planning a self-help requirement. It states that in exercising authorities conferred on the President he "shall take into account efforts of friendly countries to help themselves . . . including efforts to meet their problems of . . . population growth." The United States already is assisting countries with family planning programs when such assistance is requested. It pays big dividends, certainly. Five dollars invested in family planning can do as much to solve the food problem as a hundred dollars invested in other areas of economic development.

Each food aid agreement entered into must describe the self-help program the recipient country is undertaking. The agreement may be terminated if the program is not being adequately developed.

Are the act's self-help provisions unreasonable? Do they impose impossible burdens on the developing countries? Not at all.

Some of the countries whose food output has lagged should look around. They will see that several of their less developed neighbors have done a pretty good job of increasing food production. There's no "secret plan" enabling some countries to do better than others. According to a USDA report—"Changes in Agriculture in 26 Developing Nations"—"Rapid rates of increase in crop output have not happened just as a consequence of normal economic and social processes in societies organized on a laissez-faire basis. Rather, they have been undergirded by aggressive group action, generally national in scope, directed specifically to improving agricultural production conditions." This is another way of saying that some countries are endowed with old-fashioned get up and go. That's an attitude Americans understand and sympathize with.

Among the countries that did a good job of increasing crop output between 1948 and 1963—the period covered by the Department's study—were Israel, Sudan, Yugoslavia, Mexico, Costa Rica, and Taiwan. Countries doing less well included Egypt, Jordan, Tunisia, Pakistan, and Nigeria.

The United States extends a strong helping hand to the countries that want to help themselves. In this current fiscal year, the Agency for International Development is spending $504 million to finance transfer of American farming techniques; improvement of transportation, marketing, and irrigation facilities; extension services, cooperatives, credit systems; purchases of American-made farm equipment, pesticides, and fertilizer; and research on soils and seeds. For the fiscal year 1968, AID has asked Congress for $746 million to finance these activities, plus $20 million for family planning and $7 million for child feeding programs.

A good foundation has been laid for the technical assistance phases of this program. In the past 10 years, over 31,000 foreign nationals have taken special agricultural training in this country, many of them in the Land Grant universities under the guidance of USDA and largely funded by the Agency for International Development. Today over 1,000 U.S. technicians are scattered around the world, carrying on the U.S. tradition of making two blades of grass grow where only one grew before.

United States schools of agriculture have played a prominent role for many years in the technical assistance field. Purdue's Professor D. Woods Thomas, in an excellent summary of this activity, reports that 34 out of 50 agricultural colleges have accepted direct responsibility for foreign agricultural development. Among the leaders in this movement have been Purdue in Brazil, Oklahoma in Ethiopia, Cornell in the Philippines, and North Carolina in Peru. Currently, U.S. schools of agriculture are participating in 38 contractual arrangements with AID for agricultural and rural development work abroad. Numerous other activities of like nature, financed from other sources, are being carried on.

For years it has been a favorite sport of "development" types to argue about the best ways to apply our skills to the development problem. I doubt that I can add anything to this in the few minutes allotted to me. But I do think that discussion on this extremely important subject is highly useful. We still have much to learn about effective ways and means of getting the job done. We all need to work harder and more effectively toward this objective.

But progress is being made and quite often the slow progress is the best kind. Much of development is not a short-run endeavor and for that reason we can't afford to be impatient. As a matter of fact, we often reap dividends long after the initial effort has been made.

I'm reminded, in this connection, of the story of Mexican wheat. The story began in 1940 when Secretary Wallace, after a trip south of the border, suggested that the Rockefeller Foundation carry out research on Mexican wheat, corn, and beans. But not until after World War II when Japanese short straw wheat was introduced into the breeding program, did the researchers find the right genetic makeup. The new variety turned out to be very high yielding. As a result, Mexican wheat yields, which averaged less than 11 bushels per acre in 1943, have now climbed to 35 bushels an acre.

Other countries have heard about the new wheat. In 1966 India bought 18,000 tons of it. This year Turkey bought 20,000 tons, and Pakistan 50,000 tons. Mention of Pakistan reminds me that Purdue was tied into this development. The Japanese wheat was used by Dr. Ralph Caldwell for breeding work here. A Mexican graduate student at Purdue later headed the Mexican wheat improvement program, then went with the Ford Foundation to Pakistan to help them improve their wheat.

An interesting sidelight is that in 1947, when the Japanese wheat was brought to Mexico, Dr. S. C. Salmon, a USDA scientist, brought it to the United States. It was tested in several places, but it took root best in the Pacific Northwest, and was the basis for the new "Gaines" variety, which has produced as much as 216 bushels per acre. Dr. Orville Vogel, from Pullman, Washington, who helped develop the Gaines variety, went to Turkey last fall with a USDA/AID team, and interested the Turks in the new wheat.

General economic development is a major objective of Public Law 480.

Economic development is the foundation supporting commercial trade—the exports that are sold for dollars. The largest potential commercial market in the world is represented by the less developed countries. In the aggregate the less developed countries are a sleeping giant with an almost limitless capacity to consume. The unmet needs of these billions of people—needs for food, for clothing, for every product of modern industry—far exceed the needs of the developed world. But this sleeping giant will awaken, and this market will come to life, only when economic growth brings higher incomes and greater buying power.

As countries improve their per capita incomes by 10 percent, their commercial imports of all commodities increase by 11 percent, while their commercial imports of food increase by 16 percent. Among countries that have achieved a substantial measure of economic growth, we note that—in comparing 1955–59 with 1961–65—our cash exports of farm products to Israel doubled, those to Spain increased ten-fold, those to Taiwan increase by 13 times, and those to Greece by 16 times.

The United States has not been niggardly with its economic assistance funds. Total U.S. outlays for economic development in foreign countries amounted to $87.0 billion between 1946 and 1966. As contrasted with the immediate post-war years, our assistance is now channeled almost entirely toward the less developed countries. Also, an increasing proportion of our assistance today is represented by food aid.

That makes sense because food aid, like dollar aid, is directly related to commercial trade. Food imports on concessional terms help needy countries "buy the time" required to move forward with economic development programs. And in some countries, food is being used instead of cash to pay workers on labor intensive projects.

In the Food for Peace Act Congress directed the President to encourage other advanced nations to make increased contributions in the fight against world hunger and malnutrition, particularly through the expansion of international food and agricultural assistance programs. Other countries are responding, I am happy to say.

Some 68 countries have joined with the United States in the multilateral FAO–UN World Food Program. Pledges of commodities, services, and cash total up to about $210 million in aid. It's a good program and the United States fully intends to encourage its expansion.

In other ways, the new trend is in the direction of multilateral effort. U.S. aid to India, including food aid, is being handled through the India Aid Consortium, made up of several industrialized countries under chairmanship of the World Bank. Also, the international grains agreement worked out recently at the Kennedy Round of trade negotiations provides that the industrialized countries supply the needy countries some 4.5 million metric tons of grain in each of the next three years. Of this amount, industrialized importing countries will supply about 1.9 million tons, or 42 percent of the total.

The relationship between a healthy agriculture and industrial development is very close. Agriculture performs several functions in promoting economic growth. It must supply the food required by urban populations in the developing countries, otherwise precious foreign exchange must be used for food imports. It must generate raw materials for industry, earn foreign exchange, and make labor available for industrial construction and expansion. Agriculture also must provide part of the capital accumulation needed for further growth, as well as being a market for such industrial products as fertilizer, farm machinery, and a broad variety of manufactured consumers' goods. To the extent that a country's agriculture promotes general economic growth, to that extent it creates a commercial market for U.S. farm products.

Financing of development is becoming an increasingly difficult problem for both the developing and developed countries. Other industrialized nations, like the United States, appear to have just about reached an upper limit of what their people will support by way of added public investment capital for the less developed countries. Yet the gap between what the less developed countries need for a tolerable rate of growth and what they are likely to get is staggering. Various U.S. and international agencies estimate the gap at somewhere between $5 and $20 billion annually.

This gap creates a dilemma. To make either public or private investment abroad will mean some balance of payment losses no matter how much we tie procurement to the United States. Although in the long run we probably will get back our investment in the form of increased markets, for the short run we need to keep the pressure on our commercial exports if we want to be in a position to encourage and support a program of public or private investment abroad. In many ways the real heroes in giving the United States the ability to help in economic development are those who have expanded our commercial trade enough to make this possible.

Not only is money needed in this effort but also skilled manpower to guide its use. This brings me back again to Dr. Thomas's excellent summary, "World Agriculture and the U.S. School of Agriculture."

Dr. Thomas makes the point that "success by the United States in world affairs will depend in an important way on the degree to which it is able to meet its commitments to economic and social betterment abroad. This will be some function of our ability to promote agricultural development in these nations. In this, the crucial outputs are those that can be provided best and, perhaps, only by U.S. schools of agriculture. . ."

I agree wholeheartedly.

At the same time, I would also like to suggest that the agricultural colleges can make major contributions to the maintenance and expansion of commercial exports—the part we sell for dollars. Commercial trade, after all, follows close upon the heels of agricultural and general economic development. In the commercial export field as well as in the agricultural development area the questions to be answered—important questions—are legion. The challenge to the college graduate is great.

If it isn't out of place here, I'd like to make a recruiting pitch I'd like to urge every student and graduate of agricultural colleges, at least those who are specializing in agricultural economics and marketing, to look into job opportunities with USDA's foreign service. The work is interesting; the pay is good; and USDA's foreign agencies have it all over the Navy when it comes to seeing the world.

One thing is certain: U.S. agriculture has attained great power and prestige around the world. It will become an even more vital factor in world affairs as populations increase—as the wants and needs of these peoples expand with the spread of economic development. I might add that the time is not too far off—maybe it is already here—when the key determinant making for war and peace will be food as much as nuclear weapons, planes and tanks, and oil reserves. The tremendous importance of our agriculture as a foreign policy tool makes it essential that we derive from it its full potential. This means intensive and extensive study of U.S. commitments in the areas of foreign agricultural development, general economic development, and, not the least of these, commercial trade. In all these areas the U.S. school of agriculture can and should play an expanding role.

Portugal Fighting Its Battle Against World Opinion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1967

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, with the concentration of attention on the Middle East crisis it is well for us to keep a broad perspective on the world situation. A recent article written by Ray McHugh, Washington bureau chief of the Copley News Service, based on interviews held in Lisbon, Portugal, with key Portuguese Government officials is especially interesting.

In view of the cooperation we have received from Portugal and the need to continually reassess the world situation this article is of special significance. Mr. McHugh is an objective reporter and I believe his article merits thoughtful reading. Therefore, I insert it in the RECORD at this point:

LISBON, PORTUGAL.—From the red and white "palace of needs" overlooking the Tagus River little Portugal has been fighting its battle against world opinion.

Its foreign ministry has stubbornly beat back every attempt of the United Nations, the Communist bloc, the United States and other NATO allies to force Portugal out of southern Africa.

After more than 10 years of contest, Portugal is still in firm control of Angola, Mozambique and Portuguese Guinea. Each week brief newspaper notices report that four, six or eight soldiers have been killed fighting African Terrorists. Twenty one died in one two-week period in late March. But a visitor to the palace finds the foreign office mood optimistic.

"I think we've turned an important corner," says Ambassador Caldeiro Coeljo, a diplomatic veteran whose service includes several years in Portuguese Africa.

"The United States, Britain and other countries of Western Europe seem to be taking a more realistic attitude toward the African problem. Their criticism is subsiding. We've waited a long time for this change."

Coeljo insists that Portugal is not trying to involve any allies in the defense of its African holdings, but he also insists that continued Portuguese rule is essential to stability in the southern half of Africa.

"Moscow and Peking have identical aims in Africa," he said. "They want to create chaos in order to take Africa out of the Western Sphere of influence and they want to cut off the supply of Africa's raw materials to Western Europe."

Part of the Communist strategy, according to Coeljo, involves support for terrorist groups. He charged that Russia is backing operations from the Republic of Guinea that are led by a former Portuguese Negro named Amilcar Cabral. China, he said, is financing terrorist groups based in the Brazzaville Congo and in Tanzania.

Arms have been moving south from Egypt, he claims. The Portuguese also charge that the organization of Africa unity and some private American groups have been financing various rebel activities and that Tunisian elements of the United Nations force in the Leopoldville Congo have been passing arms to Angolese insurgents.

Portugal has about 80,000 of its 135,000 troops in Africa. More than half of these are in Mozambique where fighting is now most frequent.

Despite these activities, Coeljo says, the terrorists have not been able to disrupt the economic life of the Portuguese territories and have not been able to win popular support. He also said Portugal has been able to resist thus far without dipping into its financial reserve.

The "Carmona" area of Angola that borders the Congo is a coffee-growing region that provides the richest export asset in Portuguese Africa.

"Since 1961 when the terrorism began," the Ambassador says, "There has been no interruption in coffee production. In fact, it is increasing every year, although the pace would be faster if we could concentrate more wealth and energy on improvements instead of on defense."

The terrorist-plagued region of northern Mozambique that borders Tanzania, he said, is relatively undeveloped and lacks economic importance.

Zambia, which stretches between Angola and Mozambique, has begun to curb terrorists based in its territory, according to Portuguese officials.

"We have explained to the Zambians," said one official, "that if terrorists damage the railroads, we can't move Zambia's goods to the sea. And each time there is damage, we take a little longer to make repairs.

"Now, I think, Zambia is getting the message. The terrorists are hurting Zambia more than they are hurting Portugal."

Terrorist attacks, the Portuguese claim, are aimed largely at native populations, not at the troops or constabulary. (Both the army and the police force in Mozambique and Angola are completely integrated.)

Efforts are now underway to concentrate the native populations into larger villages that can be more easily defended.

"There is no desertion among the colored people," said Gen. Andretti Silva, former commander in Angola.

The Portuguese have been unable to open direct talks with their black African neighbors on common economic problems.

"They refuse to enter any discussions or even consider our offers of assistance," said Coeljo. "All they are willing to talk about is the sovereignty of Angola and Mozambique. That is not a subject for conversation. These lands have been a part of Portugal for centuries. They share common citizenship with Portugal. They are going to continue to be part of Portugal."

Under-population is a major problem in meeting the terrorist threat in both Angola and Mozambique.

Angola has only 5 million people. If it had the same density of population as Europe, it would have 140 million. Mozambique has 7 million. It could accommodate 90 million by European standards.

The pressures of change, however, are creating a cautious optimism in Lisbon. The factors include:

1. The Middle East war that may force African countries to reassess their ties with the Communists.

2. The increased American concern about instability in Africa that may curb "independence-at-any-price" advocates.

3. The collapse of Nigeria, so-called "model" for new African nations, which has underscored the problems of overcoming tribal differences.

"Angola would be another Nigeria if it were made independent," said Coeljo. "The area is populated by four tribes who have nothing in common with each other. The presence of the Portuguese is the only 'cement' that holds the region together.

"If we gave it 'independence' it would only be theoretical. Russia, China or someone else would move in quickly."

4. Slowing improving relations with Britain, Portugal's oldest ally. The British position in Rhodesia, her refusal to support Portugal's Mozambique-Angola stand in the U.N. and her silent assent to India's 1961 seizure of the Portuguese enclave of Goa all contributed to a major loss of confidence in London. Despite this, a reservoir of good will toward Britain remains and the Portuguese have welcomed new London overtures to Rhodesia.

5. Increased pressures for economic coordination between the countries in the southern half of Africa.

"All the states within southern Africa ally feel the need more and more for closer economic, technological, trade and other relations," says Foreign Minister Franco Nogueira.

He emphasized in a recent statement that such relations must be based on "respect for the internal problems of other nations and non-interference in domestic affairs."

Africa's problems, he said, "must be settled in Africa, in African terms and in accordance with African realities."

Instant independence, the Portuguese argue vehemently, is not the answer to the problems of black Africa.

In the Belgian Congo, they point out, Belgium had drafted a 50-year program to prepare the country for self rule and economic self-sufficiency.

"The United Nations tore up the plan," said Coejo, "and ordered 50 years cut to 15 days. What could anyone expect but chaos."

Nogueira has accused the U.S. of "market place diplomacy."

"We are not ashamed of the contributions the West has made to the rest of the world," he said. "We see no reason why the West should now abandon its interest in the welfare of the people and its contributions to it, especially at a time when other interests from the East are moving in. . .

"African advancement can be either according to a political or sociological program. We believe in a sociological program, and (such) a program cannot be tied down to a political timetable."

The quiet, hard-working Portuguese trace their ancestry back to the Saracen invasions of the Early Christian era. Their ships touched off the 15th and 16th century "age of the explorers."

Over the years they believe they have developed a formula for multi-racial government. They seem determined to see it through.

An Analysis of the Investment Picture in Latin America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1967

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker during the latter part of March, I joined Representative WIDNALL and Federal Home Loan Bank Board Chairman Horne in attending an Inter-American Conference on the savings and homebuilding industry in Latin America. The Conference was held in Buenos Aires, Argentina, and en route, Mr. Horne, Representative WIDNALL and I had the opportunity to review housing programs in Peru and Chile.

My previous and most recent experience with the savings and housing industry in Latin America has provided me with a reasonable perspective from which to view the question of investing in the 19 Latin Republics. My purpose today is to set forth my analysis of the present investment picture in Latin America, and suggest some of the causes contributing to the immediate circumstances.

I want to make clear that while my analysis is critical it should not be viewed as pessimistic. A great deal of meaningful progress is evident throughout Latin America. The potential for even greater progress is promising. There are, however, firmly rooted and acutely serious conditions causing impediments to the pace of progress. My remarks will center upon the impediments which are straining the vitality of investment in long-range programs within the region.

FLOW AND OUTFLOW

One of the most difficult obstacles attendant to attracting foreign capital into Latin America is the stance of the region's own capital flow. If we expect American capital resources to assist the Latin American housing program some effort must be made by local investors to reverse the flow out of the region of substantial sums of Latin American investment capital.

If Latin Americans demonstrate such little faith in the investment potential of their own nations, it is not unreasonable to expect U.S. investors to take a jaundiced view toward Latin American investment.

While specific data on the amount of private money leaving the 19 Republics is difficult to obtain, there is some agreement that $8 billion of Latin American money is invested abroad. A legitimate questioning of the conditions forcing local private money abroad must be made before encouraging American capital to fill the vacuum. Such questioning is particularly appropriate in light of the undeveloped circumstances of much of the 8 million square miles comprising the region. With an average per capita gross national product of $384, and in one instance as low as $70 per capita, the region is in need of vast investment, both in capital projects and human resources.

But the investment picture of Latin America would suggest that its most wealthy and leading citizens either do not have faith in the local investment climate, or do not care enough to improve local circumstances. I tend to believe the former is the more probable case.

The factors mitigating against more substantial local support for local investment are particularly discouraging to the development of a durable housing industry. The foundations of a savings and housing industry must be built first and foremost upon a local base. If the local base is nonexistent, or at best unsure, the chances of success are substantially reduced. In housing and savings, long-term commitments are necessary. An industry of this nature cannot, nor should it be allowed to rely on the vagaries of foreign resources for its strength.

What I am suggesting is that while foreign investment is desirable, it should not become a crutch upon which the Republics should depend for the development of vitally needed housing. Expectations of private U.S. resources for the housing finance needs of the Latin Republics should not preclude or diminish in intensity any effort to keep local money home.

The importance of developing a climate of faith in the investment portfolio of the Latin Republics economies cannot be stressed enough. This faith is not now present and its absence is a significant factor in the slow and extremely painful progress of Latin American development.

INFLATION AND INSTABILITY

A number of factors in the political and economic spheres have eroded the faith of local capital in local investment. Foremost among the problems facing most of the Republics is inflation, and the inability of the various governments to control or abate soaring prices and the deterioration of the value of local currencies. Unless, and until the Republics can solve their respective inflationary conditions, substantial amounts of local capital will go abroad, and attraction of foreign capital into the region will be tenuous

Inflation is particularly devastating to a fledgling savings and housing industry. Few areas in an economy have such great need for assurances of stability. These assurances cannot now be given, and there is little in the present to suggest that the future is any more reassuring if present policies are not reexamined with a view toward reform.

The Inter-American Council for Commerce and Production recently prepared an excellent analysis of the causes of inflation in Latin America. Because I consider the analysis important to the theme of my discussion, I am including a brief of the Council's conclusions.

The inflation evident in the important countries of Latin America, found in some of them as in Chile for 100 years, while in others only since World War II, is due to a wide variety of causes.

The first and major cause of inflation within the region is large fiscal deficits financed by currency issued by the central bank. For countries with a relatively simple economy and without capital or security markets, there is a close relationship between the increase in means of payment beyond the growth of production of goods and services—and the incorporation of new sectors into the money economy—and the rise of prices. As a result, the elasticity of production for the domestic market is low.

In several important South American countries fiscal deficits reach a quarter, a third, or even a half of the national expenditure. Governments have been forced to apply to central banks for loans, and the balance sheets of these institutions show clearly that such loans represent the most important part of their "assets."

Fiscal deficits are attributable to the following causes: First deficits of state-owned enterprises, due to inefficiency, excess personnel, or the sale of goods and services below cost—a notorious case in point is the state railroad in Argentina; second, Government investment in excess of amounts obtained from taxes and loans, even if such investments are good in themselves; third, excessive bureaucracy—too frequently jobs for political reasons are given to those in favor with the regime; fourth, deficiencies in the tax structure and its administration.

A second cause of inflation within the region is the often unwarranted and excessive expansion of bank credit at the request of businessmen who wish to finance investments, imports, or sales on credit. This credit expansion is secondary, as it requires a previous primary expansion of the money put in circulation by the central bank. Thus, the frequency and the magnitude of fiscal deficits financed by the central bank produces an excessive credit expansion. As a result, monetary authorities are faced with the alternatives either restricting the credit to the private sector, which in the long run is harmful for economic growth and does not provide financial stability, or of allowing such expansion, thus increasing the inflationary pressures.

Union demands for salary and wage increases completely out of proportion to the growth productivity are conceded or encouraged by political parties and the Government, either by demogoguery or a desire to redistribute national income is a third cause of inflation.

A fourth cause results from exaggerated or defective social legislation passed with a knowledge of costs and of financial implications, and usually contrary to the rules of specialized bodies like the International Labor Office. There are many instances when social benefits—vacations with pay, termination benefits, bonuses, pensions, health and old-age insurance, family allowances, and so forth—mount to 60 percent, 80 percent, or even 100 percent of direct remuneration. This in effect means a lower take home pay because both elements are added when labor costs are ascertained, and these must be related to productivity. In turn, this leads to new demands to raise wages, thus entering into a wage spiral.

In some instances, if the tax burden is excessive, costs and prices are affected. There are countries such as Argentina, Chile, Colombia, and Peru where taxes represent 20 percent or more of national income. This is too much for an underdeveloped country with a small tax potential. Under these conditions, inflationary pressures are severely aggravated.

In some countries within the region, tariff duties exceed 100 percent as an average, with many duties considerably higher. Such policies have been criticized consistently, even by ECLA. They affect domestic price levels, push up production costs generally, hamper exports, and produce inflationary pressure.

A seventh cause is the lack of incentive for increasing agriculture production. This is due to a large extent to an excessive emphasis on industrial development, and explains why food production has not increased at a pace required by the growing demand of increasing population, and urbanization. Food prices go up when demand increases ahead of production.

Distortions created by controls on prices, foreign trade, and foreign exchange provide the eighth cause for inflation. Price ceilings set on basic goods and services—food stuffs, house rents, electricity rates, transportation fares, and so forth—have depressed these activities, and an overvalued rate of exchange has produced a similar effect on exports.

The attached charts—exhibits 1 and 2—point up the problems faced within the region. With the exception of Mexico and Venezuela, the more advanced countries are plagued with runaway inflation. The costs of living have risen by more than 200 percent within 4 years in two—Brazil, Chile—of the four countries I visited in late March. The other two Republics, Argentina and Peru, had an increase in their cost of living, over the past 4 years, of 150 percent and 70 percent, respectively.

A comparison of the two charts shows that with the exception of Mexico and Venezuela, the more advanced Republics suffer from inflation, while the less advanced Republics reflect a history of depression.

And Venezuela, of course, is suffering from civil insecurity. An effective terrorist organization, the FALN, is causing the democratically elected government no end of grief and uncertainty.

Political uncertainty and instability within the region accounts, to a large measure, for the lack of faith on the part of local capital investors. Few of the Republics have a recent history of stability. Brazil, Argentina, Bolivia, Guatemala, El Salvador, Venezuela, Colombia, Peru, and Paraguay have all fallen victims to varying degrees of recent unrest. Uruguay, in the past one of the region's most stable Republics, is now in the grip of an agonizing reevaluation of its system of government.

While I will not dwell any further on the obvious history of Latin American political uncertainty, I do want to stress the continuing interruption of state stability has eroded local confidence in administrative security for investment.

HARD REALITIES

The hard realities existing within the Latin American Republics suggest the need for substantial internal reform. Fiscal and monetary reform, tooling up managerial and technical skills in government, and certainty in civil administration are all quantities necessary to keeping capital at home and attracting capital from abroad.

My colleague, Representative HENRY REUSS, has suggested one approach worth considering. He suggests:

> A combination of inflation, civil insecurity, and lack of patriotism causes many wealthy Latin Americans to send their capital abroad rather than invest it at home. This writer has urged for some years that the IDB could tap this capital resource by issuing IDB hard currency bonds—both purchased and repayable in hard currencies—to wealthy Latin Americans. The bonds could bear an attractive rate of interest, and could be sold in each of the Latin American countries, using the techniques developed by the Israel bond drives in the United States. The combined lure of a hedge against domestic inflation and default, and an appeal to the patriotism of the investor, seems well worth trying. The IDB could well earmark the proceeds, including the capital costs of land reform. Every dollar that could be returned to Latin America in this way would be a dollar devoted to Latin American economic development.

The Reuss proposal has much merit and aims at the heart of the problem facing Latin American development. Based on existing circumstances it appears more reasonable to stress and emphasize to each of the Republics that their particular problems be dealt with before encouraging private U.S. capital into a savings and housing industry facing so many internal obstacles.

Control of inflation, civil stability, and attracting local capital to local programs must be the items first scheduled on the agenda. Attraction of U.S. capital into the various Latin American savings and housing programs should come after the foundations of local initiative have paved the way.

My critique of present investment possibilities within Latin America does not preclude a knowledge and understanding of the reform and progress now taking place. The Alliance for Progress has been of assistance, and under the leadership of farsighted and skilled democratically elected leaders, many of the Republics are building firm foundations for improvement. The painful and discouraging history of the past has provided an agonizing lesson which the present leadership of many of the Republics do not want repeated. Skilled leaders, time, patience, and appropriate assistance will hopefully write an optimistic history for the future.

My statement today is meant to be a small addition to a constructive chapter in the future history of Latin America.

The exhibits referred to follow:

EXHIBIT No. 1

Cost of living of Latin American countries, 1961–66 [1]

[1958=100]

Country	1962	1963	1964	1965	1966
Argentina	395	491	600	771	1,020
Bolivia	152	151	167	172	[2] 198
Brazil	390	684	1,270	2,050	3,000
Chile	190	274	400	512	632
Columbia	124	164	192	199	239
Costa Rica	107	111	114	114	114
Dominican Republic	102	110	112	110	119
Ecuador	109	115	120	123	130
El Salvador	97	98	100	100	[3] 99
Guatemala	100	100	100	99	[3] 100
Honduras	102	105	110	114	[3] 118
Jamaica	115	117	119	123	[3] 127
Mexico	110	111	114	118	123
Nicaragua	96	96	100	103	107
Panama	102	103	105	105	106
Paraguay	143	146	148	154	158
Peru	139	148	164	191	208
Uruguay	263	317	454	710	[4] 1,360
Venezuela	105	106	107	109	[3] 111

[1] Where months are indicated end of month date and not yearly average.
[2] October.
[3] December.
[4] August.

Source: International Financial Statistics, vol. 20, April 1967.

EXHIBIT No. 2

Latin America today

Country	Population (1966)			Area			GNP and power		
	Total (millions)	Rate growth (percent)	Density per square mile	Thousands of square miles	Percent cultivated	Agricultural acres per capita	GNP (millions)	GNP per capita	Power per capital (kilo-watt-hours per year)
19 Republics	236.9	2.9	31	7,710	25.0	5.0	88,286	384	400
Argentina	22.7	1.6	26	1,084	50.0	17.0	16,050	718	690
Bolivia	4.2	2.4	10	424	13.0	8.0	599	145	130
Brazil	84.0	3.0	26	3,280	15.0	4.0	21,970	270	410
Chile	9.0	2.4	30	286	17.0	3.0	4,257	485	690
Colombia	18.5	3.0	40	440	17.0	3.0	5,103	284	320
Costa Rica	1.6	3.8	80	20	30.0	2.0	593	395	430
Dominican Republic	3.7	3.6	200	19	26.0	1.0	960	265	140
Ecuador	5.2	3.4	50	112	19.0	3.0	1,128	222	110
El Salvador	3.0	3.2	360	8	51.0	1.0	795	273	140
Guatemala	4.8	3.3	110	42	19.0	1.0	1,410	305	90
Haiti	4.8	2.3	450	11	31.0	.4	327	70	19
Honduras	2.3	3.1	50	43	38.0	4.0	504	223	80
Mexico	44.2	3.5	60	760	52.0	6.0	19,415	455	400
Nicaragua	1.7	3.5	30	57	13.0	3.0	588	355	190
Panama	1.3	3.2	40	29	18.0	3.0	617	495	400
Paraguay	2.1	2.6	13	157	27.0	14.0	443	221	60
Peru	12.0	3.1	23	514	16.0	4.0	4,281	367	330
Uruguay	2.8	1.4	40	72	86.0	14.0	1,555	573	640
Venezuela	9.0	3.4	26	352	21.0	5.0	7,691	882	920
Other:									
British Honduras	.1	3.1	12	9	2.0	1.0	39	370	170
Guyana	.7	2.8	8	83	13.0	10.0	193	298	230
Jamaica	1.8	2.6	420	4	45.0	.7	873	489	450
Surinam	.4	2.9	7	55	.3	.4	139	392	690
Trinidad and Tobago	1.0	3.0	500	2	35.0	.4	630	646	930

The Heart of a Water Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. TUNNEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1967

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to place in the RECORD today an editorial in the Palm Springs, Calif., Desert Sun newspaper concerning the Southwest water problem. I believe this editorial succinctly explains the Colorado River legislation once more being considered by the Congress.

The article follows:

THE HEART OF A WATER PROBLEM

The famed Colorado River Water Fight is still being waged, and we might as well recognize it. The term itself has been heard seldom since the U.S. Supreme Court decision settling the California-Arizona legal battle. But the one agonizing fact that cannot be eluded remains, and that fact supports continuing struggle:

The Southwest is dependent upon a Colorado River water supply which has been over-committed by compact, court decrees and long-time uses.

And all of the fighting, the jockeying of legislation and other politicking, comes down to various sections of the Colorado River Basin trying to finagle more water or hold onto rights they believe they already have.

The situation as it exists today is vastly complex, involving all sorts of statistical, engineering and political issues, but that over-commitment is the key to California's stand against bills proposed for the Central Arizona Project.

This state's Colorado River users take the stand that the proposed CAP bills of Arizona and Secretary of Interior Udall fail to recognize the water deficiencies and demands. The view simply is that it is intolerable to contemplate a project such as the CAP without assurance that present rights are protected or that more water is assured from other sources.

Any attempt to discuss this great issue without reference to specific details—particularly acre feet of water—is difficult, but let's accept a bit of oversimplification in hopes of better understanding.

Basically, the stand of California and most of the basin states is embodied in a resolution of the board of directors of the Coachella Valley County Water District supporting Sen. Thomas Kuchel's Colorado Bill S-861, which, the resolution states, contains the essential features for a settlement of the issues.

That resolution, oversimplified, calls for:

Works to augment the Lower Basin water supply. This includes authorization for meaningful studies for that purpose, including studies on importations necessary to firm up the water apportioned to the Lower Basin by the Supreme Court Decree and studies of adequate protection of areas and states where that imported water originates.

Acceptance of a proposal which would provide Colorado River basin project funds from sale of power from a high Hualapai Dam.

Provision that the Central Arizona Project would bear its portion of any shortages which it would create.

Protection of existing projects and California's allocation by the Supreme Court.

The gut issue, it appears, is that California insists that the over-commitment of water be recognized and enough water be provided to meet that commitment. Sen. Kuchel's bill seeks that. The other two bills ignore that demand.

But the details—the acre-feet, the dates of compacts and court decisions, the state and area loyalties—can and do confuse that issue for many of us.

That they do is a shame. The problem is truly a regional one. The Southwest simply does not have enough water and finding a way to provide enough water is the reasonable approach, not deciding who will have and who will not have.

This is important to all areas of the Southwest, directly or indirectly. Palm Springs, which uses not a drop of Colorado River water, is almost directly affected by the well-being of those areas which do.

The solution sought by the Kuchel bill is the only satisfactory solution: The solution to the Southwest Water Problem.

And we should let our legislators know we believe in that.

Three Editorials

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1967

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, in a recent edition of the Jewish Press, three editorials were written concerning different aspects of the Middle East crisis.

The first editorial discusses the difficult battle for peace which lies ahead and the U.S. role in attaining it. The second deals with the long history of Soviet deceit which has been a characteristic of that country since World War II. The third editorial concerns Israel's justification for keeping the land that she won during the war.

I commend them to the attention of our colleagues. They appeared in the June 23, 1967, edition of the Jewish Press, and follow:

THE BATTLE FOR THE PEACE

The war is over and the more difficult battle—that of winning the peace—remains. From all sides pressures will soon be brought to bear against Israel to give up all the territories won by blood and sweat and sacrifice. The Arab-Communist unholy alliance will demand a return to the 1949 armistice lines; friendlier, but timid powers, will try to persuade Israel to agree.

We call upon our President to continue his quest for lasting peace in the Middle East by insisting that no demands be made upon Israel until the Arabs have agreed to recognize the Jewish State and sit with her face to face in negotiations. We call upon Mr. Johnson to recognize the legitimacy of Israel's contention that the old armistice agreements are dead and that the clock cannot be turned back. We call upon the United States to help Israel win the peace for the benefit of the peoples of the Middle East.

THE RUSSIAN DOUBLE-CROSS

There should be no question in anyone's mind that Russia, if given half the chance, would destroy more Jews than even Hitler's Nazi Germany! There can be absolutely no question as to where Russia stands in relations to Israel and the Jews throughout this world.

Russia's record of being a two-faced, double-crossing nation is still untarnished.

Prior to World War II it double-crossed the United States and signed a separate agreement with Germany. After that served its purposes, Russia sold out Hitler and joined the Allies.

In recent years, Russia has held hands with the Red Chinese—as long as it served its purpose. When the Red Chinese wouldn't play in Russia's ball park, Russia pulled its famous double-cross.

Fidel Castro is a prime witness to the Russian double-cross.

Russia cannot be trusted! The Arabs found that out—only too late. Russia pulled the rug from under the very nations it had promised to support. The price these nations paid was in human lives.

Russia lulled Nasser into a false sense of security. It gave Egypt an "LSD" type of courage to make war.

Russia gave tanks, but didn't show the Egyptians how to use them. It flooded Syria with its outdated MIGS, but neglected to teach the Syrians how to fly them.

Ironically enough, speaking before the United Arab Republic conclave last year, Nasser said his nation would take at least three years to prepare for an all-out war against Israel. What he implied was that it would take at least that long to train his armies to use the Russian weapons.

Why did Nasser make his move now? He knew he was unprepared! The Russians knew he was unprepared!

Where were the "Russian Advisory Soldiers" who were to teach the Arabs how to use the Russian made equipment? In all of the Middle East battles Israel could capture only five Russian artillery officers.

The fact of the matter was that the Arabs had nothing to fight with! When the Israelis captured 300 operable Russian tanks from the Arabs in an open field, one of the Arab tank men admitted he didn't even know how to turn the tank around to flee back to his own lines!

The blood of the Arab dead shall stain the hands of the Russians for eternity.

Russia stands naked before the entire world as a murderer. There cannot be one Arab family in this nation or in any nation that could honestly trust the Russians again.

We call upon the United Nations to brand Russia as the murderer it really is. We call upon the nations that have been promised so-called "Russian help" to face the facts! A murderer helps no one but himself.

THE ARAB PLIGHT

When a C.B.S.-TV camera crew with Charles Collingwood was filming scenes of the Egyptian tanks in the desert, during the 72 hour Arab-Israeli war, Charles Collingwood hesitated for a moment as five Arab soldiers appeared before his cameras with their hands up. Mr. Collingwood cleared his throat, stammered for a second and said, ". . . err . . . err . . . what do we do now? There are five Arab soldiers surrendering to our camera crew!"

The Egyptians simply did not want to fight! They had nothing, and a war would give them nothing! Why should they fight?

Israeli troops took over land that the Arabs have permitted to lay waste for centuries. The poor Arab peasants could do nothing with the land because the Arab nobility would give them nothing with which they could convert this land into farm land to produce food.

Now that Israel has these lands the very same Arabs who inhabited the land before will have an opportunity to return to their homes and cultivate the land to build a future.

But the Communist nations have other ideas. They have given their pledge to the Arab war lords that Israel will not keep the land. The circus that has gone on in the United Nations this past week is a disgrace to that esteemed body!

If Israel is forced to return the lands she had won in the war, why shouldn't Russia return East Berlin to Germany.

Ridiculous? Just as ridiculous as Israel returning the Gaza Strip!

The Arab nations are now preparing for "the next war" with Israel. This is no secret. The Arab leaders have asserted themselves and Russia has announced she will be sending more weapons, through other communist nations.

In other words the Russians are telling Israel that if she does not give up the lands she has taken, she might have Russia to contend with. Russia will not risk a war for any Arab nation, and Israel knows that! Now if we can only convince the Arabs.

Civil Violence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1967

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, looting, rioting, burning, and other forms of civil violence are prevalent again this summer in the cities of the United States.

There are now before the Congress more than 90 separate bills designed to reduce these acts by providing penalties for those persons traveling interstate to foment strife and violence.

It was my privilege to introduce this legislation on the first day of the 90th Congress and I certainly urge passage of such a bill this session.

The police departments of the Nation are in the frontlines against riots and have been doing a remarkable job of controlling and halting these outbreaks.

But the police departments need our full support in their efforts and passage of a stiff antiriot measure will aid our law-enforcement people.

The Indiana Fraternal Order of Police met this month for their 32d annual conference and voted unanimously to support antiriot legislation.

The Indiana State Lodge of the Fraternal Order of Police represents 6,000 Hoosier members who are police and law-enforcement officers in Indiana.

A copy of their resolution follows:

FRATERNAL ORDER OF POLICE,
INDIANA STATE LODGE,
Lafayette, Ind., June 19, 1967.

Mr. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President, United States of America,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

HONORABLE MR. PRESIDENT: The 32nd Annual Conference of the Inidiana State Lodge, Fraternal Order of Police, now convened in Lafayette, Indiana, has voted unanimously in favor of the following stated resolution. This Conference is in representation of over six thousand (6,000) Police and Law Enforcement Officers in the State of Indiana.

Whereas: We feel there are persons who are inciting civil disorder and riots within our great nation, with but one goal, that being to disrupt the peace and welfare of the communities, and to antagonize the several races and creeds within the Communities, and

Whereas: It is a known fact that these individuals and groups are using the riot and civil disturbance for their benefit by looting, stealing, and causing injury and suffering to our fellow man, and

Whereas: These same people are in open difiance of the Law and Order of Society, and the common basis upon which our great nation was founded, and which we have defended in times of aggression and war, and

Whereas: If this type of condition is allowed to exist, and these people continue their attacks on human diginity and God given rights, the lives of the Police and Law Enforcement Officers will continue to be endangered as well as those citizens within the community, and

Whereas: Such conduct could and will in the near future reflect upon the United States and the free world,

Therefore be it resolved: The 32nd Annual Conference of the Indiana State Lodge, Fraternal Order of Police, representing in excess of 6,000 members urge and request the President of the United States of America to strongly recommend to the Congress of the United States legislation which would prohibit rioting and deter demonstrations which bring discredit and disrespect to the individual community, the respective State in the Union and that of the United States of America.

Fraternally,
HENRY ZAWACKI,
President.
J. STONEBRAKER, Jr.,
Secretary.

Amending and Extending Title V of the Higher Education Act of 1965

SPEECH

OF

HON. ARNOLD OLSEN

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 1967

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 10943) to amend and extend title V of the Higher Education Act of 1965.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Chairman, the amendments to the Higher Education Act which we have accepted are, as much as any legislation likely to come before the 90th Congress, a matter of grave importance to the future of our Nation.

As a nation, we have found strength in education. Lawmaking bodies on the State and Federal level have recognized the importance of, and the value of, an educated population. Surely if those who preceded us in this Chamber had not recognized the importance of education by passing such measures as the National Defense Education Act, the various GI bills and the Higher Education Act of 1965—to mention but a few—we would have a much greater task cut out for us today.

Yet today the most educated nation on the face of the earth in facing a severe educational challenge. Last fall our country was faced with an unprecedented shortage of nearly 170,000 qualified teachers. The shortage is most acute in on the face of the earth is facing a severe areas where education has already slipped behind—in depressed rural areas and in urban slums. The situation is growing worse, and it will continue to worsen unless we accept the responsibility and take action to remedy it.

We need more qualified teachers. It is as simple as that. And the purpose of this legislation is to contribute to the enhancement of the teaching profession. If we succeed, I am confident very many of our college students will be attracted to careers in teaching.

I am pleased to note that the amendments give proper attention to the need of retaining qualified teachers in the profession. It is important, I believe, that we make use of every opportunity to encourage the teachers of our children to further enrich themselves, to continue their education, to erase, wherever it exists, the feeling that teaching is a dead-end occupation.

The strong bipartisan support these amendments received are a very real tribute to the excellent work of the House Committee on Education and Labor and the fine leadership of our colleague from the State of Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS]. I believe the Congress has cast its vote for education and educators by casting its vote for these amendments.

Is America Overcommitted?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 26, 1967

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, recently the Birmingham Post-Herald published in Birmingham, Ala., carried a very provocative editorial which quite properly raises the question, Is America overcommitted?

I should like to place this editorial in the RECORD today for the purpose of starting a dialog on this very important question. It is my hope that this editorial will stimulate members of the Foreign Affairs Committee to express some of their views on this very interesting question raised by the Birmingham Post-Herald. The editorial follows:

IS AMERICA OVERCOMMITTED?

Put together this string of recent ominous incidents:

The "bumping" of an American destroyer by two Soviet warships in the Sea of Japan.

The rash of infiltration attacks by North Korean troops across the demilitarized zone on American and South Korean outposts.

The Peking-inspired riots and strikes in Hong Kong.

The resurgence of Communist guerrilla activity in Venezuela, Colombia, Guatemala and Bolivia—all traced to Fidel Castro's Cuba.

Egypt's ouster of the United Nations emergency force, blockade of the Gulf of Aquaba and war threats to Israel.

There is no way of proving it, but it is likely all this hotting up is linked to the Vietnam war, and the United States' deep involvement in it.

The Arab-Israel crisis, on top of these other developments, raises the question with fresh relevance: Is the U.S. overcommitted militarily around the world? Do we have the men, arms, ships, planes, money and appetite to face two, three, four or five simultaneous demands on our alliances, while we have a half-million men in Vietnam?

We have 40 treaties binding us to military commitments on five continents. Under President Truman the Inter-American, North Atlantic, Australia-New Zealand and Philippine treaties were undertaken. Under President Eisenhower, we entered into the South Korean, Southeast Asian, Nationalist Chinese, and Japanese treaties. Interestingly, we added no new defense treaty obligations under President Kennedy, nor so far under President Johnson.

But we have taken upon ourselves other, non-treaty commitments in the form of Senate resolutions (like the Tonkin Gulf resolution), White House statements, and press conference remarks of the incumbent secretary of state and the vice president. As a result, we have become much more deeply involved in Vietnam.

Needless to say, all these obligations were made one at a time, in response to events. They are all defensive and deterrent in intent. But they have become, over the years, an immense collective commitment to many people, in many places. So far we have always responded to the call. But there is a real possibility our resources may someday be overloaded.

Now is not the time to renege on any of our commitments, obviously. But when and where possible, we should seek to thin out our obligations. There is no reason for the automatic renewal of a treaty, without modification, as it expires. (We are thinking of the U.S.-Japan treaty that expires in 1907.)

And above all, the Administration's policy of going as far as it honorably can to conclude a negotiated settlement of the Vietnam war is a matter of prudence. It is not simply that we want a negotiated peace. We need it.

A Spiritual and Community Leader

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1967

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, recently one of my outstanding constituents, the Reverend Henry R. Kupsh, of St. Andrew's Church in Williston Park, was feted at a testimonial dinner in his honor.

Reverend Kupsh has for more than a quarter of a century exemplified the highest standards of humanitarian and community service as pastor of St. Andrew's Church and as chaplain to the Williston Park Volunteer Fire Department. As a spiritual leader, community leader, and friend he has won the hearts and minds of the people of Williston Park.

At the dinner in his honor, Reverend Kupsh heard messages of congratulations and respect from local, State, and Federal officials. Civic groups, service organizations, and youth groups from Williston Park had gifts and plaques to honor Reverend Kupsh and his wife, Alice. In addition several bishops of the Episcopal Church were in attendance to join in the tributes to Reverend Kupsh.

The testimonial dinner was well deserved; Reverend Kupsh is a special kind of person. He is the kind of person all men respect and love. St. Andrew's Church has been blessed to have so fine a pastor. The Williston Park Fire Department has been fortunate to have so devoted a chaplain. Williston Park and the entire Third Congressional District, which I am honored to represent, are forever indebted to the Reverend Henry R. Kupsh—a special quality of man.

The Medical Manpower Shortage Responsibility of Organized Medicine and the Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM T. CAHILL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1967

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, on several occasions I have directed the attention of the House to the increasing shortage of U.S. trained physicians. In an extremely perceptive article in the April 1967 issue of the Journal of Medical Education, Dr. Alex Gerber points out that unless immediate action is undertaken by medical educators, organized medicine and government, this shortage may be projected into the future with disastrous consequences to our Nation's standards of health and life expectancy. Dr. Gerber states as reasons for this marked decrease in physicians the following—

First, population growth has outdistanced and will continue to exceed the number of physicians in private practice;

Second, an explosion of demand for health services is resulting from higher income and educational levels;

Third, the upsurge in all forms of health insurance;

Fourth, the aging of the population with an attendant increase in chronic diseases;

Fifth, the added demands upon the physician's time because of highly complex diagnostic and therapeutic procedures which were completely unknown only two decades ago.

Underlining the dimensions and seriousness of this problem is the recent report of the board of trustees of the American Medical Association. While the association has long refused to issue a definitive statement of its position, at the AMA's annual convention on June 19, the board acknowledged that the shortage of physicians in the United States is reaching alarming proportions. As reported in Time magazine of June 30, 1967:

> In 1933 the Association urged medical schools to curtail enrollments for fear that they would produce too many doctors. Subsequently, as warnings multiplied of an impending crisis in the supply of doctors, the AMA kept insisting that there is no cause for concern. Last week, the Board of Trustees did an about-face. In a report using words that it had once rejected vehemently it declared that the shortage of doctors. . . . called for an "immediate and unprecedented increase". It urged medical schools whose enrollments have remained static to figure out ways of admitting more students "in the light of national demand", and also called on the five schools of osteopathy that are still independent to convert into regular medical schools.

I am also informed by officials of the Association of American Medical Colleges that the small number of U.S. medical school graduates has been recognized by that organization to present a very urgent and vital national problem. I am advised that on May 17, 1967, the members of the association authorized the president, Dr. Hubbard, to appoint a committee to recommend what facilities, people, and dollars it would take to increase the output of physicians enough to maintain the necessary physician-to-population ratio without the importation of foreign medical graduates.

Both the AMA and the AAMC are to be commended for their adoption of a progressive and responsible position. The clear statements of policy made by these organizations will do much to supply dynamics and initiative to national efforts to increase the output of doctors. Thus, I urge that the Congress, through its appropriate committees, investigate ways in which aid may be provided to commence construction and staffing of both new and expansion of existing medical schools. Specifically, I recommend that the adequacy of grant-in-aid assistanace provided to medical schools under the Health Professions Educational Assistance Act of 1963 be reassessed. Under this act and its 1965 amendments some $650 million is authorized for programs continuing through fiscal year 1969, for the construction of teaching facilities in the health professions. Competing with the medical schools for this limited amount are schools of dentistry, pharmacy, optometry, podiatry, public health and veterinary medicine.

It would seem evident that a program of the magnitude necessary to provide our Nation with adequate health services will demand a much larger outlay of Federal funds. As indicated by Dr. Gerber, Russia, with a 17-percent larger population, graduates three times as many doctors as the United States; we obviously can profitably engage in other races besides the one to the moon.

In view of the increasing gravity of this problem, Congress can be no less progressive nor less dynamic.

Twin Industries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD D. McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 1967

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, present Government regulations for contracts to foreign firms are blind to the loss of millions of dollars in tax revenue to the U.S. Treasury, and correspondingly to the American taxpayer.

Recently, Twin Industries Corp. of Cheektowaga, N.Y., lost out on a defense contract to Canadair Ltd. of Montreal, Quebec. The Twin Industries' bid was $1,495,000 higher than Canadair's, but the loss in tax revenue to the U.S. Treasury was in excess of $3 million. The net loss to the American people was, therefore, over $1.5 million.

To correct this inadequacy, Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today a bill which will require Federal agencies to take into consideration tax losses to the U.S. Treasury in the awarding of Government contracts to foreign bidders.

Airport in the Lake

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 26, 1967

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished Chicago Daily News has captured the forward-looking spirit of Chicago in its excellent editorial entitled "Airport in the Lake."

When I first proposed that the city of Chicago give serious consideration to building a third airport out in Lake Michigan, there were cynics who said it could not be done and basically, belittled the idea.

It is a source of great comfort to me to know that today, a responsible newspaper like the Chicago Daily News comes out in support of the project.

Other newspapers in Chicago have also spoken out in support of the project, and it is my hope that Chicago will be the first major city of the world to have a major airport out in the lake.

As the Chicago Daily News quite properly observes, whatever obstacles may exist to such an airport, the rewards will more than offset the problems.

Jet noise continues to be the most serious problem in my congressional district, and with the construction of a lakefront airport, this problem would be almost totally abated.

The Chicago Daily News editorial follows:

AIRPORT IN THE LAKE

Armed with an engineering report declaring that an airport in Lake Michigan is feasible, the City of Chicago should push on toward its realization as rapidly as possible. While hurdles remain, the greatest of these is a ponderous negativism in some quarters—an attitude that because nothing of its kind exists, such a project should be shunned as too "radical."

If Chicago is to carve out a place in the air age comparable to its eminence in the age of rails, some radical thinking is in order.

It would be "radical" to have an airport within 10 minutes of the central business district—none of the nation's 10 biggest cities now has this kind of convenience. Yet that is what Chicago would have with its airport just 3½ miles offshore.

It would be "radical" to have the principal approaches for the thundering jets across a totally uninhabited area. Yet the prevailing westerly winds would make it practical for most traffic into the lake airport to sweep in over the lake itself, and most takeoffs could be mainly over water, as well. In an age when the sonic boom is becoming more and more of a problem, this noise abatement factor could prove of major importance to the city's welfare and comfort.

The idea of an airport built on the lake bed with cofferdams holding back the water may itself seem radical at first blush. Yet the Dutch have used a similar principle to preserve their country for centuries, and the engineers have declared it entirely practical.

As for access to the mainland, that could be easily provided by a causeway-tunnel combination of any desired traffic capacity. Rapid transit and motor traffic could both be accommodated, and sound planning could foreclose the probability of such traffic jams as plague O'Hara and nearly all other big airports.

Critics of the lake airport plan have cited lake fog as a hazard arguing against the site. Swift and steady progress in perfecting instrument landings indicates that by the time this field can be opened—perhaps 1975—this problem will have been completely whipped.

The matter of air congestion resulting from the proximity of three major airports will have to be reckoned with no matter where Chicago's third airport is situated. Mainly it comes down to the efficient control of traffic from the towers, and here, too, science is moving steadily toward reducing risk to a minimum.

Esthetically, the lake airport will offer no problem at all, since practically all of its facilities will be completely below line-of-sight from shore and the airport will look like a big cloud shadow on the water.

In short, no formidable problems appear to stand between Chicago and the creation of the nation's most convenient major airport. The price of approximately $300,000,000 is about what any great new airport is likely to cost, by the time a costly site is acquired and made ready.

We commend Mayor Daley for his vision and boldness in bringing the airport-in-the-lake idea out of the realm of fantasy and into the area of hard practicality. Now is the time to press onward toward final clearance and construction.

Economic Opportunity Loan Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1967

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, 6 months ago the Small Business Administration announced an expansion of its economic opportunity loan program. This program is being carried on in the upper Midwest from the SBA regional office in my district of Minneapolis, as the following article from the June 15 Minneapolis Star indicates:

MORE BUSINESS LOANS TO POOR ARE PLANNED

(By Maurice Hobbs)

Business loans totaling $1 million to poor persons and persons who cannot get loans elsewhere is one goal of the regional Small Business Administration (SBA) office in the coming fiscal year, Director Harry Sieben said Wednesday.

Sieben said he hopes to make 100 loans, averaging about $10,000 each, in Minnesota and the portion of Wisconsin covered by the SBA office at 816 2nd Av. S.

The loans would be made under the economic opportunity loan program, an expanded version of the SBA economic opportunity assistance program that began in 1964.

The earlier program used small business development centers supported by the Office of Economic Opportunity to screen loan applications. The procedure ended in this area at the close of 1966, when the Hennepin County small business center closed. It was considered to be of low priority when the county anti-poverty committee had to adjust to congressional cutbacks in the anti-poverty program last fall.

Since January the SBA office has been making anti-poverty loans in two categories:

Economic Opportunity Loan I is mainly for persons now in business whose incomes provide only a marginal existence.

Economic Opportunity Loan II is for those whose incomes provide more than a marginal existence but who, for various reasons, have lacked opportunity to establish or expand small businesses.

They may be discriminated against on an ethnic basis, or may simply be in an area where banks do not make new business loans.

"We're looking for people with know-how who fit into our categories," said Charles McCoy, program co-ordinator.

The changeover in January added the second category of loan and made another major change. Previous to January the loans could be made only through small business development centers. They were located in Hennepin County, on the White Earth Indian Reservation and in northern Wisconsin.

Only persons in those areas could receive loans. Now, said Sieben, loans are available to anyone in Minnesota who qualifies. The move, he said "removed a great inequality in the program."

The SBA is still not throwing money away, he noted. It expects to be paid back, and "we don't propose to take all the economically disadvantaged and put them in business."

But it does offer loans at low interest rates over long terms and can provide financial and management counseling, calling on experts from some of the area's largest firms.

Libraries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1967

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, in our preoccupation with education these days—and I must admit I am among those very much preoccupied in this field—it is sometimes easy for us to overlook the resources which contribute to education in our communities.

We know of a need for good schools. We know of the need for educational research. We can talk glowlying of contributions an educated populous can make to its nation and its world.

It is even easy for us to think beyond classrooms and buildings when we discuss education. At such times we can talk about subject areas, research, findings, and new concepts. It is amazing, however, how few times the word "library" comes up.

That is why it was particularly satisfying to me recently to read the latest issue of a little pamphlet called Citizens Business, published by the Pennsylvania Economy League and its Bureau of Municipal Research. This little publication, I assure you, has become a valuable one in recent years, particularly to public officials. It has been known to deal with many subjects, sometimes with real insight.

The most recent issue, dated June 15, 1967, deals with local, district, regional library services as provided by the Philadelphia free library. I will not attempt to summarize the article. It is concise enough in itself. I would like to offer it in its entirety, however, for the RECORD:

PHILADELPHIA FREE LIBRARY: LOCAL, DISTRICT, REGIONAL LIBRARY SERVICES

For many years, the Free Library of Philadelphia has provided services not only to city residents but also to nonresidents. Registration for borrowing privileges is free to every nonresident who pays city taxes and to members of his family. Other nonresidents may register for an annual fee of $3. At the end of 1966, the Free Library had 337,000 registered adult and 203,000 juvenile borrowers. Of these 540,000 registrants, over 4,000 were fee-paying nonresidents.

THE PENNSYLVANIA LIBRARY CODE

Since 1961, when state legislation was enacted, and, later, federal legislation, the Free Library has broadened the base of its services and support. The 1961 Pennsylvania Library Code consolidated, codified, and amended previous laws covering public libraries and made law the Pennsylvania Plan for Library Development. The Pennsylvania Plan has receive national recognition and has served as the model for legislation in at least two other states—Michigan and Florida.

A SYSTEM CONCEPT OF THREE TIERS

A system concept lies at the heart of the Pennsylvania Plan: ready access by each citizen to *local* library service; up to 30 *district* libraries; and four *regional resource centers*[1] for research materials and specialized services. Public libraries may voluntarily become associated with the plan. In return for meeting local support criteria set by the state, they receive state financial aid.

The Free Library of Philadelphia qualifies for state aid for all three levels of support.

As a local library, the Free Library receives state aid for its services to city residents and taxpayers. The Library Code authorizes a maximum state contribution of 25 cents per person in the "service area." In 1967, state aid for local services is estimated at $535,000. As part of this aid, the state is channeling $30,000 financed by the Federal Library Services and Construction Act for a demonstration program to develop library usage in city poverty areas.

In its role as a district library, the Free Library extends services to 42 local libraries in Eastern Montgomery and Delaware Counties. District services consist of three main activities:

Rotation among the libraries of special collections of books which they might not otherwise obtain

Expansion of interlibrary loans between the Free Library and local libraries in the district

Provision of professional counsel to staff members of the 42 libraries

Sources of support, Free Library of Philadelphia, in 1967

[Thousands of dollars]

City	5, 710
State:	
Local Service	535
District Service	223
Regional Service	97
Total, State	855
Tristate	137
Federal	105
Total	6, 807

The maximum state contribution for the district library service is 25 cents per person in the service area of the 42 local libraries. For this program, state aid to the Free Library in 1967 is estimated at $223,000.

As a regional resource library, the Free Library receives state aid for the development of book collections and services for use throughout Pennsylvania. By agreement with the other resource libraries, the Free Library puts particular emphasis on its collections in the fields of Religion and Philosophy, Costume, Theatre, Folklore, Modern Literature, Fiction, Geography and Travels, Insurance, Fine Arts, Music, Sports, Criminology, Anthropology, Ancient and Modern History.

The Library Code authorizes a maximum appropriation of $100,000 for each resource library. The Free Library will receive $97,000 for this service in 1967.

TWO OTHER SERVICES

The Free Library also provides two other services for which it receives support from outside the city. As a Library for the Blind, it provides services on a reimbursed basis to the states of Pennsylvania, Delaware, and West Virginia. Using Federal Library Services and Construction Act funds, the Free Library has been selected as one of two regional film centers in Pennsylvania. The Free Library will augment its collection of educational films and distribute them to users through district libraries in the eastern half of the state. Reimbursement for services to the blind will amount to $137,000 in 1967; for film service, the Federal government will reimburse $105,000.

Commemorating Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1967

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, since 1963, Maryland has joined with other States in a nationwide program to commemorate the signing of the Declaration of Independence. All citizens have been urged to ring bells from public buildings, private homes, churches, and schools, at 2 p.m. for 4 minutes on July Fourth. This patriotic project has been energetically promoted by the Maryland Veterans of Foreign Wars and particularly by Francis Lee, department commander, and Charles A. Kreatchman, department adjutant. I commend their worthy efforts to the Members of Congress.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402, at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided,* That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

---

[1] The Free Library of Philadelphia, the Carnegie Library of Pittsburgh, the Pennsylvania State Library in Harrisburg, and the Pennsylvania State University Library at University Park.

Appendix

Jackson: Birthplace of the Republican Party

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT P. GRIFFIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 29, 1967

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, July 6 marks the 103d anniversary of the founding of the Republican Party at Jackson, Mich., in the year 1854.

To mark that anniversary, the people of Jackson are planning an appropriate observance in that city over the weekend of July 7. Among the events scheduled are a banquet, a pageant, exhibits and addresses by prominent Republicans, including Members of Congress.

A highlight of the observance will be an address by Representative **Fred Schwengel**, of Iowa, who is well known in and out of Congress as an authority on the first Republican President, Abraham Lincoln.

The early days of the Republican Party, and the concerns which gave birth to the party, need to be recalled frequently—not only in Jackson, Mich., but throughout the Nation.

It was in Jackson on July 6, 1854, that our party was founded; here that the principles for which the youthful Republican organization then stood, and still holds to, were adopted by a formal convention assembled precisely for that purpose. That famous gathering "under the oaks" remains a testament to the conscience of this America, and to the initiative and human concern of the people of Michigan.

The Republican Party is unique in our political history. It originated spontaneously, born of a determination to no longer avoid an issue—slavery—which to them was of the utmost moral consequence. It was not so much the glamor of a particular leader which brought together men of various political allegiances, backgrounds, and loyalties; but rather the love of individual liberty and the nobility of the human spirit.

Think back to that green summer day in Jackson, over a century ago, when Whigs and Democrats, Free Soilers, and Liberty men banded together to voice their anger at the evil of slavery and their belief that human dignity is not limited by color or race or religious beliefs—principles on which the Republican Party still stands today.

The party's birth is chronicled in numerous journals, from one of which I quote the following excerpt:

> As the hall was entirely inadequate to the accommodation of those assembled [a complaint we cannot make today], an adjournment was had to an oak grove on the outskirts of the village, where a platform was hastily erected. The scene, as the crowd moved toward the grove, was an inspiring one. As far back as the eye could reach was a procession of men, with many women also. The grove itself was a beautiful piece of woods, situated on what was known as "Morgan's Forty," situated between the village and the race course. The scene there was an animated one, suggesting a huge picnic, the Jackson brass band enlivening the occasion with patriotic airs.

The convention, assembling at the spot which later became the intersection of Franklin and Second Streets, was perhaps the first group officially to fuse the new antislavery elements into a cohesive group and to give that group the name "Republican." The Jackson Convention is clearly the first assembly to formulate and give an abiding place to Republican principles in a party platform.

Horace Greeley is thought to have been responsible for suggesting the Party's name. Joseph Warren, the editor of the Detroit Tribune, who had done so much to galvanize public sentiment in opposition to the extension of slavery, later stated that Greeley had suggested the name Republican a day or two before the assembly in Jackson. At the convention Warren urged the adoption of the name, which was included in the platform.

The name was a logical choice—for theoretical, sentimental, and historical reasons. Because Jefferson had initiated the policy of restricting slavery in the Ordinance of 1784, sentiment favored naming the new party "Republican"—a name which Andrew Jackson had earlier deemed expendable. For the slavery-sympathizing Democrats had betrayed both the heritage of Jefferson and the cause of liberty. It was up to the new party to revitalize the Jeffersonian concept of human freedom and republican liberty which were now so shamefully abused. Writes Arthur Norman Holcombe:

> The original spirit of the Anti-slavery Republicans was the spirit of the Declaration of Independence, of the Land Ordinance of 1785, and of the Northwest Ordinance of 1787. Of the first of these great documents, Thomas Jefferson was the author; he had a leading part in the preparation of the second; his ideals were embodied in the third. In these three documents the fighting principles of the Anti-slavery Republicans were first set forth. The interests to which the Anti-slavery Republicans were most strongly devoted were those which had most loyally supported the Jefferson policies. Thus the spirit as well as the name of the original Jeffersonian party was revived by the party of Lincoln, of Seward, and of Chase.

William S. Myers has pointed out that Michigan was especially fertile ground for the Republican Party to take seed in, since its people were well informed and scorned the institution of human slavery.

He writes:

> The State of Michigan was then peopled by inhabitants of old American stock, far above the average in education and intelligence, and we can see this section of the American people at its best.

The young Republican Party appealed to the educated and culturally sophisticated men and women who formed the intellectual nucleus of the Nation. As one historian—A. M. Simons—has noted:

> Whittier wrote its campaign songs, Lowell translated its doctrines into poetry, while Emerson, Bryant, Longfellow, Holmes, and Motley were some of the names high in American literature counted on its membership rolls.

Particularly important in gaining for the Republicans the publicity necessary to political survival, was Horace Greeley's newspaper, the New York Tribune. Journalists such as Greeley helped the Republican Party recognize in its 1854 platform the interests of working men and women as well as the intellectuals of the day.

The Kansas-Nebraska Act of 1854, which repealed the Missouri Compromise and opened the Western territories to slavery, led to the Jackson meeting. Among the Democratic leaders who participated were Kingsley S. Bigham, Hovey K. Clarke, and Isaac P. Christiancy, all famous names in the history of Michigan politics.

Among the Whigs who joined the group was Zachariah Chandler, who later distinguished himself as Republican Senator from Michigan. Chandler's speech at the 1854 convention was particularly stirring. He caught the spirit of this conference. Said Chandler:

> Misfortunes make strange bedfellows. I see before me Whigs, Democrats, and Free Soilers, all mingling together to rebuke a great National wrong. I was born a Whig; I have always lived a Whig, and I hope to die fighting for some of the good Whig doctrines. But I do not stand here as a Whig. I have laid aside party to rebuke treachery.

Another speech of great appeal was made by Lewis Clark, a fugitive slave, immortalized as the character, "George Harris" in "Uncle Tom's Cabin."

Clark was the son of a Revolutionary soldier and a Kentucky Negress, and was then living on a farm near Sandwich, Ontario. He told how at the death of his father the family was sold on the auction block, and how he escaped from slavery. The effect of his speech on the assembly was powerful, intensifying the determination of the audience to end this institution.

It was an inspiring day; one of those high moments in history which still affects human affairs.

The timelessness of that first Republican platform makes it worth repeating:

> Surely that institution [that is, slavery—for which today we may substitute civil injustice of all kinds] . . . Surely that institution [reads the platform] is not to be strengthened and encouraged against which Washington, the calmest and wisest of our Nation, bore unequivocal testimony; as to which Jefferson, filled with a love of liberty,

exclaimed: "Can the liberties of a Nation be ever thought secure when we have removed their only firm basis, a conviction in the minds of the people that thir liberties are the GIFT OF GOD? That they are not to be violated but with his wrath? Indeed, I tremble for my country when I reflect that God is just; that His justice cannot sleep forever . . ." We believe these sentiments to be true now as they were then.

In 1967, those sentiments are just as true; the Republican Party still stands for the rights of men, for human justice, and for individual dignity. The convocation under the oaks on that bright summer day did the Nation an invaluable service, for which the city of Jackson, Mich., is justly remembered.

This city is today a thriving example of the American spirit. A center for industry, transportation, and higher education; it has a reputation for enlightened political activity. The congressional district in which Jackson is located sends a Republican Representative to the Congress—partial testimony to the prominent role Republicans have played in Michigan history in the century following the Jackson convention.

Yes, we are proud of our party, and of the role which Jackson has played in its formation and perpetuation.

I salute the city of Jackson and offer my sincere admiration for the loyalty of its people to the principles for which the Republican Party stands.

As the Detroit Post Tribune wrote long ago:

> To the men who gathered on that midsummer day in the oak grove at Jackson belongs the honor of being the first to comprehend a great opportunity; they were wise enough to improve all its possibilities, and there founded and named the party of the future.

The Influence of the Minerals Industry on General Economics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 28, 1967

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, for anyone who is apprehensive about this Nation's self-sufficiency with respect to mineral raw materials, this year's Jackling Lecture will provide welcome relief. It refutes the notion that vital minerals might be denied us if international supply routes were severed.

This year's Jackling Lecture is a lesson in mineral economics. It was presented by Dr. James Boyd, former Director of the U.S. Bureau of Mines, on the occasion of his receiving the 1967 Daniel C. Jackling Award of the Society of Mining Engineers, a constituent of the American Institute of Mining, Metallurgical, and Petroleum Engineers.

Dr. Boyd, a native of Australia, received his early education in England and was later graduated from the California Institute of Technology with a bachelor of science degree and from a Colorado School of Mines with master and doctor of science degrees. In 1941, he gave up teaching geology to become head of the Army and Navy Munitions Board's metal branch and aided in the mobilization of the mining industry for World War II. Since that time he has distinguished himself in many important positions in government and private industry.

As Army liaison to the War Production Board, Dr. Boyd helped direct the flow of raw materials. As first director of the Industry Division of the Military Government, he guided the recovery of German industry from the devastation of the war.

In 1946, Dr. Boyd became dean of the faculty of the Colorado School of Mines, then reentered Government service as assistant to the Secretary of the Interior, serving as director of the Bureau of Mines for 4 years. He joined the Kennecott Copper Corp., in 1951, and since 1960 he has been president of the Copper Range Co.

In response to his selection as Jackling Award winner, Dr. Boyd presented a lecture that should be in the library of everyone who is in any way responsible for minerals policies of Federal and State Governments. It can also be valuable reading for the general public, especially for those who need reassurance about the stockpile of minerals that lie beneath the surface of our land.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert in the RECORD Dr. Boyd's lecture, "The Influence of the Minerals Industry on General Economics":

THE INFLUENCE OF THE MINERALS INDUSTRY ON GENERAL ECONOMICS

(By James Boyd)

As our society grows in complexity, it becomes more urgently incumbent upon scientists and engineers to bring their experience to bear on the solution, not only of technical problems, but also on socio-economic difficulties. It is to this field that I have directed a large part of my energies.

RAW MATERIALS BASIC TO THE ECONOMIC PROCESS

There are certain premises, frequently overlooked, which bear emphasis. As economics concerns the production, distribution, and consumption of goods, so our whole society is based on raw materials. Without the basic extractive industries of agriculture and mining, there would be no economic problems with which to deal. This principle has been expressed as:

> "All productivity is based on three factors: (1) natural resources, whose form, place, and condition are changed by the expenditure of (2) human energy (both muscular and mental), with the aid of (3) tools."

It seems strange that such an obvious statement needs to be made. It is forgotten by all of us, however, at one time or another when we get involved in the complicated theories of economics dealing with the financial and fiscal policies of the various governments, in the financing of enterprises, in marketing, and in labor relations. Unless decisions in all of these fields are made with this and the rest of the Ten Pillars of Economic Wisdom consciously in mind, the resultant policies are doomed to eventual failure, whether these are policies of individuals, companies or governments.

The economic process is basic to society. But economics and the social aspects of humanity are inevitably intertwined. If human needs are not provided for within the basic economic structure, conflicts arise to disrupt the most carefully laid social plans. Similarly, it is the failure of society to cope with basic economic prerequisites that leads to discord within the body politic and thus to eventual economic disaster. We who are engaged in the various aspects of the mineral industry, therefore, have a large part to play in society's future development.

MINERAL RAW MATERIALS OCCUR NATURALLY IN NEARLY LIMITLESS QUANTITIES

Throughout my career in and out of government, I have formed my decisions on two principles: 1) Fundamentally, all mineral raw materials exist within the earth's crust in quantities greatly exceeding man's needs; 2) Any problems of supply of these materials are primarily economic in nature.

With respect to my first assumption, analyses by geochemists enable them to estimate the quantities in which each of the known elements exist in the earth's crust. One of the most cautious and famous suggests that the average copper content of the lithosphere to a depth of ten miles is about 55 parts per million. If this is valid, then the lithosphere contains about 1.4 quadrillion ($1.4x10^{15}$) tons of copper metal—an unimaginable quantity. This is 8,500,000-fold that which has been consumed by man in his existence. To illustrate further, consider that the deepest copper mine in history went to about 9000 ft. below the surface; the present copper mines of the world now average less than 1500 ft. in depth. We can assume that in most continental land areas of the world it is technically feasible to mine to a depth of at least one mile. The land areas of the world to an average depth of one mile, then, contain 343 billion tons ($343x10^{9}$) of copper metal, or 2000 times that which has been extracted to date.

I don't believe man will ever expend his energies to extract copper from rocks which contain only a few parts per million, but he knows that each element appears in dissimilar rocks in different relative quantities. Those experienced in mineral technology search for useful minerals in those areas where accidents of nature have concentrated them in sufficient quantities to make their extraction economic.

We really do not know where or how large are the deposits which are sub-marginal under present economic conditions. We frequently observe sizable deposits in our exploration activities; hence, we are all aware that they exist, and many of us may even have given them enough consideration to appreciate their size and long-term potential. Some of these are the lean "red bed" coppers; the shales and limestones which contain small amounts of lead and zinc; or the sea waters that are known to have gold and other minerals. Harrison Brown has even calculated that there is sufficient uranium in some granites to produce more energy than that necessary to extract it, if we ever needed to do so.

The purpose of this excursion is to point out that mineral raw materials exist in infinitely larger quantities than those with which we now deal. Let us take a look at the statements of those who say our resources are limited, that they will some day be exhausted, and that our great industrial society will grind to a halt. Examine the frequently expressed general statement that the United States is rapidly becoming a "have not" nation in respect to mineral resources. I think that this notion can be quickly dispelled with some specific examples: The United States has always been an importer of manganese, without which steel could not be made by the most generally practiced metallurgical methods. We have imported almost 100% of our requirements for years, but during every emergency we have considered the vast known domestic deposits of this material, which are sufficiently high grade to be worth considering. Yet we still have only a very small manganese industry because there are deposits elsewhere in the world which can be mined, beneficiated if necessary, and the manganese shipped half-way around the world far more inexpensively than we can set up facilities to produce it from domestic sources. But we are not a have-not nation.

Aluminum is an even more dramatic example. It occurs in one form or another in every state of the Union in limitless quantities. Yet, we depend upon Surinam, Guinea, Africa, and now Australia because it is cheaper to do so. There are hundreds of other examples, including iron ore. We have the resources. Our economy just demands raw materials at the lowest possible cost.

All I am trying to say is that the supply of mineral raw materials to fill the world's industrial needs is primarily an economic problem, of which the technology required to develop these sources is only a part. Public or corporate policy should not be made on the assumption that raw materials are limited. The basic raw material resources are not limited, but only the technology or the productive capacity to make them available at the right price.

THE ECONOMIC PROCESS GENERALLY WILL PROVIDE SUFFICIENT RAW MATERIALS FOR MAN'S NEEDS

Raw materials, including those obtained from mining, have long been taken for granted. Consumers appear unaware that they cannot continue to be produced at the same relative prices indefinitely. Except for renewable agricultural commodities, most products of the extractive industries at any given price level are limited. As the population of the world increases and new nations gain affluence, the demand for basic raw materials is tending to outstrip the productive capacity, based on known resources of present economic composition.

Now let us direct our attention to the economics of the facilities that turn mineral resources into useful raw materials for industry. Industry needs materials at the lowest possible cost to make its products inexpensively enough to serve their purpose in society. Fortunately, nature has provided one of her marvellously simple answers. Most mineral raw materials that require the minimum of human energy for their production are available in profusion and are easily mined. Such things as clay for bricks and pottery, sand for glass, and gypsum and cement for building materials, need little human labor to make them into products ready for public use. Therefore, they can be locally obtained in most cases and inexpensively transported to the point of usage.

The metals, which require a relatively large effort to produce, however, are used in products that frequently also require large quantities of human effort to fabricate. To take a dramatic example as far away as possible from gypsum or cement, a jet engine needs small amounts of high refractory metals able to withstand high temperatures under great stress. A typical engine costs $250,000—primarily as the result of large quantities of human and natural energy applied through expensive tools. If ten pounds of a metal, such as columbium, are required, it really does not make much difference that this material may cost $17.00 or $28.00 per pound, which is the range of the current price for columbium ingot. The manufacturer must have the properties of that or a similar metal in order to make a reliable machine! This does not mean that cost is not important—for every penny counts—but that the material is required, and its cost is relatively small compared to the labor needed to prepare it for use. Mineral raw materials ordinarily will fall somewhere on the scale between these extremes. Fortunately, those materials, as they have been developed for use by industry, have cost patterns based on scarcity or difficulty of extraction clearly related to their essentiality.

In more simple terms, this fortuitous relationship of scarcity to need automatically aids the general economy to obtain its raw materials within the limits of economic feasibility. We can have all of the mineral raw materials we need because the economics of each product usually permits the payment of the necessary price.

In those rare instances where there is an insufficient supply of a given raw material, there remains another alternative—substitution. With the variety of raw materials made available through technology, there are very few applications today which do not have at least one alternative. In many cases, several substitutions can be made for any raw material in any given application. The characteristics of the substitutions may not be the same, and the quality of the resultant product may not be entirely satisfactory. Through evaluation of all the factors of quality, cost of the material, and manufacturing costs, the economics can be adjusted to the availability and the need. It is perfectly true that advancing technology can be hindered by the unavailability of a certain material necessary to meet some exacting requirements. This is particularly true when we deal with high temperatures and other extreme conditions. The need in such cases cannot be met until material technology advances far enough to satisfy the requirements.

Within several extractive industries, the fears of substitution outstrip a full realization that the process is a daily occurrence which has been lived with throughout history. Substitution does not have to be feared; it merely has to be coped with through technological developments. Instances where one mineral raw material has been completely replaced are very rare indeed. In fact, at the moment I cannot think of any, although patterns of use may have changed materially.

The impact of raw material availability on all of the complicated use patterns of modern society is therefore highly fluid. This requires the producer to be forever studying the qualities of his product to determine what can be done in the refining, alloying, or fabricating stages to make it more useful to his customers. It necessitates that the consumer be constantly alert to the changes in availability, quality, and cost of the alternative materials which will satisfy his needs. As the repuirements for all raw materials increase through population growth, generally increasing affluence, and changing technology, the hastening of these processes grows more urgent. The impact of improved quality and the interrelated substitution of one material for another serve the general economy by making the resultant products less expensive and more reliable. It furthermore tends to enlarge the over-all raw material supply. For example, we are all aware that the use of alloy steels in construction materially reduces the quantity of iron necessary to obtain the strength required in bridge or building construction. Modern usage of materials is replete with similar examples.

All of these encouraging factors of availability in total physical volume and quality to meet the needs of expanding economies are comforting, but availability cannot be achieved without paying the price. Whether or not the ultimate cost of the raw material content of the various products rises or falls in relative terms depends largely upon technology. We must always talk in relative terms or real dollars, for all of the economies of the world have elements of inflation built into their systems, such as steadily increasing wage rates and some government expenditures. The rate of inflation in mineral production cost has so far outstripped advances in technology that price increases have been essential to maintain the required expansion of supply.

ECONOMIC ENVIRONMENT

The world society *must* provide a favorable climate for the production of mineral raw materials if large enough quantities are to be produced. While this seems obvious, recent history has shown that society has generally failed to recognize the three basic problem areas which seem to modify the economics of mining:

1) The inherent risks of investment must be recognized, and incentive provided to overcome them.

2) Increasing amounts of research and sophisticated technology are required to extract these minerals as the obvious and richer orebodies are depleted.

3) The damage caused by ill-informed governmental action upon the expansion of the mineral supply must be corrected.

Increasingly large amounts of capital are required to find, develop and produce mineral raw materials. Frequently, much of this investment must be made before any return is secure—and long lead times for development are the rule. Let us examine the various components contributing to this problem.

One major factor in raw material supply and its impact on general economics, which has to be faced by all those engaged in economic analysis, results from the basic geological condition that necessitates the utilization of ever-increasing quantities of energy to produce a unit of raw material. Even though the geological availability of mineral raw materials is unlimited, the absolute amount of each mineral raw material that is contained in a given unit of rock has been declining. This will continue as the richer deposits are exhausted.

By way of illustration, the average grade of copper ores in the United States has been steadily declining throughout the history of copper mining. At the turn of the century it was 3%; today it is less than 1%. In the same period the average iron content of ores mined has declined from about 55% to under 40%. Most of this decrease in grade has been overcome by improved technology in mining and metallurgy, but in terms of real dollars the cost of producing copper and iron has increased. Furthermore, the expense of finding new resources continually escalates. There are no figures available to put this in absolute terms, but it becomes evident upon reviewing briefly the changes in methods required to discover new deposits.

Thirty or forty years ago, virtually all mineral deposits were found at the surface by untrained men. Most of the mines operating today were discovered in this fashion. The cost of maintaining a prospector in the field at the turn of the century was probably no more than $1000–$2000 a year, and many were self-supporting and required even less. It was possible then for one man to make a major discovery. Now that we can no longer depend upon mere surface expression to locate a mineral deposit, highly trained geologists, together with modern transportation and scientific support, are required, and the cost can be in excess of $80,000 per geologist per year. Teams of such technical personnel are usually needed to make the same kind of discovery made by one man alone years ago. The cost of discovery has therefore escalated several hundred fold within 50 years.

Until 1966 the United States Government ruled that exploration, except for a minor allowance, should be capitalized in the tax treatment of a mining property. The 1966 tax law finally recognized that geological exploration in the search for new deposits should be considered as research in the same way that the search for new products has always been treated in the tax laws. Although this revised law provides that the cost of successful exploration has to be charged against future depletion allowances resulting from the expenses so charged, it represents a major step forward on the part of the Congress in its understanding of the problems of mineral exploration.

There is, however, another major factor in the basic cost of bringing mineral products to the market, which looms larger than in almost any other industry. This is the long period of preparation during which huge capital expenditures must normally be made before any return can be realized. This period may be anything from two years to over 25 years.

Let us assume that a new company decided to go into mining. It would first have to put together a competent exploration staff, one which could not reasonably be expected to find an extensive economic deposit within five years. The staff might be fortunate and do this in less time, but the chances are that it would take considerably longer.

Assume that this staff then discovers a large deposit lying several hundred feet below the surface. It would take the company two to three years of drilling to determine its shape and size. Such a program could be expected to cost at least $1 million. During this period, or perhaps later on, large samples would have to be mined to determine, through pilot metallurgical tests, the best method of separating the valuable minerals from the waste. Only then could the engineering be undertaken to lay out the mine and to construct the beneficiating plant, and also the metallurgical plant if that were required in the process. This would possibly take a year, in view of the complexity of modern technology. At this point the deposit would have to be prepared for mining.

In this example open-pit mining is assumed, so the hundreds of feet of overburden would have to be stripped off before the ore was exposed. If the deposit were to be mined by underground methods, shafts would have to be sunk and the ore exposed and developed in sufficient quantities to be mined efficiently. In shafts and development workings, only a limited number of men could be utilized at any given time, thus restricting the rate of advance. In either case this period of preparation would consume a minimum of two years, during which extremely heavy expenditures of funds would be required. Thus, capital would be tied up without any return from sales. All of these expenditures eventually would have to be recovered from profits in subsequent years and thus become a major part of the ultimate cost of the material.

These hypothetical examples would be relatively simple ones, in which only the standard metallurgy need be designed into the extraction plant. But such is rarely the case, for every deposit is unique; and frequently after it has been determined that a mineral deposit of sufficient size to warrant extensive metallurgical research exists, such research must be undertaken. Each step up to the point of conclusion of engineering involves the risk of all of the capital invested up to date. The cost of these risks, therefore, becomes a part of the ultimate price of the product. I shall not attempt here to put a figure on the cost of such risks, but it should be obvious that it would be considerable.

Last fall Copper Range was criticized for raising the price charged for our copper. How valid was this criticism? As the discovery, development, metallurgical research and investment in the White Pine mine can be considered typical of a difficult project, I will analyse the cost of the project in relation to present returns.

About 38 years ago—in 1929—the officials of the Copper Range Co. realized that a large deposit of copper ore existed in the vicinity of the little crossroad village of White Pine, in the Upper Peninsula of Michigan. The table which follows shows the timing of the cash investment in land acquisition, exploration drilling, mining for samples of ore large enough to be tested, metallurgical research, engineering, mine development, construction and the development of a trained organization which could bring the property to final profitable production in 1961, and then to the profitability for which the company was criticized in 1966.

White Pine Copper Mine—Cash investment and return

[In millions of dollars]

	Cash flow		
	Cash investment	Cash return from operations	Net annual return
Property purchased: 1929	$0.1		($0.1)
Exploration and development:			
1930–43	.1		(.1)
1944–45	.1		(.1)
1946	.4		(.4)
1947	.4		(.4)
1948	.1		(.1)
1949	.1		(.1)
1950	.2		(.2)
1951	.1		(.1)
Construction period:			
1952	9.6		(9.6)
1953	31.6		(31.6)
1954	18.9		(18.9)
Production started:			
1955	12.5	$9.7	(2.8)
1956	1.8	11.9	10.1
1957	1.7	4.2	2.5
1958	.7	5.2	4.5
1959	1.6	5.2	3.6
1960	2.2	3.6	1.4
Operation reached maturity:			
1961	1.5	6.0	4.5
1962	2.8	7.5	4.7
1963	2.1	8.3	6.2
1964	2.0	9.4	7.4
1965	2.6	13.5	10.9
Total	93.2	84.5	(8.7)

December 31, 1965, was 36 years after purchase, 13 years after start of construction, and 10 years after start of production . . . and yet at this point in time the cash return from operations of $84.5 million was $8.7 million lower than the cash investment. It will require many more years of profitable operations to produce a return on the $93.2 investment that is sufficient to compensate for the long period required to recapture the original investment.

You will notice that the two years of unusually high prices in 1955 and 1956 distort the story, but they prevented the operation from going under before it got properly started. The table also shows a tabulation of cash return from operations. Not shown is what the alternative result might have been had the funds been invested in manufacturing stock which would have appreciated in value during these years. Also not included is the cost of capital invested, represented by the money borrowed from the government, now retired and replaced with funds from banks and insurance companies.

The true investment is not what remains on our books after depreciation, but what was really ventured, taking into account the delay in returns. The table also does not include any allowance to cover the risk factors. It is easy to see that we will have to maintain the present profitability for many years before we will earn a fair return for our stockholders for money they put into the company and the risks they took.

Perhaps White Pine is not a typical case because the nature of the deposit makes it a little more extreme. We will look at the history of two of the most important mines that have been discovered during the same period. These are the Mt. Isa mine in Australia, and the Thompson mine of International Nickel Co. in Canada.

The Mt. Isa orebody was discovered in 1923. However, it was not until 1937—14 years later—and after an investment of $23,549,000, that the first profit was made. Moreover, it was not until 1947—24 years from the time of discovery—and after a total investment of $27,399,000, that the first dividend was paid. The true nature of the deposit was known only recently. At any point in time until 1937, it could have been possible for the property to have been forced to shut down, with a consequent loss of all the monies invested. There were many properties throughout the world to which this happened during this period. Mt. Isa is probably now one of the most profitable mines in the world, but will still need years of its present profits to make up for the many years of deferred returns and the risks taken.

The great Thompson mine of International Nickel, in the Manitoba complex, was discovered in 1955, after nine years and $10 million worth of intensive exploration. Five more years and another $193 million were then required to bring this mine into production in 1961.

I do not have the year-by-year details, such as for White Pine, but this recapitulation should be sufficient to illustrate the time, the vast sums of money, and the risks that make up the economic base of mineral production. Each of these three mines will contribute materially to the economic base of the free world for many years. They are typical of similar expenditures for many other mines. Nobody would take such enormous risks if there were no hope of more than the normal return on invested capital.

If the economy is to survive, such risks must be taken by somebody and their costs absorbed into those charged for the final product. Mining remains an attractive investment if that investment is made intelligently with the application of modern technology in all of its aspects. The demands of society for the products of mines continue to increase and properly operated mining companies will grow with that demand. The future will remain bright if governments will recognize the needs and problems and, from this knowledge, encourage the development of the industry at the rate it must attain to meet industrial demands rather than inhibit society's growth.

In further answer to those who fail to recognize this difficult problem, and still believe that mineral producers make excessive profits, I should like to refer you to the excellent paper presented in 1964 by Evan Just, who was executive head of the Department of Mineral Engineering of Stanford University, entitled "Mining Profits are Inadequate." This was published in the March, 1965 issue of *Mining Congress Journal*. Mr. Just analyses the cash flow rate of return of the fifteen largest industries. Next to the railroads, which are having their own problems under government intervention, mining consistently showed the lowest rate from 1953 to 1963. Some economists argue that the cash flow rate is not a fair measure; yet, it should not be too difficult to visualize the need for far greater rates if the industry is to fulfill its role in society.

I have previously referred in several ways to the technological and other cost factors which are contributing to higher raw material costs. It would leave this discussion incomplete if we did not examine these matters in more detail. It is important that the general implications of the problems, if not the details, be understood by society, if a climate favorable to their solution is to exist.

To begin with exploration, the growing expense of investigation will inevitably create an upward pressure on the cost of ultimate production. In the final analysis, however, the cost of finding a ton of ore has, at least up to now, been a small fraction of that of production. As time goes on and deposits become more difficult and expensive to find and develop, these charges will become greater; they are already a major factor in the domestic oil industry.

The expense of mining is also a major factor in the ultimate cost of minerals produced in major quantities. Mining technology has improved immeasurably in the past few years particularly in the field of large-scale earth moving; hence, the rapid development of open-pit mining and the ability through this medium to extract economically minerals from the lower grade ores. Rock breaking, materials handling, and transportation are the three major elements of mining in the open pits, and to these must be added roof support and ventilation for underground mines. The reduction of costs in mining is therefore a function of improved technology through research and development. All five of these fields are in need of much deeper fundamental research, which should bring improvements.

A vast amount of energy is wasted and roof conditions worsened in breaking rock by the present use of explosives. Fundamental scientific work has been carried on in the past to find less expensive and more efficient means of breaking rock, and the efforts have been accelerated in the past few years, with some encouraging indications.

Loading has seen great advances through mechanized design and size of machines.

There have been few startling developments in recent years in the transportation area, except the increase in size of the units being used. This presents few problems in the open-pit operations, but has its limitations in underground applications, or in areas where access involves questions of terrain and population density. Radical new approaches to transportation systems need to be developed before major improvements in costs can be attained. This requires a considerable amount of research into the fundamentals concerned.

Roof support is a function of rock mechanics, a relatively new science in the mining industry. Only in the last few years have competent men turned their attention to this problem, which is intrinsic in all mining. The better understanding of the forces within the rocks, and the application of this knowledge to mining methods, will lead to lowered costs in ore removal. This will make it possible to work deposits which at the moment seem too difficult to undertake.

There has been very little development in the field of ventilation in recent years, as the principles are fairly well understood. Although ventilation is an important consideration in the cost of underground mining, unless some new theory is advanced there is little that can be done except to reduce the need for it by eliminating air contaminants, such as explosives and vehicle fumes, from the operation.

Each of these spheres suggests important programs for research; and each could be covered in separate lectures. In this context it is sufficient to say that studies directed toward solving the major cost problems in mining are basic to reducing the expense of mineral extraction and the over-all price of raw materials.

The next step in the process is ore beneficiation. There have been few major advances in milling technology since the introduction of the flotation principle. Since then most improvements have consisted of numerous minor changes in grinding and combinations of reagents in the milling circuit. The rapid growth of leaching as a tool for increased recovery is most encouraging, and the pelletization of iron ores has been a major factor in this direction. The automatic control of milling processes through computerization has met with only minor success in relatively simple applications. The adoption of automatic controls is one which perhaps has the greatest potential for improving recovery and costs in the mills in the future.

In some of the metals, the smelting and refining expenses are the lowest part of the over-all costs; in others, such as aluminum, they are the greatest part. Constant attention is being paid to this area and some major advances have been made.

These, then, are some of the most important areas in which the mining industry can contribute to general economics by reducing the cost of raw materials.

The real question is whether or not all of these technological improvements can keep pace with the factors which work in the opposite direction, such as the increasing cost of human resources, land availability, and the protection of the environment. The rapidly increasing population is steadily encroaching on the mining domain. In the past the availability of land in the more highly mineralized parts of the world was no particular problem. Today competing uses for land are becoming more and more urgent. Although mining takes only a small area for its operations, the disfigurement of the land is so obvious as to make the problem appear more serious than it actually is. If all of the mines in the United States were contiguous, they would cover only 1000 square miles, or 2.6% of the total being put aside for the preservation of the wilderness. The fact is that these mines are scattered from Maine to Southern California, and Alaska to Florida. During operations the land surface must be disturbed, creating an eyesore for the short period that the mine exists. It is this factor that leads to outcries from the uninitiated and to actions designed to prevent the mining industry from carrying out its function in society. Yet in almost all cases, these scars will either be healed by nature or by deliberate human effort.

Populations are also taking up more and more of the land surface, thus limiting the areas in which prospectors can operate. This is why the work of the newly established Public Land Law Review Commission in this country is of vital concern to the mining industry and to the public which depends upon mining for its existence. A similar review of mining, regulation, and taxation legislation by other countries is of equal vital importance to them.

INTERNATIONAL ASPECTS OF THE IMPACT OF MINING ON THE GENERAL ECONOMY AND THE POSSIBLE CONSEQUENCES OF GOVERNMENT ACTION

The minerals industry consists of a varied collection of mining organizations located all over the world—each with its own technological, economic, and marketing problems—and for the purposes of this lecture, it includes coal and liquid petroleum. Although each different mineral does present vastly varying characteristics, the basic principles are similar enough to permit a certain amount of generalization.

Virtually all of the great civilizations developed originally around some natural resources. The United States was no exception. Some countries even today are highly dependent upon one or more such resources. It has always been difficult for any society to rise above subsistence levels without the means to provide tools and natural energy to extend the scope of human muscle energy. The discoveries of economic deposits of natural resources have been, and are likely to continue to be, in geographic areas unrelated to nationality. In the past, the uneven distribution has been the cause of international conflict and still remains a major factor in international relations.

Minerals have been, still are, and will always remain an important part of international trade. They are also an important factor in the balance of payments. During recent years, while the United States international balances have been in deficit, the importation of minerals has become an increasing factor in that imbalance. According to the United States Bureau of Mines, in 1947 we imported $440 million worth of minerals, including oil; by 1964 this had risen to $2.16 billion. This increase is primarily the result of an expansion in demand and the steadily escalating cost of mineral production from domestic resources which have become lower grade or deeper in the earth, competing with foreign sources which have been exploited more recently and are now of the richness and depth of those deposits we mined in past years. Until the cream of these new deposits is skimmed off and the producing nations face the same problems of depth and grade as we do, there will continue to be pressure to import the less costly supplies. Yet the domestic production of all minerals continues to rise, from $14.1 billion in 1947 to $20.1 billion in 1964, based on constant 1957–59 dollars.

As other nations become more affluent, the competion for the minerals we now import will become more acute. If we become too dependent upon these outside sources at the expense of the domestic industry, we will face serious problems in rebuilding our internal sources and neglect our essential research activities. In the meantime, the interrelationship of foreign policy to resource development poses difficult problems for the industry and governments involved.

There exists a lack of understanding of the fundamentals of mineral exploration, exploitation, and trade, as well as conflicting interests of governments of the producing and consuming countries. This has led to actions by many governments which have caused serious disruptions to supply and disastrous economic results to individual producing units. These actions have often imposed restrictions on the delicate economic balance within each industry, which will take years to overcome.

Because of disproportionate geographic distribution, most of the higher priced or larger volume mineral commodities are involved in world markets. The complicated technological problems in both production and marketing, together with the long lead time factor between conception of a project and actual production, contribute to a most delicate balance in the market place. To further impose ulterior governmental influences upon that fragile structure, such as general economic controls or national ambitions, is to inhibit the solution of the very problems that tempted government to interfere.

In recent years copper has been the most dramatic example. Most of the troubles in the non-ferrous mining industry in the past 25 years can be traced to inadvisable government policies. Although such national policies seemed advisable at the time, knowledgeable counteraction was unavailable when the condition causing them was removed.

Governments would be well advised to leave complicated economics in the commodity field to those who deal with its intricacies every day. They should turn their efforts toward creating the politico-economic climate in which the commodity industries involved can flourish, for they must thrive everywhere if other economic questions are to be solved.

Should disruptions in the commodity markets cause internal problems, then governments should take steps to find internal solutions, rather than attempt to sway world markets in their favor. The latter inevitably leads only to international friction, for the simple reason that every country has needs, desires, or ambitions which are in conflict with those of other nations. This is the principal reason why international commodity agreements have never met with unqualified success. It is difficult enough for industry to maneuver within the complicated structure of mineral economics, without having imposed upon it unpredictable influences over which it has no control. In the area of international affairs, the attempts by governments to dictate mineral economics have adversely accentuated the effects of minerals on the general economy.

CONCLUSION

As we have discussed, raw materials are the basis for the entire economic process, and this economic process is the foundation for our organized society. These materials are available naturally in excessive quantity, and in general, the workings of the market place have allowed these minerals to be economically produced in sufficient quantity to fill man's needs. Society has, however, often hampered the growth in raw material supply it requires for its own growth.

And, make no mistake, society *must* improve the standard of living throughout the world. The growing desire of all individuals to be lifted out of the debilitating drudgery of sub-subsistence is the fundamental political force throughout the world today. Where this force is not reckoned with, active physical conflict breaks out, with the inevitable disruption of economic balance, resulting in a worsening of the conditions which led to the conflict in the first place. Secretary McNamara illustrated this point by showing that 87% of the nations classified as very poor have suffered at least one insurrection since 1958, compared with 4% of the wealthy nations.

It is apparent that society must provide a climate which will foster the growth of the entire mineral raw material industry if it is to survive the inherent internal human stresses.

You ask what this has to do with SME and its parent, AIME; that they are technical societies dedicated to the sciences and purposely avoid controversy. I answer that we cannot perform our role in society unless we conduct our affairs in the context of our environment. Unless we do so in full consciousness of our responsibilities to society, we are neglecting to make contributions which the privileges we enjoy impose upon us. The daily work of all members of AIME involves the production of the fundamental building blocks of an economic structure.

An effective social structure requires the ultimate of our members and the full utilization of their talents. In research and teaching the influence of those benefiting from these meetings is quite direct. In industry the influence of each individual varies greatly between companies and the communicative abilities of the individual.

In government, the member of AIME faces a challenging task. So few members of the government are knowledgeable with respect to this most important pillar of our economic framework that it is a weak underpinning indeed in the foundation of our society. This makes it incumbent upon all of us to take part in the affairs of the nation, at all levels, and to assist our colleagues in government, in order that poicy determination be soundly constructed.

Down the Rathole

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 29, 1967

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed into the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled, "Down the Rathole," published in the Wall Street Journal of June 27, 1967.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DOWN THE RATHOLE

If there happen to be any cities around which have no rats, surely they will begin to find some now.

For the House Banking and Currency Committee, by the overwhelming vote of 22 to 6, has approved a three-year, $40 million program to eradicate and control rats in urban areas.

In the first fiscal year, beginning July 1, the Government would provide $20 million, and for the next fiscal year an equal amount. Not until the third year would cities be asked to share the cost, paying $2 for every Federal $1.

There is no doubt that in many urban areas, and in slums in particular, the rat population is large. The Department of Housing and Urban Development has, it developed at the committee hearing, a rat expert, Leonard Czarniecki, who puts the nation's rat total at 90 million. Which may be conservative; some exterminators number three rats for every human being.

And it is hard to measure in dollars the damage they cause, or to estimate the disease peril they present. In New York, rat bites among slum children unfortunately are not uncommon.

We seem to remember, though, that some years ago when Richmond, Va., found itself being overrun by rats, the city fathers voted money to hire exterminators, and if they did not rid the city of the rodents they at least succeeded in controlling them.

But that was a long time ago, when municipalities were so naive as to believe that their own rats were their own problem.

It is a new day now. Now, it takes a Federal Government program to kill urban rats, at $6 per head, or so estimates Mr. Czarniecki.

The House, we are sure, is just as concerned about rats as is its committee. But we hope it will take a little harder look at this $40 million rathole to see if, after all, it is not the business of the cities themselves to plug it.

In Vietnam, We May Succeed and Prove Our Country Is Sometimes Capable of Even More Than We Should Dare To Dream

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD J. IRWIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1967

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, recently, Mr. Hedley Donovan, editor in chief of Time, Inc., spoke to the graduating class of New York University. His subject—"On the Possibility of Being Wrong"—struck a new note and an important one, it seems to me, in the way the people of the United States are viewing the war in Vietnam.

I would like to reproduce Mr. Donovan's commencement address in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that my colleagues will have an opportunity to absorb this different point of view about Vietnam.

ON THE POSSIBILITY OF BEING WRONG

(By Hedley Donovan)

History has been moving with dazzling speed in the Middle East these past few days. In Southeast Asia it moves with agonizing slowness, but equally momentously. And history has not exactly been idle in other regions. Britain once more is trying to join Europe; Nigeria, the most populous state of Africa, is tearing itself apart; China's "Cultural Revolution" continues to shake the most populous nation on earth.

I don't know how often it happens that a Trustee of New York University is caught quoting Leon Trotsky with approval, but I will risk it this morning. Trotsky said nobody who longs for a quiet life should be born into the Twentieth Century.

Clearly enough, all of you New York University graduates of 1967 come equipped with good steady nerves.

But I want to talk this morning about quite a different quality which I hope you also possess. If you have this quality, I think you must have learned it from wise parents, or developed it out of your own innate good sense, because I am not sure it is being taught today at any major American university. I am speaking of the ability to be wrong.

You may consider this a peculiarly appropriate subject for a speech by a journalist, and so do I. In our line of work we journalists are given a good many opportunities to be wrong. We have one or two other weaknesses I should mention. We are often too heavily preoccupied with the news of the last ten minutes. We are always flattered, therefore, and sometimes a little intoxicated, by an invitation to speak in some setting where it is permissible, or even customary, to talk in terms of generations, and lifetimes, and the long sweep of history. I shall try not to be carried away by the spaciousness of this occasion.

But I do want to try to look a year or two beoynd today's front pages, to what seems to me to loom up as a difficult and perhaps dangerous moment in the intellectual and political life of the United States. I foresee in this country a kind of crisis of integrity, in which powerful and influential people will have to consider the possibility of saying out loud that they were wrong. Many of them have never tried it before, and it would not come easy to them. But if they cannot bring themselves to it, I think the American intellectual climate and the whole tone of our politics could be embittered for years.

So I am going to ask you this morning to consider the American aftermath of Viet Nam. But I want to go there by way of the Middle East. The Middle East has given us a short vacation from Viet Nam; I think it may also give us fresh perspective on Viet Nam. There are certainly some instructive contracts between the two wars, and there are also significant connections.

I think if we are honest, we must all admit we found last week very exciting. It has been a long time, if ever, since Viet Nam seemed exciting. I think we must admit that we were caught up last week in some very old-fashioned emotions, ignited by a popular war, even a romantic war. It has been a long time, if ever, since there seemed to be anything romantic about Viet Nam. And wasn't it gratifying to be able to follow it all so clearly on sensible old-fashioned war maps—two columns advancing here, three towns captured over there, and so on, a satisfaction we never have (and never will have) in that maddening new-style war in Viet Nam. I suppose if we are honest we also must admit that as we saw those advancing arrows on the maps, our first thoughts did *not* turn instinctively to the casualties that must have been suffered, civilian and military, Israeli and Arab. No, I think we were busy cheering.

So the brilliant Israeli army has among other things given us an interesting glimpse into ourselves, and what we see in there is that we Americans are certainly not a pacifist people, we do not believe the use of military force is immoral *per se*, we are quite prepared to see it used in behalf of a just cause, and in the last analysis it is we ourselves, and other nations whom we think well of, who will be the judges of what is just.

Speaking to this generation of university students, I think that you, if I may say so, are especially indebted to the Israeli army, because you had not had any previous exposure to a popular war. The only war you had known, I mean not from the history books but in your daily life, as readers of the press, viewers of television, voters or voters soon to be, debaters, demonstrators, soldiers and potential soldiers, your only war has been the extremely controversial, complicated, frustrating war in Viet Nam. But now you have had at least a brief experience of another face of war.

I am not suggesting that everyone who admired the operations of the Israeli army last week must now necessarily support the operations of the American forces in Viet Nam. We might well wish that we could see in Viet Nam such surgically exact use of force as the Israelis so masterfully demonstrated. We might also wish that South Viet Nam had the cohesiveness and discipline and national spirit of Israel. We are there, of course, precisely because South Viet Nam does *not* have those things, but might in time develop them, and meanwhile occupies a piece of ground that has become enormously important, geographically, politically, and psychologically.

By the way, General Moshe Dayan, the Israeli Defense Minister, made a tour of the Viet Nam war last year. When he returned to Israel he published some articles supporting the general objectives of the U.S. stand in Viet Nam, criticizing some aspects of the U.S. performance there, praising others. Just this past Sunday, on a C.B.S. program, somebody said to General Dayan wouldn't it be nice if South Viet Nam would fight like Israel, and the General was tactful enough to say that it would also help if the Viet Cong were Arabs.

My own amateur guess is that within the next year—or two years at the most—we will see the shape of the final outcome in Viet Nam, not the last shot but an unmistakable trend. It will begin to come clear that the Viet Nam policy of the Johnson Administration is a failure, or that it is a success. This war is just not going to grind along forever.

I would define any of the following situations as constituting clear failure of the Johnson Administration's Viet Nam policy: Any significant reduction in the percentage of the South Viet Nam population now under control of the Saigon government; or a disruptive new round of coups among the South Vietnamese Generals; or a condition in which the rural pacification and development programs were completely stalled, and very large increases in the American troop commitment—such as a quarter million more men—were being requested. A more advanced stage of failure would be a negotiated American evacuation, in a situation which gave the Viet Cong control of South Viet Nam or put them in a good position to take it over soon. The latter of course is a settlement we could have had at any time with no effort whatever, so if that should be the final result of all our sacrifice, the whole policy would have been a sorry mistake indeed.

Confronted with a failure of the policy in any of these forms, there are several lines of rationalization by which an individual supporter of the policy could avoid saying he himself had actually been wrong. One obvious line would be that the policy was right but it hadn't been prosecuted vigorously enough, that we should have gone all-out to win. Another argument might be that our Viet Nam stand had already brought about certain strategic benefits—that it had helped, for instance, make possible the anti-communist revolution in Indonesia—but now this effort was no longer needed. Other ways of evading an acknowledgment of failure are fairly easy to think up. What is perhaps more difficult to visualize is any important number of politicians, editors, generals, or ordinary citizens stepping up and saying, "I was wrong. I thought the policy would work, but it didn't."

But now consider another possible outcome, that the policy succeeds. I would define success as a situation in which the percentage of Viet Nam population under government control is increasing; political stability in the countryside is improving; enemy troop strength is declining; U.S. and Allied casualties are declining, though guerrilla operations might still continue for quite a time; U.S. troop strength has leveled out; and a schedule can be set up for the first gradual withdrawals of U.S. troops. If that should be the situation sometime within the next year or two, I would say the Administration's Viet Nam policy had been vindicated.

Again, however, there could be many possible ways for opponents of the policy to evade such an admission. One would be to say that such stability as existed had been achieved in spite of the Johnson Administration's policy, that the big U.S. military effort had served to magnify rather than reduce the underlying political and economic problems of Viet Nam. Another argument would be: Yes, we did finally succeed but it just wasn't worth the cost. And still another argument could be that our policy was morally indefensible from the beginning, and therefore any apparent successes for the policy are morally unacceptable.

But I wonder if any Senator, columnist, professor, clergyman, pediatrician might come forward and simply say, "Well, what do you know, I have to admit Lyndon Johnson was right about Viet Nam." It is kind of fun to try to imagine some of these scenes, and I admit there are one or two particular individuals it would be especially interesting to watch in these roles.

But there is a much more serious point involved. Viet Nam has been a bitterly divisive issue in American life for some two and a half years, ever since we began the air attacks on the North and made the first commitment of U.S. ground combat units. Viet Nam will continue to be a highly divisive issue until the Johnson policy has unmistakably failed or succeeded. I think that realization will come not in a single thunderclap some Monday morning, but in an accumulation of evidence over several months.

And when that happens—and I believe it will happen in 1968 or 1969—then surely there is a plenty of other business America should be turning to. But if at that time everyone must still insist he was right about Viet Nam, and no one is willing to admit he was wrong, then I am afraid we are doomed to go on arguing about Viet Nam. This could perpetuate a very sour political and intellectual atmosphere in this country for years to come. It would not be an atmosphere favorable to trust and confidence and purpose in our national life.

Politicians, of course, are notoriously reluctant to admit error. Few of them have ever gone so far as Mayor Fiorello LaGuardia, N.Y.U. Law School, 1910. You remember his famous line—"When I make a mistake, it's a beaut."

The President of the United States at the time of my graduation from college, indeed for more than a decade afterward, was Franklin Roosevelt. There is no instance of President Roosevelt ever publicly acknowledging a mistake.

Harry Truman once went to a seminar at another university of this city—I hope it's all right to mention the name—it was Columbia—and said "On the big things, I was right. And on the little things . . . well, if there's anyone listening here who hasn't ever made a mistake, let him put on his wings and fly the hell out of here." You notice, of course, that President Truman was conceding mistakes only on the occasional little thing, and even this confession did not come until 1959, six years after he had left the White House.

President Kennedy has been credited by some biographers with a particularly generous confession of error after the Bay of Pigs, when he said he would not try "to conceal responsibility . . . because I am the responsible officer of the government." This was a manly but I think entirely obvious statement of a simple constitutional fact. In a great many private and semi-private remarks which got leaked to the press quite rapidly, President Kennedy made it very clear that he felt he had been given very bad advice by the CIA and the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and that his error was in underwriting their error. They in turn have let it be known that they, of course, were right, and that the crucial error was President Kennedy's, because he watered down their plans.

Lyndon Johnson is another President who is not on the record with many acknowledgements of fallibility. He did say at a press conference in February, "From time to time we will make mistakes," and then just last month he said, "We try not to think ourselves in possession of all truths . . ." At first glance these are appealingly humble statements, but then you begin to wonder a little about that "we." It's somewhat ambiguous, perhaps a trifle imperial. Or maybe it's merely the "editorial we."

Coming to the editorial, I would have to say that journalists have never been notoriously eager to acknowledge their mistakes. Many, indeed, have perfected a smooth, effortless way of taking a new position without ever noting that they once held quite the opposite view.

I do know one editor, however, who developed a remarkable facility in confessing error, and he used this to play upon the sympathies of his staff; they felt so sorry for a man who could make so many mistakes that they would do almost anything for him. Indeed one of his colleagues once accused him of practicing "wrongmanship." This is really very rare.

A few weeks ago in New York I attended a ceremony where some of the most prestigious prizes in journalism were being distributed. One of the recipients made a graceful little speech saying, among other things, that reporters in specialized technical fields do from time to time make mistakes. But I thought the particular language chosen by the reporter for this confession was revealing, and so I wrote it down. "No reporter in these fields has totally escaped from being had in some particularly difficult and humiliating way." *Being had*—here you will note that the main burden of error rests not so much on the reporter as on the people he was unlucky enough to listen to. Perhaps a little like the President and the Bay of Pigs.

Maybe journalists and politicians are hopeless cases, though I prefer to think not. But surely everyone would agree that the people who should be first and frankest in admitting error would be the academic intellectuals with their totally disinterested dedication to free inquiry and the pursuit of the truth. If the academy is indeed faithful to the rigorous standards it professes, one might expect to see it lead the way when there are errors to be acknowledged. But the recent record is not reassuring.

It may seem hard to remember now, but only two years ago much of the intellectual community of the United States was in a furor of indignation against Lyndon Johnson's intervention in the Dominican Republic. There were protest meetings, angry letters to the editor, paid ads in the papers with hundreds of professors' names in fine print, and so on. A much louder protest, as a matter of fact, than the President's Viet Nam policy had then begun to draw.

Well, you don't hear much about the Dominican Republic any more. It has not turned into a land of milk and honey, or a nice clean Anglo-Saxon model democracy, and like almost any one of the 131 countries in the world with the exception of the dozen or so richest and most stable, the Dominican Republic could have a revolution tomorrow. But in the meantime, by any reasonable standards for its part of the world, it is getting along pretty well. There is no evidence that President Johnson's intervention did any lasting harm to U.S. relations with Latin America, and in the Dominican Republic itself there is considerable evidence that his intervention did quite a lot of good. But we certainly don't see very many out of the thousands of intellectuals who protested the President's Dominican policy now coming forward by letter, picket line, lecture, editorial, paid ad, or any other of our many available means of free speech to say, "Well, Johnson was right, and I was wrong."

I wonder if it will be this generation of university graduates—your generation—that could perhaps teach Americans how to be wrong. All it takes is courage, honesty, self-respect, grace—and sometimes a sense of humor can help. You might give quite a lesson to some of your elders—politicians, journalists, even some professors and preachers.

I know many students of New York University have felt deeply, and spoken up strongly, on Viet Nam, the issue that has dominated the public life of the United States for half or more of your college years. I as a Trustee of this University am proud that so many of you have taken a stand in this passionate debate.

Some of you will turn out to have been wrong. It is in the way you react to that moment, I suggest, that you will get a chance to take another stand—in behalf of a mature and civilized style of public life in America.

How to be *right* is something of an art, too, and some of you will get a chance to show your skill at that, when the Viet Nam results are finally in. How to be right in ways that make it a little easier for the people who were wrong to decide that they were wrong, and that make it easier for all of us to turn together to a fresh agenda.

You know after a war we Americans do a beautiful job of binding up the wounds of the enemy. Look at Japan and Germany today. After Viet Nam, I think many of the most serious wounds will be internal, right here at home, and some of the most grievous will be in this very deeply divided city of New York.

Looking ahead to that time, we might perhaps begin even now, without in any way restricting the Viet Nam debate, to let a certain measure of modesty and generosity into the dialogue. As to what will or won't work in Viet Nam, we might begin by admitting that we are all to some extent guessing. Nothing is guaranteed. So far as the morality of the policy is concerned, we might do well to credit all parties to the debate with decent motives and a normal sense of human compassion. We might also try, even as we go on arguing, to reawaken some sense among us of community. As Americans we have come a long way together; our history, when you get right down to it, really reads pretty well.

I was in Viet Nam last month, and one day in Saigon I met a New York University alumnus named Hoang Nang Oanh. He took a Master's degree here in Comparative Jurisprudence, Class of 1964. He is now a Third Lieutenant—they have such a thing—in the South Vietnamese army. In the course of our conversation, he said to me, "You know it is only two days from Saigon to Washington, but it is also 200 years."

The incredibly audacious thing that Third Lieutenant Oanh—and a few million other people in South Viet Nam—and we Americans—are trying to do, is to defend not so much a nation as the possibility that South Viet Nam can become a nation. It's a very tough proposition. We may fail. If so I hope that I, as one who has supported the policy, will be prompt to admit that we had attempted something beyond our powers. But you know, we may just succeed. And if that happens, I hope that the many thoughtful and dedicated Americans who have opposed the policy will be glad to acknowledge that their country is sometimes capable of even more than we should dare to dream.

Kosygin's Duplicitous Hoax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 29, 1967

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial published in the Nashville Banner, Monday, June 26, 1967, entitled "Kosygin's Duplicitous Hoax."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LOST WEEKEND: KOSYGIN'S DUPLICITOUS HOAX

One needn't go back to Kipling's day for substantive warning to beware of "The Truce Of The Bear." It unfolded last night in the climax of a Lost Weekend. The Soviet Prime Minister, Alexei Kosygin—having made gestures of peaceful overture, ascending a mountain to view the Promised Land—turned at the crest to detonate and scuttle the very hope he had helped fabricate.

In an hour and a half of policy summation, he made it clear that the Kremlin had altered not a single position—nor retreated an inch from its course of bluff, bluster and blackmail, to affront the United States and coerce the Free World into total surrender.

Let none misread this threat by resort to wishful thinking. He moved agreement no closer by his pronouncements in the tone of ultimatum—bearing on both the Middle East and Vietnam. His were words of a studied contempt, and of unconcealed malice—unchanged by the hospitality that had been accorded him. The Glassboro conferences were behind him. In the setting of an international forum, and as doctrinaire obstructionist, he was back at the same old stand, Master of Deceit, doing what came naturally.

No phase of his billingsgate bore a heavier touch of personal insult than the conditions he attached to any prospective visit of President Johnson in Russia. The Chief Executive would be welcome there, he said, only if the United States withdraws from Vietnam, and sides with the Soviet and Arab countries against Israel. The "bridges" Mr. Johnson has been striving to build for amity toward East Europe (the Communist bloc) evidently are construed as for one-way passage only.

Whatever hopes Kosygin dashed in this vulgarian performance as a final curtain call were ephemeral and groundless in the first place; and few with a working knowledge of the Kremlin operation entertained any expectation of solid accomplishment through this round of official tete-a-tete.

Let America's answers be no less clear concerning its policy position—and solid stand—on the principles thus brought into challenge again by the top voice of the world's blackmail bloc. No enduring peace can be brought by surrender of honor and justice in the Middle East—nor in Vietnam, where American sons still are dying for national and Free World security against this identical chief conspirator, meaning Russia no less than Red China.

Far more than a half century ago, the prophetic Kipling poem detected and phrased it—and our diplomatic staff could well remember as developments fulfill it:

"When he stands up like a tired man, tottering near and near;
When he stands up as pleading, in wavering, man-brute guise,
When he veils the hate and cunning of his little swinish eyes;
When he shows as seeking quarter, with paws like hands in prayer,
That is the time of peril—the time of the Truce of the Bear!"

How Nasser Used Poison Gas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1967

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, recently there were reports that Egypt, in violation of international law and the Geneva Convention, and as an affront to all humanity, used poison gas against the people of Yemen. Documents of the International Red Cross published in the July 3, 1967, issue of the U.S. News & World Report confirm that General Nasser did, in fact, permit this dastardly deed. The disgust aroused by the use of poison gas strikes deeply. That Egypt would resort to such inhumane tactics is shocking in the middle of the 20th century.

Words alone cannot express the deep revulsion Egypt's conduct on the international arena causes me. Let me only say that if this is what men are made of, mankind's future is dim.

Under leave to extend my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the report from the U.S. News & World Report:

HOW NASSER USED POISON GAS

(NOTE.—Published below, for the first time, is the proof that Egypt used poison gas in its war against Yemen. The proof is in these secret documents of the International Red Cross. The full text has not appeared before in English.)

GENEVA.—The undersigned doctors, members of the International Committee of the Red Cross medical mission to the Yemen, arrived at Gahar [North Yemen] in the Wadi Herran, on May 15, 1967, following an appeal for assistance from the inhabitants who claimed to have been under gas attack by airplanes on the morning of May 10, 1967.

The following statements was made by the inhabitants who witnessed the incident:

1. Seventy-five persons died of poison gas shortly after the raid.

They showed the following symptoms: shortness of breath, coughing, pink foam at the mouth, general edema, especially the face; no physical injuries.

2. The undersigned doctors examined the four surviving victims and observed the following:

Subjective symptoms: burning eyes and trachea, internal thorax pain, extreme fatigue, anorexia.

Objective symptoms: dry cough, negative auscultation in two patients, signs of bronchitis in the other two, conjuctivitis, facial edema, no truamatic lesions, tympanum intact.

3. The undersigned doctors examined a corpse, four days after death and 12 hours after burial.

Immediately, the common grave was opened, and, well before the corpses—which were only wrapped in shrouds, without coffins—were visible, there was a sweet penetrating smell not unlike garlic. The bodies showed no traumatic lesions. The skin was pink. Advanced and general edema all over the body.

Examination of lungs: reddish-brown throughout, enlargement, consistence and fragility greatly increased, crepitation considerably reduced.

The undersigned doctors draw the following logical conclusions from their findings:

I. None of the victims examined, whether survivors or corpses exhumed from the common grave, showed any traumatic lesions.

II. The statements made by witnesses who escaped from the raid unharmed, in respect of the circumstances in which 75 inhabitants were killed, are consistent with the International Committee of the Red Cross medical mission's own findings by examination of the four survivors and the corpse exhumed from one of the common graves.

III. The cause of death in the case of the corpse examined was pulmonary edema. The over-all consistency of the ICRC medical mission's findings shows that in all probability this pulmonary edema was caused by inhalation of toxic gas.

RAYMOND JANIN,
ICRC Doctor-Delegate.
WILLY BRUTSCHIN,
ICRC Doctor-Delegate.

Signed at town Najran, May 18, 1967.

Here is the forensic medical report by the University of Bern Institute of Forensic Medicine:

DEAR SIRS—

In accordance with your instructions of May 21, 1967, we have duly examined the report drawn up by two doctors of the International Committee of the Red Cross on observations made by them after the bombing of a village in the Yemen. Their investigations can be summarized in the following manner.

1. Information collected from the survivors in that village regarding the death of 75 persons.

2. Medical examination of four survivors.

3. Examination of a corpse four days after death and 12 hours after burial.

The phenomena observed are the effects of skin irritation, conjunctivitis and of mucus in the respiratory tract and lungs. General edema had been noted, especially facial and also haemorrhagic pulmonary edema. On autopsy, red hepitization and a liquod of reddish scrapings were observed in the lungs.

The observations collected are gradually diversified and unspecific, but form a definite entity as a whole.

We know of no epidemical disease presenting a similar symptomatology or clinical development. The conclusion, according to which the death of the deceased persons as a result of bombing is ascribed to a toxic gas, seems to us to be perfectly justified. This conclusion is supported by the total absence of traumatic lesions caused by the effects of pressure—explosion.

Amongst the various poison gases which can produce the effects observed, phosphonic esters—nervine gas—would not, in our opinion, be involved, in view of the local irritations observed. Their effects would, moreover, have been characterized by copious salivation, myositis and muscular cramp.

On the other hand, the employment of halogenous derivatives—phosgene, mustard gas, lewisite, chloride or cyanogen bromide, or Clark I and II, etc.—would appear to us the most likely. However, neither bromide nor cyanogen chloride causes an edemic irritation of the skin. This also applies to phosgene.

As against this, all the symptoms observed are explainable by the hypothesis of the use of mustard gas, lewisite or similar substances. The odor resembling garlis, smelled on opening the common grave, would indicate the employment rather of mustard gas. These toxic substances are pulverized when the bomb explodes in the form of aerosol.

Yours sincerely,

PROF. D. E. LAUPPI,
Director of the Institute.

Hail "Glassboro State"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DURWARD G. HALL
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 29, 1967

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, herewith is an editorial from the perceptive and sharp pen of Mr. Bob Lowry, publisher of the Aurora Advertiser, June 24, 1967 in Aurora, Mo. It deals in all expertise with the Midwestern heartfelt appreciation of fellow citizens in Glassboro, N.J., and their attitude during the recent so-called summit meetings. The importance is not in the meetings which perhaps came to naught, but in the attitude of the American people. This is representative of the true outlook of over 95 percent of our informed and prudent public which recognize a real contribution with "service above self," by one community to the Nation.

We join in the salute to Glassboro.

HAIL GLASSBORO STATE

Raise a glass to the new star in the educational firmament! Hail Glassboro State!

When the little town of Glassboro, N.J. was named as the meeting place of Russia's Prime Minister Alexi Kosygin and America's President Lyndon Johnson and the campus of the college as the actual site, the students of Glassboro State, as students these days do when something unusual is about to take place, prepared placards for a demonstration. Glassboro, it was determined, was not about to be tested and found wanting.

But these were different placards. They read "Glassboro State College Loves America" and "GSC Loves USA", and when the television cameras of the world focused upon the little campus for the very first time there they were, unprofessionally lettered, to be sure, but clear, distinct and readable.

What a wonderful thing it was for old-fashioned Americans fed up to the gills with the slander, untruths and treason upon the placards carried by students at Berkeley and those of other institutions who ape it to see on TV! Think of it, a college whose students actually love the land of their birth and are wise enough to recognize the only chance the student body of Glassboro State is ever likely to have to send that message to the rest of the country! Maybe, just maybe, there is still good in higher education worth the tremendous burden it is upon taxpayers and parents. If so, Glassboro State seems to possess it in great measure.

Yes, we for one, have a soft-spot in our heart for Glassboro State, a college we didn't know existed before this week. And we think the same thing must be true in many, many hearts across this land of ours which Glassboro and a lot of others still love.

We do not know whether Glassboro State has a football team or not. We suppose it does. We know that we can be counted among the rooters for Glassboro this fall, and we will be reading down toward the bottom of the game lists come September Sunday mornings to see how one of our favorite schools came out.

We think the rest of the country and the world owe an expression of appreciation not only to Glassboro State, but to the people of that small town which found itself so suddenly smack in the center of the world's spotlight. Glassboro came through with flying colors, in a hurry, without much time to get ready.

Out came flags, up went banners welcoming the representatives of two great powers. And as they arrived, the people of Glassboro cheered and waved their hands, engulfing the two statesmen in an atmosphere so friendly, so free from hate, it was bound to have an effect upon the meeting which followed, for good-will, like hate, is infectious.

Who knows just how much has been contributed to history by the people of Glassboro? After all, it seemed pretty clear that neither Premier Kosygin or President Johnson was particularly anxious for a meeting they expected could bear little, if any, fruit and which would be, it seemed, merely a formality.

If Glassboro's outpouring of hope and friendliness created an atmosphere which helped make what was to be merely an empty gesture a real discussion of the problems of the world which set the stage for a second one which we may now hope will be fruitful, then Glassboro may well have made the most important contribution to world peace by any small town this century.

Over and beyond international considerations, however, Glassboro, we believe, has also made another contribution. Its performance on the nation's TV screens has reminded us that there are really two Americas.

It has demonstrated by its hospitality, friendliness, good manners and tolerance that behind the ill-will, turmoil, violence and intolerance so often pictured in the cities and on the famous campuses of the land there is hidden the real America, the America which in an amazingly short time has built itself from a handful of wilderness outposts into a land which is the wonder of the world. And it is that America which stands fore-square for the truths upon which this nation was founded and in which it has always persisted when the chips are really down.

And for showing this on the behalf of all of us, to Glassboro we say "well done."

Dodd Case: The End or Just the Beginning?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. RARICK
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 29, 1967

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the editor of the Baton Rouge Morning Advocate feels that the Dodd and Powell excursions should not now end but continue into the realm of Earl Warren's donations and gifts.

It would be interesting, wouldn't it? But Drew Pearson will not get into Mr. Warren's finances and staff because they have been known to be fellow junketeers.

Mr. Speaker, I insert the editorial from the Baton Rouge, La., Morning Advocate of June 25, 1967, at this point in the RECORD:

SOME ADDITIONAL SOUL SEARCHING

What with all the soul searching as related to the financial affairs of Sen. Tom Dodd and the sordid tale of Adam Clayton Powell, maybe some further excursions in such self-examination are in order in the field of fiscal morality.

Purely public funds are involved in the matter in mind, not gifts or contributions from private sources.

Chief Justice Earl Warren and Mrs. Warren drew $948 from the State Department recently for a 13-day trek to Peru, Colombia and Bolivia in the roles of "United States specialists," whatever that expression may mean. Mrs. Warren was rated as a "welfare service volunteer," which entitled her to $362.

Mr. Justice Warren, who is paid $40,000 a year for some highly original interpretations of what the Constitution says, perhaps ought to have a few fringe benefits—such as this trip. He has made ample contribution to this kind of thinking, this kind that prevails among the Wizards of Washington.

Then there was Ralph McGill, the Atlanta publisher-editor who has recognition in many quarters as a pundit of distinction. He was a "United States specialist" who drew $5,918 for "lectures on journalism" in Ghana, Kenya, Tanzania, Zambia and South Africa.

There also were the coach and two track stars from Tennessee, who participated in track "clinics" and demonstrated the American skills of running around a track and jumping over little, wooden fences in Kenya, Malawi and Ethiopia. Their take was a total of $8,223.

Whether these and similar enterprises are worth what they cost the taxpayer is judged best by that same taxpayer.

Congressman Shriver Announces 1967 Kansas Fourth District Opinion Poll Results

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 29, 1967

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, it has been my practice since coming to Congress to send to my constituents in the Fourth Congressional District of Kansas a questionnaire on important issues facing the Nation on the foreign and domestic fronts.

This year my 1967 opinion poll was sent to approximately 100,000 households in the seven counties of the Kansas Fourth District. This was done with the assistance of interested volunteers throughout the district who aided me in addressing envelopes from telephone directories. I am pleased to report that approximately 18,100 questionnaires have been returned and tabulations on these are complete. This is an excellent response. It represents the keen interest and concern which citizens of my district have regarding Government and legislative matters facing the Congress.

For the first time this year husbands and wives in the household had an opportunity to express their individual views on the issues. I was pleased to receive additional comments and personal opinions on many of the questions from my constituents.

Mr. Speaker, I am again placing the tabulations which have been made on the questionnaire in the RECORD in order that Members of Congress and the President may be apprised of the opinions of citizens in the Kansas Fourth Congressional District on the issues included in the poll. Under the leave extended, I also include a few of the comments which accompanied the ballots.

Tabulation of 1967 opinion poll in 4th Congressional District of Kansas

[In percent]

	His	Her
1. Do you favor combining the Departments of Commerce and Labor into a single Department of Business and Labor?		
Yes	40.9	40.6
No	48.1	32.0
No opinion	11.0	27.4
2. Do you favor increasing social security benefits providing it does not require an increase in the social security payroll tax?		
Yes	64.5	65.5
No	31.4	30.3
No opinion	4.1	4.2
3. Do you favor an increase in social security benefits which would require an increase in the social security payroll tax?		
Yes	20.6	19.2
No	76.4	77.1
No opinion	3.0	3.7
4. The present draft law expires June 30, 1967. Do you feel that the selective service law as it now operates is fair to all citizens?		
Yes	24.7	22.4
No	66.6	67.4
No opinion	8.7	10.2
5. Would you favor Federal legislation to regulate the sale of firearms?		
Yes	37.4	48.5
No	60.5	46.7
No opinion	2.1	4.8
6. The administration has pledged to follow "a sensible course of fiscal and budgetary policy." To achieve such objectives, do you favor:		
a. A 6 percent surcharge on individual and corporate income taxes as requested by the President?		
Yes	17.6	15.1
No	76.7	73.3
No opinion	5.7	11.6
b. Postponing and/or reducing certain domestic spending programs until the Vietnam war is ended?		
Yes	88.2	86.3
No	9.4	10.3
No opinion	2.6	3.4
c. Imposing wage and price controls?		
Yes	24.2	26.7
No	71.2	65.7
No opinion	4.6	7.6
7. Do you favor expansion of East-West trade between the United States and the Soviet Union and other Communist countries in Eastern Europe?		
Yes	41.0	39.3
No	51.4	47.7
No opinion	7.6	13.0
8. Do you favor limiting foreign imports of certain agricultural products such as meat and dairy products?		
Yes	70.3	72.9
No	24.1	20.0
No opinion	5.6	7.1
9. Would you favor lowering the voting age from 21 to 18?		
Yes	36.2	34.1
No	61.8	63.4
No opinion	2.0	2.7
10. Do you favor enactment of Federal legislation prohibiting restrictions on the sale or rental of housing on the basis of race, color, or creed?		
Yes	21.8	22.6
No	72.1	71.1
No opinion	6.1	6.3

VIETNAM

President Johnson in his State of the Union Message on January 10, 1967 stated:

"We have chosen to fight a limited war in Vietnam in an attempt to prevent a larger war . . ."—"I wish I could report to you that the conflict is almost over. This I cannot do. We face more cost, more loss, more agony. For the end is not yet. . ."

Which of the following courses of action do you favor most?

[In percent]

	His	Her
1. Withdrawal of U.S. forces	10.3	13.5
2. Continue our present course	1.4	5.1
3. Increase ground, air, and naval forces sufficient to insure complete control of South Vietnam in the shortest possible time	65.7	56.6
4. Cessation of bombing in North Vietnam	2.6	2.1
5. No increase in ground forces, but increased use of air and sea power against North Vietnam and supply routes to the south	20.0	22.7

ON VIETNAM

"I would like to state that I am for either getting in and win the war in Vietnam or get out. . ."

"As to the Vietnam conflict (not war), all I know is what I read and hear, but with that information, we are supposed to be such a strong nation, and yet we can't win over a small country like N. Vietnam. We are losing more men and planes all the time and I am personally in favor of either showing them we mean business, or if we don't get Vietnam's 100% support, get out and bring our men home."

"In regard to the war, I wish I knew the answer."

"President Johnson has much information that we do not. He is doing the best he knows how—in an impossible situation. He has my sympathy."

"We are most sad about the Viet Nam war, just can't see how it is a just war."

ON SOCIAL SECURITY

"I feel that with the spiral of cost of living raises that Social Security payments need a boost."

"Frankly I'm unequivocably opposed to any increase in the social security tax ever! Had I had my way in the beginning any Social Security program would have been strictly voluntary."

"Inflation has adversely affected effectiveness of Social Security payments to senior citizens, consequently an increase in monthly Social Security payments would be helpful."

ON THE DRAFT

"There is no such thing as a fair draft law. To be fair would mean to draft every eligible male into the service and we all know this doesn't happen and would not happen under any draft law. It would be chaos if it did."

"I feel if everyone's son had to serve by the time he was 22, there would be other ways to settle difference."

"I just wish to say how frightful I think it is to pick on 19-year-olds, and by lottery at that! It's not much of a graduation present . . ."

ON SPENDING

"I want you to know that I am a very irate and disgusted taxpayer because of all the spending of the government. The domestic programs must be curtailed war or no war. This 'Great Society is ridiculous.'"

"Along the money line . . . just think what would happen to the families if they had the same spending policies that are presently employed by our government. . . . Our government is just one big family and it should govern its expenditures like the little family has to."

ON AGRICULTURAL IMPORTS

"I feel that our foreign imports of not only agricultural products but other items such as metals, petroleum and numerous other finished products have been much too high and that we should do everything possible to bring into balance our export-import program."

"The farmers of this country labor long and hard to keep ahead of problems caused by nature, i.e. drought and floods. Why, they make less per hour than most city dwellers. We don't import foreign labor to compete with our labor. If we are to import foreign food clearly label where they are grown and by whom they were packed. The cost off the grocer's shelf should equal the amount of the American grown product."

OTHER TOPICS

"Personally, I sometimes feel that our constitution has been kicked around considerably in the last 30 or 35 years."

President's Rat Extermination Act Advances

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. BARRETT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1967

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, last week the Committee on Banking and Currency ordered reported H.R. 11000, the Rat Extermination Act of 1967. This is one of the most humane pieces of legislation that has ever come out of our committee, and it is aimed at a problem that must weigh on everyone's conscience.

In his message on urban and rural poverty, the President stated:

> The knowledge that many children in the world's most affluent nation are attacked, maimed, and even killed by rats should fill every American with shame. Yet this is an everyday occurrence in the slums of our cities.

I share the President's deep concern, and I was most pleased to see our committee approve H.R. 11000 embodying the President's recommendations by a vote of nearly 4 to 1.

The program which H.R. 11000 would authorize will supplement our present efforts in training, education, and research on the problem of rat extermination and control by providing grant assistance to cities to carry out local programs. In fact, this program will be the principal form of federally aided direct action to eliminate rats from the slums in our cities and towns. The bill authorizes the appropriation of $20 million in each of the fiscal years 1968 and 1969 to make grants to local governments to cover two-thirds of the cost of exterminating rats and then providing continuing control through such measures as eliminating their food supply through better refuse collection and better waste storage.

Mr. Speaker, it seems almost incredible that we have delayed so long in concentrating our efforts on this serious problem. The threat to health and the damage to property and the human fear these rodents cause must be removed. There is no excuse for this national disgrace in our supposedly wealthy society. Thousands of rate-bite cases are reported every year and most of the victims are infants or small children. H.R. 11000 should reach the floor of the House very shortly after the Independence Day recess, and I hope that it will receive the same overwhelming support here that it did in committee.

President Johnson's Choice of Thurgood Marshall for the Supreme Court—An Appointment for All Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1967

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, in choosing Thurgood Marshall for the highest court of our land, President Johnson has made an appointment for all Americans.

It is a choice which is receiving widespread support in newspapers the length and breadth of the country.

Why has this appointment elicited such praise?

It is not soley because Thurgood Marshall is the first Negro ever appointed to the Supreme Court, but because his life demonstrates that a man of talent, from whatever station in American society, can rise to eminence in the affairs of this nation.

This nomination is the culmination of a life of dedication to the American law.

It is the culmination of a life dedicated to equal justice and equal rights.

It is an appointment which demonstrates the vitality of American opportunity.

And it took place because we have a President who not only believes in equal rights, but recognizes the talents and dedication of those who have too long been excluded from the benefits of American society.

President Johnson deserves the highest praise for his choice of Mr. Marshall. It strengthens the Court. It strengthens our own faith in American opportunity. It strengthens the Nation.

I take pleasure in inserting into the RECORD an editorial from the Plain Dealer strongly endorsing President Johnson's choice of Thurgood Marshall:

[From the (Cleveland) Plain Dealer, June 14, 1967]

GOOD MAN FOR SUPREME COURT

Had the Negro chosen by President Johnson to be the first of his race to sit on the Supreme Court been any other than Thurgood Marshall the charge might have been made that the choice was politically motivated.

In the case of Marshall such a charge cannot be sustained.

Marshall is a man of the broadest legal experience, much of it gained in arguing cases before the court to which he has now been appointed.

The most important of the 52 cases in which he has appeared there was the school desgregation decision of 1954. At the time he was chief legal officer for the NAACP.

In national legal circles Marshall enjoys impressive stature. In addition to his 23-years career with the NAACP he served three years of what was to have been a life time appointment as a judge of the U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals handling cases from New York, Connecticut and Vermont.

At the urging of President Johnson he resigned to become solicitor general.

He argued cases before federal courts at every level after graduating first in his class at Howard University Law School in Washington in 1933.

Marshall will succeed retiring Justice Tom C. Clark, who decided to step down when his son Ramsey became attorney general.

Marshall happens to be a Negro. His knowledge of the law and of court procedures is no accident. He is qualified by experience and training to be a credit to the high court and to enhance the splended reputation he already enjoys as one of the nation's finest legal minds.

The Quality of Graduate Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1967

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, everyone of us here knows the increasing need for a well-educated society, as evidenced by the fact that our Government is spending more and more money for educational purposes than ever before. This idea of higher education is rapidly finding its target also as enrollment in our educational institutions is climbing to new heights.

But we must not overlook the quality of education being provided for our fellow Americans. In Texas, we have always taken great pride in our educational institutions and today, the field of advanced education is one of the finest. This fact was borne out of a report prepared by Dr. H. W. Magoun, dean of the graduate division at the University of California at Los Angeles, which report points out the clear recognition of the University of Texas in the graduate field. I will not attempt to offer the report in its entirety. I would, however, like to offer a brief summary of its text for the Record:

The Carter Report on Quality in Graduate Education

(By H. W. Magoun)

The Cartter Report, *An Assessment of Quality in Graduate Education*, a detailed evaluation of the quality of graduate faculty and attractiveness of graduate programs at more than a hundred institutions throughout the U.S., brings up to date (1964) and provides comparisons with earlier assessments of graduate programs. Considerably more extensive than its predecessors, the heart of the Cartter Report consists of departmental ratings in almost thirty academic disciplines, ranging through the fields of graduate specialization from classics to mechanical engineering.

The comprehensive standings of the top twenty-five institutions (Group A) show groupings into upper, middle and lower classes. Within the middle group, as in the proverbial social middle class, upper-middle and lower-middle sub-clusters are differentiated.

In engineering, M.I.T. and U.C. at Berkeley led the top twenty-five schools. An increase in the Group A graduate schools of engineering has been noted from 1925's list of nineteen schools to twenty-five schools, the most recent change being the addition of five schools in 1964. This points to the continuing improvement of quality in graduate education in a number of the country's universities. Among this top group is the University of Texas Department of Engineering.

The late Dr. Lloyd Berkner, president of the Graduate Research Center of the Southwest, has remarked that—

"with essentially our whole population flooding to the hundred or more metropolitan areas. . . . it seems clear that our economic and social health will require in each metropolitan area at least one great university."

In the Southwestern U.S., there is the University of Texas. One of the largest in the Southwest, the University of Texas ranks in the top twenty-five institutions for graduate studies in Letters and Sciences, Humanities, Social Sciences, Life Sciences and Physical Sciences, or in other words, every category represented in the Cartter Report.

Texas' Department of Engineering is rated fifteenth among the top twenty-five schools, those comprising Group A, as its excellence of both program and faculty was recognized by the Cartter Report in 1964.

As a matter of fact, the University of Texas' Department of Engineering in 1964 was the ONLY top-rated school between the northeast "Golden Triangle" (led by M.I.T.) and the West Coast (led by U.C. at Berkeley).

Since that time, graduate enrollment in the Department of Engineering at Texas has gone up almost 35%, and this year (1966) the number of degrees granted will almost double those of 1964.

In a major policy statement of President Johnson's in September, 1965, he emphasized the necessity to "find excellence and build it up wherever it is found so that creative centers of excellence may grow in every part of the Nation."

Rural Change Difficult, Too

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1967

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, it is bad enough to have one's own rural mailbox destroyed and vandalized, as has happened to me many times on Route No. 12, Hall's Half Acre, Springfield, Mo., in the past few years. Perhaps this type of vandalism cannot be blamed on the Post Office Department, but the Post Office Department can exercise better administration on assigning rural mailbox "numbers," than is presently the case. It is bad enough to try to remember one's street number, telephone number, social security number, ZIP code number, armed services number, office phone number, insurance policy number, license plate number, office ZIP code number, bank account number, and so forth, without having to keep up with constant changes in rural mailbox numbers. As a further comment on this situation, I invite my colleagues' attention to the following editorial from the Springfield, Mo., Daily News of June 26, 1967, entitled "Rural Change Difficult, Too."

Rural Change Difficult, Too

A man who gets his mail by rural delivery has written a letter to Postmaster General Lawrence F. O'Brien, and is hoping the Post Office Department knows how to reach O'Brien, since this rural mail patron, as the Post Office Department has nicknamed him, is real anxious for O'Brien to get the letter, which goes as follows:

Dear Mr. O'Brien: Knowing of your desire to improve the postal service and enhance the image of the U.S. Post Office Department, and confident therefore that you have your finger on major changes in the service, I am assuming you are aware that the post office in my town has changed my rural mailbox number from 308 to 558.

As you also probably know, my wife and I did not request this change, since we were happy with the old number, which we had grown to know by heart.

We are, in fact, somewhat perplexed by the change, since we are still living in the same rural house in the same rural location and using the same rural mailbox that used to be known as No. 308.

We do, however, appreciate your thoughtfulness and generosity in giving us all those little cards to fill in and mail out so friends, relatives, admirers, creditors, stores, newspapers, magazines, book-of-everything clubs, mail order outfits, and others from whom we hopefully or fearfully expect to get mail, may know of this change that has come into our lives.

(When you live rurally, Mr. Postmaster General, a thing like this is a pretty big deal.)

But in the upper righthand corner of each of these little cards—which we are spending quite a lot of time filling out, one after another—is a little square, as you also may know. And in this little square is a message which says "Affix firstclass postage here."

Now, at the risk of appearing businesslike if not downright scroungy, we just have to ask, Mr. Postmaster General, if you think it's reasonable, fair or sporting to handle it this way?

We have read in the paper (the daily paper which will eventually be mailed to Box 558 once the circulation department gets the notice by first-class postage paid by us) that in the fiscal year of 1966 the U.S. Post Office Department was allocated a budget of $874,158,768.

Frankly, Mr. O'Brien (and confidentially, of course), this is more than our household budget for not only that fiscal year, but for this fiscal year. And since we actually have no part in bringing about this situation, we'd like to appeal to your sense of fair play and make you a proposition:

We'll contribute our time and effort in filling out all these little cards if you'll use your influence to persuade the Post Office Department to carry them free for us.

We are encouraged to propose this because we have also read in the paper that the government on occasion was willing to bend a little to enhance its public image as a nation that is never too big or busy to help a citizen.

Believe me, Mr. Postmaster General, this would really enhance—well, at least improve—the Post Office's image with us. What do you say?

Anxiously yours,

Rural Box Patron No. 558.

P.S.—558, you understand, is our new number. The old number that we knew by heart was 308. Please be sure to use the new and correct number, as it seems to take quite a while to get our mail out here, with any number.

The 1.3 Million Causes of Tension

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1967

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial published by Life magazine on June 23, 1967, which presents some very thought-provoking ideas concerning the plight of Arab refugees in the Middle East and possible long-range solutions of this social and humanitarian problem.

The editorial follows:

THE 1.3 MILLION CAUSES OF TENSION

The 20th Century's excellence—and its horrid defects—find some of their most vivid monuments in the hate-filled camps of Arab refugees. The refugees have been supported by the voluntary U.N. contribution of some 75 governments, not to mention the Inner Wheel Club of Hobart, Australia, the Boy Scout Union of Finland, the Women's Club of Nes, Iceland, the Girls High School of Burton-on-Trent, England, and (for some reason) a number of automobile companies including Chrysler, Ford, G.M., and Volkswagen.

The philanthropy, governmental and private, that has aided these displaced Arabs is genuine—and admirable. The stupidity and political selfishness that has perpetuated the problem is appalling.

Down the ages, there have been thousands of episodes in which whole peoples fled their homes. Most were assimilated in the lands to which they fled. Brutally or beneficently, previous refugee groups were liquidated. Not until our time has there been the money, the philanthropy, the administrative skill, the hygienic know-how, and the peculiar kind of nationalism which, in combination, could take a wave of refugees and freeze it into a permanent and festering institution.

In the wake of Israeli victories, the refugee camps received thousands of new recruits, and there may be more if, as seems likely, Israel successfully insists on some enlargement of its boundaries. Thus the refugee problem, one of the main causes of Middle East instability, is about to be magnified.

The early Zionists, looking toward a binational state, never thought they would, could or should replace the Arabs in Palestine. When terrorism and fighting mounted in 1947–48, Arab leaders urged the Palestinian Arabs to flee, promising that the country would soon be liberated. Israelis tried to induce the Arabs to stay. For this reason, the Israelis do not now accept responsibility for the Arab exodus. Often quoted is the statement of a Palestinian Arab writer that the Arab leaders "told us: 'Get out so that we can get in.' We got out but they did not get in."

After the Israeli victory, Arab leaders outside of Palestine reversed their policy and demanded that all the refugees be readmitted to Israel. Israel reversed its policy, refused to repatriate large numbers of Arabs on the ground they would endanger the state. Arab leaders do not disagree on that point. Nasser, for instance, has said, "If Arabs return to Israel, Israel will cease to exist."

Now 1.3 million Arabs, not counting the recent influx, are listed as refugees. The United Nations Relief and Works Agency (UNRWA) has an international staff of about a hundred and spends nearly $40 million a year, 60% of it from the U.S. government. UNRWA services are performed by 11,500 Arab employes, most of them refugees. Obviously, this group has an interest in not solving the refugee problem.

So have the host governments. Consistently they have refused to go along with any plan or policy for the resettlement or assimilation of the refugees, preferring to use them politically. In 1955 the Arab League scuttled a Jordan valley development project precisely because it would have reduced, perhaps by 250,000, the number of Arab refugees.

It's about time this dangerous deadlock ended. The inevitable reshuffle of the Middle East ought to include a plan to phase out the refugee problem in five or 10 years. Israel, to show goodwill, should repatriate a few thousand refugees a year. All of the 1.3 million could be absorbed in under-populated Iran and Syria, provided their governments would cooperate in internationally supported development projects. Persuading Arab governments to adopt a policy of resettlement should be central to U.S. policy, and it would be worth putting up quite a lot of A.I.D. money to get the job done.

Richard P. Winder, Winner of the National Jaycees Speak Up Contest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SHERMAN LLOYD

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1967

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, I take pride in paying respects to an outstanding young man from the Second Congressional District of Utah, Mr. Richard P. Winder, who today was named the national winner of the Jaycees Speak Up contest, sponsored by this great American organization representing 300,000 young men across the country.

Through personal experience, I am aware of Mr. Winder's devotion to America and to a free and strong society. He is a man of deep religious faith, and his desire to serve his country and his fellow men is genuine and sincere.

He will give his speech in Baltimore today before 13,000 Jaycees who are attending their annual convention. Mr. Winder's speech follows:

SERVICE TO HUMANITY IS THE BEST WORK OF LIFE

(The sixth line of the Jaycee Creed)

Every citizen of this great land of ours has the opportunity to render a great service to humanity by helping folks help themselves. Abraham Lincoln once said, "You cannot help men permanently by doing for them what they can and should do for themselves." But yet, there are those among us who would say the best way to help people is to literally live their lives for them, to assume their responsibilities, to take away from them their accountability, dignity and their pride. This system has never worked in history and will never work in the future. A good example of what happens when the state takes away the initiative, the pride of achievement and the responsibility of the individual, is best demonstrated by what has taken place in Sweden. For the last 22 years, Sweden has been the most highly socialistic country in the western world. Its people are literally taken care of from the time they are born until the time they die. In fact, they even pay their high school and college students $35 a month just to attend school. They have little unemployment and little so-called poverty but yet let's take a look at how well the individual is doing in this so-called Utopian society.

According to a report that was made in a U.S. News & World Report article, Sweden has had the highest increase of crime of any nation in the western world. They have had the highest percentage of increase of alcoholism and dope addiction of any nation in the western world. They have had the highest increase of complete and total immorality and perhaps the worst of all, more people have literally stopped going to church in Sweden because they don't need God any longer, they have the State.

Well, where do we stand here in America regarding the individual, his freedom and opportunity. In 1932, Norman Thomas ran for President of the United States of America on the Socialistic party ticket. He did this in every Presidential election year for several decades. However, he was defeated each time. A check of the record of the platform that he had in 1932 shows that all the planks that he proposed now have become law of the land and the last one was Medicare.

Arnold Toynbee, the great English historian, tells us that in his study of 21 civilizations 19 of them literally vanished from the face of the earth not from some great external force or nation conquering them, but because the people themselves lost their faith in God, in their country and in themselves. They lost their determination to succeed through their own efforts. They became totally and completely dependent upon the state for everything. How then can we prevent this from happening to this great land of ours. First, stand up and speak up for America. Be proud of our country, of its heritage and the part you play in it. Second, teach every man, woman and child that you come in contact with the basic fundamentals of good citizenship, loyalty, self-discipline, honor and the desire for permanent success. In other words, each one teach one, each one teach ten, and in so doing you will truly render a great service to humanity by encouraging folks to help themselves to achieve their dreams and their goals in life.

In closing, let me leave with you the words of Dean Alfange when he summed up how he felt about America and the opportunity that is here for all when he wrote "My Creed":

"I do not choose to be a common man. It is my right to be uncommon if I can. I do not wish to be a kept citizen, humbled and dulled by having the state look after me. I want to take the calculated risk, to dream and to build, to fall and to succeed. I refuse to barter incentive for a dole. I prefer the challenge of life to the guaranteed calm of Utopia. I will not trade freedom for beneficence, nor my dignity for a hand out. It is my heritage to think and act for myself, enjoy the benefit of my creations, and to face the world and say, 'This I have done.'

"All this is what it means to be an American."

May God bless you all.

The Triumph of Vulgarity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1967

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, whither are we heading in this generation marked by growing disrespect for law and order, riots, profiteering purveyors of pornographic material, our hippies, the growing crime rate, and a host of other developments never dreamed of by even the most straight laced of our grandparents.

Last Monday the Wall Street Journal's column "Review and Outlook" took a critical look at these developments and observed that they raise doubts about the quality of life in the future.

The article follows:

THE TRIUMPH OF VULGARITY

Much of what is annoying or depressing about contemporary life can be described in one word—vulgarity.

It is an ironic circumstance in a time when educators, bureaucrats and commentators prate hopefully of progress in the "pursuit of excellence," of improving the "quality of life," of the wonders to be wrought by universal higher education. It sometimes seems the actual trend is mostly away from excellence.

We hasten to say we recognize that nothing in the U.S. can match the vulgarization of life achieved in Communist and other police states. Further, that existence was infinitely harder, materialistically speaking, for most people in the past than in the present; in the absence of many amenities it was a grubby, subsistence affair for the generality of men.

Yet in certain prior historical periods standards, at least, were high, and in any event we are here concerned with what's wrong now, not a century ago. The grains of coarseness show up in a variety of areas, as seemingly remote from each other as fashion and politics.

Witness, for a start, the state of painting and other arts. If art reflects the dominant mood of a society, it makes a sad commentary; pop, op, psychedelic or whatever, its distinctive feature is mindlessness. We by no means reject all non-representational art, but merely observe the obvious, that the quality of a great deal of the stuff being turned out today is singularly cheap. The same stricture applies to many—certainly not all—current musical, theatrical and literary works.

Next on our list of unlovables, obsession with the solvenly is grotesquely evident in the phenomenon of the drug-drunk hippies. They would not merit mention except that their careless attitudes are also found to some degree in a much larger segment of the population, namely teenagers. Whatever else anyone may think about the hippies, going around in rags and crowding together in filthy rooms—by choice, that is—constitute a triumph of vulgarity.

So, too, does the excessive and often gratuitous pornography now permeating practically every avenue of communication. Men may, and do, argue whether the concentration on sex and violence leads to anti-social behavior, and few Americans favor the heavy hand of censorship. But that pornography can be esthetically distasteful is beyond argument.

Curiously enough in such an atmosphere, high fashion, which like art is often regarded as an index of society's frame of mind at a given moment, has grown sexless. While gowns have seen many a quirk over the generations and are capable of being abruptly changed tomorrow, the remarkably ugly, mechanistic things being designed for women today must rate some kind of award for crudity. True, no one is compelled to buy high fashion; its excesses just seem perhaps symbolic of the time.

Speaking of buying, there is that favorite old whipping-boy, advertising. We come not to denounce it, since it is absolutely essential to the economy's functioning.

The fact remains that advertising has never been known for subtlety or great artistic achievement, particularly in the case of radio and TV commercials, and these appear to be getting worse. You might almost suspect that the copywriters and announcers have convinced themselves they have to appeal to a lower breed of audience than heretofore.

Pervasive vulgarity is also one of the blights afflicting our cities. Graceful structures of the past are relentlessly wrecked to accommodate undistinguished and indistinguishable glass boxes. Noise, dirt and congestion assail the nerves, and the slums grow despite all the efforts to remove or rebuild them.

Even in the sacrosanct civil-rights movement more than a trace of grossness appears, especially in the expressed attitudes of the leaders. However well-intentioned they may be, they sometimes talk as though they were not so much interested in inspiring excellence in their people as in simply grabbing some of the gains achieved by the majority. And of course the constant resort to violence in the streets is degrading and disquieting for the whole nation.

If we may offer a final instance, politics is always easily vulgarized, and so it is today. The U.S. still has the most nearly perfect form of government ever devised, but in important respects the noble objectives of the makers of the Revolution have been prostituted in a welfare state of handouts for all. For a government to try to transform people into parasites, and for many of them to be willing, is nothing if not an oafish condition.

In international politics as well, one can only turn in disgust from the hypocrisy and meanness so frequently on display in the halls and corridors of the United Nations.

It would be foolishly lopsided to contend that no offsets, or only a few, to these vulgarisms can be cited.

The undeniable fact is that our forefathers created, and their successors have expanded, a state of material well-being unsurpassed in history or in the world. If current artistic production is largely unimpressive there is nonetheless widespread interest in culture, past and present. Reports from the campus picture many if not most college students as quiet and industrious. Not least, people are attempting, even if often ineffectively, to deal with some of the ills that beset us.

Still, the manifestations of vulgarity are so ubiquitous that it is necessary to ask what has caused such a falling-off.

Without getting into more or less profound theories of identity and alienation, we would guess a fairly large part of the explanation is the growth of the cult of mass-man, which is a kind of perversion of democracy. Far from the so-called pursuit of excellence, much of human activity today seems geared to appeasing the lowest common denominator.

Democracy at its best is not synonymous with egalitarianism. The equality it promises is equality before the law and equality of opportunity, not equality of material attainment or career.

Nowadays, however, just that seems to be the idea: If A, by dint of hard work and talent, achieves a mode of what used to be called gracious living, then B must have it too, even though he may be an idler and a boor. If B doesn't get it, then it is somehow supposed to be the fault of A.

This degeneration of the democratic ideal is no casual development, nor, is it necessarily the result of the population explosion, although expanding numbers have unquestionably caused some of the vulgarity. Rather, the notion of literal equality has been persistently preached by politicians and would-be opinion-molders throughout this generation. The productive citizens are regularly berated, seemingly precisely for their attainments, while the unproductive are made into paragons of virtue.

Since the preachment reverses the incentives and aspirations that made this country pre-eminent in the world, it inevitably raises doubts about the quality of life in the future. but whatever happens then, it is in no way surprising that democracy deformed has bred a disturbing debasement of standards.

Kosygin Unmasked on Arab Question

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 29, 1967

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, lest anyone hastily arrive at the conclusion that Premier Kosygin and President Johnson made no little progress is solving the world's problems at their recent Glassboro meeting, I recommend that they first ponder this editorial which appeared in the June 27 issue of the Peoria Journal Star. In an extremely lucid and logical manner, the author wisely affirms the old adage, "You can trust the Communists—to be Communists."

The editorial follows:

KOSYGIN UNMASKED ON ARAB QUESTION

One question stripped the facade from the visit of Premier Kosygin to the United Nations.

When he was asked if he thought that the Soviet Union's sending planes and tanks to Egypt and Syria to make up for their losses in battle was a step toward peace, he gave the game away.

"That's a matter between the Soviet Union and the Arab nations," he said bluntly.

He might as well have said: "We are in cahoots with the Arabs. I am not here as a world statesman seeking peace and justice. I am here seeking to establish an advantage for the Arabs where they themselves failed."

And that is, in any case, the truth.

He spoke of peace and cooperation between the U.S. and U.S.S.R. which, he made clear, consists at the moment of the U.S. totally abandoning Vietnam, and Israel retreating behind her old open and suicidal borders.

Then, he said, it would be possible to talk of other cooperation.

The new "cooperation" would consist of what other Soviet demands? For "demands" are all that the present offer of cooperation involves. Cooperation to Kosygin means, "Do what I say!"

He demands more than world-wide retreat on the part of the U.S. and other free nations. He demands a public confession that we are blackguards, and scoundrels, who have been committing aggression against those "peace-loving" Viet Cong terrorists and the "peace-loving" Arabs.

It's hard to imagine what he and Johnson talked about for 10 hours if his language as to "aggressors" and complete. hundred per cent "We're right and you're stinkers" approach was the language of Glassboro as well as in public.

That's what all the hopeful speculation is about—the idea that it couldn't have been . . . and we seem to be a people that will go to any lengths to kid ourselves about something we want to be true.

It was very nice of those thousands of people to turn out in the rain at Niagara Falls and at Glassboro to wave and smile and cheer the Soviet premier—sandwiched in between his bitter charges against us.

The question is: Did Kosygin thus get the impression that Americans are pretty sophisticated about political speech-making, and do not take him seriously? Or has he gotten the impression that we enjoy being called aggressors and castigated before the world, and are on his side and against the U.S. policies? Does he think we're falling for his Soviet propaganda?

That could be very dangerous.

Indeed, while President Johnson says that the meeting made the "world a little safer," one cannot but fear that if the President puts trust in the Kosygin who smiled at Glassboro, damned us in New York, and then flew off to confer with his buddy Castro in Havana, the world is a little more dangerous than before.

The last time the Russians smiled and gave our president a snow job it was to cover up while they tried to sneak ballistic missiles into Cuba. And then, there was the time before that . . . and the time before that . . . and the time before that.

Commendation of Representative Gonzalez

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1967

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to acknowledge a statement made by John A. Bitter, chairman of the board of commissioners of the Urban Renewal Agency, delivered at the dedication ceremonies of the San Antonio River extension project, expressing appreciation for our esteemed colleague from Texas, Representative GONZALEZ. I heartily concur with Mr. Bitter's recognition of Mr. GONZALEZ' continued efforts on behalf of his constitutents and in the interests of the Nation as a whole. I should like to enter into the RECORD this statement made on Saturday, June 24:

REMARKS BY JOHN A. BITTER, CHAIRMAN, BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS OF THE URBAN RENEWAL AGENCY DEDICATION CEREMONIES, SAN ANTONIO RIVER EXTENSION, JUNE 24, 1967

It is eminently appropriate that Congressman Henry B. Gonzalez be the Honorary of today's ceremonies, for without his interest, influence, and effort, the contributions of the three programs involved would have been impossible.

From the start of his public career as a City Councilman in 1953, Congressman Gonzalez has contributed considerably and substantially to the development of our City, our State, and our Nation. During his 8 years as a State Senator, Congressman Gonzalez sponsored and co-sponsored 42 bills. One of these bills, introduced in 1958, allows the City of San Antonio as well as other Texas cities to participate in the Urban Renewal Program. Another of these bills established the San Antonio River Authority. Both of these bills enable us to be here this afternoon with a tremendous example of urban redevelopment and civic progress before us.

Since 1961 Congressman Gonzalez has been a member of the United States Congress from the 20th District of Texas, the 9th largest Congressional District in the U.S. In 1964, after having served for only three years in Congress, Congressman Gonzalez was selected by the New York Times as one of the 16 top Senators and Congressman in the National Legislature. Congressman Gonzalez was the only Congressman selected from the South to receive this honor.

The Congressman has secured numerous programs, grants, and facilities for the City of San Antonio. Through his efforts a 17.5 million dollar Federal Building and a VA Hospital will be constructed in our City. Through his efforts all of San Antonio's military facilities have been expanded. Kelley alone has hired 6,000 additional employees since his election to Congress.

Recently Congressman Gonzales secured a 4.4 million dollar concentrated employment program for San Antonio's chronically unemployed and underemployed. Federal participation in HemisFair would have been impossible without his legislative talent and hard work.

Congressman Gonzalez is a member of the powerful House Banking and Currency Committee as well as a member of the Subcommittees on Housing, Consumer Affairs, and International Finance. His work in the field of housing and urban development has been monumental. In 1966, Congressman Gonzalez introduced 11 amendments to the Housing and Urban Development Act, 9 of which were accepted. One of these amendments provided non-cash grant-in-aid credit for San Antonio's Convention Center facilities.

He was personally responsible for obtaining federal authorization for the last 400 units of public housing constructed in San Antonio, after the Federal Government had already committed elsewhere the total number of units authorized by Congress.

In addition to authoring the State enabling legislation for urban renewal in Texas, Congressman Gonzalez has long been a friend and contributor to the Urban Renewal Program. It was largely a result of his efforts that the Civic Center Project has progressed so rapidly and so well. Congressman Gonzalez played a major role in securing approval for the second phase of development on the San Antonio River Extension, which we are here to dedicate today.

Congressman Gonzalez's legislative contributions have been extensive and impressive. I have mentioned only a small part of the role he has played as a Representative in the United States Congress. It is, therefore, with a great deal of sincere appreciation and respect that I present to you the Congressman from the 20th District of Texas—our Congressman, Henry B. Gonzalez.

In Vietnam, Impatience Is Among the Besetting Sins

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD J. IRWIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1967

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, during the recent Easter recess, I was privileged to go to South Vietnam as a member of a special Subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee.

This visit gave me an opportunity to see at first hand the tremendous morale of our troops. It also gave me a chance to meet one of the top Australian officers serving in Vietnam—Brig. Stuart C. Graham, OBE, MC.

I was highly impressed with Brigadier Graham and have had an exchange of correspondence with him since my return from Vietnam.

I would like at this time to place in the RECORD his latest brief, but very pertinent letter. The brigadier wrote:

How very thoughtful of you to send me the photograph of yourself and myself taken on your recent visit. Thank you also for your encouragement and good wishes. We will keep plugging on here and I agree with you entirely that the main requirement is the patience to see it through. In this situation, I count impatience among the besetting sins! Might I also add that the more we see of your soldiers (and we work very closely together), the more I can say that their country can and should be proud of them.

Torah View of War and Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1967

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, from time immemorial the Jewish people have had to continually defend themselves against the threat of extinction. Now that the State of Israel has emerged as one of the most effective military powers among the "nonnuclear" nations, Jews are confronted with a seeming dilemma. The Jewish religion does not favor militarism.

I commend to the attention of our colleagues an article written by Rabbi Tobias Golombek, which explains the apparent conflict between Judaism and militarism.

It also demonstrates that the Israelis complied with their highest religious and moral duties in every aspect of this latest conflict.

The article appeared in the June 23, 1967 edition of the Jewish Press, and follows:

TORAH VIEW OF WAR AND SERVICE

(By Rabbi Tobias Golombek)

Many people ask "What is the attitude of the Jewish religion towards militarism and war," and we also hear many people utter words of criticism. They ask how can the Jews claim to be the bearers of the Messianic ideals of the fraternity among peoples when the Torah justifies war.

Answer: The Jewish religion does not favor militarism. Judaism is opposed in a positive way to fist culture; it abhors the glorfication of physical might; it forbids bloodshed; it condemns the subjugation of others.

On the other hand, passive sufferance under attack is not exalted. G-d has commanded us to defend ourselves with all our might against the attacks of our enemies. It is not "religion" to stand like sheep for slaughtering. Jewish laws teach that when your enemy approaches to kill you—beat him to the punch! Therefore King David introduced military training for the young men in Eretz Israel.

No other people has upheld the ideal of peace so much as the Jews. Our prayers always include the hope for peace. God is called "The Prince of Peace." Isaiah, the prince of prophets expressed the Jewish longing for the peace of all mankind in these inspired and inspiring words: "And they shall beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruning-hooks; nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more." But this does not mean that until the glorious era of peace is established, we must bare our breast to every foeman's weapon.

The Jewish religion condemns war and cruelty. At the same time our religious law recognizes such a thing as a milchemet mitzvah, a war of merit. If any enemy attacks or invades our country, it is not merely permissive but a duty and a positive religious merit to fight in defense of our country. It is likewise meritorious to fight to exterminate evil within the community that threatens to undermine the morality. Those who have studied the history of the Jewish wars and the Jewish laws relating to war know that the Jews never made war for the same ignoble causes as other ancient and modern nations. In the very midst of war, by their humane treatment of the enemy, by their unparalleled laws and conduct in the course of armed conflict, the Jews proved that they were animated by a high humanitarian spirit in their relationship with all mankind.

It should be understood that the Jews are not and never were powder-puff pacifists—a people who would face a murderous enemy by baring the breast to the sword. The Jewish peace ideal calls for the establishment of a state of affairs in which all people will keep the peace—not just one group who, thereby, become the easy victims of their war-like fellowmen. But the Jews, though ready to defend themselves against aggressors, never sought war. When they fought, as their history reveals, it was in defense of their people, possessions, laws, rights and country. A notable exception is the war of conquest of the land in which they were to establish themselves, from which they had to dispossess the Seven Nations; and the war against the Amalekites. The specific reasons for these aggressive wars are well known. The Jews could neither become established nor survive without fighting and winning them. They need no justification, and must be classed as wars for the extermination of evil and corruption.

In all other instances the Jews were threatened and attacked before they went to war. And now let us consider the manner of the Jewish conduct of war.

In ancient times war was the occasion for the most savage behavior of men to each other. The physically stronger simply devoured the weaker. The development of cultures and well organized governments brought about some improvement in human relations—but not in the behavior of men towards the enemy. In war there was no morality and no restraint. The loosed sword cut down men and women and children without mercy. The great and small kingdoms waged war unceasingly, believing that wealth and greatness must be achieved by subduing and enslaving other peoples. The victors laid the enemy country waste; robbed it of every valuable they could seize; slaughtered the population that could not be taken for slaves; raped the women; tortured and made sport of the captives. This is a very brief sketch of the horrors of war and its consequences in ancient times. Yet the Jews were not guilty of these horrors.

The Jewish soldiers were not transformed into wild, blood-thirsty beasts. When forced to defend themselves, and to rid the earth of brutish creatures, who made decent, civilized life impossible, they acted in accordance with a set of regulations laid down in the Torah which prevented them from degenerating to the status of their enemies. Even in war they strived to maintain the basic rules of not committing murder, not inflicting unnecessary pain on living creatures, not fighting for the sake of fighting. War, to the Jews, was never an end in itself. The real spirit of Judaism in relation to war-making is expressed in its laws, of which a few are cited here.

In the first place, the Torah emphasized the rule of avoiding war if at all possible. An offer of peace to the enemy must precede the beginning of hostilities. The sudden and unannounced attack is prohibited.

When hostilities begin, unnecessary cruelty must be avoided. Women and children may not be slain.

Even in the heat of combat the enemy must be treated justly and mercifully.

The fruit-trees around a beseiged city must not be cut down.

The enemy's water-springs may not be destroyed.

The enemy must not be completely surrounded and annihilated. Some way must be left open to enable those who wish to escape to do so. While in the case of the Seven Nations the rule of permitting escape was not applied, the motivation of this exception was, "that they shall not teach you to do according to all their abominations." But in ordinary wars the destruction of the enemy could not be made an objective. Since the purpose of warmaking was to render the foe harmless, never plunder, or power, or to give way to the brutal injustice in man, the enemy must be afforded a fair opportunity to surrender or to run away. The unnecessary taking of life had to be avoided. That is why G-d raged against the Israelites when, in violation of these rules, they once gave the Ammonities no opportunity to run away and save their lives in defeat. It was considered a major sin.

Captives of war must be treated humanely. Women captives may not be treated indecently or as chattels. The man who desires to possess a beautiful captive could do so, but under humane restrictions (Deuteronomy 21:10–14) and by taking her as his wife. If later he tired of her, he could free her, but "not at all sell her for money," and "not deal with her as a slave." This should be compared with the treatment of women captives of war by other nations.

The treatment of Jewish soldiers by their officers is also of interest in this connection. No man who had recently betrothed a wife, or built a new house, or planted a vineyard, was required to risk his life in battle; moreover any man "that is fearful and fainthearted was asked by his officers, before battle, to leave the ranks and return home.

All in all, it is evident that even in the act of unavoidable war-making the Torah sought to purify the heart of men, to regulate and control his passions, and to repress the brutish instinct in him.

In these very laws relating to war we see perhaps the highest expression of the Messianic idealism of the Jewish people, a demonstration of its divine election to purify the spirit of man, to sublimate his inclination to wickedness to keep him from violence and rapine, and to organize human society on a basis of peaceful and righteous cooperation among peoples.

These laws again demonstrate that mankind possesses no loftier code of laws than those given in the Torah.

Resolution on Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLETON J. KING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1967

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to include a resolution recently adopted by Members of the Sanford's Ridge Methodist Church, Glens Falls, N.Y. The resolution is on the subject of Vietnam and our efforts to aid the people of South Vietnam in their struggle against Communist aggression.

The resolution adopted by a majority of the members of this small country church corrects any impression that this congregation concurs with the action taken by the Troy Conference of the Methodist Church, which has called for an end to the bombing in North Vietnam.

The resolution follows:

A RESOLUTION BY MEMBERS OF THE SANFORD'S RIDGE METHODIST CHURCH, GLENS FALLS, N.Y.

Whereas, the Troy Annual Conference of the Methodist Church has passed a resolution calling for an end to the bombing of North Vietnam, which in the publics' mind may be construed as representing a viewpoint held by a majority of Methodists;

Be it hereby resolved that the following be made a part of the public record:

1. That the resolution passed by the Troy Annual Conference reflects only the opinions of those attending it, and does not necessarily represent the opinions of the majority of Methodist Church members;

2. That the fact that no vote was taken by this and other congregations on this issue, and the fact that the issue was not even discussed with the congregation, makes the Vietnam resolution highly misleading and does an injustice to the lay members of the church who feel they are perfectly capable of determining their own position on the Vietnam issue;

3. That the members of the Sanford Ridge Methodist Church, whose signatures appear below, neither approve the resolution on Vietnam passed by the Troy Annual Conference of the Methodist Church, nor do we approve of the way the resolution was passed without prior consultation with the lay members of the churches supposedly represented. Furthermore, we do not believe that the Methodist Church, by resolution or otherwise, should try to engage in making military decisions which affect the lives of our fighting men.

To clear up any confusion as to the position which we as Americans (and only incidentally as Methodist Laymen) actually support, the following is a statement of that position for the public record.

"We support the actions of the United States and its decision to aid the people of South Vietnam in their effort to overcome the aggression supported and directed by North Vietnam, Communist China, and Soviet Russia against them. We recognize that this aggression is not an indigenous revolt on the part of fellow South Vietnamese, but is instead a deliberate and vicious campaign, conducted by the Communist North Vietnamese and their allies, to conquer the people of South Vietnam by force. We firmly believe that to disregard moral and international law by retreating or by compromising freedom in the face of Communist threats can only lead to larger and more dangerous confrontations elsewhere and will inevitably result in the loss of our own liberty.

We, therefore, support the decision of the United States and its allies to bomb North Vietnam and urge that military, political, and economic pressure against North Vietnam be increased to a point where its leaders recognize they must cease their aggression against South Vietnam".

4. We further resolve that copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, to the Troy Conference, and to other Methodist Church Laymen, with the hope that they make their individual views known.

Signed: Robert A. Davenport, Gail N. Davenport, Katharine M. Webster, Elizabeth W. Keech, Constance E. Scofield, John O. Webster, Bradley R. Wright, Doris M. Webster, John E. Doty, Carson Varnum, Palma Doty, Aldin Mead, Phyllis E. Joslyn, Ethel B. Mead, Donald E. Perkins, Bernice I. Perkins, George H. Savale, Carl F. Emanuelson, Marshall Andrews, Mrs. Dorothy Andrews Case, George A. Webster (member of the congregation), Irene Andrews.

Herbert A. Henderson, Dorothy W. Henderson, Mrs. Fred B. Swan, Fred B. Swan, Thomas J. Pasco, Mrs. Chloe Pasco, Sara C. Aldrich, Thomas A. Dickinson, Sue Dickinson, Karnl Dickinson, Doris Dickinson, Kathryn N. Bovee, Marcus S. Bovee, Lucy Bullock, Raymond M. Bullock, Francis E. Archambault, Dr. Harold R. Archambault, Norma M. Savale, Janice Savale.

Practical Consequences of the Poverty Campaign

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1967

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, the Kansas City Star on June 25, 1967, expressed a sound and intelligent position regarding the Office of Economic Opportunity and the antipoverty program it administers. It presents in balanced fashion the debate over the antipoverty program.

Based on this balanced study, the editorial reaches the very sound conclusion that—

> This is not the time to give up. At this critical state of world turmoil and rapid change, the United States cannot admit defeat in a cause that much of the world—poor and hungry—is watching.

The Star's advice to the Congress is just as sound:

> Congress—

The editorial states—

> will ignore the critics of both the extreme left and the extreme right. The antipoverty program is new and must have every chance.

I am inserting the article in the Appendix of the RECORD:

IN A CHANGING WORLD: PRACTICAL CONSEQUENCES OF THE POVERTY CAMPAIGN

At a very critical era in the history of the United States, the nation is in the midst of an experiment to reduce hard-core poverty—a nucleus of misery that no society ever has been able to eliminate. In the new American effort there have been mistakes. But this isn't the time to let up on the fight. This is, in fact, the time to press harder than ever with more money and an even stronger campaign.

Much of the world is poor by American standards and most of the world is watching to see whether the United States can meet the challenge of endemic poverty in this richest nation on the planet. The alternative, in the view of our adversaries, is a total collectivism that levels off income and opportunity to a common denominator at the cost of individual economic and political liberty.

Right now a relatively conservative Congress is looking at the whole poverty operation. The 1.61-billion-dollar appropriation for fiscal 1967 is being reviewed; the 2½-billion-dollar request for fiscal 1968 is under consideration.

The Office of Economic Opportunity, the principal anti-poverty agency, is a vulnerable target for critics on every side. Some of these critics are sincerely constructive. Others seem to regard the poverty program as a thing that unnecessarily calls our attention to the seamy side of life that would go away if we ignore it.

Some Republicans give the impression of wanting to abandon the whole thing as it now exists. They talk of "new structures." Some Democrats, especially those who have manipulated the poor in big-city machine politics, are fearful that the poor will begin to elect candidates of their own.

The far-out civil rights groups denounce the program as a plot to lure the Negro poor into a middle-class mentality which they equate with selling out. The far-right groups seem to confuse the program with the outright dole of the last century, although the OEO goal is exactly the opposite.

The militant new-left denounces the poverty personnel as meddling social workers and the militant old-right denounces them as softheaded socialists. Sen. Robert Kennedy sends out a vague plea for a "virtual revolution in all social services" and Rep. Charles E. Goodell (R-N.Y.) says ominously that unless the program is set straight, "Congress may well kill off the whole thing this year."

To a very considerable degree, the administration already has altered the poverty war in a manner to answer the more realistic criticism and even some of the emotional objections. Now a relatively modest expenditure of the total federal budget is proposed to continue the campaign.

Congress, we hope, will ignore the critics of both the extreme left and the extreme right. The anti-poverty program is new and must have every chance. The humanitarian aims of the effort are not nullified by partisan quibbling or ideological sniping. From a practical point of view, the United States cannot dismiss the internal flaw of poverty that weakens our over-all strength.

This is not the time to give up. At this critical stage of world turmoil and rapid change, the United States cannot admit defeat in a cause that much of the world poor and hungry—is watching.

Statement by Msgr. Bela Varga, Last Freely Elected President of the Hungarian Parliament, and Chairman of the Hungarian Committee, on the Presence of Kosygin at the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1967

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, though the Soviet Union's false accusations against Israel were expected, it still came as a shock to those people who vividly remember the brutal attack upon the Hungarian nation by the Soviet Union, to hear the Russian demand for the withdrawal of Israel troops from Arab territories.

Msgr. Bela Varga, last freely elected President of the Hungarian Parliament and present chairman of the Hungarian Committee, made a statement on June 19, concerning Kosygin's presence at the United Nations.

I commend to the attention of our colleagues that statement, which speaks not only for the oppressed people of Hungary, but for the people of the free world.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT BY MSGR. BELA VARGA, LAST FREELY ELECTED PRESIDENT OF THE HUNGARIAN PARLIAMENT AND CHAIRMAN OF THE HUNGARIAN COMMITTEE, ON THE PRESENCE OF KOSYGIN AT THE UNITED NATIONS

For Hungarians, it was a shock to hear Mr. Kosygin assuming the role of moral arbiter at the United Nations, demanding the condemnation of Israel by the General Assembly while the country he represents stands in contempt of 13 resolutions of that same body condemning the Soviet Union's massive armed intervention in the 1956 Hungarian Revolution—a brutal, unprovoked attack on an innocent populace, costing far more lives than the Israeli-Arab war.

The resolutions passed by the General Assembly for the withdrawal of Soviet troops and the restoration of Hungary's independence was never carried out. There are still 85,000 Russian occupying troops in Hungary.

Mr. Kosygin should first withdraw them, before demanding the withdrawal of Israeli troops from Arab territories taken in the recent war.

The Hungarian nation, in Soviet captivity, awaits the honoring of those resolutions, that it may regain its free and independent life.

The State Department Gives Greece Cold Shoulder

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1967

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, while the State Department is aglow over the dubious developments which might come from the summit conference at Glassboro, our foreign policy inconsistencies remain painfully dubious. I make specific reference to the cold shoulder that the State Department is giving the Government of Greece, which after all is only a pro-Western anti-Communist group. In contrast, the Department is looking for ways to accommodate the Soviet Union and restore aid to Nasser. Therefore, I deem it of special interest that Ray McHugh, of the Copley News Service, had occasion recently to visit Athens. His interview with Foreign Minister Economu Gouras of that Government is especially timely and I insert it in the RECORD at this point:

(By Ray McHugh, Copley News Service)

ATHENS.—Continued cooperation with the United States and North Atlantic Treaty Organization allies, watchful caution toward Communist governments and scathing contempt for leftist socialist criticism are basic foreign policy pillars in the new Greek military government.

These were outlined here in an exclusive interview with Greek Foreign Minister Economu Gouras.

The military regime that took power April 21, Gouras said, empahsizes "the continued attachment of Greece to NATO."

The coup, staged to avert an alleged Communist plot to plunge Greece into political chaos or civil war, "has eliminated the danger of loosening the country's ties with the North Atlantic alliance," Gouras said.

Noting Russia's increasing naval strength in the Mediterranean and its growing influence with Arab States in the Middle East, particularly Egypt and Syria, Gouras said cautiously: "It is hoped that the Soviet Union, as one of the great powers, will not frustrate the rest of the world in failing to play a responsible and constructive role toward the maintenance of peace of which she claims to be a fervent advocate."

Gouras acknowledged Greece's centuries-old tradition of friendship toward the Arab world, but supported international rather than unilateral actions to resolve the current Mideast turmoil.

"Greece has always deployed every possible effort for the maintenance of peace and order in the area," said Gouras. "Greece will stand by the United Nations, hoping in this way to contribute toward international peace and understanding."

The Foreign Minister took a wary stand on Greek relations with neighboring Communist satellite countries—countries which allegedly supported Communist agitation in Greece and which have been incrasingly hostile toward the military regime in Athens.

"Concern amongst the states of eastern Europe . . . is totally unwarranted," Gouras said. "Greece (has) a firm policy of peace and of maintaining and developing good relations with all the countries of the world. These relations can be maintained regardless of differences in political or social systems and should be based on the principles of non-interference in internal affairs, of equality and reciprocity and mutual respect of sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity."

Gouras had stronger words, however, for western nations that have criticized the military takeover in Greece. The Scandinavian countries of Sweden, Denmark and Norway have been particularly incensed over what they claim is the denisal of human rights by the new Athens regime.

"The criticism," Gouras said, "is due to the fact that socialist governments with leftists tendencies are governing these countries. Almost all of those governments are supported in power by Communist or left parties and are forced to express such criticism to stay in power.

"Besides, international leftist propaganda plays its role more easily in these countries and parties of leftist organizations and syndicates regret losing their grip over Greece. That is why they are still shouting."

Gouras noted that there were no such protests when Turkey overthrew the Menderes regime and executed its leaders. This silence, he said, could be attributed to the fact that leftists had no organization or voice in Turkey.

The Greek Government-controlled press also has bitterly suggested that the Scandinavian countries concern themselves with human rights behind the Iron Curtain before they complain about alleged abuses in Greece.

Asked about the still-simmering Greek-Turkish crisis over Cyprus, Gouras took a conciliatory view.

"The Greek Government," he said, "has declared its willingness to seek a solution of the Cyprus problem by peaceful means. In that spirit we are ready to examine in common with Turkey the ways and means for the continuation of contacts."

What of future U.S.-Greek relations?

Gouras emphasized that Greece is looking to the United States for economic assistance that will help solve the nation's festering social and employment problems.

But he said Greece does not seek gifts.

"The Government would like that the United States' financial contribution to the country continue not as a gift," he said, "but rather in the form of investments that may prove equally useful to the American investors as well as to the national Greek economy."

He urged that the United States increase its participation in a banking consortium that makes money available for industrial projects in Greece. He drew special attention to the need for electrical energy.

Gouras also urged private American firms to join with Greek firms in developing this country's natural resources. He cited the recent agreement with Litton Industries of Beverly Hills, Calif., to undertake a $850 million study and development program in the Greek Peloponnesus and Crete.

"American capital has a very important part to play in Greece's effort for economic recovery and industrial development," he said. "Greece does not forget the generous assistance of the United States in the past. Now it hopes for a partnership that can bring mutual benefits in the future."

Speech by AFL–CIO President George Meany to the Seafarers International Union Convention at Washington, D.C., June 22, 1967

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB H. GILBERT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1967

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, George Meany, president of the AFL–CIO, made a speech recently to the convention of the Seafarers International Union in which he commented on legislation now before Congress affecting members of the railroad unions.

Since I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that all of us would like to consider Mr. Meany's remarks I am pleased to insert his speech in the RECORD at this point:

TEXT OF SPEECH OF AFL–CIO PRESIDENT GEORGE MEANY TO THE SEAFARERS INTERNATIONAL UNION CONVENTION, WASHINGTON, D.C., JUNE 22, 1967

I am very happy to come here this morning to say a word of greeting to you, the Seafarers International Union, and offer a word of welcome to Washington, the capital of the nation.

This is the home of rumors, also.

It is nice to greet you here in Washington and know that you are here collectively under the democratic labor system that we have in America.

You are here to make decisions that we hope will affect beneficially the welfare of the people that you represent.

Now, I am not going to discuss maritime problems. I see the sign in front of me stating Rebuild America's Merchant Marine Now—well, strange enough, I said that in 1940.

I wrote an article for the American Federation of Labor magazine at the time about the situation in the American Merchant Marine. I believed in a real American Merchant Marine then.

Surely anyone who believed in it 25 years ago and has seen what has happened since, certainly must be much stronger in his or her belief in a strong Merchant Marine today.

What I would like to talk to you about is what might be called the credibility situation here in Washington. You follow the news media these days and you follow television and radio.

It is pretty hard to know what to believe or what not to believe. The news and television media are not very helpful in these situations.

Three or four weeks ago in this hotel there were 3,000 delegates representing perhaps more than a quarter of a million people, representing government employees, and others representing half a million.

They were here for three or four days discussing problems that affect their families, their unions and the conditions, the working conditions, of their members.

There was practically no press coverage at all and no television or radio coverage. That particular week the television and radio and the front pages of the Washington newspapers were concerned only with the activities of eight or ten kooky kids who came down here from Boston.

They were unwashed, unshaven and long-haired boys and shorthaired girls.

They were down here and were misguided and all mixed up—on a pacifist meeting. Just who they were for or against never became clear, but what they did was quite clear.

It was covered in every paper in the city, every edition, every radio program and every television program, six o'clock, seven o'clock, and later at night.

They went over to the Pentagon and laid down in the hallways. One little girl went on a hunger strike and that really brought the press out.

I say the press, the radio and television in this country, is missing a great opportunity to make a contribution to the solution of many problems that face the American people.

For some reason known only to them they prefer this sort of stuff, this sensational business, to something that is important.

This goes for the civil rights situation, too. We have a number of sound Negro organizations in the country and a number of sound Negro leaders.

They don't get the coverage in the news. Those who preach violence and have no real standing in the Negro community get the front pages and the television screen day after day.

I think the American people ought to think more about credibility of the news media and perhaps a little less about the credibility of those in official life.

This is certainly worthwhile to comment on. We have some legislation over on Capitol Hill that is quite important. This legislation pertains to the 130,000 railroad mechanics, shop mechanics who have exhausted all of the machinery of the Railway Labor Act and were free to go on strike about three months ago.

This is after many months of following the procedures of the Act and legislation was introduced postponing that right until Monday of this week.

In the meantime, legislation to carry this strike or dispute to a conclusion was introduced, which calls for another 60 or 90 days of mediation.

Now, it calls for these men to go to work and to stay at work under the conditions laid down by someone else until January 1, 1969.

They must work if the bill becomes law whether they will it or not, or whether conditions suit them, until January 1, 1969.

Incidentally, this is two months after the Presidential election.

We are told by the Secretary of Labor that this is not compulsory arbitration; this is just mediation to finality.

You try to buy that one. It is not compulsion. It is mediation to finality. It is not compulsory arbitration because it only affects 130,000 people, and it does not say forever, it only says until January 1, 1969, as such.

We are told by a great liberal Senator much the same story, that this is not compulsion, that this is something that we had in the War Labor Board days.

I know what we had then. American labor met and said to the government of the United States that for the period of the war, there would be no strikes. American industry agreed that for the period of the war there would be no lockouts.

Now, that was voluntary on the part of American labor. Labor and industry said together that the government shall provide the means to settle disputes in lieu of the strikes and lockouts, that we could not afford while fighting a war.

This agreement was made in December, 1941, just ten days after Pearl Harbor, and American labor lived up to that agreement.

We had a War Labor Board to settle these disputes. The War Labor Board depended on the leadership of American labor to observe that pledge. That pledge was observed 99 percent.

The Board depended on the President of the United States, with emergency powers, to compel industry to live up to the decisions of the War Labor Board. This was a war emergency.

The machinery included, if you please, the seizure of any plant that refused to abide by a decision of the War Labor Board, and thereby make its contribution to the continuance of the war effort.

The comparison between this anti-strike legislation and the War Labor Board is not very well taken. Yes, we had cases where plants were seized by the order of President Franklin Roosevelt. This was because the corporation decided thirty cents an hour was enough to pay for the manufacture of very important radio parts that the Army very sadly needed at that time.

When you hear somebody say this is not anti-strike or not compulsion, don't believe it.

We have this rather odd situation, that in connection with this legislation, a member of the President's Cabinet denounced the heads of one of our unions as being unpatriotic.

This is because he did not crack down on his membership and tell them that they had to accept what some Board said was fair.

Now, this is rather odd coming from officials of the government. We have the Landrum-Griffin amendments to the Taft-Hartley Labor Act in 1959. They proclaimed a sort of labor's bill of rights.

This was to protect the rank and file, if you please. To protect them from the labor leadership that caused all the trouble, they said, not the rank and file. These were designed to bring trade union democracy and free the rank and file from the domination from the leaders.

Now, we hear the Secretary of Labor and other government officials crying crocodile tears because they say the rank and file is rejecting settlements agreed to by the leaders and that something, therefore, should be done about it.

This is what they wanted in 1959, and this is what they are getting. Then, we have Mr. Boyd, the Secretary of Transportation, questioning the patriotism and good faith of the head of one of our international unions because some of his members are involved with the railroad shop craft strike, as such.

They don't choose to work for wages offered by the railroad management. Then we hear, also, that the AFL–CIO is not doing so well.

Now, this gets into the press. Of course, nobody tells us that we are not doing so well; you tell somebody else. We will answer that through the machinery of the AFL–CIO.

Any member unit of this organization has a right to use that machinery.

They have a right to appear before the Executive Council of the AFL–CIO and a right to appear before the General Board of the AFL–CIO. They have a right to appear before a convention of the AFL–CIO.

They also have a right to request a special convention if they don't like the way that things are going to be run.

No one has exercised any of these rights. We have heard criticism of the actions of the Executive Council and I can say to you that I think that the AFL–CIO is doing quite well.

I think this will be documented publicly at the proper time. The answer will be given through the machinery, through the democratic machinery of the AFL–CIO, through an agency of that machinery.

Further, on this question of credibility, we take the incredible performance that we have all witnessed in the last few days.

Well, I don't mind being in a courtroom and hear two lawyers battle.

I don't mind hearing one person contradict everything the other person says. I realize that many of those who speak at the United Nations are under orders from their governments. You don't mind whether these people agree with you so long as they agree on the facts.

However we have just had the head of a sovereign state, a state with a population second to no other, stand before the world and give an incredible performance.

He told us that the people of Israel were the aggressors in this recent trouble in the Middle East. We were told that the two and a half million Jews in Israel were kicking around sixty million Arabs.

These are not ancient facts. Who was it that ordered the United Nations peacekeeping force out of that area?

Was it the government of Israel that ordered them out? Who closed the Gulf of Aqaba? Certainly, this, in all international relations, this is considered an act of war. You block the free passage of ships to any nation and you are practically declaring war on that nation.

Now, who ordered it closed? Was it Israel? Who was it that received the three billion dollars of military hardware from the Soviet Union? Was it Israel? And two and one-half billion of that was frittered away, to use a polite expression, within three hours on the morning of June 5, 1967.

Which country in that area has a national policy that calls for the extermination of one of its neighbors? Does Israel have that policy?

No, it is their Arab neighbors that have that policy, and have for years. They do not recognize Israel and they refuse to give them the rights of other nations to use the Suez Canal. They proclaimed day in and day out that their policy, that the reason for their national existence is to destroy Israel as a nation.

When we hear the head of a government handing this sort of bunk out to the people of the world, you say to yourself, what price truth?

I think that labor in America is quite practical. I think we know what this legislative picture on Capitol Hill, which calls for compulsory work for these 130,000 railroad workers, that we know what that means.

We know that means something to all of American labor, not just the shop craft workers. This legislation actually strikes at the heart of the American trade union movement. It is a step toward the destruction of collective bargaining.

After all, what is the difference between a Great Society and a state-controlled society, such as they have in the dictator countries? Say, the Iron Curtain countries?

What is the difference? Do you know that they have unions or what they call unions in Russia? Do you know that Hitler set up what he called a union? He called it a labor front.

In Russia today they claim to have trade unions in every branch of their society and every venture in every industrial plant. What is the real difference?

The real difference is one word—freedom. In 1957, in the United Nations, sitting on a committee with some of the Soviet delegates, I had an opportunity to point out the difference when the Soviet delegate spoke of Soviet unions.

I had at the time a copy of a Soviet so-called trade union paper. On the front page it condemned certain trade union officials for what they called deviationist tendencies. These tendencies consisted of insisting that the trade unions should have something to say about wages for the workers and about production norms—about how much money a man receives for his work and how much work he is expected to produce within a certain time, about setting up targets that each worker has in his particular job.

These trade union officials who insisted that the trade unions should have something to say were declared guilty of deviation. It was said they were developing burgeois tendencies.

The article went on to say that production norms and wages are the right of the party to determine and no one else. And the party is the government.

This is the difference between what they call unions and what we call unions. This is the difference between a free society and a state-controlled society, under which every individual is considered to be an instrument of the state and measured only on the basis of his contribution to the state.

Why are they afraid to let these unions—these so-called unions—have a little freedom? Actually they are there to regulate workers, to handle vacations, and tell them where they can live. If you exceed the production norm you may get a better apartment and go to a vacation spot. The unions also see to it that there is no absenteeism, that the workers are on the job and so forth.

This brings to mind an incident in connection with the so-called American Plan. I am quite sure that very few of you remember this. You are a little too young. This is one advantage of getting old. You can look back a little more.

The American Plan was put forth in 1920 by the financial interests in this country. It was very simple to put a tag on it. They would use their influence in the financial world and see to it that no group of workers, that no plant or building construction job would have more than 50 percent union people on it.

It could have less or none, but not more. Otherwise, it would lose its financial benefits—mortgages, construction loans and so forth.

This started in the building trades and it was quite successful in certain parts of the country—specifically it was very successful in the city of San Francisco. It not only tied up the financing, to compel open shop as they call it—this is what they meant by American Plan—but they tied up the supply companies—the people who supplied brick, cement, sand, lumber. And within a period of six months, the building trades movement in San Francisco, which was one of the best movements in the country prior to that time, was reduced to a shambles. Membership dwindled. They imported scabs to do the work. The unions held out, of course. They did the best they could to live. The work went on with scabs quite a while. Then they had a problem—these great brains who thought up this scheme. They said, "We have got to do something with these non-union people we brought in here." You see they brought them in, put them in dormitories with police protection—you know the usual things they have to do to take care of these people. After some months they said we have got to do something for these people. We have got to give them some chance for recreation. After all, they could not just have them living week in and week out every day of the week in these dormitories not mixing around with people.

Someone said, let's form them into a social club. They got them into a social club to hold meetings in the evening to come up with ideas for social recreation.

Well, lo and behold, the social club, several thousand of them, made application to join the building trades union in San Francisco.

This is what the Soviets are afraid of and this is why they keep these people under the control of their so-called trade unions.

The real difference is freedom and this is an issue in this legislation. Why should railroad management give anything to railroad labor if, down the road, there is a Congress waiting to compel that labor force to work—to compel them to work under conditions dictated by someone else other than the workers themselves? Railroad management has nothing to lose.

Let me say this and then get back to the credibility gap again. A certain member of Congress said the AFL–CIO is not really opposed to this legislation. They know it is inevitable.

I can tell you that we are opposed to this legislation. We are opposed to it as it affects the railroad machinists, sheet metal workers, electrical workers, men working there for the railroad.

We were opposed to it last year when it was before Congress and affected airline mechanics. We are opposed to it anytime it affects a free American worker.

This is our record. This is the sort of principle under which we built our movement. We are not going to abandon those principles.

We are not going to abandon our principles. Without freedom the American labor movement becomes nothing. It becomes a front, a Hitler front or a Soviet front.

Without freedom, American labor has made a contribution and it continues to make a contribution to American life and to the development and encouragement of freedom all over the world.

We have a record, we have a long record in this field. We expect to build on that record.

Now, I am sure, as we go down the road, building on that record, that marching right along with us will be the Seafarers International Union of North America under the leadership of a real great trade unionist, Brother Paul Hall.

An Urgent Appeal to Our Federal Lawmakers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1967

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, Generally, anytime that one indicates support for right-to-work labor laws, he is immediately classified as anti-organized labor. Nothing is as effective in keeping rank and file union members from reading sensible arguments in favor of right to work as starting any discussion on the subject with the charge of antilabor bias.

Mr. F. E. Schuchman, president of Homestead Valve Manufacturing Co., Coraopolis, Pa., after rising to a position of seniority in management, supported the formation of two unions, and cannot in any sense of the word be considered anti-organized labor.

Yet he does recognize deficiences in our labor unions and urges right-to-work laws as an antidote to the disease of labor monopoly.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include the attached articles in the Appendix of the RECORD:

AN URGENT APPEAL TO OUR FEDERAL LAW MAKERS

Having been engaged in industrial management for more than fifty years, I have had the advantage of seeing the seamy side of the industrial life of employees in those early days when labor unions were struggling for a foothold.

My sympathy was with their basic aim—to serve as spokesman for employees in dealing with managers of industrial plants, and to gain such wage and other benefits as was due the producers of goods for our markets.

Since I have risen to a position of seniority in management, my actions, influenced by those earlier experiences, led me to support the forming of two unions in the plant and offices of the company with which I have been associated, officially, since 1921.

I have reason to believe that the records of our company's relationship with these two unions, their elected officers, and their so-called international representatives of the AFL-CIO Steelworkers, has been open and above board, and usually tolerable under intolerable mandates from Washington.

I am not seeking to break off union contracts nor the negotiation of labor contracts since I firmly believe that, fundamentally, the orderly adjustment of wages and working conditions within the economic framework of the Free Enterprise System is as much a part of our wonderful way of life as are our Constitution, Bill of Rights, and the Ten Pillars of Economic Wisdom (copy attached).

Now, having established my honest regard for the rights of employees in my sphere of influence, I ask that you read "An Intimidated Society," which includes Donald Richberg's "causes of deep anxiety" regarding labor union leadership and labor laws, together with those of another long-time friend of union labor, Maurice R. Franks, in his book, What's Wrong With Our Labor Unions?

Mr. Frank's diagnosis, in my opinion, strikes at the heart of our present-day impasses. He says:

"And the roots of the disease of labor monopoly are these:

1. Compulsory Unionism. (Reed Larson's Right to Work proposed law will remedy this wage-slave situation.)

2. Industry-wide bargaining. (Our Anti-Trust Laws are as valid in dealing with this malignancy in labor relations as they are proving to be in dealing with wrong-doers among industrial and business firms.)

3. Dictated Strike Action. (There are more voters among customers than union members alone. In fact, union mmebers *are* customers and, as customers, are feeling the pinch of economically unsound dictation of labor leaders. Only laws that encourage understanding and acceptance of basic economic principles will resolve the present chaos.)

Please serve all of your constituents properly, within our Constitutional Rights and the Rules of the market-place.

Internal strife and economic waste cannot be tolerated, especially right now when true statemanship demands the establishment of proper labor-management relations within our country so that we may face our enemies overseas, strong, and as a united team of producers of goods to sustain our beloved country's needs within and outside of our boundaries.

Urgently,

F. E. SCHUCHMAN,
President.

AN INTIMIDATED SOCIETY

(By Louis Ruthenburg)

A few years ago a Presbyterian minister was shocked when Princeton, Indiana, the town in which he lived and worked, was torn apart by a long and vicious strike. He saw raw mob violence, assaults and shootings. A child was almost fatally injured by a bullet, presumably fired by a union goon. As frequently happens, law enforcement failed to function. For weeks the little town of Printon lived under anarchy. As he described his experiences and observations during the strike, this clergyman said that the people of the United States now live in "an intimidated society."

Our intimidation and anxieties stem not only from the flagrantly lawless antics inspired by irresponsible labor leaders. Among many causes, thinking citizens are deeply disturbed by the threat of national bankruptcy, the cumulative result of irresponsible spending and continuing deficits which have resulted in fantastic indebtedness, in shrinking gold reserves and adverse balance of international payments. You will think of many other sources of anxiety.

But, let's take a brief look at just one of these causes of deep anxiety about our nation's future.

Labor union leaders, numerically an insignificant minority group, have become a dominant force in national, state and local politics. To a great degree, these princes of privilege dictate the course of our economy.

Please read carefully a few quotations from one who speaks with authority.

Quotation 1 is this:

"Collective bargaining has become collective coercion . . . the aim of industrial justice has become greed for industrial domination . . . Political influence, once sought to protect fair dealing, is now sought to accomplish personal political goals."

Here is quote No. 2:

"The unions are powerful, aggressive organizations that are engaged in a continuing warfare against the maintenance of a free competitive economy."

Quote No. 3 (these are all from the same author) is this:

"These evils will not be remedied until an overwhelming majority of free citizens realize that labor's economic monopoly and political power are preparing the way for communism far more effective than the communists themselves."

Perhaps, as you read those three quotations, you are thinking they came from a speaker for the National Association of Manufacturers or from another protagonist of business management.

As a matter of fact, those three paragraphs were written by the late Donald R. Richberg, who devoted many years to fighting for the rights of labor.

He took part in the early struggles to unionize industry, co-authored the famed Railway Labor Act of 1926 and the National Recovery Act of 1933. Richberg attempted reconciliation of industry, labor and public interests as the last head of NRA in 1936.

Twenty years later Mr. Richberg courageously and realistically reappraised the fruit which had been produced by the seeds he had helped to plant.

He then sounded the alarm. He wrote a book—"Labor Union Monopoly—A Clear and Present Danger."

Those of us who have spent many weary hours at the bargaining table, who have experienced the tensions of labor disputes and strikes, who have been coerced by that greatly prejudiced tribunal, the National Labor Relations Board, must, as the result of much bitter experience, agree with Mr. Richberg.

From that costly teacher, experience, we have learned that, under current conditions, management invariably plays against cards that are stacked and against dice that are loaded. The cards were stacked and the dice were loaded by legislators, bureaucrats and courts who ignored and violated the ancient precept of equality under the law.

An "intimidated society" now submits to the rule of organized labor's princes of privilege.

Here, as in England, socialistic intellectuals conspire with labor leaders to capture a dominant political party in order to impose Marxian philosophy of government upon the nation. Under this alliance, elaborate political campaigns and subsidies are used to elect leftwing legislators, administrative officers and judges. Such activities are generously financed by union treasuries swollen by the dues and assessments derived from union members, many of whom are unwillingly forced into membership under pernicious union shop contracts.

Another well-known, long-time friend of union labor, Maurice R. Franks, writes in his recently published book, "What's Wrong With Our Labor Unions!"—

"And the roots of the disease of labor monopoly are three:

"1. Compulsory unionism.

"2. Industry-wide bargaining.

"3. Dictated strike action.

"Weed these out of the labor movement and the Labor Trust will crumble like a house of cards."

A series of laws enacted in 1914, in 1926, in 1932 and in 1935 place labor leaders in a preferential position. Our government has been guilty of class bias. It has abandoned the fundamental precept of equality under the law which was enunciated by Aristotle 2,000 years before Jefferson wrote our Declaration of Independence.

Supplementary legislation, the Taft-Hartley and Landrum-Griffin Acts, has been ineffective. Mild salve is applied where drastic surgery is needed.

Effective labor legislation must repeal present immunity under the anti-trust laws, limitation of the injunctive power of the courts where labor unions are concerned and the manifold inequities of the Wagner Act. Freedom to accept or reject union membership must take the place of compulsory unionism.

The nation is in sore need of a shining new labor relations act which will establish equality in the eye of the law, protect the legitimate rights of labor, organized and unorganized, take the consumer interest fully into account and deal fairly with investors who must devote their savings to provide thousands of dollars for financing every available job.

The 10 Pillars of Economic Wisdom

I. Nothing in our material world can come from nowhere or go nowhere, nor can it be free: everything in our economic life has a source, a destination, and a cost that must be paid.

II. Government is never a source of goods. Everything produced is produced by the people, and everything that government gives to the people, it must first take from the people.

III. The only valuable money that government has to spend is that money taxed or borrowed out of the people's earnings. When government decides to spend more than it has thus received, that extra unearned money is created out of thin air, through the banks, and, when spent, takes on value only by reducing the value of all money, savings, and insurance.

IV. In our modern exchange economy, all payroll and employment come from customers, and the only worthwhile job security is customer security; if there are no customers, there can be no payroll and no jobs.

V. Customer security can be achieved by the worker only when he cooperates with management in doing the things that win and hold customers. Job security, therefore, is a partnership problem that can be solved only in a spirit of understanding and cooperation.

VI. Because wages are the principal cost of everything, widespread wage increases, without corresponding increases in production, simply increase the cost of everybody's living.

VII. The greatest good for the greatest number means, in its material sense, the greatest goods for the greatest number which, in turn, means the greatest productivity per worker.

VIII. All productivity is based on three factors: 1) natural resources, whose form, place, and condition are changed by the expenditure of 2) human energy (both muscular and mental), with the aid of 3) tools.

IX. Tools are the only one of these three factors that man can increase without limit, and tools come into being in a free society only when there is a reward for the temporary self-denial that people must practice in order to channel part of their earnings away from purchases that produce immediate comfort and pleasure, and into new tools of production. Proper payment for the use of tools is essential to their creation.

X. The productivity of the tools—that is, the efficiency of the human energy applied in connection with their use—has always been highest in a competitive society in which the economic decisions are made by millions of progress-seeking individuals, rather than in a state-planned society in which those decisions are made by a handful of all-powerful people, regardless of how well-meaning, unselfish, sincere, and intelligent those people may be.

Organized Crime

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLETON J. KING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1967

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, I recently had the pleasure of reading three illuminating letters written by three Greenwich Central School seniors from the 30th Congressional District, on the subject of organized crime. The increase in crime together with the obstacles placed in the path of arrest by recent court rulings has created a wave of frustration over these young people who have always been taught that the most positive remedy to crime is prompt capture, speedy trial, and severe penalty.

We are all too anxious to criticize our young people today. Publicity is only given to those who do things out of the ordinary. Here is an example of good clear thinking on the part of young people. We should encourage such thinking.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to include the three letters I received from Nancy Morehouse, Morgan Snyder, and Frank J. Ryan, all members of the senior class, Greenwich Central School, Greenwich, N.Y. Perhaps the messages implicit in their comments will get through to those officials, who have the power, if they will use it, to do something effective to curb crime in the United States.

The letters follow:

Hon. CARLETON J. KING,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN KING: My name is Morgan Snyder, I am 18 years old, and live in the rural town of Greenwich, N.Y.

I am writing this letter to you to express my feelings on crime in this country.

In the past ten years, the population of this country has increased ten per cent. With this increase, however, the crime rate has increased forty per cent. You most decidedly will have to agree that this is a most appalling figure.

I believe this increase in crime is due to the fact that many of our justice departments are not strict enough with the criminal, especially the first offender.

Too many innocent people each year are maimed, murdered, raped, and robbed, and these offenses will keep recurring until someone cracks down on the criminal with stricter penalties for crimes.

Many people have said that to cut this crime rate, the federal government should spend more money to build better schools, better housing developments, to give more relief for the needy, "good cops", and more youth clubs. All of this is probably old hat to you.

The point I'm trying to make is that the old idea that poverty is the root of crime is erroneous! Right now, especially under the current administration, the poor have more going for them than many of them need and yet the crime rate continues rising.

The only way that I can see to resolve this problem, is to pass legislation to establish unalterable punishment in all of the 50 states, instead of leaving it up to their preference of each state. I think it is ridiculous to sentence a killer to life imprisonment, and then let him go after 7 years of good behavior, maybe to kill again.

At least with capital punishment, we don't have to worry about a killer ever murdering again.

Another thing that appalls me is the way the Supreme Court has upheld such far fetched technicalities of the laws. The criminal gets more of a break than does his victim. Such was the case with a rapist named Mallory, and who knows how many other cases.

It seems that a great deal of beating around the bush is done when it comes to meting out justice. A man in California escaped the gas chamber for 12 years on an absurd technicality of the law.

If a person commits a murder and admits his guilt in writing before legal counsel arrives, his testimony can not be used against him, and he can be set free, possibly to commit another such deed of murder, rape, or robbery, or whatever.

To nip crime in the bud, I suggest that even for a first offense by a Juvenile Delinquent, he should be subject to a term "swift kick" correction farm, which would last from three to five days at a confinement in jail and hard labor. If every juvenile delinquent knew he faced this type of chastisement, he would probably think twice before committing another such infraction of the law.

The trouble with society today is the fact that such things as drinking, smoking, and drugs too, are excused because they are the "thing to do" to be sociable.

I believe that the only way the crime wave can be stopped is to enforce capital punishment and stricter punishments. Criminals are tough and should be treated the same thus after their guilt has been determined! We owe it to the innocent victims, who are killed or injured by criminal attacks, to fight fire with fire.

George Washington once used the idealogy "firm pillar of justice" in referring to the U.S. I wonder what he's saying now?

I rest my case.

Yours truly,

MORGAN SNYDER.

ARGYLE, N.Y., *June 5, 1967.*

Hon CARLETON J. KING,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I recently had the opportunity to read "Weep for the Innocent," an essay by Jenkin Lloyd Jones.

Mr. Jones began his essay by reporting that the crime rate is growing faster than the population rate in the United States. He then proceeded to criticize our justice system.

I agreed with many of Mr. Jones' viewpoints. One situation which I find especially unreasonable is the number of confessed criminals who are set free due to some technicality of law; perhaps they made statements before being advised of their legal rights, or maybe they were held in jail a few days before charges were brought against them.

In my opinion, when a suspect willingly confesses to a crime, his statement should be accepted and employed as evidence against him. Simply because he blurts out his confession before he speaks with his lawyer donesn't mean he is any less guilty than the criminal who refuses to talk. I find it not only foolish but dangerous to release such people from custody.

I would like to use as an example the case of Andrew Mallory as cited by Mr. Jones in his essay. Mallory admitted that he had raped a girl, but for some technical reason the Supreme Court set him free. His answer to this benevolent act was to commit the same crime again upon his release.

Needless to say, there have been many other similar cases. I can only hope that, for the sake of the innocent people whose lives are endangered by such rulings, the law will soon be altered to protect the attacked and not the attackers. I also hope you will take a stand on this issue. Thank you.

Sincerely,

MISS NANCY MOREHOUSE.

GREENWICH, N.Y.

Hon. CARLETON J. KING,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. KING: I have recently read a copy of a T.V. speech written by Jenkin Jones entitled: "Weep for the Innocent." In this article an outraged citizen explains his arguments and I fully agree with him. Murderers are roving the streets because of legal technicalities. Something should be done about this. Startling statistics were quoted in this speech showing that increase in population has been 10% in the last ten years, but that the crime rate has increased 40% in the same length of time.

My main concern is that so many citizens scoff at our nation's laws. Today, soft or politically minded judges have indirectly increased the crime wave with lenient, half-hearted lectures of "milquetoast" sentences.

Juvenile crime has also risen to a fantastic total, and respect for the law among the young is practically nil.Why? First offenders return for another dose of sympathetic chastisement by a judge who accepts ridiculous alibis, voiced by these youthful offenders or their ineffective parents.

It is most probably that many people feel the way I do, but so many of us are apathetic. This is a time for some action not just good intentions on the part of those who still love this country. We have too long ignored the warnings of our law enforcement bodies, and crime can overwhelm us just as surely as the atomic bomb, and more insidiously.

I hope that the plea of worried individuals will influence you in voicing some means of attacking this problem.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK J. RYAN.

Canada's 100th Anniversary

SPEECH
OF
HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 26, 1967

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, Saturday, July 1, 1967, marks the 100th anniversary of Canada's life as a nation. This date is in one sense the equivalent of America's Fourth of July, for it commemorates that date in 1867 on which the British North America Act was effected by royal proclamation, bringing four separate Provinces into the single nation of Canada.

The tremendous progress that has been made by that nation may be seen this year by all who visit Expo-67 in Montreal. As one who has had the privilege of viewing this splendid hallmark of Canadian achievement, I would urge all visitors to the exposition to include in their tour a trip to the Canadian pavilion. There especially one can enjoy a graphic portrayal in capsule form of Canada's remarkable growth during the 100 years of her existence as a nation.

May I join today with Canada's multitude of friends in sending her America's best wishes for continued growth and prosperity in a future filled with peace and happiness.

Should We Retest All Drivers?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 29, 1967

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, all Americans, in and out of government, have become gravely concerned over the problems of highway safety. Many methods have been suggested for cutting down the increasing tolls of highway accidents. One which has been widely discussed is the mass retesting of all drivers.

At its 64th annual convention at Lake Placid, N.Y., the New York State Automobile Association issued a statement warning that New York State should not dash blindly into such a program.

The reasons given are cogent, and I bring them to the attention of my colleagues for their consideration:

RESOLUTION OF MASS DRIVER REEXAMINATIONS

There is growing disposition on the part of numerous public and private agencies concerned with motor vehicle operation to seek traffic accident panaceas through the establishment of more frequent and stringent re-examination of presently licensed drivers, despite a serious lack of scientific evidence validating a basis for such an approach.

Over recent years, proponents of re-examination have advocated such random criteria as vision, mental and physical health, knowledge of safe driving practices, of changes in traffic laws and of safety features on motor vehicles. Largely these plans have pointed to drivers under 25 and over 65 years of age as requiring the most concentrated and frequent attention in re-examination.

In this atmosphere there exists grave possibility that retesting will be mandated and restrictions imposed on a haphazard and arbitrary basis without sufficient data on the relationship between traffic accidents and various factors relating to the driver, thus unfairly penalizing large numbers of drivers with little, if any, reduction in traffic accidents.

Based on present data, the New York State Automobile Association believes that:

1. Chronological age is not a sound criterion for appraising driver competence and is thus opposed to any effort to establish more frequent testing or restrictions based on numerical age alone.

2. In view of the many questions raised by the differences in approach to driver re-examination, inconsistencies in available statistics and contradictions of evidence, scientific studies should be conducted to help determine what types of testing will be meaningful and will help reduce accidents.

3. Public policy should be based on helping all drivers continue to drive enjoyably and safely so long as they can do so competently without unreasonable hazard to themselves or others.

The New York State Automobile Association urges that the Governor of the State of New York communicate with the National Highway Safety Bureau requesting:

that action on driver re-examination be deferred under the proposed highway safety standards; and

that the Bureau move promptly to develop sound and scientific criteria for any standards which the state will be required to meet in licensing drivers.

It is directed that a copy of this Resolution be sent to the Governor of New York State, the New York State Commissioners of Transportation and Motor Vehicles, members of Congress from New York State and members of the Legislature.

Hollywood-Style Summit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 29, 1967

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the artificial progress of the Hollywood-style summit meeting between President Johnson and Soviet Dictator Kosygin grows more apparent by the hour. Yesterday my esteemed colleague, Iowa's H. R. GROSS, pointed out in detail to the House why this highly publicized meeting probably hurt the cause of peace more than it helped it. History may one day demonstrate that this was the most unnatural summit meeting of our time.

The distinguished Representative from Iowa has a way of putting his finger on the nub of the matter, and I note with satisfaction that the press is beginning to get the truth. There are indications that knowledgeable elements of the press regret the President's attempts to put a rosy gloss around a meeting where no great optimism was justified by what happened.

In this connection I insert in the RECORD by unanimous consent articles by normally liberal columnist, Richard Wilson, of the Cowles publications, and by David Lawrence, known for his fundamental powers of perception.

The articles follow:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, June 28, 1967]

MORE THAN RAIN DAMPENED "SPIRIT OF HOLLYBUSH"

(By Richard Wilson)

The attitude of the people of Glassboro, N.J., and of the State Teachers College—typifying as it does the hopes and aspirations of good people—stands in pathetic contrast to the realities of the Hollybush conferences.

President Johnson's eagerness to find good in his talks with Premier Alexei Kosygin is in tune with what the people of Glassboro, and in every American town, pray for. But the reality lies in the cool, unflappable confidence of Kosygin and the people he represents in the absolute rightness of Soviet policy in its continuing head-on collision with the policy of the United States.

The only difference with the past is that Kosygin doesn't get angry and ominous about it. But he is no less firm and unyielding than Nikita S. Khrushchev, or even Josef Stalin, and one cannot help wondering what would happen should Kosygin decide it suited Soviet policy to adopt the angry and ominous tones of his predecessors.

Johnson was clearly elated after his first day of conferences with Kosygin. "I've got a surprise for you," he happily announced to his aides when he had finished talking to Kosygin. "We're going to meet again Sunday!" I could have cried," said one of them.

But on the second day the elation was over, though Johnson tried to preserve as much of it as he could in his television reports to the American people. A little more than the drenching rain at the end of the conferences dampened the spirit of Hollybush. Johnson had seen for himself what Presidents Eisenhower, Truman and Kennedy had seen—the implacable, unaltering collision between two kinds of life, two ways of thinking, two ideas on how the world should be ordered.

All the while the two men were talking new military supplies and economic aid were pouring into the Arab countries, new military supplies were going into the port at Haiphong, new assurances were being given that Soviet support lies four-square with those who fight American imperialism. We are imperialists all over—in Vietnam, of course, and also in the Mideast where it is contended our policy favors Israel.

So then Kosygin went to Cuba to see Castro to give evidence that Soviet policy has not changed there either, and he announced to the world that the Soviet Union supports wars of liberation everywhere, now and in the future.

A very subtle aspect of Kosygin's visit to the United Nations and the United States was the way he appealed to the people of the United States over the head of their President. He did that in his press conference in terms that eventually can only serve to revive intellectual discontent with U.S. policy.

He did it also in his little talks to the people of Glassboro, making distinctions between Russia's love for the American people and the policy of its leaders.

His badinage with the press was in the same vein and obviously was intended to convey the idea that he is a nice follow at heart, much more polite to reporters than Johnson and so sorry that he could not tell them more.

Johnson played to the galleries also. If there was any doubt how he will utilize the Kosygin visit for domestic political purposes, that is dispelled by a reading of his speech at a fund raising dinner in Los Angeles. It was a skillful mixture of the Great Society with Johnson, the peace-maker, whose come-let-us-reason together doctrines would prevail also in the troubled world of U.S.-Soviet relations.

But Kosygin is not a recalcitrant congressional leader; he wants a consensus on his own terms, not Johnson's, and the room for compromise and accommodation is both narrow and fleeting. Kosygin, to use American political terms, is simply not running on the same ticket with Johnson.

Officials of the state of New Jersey are talking of making Glassboro a historic shrine to take its place with other places in the state famed in the Revolutionary War. They had better wait a bit until they find out how history judges the spirit of Hollybush. History will say whether or not Johnson's supreme confidence in reasoning together, in eye-to-eye discussion, in the power of his own persuading personality, is misplaced when dealing with a hard-head like Kosygin.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, June 28, 1967]

KREMLIN NEEDS "PUBLIC RELATIONS" EXPERTS

(By David Lawrence)

What they need in Moscow is a few "public relations" men to keep the Kremlin from making such a mistake as it did in ordering Premier Kosygin to visit Fidel Castro, head of the dictatorship in Cuba.

For just as thoughts were turning toward a peaceful relationship between the Soviet Union and the United States, the premier's special trip to Havana reminds the American people of the military bases established in Cuba in 1962. From territory only 90 miles away, Soviet missiles with nuclear warheads could be launched to kill millions of Americans in the southeastern section of this country. The Kosygin-Castro conference also focuses attention on the guerrilla activities being constantly instigated in various Latin American countries by the Communist-controlled regime in Cuba.

Recent reports indicate that, while there have been some differences between Havana and Moscow, Cuba is still the principal base of the Communist apparatus in this hemisphere. This is a blatant defiance of the Monroe Doctrine.

The United Press International, in a dispatch from London yesterday, attributed to "authoritative diplomatic sources" in Great Britain this explanation of why Premier Kosygin went to Havana:

"The Mideast crisis and the demand for more Soviet aid from the Arab countries has heightened the Cuban problem for Moscow, which has been 'keeping' Cuba at the rate of some $1 million a day . . .

"The timing of Kosygin's trip is significant, in that it comes on the eve of the so-called Latin American solidarity conference due to open in Havana July 28. It is being organized by the Latin American solidarity organization of some 27 revolutionary Latin American movements.

"Current plans envisage the setting up of Castro-type guerrilla groups in Latin American countries with armed insurrection as one of the key objectives."

Coincidentally, a special commission of the Organization of American States has just finished an investigation of charges by Venezuela that Communist Cuba is responsible for aggressive activities on its soil. The OAS findings are expected to substantiate the Venezuelan claim. Havana has officially admitted that Cubans landed in Venezuela with a group of guerrillas last month, and Castro is openly supporting revolutionary movements in Latin America. There are, of course, lots of Russian technicians and advisers still in Cuba.

Unwittingly, the Kremlin has aroused the feeling here that the emphasis given Cuba at this time is part of a Soviet policy of threatening the United States that, if it doesn't stop supporting governments on other continents, the Communists will step up their infiltration and subversion in Latin American states. Nearly every country in this hemisphere is troubled by Communist undergrounds. All this increases the friction between Moscow and Washington which has been steadily growing in the Middle East and in Vietnam.

Someday there could emerge in the Soviet Union an aroused public opinion to insist that a real peace be established with the United States. The Russian people have suffered huge losses in war. In World War I, more than 76 percent of the 12 million men in their mobilized forces were killed or wounded or listed as missing. In World War II, 7.5 million men in the Soviet armed forces were killed, and at least 14 million others wounded. These figures do not include the casualties among civilians, which ran into the millions.

The people of the Soviet Union don't want war, but they don't yet know that their own government is today sowing the seeds of another world war. If they once discover this truth, a revolution may be expected to break out. That's why the Soviet press and radio and television are always heavily censored and, indeed, why the Russian people were told so little about the critical problems that were not resolved in the Johnson-Kosygin meetings.

Park Land Gets Out of Reach

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1967

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker; pursuant to permission granted, I insert in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a fine editorial appearing in the Dearborn, Mich., Guide of Thursday, May 4, 1967, under the byline of Mr. Ray Vernon, pointing out that lands for conservation and recreation for the future are going to be impossible to acquire under the present level of expenditures and with present funding in the foreseeable future because of rapid upward spiral in land prices.

This excellent editorial points out clearly the need for enactment of H.R. 5320 and similar legislation to earmark offshore gas revenue for acquisition of land for these vital purposes in a growing and increasingly urban America.

As one of the sponsors of the legislation mentioned, I am pleased to see this matter pointed up in the local papers of the district I serve, and I am hopeful that this kind of support will generate the kind of attitude on the part of citizens that will permit early enactment of H.R. 5320 or some similar legislation sponsored by any of my many colleagues who joined in this endeavor.

WASHINGTON HIGHLIGHTS: PARK LAND GETS OUT OF REACH

(By Ray Vernon)

The Nation will make a big mistake if it doesn't acquire now—while the price is right—all of the land, forests, lakes and seashore that it can possibly get its hands on for the benefit of generations yet unborn.

If this is not done the day may come when our youngsters won't know what is means to walk in the woods, to catch fish, walk along the beaches and swim in the clean, cool waters of an inland lake.

A growing population and the rapid spread of cities and industries are gobbling up land at an alarming rate. Where there were once great forests there ae now factories. Lakes are filled with pollution. Seashores have been taken over by private owners and commercial enterprises.

So the time is here to make a decision. It is too late after the trees are cut down and the vacant land has been developed. America must have these recreation areas not only for those of us who are here today but all the millions who will inhabit this land in the years to come.

The Federal Government is taking commendable steps in this direction but it's losing ground all the time. Money which could be used to buy this land is either being diverted to the war in Vietnam or spent on the Great Society.

Money for these purposes comes out of the federal Land and Water Conservation Fund but there is not enough. A special committee, composed of top government people in several federal agencies, made a study of the problem and came up with some interesting conclusions.

Among other things, it warned that if this land is not purchased now it may be out of reach within 10 years. Land values are increasing on an average of five to 10 percent a year across the country. But this land increases in value even more when the government announces it is looking at a particular section for a recreation area. Land owners are not adverse to gouging the government if they have a chance.

Today, the Land and Water Conservation Fund operates on a budget of about $115 million a year. It gets its revenues from three sources: admission and user fees at federal recreation areas, the net proceeds from the sale of federal surplus real estate and the federal tax on motorboat fuels.

However, this is far from enough.

The committee has come up with a proposal which could keep this land buying on schedule. It recommends, for example, that the government take $90 million a year from its oil and gas properties offshore in the Gulf of Mexico and on the Pacific coast as well as $10 million more from its other mineral properties. It also suggests taking $80 million a year from what the government earns on its national forests and grasslands.

Unfortunately, while the committee recommends this, it is not prepared to ask for legislation to carry it out. Reason for this, of course, is that the government is committed up to its ears on the war and the Great Society.

On the other hand, though, there is a group of conservation-minded Congressmen who think otherwise. They have introduced such legislation and are campaigning to have it enacted into law.

The committee stressed one important point: "The rising trend in the value of land suitable for outdoor recreation is expected to continue in view of the rapid growth in population and the increasing scarcity of land for all purposes."

Both these rising land costs and other factors have placed a severe strain on the Land and Water Conservation Fund. In the last Congress alone, our lawmakers established 23 new federal recreation areas involving the acquisition of about 250,000 acres of land at an estimated cost of $119 million.

It is estimated that combined federal and state outdoor recreation needs during the next 10 years will cost in the neighborhood of $3.6 billion. But that's in terms of 1967 dollars. If the rising cost of land were taken into consideration the needs would be 40 to 50 percent higher.

There is an excellent lesson to be learned from what happened when Congress established the Flaming Gorge National Recreation Area in the Ashley National Forest in Utah. It was planned as a 309-acre park.

In January, 1958, the Bureau of Reclamation bought 195 acres of the land for $8,450 or about $43 per acre. The 114 acres left were valued at $3,550 or $31 per acre.

In December, 1965, the State of Utah paid $13,187 for 14.2 acres of the park land at an average value of about $929 per acre. Since then the government appraised the remaining 99 acres at $42,500 or about $429 per acre.

That's a big jump—from $43 an acre to $929 in less than 10 years.

Vietnam Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK EDWARDS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1967

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the good people of my congressional district wholeheartedly support our men in Vietnam. The mayors of the various cities in Mobile County, Ala., have all proclaimed the week of July 2, 1967, as "We Honor Our Fighting Forces in Vietnam Week," and have called on all citizens to reaffirm their allegiance to our great Nation and the men and women who are fighting and dying for our freedom on foreign soil. A typical proclamation is that signed by Mayor V. O. Capps of the city of Prichard, Ala., and I insert a copy of this proclamation at the conclusion of my remarks:

PROCLAMATION

Whereas, of the many great days in the history of our country, none is more universally celebrated, none is more filled with meaning to true patriots, than July Fourth, 1776, the birthday of the United States of America, and

Whereas, the events which led up to the adoption of the Declaration of Independence tell the story of the birth of a new nation which was "conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal," and

Whereas, the search for liberty—religious, civil, or personal—brought thousands of our early settlers to these shores, and peopled the young America with a race of men to whom liberty was more precious than life, and

Whereas, it was because this liberty was threatened, and attempts at conciliation with the mother country had failed, that the colonial leaders finally declared on July 4, 1776, that "these United Colonies are, and of Right ought to be Free and Independent States.", and

Whereas, our Armed Forces are this very day fighting and dying in Vietnam to preserve those freedoms,

Now therefore, I, Vernon O. Capps, Mayor of the City of Prichard, do hereby proclaim the week of July 2, 1967, to be designated as We Honor Our Fighting Forces in Vietnam Week in the city of Prichard, and ask each citizen to reaffirm his allegiance to our great United States of America by participating in any or all activities planned to honor these men and women who are fighting and dying for our freedom on foreign soil. In this proclamation, I ask God's blessing.

Americans United for Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB H. GILBERT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1967

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, our former colleague, the Honorable Christopher C. McGrath, Surrogate of Bronx County, N.Y., has transmitted to me, in his capacity as chairman of a rally of Americans United for Israel, a resolution which was unanimously adopted on June 20, 1967, at a meeting of 700 citizens of Bronx County. The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION

We, Americans of every faith, gathered in meeting assembled, on the 20th day of June, 1967, in the county of the Bronx, State of New York, United in support of Israel and her righteous cause, do hereby declare:

1. We have watched with ever-widening admiration the heroic efforts of the people of Israel to reconstruct their ancestral homeland, a Nation sanctioned 19 years ago by the United Nations and dedicated to the highest aims of peace and democracy.

2. We have observed, also, with evergrowing dismay the efforts of Israel's unfriendly neighbor states to nullify the international decision creating the State of Israel by their unceasing endeavors to exterminate its people.

3. The United Arab Republic has attempted Israel's strangulation by the blockade of the international waters of the Strait of Tiran, by amassing armies at her borders, by endless incursions and bloody assaults upon its citizens, and by launching vituperative threats to annihilate the State. These attempts have been averted by Israel's gallant defense forces. The exercise of her elementary right of survival has served to heighten all our admiration for Israel's resistance to lawless aggression.

4. As Americans, we are acutely conscious of the obligations our Government has assumed to secure for Israel a just peace, free from armed invasions and the perpetual threat of war.

Now, therefore, be it resolved, that it is the duty of the Government of these United States and the General Assembly of the United Nations firmly and unequivocally to demand face-to-face negotiations between Israel and the Arab States, conducted in the light of prevailing conditions and guaranteeing a durable and just peace which will respect Israel's sovereignty, her security and her international maritime rights.

Be it further resolved, that we united Americans here assembled, do solemnly pledge our solidarity in determined and continuing support of Israel.

Be it further resolved, that copies of this resolution be sent to: the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, the Congress of the United States, the United States Ambassador to the United Nations, and the Israeli Ambassador to the United Nations.

Israel Reaffirms Religious Freedom for All Faiths

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1967

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, unlike the Arabs who refused free access, even to Moslems, to the holy places, Israel has always insured this right to the people of all faiths who wish to visit the holy places in Israel.

In a statement made by Israel's Minister for Religious Affairs, Dr. Zerach Warhastig, he expressed Prime Minister Levi Eshkol's intention to not only retain this policy in Israel, but to extend it to the new territories which have recently come under Israel administration.

I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following statement made by Dr. Zerach Warhastig on June 8, 1967.

The statement follows:

ISRAEL REAFFIRMS FULL RELIGIOUS FREEDOM FOR ALL FAITHS

(Statement made by Israel's Minister for Religious Affairs on June 8, 1967)

The State of Israel has for nineteen years ensured full freedom of religious worship to adherents of all faiths, both Israeli citizens and pilgrims who came to visit their Holy Places. This fact has been commended repeatedly by the heads of the religious communities residing in Israel as well as those who came from abroad.

Now additional territories have come under Israeli administration, in which highly important Holy Places are located: sites sacred to Judaism, to Moslems and to most of the Christian denominations.

The Prime Minister, Mr. Levi Eshkol, declared that the arrangement for safeguarding the Holy Places would be determined by the heads of the three religions—each one for the places sacred to his faith. The Prime Minister pointed out that the battles for Jerusalem exacted human losses, in an endeavour to avoid any damage to the Holy Places.

Within the next few days the Minister of Religious Affairs will set up committees composed of the various religions, with a view to safeguarding the Holy Places and laying down suitable arrangements for them.

Two Maryland GI's Killed in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1967

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Pfc. Edmond C. Sutton, of Baltimore, Md., an Army medic, and Pfc. William J. Boehm, of Silver Spring, Md., an Army paratrooper, were killed recently in Vietnam. I wish to commend the courage of these two young men and to honor their memory by including the following article in the RECORD:

An Army medic from Baltimore and an Army paratrooper from Silver Spring, Md., have been killed in Vietnam, the Defense Department reported yesterday.

The victims were Pfc. Edmond C. Sutton, 23, son of Mr. and Mrs. Willie Washington, of 1827 West Fayette street, and Pfc. William J. Boehm, 19, son of Arthur J. Boehm, of 802 Thayer avenue, Silver Spring.

Private Sutton had been in Vietnam since February and in the Army since he was drafted in August, 1966. He was assigned to the 11th Armored Cavalry Regiment. The Defense Department said he was killed last Thursday when the jeep in which he was riding struck a land mine.

WORKED FOR PHARMACY

Before he was drafted, Private Sutton had been in Philadelphia studying to be a mortician. He was a 1962 graduate of Edmondson High School. Before going to Philadelphia, he had worked for a pharmacy at Canterbury road and Thirty-ninth street.

In one of his last letters home, Private Sutton said he was in line to be promoted to specialist fourth class. He wrote often about the work of Army medics with Vietnamese civilians, his parents said.

Private Sutton was a member of Enon Baptist Church, at Edmondson avenue and Schroeder street, and of Masonic Lodge No. 22. As a boy he reached the rank of Eagle Scout in the Boy Scouts.

DIED IN MAJOR BATTLE

Besides his parents, he is survived by a half-brother, Irvin Washington, a student at Morgan State College.

Private Boehm was one of 80 members of the 173d Airborne Brigade who died last Thursday in a major battle with Communist forces near Dak To, about 270 miles north of Saigon.

He had been in Vietnam since the end of February. He had enlisted in the Army in March, 1966, after finishing a semester at Montgomery Junior College in Takoma Park, Md.

Private Boehm was a 1965 graduate of St. John's College High School in Washington and won honors in drafting and mechanical drawing.

During his semester at Montgomery Junior College he studied data processing.

But he left college to enlist in the Army "because he had very sincere feelings about patriotism," a brother said last night. He had talked about reenlisting after his current tour of duty was up.

In one of his last letters home, Private Boehm said he was due for a seven-day "rest and recreation" leave and that he hoped he would be one of a lucky few who would be sent to Hawaii.

Besides his father, he is survived by two brothers, John E. and Arthur J. Boehm, Jr.

School Desegregation Success

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1967

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, we all are well aware of the conflict and controversy which have accompanied school desegregation in some parts of our country. A few years ago, many people were saying flatly that it couldn't be done. But it has been done, and in many cases, desegregation is being accomplished quietly, effectively, and with community support.

Too often, the instances of successful school desegregation go unnoticed because of a lack of controversy. I was pleased to read recently an account in the publication, Scholastic Teacher, relating several school desegregation success stories.

These examples illustrate what can be done to improve equality of educational opportunity in school systems which have historically been operated on a segregated basis. I think the school officials in the South who are working quietly and conscientiously to bring their school systems into line with constitutional requirements deserve a great deal of credit, and I insert at this point in the RECORD the following article from the May 12 issue of Scholastic Teacher:

DESEGREGATION SUCCESS STORIES

A Negro girl in Texas recently won an interscholastic drama competition—a contest which she probably wouldn't even have entered if it weren't for desegregation.

Desegregation success stories similar to this are unfolding constantly in the South with little publicity. "And, contrary to general opinion," says Lou Mathis, of USOE's Equal Educational Opportunity Programs, "the superintendents I have talked to are not afraid of being recognized for having accomplished a degree of desegregation."

Latest figures show that the majority of Negro students in the South still are not attending desegrated classes. But the pace of desegregtaion is increasing rapidly. The Southern Education Reporting Service says that 16 per cent of the 3,000,000 Southern Negro students are now attending desegregated schools—a sharp increase from last year's six per cent.

Here are some of the desegregation success stories:

GUY PERKINS DIST. (ARK.)

After Superintendent I. H. Fielder proposed closing the Negro elementary school, a new wing was needed on the white school. Residents voted 3–1 for increased taxes, knowing that the purpose was to achieve complete desegregation.

ROSEBUD DISTRICT (TEX.)

"The additional educational opportunity afforded to Negro students moving into formerly white schools can be illustrated in the Rosebud Independent School District," reports USOE's Mathis. It was in this district that the Negro girl won the drama competition sponsored by the Baylor University Drama Department.

Little progress was achieved in desegregation until the school district decided to desegregate fully. Superintendent Billy Bates says a policy of fully informing the community of the requirements of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, Supreme Court decisions, and the steps necessary to comply with the law, account for his success in achieving considerably more desegregation than neighboring districts.

LITTLE ROCK (ARK.)

Ten years ago, Little Rock was the scene of violence that forced President Eisenhower to call out the troops so that Negro children could enter white schools. Today, Little Rock is the scene of quiet progress. "Though not outstanding on this score, there definitely is progress," a USOE official reports.

Its most notable move was in the appointment of a Negro principal to handle all the recruitment, hiring, and assignment of faculty.

GALVESTON DISTRICT (TEX.)

The Galveston Independent School District achieved 30 per cent desegregation under freedom of choice this year, expects to double that amount next year, and achieve full desegregation in 1968–69 by a complete changeover in the way students are assigned to three of its biggest schools.

"As a result, we're desegregating and improving our education program at the same time," says Dr. Morgan E. Evans, superintendent. "The NAACP said we were moving too slow. Others said too fast. But a vast majority in the middle said, 'We'll work together.' "

The district conducted desegregation work sessions for faculty and staff, and invited parents to attend. They also worked with a council of Negro leaders, the Chamber of Commerce, and other civic organizations. The school board ended its policy of requiring photographs of its teacher applicants.

COLDSPRING DISTRICT (TEX.)

Formerly operated along the classic Southern dual arrangement ("separate but equal"), the Coldspring Independent School District, San Jacinto County, is now slowly working toward complete desegregation. This year, 77 of the 698 Negro schoolchildren attend former all-white schools. Next year, the figure will double. By 1968–69, when new buildings are finished, desegregation will be complete.

Because Coldspring has difficulty in finding and holding top-quality teachers, Superintendent M. C. Jones has used desegregation as a means of affording all his students a better education. For example, an outstanding physics teacher, who is a Negro, was assigned to a white school. Negro students taking physics are bused to her classroom. And, an outstanding chemistry teacher, who is white, was assigned to a Negro school. White students are shuttled to his classes, which, of course, are also desegregated.

The superintendent reports these temporary desegregation measures have served the following purposes: Afforded the students exposure to persons the superintendent feels are best in their fields in his district, increased desegregation; moved white students to what has always been a Negro school—which many Southern officials said was impossible; and, by these steps, paved the way for joint use of the school facilities by 1968-69.

Asked how he smoothed the way for faculty desegregation, he said, "We prepared the way a year ago, talking to parents and teachers who would be involved. Quality teaching is what the parents want, and one good teacher can dispel a lot of fears, a lot of myths."

Developing Democracy in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD T. HANNA
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 28, 1967

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, the recent National elections held in the Republic of Korea marked the beginning of the second generation of the Third Republic. The people of Korea may be proud of the accomplishments of the Third Republic in its first 4 years and look forward to even more growth and development in the future.

I have often looked to that progressive republic with warmth and admiration. I feel that South Korea is an important member of the Pacific community and a good and valuable friend of the United States. Many reactions to the recent elections in the ROK were, however, pessimistic in nature. This kind of reaction is, furthermore, all too typical of America's general view of our neighbors to the west. We seem always prone to notice the negative aspects of Asian developments and consequently the more constructive side is lost from view. In the recent Korean elections there were, of course, a number of problems, yet I feel the overall evaluation must be positive. The Republic of Korea is making a valiant attempt to stabilize her democratic system, while working under tremendous handicaps. I am confident, Mr. Speaker, that she is on her way to a successful and stable political future.

The three major areas of concern that have been reported by the American press with regard to the Korean National Assembly elections of June 6 center around: the accusation of the rigging of elections; the problem of excessive police power and its misuse; the possibility that the new DRP-controlled National Assembly will be nothing more than a "rubber stamp" for President Park. The extent of the problem is speculative, at best. The press reports, however, have unfortunately dwelt only with the negative aspects of the election; while many problems were evident in the election, still, viewed as a whole the recent Assembly elections offer the promise of improvement in the future. To allow the negative considerations to obscure the promising outlook for the future of the ROK would be a grave mistake.

The problem of election irregularities is a serious one in a democracy. As long as voters are not allowed to vote as they personally believe they should, the democratic process remains limited in its representative effectiveness. In Korea, two things must be pointed out, however, with regard to the reported election code violations. The first is that the President, Mr. Park Chung Hee, has ordered law enforcement authorities to prosecute all offenders of election regulations—regardless of party. Supreme Prosecutor, Giksoo Shin, reported that Mr. Park called for action without delay and that he felt that incidents which took place in several of the districts spoiled the election atmosphere as a whole. Thus, President Park has openly faced the problem and has taken the responsibility upon himself and his administration to work for the betterment of election processes in the ROK. Second, it should be noted that in comparison to elections of the past, this one demonstrated great progress. In the past, Korea has had numerous difficulties in administering elections. However, the 1967 elections demonstrate progress from the past. These two considerations lead one to an optimistic speculation of the future of Korean elections.

The second issue in the recent Korean elections results from the fact that the Republic of Korea is exposed to one of the most severe threats of Communist subversion and infiltration in the Pacific community. The demilitarized zone is under continuous assault from the north and the threat of Communist collaborators working through South Korean Government channels necessitates constant attention. To combat these threats to democratic stability, Mr. Park's government has developed an efficient National Police Force. The DRP has such extensive control of the Government, the possibility of that party exploiting the use of the police force is a charge available to the opposition end of the press. This is an unfortunate situation. Yet it shall exist only as long as the Government remains so heavily weighted to one side. As I shall point out later, the next election may well bring a much more balanced government, eliminating the basis for the charge, usually unfounded, of police exploitation by the DRP. In the interim elections, the problem is not serious and the Communist threat necessitates the maintenance of an efficient police program.

A third complaint registered against the June 8 elections was that President Park now has a rubber stamp legislature at his disposal since his party controls over two-thirds of the seats in the assembly. This allegation fails to consider three important conditions in the Korean Government. First of all, the DRP is not a monolith. It is a coalition of many smaller parties and subject to great internal problems. Moreover, President Park does not have singular control over the party. There are other men, such as DRP President Jong-pil Kim, who play major roles in formulating party direction. Second, the possibility for a workable two-party system is now very good. Only one splinter party candidate was able to find victory on June 8. Those who banded together in the NDP were able to find considerable success, especially in urban areas where voters are developing an admirable degree of political sophistication. If NDP leaders can learn from the June 8 election, they will work to incorporate many of the splinter groups into their fold. If the present two-party system undergoes expansion in this manner, the DRP will not be nearly as powerful in 1971.

Finally, barring constitutional amendment, President Park will be ineligible for reelection in 1971. This will afford the NDP a tremendous opportunity to gain power and influence. They will, for the first time, face the DRP with Mr. Park—the man under whose leadership the Third Republic began. Through these three considerations, Mr. Speaker, we see that the problem of a rubber-stamp legislature is not nearly as serious as it appears at first glance. The NDP has a great opportunity for growth in the next 4 years, and the DRP may face the loss of their most effective leader in the next election.

There were two points of an independently positive nature that merit mention here. The Assembly elections demonstrated a great deal of political independence on the part of the urban voters. The DRP suffer defeat in Seoul, Pusan, and other major cities. This has been seen as an attempt on the part of urban voters to put a check on the ruling party's control of the legislature. This kind of thinking demonstrates a feeling for political systems and is encouraging for the future.

Second, both major parties demonstrated the beginning of a sense of party attachment and party leadership. The DRP began the planning of their election in the summer of 1966. They were well prepared for the election effort by June of 1967. Although there remains much polishing in the future, the party idea has caught on in the ROK, and again leads to optimism for the future.

Mr. Speaker, we have a proud and just democratic system in America. Yet it is still not flawless, and we have been at it for nearly two centuries now. Further, we did not face many of the hindrances that the young Republic of Korea faces. It is, indeed, understandable that the Koreans have problems with their democratic development and stabilization. We must, however, recognize the significant progress that the ROK is making. I feel certain that they will demonstrate much more growth and progress in the years to come.

Further, I commend to the consideration of my colleagues a series of three articles appearing in the June 14, 1967, edition of the Korea Herald Weekly, which expand upon some of the considerations of the elections of June 8:

DRP Omnipotent as Election Result

(By Joong-Sup Bae)

The ruling Democratic Republican Party (DRP) is now omnipotent as the result of the National Assembly elections Thursday, and the nation enters a new phase of politics as it approaches the 1970s when the legislature will have served its term.

The ruling party became able to control a total of 130 seats in the 175-man assembly, 13 seats more than a two-thirds majority—117 seats—enabling the party to amend even the Constitution if it wishes.

In the final vote count, the ruling party had 103 elected in the 131 constituencies and is entitled to 27 out of the 44 proportional representative seats.

The major opposition New Democratic Party and the Taejung (masses) Party became the only opposition parties to hold seats in the forthcoming legislature. But they suffered a great setback by losing 16 seats in total.

President Chung Hee Park was assured of unchallenged legislative support, which he had called for during the election campaign, for his economic development programs, good-neighbor policy toward Japan and pro-U.S. stand on the Vietnam war.

With a 110-seat majority in the legislature behind him, President Park concluded the ROK-Japan amity treaty, deployed combat troops to the Republic of Vietnam and pushed ahead various reforms in domestic and external affairs.

Now, President Park, who received a bigger mandate for himself in the May 3 presidential election, is expected to push his policies with more ambition, vigor and courage. In the past, the opposition parties have charged that the status of the assembly is that of an attendant on the executive branch and that it was a rubberstamp parliament.

The major opposition New Democratic Party, during the campaign, appealed for a majority on the ground that "a majority on the part of the Democratic Republicans would mean autocratic rule."

On the lopsided victory by his party, President Park called it "a proof of overwhelming public support." DRP Chairman Jong-pil Kim said that it was the result of public credit in "our party's will and sincerity to work."

Chairman Kim briskly added that his party "will avoid doing anything which might give rise to a charge of a one-party show."

In spite of such an assurance, political observers call attention to the fact that at present, there is no way to check effectively the government and the ruling party. The country must trust their good conscience.

The overwhelming triumph was a pleasing surprise to the DRP leaders but, at the same time, gave them a headache. President Park and other top DRP leaders are confronted with the problem of how to keep their party's "excessively fattened body" in a good and healthy condition, a DRP leader confided.

DRP Chairman Kim stressed that his party "will not experience disunity or internal dissension because of its too big size in the parliament." He pointed at strong leadership over the ruling party to justify his prediction.

But most political critics foresee the possibility of disunity or factionalization among the Democratic Republicans "as a matter of time."

In Thursday's elections, the ruling party suffered a "bitter" defeat in Seoul, Pusan and some other major cities while scoring a lopsided victory in the rural and small cities.

The ruling party swept three provinces and lopsidedly carried six others. But it managed to win only one out of the 14 seats in Seoul and two out of the seven in Pusan, the second-largest city in the country.

The ruling party also lost in Inchon, Kyonggi-do, Taejon, Chungchong Namdo, Kwangju, Cholla Namdo, and in some other cities like Mokpo and Wonju.

Political observers agree that an old vote pattern under the late former Syngman Rhee's Liberal regime was revived in Thursday's elections—the opposition-dominated urban and pro-government rural areas.

This phenomenon, described as a political regression, is in direct contrast to that of the May 3 presidential election in which President Park gained a balanced support from both the urban and rural areas.

Some critics said that urban voters cast their ballots in a way to constitute a checking force in the legislature and to foil the ruling party's die-hard struggle to wrap up all seats in the rural area.

Another problem facing the government and ruling party is the restoration of peace and tranquility in the society which were disturbed to a considerable extent during the elections.

The opposition New Democratic Party scarcely managed to win 44 seats, including 17 proportional representation seats. The whole opposition strength was weakened by 21 seats compared with the last legislature where the opposition held a total of 65 seats.

Concern is mounting on what line of action the New Democrats will take in the parliament with a minority force of less than one third of the total of 175 seats.

Political circles said that the New Democrats are hardly expected to attempt to compete with the ruling party with alternative policies.

Another feature of the elections is the total collapse of the splinter parties. The nine splinter parties entered about 300 candidates but only one of them was elected. It was an unprecedented event in the nation's election history.

Political circles called the phenomenon "encouraging" for the development of two-party politics. And they said that it was a blow to politicians who migrated from party to party to win nomination.

DRP Victory

Rough and tough battles for the 175 seats of the seventh National Assembly are over. Eleven parties contested, but it appeared unlikely as of yesterday evening that any but the Democratic Republican Party and the New Democratic Party would be able to secure even a single seat in the forthcoming legislature. Official returns showed that more than two thirds of the assembly seats would go to Democratic Republicans; New Democrats would become the only opposition in the legislature in the coming four years. The way for two-party politics long sought after in the Korean political scene has now been primarily paved.

One fact worthy of note concerning Thursday's general elections may be the fact that many highly reputed old-timers shamefully suffered defeat. Parliamentary elections used to assume a personnel-oriented propensity. This has not worked out this time. In some ways, this tells of the voters' political sophistication markedly oriented in the direction of wholesome party politics.

Attention is also drawn to the overwhelming victory scored by the Democratic Republicans. A cozy two-thirds majority, while it can conduce to the enhancement of political and economic stability so badly needed by this country, is not wholly safe from the danger of complacency on the part of the ruling party. DRP leaders have already warned against this danger. DRP Chairman Jongpil Kim expressed his concern over the possibility of difficulty in rallying the newly elected DRP legislators solidly behind the party's leadership.

No majority party can complacently play a rubber-stamping role for the administration. Its primary duty is not only to support what the administration undertakes to do but also to oversee what it performs in the interest of the people, And a successful fulfillment of this duty requires, before anything else, the exercise of prudence and sincerity in honoring what little rights are entrusted by the Constitution to the minority party.

A good lesson may be learned from Thursday's general elections. The turnout of voters ran at 75.83 per cent. This is greater than that recorded in the elections conducted four years ago. But then it falls well below the May 3 presidential election. What this means is that a great number of eligible voters lost interest in the elections, and it is widely feared that the deprivation of interest was ascribable, in no small measure, to foul electioneering campaigns riddled with mudslinging and sugar-coated, empty policy pledges. This is tantamount to total distrust in politicians, whether they belong to the majority or the minority party.

Finally, no less excellent a lesson may be learned by the victorious Democratic Republican Party from a thorough reflection of its painful defeats in Seoul and Pusan where the standards of political sophistication are high and a diligent rectification of the infirmities that caused the defeats.

Election Seen Beginning of Real Two-Party Politics

Despite strong criticism by the opposition camp against what it claimed to be dishonest elections, the election results signaled the start of long-hoped-for two-party politics in the country.

The parliamentary election also gave a good lesson to many political "migratory birds" who move from one party to another for their personal interest.

The lesson is that nobody, no matter how powerful a political tycoon he might be, can become a legislator unless he is recommended by either the ruling or major opposition party.

In the election just past, not a single candidate from splinter opposition parties won a seat in the assembly.

Outstanding among such losers were Jun-yon Kim of the Minjung Party, Chae-chon Cho of the Democratic Party and Chae-hak Lee of the Liberal Party, Kim and Lee, who have been well known to the nation since the days of the now-deposed Liberal regime, won every previous election in their respective constituencies without being affected by their party affiliation in the past.

Along with those opposition leaders, many opposition leading candidates who were regarded in the past as "invincible" including former Premier Taek-sang Chang, Jin-han Chon, head of the Handok (Korea Independence) Party, and Ik-pyo Hong of the New Democratic Party, were destined to fade completely away from the nation's political field.

As the DRP became the overwhelming majority in the new National Assembly, the young opposition "three musketeers" in the outgoing legislature were broken up.

They are incumbent Reps. Sang-hum Kim, Ha-kyun Shin and Yun-yong Cho, sons of the late opposition leaders Song-su Kim, Ik-hee Shin and Pyung-ok Chough.

Of the three, only Cho was reelected in a Seoul district.

Shin was defeated by Jichul Cha, 32, the youngest DRP candidate who was one of the mainstreamers of the May 16 military revolution in 1961.

Of the total of 14 DRP candidates who ran in Seoul, only Joon-kyoo Pak was reelected and thus saved the face of the ruling party.

In the June 7 parliamentary election, most government and opposition leaders were elected.

DRP Chairman Jong-pil Kim, obtained the largest number of votes out of the total 131 electoral districts with more than 69,000 ballots in the Puyo district, Chungchong Namdo.

NDP President Chin-o Yu, who ran in the parliamentary race for the first time in a Seoul constituency, defeated his old-time friend Sung-jin Kim of the DRP by getting more than 41,000 votes.

Three opposition floor leaders—Chi-song Yu, Hoe-soo Yang and Kun-soo Han—were defeated in the elections.

The opposition NDP, however, consoled itself by winning in Mokpo, where the hottest competition was waged between opposition spokesman Dae-jung Kim and former Communications Minister Byong-sam Kim.

Upon reelection after a month-long election fight, NDP spokesman Kim thanked the voters in tears.

Letter From Secretary of the Atomic Energy Technical Committee of the Industrial Union Department of the AFL–CIO

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1967

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, unquestionably the use to which countries, both large and small, put their nuclear capability affects all nations. Nuclear power can be harnessed for the benefit of mankind, or it can be used to destroy civilization. Although potential military uses of such power has reached a terrifyingly sophisticated level, we are, as yet, on the threshold of knowledge concerning peaceful uses of the atom. The cooperative, rather than the antagonistic, use of atomic power can benefit all nations. The necessity of reducing the proliferation of nuclear weapons was emphasized by President Johnson in his recent meetings with Premier Kosygin.

In light of these considerations, I commend to the attention of my colleagues a thoughtful letter dated June 20 from Leo Goodman, secretary of the Atomic Energy Technical Committee of the Industrial Union Department of the AFL–CIO. It follows:

Industrial Union Department,
Washington, D.C., June 20, 1967.

Dear Congressman: I am writing to you because of my deep concern regarding the proposal in S. 611 (H.R. 3647) to authorize appropriations in section 101 (4) Project 68–4–g to initiate the planning, design and construction of the 200 BEV accelerator at Weston, Illinois.

The bill provides $10 million as a first allocation. The current total estimate for the construction of this project is $360 million. The AEC and the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, however, have been notoriously low in their estimates for the cost of their new and large construction projects. In addition to the cost of the construction, this project will require $60 million a year for operation.

The location of Weston, Illinois, as the site for this accelerator has caused much controversy. The expenditure of these large sums involves a fundamental question with respect to the allocation of natural resources. And I am inclined to believe that we tend to allocate a disproportionate share of our resources to this type of activity at the expense and neglect of programs that relate directly to basic economic and social needs of the American people.

But there are even more pressing reasons for not proceeding with the construction of the 200 BEV at this time. The United States government is urgently seeking to negotiate a treaty of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. In this negotiation, the United States and the other major nuclear powers are asking the smaller nations and the developing nations to forego the development of nuclear bombs in the hope and expectation that more of nuclear science can be directed toward peaceful purposes than is presently the case. This desire requires the non-nuclear nations to yield the bomb potential without any yielding on any score by the major nations. I believe this is an unachievable proposal unless the major nuclear nations are prepared to prove their willingness to cooperate in nuclear matters to maximize the extent of cooperation in increasing application of nuclear science to non-military purposes. There must be an area of cooperation between the nuclear powers preferably under the supervision of the International Atomic Energy Agency to which all except mainland China must be induced to adhere. This cooperation can not be achieved easily or quickly but as Kennedy has said, "If we have a long way to go let us take the first step."

At a recent conference near Washington, a group of 80 leaders representing a broad cross section of disciplines, occupations and interests, including a number who are daily involved with coping with the problems of nuclear proliferation, after reviewing the issues involved, urged the strengthening of the International Atomic Energy Agency and the cooperation between the nuclear powers as a first step. They said, "We believe it is likely, in the absence of an effective international agreement or a substantial improvement in world conditions, that the number of nations possessing nuclear weapons will increase in the next ten years."

The recent Middle East crisis emphasizes the urgent need for cooperation in the nuclear field before these countries turn to nuclear weapons as well. The cooperation must begin on a non-military basis. The broadened cooperation should be based on a phased series of maximum possible joint effort. Otherwise, an opportunity to use this project as a tool for international cooperation is being thrown away.

I believe the first step, because of its non-military nature, could well be the joint construction of the 200 BEV. This opening wedge of cooperation is logical because:

1) There are no military applications known to high energy physics to which construction of this project can contribute.

2) This machine which must be available to scientists from all countries is so expensive that its cost should be shared by many countries.

3) Both the European countries and the Eastern block countries have shown that it is possible to secure both the sharing of the cost and the sharing of the use of such an instrument in multi-nation organizations, such as CERN and DUBNA in the West and East respectively.

A possible second step for cooperation should be an extended program of power reactor inspection and control. Otherwise, as the experts agreed at Airlie House, it is possible "that a nation producing substantial quantities of pluntonium, as a by-product of operation of nuclear power reactors, may be influenced to use its plutonium stockpiles in weapons."

A further step of cooperation could be inspection and control of chemical reprocessing plants which take the plutonium out of the used fuel elements. There is much support for a program of joint ownership of these processing plant, either by the IAEA directly or by a committee of the four cooperating nuclear powers under the supervision of the IAEA. Further steps must be taken by all the nuclear powers to extend the "Atoms for Peace" commitments to the developing world through a cooperative effort among the four members of the nuclear (bomb) club so that the technology and the know-how of science as well as the protective programs shall be known and used for the benefit of mankind throughout the world.

The only alternative is a world of nuclear powers with all of the doom which that forecasts upon the continuation of the human race.

Therefore, this appropriation item, regarding the only available wedge to cooperation among the nuclear powers, should not be firmed up by enactment at this time for construction at Weston for narrow, partisan, political or educational purposes.

The time has also come to terminate as totally unnecessary the subsidy to the European Atomic Energy Agency. Much of this money appropriated initially to help develop a nuclear power industry in Europe to offset the threatened shortage of energy due to the cut-off of Mid-East oil in 1956 has actually been wasted in laboratories duplicating much of the research in the United States. Little nuclear power has been produced by Euratom. And much of the annual gifts from the United States to Euratom has been used to influence decisions regarding nuclear projects in the United States. This interference must end. This annual appropriation has outlived its purposes and should be terminated.

These matters should not be left solely to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. War is too important to leave only to the generals. And nuclear science is too important to leave only to the handful who participate in the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. The Armed Forces Committee should consider the issues involved as well as the Committees on Foreign Relations and the Committees on Appropriations.

Too much money for one narrow purpose can force us to spend much more unnecessarily in an expanded arms race or the continued over-emphasis in nuclear science on military applications. The time has come to change direction. The split atom can be put to work for the benefit of mankind. Let us begin truly on the broader scale envisioned above.

Sincerely yours,

Leo Goodman,
Secretary, Atomic Energy Technical Committee.

A Vital Aspect of Our Education

SPEECH

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1967

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, understanding of ideologies which threaten world peace constitutes a vital aspect of education. To insure that this area of knowledge is not neglected, the American Bar Association has planned a 15-week television series dealing with the differences between democracy and communism. The program will be broadcast to social studies teachers within the Catholic archdiocesan school system of New York.

The purpose of this commendable project is to equip instructors with the information needed to teach the facts about life under the totalitarian regimes within the Sino-Soviet orbit. Emphasis will be placed on the contrasts between the American, Russian, and Chinese systems in the economic, political, and social spheres.

Clarification of the principles which govern these systems undoubtedly can do much to facilitate the development in our young people of a fuller understanding of democracy to prepare them for assuming the full responsibilities of citizenship. The inauguration of this program by the ABA in cooperation with the archdiocese of New York represents a significant step toward achieving this goal.

Francis Cardinal Spellman is to be commended for the significant contribution he is making to increasing American awareness of the dangers of communism by cooperating with the ABA in establishing the program in New York's Catholic schools. This is but another example of Cardinal Spellman's deep concern for the preservation of our national freedom. Education in the nature and methods of governments which threaten the continuance of our democratic tradition. The program announced jointly last week by the cardinal and the ABA will do much to insure that our young people receive this kind of education. I can only hope that other school systems will follow this example.

Report No. 3: "A Strategy for a Livable Environment"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD T. HANNA
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 28, 1967

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, in continuing my comments on the recent HEW task force report, "A Strategy for a Livable Environment," I wish to explore the important areas of manpower, public awareness, and education. All these categories are, like man's environment, closely interrelated. To obtain enthusiastic workers for Government and industry who are willing to devote time and energy to attacking the serious environmental problems confronting us today requires a public awareness and generous public support for their activities—so that they may feel that their efforts are worthwhile. And, needless to say, education is the surest way of stimulating public awareness in any field.

Too often, I am afraid, in various courses offered through all levels of our school systems—public and private—there is a lack of emphasis on integrated training. Rather, each subject matter is assigned its niche. The teachers, too often, have little interest in gonig beyond the assigned subject matter, hammered out in various curriculum guides. Far too often, Mr. Speaker, courses in biology or personal health involve the memorization of various organs with precious little time devoted to an overall view of man. Social sciences, too, are not immune from criticism. Instead of using concrete examples of various functions of Government, oftentimes the courses are limited to the memorization—with no real idea of applications—of various sections of the Constitution.

Perhaps it would be more useful if we instead concentrated on analyzing various functions—delegated and implied—in the Constitution by looking at the actions of various governmental agencies. Thus, one example clearly relevant here is the vague phrase "to promote the general welfare." This could be used as a steppingstone for an analysis of Government programs in air and water pollution, in soil conservation in housing legislation, in traffic and radiation safety, all programs designed to give America a quality environment.

In short, by instilling an appreciation in the Nation's youth in the need for a healthful environment, through examples of current programs and the dissemination of community health information, in schools, we would be better meeting a serious challenge outlined by the report, which calls for more long-term attempts to change public attitudes through the educational process.

While the above comments pertain to the youth of this Nation, we should not overlook our more mature citizens. Adult education must also stress an integrated approach, an imaginative interrelation among courses and subject matter which can be construed as dealing with man's environment.

Outside the formal halls of schooling, there is also the need, stressed so rightfully by the task force, for a continuing balanced discussion of environmental problems—by newspapers, magazines, radio, television, as well as by various governmental and private reports and publications.

Maybe educational television would be interested in working out a long-term project to analyze man's environment. Better yet, perhaps there could be a weekly report, recapping developments in the improvement of man's living conditions—examination of new studies, proposals, and most importantly, of actions that various communities are undertaking to allay the mulitude of environmental problems man is battling. Perhaps commercial networks would be interested in a similar endeavor.

Having enunciated a few thoughts on education and public awareness, Mr. Speaker, I would now wish to move into the final area of today's commentary. Manpower training is a most crucial area. It is, as we all know, next to impossible to win battles without experienced personnel and modern equipment. The same is true in our battle against the polluting and decaying forces which are attacking our environment, and which, ironically, man is most responsible for unleashing.

One report recommendation calls for a determination by 1969 of manpower requirements necessary to adequately supply all environmental program needs in 1972 and beyond, with recommendations for the means of supplying such needs.

Fellowships for the in-service training and continuing education of departmental personnel in the environmental health field, as well as for State and local personnel should be established, according to the report.

As an example of the overall planning needed for a sound educational program dealing with man's environment, the report asks for the "establishment of programs and curricula in clinical and human ecology through grants to the Nation's professional schools, such as schools of medicine, law, planning, public health, and public administration."

Additionally, the task force sees the need for a functional, rather than a categorical approach, to the problems plaguing the environment. Thus, departmental programs should be shifted from their present narrow concern with specific features of the environment—air, water, food—to functional elements of the total mission of environmental protection, such as research and development, promulgation of and compliance with standards, and environmental surveillance.

Such a program, however, seems somewhat hampered—at least in adaptation to State and local levels of government. For, the report finds that most all the environmental health protection experts are concentrated at the Federal Government, with only a paltry few remaining for State and local levels.

In general, the field "finds itself with the poorly trained practitioner, the part-time worker, the nonmotivated and uninspired administrator who views his work in environmental health as an unpleasant chore, rather than a rewarding career."

Through use of fellowships to individuals and more grants to various organizations, perhaps the field of environmental health protection would be able to attract more high quality personnel, as well as rededicating the core of professionals currently engaged in these problems to even more imaginative efforts in helping combat the polluting and decaying forces at work in our Nation, and indeed throughout the world.

One very important recommendation of the report relates to the profit incentive of industry. Unfortunately, it seems that HEW's current policies "effectively deny industry a reasonable profit from work carried out under contract." There would undoubtedly be a greater concern by industry for developing talented personnel in environmentally related fields to explore various inventions or solutions for the abatement of pollution were there a greater profit incentive.

Along these lines, Mr. Speaker, I have two recommendations, one somewhat positive in tone, the other somewhat negative. First, I would urge the Government to seriously consider the awarding of cost-plus contracts to corporations and foundations which are involved with projects to combat undesirable environmental effects. Such programs have proved relatively successful in the crucial area of national defense. I suggest that the environment should be treated with as much deference and concern as national defense. Second, I believe that the Government should formulate a definite policy whereby it does not contract for any business with concerns which have not adopted certain minimum anti-pollution standards which we in Congress should earnestly begin formulating. It is time to begin work on the HEW task force recommendation for a Unified Environmental Protection Act, which could possibly embody the thought I have just outlined.

In my final comments on the report, following our upcoming recess, I shall examine the financial aspects of making man's environment a safe place in which to live.

Beautification and Billboards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERVEY G. MACHEN
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 6, 1967

Mr. MACHEN. Mr. Speaker, the Improvement and Beautification Committee of the City of College Park, Md., has long been concerned about the future of the Highway Beautification Act of 1965, as we all have.

In its work within the community, this committee has evolved a proposed alternative approach to the problem of unsightly highways and adjacent areas. The committee's recommendation, which I present for the information of my colleagues, is contained in a paper entitled, "Beautification and Billboards," which I now include at this point in the RECORD:

BEAUTIFICATION AND BILLBOARDS

The Highway Beautification Act of 1965, passed by the 89th Congress, provides for the gradual control over and exclusion of billboard signs and other clutter along federally-aided highways in the United States, now estimated at 265,000 miles.

It allows the Federal Government to pay 75 per cent and the State 25 per cent of compensation to owners of signs for removing them. It is estimated that 1,017,000 billboards are due to come down in 1970 and that out of the proposed expenditure of $200 million a year for the next ten years for highway beautification, roughly one fourth of this would be used for the purpose of compensation.

Now a battle of huge proportion is being waged in Congress over the Highway Beautification Act, which expires on June 30, 1967, to decide whether it will be extended, modified or scrapped.

Over 200 lobbyists of the billboard industry are working day and night at the Capitol to eliminate the Act—pointing out their "business rights" and ignoring those of the taxpayers whose dollars have paid for the highways and who should be guaranteed that these same highways be both safe and scenic.

The lobbyists have many supporters in Congress and many opponents. The battle is a death struggle over a serious issue: to perpetuate ugliness in America or to guarantee the beautification of America.

People resent ugliness in any part of their personal life or in their physical surroundings. They are becoming increasingly aware that their expensive home remodelings and tasteful living rooms have little meaning unless they are enhanced by tasteful landscaping. They realize that the beauty of a home is lost in a billboard-saturated area.

Now, more than ever, because of our present sophistication, people are assuming a new duty: the duty to beautify. Accordingly, they are trying in thousands of ways to pull themselves out of ugliness.

But, ironically, while people exhaust their savings and tax their incomes to improve their private and public facilities, while thousands of homemaker clubs sweat and toil to transform the unsightly junk yards into welcome sights of blooming beauty, there are some others who have become specialists of the hideous.

Perhaps we cannot totally eliminate the anti-esthetic. But we do not know, because we really have not tried; and either we know too little about the causes of the crime of ugliness perpetrated in our communities or we have been negligent in utilizing our mighty resources and effective equipment for its detection and prevention.

For those in doubt about the need for such a crash program, it might be prudent to consider that ugliness seems to take place through the process of spontaneous generation, that ugliness is a "repeater" and that, conversely, the beautification process is an agonizing and perpetual enterprise.

Mrs. Johnson has made people everywhere aware of the value of beautification, and her planned efforts are responsible for substantial improvements in our communities and cities. As only one example of this, on June 6, 1967 Mr. Adam Rumoshosky, Director of Marketing for the American Petroleum Institute, told Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson's Beautification Committee that eleven oil companies and their dealers will spend about $1.5 million this year to help beautify Washington's 400 gas stations. Mr. Rumoshosky said that oil companies believe that beauty is good business.

This belief was put into action by the Humble Oil Company in May during the Clean-up, Paint-up, Fix-up Campaign, conducted by the City of College Park, Maryland and its Improvement and Beautification Committee. At the request of the Beautification Committee, the Humble Oil Company graciously agreed to contribute its gigantic billboard space devoted to "Put a Tiger in your Tank", at U.S. Route 1 and Guilford Road, to the College Park Beautification campaign, as a courtesy of the company. The Rollins Outdoor Advertising Company also contributed its service by preparing a 12' x 20' double-faced mobile sign, carrying the campaign beautification message to the people of this city.

Now, as a measure of compromise between the Congress and the billboard industry over the Highway Beautification Act, as a way to save great Federal and State sums of money while creating better public relations, the Improvement and Beautification Committee of College Park suggests that the billboard industry, in agreement with the Congress, devote its signs and billboards to carrying as their major message, on at least 75% of any sign space, information that benefits the Nation, State, County, City and Town in their many endeavors toward beautification, health, welfare, education and other vital and worthwhile projects and let the remaining billboard space be used to state that a specific company or business has donated the public message as a courtesy and public service. This could serve the double purpose of creating widespread good will as well as publicity for the company or business donating the space and achieving an ideally associated promotion of interests.

Standards of design, color and beauty could be created for the painting of all billboards, giving natural and beautiful settings for the signs which would blend with the "green beauty" desired along our highways.

Her Prince, an American Soldier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD J. IRWIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1967

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Helen Glasgow, a constituent of mine from Bridgeport, Conn., is a woman endowed with more than her fair share of patriotism. She has written many heartwarming and inspiring poems about the American serviceman and just recently composed the following ballad entitled, "Her Prince, an American Soldier." I would like to place this touching work by Mrs. Glasgow in the RECORD at this time:

HER PRINCE, AN AMERICAN SOLDIER

(A ballad by Helen Glasgow,
Bridgeport, Conn.)

Hundred years ago in a castle of stone
There dwelt once a most beautiful Countess;
And she dreamed just of him;
Handsome, tall Prince of charm:
A Knight, a Knight in the glittering armor!

Then came the day on a prancing white steed
He rode down to the gates of her Manor.
And he fought for her hand
With his rival—a King!
A Knight, a Knight in the glittering armor!

As the time rolled by—near her cottage—a girl
Sat and gazed into clear sky above her . . .
And she dreamed how he came
Floating down in his shute . . .
Her Prince, her Prince, an American Soldier!

Then came the day in a silvery bird
He flew down for a happy reunion
He has fought against odds
And did win at the end . . .
Her Prince, her Prince, an American Soldier!

Freedom Shrine Essay Contest in Miami

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1967

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to call to the attention of the House of Representatives just prior to Independence Day, the first of the five essays which won first place in the Freedom Shrine Essay Contest in Miami, Fla. This competition is sponsored annually by the Exchange Club of Miami which has established Freedom Shrines in local schools. Each shrine consists of 28 major documents including the Declaration of Independence, the Bill of Rights, and the Gettysburg Address.

I commend the Miami Exchange Club for the fine exhibit installed in these schools, and for the opportunity it has given students to become more familiar with this important aspect of their heritage. These documents both mirror and determine our national aspirations. Analysis of them results in an increased appreciation of our past and provides an important guide for the future.

The winners of the contest have skillfully expounded the ideals embodied in the selected documents. Their essays reflect a true sense of patriotism and love of country. The beliefs they so lucidly express serve to inspire others to admiration of our national legacy.

The essays of these bright young people bear testimony to the fine teachers who impart a pride in American history. The interaction between instructor and student is an important element in the outstanding achievement of these young people. I congratulate both teachers and students on this significant accomplishment. This essay is by Michael R. Drennan of Miami Coral Park Senior High School:

THE FREEDOM SHRINES IT'S MEANING TO ME

(By Michael Drennan), Miami Coral Park High School, Miami, Fla.)

From the betrayal of Czechoslovakia to the suppression of the South Moluccas, man's dreams of liberty remain unfulfilled. Men lived, fought and died for a cause; all for a dream that has fallen away. Surge and countersurge, when the dust settles, naught remains. Gone are the thoughts of yesterday; tomorrow is lost; today is less than nothing; for they are the vanquished.

What is this dream so precious? It is a simple idea. A basic concept of man wanting to control his own actions and destiny.

Since the Hebrew tribes left Egypt seeking the land of milk and honey there have been those who sought freedom from foreign oppression—men not willing to be ruled over without their consent.

In the year 1776 fifty-six men signed their names to a document, knowing that for this simple action they could be hung. They stated, ". . . And for the support of this declaration, with firm reliance on the protection of Divine Providence, we mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes and our sacred honor."[1] Because of their determination and courage, the Declaration of Independence came into being, thus signifying a new era in which a man could stand and say, "I am free."

There are four major documents in American history: The Declaration of Independence, The Constitution, The Bill of Rights, and The Gettysburg Address.

The Declaration of Independence is a justification for the separation between the colonies and the motherland, saying that men are better than cattle and should have some hand in their own affairs. If this power is not granted to them, it is their right to change the system so that they will have control over their own management. Provided of course that they are better than cattle.

The Constitution of the United States is the formulation of the guidelines for the operation and management of the republic. It is a remarkable document in that it is vague enough so that it may function effectively. It also allows for expansion to meet the needs of the times in the form of amendments. This Constitution has formed the basis of American government for 178 years. Despite occasional criticism, it is still the best constitution ever written by men.

The Bill of Rights is the individual's shield of personal liberties. It assures the importance of the individual in this country. The government should be subservient to the people's wishes. The Bill of Rights restrains the government from overstepping its legal bounds. In effect, it guarantees the citizen power over his own government.

In a time of crisis, the Gettysburg Address was brought forth by Abraham Lincoln to reaffirm human dignity. This document, written at a time when the Union was divided against itself in the tragedy of Civil War, called for dedication of the American people to the preservation and continuance of basic doctrines of this country. "All men are created equal."[2] For better or for worse.

These four documents, included in the twenty-seven documents of the Exchange Club Freedom Shrine, are the record of a free people. Through them we trace the progress of our country in its 191 years of existence. For these represent the highlights of the history of the United States.

What makes these honored American documents so special? These dusty documents might have been forgotten had it not been for their unique significance. These are not just words on paper; they are the living heritage handed down to us by our forefathers. These documents represent the accumulation of their efforts for all succeeding generations—the perpetuation of the tradition of men who want to be free and are willing to sacrifice what little they have that others may be free. This is what the freedom shrine means to me.

---

[1] *The Declaration of Independence*, 1776.

[2] Lincoln, A., "The Gettysburg Address," Nov. 19, 1863.

The Press Warmly Commends President Johnson's Nomination of Thurgood Marshall to the Supreme Court

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1967

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, the editorial reaction to the news recently of a new Associate Justice of the Supreme Court must be heartening to both Thurgood Marshall and President Johnson.

The Nation's press expresses the feelings of Americans of good will who are proud and pleased at Mr. Johnson's selection, which to a large extent honors the Court itself.

As the Washington Post indicated:

> The nomination is another indication of (President Johnson's) desire to bring able Negroes into the highest levels of Government.

The record will show that the President was the first to appoint a Negro to the Cabinet, and has named two Negroes to sub-Cabinet posts, eight to Ambassadorships, 11 to judgeships, and dozens of others to high posts in Government.

Mr. Marshall was not appointed because he was a Negro, but because he was the best qualified individual for this high honor. The same may be said of the President's other appointments of outstanding Negro officials.

When President Johnson assumed the Presidency he made clear his determination to be President of all the people. He has done so. And his appointment of Mr. Marshall—and other Negroes of outstanding ability—underscores the fact that Americans of all races, creeds, and colors are well represented in an administration that truly seeks to serve the interests of all the people.

Under unanimous consent I insert into the RECORD both the Washington Post editorial comment and that of the San Francisco Examiner on Mr. Marshall's appointment to the U.S. Supreme Court:

[From the Washington Post, June 14, 1967]

AT LONG LAST

Thirty years ago, no one would have thought of suggesting that a Negro be appointed to the Supreme Court of the United States. Twenty years ago, such an appointment would have been inconceivable. Even five years ago, politicians generally agreed that the President who made such an appointment would be subjecting his political future to the gravest kind of risk.

But no President has put more Negroes into high office than Lyndon B. Johnson and his appointment yesterday of Thurgood Marshall to the Supreme Court was almost inevitable. It is a measure of the maturing of race relations in recent years that this nomination is not likely to be opposed, except in a few scattered places. And this should serve as a demonstration of just how rapidly race relations have improved to those Negro leaders who argue that their people can get their rights only through violence.

For President Johnson, the nomination is another indication of his desire to bring able Negroes into the highest levels of Government. He has previously appointed the first Negro to a position carrying Cabinet rank. He has named two Negroes to the sub-Cabinet level in major department, eight to Ambassadorships, 11 to judgeships, and dozens of others to major posts.

For Mr. Marshall, the nomination is the climax of a distinguished career. For many years he has been the Nation's leading Negro lawyer, challenged for the label in the past only by Judge William Henry Hastie, and in the present only by a rising group of young lawyers, too inexperienced yet to be considered for the Nation's highest court. Mr. Marshall was an outstanding advocate for civil rights in his years as head of the NAACP's Legal Defense and Educational Fund. His horizons were broadened beyond civil rights when he was appointed to the Second Circuit Court of Appeals by President Kennedy. And his years as Solicitor General have certainly helped to give him the exposure to the many aspects of law that a Justice needs.

We hope the Senate will quickly confirm the nomination.

[From the San Francisco Examiner, June 14, 1967]

A BIG FIRST

The appointment of Thurgood Marshall as the first Negro justice of the Supreme Court of the United States was both appropriate and welcome. It was another big step in the process of bringing Negro Americans fully into the political life of their country.

Marshall is a man of proven quality, with a distinguished record as lawyer and judge. He is a qualified man first, a Negro second.

We see his selection as part of a larger process in which not only Negro Americans but Americans from all minority racial or religious backgrounds have begun to participate as fully in the affairs of the nation as their individual qualities of leadership permit.

This is the generation, be it remembered, that first elected a Catholic as President of the United States, sent the first Negro to the United States Senate by popular election, and elected the first Chinese American and the first Japanese American to that august body.

This breaking down of old barriers of prejudice and this steady movement toward the true equality of man is something for the critical new generation to ponder the next time it enters one of its frequent moods of fault-finding about the ways of its fathers.

It was only 51 years ago that the first Jew, Louis Brandeis, was nominated to the Supreme Court. His selection provoked a political storm. He went on to serve with great distinction and to die full of honors. The highest court has not been without a Jew since, and all have been qualified.

Probably the pragmatism of American politics—one of its great virtues—will dictate that one member of the Court will always be a Negro hereafter. Certainly qualified Americans of Negro ancestry abound. We can best express our opinion of Thurgood Marshall by saying that we hope all of his race who may follow him on the Court will be as able as he.

Higher Education Act of 1965

SPEECH

OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 1967

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 10943) to amend and extend title V of the Higher Education Act of 1965.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, I most earnestly hope that this vitally important bill now before us, H.R. 10943, to amend and extend title V of the Higher Education Act of 1965 will be promptly and overwhelmingly approved.

In summary, this bill would establish four teacher recruitment and training programs under title V of the Education Act of 1965 and also make improving modifications in some other already existing programs.

The authoritative evidence that has been presented here this afternoon demonstrates conclusively that there is an acute shortage of properly trained and qualified teachers in this country right now, and the same authorities estimate that some 900,000 new secondary and 925,000 new kindergarten and elementary teachers will be needed by 1975.

The programs proposed by this bill are wisely designed to anticipate and prepare to meet the demand for qualified teachers that will increasingly arise over the next several years.

Mr. Chairman, the provisions of this measure deal exclusively with the recruitment, preparation and inservice training of teachers and other key educational personnel.

It may well be the most important and effective educational measure that will come before this Congress for the simple reason that it goes right to the heart of our basic educational problem by recognizing that the classroom teacher, above all other things, is the single most vital factor in our whole educational structure.

The bill also provides for a long overdue and significant extension of the Teachers Corps, which is recognized as the best means yet devised through which competent educational assistance can be provided for disadvantaged children throughout this country.

Mr. Chairman, this bill represents the best compromise of different judgments and opinions that can be legislatively presented; there can be no argument about its basic purpose, which is to help assure that there is an able teacher in every classroom in every school in this country; the programs in this bill are projected in a manner that will insure continued, reasonable Federal support for teacher education while carefully and prudently preserving the crucial decisionmaking powers to State and local educational agencies and to institutions of higher education.

By all standards, this is legislation that is good for all Americans, and I urge my colleagues to overwhelmingly approve this bill without any extended delay.

IUD Opposes Nerva Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 28, 1967

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased today, when we were debating my amendment to defer fiscal year 1968 construction of Nerva nuclear engine flight hardware by NASA, to receive a copy of a telegram of support for my position which had been sent to other Members. The telegram was signed by Leo Goodman, secretary, Atomic Energy Technical Committee, Industrial Union Department, AFL–CIO, Washington, D.C.

It is encouraging that the Industrial Union Department is aware of the problems connected with the Nerva project and is concerned with related matters in the field of the development of atomic energy.

I insert a copy of the telegram at this point in the RECORD:

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
June 27, 1967.

Urge you support Congressman RYAN's motion to delete $74 million NERVA project from NASA appropriation. Sum starts escalator of expenditure over $1 billion nuclear reactor only of obligation to spend $200 billion. This is wasteful expenditure, when we face exceeding $20 billion this year, reminds me of the waste of $1.3 billion for aircraft nuclear project, without mission or purpose until finally cancelled by President Kennedy. Failure of nuclear reactor in a space vehicle will face human race on earth with potential further contamination by radioactivity, such as the plutonium contamination scattered across face of earth when an isotope-powered satellite failed April 1964. NERVA project is unnecessary, extremely wasteful, probably technologically impractical. I repeat, I urge you to support motion to delete item.

LEO GOODMAN,
Secretary, Atomic Energy Technical Committee, IUD AFL–CIO
WASHINGTON, D.C.

Anniversary of 191 Years of Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 26, 1967

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, as we approach the anniversary of our Nation's birth, we will all once again pause and reflect on the ideals of our country.

I think the following editorial from the Stars and Stripes, the National Tribune, of Thursday June 29, is most thought provoking, and I call it to the attention of my colleagues and the readers of the RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert the article at this point in the RECORD:

ANNIVERSARY OF 191 YEARS OF FREEDOM

Since the adoption by the Continental Congress of the Declaration of Independence on July 4, 1776, this Nation has traveled far on the road to freedom.

Although the country has been engulfed in six wars with foes outside our borders and an internal conflict that threatened disruption of the Union, millions of brave and courageous Americans have risen to defend the sacred principles set forth in the Constitution.

Recognized the world over as the bastion of freedom and democracy, the Nation has stood four-square in opposition to foreign ideologies.

Today, we are engaged in bloody warfare in a far-off land in an attempt to gain for a weaker nation those rights and ideals that have held this country on its charted course for almost two centuries. We are fighting in Viet Nam to resist aggression which threatens smaller nations all over the world.

In the course of this conflict, individual and personal liberties are being abused by misguided persons who oppose our participation in Viet Nam. They loudly assert their right to dissent but only in rare instances do they accord that right to others.

Last week, the House of Representatives passed a bill providing stiff penalties for desecration of the American Flag, our National emblem which represents the principles and tenets outlined in our Constitution. It has been downright revolting to all loyal Americans to witness desecration of the Flag by the very persons who are protected under the provisions of the Constitution.

We are a rich and favored Nation built largely upon the Declaration 191 years ago, when the framers of the Constitution pledged to each other their very lives, their fortunes and their sacred honor.

Can we do less to preserve by word and act, the language and the aims of the greatest document ever written?

"The Mortgage Banker" on Industrial Aid Bonds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD T. HANNA
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 28, 1967

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, the July issue of the Mortgage Banker has a most excellent review of the public industrial revenue bond issue. As has been my practice of the past few weeks, I am including the MBA article as part of the continuing dialogue on this issue.

I would like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that the discussion, within financial circles, on this is becoming increasingly intense. I believe this reflects the present national interest in this matter. With the issue squarely before the public's eye now would be an appropriate time for the House Ways and Means Committee to bring up the various bills for hearing.

INDUSTRIAL AID BONDS

(NOTE.—*This article, reprinted from a recent issue of the Monthly Review of the Federal Reserve Bank of Richmond, presents in a succinct manner the rise in the use of tax-free municipal bonds by state and local governments to finance the building of commercial properties. MBA's Mortgage Bankers Washington Committee has viewed with alarm for some time now this encroachment upon the private lending community by local governments. MBA has expressed its concern in the Congressional Record and is currently urging the enactment of legislation to deter this practice.*)

While sales of tax exempt state and local government bonds have grown steadily since World War II, the rapid climb in the volume of one particular type of tax-exempt security—the industrial aid bond—has outdistanced the field in recent years. Far from going unnoticed, the sharp increase in industrial aid financing has been attended by a welter of controversy. Discussions concerning this type of financing are frequently laced with such strong statements as:

"The subsidizing of private corporations through tax exempt bond sales is incompatible with the free enterprise system and represents an abuse of the tax exempt privilege;" or

"Any intimation that the financing of industry through tax exempt municipal bonds does not serve the public purpose is hypocritical."

Why is it that this particular type of municipal bond issue, which accounts for only about 5 percent of all tax exempt bond offerings, arouses such controversy? This article will summarize the development of industrial aid financing, the chief characteristics of the bonds, and the principal arguments for and against their use.

WHAT ARE INDUSTRIAL AID BONDS?

Industrial aid bonds are bonds sold by a state or local government, or instrumentality thereof, for the express purpose of raising funds to acquire, build, or improve a commercial site or plant which is then leased to a private corporation. The lease is generally for 25 to 40 years, and usually contains an agreement whereby the corporation may purchase the rented facility when the lease expires. Rental payments by the corporation are set to cover the principal and interest payments on the bonds. A government or authority sells industrial aid bonds because it believes that the corporation's presence will boost the local economy. The corporation finds industrial aid attractive because it is spared the expense of building a new plant and its lease payments are lower than the costs associated with other sources of financing, due in large part to the tax exempt feature of the bonds.

The bonds may be general obligations, secured by the full faith and credit of the issuing government, or they may be the nonguaranteed, "revenue" type, secured only by the capital asset they financed and by the rental payments as established by the lease. State laws generally specify which types of bonds may be sold. Because industrial *revenue* bonds must be marketed on the basis of the credit rating of the company, their use is limited generally to financing projects for fairly sizeable companies and therefore individual issues also tend to be large. In 1965, for instance, the average size of industrial revenue offerings was over $3 million, compared to only about $600,000 for general obligation industrials. General obligation bonds are used typically in behalf of small or new corporations.

Industrial aid financing has grown from slightly over $7 million in 1957 to $216 million in 1965, an average annual increase of 41 percent since 1960. The volume of $439 million for the first three quarters of 1966 was more than double the total for all of 1965, and industrial issues as a percent of total municipal bond sales jumped from 2 percent to slighlty over 5 percent in these nine months. Because these data do not include issues advertised and sold locally, the total amounts are understated to some extent. Estimates for the actual volume of aid financing in 1965, for instance, range up to $1 billion. The average size of individual issues has also increased sharply, from less than $400,000 in 1957 to $2.3 million in 1965, and this figure also almost doubled in the first three quarters of 1966.

THE MARKET

According to estimates made by Goodbody & Company, a New York securities firm, about 90 percent of all industrial aid bonds are marketed initially through municipal bond dealers, with the remainder sold through civic groups, such as Chambers of Commerce, to local banks and residents. Not all municipal bond dealers underwrite industrial aid bonds, however. Some refuse to handle these because they disapprove of their use. Indeed, the Investment Bankers Association (IBA) adopted a negative position on aid bonds in 1951, to which it still subscribes. Reasons for such opposition are discussed later.

As the use of industrial aid bonds has become increasingly common, the average spread between the issuing yield of good grade aid bonds and good grade general obligation municipals has narrowed from about 143 basis points in 1957, to 60–70 basis points in 1965, according to estimates of Goodbody and Company. At present, the yield on industrial aid bonds falls about midway between good grade tax exempts and prime corporates.

It has been estimated that insurance companies buy around one-third of all industrial aid offerings, but commercial banks also acquire a sizeable amount.

The secondary market for industrial revenue bonds is much thinner than for most other tax exempts. Dealers often have difficulty in arriving at an appropriate price for a specific bond because of the very small turnover of this type of security, and because the quality of the bond cannot be determined without knowing the terms of the lease which secures it. Since uncovering such information may prove to be time consuming and costly, a dealer will often refer a potential buyer or seller to the original underwriter.

The present type of industrial aid financing originated in 1936 when Mississippi established her "Balance Agriculture with Industry" program. Changes in techniques of cotton culture, the depletion of her timber supply, combined with the Depression, left Mississippi with large pools of surplus farm labor. The state had little industry, and no large institutions able to finance the establishment of new industries. The constitution barred the use of public credit for private purposes. To circumvent this barrier, the Mississippi legislature declared industrial development to be a public purpose. Legislation was passed enabling cities and counties to raise funds through the sale of general obligation bonds for the express purpose of constructing industrial plants for lease to private industry. Between 1936 and 1950 only Kentucky followed Mississippi's example in authorizing industrial aid bonds, and few issues were sold.

Although Mississippi and Kentucky set a precedent by authorizing the sale of municipal bonds to provide direct assistance to corporations, the concept of public aid for the private sector was not new. In the 1800s, railroads and canals were often financed with public credit. Partly as a result of adverse experience at this time, many states adopted constitutional provisions prohibiting municipalities from extending public credit to private business activties. Today, industrial aid bonds are not the sole financial inducement for attracting industry. Among others prevalent are loans from business and industrial development corporations, both privately and publicly financed, state financing of industrial buildings through insurance or guarantees of private loans, and the offering of various types of tax immunities or concessions to corporations.

During the 1950s 21 states passed legislation enabling municipalities to sell bonds for industrial aid, and today 20 states have such laws. Five more states are either able to issue aid bonds for certain purposes, or are in the process of passing and validating the necessary legislation. Only a few year ago, over 90 percent of all industrial aid bond sales originated in the southern states, reflecting their emphasis on official programs to encourage industralization. Now, however, states in all parts of the country have authorized their use, including such heavily industrialized states as Illinois, Michigan, Delaware, and New York. It should be pointed out that, to date, these states have utilized this right very little or not at all. In the first three quarters of 1966, nine southern states accounted for almost 80 percent, or $345 million, of the total volume of aid issues, and 83 percent of the total number. Mississippi, Alabama, Kentucky, and Arkansas are the leading states in total volume of aid financing.

Many state legislatures have authorized the use of revenue bonds only, but in several states, including most of the southern ones, general obligation issues are also permitted. From 1961 through 1964 revenue bonds accounted for between 74 percent and 84 percent of the total volume of aid bonds sold, but during the past two years they have risen to 96 percent.

The widespread existence of constitutional and statutory restrictions on general obligation borrowing is to a large degree responsible for the preponderance of industrial revenue issues. In particular, the fact that in many states revenue bonds are not restricted by the necessity of holding referendums or otherwise obtaining public consent also contributes to their popularity. Mississippi is an exception to the general pattern and continues to issue mainly general obligation bonds despite legislation in 1960 permitting revenue bonds. Through the years, Mississippi has aided a large number of small, often new, corporations which might have been unable to secure financing elsewhere. In the first nine months of 1966, for example, Mississippi accounted for only 3 percent of the dollar volume of aid bond sales, but 24 percent of the number of issues.

Municipalities and statutory authorities account for the majority of all aid bond sales. In 1965, municipalities sold 36 percent of the total volume. Statutory authorities, which are often created by municipalities for the sole purpose of borrowing money, sold 55 percent of the total. Counties contributed anther 7 percent, and states and special districts 1 percent each. Direct state participation in industrial bond sales is a fairly recent development.

ARGUMENTS PRO AND CON

A fairly common objection to aid bond financing is that it may affect adversely the financial health of the issuer. In the case of general obligations, it is pointed out that while taxpayers may voluntarily accept the liability by approving the bonds in a referendum, most of them were not in a position to assess the company's soundness or potential before voting. Although revenue bonds are not a direct liability of the government they are generally recognized as a contingent liability, in fact if not in law. Default could jeopardize a community's credit and render future borrowing for recognized public needs more difficult and costly. Small towns which attract large corporations may find their finances undermined by the property tax exemption which is virtually always granted the corporation, and by the need to expand such facilities as water and sewer works, roads, and schools, to accommodate the new plant. This situation would be most apt to occur in those instances where the size of the corporation attracted far exceeded the pool of available labor, and labor had to be imported.

In regard to these objections, it should be pointed out that an extremely small number of corporations have defaulted on their lease payments, and that so far there has been little, if any, deterioration in the credit of those localities utilizing aid bonds. However, most experience with aid bonds has been in a period of economic expansion and growth. Also, the ability of the electorate to judge soundly on such questions is usually greater the smaller the community. Whether or not a referendum is held, citizens in small towns generally are informed on current local questions. Abuses are more apt to occur in larger cities, where the interests of a smaller percentage of people would be directly involved, and where word-of-mouth news would not be effective.

Another frequently heard argument is that aid bond financing may distort the rational location of business by encouraging a corporation to establish a plant in an area which would be otherwise unfavorable. It is argued that if a certain locality is advantageous for a corporation, it could or should be attracted without aid. The contention that aid bonds encourage the "pirating" of industry is also common. It refers to instances where a corporation established in one town pulls up stakes and moves to another town which offers financing, thereby creating employment in one area while reducing it in another.

Surveys have revealed that few firms move to a new area solely because a municipality offers to build a plant. Most choose a region for various economic and financial reasons. This follows from the fact that any savings realized through aid financing, while they may seem sizeable *per se*, are only a small fraction of the firm's total cost of operation. Within a region or state, however, the offer of aid financing and property tax exemption may bias a firm in favor of a *particular* locality. While few disagree with the general censure on "pirating" of industry, it is an uncommon, not common, occurrence. Most aid bonds are used to build branches, or new plants for new companies.

Criticism of aid bonds is also forthcoming from those who fear that the tax exempt status of *all* municipal bonds is threatened by adverse publicity attending the use of aid bonds. They point out that the Treasury has been opposed to such tax exemption for some time, and that this position may receive more support than it has in the past from those who regard aid financing as an abuse of the privilege. This is one of the IBA's chief objections.

Probably the most widespread objection to tax free industrial aid bonds is their increasing use for large, financially healthy corporations, frequently in areas with no outstanding labor surpluses. The growing use of revenue bonds is symptomatic of this trend. Tight money accelerated the pace of revenue bond sales in 1966 as corporations sought less expensive sources of financing. During the first half of 1966, the IBA recorded 70 industrial aid bond offerings totaling about $327 million. Of this total, $267 million of bonds were accounted for by only six offerings, each of which exceeded $20 million. Of the six localities benefited, only two were areas with unemployment over 6 percent. Of the seven corporations to be aided, five are listed on the New York Stock Exchange and one on the American Stock Exchange. One of these six offerings was the largest single issue on record. It consisted of $70 million of bonds sold by a town with a population of approximately 1,200 to build plants for two large manufacturing concerns. Retail businesses have also benefited from aid financing recently, along with a major international hotel chain.

Two specific practices have been singled out for much criticism. One is the purchase by the corporation of the municipal bonds which were sold for its benefit. It has been argued that if the company could afford to purchase the bonds, it could have provided its own financing. Second is the sale of bonds to purchase an *existing* facility which is then leased back to the corporation already using the facility. This amounts simply to a refinancing scheme using tax exempt bonds, since no new jobs are created.

CONCLUSIONS

In June 1963, after a thorough study, the Advisory Committee on Intergovernmental Relations published a report on industrial aid bonds. This committee, which was established by the Congress, concluded that this type of bond "tends to impair tax equities, competitive business relationships and conventional financing institutions out of proportion to its contribution to economic development and employment." While recognizing the beneficial uses of this device in connection with nonurban, poor regions, the Commission deplored instances of pirating, and the growing use of such bonds to finance large corporations in areas which do not have high unemployment rates.

The Commission, as well as many others concerned with the present trend of aid financing, would prefer that these abuses be remedied by action at the state level. With interstate competition becoming so keen, however, it seems unlikely that any state would care to pioneer legislation of this type. Therefore, many view action by the federal government as the only feasible solution. Several bills have been introduced into Congress, but so far none has been acted upon. One of the most frequently suggested remedies provides that corporations be prohibited from deducting rental payments from taxable income if its facilities are financed by aid bonds.

Americans United for Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1967

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I have recently received a resolution, adopted at a Bronx rally of Americans United for Israel, which sets forth the views and conclusions of many of my constituents on the Mideast problem. I insert the text of the resolution in the RECORD for the consideration of my colleagues:

RESOLUTION

We, Americans of every faith, gathered in meeting assembled, on the 20th day of June, 1967, in the county of the Bronx, State of New York, united in support of Israel and her righteous cause, do hereby declare:

1. We have watched with ever-widening admiration the heroic efforts of the people of Israel to reconstruct their ancestral homeland, A nation sanctioned 19 years ago by the United Nations and dedicated to the highest aims of peace and democracy.

2. We have observed, also, with ever-growing dismay the efforts of Israel's unfriendly neighbor states to nullify the international decision creating the State of Israel by their unceasing endeavors to exterminate its people.

3. The United Arab Republic has attempted Israel's strangulation by the blockade of the international waters of the Strait of Tiran, by amassing armies at her borders, by endless incursions and bloody assaults upon its citizens, and by launching vituperative threats to annihilate the State. These attempts have been averted by Israel's gallant defense forces. The exercise of her elementary right of survival has served to heighten all our admiration for Israel's resistance to lawless aggression.

4. As Americans we are acutely conscious of the obligations our Government has assumed to secure for Israel a just peace, free from armed invasions and the perpetual threat of war.

Now, therefore, be it resolved, That it is the duty of the Government of these United States and the General Assembly of the United Nations firmly and unequivocally to demand face-to-face negotiations between Israel and the Arab States, conducted in the light of prevailing conditions and guaranteeing a durable and just peace which will respect Israel's sovereignty, her security and her international maritime rights.

Be it further resolved, That we united Americans here assembled do solemnly pledge our solidarity in determined and continuing support of Israel.

Be it further resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to: the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, the Congress of the United States, the United States Ambassador to the United Nations and the Israeli Ambassador to the United Nations.

Portuguese Naval Training Ship Visits the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1967

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, last week the city of Newark, N.J., was host to the naval training ship *Sagres*, from Portugal. In light of the close relationship that this country has had with Portugal for many years, and the great many Americans of Portuguese descent, who have contributed so much to the growth and development of our country, I would like to make special notice of the arrival of this fine ship.

On Saturday, June 17, 1967, I personally toured the ship while it was at anchor in Port Newark. It was a proud honor for me to meet the captain of this ship, Comdr. Daniel Farrajota Rocheta, and his fine 282-man crew. It was also gratifying to see a large number of Portuguese Americans turn out to greet the *Sagres*.

The *Sagres* is a magnificent ship, and it is one of the few three-masted schooners still sailing the high seas. Before coming to Port Newark, the ship participated in a 3-day 200th anniversary celebration of the U.S. Naval Station at Norfolk, Va. After spending 6 days in Newark, the ship sailed to Fall River, Mass., and then departed for Portugal.

In honor of the visit of the *Sagres*, I would like to call to my colleagues' attention the following letters of greeting and information on the ship, which were contained in the commemorative brochure, *Sagres*.

THE "SAGRES"

The training ship "Sagres" is the second unit of the Portuguese Navy to bear the name "Sagres", a name which comes to it from the promontory by the same name and which is located in the extreme southwest of the Portuguese coast near Cape St. Vincent.

Sagres makes up a part of the region which ancient writers called "Sacrum Promontorium" and was considered by them to be the outer limits of inhabited earth.

Estrābao, referring to the forementioned ancient writers, as Artemidoro and others, says that the Sacred Promontory was "a sacred place, uninhabited, where there was no water and to which it wasn't even possible for anyone to go at night because the Gods gathered there."

The privileged geographical situation of Sagres was, of course, the main reason which led Infante D. Henrique to choose that locale for "isolating himself from society" and to be able to better devote himself to his work of initiating the glorious series of discoveries.

It was there that the Infante gathered together master national and foreign astrologers who became pilots to try to discover the unknown world, in his service and that of the country.

Portugal couldn't choose a better name for this Navy vessel of hers which serves for the nautical instruction and training on the sea for the cadets of the Naval School and recruits of the Armada.

On board, the cadets of the Naval School make their training voyages and also on board, the Marine Armada School carries out its function.

The training ship "Sagres" was built for the German Navy, in 1937–38, in the Blohm and Voss shipyards in Hamburg, Germany, and received the name of "Albert Leo Schlageter".

In 1945 the possession passed to the United States of America, afterwards being transferred to Brazil, who in 1948, incorporated it into its Navy, with the name Training Ship "Guanabara".

In 1960, negotiations were entered into for its transfer to Portugal, which was effected in October, 1961. Five months later, on February 8, 1962, after quick repairs in the Marine Arsenal [navy yard] of Rio de Janeiro, it was incorporated into the Portuguese Navy, arriving at Lisbon on June 23rd of that same year.

The training ship "Sagres", with a displacement of 1,869 tons is built with 10 mm. steel plate, with a water-tight waist constituting seven compartments whose passages are all located within the structures; it doesn't have hatchways on the deck.

It measures 90 meters long [305.1 feet], 12 meters [40.68 feet] across the beams and 5.20 meters [17.63 feet] of load-draught.

From the water level to the highest point of the mast the height is 44.3 meters [150.18 feet.]

The cloths of its sails covers a surface of 564 square meters [6482 sq. ft.]

It is powered by a 750 horsepower diesel motor, with a reverse gear and clutch, which gives it a maximum speed of ten knots per hour.

It has two 47 mm. cannons at its disposal and is endowed with modern navigation apparatus, including radar, gyro compass, supersonic depth-gauge, and electric odometer.

It has lodgings for about 300 men, with the permanent crew of the ship being one half that.

The theoretical instructions (Portuguese, Mathematics, Navigation, etc.) are given in appropriate classrooms. Besides these, the courses include, Rowing, Sailing, Seafaring Art, Regulations, etc.

All the instructions are vested in an essentially practical character, in that the student does the work, assisted and guided by specialized instructors.

Evoking the ancient ships of the discoveries, it has on the square sails of its three majestic masts, the Cross of Christ.

The United States of America possesses a brother ship, the "Eagle", built on the same date, in the same shipyard and with the same dimensions.

Commander Rocheta

Commander Rocheta entered the Naval School in October, 1933, when he was eighteen years old. Having finished the course he rose to Ensign on October 1, 1936; promoted to Lieutenant, Jg. on March 3, 1938, Lieutenant on December 5, 1945, Lieutenant Commander on March 31, 1954 and Commander on April 1, 1960.

When a young officer, Captain Rocheta served on the naval training ship which preceded, under the same name, in the Portuguese Navy, the "Sagres", which is now under his command. Likewise he served on other ships as well as in land-based departments. Thus, he was an instructor in the School of Fleet Mechanics and served on the Command Staff of Patrol Fleets. He commanded the P–7 patrol boat, the mine-sweeper "Vulcano" and the cruiser "Madeira", prior to being named Assistant Governor General of Mozambique in 1953.

After having finished the Naval War Course in the Naval Superior Institute of War, Commander Rocheta returned to the Province of Mozambique where he successively occupied the office of Harbor Captain of the Port of Lourenco Marques and Governor of the District of Zambézia (1960–64).

Returning to Lisbon, he assumed command of the torpedo-boat destroyer "Vouga", until being assigned to the post that he fills today.

Commander Rocheta is decorated with the Medal of Military Valor (2nd Class), The Silver Medal of Good Conduct, and, among other badges, he holds the Fraternal Order of Infante D. Henrique, the Fraternal Order of the Royal Star of the Grandee Comore, from France, having also received the Cross of Naval Merit from Spain.

Commander Rocheta, resides in Lisbon with his wife, D. Marie Luiza Gonzalez Rocheta and their four daughters.

The visit of the "Sagres" to Newark, city to which an industrious and thriving Portuguese community came long years ago, marking a prominent position in the United States, represents a meaningful chapter in the history of that community and its profound ties with the mother country. The beautiful naval training ship of the glorious Portuguese Navy is a very eloquent symbol of the great historical traditions of Portugal, of the predominant role that the Lusitanian sailors played as pioneers and discoverers of the modern world . . . and also, because of the bonds of friendship and communion of ideals that always existed between the American and Portuguese people, the "Sagres" is a welcome messenger that comes to bring into prominence once again that friendship between the two Atlantic nations.

Vasco Vieira Garin,
Portuguese Ambassador.

[Editorial from Luso Americano, Portuguese-Language weekly]

Greeting the "Sagres"

Young men of Portugal, welcome . . .

You are entering in this harbor as if you were entering in the Tagus, because you know that you are entering into Portuguese hearts. You know that you are entering America across the ocean, but feel at home as in New Portugal.

You come from faraway to tell us that all is possible when there's a strong will. You come slowly as one who is sure of his destiny, and at the mercy of the winds to say that ambition doesn't move you.

If you lift up arms it is for art and beauty, because you covered yourselves in white in order to announce from afar your intentions of peace and goodness.

Tall figures from the North, quiet men from the seaboard, stern-faced from the mountains or red-faced from the South, lads of my land, welcome.

You are Portugal . . . You come from Minho or Douro, you come from the Beiras or Alentejo, from Extremadura or Algrave, from the Azores or Madeira, I know you well: You are Portugal.

You come from the cities, you come from the villages, from the steep and dry hillsides or from the low and grassy plains, I recognize you: You are Portugal.

Calloused hands, aching bodies or intellectuals, prisoners of your nest of birth or anxious to fly to adventures, I know you well: You are Portugal.

Lads of my land, hope of the fatherland, I greet you. Welcome . . . Young men, my brothers, you come and will return. I came and I stayed, for you and for our Portuguese brothers. My mission has something that is yours, and your mission has something that is mine.

Lads of Portugal who are coming to meet me, welcome . . . I know your mission. But let me ask you, here, what are you coming to do from so faraway?

Lads of Portugal, upon which life smiles, who live with dreams and have in your breasts the flame of love and dedication and certainty of victory, you who accustomed yourselves to conquering the seas and widened the horizons, what are you coming here to do today? I know: to communicate your youth and your confidence in the future, in a cloudless tomorrow that you are preparing.

Reception Committee for the Naval Training Ship "Sagres"

The Lusitanian-Americans of New Jersey join in presenting the welcome to the training ship "Sagres", its captain, officers, cadets and sailors, on the occasion of its visit to the port of Newark.

During this visit of the "Sagres", the committee for these festivals worked out a program which, so we hope, will remain, with pleasure, as the occasion merits, in the memory and in the hearts of each of us.

I wish to thank all the members of the Committee, the official entites, civic leaders and all the Lusitanian-American organizations which, through their cooperation and efforts, made it become a reality.

As President, in welcoming the "Sagres" and its gallant crew, I am expressing the sentiments of all the Committee.

And, when the "Sagres" ends its visit and, once again, it heads for the high seas, with it will go our wishes for happiness and with us will remain the longing in seeing them depart and, in our souls, all of which they represent.

Donald B. Gomes,
President.

Kennedy Round Negotiations Are Praised

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1967

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, four publications of normally differing outlook have expressed themselves editorially in support of the end product of the so-called Kennedy round of trade negotiations. These arduous proceedings—written off prematurely on several occasions during their lifetime—have achieved support from the Wall Street Journal, New Republic, the Economist, and the Washington Daily News.

On May 23, 1967, there appeared in the Washington, D.C. Evening Star, a nationally syndicated column, "Your Money's Worth," by that highly regarded writer on economic matters, Sylvia Porter, on the same subject.

I am including these five articles as part of my remarks in the Appendix of the Record:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News, May 17, 1967]

Reducing Tariffs, Boosting Trade

When he signed the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 President Kennedy called it "the most important piece of legislation affecting economics since the passage of the Marshall Plan." We will have to wait and see. But what JFK had in mind—a new round of hefty tariff cuts by the world's major trading nations—has just been accomplished at Geneva.

This so-called "Kennedy Round," named in his honor, promises to boost world Trade to new high levels. With increased national prosperity and higher personal standards of living among the 80-odd nations involved as the result.

Between the two world wars nations erected high tariff walls (with average 55–60 per cent rates) in the name of "protecting" domestic manufacturers and farmers from foreign competition. As a result, trade stagnated and prices were high. But in the last 20 years six rounds of tariff-cuts, capped by the big "Kennedy" seventh, have whittled tariffs down to a 7–8 per cent average, where they are no longer a formidable barrier to world commerce.

Besides standing to benefit in general from the lowering of tariffs, the United States won two particular advantages at Geneva. One, a higher export price for our lucrative wheat exports to West Europe. The other, a pledge from other major governments to make available 2.7 million tons of wheat yearly to help us in the task of feeding hungry nations.

As can be expected with negotiations covering 60,000 items and involving so many governments, we didn't always get our own way. While the Common Market negotiators opened up to American farm products, they did not agree to the guaranteed slice (13 per cent) of their wheat market we asked. In chemicals, the Europeans rejected the "American selling price," an artificially inflated level we set on imports to the U.S. as an anti-German measure after World War I.

There will be complaints from American dyemakers, steel manufacturers, rubber-foot wear makers and others. But it is doubtful any American interest has been severely hurt. The Trade Expansion Act provides means to soften stress where it is felt. The tariff cuts will be made gradually over a five-year period.

The general welfare of the American people is being served, and that outweighs any particular interests.

But before the benefits of the Kennedy Round can be realized, there's work to do:

A small army of U.S. civil servants must speedily codify the Geneva agreements before the law expires June 30. In case they don't make it in time, Congress should grant the necessary extension.

The Senate must consider and pass the grains agreement as a treaty.

Both house of Congress must give a legislative burial to the outmoded and internationally unacceptable "American selling price" for chemicals.

[From the Wall Street Journal, May 17, 1967]

Adam Smith Was Right

In the wake of successful completion of the tariff-cutting talks in Geneva, it's strange to find it necessary to argue the case for freer trade. But the fact is that the negotiators have declared peace at a time when a lot of people are eager to go to war.

Though protectionism is on the rise almost everywhere, a disproportionate number of the would-be trade warriors are Americans. Spokesmen for the steel, chemical, textile and other industries are eager to put up new barriers to imports. At the moment the Geneva talks were winding up, ironically enough, Agriculture Secretary Freeman was making a fresh plea for a 75% slash in the inflow of foreign dairy products.

It's true, of course, that import competition can cause serious dislocations for some domestic industries, though the impact is frequently overstated. The Government could help if it would follow monetary and fiscal policies that didn't persistently push up businessmen's production costs. Even if it continues to shun that sensible course, however, a good deal of Federal machinery already exists for providing aid to companies that are actually damaged by increased imports.

Before the nation decides to retreat toward protectionism and, in effect, throw away the benefits gained from more than four years of work at Geneva, it thus may be well to remember what those benefits are.

First and foremost are the gains for consumers, who happen to include all of us. When the Geneva cuts take full effect, a foreign car like a Volkswagen may cost about $55 less; a $20 imported fishing reel may be $2.50 cheaper; the $25 duty on a $100 camera will be slashed to $12.50.

Benefits, moreover, are not limited to consumers who favor foreign products. Competition from abroad also helps keep down prices of domestic goods, surely a welcome development in these inflated times.

Whatever the protectionists may claim, freer trade helps the domestic economy too. Imports add to the competitive forces that channel the nation's resources toward their most productive uses. Businessmen are encouraged to find new and better products, new and more efficient methods of production.

Lower tariffs abroad, furthermore, make foreign markets more easily accessible to U.S. goods. This country, in case anyone has forgotten, already exports more than any other nation and thus has the most to gain from any world movement toward greater trade freedom—and the most to lose from a movement in the opposite direction.

Freer trade thus helps keep a country's economy vital and growing, providing more jobs and more income. It's a question of simple economics, one that Adam Smith answered clearly nearly two centuries ago:

"It is the maxim of every prudent master of a family never to attempt to make at home what it will cost him more to make than to buy," Smith wrote in "The Wealth of Nations." "The tailor does not attempt to make his own shoes, but buys them of the shoemaker. . . . What is prudence in the conduct of every private family can scarce be folly in that of a great nation. . . ."

What Smith stated as theory was proved in practice by Britain in the 19th century as steps toward free trade helped the nation to world ascendancy. In the U.S., similarly, a continent-wide free market was an indispensable contributor to economic growth. In more recent times, the huge gains of Europe's Common Market countries have proved, once again, the power of freer trade.

As Mr. Vicker notes on this page, there is still much to be done before world trade is truly free. Cutting tariffs is not enough; quotas and other restrictions and subsidies can often be even more insidious than actual import duties. But the negotiators at Geveva have at least given world trade a push in the right direction.

It would be sad indeed to see that progress reversed. For history surely has shown that Adam Smith not only was right but still is.

[From the New Republic, May 27, 1967]

End of the Round

The Kennedy Round of tariff negotiations concluded last week an apparent success, after four-and-one-half years of discussions at Geneva under the General Agreement of Tariffs and Trade. No one can say at this point, pending all the details, that the United States won an exactly balanced package of concessions, but there is no doubt that the US negotiator, William Roth, fought a hard fight and that the US will gain major benefits, as will all the main trading countries.

History does not deal primarily with "might-have-beens," but the main reason that success in the Kennedy Round is to be welcomed is what it averted. True, it has produced a sizable reduction in tariffs all around, bringing the great majority of duties to levels so low as to render them unimportant as a barrier to trade. The reductions will help along the already spectacular growth of world trade and, to some extent, will cut prices to the consumers, which are positive benefits by themselves.

But the real achievement was to head off a grave potential threat to the flourishing and successful system of world commerce that has been a major element in the unprecedented prosperity of the industrial world in the past 20 years. Had the negotiations in Geneva collapsed, as it seemed for a while they might, one of two things could easily have happened. One, was a return to protectionism in the United States and possibly in some other countries. The other was a division of the world into vast trading blocs, with the US joining a group of like-minded countries while others linked with the European Common Market. The principle of "most-favored-nation," under which the same tariff is charged against imports from all sources, would have been broken. No one can say what would have been the result, but the present system, with all its benefits, would have disappeared.

The Kennedy Round gave relatively little in the way of benefits to the less-developed countries, and it will be criticized on that count. But anything contributing to the prosperity of the rich also helps the poor, in terms of world trade and their own exports.

[From the Economist, May 20, 1967]

The One That Didn't Get Away

(Note.—In a black week, at least the Kennedy round has put right a mistake the world made in the 1930s.)

So the Kennedy round of tariff cuts has come off after all. To realise the importance of what happened in Geneva at midnight on Monday, it is necessary to remember the hopes of the men who set out to reshape the trading habits of the capitalist world after 1945. They looked forward to an era of universal near-free trade on a scale unknown since 1914, in a world economy made buoyant by international Keynesian policies of which the pre-1914 world knew nothing. The Kennedy round takes us a long way to their objective. This is a remarkable achievement for negotiations over which the shadow of failure has hung so obstinately for four years. It carries the postwar movement for the freeing of trade between industrial powers close to its logical conclusion. Tariffs are no longer the dominant problem of world trade among the rich; they have been reduced to a minor obstacle, even though some other obstacles still abound.

Just how each country's trade will be affected is still being worked out. But, by previous standards, the result turns all the major industrial powers into low-tariff areas. In particular, a first quick look suggests that when the cuts are made the European common market will be far more like an enlargement of the relatively free trading Germany of Professor Erhard than it will be like the protectionist France or Italy of pre-common market days. This alone would justify the negotiators' years of angry argument.

But will the anxieties and hard feelings of the past four years leave a permanent mark? Certainly experience has shown, once again, that negotiating with the common market is a formidable proposition. The belief that economic relations between Europe and America are an ill-tempered competitive business has been imprinted in the minds of officials and the public. It has played its part in an unnecessary process of partial estrangement between the two great western centres of power. Yet the apparent corollary that they must give up the hope of pursuing a common interest has been invalidated. The upshot of the great haggle is to show that when industrial powers of the elephantine size of the United States and the European community do finally move in unison they can achieve major reforms of universal benefit.

General de Gaulle could have broken the Kennedy round, and he did not. Why? Perhaps it is simply that he believes French industry must be forced to face competition in order to avoid a repetition of France's economic weakness in the early twentieth century. Such thoughts must have been reinforced by Bonn's hints that German subsidies for French farm surpluses in the common market might be withheld if France sabotaged Germany's hopes of access to a bigger world market. General de Gaulle has to make some concessions to the Germans if he is to keep Britain out of the common market. Even he can only afford to veto some of the people some of the time.

Yet, by a paradox, the success of the Kennedy round should reinforce Britain's European policy. It makes Britain's only plausible alternative to Europe—the idea of a North Atlantic Free Trade Area—virtually irrelevant. The only circumstances in which the Americans might have entertained the notion of a North Atlantic trading area would have been the frustration of their hopes for the Kennedy round. If the common market countries had destroyed the hope of a general lowering of tariffs, the United States might have reconciled itself to leading some of the outsiders into a permanent rival trading group. It is unlikely to do so after the success at Geneva—although a short-term monetary struggle, designed to persuade the French to accept reasonable international liquidity arrangements, could be another matter.

But the other reason why the French may have accepted the Kennedy round could be the most significant of all for the future of the international economy. Tariffs are ceasing to be the central issue in world trade. The great new issues—competition between science-based industries, the problems of agriculture, and the tricky business of trade with communist states and the poor nations—all call for joint policies by governments, in which free trade is at most only one element. This is true even for the poor nations of the world, who need wholly free access to the great industrial markets of the rich.

As a result, the Kennedy round looks like closing one era in world trade policies, and ushering in a new one. The negotiators have been as unenterprising in dealing with the new issues confronting the world as they have been successful on tariffs themselves. The poor seem to have been left begging on the doorstep. As for agriculture, a grains agreement was dropped at the last minute in favour of mere renewal of the international wheat agreement, with commitments from the industrial powers to provide food aid thrown in. The postwar trade negotiators have repaired the follies of the protectionist 1930s more fully than any optimist expected in 1947. But they have not begun to tackle the problems of the 1970s.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, May 23, 1967]

WHAT KENNEDY ROUND MEANS TO TRADE

(By Sylvia Porter)

Now that the Kennedy Round of tariff negotiations has been completed the question is: "what does all this stuff mean to me?"

What has happened is that after three years of tough bargaining in Geneva, the delegates of 53 nations have reached agreements which will reduce tariffs between the nations an average of 33–35 percent within the next five years, most far-reaching steps ever taken to lower tariffs and increase international trade. The U.S. entered the bargaining under the Trade Expansion Act passed during the Kennedy administration in 1962. Affected by the tariff cuts are about 69,000 items representing more than $40 billion in annual world trade. Affected in the U.S. are about 6,300 products involving $16 billion in trade.

The precise details are complicated. But the implications can be stated simply and an important point is that these cuts mean something to all of us.

For the consumer:

These tariff cuts mean that there will be a larger supply of imported goods on store shelves in the U.S. than ever before. Many items which haven't been imported until now will be appearing here as the duties come down. The choice in the marketplace will be expanded.

They also open the way for modest price reduction in many items, ranging from the German Volkswagen to French cheeses to Swiss watches to Italian pottery, if the importers pass on the savings from lower tariffs to us. But even if the savings are not passed on, price increases on these items will be held down by the tariff cuts and stiffer competition.

For the manufacturer:

The lowering of our tariffs means heightened competition from attractive imports. Several industries (notably chemicals) are already screaming "disaster." It could be that some industries will be able to prove sufficient "damage" from the increased foreign competition to qualify for special U.S. "aid" devices.

For the manufacturer using imported materials:

Cheaper prices on imported materials will offer some cost relief and permit cuts in production costs. This may then improve profits or cut prices to customers.

For the businessman exporting goods:

The reductions in barriers against U.S. products will enable you to compete more aggressively with exports in foreign markets, especially in the increasingly affluent European Common Market countries and the nations belonging to the European Free Trade Assn. The danger that these two blocs would erect high tariff walls to keep out U.S. goods has been eliminated.

For the U.S. farmer:

Many of the tariff cuts, on, for instance, grapefruits, hops, dried beans, will improve the competitive position of the U.S. farmer in foreign markets. Grain farmers especially will be benefited by some specific agreements. One estimate is that U.S. agricultural exports will rise from $7 billion a year now to $10 billion.

For all citizens of the nation:

The success of the Kennedy Round means that the world is not to be engulfed in a new wave of protectionism, even though protectionist sentiment is clearly on the rise in the U.S. and elsewhere.

This was the sixth round of world-wide tariff-cutting since 1949. It was the greatest in history.

The Strategic Dilemma in Vietnam

SPEECH
OF
HON. DONALD M. FRASER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 27, 1967

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, one of the best analyses I have read of the U.S. position in Vietnam has been written by a young professor at Syracuse University. As part of a forthcoming book on the great powers in South Asia, Dr. Oliver E. Clubb, Jr., has made a penetrating analysis of the "strategic dilemma" the United States finds itself in. His persuasive arguments for bringing our Nation out of this dilemma deserve the careful attention of the entire Congress.

THE STRATEGIC DILEMMA IN VIETNAM

(By Oliver E. Clubb, Jr., Syracuse University, March 1967)

In early 1965 the United States Government committed its armed forces on a large scale to the struggle for South Vietnam, in the obvious expectation that American intervention would lead to defeat of the insurgent forces. It is the thesis of this paper that the United States is confronted in Vietnam by fundamental strategic problems, both military and political, which cannot be overcome, and that the Administration's objectives will almost certainly not be achieved. The continuation of the war, in this writer's view, promises only great damage to the American naitonal interest and further devastation to both North and South Vietnam; and it could easily involve the United States in a greatly enlarged war, even a nuclear holocaust. If this assessment of the Vietnamese situation is correct, it follows that the United States must revise its objectives and adopt a new policy. The rationale for these conclusions follows.

THE RATIONALE

The American air offensive against North Vietnam was, of course, launched in February 1965, when the Saigon government was on the verge of collapse. Washington's bombing strategy rested on several assumptions, all of which proved false.

First, it was assumed, as the New York Times noted, "that Hanoi is not only supplying the insurrection but masterminding it.[1] It was believed, therefore, that Hanoi could turn the insurrection off. Shortly after the bombing offensive had been launched, American officials would bring forth the "estimate" that without North Vietnam's support, "60 to 90 per cent of the Vietcong operations could not be carried out. . . . The theory is that the Viet Cong insurrection will peter out if Hanoi agrees to a cease-fire and cuts off the supply of arms and manpower to the Communist guerrillas in the South.[2] But in December, only two months before the bombing offensive was launched, "top military men" in South Vietnam had stated that if the Viet Cong were completely cut off from North Vietnam, "the Viet Cong would adapt to the situation, and the war would remain what it now is—primarily a problem to be solved within South Vietnam itself."[3] Washington's preception of reality had changed to fit the requirements of its bombing strategy.

OUR STRATEGY BACKFIRES

It was also Washington's belief that it could "induce" Hanoi through physical punishment to "see reason." In theory, the bombing offensive would develop progressivley until the North Vietnamese leaders realized that the "cost of aggression" outweighed the prospective gains, at which point they would not only stop supporting the Viet Cong but order them to give up the struggle. It was hardly to be anticipated that Hanoi could bring itself to order the Viet Cong to surrender, so that North Vietnam might be spared the inconvenience of American bombing, or that the NLF would accept such an order, Indeed, punishment of those who believe their cause to be righteous almost invariably gives them a sense of martyrdom and increases their determination to carry on.[4] Bombing had not brought Great Britain to its knees during World War II and it quite obviously had not humbled the Viet Cong. The bombings produced effects in North Vietnam quite the opposite of those intended. As British journalist James Cameron wrote, after a visit to North Vietnam in late 1965:

> One thing is sure, if the bombing of North Vietnam is designed either to terrorize the people into submission or to crush their economy into ruin, its effect on both counts is precisely the reverse. . . .
>
> So far from terrorizing the people, the bombings have stimulated and consolidated them. . . . A nation of peasants and manual workers who might have felt restive or dissatisfied under the stress of totalitarian conditions has been obliged to forget all differences in the common sense of resistance

---

Footnotes at end of speech.

and self-defense. From the moment the United States dropped the first bomb on North Vietnam, it welded the nation together unshakably. Every bomb since has been a bonus for Ho Chi Minh.[5]

Nor would the United States find it possible to destroy North Vietnam's capacity to carry on. As Cameron remarked, the economy was not one "that can be wrecked by high explosives. This is a peasant, agrarian society, immensely resilient."[6] There was not much industry outside of the main cities—Hanoi and the adjacent port of Haiphong—to be bombed. Moreover, the North Vietnamese would take extremely effective countermeasures. When the bridges were destroyed, the North Vietnamese replaced them with ferries and pontoon bridges which could be assembled for use at night and concealed during the day. A total of perhaps 250,000 persons were organized into repair gangs; when roads and railroads were broken, they were often repaired overnight. The transportation routes became busy at night and deserted during the day.[7] Industries were dispersed. With Russian help, North Vietnam would in due course be provided with an extremely formidable air defense system, and the Hanoi-Haiphong area would acquire, in the words of General John P. McConnell, U.S. Air Force Chief of Staff, "the greatest concentration of anti-aircraft weapons that has ever been known in the history of defense of any town or any area in the world."[8]

The net result of the bombing strategy was to bring into being the very situation it was designed to prevent—large-scale North Vietnamese intervention in South Vietnam. At the beginning of February 1965 the number of North Vietnamese soldiers in South Vietnam was insignificant. By late April 1965, Secretary of Defense McNamara had reported the presence in South Vietnam of a battalion—about 500 men—of the 325th North Vietnamese division.[9] And by October 1966 there were reportedly more than 40,000 North Vietnamese soldiers in South Vietnam.[10] The American forces, by then numbering some 300,000 men, had at that time discovered no way of halting the flow or of driving the North Vietnamese out. The prospect of a purely South Vietnamese settlement, which had plainly existed in January 1965, would recede as the war ground on and the North Vietnamese came to play an increasingly important role in the South.

CHINA AND RUSSIA ENTER THE PICTURE

The success of the American bombing strategy also depended on the reactions of Russian and China. "The great question which arose out of the reprisal policy," as one correspondent observed, "was whether it would push Communist China and the Soviet Union back together again. That was the real danger for the West."[11] In that regard, Washington was undoubtedly gratified by what it saw. The early March meeting of 19 Communist parties in Moscow brought forth a communique calling for "joint, coordinated action by all fraternal parties in the struggle against the common enemy . . ."[12] Sino-Soviet unity against the United States was ardently desired by North Vietnam. But for Peking it would involve acceptance of Soviet leadership, Russia being by far the strongest Communist power militarily. This the Chinese could not bring themselves to do. Peking denounced the Soviet call for unity as a "swindle" designed to conceal Soviet collaboration with the United States.[13]

In late March, moreover, the Soviets let it be known that China was dragging its feet on arrangements to permit the shipment of Soviet war material across China to North Vietnam.[14] Both Peking and Moscow undoubtedly remembered the American naval blockade during the Cuban missile crisis of 1962; and both undoubtedly perceived that if Soviet aid to North Vietnam were channeled exclusively through the port of Haiphong, the risk of a direct military confrontation between Russia and the United States would be increased. Moscow's disclosures embarrassed the Chinese and shortly afterwards they agreed to grant Russia transshipment rights.[15] It became obvious in Hanoi, if it had not been obvious already, that China regarded North Vietnam less as a "fraternal ally" to be defended at all costs than as a pawn in the game it was playing against Russia and the United States.

This disarray among its Communist adversaries, for which China was primarily responsible, did much to encourage Washington in the military strategy upon which it had embarked—as Washington was encouraged by Russia's strenuous efforts to promote a negotiated settlement of the war. Even if divided among themselves, the Soviet Union and China would still have to be dissuaded, however, from intervening unilaterally on North Vietnam's behalf. China, which could be attacked with relative impunity by the United States, was to be prevented from intervening by threats. In early April 1965, Presidential adviser McGeorge Bundy warned that if the Chinese carried their aid to North Vietnam too far, "the United States will not stop at the Chinese frontier."[16] The Russians were treated differently. It was the Administration's belief, "that there is, or ought to be, a general coincidence of Soviet and American interests in Asia, at least to the extent that each wishes to contain Chinese influence among Asian Communists and in the region's non-Communist nations."[17] The administration declared "that overt Soviet assistance to the Viet Cong would prejudice relations, including trade and other contacts valued by Moscow . . . [American] officials went to great lengths to explain their actions to the Soviet Government. They underlined assurances that they desired to avoid wider war and that they appreciated the Russian's dilemma."[18]

Washington's illusions about Russia had gone full circle. In 1961 the Administration had conceived of the Viet Cong insurrection as part of a Soviet global strategy aimed at fundamentally altering the world balance of power. Now the Administration hoped that Russia would collaborate with the Americans, through inaction, to help defeat North Vietnam and the NLF—for the sake of improved relations with the United States. Moscow had plainly hoped to cooperate informally with the United States to contain Chinese influence, but hardly on the basis envisaged by Washington. The Kremlin was being asked in effect to accept the principle that the United States could attack smaller Communist states with impunity. The Soviets could hardly do so without abandoning all pretense of leadership within the Communist world and without risking grave repercussions in Eastern Europe. It was unlikely that any Soviet leader could accept that principle and stay long in power.

By bombing North Vietnam, the United States had both cut off every avenue of honorable retreat for the Soviets and threatened Russia's vital interests. Russia could supply to North Vietnam all the anti-aircraft equipment necessary to thwart Washington's bombing strategy and would do so. Moreover, the United States was no more anxious than the Soviet Union for a direct military confrontation between the two countries. That concern would impose limits on how far the United States could safely press its aerial offensive against North Vietnam.

THE UNITED STATES PLAYS CHINA'S GAME

All this was made to order for Peking, which had been endeavoring not only to forestall the creation of a Soviet-American front against China but also to play off the Soviet Union against the United States, so that China would have greater freedom of action in Asia. Washington had thwarted Russia's strategic game in Southeast Asia, aimed at China's containment, and played into Peking's hands.[19] The United States also found itself playing its appointed role in the strategy devised by Mao Tse-tung for the defeat of "American imperialism." In November 1957, it will be recalled, Mao Tse-tung had urged the adoption by the "socialist camp" of a grand strategy aimed at mobilizing the overwhelming majority of the world's population—the "socialist camp" together with the poor peoples of Asia, Africa, and Latin America—against the United States and its "lackeys" in the underdeveloped world; in that strategy, Russia's nuclear power would be employed to offset America's. The Soviets had vigorously opposed Mao's scheme and the Chinese themselves had been unable to put it into effect.

But America's deep involvement in Vietnam brought out of limbo Mao Tse-tung's strategy, as further developed by Defense Minister Lin Piao, in September 1965. In Lin's view, "The contradiction between the revolutionary peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America and the imperialists headed by the United States is the principal contradiction in the contemporary world." It was America's policy of "seeking world domination" that would lead to the exacerbation of this "contradiction" and permit the mobilization of global opposition to the United States. Not only were America's human and material resources "far from sufficient" for "dominating the whole world." The United States had weakened itself "by occupying so many places in the world, overreaching itself, stretching its fingers out wide and dispersing its strength, with its rear so far away and its supply lines so long." With its strength thus dispersed, "American imperialism could be destroyed "piece by piece."[20] A chief virtue of the strategy, as the Chinese undoubtedly saw it, was that it would not pit China directly against America's vastly superior military strength. China's purposes were to be achieved by involving other peoples not excluding the Soviet Union, in struggle against the United States—a strategy involving minimum cost and risk to China.

The Vietnam situation fits China's strategy almost perfectly. The United States, by its own actions, had brought the Soviet Union into the struggle. Those actions had also provoked widespread international antagonism to the United States, an antagonism which would grow as the United States resorted to increasingly drastic measures in its effort to achieve victory in Vietnam. Moreover, the increasing concentration of its resources on the Vietnam war would lead to a weakening of America's position in other countries where that position is sustained by economic aid and sometimes by the presence of troops. It would not be easy, of course, to parlay the Vietnam war into a global revolution against the United States. And there was danger for China in the Vietnam situation; for the United States might eventually be led to strike directly against China, in sheer frustration, even though such action would be unlikely to alleviate America's problems in Vietnam or elsewhere. But this danger had been diminished when the Soviet Union, upon becoming committed to North Vietnam's defense, was interposed between the United States and China. The United States would not undertake to invade North Vietnam except as a last contingency, and it was not until then that China would have to consider open intervention in the war.

In the interests of China's grand strategy, both Russia and the United States had to be prevented from disengaging from Vietnam. Washington, by continuing its air war against North Vietnam, served that Chinese purpose where Russia was concerned. And the Chinese themselves were quick to denounce Moscow for allegedly conspiring with the United States to sell out North Vietnam and the NLF whenever the Soviets showed the slightest sign of wanting to back off. Peking engaged

---

Footnotes at end of speech.

in psychological warfare against the United States, too. The Chinese, as Mao Tse-tung remarked to Edgar Snow, had occasionally made "loud noises" by way of ordering American forces "to march here, to march there." [21] Peking's "loud noises" about Vietnam—its vocal insistence on America's complete defeat and its assertions that national liberation wars would prove the undoing of "American imperialism"—were no doubt partly designed to frighten the United States into an ever deeper Vietnam commitment, in circumstances where the Americans would find themselves at the greatest possible military and political disavantage.

Washington saw the Vietnam war as Peking presumably hoped it would be seen. In mid-February 1965, Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara asserted that the Chinese Communists had made South Vietnam "the decisive test" of their revolutionary strategy. The choice in South Vietnam, as McNamara saw it, was "whether to continue our struggle to halt Communist expansion in Asia." He suggested that the United States "will be far better off facing the issue in South Vietnam." [22] In November, *New York Times* editor James Reston noted a consequence of the Administration's attempt to solve in South Vietnam the more general problem of "Communist expansion." Remarked Reston: "The day-to-day communiques give the impression that we win almost every encounter, but we somehow merely advance deeper into the bog." [23] America's problem would become, as Edgar Snow remarked, "not how to get more troops into Asia but how to limit the commitment." [24] Unlike Peking, the NLF and the Hanoi goverment had no reason for wanting the war to continue for its own sake. They had no global strategy to be advanced and it was their sacrifices, not China's, which paid for the continuation of the war. But so long as the United States offered them only defeat in the South as an alternative to continuing the struggle, they, like the Russians, had no alternative except to continue playing China's game.

Thus the consequences of America's decision to bomb North Vietnam—a decision made in desperate circumstances and founded on wishful thinking about almost every aspect of the problem. In a sense, President Johnson had been the willing victim of air power advocates who have a powerful compulsion to believe in the efficacy of everything they stand for. Before bombing North Vietnam, the United States had been confronted by the Viet Cong fighting largely alone, with minimum support from North Vietnam. American interests would have been best served by keeping South Vietnam, and the insurgency, as isolated as possible from outside influence. Apart from the physical damage caused North Vietnam, which had practically no bearing on the situation in the South, the bombing offensive served mainly to bring three new adversaries into the military picture—North Vietnam, Russia, and China. In this situation the United States almost certainly cannot achieve its objectives in Vietnam without overcoming all of its adversaries, and that cannot be done without fighting a world war.

U.S. TROOPS JOIN COMBAT

It very soon became apparent, in any case, that the war in the South could not be won by bombing the North. As a *New York Times* correspondent observed:

> In the spring of 1965, the battle of attrition, which had been going for years against the Government troops, began to reach a crescendo. Saigon's armed forces were disintegrating under the hammer blows of the main force guerrilla regiments, and entire battalions of 400 to 500 Government troops were disappearing in a few hours of combat.[25]

To stave off defeat and redeem its misconceived bombing strategy, the United States was obliged to intervene in South Vietnam with its own ground forces. The first sizeable combat unit—the Marine Corps's 9th Expeditionary Brigade—began to land in South Vietnam in early March; its mission was to protect the American air base at Danang, which was in potential danger of being assaulted and overrun.[26] By the beginning of April the Administration had decided to send troops for the more general purpose of offsetting Viet Cong strength.[27]

Washington declared at the outset that American forces had been sent only to defend American installations. But on May 2 the Marines launched their first search operation; and by mid-May, after the number of American troops in South Vietnam had reached 45,000, U.S. commanders were reportedly preparing their men for full combat participation.[28] The State Department disclosed in early June that President Johnson had authorized his military commanders to commit ground forces to combat if so requested by the Saigon government. The American people had been informed "by a minor State Department official," as the *New York Times* editorially observed, "that, in effect, they were in a land war on the continent of Asia." [29]

The arrival of the Marines had been the first step in the conversion of the anti-Viet Cong struggle into what became, for all practical purposes, a white man's war. On June 30, 1964, Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge had told reporters in Washington that massive American military involvement in South Vietnam "means we become a colonial power and I think it's been pretty well established that colonialism is over." [30] In late July 1965, after such involvement had become a fact, the same Ambassador Lodge reportedly told the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in closed session that the United States would keep its forces in South Vietnam even if requested by its government to withdraw.[31]

THE SAIGON GENERALS START GOVERNING

By that time the possibility of being asked to leave by the South Vietnamese government was no longer much of a problem. In mid-February 1965, after Tran Van Huong had been deposed, Phan Huy Quat had taken office as civilian Premier; in mid-April the deputy premier in Quat's cabinet told *Le Monde* that, "This war must be stopped. . . . It is necessary to create a government with roots in the masses. . . . In such a context, the left-wing South Vietnamese forces could find a place. . . ." [32] But Quat ruled only on American and South Vietnamese army sufferance. Hard-line South Vietnamese generals had meanwhile come to the fore. General Nguyen Kanh was deposed on February 23 and sent out of the country as a roving ambassador. A new five-man supreme military committee was formed on March 5; the committee was dominated by hard-line generals Nguyen Van Thieu and Nguyen Cao Ky, with the "pro-Buddhist" Nguyen Chanh Thi excluded. On June 11, Thieu and Ky ousted Phan Huy Quat and Nguyen Cao Ky became the new Premier. Ky would not ask the Americans to leave, for he had no future if they did. Nor could he be dislodged from office by anti-war, primarily militant Buddhist, pressures. With the Americans having arrived to fight the Viet Cong, Ky could deploy his own troops against his non-Viet Cong enemies without risk, and, as we shall see, he could count on American backing in a showdown. American force very quickly became the dominant factor in Saigon politics. As Bernard Fall remarked in October 1965, it would matter little if Mickey Mouse reigned as premier.[33]

On the battlefield, the Americans very quickly took over from the Saigon forces. When the Americans first undertook major offensive operations in July 1965, those operations were normally conducted jointly with South Vietnamese army units. But the Americans very quickly discovered that when attack plans were disclosed to the South Vietnamese army they very often became almost immediately known to the Viet Cong, whose agents and sympathizers were to be found at the highest levels of the South Vietnamese army. In October 1965, after the North Vietnamese 325th division eluded a Saigon-U.S. trap, an American officer expresed the viewpoint of many fellow officers in angrily asserting "that the South Vietnamese army could not be trusted to keep anything secret for 'more than 30 seconds.' For this reason, he said, any joint operations are wholly impractical." [34]

Moreover, South Vietnamese army units were frequently ambushed in Viet Cong operations designed to suck large rescue forces into battle on terrain carefully prepared by the Viet Cong themselves. The American commanders were understandably reluctant to play the rescuing role. As a Marine Corps officer put it, "I can't think of anything more unsound militarily than the way it would have to be done here. You are asked to fly into a situation you know nothing about, land in a place that any officer you have never seen tells you to land, and to attack in a direction he suggests. You are losing command of your troops almost totally." [35] The American commanders were therefore often inclined to let their South Vietnamese allies take it on the chin militarily rather than incur the risks involved in going to their assistance—a circumstance bound to embitter the South Vietnamese and further reduce their will to fight.

UNITED STATES TAKES THE OFFENSIVE

The general pattern for American military operation was established by the Marines in mid-August 1965, when they conducted a costly but successful attack against Viet Cong units in the Chulai peninsula. The South Vietnamese army had not been informed of that purely American operation until the assault was underway, and there accordingly had been no intelligence leaks. The Chulai operation showed the way, at least in a tactical sense, to the American commanders. They would undertake to fight and overcome the Viet Cong unhindered by the inconveniences of battlefield collaboration with their South Vietnamese allies. This circumstance of course created a demand for a vast increase in American military manpower. Thus the process by which America's commitment grew from 31,000 men in late April 1965 to more than 370,000 men by the end of 1966.

America's intervention with its own ground forces saved the South Vietnamese government from military defeat. But it also produced predictable effects on the South Vietnamese army. The United States had been obliged to intervene in the first place because the South Vietnamese army, even when alone in the field against the enemy, had lacked the will to fight. With the Americans there to do combat for them, the Saigon armies had even less reason to fight. In September 1966 the *New York Times* reported that, "Now, with the exception of a few elite units, Saigon's forces have lapsed into a defensive role and the majority of the offensive operations are being undertaken by American troops." [36] The following month an American official described the role of South Vietnam's forces more bluntly, "They are no longer part of the show." [37]

In addition to bombing North Vietnam and intervening with ground forces in the South, the United States in the spring of 1965 launched an almost total air war against the population in enemy-held areas of South Vietnam, which comprised about two-thirds of the countryside. It had long been recognized that peasant cooperation played a major role in the Viet Cong's military successes; the strategic hamlet program, launched in 1962, had endeavored unsuccessfully to separate the Viet Cong from the peasantry. The air war aimed at solving the same problem, simply by killing those who remained in

---

Footnotes at end of speech.

enemy country (also the ancestral homeland of the peasant who lived there, it should be noted) or driving them away. "The people in the South Vietnamese hamlets now know," wrote *New York Times* editor James Reston in August, 1965, "that if they dig tunnels for the Viet Cong and give them food and refuge, they are likely to be shelled or bombed." That policy, observed Reston, "has caused great suffering and destruction among the civilian population."[38]

By mid-September 1965 some 600,000 refugees had been driven into government-held, thus bomb-free areas, with the figure reaching 700,000 barely a month later.[39] There they were crowded together in shacks and pens, Reston further observed, "that would make the slums of Harlem look like the LBJ ranch."[40] It was officially explained that the refugees were fleeing "Viet Cong terrorism." But there had been no significant movement of refugees before the American air war began and it was not to be imagined that the Viet Cong, who had worked painstakingly for years to mobilize the peasants behind their war effort, had suddenly turned against those same peasants. Testifying before a Senate subcommittee in September 1965, former Assistant Secretary of State Roger Hilsman stated that Viet Cong terrorism had not driven the refugees from their homes. Said Hilsman: "It was American and South Vietnamese bombing and shelling."[41]

There was considerable irony in this; the United States found itself conducting a virtually unlimited air war against a large proportion of the population it was ostensibly in South Vietnam to protect. A "frightful beating" was thereby administered to South Vietnam.[42]

POLITICAL FLAWS IN U.S. STRATEGY

While this was going on, the growing American expeditionary forces conducted regular "search and destroy" operations against the Viet Cong and the North Vietnamese units which began to appear in South Vietnam. Those operations did not significantly expand the area under Saigon's control, for the Americans returned afterwards to their bases and the Viet Cong usually moved back into the area where the fighting had taken place. American strategists anticipated, however, that when their adversaries became convinced that they could not win militarily they would accept a settlement on America's terms—or, failing there, that North Vietnam's main force units would eventually be destroyed and that the Viet Cong themselves be "driven back into the woodwork."

Those expectations were not likely to be realized. The "kill" figures, by which the Pentagon measured progress toward victory, comprised civilian as well as military casualties; they were also inflated, in describing the results of battles, to produce an image of dramatic victories over the enemy.[44] Moreover, despite the casualties inflicted on the Viet Cong and the North Vietnamese, their strength continued to grow dramatically. By November 1965, according to American intelligence estimates, Viet Cong strength had grown from the January figure of 25,000-35,000 to 75,000-80,000; on January 1, 1966 the estimate of combined Viet Cong-North Vietnamese strength was 230,000; and in early August 1966 the latter figure had risen to 282,000 men.[45] Through 1966, the Viet Cong and North Vietnamese forces showed a willingness to engage the American forces in large-unit pitched battles. But if such battles became too costly for the Viet Cong, they could very easily move back down into small units, avoid pitched battles, and conduct harrassing operations indefinitely without being found and "fixed" in significant numbers by the American forces. The large American "search and destroy" operations would then become largely fruitless in a tactical sense and pointless in a strategic sense. In this situation, the American forces could never leave South Vietnam without having the Viet Cong re-assemble into large units with their military capabilities, vis-a-vis the Saigon forces, very little diminished.

Nor is there much prospect that the United States can prevent the North Vietnamese from infiltrating large numbers of men into South Vietnam. By October 1966 the American marine force of 57,000 men had become spread out so thinly in attempting to block the movement of North Vietnamese forces across the demilitarized zone into South Vietnam that it became necessary to reinforce the marines with troops from another zone of operations.[46] Even then it would almost certainly not prove possible to effectively prevent North Vietnamese infiltration unless a line were established and maintained—not only along the demilitarized zone but also along South Vietnam's border of some 275 miles with Laos. That endeavor could easily require, and immobilize, upwards of 500,000 men—with the Viet Cong and many North Vietnamese troops already in South Vietnam being left to range freely throughout the country unless a large additional American force were made available to continue the "search and destroy" operations. And even if all this seemed possible on paper, it can hardly be doubted that North Vietnam, backed by the Soviet Union and China, would mobilize still unused military resources to thwart the American strategy.

The American strategy was even less sound politically than it was militarily. Karl von Clausewitz, the famed German strategist, wrote more than a century ago that, "War is not merely a political act but a real political instrument, a continuation of political intercourse. . . . The political design is the object, while war is the means, and the means can never be thought of apart from the object." American operations in South Vietnam could scarcely have been better designed to end in political failure. Assistant Secretary of State William Bundy told Philippe Devillers in August 1965 that in his opinion there was no chance for a political settlement in the South for at least two or three years, "during which time, he said, we shall have rebuilt the social structure of the countryside, the peasants will be so disgusted with the Vietcong that they will denounce them, and Saigon will then be able to wipe them out completely, or to bring them under strict control."[47] But those familiar with contemporary Chinese history will recall that when the United States entered World War II against Japan, the Chinese Nationalists for all practical purposes stopped fighting; while the Nationalist generals corrupted themselves on American aid and their armies decayed through inaction, the Chinese Communists enormously strengthened themselves, both militarily and politically, while carrying out guerrilla operations behind Japanese lines. When the war ended and Chiang Kai-shek's American protectors were withdrawn from the scene, his armies proved no match for the guerrilla forces of Mao Tse-tung.

In South Vietnam the situation is very similar. Even before America's intervention with ground forces, the Viet Cong had brought Saigon's demoralized armies to the brink of defeat, With the government forces having for all practical purposes withdrawn from the war, that demoralization process would inevitably continue.[48] Much earlier, the Viet Cong had successfully employed a policy known as "living integrated with the enemy," by which government forces were left alone if they did not harass the Viet Cong or interfere with their operations.[49] With the South Vietnamese army practically out of the war, the Viet Cong could be expected to expand greatly on these arrangements and to propagandize assiduously within South Vietnamese army ranks. In their propaganda campaign, the Viet Cong have undoubtedly profited greatly not only from the American "invasion" issue but also from the corruption of South Vietnam's military leaders. South Vietnam's armies are likely to be rendered useless as a future anti-Viet Cong force and it is entirely possible that significant portions of it will be politically subverted as the war drags on. The Viet Cong, in fighting the world's greatest military power, can be expected to retain their toughness—assuming that the United States fails to crush them. When the American armies leave, as they inevitably must, Saigon's military position in relation to the Viet Cong is almost certain to be significantly weaker than before the Americans intervened in the fighting.

It is even more certain that the Saigon government's political position will have rotted away during the war. The military junta was already on its last legs when the United States intervened in the fighting. America's intervention has cast the Saigon generals in the role of having invited a foreign power to occupy South Vietnam militarily and to bomb the country almost to pieces while the generals themselves have been fattening their wallets on American aid.[50] That those generals will end up discredited is inevitable. By the same token, the Viet Cong can be expected to come through the war with their political position substantially strengthened—for they have been making great sacrifices, and have thus earned great merit in Vietnamese eyes, in leading the struggle against the "foreign invaders."

THE BUDDHISTS ARE ALIENATED

Following the overthrow of Ngo Dinh Diem, Washington had placed great hope on the Buddhists as a third force which could be built up as a bulwark against communism. It soon became clear, however, that the organized Buddhists wanted a negotiated settlement of the war and thus stood against American purposes in Vietnam. For some time the American authorities coexisted uneasily with the Buddhists, but in early 1966 a crisis forced the Americans to choose General Nguyen Cao Ky's side against the Buddhists. The crisis began early in March, when Ky fired his chief rival for power, the "pro-Buddhist" General Nguyen Chanh Thi. Thi's corps command then embraced South Vietnam's five northernmost provinces, including Hue and Danang; dissident troops and Buddhist opponents of Ky immediately assumed control in those two cities. The Buddhists then launched a campaign aimed at bringing military rule to a quick end and at the creation of an elected civilian government. Nguyen Cao Ky agreed to elections but in early May declared his intention to stay on as Premier for at least another year.

Washington was at first inclined to dissuade Ky.[51] On May 15, however, troops loyal to Saigon were flown to the Danang air base and from there they attacked the city. Washington, uninformed of Ky's plans, was dismayed by the prospect of civil war, and President Johnson expressed his regret regarding "any diversion" from the struggle against the Viet Cong.[52] But Ky persisted; the Danang insurgents were overcome, General Nguyen Chanh Thi made his peace with Ky, mass Buddhist demonstrations in Saigon were put down, and resistance in Hue collapsed. Ky had dashed Washington's hopes for a broad-based civilian government and left the United States with no choice except to back him against his enemies. Four Buddhists burned themselves to death at the end of May, in an effort to keep alive the resistance to Ky. President Johnson saw those suicides as "acts of desperation"—a "quite unnecessary loss of life" which "only obscures the progress that's being made toward a constitutional government."[53] The Buddhists, for their part, were left bitter and alienated. Militant Buddhist leader Thich Tri Quang blamed Johnson for the Buddhist

---

Footnotes at end of speech.

lives lost in the struggle against Ky and said the President had "killed" any remaining Buddhist sympathies for him by acquiescing in Ky's use of troops against Danang.[54]

That left in support of Washington's purposes mainly those who profited directly from the American presence. Such persons, apart from the more anti-Communist Catholics, were not many. Moreover, most of them were corrupted by their very association with the American war effort. The arrival of a large American expeditionary force had been accompanied by massive infusions into South Vietnam of American supplies and money. Saigon and to a lesser extent other cities were soon teeming with war profiteering, black market activity, and other forms of corruption. Wrote Neil Sheehan: "Bars and bordellos, thousands of young Vietnamese women degrading themselves as bar girls and prostitutes, gangs of hoodlums and beggars and children selling their older sisters and picking pockets have become ubiquitous features of urban life.[55] The longer the war continues the more likely it was that the Vietnamese who stood with the United States would be corrupted and discredited.

POLITICAL DEFEAT LOOMS AHEAD

Only the American presence sustains the Saigon power structure, which is likely to collapse when that presence is withdrawn. With the countryside devastated, with more than a million displaced peasants crowded into refugee camps, and with South Vietnamese urban society disintegrating, the Nguyen Cao Kys will probably not find it within their capabilities to restructure South Vietnam's economic and social life.[56] The task can only be accomplished by the South Vietnamese themselves; whether we like it or not, the force which has demonstrated the greatest political and organizational capacity for carrying out reconstruction is the National Liberation Front. Barring a miracle, the American military effort is likely to end in ultimate political defeat in South Vietnam and profound disillusionment within the United States.

At Canberra, in mid-October 1966, President Johnson remarked that "there is light at the end of what has been a long and lonely tunnel." [57] He and his advisors plainly continued to believe that the North Vietnamese and the NLF would eventually find the costs of the war too much to bear. The North Vietnamese, for their part, believe that the United States will eventually tire of fighting and go home. In speaking of the war against the French, Vo Nguyen Giap expressed the Vietminh strategy outlook with regard to protracted war:

> The blitzkrieg will transform itself into a war of long duration. Thus, the enemy will be caught in a dilemma: He has to drag out the war in order to win it and does not possess, on the other hand, the psychological and political means to fight a long, drawn-out war.

Ho Chi Minh vowed in July 1965 that North Vietnam would fight another twenty years if necessary to achieve victory.[58]

Hanoi's expectations were better founded than Washington's. For the North Vietnamese and the NLF were carrying on what was for them a holy struggle to defend their homeland against foreign invaders; nothing could matter more than to continue the struggle, at whatever cost, until their objectives had been achieved. Ho Chi Minh's promise to keep on fighting had not been an empty one, for the Chinese Communists and the Vietminh had already demonstrated the ability of guerrilla forces to fight for decades if necessary. The United States was in an entirely different position in relation to the Vietnam war. America itself was not under attack and Vietnam, far from being of transcendent importance to the United States, necessarily ranks low in the total spectrum of American national interests. America's larger interests will suffer, in some respects severely, from the concentration of its resources and energies on the Vietnam war. At home the social and physical disintegration of the cities, when combined with growing racial tensions, is now producing a problem of such menacing proportions that only a massive effort can be expected to save the situation; no such effort can be made, it seems clear, until the Vietnam war is brought to an end. In Europe, America's Vietnam policies have turned large segments of public opinion and several governments against the United States. NATO is in disarray; Britain is up to its neck in economic difficulties; an alienated France is beginning to work closely with the Soviet Union; and the Bonn government is coming to perceive that NATO's strength can be of little help in bringing West Germany closer to the achievement of its national objectives, and that new diplomatic initiatives are required. The diversion of American attentions to Asia is therefore certain to weaken substantially the American position in Europe as time goes on—a process which will be accelerated as the United States resorts to increasingly drastic measures in Vietnam. That circumstance, as Moscow no doubt perceives, could offer the Soviets diplomatic possibilities which have eluded them ever since the end of World War II for achieving their principal objectives in Europe.

In Asia and other parts of the underdeveloped world the problems are still more critical. There the growth of population, combined with the lag in living standards and especially in food production, is certain to produce revolutionary disturbances during the decades ahead and perhaps convulsions on a vast scale. If even minimum stability in Asia is to be maintained, it will require a massive effort to alleviate the conditions of poverty and near starvation which prevail so widely there. But if the resources are not available to tackle critical problems in the United States itself, because of the Vietnam war, such resources will clearly not be made available for a major attempt to alleviate conditions in the underdeveloped world. It is not inconceivable that the United States will find itself endeavoring increasingly to suppress by armed force the revolutionary symptoms of discontent as it fails to help solve the underlying problems.

The United States could become a garrison state endeavoring to police a revolutionary, poverty-stricken, non-white world with armed force—with American urban society concurrently disintegrating into something not much better than chaos, and with the domestic tensions engendered by continued war abroad combining with racial tensions to produce a fearful political atmosphere in the United States. All of these things may not come to pass, but the pressures are in the directions outlined above. This means, in all probability, that the United States cannot conduct a protracted war in Vietnam—one lasting for perhaps ten years—except at great cost to its global position and to the health of American society itself.

THE BASIC STRATEGIC DILEMMA MUST BE FACED

The frustrations of fighting an indecisive, protracted war can be expected eventually to bring Washington face to face with its basic strategic dilemma. On the one hand, it cannot destroy its enemy's war-making capacity even if it wipes out all of North Vietnam's industry. For much of the Viet Cong's war material is supplied by the United States itself and captured from the Saigon forces or obtained through the black market, and much of it is also made in cottage industries scattered throughout the jungles of South Vietnam. Moreover, the Soviet Union and China have an almost infinite capacity to keep North Vietnam and the NLF supplied with the arms needed to keep their war effort going. To blockade or mine the port of Haiphong, where much Soviet military equipment is landed, would greatly increase the danger of a Soviet-American military confrontation without solving the problem; Peking, in those circumstances, would not be able to refuse the Soviets unlimited transit rights across China. If it is difficult to prevent supplies from being infiltrated into South Vietnam, it would be even more difficult to prevent supplies from being shipped into North Vietnam from China. It is virtually impossible, therefore, to solve the problem of the enemy's war-making capacity without attacking both Russia and China.

The United States might think to finally destroy North Vietnam's will to fight by intensively bombing Hanoi and Haiphong. But the Hanoi-Haiphong area, as indicated earlier, has probably the most formidable anti-aircraft defense of any such area in the world. By late 1966 the American air arm had already begun to suffer heavily from losses of planes and especially of pilots—even without regular attacks on Hanoi-Haiphong.[59] The defenses guarding those two cities could be expected to exact a heavy toll from among the attacking planes, and the Soviet Union could easily be brought into more direct conflict with the United States. Even if Hanoi and Haiphong were virtually destroyed, however, it is doubtful that the battlefield situation in South Vietnam would be significantly improved. The Vietminh fought for eight years against the French without holding either city, and Ho Chi Minh was reportedly ready by late 1965 to evacuate Hanoi if necessary and fight on in the mountains.[60]

As indicated earlier, the prospect of destroying the enemy's armed forces in South Vietnam is not good either. The Viet Cong guerrillas feel under little compulsion to defend territory for its own sake and therefore cannot be engaged and destroyed in strategically significant numbers. Moreover, North Vietnam has an almost infinite capacity for infiltrating men into South Vietnam. That capacity cannot be eliminated without fighting and overcoming the North Vietnamese army itself, which would necessitate the invasion of North Vietnam. Such an undertaking would be extremely formidable at a minimum and could very easily lead to great disaster. It is generally accepted that an invading force should outnumber the defenders by at least three-to-one. With North Vietnam's army numbering 350,000 men, the United States would probably have to deploy at least a million men if it were to invade North Vietnam—without even taking into consideration the vast Chinese manpower available to back up the North Vietnamese if need be. The North Vietnamese army alone would be a formidable adversary. It is of course far stronger in artillery and other forms of fire-power than the Viet Cong and North Vietnamese units fighting in the South. The North Vietnamese also possess a far greater capacity for shooting down the ground-support aircraft which have saved so many precarious battlefield situations for the American ground forces in South Vietnam.

CHINA'S STAKE

China could be expected with certainty to intervene in the war, moreover, if such intervention became necessary to prevent a North Vietnamese defeat. Washington might imagine, as it did during the Korean war, that China would not be so rash as to risk nuclear destruction at American hands. But China in fact took that risk by intervening in Korea and the United States also risked nuclear destruction to get the Soviet missiles out of Cuba in 1962. With China's intervention in Vietnam, war would very probably engulf much of the Indochinese peninsula—certainly Thailand (where America's principal air bases for bombing North Vietnam are located) and Laos, and probably Cambodia as well. In July 1965 a "high-ranking member of the Chinese government" (probably Chou En-lai or Foreign Minister Chen

---

Footnotes at end of speech.

Yi) told the Austrian correspondent Hugo Portisch that China's army would attack if the war (presumably the ground war) were carried to North Vietnam.[illegible] He continued:

> As we have told the Americans, this would be no second Korea. Korea is a small peninsula, without room for millions of soldiers to maneuver. Southeast Asia is quite different. There a broad and extensive front could be established. Such a war could not be contained in a small area. It would spread to Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia and perhaps Thailand. This entire region is a great jungle swamp. Even with the most modern weapons—even with atomic weapons—the Americans could accomplish nothing. But in such an event we would not determine the scope of the war. Do not misunderstand us. The scope of such a war would be determined by the Americans. If they want a small war, well and good; it will be a small war. But if they want a big war, then it will be bigger than they wanted. It all depends on the Americans. We don't want a war of any kind, but if one is thrust upon us, we shall be prepared.[illegible]

One thing is clear. If the Chinese did intervene in Vietnam, they would do so with sufficent strength (as against the United States in Korea and against India in 1962) to achieve decisive results. And if the United States were to suffer heavy losses and the prospect of defeat, there would be great and perhaps irresistible pressures upon the Administration to use nuclear weapons—even though, with Russia as well as China involved, such action would be more likely to lead to a nuclear holocaust than to victory in Vietnam. Thus the fundamental strategic dilemma in which the United States finds itself. It almost certainly cannot win militarily in Vietnam without overcoming not only the existing enemy forces already in South Vietnam but also the still unused power of North Vietnam, Russia, and China; and it cannot, of course, do that without setting off World War III.

OUR VIETNAM POLICY CONFLICTS WITH OUR NATIONAL INTEREST

The American government's justification for having placed the United States, the Vietnamese people, and the rest of the world in this situation is hard to discover. For even a complete Communist takeover throughout Vietnam, if it came to that, is not likely to effect the American national interest more adversely than the existence of Communist governments in such countries as Rumania and Yugoslavia. There is little reason to believe, notwithstanding the Administration's suggestions to the contrary, that a Viet Cong victory in South Vietnam would spark an irresistible wave of national liberation wars elsewhere. It will be recalled that the victory of Mao Tse-tung and his followers in China itself, surely a momentous event in world history, was not followed by a wave of successful revolutions elsewhere—even though China then vigorously championed the spread of revolution and Communist insurgents in half a dozen Southeast Asian countries were doing their utmost to attain power by the Chinese revolutionary path. The Viet Cong's later successes against the Saigon government did not save the Indonesian Communist Party, with its two million adherents, from being led to the slaughter like a helpless lamb by the Indonesian army, and the rise of Castroism in Cuba was not followed by Castroite successes elsewhere in Latin America.

Revolutions succeed only when a revolutionary situation exists and when the revolutionary forces are stronger than the government in power. China can be expected to make trouble for those countries along its periphery, such as Thailand, which have lent themselves to American military purposes. But China's strategy, as set forth by Lin Piao, calls for national liberation wars to take place *concurrently* in as many places as possible, so that America's military resources will be spread out thinly. In terms of that strategy, it makes no sense for the revolutionaries in one country to wait upon the outcome of a national liberation war in another country before pressing ahead with their own revolution. Nor would the success of the Viet Cong in South Vietnam give *China* easier access than it already has to Burma, Laos, Thailand, or Cambodia.

This is not to suggest that Vietnam, if reunited under Hanoi or ruled by Ho Chi Minh in the north and the NLF in the south, would take no interest in neighboring Laos and Cambodia. Vietnam's minimum security requirement is that the two countries on its western flank do not fall under the influence of hostile powers. Historically, moreover, Vietnam has frequently encroached upon Laos and Cambodia, as has Thailand from the West. Where Laos is concerned, it can be assumed that Hanoi's support for the Pathet Lao has less to do with the advance of communism for its own sake than with North Vietnam's interests—to keep hostile forces away from its flank and to provide itself with a protected corridor for infiltrating men and supplies into South Vietnam. If the NLF came to power in South Vietnam, normal communications between the two Vietnams would undoubtedly be reestablished and the Laotian corridor would no longer be needed—if, indeed, it is still being used. North Vietnam's security requirement, now served by the existence of a Pathet Lao-controlled buffer zone along the Vietnamese border, would of course remain. An NLF victory in South Vietnam would not in any case give North Vietnam easier access to Laos than it already has.

Cambodia's position would seem substantially more secure than that of Laos. Anti-Vietnamese feeling is extremely strong among Cambodians and would work against Vietnamese efforts to foment revolution there. Moreover, Hanoi has greatly eased the belligerent stance it once adopted toward Prince Norodom Sihanouk's government. For his part, Sihanouk has already insured himself against the possibility of a Viet Cong victory in South Vietnam by enlisting the support of China, the Soviet Union, and France (which enjoys good relations with the Hanoi government), and by establishing friendly relations with the NLF.

If the war ended and the NLF came to power, both North and South Vietnam would of course be confronted by a monumental task of reconstruction. It can reasonably be assumed that they would turn to that task, with whatever foreign help they could get, rather than to embark on new foreign adventures; such adventures would not only necessitate postponement of reconstruction but invite more ruin without promise of compensating gains. In rebuilding, and in seeking foreign aid, the two Vietnams would necessarily acquire a vested interest in peace. Hanoi and Saigon could also be expected to concentrate much attention on the task of working out new economic and political relations with each other.

North Vietnam, even though at war with the United States, and in need of China's backing, has managed remarkably well thus far to stay out of China's embrace by balancing off Moscow against Peking. An end to the hostilities would make possible a far greater expression of the Hanoi government's natural bent, with its deep historical roots, for independence from China; and, in seeking accommodation with Saigon as well as aid and trade from both Russia and various non-Communist countries, Hanoi would be presented with both incentives and the means for achieving an effectively independent existence.[illegible]

Indeed, it is very possible that even a Communist Vietnam would come to play an important role in balancing off Chinese influence in Southeast Asia; for it is economic, political, and military strength which enable a neighboring country to resist Chinese domination, not ideological differences, and the Hanoi government is probably the strongest in Southeast Asia. Furthermore, no government in Hanoi could look with equanimity upon the swallowing up by China of the two countries on Vietnam's western flank—Laos and Cambodia. By the same token, China considers itself the natural overlord of the smaller Asian countries.

It has already assumed the obligation to protect Cambodia from Vietnam and it would probably regard a Vietnamese attempt to absorb Laos or Cambodia as an usurpation of China's rightful prerogatives. A degree of competition between China and even a Communist Vietnam, and a partial balancing off of each other's influence, could thus be expected in the Indochina region.

None of this is to suggest that the absorption of South Vietnam by the Hanoi government is either desirable or inevitable; but rather that the United States, in terms of its national interests, could easily live with a South Vietnam dominated by the NLF or, for that matter, with a reunified, Communist-ruled Vietnam.

THE ALTERNATIVES STILL OPEN

Several points emerge from the foregoing analysis: first, that there is virtually no prospect that the American strategy in Vietnam will succeed; secondly, that America's global and domestic interests can only suffer from a continuation of the Vietnam war; and third, that the worst that might come out of a negotiated settlement, however it might embarrass the Administration, would not injure the American national interest in any significant way, and could in fact pave the way for a more sensible approach to the foreign and domestic challenges by which the United States is confronted.

If all this is true, the problem before Washington is to obtain a negotiated settlement. And if negotiations are to take place, the United States must remove the obstacles to negotiations imposed by itself. First, it must halt the bombing of North Vietnam, for only then can Hanoi negotiate without embarrassment and Moscow be expected to press the North Vietnamese to negotiate; since the bombing of North Vietnam does not materially affect the battlefield situation in South Vietnam, a halt in the bombing could be safely undertaken. Secondly, the United States must agree to participation of the NLF as a separate party to any negotiations. Washington's past position on this question has not served to obtain negotiations under conditions which would lead to the NLF's elimination as a political force in South Vietnam, and has thus served to block negotiations.

The prospects, if the Geneva conference were reconvened, would not be altogether gloomy. For the interests of Russia, China, North Vietnam, and the NLF (parties now more or less united in opposition to the United States) differ in important respects. Only China has a vested interest in a continuation of the war for its own sake; and China also has an interest in keeping North Vietnam tied closely to itself. North Vietnam's aims are several: to make progress toward the eventual reunification of Vietnam; to maintain its independence of China; to retain Soviet support as a counter-balance to China; to end the hostilities; and to get the United States out of South Vietnam. The NLF shares several interests with Hanoi. But it is also safe to assume that the NLF would work strenuously to ensure that the fruits of its long struggle would not simply be turned over to the men in Hanoi. Moreover, the NLF could be expected to seek a settlement enabling it to maintain its domestic base of support, consisting mainly of South Vietnamese non-Communists. For its part, the Soviet Union has been seeking to limit Chinese influence generally, which is America's objective as well; and the Soviets un-

---

Footnotes at end of speech.

doubtedly wish to loosen the Peking-Hanoi bond.

These differences, largely submerged during the fighting, would begin to make themselves felt if the fighting were ended and the disputing parties moved to the conference table. There would be a good possibility for achieving a balance of forces in Vietnam, with beneficial effects on the security of all Southeast Asia—a balance which might be obscured from the American public mind by ideological labels but which would nonetheless be effective.

POSSIBILITIES FOR NEGOTIATIONS

Negotiations might be approached in still another way. If the United States were to halt its offensive operations and reach a tacit agreement with North Vietnam for neither party to increase troop commitments, it would probably be possible to achieve the kind of lull in the ground fighting that developed in January 1966. America's abandonment of its effort to defeat the Viet Cong militarily would in due course set in motion strong pressures within South Vietnam for negotiations with the NLF, designed not only to end the fighting but also to bring about the withdrawal of both American and North Vietnamese forces from South Vietnam.

In the past, Washington has several times worked to prevent such pressures from producing their natural fruit. If the United States feels no obligation to maintain in power South Vietnamese governments which have shown an inclination to seek peace, it surely has no obligation to maintain in power other South Vietnamese governments simply because, in order to stay in power, they have preferred American intervention to a negotiated settlement.[44] With the politics of South Vietnam allowed free play, its present government would inevitably find itself obliged to take the lead in seeking a negotiated settlement or it would be forced to step aside in favor of a government which would. The various South Vietnamese parties to the negotiations would then be obliged to negotiate with North Vietnam and the United States on the terms by which their respective forces would be withdrawn from South Vietnam. This approach would enable the South Vietnamese to work out their future for themselves, taking into account the balance of various forces in South Vietnam, and the responsibility for the settlement would fall on their own shoulders.

Washington's problem, whatever the approach to negotiations, would partly be to secure terms for the withdrawal of U.S. forces which would ease the domestic shock caused by the abandonment of America's original objectives. The liquidation of America's unpromising military venture in Vietnam cannot be achieved without some embarrassment, but the problems of liquidation are by no means insurmountable. Charles de Gaulle faced a major domestic crisis in ending the French military venture in Algeria; but he weathered that crisis, he remains in power, and France is far better off today, both internationally and domestically, than when it was bogged down in Algeria. By the same token, China liquidated its armed conflict with India, when the Indians refused to negotiate, simply by declaring an end to the hostilities and withdrawing its forces behind the line it claimed. The Vietnamese situation is not exactly analogous, but there is nothing to prevent the United States from halting offensive operations and holding to its own perimeters as a means for bringing about peace negotiations.

It is the will in Washington, however, that is lacking. If this writer's analysis of America's basic strategic dilemma is correct, the United States in fact finds itself in a strategic trap. But the trap is not perceived by those responsible for American policy, because to perceive it is to face failure and to accept responsibility for all the costs of that failure. Unlike the abortive Bay of Pigs invasion, where total failure became immediately apparent, eventual failure in Vietnam lies beyond immediate vision. It is possible, looking at the "kill rate," to imagine a "light" at the end of the tunnel and to hope, with each deeper step into war, that the light will in fact be seen around the next military corner. If such a "light" does not exist, and it almost certainly does not, the Administration will inevitably be led to a point where it must confront, and accept responsibility for, its own failure in Vietnam—or plunge the nation and the world into a new world war. Given the powerful psychological factors which work against recognition of failure, when so much has been staked on success, there is no reason to be cheerful about the outcome of that inevitable confrontation.

---

[1] New York Times, March 21, 1965. See *Aggression From the North* . . . op. cit., for a full exposition of this thesis.

[2] *New York Times*, March 21, 1965.

[3] As reported by John Huges, *Christian Science Monitor*, December 7, 1964.

[4] See the remarks of Dr. Jerome Frank, the noted Johns Hopkins psychologist, before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Testifying on May 25, 1966, Frank observed: ". . . the Vietnam war has assumed an ideological character similar to the holy wars of former times, and this has ominous implications. People who are fighting for their ideals seldom if ever can be forced into surrender by punishment. . . . To suffer and die for a holy cause is highly virtuous, and one hopes through example to convert others by one's own sacrifice." As quoted in Jerome D. Frank, "How Nations See Each Other," *War/Peace Report*, June–July 1966.

[5] James Cameron, *New York Times*, December 10, 1965.

[6] *Ibid*. Also see Seymour Topping, New York Times, April 7, 1965. Wrote Topping, from South Vietnam: "Specialists on Asian affairs estimated today that North Vietnam could absorb considerable punishment from United States air strikes over an extended period without any decisive disruption of its economy." And see Seymour Topping. *New York Times*, December 10, 1965.

[7] See Cameron, *op. cit.;* also Neil Sheehan, *New York Times*, September 28, 1966.

[8] Quoted by Sam Butz, "Our Pilots call Hanoi 'Dodge City'," *The New York Times Magazine*, October 16, 1966; also see Neil Sheehan, *New York Times*, September 28, 1966. By mid-April 1965 the first Russian missiles were being installed in North Vietnam.

[9] *Washington Post*, April 27, 1965. According to Washington, a defector captured on March 23 disclosed the presence of that battalion and stated also that the battalion had been in South Vietnam prior to February 7. It seems curious that the Administration, which had gone to such pains to substantiate its charges of North Vietnamese aggression, would have withheld for a month the information in question. In view of the Administration's common practice of fabricating "intelligence" and other kinds of information to serve its political objectives, it also seems reasonable to view with caution Washington's contention that the North Vietnamese battalion had been in South Vietnam prior to February 7, 1965.

[10] Neil Sheehan, "Not a Dove, But No Longer a Hawk," *op. cit*.

[11] Joseph Harsch, *Christian Science Monitor*, April 12, 1965.

[12] *Pravda*, March 10, 1965.

[13] "A Comment on the March Moscow Meeting," *Peking Review*, March 26, 1965.

[14] *New York Herald Tribune*, March 29, 1965.

[15] *New York Times*, April 8, 1965.

[16] *Christian Science Monitor*, April 8, 1965.

[17] As reported by Max Frankel, *New York Times*, March 8, 1965.

[18] *Ibid*.

[19] In the Indo-Pakistani war of August-September 1965, it will be remembered, the United States and Russia still found it in their respective interests to work together against China. The political context for that collaboration—support of neutralist India—differed fundamentally, of course, from the situation existing in Vietnam.

[20] Lin Piao, "Long Live the Victory of People's War!" *Peking Review*, September 3, 1965.

[21] Edgar Snow, "Interview with Mao," *The New Republic*, February 27, 1965.

[22] *New York Times*, February 19, 1965.

[23] *New York Times*, November 14, 1965.

[24] Edgar Snow, "China and Vietnam," *The New Republic*, July 20, 1966.

[25] Neil Sheehan, *New York Times*, September 18, 1965. See the *New York Times*, June 2, 1965 for a report on President Johnson's concern regarding Saigon's military reverses; also, *Washington Post*, July 21, 1965 regarding Secretary of Defense McNamara's preoccupation with finding means to save the still deteriorating situation.

[26] In early March the Viet Cong badly battered a Government column very close to Danang. See *New York Times*, March 6, 1965.

[27] *New York Times*, April 3, 1965.

[28] *New York Times*, May 18, 1965.

[29] *New York Times*, June 9, 1965.

[30] As quoted by Hans Morgenthau, "Vietnam: Shadow and Substance," *The New York Review of Books*, September 16, 1965.

[31] *Washington Post*, August 12, 1965. The Associated Press and United Press International both circulated the story, obtaining similar accounts from their own sources. Administration spokesmen stated that the accounts were inaccurate; but the transcript of Lodge's testimony, which would have resolved the controversy, was not released.

[32] *Viet Report*, July 1965.

[33] Bernard Fall, "Blitz in Vietnam," *The New Republic*, October 9, 1965.

[34] As quoted by the *New York Times*, October 13, 1965. In early 1965, NLF General Secretary Huynh Tan Phat told Japanese correspondent Akihiki Okamura: "The Americans have been calling themselves 'advisers' to the Saigon forces. But soon there will be no Saigon forces and the Americans will be needing Vietnamese 'advisers.' When that begins, half of the Vietnamese 'advising' the Americans will be our own NLF agents." Akihiko Okamura, "Back from a Vietcong Hell Hole in the Jungle," *Life*, July 2, 1965.

[35] As quoted by Charles Mohr, *New York Times*, September 12, 1965.

[36] Neil Sheehan, *New York Times*, September 18, 1966.

[37] As reported by Ward Just from Saigon, *Washington Post*, October 6.

[38] James Reston, *New York Times*, August 29, 1965. Reston's observations were made after a trip to South Vietnam. The *New York Times* (April 16, 1965) has reported that "free bomb zones," where American planes are authorized to attack anything they see, whether villages or human beings, were being designated at least as early as February 1965. Also see the *Washington Post*, August 5, 1965; and Jack Langguth, "The War in Vietnam Can be Won, But—," *New York Times Magazine*, September 19, 1965.

[39] *Washington Post*, September 12, October 20, 1965.

[40] *New York Times*, August 29, 1965.

[41] *Washington Post*, October 1, 1965. Hilsman's testimony was presented before the Senate subcommittee on refugees, of which Senator Edward Kennedy was chairman. Also see Neil Sheehan, "Not a Dove, But No Longer a Hawk," *op. cit.* Sheehan describes the bombing and shelling of villages in considerable detail, and remarks: "Most refugees I have questioned told me that the Vietcong taxed them and made them work harder than usual, but that they could live with the Communists. They left their homes, they said, because they could no longer bear Amer-

ican and South Vietnamese bombs and shells."

[43] James Reston, *New York Times*, August 29, 1965.

[44] Denis Warner, the well-known Australian correspondent, wrote in December 1965 that American public relations officers in Saigon "are engaged in the business of turning defeat into victory . . . What no one will accept indefinitely . . . is a persistent attempt to win by pretense what has not been won on the ground." Pat Burgess, another Australian correspondent, wrote: "No one in Saigon believes the kill rate given by American briefing officers daily in their briefings to the press." *New York Times*, December 8, 1965.

[45] *Christian Science Monitor*, November 11, 1965 and *New York Times*, August 10, 1965.

[46] See *New York Times*, October 3, 1966 for a description of Marine manpower shortages.

[47] Devillers, *op. cit.*

[48] In 1965 the Saigon government admitted to 113,000 desertions from its armed forces. In the first six months of 1966 there were 67,000 desertions, a rate of desertion 20 per cent higher than the previous year. *New York Times*, August 30, 1966.

[49] See Wilfred Burchett, *op. cit.*, pp. 59–62.

[50] For a description of corruption among the Saigon generals, see Sheehan, "Not a Dove, But No Longer a Hawk," *op. cit.*, Also, Beverly Peepe, *New York Herald Tribune*, June 1, 1965.

[51] See *New York Times*, May 9, 1966. Secretary of State Dean Rusk stated over American television that Ky's remarks had been misrepresented and that he did not expect Ky to stand in the way of elections.

[52] *New York Times*, May 22, 1966.

[53] *New York Times*, May 31, 1966.

[54] *New York Times*, May 30, 1966.

[55] Sheehan "Not a Dove, But No Longer a Hawk," *op. cit.*

[56] Tran Van Dinh, South Vietnam's Acting Ambassador to the United States in 1964, has written: "To the increasing resentment of the Southerners, all the key posts in the government of South Vietnam are now held by men from North Vietnam. General Nguyen Cao Ky, the Prime Minister, is a Northerner; so are the secretary general of the National Leadership Committee which advises Ky; the Minister for National Reconstruction (in charge of pacification); the director general of police and military security; the ministers for information for state security; the chief of staff; and the commander of the troops that surround Saigon and protect Ky against a coup d'etat. Northerners control the army, the police, the pacification, the propaganda, have all the money, all the power, and thus control 14 million South Vietnamese." Tran Van Dinh further notes that 63 of the 64 members of the NLF's Central Committee are Southerners, the 64th having spent most of his adult life in the South. His remarks suggest the difficulties which the existing Saigon government would have in ruling South Vietnam by consent or in competing in peaceful political competition with the NLF and other southern forces. See Tran Van Dinh, "The Ky Question," *The New Republic*, January 21, 1967.

[57] *New York Times*, October 21, 1966.

[58] *New York Times*, July 20, 1965.

[59] See *New York Times*, September 28, 1966 and October 9, 1966. The U.S. Navy found it necessary, because of pilot losses, to order many pilots to serve double tours of duty in Vietnam, and to turn down resignation requests by an estimated 100 to 200 pilots.

[60] *Christian Science Monitor*, November 6, 1965.

[61] Dr. Hugo Portisch, "Red China's Two Voices," Translated from Kurier, Vienna, and reprinted in Atlas. The official in question referred to a recent state visit he had paid to Pakistan. Chou-En-lai and Chen Yi were the only two high-ranking Chinese officials who had done so.

[62] *Ibid.*

[63] It should be noted that even North Korea, which was occupied by a million-man Chinese army during the Korean War, had by 1966 made good its independence from China.

[64] Nor is it reasonable to suggest that the United States has an obligation to fight to keep the Nguyen Cao Ky government in power extending beyond the obligation felt by that government's own subjects—a sense of obligation which, in the latter case, is clearly almost nonexistent.

The Only Road Left for the Negro

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1967

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, for the better part of the last year those who relish in disseminating predictions of doom and despair have forecast a long, violent summer of rioting within America's teeming urban ghettos. Although the veracity of many of these self-ordained prophets can be legitimately questoned, what is not in dispute is the harrowing and destructive series of ghetto riots that have characterized the month of June 1967.

I have refrained from joining the haunting chorus of gloomy prophets because indulgence in such practices rarely contributes constructively to the problems which need to be solved. I have tried to limit my past comments on the position of the Negro American to those questions with which I could honestly offer something constructive.

The most recent events in Atlanta, Boston, Tampa, Dayton, and Cincinnati are vivid reminders of the smouldering animosity, and pungent frustration permeating the ghetto.

Tuesday's Washington Post reported the preliminary results of a study recently completed by Brandeis University's Lemberg Center for the Study of Violence. The center's conclusion, according to the Post, indicated that—

> Negroes are shifting to the opinion that only intense forms of social protest—riots—can bring relief from social injustice.

With these present circumstances etched in our mind, I believe this is the most appropriate time to express a point of view toward the Negro American, all too rarely recognized in Congress.

Mr. Speaker, on an earlier occasion, I indicated to the Members of the House one important aspect of the problems of the Negro American. In our previous presentation the importance of a sense of pride and an acceptable recognition of personal identity was stressed. It now is increasingly important in the struggle of the Negro for a larger participation in the mainstream of American life for him to emphasize his proud background and racial heritage as a vehicle for the improvement of his present situation.

It is difficult to contemplate a Negro making a substantial advance as an American if at the same time he cannot be aware and proud of himself as a Negro.

The present national Negro leadership has only been able to identify the problem of the black race in modern America. However, beyond mere identification, very little of what the Negro leaders most acceptable to the white community do and say really addresses itself to the basic social requirements for improvement. Recently I ran across three separate threads of cogent comment on the underlying problem and I should like to bring these diverse but yet similar comments to the attention of thoughtful and concerned Americans.

The first comment is from Negro minister James H. Hargett, of the Congregational Church of Christian Fellowship. In a recent letter to the editor of the Los Angeles Times, Mr. Hargett said in part the following:

> I am not so naive as to suggest that we do not need police presence patrolling Los Angeles. I rest much easier at night knowing the police are patrolling my neighborhood . . .
>
> What I am concerned about is the vast difference between law enforcement and order enforcement. In the final analysis, order can only be maintained by a community from within and not through pressure from without . . .
>
> If there is a real sense of community, there is order, and the police may make arrests within that community, but it is very seldom persons of that community. If there is little or no sense of community, then it becomes necessary for the police to make frequent arrests of people who live in a given area.
>
> Negro leaders must face the fact that what is sometimes referred to as the Negro community is in reality an amorphous mass of humanity in search of a sense of community.
>
> A community by definition is a place where people are genuinely and sincerely concerned about each other's problems. A community is a place where people seek to provide care for the sick, food for the hungry, clothes for the naked, education for the illiterate and religious training for the young and spiritual guidance for the adults and also employment.
>
> It is this simple but fundamental concern for the whole person that nurtures a sense of a reciprocity of concern and mutuality of support.
>
> Negro leaders have been struggling so desperately and so sincerely for integration over the last 12 years, until their vision has been reduced to vertical vision. My desperate appeal is for both vertical and horizontal vision.
>
> The vision of a community must be primarily horizontal. The vision of the individual in that community must be primarily vertical.
>
> We must, through a commitment to order, reduce the function of policemen to protecting us primarily from outsiders rather than the need to protect us from one another. Only racial pride and self-love can accomplish that. When that happens on a large scale, we will discover for the first time what it means to have law and order in our community. A community has law and order when there is a minimum need for law enforcement . . .
>
> Any community that has self order enforced from within narrows the policeman's job to protecting it rather than prosecuting it.
>
> Let us give no legitimate excuse for a fearful or bigoted policeman to do anything but patrol the black community.
>
> JAMES H. HARGETT,
> *Minister, Congregational Church of Christian Fellowship, Los Angeles.*

Although Rev. Hargett was talking narrowly about the problem of self-imposed order as an ingredient in healthy law enforcement, he properly brings the focus of concern within the proper perspective. The Negro community's most important responsibility is the creation of its own self-image. Developing the consciousness of the Negro America's own proud and rich culture, and an understanding of the need not to apologize for being black, is the major challenge facing the Negro leadership. Here is where the major effort on the part of all who hope to serve the problem should now be applied.

This is largely, but not solely, the black American's problem.

Although a very controversial figure, and a white man, Mr. Saul Alinsky has more successfully attacked the problem of community building and self-identification in the Negro ghetto than most of the national Negro leadership.

His methods have not always led to smooth and happy handling, and perhaps should not serve as a model, yet who will say this problem can ever lend itself to orthodox treatment? The important fact is that he is successfully building a most important handhold. A recent article in the Economist points to Mr. Alinsky's methods. We include it as point two in our brief.

Plato on the Barricades

New York.—Mr. Saul Alinsky is that rare specimen, a successful radical. He has been organizing the have-nots in America for twenty-five years but only recently has the country caught up to him. In the early days Mr. Alinsky found himself working with Mexican-Americans and with Poles, Lithuanians, and Italians; the poor in those ethnic groups were at the bottom rung of the ladder, without a bargaining voice in the system. Mr. Alinsky, strength then, as now, lay in his ability to organize a community so that it could stand on its own feet, with its own leaders, fight effectively for its own demands—and go on doing so after he had left it on its own as he always did.

Today, he and his twenty helpers are still mobilising those who live outside the power structure in urban America; only today the people who request his help and tend to come from the Negro ghettos—in Chicago, in Buffalo, in Rochester. Mr. Alinsky (white, middle class, son of immigrant Russian Jews) seems to be the only radical who has succeeded in organising the Negro communities. For, when he and his staff have left, the organisation continues functioning with its own leaders while, by and large, the Negro civil rights groups have failed to create this staying power. When Mr. Stokely Carmichael or Dr. Martin Luther King and their aides have pulled out of communities in Alabama and Mississippi, the people have quickly fallen back into apathy and servitude.

This explains the interest in the Alinsky approach, an interest that has affected a diverse set of observers. Negro groups in the urban north are impressed by the gains that Chicago's Woodlawn community (organised by Mr. Alinsky and now operating on its own) has been able to make. When he arrives to help the Negroes in Oakland, California, or in Rochester, New York, invariably they discover that the press, the political and business leaders, in fact all the bodies that seem to represent the establishment, immediately begin to attack him and to put pressure on the local middle-class Negro leaders to denounce him. As Mr. Alinsky likes to explain, the Negroes may have distrusted him—a white man and an outsider—at first; but the frightened reaction of their opponents usually serves as convincing proof that he must be on their side.

Oddly enough church groups—Catholic, Episcopalian, Lutheran, Presbyterian—are strong supporters of Mr. Alinsky. In the past they have contributed financially to his activities and often it is one of the churches that is responsible for inviting him into a community to help the poor. He contends that they understand him because he avoids religious and spiritual nonsense and deals with the poor, and the church, on a realistic plane, that is in terms of power and self-interest. However, he is very ready to attack those members of the church hierarchy who line up with the opposition, calling a conservative Los Angeles Cardinal, for example, an "un-Christian prehistoric mutton-head."

In the early days of the New Frontier some of the bright young men in government were interested in the Alinsky tactics. They borrowed some of the ideas, some of the phrases, for the Peace Corps ("help people to help themselves") and for the community action projects in the poverty programme. But Mr. Alinsky, who has a habit of firing off outrageous statements about those who look as if they are intent on co-opting him into their organisation, sees the government programmes as welfare projects, paternal forms of colonialism peddled out to the docile and the co-operative poor, while the social workers push up their salaries and glamorise their positions in the bureaucracy. To him the poverty programme stands as "a prize piece of political pornography." And such views put an end to a very brief romance with the government.

Essentially what Mr. Alinsky objects to is the consensual nature of government projects. A modern day Hobbesian, he believes that men with power try to retain their power, at the least, and generally exert all their energy to increase it. Those who lack power, the apathetic masses, the poor, are neither noble nor deserving merely because they are poor. But they can be mobilized to fight for their interests and in the process they can gain a voice and with it a share of the power. Since they lack money and status, the resources that they must harness are numbers and discipline.

The question is, of course, why Mr. Alinsky is concerned with the plight of have-nots. He is neither a religious man nor a sentimentalist. He does, however, believe in a democracy in which the masses participate, with all the tension and instability that this entails, something that many liberals in America today are uneasy about. Mr. Alinsky, however, is a radical, not a liberal. And while he holds to a Jeffersonian view he rarely permits ideology to get in the way of tactics. To wrest power away from the establishment entails conflict and battle and his first goal is to win the battle.

Thus in the past Mr. Alinsky has attacked slum landlords by sending Negro tenants to picket the owners' exclusive suburban houses. He has fought opposition on a local board of education by dispatching Negro mothers to sit-in at the business office of a board member who was also a vice president of a major steel company. (Shortly after this the man resigned from the board of education.) He is now demanding that the philanthropic foundations, particularly Ford and Rockefeller, use their investments as a way of forcing industry to go along with social change. It requires little imagination to discover why he is so disliked by his opponents. He cannot be bought; he cannot be intimidated; and he breaks all the rules.

Despite his new found prominence, and despite the fact that his work often is cited as a model for community action projects, Mr. Alinsky has never received a major grant from any of the large foundations, or the government. Lacking such financial help, his programmes might be expected to fail simply for lack of funds. But he has his own non-profit-making Industrial Areas Foundation; set up in 1940 with the assistance of several small contributions from the Roman Catholic church and from Chicago philanthropists, this is a self-sustaining operation. When Mr. Alinsky is invited into a community he insists that his hosts must finance their own fight and pay the salary of his organiser (as well as covering his travel and telephone expenses).

To raise additional funds to cover his expenses, Mr. Alinsky takes to the road. He criss-crosses the country, speaking to groups at Harvard, Columbia, Stanford and other universities; business organisations now invite him to address their executives; and church and educational bodies are eager to line him up as a guest speaker or as a consultant. For in addition to his skill as an organiser extraordinary, Mr. Alinsky is a man of exceptional charm and humor. He is a witty, well-read humanist, although one who delights in describing the action of friends and opponents alike in salty, four-letter phrases. His charm lies in his ability to commit himself completely to the people in the room with him. In a shrewd though subtle way he often manipulates them while speaking directly to their experience. Still he is a man totally at ease with himself, mainly because he loves his work, which always seems to be changing—new communities, new contests, new fights.

Now he is on the verge of shifting to a new environment. He is about to dissolve his own foundation and move into education in a formal way. Backed by several church groups, he is launching a school to train community organisers. It is to be a fourteen-month course and will be attached to one of the universities in the San Francisco area. Work projects in the surrounding communities will be included as part of the academic programme. Expenses, Mr. Alinsky expects, will come to $11,000 a person and he anticipates that about 70 per cent of the students will fail to complete the course; that is the figure that experience has taught him to expect. At last count, though, he had received nearly 3,000 applications for some 60 places. It will be, everyone believes, an education that combines Plato and the barricades.

When history finally records the results of this period's handling of what is America's major domestic problem, the assimilation on equal terms of the black American into American life, one of the names apt to loom large is likely to be that of Saul Alinsky.

Seeing clearly the need to build what Reverend Hargett termed the horizontal base of true community in order to support the vertical climb of the individual Negro who successfully finds himself, Saul Alinsky is one of the few effectively providing a reliable ladder to climb.

Finally, Eric Hoffer, the workingman's philosopher, offers insight into the confidence crisis of black America. In his latest work, "The Temper of Our Times," Hoffer hits all of use right in our predilections, and at the same time deals a stinging rebuke to many of the so-called leaders of the Negro movement. The Black Muslim movement, Hoffer declares, really deals with the fundamental issue. Hoffer says:

> Alone of all the Negro leaders, Elijah Mohammad has a vivid awareness of the vital need of a new birth in any drastic human transformation, and he alone has mastered the technique of staging a new identity. In one sense, the Black Muslim movement is trying to do to the Negro what America automatically did to the millions of immigrants from Europe. By joining the nation of Islam, the Negro is stripped of his habits,

> attitudes, opinions, beliefs, etc. He is given a new name, a new religion, and a new way of life. He is processed into a new man. The fact is that the Black Muslim movement can point to many solid achievements. It has transformed idlers, criminals, junkies, and drunkards into clean living, purposeful human beings.

The knowledge of self-identification, self-acceptance, and self-improvement all must come before any real extensive and meaningful participation by the black man in the American mainstream can realistically be expected. Until America's black people understand and have pride in their own identity, in their culture, and in their race, the circumstances for equal participation for Negroes in America will be tenuous, frustrating, and incomplete.

It is exceedingly difficult for a white man to have any real comprehension of the circumstances of ghettoized depression that weigh heavily on millions of black Americans. After a brutal and dehumanizing history of involuntary servitude, and the frustration of the second-class citizenship available after the Emancipation Proclamation, many of America's black people today are on a continuing treadmill of shattered hopes and expectations long tarnished with disillusionment.

Multiple and overwhelmingly complicated welfare programs reinforce the defeatist subculture evident in the black ghetto. White-administered welfare is a continual and cynical reminder to the black recipient that white America considers him unable to take care of himself.

The reaction of government to crisis in the ghetto most often takes the form of money. Apparently unlimited dollars are not the answer. In the last year more than $46 million in Federal funds alone have been spent in Watts, the black ghetto in south-central Los Angeles. Despite the great infusion of financial assistance, the ghetto is still a desolate, despairing, and isolated tinderbox capable of erupting into irrational rioting reminiscent of the horrible days in August–September 1965.

Mr. Speaker, the three men quoted in this statement suggest what is perhaps a revolutionary view of the circumstances of the black American. I believe, however, it is a far more realistic view than the often demeaning and patronizing program that is presently the most widely accepted and practiced approach.

To the Negro leaders who are capable of making black America proud of itself, its culture, its triumphs, and its goals, will go the most meaningful successes. The black man must be consciously proud of his color, never apologizing for it. He must understand his identity and never prostitute it. When he is capable of exercising the legitimate strength of his community for the betterment of his community and each individual who is part of it the black American will have arrived and taken his place.

There are indications that this is beginning to happen. Mr. Alinsky's progress and a few other examples offer encouragement. However, to be successful and meaningful, the primary thrust that develops self-pride and self-identity in the black community must come from within. Well-meaning whites must not smother with good intentions such effort since their activities may be self-defeating. Self-pride comes from self-identification, and self-help. The black American does not need, nor should he want the white man telling him who he is or how he should do things. This has been precisely the problem for too long.

The black American is capable of building his own community and selecting those white institutions he feels will enhance his own needs. Assistance from the white community should be available and given when asked for. As the black community builds, it will be able to exercise its own potent strength. When this occurs, the black community will be able to compete with the other diverse interests that have learned to operate and prosper within the American system.

We are well aware that referring to a controversial figure as Mr. Alinsky and a controversial movement such as the Muslims is an invitation for emotional reaction. This reaction may even be tied to what could be legitimate distaste for certain aspects of Mr. Alinsky's presentations and pronouncments, or the uncalled for extremism of the Muslims. However, the risk that we might be misunderstood has been borne because the point to be made is so important.

The point tells the well-meaning white American that his efforts, where appropriate, must be applied at the place where the Negro American in fact is in the most trouble, and effort must be bent and subordinated to a constructive self-help and self-improvement approach. Our point tells the Negro leaders there can only be laders for vertical rise, not a forced imposition of a lowered standard for accommodation of a minority. The ladders out of the ghetto must be broadly available to all, but must be supported by a self-improved horizontally built base of community improvement.

More violence and more destructive protest may give momentary relief from frustrations and from pressure, but it may also reduce the cooperation and tolerance which feeds the combined efforts of all Americans to accommodate and assist all citizens to enjoy the full fruits of the United States.

Socrates' ancient admonition to his students is applicable to today's circumstances. Socrates told his aspiring students that if they wanted to improve, the first step was "Know thyself."

Eric Hoffer succinctly concludes with this observation:

> The only road left for the Negro is community building. Whether he wills it or not, the Negro in America belongs to a distinct group, yet he is without the values and satisfactions which people usually obtain by joining a group. When we become members of a group, we acquire a desirable identity and derive a sense of worth and usefulness by sharing in the efforts and achievements of the group. Clearly, it is the Negro's chief task to convert this formless and purposeless group to which he is irrevocably bound into a genuine community capable of effort and achievement and which can inspire its members with pride and hope.

The American Dream: On-the-Job Training Succeeds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1967

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson's promise "to make the poor, the unemployed, and the disadvantaged tax-eaters into tax-payers," has been given substance by the success of the on-the-job training programs.

This success is largely due to the widespread local cooperation and initiative achieved under the historic Manpower Development and Training Act.

In the Los Angeles area a local organization, the Mexican American Opportunities Foundation, has mounted a major attack on unemployment among Spanish-speaking people through on-the-job training programs.

The foundation is actively overcoming the technological change gap in which many Mexican Americans find themselves caught.

With the cooperation of the Los Angeles industrial community nearly 400 Mexican Americans are working in the aerospace industry and in other fields due to the efforts of the foundation.

The foundation is continually working to improve the social and economic situation of the Los Angeles Spanish-speaking people through educational and on-the-job training programs.

I feel that the foundation is another example of the success of minority-oriented programs throughout the country. For this reason, I insert this Los Angeles Herald-Examiner article into the RECORD:

THE AMERICAN DREAM—ON-THE-JOB TRAINING SUCCEEDS

(By Marina Mireles)

An East Side young man's dream of a back yard for his four children soon may come true.

Guillermo Navarro, 27, began working last week in the aerospace industry as an on-the-job-trainee structure assembler. This is the first time in his life he has earned more than $1.60 an hour.

His new $2.45 hourly wage means he can start looking for a little house with a back yard, he said.

Navarro presently lives with his wife, Socorro, and four children 3, 6, 7, and 8, in a four-room dwelling. His children must either play in the street or walk several blocks to a public playground.

A quiet, unassuming man, he is the 389th Mexican-American whose life has been changed by the Mexican-American Opportunities Foundation since it began its on-the-job training program in August when it was granted $198,000 by the Department of Labor.

An organization that had its start at the grass roots, the foundation travelled a long and difficult road before it was able to bring practical help to people like Navarro.

TO DO MORE

It began in 1963 when Dionicio Morales, today its executive director, and nine other members of the Pico-Rivera community, contributed $100 each "to start an organization that would do more than philosophize on the problems of Los Angeles' Mexican-Americans."

"We approached the problem from an economic point of view," said Morales, "seeing that the Mexican-American had a serious employment problem. The solution for those already with families was not to tell them 'go and get yourself an education' but to help them get a better job now."

The first step Morales took was to approach local major industry executives and acquaint them with the potential of the Mexican-American worker.

"Executives at North American, Douglas, Lockheed and Northrop were enthusiastic about giving jobs to Mexican-Americans," Morales continued, "but explained that our people frequently failed the tests for job applicants.

"The basic problem here is that Spanish-speaking people have been caught in the technological change gap.

"Our East Side high schools are not preparing our youth to overcome this gap. Their vocational curriculum concentrates on courses in wood shop, where they make wooden trinkets and shelves; in upholstery classes, and outmoded printing methods for the boys and sewing for the girls.

"Many of these youths have sufficient mechanical ability to take apart and put together an old car, but the schools do not prepare them to either understand or pass the tests they will run ito at industrial plants."

Morales added that many of the tests are unrelated to the jobs and that a language barrier further makes it difficult.

In 1964 Morales met with President Johnson.

"That was the turning point," he recalled.

"It was during my Washington visit that I learned the foundation was eligible for an on-the-job trainee grant from the Bureau of Apprenticeship in the Department of Labor."

The grant was approved, and immediately North American, Douglas, Northrop and other industries made good their promise and made training slots available to the foundation.

Now nearly 400 Mexican-Americans are working in the aerospace industry and in other fields due to the efforts of the organization.

Sing Anthem, Wave Flag

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1967

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, in these days of questioning our young people's patriotism and criticizing the war in Vietnam, it was most reassuring for me to read two letters, one from a high school student to the editor of the Miami News, and the other from an infantryman in the U.S. Army in Vietnam. Each letter demonstrates that our younger citizens are indeed patriotic and mature. The letters from these two young Americans follow:

[From the Miami (Fla.) News, May 5, 1967]

SING ANTHEM, WAVE FLAG

To the EDITOR:

It's a sad, sad day when someone can't feel proud of his country. There is absolutely nothing wrong with "waving the flag," or singing a patriotic song. I am proud of the United States, the best and richest country in the history of man.

You'd think people are ashamed to say, "I love America." Ever notice the crowds at a ball game during the National Anthem? There are those who stare at their shoelaces as if there were huge spiders on them, and there are those who act as if their vocal chords had been paralyzed.

Right or wrong it is my country. I have faith in the decisions made by the courageous leaders of our great nation. Of course I can question the validity of a policy but I trust my life, and the lives of generations to come, to the judgment of the leaders of the Free World.

I could burst with anger when I see the so-called Americans picketing the White House on foreign policy decisions. They're always around for Social Security checks, ever notice?

Think about it. Don't be ashamed to raise your voice in song, or to recite the Pledge of Allegiance with pride, for, remember, you are part (an important part), of this "Great Society."

STEVE BENSON.

SOUTHWEST SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL.

NOVEMBER 18, 1966.

I would really and truly like to thank you with the bottom of heart and the rest of people with grateful hearts of Dade County, City and the State of Florida for the most wonderful package that you sent me. I can never forget you for what you did for me. The package you sent me was like getting a Christmas present. There wasn't one item in the package that I couldn't use, even the American flag was used. We put it up high so that everyone can see it and remember that we come from a free country and are proud to serve it in combat and in peace, and also to remind us of all you wonderful people back in the states who support our cause over here in this war torn country of South Vietnam. It is you people who make the difference between freedom and a good way of life. Yes we know that there are some who disagree with us, but we are many and they are few. So in closing, again I would like to thank you for your most wonderful package and I would like to say that I'm proud to serve our country and the state of Florida over here. I only have 3½ months left over here. I will be coming home to Florida on or about the 6th of March, and I would like to thank you in person then. So until then, God Bless You and thanks again.

Yours truly,

PFC. PHIL GOODMAN.

P.S.—We must and will win over here in South Vietnam.

Protect Our Flag From Desecration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1967

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the General Assembly of South Carolina adopted a resolution on Flag Day, June 14, recommending to the Congress that Federal legislation be enacted that would protect the flag of the United States from desecration.

Since this resolution was adopted by the general assembly, the House passed a bill making it a crime to desecrate the American flag by a vote of 385 to 16.

The vote in the House here and resolutions such as the one unanimously adopted by the South Carolina General Assembly are encouraging to our men who are fighting to defend our flag the world over—and to every dedicated, patriotic, loyal citizen here at home.

I believe the bill passed by the House will now be favorably considered by the other body and will become the law of the land.

I commend to the attention of my colleagues and to the people of the United States the very timely resolution adopted by the General Assembly of South Carolina on Flag Day:

CALENDAR NO. S. 530

(Introduced by Senators Long, Mason, and Albright.)

A concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to enact pending legislation which would protect the flag of the United States of America from desecration

Whereas, on this day, June 14, 1967, which is Flag Day, Congress is considering legislation which would protect the flag of the United States of America from desecration and impose a one thousand dollar fine or a year's imprisonment on any person guilty of publicly mutilating, defacing, defiling, or trampling upon it; and

Whereas, the State of South Carolina, years ago, provided such protection not only for the flag of the United States but for the flags of South Carolina and of the Confederacy; and

Whereas, the desecration of the flag of the United States of America is regarded, legally and morally, as an offense against the United States by the people of South Carolina. Now, therefore,

Be it resolved by the Senate, the House of Representatives concurring:

That the Congress of the United States is hereby memorialized to enact, without delay, pending legislation which would protect the flag of the United States of America from desecration and impose a one thousand dollar fine or a year's imprisonment on any person guilty of publicly mutilating, defacing, defiling, or trampling upon it.

Be it further resolved that copies of this Resolution be forwarded to each member of Congress from South Carolina.

Attest:

L. O. THOMAS,
Clerk of the South Carolina Senate.

The Ballad of America: The Revolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERVEY G. MACHEN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1967

Mr. MACHEN. Mr. Speaker, today the Congress will recess in order that we may participate in the nationwide celebration of our Day of Independence on July 4. It is on this day each year that every American rededicates himself to the principles and ideals that have set the course for our democracy for almost 200 years.

It is my privilege to bring to the attention of my colleagues a patriotic poem composed by a constituent, Mr. John Croff, of 4817 Hollywood Road, College Park, Md., who works for the U.S. Department of Agriculture in Beltsville, Md. I believe it to be extremely timely for us to rekindle the spirit of freedom and democracy which Mr. Croff states so well in his poem, "Ballad of America: The Revolution."

At this point I include this poem in the RECORD:

BALLAD OF AMERICA: THE REVOLUTION

1. KING GEORGE THE THIRD (SPOKEN)

In 1760 King George The Third ascended the throne of England,
And little by little the rights of the American colonies were taken away.
The colonists didn't like it, and they resisted,
And as the Crown got tougher, so did the Americans.

2. BOSTON MASSACRE

The night of March fifth, Seventeen Seven O,
Five dead Americans lay in the snow.
It was called "The Boston Massacre." The Redcoats did it.
Our Sam Adams wouldn't let us forget it.
Puritans and Pilgrims were their forefathers;
Come to America to be free.
Now their angry sons and daughters
Called themselves "The Sons of Liberty."

3. BOSTON TEA PARTY

The King wanted taxes, and was getting pretty rough.
The Yankees up in Boston thought they'd taken enough.
Three ships in Boston Harbor with tea to be taxed,
Were boarded by "Indians" and given the ax.
The Indians were phony as they could be,
But three hundred forty two cases of tea
Were dumped in the water, and history
Calls it "The Boston Tea Party."

4. LIBERTY OR DEATH

"Taxation without representation is tyranny."
But the King with his "Lobsterbacks" do not agree.
Boston Harbor is blockaded. Nothing enters, nothing leaves.
To starve the Bostonians and bring them to their knees.
Where are the countrymen in this hour?
Will this nation pass its test?
Patrick Henry speaks the answer:
"Give me liberty or give me death."

5. LEXINGTON AND CONCORD

At Lexington and Concord were men and supplies.
The British marched to take them and got a surprise.
The Minute Men were ready for just such an event.
All they needed to know was that the Redcoats were sent.
We had a man in Boston—Paul Revere.
He rode through the night and brought that word.
The Minute Men responded; they didn't fear
To fire "the shot heard round the world."

6. CONTINENTAL ARMY

The thirteen colonies separately knew they could not prevail.
The Continental Army was to see they did not fail.
With guns and ammunition, and men who loved this land,.
All they needed was a general to take command.
A delegate from Virginia—six foot two;
Fought in the French and Indian War too;
Had a reputation and everyone knew
That our George Washington would do.

7. FORT TICONDEROGA

At the tip of Lake Champlain, where Richelieu River runs,
Lay Fort Ticonderoga, with a hundred heavy guns.
Confronted by eleven thousand men in the French and Indian War,
It was just right for Ethan Allen's eighty three Green Mountain Boys.
In the gray of dawn, with quick surprise, to the fort they came,
When their chances were the strongest.
And won possession "In the name
Of the Great Jehovah and the Continental Congress."

8. BUNKER HILL

We learned what Yankee Rebels could do in The Battle of Bunker Hill;
That volunteers could fight regulars, because they had the will.
Bombarded by artillery, from ships and from shore,
The Rebel line was standing fast; steady as before.
Two thousand disciplined British troops moved forward to attack,
And met a fire so deadly they had to fall back.
The Rebel lads had taken William Prescott's advice
"Don't fire until you see the whites of their eyes."

9. CANADA

Canada was a perfect base for the British to mobilize,
To invade New York and New England, and send Indians to terrorize.
Congress ordered our soldiers to make the northern trek.
Some attacked at Montreal, while others approached Quebec.
It was thought the French Canadians would rise against the King,
But they didn't; the Yanks were on their own.
The final Rebel assault was repulsed most bloodily.
Only a handful of survivors came home.

10. SIEGE OF BOSTON

To the enemy troops in Boston it was a terrifying sight—
The gunds of Ticonderoga arrayed on Dorchester Heights.
Henry Knox had hauled them all by sleigh and set each one in place.
Then launched the bombardment, at a furious pace.
Deadly shells and hot shot poured in mercilessly.
The harried British army put out hastily to sea.
Leaving a mountain of precious stores for the Rebel troops to seize,
And the siege of Boston as a Rebel victory.

11. PALMETTO FLAG

Twenty five hundred British troops marched ashore at Charleston;
Supported by the Royal fleet, conducting a bombardment.
The fighting men of South Carolina met this joint attack.
With a cannonade and a ground assault they stopped it in its tracks.
"Through the smoke of battle, I looked aloft and saw
Our banner, our Palmetto flag, still flew,"
Wrote a Rebel gunner as the British fleet limped off,
With their Redcoats abroad, and glad to be too.

12. DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE (SPOKEN)

On July 4th, 1776, after more than a year of open war,
The colonies voted unanimously to publish
The Declaration of Independence.
The thirteen colonies were now The United States of America.

13. LIBERTY BELL

The sound of "Yankee Doodle" filled the Philadelphia air.
The Spirit of Seventeen Seventy Six was bubbling everywhere.
Yet the town was apprehensive, waiting to know
How the Second Continental Congress would go.
Would they vote for freedom, after all?
Could we call that building Independence Hall?
Soon the people knew darn well,
When they heard the ringing of the Liberty Bell.

14. NATHAN HALE

A Yankee from Connecticut—Nathan Hale
Volunteered for General Washington to learn the tale;
How the British on Long Island planned to attack,
But Nathan Hale was caught and hanged, and he never looked back.
They offered him a captaincy, and money besides.
He refused to turn traitor, and replied,
"I only regret that I have but one life
To lose for my country."

15. BATTLE OF NEW YORK

The battle for New York began in June of 'Seventy Six.
It ended in the winter cold, with the Rebels taking their licks.
Thirty two thousand professionals, with frigates and ships of the line.
Were just too much for Washington, at that time
Defeated, in full retreat and deep despair,
Still they felt blessed,
When they reached the shores of the Delaware,
And crossed, and had a chance to rest.

16. SUMMER SOLDIER

Deprived of every necessity, proper food and shoes and clothes,
Our weary boys by the Delaware were longing for their homes.
With bitter winter closing in, and the river choked with ice,
The Cause seemed doomed to a frozen death, as Tom Paine sat to write:
"These are the times that try men's souls . . .
The summer soldier and the sunshine patriot . . .
Shrink from the service of their country . . ."
But the Revolution was not dead yet.

17. TRENTON

A force of Hessians in the army of the King;
Posted at Trenton, were celebrating Christmas Eve.
Washington learned of their revelry, and in a daring counterstroke,
Crossed the Delaware River, with men and guns in boats.
All through the night in the wind and sleet of a cruel winter storm.
His soldiers labored and shivered and marched, and then at dawn,
Swept down on the Hessians with bayonets drawn.
Our Christmas was Trenton, and the spirit to carry on.

18. BRANDYWINE

Eluding an irate British force, chasing "That . . . fox",
Washington camped at Morristown for the hard winter months.
In the spring, with fresh supplies, his army was feeling fine.
Then came summer, and the Battle of Brandywine.
The Rebels fought courageously, but lost the battle.
Congress had to evacuate before England took our Capitol.
Some blamed Washington, and asked for his release.
But the rank and file kept faith in their Commander-in-Chief.

19. GERMANTOWN

Ignoring the raging controversy over his generalship
Washington struck at Germantown, and almost won it.
Foreign statesmen and generals were very much impressed
That half-trained Continentals could match King George's best.
In the opening advance the Rebels hurled through the town.

Victory seemed almost a certainty.
The tactical errors let the Redcoats gain ground.
At night Washington broke off the battle, grudgingly.

20. VALLEY FORGE

The road to Trenton was so cold that two men froze to death.
They suffered too at Morristown, the prison ship, and all the rest.
But where would you find description, in poetry or prose,
For three thousand Americans who perished at Valley Forge?
From Germantown they chose the natural safety of its hills.
Ignoring their hardships, they did military drills.
Maneuvering by squads, platoons, regiments and brigades,
A fighting force was welded good as any army made.

21. BURGOYNE'S THREE-PRONGED DRIVE

Valley Forge would have known its suffering was not in vain,
Had it learned of the action started at Lake Champlain.
General "Gentleman Johnny" Burgoyne had a carefully worked out plan.
With Howe and St. Leger in a three-pronged drive he'd crush the Rebels' stand.
St. Leger marched to Fort Stanwix, near present Rome, New York,
The American garrison held him off, while other Rebels approached.
St. Leger's fickle Mohawk Indians panicked and ran;
Then turned on their British allies and slaughtered most every man.

22. SARATOGA

Though the western third of his drive was gone, Burgoyne was hard to daunt.
He sent a detachment to plunder some Rebels in Vermont.
The Rebel boys, under General Stark, almost wiped them out.
Burgoyne, stunned, went tramping toward his army in the South.
This southern force hadn't gotten its orders straight.
Instead of joining Britain's Howe, he met Yankee General Gates.
The American army poured it on at Saratoga.
Five thousand Redcoats surrended. The brilliant plan was over.

23. FRONTIER WAR

Frontiersmen, like Daniel Boone, had settled in "Kaintuck."
Angry Indians wanted scalps—the British were in luck.
Given guns, and a bounty for every scalp they found,
Indians made Kentucky "The Dark and Bloody Ground."
George Rogers Clark and his riflemen would endure no more delays.
They marched one hundred eighty miles in eighteen winter days,
Captured the "Hair Buyer" and met with the Indian chiefs,
A truce was agreed to, and Kentucky had peace.

24. MOHAWK VALLEY

It wasn't 'till Seventeen Eighty One, on a blizzard-swept battleground,
That Indians and Tories marauding for the crown,
Quit Wyoming and Mohawk Valleys in Pennsylvania and New York,
With the death of their leader and defeat of their major force.
With British arms from Canada they'd wrought depredation.
Homes and fields were burned, with death and mutilation.
Innocent women and children were murdered with the men.
A Yankee named Millet brought that terror to an end.

25. JOHN PAUL JONES

Although our navy was small in size it did the best it could
To harrass the enemy merchant marine and halt its flow of goods.
Hundreds of Yankee seamen went fighting on their own.
But the most feared man on the seven seas was Captain John Paul Jones.
In battle with a British man-of-war and his ship shot through with holes,
And only three nine-pounders left, of forty guns all told,
The British captain asked if Jones did now his colors strike.
Jones hollered back, "I have not yet begun to fight!"

26. BENJAMIN FRANKLIN

The courage of George Washington, the surrender of Burgoyne,
With the feats of John Paul Jones, showed France and Spain
That England could be beat and that they should play their parts.
But it was our ambassador to France, who won their hearts.
Too old to bear arms on the battelfield,
His wisdom was his fame.
To his persuasion the French could yield—
This printer from America; Ben Franklin, was his name.

27. PEACE OFFER

General Henry Clinton, replacing General Howe,
Was shocked to learn that powerful France was in the conflict now.
At Valley Forge, however, it was news to celebrate,
When Washington made the announcement, in the spring of 'Seventy Eight.
Soon the French navy would sweep the British from the seas;
French soldiers would be fighting at our side.
Congress now could reject the English pleas
To return to the Mother Country, and accept a compromise.

28. MONMOUTH

Afraid that France would bottle him up by blockading the port,
Clinton left Philadelphia and marched for New York.
Washington ordered a full assault, in command of Charles Lee.
When Washington arrived he was burning mad, for his army was starting to flee.
He comes at Lee with a furious tongue that "turned the air blue,"
For needlessly withdrawing from the fray.
Washington took command of that battle at Monmouth.
Lee was court-martialed, but American won the day.

29. BENEDICT ARNOLD

General Clinton still believed, in spite of Burgoyne's debacle,
A march up Hudson River would place America in shackles.
The Redcoats captured Stoney Point to launch their Hudson drive.
Washington promptly took it back, yet Clinton's hopes survived.
America's strongest fortress on the Hudson was West Point,
Commanded by General Benedict Arnold.
He plotted to betray his post and thereby did annoint
His once heroic name to perpetual dishonor.

30. FALL OF CHARLESTON

Subjugation of the South becomes the British goal.
Savannah falls, then Charleston, with a heavy Rebel toll.
South Carolina is inflicted with grave atrocities.
Men are murdered, homes burned, by unrelenting Tories.
In June of Seventeen Eighty, Clinton is satisfied
The Revellion in South Carolina has died.
Lord Cornwallis is placed in charge.
He soon finds out there are some Yankees still at large.

31. COWPENS

Cornwallis builds a chain of forts to secure South Carolina,
Then scatters wide at Camden a small Rebel army.
This scattered band is revitalized by General Nathaniel Green.
In a fight at Cowpens it earns high esteem.
Those ghosts from the swamps—Rebel partisans—
Raiding enemy outposts and waylaying their patrols,
Help Green win that victory at Cowpens,
And will help take back all the land Cornwallis holds.

32. TO YORKTOWN

Cornwallis goes to North Carolina; meets Green again.
Suffers heavy casualties—five hundred British men.
After this battle, at Guilford Court House, in March of 'Eighty One,
Cornwallis withdraws to refit his troops, in the town of Wilmington.
With Cornwallis out of the way the Rebels give the rest such a threshing
They run to their forts at Charleston and stay there for the duration.
Cornwallis, reinforced, makes his fatal journey
To the little port of Yorktown, in the State of Old Virginny.

33. YORKTOWN SURRENDER

Yorktown was to be the base for Virginia's overthrow,
But Americans under Washington, and French under Rochambeau,
Laid the siege of Yorktown, and with the British backed to the sea,
Brought up almost a hundred guns of heavy artillery.
Cornwallis scanned the waterfront in search of the British fleet.
But a French flotilla in Chesapeake Bay had turned it back in defeat.
Dismayed by this catastrophe, Cornwallis had to tender
His request to Washington for terms of the surrender.

34. THE WORLD UPSIDE DOWN (SPOKEN)

Over seven thousand Redcoats marched out of the Yorktown fortifications
And stacked their arms, while a British band played "The World Upside Down."
The defeat convinced King George he couldn't win, but there was a year
And a half more of sporadic fighting and personal hardships before Congress
Officially declared the war ended on April 11, 1783. It was a sad farewell
When Washington said good-by to his men, but this little nation of three
Million would have more work for this man, the Father of our Country.

35. GEORGE WASHINGTON

First in War, First in Peace, First in the Hearts of his Countrymen.
Not only first, but only unanimous President.
It was he, George Washington, of all in our remembrance,
Who made possible those goals of Independence:
That all men are created equal . . .
Endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights . . .
Among these . . . Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness—

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20515

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Speaker: John W. McCormack

Abbitt, Watkins M., *Va*	
Abernethy, Thomas G., *Miss.*	6278 29th St.
Adair, E. Ross, *Ind*	4000 Mass. Ave.
Adams, Brock, *Wash*	
Addabbo, Joseph P., *N.Y*	
Albert, Carl, *Okla*	4614 Reno Rd.
Anderson, John B., *Ill*	
Anderson, William R., *Tenn.*	3006 P St.
Andrews, George W., *Ala*	3108 Cathedral Ave.
Andrews, Mark, *N. Dak*	
Annunzio, Frank, *Ill*	
Arends, Leslie C., *Ill*	4815 Dexter St.
Ashbrook, John M., *Ohio*	
Ashley, Thomas L., *Ohio*	
Ashmore, Robert T., *S.C*	
Aspinall, Wayne N., *Colo*	The Towers Apts., 4201 Cathedral Ave.
Ayres, William H., *Ohio*	
Baring, Walter S., *Nev*	
Barrett, William A., *Pa*	
Bates, William H., *Mass*	
Battin, James F., *Mont*	
Belcher, Page, *Okla*	
Bell, Alphonzo, *Calif*	
Bennett, Charles E., *Fla*	3421 Rusticway Lane, Falls Church, Va.
Berry, E. Y., *S. Dak*	118 Schotts Court NE.
Betts, Jackson E., *Ohio*	
Bevill, Tom, *Ala*	6224 N. 35th St., Arlington, Va.
Biester, Edward G., Jr., *Pa*	
Bingham, Jonathan B., *N.Y.*	
Blackburn, Benjamin B., *Ga.*	
Blanton, Ray, *Tenn*	
Blatnik, John A., *Minn*	
Boggs, Hale, *La*	
Boland, Edward P., *Mass*	
Bolling, Richard, *Mo*	307 Warrenton Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Bolton, Frances P. (Mrs.), *Ohio.*	2301 Wyo. Ave.
Bow, Frank T., *Ohio*	4301 Mass. Ave.
Brademas, John, *Ind*	
Brasco, Frank J., *N.Y*	
Bray, William G., *Ind*	
Brinkley, Jack, *Ga*	
Brock, W. E. (Bill), *Tenn*	
Brooks, Jack, *Tex*	
Broomfield, William S., *Mich.*	
Brotzman, Donald G., *Colo*	
Brown, Clarence J., Jr., *Ohio.*	
Brown, Garry, *Mich*	
Brown, George E., Jr., *Calif*	
Broyhill, James T., *N.C*	
Broyhill, Joel T., *Va*	
Buchanan, John, *Ala*	
Burke, J. Herbert, *Fla*	
Burke, James A., *Mass*	
Burleson, Omar, *Tex*	
Burton, Laurence J., *Utah*	
Burton, Phillip, *Calif*	
Bush, George, *Tex*	
Button, Daniel E., *N.Y*	
Byrne, James A., *Pa*	
Byrnes, John W., *Wis*	1215 25th St. S., Arlington, Va.
Cabell, Earle, *Tex*	
Cahill, William T., *N.J*	
Carey, Hugh L., *N.Y*	
Carter, Tim Lee, *Ky*	
Casey, Bob, *Tex*	
Cederberg, Elford A., *Mich*	
Celler, Emanuel, *N.Y*	The Mayflower
Chamberlain, Charles E., *Mich.*	
Clancy, Donald D., *Ohio*	
Clark, Frank M., *Pa*	220 C St. SE.
Clausen, Don H., *Calif*	
Clawson, Del, *Calif*	
Cleveland, James C., *N.H*	
Cohelan, Jeffery, *Calif*	1202 Longworth House Office Bldg.
Collier, Harold R., *Ill*	
Colmer, William M., *Miss*	
Conable, Barber B., Jr., *N.Y.*	
Conte, Silvio O., *Mass*	5619 Lamar Rd., Washington 16, D.C.
Conyers, John, Jr., *Mich*	
Corbett, Robert J., *Pa*	
Corman, James C., *Calif*	
Cowger, William O., *Ky*	
Cramer, William C., *Fla*	6215 Beachway Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Culver, John C., *Iowa*	
Cunningham, Glenn, *Nebr*	
Curtis, Thomas B., *Mo*	
Daddario, Emilio Q., *Conn*	
Daniels, Dominick V., *N.J*	
Davis, Glenn R., *Wis*	
Davis, John W., *Ga*	
Dawson, William L., *Ill*	
de la Garza, Eligio, *Tex*	
Delaney, James J., *N.Y*	
Dellenback, John R., *Oreg*	5911 Onondaga Rd.
Denney, Robert V., *Nebr*	
Dent, John H., *Pa*	
Derwinski, Edward J., *Ill*	
Devine, Samuel L., *Ohio*	
Dickinson, William L., *Ala*	
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., *Mich*	
Dingell, John D., *Mich*	
Dole, Robert, *Kans*	6136 Beachway Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Donohue, Harold D., *Mass*	
Dorn, Wm. Jennings Bryan, *S.C.*	2030 Laburnum St., McLean, Va.
Dow, John G., *N.Y*	
Dowdy, John, *Tex*	
Downing, Thomas N., *Va*	
Dulski, Thaddeus J., *N.Y*	347 Cannon House Office Building
Duncan, John J., *Tenn*	
Dwyer, Florence P. (Mrs.), *N.J.*	
Eckhardt, Bob, *Tex*	
Edmondson, Ed, *Okla*	
Edwards, Don, *Calif*	9201 Fox Meadow La., Potomac, Md.,
Edwards, Edwin W., *La*	
Edwards, Jack, *Ala*	
Eilberg, Joshua, *Pa*	
Erlenborn, John N., *Ill*	
Esch, Marvin L., *Mich*	11754 Gainsborough Rd., Rockville, Md.
Eshleman, Edwin D., *Pa*	
Evans, Frank E., *Colo*	
Everett, Robert A., *Tenn*	
Evins, Joe L., *Tenn*	5044 Klingle St.
Fallon, George H., *Md*	
Farbstein, Leonard, *N.Y*	
Fascell, Dante B., *Fla*	
Feighan, Michael A., *Ohio*	
Findley, Paul, *Ill*	
Fino, Paul A., *N.Y*	
Fisher, O. C., *Tex*	Calvert-Woodley
Flood, Daniel J., *Pa*	The Congressional
Flynt, John J., Jr., *Ga*	
Foley, Thomas S., *Wash*	
Ford, Gerald R., *Mich*	514 Crown View Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Ford, William D., *Mich*	
Fountain, L. H., *N.C*	The Westchester
Fraser, Donald M., *Minn*	
Frelinghuysen, Peter H. B., *N.J.*	3014 N St.
Friedel, Samuel N., *Md*	
Fulton, James G., *Pa*	
Fulton, Richard, *Tenn*	
Fuqua, Don, *Fla*	
Galifianakis, Nick, *N.C*	
Gallagher, Cornelius E., *N.J.*	
Gardner, James C., *N.C*	
Garmatz, Edward A., *Md*	
Gathings, E. C., *Ark*	
Gettys, Tom S., *S.C*	
Giaimo, Robert N., *Conn*	
Gibbons, Sam, *Fla*	
Gilbert, Jacob H., *N.Y*	
Gonzalez, Henry B., *Tex*	200 C St. SE.
Goodell, Charles E., *N.Y*	3842 Macomb St.
Goodling, George A., *Pa*	
Gray, Kenneth J., *Ill*	
Green, Edith (Mrs.), *Oreg*	
Green, William J., *Pa*	
Griffiths, Martha W. (Mrs.), *Mich.*	
Gross, H. R., *Iowa*	
Grover, James R., Jr., *N.Y*	
Gubser, Charles S., *Calif*	
Gude, Gilbert, *Md*	
Gurney, Edward J., *Fla*	
Hagan, G. Elliott, *Ga*	
Haley, James A., *Fla*	
Hall, Durward G., *Mo*	
Halleck, Charles A., *Ind*	4926 Upton St.
Halpern, Seymour, *N.Y*	
Hamilton, Lee H., *Ind*	
Hammerschmidt, John Paul, *Ark.*	
Hanley, James M., *N.Y*	
Hanna, Richard T., *Calif*	
Hansen, George V., *Idaho*	
Hansen, Julia Butler (Mrs.), *Wash.*	
Hardy, Porter, Jr., *Va*	
Harrison, William Henry, *Wyo.*	
Harsha, William H., *Ohio*	
Harvey, James, *Mich*	
Hathaway, William D., *Maine.*	
Hawkins, Augustus F., *Calif.*	
Hays, Wayne L., *Ohio*	
Hébert, F. Edward, *La*	26 Cockrell St., Alexandria, Va.
Hechler, Ken, *W. Va*	
Heckler, Margaret M. (Mrs.), *Mass.*	
Helstoski, Henry, *N.J*	
Henderson, David N., *N.C*	
Herlong, A. S., Jr., *Fla*	
Hicks, Floyd V., *Wash*	
Holifield, Chet, *Calif*	
Holland, Elmer J., *Pa*	
Horton, Frank, *N.Y*	
Hosmer, Craig, *Calif*	
Howard, James J., *N.J*	
Hull, W. R., Jr., *Mo*	
Hungate, William L., *Mo*	
Hunt, John E., *N.J*	
Hutchinson, Edward, *Mich*	
Ichord, Richard (Dick), *Mo.*	
Irwin, Donald J., *Conn*	
Jacobs, Andrew, Jr., *Ind*	
Jarman, John, *Okla*	
Joelson, Charles S., *N.J*	
Johnson, Albert W., *Pa*	
Johnson, Harold T., *Calif*	
Jonas, Charles Raper, *N.C*	
Jones, Paul C., *Mo*	1111 Army-Navy Dr., Arlington, Va.
Jones, Robert E., *Ala*	
Jones, Walter B., *N.C*	
Karsten, Frank M., *Mo*	
Karth, Joseph E., *Minn*	
Kastenmeier, Robert W., *Wis.*	
Kazen, Abraham, Jr., *Tex*	
Kee, James, *W. Va*	5441 16th Ave., Hyattsville, Md.
Keith, Hastings, *Mass*	5906 Harwick Rd., Woodacres, Md.
Kelly, Edna F. (Mrs.), *N.Y*	
King, Carleton J., *N.Y*	
King, Cecil R., *Calif*	
Kirwan, Michael J., *Ohio*	
Kleppe, Thomas S., *N. Dak*	
Kluczynski, John C., *Ill*	
Kornegay, Horace R., *N.C*	
Kupferman, Theodore R., *N.Y.*	
Kuykendall, Dan, *Tenn*	
Kyl, John, *Iowa*	
Kyros, Peter N., *Maine*	
Laird, Melvin R., *Wis*	
Landrum, Phil M., *Ga*	
Langen, Odin, *Minn*	
Latta, Delbert L., *Ohio*	
Leggett, Robert L., *Calif*	
Lennon, Alton, *N.C*	
Lipscomb, Glenard P., *Calif.*	
Lloyd, Sherman P., *Utah*	
Long, Clarence D., *Md*	

Appendix

Northeastern Illinois State College—A New Liberal Arts Institution for Chicago's Northwest Side

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1967

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to announce that on July 1, 1967, by action of the Illinois Legislature and Gov. Otto Kerner, Northeastern Illinois State College became a legal entity. This college, located in the 11th Congressional District of Illinois, in the city of Chicago, is both a very old and very new institution of higher learning. It is very old since it is one of two institutions tracing descent back to the normal school established in Cook County in 1869. It is very new since it has been acting as an autonomous unit only since the occupation of its new campus in 1961.

In a rapidly changing world, educational systems, too, are changing. It is, therefore, appropriate that this college should look toward change in the present and the future. At the same time, it should also be mindful of, but not unduly influenced by, the past, for it has almost 100 years of continuous service.

In 1869, the general assembly of the State of Illinois authorized the establishment of a normal school in any county of the State. The Cook County Board of Supervisors, which had been operating experimental normal school classes at Blue Island, established a normal school in the village of Englewood. When Englewood was annexed to Chicago, ownership, control, and support of the normal school was transferred to the city of Chicago.

The length of the program was originally 6 months; in 1899, it became 2 years. In 1938, upon authorization to grant the bachelor of education degree, the 4-year curriculum was introduced. Graduate study was also inaugurated in 1938. After a series of changes, the name of the Cook County Normal School became Chicago Teachers College in 1938.

To meet the growing demand for accessible teacher training facilities in Chicago and to relieve overcrowding on the south campus, one or more branches of the college have been maintained in various locations since 1949. This policy led to the decision, in 1957, to establish and build a permanent north campus. Chicago Teachers College North began operation on this new campus in 1961.

On July 16, 1965, the ownership and control of Chicago Teachers College was transferred, by authorization of the General Assembly of the State of Illinois, to the board of governors of State colleges and universities and its campuses renamed Illinois Teachers College Chicago—North and South.

When Chicago Teachers College became Illinois Teachers College, it had a precise and single purpose—to educate men and women to become career teachers. This was also the purpose of the Cook County Normal School when it opened its doors in 1869, as it was the purpose of many normal schools and teachers colleges which blossomed in the United States in the late 19th century.

Under Colonel Parker, who was principal from 1883 to 1899, the Cook County Normal School acquired a worldwide reputation for innovation. Visitors from far and near were attracted to the campus by reports of the radical practices and ideas being used to modify the process of teacher education. Northeastern Illinois State College does not reject the innovative heritage of its ancestor. From the beginning on the new campus in 1961, the program has been openly and frankly experimental with the broad general goal of developing in each individual student his ultimate potential of human worth and dignity and the concomitant sense of responsibility to himself and his fellow men, individually and collectively.

To guide each student as he strives to develop his full potential, the faculty used the basic assumption that any process designed to help a person understand himself, other human beings, and the society in which he lives, must be in essence a liberally trained student. The faculty believes that the educational process should enable a student to broaden and deepen his insights into man through the study of world cultures. It believes this process should assist a student in developing understanding of some of the major concepts and principles of knowledge as they bear on the full range of human concerns. It believes this process should stimulate intellectual curiosity and provide the incentive for continuing study and inquiry throughout life. It believes this process should encourage the student to question and explore across disciplinary lines as he attempts analysis and synthesis within his expanding intellectual world. It believes the process should include decisionmaking and problem solving on the part of the student as preparation for his role as citizen and potential leader. Also, the faculty of the college believes that the process should provide a foundation for skill in the art and science of teaching for the many students who seek careers in the classroom.

The excellent faculty at the college has developed a philosophy for the education of teachers which is strikingly nontraditional. It is a deliberate attempt to make the liberal arts the major emphasis in the education of teachers. Such a strong emphasis on the liberal arts for teachers is in the college's tradition of questioning the wisdom of the well-worn paths in education. Our program has encompassed a succession of experiments and innovations in content, method, and organization. Some have been more productive than others. The college has tried to keep the most productive processes and discard the least productive in both old and new approaches. This attitude has served well in the past and the intent is to foster it in the future in the face of whatever changes there may be. This college proposes to imitate no other college as it continues its tradition.

It does not see itself as a shadow institution molded to a pattern, however good that pattern may be; it aspires to be an institution of unusual substance, changing with a changing world; it accepts as the only constant in this world of change, the creativity and ingenuity of a faculty engaged in exploring education with a good student body.

The plans for nonteaching majors and the curriculums designed for the education of secondary school teachers have been in preparation for 2 years. The new curriculums will be available in the academic year 1967–68 and will reflect the basic philosophy of the college that an education to be worthy of the name must have as its primary goal the liberation of the mind of man.

It should be emphasized that in becoming a multipurpose institution, the college will not in any sense neglect teacher education. This will continue to be a major interest of the institution. It is expected that more teachers will be produced than ever before. Young people just graduating from high schools sometimes do not see the promise of careers in teaching. The faculty of this college hopes that its conviction that teaching can be both exciting and rewarding, that it offers a unique opportunity for the creative person, will be contagious. By its example, this faculty will attract young people of intellectual quality to the profession of teaching.

This college is, and will continue to be, concerned with the problems of urban areas. The advantages of our urban location are many. The city dominates cultural activities. The city has become the focus of political ferment; it serves as a laboratory for social problems of astonishing diversity. This is where the problems are. This is where the problem solving goes on. Here are the challenges in education, in housing, in matching people without jobs to jobs without people. Here are the problems in transportation, in air pollution, in water supply. Here is a world microcosm with many cultures in close proximity. Here is the battlefield for undoing the wrongs of the past and doing careful planning for the rights of the future. Here are the great industries, the research laboratories, the thought-provoking meetings of opposing convictions, the media centers for television, radio, the great newspapers. If the wish is to stimulate problem solving, the city may serve as a text, resource, laboratory. From megalopolis, this college draws its students. While they are on campus, they are still in close contact with the city. If the college succeeds in liberating their minds, and helps them to become problem solvers, these students will leave campus with ideas and ideals which will bring a fresh vitality and enthusiasm to their battle to improve the human condition. The city and the Nation will reap the benefits.

As an urban institution, the college will maintain its experimental and innovative bent. Experiments seeking the answers to many questions in education are in progress or being planned. Two questions which concern the college greatly should suffice as examples—

First, how can an urban commuter college attain the climate for learning claimed for the living-learning situation of the residential college?

Second, as we grow, how can we preserve the advantages of the small close-knit community?

The college intends to continue asking probing questions about the problems and myths of higher education. It has expressed the firm determination to be candid about failure and to recognize the ephemeral quality of success.

The college is fully aware of its responsibilities in developing problem-solving approaches which deal with major questions at the State, National, and international levels. It is important in our shrinking physical world that all educated people understand that many problems are worldwide. It is also essential that we come to realize that an understanding of some of the diverse world cultures is a prerequisite for progress toward a peaceful better world. With this in mind, the college is developing programs in international education.

The college will continue to develop activities on the campus which will be intellectually provocative and culturally stimulating. There will be expanded services to the community. Neighbors have been welcome at concerts, plays, art exhibits, and lectures. Planning is being done for a wide variety of credit and noncredit activities designed for residents of the community. These could range from art classes to seminars on the Far East. Northeastern Illinois State College is an educational and cultural asset to its community, the city, the State, and the Nation.

Department of the Interior Conservation Award Conferred on Two Montanans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 10, 1967

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, the highest award the Secretary of the Interior can confer is the Department's Conservation Award. On June 12, the Secretary so honored two Montanans. They are Maurice Arnold, a member of the Valley Board of County Commissioners, and Robert McColly, chairman of the Valley County Citizens' Advisory Planning Committee.

Senators may recall that I took some part in the floor deliberations of the Classification and Multiple Use Act when it was before us in 1964. I am very pleased therefore, that the activities of these two Montanans led to the first classification under this important act.

The Classification and Multiple Use Act—P.L. 88–607—is interim legislation calling on the Secretary of the Interior to review public lands to determine those suitable for certain kinds of dispositions and those suitable for retention in Federal ownership. The legislative history anticipated the closest cooperation between Federal officials and the States and localities in which these reviews would take place.

Mr. Arnold and Mr. McColly are proof that the anticipation has been fully met. Working through the National Association of Counties, Valley County, Mont., accepted an invitation from the Bureau of Land Management to test the criteria and procedures.

The Valley County commission appointed a citizens' planning advisory committee to acquaint the people of Valley County with the facts affecting land use in their county. The committee, led by Mr. McColly, met group by group with the various people using the public lands in Valley County. Later there were meetings with all groups together. At these meetings the Bureau of Land Management officials were invited to explain the terms of the Classification and Multiple Use Act, the criteria and procedures for the review. In other words, these Federal officials working with respected local leaders were able to bring complete understanding of the purposes of this act down to the citizens who were affected by it.

"As a result of this widespread understanding," as Secretary Udall's citation declares, "the first classification order under this crucial public land act designates 614,000 acres of public lands in Valley County as the first public lands" to be marked for retention in Federal ownership for multiple-use management. As Secretary Udall points out in his citation—

> This classification erases the indeterminate status of these lands which has been impending management levels need to produce their potential contribution to American life.

Mr. President, this classification of public lands in Valley County, Mont., shows the excellent results we can get when the purposes of laws are fully understood by the local people most immediately affected by them. We owe much to the Maurice Arnolds and Robert McCollys throughout the West who have undertaken to be thoroughly briefed on the meaning of the Classification and Multiple Use Act and are taking an active part in explaining it to their friends and neighbors.

Mr. Arnold and Mr. McColly received their award at the annual meeting of the Montana County association at a meeting in Miles City on June 12, 1967. Harold Tysk, State Director for the Bureau of Land Management, represented Secretary Udall and presented the awards during a session of the public lands panel. Dan Mizner, president of the Montana County association; Ken Rustad, chairman of the public lands panel; and John Stevens, new president of the Interstate County Commissioners Association, were present.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Secretary Udall's citations to Maurice Arnold and Robert McColly be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the citations were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, D.C., June 12, 1967.

Mr. MAURICE ARNOLD,
Hinsdale, Mont.

DEAR MR. ARNOLD: In recognition of your outstanding leadership resulting in historic milestones in public land management, it is a pleasure to present to you and Mr. Robert McColly the Department of the Interior Conservation Service Award.

Your local leadership in Valley County, Montana, has fully justified President Johnson's faith that "new concepts of cooperation" can be devised between national leaders and "the leaders of local communities." You have combined a concern for proper land use with skill as respected local leaders to place before the people of Valley County the fundatmental facts regarding the new Classification and Multiple Use Act as it was proposed to be applied in Valley County.

As a result of this widespread understanding, the first classification order under this crucial public land act designates 614,000 acres of public lands in Valley County as the first public lands prossessing "such values as to make them more suitable for retention in federal ownership . . ." This classification erases the indeterminate status of these lands which has impeded a management level needed to produce their potential contribution to American life.

This classification came about because of your dedication to good land use planning, your willingness to grasp the principles of a new law and your untiring efforts to place before the people the facts of the land situation in eastern Montana as they related to the law.

Representing the people of Valley County, you and Mr. McColly have erected a historic milestone in public land management. You have justified the President's belief that new modes of cooperation can be worked out between national and local leaders. Please accept our congratulations and gratitude for your fine public service.

Sincerely yours,

STEWART L. UDALL,
Secretary of the Interior.

THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, D.C., June 12, 1967.

Mr. ROBERT MCCOLLY,
Hinsdale, Mont.

DEAR MR. MCCOLLY: In recognition of your outstanding leadership resulting in historic milestones in public land management, it is a pleasure to present to you and Mr. Maurice Arnold the Department of the Interior Conservation Service Award.

Your local leadership in Valley County, Montana, has fully justified President Johnson's faith that "new concepts of cooperation" can be devised between national leaders and "the leaders of local communities." You have combined a concern for proper land use with skill as repsected local leaders to place before the people of Valley County the fundamental facts regarding the new Classification and Multiple Use Act as it was proposed to be applied in Valley County.

As a result of this widespread understanding, the first classification order under this crucial public land act designates 614,000 acres of public lands in Valley County as the first public lands possessing "such values as to make them more suitable for retention in federal ownership . . ." This classification erases the indeterminate status of these lands which has impeded a management level needed to produce their potential contribution to American life.

This classification came about because of your dedication to good land use planning, your willingness to grasp the principles of a new law and your untiring efforts to place before the peopel the facts of the land situation in eastern Montana as they related to the law.

Representing the people of Valley County, you and Mr. Arnold have erected a historic milestone in public land management. You have justified the President's belief that new modes of cooperation can be worked out between national and local leaders. Please accept our congratulations and gratitude for your fine public service.

Sincerely yours,

STEWART L. UDALL,
Secretary of the Interior.

Food for War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 10, 1967

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the chaos created in the Middle East by the Soviet Union was compounded by the total ineffectiveness of our own diplomacy. For years we have made efforts to control the shortsighted moves of the State Department and its AID agency. A classic example of this was the aid poured into Egypt to sustain the Nasser dictatorship. The Chicago Tribune, in a very timely editorial in this morning's edition, reviews this point and gives proper credit to our colleague from Illinois, PAUL FINDLEY, who was truly a "prophet without honor," since he was correct in foreseeing the danger of substaining Nasser. However, the administration controlled enough Members in the House to reject his earlier suggestion. The editorial follows:

FOOD FOR WAR

Amid the welter of United Nations debate over the middle east, it might be well for Americans to consider this country's role in heaping economic aid on the United Arab Republic.

While we were giving military aid to Israel, and some arms to Egypt as well, it was United States economic assistance to President Nasser that enabled him to concentrate on the military plans which threatened the peace of the world. So great has been our economic assistance that Egypt ranks third among all nations in total United States aid. Nasser repaid our benevolence with systematic efforts to undermine our objectives not only in the middle east, but in north Africa, the Congo, Viet Nam, and the U.N. as well.

Yet when Congress—and particularly the Republicans in Congress—tried to call a halt back in 1963, the administration applied so much pressure that the President was granted authority to continue aid to Egypt whenever he deemed it to be in the "national interest."

Since Nasser came to power in 1953, the United States has extended him economic assistance totaling about 1.1 billion dollars in food, loans, and grants. Egypt is a nation constantly on the brink of widespread famine. Rep. Paul Findley (R., Ill.) in a speech to the House set forth in detail how United States economic aid to Nasser actually financed the subversion of our own policies in the middle east, one of which was to preserve peace and reduce soviet influence by improving the Arab economy.

"Without this aid, food shortages long ago might have overtaken the Egyptian population and forced Nasser out of office or into new policies," said Findley. "In those circumstances, his only chance for continued political survival would have been to halt all aggression and active diplomacy against the United States and devote every available resource to food production and population control."

Findley, a member of the House foreign affairs committee, is the author of the Findley amendment to the 1966 agricultural appropriations act, which finally ended food aid to Nasser a year ago. This amendment, and a similar one to the Food for Peace act, both prohibit food sales for foreign currencies and long term dollar credits under public law 480 to any country which trades with North Viet Nam.

All economic assistance to Egypt under foreign aid was halted in 1963 by congressional action over administration protests. Congress then sought to bar aid to Egypt under public law 480 [Food for Peace], but under the administration pressure finally watered down the language to permit the President to set aside the restriction if he deemed such action to be in the national interest. The administration's argument then and later was that the President has better knowledge than Congress of foreign affairs and that with discretionary authority to dispense aid he would have more flexibility in diplomacy.

Since 1963, Rep. Findley and other Republicans tried repeatedly to end all aid to Egypt, but it was not until the 1966 amendment [which Republicans supported without exception] that the objective was accomplished.

Rep. Findley charges that in continuing to exercise his discretion to extend aid to Nasser, the President of the United States clearly acted against the national interest. The charge is valid because at virtually every turn, particularly during the last six years, the Egyptian dictator sought to undermine every objective the United States had to preserve the peace and reduce Soviet influence in the middle east.

A 92d Birthday Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 10, 1967

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, Mr. Charles A. Upson, of Lockport, N.Y., recently celebrated his birthday anniversary—his 92d.

Mr. Upson, in 1910, founded and for years served as president of the Upson Co., a Lockport firm specializing in the manufacture of wood fiber panels and laminated paper products. Many of the company's principal products were invented and patented by Mr. Upson himself.

As befits a civic leader marking his 92d birthday, Mr. Upson received many congratulatory messages from friend all over the country, including one from Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

Included among his birthday honors was the Award of Merit, conferred upon him by the American Paper Institute.

I ask unanimous consent that the congratulatory message from Vice President HUMPHREY, the American Paper Institute's Award of Merit, and an article published in the Buffalo Evening News, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. CHARLES A. UPSON,
Lockport, N.Y.:

Your many friends in Washington join me and Mrs. Humphrey in extending our heartiest congratulations to you today on the great occasion of your 92nd birthday.

We know what great satisfaction you must feel as you look back over almost a century of service and devotion to your country, your industry, and your fine family.

We are especially pleased to learn that the American Paper Institute will soon honor you with an award in recognition of your many contributions over the years to the progress of the paper-making industry. This is an honor you richly deserve.

Best wishes to you and your family for many more happy birthday celebrations.

Sincerely,

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
The Vice President of the United States.

Award of merit conferred upon Charles A. Upson on the occasion of his 92d birthday in recognition of his many contributions over the years to the progress of the paper making industry;

His imaginative and enduring innovations in the development of paper products;

His energetic leadership in the expansion of the frontiers of knowledge in the paper making industry;

His dedicated participation in civic affairs and humanitarian activities at the local, state, and nationl levels;

His constant striving toward the brotherhood of man under the fatherhood of God.

In testimony whereof the signatures of the President and Secretary and the Seal of the Association are hereunto affixed this — day of April, 1967.

———, ———, *President,*
———, ———, *Secretary.*

PAPER INSTITUTE WILL HONOR UPSON FOR HIS CONTRIBUTIONS

LOCKPORT, March 31.—A 92-year-old retired business executive who pioneered many innovations in the paper making and wall board industry will be honored next week by the American Paper Institute Inc.

Charles A. Upson, who marked his 92d birthday Monday will receive a citation in his home at 573 Washburn St. for his contributions to the industry and national economy while he was president of The Upson Co. which he founded in 1910.

Mr. Upson, who still keeps busy with civic duties and gardening and flower raising, has received birthday congratulatory telegrams from Vice President Hubert Humphrey and Robert E. O'Connor, president of the Paper Institute.

He was born March 27, 1875 in Tonawanda, the son of the late William H. and Nella M. Ayrault Upson, descendents of early French Huguenots who first settled in Connecticut and later at Canisteo.

Mr. Upson founded the Upson Co. here after graduation from the University of Pennsylvania and association with the former Beaverboard Co. of Buffalo and the Niagara Paper Co. here.

His career included patenting more than 40 inventions associated with the papermaking industry. Included were development of protective film paper for Eastman

Kodak Co., the manufacture of jigsaw puzzles, special fasteners for erecting fiber board and designs for machinery used to produce laminated fiber board, paper board and specialty papers.

Excellent Appointment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 10, 1967

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, a distinguished public servant from my home city of Pittsburgh, Dr. David H. Kurtzman, has recently been named Pennsylvania's superintendent of public instruction.

Dr. Kurtzman recently resigned as chancellor of the University of Pittsburgh, which he served with distinction. His recent appointment to one of the most important jobs in his State's government is a tribute to both his administrative experience and his academic prestige.

In an editorial in its edition of June 29, the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette rightly described Dr. Kurtzman as "the ideal choice" for State superintendent of public instruction and gave abundant illustration of his qualifications. Under leave to extend my remarks, I insert the editorial in the RECORD at this point. I urge my colleagues to read about this truly remarkable and gifted man:

EXCELLENT APPOINTMENT

In naming Dr. David H. Kurtzman of Pittsburgh to be Pennsylvania's Superintendent of Public Instruction, Governor Shafer found the right man for one of the most important jobs in state government.

Education is by far the state's greatest undertaking. It costs about half of the state's General Fund of nearly $2 billion a year. Clearly the Department needs administration of a very high order if its job is to be done efficiently and well.

Public administration is Dave Kurtzman's forte. He has excelled at it throughout a distinguished career of non-partisan public service. Few men could be as familiar as he with the workings of state government. Through many years with the Pennsylvania Economy League, he conducted studies of public finance at state and local levels. When the late David L. Lawrence was Governor of Pennsylvania, Dr. Kurtzman served as Secretary of Administration, in which position he contributed much to greater governmental efficiency.

In July of 1965, Dr. Kurtzman was called back to Pittsburgh from service with the Fels Institute in Philadelphia to untangle the finances of the University of Pittsburgh, which had become insolvent. From Vice Chancellor for Finance he progressed to Acting Chancellor, then to Chancellor and now as Chancellor Emeritus of that great institution of higher learning.

It is thus evident that Dr. Kurtzman will take to his new position the administrative experience and the academic distinction to be expected of the state's top educator. He was the unanimous first choice of the Governor's screening committee so ably chaired by Lieut. Gov. Raymond J. Broderick. The committee studied the qualifications of some 70 educators recommended nation-wide and interviewed about 15 of them. It concluded that Dr. Kurtzman was the ideal choice.

He will succeed Dr. J. Ralph Rackley, who held the position for about 21 months while on leave from Pennsylvania State University, to which he returned recently as provost. Dr. Rackley performed valuable services for the DPI. He reorganized the department and staffed it at the upper echelons with able educators who should be most helpful to Dr. Kurtzman when he assumes the superintendency in September.

More Bouquets for the Younger Set—Fewer Brickbats

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT P. GRIFFIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 10, 1967

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, the alarming rise in crime involving teenagers tends to draw our attention away from the outstanding contributions being made by many of our younger citizens to worthwhile community projects.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "More Bouquets for the Younger Set—Fewer Brickbats," written by Jess Soltess, and published in the Muskegon Chronicle, of April 22, 1967.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Muskegon (Mich.) Chronicle, Apr. 22, 1967]

MORE BOUQUETS FOR THE YOUNGER SET—FEWER BRICKBATS

(By Jess Soltess)

Growing community sentiment to that effect has produced the conclusion that members of the younger generation who fall into the descriptive category of "irresponsible, slovenly, unkempt, demanding, and lazy" are the exception, not the rule.

Two 18-year-old high school seniors from this area have helped drive the point home with their dedication to a community project, towards which they devote considerable time, preparation and effort, but for which they receive no pay.

The two beavers are Andrew Fraser, son of Mr. and Mrs. R. J. Fraser, 914 Quarterline Road, valedictorian of the 1967 class at Orchard View High, and Roger Grossenbacher, son of Mr. and Mrs. Willard E. Grossenbacher, 7415 Whitehall Road, Whitehall High student who is a member of the National Honor Society.

Andy, aside from his academic endeavor, is president of the senior division of Port City Amateur Astronomers, and Roger is vice president.

"Our membership was on the wane," Andy explained. "We noted a lack of new blood in our organization. We decided to try to encourage membership in our junior division (16 and under)."

He was aware that young people have an increasing interest in astronomy and space exploration in view of the noticeable gains man has been making in his attempt to conquer the heavens.

Contact was established with Chase H. Hammond, Muskegon recreation director, a man who has a keen interest of his own in arranging activities that prove rewarding and educational for young persons.

From that association has come an astronomy course, sponsored jointly by the Amateur Astronomers and the municipal parks-recreation department, and taught by the two high school seniors.

The class, offered without charge, is held at 9:30 a.m. Saturdays at the McGraft Park Community Building. About 20 junior and senior high students have shown interest, and especially enjoy the "observing sessions" each Tuesday night at the park.

With valuable telescopic equipment loaned by Andy and Roger, the class is instructed in observation of the night sky and the operation of eight and eight-and-one-half-inch telescopes.

Andy says there are four girls in the class at this time, and they appear to be benefitting more from the non-mathematical instruction. "They are better students because they seem to be more attentive," the teacher explained.

First indication that the younger generation genuinely was curious about space came to Andy when he lectured to exploratory science classes at Orchard View Middle School.

Andy plans a career in astronautical engineering while Roger is preparing to study astronomy at the college level.

Although still in high school, Andy is taking a class in engineering at Muskegon Community College for credit. He already has completed an astronomy course at the college.

"Two fine young men," Director Hammond told Muskegon Recreation Commission this week. "We're pleased to have them in our program."

Kosygin Steals the Show: Stage Provided for Attack on United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 10, 1967

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the San Diego, Calif., Union of June 27, 1967:

KOSYGIN STEALS THE SHOW: STAGE PROVIDED FOR ATTACK ON UNITED STATES

It is to the discredit of our nation, the world leader in public relations, that Soviet Premier Alexei Kosygin was able to steal the center of the world stage of propaganda at our invitation.

Kosygin came to the United States of America as a beggar, seeking to pick up some pieces of the Soviet debacle of misjudgment in the Mideast. He left in the role of a dictator, after being granted the full co-operation of the United States in calling us aggressors and generally undermining our entire foreign policy.

President Johnson has said the summit meeting with Kosygin after the Russian's United Nation's appearance resulted in the world's being a "little less dangerous."

Facts do not support him.

Summit or not, Russia still is fueling the Communist aggression in Vietnam. When he came and when he left Kosygin excoriated the United States for its support of freedom and self determination in Asia.

Kosygin talked of peace in the Middle East. Yet even as he spoke, reports indicated the Soviet Union was shipping new arms to Arab nations to supply the seeds for another war.

He insisted the arms shipments were a matter "between the Arab countries and the Soviet Union." In the same breath he insisted that the peace settlement in the Middle East is not only a matter for Israel and the Arab nations, but for the whole world.

On whatever subject he touched, Kosygin showed the hard, uncompromising Soviet line. And his ultimate slap was his stop in Cuba en route home.

Kosygin, had for example, the unmitigated gall to use a platform in the United States to tell the world Russia will support so-called "wars of liberation" in the name of "people fighting for their freedom and independence." Yet there are millions of persons living in slavery behind the Iron Curtain.

It is a bitter thought that Kosygin was able to echo this virulent Russian propaganda throughout the world with increased drama and attention because of the platform provided by the United States of America. And parts favorable to the United States, showing kindness of our people, were even censored from the Russian populace.

Especially galling was the assertion that President Johnson would not find the same amiable reception in the Soviet Union unless the United States unconditionally leaves Vietnam.

Assisting the Russian propaganda was the fact Americans in Los Angeles were harassing their President even as kindly, polite Americans were applauding Kosygin.

The fact is that summit meetings cannot be significant if held without proper preparation and acceptance of a concrete agenda. As a result the so-called summit at Hollybush in New Jersey was largely hogwash.

Miles City, Mont., Can Thank Yellowtail

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 10, 1967

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, during the disastrous June 1964 flood in Montana, the town of Loma was saved from destruction by an upstream dam, constructed by the Bureau of Reclamation, on the Marias River.

This summer, another upstream Bureau dam, Yellowtail, on the Big Horn River, also prevented serious downstream flooding in the Miles City area.

Yellowtail Dam was completed only last year.

It is difficult indeed for Congress, or any agency responsible for dam construction, to forecast the ultimate values of these structures and to work out cost-benefit ratios. In these two instances, Tiber Dam and Yellowtail Dam, the flood control benefits have already been substantial.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Miles City Can Thank Yellowtail," written by Dick Gilluly and published in the Billings Gazette of June 24, 1967.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MILES CITY CAN THANK YELLOWTAIL

(By Dick Gilluly)

Yellowtail Dam is saving Miles City from worse than record floods, Harold Aldrich of Billings, U.S. Bureau of Reclamation Region 6 chief, said Friday.

Maximum flood or record in Miles City was June 19, 1944, when Yellowstone River flow was measured at 96,300 cubic feet per second (second feet).

Flow in the Yellowstone at Miles City Friday was 66,400 second feet. About 37,000 second feet of flow from the tributary Big Horn River is being held in Yellowtail Dam.

If the dam were not holding the water, flow at Miles City would be a record-setting 103,400 second feet.

Boysen Dam on the Wind River and Buffalo Bill Dam on the Shoshone River, both above Yellowtail Dam in Wyoming, will be filled by Saturday, Aldrich said.

Yellowtail Reservoir is now filled up to the bottom of the flood control reserve, 17 feet below the maximum level.

"We've got plenty of room," Aldrich said.

In a "normal water year" the reservoir wouldn't have reached this point until the end of July, he added.

Water conditions throughout Montana have become "worrisome" with new rains, but Aldrich does not anticipate any serious floods—yet.

The Sun River which caused disastrous floods in Great Falls and on the northeastern slope of the Rocky Mountains in Montana in 1964 is relatively low and poses no threat, Aldrich said.

High water is coming primarily from heavy rains, though snow melt is a factor, too, Aldrich said.

"Had these rains come three or four weeks earlier when the snow runoff was heavier we could have had a serious problem," he said.

The rainfall is general throughout the West, and the high water on the Missouri River below South Dakota caused the Army Corps of Engineers to halt navigation temporarily, Aldrich said.

The 1967 Delegates to Girls' State in Delaware

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM V. ROTH, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 10, 1967

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, this week 88 Delaware high school juniors will be in our State capital, Dover, as delegates to the 1967 Girls' State.

This program, sponsored by the Department of Delaware, American Legion, is intended to give students the opportunity to learn about their State government through actual experience. During the week, the delegates will stay at Wesley College and conduct their business in the chambers of the Delaware General Assembly.

The students will form two political parties, Nationalists and Federalists, and elect party leaders. They will name a slate of candidates for top executive offices and hold an election to fill State posts from Girls' State governor on down.

In order to recognize their efforts, hard work, and achievements, I am placing in the RECORD the names of delegates to Delaware Girls' State, along with the schools they represent:

Alexis I. du Pont High School, Evelyn Taylor and Erika Lefren; Brandywine High School, Patricia Cleaver and Deborah Smith; H. Fletcher Brown Technical High School, Diane Troskey and Lyvonne Rustemis; Claymont High School, Linda Waite and Janice Hellwig; Christiana Senior High School; Karen Lynam and Nan Butterworth; Gunning Bedford High School, Eileen Bennett and Betty Lewis; Henry C. Conrad High School, Mary Ann Phillips; Howard High School, Gwendolyn Strode and Ruby Collins; Mount Pleasant Senior High School, Jody Ladio and Cheryl Pomeroy; Newark Senior High School, Klobia Spencer and Mary Gouvellis.

Padua Academy, Barbara Fierro and Mary Jane Ward; St. Elizabeth High School, Suzanne Boyle and Kathleen Houghton; St. Peter's High School, Mary Hance and Christine Madora; William Penn High School, Susan Carpenter and Lois Moore; Wilmington High School, Sandra Revis and Deborah Montgomery; De La Warr High School, Cheryl Newnam and Donna Bell; John Dickinson High School, Christine Smith; Corpus Christi High School, Bonnie Halliday and Kathleen Taylor.

Tower Hill School, Julia Rose; The Tatnall School, Abigail Bacon and Anne Connell; Pierre S. du Pont High School, Lindsay Gardner and Deborah Ehrenfeld; Middletown High School, Rena Johnson and Gretchen Hill; Thomas McKean High School, Nancy Dodd and Deborah Lake.

Caesar Rodney High School, Linda Harper and June Callaway; Dover High School, Sallie Smith and Sydney Gill; Dover Air Force Base High School, Diane McDaniel; Felton High School, Betty Myers and Doris Paskey; Harrington High School, Debbie Aiken and Cynthia Kohel; Milford High School, Ilona Szucs and Cheryl Hoyt; Holy Cross High School, Sheila Gagen and Shirley Jackewicz; John Bassett Moore High School, Carol Ann Rees and Juanita Gibbons.

Bridgeville High School, Diane Kelly and Karen Kalinevitch; Delmar High School, Grace Slabaugh and Stacey Larmore; Georgetown High School, Dawn Hudson and Gail Larson; Greenwood High School, Gwen Stevens and Eleanor Lamica; John M. Clayton High School, Sandra Long and Renda Hickman; Laurel High School, Sherry Downes and Linda Parker; Lewes High School, Carolyn Best and Rowena Foley; Lord Baltimore High School, Debbie Hickman and Julia Taylor; Millsboro High School, Janet Challman and Jeni Green; Milton High School, Lorraine Atkins and Peggy Tobin; Rehoboth High School, Jacklyn Johnson and Suzanne Brittingham; Seaford High School, Theresa Bennett and Alice Fields; Shelbyville High School, Mary Lou Rogers and Abigail Hastings; and William C. Jason Comprehensive High School, Pearl Hood and Joyce Bynum.

Also attending are: Susan Wood and Linda Oswell.

Changing Responsibilities of School Boards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 10, 1967

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, in an address before the 27th annual convention of the National School Boards Association in Portland, Oreg., on April 24, 1967, Mr. Max J. Rubin, a member of the Board of Regents of the State of New York, and a former member of the New York City Board of Education, has raised some interesting points on the functioning of school boards in this era of educational change. The growth of widespread public interest in education and the larger roles being played by both State and Federal authorities are among the many factors which present new situations with which school boards must contend.

I ask unanimous consent that appropriate excerpts from Mr. Rubin's address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY MAX J. RUBIN, REGENT, STATE OF NEW YORK, AT ANNUAL CONVENTION OF NATIONAL SCHOOL BOARDS ASSOCIATION, PORTLAND, OREG., APRIL 24, 1967

Recently Father Hesburgh of Notre Dame wrote: "Every human institution must renew itself as it faces the problems of each new age. Otherwise, it will develop organizational arteriosclerosis."

Surely education is facing new problems in a new age. And in order to renew, it is well to review, the evolving conditions and forces that call for examination.

It may quickly be agreed that our nation has produced a system of mass education which has served us well. Although the recent international tests in mathematics do not furnish grounds for complacency, when one considers the diversity of our population and the waves of immigration, it is fair to say that our public education system has served as a vital, unifying force and has equipped our people for the democratic management of our society.

And it is also true that this achievement has been accomplished under an unusual mechanism of governments—the concept of local or community control vested not in professional educators, but in laymen. And these trustees have performed the task without compensation and on a part-time basis.

The great question is how this concept of governance, how this instrument of government, can adapt itself to meet the demands of a period which, in most of its aspects, is unsettled, which, in many respects, is turbulent, and which is therefore creating and presenting for solution educational challenges that are complex and far-reaching.

To be sure, ours has always been a nation of change. What separates our contemporary period from the past, in the pace of change. We live in a time of acceleration in scientific developments, which is almost incredible. Fantastic achievements in communication are being recorded daily. The technological changes in our economy are revolutionary in their scope. And these advances are having their impact on the social structure of our pluralistic society.

The poor, those who are disadvantaged economically, racially and environmentally are no longer willing to accept such status as inevitable. They insist, and justifiably, on the right to participate in the fruits and in the mainstream of our affluent society. They know that unless their children are equipped educationally to grasp the opportunities of this age, their expectations are doomed.

We live in what has been described as the era of rising expectations. Education is at the core of our social and economic change and objectives, whether we are talking of integration or the anti-poverty effort or urban renewal or the training of our young for an economy demanding new skills. That degree of progress which once was tolerated, at least to the point or arousing no national concern, is no longer sufficient.

A direct and immediate responsibility, more insistent than in any past period, rests now upon the school board members of our country. For they are the educational trustees of our people.

Without attempting a discourse which is beyond my competence, upon the dynamics of our unsettled times and changing society, I shall speak of several basic elements which are directly relevant to educational needs and problems and which must frankly be recognized in order for solutions to be found.

Only 20 or 25 years ago national and state committees were being organized to stimulate citizen interest in education, to overcome the indifference and the lethargy of most of our citizens respecting what was going on in their schools.

INSISTENT DEMAND FOR COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

Today, however, there is a deep public concern and an insistent demand for community involvement. This is the product of factors in addition to the efforts which school boards and administrators have made over the years. Another source of this pressure has been the effort of the various civil rights movements and the recognition of the need to solve the problems of education in order to solve other problems through education. Another has been the dramatic entrance of the Federal government on an unprecedented scale into the area of education. Another has been the focusing of national attention upon the educational needs of our disadvantaged children.

The demand for quality in education for all the children and youth of this nation is not the concern of merely some school board members. It is a challenge to all of us. We live in a mobile society and in a nation becoming increasingly urbanized.

We, of course, have a duty to our immediate school district, but we also serve as the agents of our respective States, and, in the truest sense, are trustees of a national responsibility. Public involvement is not only extensive. It is also articulate. And important consequences are being and will continue to be felt in many respects.

State Legislatures are becoming far more active in the mandate of educational programs because they assume that Local electorates have assigned the responsibility of accountability to them and because today the action or inaction of Legislatures in the field of education has political consequences that did not have to be reckoned with in the past.

In the large cities the municipal governments are assuming an increased role, arguing that they are being held politically responsible for the conduct of what has traditionally been an independent, autonomous board.

State departments of education are being strengthened, and while the funds for this purpose under Title V are extremely modest, the fact is that attention has been directed toward the State and the need for strengthening State departments is clearly recognized. As this evolves, it is inevitable that the contacts between the State department and the Local district will be more frequent and more direct.

With respect to the role of the Federal government, a plea for general, rather than categorical, aid can be justified. But I believe given the realistic and political facts of life, at least for the foreseeable future, Federal aid will be addressed to meeting particular needs and coping with particular problems which are determined to be for the national good.

TRADITIONAL CONCEPTS CHANGING

All of these new developments inevitably will be deemed to impinge upon the traditional concept of the jurisdiction and the powers of Local boards of education. I quickly agree that education is best served when decision making is vested in those who are not concerned about partisan political consequences. The independence from political partisanship has been one of the major strengths of the concept of Local boards of education. But the forces which I have so briefly mentioned are here, and they are real. The boards therefore individually, and very importantly, through their State associations and through this national organization, must respond to these new and powerful pressures. One can attempt to ignore these developments and insist upon a rigid adherence to traditional authority—or one can respond with a constructive effort to meet successfully the new demands of the day.

I submit that despite all of these developments which can be considered an impingement upon orthodox Local authority, the basic responsibility for meeting the educational needs of the children will continue to reside in the Local boards. What is essential is that in this age of increasing expectations and demands upon education, board members dare not view themselves as the caretakers of educational traditions nor as the guardians of ancestral concepts. Their response must be flexible, designed to meet contemporary needs, and constructive in its approach to the public and to all agencies of government.

NEW AND EMERGING RELATIONSHIPS

I have adverted to the new and emerging relationships between Local boards of education and the State departments of education and the State Legislatures and the Federal government. If these relationships are to be effective ad productive, boards of education must exercise forthright leadership in the articulation of their views.

For example, there has been much understandable complaining about the paper work and red tape involved in the granting of Federal funds. I submit that the best experts on how to cut down on red tape are the Local boards and their administrators. They are the ones who deal with this on a daily basis. Local boards and their superintendents and administrators should not merely be critical of excessive paper work or of overlapping agencies.

They should come forward with the concrete recommendations and proposals which would result in reducing unnecessary paper work and in eliminating overlapping. They have the opportunity to play a constructive and significant role in order that the dollars available be spent with maximum efficiency. They are the ones to make constructive and concrete recommendations with respect to flexibility in programs which will meet the basic objectives of the Federal program.

In connection with the increased activities of other governmental agencies in the area of education, boards will function most effectively through their state-wide associations and through this national organization. I do not believe that the boards of education of this country have heretofore exercised the effective leadership of which they are capable in dealings with Local, State and Federal governments. None should be more articulate than they in calling upon government to supply the funds that are necessary to meet the needs that the people of this country demand to have met.

When it comes to urging the need for increased funds, Legislatures have become so accustomed to the pleas of professional educators and school board members that in all likelihood they discount such pleas in advance. But today the school boards possess allies which they did not have in the past.

The case for more financial investment in education is being argued not only by professional educators, but by the most conservative and powerful financial elements in our country.

In other words, board members must mobilize the arguments, coordinate the efforts of allies and employ all legitimate resources effectively to call upon our people and their governmental representatives to furnish the financial means by which educational needs can be met.

One can believe in the perfectibility of man while recognizing at least some imperfections at the moment. The traditional appeal for money based upon the right of every human being to realize upon his potential is a valid ideal, but perhaps the argument is more effective if it appeals to the self-interest of our people and their representatives. And as these economists argue, our own economic self-interest calls for increased investment in education.

SCHOOL BOARDS MUST ACT COLLECTIVELY

On this as on other of the major problems facing the educational enterprise, school board members can exercise their powers of leadership and influence most effectively if they act collectively. This means that this national association (and it is good to learn that it has established an office in Washington) and the State associations of school board members must bes strengthened and must adopt forceful leadership responsibilities. In the evolving relationships with State Legislatures and State agencies, with the Federal government and its agencies, the State associations must be both articulate and constructive.

Unfortunately, too often in the past, State associations have been so eager to achieve wide consensus that their positions with respect to issue have been watered down and diffused. Too often in the past, they have not come to grips with the hard, difficult, controversial problems. I submit that the day is past when unanimity and tranquility are the prime objectives.

The State associations must be prepared to confront the issues on which members will disagree and be prepared to accept the consequences of minority disapproval. These associations must seek out the best talent within them for positions of aggressive leadership. Perhaps it is an indication of the underassessment we have made of the potential significance of these associations that so often senior officers have been elected almost exclusively on the basis of seniority.

I do not denigrate the importance of experience and continued service. But generally we speak of people climbing the ladder of success. Too often in our State associations men have merely stepped upon the escalator and thereby reached the top. I do not believe that educational organizations can any longer equate leadership with longevity.

There is another topic to which I would briefly advert.

LAY BOARD AND PROFESSIONAL ADMINISTRATOR RELATIONSHIPS

Perhaps the most important is the respective roles and areas of responsibility as between the lay board and the professional superintendent. It has generally been said that the board is the decision-making body and the superintendent the professional administrator of those decisions.

Obviously, there is no exact line between the two. In fact, even the definition is oversimplified, because in addition to being the executive officer, the superintendent is also the professional advisor to the board. By the same token, there are administrative problems whose impact upon the community may be such that the superintendent should consult the board for its advice.

What is necessary is that as a matter of self-discipline and as a matter of legislation where that is necessary, to the maximum extent possible, there be a definition of the responsibilities that belong to each.

Our course, the role of the board will vary on the basis of sheer size of the district. In a district which has three school buildings, the proposed construction of a fourth will understandably call upon the board to become more involved in the details of the new building than will be expected of a board in a major city where millions of dollars are spent annually on a large number of school projects.

But to the extent that a generalization is possible, I submit that there should be a spelling out, as clearly as is feasible, of the duties and the scope of responsibility of the administrator and that the board limit its role to determination of policies. And the duties of the superintendent should not be merely delegated by the board, for then a conscientious board necessarily tends to impinge upon the superintendent's functions; they should be separate, independent responsibilities, and administrative decisions should be subject to appeal to the board only when the board decides that the issue warrants an appeal.

The board does have an important responsibility in the evaluation of administrative performance. It has the right and the obligation to know that its policies are being effectively implemented. In the small community this evaluation is almost intuitive. Board members in their personal, informal social contacts within their community will have a very good idea of what is going on in the schools.

As we deal with districts that are large, the problem is more complicated. I believe that the answer does not lie in setting up a separate staff for this purpose, reporting directly to the board. This procedure is likely to produce more friction and distrust and generate more problems than it solves.

Rather I would believe that the board should require of the superintendent, regular and complete reports, respecting educational efforts and accomplishments and business and financial administration.

In the large cities when the board desires an independent appraisal of a particular area of operations, it may engage the services of outside consultants. Again, if the size warrants it, an internal evaluation staff reporting to the superintendent and the board may be useful.

Another technique helpful in making board membership a manageable service is the use of citizen advisory committees. This subject was explored at your convention last year. Therefore I need only add that I commend to you the use of committees appointed by the board to study in depth a particular problem and cooperation with citizen groups which are independent of the board, but concerned with educational affairs in the district.

In these days of great citizen interest, the handling of board meetings has become increasingly difficult. To the extent that it is practical, and depending upon the nature of the issue, it is, of course, most desirable that the public be given the opportunity to be heard at the board meeting. If there are many who wish to be heard, then the chairman must fix and adhere to time allotments and select as speakers a fair cross-section representing whatever different views may exist.

It is also to be remembered that a public board meeting is not necessarily a hearing. It is up to the board to decide on which issues on the agenda it will invite and permit public discussion. Unless this is done, meetings may be interminable and prevent the discharge of board duties.

I believe it will produce an economy in time and more fruitful deliberation by the board, if as a matter of regular procedure, the superintendent furnishes each member sufficiently in advance of the meeting, a full analysis of an issue, presenting the pros and cons and making his professional recommendation. Unless this is done, too frequently the problem is not debated with accuracy and sophistication, more information is called for, the issue is then tabled for further consideration and the time and energy of both the superintendent and the board have been ineffectively utilized. If it be argued that this suggestion puts too heavy a burden upon the superintendent, I can only express the belief that in the long run it saves his time as well as that of the board.

I would also recommend that whether it be once a year or more or less frequently, it would be a good idea for board members and the superintendent to get together for a frank discussion of board operations. There should be no discussion of items scheduled to come before the board. It should be limited to a frank discussion in which any board member and the superintendent may express his views on improvements in board functioning.

If a board members feels that the superintendent is overstepping the proper limitations of his authority, if the superintendent feels that a member or all the members are too involved in administrative matters, if a member feels that the superintendent communicates more fully with one or two members than with the others, if there is a feeling that the superintendent is intransigent respecting his recommendations, if the superintendent is unhappy with the public relations policy of the board or feels that the limitations upon his authority are excessive or believes that citizen complaints are not being channeled correctly—all of these should be openly and frankly discussed.

If anyone feels that important problems are being postponed while unimportant ones are being given priority, if there be uncertainty as to goals and objectives and what steps should be taken toward defining them—all of these should be subjects for discussion. I believe that such informal sessions can be very helpful in eliminating misunderstandings, in improving efficiency and in making service on the board a more satisfying experience.

Also I submit that boards should take the initiative in encouraging the community to set up such screening and nominating procedures as will help insure for board service the best talent within the community. I am not suggesting that such screening or nominating panels or groups should be dominated by the board. On the contrary, I believe that they should be independent.

In this day when boards are confronted with social issues that are frequently charged with emotion, there is always the risk that candidates for board membership will run because of a particular stand on a particular issue. To the extent possible, this, of course, should be avoided. For what is needed for effective board service are citizens of intelligence, of courage, of dedication to the importance of good education and with a sense of trusteeship, responsible to all the children in the community and not merely a segment.

SUMMARY

It is inevitable that despite all the leadership and statesmanship which boards will exercise, despite their devotion and dedication to the goal of excellence in education, there will be those who will be dissatisfied with either programs or accomplishments. Board members are subject to criticism frequently expressing not merely differences of opinion, but grounded upon misinformation or even ill will.

To the extent that misinformation is the cause, then the channels of communication must be widened. With respect to unfair attack which is deliberate, the board must rely upon the good sense of the majority of its community. No one engaged in public service at this time can hope to be immune from unfair criticism and attack.

But the importance of providing children and our youth with a quality of education which will equip them successfully to meet the challenges which will face them, is so great a service that I am confident that there are people, like yourselves, of sufficient courage and determination to accept the responsibility despite its frustrations.

There are times when undoubtedly the problems seem overwhelming, almost impossible of solution—when it seems so difficult to achieve understanding and support—when criticisms are unjust and violent.

But then we remind ourselves that there is no service we can render more vital to our Nation and its children then to provide for excellence in education.

And this responsibility cannot be discharged by men of timidity, by men to whom tranquility is the prime goal. Our board members, who are the lay leaders in education will recognize the needs and demands of a society in transition—will recognize that turmoil frequently accompanies important change—and will demonstrate the dedication, the courage, the statesmanship necessary to confront and meet the challenges.

The Second Battle of Antietam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD D. McCARTHY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 8, 1967

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, the fact that a giant, 500,000-volt powerline may be run through the historic part of Washington County between Harper's Ferry and the area of the Antietam battlefield is a highly regretable prospect.

A measure proposed by the Potomac Edison Co., of Hagerstown, Md., this ugly line would confront visitors to the historic battlefield and the National Park Service's new center for visitors. In short, the entire area would be distorted by this line.

Mr. Speaker, both Life magazine and the Washington Post have called attention to this deplorable fact, and I would like to place their excellent articles in the RECORD today:

[From Life magazine, June 23, 1967]

THE SECOND BATTLE OF ANTIETAM

In the holy writ of the engineers who design high voltage transmission lines, the first commandment reads, "Thou shalt not deviate from a straight line between Point A and Point B." To stray from the straight and narrow costs money, even though a detour might save a choice historic area or beautiful vista from festoons of cables and the Eiffel towers used to support them.

When, occasionally, outraged citizens attempt to save an area they soon come up short against an extraordinary fact. The majority of power companies in the country can take what land they want by eminent domain. Twenty states allot full control over choice of routes—from which there is essentially no appeal—to private companies. Other states require certificates of necessity, but since electric power is an unquestioned necssity today, the companies' right to condemnation is seldom hampered. In the majority of such proceedings, even though the landtaker is a private company, the only appeal possible is one against the amount of money offered, not the land-taking itself.

The latest group to make this discovery is now fighting the second battle of Antietam. The Potomac Edison Company has laid out a right of way that cuts straight through one of the most historic areas of Maryland. The towers, up to 110 feet tall, built on a 200-foot right of way, would dominate an area that includes the Antietam and South Mountain battlefields, John Brown's farm and Cheasapeake and Ohio Canal near Sharpsburg.

The proposed power line has been condemned by everybody from members of the local zoning boards on up to Interior Secretary Stewart Udall. But nobody has the power to stop the march of the towers.

There is no argument with the country's multiplying needs for electric power—the demand doubles every 10 years. And since nobody wants transmission lines in their own backyard, some form of eminent domain taking is inevitable. But it is a perversion of the democratic process to allow the private power companies to be the final judge of what they will take.

In effect, the companies have been ceded one of the great powers of government—without having to accept the responsibility that goes with it. Deciding what is the greatest good for the greatest number in an eminent domain proceeding is outside the province of a private company responsible to its stockholders.

The final decision on whether a land-taking creates values greater than those it destroys must be returned to the government which is responsible to all the people involved. And since high voltage transmission lines are now mainly interstate in nature, the logical arbiter would be the Federal Power Commission.

A number of bills now before Congress would accomplish just that end. Though designed primarily to avert massive intersystem blackouts, the best of the measures would also direct the FPC to consider esthetics in the granting of licenses. The need for such a law is urgent if the latest battle of Antietam is not to be lost.

[From the Washington Post, May 22, 1967]

WASHINGTON COUNTY CONTROVERSY: POWERLINE WILL SKIRT ANTIETAM BATTLE AREA—POTOMAC EDISON DENIES SECRECY IN ITS PLANNING

(By Bart Barnes)

HAGERSTOWN, MD., May 21.—A gigantic, 150-mile-long electric power line, part of which will slice through a Civil War battle area in Maryland's Washington County, was quietly designed by the power company without consulting local officials.

Under local law, the company, Potomac Edison, can build the line virtually wherever it wants without consulting anybody. It has blanket powers of condemnation.

The $25-million line—due for completion by the spring of 1970—will run from a generating station at Hatfield's Ferry, Pa., down through Maryland and into West Virginia, then back to Maryland to its terminal at Doubs in Frederick County.

SECRECY DENIED

"We didn't exactly plan it in secrecy," says Charles D. Lyon, president of Potomac Edison. "But we didn't advertise it either."

Says Lem E. Kirk, president of the Washington County Board of Commissioners:

"Our Board wasn't consulted and neither was our planning and zoning board. We're not * * *," an official of the Interior Department said.

It is now a region under study by the National Park Service for a Potomac Valley Park. A local commission also drew up a general plan for the region, recommending certain sites for parks and others for preservation of scenic values and a rural atmosphere.

Potomac Edison was included among the representatives of local industry to serve on the local commission, yet Kirk said, there was still no mention made of the proposed power line. The commission made its report last December.

"We don't have many historical sites around, here," he said. "The line will bisect that area. It will definitely be an eyesore."

Only a small nucleus of property owners and local Civil War buffs, however, is actively fighting the line.

One of the property owners is Bernard F. Hillenbrand, executive director of the National Association of Counties, who owns a farm in the projected route of the line.

He first learned of the line about three months ago when Potomac Edison asked permission to go onto his property to survey for it. He said no. Potomac Edison got a court order—Hillenbrand was not even invited to the hearing—and has done the survey work. Legally, the company was not required to notify Hillenbrand of the hearing.

In Maryland, the company has now acquired rights of way all the way up to Hillenbrand's property. He is still fighting the line, but Potomac Edison has power to condemn his land if he holds out.

On Friday Potomac Edison and its parent company, Allegheny Power Systems, Inc., agreed to hear Hillenbrand's arguments against the line's proposed location. They agreed to consider them, but made no commitments to change the route, worked out over months of behind the scenes study.

In defense of its position, Potomac Edison argues that some power line is necessary and there is no possible line that won't make somebody umhappy.

Lyon argues that the company did route the line so it would not go through the Antietam Battlefield, although he concedes the towers could be seen from there.

And officials insist the company is doing everything it can to minimize the scenic impact of the giant towers.

The company has had preliminary discussions with officials of the C&O canal over the site of the canal crossing, but there will be no formal proposal until engineering details are final.

Both to serve a fast growing industrial complex near Martinsburg, W. Va., and the expansion of the Washington suburbs into Potomac Edison territory, there has to be a big—500,000 kilovolt—line, Potomac Edison says.

Says Lyon: "We really can't waste much time on it."

Reduction of Utility Overcharge Increases Education Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE METCALF
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 10, 1967

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, an enterprising public school in Steel, N. Dak., recently increased its education budget by reducing its utility overcharge. This was accomplished by obtaining electricity from a cooperative rather than from an investor-owned utility.

On the average, electric co-ops serve only one-tenth as many customers as investor-owned utilities. Thus their revenue is proportionately much less. The investor-owned utilities collect $7,820 in revenue per mile of line annually, 15 times as much as the co-op's $516. But the co-ops, controlled by customers rather than distant stockholders, are nevertheless able to compete effectively on rates in many parts of the country, because their rate structure is not padded with overcharges, as rates of most investor-owned utilities are.

Utility overcharges reduce the education budget in many parts of the country. Harry B. Gorton, Ed. D., district superintendent of Penn-Trafford School District in Harrison City, Pa,, examined this aspect of education in his dessertation entitled "A Study of Electric Rates for Public Schools in Pennsylvania." He found that excessive rates cost as much as $2.64 per pupil annually.

For a school system of 100,000 children, that is a quarter of a million dollars a year that goes out of the education budget into the excess profits of utilities. And Pennsylvania is not the worst example of overcharges by power companies.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the story of the enterprising Steele, N. Dak., school which was published in the May 1967, issue of North Dakota Rural Electric magazine; and a digest of Dr. Gorton's dissertation, which appeared in Dissertation Abstracts, volume XXIV, No. 11, 1964.

There being no objection, the items

were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OH, THAT COMPETITION WILL WORK WONDERS—I O U's OVERCHARGE TO SCHOOL AT STEELE MORE THAN HALF A TEACHER'S SALARY

Because it dared to show its "free enterprise" about a year and a half ago, the Public School at Steele, N.D., not only saved a bundle of public money on its electric service costs, but received from Montana-Dakota Utilities Co. a check for $4,373.32 in overcharges, including interest.

That kind of money isn't peanuts anywhere, including a town and school district the size of Steele.

It's an interesting story—one that would qualify for mention in a book like "Overcharge!," recently published by U.S. Sen. Lee Metcalf, long a proponent of consumer ownership and a burr under the saddle of the investor-owned utilities.

Steele's new school was built on the outskirts of town. At first it continued to get its power from the franchised city supplier, Montana-Dakota Utilities Co.

School board members cringed when they authorized payment of the monthly power bill. When their contract expired late in 1965, with MDU, they asked the nearest rural electric cooperative, KEM Electric at Linton, if it would submit a bid for power supply.

Nothing in the law prevents this; since the school was outside the franchised city limits, so KEM submitted a bid. It was lower than MDU's, by a country mile, and KEM got the five-year contract.

The rural electric cooperative began its service in December of 1965.

Ten months later, the Steele Ozone-Press a weekly newspaper, published a comparison of the school's power costs between its former supplier, MDU, and the new supplier, KEM Electric.

Total amount paid to MDU during the period of December, 1964 to September, 1965, was $3,261.91.

Total amount paid to KEM Electric during the same nine-month period in the following year was $1,795.20.

Net difference (and savings to the school): $1,466.71.

The power company protested mightily to the newspaper. Something had to be wrong, said MDU. Maybe the school wasn't using as much electricity as before?

That didn't sell.

Something wrong with KEM's meter?

KEM had it checked. It was accurate.

The argument continued.

Along came the time for MDU's franchise in the city to expire. The company asked the City Council for a 20-year renewal. The Council refused.

At most of the City Council meetings, an MDU employees, and a member of the Council, makes a motion to renew the franchise. A substitute motion is made to table the original motion. The substitute motion is always passed, 5 to 1.

The city continues to receive its service from MDU without a franchise. (None is needed, of course, but most cities don't realize this.)

About a month ago, with some explanation about an alleged faulty transformer installation, an MDU official presented the superintendent of the Steele school with some diagrams and a check for $4,373.32.

He said it was the amount the school had been overcharged, $3,706.23, plus $667.09 at 6 per cent interest, in the 38-month period just prior to the school's switch to KEM Electric.

What's the reaction in Steele, after the paper published the overcharge story?

"Most of the folks are wondering if they shouldn't also be getting a refund," said one businessman.

A STUDY OF ELECTRIC RATES FOR PUBLIC SCHOOLS IN PENNSYLVANIA

(By Harry Burton Gorton, Ed. D.)

THE PROBLEM

Although electrical energy costs represent a sizeable amount of the school plant budget, school administrators have little information on which to judge whether the energy costs to their schools are reasonable. They have few guide lines for action to reduce these costs.

This study undertook to examine rates and practices of electric utility companies as applied to schools, comparing these with rates to other consumers; and to examine effects of any differences found.

PROCEDURE

The study was limited to six major companies which serve about 95 per cent of the customers in Pennsylvania. A pilot study in two countries revealed that necessary data could be accumulated and that there were rate differences worthy of attention.

Schools of similar size and age were selected for the study and information on use and cost of electrical energy was obtained through questionnaires.

Comparisons of rates were made, including the computing of bills on the rates of all six companies for the actual use experience of two schools for a school year.

PRINCIPAL CONCLUSIONS

1. Electric rates which schools pay vary, ranging from 1.47 to 3.22 cents a kilowatt hour average among the six companies.

2. If schools served under the highest rates could get service at the lowest rates, savings of from 35 to 46 per cent would result.

3. Rates for all classes of customers varied between companies but not nearly so greatly as rates paid by schools.

4. Higher rates increased per pupil costs and appeared to result in less use of energy per pupil.

5. High rates cost as much as $2.64 per pupil per year more.

6. Characteristics of electrical use by schools would justify favorable rates. Four of the six companies extend such rates.

7. Some saving can be effected by checking electric bills, including meter reading, computation, correctness of demand, and application of the most favorable existing rate.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Electrical energy costs can be reduced in three ways: less use, reduction in billing demand, and buying at lower rates.

Except for elimination of waste, efficiency of plant operation would not likely be improved by reducing use of electrical energy. But equipment defects and leakage should be found and corrected.

Where demand is metered, administrators should learn if scheduling of high energy use equipment operation can be arranged to limit demand peaks.

Where rates paid are higher than those charged other classes of customers, attention of the utility company should be called to the situation with a request that consideration be given revising rates so as to make charges more equitable.

Records should be kept to check accuracy of billing and to compare bills by months and years to detect unusual variations. These records should show what bills would be under all possible applicable rates.

Electric utility company representatives should be consulted for advice on best rates available and on other factors affecting cost of electrical energy.

Consideration should be given consultation with an independent rate engineer in cases where the possible saving appears great enough to justify paying his fee.

The Generation Gap

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 29, 1967

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, traditionally, June is a month for commencement addresses and thoughts for the future.

At no other time of the year are our thoughts more hopeful than when addressing the young people who have inherited the past and must determine the future.

Committeeman Seymour Simon, of Chicago's 40th ward, delivered the commencement address at North Park College earlier this month. Mr. Simon is an unusually perceptive man, with deep insight into today's challenges. He has served the city of Chicago for many years and his intelligence and great administrative talents have contributed vastly to Chicago's ever-expanding reputation for leadership among America's great cities.

Mr. Simon titled his speech, "The Generation Gap." Rather than enumerating the differences which separate us, he has managed to bridge the span of years with commonsense and shared experience. He says for all of us what we would say to our own sons and daughters; what we feel and know, but often cannot express.

Mr. Speaker, I call this eloquent address to the attention of my colleagues, trusting they will find it as meaningful and important as the graduates and parents of North Park College.

Mr. Speaker, Committeeman Simon's remarks follow:

THE GENERATION GAP

For fifty years the whistle of the largest factory in a small town blew exactly at noon. When the factory owner retired, a civic banquet was held in his honor. There he explained how his factory whistle was so prompt. "Every day as I walked to work," he said, "I set my watch by the clock in the town jeweler's window. Each day when my watch reached noon, I ordered the whistle blown." He thanked the jeweler, who was in the audience, for his part in giving the factory whistle its reputation for promptness. When the jeweler got home, he told his wife what had happened and then he said, "Isn't it strange, dear, all these years I have been setting the clock in my window by the factory whistle."

There is a message in that story, but it has nothing to do with prompt factory whistles. It is about a closed society, dedicated to the status quo, resisting change, never admitting error. It is about relationships in which too many of us get our time from each other, in which too many of us are conditioned to marching in step with everyone else.

Adjustment to that kind of world presents a particular dilemma for those who are leaving the academic life. As students, you have been encouraged to question, to probe, to think for yourselves. On leaving the campus, a different orientation closes in on you. Its tendency will be to transform you from individuals into a group. It will caution you: "Don't rock the boat; don't make waves; play it safe; go along; why get involved in controversy; accept things as they are, because there isn't much you can do to change them anyway."

This is cynical and feeble advice. It is based on the erroneous premise that the individual lacks the will to chart his own course. It destroys individuality, human dignity, and the strength each man should strive to find within himself.

The prophet Joel said, "Your old men shall dream dreams; your young men shall see visions." This is the generation gap. The difference between acceptance of what is and the need to take it apart, re-examine it and reappraise its value.

A monolithic society gives the generation gap little opportunity for expression, for that society depends on uniformity for survival. Its structure does not permit it to stand exposure and scrutiny.

In a free society, a generation gap always exists, although in periods of turbulent change such as ours, its outlines are sharper and its sounds louder than in more placid times. No matter how visible and noisy the gap between our generations seems to us today, it will disappear all too quickly. You who are being graduated will find yourselves conforming to an older generation almost so soon you will fail to realize what happened to you, and you won't even be able to remember the route which carried you across the generation gap.

Don't try to close the generation gap quickly. On the contrary, preserve it in your own attitudes and values for as long as possible. There is no reason to fear the fresh thoughts and challenging ideals your youth and your boundless enthusiasm can and should bring to our society. Protest against worn out concepts and the imagination and courage to develop new viewpoints strengthens any society which places a supreme value on liberty. The famous historian, Henry Steele Commager, teaches that "when a nation silences criticism and dissent, it deprives itself of the power to correct its errors."

Our laws protect the privilege to differ and disagree better now than at any time in our history. In the last twenty years our Federal courts, our four Presidents, our Congress and many state and local officials have given broader and more vital meaning to our Bill of Rights and our constitutional immunities than they ever had before. You have never been as well safeguarded as now in your individual right to speak, to write, to assemble without fear, to be free from intrusion and coercion by agents of government. Yet, there is a great difference between what the law permits and what society accepts.

Many in my generation and unfortunately even in yours have little patience for ideas which are different or disturbing. They pay lip-service to the American tradition of protest by saluting the dissenters of other generations while at the same time steering clear of any involvement with their modern counterparts. Most of the men whose stories were told in President Kennedy's book Profiles In Courage merited inclusion in the book because of their courage in expressing a philosophy of dissent. Yet, these men in the circumstances which brought them to their roles of protest, and to positions of importance in history, did not attract a large number of enthusiastic supporters. The dissenter often does not become a hero until historians have reviewed his role. To his contemporaries he is at the worst a devil and at the best an irritating annoyance to conscience which most people wish would go away and not bother them.

The class of 1967 may be to young to remember it, but my generation is not too old to recall the exciting demonstration of courage by Edward R. Murrow when in early April, 1954, on his television program See It Now he took on a powerful United States Senator, Joseph R. McCarthy, of Wisconsin. That program exposed agents of government.

Yet, there is a great difference between what the law permits and what society accepts.

Many in my generation and unfortunately even in yours have little patience for ideas which are different or disturbing. They pay lip-service to the American tradition of protest by saluting the dissenters of other generations while at the same time steering clear of any involvement with their modern counterparts. Most of the men whose stories were told in President Kennedy's book Profiles in Courage merited inclusion in the book because of their courage in expressing a philosophy of dissent. Yet, these men in the circumstances which brought them to their roles of protest, and to positions of importance in history, did not attract a large number of enthusiastic supporters. The dissenter often does not become a hero until historians have reviewed his role. To his contemporaries he is at the worst a devil and at the best an irritating annoyance to conscience which most people wish would go away and not bother them.

The class of 1967 may be too young to remember it, but my generation is not too old to recall the exciting demonstration of courage by Edward R. Murrow when in early April, 1954 on his television program See It Now he took on a powerful United States Senator, Joseph R. McCarthy, of Wisconsin. That program exposed Senator McCarthy's cruelty and disregard for truth in labeling people as Communists by star chamber methods without evidence and without hearing.

Mr. Murrow provided an eloquent addition to the rhetoric of liberty and freedom with words as wise and sound today as they were thirteen years ago. He summed up his program saying, "We must not confuse dissent with disloyalty. We must remember always that accusation is not proof and that conviction depends upon evidence. Remember that we are not descended from fearful men, not from men who feared to write, to speak, to associate with and to defend causes whic were for the moment unpopular."

This was the first of a series of public confrontations with McCarthyism which a few months later brought McCarthy's witch hunts to an end. The McCarthy broadcast committed the network which employed Murrow to controversy and he became controversial himself. The controversy made the establishment in the network uneasy; immediately after the broadcast coolness developed between Murrow and the network executives and Murrow never again had the same prestige and authority in the network. But, while history regards McCarthyism as a sickness which passed and will seldom record the names of the executives who made up the network establishment, it has and always will have respectful affection for the man who had courage to take on Senator McCarthy.

Dissent sometimes has ironic results and brings about surprising alignments. Chicago engaged last week in Project Good Neighbor. It was a special activity of friendship and brotherhood, designed to teach the need for providing equal opportunities in housing for all people, regardless of race and to open housing in communities which are now all white. It received great public acclaim and support from the press, public officials, executives of large corporations and a large number of white people. With all the public acceptance Project Good Neighbor received, I wonder how many people bothered to trace its genesis. It was sponsored by the Leadership Council for Metropolitan Open Communities which is an ongoing citizens organization created in response to the statement of principles adopted at what is popularly known as the summit conference held at the Palmer House in Chicago last summer. For those of you who do not live in Chicago, may I recall for you that this was the meeting between city officials, county officials, religious, business and labor leaders and Dr. Martin Luther King and leaders of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference to find a way to end the housing marches which tore Chicago apart last summer. It is clear that those marches were a forerunner of Project Good Neighbor. Would it be uncharitable to inquire how many of the thousands of men and women who enthusiastically participated in Project Good Neighbor, particularly because the establishment supported it, were opposed with at least equal vigor to the marches Dr. King led last summer.

In the past few months many people have re-examined the nature of disagreement and dissent. They have told us it is good in a free society and consistent with the most previous of American traditions. But this appraisal has usually been followed by the admonition that dissent should be creative or constructive or responsible or that it must be justified by the suggestion of meaningful alternatives.

Who is there to say what is good dissent and what is bad dissent. Who can frame fair and meaningful standards to measure what is creative, constructive or responsible in disagreement and what is destructive. Are these decisions which can safely be left to a local police chief or a municipal administrator or the majority or to public opinion or perhaps to those good people who simply want to remain comfortable and uninvolved?

The dissent which I urge be left free does not encompass violations of the law and neo-nazi pressure tactics. Draft card burning, cross burning, flag burning and property burning as well as taunting others solely to provoke them to assault are not legitimatized by the privilege of dissent. Rioting, looting, rock throwing and sniping are violations of law which no concept of dissent can justify. Dissent does not include the freedom to destroy the system of law which guarantees freedom to speak, assemble and march in protest. Dissent is not anarchy.

I am not suggesting that you prove your resistance to conformity by joining the nearest march as soon as you pick up your diploma or participate in the first demonstration you run across. Nor am I suggesting that you spend the rest of your life supporting minority ideas, unpopular causes or concepts in which you do not sincerely believe. What I recommend is that you think through your own position on issues of importance and arrive at your own conclusion on the basis of your own thinking. Be free in your spirit; set your time by the sun and the stars and not by factory whistles. Do this with awareness that ideas initially scorned by many often later become accepted doctrine. What better example can you have than the rule that separate but equal schools were permissible, a concept which the Supreme Court of the United States, after 54 years, declared to be a judicial error.

Also, resist being crushed by pressures to conform whether they come from the business organization in which you work, the community in which you live, the religion within which you pray, the social group in which you travel, the country club to which you belong or the newspapers to which you subscribe. If there is any obligation or responsibility or leadership an educated person can have for society, it is this.

Congratulations to all parents for I am sure they worried almost as hard as the graduates over the academic pursuit. And best wishes to you who are graduating. May you find happiness in the pursuit of your own individuality.

Resolution in Support of the War on Poverty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 10, 1967

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I am pleased and proud to commend to the attention of the Senate a resolution adopted by the Veterans of Foreign Wars, department of Montana, in strong support of the war on poverty. This resolution, which encourages each individual member at each VFW post to participate to the fullest possible extent in local and national endeavors to eliminate poverty, is in the fine tradition of civic awareness we have come to expect from the Veterans of Foreign Wars. I am especially encouraged that this expression of support of the antipoverty effort comes at a time when the Senate itself is about to renew its commitment to this most worthwhile program. The Office of Economic Opportunity has achieved a remarkable record of progress, and it merits the continued support of us all. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution to which I have referred be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED AT DEPARTMENT CONVENTION

Whereas, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, through direct action and collective support, have always promoted increased opportunities for all Americans, that every individual, regardless of race, color, creed, or ethnic background, might share in this Nation's abundance, and

Whereas, the Economic Opportunity Act originally passed by Congress in 1964 and since extended and amended in 1965 and 1966, has established programs and mechanisms to enable the poor of our country, in the best American tradition, to break their own cycles of poverty.

Be it resolved, that the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Department of Montana, assembled in convention at Miles City, Mont., June 7 through June 10, 1967, stand unanimously in favor of continuing and expanding the vital efforts begun, and thus far well advanced, by the Economic Opportunity Act, and that each individual member and post be encouraged to participate to the fullest possible extent in local and national endeavors to eliminate poverty.

And further resolved, that the Veterans of Foreign Wars national magazine, as well as all publications, advise the members of ways and means to help as a community service project those young men and women who have been trained at Government expense to reestablish themselves in the areas where they have been sent for employment, to help those people find housing, learn the area so they can get to and from work, and other things that good Americans do for other good Americans,

And further resolved, that this resolution be forwarded to the national organization of the Veterans of Foreign Wars for appropriate action at the national convention in New Orleans, La., August 17 through 25, 1967.

Attest:

ROBERT A. DURKEE,
Department Adjutant, Department of Montana, Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Mighty Israel: Lesson to World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 10, 1967

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, one of the most knowledgeable international observers is Columnist Richard Pattee, who is featured in the New World, the Chicago archdiocese newspaper. I feel his June 30 commentary on the Middle East war gives an excellent summary and I insert it in the RECORD at this point:

MIGHTY ISRAEL: LESSON TO WORLD

(By Richard Pattee)

The post-mortem on the four-day war in the Middle East will doubtlessly go on for a great many years. The spectacular triumph of the Israelis and the total incapacity of the neighboring Arab states to make good their threats provide a lesson for other parts of the world.

A British commentator, Peregrine Worsthorne, has described the situation as the confrontation of the technically developed and the underdeveloped, with the inevitable collapse of the less advanced when faced by the military power of a modern state.

It has been stated over and over again that Israel's principal characteristic is that it is, for all practical purposes, a European-type state in the midst of nations which are only superficially developed. When the show down came, the ability of this highly evolved society was brought to bear on the problem of smashing the infinitely more numerous adversary.

Although the thesis may very well be true, it must also be clear that it applies primarily to developed and undeveloped nations which are geographically juxtaposed. It would not necessarily apply to the U.S. in Vietnam where enormous distance and a very different geography are involved.

In the Israeli-Arab war, the forces were facing one another on their respective frontiers. Moreover the geography of both was identical and there is no huge hostile power, such as China, just to the north of the enemy.

Nevertheless, one of the lessons of the recent Middle Eastern clash must certainly be that none of the African or Middle Eastern countries, even though armed by the Soviet Union or anyone else, is able, as things stand now, to bring down a technically superior enemy, even though his resources and territorial area may be small.

This lesson must certainly be applied to the threats against Rhodesia and South Africa.

There is, indeed, a close analogy between the situations. Rhodesia is a tight little country with a proportionately capable army and excellent leadership. It is unthinkable that any of the neighboring African states on their own could possibly make an invasion stick.

Rhodesia versus Zambia and Tanzania, with the support in theory of other states removed from the immediate theater of hostilities, would be somewhat comparable to Israel in the recent war. The result would probably be the same, the quick thrust and the collapse of the African states.

In the case of South Africa, the situation would be still more similar and on a vast scale. There is something of the same mentality in Israel as in Rhodesia and South Africa: the same conviction of a justified presence; a solid and almost unanimous will to maintain positions and ward off outside interference.

This is accompanied by a far greater industrial capacity than Israel. In short, the recent war demonstrated that beneath the oceans of verbalism, the inflammatory speeches and the boasts of strength, there was precious little more than bluff and sham.

Unfortunately the deflation of these claims to easy victory on the part of the Arabs, leaves a hundred million people in frustration and humiliation.

The unfortunate thing has been that they were encouraged in political terms to seek for goals which were absolutely unattainable on the field of battle. This state of mind that war will solve the questions still prevails with reference to Rhodesia and South Africa. One wonders if the lesson of defeat will have repercussions as far as the Zambesi.

Peace: A Mandate From Mankind

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 10, 1967

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, following is an article which appeared in the Patriot Ledger, Quincy, Mass., on July 6, 1967, recommending a path to world peace. I commend this editorial to the attention of my colleagues for their consideration:

PEACE: A MANDATE FROM MANKIND

Pride, and the narrow interests of governments and their leaders, have made the establishment of a firm and equitable world peace impossible.

In today's world, governments and their leaders appear to place more importance on saving face and self-interest than on ensuring the survival and well-being of their citizens.

The result is that today's world hangs in a purgatory between war and peace.

Every nation hates war, but no nation, alone or in concert, seems willing to make the first step toward peace.

Because of the national self-interests of its members, the United Nations General Assembly has been unable to do anything constructive toward peace in the Middle East.

The General Assembly's failure is a mirror image of the Security Council's lack of agreement on how to bring about a settlement in an area that has endured three wars in the last two decades.

To its credit, the Security Council has secured a cease-fire between the Arab nations and Israel—a cease-fire, however, is not a peace. The Middle East is only one of the world's trouble spots where a cease-fire is standing duty for a full and honorable peace, as in Korea.

It is now time that nationally self-centered considerations be discarded and the welfare of mankind be taken up. It is now time that the egos of nations and their leaders be forgotten and that peace on this planet becomes the prime consideration.

Only if this is done can the United Nations fulfill its mandate from mankind: "to maintain international peace . . . (and) to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to peace."

The United Nations is a community responsibility. It places obligations upon all its members, great or small. Its burdens fall most heavily upon the powerful, to whom the whole world should be able to look for guidance.

Thus the U.N., and the people of the world, expect much more than they have been getting in the way of responsible international leadership from President Johnson of the United States, Premier Kosygin of the Soviet Union, President de Gaulle of France, and Prime Minister Harold Wilson of Great Britain. It is time these men carry out the task of statesmanship and place peace before national prestige.

In its most fundamental sense, the U.N. is an organization of the peoples of the world. Its General Assembly is the only place on earth where each nation, no matter how small, has an equal voice and an equal vote.

With this in mind, there follows a proposal for world peace. It requires that governments place statesmanship before politics, thoughtful consideration before fiery oratory. This proposal must be taken as one complete package, recognizing that many nations must forsake traditional positions in order to find peace for all.

WORLDWIDE

United Nations peace-keeping forces and observer teams shall not be withdrawn from any area without formal U.N. consent, after thorough deliberation.

Any attempt on the part of any nation to use force against United Nations personnel shall be considered aggression against all member states.

Freedom of innocent passage shall be guaranteed for vessels of all nations through all international waterways, including the Gulf of Aqaba, the Suez Canal, the Panama Canal, the Dardaneles Straits and the Bosporous Straits.

Communist China be offered United Nations membership under a two-China policy.

All U.N. members must sign and adhere to the nuclear test ban treaty.

Indian and Pakistan must accept a U.N.-directed settlement in their dispute over Kashmir and agree to respect each other's borders.

Agreements must be reached among U.N. members to halt all arms races.

A treaty prohibiting the spread of nuclear weapons must be concluded and signed by all U.N. member nations.

The U.N. shall guarantee and enforce these agreements. All members must agree to fulfill United Nations peacekeeping obligations, including payments of past and future financial assessments, and furnishing of personnal, equipment and services upon request. Nations refusing to meet such obligations shall lose the voting privileges of U.N. membership.

MIDDLE EAST

The Old City of Jerusalem shall be internationalized under U.N. auspices as a world religious shrine, open to people of all faiths and all nationalities.

Arab nations shall recognize Israel's existence as a sovereign state.

Israeli forces shall be completely withdrawn to boundaries existing before the outbreak of last month's war.

Arab military forces shall be prohibited from approaching within 20 miles of Israeli frontiers.

United Nations peace-keeping forces must be stationed—with adequate personnel, equipment and freedom of movement—on both sides of the Israeli-Arab frontiers and at Sharm el Sheikh, the fortress commanding the Strait of Tiran.

Israel and the Arab nations shall agree to respect each other's territorial integrity.

Palestinian Arab refguees shall be permanently resettled and assisted as part of an international economic and technical assistance program for the Middle East, administered by the United Nations and financed by mandatory assessments on all U.N. members. Oil-producing Middle East states shall contribute a percentage of their income from oil to this program.

VIETNAM

The United Nations must accept primary responsibility for ending the war in Vietnam. the Security Council shall be charged with the responsibility for ensuring a negotiated settlement, with the full cooperation of the Soviet Union and the United States.

To implement the negotiations, the United States must cease bombing North Vietnam.

In turn, the United Nations shall ensure that North Vietnam ceases infiltration of men and supplies into South Vietnam.

An immediate cease-fire shall take effect in South Vietnam, to be supervised by United Nations observer terms, as a prelude to a full and honorable peace.

WESTERN HEMISPHERE

Cuba and all other Western Hemispheric nations must agree to respect each other's sovereignty and territorial integrity.

Cuba shall rejoin the Organization of American States and participate in the Alliance for Progress with the guarantee that she shall refrain from "exporting revolution".

Cuba shall permit refugees to return to their nation, with full rights of citizenship and return of expropriated property or full and equitable payment for such property.

This proposal is not a complete listing of the answers to the world's problems; however, acted-upon favorably as a complete package it could be the first concrete step to world peace.

For too long, the issues of war and peace have been considered on a limited basis. Only a comprehensive approach, with true humility and conscientious desire, can fulfill mankind's mandate for a life of peace.

Therefore we propose that these suggestions be made the next order of business before the United Nations General Assembly. They should be proposed as a single resolution.

The most urgent problems the world faces today are not wars for national prestige waged on barren deserts or in steaming jungles. The world's greatest problems today are hunger, disease, illiteracy and poverty.

The answers for these four problems can never be found while the world's major powers are concerned with self-interest, while fighting may erupt at any time, anywhere on this globe. For these wars are terribly wasteful of the time, money, knowledge, and human resources needed to conquer today's greatest problems.

The technical capability to conquer hunger and disease exists; the "have-nations" of the world possess the financial resources to apply that technology. Likewise, the developed nations have the ability to eradicate illiteracy.

All that is needed to conquer hunger, disease and illiteracy is a redirection and coordination of resources now being wasted. Once hunger, disease and illiteracy are conquered, poverty will fall by the wayside.

Additional Boys' State Delegates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM V. ROTH, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 10, 1967

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, in the RECORD of June 19, 1967, I entered the names of delegates to Delaware Boys' State in Dover. Because of changes made in the original list of delegates, I insert into the RECORD the names of the following young men who participated in this fine program:

C. Todd Collins, Leonard Campbell, Joseph R. Breen, Jack Hayden, Peyton Lewis, James Kerrigan, Harry G. Temple, Robert Stowe, Jay Reynolds, and Connie Longshore.

Eating High on the U.N. Hog

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 10, 1967

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, in the Washington Post of Sunday, July 9, the inimitable columnist, Art Buchwald, does an excellent job of telling the story of that weird organization known as the United Nations.

Buchwald's literary gem needs no further comment. It follows:

EATING HIGH ON THE U.N. HOG

As the United Nations gets larger, its member countries are becoming smaller, and sometimes it's hard to recognize the name of a nation, much less to pronounce it. The other day I was in a restaurant in New York and I got to talking to a man who turned out to be the U.N. Ambassador from Boolah Boolah, a speck of land located somewhere between the Indian Ocean and the Antarctic.

"How many people in your country?" I asked him.

"I think about 2000," he said. "I haven't been home for some time. My brother is the Prime Minister and I'm the Ambassador to the United Nations. We tossed a coin for our jobs, and he lost."

"Then you like being Ambassador to the United Nations?"

"I adore it. The General Assembly is air conditioned, we get diplomatic immunity when it comes to parking and if you get tired of listening to the speeches you can always tune in a transistor radio. Everybody thinks you're listening to the translation of a speaker."

"If you're such a small country, where do you get your funds to entertain?"

"I don't have to do any entertaining. Everyone wants to entertain me. First the Russians take me to lunch, then the Americans take me to dinner, the Arabs have me over for shishkebab and I must say they don't serve a bad breakfast at the Israeli delegation. If you get a good debate like this one, you can eat for months without picking up a check.

"The trick, of course, is never to tell them how you're going to vote. If you aline yourself with one side or the other too early, you could starve to death."

"Then it's best to be neutral," I said.

"Absolutely, particularly because the French are always wooing neutral countries, and you know what kind of a feed they can put on."

"You've been entertained by the French?"

"Would you believe President de Gaulle sent me a can of foie gras from his own back yard?"

"People really make a fuss over you, then."

"Why not? My vote is as important as Great Britain's in the General Assembly, and as long as they don't know which way you're going to go, they have to cater to you."

"How do you finally decide which way you're going to vote?"

"I send a wire back home and ask them what we need. If they cable back that we need a dam, then I inform the Soviet bloc and the United States bloc and I let them bid on it. The highest bidder gets the job and my vote."

"The highest bidder?"

"Yes, whoever offers us the most money is given permission to build our dam."

"That's one way of getting a dam built," I said.

"This doesn't happen every day. We really get most of our aid during an emergency session of the General Assembly. You can't get a ton of wheat during a regular session, or, for that matter, a cup of coffee."

"I notice you're eating alone now. Does that mean that no one is taking you to dinner tonight?"

"Not exactly. I'm eating alone, but the bill is being sent to Red China. Although they're not a member of the U.N., they're so mad at the Soviet Union and the United States that they're trying to get me to abstain."

Rail Service Disturbing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 10, 1967

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I have long been an outspoken critic of the Post Office Department's announced policy to phase out RPO's. Nevertheless, the Post Office Department has continued this policy with the detrimental results on railroad passenger service that I have predicted. In support of my views, I submit the following article from the May 7 edition of the Omaha World Herald. The article follows:

RAIL SERVICE "DISTURBING"—SUBSTANTIAL CUTBACK CITED BY PETERSON

LINCOLN (AP).—Chairman Fred Peterson of the State Railway Commission said Saturday the Commission is concerned about a trend toward reduction of rail passenger and freight service in Nebraska.

He said a substantial cutback in passenger train service is a direct result of the United States Postoffice Department's decision to award mail contracts to truckers rather than railroads.

"We think it's a rather arbitrary attitude of the Department," said Mr. Peterson. "We're talking about many millions of dollars."

He also said the railroads' attempt to streamline freight service with the goal of handling only carload shipments has curtailed good freight service to small communities.

"I think this trend will continue," Mr. Peterson said.

Since 1960, more than 150 Nebraska communities have directly suffered a loss of rail passenger or freight service, records of the Railway Commission indicated.

During that period, 10 passenger trains have been discontinued and more than 170 miles of track have been abandoned, completely eliminating rail service to 20 towns with a total population of some eight thousand.

In addition, railroad stations have been closed in 36 communities, stations have been dualized in 30 others and custodians have been discontinued at 34 stations, according to Commission records.

Legislative Speaker Elvin Adamson of Valentine said discontinuance of two passenger trains in Western Nebraska is "setting a trend that could hurt us considerably."

BURLINGTON TRAINS

He referred to Burlington Railroad's discontinuance of passenger trains from Alliance to Billings, Mont.

Mr. Peterson said Burlington also plans to ask for authority to discontinue its passenger train between Lincoln and Chadron.

"Western Nebraska already is more or less isolated from a communications and transportation standpoint," said Senator Adamson, "and you can't take anything away from a small community without hurting it economically."

The Chairman of the Legislature's Public Works Committee, Senator C. W. Holmquist, of Oakland, criticized the railroads for deliberately trying to eliminate service to small communities.

"They have a long-range plan to cut out all less-profitable short service," said Senator Holmquist. "They claim they aren't doing any business in some of these towns, but they aren't getting the business because they don't offer good service."

Results of 1967 Questionnaire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE BUSH

OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 10, 1967

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, in May of this year, I sent a questionnaire on 10 important issues facing our Nation to all of the households in the Seventh Congressional District of Texas—221,000. I am happy to report that we received approximately 30,000 replies to this questionnaire, and today I am placing in the RECORD the opinions of my constituents.

The results speak for themselves. The vast majority of my constituents are not satisfied with the status quo. They would like to see constructive action by this Congress on almost every important issue. I respectfully request that all Members review this tabulation so that they, too, may have the benefit of the opinions of these interested citizens from the Seventh Congressional District of Harris County, Tex. The tabulation follows:

RESULTS OF 1967 GEORGE BUSH QUESTIONNAIRE

[Results in percent]

1. What should we do about Vietnam?

Total	100
Escalate military action by continuing bombing enemy airbases	66
Continue present course without negotiations	2
Continue present course with negotiations	22
Withdraw as soon as possible	10

2. What should we do about the administration's estimated deficit?

Total	100
Increase personal and corporate taxes to reduce deficit	6
Curtail domestic spending	62
Combination of these	21
No action required as long as gross national product increases	11

3. What should we do about the war on poverty?

Total	100
Increase expenditures	3
Reorganize program to make it more responsive to local needs	52
Eliminate program	45

4. What should we do about the draft?

Total	100
Eliminate all college deferments	27
Eliminate graduate school deferments only	28
Eliminate draft and make service careers attractive enough to attract volunteers	27
Retain present system	18

5. Should a tax credit be allowed parents of college students?

Yes	75
No	25

6. Should third-class mail rates be increased?

Yes	80
No	20

7. What should we do about relatives on congressional payrolls?

Total	100
Require Congressmen to disclose relatives	60
Make it illegal to have relatives on payroll	37
Take no action	3

8. What should we do about social security?

Total	100
Increase benefits 20 percent as recommended by President	17
Increase benefits 8 percent with no tax increase necessary	69
Increase benefits 50 percent but finance program through general revenues rather than social security taxes	14

9. What should we do about gun legislation?

Total	100
Strong bill requiring all citizens to register firearms	34
Strong bill providing tougher penalties for criminals	55
No additional laws required	11

10. What should we do about trade with communist countries?

Total	100
Increase all trade with Soviet-bloc nations	7
Increase trade of nonstrategic items only	36
Eliminate trade altogether	29
Defer trade talks until Vietnam war is terminated	28

Private First Class Pfiefer Wins Medal for Heroism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 10, 1967

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, a young soldier from Maryland, Pfc. Jan L. Pfiefer, has been awarded the Bronze Star Medal for heroism in Vietnam. I should like to commend Private Pfiefer's courage and his service to his country by including the following article in the RECORD.

PRIVATE FIRST-CLASS PFIEFER WINS MEDAL FOR HEROISM

Private 1st Class Jan L. Pfiefer, 22, of Baltimore County, has been awarded the Bronze Star Medal for heroism in Vietnam.

Pfiefer, son of Mr. and Mrs. Chris Pfiefer, 349 Darkhead Rd., Middle River, was cited for "devotion to duty, courage under fire, and initiative . . . in keeping with the highest traditions of the military service."

According to Col. Robert C. Shaw, acting chief of staff for the 27th Infantry Division, Pfiefer, who was serving as a radio-telephone operator on a pathfinder detachment near Duc Hoa, repeatedly exposed himself to intense enemy fire while directing loading operations and maintaining continuous radio contact with support forces.

Pfiefer is a graduate of Kenwood High School. He also was a winner in the Baltimore County wrestling championships, and listed in the Red Shield Hall of Fame at the Highlandtown Boys Club.

Flood Control for the Monongahela River

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 10, 1967

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, as was evidenced by the March 7 flood disaster in Pennsylvania and West Virginia, immediate action is required to control the Monongahela River and its tributaries in order to prevent future flooding in these States. Two dams, the Rowlesburg and Stonewall Jackson, and several reservoirs have been authorized by the Congress to help correct this situation. As of yet, however, few funds have been appropriated for them. I strongly urge the Congress to appropriate immediately the money necessary to construct these dams and reservoirs in order to avoid any further hardships to the people of these areas, and damage to their property.

In line with this, I commend the following resolution of the House of Representatives of Pennsylvania, passed in Harrisburg on April 11, 1967, to the attention of my colleagues. Quite obviously, this matter is of vital concern to the residents of the area involved, and to the Legislature of Pennsylvania:

RESOLUTION

(In the Pennsylvania House of Representatives, April 11, 1967)

Additional flood control dams are needed on the Monongahela River if major flooding similar to the disaster of March 7 is to be avoided.

The Rowlesburg and Stonewall Jackson Dams, both in West Virginia, are urgently needed to control watersheds along the Monongahela's tributaries. The Rowlesburg Dam would be of particular value in solving any floor danger in the immediate future. Both dams have been authorized by Congress, but little money has been appropriated. About one million dollars is needed to get the plans off the drawing boards and into construction.

In addition to the two West Virginia dams, reservoirs will have to be built at strategic locations on creeks flowing into the Monongahela; therefore be it

Resolved (the Senate concurring), That the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania memorialize the Congress of the United States to make the necessary appropriations to start construction of dams, particularly the Rowlesburg Dam to put into effect flood control on the Monongahela River; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the presiding officers of each House of the Congress of the United States and to each Senator and Representative from Pennsylvania in the Congress of the United States.

I hereby certify that the foregoing is an exact copy of a Resolution introduced in the House of Representatives by the Honorable Messrs. A. J. DeMedio, Russell J. Blair, James J. Manderino, Fred Taylor, Russell E. Headlee, John L. Brunner, Marion C. Klingensmith and Austin J. Murphy, and adopted by the House of Representatives the 11th day of April 1967.

KENNETH B. LEE,
Speaker.

Attest:

ADAM T. BOWER,
Chief Clerk.

Atterbury Job Corps Program Progressing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 10, 1967

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, the Indianapolis Star, one of Indiana's leading newspapers, has taken editorial note of the progress being made at the Camp Atterbury Job Corps Center, near Edinburg, Ind.

Such news stories as the one I wish to insert in the RECORD are filled with examples of success and predictions of more achievements in the future. Not too long ago, stories of success were something of an exception. Today, they are becoming the rule.

As pointed out in this excellent article, 85 corpsmen were graduated from the Camp Atterbury center 2 months ago. Most of them received skilled training. Their average starting salary was $1.83 an hour.

The program, which attempts to make "taxpayers of our youths who would otherwise be taxeaters," appears to be well on the way to reaching that goal at Camp Atterbury.

The article describing progress at Camp Atterbury follows:

WANTS YOUTH AS TAXPAYERS, NOT TAX-EATERS—ATTERBURY JOB CORPS PROGRAM PROGRESSING

(By Russ Leonard)

EDINBURG, IND.—Progress of the Job Corps program and its image with the public has progressed steadily since Westinghouse Management Services Inc. took over the operation of the Camp Atterbury Center a year ago June 1, center officials said yesterday.

The program which attempts to make "taxpayers out of youths who otherwise would be tax-eaters" had been branded as a colossal waste of money dealing with youths who would always be in trouble with the law.

For awhile it appeared the critics of the program had a point—corpsmen were being arrested for a variety of offenses, especially when they had weekend leaves in Indianapolis.

But now the program seems to be fulfilling its promise of preparing young men to enter society as productive citizens.

More than 1,500 of the youths, who range in age from 16 to 21, have been graduated into well-paying jobs. There have been 250 of them pass the General Educational Development tests.

The average youth here comes into the program with less than 10 years of schooling and a fourth-grade reading level. Nine of 10 never held a job and the tenth was working for 80 cents an hour.

One of every two comes from a family that is living on some form of public welfare.

Statistics here show that only 5 per cent of the Corpsmen have caused any trouble. Nationally, according to J. Edgar Hoover, chief of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the same age group causes 44 per cent of the crimes.

Since Atterbury opened its doors to corpsmen in April of 1965, only 1.6 per cent of the youths here have broken any law, either on the Center property or elsewhere. Ninety per cent of the offenses involved the misuses of alcohol.

Robert J. Hadden, director, said most of the misbehavior in the past was caused by youths who had just come into the program and hadn't been fully oriented by the time they got their first weekend away from the camp.

"They would go to Indianapolis," he said, "and in many of the cases we discovered they would get some 'wino' to buy them alcohol. The 'wino' would charge them the $5 or so they said.

"The kids later realized they had been 'burned' and their next trips, after settling into the program here, usually would be uneventful."

Haddon added that counseling now by some of the older hands here, who have become deeply involved in taking advantage of their opportunities, has helped the newcomers.

He also said that more college and high school students were arrested last March on Florida beaches than all corpsmen arrests in the history of the Atterbury Center.

Training here, in addition to GED, consists basically of vocational courses in electronics, food service, building service and automotive service. Primary emphasis is placed upon the development of basic skills required for entry-level occupations.

Each trainee proceeds at his own best pace in a series of short-term objectives so that he might experience several successes, something he has not been able to do in the past.

Instructors range from bus drivers to psychologists, carpenters, physicians, professional counselors and administrators, and businessmen. The staff numbers slightly more than 600.

The average corpsman is here seven months and the actual cost per individual has been pegged at about $3,000.

One young man trained here now is an employe in the office of Vice-President Hubert H. Humphrey.

Another is employed by the Westinghouse Defense and Space Center at Baltimore, Md., and travels throughout the country with its trouble-shooting team. He now is working on radar installations at the McDonnell plant in St. Louis and is paid $113 a week plus expenses.

Last April 85 corpsmen were graduated, most of them having completed skilled training. Their average starting salary was $1.83. Many of the graduates qualify for a high school equivalency certificate.

The trainees are paid $1 a day, most of which goes for cigarettes and snacks at the Center's recreation building.

Extra activities are on the agenda each night and officials here say that 98 per cent of the enrollment is active in such things as arts and crafts, a Civil Air Patrol squadron, scouting and drama, glee and Spanish Club meetings.

Westinghouse long has felt that private industry has a great deal to offer in developing a systems approach to education and training.

"We are happy with the results that have seen a prospective corpsman arrive with little else but the clothes on his back and leave well-oriented and a good-paying job waiting.

"Although we feel our program here is a good one, we are striving to make it better. There is much work yet to be done in learning the most effective way to demonstrate the value of self-discipline and good citizenship to young men whose lives have taught them other and harsher lessons.

"We firmly believe this task will pay dividends in the future for the entire nation," he concluded.

What My State Has To Offer the 1967 Traveler

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. S. JOHNNY WALKER

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 10, 1967

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, as you know, I rarely seek the privilege of making insertions into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

However, since my home State spends about $800,000 a year to promote tourism, I think it is incumbent upon me to call attention to the beauty to be seen and the pleasure to be had by visitors to the land of enchantment—New Mexico.

Mrs. Gloria Herigodt, of 12217 Pineridge Avenue NE., Albuquerque, was runner-up in a nationwide scholarship essay contest sponsored by the Lewis Hotel-Motel School Alumni Association.

Her essay reads as follows:

WHAT MY STATE HAS TO OFFER THE 1967 TRAVELER

(By Mrs. Gloria M. Herigodt, 12217 Pineridge Avenue NE., Albuquerque, N. Mex.)

New Mexico is one of the most beautiful and interesting States in the United States.

The scenery varies from large mesas to high mountains; desert areas to forests; and rivers and streams to absolute dryness.

Driving through the Sandia Mountains on Highway 66 just at sundown going West, the mountains open to the valley, making one feel as though one has opened a doorway to a room filled with gold. The sunset can be seen clear across the valley, and as the "gold dust" falls to the earth, a wonderful feeling of warmth fills your being.

Traveling through the dry areas where large craggy rock formations rise from several miles of flat surface land, gives one a marvelous feeling of adventure and the imagination seems to run wild. One can almost see the covered wagons winding their way through the strange vast area on their way west. The formations of the rocks take on appearances of ships, castles, animals, and anything else one might want to see.

In the mountains are many icy streams, tremendously large pines, and evergreens galore. There are wonderful lakes on which to camp and fish, and if one is in certain areas, one may find fossils of sea life on or near the top of these high mountains. Again the mind sees these vast dry areas completely covered by water thousands of years ago.

The "Old West" is full of the history of fascinating characters such as Billy the Kid, "Kit" Carson, Governor Bent, and many more. There are museums, and the homes of these men are kept intact for all to see, as well as Ghost Towns, where men onced mined for gold, and settled for coal, which soon was depleted.

Santa Fe, the capitol of New Mexico, is an old, arty town. The oldest Church and house in the United States are located here. This is where old traditions are carried on, and there are many museums.

The Indian Pueblos are quite fascinating. You may have to climb up the side of a mountain to see the "apartments" they were most creative to build. Others were built in the valleys near the water: a large circle of living quarters with an inner yard, in the center of which was a round building, called a Kiva, where their ceremonials and council meetings were held. The inside of the Kiva was also round, and the sides of the large room were raised to several floors, where their leaders climbed ladders to get to their living quarters.

The summers in New Mexico have warm days and cool nights; the winters are mild but cold. One can take a sunbath in a protected area almost 365 days a year.

The mountains get quite a bit of snow, so skiing and winter resorts are most popular.

My State has a great deal to offer the 1967 traveler.

Don't you agree?

Postal Problems and Salaries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 10, 1967

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, the need for the development of legislation to improve and advance the postal service and the working conditions and salaries of career postal employees is most urgent. On several occasions in the past, I have called attention to the inadequacies and inefficiencies of the postal service in the 13th Congressional District of Illinois. I have discussed these problems with postal employees who have repeatedly emphasized that the major obstacles to the improvement of postal service are the constant turnover of personnel and the difficulty of recruiting high-caliber employees, due to the level of salaries and the working conditions which, I have been told, are not conducive to high morale in many instances.

The Congress must find an acceptable and effective solution. Bills have been introduced, on which hearings have been held, to reclassify the levels of positions in the postal field service in an effort to attract qualified personnel to the service. I am hopeful that the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service will give particular attention to the problem of employee turnover and full consideration to the steps that have been proposed to meet this problem, including the reclassification of postal positions.

I would also urge once again that the concept of pay differentials, based on cost-of-living data, be thoroughly explored. What may be a fair wage in one section of the country may not be a fair or even a livable wage in another area. The Chicago metropolitan area, for example, is one of the highest cost-of-living areas in the country. Based on the 1959 comparison study of 20 cities, the latest such study conducted by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the Chicago area ranked with Seattle, Wash., as the most expensive section in the United States. There is no question but that postal employees in the Chicago area find it difficult to maintain a reasonable standard of living on their salaries.

Rapid and reliable postal service is a necessity, not a luxury, in a modern commercial society. It is past time for the Congress to take the initiative in seeing that the necessary steps are taken to assure that goal.

Johnson Political Remark Belies Pleas for Unity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 10, 1967

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

JOHNSON POLITICAL REMARK BELIES PLEAS FOR UNITY

Our embattled country, worried and prayerful, is forced to witness again and again the moral vacuum in President Johnson.

The President pleads for unity. He turns sanctimonious at the drop of a hat on anything from the Vietnam War to poverty. Then, typically, Mr. Johnson comes up with a crack like his TV outrage on July 1: "Generally speaking, the worst Democrat is better for the country than the best Republican."

Mr. Johnson himself is living in a glass house and should exercise great caution about throwing stones.

But the real significance of the President's latest lapse is that in our nation that so sorely needs unity, dedication and the spiritual balm of inspired leadership the President delivered another wrecker.

We are fighting a horrible war. Our men's casualties mount, our sacrifices multiply—on his say-so. When the President started to shove in our men by the hundreds of thousands, heavy Communist units stood 15 miles from Saigon. They are still there. Why?

Across a full five years the only answer Mr. Johnson has ever given amounts to: "Sorry, folks. Send more of your boys."

No wonder that everywhere I travel I find a feeling of confusion, anxiety and impatience.

If ever any nation fought a mismanaged war this is it. And if ever a President did exactly the things he swore not to do it's President Johnson. Do you remember how he pilloried those who predicted this while he was making his promises?

Yet, with a nonpartisan pitch in his voice as plaintive as a flute, Mr. Johnson pleads for national unity regardless of party, and calls for bipartisanship in Congress whenever he wishes.

He is surrounded by men who are mere echoes of his footfall and voice. They give him a thorough knowledge of the law and of methods of making a farce of it if advisable.

Keeping his own counsel to an astounding degree, he operates by executive orders that repeatedly sidestep the necessity of congressional approval.

No wonder worried millions are alarmed by his old habit of one-man rule, the twisted arm and the muzzle.

On a Monday Mr. Johnson tells us we never had it so good. On a Tuesday he speaks of our country as if it were a substandard orphanage, no matter how this sounds abroad.

His economic performance is 10 per cent economics and 90 per cent politics. Intent on his passage to the haven of re-election, he just goes on increasing the national debt.

Mr. Johnson's "credibility gap"? This is not only amazing. It's tragic. We may not believe in one man's infallibility, but we have a right to believe in a president's integrity.

Ambassador Arthur J. Goldberg even confessed to the U.N. General Assembly: "We have a great problem here maintaining our credibility with our own people." Until a more disgraceful confession comes along that one will do.

For this "credibility gap" at home and abroad Mr. Johnson has none to blame but himself. He has earned it and keeps on earning it nearly every day.

Worried millions—including this writer—would bend backward to support the President, at least in foreign affairs, and do so at every possible opportunity. Then he embarrasses the country by stooping to a level that makes support barely possible.

This latest case on July 1 is too outrageous to let slip into the obscurity of no comment. As our President fails to deserve respect, and the respect falls, so does the United States of America.

Fiesta Days in Montevideo, Minn.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 10, 1967

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, recently I had the honor of attending fiesta days in Montevideo, Minn.—in the heart of the Sixth Congressional District. Each year the city of Montevideo holds this remarkable fiesta to salute her sister city, Montevideo, Uruguay.

Mr. John L. Mills, editor of the Montevideo News-American and former mayor of the city, has written a review of the activities on June 24–25.

Mr. Speaker, I am inserting this account in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

THE 1967 FIESTA DAYS IN MONTEVIDEO, MINN.

Representatives of Uruguay and the United States exchanged sincere greetings of friendship June 24 and 25 in Montevideo, Minnesota, during the city's 22nd annual Fiesta Days salute to its sister city in Uruguay.

The celebration included parades, dances, a carnival midway, an air thrill show and the Fiesta Queen Pageant, but the highlights of the event were the expressions of good will exchanged at the International Ceremony—held near the statute of Jose Artigas in Artigas Plaza—and the Mayor's Reception.

Speaking on behalf of the Republic of Uruguay was Alfredo J. Platas, Minister of the Embassy of Uruguay in Washington, D.C., who was accompanied to the Fiesta City by his wife and daughter, Magela, 14.

Senor Platas told the Montevideans: "Not many days ago, the Latin American countries decided to meet in a most significant conference held at Punta del Este, Uruguay, to establish a common market that will improve the social and economic levels of all their countries. This multinational integration so anxiously sought to create closer ties between sister countries and offer equal opportunities for all in this enormous continent, is what you have achieved on a small scale.

"You have basically accomplished the objective that we should know each other better, exchanging knowledge in the social, cultural, and economic fields, and you have also accomplished the objective that this knowledge be transformed into a deep friendship.

"You may be sure that these Fiesta Days are fondly shared with you by all Uruguayans, and above all, by our Montevideans who would wish to accompany you and know this small city which remembers them so much!

"It is on their behalf and on behalf of Ambassador Juan Felipe Yriart, who deeply regrets not being present at this time due to pressing duties in Washington, that I wish to express my sincere congratulations for these Fiesta Days and the assurance of a growing friendship between people who feel and desire a better form of life."

Representing the U.S. Department of State was I. Lee Sanders, who read the following message from Vice President Hubert Humphrey: "President Johnson has asked me to convey his warm greetings on the occasion of the 1967 Montevideo Fiesta Days Celebration. Heartwarming is the word for this 22nd year of the traditional salute from our citizens of Montevideo, Minnesota, to the citizens of Montevideo, Uruguay. The Fiesta Days symbolize so well Minnesota's strong support of the Partners of the Alliance Program which means so much for an ever finer tomorrow for the hemisphere's peoples.

"As you will recall, earlier this year, President Johnson met with Presidents of our sister republics at Punta del Este, Uruguay. Their fruitful discussions were immeasurably aided by the people-to-people relationships developed over the years by your type of friendly sister city outreach.

"To my fellow Minnesotans, I say: May the 1967 Fiesta Days be the greatest ever. And may your splendid example be a further inspiration for inter-American good will and collaboration."

Congressman John Zwach of Minnesota's Sixth District said: "It is a signal honor to join with you in your happy Fiesta Days. It is especially pleasurable because of the spirit that pervades, the extending of the hand of friendship and love to our neighbor beyond our shores.

"It is this spirit of friendship and co-operation that is all too often lacking in today's tense, suspicious world. Today we extend a neighborly hand of friendship to our sister city in Uruguay.

"Much of the continent of South America is in the same phase of development that our country was a few short years ago. We say to our neighbors, have heart, have courage. Keep the dream bright. Never let it be tarnished by the faithless gods of materialism, by the promises of false prophets. Economic prosperity can live only with freedom and liberty. Individual, free-choice initiative is the path to the bright star.

"We have been given a priceless heritage. It has been paid for by the blood of countless generations. Let us guard it well. The future, not only of our twin continents, but the world itself, depends upon how close to our hearts we carry this treasure," Cong. Zwach concluded.

Mayor George Anderson pointed out that for half a century a deep feeling of good will and friendship has existed between Montevideo, Minnesota, and Montevideo, Uruguay. He urged closing of the communications gap between peoples of the world and called for better understanding between the Americas and all the countries of the world.

The first major event in an exchange program between Minnesota and Uruguay as part of the Partners of the Alliance program was an Uruguayuan art exhibition on Montevideo during the Fiesta celebration. Pottery, paintings, ceramics, bottles of wine, woolen goods, copper and leather work and many other items are included in the exposition of Uruguayan arts, crafts, and products. The Partners program, an offshoot of the Alliance for Progress, was started three years ago to link U.S. states with Latin American areas on a grass-roots people-to-people basis.

While the Alliance deals in million-dollar programs, the Partners are concerned with smaller but more personal projects. The most immediate project is the artisan and art exhibit, which features 100 years of Uruguayan painting and for many craftsmen will mark the first time their work has been outside the country. From Montevideo, the display went to Minneapolis.

Minister Platas and his family, and Mr. Sanders of the State Department left Montevideo several hours earlier than planned because of an invitation from Vice President Humphrey who invited them to visit with him at his Waverly, Minnesota home before they returned to Washington.

The celebration concluded Sunday night with the Fiesta Queen Pageant. Reigning Queen Anita Barsness placed the crown on the head of the new queen, Cathy Marienau, a brown-eyed, brown-haired beauty who graduated this spring from Montevideo High School.

Carmichael May Find His "Washington-Loo" in the District of Columbia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 10, 1967

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, with great fanfare the notorious militant anarchist, Stokely Carmichael, is arriving in Washington to attempt to create chaos among the residents of the Nation's Capital.

Carmichael attempts to create the impression that he and his fellow troublemakers actually represent the majority thinking of the American Negro. Therefore, I consider it especially timely that I insert at this point an editorial from the Saturday, July 1, South Surburban News, an independent publication serving the Negro communities of Chicago and its southern suburbs. The South Suburban News is known for its frank editorial comments and its editorial on Stokely Carmichael is an example of penetrating journalism.

The editorial follows:

CARMICHAEL MAY FIND HIS "WASHINGTON-LOO" IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Stokely Carmichael is going to Washington, D.C. and the nation's capital is in a sweat.

President Johnson has been informed that Washington could see its first summer of serious racial conflict. Pleading publicly, Vice President Hubert Humphrey asks for major doses of "preventative medicine before we are struck down by the disease of violence." Other leaders in Washington fear that Carmichael's brand of "black power" may provide the germ for an epidemic of trouble.

Washington is worried and for a good reason. Carmichael is threatening to declare "all out war" on the District of Columbia, the 69 square mile Federal city that, on the surface at least, would seem to offer natural opportunities for a black power movement.

Washington contains many ingredients that are associated with racial turmoil: dilapidated housing, segregated neighborhoods, high unemployment among Negro youngsters, poverty, bad police-ghetto relations, poor schools and limited welfare help. Moreover unlike other major cities, more Negroes than whites live in Washington; over 60% of the total population of 806,000 was Negro at the last count.

Yet the capital is marked differently than other major cities, in that it is not the threat of turmoil but the near unanimity with which local Negro leaders ranging from the very militant to the nonviolent, predict relative calm—Stokely Carmichael and the white anxiety notwithstanding. Their basic reason: Washington's Negro population seems less discontented than that of other cities.

All the Civil rights leaders in Washington have tried for years to get the Negroes roused to act but have failed. If they can't get Washington Negroes to move why should Carmichael? All these people could be wrong, certainly none believes Washington stands as a model for race relations or anti-poverty efforts. Each agrees that tensions are building and that police-ghetto relations—the trigger of explosions elsewhere—are as bad, if not worse, in Washington than in other cities. To the slum dweller in Washington, D.C., the police force is an "army of Occupation" staffed by "racist cops who hate Negroes." The spring was marred by several ugly incidents, and if they continue there's no predicting what may happen in the heat of July and August. But the present consensus is that the capital will suffer tension, perhaps some threats and rock throwing, but probably nothing worse. The reasoning is based on some unique qualities that that city has, and that is—its citizens are largely Negro.

As the Nation's capital, Washington has no elected mayor and no city council governs it; instead, there is a Presidentially appointed Board of Commissioners—and Congress. Anger needs a target, and in Washington the top target is both distant and awesome.

The President himself is the one who can exert the most powerful influence over the District's fate. Lady Bird buzzes around the city planting flowers and prettying up things. The Vice President dedicates swimming pools and exhorts local business to hire more Negroes.

In the set up of an ordinary city, slum residents can rally against the Mayor in hopes of compelling the Federal government to come to the rescue. In Washington there is no rescuer who isn't already on the scene. To the ghetto dweller the federal government is the best friend available. To go up against the Federal Government is something you don't decide to do lightly.

The slum dweller is aware that the White House is not about to tolerate embarrassment at its doorsteps; in Washington you not only have to deal with the police department and the National Guard, but Federal Troops.

Also to be kept in mind is the "don't bite the hand that feeds you" consideration. The capital is basically a one company town with the Federal Government the major employer. This being the situation in Washington, Carmichael may find his Washington-Loo sinking him forever.

Tribute to Oxie Reichler

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 10, 1967

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, Westchester County, N.Y., recently lost one of its leaders of journalism and civic affairs when Oxie Reichler retired as editor emeritus of the Herald Statesman in Yonkers.

It has been my privilege to know Oxie Reichler as an editor, a leader of his community, and as a warm, understanding human being. A recent editorial in the newspaper he directed for so many years best expresses my sentiments about him and I present it herewith for inclusion in the RECORD:

OXIE REICHLER, GENTLEMAN

When those who know Oxie Reichler best gathered recently to honor him as retiring editor emeritus of The Herald Statesman, they paid tribute to him as a "gentleman."

In his one-word accolade, the intimates of his newsroom, the colleagues who worked with him and under his direction, feel that they have summed up the man.

They could, and do, term him a great editor. They could, and do, acknowledge his zeal, his enterprise, his perseverance, his loyalty, his zest, his unparalleled devotion to the community served by his newspaper and his unswerving dedication to the principles of journalism.

They could, and do, extol his erudition, his mastery of the English language the tool with which he championed the causes of righteousness and justice and civic betterment in challenging editorial comment and in speeches and lectures both in Yonkers and all across the nation.

They could, and do, pay full tribute to his role as a husband, father and family man.

They could, and do, express their admiration for his professional status earned in 47 years of unremitting devotion to a difficult and demanding craft and of the accomplishments he has recorded during the 37 years he has served the city of Yonkers, 29 years as editor, noting as well his share in the common efforts of his sister newspapers thereby serving as well all the people of Westchester and Rockland Counties.

Oxie Reichler is no local phenomenon. He is a fountain of sage advice and sound judgment and it is without question that he has staunchly upheld the principles of honesty and integrity in the practice of journalism to such effect that this contribution has soared far beyond the borders of Yonkers and Westchester.

Oxie Reichler has been heard and heeded in state and national newspaper circles; he has been listened to in political and governmental sectors; and he has been cited as a respected spokesman for good government everywhere.

Oxie Reichler has earned a solid place in the annals of journalistic endeavor as an editor; he has been given a place in man's hearts and hopes as a gentleman.

The Delaware River Port Authority Log—A Special Report on the State of the American Merchant Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM V. ROTH, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 10, 1967

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, much has been written and said about the appalling and dangerous decline in the fortunes of our merchant marine since the end of World War II. Recently, an article appeared in the Delaware River Port Authority magazine, Log, which I commend to my colleagues' attention. Written by Mr. John J. Curtin, editor of the Log, the article sketches the history of America's maritime industry, and discusses the origins of the present crisis in our merchant marine. More importantly, it offers a critical analysis of current programs concerning the industry.

I need not point out the importance of the maritime industry to this Nation's security and prosperity. It seems to me, therefore, contradictory that while we are reaching out into space, to the moon and beyond, we are so short-sighted as to neglect our vital interests on the seas of this planet.

Mr. Speaker, we are pursuing a wide variety of important and worthwhile national programs, but, at the same time we suffer our merchant marine to deteriorate to a shameful state. And, all the while potential adversaries add to their fleets with alarming speed. The war in Vietnam has strained our maritime capability—we have been compelled to reactivate World War II vessels from the mothball fleet. The concept of effective control of U.S.-owned ships flying foreign flags has been brought into question. What would happen were another crisis in Korea, or in Europe, or some other far-flung place to demand our attention? Would we be able to meet the challenge?

The day may come when we awake—too late, perhaps—to find that unfriendly powers have gained the dominant position on the sealanes of the world. I hope that every Member will find the time to read Mr. Curtin's article, and to ponder the responsibility we here in Congress owe the Nation to take steps to remedy this situation. The article follows:

1. MERCHANT MARINE—AN IGNOMINIOUS POSITION

The U.S. merchant marine is sick.

And it's in danger of becoming a terminal case unless there is some agreement among all the various forces who are proposing a cure for its ills.

This vital national fleet of vessels which is the key to our international trade and the primary auxiliary force in our national defense structure has gone through a two-decade period of decline which has seen it sink from a ranking as the strongest maritime force in the world to a sixth-rate status.

And the decline is continuing at a time when the American involvement in Vietnam and booming world commerce are making increasing demands upon U.S. shipping capabilities.

The picture is bleak:

In 1966, U.S. shipping lines lost some 3.5 million tons of cargo, with a resulting decrease in net revenues of about $32 million.

Last year, U.S. ships were also unable to carry the mandatory 50 percent of government-sponsored exports of U.S. agricultural surpluses and did not carry their legal share of shipments financed by the Inter-American Development Bank.

In all, American ships carried less than eight percent of the nation's export-import shipments in 1966—against 57 percent 20 years ago. Although ocean-borne trade last year was almost three times that of two decades ago, U.S. shipping tonnage was only a third of its 1947 total.

Merchant ship deliveries from U.S. shipyards hit a ten-year low of 13 last year and well over 60 percent of the total U.S. fleet is beyond the 20-year age limit deemed acceptable.

How significant is this decline?

It could be a matter of life and death for our nation—and the Free World.

For example, of the 77 most strategic materials required to maintain our industrial and military might more than 60—such as iron ore, manganese, copper and rubber—are imported. And 96 percent of this tonnage is now being carried on foreign flag ships, vessels over which the U.S. has no control and which could be denied us at any time because of changing world political conditions.

And Soviet Russia—which has promised to "bury" the United States in economic competition—has built itself into one of the merchant shipping powers of the world in less than ten years. New ship deliveries to the Russian fleet have exceeded ours by a ratio of eight to one over recent years: the USSR has 395 ships presently on order or under construction, against 45 in this country. A five-year expansion program is scheduled to provide the Russians with a 15-million ton fleet by 1970.

Significantly, the Soviet Union's fleet today carries 75 percent of its foreign commerce.

Paul E. Atkinson, president of the Sun Shipbuilding and Dry Dock Company of Chester, Pa., has vividly envisioned the possible result of these different approaches by describing how the situation might look to an observer in ten years:

"By 1970, the Russians had about 40 percent more merchant ships on the high seas than did the United States. . . . The U.S. flag was rarely seen on vessels in any world port—and then only on the shabbiest of tramp ships. . . . In 1974, the vast majority of international trade was dependent upon the good will of communist shipping. . . . The year 1976 saw the oceans of the world filled with Russian and Chinese flags. Sea commerce under communist domination and control was no longer a mere threat, it was an accomplished fact. . . ."

The domination of the seas by any nation or group of nations could spell disaster for the largest trading nation in the history of the world, one which consumes more than half of the world's non-agricultural raw materials.

Everyone agrees that the U.S. merchant fleet is a valuable resource. . . .

"A seagoing transportation capability to meet the needs of United States exporters and importers at those rates which put them in a position to successfully compete with their foreign counterpars . . . is a key to the successful increase of our foreign trade," says Acting Maritime Administrator James W. Gulick.

And everyone agrees that our position has substantially deteriorated. . . .

"The United States, which emerged from World War II as the supreme maritime power, in terms of merchant ships, shipyards, skilled manpower—seagoing and shoreside has sunk to an ignominious position. From a fleet of some 5000 ships, totaling more than 50 million deadweight tons, nearly all of which were less than three years old, the American merchant marine has contracted to 1095 active vessels aggregating 14.8 million tons—four-fifths of which are 20 or more years of age," points out Shipbuilders Council of America President Edwin M. Hood.

What no one can agree on is exactly what to do about it.

2. MERCHANT MARINE—HISTORY OF A PROBLEM

Amazingly enough, this nation has a record of periodically squandering substantial maritime advantages.

The American fleet grew rapidly in the years following the Revolutionary War and blossomed into one of the great maritime forces after the War of 1812. It had almost achieved parity with the British at the time of the American Civil War—but that struggle was to mark the beginning of a half century of neglect and retrogression. The upheavals of the war and a stubborn reluctance to acknowledge that steam-powered vessels would replace the famed sailing clippers plunged the U. S. into a maritime "dark ages."

The chickens came home to roost in 1914. We had been content to let others carry our goods, but now war in Europe between the two greatest shipping nations in the world disrupted all normal trade patterns. Almost $3.5 billion had to be spent in a crash program which resulted in 2382 merchant ships of about nine million gross tons. New shipyards had to be built almost overnight (the most famous of these was at Hog Island on the Delaware River).

This hastily-built and relatively unplanned force was inadequate for the demands of peacetime service. Still, insufficient and uncoordinated government efforts and the stifling effects of the Depression resulted in a virtual maritime standstill until the mid-1930's.

Then came the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, the statute which still governs the industry today.

This act provides outright operating subsidies designed to meet the difference between American and foreign costs in operating ships on "essential" runs. The operating line must show that the service is in the national interest, maintain a specific number of sailings at regular intervals to particular ports regardless of the amount of cargo, use only American-built ships and replace them every 20 years and return to the government half of all earned profits over ten percent.

Government subsidies are also provided to cover a maximum differential of 55 percent (originally 50 percent) between U.S. and foreign shipbuilding costs. Additionally, foreign-built vessels are not eligible for operating subsidies, cannot trade between U.S. ports and cannot carry government cargoes for three years after their launchings.

Construction programs under the act began in 1937, with 500 new ships proposed to be built in the following decade. Within two years the United States was fighting the first two-ocean war in its history and the most impressive single shipbuilding effort of all time was under way: this building program jumped the U.S. fleet from 1,100 to 5,500 vessels by 1945. More than 2,300 of these were privately-owned merchant vessels.

Today there are but 955 privately-owned ships in the U.S. fleet, with an average age of 18 years and 60 percent of them over 20 years old. Even the subsidized fleet ships—304 of them—average 14 years. We have fewer merchant ships operating than we did prior to World War II, even including the almost 200 mothballed vessels dragged out of the reserve fleet for the Vietnam emergency.

What happened?

Sun Ship's Atkinson puts it this way: "The policy stated in the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 is not being carried out—and it never has been.

"The government and the various officials who have headed its maritime programs have never had a clear understanding of our problems and as a consequence we've become tied up in red tape and controls. We've ceased to be competitive.

"There has been a lack of sensible interplay among the parties involved—government, industry and labor. In particular, the fact that labor has become far stronger than management has led to extreme problems.

"Very simply, there has been a great deal of talk—and little action."

What has happened, over the past two decades, is that maritime considerations have been ignored, set aside, sacrificed for budgetary considerations and just generally allowed to flounder. Despite the lessons we learned in Korea and during the Suez crisis, the U.S. finds itself strapped for shipping capabilities for Vietnam support—and ships have carried 98 percent of all the materials delivered for the American war operation.

There are programs being offered which purport to solve these problems, of course, but these vary all the way from increasing the existing policies and supports to totally revamping them, and the points at issue range from the proper place of the Maritime Administration in the government to the actual value of the merchant marine to the nation.

And the rifts seem to be widening.

3. MERCHANT MARINE—BLUEPRINTS FOR TOMORROW

The key to the future of the U.S. maritime industry is of necessity the programs offered by the government.

The Maritime Administration budget for fiscal 1968 is $372,967,000. Of that total, $200 million is for operating subsidies to be paid to 14 companies operating about one-third of the U.S. privately-owned fleet. Approximately 83 percent of that sum will be utilized for wages, since the big difference between U.S. costs and those of foreign shippers is in the standard of living of ship crews.

Ship construction subsidies take up another $143 million of the total, enough for 13 new commitments at current prices.

An indeterminate sum of money—one which some observers claim tops the subsidy expenditures—is used to support U.S. maritime interests in the form of payments of the difference between the American ship rate and the world market rate on "cargo preference" shipments. Under the cargo preference system, stated percentages of cargo financed by the government are reserved by law for American ships—a form of indirect subsidy to the tramp fleet which makes up most of the U.S. merchant marine.

These are the prime government support policies under the 1936 law which various groups want to increase, change or eliminate.

Another aspect of government policy is based upon a concept which is as old as the shipping industry itself, "flags of convenience." There are close to 500 ships owned by U.S. companies but registered under foreign flags to avoid American operating costs. In recent years the Defense Department has developed the theory of "effective control," claiming that these foreign-registered ships under American ownership would be available to us in an emergency and should be considered part of our national defense capability, thus minimizing the effects of the U.S. fleet's deterioration.

This theory is blisteringly attacked by many maritime interests, who are quick to point out incidents last year when foreign crews refused to take U.S. cargoes to Vietnam. Joseph Curran, president of the National Maritime Union, is particularly outspoken on this point:

" 'Effective control' is not something that was decided by Congress. It is not even a formally defined policy of government. It is only a theory—a raw, untested and highly explosive theory—on which our basic maritime defense policy is supposed to rest."

Although "effective control" was a pseudo-policy in Washington long before he arrived on the scene, Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara generally gets the industry's blame for the concept.

Perhaps the most unified and vocal opposition to defense programs has come to the tentative proposal for a five-year program which would spend $250 million per year on the rehabilitation of World War II victory ships from the reserve fleet. "That is the single most ridiculous thing I ever heard of," snorts Sun president Atkinson. "They say it would be more economical—more economical than what?"

Most maritime interests also oppose the Defense Department's fast deployment logistic (FDL) cargo ship program. It would involve the expenditure of $2 billion for 30 new fast ships which would be kept at sea, loaded with equipment, troops and supplies, and be ready for dispatch anywhere in the world at a moment's notice. Shipbuilders and unions would rather see the money spent on conventional merchant marine construction.

McNamara, for his part, has sharply criticized subsidized fleet operators for not making more ships available to the Vietnam effort and noted rather pointedly that both costs and construction times in the U.S. shipbuilding industry are double those elsewhere.

All of these controversies, however, will undoubtedly fade into insignificance in the wake of those that should develop in coming months as the Administration unveils its new maritime program.

The Administration wants to move the Maritime Administration from the Commerce Department to the new Transportation Department, change the operating subsidy structure, ease cargo preference laws and permit some foreign ship construction.

It can probably get industry and union groups to go along with the first proposal (although many would like to see a separate Federal Maritime Administration—close to 100 bills proposing the establishment of an independent agency have been introduced into Congress this year) and the second (particularly if it involves some extension of operating subsidies to additional operators).

Elimination of cargo preference laws would be fought bitterly, but a new plan which allowed foreign vessels to bid on government shipments and retain first refusal for U.S. ships—providing their rates were within a specified percentage of the foreign bids—might stand a chance.

But the shipbuilding issue is a bomb just waiting to explode.

Any proposal to allow foreign shipbuilding will be strongly opposed by the shipbuilders, construction unions and many ship operators (mostly unsubsidized, since it is with the tramp fleet that foreign-constructed vessels would primarily compete).

The rationale behind such a suggestion is the charge that American costs are twice those abroad. But American builders don't agree with that statistic.

"While our costs are higher than they should be," says Sun's Atkinson, "they're not as high as some people would have you believe. First of all, there's no basis for comparison—no foreign yard has ever had to build to strict U.S. specifications or deal with all the red tape and problems we do here. I would estimate that at best foreign costs would work out to be about 70 percent of ours—and they'd be a lot closer if we had a freer hand."

The Shipbuilders Council's Hood has suggested that "production-oriented construction of austere ships of standardized design would potentially reduce shipbuilding costs about 20 to 30 percent with a corresponding reduction of 35 to 55 percent in the construction differential subsidy." (Hood feels that the entire subsidy program could be cut in half by also reducing the size of crews by one-half through the installation of automated shipboard equipment and improving cargo handling and loading operations.)

The standardization of ship design has been advocated by shipbuilding spokesmen for years—"There is no need for anyone to have to specify in detail the kind of ventilation blower or protective paint he wants," says Atkinson—and there is some feeling that the FDL program, if approved by Congress, would spur this kind of approach, since bidders for the contract are major aerospace firms rather than traditional shipbuilders and more attuned to modern, volume production.

There has also been talk that new Navy purchasing programs will leave much of ship design to the yards themselves and be commitments to multi-purchases of identical ships.

The tentative Government program—which has not been publicly acknowledged by Transportation Secretary Alan S. Boyd—has split the ranks of industry and labor. Organizations such as the American Merchant Marine Institute, the Committee of American Steamship Lines and the American Maritime Union support it (some with reservations); others like the Shipbuilders Council, American Maritime Association and Seafarers International Union oppose it.

It is a complex picture and the resolution of differences and programs may be a while in coming.

"I think it will be another year or more before things settle down into some sort of firm policy everyone can agree on," says Atkinson.

4. MERCHANT MARINE—A TIME FOR ACTION

The maritime industry is not all that different. Other major U.S. industries enjoy the benefit of subsidies in one form or another—the railroads and the airlines come immediately to mind—and the nation's tariff policy is a protective shield for many major industries.

The big difference is that the maritime industry must compete directly, must go out and sell its services and products in the world market while paying American prices and American wages.

This is not the sole source of its ills, of course. The lack of a clear national policy, emphasis on the industry's standby military status at the expense of its proper function in the economic life of the nation (which, paradoxically, has still left it sorely pressed in the current situation), the growing U.S. investment in ships flying foreign flags and other such factors have all helped bring us to the present point.

What will develop out of current efforts to revitalize the industry is still uncertain, but certain conclusions and considerations seem fairly evident.

A healthy merchant marine is vital to the future of our nation. "The value and necessity—commercial and otherwise—of our merchant marine is too evident to those who know its vital importance for any of us to accept the idea that it ever can or will be allowed to sink into oblivion," says Acting Administrator Gulick.

Although it undoubtedly needs revamping, the government's program of maritime support will continue to be necessary for the survival of the merchant marine. "Our maritime industry exists because of Federal Government programs and regulations," states Edwin Hood. "Should the various maritime programs be eliminated . . . there would be no material maritime industry since a world market confrontation solely on the basis of our wage rates versus foreign rates would invoke a competitive contest we have little chance of winning."

It would seem that the best approach to the subsidy problem would be to consider ship operation and ship building as separate industries, as has been suggested by some observers. The present structure often seems to stifle rather than encourage and is, in a sense, self-defeating. It is obviously detrimental to the cause of creating a strong and modern merchant fleet to have built-in restrictions upon ship replacement keyed to available building subsidies.

It might be that the best answer to shipbuilding problems is to aid the industry in forms other than subsidies—in fact, some industry spokesmen indicate a preference for other approaches.

"Our problems are the same as those of any industry," says Sun's Atkinson. "To make a good product that people will buy and do it at a reasonable cost. Government handouts are never the answer—what we need is the freedom to be creative, to take advantage of new technology, to operate our business without endless controls and regulations. We must have a climate in which there is an incentive to be competitive—and I mean competitive on a world-wide basis."

Perhaps the future course of American support for its shipbuilding capability might be similar to that taken in Japan, where the industry gets special tax breaks, banking terms and prices on key materials. It is worth noting that Japan constructed 47 percent of the world's shipping tonnage last year.

Even with repair work and Navy assignments (which, along with shipbuilding revenues, brought U.S. industry billings to the highest in the world last year), our nation's 18 major private shipyards have space available for the construction of 50 ships annually. Yet, although our replacement program is generally agreed to be some 100 ships in arrears, we have been averaging only a dozen new constructions a year. So there is ample potential to be tapped, and the solution could have tremendous impact on all areas of the economy: more than half the ship contract price goes for the purchase of materials—about one percent of national steel output, for example, is consumed by shipbuilders.

Additionally, there is going to have to be greater productivity, both on board ships and in the shipyards, which means close cooperation between management and labor and the acceptance of some automated procedures.

There will have to be extensive research and development to insure the most modern shipping fleet available. In this regard, Senator Warren G. Magnuson last month urged the government to "end the stepchild status of the merchant marine in this country" and called for the construction of a fleet of nuclear-powered ships. Certainly the nation cannot afford to make the same mistake with nuclear power that it did with steam.

There must be an understanding of the merchant marine as an economic force important to the nation. "On both exports and imports . . . the U.S. balance of payments position is improved by $300 for every $1000 of ocean transportation shifted from a foreign flag ship to a U.S. flag ship," notes Acting Secretary of Commerce Alexander B. Trowbridge.

There must be a realization that saying the United States should have a strong maritime industry is not enough. That industry must be efficient, competitive and capable if it is to survive; it must serve the shipper, not plead for his support merely on the grounds of national origin.

In the end, perhaps the most important consideration of all has been articulated by Maritime Administrator Gulick: "In this day of modern marketing concepts, the sea coasts begin and end not at the ocean's edge, but at the loading platforms of the exporter and importer." In other words, there must be a recognition of the total picture, a realization that maritime facilities must be considered in terms of a unified transportation system.

And with it all, of course, it is imperative that skilled, capable administrators guide and direct federal policies.

Seen in the proper perspective, there is even a bright side to the dilemma. Atkinson has put it succinctly: "The thing to remember is not that we're carrying less than ten percent of our international cargo, but that there is 90 percent of that cargo still available for us to capture. We have tremendous potential for growth."

That's good, healthy American optimism. Now it needs some good, healthy American legislation to back it up.

French Opposition to De Gaulle's Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 10, 1967

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, following is an article by Flora Lewis, the Philadelphia Bulletin's correspondent in Paris, entitled "French Cabinet Split." It is a very revealing article and covers the entire French question in depth.

It is apparent Miss Lewis has found from talking to most any Frenchman that the policies of De Gaulle generally have not been approved by the overwhelming wave of French public opinion. I recommend a careful reading of this article by Flora Lewis to my colleagues:

French Cabinet Split—Ministers Buck De Gaulle on Israel

(By Flora Lewis)

Paris.—By a count which cabinet ministers have leaked personally, there are no more than four of the 28 members of President De Gaulle's government not opposed to his stand on Israel and the Middle East. At least half a dozen ministers have talked privately of resigning on the issue. Defense Minister Pierre Messmer did, taking it back only at the last minute.

Prime Minister Georges Pompidou, formerly a director of the Rothschild Bank, had what are described as "angry words" with De Gaulle. As a result his current trip to Russia was nearly cancelled. It was reinstated only so as not to offend the Russians, and Pompidou was told that from now on he is to keep strictly out of foreign affairs and mind his fragile parliamentary majority.

These facts are fairly widely known in Paris. It is a measure of how much De Gaulle's recent policies are resented among his own supporters that normally discreet officials are talking openly, and bitterly, about them.

BEFORE GLASSBORO

Nor do some in a position to know as much as anyone can about the president's mind hesitate to say that the purpose of his latest move was to harden the Russians against any agreements with the United States.

The following details are cited as indications that De Gaulle hoped to prevent the Kosygin-Johnson meeting which he had called impossible just before Glassboro. Having failed, he is said to be concentrating on trying to prevent results.

Foreign Minister Maurice Couve de Murville flew to New York on a Sunday for the opening of the United Nations Assembly with a speech approved in detail by the president. Then word came of the scheduled Glassboro summit. On the Wednesday, De Gaulle read a mimeographed statement to the cabinet condemning Israel as aggressor and blaming America's Vietnam war for the Middle East crisis.

"Gentlemen, I will read you a statement," De Gaulle said. "There will be no discussion." And the meeting was adjourned when he finished.

WAN ASSUMPTION

Couve's speech had to be returned to Paris for corrections. Not only were harsher points inserted to conform to de Gaulle's new line, but some sentences considered too pleasant for Israel were crossed out.

After Glassboro, the French ambassador in Washington, Charles Luset, was told not to bother asking the Americans what happened at the summit. It could have amounted to anything, he was advised, and, anyway, de Gaulle would hear about it from Kosygin during the Russian's Paris stopover on the way home. This violated not only the wan assumption of relations between allies but the elementary diplomatic practice of asking both sides.

Once again, de Gaulle is handling the affairs entirely personally and with little effort to disguise a sense of personal peeve.

A Gaullist parliamentary leader challenged him on the anti-Israeli policy.

De Gaulle replied, "I told them (the Israelis) not to make war. They didn't listen. I hold it against them."

EMBARGO ORDER

It was no accident that there was a clear-cut difference in the acknowledgement of messages from Tunisia's Bourguiba and Algeria's Boumedienne shortly after the war. To Bourguiba, who is a moderate, de Gaulle sent merely cool thanks for praise of the French position. To pro-Soviet Boumedienne, who refused to recognize the cease-fires and called for renewed Arab attacks, de Gaulle said warmly that "we agree on all fundamentals."

De Gaulle's office has tightened the embargo on French arms to Israel. Despite the original embargo order, these were continuing to flow out, sometimes via Holland or Belgium or Switzerland, because shocked French used every loophole to defy it.

The added pressure by de Gaulle brought Messmer to the breaking point. Foreign purchasers have paid a large part of the French armament industry's research and development costs. Military aircraft production depends on exports. Countries outside the Middle East have told Paris they must reconsider orders if the arms embargo on Israel means they will be cut off from replacements should they do something de Gaulle dislikes. As a result the whole military production program may be threatened.

Nobody has resigned so far. Messmer may yet if the Israel embargo is not lifted in a few weeks. But whatever happens, de Gaulle now represents a small minority inside his own administration on Middle East policy. It does not strengthen him.

Our Textile Industry Needs Help

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 10, 1967

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Elizabethton Star of Elizabethton, Tenn., printed an editorial on the present serious situation in which our textile industry is involved.

I am inserting this article in the Record in order to again call to the attention of my colleagues the great need for immediate action to alleviate the hardships that textile imports are inflicting on our textile industry and all its employees.

We have discussed this matter on the floor of this House. We have contacted the economic advisers of the President. We must continue to do everything in our power to assist our textile industry in their hour of need.

I call on the President and my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join me in working for a solution that will save our textile industry.

Mr. Speaker, the editorial from the Elizabethton Star is as follows:

A Government of the People, by the People, for the People

When any administration forgets the "for," overlooks the "by" and fails to respond to the critical needs of over 2,000,000 U.S. citizens when government funds are not in question, we pose the question—why?

Specifically, we are talking about a situation very close to East Tennesseans and hundreds of thousands more whose futures are so linked with textiles and fibers.

Many people here are aware of the efforts thousands made to call the import situation to the attention of congressional representatives and the President during the P.O.I. campaign. The severe blows the virtually uncontrolled flow of imported goods have dealt American jobs and American industry have been adequately explained.

The message was taken to Washington personally by an Elizabethton delegation, not to mention the pleas of Congressmen, Textile leaders and other knowledgeable persons across the U.S. The warm reception given to the 40,000 P.O.I. letters by Senators Gore and Baker and Representative James Quillen showed Congress is concerned. Many hoped for presidential action—the quickest and most effective way to combat a problem which has slashed deeply into the employment of people and profits of companies here and in other fiber producing areas.

Instead of receiving the news that President Johnson had ordered a quota placed on imports or that tariffs on such goods had been raised (to help slow the flow), we read that the four-year long "Kennedy Round" dealt the people and the textile industry another devasting blow. Unbelievably, tariffs on imported man-made fibers were reduced by as much as 50 per cent!

When a government sincerely keeps in mind that it functions "for" all the people and has an obligation to protect their interests and safeguard their freedom to earn a living without depending on government aid, it does not deliberately turn a deaf ear.

Tennessee voted Republican in the last presidential election. It seems that the present administration is following a course which would insure a repeat of this performance.

Can the President simply "write off" Tennessee, South Carolina, North Carolina, Maine and other important textile states. He knows the results of 1964. By taking some action on the textile import problem, he would go a long way toward gathering support in 1968.

Maybe he doesn't feel the need of support from 2,000,000 textile employes whose jobs may depend on his actions.

Hawaiian Doctors Provide Outstanding Cooperation in Medicare Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 10, 1967

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, Honolulu Advertiser staff writer, Harold Hostetler, has written an excellent article spotlighting the reasons for the expeditious processing of claims in Hawaii under the 1-year-old medicare program, and—contrary to what might be expected—most of the praise for this success goes to Hawaii's doctors.

The head of Aetna's medicare claim administration office in Hawaii, Mr. Jon Staggs, who supervises the handling of an average of 8,000 claims a month under the program's part B, dealing with doctor care, stated in a recent interview with Mr. Hostetler that doctors in the island State have been unusually cooperative in connection with the processing of medicare claims in Hawaii.

In describing this cooperation which has contributed so significantly to the success of medicare, Mr. Staggs said that "Hawaii's doctors seem to have more concern for their patient's welfare." This assessment was concurred in by Mr. Edward Pare, who supervises the processing of claims for hospitalization benefits, through the Hawaii Medical Service Association, for part A of the medicare program.

I believe my colleagues will find of great interest this extension of the doctor-patient relationship in Hawaii and how it augments the effectiveness of the medicare program in the island State. I am, therefore, pleased to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the article, "Island Physicians Win Praise for Cooperation in Medicare," as it appeared in the June 18, 1967, issue of the Sunday Star-Bulletin & Advertiser:

ISLAND PHYSICIANS WIN PRAISE FOR COOPERATION IN MEDICARE

(By Harold Hostetler)

Hawaii's doctors have been given some unexpected praise. It comes from a man who handles some 8,000 Medicare claims during an average month.

The man is Jon Staggs, head of the Medicare Claim Administration office at Aetna Life & Casualty. He supervises payment of claims under Part B of Medicare, which deals with doctor care.

Doctors nationwide fought for years against a Government health insurance program for retired persons. The fight was headed by the American Medical Assn., whose local chapter is the Hawaii Medical Assn.

The doctors threatened to have nothing to do with Medicare once it became a reality. They said they would bill their patients direct and let the patients worry about collecting from Medicare.

Well, Medicare is almost a year old now. It began last July 1. But the doctors seem to have mellowed in their attitude toward Medicare as it concerns the doctor-patient relationship.

Nationally there have been many problems created by just that attitude. Elderly patients have had to mortgage homes and take out high-interest loans to pay off doctors, then wait perhaps months to collect from Medicare.

This problem has not been true in Hawaii, however, according to Staggs.

"There has been no problem locally of a lack of doctor cooperation," Staggs told The Advertiser. He said that, although doctors here had been no more receptive to Medicare than those anywhere else, "Hawaii's doctors seem to have more concern for their patients' welfare."

Staggs pulled a folder from a stack on his cluttered desk in the Dillingham Transportation Building on Bishop St. It included a doctor bill for $1,455, and the doctor had agreed to "assignment," or direct payment from Medicare.

"This particular doctor does not normally accept assignments," Staggs explained. "But in this case he was apparently concerned enough about the patient to bill us direct.

"If a patient can afford to pay the bill, doctors prefer to bill them direct," he added.

He also noted that the claim was received on a Wednesday and was paid on Friday, only two days later. He explained that the average processing time for "clean" claims is seven days here. It takes 50 days in Iowa and 35 in Maryland.

However, when troublesome claims are included, the average goes up to 14 days locally. This includes claims that have to be sent back to the patient because of insufficient information.

But even in Hawaii, there can be problems here. He pulled out one folder that has gone unpaid for nearly two months.

"The patient sent us a receipt that said only, 'Medical services, $56.' We received it April 18," Staggs said. He explained that Medicare requires itemized doctor charges.

The claim went back to the patient the next day, was returned to Medicare April 28 with a more complete form, but still no itemized doctor bill, which would include the number of visits.

"We sent a letter to the doctor requesting the information, and on May 28 sent him a second letter," Staggs said. "We still haven't heard from him, and we can't pay the claim until we do."

Staggs advised patients to get complete itemized bills when they pay the doctor direct. He said, however, that the problem is lessening here.

Staggs' office processed more than 32,000 claims during the first four months this year. Five per cent of them had to go back for additional information, and 1 per cent were problem cases.

He referred to a chart that showed the office had received 1,965 claims last week, and 1,461 were still waiting to be processed. "You can see, we're running about five days behind," he said. Part of the trouble stemmed from teletype garbling in communications between the local office and the Medicare computer center in Baltimore.

"When we receive a claim, we have to query Baltimore," Staggs explained. "This is for eligibility, deductible status, and so on. The turn-around time is about three days."

Staggs said the biggest problem is communicating with the public. Many Medicare beneficiaries do not understand the way the health plan works and that they must pay the first $50 of doctor bills each calendar year, plus 20 per cent of the remaining bills.

If the doctor chooses to bill the patient direct, the patient must pay the whole bill, then send in his receipt with his claim to the Medicare office. Problems have arisen when patients paid only the deductible plus the 20 per cent, then sent the remainder of the bill to Medicare.

If the doctor accepts assignment, he bills Medicare direct, and they figure out the deductible and 20 per cent. They pay what's left and let the doctor settle the unpaid portion with the patient.

Of last week's 1,965 claims, 782 doctors accepted assignment and another 432 were paid through hospitals. The remaining 751 billed their patients direct, and the patients had to worry about collecting from Medicare.

"Like any new program, there have been some problems," Staggs said, summing up his office's situation. "But in the first year that Medicare has been effective, most of us can say with a great deal of surprise that it has been easier than we anticipated."

Staggs' assessment was echoed by Edward Pare, who handles the processing of claims through the Hawaii Medical Service Assn. for Part A of Medicare, or the hospitalization benefits.

"We normally process in about five days," Pare said. "But our payments go out only on the 4th, 14th and 24th of each month. So if a claim comes in on the 4th, the payment won't go out until the 14th."

Pare processed 17,629 claims up to the end of May. Of those, 15,925 have been paid. Many have not because the $40 deductible had not been exceeded. This is usually for outpatient care.

"One of our biggest problems is people who have stayed in a Mainland hospital first," Pare said. "We have to get information on that hospitalization, and sometimes it takes five to seven days to get an answer to our queries."

Rural Electrification in the Public Interest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 26, 1967

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, Norman M. Clapp, Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration, recently addressed the Western Conference of Public Service Commissions at Lake Tahoe, Nev. It is a talk that should be of interest to the power industry of America and to all of us who want to see electric service in rural America as good and as reasonable as that in urban America.

Mr. Clapp calls the rural electric systems an integral part of the overall picture of nationwide electrification, and he declares that it is in the public interest that the rural systems be accorded such recognition as the industry makes plans for the future.

The REA Administrator says that good low-cost electric service is vital to the life and economic development of rural areas. He points out that the needs of these systems and the areas they serve are parts of the needs of the Nation. Electricity, he says, is just as vital to rural life and development as it is to urban communities.

Because of the great interest I think Members of the Congress will find in this most important address, I insert the full text in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION IN THE BIG PICTURE

Public interest must be the password at a gathering such as this. It is the common denominator of our respective roles in the electrical industry. As public utility commissioners the public interest is your special responsibility. As Admnistrator of the Rural Electrification Administration it is also mine. And to all who are engaged in a business as vital as electrical service, the public interest is a consideration which must be constantly kept in mind and respected in return for the privilege of serving.

So it is in the name of the public interest I speak to you today on the place of rural electrification in the "Big Picture."

And the "Big Picture" of the electrical industry as it is now rapidly developing is an exciting one of rapid growth, far-reaching technological change, and a consequent emphasis on large-scale facilities which are bound to have equally far-reaching effects upon the organizational and operational relationships of the industry.

Today electricity constitutes about one-quarter of the total energy used in the United States. This is double its proportionate share of the energy market 25 years ago. Not counting the volume of various fuels used in generating the electricity, electrical energy probably ranks second in use only to petroleum.

The Nation's electric power bill in 1966 was $16.2 billion.

To meet this growing demand, to measure up to this vital national need, significant changes are taking place in the industry.

In generation, two trends are developing: to large or giant-scale units and to low, low fuel cost. The day of the 1 million kilowatt unit has arrived. And this mammoth is not limited to a fossil-fuel diet; it can go nuclear. Just a few years back, the move of big generation was to mine-field plants; now there is the promise of savings from large units located close to the load centers, using nuclear fuel. But whichever way it goes, the move is definitely now to much greater size because of the economies it affords.

The scale of practical transmission of electrical energy also is bounding upward, bringing substantial economies and opening the way to the transmission of large blocks of power for long distances. Here in the West, you are moving forward in the first large-scale application of extra high voltage (EHV) and direct current transmission in this country, the $700 million Pacific Northwest—Southwest intertie. For approximately two and one-half times the investment in 230-kv construction, a 700-kv line will carry thirteen and one-half times as much power. And the higher voltages permit transmission over greater distances.

These are the major factors shaping the "Big Picture" of the electrical industry for the future. Big demand can now be met better and cheaper by big production from giant units. Big transmission and nuclear development have made this possible by facilitating the gathering of load demands over a greater area to justify larger-scale units on the one hand, and on the other hand by providing a competitive fuel which can be easily transported into the heavy load centers.

The National Power Survey of the Federal Power Commission points to the possibility of annual savings of as much as $11 billion in the industry by 1980 from anticipated growth of demand and advanced technology.

Under the impetus of the economies thus possible, as well as the tremendous investments involved, the industry is moving toward greater coordinated and joint ventures. Planning can no longer be limited to mere system planning. It is becoming regional and even inter-regional in nature. Power pools are moving toward super-pools. The old lines of demarcation between public and private systems, and between consumer and investor-owned, are already yielding to the necessity for joint effort to take advantage of scale and at the same time conserve investment.

This is the "Big Picture." Now where does rural electrification fit in it?

We talk about this enterprise in which the Rural Electrification Administration and its 992 active borrowers are joined as "rural" electrification because of the very special problems confronting those who pioneer in bringing central station electric service to rural areas. But the plain fact is that this important program is a part of nationwide electrification. Good low-cost electric service is vital to the life and economic development of rural areas. The needs of these systems and the areas they serve are part of the needs of the Nation. The resources they represent, both present and potential, are important to the full achievement of the maximum potential of the Nation and its people.

It may not be fully realized yet, but the stake of urban America in the development of rural America is growing and will continue to grow as the Nation grows. It will continue to grow because rural America has become increasingly important to urban America as a source of food and natural resources, as a market, and as an escape from many of the problems created by crowding too many people into too little space.

And electricity is just as vital to rural life and development as it is to urban communities.

So without belaboring the obvious we can start from the premise that the public interest will require electrical service for the rural areas of the Nation as good and as economical as the industry can provide in the more densely populated urban areas.

But, as all of us here know so well, there are practical problems in achieving this objective.

There are first of all the basic cost handicaps of the rural distribution systems.

Low density is still the prime handicap of rural service, despite 32 years of fill-in growth. There are fewer people in rural areas to use and pay for each mile of construction. If you leave out one large borrower, the average density of the remaining 168 REA-financed electric distribution systems in these 11 western states is only 2.5 per mile. Nationally, there are only 3.5 consumers per mile of line on REA-financed electric systems, against the average of 34 consumers per mile on the lines of Class A and B commercial power companies.

This, coupled with a general lack of commercial and industrial loads, reflects itself in relatively very low revenues per unit of investment. Despite the remarkable expansion in uses of electricity and the multiplicity of appliances available to the consumer, average annual revenues on REA-financed rural electric systems are still only $516 per mile, compared with $7,820 for the urban-based power companies.

If we are to bring parity of electrical service to rural areas in the face of these cost handicaps there must be some offsetting cost equalizers provided.

Through the REA program the Federal Government has provided two equalizers, low-cost capital and technical assistance. It has made it possible for the rural consumers themselves to supply another, perhaps more basic, cost equalizer in the organization of nonprofit, "serve yourself" cooperative systems.

Without these equalizers, I am sure we would agree, electrical service would not be available as it is to 98 percent of the Nation's farms today. Even with these equalizers there is still much to be done to improve the adequacy and reliability of service. And the rates for rural service are still substantially higher than comparable service in the urban communities.

Other basic equalizers need to be developed at the distribution level if rural electrification is to achieve parity.

One is simply a frontal attack on the density-revenue gap by stimulating rural area development.

Another is the development of service area protection so that the fruits of growth can be retained by the rural systems. In this the law and policy of the states are crucial, and I am gratified to be able to report that progress is being made in providing rural electric systems this kind of protection as more and more states face up to the need and assess the public interest involved.

Here in the West we have noted particularly the progress made in Nevada, New Mexico, Oregon and Arizona. The benefits which will flow from the greater territorial protection now available in these states will make it possible for the rural systems there to provide better service at lower cost from greater operating efficiency and better utilization of investment.

But although the basic cost handicaps of rural electrifications are in its distribution problems, the application of offsetting cost equalizers must not be confined to distribution operations alone. The cost of wholesale power represents 43 percent of the total operating cost of REA-financed rural electric distribution systems.

The rural electric systems must therefore find a way into the "Big Picture" of giant generation and transmission if there is to be any ultimate hope of parity service and costs for the rural areas they serve.

The average rural electric distribution cooperative among REA's 992 borrowers consists of 5,000 consumer-members with a total load requirement of 11,000 or 12,000 kilowatts. Collectively, although REA borrowers have roughly half of the industry's distribution line mileage, their power use is only about 4½ percent of the total output of the industry. Nevertheless taken all together the present use of 53 billion kilowatt-hours, which is expected to increase to 135 billion kwh by 1980 is a significant total which cannot be ignored and must not be neglected.

The big problem is to find ways to put together all these many small system requirements scattered over 97 percent of the Nation's geography into organizational and operational patterns which can gain access to the economies of large-scale power production.

Already there has been substantial progress made in that direction, but it is only the beginning.

First of all there has been widespread attachment of individual rural systems to the major public power marketing systems where they exist. Here in the western part of the United States this has been possible through the Bonneville Power Administration and the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation.

Secondly there has been a trend toward federation of rural electric distribution cooperatives into federated generation and transmission cooperatives. Some of these have in turn federated into larger power supply cooperatives.

The Basin Electric Power Cooperative at Bismarck, North Dakota, for example, is composed of six smaller, more localized G & T federations of rural electric cooperatives, as well as 16 distribution cooperatives which belong directly to Basin. Through this organization a total of 87 distribution cooperatives have financed a 200 megawatt lignite-burning power plant at Stanton, North Dakota, the largest lignite-burning plant in the western hemisphere, and deliver the power over an 8-state area through the Bureau of Reclamation's transmission system.

Altogether there are more than 400 REA-financial rural electric distribution systems federated into 41 power supply cooperatives across the country.

Then there has also been a continuing effort—and in most recent years REA has given special encouragement and emphasis to this effort—to align these generation and transmission organizations with other power suppliers, public and private, in the development of power pools from which the economic and operational benefits of coordinated planning, investment, and operation can be shared by all participants on an equitable basis.

The outstanding example of this development is probably the Upper Mississippi Valley Power Pool in which the Dairyland Power Cooperative, the largest REA-financed power-type cooperative and a number of other G & T cooperatives have joined with the investor-owned companies of that area to the mutual benefit and satisfaction of all.

Other significant pooling arrangements between rural electric cooperative and investor-owner power systems have been developed in such states as Kentucky, Missouri, Texas, and Iowa. Coordinated or pooled operations with public power agencies have been developed with the Southwestern Power Administration in Oklahoma, Missouri, and Arkansas and with the Bureau of Reclamation in its marketing areas.

And out here in the West three rural electric power supply cooperatives—Colorado-Ute Electric Association, Inc., of Montrose, Colorado; Plains Electric Generation and Transmission Cooperative, Inc., of Albuquerque, New Mexico; and Arizona Electric Power Cooperative, Inc., of Benson, Arizona—are members of Western Energy Supply and Transmission Associates, known as WEST, for purposes of joint planning, which hopefully will lead to participation in future large-scale joint power sources.

These are only beginnings. There are still long steps ahead which must be taken to give rural electrification full and equitable access to the economies of million-kilowatt generating units and the new big bulk transmission systems of the future.

We are making—as a matter of public policy—a determined effort to build big on a cooperative basis through the mixed participation of public and private entities in the facilities required. The arrangements under which the Pacific Northwest—Southwest intertie is going forward are a notable example of this. The Federal Power Commission's Power Survey and its continuing emphasis on joint planning through the standing committees representing various segments of the industry is another indication of this effort.

Proposals have been made to exempt joint action of private power companies from antitrust law in order to clear this possible stumbling block from the way of larger power combinations to provide the facilities of giant power supply.

Whatever arrangements are worked out, they must in the last analysis meet the test of the public interest. They must in some way allow all systems which have the responsibility of providing electrical service to the consumer, access to the economies of large-scale power production.

The public concern is that electric service be available to all who want it, wherever they live or do business—in city or country, on investor-owned, consumer-owned, or public lines. It will insist that the service be fully adequate for people's needs. Token service for just a light bulb or two will not suffice in this day and age. It will insist too that the service be fully reliable. We have seen the public concern and protest over the massive Northeast blackout still fresh in everyone's memory. Other blackouts closer to home in this area have demonstrated, too, the depth of the public's concern over service failures. And finally the public interest is going to insist that electric service be available at a cost which reflects the potential savings of the industry's advancing technology.

If this can be provided through participation in joint large-scale generation and transmission facilities by all systems having a need to do so, whether they be large or small, private or public, consumer or investor-owned, rural or urban, this will do more to preserve the integrity of our pluralistic electrical industry in its present proprietary pattern than any other effort which could possibly be made.

If on the other hand, the economies of scale are allowed to be monopolized by a few, the public interest is going to demand better treatment and different ways of dealing with the problem, perhaps moving toward more stringent regulation, perhaps more direct public power supply.

The test of the public interest can be met through the cooperative and joint efforts of the industry as it is now constituted, but it will take some adjustment in our respective thinking as well as in our respective performance.

Vital to the success of such an effort will be the degree to which we can establish among electric systems proper stability of retail service territory with mutual respect and acknowledged protection for each other's rights in serving at the retail level. You who exercise the powers of state public service commissions have a special responsibility and opportunity to make a great and lasting contribution in the solution of this basic problem. The apple of discord in wholesale power problems is usually the prospect of competitive advantage at the retail service level which can be secured from discriminatory wholesale power arrangements. If we can bring peace and a reasonable stability to the retail service areas, it will go a long way toward enabling everyone to approach the problems of power supply strictly on a basis of practical need and sound technology rather than in an atmosphere charged with selfish and predatory emotion.

Success of the joint approach will require from the investor-owned companies a recognition of the fact that the special problems of rural service have cast the rural systems in a different mold, but that, even so, the rural electric cooperatives have utility responsibilities to meet just as do the companies. It will require a recognition not only that the rural electric cooperatives are here to stay, but that it is in the public interest they are here to stay.

From the regulatory commissions the success of this approach will require an ever-present understanding of the broad public interest in good rural service, a recognition that the different problems of rural service have made necessary a different kind of service organization, and an acknowledgement that the standard formulas which have been developed over the years to test the financing and operations of investor-owned companies do not apply with equal validity to rural cooperative organizations.

And it will require some changes in the thinking of the rural electric cooperatives, too. It will require of them an acceptance of greater public review of their activities. No longer will they be able to look on their operations as just private matters between their member-owners and management. If the public interest is involved in their existence and support, it is likewise involved and concerned with their performance. The rural electric cooperatives must recognize that as they move into the "Big Picture," as they become a part of power pools and interconnected systems, their operations, their management decisions, their overall performance affects not only their own member-consumers, but other systems with which they are interconnected and through them, other consumers who are not their members.

Here is the key issue facing the industry today: Technology is showing the way to greater service for less money through the economies of scale. Is the statesmanship of the industry—and the wisdom and commitment of those of us who work with the industry—equal to the challenge of making these benefits available to all the public, rural and urban alike? Can the industry rise above its intramural rivalries to develop its full potential in the energy market?

If so, to make it possible—we are all going to have to work together in the public interest.

Pittsburgh Saddened by Jessie Vann's Death

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 10, 1967

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, my city of Pittsburgh was saddened recently by the death of one of its most beloved citizens, Jessie Matthews Vann.

Mrs. Vann was, until she retired in 1963 at the age of 78, the president and treasurer of the Pittsburgh Courier, the largest Negro weekly in the country.

In her long life, Mrs. Vann was a constant and energetic worker for the advancement of Negro Americans. She served on the national boards of both the NAACP and the Urban League, and as a member of the Governor of Pennsylvania's Committee on Industrial Race Relations. Not long ago she raised $38,000 for the United Negro College Fund.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I insert in the RECORD at this point an eloquent tribute to Mrs. Vann that appeared in the June 10 edition of the paper she guided after the death of her husband, Robert Lee Vann. The article follows:

FORMER COURIER PRESIDENT DIES AT 82

One of the best known and loved women in the nation, died Wednesday morning at 11:30 after less than two days illness. Mrs. Robert L. Vann, who had hardly ever had a sick day during her 82 years, died in West Penn Hospital of a massive cerebral hemorrhage, June 7 after being admitted to the Hospital at 7:15 P.M. Monday.

She was the widow of the late nationally known publisher and attorney, Robert Lee Vann. At his death she became president-treasurer of the Pittsburgh Courier, which post she held until her retirement in 1963.

It was a nightmare to those close to her. And as sudden illnesses strikes, and as death comes, the strain is unbearable.

At the time illness struck, Mrs. Vann's housekeeper of nearly thirty years, Mrs. Thomas (Susie) Hallis, heard her call. When she reached the bedroom, Mrs. Vann was lying on the floor conscious, but aware that something was happening.

She told Susie Hollis, "I think I'm having a stroke. Susie, I think I'm having a stroke."

Mrs. Hollis called Dr. Edward H. Hale, Mrs. Vann's physician and at once Dr. Hale dispatched an ambulance and alerted the emergency room at West Penn Hospital. During the short ride to the hospital, the ambulance crew administered oxygen. Once in the hospital six doctors surrounded her.

She had suffered a massive cerebral hemorrhage.

Jessie Matthews Vann was born in Flora Dale, near Gettysburg, Pa., the daughter of Mary Jane and William H. Matthews. There was one sister, Edna, who became Mrs. Reed.

Mrs. Vann, who was 82 when she died, met young law student Robert L. Vann when she came to Pittsburgh after her graduation from high school in Harrisburg. It was a beautiful romance, one that she treasured until the end, just as she treasured each moment of their long married life.

Jessie Vann was sentimental, and very often let her heart rule her head, especially in the Courier Family which included literally hundreds of workers and former workers. She was the sweet, gentle woman who came out of her role of housewife to take over the largest Negro weekly in the country.

She had an excellent memory and could seemingly remember everything her famous husband ever said. "Vann," she used to tell her friends, "told me on his dying bed, 'Jess, I want you to be at the Courier. I want you to be treasurer."

So she walked out of her mansion in Oakland and into the president's office at the top of the old Courier building.

Many honors came to the widow of Robert L. Vann. She won citations from many sources, including the Haitian government. She was named a delegate to the inauguration of the president of Liberia by President Dwight Eisenhower. She was a member of an overseas commission for two years, traveling via jet.

Several years ago, honors came directly to her door in Pittsburgh when citizens entertained some 600 people from many states in her honor. When the "This is your Life" program was most popular, Mrs. Vann was the subject for an enthralling hour. Flown to California was her sister from Gettysburg; her foster daughter Mrs. Burrell (Mable Page) Johnson of Johnstown, Pa. and several friends.

She held life memberships in the National Council of Negro Women and the National Association of Colored Women's Clubs.

A friend of presidents, she was constantly shuttling between Pittsburgh and Washington, D.C. with invitations from both Republicans and Democrats. During Eisenhowers' residence in the White House, she attended State dinners, receptions, teas and meetings.

Jessie Vann's activities were legion. She was a member of the Board of Directors of the YWCA; served on the national board of the Urban League and the NAACP. At one time she was director of the board of Hill City youth municipality; the Pittsburgh Conference of Christians and Jews, Virginia Union University, Richmond, Va. from which institution Mr. Vann had graduated. She was also a director of Storer College, Harpers Ferry, W. Va.; the Department of Public Assistance, Allegheny County, and the National Newspaper Publishers Association.

She was vice-president of the National Achievement Clubs, Inc., a member of the Governor's Committee on Industrial Race

Relations, and an honorary member of Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority.

In recent years she raised some $38,000 for the United Negro College Fund and was honorary President of the Pittsburgh group when she became ill.

Mrs. Vann and her husband had no children, but foster daughter Mable Page Johnson was as close to her as any daughter could possibly be. She had spent Memorial Day in Johnstown with Mabel and her family and even as late as Sunday June 3rd, she had been on the Victory Charity Club's June 4th program.

Mrs. Vann held active membership: The Saturday Card Club, the Monday Bridge and the Singletons, a bridge club of widows. She was also president of the Lucy Stone League, and was a member of the Aurora Reading Club.

A long time member of the Episcopal Church of the Holy Cross, she worked actively with the Daughters of the King, within the church.

A world traveler, Mrs. Vann had been around the world before jet flights were possible. She enjoyed the luxury steamships and their conveniences. And being a hardy traveler, she missed none of the cathedral tours, the museums, the historic sights of Europe and the Far East.

She leaves relatives Joseph Wansel, great nephew and great great nieces Mrs. Joanne Mitchel, Mrs. Theresa Ambush, and Misses Jessie Wansel and Toki Wansel all of Gettysburg; and one great great nephew, Nelson V. Wansel, now overseas with the U.S. Army.

Let's Do a Better Job of Telling Our Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 26, 1967

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, fairs and expositions, both here and abroad, have played an important role in American history and have helped to publicize our mechanical and scientific marvels. Among the exhibits shown at the Crystal Palace Exposition in London in 1851 were the McCormick reaper and the Colt repeating pistol. Two years later the New York Crystal Palace Exposition featured the first passenger elevator and demonstrations of the sewing machine.

At the Centennial Exposition, which was held in Philadelphia in 1876 to celebrate the hundredth anniversary of the signing of the Declaration of Independence, the crowds were fascinated by moving, working models of new machines. These included the continuous-web printing press, the typewriter, the Corliss steam engine, the telephone, the Westinghouse air brake, the refrigerator car, and Edison's duplex telegraph. The latter could send two messages over one wire at the same time. As the "World Book Encyclopedia" so well expresses it:

> Visitors came to Philadelphia with their minds full of Thomas Jefferson and the Liberty Bell and found themselves almost without warning in the modern machine age.

At the World's Columbian Exposition, which commemorated the 400th anniversary of the discovery of America and brought visitors to Chicago from all over the world, structural steel and electricity were prominently featured. Another world's fair was staged in the Illinois metropolis in 1933, when the Century of Progress Exposition honored Chicago's centennial as an incorporated city. The exhibits, which emphasized the union of science and industry and its remarkable scientific developments, were regarded as the best ever assembled in this country up to that time.

Unlike most previous major expositions, the Century of Progress was an outstanding financial success, even though it was held during the early part of the great economic depression. This fair, which was held over for another year, paid off its underwriters and yielded a surplus. Its construction and operation and the many visitors it attracted provided strong business stimulants and helped many Chicago businessmen to avoid bankruptcy.

During the years since the end of World War II the word "image" and the expression "world opinion" have become trite. Even so, it seems to me that we ought to seize every opportunity to tell the peoples of other nations about the United States and the American way of life. The exposition which our good neighbors to the north are putting on in Montreal this year to commemorate Canada's centennial is such an opportunity. It appears that those who were in charge of this opportunity have fumbled the ball.

A letter from a dentist who resides in my district, is but one of a number of disquieting reports that have come to my attention. I can well understand why my constitutent was disappointed in what he saw in Montreal and agree with him that we could and should have done a better job of telling America's story to the nations. A good story loses its effectiveness if it is told badly.

The letter follows:

JUNE 12, 1967.

During this past week I visited Expo '67 in Montreal, Canada. I was particularly interested in a comparison of the American and Soviet Pavilions.

The Soviet Pavilion was of interesting structural design, with a large replica of the hammer and sickle in a prominent position in front of the entrance. On this symbol were boldly embossed words to the effect, "Freedom, equality and peace for all mankind". Near the statue was a summary of the Soviet Constitution, guaranteeing freedom, equality, justice, and so on, for all Soviet citizens, as well as other propaganda material. Inside the very impressive pavilion, which has a maximum of floor space, escalators, and a large theater for producing plays, ballet, movies, and so on, the dominating figure in the pavilion was an immense relief plaque of Lenin. Throughout the spacious pavilion were countless quotations by this same man. There also appeared in large print the alleged benefits given to the Soviet citizens. Throughout the whole pavilion there was an air of dynamic progress, with photographs, diagrams, models, and so on, which the Soviet nation is making in the world. The presentation, in all, was extremely well done and effective for the uneducated.

After seeing this pavilion, I visited the American Pavilion. The outside structure is impressive, however, when one enters the main entrance, the hall appears empty, austere, without color, and with no spirit. A film is shown, called, "Games Children Play". It was introduced by a girl who showed no poise and spoke English poorly. The film showed such games as Hop-scotch, King of the Mountain, and so on, and ended with no point or moral. The film was a devastating failure to show the greatness of America, the cooperation of its people, and the spirit for progress. Upon touring the building, one observes such displays as women's hats, Indian artifacts, and various objects from old movie sets, including a 1937 Plymouth Yellow Cab which had a flat tire. The fender was held together with masking tape. The automobile had no sign on it, whatesoever, yet maintained a prominent position for the passerby. The various large photographs of Hollywood stars were seen, with small projection booths, which, at the time, were not working. Other artifacts included an old bed, some rocking chairs, and an old, nondescript airplane. The tour continued to an impressive map of the world with the prominent position of this map showing the Soviet Union, with the United States in a poor position above this. A large display of art was seen, showing blank canvases or with arrows, or an occasional line, with one containing the numbers one to nine. The only exhibit of any worthwhile note, showed our moon probe. I questioned one of the managers of the pavilion about the poor presentation of the United States, and he answered me by saying, "If you don't like it, then get out". I think his answer typifies the lack of concern of the United States Government for a good representation of our great country. The uneducated visitor from foreign lands will view this exhibit as the decay and disintegration of a once proud nation. Every visitor to this pavilion, whether from the United States or from foreign countries, all, down to the last person, agreed that it was disappointing or shockingly poor.

The American people demand an immediate face-lifting of the American Pavilion to inspire patriotism, with perhaps the Liberty Bell or the Statue of Liberty, dynamic exhibits, a reduction of the space given to this ridiculous art or an inclusion of other forms of art, as well as a reduction in the movie space allotted. Free elections should be played up. All titles must be enlarged so they may be read. There should be famous quotations by patriotic Americans, such as George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, Benjamin Franklin, Nathan Hale, and so on. I urge all of you leaders of America to make an investigation of this pavilion and give it the true spirit America deserves.

Alfred Laureta Dons Judicial Robes of Hawaii Circuit Court Judge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 10, 1967

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, a success story of the first magnitude was climaxed in Hawaii on June 1 with the appointment of Alfred Laureta as judge in the First Circuit Court of Hawaii.

By his elevation to the bench, Judge Laureta now holds the highest position to which an American of Filipino ancestry has ever been appointed in the State of Hawaii, and presumably in the entire United States.

I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues some interesting facts about Judge Laureta, as presented in a recent article by Ligaya Fruto in the Honolulu Star-Bulletin. Miss Fruto presents with effective emphasis the highlights of Judge Laureta's varied career which led him to this high judicial post.

By hard work, energy and resourcefulness, Alfred Laureta, the son of immigrant parents, overcame serious financial handicaps to obtain his legal education. After a period in private law practice in Honolulu, he entered public service where his leadership and ability were demonstrated by the effective work he rendered in Washington as administrative assistant to Senator DANIEL K. INOUYE, and more recently as director of the department of labor in Governor Burns' cabinet. It is good to know that our State will continue to benefit from the services of one of its most able sons as he discharges the responsibilities of his new office.

The noteworthy appointment of Alfred Laureta to the bench is another example of the course Hawaii has followed in adhering to the ideals of human equality, which was a goal of the Founding Fathers of this Nation. America is still the land of opportunity for those who choose to work hard in seeking it, and this success story of the son of an immigrant plantation laborer proves that it is so.

I take pleasure in submitting for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the article, "From a Plantation in Ewa to a $25,000 Judge Post," as it appeared in the Wednesday, July 5, 1967, issue of the Honolulu Star-Bulletin:

SUCCESS STORY OF ALFRED LAURETA: FROM A PLANTATION IN EWA TO A $25,000 JUDGE POST

(By Ligaya Fruto)

The son of illiterate parents holds the highest position to which an American of Filipino ancestry has ever been appointed in the State of Hawaii.

Even before Alfred Laureta, 43, stepped into his $25,000 job as judge in the First Circuit Court of Hawaii on June 1, he was the highest-ranking Filipino in public service here.

Since 1963, he had been director of the Department of Labor, a cabinet post that now pays $22,500.

Laureta, born at Banana Camp in Ewa, was the only son in the family of three of Laureano Laureta (now deceased) and Mrs. Rafael Pojas, now of Wailuku, Maui.

His parents came from Ilocos Norte, Philippines, in 1922 so his father could work here as a laborer.

When Alfred was 4 or 5, the family moved to Maui.

At about this time his parents were divorced, and Alfred chose to live with his father, first at Haleakala Camp and later at Libby Camp.

ONLY CHILD IN CAMP

At the first camp he was the only child in a community of bachelors.

"Because I was 'motherless,' everyone took an interest in me," Laureta recalled.

"The single men looked on me as their responsibility, encouraging me to do well in school.

"My report card became community property.

"If I did well, I was praised; if not, I was scolded by everyone."

"Father never worried about my meals or whether I came home to sleep. He knew that somewhere in camp I was fed and rested."

Laureta remembers being whipped only once by his father, when he took a belt belonging to one of the men. The idea of "being good" has stuck to him because of his upbringing, he said.

In Lahainaluna High School, where he went because he could work there for his room and board, he had his first taste of politics.

He ran for freshman class president and won, in spite of the intial handicap of not knowing many of the students. He was subsequently elected to other positions, including that of president of both the Student Body Association and Boarding Student Association in his senior year.

It was also at Lahainaluna that he won first prize in the 1943 Territory-wide high school oratorical contest sponsored by the Honolulu Star-Bulletin and the Maui Junior Chamber of Commerce, and received the American Legion Award of Merit for scholarship, citizenship and leadership.

Going to college presented problems. He could get very little financial help from his father.

A friend offered him a temporary home until he could find other quarters, and his summer job in a pineapple cannery took care of his tuition.

For three years he lived with four other students (including Nelson Doi, who later became State Senate President) in a building near the University of Hawaii, so dilapidated that it was called "Termite Mansion" on campus.

"My summer earnings, occasional contributions from my father, scrimping and saving financed my entire college education," Laureta said.

He had always wanted to be a lawyer, but felt law school was beyond his means, so he went to Teachers College.

"As a student I'd say I was average, with an occasional D (art and music appreciation)," he said.

He was completing his fifth-year teaching courses and was planning to settle down to teaching when unexpected forces were set in motion to change the course of his life.

First, one of his professors got him a position as a graduate assistant so he could work for a master's degree.

Then the Rev. Osmundo Calip of the Philippines, who was in Hawaii to work with Filipinos, urged Laureta to go to Law School and got him a scholarship to Fordham University.

The Hawaii Memorial Foundation guaranteed an annual grant of $1,000 a year to the lawyer-to-be, "with no strings attached," plus an airline ticket to New York, so off he went.

He found law school a tough grind, and so he dared not work during the school year.

Living in New York on $1,000 a year, however, was almost impossible. Laureta's summer earnings as an elevator operator at Rockefeller Center did not help much.

He admits he owes a great deal to the parents of a nursing student at Columbia University's Presbyterian Hospital, Evelyn Reantillo.

"Her parents liked to see me eat, starving as I was on my budget," Laureta said, "and I just loved her mother's cooking.

"Truly it can be said that they partially subsidized my legal education through the frequency of the meals I had at their home."

Just before his graduation from law school, Laureta married Miss Reantillo, and the couple returned to Hawaii to live as best they could until he could pass the bar exams.

He looked for any kind of law office work so he could supplement his wife's meager savings, but had no luck.

Then one day a young attorney, Bert T. Kobayashi (now State Attorney General), and his partner, Russell Kono, took him under their wing.

He didn't know it then, but the meeting also marked the start of his interest in political activities and service.

This took him to Washington, as administrative assistant to Sen. Daniel K. Inouye, and eventually to Governor John A. Burns' cabinet and the First Circuit Court.

"There is need for qualified people in Hawaii," Laureta said.

"Government and politics here, while sympathetic to the clamor for racial equality—and which are, in fact, non-discriminatory—must and can only respond to those who have skill, talent and ability."

The Lauretas live in Kailua and have four children: Michael, 13; Gregory, 12; Pamela Ann, 10; and Lisa Lani, 6.

Editorial From Columbus, Ga., Enquirer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK BRINKLEY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 10, 1967

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, the editor of the Columbus Enquirer, Columbus, Ga., winner of the 1967 American Cancer Society Award in the Best Editorial and Writers' Contest for the Georgia State press group, Mr. Millard Grimes, is noted for keen insight and excellence of writing ability. He is sensitive to inequities wherever they occur. His views reflect reason and logic. He exemplifies a philosophy of "Too low they build, who build beneath the stars."

On June 29, Mr. Grimes had the following comments which, if read objectively, will be a lesson for us all:

EDITOR'S REVERIE

In commenting on Judge J. Skelley Wright's court directives to the schools of Washington, D.C., I have tried essentially to make the point that the first priority of schools is to dispense information, not serve as a means of breaking down racial, social and economic barriers.

In examining comments from other sources, I was surprised to find that most of them agree on that point, no matter what their position on the broader question of racial and economic integration.

Joseph Alsop's column on the subject was carried on this page last Saturday. Alsop is dedicated to the value of integration, but in his own meandering way, he said exactly what the editor of Columbus Enquirer said: Put education first, rather than desperately striving for a pretense of integration in a system that is almost totally Negro.

The Washington Star, in an editorial reprinted on this page Wednesday, also pointed out the fallacies of sacrificing all other precepts in a blind adherence to the idol of integration.

But most significantly, The New York Times in an editorial on Judge Wright's ruling, arrived at virtually the same conclusion. The Times cannot be faulted on its slavish allegiance to the principle of integration, and in the past, its editorials have reflected small concern for the problems involved.

But now consider the words of the Times editorial:

"Desirable as integrated education is (naturally, the Times had to first reassure its readers that it is not backing down on that point) experience suggests (experience, by the way, refers to the problems of northern cities when they try to integrate. The Times never refers to problems in the South as "experience," only as defiance) that white parents will not willingly accept long-distance busing, and furthermore that busing does not necessarily lead to desirable educational results for white or Negro students . . ." (That's what a lot of southern editors and educators have been saying for years, and been getting called "racists" for their trouble.)

"Moreover," the Times continued, "unless a neighborhood is integrated, and the racial balance in the neighborhood school is carefully controlled (notice that language) integration has not proved in reality to be attainable.

"And even if it were, it is certainly not the only—or necessarily—the principal educational desideratum."

That last sentence is the key one. The Times is saying that inegration isn't the most important factor for schools to consider. "Desideratum" is a two-dollar word meaning "something desired as essential or needed," and the editorial writer must have pulled it out of the dictionary in the hope that his meaning would be softened because a lot of folks wouldn't know exactly what he was saying.

Now, if The Times admits this, the nation may be coming to a place where schools can begin doing a better job of helping both white and Negro children.

Notice also the Times editorial admitted that unless the racial balance in a school is "carefully controlled" that "integration has not proved to be attainable."

The editorial is referring to the big cities of the north, but of equal concern should be the small counties and cities of the South where the balance is heavily weighed toward a Negro majority in all schools.

But the Times editorial winds up with this astounding conclusion: "This brings the nation back, as Judge Wright recognized, to the old 'separate but equal' doctrine. Predominantly Negro schools should be more equal, so to speak."

In questioning Judge Wright's rulings, the Times is only taking a practical view of the facts.

The New York program which puts added money and effort into ghetto schools, in some respects, follows a "separate but unequal" doctrine; separate, because the schools have mostly Negro enrollments, and unequal, because more—not less—is being done at these schools.

Alsop, The New York Times, the Washington Star, and yours truly are in pretty general agreement—even though starting from different basic viewpoints—on the necessity of stressing education over integration.

At least that demonstrates that opinion in the nation is not as wide apart as it once was, and that a measure of understanding—perhaps even of consensus—is building and may yet save our schools from becoming psychological experiment labs.

—MILLARD GRIMES.

District of Columbia Residents Deserve Right To Vote for Representation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT TENZER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 10, 1967

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, I am certain that all Members of the House have known for many years that the residents of the District of Columbia have never had and still do not have the right to vote for any representation in the Congress.

When one comes here, and meets the people of Washington and appreciates the size and beauty and substance of this community, he cannot help but wonder why they have no representation in the national body.

The U.S. Constitution speaks of Senators and Representatives being selected by and coming from the several States and since the District of Columbia is not a State, it does not have the right to elect Representatives and Senators. The legislative history of the Constitutional Convention does not avail itself with information which can today clearly explain this omission.

Washingtonians can and should be able to participate in the national debates and decisions which concern the citizens of our Nation. It is also interesting to note that Washingtonians have an added involvement in the Congress because it is the city council for the District.

If separation from the voters was a reason for disenfranchising nearby residents in the earlier years, it is no longer valid today because it is impossible. The means of transportation and communication have become so progressive that geographical separation is no longer an insulation, even for those who might desire it.

I understand, Mr. Speaker, that back in December 1800, Representative Dennis made a speech in this body, on this subject, and that he said:

> If it should be necessary, the Constitution might be so altered as to give them a delegate to the general legislature when their numbers should become sufficient.

This seems to be a reasonable criterion. If there were not enough people in the new District to justify a Congressman, then they should not have one at that time. It would follow then that the District should be franchised when it has an adequate population.

We all know that the District has grown tremendously. The census of 1880 showed it to have acquired a population that would have entitled it then to ask admission as a State if it were upon the footing of an ordinary territory. At that time the number of persons to be represented by each Member of the House was about 152,000 according to the apportionment. The District then had 177,638 residents and exceeded the populations of Nevada, Delaware, and Oregon. Today it has more residents than 11 of our States.

Washington, D.C., has thus met the qualifications stated by our predecessor, Mr. Dennis, in 1800. It has the people and it is entitled to the representation that he suggested.

In summary, Mr. Speaker, the arguments of freedom from popular pressure and of inadequate population have been met and overcome by developments in our modern society and are now irrelevant. It is highly desirable for Washingtonians to elect their own representatives to the Congress. Since this will not impair our national independence from State governments and will actually assist us in providing for our own protection, I believe we should give them the franchise now.

I am therefore introducing my own resolution—House Joint Resolution 597—to indicate my support for an amendment to the U.S. Constitution which provides for representation of the District of Columbia in the Congress.

The 4-H Clubs of Connecticut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 1967

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, in the 66 years of its existence, the 4-H Clubs have dedicated themselves to four causes: their heads to clear thinking, their hearts to great loyalty, their hands to larger service, and their health to better lives for their club, community, and country. Today an increasing number of 4-H service activities, such as finding summer work, antilitter campaigns, and other assorted community projects, have become as much a part of everyday city life as they have become a very real part of rural life.

Recent 4-H projects in my district include a campaign to enhance the beauty of local communities, reading activity programs to encourage good reading habits in youngsters and an adult home economics program for culturally disadvantaged families in community action centers of Middletown and Portland.

These are a few of the many activities sponsored by Connecticut's 4-H Clubs. Ronald Aronson, Alan Aho, and Mrs. Evelyn Hebert are among the leaders involved in these projects. I would like to commend the organization and its many fine leaders and members for their contribution to a better America. We have about 800 such clubs in Connecticut with a membership of 9,500.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to insert into the RECORD an article which appeared in the spring-summer 1967 issue of Milestones, published by the University of Connecticut College of Agriculture. The article discusses the 4-H Clubs of Connecticut and their recent project achievements. It is written by Ronald F. Aronson, Connecticut State 4-H Club leader, and reads as follows:

CONNECTICUT'S 4-H CLUB PROGRAM

(By Ronald F. Aronson, State 4-H Club leader)

It would take at least a score of books to record the many fine accomplishments made this past year in the Connecticut 4-H Club program. More importantly is the fact that this work helps the members become better, more responsible citizens in their communities. Some of the major activities conducted by the 9- to 19-year-old 4-H'ers, together with their dedicated volunteer leaders, are related here.

A group of eleven senior members last summer, in cooperaiton with the Torrington library staff, staged a series of eight reading activity programs for 105 preschoolers. Mrs. Evelyn Herbert, a 10-year 4-H leader for the group, observed that the program was quite successful in getting youngsters interested in books and going to the library at an early age. She brought back the idea to Connecticut from a Washington, D.C. 4-H Leaders' Forum.

In Coventry Alan Aho, a high school sophomore and 4-H Foresters president, directed a Rid Litter Day as part of a Statewide campaign to enhance the beauty of the State's communities. Assisting Aho were several 4-H and civic groups and the town's high schol art department. Art teachers Mrs.

Teresa William and Peter Sturrock had their students make as a class project over 50 anti-litter posters which were placed at the library, the town hall and local businesses.

The Middlesex County Extension staff has organized a coordinated 4–H Club and adult home economics program for culturally disadvantaged families in Community Action Centers of Greater Middletown and Portland. Some 175 Negro and white youths engage in such 4–H projects as sewing, clothing, woodworking, crafts, electricity, bicycle safety and recreation under the guidance of several parents and others who serve as volunteer leaders. Meantime, their parents are participating in comparable programs such as sewing and clothing. Recently, several community service groups in the area have given financial scholarships which will allow about 50 of these youths to attend the Middlesex County 4–H Camp in Moodus this summer.

In addition to Middletown, three years of experimental "inner city" 4–H work in New Haven, Hartford and Willimantic have proven 4–H to be popular and worthwhile for youth in the core of the cities. Urban members like projects in woodworking, mechanics, electricity, crafts, clothing, foods and home furnishing. 4–H is relevant to their needs because it helps them prepare for a future, it helps them improve their homes and communities now, and gives them new social opportunities.

Connecticut 4–H is a successful teaching method because boys and girls are involved in experiences relevant to them today. Youth are growing up in a time of high educational levels, and rapid mass communication. 4–H programs set a similarly high standard of excellence to attract and serve young people. Changing times mean new educational programs and activities, and more leaders with a wide range of interests and skills. With unprecedented demands on their time, boys and girls continue to find time for 4–H Club work. In Connecticut there are 9,500 members in 800 clubs led by 1,500 leaders and junior leaders. The 4–H program is conducted under the supervision of the Cooperative Extension Service in the University of Connecticut's College of Agriculture and its County Extension Services.

Projects—Today's 4–H member selects his project and, with the guidance of his 4–H leader and parents, decides the size and completion requirements for it. No one set of project requirements can possibly challenge all boys and girls of all ages and backgrounds. Helping youth set realistic and meaningful project goals is a major responsibility of today's 4–H leader.

Several of the most rapidly growing 4–H projects are associated with the use of leisure time and cultural development. These include crafts, riding horses, photography and dogs. Profit making is often not a goal in leisure-time projects. New skills and knowledge, pleasure, and gaining a greater feeling of self worth are the major values of these projects. Adults who enjoy leisure-time hobbies provide strong knowledgeable leadership for these programs. Connecticut has just completed a 4–H Leisure-Pleasure project series of art, music, reading and crafts in response to the need for more constructive leisure-time projects.

Mechanical projects for boys now include woodworking, electrical, bicycle repair, small gasoline engines, automotive care and tractor maintenance. Shops, tools, garages and service stations are exciting to boys and lead to numerous careers or hobbies.

Science projects concerned principally with experiments in horticulture, nutrition and incubation help members learn "why" as well as "what." Some of these projects have just been started and give promise of great appeal to young people interested in an introduction to scientific procedures.

Special projects in 4–H have been designed to meet present day needs. However, traditional projects in agriculture and home economics continue to interest and serve a large proportion of the members in 4–H.

Summer work experience—Job opportunities for teens have become fewer with increased mechanization. The most valuable, supplementary educational program for a teen may be one that will better prepare him for the few summer and part-time jobs that are available. Short-term programs (3 to 5 sessions) for baby sitters, grocery clerks, yard maintenance men, and service station attendants are being conducted by persons qualified to do the teaching under the supervision of the County 4–H Club Agents. The short courses are offered to all youth and often include as many without 4–H experience as those with it.

Unlimited job variety and the need for increased education makes career selection a difficult task. Career tours to learn about training needs, number of job openings and advancement possibilities are conducted in fields of home economics, the automotive and electrical industries and agriculture. The Connecticut Career Exploration, 4–H Member's Guide, provides teens a systematic method of studying and evaluating a series of careers they feel may fit their interests and abilities. Cooperative Extension has a wide and direct contact with the people of the state and can provide effective career exporation programs.

Camping—Summer camping has been a 4–H tradition in Connecticut for many years. 4–H camps are located at Warren, Abington, Franklin, East Haddam and Marlborough. Twenty-seven hundred 4–H campers learned and played under the direction of college-trained instructors in nature, recreation, arts and crafts and swimming.

The camp programs show evidence of change no less dramatic than the changes in other aspects of 4–H. This past summer, one camping program for teens was conducted on buying and selling common stock, another an inquiry into teen leisure, a third was a special band camp. This summer horse, art, and mechanics camps are scheduled.

"Rustic" facilities are no longer enjoyed by the majority of 4–H members or counselors. Hot water, showers, flush toilets, dishwashing machines and cabins are the trends in our camping standards in 1967. The five 4–H camps have an appraised value well over one quarter million dollars and the funds have all been given by friends of 4–H.

The 4–H purpose of helping boys and girls and their families help themselves has not changed. 4–H started with projects and programs that held the interest of the young people of that time just as 4–H programs today relate to current needs. Helping youth accept and utilize their opportunities for full personal development offers 4–H a continuing and growing challenge. This challenge can be met with programs that have the freshness and urgency of today.

Peace Corps Volunteer Brought Hope and Happiness to Philippine Orphan Boys

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 15, 1967

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, at a time of summit conferences and U.N. debate it is gratifying to know that Americans continue their efforts, on an individual and personal basis, to help foster the spirit of brotherhood and peace throughout the world. One such person who qualifies in the unique role of self-initiated goodwill ambassador is one of my young constituents, Joan Galletta who has just completed her 2-year assignment with the Peace Corps.

To Joan, the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Joseph Galletta of Fair Lawn, N.J., the prospect of becoming a Peace Corps volunteer was a challenging one. She felt it was an opportunity to use all of her resources in a "sink or swim" situation where she would be completely on her own to try and help others not so fortunate as herself. As a result she was stationed in the Philippines where her regular assignment was as an instructor of English to grade and high school students. But this was still not fulfilling enough for Joan, so she found yet another way in which to help. She adopted and was in turn adopted herself by the orphans of the Iloilo City's Boys Town, an institution that serves as home to some 137 boys ranging in age from 3 to 18 years old, who are products of broken homes and other misfortunes.

I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to an article which appeared in the Philippines Herald of Sunday, June 4, 1967. It clearly demonstrates the reason for the success of the Peace Corps; namely, volunteers like Joan Galletta.

The article follows:

[From the Philippines Herald, June 4, 1967]

A Charmer Named Joan

(By Norman H. Dohn)

Gay singing and joyful laughter seldom are heard at an institution for homeless, parentless, sometimes incorrigible boys.

An exception is Iloilo City's Boys Town where happy voices fill the the air, especially since a pretty, vivacious 24-year-old American Peace Corps volunteer, Joan Galleta, has been making daily visits.

"The 137 orphans, minor law violators, sons of lepers and victims of broken homes, ranging in age from 3 to 18, have taken a new lease on life," says the institution's director, Humberto Andres, "since last October when Miss Galleta started coming here."

Joan's service to Boys Town is strictly voluntary. She goes there to conduct an informal class for first and second graders and a few older boys who arrived at the institution too late gain admission to regular classes.

Her full-time Peace Corps assignment is at Leganes where she has taught English to both grade and high school students since arriving in the Philippines in September 1965.

"She just dropped by one day," said Andres, "looked around, talked to me and the boys and said she'd be back the next afternoon. I offered to pay her jeepney fare, because it's quite a distance from Leganes, but she told me 'you need the money for the boys, I can pay my own way.' "

That the dark-eyed, raven-haired young lady from Fairlawn, New Jersey, has won the hearts of the boys, from toddlers to teenagers, is readily apparent to a classroom visitor. She has the happy knack of making learning fun. There are songs to sing and games to play, but all activity is geared to learning.

Joan is at her best when leading the boys in group singing. Even the ordinarily shy, retiring ones lose their inhibitions, bursting forth in high squeaky voices.

While a student at New Rochelle College, where she was a psychology major, she sang with the glee club. She also performed in summer stock and is a one-time ballet instructor.

Her voice has become well known to Iloilo residents since she frequently sings on local radio; she has used these appearances to solicit contributions in support of Boys Town.

She's been instrumental in other ways in helping the institution which was founded in 1947 and has the distinction of being the oldest Boys Town in the Philippines.

"She was responsible for getting us 200 bags of cement, reinforcement bars and technical help from the PACD," said Andres, "to build a basketball court. She rounded up athletic equipment, including tennis shoes. And she even helped to smooth relations between me and the barrio captain. She's made life much easier for me."

Although admitting her work at Boys Town has been "more rewarding than my regular job," Joan modestly maintains her contribution to the institution "really has been very little."

This summer Joan has been joined by four more Peace Corps volunteers in developing a recreational-educational program at Boys Town.

Her two-year assignment with the Peace Corps will soon be over. "Now that it's getting time to leave," she smiled, "I'm getting terribly sad."

No sadder, however, than the residents of Boys Town over the thoughts of her leaving. "We've all fallen in love with her," explained Andres. She often spends the weekend with my wife and me. She's like a daughter to us. It won't be the same at Boys Town without her.

Retirement Ends 40-Year Teaching Career of Ruth Wong, of Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 10, 1967

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Chew "Ruth" Wong, principal of the St. Elizabeth's Episcopal School in Honolulu, Hawaii, retired this year following a teaching career which spanned 40 years.

I should like to call to the attention of my colleagues an excellent article about Mrs. Wong by Wayne Harada, staff writer for the Honolulu Advertiser, in which he summed up the career of this kind and gracious lady. As Mr. Harada's article points out, Mrs. Wong was more than a capable teacher and administrator. She also demonstrated a genuine concern for the thousands of youngsters who benefited from her guidance over the past four decades.

Mrs. Wong not only displayed competence in the classroom, but she gave unstintingly of her time and attention to the very human needs of the youngsters in her "family" of thousands. I can imagine no greater satisfaction than that which Ruth Wong carries with her into retirement—the memory of the smiles of joy she brought to children's faces by her many acts of kindness and guidance throughout her long and useful teaching career.

It gives me great pleasure to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the warm tribute to Mrs. Wong which appeared in the June 18, 1967, issue of the Sunday Star-Bulletin & Advertiser:

SCHOOL'S OUT, AFTER 40 SATISFYING YEARS

(By Wayne Harada)

When you've spent 40 years teaching, you acquire a "family" of thousands of children and the memories of them and their activities can comfort and warm you the rest of your life.

Mrs. Chew (Ruth) Wong retired last week as principal of St. Elizabeth's Episcopal School at 720 N. King St. Yesterday, she talked about those long, satisfying years in a school room.

"When I first started out in teaching, in 1928, discipline was a problem," she said. "The kids weren't really bad, but some didn't obey.

"Almost 40 years later, the problem's the same. Only, the children know so much more now. They're more alert."

Mrs. Wong, who'll be 60 next October, had been principal at the Palama school since 1942. Except for a few years off in-between to raise her family of five, she's been an active teacher-administrator.

"People say the Kalihi-Palama kids are tough," she mused. "But that's not all true. Most kids are nice. I feel so good when I read about the ones who've done good things.

"I must have come in contact with hundreds—no, thousands—of youngsters in all the years. And really, only a handful were problems.

"It feels just fine, waking up in the morning, knowing I don't have to go to work. But I still think of the children. I think I'll miss them.

"I have always thought about retiring, but I've always gone back. I felt it was about time to do it, though. My son kept telling men, 'You've got to get out of it sooner or later.'

"In teaching, you have to sacrifice a lot. Spend a lot of time. You have to.

"We have had all sorts of children. Some of them didn't speak English, only Chinese. Now, we have a lot of Japanese children, and cosmopolitan children.

"We used to teach up to the fourth grade, but now it's up to the third grade. You know, the parents have been real nice, but they actually presented some problems when their youngsters started out in nursery school or kindergarten.

"I'm speaking about the youngsters that cried. I had one mother who stayed with her girl for two weeks. She made it difficult. I think if the child cries, it's the parent's fault.

"Sure, the child is afraid. But with the mother around, it doesn't help.

"This one mother came in with her girl, who was attending our school. She had another child holding her hand, and another in a stroller. Two weeks, she stayed with the child.

"Finally, I told her, 'I wish you wouldn't stay.' I told her to come early the next day, and stay till the bell rings. Then leave.

"You know, the child cried when the mother left. But I saw the mother, and she was crying, too. There were tears in her eyes.

"I told the child, 'Mommy had to go home to do the housework' and she cried louder. I told the mother to wave good-bye, but she couldn't. She turned around, and I saw the tears.

"Well, it didn't take long. The girl overcame her crying, and before long, she was such a happy child. I only wish I had told the mother two weeks earlier to leave the class.

"When you teach for almost 40 years, you have a lot of memories.

"I recall a lot of faces I come across. It's so nice when the people I recognize come up and introduce themselves. They remember me. They ask me if I'm the Mrs. Wong who taught at St. Elizabeth's.

"In fact, I was teaching second-generation youngsters, too. Does that make me feel good, though.

"I guess the war years were the hardest. I used to teach then, and well, we had gasoline ration those days. So Chew would give me his gasoline coupons so I could get to school.

"A lot of my youngsters couldn't come to school because they didn't have transportation, so I picked them up. I felt I had to. Then I brought them home, too.

"You know, in all these years, I've always had a carload of students.

"You know, once I was offered a job that paid three or four times more than I was getting. But I couldn't leave teaching. I loved it too much.

"I used to teach some children who came from poor families. I'll always remember one child.

"He invited me to his birthday party, but there was a conflict. Chew and I had to go to a nine-course dinner that night .

"But I had to make a choice. I decided on the birthday. You know, I'd never been in a place like that. It was a tenement on Pauahi St., behind the American Theater. We had to climb up some shaky stairs.

"I was thinking, 'I'm giving up a dinner for this party.' But I've never regretted it. You should have seen the joy in the child's face. He was so pleased that we came.

"The memory is well worth the sacrifice."

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402, at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

Appendix

Thurman Kennedy, Dedicated Agricultural Agent of Bexar County, Tex., Makes Enviable Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 11, 1967

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, Thurman Kennedy, the agricultural agent for Bexar County, Tex., is one of the dedicated individuals who have made farming in Texas such a modern and successful industry.

Mr. Kennedy has been extremely active in local agricultural demonstration test plots on soils, an ingenious method which enables farmers to test which crops and fertilizers are best for their particular plots of lands. The program that he and his assistants run so efficiently is connected with the U.S. Department of Agriculture and Texas A. & M. University, one of our State's finest centers of higher education.

He has unselfishly given his time to such fine organizations as the 4–H clubs, and has also worked with high school counselors to provide information on career opportunities for the young adults of his area.

In short, he is a fine Texan and a credit to his profession. I ask unanimous consent that an article describing his great achievements and published in the San Antonio Express, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COUNTY AGENT IS EDUCATOR

(By Arthur Moczygemba)

When Bexar County Agricultural Agent Thurman Kennedy picks up his telephone, chances are 10 to one there's a problem at the other end of the line.

Farmers, ranchers, housewives, gardeners, nurserymen, just about every walk of life in Bexar County calls the local county agent on some problem or another, seeking information for their particular needs.

Over 11,000 persons contacted the county agent's office last year, by telephone, letter or personal visit to the third floor office in the county courthouse.

Kennedy came to Bexar County in January, 1963, from Young County. He has two assistants, Preston Sides, associate county agent; and Lin Wilson, assistant county agent.

"We're basically set up as the educational arm of the U.S. Department of Agriculture and Texas A&M University," Kennedy said. "Our job is to bring the latest research information and apply it to the local area as rapidly as possible."

"Over 40 per cent of the people in Texas derive their livelihood from agribusiness, and San Antonio and Bexar County are one of the major agricultural centers of the state," he went on.

Kennedy works closely with Bexar County farmers and ranchers, especially on a program of local demonstration test plots.

"There is no better way for a farmer or rancher to find out what's best for his particular place than to have a test plot of the latest varieties of corn, grain sorghum, potatoes, or grass, and letting him see which does best. The same thing is true for finding the most economical fertilizer rates, or whatever result we are trying to achieve. This result demonstration test plot program is the basic way of demonstrating the latest technological information," the county agent stressed.

"Certainly we work with people in agriculture, but we also work with anyone in Bexar County that has problems or is seeking information about horticulture," Kennedy said, pointing out that the county Extension Service program is a combination of federal, state and county cooperation.

The Bexar County agent's office sent 781 educational letters directed to 12,234 persons last year, and expects to equal that volume this year.

"We are starting a big push in developing an agribusiness committee in Bexar County," Kennedy said, just about always stressing the "we."

In this agribusiness program, the Chamber of Commerce is lending a big hand, along with agribusiness people. The tentative goal is to assist and possibly develop better marketing, distribution, selling, communication and generally better cooperation in the agribusiness community. Agribusiness includes farmers and ranchers, who are the producer; the transportation industry, processing plants, wholesalers, warehousemen, labor, and retailers, or everyone who handles agricultural commodities from beginning to end.

The big city county agent is everything from the farmer's friend to sociologist, counselor, speechmaker, specialist on everything from insect and disease control to why laws and flowers get sick.

Kennedy and his two assistants work with over 700 4-H Club youths in the county that are enrolled in 22 clubs. They receive a big hand from 125 adult leaders who devote their time, energy and skills in assisting and furthering the education and character building of these boys and girls. The county home demonstration agent, female counterpart of the county agent, works with 4-H Club youths and adults alike.

Kennedy also works with high school counselors in providing students with information on career opportunities in agribusiness and possible avenues of finance for higher education.

"The whole idea of a county agent is education and assistance on a local level, person to person," Kennedy said.

Information is disseminated by the county agent's office through direct contact, meetings, letters, telephone, and the news media. Kennedy has a radio commentary twice a week and writes a Sunday garden column for the San Antonio Express-News.

"While some telephone calls may seem far fetched and peculiar, each call represents an individual's problem," Kennedy said.

Louise Faber, secretary in the county agent's office since 1927, laughs about occasional calls that have come in durnig her tenure.

"I think the one that takes top prize came from a school teacher who asked how to prove a milk snake cannot milk a cow dry," Miss Faber said.

She has served as secretary to former county agents Fred W. Mally, H. A. Fitzhugh and Bob Tate. Kennedy calls her his right arm and says when she retires he'll probably quit.

Kennedy admits that when he first came to Bexar County he had some misgivings about being able to cope with such a heavily populated county.

"People in San Antonio and Bexar County have been just wonderful," Kennedy said. "The Bexar County Commissioners Court (Kennedy's bosses) have consistently given the county extension program their wholehearted support.

"The Farm and Ranch Committee of the Chamber of Commerce has been most cooperative at all times, and San Antonio has some exceptionally fine agricultural leaders," Kennedy said, explaining that he used the word "we" frequently because someone else is almost always involved in the various programs.

Savages' Sullivan Stepping Down

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ALBERT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 11, 1967

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, on August 1 of this year, the world of college sports will lose one of its greatest coaches when Bloomer Sullivan steps down as head of basketball at Southeastern State College in Durant, Okla. In his illustrious 31-year tenure at Southeastern, Bloomer Sullivan compiled a winning average which is surpassed by only one coach currently in the game. He produced 14 conference championships and six all-Americas, and in the process became dean of Oklahoma Collegiate Conference coaches. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to commend Bloomer Sullivan on his fine record, and join his many friends in wishing him every success for the future.

I also include in the RECORD at this point a tribute to Bloomer which appeared in the Oklahoma Journal of June 26:

SAVAGES' SULLIVAN STEPPING DOWN

DURANT.—Bloomer Sullivan, the nation's third winningest basketball coach and the dean of Oklahoma Collegiate Conference coaches, is retiring Aug. 1.

The 65-year-old Southeastern cage coach and athletic director said Sunday that he is "stepping aside" because of a mandatory retirement rule for state college administrators.

Thus ends a brilliant 31-year coaching career at Southeastern that has produced 14 conference championships, three national runners-up and one third-place finish in the NAIA tournament.

During that span, Sullivan's sharply-drilled Savages won 666 games, lost 229 for a .752 winning percentage. Only Adolph Rupp of Kentucky and Henry Iba of Oklahoma State have won more games among active coaches.

Only Rupp's .800-plus winning percentage tops Bloomer's .752 mark.

Sullivan said he was not retiring because of ill health. "I missed the last two games of last season because of bleeding ulcers. That's the only time in my life I was ever off the bench," he said. "I feel fine now." He would not speculate on his successor. He said the new coach, and athletic director, will probably be named "about July 1."

"It's been interesting," allowed Sullivan as he looked back on 37 years of coaching.

Defense and discipline were the trademarks of his slick-passing Southeastern teams which almost always led the nation's small colleges in defense.

His 1942 Savages went to the national finals at Kansas City before bowing to Hamline. They reached the finals in 1957 and 1959, and finished third in 1963. Two years ago, Oklahoma Baptist University defeated the Savages by two points in the third game of a playoff and then romped to the national championship.

Sullivan refused to name the best team he ever coached. "There were so many of them," he said. Only once did a Southeastern team finish below .500 during his 31 years as head coach. His 1945 team went 23–0.

The portly little man with the thinning silver hair was a tremendous three-sport athlete at Ardmore High School in the early '20s, leading the Tigers to their last all-victorious season in 1923. In 1950, he was voted to Ardmore's mid-century all-star football team.

He started his coaching career at Madill in 1930. "I had a wife and kid and had to go to work," he recalled. "I was there about a month and Dr. Eugene Briggs called me from Southeastern and wanted me to start a football team and coach basketball at Russell Training School.

"I coached there six years, then went to Oklahoma A&M in 1936 and worked under Mr. Iba, and got my master's degree. I returned to Southeastern in 1937. I never coached anywhere else. I never wanted to," he continued.

Sullivan was considered a prime candidate for the vacant University of Oklahoma coaching job in 1963, but his age was a disadvantage, and Bob Stevens was hired from South Carolina. Stevens resigned this spring after four losing seasons.

Sullivan also served as an assistant football coach at the Durant school until 1954. He also was track and baseball coach.

But it was on the hardwoods where he reaped his glory. He credits it to "hard work and a great number of fine young men."

His All-Americans included Cotton Patton, Otho Curtis, Jim Spivey, Jerry Shipp, Max Yarborough and Connie McGuire. Some other standouts of his 30-year reign were Tall Boy Brown, Gene Jones, Austin Earnest, Troy Webb, Carl Roblyer, Cecil Hankins, Warren Womble, Richard Muldrew, Mervin Bass, Marvin Adams, Kirby Minter and "a whole lot of others."

Womble later became coach of the Peoria, Ill., AAU Caterpillars, and coached the 1952 United States Olympic championship team.

His former players, and associates have scheduled a banquet in Sullivan's honor July 20 at Lake Texoma Lodge.

The 60th Anniversary of American-Hungarian Federation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 11, 1967

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the American-Hungarian Federation this year is celebrating its 60th anniversary. This is a national organization representing American-Hungarian churches, fraternal organizations, societies, clubs, and associations. It was chartered 60 years ago by a group of clergymen and civic leaders of that nationality in Cleveland, Ohio.

Historically, the federation has been the bulwark of Hungarian culture in our Nation. It is also a catalyst to Hungarian immigrants who want to become an active part of the American way of life by serving American ideals and maintaining American values.

Today the federation continues its good work under the leadership of President Albert A. Kiok, a municipal judge from Pittsburgh, Pa.

A major aim of the federation is to direct attention to the problems of Hungary and other Danubian countries under Soviet rule. This is done largely through their foreign relations committee, presided over by Dr. Emery G. Szekely of Temple University, in Philadelphia.

Through the efforts of the federation, Americans of Hungarian origin are cognizant of the responsibilities of U.S. citizenship and they willingly and eagerly accept their responsibilities. Yet, they maintain a kinship with their native country and exercise an active concern with its problems.

The United States benefits through the cultural and intellectual endeavors of Hungarian-Americans. The American-Hungarian Federation has played a large part in furthering those endeavors.

Maryland Soldier Dies in Vietnam War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 10, 1967

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Pfc. Roger Blake, of Baltimore, Md., was killed by enemy fire in Vietnam on June 28. I wish to commend the courage of Private Blake and to honor his memory by including the following article in the RECORD:

Pfc. Roger L. Blake, 23, of 502 South Albemarle street, has been killed in action in Vietnam, the Defense Department announced yesterday.

Private Blake died June 28 under enemy cross-fire. He belonged to Company A of the 1st Cavalry Division.

Born in West Virginia, Private Blake came to Baltimore as a small boy. He graduated from Hampstead Hill Junior High School and from Patterson Park High School in 1960.

After graduation he attended the Weaver Airline Personnel School for several months and then drove his father's ice cream trucks.

WORKED FOR B. & O.

He had worked for the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad for more than a year when he was drafted last fall.

After his basic training at Fort Bragg, N.C., he received guerrilla warfare training at Fort Ord, Cal., and then armored car instruction at Fort Knox, Ky.

He returned to Baltimore for a few days leave in February and went back to Vietnam in March.

In frequent letters to his family and friends, he described the high morale of his company. He often said that he resented the anti-war demonstrators in this country when so many men were fighting in Vietnam, his sister-in-law said.

NEVER DOUBTED HIS DUTY

Although he wrote that he did not believe in killing, he said that he never doubted that it was his duty to be there, she said.

Survivors include his wife, the former Carol Sue Wood; a brother, Douglas Blake, of Baltimore; two sisters, Mrs. Dona Mahoney of Fort Myers, Fla., and Miss Jean Blake, of Baltimore; and his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Marvin Blake, of Baltimore.

The Freedom We So Casually Enjoy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 11, 1967

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, if our Nation is to survive the perils in which it presently finds itself, a greater number of Americans are going to have to take a more active and sincere interest in its well-being. Perhaps the first of January would be the most appropriate day for all of us to make such a resolution. After all, January 1 has long been the accustomed day for drafting lengthy lists of resolutions designed to help us secure the blessings of a satisfying and successful life. But as I look at this country of ours from both a domestic and worldwide point of view, I cannot help but feel that there is one resolution which cannot wait until January 1. Freedom demands hard work, and I strongly urge that Americans resolve to start working now, in this Fourth of July season.

The following editorial was written by Charles Dancey for publication in the Independence Day edition of the Peoria Journal Star, and I heartily recommend that my colleagues drain it for every ounce of worth. You will find it laden with the type of commonsense that our more way out interpreters of liberty would do well to ponder before they begin spinning their complex theoretical webs. Although commonsense is rapidly becoming a rarity, we can at least be thankful that it shows up like a diamond in the dust, beckoning that we pick it up and give it our every consideration.

The editorial follows:

THE FREEDOM WE SO CASUALLY ENJOY

(By C. L. Dancey)

He was a big barrel-chested fellow with a handlebar mustache and brown skin riding next to me on a beat-up old twin-engine plane en route to Odessa, Russia in 1959.

He took a cigarette and offered me one. Then, he pointed to the cigarette which was marked as having been made in the city of Tashkent, Uzbekistan. (An "autonomous republic" of the Soviet Union).

He stuck a big finger in his own chest and said . . . "oo menya . . . gorod," ("My city.")

I checked my calendar and indicated to him as best I could that I expected to be visiting Tashkent on July 4.

Then, added, in limping Russian: "July Four Is a Very Big Day in America."

He nodded: "Ya znayoo," ("I know,") and then ignored me, staring for a long time at the floor of the plane between his seat. Then, still staring blindly, he said in a low, rumble from deep in his chest—as if to himself—"Svoboda."

It means "freedom" or "independence."

You should have heard the way he said it. . . . And nothing more.

Beyond that place, beyond the Black Sea, high up in the Caucasus mountains of the land they call "Gruzhia" or "Georgia," I made a friend, and hardly a word of politics passed between us.

When I left, this friend gave me a "momento," and very soberly and earnestly and strongly impressed upon me that it was only a sample of Georgian "culture."

It was a poem.

Here is what it says: (It is addressed to a picture of the ancient Queen Tamara of Georgia in its "Golden Age.")

"We beg of thee to make us free
  And lead us on to liberty
But, woe! thy eyes see but the skies
  And not thy sons in slavery.

Thus humbled, low, thy son below,
  A wretch unmanned, is stricken mute.
All hopes have fled. All joy is dead.
  By cruel despair I stand subdued.

A word of lies, where honor dies,
  And all that fades, ne'er revives.
Of glory's fame that crowned thy name
  Is this the relic that survives?"

It seems that only people who have freedom can holler that they don't have it, and kick the word around freely for their own purposes.

You find that those who really don't have it cannot even talk about it. They are obliged to let you know, if at all, by circuitous means . . . and be careful of eye, word and manner to build into their messages the self-protection from tyranny that actually tyranny requires.

Few of us seem to understand that in the United States.

It is a great luxury not to have to learn that bitter lesson.

It is a luxury bestowed upon us by those who went before, and a minimum of decency or manhood would require that we respect them for it.

Unfortunately, it sometimes seems more commonplace for us to think of our forefathers as a bunch of stupid squares because they didn't have shiny automobiles, jet planes, television, miniskirts or loose morals.

We remember, "Liberty what crimes have been committed in thy name!" And we also paraphrase it to point and to shout, "Patriotism, what crimes have been committed in thy name!"

And it is true, that virtuous things are sometimes used as "cover" for "crimes."

It is still true, but the popular virtue today is "progress," being "modern"—and one wonders what crimes are being committed by us, today, in the name of "Progress."

It is not progress to ridicule all expressions and forms of patriotism. It is not progress to twist "freedom" to mean "anything I want" instead of its deeper, precious, vital meaning.

On the first Independence Day, men gathered around at the direct risk of their lives and the peril of their families, to proclaim the independence of Americans from British rule . . . and perhaps more important, to express the basic principles of another kind of freedom.

They set down the basic principles of human rights, of freedom of opportunity, which applies not to nations but to the sovereignty of the individual human being.

They risked their lives to establish that principle. They fought for it. Not for Utopia. Not for indulgence. Not even for security.

For the rights which we so casually enjoy today—and often complain are insufficient. For the rights denied millions of people on this earth, to their sorrow. And they seem, often, to know what they've lost far more intensely than we seem to know what we have.

Perhaps on one day at least, this Fourth of July, we could take a little time to reflect and briefly to humble ourselves a little bit, to be big enough to feel some gratitude for what we have, and respect and honor to those whose sacrifices through the generations have made it possible. Every single one of us should.

Handy-Cap Horizons Washington Tour

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 11, 1967

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, I was recently privileged to meet with members of Handy-Cap Horizons when they visited Washington on a sightseeing tour. Handy-Cap Horizons is a nonprofit corporation for the handicapped. Mrs. Dorothy S. Axsom, of Indianapolis, is president and also serves as tour sponsor and director. A devoted, highly capable, and amazingly energetic woman, Mrs. Axsom not only directs Handy-Cap Horizons but also heads the community relations program for the Atterbury Job Corps Center at Camp Atterbury, Edinburg, Ind.

This year's tour had assistance from Atterbury Job Corpsmen and staff members, as well as additional help from local members of the Capital Youth Corps. Westinghouse Electric Corp., which operates the Atterbury Job Corps center, also rendered material assistance to the group.

The following press release from the Atterbury center describes the tour:

EDINBURG, IND.—When members of Handy-Cap Horizons tour the White House next week, their helpers will be young boys and girls from Atterbury Job Corps Center and the Capital Job Corps Center in Washington, D.C.

In addition, one of the younger members of this national group of handicapped, Louis Earl, 15, of Nineveh, Indiana, will have his trip financed by the Atterbury Spanish Club, an organization of Corpsmen and staff members.

And three members of the Atterbury Center staff are using their annual vacations to join the touring group as adult helpers.

The cost of the Job Corps participation in this annual tour is being paid by Westinghouse Electric Corporation, whose subsidiaries operate both the Atterbury and Capital centers.

Handy-Cap Horizons is an Indiana-chartered, non-profit organization, which grew from tours for the handicapped conducted since 1957 by Mrs. Dorothy S. Axsom, of Indianapolis. She also directs the community relations program for Atterbury Center.

Last year, the members toured the islands of Hawaii. Several of those on the Washington tour will go on to Bermuda for an additional week while the Corpsmen and women return to their classes.

In Washington, besides their "VIP" tour of the White House, they will visit Mt. Vernon; a foreign embassy; both Houses of Congress; the FBI Headquarters; Westinghouse Defense and Space Center at nearby Baltimore, Md., and hear Indiana Congressman William Bray at their farewell banquet Friday, June 23, at the Sheraton-Park Hotel.

Other Atterbury staffers joining Mrs. Axsom are Mrs. Janet Shriver, of Franklin, and Dan Rogers of Indianapolis. Corpsmen include John Lavender, of Jacksonville, Florida; Edward Byrd, of Suffolk, Virginia, and Daniel Moss, of Grady, Arkansas.

Tourists include handicapped persons from Oregon, Missouri, Michigan, Illinois, Indiana, Ohio and New York.

Indiana Members include Joann Jolly, R. R. 1, Seymour; Vickie Sheffield, R. R. 1, Seymour; Mrs. Anna Earl, and her son, Louis, R. R. 1, Nineveh; Shirley Stucky, Box 385, Warren; Patrick Skirvin and Terry Sue Skirvin, Box 245, Nashville; Mrs. Mary Pence, 3901 N. Meridian, Indianapolis; Mrs. June Bovine, and daughter, Sue, 427 Bass St., Ft. Wayne; Barton Charnstrom, R. R. 4, Greenfield; Ray Davis, 1301 N. Dolton, Indianapolis; Richard Hake, Monroeville; Virginia Rose Hyatte, Lowell; Pamela Jaeger, 4639 Henry Ave., Hammond; Gloria Koenig, 1613 Spyrun Ave., Ft. Wayne; Janet Krygoski, 6117 White Oak Ave., East Chicago; Mr. and Mrs. Darrell Latham, 1001 Wilt St., Ft. Wayne; Mrs. Laura Kreuckeberg, 1001 Wilt St., Ft. Wayne, and Marsha L. Roberts, R. R. 2, Nashville.

Political Action in Lamb's Clothing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 11, 1967

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, time was when ministers devoted their work to the spiritual salvation of their flock and were a respected group as a whole. But since the manipulations of the tax-free foundations, we find the temptation for silver has dulled the spiritual inspiration of some men of the cloth who have joined in an unholy crusade to redesign our Christian Nation.

I cannot disagree with Brother Billy Graham that the Holy Bible commands us to work and aid the poor and needy. To give to Caesar what is his and to God what is His. But, nowhere can the new political advocate of the poverty program cite Scripture as to where the Good Book commands us to give our charity to "big brother" government so that Federal funds replace love and charity and government stands in the stead of God.

Mayhaps Brother Graham—now in Communist Yugosalvia—would teach the few Christian stalwarts suffering under a Godless leadership to give to the Communist government their gifts and let the poor—who are out of grace with communism—await their dole as charity from the Central Government.

For shame that so good a man as our Brother Billy Graham has lost the way from His teachings and, at most, has endorsed an increase in the income taxes of our trusting people.

Mr. Speaker, I include an article by Mr. Thurman Sensing, executive vice president of the Southern States Industrial Council; an editorial from the Baton Rouge Morning Advocate for July 4, and a UPI release of July 4 in the RECORD:

SENSING THE NEWS

(By Thurman Sensing, Executive Vice President, Southern States Industrial Council)

Because an international organization ostensibly is devoted to religious purposes, many citizens in many lands assume that such a group is genuinely devoted to the highest goals in life and is not a mask for political activity.

A case in point is the World Council of Churches, which has headquarters in Geneva, Switzerland. Innumerable innocent churchmen no doubt long have assumed that the WCC was free of the taint of anti-Western politics.

Unquestionably, therefore, many of these churchmen must have received a crude shock May 1—the Communist May Day—when the government of the Soviet Union announced that the Rev. Dr. Martin Niemoller, president of the World Council of Churches had been awarded one of its highest honors—the Lenin Prize.

The character of the Lenin Prize cannot be mistaken. It is given to those who, in one fashion or another, have advanced the interest of the communist world. Previous recipients of the Lenin Prize include Fidel Castro of Cuba and former Dictators Ahmed Ben Bella of Algeria and Kwame Nkrumah of Ghana.

News reports received in this country did not specify the reasons ascribed for giving the award to Dr. Niemoller. But knowledgeable Americans will recall that last year Dr. Niemoller went to North Vietnam and fiercely condemned the United States for its aerial attacks on Ho Chi Minh's bastion. This attack on the U.S. at a critical time in the American-South Vietnamese struggle against communist aggression was of major help to the communists in influencing "world opinion."

Those who have made a study of the World Council of Churches, do not find it extraordinary, however, that its president should receive the Lenin Prize from the USSR.

For years the WCC has been consistent in its opposition to moves by the West to protect freedom. It was strenuously against U.S. development of the hydrogen bomb, though that mighty weapon provided a nuclear shield for the free nations of the world.

At the same time, the WCC has been strangely silent about the terrors that take place behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains. Indeed, the leaders of the WCC have steadily promoted a dialogue with communists, a not surprising action inasmuch as leaders of the state-controlled churches of Eastern Europe and the USSR now are represented in the WCC.

The award of the Lenin Prize to the president of the World Council of Churches provides a timely and interesting background to recent speeches in the United States by the Rev. Dr. Eugene Carson Blake, former head of the National Council of Churches who is now general secretary of the WCC and, as such, right-hand man to Dr. Niemoller.

Speaking April 26 at Norwalk, Conn., Dr. Blake castigated the United States, the country of which he is a citizen and to which he owes loyalty. In a brutal attack on the American defense of freedom in Southeast Asia, he said: "The picture of a great and wealthy nation mobilizing each month more and more of its unparalled technological might to bring a tiny long-suffering, dark-skinned nation to capitulation means clearly that the more we win the more we lose and each American soldier dead or wounded is a useless sacrifice."

This, of course, a cruel and false picture of the American defense effort in Asia. The U.S. isn't picking on a "tiny long-suffering" nation. North Vietnam is a front and proxy for Moscow and Peking. Certainly this "tiny" state didn't build the exotic SAM missiles that are fixed at American aircraft. But Dr. Blake had no word of criticism for the Soviets or Chinese, nor did he refer to the campaign of terrorism that the North Vietnamese conduct against men, women and children in South Vietnam.

As for the reference to "dark-skinned," that is an unworthy piece of distortion aimed at misleading Americans and foreigners. The Vietnam war is not a war of whites against dark-skinned people. The U.S. is in Vietnam at the invitation of the free people of Vietnam who want to escape Hanoi's tyranny. Moreover, American forces in Vietnam include many Negroes, who are building a record of valor that is a credit to their nation and to their race.

Clearly, Dr. Eugene Carson Blake is following in the footsteps of Dr. Niemoller. He is hitting the U.S. as hard as the German pacifist clergyman who won the Soviet award. In time, Dr. Blake's speeches may earn him a Lenin Prize.

[From the Baton Rouge (La.) Morning Advocate, July 4, 1967]

THE FDP–DM–NCC AXIS

Of some interest in connection with the politics of the civil rights movement is the announcement of the Freedom Democratic Party of Mississippi that it is moving its headquarters from Jackson, the state capital, to the small city of Sunflower. The party chairman says that the move has been decided on because the party wishes to concentrate its efforts in that part of the Mississippi delta. The Sunflower telephone number given for the FDP is the same as that of the Delta Ministry of the National Council of Churches with which the party chairman says the FDP "will work closely."

The move from Jackson to Sunflower merely makes official what has been plain to everyone with half an eye to see all along. The Freedom Democratic Party is and always has been a political arm of the Delta Ministry, which is to say of the National Council of Churches. The Freeedom Democratic Party-Delta Ministry group has been responsible for political and social agitation in the delta area, for such activities as the FDP forays to Washington and the effort of a group of self-styled "unemployed plantation workers" to take over an unused air base, and for sensational stories about widespread starvation in the Delta area.

A favorite propaganda yarn of this same group has been the supposedly heartless and brutal manner in which plantation managers, supposedly resentful of growing political consciousness among their tenants and employees, have been "driving the latter off the land." This is the FDP–DM version of the mechanization of agriculture and the migration of farm workers to the cities, a process that was under way all over the nation long before the current civil rights agitation began.

BISHOPS BACK SUIT SUPPORTING VALLEY UNION

AUSTIN.—The Roman Catholic Bishops of Texas, Monday threw their support behind a suit filed by the Texas Council of Churches in federal court at Brownsville against Texas Rangers and other officers in connection with a drive to organize farm workers in the Rio Grande Valley.

The suit was filed early last week by the council of churches for an injunction to prevent the Rangers and Starr County officers from interfering with a council employe, his wife and two others.

The Bishops released a statement in Austin congratulating the council, saying "profoundly serious questions have been raised by reports emanating from the Rio Grande Valley."

The statement said the Rev. Edgar Krueger, who was hired by the council, and his wife "in the course of performing their assigned duties there were arrested and jailed by Texas Rangers."

"Rev. Kreuger has reported to the Texas Council of Churches that he and his wife were rudely manhandled by the Rangers, subjected to degrading verbal and physical treatment, publicly humiliated and unjustly imprisoned," the Bishops' statement said.

"If these reports are true, in whole or in part, it is a shameful disgrace to the entire State of Texas and appropriate remedial action is surely called for.

"In addition to the serious question of individual human rights which is involved in these reports, there is also a question, inherent in the reported accounts, regarding the possilbe use of the police force of the state to unduly interfere with the churches in carrying out a legitimate ministry."

The Texas Council of Churches, a Protestant organization, said it sent the Rev. Krueger and his wife to the Valley "to aid and counsel all parties" in the farm worker organization drive.

The suit contended Krueger was slapped by a Texas Ranger and a Ranger took a camera from his wife, exposed the film, and returned the camera.

National Marksmanship Programs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 11, 1967

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, it is important that the public have the facts. In the attacks upon the national marksmanship programs, a distinctly distorted picture has been presented by critics of these programs. I think it important that the other side of the story be known, and I am pleased to submit for reprinting in the RECORD a significant statement by Franklin L. Orth, executive vice president of the National Rifle Association:

NATIONAL MARKSMANSHIP PROGRAMS

"While nearly half a million young Americans fighting Communism in Vietnam rely heavily on rifles, homefront attacks on civilian marksmanship activities that prepare our finest young men for military service have reached such a reckless pitch that the Communist Party, U.S.A., has openly joined them.

"Patriotic Americans both in and outside public life are being increasingly misled by propagandists as to the purposes and accomplishments of the Civilian Marksmanship Program which has been sponsored since 1903 by the Army's National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice, assisted by the National Rifle Association as a patriotic service. The American public is also being deliberately misinformed concerning the National Matches conducted annually at Camp Perry, Ohio, and scheduled to be held this year Aug. 3–Sept. 1.

"To dispel this barrage of propaganda, which apparently is aimed at lowering the marksmanship level of American servicemen, present and future, the National Rifle Association feels that it is its duty to present certain facts concerning not only the Civilian Marksmanship Program and National Matches, but the NRA itself. Briefly:

"1. The Civilian Marksmanship Program represents the least expensive way of teaching many young Americans to shoot, because the NRA provides free of Government expense the necessary instructors, ranges and other aids. As one Congressman accurately expressed it in preventing a curtailment of appropriation last month, the NRA 'is actually subsidizing the U.S. Treasury' and not the other way around.

"2. Individual civilian competitors at Camp Perry are not subsidized in any way. They pay for their own travel, lodgings, meals, and entry fees. State teams, not exceeding 14 persons or a maximum of 700 individuals, receive 5¢ a mile travel and $1.50 for meals, or less than half of their actual expenses. In return, they attend the latest military combat marksmanship courses and act as instructors in their States.

"3. More than half of the $2,717,300 which has been quoted as the Government cost of the National Matches (1965 figure) represents an expense that would be incurred even if the matches were cancelled, as it consists of pay and allowances for support personnel who would in any case be called up for reserve duty annually. By crediting the overall program with other revenue including surplus arms sales, the net cost to the Government can be reduced to approximately $500,000. This represents an estimated cost to the Government of only $16.50 per soldier for civilian pre-induction marksmanship training.

"4. The NRA, in furtherance of such programs and of the national defense generally, feels duty-bound to oppose all proposals that might now or in the future impede or curtail the legitimate instruction and use of firearms by law-abiding Americans. It has been alleged without basis that the NRA is primarily a lobbyist group. Actually, the NRA is a self-supporting organization of more than 800,000 members, the largest sportsmen's association in the nation and perhaps in the world, and it devotes only about 3% of its normal revenues to legislative matters. Most of this is spent simply to inform its members of Federal and State legislation on firearms, conservation and related matters which, when constructive and in the public interest, the NRA traditionally supports. The organization's main concern is with firearms safety, in hunting, target shooting and in general, and with the proper use of firearms for legitimate pastime.

"5. Concerning pending bills in the Congress, the NRA is on record as supporting a series of reasonable measures which, from its long and respected experience in the firearms field, it sincerely believes should help curb the illicit use of guns by some 125,000 criminals without impairing the legitimate activities of an estimated 50,000,000 law-abiding gun owners.

"Despite recent misrepresentations by its critics, the NRA has always steadfastly adhered to the full principles of Americanism. It opposes extremists of all sorts and constantly screens NRA applicants and activities to exclude improper ones. In this respect, it cooperates closely with appropriate Federal and State agencies including the FBI and State Adjutants General.

"The NRA is in its 96th year, a venerable organization with the highest antecedents. President Ulysses S. Grant, 18th President of the United States, was the 8th President of the NRA, to cite only one. Americans of unimpeachable patriotism and of all walks of life have been proud through the generations to be NRA members.

"The final proof of the genuine Americanism of the NRA, if any is required, came recently in the form of a published attack on the organization in The Worker, official organ of the Communist Party, U.S.A., signed by two longtime avowed Communists, National Chairman Henry Winston and Party Secretary Gus Hall. These spokesmen openly attacked the NRA with typical distorted accusations and demanded that Federal appropriations for the Civilian Marksmanship Program be cut off.

"It is quite understandable that these opponents of the American way of life, whether in this country or in Vietnam, should be opposed to any program which improves the military efficiency of the American Armed Forces.

"What is saddening and sickening to many loyal Americans is to see their honest fellow-Americans misled into adopting a similar attitude and into attacking the very programs which help to defend our country."

We Are Still in the Jungle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 11, 1967

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important functions of the Government is the protection of health of the Nation.

Individuals who buy meats and meat products cannot inspect the slaughtering plant where their meat came from in a vast meat industry like we have in the United States. Only the Government can render this kind of protection adequately.

Hearings are now being held on a bill designed to further protect the American people against the risk of unwholesome and adulterated meat and meat products being sold to them without their knowledge.

An article appeared in the July 15, 1967, issue of the New Republic by Ralph Nader under the title "We're Back in the Jungle." I believe it is a subject matter that is of interest to many Americans and should be available to all who use the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for informational and resource material.

WE'RE STILL IN THE JUNGLE

(By Ralph Nader)

Before he was elected to the House of Representatives in 1958, farmer Neal Smith (D, Iowa) noticed something curious about the numerous livestock sales he attended. The same buyers seemed to be purchasing all the diseased, sick and maimed cattle and hogs. The destination of this miserable cargo was slaughterhouses not subject to federal inspection because the meat was sold only within the state. These meat-packing houses are outside the federal Meat Inspection Act of 1906. Since they do not have to incur the risk of having meat rejected by a federal inspector, the intrastate packing firms manage to outbid other potential buyers. Once in possession of these animals, they are free, as Rep. Smith points out, to cut the eye out of the cancer-eyed cow and send the rest of the carcass through the stream of commerce on its way to the dinner table.

Since 1961, Smith has been trying vainly to secure passage of strong amendments to the Meat Inspection Act—a law which has not been amended substantively since its enactment 61 years ago following publication of Upton Sinclair's *The Jungle*. The proposed amendments would extend federal jurisdiction to all packing and processing companies operating intrastate but deemed to affect interstate commerce, as well as close glaring gaps which have absolved unscrupulous operators from legal sanctions. Until last month, Smith's bill was not even accorded a subcommittee hearing.

About 15 percent of the commercially slaughtered animals (19 million head) and 25 percent of commercially processed meat products in the US—enough meat for 30 million people a year—are not covered by adequate inspection laws. According to the Department of Agriculture, significant portions of this meat are diseased and are processed in grossly unsanitary conditions, and its true condition is masked by the latest preservatives, additives and coloring agents.

Even in federally inspected plants, management is reluctant to resist the temptation of keeping costs down by keeping revolting meats on the sales shelf. In one year, the Department of Agriculture reported that its inspectors condemned over 22 million pounds of meat as tainted, rancid, moldy, odorous, unclean or contaminated. And consumers of meat sold *intrastate* have not been fortunate enough to have any such screening procedure by public specialists. Contaminated meat, horsemeat and meat from sick animals originally intended for dog and cat food has ended up in hamburger and processed meat. Eyeballs, lungs, hog blood and chopped hides and other indelicate carcass portions are blended skillfully into baloney and hot dogs. Hamburger embalmed with sulfite—a federally banned additive that gives old meat a deceptively bright pink color, abounds. One New York state survey found sulfite in 26 out of 30 hamburger samples.

A New York state official estimated that 90 percent of the uninspected processed meat sold in the state is deceptively labeled. Those big hams that you buy have 10 to 30 percent of their weight in water pumped into their veins at the supermarket's back room, meat is doped with Aureomycin as a substitute for sanitation, and detergents are applied to freshen up unfit meat. So the NY finding is not surprising.

It would be misleading to compare such intrastate operations today with those conditions prevailing at the turn of the century: As far as impact on human health is concerned, the likelihood is that the current situation is worse! The foul spectacle of packing houses in that earlier period has given way to more tolerable working conditions, but the callous misuse of new technology and processes has enabled today's meat handlers to achieve marketing levels beyond the dreams of their predecessors' avarice. It took some doing to cover up meat from tubercular cows, lump-jawed steers and scabby pigs in the old days. Now the wonders of chemistry and quick-freezing techniques provide the cosmetics of camouflaging the product and deceiving the eyes, nostrils and taste buds of the consumer. It takes specialists to detect the deception. What is more, these chemicals themselves introduce new and complicated hazards unheard of 60 years ago.

With conditions worsening year after year, the Department of Agriculture finally moved itself to dispatch a fact-gathering mission on intrastate meat slaughtering and processing operations. (There are 2,500 slaughterhouses and many thousands of meat processors operating solely within state borders.) The report, prepared by Dr. R. M. Clarkson, came in two portions. The public portion was presented in 1963 to a House appropriations subcommittee, while the nonpublic portion—said to be filled with sickening pictures, affidavits and other documentation—remains inaccessible in the department's files. Dr. Clarkson's public findings, however, were jolting enough without the pictorial assists. He criticized packers and processors for:

"allowing edible portions of carcasses to come in contact with manure, pus and other sources of contamination during the dressing operations;

"allowing meat food products during preparation to become contaminated with filth from improperly cleaned equipment and facilities;

"use of chemical additives and preservatives that would not have been permitted under federal meat inspection;

"failing to use procedures to detect or control parasites transmitted to man that could lead to diseases such as trichinosis and cysticercosis;

"Inadequate controls to prevent possible adulteration of meat food products during their preparation with substitutes such as water, gum, cereals or sodium caseinate;

"use of false or deceptive labels on packaging;

"failure to supervise destruction of obviously diseased tissues and spoiled, putrid and filthy materials."

The Clarkson report fell upon the states with all the force of a helium balloon. Only 41 states have any form of law at all related to meat inspection. Of these, 26 provide for mandatory inspection of animals before and after slaughter; the rest have voluntary programs. Twenty-five states provide for mandatory inspection of processed meat products. The legal authority on paper is weak enough, but its efficacy deteriorates to near futility because of grossly inadequate enforcement funds, personnel and laboratory facilities and the omnipresent pressure of local packing and processing firms. Many of these firms are substantial business operations. Year after year, attempts to obtain bigger state legislative appropriations are tabled or defeated.

Probably the most effective restraint working to shield these packers and processors from inspection and safety standards is their common interest with both state departments of agriculture and the U.S. Department of Agriculture in promoting the sale of meat products. Promotion is the categorical imperative animating these governmental agencies entrusted with the mission of insuring the safety of meat products. Despite the devastating evidence in its files, the U.S. Department of Agriculture adheres in its policymaking to the avoidance of unfavorable publicity about meat products as the first priority. Consequently, years have passed without congressional hearings when all the department had to do was to request them.

Finally, late last month, chiefly through Rep. Smith's urgings, the livestock and grains subcommittee of the House Committee on Agriculture opened hearings on bills to update and strengthen the Meat Inspection Act. The Administration's bill, H.R. 6168, is a pathetic response to the needs of effective regulation. The department's witness, Rodney E. Leonard, took note of the hazards of "fast-curing processes, artificial tenderizing, artificial smoking, coloring agents and other additives that are potentially deceptive or dangerous to one's health." He added that there "are many opportunities for illegitimate operators to introduce into human food channels meat derived from dead, dying, disabled and diseased animals—commonly referred to as '4-D's'." Then he came up with the department's proposal—Federal technical and financial assistance to the states if they desire to toughen their laws! If a state chooses to remain indifferent to its responsibilities, as there is every indication to believe will occur, the federal government remains powerless. (H.R. 6168 would eliminate some deficiencies in federal meat inspection authority but then proceeds to reduce the penalties for knowing violations from the 1906 Act's levels.)

Even such a weak legislative offering is too strong medicine for the states. The National Association of State Agriculture Departments is scheduled to appear at the resumption of the House hearings on July 17 with a number of amendments designed to turn the bill into a nullity. If anything remains of the bill, the Independent Meat Packers Association will tell the subcommittee how to finish it off.

The administration's position on this entire matter is not being helped by the Department of Agriculture's determination to take over the Food and Drug Administration's powers over unsafe meat, principally seizure authority. The department's conflict of interest between its promotional and safety responsibilities does not merit such presumptuous preemption; nor does the department's record of indifference to the effect of drugs, including antibiotics, in animal and poultry feeds on human health.

The Department of Agriculture's laggard response to the intrastate contaminated poultry problem since enactment of the Poultry Products Inspection Act in 1957 further weakens confidence. A recent study, assisted by the National Institutes of Health, revealed that out of 2,057 samples of poultry taken from two representative plants, 11.2 percent contained the salmonella organisms. (The incidence of salmonellois has increased sharply in the past 20 years.) The uninspected plant contributed a salmonella rate triple that of the federally inspected plant. The rapid growth of new frozen food products and "ready to serve" dishes that are eaten following short cooking periods are increasing the danger of trichinosis and other bacterial diseases. This trend is alarming scientists at various universities. Yet the department, apart from grudging recognition of the problem, does not rise to the challenge because of an aversion to unfavorable publicity for its clientele.

When Upton Sinclair's book came out on January 25, 1906, it was front-page news from coast to coast. Theodore Roosevelt wired the young author to visit him at the White House to discuss the problem. Now, with many more threats to consumers contained in the combination of old vices with new technology, the great hush-hush is the order of the day. Perhaps, Upton Sinclair, who at age 88 lives just outside of Washington, is needed once again to tell the Congress that the Jungle is still with us.

Wheat Month in Kansas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER L. MIZE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 11, 1967

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, July is being observed in Kansas as Wheat Month. In this connection, I wish to call attention to an excellent editorial from the Topeka, Kans., Daily Capital which sets forth not only the value of the wheat crop to the economy of Kansas but to the rest of the world as well. The editorial follows:

WHEAT MONTH

It is fitting that Gov. Robert Docking has proclaimed July "Kansas Wheat Month" for much that has made this state famous and prosperous derives from the crop.

For years Kansas has been known as the wheat state, a title originating in the fact that it is the leading wheat producing state in the nation with approximately one-fifth of the U.S. wheat crop grown here.

In Kansas, wheat accounts for approximately one-third of the cash receipts from farming, with a 10-year average of $360 million. Only livestock production tops this.

Cash sales of wheat are only a fraction of its value to Kansas, for wheat is the basic raw material for the milling and baking industries as well as for storage and transportation facilities.

Harvesting a wheat crop sets off a chain reaction of moving or storing the grain and converting it to use, all of which means millions of dollars.

It means food on tables throughout the world, for through Uncle Sam's largess hungry people over the globe have been sustained by Kansas wheat.

Partly because of proximity to the source of supply, Kansas is the leading state in flour production and second in the number and capacity of grain storage plants.

While this year's crop is not up to par because of last fall's dry weather and this spring's and summer's excessive rains, especially during harvest, wheat still is a major factor in making Kansas rich.

It is good that Kansans take time occasionally, as during this specially-proclaimed month, to sing the praises of wheat as a staff of life.

Election Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 11, 1967

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a recent public service television and radio newscast, "The Kee Report." The subject discussed is election spending, as follows:

This is Jim Kee, bringing you the Kee Report.

This week I would like to talk to you about one of the most perplexing problems of democratic government. This problem is the use of money, and sometimes the excessive use of money, in political campaigns.

Campaigning for political office has been costly since the early days of this Republic. But in recent times the cost of electioneering, especially where the presidency is at stake, has inflated to an alarming degree. Billboards and newspaper advertising and campaign buttons are more expensive than they used to be. But the major inflation has been caused by the advent of television and the candidate who tried to run a national campaign without television would be lost before he started.

Last year, Congress enacted the first major overhaul of Federal election laws in 25 years. A law was passed authorizing the use of tax money to finance presidential elections. The plan worked like this: as a taxpayer, you could instruct the Treasury Department to donate one dollar of your tax money to your favorite political party, either Democratic or Republican. It was estimated that in this way as much as $30 million could be raised for each of the two major political parties.

This year Congress had second thoughts and this plan of campaign financing was suspended until special guide lines are worked out to govern its operation. There is no doubt that the plan needs additional safeguards. It is also true that a major overhaul of existing statutes is badly needed.

The reason is that the spiraling cost of present-day campaigning has resulted in two potential dangers to the democratic process. The first danger is that only the candidate with the most wealthy backers may hope to win. The second danger is that is campaign costs keep on skyrocketing, a man of modest means will find himself unable to run for the White House. Although the next presidential election is more than a year away, the electioneering process is already in full swing.

There are many sincere citizens who oppose the idea of Federal financing for presidential campaigns because they fear it will encourage excessive spending by the major political parties. There is that danger but reasonable guidelines should keep spending within reasonable bounds.

The real need for change is found in the fact that existing Federal statutes are outdated and wholly unsuited to present day needs.

The so-called Hatch Act, which fixed a limit of $3 million for each campaign committee, was enacted before World War II. The purpose was to limit each party to $3 million. But each party could now legitimately spend that much in one month.

In the past, both major parties have set up independent committees to get around the law. In this way, they could exceed the $3 million limitation. But while the practice was legal, it was a subterfuge to get around the law—and the American people do not like subterfuge in the election of a President.

Federal financing of presidential elections may not be the ideal solution. But it is certainly an improvement on what we have today.

Thank you for listening.

Open Letter to Premier Kosygin on Lithuanian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 11, 1967

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the open letter to Premier Kosygin written by the Committee To Restore Lithuania's Independence.

The letter points out the great discrepancy between the words of Premier Kosygin when he addressed the General Assembly and the fact of continuing Russian aggression and oppression in case of the peoples of the Baltic States.

The letter read as follows:

THE BALTIC QUESTION: OPEN LETTER TO PREMIER KOSYGIN

NEW YORK, N.Y.

On June 19, 1967, the Soviet Premier, Aleksei Kosygin, in addressing the United Nations General Assembly, accused Israel of continuing aggression by occupying the territories of the United Arab Republic, Syria and Jordan.

Mr. Kosygin defined continuing aggression was attempts "to interfere in the internal affairs of independent countries and peoples, to impose on them, from the outside, political concepts and views alien to them on the social order."

The Soviet Premier is adept at defining continuous aggression, for his state has a long record of conspiracy against the sovereignty and territorial integrity of independent nations. While vituperating against the State of Israel, Mr. Kosygin would do well to consider his own government's continuing aggression. The most conspicuous victims of joint Soviet-Russian and Nazi German aggression are the Baltic States of Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia.

The annexation of the Baltic States by the Soviet Union was pre-determined by the Ribbentrop-Molotov Pact of August 23, 1939. The agreement stated: "In the event of territorial and political rearrangement in the areas belonging to the Baltic States (Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania and Finland), the northern boundary of Lithuania shall represent the boundary of the spheres of influence of Germany and the U.S.S.R."

While the attention of the world was focussed on the Blitzkrieg in the West, the Soviet Union imposed it's "sphere of influence." On June 15, 1940, troops and tanks of the Red Army poured into the Baltic States. Moscow hastily set up puppet governments. A single list of representatives, hand-picked by Moscow, was proposed to the "liberated" countries. To insure the election of the Communist candidates, tens of thousands of people were arrested on the eve of the elections as a threat to those who might protest by refusal to vote. The decisions of the "elected representatives" to "request" incorporation of the three Baltic States into the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics were prepared in Moscow and carried out by the occupying Red Army.

In their zeal to impose their alien system on the Baltic States, the Soviets deported or liquidated 700,000 men, women and children from Lithuania alone, between June, 1941 and March, 1951. Notwithstanding this inhuman oppression, the peoples of the Baltic Nations perservere in their aspirations towards personal freedom and national independence.

While addressing the General Assembly, Mr. Kosygin unequivocally stated, "In the course of its 50 year history, the Soviet Union has regarded all peoples, large or small, with respect; every people enjoys the right to establish an independent national state of its own. This constitutes one of the fundamental principles of the policy of the Soviet Union. While upholding the rights of peoples to self-determination, the Soviet Union just as resolutely condemns the attempts by any state to conduct an aggressive policy toward other countries—a policy of conquest of foreign lands and the subjugation of the peoples living there."

In view of the above facts, we request the Premier to clarify the following questions:

Why has the Soviet Union continued to violate the soverignty of Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia?

When will the Soviet Union apply the principles of the United Nations Charter to the Baltic States?

When will the Soviet military and administrative apparatus be withdrawn from the territory of the Baltics?

When will the Soviet Union desist from its policy of Russification and Sovietization of the Baltic peoples?

When will the Baltic victims of mass deportation be allowed to return to their homelands?

When will the Soviet Union cease interfering in the political, social, and religious life of the Baltic States?

Mr. Premier, the Baltic Republics have a right to preserve their own languages, religious freedoms, traditions and political aspirations. Will you enact measures to correct the gross injustices imposed by Stalin on the Baltic Nations and restore independence—or are your noble words addressed to the General Assembly mere hypocrisy?

Executive coordinators: Algirdas Budreckis, Romas Kezys, Anthony B. Mazeika, Joseph Miklovas, Anthony V. Snieckus.

COMMITTEE TO RESTORE LITHUANIA'S INDEPENDENCE.

Sister City Trip to Mexico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 11, 1967

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, during this past spring the a cappella choir of the Charter Oak High School, Covina, Calif., took a 10-day trip to Mexico to perform for the people of Mexico under the sponsorship of the people-to-people program.

Covina is located in the 24th District of California, which it is my privilege to represent in Congress.

The central purpose of the trip by the Charter Oak High School choir was to visit and perform in Covina's sister city of Jalapa, Veracruz, Mexico. Following their stay in Jalapa the group journeyed to Mexico City. It then presented a concert at Quadalahara, Mexico, on Easter Sunday afternoon prior to returning home.

From all accounts the trip was an unqualified success. It afforded the Charter Oak High School students a unique opportunity to visit another country. They met and learned about Mexico and its people. Everywhere they went they were courteously and enthusiastically received. The trip was a fine opportunity to generate mutual goodwill and friendship between the United States and Mexico.

Because I know the experiences of the Charter Oak High School a cappella choir will be of widespread interest, under leave to extend my remarks I submit a summary of the trip which was prepared by Mr. John W. Hunt, Jr., principal of Charter Oak High School.

The summary follows:

CHARTER OAK HIGH SCHOOL CHOIR TRIP TO JALAPA, VERACRUZ, MEXICO

The Sister City portion of the People-to-People Program, sponsored by the United States Government, has recently afforded an opportunity for a group of 72 A Cappella Choir students and their advisors from Charter Oak High School to tour Mexico for ten days in order to sing for the people of Mexico.

The major purpose of the tour was to bring a cultural exchange between the people of the City of Covina, California, and the people of their Sister City of Jalapa, Veracruz, Mexico. Through the efforts of the officials of the city of Covina, the city of Jalapa and the Charter Oak Unified School District, arrangements were made for two concerts in Jalapa and one concert at Agua Azul Park in the city of Guadalahara on Easter Sunday.

The Charter Oak High School Choir has for many years had an extremely fine reputation among schools and the communities of the East San Gabriel Valley. When the choir director, Mr. Leonard Cesene, and the City Administrator of Covina, Mr. Neil Goedhard, discussed the possibility of this kind of exchange, the students and the administrative officials of the Charter Oak, Unified School District were extremely pleased and enthusiastic about the possibilities. After much dilligent work, two bus loads of students left Charter Oak High School at 4:00 a.m. on Saturday, March 18, for a ten-day trip through Mexico. For two and one-half days students and their sponsors rode day and night to arrive at the city of Jalapa at 3:00 a.m. on the morning of March 21. On the way to Jalapa, students were able to see much of the Mexican country side, to see how the people live and to talk with the Mexican children at the various stops.

In Jalapa the students were accommodated in the dormitories at the new Olympic Village. The choir gave two performances in Jalapa. One was at the beautiful, new National Auditorium which was filled to capacity by the people of that city. The students were extremely well received and the people of Jalapa seemed to enjoy and appreciate the skill with which high school students could sing and the beauty of their selections. They, in turn, presented several folklore dances, which the students of Charter Oak High School were enthusiastic about. A second performance was also held in Juarez Square the next evening before a large audience. Of significant importance to the students was the opportunity for them to spend an afternoon and part of an evening talking with teen-agers in Jalapa and getting to know them. Everyone involved felt that truly a great amount of good will was transmitted back and forth between the people of Jalapa and Covina in both the formal and the informal gatherings in which they participated.

After two and one-half days, the group left for Mexico City where they spent one day and two evenings touring the city and getting as much of the culture and color of Mexico and Mexico City as they possibly could. The next stop on the itinerary was Guadalahara. The group arrived in Guadalahara on Saturday evening prior to Easter Sunday and were met there cordially by officials of that city. The city officials had arranged for the choir to sing at the Agua Azul Park on Easter Sunday afternoon. The group sang before approximately ten thousand people in the seating area. Because the music was piped throughout the park from the outdoor amphitheater, another fifteen thousand people were able to listen to and appreciate the selections brought to them from the United States. The opportunity for our young people to meet the young people of Guadalahara and for them to talk with Mexicans from all walks of life was truly an outstanding experience and one which I am sure was a mutual benefit to both the Mexicans and the Americans.

The students left Guadalahara on Sunday evening for the trip back to the United States. Again, the students were able to meet with many Mexican children and teenagers and talk with them. The group arrived back at Charter Oak High School on Tuesday afternoon, March 28. They brought with them many things that they had purchased in Mexico; but of most importance to them was the experience that they had in seeing another country, seeing how other people live and realizing, possibly for some of them for the first time, the advantages of living in the United States. The exchange trip was arduous, but this opportunity afforded by the People-to-People Program provided another strong link in the chain of mutual understanding between our two countries.

Israelis Don't Overmanage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 11, 1967

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, in the July 2 edition of the Peoria Journal Star, editor in chief Charles L. Dancey seems to have placed his finger on the brilliance of Israel's Defense Minister, Moshe Dayan. In a nutshell, Dancey portrays Dayan as a great believer in freedom of action preferring to shy away from overmanagement. Mr. Dancey wisely infers that Dayan's no strings attached policy can be a highly successful modus operandi in areas other than military science. I include the editorial at this point in the RECORD:

ISRAELIS DON'T OVERMANAGE

The world is pretty well convinced that Moshe Dayan, the one-eyed Israeli general, is a brilliant tactician and military leader.

Our own politicians have made the jokes about trading 400 F-111's (with McNamara thrown in) for "a one-eyed Israeli general."

What is Dayan's approach?

His diary of the previous Sinai campaign reveals it in detail as well as in succinct example. The example is the kind of orders he said he gave. He said he could tell the commander of a mobile force something like this: "Here is the force you have. Here is where you start from. Here is the direction you are to take. You are to reach the Suez canal in three days. Don't signal me for any men or other assistance. You have all there is. Just do it."

And that's all.

He said that the Israeli army had the kind of field commanders who could act on such orders and solve their own problems as they came to them. That, of course, is what makes for swift and decisive action.

In short, Dayan follows an old and honored rule of military administration that goes down through all ranks as the way to get things done. The rule is: "Tell a commander what must be done, but don't tell him how to do it."

The idea is that if you have a good man on the job, he can figure out the answers on the spot better than you can figure them out at some location far from the problem itself.

There is nothing more inefficient, nothing more fraught with danger and error, nothing more sterile to effective action of any kind than over-management . . . too much interference from "upstairs."

Clear "policy" as to the objective and general line of attack, and then freedom of action for the doers is the way to get things done.

The principle applies to a great deal more than just military science, and is equally hallowed in the doctrines of professional management.

But it is a hard one for politicians, amateurs, lawyers, specialists, "experts," and especially bureaucrats to pursue.

This is the basic reason why free societies always turn out to be more efficient than regimented ones in terms of actual results.

In the age of experts, of computers, and of political "management" it would be well if we Americans would remember this fundamental principle and not drift as far from it as we seem to be drifting.

Panama Canal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 11, 1967

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, with permission of the writer, included herewith is letter dated June 27 from a man of great experience in the Panama Canal. At a time when over 130 Members of this House have filed a concurrent resolution against the treaty remanding the Panama Canal Zone to the Republic of Panama, it is particularly apropos:

MINDEN, LA., *June 27, 1967.*

Congressman DURWARD HALL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR DURWARD: On a visit to the Panama Canal Zone, where I do a nice business, and having traveled in there for some six (6) years now very steadily and intermittently now from 1952, I have become acquainted with a great number of businessmen.

During this last trip, many of these businessmen, in fact all whom I had time to contact, asked me to return to the States, and to talk to the Senate and the Congress with respects to the Johnson Administration turning over to the Communists the Panama Canal. These men with which I talked naturally are in no way connected with the Commies, in no way connected with Castro, and for that matter not connected with the lousy president of the country of Panama.

It was my privilege to visit Panama two days after the big racket there in early 1964 when a friend of mine was shot, but not seriously wounded. This was at a time when the Communists were throwing their weight with respects to the Panamanian Flag as an excuse to be flown in the Canal Zone.

If history reminds me correctly, we have spent some 4.7 billion on the canal and we lost a lot of American souls in its construction. This canal, as you know, gives lifeblood to the Eastern and Central United States for its operations in the Pacific.

There is no more reason for the Johnson Administration to turn over the Panama Canal to the Communist than there is for them to turn over the Western Half of the United States to the Communists. I say damn any man who will attempt to toy with this treaty of 1903. Frankly, what we need is a man in the White House who built the Canal, namely Teddy Roosevelt.

Fight it, Durward, and if I can be of any help whatsoever, please advise. I am writing a number of Congressmen and a number of Senators with respects thereto.

Very sincerely yours,

ED C. HUNT.

Proposed Tax Increase

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER S. BARING

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 11, 1967

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, like many of my colleagues I have received quite a voluminous mail concerning the proposed increase in income tax. Of the many that I have received, I would like to place in the RECORD the following letter from one of my constituents, Mrs. Velma B. Johnston, of Reno, Nev., concerning the proposed increase in income tax. As the writer points out, we have strayed a long way from the path of being free, enterprising Americans. The letter follows:

RENO, NEV., *June 28, 1967.*

Hon. WALTER S. BARING,
Congressman for Nevada, Rayburn Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR WALTER: Thought you'd like to receive word from one of your more vocal constituents, concerning the proposed increase in income tax.

I have today made application for a "moonlighting" job. Am I doing this because I suddenly find myself with more free time than I know what to do with? Am I doing this because at age 55, after 38 years of continuous employment as a secretary-accountant, I have such boundless energy that I must find some outlet for it? Am I bored with the usual things one does after a day's work, such as indulging in a hobby; or going to a show; or having guests in for the evening; or maybe just plain resting? The answers are "no".

Having been reared in the old school that taught us to assume our own responsibilities of providing for our education; our medical expenses and those of our family; our own senior citizens in the twilight of their years; our own "rainy days" that come into the life of each of us occasionally—my earnings have gone for those things. And in years gone by (too long ago to remember, almost) there was even enough left over for modest deposits in a savings account. It was all an integral part of life as a free, enterprising American.

Then along came income and social security taxes for various "do-good" programs . . . not too bad at first, but increasing steadily over the years like a cancer that eventually destroys the unfortunate victim. Added to the cost of discharging what I have always considered my own responsibilities financially, the burden has become staggering. Caught in the unenviable tax bind of being a single person since Charles' death, not eligible to qualify as head of a household even though I maintain a home with its attendant expenses, and hopelessly trying to cope with the astronomical rise in the cost of living, I am faced with the realization that my one salary cannot possibly stand a greater tax confiscated to take care of the freeloaders who are rapidly becoming accustomed to a standard of living that I can no longer afford.

So . . . in order to help The Great Benevolent White Father distribute largesse to the ever-increasing multitude with its hand out; in order to continue the prosperity of this great country of ours (*WHOSE* prosperity, I ask, and am told it would take a week to explain the whole complicated mess of it); and in order to keep from sinking in the sea of insolvency that is slowly but surely drowning a great segment of the people of our land whose income no longer equals the outgo—I hope I land that "moonlighting" job, and once having landed it that I will have the health and energy to keep it.

Do the financial wizards of our Administration have the answer to these questions:

"What happens when the goose that lays the golden egg just plain quits from exhaustion?"

"What happens when the initiative and enterprise that made this country great dissolve in complete apathy?"

If it were only I who is troubled and discouraged and downright angry, I would take a course in business management (at my own expense) in the hope of learning how to handle my financial affairs better. But I have millions of equally troubled, discouraged and downright angry individuals for company, and I'm sure we can't all be completely inefficient or inadequate.

Best wishes, Walter. And thanks for listening to me.

Sincerely,

Mrs. VELMA B. JOHNSTON.

The Big Achievement of Glassboro: Better Understanding

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NEAL SMITH

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 11, 1967

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, the euphoric dreamers in our midst who believed that the summit meeting between President Johnson and Premier Kosygin would lead to quick solutions to the difficult problems confronting the world will be very disappointed. But those of us who are more realistic—and I believe this includes the majority of Americans—view the summit conference as a first, but important, step toward a greater understanding that may lead to a brighter future for all mankind.

President Johnson has said that none of the major problems was solved at this meeting. But this was to be expected. What was accomplished—and perhaps even more important in the long run—was a clear notion, on the part of both leaders, about where their countries stand on the vital issues of our time.

As the Des Moines Register notes:

> The meeting at Glassboro should be viewed as a means of establishing better understanding between the two governments rather than as a device for making compromises and settling problems.

And the paper adds:

> As such, it seems to have been worthwhile. The two leaders probably know more intimately the fine points of their differences, which could be helpful.

The world of the nuclear bomb leaves little room for miscalculation. And because this is so, I think a significant contribution to a more stable community of nations has been achieved at Glassboro. For by sitting down to reason together, the President and Kosygin could cut through the diplomatic glaze and secondhand interpretations that often cloud the issues between nations, and lead to tragic mistakes.

The American people strongly support the President's effort at Glassboro. And deservedly so. Peace and understanding are synonymous. We may now dare to hope that with the understanding achieved at Glassboro, the quest for peace is an important step closer to realization.

Under unanimous consent I insert into the RECORD an editorial from the Des Moines Register on the summit conference:

[From the Des Moines Register, June 27, 1967]

NO SIGN OF COMPROMISE

Americans who may have expected that Alexei Kosygin and Lyndon Johnson would reach positive agreements on world issues have been disillusioned. There was no reason to think that the leaders of the two superpowers could settle any major question, but the drama surrounding a meeting "at the summit" invariably leads to false expectations.

Kosygin, less than any Soviet leader since the Communist revolution, can conclude agreements on his own. He is part of a team or "collective" now running the Soviet Union, and it is far from certain that he is No. 1 on the team, as Chairman Nikita Khrushchev obviously was when he met with Presidents Eisenhower and Kennedy.

Leonid Brezhnev, first secretary of the Soviet Communist party, may well possess more power than Kosygin. The first secretaryship is the post from which Stalin and Khrushchev gained and wielded dictatorial authority. But it seems more likely that the present leadership of Russia is truly by committee, with Brezhnev, Kosygin, President Nicolai Podgorny and possibly others sharing the power.

No American president, of course, has the power to commit the nation to international treaties or to conclude agreements singlehandedly. He is subject to the constitutional authority of the Senate on treaties. He must assure himself of support from Congress and the public or run the risk of being repudiated, as President Wilson was on the League of Nations.

So the meeting at Glassboro should be viewed as a means of establishing better understanding between the two governments rather than as a device for making compromises and settling problems. As such, it seems to have been worthwhile. The two leaders probably know more intimately the fine points of their differences, which could be helpful.

Among the many world issues on which the Soviet Union and the United States disagree, three seem paramount at the moment. These are the continuing hostility between Israel and the Arab countries; the Vietnam war; the question of world armaments, including pending decisions on the building of anti-ballistic missile systems and the spread of nuclear weapons.

Only on the matter of the arms race does there seem to be possibility for further agreements beyond the treaty prohibiting nuclear weapons tests in the air or under the sea. Both President Johnson and Premier Kosygin stressed the importance of reaching accord on a treaty against non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. President Johnson reported that progress was made toward arms limitation.

Kosygin did not bend an inch on Russia's insistence that Israel be charged with aggression by the United Nations, that it withdraw from territory taken in the war before peace talks can occur and that it pay compensation to the Arabs for losses in the war. Also, the Russian demand that the United States quit bombing North Vietnam and withdraw its forces from South Vietnam has not altered.

From what was reported about the Glassboro meeting, no hint appeared of compromise on these issues. What would happen, we wonder, if the United States did agree to quit bombing North Vietnam and if Russia agreed to stop rearming the Egyptians and to seek an Arab-Israeli settlement? We can only hope that some conversation took place on these points which may be pursued further in the continuing contacts of ambassadors and foreign ministers which Kosygin and Johnson promised would occur.

H.R. 2082, a Bill for Educational Allowances for Military Dependents

SPEECH

OF

HON. PATSY T. MINK

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1967

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to express my unqualified support for H.R. 2082, a bill introduced by Representative WILLIAM FORD that will provide much needed educational allowances for dependents of American servicemen assigned to foreign areas. This legislation is necessary to correct an existing inequity where our military people are stationed in areas with so few dependents that the Department of Defense cannot justify the cost of establishing a government school for them, forcing the military family to incur the costs of transportation to the nearest DOD school, as well as room and board. Some of these individuals serving our country overseas are in the lower grades, and the expenses they must bear for an adequate education for their children impose a real hardship.

I was privileged to be on the 1965 overseas schools inspection trip with my distinguished colleague from Michigan whose introduction of this bill has once again demonstrated his dedication to equal education for all Americans. On this trip we found many servicemen who were sending their children to distant schools, and we also discovered the difficulties they encounter in providing their dependents with access to a college education once they complete their secondary studies.

This bill then would provide government allowances for room, board, and transportation for those youngsters who must travel to DOD dependents' schools, and it will also authorize one round trip by air each year for those dependents who are admitted to colleges in the United States. Since we have already recognized this problem by providing such benefits for U.S. Government civilian employees in similar situations, it is essential that we extend this assistance to the nearly 4,000 dependents of servicemen who would be covered by H.R. 2082 and whose education is just as much our responsibility. This legislation is much needed, and I urge its speedy enactment into law so that we may continue to demonstrate our ongoing commitment to providing all American youth with the very best education available.

Dissent or Treason

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 11, 1967

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I have been fortunate in receiving a copy of a critique of a special ABC telecast entitled "Dissent or Treason."

It was written by Reed J. Irvine, of Silver Spring, Md., to Leonard H. Goldenson, president of the American Broadcasting Co., and I think it is worthy of each Member's attention.

I can well understand Mr. Irvine's thoughts on the program. ABC interviewed me for nearly a half hour on the subject of "Dissent and Treason." But on the program ABC used only a minute of my interview and in the context so that what I said appeared to have racial overtones.

The network used none of the comments I made distinguishing treason and sedition from dissent. The program was slanted in favor of the dissenters and said nothing of the policy and attitude toward such people as is recorded in history.

Therefore, I present to you Mr. Irvine's critique of the program "Treason or Dissent," and I think he has done a very adequate job in pointing out discrepancies in the program.

I might add, too, that I thought ABC would do an objective job on the subject, but I was very disappointed after seeing the program. The critique follows:

JUNE 22, 1967.

Mr. LEONARD H. GOLDENSON,
President, American Broadcasting Corp.,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR MR. GOLDENSON: I have just finished watching the ABC documentary "Dissent or Treason," sponsored by the Shell Oil Company and "Vanquish." I regret to say that this presentation lacked balance to such a degree that it verged on being propagandistic rather than informative.

One would expect that an historical analysis of the question of dissent in time of war would focus not merely on the existence of dissent but also on the attitude and policy toward dissent and opposition to the war effort. This was completely lacking in the ABC historical review as presented by Professor Blum.

We were told that there was dissent during the American Revolution. We were not told what measures were taken to curb or discourage the dissenters. Those who refused to take the oath of fidelity were subject to serve persecution. Jefferson said, "A tory has been properly defined to be a traitor in thought but not in deed." Certainly the policy of those men whom we revere as our Founding Fathers did not believe in dissent to the extent of offering unlimited toleration to those who gave aid and comfort to the British. Why was nothing said about this?

Professor Blum quoted Lincoln's criticism of Polk's conduct of the Mexican War. He neglected to point out that in this same speech, which was Lincoln's first public utterance on the war, which had then been in progress for over a year, Lincoln said:

> When the war began, it was my opinion that all those who, because of knowing too little, or because of knowing too much, could not conscientiously approve the conduct of the President, in the beginning of it, should, nevertheless, as good citizens and patriots, remain silent on that point, at least till the war should be ended . . . and I adhered to it, and acted upon it, until since I took my seat here; and I think I should still adhere to it, were it not that the President and his friends will not allow it to be so. (The Collected Works of Abraham Lincoln, Rutgers Univ. Press, V. I, p. 432)

Professor Blum's remarks might have given the uninformed listener the impression that Lincoln believed in unlimited dissent in time of war. Blum, of course, knows that Lincoln's position was not that at all. Why did he not describe what Lincoln's attitude really was, rather than leave a misleading impression? Why did he not point out, in discussing dissent during the Civil War, that Lincoln suspended the constitutional guarantee of *habeas corpus* and had dissenters put behind bars? He might have used this famous statement that Lincoln made in justifying this action:

> Must I shoot a simple-minded soldier boy who deserts, while I must not touch a hair of a wiley agitator who induces him to desert? This is none the less injurious when effected by getting a father, or brother, or friend, into a public meeting, and there working upon his feelings, till he is persuaded to write to the soldier boy, that he is fighting in a bad cause, for a wicked administration of a contemptible government, too weak to arrest and punish him if he shall desert. I think that in such a case, to silence the agitator, and save the boy, is not only constitutional, but, withal, a great mercy. (Collected Works, V. VI, pp. 266–67)

Similarly in your discussion of dissent in World War I, there was a glaring omission of the attitude toward those who opposed the war and the actions taken to restrain them. Your program might have shown some balance by pointing out that the Supreme Court in a decision written by none other than Justice Holmes upheld the conviction of an officer of the Socialist Party who was convicted of printing and distributing leaflets which might have deterred soldiers from doing their duty. Holmes rejected unequivocally the defense based on the First Amendment, saying,

> When a nation is at war many things that might be said in time of peace are such a hindrance to its effort that their utterance will not be endured so long as men fight, and no court could regard them as protected by any constitutional rights. (Schenck v. the United States)

A balanced presentation would also have pointed out that Senator George Norris, who was one of six senators to vote against the declaration of war on Germany took the Lincolnian view once war was declared. He refused thereafter to criticize the administration, declaring, "The war is now my war as much as it is the war of our General Staff."

When we come to World War II, your presentation seemed to forget all about dissent. Not only was the attitude and policy toward dissent not mentioned, but one might have concluded that dissent was non-existent.

And yet World War II dissent is most interesting and quite instructive in considering the attitudes we encounter today. Even in the 1939-41 period when not a single American soldier was engaged in combat, those who opposed the steps which they thought would lead to involvement in war were severely criticized. Some of the severest critics were those same journals which today loudly demand the right of unlimited dissent when American boys are dying on the battlefield. For example, *The New Republic* early in 1941 suggested that Charles A. Lindberg's speeches be censored by the National Association of Broadcasters, and both *The New Republic* and *The Nation* called for a congressional investigation of the America First Committee. Senator Burton K. Wheeler mailed out a million anti-war postcards in the summer of 1941. Secretary of War Stimson, with the advance knowledge of President Roosevelt, told a press conference, "This comes very near the line of subversive activities against the United States—if not treason." (See Henry L. Stimson and McGeorge Bundy, *On Active Service*, p. 378)

The attitude of the communists toward our involvement in war in this period was most instructive—and relevant to the present situation. You will recall that prior to the German attack on Russia the communists, not only here but even in the embattled U. K., were active in opposing the war and fomenting strikes to hinder war production. That dissent evaporated on June 22, 1941, which was the best possible demonstration that it had nothing to do with principle. Since we know that the Soviets have an extremely effective international mechanism for influencing public opinion—Raymond Aron has called it the "most astonishing propaganda machine history has ever known"—one might legitimately ask how this mechanism is being employed to influence public opinion with respect to the Vietnam conflict. Since the Soviets have a very keen interest in that conflict, it would indeed be extraordinary if they were not using their "astonishing propaganda machine" to influence its outcome. It was surprising, to say the least, that this did not occur to those who prepared the ABC documentary. Some footage was given to the mammoth anti-Vietnam demonstration in New York City, but not a word was said about the documented evidence of the role that leading communists played in organizing that event. We had an academic psychologist telling us about the motivations of the student dissenters and we saw a nice group of Harvard students. Not a word was said about he Anti-Vietnam Day Committee in Berkeley and the role played by known party members such as Bettina Aptheker in getting it under way.

This information is by no means difficult to come by. It must have been known to the writers of the ABC documentary. One must ask, therefore, why it was omitted. It seems to me that the program was not designed as a careful, objective study of the role of dissent in time of war so much as a defense of the type of dissent that we are now observing. This came through in the omission of the type of balanced history that I have tried to call attention to, in the failure to attempt to assess the role of the Soviet propaganda machine, which typically works through agents and dupes within the country that it zeroes in upon, and in the summary presented by Edward P. Morgan at the conclusion of the program. This is why this program impresses me as being propagandistic, i.e., slanted to make a point that the producers favor. I am sorry that ABC and the sponsors of the program permitted this, not because I favor suppression of free speech, but because I believe you have an obligation to present as much of the truth as you can squeeze into an hour program, not just half of it.

Sincerely yours,

Reed J. Irvine.

Strange Justice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. RARICK
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 11, 1967

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, special interests and the revolutionary activists have produced a mockery to justice in our country.

In Virginia, a man burned a wooden cross and was placed in prison for 3 years. In New York and other cities American flags are burned, yet the perpetrators go scot free.

One act is called "hate"; and the other explained as "dissent" guaranteed under the umbrella of the first amendment.

A dissident youth—perhaps encouraged by the current "education to be against" by some educators and backsliding clergy—burns a draft card and is sentenced to prison, yet a paint dauber, who has been extremely well rewarded by the capitalist system, accepts a $10,000 Communist reward for his cooperation in expression only to give the Communist award back to the murderers of his fellow Americans. No crime is charged—no punishment meted out for such cruel disloyalty.

What is dissent and freedom of expression? Which acts generate the most hate against the American people? The cross burner, in his own way defending his country; the flag burner; or the financial contributor to the Communist killers cutting out the hearts of our boys, destroying our Nation and our youth.

The American people are tiring of the double standard of justice provoked by the power-mad, emotion-coated revolution. And rightfully so, for after all, it is their sons who are being slaughtered and their birthright which is being hoodwinked by this undermining of justice.

It may become a crime to display a lighted cross on a Christian church, but no offense to burn the church in dissent.

Mr. Speaker, I insert the article by Mr. John J. Synon, of Richmond, Va., and the editorial from the Baton Rouge State Times for July 8, following my remarks in the Record:

STRANGE JUSTICE

They put a Virginian in the State penitentiary, some weeks ago, put him in prison for three years. His crime: He had burned a cross, a wooden cross where Negroes were sure to see it burning. That was the extent of his infraction—burning that cross.

And for that, he was sentenced to three years in the State penitentiary.

Now comes an indignant note from the ever-vigilant Bill Loeb. I think the publisher of the Manchester (N.H.) Union-Leader must read everything. In any event, the scorching note he sent was accompanied by a tearsheet from a Georgia weekly—The Wilkinson County News—that recounted the significance of the trial.

In effect, Bill Loeb asked me what I had done to protect the outrage. And the answer? Nothing. But in my small and dilatory way, I mean to fix that, now.

Joe Boone is the author of the piece Loeb sent me. See how it goes:

"How far America has strayed from the fairness of Anglo-Saxon justice!

"The Associated Press reported on March 16th, in a news item from Richmond, Virginia, that Lilson R. Price, 30, was convicted by an all-white Hustings Court jury for illegally burning a cross in public.

". . . There was no evidence listed of Price being under the influence of LSD, pot, baked banana peels, or any of the other specifics of the good life of the beatnick, the civilrighter, or the hippie.

"There was no evidence shown that he was of the new order in America which looks for life without responsibility, sex without marriage, salvation without religion, luxury without work, food without sweat, shelter without struggle, or mercy without justice.

"He was not charged with burning his draft card, donating blood to the Viet Cong, consorting with the communists fronts, or any of the other non-patriotic and/or treasonous activities common to the corrupt society which seeks to take over America.

". . . Had he had the foresight to . . . use his burning cross as torch to set fire to everything in sight . . ."

Let me break in here: There stands, within three blocks of my home, the shell of an arson-destroyed church. At the time of the burning, students who attend the adjoining college reported that they had seen Negroes set off the fire by heaving Molotov cocktails through its windows. They made that statement without equivocation and voluntarily. But that just couldn't be—Negroes throwing Molotov cocktails. So, in a few days, the young people issued a recantation. Perhaps they had just imagined it. And that is the last we have heard of who burned down Pace Memorial Methodist Church.

In addition, we have had a clutch of arson-inspired, lumberyard fires. These places, in my town, have been going up like the tinder they are.

No, no trace of the burners. People think they know who—generally—is doing the dirty work but it is not good manners to say so out loud. Our indignation, you see, is saved for the Wilson Prices, they and their materially-harmless cross burnings. We send such as Wilson Price to the penitentiary for three years.

But back to Joe Boone's piece: "Had the back of his (Wilson's) car been filled with directions for making Molotov cocktails, his pockets stuffed with the pornographic filth legalized by the Supreme Court, his bearded mouth spouting the obscenities common to the Berkeley campus, exuding an odor pungent enough to stagger an overworked boar hog, his eyes alight with the religious ectasy of LSD—his treatment would have been entirely different."

Amen!

Such is the tenor of our time: Burn a church and you go scot free. Burn a cross and you go to the penitentiary.

There will be a day of reckoning. A fearful day.

[From the State-Times, Baton Rouge, La., July 8, 1967]

A PICTURE OF TREASON

Whatever the legalistic pettifoggery, artist Rockwell Kent paints himself into a picture of treason in a very real sense when he confirms that he contributed $10,000 (Lenin Peace Prize proceeds) to the Viet Cong whose rifles and mortars are spilling American blood and taking American lives.

Much of the arguing over what is not treason currently turns on plain truth that the U.S.A. is fighting a war without declaring formally that it is doing so. This vague situation would seem to be a mistake. Preciseness, not imprecision, is the need now.

Still, there remains on the federal books a 1917 statute which prohibits aiding and comforting an enemy. It ought to suffice to take care of Mr. Kent.

He probably won't be prosecuted. Don't hold your breath waiting for it.

After all, a United States senator named Robert Kennedy gave his blessing to the dispatch of blood and plasma to the same Communistic enemies of the United States. He still sits in the Senate in the name of the State of New York.

And Stokely Carmichael travels hither and yon, stirring highly emotional people to what is tantamount to civil insurrection.

So don't look for prosecution of Rockwell Kent.

He can, with impunity, give $10,000 to the Viet Cong who are killing Americans.

But he'd better not announce a $10 contribution to the Minutemen nor the John Birch Society nor the Invisible Empire. How foaming wrath would descend on him then! The artists union, if there is one, would take up his card. The academic pinkos would fire at him with all their multisylabics set on full automatic.

He'd be a real rascal, a cur, a lunatic extremist.

As it is, many quarters by present standards set him up as a dissenter.

At a former time, he'd have been an out and out traitor, the length and breadth of the land.

Reaching the Unreached

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN P. HAMMERSCHMIDT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 11, 1967

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following, which was my Capitol report to my constituents on April 27:

I recently had a chance to examine an experimental workshop on wheels which came to Washington from Arkansas. I met and talked with leaders of the Arkansas Special Youth Project—who conceived the idea of the Mobile Unit as part of their cooperative venture to assist "disadvantaged" youngsters.

I am impressed with the possibilities of this program—which is known as "Reaching The Unreached."

The Agriculture Extension Services of the State and Federal Governments have worked together for almost three years—exploring ways to increase the informal education opportunities of young people who, for one reason or another, might not otherwise have a chance.

Through 4–H leaders, several experimental programs have been carried out.

The "workshop on wheels" is an old surplus bus, purchased from the State Department of Education. It was painted—fixed up inside. There are two work areas. For the boys, work benches, electric saws, drills, and various hand tools; for the girls a 4-burner gas range, double sink, three sewing machines, and table space.

The bus followed a schedule of visiting various communities. Up to 12 youngsters at a time were able to acquire new skills, and increase their chances for the future.

In another instance, a youth camp was established in a county where youngsters between 9 and 15 years old went to camp for up to five days. This was a new social and cultural experience for 42 children. They were from families of less than $2,000 a year annual income.

In another county, the Extension Service set up workshops which provided training in handicrafts, woodworking, knitting, etc. for almost 250 youngsters.

Yet another program utilized the skills of Home Demonstration Agents in training 87 girls in home management. This was real, honest-to-goodness education in how to wash dishes, polish silver, make beds, care for furniture, clean windows and woodwork, operate dishwashers and food disposers, clean trashcans, care for foods, clean ranges and refrigerators, care for floors, launder and iron clothing, and take care of the bathroom. Many of the girls had never seen any of the modern gadgetry which is supposed to make housekeeping chores easier.

I like this program because it does not involve vast sums of money. It operates with the advice and leadership of both volunteers and men and women who all their lives long have worked in behalf of rural America as government employees. They know the problems and the reasonable solutions. They are accepting the challenge of tomorrow."

U.S. Inquiry Urged on Auto Insurance, But Some Progress Noted

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM T. CAHILL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 11, 1967

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, for the past several months, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GREEN] and the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SNYDER], along with several other Members of the House of Representatives have joined me in bringing to the attention of the House and the American public the national problem occasioned by the activities of some of the automobile liability insurance firms of our country. In all of these discussions we have expressed the hope that the insurance industry would police itself and thus eliminate the necessity for congressional activity. A heartening sign along these lines has recently taken place through the action of the Allstate Insurance Co., a subsidiary of Sears, Roebuck & Co. According to an article appearing in the New York Times on Monday, July 10, 1967, written by John D. Morris of the Times' staff, the Allstate Insurance Co. announced that effective July 1, 1967, it was giving current policyholders a guarantee of a renewal for 5 years of all clauses in their policies, no matter how many claims were filed. This certainly, Mr. Speaker, is a dramatic step in the right direction, because it will insure the policyholders of the Allstate Insurance Co. that they can be certain once they have a policy with this company that they will not be canceled for making a claim and can be certain of renewal during that 5-year period. In the dialog we held on the floor it was pointed out repeatedly the arbitrary and capricious reasons expressed by insurance companies for canceling existing policies and the failure of the insurance companies to renew some policies without giving any reason whatsoever. We sincerely hope, Mr. Speaker, that the example set by the Allstate Insurance Co. will persuade other insurance companies in the United States to follow their example, so that the policyholders of other companies can enjoy this same privilege. I commend the officers and executives of the Allstate Insurance Co. for taking this progressive step. It would seem to me that the insurance industry would be well informed indeed if it took immediate corrective measures to eliminate many of the abuses which have been pointed out by the Members of the House of Representatives on the floor. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to enclose the entire article that appeared in the New York Times relative to this important matter. I commend the New York Times for placing this article on the front page so that it will be brought to the attention of all of the executives of the insurance companies of our country. I also commend John D. Morris for an excellent job of reporting.

U.S. INQUIRY ON AUTO INSURANCE AS COMPLAINTS RISE

(By John D. Morris)

WASHINGTON, July 9.—A growing volume of complaints against automobile insurance companies by indignant policy holders has raised the possibility of one or more Federal investigations of the industry.

Representative Emanuel Celler, chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, is considering a request by two committee members for a preliminary inquiry.

The Department of Transportation is studying a similar request by Senator Warren G. Magnuson, chairman of the Senate Commerce Committee.

Mr. Celler, a Brooklyn Democrat, said in a telephone interview that he was giving "very serious attention" to what he described as the "meritorious suggestion" for a staff study. The inquiry was proposed last week by Representative Peter W. Rodino, Jr., Democrat of New Jersey, and William T. Cahill, Republican of New Jersey.

"A full-scale and fundamental investigation of the insurance industry is long overdue," Mr. Celler said. "Sooner or later we will have to address ourselves to it."

Senator Magnuson, Democrat, of Washington, in a recent letter to Alan S. Boyd, Secretary of Transportation, asked that the department conduct "a comprehensive study of compensation for motor vehicle accident losses."

He complained particularly of "sharp underwriting practices, including arbitrary cancellations and failure to renew," of "geographical, racial and economic" discrimination and of "discriminatory, escalating premium rates."

Mr. Magnuson suggested that a departmental study might provide the basis for Congressional action to correct "fundamental defects, both in automobile insurance and in our underlying common law and statutory system of fault liability."

Representatives Rodino and Cahill, in a letter to Mr. Celler, noted that the insurance industry has been exempt from Federal antitrust laws since 1945, when Congress delegated regulatory responsibility to the states.

They contended, and Mr. Celler agreed, that Congress should consider whether continuation of the exemption was in the public interest.

WIDESPREAD PRACTICES CITED

Among other things, the Rodino-Cahill letter cited:

"The widespread practice of canceling policies without sufficient justification, and often on the basis of whim or flimsy excuse."

The discriminatory nature of present rate practices, which penalize motorists because of age, sex, color, race, economic background, occupation and place of residence, irrespective of individual driving records.

A sampling of hundreds of letters received by Senator Magnuson and other legislators indicates a widespread belief among automobile owners that they are victims of such practices.

A California woman, for example, complained that her insurance had been canceled when a son started driving at the age of 16, forcing her to resort to a "high-risk" company that charged her $476 for liability coverage of two small cars.

"Something has to be done about these insurance companies," she wrote, "as they are just getting rich on all us little people."

OVER 65 PENALTY

A number of drivers over 65 contended that their liability insurance had been unjustifiably canceled. One of them, a Seattle man, said he had started driving model T Fords in the Twenties and had his policy canceled three weeks after his first reportable accident, which involved damage of less than $50.

A California school teacher's policy was canceled shortly after an accident involving $215 in property damage. She reported that she now pays more than $800 a year in high-risk liability premiums.

A number of young men who said they had good driving records reported that their policies had been canceled, or their premiums raised, when they entered the armed services.

Other disgruntled motorists complained of cancellations or high rates that they attributed to such factors as their residence in low-income neighborhoods; divorces; occupations such as bartending, restaurant work and unskilled manual labor; accidents in which the other driver was at fault, and minor traffic violations.

One man in his sixties complained that his annual premiums had been raised $79 because his wife paid for a parking ticket, under protest, that had been left on the car when it was parked by a broken meter.

"Is this just another legal shakedown?" he asked.

ALLSTATE GUARANTEED RENEWAL

Insurance industry spokesmen could not be reached for comment last night on the demands for an investigation. However, a leading automobile insurance company announced last Wednesday that, effective July 1, it was giving current policy holders a guarantee of a renewal for five years of all clauses in their policies, no matter how many claims were filed. The Allstate Insurance Company, a subsidiary of Sears, Roebuck & Co., said the guarantee was in effect in all but five states, in which approval of state authorities was being sought. These are Texas, Louisiana, North Carolina, Virginia and Massachusetts.

Does Senate Need Ethics Code?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 11, 1967

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, I believe the following article from the July 9, 1967, Indianapolis Star, by Ben Cole, is especially timely and pertinent:

DOES SENATE NEED ETHICS CODE?

(By Ben Cole)

WASHINGTON.—The refrigerated air in the United States Senate will resound the rest of the summer with ponderous commentary on the pros and cons of writing a code of ethics.

Such a prescription for senatorial deportment is believed necessary, so say the proponents, because of such incidents as the censure of Senator Thomas J. Dodd (D-Conn.).

Senator Dodd, so the Senate decided, was doing wrong when he pocketed money raised by testimonial dinners ostensibly to finance his campaign.

And there are supposed to be many gray areas where senators can't just be sure if they are doing right or wrong—keeping law practices made prestigious by their high office, accepting certain kind of emoluments for speeches and articles, etc.

A few years ago, a code of ethics without a penalty clause was adopted by the Senate. Some handsome red-white-and-blue lithographs of this brave document showed up recently in an unused broom closet in the basement of the Senate Office Building as reminders of the fact.

This time, though, the idea seems to be to nail the thing down—lay down the rules and spell out the punishment for offenders.

This sounds great until you start to think about it in terms of common sense.

Except for a few extraordinarily disadvantaged members of the American society, most people grow up amid constant reminders of what is right and what is wrong. Home, church, school, clubs, Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts, YMCA, YWCA, sandlot ball games, everyday relationships with fellow workers—all these experiences sharpen the knowledge of what is and what isn't according to the rules of the game.

By the time a man or woman is old enough and has attained sufficient eminence to be elected to the United States Senate, he or she should know what is right and what is wrong. And if there is any doubt about the situation, then the individual should resolve it easily by not doing whatever is so marginal as to require a decision.

A code of ethics for the United States Senate, when you come right down to it, would be a kind of admission that the men and women who make the laws for the rest of us don't know how to conduct themselves.

As a matter of fact, a code of ethics already exists—it is summarized by the simple term, "honor." Anything else the Senate might produce by way of a code of ethics couldn't so much define what is forbidden as what would be allowed.

National Rifle Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 29, 1967

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, one of the clearest portrayals of the work of the National Rifle Association was given on Thursday, June 29, at the National Press Club by Harold W. Glassen, president of NRA. I feel that the Members of Congress will profit from reading the statement, and I submit it for reprinting in the RECORD:

First, I'd like to explain what the National Rifle Association is, and what it is not.

It is the oldest sportsmen's organization in the United States. It is a non-profit membership organization. Its rate of growth is phenomenal.

Four years ago, when the current controversy over gun control legislation began, NRA had less than 500,000 members. It now has more than 800,000 members, a gain of more than 60 percent, and is looking forward to more than a million by 1971, the year it celebrates its one hundredth anniversary. We anticipate we will reach this goal before then, for our membership is increasing at an average of 80,000 per year. At this rate, today at least 200 persons will join NRA.

NRA members are sportsmen whose common bond is the sport of shooting. Most are hunters. Many are trap and skeet shooters. Several hundred thousand are serious target shooters, who work as hard to boost their scores as any golfer. Last year, American shooters took 17 gold medals in world events, establishing the United States firmly as the world leader in this international sport.

AIDS IN TRAINING SOLDIERS

NRA members are dedicated to the national defense. Criticism has been leveled at our organization for conducting shooting programs using surplus U.S. military rifles and ammunition. But the reasons for this program have been largely overlooked. The truth is that the NRA is a valuable adjunct to our military program, providing vital marksmanship training to young Americans who may shortly find themselves in battle.

Proof of the value of this program in training of combat troops was contained in a 1966 report by the Arthur D. Little Company, a private industrial and management research firm, which made a comprehensive study of the Civilian Marksmanship Program at the request of the Army.

Not only did the Little Report note that rifle training prior to military service better prepares a soldier to use a rifle, it said trainees who have been members of gun clubs are more apt to enlist, are more apt to prefer combat, are more confident in their ability to use a rifle, require less time from instructors for rifle training, and share their knowledge and provide coaching for those who need it most. It also found that outfits that have the greatest number of gun club-trained soldiers are likely to suffer fewer casualties themselves, and inflict more casualties on the enemy.

In short, it was the conclusion of the Arthur D. Little Company, after long study, that shooting experience and marksmanship training with military type small arms prior to military service contribute significantly to the individual soldier's training.

The major problem with the program, according to the research firm, is that it should be expanded in order to provide our soldiers with the basic rifle training necessary to sustain them in combat.

These are some of things that NRA *is*.

Now, what is NRA *not*?

First, it is NOT a powerful lobby as it has been painted. Fortunately, its members are dedicated enough to protest long and loud when their sport is threatened. We keep our members informed on what is happening that could restrict their right to possess and use firearms. But it is *their* reaction that members of Congress hear, not the centralized voice of a Washington lobby. I have heard the complaint that the gun control bill has sparked more mail than any other issue in Congress. I see this as a healthy sign, that citizens are upset over a threat to their rights under the Constitution. They are using one right—the right of petition—to protect another—the right to bear arms.

WHO SHOULD OWN A GUN?

One thing I want to make clear: NRA is dedicated to the proposition that ALL American citizens of adult age have the right to keep and bear arms unless they have abused this right or unless they have been adjudged by proper judicial authority to be incapable. We believe that they are those who should not have a gun, but we oppose the establishment of authority that would permit arbitrary determination as to who is, and who is not, qualified to own a gun. The withdrawal of such a right should be subject to due process of law.

Because we believe in the right of the individual to possess firearms, we are vigorously opposed to several provisions of legislation proposed by the Administration and sponsored by Sen. Dodd and Rep. Celler that would unduly restrict the sale and possession of firearms.

This brings us to the second thing that NRA is *not*.

It is *not* opposed to gun control legislation.

It IS opposed to the Administration bill. We agree in many respects with the intent of the legislation proposed by the Administration, and endorse some of its provisions, but several we cannot abide. Our members have been quite vigorous in their protests against these provisions. This legislation would virtually eliminate interstate commerce in firearms, except between Federally licensed manufacturers and dealers. We favor controls over the shipment of concealable firearms through the mails, and we have proposed our own legislative plan to accomplish this. But we are utterly opposed to a law that would eliminate sales across state lines completely.

The very premise of this legislation holds the key to what its sponsors want. It begins with a declaration that would put Congress on record that there is a casual relationship between the availability of firearms and the crime rate.

RECORD IS A PRETENSE

Gentlemen, there has not been developed in the four years of public hearings on proposed gun controls a record to show that such a relationship exists. Nevertheless, its supporters continue to press for its enactment on the pretense that such a record exists.

The Dodd-Celler bill's supporters have attempted to show, for instance, that a strict new gun law in the City of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, has worked wonders in reducing violent crime and murder in the last year or so. Our figures, obtained from the City Police Department, show just the opposite. They show that more persons were shot to death in Philadelphia in the year after the law was passed than were killed by firearms the year before the law went into effect. This at the same time that legitimate gun sales fell about 90 percent (see table).

The NRA believes that these statistics show that the new law is NOT effective, as claimed by its proponents.

NRA 4-POINT PROGRAM

Rather than get bogged down in criticizing what NRA considers to be an unworkable bill, however, I believe I should outline to you the Association's position in favor of positive, effective and practical legislation on guns.

The NRA has proposed a comprehensive four-point legislative program that it believes will do the most to keep guns out of the hands of criminals and incompetents—and this, after all, is the intent of all such legislation today. These points have been introduced in the Senate and House by a number of members of Congress, some of whom are here today. I would like to take this opportunity to thank these gentlemen for their support of our position on behalf of the members of my Association and the estimated 50 million gun owners in the United States who are alarmed over attempts to pass the severe restrictions contained in the Dodd-Celler bill.

Gun homicides under Philadelphia gun ordinance

Year	Guns	Knives	Other	Total	Percent guns
Before new law: 1964	62	62	64	188	33
Since new law:					
1965[1]	89	76	40	205	43
1966	69	61	48	178	39

[1] Ordinance effective Apr. 15, 1965. Thus, 3½ months of 1965 not under new law, 8½ months under it.

The four points that NRA has proposed to be enacted into law would:

(1) Provide a mandatory penalty for the possession or use of a firearm transported in interstate commerce or foreign commerce and used in the commission of a crime.

(2) Prohibit licensed manufacturers or dealers from shipping any firearm to any person in any state in violation of the laws of that state.

(3) Place "destructive devices" (bombs, grenades, mines, crew-served military ordnance, etc.) under the tax and registration provisions of the National Firearms Act.

(4) Require that a person who orders a handgun by mail or over-the-counter in a state other than his own submit to the seller a sworn statement that he is over 21 years of age, is not prohibited by federal law from receiving a handgun shipped in interstate commerce, and his receipt of the firearm is not in violation of any state statute. The statement must contain the name and address of the principal local law officer of the locality to which the handgun will be shipped, and the seller must forward the statement by registered or certified mail to that law enforcement officer. The seller must wait at least seven days following receipt of notification by the law enforcement officer before shipment can be made.

We believe these four measures would provide adequate safeguards over firearms. To go beyond them would cause undue hardship on legitimate sportsmen, without attacking the root of the problem.

I'd like to clear up another point, which has been seized upon by our opponents to discredit the NRA in recent weeks. In the May issue of its magazine, "The American Rifleman," NRA ran an editorial in which it reiterated its position that the American citizen is entitled to keep and bear arms and that this right will provide authorized law enforcement agencies with a reservoir of citizens prepared to take their place in the "posse comitatus." The "posse comitatus" is a historic heritage here and in other free nations. It consists of all adult male citizens who can be called upon by law officers to aid in keeping the peace in times of emergency.

Because of this editorial, NRA was accused in a syndicated "New York Times" story of urging the formation of citizen posses or vigilante groups. This report was absolutely false, for not only did NRA NOT urge this, but it also made its position absolutely clear on this subject. In 1964, in a policy statement in the same magazine, NRA declared that the formation of such groups is "completely foreign to the tenets and purposes for which the NRA stands." That same statement declared: "The NRA does not approve or support any group activities that properly belong to the national defense or police."

I hope this clears this matter up once and for all, for everyone can see the damage that can be done to an organization's reputation when something that is completely in error gets such wide circulation.

NRA UNDER ATTACK

Today, because it has stuck its neck out to oppose restrictive legislation, the National Rifle Association finds itself under attack. We've been attacked before, and I daresay that we will be attacked again. We aren't particularly worried about this. We've been around for almost a hundred years, and we're looking forward to another hundred years of encouraging a great organized sport and contributing to the national defense of the greatest country on earth.

What really disturbs us, however, is that the proponents of strict gun control legislation believe that the way to pass their bill is to attack those who believe otherwise.

This is not the American way, and we will fight these tactics even harder than the bill itself.

Is the Supreme Court Really Supreme?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS G. ABERNETHY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 11, 1967

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

[From the Reader's Digest]

Is the Supreme Court Really Supreme?

(Recent controversial rulings by the High Bench raise anew the troubling issue: Who is the ultimate arbiter of the Constitution? Our founding fathers provided a foresighted answer.)

(By Eugene H. Methvin)

Fifty-two percent of the American people rate the Supreme Court's performance as "only fair" or "poor," according to a recent Louis Harris opinion poll. "The Justices are stretching the judicial process to try to translate their notion of an ideal society into reality," says Prof. Philip B. Kurland, editor of the University of Chicago Law School's *Supreme Court Review*. From legal scholars to the man in the street, from Congress to the Justices themselves, this most revered of our governmental institutions is today drawing stinging criticism.

Some of the most eloquent protests have come from within the Court itself. In 1962, when the Supreme Court invaded the political thicket of legislative reapportionment, the late Justice Felix Frankfurter denied that the Court had constitutional authority for its move. He accused his colleagues of "a massive repudiation of the experience of our whole past."

In another case last year, Justice Byron R. White charged the Supreme Court with laying down specific rules that have "no significant support" in the history of the Constitution.

Justice John M. Harlan has despairingly proclaimed that recent Court decisions amount "to nothing less than an exercise of the amending power by this Court."

DIRECTION BY DECISION

Repeatedly in recent years the Court has claimed vast new powers to change by judicial decree the shape of our constitutional system. A narrow majority of "activist" Justices, spearheaded by Chief Justice Earl Warren and Justice William O. Douglas, has increasingly taken away from juries and legislatures—the two authentic voices of the people—crucial decisions affecting the order and direction of American life.

Consider the Court's decisions in three vital areas:

School Prayer. The Court has declared that reading the Bible or saying the Lord's Prayer (or even a non-sectarian prayer) in voluntary classroom religious exercises is unconstitutional. It has relied on the theory that the First Amendment ("Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof") somehow requires the Court to impose a wall of separation between religion and any sort of governmental activity.

This notion is "sheer invention," say many distinguished law scholars, among them Dean Erwin Griswold of Harvard Law School. We have, Griswold says, "a spiritual and cultural tradition of which we ought not to be deprived by judges carrying into effect the logical implications of absolutist notions not expressed in the Constitution, and surely never contemplated by those who put the constitutional provisions into effect."

Reapportionment. In one stroke, in June 1964, the Court rendered "unconstitutional" the legislatures of most of the 50 states. The action boldly asserted a judicial power never before claimed. It was based on the 14th Amendment. The dictum that "no state shall deny to any person the equal protection of the laws" means, said Chief Justice Warren, that states cannot adopt "Little Federal" plans, in which one house of the legislature is apportioned like the U.S. Senate, to accommodate other factors (historic, economic or geographic) than population. The states must, instead, elect *both* houses on a "one man, one vote" basis.

Justices Potter Stewart and Tom Clark objected sharply. They called the Court's action "the fabrication of a constitutional mandate," and said, "The Draconian pronouncement finds no support in the words of the Constitution, in any prior decision of this Court, or in the 175-year political history of our Federal Union."

The quarrel arose because many state legislatures had failed to reapportion their districts as people moved from country to city and from city to suburbs. Other states, however, had reapportioned conscientiously—Colorado, for one. In 1962, Coloradans went to the polls to choose between two reapportionment plans, and voted 305,700 to 172,725 in favor of a "Little Federal" plan which gave Colorado's lightly populated western mountains and eastern wheatlands a few more members in the state senate than their population warranted. A majority in every county, including urban Denver, supported this plan.

Justice Clark and Stewart pleaded with the Court to avoid destroying such local initiative and decision. Under the "equal protection" clause, they said, federal courts might properly void any systems which prevent ultimate majority rule. "Beyond this there is nothing in the federal Constitution to prevent a state from choosing any electoral legislative structure it thinks best suited." Colorado simply "sought to provide that no identifiable minority shall be completely silenced or engulfed," an aim that "fully comports with the letter and spirit of our constitutional traditions." The Justices pleaded in vain.

Criminal Procedures. Historically, the administration of criminal justice has been left to the states. The Constitution originally gave the federal government no authority whatever to intervene in ordinary criminal matters. However, the 14th Amendment forbids states to deny a person "due process of law," and the Court has now been using this language as reason to impose a new set of detailed, and controversial, rules of its own making on state law enforcement.

In 1961, for example, five Justices asserted that "due process" requires a state judge * * * and nullified contrary rules in 26 states. Then, in 1964, five Justices prohibited the century-old practice in 15 states of letting the jury decide whether a confession has been coerced. Justice Clark protested. "Dependence on jury trials is the keystone of our system of criminal justice, and I regret that the Court lends its weight to the destruction of this great safeguard to our liberties."

In June 1966, Chief Justice Warren and four fellow Justices imposed on all states a new rule, never before followed in any state: Judges must also keep a confession from the jury unless police can prove beyond doubt that they warned the suspect of his rights, and even furnish him a lawyer throughout interrogation if he wished.

There is mounting evidence that the Court's massive federalization of criminal justice has grievously crippled law enforcement. FBI statistics show that, since the 1961 ruling, the rate at which police are solving reported crimes—a rate which had held steady for years—has dropped by almost ten percent. In New York City, after last year's ruling on interrogations, the proportion of unsolved murders increased by 40 percent. Indeed, the Supreme Court's rulings have compelled the freeing of many apprehended and confessed criminals.

Last September, for example, a woman stood before Brooklyn Judge Michael Kern. She had confessed to taping her four-year-old son's mouth and hands and beating him to death with a broomstick and a rubber hose. Nevertheless, because of the new Supreme Court ruling, her signed confession, the state's only evidence, had to be thrown out.

"Thank you, your honor," the woman said.

"Don't think me," the judge replied icily. "Thank the United States Supreme Court. You killed the child and you ought to go to jail."

Conflicting Philosophies. These highly controversial decisions reflect a titanic clash of judicial philosophies in today's Supreme Court. Justices Harlan, White and Stewart are currently the chief representatives of the philosophy of judicial restraint propounded by the great jurist Oliver Wendell Holmes: In a democratic society, judges who never face the discipline of the ballot box must defer to elected legislators in policy choices—and leave it to the voters to discipline the legislators at the polls if the legislators' decisions are bad. A judge should declare a legislative act unconstitutional only when he is certain that reasonable men could not disagree. Otherwise, said Holmes, even though the legislators have decided unwisely, a judge is obligated to say, "Damn 'em, let 'em do it!"

On the other side in today's Court, Chief Justice Warren, Justice Douglas and usually Justice Hugo L. Black represent the activist philosophy, or what is sometimes called "political jurisprudence." This school holds that constitutional claims coming to the Supreme Court involve, primarily, conflicting values and interests. There may be no express law relevant to today's conditions. So, in weighing conflicting interests, the Justices must impose their own "social preferences." This philosophy sees the Justices as the modern interpreters of the values expressed in "our living Constitution."

Last year, for example, the Court outlawed Virginia's poll tax—even though it had unanimously upheld a similar tax 29 years before. Even Justice Black denounced this change by judicial decree as "an attack on the concept of a written constitution which is to survive unless changed through the amendment process."

But do we want the Court to be such a lawgiving body? Carried very far, this philosophy would mean in effect abandoning our written Constitution. The High Bench would become not a court of law but a Grand Policy Council, a "Big Brother Club," as one law professor irreverently dubbed the activists.

From the first, men like Thomas Jefferson feared the federal judiciary as a dangerous, fundamentally anti-democratic power. Their fears have proved valid. For half a century (between 1890 and 1937), reactionary "activists" on the Court virtually destroyed the nation's legislative ability to cope with the industrial revolution, to regulate wages and working conditions, child labor, utilities, railroads, labor-management wars. They nullified 52 acts of Congress and 228 state laws. Ultimately, in the "limited constitutional revolution" of 1937, President Franklin D. Roosevelt, Congress and public pressure persuaded three activits Justices to retire or switch, thus allowing needed social legislation to stand.

Today, the Court is again exhibiting judicial "activism"—only this time designed to impose radical change instead of a freeze. "When in the name of interpretation, the Court *adds* something to the Constitution that was deliberately excluded from it," warns Justice Harlan, "the Court in reality substitutes its view of what should be so for the amending process."

TO GUARD THE GUARDIANS

Who is the ultimate arbiter of our Constitution? *Does* the Constitution limit the Justices as well as the legislators and the President?

The founding fathers, understanding the tendency of all men to grasp ever more power, labored to subject every branch of government to checks and balances. They specifically included the Supreme Court. To the ancient question, "Who will guard these guardians?" they answered emphatically, *"The people—through their elected representatives."* And, historicaly, we have asserted that authority on many occasions.

For example, one powerful check on the Court is the President's power of appointment. In 1870, President Ulysses S. Grant filled two vacancies. The votes of these new Justices made it possible to reverse a recent crucial decision, which declared that Congress had no power to issue paper money. Last June's crucial five-four decision on criminal confessions could not have been made had not President Johnson's first appointee, Justice Abe Fortas, promptly lined up with the activists. Since Justice Clark, a moderate, has recently retired, and since several Justices are over 65, Presidential appointments may completely reshape the Court in the next few years.

The Constitution also plainly specifies two major ways in which Congress can check the Court:

The 14th Amendment—under which the Supreme Court has dictated state legislative apportionments and criminal procedures—specifically names Congress as the protector of the rights it creates. While Congress cannot reverse a Supreme Court decision in a specific case, it *can* write new remedies which the Court is then obligated to apply in resolving such cases in the future. Last year, for example, Chief Justice Warren specifically acknowledged that Congress may, by simple statute, write rules different from those that the Court handed down for police interrogations.

Article III empowers Congress to make "exceptions and regulations" to the Court's appellate jurisdiction. Thus the Constitution explicitly makes *our elected legislators* the supreme judges—by simple majority vote—of what types of cases the Court may decide. Says Herbert Wechsler, Columbia Law School professor and director of the American Law Institute, "The plan of the Constitution was quite simply that Congress would decide from time to time how far the federal judicial institution should be used. .Congress has the power, by enactment of a statute, to strike at what it deems judicial excess."

Thus the judges are *not* the sole arbiters of the Constitution. The framers of the Constitution laid on Congress a duty to define the rights it provided, and to act as a counterweight to the Court.

"BEYOND THE BOUNDS"

Though it has acted at other times—for example, in 1868, when it stripped the Court of powers to hear appeals in habeas corpus cases—Congress has failed so far to rein in the present Court. In 1964, the House did vote 218–175 to forbid the Court to interfere in state legislative apportionments. This simple majority vote was, under Article III, sufficient. But in the Senate, an attempt was made to seek passage of the measure as a constitutional amendment, and it missed—by seven votes—the required two-thirds majority. An amendment to permit voluntary school prayer also failed by a narrow margin. Both goals might well have been accomplished, by a simple majority vote, under Article III and the 14th Amendment.

Some scholars are convinced that the present Supreme Court would have declared any such effort unconstitutional. Others argue, however, that if the Court had gone to that extreme, Congress could then have retaliated by restricting the Court's future jurisdiction in cases of the kind under Article III.

In the absence of such an effort to check the Court, five Supreme Court Justices, in alliance with one third of either House or Senate, are—by "interpretation"—radically amending our Constitution. Yet amendment is supposed to require a two-thirds vote of Congress and ratification by three fourths of the state legislatures.

The great liberal Justice Benjamin N. Cardozo wrote: "Judges have, of course, the power, though not the right, to travel beyond the bounds set to judicial innovation by precedent and custom. Nonetheless, by that abuse of power, they violate the law."

The founding fathers named Congress as the referee to guard the bounds beyond which the Justices should not go. The time has come for our elected representatives to blow the whistle.

The Voting Age Should Not Be Lowered

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 11, 1967

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, there is an attempt on the part of some delegates to the New York State Constitutional Convention to revise the voting age downward to that of 18. For reasons I have stated in the article which follows and which appeared in the American Legion magazine, and for additional reasons which appeared in the New York Times' excellent editorial, I strongly urge against the adoption of this proposal. As a further note of interest, it is significant that a poll taken by the American Legion magazine, a large majority voted against lowering the voting age.

I am opposed to lowering the voting age to 18.

When we consider how easily the adolescent is inflamed, how passionately he attaches himself to "causes," how imperative it is for him at that age to see in patterns of black or white without shadings lest he falter in his commitments, we can readily understand why the demagogue, and the dictator, and the hypnotic orator have been able, historically, to capture the youth of the land. Witness the regimes of Hitler and Mussolini. There are sound psychological reasons why the age of 21 has been considered the beginning of maturity.

There have been a number of non sequiturs used in argument in favor of imposing a national qualification of 18-year-old eligibility to vote. Among them will be found, "If he is old enough to fight, he is old enough to vote." Another is "If he is old enough to marry, he is old enough to vote."

The qualities which make for a good soldier hardly make for a good vote. Thus, "instant obedience," "to act quickly upon a command," "not to stop to question why," "quick reflexes," "physical fitness" are indispensable qualifications for good soldiering. And scrutiny, critical appraisal, a point of view and philosophy are essential in effective voting. So, to say that if he is old enough to fight he is old enough to vote is hardly following the principles of logic.

In some states, the age of consent in entering into marriage is as low as 16. If he is old enough to marry at 16, does it necessarily follow that he is old enough to vote? Many a lad or lass of 15 or 16 has earned enough money to pay taxes. Does it then follow that if he is old enough to pay taxes, he is old enough to vote?

There are some states which through referendum have asked their citizens to vote on the question of granting suffrage to 18-year-olds. Most of them have rejected this proposal, as have many of the state legislatures. At present only two states, Georgia and Kentucky, have a voting age of 18; one state, Alaska, has set its voting age at 19, and one state, Hawaii, at 20.

It is equally interesting to note that nearly all representative democracies have a minimum age requirement for voting of at least 21 years. This is no accident, for the cumulative experience of representative government—based on the concept of consent by the governed—has proven the need for political and social maturity, and a greater emotional stability than is possessed by the 18-year-old.

Unless I am given sounder arguments than I have heretofore been given, I see no reason for imposing a uniform voting age on all of the states.

The New York Times' editorial is as follows:

THE RIGHT VOTING AGE

It now appears probable that the Constitutional Convention will propose to lower the voting age to eighteen from 21, where it has been ever since the state's first Constitution was adopted in 1777. If this change were effected, the voting rolls would be enlarged by nearly a million inexperienced and immature voters—which is one reason why some politicians who are particularly popular with youth are in favor of it.

The argument is frequently advanced that since young men are drafted into the military service at eighteen they are entitled to vote at that age so that they may participate in making the policies for which they may have to fight. But the qualities that make a good soldier—courage and physical hardihood—are quite different from the experience and good judgment that make a good voter.

A young man or woman becomes liable to criminal prosecution as an adult instead of a juvenile offender at the age of sixteen, but not many people would argue from that that the voting age should be lowered accordingly. There is, in fact, no clear-cut age at which a youth becomes an adult in the eyes of the law. A woman can marry without the consent of her parents at eighteen, but a man must wait until he is 21. In most cases a contract entered into by an individual before he is 21 cannot be enforced if he disavows it.

What is really important is the age at which the voter is likely to make a valuable contribution to the solution of public questions. It cannot be denied that some boys and girls of eighteen are sufficiently mature and well informed to do so, but many more are not.

Only four of the fifty states in the Union—Georgia, Kentucky, Alaska and Hawaii—permit voting before 21. In recent years Missouri, Oklahoma, North Dakota, South Dakota, Idaho and Michigan have all rejected proposals to lower their requirements. Most of the Western European democracies make 21 the legal voting age. The balance of collective experience is heavily in favor of retaining the present 21.

Congressman Horton Praises Private Industry for Job Corps Activity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK HORTON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 11, 1967

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to direct the attention of my colleagues to an article which appeared in Electronics News on June 5, 1967, concerned with bridging the gap between the shortage of skilled labor and the Nation's pool of high school dropouts.

As many of my colleagues are aware, Job Corps centers are being run by many private corporations.

Two of the leading firms of the 36th Congressional District of New York, which I am privileged to represent in the Congress, are engaged in this creative effort to equip young men and women with modern skills.

Graflex, Inc., a division of General Precision Equipment Co., manages the large Breckinridge Job Corps camp in Kentucky.

Xerox Corp. is the prime contractor for the women's Job Corps center in Huntington, W. Va.

I have visited both Job Corps centers and have seen young men and women inspired to acquire the skills which will make them valuable, and sought-after additions to the payrolls of modern industry.

The article in the Electronics News points out that although these corporations make a profit of about 5 percent on their Job Corps contracts, this alone is not a big enough incentive to bring the corporations into an uncertain and potentially damaging arena.

The corporations view their contracts with the Federal Government for Job Corps centers as more than just contracts. Job Corps seems to have provided industry with a challenge to its skills as well as an opportunity to "do something" about the social ills of society. The corporations have embraced Job Corps as well because it gives them a chance to learn as well as to teach. Through insights gained in training youngsters who are underprivileged, corporations are preparing for roles in the future education market. Corporations also hope that by learning to train dropouts, they can get this information into the school systems and prevent further dropouts.

The article goes on to describe the work and progress in several centers which are run by electronic corporations.

This article gives another example of business and Government cooperation through the Job Corps, and the arrangement has proved profitable to both. The corporations learn as well as teach, fulfill their social obligations, and make a small profit. The Job Corpsmen learn new skills, get an education, improve their health, and better their lives in general.

I commend this article to my colleagues and am pleased to share it with them:

Electronics firms have embraced the Job Corps, finding in it not only a chance to teach but a chance to learn.

Through insights gained in training youngsters who are deeply disadvantaged, companies are preparing for roles in the future education market.

But electronics firms also insist they help the Job Corps from a sense of responsibility for the society that is growing around them. They say the fixed profit of about 4.5 percent would not in itself bring them into an uncertain and potentially damaging arena.

At Congressional hearings last year, corporate executives including Gerald Philippe, chairman of General Electric Co., strongly supported the goals and methods of the Job Corps.

BACK PROGRAM

In Texas this spring another group of executives, called together by Antipoverty Director Sargent Shriver, passed a resolution backing the program. They pledged the resources of their companies to "further progress in creating educational opportunities for the disadvantaged youth of the nation."

Executives of the Radio Corp. of America, Burroughs Corp., International Business Machines Corp. and Litton Industries signed the resolution.

The Job Corps enrolls more than 30,000 people between the ages of 16 and 21 in 113 centers around the country. Youngsters with some reading skills are assigned to urban centers for training for employment. Others go to conservation centers.

Set up by the Office of Economic Opportunity, the Job Corps seeks to break the poverty cycle in which hundreds of thousands of young Americans are mired.

And an official of Philco-Ford Corp. feels his company has an obligation to help guide the growing pool of youth who have neither motivation to find a job nor the skill to retain one.

Said M. L. Long, vice-president and general manager of Philco's Education and Technical Service Division:

"From a purely pragmatic view, we make a profit. However, the profit is always less than 5 per cent and the Office of Economic Opportunity has asked us to reduce our margin far below that level. The profit really isn't enough to encourage us to risk manpower and reputation on a potentially explosive program."

But through the Job Corps and other programs, industry reclaims a valuable source of available talent, Mr. Long said.

"We are finding ways to reach young people who had been condemned as unreachable. And the lessons we are learning eventually will have many applications in revised approaches to problem students and potential dropouts in standard school systems."

EXPRESSES GRATIFICATION

One of Philco's key administrators of Job Corps contracts, Perry Rushlau, expresses the gratification that comes with rehabilitating young people:

"You have no idea, until you experience it, of seeing some of the bedraggled girls enrall—and leave more mature and confident. This is the basis of our program and our great joy."

Philco-Ford is running four centers under contracts of more than $8 million. Employes with backgrounds in education and school administration direct the centers and staffs.

Philco's curriculum is typical of the Job Corps Electronics trades and drafting are taught together with a variety of skills, from cooking to health services.

HIRED SOME

Philco does not train students for its own specific needs, Dr. Rushlau explained. "However, we have hired a few and expect to hire others." He said some corpsmen have been signed from other centers as well.

Philco runs programs in Guthrie, Okla., Tongue Point, Ore., Jersey City, and assists at a center in Breckenridge, Ky.

To attract youngsters, ads are carried on radio and television and on the East Coast brochures are put in welfare check envelopes.

Corpsmen are assigned as close to their own town as possible, since homesickness is a problem. The youngsters receive $30 a month living expenses and $50 a month is put aside for work well done.

About 75 per cent finish their training, a higher average than among the nation's high schools. The Job Corps is proud of this record since it was achieved largely with high school dropouts.

SOME TROUBLE

Job Corps centers occasionally have trouble with nearby towns—as do colleges and high schools, Corps officials note.

Last year difficulties broke out between Fort Rodman center corpsmen and teenagers in nearby New Bedford, Mass., leading to an 11–0 City Council condemnation of the center. The city asked President Johnson to remove the corpsmen.

Science Research Associates, Inc., a subsidiary of IBM, runs the center. It acted fast.

The center enlisted staff members, students and leading citizens to speak in almost every club in the area. The gates of the 60-acre center were opened to visitors and an adult program was begun there.

News articles were run in the local paper and a summer basketball league of corpsmen and local teen-agers was set up. A "World of Computers" program offers juniors from local high schools a chance to learn about programming.

After these efforts a second vote of the City Council backed the center 9–2.

Fort Rodman began in August, 1965, with courses in office skills, data processing techniques and retailing.

A staff of 250 directs 600 students; about 350 have graduated.

GENUINE CHANCE

An IBM 1401 computer gives students a genuine chance to learn something about EDP. In fact, IBM has hired 35 students and B. F. Goodrich, Texas Instruments, Inc., and Xerox have signed others.

A Massachusetts Department of Employment Security spokesman described a by-product of the program:

"One of our aims is to learn how to train dropouts. If we can get this knowledge and get it into the public schools we can prevent dropouts from occurring in the first place.

"We hold seminars with educators from all over New England each summer and we exchange ideas. Some of the things we've learned have been incorporated in New England School systems."

One of the biggest programs in the nation is run at Camp Kilmer, N.J., by Federal Electric Corp., a service subsidiary of the International Telephone & Telegraph Corp.

Its original $20 million contract was renewed for 17 months at $12.6 million.

Some 620 employees serve the needs of 1,500 young men in four schools where electronics, printing, food services and automotive skills are among the courses.

NINETEEN HUNDRED GRADUATES

More than 1,900 have graduated from the center since its opening in February, 1965. Jobs were found for 1,600, about 50 of them at ITT.

The electronics includes training in basic breadboard circuitry and troubleshooting.

One feature of the corpsman's day at the camp is a mandatory group meeting in which the boys talk about programs—from racial to personal. On weekends bus trips are taken to neighboring cities.

The center has a musical group that performs at institutions and schools and a basketball team that plays small colleges.

Groups take trips as far as Washington and spend weekends at homes in the area.

SOCIAL ILLS

The Job Corps seems to have provided industry not only with a challenge to its skills but with an opportunity to "do something" about the social ills of society. Many corporations have seized the opportunity almost gratefully.

At a Job Corps graduation ceremony at Breckenridge, Ky., Donald W. Smith, president of General Precision Equipment Co., made this clear.

"Of course we in industry are interested in profits for our stockholders, but we also feel that we have an obligation to help other people perhaps less fortunate than ourselves.

"Graflex, a subsidiary of General Precision, entered this field about a year ago with some apprehension. We asked ourselves the question—is this the type of business in which a company like ours should become involved?

"And yet . . . we were intrigued with a management challenge and felt we could make a definite contribution to the corpsman, to OEO, and our nation."

Mr. Smith told how General Precision, experienced in audio-visual and training techniques, made available personnel experienced in management, fiscal affairs, education, security and programming, as well as "corporate headquarters support."

SAW GOALS

He said General Precision saw as a goal "the reorientation, rehabilitation and re-education of the corpsman to the point of their useful integration into our economic system, together with the personnel acceptance by, and effective contribution to, society."

The company, he said, was interested in developing the corpsman's skills and attitudes "essential to his complete acceptance as a contributing member of our social system, regardless of his special vocation."

Litton Industries, among the original planners of the Job Corps, maintains a strong interest in its success. Executives there believe the program has great social significance and will have a beneficial impact on the individuals involved, American industry and economy.

"I think we're in it for as long as it exists," said Charles Overhold of the Community Affairs Department.

Robert K. Bronson, director of Litton's Parks Job Corps Center near Pleasanton, Calif., said:

"Litton earns approximately $250,000 after taxes for operating a 2200-man center. The total contract is for $12.5 million. It is a cost plus fixed fee contract and I wish to emphasize that the fee is fixed. Litton does not gain more profit by having an expensive program."

PLACED STUDENTS

Litton says the center has placed more than 1900 graduates in jobs at an average wage of $1.94 an hour. Many found jobs in mechanical repair and in the growing electronics industry in Northern California. Litton itself hired many of the graduates in the office machine repair field.

The program undergoes constant evaluation to make it more realistic in finding job opportunities.

Litton finds, as do other companies, that many graduates enter the military service, sometimes after rejection on an earlier attempt.

Young women, too, benefit from the Job Corps. Poland Springs, Me., once a posh vacationing spa of East Coast Society, is now the schooling grounds for 1130 girls from all sections of the country.

Economic Systems Corp., a subsidiary of Avco Corp., operates the largest woman's center in the program on the vast complex of what was once the fashionable Poland Springs House.

In addition to cooking, secretarial, nursing-aide skills, the girls can acquire a knowledge of electrical assembly. Oscilloscopes, tube testers, vacuum tube voltmeters and other equipment are at their disposal.

Before the girls moved in, the small farming community of Poland Springs was nervous and uncertain of its future. Townspeople feared loss of their largest taxpayer, the Poland Springs House.

But Avco pays the town $27,000 annually in real estate taxes as well as paying the estate owner $175,000 a year in rent.

SECOND CONTRACT

Economic Systems is so satisfied with its success in New England, that it has undertaken another contract to operate a woman's center near Moses Lake, Wash.

What lies ahead for the Job Corps? By June, the Office of Economic Opportunity expects to have the program up to its full strength of 41,000 young people. And no new camps are planned.

However, companies, happy with their accomplishments in the corps, are looking for similar worlds to conquer.

Westinghouse Electric Corp.'s Defense System division believes private industry can operate Vista and Peace Corps training centers.

And the company thinks its Peace Corps experience could be applied to Agency for International Development projects overseas.

Richard Hale, vice-president of the division, says AID officials appear responsive to the suggestion.

"Private industry has demonstrated ably in the Job Corps program that it can do the job cheaply and effectively for the government," Mr. Hale maintains.

In the Westinghouse Atterbury center in Indiana, said Mr. Hale, costs were controlled so well that the camp will be operated for 15½ months at the cost negotiated for 13 months.

The Office of Economic Opportunity is particularly pleased with the way aerospeace and electronic firms have operated the centers.

Said a Job Corps spokesman:

"This industry is used to starting new ventures—it gets off the ground quickly."

Not a single private firm has been dropped, while contracts with several non-industrial institutions were not renewed, he pointed out.

The Government does not anticipate any contractor changes—so the Job Corps, a job well done by engineering firms, is likely to continue as it is.

A Study of Prospects for Secretarial and Business Education Curriculums in 4-Year Colleges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GRAHAM PURCELL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 11, 1967

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Helen Lowe is an instructor in the division of business and economics at Midwestern University in Wichita Falls, Tex.

Mrs. Lowe recently completed "A Study of Prospects for Secretarial and Business Education Curricula in 4-Year Colleges." The study was published in the August 1966 edition of the Delta Pi Epsilon Journal. Delta Pi Epsilon is an organization dedicated to professional business education.

I would like to include this study in the Record at this point:

A Study of Prospects for Secretarial and Business Education Curriculums in 4-Year Colleges

(By Mrs. Helen Lowe [1])

This questionnaire study (Survey included: 90 per cent Teaxs schooools, sent questionnaires; 10 per cent Texas schools, interviewed; sample of 100 schools from rest of U.S. were sent questionnaires) sought primarily to determine the attitudes of deans of programs of business administration toward secretarial and business education curricula as part of four-year baccalaureate programs. The study was motivated by the recent trend of some schools at the university level to phase out secretarial curricula.

A second objective of the study was to identify factors which have the greatest influence on decisions which college and university administrators make concerning secretarial curricula. That is, the study concentrated on trends of thinking and on factors influencing decisions rather than on scope of curricula.

Questions used were inspired by two reports prepared by three professors of economics: Professors Gordon and Howell (Ford Foundation study) [2] and Professor Pierson (Carnegie Institute study).[3] The purpose of these two studies was to determine whether collegiate schools of business were meeting the needs of business. The questionnaire which resulted was pretested and reviewed by consultants. It took 15 minutes to complete; 30 minutes if used as the basis of a personal interview. A total of 8 interviews (10 per cent of the Texas schools surveyed) were held in Texas. These are some of the questions asked:

1. Should the secretarial program be offered in colleges and universities?

2. Should the business education program be under the direction of the school of business or the school of education?

3. Has there been any pressure on your school because you offered the secretarial program?

4. To what extent have the reports or agencies listed below influenced secretarial and business education curricula in your school?

a. Ford and Carnegie reports

b. Texas Education Agency

c. Southern Association

d. American Association of Collegiate Schools of Business

e. National Commission For Accreditation of Teacher Education

5. What factor influenced most your decision to discontinue the skills courses?

6. Why does your school offer courses in office skills?

7. Should some of the secretarial skills courses be eliminated even though the secretarial program is continued?

The information collected was classified according to schools having secretarial programs and those not offering secretarial courses.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Significant findings of this study are as follows:

1. In Texas, 83.6 per cent of the four-year colleges and universities offered secretarial courses and 65 per cent of the sample of one hundred schools from other states throughout the United States offered secretarial courses.

2. In Texas, 80 per cent of the deans planned to continue current secretarial curricula. Of the 16.7 per cent of the schools that planned to discontinue them, the Ford and Carnegie reports were the most influential factors in arriving at the decision. Other schools, accrediting agencies—the American Association of Collegiate Schools of Business, Committee for Economic Development reports, and the Commission on Higher Education—were also mentioned as influential factors.

In Texas, 73.3 per cent of the deans did not feel that their schools had been pressured because they continue to offer the secretarial program. The 23.3 per cent who reported pressure believed that typewriting and shorthand received more criticism than other secretarial courses. From other states, 29.6 per cent reported pressure or criticism because they continued to offer the secretarial program. About 70 per cent of these reported that the pressure originated with liberal arts advocates, private secretarial schools, administrators, and the "uninformed." The other 30 per cent thought the AACSB was a source of pressure.

Two-thirds of the Texas deans reported the central administration, other deans, education department personel, liberal arts advocates, and consultants from other universities as sources of pressure. The remaining one-third mentioned pressure from the Commission on Higher Education and the AACSB.

3. No dean from the one hundred schools studied outside of Texas reported planning to discontinue a secretarial program.

4. In Texas, 90 per cent of the responding deans (84 per cent of the deans from the rest of the United States) believed that the secretarial program would continue in the four-year colleges and universities.

Other findings of the study are as follows (numbering continued for reference purposes):

5. In Texas, 70 per cent of the deans (61.3 per cent from the rest of the United States) believed that business education curricula should be contained within the school of business because of the qualifications of the faculty and because of emphasis on business subject matter.

If business education were directed by the school of education, the Texas deans thought the school of business should have the following respensibilities:

	Percent
a. Furnish a broad curriculum in business	67.7
b. Counsel with business education students	60
c. Supervise student teachers in business	47
d. Offer special methods courses	36
e. Offer one general methods course	27

If business education were directed by the school of education, the deans from other states thought the school of business should have the following responsibilities:

	Percent
a. Furnish a broad curriculum in business	75
b. Counsel business education students	45
c. Prepare degree programs for these students	41
d. Offer special methods courses	34
e. Supervise student teachers in business education	30
f. Offer one general methods course in teaching business	18

6. Over 53 per cent of the Texas deans (56 per cent from the rest of the United States) believed that skill courses are essential to secretarial and business education programs.

7. In Texas 54 per cent of the deans (90 per cent from the rest of the United States) believed that the responsibility for skill courses belongs primarily to the four-year colleges or universities. In Texas, one dean thought the responsibility for secretarial skills should rest entirely with the high schools and three thought it should rest with the private business school. From the United States sampling, no dean supported such belief.

8. Throughout the United States, 50 per cent of the deans reported liberalizing their secretarial curricula (more hours of liberal arts and fewer of secretarial) because of the Ford and Carnegie reports and the AACSB accreditation requirements. Many stated that the total business curriculum was affected this way equally as much as the secretarial and business education curricula.

9. Of those Texas schools reporting secretarial curricula, 16.7 per cent mentioned not giving credit for elementary typewriting, intermediate typewriting, and/or elementary shorthand.

Only 11 per cent of the schools responding from the other states offered non-credit secretarial courses.

10. While 36.7 per cent of the Texas deans believed that some skill courses should be eliminated from the curricula, only four (9 per cent) of the deans from other states wanted to eliminate some secretarial courses from the curricula.

Courses checked for elimination (more than one could be checked by a dean) from the Texas business curriculum were as follows:

	Percent
a. Typewriting (either completely or for credit)	27.0
b. Beginning shorthand	17.0
c. Office machines (calculator, adding, and all machines other than the computer)	16.7
d. All shorthand	10.0
e. Filing and duplicating	3.3

The influence of recent reports, associations, and accrediting groups upon the elimination of these skill courses from Texas curricula was indicated as follows:

	Percent
a. The Ford and Carnegie reports	27.3
b. Curriculum reports or self-studies	27.3
c. The AACSB or accrediting associations	18.2
d. Other schools, Commission on Higher Education, thinking of the times, personal beliefs, and the possession of these skills by high school graduates were mentioned.	

11. Only 20 percent of the Texas deans and 15.9 percent of the deans from other states required a doctorate for persons teaching advanced secretarial and business education courses although 23 percent in Texas and 40 percent in other states planned to require the doctorate. In Texas, 100 percent would accept a Ph.D., 83 percent would accept a D.B.A., but only half would accept the Ed.D. The three degrees were equally acceptable to deans from the other states.

Fifty percent of the Texas deans and 40 percent of the others did not, and do not plan to, require a doctorate for secretarial teachers and business education because of the shortage of such teachers.

12. Approximately 41 percent of the deans from the United States sampling and 23 percent of the Texas deans considered the CPS for a secretarial teacher the equivalent of the CPA for an accounting teacher. In Texas, the 30 percent who indicated the two certificates (CPA and CPS) were not equivalent gave reasons that the CPS is not known to the men in administration and business, has not gained status, or is too new to have the same weight as the CPA. In other states, over one-third of the deans stated that the CPS was not as widely recognized or was not as well established as the CPA. Yet, one dean indicated that he preferred the CPS over the Ed.D.

---

[1] Mrs. Helen Lowe is an instructor in the Division of Business and Economics, Midwestern University, Wichita Falls, Texas.

[2] R. A. Gordon and I. E. Howell, *Higher Education for Business* (New York, 1959).

[3] Frank C. Pierson, *The Education of American Businessmen, A Study of University-College Programs in Business Administration* (New York, 1959).

Approximately 27 percent of the deans from throughout the United States who did not consider the CPS plus a master's degree as terminal for a secretarial teacher gave the reason that the certificate was not considered terminal by the university or the AACSB.

13. Some Texas deans (17 per cent) thought the secretarial program would, in the future, be more management oriented and would include more accounting, statistical analysis, and data processing. Thirteen per cent thought secretarial curricula must be "up-graded" or changed to office management if it is to remain in the colleges and universities. Another 13 per cent thought secretarial courses would continue in the four-year colleges and universities for the present but would eventually be pushed back into the junior colleges and high schools "because the accrediting agencies take a dim view of the program."

In the one hundred schools studied throughout the United States, 36.4 per cent of the deans thought the collegiate-level secretarial program would remain about the same, with possible changes made to meet the AACSB requirements.

Another 25 per cent of these deans thought the future of the secretarial program was limited to the business education program, would include more management and general courses, or would continue only in smaller schools or in the non-AACSB schools.

Another 22.7 per cent thought the future of the program was bright whereas 15 per cent, making no comments to support their beliefs, thought the future was dim.

CONCLUSIONS

In summary then, the following general conclusions are drawn from this study:

1. The secretarial program will continue to be offered in four-year colleges and universities.

2. In a majority of the schools, secretarial and business education programs will continue to be contained within the School of Business, with the School of Business working cooperatively with the School of Education in preparing business teachers.

3. While little pressure has been placed on deans because they offer the secretarial program, criticism has come from colleagues within their institutions and from the AACSB.

4. Secretarial programs in four-year colleges, even in non-AACSB schools, will be affected by AACSB recommendations.

5. The secretarial skills will be offered for credit in the majority of the schools because they are essential to the training of executive secretaries and business teachers.

6. Because of the influence of accrediting associations, particularly the AACSB, and the Ford and Carnegia reports, college and university secretarial programs will become more management oriented.

7. Even though there is an increasing acceptance of the CPS for the secretarial teacher as the equivalent of a CPA for an accounting teacher, there will continue to be a secretarial and business education teachers with terminal degrees as defined by the AACSB.

For the Person in Trouble Who Cannot Afford a Lawyer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL E. BUTTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 11, 1967

Mr. BUTTON. Mr. Speaker, in the June issue of Law in Action, a monthly publication of the legal services program of the Office of Economic Opportunity, there appears an article concerning the conference on law and poverty held this past May in Albany, N.Y. The conference was cosponsored by the Legal Aid Society of Albany and the dean of the Albany Law School.

The principal speaker at the conference was James Dumpson, dean of the Graduate School of Social Welfare of Fordham University. He spoke on the relation between lawyers and social workers.

The article points out that the conference was a "rousing success," and says that it "demonstrated the community's interest in the (Albany Legal Aid) society's efforts" related to the legal services program.

Mr. Speaker, I am especially proud of the Albany Legal Aid Society's excellent performance, its 45-year record of assisting the poor, and all the others in Albany County who have helped make the program a success. Moreover, I know many of my colleagues are equally pleased with OEO-initiated legal services programs, and share my feeling of full-fledged support for continuing this "exciting and imaginative" way of assisting the poor in this truly meaningful way. For these reasons, I include the article in the Appendix of the RECORD:

LAW AND POVERTY CONFERENCE AT ALBANY, N.Y.

On May 11, 1967, the Legal Aid Society of Albany, Inc., held a conference on Law and Poverty as part of the celebration commemorating the 45th anniversary of the Society. The principal speaker at the conference was James Dumpson, Dean of the Graduate School of Social Welfare of Fordham University. Dean Dumpson is the former Welfare Commissioner of the City of New York; his subject was the relation between lawyers and social workers. The Conference was generally proclaimed "a rousing success."

The Legal Aid Society of Albany is directed by Lawrence Klepper, a former law clerk in the New York firm of Sullivan and Cromwell, and Director of the Anti-Poverty Committee in Manhattan. "There are about 10,000 families in Albany County who do not have enough income to maintain a decent standard of living," he recently told a newspaperman. "Every aspect of their lives must be a tragedy. They can't afford decent rent, and they cannot furnish a home properly or even buy adequate food."

"This produces pressures which often make the family situation intolerable, because most of them do not have the education necessary to budget wisely or to avoid being taken by consumer frauds.

"Many of these situations . . . could be avoided if there was someone available to give them advice about sales contracts, their rights as employees, advice about a family conflict involving support, or custody of children, or avoiding wage garnishments."

The Legal Aid Society of Albany is attempting to do something about these 10,000 families, and the Conference held on May 11 demonstrated the community's interest in the Society's efforts. The Dean of Albany Law School co-sponsored the Conference, and attendance was over 200. The National Legal Aid and Defender Association awarded a certification of merit to Arthur J. Harvey, President of the Board of Directors, in honor of the Legal Aid Society's 45 years of service to the poor people of Albany County.

The Legal Aid Society of Albany is conducting an exciting and imaginative program. The program's slogan is particularly pithy, and may be of interest to other programs seeking to make their existence known to poor people: "For the Person in Trouble Who Can't Afford a Lawyer."

An Outstanding Effort: "Peace," by Kansas Student

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE SKUBITZ

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 11, 1967

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, I am extremely proud to bring to the attention of my colleagues the following article from the Caldwell Messenger saluting Kathy Kloefkorn, of Caldwell, Kans., for her creative contribution to our hope for peace. Kathy lives in a small Kansas community where there are no peace-marchers, sit-ins, or demonstrations. And yet, could not all of our protestors, demonstrators, and marchers benefit from the impact of Kathy's effort and plea for peace? With the recognition of Kathy should come an equal appreciation of the community, the families, and teachers of Caldwell, Kans., for providing an environment of warmth and understanding in which insight, growth, and expression such as Kathy's can flourish.

I commend this article to the attention of my colleagues, with the sincere hope that we can all benefit from Kathy's poem "Peace":

KATHY KLOEFKORN'S POEM ON "PEACE" TO APPEAR IN BOOK

Kathy Kloefkorn, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Marvin Kloefkorn, has received notification from the American Poetry Press of Los Angeles that her poem "Peace," which appeared in the Annual Anthology of High School Poetry, has just been selected for publication in "Sermons in Poetry." This is a compilation of religious and philosophical poetry written by the youth of America. Selections were made from thousands of poems. Miss Kloefkorn, who wrote the poem as a sophomore, will be a junior in Caldwell High School next fall.

Her English instructor, Mrs. Gweneth Reeder, stated: "We are so pleased about Kathy's recent honor. I think it might be most appropriate to publish the poem with all the conflict in the world—especially this week. Kathy is one of five students from Caldwell to have poems published in the Annual Anthology, but the other four were all juniors and seniors. This girl has talent along this line! I would estimate that she handed in at least 100 poems last year during English class. She sent two in to be considered for the Anthology, and I think that both were to be published. The Anthology hasn't arrived as yet."

Miss Kloefkorn's poem follows:

"PEACE

"The world is in a terrible state.
It's almost filled with war and hate.

"Men have cheated.
Men have lied.
Are wars needed?
Has man really tried?

"The alternative to peace is not war,
Is this what you want? Isn't there more?

"Those without peace will soon find out
That life without love is a sin.
If we wish to find peace without,
We must first find love within."

—KATHY RAE KLOEFKORN.

Two Editorials From WITI-TV, Milwaukee, Wis.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY C. SCHADEBERG

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 11, 1967

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, several residents of my district have called my attention to two excellent editorials which appeared on channel 6, WITI-TV, in Milwaukee. The editorials are well done and thought provoking, as well as being pertinent. In the case of their July 5 presentation concerning rioting by young hoodlums in Lake Geneva, it was only yesterday that I touched on some of their points in a speech to the House.

I am inserting the two editorials in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that others may benefit from them:

[Tuesday, July 4, 1967]

WAVING THE FLAG NOT ENOUGH—WE NEED TO LIVE THE PRINCIPLES THE FLAG REPRESENTS

We hear a lot about our flag these days. We're angered because some would desecrate our stars and stripes . . . so angered that we've asked our lawmakers in Washington to make it a crime to burn or mutilate the flag. Our anger is justified. The flag, after all, is the symbol of all we hold dear in this country. To protect the flag from being spit upon . . . trampled upon . . . or set afire is a noble gesture. But, what of the principles this flag represents? Are we striving to preserve *them?* Those principles are found in the birth certificate of our nation, the Declaration of Independence. We need to review them now and then . . . check our allegiance to them . . . and make certain we're following those principles in our every-day lives.

"We hold these truths to be self-evident. That all men are created equal. That among them are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

Those are not idle words. They were well thought out by brave, wise and far-sighted men . . . men who had pledged their "lives" . . . their "fortunes" . . . their "sacred honor" . . . to American freedom and independence. They were people who had suffered because they had been denied freedom . . . freedom of religion . . . freedom to live where and how they chose.

So, while we concern ourselves about the flag burners and rise to protect the flag from desecration . . . let's be more concerned about and protect the principles "for which it stands." There's still defiance of constituted law in our land. There's still hate and bigotry . . . with not all our people accepted as "equal." On this Fourth of July holiday . . . of all days . . . let's be honest with ourselves and admit that flag-waving alone does not protect those "self-evident" truths our forefathers treasured so highly. Let's remember that our flag is also desecrated by those Americans who fail to *live* the principles of justice and freedom for *all.*

[Wednesday, July 5, 1967]

LAKE GENEVA SHOULD "LAY IT ON THE LINE"—GET TOUGH WITH HOLIDAY HOOLIGANS

"The first vacation we've had in five years and these punks spoil it." So said a Milwaukee man to TV6: He was complaining about the mobs of rebellious college-age youths which brought law-breaking disorder to the otherwise pleasant, peaceful enjoyment of the Lake Geneva resort area.

All kinds of experts try to figure out these youths . . . why they insist on battling police . . . destroying property . . . and seemingly delight in flaunting all authority. Now, these are not frustrated, hopeless, underprivileged young people. On the contrary, it appeared that most of them were treated very well by their parents . . . perhaps too well. They wore college and fraternity emblems. They had cars and motorcycles. They had the money to buy the booze and the beer.

Many of them have been excused from military service so they could pursue their education. Well, if what they displayed in Lake Geneva was "educated" behavior . . . we're making a mistake. Their deferments should be dropped. They don't seem to be getting much good sense out of learning. Of course, that good sense should come from the home. Parents should take away their "wheels." Stop doling out money to them . . . if they can't act responsibly.

Police and guardsmen did a good job of rounding up these rowdies . . . and locking them up. They should continue to do so . . . and level the maximum penalty.

TV6 would add this: Lake Geneva, through the years, has enjoyed the reputation of providing thousands of people every year with a delightful, peaceful vacation and resort area. It could quickly lose that reputation . . . unless strict, lasting measures are taken against these holiday hooligans. They don't have to have them there. Just turn off all activities that attract them. Stop the beer and the booze from flowing so easily . . . and get tough about an early curfew. Lay it on the line with these punks. Stop playing host to them . . . and they'll go elsewhere. If the measures taken are tough enough . . . they might even get some good sense . . . shape up . . . and learn how to behave in an orderly society.

The Involved Generation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GILBERT GUDE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 11, 1967

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, I place in the RECORD today, a speech recently given by Joseph P. McCaffrey, on the occasion of graduation at the Good Counsel High School in Wheaton, Md. I think young McCaffrey's remarks merit the attention of my generation—a generation which too often thinks it has a monopoly on wisdom. We sometimes feel the gap between the generations is unbridgeable, put perhaps if we took more time to listen to such fine young men as Joseph P. McCaffrey, we would not feel the distance so great.

STUDENT ORATION AT GOOD COUNSEL HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATION, CONSTITUTION HALL, JUNE 5, 1967

(Written and delivered by Joseph P. McCaffrey)

Sometimes history has recorded a division of opinions between two successive generations. Even fewer times have the differences been as great as they are today. The older generation constantly asks us: Why do you complain, protest and rebel? What are you rebelling for? What are you protesting about?

I don't pretend to know all the answers, but maybe I can say something for my generation that very seldom gets said. And then, maybe, I can say something to my generation that gets said even less often.

Generations often have names. In the 1920's they talked about the "Lost Generation". In the 1950's it was the "Silent Generation". Today I would call it the "Involved Generation", a concerned generation.

We're asked: Why should you be so concerned? Why should we be so concerned when, as they say, we've never had it so good? And in many respects they are right. We eat well, we change suits often, we can view the television which is produced for us: we see as a hero the man who is proper and correct in all respects and who thinks the right thoughts, but not really thinking too much or too often. And we ask what purpose is left in a soft, easy life where man is pampered and protected, and groomed to be just like all other men?

We don't want that, but it's what we're getting to the tune of "We've never had it so good."

We see all this, we see the bright spots; too often we ignore them. But we also see the shadows.

We've never had it so good.

We can look at a world in which man is not coming closer together in ideas, or in spirit: but is coming closer together in sheer numbers. Scientists tell us that by the time that all of us really hold the reins of power, man will be looking for room and food, the very essentials of survival. Even today half the world starves, and we've never had it so good.

You see, that problem must be solved today; tomorrow will be too late. And by the time that my generation would generally get a chance to attempt a solution, it would be far, far too late. That's why we're in a hurry. That's why we're concerned.

We've never had it so good.

We can look at a world that every day appears closer to its destruction. A destruction that, by accident, design, or sometimes it seems, even whim, can fall on us at any moment. And, you see, we're young. We have the most to lose if that occurs. And yet we have no control over it. That is another reason we're concerned.

So there have been reactions. Some of our generation have grown beards, worn tight trousers, and read poetry to express their rebellion. Others have protested. Some burn their draft cards; others burn American flags. Some march and some riot. And what has it accomplished? Very little. And so this is what I have to say to my generation.

If you are concerned about civil rights, if you feel that all Americans do not receive equal opportunity, don't protest about it. Do something about it. You don't have to riot, you don't have to march. You can teach tolerance, and practice tolerance, and live tolerance. You can make yourself so others follow your lead.

If you are concerned about war, don't burn your draft card. Don't protest; do something. Make yourself someone who will be listened to as an equal, not as a radical.

If you are concerned about hypocrisy, don't complain about it; do something. Make yourself a person who says what he thinks and does what he says.

If you are concerned about being a number and not a person being a part of the mediocrity of the crowd, don't talk about it; do something. Develop your own imagination and initiative and individualism. Don't be afraid to be different. And help other people be different, too. For all of your problems don't talk about solution; institute them. Don't complain about situations; remedy them.

But most of all, don't break off from the older generation. That's not attacking your problem, that's retreating from it. Whatever we do must be done with their help. With their wisdom, and our energy, we can solve those problems. Or at least make a start. And maybe the generation we father could be called the "Happy Generation".

Added Need for Gibraltar Accord

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 11, 1967

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I insert in the Appendix of the RECORD another most penetrating article with respect to the importance of Spain, by Brig. Gen. James D. Hittle, USMC, retired, director of national security and foreign affairs, Veterans of Foreign Wars.

General Hittle is eminently qualified to comment on Gibraltar and the importance of Spain to the defense of Western Europe.

The article, entitled "Added Need for Gibraltar Accord," appeared in the Burbank, Calif., Daily Review on May 20, 1967, and I recommend its reading to all who are interested in the defense of freedom:

THE CHANGING SCENE: ADDED NEED FOR GIBRALTAR ACCORD

(By Brig. Gen. James D. Hittle, USMC, ret.)

WASHINGTON.—Exposure of the Kremlin's Rome-based spy ring gives added urgency for early settlement of the Spanish-British argument over Gibraltar.

This massive Russian-controlled espionage operation was directed largely at the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and our bases in Spain. Such Kremlin sensitivity to NATO spotlights two basic aspects of European strategy:

1. NATO, in spite of its difficulties, stands in the eyes of the Kremlin, as a major obstacle to Communist penetration of free Europe.

2. Russian general staff recognition of the vital role of Spain in the defense of free Europe and the Atlantic.

It's high time that many in Europe and the United States also recognizes Spain's strategic role.

Such recognition, in turn, makes it imperative that there be a prompt resolution of the British-Spanish row over Gibraltar.

Gibraltar, guarding the straits between the Mediterranean and Atlantic, is indispensable to the broad strategic role Spain can perform in defense of the West.

It takes no detailed staff analysis to realize that in tension or war there must be an intimate operational relationship between Gibraltar and our Polaris submarine base at Rota, on Spain's Atlantic coast eastward from the Rock.

Also, the Straits of Gibraltar, dominated by the naval base there, is a maritime needle's eye through which Russian submarines must threat their way from the Atlantic into the Mediterranean flank of NATO.

Thus, realization of the full, and necessary, strategic potential of Spain requires three-way cooperation. Spain occupies most of the strategic Iberian peninsula. The United States has granted air and naval bases in Spain. England holds Gibraltar.

Unfortunately, the unity of effort needed in the face of Soviet expansion into the Mediterranean and Atlantic is in jeopardy. The Spanish-British argument over the status of Gibraltar is what's causing the trouble.

The Madrid government, reflecting the Spanish attitude that Gibraltar, under the British, is a foreign colony on Spanish soil, is pressing for recognition of Spanish sovereignty over the base. England, having held the Rock since the treaty of Utracht (1713) shows little intention of agreeing.

The point that must be realized is that the issue of Gibraltar has a direct relationship to the defense of the West. The hard cold fact of the matter is that Spanish cooperation is essential for Gibraltar, even as a British base, to perform its full strategic role.

Three nations are vitally concerned—Spain and England are at odds. So, that leaves it up to the United States to try to get a settlement. Such U.S. interest is necessary from the standpoint of the defense of free Europe, the Atlantic and, hence, our own national security.

Text of Prime Minister Levi Eshkol's Statement on June 20, 1967, at Sharm-el-Sheikh

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 11, 1967

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, from the beginning of her existence, Israel has wanted nothing more than peace with her Arab neighbors.

When Egypt began her aggressive activities against Israel and resolved to completely destroy her, Israel asked for peace.

And even now, after Israel has won a costly war and is in a position of strength, she still asks for peace.

I commend to the attention of our colleagues the text of Prime Minister Levi Eshkol's statement made on June 20, 1967, at Sharm-el-Sheikh. The text appeared in the June 30 edition of the Jewish Press and follows:

PRIME MINISTER LEVI ESHKOL OFFERS TO MEET ARAB LEADERS TO DISCUSS PERMANENT PEACE

Following is the text of the statement made on June 20 by Prime Minister Levi Eshkol at Sharm-el-Sheikh in Southern Sinai at the entrance to the Strait of Tiran and the Gulf of Aqaba.

"At the site where hate and aggression against us reached its peak forcing us to defend ourselves; from this place where evil started, I again state to our neighbors my readiness to meet with each one of the Arab leaders to discuss permanent peace."

"My words do not stem out of arrogance. I would not like somebody to believe that I am saying this because I am in a position of strength, but out of a desire to forget the past and to prevent tests of strength in the future, out of a deep longing to serve jointly the entire region and to renew the days of prosperity when Jews and Arabs contributed together towards human culture."

"Some years ago, during a comparatively quiet period I put forward a similar suggestion to the President of Egypt, but my words were then received with mockery. At this historic hour, here in Sharm-el-sheikh, I renew my appeal, and I am ready to meet for peace talks with our nearest neighbors, with President Nasser, with King Hussein, and with other Arab leaders, at any time and at any place."

MIDDLE EAST HAS GREAT FUTURE THROUGH PEACE

"The Middle East has a great future only through peace and joint endeavor. We should not miss the opportunity. Let no one think that it is possible to turn the clock back. Let us therefore march together towards permanent peace and security."

"I am against a settlement which calls for an armistice agreement. I speak about permanent peace and the creation of such security conditions under which one party will not be afraid of the other. I therefore appeal for cooperation in all fields—economic, cultural and spiritual, for the common contribution towards the prosperity of our peoples and the entire world."

Death of a Medic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY L. PETTIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 11, 1967

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, the confusion and grief incident to the tragic conflict in Vietnam becomes especially poignant when a loved one falls in battle.

Rudolph and Nancy Grajeda, of Lucerne Valley, in California, voice an anguished cry for direction and purpose in a war that, to them, seems increasingly senseless.

I submit their letter for the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, as an impassioned protest against our Government's indecisive management of the war in Vietnam.

Their letter follows:

JUNE 25, 1967.

DEAR MR. PETTIS: I wonder if it does any good to write to you, but I will anyway. Tonight, just after sunset, a neighbor and friend came home. I called to him and waved the way I always do when I see him. But something was amiss, for he called my name in a desperate way—a way that frightened me, because I had never heard his voice in that tone before. He walked in a funny way as if he hurt somewhere, as if he had the wind knocked right out of him. He was walking toward me, so I started walking toward him.

When close enough to hear he said "Call the plant and tell them I won't be in for about a week." I said okay, but why? He said with tears in his voice, "My boy just got killed in Vietnam."

I knew his boy well. He was a medic in the paratroopers, and had been on the front line for about seven days. Also he was only nineteen years old.

Then Bill turned around and walked to his house, and I to mine. A few moments later I heard a wail and a scream, and a voice saying, "No, no, no, not my honey, no, no, no." That must have been when Bill told his wife that her son was dead. It was something President Johnson should have heard.

Bill's wife just had an operation last week and has been home for a few days, and you should have heard her screaming as Bill drove his car past our house on the way to the hospital tonight. It shouldn't have happened to these nice people.

What I have been getting around to is this. Let's get that no good war over with and quit killing boys like Bill's son.

We have been fighting that war for years now and still the North Vietnamese have not so much as hinted that they want to talk peace. Why go on kidding ourselves. They think they have us licked and maybe they do. But if they don't let's get the whole thing over with. Let's bomb hell out of them. Let's hit them with everything we've got. They don't know what peace is—so how can they talk it?

I feel great sorrow for Bill and his wife. But I hope they did not lose their fine boy in vain. I hope that this Great country will stop playing games with that little communistic country over there and get this war won—or lost, but get it over with.

Please write and give us some answers—any hope that we might either get in the war with everything, or pull out, so we can tell our neighbors and they might feel that their son didn't die in vain.

It isn't just myself who feels this way. Everyone I talk to thinks that it's such a stupid waste for us to be over there, helping a country which won't help itself.

Yours truly,
RUDOLPH W. GRAJEDA, Jr.
NANCY GRAJEDA.

Boys Who Work With Fear: Some Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 10, 1967

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, part of the article written by Miriam Ottenberg, staff writer for the Sunday Star, contained a report on some changes made by Chief Judge Morris Miller, of the District's juvenile court. Miss Ottenberg's story deals with the unsavory conditons our young "businessmen" face at the hands of gangs of young bullies. As a former judge, I handled many juvenile cases in my own home community. In directing my probation officers, one of the things I insisted be done was that the arrest of a repeater be put on the top of the list for next morning's court action. It is impossible for a judge to take action unless the probation officer and the police adequately inform the court that a second offense has been committed. Priorities have to be set up giving precedence to repeaters and juveniles who engage in reprisals as a means of keeping from being informed on. Apparently, Judge Miller of the District juvenile court has made some changes to make sure that juveniles charged with robbery are taken before a judge. I would emphasize that those assaults on persons take higher priority over assaults on property. But this is a start, and Miss Ottenberg's reporting of this change follows:

SOME ACTION

Chief Justice Morris Miller of the District's Juvenile Court has changed court policy to make sure juveniles charged with robbery are taken before a judge, it was learned last night.

In a memorandum to the court's director of social work, the judge said: "It appears to me that we must at this point make a concerted effort to handle offenders in cases involving offenses against persons on a firmer basis and with more exposure to the judicial processes of the court as the circumstances may warrant."

The judge acted after reviewing the facts brought out in The Star's investigation of the increasing number of juveniles preying on working boys. The Star noted that despite repeated robberies and threats of reprisal if the robbery is reported, many of the juveniles never appear before the judge on a robbery charge.

That's what Judge Miller wants changed.

He recalled that after Judge Aubrey E. Robinson Jr. left for District Court in November, 1966, and seven months passed before a successor was sworn in, two judges, in effect, had to cover the work of three.

So, court procedures were modified to give priority to cases where the boy was being held at the Receiving Home or a change of his status—such as commitment—was involved.

Judge Miller said he had become increasingly concerned with the number of complaints filed with the court involving offenses against persons. He particularly cited yoke robberies of youngsters engaged in delivery and collections as well as assaults on persons accompanied by intimidating threats.

"I have noted, too," the judge added, "that there have been incidents of repeaters in these categories of cases and under our present policy, since no change of status may be involved, subsequent cases are not normally petitioned and brought before a judge."

In calling for a change of policy, Judge Miller specified that these complaints should get to the judge, not only initially but more particularly where there is evidence of a pattern of repeated incidents.

"Intake workers and probation officers," Judge Miller warned, "should be alert to situations where intimidation is involved and threats of reprisal are made to the victims and these facts should be made known to the judge in social study reports and at hearings in court.

"This will, of course, involve more judicial time, but the situation should be somewhat alleviated after the third judge is confirmed and takes office and will be even more alleviated should pending legislation to expand the bench of this court to five judges be passed by the Congress."

A Unique Community Experience

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROGER H. ZION
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 11, 1967

Mr. ZION. Mr. Speaker, the southern Indiana community of Princeton is currently enjoying a status probably unique for the State and rare in this Nation.

It is debt free.

At the city council meeting held on June 19, Princeton's dynamic young mayor, Bill McConnell, announced that "as of July 1, this city will be debt free."

July 1 marked the date of final payment on the community's swimming pool bonds. With the receipt of funds by the bonding company, Princeton moved into a rather exclusive circle. The city's former indebtedness, besides the swimming pool bonds, was limited to $10,000 in school aid bonds. These were recently assumed by the North Gibson School Corp.

Related Mayor McConnell to the council, "I know of few, if any Hoosier communities which can state that they are debt free." McConnell announced that the city now has $180,000 in bonding power with which it may build for the future.

Mr. Speaker, I am certainly proud of Princeton and its city government and proud that this aggressive community is in my district. Under the leadership of their resourceful mayor, Princeton is making its mark on the economy of southern Indiana. Its hard-working citizens can commemorate July 1 as their own independence day. Today, I am pleased to ask this Congress to note Princeton's accomplishment.

Hawaii Citizens Play Important Roles in American Samoa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA
OF HAWAII
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 11, 1967

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, the future of agriculture in American Samoa has never looked brighter due to the effective work of two University of Hawaii graduates, Mr. Thomas Hatakeyama and Mr. Charles Shiraishi.

Mr. Hatakeyama has recently been appointed as the new director of agriculture for the government of American Samoa to succeed Mr. Shiraishi, who takes on a new role as director of Peace Corps training in the South Pacific. The activities of these able administrators, who have been so instrumental in enhancing the potential of agriculture in this group of seven islands located approximately 2,300 miles southwest of Hawaii, was the subject of a recent news dispatch from Pagopago, the capital.

The newly appointed director of agriculture was graduated from the University of Hawaii in 1950, where he majored in agriculture, and received his master's degree in agricultural education from Cornell University. Mr. Hatakeyama's work as extension services supervisor in Samoa began in 1963, following an 8-year assignment teaching vocational agriculture in Hawaii. In his capacity as extension services supervisor, he helped to establish varied home demonstration and 4–H Club activities which were highly successful in encouraging the women and young people of Samoa to take a more active role in agriculture.

Mr. Hatakeyama said that although there is still a great deal of work that needs to be done, he feels that "With the continued support of the public in agricultural endeavors, we can work together to make a better and more prosperous Samoa." I am confident that the people of American Samoa will continue to benefit as a result of the contributions which have been made by these two outstanding Hawaii agriculturists toward the goal of a better and more prosperous Samoa.

I believe that my colleagues will also find of interest this report on agricultural activities in American Samoa. I therefore submit for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the news article from the June 20, 1967, issue of the Honolulu Advertiser, entitled "University of Hawaii Grad Heads Samoa Farming":

UNIVERSITY OF HAWAII GRAD HEADS SAMOA FARMING

PAGOPAGO.—Thomas Hatakeyama, a graduate of the University of Hawaii, is the new director of agriculture for the government of American Samoa.

He succeeds Charles Shiraishi, who has been appointed director of Peace Corps training in the South Pacific.

Hatakeyama was born in Hawaii and was graduated from UH in 1950. He majored in general agriculture.

In 1951, he received his teaching certificate in vocational agriculture.

He received his master's degree in agriculture education from Cornell University after serving in the Army, and taught vocational agriculture in Hawaii for eight years before moving to American Samoa in 1963 as extension services supervisor.

As supervisor, he was instrumental in establishing extension services. He initiated home demonstration and 4H Club activities to encourage women and young people to take a more active role in agriculture in Samoa.

Hatakeyama was appointed assistant director of agriculture in 1964.

He believes there is still a great deal of work that needs to be done in agriculture in Samoa.

"Farming is just coming into its own," he said. "Many more people are needed to farm before Samoa can become independent of imported commodities.

"Farming is profitable and should be thought of as a worthy occupation instead of a part-time job."

He added, "With the continued support of the public in agricultural endeavors, we can work together to make a better and more prosperous Samoa."

Shiraishi's post with the Peace Corps was created recently. It will entail establishing a training program for trainees who will be assigned in Western Samoa, Fiji and Tonga.

He received his degree in agriculture from the University of Hawaii. Before coming to Samoa in 1963, he was engaged in his own business in Hawaii for 15 years.

In Samoa, he has been instrumental in changing the potential of agriculture. For the first time eggs and fresh vegetables were made available to the public on a regular basis and at a reasonable cost to the consumer.

Vietnam Policy Support

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS G. MORRIS

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 11, 1967

Mr. MORRIS of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, today when we are hearing such varied discussion of the conflict in Vietnam, both pro and con, I believe that the views of the Disabled American Veterans of New Mexico will be of value to my colleagues. Commander Antonio Viramontes of this highly respected organization has sent me a copy of a letter addressed to President Johnson expressing their support of the administration policy in Vietnam. I would like to enter this brief but significant letter into the Record at this point for the benefit of my colleagues:

June 29, 1967.

Lyndon B. Johnson,
President of the United States, White House, Washington, D.C.

My Dear Mr. President: The Disabled American Veterans of New Mexico, at their State Convention in Santa Fe, New Mexico, on June 1–4, 1967, voted to reaffirm their support of the government policy in Viet Nam.

Sincerely yours,
Antonio Viramontes,
Commander, Department of New Mexico.

Outstanding Court of Military Appeals Opinion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 11, 1967

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, last Friday, the U.S. Court of Military Appeals handed down an important decision in the application of Captain Levy for bail pending his appeal.

The court, in a careful and scholarly manner, examined the precedents for bail, including the legal background of the eighth amendment—the constitutional provision relating to bail. It also makes an analysis of the history of bail in court-martial cases.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert this important opinion in the Record at this point:

[Miscellaneous Docket No. 67–9]

U.S. Court of Military Appeals—Howard Brett Levy, Captain, U.S. Army, Petitioner *v.* Stanley R. Resor, Secretary of the Army; Gines Perez, Major General, Commanding General, Fort Jackson, South Carolina; E. B. Roberts, Brigadier General, Acting Commander, Fort Jackson, South Carolina; Jode Wilson, Lieutenant Colonel, Provost Marshal, Fort Jackson, South Carolina; Charles Jackson, Second Lieutenant, Confinement Officer, Fort Jackson, South Carolina, Respondents

On Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus, or, in the alternative, bail pending appeal, or, in the alternative, Relief in the Nature of Mandamus, or, in the alternative, such other further or different and appropriate relief as may be required, July 7, 1967.

Charles Morgan, Jr., Esquire, argued the cause for Petitioner. With him on the brief were *Laughlin McDonald, Esquire, Anthony G. Amsterdam, Esquire, Alan H. Levine, Esquire, Mrs. Eleanor H. Norton, Melvin L. Wulf, Esquire, Captain Charles M. Sanders, Jr.,* and *Captain Walter Jones.*

Captain L. Dean Moore argued the cause for Respondents. With him on the brief was *Lieutenant Colonel David Rarick.*

OPINION OF THE COURT

Per Curiam: Petitioner was arraigned before a general court-martial convened at Fort Jackson, South Carolina, charged with disobedience of an order of a superior officer, promoting disloyalty among the troops, and making intemperate, defamatory, provoking, and disloyal statements to enlisted personnel, in violation of Articles 90, 134, and 133, Uniform Code of Military Justice, 10 USC §§ 890, 934, and 933, respectively. He was convicted as charged and sentenced to be dismissed from the service, total forfeitures, and to confinement at hard labor for three years. Pursuant to the judgment and sentence, the petitioner is being detained in the United States Army Hospital at Fort Jackson, awaiting action by the convening authority under Article 64 of the Code, supra, 10 USC § 864.

On June 20, 1967, counsel for Captain Levy filed with this Court a Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus, or, in the alternative, bail pending appeal, or, in the alternative, Relief in the Nature of Mandamus, or, in the alternative, such other further or different and appropriate relief as may be required. In its brief, counsel allege that the petitioner's continued confinement pending final disposition of his appeal is unlawful and unconstitutional because it is in violation of (a) Manual for Courts-Martial, United States, 1951, paragraph 21*d;* (b) the Due Process clause of the Fifth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States; (c) the excessive bail provision of the Eighth Amendment; (d) Rule 46(a)(2), Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure; and (e) the First Amendment to the Constitution.

Petitioner seeks the issuance of writs of *habeas corpus* or *mandamus.* In a proper case, this Court has the authority to issue such writs. United States v Frischholz, 16 USCMA 150, 36 CMR 306. The former would test the legality of petitioner's restraint, while the latter is addressed to the enforcement of that judgment and discretion which a public officer, duty bound in law, has failed to exercise. Since the question involved in both of these writs concerns the granting of bail, or release from confinement without bail, pending appeal, also sought by the petitioner, our decision necessarily will be dictated by the answer to the question whether bail is available to a military prisoner.

In tracing the history of bail in the United States, we quite naturally begin with the Eighth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which provides:

"Excessive bail shall not be required, nor excessive fines imposed, nor cruel and unusual punishments inflicted."

In Carlson v Landon, 342 US 524, 545, 96 L ed 547, 563, 72 S Ct 525 (1952), the Supreme Court of the United States observed:

"The bail clause [of the Eighth Amendment] was lifted with slight changes from the English Bill of Rights Act. [1 Wm. & Mary II, ch 2, § 1 (10).] In England that clause has never been thought to accord a right to bail in all cases [Petersdorff, on Bail, 483 et seq.], but merely to provide that bail shall not be excessive in those cases where it is proper to grant bail. When this clause was carried over into our Bill of Rights, nothing was said that indicated any different concept. [1 Annals of Congress 753.] The Eighth Amendment has not prevented Congress from defining the classes of cases in which bail shall be allowed in this country. Thus in criminal cases bail is not compulsory where the punishment may be death. [1 Stat 91, § 33; Rules of Criminal Procedure, 46 (a).] Indeed, the very language of the Amendment fails to say all arrests must be bailable."

And in Stack v Boyle, 342 US 1, 96 L ed 3, 6, 72 S Ct 1 (1951), the court said:

". . . From the passage of the Judiciary Act of 1789, 1 Stat 73, 91, to the present Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure, Rule 46 (a)(1), federal law has unequivocally provided that a person arrested for a non-capital offense *shall* be admitted to bail. This traditional right to freedom *before conviction* permits the unhampered preparation of a defense, and serves to prevent the infliction of punishment *prior to conviction.* See Hudson v. Parker, 156 US 277, 285, 39 L ed 424, 426, 15 S Ct 450 (1895). Unless this right to bail *before trial* is preserved, the presumption of innocence, secured only after centuries of struggle, would lose its meaning." [Emphasis supplied.]

It is clear, from the interpretation placed upon it by the Supreme Court, that the excessive bail provision of the Eighth Amendment, taken from the English Bill of Rights, was concerned only with the right to bail *prior to conviction.* That the English Bill of Rights was also so limited is borne out by the following statement from Blackstone in his Commentaries on the Laws of England, Book IV, Chapter 22, Of Commitment and Bail, at page 295:

"Let us next see, who may *not* be admitted to bail, or, what offences are *not* bailable. And here I shall not consider any one of those cases in which bail is ousted by statute, from prisoners *convicted* of particular offences; for then such imprisonment without bail is part of their sentence and punishment. . . ."

The First Congress, by enacting the Judiciary Act, 1 Stat 73 (1789), established the

Judicial Courts of the United States and the rules under which they were to operate. With reference to the granting of bail, the Act provides:

". . . And upon all arrests in criminal cases [for any crime or offense against the United States], bail shall be admitted, except where the punishment may be death, in which cases it shall not be admitted but by the supreme or a circuit court. . . ." [1 Stat 73, 91.]

The Act is silent with regard to bail after conviction.

The Supreme Court, organized under the Judiciary Act, subsequently adopted specific rules for practice and procedure in courts of the United States. In that connection, the Circuit Court for the Northern District of Florida, in Ex parte Harlan, 180 Fed 119, 135 (ND Fla) (1909), (affirmed 218 US 442, 54 L ed 1101, 31 S Ct 44), stated with reference to bail:

"Supreme Court rule 34 (29 Sup. Ct. xxi) as to bail, when a writ of habeas corpus has issued and been discharged, leaves the bailing of the prisoner pending appeal entirely within the discretion of the court which issued the writ. *It is needless to say that there is no constitutional right to bail in any case, after conviction.* After all that has been said and written on the subject, the only rule which can be deduced from the authorities is that bail should be granted or denied as best effects exact justice between the government and the defendant according to the character and urgencies of the instant case, determined in the light of the principles of the common law as affected by the enactments of Congress." [Emphasis supplied.]

See also the Annotations in 19 ALR 807 and 77 ALR 1235, "Constitutional right to bail pending appeal from conviction," for additional authority, both State and Federal, in support of the proposition that the right to bail after conviction is not a matter of constitutional right.

By authority of Congress, Act of June 29, 1940, 54 Stat 688, the Supreme Court was given specific authority to prescribe rules of pleading, practice, and procedure in criminal courts of the United States. Rule 46 pertains to bail. As originally enacted, Rule 46(a)(2) of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure provided in pertinent part:

"Bail may be allowed pending appeal or certiorari only if it appears that the case involves a substantial question which should be determined by the appellate court."

This was substantially a restatement of the previously promulgated Rule VI of the Supreme Court Rules of Practice and Procedure in Criminal Cases.

Rule 46(a)(2) was amended in 1956 and the present rule reads:

"Bail may be allowed pending appeal or certiorari unless it appears that the appeal is frivolous or taken for delay."

Justice Frankfurter in speaking of the change in the rule observed:

"Obviously, as the Government recognizes, the amendment has greatly liberalized the basis for admission to bail in the federal courts pending an appeal from conviction.

". . . I think the Government is right in saying that the granting of bail is called for more readily under the new standard than it was under the old concept of 'substantial question.' It is also right in indicating that the new Rule effectuates a shift from putting the burden on the convicted defendant to establish eligibility for bail, to requiring the Government to persuade the trial judge that the minimum standards for allowing bail have not been met." [Ward v United States, 1 L ed 2d 25, 76 S Ct 1063 (1956); Annotated at 1 L ed 2d 1564, Right to bail before conviction or upon review thereof, under Federal Criminal Procedure Rule 46(a)(1) and (2).]

It is apparent, therefore, that if a military prisoner is entitled to bail, the burden is on the Government to show why it should not be granted.

In an earlier annotation entitled "Bail pending appeal from conviction," 45 ALR 458, covering Federal cases, the majority of the States, as well as England and Canada, it is stated that:

"Under the common law bail pending an appeal from a conviction was not a matter of right. Rex v Wilkes (1770) 4 Burr. 2527, 98 Eng. Reprint, 327; Rex v Waddington (1800) 1 East, 143, 102 Eng. Reprint, 56. And see the various American cases cited throughout this annotation for dicta to the same effect.

"But generally in the United States, and even to some extent in England, bail pending an appeal from a conviction seems to be a creature of statute." [*Ibid.*, at page 459.]

Having established that the right to bail pending appeal from conviction is not of constitutional dimensions but statutory only, we must look to the statutory law and the rules of procedure governing the military to determine whether the appellant should prevail in his petition.

At the present time, courts-martial are governed by the provisions of the Uniform Code of Military Justice, 10 USC §§ 801 to 940. As recently as United States v Gallagher, 15 USCMA 391, 35 CMR 363, we had occasion to trace military law from its inception prior to the adoption of the Constitution to the present, and the same need not be repeated here. Suffice to say that the First Congress specifically provided, "That the said troops shall be governed by the rules and articles of war which have been established by the United States in Congress assembled, or by such rules and articles of war, as may hereafter by law be established." Act of September 29, 1789, 1 Stat 95, 96. We have not found, nor has any instance been called to our attention, wherein the guarantees of bail, existing in the civilian jurisdictions, have been extended to military personnel, sentenced to confinement pursuant to conviction by courts-martial, either by statute, rule or regulation promulgated by the President, or judicial decision. As we stated in United States 1 Hangsleben, 8 USCMA 320, 323, 24 CMR 130, "in the military bail is not available," Cf. United States 1 Bayhand, 6 USCMA 762, 21 CMR 84.

Federal courts have also recognized the absence of the right to bail pending appeal from a conviction by courts-martial. In United States v Vissering, 184 F Supp 529, 530 (ED Va) (1960), that court stated:

". . . the Eighth Amendment is not applicable to military personnel, and bail is wholly unknown to the military law and practice. 72 Harv. Law Rev. 266, 284, 285; United States ex rel. Woodard v Deahl, D.C. W.D. Ark., 60 F Supp 666; 29 Temple Law Quarterly, 1, 5; United States v Bayhand, 6 U.S.C.M.A. 762, 21 C.M.R. 84 (1956)."

Civilian statutes, on occasion, are not intended to apply to the military. Pertinent to the problem at hand is the Bail Reform Act of 1966, 80 Stat 214, 18 USC § 3146, *et seq.* This Act sets forth the current guidelines to be followed by the Federal courts in determining whether an accused should be released pending appellate review, and specifically excludes courts-martial from its provisions. 18 USC § 3152(2).

Similar to its grant of authority to the Supreme Court to prescribe rules of practice and procedure in Federal civilian cases, which have the force of statutory law, the Congress, by Article 36 of the Code, supra, 10 USC § 836, granted to the President the parallel power to make such rules for the military courts. By virtue of this authority, the President prescribed by Executive Order 10214 of February 8, 1951, the "Manual for Courts-Martial, United States, 1951." The rules contained therein are similar to, and in some instances identical with, those of the Supreme Court. See United States v Smith, 13 USCMA 105, 32 CMR 105. No express provision respecting bail is found therein. However, paragraph 21*d* of the Manual, in essence a parallel provision to Rule 46(a)(2), supra, called to our attention by the appellant, provides:

"Responsibility for restraint after trial.—Upon notification from a trial counsel of the result of a trial (44*e*(2)), a commanding officer will take prompt and appropriate action with respect to the restraint of the person tried. Such action, depending on the circumstances, may involve the immediate release of the person from any restraint, or the imposition of any necessary restraint pending final action on the case."

While it seems more likely that that portion of the paragraph relating to "the immediate release of the person from any restraint" applies to those accused who have been acquitted by judgment of the court (see paragraph 22), we will assume that it also applies to convicted persons awaiting final action. Had the President intended to institute a system of bail for the military, it being within his power to do so, it seems evident that this would have been the logical point at which it would have been provided. Not having done so, we will not speculate as to his reasons therefor.

Congress is apparently aware of this omission for, as noted, it specifically excluded courts-martial from the provisions of the Bail Reform Act. We are informed by Government counsel that this was a considered action. In its brief it states:

"In 1965, the House of Representatives and the Senate developed parallel bills on bail reform, H.R. 10195 and S. 1357. The Senate bill excluded all military tribunals and the House bill did not. The Attorney General of the United States brought this difference to the attention of the House Judiciary Committee. In 1966, the House accepted the Senate version and the bill was enacted with the express provision for the exclusion of all military tribunals (See Senate Report No. 750, 16 September 1965 and House Report No. 1541, 18 May 1966)."

The absence of a specific provision for bail does not fully answer the question for paragraph 21*d* of the Manual, supra, reposes in the commanding officer a discretion in dealing with a convicted prisoner—he may release him on his own recognizance—similar to that reserved to the civilian courts under Rule 46(a)(2). Each case must be decided on its own merits and only where there is a showing of an abuse of discretion will the judgment be reversed. As noted in United States v Williams, 253 F 2d 144, 148 (CA 7th Cir) (1958):

"It is obvious that where there is no showing that the appeal is frivolous or taken for delay, and under the plain language of the Rule that bail *may* be allowed, there are some cases where, under the facts, the court is allowed to exercise some discretion in passing upon such a motion as before us here."

The character and extent of a series of offenses afford a proper basis for the exercise of discretionary power to deny bail under Rule 46 (a) (2). United States v Wilson, 257 F 2d 796 (CA 2d Cir) (1958). In accord, see additional citations in note 49 (Discretion of the court) to Rule 46, 18 U. S. Code Annotated.

In the case at bar the petitioner was placed not in a military stockade, with other convicted prisoners, but in a hospital room on the base, albeit under guard. In its brief, counsel alleged that the petitioner was subjected to harrassment by the light in his room being on constantly and by the fact that his guard followed him whenever he left the room to use the toilet facilities. We were told at the time of oral argument, however, that these indignities have now been removed.

Under the facts of this case and in light of the circumstances of the petitioner's present confinement, we do not find an abuse of discretion on the part of the commanding officer in refusing to release the petitioner from confinement under paragraph 21*d*, supra.

We are also urged by counsel to hold the petitioner's confinement illegal under the due process clause of the Fifth Amendment, "because other officers, except those convicted of heinous crimes, are not confined pending appeal"; and under the First Amendment, "because it as had and will have the effect of deterring others from exercising their constitutionally ordained rights of free expression and association." For the purpose of this petition, we find the arguments on these issues unpersuasive.

Accordingly, the petition for writs of *habeas corpus* or *mandamus* is denied. And, in accord with our comments above, petitioner's request for bail, or release without bail, is also denied.

Success Marks Donnelly Career

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HORACE R. KORNEGAY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 11, 1967

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, recently one of the most respected members of North Carolina's industrial community was honored by Elon College, one of the fine institutions of higher learning in the Sixth Congressional District of North Carolina.

Mr. S. C. Donnelly, assistant administrator of Western Electric's North Carolina works and director of the Burlington and Greensboro shops, was granted an honorary doctor of science degree by Elon. Now "Doctor" Donnelly also presented the principal address at the graduation ceremonies during which he received his honorary doctorate.

Mr. A. Howard White, a distinguished North Carolina journalist and editor of the Burlington Daily Times-News, wrote a feature article about the interesting career of Mr. Donnelly for the June 6 issue of his publication. So that others may benefit from this article, I insert it in the RECORD. The article follows:

SUCCESS MARKS DONNELLY CAREER

(By A. Howard White)

A skilled executive and respector of production deadlines who always wanted to be an engineer become a Doctor of Science at Elon College yesterday.

Stanley Charles (Don) Donnelly, assistant administrative officer of Western Electric's North Carolina Works and director of the Burlington and Greensboro Shops, must have had an inward feeling of much satisfaction as Elon College conferred the honorary degree upon him. He had been administering the direction of highly-skilled people for many years through his rise in the company's leadership. Now, an institution of higher learning had cited his success and achievement and had placed him in the levels of official academic recognition for it.

To the man himself, he still was back here this morning at his desk at 8 a.m. Another significant day in his life was over, and there was much ahead to be done.

"The job still is the boss," he said in commenting on the recognition and in his philosophy of individual effort.

He didn't mean that he accepted lightly the honor conferred upon him. Yet, his basic approach yields to his feeling that "the combined efforts of many people over many years and their use of their talents and dedication" made yesterday possible for him.

"I accept this honor," he said, "in the recognition of these many people who made it possible." Therefore, the Western Electric teams of the past and present with whom he has worked are collectively "Doctors of Science" today to him.

EVENTS IN EARLIER YEARS

Conferring of the degree permitted a brief review of his career in highly-specialized industry to become more publicly known.

There were those events in earlier days, however, which could not be well documented in brief form. Yet, they come into focus strongly as he speaks modestly but in great respect for opportunity created by his company and opened to him and to others.

There was the decision made upon high school graduation in 1923, for instance, that became the foundation for his career.

Leading into the last weeks before graduation in his home town of Toluca, Ill., several seniors showed their ambition for further training. Since college was not possible for them at the time, they searched for companies which might have on-the-job training and technical programs of instruction.

Western Electric Company had such a program in nearby Chicago, as did Westinghouse in more distant Pittsburgh. There also was a technical institute in Chicago to be considered.

Investigation of the possibilities led to his application to Western Electric where he was accepted and began his company career in September of 1923 as a production student in the company's Hawthorne Works. It developed that the program in the year was the last sponsored by the company in offering a year of training to high school graduates.

The year, to him, was what he needed to fully realize that he had found the work he wanted. He gained knowledge and experience in all phases of electronic manufacturing and procedures, and he gained his first impressions and satisfaction in seeing production deadlines met. This made its impression on him.

It is apparent, too, that his skill made an impression on the company, for he began moving upward in responsibility. At the age of 23 he was named a section chief in the company's interworks service, and one year later he became its department chief.

More recognition continued to come as he was given new assignments that called for his administrative and production skills, leading to June of 1937 when he was named department chief of specialty products. Subsequently, he had the responsibility of building the first submarine and capital ship radars for his company.

HE MET THE QUOTA

It was then that he apparently reached his most significant objective in his comparatively young career in top management. At the start of World War II, he was selected for a highly professional assignment in building 1,000 radars a month in a program that was new in its magnitude to Western Electric. There was much discussion and study on whether such a project could be handled immediately and, if so, if Don Donnelly could do it.

Presented the challenge, Mr. Donnelly did not hesitate. Though he was warned that failure could cast a dark cloud over the company's efficiency record, as well as his own, he said the 1,000 radars would be forthcoming—monthly.

One month after the production program started, the first 1,000 units were off the line. He was given a highly skilled team, he traveled to all sections of the country to get the supplies he needed, and the company's challenge was met.

That was a major deadline and quota he faced. Through the years that have followed, he has never failed in meeting a deadline on a top-level project.

THE MOVE TO BURLINGTON

At war's end, he was well known within the company's production leadership and personally found much pride in the work which he and his fellow workers had contributed to the war effort. Radars for ships, submarines and aircraft played a major part in the nation's victory and in saving lives of the fighting forces, and his production success could have made the difference in numerous engagements.

The government also recognized his production record by presenting him a certificate of commendation for service to the Navy during the war.

His company then placed him into an assignment directing what it called "general apparatus, rubber, lamps, ceramic, fiber, commercial screw, and die casting manufacture."

Then came feelers to him, unofficial at first, on his newest assignment. Opening of the new Western Electric plant in Burlington called for some special skills. The electronics industry was a new entry in North Carolina's economy, and there were few skilled people to work in it. There had to be training, coordination, numerous adjustments in administration, and there had to be production.

The company decided that Mr. Donnelly had demonstrated himself through training and experience, as well as performance, for the many requirements for the job. He was assigned to Burlington's plant as superintendent in November of 1946, a few months after the plant's operations started. It was a pioneering assignment, in many respects, in a new field of operations—and he was given the responsibility when he was only 41 years old.

The years which have followed in North Carolina have had him in charge of some of the company's—and the nation's—highest defense projects, including the Nike series of anti-missile missiles from Ajax into Hercules, then to Zeus and now the Nike-X.

He became director of Western's Burlington and Greensboro Shops in 1956, joined the Defense Activities Division as manager of the Nike Zeus project in 1959, and returned to his present position in August of 1962.

The Nike-X has been going through several years of research and development by Bell Laboratories. Whether or not it will go into actual production will be decided, Washington sources believe, by the end of this year.

SERVES NUMEROUS INTERESTS

When he arrived in Burlington to assume his new duties, housing was scarce. He lived at Alamance Hotel for a period of time and then, anxious to get his family with him, bought a home in Durham, where he since has lived. He often has remarked that it takes him less time to get to his work here from Durham than it did when he lived in Chicago and reported to the Hawthorne plant.

His years in North Carolina also have had him involved in numerous activities beyond the primary time he gives to his work.

He currently is chairman of the Carolinas' Chapter of the American Ordnance Association, which held its annual meeting in Burlington last Friday; chairman emeritus of the American Ordnance Association; a member of the Maintenance Advisory Planning Committee of the National Security Industrial Association; a member of the Advisory Council of the U.S. Army Junior Science and Humanities Symposia Program; and in various capacities with the Association of the U.S. Army and the Telephone Pioneers of America.

He also has been a member of the Governor's Council on Occupational Health since 1957.

In Burlington activities, he is a director of the Chamber of Commerce, a member of the Rotary Club, and a participant in numerous civic interests. For those who do not know, his part in the Burlington and Alamance County life would leave the impression that he is a full-time resident.

In Durham, he is a member of the Church of the Imaculate Conception. He also serves as Diocesan Lay Consultor on the Bishop's Consultor's Committee.

His three daughters are living in different sections of the country. Mrs. Romana London in Winter Park, Fla., Mrs. Marcia Wellons in Ames, Iowa, and Mrs. Mary Kaser in Wilmington, Del. There are seven grandchildren.

OTHER HONORS

There have been other honors in the past. His biographical background shows him as a former director of the North Carolina State University Engineering Foundation, as well as chairman of the Advisory Council in the University's School of Engineering. Another significant honor had him for four years as chairman of the Guidance and Control Technical Section (the missiles section) of the American Ordnance Association, functioning on the national level.

Through the numerous achievements and recognition, then, there now is the Doctor of Science degree.

He has three more years with his company before he will retire. He and Mrs. Donnelly, his hometown sweetheart whom he married when he at 23 years old became a section chief with his company, then will come to know their grandchildren better.

Looking back over past years when he has guided the direction of untold numbers of people, he has found much satisfaction with his company and his assignments in it. There also has been much reward, as he sees it, in being able to be with the North Carolina Works and its contribution to the company's full program.

He's had a challenge and has met it in being given his varied assignments, accepting the fact that "the job's the boss," then "putting two and two together to make things work."

Would he have done anything else if he, today, were the 18-year-old boy about to finish high school and not knowing the direction he would take?

"Yes, I'd be an engineer or a lawyer," he replies.

"Which one first?"

"An engineer."

A CITATION

In commenting on the Donnelly degree, an Elon College official reviewed a citation shared by college trustees.

It read, in part:

"Mr. Donnelly . . . is competent, learned, has a diversity of interests, and is highly respectful of duty . . . He has attained high stature not only within his own company but in the nation's defense effort, at one time being the director of the Nike project for his company and the one responsible for interpreting the program that today is on the highest level of consideration by the Congress. The new Nike-X has not been produced, but it has been researched and developed to the point that it can be produced when approval is given. It is a defense, too, which if accepted can become one of the great influences in whether or not the nation at some future time might be safer from enemy missile attack. Indeed, this is a high responsibility held in the past and a part of his overall responsibility today which still has him within the executive group that holds the key to what the nation can do in production if Congress decides favorably upon it."

Then this:

"He is one who has achieved against tremendous odds, since his formal education in a highly-skilled industry was limited . . . He took advantage of opportunity and attained much in self-education, applying himself so strongly that he has over the past many years guided a rather large force of highly-educated and skilled engineers and other professional men and women.

"He has been a good nonresident citizen of Burlington . . . He represents an individual in excellence."

It is not surprising that in his address at yesterday's commencement the then Dr. Donnelly chose "Climb The Highest Mountain" as his theme. He has climbed many mountains in his 44 years with Western Electric and as a private citizen, and his record shows that he has reached many peaks.

Conferral of the Honorary Degree of Doctor of Laws Upon Hon. Louis J. Lefkowitz

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 11, 1967

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on June 12, 1967, I had the privilege of attending the 36th annual commencement exercises of Yeshiva University.

On that occasion, the honorary degree of doctor of laws was conferred upon my longtime, dear friend Hon. Louis J. Lefkowitz, attorney general of the State of New York.

I commend to the attention of our colleagues the presentation address by Rabbi Joseph H. Lookstein, and the citation by Dr. Samuel Belkin, president of Yeshiva University, in conferring the honorary degree of doctor of laws upon Hon. Louis J. Lefkowitz:

PRESENTATION OF HON. LOUIS J. LEFKOWITZ, BY DR. JOSEPH H. LOOKSTEIN, UPON CONFERRAL OF HONORARY DEGREE, 36TH ANNUAL COMMENCEMENT EXERCISES, YESHIVA UNIVERSITY, JUNE 12, 1967

Mr. President: If there were no bad people, said Charles Dickens, there would be no good lawyers. Twenty million New Yorkers must, therefore, have the best possible lawyer. They have him in the person of the Attorney General of the State of New York, Louis J. Lefkowitz.

He is a true product of the kaleidoscope that is New York, of its teeming millions, diversified in race, creed and national origins. He was educated in the schools of New York—elementary, secondary, collegiate and professional. He has caught the spirit of New York and is committed to its service.

This service he rendered in every area affecting the public good. He was a member of the State Assembly and was acknowledged as one of the most valuable members of that body. He sat with grace and dignity as a Justice of the Municipal Court and of the City Court and won the commendation of his peers at the bar and on the bench. He has served longer than most of his predecessors as Attorney General of our State and is currently the President of the National Association of Attorney Generals. .

But he is more than a courageous and effective Attorney General, more than a learned dispenser of justice, more than an enlightened legislator. It is not merely in public office that he excels. It is as a human being in the community that he has earned affection and admiration.

There is hardly a cause or institution, irrespective of creed or color, within the confines of our State that he has not championed or supported. Every faith has his respect, every minority his understanding, every deprived child his compassion and every fellow man his love.

Mr. President: Louis J. Lefkowitz is a proud son of our people, and our people may justly be proud of him.

I have the honor, sir, to present Attorney General Louis J. Lefkowitz for the degree of Doctor of Laws, *honoris causa*.

CITATION BY DR. SAMUEL BELKIN, PRESIDENT, YESHIVA UNIVERSITY, IN CONFERRING THE HONORARY DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF LAWS UPON HON. LOUIS J. LEFKOWITZ, 36TH ANNUAL COMMENCEMENT EXERCISES, MONDAY, JUNE 12, 1967

As a member of the State legislature, you sponsored liberal laws for the benefit of all. As a jurist you tempered justice with mercy, and as the highly respected attorney general of our Empire State you are nationally esteemed as a gifted and skillful exponent of our American legal system. Through your forthrightness and moral courage you are today a vital force for the betterment of our democratic way of life. Above all, throughout your life you have fought against every form of bigotry and discrimination.

I therefore consider it a privilege to confer upon you the degree of Doctor of Laws, *Honoris Causa*.

In token thereof, I cause to be placed over your shoulders this visible symbol of our high regard for you, and I hand you this diploma.

Prospects for United States-Soviet Understanding Enhanced by Meeting of President Johnson and Premier Kosygin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 11, 1967

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, a whole generation of Americans has come of age in the years following World War II. Our people have learned the lessons of these difficult, dangerous years. They know there can be no overnight miracles that will erase the tensions and deep divisions that lead to international crises. Yet it may be possible to narrow these differences through better understanding between the leaders of the free world and the Communist nations.

The real accomplishment of the summit conference between President Johnson and Premier Kosygin was a contribution to a clearer understanding between the two leaders about the policies and problems of their respective nations. By clearly and forcefully setting forth our Nation's policies, President Johnson served the cause of peace and increased the possibility of fruitful negotiations in the future. As the President said:

> It does help a lot to sit down and look a man right in the eye and reason with him.

As the Milwaukee Journal said in a thoughtful editorial:

> To the extent that reason controls, the summit sessions are good for the world.

The public's realistic acceptance of what the summit sessions did and did not accomplish has made it easier for President Johnson to look forward to future meetings with Soviet leaders. For the President can be assured that our people are not harboring exaggerated expectations that summit conferences will achieve sweeping solutions to world problems. Americans appear to support such conferences with the full realization that their benefits will probably accrue only gradually.

I include hereafter several editorials about the summit meeting:

[From the Milwaukee (Wis.) Journal, June 26, 1967]

The Summit

Premier Kosygin of the Soviet Union said about all that can be said about it: "These meetings provided the governments of the Soviet Union and the United States with an opportunity to compare their positions on the questions under discussion, and this both sides believe is useful."

In a way both countries are on a spot—the United States would give a lot to get out of Vietnam with honor and the Soviet Union would like to recoup some of the losses due to its bad judgment in the middle east. Each has agonizing decisions to make in the field of nuclear weapons—whether to push ahead with costly antimissile missile systems or agree to limitations, how to stop the proliferation of nuclear bombs to nations which might lack responsibility, how to insure full compliance with any agreements that are reached.

It is apparent that both countries realize how vital it is to the future of the world that they avoid full and direct confrontation that could lead to war. So it is bound to be valuable to have the two leaders of the two most powerful nations get to know each other, to talk—even if bluntly—and to assess each other and their national policies.

As President Johnson said, nothing may come from the meetings immediately. But "it does help a lot to sit down and look a man right in the eye and reason with him." To the extent that reason controls, the summit sessions are good for the world.

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Inquirer, June 27, 1967]

Glassboro Summit Brought Glimmer of Hope for Mankind

(By William L. Ryan)

New York, June 26 (AP).—In their two days of meetings at Glassboro, leaders of the United States and the Soviet Union came as close to statemanship as Russians and Americans had for a long time, even though their summit failed to make discernible progress on major explosive issues.

Glassboro was just a small beginning, but the fact remains that it happened. In that alone, Glassboro becomes a sort of beacon. Even the damp blanket spread by Alexei N. Kosygin once he left New Jersey failed to smother the glimmer of hope which the face-to-face meeting produced—the hope, as President Johnson put it, that the world now is a little less dangerous.

Now Kosygin has some fences to mend. A Soviet leader had come close, perhaps too close, to looking human. Russian leaders, trapped by their own cliches, now must try to allay suspicions which have arisen among those who already were distrustful allies.

Thus, the first stop on Kosygin's long journey home is Communist Cuba, whose "maximum leader," Fidel Castro, must take a dim view of any Soviet chieftain exchanging handshakes with the leader of "the imperialists."

Nobody expected a radical change from the meeting. Any deep-going change in U.S.-Soviet relations would take time and patience. But there was, indeed, a change in the fact that the Premier and the President met at all, and that both, for the time being, put aside domestic and foreign considerations which could make such a meeting politically risky.

Soviet-American summits tend to refocus attention on something which often is forgotten. That is that there are two enormously powerful nations in this world.

The United Nations has been a safety valve, a forum for debate. But major decisions affecting the future of the world and the future of peace cannot be made without American-Soviet collaboration.

U.S.-Soviet summits in the past have shaped the destiny of the rest of the world, or made the difference between extreme tension and relative tranquility. Whatever was accomplished was done by the two big powers themselves, with the rest of the nations as spectators.

Once back from Glasboro, Kosygin stopped smiling. He retreated to the rigid, prefabricated positions of Moscow policy on all major issues. That was predictable. He had no other choice. What he said at his news conference at the United Nations was practically a rerun of his speech a week ago in the U.N. debate on the Middle East war crisis.

Kosygin is a member of a collective regime. Before he even arrived in Glassboro, a Pravda editorial made it clear the Soviet Premier was in no position to depart in any significant respect from prescribed lines.

"The speech at the session of the U.N. Assembly by Comrade Alexei Nikolayevich Kosygin has expressed the position of our party and government," Pravda, the Communist Party paper, said.

The position had been mapped out in advance. Kosygin was just a messenger of the collective, the representative of the whole Soviet leadership.

By the same token, however, Kosygin could not have attended the summit without that collective leadership's approval. Undoubtedly people in it objected in principle and disliked the risks involved, just as there are some in the United States who gagged at the idea.

Now the Chinese Communists will point scornfully again at Moscow and cry, "We told you so." Cuban Communists will be suspicious. Algerians and Syrians, the farthest left and most loudly "anti-imperialist" of the Arab bloc, will entertain doubts of long-range Soviet intentions. Kosygin hardly made the Arabs happy, for example, by conceding that Israel had a right to exist. China will accuse the Russians of under-the-table deals toward a future Vietnam settlement.

But whatever Kosygin and the Soviet collective do now, they cannot turn back history's pages. There may be repercussions in Moscow and perhaps even a new clash at the top, but Glassboro will stay in the history books, continue to represent a timid step on a long road.

[From the Providence (R.I.) Journal, June 27, 1967]

Summit Results

If the basic policies of the world's two greatest powers remain unchanged and opposed despite the two-day summit conference at Glassboro, at least the confrontation was calm and reasoned. The most hopeful development was the agreement by President Johnson and Premier Kosygin to "keep in good communication" with each other through their staffs and through personal exchanges.

History may record that the Russian leader missed a great opportunity at Glassboro. Mr. Johnson gave every evidence of being ready to talk meaningfully in the hope of achieving meaningful results. But as Mr. Kosygin indicated at a press conference in New York, he is clearly the voice of adamant policies established in the Kremlin before he came to this country.

There is little doubt that the two-day meeting was useful in that it gave each man a chance to explore more than international policies; it gave them the chance to size each other up as human beings, as negotiators, as national leaders in whose power it rests to launch the world on thermonuclear war—or steer a steady course toward peace.

There is certain to be speculation as to possible private understandings which neither man would want to publish to the world for a variety of practical reasons, as for instance Mr. Kosygin's desire in the United Nations to continue to manifest strong support for the Arab nations in their running quarrel with Israel in the General Assembly.

If there were understandings on various points, as on the Mideast, only time will indicate their nature. Perhaps the Russians will be able to persuade the Arab leaders to accept the fact of Israel's existence and to negotiate a peace settlement directly with Israel. Perhaps Mr. Johnson can induce the Israeli government to ease the toughness of its stand on conquered territory.

Perhaps the differing functions of the two men in their governments made it impossible to reach firm decisions. Mr. Johnson sets policy for this country; Mr. Kosygin is the head of a group of Russian leaders who made policy collectively. Perhaps the message Mr. Kosygin brings back to the Kremlin will open the way to later, formal understandings as on nuclear arms controls.

No one expected the summit to settle the problems of the world. But, then, no one expected the talks to go on as long as they did or in as friendly and understanding a way as they did. Basic differences continue to divide this country and Russia, but the conference suggests that although the differences remain, a common hope for peaceful coexistence also remains.

[From the St. Petersburg (Fla.) Times, June 27, 1967]

Summit Scorecard

The Spirit of Hollybush produced no false theatrics and created no cheap hopes that a stable peace will be simple and soon.

Officially recognizing their differences and willing to envelope them in goodwill, President Johnson and Soviet Premier Alexei Kosygin will talk again. They have established the pattern for gradualism. The steps may be small; chances are, they will be lasting.

That their meeting seemed to improve possibilities for such steps is the enduring good of the Glassboro summit.

As in any diplomatic exchange there were pluses and minuses:

NO SOLUTION

The two leaders did not solve the basic conflict between the United States and Russia—Vietnam and other so-called internal "wars of liberation."

COMMON GOAL

Their common goal, a nuclear non-proliferation treaty, was a recognition of the disaster to mankind that can come from thermonuclear irresponsibles, an unspoken agreement that the renegade leadership of Red China must be brought to the councils of diplomacy.

MISSILE DEFENSE

For a delay in another armaments game, the anti-ballistic missile system, Glassboro had no solution. Coming within a week of China's H-bomb explosion, talk of stopping ABM construction ran against current events.

POLITICS AT HOME

Premier Kosygin's revival of accusations of "aggression" by Israel in the Middle East and the United States in Vietnam, when he staged the unusual sight of a Communist press conference was transparent. The Soviets lost a $2-billion war machine, deserted by fleeing Arabs; their credence is highly suspect in the United Arab Republic for failure to save it from the fierce Israeli response; and Premier Kosygin has in the Kremlin advisers fully as diverse as President Johnson's. Russia has its Curtis LeMays and Strom Thurmonds. Had he come away softening the Communist line, his premiership would have been under attack and plotting before he reached Moscow.

CHINA'S RELATIONSHIP

More revealing than Kosygin's press conference was the major position paper issued Sunday by the Soviet Communist Party. Condemning Mao Tse-tung as a petty adventurer with a great-power complex, the paper emphasized peaceful coexistence and competition with the West, and internal development over foreign intrigue.

. . . AND FIDEL'S

Nor does Kosygin's decision to visit Cuba reflect bold Soviet power politics in the Caribbean. Just as likely, he is seeking an economic adjustment with that bearded bankrupt, Castro, to ease the drain on Russian finance. Nevertheless, the trip was not in the spirit of Hollybush.

THE TRUE AMERICA

Response to the summit was in the finest of American tradition, a genuine outpouring of hope for peace. A cautious leader as Kosygin could not fail to appreciate the inherent friendliness of Americans in the cheers and the hastily collected band which played the Russian national anthem in little Glassboro, while with engaging informality, Mrs. Johnson entertained the premier's daughter.

MR. JOHNSON'S GAIN

In foreign policy, President Johnson won his spurs at Glassboro. Firm, patient, unwilling to be duped, the President showed the depth to strive for global rest without diluting American principles, or relying solely on force.

MEANING FOR TOMORROW

After Glassboro, the quagmire of Vietnam remains, yet it has been cleared of some fuzzy theories. Knowing Russian determination to support North Vietnam, the President has bargaining power against the all-out-to-win-at-any-cost advocates in Washington. Understanding American perseverance will continue until South Vietnam is left alone, Premier Kosygin is likely to become fascinated with a diplomatic settlement in which neither side wins, but neither loses.

The importance of Glassboro is not in what it accomplished for today, but in what it could mean for tomorrow.

Former Arsenal Employee Wins Medal of Honor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 10, 1967

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Sp6c. Lawrence Joel, a medical aidman with the 82d Airborne Division, at Fort Bragg, was recently awarded the Medal of Honor for his gallantry in action in Vietnam. As a Marylander, I am proud that Corpsman Joel made his home in our State for 2 years while he was working at Edgewood Arsenal.

I should like to commend this soldier's service to his country by including the following article in the RECORD:

FORMER ARSENAL EMPLOYEE WINS MEDAL OF HONOR

A Medal of Honor winner who recalls that one of his first jobs was at Edgewood Arsenal in the early 1950's, will return to the Baltimore area today for further recognition of his valor and to renew contact with friends and acquaintances in the area.

SP6 Lawrence Joel, a Medical Aideman with the 82nd Airborne Division at Fort Bragg, N.C., worked for two years in the Ordnance Assembly plant at this installation in the early 1950's.

It was at Edgewood Arsenal that he met his wife, the former Dorothy Region, and his mother-in-law, Mrs. Louise Jones, both of Baltimore who worked here at the time.

Both Joel and his wife will be in Baltimore today as guests of the National Junior Chamber of Commerce, who are honoring him for his gallantry in action in Vietnam. The Jaycees annual convention will present the Medal of Honor winner at the official opening ceremonies at the Civic Center.

The Department of Army has granted Joel leave to attend the ceremony and all expenses for the Joel's trip here from North Carolina will be borne by the National Jaycees.

Congress awarded the 39-year-old paratrooper the Medal of Honor for his gallantry in action two years ago during an attack by the Viet Cong in which nearly every man in his company's lead squad was killed or wounded. Although wounded twice himself, Joel "crawled through an intense hail of gunfire to the wounded men" and continued to administer aid until his own evacuation was ordered.

The former Arsenal employee and his wife and two children currently live in Fayetteville, N.C., adjacent to Fort Bragg.

Commencement Address by Senator Robert F. Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 11, 1967

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, it is with considerable pride and pleasure that I submit for publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an outstanding address by the junior Senator from the State of New York, the Honorable ROBERT F. KENNEDY. Following is the commencement address delivered on June 1, 1967 at the third commencement of the School of the Holy Child, Potomac, Md.:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR ROBERT F. KENNEDY

I am very pleased to be here at your graduation ceremony.

Daniel Webster once said of his college, Dartmouth, that "It is a small school, yet there are those who love it".

This is a small school too; yet not only are there also many who love it; but I for one am sure that as its graduates increase in number and you come to full participation in society—as students and teachers, as workers and writers, eventually as wives and mothers—that by your conduct and your contributions, by the credit you will reflect on this school, that you will bring many others to love it as well.

From time almost beyond memory, it has been customary for graduating seniors to hear a lecture from someone whose own graduation took place long before.

Well here I am and I qualify for that description.

These lectures, although they take place on the occasion of your graduation, are called "commencement"—beginning.

And a beginning is what this is.

This is a beginning of greater independence from home and parents and the groups of your friends—and therefore the beginning of the loneliness of independent choice.

This is a beginning of participation in the affairs of your country—for young people can and do have an influence on this nation long before they reach the legal voting age of 21.

This is a beginning of contribution—the time when you begin the long process of "paying your dues"—giving of yourself to others, as others, your parents and teachers and all those who have worked and sacrificed to build this nation and our entire civilization, have given to you.

This then is commencement—the beginning of your adult life; you have new freedom and new responsibility.

What kind of world is it, that you are now joining? And what are the responsibilities you are being asked to assume?

Above all, this is a world of change—swirling, constant change.

This is more clear perhaps to your elders than to you; for we have in our lifetimes, passed already through two major wars, and now into a third; from passive acceptance of segregation, through a civil rights movement, into a new crisis of conflict between the races; from a bitter peace after World War Two, through a massive confrontation with the Soviet Union, into a tentative period of easing tensions—and now again into a time of uncertainty, and the rise of the Empire of China.

But even for you, the children of this time of change, there is much ahead that will be challenging—and dangerous—and hardest of all to understand.

For the world in which you take your place is a world in revolution, a world aflame with the desires and hatreds, the passions and dreams, of multitudes which will double in size just within our lifetimes.

Around the world—from the Straits of Magellan to the Straits of Malacca, from the Nile Delta to the Amazon Basin, in Jaipur and Johannesburg—we can hear the voice of the dispossessed, the insulted and injured of the globe.

For uncounted centuries, they have lived with hardship, with hunger and disease and fear.

For the last four centuries, they have lived under the political, economic, and military domination of the West—of Europe and in more recent years, of the United States.

We have shown them that a better life is possible; but we have not done enough to make it a reality.

We live in a country where people diet—but most of the world starves.

We buy 8 million new cars a year—while most of the world goes without shoes.

You are the healthiest generation of Americans in history, and you can expect to live far longer than the biblical threescore and ten—but half of the people buried in Latin American are under the age of four.

We and the other developed nations spend over $100 billion a year on armaments;—while the poor countries cannot obtain the $10 billion they need to help two billion people begin to develop their economies.

And therefore this revolution is directed against *us*—against the powerful and the rich and the mighty, against the established order of which we are the principal part.

Yet it is a revolution carried out in the name of ideals we also share—social reform and political freedom, internal justice and international independence.

We can recognize the rightness of these ideals—for they were the ideals of our own revolution.

We can recognize their power—for they have sustained us throughout our history.

But in most of the world today, these are subversive ideals, subversive of the established order of power and privilege.

Political freedom is subversive in Russia, where writers go to prison for a metaphor.

Social reform is subversive in northeast Brazil, where a great Archbishop is called a communist, and his students thrown in jail, because he wants land for the peasants—peasants who now work 12 hours a day for less than 2 dollars a week.

Internal justice is subversive in South Africa, where a Nobel Peace Prize winner is imprisoned because he is black—and a Nobel Prize-winning writer, who is white, is restricted because he wishes justice for his black compatriot.

Thus our choice, in your lifetimes, will be whether to support the status quo, or the forces of change; whether to sit content in our storehouses, or share our wealth with our fellow human beings around the world; and; in the last analysis, whether to recognize the rights of others to the ideals for which we have fought so long—even when they can be achieved only in opposition to the status quo in which we ourselves are so comfortable.

As this is true for our nation in the world, so it is true for us as the fortunate within our own nation.

Here in the United States, I have seen children starving.

Here in the United States, here in the city of Washington, I have seen children living in rat-infested tenements, going to overcrowded and inadequate schools, without books to study or fathers to lean on, without a chance and without hope itself.

These people, too, demand change.

These people, too, demand hope for their children.

These people, too, demand to know why we spend less on programs to help people out of poverty—about $2 billion—than we spend to take care of our dogs, on which we spend $3 billion.

These people, too, demand a revolution, as profound as the revolution which gave our nation birth.

They ask: which side are we on?

Which side are *you* on?

If you were four years older, if you had graduated four years ago, the answers to our problems would have seemed simpler than they are today.

Your older brothers and sisters joined the Peace Corps and the Civil Rights movement, they worked in Appalachia and Harlem, Mississippi and Mauretania, with a firm belief in their power and ability to shape a world to the standard of their ideals.

But now our colleges, and many of our best young people seem to have turned from engagement to disengagement; from politics to passivity; from national purpose to personal satisfaction; from hope to nihilism; and all too often, from confrontation with the suffering of their fellows—toward forgetfulness in the self-absorption of drugs.

What has disillusioned so many of them, will face you as well.

They are perplexed and troubled by the war in Vietnam—and it will perplex and trouble you as well.

They are disappointed with the slow pace of progress in civil rights, and with the new bitterness and potential violence which frustration has brought in the Negro—and you will be disappointed and frightened as well.

All the hypocrisies, all the everyday violations of the ideals we have tried to teach you, may repel and disappoint and anger you as well.

But whatever your disillusionment, whatever your disappointment, you cannot lose heart; for too much depends on you.

As President Kennedy said, "Our problems are man made—therefore they can be solved by man."

But they cannot be solved, the cruelties and obstacles of this world will not yield, to obsolete dogmas and outworn slogans, to those who have failed in the past.

I believe that injustice and want and human degradation can be lessened, that a better world can be built, that we can meet our challenges at home and abroad; but to do so we must rely on our young people, and especially on that privileged minority who are the educated young people of America.

This is the time, and yours is the generation, that cannot only remedy the mistakes of the past—but can transcend them.

"There is," said an Italian philosopher, "nothing more difficult to take in hand, more perilous to conduct, or more uncertain in its success than to take the lead in the introduction of a new order of things."

Yet this is the measure of the task of your generation and the road is strewn with many dangers.

First, is the danger of futility; the belief there is nothing one man or one woman can do against the enormous array of the world's ills—against misery and ignorance, injustice and violence.

Yet many of the world's great movements, of thought and action, have flowed from the work of a single man.

A young Italian explorer discovered the new world, a young general extended an empire from Macedonia to the borders of the earth and a young woman reclaimed the territory of France.

And it was the 32 year old Thomas Jefferson who proclaimed that all men are created equal.

"Give me a place to stand," said Archimedes, "and I will move the world."

These men moved the world, and so can we all.

Few will have the greatness to bend history itself; but each of us can work to change a small portion of events, and in the total of all those acts will be written the history of this generation.

Thousands of Peace Corps volunteers are making a difference in isolated villages and city slums in dozens of countries.

Thousands of unknown men and women in Europe resisted the occupation of the Nazis and many died, but all added to the ultimate strength and freedom of their countries.

It is from numberless diverse acts of courage and belief that human history is shaped.

Each time a man stands up for an ideal, or acts to improve the lot of others, or strikes out against injustice, he sends forth a tiny ripple of hope, and crossing each other from a million different centers of energy and daring those ripples build a current which can sweep down the mightiest walls of oppression and resistance.

The second danger is that of expediency; of those who say that hopes and beliefs must bend before immediate necessities.

Of course, if we would act effectively we must deal with the world as it is.

We must get things done.

But if there was one thing President Kennedy stood for that touched the most profound feelings of young people across the world, it was the belief that idealism, high aspirations and deep convictions are not incompatible with the most practical and efficient of programs—that there is no basic inconsistency between ideals and realistic possibilities—no separation between the deepest desires of heart and mind and the rational application of human effort to human problems.

It is not realistic or hard-headed to solve problems and take action unguided by ultimate moral aims and values.

It is thoughtless folly.

For its ignores the realities of human faith and passion and belief; forces ultimately more powerful than all the calculation of economists or generals.

Of course to adhere to standards, to idealism, to vision in the face of immediate dangers takes courage and self-confidence.

But we also know that only those who dare to fail greatly, can ever achieve greatly.

A third danger is timidity.

Few men are willing to brave the disapproval of their fellows, the censure of their colleagues, the wrath of their society.

Moral courage is a rarer commodity than bravery in battle or great intelligence.

Yet it is the one essential, vital quality for those who seek to change a world which yields most painfully to change.

Aristotle tells us that "At the Olympic games it is not the finest and the strongest men who are crowned, but they who enter the lists . . . So too in the life of the honorable and the good it is they who act rightly who win the prize."

I believe that in this generation those with the courage to enter the moral conflict will find themselves with companions in every corner of the world.

For the fortunate among us, the fourth danger is comfort; the temptation to follow the easy and familiar paths of personal ambition and financial success so grandly spread before those who have the privilege of education.

But that is not the road history has marked out for us.

There is a Chinese curse which says "May he live in interesting times."

Like it or not we live in interesting times.

They are times of danger and uncertainty; but they are also more open to the creative energy of men than any other time in history.

And everyone here will ultimately be judged—will ultimately judge himself—on the effort he has contributed to building a new world society and the extent to which his ideals and goals have shaped that effort.

In your hands, not with Presidents or leaders, is the future of your world and the fulfillment of the best qualities of your own spirit.

SNCC Now Follows Klan's Steps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 11, 1967

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, a few years ago, an organization came upon the civil rights scene whose courageous members were dedicated to the achievement of equality for the American Negro.

Unfortunately, this same organization, the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, has today emerged as one of America's most violent hate groups. Under the leadership of Stokely Carmichael, SNCC has become comparable to a Negro Ku Klux Klan, preaching hate and violence not only towards the white people, but also towards what Carmichael calls the "Black Bourgois."

I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article written by Ralph McGill for the June 28, 1967, edition of the Washington Evening Star.

The article follows:

SNCC NOW FOLLOWS KLAN'S STEPS

It was after I read that death and property-destruction had come to a Negro community from violence incited by SNCC field worker Stokely Carmichael that I found myself thinking of the more successful white charlatans of the past—and present.

I recalled the late Theodore Bilbo, for example, and others like him—before him and after him. These were the hate charlatans of society . . . the rabble-rousers, the encouragers of white racial violence, of hatreds, lies and fears. They, their predecessors and followers poisoned minds for a century.

It is one of the ironies of our time, but perhaps an inevitable one, that a Negro organization should emerge that is a black Ku Klux Klan closely following the white Klan that flourished during the 1920s. It remains today as a sort of malignant, vestigial relic of the past—a malarial-like infection that now and then recurs in the white bloodstream.

The new Klan in reverse is the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC). Once this organization included some of the bravest, yet the gentlest, most dedicated young men and women I have ever known. They endured jail, insults and indignities unspeakable, and death and danger. Now SNCC is a hate group, which openly hates what they call the "Black Bourgeois" along with white persons.

A part of SNCC's plan of violence is to bring destruction to the Negro bourgeois. Coercion and fear are among its weapons. SNCC, like the Klan, has its inner secret organization for violence, known only to the leadership. SNCC operates now on cash, having attained a bad credit rating. The cash, according to the best available information, is funneled into New York and disbursed chiefly through three individuals, one a lawyer. Sources of the cash also are known.

The Bilbo stereotypes of our time are best illustrated by two SNCC field workers—Carmichael of Atlanta and Monroe Sharpe, field director of SNCC's Chicago office. Sharpe shows up in other cities. He was, for example, a participant in the rather brief Atlanta riots of some months ago.

These and other associates are also stereotypes of sickness. They, too, will pass, even as the Klan "notables" of the past have come and gone—and as the tough sheriffs and police chiefs of a few years ago are gone from the scene.

Some of Sharpe's publications, attacking the Negro citizen who refuses to become a Black Panther or Black Power SNCC activist, are absurd and shocking in their falsehoods and violence.

They remind one of the Southern governors and senators in the past who kept going a program of hate and violence that produced lynchings and cruelties.

We are in a time of transition, much of it traumatic. It is necessary for our sanity and perspective to keep in mind that white organizations and individuals have matched every inflammatory word and action by Carmichael, Monroe Sharpe, and others.

Carmichael's charlatanism is illustrated by a manor habit. He wears a shirt on which is imprinted a picture of the late Malcolm X—once a preacher of hatred against white persons.

Carmichael dishonestly ignores the fact that Malcolm X changed before his death. Malcolm X came back from a Muslim trip to Mecca. He said that he returned without his hatred. He had had a new spiritual insight.

"The American Negro has reacted to 400 years of the conscious racism of American whites. . . . But . . . I believe, from experiences I have had that the whites of the younger generation, in the colleges and universities, will turn—to the path of truth—the only way left to America to ward off the disaster that racism must inevitably lead to. . . . You may be shocked to hear me. . . . In the past, yes, I made a sweeping indictment of all white people. I never will be guilty of that again—as I know now that some white people are truly sincere. The true Islam has shown me that a blanket indictment is as wrong as when whites make blankets against blacks. . . ."

Carmichael might, at least, take off that sweatshirt.

Honolulu VA Regional Manager William C. Oshiro Lauded in DAV Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 11, 1967

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, a resolution expressing appreciation for meritorious service to Hawaii veterans and their dependents provided by William C. Oshiro, manager of the Honolulu regional office of the Veterans' Administration, and his staff, was adopted by the State executive committee of the Disabled American Veterans, department of Hawaii, at its meeting on May 9, 1967, and a bronze plaque for this outstanding service was presented to Mr. Oshiro at the 16th Annual DAV Convention in June.

Mr. Speaker, because this resolution reflects my personal feelings with respect to Mr. Oshiro, I extend my remarks in the RECORD to include the full text of the DAV resolution.

I had the honor, along with Senator INOUYE of Hawaii, of recommending Mr. Oshiro for appointment to his position as manager of the VA regional office in Honolulu, where he serves with ability and distinction.

My personal knowledge of Mr. Oshiro's outstanding qualities, however, goes back to the days of World War II, when we served together in the famed 442d Regimental Combat Team. The 442d, which suffered casualties amounting to 314 percent of its original strength, piled up the most impressive record of individual citations for bravery of any similar unit in the war. There were 18,143 decorations awarded, and among those decorated for conspicuous bravery was William Oshiro.

Following the war, Mr. Oshiro, an amputee, amazed everyone with his accelerated rehabilitation. His deep devotion to our American ideals remained steadfast throughout, and today he continues to serve his country through his vigorous and dedicated work on behalf of our veterans. He has indeed set a standard that all Americans would do well to emulate.

I consider it a distinct privilege, therefore, to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point the resolution adopted by the Disabled American Veterans, department of Hawaii, conferring its tribute upon VA Regional Manager William C. Oshiro and his staff:

RESOLUTION

Whereas, William C. Oshiro, Manager of the Veterans Administration Regional Office, Honolulu, Hawaii, and his staff have provided meritorious and outstanding service to the Disabled American Veterans, their dependents and the dependents of the war dead, and

Whereas, William C. Oshiro and his staff have always cooperated and assisted most effectively and efficiently all the veterans' organizations in the State of Hawaii and their representatives, especially our National Service Officer, and

Whereas, William C. Oshiro and his staff have participated and contributed to all the DAV functions by providing their talents and experience, and

Now, therefore, be it resolved, That the State Executive Committee of the Disabled American Veterans, Department of Hawaii, confer its tribute of praise to Mr. William C. Oshiro and his staff for their dedicated and outstanding service to disabled veterans, their dependents and the dependents of the war dead, and

Resolve, That a bronze plaque for distinguished service be presented to Manager Oshiro and his staff at our 16th annual state convention to be held in Lihue, Kauai, on June 16, 17 and 18, 1967, and

Be it further resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to Mr. William C. Oshiro and his staff, The Honorable William J. Driver, Administrator of Veterans Affairs, members of Hawaii's Congressional delegation, The National Commander of the Disabled American Veterans and the news media in Hawaii.

CERTIFICATE

We hereby certify that the above Resolution was duly adopted by the Disabled American Veterans, Department of Hawaii, at its State Executive Committee meeting held on May 9, 1967, in Honolulu, Hawaii.

MUGGSY K. MORIKAWA,
Commander.
RICHARD J. HARVEY,
Adjutant.

Regional Program Is Considered by TV Network

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS G. MORRIS

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 11, 1967

Mr. MORRIS of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues the good activities of television station KNME in Albuquerque along with the other Rocky Mountain States in developing their own regional educational television network. For this reason, I am inserting an article from the Albuquerque Journal which describes the activities of the station and the region in this area of public service.

I believe that this will be of benefit especially in light of the present discussions surrounding the Public Broadcasting Act.

The article follows:

[From the Albuquerque Journal, June 19, 1967]

JOINT EFFORT: REGIONAL PROGRAM IS CONSIDERED BY TV NETWORK

(By Frankie McCarty)

Regardless of what happens to the national educational television picture, plans are under way to unprecedented cooperation on a regional and state basis.

Impetus for the formation of a Rocky Mountain noncommercial network was given last year by the organization of the Federation of Rocky Mountain States. The federation, which will hold its second annual meeting in Albuquerque this September, is made up of governors and delegates from seven states—Arizona, Colorado, Idaho, Montana, New Mexico, Utah and Wyoming—and its aim is to foster regional cooperation in many areas.

Educational television is one of these. Dr. E. W. Bundy of the University of New Mexico, chairman of the Educational Television Committee, said because of the top level participation in the federation, the committee has been able to make more strides toward a regional network than any area in the country.

In a statement of goals, the committee notes that there are 10 stations in the seven states. "Today, these stations are isolated operations, with a minimum of exchange material. Each station is on its own, developing local program material, and acquiring programs from outside sources many times at a much higher cost than would be necessary in a cooperative venture."

Purposes of the federation committee are to establish a system of planning and design; to survey plans and resources in ETV; inventory and exchange existing program material develop a mutual system of program acquisition, exchange, duplication and distribution; and develop cooperative projects via a system of inter-connected stations.

By having a system of interconnected stations, the committee points out, the stations could cooperate on various programs, such as communications to all the states on mutual problems, including water, transportation, tourism, business development and education.

The committee has also proposed that the federation board approve the establishment of a Rocky Mountain Public Television Network to serve these needs regionally through the facilities of the 10 non-commercial stations now operable. Seven of these stations now are affiliated with National Educational Television, the exiting educational TV network, but interconnecting service is provided at the present time to only two. The ET Committee has asked NET to provide future interconnecting programming to all affiliates in the region.

It has also asked the federation, which has a $450,000 budget—made up of foundation funds, contributions from the states and individual businesses—to endorse the principle of the establishment of a "Rocky Mountain Corporation for Public Television," with purposes paralleling that of the proposed National Corporation for Public Television, i.e. to experiment and aid in the developing of programs.

The committee has also proposed pilot tape duplication and distribution projects, cooperative programming projects, a "live" interconnection demonstration project, and has asked funds to conduct a feasibility survey for proposed intereonnection and related activities.

The committee has also asked the board of the federation to ask the governors of the involved states to insure that appropriate education authorities in each state mutually discuss: 1—educational needs and goals and curricula common among the seven states, and 2—"desirable and practicable education cooperation possible among the states."

It also stressed that the federation should concentrate on the development of all communications systems—not just television—in a coordinated effort.

Dr. Bundy said the federation has endorsed the principles drawn up by the educational television committee, but funds for the various projects have not yet been awarded. He is hopeful this will occur at the September meeting of the federation.

Another activity in cooperation which is well underway is the Statewide Television Education Program committee which is advocating that a net work be set up from Albuquerque to Las Cruces and the Portales-Roswell area, to hook the three areas of the state together in a two-way microwave system. Then, when the network that will be established across the nation comes in here, material could be fed to the other parts of the state through Albuquerque's facilities.

Dr. Claude Hempen, director of KNME-TV, described the way Channel 5 would fit into the national, regional and state system as a "working gear unit. At the national level, there is a larger national gear, and fitting into it are smaller regional, then state gears. It's all part of the same picture. The large national plan will fit into our plans as though we had planned it ourselves."

Rigged Charter Balks U.N. Peace Efforts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 10, 1967

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, one of my constituents has recently sent me a very interesting article by Herbert Brucker which was printed as a syndicated column in the Palo Alto Times on June 14, 1967.

The article clearly shows that something must be done to strengthen the United Nations and, because it is thought provoking, I thought it should be brought to the attention of the entire House:

RIGGED CHARTER BALKS U.N. PEACE EFFORTS

(By Herbert Brucker)

After last week's lightning war between Israel and its Arab neighbors, the United Nations looks like a failure. It was Secretary General U Thant's withdrawal of U.N. peacekeeping forces, in unseemly haste after President Nasser requested it, that made war possible in the first place. Then, when the shooting started, all the U.N. did was talk. It couldn't even get a cease-fire until Israel had ended the war by winning it.

No wonder then that many are saying things like what John S. Knight, owner and editor of the Knight newspapers, said recently.

"Within a relatively short period of time, the United Nations must either justify its existence by attempting to sustain international law, or be discredited as a world agency for the preservation of peace."

Nevertheless, don't blame the U.N.

It is true that Article 1 of its charter says that the U.N.'s purposes are "To maintain international peace and security, . . . to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace, and for the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace. . . ."

And so on. There is, however, a catch. It is that in setting up the U.N. the member nations so rigged its charter that the U.N. could not do what it was supposed to do.

You can readily see why if you consider Vietnam. Here is a war that grew from nowhere into the overriding threat on the world scene today. The United States has no policy but escalation and ever more escalation. Inevitably we shall force a crisis at some point, at which Russia or China or both will take over the war from North Vietnam as we long since took it over from South Vietnam.

The article of faith among the hawks in Washington, to the effect that Russia and China will simply stand by, and let us force our will on Hanoi, is fantastic. Therefore Vietnam may yet let loose World War III, without anyone's really wanting it that way.

Here surely is a threat to peace, a fire that the U.N. ought to quench. But before the U.N. could keep peace in Vietnam it would have to have power to tell us to stop escalating and get out, and the other side ditto. You can imagine what not only President Johnson but Russia and China would say to that.

ONLY ONE WAY

No, all history testifies that there is only one way to prevent wars, large and small. That is to set up a rule of law. Mankind found that out in millennia of trying. Peace came first to neighbors in small, primitive societies. They banded together under tribal law, on the theory that they would all be better off if they got together instead of hitting one another on the head and stealing one another's wives, goods and land.

Athens, Rome and then the medieval principalities and kingdoms in turn all found out the same thing. Then finally, when the nation-state took its modern form after the Napoleonic wars, they too found the same thing: There can be peace within a nation, where there is law. There can be no peace among nations, who live in anarchy with no law above them.

The trouble is that you can't have law without someone to make it, and then enforce it. And that means government. But it is plain on the face of it that the nation-state prefers to be free to gamble that it can have its way by war if not by peace. Consider Nasser and the Israelis, or ourselves in Vietnam—or the Chinese and the Russians in Vietnam. We will all see snow fall in hell before we submit our free and independent United States—or anybody else's free and independent state—to a world government.

Until we all do, war will remain. Therefore the U.N. is a handy thing to have around. The nations can meet there. They can talk instead of shooting. But we must not expect the U.N. to do more until we are ready to let it do more.

Communism: American Style

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 11, 1967

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an outstanding address delivered by Adm. Ben Moreell, CEC, U.S. Navy, retired, on May 27, 1967, to the Order of Lafayette, Washington, D.C. I urge all who are concerned with the spread of communism throughout the world and the United States to read this searching, incisive, and alarming address.

The address follows:

COMMUNISM: AMERICAN STYLE

(Address by Adm. Ben Moreell, CEC, U.S. Navy, retired, to the Order of Lafayette, Washington, D.C., May 27, 1967)

In this era of fiscal fantasies, which has seen our National Debt increase from $22 to $326 billions over the last thirty-four years, the economic soothsayers console us, saying, "Don't worry; we owe it to ourselves."

They gloss over the fact that $15.0 billions are held by foreigners who could demand gold in payment, thus more than exhausting our entire National gold reserve. Actually, we do not owe it to ourselves any more than a man who borrows a million dollars from a bank can be said to owe it to himself merely because he is a shareholder of that bank.

In fact all of us taxpayers owe the National Debt to the owners of government securities. If you want convincing proof that you do not owe it to yourself, try withholding payment on that portion of your tax which represents the service on the National Debt.

But, in these chaotic times, it seems to be conceded that if a wound is self-inflicted it automatically becomes painless and harmless!

This is tragically evident with respect to Communism.

Most Americans are aware of the dangers of "Communism." But we make a serious mistake when we concern ourselves only with "Russian Communism," the proletarian imperialism which radiates from Moscow.

Some see Russia as another autocracy differing little from the Czarist regime. The basic aim of its expansionist policy, they say, is to establish a protective belt of buffer states between Russia and its potential enemies, thus assuring the sovereignty and tenure of its present rulers. The theory is that when this is done Russia will abandon its aggression and become a respectable member of the family of nations, a despotism, but one with which we can do business.

Others hold that the Communism centered in Moscow is driven by an ideology bent on world rule. Over the years, this "ideological Communism" has attracted many sympathizers by its professed concern for the welfare of humanity and its claimed championship of the world's poor and downtrodden. These sympathizers are the "fellow-travelers" who, from fear, or lack of conviction, or to cover their subversive activities, are not card-carrying Party members. Nevertheless, they constitute, in the aggregate, an important force. They often achieve positions of power in government, the professions, commerce, industry, education, the church and labor unions. They are the "Fifth Column," the enemy within. Their tactic is to betray the religion, the morals, the laws and the institutions by which we have lived for generations and without which we cannot survive as a free people. These are the disciples of "sympathetic Communism."

Finally, there is "domesticated Communism," a species far more destructive of our institutions than all the others. Its followers denounce "Communism," in the abstract, while advocating measures which differ little from those propounded by Karl Marx.

Americans have been alerted against an undefined "Communism." But many have not been alerted against the specific measures which, taken together *are* Communism. So, unknowingly, they accept the heart of the Communist doctrine, which is the enhancement of centralized State power at the expense of the natural rights of the individual, the right to life, the right to liberty and the right to acquire, own, enjoy and freely dispose of one's honestly accumulated property.

Like most Americans, I began by hating Russian Communism because it is an evil thing which wars against the best in human nature. Its followers invented a new code of morality which elevates lying, murder and treason into primary virtues, whenever these are thought to further their goals. They would deny our religion, trample on our political liberties and put our economic activities in a straight-jacket. They would stratify society into an elite of brutality riding herd on the rest of us. History shows that wherever communists achieve power they institute secret police, slave labor camps, and despotic control of every phase of human life.

Recently, I undertook a study of the Communist Manifesto of 1848, to determine whether these evil practices are an integral part of their basic creed. That study led to two important discoveries: first, that the cruel methods and despotic practices of Communism are essential to make their system function; and second, that there is a remarkable parallel between the ten planks of the Manifesto and the things we have been doing to ourselves during the past half century! From my studies, I concluded that since Marx expounded his doctrine 119 years ago, we Americans have adopted, in some degree, every plank of his platform; and this process has accelerated markedly in recent decades!

Communism with a "Made in Moscow" label is not popular in America. It doesn't need to be, if only we can be induced to accept Marxism under some other label. This we are now doing. Similar things have happened before as the great churchman, Dean Inge, warned us in these words:

"History seems to show that the powers of evil have won their greatest triumphs by capturing the organizations which were formed to defeat them, and that, when the devil has thus changed the contents of the bottles, he never alters the labels. The fort may have been captured by the enemy but it still flies the flag of its defenders."

We Americans have been running away from the spirit and principles of our Revolution in order to embrace an alien program saturated with Marxism. We are under the delusion that there is some safe middle ground between the idea of Freedom, on the one side, and Communism on the other. But the danger of the "middle-of-the-road" position, as former President Hoover once remarked to me, is that "you get hit by the traffic in both directions." If we are really opposed to Marxism there is only one place to take a stand and that is with Freedom, which makes no compromise with Communism, however it may be disguised!

The great political scientist, Wilhelm Röepke, architect of the economic renaissance of West Germany, stated:

"We should stand for a free economic order even if it implied material sacrifice and even if Socialism gave the certain prospect of material increase. It is our undeserved luck that the exact opposite is true. More important, the free economic order is indispensable as the prerequisite of liberty, human dignity, free choice and justice. That is why we want it, and no price would be too high for it, even if the Communists would make bigger and better washing machines."

It is tragic that we Americans are so divided on this issue. Many of us have failed to weigh the philosopher's question, "If men use their liberty in such a way as to surrender their liberty, are they thereafter any the less slaves?"

We have casually surrendered liberty in the economic sphere, forgetting the old adage, "whoso controlls our subsistence controls us."

"Economic control," said the economist Hayek, "is not merely control of a sector of human life which can be separated from the rest; it is control of the means for all our ends."

Slavery is commonly thought of as ownership of one man by another. But no slaveholder would quibble about owning the man if he can own the products of the man's labor. A slave is a person to whom economic freedom is denied. From this premise, the denial of all other freedoms follows.

The total tax "take" by all levels of government is now in excess of 40% of the National earned income! This is a valid measure of the erosion of our freedoms. But this takes account only of direct taxes. In addition, there is a large hidden tax which results from inflation, the loss in value of our savings!

If the increasing power of the giant centralized State does not frighten us, then we get our ulcers from some of its by-products: corruption in high places, the growing crime rate, juvenile delinquency, indifference to our time-tested spiritual, moral and cultural values, oppressive taxation, and a succession of foreign crises from each of which America emerges bearing the onus of another defeat by appeasement of God-less Communism!

It is pertinent to recall the prophecy of the great English Statesman, Macaulay, in 1857. Addressing himself to America, he said:

"Either some Caesar or Napoleon will seize the reins of government with a strong hand, or your Republic will be as fearfully plundered and laid waste by barbarians in the Twentieth Century as the Roman Empire was in the Fifth—with this difference, that the Huns and Vandals who ravaged the Roman Empire came from without, while your Huns and Vandals will have been engendered within your own country and by your own institutions."

Is there a way ahead which will take us out of this morass? Is there a way to recover the sanity and balance which once marked our life? I believe there is. But it is not by means of political legerdemain. It has been pointed out by Dr. Ralph Hutchison, former President of Lafayette College, in these words:

"Our common ideal is that these laws of God, these rights of man, these responsibilities of the individual to the social order should be preached and taught, but not otherwise forced upon the minds and consciences of the human race. 'Go ye into all the world and teach all nations,' was the last command of the Master. To force men into ways of righteousness by police powers, to legislate them into social progress by laws, to brainwash them from their evil ways, to torture men to the confessional, to hypnotize the social order with mass psychiatry, to terrorize them into discipline, was never the Creed of Spiritual America. Education by conviction has been our ideal. The teaching, persuading mission, we believe, is the way of social reform."

I do not imply that there are no problems peculiar to the economic and political levels. But if men are not right at the deeper level, in their understanding of the nature of the Universe and man's position therein, they can tinker with economic and political problems from now until doomsday and still come up with the wrong answers.

It is a case of putting first things first, and the very first thing is a rehabilitation of those spiritual values which are basic to the American dream. Such effort on our part will call forth the supporting power of cosmic sanction, for God intended men to be free.

"The God who gave us life," Jefferson observed, "gave us liberty at the same time."

We cannot defeat the forces of evil if we feel compelled to adopt their practices even though this be done gradually, in increments so small they do not arouse suspicion.

The final battle will be fought in the arena of spiritual realities. The forces of self-disciplined, morally responsible individualism will be arrayed against those of atheistic, coercive collectivism. It is my prayer that, in this Armageddon, Americans will be found fighting on the side of a just and merciful God.

Whitney Young Calls OEO the Voice of the Poor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 11, 1967

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, Whitney M. Young, Jr., executive director of the National Urban League, has warned that "the one Federal agency that serves as a spokesman for the poor" is in danger.

I agree with him that the Office of Economic Opportunity is the unified voice for the poor. It has succeeded in involving the poor in the processes of government and has experimented outside the traditional departmental barriers. This voice would be eliminated by the proposal to abolish OEO and scatter its programs among established Government agencies.

At this point in the RECORD I include the New York Times' account of Whitney Young's remarks:

NEGRO HEAD BACKS POVERTY UNIT AS VITAL AGENCY TO AID THE POOR

WASHINGTON, June 8.—The Office of Economic Opportunity has "on the whole done a spectacular job" in just two and one-half years of work to aid the poor and should not be dismembered, a Negro leader said today.

Whitney M. Young, Jr., executive director of the National Urban League, said opponents of the poverty agency wanted to destroy "the one Federal agency that serves as a spokesman for the poor."

Soon after Mr. Young testified before a Senate subcommittee reviewing poverty legislation, house Republicans introduced a bill that would wipe out the agency and scatter its programs among established government departments.

Mr. Young said the poverty agency had "launched important programs with a speed unmatched by any Federal agency since the New Deal" with funds he called inadequate and one-fiftieth the staff of the Health, Education and Welfare Department.

He characterized the poverty agency as "the most ambitious, innovative and imaginative program the nation has ever undertaken to help the poor become self-sufficient."

He said running such a program required that it have the freedom to cut across departmental lines.

"The established departments are unlikely experimenters and if [poor people] are not directly involved, despite whatever discomfort this may occasionally cause the politicians, their reactions will be manifest in more violent and nontraditional ways," Mr. Young observed. "It is better to have people petitioning through established channels than to have them throwing rocks at City Hall."

The Negro leader presented a long list of the agency's accomplishments in the short time it had been around. But he said the agency had created the unfortunate impression that "rioting is a necessary prelude to eligibility for poverty war funds."

Mr. Young had little good to say for members of Congress and their attitudes toward the drive to aid the poor.

"Some Congressmen use the excuse of Vietnam to oppose programs they never supported anyway," he said. "The liberals are so preoccupied with Vietnam that they have neither the stomach nor the stamina to work on two problems at the same time."

The President's Efforts for Peace at the Summit Meeting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 11, 1967

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, it has often been said that peace is the overriding issue of our time. That statement became a fact of life the day the first atom bomb was exploded nearly a quarter of a century ago—and it has taken on even added significance today, just a few weeks after Red China exploded her first hydrogen bomb.

So if we are looking for the real meaning of the recent summit meeting between President Johnson and Premier Kosygin, it is simply a restatement of that old truth: No matter how grave the issues are that divide us, they must not be allowed to block the path to greater international understanding.

If President Johnson had been looking for reasons not to meet with the Russian Premier, he could have found them easily. The war in Vietnam, the Russian-sponsored crisis in the Middle East, Mr. Kosygin's belligerent speech to the UN just a few days before—any of these would have been reason enough.

But President Johnson was not looking for excuses. He was looking for a new basis of understanding between the two most powerful nations on earth. He knew that without such a basis of understanding, the world will surely continue its drift toward the brink of a catastrophe.

So the President went to Glassboro to begin anew.

He was firm, but he was not belligerent.

He made our position clear in a number of areas, but he tried to gain a new insight into conflicting Russian positions.

As the Baltimore News American declared:

> All in all it is President Johnson who has emerged from the two-man summit with his stature increased. He tried, and the free world knows it.

Under unanimous consent I insert into the RECORD this excellent editorial from the Baltimore News American:

AFTER HOLLYBUSH

Now that reality has returned in all its grimness, the incredible week-end meetings in New Jersey seemed as faded as a half-remembered pleasant dream. Even while the sessions were going on, of course, the smiles and all the other indications of good will were far too good to be true. Yet most Americans, being optimists, chose to hope that maybe the outward display of amity and common sense somehow would continue. After all, seeming miracles had happened before.

Soviet Premier Kosygin, discarding his Hollybush humanity, abruptly ended the dream with his sum-up press conference. Uncompromising as an automaton, he proclaimed the harsh truth which realistically-minded people had known all along. Russia had not yielded an inch on Vietnam or on the Middle East. The only areas of agreement hinted were that both Moscow and Washington want to avoid atomic war and both see Red China and her bomb as a world menace. Neither of these mutual attitudes came as a surprise to anyone.

So now we're right back where we were, more or less. Our differences have, in fact, been accentuated and underscored, if not actually deepened. The futile debate in the United Nations continues. The war in Vietnam goes on. Koskgin has left, but his stubborn, iron-fisted words remain as irrefutable proof that his masters in the Kremlin are determined on a policy of getting their way no matter what.

It is not a clever position. Someday, just possibly, the Russians may learn if they take one step in our direction we probably would take four or five in theirs. It is almost unbelievable that in 10 hours of personal conversation with President Johnson the Soviet Premier did not advance some even tentative offer of compromise somewhere. Even the Communist satellite, Rumania, has enough sense to admit that talks between Israel and the Arabs are vital if their problems are to be resolved.

All in all, it is President Johnson who has emerged from the two-man summit with his stature increased. He tried, and the free world knows it. On the other hand, Kosygin and the Russians have let themselves in for China's renewed charges of selling out the Communist cause by even talking decently with Americans. These attacks can be expected to continue with more and more vehemence.

Mr. Johnson's greatest success, it seems to us, was the fact that he gave away nothing in his efforts to be reasonable. When the chips were down, when he learned compromise with the Russians was impossible, he proved he was every bit as tough as Kosygin. You can bet the Muscovites have a lot more respect for him than some of his predecessors. And someday, somehow, a fruitful harvest from Hollybush may be reaped because of this fact.

Amazing Healing Qualities Found in Pineapple Drug

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA
OF HAWAII
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 11, 1967

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, in the May issue of Pine Review, a newsletter published by the Pineapple Growers Association of Hawaii, it was stated that Hawaii's 1967 pineapple harvest season was "off and running"—and running ahead of itself at many points toward a record harvest.

Borrowing that expression from the world of sports, I would like to add that football players and other sportsmen throughout the Nation may soon be "off and running" to their nearest drugstore to obtain a new pineapple drug which will help their injuries to heal faster.

This good news from the land of the pineapple is that the drug, Bromelain, which is made from pineapple stumps, serves as a catalyst to hasten recovery from injuries. It is reported to be an effective supplement to the standard treatment for athletes who have sustained bruises, pulled muscles, tendons, and ligaments, black eyes, and fractures.

Impossible? It would not be surprising to find a few quizzical brows raised over the news that the same source from which we obtain the delicious golden fruit can also provide the cure for athletes' ills.

Let me call to the attention of my colleagues what Dr. Ralph Heinicke, Dole Co., research chemist, said about the pineapple drug at a recent meeting. I submit for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point the article, "Pineapple Drug Right Guard for Football Players," which appeared in the June 19, 1967, issue of the Honolulu Star-Bulletin:

PINEAPPLE DRUG RIGHT GUARD FOR FOOTBALL PLAYERS

Football players' injuries will heal faster if they take a drug made from pineapple stumps before their games.

The drug Bromelain is recommended for athletes who are likely to be bruised, according to Dr. Ralph Heinicke, Dole Company research chemist.

Administration of the drug after an injury also speeds healing.

It is an effective supplement to standard treatment of bruises, pulled muscles, tendons and ligaments, black eyes and fractures, Dr. Heinicke said at a recent meeting of the Engineering Association of Hawaii.

Bromelain comes from the stump of a pineapple plant.

After the juice is passed through a series of filtering and precipitating steps, the residue is dried.

Manufactured commercially by Dole, it is available in sugar-coated tablets such as "Ananase" and "Kimotab."

Bromelain serves as a catalyst to hasten recovery from injuries.

It substitutes for fibrinolysin, and antibody which counteracts clogging.

A. Theodore DeMuro

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 11, 1967

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, Nutley, N.J., recently lost one of its finest civic and political leaders with the death of A. Theodore DeMuro.

The town of Nutley, as well as the county of Essex have been greatly saddened by the death of this outstanding citizen. Mr. DeMuro was a tireless worker for honesty and economy in local government, a man of integrity whom we all admired.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I insert in the RECORD, at this point, an eloquent tribute to Mr. DeMuro that appeared in the Nutley Sun:

A. THEODORE DEMURO

A death is always a sad occasion. But when life's end comes to a citizen who has contributed most of his adult years to the advancement of his community, the family sadness is shared by the community at large; such is the reaction to the passing of former Commissioner A. Theodore DeMuro.

Almost from the time he moved from Passaic to Nutley more than 40 years ago, Teddy DeMuro became an active member of Nutley's civic affairs. DeMuro's political fortunes were mercurial. Winning a seat on the Commission by one vote in 1932, he lost his bid for re-election four years later because of a political row that developed between his forces and those of the late Mayor Charles Sherwood.

At the municipal election of 1940, Sherwood and DeMuro joined forces and as a result Sherwood finished top man and DeMuro enjoyed the pleasure of experiencing the height of his political popularity, finishing third in the commission race.

From 1940 to 1964, DeMuro served continuously on the Commission except for the years 1956–60.

Conservative by nature, DeMuro was known as the taxpayer's friend. More than that, because of his rigid stance against wheelers and dealers, he became known as Honest Ted—the highest tribute politicans can pay to a public servant.

Over a period of four decades, DeMuro has served well his adopted community. Mrs. DeMuro and her two children, even though burdened with great sorrow, can find comfort in the knowledge that their late husband and father has left a priceless heritage—an unblemished reputation and fine family reputation.

Nutley's prestigious place in the community of New Jersey's fine towns is in no small measure due to the personal and public conduct of public officials like the late A. Theodore DeMuro.

We join the citizens of our community in expressing sympathy to the bereaved family with grateful acknowledgement of sacrifices required to permit a family member appropriate substantial amounts of personal time to the performance of civic responsibility.

F. A. O.

Resolution of Southern Association of Commissioners of Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HORACE R. KORNEGAY
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 11, 1967

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, recently, the Southern Association of State Departments of Agriculture adopted a resolution pertaining to tariffs on imported agricultural products.

So that others may have the benefit of the thinking of those who represent one of the largest segments of this Nation's farm population, I insert the resolution in full in the RECORD.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION OF SOUTHERN ASSOCIATION OF COMMISSIONERS OF AGRICULTURE

A resolution to the President of the United States, the Congress of the United States, the Secretary of State of the United States, and the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States

Whereas, the government of the United States has established as national policy that poverty within this nation shall be eliminated, that every citizen is entitled to a decent and respectable standard of living and each worker entitled to a minimum wage in excess of that earned by the citizens of any other nation, and

Whereas, the United States, the world's greatest agricultural nation, depends heavily upon agricultural laborers to produce the necessary food and fiber for the sustenance and clothing of our people and of other friendly peoples throughout the world, and

Whereas, no other nation on earth pays its agricultural workers as well or maintains such a high standard of living and healthful environment for her people as does the United States and that as a result thereof, the cost of labor for food production in the United States greatly exceeds the cost of labor in any other nation, and

Whereas, in our determination to provide only the most wholesome foods of the highest qualities possible for our citizens we have added to the cost of food production expensive inspection and grading services for the benefit of our consumers, and

Whereas, the preceding factors have resulted in an unavoidable increase in the prices of home grown agricultural products, and

Whereas, foreign agricultural products do not have to contend with comparable cost increasing factors and therefore are economically sold for a price lower than that of the home grown agricultural products, causing the American product to have an unfavorable competitive position, and

Whereas, the disparity in prices between home grown and foreign grown agricultural products induced by governmental action can only be removed by governmental action, and

Whereas, if remedial action is not forthcoming the American agricultural industry will expire and the American consumer, though initially paying a lower price, would eventually be at the mercy of prices set solely by foreign governments, and

Whereas, the lack of remedial action will result in American investment in foreign agricultural industries with a consequential additional depletion of the gold supply, and

Whereas, food has been recognized by the federal government as our most powerful weapon in the fight for peace, and

Whereas, the collapse of the American agricultural industry or a reduction in the productive capacity of such industry would detrimentally affect the civil defense posture of the country as the survivors of a civil defense emergency would be solely dependent upon American agricultural products for continued existence,

Therefore, the Southern Association of Commissioners of Agriculture Resolve:

That they do support those protective import tariffs which currently exist.

Be it further resolved That the Southern Association of Commissioners of Agriculture urges the Congress of the United States to make a detailed study and determination of what additional agricultural tariffs and quantitative limitations on imports are needed to perpetuate the American agricultural industry and expeditiously enact such import controls.

Be it further resolved That copies of this resolution of the Southern Association of Commissioners of Agriculture be dispatched to the President of the United States, to the President of the United States Senate, to the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, and to each member of the Congressional delegations to the United States Congress of each state represented in the Southern Association of Commissioners of Agriculture.

Adopted June 7, 1967.

GUS R. DOUGLAS,
President, Southern Association of Commissioners of Agriculture.
JAMES A. GRAHAM,
Secretary, Southern Association of Commissioners of Agriculture.

Freedom Isn't Free

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 10, 1967

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I insert at this point in the RECORD the guest editorial by our able and dedicated Director of the FBI, Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, which appeared in the Greeneville, Tenn., Sun on Friday, July 7, 1967:

FREEDOM ISN'T FREE

(Guest editorial by J. Edgar Hoover, Director of FBI)

Can there be any act more sickening and revolting than a crowd of so-called citizens desecrating and burning their country's flag? Those who resort to such moronic behavior are surely lost in the depths of depravity. Obviously, their first loyalty is not to the United States.

True, our Nation is founded on concepts and principles which encourage dissent and opposition. These are traditions we must always defend and support. But touching a torch to the flag far exceeds reasonable protest. It is a shameful act which serves no purpose but to encourage those who want our country to erupt in violence and destruction.

On this 191st anniversary of the Declaration of Independence, we might ask what causes unpatriotic outbursts and irrational protests. Why do people turn against their native land and openly support totalitarian forces whose goal is to enslave the world-forces which do not even allow token opposition from their subjects? Why do some individuals refuse to serve and defend their country? Why do they burn their draft cards and their flag?

There may be many reasons for such action, but I am fully convinced that dying patriotism is one major cause. Love of country is being deemphasized and excluded from several phases of our life. Many educators and other leaders seem to feel it is no longer necessary for boys and girls to be concerned with how our country came into being, what it stands for, and the courageous and noble deeds of our forefathers to preserve it.

Conditions are now such in some circles that an individual who professes love of his country, reverence for its flag, and belief in the principles which make our Nation great is considered a yokel. Open aversion to patriotism of any form is increasing. Even some news media take a "tongue-in-cheek" approach to persons and groups which promote and participate in patriotic endeavors. Love of one's country is treated as some kind of social disease to be tolerated, if not stamped out. Protests are made that too much patriotism leads to international conflict. I submit that the United States will never have anything to fear from its ardent and genuinely patriotic citizens.

American history proves that freedom and liberty come at high prices and that their upkeep is costly and time-consuming. As Daniel Webster so aptly put it, "God grants liberty only to those who love it and are always ready to guard and defend it. Let our object be our country. . . ."—not our country the object of desecration and abuse.

Executive Branch Must Act on Aircraft Noise Abatement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT TENZER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 10, 1967

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, on June 30, 1967, the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of New York struck down as unconstitutional an aircraft noise abatement ordinance of the town of Hempstead, N.Y. In his decision Federal Judge John F. Dooling held that regulations restricting aircraft must come from a Federal agency.

As a sponsor of legislation to establish maximum aircraft noise levels—H.R. 1398—I have maintained that jet noise is a national problem. On February 6, 1966, in his transportation message to Congress, the President recognized jet noise as a national problem and appointed a White House task force "to frame an action program to attack this problem."

The task force is headed by the President's science adviser, Dr. Donald Hornig who wrote to me on June 5, 1967, stating that the passage of the aircraft noise abatement bill was "critically important."

The problem of jet noise has now been recognized at the highest levels of our Government as a national problem and by the courts as a Federal responsibility. The time for action is now.

The wheels of the legislative process move slowly. The use of the airplane as a means of transportation is growing at a faster rate than our population. It is estimated that the airplane passenger rate is growing at the rate of 10,000 passengers daily while our population is increasing at the rate of 6,700 persons per day. This rate of increase is bound to accelerate the hazards of air travel. Air safety must not be sacrificed because of the failure of Congress to act. That is why I am calling for the exercise of executive authority.

The 1958 Federal Aviation Act—section 307(c)—authorized the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency to establish regulations limiting the use of navigable air space "to protect persons and property on the ground." The Congress has mandated the FAA to protect the rights of homeowners and persons living in and around the airports. The nuisance of jet noise and the growing menace from the increased number of jet flights as more jet planes are delivered, leave no room for delay. The people of my district, within the shadow of Kennedy International Airport, are crying out for relief from this menace and demand the protection and the right to quiet and peaceful enjoyment of their homes.

At the request of the President, the Congress approved the establishment of a separate Department of Transportation with a secretary at the Cabinet level. The Honorable Alan S. Boyd was made Secretary of the Department of Transportation. I have today written to Mr. Boyd urging him to take cognizance of the mandate of the Congress and exercise his executive authority to set aircraft noise standards at a maximum level. By administrative regulation, the executive branch of the Government will make it immediately clear to every airline operator and airplane engine manufacturer that the Federal Government recognizes its obligation in the area of aircraft noise abatement. The Secretary should promptly take the necessary steps to implement the basic objectives of the pending aircraft noise abatement bills, cosponsored by more than 20 Members of the House of Representatives. This will be a step in the right direction. The people have spoken; the Congress has issued its mandate in the Federal Aviation Act; the Federal courts have pinpointed the responsibility; the President has called for action and his science adviser has called the need "critically important." Now is the time for Secretary Boyd to take the necessary action.

Need for Apprentice Training Programs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 11, 1967

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, on June 29 I had the privilege of addressing the graduating class of Electric Boat Division of General Dynamics Corp.'s Apprentice School, located at Groton, Conn., in my congressional district. I was particularly pleased to make this address in view of the fact that the apprentice training program is making an important contribution toward filling the growing shortage of skilled workers in industry.

It is estimated that in the next 10 years our country will have to provide over 4 million new craftsmen. The problem is further complicated by the fact that the supply of skilled labor in recent years has become relatively small, while the demand for such labor has become relatively large. In the years ahead there will be substantially larger increases in the earnings of skilled workers and work will be much more plentiful.

An apprenticeship training program is an expensive and complex administrative problem for any firm. Training must be provided, classrooms set up, instructors chosen and trained, and the whole program must be carefully supervised. Unfortunately, there are not enough firms who are willing to invest in apprenticeship training. However, the effectiveness of such a program may be judged from the fact that since 1948 Electric Boat has trained 1,207 apprentices, of whom 933 are still working there.

The needs of American industry require dozens of other firms to follow Electric Boat's example. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert my remarks in the RECORD with the hope that this will encourage other companies to establish similar programs.

The address follows:

SKILLED LABOR IN THE ECONOMY OF AMERICA

(Address by Congressman WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE, apprentice graduation, Electric Boat, June 29, 1967)

Mr. Wilkens, Mr. Holschuh, Dr. Mall, officials of Electric Boat, relatives, and members of the 1966 and 1967 graduating classes, ladies and gentlemen:

As one who is not entirely unfamiliar with graduations, I note here today many things this graduation has in common with others I have attended in the past. Here, as elsewhere, the focus of attention and of envy are you, the graduates. This is *your* day. Here, too, one finds hosts of parents, relatives, friends, and well-wishers. There are, I see, a few more wives and children of graduates here than one would find at other graduations.

First, let me note something about the training program which our guests may not know, although the graduates themselves do. This is a double graduating class of apprentices, with 186 who completed their training in 1966, and an additional 62 who completed their training this year.

I believe that a few interesting facts will serve to illustrate the importance of this program. Since Electric Boat reactivated its apprenticeship training program in 1948, a total of 1,207 apprentices have received their graduation certificates. Of these, no less than 933 still work here at Electric Boat. This is more than three-fourths of the total number and is in itself the best evidence of the success of the program. Of these, 154 have been promoted to supervisory positions and not less than 442 to technicians' jobs of many kinds. This is an unparalleled record of accomplishment both in training and in retaining apprentices.

It is this prospect of achievement and promotion which sets graduates of an apprenticeship program such as this one apart from other graduates. Today you should not feel that this is the "commencement" of your working career, but rather that it constitutes a further, perhaps major, step forward along a road on which you, long ago, set your goal. Yesterday you were still apprentices, today you are journeymen. Sometime ago you had decided upon a career as a pipefitter, machinist, welder, shipfitter, painter, carpenter or any other of the nineteen trades represented here today among you graduates. That marked your entrance into the "world of work." You have been working in that world for several years already, and here at Electric Boat where you gained considerable knowledge and experience.

For these reasons, I must speak to you today about the prospects opening to you now. At the same time, I am well aware that you have already developed an immediate interest in your trade and have acquired practical knowledge of its place in human affairs. I have chosen to try and place this interest and this knowledge of yours in a somewhat larger context. You are, as of today, skilled craftsmen. Let me talk for a few moments about you and about your fellow-craftsmen.

Taking skilled workers together, as a group, there are well over nine million of you in this country of ours. You earn—and this is a pretty general figure—about $7,000 to $8,000 a year on the average. You can translate that to $150 or $160 a week, on the average, if you wish. You should remember that, like any average, this in itself may be meaningless. The really significant thing about this figure is that *only* professionals, managers, and certain sales personnel, as occupational groups, earned more. Consequently, I would say that you have chosen wisely, with respect to your earnings prospects, in entering this field of employment.

On the other hand, skilled workers, as a group, have relatively not fared as well financially in recent years as the groups in our work force with lesser skills. Most of you who have followed labor matters in the newspapers or in your union periodical know that a major issue in the recent railroad shopcrafts dispute was the problem of skilled-unskilled wage differentials. This is also a major problem in the automobile industry, and elsewhere.

The years during and since World War II have been, for the most part, years of relatively full employment. Organized labor, addressing itself to the problems of working people in this period, found that the wage structure during the ten years of depression after 1929 had seriously broken down among the unskilled and semiskilled workers. Among such workers, wages as low as 50 or 75 cents an hour were still not unknown in those years. Wages of the skilled, however, had held up relatively well.

Thus, the union approach to wage adjustments, begun during the war years and continued after the war, was to put the greatest emphasis upon improving the earnings of the unskilled to a living wage. The method adopted was to seek wage increases per hour, in union agreements and through legislation, such as the Fair Labor Standards Act.

Over the years this procedure resulted in the now well-known phenomenon of a compression of the wage structure. The difference between skilled and unskilled remained the same in amount, but was compressed in proportion to the ability and training of the skilled worker. Instead of skilled work being worth over three times as much has unskilled, it became worth only about two-thirds more.

You know the problem, I am sure, from your own experience. How many times have you thought, during the years of your apprenticeship, that you were perhaps foolish not to take a regular job and forget the training? You can probably recall friends who dropped out for this very reason.

Due to this and other causes, to which I shall turn in a moment, the supply of skilled labor in recent years has become relatively small, while the demand for such labor has become relatively large. From this fact two conclusions emerge, both of which you will appreciate:

First, the push is now on to restore a part of this differential, by granting substantially larger increases in earnings to skilled workers than to unskilled and by shifting wage adjustment from a cents-per-hour basis to a percentage basis.

You can see this new approach in the current wage demands in the railroad shopcraft negotiations, where a 7 *percent* overall increase was coupled with a demand for an additional fifteen to twenty-five cents per hour for skilled workers, to help narrow the differential. Thus the wages in your crafts are going to become relatively much more attractive in the next few years.

Second, work is going to be generally much more plentiful. And this brings me to the other reasons I mentioned a moment ago about the supply of skilled labor being smaller than the demand.

In addition to the fact that job training has been relatively less attractive to the *worker* in recent years, it has been also relatively unattractive to *employers*. Few firms have as good a record in the promotion and carrying out of apprenticeship training programs as your firm, Electric Boat, has earned.

An apprenticeship training program is an expensive and a complex administrative problem for any firm. Not only must training be provided, classrooms set up, instructors chosen and themselves trained, but such a program must be carefully supervised. A coordinated effort, which extends to Hartford and to Washington, is involved. Not only are Electric Boat and the Metal Trades Council involved, but also the Connecticut State Department of Education and the Connecticut State Department of Labor and the U.S. Department of Labor.

You may have heard some talk about the role of the craft unions in holding down apprenticeship opportunities. I would not stand here and tell you this has never happened. But I can tell you that the Federal Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training has reported that in practically all trades, and in most areas of the United States, the number of apprentices allowed under the union rules has in recent years *consistently* exceeded the number employers were willing to train. There was always need for apprentices and no vacancies.

The problem is that there are simply not enough firms like General Dynamics, with foresight, who are willing to invest in apprenticeship training. We need dozens of more firms to follow the example of Electric Boat. Unfortunately, very few have made any comparable effort.

The result is that, while the number of apprentices being trained to fill job vacancies was decreasing, the number of new jobs was increasing. Add to this a fact which is often overlooked, namely, that in most trades we must train a larger number of young workers than are now being trained just to replace the older workers as they retire from the work force. This leaves no journeymen to fill the new jobs.

Let me cite just a few more figures. The United States Bureau of Labor Statistics, in a recent study of the future need for skilled workers, found that the 9.2 million skilled craftsmen in 1965 would have to be increased to about 11.4 million by 1975. This is a hefty twenty-five percent increase of what looks like over two million new jobs in the next ten years.

Actually, that is hardly the half of it. These are only the *new* jobs, the additional jobs. During that same ten years, an additional 1.8 million jobs will open up because of deaths and retirement on the part of present jobholders. The need for new *skilled workers* in the next ten years will therefore be for over four million apprentices and journeymen, rather than two million.

Let me emphasize again, these are overall figures. But broken down, they are even more impressive. Take machinists. There are 325,000 machinists today. By 1975 we shall need another 105,000 including replacements.

Take plumbers and pipefitters, 150,000 will be needed. Painters, 130,000. Carpenters, 245,000. Electricians, 135,000. Tool and die makers, 45,000. But enough of the statistics. The point I am trying to make is that there are likely to be more vacancies for skilled jobs than men to fill them.

I only wish that I could address myself to every graduating class with the same confidence that I feel today, and tell them that their future was as bright and their positions as assured. You have indeed chosen wisely.

Your graduation certificate is not merely a license to go out and find a job, if and where you can, but it is a guarantee of an even better job at higher pay. It is lasting proof, not only of what you have learned, but that you have successfully served on the job with your fellow-craftsmen, and have years of experience already behind you. It is a letter of recommendation, a citation of achievement, as well as a diploma.

Again, my congratulations and my best wishes to all of you, to your employer, Electric Boat, and to your relatives and friends who are with us here today. It has been, indeed, a happy occasion. I appreciate having the opportunity to share it with you and to wish you much success in the years ahead.

A Healthy Infant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 11, 1967

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, those of us who took part in the long, hard struggle for enactment of the medicare program have reason for pride and gratification in the remarkable record of its first year. Medicare ranks high on the list of noteworthy legislative achievements of our history, and its initial success should spur us on to correct its deficiencies and make it even more effective and more equitable. It is more regrettable that, instead of joining in the effort to make medicare serve more adequately the health needs of our older citizens, some diehard opponents are still complaining and criticizing, still fighting its implementation. The narrow, negative attitude of the leaders of the American Medical Association was vigorously criticized in a splendid editorial in the Newark Star Ledger of Saturday, July 1, 1967, which I should like to insert in full at this point in the RECORD:

A HEALTHY INFANT

Medicare is a year old today and it is apparent that it has grown up faster than some of the infantile opposition that persists in the hierarchy of the American Medical Association.

Medical insurance for the aged is a fact of American life, despite the diehard opposition of AMA leaders, fortunately not widely reflected in the ranks of practitioners. It is not going to die in infancy, it is not going to disappear . . . it is here to stay.

And the medieval, feudal opposition that is still spouted as part of the AMA party line by its president fails to obscure the substantial progress made by Medicare in a single year. Most of the administrative kinks have been smoothd out; some still remain.

But the overall success of Medicare has provided a new era of assurance and tranquility for the nation's elderly at a time of their lives when they urgently need it. Almost 20 million Americans 65 and older are covered by the program, serviced by 250,000 physicians, more than 6,000 hospitals and 2,500 nursing homes.

On numbers alone, the remarkable progress achieved in the medical insurance program refutes the negative, defeatist position of the AMA president who callously declares that health care is a "privilege not a right."

It is pertinent and reassuring to note that three medical associations have excoriated the AMA president for his irrational attack on a federal program that has been clearly mandated by the people. If he had his way, this nation's health and medical care would retrogress sharply, devoid of government support for medical research and education, hospitals, medical insurance for the aged, programs for the indigent and planning for community health care.

When the AMA president speaks about health care being a privilege rather than a right, he displays an abysmal lack of knowledge of fundamental law. Physicians sell their services for a fee; they are not conferring a privilege by treating a patient any more than a lawyer's relationship with a client involves the conferring of some kind of "privilege."

Under this kind of thinking, doctors could withhold their services if they deem it a privilege rather than a right. This has no legal substance, nor does it serve any constructive purpose.

The Battle of Midway Island

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS G. MORRIS

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 11, 1967

Mr. MORRIS of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, Miss Susan Ryan, a seventh-grade student of the Holy Cross School in Las Cruces, N. Mex., was the recent winner of an essay contest at the school and sponsored by the Daughters of the American Revolution. The category in which Susan wrote her essay was "Great American Naval Battles." Susan chose her own topic—"The Battle of Midway Island." I believe this essay to be a fine historical report of that great battle that was a turning point in the war for the Pacific. So that my colleagues may have an opportunity to read the work of this young lady, I am inserting her winning essay in the RECORD:

THE BATTLE OF MIDWAY ISLAND

(By Susan Ryan)

Several small but important islands were the focal points of many embittered battles in the duration of World War II. Among the first, and the bloodiest, was the tiny isle of Midway.

The Japanese had plans for this islet. They felt that they would be able to "destroy what remained of the American Fleet at Pearl Harbor."[1] They hoped to attack the Aleutian Islands because they believed we would not defend Midway, but would instead send our full force to the Aleutians. However, we had, unknown to the enemy, broken their code and were awaiting their arrival. The good ships, "Enterprise," "Hornet," and the "Yorktown," all aircraft carriers, held their positions to the east of Midway. The "Enterprise," the commanding vessel, had been brilliantly maneuvered by Admral William Halsey. Since Admiral Halsey was ill, Vice Admiral Raymond A. Spruance, whose cold, nerveless, thoughtful approach to the problems of battle had earned him the nickname of the "Human Machine,"[2] had taken over.

June 4, 1942, will long be remembered as the bloodiest encounter in the three-day Battle of Midway. It will also be remembered as the first successful battle in which the Japanese were completely stopped. The American carriers saw very little actual fighting, although a few were hit by bombs from Japanese planes. The American aircraft did most of the work. Marine planes took off from the "barren, rocky dot about six miles across."[3] These planes "staged a furious attack."[4] Casualties were severe to both sides but even so the Americans made their presence felt. More than one Japanese carrier was sunk. The Commander in Chief of the Japanese Navy, Admiral Yamamoto, went to battle in his ship, the "Yamato." Other enemy vessels: the "Akagi," the flagship; the "Kaga," the increasing joy of the Japanese Navy; the "Soryu" and "Hiryu," with a large escort of battleships, also went into battle. Japanese planes from the carrier "Hiryu" located the American carrier "Yorktown," and dealt the fatal blows to her. She had been damaged in the Battle of the Coral Sea. The enemy was sure we had sent all our planes up, but Admiral Spruance "sent off from the 'Enterprise' and 'Hornet' every combat plane that he could command."[5] The result was a completely confused enemy. Later, American planes sank the daring "Hiryu," and that night two of the Japanese carriers went down in fiery defeat. A small, but nevertheless sly, American submarine crept up on a third carrier and utterly destroyed her. During this battle, a surprise raid was directed on the islet by Japanese aircraft. The island was damaged heavily, but gunners shot down many of these destructive craft. The brilliant strategy of Vice Admiral Spruance led our Naval planesto plan an attack on the enemy carrier "when their flight decks would be crammed with aircraft."[6] A group of planes following the three Lieutenant Commanders Lindsey, Waldren, and Massey flew low or dive-bombed these plane-ladened carriers and either destroyed or damaged almost every plane aboard the enemy vessels. Burning oil spewed over the water, and fuel tanks exploded. So intense was the fire that the area looked like a sea of roaring flame. More than three hundred planes, four carriers, two cruisers, four destroyers, and scores of lives were lost by the Japanese in this treacherous battle. Fortunately, American losses were not quite as heavy.

This small but important island was the site of a terrible battle, a battle caused by necessity. The Japanese needed this island for the same reason as the Americans. On a map if you find Midway you will see why. This island is in the middle of the Pacific. Whoever holds possession of this islet has a refueling place between America and Japan. Without this island many airplanes would have run completely out of fuel, forcing the aircraft to go down at sea. Many brave young pilots would have either perished in a watery grave or would have been at the mercy of the allies or the enemy for rescue.

The Japanese also hoped to cripple the American Navy by sinking many of our ships at Midway. Instead, the Japanese forces themselves were dwindled to a considerable amount less than the original number. Many men from both sides were killed in a horrible manner. The determination of the American Forces, together with the strategy and will power of the Japanese naval forces, caused needless death to both sides. Screaming, helpless men were burned to death, young men's lives were ruined by gunshot wounds too extensive to repair. Many men drowned because of sheer exhaustion and confusion during battles, and others lost their lives when the bombs detonated. Midway was indeed a major turning point in World War II.

Footnotes at end of speech.

[1] *The Golden Book History of the United States*, vol. IX (New York, 1963), p. 759.

[2] Ibid, p. 759.

[3] Savage, Katherine, *The Story of the Second World War* (New York, 1964), p. 165.

[4] *The Golden Book*, op. cit.

[5] Savage, op. cit., p. 166.

[6] Savage, op. cit.

Remarks of the Honorable Mills B. Godwin, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 11, 1967

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, the following speech was given by the Honorable Mills B. Godwin, Jr., Governor of the Commonwealth of Virginia. Governor Godwin expressed the position of the southern Democrats so clearly, so brilliantly, that I felt his speech should be called to the attention of all Members of this Congress and to the attention of all those who peruse the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I hope that his remarks will receive the full attention that they deserve.

The speech follows:

REMARKS OF GOV. MILLS E. GODWIN, JR., AT GOVERNOR'S DINNER, CHARLESTON, S.C., JUNE 23, 1967

In more than twenty years of politics, I have not always felt that I was among friends, and there have been a few occasions when I was certain that I had fallen among the Philistines.

But tonight I feel that I speak to kindred spirits.

We share more than the name of a great political party.

We share a common heritage of leadership in the South for almost a century unbroken.

And in our darker moments, we are drawn together by a foreboding about the direction in which our country is drifting, and by a growing frustration over what we as Southerners and Democrats ought to do about that drift.

Some have been appalled and rebelled. They have split their tickets, or gone fishing on election day.

But we have watched the legions of liberalism marching to the polls, and we know this is not the answer.

In despair, some have voted down the line against the party of their fathers. Perhaps this has brought them personal satisfaction, but I see no evidence that it has been effective in furthering our larger aims.

Some have felt the need for violent reaction, and flocked to the banner of the extremist on the white charger, who promised victory, but produced only disappointment.

Theirs was the bitter lesson, that in the end the extremist only breathes new life into the very thing he wants to kill.

Let us hope they remember that lesson. Where then shall we turn?

Already the extreme right of our political spectrum has tended to move off by itself, taking along many of the protest votes of our sober conservatives.

The extreme left as we see political directions is gaining new adherents, and warning us that it cannot be ignored except at grave risk.

Gone is the day when our party can count in every precinct on a solid core of votes from men and women whose fathers and grandfathers voted Democratic.

Gone is the day—and you know this so well in Charleston—when being a Democrat in the South meant being elected in the South, or when winning a primary meant winning an election.

There was a day when in the solitude of the voting booth, the frustrated Southern Democrat could vote for the candidate of another party and salve his conscience with the knowledge the fellow couldn't get elected.

But, my friends, the day never was when we could build a sound and solid Democratic Party in the South by electing Republicans.

We don't even have to open the back door to see how those chickens have come home to roost.

It seems to me our choice as Southern Democrats is clear. We can debate our differences inside the doors of public office, or we will find ourselves protesting in vain from the cold outside those doors.

We may not always like the final settlement after we have spoken our piece, but it will be a whole lot better than having no chance to speak at all.

Believe me, my friends, it is just that simple.

In politics, we are nothing if not realtists. We cannot hope to isolate politics from the economic and social and cultural realignments we see taking place throughout the South.

They are the price we pay for the new industries, the new commerce, the new citizens, the Federal programs—old and new—that we have in our midst.

In our efforts to preserve the principles by which we have lived so long, we have fought delaying actions on a thousand fronts.

And while we have lost many skirmishes, I hope we have learned something.

I hope we have learned which tactics are fruitless.

I hope we have learned which alternatives only hasten what we abhor.

I hope we have learned where we can afford to adjust, and where we must stand firm.

And I trust our faith has been confirmed that our best and brightest hope is still within the Democratic party.

For ours is still the mission that has inspired Southern Democrats for two score years.

Over that span, the men we have sent to Congress have battled with a skill and with power far beyond their numbers to keep the pendulum from swinging too far too fast.

From their long experience, they have learned how to use their key positions to best advantage.

We could learn strategy and tactics from them, and apply what we have learned within our own states.

For it is not only the nation which is changing at an ever-quickening pace. The South is changing even faster. And it is the South of today and of tomorrow in which we all must live.

Within our Party, there has always been room for differences. In a dynamic political philosophy, there must always be room for shadings of opinion, for divergence over means, if not over ends.

And both the differences and the agreements must be worked out at the very highest level, if the machinery supporting that philosophy is to hold together.

There is still room for diversity of opinion in the Party we know, room for traditional conservatives and for those of more moderate views.

In states as diverse as ours, there must be room, just as there must be limits agreed to by mutual consent, unspoken boundaries that are felt, rather than seen.

And as always, the door is still open for those who can find a place within the broad outlines of our philosophy.

But the handwriting on the wall says one thing more.

It says that we can no longer crank up the Party machinery just before an election, run it long enough to win, and then turn off the ignition.

From now on, being a Southern Democrat is going to be a full-time job, from the State Central Committee down to the most remote precinct.

We can no longer assume that we are the old pros, playing against a haphazard and poorly coached bunch of amateurs. If we do, we will fool nobody but ourselves. No Monday morning quarterbacks will be able to argue with the final score.

In politics, even more than in football, it is team spirit that wins the game!

The opposition always is set to take advantage of any mixup in signals, any disagreement over plays. They have no winning record to defend. They have nothing to lose.

I have no fear for the outcome if we play with the usual smooth-working team, if we pound away at fundamentals in our pregame practice, if we agree on basic strategy, if we make our diversity our strength, rather than our weakness.

The Democratic Party in the South has not always played an easy schedule. We can all recall some of the tough ones.

But we have usually realized in time that we must submerge our differences in the overriding necessity of winning elections.

We have understood with Winston Churchill that a statesman who cannot get re-elected is no longer a statesman.

And now, another generation is hard upon us. Some of them have come from other states, with different ideas and different political affiliations.

They will accept our jobs and our citizenship without question, but they will not accept our traditional political philosophy unless it is flexible enough to meet their needs.

Behind these visitors from across our borders there is still another generation of our own, born to the new prosperity of the South, born to the resurgence we can see in everything around us.

And born also to a new freedom of political choice, for there is a buyer's market seeking their talents.

Like young people through the ages, many have no great reverence for the wishes, or the wisdom, or the works of their fathers.

They have no desire to wait their turn, when the opposition promises they can go to bat in the next inning.

They have yet to be sold on the idea that another solid and substantial victory is better than the excitement of an upset.

We must convince them, and we must do it soon.

But you need no visiting Virginian to tell you what must be done. Let your inspiration be the sure knowledge of why it must be done.

We hold in our hands the heritage of a political institution which generation after generation has brought forth the leaders of the South.

The destiny of South Carolina, of Virginia, of every Southern state, has been forged by Democrats.

They form an illustrious procession, those predecessors of ours. The risks they took far out-weigh our own. Their courage speaks to our fears. Their sacrifices shame our doubts.

They, too, labored in the field of politics, but their purpose always was to defend and to preserve the principles guiding a new nation of free men.

Let this also be our own purpose always.

Our first goal has been a better state, a better Virginia or a better South Carolina. But deeper still lies the conviction grown stronger in recent years, that in our hands, history may have placed the fate of this nation.

If this is, indeed, the bedrock on which we build, let it be the bedrock to which we always return, when questions of smaller moment divide us.

Tomorrow I will return to Richmond, to take up again my own battles, so similar to yours.

It would be a great comfort to know from your words and from your works, that you, too, have pledged upon the highest altar that there shall be no limit to the pursuit of this, our common cause.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402, at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

NBS Sponsors Symposium on Computer-Aided Typesetting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. OMAR BURLESON

OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 11, 1967

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, almost 600 people from 25 States and two foreign countries, interested in the field of computer-aided typesetting, converged on the new installation of the National Bureau of Standards in Gaithersburg, Md., on June 15 to take part in the 2-day "Symposium on Electronic Composition in Printing." The symposium was sponsored by the NBS Center for Computer Sciences and Technology to permit a state-of-the-art review of a rapidly advancing field of computer application which has great potentialities for increased efficiency and savings in the Federal Government.

The state of the art of photocomposition was well covered by representatives from the major manufacturers of photocomposing machinery. Participating companies included: Mergenthaler Linotype Co., Bell Telephone Laboratories, Photon, Inc., A. B. Dick Co., Fairchild Graphic Equipment, RCA, Stromberg-Carlson, and IBM. The policy of the Government concerning the new technology was made clear by James L. Harrison, Public Printer of the United States, and by John F. Haley, Staff Director of the Joint Congressional Committee on Printing.

As vice chairman of that committee, I am particularly proud of the role it has performed in initiating this significantly historical graphic arts achievement.

Our policy determination to give a mandate to the Public Printer to engage in a research and development program was the foundation on which today's structure has been built.

Designed to create a method whereby the ever-increasing waste that was resulting from computer printout composition would be reduced or eliminated, the decision was based on our review of a Joint Committee on Printing staff analysis which clearly identified a loss of legibility, great increase in bulk, and excessive increases in printing and binding costs.

From that rather quiet beginning, only about 6 years ago, we have successfully passed a number of important milestones, another one of which was the NBS Symposium, at which several papers were presented by representatives from research and printing and publishing organizations including Documentation, Inc.; Photo Data, Inc.; and American Chemical Society, Washington, D.C., chapter; and by Battelle Memorial Institute of Columbus, Ohio, and ROCAPPI, Inc., of Swarthmore, Pa.

Papers describing specific applications of the computer in typesetting were presented by representatives from the Air Force; the Government Printing Office; the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; National Library of Medicine; U.S. Patent Office; Defense Supply Agency; and the National Bureau of Standards.

Session chairmen included Lowell P. Hattery of American University, Paul A. Ziemer of the Department of Commerce, Glenn E. Roudabush of the University of Pittsburgh, and Samuel N. Alexander and Mary E. Stevens of NBS. The symposium committee consisted of Richard W. H. Lee, Roy W. Worral, and W. R. Tilley of NBS.

The proceedings will be published in the near future and will be available from the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office.

Following the formal registration session, the program proceeded, as follows:

SESSION I. STATE OF THE ART

Overview, by Lowell P. Hattery, American University.

The Linotron System, by Donald H. Rollert, Mergenthaler Linotype Co.

Computer Image Drawing from Digital Data, by M. V. Mathews, Bell Telephone Laboratories.

High Speed 901 Zip, by Anthony G. Bernardo, Photon, Inc.

The Videograph Text Editor, by Glendon T. Gerlach, A. B. Dick Co.

The PhotoTextSetters, by A. J. Smith, Fairchild Graphic Equipment.

A Videocomp Systems Approach, by Aaron H. Coleman, RCA.

Micromation—Its Impact on the Photocomposing Industry, by J. J. Kalagher, Stromberg-Carlson.

IBM's Position in Electronic Composition and Text Editing, by Hans E. Weiss, IBM.

SESSION II. GOVERNMENT POLICY

An introduction, by Paul A. Ziemer, U.S. Department of Commerce.

Transition on the Tiber—A New Look at the G.P.O., by Hon. James L. Harrison, Public Printer of the United States.

Present and Projected Policies of the J.C.P., by John F. Haley, Staff Director, Congressional Joint Committee on Printing.

SESSION III. NON-GOVERNMENT APPLICATIONS AND RESEARCH

Introductory Remarks, by Glenn E. Roudabush, University of Pittsburgh.

Chemical Information—A Computer in Photocomposition, by Bernard G. Lazorchak, American Chemical Society.

The Import of Computerized Typesetting on Commercial Printing, by William C. Lamparter, Battelle Memorial Institute.

Computerized Typesetting Projections, by Kenneth B. Ludwig, Photo Data, Inc.

Classification in Computerized Text Processing, by Raymond P. Wishner, Documentation, Inc.

System 70, by John W. Seybold, ROCAPPI, Inc.

SESSION IV. GOVERNMENT APPLICATIONS

A Brief Overview, by Samuel N. Alexander, National Bureau of Standards.

Electronic Composition Within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, by E. Ray Lannon, Assistant Commissioner for Administration, Food and Drug Administration, HEW.

Electronic Composing System Applications, by John J. Boyle, Special Assistant to the Production Manager, U.S. Government Printing Office.

Use of GRACE at N.L.M., by Ronald E. Bogart, National Library of Medicine.

Computer Typesetting Program at NBS, by William R. Bozman, National Bureau of Standards.

Typewriter-to-Computer Roster Publication and Maintenance, by Arthur North, U.S. Patent Office (Now with Documentation, Inc.).

Implications of Electronic Composition System at DSA Publications, by William J. Beran, Defense Supply Agency.

Conversion to Linotron, by Victor G. Kehler, Department of the Air Force.

In conclusion I would like to cite the bill sponsored by my colleague, Congressman BROOKS, of Texas, which has become Public Law 89–306, under which the NBS Center for Computer Sciences and Technology has the responsibility for advising Federal agencies on the selection and use of computer-based systems to improve the cost effectiveness of their programs. In line with this responsibility, the Center is sponsoring the Symposium on Electronic Composition in Printing to permit a state-of-the-art review of a rapidly advancing field of computer application which has great potentialities for increased efficiency and savings in the Federal Government.

Address by Israel Army Commanding General, Rav-Aluf Rabin, on Award of Honorary Doctorate Degree From Hebrew University, Mount Scopus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 12, 1967

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, on June 28, 1967, the Israel Army commanding general, Rav-Aluf Rabin, received an honorary doctorate degree from the Hebrew University on Mount Scopus. The general's short acceptance speech was published in the Jerusalem Post on June 29. I ask unanimous consent that the speech be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I regard myself here as a representative of the entire Israel Defense Forces, the body of soldiers who brought the State of Israel its victory in the six-day war. It may be asked why the University saw fit to bestow an honorary doctorate on a soldier. What do military activity and the academic world of civilization have in common? What is there in common between those whose profession is violence and those who labor in spiritual values? I am, however, honoured that through me you are expressing deep appreciation for my comrades in arms and to that extension of the unique spirit of the entire Jewish people, the Israel Defense Forces.

The world has recognized that the I.D.F. is different from other armies. Although its first task is the military one of maintaining security, it has numerous peacetime roles, not of destruction but of construction and the strengthening of the nation's cultural and moral resources.

Our educational work has been widely praised and received national recognition, when in 1966, it was granted the Israel Prize for Education. The Nahal, which combines military training and agricultural settlement, and the provision of teachers in border villages are but two examples of the part played by the I.D.F. in this sphere.

The University has conferred this honorary title in recognition of our Army's superiority of spirit as it was revealed in the heat of war. We are all here in this place only by virtue of a war, which though forced upon us, was forged into a victory that astounded the world.

War is intrinsically harsh and cruel and bloody, yet this war has brought forth rare and magnificent instances of heroism, together with humane expressions of brotherhood, comradeship and spiritual greatness.

Anyone who has not seen a tank crew continue to attack though its commander has been killed and its track badly damaged; who has not seen sappers risking their lives to extricate wounded comrades from a minefield; who has not seen the entire Air Force dedicating every effort to rescue a pilot who has fallen in enemy territory, cannot know the meaning of devotion among comrades in arms.

The entire nation was exalted by the news of the capture of the Old City. Our sabra youth and most certainly our soldiers do not tend to be sentimental, and shy away from all show of feeling. However, the strain of battle, the anxiety which preceded it, and the sense of direct participation of every soldier in the forging of the heart of Jewish history cracked the shell of hardness and shyness and released well-springs of excitement and spiritual emotion. The paratroopers who delivered the Wailing Wall leaned on its stones and wept. As a symbol this was a rare occasion, almost unparalleled in human history.

Such phrases and cliches are not generally used in our Army but this scene on the Temple Mount, beyond the power of words to describe, revealed, as though by a flash of lightning, deep truths. And more than this, the joy of triumph seized the whole nation.

Yet a strange phenomenon can be observed. The joy of our soldiers is incomplete, and their celebrations are marred by sorrow and shock. There are some who abstain from all celebration. These men in the front lines were witness not only to the glory of victory, but the price of victory; their comrades who fell beside them bleeding. This terrible price which our enemies paid touched the hearts of many of our men as well. It may be that the Jewish people never learned and never accustomed itself to feel the triumph of conquest and victory and we receive it with mixed feelings.

The six-day war revealed many instances of heroism far beyond the single attack which dashes unthinkingly forward. In many places, desperate and lengthy battles raged. In Rafia, in El Arish, in Um Kataf, in Jerusalem, and on the Golon Heights and in many other places, the soldiers showed themselves heroic in spirit and great in courage.

We speak a great deal of the few against the many. In this war, perhaps for the first time since the Arab invasion in the spring of 1948 and the battles of Negba and Degania, units of the I.D.F. stood in all sectors, few against many. Relatively small units often entered seemingly endless networks of fortifications, surrounded by hundreds of thousands of enemy troops. Faced with the task of forcing their way, hour after hour, in this jungle of dangers, they continued on, even after the momentum of the first attack had passed, summoning up every spiritual resource to carry the fight through to the very end.

Thus our armoured forces broke through on all fronts, our paratroopers fought their way to Rafiah and Jerusalem, our snappers cleared minefields under enemy fire. The units which broke the enemy lines and reached their objective after hours and hours of struggle, continuing on and on while their comrades fell by their sides, were kept going more and more by their spirit than by their weapons or the tactics they may have learned.

We have always demanded the best of our youth for the Israel Defense Forces. We coined the slogan *"Hatovim Letayis"* . . . Only the Best for the Air Force . . . and this became a meaningful phrase. We meant that if our airmen were to be capable of defeating the forces of four enemy countries within a few short hours, they must have moral values and human values.

These airmen attacked enemy planes with such deadly accuracy that the world does not understand how it was done and experts seek to explain it by secret weapons. Our armoured troops stood and beat the enemy even when their equipment was inferior to his. Soldiers in every branch of the service overcame their enemies despite superior numbers and fortifications. They showed not only coolness and courage in battle but a burning faith in the righteousness of their cause, and the sure knowledge that if victory was not theirs, the alternative was destruction.

In every sector our commanders of all ranks far out-shone the enemies'. Their understanding, their will, their ability to improvise, their care for soldiers and above all, the fact that they went ahead of their troops into battle, are not matters of material or of technique. They have no rational explanation.

All of this springs from the spirit and leads to the spirit, Our warriors prevailed not by their weapons but by the consciousness of a mission, by a consciousness of righteousness, by a deep love for their homeland and an understanding of the difficult task laid upon them: to ensure the existence of our people in their homeland, to protect, even at the price of their lives, the right of the State of Israel to live freely, independently and peacefully.

This Army, which I had the privilege of commanding through these battles, came from the people and returns to the people, to a people which rises in this hour of crisis and overcomes all enemies by virtue of its moral value and spiritual readiness in the hour of need.

As a representative of the Israel Defense Forces, and in the name of every one of its soldiers, I accept your recognition with pride.

Boys Who Work With Fear

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 12, 1967

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, the first part of Miss Miriam Ottenberg's article in the Sunday Star, of July 9, 1967, describes vividly actual incidents of assault and robbery of young boys working in our city. Miss Ottenberg, staffwriter for the Star, goes on to report how similar situations are handled in other jurisdictions. I commend the reading of this entire article to all my colleagues:

WHAT'S DONE ELSEWHERE?

If the juvenile robbers stray across the line into Maryland and threaten to "get" a young victim who reports what happened to him there the chances of the robber remaining free to carry out the threat are much less likely than in Washington, The Star found.

"If a robbery with threats of reprisal ever came to my attention, the leaders of the gang would be put away," said Judge Edward A. Loveless Jr., who is assigned to juvenile matters in Prince Georges County. "This goes beyond the question of rehabilitation. They're not only hurting themselves but everybody else."

In Montgomery County, Juvenile Court Judge Alfred D. Noyes said he has warned boys that "if you threaten or any of your friends threaten retaliation, we'll hold you responsible."

Judge Noyes believes the "streetwise" should be put in a facility where they can be controlled because "I don't think it does any good to put a boy on probation if he thinks he's getting away with something."

Maybe it's a coincidence but neither county is plagued by reprisal-threatening young bandits preying on working boys.

Judge Robert I. H. Hammerman of the Supreme Court of Baltimore's Division of Juvenile Causes likewise reported that his court didn't have that kind of problem. "We avoid reprisals through detention," he said.

In Cleveland, Juvenile Court Judge Walter G. Whitlatch, president of the Ohio Association of Juvenile Court Judges and an adviser to the National Crime Commission's task force on juvenile delinquency said he keeps boys in custody if there's any threat of retaliation.

He feels strongly that putting aggressive boys into residential training schools is the real way to handle chronic young offenders and to prevent their followers from being involved in similar crime careers.

And how does Judge Whitlatch react to juvenile robbers preying on working juveniles?

"We consider this serious," he said. "These boys need custody and control. If you take them out of the community, you don't have this problem."

But they're not out of the District of Columbia community and we do have a problem. All kinds of long-range solutions are proposed to the over-all problem of juvenile crime in the District in both the National and District Crime Commission reports.

Chief among the District recommendations is a Youth Commission, which would seek out pre-delinquents and steer them in the right direction before trouble catches up with them. The proposed commission would also oversee the treatment of delinquents.

Other solutions are being sought.

Chief Judge Morris Miller of Juvenile Court insists he can't accomplish his goal of bringing juveniles promptly before the court without a fourth judge, even with the new third judge. Judge Miller wants more probation officers to reduce the impossible case load now being carried by the workers and he's asked for the nucleus of a research unit to pin down individual problems in need of special attention just as The Star has pinned down the problem of juvenile robbers preying on working boys. The unit would also analyze the results of various treatment programs.

Welfare Director Winifred Thompson is having such success with the three small half-way houses now in operation on an experimental basis that she has asked Congress to fund not only the three original ones but five more. These closely supervised centers are the bridge between commitment and the community, giving court and welfare staffs a better chance of determining when it's best for both the juvenile and the community for a boy to be on his own again.

Commissions and officials are trying to meet long-festering problems with long-range solutions. But the problem of juvenile criminals preying on juvenile workers is immediate. What can be done now—not a decade from now—to protect boys against both robbery and reprisal?

Herbert J. Miller Jr., District Crime Commission chairman, reaches the same solution as the judges in other jurisdictions.

"The only immediate short-range step that can be taken is to remove from society those who have demonstrated their inability or unwillingness to comply with the law," he said.

"Just because you feel sorry for these boys doesn't mean you have to leave them on the street. You don't really help them by turning them loose to prey on more kids."

Since offenders are being turned loose, these steps are now promised or proposed to make the city safer for the working boy:

Both Judge Miller of Juvenile Court and Welfare Director Thompson intend to have their staffs focus more attention on robbery repeaters.

Judge Miller wants to make sure juvenile robbers see the judge even if their status doesn't change.

Miss Thompson wants all new offenses by welfare wards reported to the department, which doesn't always happen now. Then, as a condition of their parole, these repeaters would have to attend group discussions at least once a week because "they may outsmart the case workers but they can't fool each other."

Corporation Counsel Charles Duncan plans to make certain that the government is represented at every stage of Juvenile Court proceedings where juveniles now have counsel. For example, he said government attorneys could recommend to the judge that the juvenile robber make restitution as a condition of probation.

Similar suggestions to take the profit out of crime came from Deputy Chief John F. Ryan, head of the Youth Aid Division, who wants parents held responsible for their children's depredations, and from Assistant School Superintendent John D. Koontz, who proposes disciplining juvenile offenders by putting them to work on neighborhood improvement projects.

Out of all the what-can-be-done questioning, this answer came most often: "Report the crime!"

And what about the threats of retaliation that keep so many victims silent?

Says Police Chief John B. Layton: "Where there is a threat of reprisal, one of the best assurances of safety is police awareness of the original offense. The fact that the offender is identified and known to the police acts as a deterrent against reprisal."

Layton said police officials will stress reporting these boy-against-boy crimes when they address civic meetings and confer with precinct councils.

Ryan will have the schoolboy patrol coordinators carry the same idea to class assemblies in the fall. At the same time, the coordinators will sound a warning that any reprisal will be considered more serious than the original offense.

Emmett R. Brown Sr., president of the District Congress of Parents and Teachers, will urge the juvenile protection chairman of each PTA to launch a concerted drive to encourage both children and parents to report the robberies.

And Deputy School Superintendent John M. Riecks says if police believe a report-the-crime campaign will be useful, the schools will hold anti-crime assemblies as soon as school starts—beginning with the trouble spots, particularly in Southeast Washington.

Meanwhile, the mother of one newsboy has her own answer.

"For my own peace of mind," she said, "I walk with him when he's collecting. As soon as he gets a dollar bill, I take it. At least when I'm with him, I know he's all right."

Meddling in the Congo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 12, 1967

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Meddling in the Congo," published in the Washington Evening Star of July 12, 1967.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEDDLING IN THE CONGO

Some administration officials are said to have been "irked" by the vigorous criticism in the Senate of the President's decision to send American planes and troops into the Congo. If these officials were wise, they would welcome the criticism. For it serves timely notice that there is not and will not be any support in similar circumstances for this kind of meddling in the internal affairs of the Congo or any other country.

It is being said, belatedly and lamely, that the three military transports with their load of troops were flown to the Congo to cool off rising anti-white sentiment in that country. But this isn't what was said originally. The story at the outset was that we were responding to a call for logistical help from Congo President Mobutu in putting down an uprising by some of his own troops and a few "white mercenaries." This, we think, is the right explanation.

Much has been made of the wicked role of the white mercenaries—two or three hundred men. Very little has been said about the fact that these mercenaries, far from having been parachuted into the Congo, as was at first claimed, have been on the payroll of the Congolese government for years. Nor has much been said about reports by white refugees from the affected area that the mercenaries were outnumbered by rebelling Congolese troops in Katanga province, and that they had no choice except to go along with the rebellion. Finally, a bit more emphasis should be put on the fact that it was Mobutu's troops, not the rebels or the mercenaries, who butchered some 60 civilians in the town of Bukavu, women and children included.

On the basis of the known facts, there was not the slightest justification for the decision to intervene in what is apparently just another internal Congolese disturbance. And in our view, Senator Russell, chairman of the Armed Services Committee, was exactly right when he said "we should have enough common sense to keep our heads, and keep our people out of situations of this kind." Majority Leader Mansfield was among those who spoke up in support of Senator Russell, and not one voice was raised in the Senate in defense of the administration's action.

The lesson should be taken to heart. The President can count upon support when he is forced to intervene in a foreign country pursuant to a treaty obligation or when some vital national interest of ours is at stake. Intervention will not and should not be supported when, as in the case of the Congo, neither of these justifications is present.

Israel and the Soviet Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 12, 1967

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, in a recent issue of the American Examiner, two articles appeared concerning the relationship between Israel and the Soviet Union.

The article written by Rabbi Philip R. Alstat presents six reasons for Soviet anti-Semitism, and the editorial expresses shock at hearing the Soviets compare Zionism with nazism.

I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following items which appeared in the June 22, 1967, edition of the American Examiner:

TO UNDERSTAND SOVIET ENMITY FOR JEWS AND ISRAEL

(By Rabbi Philip R. Alstat)

(At the time of this writing it is reported that Premier Kosygin of the Soviet Union is on his way to address the General Assembly of the U.N. Presumably it is for the purpose of undoing Israel's victory on the battlefield by a vicious anti-Israel propaganda campaign in the forum of the UN. For an understanding of the complex motives which feed Russian hostility for Jews in general and Israel in particular we reprint this column of May 21, 1964.)

Why should the mighty Soviet Union embracing so many republics, nationalities, ethnic and religious groups, whose total population is in excess of two hundred and twenty million, single out its insignificant minority of three million Jews and the tiny state of Israel as the special objects of hostility and persecution. For a plausible explanation we present six possible answers culled from various sources.

1. DEEPLY ROOTED ANTI-SEMITISM

The poisons of virulent anti-Semitism have been circulating in the Russian body politic for centuries under the Czars. This is attested by that nation's literature and its record of pogroms and ritual murder accusations. It is therefore not surprising that its residual remains are still embedded in Russian phychology. Officially it is forbidden by the letter of the Soviet constitution, but unofficially it is encouraged and practiced by the top-most officials from the Polit-Bureau down.

2. TO PLEASE ARABS

In the struggle between the democratic and communist blocs for influence and power in the oil-rich Arab lands Soviet Russia is eager to prove that it is the truest friend of the Arabs. It is expected that Russian-Arab friendship will be the more strongly cemented by the hatred of a common enemy—the Jews and the state of Israel.

3. LENIN'S TEACHINGS

Lenin, one of the major prophets of the communist faith, stated in his pre-revolutionary writings—which are part of the hallowed communist bible—that Jews do not constitute a people, since they do not inhabit a common territory or speak a common language. He was therefore opposed to the Zionist ideal of the Jewish national renaissance and favored instead complete Jewish assimilation. After the revolution the Bolshevist regime did attempt at first to establish an autonomous Jewish republic in Birobidjan—probably as a counter-attraction to Zion—but since Jews refused to settle there, the Kremlin reverted to Lenin's policy of forced Jewish assimilation.

4. THE NEED FOR A SCAPEGOAT

To retain power, dictators must maintain their reputation for omniscience and infallibility. However, when their highly publicized five- or seven-year plans miscarry—as had in recent years become apparent in the lag of Russian agriculture—the frustrated dictators must then divert popular discontent and wrath from themselves to some convenient scapegoat. This unenviable role is frequently forced upon Russian Jews, who are then stigmatized as swindlers, black-marketeers, currency speculators and spies.

5. CONSTITUTE A SECURITY RISK

In government circles Russian Jews are regarded as a grave security risk for the Soviet Union. First, because Jews are by nature strongly individualistic, sophisticated, soberly critical and therefore (except for the few occupying high positions in the hierachy) incapable of being truly enthusiastic about the communist philosophy, aims and methods. Secondly, because of their ineradicable emotional attachment to their fellow-Jews everywhere and especially to the state of Israel. These inextinguishable Jewish loyalties lead the suspicious Russian authorities to visualize the following chain of transmission: Many Jewish scientists are engaged in secret military research projects. From them their elderly parents may derive confidential information and pass it on to Israeli diplomats in conversations at synagogue services, and they in turn may pass it on to American intelligence agents.

6. JUDAISM IS FEARED MOST

As a matter of fact the Soviet government aims to suppress all religions, including Christianity and Islam, but none is attacked as vehemently and venomously as is Judaism. To explain this complex phenomenon this sixth theory is added to the foregoing.

It has been suggested that dictators fear the Jewish Bible more than the New Testament. For the ancient Hebrew prophets were utterly fearless in denouncing the evils and sins of kings and queens, while in the New Testament Peter and Paul urged meek submission to the ruling powers. (I Peter 2:13–4; 18–9. Paul to the Romans 13:1–7)

STALIN'S BOYS IN ACTION

When the Soviets' "distinguished" representative at the UN Security Council, Mr. Fedorenko, attempted to equate Zionism with Nazism, some observers attributed it to fatigue, lack of sleep and general tension prevailing at the special session of the Council. But when the same tune was taken up by the Moscow radio, by Pravda and Tass, it became obvious that the Soviets were resolved to outdo the late Hitler and Goebels in stooping to the lowest depths of cynical immorality. Indeed, human credibility must stagger and collapse to hear Moscow accuse the Israelis—and by extension all Jews—of duplicating the brutality of the Nazis, at whose hands six million Jews lost their lives. This kind of chutzpah is unbelieveable. But it's there; it was placed on the line by the Soviets themselves for all the world to see and hear.

One wonders where do the Soviet leaders get the unmitigated gall to call the Israelis Nazis. Is it because they, the Moscow rulers, signed the Hitler-Stalin pact and thus created the conditions which made possible World War II? Is it because the Soviets invaded tiny Finland in 1937 in an act of naked Red imperialist aggression? It is because Moscow double-crossed the heroic fighters against Franco in the Spanish civil war? Is it because of Moscow's treacherous role when Hitler's panzer divisions overran Poland? Is it because the Soviets through the use of sheer force and treachery conquered Latvia, Lithuania, and several other East European countries? Is it because of the murderous aggression by Moscow against the people of Hungary in 1956?

With the kind of record the Soviets have piled up since coming to power half a century ago perhaps we need not wonder, after all, why they have the blend of impudence and arrogance to employ the Nazi strategy of the Big Lie, why they are so lacking in human decency and regard for the truth as to resort to the lowest tactics in their drive to win Arab favor.

And another thing: let us not forget who these gentlemen of Moscow are: they are Stalin's pupils. That they exposed Stalin for the monster he was when it suited their purposes after his demise only proves the point. Where were they when Stalin was committing the horrendous crimes against humanity? Where were the Kosygins, the Brezhnevs, the Khrushchevs and their pals when Stalin was torturing and murdering his whilom comrades and committing genocide against national minorities who refused to toe the mark? The answer is, they were fawning upon their great god Stalin and carrying out his orders. They were Stalin's eager-beaver boys.

Having described Stalin's criminal nature, they described themselves. Having all that blood on their hands they feel no compunction in offering to help the Arabs to finish Hitler's job of genocide against the Jews.

The Free Society Isn't Free

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 12, 1967

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, ever lurking behind the come-on and ballyhoo of "giveaway" programs is the rock-bottom realization that big brother has nothing to give that it first does not take away from its productive citizens.

The House recently went through the acrobatics of reversing itself by raising the national debt limit. Some of the stalwarts who reversed their earlier vote rationalized that by authorizing the borrowing of money under planned deficit spending, a tax increase against the people might be avoided.

But, weeks later, the intellectual genius that plans how to control our economy says there is too much money in circulation and the bottom is about to drop out of the buying power of our dollar. So, in order to get the easy money out of circulation, to control inflation resulting from the newly authorized Federal borrowing, these mental manipulators to dry up spending turn on the people as the wasteful culprits who must suffer greater loss of wages to spend by having more taxes taken from their paychecks.

Real education—to tax the man who works and supports the whole motley mess of programed vote-buying gimmicks, as if he does not know how to spend his money. To take from the worker and give our money to big brother's disciples—as if they know better how to spend it than the wage earner.

If a controlled spending is the answer, why not a 100-percent tax on all incomes and profits and let the bureaucrats issue the people coupons or tickets for the necessities of life? After all, in an affluent society, income and savings are no longer an incentive to life or progress. Some would have us live and breathe primarily to finance our social planners and, like so many pawns, to prove their theories, forcefully if necessary.

Sooner or later the American people will tire of being controlled through their pocketbooks and threatened by fearful consequences which they did not cause, unless it be to sit obediently back and by inaction and silence ratify.

Small wonder it requires so much "higher" education to become a Federal Reserve expert—one must learn how to dream up educated excuses for legally taking over his fellow countryman's wealth.

This free society is not free unless it be free to take away. How long, Mr. and Mrs. American, before they hear your ouch? They would have us believe this is for your good and that you like it.

Mr. Speaker, I insert the Associated Press release of July 2, 1967, in the RECORD:

ECONOMISTS URGING INCREASE IN FEDERAL INCOME TAXATION

NEW YORK (AP).—Pressure for a federal income tax increase grew this past week.

William McChesney Martin Jr., chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, and Gardner Ackley, chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, urged prompt action and suggested that the boost should be higher than originally proposed by President Johnson.

But Leon H. Keyserling, former chairman of the economic advisers, called the proposal "ill-timed and unwise."

Johnson recommended to Congress last January a 6 per cent surcharge on corporate and personal income taxes. The administration has yet to submit such legislation but it is expected to reach Congress during July.

"I am firmly convinced that we must have adequate, effective—and above all-prompt tax action that would wittle down the prospective deficit for the coming fiscal year to one of manageable proportions," Martin said.

NO DELAY NEEDED

Martin added that the economy was showing signs of moving ahead after a sluggish first half and that he would support quick action on a higher surcharge "for delay would permit inflationary forces to gain momentum."

Ackley told Congress that an income tax boost was needed to avert renewed inflation and higher interest rates later this year and in 1968.

Keyserling contended that a tax rise would "further restrain an economy which now needs a program for balanced acceleration of the rate of growth."

With the economy beginning to show signs of more life, some government analysts now say they expect the gross national product—total of all goods and services—to advance by about $10 billion during the second quarter of this year.

This would compare with a gain in the first quarter of $4.4 billion.

The Commerce Department estimated the GNP at an annual rate of $763.7 billion during the first quarter. The Council of Economic Advisers last January projected the GNP for this year at $787 billion.

The Labor Department reported this past week another sharp rise in the cost of living in May. Its consumer price index climbed three-tenths of one per cent to 115.6, which was 2.7 per cent higher than a year ago. This means that it cost $11.56 to purchase items costing $10 in the 1957–59 base period.

The largest increases were in the prices of apparel, used cars, medical care and the cost of running a house.

SOME ORDERS UP

Orders for machine tools in May totaled $110.7 million, up 7 per cent from $103.45 million in April but well below $158.8 million in May 1966, the National Machine Tool Builders Association reported.

Tool builders said the May orders were helped by confidence that restoration of the 7 per cent business investment tax credit, retroactive to March 10, would be enacted. The legislation was signed into law this month.

F. W. Dodge Co., a construction information service, said the construction industry continued to recover in May.

All construction contracts last month totaled $5,094,827,000, topping any month this year and coming within 1 per cent of the record $5,131,660,000 in May 1966.

Dodge said the recovery for the most part has been "a revival in housing as mortgage funds became available."

Automobile production for the week began to taper off prior to scheduled model-change close-downs of most makers next month. Output was estimated at 171,000 passenger cars, off 2.2 per cent from 175,039 the previous week and off 3.3 per cent from 177,022 a year earlier.

Steel output during the week edged up 1.8 per cent to 2.25 million tons from 2.21 million the previous week.

U.S. Sawmill in Vietnam Aids Pacification Efforts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 12, 1967

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to read the other day that the U.S. mission in Saigon has worked out details of its new pacification team plan in which civilian advisers in Vietnam retain an active role under the military command.

I would like to place in the RECORD today a heart-warming account of a U.S. Forest Service adviser's experience on one pacification project in the Central Highlands of Vietnam.

I believe it exemplifies what we are trying to accomplish, and what an effective civilian-military team can do.

It is in the form of a letter from Jay Cravens, Forest Service team leader in Vietnam, to Edward P. Cliff, Chief of the Forest Service.

The text of the letter follows:

Last week we went to Tra Bong, a remote Montagnard hamlet in a deep valley of the Central Highlands of Viet Nam. Our purpose was to set up the Mighty Mite Sawmill and to train villagers in its operation. On arrival, I was delighted to see a deck of about 100 logs. The people of Tra Bong had clearly been at work, confident that we would return in accordance with our promises.

On May 16 we set up the mill and by 4:30 p.m. were ready to begin sawing. For the first 30 minutes the village Chief manipulated the controls. Some 300 villagers were awed by this "walking machine that made boards." During the days that followed we trained six refugees in the operation of the small portable sawmill. Others were trained to handle the lumber including stacking and drying. Up to 100 loggers were trained in the utilization of logs.

Security prevented us from accompanying the loggers to the logging areas. Most of the logs to date have been salvaged from recent Montagnard areas of shifting cultivation. Logs are transported up to ¾ of a mile by two methods. One involves men carrying the logs by means of poles suspended from their shoulders. The other method employs a very primitive logging arch with wheels cut from hardwood logs. Up to 20 men drag, push, and pull these heavy logs down a steep jungle hillside, across a 200-foot river, up the other side, and down a primitive village road to the mill site.

Production by the time I left the operation on May 22 aggregated about 5-cubic meters of lumber. Not very much, but based on current market values worth about $850 US. This is the first income these people have had in many years.

They were proud to be working and earning their rice and fish sauce. In the opinion of those of us who helped with this project the venture has done wonders for the morale of the people.

This project was made possible through the efforts of many—Captain Tung, District Chief; Director Tan of the Vietnamese Forest Service who approved salvage of this timber; the private businessmen in the U.S. who ran the risk of bringing their sawmill into the country; Captain James E. Callahan and his Green Berets, eight of whom provided for the security and odds and ends of vital miscellaneous supplies (including the safety of sandbag bunkers for their "round eyed" guests); the USAID/USDA foresters who gave technical guidance and moral support to the people of Tra Bong; and last and perhaps the most important, Tran Cao Thuong, Administrative Assistant of the Forestry Branch, who accurately and faithfully served as our interpreter to convey technical, mechanical, and other instructions to the people.

The job was not accomplished without problems. The daytime temperatures at the mill site ranged from a cool 110° to 117° F. The operation had all the aspects of setting up a sawmill in the middle of a heavily-used rifle range—shots were heard at all times, and some even landed in nearby rice paddies.

Loggers were contacted daily by the heavy population of Viet Cong. I am sure that I handed out tobacco and shook hands with local Viet Cong. We learned that the Viet Cong was totally confused as what to do—in other words, to blow up the mill, shoot up the camp and village, or tax and tolerate the operation. So far they are doing the latter. Since my first visit to Tra Bong about a month ago, numerous Cheiu Hoi have come in, and last Monday an entire platoon of Viet Cong sent in word that they would come into Tra Bong and surrender their arms. These Chieu Hoi are coming in for a variety of reasons. The District Chief kept emphasizing that one was the little forestry project that we had helped organize. He said that this promise of employment and prospect of coming home to be with their families was most important.

I have derived a great deal of satisfaction and pride in helping these poverty stricken people without much hope, to start a productive enterprise. This is what I came to Viet Nam for. I know the others who shared in this experience feel the same way.

New Credibility Gap

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD RUMSFELD
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 12, 1967

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, responsible fiscal and monetary policies can be predicated only on accurate, up-to-date information. The administration's underestimate by $10 billion of the cost of pursuing the war in Vietnam last year and the consequent reverberations throughout the economy illustrates the importance of careful and candid expenditure estimates.

Yet, the administration is straining our economic credibility again this year with underestimates of expenditures reliably reported to run from $4 billion to $6 billion.

The Christian Science Monitor comments on the problems facing the Congress absent accurate expenditure estimates. The Monitor labels its editoral as the "New Credibility Gap," and it clearly is a gap which must be closed.

The editorial follows:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, July 10, 1967]

NEW CREDIBILITY GAP

The effect of the rising cost of the Vietnamese war on the American economy—and the American taxpayer—will be bad enough under the best of conditions. But it becomes worse when the government fails to take the ordinary precautions required in such cases. First and foremost of these precautions is to keep the nation's fiscal and economic watchdogs informed of the full cost of the war.

This, we are told, the government has not been doing. In an unwontedly sharp report, the Congressional Joint Economic Committee charges that the administration's $10 billion underestimate on last year's cost of the war played "havoc" with the national economy. Even worse, the report warned that "the same dreary cycles of events threaten again in 1967," adding that this year's underestimate now seems likely to run from $4 billion to $6 billion.

The committee rightly points out that it is impossible to do adequate economic and financial planning under such circumstances. This is particularly so in the field of taxation, an area crucially important when the nation is faced with the strong inflationary pressures which exist today. When war-cost estimates can be out by as much as $16 billion over a two-year period, it is obvious that Congress does not have the facts which can enable it to move with confidence on so ticklish a topic as taxes.

But, perhaps worse than even this is the doubt which such administration laxity raises in the average citizen's mind. It revives the old, divisive issue of the "credibility gap."

Furthermore, this new attack on the administration's credibility comes at the very moment when the nation is entering what is bound to be a harsh debate over whether to send heavy reinforcements to the battlefields. Since such reinforcements would, on their own, require many billions of additional dollars, it becomes all the harder for either Congress or the man-in-the-street to know just how much the war is costing and how much it is likely to affect everyone's pocketbook.

It is long since time that the administration keep the country fully up to date on all aspects of the war. Not to do so is inexcusable.

Emhart President Tells Trenton Division Employees Food Still Top Buy for Family Dollar

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 12, 1967

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, last fall's housewives boycott and picketing of supermarkets to protest food prices is still fresh in the memory. Many housewives are convinced that there is some mysterious middleman reaping huge profits between the time the food leaves the farm and the time it reaches their table.

Recently, I read a most interesting analysis of this complete subject by the president of a firm deeply involved in the food business. The letter was written by G. J. Doyle, president of Emhart Corp., to employees of the company's Hill Refrigeration Division in my home city of Trenton, N.J., where food freezer cabinets are manufactured.

Mr. Doyle's letter candidly reviewed the whole food price controversy. I commend this objective analysis of a complicated subject to the attention of my colleagues.

Mr. Doyle's letter follows:

HILL REFRIGERATION,
Trenton, N.J., June 22, 1967.

To All Hill Employees:

You are well aware, I'm sure, of the controversy that's been running over food prices. Have the games, the advertising contests, the stamps, the give-aways pushed the cost of food higher than it should be? Are profits too high in the food industry?

As a consumer, you'd naturally be interested in the answers. But each one of you shares with me a more professional interest in these questions, because of our Company's closeness to the food industry for more than 75 years.

What's true and what's false in the food prices argument? Well, as is often the case, there's a little of both involved. We need to understand profit structure, costs, competition and an array of economic factors that bear on the problem. To many of us these considerations are hard to pin down, to see in black-and-white terms. What is real and undeniable is the fact that the prices of meat, fruit, milk, etc. have gone up. But are they overpriced?

My first caution is, let's look more closely at the statistics. It sounds ominous when a government agency, with all its prestige, announces that food prices are rising 2 to 3 per cent. But that doesn't tell us that food nowadays takes only 18c of our take-home dollar—the lowest level in 38 years. In France, food takes 31c of the citizen's dollar; in Italy, 43c; in Japan, 46c; and in Russia, 53c.

When the headlines tell us that food prices rose 3 per cent we get aroused. But did we get as alarmed when the price of a newspaper rose 30 per cent (from 7c to 10c), or when shoes rose 6 per cent, or public transportation went up 7 per cent? Even the usually voceriferous New York subway riders bore up silently and calmly to a 33 per cent increase in subway fares and, later, the same rise in bus fares.

It's all a matter of perspective. The combination of our own natural inclination to leap to conclusions and the half-of-a-story we often get on a subject creates a substantial "understanding gap."

Take the area of profits—least understood of all. The biggest supermarket chains in the industry earn 1 to 1½ per cent of sales in profits. When you operate on a margin so thin that you can make only a penny-and-a-half on a dollar sale, it's obvious that you can't cut prices 18 to 20 per cent across the board, as some demand. Let me be even more specific. Grand Union, one of our good customers, makes 1.3c net profit on each dollar. On a $6 food order they don't make even a dime of profit. If they waste one grocery bag (cost 1.3c) they lose the entire profit on a $1 sale. If they were to eliminate all profit from a $10 basket of food you'd still pay $9.87.

Now I'm not trying to generate sympathy for the chains. But you should understand this to appreciate that A&P's record sales last year of nearly $5½ billion stems from their improved performance and operating efficiency, *not* from raising prices. They and their competitors use every new device, technique and system to get the maximum economy from their own operations. They have to. It's a way of life with an industry where half the merchandise is perishable and sales are rung up in units of pennies.

People are easily confused about profits. Opinion polls invariably show that people think businesses average about 20 per cent profit, while they think 10 per cent would be "fair." A profit of less than 2 per cent is, apparently, inconceivable to them; yet that is the fact in the food industry, as I've pointed out.

Further, despite what you may read, the cost of all the promotion-advertising games, give-aways, stamps, etc., is only about 2c on the dollar. If they were completely eliminated you'd save only 20c on a $10 order!

Now, even if you agree to all of this, you know simply by looking in your pocketbook that food costs more today. No one denies this. Again, virtually everything costs more today than it did a few years ago. Using the 1957–59 period as a base, to compare with 1967, medical expenses increased 28.3 per cent more than food; recreation 14.3 per cent more than food; and home ownership nearly 13 per cent more than food.

And I might point out here that the gasoline "wars" that have run rampant for the past year made little lasting impact; the price of gasoline and motor oil has risen 5 per cent since April a year ago. The analogy to food may be remote, but the trend toward increased costs, consumer objection notwithstanding, is clear-cut.

Look closely at your grocery bill. How much is food and how much non-food items? Statistically they tell us that about 20 per cent of the average grocery bill is for items to read, wear or listen to—not to mention beer, cigarettes, cleaners, and pet food.

But maybe there's another reason we feel the "pinch"—one that has nothing directly to do with food prices. It's simply that we're eating more—hungry teenagers will wreak havoc with any food budget—and we're eating better, more expensive foods. For example, more meat, more canned and frozen fruits, juices and vegetables. We're buying proportionately less of the inexpensive—but more fattening—foods such as flour, pork, poultry, macaroni, and rice.

So, as one newspaper columnist suggests, the so-called "squeeze" may be a result of what you buy, how you buy, and for whom and how much you buy. Whatever the costs, it still absorbs only 18 cents out of the average family's spending dollar.

Or, to look at it another way, the average cost, per person, when a family sits down to eat is less than 50 cents per meal and it took you about the equivalent of a day's work to earn the money to buy a week's supply of farm food, as contrasted to the 13½ hours it required back in 1949.

We must also be mindful of the convenience factors that exist today in prepared foods, with reduction of work hours for the housewife to spend in the kitchen in preparing food for the family dinner. With all these conveniences, the above facts still stand.

There are many ways you can economize without changing your food selection habits. Buy private label brands, watch for the weekly specials, buy family packages of meat, buy cheaper but equally nutritious cuts of meat, and so on. No doubt you have many techniques of your own.

The point is that food is still one of the best buys, per dollar, we make daily—even if you have filet mignon for breakfast.

Since you, as a Hill employee, and your family are vitally interested in the food industry, it is our suggestion that you not only realize the above facts, but also communicate with your friends and neighbors in establishing the facts of life concerning food prices. Lack of factual knowledge on a subject as vital as this often allows a person to be confused; hence, the action that we have taken in preparing this summary outline.

Sincerely yours,

G. J. DOYLE, *President.*

Preying on the Innocent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 10, 1967

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, Miriam Ottenberg, Star staff writer, for the Sunday Star has written an excellent article entitled "Boys Who Work With Fear." I happen to know from personal experience that much of what Miss Ottenberg has said in this article is true. This is, indeed, a difficult situation and the juvenile court will certainly have to reorganize in such a way as to be able to handle repeaters and reprisals. Apparently, reprisal is an important part of keeping the police from knowing how many of these incidents take place.

It is a sad situation that the Capital of the country has to make such a report as is contained in Miss Ottenberg's article. There is no way to correct such a situation without adequate publicity. Miss Ottenberg has rendered a distinct service to the District of Columbia in this fine piece of reporting. I recommend that everyone read it carefully:

PREYING ON THE INNOCENT: BOYS WHO WORK WITH FEAR

(By Mariam Ottenberg)

THE PROBLEM

Every day, somewhere in Washington, a working boy is yoked and robbed. Sometimes, a knife is pressed against his side to back up a demand for money. Often, half a dozen youths gang up on him.

Always, fear is a weapon—the victim's fear of reprisal if he tells who was involved in what has happened to him.

Parents, sharing the fear, hesitate to let their sons report the robbery to police. Sometimes a boy is too terrified even to tell his mother.

If the crime is reported, the young victim often claims he can't identify his assailants although they may go to the same school or use the same playground.

This aura of fear settles not only on the boy and his parents but on whole neighborhood. No one wants to get involved.

Only rarely do young robbers carry out their threat to "get" their victim if he identifies them, but the fear of retaliation is always there. What adult—much less a 12-year-old newsboy—feels comfortable about putting the finger on a knife-wielding bandit? After all, he knows from experience that Juvenile Court is going to put the young criminal back on the streets within a couple of days if he's kept in custody at all.

Even the most cursory check of juvenile records shows the hoodlum is quite likely to remain at large through half a dozen yoke robberies, housebreaking and car-stealing episodes.

In Washington now, the young criminals are riding high because—as they brag openly—nobody can touch them. They've beaten the rap, as they see it, and they want their friends to know it. They've got the law on their side. All the talk they hear about their "constitutional rights" makes them feel they've really made the "big time."

Meanwhile, the number of young victims of juvenile robbers has risen sharply. In the first 10 months of this fiscal year, 456 children under 16 years of age were robbed, compared with 48 young victims for all of fiscal 1957—an 850 per cent increase. Studies of robbery reports show that the majority of the young victims were working boys.

That's why The Star decided to investigate the plight of working boys and to seek ways to curb the runaway rampage of juvenile robbery gangs, particularly with school out and honest teen-agers trying to earn money.

With public officials and community leaders calling for employment opportunities for juveniles to keep them out of trouble, The Star found too little attention being paid to the juveniles who already work but are being robbed of the fruits of their employment by other juveniles. And sometimes they're robbed of the jobs, too.

For the young robbery victims, feeling like marked men, have given up their newspaper carrier jobs, stopped spending their Saturdays delivering groceries or have quit any work that kept them on the street after dark.

PROFILES OF VICTIMS

Often the term "disadvantaged" is used to excuse juvenile criminals but it applies just as well to their victims. The working boys come from the same neighborhoods and frequently have faced greater deprivations than their assailants. Eighty-four percent of this year's young victims have been Negro.

By far the majority of the working boys who get robbed range in age from 11 to 15 years. The bullies always pick on the smaller or weaker, but there's another reason why younger boys become the targets. They're known to have money at certain times and their work often takes them on the streets alone after dark.

As a group, probably the most frequent victims are the newspaper carrier boys collecting on their routes. About 10 of them a week are now being robbed by other juveniles.

Another hard-hit group are the boys of Organized Community Youth for D.C. Inc. (OCY), who wear badges, obey a set of rules and earn their money in tips by hauling packages for grocery customers.

A few years ago, one of these boys saved $3,000 toward his college education with tips collected during four years of carrying packages. No longer.

A mother last week recalled her grocery-carrying son brought home $8 in tips one Saturday. Since he had been bringing home only $2 or $3 a week, she asked if he were getting bigger tips.

"No," he said. "The big guys weren't around today so I got to keep all my tips."

That was how she learned her son had been robbed week after week.

Organized Community Youth used to have grocery-carrying boys at 26 groceries. The group had to give up serving four stores because of frequent attacks on boys on their way back from delivering the groceries.

In the 22 remaining stores served by OCY, delivery boys at four or five stores are now being robbed weekly.

How many working boys have been robbed in Washington this year and kept quiet about it is anybody's guess. A national estimate puts the unreported robbery figure at 50 per cent. It could run higher among the young victims here.

MOTHER BACKS SILENCE

A Southeast mother explained why she didn't let her young son report being beaten and robbed as he was returning from his service station job one night. "This time," she said, "they used fists. If he tells police what happened, next time they may come after him with a knife."

One newsboy was so terrorized by the robbers that he determined to make good the loss of his subscriber's money out of his savings rather than tell even his mother that he'd been threatened with the jagged edges of a broken bottle unless he emptied his pockets.

Occasionally, robbery comes to light because the boy is injured. One boy suffered fractured ribs. Another had his front teeth knocked out. Often the victims require treatment for cuts.

Sometimes, working boys are beaten after the gangs get their money. A 14-year-old was smashed in the jaw by a young robber who warned him: "Next time, don't tell me you don't have any money." Two days later, the boy spotted his assailant and alerted police. But the boy's parents decided there wasn't going to be a "next time" for their son to be robbed. They made him give up his newspaper route.

Experiences of youthful victims in the Fifth Precinct are typical of what's happening to working boys in many parts of the city. This year, in less than five months, more than 30 Southeast juveniles were robbed and all but a few were working boys.

These excerpts from Fifth Precinct reports tell the story:

"Youth with Abe Lincoln beard jumped out of the bushes and pointed a small black pistol at him."

"Surrounded by eight boys who told him if he ran they would hit him with stick. Took $27.42."

"Approached from behind by three youths. One pointed long-bladed knife at him while second got $17 from his pockets."

"Four boys took $32 and then beat him about face and stomach. One wore stocking mask."

"Three boys went through his pockets and got $16. Victim then beaten about face and knocked to ground where he covered his face to prevent further injury."

ACTIONS ARE ADULT

These are the nightmarish encounters which go under the misnomer of "misconduct." Tomes have been written of late about juvenile misconduct by such authorities as Supreme Court justices and the National Crime Commission but the District's young robbers don't match the popular descriptions of the juvenile delinquent.

They may be classed as children but they rob like adults, and nearly as often. Juveniles accounted for 46 percent of all robbery arrests in the District during fiscal 1965 and 42 percent during fiscal 1966. Nationally, juveniles accounted for only 28 percent of robbery arrests.

The number of juvenile arrests for robbery in Washington rose from 191 for all of fiscal 1957 to 725 in fiscal 1965 and 598 in fiscal 1966. Juvenile authorities predict a sharp increase this year.

As an influence for bad among teenagers, the effect of these juvenile robbers is incalculable. In April, one week after a Northwest newsboy was robbed and lost $51 in newspaper collections, he was arrested himself with two others for robbing a newsboy. He was tired of fighting the gangs so he joined them. He's been in trouble ever since.

In another case, a bigger boy threatened to beat up a youngster if he didn't hand over $10 by the next day. Terrorized, the younger boy stole $10 from his mother's pocketbook. That was his introduction to crime.

PATTERN OF OFFENDERS

The Star's study of juveniles who rob juveniles shows some meaningful patterns.

Usually, they're no longer first offenders when they start yoke-robbery.

Earlier, they've tried their hand at shoplifting and housebreaking. When they move from crimes against property to crimes against the person, their first targets are the working boys.

The young criminals don't buy food or clothing with their loot because it wasn't hunger for necessities that made them rob. More often, the money goes into the nearest pinball machine or to adults who'll buy whisky for them.

These "children" may be arrested five times times a year but, more often than not, their only experience behind locked doors is a night or two in the Receiving Home. They're supposed to get rehabilitated in the community but, all too often, their only change is to become more confident that they can get away with the next offense.

They used to admit their "involvement." Now they deny it. They know they can keep silent when police question them. They want a lawyer. They ask for a jury trial. They are told they're entitled to a face-to-face meeting with the witnesses who speak against them. They know their rights.

That's apparently the way the Supreme Court justices want it—all but Justice John M. Harlan, who thinks the court has gone too far in some ways and not far enough in others, and Justice Potter Stewart, dissenting all the way, who warns that the court is inviting "a long step backward into the 19th century."

COURT DECISION EFFECTS

Why are so many juvenile offenders left to roam the streets? Here's how court decisions have contributed:

1. The Supreme Court says the boys should have lawyers and the lawyers demand jury trials—even thought the judicial conference here a few years back suggested abolishing jury trials in Juvenile Court. At the end of May, 31 juveniles were waiting to be tried by juries, the highest in the history of the court. Half the jury demands were made by the group that represents many of the boys—Neighborhood Legal Services. Meantime, the boys are free to rob again.

2. The U.S. Court of Appeals has overwhelmed Juvenile Court with so many new time-consuming procedures that a juvenile robber arrested today won't appear before the judge until late September, if he faces the judge at all. One jury trial, for instance, occupies the hours that could be spent on 25 initial hearings—the first and often the only time a juvenile comes face to face with the judge.

3. The appellate court's wide-open invitation to lawyers to test other aspects of Juvenile Court law has prompted more motions, arguments and hearings that spring-board the cases to the higher court while the juveniles involved in it all are often free to spring-board from one offense to another.

4. Even when they are tried, found involved and committed, the commitment has

a way of coming apart and the boy is put on the street again. The latest such case, by coincidence, mirrored many elements of The Star's investigation.

A 17-year-old with two unknown companions allegedly grabbed a 13-year-old newsboy in pre-dawn darkness, struck him in the eye and demanded money. A jury found the youth "involved" and committed him to the National Training School. Then a Neighborhood Legal Services lawyer appealed the boy's commitment and the D.C. Court of Appeals ruled that a verdict of "involved" was too vague and indefinite to satisfy the constitutional requirement of due process now laid down by the Supreme Court.

Conviction reversed. The boy is now free to go his way unless the corporation counsel wants to start all over again, which is highly unlikely.

If a finding of "involved" or "guilty" does stand, probation is much more likely for the youth than either commitment to an institution or a waiver of the case to District Court for trial as an adult.

Juveniles who are not really juvenile any more figure the percentages. What are the odds for continued freedom? Right now, the odds are with them, despite these two pointers the other way:

1. The number of delinquents referred to Juvenile Court this fiscal year hit an all-time high weeks before the fiscal year ended.

2. Robbery is a crime against the person and thus more dangerous than property crimes, and juvenile robberies are on the increase.

More crimes, yes, and more dangerous crimes, but the number of boys committed because of their crime sprees has gone steadily downward.

At Cedar Knoll, the Welfare Department's institution for older delinquents, the average daily population decreased from 465 in April, 1966, to 391 in April, 1967. Admissions likewise dropped, from 63 in April, 1966, to 44 this April. Lack of space didn't hold down the commitments, either. Space hasn't been a problem at Cedar Knoll for 10 years.

Washington's young toughs aren't bulging the National Training School for Boys, either. Currently, only 80 District boys are lodged in the training school compared with 113 in June, 1966, when the rate of serious juvenile crime was considerably lower.

STUDY OF CASES

What's happening to the boys picked up repeatedly for preying on other boys? The Star delved into eight cases where the juvenile had included such robberies among their assorted crimes. Of the eight offenders—all with sizable records—only one had been committed to an institution. The others are still on the street.

The case of a 14-year-old is typical.

He had been picked up and warned by police repeatedly since 1963 for such offenses as beating up a boy, disorderly conduct, shouting curses and petty larceny where a shop owner declined to prosecute.

In October, 1966, he climbed to the roof of a garage and damaged cars stored there. He was charged with unlawful entry and made his first trip to Juvenile Court. It was a short trip because the case against him was dropped and the boy never went before the judge.

Two weeks later, police caught him and two other boys when they broke into a beauty parlor. That time, he faced the judge. On December 12, 1966, he admitted his involvement and the case was continued for disposition.

A week after that court appearance, he was arrested with four other boys in a vacant house piled high with stolen merchandise. Police charged him and the other boys with two housebreakings. The boy showed police how he had entered some 34 other stores on burglary expeditions since February but he wasn't charged in those cases.

Juvenile Court officials decided not to take the boy before a judge even in the two housebreakings where the loot had been recovered and the boy had been caught with it.

Now the boy's criminal career shifted from housebreaking to robbery.

On January 21, 1967, he joined seven or eight others in ganging up on a 16-year-old grocery employe and demanding his money. The 14-year-old robber was caught near the scene. He didn't see the judge that time either. The intake section decided against it on the grounds that the boy denied the offense which would have meant a trial; he was already under court jurisdiction, although the first case still hadn't been disposed of, and he was being seen at the adolescent clinic.

In March, with another boy, he yoke-robbed a 12-year-old newsboy and took $11.40 from his pocket. Again he denied the robbery and gave police an alibi which turned out to be false. The victim identified him. This case wasn't presented to the judge either. The youth was still awaiting disposition of the original case—the housebreaking for which he had seen the judge more than three months earlier.

On May 18, he robbed for the third time in five months. He pushed a boy against the wall of a school building, pulled up his shirt and took the money the boy had hidden under his belt. When police picked him up this time, they decided it wasn't safe to leave him in the community any more. They put him in the Receiving Home.

On May 22, he was taken from the Receiving Home to appear before the court's hearing officer for disposition of the housebreaking in which he had been caught the previous November.

None of the three robberies had gotten the boy to the judge. The hearing officer didn't even known about the robbery four days earlier. He put the 14-year-old robber on probation.

Juvenile Court records show a boy can stay on probation through a series of robberies. The case of a 17-year-old tells a story repeated many times:

After six robberies, he's still on probation.

The continued presence of these juvenile robbers on the streets contributes to the victims' sense of hopelessness and adds to the fear of reprisal. What's the use of risking a beating by reporting the robbery, the victims ask, when nothing changes for the one who does the robbing—and the threatening, too?

Cause and Effect: Civil Rights Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. RARICK
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 12, 1967

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, by now, one might feel that the American people had seen enough of riots, looting, and revolution in our cities and towns against America. But they still cannot separate the cause from the effect.

Yesterday, by a large vote, the House passed H.R. 10805 appropriating $13 million and extending the life of the Civil Rights Commission for 5 more years.

Possibly some of the Members who voted "yea" felt their action justified to help overcome the freedom menaces that walk our streets by night.

If so, they are like the woman who fears snakes and takes one to bed with her to cure her ailment.

The record of the Commission shows that it has acomplished nothing to control emotions and unrest. Its works are inflammatory and anti-American. Its credo is basic socialism and its activity has been to encourage the downtrodden and poor to raise up in revolt.

Perhaps its leading service has been to provide a vehicle for transmission of the revolutionary movement's propaganda—under the pretentious name and seal of a U.S. Government agency.

I fear that the underlying cause of many of this country's riots can—in substantial part—be laid at the doorstep of the Commission. So the people's representatives have again, using taxpayers' money, subsidized violence and un-American activities to solve the problem the creature has aided in creating.

War on Waste

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT V. DENNEY
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 12, 1967

Mr. DENNEY. Mr. Speaker, today, with pleasure, I join with Congressman SNYDER and a number of my colleagues in cosponsoring H.R. 11385. This bill will establish a bipartisan commission to study and make positive recommendations to promote efficiency and economy in the executive and legislative branches of the Federal Government. Mr. Speaker, this is not, nor should it be, a partisan matter. All of us here are, and should be, interested on both sides of the aisle in making the operation of the governmental process as efficient as possible.

My concern in this area was demonstrated on January 11, 1967, when I introduced H.R. 1982. However, H.R. 11385, although similar to H.R. 1982, has one additional advantage. My original bill covered only the executive branch, whereas this bill calls for a penetrating study of both the legislative and executive branches. By the enclosure of ourselves in this effort, we show the executive branch that we are willing to put our own house in order as well as theirs. Since many of the problems of function overlapping, responsibility, and so forth, are coexistent in each branch, the establishment of this commission will provide a sensible approach toward a solution to these problems.

However, there are several features contained in my original bill, H.R. 1982, which I believe should be considered. That bill makes provision for incorporation of two members of the Federal judiciary on the commission. It seems to me that their expertise and experience would be a welcome addition to such a commission. Second, a broad subpena power is vital to enable such a commission to function properly. Reticence and even recalcitrance in the furnishing of necessary information by the executive branch has been experienced by every Congress. Therefore, it is necessary that adequate provision be made to insure compliance with requests for information. For that reason, I would prefer section 9(b) of H.R. 1982 over section 10(a) of this bill. The general subpena power of Congress has proved unworkable in the past and section 9(b) of H.R. 1982 would remedy this deficiency. It would be my hope that both H.R. 1982 and H.R. 11385 could be taken up by the appropriate committee at the same time so the more desirable features of each could be considered.

Mr. Speaker, the need for such legislation is obvious. There are more than 260 Federal programs bearing on poverty problems that are administered by 16 separate departments and agencies. In the area of community water supply and sewers alone, there are five Federal agencies involved in administering various programs. Since 1960, the number of Federal employees has increased by 18 percent and the Federal payroll by almost 50 percent. Needless duplication and lack of clear-cut lines of responsibility are, in a large measure, responsible for the increased demands on tax dollars. Obviously, for every dollar of overhead eliminated, one dollar less is needed to be raised in taxes. As the need for additional revenues increase, so increases the responsibility to make the tax dollar go as far as possible.

Come to the Berkshires

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SILVIO O. CONTE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 12, 1967

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, if you like great symphonic music played under the stars; if you dig modern dance and ballet; if you are a jazz fan; if Broadway bores you, and you would like to see theater done with integrity and skill; if you pride yourself as an angler—come to the Berkshires.

This is the vibrant message carried by the New York Post in a recent article, "The Berkshires: Music and the Great Outdoors."

Al Ellenberg devotes a full page to extolling the many fine enjoyments of the Berkshires—enjoyments which those of us who have been residents of the area have come to know and enjoy.

The excellent article covers the Berkshires from Tanglewood, where my good friend Erich Leinsdorf conducts the Boston Symphony Orchestra during the summer, to Eastover where Civil War history and recreation are found year around, owned by another of my close friends, George Bisacca.

For the benefit of my colleagues who may not know about all the wonderful activities—cultural, recreational, and entertaining—I want to make Mr. Ellenberg's article a part of the RECORD. At the same time I want to invite my colleagues to come see for themselves the great Berkshires.

THE BERKSHIRES: MUSIC AND THE GREAT OUTDOORS

(By Al Ellenberg)

If you like great symphonic music played under the stars by consummate musicians, come to the Berkshires.

If you dig modern dance and ballet performed by some of the most gifted companies and individual dancers around, come to the Berkshires.

If you're a jazz fan come to the Berkshires.

If Broadway bores you, and you'd like to see theater done with integrity and skill, come to the Berkshires.

If you pride yourself as an angler, come fish in Berkshire lakes and ponds.

If rolling hills and New England architecture knock you for a loop, visit the Berkshires.

Tennis? Golf? Horses? Water skiing? The Berkshire hills harbor all these pastimes and more.

"I have never seen an area with the resort possibilities of the Berkshires," says David Marks in a tone of near reverence. Marks, a sun-tanned silver-haired hotel man from Puerto Rico, just began his first season in the area, managing the Curtis Hotel in Lenox. The Curtis belongs to the old school of hotels, slightly frumpy in decor, meticulous in service, catering to the staid and fairly well-heeled. It boasts a wine cellar, the only heated outdoor swimming pool, free golf and tennis and one of those dying architectural features—a porch with rocking chairs.

Marks brought a three-piece, strawhatted combo with him from San Juan, and they stroll around the dining room contributing a rather jarring tropical beat. Nobody pays much attention to the trio; many of the clientele are there to listen to a different kind of music.

Lenox is just a short hike from the Berkshires' most compelling attraction—Tanglewood, summer home of the Boston Symphony Orchestra, site of the best known music festival in the country.

"If there were no Tanglewood," says Francis L. Champoux, an assistant executive director with the county's Assn. of Business and Commerce, "I guess we'd have to invent it." The musical events at the 210-acre Tanglewood estate—symphonies, chamber music concerts, recitals, open rehearsals—draw about 200,000 tourists a summer from all over the country to the western Massachusetts hills.

Champoux, who recently retired as a lieutenant colonel from the Army and settled in Pittsfield, his old home town, with his wife and eight children, isn't altogether happy about the pre-eminence of the music center.

"That long-haired stuff at Tanglewood dominates everything around here," he complains, "and a lot of people just don't know about all the other things there are around here."

More about "the other things" later. First, Tanglewood. The summer symphony concerts in the Berkshires go back to 1934, when the New York Philharmonic gave three open-air concerts on a farm just outside of Stockbridge.

Two years later, the Boston Symphony Orchestra took over the music-making for three concerts in a tent on the old Vanderbilt estate. "Holmwood," just outside of Lenox. Serge Koussevitzky was the man with the baton, and the local gentry were so appreciative that two pillars of society—Mrs. Gorham Brooks and Miss Mary Aspinwall Tappan—offered the Tanglewood grounds to Koussevitzky as a permanent summer home for the orchestra. The conductor turned the property over to the orchestra's trustees, and the Tanglewood concerts were born.

Local residents still talk about "the $100,000 storm" that ripped through the tent one August day, literally dampening the concert. "Even the French horns were shipping water," cracked one oldtimer.

By the time the next summer concert series rolled around, a huge permanent shed had been erected to house the orchestra and the audience. The open-sided shed, designed by Eero Saarinen, is an acoustical miracle. Even the most muted drum rolls are audible to every ear in the 6,000-seat structure, as well as to another 6,000 music lovers who can loll on the grassy apron in front of the shed.

But if the acoustics are splendid, the audience is also a very discerning one. On a recent Saturday morning, a teenager whose serious face was set off by a pair of horn-rimmed glasses wandered into the shed with his mother to catch Erich Leinsdorf rehearsing Beethoven's Symphony No. 4 and Prokofiev's Lt. Kiji Suite.

When the mother steered them toward seats in a stage-left section, her son called out vehemently, "Not there, mothere, the bass is too strong."

Music-making at Tanglewood began this season with a weekend "prelude" June 30 and will close Sunday afternoon, Aug. 20, with an all-Wagner program. In between, there will be performances of Beethoven, Prokofiev, Mozart, Bach, Vivaldi and other symphonic staples and guest artists will include such names as pianist Van Cliburn, violinist Yehudi Menuhin and conductor William Steinberg. Tickets range from $7 for box seats to $2.50 for general admission (bring a blanket for the general admission seat: you'll be sitting on the grass). You can get a schedule and order blank by writing to Festival ticket office, Tanglewood, Lenox, Mass.

A 20-mile ride southeast from Lenox along Route 20, brings you to that shrine of American dance, Jacob's Pillow, where Ted Shawn established the first U.S. dance festival in 1932. The dance oasis is still going strong. This season, you can see ballet represented by Toni Lander and Bruce Marks, modern dance by Norman Walker and his company with Cora Cahan, and "ethnic" performances—India, North Africa, Korea and Hawaii—by Rebecca Harris.

Five miles or so south of Lenox, along Route 7, is the perfectly New England town of Stockbridge (pop. 2,161), which boasts the Berkshire Theater Festival, a project born in 1966 through the efforts of certain artists with local roots: playwright William Gibson, actress Viveca Lindfors, actor Alvin Epstein and playwright George Tabori, among others. Last year, they painstakingly produced five relatively unpopular plays: Robinson Jeffers' "The Cretan Woman," Becket's "Waiting for Godot," Wilder's "The Skin of Our Teeth," "The Merchant of Venice," and a premiere of one-actors by "Luv" author Murray Schisgal. At the end of the season, the Berkshire Theater Festival was in hock $38,000.

This year, the producers, according to Gibson, have decided to be "hardheaded utopians". Three of the season's plays "have long pleased many audiences," says the playwright. They are Pinero's farce "The Magistrate," Williams' "Streetcar Named Desire" and "Dracula." The art-for-art's sake plays are Lewis John Carlino's "The Exercise" and Don Petersen's "Does a Tiger Wear a Necktie?"

"If our safe plays are safer this season, the new plays are more hazardous. That formula must suffice, for today, as our creed," Gibson insists.

The establishment of the Berkshire Theater Festival is one of the few recent changes in the life of Stockbridge, whose folks bear a distinct resemblance to the faces on Norman Rockwell covers and calendars (perhaps that's because Rockwell lives in the area).

"We tried to get them to widen the road through the town to accommodate the tourist traffic," chuckles industrial developer Champoux, "but they wouldn't do it. They seem to want everything to remain the same. They wouldn't let a sparrow fall in Stockbridge."

If you're a nut for jazz, the place for you is clearly the Music Inn, just outside of Lenox, a 100-acre spread which features the only summerlong folk and jazz concert series in the world offered in a converted barn called, reasonably enough, the Music Barn.

You can stay at the inn for a week for between $105 and $120 (modified American plan), catch such jazz luminaries as Dave Brubeck, Fats Domino, Cannonball Adderly, such folk music heroes as Pete Seeger and Theodore Bikel, and such master instrumentalists as sitar player Ravi Shankar and guitarist Carlos Montoya. There are also impromptu jam sessions and a resident jazz group. If you want to take in Tanglewood or Jacob's Pillow or other local cultural events, the inn, like many hotels in the area, provides a jitney service. The food at the Potting Shed, on inn grounds, is spicy Northern Italian. The crowd is youngish and nonfeverish.

Not everything in the Berkshire Hills is culture-oriented. Eastover is a sprawling 1,500-acre resort outside of Lenox where the schedule is as tight and full of things to do as any of the fabled Borscht Belt spas, the emphasis is athletic and fruggy, and the guests are often secretaries, bank clerks and bachelor policemen.

"Most of our guests never even heard of Tanglewood," declares Eastover owner George Bisaca with evident relish. "They drive up here, take the key out of the car, and stay right on the grounds here until they go back home." Bisaca is a jut-jawed, military sort with two passions, Eastover and the Civil War. He's managed to combine the two by creating, over the last 20 years, a Civil War museum on the premises. In the evening, guests mingle and drink amidst cannons, sabers and mannequins dressed as Confederate or Union forces.

The Oak n' Spruce resort/lodge in South Lee catered for years to a "senior citizen" clientele, but this season makes a bid for "the swinging crowd" with a Red Garter room. "You know," explains owner Frank Prinz, "beer by the stein, banjo playing, peanuts on the floor, old time movies." Weekly rates range from $102 to $132, including meals, which is fairly typical of most of the resorts and motels in the Berkshires.

There are, literally, scores of places to stay at for a weekend or a week or a month, or more. There are guest houses throughout the area where the rates per person vary from $5 to $15 a night. If you want to make sure of a reservation, just write or call the Berkshire Hills Conference, 100 North St., Pittsfield, Mass., for stays of more than one night.

Cottage rentals are available, but you better clinch the deal before May, because there aren't that many cottages to go around. Rentals range from $50 to $150 a week. A typical cottage might have one large living room, two small bedrooms, a small kitchen, a porch and lake frontage at $90 a week.

The Berkshires are a lot of things, but nobody ever accused them of "swinging." A few years back, Lenox residents were shocked at the sight of bikinis being worn on the street, and informal wear has become more modest since. Music and the green outdoors still provide the biggest kicks in them thar hills.

Edmon Low, College Library Authority, Passes Milestone

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM STEED

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 12, 1967

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, one of our Nation's foremost authorities in the college library field, Dr. Edmon S. Low, passed a milestone in his career June 30. Dr. Low retired as head librarian of Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, a position he has held since 1940.

His service to the State of Oklahoma, to the college library field, and to education in general has been equalled by few. But no one who knows Edmon Low would expect him to retire. And he has not done so. He will continue to work actively as legislative chairman for the American Library Association and as professor at the University of Michigan library school. For many years he has spent his summers as a member of the University of Michigan staff.

As an old friend it is good to know that when he finally does decide to retire he plans to come back to his native Oklahoma.

The lives of hundreds of thousands of students have been touched by Edmon Low's creative ideas of building college libraries with stacks accessible to the student. None can say how much good this one contribution will accomplish.

He has made many others, and only recently received the coveted Joseph Lippincott Award for distinguished service in the field of library work. This is the first time the award has gone to a librarian in the areas of the Southwest and the Big Eight Conference.

The following article which appeared in the Stillwater, Okla., News-Press June 25, is a fitting tribute to Dr. Low:

EDMON LOW IS LEAVING, BUT NOT QUITTING

The "Gentle Persuader," who got into library work by accident, who helped quadruple Oklahoma State University's collection in 27 years, and who launched a national trend in the process isn't ready to quit, even at age 65.

Edmon Low, OSU head librarian since 1940, retires effective June 30, but he sees years of service ahead—with the National Library Association, and as professor in the University of Michigan Library School.

"This is actually a change in jobs more than a retirement in the usual sense," said Low. "We'll come back to Stillwater when we're ready to retire, but this isn't it."

Low started a quiet revolution in library circles during the late '40s when he persuaded OSU officials to scrap plans for a traditional library building and to design a new unit flexible enough for open stacks.

Since the $5 million library opened in January, 1953, Low has been consultant for 40 new college libraries, and many more have used the OSU building as a basic model.

The system is so quietly efficient that a generation of OSU graduates, have forgotten, if they ever knew, how frustrating and time-consuming the old system was.

Basically, a closed stack system has the books "fenced off" from the public. Book stacks alternate with reading rooms. Students wishing to inspect a book even casually have to fill out a card, then wait for a library worker to locate the book.

The "help-your-self" concept adapted by Low literally surrounds the student with books. It has the side effect of encouraging more use of the library.

But even Low underestimated the immediate increase in library use when students found they could "get at the books."

"That's why we're having to put in a new addition five years ahead of time," he said. "Where enrollment has doubled, our library use had quadrupled."

As significant as his work has been in library pioneering, Low is perhaps even more recognized as a tough-minded but "gentle persuader."

His own staff members pay the most telling tribute to Low's ability to deal with people and mask his own problems.

"He has a way of wanting to make you always do your best—without directly giving an order," said one. "He's always cheerful and interested in you, even when he must have important problems of his own," said another.

Still another recalled 1951 when word came of the plane crash death of Dr. Henry G. Bennett, then OSU president.

"Mr. Low said hardly a word, but he spent hours silently shelving books."

Low himself says he still regrets that Dr. Bennett never had an opportunity to see the great library functioning. Bennett had been skeptical of the new "open stacks" concept, but was persuaded by Low and OSU architect, Phil Wilbur.

"If he could have seen the multitudes that have used this his heart would have been very glad," Low said.

Another important time of persuasion came when the library was completed and time came to centralize all of the university's book collection.

There were 23 different distribution points on campus then. Many department maintained their own libraries and were reluctant to give them up.

Besides creating confusion and hardship for students and faculty alike, it also made uniform "open hours" impossible.

With its 850,000-book collection, OSU is still the only major U.S. university with a completely centralized library. This makes it possible to keep the building open from 7 a.m. to midnight every day of the year except for shortened periods on Sundays.

On peak days the load will reach 10,000 persons. The yearly rate is over 2.5 million, equal to Oklahoma's total population.

During late-nite situations when a "light load" of only 1,000 or so persons are using the facilities, the building can be staffed with a three-man door crew.

"Under such conditions our cost is $5 an hour, about one-half cent per person per hour," said Low. "It's some of the best money the university spends."

Low began his library career as a freshman at East Central College at Ada when he accidently heard the head librarian dismissing a worker, asked for, and got the job.

"I had been interested in books as a student at Kiowa and this gave me the chance to see how intriguing it was," he said. "I just never got out."

As chairman of the influential legislative committee of the American Library Association next year, Low will be involved in still more liason with people, books and legislation.

His wide experience in this area was underscored when he testified before the House subcommittee on education successfully urging support of the Higher Education Act.

The next morning's Washington Post carried a front-page story, beginning, "A short, balding librarian from Oklahoma explained yesterday in a hearing the explosion of knowledge in terms so clear that even a congressman could understand it."

Excitement still creeps into his voice when he talks of the need for a national transmission and bibliographical setup to locate scarce books and transmit them rapidly to where they are needed.

"It will be another way of serving people better, and after all, people are the only reason for a library," he said. "I feel like I'm starting a new era. "I'm just as excited as a youth starting all over again."

EDMON LOW RECEIVES LIPPINCOTT AWARD

Edmon Low, head librarian at Oklahoma State University since 1940, was named recipient Sunday of the coveted Joseph Lippincott Award at the American Library Association's convention in San Francisco.

The award is given for distinguished service in the field of library work and carries a $1,000 stipend.

Open also to public and private librarians, this marks the first time the award has gone to any librarian in the Southwest, to anyone in the Big Eight Conference or any of the states represented by the conference.

A native of Kiowa, Okla., Low obtained a bachelor of arts from East Central College at Ada, a bachelors in library science at University of Illinois, and a masters in library science from University of Michigan where he won the Phi Kappa Phi award.

Low is presently chairman of the Oklahoma Council on Libraries, and has received the state association's Distinguished Service award.

He was president of the Oklahoma Library Association in 1949, of the Southwestern Library Association in 1951–52, vice president of the national association in 1964–65, and president of the Association of College and Research Libraries in 1960–61.

Low has also been a member of the national association's influential legislative committee for 12 years and will be its chairman for the coming year.

However, he is probably best known for originating the "open stacks" library system at the university level with OSU's $5 million unit which opened in January, 1953.

Since that time, Low has been called as consultant for over 40 new university libraries and the OSU building has served as a basic model for many more.

We're Running Out of Time

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 12, 1967

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, a matter of very great concern to me, as a member of the Committee on Armed Services and to the committee itself, is the failure—indeed, the refusal—of Defense Secretary McNamara to proceed with the production and deployment of an antiballistic missile system.

We are not suggesting that we enter upon a vast program entailing an expenditure of billions of dollars. We are suggesting—in fact, we are urging—that we at least make a beginning, that we at least be prepared to undertake all that may be necessary for our country's security. Tomorrow may be too late.

When it comes to national defense, and particularly in these days of international crises and increasing tensions, it is better to have too much than too little, better not to wait and to be too late in defending ourselves against those obviously intent upon our destruction.

Under leave to extend my remarks I am inserting in the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Washington Evening Star of yesterday. It is entitled "We're Running Out of Time." Yes, we are, Mr. Speaker; we are running out of time, and it is not the fault of the Congress. The editorial follows:

WE'RE RUNNING OUT OF TIME

Red China's development of an H-bomb reduces one aspect of the ABM debate in this country to an absurdity.

This has to do with the contention that the United States should not deploy an antiballistic missile system until we find out whether the Russians will agree not to expand the ABM system which they have already started. It is said that no consensus on this point was reached at the Glassboro summit session. One report has it that the official Kremlin version of the ABM discussion between the President and Premier Kosygin took an even "tougher" line than Kosygin's.

This argument might as well turn on the question of how many angels can dance on the head of a pin. For the perfectly obvious fact is that neither Russia nor the United States, given the ominous development in Peking, can neglect their missile defenses. Each country must proceed, and we think proceed promptly, with building and deploying the kind of ABM system which is best suited to its own particular security.

At the moment Russia is more directly threatened than we are. In just a few more years, perhaps three or four, China will be able to strike deep into Russia with H-bombs mounted on intermediate-range ballistic missiles. It is possible, of course, that the Chinese will not actually build the bombs and the delivery missiles. But it is foolish to think that the Russians would bet a single ruble on peaceful intentions in Peking. They will be forced to protect themselves with whatever anti-missile system seems necessary.

The case with the United States is not much different. One current estimate is that it will be 1972–75 before China becomes a first-class nuclear power, equipped with enough H-bombs and intercontinental missiles to seriously threaten large areas of our own country. The Chinese might reach this stage sooner, just as they tested their first H-bomb years before many people thought possible. But if one accepts the 1972–75 date, that is only five to eight years away.

How long will it take us to build and deploy even a "thin" ABM defense? Well, Defense Secretary McNamara, who is said to think we have plenty of time to meet a threat from Red China, has also been reported as saying that a "thin" ABM system could be built for about $3.5 billion by 1975. A Pentagon spokesman, refusing to be more specific, said this week that the job would take "several years." Plenty of time? It seems to us that we are running out of time—and quickly.

The Senate-House Atomic Energy Committee is scheduled to begin closed hearings this week on the ABM argument. For our part, we think a decision is urgent, and if Mr. McNamara really believes we have plenty of time, we hope the commitee will press him hard on his reasons for thinking so.

There are many well-informed people who are convinced that too much is at stake to leave a decision on the start of an ABM to one man—Mr. McNamara. And this sentiment was at least implicitly underscored by General McConnell, chief of staff of the Air Force, when he said last week that the real question at stake in the ABM debate comes down to "the difference between our destruction and survival as a sovereign state."

President Johnson Praises Training Center

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. BARRETT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 12, 1967

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, when President Johnson said in Philadelphia recently that "I think we are going to make it" to victory in the war on poverty, he had good reason for his optimism. The President was visiting Philadelphia's highly successful Opportunities Industrialization Center, a very important job-training effort which is part of the effort to help the poor become self-sufficient.

Founded by Rev. Leon Sullivan, these imaginative job-training centers have won the praise and support of business and labor groups as well as the Office of Economic Opportunity. The centers have already trained and found jobs for 6,000 persons in the short 3 years since its inception. The approval of the centers is coming to serve as a model for similar efforts around the country.

Mr. Speaker, there is no magic involved in the remarkable results achieved by this antipoverty effort. The center is the product, as President Johnson said, of the spirit that "wants to affirm the dignity of every man, whatever his race or religion." The success of the center is traceable to determination on the part of many individuals not content to stand idle while human potential and human dignity go undeveloped; it is traceable to the good sense of an enlightened Congress which set up the Office of Economic Opportunity to wage war on poverty, and to the timely support the OEO rendered to the OIC idea.

I am proud to say, Mr. Speaker, that the entire congressional delegation from the city of Philadelphia, Congressmen BARRETT, NIX, BYRNE, EILBERG, and GREEN, accompanied the Pesident on his visit to the City of Brotherly Love. It was a happy event, too, that the President took the occasion of his visit to sign an education bill extending the Teachers Corps, another important weapon in the poverty war.

I know my colleagues will be interested in reading the following story from the Baltimore Sun which describes the President's visit to Philadelphia:

JOHNSON PRAISES TRAINING CENTER—SIGNS TEACHER BILL IN GHETTO SELF-HELP PROJECT

(By Muriel Dobbin)

SAN ANTONIO, June 29.—President Johnson today went into the Philadelphia slums to celebrate a victory for his much-criticized war on poverty.

Heading for a funeral in Texas and an extended stay at the LBJ Ranch, the President paused in Philadelphia to pay tribute to a man who has been so successful in organizing his own battle against poverty that his programs are now being backed by $6,500,000 of Federal money.

In a former police station located in an area once known as "The Jungle," Mr. Johnson met the Rev. Leon H. Sullivan, a 6-foot, 6-inch Negro Baptist minister who founded the first Opportunities Industrialization Center in an abandoned station house of the Twenty-third Philadelphia police precinct in 1964.

SIX BRANCHES

There are now six branches of the center, which concentrates on encouraging self-help within the poverty program, and training unemployed adults to fill jobs in short supply.

The Chief Executive used the Opportunities Industrialization Center to prove his theory that the problems of poverty are created by men and can be overcome by them.

"What I have seen is not just a training program," declared the President, asserting that in such centers, self respect is born.

"The Federal Government did not build this center," he emphasized. "Neither business nor labor nor philanthropy nor city officials built it. The spirit that built this center wants to affirm the dignity of every man, whatever his race or religion."

It is the same spirit, said the President, which motivated the poverty programs such as the Job Corps, Head Start, the Neighborhood Youth Corps and the Teacher Corps.

Mr. Johnson took the opportunity of his visit to sign into law the Teacher Corps bill passed this week by Congress, authorizing $135,000,000 over the next three years to increase the corps to 9,000 trainees a year by 1970.

Appealing for recruits for the Teacher Corps, the President said he hoped to double the size of the corps by fall. He stressed that the most challenging work which can be undertaken is to "light the spark of learning in a young child."

SMALL PROGRAM

He conceded that the Teacher Corps is still a small program, but reminded that the Peace Corps was once a small program, yet had "left the mark of America's idealism all over the world."

The Teacher Corps program, said Mr. Johnson, "will bring the best instruction Americans can produce to the children who need it most—the children of poverty."

The President, who rarely misses an opportunity to criticize his critics, tossed an impromptu aside or two into his speech complaining that "when you talk about what is right, you don't appear to be nearly as interesting as you do when you talk about what is wrong."

In case anyone had missed his point, Mr. Johnson added that more attention was paid to the person who fell down the steps than the man who lifted him up.

The Chief Executive, who was accompanied on his Philadelphia foray by Sargent Shriver, director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, and Pennsylvania Republican Senator Hugh Scott, viewed training classes for metal workers, textile workers, welders and beauticians, and took a look into the old cellblock of the former police station.

It is estimated that since the center was founded there, it has trained and provided jobs for 6,000 people.

As the President left the center, Mr. Sullivan pointed at him and announced to the crowd, "He is the man who made it possible; he and the Lord."

Mr. Johnson flew from Philadelphia to San Antonio where he attended the funeral of his uncle, Huffman Baines, then went on to the LBJ Ranch 70 miles away, where he is expected to spend several days.

Benefits for Vietnam Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 12, 1967

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include last week's public service television and radio newscast, "The Kee Report." The subject discussed benefits for Vietnam veterans:

BENEFITS FOR VIETNAM VETERANS

This is Jim Kee, bringing you the Kee Report.

The Congress is now completing action on a bill known as the Readjustment Assistance Act for veterans of the Vietnam era. The basic purpose of this legislation is to ensure that the men fighting in Vietnam receive comparable benefits to those who served in either World War or in the Korean Conflict.

Most Members of Congress believe that this legislation is long overdue and I believe the American people will agree. Certainly, the bitter struggle now going on in the tropical heat of Indo China has developed into a major war. The servicemen who survive this conflict, or who are injured there in line of duty, are surely deserving of equal treatment with those veterans who served their country in prior wars.

Under the Act, the period of eligibility will extend from the Bay on Tonkin incident in 1964 until the crisis is declared ended—either by the President or the Congress. Thus, the period of eligibility has already lasted nearly three years.

The additional benefits conferred upon Vietnam veterans may be divided into four major classes as follows:

1. Disability compensation at full wartime rates for all veterans.
2. Disability pensions for veterans and death pensions for widows and children.
3. Special medical care including medicines and drugs for severly disabled veterans on the pension rolls and
4. Financial aid in the purchase of specially equipped motor cars for those who need such vehicles.

In general, compensation for peacetime service averages about 80% or wartime rates. This means that servicemen who suffer disabilities in Vietnam will receive a substantial increase in their monthly payments. The provision authorizing the donation of drugs and medicines to severely disabled veterans on the pension rolls will give help to those who need it most. But this provision also points up the wonderful advances made by the medical profession in the treatment of patients suffering from deep-seated physical or mental illness. Many cases which were listed as incurable in former times now respond to advanced methods of therapy which are administered under the supervision of the Veterans Administration.

The new legislation also provides for the payment of $1,600 to help in the purchase of an automobile for those combat veterans who suffered the loss of one or both hands or one or both feet. This provision has been on the statute books for other veterans for some time. The motor industry builds special type vehicles for those badly crippled veterans who otherwise would be unable to drive at all.

There is one other development of importance to those interested in the field of veterans legislation. In a message to Congress in January, President Johnson proposed a thorough study of the entire program of assistance to veterans to bring it up to date. This proposal was based on the sound principle that even the best of programs need revision in the light of changing times. A special Advisory Committee is now in the field studying what needs to be done. When this Committe makes its report, Congress will be better equipped to modernize the whole program of veterans assistance.

Thank you for listening.

Neighborhood Youth Corps a Success in East Chicago, Ind.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 12, 1967

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, we hear of a great deal of agitation from certain sources that some of our productive programs enacted during the last Congress should be curtailed on account of international expenditures. I firmly believe that the curtailing of the great programs which benefit so many millions of people over the Nation through education, apprentice training, and so forth, would be false economy.

By reason of the various projects enacted by the Congress during the last dozen years and especially during the 89th Congress, millions will become taxpayers instead of taxeaters on relief rolls.

About a year ago, Dr. John B. Nicosia, mayor of East Chicago, Ind., and James Porter, project director, with the aid of a representative from the U.S. Department of Labor, inaugurated the Neighborhood Youth Corps project in the city of East Chicago, Ind. It is a pleasure to be able to report on the success of this program.

Although originally funded for 100 slots, the out-of-school project has helped more than twice that number of young men and women take their place in the world of work. The statistics of success illustrate the excellence of this endeavor. Approximately 220 young people are now or have been enrolled since last fall, and the NYC job counselors have already been able to place 60 enrolleees in private industry jobs. Twenty-five more have been encouraged to go back to school as full-time students. Four have gone into the Job Corps for further training, while 11 have enrolled in training programs run by private industry or MDTA. Eight have joined the armed services. Only 10 have left because they could not adjust to daily work.

The East Chicago project has also helped to place directly into private industry over 125 young men and women who wanted to enroll in NYC, but were ineligible. While NYC's placement role is directed primarily toward enrollees, it was able to help these additional young people because of its close relationship with local employers.

To help prepare these out-of-school youths for the competitive job world, the project directors require all enrollees to take remedial education. They have set up a program with the city school system in which the NYC uses the school facilities and supports counselors and other professionals, while the school system pays the teachers with funds from title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Each youth receives 4 hours of classes a week, studying basic English and mathematics along with other subjects directly related to his job.

In tribute to these young people, participating in the Neighborhood Youth Corps, Mayor Nicosia of East Chicago and chairman of the East Chicago's poverty committee recently wrote a column in their monthly newsletter. Citing the contributions made to his city by the NYC, he said:

> One of the greatest pleasures I have had in my career in public life has been to help begin our local NYC program.
>
> The benefits to East Chicago, the state and the nation are many and diverse. Initially the program puts dollars into the pockets of youth from families living at or below the poverty level, but this isn't the most significant aspect. For the heart of the program helps nuture abilities and skills of our young citizens to take their rightful place in this great society.

It has been brought to my attention that the young citizens involved in this program have made very substantial contributions to the local agencies to which they have been assigned. They have performed admirably as water filter aides and in a host of other positions. Knowing full well that we have a fiscal responsibility to all taxpayers, I would like to reflect upon a dollars and cents approach to our program. It is economically sensible to have our youngsters, who have minimal job skills, as employees in NYC programs at taxpayers expense; creating opportunities anew for the re-education and retraining of successive waves of young adults. We indicate with pride the additional benefits of the program because since its inception in June 1965, so many young adults have moved from the NYC program to full-time employment in the private economy. They are taxpayers (in some instances removed from the welfare rolls) and now contributing members of society). From this point of view our NYC program has to be considered a dollars and cents success.

I would like to join with Mayor Nicosia in praise of the East Chicago NYC for its successful project; and encourage the Department of Labor's Bureau of Work Programs in its efforts to help our young people compete in this rapidly changing world. Because of this project and others like it, thousands of young men and women throughout this Nation will lead useful and productive lives, helping to build a better America.

New Junior High School in Stony Point, N.Y., Dedicated in Honor of Jim Farley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 12, 1967

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, on June 4, the Honorable James A. Farley returned to his hometown, Stony Point, N.Y., for the dedication of a new junior high school in his name and honor. Although Jim Farley never graduated from the schools of Rockland County or attended college, his list of attainments has far exceeded the dreams of most other Americans—town clerk, supervisor, assemblyman, top Democrat who put Franklin D. Roosevelt in the White House, distinguished Postmaster General and presently chairman of the board of the Coca-Cola Export Corp.—he could hardly have gone further.

In speaking of the dedication, Jim Farley, with typical modesty and sincerity, remarked:

> I have received many honors from colleges and universities down through the years, but frankly, nothing ever gave me the satisfaction that the naming of this school for me did.

Mr. Speaker, it is indeed fitting that the North Rockland Junior High School be named in Jim Farley's honor to serve as a reminder to all who follow that education and the determination to succeed comprise a combination that can never fail.

So that our colleagues may have the benefit of General Farley's remarks, I insert the text of his dedicatory address, the invocation by the Rt. Rev. William J. Flannery, editorials from the Nyack Journal-News, and Rockland Messenger, at this point in the RECORD:

THE OPPORTUNITY OF EDUCATION

My friends, my townspeople:

It has been my privilege during the past many years to address gatherings of every nature, large and small, East and West, North and South, here in the United States and in many countries in different parts of the world. But, never has there been a time when an invitation to speak has given me the genuine sense of fulfillment as has this occasion—the dedication of the James A. Farley Junior High School in the town of Stony Point, New York. Naturally, everyone likes to come back home—and Stony Point will always be home to me.

As I look over the names of the students I note many familiar ones, grandsons, granddaughters and descendents of many intimate friends of a lifetime. And, I also note names new to me—the sons and daughters of families who have settled here since I moved away nearly forty years ago. Ours is indeed a growing community. And, I congratulate one and all—old-timers and newcomers—and all the parents, relatives and friends who have made it possible for these boys and girls to have the opportunity of education.

I well remember today, that part of my education which I received in the Grassy Point grade school before I attended the Stony Point High School. In looking back over that span of years I can recall a hundred pleasant memories and hardly a single regret. Memories of my graduation in 1905 from the Stony Point High School return to me today, as do the memories of the mixed emotions I had when I was invited to address the graduating class of that high school—thirty years later.

I want this audience to know how grateful I am and always will be to Stony Point because of the confidence they reposed in me at the start of my political career as Town Clerk and the support they accorded me in subsequent elections when I was a candidate for Supervisor and member of the State Assembly. Whatever success I have had in public life (and with which most of you are familiar) can be attributed wholly to my first election as Town Clerk. I shall always remember with a heart full of gratitude the people of Stony Point for the trust they placed in me—as well my children and grandchildren for I have told them the story many times; they all know exactly how I feel about the Town of Stony Point and what it means to me.

Now, the official measuring point in the United States is in Washington, D.C., and from it all distances are measured. But every American carries his own measuring point, imbedded in his heart—and he calls it his home town. Other Americans are his countrymen, united in a great Republic; other nationalities are his fellow men, part of a wide, wide world. But his townsmen are *his* people, the people who put the meaning of "home" in his homeland.

Far more important than any measurement of distance, a home town gives a person his estimate of values.

Geographically, I have measured off Stony Point, and more particularly by its distance in miles from the rest of the world; but, all of my life I have measured the rest of the world by its distance from the values of Stony Point.

I am glad to report to you that most people and most countries aren't very distant from us at all. Furthermore, while the means and the methods of life have changed greatly, the values have not.

The reason is that the true values were established before this Republic was born. Here in Stony Point, when I was a boy, people worked hard to give their children a better chance in a better world. In spite of what the pessimists tell you, they succeeded. This is a better world, with better chances than when I was a boy. And the chances are getting better because all over the world people want for themselves and their children the same things that we want here.

Now, this wasn't always so. Only a century and a half ago, the whole world thought war was a glorious thing. Now they know better. During the whole American Revolution, only 4,000 lives were lost. In World War II, our country alone lost 350,000 men killed, and 1,000,000 wounded—and over 37 million people were killed. There are, of course, things worth fighting for and we are fighting for them right now. But, as Cardinal Spellman declared, "Everybody wants peace, and no one knows how to achieve it."

I predict that the generation which is going to this and other schools will find the way. I am optimist enough to believe that the next great step in the affairs of men will be the abolishment of war through international understanding.

Furthermore, I believe that our country has pioneered the coming of that day. Let us look at the American record. Right here in this town, General Wayne won the battle of Stony Point. The great strategic body of water during the Revolution was the Hudson River, just as the Suez Canal and the Gulf of Aqaba are today.

Now, when the Revolution was won, Orange County made no claim that it could stop ships from using the Hudson. It realized it was part of New York State. And New York State realized that it was part of the United States; it did not try to stop the other states from using it. So long as the use is lawful and peaceful, the Hudson River is open to all nations. This very day, steamers flying foreign flags have gone up and down the river to the inland port of Albany. Foreign flags also fly on our Great Lakes, since the St. Lawrence Waterway was completed. That is the American Way. In spite of the lies and distortions of those who wish to see it fail—that is the way our country offers to the world. The offer of the American Way is just this simple. I ask no man to be less than a patriot in his own country. I do not ask a Frenchman to love France less than I love the United States, nor a Russian to love Russia less than I love my country. Americans ask no man to be less than a patriot, but Americans offer to be something more than a patriot in order to achieve World Peace.

What do we Americans mean by being more than patriots?

No nation in recorded history ever gave more of its treasure in rebuilding a war-wrecked world. In the tens of billions, the American people taxed and taxed themselves, to bring peace and dignity to other lands.

Every President of the United States in this Century has declared again and again that the American people want no more for themselves but they will not stand idly by while aggressors attempt to make little nations less.

In its deepest sense, therefore, I believe that the American Way means the expansion not of political borders but of the human values of the human heart. For a world gone mad with materialism, I am confident that the least materialistic nation in the world is the United States. These are the values that my parents taught me, for these are the Stony Point values.

American foreign policy is as simple as President Lincoln:

"With malice toward none and with charity toward all, let us do the right as God gives us to see the right."

Since the American school system is the cornerstone of this Republic and since a person's home town is the cornerstone of his heart, my heart is simply too full for me to tell you today how much the naming of this school means to me. I have one deep regret: that my parents who so deeply loved their children and their townsfolk are not present;

but I know you will not count it amiss if, on this day, I silently rededicate this school to the parents who taught me these values which you have seen fit to notice.

I am delighted, however, that my brother, Bill—and four of my grandchildren—Joan Montgomery, Carol Montgomery, Gail Montgomery and Tara Farley are persent. To them and to all of the children now attending and who will attend this splendid school I can only transmit the Stony Point values as they were transmitted to me.

In conclusion, let me again express my sincere appreciation to the people of the Town of Stony Point who have so greatly honored me today. I have received many honors during my life, many colleges and universities have conferred honorary degrees on me—but I count the greatest honor I have ever received from an institution of learning the Dedication of the James A. Farley Junior High School, Stony Point, New York—my home town.

This school will make it possible for thousands of boys and girls to go out into life in the same spirit and in the same commendable way as did their parents and ancestors, equipped with the same solid foundations of education that were provided for us here at Stony Point. But in the last analysis however, you are the ones who must complete your own education. Others can give you the opportunity to achieve things in this world but you are the ones who must adapt these opportunities to the conditions you meet. It is your loyalty and your courage that make your education count in this world, not only to the end that you, yourselves, may succeed but that your success may make the world in which you live a better place for others—and I repeat, the opportunity of education will in a very great measure make that possible.

As our town is part of a great state and our great state part of a great nation, you will lead our great nation into the making of a great and peaceful world. The faith and the optimism which have carried this nation the greatness will never fail. You will carry on and there will be a day and soon when all nations will say, "One World, indivisible under God, with Liberty and Justice for all".

Thank you—and God bless you.

INVOCATION BY RT. REV. WILLIAM J. FLANNERY

O Almighty and Eternal God as we gather with our neighbors of all faiths in a common bond, we invoke your Blessing upon the James A. Farley Junior High School and Stony Point Elementary School. These beautiful buildings are a tribute to the sacrifice of the people of the community. and their love and affection for their children.

It is eminently fitting that the Junior High School be dedicated to a man who was born in this town, and has risen to the highest levels in our great country. He has served his God, Country and neighbors in such a manner as to be a shining example to the youth who will attend school in our community. His well known affection for the friends of all ages is appreciated by all who know him. We hope that he will be able to return home for many, many more birthdays.

O Lord, you said to let the children come to you and forbid them not. We implore your blessing upon these buildings which will be used to educate your children.

Fill the teachers with the spirit of knowledge, wisdom and understanding. Strengthen the students with Your inspiring help, that they may grasp with their minds, treasure in their hearts, and carry out in their deeds, all the teachings that will make them good, loyal citizens. May the students appreciate and use the wonderful facilities provided by their neighbors, and the dedicated service of their teachers, school administration and the Board of Education.

We humbly ask Your Blessing O God upon all here present, our community and our beloved country, in the Name of the Father, and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit.

[From the Journal-News, Nyack, N.Y., May 31, 1967]

WHERE HONOR IS DUE

No school in the North Rockland District could be more appropriately named than the James A. Farley Junior High School which is to be dedicated this Sunday. The district thus recognizes its most distinguished son, a man who may not have graduated formally from its schools and who may not have gone to college but who has been granted a full two-dozen honorary college and university degrees during his tremendous career.

Nor does Jim Farley forget his early schooling and what it meant to him, his earlier years in Grassy Point and what they did for him in sending him on his way. "The people of Grassy Point, the Town of Stony Point, and Rockland County were very kind to me," said Mr. Farley in speaking to the county's high school valedictorians of 1967 the other evening. "If they hadn't elected me town clerk, supervisor and assemblyman I couldn't have gone ahead."

What Mr. Farley said is true—but it is equally true he had a talent all his own to offer to the public that elected him, a talent that would not have been denied no matter what career he chose to follow. Whatever it might have been, he could hardly have gone higher than as the top Democrat who put President Frankling D. Roosevelt in the White House, as a distinguished Postmaster General in the Roosevelt cabinet, and now as chairman of the board of the world-wide Coca-Cola Export Corporation.

It is not amazing that he is still the Jim Farley he was when he attended school in Grassy Point, when he played a top first base for the Haverstraw town team, when he served in his several elective offices. He has an inborn interest in people, a natural friendliness for them, a bubbling enthusiasm for whatever is going on around him.

So it is fitting that the North Rockland Junior High be named in Mr. Farley's honor and that he be the day's guest of honor so he may know his friends and neighbors have not forgoten him just as he has not forgotten them. He will have many friends from his early days in the audience but he will also have the friends who have known him in the years between.

Certainly the name and the school will be an inspiration to the boys and girls of the district, a reminder to them that education and a will to succeed make a combination that can't lose. And on this occasion, too, the county joins the North Rockland district in paying its tribute to its most distinguished native son.

[From the Rockland County Messenger, Stony Point, N.Y., June 8, 1967]

Big Jim—James A. Farley attended the former one room schoolhouse in Grassy Point but he never received a high school diploma. So it was a distinct honor to Big Jim to be in his hometown Sunday and to be at the ceremony dedicating the junior high school in his name and honor. James Farley has gone far in this world and one of the reasons is his humanness. It was evident Sunday that Jim was deeply touched by the honor bestowed on him. He also said that geographically, he has measured off Stony Point by its distance in miles from the rest of the world but that all of his life, he has measured the rest of the world by its departure from the values of Stony Point.

In Stony Point people worked hard to give their children a better chance in a better world, he said. Now the world is working toward a better life in spite of its troubled times . . . This is the value of Stony Point, said Big Jim. This is what he learned in those early formative years and Big Jim brought back those values with him . . . The human value of the human heart, the desire for a better world not only for Americans but for all mankind. James A. Farley spoke of a day of peace in the world and predicted someday there will be one world, indivisible under God, with liberty and justice for all. His message was to the point . . . if it could happen in your own home town it can happen throughout the world.

Social Security Amendments of 1967

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 12, 1967

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, one of our most distinguished senior citizens from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts appeared before the House Ways and Means Committee on March 21 to continue his fine efforts in behalf of social security recipients. Charles O'Donnell is well known in my State for his more than 30 years of service to his fellow man, and I would like to call attention to his testimony which follows:

STATEMENT OF CHARLES C. O'DONNELL, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, SENIOR CITIZENS & ASSOCIATES OF AMERICA

Mr. O'DONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I might say a word, that Congressman Burke fought for the aged in my State for 36 straight hours, and they kept moving the clock back to make it a legislative day.

Mr. Chairman and honorable members of the House Ways and Means Committee: First of all, I wish to thank your committee for the privilege of addressing you.

My name is Charles C. O'Donnell, of Lynn, Mass., executive director of the Senior Citizens and Associates of America, incorporated as a nonprofit corporation under the laws of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. As a matter of identification, I think I should give you a brief statement in regard to our society. It was established in 1926 as the Massachusetts Society for Old Age Pensions. Later on, it became the Senior Citizens and Associates of America, and was incorporated last August in order to be of better service to our elderly people.

Realizing that you have received almost every conceivable reason why social security should be increased, I am giving you a brief summary of action that your body has taken in regard to increased benefits for the elderly and the cooperation that our society has given the social security.

Our society has placed five questions on the ballot, of which four were approved by the people. We have taken part in every piece of legislation designed to benefit our retired elders, and we are proud to state that Massachusetts is rated as having the best all-around laws benefiting the elderly in the Nation. Our Commonwealth passed the first law for the elderly in 1930. The bill was signed by the late Gov. Frank Allen and provided for benefits to begin at 70 years of age. Due to the action of the U.S. Congress, requiring that in order for the State to become eligible for Federal benefits they had to match the grant of $15 a month and decrease the age to 65, these monthly payments were very meager. Throughout the years you have greatly increased the allowance to the various States for the blind, the disabled, the elderly, and aid to dependent children.

Our society has constantly fought to see that the benefits your committee approved and Congress has granted have been passed on to those it was designed to help. There are 338 golden age and senior citizens organizations in our Commonwealth. Our society has limited its membership to those who wish to assist in carrying out the activities of being helpful to our less-fortunate elders, that is, visiting hospitals, nursing homes, et cetera. We have meetings in various parts of Massachusetts. Our headquarters are at 20 Lincoln Street, Lynn, Mass.

Last year we sent letters to 102,000 Massachusetts voters who were 65 years of age or older, and we have notified the 338 clubs of this hearing and of our participation in testifying. I am including for the record a list of clubs who join with the Senior Citizens Association of America in supporting H.R. 5710, filed by Chairman Wilbur D. Mills in behalf of President Johnson's request for increased social security benefits.

My reason for discussing old-age assistance is to encourage you to recognize the necessity of increased social security payments. The time is past due when our Government should realize its responsibility in providing adequate means for supplying sufficient incomes for the Nation's retired elders so that they may face the twilight of their lives free from the fear of welfare and want, and take a prominent place in the Nation's economy by being in the position of becoming consumers of the Nation's products. At one time in Massachusetts we had 107,000 persons on old-age assistance, but due to increased social security benefits and industrial pensions, we now have 48,000, according to the last report I received. This speaks for itself—the benefits that increased social security payments have accomplished. Those who are the hardest hit are the elderly who have saved a few thousand dollars, and the only income they have is their social security payment, which requires them constantly to draw on their reserve savings, and leaves them with the fear that they will end up as welfare recipients.

We have recognized the responsibility of retiring our Federal, State, county, city, and town employees on pensions after a period of faithful service. This is no more than right and what we should do. The Nation's producers, through their taxpayments, are providing retirement privileges for their public servants. Our group has never had any quarrel with this position. We do, however, resent wholeheartedly that one segment of the Nation's retired elders are able to live on the hill of plenty, while at least 60 percent of our senior citizens must spend their remaining days in the valley of despair.

It is nonsensical to talk of rehabilitating retired elders for gainful employment. A very small percentage of our elders would be able to take advantage of this opportunity. The vast majority have worked all their lives and have earned dignified retirement in order that they may maintain a standard of living compatible with the American way of life. There is talk about overproduction. I claim it is underconsumption, as at least 10 million of our retired elders are unable to purchase even the bare necessities of life, and this results in underconsumption, which leads to unemployment. The answer to this problem is a national old-age pension of at least $200 per month. This vast sum of circulating wealth would balance the Nation's productive facilities.

According to insurance statistics, only 1 out of 12 of the Nation's elders have been able to accumulate enough to take care of them through their retirement years. A comprehensive medical plan has been enacted by the Congress to protect the Nation's elderly in time of sickness.

The Massachusetts Legislature has adopted a resolution calling on Congress to organize a national convention for the purpose of enacting an old-age-pension amendment to the U.S. Constitution providing for $200 a month, and I feel that this movement will gain momentum and finally be enacted. Attached for the record is a copy of this resolution, as well as a descriptive article from the Lynn Post.

In supporting increased social security benefits for all, I further advocate the establishment of centers, open at least during the daylight hours, where the aged can meet with one another, renew oldtime friendships and hold their meetings, and be informed of their rights under the law. If their rights are not granted, a representative from these centers could bring their case before an appeals board or appropriate legislative body, which I have done for years.

Our society will support any report this committee brings out that will provide increased social security benefits. We do wish to go on record as being opposed to a decrease in the amount of exemption for persons 45 years of age or over from $1,200 to $600, whether they are receiving social security or railroad retirement benefits. This decrease would tend to discourage many of the oldsters from continuing employment. I suggest that the $1,500 earnings limitation be increased to allow a joint earning ceiling of $3,000 as, in many cases, one of the spouses is unable to work. The one that is employed is in the same category as a single person although they have double expenses.

We also hope it will be possible for this committee to include legislation preventing any increase in social security benefits from affecting veterans' pension payments. For those elderly persons trying to live on a combined social security and veteran's pension, an increase in one reduces monthly payments in the other and precludes their realizing the financial relief intended.

My opinions expressed here today are based upon close to 40 years of experience as a worker and a leader in the old-age groups in coping with their problems.

I wish to thank you, Mr. Chairman and the members of this committee, who throughout the years have assisted in passing legislation which has made life a little more pleasant for our elders in the twilight of their lives. It is too bad you have not received all the credit you deserve in assisting in passing legislation.

We wish all of you good health, happiness and future success in your endeavors.

Member clubs on record in favor of the views expressed by the Senior Citizens and Associates of America are:

Weymouth Senior Citizens, Weymouth, Mass.

Golden Age Club, Whitinsville, Mass.

Haverhill Golden Age Club, Haverhill, Mass.

Palmer Golden Age Club, Palmer, Mass.

Golden Age Club, Amherst, Mass.

Jackson Gardens Senior Citizens, Newton, Mass.

Parker House Senior Citizens, Newton Center, Mass.

Horace Mann Senior Citizens, Newtonville, Mass.

The CHAIRMAN. We will include in the record, Mr. O'Donnell, the letter of April 29, 1964, which is appended to your statement. This material will be included in the record.

Mr. O'DONNELL. Thank you.

(The letter referred to follows:)

THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS,
Boston, April 29, 1964.

RESOLUTIONS REQUESTING CONGRESS TO CALL A CONVENTION FOR PROPOSING AN AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES PROVIDING A PENSION OF TWO HUNDRED DOLLARS MONTHLY FOR CERTAIN PERSONS

Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts, acting in pursuance of article V of the constitution of the United States, hereby requests the Congress of the United States to call a convention under said article for the purpose of proposing an amendment to said constitution, as follows:

"ARTICLE

"SECTION 1. The Congress shall provide for the payment, subject to such terms and conditions as it may prescribe, of a pension of two hundred dollars monthly to persons over the age of sixty-five.

"SEC. 2. Contributions made by any individual for the pension provided in section one shall be exempt from taxation."; and be it further

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be, and it hereby is, requested to propose as the mode of ratification of said amendment that it shall be valid to all intents and purposes, as part of the constitution of the United States, when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States; and be it further

Resolved, That the State secretary be, and he hereby is, directed to send a duly certified copy of these resolutions to the presiding officer of each branch of the Congress of the United States and to the Administrator of General Services.

Senate, adopted, April 21, 1964.

THOMAS A. CHADWICK, *Clerk.*

House of Representatives, adopted in concurrence, April 23, 1964.

WILLIAM C. MAIERS, *Clerk.*

Attest:

KEVIN H. WHITE,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

OEO's Legal Services Program: Helping the Poor Find Justice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DON EDWARDS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 12, 1967

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, one of the most exciting and far-reaching programs begun by the Office of Economic Opportunity is the legal services program. I am familiar with the superb job being done under this program because in my congressional district in California there are three legal services program offices serving the low-income residents of Livermore, San Jose, and the Eden area of Hayward. Through neighborhood law offices, low-income persons are for the first time able to obtain legal advice and representation before the courts and in their everyday dealings with landlords, merchants, and bureaucracies, both public and private. The guarantees of equal protection and due process are being invoked for all, where too often in the past these constitutional principles were only available for those who could afford legal representation.

The legal services program was the subject of an excellent article by Mr. Wade Greene, "Helping the Poor Find Justice," which appeared in the Reporter magazine, May 18, 1967. Mr. Greene also discusses the broad implications of the program and the effect these cases and services might have in reforming both law and judicial administration. I insert the article by Mr. Greene in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point.

The article follows:

HELPING THE POOR FIND JUSTICE

(By Wade Greene)

With little publicity, the Legal Services Program of the Office of Economic Opportunity is emerging as potentially one of the most valuable and durable projects of the war on poverty. Through its neighborhood law offices it is already providing direct legal counsel and assistance to the poor in many parts of the country. Some of the program's most ardent supporters, especially academic sociologists, would like to see it go much further in bringing about fundamental reforms affecting the poor. They believe it is a useful instrument for defining, enforcing, and ultimately enlarging the asserted rights of the poor through the courts. The emphasis of these visionary supporters, often standing in sharp contrast to the traditional approach of the privately financed legal-aid societies, has created some opposition; but the program itself has proved good enough to win over other initial opponents.

NEIGHBORHOOD LAWYERS

Operating on a $30-million budget and headed by a former Justice Department junior staff member, thirty-three-year-old Earl Johnson, the Legal Services Program has set aside funds for 180 local projects around the country, with some six hundred offices, most of them in poor neighborhoods. Of these, 155 projects and some 550 offices are already in operation. LSP has also given infusions of money to long-established and long-undernourished legal-aid and public-defender services, allowing them to expand their operations greatly. On occasion it has even supplied the poor with credit that enabled them to hire attorneys of their choice under experimental "Judicare" programs.

Most of LSP's operations started only last summer, but already the amount of legal representation for the poor has multiplied many times and the poor have gained greater leverage in their day-to-day dealings with landlords, merchants, and bureacracies. This, according to the program's staff members, is a worthy goal in itself. To the poor, the law has often meant only welfare cutoffs, wage attachments, arrogant policemen, and marshals with eviction notices. Being able to call on a lawyer for advice or representation gives the poor a sense of participation, power, and dignity, as well as more tangible gains. Legal-service advocates point out that society at large benefits, too. "We in the Legal Services Program," Earl Johnson has said, "have a duty to do everything to substitute justice in the courts for violence in the streets."

At the latest count, eleven hundred full-time lawyers, their average wages of $9,500 a year paid from the Federal treasury, were working for clients who could not have afforded them before. Their activities cover the full range of legal concerns except felony trial work, which is left to court-appointed lawyers, and cases that private lawyers might want to take for a share of a potential monetary award.

Take, for instance, the experience of Marna Tucker, a twenty-five-year-old lawyer who has worked with the Neighborhood Legal Services Project in Washington for a year and a half. During a recent three-day period she handled a variety of cases. In one of them she defended a young man on a petty-larceny charge—her first jury trial. Such cases are normally whisked through court in about an hour, but this time the jury's deliberations alone took an hour and a half. The man was found guilty, but because of a probation report based largely on Miss Tucker's investigation into his background—which included psychiatric treatment—her client is free and undergoing further psychiatric care.

A day after the jury trial, a mother of two children came to Miss Tucker's office; almost hysterical, she said one of her children had been bitten by a rat and that she wanted to move out of her apartment. The lawyer placed the mother and her children in temporary lodgings, found welfare and charity funds for them, and eventually helped find them a new apartment. She referred the rat-bite case to a private attorney, who plans to file a suit against the landlord for damages. Later on the same day, a couple from Roxbury, Massachusetts, was referred to her by District juvenile authorities, who were holding the couple's son on suspicion of armed robbery. Miss Tucker argued with the authorities that the evidence would never stand up in court; they agreed to let the boy go home with his parents.

The next day, Miss Tucker began looking into the possibility of seeking relief under the bankruptcy laws for a couple with three children whose combined earnings were $116 a week and who had four thousand dollars in debts. One obstacle was a fifty-dollar fee required by the courts for a bankruptcy petition. The LSP lawyer considered trying to challenge the fee as a violation of the "unequal protection of the law" clause of the Constitution on the grounds that it clearly did not provide as equal an avenue to legal remedies for someone without fifty dollars as it did for a potential bankrupt who still had that much to spare.

Poor clients naturally are pleased by such attentions, but not everybody else is. Some of Washington's lower-court judges are unhappy about the traffic jams in their courts caused by the energetic advocacy of the program's lawyers. Their opposition sometimes goes deeper. "It is no secret that many judges, including myself, are somewhat disenchanted with the Neighborhood Legal Services' attorneys," said General Sessions Judge Charles W. Halleck at a recent legal gathering. The lawyers, he said, were using their cases "to test novel legal points. . . . These crusading knights on white chargers are trying to take every fifteen-cent case all the way up to the Supreme Court."

NEW LAWS FOR OLD

Indeed, changes in the law and in its administration are what many of the poverty lawyers are aiming toward, above and beyond their patchwork responses to their clients' daily crises. Earl Johnson even announced in March that law reform would thereafter be the primary goal of the program. Toward this end, appeals on a number of major legal issues have been prepared and are currently before state and Federal courts.

Paralleling the government's efforts in this area is a private group, the National Office for the Rights of the Indigent, which is headed by Jack Greenberg of the Legal Defense and Educational Fund. Last November Greenberg received a million-dollar grant from the Ford Foundation to set up the new group. It will focus on test cases involving the poor in much the same way that the Legal Defense Fund has led civil-rights battles through the courts. "Those of us who years ago were concerned solely with what I might call the orthodox issues of civil rights," Greenberg says, "have little by little, and for a time not fully realizing it, been dealing more and more with questions of poverty."

Greenberg and other poverty-rights advocates are hoping to benefit, as civil-rights advocates have benefited, from a shift of judicial philosophy in the United States—"to justice and away from fine-spun technicalities and abstract rules," as Supreme Court Justice William J. Brennan put it last year. This shift can be seen in the Supreme Court's 1963 decision in *Gideon* v. *Wainwright*, requiring that courts provide counsel for poor defendants in felony trials. Radical reforms in bail procedures also are being inaugurated across the country; fewer poor men accused of crimes now need languish in jail pending trial for lack of a deposit to ensure their appearance in court. And last December, the high court unanimously ruled that a state had to pay for legal papers, such as trial transcripts, if a poor prisoner wanted them in order to appeal his conviction.

In recent months Justices Brennan and Abe Fortas have demonstrated their receptiveness to the idea of extending protections for the poor from the field of criminal law to the far more pervasive and controversial arena of civil law. "We are on the threshold of a great development in law," Justice Fortas said in September. "We are now ready to begin the process of using the law and lawyers not merely as instruments of defense against criminal accusation, but as positive tools in the everyday life of one-sixth of our population who live on society's fringes."

Last December, in what poverty lawyers hoped would be a landmark case, the Supreme Court agreed to review the first welfare-rule challenge based on a Constitutional right that is neither religious nor political. Mrs. Joyce C. Thorpe, with the aid of a battery of poverty lawyers including Jack Greenberg, contested the decision of the Housing Authority of Durham, North Carolina, to terminate her lease without a hearing or explanation the day after she was elected an official in a tenants' organization. The North Carolina Supreme Court had upheld the eviction of the Negro mother of three, saying that the Housing Authority's obligations to its tenants were the same as a private landlord's and therefore the authority did not have to hold a hearing or explain why it was evicting Mrs. Thorpe.

In their lower-court challenge, Mrs. Thorpe's lawyers contended: "The tenant in a public housing project has a *right* to her apartment, and a deprivation of that right without a hearing violates due process of law." Their Supreme Court brief summed up the ultimate implication of the legal issue at stake: "The question presented by this case is no less than whether thousands of persons are able to live at a minimum level of comfort and decency without being denied this right by arbitrary and unexplained actions of public agencies. In addition, the broader question is involved of the right of persons receiving any public benefits to at least a bare minimum of procedural protection before the very necessities for life are taken from them." Under legal interpretations that stem from English poor laws, the prevalent judicial view in the United States is that welfare benefits are in effect a charity of the state, which can be granted or withheld on any grounds the state in its wisdom chooses: the beneficiary has no more rights concerning his benefits than does the recipient of a gift.

The master strategist in trying to limit the discretionary powers of welfare agencies and to establish a firm claim to welfare benefits by the poor is thirty-eight-year-old Edward V. Sparer, a former labor lawyer who once headed Mobilization for Youth's Legal Services Program on Manhattan's lower East Side. On a $112,000 grant from OEO plus $40,000 from private sources, he and six other lawyers plot welfare-law appeals from an office at Columbia University, where Sparer is legal director of the Center on Social Welfare Policy and Law of the university's School of Social Work. He was delighted when the Supreme Court agreed to review the Thorpe case—he did much of the research for it.

Following the Supreme Court move, however, the Department of Housing and Urban Development ruled that a public-housing tenant was entitled to a statement of the reasons for his eviction and a conference with his would-be evictors. The Supreme Court then referred the case back to the lower court for consideration under this new rule. The poverty lawyers were disappointed in missing a Supreme Court showdown, but they think that the HUD rule may have been prompted by the litigation. Therefore, Greenberg says, they consider it a "half-step forward."

THICKETS OF TRADITION

There are established powers within the judicial system who are plainly skeptical about the new legal services for the poor and what they are trying to do. Four months ago, the Appellate Division of the New York State Supreme Court, under a prerogative open to it, refused to allow three proposed OEO legal-service corporations to set up shop. The court said its primary objection was the complex structure of the corporations, which would prohibit "effective professional or disciplinary supervision by the court." But the court also seemed to be expressing uneasiness about certain political and social aspects of legal services for the poor in general. The plans, the court decleared, were deficient "in not prohibiting entirely and without evasive qualifications political lobbying and propagandistic activity." They also were unsatisfactory "in the indiscriminate mingling of social goals and legitimate legal practice." The court also expressed fears that the law firms for the poor would advise and represent "political factions or organizations of social and economic protest, however worthy."

Other objections have also been voiced in Houston, where some local lawyers disputed the propriety of the Legal Services Program in giving assistance in a civil-rights suit. And Governor William L. Guy of North Dakota vetoed the program proposed for that state, after an informal sounding of local lawyers indicated their opposition.

Yet there is a steadily growing recognition in the legal community that the nation stands to benefit from the program. Some formidable doubters have become champions. The American Bar Association, for one, overcame some original misgivings and enthusiastically backed LSP, going so far as to establish a committee to consider overhauling its long-sacrosanct Canon of Ethics to make allowances for the special problems of providing legal aid to the poor. And last summer, the American Trial Lawyers Association's board overrode a resolution by its president and vice-president that called the Federal program "costly," "wasteful," and "inferior" and then offered cooperation with LSP.

Traditional private legal-aid societies also have come to a peaceful and in some areas even friendly coexistence with LSP. Only two years ago, the executive committee of the National Legal Aid and Defender Association issued a statement declaring: "The creation of separate duplicating agencies to offer legal service will be more costly and less effective than will proper use of existing facilities." Yet last year, the association's president, Theodore Voorhees of Philadelphia, revealed an almost total turnabout. "We have not been foresighted and cannot claim the slightest credit for the initiation of the OEO Legal Services Program," he said. "It did not take us long, however, to realize its potential value, and NLADA at the present time is more vocal in its insistence upon the full-fledged development of this new legal service than [OEO director Sargent] Shriver and the President himself."

A few months later, President Johnson strongly endorsed the LSP, suggesting that it had become a primary weapon in the war on poverty. LSP has also received the qualified blessings of Congress, which has earmarked community-action funds for the program.

This growing support for the Legal Services Program both in and out of government is not hard to understand. For in helping the impoverished assert their rights by recourse to the established rules and regulations of society, the program helps society as well.

VITA Volunteers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL E. BUTTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 12, 1967

Mr. BUTTON. Mr. Speaker, it is most gratifying to see private individuals and organizations in our country take the initiative to further the cause of international peace and development. Volunteers for International Technical Assistance, Inc.—VITA—with international headquarters in Schenectady, N.Y., has recently provided me with information concerning its activities which I am sure will prove of special interest to many of my colleagues. In a recent letter to me, Dr. Beno Sternlicht, President of VITA, spoke of "the significant impact that VITA volunteers are having on those individuals in developing countries who are motivated to help themselves." With over 2,000 requests for technical assistance anticipated in 1967, VITA volunteers are kept very busy helping to fill requests from a world eager to improve itself.

In 1966 the number of nations receiving VITA volunteers increased from 27 to 55. Of the inquiries received, 40 percent are from Latin America, 34 percent from Asia and the Pacific islands, 15 percent from Africa, 4 percent from the Middle East, 7 percent from the United States, Europe, and the world generally.

To meet this demand, 800 new people volunteered for service in 1966, though there was no campaign to recruit them. "VITA's greatest resource," the 1966 annual report said, "is the willingness of its volunteers to give of their time and talent, without thought of material reward. The VITA idea thus complements the work of many official agencies which by themselves cannot afford to hire enough individuals to cover the breadth of experience represented by VITA's list of volunteers."

The services which these volunteers provide is summarized in VITA's 1966 annual report, the following parts of which I commend to general attention:

> The Inquiry Service was the initial source of VITA problems and it remains the heart of the entire VITA operation. Any individual who sees a need in his location, but is unable to meet the need from his own resources can write to VITA and ask for help. . . . The able below classifies the problems according to the nature of the problem. The total higher than 100% is caused by the number of problems that fall into two or more categories.
>
> | | *Percent* |
> |---|---|
> | Small business | 29 |
> | Community development | 25 |
> | Agriculture | 22 |
> | Food processing | 15 |
> | Energy sources | 11 |
> | Education | 10 |
> | Crafts | 7 |
> | Transportation and communications | 6 |
> | Other | 9 |
> | Total | 134 |
>
> VITA's Publication Program is a child of the organization's Inquiry Service. As individual technical request are answered, a vast amount of information is collected. Through its publications, VITA is making this information more widely available . . .
>
> On December 16, 1966, the establishment of the Village Technology Center was announced. The Center represents a capability for testing instructions from the Village Technology Handbook which was written by VITA volunteers. It is a collection of hand tools and other simple devices which demonstrate what is currently being used in various parts of the world. The Center also represents a resource for training individuals from the United States who plan to travel abroad.

Mr. Speaker, it is good to know, especially in times of international unrest, that private organizations such as VITA are offering substantial help to the underdeveloped nations in building internal self-sufficiency, insuring world progress and peace.

Situation in Greece

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 12, 1967

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks I have placed numerous commentaries in the RECORD on the situation in Greece and have criticized our State Department for its failure to give practical support to the present Greek Government and acknowledge the situation realistically. Therefore, in a further effort to provide enlightenment to our foreign policymakers I submit for the RECORD the following articles by Dumitru Danielopol and Ray McHugh of the Copley News Service.

The articles follow:

[From the Aurora (Ill.) Beacon-News, June 21, 1967]

GREEKS FEAR THAT WASHINGTON MAY FORGET TRUMAN DOCTRINE

(By Dumitru Danielopol)

ATHENS.—Greeks in and out of the new military government are deeply concerned that Washington may turn its back on the "Truman Doctrine."

The question is pertinent here because the Johnson administration is "reviewing" some Greek aid programs. The review indicates official U.S. displeasure with the colonels' April 21 coup, but any long delay could be disastrous for Greece and NATO.

The Truman Doctrine inaugurated in 1947 by President Truman pledged help to any country threatened by communistic expansion.

It started when the Greeks were fighting with their backs to the wall against a well-armed, determined guerrilla force sponsored and supported by the Soviet Union and its satellites in Eastern Europe.

"Greece's guardian angel came to its rescue in the spirit and form of President Harry S. Truman," says Col. George Papadopoulos, minister to the Greek prime minister's office, and the key man in the new regime.

Truman sent moral and material help, military experts and armaments.

"Not one single American soldier had to take arms to save Greece," one Greek boasted, "the Greeks did all the fighting."

But defeat in 1948–49 did not destroy the Communists' hope of capturing Greece.

There is plenty of evidence of that.

Seizing on the inability of Greek parties to settle quarrels, the Communists have exploited three years of confusion with their old weapons of blackmail, terror and murder. Communists inside Greece, aided by the neighboring satellite countries, were sapping deeply at the roots of the Greek democratic system.

"They brought the country to the brink of precipice," Prime Minister Constantine Kollias told me in an interview.

"You don't have to believe me, go out in the streets anywhere in Greece and talk to people. You will see that I'm not giving you propaganda."

Despite foreign press criticism of the coup, the Greek in the street seems convinced that his country was saved in the nick of time by the military on April 21.

They are impressed by the efficient, bloodless manner in which it was carried out. Attacks by Sweden, Denmark and Norway on the junta's action seems to have stiffened the support for the new government.

"The Scandinavians worry about 'human rights' here," said one informed source. "They show little concern about real persecutions in the Communist countries."

The colonels are enjoying general popularity among Greek citizens fed up with inept, corrupt, divisive parliamentary politics. Their first month in office is impressive.

With the Red base in Greece shattered, Europe's Communists are wringing their hands and crying about the loss of "democracy." The din is joined by so-called intellectuals and liberals who it seems would have preferred a chaotic situation, followed by a Communist takeover rather than a military coup.

The issues here are major.

Would it have been preferable to see Greece pulled behind the Iron Curtain in the name of democracy to suffer a ruthless totalitarian regime?

Would it have been preferable to see another blood bath which certainly would have ensued if the Communist plans had been allowed to reach fruition?

No democrat favors a military dictatorship but there seems to be overwhelming majority agreement among Greeks: There was no third alternative.

Should President Johnson decide that the Greek military government does not represent the wish of the people of Greece, that the administration doesn't find it worthy of American support, he would jeopardize all the justification he has for his policy in Vietnam.

There cannot be double standards.

The similarity between the two cases is marked. But in Greece the military was able to seize control without loss of life. In Vietnam it is only by the sacrifice of American lives and at a very heavy cost to the American taxpayer that Communist aggression has been more or less contained.

A good many Greeks are convinced that they were "rescued." If Washington wants to avoid new tensions in the Mediterranean it must rally to support this military regime.

It may not be "democratic" but it represents the country's best hope for progress and stability.

It deserves support.

[From the Springfield (Ill.) State Journal, May 12, 1967]

Greek Newsmen Cite Red Putsch Plan

(By Dumitru Danielopol)

Paris.—"The army saved Greece in the nick of time," said the editor of "Independance" a well known Greek newspaper published here.

When the army took over the government in late April, Greece escaped a Czechoslovak type Communist "putsch" according to the Greek newsmen.

A plot to start a revolution which would overthrow the monarchy and bring in a Communist government was uncovered by the army general staff.

The Red operation was to have taken place in stages.

George Papandreou, 81-year-old former prime minister, and his son, left winger Andreas Papandreou were in the forefront of the move, according to these newsmen.

The old man was to act as stooge in the preliminary stages and eventually be removed from power by a purely Communist government.

The plot was hatched in Bucharest in March, according to these Paris reports, when the heads of the banned Greek Communist party, now headquartered in Moscow, met their counterparts from Greece who are incorporated in EDA, a left wing party that is allegedly only a camouflage for a Communist organization receiving orders from Moscow.

The secret meeting was attended by Apostolos Grozos, the president of the Central Committee; Kostas Koliannis, first secretary of the Party, Leonides Stringes; and Panos Dimitriu from Moscow.

The "putsch" was allegedly set for Sunday, April 23, when George Papandreou was staging a massive rally in Salonica.

Free elections were scheduled for May 28th, but the Reds never planned to hold them. According to Paris sources, the rally was to be an excuse to trigger rioting and Communist organized demonstrations throughout Greece.

Youth movements called, "Lambrakis patriotic defense"; Communist infiltrated and directed; were to have spearheaded the rioting.

The revolutionary forces were to be reinforced by some 10,000 "comrades" infiltrated from Bulgaria. These were mainly cadres formed from Greek children stolen during the Greek civil war who have been brought up and trained in Romania.

They were reportedly stationed at Florica, once the Bratianu estates, at Brasov and in the Moldavian and Transilvanian Alps. According to official Greek sources, they have been trained as shock troops to be used for a Communist take over of their native country. They have been armed by Russia and her Communist satellites. They are similar to the "Yenitzars," Greek youths stolen when Greece was under the Turks. These youths were trained in Mahometanism, then infiltrated among the Christian soldiers of the Greek army to act as agents provocateurs.

Some of the officer cadres in the Salonica garrison are said to have been infiltrated by pro-Papandreou factions. These units were reportedly ready to take over the whole area, proclaim a dissident government in Northern Greece, with George Papandreous at the head, and challenge the authority of the Athens Government and King Constantine.

This was the situation, these Greek sources say, that confronted the general staff and forced the coup of April 21.

The new government seized some 18 tons of documents revealing the names of the Communist organization and of others taking part in the planned "putch."

Andreas Papandreou, the left wing former American and ex University of California professor at Berkeley, who was already deeply involved in the ASPIDA plot, is said to be one of the ring-leaders.

He now faces charges of high treason.

[From the Torrance (Calif.) Daily Breeze, July 3, 1967]

Greece: "We've Nothing to Prove"

(Editor's Note—The new prime minister of Greece gives his version of the military takeover in the following story.)

(By Ray McHugh)

Athens.—"This government has no ambition to carry on the burdens of office. Since the day it took office its fundamental aim has been to return Greece to parliamentary government as soon as possible."

Prime Minister Constantine Kollias spoke slowly with emphasis, obviously anxious that the interpreter relay the full meaning.

A short man with a little moustache and dark-rimmed spectacles, he seemed uncomfortable, almost out of place behind the huge desk in the red-carpeted room. A pudgy figure in a dark blue suit and a thickly knotted gray and black tie, Kollias looked like a man who would rather be doing other things than running the Greek government.

But Kollias also looks like a man who is determined to see a job through.

"I have already told the American ambassador that even if Greece is left to stand alone in its struggle for freedom and democracy, it will continue that struggle," he said in an exclusive interview.

Nettled by foreign press criticism of the military regime he heads and concerned about the "review" of American aid programs to Greece, Kollias said Greece needs no reminders or lectures about the basic values of democratic government.

"The history of this land is soaked with the blood of its citizens," he said.

"We do not have to prove that Greeks know how to fight for freedom and democracy."

His voice had a tart quality.

"The government has set as its aim the reconstruction of the political and economic ruins left by the corrupt policies of political parties who ignored the national interest for strictly partisan goals and spent the national treasure in a selfish bid for votes."

Once this reconstruction job is finished, Kollias said, his regime, placed in power April 21 in a bloodless coup by army colonels, will step from the scene.

He said a committee of 20 specialists has been drawn from a cross section of the Greek society to revise the national constitution. It has been instructed to report within six months.

"When the draft is completed," he said, "the government will review it and then submit it to the people for approval at a referendum.

"If approved, the government will then select the proper time for election of a new parliament."

Kollias declined to set a time limit for his army-installed regime, but the head of the Greek supreme court emphasized several times during the interview that "the government has decided this should come as soon as possible."

From the United States, he said, Greece "expects not only material but moral support."

Though disappointed by Washington's review of military aid to Greece—an implied disapproval of the power grab—the prime minister said Greece will proceed to ask more help from the United States.

Washington, he indicated, has not yet realized that the colonels saved Greece from political chaos and a well-organized Communist plot to seize control of the country and take it out of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

The plot, said the prime minister, was organized in conjunction with Greek Communist exiles and the Communist governments of Eastern Europe, principally Yugoslavia, Bulgaria and Romania.

"It is an indisputable fact that the Union of the Democratic Left (EDA) leftist party in Greece was headed by five exiled Greek Communists who are in an Eastern country," said the premier. "The EDA took direct orders daily from the Communist parties in Eastern Europe."

The prime minister mentioned no names, but he said some Greek political leaders in recent months openly adopted extremist EDA slogans and accepted Communist support in a bid for victory in elections that had been scheduled for May 28.

This was an obvious reference to George Papandreou, former premier and head of the Center Union Party, and his son, Andreas, former University of California professor and the most controversial figure in Greek politics.

Greece has moved from one political crisis to another since 1964 when the elder Papandreou was named premier, then resigned in a clash with King Constantine over efforts to establish political controls in the military.

Kollias declined to comment on the activities of the younger Papandreou. He pointed out that the man has been indicted on charges of high treason and he said it would not be proper for him to discuss the case in view of his jurist background.

He did say, however, that the "Aspida" group in the Greek army—with which the younger Papandreou was allegedly allied—sought to overthrow the monarchy, seize power and take Greece out of NATO into a neutralist phase that could easily have been a prelude to communism.

Other Greek officials dismiss fears voiced in the United States that young Papandreou might be executed. Greek law does not provide the death penalty on the charges he faces, said one high official.

"Besides," he added, "we have no intention of creating any martyrs. This has been a bloodless revolution and we have given our pledge to King Constantine that it will continue to be bloodless."

Kollias indicated that he does not believe that most Greek political figures who accepted Communist help were themselves Communists.

"They thought they would use the Communists and their methods and slogans to gain power," he said. "Then they thought they could deal with the Communists. But the Communists had other plans."

In the early days of April, the prime minister said, there was increased infiltration of Communist guerrillas into Greece from Yugoslavia, Bulgaria and Albania. He said this was accompanied by the reactivation of Greek Communists who had been released from prison by previous governments, or who had been allowed to return from exile.

CYO Supports the War on Poverty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 12, 1967

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, on the weekend of June 16–18, the young adult section of the National Catholic Youth Organization held its annual meeting here in Washington. During this conference, the board of directors unanimously passed the following resolution:

> We, the Board of Directors of the Young Adult Section of the National Catholic Youth Organization, acting in the spirit of the Papal Encyclical, "Progress of People," do hereby endorse the War on Poverty Program and urge all of our affiliated dioceses to support this program on a local level wherever possible.

Adoption of the resolution was jointly moved by Ray Hayser and Paul Jordan, outgoing and incoming presidents, respectively, of the archdiocese of Newark, and seconded by Ed Kemple, of the archdiocese of New York, the national civic action and awareness chairman for the young adult section. Frank Clager, from the diocese of Columbus, is the national president of the young adult section, which represents approximately 1 million Catholics between the ages of 19 and 30.

Efforts are underway to implement the resolution through education of the affiliated dioceses to the possibilities for participation in the various programs currently in operation.

I think these young men and women should be commended for their interest and concern over one of the major social problems the Nation faces today.

U.S. Intervention in the Congo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 12, 1967

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, the Los Angeles Times today, July 12, 1967, carries an editorial with regard to the administration's action in providing transport planes and men to aid the Central Government of the Congo.

The Times editorial provides a good assessment of the significance of this move and the reasons for the reaction to granting such aid to the Congolese Government which I believe will be of interest to the Congress.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I submit the editorial for inclusion in the RECORD:

U.S. INTERVENTION IN THE CONGO

President Johnson's dispatch of three U.S. Air Force transport planes and 150 men to the Congo to aid the central government in its fight with mercenary-led rebels has triggered a congressional explosion of surprising magnitude. So vigorous was the attack that it has apparently forced cancellation of a similar plan to intervene in the Nigerian civil war.

The Congo intervention ostensibly had the highest of purposes.

Mutinous troops fighting against President Joseph Mobutu's government reportedly hold a number of hostages, including perhaps some Americans. The U.S. planes were to provide support for government troops, and to attempt a rescue mission to free the hostages.

But there was also a political purpose to the U.S. move. Soviet and Arab attacks in the United Nations against alleged U.S. imperialism may have done some damage to the U.S. position in Africa. Intervening in the Congo against white-led rebels could have been seen as a chance to answer this criticism.

Mr. Johnson obviously blundered in not apprising key men in Congress of what he was doing, and why he was doing it. Had he shown some foresight the criticism might have been more muted. As it was the attack on his action came first from congressional leaders of his own party.

The nub of the criticism was that the United States has no treaty commitments in Africa which would compel its intervention on behalf of any government, particularly in what appear to be civil wars in both the Congo and Nigeria.

Of overriding concern was the possibility that once the first step toward intervention was taken other steps would be inevitable. This feeling—what might be called the Vietnam syndrome—has been increasingly evident lately. It was visible during the recent Middle East crisis, when members of Congress almost unanimously urged no unilateral intervention.

The evident danger of the Vietnam syndrome is that it could lead to a paralysis of will and action in cases where unilateral U.S. efforts might indeed be necessary to protect American lives or vital American interests.

But the trauma of Vietnam also has its useful side. It has driven home the fact that the United States is not and cannot be the world's policeman.

With all its military power and economic wealth, with all its generous intentions, it cannot control events everywhere. What has been called the "illusion of American omnipotence" is just that, and it is high time the government and people adjusted to the fact.

The interests and commitments of America must be protected and honored—where they really exist. Fulfilling these imperatives is, however, a far cry from seeking to pick up a quick political victory or going to the aid of governments to whom we really owe nothing.

War, Prodigality Demand Sacrifices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 12, 1967

Mr. AYERS. Mr. Speaker, throughout the years many of us in public life have turned to John S. Knight for guidance on national and international affairs. Practically every President of the United States has also benefited by their consultations with this great editor.

His column, "The Editor's Notebook," is not only carried by his own Akron Beacon-Journal, Miami Herald, Detroit Free Press, Charlotte Observer, Tallahassee Democrat and the Charlotte News, but in many other great newspapers of our Nation.

I believe that a recent column could be of great interest to my colleagues in the Congress. It is very fine objective evaluation of our present situation.

Mr. John S. Knight's column follows:

WAR, PRODIGALITY DEMAND SACRIFICES

The most annoying phrase in the English language is "I told you so."

No one enjoys being reminded of past mistakes, or of failing to heed advice which, if taken, could have avoided deep trouble.

Even so, this chronicler cannot resist the urge to pick up a few paragraphs from The Editor's Notebook which appeared on the Sunday after the Fourth of July in 1957—ten years ago.

"The strain on America's capitalistic, or profit and loss, system comes from two sources:

"1—Big government spending, and

"2—The wage-price cycle.

"The President has said there must be statesmanlike action by business and labor to combat inflation or 'we are lost.'

"Yet the government, which could set the example for economy, constantly increases its commitments and thereby its costs.

"Every proposed union contract is loaded with wage hikes and innumerable fringe benefits. The employer, with a gun pointed at his head, usually agrees to most of the demands and passes the cost along to the consumer.

"So everybody gets hooked, including the union members and their families.

"Two world wars have failed to bring lasting peace. We are pledged to fight on a score of fronts in case of aggression.

"Yet it is not only the force of arms that could spell disaster, but decay from within."

These observations, mind you, were made during the Republican administration of Dwight D. Eisenhower.

Now, 10 years later, the problems of 1957 are vastly more troublesome. We no longer have creeping inflation. Inflation is on the gallop.

The economy suffers from nationwide strikes and work stoppages.

Consumer prices are rising at an alarming rate. Business earnings, bolstered for years by a false prosperity, have generally been declining during the last six months.

Taxation, at state and local levels, rises every year as officials seek new ways to extract additional revenues for needs which continue to mount.

And higher federal income taxes are in prospect to help pay for the war in Vietnam—about $2 billion a month—and cover overly optimistic miscalculations in the national budget.

The chairman of the Federal Reserve Board and Gardner Ackley, chairman of the President's Council of Economy Advisers, both state that the record $18 billion federal deficit could lead to massive inflation.

As I have so often stated, all of this fiscal confusion was reasonably predictable, the Great Society's choral renditions on how to spend more than you have and still get rich notwithstanding.

In assessing the responsibility for our unhappy plight, these factors are as visible as the anatomy of a fat-legged female in a mini skirt:

1—President Johnson's decision to escalate an unconscionable war in Vietnam where nearly 500,000 young Americans are now bogged down in a bloody conflict with no end in sight.

2—The President's lack of prescience in not asking for higher federal revenues some 18 months ago when this course was clearly indicated.

3—Lack of restraint and statesmanship in labor relations; complete disregard of governmental guidelines in settlement of labor disputes.

4—Ever higher government spending for social programs, together with creation of new and non-essential projects even as the Vietnam war is taxing our resources.

5—Increasing public demands for more and more services, often inspired by the commonly accepted misconception that the federal government "pays for all of this."

6—Strikes of schoolteachers, police, firemen, maintenance and welfare workers—all clamoring for higher pay without recourse to normal procedures.

7—The false assumptions by a majority of the U. S. Congress and many state legislatures that since the United States "is the richest country in the world, we can afford anything."

8—The vast outflow of foreign aid—much of it in military hardware—which is draining our once ample gold supply far below prudent limits.

Yet it is you—not the Federal government—who pays for "all of this." The government has no financial resources other than your taxes. It creates no wealth. It simply spends your money. And how!

The early purpose of Federal taxation was to defray the running expenses of government. It is now being used to change our social structure, to reform and instruct the people, to take from the thrifty and give to the nonproductive elements of our society.

As the Wall Street Journal says so cogently: "The notion of literal equality has been persistently preached by the politicians and would-be opinion molders throughout this generation. The productive citizens are regularly berated, seemingly precisely for their attainments, while the unproductive are made into paragons of virtue."

This is not to say we should neglect the needy, the ill, our veterans or the elderly. But one might wish for better management of these endeavors and the accompanying satisfaction of knowing that your money is being expended efficiently for worthy causes and not to reward chronic idlers.

Our government's prodigality has finally brought its "new school" economists to the belated admission that higher taxes must be imposed.

Yet when I, among others, urged this course upon the President a year ago, he replied that I was not only wrong but underinformed.

It was quite apparent almost two years ago what should be done. The President might have foreseen that the economy could not sustain the vast costs of a war in Vietnam and proliferation of administration programs without recourse to new revenues.

When he had a change of heart last January and proposed a six per cent surcharge on all incomes, he encountered nothing but solid opposition.

The cry went up from labor, business and political leaders, "It is much too late, the economy will be adversely affected."

It was indeed late, but not too late to take the exact steps which are now being recommended. Yet the President chose to stall and delay as public opinion went against him.

He now faces the moment of truth. Wars and huge domestic spending cost money, vast sums which Washington doesn't have.

No longer can the administration duck the issue by trying new fiscal gimmicks and hoping wistfully that the war will soon be ended.

The President keeps advising us that Americans should count their blessings as the best-paid best-fed and best-educated people on earth.

We are likewise a spoiled, pleasure-bent society which has made no sacrifices whatsoever while our gallant men are suffering and dying in Southeast Asia.

If the President were less politically motivated and considerably more candid with the people, he would take them into his confidence and speak the truth.

The truth being that the nation is overcommitted, our resources strained, the treasury bare, inflation out of hand and each of us must be prepared for an uncertain future of war, higher taxes and personal sacrifices for an indeterminate period.

But what politician would utter these unpopular thoughts?

A Winston Churchill, of course, but no other illustrious name in this generation of political leaders comes to mind.

Queens Borough Public Library

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 12, 1967

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, my home County of Queens, which is part of New York City, is rightfully proud of its Queens Borough Public Library, the only library system in the city which is not part of the New York Public Library.

For years, Queens has been the fastest growing borough and county of New York City. Its public library serves some of the city's most prosperous communities, and at the same time offers numerous progressive, advanced services to its culturally deprived children and adults.

A recent report by Harold W. Tucker, director of the Queen Borough Public Library, to the National Advisory Commission on Libraries, outlines some of the achievements and the goals of the system.

I commend it to the attention of my colleagues, for its values for comparison and discussion in a field which we recognize as highly important in all of our communities:

STATEMENT OF HAROLD W. TUCKER TO THE NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMISSION OF LIBRARIES

Serving the County of Queens, New York City's most rapidly growing borough, with over two million residents, the Queens Borough Public Library occupies a unique position in the New York City area. Its central reference and research library not only serves the large and demanding population of Queens County, but attracts numerous users from Nassau and Suffolk, the other two counties on Long Island, having between them an additional two million residents.

Because of the high level of education which characterizes Queens County's adult residents, the proportion of college students in Queens' population is very high. What sets Queens apart from other areas in this respect is the "commuter" quality of local higher education. Queens County students reside at home more frequently than not, travelling to colleges in the other boroughs of New York City, and in Nassau County, but relying on the reference resources of the Queens Borough Public Library's Central Building, which is in their home area. Furthermore, these students are in large numbers enrolled in the newer colleges and universities in the Queens-Nassau-Suffolk "Tri-County" areas; a group of schools which are themselves rapidly expanding and in urgent need of library development. Thus, the Central Library serves to supplement, and in some instances substitute for college and university libraries required by an already large and rapidly growing college student population.

The System's extension system comprises 54 branch libraries, 3 bookmobiles and a hospital library service. The branches range from small neighborhood agencies to large collections in congested commercial areas, and serve a wide variety of public ranging from pre-school children to the local business communities. The agencies of the branch network have always distinguished themselves in supplying local library service to a large, highly literate and critical local population, reflecting the prosperity of the county's fine residential communities. This variety of user is growing in numbers as the county develops, and these readers continue to receive the high quality of library service they demand.

The System has responded in earnest, however, to the newer and frequently more challening and demanding requirements of Queens' growing numbers of culturally deprived children and adults. The regional circumstances here have determined that the Queens Borough Public Library shall function in a great number of different ways, and in different contexts, causing it to develop a far more varied and complex character than is the case among the great majority of library systems.

Principal among Queens Borough's problems in offering the varied services of its central reference and research center is the retention of a large and stable force of trained reference specialists, a variety of librarian currently in short supply. A suitable project for the National Advisory Commission on Libraries would be a study of possible awards to specialist professional employees through federal or state grants to encourage their remaining in reference positions. These awards could be made on the basis of graduate education completed beyond the required master's degree. Such a system of monetary awards in supplement to locally established salaries would serve not only to stabilize the specialist force, but to improve it by rewarding specialist education.

Subsidy of professional education itself through government aid to work-study programs is also a legitmate field for study by the Commission. At the present time the Queens Borough Public Library system gains a large proportion of its professional staff through its Librarian-Trainee program. This work-study program employs qualified college graduates in the system where, as their graduate education progresses in a school of library service, they are introduced to progessively more sophisticated pofessional activities. This sort of combination of academic discipline and practical experience gained under the guidance of seasoned professionals has proven itself to be the best system of education for librarianship yet devised. Under the present circumstance however, the burden of tuition and fee rests entirely on the student. A system of grants in aid of library education, relieving the student of some of the tuition expense would not only boost recruitment, but would enable many trainees to complete their degree requirements more quickly, and therefore join the pofessional ranks at an earlier date. An acceleration of library education is precisely what is needed at this time if the country's libraries are to keep pace with the expanding mass and complexity of library materials and the rapidly growing pressure on libraries from their public.

The central reference and research center's supplementation of local college libraries, as productive and worthwhile as it is, causes great additional strain on its resources, and aggravates the shortage of reference specialists. The public-university library relationship could be made far more productive in the presence of effective model plans of interlibrary cooperation in the fields of monograph and serial acquisition, retention and microfilming. Regional studies undertaken through N.A.C. initiation might serve to lay the ground plans for the development of integrated regional systems of cooperating academic and public libraries reciprocal to each other. Even more basic, however, is the examination of the fundamental roles of the public and academic libraries in higher education, notably in such new developments as community and junior colleges.

On the material side, the Central Library finds itself with a number of problems stemming from its position as a depository for local publications and material relevant to local New York and Long Island history, geography, economics and folklore. Prime among these problems is the crisis of the deterioration of materials before they can be adequately preserved or duplicated on microfilm or some other form of microprint or photoduplicate. At the present time, no regional organization coordinating microfilming projects of the various local libraries, historical societies and museums exists. The formulation by the National Advisory Commission on Libraries of national standards for coordination of microfilming programs would prove of inestimable help in situations like ours, which, of course, exist throughout the country.

Pursuant to our continuing policy of supplying the finest possible library service at the neighborhood level through the branch system, the Queens Borough Public Library has planned a variety of methods of increasing branch service efficiency. Several of these projects could be set up on an experimental basis with public aid, and their results published. Among those experiments planned is a system of teletype communications to hurry the processing and filling of interloan requests among branches and the Central Library. At the present time, the Central Library and the Flushing Branch are involved in a project financed by the Federal Government in accordance with the Library Services and Construction Act. The general purpose of this study is to analyze the extent to which Flushing Branch patrons might be aided by readier access to the collections held in the Central Library. If it is determined that readier access to these resources would be of major benefit to Flushing patrons, the study will suggest means by which such access might be achieved, including the installation of any needed communication equipment. In effect, this is an experimental reversal of the traditional relationship between branch and Central Library in the reference role. Rather than referring the patron to the central reference collection when its own resources have been exhausted, the resources of the Central Library would, in effect, be brought to the branch through the use of telecommunication equipment.

At the same time that the system carries forward these experimental programs, the more routine extension service activities of branch network expansion continue. The pressing need for new buildings, both to re-house agencies presently in obsolete or inadequate quarters, and to open new branches in developing localities dictates the most cautious site selection and planning of physical plant. Studies undertaken through National Advisory Commission influence could provide public library systems with data on pedestrian traffic patterns and location preferences which would materially aid the public library in its efforts to maximize the effectiveness of its expenditure of the building funds available.

All of the activities and innovations mentioned here have referred to service of the Library's traditional public, the mass of educated citizens and their children, familiar with books and the printed word in various forms. In recent years, however, the requirements of the culturally deprived segment of the community have shaped branch library service to an increasingly great extent. The Library's "Operation Head Start to Reading" for pre-school children is a project designed to reach this segment of the population. It operates with the objectively substantiated view that exposure to books and storytelling during pre-school years has a lifelong beneficial influence, and consists of branch programs designed to expose three to five year old children in deprived neighborhoods to the printed and spoken word. Among specific benefits derived from the program are development of the culturally deprived child's ability to learn by listening, the attainment of reading readiness through the development of verbal skill and the broadening of his experiences and knowledge, and the development of his imagination. Along the general lines of library service to the culturally deprived, the Queens system has developed a plan for the establishment of local "storefront agencies" tied in with small community centers in deprived neighborhoods. These agencies could provide guidance in remedial reading for children, and an adequate place for elementary school children to study. Together with "Operation Head Start to Heading", this project could prove invaluable in enabling the Library to realize its potential as an agent for social progress on an informal, local basis. The National Advisory Commission on Libraries could further no better project than one aiding regional cooperative efforts in evaluating these and similar programs and gathering information on local needs and practices.

Vietnam Comes to Ontonagon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP E. RUPPE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 12, 1967

Mr. RUPPE. Mr. Speaker, with every death notice from Vietnam, we are reminded that for the families and loved ones of our fighting men, that far-off war is very near indeed. The village of Ontonagon in northern Michigan recently lost two of its young citizens in a single day. I wish to submit the following article, which appeared in the Saginaw News, describing with some poignancy the effect of those deaths on that town.

The article referred to follows:

VIETNAM COMES TO ONTONAGON

(By John Barbour)

ONTONAGON, MICH.—This is a quiet town, a long way from Vietnam.

It is a town where children grow free to wander woods and build campfires on the Lake Superior shore, where people know each other's license plates and family troubles and where the weekly newspaper prints personal notes of thanks on the front page. It is a long way from Vietnam.

But on a cold night in April, Vietnam came to Ontonagon with brutal swiftness. A military car made two stops. A dutiful hand knocked softly on two doors. The words were brief, the facts few.

It had happened the day before on the other side of the world. In one terrible moment enemy automatic weapons fire killed Ernest Mack Skinner, 22, and William Raymond Lundberg, 20.

They are only names in the long list of American dead in Vietnam that now totals over 10,000. But in this town of 2,500 where people pride themselves on knowing most everyone, they were much more than names. They were a polite boy and a laughing child, an ambitious teen-ager and a good friend.

They were intimate parts of people's lives: Ernie, whose parents died in a plane crash when he was 2, whose high spirits led him through the troubles of growing up to become a young man of drive and promise. Billy, whose father died when he was 15, whose quietness was a puzzle to some, and a gentleness to others, whose first thought was always the welfare of a friend.

Word of their deaths, like ripples on a darkened pond, spread through the town, from family to family, from the mill to Stubb's Bar, by telephone and hushed word of mouth, ending always in frustrated, unbelieving silence.

"Ontonagon only has 2,500 people, and it's lost three," said Irene Wolfe, editor of the weekly Herald. "We have the feeling it isn't over yet."

The first Vietnam death came last June. Kenneth Somero, 24, a graduate of Ontonagon High School, was on a weekend pass. He was shot by a sniper. "My God," said one townswoman, "what kind of a war is it? You can't tell your friends from your enemies."

It was a week between the first word that Billy and Ernie had been killed, and the arrival of their bodies in Ontonagon. In the stunned silence of that week, most of the town could not come to grips with the reality.

Nancy Kulppi, who lives in Marquette now, but who grew up with Ernie Skinner, broke down when she heard the news. She remembered him as a talkative, laughing child with dark flashing eyes. In all sincerity he gave her a present once, wrapped in an old box. It was a dead frog he had found in the road. He was only 4 then. She was 6, but she remembered.

And she remembered the silly, inconsequential things that made up their childhood together, making walkie-talkies with embroidery thread snitched from her mother, playing leapfrog over the tombstones in the cemetery, searching out the home of a favorite teacher and being too afraid to knock on the door, bicycling into town for the first time and getting lost in the backstreets of its smallness, taking forbidden swims in the lake, eating paid-for watermelon and stolen corn on the cob, camping overnight in the woods and making coffee with swamp water, and having to throw it out because it was full of frog's eggs.

When Nancy saw him in the open casket for the last time she thought, "He looked older and so tired," and she cried again. "I guess it was knowing my childhood was over," she said.

Donald Roehm, 22 was working at the paper mill when he got word Billy Lundberg was dead. It hit him hard. He owed his job to Billy who had stepped aside in the mill's seniority ranks and took a laboring job in those months before he was drafted to let Donnie have the better job as paper tester Billy had been in line for.

When he left work, Donnie went to the Veterans of Foreign Wars hall where his father tends bar. It was there he heard about Ernie who had been his best friend all through high school. In Donnie's words, he could not say, nor do a thing.

"The only thing I remember was disbelief," Donnie said later, "until they brought the caskets home and I saw it was true with my own eyes."

Remembering Ernie, Donnie looked far away. "He loved life so much, and he knew how to live it," he said, "and something like this has to happen before he had a chance."

After graduation, Ernie left town to learn the trade of meatcutting and to work in supermarkets in Illinois. Donnie became close then to Billy Lundberg, a quiet young boy a year behind Donnie and Ernie in school.

Once, for a Labor Day parade, they built a float, a mechanized hand of a monster, called "The Thing." It won first prize.

"Billy was the type of kid you really had to get to know," Donnie said softly. "In a crowd of guys, he didn't say much. He wasn't full of wisecracks. He didn't say much around grownups either. He was always just polite."

High school Principal James Webber knew both boys, and he heard the numbing news at home. "I came here in 1954," he said slowly. "I had them in school for seven years."

Sitting in his crowded school office behind his paper-stacked desk, he thought back to the two boys.

"I probably knew Ernie better than Billy," he said. "He was a real spirited boy, and there were a lot of times I had him in the office here to talk turkey to him. But he was a good boy, too. He responded well, and grew into a responsible young man.

"In fact, Ernie was a good friend of mine. At least, I felt so. He used to come here whenever he was back in town, and we'd talk about his job, and how he was getting along. Once he was worried about some people who worked for him, but weren't doing their jobs. He felt he had to fire them in loyalty to his employer, but he didn't want to do it. And he was concerned about his friends here, that they weren't doing as much with their lives as they should. He was determined he was going to."

Ernie was raised by his grandparents. He called them mother and father, but they were older than most mothers and fathers. His grandmother, Fay Noble, was the only white-haired member of the Kindergarten Mother's Club.

She and her husband who died in 1959 had one ambition, to see Ernie and his younger sister, Reba, graduate from high school. Mrs. Noble and Reba still live in the white frame home west of town, where Ernie grew up. Reba's husband, Tom, was brought home from duty in Thailand for Ernie's funeral.

Ernie worked all through high school, first Wagner's Restaurant, then at the IGA Foodliner where owner Henry Hoefferle remembers his ambition and his hard work.

"We felt especially bad about it because he worked with us, and we knew what he was like," Hoefferle said standing at the checkout counter. "And when you lose two boys from a town as little as this—that's sadness."

At the local chapter of the United Papermakers & Paperworkers Union, where Billy belonged, they draped the charter in black. And they remembered things about him, his selflessness, and how he lent money to a buddy to go to college even though he wasn't going himself.

Billy's mother, Mrs. Robert Letson, still can't bear to talk about her son's death. She has Billy's younger brother and sister, Freddie and Nyra, at home as well as two children from her present marriage. Billy's sister Linda was injured in an auto accident, coming to spend Mother's Day at home. In a town where not many people move away, Billy's family had lived here only 10 years. They came from Green Bay, Wis., in 1957.

The Rev. David J. Musall, pastor of St. Paul's Lutheran church where Billy's family attended, recalled the disbelief that spread through the town.

"It isn't like World War II, when everyone was involved in some way," he said. "This war seemed so distant until something like this brought it home."

"But there are men in this town who have been in the services, who have seen things like this happen before," he said. "Maybe they wonder if there is as good a reason to fight now as when they fought. But, above it, they have a sense of national pride and duty."

The weekly Herald published again a letter it had printed three months earlier from a soldier in Vietnam. The writer had requested his name withheld. It was addressed to the people of Ontonagon, and said:

"The last couple of weeks I have seen notes in the paper about bringing our boys home.

"No man wants to leave his home and go to war, but the great leaders of our country think we have to, to keep peace in our country. Every man that is here would like to be home, but we know we have to be here, and while we are here we are going to do our best to fight, and, die, if we must, to keep our country free.

"We do not ask much of the people at home, just a little support will make it a lot easier, to know the people at home are pulling for us. We also feel we are winning the war, and we have a right to be here. Please do not protest the war."

This time the letter was signed, "Ernie Skinner."

When the news of the deaths spread through the town, one old man, his eyes glistening in the sun, leaned across the breakfast room table in the home he built and remembered the little boy "I bounced on my knee." Another old man who knew one of the boys well broke into uncontrollable tears at the funeral home and had to be helped outside.

One teacher found a desk in her classroom with the name "Ernie Skinner" carved in it, and another found some old test papers the boys had done in school. One man remembered how Ernie on his last visit home had confided that someday he wanted to put a proper marker on his parents' grave in Oregon.

These were the things the townspeople remembered, quietly, each in his own way. The bodies came home separately. A military guard of honor accompanied them. Flowers were sent from Vietnam, from the men of Company B, 4th Battalion, 23rd Regiment, 25th Infantry Division, the final buddies of Ernie and Billy.

All the businesses in town closed in their honor. The veterans without any formal organization quickly posted an honor guard for each boy. The men stood short tours, passing on and wearing one tired VFW hat whether they were members or not.

Billy and Ernie died while on patrol with their company in the heavily forested area near Cu Chi, some 25 miles northwest of Saigon. They came under heavy fire from Viet Cong guerrillas. One sergeant saw three of the enemy running into the underbush and gave chase. He didn't come back.

Sgt. Ernie Skinner started out to look for him. He had moved barely 15 yards when a burst of enemy automatic weapons fire cut him down. Cpl. Billy Lundberg saw him get hit, leaped from his position and firing his 25-pound, M60 submachine gun, charged toward the enemy fire.

Another burst from the concealed enemy positions hit Billy Lundberg and he slumped to the ground. When the battle was over, Billy and Ernie were found in the brush only a few feet apart.

Billy Lundberg was awarded the Silver Star, and Ernie Skinner the Bronze Star, both posthumously.

They were brought back to be buried. And Nancy Kulppi remembered how she and Ernie had run home from the cemetery one night, frightened by a ghostly clinking noise in the wind. The next day they had laughed when they found it was only the flag clips blowing against the pole. Now Ernie is buried barely 15 feet from the same flagpole in the same cemetery.

And a man who knew Billy, and how close he had been to his father, remembered how hurt Billy had been when his dad died. And now Billy lies by his father's side in another cemetery in another town.

Louis V. Sutton: Man of the South

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. GARDNER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 12, 1967

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, each year a Man of the South Award is presented to an outstanding citizen by the Dixie Business magazine, edited by Hubert F. Lee, of Decatur, Ga. The 1966 recipient of this award is Louis V. Sutton, chairman of the Carolina Power & Light Co., of Raleigh, N.C.

Mr. Sutton is the 21st recipient of the award, which was begun in 1946. The late Senator Harry F. Byrd, Sr., was the Man of the South for 1965.

Under unanimous consent I insert the news release and a number of news articles naming Mr. Sutton as Man of the South for 1966 in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

LOUIS V. SUTTON: MAN OF THE SOUTH

In the "Man of the South" for 1948 edition of Dixie Business featuring C. Hamilton Moses, then President of Arkansas Power & Light Co., I wrote in my Editor's Whirligig the following personal appraisal of Louis V. Sutton:

Sutton.—Louis V. Sutton came back to his Alma Mater this past June to deliver the Commencement address at the 76-Commencement of Virginia Polytechnic Institute at Blacksburg, Virginia, and though he declared "This institute taught me much of value but it never taught me mastery of the eloquent word . . ." his eloquent words were equal to his modesty. He spoke on "The Heritage that Is Ours."

Those who heard him will never forget what he said. Here are extracts:

"The need for the type of service which you have been carefully fitted to render, was never greater than it is today. . . .

"Above all and most important of all, you are graduating into an economic and political society that is free. . . .

"There are those among us who scoff at the American way of life. Many of them pray with their starry eyes turned toward Moscow as the Moslem prays with his face turned to Mecca. They would have us exchange the priceless blessings of political and economic liberty for a regimented society. They are the frustrated and the foolish among us. They esteem liberty so lightly that they would barter it away for the promise of a dole. . . .

"The principle difference between our economic system and all others is that ours is a privately owned economy. The profit incentive is the spur to all men. That is the real basis of success in America—the hope for reward—the incentive to produce together with the necessity of competing with others. Incentive might be called the spark plug of our system. Incentive is what makes our system tick. . . .

"Here in our country the profit motive is coupled with private ownership and as a result we have today in America 3½ million businesses and 6 million farms, all privately owned, where men and women are producing goods and services in competition for a portion of the national income . . .

"The economic system which produces the greatest supply of material benefits for the greatest number of people is indisputably the system which provides the greatest good for the greatest number. That system is the private enterprise system which has been developed to such a high degree of efficiency and productivity in the United States and which has contributed so much to the security and power of this republic. It has enabled the average American worker to manufacture and to possess more than 6 times as much goods as the average worker outside the United States . . .

"Hold fast to that system of free enterprise. Economic freedom and political liberty are inseparable. You cannot throttle one without weakening and destroying the other. Economic regimentation leads inevitably to political regimentation, and political regimentation results sooner or later in the fatal undermining of democracy.

"The system of private ownership and management of industry comes down to your generation as a heritage of the past. It is a sacred duty. It is none the less sacred because in its actual functioning it will serve your happiness, your freedom and your prosperity. It is as essentially American as the Stars and Stripes. It is just as much a part of the free traditions of this republic as the Declaration of Independence . . ."

Since winning his B. S. degree in 1910, Mr. Sutton has been a leader in the public utility field . . . in 1944 he was awarded the Honorary degree of Doctor of Engineering by N. C. State College, Raleigh . . . Amicron Delta Kappa . . . Rotarian.

Mr. Sutton is President of the Carolina Power and Light Company, Raleigh, N.C.

Many new industries in his territory attest to his dynamic leadership and his being a man who practices what he preaches.

Louis V. Sutton Named South's Man of 1966

Atlanta.—Louis V. Sutton, chairman of Carolina Power and Light Co., Raleigh, N.C., was named today by Dixie Business Magazine as "Man of the South" for 1966.

In announcing the selection, Editor Hubert F. Lee termed Sutton an outstanding symbol of the leadership of public utility officials.

Sutton, a native of Richmond, Va., joined Carolina Power & Light in 1912. He returned as president of the firm in 1933, after service with Arkansas Power & Light and Mississippi Power & Light. He became board chairman and chief executive officer of the CP&L in 1949.

The award will be presented formally early next year.

Decatur, Ga.—Louis V. Sutton, pioneer utility leader and chairman of Carolina Power and Light Company, Raleigh, N.C., today was named by Dixie Business magazine as the "Man of the South" for 1966.

Sutton is the 21st to receive the title since 1946. The late Senator Harry F. Byrd, Sr. was 'Man of the South" for 1965 and the late Bernard M. Baruch, for 1964. Hubert F. Lee, editor of Dixie Business for 38-years, said that Mr. Sutton is "a fine symbol of the leadership of public utility leaders of the South."

Sutton was one of the "South's 50 Foremost Leaders" named by Dixie Business in 1949 to celebrate the magazine's 20th anniversary.

This 50, with subsequent increases to 200, is now termed the South's "Hall of Fame for the Living," the honor group from which the "Man of the South" is selected each year.

Frank P. Samford, Birmingham, the "Man of the South" for 1958 who is chairman of Liberty National Life Insurance Company and in whose honor Samford University is named, wrote Lee, in confirming the poll, "Mr. Sutton is worthy of this award. The heads of our utility companies in the southeast have done a great job in developing this area, and certainly have proven themselves to be great business leaders."

A number of the investor-owned utilities also expressed approval of the honor to Mr. Sutton, including W. B. McGuire, president of Duke Power Co., Charlotte, N.C., S. C. McMeekin, chairman of South Carolina Electric & Gas Company, Walter Bouldin, president of Alabama Power Company, and Harllee Branch, Jr., president of the Southern Company.

Bishop Arthur J. Moore, of Atlanta, "Man of the South" for 1954, likewise endorsed the selection of Louis V. Sutton, and William H. Barnhardt, Charlotte, a Presbyterian layman, philanthropist, and textile manufacturer said, "I am pleased that Louis V. Sutton has been named 'Man of the South.'"

Reuben B. Robertson, Asheville, N.C., chairman emeritus, Champion Papers Inc., "Man of the South" for 1950. "As you know, I have always been an ardent admirer of Louis Sutton and am delighted to see that this additional recognition has been given him. I express complete and enthusiastic approval. I welcome Mr. Sutton to the ranks of the 'Man of the South' and feel quite distinguished—that is 'distinguished by association.'"

Edwin I. Hatch, Atlanta, president Georgia Power Co., "I heartily concur in th suggestion of Mr. Louis V. Sutton as the 'Man of the South' for 1966."

William H. Ruffin, Durham, N.C., chairman, Erwin Mills and president of American Textile Mfg. Institute, "Louis Sutton has done a great job in building up the very fine Carolina Power & Light Company and in doing so the broad areas that it serves. He has long been an outstanding leader in his industry and here in this part of the Southeast . . ."

M. M. Masterpool, General Electric public information director, New York, "Congratulations to Mr. Sutton, the 'Man of the South' and to Dixie Business for selecting him . . .'"

Alexander Nunn, Birmingham, Ala., Executive Editor, The Progressive Farmer and Southern Living, "Louis Sutton certainly does have a highly significant record." Editor Nunn was presented the W. D. Boyce Award for "Distinguished Service to Scouting" at the Elbeetian Legion in Winston-Salem, August 13, 1966, by the editor of Dixie Business, national chairman of the Committee to honor W. D. Boyce, the founder of the Boy Scouts and Lone Scouts of America.

Rufus C. Harris, Macon, Ga., president of Mercer University, "I am glad to give my approval of Louis Sutton."

O. R. Cheatham, Chairman of Georgia-Pacific Corporation, "I think Louis Sutton is an excellent choice for 'Man of the South' for 1966."

Fred J. Turner, Atlanta, retired president of Southern Bell Telephone and Telegraph Company and a director of Eastern Airlines, "I couldn't agree with you more on Louis Sutton for '66 . . ."

David Tennant Bryan, Richmond, Va., chairman and publisher Richmond Times-Dispatch, Richmond News Leader. "I do heartily applaud your nomination of Mr. Louis V. Sutton."

John C. Whitaker, Winston-Salem, N.C., retired chairman of R. J. Reynolds Tobacco Company, "I approve the selection of Louis V. Sutton. He is a very capable man—a good administrator—and popular with people. He deserves this honor."

P. F. Wetzek, Greenville, Mississippi, "Louis Sutton is a fine choice."

Dr. T. Marshall Hahn, Jr., president, Virginia Polytechnic Institute, (Louis Sutton, Ben M. McKelway and Owen R. Cheatham are VPI grads) wrote: "Needless to say, this selection of Mr. Sutton meets our wholehearted approval, Mr. Sutton is one of our most outstanding alumni, and this new and deserved honor certainly is a fitting addition to his distinguished career."

Born in Richmond, Va., Sutton was reared in Petersburg, Va. He graduated from Virginia Polytechnic Institute in 1910 in electrical engineering. He worked two years with General Electric, and in 1912 went with Carolina Power & Light Co. He joined Arkansas Power & Light Company in 1924.

In 1927, Mr. Sutton went with the Mississippi Power & Light Company, Jackson, Miss., as president and general manager. In 1933, Sutton returned to Carolina Power & Light Company as president. In 1949, he became chairman and chief executive officer. Shearon Harris is president of Carolina Power & Light Company.

The State Magazine gave Mr. Sutton its "Most Outstanding North Carolinian" award in 1953, and Virginia Polytechnic Institute honored him with its "Distinguished Alumnus Award" in 1961. The North Carolina Society of Engineers in 1953 picked Sutton for its "Engineering Achievement" award.

"Louis Sutton is a shining example of the men who have made the South great," Hubert F. Lee said.

The Rootless Young

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 12, 1967

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, an especially dramatic editorial appeared in yesterday's Chicago Tribune which, in effect, was an extended commentary on an article by the Tribune's Washington bureau chief, Walter Trohan. The only additional observation that I make in the process of submitting this article for the Record is that it effectively opens up thoughtful review of the danger to this country of the radical left. For years there has been the clever and effective propaganda barrage to create monsters of individuals and groups described as the radical right whereas in fact the most sinister threat to this country is obviously by the multitude of radical leftist groups. The editorial follows:

THE ROOTLESS YOUNG

Walter Trohan's extended article on the New Left in THE TRIBUNE's Sunday magazine was a masterful profile of a movement of a minority of the younger generation. This new brand of radical is "agin" everything. He is against the war in Viet Nam, against the military, against selective service, against civilian political leaders, against business enterprise, against law and order, against education as now structured, against everything his country represents, against tradition and social organization.

But the mystery to Mr. Trohan—and to us—is why. The New Left has no tangible substitute for what it seeks to destroy. The movement is characterized as one of "seditious resistance", but in essence it is anarchic and nihilistic.

"The New Leftists," Mr. Trohan says, "do not seem legitimately interested in bringing about a better country, except by destroying the values it has. They are dedicated in their strange and unpredictable ways to cutting at the roots of American society."

Granted that the New Left is a minority movement. Mr. Trohan does not take it lightly because of that. He finds that its members are a novel and distinct type of subversive, and their danger, if allowed to run unchecked, is great.

What concerns perceptive citizens, as Mr. Trohan points out, is the alienation of the New Left from our democratic processes and ideals. It is the open hostility of the minority of students to law and order, to civilized behavior, and the concept of liberty under law. It is the growing nihilism, the swelling anarchism, and the mounting negativism of a movement which flouts and derogates the institutions which give it the freedom it enjoys.

While the New Left forever prates about free speech, civil rights, and peace, it ignores the fact that only American free speech and civil rights allow it to function without interference or molestation. As for peace, this movement views the United States as the only disturber of peace. It will not admit that American force has been exerted only to counteract communist threats to the peace. It would be happy if our whole defense establishment were dismantled and the country opened for our enemies to walk in.

To say that these attitudes are illogical and irrational will not impress the New Left, for it does not deal in logic or rationality. Its members have not the imagination to think of what would happen if they were Russians, not Americans, and tried to launch the form of massive protest they dream of here within the confines of a totalitarian country. Their ranks would soon be dispersed thru the salt mines and forced labor camps of the Soviet Union.

Dr. William Petersen of the University of California, who viewed the sustained disorders on the Berkeley campus, has offered the comment, "Preposterous as this may seem to those on the outside, the real issue is the seizure of power. The guiding principle of the radicals heading the revolt is one of Lenin's favorite aphorisms, which he borrowed from Napoleon: 'On s'engage et puis on voit.' Roughly translated, this appeared on one picket sign as 'Strike now, analyze later'."

We have no belief that the New Left can succeed in its goal of wrecking the country. But it would be imprudent to disregard the fact that its humorless intent is not to build a better society but to destroy the American system as we know it.

Nation Honors Ann Pellegreno

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARVIN L. ESCH

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 12, 1967

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, it is with special pride that I call the attention of the House to the unique achievement of a distinguished constituent from my district, Ann Pellegreno. This Saturday, Mrs. Pellegreno will be honored by her friends and neighbors in Saline, Mich., with a tickertape parade welcoming her home from an historic adventure, an around-the-world flight which followed the path of another great aviatrix, Amelia Earhart.

I know that you, Mr. Speaker, and the other Members of Congress, together with the whole Nation, have closely followed the flight of Mrs. Pellegreno and her crew and join with me today in offering congratulations on the successful accomplishment of her mission. I have taken a deep personal interest in her adventure not only because she is from my district but also because my 9-year-old son, Thomas, logged his first flight instruction with Mrs. Pellegreno during this past year and so symbolically joins me as I make this tribute.

In reflecting on Mrs. Pellegreno's achievement, I cannot help but think that too often today our adventurous spirit is clouded by our increasing technological advances. In an age when we tend to bring massive, collective action to bear upon massive social and environmental problems, we tend to lose sight of the spirit of the individual.

Why would this young woman leave her home to wing her way around the world?

When man can circle the globe in a few hours, why would a group laboriously plan and execute this feat in an aircraft of 1937 vintage?

Why, with the massive political, social, and economic problems which this world faces, would people give attention to this mission and acclaim its accomplishment?

The answer to all these questions can be found in that wonderful phenomenon known as the spirit of the individual. It all has something to do with the fact that each one of us on this earth is an individual human being; each capable of doing more than what he is now doing if he has a challenge, a goal, and a determination.

Ann Pellegreno and her crew symbolize this spirit. Ann Pellegreno has brought all the people of the world closer together, not only because she flew 27,000 miles, but more significantly by her symbolic achievement of what one individual can do. And this is why we take time out in Congress today to honor her on behalf of the whole Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I know there have been and will be many fine tributes to this outstanding woman and her fine crew. If I may, however, I would like to present to the membership two editorials from the Ann Arbor News so that we all can be aware of the feeling of pride of her hometown area:

ANN ARBOR AREA SALUTES "EARHART FLIGHT" CREW

A world which accepts the latest advances in speed and time-saving machines with no big stir and which some people say is becoming increasingly depersonalized can be thankful for the Robert Manrys and the Sir Francis Chichesters and the Ann Pellegrenos. Not only are these individuals and their accomplishments pleasant diversions from the general flow of personalities and events, but they also help to let the rest of us catch our breath, lean back and dream a little in the finest tradition of Walter Mitty.

Mrs. Pellegreno of Saline arrived at Willow Run Airport yesterday after her round-the-world, step by step imitation of Amelia Earhart's flight in 1937, the flight which ended with the disappearance of Miss Earhart somewhere in the South Pacific Ocean. The events surrounding Miss Earhart's disappearance are as much a mystery as ever.

Without wishing to detract from a magnificent feat, Mrs. Pellegreno had a lot going for her. She had a fine crew, including William Polhemus of Ann Arbor, Lee Koepke of Ypsilanti and Col. William Payne of McLean, Va. Her machine held out beautifully, certainly a tribute to superior craftsmanship and a knowledge of the flying conditions Mrs. Pellegreno would encounter. She had the advantage over Miss Earhart of 30 additional years of great strides in aviation experience, knowledge and communications development.

Mrs. Pellegreno's voyage is the stuff of which great memories, civic celebrations and memorial plaques are made. Her trip was an ambitious one and we were happy to share her elation at the successes along the way, but we're happy to have her back with us again.

MRS. PELLEGRENO FLIES THE EARHART ROUTE

Mrs. Ann Pellegreno of Saline is on the trail of Amelia Earhart and Fred Noonan, a trail which is 30 years old and key to one of the great mysteries of aviation. Despite a best-selling book which purports to unravel the mystery of Miss Earhart's disappearance in 1937, there is as much doubt and uncertainty as ever.

Will Mrs. Pellegreno and her crew unlock the secret of the Earhart flight? More than likely, they won't; the trail has grown cold after 30 years. Was Miss Earhart's plane shot down or did it crash due to a storm or faulty equipment? That answer, too, would appear to be one of history's best kept secrets.

This seems to be the year to honor American adventurers. The anniversary of the Lindbergh flight across the Atlantic has been duly noted at the French International Air Show. One of America's most popular explorers, the noted author-adventurer Richard Halliburton, also disappeared somewhere in the Pacific in 1937, although we haven't heard of any Halliburton commemoration. And now, of course, the re-enactment of the Earhart flight.

Mrs. Pellegreno's trip is no cakewalk. The passage of 30 years doesn't shorten the miles one bit. The time spent over the ocean is long and a great strain on men and machine. Mrs. Pellegreno is an experienced pilot, but a flying trip around the world is not something which occupies her time on summer weekends.

So why does she do it? Ask Mrs. Pellegreno when she comes back. We rather suspect it's like that old line about George Leigh Mallory and Mt. Everest: "Why do you want to climb it?" Mallory's answer still draws snickers, except from mountaineers. Why does Mrs. Pellegreno risk her pretty neck over the Pacific? Her answer would not satisfy the person who has never felt the exhilaration that comes from challenging something superior to himself on its own terms.

If nothing else, Mrs. Pellegreno's flight is strong affirmation that the spirit of adventure lives. There are sentimental reasons for this flight, too; why do some moderns follow the wanderings of Ulysses, for example? The answer is easy: They sentimentalize, they want to retrace the steps of one of their heroes, they want to identify with a man whose deeds and daring come alive even from history's dispassionate account.

What Mrs. Pellegreno has undertaken and what Lindbergh did and what Sir Edmund Hillary achieved and Richard Byrd and a lot of others is essentially a personal commitment. For compelling personal reasons, they took great risks to reach the peak of human pride and thereby fulfill themselves. Again, the mountaineers have the last word: "Have we conquered an enemy? None but ourselves."

League of United Latin American Citizens Strongly Endorses War on Poverty Program, but Warns Against Dismemberment of OEO

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 11, 1967

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, in convention assembled on June 25, 1967, the League of United Latin American Citizens—LULAC—meeting in Phoenix, Ariz., adopted a resolution in wholehearted support of the war on poverty as waged by the OEO.

It is a resolution of particular timeliness and importance, and I want to add my personal endorsement of the sentiments expressed in the document, which goes on record as "commending Sargent Shriver and the OEO for responding quickly and efficiently to the needs of the American people with sympathy and integrity unmatched in the Federal Government."

In addition, Mr. Speaker, let me make clear my agreement with the LULAC position of determined opposition "to any dismemberment of the OEO."

Unfortunately, there seems to be, in the words of the LULAC resolution, "a real and immediate danger of a retreat in the war on poverty in the form of a proposal before the U.S. Congress—the so-called Opportunity Crusade—to abolish the OEO and turn parts of this poverty program over to the older Federal agencies."

In my opinion, the losers in such a scheme would not be confined to the poor, but would include every interested citizen, for we all have a vital stake in broad-based American prosperity.

On the other hand, our support for the OEO helps insure continued flexible and sensitive attention to the problems of the poor.

The LULAC resolution specifically urges Congress—

> For the good of the American people not only to maintain the OEO as a separate agency . . . but to appropriate additional funds to expand the war on poverty.

Mr. Speaker, I insert at this point in the RECORD the full text of the excellent resolution to which I referred:

Whereas, the Office of Economic Opportunity has, among Federal agencies, been one of the most sensitive and responsive to the needs of the Mexican-American people and,

Whereas, unlike many older, bureaucratic Federal agencies, the OEO has provided for the democratic involvement of people in solving of their own problems and has maintained the flexibility to respond with a minimum of red tape to the specific needs of impoverished Americans, including Mexican-Americans and,

Whereas, there is a real and immediate danger of a retreat in the war on poverty in the form of a proposal before the United States Congress to abolish the OEO and turn parts of this poverty program over to the older Federal agencies.

Be is resolved as follows that the League of United Latin American Citizens is strongly opposed to any dismemberment of the OEO,

Urges the Congress, for the good of the American people to maintain the OEO as a separate agency,

Urges the Congress not only to continue the OEO but to appropriate additional funds to expand the war on poverty.

That the LULAC goes on record as commending Sargent Shriver and the OEO for responding quickly and efficiently to the needs of the American people with sympathy and integrity unmatched in the Federal government. Goes on record as commending the OEO Migrant Program for the extraordinary success it has had in coming to the aid of the hitherto forgotten and exploited people, the American farm workers, many of whom are Mexican-American.

That the LULAC is directed to send copies of this resolution to each Congressman and Senator of the southwestern states.

Urges each individual LULAC council to contact their Congressman to express strong support of LULAC members for the OEO and its Migrant Program and to urge the Congressman to show his concern for his Mexican-American constituents by voting for continuance of OEO and additional antipoverty appropriations for its Migrant Program.

This resolution was adopted as read, on Sunday, June 25, 1967.

Amend the Surplus Property Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GARRY BROWN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 11, 1967

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced legislation to amend the Surplus Property Act of 1944 to authorize certain surplus property of the United States to be donated for park and recreation purposes.

The Surplus Property Act authorizes conveyance to any State, political subdivision, or municipality, all of the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to any surplus land which in the determination of the Secretary of the Interior is suitable and desirable for use as a public park, public recreational area, or historic monument for the benefit of the public. Under provision of the act, conveyance for park or recreational purposes must be made at a price equal to 50 percent of the fair value of the property conveyed, based on the highest and best use of the property at the time it is offered for disposal. Conveyance of property for historic monument purposes under the act is made without monetary consideration.

Mr. Speaker, although our Nation is blessed with a great wealth of natural resources, the development of recreational facilities has not kept pace with the population explosion and economic growth. Preservation and development of our recreational, scenic, and historic sites is of the utmost importance to our well-being and that of future generations. Likewise, provision of open space in or nearby our densely populated urban areas is essential if they are to be satisfying and rewarding places in which to live.

In my own State of Michigan, for example, over 88 percent of the population resides in the southern one-third of the State. Yet, the vast majority of publicly owned land lies in the upper portion of the State. This situation makes it imperative that we undertake immediate programs for the preservation of open park and recreational space in urban and suburban areas.

The major problem facing Michigan and other States is that the prices for these lands are escalating at an ever-increasing rate. It has reached the point where State and local governments are finding it difficult to compete with individuals and developers for prime recreational lands even at the 50-percent discount price allowed under the Surplus Property Act.

In this connection, a recently completed Michigan outdoor recreation plan projects a 10-year expenditure of $150 million which will be needed for State parklands and development. Unfortunately, present funding sources will not be adequate to finance more than one-third of these anticipated needs during this 10-year peroid. Major new sources for obtaining and developing these lands must be found if we are to be successful in meeting this recreational challenge.

The Federal Government is committed to various programs to assist local public bodies in the acquisition of land to be used for park and recreation. Why, then, not donate surplus lands which would be suitable for this use?

While States are required to purchase lands from the U.S. Government for this purpose, they are, on the other hand, asked to give their State-owned lands to the Federal Government free of charge. My own State of Michigan has done this willingly in the past. Fifty percent or more of Isle Royale was State-owned and given to the Government at no cost. Michigan also donated some 5,000 acres of land lying within the Pictured Rocks National Lakeshore area and it is anticipated the State will donate over 8,400 acres of land to the Department of the Interior for the establishment of the Sleeping Bear National Lakeshore. Michigan is glad to give these lands in order to aid in the establishment of these outstanding National parks and recreation areas. However, it would seem only fair that surplus Federal lands suitable for park and recreational purposes be turned over to the States at no cost.

A review of the comprehensive statewide outdoor recreation plans submitted by the States for the years 1968 through 1977 to the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation reveals an estimated capital cost of $7.1 billion needed for acquisition and development projects. Of this total, approximately $2.8 billion would be for State projects and $4.3 billion for projects financed in part by local governments but sponsored by the States. These figures may be conservative when one considers the growing demand for State and local public recreation facilities in or adjacent to urban centers where costs are greatest. Furthermore, those figures do not include any estimates for eight of the States and three territories.

It is obvious that State and local governments will not meet needs of this magnitude over the next 10 years without Federal assistance. My amendment to the Surplus Property Act is a concrete proposal to give them some assistance.

It is important, Mr. Speaker, to emphasize that local levels of government could not indiscriminately claim surplus property for parks or recreation, for my amendment to the act states that the Secretary of the Interior must make a determination of whether or not the property in question is suitable, desirable, and needed for use as a public park or public recreational area.

Observe Voting in South Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 12, 1967

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, the Rules Committee has been referred House Concurrent Resolution 382 which I introduced to send a team of congressional observers to the September elections in South Vietnam. At the time I introduced the resolution, and on several other occasions since then, I have made clear my belief that American observers are needed in Vietnam to insure the fairness of the voting.

Now Tran Van Dinh, former acting ambassador to the United States from South Vietnam, has urged that American observers be sent to Vietnam at election time. The reason for his recommendation is in accord for the reasons behind House Concurrent Resolution 382; the United States has a vital interest in free elections in South Vietnam and we must do all we can to see that democracy does prevail in that brave nation.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the RECORD a copy of an article from the July 7 New York Times about Tran Van Dinh's recommendation that the United States send observers to South Vietnam at election time.

U.S. GROUPS URGED TO OBSERVE VOTING IN VIETNAM

(By Donald Janson)

CHICAGO, July 6.—A South Vietnamese Buddhist urged today that American farm, labor, church, bar, press and student organizations send observers to the presidential election in South Vietnam Sept. 3.

Tran Van Dinh, former Acting Ambassador to the United States, said this would reduce peasant fear of retaliation by the Saigon military regime if the vote went against its candidates.

Without such impartial observation from non-Governmental groups, he told an all-day convocation on Vietnam at the University of Chicago, sponsored by the National Council of Churches, the election will not be free and the winners will be the Saigon's regime ticket of Lieut. Gen. Nguyen Van Thieu and Premier Nguyen Cao Ky.

Only a free election, said the 44-year-old president of the Vietnamese Overseas Buddhist Association, can produce a popular government capable of dealing effectively with Hanoi, the United States and the Vietcong to produce peace.

He said the American State Department should have no objection to the appearance of private observers on the scene in the interest of the free elections it advocates.

About 70 United States and Latin-American citizens went to the Dominican Republic last year as unofficial observers of elections that followed a military uprising in 1965 and United States military intervention.

That committee on free elections was headed by Norman Thomas, the long-time Socialist leader; Bayard Rustin, the civil rights leader, and Victor Reuther, labor leader.

Mr. Dinh's proposal was promptly endorsed by Dr. Edgar H. S. Chandler, executive director of the Church Federation of Greater Chicago, at a news conference.

Dr. Chandler suggested that church participation be sponsored by such bodies as the World Council of Churches and the National Council of Churches.

Gerhard A. Elston, director of Vietnam affairs for the National Council study team that returned from Vietnam yesterday broached the idea to Premier Ky last week without receiving a definitive response.

CHURCH GROUPS STRESSED

The study team, he said, asked that non-Governmental groups be allowed to observe. The team, he said, was thinking particularly of church groups of all faiths throughout the world.

Robert Pickus, director of the West Coast office of a peace group called the World Without War Council, said in an interview that his organization was polling leaders of major American voluntary organizations in many fields to determine whether they would like to send observers to "help assure genuine free elections."

Mr. Dinh said it would be futile to rely solely on United States Defense and State Department observers because the Vietnam populace would consider them "too sympathetic to the Saigon Government's point of view."

That Government, he said, is "99 per cent corrupt," wants the war to continue for selfish reasons and lacks the confidence of the general population.

Mr. Dinh resigned from the Vietnam Foreign Service in 1964 because, he said, the Government was stressing only a military solution to the war. He lives in Washington.

The convocation was the first of a series planned around the country to involve Protestant clergymen and leading laymen in thought and action on alternatives to war in Vietnam and to future wars. The National Council represents 34 Protestant, Anglican and Eastern Orthodox denominations with a membership of 34 million persons.

Invitations to the convocation here went to clergymen and key laymen of the 2,300 churches affiliated with the Church Federation of Greater Chicago.

Southern California World Trade Center Selects Construction Site in Downtown Los Angeles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 11, 1967

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, I have recently been advised by officials of the Southern California World Trade Center Authority of the selection of a 9-acre site in downtown Los Angeles, located immediately adjacent to the future Los Angeles Convention and Exhibition Center, for construction of the proposed multimillion-dollar Southern California World Trade Center.

Because of the importance of this development to the continued rapid growth of international trade and commerce, particularly in the Greater Los Angeles metropolitan area, I would like to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD articles which appeared in the Southern California Industrial News, the Los Angeles Times, and the Long Beach Independent-Press-Telegram, on this subject:

[From the Southern California Industrial News, June 19, 1967]

LOS ANGELES LOCATION WINS OUT—WORLD TRADE CENTER TO ADJOIN CONVENTION SITE

A Pico and Figueroa site, adjoining and adjacent to the forthcoming Los Angeles Convention Center, has been chosen as the location of the Southern California World Trade Center building.

Recommendation was made in a partial presentation of the long-awaited feasibility study by Charles Luckman Associates and Kistner, Wright & Wright at World Trade Center Authority meeting in Los Angeles last week.

A total of 23 possible sites were studied, it was revealed, and the Pico-Figueroa site selected because of the financial advantage and convenience of having a trade center adjoining a convention center with permanent exhibit facilities.

The latter Center, to be built by the Los Angeles Convention and Exhibition Center Authority, expects its financing plan involving a $35 million bond issue to be approved by the City Council by August.

No final cost has been arrived at for the World Trade Center Building. But finalized feasibility study is expected from Charles Luckman & Associates in the next week or two.

Preliminary plans call for a high-rise office building and a 900-room hotel, to be financed by a state bond issue.

[From the Los Angeles (Calif.) Times, June 15, 1967]

FINAL DRAFT ORDERED—DOWNTOWN SITE CHOSEN FOR WORLD TRADE CENTER COMPLEX

(By Ray Hebert)

A downtown site for a multimillion-dollar Southern California World Trade Center building was selected Wednesday and the architectural firm of Charles Luckman was ordered to draft final plans for the structure.

The trade center complex will be located between Trenton and Figueroa and 11th Sts. and Pico Blvd., said Robert W. Prescott, head of the seven-member trade center authority.

Preliminary plans call for a high-rise office building and a 900-room hotel as the first stages of the complex. The project would be finaced by the authority with a state bond issue.

It is the third major related trade center project in the Los Angeles area. Ground was broken last Thursday on Terminal Island for a $200 million World Trade Center Complex and on Wednesday documents required for financing a downtown convention center were approved.

THIRTY-ONE-ACRE SITE CHOSEN

The latter, to be built by the Los Angeles Convention and Exhibition Center Authority, would be located on a 31-acre site near Pico Blvd, and Figueroa St.

Neil Petree, authority president, said he hoped a lease agreement for both the site and the facility along with the financing plan would be approved by the City Council by August. This would permit sale of bonds in September and the start of property acquisition.

Under the financing plan for the convention center, the authority would issue $35 million in bonds to cover land and construction costs. Upon completion, the facility would be leased back to the city with rentals guaranteeing the bonds.

Originally the City Council set a $25 million ceiling on the center. But new land appraisals—up from $8 million to $11 million—and other additional costs have pushed the total figure to $35 million.

Consultants had estimated the city's annual deficit at $125,000 a year for 35-year bonds. But the loss is now figured at $241,000 a year. The authority was told this would be for a 31-year period commencing with the center's completion.

Petree estimated it will take a year to acquire the property, assuming the City Council gives a go-ahead, and about two years to build the 458,000-square-foot facility.

The authority has not yet made a decision on whether to face the center toward the Harbor Freeway or downtown, or whether to acquire additional land east of Trenton St.

This property would be used for a proposed hotel and office building, plaza and additional parking space.

[From the Long Beach (Calif.) Independent & Press-Telegram, June 15, 1967]

Trade Center Goes to Downtown Los Angeles

(By Jack O. Baldwin)

A nine-acre site in downtown Los Angeles was selected Wednesday for a World Trade Center which would include twin skyscrapers and several satellite buildings.

The Southern California World Trade Center Authority chose a site which would share a common boundary with the proposed multimillion-dollar Los Angeles Convention Center.

The area agreed upon is a tapered plot bounded by 11th Street, Figueroa Street, Pico Boulevard and Trenton Street. The proposed Convention Center site is immediately to the west and extending to the Harbor Freeway.

The authority voted 7–1 to accept the site recommended by Charles Luckman Associates.

Voting against the motion was H. E. (Bud) Ridings Jr., chairman of the Long Beach Board of Harbor Commissioners.

"I have not seen the studies of any other sites and will therefore have to vote against the recommendation," said Ridings.

William M. Schoenfeld, executive architect with Luckman, said agencies which had expressed interest in becoming tenants in the proposed high-rise office building include the United States Customs Service. Robert W. Prescott, chairman of the trade center Building Committee, also said the Customs Service was interested in becoming a tenant.

However, a check by The Independent, Press-Telegram with Frank R. Creed, regional customs commissioner, prompted a denial.

"I cannot recall discussing any such move with anyone regarding a World Trade Center Building as being used by customs," Creed said.

"We intend to move into the new customhouse on Terminal Island on Aug. 19 to provide services to the Long Beach-Los Angeles Port area. We will continue to provide services in the Los Angeles downtown area to meet the demand," he said.

While state law limits the site for a Southern California World Trade Center to 30 acres, a deputy attorney general said there was no limit set on the cost of the project. The law states that the amount allocated for the project, to be financed through a bond issue, would depend upon predicted revenues.

Prescott said the committee expressed "an overwhelming preference for a downtown Los Angeles location."

Schoenfeld said his firm had querried 1,303 possible tenants including foreign governments, trade associations, custom brokers and federal agencies.

Murray D. Goodrich, vice chairman of the Authority, claimed that the center would be delayed a year "if the authority failed to select a site now."

Schoenfeld described proposed facilities in the World Trade Center complex. They include a 900-room hotel, a 500,000-to-600,000-square-foot office building, a 50,000-capacity exhibit hall, two levels of parking, several restaurants, meeting rooms and related facilities.

Schoenfeld said the site would be served by a proposed monorail linking International Airport with the Civic Center. He said the area is serviced by eight on-ramps and off-ramps from the Santa Monica and Harbor Freeways.

Although the study covered 23 other sites, Schoenfeld said whatever site is selected "it should be in downtown Los Angeles."

Tribute to John Quincy Adams

SPEECH

OF

HON. JAMES C. CORMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 11, 1967

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, there are many brands of courage but few have been as commemorative as the courage that typified John Quincy Adams. This Massachusetts man's fortitude was of such caliber that another inimitable man from Massachusetts, the late President John F. Kennedy, saw fit to feature the resolute deeds of John Quincy Adams in his Pulitzer Prize winning book, "Profiles in Courage."

Few men have exercised their capacity for vision to the extent that was true of John Quincy Adams. Devoted to the principles imbued in him by his parents, John and Abigail Adams, he did not subvert his concept of national responsibility for the more immediate interests of his his constituency. Risking his own popularity, he stood for the acquisition of western lands that were to add immeasurably to the vast richness of our Nation. Though most of his constituents were merchants, he backed the Embargo Acts in an effort to strengthen first his country and, therefore, his own district.

This strength did not waver, his course withstood the hurricanes of time and circumstance. His perception encompassed not only his Nation but the globe. He envisioned a cohesive, autonomous hemisphere and implemented the Monroe Doctrine to insure its reality. President Kennedy once said:

> This country cannot lie still in the harbors but must set sail.

John Quincy Adams served with distinction at that stormy helm.

I join with my colleagues on this the 200th anniversary of the birth of John Quincy Adams in giving this stalwart and noble statesman the tributes after his death that were due him in his lifetime.

Perils of Old Age

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 12, 1967

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, one of my constituents recently called my attention to a letter written to the editor of Technology Week and published in the issue of June 5, 1967.

Having been personally involved with employed engineers and their employment problems, I can wholeheartedly endorse this letter as pointing out a problem that should be looked at closely by industry.

It also points up the fact that Congress can try in any of a number of ways to stimulate higher education in the space age of today, but the full cooperation of Government, industry, and institutions of higher learning is essential for success in meeting the engineering manpower needs of future years.

The letter follows:

Perils of Old Age

To the Editor:

William S. Beller's highly competent "Long-Term Engineering Shortage Seen" (TW, March 20, p. 28) summarizes Engineering Manpower Commission findings. After noting that engineering never looked better for number of jobs nor worse for number of students shying away, Mr. Beller asks why.

I believe a major factor keeping students out of engineering is the bad reputation industry employers have acquired for refusing to hire engineers over 40 regardless of competence. As a result, many older engineers dissuade their sons and acquaintances from entering the discipline of the industrial field.

To support my belief, may I cite a study conducted by Prof. Loomba of San Jose State College. Prof. Loomba surveyed 1,200 engineers laid off by aerospace firms in 1964. He found that to avoid layoff and reduce the unemployment period, one must "find a way to stop growing old."

In another technical field, President Halbouty of the American Association of Petroleum Geologists complained of an Earth-scientist drought, "which could have frightening consequences for our nation in its need for petroleum products." Some paragraphs later, Mr. Halbouty noted that while students have a choice of jobs, "numerous older and experienced geologists . . . are without employment due to multiple layoffs by oil companies . . . college professors . . . cannot recommend the oil industry to their students until it changes its policy of hiring young geologists."

The Engineering Manpower Commission could illuminate the picture if it chose. But its survey merely asks employers to list the numbers of new and experienced engineers hired; it asks nothing about the age of the men concerned.

This key omission raises a question as to whether the Manpower Commission is shielding industry age discrimination. In any event, the commission's report is now open to doubt.

Name withheld by request.

A Letter to the President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 12, 1967

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, from the beginning of the Middle East crisis, I have had nothing but the highest praise for the way in which our President handled this most tense situation.

I commend to the attention of our colleagues a letter to the President written by Dr. William A. Wexler, president of B'nai B'rith.

The letter appeared in the June 1967 edition of the Metropolitan Star, a publication of the metropolitan council of B'nai B'rith, and follows:

A LETTER TO THE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: It was with deep gratification that I listened to the reassurances of Vice President Humphrey in the company of the other members of the Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organizations. We had just come from a highly emotional rally held at Lafayette Square which had been interrupted with the news that the U.A.R. had accepted the cease fire. Our hearts were filled with gratitude that there would be no further bloodshed.

The Vice President spoke to us with candor and deep feeling concerning the role you had played in these tense and epochal days, of your unremitting frienship for Israel and your deft handling of that so explosive situation. His reassurances were deeply appreciated.

Both in the Senate and in The White House you have demonstrated your firm resolve to sustain Israel and preserve its integrity. This resolve has been put to the test on many occasions and you have been unwavering in your determination to sustain it.

Now, Mr. President, your great resources of mind and spirit will be called upon again to bring fulfillment to the aspirations you hold. The description of your determination to have a permanent peace in the Middle East rather than a patchwork of armistices and truces was received by us with great rejoicing.

It is my fond hope that you may bring the neighbors face to face for negotiations, that the great waterways of the area may be open to all nations, and that the bitterness which has existed for too long between the inhabitants of the Middle East may be eased through a mutual relationship beneficial to all. I know these are your own hopes and I pray your efforts in this area and difficult enterprise may win success.

With kindest greetings, I am,
Sincerely yours

DR. WILLIAM A. WEXLER,
President, B'nai B'rith.

Medal of Honor Presentation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1967

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I have just attended a special Army full honor award ceremony at which the Medal of Honor was posthumously awarded to Sgt. James W. Robinson, Jr., by the Honorable Stanley R. Resor, Secretary of the Army. It was a most impressive ceremony. The citation carries such a stirring story of heroism and devotion to country that I must call it to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress. The account of this young man's heroism will endure forever in American annals of courage and sacrifice:

MEDAL OF HONOR PRESENTATION BY THE HONORABLE STANLEY R. RESOR, SECRETARY OF THE ARMY, TO SGT. JAMES W. ROBINSON, JR., (POSTHUMOUSLY), U.S. ARMY, AT THE PENTAGON ON WEDNESDAY, 12 JULY 1967, AT 1030 HOURS

The President of the United States of America, authorized by Act of Congress, March 3, 1863, has awarded in the name of The Congress the Medal of Honor, posthumously, to Sergeant James M. Robinson, Jr., United States Army for conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity in action at the risk of his life above and beyond the call of duty:

On April 11, 1966, Company C, 2d Battalion, 16th Infantry was engaged in fierce combat with a Viet Cong battalion. Despite the heavy fire, Sergeant Robinson moved among the men of his fire team, instructing and inspiring them, and placing them in advantageous positions. Enemy snipers located in nearby trees were inflicting heavy casualties on forward elements of Sergeant Robinson's unit. Upon locating the enemy sniper whose fire was taking the heaviest toll, he took a grenade launcher and eliminated the sniper. Seeing a medic hit while administering aid to a wounded sergeant in front of his position and aware that now the two wounded men were at the mercy of the enemy, he charged through a withering hail of fire and dragged his comrades to safety, where he rendered first aid and saved their lives. As the battle continued and casualties mounted, Sergeant Robinson moved about under intense fire to collect from the wounded their weapons and ammunition and redistribute them to able-bodied soldiers. Adding his own fire to that of his men, he assisted in eliminating a major enemy threat. Seeing another wounded comrade in front of his position, Sergeant Robinson again defied the enemy's fire to effect a rescue. In so doing he was himself wounded in the shoulder and leg. Despite his painful wounds, he dragged the soldier to shelter and saved his life by adiministering first aid. While patching his own wounds, he spotted an enemy machine gun which had inflicted a number of casualties on the American force. His rifle ammunition expended, he seized two grenades and, in an act of unsurpassed heroism, charged toward the entrenched enemy weapon. Hit again in the leg, this time with a tracer round which set fire to his clothing, Sergeant Robinson ripped the burning clothing from his body and staggered indomitably through the enemy fire, now concentrated solely on him, to within grenade range of the enemy machine gun position. Sustaining two additonal chest wounds, he marshalled his fleeting physical strength and hurled the two grenades thus destroying the enemy gun position as he fell dead upon the battlefield. His magnificient display of leadership and bravery saved several lives and inspired his soldiers to defeat the numerically superior enemy force. Sergeant Robinson's conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity, at the cost of his life, are in keeping with the finest traditions of the United States Army and reflect great credit upon the 1st Infantry Division and the United States Armed Forces.

What Is United Republicans of America?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 12, 1967

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, many Members have received letters asking about a group which calls itself United Republicans of America. The group is sending out letters asking for funds, and some people have questioned whether this group has any official connection with the Republican Party or its financial arm.

Mr. Paul Hope of the Washington Star has recently written an article about the United Republicans of America which I believe will be of interest to all who see the RECORD. Accordingly, I include the text of Mr. Hope's article at this point:

[From the Evening Star, June 19, 1967]

RIGHT-WING GROUP USES GOP NAME

(By Paul Hope)

A right-wing splinter group trading on the Republican name has set itself up in a spanking new Washington office and is going all out to lure dollars from Republican party contributors.

United Republicans of America, a political organization that claims to help conservative candidates around the country but which hasn't filed financial reports with the House clerk for nearly two years, has undertaken a massive mail campaign for financial support.

URA's tactics have caused consternation among Republican party finance officials who are taking steps to warn party contributors that URA has no connection with the party.

URA's latest gimmick is a "presidential poll." It sent out a nationwide mailing urging "fellow Republicans" to fill out an enclosed ballot giving their preference for the Republican presidential nomination.

Implying some connection with the Republican party, the letter says: "We will announce the results to the press and to the Republican National Committee."

Further on, the letter makes a pitch for financial support. It says URA plans to work for conservative candidates in 73 congressional districts in 36 states next year and it needs "at least $5,000 per district to start."

C. Langhorne Washburn, finance director of the Republican National Committee, sent a memorandum last week to all state Republican finance chairmen and directors saying that the committee "has received so many requests for clarification that I am writing this memorandum to advise that United Republicans of America has no official affiliation whatsoever with the Republican Party.

A Pennsylvania congressman told some of his Republican colleagues the other day that one of his constituents, a businessman, sent URA $1,000 on the assumption that it was an official party fund-raising organization.

Rep. Bob Wilson of California, chairman of the Republican Congressional Committee, has fired off a letter asking URA to indicate clearly on its letterhead that it has no official connection with the party.

Meanwhile, returns from the presidential poll are piling up at the URA office just a few blocks from the Capitol. Wainwright Dawson Jr., URA's executive director, declined to say how much money is coming in with the ballots.

URA was founded in May 1965 by D. Bruce Evans, former director of the Lorain (Ohio) Chamber of Commerce. It proposed to build precinct organizations to take over the Republican party along the lines of a "party within a party" approach advocated in a publication of the ultra right-wing Liberty Lobby.

Political committees operating in two or more states are required by federal law to file financial reports with the clerk of the House of Representatives. URA filed one listing contributions of some $3,000 up to September 1965. No reports have been filed since, although URA says in its latest mailing that "last year (1966) URA put money and manpower to work for conservative candidates in congressional districts throughout the country."

Evans left URA last April and was succeeded by Dawson, 32, who helped organize YAF–PAC, a political action committee offshoot of the conservative Young Americans for Freedom. YAF–PAC was merged about a year ago with the American Conservative Union, another organization that sprang up after Barry Goldwater's 1964 defeat. Dawson became political action chairman for ACU but left because of a policy dispute.

Dawson, who said he has reorganized URA, moved his office out of quarters rented from Liberty Lobby and into a six-room suite in a new office building a few blocks away. He claims the organization has no connection with Liberty Lobby.

He has hired as his field director John LaMothe, a former YAF field director in Philadelphia. Last year LaMothe was active in the Committee for the Commonwealth in Pennsylvania that tried but failed to knock off moderate Republican Rep. Richard S. Schweiker in the primary.

Dawson said three members of his new "board of advisers" are Richard Durant of Michigan, Philip J. Herrman of Lancaster, Pa., and Theodore Humes, formerly Pennsylvania and now of Baltimore. Durant, a former member of the John Birch Society, has fought moderate Republican Gov. George Romney of Michigan. Herrman and Humes were active in the Goldwater campaign in Pennsylvania.

State Flag Law Upheld

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 10, 1967

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I am sure the following editorial from the Johnson City, Tenn., Press-Chronicle will be of interest to my colleagues and the readers of the RECORD.

It concerns the recent upholding by the New York Court of Appeals of the New York State law which prohibits the burning of the American flag:

FLAG LAW UPHELD

A New York state law prohibiting burning of the American flag has been upheld unanimously by the New York Court of Appeals.

The court acted in the case of Sidney Street, a Negro, who set fire to a flag June 6 last year after hearing that James Meredith had been shot and wounded during his march through Mississippi.

Street's lawyers made the familiar argument that a law against flag burning violates freedom of speech. But Chief Judge Stanley H. Fuld held the New York law's intent was to prevent a breach of the peace.

Judge Fuld said Street's action was one "of enactment, literally and figuratively incendiary, and as fraught with danger to the public peace as if he had stood on the corner shouting epithets at passing pedestrians."

We don't see how the court could have held otherwise.

A good ruling!

Manpower Development Program Praised by Newark Hospital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 12, 1967

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, so often we hear varied kinds of criticism directed toward the Federal Government in its effort to adequately train and prepare young people for rewarding employment. While the difficulties are obvious, the job simply must be done. I was heartened to hear the other day of the Newark Presbyterian Unit Hospital's excellent experience and wholehearted endorsement of the manpower development training program, as outlined by the following letter:

UNITED HOSPITALS OF NEWARK, N.J.,
June 16, 1967.

DR. ROBERT WORTHINGTON,
Assistant Commissioner of Vocational Education, Vocational Division, Trenton, N.J.

DEAR MR. WORTHINGTON: My heartiest congratulations to you and the staff of the Manpower Development Training Program at the Montgomery Street School in Newark for a job "well done".

Just prior to their graduation in May, I interviewed the twelve students who were completing the six month dietary workers course. There was not one who was not acceptable for employment here in the Dietary Department at Presbyterian Hospital.

The one fact that surprised me the most was the contrast in ability and potential that existed between the students. While most of the girls were qualified to start in the lower grade positions, ie Cafeteria worker, Traygirl, Dietary Maid, several were qualified to start at higher levels, Dietary Aide and Food Service Supervisor.

The training they have received is evident regardless of the position they have been hired for. Members of the department have commented to me about the ease of training these new employees and how rapidly they learn. Normally we allow eighty hours to train a new employee (with prior hospital experience) for the position of Dietary Aide. The girl whom we hired from Manpower Development Training learned it in less than sixty hours and since has had a high level of performance.

While the woman who was hired as Food Service Supervisor is still in training, her progress is most satisfactory and shows the potential of becoming a better than average supervisor. Should she remain and perform as expected, she should be making $5,000 annually in less than two years time.

It was not my intention to give you a progress report on the seven graduates whom I was able to find positions for here in the Dietary Department at Presbyterian Hospital, but rather to let you know the fine quality of training that these students received.

May your program have continued success.

Very truly yours,

ARNOLD WEINSTEIN,
Food Service Manager.

Nuuanu YMCA: Hawaii's 50-Year-Old Model of Racial Integration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 12, 1967

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, the 50th anniversary of Honolulu's Nuuanu YMCA—widely recognized for its extraordinary success in fostering harmonious and beneficial relations among the various ethnic groups which make up its membership—will be the occasion for celebration on July 14, 1967, when a banquet will be held in Honolulu, Hawaii.

The Nuuanu "Y" was established in 1917 as the result of the merger of four separate racial YMCA's—Japanese, Chinese, Korean, and Filipino. Mr. Robert Dye, present general secretary of the Honolulu YMCA, describes this merger as a "first" for a city which was then sharply divided along racial lines. Mr. Dye observed in a recent interview with the Honolulu Star-Bulletin that—

> Fifty years ago immigrant sons of all races came together at Nuuanu in classes and groups to improve educational and social skills and to achieve a relationship with persons of different racial and cultural backgrounds.

Five decades later, the success of this racial blending is evident everywhere. The boys who once were the beneficiaries of the community service rendered by Nuuanu YMCA are now the doctors, dentists, lawyers, clergymen, teachers, and government workers who are practicing the lessons they learned so well at the "Y".

Based on its past performance, and under the enlightened leadership of its staff members, Nuuanu YMCA promises to achieve new dimensions at it moves forward into its sixth decade of community service.

I am sure that my colleagues in Congress would want to join me in extending congratulations to the Nuuanu YMCA for its outstanding record of service to the community over the past 50 years, and in wishing the "Y" ever-increasing success in its continuing efforts to make this a better world in which to live.

The article entitled "Nuuanu Y Celebrates 50 Years Service," from the July 5, 1967, issue of the Honolulu Star-Bulletin, is submitted for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

[From the Honolulu Star-Bulletin, July 5, 1967]

NUUANU Y CELEBRATES 50 YEARS SERVICE

After 50 years of community service, the Nuuanu YMCA is still trying to bridge the gaps between sexes, generations and ethnic groups.

Robert Dye, general secretary of the Honolulu YMCA noted that Nuuanu Y's "integrated beginnings have taken on increasingly new dimensions over the five decades of its existence."

The Nuuanu Y is commemorating its 50th anniversary this year with a week-long celebration and a banquet at 7 p.m. July 14 at the Ilikai Hotel.

The merging of the four separate racial YMCA's—Japanese, Chinese, Korean, and Filipino—in 1917 was "a first at a time when the city was sharply divided along racial lines," Dye said.

After some 46 years at the area now covered by the parking lot for Long's Pali Drugs and Safeway Market, the Nuuanu Y moved in 1963 to $2.5 million buildings and grounds at Vineyard and Pali Highway.

The old complex cost only $41,000 when built in 1917. In 1920 the gymnasium and the pool was added, the latter through the donation of Dr. and Mrs. W. D. Westervelt.

A fund drive, organized by the second generation oriental business and professional men who came through the Nuuanu Y as boys, resulted in the Atherton Building in 1937, with dorm facilities, a lounge and a clubhouse added later.

"Fifty years ago immigrant sons of all races came together at Nuuanu in classes and groups to improve educational and social skills and to achieve a relationship with persons of different racial and cultural backgrounds," Dye said.

"Today's young people take their leadership roles for granted, and with poise and sophistication debate governmental issues through the instrument of their own 'Y' Model Legislature."

Dye stressed the fact that one of the most unique contributions of the YMCA branch fellowship is the "quality of relationship that exists between its members."

He added, "Nuuanu staff members work today to help YMCA and other community groups communicate with each other at the 'feeling' level and thus become more sensitive to the real needs and feelings of each other."

False Fears About SST Boom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 11, 1967

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the subject of the sonic boom is being discussed in the press and through the halls of Congress in these days prior to the construction of the prototype of the supersonic transport.

For the information of my colleagues who are interested in this matter, a recent editorial from the Seattle Post-Intelligencer follows:

BOYD LOWERS THE BOOM

The best answer yet to those detractors of the supersonic jet transport program who base their opposition on the threat of sonic boom has come from Secretary of Transportation Alan S. Boyd.

Interviewed on a national telecast, Boyd put it succinctly: ". . . sonic boom will not be a problem, because supersonic aircraft will not be flown at supersonic speeds if this is a problem over inhabitated areas."

He went on to observe that, because of the Boeing SST's swept wing design, the aircraft will be able to shift from supersonic to subsonic speeds with very little economic penalty.

The common-sense statement is an effective response to such irrational positions as that taken by the nationwide Citizens League Against the Sonic Boom. It direly predicts that a single SST flying coast to coast would startle as many as 20 million persons and that a fleet of 150 SSTs would cause $1 million worth of damage a day to windows, plaster, and what have you. It therefore is demanding a halt to the SST program.

As Boyd has patiently explained, such a forecast is nonsense simply because the SST will not be flown at supersonic speeds if these kinds of undesirable effects are produced.

Even if the SST were forced to chug along, relatively speaking, at subsonic speeds over populated land masses there is convincing evidence that it will still be an economic success. Much of the aircraft's travel will be over the oceans, as well as unpopulated terrain.

We suggest, therefore, that those who fear the SST's sonic boom find something more plausible to be neurotic about.

Hon. Crawford C. Martin Dedicates Universal Pipe & Plastics Co., Hillsboro, Tex.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1967

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, during the Fourth of July recess of the Congress, I spent some 10 days traveling in my congressional district and while there attended the dedication of a new industry in Hillsboro, Tex. The dedication address was made by the Honorable Crawford C. Martin, a native of Hillsboro and the present attorney general for the State of Texas.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include Attorney General Martin's speech:

REMARKS OF CRAWFORD C. MARTIN, ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS, AT THE RIBBON-CUTTING CEREMONY FOR THE UNIVERSAL PIPE AND PLASTICS CO., HILLSBORO, TEX., JULY 1, 1967

This is a proud and happy occasion for us Hill Countians as well as for our new friends and neighbors, the officers and incoming personnel of the Universal Pipe and Plastics Co. It gives me a great deal of pleasure to take part in this ceremony, marking the opening of Hillsboro's most recent addition to our young but promising industrial development.

Hillsboro is very happy to welcome you, and we wish you great success for many years to come.

The excitement of building and growing—of exploring new ways to do things better—the opportunities afforded by a free competitive system—*this* is what our ceremony here today is all about.

This ceremony is about *people*—people investing their capital, their talents and their hard work into making things that other people need. It's about jobs for people, whose wages buy goods and services from their neighbors—people whose taxes build schools, hospitals and other public essentials.

Every ribbon-cutting such as this is a reaffirmation of the faith of the American people in our free enterprise system and what it means to us individually and as a nation.

Of more importance, it is a reaffirmation of our willingness to work out our own destinies.

Here in Texas especially, each such ceremony today demonstrates our system's ability to adapt to changing conditions. Not too many years ago, we Texans based our economy almost entirely on the abundance of our natural resources. In Hill County, for many generations we have prided ourselves on being one of Texas' leading producers of agricultural products. While agriculture still is Hill County's mainstay, as you all know, national and international developments have combined with the arrival of competitive synthetics to sharply reduce the farmer's return from his investment. And the impact is felt all the way down the line on agriculture-related businesses and services. Like many other regions of the state and other traditionally agricultural parts of the country, Hill County must turn to industry to bolster her lagging economy. Hill County must adapt; Hill County has begun to adapt.

In doing so, we will parallel the *state's* industrial growth. Last year, we added 34,000 new manufacturing jobs. The previous year's gain was 25,400 jobs.

At the beginning of this year, the Texas Industrial Commission estimated the state's labor force at 4,080,000 employees, of whom 618,000 were employed in manufacturing.

Our strongest growth last year was in the so-called durable goods, producing 23,000 new jobs. The biggest gain in this field was in transportation equipment, accounting for 15,000 new positions.

A noteworthy point often overlooked is that today, Texas' industrial development in an area frequently has little or no relation to the raw products of the area. For example, in our section, traditionally our manufacturing activities have been cotton-ginning, cottonseed oil milling and meat packing. These are our raw products. In the wooded areas of East Texas, paper mills have been a natural outgrowth of the saw mills. In the Rio Grande Valley, concentration has been on food processing—in our coastal oil fields, petro-chemicals. But *now* we see fabribated products coming off assembly lines in cities and towns where as recently as five years ago manufacturing was limited entirely to the processing of raw materials indigenous to the particular areas.

Unquestionably, the coming of NASA to the Houston region, and of the aircraft and automotive assembly plants in the Fort Worth-Dallas complex have been the prime forces behind Texas' industrial advances. And the greatest result of their coming has been the awakening of the people of Texas to the call of their Governor for higher education standards to fill high-skill labor demands.

Higher education in Texas still is far from the excellence to which we are striving, but tremendous strides have been made in the past several years, and more will be in evidence next year.

Most of today's industries look to "raw materials" of a different kind from those of a decade ago. Brain power—high skills—the proximity to research facilities—an alert, receptive community and region—good schools and medical facilities—and finally, a well-developed recreational outlet: these are the major factors. Hill County can offer them all.

In short, the rapid growth of metropolitan areas in Texas need not mean the decline of the smaller communities. Hillsboro is making its move in the right direction. I believe we can and will adapt to today's demand for new economic development in the form of industrial development in our town.

Again, my best wishes for abundant prosperity to all of you who are associated with the Universal Pipe and Plastics Company—and a personal welcome to each of you, to the community my family and I think is made up of the finest people in the great State of Texas.

Amending and Extending Title V of the Higher Education Act of 1965

SPEECH
OF
HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 27, 1967

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 10943) to amend and extend title V of the Higher Education Act of 1965.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, I support the passage of H.R. 10943, a bill to amend and extend title V of the Higher Education Act of 1965.

The focus of this legislation is on the teacher, the hub of any sound educational program. Today, we find that there are not enough teachers to educate our children. This storage falls primarily on those local educational agencies which are least competitive in the educational market. It places the greatest burden on schools in poor areas where the need for education is urgent and the shortage of teachers most critical.

I support this legislation specifically because I believe it will work to alleviate the teacher shortage in many disadvantaged areas of this nation.

One of the most controversial parts of title V, but singularly one of the most important for poor areas, is the authorization for the Teachers Corps. This provision allows the U.S. Commissioner of Education to make arrangements with local educational agencies, upon approval by the appropriate State educational agency, to furnish teaching teams in areas having concentrations of children from low-income families. Each teaching team will consist of an experienced teacher and a number of teacher interns. These teacher interns, in addition to their teaching duties, will be afforded an opportunity to take part in a teacher training program so that they can raise their educational level while gaining experience and providing a valuable public service in local communities.

The Teachers Corps will be a local effort aimed at local educational needs. Recruiting, selection, and enrollment in the Corps, for up to 2 years, will be handled by local educational agencies and institutes of higher education in arrangement with the U.S. Commissioner of Education.

There is much to be said for this local control, and I suspect that this arrangement will be effective in most areas of the country. However, as time goes on, I believe it is essential that we carefully assess this provision to make sure that the program benefits are being extended to all disadvantaged areas.

Mr. Chairman, the Higher Education Act of 1965 included a teacher fellowship program, designed to give teachers an opportunity to update and upgrade their teaching skills. The present legislation would amend this provision by extending the program to include graduate education for preschools, adult, and vocational education. I believe this amendment is most important for it allows the upgrading of educational personnel in fields where the need is pressing.

Mr. Chairman, the funding of the amended title V is generally for a 2-year period, with the exception of the Teachers Corps and National Advisory Council on Education Professions Development. Both these programs will be funded for a 3-year period to include 1968, 1969, and 1970. Again, I believe this is wise legislation. It will give State education departments, local school districts, and universities an opportunity to better plan their programs.

Any program is of limited public value unless it allows for a constructive program of evaluation and the means to apply this knowledge to future plans. I view with satisfaction the creation of the National Advisory Council with responsibility to review program operations and to evaluate their effectiveness in meeting educational personnel needs. I also view with satisfaction, the provision which authorizes the U.S. Commissioner of Education to stay apprised of the Nation's existing and future personnel needs.

Mr. Chairman, education is not a cure for all the ills of our society, but without an adequate education system, can we truly believe that we will be able to solve any problems? I support H.R. 10943 as a program responsible for upgrading educational personnel and as one responsive to the expanding needs for teachers in local communities.

Los Angeles' Neighborhood Youth Corps Trains Urgently Needed Hospital Technicians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 11, 1967

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, in his 1967 manpower report to the Congress, President Johnson said the tragedy of joblessness is not only in the amount of unemployment, but in the kind of unemployment. A job calls for a special skill—a skill that the unemployed person does not have.

I wholeheartedly agree with the President. And I believe the tragedy befalls not only the unemployed, but the general public as a whole. One of the crucial issues facing our Nation in the future is training people to fill jobs that are needed, jobs that stimulate the economy and improve the services we offer all Americans.

We all know that one of the most critical manpower shortage looming before us today is in the field of health services. This is a great paradox in a country of prosperity. But, there just are not enough trained people to meet the health needs of our people. And this problem can affect even the most affluent members of our society. If our laboratories, research clinics, and hospitals are understaffed and overburdened, all the money in the world cannot buy the kind of care that would be available if those institutions were operating at peak capacity.

Therefore, I was very encouraged to read in the Los Angeles Times that 12 youths from Los Angeles poverty areas had completed 1 year of medical technician training and will be working full time at five hospitals in the area. These youths received their training through the Department of Labor's Neighborhood Youth Corps program in Los Angeles.

I believe other youth programs, such as this, can develop and train a cadre of young men and women for service in the health fields. Not only will these young people be performing productive, rewarding work, but they can help provide improved and expanded health care for all Americans.

At this time I insert into the RECORD the Los Angeles Times article:

POVERTY TRAINEES WIN JOBS

Twelve youths from Los Angeles poverty areas will be promoted today to positions of responsibility in Los Angeles area hospitals, according to War on Poverty officials.

After completing one year of medical technician training sponsored by the Neighborhood Youth Corps and the University of Southern California School of Medicine, they will take over such hospital positions as electrocardiography technicians, pulmonary technicians, dark room technicians and lab technician aides.

The students upon graduation will begin working full time immediately at San Fernando Valley Veteran's, USC School of Medicine, Los Angeles County General, White Memorial and Mt. Sinai hospitals.

This antipoverty program, which is funded through the Economic and Youth Opportunities Agency, offers a basic work-study course in fields of medical technology, mathematics, English, chemistry and human biology. Students receive $1.27 per hour.

Although one-third of the graduates were high school dropouts, they have taken a keen interest in their hospital work, and some expect to return to school to get their diplomas.

Mrs. Delores Ewell, 18, of 1356 E. 58th Place, who dropped out of high school at 15 when she became pregnant, has become the operator of a portable electrocardiograph machine. She returned to school and obtained her diploma and is attending college at night.

Dr. John Mohler, the member of USC medical school who originated this program, said the graduates will make it possible to expand available medical facilities in Los Angeles.

Martin Delivers Wingless Plane

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE D. LONG
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 12, 1967

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, yesterday at the Martin Marietta Corp.'s plant in Middle River, Md., a wingless rocket plane, of the type that may one day enable astronauts to land at airfields after flights in space, made its first public appearance. This pioneering craft is a significant contribution to this Nation's space program, and I congratulate the men and women at Martin Marietta who did such fine work on the project. I would like to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article from today's Baltimore Sun describing this plane:

MARTIN DELIVERS WINGLESS PLANE—ASTRONAUTS MAY SOME DAY USE SUCH A CRAFT

(By Albert Sehlstedt, Jr.)

A wingless airplane, forerunner of a type which may one day bring men back from space, was presented to the Air Force yesterday by the Martin Marietta Corporation at its Middle River plant.

Designated the X-24A, the plane will join a family of similar craft being flown by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and by the Air Force to study techniques for returning men from space for a conventional landing, like that of a regular airplane.

SHAPE SUPPLANTS WINGS

Astronauts flying spacecraft such as the Gemini into the atmosphere from orbit have very limited control over their vehicles, which are finally lowered to a safe landing by parachute.

Martin Marietta built the X-24A in fifteen months at a cost of approximately $1,300,000, a sum which includes support for flight operations scheduled to begin early next year at Edwards Air Force base in southern California.

Two other wingless planes, the M2F2 and the HL-10, products of Northrop Corporation, have been test-flown at Edwards. In addition, Martin Marietta has successfully completed a related project for the Air Force involving flights of smaller, pilotless vehicles with the designation X-23A.

All these wingless craft are broadly referred to as lifting bodies. They are oddly shaped vehicles designed to achieve stability in flight and lift (the upward push of air that keeps a plane aloft) without the use of wings.

The X-24A was rolled out of a Middle River hangar at 11:10 A.M. yesterday, highlight of a ceremony marking the company's presentation of the plane to the Air Force. A roll-out of an aerospace vehicle is comparable to a ship launching in the maritime industry.

GENERALLY TRIANGULAR

Rather bulbous in appearance and in the general shape of a triangle, the X-24A is 24 feet long with a maximum span of nearly 14 feet at its aft end. The plane rides on a tricycle landing gear and has a forward seat for one pilot.

The plane's movable control surfaces, which permit it to maneuver in flight, consist of flaps and rudders on the tail.

During test flights at Edwards, the X-24A will be carried to an altitude of 45,000 feet under the wing of a B-52 jet bomber. At that altitude, the plane will be released and then climb to approximately 100,000 feet.

The X-24A is powered by an XLR-11 rocket engine, the same type which pushed the X-1 aircraft through the sound barrier for the first time, on October 14, 1947.

SPEED RANGE NOTED

In the course of the X-24A flights, engineers will have an opportunity to observe the maneuverability and other characteristics of the plane from speeds as high as mach 2 (1,300 miles an hour at 100,000 feet) down to landing speeds of about 180 miles an hour.

The XLR-11 engine, made by Thiokol, develops 8,000 pounds of thrust. The weight of the plane is less than 6,000 pounds without fuel and about 11,000 pounds with its propellant aboard.

Accepting the new plane for the Air Force was Lt. Gen. Charles H. Terhune, Jr., vice commander of the Air Force Systems Command, who described the craft as a "vital link between the fields of aeronautics and astronautics."

General Terhune went on to say:

"But the real significance of the X-24 lies in its potential contributions to the national space program. We have long recognized that our nation's ability to fully explore the potentials of space depends largely on economical access to it. The X-24 is a significant step in this direction."

The FCC: The Wasteland's Paper Tiger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 12, 1967

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, a great deal of attention is being devoted by Congress and by the public to questions relating to the role of radio and television in connection with controversial public issues. Most of these issues are political in nature, whether it is the war in Vietnam, cigarette advertising, or the endorsement of political candidates by radio and television stations.

I think it is appropriate, therefore, to include in the RECORD a paper recently prepared by a responsible observer of the California scene pertaining to some aspects of this problem as it appears in California. Mr. Mitrovich is a Democrat, has written articles for numerous publications, and formerly served on the staff of ex-Lt. Gov. Glenn Anderson of California.

The article follows:

THE FCC: THE WASTELAND'S PAPER TIGER

(By George S. Mitrovich)

The time was 10:45 p.m. on election eve in Los Angeles and George Putnam, newscaster for television station KTLA was in the process of telling his viewers, "What I want as Governor of the State of California," when Eugene L. Wyman, California's Democratic National Committeeman, who had just arrived home from a long last day working in behalf of Governor Edmund G. Brown and other Democratic candidates, stopped in front of his television set, "curious," he was later to say, "as to just what it was that George Putnam wanted." Putnam, who Samuel W. Yorty credits with electing him Mayor of Los Angeles, was saying:

"First of all, I'm not interested in party labels. I want a man of absolutely unquestioned integrity. A man whose character is beyond reproach, one who will not engage in influence peddling, preferential treatment, or any shady deals. A man who will lead—a man who will give us the facts and take us into his confidence and not treat the office of Governor of this state like some special property of his very own . . . Now this is what I want for the state I love—and it is this reporter's opinion that it is now time for a change!"

"Now I must confess," Wyman said as he recalled his surprise to me, "that from past experience I shouldn't have been shocked at what Putnam was saying, yet in calling for a change in the Governor's chair coupled with a violent attack upon Governor Brown just one hour before election day without any chance for a rebuttal was more than I thought even he was capable of."

Wyman's shock quickly gave way to anger and he reached for the telephone and dialed KTLA and asked for the news department, only to be frustrated by an endlessly ringing telephone that no one would answer. He next called Don Bradley, one of the Governor's campaign managers who in turn called KTLA demanding to speak to someone in authority, but was told that everyone had gone home for the night, "so call back tomorrow."

The following day, Bradley demanded from and was sent by KTLA a transcript of Putnam's remarks as well as a denial from Harry P. Warner, the station's Resident Counsel, of any knowledge on the part of management that Putnam would end his news show by calling for a change in the state's administration. Warner insisted to Bradley that Putnam's comments were "off the cuff," an allegation belied by the transcript itself.

On that same day, November 8, Charles Warren, Democratic State Party Chairman, wrote a seven page letter to Rosel H. Hyde, Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission. The letter, which chronicled a long list of complaints against Putnam, called for "immediate revocation" of KTLA's license. Warren described Putnam's endorsement of former movie actor Ronald Reagan as a "defiant, nose-thumbing gesture of contempt for FCC policies of fair-play, for administrative authority, for the rights of the public, for our right to be heard in rebuttal . . ." A copy of the letter was sent to Representative Emanuel Celler, Chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, who had on previous occasions promised to seek a Federal ban on the endorsement of political candidates by radio and television stations. Warren, concerned that the "fairness doctrine" of the FCC be enforced to its fullest, was well aware that for newscaster Putnam this was not the first time a complaint had been registered against him with the FCC.

It was the night before Primary Election Day 1960 and George Carson Putnam, then working for television station KTTV, was ending his newscast (the thought occurs to me that when referring to Putnam, one should place newscast in quotes) by saying:

"This is one reporter's opinion. Tomorrow the voters of Los Angeles will cast their ballots in perhaps the most important primary election in this city's history . . ."

Putnam went on to tell his viewers why then Mayor Norris Poulson was no longer fit to occupy the city's highest elective office and reminded those watching that Poulson himself had once said that eight years in office was long enough for any man. "Shall we," asked Putnam, "take the Mayor at his own words?" Having already asked, "Is this the city of angles? Is this the city of the big fix?" It was hardly necessary for Putnam to answer his own question. Mayor Yorty wasn't kidding when he said that "George had elected him."

Two years later Putnam informed his KTTV audience why "in this reporter's opinion" Richard Nixon should replace Pat Brown as Governor of California. Putnam's wishes to the contrary, Brown decisively defeated the former Vice President and sailed happily into his second term as the State's chief executive. Following the election a complaint was filed by the Brown forces with the FCC against Putnam. After some time, the FCC finally issued an opinion charging Putnam with having indeed broken FCC policy relating to the "fairness doctrine." Beyond the reprimand the FCC failed to take any punitive measures against Putnam and thus, Wyman charges, "he has continued to thumb his nose (borrowing Warren's phrase) at the very regulatory agency responsible for his conduct.

"The fact that Putnam had on previous occasions violated FCC rules," Wyman says, "should have served as sufficient warning to KTLA that he might do so again. Realizing this the station should have taken whatever steps were necessary to have precluded such a possibility from reoccurring."

Putnam, who enjoys being the center of controversy (it helps his ratings), has evidenced little concern over his present problem beyond asking Mayor Yorty to write a letter to Chairman Hyde of the FCC, in which Yorty wrote that George is nothing more than the victim of a leftist smear. Putnam, for his part, has been content to accuse the Democrats of being nothing less than "sore losers."

The Putnam incident raises many issues that will undoubtedly find their way into the present Congressional session. California Congressman John Moss, advised by Wyman of Putnam's "willful violation" of FCC regulations, has proceeded to take a personal interest in the matter and has put Chairman Hyde on notice of his concern, requesting that he be "fully apprised of all developments."

The trend toward radio and television stations endorsing candidates (as opposed to the personal endorsements of a Putnam) began during the reign of Newton N. Minow as Chairman of the FCC. Minow, best remembered for his famous reference to television as a "vast wasteland," was the first to encourage television and radio stations to become involved in issues of contemporary concern through editorial statements, thus paving the way for the present situation which allows for some to flaunt the rules of the industry's regulatory agency.

The majority of stations, both television and radio, presenting editorial opinions do so well within the limits of the "fairness doctrine" rule of the FCC which provides that equal time will be given responsible organizations or persons caring to offer an opposing point of view. Most stations do not permit individual members of their news departments to editorialize. In almost all cases where editorials are used, they are presented by the station's management and are carefully identified as such.

The issue, however, is much larger than the indiscretions of one "newscaster," it involves the whole question of television and radio stations endorsing at all. There are those who argue that newspapers and magazines (notably Life in the last election) endorse, so why shouldn't radio and television stations be allowed to do so? The answer, as pointed out by Wyman, is basic. "Newspapers and magazines do not use airwaves owned by the public. While anyone might, if he is sufficiently capitalized, start a newspaper or magazine—no one can start a radio or television station unless the airwaves are available."

Wyman argues that endorsing candidates over publicly owned airwaves should be prohibited for other reasons too. "Newspapers," he says, "are now classified by the public as being either Republican or Democratic. Their endorsements are understood in this light. Television and radio stations are not so classified and their endorsements are given far more weight than they deserve."

"Rarely," Wyman continues, "does a listener ask what may have motivated an endorsement. Is it friendship? Or is it that a station may be part of a giant complex, including such varied items as a baseball team and a publishing house, all of whose interest may be better served by a certain candidate?"

"The dangers," he says, "are clear." And so they are.

Historically, the FCC has been the tamest of the regulatory agencies and the most reluctant to use its powers to penalize members of the industry it supervises. If Minow is correct in having called television a "vast wasteland," then it poses the very real possibility that the FCC is its paper tiger, which is not to suggest that the FCC should commence abusing the powers it has over radio and television—though its authority extends beyond the two—but to ask that it uphold and enforce its own rules.

There is some doubt that the FCC, given its past record—though some hope did exist under the chairmanship of Minow and his successor E. William Henry—will ever amount to anything more than a "Watch out now or I'll slap your wrist" type of "regulatory" agency.

Wyman, as well as others, hopes that Representative Celler, the crusty old Congressman from Brooklyn, will follow through on his promise to seek a Federal ban on radio and television stations endorsing candidates for public office. But should such a ban become law, it will be less than adequate if it fails to consider the fact that editorializing on issues can be more damaging to a candidate than a flat editorial statement of endorsement for his opponent. Indeed, the former is more effective because it is considerably less obvious than the latter. Hopefully, any ban on endorsements would then include a measure preventing any station from presenting any editorial affecting any issue during the final thirty day period prior to election day. It hardly would have been necessary for a television or radio station which consistently opposed Barry Goldwater on issues in 1964 to have informed its audience that it was giving its editorial support to the Democratic nominee, although the illustration is hypothetical for the simple fact that no television or radio station endorsed either of the two presidential candidates in that year when the right was renounced.

During the 1966 statewide campaign in California, a number of stations made endorsements affecting virtually all elective offices on both sides of the political fence, from Governor to Controller. No one station's endorsement was as sought after as that of television station KNXT in Los Angeles. The reason why is obvious for the CBS owned station is watched by as many as 2,000,000 persons during its peak viewing hours. Its hour long Big News, beginning at six o'clock, has the highest rating of any Southern California news show. The station's editorials, presented immediately after the Big News, are designed to reach the largest segment of the viewing audience and usually succeed. Because of this, a great deal of interest and concern centered around the man who would make the announcement, Robert L. Wood, then General Manager of KNXT and since elevated to a higher job by the network. Under Wood's direction a careful build-up was given as to the day and time when KNXT would announce which one of the two candidates for Governor had gained its support for the highest office of the nation's largest state. Finally, the great moment arrived—Wood went before the camera to announce that KNXT would support Ronald Reagan for Governor. KNXT's viewers knew Robert Wood; he had become as familiar to watchers of Channel 2 as anyone employed by the station. What they did not know is that Wood is (1) a Republican, and (2) a conservative Republican at that. A fact that Wood did not choose to disclose to KNXT's viewers. For all they knew he simply was playing out his role as the station's General Manager with no vested interest in KNXT's endorsement beyond having to make it known to the public.

When the CBS owned station announced its support of Reagan, the Brown campaign people asked to have the Governor himself respond to the editorial. KNXT refused. In so doing they used a curious bit of logic. "We cannot," they said in effect, "allow the Governor to rebut the editorial for if we do so, it will then become necessary for us to give equal time to Mr. Reagan." So instead of flaunting the FCC rules, they chose to hide behind them. The reason for asking if the Governor could respond the KNXT's editorial was based upon the belief that he, better than anyone else, could make the most effective use of the time allowed for rebuttal. Conversely, the same was not true for Reagan. Wood was vastly more effective than Reagan because Wood bore the image of Channel 2. For many people Wood was KNXT and if he said they were supporting Reagan, then everyone at KNXT was supporting the former movie actor.

The decision to support Reagan, which was basically Wood's decision, met with considerable resentment among the station's award winning news department. Grant Holcomb, news director, and a respected reporter in his own right, though a member of the editorial board (whose members were never publicly identified) which gave Wood the votes he needed to support Reagan, was strangely enough not allowed to cast a vote as to which candidate he thought KNXT should support for Governor. Holcomb, though placed in a difficult position, was not nearly as upset as some of his reporters, most of whom felt their role as television newsmen had been badly compromised.

The day after it became known that KNXT was supporting Reagan, Governor Brown called a press conference in Sacramento. At the gathering the Governor was somewhat taken back by an unusually tough question from KNXT's Sacramento Bureau reporter, Robert Simmons. Later, on the way out of the press conference, the Governor accused Simmons of parroting KNXT's editorial policy by having been hostile to him. Simmons, a hard but fair questioner, uttered a few expletives and explained that he wasn't responsible for what management did and once more didn't like being placed in the position of having to say so, a fact he later made clear to Wood.

The issue, however, is more than a Putnam, Wood or KNXT, the issue is the endorsement. Wyman and others obviously opposed KNXT's support of Reagan, but they were just as opposed to the fact that KCBS Radio in San Francisco endorsed Brown. Such endorsements place within the hands of one man, be he Robert Wood or someone else, too much power to influence the viewing public. For there can be little doubt but that those who appear regularly on television create their own followings, as evidenced by the success that people like Chet Huntley, David Brinkley, Walter Cronkite and others, enjoy on a national level. In Los Angeles, some of Southern California's newsmen are as hounded by autograph seekers as are members of the film colony.

The concern that Wyman and others share may not be accepted by some who will look upon it as being mere partisan unrest prompted by what happened to the Democratic Party in the last election, but surely they must realize that the issue is greater than that affecting a single political party.

What happens if in 1968 CBS decides to endorse a candidate for President? Let us suppose that Dr. Frank Stanton and William Paley, who head CBS, decide the network's endorsement should go to the Republican candidate, whoever he may be and against President Johnson, assuming he runs for a second term. What then? Will the FCC sit idly by while tens of millions are informed that CBS supports the GOP candidate? What about the network's stockholders, not all of whom are Republicans? How will they react?

Most media people are convinced that no network will try and endorse a candidate for President. Why then should it be allowed at a state or local level?

The issue over endorsements has not received the attention it deserves, a fact that people like Wyman hope to alter. For its own part, the FCC continues to act as if no problem exists. But the matter of endorsements is only one problem, the FCC has others, one of which concerns predictions by television and radio stations of supposed winners in election contests.

On the first Tuesday in November in 1964, at 6:48 p.m., E.S.T., with polls still open in 23 states, with hundreds of thousands waiting to cast their vote, one of the major television networks forecast that Lyndon Baines Johnson would be the next President of the United States. Johnson won, but many who have been predicted as winners have lost.

In California during the 1965 Regular Session of the State Legislature, a bill was passed making it illegal to release any result of any count relating to any candidate or proposition until after 8:00 p.m., P.S.T. The measure was passed specifically to prevent forecasts by any television or radio stations of projected winners. Unfortunately the measure did not apply to precincts where the polls closed prior to 8:00 p.m. This one loophole in the law enabled NBC, 27 minutes before 8:00 p.m., to forecast Ronald Reagan as the winner of California's last gubernatorial contest. NBC made its prediction based upon the count from one small county in Northern California whose polls had closed in advance of the rest of the state.

NBC's forecast of Reagan's victory over Governor Brown, prior to the time when all of the polls were closed, did not keep the Governor from winning reelection. But it may have cost some candidates running for lesser offices their chance to win.

In 1964, a survey taken after the election disclosed that some 300,000 Californians did not go to the polls election night thinking that President Johnson had already won. As indicated, the staying away from the polls by people who think the election is over, may not affect those candidates running for national office, but it does affect the chances that lesser candidates running for statewide or local offices may have. If one man, be he Republican or Democrat, New Left or Old Right, loses a chance to win because some people stay home thinking its all over, then the laws need changing.

Another problem for the FCC to consider involves the number of radio "talk shows" on the air. Unique, in that they provide thousands with an opportunity to be heard on everything from Vietnam to vivisection, the "talkies" also offer a ready platform for the most irresponsible and scurrilous of charges, a problem compounded during an election campaign.

The most popular talk show in Southern California belongs to Joe Pyne. It was hardly a secret that Pyne did not like Governor Brown as evidenced by the fact that at one point in the gubernatorial campaign. Pyne called the Governor a "baboon!"

Don Bradley, who along with Fred Dutton managed Brown's campaign, was vexed by the fact that Pyne and some of his other radio "talk show" colleagues, allowed a great deal of drivel to be heard during their time on the air, most of it directed against the Governor. In fact, there is considerable evidence for believing that much of the material heard was carefully packaged by the Reagan people. What particularly bothered Bradley was the failure of Pyne and others to challege the half-truths and outright lies being offered—whether knowingly or not—by callers. Finally, Bradley blew up and called the people phoning Pyne "a bunch of kooks."

Pyne, the next day, suggested that his listeners phone the Brown campaign headquarters and protest being referred to as "kooks." Immediately the switchboard at the Governor's headquarters lit up completely and stayed that way throughout the morning, making it impossble to receive calls relating to the business of the campaign. Pyne and his callers had temporarily put the Governor's campaign out of business.

The problems outlined in this article are all within the jurisdiction of the FCC. They have the power to change the rules which allow these excesses to exist. Whether the problem is Pyne or Putnam or whoever, they are serious enough to demand adequate policing by the FCC. The dialogue of democracy can do without the frills of television and radio stations endorsing candidates for public office; the announcement by UNIVAC that based upon the results from Piney Knolls Precinct "our network is now able to tell you that our next President will be George Wallace," or the word from some unknown mystery voice on a radio "talk show" warning one and all that Robert Welch is really a front man for the Communist Party.

For the ultimate question involves the FCC and whether or not it will throw off its role as the industry's paper tiger—if in the final analysis it will somehow understand that a regulatory agency is supposed to be just that, a regulatory agency.

A Report on Graduates of Timken Vocational High School

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 12, 1967

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, Canton, Ohio, has established an outstanding program of vocational education centered around the facilities of our Timken Vocational High School, offering talented youngsters a successful entry into the world of work without benefit of college training.

In the coming school year, Canton will add 20 additional units of vocational education which include for the first time all public high schools. An additional 500 vocational upper classmen will be offered courses in office practice, distributive education and trade and industrial training.

As an illustration of the success of the program, George W. Swindell, its director, has sent me an interesting report on the graduates of Timken Vocational High School which I include in the RECORD as proof positive of the success of this program. The article follows:

PUBLIC SCHOOL VOCATIONAL EDUCATION SERVES PEOPLE AND SUPPORTS BUSINESS AND INDUSTRY—A REPORT ON GRADUATES OF TIMKEN VOCATIONAL HIGH SCHOOL

It is with much pride that the public school system of Canton, Ohio can point to the fruits of its vocational education program in industries situated locally and in other cities as well.

As we visit the varied industries in the city, we see many who are in positions of leadership and responsibility. These are the men and women who were the students of yesterday fulfilling the positions for which they prepared themselves in their vocational training program.

A tour through town takes us to a new one and one-half million dollar church where Frank Marchione designed and made the stained glass windows. Frank was graduated from the Vocational Commercial Art Department in 1943 and now has his own studio in Cleveland, Ohio.

Ray Maurer, a 1949 graduate of the same department, has just been appointed as Promotion Director of Wonderland Shopping City of San Antonio, Texas.

A visit to the Danner Press finds Charles Cheviron, a graduate of the Vocational Printing Program in 1942, in the Vice-President's chair, directing publications which have worldwide circulation. Gary Cockrill, a product of the Vocational Printing Program of 1952, is Plant Superintendent in one of the largest print shops in town, while Bill Hofacker (1951) and Joe Nunez (1958) teamed up to buy out another printing concern.

A trip out Fulton Road finds Jim Farina, a 1946 Vocational Auto Shop graduate directing one of the largest independent body shops in the area as its owner. Johnny Constantino, a Vocational Auto Shop product of 1947, is now General Manager of one of the largest Ford agencies in the area.

In the south end of town, we find that Roy Miller, a 1943 Vocational Machine Shop graduate, is Plant Superintendent of Poor and Co., while Bob Hahn, who finished his Vocational Machine Trade course in 1944, is Supervisor of Apprentice Programs which involves responsibility in apprentice programs in all Timken Roller Bearing Co. plants. Incidentally, there are ten men who were former Timken Vocational High School students who are on the apprenticeship training staff at the world-famous Timken Roller Bearing Co.

At Macomber, Inc., Bernard Cromi (1944), a Vocational Drafting graduate, is Vice-President in Charge of Sales, while Russell Fink (1945) is Chief Engineer in the same plant directing the engineering of their structural steel plant. He is also a graduate of the Vocational Drafting and has not attended a college or university.

Eugene Muntean (1941), a graduate of the Vocational Sheet Metal Program, now directs the operations of Muntean Sheet Metal and Home Improvement Co., a large independent sheet metal shop. Ralph Leo (1948), who chose the Vocational Sheet Metal field is Maintenance Foreman at Timken's, and Mike Drozda (1942), is a former student in the Vocational Welding Program, is General Welding Foreman.

James Gellenbeck, a 1948 graduate of the Vocational Pattern Shop, is a building contractor specializing in business buildings.

One of the youngest men to assume a position of high responsibility is Edward Maddern, a 1959 graduate of the Vocational Electrical Trade Program, head of the electrical section in Product Engineering at Diebold, Inc., one of the world's largest safe manufacturers and fabricators of drive-in bank windows in addition to filing equipment.

Two of the Vocational Clothing and Textile graduates became designers at the firm of Travilla in Hollywood. Helen Joseph, one of the girls, was graduated in 1948, while Betty Navrozides was graduated a year later.

None of the people listed above have a college degree. All have achieved success in the areas of vocational employment related directly to their high school vocational programs. Success stories like these could be duplicated time and time again to indicate the value of motivation in securing good positions through vocational training without a college education or a degree.

Most have taken work beyond high school in vocational programs for out-of-school youth and adults at Timken Vocational High School while others have studied on their own. Salaries range from nine to twenty-five thousand dollars, another indication of the value of having a skill to offer an employer. The length of time to attain these positions varies from seven years to twenty years.

We are proud of our placement records of our vocational graduates. Over the past ten years, our placement record of graduates in occupations related directly to their programs has averaged eighty-five per cent. Last year (1965–1966 school year), placement was ninety-seven per cent of the vocational graduates.

Vocational education is not a block for the six per cent of our graduates who change their goals and enter colleges and universities instead of employment. Students who had no intention to go on to college tell us that through the inspiration received from their vocational programs, they were motivated to seek higher education on a college of technical level. Many electrical graduates have gone on to be technicians and engineers.

In conclusion, we are sure that our educational program, which produces leaders and skilled craftsmen such as we have enumerated and have, in addition, graduates who have become ministers, priests, doctors of medicine, psychologists, lawyers, Ph. D.'s, and engineers from the limited number going on to college, has much merit and it worthy of mention. That is vocational education in Canton, Ohio.

Presidential Citations for Three Members of the Coast Guard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 12, 1967

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, last week it was my privilege to visit the Coast Guard headquarters of the 7th Coast Guard District in Miami, Fla., and also the Coast Guard Air Station at St. Petersburg, Fla.

I was tremendously impressed with the efficiency of the operations there and want to commend Rear Adm. Paul G. Prins, the commander of Seventh District, for his effective leadership and accomplishments there. Persons and ships using the waters off the Florida coast are, I am confident, cognizant of the value of this installation in their midst, and travel the waters of the area with much more confidence, because of its presence.

During my visit, a special ceremony was held to present Presidential citations to three members of the Coast Guard for extraordinary valor while participating in a sea rescue of four adults and two children, from a sinking vessel about 120 miles from St. Petersburg. One of them was awarded the Distinguished Flying Cross and two of them the Air Medal, and they also received the commendation of the Commandant of the Coast Guard, Adm. W. J. Smith.

Knowing that all Member of Congress share my pride in their heroic efforts, I am inserting in the RECORD, the citation and commendations referred to above.

MAY 18, 1967.

Lt. ROBERT B. WORKMAN,
USCG, Seventh Coast Guard District,
Miami, Fla.

DEAR MR. WORKMAN: It is noted with pride that the Secretary of Transportation has awarded you the Distinguished Flying Cross. You were cited for extraordinary achievement in aerial flight on the night of 27 January 1967 as aircraft commander of a Coast Guard helicopter, engaged in the perilous rescue of four adults and two children from the sinking vessel *Cecil Anne*, located 120 miles northwest of St. Petersburg, Florida.

I take this opportunity to express my personal congratulations on this well-deserved recognition of your meritorious service. The credit you have brought upon the Coast Guard by your devotion to duty and adherence to the traditions of the Service is deeply appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

W. J. SMITH,
Admiral, U.S. Coast Guard.

THE SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION,
Washington, D.C., May 8, 1967.

The President of the United States takes pleasure in presenting the Distinguished Flying Cross to Lieutenant Robert Bruce Workman, United States Coast Guard, for service as set forth in the following Citation:

"For extraordinary achievement while participating in aerial flight on the night of January 27, 1967 as aircraft commander of a Coast Guard helicopter, engaged in the perilous rescue of four adults and two children from the vessel *Cecil Anne*, which was sinking 120 miles northwest of St. Petersburg, Florida. Lieutenant Workman proceeded without fixed wing escort and made a night instrument 'Beep to a Hover' maneuver while hampered by darkness and obstructions from a 24-foot antenna and a 12-foot jack staff. Despite the vessel yawing as much as 60° and her stern submerged, he skillfully maneuvered the helicopter crosswind to hoist the six persons, one with a broken leg, from the bow of the boat. Due to the total weight on board, the last hoist required 100% power plus forward motion to remain airborne. Lieutenant Workman displayed expert airmanship and dauntless valor throughout this perilous rescue mission. His skill, courage, sound judgment and unwavering devotion to duty reflect the highest credit upon himself and the United States Coast Guard."

For the President:

ALAN S. BOYD.

MAY 18, 1967.

Lt. NORMAN H. HUFF, USCG,
Seventh Coast Guard District,
Miami, Fla.

DEAR MR. HUFF: It is noted with pride that the Secretary of Transportation has awarded you the Air Medal. You were cited for meritorious achievement in aerial flight on the night of 27 January 1967 as copilot of a Coast Guard helicopter, engaged in the perilous rescue of four adults and two children from the sinking vessel *Cecil Anne*, located 120 miles northwest of St. Petersburg, Florida.

I take this opportunity to express my personal congratulations on this well-deserved recognition of your meritorious service. The credit you have brought upon the Coast Guard by your devotion to duty and adherence to the traditions of the Service is deeply appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

W. J. SMITH,
Admiral, U.S. Coast Guard.

THE SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION,
Washington, D.C., May 8, 1967.

The President of the United States takes pleasure in presenting the Air Medal to Lieutenant Norman Henry Huff, United States Coast Guard, for service as set forth in the following Citation:

"For meritorious achievement in aerial flights on the night of January 27, 1967 as copilot of a Coast Guard helicopter, engaged in the perilous rescue of four adults and two children from the sinking vessel CECIL ANNE, located 120 miles northwest of St. Petersburg, Florida. Lieutenant Huff assisted the pilot by monitoring the flight instruments on this hazardous flight during darkness, with poor visibility and 30-knot winds and in making a night instrument "Beep to a Hover" maneuver over the stern of the boat, obstructed by a 24-foot antenna and a 12-foot jack staff. With the vessel yawing as much as 60° and her stern submerged, the helicopter was positioned crosswind to permit hoist of the six persons, one with a broken leg, from the bow of the boat. Due to the total weight on board, the last hoist required 100% power and forward motion to remain airborne. Lieutenant Huff displayed expert airmanship throughout this perilous rescue mission. His initiative, skill, sound judgment and unwavering devotion to duty were in keeping with the highest traditions of the United States Coast Guard."

For the President:

ALAN S. BOYD.

MAY 18, 1967.

Aviation Structural Mechanic First Class
JOHN L. CHASSEREAU,
USCG, Seventh Coast Guard District, Miami, Fla.

DEAR PETTY OFFICER CHASSEREAU: It is noted with pride that the Secretary of Transportation has awarded you the Air Medal. You were cited for meritorious achievement in aerial flight on the night of 27 January 1967 as aircrewman and hoist operator of a Coast Guard helicopter, engaged in the perilous rescue of four adults and two children from the sinking vessel CECIL ANNE, located 120 miles northwest of St. Petersburg, Florida.

I take this opportunity to express my personal congratulations on this well-deserved recognition of your meritorious service. The credit you have brought upon the Coast Guard by your devotion to duty and adherence to the traditions of the Service is deeply appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

W. J. SMITH,
Admiral, U.S. Coast Guard.

THE SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION,
Washington, D.C., May 8, 1967.

The President of the United States takes pleasure in presenting the Air Medal to John Lee Chassereau, Aviation Structural Mechanic First Class, United States Coast Guard, for service as set forth in the following citation:

"For meritorious achievement in aerial flight on the night of January 27, 1967 as aircrewman and hoist operator of a Coast Guard helicopter, engaged in the perilous rescue of four adults and two children from the sinking vessel *Cecil Anne*, located 120 miles northwest of St. Petersburg, Florida. When advised of the emergency, Petty Officer Chassereau manned the aircraft and persevered in his duties on this hazardous flight during darkness, without fixed wing escort, with poor visibility and 30-knot winds. Upon his arrival, he skillfully aided the pilot in making a night instrument "Beep to a Hover" maneuver over the stern of the boat which was obstructed by a 24-foot antenna and a 12-foot jack staff. Despite the vessel yawing as much as 60° with her stern submerged and as the helicopter was positioned crosswind Petty Officer Chassereau carefully controlled the rescue basket while hoisting the six persons, one with a broken leg, from the bow of the boat. Due to the total weight on board, the last hoist required 100% power and forward motion to remain airborne. Petty Officer Chassereau displayed expert airmanship throughout this perilous rescue mission. His initiative, skill, sound judgment and unwavering devotion to duty were in keeping with the highest traditions of the United States Coast Guard."

For the President,

ALAN S. BOYD.

The Air Medal was presented to Lt. Norman H. Huff and AM1 John L. Chassereau by Rear Adm. Paul G. Prins.

It was my privilege and pleasure to present the Distinguished Flying Cross to Lt. Robert B. Workman, Jr., on behalf of the President.

During this ceremony, a letter of appreciation was awarded to Lt. Comdr. Duane P. Gatto, commanding officer of the cutter *Ariagne*, and his crew for outstanding performance during 1966, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION,
U.S. COAST GUARD,
Washington, D.C., June 16, 1967.

From: Commandant.
To: Commanding Officer, USCGC *Ariadne* (WMEC 101).
Via: Commander, Seventh Coast Guard District (d).
Subj.: Letter of Appreciation.

1. I note with pride and am pleased to commend you and your crew on board the

USCGC *Ariadne* (WMEC 101) for the outstanding achievement of steaming 32,753 miles during fiscal year 1966. This performance, which was exceeded only by one tender on oceanographic duties and one of the high endurance cutters, was attained despite the obsolescence of the plant and equipment, cramped quarters and long family separations.

2. I congratulate all hands on their pride in the Coast Guard, the USCGC *Ariadne* and themselves which made this outstanding accomplishment possible. The collective efforts, initiative, diligence and conscientious attitude of personnel on board during this period are appreciated.

3. It is requested that all personnel concerned be apprised of the contents of this letter and a copy placed in each individual's service record.

W. J. SMITH.

A letter of appreciation was also awarded to Dr. (Lt.) Henry E. McCullough, for his numerous medical assists in search and rescue helicopter medical evacuations and his efforts to improve medical care of coastguardsmen in the area, which I am inserting:

28 MAY 1967

From: Commander, Seventh Coast Guard District.
To: Lt. Henry E. McCullough 25556, USPHS.
Via: Commanding Officer, CG Air Station, St. Petersburg, Florida.
Subj: Letter of Appreciation.

1. The District Commander notes with pleasure the outstanding services you have performed since reporting to Coast Guard Air Station, St. Petersburg, Florida.

2. Since you reported to Air Station St. Petersburg in July 1966, you have greatly improved the medical facilities of that unit and the services to Coast Guard personnel and their dependents. You have made yourself available at all times and have unselfishly given much of your own time.

3. I note particularly that you have participated in many SAR cases. Recently you served as crewman of the helicopter utilized in the medical evacuation of a Chinese Seaman from the M/S *Baron Holberg*, 130 miles off shore from St. Petersburg. The helicopter utilized was stripped in view of the long distance flight and you were the only crewman assigned. As the SAR aircrewman you guided the helicopter for the hoist and accomplished the hoist yourself. You then treated the patient while enroute to St. Petersburg.

4. Your outstanding performance and devotion to duty are hereby most heartily commended.

5. A copy of this letter of appreciation will be forwarded to the Commandant for inclusion in your official record at Headquarters.

P. G. PRINS.

The members of the Coast Guard are a valuable branch of our Armed Services in peacetime activities, as well as in war, and are proving themselves in local areas and in as distant areas as Vietnam, and we can well be proud of them.

An Elected Judiciary: Free and Independent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. MURPHY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 12, 1967

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, one of Brooklyn's outstanding bankers, who has been most active in all aspects of community affairs, delivered an excellent address before the Brooklyn Rotary Club at the St. George Hotel on May 10, 1967. I commend to the attention of my colleagues the remarks of Andrew S. Roscoe:

AN ELECTED JUDICIARY: FREE AND INDEPENDENT

My Fellow Rotarians and Guests: This is my sixth visit to the Brooklyn Rotary Club as speaker during the past quarter of a century and I am deeply grateful for the privilege.

On my first visit, we discussed public housing. Later, we treated with Brooklyn's contribution to our social pattern; then we explored Brooklyn's enterprises. Not too many years ago, you and I dared to take a long, hard look at the problems emanating from the slums. Apparently, our plea fell on deaf ears. Instead of accepting our humble requests for remedy and improvement in housing, we were told that there was no blight or corrosion in any of our Brooklyn communities. Had we been able to initiate a program in 1958, I am certain that our borough and our greater city would not be confronted with the problems they face today.

Last year, we discussed the economy of our community, with special reference to the place occupied by the savings institutions—that is, the savings and loan associations and the savings banks of this borough.

My topic today is "An Elected Judiciary: Free and Independent." This is a subject that covers a lot of territory and who knows where we may land. May I again mention that when I get up steam, I am like the preacher who announces the title of his sermon, then goes off on a tangent and speaks about everything else.

All of us are citizens of the State of New York. Therefore, we are keenly interested in the Code that our Constitutional Convention, currently in session, is developing for the conduct of our lives.

May I, at this point, indulge in the privilege of stating my conclusion right at the outset. I visualize that our Constitutional Convention will develop a Code that will assure a greater future for our state—and I will make an effort to justify my forecast on a single premise—the integrity of the people of this great state.

I am reminded of an occasion some years ago when I delivered a commencement address and discussed the relationship between economics, political science and sociology. I mentioned that among the students of these disciplines, there are those who believe that economics, political science and sociology constitute pure science and that to the extent that we know the area, we can write out our equations exactly as we do in mathematics and physics. Then, there are those who feel that economics, political science and sociology should be branches of philosophy, branches of human principle.

We know that there is no conflict between the two theories. The thinking of the first group deals with study and research and we agree that the result can be expressed in equations. The concept of the second group covers the activity following that study and research to find the answer to the question of what we are to do with the results of our research. At this point, we treat with policy—and if we are to obtain that summum bonum, that maximum good out of our pattern, then economics, political science and sociology had *better* become branches of philosophy!

I believe that economic functions cannot be studied in a vacuum and I believe that our democracy represents a moral plan designed for the greatest good for the greatest number.

I further believe that the American scheme is so nearly ideal that unless the relationship between economics, political science and sociology is properly synchronized, the gears will not mesh and the machinery will break down. Our New York State machinery may have slowed down but it is there and can roll at higher and higher speeds if that is what we want. Let me illustrate my point. The State of New York in 1950 attracted 14.9% of the total personal income of the country. At that time, our beloved Empire State was the ranking state, with Pennsylvania second, Illinois third and California fourth. In 1960, our state attracted 11.58% of the total personal income of the U.S. and again was the ranking state, with California second, Illinois third and Pennsylvania fourth. However, in 1965, New York State dropped to second place, attracting 11.1% of the total personal income of the states. It was outranked by California with 11.27%. It was a small margin but, nevertheless, our state lost ground.

Our national economy is progressing at a tremendous rate and we are living in a highly competitive age. Countries and states, cities, corporate and individual enterprises, compete for economic attainment. Our state has been steadily losing business to other states. In Brooklyn, we are losing our business to other communities on a consistent pattern. Our state must face the grim facts—the advantages of better labor markets, tax exemptions, bonuses, cheaper transportation, longer daylight and a better climate for businesses offered by other states.

If our Empire State is to regain its number one position in the Union and in the eyes of the world, the struggle must begin with the basic code for the conduct of life and the development of this code is now the responsibility of the distinguished delegates to the Constitutional Convention.

America is a business country and the State of New York, I repeat, was the ranking state in the Union until the last few years. That the prosperity of our commerce and industry brought our standard of living to the highest point in the world's history is not a question for debate. Our social structure is pretty solid, the many problems notwithstanding. In our business, we are, in effect, relating our economic functions to social objectives and we follow a code established by the body politic. Hence, our keen interest as business men in the program of our Constitutional Convention and in the Code that this convention will develop for our state government.

Our state government consists of the Executive branch, the Legislative branch and the Judiciary. We generally agree that there is a delicate balance among the three branches and if any one of them becomes subservient to another, the result could be disastrous.

In our case, it is not a question of dealing with the sovereign power and the rights of the subjects against it. We are not confronted with dualistic concepts in a constitution where the legislative power is in the ruler, in Parliament, and the executive power is in the ruler, in Council—and each is independent of the other. Our rights with respect to the writ of habeas corpus, the right to a jury trial and the right to a judicial review of the acts of any officer of the Executive branch for wrongful acts even though committed in his official capacity are similar to those guaranteed by the constitutions of some of the other countries. However, in the United States, through the foresight of the founding fathers and traditions, a rather delicate balance has been created among the three branches of our government and neither the executive nor the state is the sovereign. In our case, the people of the state are the sovereign.

Students of political science agree that the moment the legislative branch or the judicial branch of the government becomes subservient to the executive, the people of the state no longer hold title to their sovereignty.

We also accept as an axiom that justice is the keystone and pillar of good government. As an individual, I am grateful to those before my time and to the symbolic body politic which has constantly fought for the rights of a free citizenry against external enemies and those enemies within ourselves, such as doubt, timidity and corroding self-aggrandizement. Community advancement, of necessity, is based on the essentials of civil progress. In this progress, the people rely upon the law, its administration and interpretation. Different points of view demand interpretation. The rapid and just disposition of litigation has played a vital role in any community's progress over the years. The ideal concept of justice for all enables us to plan for a community's future in which our citizenry recognizes equality before the law and integrity in the administration of justice. I thank God that we live in a society where justice cannot be dispensed by electronic machines, for only the creatures of the Lord are endowed to judge and understand their fellow mortals.

I noted before, my gratitude to the body politic, and I now note the deepest gratitude to the members of our courts who are continuing to follow, with distinction and greatness, the traditions of justice, humanly administered. We may indeed be proud of the judges of our Supreme Court, of our lower courts, and of our Federal courts.

The proposition of how to select judges is before the Constitutional Convention and it is a controversial question. There have been many suggestions such as a direct primary, judicial conventions, non-partisan judicial elections and a number of plans dealing with executive appointment. Presently, the judges of the Court of Appeals, our Supreme Court and Civil Court judges are elected after having obtained their nominations at the state convention, or a judicial convention, or primary election. Under our recent laws, the judges of our highest court will be nominated by direct primary elections.

The people of the U.S. derive from every part of the world, therefore our political pattern is developed from the highest ideas and ideals of all the peoples of the world and we have added characteristics strictly our own. One of the strange phenomena of the American way of life is the elected public servant and that includes our elected judiciary. We may name a plain man to Congress, even take a man out of smoke-filled halls and make him an Assemblyman, a State Senator or we may elevate a modest lawyer to the bench. In the main, these men make good Congressmen and judges, responsible to the people who are their master. Indeed, our body politic is in a class by itself.

Now, let us take a look at our elected judiciary. They are all lawyers and I know that you and I hold the legal profession in the highest esteem. When these lawyers decided on a political career, they started at their local political clubs where they had an opportunity to become exposed to the problems as well as the hopes and ambitions of the most modest citizens. These men were constantly called upon for service to their neighbors and to their community. Their assignments practically compelled them to keep pace with the progress of their community and that included the progress of their knowledge of law. At the judicial convention, they were named by individuals who were designated by the political representatives of their respective parties. Those who designate them must stand election quite often. There is not a year that we do not hear of district primary fights in both parties.

The field of politics is also a highly competitive arena. The district leaders, county leaders, state or national chairmen of a political party, are exposed to severe tests, day in and day out. They have obtained their positions through the democratic process of nomination and election, which means the approval of their neighbors and as long as they are leaders, they are answerable to their neighbors.

When we view our Brooklyn political scene, and note the distinguished service that such men as the Hon. John R. Crews, our sterling Republican leader and great benefactor of Brooklyn, has rendered for the past forty years, and note the careers of others in this highly competitive area, and when we recognize the presence and prestige of Stanley Steingut and John Lynch, we need not wonder about the high standing of our judiciary.

The great revolutions of the world, including our own Revolution, were fought for equality, which means equal claims for equal services rendered under equal conditions, and it also means equal and absolute justice.

When it comes to the method of selecting judges, I think that the qualifications and the great integrity of our Brooklyn judiciary should provide the answer. There is no point in making a change just for the sake of change.

I am sorry to inject a regretful note into my remarks but undoubtedly, there is a lack of appreciation of the tremendous burdens that have been placed on our distinguished jurists. I hope that steps will be taken to lighten these heavy burdens which the members of the Supreme Court in this district and the members of other courts have shouldered without complaint and with such dedication to the service of the people of Brooklyn.

As businessmen, you and I know that the volume of business cannot be increased beyond a given point without proportionately increasing the manpower.

Because our state is taking steps to meet the competition of the other states and we are anticipating a greater future of economic and social growth, our courts will face additional tasks. The issue of an adequate number of justices is urgent. Time itself can be an element of justice or injustice. The law's delays, in Hamlet's grim soliloquy, may well constitute a form of tyranny itself.

It is my hope that you good people will follow the activities of the Constitutional Convention and that you will take the time and effort to advise the delegates of your views. Our democracy, within the framework of our great Republic, has demonstrated that it can perform wonders because of the integrity of its pattern. Our body politic recognizes that there is an ethical concept of political obligation and that there must be a moral basis for political power and for all political authority.

In all ages, history identifies persons who believed themselves to be superior to the rest of the public and who were convinced that the people were incompetent to govern themselves but rather, should be ruled by autocratic laws and supermen.

Fortunately, in our pattern, the pure concept has generally prevailed and our democratic government has always made progress. Today, we have a concerted effort to alter our democratic processes of electing judges. The defects of the elective system are called to our attention, without however, offering a purer substitute. The principal complaint is that politics control the designation of judges. Fortunately, the politics involved in the nomination of the judiciary represent the politics of the people.

Under the appointive system, the complaint of politics also applies; however, it could be the kind of politics that represents special interests and the untested visions of the dreamers. Surely the people of the state of New York have demonstrated that they can be trusted, particularly when it comes to the elective processes.

The judges of our highest court enjoy the respect of the whole country, if not the world. The judges of our other courts share in this high esteem. If our people should ever surrender their right to elect their own public servants who can exercise control over their lives and property, then on that day they will surrender their freedom, their human rights and human dignity.

Private Industry-Government Cooperation Helps Disadvantaged Youth in Los Angeles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 11, 1967

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, newspapers, telecasts, and broadcasts every day are crammed full of stories depicting the grimmer side of human affairs—violence, crime, aggression, dishonesty, man's inhumanity against man.

But that is only part of the story. There is a far brighter side to human events. A good many stories of human kindness, really warm stories, go quietly unseen and unheard, because they do not appear on the police blotter.

It is, therefore, always pleasant, refreshing, and encouraging to come across a heart-warming story about how more fortunate people band together to help the less fortunate in our midst.

I am happy to report one of these warm stories, a story of cooperation between a private industry, the Pacific Telephone & Telegraph Co. and the Federal Government in helping disadvantaged youth in Los Angeles get a better start in life. It is a story of which all Americans can be amply proud.

In a recent article in the Bell Telephone magazine, Ray Garcia, of the Pacific Telephone & Telegraph Co., recounts how the firm's community relations team in the Los Angeles area got stirred into doing something about furthering the reading of some young dropouts in the Department of Labor's Neighborhood Youth Corps.

In their visits around the community, members of the team were interested in much more than merely the telephone service problems of their patrons. They were also interested in the broader problems confronting people living in the area they were serving. They were deeply troubled about the low levels of education they found, Mr. Garcia said.

> We talked at length with teachers, among others—

He noted—

> and the consensus was that the reason the education level was so low and there were so many dropouts was that the kids never learned to read well. They were never encouraged to read in the home. There was no environment in which they could see books, admire books, learn to like books, feel comfortable with books.

The concern of this small team headed by Mr. Garcia was quickly translated into action—the kind of action that, in concert with similarly motivated efforts by Government, churches, labor unions, civic groups, and other private organizations, is so essential for eliminating the disadvantage that continues to hamper so many of our fellow citizens in Los Angeles and throughout the country in this time of record prosperity.

Mr. Garcia's team clearly saw a problem and it moved to do its part to solve it. With contributions from telephone company workers, the team distributed several thousand books to boys clubs, a halfway house, and to the economic and youth opportunity agency of greater Los Angeles, an umbrella antipoverty organization that has two Neighborhood Youth Corps programs.

The lives of the young people in this federally funded program will never be the same again. They will not be the same because of the enriching experience they will gain from these books donated by this private company. And they will not be the same because of the invaluable work experience they are receiving through the important public-service jobs they are performing in the Corps to build better futures for themselves and their community.

The antipoverty agency which sponsors this program now has its own library that is stocked with novels, encyclopedias, and research books. For these young people who have seen too few books in their lives, this library may help unveil shining new vistas far beyond anything the youths have ever imagined. Learning has that kind of fantastic potential.

Further, these books represent an integral part of the overall aim of the Neighborhood Youth Corps effort to assist these 16- through 21-year-olds in getting new starts in life, starts toward productive and rewarding lives, rather than lives of unemployment and frustration.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the telephone company for this most worthwhile contribution, and I would like to insert in the Congressional Record the text of the article, "A Man and His City," which appeared in the Bell Telephone magazine.

A Man and His City

(By Ray Garcia, as told to Robert L. Varner)

When we first put the windows in the back wall at the new Salesian Boys' Club—and there are a lot of them; the wall is almost all glass—they all were broken out in a matter of days. Fortunately, one of the club board members owns a glass company and was willing to contribute new glass.

The second time we put the windows in they lasted about a week. The third time they lasted a month or more. Finally, this time, they've been in for many months and although some are cracked they haven't been knocked out altogether. I'm confident the windows are going to stay in. The kids gradually are getting used to playing and living where all this glass lets in the sun. Gradually they're learning a new respect for property.

To me, those windows say something about the problems of East Los Angeles or all of Los Angeles or any city. The problems can't be licked quickly or easily. The people concerned need great patience and perseverance and understanding. But the problems can be licked.

The one most significant change in East Los Angeles since my boyhood days here, as I see it, is the feeling generally that we can improve the quality of our lives. It's a feeling that we don't have to consider ourselves different from anybody else—that, if we really want to, we can climb over any obstacle that may be placed in our way.

When I was very young the attitude was more passive. The attitude was, "Well, we are Mexicans and most Mexicans always have lived in poverty and always will, so there's no point in struggling." This has changed. Actual living conditions in East Los Angeles haven't changed too much, but the attitude has. People are trying harder; their aspirations are higher; they have more hope.

Tied in with this is the fact that the poor people of the area are gaining a more effective voice in some of the programs for community betterment.

I don't think you can put a poor person with limited education in a very responsible position administering a program right off the bat. He can come in as an aide, however—and this is being done in many instances—and gradually gain the experience and training necessary in order to be able to take an administrative role.

And, whether they work as aides or not, the people of the community speak up more in the planning of the programs. They don't dictate what goes on, but they have something to say about it.

So there is hope.

There is also despair, I know, for many individuals. Of the 12 fellows I knew best as I grew up, only two have been steadily employed the last 10 years.

Louis, for instance, was a very handsome young man, an athlete, who started using dope while in junior high school. He is still a dope addict and I understand has since gotten his wife hooked also. One day last year when I was working with the library at the Variety Boys' Club, which we both attended as kids, I met Louis standing across the street from the club. He was trying to sneak a look at his son, who now attends the club, but didn't have the courage to come any closer because of his condition.

Another friend, Victor, started using dope when he was about 15, and has been in and out of jail since that time. He married my wife's closest friend and for a while seemed to be doing very well. But then he went back to dope and the situation deteriorated, there was no food for their three children, and the family had to go on relief. Victor is in prison now, and by chance was arrested the last time by a police officer who also was a boyhood friend of ours.

And there are others. I consider these men my brothers, and because of them and other experiences I have had, I can never entertain any lightheaded or falsely optimistic outlook on life.

I have been very lucky in many ways—far more fortunate than many of my friends.

I was lucky, first of all, to learn the meaning and the value of working very hard from my father's background. As a cowboy in Mexico at the age of 12, he rode the range caring for the cattle from sun-up to sundown, while my grandfather collected my father's pay from the Mormon rancher. This was the way my father contributed to their family.

He crossed the river to El Paso at the age of 16, thinking my grandfather would join him. My grandfather never did, although just before he died he traveled to Los Angeles to apologize to my father for having treated him as he did and to tell him he truly loved him as a son. In El Paso, where my father stayed for three years, over the western states, and finally in Los Angeles, he continued to work very hard, as a mason apprentice, a farm laborer, and at many other jobs. He still works hard today.

He told me the stories of how he worked as a boy, not in a bragging way but because I wanted to know. To me the stories said that if you have a job to do, and you really want to do it, you can.

I was fortunate also in that certain teachers and other older people took an interest in me, Mrs. Green for instance, encouraged me in my art work in grade school days. She would put up as many as 10 of my pictures of trees on the bulletin board at the same time. Some years later a really fine teacher, Mrs. Crane, helped arrange for me to attend night school when I was still in my teens, although technically it was for adults only.

I was lucky, more than 10 years ago, to get a job with the Pacific Telephone Company, with its infinite variety of opportunity. It was good to start as a lineman, where, as had been the case for my father, I had to work very hard. This kind of experience adds extra drive for any job you may move into later.

My two years of Army experience worked to my benefit also. I was able to prove to myself that I had the abilities I had felt were mine—the abilities to write, to speak, to teach, to counsel. Army public information and NCO academy work gave me these opportunities.

The greatest personal influence came from Corinne. She set a beautiful example for me. She was just exactly the opposite of what I thought I was as a teen-ager. I drank and she didn't drink. I smoked and she didn't smoke. I didn't study and she studied. I finally decided that if she was really going to be my steady and we were going to get married some day, I would have to be a better guy because she deserved something better.

Before we were married she helped me see the quality our lives could have—she urged me to finish high school and go on to college—and since we've been married she's given me help all the way.

I had, and still have, strong faith in God. I once worked in a warehouse with six other fellows, all of whom were taking dope. At times they did their best to get me to try it "just once." I feel God helped me steer clear.

Those of us who are concerned with the problems of the city will need to work hard; we'll need faith; and certainly we can use a little luck if we're to deal with the problems.

In East Los Angeles, as in other cities, we face problems of employment, housing, and education, wtih education the greatest problem of all.

The employment situation has improved some. At one time prejudice blocked employment to a degree, but this is not really a factor today. There is some unemployment, but most people here are able to get jobs, and many hang on to them for long periods of time.

The bad feature, however, is that because of their lack of education, they generally are not able to progress to any position of responsibility. Many times they don't want responsibility because they feel inadequate, again as a result of the educational lack. If you are loading boxcars, as an example, you don't want to be a checker who sees that the orders are correct because your reading isn't good enough or your math isn't good enough and you're afraid of making errors in counting.

This means that the average family income in East Los Angeles is low—on the order of the poverty mean, actually.

About 85 per cent of the housing is owned by absentee landlords. And about the same percentage is old, by California standards. Many of the single dwellings have given way to multi-unit low-rent housing projects, but a great number of the small, individual houses remain.

A lot of these are sub-standard, but they could be restored, rather than torn down. I think a slum is a slum by definition and partly because of the fact the people living in the homes often don't really know what they are living in. They are too close to them to see the beauty in the old homes.

I especially like the gingerbread on the small Victorian homes which are all over the place. These homes have style and character. I would like to see a program under which the fundamentals of architecture could be taught to the children in the area so that they would have an appreciation of the homes they live in and perhaps a desire to make them as they were when brand-new.

Along with this could go courses in remodeling and restoration—the practical steps to be taken in rented dwellings as well as those individually owned.

A related idea: an art class could paint these houses as an assignment, not as they are now but as they appear in the mind's eye, after restoration. An art show of paintings of this kind for all the residents of the area would give further impetus to restoration. A resident could be given the painting of his home as a reminder of what might be done.

Race relations pose no particular problem within East Los Angeles. Roughly 65 per cent of the people here are Mexican-American, some 20 per cent are of oriental background, mostly Japanese, some 10 per cent are Negro, with the balance a mixture, mostly of European extraction.

People here generally are indifferent to race or color. If you live here, you belong here, and you're accepted. The only time I notice any distinction is when people try to define what I am. Those outside East Los Angeles, particularly, don't seem to feel comfortable just saying, "Ray Garcia is going to be here." They usually add, "By the way, he's that Mexican-American fellow I've been telling you about."

Most Mexican-Americans never doubt that they are Americans first, even though Spanish may be spoken in the home and there is pride in the Mexican heritage.

As in many other cities, the roots of most of our other problems in East Los Angeles reach back to the one big problem of education. The Mexican-American population here averages between eight and nine years of school completed, as compared to the Los Angeles Negro average of 10 years, and an average for the city as a whole of 12 years. The educational area is one in which the telephone company, with its pool of brainpower, has contributed and must continue to contribute, as should all business.

Sometimes people question the wisdom of business action in such a field. I feel, as a student of sociology and a member of the business community, that the two worlds need not be at odds at all. The one leads to greater sensitivity to human need and the other to workable, practical approaches to meet the need. Society requires both, and in some kind of reasonable balance and creative league.

A couple of years ago, when I was serving as chairman of the Pacific telephone community relations team in my home area, the Boyle Heights community of East Los Angeles, we dug pretty deeply into this question of education and other questions of concern. We visited much of the area and talked with many people, researching what the problems were from the point of view of the customer—telephone service problems and broader problems as well.

We talked at length with teachers, among others, and the consensus was that the reason the educational level was so low and there were so many dropouts was that the kids never learned to read well. They were never encouraged to read in the home. There was no environment in which they could see books, admire books, learn to like books, feel comfortable with books.

They would do some reading in grammar school and in junior high school, but they would never really read well. By the time a youngster got to high school he was in bad shape, because he couldn't understand what he was reading. He would try to fake it, and eventually the teachers would discover he was faking.

This inability to understand what he was reading smothered the learning process and confused the student to the point where he no longer wanted to attend school and out he would go. It was much easier to go to work digging a ditch or doing something else where little or no education was needed than to try to make a fresh start at learning to read. He now was too far behind.

With this need as our base, we have provided books in the places where the youngsters congregate. They weren't going to libraries, which often are miles from their homes, so we took libraries to them. Telephone company people contributed the books in response to our drive—about 5,000 books in all.

The team gave almost 1,000 books to the Variety Boys' Club, which tripled the size of their library and brought it up to date.

About 800 books, including some sets of encyclopedias, went to the Youth Opportunity Board of Greater Los Angeles, which is a Federal program for teaching dropouts and getting them back into school. It had no library at all until we gave them a start.

We helped the Halfway House start a library. This is a temporary residence, during a brief adjustment period, for former dope addicts who have just been released from jail.

The library at the Salesian Boys' Club was a telephone company project from the beginning, and about 2,000 books have recently been delivered and are being categorized and shelved there.

Getting books into these and other places where the kids can feel comfortable with them will help a great deal, but much more needs to be done.

Our community relations team wanted to take two other steps in the educational area. One step would have motivated the youngsters through some kind of inexpensive slide-film presentation concentrating on East Los Angeles people who now have good jobs with the telephone company or other businesses. This could show the youngsters that there is opportunity for them if they work for it.

The other, and more fundamental, step would have provided individual tutoring to youngsters who needed it in reading or other subjects. People in business represent a great variety of expertise—just about anything the kids would require—and quite a number of telephone people, in fact, have volunteered to help in such a program.

We somehow have failed, however, at least so far, to get the motivation and tutoring programs off the ground. Perhaps we will make the grade yet.

So long as a real need is being met intelligently, business should not be reluctant, as I see it, to get into fields that may at first blush seem new or strange or where there may be the fear of stepping on somebody else's toes. The tutoring program, for example, would be welcomed, not only by the youngsters but by the school system if planned cooperatively.

Such programs are needed in the best interests of the community and business. I don't know a single boy in East Los Angeles who considers a businessman an idol. The idols are ballplayers, teachers, priests, social workers. Except for the ballplayers, these figures personally know and care about the boys as individuals and are known in the community.

Certainly we're not interested in being idolized. But being known for genuine concern about people is something else again.

Digging beneath the surface as a company, gaining true understanding of a basic problem such as education, and then acting on this understanding will, in the long run, not only help others individually, but also will improve employee recruiting prospects and will upgrade the community generally.

All of the problem-solving should not be left to government. To do this would be ducking individual and corporate citizenship responsibilities.

When families with moderately good incomes choose to stay in East Los Angeles I feel they can, in a small way, help improve the appearance and the environment of their neighborhood by what they do with their homes.

On the other hand, when people who can afford to make some improvements move away instead, they leave a vacuum. The vacuum usually is filled by people of lesser means so that there is a continuing process of deterioration in the housing.

But, even so, you don't have to live in East Los Angeles in order to be of some help here, particularly in something like tutoring. If someone comes in from outside and immediately offers too much advice, there is resentment, but if the outsider's attitude is right and he can give genuine help, he will be accepted.

Los Angeles, sprawling though it may be, is after all, one city. I don't want to sound corny, but I love my city. Books and articles recently have dealt with Los Angeles as a psychologically unsound place in which to live. Our smog gets plenty of attention. The riots have been analyzed in print again and again. It's almost as though people are saying, when they know anyone will visit Los Angeles, "Oh, he's going where the riots were."

I don't minimize the problems underlying the riots. I know our city faces monumental problems. But there are voices I call "silent people" who speak for Los Angeles at such a time. These silent people are statues erected by our citizens over the years because they represent some truths we believe in.

For instance, a bust of Abraham Lincoln at the county courthouse speaks for justice.

A monument on Bunker Hill depicting a victory of Mormon soldiers during the early growing pains of our city speaks of our heritage, which is a rich and varied heritage, San Francisco to the contrary—not exclusively a Mexican heritage by any means.

In Forest Lawn, where our baby boy, Paris, is buried, there are statutes of two little girls that speak of hope. The one called the duck baby reminds me of the poem that talks of a child looking up, holding wonderment in his hands like a cup.

With all of our problems in Los Angeles, we do look up, we do hold wonderment like a cup.

The people I am concerned with are truly interested in solving their own problems. This is the most important thing to remember, I feel. They have much to contribute to our society, and if they can know opportunity, we all will gain.

Resolutions of Inter-American Bar Association at Conference in Costa Rica Named in Memory of William Roy Vallance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 10, 1967

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am extending my remarks to include the resolutions, recommendations, and declarations approved by the XV Conference of the Inter-American Bar Association at San Jose, Costa Rica, April 10–15, 1967.

The conference, held in San Jose, was a memorial conference to William Roy Vallance, former secretary general and founder, who died February 15, 1967.

The host organization was the Costa Rican Bar Association, and Lic. Fernando Fournier was president.

Among the U.S. delegates were Hon. Orison Marden, president of the ABA; Judge Walter Craig; Dean Robert Storey; and Judge Leonard Sutton.

There was a special symposium on inter-American commercial arbitration, which emphasized the importance of arbitration in disputes within the Central American Common Market.

The resolutions and other proceedings of the William Roy Vallance Memorial

Conference of the Inter-American Bar Association, as prepared by Carolyn Royall Just, reporter general, assisted by H. Hugo Perez, assistant secretary, and Phanor J. Eder, Esq., follow:

COMMITTEE I. PUBLIC INTERNATIONAL LAW

SECTION A. GENERAL PROBLEMS

[Topic 1]

1. Whereas:

1. International developments show, especially during the recent years, the permanent and gradual improvement of the laws governing the use of international rivers and lakes;

2. The above-mentioned improvement requires a continued study of the facts, of the agreements entered into and the attempts to establish general principles for the common use;

3. International waters have for America unique importance to the extent that it is difficult to imagine a social and economic development and integration of the continent without an equitable and adequate usage of such waters, in achieving which the law has a substantial function;

4. "The Permanent Committee on Use of International Rivers and Lakes", created at the X Conference in Buenos Aires, has produced important reports up to this present Conference, about studies in America and the Western Hemisphere on this subject;

Resolves: That the Permanent Committee on Use of International Rivers and Lakes continue its studies on the use of such waters for industrial, agricultural, commercial and other purposes, and inform the XVI Conference as to the result of such studies.

[Topic 1]

2. Whereas:

The Permanent Committee on the Use of International Rivers and Lakes, in accordance with the respective resolution passed at the XV Conference in Puerto Rico, has prepared and submitted its report for approval,

Resolves: To approve the report of the Permanent Committee on Use of International Rivers and Lakes, and to provide for its publication. (Note: Chile regretfully abstains because the report has not been available to the delegation.)

[Topic 3]

3. Whereas:

1. The work carried out by the Organization of American States in studying the juridical regime for the use of international rivers and lakes is worthy of prominence, and likewise made use of by statesmen, lawyers, or professors interested in the juridical problems and issues raised by the use of these rivers and lakes;

2. The task which the Organization of American States proposes to undertake in this connection has an extraordinary importance as it proposes to equip the American countries with adequate legal instruments for the solution of issues arising from the use of those waters;

Resolves:

1. To suggest to the Organization of American States to call a Specialized Conference on the use of international rivers and lakes for industrial, agricultural and commercial purposes, at the earliest possible date, as called for by Resolution X of the Second Special Conference held in Rio de Janeiro in 1965.

2. To express the desire that the General Secretariat of the OAS continue the studies on the use of international rivers and lakes with the above-mentioned purposes, and that it publish up-to-date editions of the studies already prepared.

[Topic 3]

4. Whereas:

1. It is the vehement hope of those devoted to law and of the people of America in safeguarding their interests and sovereignty to have a definite limit to the territorial sea, avoiding thereby any debate and conflict; and likewise a precise determination of the maritime zones to which the sovereignty of the coastal State should extend for specific purposes of usefulness;

2. At the present time there is a trend to adjust such limit in each State so as to allow for the protection of its development, wealth and welfare;

3. Law, and the resulting juridical rule, should govern the present and future problems of mankind, in order to solve these problems without stirring up animosity or friction, thus creating a happy co-existence;

Recommends:

1. That a congress of the American States fix the limits of the Territorial Sea and zones of maritime sovereignty, according to the geologic, geographic, biological rights and interests that make up the economy and military defense of each American nation.

2. That in the XVI Conference, the Law of the Sea be included as one of its specific topics, and specially, the development of the same in the American countries.

5. In view of the agreement entered into last June between Brazil and Paraguay on the use of the Paraná Rapids for the production of electric power,

Resolves: To express its deepest satisfaction to the Governments of Brazil and Paraguay because of the most fortunate solution arrived at by means of the agreement signed in June of 1966 for the electric energy to be produced at the rapids of the Paraná River from the Salto Grande de Sete Quedas or Salto de Guaira to the Foz do Río Iguazu.

(NOTE.—Adopted with applause.)

6. Resolves: To express its deep satisfaction for the happy solution reached by the Governments of Argentina and Paraguay in the true spirit of America in regard to the problems that affect both countries as to navigation in the Paraná, Paraguay and La Plata Rivers, by the signing on the 23rd of January of 1967, of a treaty ratifying the principle of freedom of navigation in these rivers and resolving to apply it in their respective jurisdictions, agreeing to accord equal treatment to their ships in all navigation matters.

SECTION B. UNITED NATIONS AND HEMISPHERIC ORGANIZATIONS

[Topic 2]

7. Declares:

1. That the American Republics belonging to the Organization of American States are obligated to fulfill their international commitments, not only in respect of their external relations, but also with regard to the internal duties infringement whereof may have a harmful repercussion in the continent, for the purpose of maintaining inter-American solidarity and cooperation, and furthermore living jointly within a regional community based upon a legal organization.

2. That the Charter of the Organization of American States and a network of inter-American treaties have adopted principles which actually constitute an American Constitutional structure, on the basis that: a) the internal political organization of the American States shall be governed by means of the effective practice of true representative democracy; b) true representative democracy is not confined solely to the mere electoral process; c) collective or joint action is legitimate under the present and future treaties in order to maintain the security of the continent, as well as effectively to defend the principle of true representative democracy.

3. That any American State which in its internal political organization should destroy such regional legal structure, thus departing from its treaty obligations, is subject to the jurisdiction of the Organization of American States for the application of appropriate measures, pursuant to the Inter-American treaties.

COMMITTEE II. PRIVATE INTERNATIONAL LAW

8. Resolves:

1. To establish as present subjects (of work) of this Committee:

(a) The possibility of harmonizing legal criteria in America in matters relative to letters rogatory for the purpose of serving notification and furnishing evidence of any kind and subsequently the execution of foreign judgments and decisions of arbitrators.

2. Request from the Bar Association of member lawyers, either directly or through competent organizations such as the Pan American Union, international or national academies, universities and Comparative Law Institutes, reports on the operation of the legal texts currently in force on the subject, court decisions and practice, which have been compiled by the first of the above-mentioned organizations, in order to promote comparative studies that would point out the most important problems arising in the dispatch and handling of letters rogatory.

3. To carry out, through its members or persons designated by the "Committee on Letters Rogatory", comparative studies of related principles, especially in the National codes of civil, penal or administrative procedure in order to group juridical systems according to their similarities so as to facilitate the formulation of general principles tending to unify the governing rules in the dispatch and handling of letters rogatory.

4. To submit to the XVI Conference the reports received and the principles proposed by the above-mentioned Committee, in order to effect their adoption by the Governments of the countries of the various member Bar Associations.

5. To designate a "Committee on Letters Rogatory" made up of the members of Committee II, which will be charged with the execution of the agreements reached, on which the committee will report at the XVI Conference.

6. To approve the following resolutions in regard to the proposal presented on the juridical system of the powers granted within a State to be effective in another State, as follows:

(a) Collection of data by the same channels indicated in point II of these resolutions, on the texts currently in operation relative to legal regulations governing the granting of power in member countries of this Association.

(b) A comparative study shall be made in order to draw up the most adequate regulations that may be adopted as uniform regulations for the preparation of powers granted in one state to be effective in another (State), in order to propose them in that manner to the various Governments of the States of the American Continent.

(NOTE.—For purposes of the above resolutions, the following terms are taken as equivalent: a) cartas rogatorias, b) exhortos; c) supplicatorios. For that reason these three terms are translated as "letters rogatory".)

COMMITTEE III. CONSTITUTIONAL LAW

[Topic 1]

9. Whereas:

1. The reports presented to this Conference stress the fact that progress has been satisfactory and varied in most of our Nations with regard to the adoption of measures intended to specify and set forth clearly the basic principles of the independence of the Judicial Power and the irremovability of the Judges;

2. That these advances are to be deeply commended, since said principles constitute the most important expression of any rule of Law and it is imperative that these principles be affirmed and supported;

3. That, in spite of the above statement, it is only due and appropriate to record that respect for such principles is a requirement

of constitutional government yet, unfortunately, in fact, it frequently appears only on the surface and is ineffective in achieving the maintenace of legal continuity and preventing the rule of Law from suffering disturbances in which the said principles are violated in their most highly important aspects;

4. That given the nature of the judicial function, prevented by its own nature from operating in the field of political struggle, the courts are defenseless in avoiding crises of institutions and substantial violations of the above-mentioned principles in the midst of the changes provoked by such crises;

5. That the force of public opinion, in the core of each country and in the scope of the Inter-American co-existence, may represent an important factor in the defense of the Judicial independence,

Resolves:

1. To express its satisfaction with the progress made in bringing into conformity the agreements of the conferences relative to the measures therein recommended, to have the postulates of Judicial independence and irremovability put into practice.

2. That a report be presented at all Inter-American Conferences as to the manner in which in fact such principles have been adhered to and the advances and retrogressions experienced in this respect, and

Recommends:

1. That bar associations expend their greatest efforts in the struggle for the maintenance and effectiveness of such postulates, showing them the responsibility they have for initiating and guiding the most adequate and efficient reactions to combat any violation or threat of infringement of these bases and to stir the public opinion of their countries toward their defense.

2. That it is advisable that the member organizations and individual members inform the General Secretariat of any violation or threat of violation of the principles involved so that pertinent and appropriate steps may be taken to assist in their defense in the form deemed most appropriate, or, at least, that a report be made in regard thereto at the XVI Conference.

[Topic 2]

10. Whereas:

1. Resolution XXIII, II Special Inter-American Conference (Rio de Janeiro, 1965), after hearing the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights, directed the Council of the Organization of American States to revise the Draft Inter-American Convention on Human Rights, as written by the Inter-American Council of Jurists (Santiago, 1959), and to call the meeting of a Specialized Conference no later than one year after, to assume the discussion and approval of the above-referred Convention;

2. The Inter-American Commission on Human Rights, after being heard by the Council of the OAS, in presenting its opinion on the draft from the Council of Jurists, was actually able to write a new improved and up-to-date draft, worthy of the highest praise; and

3. The term of one year given to the Council has already elapsed, and that the adoption of a convention comprising a true instrument for the protection of human rights is increasingly urgent, in accordance with the resolutions of the XIV Conference (San Juan, 1965):

Recommends:

1. That the Council of the OAS calls a meeting, on an urgent basis, of the Specialized Conference as provided for by Resolution XXIII of the II Special Inter-American Conference, for the discussion and approval of the final text of the Inter-American Convention on Human Rights.

2. That a copy of this Recommendation be sent to the Council of the OAS through its Secretary General.

3. That the National Member Associations urge the Governments of their respective countries to take all available and expedient means to support the convening of the meeting which is hereby recommended.

[Topic 3]

11. Whereas:

1. From reports obtained from the various representatives of the countries in the Continent it is evident that the condition of delay in the courts and in the administration of justice continues and that such condition is becoming worse, condition which is pointed out under Resolution 21, XIV Conf. Puerto Rico, 1965;

2. The serious problem of congestion in the courts and of judicial delays is intimately and inseparably connected with another problem concerning judicial organization, particularly as regards the system of specialized professional training, recruiting, and appointment of judges;

3. With respect to the subjective aspect regarding the persons who hold judicial positions, delays in the administration of justice could be overcome by improving specialized legal training and incorporating courses in internal administrative organization for a suitable distribution of tasks, choice of personnel and utilization of more advanced administrative techniques;

4. Judicial organizations should not only be diligent and appropriate but also sufficiently effective numerically, in conformity with the growth of the population and the corresponding increase in the number of cases submitted for decision, with a view to protecting legitimate rights and interests, and be practically and financially accessible to all sectors of society;

5. The participation of lawyers in an action gives importance to the need for them to observe standards of ethics and professional practice that will tend to speed procedures and to eliminate dilatory action or measures taken for the sole purpose of delay, always provided that the full exercise of the right of defense be not affected;

Recommends:

1. That professors and law schools and Professional Associations in their respective departments of specialization or forensic practice envisage the creation of courses for training judges.

2. Similarly that judicial authorities in their respective spheres of action should foster the creation of schools to train and improve the rolls of judicial magistrates and officials.

3. That Committees engaged in studying procedural reform take into consideration in their work the need of machinery that will tend to speed the administration of justice.

4. That the above Committees adopt standards of professional ethics tending to speed procedures by eliminating dilatory action or measures taken in bad faith, without thereby impairing the full right of defense.

12. Whereas:

1. The process of economic development and integration of the Americas presents numerous problems which constitute the principal objective of this conference which was called for special treatment;

2. Among various legal matters that can arise because of the above-mentioned process not the least important are those related to their incidence in regard to current provisions of the constitutions of each country, since they may either jeopardize or facilitate the above-mentioned integration and development process;

3. There it is at once evident that such situations can engender problems in three precise fields: national sovereignty, the delegation of authority on para-national or supernational entities and the control of the legality of the resolutions taken by such entities, in regard to the system of rules of each country;

4. That it is believed that the study, consideration, and eventual solution of such matters, as well as advice on convenient measures to be adopted in regard to the reform of the constitutional clauses (when required) is within the specific scope of Committee III on Constitutional Law, as it deals with the problems of juridical constitutional subject matter; and due to the importance of the subject, the creation of a permanent committee is considered to be feasible, as a section of the above-mentioned committee, to carry out the preparation and treatment of the matters which motivate this resolution;

5. That said Committee be joined immediately and without detriment to its open nature, by those jurists who have shown special knowledge and concern on this subject:

Resolves:

1. To establish as a Permanent Section of Committee III (Constitutional Law) the topic: "Constitutional Problems of American Integration."

2. To create a permanent committee for the handling and consideration of the above-mentioned item to be made up initially of the following persons:

Dr. Jorge Reinaldo Vanossi (Argentina), Chairman.

Dr. Alejandro Silva Basucuñán (Chile), Co-Chairman.

Dr. José-Luis Dedondo (Costa Rica), Co-Chairman.

Dr. Charles R. Norberg (U.S.A.), Co-Chairman.

Dr. Julio Carri Pérez (Argentina), Secretary.

Members

Dr. Alberto J. Alegre Hernando (Argentina).
Dr. Andrés A. Aramburu Menchaca (Peru).
Dr. Rodrigo Borja (Ecuador).
Dr. Carlos Alberto Dunshee de Abranches (Brazil).
Dr. Miguel J. Escobedo (Mexico).
Dr. Fernando Galindo Pohl (El Salvador).
Dr. Eduardo Jiménez Aréchaga (Uruguay).
Dr. Pedro J. Mantellini (Venezuela).
Dr. Antonio Martinez Báez (Mexico).
Dr. Alejandro Mendoza Mendoza (Colombia).
Dr. Jose Rafael Mendoza (Venezuela).
Dr. Ismael Vargas (Costa Rica).

Plus a representative of the Secretariat of the Central American Economic Integration, a representative of the Organization of American States, a representative of the Latin American Free Trade Association, and a representative of the Inter-American Institute of International Juridical Studies.

Committee IV. Municipal Law

13. Whereas:

1. The Panamanian Association of Inter-Municipal Cooperation has appointed a Codification Committee of law professors and distinguished practicing lawyers to draft a Panamanian Municipal Code and a preliminary draft of a model Inter-American Municipal Code;

2. That these legal instruments can furnish a basis for harmonizing municipal legislations in Latin America;

Recommends:

1. To applaud the initiative of the Panamanian Association of Inter-Municipal Cooperation, in regard to the drafting of a Panama Municipal Code and a preliminary draft of a model Inter-American Municipal Code.

2. That the Regional Bar Associations of the various countries send to the Panamanian Association of Inter-Municipal Cooperation all of the publications that they may have available on current municipal laws.

3. To request the Panamanian Association of Inter-Municipal Cooperation to send to the Association and specially to Committee IV on Municipal Law, all of the proposed Municipal Codes prepared by its Codification Commission so that the Committee may submit a report on them to the XVI Conference.

SECTION A. HOUSING LAW

14. Recommends:

1. That the governments of the Hemisphere stimulate self-help housing construction for low-income persons by all adequate means to that end, with special emphasis on the following:

(a) The provision of long-term credit and technical assistance;

(b) Orientation of national and foreign savings toward investment in housing, with an adjustment to currency depreciation in countries suffering inflation;

(c) The creation of tax exemptions and incentives;

(d) The cooperation of the interested persons themselves.

2. That institutes dedicated to the solution of housing problems be created and protected.

Committee V. Civil Law

SECTION A. PERSONS, FAMILY LAW AND SUCCESSION

15. Whereas: Without entering into consideration of the advantages of establishing absolute divorce in the American countries; taking into account that not only for divorce purposes but for simple separation of persons and property, the grounds required by the various legislations in each country are, in essence, the same in all of the American States, differing only in matters of interpretation (which is logical since this is a family type problem, and organization of the family is similar throughout America).

Recommends the study of the possibility of harmonizing the existing legislations on divorce, adjusting the procedure of its application to the local law of each country.

16. Whereas: It is necessary to protect minors and especially to consider the subject of qualification or discrimination within the categories of legitimate and illegitimate, natural, adulterous and incestuous children still prevalent in the legislation of some of the American States, which affects the human dignity of those who are totally alien to these situations, being the innocent victims of their parents' conduct;

Recommends;

1. That those countries still maintaining such qualifications and discriminations in their legislation, abolish such practices and those countries that lack regulations for the protection of minors proceed to enact them, creating organizations that will protect them in an integral manner.

2. That the American Governments give special financial support to all those institutions which protect minors.

[Topic 1]

17. Whereas:

Mrs. Jo Dunn Dolan (USA) has presented an interesting paper on the laws of descent and inheritance:

Recommends to make further study of this subject for the purpose of a possible later recommendation by the committee for harmonizing the various concepts of laws of inheritance in the Americans in such manner as to retain the best of both the Civil and Common Law Systems.

SECTION B. INTELLECTUAL AND INDUSTRIAL PROPERTY

[Topic 1]

18. Whereas, Although the Proposed Draft of a Model Law on Trade Marks, Trade Names, and Acts of Unfair Competition for developing countries has not yet been adopted by any of the Latin American countries, however its adoption is being studied in several of them;

Recommends that all association and individual members of the Association continue in their efforts of making such Draft of a Model Law on Trade Marks, Trade Names, and Acts of Unfair Competition known to all developing countries and to strive towards its final adoption as part of the legislation in the Latin American Countries.

Committee VI. Civil Commercial Procedure

[Topic 1]

19. Recommends:

1. That all the American States enact the draft uniform law on Inter-American Commercial Arbitration approved at the third meeting of the Inter-American Council of Jurists held in Mexico in 1956; and to ratify the Convention on Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Arbitral Awards, approved by the U.N. Conference held in New York in 1958.

2. That in each of the American States there be created a permanent commission for Inter-American Commercial Arbitration to resolve disputes arising between parties domiciled in different countries.

3. That all the Stock Exchanges and Chambers of Commerce in the American States assume the responsibility for organizing such arbitration commissions in cooperation with the Inter-American Commercial Arbitration Commission; and that they recommend and promote the use of a uniform arbitration clause in Inter-American contracts;

4. That the Inter-American Council of Commerce and Production, as well as other commercial, industrial and investment organizations and the federations and bar associations support the above recommendations, publicize the advantages of arbitration and promote the adoption thereof in their respective countries.

5. That the Latin American Free Trade Association and the Central American Common Market adopt within their respective jurisdiction measures appropriate to accomplish the objectives stated above.

6. That the Inter-American Commercial Arbitration Commission be reorganized, having as members one representative from each of the National Commissions, and that the Inter-American Commercial Arbitration Commission formulate uniform procedure and regulations on Inter-American commercial arbitration.

20. Recommends to seek the means that, in each country and in each case, will lead to assurance that the laws regulating procedure shall guarantee prompt rendering of judgments on the merits of each matter, with a due sense of justice, law, and equity.

[Topic 2]

21. Recommends:

1. That the Organization of Central American States prepare a draft protocol to the General Treaty of Central American Economic Integration, concerning the use of commercial arbitration as an optional method for resolving controversies arising within the Central American Common Market, in accordance with the following:

(a) That the arbitration clause be considered fully valid in all contracts where it is so agreed;

(b) That when the contracting parties have not specified the procedures to be followed, those established in the draft uniform law on International Commercial Arbitration approved in 1956 by the Inter-American Council of Jurists shall govern;

(c) That the competent judicial authority may be called upon to intervene for the purpose of ensuring the performance of the arbitral clause and the eventual execution of the award, which shall have the effect of res judicata.

2. To consider the advisability of creating a permanent Central American Arbitration Commission for the purpose of resolving differences arising in transnational transactions within the Common Market.

3. That the Secretariat for Central American Economic Integration, the Federations of Chambers of Commerce or Industries, the Chambers of Commerce or Industries and the Federations and Bar Associations of the Central American countries, support the above resolutions and promote the adoption thereof by the governments and appropriate authorities within the Common Market, to whom copies of this resolution will be sent.

Committee VII. Commercial Law

SECTION A. MARITIME LAW

22. Whereas:

1. The subject of Safety of Life at Sea was considered; and the proceeding of the International Convention for the Safety of Life at Sea which met in London in June 1960, were examined;

2. The amendments adopted thereto by the Assembly of the Intergovernmental Maritime Consultative Organization (IMCO) at its Third Extraordinary Session, held in London, November 20–30, 1966, and examination of the Hearings before the Subcommittee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries of the Committee on Commerce, United States Senate, 89th Congress, Second Session, on S–1351, S–2417 and HR 10327, S–3250, and S–3251, and Public Law 89–779, 89th Congress, HR–10327, November 6, 1966, 80 Stat. 1356 enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress Assembled, an Act, to require evidence of adequate financial responsibility to pay costs of suits for personal injury or death, or to repay fares in the event of non-performance of voyages, to establish minimum standards for passenger vessels and to require disclosure of construction details on passenger vessels, and for other purposes;

Recommends:

1. The acceptance of the amendments to Chapter II of the International Convention for the Safety of Life at Sea, 1960 annexed to the Resolution A 106 (ES111) by which they were adopted on November 30, 1966 by the Assembly of the Intergovernmental Maritime Consultative Organization (IMCO) at its Third Extraordinary Session, held in London, November 28–30, 1966.

2. Recognizing the need for intensive continental cooperation that the Association and individual members obtain from their governments the acceptance of said amendments.

SECTION B. BANKING LAWS AND TRUSTS

[Topic 1]

23. Whereas:

1. By resolutions adopted in the XIII and XIV Conferences the Association endorsed the need of comparative study of the Commercial Laws of the Americas and directed the Commercial Law Committee to study and report on this subject;

2. At San Juan, Puerto Rico a report was submitted and approved to take first steps for the publication of a full text of the Uniform Commercial Code of the United States and a Spanish translation thereof with appropriate index to be available and such a text has been prepared and printed—through the courtesy of Equity Publishing Corporation of New Hampshire, U.S.A.—and sample copies submitted to the Committee and reviewed by it;

3. It has been estimated by Committee VII that 2000 copies are required to supply all of the major libraries and universities of the Hemisphere with reference copies and to supply the several committees on comparative law of each country with copies for its members in pro-rata numbers;

Resolves:

1. That the program of procurement from Equity Publishers Company of such copies be approved and that Committee VII is instructed to proceed with the Comparative Law Study dependent on funds procured by Foundation grant.

2. That the bar associations of each country in cooperation with its individual members appoint a Chairman and a committee

of qualified members to make a study of the laws and procedure of that country compared to the Uniform Commercial Code and to state the differences for comparison of the other states Commercial Law and report from time to time to Committee VII on possible items in uniformity with the ultimate objective of publishing in time a Comparative Commercial Code for all countries of the Hemisphere in English and Spanish with the editorial assistance of our Academy in Lima.

3. That the publisher be authorized to sell to the public copies of the document.

4. That Committee VII on Commercial Law be directed to report fully its activities to the Executive Committee for submission to this Association and for further guidance as to the policy of its work.

SECTION C. TRANSPORTATION AND COMMUNICATIONS

24. Whereas:

1. Committee VII has studied the great development of unit container Transportation in Europe and North America and reported at length on the importance of this multimillion industry and its great advantages in improving the welfare of industry and commerce in the Western Hemisphere, particularly in South America and the need of improvement and harmonization of the customs laws, international regulatory laws and the domestic commercial laws to permit its growth;

2. This Association is the best forum to continue such studies and prepare such draft laws and reports thereon;

Resolves:

1. That Committee VII be directed to continue its studies and reports for presentation to the XVI Conference.

2. That Committee VII continue to supply Observers at the meetings of international economic and legal bodies engaged in similar work.

[Topic 3]

25. Whereas:

1. The technical advance in terrestrial and space communications in the past two years portends increased use of telecommunications in ever widening fields such as voice communications, data control and educational television;

2. Such technical developments will bring their concomitant legal and organizational-administrative problems;

3. The Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, including the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies, will foster the orderly development of space communications;

Resolves:

1. That the Committee on Space Communications continue its liaison in observer capacity with various organizations such as the Interamerican Telecommunications Commission (CITEL), the International Telecommunication Union (ITU), and the Communications Satellite Corporation (COMSAT).

2. That the Committee give attention to the legal and organizational-administrative problems which are basic to the development of terrestrial and space communications systems in the Americas and report to the XVI Conference thereon.

3. That in such report the Committee give consideration in particular to legal aspects of the establishment of earth stations and the development of educational television, as well as to the applicability of the aforesaid treaty to space communications.

COMMITTEE VIII. CRIMINAL LAW AND PROCEDURE

[Topic 2]

26. Whereas:

1. Lawyers have a responsibility in the administration of justice including the duty to determine that no person be deprived of the assistance of counsel because of financial inability;

2. The legal profession has a responsibility in the administration of justice to take affirmative action to provide for the defense of or representation of indigent persons;

3. In spite of the foregoing the profession has failed to some extent in undertaking to provide competent counsel to indigent persons;

4. Experience indicates the most certain way to assure indigent persons competent representation is through creation of legal aid and defender services at state expense;

5. Law schools are able materially to assist in legal aid and defender programs through the requirement that advanced students as a prerequisite to graduation participate in legal aid and defender programs;

6. In order to avoid political and other problems in the distribution of funds provided for legal aid and defender services the responsibilities for the administration of such funds should be entrusted to those indicated below.

Recommends:

1. That the several governments of the American nations that have not yet adopted such measures take immediate steps to provide legal assistance to indigent persons.

2. To that end, defense counsel be provided who shall be compensated by the government.

3. That the responsibility for the administration of funds provided for legal aid and defender services be upon the judiciary.

4. That law schools, as a prerequisite to graduation, require advanced students to participate, without compensation, in legal aid and defender programs.

27. Whereas, Man is the subject of law, and modern psychiatry and physiology have discovered and perfected theories and systems which permit a better understanding of the motivations of human conduct;

Recommends:

1. That such theories, systems, and knowledge should be adequately integrated into the law in such states where this has not yet taken place.

2. That the XVI Conference include among the topics to be dealt with by Committee VIII on Criminal Law and Procedure a topic on the relation and application of psychiatry and physiology to the field of the criminal sciences.

COMMITTEE IX. ADMINISTRATIVE LAW AND PROCEDURE

28. Whereas, In many legal systems of the American States there persists the so-called "Act of State" doctrine conceived as the impossibility of revision by the courts of an act issued by the Executive Power in detriment to rights and interests, issued by a foreign Government, even though said rights and interests may be protected by the Constitution or laws of the country where they are effective;

Resolves, To strive for the total elimination of the "Act of State" doctrine in America.

29. Whereas:

1. Any act regardless of its origin and nature must be subject to legal process and to the determination of its legality within a State dedicated to the Rule of Law;

2. In many legal regulations of the American States there persists the institution of the so-called "political" or "governmental" act, conceived of as an act of the Executive power in detriment of rights and interests and immune to any control by the courts for reasons of State, even though it is regulated by the constitution or by statute;

Recommends that the governments of America embody in the respective regulations the necessary provisions to ensure control by the courts, for legal reasons, of acts of the Executive power of every kind without any exception.

30. Whereas:

1. The laws governing the process of integration in Latin America tend to accentuate the flexibility and expedition of the means of administrative action and execution, with frequent and important gaps in matters concerning the supervision of the legality of administrative actions and concerning the protection of the legitimate rights and interests of the individual;

2. We must add, to the creation of independent and specialized courts and to the adoption of adequate procedures for the resolution of conflicts concerning the interest that arises in the field of integration, the recognition of the necessity of exhausting administrative remedies and the appellate procedure which adequately guarantee the legality of the decisions of the administrative bodies, as well as special protection of the legitimate rights and interests of the individual, without exception of any kind;

Recommends that the Governments and organizations involved in the preparation of laws governing the Latin American integration processes embody regulations that recognize all parties interested, all administrative remedies and appellate procedure before independent specialized courts which provide adequate legal assistance and guarantee the legality of the administrative regulations and actions taken within the field of integration, regardless of origin or nature, as well as the special protection of the individual's legitimate rights and interests, without exception of any kind.

SECTION A. ADMINISTRATIVE LAW CONCERNING PROCEDURE

[Topic 1]

31. Recommends to the Governments of the American States the initiation, as soon as possible, of the codification on Administrative Law.

COMMITTEE X. FISCAL LAW

SECTION A. TAXATION

[Topic 1]

32. Whereas:

1. The interesting papers presented by Messrs. Manuel de Juano and Mitchell B. Carroll have allowed the Committee to take a big step towards the preparation of a model tax treaty that may be agreed between Latin-American countries and the United States;

2. The discussion on these papers has allowed the Committee to come nearer to the preparation of a text that may be incorporated in such model, so as to reduce, as far as possible, the discrepancies in certain points of view which these papers and the discussion thereon brought to light;

3. This discussion has also shown the need to have at the Committee's disposal English and Spanish texts correctly drawn up and equivalent in content;

4. The exposition made by the representative of the Treasury Department of the United States, Mr. James B. Sitrick, has contributed some very useful information on the points of view of said Department, which may profitably be included in the model tax treaty:

5. The sending by Mr. Joseph P. Crockett of copies of his paper presented to the XIII Conference has also contributed valuable information;

6. In order to be in a position to approve finally a model tax treaty at the XVI Conference, it is necessary to have available English and Spanish texts at least six months in advance of the date of said Conference;

Resolves:

1. That a Committee be formed composed of Messrs. Norton Kern of the United States, César Carter of Costa Rica, and Manuel Risueño of Chile, to prepare a final draft for a model tax treaty that may be agreed upon between Latin-American countries and the United States, incorporating in said draft all the information obtained as mentioned in paragraphs 1, 2, 4 and 5 above.

2. That this Committee send this final draft, in English and Spanish, to all members of the Permanent Committee on Taxation at least six months in advance of the opening of the XVI Conference.

3. That a discussion of this final draft be included in the topics for the XVI Conference.

4. To thank the Treasury Department of the United States for the visit of Mr. James B. Sitrick and for the information made available through him.

[Free Topic]

33. Whereas:

1. The effects of inflation on the effective rate of tax borne by business enterprises, discussed in the interesting paper presented by Mr. Aarón Germán (Argentina), show the need that tax laws take into account such effects;

2. The wording of concrete recommendations on the form in which such effects could be eliminated or reduced still requires careful study;

Declares that, when as a consequence of inflation the currency of a country loses its function as an approximately constant unit for measuring value, governments should adjust their tax laws accordingly, so as to avoid taxing profits which are only apparent, arising out of such loss of value, and to tax only real profits, expressed in a currency of constant value.

Recommends that the topic "Effects of Inflation on the Tax Burden" be included in the topics for the XVI Conference and that the members of the Permanent Committee on Taxation be invited to present papers which propose concrete legal measures that could be adopted to eliminate or reduce said effects.

Committee XI. Legal Aspects of Social and Economic Development and Integration

SECTION A. LABOR LAW

[Topic 1]

34. Whereas, Mr. Warren Woods presented a paper on the need of fair treatment for the employee-employer covering the entire area and the need for uniform labor legislation as prerequisites for successful economic integration;

Resolves, That Committee XI, Section A, carry out studies to determine the basis for the establishment of labor laws of a harmonious nature to be considered at the XVI Conference in order to promote integration and development in Latin America.

[Topic 1]

35. (a) Resolves:

1. That Committee XI, Section A-Labor Law, make for the XVI Conference a thorough study of the problems related to the form of insuring and maintaining the juridical, social and economic rights and benefits, which are granted to workers in the specific legislation of each country of origin, especially in the aspect of social security, as to the rights already vested, and the preparation of a legal instrument of common application in view of the creation of a Latin American Common Market.

[Topic 2]

35.(b) Resolves:

1. The workers of the signatory countries of "ALALC" and those of the Central American Common Market be assured—after determination of the necessary actuarial studies—of the benefits of social security, without prejudice at all times to the rights already vested in the respective country of origin which they abandoned for occupational reasons.

2. To address the Ministers of Labor of the Central American States requesting that studies be made which may lead to guarantee to immigrant workers within the countries of the Central American Common Market the preservation of their rights and fringe benefits already enjoyed in aspects of social security and retirement system.

SECTION C. LEGAL ASPECTS OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND INTEGRATION

[Topic 3]

36. Whereas, The economic integration of Latin America in so far as foods are concerned can be easily achieved if the member countries of the Common Market to be formed succeed in harmonizing their legislation pertaining to this subject;

Recommends:

1. The creation of an Inter-American committee consisting of government delegates and representatives of private industry empowered to reach a progressive harmonization of the differences now existing in Latin American food laws.

2. To send to each of the Latin American governments, through the member associations a letter enclosing a copy of the above recommendation.

37. Whereas:

1. The processes of economic development and American integration are inseparable, cannot be turned back and are of top priority to Latin America;

2. The condition called "Economic Development" calls for a harmonious development in cultural, social and political aspects;

3. The purpose of integration is to bring together the peoples of the various countries, but not necessarily to make them uniform, for which reason the manner chosen by each country for its development and integration in social, political and economic aspects, must be respected, provided human dignity, the Western and Christian tradition and the legitimate interest of the Continental Community are preserved;

Resolves:

1. Formally to urge all jurists of the Continent to take an active part in the processes of Latin American development and integration, for which purpose the following are recommended:

(a) The study of juridical and legal problems that these processes give rise to, in all branches of Law;

(b) To diffuse among universities, professional associations, public and private institutions, information on juridical and legal topics related to development and integration;

(c) Sharing in the study and drafting of legal and juridical instruments that may be necessary and that are directed toward integration and development.

2. To support the change that will have to occur in the attitude of the Jurist in order that the processes of development and integration will not be ignored or delayed, for which purpose the following is recommended:

(a) To meet the real needs of the Law Schools and their courses, for both their undergraduate and post-graduate students, that changes be made in the curricula, that there be a new approach to the subjects, and that new post-graduate courses be created;

(b) To create study committees which, in collaboration with public and private entities involved, will devote themselves to problems of economic and social development in order to find normative solutions that will ensure an integral process;

(c) The removal of fiscal, customs and exchange barriers to the free exchange of educational material and the exchange of ideas, as essential elements of integration.

3. Support the creation of jurisdictional entities for the solution of such differences as may arise as a result of the process of integration for which purpose the following is recommended:

(a) To carry out technical and legal studies to determine the most adequate structure for such entities, their appropriate functioning, and the provision of effective means to ensure their authority and the observance of their resolutions

4. Undertake multilateral concerted action regarding substantive national legislation of Latin American countries, for the purpose of accomplishing the following objectives:

(a) To determine the legal subjects that are most affected by the profound transformations that development and integration will give rise to;

(b) Gradual bringing into harmony of national legislations, on bases arranged for development and integration;

(c) Bringing together or making uniform such subjects as may be necessary or advisable, in said legislations.

5. To promote the concentration of efforts and the coordination of the tasks being carried out in connection with economic development and integration, for which purpose it entrusts the chairman of the Committee to communicate and cooperate with every institution doing similar work, to make an inventory of the studies being made and to systematically diffuse same.

6. To write to His Holiness Paul VI in grateful recognition of his concern about the areas under development, as set forth in his encyclical "Popularium Progessio".

Committee XII. Legal Education

[Topics 2 and 3]

38. Whereas, inadequate funds prevented a meeting of this Committee

Recommends:

1. That steps be taken to obtain adequate funds to assure a meeting of the Committee at the XVI Conference.

2. The Deans of the Law Schools in the city where the XVI Conference is to be held will extend the corresponding invitations.

3. The meetings of Law School Deans should be carried on during the three days prior to the regular meetings of the Association.

39. Recommends to support plans for university studies on legal and institutional problems arising from Latin American Integration and to urge all Law Faculties in the Hemisphere to include in their curricula research and study in this field.

40. Recommends:

1. That Law Schools adopt changes in their programs of study, intended to improve the curriculum through the incorporation of elective courses which would permit law students to undertake a certain degree of specialization in their professional preparation.

2. The following specific means for effectuating the above recommendation are proposed:

(a) The training of lawyer-specialists to serve as legal advisors to business enterprises as a means of contributing to economic development;

(b) The fostering of professional groups to carry on research and publication on legal problems affecting business enterprises;

(c) Offering to practicing lawyers post-graduate specialized courses on the needs of business enterprises.

41. Recommends that Law Faculties consider Drs. Horwath and Vanossi's proposed regulation for the School of Law of the University of Buenos Aires.

42. Resolves:

1. To sponsor the Inter-American Seminar on Comparative Law which will be offered by the John F. Kennedy University in Buenos Aires from September 11 until November 25, 1967, for lawyers, law professors and students proficient in the law of the United States.

2. To request the Secretariat of the Association to inform the American Bar Association, the Association of American Law Schools, the Bar Associations of the larger cities in the United States, and large enterprises doing business in Latin America, as to such seminar.

Committee XIII. Legal Documentation

43. Whereas:

1. It is a rule of Law that "ignorance of the law does not excuse failure to comply therewith"; however, the complexity of the law in our day makes it possible that many provisions are unknown in the place where they are in effect and that nations know very little of the laws governing their neighbors. It is imperative to improve the system of legal publications in some nations and national and regional association members of

the IABA can contribute, to a great extent, to that end;

2. It is not surprising that misunderstandings between north and south arise when not only different languages are spoken but their respective laws are known only by a few;

3. The IABA is doing good work for the rapprochement of the different systems of law in this hemisphere; knowledge increases tolerance and tolerance brings unity;

Resolves:

1. That a study be prepared by Committee XIII on Legal Documentation of the different systems of legal publications and codification existing in the various jurisdictions of this hemisphere.

2. That cooperation be requested from national and regional association members of the IABA to exchange information which may be needed for such study.

3. That such study should include recommendations to improve and make uniform the systems of publication of statutes and their codification in every possible way, and to spread and exchange official and private legal publications throughout the hemisphere.

Committee XIV. Activities of Lawyers

SECTION A. YOUNGER LAWYERS

44. Resolves, To authorize the Younger Lawyers Section to draft its by-laws which will come into effect after approval by the Council.

Recommends:

1. That the National Bar Associations which are members of the Association appoint a younger lawyer as Permanent Delegate before the Younger Lawyers Section, so that he may come into contact with those students of the Law Schools which are in the last two years of their professional careers, interesting them in the objectives and tasks of the Association.

2. That the above-mentioned Delegates keep in permament contact with, and maintain contact with an inform the Chairman of the Younger Lawyers Section.

3. That the Bar Associations establish an adequate system to facilitate graduate lawyers in the transition between academic learning and practice of the profession.

SECTION B. PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS OF CONDUCT

45. Whereas:

In the great majority of the universities of the Americas there is no course in Professional Ethics and Deontology*, the teaching of which is fundamental for correct professional practice;

Recommends:

To the member associations that they request the Universities of their respective countries to establish such courses.

SECTION C. ASSISTANCE AND SOCIAL SECURITY FOR LAWYERS

[Topic 1]

46. Whereas:

1. The profession of the law, having had a long liberal tradition, does not have Social Security to protect the lawyer whenever for reasons of age or physical impediment he is forced to retire;

2. Although it is true that some lawyers with their professional activities are able to achieve a firm standing for their future and create for themselves an income for such events, and that others remain covered upon their retirement by pensions protecting them by reason of having been salaried employees, nevertheless there are always a great number of lawyers who are not able to build up a safe and sound income for their old age nor to be covered by a system of Social Security;

3. Some Associations and professional groups always have tried to establish funds for mutual aid or mutual funds to solve the most pressing needs of the lawyer who is forced to retire but such aid has never been sufficient to give what the lawyer needs for a dignified life when incapacitated, in view of the nature of the meager funds with which such aids are provided;

4. It is a duty of professional associations or groups to endow their members with a retirement fund which may assure them the indispensable minimum for a dignified living standard;

Recommends to the bar associations of America that they undertake studies for the creation and development of a system of Social Security legal and mandatory upon the lawyer, by means of integrating that system which is most adequate according to the special conditions of each country. The provision shall include as basic benefits, medical asistance, retirement, life insurance and death benefits.

47. Whereas: The "Instituto de Provisión Social del Abogado de Venezuela" (Venezuelan Lawyers Social Welfare Institute) has advised this Conference of its purpose to hold an International Lawyers Social Welfare Congress, in Caracas this year in the month of November, to which it has invited all Bar Associations of the Americas;

Recommends to all member associations that they attend the Congress convoked by the Instituto de Previsión Social del Abogado de Venezuela, in order to collaborate in the adoption of measures which may result in effecting social welfare for the lawyer.

Committee XV. Natural Resources

SECTION B. ATOMIC ENERGY LAWS

[Topic 1]

48. Whereas, in view of the report submitted by Mr. William Mitchell, Chairman of the Permanent Central Committee on the Legal aspects of the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy

Recommends:

1. That Committee XV(B) further its endeavors.

2. That studies be undertaken on the juridical and institutional problems involved in the creation of a Latin American Common Market on the Peaceful Uses of Nuclear Energy, notwithstanding the possibility for its future expansion.

SECTION C.—LAWS CONCERNING AGRICULTURE

[Topic 3]

49. Whereas:

1. Agrarian Reform is a necessary process to increase agricultural and livestock production in the American Continent and satisfy the ever-increasing food needs of each country due to demographic growth:

2. Agrarian Reform must see to the raising of the living conditions of peasant populations, in order to permit their exposure to culture, dignity and material welfare within a developing process of economic integration;

3. By Agrarian Reform we must understand fundamentally the concensus of measures which, within the rule of law and the state of the laws, with due respect to the essential rights of man as related to property, try to intensify agricultural and livestock production, utilize uncultivated areas, prevent loss of foreign exchange through importation of agricultural products, satisfy the consumption needs of the people and raise living standards, not only economic but also cultural, of the social groups that work in agriculture;

Declares:

1. That it promotes the enactment of legislation which, while encouraging improvements in agricultural production and the better distribution of land, will dignify the agricultural worker, with respect for the constitutional and legal guarantees of property.

2. That expropriations made to satisfy agricultural needs be framed recognizing the right of ownership, in such terms that the value of the indemnification be just, based on the actual price of the expropriated item, and that in those exceptional cases where expropriations are authorized with installment payments for reasons of social interest, the rules for maintenance of the value of the indemnification be observed, be it through the readjustment of the balance due on the price, or through any other system of complete indemnification that will sufficiently safeguard the expropriated owner.

3. That the expropriation of lands well exploited in accordance with the productivity conditions of the area where they are located and with the well-being of those working thereon and also of those smaller agricultural lands cultivated directly by the owners may only be decreed for especially determined reasons.

4. That agriculture be provided with the technology, machinery, seeds, fertilizers and credit necessary for its development and the fulfillment of its socio-economic function.

5. That Agrarian Reform cannot be turned into a mere political instrument to replace present land ownership, nor into a mere process for the division of property, but rather into a far-reaching complex for the economic and social development of the American Continent.

Anything to the contrary would cause it to lose its raison d'etre and its justification as a juridical instrument for the promotion of the general welfare of its inhabitants.

(NOTE.—The Colombian and the Mexican delegations respectfully abstained from voting on this resolution because of their non-agreement with points 2 and 3.)

Committee XVI. Interplanetary Space Law

[Topic 1]

50. Whereas:

1. Resolutions have been passed in previous Conferences and in view of the pioneering efforts of Committee XVI which has considered the Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space including the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies adopted by Resolution 2222 of the XXI United Nations General Assembly on December 19, 1966;

2. It is desirable to affirm the importance of international cooperation in the peaceful exploration and use of outer space and the importance of developing the rule of law in this new area of human endeavor;

Recommends that all States sign and ratify the said Treaty at the earliest possible moment and express hope for the widest possible adherence to its terms.

51. Whereas:

1. It is recognized that the common interest of all mankind in the progress and use of outer space for peaceful purposes;

2. It is desirable to implement the treaty on principles governing the activities of States in the exploration and use of outer space and other international agreements on space activities;

3. International cooperation in the legal aspects of the exploration and use of outer space for peaceful purposes will contribute to the strengthening of friendly relations between States and peoples;

Recommends:

1. That the Law Schools of the Western Hemisphere establish areas of study in the developing field of space law.

2. That the O.A.S. provide every assistance to the said law schools to achieve these objectives.

---

*"Deontology" was coined by, or at least first used by Jeremy Bentham (1826) who wrote in his book *Deontology* (1832) "Deontology or private ethics may be considered the science by which happiness is created out of motives extra-legislatorial". This book was translated into Spanish from the French edition of 1834 under the title "Deontologia o ciencia de la moral" (1836), and the term "deontology" became well known in Spanish countries. The Oxford Dictionary defines it as, "The science of duty; that branch of knowledge which deals with moral obligations; ethics".

Committee XVII. Military Law

[Topic 2]

52. Whereas:

1. The improvement of economic, social, and political conditions of our people is necessary for the maintenance of their social peace and progress;

2. Appropriate legal provisions to fight subversive activities which undermine the basis of the democratic system given in our political constitutions, exist in each of our countries;

Resolves:

1. To foster the creation of legal rules which may allow for the political, social and economic development of our countries as the fundamental means to fight subversion in any form.

2. To enhance the study and exchange of Inter-American military legislation for the purpose of improving and harmonizing as far as possible the legal instruments to combat subversion.

(NOTE.—The Costa Rican delegation abstained from voting on this resolution.)

Committee XVIII. Civil Service Law

No resolutions.

Committee XIX. Food and Drug Law

53. Whereas:

1. The Joint FAO-WHO Codex Alimentarius Commission is devoting its time to the harmonization of food laws;

2. The Secretariat of that Commission reported at the time of the Fourth Session of the Commission held in Novmeber, 1966 that the only Countries of the Western Hemisphere which had formally declared their intention to be considered members of the Commission were: Argentina, Canada, Cuba, Peru, Trinidad and Tobago, United States of America.

Recommends that those countries of the Americas which have not yet declared their intention to become members of the Joint FAO-WHO Codex Alimentarius Commission take the necessary steps to do so and to participate in the work of said Commission.

Miscellaneous Resolutions

54. Whereas:

1. There is being created in San Antonio, Texas, a group of buildings for a World's Fair to be known as the "Hemis-Fair" which will open in April 1968;

2. Various republics of the Western Hemisphere are cooperating in this effort thorugh various exhibits and programs;

3. It has been determined by the officials of the Hemis-Fair that legal history and legal institutions will be represented at the Hemis-Fair through appropriate exhibits and programs;

Resolves:

1. To endorse and recommend appropriate exhibits and programs by the various republics of the hemisphere relating to the legal history, its development and functioning and various legal institutions in the several republics.

2. Each republic and other legal and historical institutions in the several republics should exhibit their various legal documents, constitutions, or declarations of independence at the Hemis-Fair provided that Hemis-Fair officials provide adequate buildings and facilities for such exhibitions and that such documents will be adequately protected during the exhibition and returned to their respective owners at the conclusion of the Hemis-Fair exhibition.

3. The various bar associations, law schools, universities and government institutions throughout the Hemisphere be encouraged to participate in such programs and make available "great documents of law and liberty".

55. In view of the success of the Conference, as a result of the efforts and cooperation furnished by all who have directly or indirectly participated in its organization and proceedings, and the lustre conferred on it by the attendance and support of eminent personalities

Declares:

1. That it expresses on the record its deep gratitude for the support it has received from the Acting Presidgent of Costa Rica, Dr. Jorge Vega and the second Vice-President Licenciado Virgilio Calvo and the prestige they have accorded by their participation in its principal events.

2. That it expresses a like sense of gratitude to the Minister of Government and Justice, Lic. Cristián Tattembach Yglesias, to the Minister of Foreign Affairs Lic. Fernando Lara and to the Vice-Minister Lic. Luis Dobles Sánchez; to the Chief Justice and Magistrate of the Supreme Court of Justice; to the Rector of the University of Costa Rica and to the Dean of the Law School; to the members of the Legislature and other officials who have added brilliance to the Conference.

3. That it thanks the Organization of American States, its Secretary General, its observers at this Conference, and its representatives in Costa Rica who have helped by their presence and collaboration to add stature to the meeting.

4. That it expresses its gratitude to Lic. Fernando Fournier for his magnificent work in making the Conference an outstanding success and for the splendid welcome extended to all the Delegates.

5. And to the Bar Association (Colegio de Abogados) of Costa Rica for its friendship to the attending Delegates and for the outstanding participation of its representatives in the assembly.

6. And to the Organizing Committee of the Conference and especially its Secretary Lic. Rodolfo Yglesias Vieto for the work accomplished and its efficient activities.

7. To the lawyers of the local Bar for their attendance at the meetings of the Conference, and the learning and eminent legal ability displayed in its proceedings, in addition to the personal attention shown to the visitors.

8. To the Association of the Wives of Lawyers who so kindly accompanied the Delegates at the principal events, adding lustre by their presence in addition to the attention shown to the ladies who participated.

9. To the employees of the Secretariat, translators, interpreters and typists, students of law and the technical personnel whose task it was to facilitate the course of the meeting and the interest of the participating delegates.

10. To the Press in general and to the journalists whose heavy task it was to furnish information, carried out so efficiently.

11. To the officers of the Hotel Costa Rica who furnished the necessary accommodations for this Assembly.

To Protect Our Older Citizens Against Unnecessary Hardship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GARRY BROWN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 11, 1967

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, it has been said that the true measure of a society is how well it treats its elderly citizens.

Our society has made a commitment to enrich and improve the lives of all senior citizens. I believe my distinguished colleagues in Congress are aware of this national responsibility to what sometimes appears to be America's forgotten generation.

Congress endorsed this goal when it passed medicare, the Older Americans Act, and other old-age assistance programs.

These needed measures have moved us closer to realizing the goals which we have set as objectives for our older Americans—an adequate income, a decent home, and a meaningful retirement. But the administration of many of these programs is not all that we would like it to be.

Social security, for instance, is the major source of income for about half of its beneficiaries over 65. Yet, too often, bureaucratic redtape and clerical errors have caused long delays for those who depend on social security checks.

For many of these people, the subsistence line is indeed a thin one. A delay of a month or even a few days means tightening the belt, doing without, and sometimes acute distress.

Therefore, I am introducing legislation today which would end unnecessary delays in social security payments to our needy senior citizens.

This legislation, similar to that introduced recently by U.S. Senators Robert Griffin and Hugh Scott, would authorize local social security offices to make immediate payments for up to 60 days when presented with clear evidence of a valid claim.

Such a proposal would authorize a supervisor, to be designated in each local office, to order normal payment when he determines there is clear evidence of a proper claim. Persons would have a valid claim if their checks were more than 30 days late and new claimants could file for immediate payments after waiting 90 days.

Last month, I urged the Social Security Administration to investigate slow payments of medicare claims and to recommend ways of improving the service of the private health groups which service the medicare program.

The introduction of this proposal today is a further attempt to offer an effective and practical way of protecting our older citizens against unnecessary hardship.

The Promise and Potential of Aquaculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1967

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I have often spoken of my concern over the world food crisis and my interest in the efficient utilization of marine resources. Recently, there has been much research done on the application of the largely untapped, protein-rich resources of the sea to alleviate the world protein deficit. Today, I would like to talk about an industry, aquaculture, which, if properly developed, could contribute significantly to our battle against world hunger.

The biological management of the oceans in order to produce the maximum, long-range yield of food is a formidable problem, both scientifically and politically. It is this problem that aquaculture seeks to solve by the systematic husbandry of marine life for harvest and use by man. Aquaculture is analogous to agriculture in that both aim to provide an environment where useful plants and animals will not only grow but thrive. Aquaculture is most advanced in Japan, where it has been in use for 300 years. In this country, we are almost entirely without practical experience in the techniques of aquaculture, except in the raising of shellfish like shrimp and oysters. Raising fish on such a large scale as would be necessary is an exacting task. To do it well and efficiently requires thorough understanding of the life cycle of the species and its relationship to its environment. The right food must be readily available and water conditions must be maintained within narrow limits. While protecting the cultured species from its natural enemies, the percentage of deaths from fish disease is likely to rise sharply. We also are in need of the equivalent of cheap fencing on land. Recently, there has been some experimentation with acoustical fences, and Maine sardine fishermen are using "bubble" fences—simple pipes with holes, through which compressed air is forced. Fish are not inclined to pass these bubble fences. Not until such fencing is in universal use will fishermen become farmers. Production costs of aquaculture are high, making it practical, at the moment, only for high value products.

The Rockefeller Foundation made two major grants in 1966 in support of aquaculture projects. One grant was made to Taiwan and one to the Philippines. Included in these projects is research on fish grown in both brackish and freshwater ponds. One important goal is to determine how the fish can be induced to spawn in artificial ponds, so that the farmers need not rely on ocean fishing for their supply. Pond management is also being studied, in hopes of discovering methods for increasing yields. Marine biologists are being trained at both centers, to spread the newly acquired techniques throughout Southeast Asia, where both coastal waters and inland lakes and streams can be profitably developed to supply much-needed protein for growing populations.

Political barriers to the expansion of aquaculture are even more formidable than the scientific or technical ones. The efficient utilization of fish protein could, if conducted on a large enough scale, eliminate the world protein deficiency. Right now, ocean programs of the Government, industry, and the academic world are suffering from a lack of communication and coordination. More than a willingness to cooperate on the part not only of the numerous Government agencies involved in oceanographic research, but also industry and the academic world, is needed to transform the potentialities of the ocean into practical realities. A common sense of direction is essential. This is the purpose of the Marine Resources and Engineering Act of 1966, and it cannot be overemphasized. The traditional lack of ownership of existing or potential resources of the ocean is an impediment to practical experimentation. The concept of freedom of the seas, which developed because the waters were considered worthless except for transportation and naval warfare, operates in direct opposition to the wise utilization of ocean resources. Only very recently was an agreement reached as to the ownership of the subbottom resources of the North Sea, which include such nonrenewable products as oil and gas. Similar plans are being initiated by commercial companies in other areas.

The expanding world population is depleting the nonrenewable resources of the land at an ever-increasing rate. The biological and chemical resources of the ocean, on the other hand, renew themselves naturally. It will be necessary to expand the fishing industry into now unused areas. Initial steps toward such a goal have been undertaken. For example, the Indian Ocean expedition, only recently begun, will reveal new and promising fishing grounds. Similar projects will have to be started in other areas. The challenge for the future is to reach solutions for the political as well as scientific problems and use the many marine resources available that cannot be destroyed by man. Such solutions could well be a key to survival for millions.

Aquaculture itself, however, will make only a small dent in the world protein deficit. Traditionally, man has taken only a small percentage of his diet from the sea. The reasons for this are both technical and cultural. Fish were not easily or cheaply preserved. Now, however, chemical engineering has reached the point where this no longer need be an obstacle. Social taboos on the other hand exert tremendous influence on people's diets. In some traditionally agricultural inland areas, even hungry people may refuse to eat fish for social or cultural reasons. Imaginative marketing techniques will be needed if poor nations are to benefit from the food potential of the ocean.

Processing fish into readily acceptable forms will alleviate some of the marketing problems. One such product is fish protein concentrate—FPC. A tasteless, odorless, neutrally colored powder that is over 80 percent protein, FPC is essentially fish meal with the oils removed. The President's Panel on Oceanography estimates that a small daily supplement of FPC could meet the world protein deficit for as little as $2 per person annually. U.S. fisheries could produce enough FPC to meet the needs of 300 million people as well as creating new markets for themselves and utilizing resources now regarded as unprofitable wastes.

If developed carefully, both FPC and aquaculture could have a significant impact on the world food crisis. Our program should not consist solely of handouts, but should be directed towards aiding other nations in developing their own potential food sources in the sea. Such a program alone will not achieve a total solution to the problem of world hunger. It must, of course, be accompanied by population controls and agricultural reforms. The people of these less developed nations will need assistance in the efficient use of accumulated scientific information. It is toward this goal that our long-range plans should be directed, and the maximum utilization of ocean resources is a prime example of the importance of scientific research and cooperation.

Statement of Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 12, 1967

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on February 5, 1967, the American Israel Public Affairs Committee issued a statement of policy concerning the growing tensions and problems in the Middle East.

Especially significant is their accurate foresight. The great need is for peace treaties if a major war in the Middle East is to be averted.

I commend to the attention of our colleagues the text of the statement of policy adopted at the eighth national policy conference of the American Israel Public Affairs Committee, in Washington, on February 5, 1967:

STATEMENT OF POLICY

(Text of the statement of policy adopted at the eighth national policy conference of the American Israel Public Affairs Committee, in Washington on February 5, 1967)

THE DANGER OF WAR

We meet at a time of rising danger. The continuing Arab threat to destroy Israel and the costly and dangerous arms escalation menace all the peoples of the Near East and challenge the international community to take positive steps to achieve peace.

TERRORISM

In recent months, terrorism has spread on Israel's frontiers. We are alarmed by the inability of the United Nations to curb it and the censure of Israel's attempts to deter it. We deplore the United Nations resolution of November 25, 1966, which censured Israel while ignoring Arab terrorism against her. We feared then that this resolution, which was supported by our Government, would encourage Arab aggressors to prepare for new murderous assaults. This has happened. Within recent weeks there has been a series of new outbreaks of shooting and terrorist activity against Israel, primarily organized by Syria. The United Nations and the United States failed to censure these activities.

THE NEED FOR PEACE

Throughout the years our Government has provided generous economic aid to both Israel and the Arab states and has demonstrated its friendship for all the peoples of that region.

But the greatest need of the area is peace. We call for a stronger and more dynamic U.S. policy to reverse the present drift toward war and to convert the UN armistice agreements into Arab-Israel peace treaties.

THE ARMS RACE

We urge that our Government enlist the cooperation of the Soviet Union to bring about a relaxation of tensions in the area, specifically by an agreement to reduce the flow of arms and to foster direct negotiations between the Arab states and Israel. Pending such an agreement, we urge our Government to ensure maintenance of the arms balance in the region.

ARAB BOYCOTT

We urge a Congressional inquiry to study and recommend new measures to curb the efforts of the Arab states to boycott American business interests. Such an inquiry should ascertain whether the legislation enacted by Congress in 1965, amending the Export Control Act, needs to be strengthened to protect American businessmen.

ARAB REFUGEES

Over the years the relief and rehabilitation program for the Arab refugees has been administered by the United Nations Relief and Works Agency, whose budget has been financed by the United States and other powers—70% by the United States.

But the high purpose of UNRWA's program has been thwarted because the refugee rolls have not been purged of fraud, and substantial sums have been diverted to support persons who are being trained by the Palestine Liberation Army for war against Israel. It is intolerable that UNRWA should enter into a partnership with Arab states to use international funds for war preparations against a member state of the UN.

We are convinced that the only practical solution of the Arab refugee problem is the resettlement of the Arab refugees in Arab states, and we call for a change to provide that U.S. funds for refugee rehabilitation should be allocated directly to Arab governments, on condition that they use them for constructive projects to stimulate economic and social absorption of their refugee populations.

ECONOMIC AID

We support continued economic aid to Israel and the Arab states for the development of agriculture and industry. Priority should be given to the maximum utilization of water resources. We believe aid should be withheld from those who misuse it directly or indirectly, for war preparations and aggression.

NEGOTIATIONS AND PEACE

We believe that all outstanding issues between Israel and the Arab states can be resolved by direct negotiations. We believe that there are progressive leaders in the Arab countries who are prepared to abandon past enmities and to participate in a new era of cooperation which will help all the peoples of the Near East. We believe that peace can be won if the peoples of the area are encouraged to pursue that goal. We urge our Government, in concert with the community of nations, to summon the Arab states to the peace table with Israel.

A Declaration of Conscience

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER L. WOLFF
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 12, 1967

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, it is somewhat ironic that it takes a nuclear bomb to bring mankind to knowledge of its own brotherhood, so that in this age a war in any of the world is on the conscience of us all. But today, especially in a democracy where each citizen is free to make his voice heard on national affairs, every human being has personal responsibility toward the achievement of world peace.

The deep commitment of our Churches to the salvation of man's individual soul has been drawn by the threat of nuclear annihilation to involvement in national policies. From the vantage point of universal brotherhood, not partisan politics, they bring a message that deserves to be studied carefully by those of us who guide the policies of these United States.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include the statement of the general assembly of the United Presbyterian Church on the war now being waged in the jungles of Vietnam. It speaks most eloquently to the conscience of us all:

A DECLARATION OF CONSCIENCE

(To the congregations of the United Presbyterian Church from the 179th General Assembly)

"Grace be unto you, and peace from God the Father and from our Lord Jesus Christ"

There is no moral issue more urgently confronting our church and nation than the war in Vietnam. The hour is late; the church dare not remain silent. We must declare our conscience.

We share widely-held feelings of sadness that steps were taken in the past which have involved our nation in its present difficulty. Although each step was taken with hope it would be the last, their cumulative result has brought us to an agonizing dilemma. On the one hand, we cannot responsibly withdraw our military forces unilaterally from Vietnam. On the other hand, further escalation seems to us to raise the spectre of World War III and the possibility of a nuclear holocaust.

A. We recognize that our leaders desire an end to the war, and believe that their motives for pursuing the war are those of honorable men. We must nevertheless declare our deep misgiving at the policy of military escalation (further steps being taken during the week of this Assembly) which leads the world daily closer to the danger of wider war. Acts of escalation tend to commit us to further acts of escalation and may lessen the possibility of settlement by negotiation.

B. We realize that a decision to change national policy in the midst of military conflict is an agonizing one for the President and his advisors. Nevertheless, in the light of the increasing cost and peril of our present course of escalation we ask for ourselves and our nation:

1. The moral courage to acknowledge our obligation, as the stronger nation, to act first taking initiatives that will create a climate of trust leading finally to the negotiating table;

2. The recognition that with such information and such insights as we now possess, it appears that the immediate need is an alternate to the bombing of North Vietnam. Mindful of the fact that our forces have already interrupted the bombing on several occasions for varying periods of time, we nevertheless urge our government to consider again cessation of bombing as one tangible evidence of our desire to negotiate.

3. Renewed attempts to get all parties concerned to seek arbitration of the war through the United Nations, to accept its decisions as final, and to cooperate with the United Nations in assuring peace by means of an international peacekeeping force on the scene;

4. Exploration of other alternatives, such as a purely defensive war behind a fortified demilitarized zone in South Vietnam with the subsequent pacification of the South Vietnamese countryside.

We understand this Declaration of Conscience to be required of us by our Confession of 1967: "the search for cooperation and peace . . . requires the pursuit of fresh and responsible relations across every line of conflict even at risk to national security." Just as our present policy of escalation involves risk, so also does a policy of de-escalation. We believe it is a risk we must take for the sake of the future of mankind.

C. We call upon members of every religious faith and communion, and upon all men of good will everywhere, to make common cause with us in an effort to bring about an end to the war. As we do so:

1. *We must continue to affirm the morality of dissent.* Increasing numbers of citizens, including some in high office, are equating dissent with disloyalty.

The enemy can always misunderstand the meaning of dissent. We, however, must affirm unequivocally that the right of dissent is the lifeblood of democracy. We also affirm unequivocally that the first mandate under which the church lives is the mandate, "You shall have no other Gods before me" (Ex. 20:3). We acknowledge that "The church which identifies the sovereignty of any one nation or any one way of life with the cause of God denies the Lordship of Christ and betrays its calling" (Confession of 1967).

We remind ourselves and other citizens addressing themselves to public questions that we must speak in an informed way, and must avoid impugning the loyalty or integrity of those with whom we disagree. We call for candor on the part of policymakers, and the abandonment of cliches and slogans, in order that there may be a frank facing of the extent and limitations of our national interest in Vietnam and Southeast Asia.

2. *We must continue to affirm the morality of restraint.* We recognize that our military actions have been conducted with a high degree of restraint in comparison to the military power we possess. Nevertheless, we are dismayed that as the war gathers momentum this restraint shows signs of erosion. Our people seem willing to accept as normal today what was unthinkable yesterday. We recoil from rash proposals to use nuclear weapons, or to invade the North. We deplore the increasing willingness at home to justify inhumane acts because the enemy also commits them. We mourn the fact that although we had hoped to be in Vietnam to liberate its people, our use of modern weapons is increasingly destructive both to that people and to their country.

3. *We must break new moral ground in courage and in ecumenical action.* Let men of all faiths pray that our nation will have the moral courage to undertake those steps of redirection.

We support the concern over Vietnam already expressed by many Jewish groups, by Protestant and Orthodox bodies such as the World Council of Churches and the National Council of Churches, and join in the plea of Pope Paul VI that "men must come together and get down to sincere negotiations. Things must be settled now, even at the cost of some loss or inconvenience, for later they may have to be settled at the cost of immense harm and enormous slaughter that cannot even be imagined now."

4. *We must declare our conscience at whatever cost.* We recognize that if our military escalation is not reversed, the time may come when those who dissent because they seek peace will be placed under even greater pressure, and that the possibility of significant influence by the church on public policy will have disappeared. Should that time come, we urge our corporate church and our individual church members to exercise the voice of conscience, so that faithful witness may be rendered to God's reconciliation in Jesus Christ, which is the only ground of peace.

The above "Declaration of Conscience" was adopted by the 179th General Assembly (1967). The General Assembly also adopted the following resolution:

"That the General Assembly seek through the National Council of Churches the widest possible participation of all faiths in a Day of Prayers for Peace in Vietnam on a date to be mutually agreed upon as soon after June 1 as possible; and that in United Presbyterian congregations the Declaration of Conscience be read on the Sunday nearest that date, and that United Presbyterians be urged to fast on that Sunday and receive offerings for civilian victims of the war, offering prayers for all persons caught in this tragic struggle.

"When a date has been decided upon, a notice will be sent immediately to all pastors.

"Offerings received on the Day of Prayers for Peace in Vietnam are to be transmitted to the Central Receiving Agency, 475 Riverside Drive, New York, N.Y. 10027."

President Visits OCI in Philadelphia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 12, 1967

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, in an editorial, which captures brilliantly the spirit and significance of the day, the Philadelphia Inquirer has described President Johnson's recent visit to Philadelphia's Opportunities Industrialization Center. As the editorial states, the President's visit "was a richly deserved tribute to the founder of the center, Rev. Leon H. Sullivan, and to all of those whose foresight and hard work have made this job-training effort a model of national importance for antipoverty programs."

We were delighted to have the President in our city and very happy that he took the occasion to sign into law there a bill of major importance—that extending the life of the Teachers Corps. But it is of special interest to me, Mr. Speaker, that President Johnson once again showed an interest in efforts underway to deal effectively with the fundamental problems of poverty. His continued interest, together with such successful antipoverty programs as the Opportunities Industrialization Center and the variety of far-reaching, far-sighted programs of the Office of Economic Opportunity, serve as important reminders; first, that the war on poverty is presently being waged successfully with enthusiasm and determination and, second, that it is important for us in the Congress to act to prevent the destruction of the antipoverty effort by the partisan Republican mischief designed to abolish the OEO.

Mr. Speaker, I insert at this point in the RECORD the editorial to which I referred, as well as Mr. Jack Lloyd's article describing the OIC formula for success in the war on poverty.

The articles follow:

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Inquirer, June 30, 1967]

THE PRESIDENT'S SURPRISE VISIT

President Johnson's surprise visit to Philadelphia Thursday morning was a richly deserved tribute to the Opportunities Industrialization Center, to its founder and chairman, the Rev. Leon H. Sullivan, and to all who have made this job-training organization a model for nationwide anti-poverty programs.

The President came here to see for himself—at two job-training centers in North Philadelphia—the wonderful achievements of the OIC that he and the entire country have heard so much about. He selected one of the OIC installations as the site for bill-signing ceremonies to extend the life of the Teacher Corps.

In word and deed, Mr. Johnson was creating a memorable occasion to honor the Opportunities Industrialization Center and, equally important, to encourage men and women across the Nation to adopt for themselves the OIC spirit of self-help and self-improvement.

Mr. Sullivan's remarkable accomplishments—in raising the poor and disheartened to positions of responsibility as productive wage-earners and operators of independent business enterprise—are a familiar story to Philadelphians. President Johnson, in going out of his way to give formal recognition to OIC's program, is aiming the war on poverty in a desirable direction.

There is no more effective way to aid the jobless than to qualify them for available job openings. This is the kind of fight against poverty that goes beyond the theoretical and into the practical. Jobs are the key to the war on poverty but, as Mr. Sullivan has had the wisdom to see, the jobs are useless unless the jobless can be qualified to fill them.

Startled Philadephians walking and driving on Broad street and other thoroughfares of the city early Thursday had to look twice to believe their eyes when the President of the United States suddenly appeared in their midst. Aided by the excellent security work of Philadelphia police, provided on exceptionally short notice, Mr. Johnson and his party journeyed through business and residential areas to his hastily arranged destinations with no perceptible confusion. The element of surprise is a favorite device of the President and he must have enjoyed this one as much as his amazed audiences were delighted in welcoming him.

There is something touchingly symbolic in all this. Surprise often has been the first reaction of enrollees at the Opportunities Industrialization Center—surprise at their own undeveloped skills and talents they did not know they had. Perhaps the President's visit to the OIC here will serve to inspire unemployed everywhere to find new hope and new opportunity.

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Inquirer, June 30, 1967]

FORMULA OF OIC SUCCESS: SELF-HELP

(By Jack Lloyd)

It all began Jan. 26, 1964, in a shabby building at 19th and Oxford sts., in the heart of the North Philadelphia Negro ghetto.

Hopes were high, but so was pessimism. There had been too many attempts over the years to achieve the noble goal, to lift the Negro up and prepare him for the good things in life.

But this was something else, the beginning of the Opportunities Industrialization Center—the creation of a tall Negro minister named the Rev. Leon H. Sullivan.

And it worked.

"They said it couldn't be done," Mr. Sullivan conceded in an address last month, "but OIC has become the miracle of the decade."

The formula is simple: Self-help. Take the uneducated and untrained and with skilled efficiency and understanding of his problems, teach him what he has to know to become a productive citizen.

"I taught my ladies that they don't have to be blonde to be beautiful," Mr. Sullivan said, "and my men that they don't have to be white to be smart.

"I taught them to put their head up and their shoulders back. And most of all I taught them to believe in America."

Mr. Sullivan has been receiving National recognition and praise for his work, and his methods are spreading rapidly to other cities.

Just last September, R. Sargent Shriver, director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, announced that the Government would spend more than $5 million this year for the establishment of job preparation centers in eight cities.

These centers, Shriver said, will be patterned after the OIC, which since its inception has received the major part of its support from Federal funds.

For Mr. Sullivan, a native of West Virginia, who is pastor of the Zion Baptist Church, the successful formula was not something he hit on overnight. He had been fighting the battle for first-class Negro citizenship for many years.

In 1953 he helped organize the Philadelphia Citizens Committee Against Juvenile Delinquency and Their Cause. And in 1960 he helped to establish the North Philadelphia Youth Employment Service, an agency for part-time jobs.

And Mr. Sullivan's dynamic drive has been influential in other areas. Under his direction, $250,000 was raised to move his Zion church from an ancient structure at 13th and Wallace sts., to its present site at Broad and Venango sts.

About 1,400 persons are being trained at five OIC centers. Of these—and the others who came and went on to good jobs—97 percent are in the "poverty category," Mr. Sullivan said.

They come to Mr. Sullivan without a purpose and scant prospects and they leave with a trade. And equally important, if not more so, they leave with pride.

Bilingual Educational Opportunities for America's 3 Million Non-English-Speaking Schoolchildren

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 11, 1967

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, I had the honor of testifying at the recent Los Angeles hearings of the U.S. Senate Subcommittee on Bilingual Education—in support of Federal legislation to provide new bilingual educational opportunities to offer America's more than 3 million non-English-speaking elementary and secondary schoolchildren a better chance to achieve their full educational aspirations.

As the author of H.R. 8000, the Bilingual Educational Opportunity Act, and because of the urgent importance of the legislation to this vital segment of the Nation's school-age population, I would like to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of my statement to the Senate subcommittee:

STATEMENT OF HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL, REPRESENTATIVE, 30TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT, CALIFORNIA, IN SUPPORT OF FEDERAL LEGISLATION TO PROVIDE BILINGUAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS BEFORE THE SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON BILINGUAL EDUCATION OF THE U.S. SENATE COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE, IN LOS ANGELES, CALIF., JUNE 24, 1967

Mr. Chairman, and Members of the Subcommittee: I am happy to be able to discuss with you today the important subject of bilingual education for America's non-English-speaking school children, and to outline for you some of the reasons why I have supported the effort to achieve this goal by joining in introducing my own companion legislation in Congress: H.R. 8000, the Bilingual Educational Opportunity Act.

First of all, I want to express my personal appreciation to the Members of the Special Subcommittee, for your initiative and outstanding leadership in the effort to promote the cause of bilingual education. In particular, I want to commend you for scheduling these Los Angeles hearings to offer interested

California citizens an opportunity to make a meaningful contribution to the legislative process.

Secondly, I want to make it clear that I am in favor of the very best possible bilingual education bill we can pass this year in Congress.

By this I mean that, while my own bill, H.R. 8000, would, in my opinion, serve as an excellent beginning for a long-overdue program of assistance to local school districts to promote bilingual education, I also believe that each of the bills introduced in the House and Senate has merit, and though differing in various particulars, could become the basis of a valuable start in the right direction.

In addition, many worthwhile suggestions for substantive changes and technical improvements will undoubtedly result from this Committee's extensive hearings, and will also develop in the course of further Congressional consideration of the bilingual education proposals.

Therefore, I think it is important that all of us who are convinced of the need for bilingual education should work together to assure passage—this year—of the best bill obtainable, given all the legislative and parliamentary circumstances, plus the practical consideration of the very limited time remaining in the present session of Congress.

If we are able to secure favorable action by Congress this year on a sound beginning in bilingual education, we can then focus our future energies on improving, perfecting, and refining these programs, as we gain greater experience and increased knowledge in this relatively new field of academic endeavor.

With that thought in mind, Mr. Chairman, and with your permission, rather than concentrate on the technical aspects of the legislation, I would like to emphasize the urgent need for national programs of this type, especially here in California, and in America's other Southwestern States—and to discuss with you briefly the general provisions of my bill, H.R. 8000, the Bilingual Educational Opportunity Act.

I would hope that through your help, and the help of all the other Members of the House and Senate who have introduced bilingual education bills this year, we in Congress will be able to enact legislation during the present session that will make a significant start toward establishing a system of bilingual education programs for America's more than 3 million non-English-speaking elementary and secondary school children—to offer them for the first time a real chance to achieve their full educational potential.

I have been encouraged and deeply gratified by the overwhelmingly favorable response this proposal has received, not only from Members of Congress on both sides of the political aisle, but also from the members of the teaching profession on the local, state, and national levels, and, particularly, from community leaders and organizations from the non-English-speaking ethnic and nationality groups who have a vital interest in this subject.

Briefly, my bill, H.R. 8000, is designed to assist local school districts in setting up new and imaginative systems of bilingual education, individually tailored to meet the specialized needs of Spanish-speaking grade and high school students living mainly in the Southwestern States, New York and Florida; French-speaking youngsters in Louisiana and along the Canadian border; children of Oriental ancestry chiefly located on the West Coast and in Hawaii; students of American Indian descent; as well as other school-age children of non-English-speaking background residing in widely scattered sections of the country.

Since the majority of non-English-speaking young people in the United States have learned Spanish at home as a result of a long heritage of Spanish culture in the Southwest, or because their families came from Mexico, Puerto Rico, Cuba, or other Latin countries, the primary beneficiaries of any nationwide bilingual education program would undoubtedly be Spanish-speaking children.

However, under H.R. 8000, the benefits of bilingual education would also be shared by American youngsters from a wide variety of other family linguistic and cultural backgrounds: French, Oriental, American Indian, Eskimo, Portuguese, Greek, Italian, Polish, Hungarian, and many more.

In fact, I would anticipate that the number of children from many of these linguistic groups will increase substantially in the next few years as a result of the recent liberalization of the Immigration Act—so that special language programs may be necessary to meet this situation alone.

Few, indeed, would dispute the fact that there is an urgent need to find constructive solutions to the unique bilingual/bicultural education problems faced by the hundreds of thousands of American school children who are members of our many non-English-speaking ethnic and nationality groups.

The situation is just beginning to receive the long-overdue national recognition it deserves as one of the most critical education problems in the United States—calling for immediate, aggressive, remedial action to help overcome the serious learning difficulties experienced by this important segment of the Nation's school-aged population.

However, Mr. Chairman, I regret to say that, so far, little or no progress has been made toward finding adequate answers to the highly complex problems involved.

And today, job opportunities, income levels, economic advancement, in fact, all the aspects of personal and family well-being, are closely linked to educational achievement and the ability to communicate effectively with one another.

Those of our citizens who are severely handicapped because of language barriers in our modern, predominantly English-speaking society suffer a continuing denial of the opportunity to participate and share fully in the rich abundance of 20th Century America.

What we need, and what my bill, H.R. 8000, represents, is an effort to develop the kind of local-state-federal cooperative approach I believe is necessary to meet the special educational needs of the large number of students in the United States to whom English is a second language.

The compelling urgency for greater attention to this area is graphically demonstrated by the fact that the median of years of school completed for Spanish-speaking in the Southwest is 7.1 years, whereas for the Anglo child in the Southwest, it is 12.1 years, and for the non-white child it is 9.0 years of school completed.

This tragic record of educational disparity and underachievement in the Southwest, has been called "the greatest single failure of our system to provide equality of educational opportunity in this region."

Moreover, this failure continues on into the vital field of higher education.

For example, according to the population ratio right here in the State of California, some 20,000 students from the Spanish-speaking community should be enrolled on the twenty-seven campuses of our fine University and State College systems.

However, fewer than 2,000 are actually enrolled!

As a modest beginning to help remedy this appalling situation, my bill would provide $7 million the first year, with larger amounts earmarked for succeeding years, to enable local school districts to initiate comprehensive bilingual systems of teaching non-English-speaking students.

H.R. 8000 authorizes federal financial assistance to local education agencies to conduct a variety of programs such as:

original research and demonstration pilot projects in the field of bilingual education;

intensive pre-school Headstart-type programs specifically designed to orient and prepare non-English-speaking children for smoother transition to, and more rapid advancement in, the elementary school environment;

activities to emphasize the mutually reinforcing learning-aid benefits of the ability to speak a language other than English, and the ability to speak English;

regular, on-going school-system-wide bilingual education programs;

the teaching of both English and the language spoken in the home so as to enable non-English-speaking students to become truly bilingual and bicultural;

programs designed to impart to non-English-speaking students a knowledge of and pride in their ancestral language and cultural heritage;

programs to attract and retain as teachers promising individuals of non-English-speaking ethnic or nationality background;

community efforts to establish closer cooperation between the school and the home; and

other related activities which promote the purposes and objectives of bilingual education.

In addition, my bill would provide a 9-man "Advisory Committee On Increasing Educational Opportunity For Bilingual Children" within the Federal Office of Education, with the U.S. Commissioner of Education serving as Chairman.

Of the eight regular members of the Advisory Committee, four are required to be educators with experience in dealing with the educational problems of children who speak English as a second language.

Moreover, at least four of the Committee members must be of non-English-speaking ethnic or nationality background!

This arrangement would assure that the Advisory Committee would always have the benefit of the views of persons with an academic background in bilingual education, as well as of those with personal experience with the problems of bilingual children.

Persons with these kinds of experience and background would be especially valuable when advising the Commissioner on establishing general program policy, drafting criteria and regulations for approval of projects, and in advising on approval or rejection of applications.

Another significant provision of H.R. 8000 is that, in order for a grant application to be approved, provision must be made for the participation of children who may be enrolled in non-profit private schools in the area to be served, whose educational needs are of the type which this legislation is intended to meet.

In California, and the other Southwestern States, this requirement is an important one because it will assure that the full benefits of bilingual education will be available to all our children, regardless of whether they attend public schools or not.

My bill also provides additional authorization to set up special centers for training teachers of bilingual children, and for supporting special summer and regular session institutes for such teachers.

Finally, the measure makes research in the field of bilingual education eligible for funding under the provisions of the Cooperative Research Act.

Mr. Chairman, I do not want to suggest that my bill is a perfect piece of legislation, nor that it cannot be improved upon.

In fact, I am confident that you and your fellow Committee Members will, as a result of these hearings, be in an excellent position to make both technical and substantive improvements in the language of the differing proposals that have been submitted for consideration. And, in future years, with the practical experience we will have gained in conducting bilingual education programs in all parts of the country, we will be able to amend the statute as this experience indicates.

I understand that suggestions have already come from various sources to revise the bill for such purposes as to add further emphasis to the teacher and teacher-aide training aspects of the program, to stress adult education especially for parents of non-English-speaking children, to provide a more flexible criteria or formula for distributing funds for bilingual education and to review the extent of involvement in and contribution toward the overall program by state education authorities.

I trust the Committee will consider these and other ideas as it continues its analysis of the problem, and attempts to devise the best legislative approach to its solution.

In this connection, and as additional evidence of the urgent need for supporting the principle of bilingual education for America's non-English-speaking school children, I would like to draw the Committee's attention to a recent survey on the teaching of Spanish to Spanish-speaking students, entitled "The Invisible Minority", in which the National Education Association found that this group of bilingual and bicultural young people represented what it called "the most acute educational problem in the Southwest."

The N.E.A. study continued: "Many of these young people experience academic failure in school. At best, they have limited success. A large percentage become school dropouts. And little headway is being made against the problem.

"Spanish-speaking children start school with a decided handicap (the almost exclusive use of Spanish), fall behind their classmates in the first grade, and each passing year finds them farther behind.

"They are conditioned to failure in the early years of their schooling, and each additional year only serves to reinforce their feelings of failure and frustration."

The Spanish-speaking student "knows some English but has used it infrequently. The language of his home, his childhood, his first years, is Spanish. His environment, his experiences, his very personality have been shaped by it.

"But he soon discovers that English is the only language acceptable in schools."

In addition to the language barrier, the survey found that children of Spanish-speaking background "encounter a strange and different set of cultural patterns, an accelerated tempo of living, and, more often than not, teachers who, though sympathetic and sincere, have little understanding of the Spanish-speaking people, their customs, beliefs, and sensitivities."

The National Education Association report concluded: "The need is for action—now!

"To meet the problem fully, however, further legislation and substantially increased appropriations are needed. A more intensive effort to recruit additional teachers from among the Spanish-speaking is another imperative. Additional research, especially of a demonstration nature, is yet another. An extended series of needs could be listed. But the urgent need is for action and innovation in local school districts almost everywhere."

Mr. Chairman, I believe the bilingual education proposals you are now considering represent the kind of immediate legislative action recommended by the N.E.A. to help overcome the serious linguistic handicaps suffered by America's 3 million non-English-speaking elementary and secondary school children.

Also on a positive note, Mr. Chairman, I am convinced that we should begin to think of bilingualism in this country, not so much as a problem, but as a great opportunity and a potential national asset of tremendous value—if we will but develop it as such.

Up to now in our schools, millions of young people who speak a language other than English have been cheated or damaged or both by ill-informed educational policies which have made of their bilingualism an ugly disadvantage in their lives.

It is certainly absurd that our national educational policy has directed the expenditure of an estimated billion dollars a year to teach foreign languages—in our schools, colleges, universities, and government agencies—and yet virtually none of this effort has gone to maintain and develop the already existing cmpetence of American children who speak these same languages as a result of their family background.

For instance, with some 4 million native speakers of French or Spanish in our country, these are the two languages most widely taught, and yet, they are also the ones for which we recognize the greatest unfulfilled need.

It is absolutely incongruous to me that we should continue to largely waste the native-speaking talents and abilities of our own citizens, when there is such an urgent need for those very talents right here in the United States.

But, Mr. Chairman, I believe that your Committee is providing the kind of forward-looking, progressive leadership we need to end, once and for all, this tragic waste, and to begin to utilize the extensive linguistic abilities of our own people.

With endorsements of bilingual education from the Association of Mexican-American Educators, the Affiliated Teacher Organizations of Los Angeles, the Los Angeles City Council, the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors, and the recent "Neuvas Vistas" Conference sponsored by the California State Department of Education—plus enactment by the California Legislature this Spring of a bill (proposed by the California Teachers Association) to permit school districts to establish bilingual instruction programs when deemed educationally advantageous to their pupils—I believe your Committee should have a friendly reception here on the West Coast, and you can feel assured of the enthusiastic support of all those who are interested in improving the educational opportunities of America's non-English-speaking students.

And, with the wholehearted backing of the National Education Association, the unmistakable evidence of fast-growing nationwide support on the local and State level for this long-needed legislation, and the active contribution of Members of both House and Senate, I am greatly encouraged that our joint efforts will be successful this year.

If such a bright prospect is realized, much of the credit will belong to the pioneering leadership provided by this Committee.

Thank you again for coming to California, and for offering our citizens an opportunity to express their thoughts on this vital subject.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402, at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided,* That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the Congressional Record, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H–112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the Record at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the Record should be processed through this office.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C. 20510

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey

Aiken, George D., *Vt.*	
Allott, Gordon, *Colo.*	
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.*	6 Wesley Circle
Baker, Howard H., Jr., *Tenn.*	
Bartlett, E. L., *Alaska*	
Bayh, Birch E., *Ind.*	
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*	
Bible, Alan, *Nev.*	
Boggs, J. Caleb, *Del.*	
Brewster, Daniel B., *Md.*	
Brooke, Edward W., *Mass.*	
Burdick, Quentin N., *N. Dak.*	
Byrd, Harry F., Jr., *Va.*	
Byrd, Robert C., *W. Va.*	
Cannon, Howard W., *Nev.*	
Carlson, Frank, *Kans.*	Sheraton-Park
Case, Clifford P., *N.J.*	
Church, Frank, *Idaho*	
Clark, Joseph S., *Pa.*	
Cooper, John Sherman, *Ky.*	
Cotton, Norris, *N.H.*	
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr.*	
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill.*	
Dodd, Thomas J., *Conn.*	
Dominick, Peter H., *Colo.*	
Eastland, James O., *Miss.*	5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La.*	
Ervin, Sam J., Jr., *N.C.*	
Fannin, Paul J., *Ariz.*	
Fong, Hiram L., *Hawaii*	5519 Uppingham St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Fulbright, J. W., *Ark.*	
Griffin, Robert P., *Mich.*	
Gore, Albert, *Tenn.*	
Gruening, Ernest, *Alaska*	
Hansen, Clifford P., *Wyo.*	
Harris, Fred R., *Okla.*	
Hart, Philip A., *Mich.*	
Hartke, Vance, *Ind.*	
Hatfield, Mark, *Oreg.*	
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz.*	
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa*	5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala.*	
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla.*	Sheraton-Park
Hollings, Ernest F., *S.C.*	
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr.*	
Inouye, Daniel K., *Hawaii*	
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash.*	
Javits, Jacob K., *N.Y.*	
Jordan, B. Everett, *N.C.*	
Jordan, Len B., *Idaho*	
Kennedy, Edward M., *Mass.*	
Kennedy, Robert F., *N.Y.*	
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif.*	
Lausche, Frank J., *Ohio*	
Long, Edward V., *Mo.*	
Long, Russell B., *La.*	
McCarthy, Eugene J., *Minn.*	5916 Bradley Blvd., Bethesda, Md.
McClellan, John L., *Ark.*	
McGee, Gale W., *Wyo.*	
McGovern, George, *S. Dak.*	
McIntyre, Thomas J., *N.H.*	
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.*	The Shoreham
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont.*	
Metcalf, Lee, *Mont.*	453 First St. SE.
Miller, Jack R., *Iowa*	5417 Kirkwood Dr., Bethesda, Md.
Mondale, Walter F., *Minn.*	
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*	
Montoya, Joseph M., *N. Mex.*	
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg.*	
Morton, Thruston B., *Ky.*	
Moss, Frank E., *Utah*	
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak.*	122 Schotts Court NE.
Murphy, George, *Calif.*	
Muskie, Edmund S., *Maine*	
Nelson, Gaylord, *Wis.*	
Pastore, John O., *R.I.*	
Pearson, James B., *Kans.*	
Pell, Claiborne, *R.I.*	3425 Prospect St.
Percy, Charles H., *Ill.*	
Prouty, Winston L., *Vt.*	
Proxmire, William, *Wis.*	
Randolph, Jennings, *W. Va.*	4608 Reservoir Rd.
Ribicoff, Abraham A., *Conn.*	
Russell, Richard B., *Ga.*	
Scott, Hugh, *Pa.*	
Smathers, George A., *Fla.*	
Smith, Margaret Chase (Mrs.), *Maine.*	
Sparkman, John, *Ala.*	4928 Indian Lane
Spong, William B., Jr., *Va.*	
Stennis, John, *Miss.*	
Symington, Stuart, *Mo.*	
Talmadge, Herman E., *Ga.*	
Thurmond, Strom, *S.C.*	
Tower, John G., *Tex.*	
Tydings, Joseph D., *Md.*	
Williams, Harrison A., Jr., *N.J.*	
Williams, John J., *Del.*	
Yarborough, Ralph, *Tex.*	
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak.*	Quebec House So.
Young, Stephen M., *Ohio*	

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Francis R. Valeo.
Sergeant at Arms—Robert G. Dunphy.
Chief Clerk—Darrell St. Claire.
Secretary for the Majority—J. S. Kimmitt.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences

Messrs. Anderson (chairman), Russell, Magnuson, Symington, Stennis, Young of Ohio, Dodd, Cannon, Holland, Mondale, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Hickenlooper, Curtis, Jordan of Idaho, Brooke, and Percy.

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Holland, Eastland, Talmadge, Jordan of North Carolina, McGovern, Montoya, Mondale, Byrd of Virginia, Hollings, Aiken, Young of North Dakota, Boggs, Miller, and Hatfield.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell, Ellender, Hill, McClellan, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Pastore, Monroney, Bible, Byrd of West Virginia, McGee, Mansfield, Bartlett, Proxmire, Yarborough, Young of North Dakota, Mundt, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Kuchel, Hruska, Allott, Cotton, Case, and Javits.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell (chairman), Stennis, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Cannon, Byrd of West Virginia, Young of Ohio, Inouye, McIntyre, Brewster, Byrd of Virginia, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Thurmond, Miller, Tower, Pearson, and Dominick.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Sparkman (chairman), Proxmire, Williams of New Jersey, Muskie, Long of Missouri, McIntyre, Mondale, McGee, Spong, Bennett, Tower, Hickenlooper, Brooke, and Percy.

Committee on Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Lausche, Bartlett, Hartke, Hart, Cannon, Brewster, Long of Louisiana, Moss, Hollings, Cotton, Morton, Scott, Prouty, Pearson, and Griffin.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Bible (chairman), Morse, Kennedy of New York, Tydings, Spong, Prouty, Dominick, and Morton.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Long of Louisiana (chairman), Smathers, Anderson, Gore, Talmadge, McCarthy, Hartke, Fulbright, Ribicoff, Metcalf, Harris, Williams of Delaware, Carlson, Bennett, Curtis, Morton, and Dirksen.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Sparkman, Mansfield, Morse, Gore, Lausche, Church, Symington, Dodd, Clark, Pell, McCarthy, Hickenlooper, Aiken, Carlson, Williams of Delaware, Mundt, Case, and Cooper.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Ervin, Gruening, Muskie, Ribicoff, Harris, Kennedy of New York, Metcalf, Montoya, Mundt, Curtis, Javits, Hansen, and Baker.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Jackson (chairman), Anderson, Bible, Church, Gruening, Moss, Burdick, Hayden, McGovern, Nelson, Metcalf, Kuchel, Allott, Jordan of Idaho, Fannin, Hansen, and Hatfield.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Eastland (chairman), McClellan, Ervin, Dodd, Hart, Long of Missouri, Kennedy of Massachusetts, Bayh, Burdick, Tydings, Smathers, Dirksen, Hruska, Fong, Scott, and Thurmond.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), Morse, Yarborough, Clark, Randolph, Williams of New Jersey, Pell, Kennedy of Massachusetts, Nelson, Kennedy of New York, Javits, Prouty, Dominick, Murphy, Fannin, and Griffin.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Monroney (chairman), Yarborough, Randolph, McGee, Brewster, Hartke, Burdick, Hollings, Carlson, Fong, Boggs, and Fannin.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Randolph (chairman), Young of Ohio, Muskie, Gruening, Jordan of North Carolina, Inouye, Bayh, Montoya, Tydings, Spong, Cooper, Fong, Boggs, Murphy, Jordan of Idaho, and Baker.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Jordan of North Carolina (chairman), Hayden, Cannon, Pell, Clark, Byrd of West Virginia, Curtis, Cooper, and Scott.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D.C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 4852 Hutchins Pl.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.
Mr. Justice Brennan, of New Jersey, 3037 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Stewart, of Ohio, 5136 Palisade Lane.
Mr. Justice White, of Colorado, 2209 Hampshire Rd., McLean, Va.
Mr. Justice Fortas, of Tennessee, 3210 R St.
(Vacancy.)

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—John F. Davis, 4704 River Rd.
Deputy Clerk—Edmund P. Cullinan, 4823 Reservoir Rd.
Deputy Clerk—Michael Rodak, 6311 Joslyn Pl., Cheverly, Md.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Rd.
Reporter—Henry Putzel, Jr., 3703 33d St.
Librarian—H. C. Hallam, Jr., 10927 Pleasant Acres Dr., Adelphi, Md.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS
JUSTICES ASSIGNED
TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Fortas. Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Connecticut, New York, Vermont.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Brennan. Delaware, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, West Virginia.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Alabama, Canal Zone, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, Texas.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Stewart. Kentucky, Michigan, Ohio, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: ——— ———. Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice White. Arkansas, Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Alaska, Arizona, California, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Washington, Guam, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice White. Colorado, Kansas, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Utah, Wyoming.

Appendix

The Remarkable Israel Victory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 13, 1967

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, many articles have been written about the recent Israel-Arab conflict, but few have been as trenchant and knowledgable as the recent full-page account in the Charleston News and Courier, written by that newspaper's associate editor, Anthony Harrigan. Perhaps because of his personal knowledge of the terrain of fighting, as well as of his professional understanding of military expertise, Mr. Harrigan was able to give an objective and analytical account explaining the remarkable Israel victory.

Let me quote, in particular, the concluding paragraph of Mr. Harrigan's article:

> By rejecting a defensive strategy, Israel denied the Arab forces the time they needed to "shake down" and organize their combined armies. The Israelis relied on the quick knock-out, and won.

In the hope that this article will aid others in a better understanding of modern warfare, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BLITZ IN THE DESERT—THE 6-DAY ISRAEL-ARAB WAR

(By Anthony Harrigan)

Needle-nosed Mirage jets swarmed from airfields around Tel Aviv and headed over the sea to approach Alexandria from the west. Shrapnel burst amid the poplar trees of Dan Kibbutz on the Syrian border, and fields of grass and wheat caught fire. Sherman tanks raced across the Sinai Desert, heading for the Egyptian base of El Arish where Russian-built MIG fighters were parked near the white sand dunes and groves of date palms.

It was Monday, June 5, and Israel and the Arab states were at war after more than a decade of shaky peace. The world wondered how tiny Israel, with 2.6 million people, would fare against the combined forces of Arab states with 100 million people—nations with large numbers of modern tanks and jets supplied by the Soviet Union.

Six days later, the Israelis had defeated three armies, captured $2 billion worth of military equipment, occupied territory three times the size of Israel, and secured strategic approaches to Israel from the Suez Canal to the mountains of Syria. Gen. Moshe Dayan, Israel's defense minister (a dramatic figure with a black eye-patch) overnight was a familiar world figure—the master of lightning war.

In the same brief period, an Egyptian general handed an engraved calling card to his captors, and complained bitterly that his new luggage and transistor radio had been lost in the Sinai debacle.

Behind emergence of new personalities and stories of daring and heroism is a massive power transformation, with Israel suddenly becoming the strongest military force in the Middle East. Israel's armed forces confounded the world. They destroyed the aggressive potential of the Arabs. The only unfinished aspects of the war are political, and the fighting is confined to the United Nations.

The armed conflict came and went so fast that it has the hazy, distant character of battles recorded in the Old Testament.

For years to come, however, students of warfare will study Israel's extraordinary six-day campaign against the combined Arab armies. Military men will scrutinize the success of the Israeli armed forces on four fronts—in the Sinai peninsula, on the Syrian border, in the Jerusalem sector and at Sharm el Sheik overlooking the Strait of Tiran.

The precise time the war began is a matter of dispute between the Israelis and Arabs. President Gamal Abdel Nasser of the United Arab Republic charges that the Israelis struck on the morning of Monday, June 5, with the aid of British and American aircraft (a baseless charge which has been positively denied by the U.S. and U.K. governments).

The Israeli position is that June opened with an Egyptian armored division of 200 tanks concentrated against the Israeli city of Eilat at the southern tip of the Negev Desert.

On June 2, according to the Israeli Foreign Ministry, the Egyptian front commander in the Sinai, Gen. Abdul Mohsen Mortaga, published an order of the day calling on his troops to wage a war of destruction against Israel. Thus on the morning of June 5, according to the Israelis, forces engaged Israeli air and land forces, bombarding border villages on the southern frontier. The Israelis also charge that shortly after noon on the same day the Syrians bombed Israeli territory and directed artillery fire at farming settlements.

The operations of the Israeli armed forces were carried out with surgical efficiency. Military observers have remarked on both the audacious generalship of the Israelis and the exceptional discipline and dash of a true people's army. Patrick O'Donovan, a discerning British writer who covered the blitzkrieg in the Middle East, has said of this six-day conflict: "Perhaps not since the defeat of the Armada has there been this sort of absolute, symbolic and fecund victory."

The key Israeli military leaders involved in the victory include Gen. Moshe Dayan, Minister of Defense; Maj. Gen. Itzhak, Rabin, Chief of Staff; Maj. Gen. Haim Barley, Deputy Chief of Staff, Brig. Gen. Mordecai Hod, Air Force Chief of Staff, and four tank task force commanders, Brig. Gens. Yeshayah Gavish, Avraham Joffe, Arieh Sharon and Israel Tal.

On the U.A.R. side, the commanders were Field Marshal Abdel Hakim Amer, Gen. Sidky Mahmud of the Air Force, Adm. Soleiman Ezzat of the Navy, and Gen. Mortaga of the Army.

In a triple-pronged attack, representing brilliant contingency planning, the Israeli ground forces drove toward Port Said, Ismailia and Suez City. Another attack was opened simultaneously on the Jordanian front.

Within 48 hours of the start of the war Israeli mobile forces had captured or bypassed U.A.R. strongpoint in the Rafah, El Arish, Abu Agweigila triangle.

On June 7, Gen. Abdul M. Husni, commanding Egyptian forces in the Gaza Strip, surrendered unconditionally in Gaza City after a fierce assault. Thus Israeli armed forces dominated the coastal roads and the railroad across Sinai to the Suez Canal. On the same day, Israeli paratroopers supported by torpedo boats, captured Sharm el Sheik and the Kuwaiti troops sent to defend it.

Within 72 hours, Israeli forces had reached the Suez Canal. In comparison, it took the Israelis five days in 1956 to reach a point 10 miles from the Suez Canal. And in that campaign of 11 years ago, Sharm el Sheik was not seized until the eighth day of the war.

Meanwhile, on the 6th, the main U.A.R. tank force was engaged in northeast Sinai and destroyed within 24 hours. In the armor struggle, the Israelis had 600 tanks against the U.A.R.'s 1,000.

By the fourth day, Israeli troops enveloped the second line of Arab defenses in the Sinai. Far to the north, Israeli units had moved into Jordan June 5 and seized the Old City of Jerusalem on June 6.

Brig. Gen. Gavish, commander of the southern front, reported that his armored and mechanized columns killed between 7,000 and 10,000 Egyptian soldiers and captured 3,000. He also has stated that his forces destroyed between 500 and 600 tanks and captured another 100. The captured and destroyed tanks included Soviet tanks of the T–34, T–54 and Stalin types,

According to Gen. Gavish, the Egyptians had five infantry and two armored divisions deployed east of the Suez Canal when the war began June 5. He also asserted that a large percentage of the U.A.R. troops that had been fighting in Yemen were switched to the Sinai before the war began. Saudi Arabian and Algerian troops, which were to buttress the Egyptians, failed to reach the battlefield before disaster overtook the Arab cause.

While Israelis conducted the most perfectly planned armor assault since German panzer divisions swept through France a generation ago, they were aided by the Egyptian inability to handle the Soviet weaponry. Though tanks are weapons designed to be used in mass and motion, the Egyptians seemed to have no plans for mobile warfare. Egyptian tanks were generally in dug-in positions, which made them vulnerable to aerial attack by the Israelis. Indeed one of the basic truths regarding war in the desert—a truth which the U.A.R. forces ignored is that desert war is a war of mass and movement. Israeli thinking on this point should have been well-known to the Egyptians. Gen. Dayan was on record as saying that in desert terrain "There is no alternative to armor, aircraft, paratroopers and motorized infantry." Indeed the chief Israeli combat vehicle is a half-track, mounting a mortar and machine guns. The Egyptians were unable to maintain unit cohesiveness in making withdrawals. The result was what Gen. Dayan described as "panic flights."

Aside from this, there are the factors of Israeli military planning and national morale. In Israel the army IS the nation. Thus the Israeli victory testifies to the superior efficiency of democratic societies in developing modern armies. In an under-developed country such as Egypt, there is a severe shortage of technological and planning skills. True soldierly spirit, which unites officers and men in a single well-knit combat team, also is lacking.

From the standpoint of military organization, the Israelis were prepared for a rapid assault utilizing close coordination among the various branches of the armed forces. The Israelis, for example, depended on the task force concept in employment of brigades.

In the Israeli army, the brigade is the largest organizational unit. The professionalism of the Israeli armed forces is remarkable inasmuch as the overwhelming majority of servicemen are reservists. The army which scored colossal victories was not in existence a week before June 5. Reservists were at their civilian jobs. A key element in the successful Israeli blitz was Gen. Hod's swift, deadly employment of 400 aircraft.

The military correspondent of the London Sunday Times has given this account of the initial air operation:

"Just before 9 a.m. (on the fifth of June), people who live among the complex of military airfields near Tel Aviv heard the howl of jet engines rising to a crescendo. The fighter-bombers lifted off, rising no higher than 500 feet. The squadrons raced out across the Mediterranean. Within minutes, they were curving in across the flat coastline of the Nile Delta, west of Alexandria."

This first strike was the crippling attack. Other raids were conducted in an easterly direction—against Habbaniyah in Iraq, for instance. Some of the French-built Israeli Mirage and Mystere jets flew eight sorties on June 5. Most of the Egyptian aircraft were caught on the ground at four airfields in the Sinai Peninsula and two air bases between the Suez Canal and Cairo. The Egyptians failed to use the air-defense missiles furnished to them by the Russians. A SAM base was located by Israeli forces between the Mitla Pass in the Sinai and the Suez Canal. Gen. Gavish, whose forces captured missiles at this site, said: "The base was complete and ready for use."

In the first 24 hours of the war, the Israelis won the most complete and sudden victory in the history of aerial conflict. Gen. Hod stated that "we virtually destroyed the Egyptian air force in three hours." He said Arab aircraft losses in the first three days of the war included 145 MIG–21's, 105 MIG–17's, and 27 MIG–19's.

This success ended the threat of Arab air attacks on Israel's major cities. Remnants of the U.A.R. air force remained in action, but fought a hopeless battle. The bulk of the Egyptian airpower had been parked on the ground at El Arish and other jet airfields, and was destroyed.

Jack Scott of the Toronto Star was one of many correspondents who reported "burned skeletons of Soviet-built MIG jets and other Egyptian aircraft caught cold on the tarmac by Israel's marauding jets in the first hours of the war."

Israel's Dasault Mirage and Mystere attack fighters attacked 25 Arab airbases in the first three hours of the air war on June 5. There was 100 per cent commitment of the Israeli air force at zero hour, with no planes held in reserve. Israel lost 40 aircraft in the six-day war, or 10 per cent of its air force. Approximately $500 million worth of Soviet-built aircraft were destroyed in the first three hours of the conflict.

The initial devastating air strikes were followed up by a powerful land strike. Playing an important role in smashing Egyptian defenses were Israeli 155-mm howitzers mounted on tank chassis.

Once the Israeli tanks burst through the outer defenses, the armored and mechanized moved forward on a front about a half-mile wide.

Gen. Tal headed for the southern end of the Gaza Strip. Gen. Sharon struck at the Egyptian stronghold of Abu Agweigila. Gen. Joffe moved his force between them, and encircled the Egyptians facing Gen. Tal.

After seizing El Arish, Gen. Tal's units moved west toward the Suez Canal. Gen. Joffe's brigades aimed at the Mitla Pass, a key strategic point on the Sinai Peninsula.

"The Mitla Pass," Gen. Joffe explained later, "is about 14 miles long, and whoever commands the opening to the pass is actually in command of all access to the canal from the Central Sinai."

By the night of June 7, the Mitla Pass was in Israeli hands. To the north, a fierce battle raged at Bir Gifgafa, another strategic point in the Sinai. Approximately 1,000 tanks were involved in this engagement. The Israeli triumphed here, and by 1 a.m. June 9 Gen. Tal's forces were on the east bank of the canal opposite Ismalia.

While the principal war zone was in the Sinai Peninsula, the six-day war also involved major operations against Jordan and Syria. As soon as the war began in earnest, Jordan commenced an artillery bombardment on the eastern front. Artillery shells fired by the Jordanians fell in central Tel Aviv and Jerusalem.

Within 36 hours of the start of the war, however, Israeli troops had overrun Jordan's Arab Legion and moved on Bethlehem. Filling out the Jordanian pocket on the west bank of the Jordan River, Israeli troops captured Hebron, Nablus and Jericho.

The capture of the Old City was very much an infantry operation, however. According to Col. Mordecai Gichon, one of the commanders in the fighting, Israeli infantrymen assaulted the heights of the Old City—in an effort to prevent damage to its shrines—rather than permitting artillery to do the job. "That cost blood and sweat, not to touch the holy places," he insisted. "We didn't shoot with heavy stuff into the city."

The strategic aim behind the Israeli push on the Jordanian front was threefold: 1) to relieve the threat to Jerusalem, the seat of government; 2) to prevent cutting of the vital Jerusalem-Tel Aviv highway, and 3) to protect the narrow waist of Israel, which at its narrowest point is less than 10 miles wide. With the capture of Old Jerusalem, the threat of a slicing in two of Israel was eliminated. This enabled the Israelis to shift their attention to the Syrian front.

According to documents released by the Secretary General of the United Nations, heavy firing broke out at 3:55 a.m. on June 6 along almost the entire length of the Israel-Syrian Armistice Demarcation Line. Artillery, tanks, aircraft and napalm were employed. The U.N. Control Center at Tiberius, on the Israeli side of the border, reported that at 5:52 a.m., Syrian armed forces launched an infantry attack from Tel Azaziyat towards Israeli territory. The Syrians began with a general shelling of farming settlements. This is an area where the Syrian-held mountains tower over the Israeli kibbutz.

On the 9th, the Israelis began to force their way up the steep escarpment on the eastern bank of the Jordan River in a drive for the high Syrian plateau.

Jay Bushinsky, a Canadian journalist, observed this attack.

"I watched the battle get under way," he wrote for The Toronto Star "from a vantage point high above the lyre-shaped Sea of Galilee. Artillery duels were pumping up columns of black and white smoke that hovered incongruously over Capernaum, at the sea's northwest shore. I watched the delta-winged Israeli aircraft roar in and drop their payloads over artillery emplacements that had been bombarding Israeli settlements below throughout the morning and afternoon. Not a single Syrian or Iraqi plane challenged the Israeli Mysteres."

Michael Lerner of The Washington Post was with the Israeli troops on their drive into Syria. He wrote:

"One could look down the hills at the position that the Israelis had come from in the fertile valley. There were no permanent defenses, no dug-in gun emplacements there. At the top of the hills stood a formidable stationary defense line. Mile upon mile of barbed wire ran across the fields. There were carefully reinforced stone trenches and pillboxes that withstood even direct bombing hits.

"Russian T–54 tanks still stood in their bulldozed emplacements. Two more stood scorched as their drivers had tried to flee toward Damascus. It was not until five miles from the border that I saw the first Syrian vehicle that had not been reduced to a twisted steel frame. The melange of traffic streaming in to Syria is incredible: Russian trucks captured at one Syrian border point, American trucks given in aid agreements, dozens of civilian buses carrying infantry, and a stream of private vehicles which the more fortunate soldiers took to war with them. Many of the trucks carry inscriptions: 'To Damascus from Israel via The Dayan Express!'"

This reference to "express" was highly accurate, for the Israeli forces sped into hitherto ominous Syria. The Israeli strike in Syria was three-pronged, with forces moving eastward from the vicinity of the Lebanese border, from approximately a mid-point on the Israeli-Syrian border, and from the southern end of the Sea of Galilee.

This, in short, is the story of the six day war in the Middle East. It was triumph of a well-trained, well-led army capable of quick mobilization and rapid maneuver. It took a tremendous toll of Arab forces by deep-thrusting attacks.

By rejecting a defensive strategy, Israel denied the Arab forces the time they needed to "shake down" and organize their combined armies. The Israelis relied on the quick knock-out, and won.

An American Answers Stokely Carmichael

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 13, 1967

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, while Stokely Carmichael rants and raves across the country spewing forth racism and inciting riots and bloodshed, thousands of Americans are fighting—and far too many thousands dying—in Vietnam. A greater loss of life than the total killed in the American Revolution, the War of 1812, the Mexican War and the Spanish-American War combined.

Yet, Carmichael is given banner headlines in many of our Nation's press, on radio and TV by newsmen and commentators, who for some reason have created racism to sensationalism and now overplay disloyal tactics and utterances.

What do Negro-American servicemen in Vietnam think of Carmichael's activities? These same journalists, who sell newspapers by overplaying Carmichael, have little place in their newspaper columns or on their newcasts for this vital story.

Mr. Speaker, an interesting and thought-provoking article on this subject appeared in a recent edition of the Chicago Tribune. I insert it following my remarks:

VIET VET RAPS HATE GROUPS—BLAMES DEATHS ON ANTIWAR SPEECHES

(By Rod Gibson)

Lawson Burford, a 24-year-old Negro corpsman recovering in the naval hospital at Great Lakes from bullet wounds in both legs, said yesterday he believes Stokely Carmichael and his followers are indirectly to blame for many American casualties in Viet Nam.

"The Viet Cong use these riots and anti-war speeches as propaganda," Burford said. "It does not affect the Americans fighting there, but it sure makes the Cong keep fighting and confuses the Vietnamese."

Burford served in a combined action command [C.A.C.] unit in the Vietnamese village of Cau Hai. Here he delivered four babies, treated the civilians for wounds and diseases, and went on patrols with the rest of the unit.

SHOT IN BOTH LEGS

Burford, a corpsman from Webster Grove, Mo., said he cannot join Carmichael's hate campaign against whites. He saved too many of them from dying and in turn was saved by 22-year-old southern white marine corporal from his unit who sacrificed his life to save Burford's.

Burford had been shot in both legs during a night ambush of his patrol. The marine corporal left his position of safety to drag the wounded corpsman off an exposed road.

When a grenade landed nearby, the marine protected Burford with his body, suffering wounds to his back. He started to drag Burford away when the second grenade landed. Again the marine took more shrapnel in the back. He was setting up a machine gun when the third grenade explosion mortally wounded him.

"Doc, I'm hit. Can you reach me?"

Burford tried to help, but his useless legs prevented him from crawling the 15 feet which separated him from the white marine.

TREATED AS TRAITORS

The young marine called for his mother, and then there was silence. Tears ran down Burford's checks as a flare outlined the body of the dead marine. The dead man's hand still extended toward the corpsman.

"Negroes and whites must realize that the most important thing is to save this country when it is in trouble," Burford said. "That comes first. If the Communist ever take over, there won't be any marches or demonstrations for Negroes, peaceful or otherwise. Men like Carmichael would be jailed for the traitors they are.

"I lived with the Vietnamese and learned to like and respect them. They are a wonderful people. There are Vietnamese civilians killed by American fire, but it always is accidental. What does Carmichael have to say about American troops who are killed accidentally from their own artillery and planes? Wherever there is war, there will be tragic accidents.

"As for the Vietnamese babies, I treated many of them who had been tortured by the Viet Cong. Some were beyond treatment, such as the 4-month old baby in our village. The Viet Cong held a pistol to its head and shot it to convince the family it is more advantageous to become Cong. These are not accidents. And this is why this war must be fought."

"There are things that have to be done in this country for the Negro. And this requires a responsible Negro leader. But Stokely Carmichael is not that man. He never listens, just keeps talking hate and violence.

He checked the dressing on his wound, was silent for a moment, then leaned back and sighed. "I have wanted to debate Carmichael publicly and this is probably the best chance that I will have. Most of the Negroes I have talked to in Viet Nam feel the same way about him. It always seems that the fool like Carmichael gets the most publicity. The rest of us are too busy fighting wars, making a living for ourselves, or caring for our families."

Liberty and Freedom—Sermon by Dr. Malcolm Matheson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDWARD W. BROOKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 13, 1967

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an eloquent, thoughtful, and timely sermon entitled "Liberty and Freedom," preached by Dr. Malcolm Matheson, of the Chestnut Street Congregational Church, Worcester, Mass., on July 2, 1967.

There being no objection, the sermon was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LIBERTY AND FREEDOM

(Sermon by Dr. Malcolm Matheson, Chestnut Street Congregational Church, Worcester, Mass., July 2, 1967)

"If you continue in my word, you are truly my Disciple, and you *will* know the Truth, and *the Truth will make* you free!"—John 8: 31–32.

"The Lord is the Spirit, and where the Spirit of the Lord is—there is—there is Freedom."—Corinthians 2: 3–17.

The words of Jesus concerning truth and freedom seemingly went unchallenged. He was speaking to a rather sophisticated group of Jews who had some faith in Him. The Jews believed they were free and so they were to some degree, even while under the yoke of Rome. Russia longs to liberate the American people from the shackles of the "Capitalists". We can think of many countries which were "liberated" by the Soviet Union—Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, etc. When we speak of "freedom" and "liberty" we instinctively think of political independence.

We have been taught that the "Founding Fathers" established Liberty here for all—and for all time. But we know that we must continually defend our freedom all the time from enemies within and enemies without. Jesus spoke about another freedom; a freedom born of knowing God in Christ.—"If you continue in My word, then you will know the Truth, and the Truth shall make you free." In the context there is no such thing as being free by heritage. Every person must make the choice whether or not he really wants to know Jesus Christ and upon that decision rests the second part of the proposition—"You shall know the Truth and the Truth shall make you free."

An example might be found in that of cigarette smoking. I think everyone in this country knows *the truth* about cigarette smoking. But just this week the report was released that percentage-wise, cigarette smoking has increased. The constant advertising is paying off. Alcoholism is our number-three top disease in this country today. *One* in every *13* who indulge in alcoholic beverages is doomed to become an alcoholic! Think of that. We know the Truth about alcohol; but structures of our Society are doing everything possible to make it a nation of alcoholics—and they are suceeding at an alarming rate. During this past week I attended the General Synod of the United Church of Christ held in Cincinnati. There was no mention of the dangers of cigarette smoking *or* of alcoholism, or of gambling. We were too busy with other things.

We, who *claim to be free*, are very often slaves—prisoners of forces, influences, passions and desires which each of us knows only too well. And yet in our more sober moments, we know that these keep us from being our real, true selves. In other words, we are *not* truly free from outside influences and therefore we cannot be the persons God intended us to be! But, hear this—"If you *continue* in my word, you *shall* know the Truth and Truth shall make you free!"

People must *choose* to be free before freedom can be a reality. Somehow, as a nation, we don't understand this. Political and economic freedom are contingent upon spiritual freedom. *Every* person, simply because he or she is a person, has the God-given right to be free! Slavery, in any form, is an insult to God and humanity! For me, this is true religiously as well as politically!

Freedom can never mean "the right to do as we please". Freedom involves *choices*. Right choices involve study and hard work. Freedom involves responsibility. 'Obedience to Law is Liberty or Freedom." But this involves, making, testing, reviewing and getting proper laws enacted (also getting obsolete laws off the book!). This is no simple task. Freedom is always jeopardized when it involves unnecessary injury to others.

The great drama enacted out in each of us, which is the never-ending plot of the novelist and playwright, is this: Man longs to be free, yet plunges into one slavery after another! Inner and outer conflicts. The genius of Jesus, for me, was His ability to see and understand the "human dilemma". Jesus gave the answer. There can be no *real* freedom unless and until men and women and young people voluntarily accept the Lordship of God over all of life. We will be slaves of something or someone—no matter! Jesus calls us to be God's slave, but we are assured that if we become God's person, we shall then indeed be free to be authentic persons. God is our Maker. Then if He is our Master—no other power can enslave us!

Arnold Toynbee, in his "Study of History", lists *19* great civilizations that have collapsed. *16* of these died as a result of internal weakness such as idleness, drunkenness, physical infirmities etc. *Only 3* of the 19 were conquered by enemies without! The rapid increase of divorce—the belittling of the sanctity of the home—higher and higher taxes, while the public money was wasted—a mad craze for pleasure which became increasingly exciting and brutal—gigantic armaments for war, while the nation decayed internally—the decline of religion, with faith becoming mere form—all of this brought about the fall of a great nation—Rome, according to Edward Gibbons, written nearly two centuries ago. In many ways, this may be a picture of 1967 America!

July 4, 1967, Independence Day, can be a milestone in our National Life and in your personal life—if we stop to remember that *real* Freedom and Liberty! God in Christ offers to enter our hearts and our wills and be our personal liberator. This is what the Bible means for me where we read that *Christ came to set the captives free*. All people are in one bondage or another until they, each one, voluntarily accepts God as the most important Reality of Life itself!—becoming God-centered!

What about your life? Do you know Liberty and complete Freedom in your life? To consciously invite God to rule your life is to live a Godly life each moment of your life. "If you continue in my word, you are my Disciple. You will know the Truth and the Truth shall make you free." (Jesus' words) Saint Paul tells us, "Where the Spirit of the Lord is, *there* is Freedom".

What about you! Have you been liberated by your choice of becoming a servant of God?

Meeting the Threat of Superstrikes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. E. (BILL) BROCK
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 13, 1967

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, an article by Mr. David L. Benetar, appearing in the July 11 edition of the Wall Street Journal describes the growing menace of industrywide bargaining in labor-management disputes. The disruptive effect which widespread application of coalition bargaining could have on our economy poses a serious problem. It is our responsibility as legislators to act on it before it becomes insoluble.

To this end I recently introduced H.R. 10530, a bill which would fractionalize massive labor disputes such as the recently threatened rail strike, facilitate rapid, equitable settlement, and protect the interests of the general public.

The facts enumerated in Mr. Benetar's article are further proof of the need for such legislation in this field. Under unanimous consent I include it in the Appendix to the Record:

New Labor Ploy: The Superstrike

(By David L. Benetar)

(Note.—Mr. Benetar, a partner in the New York law firm of Nordlinger, Riegelman, Benetar & Charney, is active in the practice of labor law.)

The forces of organized labor are embarked on two campaigns that seem destined to collide: One is determined to resist the mounting pressure for strike curbs and compulsory arbitration, and the other is simultaneously pushing on to bigger and more crippling strikes by way of coalition bargaining.

The legality of coalition bargaining as it has been practiced and developed is being tested now in the courts and before the National Labor Relations Board. But its economic significance to the future of labor-management relations, its aims and probable consequences are already clear.

Coalition bargaining is the latest step the unions are taking toward increasing economic power. In recent bargaining with General Electric Co. and Westinghouse Electric Corp., this meant an alliance of international unions that—directly or through locals—represented various employes in separate bargaining units. This way, the employer was confronted with the massed power of the union group.

Common bargaining goals were adopted by the allied unions after joint conferences and a pledge of unity. The conference, the pledge and all succeeding joint meetings and pronouncements were given maximum publicity by the unions so as to keep the affected employes, the employers and the public at large aware of the economic strength being built up. The entire venture was conducted under the aegis of the AFL–CIO and its president, George Meany.

ULTIMATE GOAL

Before the coalition got under way officially, its ultimate goal was described by Walter Reuther. Speaking as the author of the concept to a November 1965 AFL–CIO convention, Mr. Reuther saw this goal as being "to force companies to negotiate major economic items on a national level." Once the coalition was formed, the president of the International Union of Electrical Workers—the union representing the largest number of GE and Westinghouse employes in the coalition—while denying the existence of any formal agreement not to make separate settlements, defined the alliance as one wherein the unions must "think together, plan together and act together." Thus while individual autonomy was claimed in form, the essence of the alliance was, of course, group action.

The unions' asserted justification for this kind of alliance is their desire to offset central labor relations planning by an employer who deals separately with several unions but maintains a common policy as to all. The plain effect of it, however, is to blur or even obliterate the separate bargaining unit lines established for the most part by the NLRB at the request of the very unions now seeking to eliminate them.

In fact, in many instances the unions now joined in coalition were rivals in the election proceedings that established the units. And each rival was at great pains to convince the employes in those units that it, rather than any other union, could best represent them.

With coalition bargaining, the role of the rank-and-file union member in deciding his own destiny within his own union seems headed for minimization, if not extinction. Moreover, it was the unions themselves, in their organizational stage, that were responsible for the segmentation of business enterprise into separate bargaining units. This process is still going on over the vigorous protest of management in such fields as department stores and insurance companies. Their traditionally large, and in some instances multi-location, units have been fragmented at the unions' behest.

What does all this portend? The future expansion of the plan and concept of coalition bargaining has been authoritatively predicted in a United Auto Workers administrative letter of last April 20 which states that plans are afoot in more than 70 multiplant corporations.

The measure of coalition bargaining's success is the unity it commands. This means both tighter control of union bargaining policy from the top of each participating union and, more subtly, a transfer of autonomous power by each union to the group. Thus the leadership role given to the president of the AFL–CIO seems to be not merely symbolic of multi-union group action but prophetic of it as well.

STRIKING TOGETHER

The coalition movement is not confined to common planning; it is also dedicated to common action. When the UAW describes the bargaining at GE in 1966 as a "fruitful experience which combined the power of 11 unions," it is talking in polite terms of a strike threat by 11 unions. And an assistant to the president of the IUE noted in a speech entitled "A Victory for Coordinated Bargaining" that "thus was created a unanimous determination by the membership of 11 unions to stand firm. If no acceptable agreement was reached by Oct. 2, chainwide strikes would shut down 90% of the GE plants."

This kind of talk awakens echoes of the on-going confrontation between 10 unions in New York City and the publishers of the dwindling total of the city's newspapers. It is an all-for-one-and-one-for-all approach, massing strike power and building toward emergency disputes of national import.

It would appear difficult, at the very least, for labor to justify this new massing of strike power that coalition bargaining represents and its unprecedented trend to oneness and bigness while at the same time fending off legislative curbs on major strikes. The public and Congress might not readily accept as convincing any explanation that seeks to reconcile the drive of the unions for segmentation of a business enterprise during organizing campaigns with a sharp reversal of direction when organizing is completed and the time for bargaining arrives.

In short, will the public and Congress accept the unions' asserted need for central planning as an excuse for a buildup of central strike power that will overrun the dividing lines between bargaining units and between unions and weld a new aggregate of economic power to threaten more, and more crippling, strikes?

This question will emerge with increasing clarity in the weeks and months ahead as Congress ponders strike-curbing measures. And it will demand answers that aren't self-contradictory.

Geneva Tariff Negotiations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 13, 1967

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an article entitled "New Tariff Cuts Pose Dangers," written by Henry J. Taylor and published in the State newspaper, Columbia, S.C., on July 6, 1967.

Mr. Taylor is a knowledgeable and well-informed writer. He raises some basic and serious questions concerning the economic impact of the agreements reached in the Kennedy round of tariff negotiations, which have recently been completed. I share Mr. Taylor's concern, and I commend his observations to the study of all Members of Congress.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

New Tariff Cuts Pose Dangers—United States Should Relate Imports to Domestic Needs

(By Henry J. Taylor)

Congress should take a careful look at the touted new reductions in tariffs.

General Motors built its first 25 million cars across a period of 32 years. It built its next 25 million within 14. This has typified the thrust in our automotive industry—but no longer.

The output has remained largely static for the past decade.

The period's great increase in our use of automobiles has been mostly lost by Washington's out-of-date import policy, which is today just plain stupid.

Foreign sellers have already surpassed our country by making more than half the world's output. While our own automotive industry—this great belwether—languished last year and laid off countless workers, imports soared to a record 650,000 units.

Our auto manufacturers expect to build only 7.7 million cars in their U.S. plants in 1967, fewer than 10 years ago. But foreign workers will deliver here an estimated 700,000 another, new all-time high. As one result, dealers in U.S.-built cars have declined nine times in the past 10 years. The only exception was 1963.

Says Japan's Nissan Automobile Company's export manager, Kaijii Uno: "There is much room for our sales expansion in America."

Yet, except for Canada, we cannot sell our cars abroad in a single major country, including Japan, without leaping a prohibitive tariff barrier and in some we face an absolute shutout through a quota.

Industrialists abroad seem to feel that turnabout is foul play, protesting even the increased Common Market auto imports into Italy; Fiat chief Vittorio Valetta has complained: "When eating at someone's table you should be very careful to take only your own portion."

Straight across the board foreign sellers here are already on the biggest bender since the sack of Constantinople.

Our imports of steel have reversed our fine $600 million export balance of 10 years ago. Steel imports now exceed our exports by about $600 million annually. The steel industry slump is just a question of who makes the steel—American or foreign suppliers. So is the slump in the aluminum industry.

It takes a ton of coal to make a ton of steel, and 10 tons of coal to make a ton of aluminum. Consider the effect of our coal miners.

Meanwhile, Washington allowed a high-record billion pounds of foreign meat to come in last year. This intensified foreign meat invasion is obviously indistinguishable from a 30 per cent drop in U.S. range prices since 1963. And all this while Washington spends our taxpayers' money hand over fist to bolster meat prices to salvage the disaster of our ranges. Imports are also wrecking our sheep and wool industries and even mink-ranching as well.

Our 1966 textile imports exceeded our exports by $902 million. Is it any wonder that unemployment is increasing in our slumping textile industry? And how about the American cotton farmer who depends on the textile output?

The Agriculture Department recently reported that U.S. 1968 imports of cotton textiles represented 1.03 million bales of raw cotton. This is three times the bales represented in our cotton textile exports. The annual drain on our balance of payments by imported steel and textiles alone exceeds $1.5 billion annually. Is it any wonder we have a gold crisis?

Foreign machine-tool imports have nearly doubled in the past five years to an all-time high while our own machine-tool industry is in a dreadful slump. Its 1967 first-quarter orders fell 37 per cent below last year. Order cancellations rose 43 per cent—three times the year-earlier rate. And the railway equipment industry's backlog of new orders has fallen $1.2 billion in the past 12 months—a sickening 80 per cent.

Doesn't charity begin at home?

Our supine bureaucrats seem afraid to enforce our antidumping laws. As a result, foreign producers dump here surplus steel, aluminum, textiles, glass, chemicals, wire, shoes, automobiles, electrical goods and whatnot produced by labor so cheap that the American worker couldn't possibly live on what the foreign workers are paid.

Free trade is the right goal. Certainly, America must buy from the world to sell to the world. But every country in the world relates its imports to its domestic needs. So should we.

The Subsidized Rioters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 13, 1967

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial which appeared in the July 7 edition of the Peoria Journal Star sheds some badly needed light on the "whys" of the latest teenage fad, the summer riot. In the course of his remarks, the author argues that society itself, with its abhorrence of police protection and belief in uncontrolled child development, is only paving the way for further outbreaks of violence.

The editorial follows:

THE SUBSIDIZED RIOTERS

After hearing all the sage and self-serving explanations and excuses for Negro explosions of violence, we come face to face with the Lake Geneva type riot which has also become an annual affair.

There are similar annual affairs of the same nature in Florida, California, and New England—not to mention sometimes virtually unreported campus riots which consist of little more than the youth having sport with the police.

In any case, the new American custom is annual summer rioting which takes little account of the color of the skin of the rioters.

The only difference between Negro youth and white youth seems to be that whites prefer to go to somebody else's town for the riot, whereas the Negroes do theirs at home.

Why?

One begins to suspect that the biggest single reason is simply that those involved are either too young or too dumb to realize the possible long-term consequences; they are bored; they regard the activity as a kind of sport and a particularly attractive one in which they can make their own rules while the police have to be sporting about it; and if you "lose" and they grab you what can they really do to you, anyway?

This "so what?" attitude has repeatedly been displayed by youth arrested in the course of vandalism, or a game of "cowboys and Indians" played with police who are supposed to use great restraint and not hurt anybody.

It has been expressed flat out, also, by "test wise" youths who are described as backward, drop-out, retarded and stupid, as well as smart-aleck college kids. We know of more than one example of the kid who is supposed to be stupid, but who is smart enough to grin and tell you, "Until I'm 16, I can do anything and the police can't lay a hand on me. I can get away with murder."

Ninety per cent of crime is juvenile, we are told now.

Why?

Well, for one thing, we've adopted the abstract theory that "deterrence doesn't work" . . . and we've been proving that without it we have a permissive atmosphere which escalates juvenile misbehavior in multiples on multiples.

This phenomenon is uniquely American, and there is another aspect that really tells us what they think of our philosophic approach.

Both the "rebels" against "adult society" and the "rebels" against "white society" constantly demand that the society they mark as "enemy" should subsidize their revolt.

The subsidized rebel, expressing his dependent independence and his "pay my way" individualism is a real phenomenon, indeed!

Who is kidding whom?

One thing sure, we aren't kidding the youngsters. We're only kidding ourselves.

U.N. Troops From United States for Africa?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 13, 1967

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, a news report appeared in the Washington, D.C., Evening Star of June 21, indicating that during the northeast Africa crisis, our American boys, at an estimated taxpayers' expense of $20 million, were ordered to stand by as "quick reaction" forces ostensibly to prevent any infringement on national sovereignty by either Arab or Zionist.

Mothers and dads are entitled to ask under what authority their boys were placed on the alert for interference in another war on foreign soil, and upon whose orders would they have been thrown into combat, that is, the President's, or the Secretariat General of the U.N.? Who in our country are so determined to have American blood spilled in Africa?

Since our announced foreign policy was "neutral," except to protect territorial integrity from aggression, on which side were American boys to have fought? Egypt was and still is occupied, but our troops were not committed. Had Israel been invaded, would our boys have been "needed"? Or was there no act of aggression by either side? Weird national policy?

Or was the intended sinking of the U.S.S. *Liberty* to have served as the catalyst to justify U.S. involvement? Combined attack effort by sea and air—seldom under single command—calls for a staff command decision.

I insert the news release following my remarks:

WAR EXERCISE BY 70,000 IS CANCELED

The Pentagon has called off Exercise Kitty Hawk, a large-scale training exercise for the quick reaction forces that would have been used—if they had been needed—in the Middle East crisis.

The Defense Department announced the cancellation of the operation, which would have cost more than $20 million yesterday afternoon in an effort to cut spending.

About 70,000 members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps and two major National Guard units would have been involved in the 8-day exercise, which was scheduled to start Aug. 22 and cover a 5.8-million-acre area on the coast of North Carolina.

During the war in Vietnam, the Pentagon has cut its spending on training exercises from more than $100 million a year to about $25 million.

The announcement of the cancellation of Kitty Hawk said alternate plans for the training of the National Guard and Reserve units involved were under study, but it didn't say what they were. No mention was made of any substitute training plans for the active duty forces—including elements of the 82nd and 101st Airborne Divisions—that would have been involved in the exercise.

"Mrs. B" and the American Dream

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 13, 1967

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, along with millions of other Americans, I continue to believe in "the American dream," the dream that no matter how humble his or her beginnings, each and every American has the opportunity to succeed in his or her endeavors beyond one's wildest expectations.

Mr. Speaker, there is no other person in my district who more clearly illustrates that the American dream, continues to be true today than does Mrs. Rose Blumkin, affectionately known by her many friends as "Mrs. B." Her success story is so inspirational that I would like it to be included in the Record at this point. This was a feature article appearing in the Omaha World Herald on July 9.

The article follows:

Blumkin Business Phenomenon Began at Age 6

(By Robert McMorris)

The year was 1951. There was a war on. Business—particularly the furniture business—was slow. For Mrs. Rose Blumkin, founder and head of the Nebraska Furniture Mart, it was a time of crisis.

"I owed money," she said. "I wrote all the companies: 'When business picks up, I'll pay you.' One day Wade Martin, the banker, came into the store. He said I looked unhappy. For that I had a reason, I said. I told him, 'I've got lots of merchandise, but I can't eat it.' Right away he loaned me 50 thousand dollars for 90 days."

That night, Mrs. B., as she is widely known, couldn't sleep. She had never borrowed money from a bank before. What if business didn't get any better?

Next day Mrs. B. tackled the problem with characteristic imagination and decisiveness. She rented the old City Auditorium and turned it into a gala furniture bazaar.

In three days she sold 250 thousand dollars worth of furniture. She liquidated her debts, including the bank note. "I've never owed anybody a penny since," she said.

Mrs. Blumkin's self-initiated business boom, in the face of a general economic "bottoming out," was quickly the talk of the industry.

EARLY START

Local competitors, however, had long since come to expect such enterprise from Rose Blumkin, a diminutive (4 feet, 10 inches) mother of four and grandmother of 12 whose merchandising know-how has made her a legendary success in a field rarely, if ever, tackled by a woman.

News of Mrs. B.'s achievements would have excited little surprise among those who knew her in her hometown in Russia. There, in a small village in the province of Minsk, little Rose Gorelick was recognized as a phenomenon, nothing less than a business prodigy.

Daughter of a rabbi, Rose knew her father as a kindly scholar and teacher and "a genius in books." But he was an impractical man who had no special knack for supporting his family. His wife supplemented the family income by operating a small grocery store.

As she watched her mother bake bread and iron clothes far into the night after the store closed, Rose would say: "I can't wait 'til I grow up. I can't stand to see you work so hard."

At the age of 6, Rose began working in the store. At 13, feeling she had fulfilled her apprenticeship in retailing, she got a job in the dry goods department of a local general store. Overnight she learned everything there was to know about the merchandise. She proved to be a whiz at selling. The management recognized her special gifts and installed her as head of the department. It was an incredible appointment. A slip of a girl was expected to pass on the work of six grown men, all of whom were married. Some had children older than the department head.

But Rose assured her mother: "Don't worry about the men. They mind me."

LOVE

At 16, Rose went to a more responsible job in another store in a larger city. It was the first time she had seen a train.

There she met and married a young man named Isidor Blumkin. They planned to begin a new life in America.

America had been in Rose's dreams since the age of 9 when she learned for the first time that there were people in the world who did not like Jews. Cossacks, she recalled, came into her town and "chopped the Jews into little pieces—especially the pregnant women." Some Jews fled into the woods. Others successfully defended themselves.

"I hated the Cossacks," said Mrs. B. "I didn't want to live in Russia anymore."

BOTTLE OF VODKA

Her husband went to America in 1914, settling in Fort Dodge, Ia. But it wasn't until 1917 that Rose had a chance to follow. She started her journey, coincidentally, on the day that Rasputin was killed.

"I had no passport," she said. "At the China-Russia frontier a soldier was standing guard with a rifle. I said to him: 'I am on my way to buy leather for the Army. When I come back I'll bring you a big bottle of vodka.' I suppose he's still there waiting for his vodka."

Mrs. B. booked passage on a freighter, "a peanut boat" that made several stops on the way to America. After six weeks it docked at Seattle.

Mrs. B. had no entry permit. But immigration officials in those days were not as bureaucratic as those of today. "If you were healthy, you got in," she said. "And healthy I was." She had two hundred rubles (66 dollars) in her purse.

LANGUAGE BARRIER

At Fort Dodge, where Isidor Blumkin had established himself as a junk dealer, Mrs. B. found the natives to be "wonderful, wonderful people. They gave me pots and pans and they taught me to cook." (Years later, when a customer at the Omaha store remarked that he was from Fort Dodge, Ia., Mrs. B. immediately gave him a check for five hundred dollars for the Fort Dodge community fund.)

The language problem, however, was a formidable one for Mrs. B. She knew only a few words of English. One day a neighbor came over and announced, "My father is dying."

"I didn't know what she meant," Mrs. B. said. "I just smiled real big and said, 'That's all right.' When I found out about her father, I was very unhappy and ashamed. This was too much. I knew I had to go somewhere that was bigger so I could communicate."

SOMEPLACE BIGGER

The "someplace bigger" turned out to be Omaha, in 1919. Mr. Blumkin opened a second-hand men's clothing store at 1211 Douglas Street (later, 1311 Douglas).

Meanwhile, Mrs. B. continued her Fort Dodge practice of avoiding any unnecessary expense, such as a "motion picture show or a bottle of pop." She was piling penny on penny for her relatives still in Russia. In 1922 she and two brothers paid for the passage to America of their parents, one brother, four sisters and a cousin.

Mrs. B. was also busy rearing children. "I learned English from them after they started to school," she said. "They come home and say, 'Mamma, you love this country so much and you always say how lucky you are to be here, then why don't you learn the language?' And I'd say, 'Okay, okay, teach me.' So they did. And I learned."

THE $5 WARDROBE

The depression was a difficult time for Isidor Blumkin's store. At one critical period, when stock and bills were piling up, Mrs. B. resolved to do something about it.

Flashing an inventive kind of merchandising know-how that was later to become a trademark, she printed 10 thousand circulars offering to dress "any man from head to toe for five dollars." The fiver would buy a suit of clothes, hat, shoes, socks, shirt, tie and underwear.

The next day the Blunkins took in eight hundred dollars. That was a lot of money in those days. It paid a lot of bills.

THE MART

In 1937, with a capital investment of five hundred dollars, Mrs. Blumkin opened her own business—a furniture store—in a 30-by-100-foot room at 1312 Farnam Street. It was called the Nebraska Furniture Mart.

Rose Blumkin wanted to get into the furniture business because "it's a happiness business. When people buy furniture, it's a happy time. They're just married. Or they're older people who are redoing their house and they're all excited about it."

Getting a start in the furniture business was no simple matter, however. Name-brand manufacturers, protecting old-line customers, declined to sell to Mrs. B.

Refusing to be thwarted, she found a Chicago dealer who agreed to let her have three thousand dollars worth of merchandise on credit.

With the help of a low markup, Mrs. B. quickly sold the stock and was back for more.

She also managed, in a variety of ways, to get brandname merchandise. Example: A representative of Mrs. B. went to Chicago and bought a big supply of carpeting, explaining that he needed it to "carpet a new apartment house in Sioux City."

Sioux City's loss was Omaha's gain.

BOOTLEGGER? YOU BETCHA

"I wasn't always well liked by some people" Mrs. B. said. "One time a competitor said to me, 'You're nothing but a bootlegger.' And I said, 'You betcha. I'm the best bootlegger in town.' "

Once, in a civil case, Mrs. B. was accused of selling carpeting at too low a price. She told the judge: "Why should I charge a higher price? I'm making a fortune as it is."

The case was dismissed. Next day the judge came around and bought 14 hundred dollars worth of carpeting for his own home.

SIGN OF THE TIMES

In 1945, Mrs. Blumkin moved her store to 2205 Farnam Street. It has since expanded in all available directions until it now covers 120 thousand square feet. It employs 250 persons, including Mrs. B.'s son, Louie, who is president, and two sons-in-law, Norman Batt and Jerome I. Cohn. (Another son-in-law, Charles Schneider, heads a manufacturing company in Council Bluffs).

There is also a large warehouse near Seventy-seventh and Dodge Streets, as well as "the farm" of more than two hundred acres on West Dodge Road. One of the farm's principal improvements is an expensive stone ranch house at 12200 West Dodge.

Mrs. B., who bought the property several years ago from Fred Lippold, lived at the house for two years but now prefers a town house that's closer to the store.

For a long time a sign, "Miracle Hill Shops," has stood near the highway on the front lawn of the West Dodge house, signifying Mrs. B.'s plans to erect a large shopping center on ground to the east of that point some day.

LIKE SHE IS

What kind of a woman is Rose Blumkin? Widowed since 1951, Mrs. B. describes herself as a very simple woman who loves her adopted country and is devoted to her children and grandchildren. She has few social contacts outside the family.

But (dark eyes flashing) she admits that she gets a big kick out of running the store. It's stimulating. It's exhilarating to compete and win.

The chairman of the board can't remember when she's had a vacation. She gets to the store every day at 7 a.m., including Sunday (clean-up day). She puts in 14-hour days Mondays and Thursdays.

Yet she will insist that she's "tired of the business" and tired of competing. Maybe, she says, it's about time she "took a trip around the world."

Most of her associates will believe it when they see it.

Need for Riot Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 13, 1967

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, a recent editorial in the Washington, D.C., Evening Star points to the need for adequate legislation to deal effectively with people who are bent on destroying domestic tranquility in general, and private property in particular. The editorial is a significant one in that it illustrates that the "riot disease" is simply not restricted to the life of the ghetto, but extends farther into the very character of irresponsible living in every class.

The editorial follows:

RIOTERS AND PUNISHMENT

One of the more interesting questions in connection with this country's epidemic of riots is what happens to the rioters after they have been arrested for smashing windows, looting stores, stoning the police and so on. The news reports tell of scores of arrests. But, with one exception, there is little or nothing about what punishment, if any, follows the arrests.

The most recent, and in our view the most inexcusable kind of rioting, plagued the community of Lake Geneva, Wisconsin, for three nights over the past weekend. These hoodlums were white—college and high school boys and girls who "tore hell out of the place" Monday night. They did not come from the big-city ghettos. They were not "underprivileged." They were not frustrated by poverty or lack of jobs. They were loaded with beer and booze, determined to wreck the joint, and they did a rather thorough job of it.

This particular binge ended when Wisconsin's Governor Knowles called in a detachment of the National Guard to help the overpowered local police put down the rioting. Hundreds of the rioters were hemmed in by the guardsmen and police, and hauled off in trucks to the National Guard armory in a nearby town. One observer said that these hoodlums, when trapped, obeyed orders without a word of protest. They all looked frightened, said the observer, and one girl was crying. What a pity!

What will the Wisconsin authorities do to these town-wreckers? Probably not much of anything. Perhaps a trifling fine for a few of them, a verbal slap on the wrist for the others. And next year it will be the same thing all over again.

There are, of course, those who say that punishment, meaningful punishment, is not the answer to rioting whether it occurs in a resort center or in a ghetto.

As a small item of proof in rebuttal of this view we offer a recent news report (the exception) on the happenings in Berkeley in 1964.

There, a no-nonsense municipal judge has slapped substantial jail sentences on Mario Savio and Bettina Aptheker Kurszweil, who were torch bearers in the sit-ins and whatnot on the University of California campus. This same judge has imposed sentences on more than 400 of the 576 youths and students arrested during that non-educational uproar. The judge, of course, acted after the Supreme Court had refused to review the convictions of those who tried to turn the campus into a battleground. But the significant fact is that things have been quiet in recent months at Berkeley. And we think it is possible, more than possible, that punishment is the answer. At least, it should be worth a try in Lake Geneva, Buffalo, Cincinnati, Cleveland, Atlanta, or wherever citizens disrupt domestic tranquility.

Tribute to the SBA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES A. BURKE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 12, 1967

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I think it is indeed interesting to note that by the time our Nation's independence had been won, we had recorded what was probably the first small business loan by the Federal Government. The loan was granted to that noted horseman, Paul Revere, who obtained a $10,000 loan from the U.S. Government to build a mill that would supply copper sheathing for American ships.

Mr. Revere, also a noted Boston silversmith, sought the aid of his Government in helping him to supply a growing demand and thereby make a contribution to the economic growth of the colony of Massachusetts and the newly formed Union of States.

Paul Revere was exemplary of a new breed of American businessmen. This new breed of American was always ready for new ideas, for innovation, for a never-ending effort to learn more, to do more, to dream more. The striving epitomized the growing Nation. It still does today.

Much of the progress in the newly founded Nation came about because the Founding Fathers, and the people who followed their sage, if often stern leadership, were never content merely to maintain the status quo, to play it safe, to rest on their laurels.

It is that same drive and determination on the part of today's small businessmen, just as it was in the time of Paul Revere, which has helped to make our Nation's economy strong and prosperous.

Mr. Speaker, it is wise, I think, that our Government continues to realize the important role which our nearly 5 million small businessmen play in the Nation's growth and prosperity.

As many of my colleagues are aware, the Government continues to aid the small businessman with financial assistance and sound management advice through the Small Business Administration.

To encourage the growth of new small business, the Small Business Administration has in the past 3 years granted 830 loans, totaling over $131 million, to local development companies. These loans have resulted in the creation of 28,800 new jobs, and added nearly $1.2 billion to our economy. During the last 3 years there has been a net increase of 200,000 in the number of small business establishments in our Nation.

SBA has the responsibility of assisting small firms. It not only provides financing when they are unable to obtain loans from other sources, but it also helps them sell their products or services to the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to call my colleague's attention to the assistance SBA provided to Milton Machine Corp., of East Weymouth, in the 11th Congressional District of Massachusetts, which I have had the honor to represent since 1958.

I am especially pleased to take note of this firm because of the important work it is doing in the manufacture of components for misiles for our Armed Forces. The great bulk of sales volume of the firm represents high-priority classified work for the Government. Two Government inspectors are assigned to duty at the plant. The labor force consists of highly skilled machinists with a few apprentices drawn from a local technical school.

The work which Milton Machine Corp. is doing is vital to our national defense and to the strength of our Armed Forces in the field.

The firm was established in 1958 by two brothers, Richard and John Travers. Both of these men are dedicated to the principles of sound business practices and they closely oversee the work which goes on in their plant to insure the highest quality workmanship possible.

In 1965, the Milton Machine Corp. needed a $75,000 loan for expansion of the plant. The Boston regional SBA office approved this loan in participation with the Quincy Trust Co. Mr. Chester Weeden, president of Quincy Trust Co., signed for his bank to participate on a 10-percent basis.

This loan has helped Milton Machine Corp. to expand its facilities and hire additional employees so necessary to growth of the firm. The management of this small firm is appreciative of the aid given by SBA and realizes the importance of the loan to the company's growth.

To show the dramatic economic progress which this firm has made since the loan of $75,000 in 1965, I would like to note that in 1964, prior to the loan, the company's sales were about $150,000 and in 1966, after the loan, the firm's sales increased to an alltime high of $700,000.

These figures tell the story. The SBA loan has meant much to this small firm and I think that a recent letter from Mr. Frank Caliri, executive vice president of the firm, to the SBA office in Boston explains the situation much better than I can.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to insert Mr. Caliri's letter at this point in the RECORD:

MILTON MACHINE CORP.,
East Weymouth, Mass., April 27, 1967.

Mr. LAWRENCE GRADY,
Small Business Administration, John F. Kennedy Federal Building, Government Center, Boston, Mass.

DEAR LARRY: I am sure that you will be pleased to learn that we recently received a contract from Redstone for the Rocket Motors that became such a controversial matter over the past several months. They increased the quantity by approximately 50%, to $95,000, which makes the effort you and I put into it quite worthwhile.

I want to thank you sincerely for all the time and guidance you afforded me, without which I doubt that I could have successfully pursued this effort.

As you know, we recently moved into larger quarters in Weymouth, Massachusetts. We naturally are very pleased that business conditions permitted us to make this move.

We have a great deal to be thankful for when we consider the fact that sales have jumped from approximately $150,000 in 1964, when I started with the company, to $700,000 in 1966 and which we expect to exceed by about 25% this year.

It seems like only yesterday when I came into your office looking for some financial assistance, which you arranged for us and without which we more than likely could not have processed our first significant prime contract with the Government.

Our current backlog is in excess of ½ million and I am presently negotiating a contract with N.O.P., Louisville, for more than $250,000 which should be resolved within two weeks. You may remember when I first talked to you in early 1964, that the company's backlog was $5,000 and they were planning to close up.

The company's future now, thanks to several of the Small Business Administration group and especially to you, seems quite secure.

I wish I could say more than "Thanks", and I hope to see you at our new plant soon.

Very truly yours,

FRANK A. CALIRI,
General Sales Manager.

Mr. Speaker, the Johnson administration deserves much credit for successes such as that experienced by Milton Machine Corp. The President is a strong supporter of the Small Business Administration as part of his program of promoting "creative federalism."

By working together, business and Government gain great advantages. In his state of the Union message, President Johnson said:

> Federal energy is essential but it is not enough. Only a total working partnership among Federal, State, and local governments can succeed.

The President includes in this "working partnership," the Nation's businessmen. He has said that the Nation faces "a tremendous job of reorganization of systematic management, calling upon all of our public and private resources at all levels of our national life."

It is President Johnson's type of "working partnership" which has resulted in 3,311 SBA loans amounting to $159,525,000 being approved in the State of Massachusetts since SBA's inception in 1953.

President Johnson has stated:

> The closer we can work together, the sooner, the better, and the more economically we can get the job done.

By giving Milton Machine Corp. assistance at a critical time in its development, SBA started this firm on its way to becoming a large, successful enterprise accomplishing vital projects for the Defense Department.

Under Administrator Bernard L. Boutin, the Small Business Administration has adhered to its mission of keeping the "seedbed of the American economy" vigorously growing and seeing to it that small firms have a chance to grow and prosper.

Johnson-Kosygin Summit Talks Have Positive Impact

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN C. CULVER
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 13, 1967

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, adequate communication between the United States and the Soviet Union is one of the most critical factors in world peace and international security, and the summit conference which recently took place at Glassboro, N.J., between President Johnson and Premier Kosygin was therefore of vital importance, to both Nations and to the entire world.

Although the final evaluation of that meeting must await the test of time, very practical and tangible results have emerged, as carefully articulated by the Christian Science Monitor in an editorial of June 27:

> Even though no hard-and-fast agreements resulted—

Said the Monitor—

> something important—and, we hope, lasting—was accomplished. For the second time during this month of crisis . . . the leaders of the world's two superpowers spoke to each other to reduce tension and explain their views.
>
> Those who believe that much can eventually be achieved through closer contacts, through the use of every opportunity to overcome misunderstanding, through face-to-face conversations, have a right to feel heartened as they look back on the two remarkable meetings at Glassboro.

I concur with that assessment, and insert in the RECORD the full text of the editorial from the Monitor:

THE KOSYGIN TALKS

Those who expected any tangible, hold-in-the-hand results—let alone miracles—from the Johnson-Kosygin meetings were bound to be disappointed. The present disagreements between America and Russia are too deep, the outlook on world problems too dissimilar, the degree of prestige committed to different policies is too great for there to be any sharp change in the situation.

But those who believe that much can eventually be achieved through closer contacts, through the use of every opportunity to overcome misunderstanding, through face-to-face conversations, have a right to feel heartened as they look back on the two remarkable meetings at Glassboro. Even though no hard-and-fast agreements resulted, something important—and, we hope, lasting—was accomplished. For the second time during this month of crisis (the first was in the use of the White House-Kremlin "hot line") the leaders of the world's two superpowers spoke to each other to reduce tension and explain their views.

President Johnson is happily right when he says that, as a result of Glassboro, the world situation is a little less dangerous.

It is true that, in his remarkable press conference at the United Nations, Soviet Premier Alexei Kosygin reiterated what may be termed Moscow's "hard" line. Although he uttered no threats (and this bears underlining), he showed little sign of accommodation on either the Middle East or Vietnam. On both he repeated stands which appear to be unrealistically harsh. He demanded that Israel withdraw behind its pre-June 5 lines before talks on any other aspect of the Middle Eastern situation take place. He said that America must withdraw from Vietnam. Finally, he made it clear that he has no wish for President Johnson to visit the Soviet Union at this time. While a main reason for this may be because Russia fears the President might receive a tumultuous welcome (which under present circumstances would be diplomatically embarrassing to Moscow), Premier Kosygin's brusque answer to this question showed how deep the Moscow-Washington chill still is.

Yet, it must never be forgotten that Premier Kosygin and the Soviet regime are hard-headed and realistic. Their public statements may appear unyielding, but they are well aware of hard facts. Moscow knows its Arab protégés, and consequently its own Middle Eastern policy have suffered a severe setback. And Moscow, which is quick to seize any favorable opportunity for advance, knows that setbacks must be followed by some degree of accommodation.

But this accommodation cannot be such as to "rub in" unduly the Soviet embarrassment over the Middle East, nor should it be such as to play straight into the hands of Moscow's Chinese enemies. Thus Washington must also be accommodating.

In the end, the most important single subject on the world's diplomatic blackboard remains American-Soviet relations. On these relations, more than on any other single circumstance, hangs world peace. In fostering better relations the Holly Bush meetings were at the least a modest success. For this three billion human beings can be grateful.

The U.S. Constitution Versus Vietnam and State Department Bureaucracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. RARICK
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 13, 1967

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, since the armistice ending World War II, the United States has waged two major undeclared wars, Korea and Vietnam. We are now applying economic sanctions against anti-Communist Rhodesia and, whether we admit it or not, are seriously entangled in the Near Eastern crisis in Africa.

In Korea, the situation is one of suspended hostilities under an armistice; in Vietnam our military forces are denied the right to win the war with a decisive victory which would minimize loss of life and treasure.

In the Near East, our vessel the U.S.S. *Liberty* was unmercifully attacked with substantial loss of life.

At Panama, blackmailed by the threat of mob assault, we have been engaged in diplomtic negotiations that plan to lower Old Glory and surrender U.S. sovereignty over the Canal Zone territory to Panama to further endanger the lives of every American citizen in the United States.

Fortunately, we have leaders of clear vision and ability, and with knowledge of the Constitution, such as Lt. Gen. P. A. del Valle, U.S. Marine Corps, retired, president, Defenders of the American Constitution, Ormond Beach, Fla. In an editorial in the May 1967 issue of Task Force, General del Valle discusses in realistic manner constitutional questions confronting the American people.

In order that General del Valle's editorial may have wider circulation, I include it as part of my remarks, as follows:

THE AMERICAN CONSTITUTION VERSUS VIETNAM AND OTHERS

(By Gen. P. A. del Valle, U.S. Marine Corps, retired, president, Defenders of the American Constitution)

Article I, Section 8, Paragraph 9 of the American Constitution gives to the Congress, unequivocally and exclusively, the power to declare war. Congress has not declared war in Viet Nam, yet our sons are fighting and dying in that war.

A "rubber stamp" Congressional resolution upholding the Executive in his war-making in Viet Nam is just another violation of the Constitution, for there is no provision in that basic law for the transfer of powers from one federal agency to another. This destroys the system of checks and balances of our form of government (which is a Republic) and tends to place in the hands of one man the power to become a dictator instead of a President.

Once we are in such war, declared or undeclared, the point at issue becomes one step removed from the clear point of law we here set forth. The issue, then, at least among those of us who still have the temerity to call ourselves patriots, becomes "Our Country, may she always be right, but our Country, right or wrong."

The departure from the Constitution brings on two vital issues:

1. The presidential declaration that we are fighting, not to win, but to bring the enemy to the conference table.

As those who lost their kinfolk in the undeclared Korean War may remember, this is the same evil smelling kettle of fish that brought the enemy to the conference table in Korea. As far as one can determine, there is no peace, but only an armistice in Korea. The conference is still in being, and our men are still there, and we suffer casualties from enemy breaches of the armistice. But even worse, it constituted a defeat for the United States. This defeat was brought on by orders from Washington. The military were forbidden to strike targets beyond the Yalu River where it was known the Red Chinese were building up their power for a strike against our forces. Similar orders give the enemy sanctuary in Hanoi and Haiphong, where abundant arms sent by Soviet Russia, come in with impunity through the latter and are installed about Hanoi as well as distributed to the enemy in the field. Every honest military leader will tell you (but is not permitted to publish) that all we need to do to win the Viet Nam War quickly and with honor and victory, is to attack and put out of action these two places. We have abundant power with which to do this, even without use of our nuclear weapons. In Japan we struck cities after dropping leaflets and otherwise warning the civil population to get out. Without using the atom bomb we destroyed, not only their cities, but their will to fight. We did the same in Germany. What, then, is stopping us from cutting short the loss of our finest manhood by doing this in Viet Nam?

2. The second vital issue, is the unusual behavior of our Executive and Senate in the matter of treaties which give the enemy, whose weapons are killing our men, abundant aid and comfort. These are three glaring examples:

a. The Consular Treaty, passed by the Senate and signed by the President. This gives Soviet Russia consulates in this country on terms not previously given to any other powers who maintain them in the USA. This treaty gives immunity from arrest and punishment to all the personnel of these new style consulates. Since a high ranking Soviet intelligence officer who defected tells us that Russian consulates are manned 100% by intelligence personnel, it seems odd indeed that we have facilitated their spying by this extraordinary accommodation, especially when the Russian Premier is forever boasting that the USSR is furnishing the weapons that kill our sons.

b. The "oh-so-secret" East-West Trade Pact, which we have not been permitted to see or know about, but which is under congressional consideration and very much "in the works". This can be nothing else but a complete surrender of our controls on strategic materials being sold to Communist countries. There is more in this than meets the eye, or those in charge would not be so secretive. It would seem that the American People are not being allowed to know just what is being done to them.

c. The Panama surrender treaties, urged by the Executive, which under the guns of Castro, will surrender to Panama, the sovereign territory of the United States in the Canal Zone, bag and baggage, with the Canal being thrown in for good measure.

We see in these three outrageous measures two very serious constitutional crimes:

1. The Constitution defines treason in Article III, Section 3, Paragraph 1 as consisting only in "making war against them, (the United States) or in adhering to their enemies, giving them aid and comfort."

We must then decide whether these treaties must be attributed to suicidal imbecility or to cowardly treason. We know as well, that the Panama Treaties are un-constitutional, for there exists no place in the Constitution where any agency of government is given the power to surrender our sovereignty.

2. Since our national government fought a United Nations War in Korea, even under the United Nations flag; and is fighting a United Nations War in Viet Nam, under Articles 25 and 54 of the United Nations Charter, we must decide whether Washington's peculiar behavior is or is not evidence that our sovereignty has passed from Washington to New York; from our duly elected servants in government to the conglomeration of non-descript United Nations. If such is the case, we can judge the continuing policy of our last four presidents as un-American and made, not by the United States Government, but by the United Nations.

If our readers will pursue their search for proof of this we will draw their attention away from Viet Nam and Korea and focus upon Rhodesia and South Africa. This is important, because, unless we are alert and quick to act, we shall find our sons fighting and dying in another United Nations War in those two friendly White countries of Africa. It must be borne in mind that there are some fifty so-called nations, members of the United Nations, with a total population only a fraction of that of the United States, each of which has one vote in the General Assembly of the United Nations, a total of fifty against our one! The United Nations Participation Act, passed by the Congress in 1945 and Article 41 of the United Nations Charter are now given by the State Department, in answer to a question by Congressman Younger of California as the authority of the President to issue his recent Executive Order applying sanctions against trade with Rhodesia. And this Executive Order contains teeth. American citizens, who never had a chance to vote about this, are threatened with prison for violation of this Executive Order.

This preliminary to another undeclared war, based upon a United Nations declaration that Rhodesia was imperilling world peace because they allegedly discriminate against the blacks, should convince the most skeptical, and even the most adoring protagonists of the United Nations, of two very grave dangers. One, that this proves beyond reasonable doubt that our government in Washington has become merely a transmission agency for orders by the United Nations; and two, that the whims of a collection of nations, mostly African and black or tan and un-Christian can cause our beloved sons and other kin to fight and die in un-declared wars anywhere in the world. They out-vote us fifty to one, although not elected, but appointed, and some are representing peoples not yet "emerged" from cannibalism. And the resolution upon which our President has acted is obviously untrue, and a provocation and aggression against White, Christian friendly nations which only ask to be let alone and have done nothing whatsoever to disturb the peace of the world.

This being the case, and we have abundant proof of what we have written, there is but one conclusion we can reach: Our government in Washington, having publicly discarded the American Constitution for the United Nations Charter, can no longer be considered the lawful government of the United States. For it is only the American Constitution which grants them their lawful powers. It is merely a de facto government ruling by force without de jure authority. The actions of this lawless government: surrender of sovereignty, unilateral disarmament, undeclared wars, foreign aid to and trade with our enemies, accommodation of our enemies by aiding Mao in China and Castro in Cuba, aid and comfort to the USSR, socialistic legislation, persecution of patriots, integration, the right to lie to the public, the management of the news—all of these and many another un-constitutional act proclaim loudly the disturbing truth of the matter.

What we have left, because of an absconding leadership are fifty sovereign states, not a United States, for it was the Constitution that united the states originally—and now the Constitution is being ignored. You will ask: What can we do about it?

In 1776 the patriots asked the same question. The Founding Fathers, risking "lives, fortunes and sacred honor", wrote and signed the Declaration of Independence. In paragraph two of that document you will find the answer.

However, there seems nothing wrong with our form of government, which is based on the Constitution, but only with the servants we now have operating it. We have an easier problem than the Founders, for they had to write the Constitution and get it adopted, while we still have our Constitution. (Even if our internal enemies can only use the 5th Amendment of it.) We can toss out the servants who violated their oath to uphold and defend the Constitution, restore constitutional government by electing public servants who will adhere to this oath, and our fifty states will again become a United States of America, one nation under God. And this we can and must do.

Antiriot Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 13, 1967

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, the ever-increasing number of civil disorders which are obviously being incited by a few professionals makes prompt enactment of this antirioting legislation a must.

The mechanics of the bill would simply give local law enforcement authorities an additional and badly needed weapon in coping with these professionals who travel from area to area only to cause civil disturbances, riots, and violence. Their actions are a mockery to the due process and legal foundations upon which the rights of all are based. Anarchy of this type cannot be permitted in a civilized nation.

Salute to the Ladies Auxiliary of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Post 2323, Granada Hills, Calif.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. CORMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 13, 1967

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Ladies Auxiliary of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Post 2323, has made its mark in the community of Granada Hills and the San Fernando Valley, Calif., as an outstanding, dedicated, and devoted women's service organization.

The ladies auxiliary, instituted on March 25, 1955, has consistently proved its loyalty to the veterans whose name the organization bears. Its motto—"To Keep Faith With Our Dead by Serving the Living"—has been repeatedly proven through service not only to living veterans, but to wives, widows, and orphans needing care and attention.

Auxiliary activities include work in the Sepulveda, Calif., Veterans' Hospital, cancer aid and research, civil defense, VFW National Home Assistance, youth activities, USO, and a dedication to the values of community service and rehabilitation.

The ladies auxiliary has raised funds for these worthy causes through annual Buddy Poppy sales during the Memorial Day holiday, auxiliary dinners, dances, fashion shows and other regular functions scheduled throughout the years.

In every way possible the women of the auxiliary have surpassed the pledge laid down in their constitution:

> The objects of this organization shall be fraternal, patriotic, historical and educational; to assist the Post and members thereof of the VFW and its own members whenever possible; to maintain true allegiance to the Government of the United States of America.

The loyalty of the auxiliary ladies to these objectives has won them a number of awards for community service and a recognition from all levels of Government. On a recent occasion, I had the honor to present the auxiliary with a flag that had been flown over the Capitol of the United States. This was a singular pleasure and privilege.

Under the leadership of Fern Flanagan, the auxiliary's president for this past year, the organization has completed a year of exceptional service to the community, the city of Los Angeles and the State of California.

Mrs. Flanagan has recently inaugurated an historical, educational, and patriotic program for the community, by requesting photographs of living wives of the Presidents of the United States, dedicated to the auxiliary. The post home proudly displays photographs of Mrs. John F. Kennedy, Mrs. Dwight D. Eisenhower, and Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson.

I extend to the officers and members of the Ladies Auxiliary of the VFW Post 2323 my best wishes for continued success.

Lessons To Be Learned From Mideast Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. E. (BILL) BROCK

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 13, 1967

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, the Hamilton County Herald of Hamilton County, Tenn., contained a most illuminating column by Ernestine Lyle on the valuable lessons to be learned from the recent Near East crisis, and the decisive victory of the Israel Armed Forces. The article goes on to contrast this with the Johnson administration's less successful management of our own war effort in Vietnam.

Because of the value of these observations, under unanimous consent I include this article in the Appendix of the RECORD.

AND THE WALLS CAME TUMBLING DOWN

The Israelis have done it! And I guess that will teach us a thing or two about fighting a war. If you've got a war on your hands—the thing to do is get in there and fight with everything you've got.

Surrounded by a wall of hostile Arab nations bent on destroying the tiny nation of Jews gathered to their homeland from all over the world, the Israeli Army, undaunted by superior numbers and armed strength of its adversaries, moved against its enemies with such swift purpose and courage that "the walls came tumbling down."

The action took everyone by surprise, except the Israelis themselves, who, in the tradition of Joshua, planned methodically and knew their strength was not only in their armaments. Today, the ancient city of Jerusalem is again in the hands of the sons of Abraham. And so, also, is Jericho.

The "tumbling walls" sent shock waves far beyond the Middle East. The walls of the Kremlin felt them. The United Nations—that glass Palace on the East River—rattled and shook with the tremor and the clamor that arose for a "cease fire." It was the most real excitement the international debating society had had since Khrushchev a few years back interrupted debate by taking off his shoe and pounding the table with it.

The United States—bless us—had no intention of standing idly by if Israel needed help, although we did want to talk about it for awhile. The fighting is still going on but it looks now as though the "no help needed" sign has been hoisted by Israel. They certainly did not wait for us to stop talking and start acting before moving out on their own. They didn't give us a chance to come to their aid. Not even to declare an undeclared war!

Just think what that did to us. President Johnson did not have an opportunity to designate "sanctuaries" where no bombing could be done. The State Department was deprived of a chance to set up a "pacification program" for dissident pockets of Arabs within and on the borders of Israel. And Secretary of Defense McNamara didn't have time to order a cut-back on arms production, order a restudy of certain types of military aircraft the Generals might have needed for combat. He didn't even have time to get up a batch of new-fangled rifles to send over that fire everywhere except on the front lines.

Even the "doves" hardly got tuned up for a cooing session, although they tried; and the Vietniks didn't have time to change into Israelniks and work up a reasonably presentable demonstration.

So, for the time being at least, we will just have to plod along with the Vietnam War, pacify the peasants, sanctify the sanctuaries, and insure democratic elections in a country where the real meaning of the word is hardly understood.

And none of this, believe me, is funny.

Smithsonian's Out To Land Huge Gold Coin Collection

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 12, 1967

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, the following story from the July 10, 1967, Washington Evening Star, tells how the greatest gold coin collection ever assembled by one person, Mr. Josiah K. Lilly, Jr., of Indianapolis, will, hopefully, soon become a part of America's national treasure.

SMITHSONIAN'S OUT TO LAND HUGE GOLD COIN COLLECTION

(By Herman Schaden)

The Smithsonian Institution is hot on the trail of the greatest gold coin collection ever amassed by one person.

The multimillion-dollar collection is so complete that it would raise the institution's numismatics stature to a peak second to none.

Behind the collection is a story as fantastic as the 6,113-piece hoard itself. It is but one of numerous, almost unrivaled collections which Josiah K. Lilly, the late board chairman of the Eli Lilly & Co. pharmaceutical concern, made in many fields, including stamps, guns, rare books, jewels, naval gadgets, painting and even toy soldiers.

So secretive was the shy Indianapolis tycoon about these hobbies that most of them did not come to light until his death in May 1966.

Now the executors of his estate are faced with the problem of disposing of many of the possessions to satisfy a huge tax bill. Already the stamp collection is being sold at public auction with unprecedented yields. And unless a way is found to save them as a national treasure, the coins will meet the same fate.

Reps. William G. Bray, R-Ind., and Andrew Jacobs, Jr., D-Ind., are preparing legislation which would send the coins to the Smithsonian in return for a tax credit to the Lilly estate equal to 23 percent of the appraised value of the coins.

Indiana's senators, Birch E. Bayh and Vance Hartke, are expected to give the bill a lift, as is Rep. George H. Mahon, D-Tex., chairman of the House Appropriations Committee and a Smithsonian regent.

Legislative action must be deferred, however, until an appraisal of the collection is completed, perhaps sometime next month. Early guesses have placed the worth at from $3.5 to $7 million, though most experts believe the smaller figure closest to reality.

Whatever the market value, professional numismatists are convinced that the collection could never be reassembled and that its dissolution would amount to a tragic loss for the American people.

Among those who feel this way are Paul E. Rawley, vice president of the executor bank, the Merchants National Bank and Trust Company of Indianapolis, and Dr. Vladimir Clain-Stefanelli, head of the Smithsonian's numismatics division.

"It would be sad to see this collection disappear," said Stefanelli.

"The United States section alone consists of 1,227 pieces, complete except for the 1870 San Francisco mint $3 coin of which only one exists.

"Every bit as impressive are the 1,236 Latin-American coins, far superior to other noted collections.

"And the 153 United States pioneer and territorial gold pieces are particularly awe-inspiring to the Smithsonian curator.

"Among them are 41 unique ingots. Compare this with the two ingots we have in the national collection today. Beyond that, the collection starts with earliest Roman and Greek coins and continues through modern times," he said.

"The Lilly coins would make the Smithsonian collection at least the equal of the Hermitage Museum in Leningrad, now regarded as the finest in the world," Stefanelli said. "In some areas, we would be superior."

SHUNNED PUBLIC LIFE

Lilly has been described as an astute businessman who shunned public life and spent every spare moment with his secret hobbies. His advisers, agents and dealers were sworn to secrecy. He would put in as much as 14 hours a day with his vast collections in a private museum described as a kind of blockhouse.

"We knew as long as 10 or 12 years ago that someone was making an incredible collection of gold coins in the United States," Stefanelli said.

"Such activity is recognizable when rare coins disappear from the market and never show up again. But we were never able to learn the name of the big collector."

The first inkling of Lilly's secret life came 11 years ago when he donated a $10 million collection of rare books—first editions, original manuscripts and drafts—to Indiana University.

Stamp collectors were drooling when the full extent of the Lilly activity in that field became known. How carefully Lilly selected stamps as well as coins—he was continuously improving both piece by piece—was revealed when more than $1 million was realized from just the first three of a number of public auctions planned for the 77,000-stamp collection.

When it came to jewels, Lilly was interested enough in diamonds, rubies and sapphires that the estate profited $560,000 from their disposal.

A free-handed philanthropist, Lilly gave extensive land to Purdue University which later was converted into a public park, and his 43-acre estate has become the pride of the Indianapolis Art Association.

In all his genius, there was a something of the boy in Josiah Lilly which prompted him to collect, along with his fabulous coins, stamps, diamonds and painting, little toy soldiers.

He had them back to the Middle Ages, and when he could not find American soldiers on the market, he had them custom made. At the end he had soldiers from 600 different regiments marching all over the place.

Phony War on Crime

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD H. POFF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 13, 1967

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I quote herewith an editorial from the July 12 issue of the Washington Evening Star which reflects a remarkable insight into one of the more obscure but nonetheless real truths of the day:

PHONY WAR ON CRIME

There comes a time when a spade should be called a spade, and there also comes a time when a phony war should be called a phony war. That time has been reached in Lyndon Johnson's much-touted and loudly-heralded "war on crime."

The sweeping—and they are sweeping—regulations just put out by Attorney General Ramsey Clark restricting the use of wiretaps and electronic listening devices are the last straw. The attorney general surely would not have sounded this call for retreat without the approval of the President. So one is driven to the conclusion that the war on crime is a phony war, and that all of the President's high-flown speeches, not to mention the attorney general's rhetorical contributions, have been nothing more than wordy exercises designed to conceal the fact that this administration's heart is not in its so-called war.

The attorney general's new regulations go well beyond the restrictions on wiretaps and bugging imposed two years ago by the President. They forbid law-enforcement practices which the Supreme Court has not yet outlawed. A suspicious soul might think that they are an invitation to the court to go farther than it has up to this time—and this may not be lost upon the "liberal" judicial majority.

Ramsey Clark obviously has a thing about wiretaps and bugging. He thinks they are a waste of manpower. He has testified that they are "abhorrent" devices. He says that all of his experience shows that electronic surveillance (he has had very litle experience in criminal law enforcement) is not necessary for the public safety, is not a desirable or effective investigative technique, and that these abhorrent devices should be used only in the national security field. He has never explained why wiretaps and bugs are essential in national security cases but useless against organized crime. Of course he cannot come up with any rational explanation.

Let's turn to another witness. Frank S. Hogan, New York County district attorney, has been in the front line of the war on crime for 27 years. He told the President's Crime Commission: Electronic surveillance is the single most valuable weapon in law enforcement's fight against organized crime. . . . It has permitted us to undertake major investigations of organized crime. Without it, and I confine myself to top figures in the underworld, my own office could not have convicted Charles "Lucky" Luciano, Jimmy Hines, Louis "Lepke" Buchalter, Jacob "Gurrah" Shapiro, Joseph "Socks" Lanza, George Scalise, Frank Erickson, John "Dio" Dioguardi, and Frank Carbo.

Well, there it is. Take your choice. Frank S. Hogan, who has sent scores of vicious hoodlums to jail, is quite willing to use the "abhorrent" eavesdropping weapon in his war on crime. He thinks it is an essential weapon. Ramsey Clark and Lyndon Johnson are not willing. They would prefer to conduct their war with speeches at twenty paces. And, in consequence, this war is one which organized crime will surely win and which the American people, the ultimate victims, will surely lose.

America and Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 13, 1967

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include two articles on America and freedom, by Miss Denise Marie Evers. The one entitled "From Whence America's Greatness?" was delivered by Miss Evers on January 28, 1967, in the American Legion Oratorical Contest on the Constitution, and I believe that it should be available for reading by the general public. The articles follow:

FROM WHENCE AMERICA'S GREATNESS?

(By Denise Marie Evers)

If I were to ask my fellow Americans at random: "What do you consider the reason for the greatness of this nation of ours?", the answers would be varied. Some would say, "The pioneer spirit of rugged individualism instilled within the soul of America is the reason for our greatness."

Others would say, "America is great because it was founded upon the principles dictated to Moses atop Mount Sinai, several thousand years ago. God has blessed America with freedom, and He watches over us.

Still others would say, "The greatness of America lies in her form of government as outlined in our Constitution."

Perhaps all three answers are correct, but this much we do know. Without our Constitution America could never have survived the test of time—nearly two hundred years during which our nation has experienced Civil War, depressions and foreign wars, as well as prolonged periods of prosperity. It is a fact of history that our present form of government under the Constitution of the United States has lasted longer than any other form of free government devised by man.

Doesn't this prompt you to ask—"Why? What's so great about our Constitution?"

William Gladstone, a distinguished English statesman, said: ". . . the American Constitution is the most powerful work ever struck off at a given time by the brain and purpose of men."

The true greatness of the Constitution lies in the fact that the government derives its just powers from the consent of the governed.

Throughout a study of this magnificent instrument, one finds frequent reference to the fears on the part of our founding fathers that government, if unchained, would eventually enslave men by its very nature. To insure the newly formed Republic against such a fate, the framers of the Constitution established built-in safeguards. These consisted of what is commonly known as our "system of checks and balances," whereby the three departments of government, the Legislative, Executive and Judiciary counterbalance each other so as to keep any one from acquiring too much power.

Our founding fathers were well aware of government's inclination to infringe upon the rights of the individual. So suspicious, in fact, were they, that ratification of our Constitution did not come until after specific guarantees had been written into it in the form of the Bill of Rights.

It is in the first ten amendments that

the basic God-given rights of the people are guaranteed; and, in addition to giving these rights directly to the people, these ten amendments state that Congress shall pass no law infringing on these enumerated rights of the individual, thus limiting again the power of the government.

It is through the sovereignty of the individual and the privileges provided him by the Constitution that our Capitalistic Free Enterprise System has evolved. Under this system, the people of America have the highest living standard in the world, literally characterized by an abundance of food and clothing and other essentials. Although the United States comprises only one fifteenth of the population of the world, it consumes one third of the meat, buys one half of the shoes, and four fifths of the cars. This phenominally high standard of living can be attributed to only one thing: the constitutionally guaranteed right of every American to own property and, if he wishes, to go into business for himself. This, of course, results in competition which in turn, stimulates improvements in both the quantity and quality of consumer goods. The next inevitable results is better wages and a higher standard of living. Few people realize the vast protection, even in the economic field, guaranteed to us by our Constitution.

Or consider opportunity. It has been said that the Constitution is written entirely in the language of opportunity. In this room, today, there are, doubtless, many whose parents or forefathers accepted the challenge to begin life anew amid the political and economic opportunities in this land of the free and home of the brave. George Washington Carver took advantage of the golden opportunity provided by our Constitution. He rose from an obscure childhood as a member of an impoverished Negro family to a place of prominence and glory in American history. Countless others have done the same but they have all had one thing in common: None was afraid of hard work or honest competition; for this is the American way.

Thus far, we have spoken of the greatness of the Constitution and what it does for us. Is it not logical that we, in return, must give something in order to preserve it?

Upon emerging from the convention hall immediately following the signing of the Constitution, Benjamin Franklin was asked by an anxious bystander, "What type of government have you given us?"

Franklin responded, "A Republic, if you can keep it."

Almost without exception other founding fathers expressed similar sentiments. George Washington, the Father of our Nation, ventured that the Republic would collapse because of apathy on the part of the people.

The challenge is apparent. Our freedom has been paid for in blood. In the words of Daniel Webster, "The tree of liberty must be nourished from generation to generation with patriots' blood."

True, many of us may not be called upon to shed our blood in defense of freedom as young Americans do in Viet Nam at this very hour, but, there are things that you and I can do and must do:

We must accept a personal responsibility for the freedoms that our Constitution guarantees to all Americans.

We must become informed of our great heritage of freedom.

We must become active in protecting our inalienable rights.

We must dedicate ourselves to the preservation of those rights for all times. To actively exercise our freedoms.

We must accept willingly jury duty and in doing so protect our right of trial by jury.

We must vote in local, state and national elections.

We must study all aspects of ballot propositions and crucial issues of the day.

We must express constructive criticism of our local, state or federal government if we sincerely and conscientiously disagree with its policies.

We must support the religious, political and social organization of our choice, for in doing so, we strengthen our own religious and political freedom.

We must do all in our power to discourage bigotry and discrimination.

Last, but most important, we must accept a personal responsibility for the freedom of all mankind, for our personal freedoms and the rights of all mankind are inseparable.

Today, we see young American servicemen fighting a war thousands of miles from home. Some may wonder why.

"Why," they ask, "do we Americans have to risk our lives and spend our money defending some little far-off backward country?" Those who ask, I fear, are looking only at the surface appearance of the conflict. They fail to see that behind this comparatively small active aggression on the part of the atheistic communists, lies a larger and more diabolical plan—the plan on their part to enslave the entire world. If we do not stop communism in Southeast Asia, where will we stop it?

I feel that today, in our free society, something ominous is happening. The "something" I speak of is that which our forefathers feared when framing our Constitution—apathy.

J. Edgar Hoover, courageous and eminent director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, in a speech before the Catholic Youth Organization in New York, on November 16, 1963, prescribed the antidote for apathy when he admonished: "Do not hesitate to speak out and bring pressure to bear upon negative influences within your communities. We must never become so accustomed to filth, or so intimidated by the advocates of so-called 'worldly reality' that we fail to revolt against corruption and decay."

Fellow Americans, let me conclude by again reflecting on the words of that great American statesman, Daniel Webster, who so eloquently declared: "God grants liberty only to those who love it, and are always ready to guard and defend it." In reality, he was referring to our Constitution . . . . And I wish to speak for the great responsible segment of American youth in answer to Mr. Webster's admonition. Our answer is the same answer that has echoed down the corridors of history, ever since Nathan Hale with throat bared and head erect, only twenty one years of age, with his parting breath declared: "I only regret that I have but one life to lose for my country." Since then, American youth have fought and died in defense of our Constitution at Verdun, Okinawa, Korea and now Viet Nam. We know that in the words of James Russell Lowell:

> "They are slaves who fear to speak for the fallen and the weak
> They are slaves who fear to choose hatred, scoffing and abuse
> But would rather, in silence shrink from the Truth
> They are slaves who fear to be in the right with two or three."

FREEDOM'S YIELD

(By Denice Evers)

As we look around our world today, we see a life and death struggle between two opposing forces—Communism and Capitalism. Each represents an economic system based on two different foundations. In the Communist system, everything is controlled by the state, the people exist only for the state, as cogs in the giant machine of the state. The Capitalist system, however, represents another picture. The state is the servant of the people—the people enjoy the rights to work for whomever they wish, at what they wish, and where they wish. It is a system of private enterprise and private ownership of property, where a man has the incentive to make a decent living for his family.

With two systems so opposite in nature, we would guess that the economic situations in a Communist and Capitalist country would differ radically. As it turns out, our guess is right.

A classic example is Germany. After the Second World War, the same type of bomb destruction could be seen in East and West. Both sides had a depleted labor force. In both East and West there existed the same political, economic and social chaos. With identical backgrounds, it has been interesting to watch the development of the economic systems of a government of free choice versus a Communist government.

Seventeen years later, with a slave labor force of the entire populace, East Germany ranks tenth among nations in industrial production.

West Germany, on the other hand, during the same period has achieved fantastic economic growth. For example: West Germany generates five times as much electrical power as the East, produces 25 times as many automobiles, six times as much steel, and ten times as many housing units.

The lot of the common worker shows the same type of development. Butter is still rationed in the East as it was during the war. One pound costs the working man two hours of wages. Coffee sells at $8.00 to $10.00 a pound, chocolate $1.20 for three ounces, gasoline $1.40 a gallon. The East German buys these commodities when he can get them, with an average salary of $35.00 a week. His neighbors in West Germany can buy the same commodities at ⅓ the price at an average salary two times higher.

Is the system in the East working? Our newspapers can answer this for us. Robbed of personal freedom, East Germans daily risk their lives in attempts to flee the "Workers Paradise" to reach the West. From these examples it seems that, to the people involved, freedom is sweeter than life itself. Where the personal freedoms and incentive are taken from an individual, the morale, as well as the economic situation of the country is at low ebb. But, where the person is given free choice and the right to own property, and where competition generates research and development, we see an all-around brighter picture.

We Americans have learned this the easy way. Our forefathers fought for a government *by* the people, *for* the people and *of* the people and now, almost two hundred years later, our free enterprise system is still successfully at work. This system can set an example for the entire world. Without freedom of choice, men cannot work to capacity, and robbed of freedom, men will die to gain it.

Keeping Protests in Perspective

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 13, 1967

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, in recent months protest American style has become a run-of-the-mill way of life for various discontented minority groups within our Nation. And, more often than not, these beatniks, peaceniks, Vietnicks, and all of the other niks in our society have been reaping the benefits of exaggerated news coverage. The following editorial which appeared in the June 30 edition of the Peoria Journal Star lends some useful advice as to how protests might be kept in the proper perspective:

KEEPING PROTESTS IN PERSPECTIVE

The President was a little upset about news coverage this week. He found a "credibility gap" of his own in the way "news media" has presented some things.

He objected that while all the "cameras" were focused on making national figures out of 12 kooks that staged a sit-in at the Pentagon, 10,000 young Americans were volunteering for service in the armed forces that same day. He objected that the 12 got the "Publicity" and the 10,000 did not.

The President is right . . . and wrong.

The ten thousand volunteer daily, but the 12 "invading" our top military headquarters never happened before in the history of the U.S. In "news" this makes a difference.

The 12 figure was a "compilation" of a single incident at one place. The 10,000 total was a compilation of activities in all 50 states.

However, the President is quite right in that the news of the unusual needs to be seen in perspective to the real basic, everyday reality.

A rigged 12 versus 10,000 doesn't exactly present that perspective but the basic charge is certainly correct.

It could be applied in many ways. While Stokely Carmichael led a march of 300 to 400 Negroes through Roxsbury in a demonstration, more than 50,000 Negroes were fighting in Viet Nam.

But that isn't a fair comparison either.

Let's get it down to a single area performance, instead of this kind of comparison between one area and statistics for the whole U.S.

In Peoria what are the "volunteer" statistics which we can compare to the "Peace demonstrators"? After all, offering yourself in service for three years or more, including for physical combat, is a considerably more significant "demonstration" for one's beliefs than carrying a sign for a few hours, or making a speech . . . or writing an editorial.

(As a curious coincidence, we asked the recruiting officers here for recent enlistment records a week ago, and the reports arrived at our desk the day the President made his comparison!)

The different services have provided us figures in different breakdowns and for different spans of time, but together they show clearly that approximately 1,000 people volunteer each year.

Clearly, more young people are serving their country in the fighting services as volunteers today than have participated in any kind or type of demonstration in the area.

Clearly, more Negro youth are serving as volunteers defending all of us, than have taken part in any and all of the destructive acts that have disturbed many people so much.

The army enlisted 334 volunteers, who passed the necessary physical and mental exams, in the past 12 months.

Last year the Air Force enlisted 237 volunteers, the Navy 177, and the Marines 156.

In the first five months of this year, the Air Force had 155 volunteers here, a third of whom were pilots or other officer training volunteers. In the same time, 62 local volunteers have gone into the Navy, and 84 to the Marines.

About half of the Army volunteers have specified a preference that is in what is definitely a combat arm, although there is sizable enlistment here, as might be expected, for heavy equipment operations (which is hardly non-combat but nat as clearcut as infantry, tanks, etc.) and a good number for clerical specialties (some women). All Army nurse volunteers here without exception expressly asked for Vietnam service.

The 84 Marines in five months shows a jump in volunteers just as the fighting has stepped up in Vietnam, and 90 per cent reportedly expressed a specific desire to serve in Vietnam.

These are not extreme or spectacular figures like the President's, cited, but they do bring a sense of proportion. They do not include the numerous volunteers who fail to pass induction tests, and they do not, of course, include draftees—many of whom present themselves "ahead of schedule" and volunteer immediate service instead of waiting to be called.

Clearly more than 3,000*local youth are serving on a volunteer basis in the armed forces today.

The biggest ruckus seen here in recent years concerned 600 Bradley students (and that wasn't on any national issue) on campus. Compare that to about 4,000 volunteers serving or having completed service out of the same four years of high school graduation "classes" as the Bradley group represented.

Consider our size here. Cut this to the narrow age group involved. Cut that down as a practical matter to the young men, only. Cut that further to those who can pass the physical and mental tests.

Then one can get some sense of proportion out of the number that have "demonstrated" by stepping forward to serve directly in the armed forces. It is impressive.

And one shouldn't forget their absence. During the Civil War, Peoria became somewhat notorious as a "Copperhead" city, where anti-war and anti-Lincoln groups created a lot of fuss for a while.

A big chunk of the non-Copperhead population was gone—busy fighting the war. When they did come home from the Army the political character of the city of Peoria changed completely. It turned all the way around, overwhelmingly, and almost overnight.

The situation is not the same, but our absent thousands in service are a very important part of the "youth community," a very important part of what is "relevant" and of what is "contemporary."

Their physical absence shouldn't cause us to overlook this basic fact.

Union Members Exploited

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 13, 1967

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the American people question the strange behavior of salaried union spokesmen who give lip service advocacy to guaranteed voting rights, freedom of expression, and democracy, yet would deny all civil rights to their dues-paying membership and, in fact, turn their backs to the workmen's wishes and desires, as they announce plans to promote laws not wanted by the laboring man.

Why are union leaders afraid to defend the fears and frustrations of their members in the American tradition that brought them the strength rather than to choke off free expression and tax the members without representation. It is like telling the labor members that they are too stupid to understand what is good for them—that regardless of their wants, the union "big daddy" boss knows what is best and is going to overrule the membership vote and feelings. And should the union man disagree with the programs of the untouchable bosses, he is smeared into silence by name calling.

Consider a few of the plans announced by organized labor to be financed by the unionman's dues and muscled by the weight of his membership.

The fair housing bill—this is unfair housing to the workingman who has sweated and saved to own his personal castle. Any such bill may wipe out his financial investment. We are not dealing in statistics—these are human beings. Why should labor's leaders be afraid to let the members alone to own and dispose of their property as the individual wishes?

The guarantee against discrimination in State juries. But another power grab by the Federal Government to take over control of all courts and law-enforcement officers, thus destroying local control and self government. Is it not the same as telling the union man, "We don't trust you to run your affairs in your own backyard"?

But, if a man can not be trusted in his own town to manage his personal affairs, who are these mental giants in Washington that you are asked to surrender your decisions to? Are they suddenly, because of a big titled name, made saints and free from human error? Kingdoms, serfdom, and colonialism are out of date in a progressive world. What local do these organized planners belong to? Where do they pay their dues, and when do they walk a picket line?

Stronger Federal laws against job discrimination can be a fancy name to cover up denial of seniority, recall, and collective bargaining, and a legal maneuver to invite "Federal spies" into union hiring halls to oversee ratio callouts on the job.

Why special interests law to protect civil riots workers? Is there a special law to protect pickets on a job site? Or scabs? If they are Americans, they are protected so long as their actions are legal. Needed may well be a special law to protect the civil rights of the public from the agitators. Informed Americans know by now that the so-called "civil rights workers" is but a fancy handle for a pack of revolutionaries hard set on denying all civil rights for the majority to carry special preferred benefits for a few.

Such are the announced sought-after goals of the leaders of organized labor.

Small wonder the great majority of workers disagree. They, the workmen, are not being heard. Their voices of leadership are being mobilized against them instead of speaking and working for them. We may soon behold union men picketing labor bosses as being "unfair." Those who start and aid in revolutions are usually those who suffer most in the final victory of the people.

That the planned backlash against the working men had to come at a NAACP convention may cause many to wonder who is calling the signals for the leaders of organized labor. The NAACP, many recall, is that so-called Negro organization that has never trusted a Negro to be its president. The guiding lights of the NAACP, like labor, seem to feel the members are not qualified to decide what is best for them. This same exploitation in past history has often been called "white paternalism." Makes one wonder who is representing whom in the labor program.

I insert the AP release of July 10, 1967, following my remarks:

MEANY TAKES STAND FOR CIVIL RIGHTS, WHITE WORKERS DON'T

WASHINGTON (AP).—AFL–CIO President George Meany reaffirmed Sunday the labor federation's strong support for civil rights legislation, despite a secret poll indicating many white union members disagree.

Meany made no reference to the poll which AFL–CIO officials have kept under lock and key for months.

"The AFL–CIO has a commitment for equality and equal opportunity for all," Meany said in a message to the Boston convention of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

Meany called vital pending civil rights legislation including a national fair-housing law.

The poll of some 3,000 union men reportedly had reflected concern among many white homeowning members about the effect of housing desegregation on property values.

But other sources indicate that labor leaders now do not think such concern among white union members is as strong as painted by the results of the poll.

TEST BACKLASH

The professional polling firm of John F. Kraft of New York made the survey for the AFL–CIO after last year's severe Democratic election losses, aimed in part at finding the extent of racial backlash among white union voters.

Most of the figures gathered in the poll have been kept secret from all but top AFL–CIO officials.

But it was learned the poll showed 16.5 per cent of AFL–CIO members are Negroes, providing union leaders answers to complaints that they are dragging their feet in fighting discrimination in labor's own house.

AFL–CIO sources said the figure shows a favorable comparison with the U.S. Negro population, which amounts to less than 11 per cent of all Americans.

Meany, in his message to the NAACP, urged passage of the fair-housing bill, legislation to guarantee against discrimination on juries, stronger federal enforcement powers against job discrimination and protection of civil rights workers against intimidation and harassment.

MUST COMPLY

"Even more important is the implementation of and compliance with already existing legislation, especially in the areas of employment and education and we—as well as you—are working on these too," Meany said.

"But it becomes increasingly clear that eliminating discrimination is not sufficient for the achievement of equal opportunity. Full employment, better schools, adequate housing, protection of the aged, higher minimum wages, medicare and the benefits of union representation are necessary ingredients for the achievement of equal opportunity," Meany said.

"Too often appeals to prejudice and racism have diverted many of our citizens from voting in their own interests and in the interests of their country and communities," Meany said.

"I am sorry to see that this tendency has crept into the Negro community. It has affected only a small group but it is worrisome nonetheless."

The Diamond Was Found at Home

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT G. STEPHENS, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 13, 1967

Mr. STEPHENS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased and proud to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial by H. Randolph Holder, Radio WGAU, Athens, Ga., on the recent selection of Dr. Fred C. Davison, to succeed retiring University of Georgia president, Dr. O. C. Aderhold. The board of regents began its search for a replacement, and after exhaustive deliberation, the quest fortunately ended at home.

Dr. Davison, who assumed office on July 1, brings an impressive background of scholastic excellence with him as well as proven experience as a good administrative officer.

The editorial follows:

THE DIAMOND WAS FOUND AT HOME

The fanciful tale of the huge Kimberly Diamond Mine strike holds a parallel to the discovery of the new president of The University of Georgia. After an attempt to find diamonds all over the world, it is said, the richest strike in history was made practically in the searcher's own back yard.

The search for the man to succeed retiring University of Georgia President, Dr. O. C. Aderhold, spread to all corners of the nation . . . as faculty, regents and other educational and political leaders tried their best to find a fitting successor, who would be a leader in the educational world, aggressive in seeking excellence, and one with the vision necessary to continue the current successes of the State University in Athens and to expand and develop new, progressive and exploratory ideas. Just as in the story of the diamond strike . . . the search ended at home.

WGAU believes that in Dr. Fred C. Davison, the regents have successfully achieved their goal. They have selected a man of impressive credentials, tremendous enthusiasm and wide experience . . . . a man who has successfully been in business for himself . . . a research scientist of repute . . . an educator of note and a proven administrator.

Dr. Davison at thirty-seven says, "age is no liability in this day," and proves it with his own career record. Upon graduation from The University of Georgia School of Veterinary Medicine in 1952, he practiced until 1958, when at Iowa State University he won a research assistanceship and then directed the project in a new field of atomic research. He also achieved a Ph. D. in pathology and biochemistry. He then became assistant director and later director of the Department of Scientific Activities of the American Veterinarian Association and was named to the National Science Academy and its Professional Educational Committee. He next headed The University of Georgia's School of Veterinary Medicine, and last year joined the State Board of Regents' staff as vice chancellor of the University system.

WGAU congratulates the regents in their selection. We believe that Dr. Fred C. Davison will be a fitting successor to Dr. O. C. Aderhold in the continued development of the University into one of the finest educational institutions in the nation. WGAU joins with the citizens of Athens and Northeast Georgia in welcoming Dr. Davison and his family back to our community . . . and in pledging our full support toward achieving his goals.

It Protects Our Flag

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM C. WAMPLER

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 13, 1967

Mr. WAMPLER. Mr. Speaker, I am sure all Members are well aware of the efforts of my friend and colleague, the Honorable JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN, in spearheading the drive to make desecration of the American flag a Federal crime. JIMMY QUILLEN did not merely approve of this bill; he believed in its necessity. He devoted himself to the task of seeing this bill pass this body, and his efforts were successful. JIMMY QUILLEN, in making himself champion of this bill, also made himself a symbol of patriotism to the Nation. He is indeed deserving of the praise he has received from the people and the press. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to insert in the RECORD two editorials praising JIMMY QUILLEN for this service to his country. These editorials appeared in fine newspapers which serve both his First District of Tennessee and my Ninth District of Virginia, and their words remind all of us of the debt of thanks we owe this colleague.

The editorials follow:

[From the Knoxville Journal, June 26, 1967]

IT PROTECTS OUR FLAG

Rep. James H. Quillen, of the First Congressional District, should not be unduly concerned about the fact that the actual words "Flag burning" were inadvertently omitted from his bill that makes mutilation or desecration of Old Glory a federal crime with a maximum penalty of one year's imprisonment and $1000 fine for anyone convicted under terms of the bill.

The fact is Representative Quillen should feel flattered that his bill has been so carefully scanned for possible defects and omissions. In any event, the wording of the bill as passed by an overwhelming majority of the House—385 to 16—contains wording which would certainly cover burning the Flag as well as offering any other indignity to it.

[From the Bristol Herald Courier, June 25, 1967]

FOR OLD GLORY

The long debated and long delayed bill to make it a federal crime to deface the American flag has passed the House and now awaits Senate action.

It represents "a dream come true" for Tennessee First District Rep. James H. Quillen—and throughout its course through the House, Quillen's influence was a motivating factor.

It was Quillen who overrode objections of House Judiciary Committee chairman Emanuel Celler of New York and made him agree to hold public hearings on the measure.

It was Quillen who was lead-off witness during the hearings and who presented a damning picture of the consequences of flag desecration.

And it was Quillen's name which appeared first on the bill after a final version had been ironed out in the committee and placed in the House hopper.

Again, Quillen prepared exhibits and delivered a stirring address on the measure during House debate.

In essence, the flag bill must be considered Quillen's and, indeed, he called its passage, the happiest day of my career in Congress."

Chances of passage of the bill were never really questionable because few congressmen would risk voting against the measure—one with high-pitched, emotional appeal.

One point of concern to House members—the elimination of the word "burning" from the final version—is probably more academic than anything else.

We feel that if the Senate does not insert the word "burning" in an amendment, it is still adequately covered by the phrase "defacing." The bill also bars mutilating, defiling or trampling upon the American flag and mutilating or defiling, in our book, also includes burning.

Regardless of all the charges that the bill is a political snafu and needless because many states have similar laws, we believe it is a good measure.

It doesn't attempt to legislate patriotism, but rather guarantees that patriotism will now have the due respect of law, just as the rights of dissenters to dissent are protected by law.

The flag is, of course, merely symbolic. But for that symbol, millions of American lives have been lost in gallant attempts to preserve it.

It is only right, then, that there be a law to assure that the symbol will be preserved from those who would treat it with contempt.

Flag burning and defacing has its roots in something we feel much more dangerous than the mere piece of brightly colored cloth.

The fabric of the flag, is, in essence, the national fabric out of which this country has been developed. It is something which, rightfully, should be of national concern—and this law makes it so.

It is not an infringement on states rights but rather a guarantee that these states rights will be strengthened. Now, a potential flag defacer will undoutbedly think twice before breaking a state statute if he realizes a federal law will still punish him.

As Quillen said, "If the American flag is worth dying for, it is worth protecting."

We echo these words and commend Rep. Quillen for a piece of legislation he inspired and untiringly guided through the legislative maze of the House.

It's a strong bill—calling for a 10-year prison term or $10,000 fine—for flag destruction. We hope it will be quickly passed by the Senate.

More "Hip Pocket" Diplomacy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 13, 1967

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, Nikita Khrushchev's jolting interview on nationwide television may have supplied many answers to an awakening America as to just what is taking place in our U.S. foreign policy.

Have the policymakers completely abandoned the constitutional system to the extent that a commitment to send our boys to foreign battlefields no longer requires approval of the Congress? Does a "flexible" foreign policy really boil down to a few top-level phone calls or letters between the new ruling class—with all such "hip pocket" deals kept secret from the people?

If the leadership has dodged the constitutional limitations and fears telling the American people the truth, let us get Khrushchev back on television for some more enlightenment. It seems the Communists know more about what we can and cannot do than we are permitted to know.

This Congress, the news media, State legislatures, and citizens must demand hearings to expose these backdoor secret treaties so we can evaluate what, if any, national sovereignty has not been perverted. This done, the running of our country and all treaties and commitments should be made in the sunlight with full disclosure to all our people. We pay; our boys die. Why should we not know? Asia was too much—we do not need anything to do with Africa.

I insert the July 12 editorial from the Richmond, Va., Times-Dispatch, on the Congo war possibility in the Record:

War Now in the Congo?

Is the United States, already bogged down in a bloody and frustrating war in Southeast Asia, about to begin the process of getting involved in another in the jungles, forests and swamps of equatorial Africa?

President Johnson has dispatched three military transport planes, and 150 supporting personnel, to the Congo to help quell a rebellion there, led by white mercenaries. What possible excuse is there for this reckless action? No American lives are endangered, as far as anybody knows.

True, the President of the United States is understood to have told the president of the Congo that he is determined to avoid any direct U.S. involvement in this fighting. But that, with the best of intentions, was what President Eisenhower said when the first U.S. "advisers" were dispatched to South Vietnam, back in the 1950s. And look at South Vietnam, and those "advisers," today!

Despite all the official pronouncements that it would never happen, despite counsels from the most authoritative sources, that the worst thing that could possibly befall the United States would be to get involved in a land war in Asia, precisely that has occurred—a war whose end nobody can foresee.

And with nearly half a million Americans dragged into this seemingly interminable conflict, we are now playing around the fringes of another in darkest Africa, which could spread to ever wider areas.

We are doing this, God save us, in behalf of an erratic, unpredictable, political chameleon named Joseph Mobutu, who has been on both sides of most of the principal controversies and conflicts that have wrecked the Congo in recent years. Mobutu's gyrations on all sides of nearly every question were outlined in this place last Saturday.

Just wherein a person of his stripe deserves to have the United States risk its future by sending in transport planes and personnel is a mystery as impenetrable as the Congo's vast rain forests. Yet President Johnson has chosen to take that risk, without the consent of Congress, and in the face of loud outcries from some of his own congressional leaders.

In the background of all this is the Congolese politician, Moise Tshombe, under whom the Congo enjoyed its only brief period of reasonable stability in late years. Tshombe was driven out of the country two years ago, and then a few weeks ago was kidnaped when his plane was hijacked, and taken to Algeria. He is in prison there, and the Congo is demanding that he be turned over to its government for execution.

The U.S. State Department has always been violently hostile to Tshombe. Its attitude toward him has been quite similar to that which it manifested toward the late President Diem of South Vietnam. We actually connived at Diem's murder, and Vietnam has not only been in turmoil ever since, but we have been drawn deeper and deeper into the dreadful war there. Both Diem and Tshombe had their serious faults, but they had many points of superiority over those who succeeded them.

And now we are pulling chestnuts out of the fire for the utterly irresponsible and unreliable Mobutu, and apparently furthering his plan to put Tshombe to death—all at the risk of getting ourselves involved in another war in Africa.

Will we never learn?

Kiwanis International Trustee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. WATTS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 13, 1967

Mr. WATTS. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call attention to one of Kentucky's outstanding and dynamic sons—Ted R. Osborn—who has recently been elected for a 2-year term as a Kiwanis International trustee. Mr. Osborn has been a Kiwanian for 13 years, belonging to the Blue Grass Kiwanis Club in Lexington, Ky. At the moment he is both the chairman of the committee on programs for his club and secretary for his district. In the past Mr. Osborn served as president in 1958 for his club; director and chairman of the committee on key clubs. While for his district, he served as lieutenant governor, governor, secretary from August 1964, and chairman of committees on achievement; golden anniversary—2 years; new club building; and past district governors. In the Kiwanis International he was both chairman and member of the committee on attendance and membership.

By profession, Mr. Osborn is a land developer and president of the American Businessmen's Life Insurance Co. His training and education was received at Transylvania College, in Lexington, where he received his A.B. degree.

At the age of 40, Mr. Osborn and his wife, Della, have four children—Zan, 12; Ted, 10; Holly, 5; and Lee Adams, 1. While not only as a busy father, Mr. Osborn is a very active participant in civil affairs.

Throughout the years, he has served both city and State widely. For the city of Lexington he has acted as chairman of the city, county civil defense and chairman of the airport zoning board of appeals. For his State of Kentucky Mr. Osborn has served in dedication two terms in Kentucky Legislature and as vice chairman of the State Commission on higher education. He has also been past president for the Lexington Sub-Dividers Association.

While some may wonder where such time may be found, Mr. Osborn's activities certainly do not stop here. As a member of various other clubs and organizations he has also participated very actively in all of them as well. Such are: President of the Lexington Junior Achievement; member of the national junior achievement board; regional board member of the Boy Scouts; vice president of the YMCA; president of the Community Recreation Association; president of the President's Civic Roundtable; president of the West End Foundation, which is active in the promotion of free school lunches; past county chairman of the United Community Fund; past State chairman of the Easter Seals campaign; past president of the Transylvania College National Alumni Association; past president of Y Men's Club; and past board member of Big Brother's.

There is little need to ask what benefit and service Mr. Osborn can be to the Kiwanis International trustee. It can easily be seen that his sound and stable judgment gathered through many years of work and dedication will be of great avail to anyone's interests that he might serve—and especially to that of the Kiwanis Club. Genial and versatile, Mr. Osborn again will prove his ability as an able organizer and inspiring leader as a member on the international board of trustees.

Antipoverty Support

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN YOUNG

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 13, 1967

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, because the future of the Office of Economic Opportunity is presently being debated in this body, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues an editorial which recently appeared in the Corpus Christi Caller-Times entitled "Antipoverty Support." I wholeheartedly agree with the paper as it states:

> Public support appears to be growing and there is reason to hope that the Office of Economic Opportunity will bring us substantially closer to the goal of eradicating poverty in the United States.

I find of particular interest the editorial's comment on the increasing involvement of the business community. The enlistment of such organizations as the National Association of Manufacturers in the war on poverty is truly indicative of the broad base of support behind OEO.

I commend this excellent editorial to my colleagues and insert it in the RECORD:

> ANTIPOVERTY SUPPORT
>
> There are heartening indications that the War on Poverty has weathered early shoal waters and is now proceeding on course. Though it would be over-optimistic to describe its progress as "full steam ahead," public support appears to be growing and there is reason to hope that the Office of Economic Opportunity will bring us substantially closer to the goal of eradicating poverty in the United States.
>
> Rising public support is reflected by a favorable shift in sentiment in Congress. Even allowing for OEO Director Sargent Shriver's natural enthusiasm, there is evidently much truth in his recent statement that "the critics have become the consenters." Overwhelming Senate approval of a 75-million-dollar OEO supplemental appropriation was a significant straw in the wind.
>
> Shriver calls attention to others—that the major civil rights and religious groups urge pushing ahead with the War on Poverty, that the American Bar Association is backing the national program for legal services to the poor, that the president of the American Medical Association urges expansion of Neighborhood Health Centers financed by the federal government, that congressional opposition (as in the case of the Peace Corps a few years back) was switched to calls for spending more this year on anti-poverty programs.
>
> Business support of the War on Poverty is of particular significance. In this connection, it is interesting that private enterprise will play a major role in three new projects announced by the OEO—in North Carolina, in New York City's Harlem, and in Baltimore. The Baltimore program is a slum regeneration project; in Harlem there will be a concerted effort to expand the district's economic base and upgrade skills and pay of Harlem workers; the statewide North Carolina manpower training program will be carried out with the active cooperation, for the first time, of the National Association of Manufacturers' Center for Independent Action.
>
> All in all, it is fair to say that things are beginning to hum in the nation's War on Poverty.

Dr. Carl Hansen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 13, 1967

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the high priests of local education in this Nation today are the Federal bureaucrats and robed justices who sit amidst the political splendor of their offices and issue edicts to our educators, nosecounters to our classrooms, and bus schedules to our pupils. It is a sorry state of affairs.

It became sorrier when Dr. Carl Hansen resigned as superintendent of schools in the Nation's Capital. Dr. Hansen is a victim of this meddlesome intervention in education.

Dr. Hansen has no peer as an innovator in education, a man of principle in local control of schools, and as a realist in the relations of education and government.

He mastered the school system of Washington, D.C., and set an example of conduct for school superintendents across the Nation in the process. We who respect and honor him are the least of the victims of his departure from this school system. The children will suffer most from the forces of villification and slander who engineered his departure.

I respect Dr. Hansen as a man, as an educator, and for the enemies of his efforts. He is right and they are wrong. Time will verify his excellence. Let it also bring him the recognition and success he deserves. He worked with the best in combating the worst. It is my hope he will continue to do so for the sake of local school systems everywhere.

Congressman James H. Quillen Reports on His 1967 Questionnaire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 13, 1967

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I believe that my colleagues and the readers of the RECORD will find most interesting the results of my 1967 questionnaire, which I recently sent to all boxholders in my district.

Under unanimous consent I insert at this point in the RECORD the report on my questionnaire which was mailed last month to all who responded:

> DEAR FRIENDS: This Report from Washington is devoted to the results of my 1967 Questionnaire.
>
> I received many favorable comments on the IBM type of questionnaire I used this year, and I am real pleased with the results. More than 22,100 returns were received from over 154,000—or about 15 per cent—of those mailed out.
>
> Residents of the First District again strongly favored making an all out effort to win the war in Viet Nam. The great majority (76.1%) expressed this desire, while far behind were 14.3 per cent who want to end the war at any cost in prestige and money and the 9.6 per cent who felt that the present course of the war should be continued.
>
> The people called for action by the Federal Government in the areas of water and air pollution. They also showed overwhelming approval of an eight per cent increase in Social Security benefits without raising the Social Security taxes, and they expressed strong support for Federal legislation to assist police and law enforcement agencies in combating crime.
>
> Many of the answers to the questions showed that the people of the First District are quite evenly divided in their thinking on the important issues that are now facing our Nation. Reactions on the program to put a man on the moon evidenced less than four per cent more in opposition to the program than in favor of it. Almost even opinion was expressed on combining the Department of Commerce and the Department of Labor into a single Department of Business and Labor—four per cent more opposed this merger than favored it.
>
> Two areas in which approval ran from 35 to 40 per cent over opposition were in reference to ending the war on poverty and enacting legislation to prevent the President from expanding U.S. trade with the USSR and her satellites.
>
> Our farmers and others expressed the opinion that our present farm programs are not achieving their purpose of maintaining farmers' income at adequate levels. Although in this category, and in the area of merging the cabinet positions of Commerce and Labor, the percentage of undecided vote was the highest by a fairly large degree.
>
> I am sure that the large percentage of those who favor changes in our present draft

laws is well in keeping with the national feelings, as I believe many of the questionnaire returns are. More than 23 per cent more favored amending the draft laws than those who would prefer that they remain the same.

Finally, on the question of the need for stricter laws regulating the right to buy and own a gun, the majority opinion ran nine per cent ahead in favor of such laws.

The following is a complete breakdown of the overall District returns.

Overall district results

[In percent]

	Yes	No	Undecided
1. Do you favor Federal laws enacted to assist police and other law enforcement agencies in combating crime	74.4	17.5	8.1
2. Should Congress enact legislation to prevent the President from expanding U.S. trade with the U.S.S.R. and her satellites	60.2	25.7	14.1
3. Should we continue our program to put a man on the moon	41.4	45.8	12.8
4. Do you favor an end to the war on poverty	64.1	25.3	10.6
5. Do you favor changes in our present draft laws	53.3	29.8	16.9
6. Should the Federal Government take further steps to prevent water and air pollution	84.2	7.2	8.6
7. Are our present farm programs achieving their purpose of maintaining farmers' income at adequate levels	14.2	59.4	26.4
8. Do you favor the proposal to merge the Department of Commerce and the Department of Labor into a single Department of Business and Labor	31.6	35.8	32.6
9. Do we need stricter laws regulating the right to buy or own a gun	50.8	41.7	7.5
10. Should we—			
(a) End the war in Vietnam at any cost in prestige and money	14.3		
(b) Continue to follow our present course in the war	9.6		
(c) Make an all-out effort to win the war	76.1		
11. Do you favor increased social security benefits—			
(a) Of 8 percent without an increase in social security taxes	74.0		
(b) Of 15-20 percent with an increase in social security taxes	26.0		

This year I was happy that some of the institutions of higher learning in the District requested to participate in my questionnaire, and I was extremely gratified by the response. I think a comparison of these returns to those of the overall District will be of interest to all.

The students in our university and colleges leaned in opposite directions on the questions of putting a man on the moon, expanding trade with Russia and her satellites, and ending the war on poverty. However, on many of the questions in which they were in agreement with the overall District opinion, they were more strongly in favor or more strongly in opposition to the proposals. Their approval ran as high as ten per cent above the overall results on the question of Federal laws to assist police and other law enforcement agencies in combating crime and on Federal action to prevent water and air pollution.

Up to thirteen per cent more of the college students favored changes in the draft laws and as much as 17 per cent more favored stricter laws in regard to buying and owning a gun.

The percentage of students disapproving of the farm programs and in favor of an eight per cent increase in Social Security without an increase in taxes was below the overall figures. Only on the questions of combining the Departments of Commerce and Labor and on the war in Viet Nam were the college and overall figures quite close.

Here are the individual results of the colleges and university—Carson-Newman, East Tennessee State University, Milligan, and Tusculum.

University and colleges results

[In percent]

	Yes	No	Undecided
1. Do you favor Federal laws enacted to assist police and other law enforcement agencies in combating crime?	84.7	8.8	6.5 (Carson-Newman).
	79.2	12.2	8.6 (ETSU).
	75.5	13.8	10.7 (Milligan).
	80.5	7.9	11.6 (Tusculum).
2. Should Congress enact legislation to prevent the President from expanding U.S. trade with the U.S.S.R. and her satellites?	34.7	37.2	28.1 (Carson-Newman).
	24.1	57.3	18.6 (ETSU).
	33.7	41.4	24.9 (Milligan).
	28.0	47.1	24.9 (Tusculum).
3. Should we continue our program to put a man on the moon?	79.9	10.5	9.6 (Carson-Newman).
	82.7	10.0	7.3 (ETSU).
	74.1	13.3	12.6 (Milligan).
	83.1	11.1	5.8 (Tusculum).
4. Do you favor an end to the war on poverty?	40.2	45.1	14.7 (Carson-Newman).
	36.4	51.4	12.2 (ETSU).
	40.6	40.0	19.4 (Milligan).
	28.7	59.7	11.6 (Tusculum).
5. Do you favor changes in our present draft laws?	63.2	25.7	11.1 (Carson-Newman).
	63.2	27.1	9.7 (ETSU).
	61.4	25.3	13.3 (Milligan).
	62.8	19.7	17.5 (Tusculum).
6. Should the Federal Government take further steps to prevent water and air pollution?	94.6	2.3	3.1 (Carson-Newman).
	94.3	2.9	2.8 (ETSU).
	82.1	9.3	8.6 (Milliagn).
	92.2	2.6	5.2 (Tusculum)
7. Are our present farm programs achieving their purpose of maintaining farmers' income at adequate levels?	7.6	48.8	43.6 (Carson-Newman).
	7.9	57.3	34.8 (ETSU).
	8.9	44.2	46.9 (Milligan).
	11.7	42.8	45.5 (Tusculum).
8. Do you favor the proposal to merge the Department of Commerce and the Department of Labor into a single Department of Business and Labor?	34.4	23.7	41.9 (Carson-Newman).
	29.7	33.3	37.0 (ETSU).
	22.8	28.9	48.3 (Milligan).
	28.1	32.8	39.1 (Tusculum).
9. Do we need stricter laws regulating the right to buy or own a gun?	60.1	31.0	8.9 (Carson-Newman).
	51.9	40.2	7.9 (ETSU).
	59.4	27.2	13.4 (Milligan).
	67.8	23.8	8.4 (Tusculum).
10. Should we—			
(a) End the war in Vietnam at any cost in prestige and money	11.3		Carson-Newman.[1]
	14.6		ETSU.[1]
	14.3		Milligan.[1]
	22.8		Tusculum.[1]
(b) Continue to follow our present course in the war	15.8		Carson-Newman.[1]
	18.3		ETSU.[1]
	13.3		Milligan.[1]
	15.9		Tusculum.[1]
(c) Make an all-out effort to win the war	72.9		Carson-Newman.[1]
	67.1		ETSU.[1]
	72.4		Milligan.[1]
	61.3		Tusculum.[1]
11. Do you favor increased social security benefits—			
(a) Of 8 percent without an increase in social security taxes	80.5		Carson-Newman.[1]
	79.3		ETSU.[1]
	89.8		Milligan.[1]
	79.9		Tusculum.[1]
(b) Of 15-20 percent with an increase in social security taxes	19.5		Carson-Newman.[1]
	20.7		ETSU.[1]
	10.2		Milligan.[1]
	20.1		Tusculum.[1]

---

[1] Not applicable.

I am most grateful to each and every one who extended his views to me by returning my questionnaire, and I also appreciate very much the hundreds of letters that I received in which many clarified and expanded their views on the questionnaire's propositions, as well as on many of the other vitally important issues that are now before the Congress or that will be in the near future. It is most helpful to me to have this information as a guideline. The views expressed in the questionnaire follow closely the letters that I have received in the past months on these issues.

I always make it a point to consider first and foremost the thinking of the people in my District. However, sometimes bills are greatly transformed by the time they reach the final voting stage; therefore, I must then in the light of the bill's final form do what I feel is best for the District and the Nation.

It is true that an informed public is the best safeguard of democracy, and it is my deepest hope that our people will continue to take such a concerned interest in the affairs of our national government. Please never hesitate to let me know your thinking on any of the issues, no matter how small or large they may seem to you. Your views are of great assistance to me.

Again, I thank all of you for your cooperation in participating in my 1967 Questionnaire, and I look forward to hearing from you on other programs and issues.

Sincerely,

JAMES H. QUILLEN.

Texas Rangers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. O. C. FISHER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 12, 1967

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, recent attempts to smear and tarnish the reputation of the Texas Rangers should be discounted and placed in proper perspective. Using the presence of a few rangers—assigned to maintain law and order during a labor union organizing drive in the Rio Grande Valley—these critics have screamed "police brutality" against one of the Nation's most respected and responsible enforcement officers, Capt. A. Y. Allee, of the Texas Rangers.

The propriety of the union organizing effort is beside the point. It is not the business of enforcement officers to take sides in such controversies. But it is the business of the police to maintain law and order, no matter where it may be required.

Certain elements of the press, and others, have used this incident as an excuse for attempting to degrade the famous Texas Rangers as a bad guy, one who goes around slapping helpless women and abusing little children. Nothing could be further from the truth. That sort of talk is pure hogwash. Every person who knows A. Y. Allee knows he does not operate that way. He is a man of restraint and caution in the application of force. He has established that reputation throughout his 35 years of distinguished service in law enforcement.

For more than a century the Texas Ranger has been feared by the lawless and admired by the law abiding. In legend and in history, this rugged enforcement group has molded a reputation unsurpassed in modern history. It was the famous Texas Ranger who was credited with bringing law and order to the border country a hundred years ago when thousands of cutthroats, thieves, and outlaws, operating from both sides of the border, terrorized the frontier. It was said of the Ranger that "he could ride like a Mexican, trail like an Indian, shoot like a Tennesseean, and fight like the devil." And throughout a century of law enforcement the Ranger has built and maintained an incomparable record.

No amount of criticism, no amount of vocal abuse, can tarnish that record of courage and devotion to duty—always, and down to this very day—properly associated with the famous Texas Ranger. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article which appeared in the July 9, 1967, issue of the Dallas News. Entitled "Allee Has Heart of Gold, Friends Say," this story should be read by all who are interested in knowing the truth about this great Texan.

The article follows:

BRUTALITY CHARGE DENIED: ALLEE HAS HEART OF GOLD, FRIENDS SAY

(By Jimmy Banks)

CARRIZO SPRINGS, TEX.—Those who know him best insist that a heart of pure gold beats beneath the Texas Ranger badge worn by Capt. A. Y. Allee, despite his reputation as a man of steel.

For 40 years, he has enforced the law with an iron hand. The grizzled, balding and slightly pudgy Allee has survived a broken neck caused by a balky cow, three heart attacks and countless gunmen.

He is a former Baptist Sunday school teacher who spends much of his time working with young people. Several years ago, he defied his doctor's orders while recuperating from a heart attack and got out of bed to help search the wilds of Garner State Park for a lost youngster. With typical persistence, he found the lad's body after most of the other searchers gave up.

Allee has been shot and sued and criticized and investigated so many times that current accusations of "brutality" seemingly should not bother him.

But they do.

From a personal standpoint, he couldn't care less—perhaps because he has weathered so many trials and tribulations with his spotless record still intact. He has never lost a court suit. The FBI, in several probes, apparently has never found any evidence that Allee has violated anyone's civil rights.

What concerns him is the effect the "brutality" charges, arising from the prolonged Rio Grande Valley farm labor dispute, may have on the reputation of the Texas Rangers. That is of paramount importance to a man who has been a Ranger for 35 years, whose father and grandfather were both Rangers and whose son is a fourth-generation Ranger.

He can hardly wait to get those who have made the charges in a courtroom under oath but, unfortunately, some are out-of-staters who probably will never have to testify.

Col. Homer Garrison, director of the Department of Public Safety and chief of the Rangers, is convinced that his organization's reputation could not be in better hands than those of Allee.

"He's a terrific Ranger," said Garrison, "and I've known him intimately since 1935. He's the most dedicated guy I've ever known. He has sacrificed his personal health all along and he's refused to follow his doctor's advice many times, insisting that he had too many things he had to do.

"He's truly one of the alltime great Rangers," Garrison added, paying him the supreme compliment.

The feeling is mutual.

"I wouldn't work five minutes longer if Col. Garrison ever left," said Allee. "If he hadn't been made director of the Department of Public Safety, I think it would have died in its infancy. He's fair and square with everyone—and he certainly wouldn't condone any improper action by any of his men. And I certainly wouldn't do anything that might reflect on him."

Garrison came quickly to Allee's defense recently when a rather puzzling attack was made on him in Washington by Dennis Chavez, Jr., son of the late New Mexico senator. Chavez, testifying before a House agriculture subcommittee, called Allee, among other things, "the fastest gun, who is a known killer, a professional Mexican hater . . ."

Garrison immediately said that Allee, so far as he knew, had killed only one man—an accused felon he shot in self defense. Allee was exonerated by a grand jury.

That happened in 1937, and it produced one of Allee's closest brushes with death.

"I went to Laredo to pick up a prisoner and take him back to Kinney County," Allee recalled during an exclusive interview with The Dallas News. "I didn't handcuff him and, about three miles outside of Laredo, he grabbed my .45 out of the holster and started shooting at me.

"Two of his bullets grazed me, coming just close enough to leave red streaks, one on my stomach and one on my arm. I had a coupe with a ledge right behind the seat. I reached behind him picked up another pistol I had stashed back there and shot him. I lost control of the car, of course, and wrecked it—ran into a tree. We had to furnish our own cars in those days and this was a new one I'd just pickedup the day before. But I still felt real lucky."

"The Lord was riding with me," he declared.

"And I'll tell you this," he added. "I've handcuffed everyone I've arrested and put in a car with me since then."

Six years earlier, Allee survived another shot, one which grazed the top of his head while he was walking through wild, rugged country looking for moonshiners' stills. He never learned who fired it or why—whether it was aimed at him or whether it was a stray shot—but his reaction may have helped build his reputation for toughness.

"It was a .22 bullet," said Allee, "and it went through my hat, just grazing my scalp. I didn't even hear the shot fired but it knocked me down. It wasn't serious, but I thought maybe for a while I might bleed to death."

"I came on back to town, went to a drug store and bought some iodine then walked across the street to a service station. I washed it off and put iodine on it and it never did bother me anymore."

One of his closest calls came three years ago, on his 755-acre ranch between Carrizo Springs and Crystal City. A Mexican hired hand was loading cattle into a trailer and one of the cows stopped in the chute, refusing to budge.

Allee, recuperating from a heart attack, finally went out to help. He climbed up on the chute but fell and his neck struck the top rail on the trailer's sideboard. The accident broke his neck in three places and his recovery from that did nothing to dilute his "tough guy" reputation.

But many of the people in this area, where he was born and raised, know the 62-year-old Allee as a warm, compassionate and generous friend—a man who grew up among Latin Americans, who speaks their language and counts many of them among his closest friends. He frequently is called upon to arbitrate marital disputes, and his wise counsel is credited with having saved a great many homes.

He sees nothing unusual in the small loans he frequently makes to those in need, in the many jobs he has arranged for deserving Latins and whites alike or in the sage advice he gives youngsters who get into trouble.

"The biggest part about most peace officers," he told a friend recently, "is the heart."

Last spring, shortly before Allee went to Rio Grande City in connection with the labor dispute, a high school teacher called him about a problem youngster. The 17-year-old boy had been convicted of writing hot checks in a neighboring state, put on probation and sent here to live with relatives.

He hated the world in general and law enforcement officers in particular when Allee first talked with him. But by the time the conversation was over, he had decided to return to school and work in the afternoons on Allee's ranch. When the Ranger gave him part of his salary in advance without being asked, the surprised young man declared he had "never seen such a cop before."

Allee convinced him, by the time the school term ended, that he should learn a trade and "go straight" from now on. The youngster agreed and Allee arranged for him to enter the Camp Gary Job Corps Training Center.

The incident might amaze many of the salty Ranger captain's critics but his friends found nothing unusual about it.

"He's basically kind and gentle, even though he appears pretty crusty and gruff," said one of his friends. "And he just can't understand these accusations about brutality."

Allee declares flatly that the charges are completely false.

"This just hasn't happened," he said. "We haven't slapped or pushed or shoved anybody around—except when I arrested Magdaleno Dimas on June 1 and grazed his head with a shotgun barrel. That just gave him a little scratch, and I'd much rather do that than shoot him."

Allee was called upon by the sheriff to help locate and arrest Dimas, who allegedly had threatened the life of Jim Rochester, a foreman at La Casita Farms. Dimas and another man reportedly had driven by a La Casita shed a short while earlier with Dimas holding a rifle and Rochester had fired several shots at the car.

When Allee located Dimas, a convicted murderer with a long criminal record, Dimas came running out of the house with a rifle in his hands. Allee said he told him to stop and drop the gun. Dimas dropped the rifle but ran back into the house, according to Allee.

The Ranger captain said he radioed the sheriff's office to bring a justice of the peace with a search warrant for the house. After obtaining the warrant, he called several times for Dimas to come out.

"Finally, I kicked down the door," he said. "I found Dimas and another man sitting behind a table with their hands under it. I told them to put their hands on the table, since I didn't know if they had guns under it or not, and stand up. They refused even after I told them several times. So I tilted the table back against them and hit Dimas on the head.

"My main interest was to get him out of there and keep him from killing somebody that night," Allee added. "And I think he would have if we hadn't arrested him."

Allee said the Rangers' only purpose in the Valley was "to enforce the law and protect life and property."

"I'm not on the side of management or the unions," he declared. "But when they're putting sugar in gasoline tanks, burning railroad bridges, trying to derail trains and damage irrigation pumps, I think it's time to stop them.

"I wouldn't call this a strike, because the law says a strike doesn't exist until 30 per cent of the employes have a disagreement with an employer," he added. "This is an attempt of the union to organize farm labor. I haven't even seen any workers try to walk out of the fields and we've certainly never tried to keep any of them in the fields. They've been free all along to walk out anytime they want to.

"I understand that several times the farm managers moved the workers to another part of the field when they were cutting melons near the road and some of these pickets were taunting 'em—cussing 'em and insulting 'em," he said. "They did that to avoid trouble between the workers, who were using those long knives to cut melons, and the pickets. But the Rangers didn't even have anything to do with that.

"Why they're making all these accusations is a puzzle to me because these things just didn't happen," he added. "They must think it will help them get farm workers under the National Labor Relations Act or something.

"I'm a strong believer in enforcing the law and enforcing it like it is written," he added. "And I don't think we've been wrong in what we've done."

One of the "brutality" charges arose from the arrest of the Rev. Edgar Krueger, a "migrant minister" for the Southern Church of Christ and the Texas Council of Churches, and his wife.

"He asked me about six times, on two different occasions, to arrest him," Allee said of Krueger. "I told him that I didn't want to arrest him, that I respected him as a minister, but that I also didn't want him to violate the law. A few days later, he was acting as a picket captain on a mass picket line—and mass picketing is illegal.

"We arrested the pickets and Krueger again asked me to put him in jail. He said I'd put his people in jail so I could put him in jail, too. I finally told him if that's the way he felt about it I'd sure as hell accommodate him. I grabbed him by the belt but I didn't rough him up.

"His wife told me not to put him in jail and I told her he'd asked me to six different times," said Allee. "She was under arrest, too, and one of our men asked her to give him her camera—it's customary, when you arrest somebody and they cause a commotion, to take whatever articles they're carrying away from them. She put the camera behind her back so I grabbed it and handed it to him.

"It was put in an envelope with their other belongings in the jail and held for them until they were released—and we sure didn't expose any film that was in it," he said in reply to another charge made by the Kruegers.

Allee has received hundreds of letters and telegrams from all parts of the country, including Alaska, expressing confidence in him and praising him since the "brutality" charges were publiczed. One man, whom Allee arrested for murder eight months ago and who is now free on bond, telephoned Garrison to say he had never been treated better by anyone than he had been by Allee.

One of the letters came from James C. Ailes, chief of police in Delano, Calif., where the farm labor organizers claim they also encountered "police brutality."

Ailes wrote that he had noticed the Rangers were receiving "the same type of publicity as we have received here for nearly two years." He enclosed two copies of a publication describing the California situation, he said, "to show you the tactics they use and that we are behind you 100 per cent."

Perhaps the charge that rankles Allee the most is that he is a "Mexican hater."

"Nobody can prove that," he declared. "I have worlds of friends among the Latin Americans and they come to me with all sorts of problems. I certainly am not prejudiced against them and I always try to treat them right.

"A peace officer's job is not to put everybody in the pen," he added, "but to try to help straighten them up if they get out of line—to try to help them become good citizens, I've always tried to do that with Latins and whites both."

Many of the letters of support came from prominent citizens who have succeeded as a result of Allee's nudging them back into the straight and narrow instead of sending them to prison.

Allee, who doesn't drink or smoke (he chews on cigars almost constantly but never lights one), believes that's the way it should be.

Five-feet-10½ inches tall and weighing 192, Allee now considers himself in "good shape" physically and has no intention of retiring anytime soon.

There's only one good thing about this trouble in the Valley," he said. "My doctor's been trying to get me to lose weight and I've lost 28 pounds on this assignment.

"And I'll tell you this," he added. "If I had as many enemies as I have friends, I'd retire right now."

John Quincy Adams

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 11, 1967

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, today we commemorate the 200th anniversary of the birth of John Quincy Adams. It is much less a celebration of his birth, however, than it is a celebration of his accomplishments. The present shape of our Government and of our Nation were both influenced by his efforts.

During his lifetime of public service, Mr. Adams held a variety of important positions. He served as Ambassador to Great Britain and as the American representative to the Netherlands. He was a member of the Massachusetts Senate, a U.S. Senator from Massachusetts, the Secretary of State under President Monroe, President of the United States, and served nearly 17 years in the House of Representatives.

His accomplishments in these positions were equal to the importance implied by their titles. In foreign affairs he was a strong advocate of a firm foreign policy. He was one of the chief negotiators at the peace conference with England after the War of 1812. As Secretary of State he played a key role in the formulation of the Monroe Doctrine, a policy as important today as it was in 1823.

His domestic accomplishments were equally impressive. He successfully advocated the purchase of Florida and defended the Louisiana Purchase. As President he proposed a broad plan of internal improvements and generally promoted the western expansion and increased industrialization throughout the Nation.

He was one of the earliest and most vocal opponents of slavery, and once wrote that a life devoted to the problem of emancipation would be one "nobly spent or sacrificed." He spoke out, virtually alone, against the "gag rule," which suppressed political activities of those who opposed slavery.

Mr. Adams was the only ex-President ever to serve in the House of Representatives, and his 17 years in this body produced some of his greatest accomplishments. His death, following a stroke on the floor of the House, was a dramatic climax to a distinguished career. The legacy he left for the generations which followed remains today as an example of the great accomplishments of a truly brilliant and dedicated public servant. We who serve in the House today would do well to emulate his example.

Americanism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HERBERT BURKE

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 13, 1967

Mr. BURKE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the Ladies Auxiliary No. 517, Veterans of World War I, in West Hollywood, Fla., have brought to my attention a speech on "Americanism" which I understand was written and delivered by a fourth-grade student in Miramar, Fla. The young writer is David Curtis Redheffer, who is 9 years old. It is gratifying to see such patriotism reflected in the youth of our Nation, and I take this opportunity to have David's speech printed at this point in the RECORD:

AMERICANISM

Madam President, distinguished guests, ladies of the auxiliary and friends *"Why I am glad to be an American."*

Many people do not know what it is like to be free, to be an American. Their countries are being taken over or separated from the rest of the world by Communists or Fascists.

Many countries, such as India, are not self supporting, but they have a great many people with many needs. They need money to buy food, clothing, seeds, tools, machinery, medicines and many other items. The United States has many programs to help these people become self supporting and independent as we are, one being the Marshall Plan.

Out of our benevolence, other programs planned and started in the United States help crippled people, the blind, the deaf and dumb, the retarded, the unschooled and other disabled people. But in my opinion, I think the best way the United States helps the world is by helping other countries defend themselves. Even today we are helping a country to have and keep its freedom!

We, you and I, have many rights. Among them, the right to vote, the right to religion, to worship as we please, the right to speak, the right to a fair and speedy jury trial, the right to disagree with our Government . . . provided we do not advocate and support violent revolution . . . and many more. All of these are guaranteed by the "Bill of Rights" in our Constitution. (I have copies here if you care to see them later.)

This past Christmas vacation, I enjoyed the privilege of visiting Independence Hall in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, where our Declaration of Independence was framed and signed, and where our Liberty Bell is housed.

I also visited the home of Betsy Ross where our *original* Stars and Stripes were made, and, to live in my imagination, the times of Washington and Jefferson, Lafayette and Patrick Henry, Ben Franklin, Thomas Paine and Von Steuben.

I was lucky enough to sit in the pew where Washington sat in Christ Church, Philadelphia, and offer a prayer. I also went to St. John's Episcopal Church in Richmond, Virginia, where Patrick Henry made his famous speech. May I suggest you visit these historic shrines, in the cradle of liberty, to renew your faith and pride in America and your own heritage, and to more fully realize our debt to these great men . . . *Americans all!*

Yes, even Lafayette and Von Steuben . . . could anyone have been more American than they in our great Revolution of 1776?

To all in uniform who served through all our wars, who gave their lives *not* for personal gain, but for liberty and freedom . . . to preserve the American dream of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, we owe a debt we can never repay. But I am absolutely sure they must have felt as Patrick Henry did when he said:

"Is life so dear, or peace so sweet, as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery? Forbid it Almighty God! I know not what course others may take, but as for me, *Give me liberty or give me death!*

These are my people, this is my country, and this is why I am glad and proud to be an American!

Israel Forever

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 13, 1967

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, the courageous State of Israel must never be threatened again as she was a few short weeks ago. A just and enduring peace must be achieved, and the United States must use its influence toward this end.

I believe that a recent address by the Honorable Charles Silver of New York City makes clear the obligation of freedom-loving people everywhere to Israel. In this address before Congregation B'nai Jeshurn, which was also broadcast over radio station WEUD on Friday, June 23, Mr. Silver declared:

> Let us make sure—permanently sure—that Israel, victorious in arms, will not be overcome by words . . . that Israel today will survive to a greater Israel tomorrow . . . and tomorrow.

I am including this full text in the Appendix of the RECORD so that my colleagues will have the benefit of sharing the stirring words of Charles Silver:

ADDRESS BY HON. *CHARLES* H. SILVER, JUNE 23, 1967

A few weeks ago, a world already shuddering under the blows of bloody conflict in many quarters was shocked to discover that the Arab nations, in their millions, were deployed on Israel's borders, poised to plunge forward and wipe Israel from the face of the earth.

Of course, as we listen now to the afterthoughts of Israel's enemies at the United Nations, it would seem that everything is upside down, that black is white, good is bad—and the lamb has viciously pounced on the helpless lion.

Forgotten by Israel's oil-hungry foes are the frontiers bristling with Arab enmity.

Forgotten is the frenzy of Nasser's holy war and the cry to kill—that went up over all Islam to strike the fatal blow which would mark Israel's final tragic hour.

The Arab legions, confident of their might, had not calculated on the one precious factor that proved more significant than numbers . . . more powerful than hate . . . the faith and courage of Israel rising again like David against his giant opponent.

The four-day war is only one week old.

The lamb overcame the lion.

But she is now being led to the slaughter.

It is almost beyond belief that great powers—fully aware of the actual facts—have become accomplices.

They have waited to count noses—to see where the greatest possible gain may lie—in oil or allies—and then they come forward to condemn Israel—but only after long delay during which profit and potential advantage have been carefully weighed—but not truth nor justice.

Delegates at the United Nations, presumably there to hear and to judge the statements of all who speak, are suddenly absent when opinions are being expressed with which they do not agree.

But—in the long run—the long run which is usually won at last by reason—you cannot turn your back on truth or walk out on justice.

Is the miraculous triumph, snatched from the jaws of treachery, about to be devoured by the enemies that could prove even more dangerous as they sit to decide the fate of Israel—as they seek to erase her victory with bitterness and vengeance in their hearts—with slander and abuse on their tongues?

The pendulums of diplomacy are swinging wildly. Every tick of the clock takes us closer to civilization's final chance to save herself.

You think the future of Israel alone is at stake? More can come of this far-off but far-reaching treachery than we dare to imagine.

If Israel is pushed back to her previous borders, returned to a subordinate status—permitted a second-class statehood and punished for this farcical definition of aggression—we will witness one of the most tragic injustices of history.

And we will be sowing the seeds of a future disaster that will engulf the entire world.

For, here is a country which—in a few short years of precarious existence, without fixed boundaries, with few friends around her and not a day of peace—has shown a matchless zeal for creative effort and constructive accomplishment.

That land is Israel . . . and the miracle of her recent victory will be told and retold for generations to come . . . yes, a thousand generations from now . . . it will be related in the same breath as the bravery of the Maccabees and the Battle of Jericho.

She has summoned the strength to overcome her enemies and break the ring of steel around her.

Can we now afford to let her down?

Can the world afford to let her down?

Hounded and beaten about the globe for centuries, extended little compassion and less protection by law, these pioneers of Israel have survived their trials as a sword survives the flame in which it is tempered.

They made the desert bloom.

They emerged at last from their endless wanderings and created a new home in their ancient homeland.

They built cities, hospitals, schools . . .

They resolved to preserve their new nation and proved themselves ready to die in its defense.

They deserve the protection of every other freedom-loving people against any future attack.

They are entitled to negotiate their own peace terms with the enemy—for this is an enemy that will not soon forget . . . but will bide its time to strike again.

This is Israel's hour of decision!

We cannot forsake her now. Civilization cannot forsake her. If we let Israel down, then you and I go down—and down go the honor and decency of all mankind.

We are Americans, first . . . and America is our country. But as lovers of freedom—all who love freedom in every land—we must not sit idly by while the courageous people of Israel see valor turned into defeat. We must resist the overwhelming forces of hostile nations who are bitterly disappointed that Israel turned the tables on her enemies.

They would not have lifted a finger if the tide of battle had gone the other way—the way they evidently hoped and expected. There would have been no clamor to return to former boundaries . . . no outcry . . . no indignation . . . no tears or even polite regret if Israel had vanished from the map of civilization.

We know the danger of Soviet domination of the Middle East. We know the value of the oil fields of Arabia. But oil is not stronger than blood. It is not more precious than peace.

The Soviet powers must not terrify us into silence, injustice and shabby compromise by their outrageous and insulting performance at the United Nations.

We must not turn our backs on infamy and accept the Soviet Bloc as bargaining agent for the peace of the world.

If we have hearts that beat for justice and hands that will strike for the right . . . if we have voices to cry out against the shame of surrender . . . we cannot remain guilty bystanders.

There are not many occasions involving the destiny of man when the issue is as clear-cut and conclusive as the unprovoked surrounding of Israel's borders by the aggressive union of Arab states. This infant commonwealth is a child of freedom, born out of the highest principles of democracy. Israel was brought into being by the United Nations, itself. This is no time for the parent to forsake its own tormented child.

Israel, courageous and victorious, needs support urgently and at once—not only moral support and military support—but money—as well.

She is struggling in the grip of an enormous financial crisis, with most of her income spent on manpower and munitions for defense.

Israel's people are already paying two to five times the taxes that we do . . . to say nothing of the costs required to meet and overcome the sudden onslought of her foes.

Unless our pockets go with our hearts to face this crisis, we invite total economic collapse. And economic collapse for Israel, as you well know, would be the prelude to military destruction by her enemies.

Surely this is no time for lengthy debate about how many dollars we can spare to send our kinsmen.

Israel is no aggressor.

The brilliant presentation by Abba Eban of her brief and tortured struggle to survive should rouse the defense of all who declare themselves on the side of peace and justice.

Israel has proved able to help herself in the pursuit of peace. She has proved able to defend herself in the horrors of war. She has certainly earned the right to expect the assistance of others in assuring her justice.

Israel has faced a desperate hour of ultimate agony and turned it into a glorious page in her history.

She must never again stand alone against the organized hate of one hundred million fanatical enemies.

This is the moment for the better instincts of mankind to mobilize. It is a time of jeopardy for all civilization. Humanity's tomorrow depends on what we do today.

Let us see to it that Israel, who received no assistance in war, will secure a just and lasting peace.

"This is the time to extend our hand,
To protect the life of our Promised Land;
Israel, embattled, cries out to you . . .
Out of the hope of years,
Out of the growing fears,
Out of the anguish, out of the threats,
Out of the diplomats' tangled nets."

Let us make sure—permanently sure—that Israel, victorious in arms, will not be overcome by words . . . than Israel today will survive to be a greater Israel tomorrow . . . and tomorrow.

Forever—Israel forever.

John Quincy Adams

SPEECH

OF

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 11, 1967

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, in a country such as this where so much of what we now have we owe to the wisdom and courage of our forefathers, it is right to occasionally take time out to acknowledge their contribution to America. John Quincy Adams was certainly one of those to whom we owe the most, and on the occasion of the 200th anniversary of his birth, I wish to express my appreciation of his accomplishments.

Adams devoted the greater part of his life to public service both at home and abroad. In 1802, after serving for 7 years in Europe, he was elected to the Massachusetts State Senate, and 6 months later he was elected to the U.S. Senate. Adams went from here back into diplomatic service and was largely responsible for the peace settlement following the War of 1812. As a diplomat, Adams was greatly responsible for the truth of his own description of U.S. foreign relations:

> America, in the assembly of nations, since her admission among them, has invariably, though often fruitlessly, held forth to them the hand of honest friendship, of equal freedom, of generous reciprocity. She has uniformly spoken among them, though often to heedless and often to disdainful ears, the language of equal liberty, equal justice, equal rights.

In 1817 President Monroe appointed Adams Secretary of State. In filling this position Adams drew on his vast wealth of political experience and as usual he served with tremendous vigor. A great deal of the credit for the Monroe Doctrine belongs to him.

Adams became President in 1824. During his term in the White House he worked hard to bring about a large variety of improvements, especially in the field of education. He pursued these goals incessantly and with a self-restraint which was true to his concept of the ideal government.

In 1831 Adams began a period of service in Congress almost 17 years long which was probably the high point in his long public career. This made him the only ex-President ever to serve in the House. He was always knowledgeable and conscientious, and he served on many of the most important committees. Throughout, he brought all of his influence and powers to bear in defending the rights of man.

In February of 1848 he suffered a stroke from which he never recovered, just after responding to the call of his name in the House. Few have devoted themselves to the pursuit of their ideals with the persistence, honor, and courage of John Quincy Adams.

Today we do well to follow Adams' own advice which he quoted from a barbarian chieftain who defended his country against the Roman invasion:

> Think of your forefathers and of your posterity.

Role of Women in the War on Poverty

SPEECH

OF

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1967

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, the role of women in helping to win the war on poverty is absolutely crucial, and more attention needs to be paid to the efforts of many women's organizations and many thousands of dedicated individual ladies in helping the poor to help themselves.

Mr. Speaker, one of the most active and articulate ladies engaged in support of the war on poverty is Mrs. Joseph Willen of New York City, past president of the National Council of Jewish Women, and a leading figure in Women in Community Service—WICS—an organization comprised of women of all faiths which was formed to help make a success of the Women's Job Corps program.

As an example of Mrs. Willen's efforts on behalf of disadvantaged American youth, I would like to call the attention of my distinguished colleagues to a report on the Tongue Point Job Corps Center for Women in Astoria, Oreg., which Mr. Willen, as NCJW president, sent out as a news release this past March. Mr. Willen's report is especially significant, Mr. Speaker, in that it stresses the vital contributions of our distinguished colleague, the gentlelady from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN], to a successful Job Corps program.

Mr. Speaker, with permission I insert Mrs. Willen's report on the Tongue Point Center at this point in the RECORD:

A VISIT TO TONGUE POINT

(By Mrs. Joseph Willen)

With the Presidents of the National Council of Catholic Women, the National Council of Negro Women and Church Women United, I went to Oregon to be in on the planning and opening of the new Women's Job Corps Center in Tongue Point, Oreg.

The new center will be a symbol of the success of the Women's Job Corps, and a tribute to the people who believed in it from the start. It is located in the state of Congresswoman Edith Green, who was largely responsible for having women written into the original Job Corps legislation. It is being reconverted from a former men's center to accommodate the vastly increased number of women trainees now called for by the new amendments to the Economic Opportunities Act. Thanks to Rep. Green—and the achievements of the women's corps—the number of women has been more than doubled, from 10% to 23% of enrollees. And, last but not least, it is WICS which is being given credit for much of the trainees' success.

We were invited to the opening particularly because the Job Corps wanted us to share some of WICS' experience with staff members of the University of Oregon, which has a contract to manage the new center. We had an unusually instructive and exciting meeting with these dedicated men and women, who are headed by former Secretary of Health, Eduaction and Welfare Arthur Flemming.

They told us that they felt it was an "added ingredient" to be working with girls who had come through WICS. They were delighted with WICS' approach to the whole girl, rather than to her job-training problems alone. The volunteers' personal involvement with the girls, the interest in their day-to-day problems and their struggles to grow and identify as women have made a crucial difference in the girls' motivation, it is felt by many Job Corps people. The knowledge that others really care if they succeed has given these youngsters a true headstart in accomplishing the profound changes that most have had to make in their lives.

The university people told us that they themselves expect to learn a great deal in working with the girls, because they will be able to explore new ways of reaching a segment of the school population which the public schools have largely failed. They are examining many new teaching and counseling techniques which they hope will enrich their own school of education as well as improve teaching methods throughout the state.

They are already working to attract community interest in the center, and thus create a favorable atmosphere for the girls' experience. While we were there, we took part in a luncheon given for the Mayor, his wife and leading citizens of the nearby town of Astoria, at which the community people pledged to do all in their power to help the project and make the girls welcome. They were particularly interested in our experiences, and so stirred by the remarks of WICS President Rosemary Kilch at the luncheon that a local WICS group was organized on the spot.

I came away feeling that our country is becoming more and more aware that experiments like the Job Corps are worth many times the dollar investment that has been put in them. Economic deprivation has done far more than rob millions of our children of good food and homes; it has also robbed them of the incentive to try to become successful members of our society.

The Job Corps, I am convinced, is one of the answers because it gives its students for 24 hours a day that combination of good home and good school that our privileged children take for granted. It will give our Job Corps girls a new chance to contribute to the two families in their lives—the families they come home to and the families they will raise.

Pioneering is not easy. It has its risks. The girls themselves, the staff person who invests a few years of his life, the University which sacrifices the valuable time and energy of faculty members—all of these are taking risks. We in Council took a risk when we embarked on this new and difficult program. Even had it not paid off, we should have done it anyway. But we are lucky. The reward is already before our eyes.

Too Much "PR" in Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WENDELL WYATT
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 13, 1967

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, there has been a growing concern among many Members of Congress with regard to the Federal budget. Government spending is growing by leaps and bounds, often needlessly.

An editorial in the July 8, edition of the Oregon Journal raises some very legitimate doubts as to the utility of many Government information posts.

I commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

> The expansion of "flackery" in governmental agencies in recent years should be reviewed with a critical eye by the public and planners of the structure of government.
>
> Are all these hand-outs really necessary? We would ask it of the growing army of press agents, propagandists, information officers, public relations men, or whatever handle is tacked on to the persons newspapermen refer to as "flacks."
>
> Without question, there is justification for many of them. As in business, governments have a need for some kind of liaison between their officials and the public. Also, there are publications that must be put together.
>
> But in instances where the system boils down to a government propaganda machine, there is cause for genuine concern and legitimate doubts should be raised as to whether this is the way tax money should be spent.
>
> Budget requests during the recent legislative session included information positions in nearly every agency of any size and more than one in some of the larger units.

Noted Negro Historian Heads History Department of University of Chicago

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 12, 1967

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is with pride and pleasure that I announce the appointment of John Hope Franklin as chairman of the Department of History of the University of Chicago, which is in the district that I have the honor to represent. By unanimous consent I am extending my remarks to include the following news article from the June 30, 1967, issue of the Chicago Maroon:

Franklin Appointed History Chairman

> John Hope Franklin, one of the nation's most distinguished historians, has been appointed chairman of the Department of History here. He is the first Negro ever to be named to a department chairmanship in a major American university.
>
> Franklin, an authority on the history of the American Negro and on the Civil War and Reconstruction periods, has been a professor of American history at Chicago since 1964.
>
> He will succeed William H. McNeill, chairman since 1961, who will return to full-time teaching and research.
>
> According to D. Gale Johnson, dean of the Division of the Social Sciences, "John Hope Franklin is recognized as one of our foremost historians. Professor Franklin, with Daniel Boorstin, Arthur Mann, and Richard Wade, has made the University's Department of History one of the strongest in the nation in the field of American history."
>
> WAS PITT PROFESSOR
>
> Before coming to Chicago, Franklin served for eight years as professor and chairman of the Department of History at Brooklyn College.
>
> During the 1962–63 academic year, he was the Pitt Professor of American History and Institutions at Cambridge University, and a fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge.
>
> Franklin's writings have had a powerful impact in both academic and public policy-making circles. He was one of the authors of the brief against school segregation which was submitted to the Supreme Court in 1954 by the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.
>
> Among Franklin's books is "From Slavery to Freedom: A History of American Negroes" (1956), which has become the standard work in its field. His articles and book reviews have appeared widely in learned journals and in the popular press.
>
> Franklin has been active in efforts to revise secondary school textboks which, until recently, have largely ignored the role of the Negro and other minority groups in American history. He is a co-author of "Land of the Free" (1966), an eighth grade American history text which also includes the story of minority groups, and which has been adopted by many major school systems.
>
> FATHER A JUDGE
>
> Franklin was born in 1915 in Rentiesville, Oklahoma. His father, the late Buck Colbert (Ben) Franklin, was one of Oklahoma's first Negro lawyers, and the first Negro judge to sit in chancery in the District Court of the State of Oklahoma.

New Minimum Wage Law Is Beginning To Pinch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. O. C. FISHER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 12, 1967

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, a recent independent survey across the Nation revealed that the new minimum wage hike is forcing thousands of workers out of jobs. Those who are hurt the most are those who can less afford to be without work. They include the fringe workers—the physically handicapped and the less productive. It was also found that vast numbers of youngsters, those in high school, and many in college, who do part time or temporary work, are losing job opportunities because of this new law.

Another adverse aspect of this unfortunate enactment is discussed in an editorial which appeared in the June 23, 1967, issue of the Dallas Morning News. Entitled "Destroy the State?" the editorial follows:

Destroy the State?

> The courts and the Department of Labor are charting for themselves a course in deep and dangerous waters. Among other things, they may wind up having to rule arbitrarily on who is a professional person and who is not—a question that has kept scholars busy debating for centuries.
>
> Pending in Baltimore is a case filed by Texas and 25 other states asking that the federal wage and hour law be clarified. The 1966 law apparently extends the minimum-wage: and overtime-pay provisions to many employes of the states, possibly to all employes.
>
> Atty. Gen. Crawford Martin is one of many state official who harbor more than a little anxiety over what the three judges in Baltimore, then the Labor Department lawyers, will say. If the extensions are upheld, it could cost Texas $14 million a year in overtime pay.

Martin says that after Labor gets through interpreting, teachers who grade papers at home or football coaches who go to night games might well be entitled to overtime pay. The layman might ask, why not?

Teachers and professors are not hired by the hour. They sign contracts to serve for the duration at a fixed amount of pay. Sometimes they are docked for missing work, sometimes not. They punch no time clock but agree, in their contracts, to be at the right place at the right time and to do what work must be done—whether in the classroom or elsewhere.

In all, it is a contractual agreement that retains the services of a professional. Since no hours are spelled out, any determination of the wage per hour would be ludicrous guesswork.

In light of this, the interpreters may be forced to a fork in the road: Down one route lies a ruling that, since teachers are professionals who work by contract rather than on an hourly basis, the law does not apply. Down the other lane is a ruling that teachers must be hired for specified numbers of hours, and that any time spent above that should be considered.

Who would check on the teacher grading papers at home, no one knows. Whether overtime would be allowed for attending required summer classes at college is another of many uncertainties.

This hornet's nest may upset the educational community, but what troubles Martin and other state officials is the fact that the law was passed in the first place:

"If the federal government is entitled . . . to regulate any of the governmental functions of a state, then merely at the whim of Congress all activities of the state could be regulated." This, says Martin, would "virtualy destroy the state as a separate political entity."

This is where the courts and the Labor Department, perhaps unwittingly, are sailing. Congress should keep them from leaving port.

Fight for Human Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 13, 1967

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the 23d session of the United Nations Human Rights Commission was recently held in Geneva, Switzerland. The major accomplishment of this session was the adoption of a draft Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Religious Intolerance, specifically singling out anti-Semitism for special condemnation.

A significant occurrence at the session was the voicing of anti-Semitic remarks by the Soviet delegate directed towards Morris B. Abram, the representative from the United States. To these remarks Mr. Abram responded vigorously and eloquently expressing his dissatisfaction at the Soviet delegate's lack of propriety and relevance.

I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article written by Morris B. Abram which appeared in the June 1967 edition of the National Jewish Monthly.

The article follows:

FIGHT FOR HUMAN RIGHTS

(By Morris B. Abram)

(NOTE.—Morris B. Abram is U.S. Representative to the UN Commission on Human Rights, and at 48 is the youngest President the American Jewish Committee has ever had. A native of Georgia, he now lives in New York, where he is a distinguished trial and appellate attorney, who has taken a leading part on behalf of civil rights for all He was appointed to high government posts by Presidents Kennedy and Johnson, and for years he has devoted much of his time to public service.)

The recent 23rd session of the UN's Human Rights Commission in Geneva was barely noted in the world's press. Yet it was a singularly fruitful and possibly historic session.

One of its major achievements was the adoption of a draft Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Religious Intolerance, designed to parallel the historic Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, approved by the General Assembly in December, 1965. This movement owes a great debt to the non-governmental organizations accredited to the UN, especially to such groups as the Coordinating Board of Jewish Organizations (of which B'nai B'rith is a constitutent), the International Commission of Jurists, the World Council of Churches, Pax Romana, and the International League for the Rights of Man (with which the American Jewish Committee is affiliated).

The adoption of the religious intolerance convention, which now goes to higher UN bodies for review and approval, would not have been possible as recently as five years ago. Not until the Ecumenical Council was it conceivable that 32 diverse nations from every region, political system, and religious constellation—Hindu, Moslem, Christian, Jewish, Atheist, Agnostic—would vote unanimously for a convention proscribing all forms of religious discrimination and intolerance as a matter of international law.

This convention woluld obligate contracting states to insure all their people, whether they adhere to theistic, nontheistic or atheistic beliefs, "the right to freedom of thought, conscience, and religion." It would safeguard their right to worship, to hold assemblies, to learn, teach, and disseminate sacred languages and traditions, and to maintain charitable and educational institutions and national and international associations.

A significant feature of this convention is that it singles out anti-Semitism for special condemnation, thus redressing the General Assembly's deletion of a similar condemnation from the convention on racial discrimination. It is to be hoped that the Soviet-Arab bloc, which spearheaded that dubious "victory" in 1965, will not attempt to repeat its performance when the convention on religious intolerance is considered by the Assembly.

Of equal importance was the series of steps taken by the Commission in Geneva to break through the obstacles which, practically from the beginning of its existence, impeded its capacity to deal with concrete human rights violations. Earlier, by a self-imposed rule, the Commission had, in effect, consistently declined to consider complaints or information about such violations—not even to discuss, much less undertake any actions, in regard to them. It had restricted its role essentially to conducting studies and drafting declarations and conventions.

The impetus to give the Commission implementation functions came substantially from the African members, who were determined to involve it, as they already had the General Assembly and other UN bodies and specialized agencies, in the struggle against colonialism and racial discrimination in South Africa and the dependent territories of Southern Africa.

Also at their behest, the Commission adopted a resolution dealing in strong terms with "the grave situations obtaining in the rebellious colony of Southern Rhodesia, in Mozambique, in Guinea Bissau, in the mandated territory of South West Africa and the Republic of South Africa," and it appointed a special rapporteur to survey past UN action against the policies and practices of apartheid in South Africa, and to report back with recommendations.

The Commission, by a unanimous vote with only three abstentions, then agreed to give annual consideration to the question of violations of human rights and fundamental freedoms. It requested the Economic and Social Council to empower it "in appropriate cases . . . to make a thorough study and investigation of situations which reveal a consistent pattern of violations of human rights," and to report them, with recommendations, to the Council. It also appointed an *ad hoc* study group to consider proposals to establish regional human rights commissions.

Of greatest potential significance was the Commission's recommendation, adopted by a vote of 20 in favor, 7 against, with 2 abstentions, that the General Assembly establish an office of UN High Commissioner for Human Rights. The proposal for such an office, first publicly advanced by Jacob Blaustein in December, 1963, was brought to the General Assembly by Costa Rica in 1965. Complying with the Assembly's request, the Commission appointed a working group which, in February 1967, submitted a set of guiding principles on the basis of which the proposed office could be established.

In substance, these principles looked to the election by the General Assembly of an official of internationally-recognized stature, who would keep abreast of human rights violations throughout the world, and in various ways, especially by the use of quiet diplomacy, assist in their alleviation. This High Commissioner, who would "institutionalize" the world's conscience, would be nominated by the Secretary-General and elected by the General Assembly. Though he would command no army and have no power to render judgments, as the voice of mankind's conscience his words could have immeasureable impact.

The size of the vote in favor of such an office was extremely gratifiying, and must be attributed in considerable part to the leadership of such African states as Dahomey and Senegal. As expected, the opposition came principally from the Communist states led by the Soviet Union, and this is the key to the most unpleasant experience I encountered in the several years I have served at the UN. I refer to the crudely anti-Semitic remarks directed against me by the Soviet delegate, Jakub A. Ostrovski.

I assume it was his frustration at indications that supporters of the High Commissioner proposal had sufficient vote to put it across that precipitated his outburst. Perhaps he was worried about the reaction of his superiors back home. For the Soviet Union had made its adamant opposition known when the proposal was first broached in the UN, before it was even seriously considered. The USSR attacked the proposal as looking toward the establishment of a supranational organ whose activities might infringe on the sovereignty of the Member States. It opposed giving such unprecedented authority to a single individual, and stated that it would not cooperate with such an office if the proposal was adopted. It even refused to take part in the Commission's working group on the subject.

Perhaps Ostrovski was annoyed over the speech several days earlier by Charles Silver, adviser to our delegation, who commented at length and eloquently on Soviet repressions against the Jewish religion and culture, and pleaded for "equality for every ethnic and racial group," and for "the same measure of freedom—no more and no less—that is granted to all other people in a civilized society."

ATTACK AND COUNTER-REPLY

Whatever the reason, Mr. Ostrovski's attack on me followed my call for a point of order, when he intervened to oppose the placing of the High Commissioner proposal on the Commission's agenda immediately. This would have effectively barred its consideration at this session. My point of order—a common and legitimate usage—elicited from him the angry and amazing response that I extend him the courtesy due to a government representative, and moreover, "that one cannot treat Commission members as though they were members of the American Jewish Committee."

In my counter-reply, I expressed regret that the Soviet delegate . . . "exceeded the normal standard of conduct here by twice making reference to my Jewish connection. I understand also that he has indulged in religious implications with respect to another member who is Jewish in the deliberations of a working party."

I observed further that though I had many other private connections—with foundations, universities, civil rights organizations, and bar groups—it was significant that the Soviet delegate had twice referred in sarcastic terms to my American Jewish Committee association. I expressed pride in my affiliation with "the world's oldest human rights organization, which was founded in 1906 to fight Czarist anti-Semitism," and which "struggles against all forms of man's inhumanity to man, and for all people regardless of race, color or creed." I added that the Soviet delegate was well aware of the nature of this organization, since he had several times used its excellent human relations library. Thus, "the choice of this one association to which the Soviet delegate has now twice referred shows what all mankind knows—the deep prejudice which has been deplored by Communist parties in other states. I want it clearly understood that Communist parties in Poland, Rumania, and elsewhere fight anti-Semitism, and there is no necessary connection between Communism and anti-Semitism. The manifestation of anti-Semitism is in the Soviet Union."

ANTI-SEMITISM BOOMERANGS

If I found the Soviet delegate's conduct outrageous, the reaction of the other Commission members was correspondingly comforting. A number of them approached me in the chamber, and others spoke to Roger Tubby, the American Ambassador in Geneva to express their outrage at the Soviet delegate's conduct. In fact his outburst may have boomeranged against the USSR to the extent of producing several additional votes for the High Commissioner proposal.

If I had any doubt about Mr. Ostrovski's real attitudes, it was dispelled in a private exchange with him after the meeting. When I asked why he had expressed himself in such a manner he said he had been angry. I observed that even in anger one speaks like a human being and not like an anti-Semite. His answer to this was that his remarks had been substantially true, and that he had a dossier proving I had been appointed U.S. delegate to the Human Rights Commission at the instance of ruling Zionist circles in my country!

The following day, he made another statement which opened with what appeared to be an apology, saying "there was nothing wrong in the fact that the U.S. representative was President of the U.S. National Jewish-American Committee." But then, as though incapable of containing his prejudice, he expressed the view that I am "the servant of two masters, one of the United States government and the other of a group of Zionist organizations." He went on: "If the United States representative and the Zionist organization over which he presided were sincerely interested in the Jewish question they should start to fight anti-Semitism in the U.S.A."

RUSSIAN IS BRANDED GUILTY

My reply to this second attack, as reported in the official Summary Record of the Commission, was (in part) as follows:

"Mr. Abram (U.S.A.) said that the issue of his Jewish affiliations had been raised by the USSR representative, deliberately and, he was bound to assume, on instructions from the USSR Government. The USSR representative had been guilty of a breach of propriety in making an issue, in the Commission's debates, of the religious affiliations of one of its members. Such affiliations were totally irrelevant; that was the basic principle underlying the draft International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Religious Intolerance adopted by the Commission earlier in the present session . . ."

Lastly, aware of the implications of this public comportment by a Soviet delegate in an important UN organ—ironically, the Human Rights Commission—our government did not fail to react quickly and vigorously. Thus, replying to a letter protesting the incident, received from the Chairman of the National Community Relations Advisory Council, Secretary of State Rusk reports the following:

"Let me assure you that we in the Department received the report of this incident with equal concern. We fully supported the eloquent and telling response which Mr. Abram made. That response was made on behalf of the United States Government, in Mr. Abram's capacity as United States Representative. We believe that it disposes very effectively of the anti-Semitic aspersions made by the Soviet Representative.

"I should like to inform you that, subsequently, the United States Mission to the United Nations, under instructions from the Department of State, made formal representations to the Soviet Mission in New York, at a high level, to make it absolutely clear that Mr. Ostrovski's conduct was considered to be a regrettable departure from the standards which should prevail—and which normally have prevailed—in United Nation bodies.

"We shall continue to react vigorously to such unfounded attacks on American representatives if they should recur."

In the present state of the world, episodes like these are probably inevitable. But the session will be remembered not for them, but for its quieter labors: for completing the initial work on measures that may benefit man for centuries hereafter.

Authorizing Appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission for Fiscal Year 1968

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1967

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 10918) to authorize appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, Mr. Roy Wilkins, executive secretary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, has chosen the housing discrimination around the Weston, Ill., site for the atom smasher as the topic of his next syndicated column. He has been kind enough to permit me to use an advance copy of this column, which will appear in the Detroit News, July 1, 1967, during this debate.

Mr. Wilkins' column clearly expresses the frustration of many Negro Americans who are told that on the one hand the Federal Government believes in equal opportunity and that on the other hand a Federal agency has decided to locate a huge project in an area which is known to be discriminatory. Mr. Wilkins makes two very important points which I would like to emphasize. One, this project is being paid for by all the taxpayers and not all will benefit equally; and two, by placing this project in an area which already practices housing discrimination we are laying the groundwork for a pattern of prejudice for the 6 to 8 years needed to construct the atom smasher.

Many persons with whom I have spoken feel that this project should not be built on a site in a State which does not have a fair housing law. However, I do not contend that a State law is the only way to guarantee fair housing, nor does a fair housing law necessarily mean that discrimination will be abolished. This is certainly the case in many States which have State open housing laws. Local ordinances and real estate practices could provide the same degree of fair housing as a State law. My basic disagreement with the Weston site is that open housing is not available in this part of Illinois. Until open housing is a reality, whether achieved through a State fair housing law or local ordinances and assurances, the atomic project should not be built on this site or any other site where housing discrimination prevails.

I would like to insert Mr. Wilkins' column into the Record at this point:

Illinois Criticized as Atom Plant Site

(By Roy Wilkins)

Negro citizens who have managed to preserve a faith in the easing of racial difficulties through steady, orderly procedure got another kick in the teeth a few days ago.

The Illinois state senate has killed a fair housing bill. The arresting aspect of this act lies in the fact that housing for minorities was a factor in the selection of Weston, Ill., as the site for the $375-million atom smasher by the Atomic Energy Commission.

Weston, a town of a few hundred residents, has no Negroes in or near the place. DuPage County, in which Weston is located, has a population of approximately 300,000, of which only 600 are Negroes. Since the county is very near Chicago and Weston is only 35 miles from the metropolis, it is easy to believe that DuPage County has had a policy of deliberately discouraging Negroes from settling there.

In fact, the record shows that DuPage County politicians and leaders have opposed adamantly the enactment of any fair housing legislation by the state legislature. They were unbending when the Weston plant was being discussed. They wanted no concessions on minority housing.

Five other states, California, New York, Michigan, Wisconsin and Colorado, had sites competing with Illinois. All of Illinois' rivals had laws on housing and employment even though California was involved in litigation. Despite this, and dispite lily-white Weston and almost lily-white DuPage County, the Illinois town was the winner, principally upon the assurance from Illinoisans that a fair housing law would be enacted.

Now the Illinois legislature has reneged. The state has the $375-million atom plant and the $60-million a year in maintenance money. It has 2,000 technical employes and many workers in other categories, all making up a fat payroll for Illinois. For white Illinois, that is.

Just in case Negro citizens get any ideas, a spokesman for the suburb of Cicero has already laid down talk of "bloodshed." Weston has adopted a town fair housing ordinance but a town official said that it would not require anyone to sell or rent to "anyone he did not choose to deal with." Negroes are still out in the cold on housing.

Why is this important? Why the blood pressures? Well, the United States, where Negroes have lived for 348 years, where they pay taxes and where their men have fought and died in defense of their country in every war from 1776 to Vietnam, is going to use tax money to create an employment bonanza in the middle of an Illinois prairie and that bonanza will be for white, not black, Americans.

This use of the money of all the people to build a facility where nonwhite workers will have to face insults and bricks and mobs in order to occupy a home is a monumental sin in the world of 1967. Since about eight years of construction are required, a procedure is being adopted that will give life to the jim crow policy of 1975!

In a letter to a New York newspaper a woman points out that one Negro is in the President's Cabinet and one has been nominated to the Supreme Court. She asks, plaintively, "What more do they want?"

Well, madam, they are grateful to the President for the Cabinet member and (if confirmed) for the Supreme Court associate justice. However, two men, estimable as they are, cannot substitute for opportunity and justice and dignity for the entire Negro population, or even for Negro Illinoisans.

The Atomic Energy Commission and its controlling Joint Congressional Committee should cancel out Weston, Ill., and build the plant elsewhere.

Right To Dissent Defended by Judge Masato Doi in Inspiring Address at Nisei World War II Veterans Reunion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 13, 1967

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, the right to dissent is one of the most basic and cherished rights of this Nation. However, the smokescreens which rise from the flames ignited by the very dissidence of dissent sometimes obscures the way to finding solutions to the difficult problems confronting our Nation today.

Hawaii Circuit Judge Masato Doi put this issue in its proper perspective in a penetrating speech in defense of dissent which he delivered at the welcoming banquet of the 1967 Nisei Veterans Reunion in Honolulu on June 27, 1967.

Judge Doi, an honor graduate of the Columbia University School of Law, and a decorated veteran of the famed 442d Regimental Combat Team spoke on "The Greater Challenge," and I commend his eloquent address to the attention of my colleagues in Congress.

Also participating in the program of this 25th anniversary event commemorating the departure of Americans of Japanese ancestry for the battlefields of World War II, were Mr. William Oshiro, who served as master of ceremonies, Chaplain Hiro Higuchi, Mr. Harry Tokushige, and Mr. Katsugo Miho, who introduced Judge Doi.

The essence of Judge Doi's address can be found in his closing words that—

> Other men now bear the arms. But we at home must always bear in mind what it is that is being defended. And most zealously must those very principles be guarded here at home.

In an editorial commending Judge Doi's address, the Honolulu Advertiser stated—

> By pointing out that the struggle of the past is part of a continuing challenge in human freedom, Judge Doi has given even deeper meaning to this past quarter-century of accomplishment.

Mr. Speaker, Edmund Burke said that great men are the guideposts and landmarks in the State. We in the State of Hawaii are fortunate that we have such a man as Judge Masato Doi, who stands straight and tall in the proud knowledge of his American heritage. It is an inspiration to know that he continues to fight as valiantly for the preservation of our democratic ideals from the bench as he did on the battlefields of World War II.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert the full text of Judge Doi's address and the editorial from the Honolulu Advertiser of June 29, 1967, in the RECORD at this point:

THE GREATER CHALLENGE

(Address by Masato Doi to Nisei Veterans Reunion, June 27, 1967)

Old soldiers fade away, but ignorance and prejudice die hard, and sometimes, never.

Not more than a fortnight ago, there broke in the local papers an interesting little story of special significance to this gathering. What with the daily swirl of white and negro rioting, of crisis in the Middle East, of mounting crime across the nation, and of murderous encounters on the Vietnam battlefields, the local splash was like a little pebble thrown in a little puddle.

But the memories evoked were not unreal.

First, a little background on the local story for our mainland friends.

It germinated just about nine months ago with a decision I rendered in a case called State v. Noel Kent. Kent was a student on the University campus and president of the Political Affairs Club. The Club sponsored an open rally in a campus hall on the topic of American participation in Vietnam.

At the rally, Kent put up several posters, one of which was a caricature of the American flag. The stripes were pointed and dollar signs were in place of the stars. The idea was that American dollars were being spent for unjust wars.

Kent made a talk which was strongly critical of American participation in Vietnam. A young man who had been heckling Kent during the speech was invited to the stage. After making some comments, he asked Kent whether the placard was the American flag. Kent replied, "that is what it has become," and that LBJ has desecrated it by napalming and murdering women and children in Vietnam. Boos, Jeers and catcalls from the audience ensued.

A young lady was given the platform, who stated that her father and uncle were fighting in Vietnam and that she was proud of America. Kent received the impression that she was labelling all opponents of American Vietnam policy as traitors, so he responded by saying that he loved America, that if he were a betrayer who did not love America he would not take the trouble to get himself involved, that he did not want to see people like the young lady's father and uncle killed in Vietnam.

A WAC was given the platform and spoke in support of our country's involvement.

And the rally was ended by a short question and answered period.

Kent was charged with defiling, defying and casting contempt on the flag of the United States.

My decision was that to be guilty of the charge, a defendant must by word or conduct evince a purpose to dishonor the flag, that the circumstances must show an intent to shame the American flag.

I decided that the American flag is an emblem which, if it can be said to represent anything, is a symbolic representation of the United States as an entire nation, a unified body politic embracing the bad as well as the good and welded into one by a common bond of territory and history. It is not symbolic of segmented fragments of the American nation, whether they be American military might or race riots, Rocky mountain majesty or night life in Las Vegas, Vietnam involvement or peace marches against it.

To this concept of our flag as symbolic of the entirety of what we call America, I said, Kent envinced no contempt or defiance; rather, to his own way of thinking, he wished to gain respect for it. I may not agree with his thinking, I said, but in his own way, Kent, far from intending a desecration of the American flag, was himself accusing others of doing the same and that the exaggerated poster caricature was not intended to represent the American flag but was displayed by him as a symbolic portrayal of his violent disagreement with present American policy in Vietnam.

And he was acquitted.

Well, this caused a little fireworks at the time, but not much. The incubation period was to be nine months. And Mr. Kent kept the incubator warm during the period by getting into the news from time to time, identified by the press as the man acquitted in the "flag-burning" case.

Then about two weeks ago, a district attorney in Brooklyn out-did the old Brooklyn Dodgers. Referring to Kent's acquittal, he wrote to a congressional committee stating: "We must realize that the background of the State of Hawaii is not as steeped in the same spirit of Americanism as are the other states of the union. Hawaii has a foreign ideology as its background and that is probably explanatory of the court's attitude."

Of course, I have been kidded about this, especially by some 442nd veterans. My flippant reply has been: "If only you foreigners would get out of here, my thinking would not be warped so much by your foreign ideology."

But this little incident is a yellow caution light of a deeper danger.

If the district attorney had criticized or condemned me individually, I would not be concerned. In fact, he quickly said that he had been misinformed and did not realize that no actual flag but only a poster was involved in the case before me.

But warning to us is how quickly man is wont to vent his distrust on fellow man. A strange face or a strange name seems cause enough for fear. And the brush of fear is broad and indiscriminate.

Two decades and two years is short in time but long in one man's life. It is too short to forget and too long to have considered wasted.

Whether with Merrill's Marauders or the M.I.S., with the 1399th or the 100th, with the 442nd or some other, and this whether as AJA or as "haole", none can forget the fiery forge of World War II that caused a common fusion. And none should forget the comrades lost in stinking trench and battered hills. And none must forget our nation's high ideals of individual worth and individual respect and individual liberty, whatever the color, for which the war was fought and won.

And in the cooling of a score of years, each of you have stood the test of sober responsibilities. And you have not departed from your love of land nor pride in country.

Oftentimes in war, the dizzying heights of glory and the tragic depths of despair, the exhilaration of accomplishment and the weariness of exhaustion, the pride in esprit de corps and the resentment at dictation—oftentimes in war—these varied feelings alternate with such speed that life remains one continuous excitement. The muck and stench are cancelled by the furlough and the wine. And the only thought is group survival.

How much harder it is to think and act behind the lines in peacetime on the common problems of common living. Yet in the score of years just past, whether in the task of daily work, or in the silent challenge of civic duty, or in the limelight of community leadership, each of you have proven strong and solid.

You have stood straight these score of years, and these are years too long to be surrendered as a "nothing", too long to be erased by the smearing brush of thoughtless men.

You have stood straight, but standing straight is not enough. The greater challenge is to stand tall.

And standing tall is much the harder task.

Standing straight, you bow to no man. And standing tall, you ask no man to bow to you.

Standing straight, you exercise your right to express your thoughts. And standing tall, you command none to silence his.

Standing straight, you plant your two feet firm and self-sufficient. And standing tall, you extend your helping hand to him who needs.

Standing straight, you take pride in your country's glory. And standing tall, you see the bigger picture of mankind.

Standing straight, you are proud to be an American. And standing tall, you give conscious, careful thought to the meaning of our nation's heritage.

It is not easy to stand tall in the midst of all that goes on around us.

In the field of civil rights, the steady progress of a decade is now threatened by overt resentment: rioting by a few in the minority rooted in the deprivations of a century, rioting by a few in the majority rooted in reaction. How easy it is to fall prey to disgust at these superficial symptoms and turn our backs on basic principles in our tradition.

Stand tall and ask no man to bow to you. Remember always that our own humiliating experience in the days of World War II as the butt of prejudice was only an example of unreasoned acts of men who forgot the tenets of our nation.

True that our experience found its ugly birth in circumstances quite different from those in which the black man's plight is born. But the unjustified brush of fear and prejudice remains the same. It paints broadly and indiscriminately and denies our nation's heritage of equality, of the individual worth of man, and of the principle that Americanism is a matter of mind and heart and not of skin.

Let us not forget this lest our children be condemned to relive that part of our lives which all would wish to blot.

I do not ask that you condone the riots and the senseless looting. But I ask that you do not react to them in such a way that you deny the basic tenets of our nation.

Too, as we look around us wishing to stand tall, we see our nation embroiled in conflict in the jungles of Vietnam and see a raging controversy as to our country's course. The hawks and doves, the escalators and the pull-outs, the warmongers and the peace-niks, swirl furiously in confusing array.

I support our nation's present course and its posture of "never fearing to negotiate, though unwilling to negotiate from fear."

But the hawks and doves who dissent from such a course can stand straight and state their thoughts. Expression of dissent is not to be equated with treason.

And you stand tall if you ask not for official suppression.

Where no clear and present danger of substantive evils arises under circumstances which afford no opportunity for testing the merits of ideas in the marketplace of public opinion, expression of ideas is a bulwark against unenlightened and arbitrary action.

The great genius of America is its belief that out of untrammeled expressions of men free and equal rise the truths which ultimately triumph.

Officially prescribed orthodoxy in politics, nationalism, religion and other matters of opinion has been many times tried and battered down. This is a hallmark of our nation that sets us apart from totalitarian regimes.

And as was said by the Supreme Court of our country: ". . . a function of free speech under our system of government is to invite dispute. It may indeed best serve its high purpose when it induces a condition of unrest, creates dissatisfaction with conditions as they are, or even stirs people to anger. It may strike at prejudices and preconceptions and have profound unsettling effects as it presses for acceptance of an idea."

And the "freedom to differ is not limited to things that do not matter much. That would be a mere shadow of freedom. The test of its substance is the right to differ as to things that touch the heart of the existing order."

And even if the idea is one which we despise, the answer is that in an atmosphere of freedom, truth will prevail in any contest with error.

Other men now bear the arms. But we at home must always bear in mind what it is that is being defended. And most zealously must those very principles be guarded here at home.

Stand straight, stand tall, until we meet again.

DOI AND DISSENT

Circuit Judge Masato Doi has done this community a great service by using the Nisei veterans reunion as a forum for defending the right to dissent.

Few others have done more for the cause of minority rights in this nation than the Hawaii and Mainland Nisei who observe here this week the 25th anniversary of their departure for war under the flag of the 100th Battalion.

Such was the climate of suspicion and prejudice in our nation that it was an uphill fight for them to even win the right to wear the uniform, the right to fight and die.

In the end a grateful nation honored them, and as much as anything their record brought the people of Hawaii the full political equality of Statehood.

Judge Doi, a distinguished alumnus of this distinguished group, has reminded not only his old comrades in arms but all the rest of us that the struggle for racial equality is part of something bigger—the struggle for individual rights and freedom of expression.

He pointed out how his most reasonable acquittal of a young man charged with defiling the American flag was used recently by the district attorney in Brooklyn to cast racial aspersions on Hawaii's people.

The inner-relationship of emotional superpatriotism, racial prejudice, and restriction on minority dissent is something that dies very hard indeed.

Judge Doi did not turn his back on the fact other racial groups, the Negroes especially, still suffer and themselves indulge in extremes:

"I do not ask that you condone the riots and the senseless looting. But I ask that you do not react to them in such a way that you deny the basic tenets of our nation.

Nor did he ignore the fact the nation is involved in another grim shooting war that calls for patriotic sacrifice.

Expressing his own support for President Johnson's middle course on Vietnam he added: "But the hawks and doves who dissent from such a course can stand straight and state their thoughts. Expression of dissent is not to be equated with treason."

And he posed this view against the meaning of such freedom as expresed by the U.S. Supreme Court:

". . . a function of free speech under our system of government is to invite dispute. It may indeed best serve its high purpose when it induces a condition of unrest, creates dissatisfaction with conditions as they are, or even stirs people to anger. It may strike at prejudices and preconceptions and have profound unsettling effects as it presses for acceptance of an idea."

And the "freedom to differ is not limited to things that do not matter much. That would be a mere shadow of freedom. The test of its substance is the right to differ as to things that touch the heart of the existing order."

Judge Doi's closing words to his Nisei comrades are to be commended to all of us:

"Other men now bear the arms. But we at home must always bear in mind what it is that is being defended. And most zealously must those very principles be guarded here at home."

The record of the American Nisei continues to speak for itself in a way that makes statements from Brooklyn sadly laughable.

By pointing out that the struggle of the past is part of a continuing challenge in human freedom, Judge Doi has given even deeper meaning to this past quarter-century of accomplishment.

Senator Joseph S. Clark, Doctor of Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 12, 1967

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, honorary degrees are given in recognition of public service. JOSEPH SILL CLARK, the senior Senator from my State of Pennsylvania, has for nearly two decades served the people of his city, his Commonwealth, and his Nation. In recognition of his accomplishments Franklin and Marshall College presented Senator CLARK with a doctor of laws degree at its 180th annual commencement on June 11. The following is a transcript of the citation:

CITATION OF JOSEPH SILL CLARK ON THE OCCASION OF HIS RECEIVING THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF LAWS AT THE 180TH ANNUAL COMMENCEMENT OF FRANKLIN AND MARSHALL COLLEGE, LANCASTER, PA., JUNE 11, 1967

Mr. President, I am pleased to present for the Honorary Degree of Doctor of Laws

Joseph Sill Clark

That rich, deep vein of practical idealism which has enriched the American character, that tendency to work with nuts and bolts while seeking stars, finds eloquent expression in the life of the senior senator from Pennsylvania.

A senatorial visionary is Joseph S. Clark, to be sure, for only a man who has dreamed would dare write books entitled *The Senate Establishment* and *Congress: The Sapless Branch!* But mere dreams have not been the concern of this Senator, reform Mayor, World War II Air Force Chief of Staff in the China-Burma-India Theater, attorney and law review editor. Forty-four presidential bill-signing pens are displayed in his Washington offices, alone providing eloquent testimony that this is a man with both a vision of the good society and the determination to carry it out.

Trail-blazing has been his trademark during a turbulent decade in the Senate, through work typified by the subcommittee hearings he guided through a pioneering study of the impact of automation on our economy.

He has combined a search for world peace with major contributions to a war on poverty, and support for the United Nations with charter revision in his native Philadelphia. A successful advocate of social-welfare programs, he worked with equal fervor for exemption of the Amish from Social Security provisions—this through one of the most unique legislative partnerships of our time, the Clark-Goldwater amendment to the Medicare bill!

Practical idealism has basically—and perhaps most significantly—made him a champion of the sometimes forgotten balance inherent in our Federal system. His friends know him not only as a Pennsylvania Senator but as a United States Senator *from* Pennsylvania, a national statesman who simultaneously understands the importance of local government as perhaps only a former controller and mayor of Philadelphia could do.

Mr. President, it is a great pleasure to present him for the degree for which he has been cited.

Phony War on Crime

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. GOODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 13, 1967

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the July 12, 1967, edition of the Washington, D.C., Evening Star:

PHONY WAR ON CRIME

There comes a time when a spade should be called a spade, and there also comes a time when a phony war should be called a phony war. That time has been reached in Lyndon Johnson's much-touted and loudly-heralded "war on crime."

The sweeping—and they are sweeping—regulations just put out by Attorney General Ramsey Clark restricting the use of wiretaps and elecronic listening devices are the last straw. The attorney general surely would not have sounded this call for retreat without the approval of the President. So one is driven to the conclusion that the war on crime is a phony war, and that all of the President's high-flown speeches, not to mention the attorney general's rhetorical contributions, have been nothing more than wordy exercises designed to conceal the fact that this administration's heart is not in its so-called war.

The attorney general's new regulations go well beyond the restrictions on wiretaps and bugging imposed two years ago by the President. They forbid law-enforcement practices which the Supreme Court has not yet outlawed. A suspicious soul might think that they are an invitation to the court to go farther than it has up to this time—and this may not be lost upon the "liberal" judicial majority.

Ramsey Clark obviously has a thing about wiretaps and bugging. He thinks they are a waste of manpower. He has testified that they are "abhorrent" devices. He says that all of his experience shows that electronic surveillance (he has had very little experience in criminal law enforcement) is not necessary for the public safety, is not a desirable or effective investigative technique, and that these abhorrent devices should be used only in the national security field. He has never explained why wiretaps and bugs are essential in national security cases but useless against organized crime. Of course he cannot come up with any rational explanation.

Let's turn to another witness. Frank S. Hogan, New York County district attorney, has been in the front line of the war on crime for 27 years. He told the President's Crime Commission: Electronic surveillance is the single most valuable weapon in law enforcement's fight against organized crime. . . . It has permitted us to undertake major investigations of organized crime. Without it, and I confine myself to top figures in the underworld, my own office could not have convicted Charles "Lucky" Luciano, Jimmy Hines, Louis "Lepke" Buchalter, Jacob "Gurrah" Shapiro, Joseph "Socks" Lanza, George Scalise, Frank Erickson, John "Dio" Dioguardi, and Frank Carbo.

Well, there it is. Take your choice. Frank S. Hogan, who has sent scores of vicious hoodlums to jail, is quite willing to use the abhorrent eavesdropping weapon in his war on crime. He thinks it is an essential weapon. Ramsey Clark and Lyndon Johnson are not willing. They would prefer to conduct their war with speeches at twenty paces. And, in consequence, this war is one which organized crime will surely win and which the American people, the ultimate victims, will surely lose.

OEO Responds to Genuine Needs of the Poor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL E. BUTTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 13, 1967

Mr. BUTTON. Mr. Speaker, in the face of considerable vocal political opposition last month, the Office of Economic Opportunity announced a $400,000 grant to the Southwest Alabama Farmers' Cooperative Association, a 10-county cooperative in one of America's most depressed rural areas.

As was expected, Mrs. Wallace vetoed the grant. Recently, Mr. Shriver, using the authority vested in the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, after a further detailed investigation of the whole proposal, found the grant to be "fully consistent with the provisions and in furtherance of the purposes of the (act)."

I applaud Mr. Shriver and the OEO for displaying the kind of leadership and innovative responsibility that others often shun. Once again, Mr. Speaker, the OEO is responding to the urgent needs of people so poor that they are, in a very real and tragic sense, the "untouchables" of American society.

Approximately 96 percent of the present members of SWAFCA are poor. Many members have incomes below $1,000 a year. The vast majority have incomes so low that the Farmers Home Administration cannot consider making them loans.

All of the present and potential members of SWAFCA are faced with technological changes in agriculture, falling prices, and reduced Federal allotments that make their survival on the land precarious at the very best. Many have already been forced to leave the only environment they know and can cope with and to forfeit their only source of saving and capital, pitifully small though that source may be. In approving this grant, OEO has recognized the need to act quickly before many more inevitably follow, cast adrift into city slums. Members of SWAFCA have already identified 300 families who are at the point of being forced off their land.

Mr. Speaker, the OEO has been meticulous in its processing of this grant. In not the slightest sense is it an impulsive giveaway. The SWAFCA proposal was submitted to the OEO 5 months ago and received intensive profesisonal evaluation and development. The program will not duplicate existing services. On the contrary, the Department of Agriculture has indicated that it simply does not have sufficient resources to undertake a project of this magnitude and complexity but has pledged to the program its support and assistance in every way possible.

The proposed budget has been gone over with a fine-tooth comb and pared, line by line, by a little over $100,000 from the oriignal request.

Because of local personal attacks on the backgrounds of certain members of SWAFCA's board of directors, the backgrounds of all board members have been checked. No subversive or objectionable information has been discovered by any of these checks.

Finally, although the membership of SWAFCA will undoubtedly be predominantly Negro, a special condition to the grant specifies that low-income white farmers will be eligible to become members and to participate fully in SWAFCA's activities.

It is commendable, Mr. Speaker, that OEO went to such great lengths in taking these precautions. But it is vital that the needs of people like the farmers in SWAFCA receive imaginative and comprehensive support. This poverty has implications which extend far beyond the confines of the 10 black belt Alabama counties. Mr. Speaker, OEO's willingness to come to grips with these implications has been dramatically shown by the approval of the SWAFCA grant, addressing itself to fundamental issues that are vital to the development of genuine economic opportunities for the poor.

Armed Forces of the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HERBERT BURKE

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 13, 1967

Mr. BURKE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, John Pigott, 10th grade honor student at Stranahan High School, Fort Lauderdale, Fla., recently participated in a world history test sponsored by the United Nations Association of the United States of America. The results of the 3-hour examination placed young Pigott among the top contestants in Broward County. On Armed Forces Day—May 20th—John gave the following remarks before the Broward County chapter of the United Nations Association. In view of recent events, I am sure this young man's conclusions merit our consideration.

By the way, John Pigott received his junior high school education in Nassau, New Providence Island, the Bahamas.

His remarks are as follows:

Since today is Armed Forces Day, I thought I would talk about the armed Forces of the United Nations.

The United Nations has occasionally used force to repel aggression, as in Korea, and to maintain peace, as in the Suez Canal, in the Congo, and most recently in Cyprus.

On June 27, 1950, the Security Council made a historic request that all member nations provide military assistance to the Republic of Korea. Fifty-three States approved this action in principle, sixteen promised combat units, and five agreed to contribute medical units. In July, a unified command was set up in Korea under the United Nations flag and United States leadership. An armistice was signed on July 27, 1953.

After the armed clash in the Suez Canal in 1956, and in order to prevent the possible recurrence of hostilities, the organization recruited a military force, called the United Nations Emergency Force composed of troops furnished by several member nations, to be dispatched to the border between Israel and Egypt.

This force performed its task so well that it established a pattern that was followed in the Congo. Here, the ONUC (from the French words meaning, United Nations Operations in the Congo) was created and it greatly contributed to the maintaining of some peace and stability in the former Belgian territory that had achieved independence in 1960.

In 1964, in an attempt to keep under control the potentially explosive situation in Cyprus, a similar force was created—the United Nations Peace-keeping Force in Cyprus—and dispatched there.

Successful as these operations have been, they have produced huge strains on the United Nations' budget, which has had difficulty in recovering from the effects of these unforeseen and heavy expenditures.

On top of this, two member nations, Russia and France, have refused to pay their share of the expenses in several situations. Russia refused to pay her share in the Congo because she was unable to spread communism, and France refused to pay her share in the Suez Canal because Egypt was given her territory.

Although the United Nations has been successful in its actions in Korea, Indonesia, Kashmir and the Congo, the Suez Canal is a different story. Just yesterday, Secretary General U Thant informed the General Assembly that he was bowing to Egypt's demands that the Emergency Force be withdrawn from the Gaza Strip and from Egyptian territory.

In a special report to the 122 nation assembly, the Secretary General said he is proceeding for the withdrawal of the 3,400 man force although he is doing so with the possible threat to peace in the area. One mistake could plunge the bristling area into war.

Such an action, in my judgment, will put our world into an inferno! With our problems in Asia, that is, Vietnam, Korea and other areas. Frankly, I am concerned. The world is in serious trouble, believe me, and our future is treading on thin ice.

This conclusion is based upon the contents of a recent news release from Washington—which in short—stated that some 10,000 young men have already given their lives in South Vietnam. These men were only my seniors by a few years—less than five.

Thus, I am, and my associates, are interested in any feasible plan that will stop the destruction of our youth!

Thank you.

Congressman Horton Praises Damascus Temple, A.A.O.N.M.S.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 13, 1967

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues are surely aware, Washington is the host city this week to the 93d Imperial Council of the Ancient Arabic Order, Nobles of the Mystic Shrine, and to tens of thousands of Shriners.

On Wednesday of this week, it was my pleasure to present a flag which had flown over the capitol to 3 members of the Color Guard of Damascus Temple, A.A.O.N.M.S. of Rochester, N.Y., the Temple to which, I am proud to say, I belong.

The members of the Damascus Temple color guard who received the flag were Nobles William D. Staples, Randall G. Beachner, and Robert J. Gabel.

They are three of the more than 400 Damascus Temple Shriners who are on the pilgrimage to the national convention.

Damascus Temple is the second oldest temple in the Shrine jurisdiction. Its charter is dated in 1875.

Because of its seniority, Damascas Temple will be one of the first units whose colorful band and Shriners will thrill and delight the many thousands of people who will watch tonight's parade up Pennsylvania Avenue.

Damascus Temple this year is under the able leadership of Potentate Clayton F. Kaul.

Potentate Kaul is assisted by these elected members of the Divan—

Chief Rabban Barton S. Horner.

Assistant Rabban James B. Scobell.

High Priest and Prophet Robert L. Anderson.

Oriental Guide Leonard Parker.

Other Shriners who head units in Damascus Temple, and who are on the pilgrimage to Washington, are—

Patrol Captain William J. Cox.

Legion of Honor Captain Le Roy Wilson.

Band Director John W. Cummings.

President of Director's Staff Douglas McLean.

Director of Director's Staff Ralph I. Oatman.

Director of Musical Unit Charles B. Benedict.

Horse Patrol President Leland Pflanz.

Horse Patrol Captain Theodore Hamilton.

Color Guard Captain Karl Lemperle.

Patrol President Charles Jack.

Chanters President Anton Hanson.

Shrine activities which the public is seeing this week highlighted by the parades, emphasize high spirts, good fellowship, and enjoyment of life. I can attest to the enjoyable aspects of being a Shriner.

But the public is not as aware of the serious aspects of Shrine activities.

The 3,500 members of Damascus Temple in Rochester, for example, are deeply involved in the operation of two Shrine Hospitals for Crippled Children. One is located in Springfield, Mass.; the other in Erie, Pa.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to draw the attention of my colleagues to the worthy activities of the Shrine, and of Damascus Temple of Rochester, N.Y.

Open Letter to Premier Kosygin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 12, 1967

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, in a recent open letter to Soviet Premier Kosygin, printed as an advertisement in the New York Times, the Committee To Restore Lithuania's Independence asked some important, pertinent questions.

The entire free world and, I have no doubt, many of the people whose freedom has been abrogated behind the Iron Curtain, would be interested in hearing answers to these questions.

I doubt very much if they will be answered, at this time, but as rhetorical questions they illuminate the full hypocrisy of the Soviet position in the Middle East situation.

I commend the committee's letter to the attention of my colleagues:

THE BALTIC QUESTION—OPEN LETTER TO PREMIER KOSYGIN

On June 19, 1967, the Soviet Premier, Aleksei Kosygin, in addressing the United Nations General Assembly, accused Israel of continuing aggression by occupying the territories of the United Arab Republic, Syria and Jordan.

Mr. Kosygin defined continuing aggression as attempts "to interfere in the internal affairs of independent countries and peoples, to impose on them, from the outside, political concepts and views alien to them on the social order."

The Soviet Premier is adept at defining continuous aggression, for his state has a long record of conspiracy against the sovereignty and territorial integrity of independent nations. While vituperating against the State of Israel, Mr. Kosygin would do well to consider his own government's continuing aggression. The most conspicuous victims of joint Soviet-Russian and Nazi German aggression are the Baltic States of Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia.

The annexation of the Baltic States by the Soviet Union was pre-determined by the Ribbentrop-Molotov Pact of August 23, 1939. The agreement stated: "In the event of territorial and political rearrangement in the areas belonging to the Baltic States (Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania and Finland), the northern boundary of Lithuania shall represent the boundary of the spheres of influence of Germany and the U.S.S.R."

While the attention of the world was focused on the Blitzkrieg in the West, the Soviet Union imposed it's "sphere of influence." On June 15, 1940, troops and tanks of the Red Army poured into the Baltic States. Moscow hastily set up puppet governments. A single list of representatives, hand-picked by Moscow, was proposed to the "liberated" countries. To insure the election of the Communist candidates, tens of thousands of people were arrested on the eve of the elections as a threat to those who might protest by refusal to vote. The decisions of the "elected representatives" to "request" incorporation of the three Baltic States into the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics were prepared in Moscow and carried out by the occupying Red Army.

In their zeal to impose their alien system on the Baltic States, the Soviets deported or liquidated 700,000 men, women and children from Lithuania alone, between June, 1941 and March, 1951. Not withstanding this inhuman oppression, the peoples of the Baltic Nations persevere in their aspirations toward personal freedom and national independence.

While addressing the General Assembly, Mr. Kosygin unequivocally stated, "In the course of its 50 year history, the Soviet Union has regarded all peoples, large or small, with respect; every people enjoys the right to establish an independent national state of its own. This constitutes one of the fundamental principles of the policy of the Soviet Union. While upholding the rights of peoples to self-determination, the Soviet Union just as resolutely condemns the attempts by any state to conduct an aggressive policy toward other countries—a policy of conquest of foreign lands and the subjugation of the peoples living there."

In view of the above facts, we request the Premier to clarify the following questions:

Why has the Soviet Union continued to violate the sovereignty of Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia?

When will the Soviet Union apply the principles of the United Nations Charter to the Baltic States?

When will the Soviet military and administrative apparatus be withdrawn from the territory of the Baltics?

When will the Soviet Union desist from its policy of Russification and Sovietization of the Baltic peoples?

When will the Baltic victims of mass deportation be allowed to return to their homelands?

When will the Soviet Union cease interfering in the political, social, and religious life of the Baltic States?

Mr. Premier, the Baltic Republics have a right to preserve their own languages, religious freedoms, traditions and political aspirations. Will you enact measures to correct the gross injustices imposed by Stalin on the Baltic Nations and restore independence—or are your noble words addressed to the General Assembly mere hypocrisy?

Committee to Restore Lithuania's Independence, 29 West 57th St., New York, N.Y. 10019.

Executive Coordinators: Algirdas Budreckis, Romas Kezys, Anthony B. Mazeika, Joseph Miklovas, Anthony V. Snieckus.

Antiriot Bill Is No Answer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 13, 1967

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, next week, this House will take up a bill which purports to prevent riots. It betrays a tragic misunderstanding of the causes of social disturbances. Having failed to take effective action to eliminate poverty, discrimination, and despair, the Congress now hopes to legislate away its frustration on the theory that outside agitators, not internal ills, cause riots.

Tom Wicker, in his column in the New York Times of July 13, puts the matter brilliantly when he writes:

> A Congress representing a dominantly white society, that will not even pass a diluted open-housing law or provide increased protection for civil-rights workers, but which does not "want to be in a position of opposing" a demogogic anti-riot bill, is unlikely to persuade unemployed, slum dwelling, poorly educated, often ill-fed, ill-clad Negroes that they can get relief from the law before they can get it from the streets.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to consider Mr. Wicker's article, the text of which follows:

[From the New York Times, July 13, 1967]

IN THE NATION: THE DEADLIEST POLLUTION

(By Tom Wicker)

WASHINGTON, July 12.—The other day in Cincinnati the Rev. Fred Shuttlesworth—once a lieutenant of Martin Luther King in the nonviolent upheavals in the South—told Gene Roberts of this newspaper that the basic reason Negroes rioted was that "they say, 'we've already tried nonviolence and we're still where we are.' "

Even Senator Edward Brooke of Massachusetts, always a moderate, warned at the N.A.A.C.P. convention in Boston this week that the failure of public officials to respond adequately to the needs of Negroes was "an invitation to violence." And Roy Wilkins, who has risked his leadership to stand for reason and understanding, told the N.A.A.C.P. that Congress's refusal to pass open housing and other needed legislation was "creating the atmosphere" for violence.

IS GRATITUDE DUE?

This will outrage those whites who believe that the civil rights legislation of recent years ought to have "satisfied" the Negroes, and that "these people" are only proving themselves beastly ingrates by rioting in the streets. The fact is, however, that all that legislation has yet to produce real gains for ghetto Negroes in employment, housing or education; and while Southern Negroes finally have the right to vote and eat grits in the local cafe, and a small percentage of them can even send their children to adequate schools, why should they be grateful for that? What gratitude is due a thief who steals your money, keeps it for a few generations, then grudgingly gives a little of it back under court order?

'LONG COLD WINTER'

During this season's rioting in Buffalo, Mayor Frank Sedita pleaded for "just a few days" to find jobs for unemployed Negroes. He was willing enough to find jobs to *end* violence in the long, hot summer; but why had jobs not been found to *prevent* violence in what Martin Luther King calls the "the long cold winter"?

In an even more myopic answer—or non-answer—to the ghetto, the House may bravely pass this week an "anti-riot" bill that would make it possible to jail and find anybody who crosses a state line "with intent to incite street violence and rioting."

This political popgun is aimed squarely at Stokely Carmichael, described by its sponsor, Cramer of Florida, as a giant of a fellow whose itinerant rabble-rousing has left in its wake "thousands of Negroes whose blood is simmering and waiting for a chance to riot."

Even assuming that Carmichael and other supermen actually caused the trouble in Los Angeles, Cleveland, New York, Chicago, Rochester, Buffalo, Tampa, Lincoln, and points west; even assuming that local authorities could not, in that case, deal with them in the manner of Atlanta, which put Carmichael in jail; even assuming the constitutionality; of the bill's language and intent; even assuming all these dubious propositions, the truth of this bill still is to be found in the words of Representative Celler of New York, who at least tried to block it.

Nevertheless, he confessed to the Committee on Rules, "I don't want to be in a position of opposing this bill."

That is what Shuttlesworth and Brooke and Wilkins, none of whom ever threw a Molotov cocktail or stoned a loanshark's office, were talking about. A Congress representing a dominantly white society, that will not pass even a diluted open-housing law or provide increased protection for civil rights workers, but which does not "want to be in a position of opposing" a demagogic anti-riot bill, is unlikely to persuade unemployed, slum-dwelling, poorly educated, often ill-fed and ill-clad Negroes that they can get relief from the law before they can get it in the streets.

SQUEAKY WHEELS

Shuttlesworth told Roberts about a new park being built in the riot area of Cincinnati. "A lot of people think they got that because of rioting, and I think they are right," he said. "Nonviolence didn't get it."

And the final tragedy is that while violence produces jobs in Buffalo and a park in Cincinnati, it also produces untold hatred and suffering and bitterness. Thus white myopia and black despair work together to pollute a nation's soul.

Command Decisions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 13, 1967

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I am setting forth at this point a book review written by Milton Viorst, a freelance author and writer on the Washington scene. Mr. Viorst reports on Roger Hilsman's new book, "To Move a Nation: The Politics of Foreign Policy in the Administration of John F. Kennedy," and his review is so excellent I would like to bring it to the attention of my colleagues.

It provides much food for thought, and gives us a clearer insight into the reasonings and maneuverings behind our foreign policies.

The review, which appeared in the June 11 edition of Book Week, published by the Washington Post, follows:

COMMAND DECISIONS

(By Milton Viorst)

("To Move a Nation: The Politics of Foreign Policy in the Administration of John F. Kennedy." By Roger Hilsman. Illustrated. Doubleday. 602 pp. $6.95.)

Roger Hilsman is no dove. He's a tough-minded intellectual who served under President Kennedy in high posts in the State Department. He admired Kennedy's diplomacy, not because Kennedy always made the right decisions but because he applied—except, perhaps, during the first Cuban crisis—rigorous intellectual processes to reach them. In this excellent book, Hilsman reviews critically the diplomatic policies in which he was himself involved. He writes with authority, offering fresh insights and information on crises ranging from Cuba to Malaysia. But the casual reader will be forgiven for skipping to the chapters on the crisis that really concerns us most. Hilsman never quarreled with the objective of defeating the Vietcong rebels. What horrifies him about the Vietnamese war is the sequence of mindless decisions, most of them taken since Kennedy's death, which seem not only to preclude suppression of the rebellion but have managed, at the same time, to alienate our allies, reduce to rubble an already wretched land, and bring the United States to the edge of World War III.

Though he may be unduly quick to understand, Hilsman does not forgive Kennedy his mistakes, of which he considers the most flagrant, in a policy-making sense, the President's failure to replace his Secretary of State when it became clear that Dean Rusk would not accept responsibility for the advocacy of political and diplomatic action in the on-going policy debates with the military. Furthermore, Hilsman says, Rusk would not back his own people when *they* felt compelled to take on the generals. Hilsman says that when he was promoted from Director of Intelligence and Research to Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs, Rusk solemnly directed him to cease irritating the Pentagon by intruding into military and strategic matters. Since the country's Far Eastern problems are largely strategic, Hilsman wondered what the job was that Rusk expected him to do. Then he received a phone call from the White House in which he was instructed to disregard Rusk. "The President," he was told, "wants you to understand that it was precisely because you have stood up to the Defense Department that you were chosen, and that he expects you to continue."

Hilsman says Kennedy kept Rusk because to sack him would have reflected poorly on his own judgment. Instead, he sacrificed the Undersecretary, Chester Bowles, who alone in the Department had fresh ideas about the conduct of foreign policy and who was, despite the stories leaked to the press at the time, an excellent administrator as well. There may have been other justification for firing Bowles, but if, as Hilsman suggests, the principal motive was to warn the State Department of the President's dissatisfaction, it was a curiously perverse way to go about it, indeed.

But as long as Kennedy lived, the government had adequate substitutes for Rusk in the debates over policy. Kennedy himself, backed by his team of White House advisers, served as a counterforce to the military. It was in the next Administration that the country paid the price of Kennedy's dereliction, when a new President sought not a diversity of opinion but a consensus that matched his own predispositions. Thus Rusk emerged into his own, a major figure in the cabinet, characterized not by a strong will but by a ready acquiescence to the will of others.

Hilsman does not dispute the official Rusk-Pentagon contention that the Vietnamese war is the product of aggression from the North. But he adds (in a footnote, oddly) a fundamental modification:

> Even though Hanoi triggered the Vietcong insurrection, . . . it should be noted that they would not have been successful in starting the insurrection if there had not been a substantial core of resistance already in existence among the people of South Vietnam and a framework of native Communist leadership there. As it happened, Hanoi did fire the starting gun; Hanoi did supply the key items of supply; Hanoi did exercise command and overall direction. But it is possible that the Vietcong insurrection may have occurred anyway, even if Hanoi had not existed.

From the Pentagon's own statistics, Hilsman shows that almost all of the Vietcong's forces are recruited and almost all of their supplies acquired in the South. Yet Rusk and the military take the position that the Vietcong are not indigenous to South Vietnam and that the war would be over tomorrow if North Vietnam gave up its aggressive designs. For them, if Hanoi had not existed, it would have had to be invented.

It follows, then, that Rusk and the generals, despite all that Kennedy and Johnson have proclaimed to the contrary, never really believed that the source of the violence in Vietnam was political. General Earle G. Wheeler, whom President Johnson later made chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, even had the candor to declare: "It is fashionable in some quarters to say that the problems in Southeast Asia are primarily political and economic rather than military. I do not agree. The essence of the problem in Vietnam is military." The consequence of this kind of thinking has been the toleration of unpopular political regimes in Saigon, indifference to reform efforts in the countryside, and the adoption of military tactics which are, to be sure, a change from those pursued on the Western front in 1945 but still totally inadequate for dealing with native guerrillas.

Still, despite the spread of Vietcong control, the Pentagon—wedded to McNamara's computerized view of the world—managed somehow to persuade itself that it was winning the war. *"Ah, les statistiques,"* exclaimed a Vietnamese general whom Hilsman quotes. "Your Secretary of Defense loves statistics. We Vietnamese can give him all he wants. If you want them to go up, they will go up. If you want them to go down, they will go down." The climax of this kind of dream analysis occurred in October, 1963, when McNamara announced that by the end of the year "one thousand U.S. military personnel assigned to South Vietnam can be withdrawn." Not since MacArthur promised to get the boys home by Christmas has a military prediction turned out to be so disastrous.

Faced with their own rosy estimates and simultaneous failure in the ground fighting, American generals withdrew further and further from the reality of local conditions, Hilsman maintains, to the prepared positions they knew best. They wanted to drop bombs. The targets were divided into three groups: the Vietcong emplacements in South Vietnam, the infiltration trails which passed through Laos from the North, and the war-making potential of North Vietnam itself. That bombing had failed to make a major difference in Korea, where the war was at least "conventional," did not upset the generals. Bombing was a clean way for Americans to make their strength felt in Vietnam—and the military was sure that it could, thereby, end the trouble once and for all.

The argument over intensive bombing of South Vietnam, Hilsman points out, went to the heart of the disagreement over the nature of the war. In a guerrilla struggle, he says, the best weapon is the knife; the next is the rifle. Bombing and artillery fire are the worst. Indiscriminate killing can only detract from the objective of winning popular allegiance. But the generals, he says, were impatient with the argument that bombing would turn an indifferent native population into a hostile one. As General Harkins, predecessor of Westmoreland, declared in a debate over the political consequences of napalming the villages: "It really puts the fear of God into the Vietcong. And that is what counts."

Hilsman says a powerful counter-argument was also raised to bombing the North. All of North Vietnam, he writes, had only a few dozen industrial targets worth hitting. Once, they were destroyed, Hanoi would no longer be deterred from moving its 250,000 regular troops into South Vietnam. China, furthermore, would be tempted to intervene as American power advanced northward. And, of all arguments the most compelling: the North Vietnamese contribution was not a significant factor in supporting the Vietcong rebellion. But in advocating attacks on the North, General LeMay, the Air Force chief, could still maintain: "We are swatting flies, when we should be going after the manure pile."

As for bombing the infiltration routes, Kennedy himself made the most prophetic remark: "No matter what goes wrong or whose fault it really is," he told Hilsman, "the argument will be made that the Communists have stepped up their infiltration and we can't win unless we hit the North. Those trails are a built-in excuse for failure and a built-in argument for escalation." Kennedy understood better than anyone else that, given the crush of intra-governmental pressure politics, he was in a serious and dangerous dilemma.

The generals, Hilsman says, were in a very real sense seeking to blackmail Kennedy. They complained incessantly of having been humiliated in Korea by the seedy requirements of international politics and deprived of a victory that was rightfully theirs. Within the Joint Chiefs of Staff, some of the generals maintained so vociferiously that they would never again submit to such limitations that they became known as the "Never Again" club. They might consent to bombing, as a sanitary form of warfare. But they said they would not fight on the ground unless it was clearly understood beforehand that they would be free, if necessary, to go all the way. And that, indisputably, included using the "nukes."

In discussing the realities of making foreign policy, Hilsman makes clear that Kennedy, whatever his theoretical powers and responsibilities, had to take into account the dynamics of the contest for influence which exists within the government. The military has its own constituency, in Congress and the press and the electorate. A President—particularly one with a flank weakened by the passivity of the State Department—ignores it at his own peril. This does not mean that the country is in danger of being taken over by a junta, any more than by another of the vested interests in government. But it does mean that Kennedy had to make greater and greater concessions to the military in order to retain fundamental control over the conduct of the war. This may be what Schlesinger calls the "politics of inadvertence," though Kennedy undoubtedly recognized it as the steps in a trend. With each concession, his own freedom of action was irreversibly diminished.

Kennedy's objective was to keep the country's hand in Vietnam, while avoiding at all costs an irrevocable national commitment. He understood the moral distinction between an American contingent of 15,000 men, backing a war effort of the South Vietnamese, and an American army of several hundred thousand, taking over the war and fighting it as their own. A major American army had to be taken as evidence of Saigon's failure to retain popular support, which in turn deprived the United States of the real justification for its presence. To the end of the Administration, Robert Kennedy argued for an open-minded review of the American commitment. But perhaps by that time President Kennedy had already gone too far to turn back.

Hilsman resigned shortly after the assassination. He was disturbed at Johnson's ardent embrace of the military's doctrines on escalation. He argued himself for conserving the *threat* of escalation to prevent the Communists from expanding the war. "In my judgment," he wrote to the new President, "significant action against North Vietnam that is taken before we have demonstrated success in our counter-insurgency program will be interpreted by the Communists as an act of desperation, and will, therefore, not be effective in persuading the North Vietnamese to cease and desist." The words, as understatement, scarcely do justice to the horror that has ensued, but the President presses relentlessly on. What disturbed Hilsman, however, even more than the new policies themselves was the abdication of the intellect involved in selecting them. After three years with Kennedy, he was shocked at the reversion to patriotic cliches and self-righteous jingoism. Hilsman has since taken a teaching post at Columbia and signed up in Robert Kennedy's shadow cabinet.

According to a story out of the State Department, the impending publication of this book has confirmed the old diplomatic hands in their distaste for outsiders in their councils. It has persuaded them to close ranks against the amateurs. "You can be sure I won't write my memoirs when I leave this job," Rusk has been heard to say to a colleague. Memoirs are now considered bad taste among the professionals. As for Rusk, who does not lack taste, it is known he has been awaiting publication day with some trepidation. Hilsman's book—though scholarly in method and sober in tone, the antithesis of diatribe—will confirm that he had good cause.

Land Reform in South Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1967

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, on June 6, 1967, I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, material related to the need for land reform in South Vietnam. Although programs were promulgated more than 10 years ago to provide land to the landless sharecroppers and farm laborers, these programs have experienced many difficulties.

I was therefore pleased to see the following article in the June 1967 Vietnam Bulletin, from the Embassy of Vietnam:

SOUTH VIETNAM LAND REFORM

When a planeload of official documents recently arrived in the city of Can Tho, the gateway to South Vietnams' fertile Mekong Delta, it marked the beginning of a new era in the lives of thousands of families. For the documents were ownership titles to some 113,984 hectares of land, and within a few days the province chiefs began distributing them to 42,000 farmers in the 16 delta provinces.

That same week government officials from Saigon went to Bien Hoa Province to attend ceremonies at which an additional 5,105 land titles were presented to local farmers.

Both events were part of accelerated efforts by the Government of South Vietnam to revitalize its land reform program. Evidence of official recognition of the need for land redistribution was included in the new South Vietnamese constitution promulgated on April 1, Article 21 of the constitution declares that one of the nation's objectives is "raising the standard of living of rural citizens, and especially helping farmers to have farmland."

Although land reform legislation was promulgated by the government of South Vietnam more than 10 years ago, relatively little progress was made until recently. Several factors contributed to the lag, but the major reason for the delay has been the government's preoccupation with the problem of repelling Viet-Cong and North Vietnamese aggression.

In addition to a shortage of trained land agents and registrars and a lack of surveying facilities, *one of the principal contributing area factors was the fact* that *much of the land to be distributed was in areas controlled by the Viet Cong.* But as allied military offensives continue to recapture more and more land from Viet Cong control, the land reform program has been extended.

South Vietnam is a predominantly agricultural country. It has been one of Southeast Asia's major producers of rice for centuries, and was an important rice exporter until it became a victim of Communist aggression. *About 85 percent of the South Vietnamese live in rural areas which have borne the brunt of the war.* Farmers have had to abandon their ancestral acres to escape the Viet Cong.

Land reform and the resettlement of displaced farmers thus is one of the most critical problems faced by the government of South Vietnam.

In addition, *a stable land tenure system is essential to any large-scale agricultural development program.* Farmers naturally are reluctant to invest their labor and money in cultivating land to which they have no legal claim and are unable to pass on to their heirs. *This problem is particularly acute in South Vietnam where some 60 percent of the rural population has consisted of landless sharecroppers and farm laborers.*

The government of South Vietnam is now giving more flexibility to its land reform program by granting farmers immediate titles to their plots before full payment is completed. Under the provisions of a 1957 law, some 462,000 hectares were expropriated from landlords owning more than 100 hectares. Subsequently 348,000 hectares of this expropriated land was sold to farmers on a six year payment basis.

Under the old program, farmers buying expropriated land were given provisional titles pending full payment. The new policy enables them to receive full titles immediately and extends the payment period to 12 years, with an exemption from land taxes.

The South Vietnam government plans to issue more than 125,000 full titles to replace the provisional agreements. These new titles will cover 268,000 hectares of land in 25 provinces.

The Merchant Marine's Role in National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS N. DOWNING

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 13, 1967

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished Commander of the Military Sea Transportation Service, Vice Adm. L. P. Ramage, USN, recently delivered a stirring address in the district which I represent in which he complimented the role which our merchant marine plays in our national defense.

In view of the need for a declaration proclaiming a strong merchant marine as one of our national goals and especially in light of the current hearings before the Subcommittee on Merchant Marine, I feel that Admiral Ramage's remarks should most appropriately be drawn to the attention of all of the Members of the House of Representatives. Under unanimous consent I insert them in the RECORD:

THE MERCHANT MARINE'S ROLE IN NATIONAL DEFENSE

(Remarks by Vice Admiral L. P. Ramage, USN Commander, Military Sea Transportation Service, before the Propeller Club, Port of Newport News, 28 June 1967)

It is a genuine pleasure for me to be with you tonight at this meeting of the Propeller Club, Port of Newport News. Like all Navy men, I have spent time in the Hampton Roads area, and in a sense it is like coming home to join your meeting tonight.

I have chosen for my subject tonight a topic which, at first glance, I am sure many of you will almost instinctively say, "Egad, we know about that. We have had the 'Fourth Arm of Defense' story dinned into our ears until we are almost tired of hearing it. We have been told that we need a merchant marine to provide an auxiliary for the military forces. So, what's so great about this as a talk to a group of people who have lived with the merchant marine for decades?"

I have a good reason for picking this topic, and it is not just because I had to find something to talk about after this excellent dinner and good fellowship. My reason is that I know you are interested in the future of the American merchant marine, and how it has been used recently in support of military requirements.

Let me start by getting the statistics out of the way. There are about 18,000 oceangoing ships of over 1,000 gross tons now sailing the seas today. The United States flag flies over 987 privately-owned and 181 government-owned steamships, for a total representation on world sea routes of 1,168 ships. This is about 6% of the total.

Our national share in the transportation of cargo moving in the foreign trade of this nation is less than 9%, and actually seems to be dropping a little bit further down the scale each year.

While this is happening, we are supporting a war at the far end of the longest transoceanic supply route in the history of military operations. From San Francisco to Saigon the distance is 6,878 miles; from Newport News to Saigon is 10,963 miles via Suez, and 11,837 miles through the Panama Canal. Even if we relay material through Japan, the intra-theatre haul is 2,419 miles after a voyage of 4,536 miles from San Francisco to Yokohama.

In calendar year 1966, the Military Sea Transportation Service arranged for the delivery of 6,779,000 measurement tons of dry cargo to Vietnam. The overwhelming bulk of this moved in American ships. It took a lot of ships a great number of operating days to put that much tonnage into the Vietnam area. The critical proposition is, "How much more can the American merchant marine do for the military organization and still maintain some sort of service to commercial shippers?"

This is why I want to talk to you tonight about the role of the American merchant marine in the national defense. You are well aware of the tremendous importance of merchant ships during World War II, and I am sure you have heard stories of how we tried to build a bridge of ships to Europe during the first World War, but did not quite succeed because peace overtook our schedule.

You know, too, about the boom that engulfed American shipping just after the end of World War II, and you have watched the slow reduction in the size of our fleet since 1948. You are familiar with the problems that face our American ship owners: intense competition from foreign carriers who have splendid new ships to run against our aging and obsolescent cargo carriers; freight rates that hardly compensate the low-cost operations under foreign flag; and apathy on the part of the American public as to the nationality of the ships that carry their commerce.

There is a brighter side, and I want to dwell on that for a few minutes. Let's take a further look at the truly remarkable, almost fantastic, achievements in this Vietnam logistical sealift. The distance, first of all, is enormous. It takes a 15-knot Victory, which is the backbone of our supply fleet, just a little less than 20 days to steam from San Francisco to Saigon. From this port of Newport News, it would take the same ship 33 days of uninterrupted steaming to make the full voyage.

The volume of what has to be moved each month is almost beyond comprehension. Last year, July thru December, for instance, we moved almost four million measurement tons from the continental United States to the various ports of Vietnam. This would have been equal to what could be carried by about 570 Victory-type ships, in a one-time lift.

Last year we also carried about two and one-quarter million measurement tons of cargo from other parts of the world to Vietnam. Most of this movement was from Japan and Okinawa to destinations such as Cam Ranh Bay, Da Nang, and Saigon.

If that were the extent of what MSTS had to move, it would be a full-time job, but it would not break our backs, nor would it tax the capabilities of the American merchant marine. What complicates the situation is that, while the attention of the public is directed toward Vietnam, there was an unpublicized requirement to move almost fourteen million measurement tons of dry cargo to all other parts of the world. That is a tremendous lift!

Since most of the MSTS-owned fleet—we call it the blue-and-gold fleet, from the stripes painted on the stacks of the grey-hulled ships—was committed to operations in direct support of Vietnam, we turned to the commercial carriers for help. They responded, enthusiastically and promptly.

Currently, then, it is self-evident that the American merchant marine is playing an important role in the national military effort.

During the campaign in Korea, the brand-new Military Sea Transportation Service (which had been established only in October of 1949, and was overtaken by the outbreak of hostilities in Korea in July 1950) turned to the merchant marine for a large number of ships. Some of the great traditions of both the merchant marine and MSTS arose out of that experience. Just to cite one, I am sure you remember the amazing story of the *Meredith Victory*, which carried 14,000 refugees from North Korea down the coast to safety in the southern sector. You may not have heard that the *Meredith Victory* is back at work, hauling cargo to Vietnam.

The support of military operations during World War II wrote history for the merchant marine that is almost the stuff of legends: the Murmansk run; the convoys that refused to turn back despite the worst of submarine and air and surface attacks; the B–29 express that carried spare parts and bombs for the aircraft that brought the war to the Japanese homeland; the passenger ships that became transports almost overnight, and voyaged to every part of the world; the "Magic Carpet" that returned the troops to the United States; and the "war bride specials," carrying the wives and babies of servicemen who had married overseas.

Those achievements were magnificent, but they were possible only because we had a vast fleet. Our record in World War I is hardly so distinguished, for the simple reason that we had only a few ships that were ready and able to sail in support of the military effort. A fact that we are prone to forget is that most of the American Expeditionary Force was carried to and from Europe in ships that belonged to our allies.

A significant lesson could have been learned by the United States, but it was not. It is all too obvious to us today that only an active fleet in-being can provide the immediate support that the nation must be able to count on to meet the sealift demands of a sudden emergency. If it is necessary to build the ships, to create a merchant marine, before the troops can be deployed, there can be no response to the alarm.

A pertinent footnote to this lesson is the fact that when the Navy's Great White Fleet cruised around the world in 1907–1909, it had to be supplied by foreign ships, because there were no suitable American ships available to do the job.

This bird's eye view of salient points in the history of American merchant marine support of national defense efforts emphasizes a point. In an age of brush-fire conflicts, "incidents," sudden flare-ups, and other small-scale operations deliberately kept below the level requiring mobilization, it does not seem wise to plan for the ocean transportation so vital to troop movements to be provided by friendly foreign countries. Nor does it appear to be very sound planning to expect to have time or appropriated funds with which to build a fleet of ships to meet the emergency needs.

We have relied heavily upon the National Defense Reserve Fleet during the last two years. Without the 135 Victories, the four C–3's, the nine C–2's, and the fifteen C1–B's, and the turbine-driven Liberty ship *Benjamin Chew*, we would have had considerable difficulty meeting the requirements.

The ships from the NDRF have done a job for us, but these ships are old, and are getting older. They are wearing out. They will not be around for many more years.

We also have had commendable support from the American tramp fleet. Their work has been indispensable to our achievements in Vietnam. Unfortunately, however, the ships these operators have been able to offer to MSTS all date from World War II, and they are wearing out. They will not be available for many more years.

At the end of World War II, when contributions to victory were being evaluated, it was declared that the merchant marine had been, in truth, the Fourth Arm of Defense. It was modest praise considering what had been done, and it certainly was merited. When the Stars and Stripes flew over five thousand ships in active service, the metaphor of the Fourth Arm of Defense was full of meaning to the entire world.

Today there are only 1,186 ships flying the American flag. Of critical importance for the future of the American merchant marine is the fact that only 139 of these ships, excluding the passenger liners, are less than 20 years old. Many people are concerned. For example, a columnist in a national newsmagazine not long ago wrote two articles entitled, "The Withered Arm." When we look at the resources, and observe the job being done by the tired veterans of years of arduous merchant service, one is almost overwhelmed with admiration for the indomitable spirit of the men, afloat and ashore, who will not permit the ships to stop working.

Let me return now to continue my earlier commentary on the Vietnam sealift.

When the decision was announced in July 1965 to send the First Cavalry Division (Airmobile) to Vietnam, MSTS had available only a relatively small number of ships with which to meet this new requirement. At about that time, a labor-management dispute delayed about a hundred cargo liners on the East and Gulf Coasts of the United States. When the need for ships was made known to the industry, these strike-bound ships were offered, and the unions agreed to sail them in support of the war effort. Among the ships chartered by MSTS at that time were the finest and most modern ships in the fleet. Their performance in those early months of the war was magnificient.

When the strike ended in September 1965, the owners understandably asked for the prompt return of their new economically competitive ships, so that they could resume full service on their established trade routes. We accommodated them insofar as it was possible, and we have maintained the service to Vietnam for the most part with the older and less efficient ships. We have right now thirty-two subsidized cargo-liners and thirty-seven unsubsidized berth line ships on charter to MSTS, almost all of which are in the Vietnam pipeline.

This brings up a valid point in evaluating the role of the American merchant marine in support of national defense requirements. If the best and most satisfactory ships can be made available to the military only for short periods, and the resupply phase must be conducted entirely with the older, slower, less efficient, and consequently more expensive types of ships, is the real importance of the support role understood? Should the military be a sort of second-class customer, taking its place in line after commercial interests have been satisfied?

The answers are extremely difficult. The U.S. merchant marine receives government support in the form of large, direct and indirect subsidies in order to provide an assured sealift capability to meet national defense needs. This means that the shipping capability so provided must be available on a timely basis and at the right places in order to be militarily effective. Yet, in the absence of a large military demand, such as is the case during peacetime conditions, the merchant fleet must earn its revenues and profits in the commercial service. And private shippers demand regular, efficient, economical service by the most modern ship available. Any interruption to this service, no matter what the reason, may be intolerable, and the shipper may switch to a different carrier who appears to be more dependable. If American ships are subject to frequent demands from the military which have the effect of seriously reducing service to commercial customers, the American carriers may be driven out of business.

The military cannot be, and historically has not been, selfish in its attitude toward the use of the newest and best ships. This has been demonstrated in the return of these types to the operators when the first charter period ended late in 1965 or early in 1966. The older and commercially less desirable ships have been accepted and used by the military in order to minimize the reductions in berth service.

I think it is true to say that there is a keen awareness within the Department of Defense that the available resources must be shared with the commercial interests.

The problem is especially critical today because of the small number of modern ships in the American fleet, and the requirements of both commercial and military interests for these ships. Even with operating differential subsidy support or mutually accepted compensatory charter hire, there is no assurance that the shipowner will be reimbursed for the losses he might sustain if his berth operations were curtailed for too long a time.

One solution does occur to me. This is to have a modern merchant fleet composed of hundreds of the finest, newest, most efficient, and most effective ships that can be devised. Then, if the military needed modern ships, the strains of the competing military and commercial demands would not be as severe as in the current situation. I know this is Utopia, but we should strive for the best possible solution.

It certainly is clear that MSTS, as the executive agency for the Single Manager for Ocean Transportation for the Department of Defense, depends upon all segments of the American merchant marine. I have mentioned very briefly the liners, both subsidized and unsubsidized. A few words on the tramp fleet are appropriate.

The tramp fleet, not being committed to regular voyages on fixed routes, has much less firm obligations than do the liner operators. The tramp fleet, therefore, is responsive to our requirements, and eargerly solicits our business. The difficulty here is that the tramp fleet, for reasons which I do not have time to discuss here tonight, but which I am sure you know already, is comprised of World War II ships exclusively. These ships are coming to the end of their lives and will disappear before many more years have passed. If age does not get them, the insurance underwriters will. At the moment, therefore, the tramps are willing and able to help, but the only equipment they can offer is old, slow, and inefficient.

This poses the problem once again. Should the military depend upon obsolescent equipment, or can it obtain a higher level of transportation?

There are no easy answers to that question, as I have indicated.

Up to this point, I have talked about the capability of the merchant marine to provide support for the military services. I want now to conclude by giving appropriate attention to the human side of the story, because in the last analysis a ship is only as good as the people who man her, and a management office is no better than the clerks and supervisors who staff it.

First, a comment about the liner companies. They have been assiduous in watching our requirements, and in trying to find ships to lift our cargoes. The availability of these ships on their regular trade routes, carrying every kind of military supply, has been of the greatest value to us. Many of the new ships that were chartered by us in 1965 are back in their regular trades, and are now carrying substantial tonnages of military cargoes. We therefore do not lose completely by having these modern ships working on normal trade routes.

Second, a word for the tramp operators. They have done what they could to upgrade their fleets; many of them have exchanged obsolete ships for better hulls held in the National Defense Reserve Fleet. We commend this practice, and would hope that these carriers will be able to expand their procurement programs to obtain even better and faster ships than they have acquired so far. The service of these ships in support of the military has been outstanding. We have 73 of them on charter right now. Without them we would find our problem much more serious than it is.

Now a few words about the forty general agents who have been selected by the Maritime Administration to operate for that agency the ships withdrawn from the National Defense Reserve Fleet and assigned to lift military cargo. These companies are doing an excellent job, and it is my privilege to commend them. They have had to face and solve many difficult problems in finding qualified seamen to staff ships that are old, with only marginal accommodations for the men who must live aboard them for months at a time. These agents have had to learn how to operate by remote control, depending upon sub-agents half-a-world away whose notions of ship husbandry may be 179 degrees out of phase with those of the American agent. They also have had to adapt their normal procedures to fit the patterns prescribed by government orders and regulations. Despite these problems, they have been unstinting in their application of managerial skill and knowledge, and have not withheld the wisdom obtained from the experience of thousands of days of ship operations. We are grateful to them for their contributions to the war effort.

To the seamen—the unlicensed members of the deck, engine, and steward departments, as well as to the licensed officers who supervise their work—who sail not only the fine new products of American shipyards and have all the comforts of modern seafaring, but also those sturdy workers who take the obsolete ships to Vietnam, enduring the discomforts of living in steel-hulled ships without airconditioning where the temperature, when it is cold, is down to about 85 degrees at night, and accept the loneliness, monotony, privations and dangers of that service, I want to pay special tribute. They have done a splendid job. There are over 6,500 men on the NDRF ships. For the vast majority, it has been another ship, another job, another opportunity to show their vast professionalism, their steady, skillful resourceful, patient competence in sailing the ship safely to destination and return. If there have been a few notorious examples of malingering, improper conduct on liberty, and incompetence in performance of duty, this must be expected. I can say that these are the real exceptions and we depend upon, and thank, the quiet and inconspicuous workers who take pride in their calling as men of the sea.

In a day of change, when the future is clouding with uncertainities of every sort, the American merchant marine has been asked once again to provide major support to a military effort. This time, in helping the campaign in Vietnam, it has been assigned the longest and most difficult overseas supply route in the history of warfare. Characteristically, it has accepted the assignment, and, equally characteristically, it has done a highly creditable job.

My personal salute, as well as the official thanks of the Navy, to all who have had a part in this great achievement.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the Record.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402, at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided,* That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the Congressional Record, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H–112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the Record at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the Record should be processed through this office.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the Congressional Record, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

Thursday, July 13, 1967

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Senate passed agriculture appropriations and took up bill on election of Governor of Virgin Islands.

See Congressional Program Ahead.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S 9539–S 9610

Bills Introduced: 19 bills and one resolution were introduced, as follows: S. 2097–2115; and S. Con. Res. 33.
Pages S 9541–S 9542

Bills Reported: Reports were made as follows:

S. 1956, extending for 2 years authority for more flexible regulation of maximum rates of interest or dividends (S. Rept. 396);

S. 1581, to increase participation of service personnel in Federal elections, with amendments (S. Rept. 397);

S. Res. 140, to print as a Senate document annual report of National Forest Reservation Commission (S. Rept. 398);

H. Con. Res. 253, to print as a House document the Southeast Asia briefing map prepared by the Army Map Service (S. Rept. 399);

H. Con. Res. 346, to print as a House document pamphlet entitled "Our Flag" (S. Rept. 400);

H. Con. Res. 348, to print for House Veterans' Committee "Summary of Veterans' Legislation Reported, Ninetieth Congress, First Session" (S. Rept. 401);

H. Con. Res. 369, authorizing printing of several documents of the Select Committee on Small Business of the House (S. Rept. 402);

S. Res. 137, authorizing an additional $35,000 for expenses of the Committee on Appropriations (no written report); and

S. Res. 141, authorizing an additional $25,000 for expenses of Committee on Labor and Public Welfare (no written report). **Pages S 9541**

Bill Referred: H.R. 4833, providing for conveyance of certain realty situated in the State of Pennsylvania, was referred to Committee on the Judiciary. **Page S 9540**

Corregidor-Bataan Commission: Senate adopted motion entered by Senator Ellender on May 8 that Senate reconsider its action in passing on May 4 H.R. 3399, authorizing extension of termination date for the Corregidor-Bataan Memorial Commission, and the bill was then referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.
Page S 9610

Government Employees: Senate disagreed to House amendments to S. 1320, providing for career status for certain Government employees serving under temporary appointments, asked for conference with House, and appointed as conferees Senators Monroney, Yarborough, Randolph, Carlson, and Fong. **Page S 9618**

Legislative Program: Majority leader announced that on Monday, July 17, it will be in order for the Senate to take up for reconsideration S. 1577, to complement Vienna Convention (privileges to foreign diplomatic personnel), to be followed by S. 450, election of Governor of Virgin Islands. On Tuesday, July 18, it is anticipated that Senate will take up the clean air bill.
Page S 9618

Agriculture Appropriations: By 88 yeas to 3 nays (motion to reconsider tabled), Senate passed with amendments H.R. 10509, fiscal 1968 appropriations for the Department of Agriculture, and related agencies, after rejecting the following additional amendments offered thereto:

Rejected: By 17 yeas to 74 nays (motion to reconsider tabled), Proxmire amendment to reduce by $1,584,856,389 funds for reimbursement to Commodity Credit Corporation for net realized losses; by 14 yeas to 76 nays (motion to reconsider tabled), modified Williams (Delaware) amendment to limit payment to any producer under any Agriculture Department program to $10,000 in any 1 year; by 10 yeas to 82 nays Williams (Delaware) amendment to reduce by $100 million funds for 1968 program of soil-building and soil- and water-conserving practices.

Senate insisted on its amendments and asked for conference with House, Senators Holland, Russell, Ellender, Hruska, and Young of North Dakota being appointed as conferees. **Pages S 9610–S 9656**

Salt Lake Monument: By 46 yeas to 35 nays (motion to reconsider tabled), Senate passed with amendments S. 25, providing for establishment of the Great Salt Lake National Monument, after taking the following actions on amendments:

Appendix

The Fourth and Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1967

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, some challenging thoughts on the subject of American rights and freedom come from the Monroe County Citizen-Democrat of Madisonville, Tenn., in a prize-winning editorial entitled "The Fourth and Freedom." This editorial, written by Editor Joe G. Bagwell, won second place in the best editorial division of the National Newspaper Association 1967 Better Newspaper Contest. It merits wide reading.

Because of its interest to the Congress and the Nation in general, I include Mr. Bagwell's editorial in the Appendix of the Record:

[From the Madison County Citizen-Democrat, Madisonville, Tenn., June 28, 1967]

The Fourth and Freedom

Every signer of the Declaration of Independence lost his life, fortune or family in the violent conflict following their act and a lot of us are wondering whether there are any Americans left who would go as far for freedom. Yes, there are many young Americans laying down their lives in Vietnam and I have no doubt that most of them are as dedicated as Nathan Hale, who said, as they put the hangman's noose around his neck: "I only regret that I have but one life to give for my country."

We know that our boys in battle are doing all they can for the freedom of man, but we certainly have cause to hang our heads in shame over the things we are doing and not doing about freedom here at home. We can observe destruction of our freedoms at every hand and we either can do nothing or, in most instances, we just do not care.

The law is our guaranty of freedom and there is no freedom in America without laws. A line in the Jaycee Creed reads: "Government should be of laws rather than men." Laws protect the freedom of everyone whereas men protect themselves first, and then their friends, at the expense of everyone else's freedom. Our government can give us nothing, but, on a politician's promise that it CAN, we give up our freedom.

Sex appeal, money and influence are replacing honesty, decency and ability as qualifications for public office. A promise of a chicken in every pot is getting us a personality in every office and a chain for every freedom.

Somewhere in our nation's history since 1776, independence peaked and has been on skids in recent years. Individual thought and initiative in politics gets quickly labeled as "Conservative" or "Liberal" and open season is declared by advocates of the other. The average citizen is so confused by the melee that he doesn't know who to trust, and that individual and his thoughts are soon compromised so that he is far afield from where he intended to go.

When and only when every American respects the rights of others can the Declaration of Independence regain real meaning for Americans. If we respect the rights of others, discrimination, prejudice and bigotry will only be archaic words in the dictionary. When we respect the rights of others then public offices will no longer be for sale and dishonesy will have no reward. When we respect the rights of others, the chicken in the pot of the underprivileged will be there out of a true compassion of the privileged and respect for law will be a matter of course.

Resolution of East Chicago, Ind., Lithuanians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 17, 1967

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I recently received a copy of a resolution adopted by the American Lithuanian Community of the United States, Inc., of the East Chicago, Ind., area, signed by Kazys Valeika, chairman, and Stephen Karvelis, secretary. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Resolution

We, the residents of East Chicago Area, Indiana, of Lithuanian descent, in a special meeting of June 11, 1967 to commemorate the 27th anniversary of mass deportation of the Lithuanian people to Siberian concentration camps, being animated by a spirit of solidarity, united by a common bond in resisting the brutality of the Soviet military force, take this opportunity to state that:

We are gravely concerned with the present state of affairs in our enslaved country and strongly protest Soviet Russia's aggression and the crimes perpetrated by Soviets in occupied Lithuania:

Genocide and yearly systematic deportations under various guises to forced labor camps in Soviet Russia;

Colonisation of Lithuania by the Soviets;

Persecution of the faithful;

Distortion of the Lithuanian culture and transformation of it into a Russo-Communist hybrid.

We are requesting that the U.S. Government raise the issue of the freedom of the Lithuanian people and the other Baltic States in the United Nations and stipulate to reinstate the independence and sovereignty to Lithuanian people and its member Baltic States.

Be it resolved to forward this Resolution to the President of the United States and copies be sent to the Secretary of State and to the honorable Senators and Representatives of the State of Indiana and to the press.

Kazys Valeika,
Chairman, East Chicago Area.
Stephen Karvelis,
Secretary.

Commissioner Tobriner Makes a Strong Case for the President's Reorganization Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 13, 1967

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, in an article in Monday's Washington Post, Walter Tobriner made a very persuasive case for the President's reorganization plan for the District of Columbia government.

Commissioner Tobriner should know. He has worked at the top of this city government for 6 years. He knows what can be done and what cannot be done; what will work and what will not work. And he has made clear that the District must have an improved government now—and that the President's plan provides such an improved government.

As the Commissioner notes, the President's plan will give the District an opportunity for strength and leadership in dealing with problems that demand a government action equal to meeting the people's needs.

The Commissioner's article is important reading for all those who are deeply concerned about the District's future and its development as a modern, efficiently administered city. Under unanimous consent I insert this article into the Record:

[From the Washington Post, July 10, 1967]

Two Views on District Reorganization—"The Advantages of a Single Head Are Obvious" Tobriner Asserts

(By Walter N. Tobriner)

Washington is not only the Captial City and the center of Federal Government, but it is also a living community of human needs and problems. It is a city in search of strong executive leadership. But the present form of District government was designed in 1874, when Washington was a sleepy government town of 150,000 and the District government functioned easily with 500 employes and a budget of less than $4 million.

A commission form of government was once a daring experiment, but no city has adopted it since 1913. In fact, the District of Columbia is the only remaining city of more than 500,000 population that retains a Board of Commissioners.

We have had 93 years to learn that a three-man Board of Commissioners cannot provide streamlined effective executive and administrative leadership. The District Commissioners hold divided jurisdiction over the agencies that serve the vital interests of Washington residents. There is a Commissioner of Public Health and Welfare, a Commissioner of Public Safety, and a Commissioner of Public Works. Each supervises only the agencies assigned to him, although major policy matters affecting any department are subjects for Board action. This kind of city administration is neither realistic nor effective.

BACKS JOHNSON PLAN

And that is why I strongly support President Johnson's reorganization plan for District government—a plan that will install a single executive to lead District affairs.

The advantages of a single Commissioner are obvious. He can deal more effectively with our complex urban problems. When all major District agencies—and there are more than 30 of them—draw their authority and policy guidance from a single source, there is bound to be greater effectiveness.

The establishment of a city council is equally important. The Council will be a forum to provide D.C. citizens with a larger voice in District affairs. Such a forum does not now exist.

CRIME PROBLEM

Crime is the overriding concern in the Washington area. The crime rate was 40 per cent higher last month than it was a year ago, and the public is rightly alarmed and indignant. Yet, the D.C. Crime Commission recently criticized the District's program to combat juvenile delinquency, to rehabilitate alcoholics, and to alleviate other crime problems.

These findings underscore the weaknesses in a system of divided responsibility. In fact, the Police and Health Departments each report to a different Commissioner; the Department of Buildings and Grounds, responsible for correctional facilities, reports to the third Commissioner.

WHAT IT WILL NOT DO

Clearly, the President's reorganization plan represents a major advance in the direction of modern government. But I think it is also important to understand what the President's reorganization plan *will not do*.

It will not change one iota the constitutional authority of Congress over District affairs. The Commissioner, his assistant, and the nine members of the City Council would be subject to Senate confirmation. The Commissioner and the Council would still regulate and enforce the laws of Congress.

It will not cause widespread hiring and firing of District employes. The District government's personnel system involves 4000 persons under Civil Service protection and an additional 8000 employes under a similar protective system of the District government. There are approximately 7400 blue collar workers; 7000 schoolteachers and administrators; 2900 policemen and 1400 firemen—comprising the great majority of District employes. All are adequately protected against unwarranted firing, by grievance committees or by right of appeal to the Commissioner.

It will not obviate the need for home rule. This plan is in no way an alternative for home rule. It is an attempt to modernize and streamline an existing system of government.

Eavesdropping: A Far-Reaching Edict

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 17, 1967

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Eavesdropping: A Far-Reaching Edict," written by William H. Fitzpatrick, editor, and published in the Norfolk, Va., Ledger-Star of July 13, 1967.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EAVESDROPPING: A FAR-REACHING EDICT

The severity and scope of the new crackdown on federal eavesdropping, announced by Attorney General Ramsey Clark, represent an important new measure of restraint on official snooping.

In keeping with the trend of court decisions and increasing public indignation over electronic spying practices, Mr. Clark has forbidden federal agents to seek leads or evidence by this means in all cases except those involving national security.

This implements his own clearly stated position that criminal investigation will not be crippled if the snooping devices are outlawed. And the edict is made sweeping by specific inclusion of each of the three types of surreptitious listening techniques: the tapping of phone lines, the detection of conversations by microphones placed within a private premise and the use of those more sophisticated implements which can listen in without any equipment actually being connected to the private area.

This last is especially significant in the light of the new electronic wizardry which doesn't involve a physical trespass but which violates the spirit of the Constitution's safeguards on privacy.

The Attorney General's rules might well serve as a model for other agencies at other levels of government as well as for laws controlling such agencies and the activities of private eavesdroppers. The Clark code is a tight one, and such restrictions in our view can scarcely be made too tight.

The 20th Anniversary of the First Hoover Commission

SPEECH

OF

HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 13, 1967

Mrs. DYER. Mr. Speaker, the meaning of government reorganization could hardly be stated more concisely and pointedly than in the following words:

> The highest aims and ideals of democracy can be thwarted through excessive administrative costs and through waste, disunity, irresponsibility, and other byproducts of inefficient government.

The words were those of the Hoover Commission on the Organization of the Executive Branch, but more significantly those same words were quoted approvingly by the President in his March 17 message to Congress on the quality of American government.

Another administration spokesman, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, has stated the problem in more contemporary terms. Testifying before the Senate Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations, Director Schultze said this on November 21, 1966:

> We have tried to do a great deal in a short time, and the Federal system has been hard put to digest so much so quickly. The inevitable gap between the creation of new programs and the re-tooling of the administrative process has resulted in the array of unfinished business that constitutes the agenda for these hearings.

Mr. Schultze added this evaluation:

> This complexity and fragmentation of Federal grant programs in and of itself creates major problems of administration and information flow, for both the Federal and local governments, and inhibits the development of a unified approach to the solution of community problems.

On November 18, 1966, before the same subcommittee, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, John W. Gardner, confirmed the urgent need for reorganization of governmental activities. He said:

> In almost every domestic program we are encountering crises of organization. Coordination among Federal agencies leaves much to be desired. Communication between the various levels of government—Federal, State, and local—is casual and ineffective. State and local government is in most areas seriously inadequate.
>
> We will never get more than a fraction of the full yield from the taxpayer's dollar until local, State and Federal Governments, and the American people generally, decide that action is needed.

To the Secretary's next words, Mr. Speaker, we can all give enthusiastic assent: "The time has come to correct these deficiencies."

In a report to the people I represent shortly after the President issued his message on the quality of American government—a message I found to be unfortunately inadequate to the need—I defined the problem this way:

> Of the multitude of domestic problems facing the President and the Congress this year, none is more demanding of attention than whether the Federal Government is organized and administered in the most efficient and effective way. It touches you directly as citizen and taxpayer: how wisely your money is spent, how responsive your government is to your needs and wishes, how responsible it is in respecting your rights and interests, how sensitive it is in preserving the delicate balance of powers between Federal, State and local governments—all of which depend on the consistency of the Government's policies, the coordination of its programs, the competence of its operations, the efficiency of its machinery.

The need for a thorough-going, top-to-botton reorganization of the executive branch of the Federal Government is indisputable. As ranking minority member of the Government Operations Committee—the committee charged with responsibility for overseeing the economy and efficiency of Government activities—as ranking minority member of its Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations, and as one of three members representing the House on the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, I have had innumerable opportunities to appreciate the high price we are paying for the waste and duplication, the inefficiency and failures of coordination, the frustration of lost time and poor communication which characterize so much of Federal operations. To a great extent, the burden of this inefficiency falls on the ill-prepared shoulders of State and local governments which have become increasingly involved with the Federal Government in what are supposed to be cooperative efforts to solve public problems. Too often, however, cooperation is sacrificed on the altars of complex organization and conflicting requirements. In its most recent annual report, the Advisory Commission, which includes Cabinet officers, Senators, Congressmen, Governors, State legislators, mayors, county officials, and private citizens—as representative a cross-section of Government leaders as exists—pointed to "the increasing unmanageability of Federal grant programs" as the principal problem of the day.

The need for reform is widely recognized and understood, Mr. Speaker. During the 89th and 90th Congresses, dozens of our colleagues have introduced legislation to establish a Commission on the Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, bipartisan in membership, and capable of recommending the kind of comprehensive and rational restructuring of the Federal establishment which today's problems require. This year, at last count, approximately 50 such bills had been introduced in the House, including H.R. 526 which I introduced on the first day of the present session. And it is, of course, the purpose of today's round-robin of speeches, in which I am delighted to join with so many of our colleagues, to bring renewed and reinforced attention to the necessity of getting on with the job of reorganization.

Why, one might ask, in view of the widespread recognition of the need for a complete—as distinct from a piecemeal—overhaul of the Federal Government's organization, has the administration refused to acknowledge the need? It would be futile to speculate, for to the best of my knowledge administration officials, from the President on down, have simply refused to discuss the issue. Though these officials are frank to concede that the Federal bureaucracy is all but unmanageable today, they insist on pursuing limited, ad hoc, one-shot efforts at reorganization—efforts which cannot, by their very nature, deal with the problem in the broad scope in which it exists.

This narrowly circumscribed approach, too, is subject to a further disability. Almost invariably, whether the reorganization plan involves a new department or merely a reshuffling of agency functions, the product is the result of internal pressures and politics rather than an objective and governmentwide view of what is needed. Consequently, despite the limited progress such plans may, at best, represent, they are as likely as not to introduce new elements of confusion and complexity into the overall structure of administration, creating new barriers to simplification and coordination.

The size of the problem, Mr. Speaker, demands an effort at reorganization which will match the need. Consider, for a moment, what has happened to the Nation and its Federal Government since the last Hoover Commission reported its recommendations in 1955. The Nation has added 35 million people to its population. The gross national product, in constant dollars, has increased by more than $200 billion to an estimated $657.2 billion in the first quarter of this year. Federal spending has more than doubled, from $67.3 billion in fiscal 1955 to an estimated $142.7 billion in fiscal 1967 and, of course, to a much higher figure in the current fiscal year. And more than 500,000 civilian employees have been added to Federal payrolls in this period.

This tremendous growth has not only been matched but compounded in the size and complexity of Federal Government programs and activities. Whereas in 1955, there were 85 Federal grant-in-aid programs, the total has now reached 387, and this figure excludes many programs and functions which do not qualify under standard grant-in-aid definitions. For instance, the new June 1967 edition of the Office of Economic Opportunity's "Catalog of Federal Assistance Programs" lists no less than 459 such programs.

According to one count, referred to in the Advisory Commission's annual report, these programs are being administered by 21 departments and agencies and 150 Federal bureaus and divisions, involving all 50 States and a sizable proportion of the 92,000 units of local government. They include, for example, 57 programs in the field of vocational and job training, 35 in housing, 20 in transportation, 27 in utilities and services, 62 in community facilities, 32 in land use, 28 in recreation and cultural facilities, and almost 100 in education. To further complicate matters, these programs are often administered by different bureaus and agencies and therefore must be coordinated not only with each other but across jurisdictional lines within the Federal Government and between Federal, State, and local units of government.

Two recent developments will serve to illustrate the extent of the problem. First, between January 1 and April 21 of this year, according to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, 24 new Federal advisory groups, study committees and special commissions were formed, all of them designed to improve in some way the operations of the Federal Government, but each of them functioning in arbitrarily limited areas. Second, this morning's Wall Street Journal reports growing concern that "Federal job-training endeavors are bogged down in a morass of unmanageable administrative machinery." The Journal report, an excellent example of in-depth study of problems of Government organization, deserves to be printed in full and I include it at the close of my remarks.

It should be obvious, Mr. Speaker—to repeat myself—that a piecemeal approach to governmental organization cannot hope to cope with a problem of this magnitude. I do not pretend that there are any simple answers or neat administrative devices which can reduce this complexity to an easy simplicity. Our country is too big, our public needs too many, and our society too interrelated to expect that the management of the public business can be other than involved. Nevertheless, unless we make a fresh start at reorganization, the proliferation of problems and programs threatens to overwhelm us.

The Hoover Commission reports of 1949 and 1955, and the actions taken to implement their recommendations, demonstrate conclusively the value of the comprehensive approach to reorganization which we propose. A 1963 summary of the results of the two Commissions, published by our Government Operations Committee, shows that the first Commission made 273 reorganization proposals, of which 196 were adopted, while the second Commisison proposed 314 such plans with 200 of them approved. Had all their recommendations been put into effect, Commision officials estimated that savings would total approximately $15 billion a year—a very rough figure, admittedly. But the significance of these statistics, I believe, rests in the fact that a much smaller and simpler Federal Government than we have today required such a substantial reorganization effort, and possessed a potential for such huge economies.

More important than the numbers of reorganization plans and the dollars of savings, however, was the added efficiency and responsibility and accountability which the Commission proposals accomplished. It is impossible to state in quantitative terms the qualitative improvement which these vast reorganization efforts achieved. But there can be no doubt that the two Hoover Commissions made the Federal bureaucracy more manageable, brought it closer to the people, and made democracy and representative government function more effectively.

And never before, Mr. Speaker, have these objectives been more paramount.

The Wall Street Journal article follows:

MANPOWER MORASS: DRASTIC CHANGES ARE NEEDED IN MUDDLED FEDERAL PROGRAMS

(By Jonathan Spivak)

WASHINGTON.—When the nation's first major manpower-training program was enacted in 1962, Uncle Sam's targets were modest: To solve shortages of skilled labor, and to retrain workers temporarily idled by automation.

But now the social sweep of the Great Society has set far more formidable goals—rehabilitating slum dwellers and other "hard-core" poor who have never held a job or are condemned by lack of education to meaningless, marginal employment.

Whatever improvements occur in the economy, Johnson Administration manpower planners calculate at least two million citizens will need such special Federal help, and many other experts estimate the figure is far higher. In some urban slums, Labor Department surveys show unemployment as high as 47%.

Thus, mounting Federal manpower outlays, now totaling $2 billion a year (a five-fold increase since 1962), are becoming the heavy artillery of President Johnson's antipoverty war.

Yet there is creeping concern in Washington and the big cities that Federal job-training endeavors are bogged down in a morass of unmanageable administrative machinery, miss their targets, overlap and duplicate their efforts, provide insufficient education and other personal aid essential to the poor's long-term progress, and—even if effective—fail to lead to permanent employment.

The great growth alone of new manpower programs administered by the antipoverty agency, Labor Department and Health, Education and Welfare Department would provide problems. In the current fiscal year, these efforts will aid about one million persons; the total was zero five years ago. Three new training endeavors are now getting under way, and Federal officials are making major remedial changes in older ones.

For example, more basic education and other services are being offered youngsters who enroll in the Labor Department's Neighborhood Youth Corps, mainly a make-work program to keep youth off the streets and put money in their pockets. The corps is also attempting to find for its members jobs with a future in private industry, rather than rely on low-level public employment such as school cleanup details. More welfare recipients, minority group members and other hard-core unemployed are gradually being enrolled in adult Manpower Development and Training Act courses. It is hoped these groups will constitute two-thirds of the total, enrollment of 280,000 trainees this year. More affluent high school graduates, requiring only brief skill training for successful job placement, made up the MDTA majority in the past.

CALLING IN THE CONSULTANTS

HEW is moving ahead this year with a Congressionally ordered study of all manpower training programs, designed to detect administrative weaknesses and recommend remedies. Field work will be performed by a respected private management consultant firm, Greenleigh Associates. The Labor Department is instituting a Government-wide manpower-planning system known as CAMPS, which will at least begin to bring closer coordination among the nine agencies and 21 programs involved.

Whatever such steps are taken, stubborn problems will persist. In the end, Washington argues, community-by-community efforts will be required to end waste and duplication, and new Federal incentives will be needed to intensify private industry's participation in training the poor.

Meantime, however, "If you wanted to get all the Federal people into a room who carry manpower money into a community, you'd need to hire a hall," protests one disgruntled Federal manager. "It's chaos," laments another.

Congressmen, in their pride of political authorship, frequently specify different eligibility requirements, training objectives and the like for manpower programs. Washington agencies are fiercely competitive. The Labor Department demands dominant jurisdiction because it's the nation's basic manpower agency, already operating many of the programs and possessing much of the expertise. The Welfare Administration insists on training its own impoverished clients, arguing it has special knowledge of the needs of relief recipients. The Office of Economic Opportunity wants to mesh manpower programs with its health, education and other uplift efforts, to enhance their effectiveness. The Office of Education jealously guards the public schools' jurisdiction over classroom job training; the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration supports its own sheltered workshops for the handicapped.

The outcome can be unnecessary duplication. In Cleveland, a system of Welfare Administration day care centers for the children of working relief recipients is being paralleled by Labor Department centers that are part of a new slum employment program. In eastern Kentucky, separate OEO and Welfare manpower efforts serve the same clients. Sometimes the poor are primed with basic knowledge by the Office of Education and then funds are not available for their more advanced vocational training by Labor. Six months of meetings preceded the transfer of certain aspects of Welfare job training to Labor. High level in-fighting between OEO and Labor delayed by two months the start of several other manpower endeavors.

No swift solution is in sight to such bureaucratic bottlenecks. Some experts advocate wholesale consolidation in the Labor Department. But Congress would never consent (key committees would lose jurisdiction) and local-level problems would remain. Sometimes city and county manpower men don't even know each other until Federal folk on field trips introduce them. Separate local agencies may seek the same recruits for their training programs or pester the same employers for placement.

CAMPS will help by establishing overall national manpower goals for all agencies and assuring an exhaustive exchange of information through Federal, state and local committees. Red tape will gradually be reduced. The Labor Department's new Bureau of Work Programs is pioneering; a single local application form serves for an assortment of activities.

MORE REFORM NEEDED

Yet the nation's biggest and most important manpower agency, the U.S. Employment Service, is often more interested in filling employers' job orders than solving the problems of the poor. Despite vigorous efforts by Labor Secretary Wirtz and others, the USES is still deeply in need of reform, critics contend.

Some steps have been taken, but the difficulty is that the 2,000 USES offices, though Federally financed, are controlled by the states and resistant to change. Employer pressures often predominate; pay scales are not always adequate to attract first-rate personnel; politically appointed state directors may not be sympathetic with the Great Society.

Some Washington officials despair of remolding the service into an effective antipoverty agency. But others say competition from local Community Action Agencies, which have attracted youthful, aggressive poverty fighters, will force the USES to change. "The CAAs have come in with a different breed of guys. They have scared the old-line established agencies," one official comments.

It's increasingly evident that only an immense effort will persuade the hard-core poor to participate in training. Many have been so alienated by school, welfare, police and other public officials that they won't wander into a neighborhood manpower office, even in the heart of the slums. Welfare recipients, the poorest of the poor, make up only 12% of manpower course trainees, and the percentage was even slimmer in the past.

Also, manpower administrators often prefer to concentrate on the most promising candidates—a process known as "creaming"—to make certain their programs avoid dropout problems and achieve high job-placement records. Shiny statistics persuade politicians to appropriate the necessary money.

Handling the hard core furnishes little hope of such success. Dropout rates may run over 50%, lengthy remedial education is often essential, and even then employers may balk at hiring graduates because of police records, emotional instability or other difficulties. Experts argue the only answer is to invest more money and run greater chance of failure by deliberately focusing on the tough training risks.

Manpower courses developed for literate high school graduates must be modified for the needs of the uneducated and unemployed. Lengthy classroom sessions are usually unsatisfactory because the poor have already failed in school and have no patience for the academic. Training tied to tangible work experience is more successful. One approach is to give the unemployed, particularly youths, a brief indoctrination in proper work habits and then place them in low-level jobs in private industry. But the hard-core poor may need prolonged preparation to become productive workers, and many companies are unwilling to run the risk.

COSTS, AND SOME WORRIES

Thus, a fundamental issue arises: How to furnish Federal financial incentives to induce private industry to train the poor. "There's general agreement this the next major direction we'll probably have to move in to get the job done," declares one Federal official. Two high-level Washington task forces—one announced, one still secret—are seeking to chart public policy in this difficult area. Besides the expense, the major fears are that some companies would derive unfair competitive advantage or would profiteer on the poor.

Some experts advocate reliance on corporate tax credits, but safeguards would have to be arranged. Local public agencies might certify those "disadvantaged" workers for whom credits could be claimed. Defense and other Federal contracts could be used as a financial lever to force more private training of the poor; now the Government wields only moral suasion.

A more limited approach would be to underwrite a portion of the wage costs in Federally sponsored on-the-job training, which now benefits more than 100,000 workers. Payments to employers average $25 a week per person and cover only the employer's extra costs of providing training. Thus, companies usually prefer to use this training to upgrade the skills of their own employes or to hire only the most promising prospects. Some specialists think a payment of $40 or $50 a week would be sufficient subsidy to encourage employers to take on the neediest of the unemployed. It's agreed that on-the-job training provides the poor the most promising pathway to employment.

But even if all these obstacles are overcome, the employment problems of any of the hard core will probably remain.

"We are going to find out a lot of the poor are not trainable. Even the best programs have success rates no better than 50%," warns one manpower man. Federal officials have already created several hundred thousand low-level jobs in the public sector. Some experts advocate a substantial step-up, to aid all the unemployed who can't compete in a free enterprise society. But the cost would be considerable, several billion dollars a year, and many a Congressman might balk at the concept that Uncle Sam assure every citizen a job.

Thus, before the Government's mushrooming manpower programs can claim more than limited, local success with the poor, drastic national departures in policy and practice will be essential.

A Call for Personal Commitment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT P. GRIFFIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 17, 1967

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, one of the most serious problems facing America today is a decline in personal initiative and commitment. This decline is accompanied by an increasing tendency on the part of individuals to rely on Government.

With characteristic vigor and conviction, Gov. George Romney recently addressed himself to this problem when he spoke to the Governor's Conference on Innovation in Social Problem Solving and Strengthening Family Life, at Lansing, Mich.

Because I know my colleagues in Congress will be interested in his forthright call for the restoration of a sense of individual purpose in American life, I ask unanimous consent that the text of Governor Romney's address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address

was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Address by Gov. George Romney at the Governor's Conference on Innovation in Social Problem Solving and Strengthening Family Life, Civic Center, Lansing, Mich., June 20, 1967

An appropriate motto for this conference would be these words from Winston Churchill: "Give us the tools, and we will finish the job."

This afternoon, we will be examining a set of new tools. It's an incomplete set; we're only starting to assemble it. In fact, many of the tools we seek and badly need have not yet even been designed.

These tools are needed for a job that's just begun—the job of liberating the energies of a free people to overcome our growing human and social problems.

The problems are in the headlines every day:

Riots of the disadvantaged in the ghetto. Riots of the affluent on the campus. Crime in the streets. Juvenile delinquency in the suburbs. Dishonesty in high places. Drug addiction. LSD. Alcoholism. Tranquilizers. Sexual promiscuity. Marital infidelity. Family breakdown. Personal irresponsibility in all its forms.

What a paradox!

In the land of the free, men and women are increasingly dependent—whether on drugs or alcohol, on a psychoanalyst, on sensual stimulation, or on governmental handouts.

In the home of the brave, men and women are increasingly afraid—whether of personal insecurity and failure, of personal responsibility, of vast impersonal forces and institutions they can neither control nor comprehend, or even of other men and women, perhaps with different colored skins.

To solve our human and social problems, we must find a way to re-create a sense of community within America—a community of responsible Americans—responsible for themselves and responsible for helping one another.

To succeed, we must choose our tools carefully. For I believe many of the tools we are now using are taking us into a blind alley.

The story of America has been the story of a great people working together to build a great nation—primarily through personal responsibility, private initiative, and voluntary cooperation, but supplemented by local, state, and federal governmental action when appropriate.

But we were slow in responding to the new, intricate, and demanding human and social problems of the twentieth-century.

We were slow in developing the full range of tools we needed—private and voluntary tools—even state and local governmental tools—the tools of personal responsibility.

Because we were slow, we have come to doubt the effectiveness of these traditional American methods.

Instead, we have passed the ball primarily to the federal government. We have come to look to government for the solution of almost all our problems. We have begun to think that, if government can't solve our problems, they can't be solved at all.

And today, frustration and disillusionment are growing because—despite hundreds of federal programs costing billions of dollars—our human and social problems continue to multiply on every side.

We face a crisis of confidence in the primarily federal approach that we have taken.

Even the advocates of massive federal programs concede that federal tools have failed to do the job.

A cabinet official decries the "major problems" that result from narrow and fragmented federal programs.

The federal Budget Director deplores the tendency of federal programs to by-pass and weaken governors and mayors.

A chief architect of the federal anti-poverty program questions the "altogether too glowing" official claims about the results of federal urban programs.

A leading liberal urban analyst notes unhappily, "At a cost of more than three billion dollars, the Urban Renewal Agency has succeeded in materially reducing the supply of low cost housing in American cities."

An aide to the two most recent Presidents is troubled that the growth of central power is shrinking the significance of the individual citizen.

The Welfare Commissioner of New York City testifies that our nation's welfare system is "bankrupt" because it locks the poor into dependency.

And a militant civil rights leader calls the welfare system "the white man's greatest weapon to keep the Negro down."

But the trouble goes deeper than the mere fact that federal tools have failed to solve our problems. In many cases, despite their good intentions, they have made the problems worse.

A democratic society requires many active independent centers of responsibility and creativity—not just one. There must be many communities of concern, each willing and equipped to take direct responsibility for direct action to meet needs.

But too often, federal programs have stifled, rather than strengthened, the rich diversity and creativity of America's human and social resources for solving human and social problems.

We are finding that it is possible to lose the substance of a democatic society, even though the structure of democratic representative government remains.

For the federal approach has speeded the depersonalization of society and rationalized the abdication of personal responsibility. And these are major causes of America's declining sense of community and mounting problems.

The changes brought by industrialization, urbanization, and technological advance—despite their many benefits—have increasingly tended to transform America into an impersonal society.

A large city is more impersonal than a small town. And the majority of Americans live in urban centers.

Driving an automobile is more impersonal than riding a streetcar. And most Americans go by auto.

Working in a giant enterprise is more impersonal than working in a small business. And most Americans work for large organizations.

Studying in a giant university is more impersonal than going to a small college. And most American students attend the larger institutions, where the college pennant has been replaced by the IBM card.

And to all these depersonalizing forces, add one more: big government.

Government agencies have an unfortunate tendency to think of people in terms of categories—"target populations" to shoot programs at—depersonalized blocks, not individual human beings.

As seen by government agencies, the people have a way of becoming subjects to be manipulated, not citizens to be served.

As seen by the people, government has a way of becoming "they," not "we"—"theirs," not "ours."

And by substituting governmental effort, however well-intentioned, for personal effort, we tend not only to depersonalize society, but to dehumanize ourselves.

Many of you are active in your United Fund and Community Chest campaigns. I know a man who never contributes. He says, "Why should I? It's the government's job to take care of the needy. I pay my taxes, and that's enough."

He's a brave man! But he's wrong.

What he's really saying is that we've hired our Good Samaritan, so we can forget our personal responsibility for attacking human and social problems.

But when that assumption takes hold in a community, we have cut off at the root the humane impulse of concern that led us to seek an answer in the first place—even a governmental answer.

With that kind of reasoning, the answer to the question, "Am I my brother's keeper?" is a quick and easy "No—because we've hired a keeper for our brother."

Thus we are shielded from direct personal confrontation with our disadvantaged brother. We never really see him as a human being and fellow child of God. We make it easy to forget that he is a real person with flesh and bones and blood—with problems, hopes and fears like ours.

And even the governmental keeper we have hired is insulated from his charge—by layer after layer of bureaucracy, by rigid rules and regulations, by professional manpower shortages, and by overcrowded caseloads that prevent even the most dedicated social worker from supplying more than sporadic attention to those whom he is trying to help.

The result is a tragic loss of the fellow-feeling that knits a mere aggregate of people into a true community. The sequel is rising discord, suspicion, animosity, and fear.

For inevitably, the members of one "target population" begin to see themselves as competitors with every other "target population". Each group suspects the other of getting a larger share of governmental favors, or bearing a smaller share of governmental costs.

Take, for example, the affluent or reasonably comfortable middle-class—the majority of the people who pay the bulk of the taxes. They may be right in thinking that they're the biggest target group of all.

More and more, they are resisting many governmental programs designed to help the disadvantaged. They not only sense the shortcomings of the government approach—but they resent its growing cost. Even school millage proposals, which would directly benefit almost everyone, are repeatedly defeated.

Many taxpayers are increasingly resentful and intolerant of the faceless recipients of governmental handouts. Those who pay tend to stereotype those who receive as lazy, shiftless parasites.

Thus decent, warm-hearted human beings—who would not think of turning their backs on someone who was starving, injured, or troubled if they met him in the flesh—will oppose without a second thought governmental programs intended to help those very same starving, injured, troubled people.

As a result, there is serious doubt about the future of public support for governmental welfare, educational, and social programs.

And how about the people at the bottom of the heap—the disadvantaged individuals and groups who need help the most?

Many are becoming increasingly resentful at their apparent inability to break through into the affluent society around them. They are fed up with being "kept." They are tired of being locked into the cycle of poverty and dependency that governmental programs too often force upon them. And too many—with their hopes shattered, their self-confidence undermined, and their motivation destroyed—have simply given up.

Thus the affluent think we're spending too much and doing too much, and the deprived think we're spending too little and doing too little.

And paradoxically, both are right. We're spending too much on the wrong things, and not doing enough of the right things.

The result is a widening gulf between the affluent majority and the deprived minority—not only an economic gulf, but a psychological gulf, a chasm in human understanding, a brotherhood gap.

Three-quarters of us are in danger of smothering in the cozy bedclothes of our affluence, while millions are choking on their own hopelessness and squalor.

Too many of the affluent have become

arrogant, unsatisfied, and frightened, while too many of the deprived have become dependent, frustrated, and embittered.

We sense the impending danger of a great breach in our social structure, a tearing of our social fabric.

How shall we respond to this grave challenge?

Shall we echo the fanatic and desperate outcry of extremists on the left and right—embracing either blind, irresponsible collectivism or equally blind and irresponsible individualism?

Shall we throw up our hands in despair and await the seemingly inevitable dissolution of society?

My answer is no—we will do neither. For the cause is not lost—not while responsible Americans are willing to give of themselves for the sake of their fellow men, their children, and their country's future.

Together, we can find a better way—a better way to re-create the sense of community we so desperately need—a better way to make our whole society come alive to its responsibilities and opportunities—a better way to overcome our mounting problems.

And that better way is active, personal, responsible commitment and concern.

This can never be imposed from the top down. We can only build it from the bottom up.

Today, our problems are so massive that we must call upon the full resources of society, in all their rich diversity. That includes government, business, universities, private organizations of all kinds—and most of all, individual men and women.

I believe that there is still a vast reservoir of commitment in Michigan and in America just waiting to be tapped—men and women who are willing and eager to get out and get involved.

The trouble is that so many of our voluntary programs in the past have seemed irrelevant to the problems we confront. Rolling bandages is an anachronism in the space age.

This is the generation of innovation. Yet our innovation in the social field has lagged far behind our innovation in the physical and material field.

We have failed to develop the social instruments—the tools—through which people who want to help can make a truly meaningful contribution.

Sure, it's important for people to have a place to go when they want to ask for help. But it's just as important for people to have a place to go when they want to give their help. And it's essential that they have something meaningful to do when they get there.

The new tools we will examine at this conference are innovating tools. They reflect the tested insights of social research. They seek to apply the fruits of scientific and technological development to social problem-solving. They seek to make the forces of science and technology work for us, not against us—transforming even the computer into an instrument for re-personalizing American society and reasserting the primacy of the individual person.

And because these are innovating tools, they are also renovating tools. They seek to put private and governmental effort in proper relationship to one another.

Thirty years ago, Walter Lippman wrote:

"It is generally supposed that the increasing complexity of the social order requires an increasing direction from officials. My own view is, rather, as affairs become more intricate, more extended in time and space, more involved and inter-related, overhead direction by officials of the state has to become simpler, less intensive, less direct, more general."

These tools recognize the crucial importance of a true partnership between private effort and governmental effort. It is not a question of "either-or"; it is a necessity for "both-and." These tools apply the principle that has guided the work of our State Human Resources Council—that government has a responsiiblity to encourage, assist, and stimulate private effort, but never to replace it. Only then can private effort play its proper role in a balanced attack on social problems. Only then can we tap the full range of society's creativity and diversity.

These tools also come to grips with the fact that much of the frustration and division in our society stems from false perception.

If the disadvantaged perceive themselves as helpless failures, as they too often do, their motivation is destroyed. If society perceives them as utterly useless and irredeemable, as it too often does, it is reluctant to extend a helping hand. These false perceptions on both sides reinforce the cycle of dependency.

These new programs seek to change such false perceptions. They give the disadvantaged a chance to prove their worth both to themselves and to society. They provide the opportunity for self-help, self-advancement, and renewed self-confidence. They can transform losers into winners—benefitting both the individual and society at large.

In addition, each of these tools seeks in its own way to strengthen the fundamental social institution on whose vitality the ultimate health of society depends—the family.

The family is our first window on the world. It teaches us who we are and what we stand for. It shapes our attitudes toward other people and society. It teaches us how to relate to other people—first to the members of our family, who are only slightly different from ourselves, and then to outsiders who may be vastly different. Sound families build sound character. And sound character builds a sound society.

These programs strengthen the forces that will strengthen family life—church activities; sound child-training habits; decent, productive, meaningful employment; home ownership; a solid family financial base; well-founded self-confidence; and constructive participation in community life.

Finally and indispensably, these tools recognize the central role of the individual volunteer. Their success importantly depends on responsible, dedicated individuals—yes, and families—who care enough to get involved directly, actively, and personally in the day-to-day struggles and problems of those in need of help.

The volunteer supplies the touch of personal concern that is missing in so many governmental programs. After all, a case worker can spend only a few minutes a week with each family assigned to him. But the volunteer works on a one-to-one basis. He helps the social worker do a better job, by providing sustained contact with the family. His gift of time, inspiration, example, and concern can make the difference between failure and success.

The most exciting fact about programs like these is that they work—they really work. And their success is a tribute to the problem-solving capacity of responsible Americans.

As a veteran social services administrator remarked about the Lansing one-to-one family volunteer program, "When I heard about this project, I though I'd been around this business too long. But when I sat through the first report meeting, and saw the results they were getting, I decided I hadn't been in the business long enough."

When this conference is over, I think you too will decide that we haven't been in this business long enough.

We know these tools do not provide a total answer to our problems—but they point the direction we must go.

I urge you to pick up these tools, take them home, put them to work. And out of your own experience, forge new and even better tools.

I believe—I deeply believe—that the future of this state and nation requires a revitalization of personal responsibility, family responsibility, and private institutional responsibility.

I appeal to you, and through you to the people of Michigan:

As responsible Americans, join in the pursuit and practice of the better way.

Join in the struggle to reclaim the lives of those for whom each new day is only one more lesson in futility.

Join in the great task confronting this generation of Americans: to restore the concept of community and brotherhood.

Give more than your money. Give your time, your talent, your example, your inspiration, your concern. Give yourself.

The responsibility is ours. The need is great. The time is short. The tools are in our hands.

If the commitment is in our hearts, we cannot fail.

Strengthening NASA Safety Procedures

SPEECH

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 13, 1967

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, to say that human life is far too precious to risk foolishly would seem to be repeating a self-evident truth. Yet precisely because it is so obvious, this fact can sometimes be taken for granted. That this situation can occur has been firmly impressed upon the public mind by the gentleman from Illinois, Congressman Donald Rumsfeld, who authored an amendment to the 1968 authorization bill for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. After thoroughly studying the tragic Apollo fire of January 1967, Mr. Rumsfeld found that a serious "safety hazard evaluation gap" existed in the U.S. space program. He therefore proposed, and the House of Representatives accepted, an independent safety review board for NASA.

It was in order to avoid this potential gap that an independent safety review board was made an integral part of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954. Section 29 established the Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards—ACRS—as a "safety review system which is independent of direct program interest." The success with which this committee has been utilized has convinced us that such a group is vital to any project in which human life is even conceivably threatened.

It is with the example of the ACRS before us that I strongly support Congressman Rumsfeld's proposal for a similar independent safety review board for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. This proposal is embodied in the House-passed NASA authorization bill for fiscal year 1968. I sincerely hope that the House-Senate conference will retain this provision when the conferees meet to consider the authorization bill.

NASA, of course, already tests the components and systems as they are delivered by the contractors. Similar testing is done within AEC. As Martin B. Biles, Director, Division of Operational Safety, AEC, has pointed out:

> The AEC reactor program is carried out by contractors . . . [so] that AEC can act as

an independent auditor of its contractors' operations.

Yet Congress, in 1954, realizing that the pressures of program deadlines and goals could occasionally become so great that they take precedence over safety considerations, provided for an independent safety review board for AEC. Dr. Biles has observed:

> The ACRS is at liberty to investigate areas of safety significance at will.

This increased independence is especially important "as the hazard becomes more significant." What can be a more significant hazard than sending men into outer space in launch vehicles which can turn into engines of death at the slightest malfunctioning?

A safety review system which is independent of direct program interest has proven that it can provide safety and yet allow the project it is overseeing to continue functioning successfully. The risks in space are as great as those involved with atomic energy. There should be no delay in establishing a safety panel for NASA. Congressman Rumsfeld and the House have provided an opportunity for the Senate. We strongly urge that body to take advantage of this opportunity offered to it.

New Declaration of Independence Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 17, 1967

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an editorial entitled "New Declaration Needed," written by Walter Potter, editor and publisher, and published in the Culpeper, Va., Star-Exponent of July 3, 1967.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

GREATER THREAT EXISTS: NEW DECLARATION NEEDED

Tomorrow, we will celebrate the 191st anniversary of the Declaration of Independence by this nation on July 4, 1776. This Declaration was issued as the basis for a course of action to unite the people of the colonies against a common foe. Today we need a new declaration, for today we, the people, face a far greater threat to our individual freedoms than our forefathers did.

The threat today is not that of a colonial power who would impose its will on a colony with "taxation without representation." Today the threat comes from an ideology which has as its avowed purpose the destruction of our way of life and the changing of our freedom to slavery. The name of this threat is Communism but it has many faces.

First, we must recognize that we are at war today. Our adversaries are the Soviet Union, Communist China, all the other Communist countries plus individual Communists in the United States and throughout the world. This is a different kind of war but the objective of our enemies today is exactly the same as that of our enemies of the past—to impose their will on this nation.

The face of war is different today. It is a time when slavery is called democracy, self-defense is called aggression and lies are called truth. It is a time when enemies are called friends and friends are distrustful of each other. It is a war of cruelty and terrorism that recalls days of past conflict with savages and neo-savages. The enemy constantly changes his colors to allow fading into the cloaks of peace as the guerrilla fades into the countryside.

Today, there is a constant call for peace but there can be no peace without complete surrender of our honor, our liberty and even our very lives. These our forefathers called sacred. They must be held no less sacred today if we are to survive as free men in this world.

As this is written, American military forces are fighting and dying in South Viet Nam. Some at home question the necessity for this sacrifice and even demand that we end it on our own. This we cannot do without surrender. And, piece-meal surrender arrives at the same final end, it only takes a little longer. One nation can start a war, but peace comes only when two or more agree.

What can be done? How can we fight this insidious force that confuses even our leaders?

The answer lies in the lessons of the past. Our nation can survive in freedom today in the same way in which this freedom was gained—by dedication and determination to achieve this goal. We must be steadfast in purpose and we must be true to the virtues on which our freedoms are based.

The answer too lies in facing up to the realities of today. We must eschew wishful thinking and face the hard facts of this conflict. We have tried to make peace by talking peace and offering concession after concession. Thus far, our foe has met all our offers with insistence that we surrender. There must be mutual willingness for any agreement to be reached.

For too long we have tried to find an easy way to insure our freedoms. We have tried to buy our way out of some of our difficulties and we have tried to buy loyalty and agreement. We have too often rewarded aggression and enmity while we have penalized some of our friends. International blackmail is no different from the private kind, it grows in price with each payment.

Finally, we must face up to our enemies and demand an end to their efforts to subvert the world. There must be an end to infiltration of free peoples by trained saboteurs from Russia, China, Cuba and the other Communist camps. This type of aggression can be stopped at the source and only in that way. We must brand them as the aggressors they are and refuse to deal with them until it is stopped.

We need a new Declaration of Independence. Let us now declare that we will never surrender our freedom and that we intend to maintain it at all costs. To this end, let us once again dedicate our lives, our hearts and our sacred honor.

The Honorable J. Arthur Younger

SPEECH

OF

HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 13, 1967

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, it is always a sad occasion when we come to the time on the House Calendar that we pause to pay tribute to one of our departed Members. Words come hard at a time like this and there is little that words can accomplish in filling the vacuum in his household when one of our colleagues is removed by his Maker.

I join my colleagues today in paying tribute to the late J. Arthur Younger who was taken from us on June 20 while a patient at Walter Reed Hospital. He joined our ranks in the House in 1953 and served alongside us continuously until his death.

The 11th District of California was very ably represented in Washington by Congressman Younger. His obituary reveals what all of us who served with him had long since come to know—that he was a conscientious and dedicated public servant. Even before he joined our ranks his abilities were utilized profitably by agencies of the executive branch of the Federal Government as he served in his home State of California.

He brought to these Halls a wealth of knowledge and experience in government-citizen relationships. He was an asset not only to his State, but also to the Congress.

As others of my colleagues have said, Arthur Younger will be missed in Congress.

Mrs. Younger and other members of his family have my deepest sympathy.

Congress Should Act To Deter Firebrand Inciters of Riots and Violence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1967

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the House this week is scheduled to take up H.R. 471, which would make it a Federal crime to travel across State lines for the purpose of inciting riots and violence.

In view of the events of recent days—the continuing pattern of anarchy and violence spreading through our major cities—it is most important that the Congress act favorably on this matter and serve notice on the inciters that law and order will prevail.

Our local law enforcement agencies need the assistance our Federal Government can provide by deterring outside agitators from disrupting communities with their doctrines of hate and violence.

In this connection, under unanimous consent I include my newsletter concerning this matter in the Appendix of the Record:

CONGRESS CONSIDERS ANTI-RIOT BILL

The House this week is scheduled to consider legislation designed to outlaw activities of roving agitators who leave waves of violence in their wake. I have joined with others in sponsoring this bill, reported out of the Judiciary Committee, which would make it a Federal crime to travel across state lines for the purpose of inciting riots and violence. The bill would impose a penalty of up to $10,000 fine or five years Federal imprisonment upon conviction of violation of the act.

It is my belief that this bill represents a step toward a return to law and order in our land. Within recent months we have seen a breakdown of law and order in many of our major cities throughout the Nation. Continued violence and the practice of resorting to violence serves to undermine and erode the foundation of our democratic society which is based on law and order. Riots and violence are destructive of our way of life and cannot be tolerated.

The Judiciary Committee in expressing concern on this issue said that while the immediate victims of street riots and terror are the innocent bystanders, law-abiding citizens and small businessmen, in a larger sense all America is victimized by such lawlessness. The Committee emphasized that the proposed bill will supplement—not supplant—local law enforcement. The primary and most effective means of control of violence and riots rests with state and local authorities—our local police. However, it is my hope and the hope of the Committee that by assuring prosecution of "out-of-state inciters" of riots and violence Congress will assist state and local authorities in keeping the peace. There is no question but that much of the violence stems from outside agitation—much is Communist inspired and promoted.

In connection with the necessity of a return to the traditions of respect for law and order, the House recently passed a bill making desecration of our U.S. Flag a Federal offense. It is shocking to think that such a law is even necessary—I can remember the time that a man was nudged and advised to take his hat off if he failed to extend this courtesy to Old Glory passing by. A rebirth of patriotism seems needed.

Most Americans are law-abiding citizens who understand and respect the necessity for law and order in our Country. This law will support and protect them.

J. Arthur Younger

SPEECH

OF

HON. ROBERT B. (BOB) MATHIAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 13, 1967

Mr. MATHIAS of California. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in mourning the death of my good friend, a truly great man, ARTHUR YOUNGER.

As a new Member, I did not have the opportunity to work with ARTHUR YOUNGER to the extent my colleagues did, but in the 6 months I have been here, I have come to know the great ability, integrity, and character of this fine man. The people of his district, in northern California, respected him as a statesman who in his years of service and leadership had been a spokesman for sound, responsible government.

On a few occasions, I sought the counsel and assistance of Congressman YOUNGER. He always offered a willing hand, and it was a privilege to have been associated with him.

A recent newspaper account of Mr. YOUNGER's passing stated, "On Capitol Hill, Mr. YOUNGER was a friendly and well-liked Congressman." This expression of sentiment, simple as it may be, describes a man who meant a great deal to many. What a fine way for us to remember him.

Little I could say would add anything to the record of J. ARTHUR YOUNGER. I, personally, will treasure the memory of his friendship.

Foreign Affairs: When Cats Eat Mustard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD J. IRWIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 13, 1967

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, I should like to insert in the RECORD the New York Times column written by Mr. C. L. Sulzberger on July 12. In his column, Mr. Sulzberger places Soviet foreign policy in a broad historical perspective and avoids the usual narrow crisis orientation. This is a refreshing and valuable approach—it is one that we must not forget to use at times as we toil daily to meet the challenges of national policies and undertakings.

Mr. Sulzberger's column follows:

FOREIGN AFFAIRS: WHEN CATS EAT MUSTARD

(By C. L. Sulzberger)

Soviet foreign policy tends to be more ingenious than successful. A legend stressing such ingenuity is still told in Geneva about League of Nations days. As the tale goes, Sir John Simon, Aristide Briand and Maxim Litvinov met in a lakeside restaurant to discuss a Greco-Bulgarian crisis.

"You can no more make the Bulgars talk with the Greeks than you can make a cat eat mustard," said Simon. "But a cat will eat mustard," Litvinov replied, "if properly persuaded."

ANIMAL KNOW-HOW

Simon, convinced the English knew more about animals than anyone, summoned the waiter, ordered sugar, a dish of cream, stirred in some mustard, and commandeered the barman's cat. The cat refused to sniff the preparation. "All right," said Simon to the sneering Briand, "you try."

The Frenchman told the *maitre d'hôtel to* bring a mixture of sole, butter, sardine heads, *sauce Bechamel* and herbs. Murmuring that a good chef could disguise any taste, he carefully stirred in mustard. The cat spurned it.

"You gentlemen are too conventional," said Litvinov. He lifted the cat and smeared a dab of mustard under its tail. The cat shrieked, jumped, landed in a corner, turned around—and licked the mustard off.

The Greeks and Bulgars never became friends, but the habit of trick policy-making remains in the Kremlin. Right after World War II, Moscow permitted its satellites to foster a proxy war in Greece, despite Stalin's promise to regard this as a British sphere. When the idea didn't work, Russia backtracked.

The U.S.S.R. tried to squeeze the West out of Berlin and then to discourage it by bisecting the city. It encouraged a North Korean attack southward, but subsequently, by warning China, permitted an armistice. It moved missiles into Cuba to menace the United States, yet, when warned off, pulled them out again.

In the Far East, Russia first looted China, then helped Mao Tse-tung to take over, while always backing Mao's chief rival, the pro-Soviet Liu Shao-chi. Liu has since lost all his power. Moscow told the North Vietnamese they would be wise to make peace, and then armed them to make war.

In the Middle East, Moscow set up a North Iranian puppet state and abandoned it. It tried to bully Turkey into ceding two provinces and control of the straits, and forgot the issue. It helped create Israel, even arranging an underground railway for arms, and then proceeded to back the Arabs. When, as last month, that backing was really challenged, Russia turned the other cheek.

The artful dodges of Soviet policy have often been flamboyant—swift Berlin wall or secret Cuban missiles—but whenever the Kremlin gets fancy, its diplomacy fails. It does best when it is rational, as with Kosygin's praiseworthy Tashkent arbitration between India and Pakistan.

DEATH IS INDISCRIMINATE

Today Moscow is quite as interested as Washington in avoiding holocaust and impartial destruction of Communists and capitalists. Therefore, encouragement of small-scale conflicts carries with it implicit risks whose ultimate consequences the Kremlin isn't ready to accept.

Nor is it in a good position to help clients who want to press minor wars of "national liberation" which Soviet doctrine defines as desirable. Russia possesses neither distant bases nor naval facilities to grant direct military support, whether in Cuba, the Congo, Vietnam or Egypt. It has not carriers, insufficient air transports, and far less apparatus for distant conventional warfare than its arch-rival, the United States.

POLICY PARADOX

Thus Moscow is in an inherently uncomfortable position. It encourages local wars it cannot effectively support. It can only offer to unleash nuclear missiles, yet this is the one thing Moscow doesn't want to do.

Soviet diplomats often managed to make cats eat mustard—from Berlin to Cuba to Sinai. But so long as this is only a trick and not rational policy, it doesn't work—for Moscow is hoist on its own paradox. Dogmatically it encourages small wars which it cannot support pragmatically—without blowup the world.

J. Arthur Younger

SPEECH

OF

HON. JAMES A. HALEY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 13, 1967

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, it is always sad to say farewell to a friend, to stand here in the hall of the House of Representatives and pay final tribute to a colleague who has been taken from us.

I feel a deep personal sorrow in the passing of J. ARTHUR YOUNGER, of California. We came to the Congress together—while our States are at the opposite ends of this great Nation. We shared similar problems in many areas. I came to know ARTHUR YOUNGER well, to admire and respect him deeply. He was a warm, wise man.

He was a good man—in the finest sense of the word. His advice and counsel were highly valued by his colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

One of the measures of a man is the respect in which he is held by those who are his juniors. In each Congress as the new Members arrived I observed that ARTHUR YOUNGER was one of the first from whom they sought advice. It was a part of his nature to counsel—and his advice was sound and constructive. He was fair and he was impartial. He was a source of strength. He was interested in the problems of all.

I shall deeply miss his wisdom and the warmth of his personality. I have lost a personal friend.

All of us who served with Arthur Younger mourn his passing. The State of California has lost one of her finest sons and most effective representatives. The Congress has lost one of its ablest and most distinguished legislators.

To Mrs. Younger and their children, Mrs. Haley and I extend our deepest sympathy.

The In-School Neighborhood Youth Corps in St. Paul

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1967

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, the impact of the Neighborhood Youth Corps on the personality and attitudes of young people is one of the rewarding results of this program. In May of this year I called to the attention of the Congress the success of the out-of-school NYC program in St. Paul in teaching dropouts good "work attitudes." I am pleased to report that the in-school project in St. Paul is also having a profound effect on the lives of needy youths.

Giving these deserving young people pride in themselves and a chance to feel that they can contribute positively to society is the first step in making them responsible adults. The NYC provides them with the opportunity to perform worthwhile work, earn money for clothes and books, and receive guidance and other supportive services to help them stay in school and to make the transition to the competitive job world.

Under unanimous consent I insert into the Record an article from the Union Advocate which aptly describes the radical change in one young man who had the opportunity to participate in the in-school Neighborhood Youth Corps program.

The article follows:

YOUR ST. PAUL PUBLIC SCHOOLS: YOUTH CORPS OFFERS OPPORTUNITY

(Editor's Note.—This is the 27th in a series of articles and pictures relating to the 1966–67 school year, contributed by the publications office of the St. Paul public schools.)

John R———, that's not his real name, is a Neighborhood Youth Corps (NYC) enrollee. His mother, widowed three years ago, supports her family of six children on social security payments and—for emergencies—what remains of her husband's insurance.

Raising a family alone is not an easy task in any society, and in our very complex one Mrs. R——— has had her problems.

As John reached high school age he became increasingly difficult to live with. His temper flared, he neglected his school work, he yearned to possess more of the material goods of a rich society in which he and his family were very poor. He stayed out late and was uncommunicative.

In the language of the psychologist, John might be described as one whose self-image had not developed positively.

In unguarded moments, John revealed that he actually held a concept of himself as an unworthy person. It began to look as though his behavior would soon match his self-concept. John seemed to stop planning for his future.

The counselor at the high school John attended knew something of both John's negative self-image and his anti-social behavior. Mrs. R——— had talked to the counselor about her difficulties, and John's teachers had too.

When the Neighborhood Youth Corps began recruiting in this second year of its operation, the counselor recommended John. When John talked to a NYC area supervisor, a spark of interest was generated by the idea of earning some money. John's own attempts at finding a job had been futile.

John went to work in a hospital. As weeks went by he seemed to change.

Perhaps it was the few dollars of spending money he now had. Perhaps it was a reflection of the interest his Neighborhood Youth Corps area supervisor obviously had in his success. Perhaps it was his job-supervisor's encouragement. Perhaps it was the success he had at his work.

Perhaps it was the insights John developed into the working world of his society. Perhaps all of these contributed to John's new self-image as a person of worth who could succeed.

John is not a composite of Neighborhood Youth Corps enrollees. Each enrollee's story would be unique—for each is a different person. All they really share is an opportunity.

Some 324 students, 27 from non-public schools, and 297 from public schools, are enrolled in the Neighborhood Youth Corps. Eligibility is based on family finances relating to family size.

The students are referred by school personnel, welfare, state employment, and private service agencies. "Enrollees are employed 11 hours weekly at $1.25 per hour," indicates project director, Clyde R. Manchester.

Students work at 104 different job sites. Fifty-seven are employed in hospitals; 102 in public and non-public schools; 94 in city government departments; 15 in state agencies; 9 in federal agencies; and 47 in nonprofit private service agencies.

The program is supported by a $160,000 grant from the United States Department of Labor and coordinated by Lyle K. Swanson, a former high school counselor.

Three area supervisors assist in placement, individual and group guidance, and special guidance workshops involving career planning, post-high school educational opportunities, and on-the-job communications' skills.

For many students, the Neighborhood Youth Corps has provided an opportunity for experiencing success in assuming the responsibilities of a young adult.

The Late Honorable J. Arthur Younger

SPEECH

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 13, 1967

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to know our departed colleague, Hon. J. Arthur Younger, from the time he first came to Congress in 1953. He had served his country in time of war and he zealously served his adopted State of California in Congress for more than 13 years. He was a gentleman of integrity, dignity, and dedication to his people and to his country. Our Nation has been the beneficiary of his loyal service, and his death has saddened all of us here where he was held in high esteem. I am happy to have had his friendship and extend my sympathy to his widow.

Galbraith and Liberalism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1967

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, every American knows the name of Al Capp and his perceptive cartoon strip syndicated in most newspapers. But perhaps not too many are aware of Mr. Capp's keen wit and his understanding of the American political scene. In a recent radio special on NBC's "Monitor," Mr. Capp analyzed "Galbraith and Liberalism," which I feel is an excellent commentary of the present state of liberalism in America. Here is what he said:

GALBRAITH AND LIBERALISM

(By Al Capp)

Kenneth Galbraith is my neighbor and friend. Tomorrow, he'll still be my neighbor. Galbraith is one of Harvard's great professors, and one of the world's leading economists, and I mention these places in the order of their importance. But he's best known for having created the phrase "the affluent society," which is what all us deadbroke Americans are now known as to the rest of the world.

The other day he sent me his latest book, "The New Industrial State," and it had this inscription—"To Al Capp, to encourage that old Liberal revival—Affectionately, Ken." Well, I think it'd be downright unneighborly not to answer an inscription like that. And here's the answer—

I don't figure it's up to me, Ken, to revive Liberalism. It seems to me it's up to the guys who killed it—you, and Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., and the club you run—Americans for Democratic Action. Remember, Ken, how we all learned—not so long ago—to sort out Liberals from the play-it-safers or the ultraconservatives. A liberal earned the right to be called one by standing up and fighting McCarthyism at the risk of sacrificing everything. You fought McCarthyism, Arthur, Jr. did, I did, and so did the ADA. Who's changed? You, Ken. And Arthur, Jr., and the ADA.

A Liberal is a guy who understood the lunacy of our old policy of isolationism. Remember when American isolationism was so strong it fought every effort to help prevent Hitler from taking over the world. Even after Pearl Harbor, Zero Mostel as a die-hard isolationist Senator, got his biggest, most bitter laugh by roaring, "What I wants to know is what was Pearl Harbor doing in the Pacific?"

The Liberal was a guy who risked being called a war-monger to persuade his country to pull its head out of the sand to save the free world and, as a by-product, to save ourselves.

But who today is urging us back to isolationism? Who said when Israel was threatened with extinction by Communist-equipped force, "Since I am opposed to unilateral intervention in the Far East, I must be opposed to unilateral intervention in the Near East." Or, to put it another way, let's not lift a finger to stop the Communists until they get to Seattle.

It was your fellow leader of American for Democratic Action Ken—Arthur Schlesinger, Jr.—speaking for the high command of your Liberalism. Americans for Democratic Action my foot! They become Americans for no action at all. No different, really, from the ultra conservative isolationists, except that they're a lot more sanctimonious.

And finally, Ken, do you remember that old photograph (of) Sewell Avery? It was a symbol of everything Liberals were against. Sewell Avery was an old-time tycoon. When the government ordered him to do something he didn't care to do, he refused to do it. When they ordered him to move, he refused to budge. And so they had to carry him out. It was a famous picture.

Who, today, defies the government? Who, today, denounces its committees? Who, today, refused to leave hearing rooms until they're carried out? Not the Conservatives, Ken. The Liberals. *Your* Liberals. Guys like me didn't desert Liberalism, Ken. You fellas kidnapped it.

This is Al Capp on NBC's "Monitor."

The Late Honorable J. Arthur Younger

SPEECH

OF

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 13, 1967

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, it is always difficult to say farewell to a colleague who has departed from us—and from this world. But I find it especially difficult in the case of our beloved friend, "ART" YOUNGER.

Not only was ART—and I must still call him that for his very nature made it almost impossible to address him in more formal terms—one of the most capable and dedicated Members of this body, which he loved so well, but he was, truth to tell, a comfort just to have around. His cheery smile, his innate optimism, and his radiant personality brightened many a day for all of us.

He will be missed for these qualities—but he will also be missed for reasons of perhaps greater importance, foremost among which would be that ART YOUNGER was one of those Americans, of which we have far too few, whose every thought, word, and action was marked by a stalwart sense of integrity. Whatever he believed in, he believed in deeply, and on these matters there was no room for compromise. When he spoke to us we knew his words came from his heart—and his was a good heart, a great heart. His service to his constituents—and to his Nation—can be measured in years and in substantial accomplishments; but the true measurement of his service would, for this basic reason, produce a truly enviable score, and it thus becomes one to which we all should aspire.

The French dramatist, Molière, wrote:

> If everyone were clothed with integrity, if every heart were just, frank, kindly, the other virtues would be well-nigh useless, since their chief purpose is to make us bear with patience the injustice of our fellows.

Mr. Speaker, this body was enriched through the years of J. ARTHUR YOUNGER's service in it because he was one among us who was "clothed with integrity," and whose heart was a "just, frank, and kindly" one. Our loss, therefore, is a very real one, and one we can ill afford.

But, Mr. Speaker, we can be sustained by the continuing memory of our departed colleague—and constantly encouraged by the thought of his shining example.

Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Robison joins me in expressing our deepest sympathy to Mrs. Younger and the other members of his family.

NLRB Rebuffed by Supreme Court

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 26, 1967

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, attention is called to a recent Supreme Court decision which took the National Labor Relations Board to task for the application of antiemployer bias in the disposition of a labor-management dispute.

That court action inspired an editorial which recently appeared in the Wall Street Journal. That paper also recently editorialized concerning another NLRB abuse of power.

The two editorials follow:

LOCKING OUT LOGIC

The National Labor Relations Board, which sometimes seems determined to be almost a law unto itself, has decided to accept the Supreme Court's view of managament lockouts. But it's only a reluctant recognition of legal reality and not a change in the Board's basic anti-employer bias.

In the case at issue, the Detroit News in 1962 had locked out employes. Negotiations with a union were stalled, so the newspaper decided to use economic pressure to try to induce movement toward a settlement. When the union appealed to the NLRB, however, the Board held that the lockout was an undue exercise of economic power—an especially ridiculous idea in this instance, since the union involved was the Teamsters.

In any event, the NLRB finding ran head-on into two Supreme Court decisions, which spelled out a much more logical approach to lockouts. In essence they make it clear that, in labor-management battles, it's less than fair to strip one side of a legitimate weapon.

Though labor unions have tried, with some success, to make "lockout" a dirty word, the fact is that it is largely merely the reverse of a strike. Stringent curbs on the practice may have made some sense when unions were powerless, but that time is long since past.

The chief tactical difference between strikes and lockouts, the Supreme Court explained, is a matter of timing, the importance of which was particularly evident in a 1965 case.

That year, American Shipbuilding Corp., which builds and repairs ships at Great Lakes ports, was conducting wage negotiations with eight different unions. The talks broke down in August, but the unions put off striking; the company's busiest season, you see, is winter, with the Great Lakes frozen and ships laid up for any needed repairs.

Rather than wait around for the union to squeeze the firm when they pleased, the company began laying off workers, hoping to bring the dispute to a head. The tactic worked; agreement was reached before winter came. And the Supreme Court, over the NLRB's objections, held that American Shipbuilding had acted entirely within its rights.

Lockouts, like strikes, are painful for employers as well as employes. The company loses income and its various expenses of plant maintenance continue on unabated. Yet if a firm feels sure it will be shut down by a strike anyway, it's only reasonable that it may want to pick the time.

Even with the new official attitude, lockouts and strikes are not on equal legal footing. Unions can and increasingly do strike for practically any purpose and sometimes for what may appear to be almost no purpose at all—except to harass employers. Companies have no way to recoup losses, which can be staggering, from the unions' irresponsible use of the strike weapon.

Lockouts, on the other hand, remain surrounded by a number of legal restrictions. With some justification, for instance, employers cannot lock out their workers if it is evident that their purpose is to coerce employes into refraining from joining a labor union.

The Labor Board, moreover, manifestly intends to try to continue to bar lockouts in any way it can. In ruling in favor of the Detroit News, the NLRB argued that the Supreme Court's stand "does not insulate all lockouts from illegality solely because no bad motive exists."

Before the NLRB, in other words, one side is still a good deal more equal than the other. Still, it's mildly encouraging that the Board can no longer entirely shut out equity and logic.

MISPLACED CONCERN

Plainly there is something wrong when a citizen who happens to be a member of a labor union can be penalized for asking an election at the plant where he works to find out whether a majority of his fellow employes want the union to continue to represent them. It's even worse when his penalty is upheld by a Federal agency which is supposed to protect him again abuses of union power.

If an employe is forbidden to use the legal avenue making possible the ouster of a union a majority of workers no longer wants, then he may be doomed to belong to the union as long as it exists. That would seem to be the case where the union shop, requiring union membership as a condition of employment, prevails. Of course he can try to find other work. Either way, it is not much of a choice, as a member of an AFL-CIO Steelworkers local employed at a steel plant in California has discovered.

This employe filed a petition, as he legally was entitled to do, with the National Labor Relations Board asking an election to determine whether a majority of workers at the plant wished to continue their union membership. Affronted by this challenge to its position, the union suspended the petitioner's membership and, for good measure, fined him $500, the fine later being withdraw.

In turn the employe appealed to the NLRB, charging that his union was interfering with his right to file a decertification petition. The NLRB dismissed his complaint, on the ground that since such petitions are of serious "union concern," the unions must be able to protect themselves by penalizing employes who file them.

To be sure, any move to decertify a union as the workers' bargaining agency is of "union concern"—especially when to date about two-thirds of all decertification elections have been lost by the challenged unions. But in its eagerness to protect unions against collapse the NLRB shows an almost incredible lack of concern for the welfare of the individual member and for his right to determine whether or not the union in fact represents a majority voice.

By coincidence, Congress now seems close to repealing Section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, a move that would invalidate state right-to-work laws that protect employes against compulsory unionism. The NLRB's sanction of union coercion should, at the very least, persuade the law-makers to take another look at what they are asked to endorse.

Public Records Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1967

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, the Federal public records Law—Public Law 89-487—became effective on July 4, 1967. It remains to be seen how well the new law will work in making more Government information available to the people.

The opportunity for the administration to improve the public's right to know was discussed in editorial comments in the Arlington Day of Arlington Heights, Ill., on July 10, 1967, and in the New York Times of July 17, 1967. I commend these editorial comments to the attention of my colleagues. The editorials follow:

[From the Arlington (Ill.) Day, July 10, 1967]

A STEP FORWARD IN OUR RIGHT TO KNOW

You can't go to the Internal Revenue Service and see your neighbor's income tax return, or storm into the Pentagon and demand a copy of the minutes of the last meeting of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, but thanks to Public Law 89–487, your right to peek behind the bureaucratic curtain in which big government cloaks itself has been greatly enhanced.

In the past, a person asking to see documents in a particular government agency had to prove, to the satisfaction of the agency, that he had a demonstrable need for the information.

Under the new law, which went into effect on July 4, any person may request information from a government agency. Furthermore, the agency must provide a reading room, a list of administrative materials and photocopying equipment for public use.

If a request for information is denied, the burden of justifying the denial rests with the agency. If the private citizen still thinks he should have the information, he can file suit against the agency denying it.

The government's files have not been flung wide open by any means. Material falling within nine categories—such as national defense secrets, foreign policy documents, personnel records—is exempted.

The law has already been criticized as being fuzzy, confusing and open to varying interpretations as to what is exempted and what is not. Some agency officials foresee no effect on their information policies; others predict a rash of lawsuits to test the law in courts.

Congress will keep an eye on the implementation of the law, promises its House sponsor, Rep. John Moss, D–Calif.

"The objective of the new law is clear," says Moss. "How well it works will depend on how effectively the people exercise their guarantee of access to the facts of government."

[From the New York Times, July 17, 1967]

SPIRIT OF INFORMATION

The significance of the Freedom of Information Law which symbolically took effect July 4 cannot be measured in statutory words alone. Government bureaucrats can take comfort in both the rules and the exceptions. What is more important is that such a law is on the books at all. How it will work will depend primarily on the tone and style set by the Administration and Congress.

The new law's most important provision establishes the right of judicial review of administrative decisions to withhold records, with the burden on the Government to justify any censorship. The new law is expected to make it easier to ascertain contents of Government contracts, the procedures of Federal agencies, and how members of regulatory bodies vote.

But this does not mean that the Government's confidential or commercial records will be thrown open to the public. Restrictions on security matters—if not managed to deceive press and public—have long been accepted. So, too, personal facts about both Government employes and private citizens whose names are in Government files should be safeguarded. Difficulties may arise in the in-between area where powerful agencies are asked to disclose records on their regulations and decisions. Here is where the public's right to know can become a reality if not blocked by bureaucratic subterfuge.

Mr. and Mrs. Alvin Horwitz: Outstanding Philanthropists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GRAHAM PURCELL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1967

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, it is my distinct privilege to take this opportunity to pay tribute and call attention to the outstanding humanitarianism of Mr. and Mrs. Alvin Horwitz, longtime residents of Wichita Falls, Tex.

As evidenced by the many notable deeds performed by this couple in the service of their fellow man, Mr. and Mrs. Horwitz have shown themselves to be outstanding examples of the type of devoted citizens who have helped build our great country.

Reviewing Al Horwitz' life, one comes to the obvious conclusion that Al Horwitz is an active supporter of any humanitarian cause. Born in Cleveland, Ohio, Al and his family moved to Kaylor, Pa., when he was very young. Having lived in Kaylor until he was graduated from high school, he and his family returned to Cleveland. Following his graduation from Spencerian Business College, he became a manager of a grocery company. It was in this position that he first became acquainted with the Salvation Army, supplying churches with the names of needy people, and then sending out food baskets from the churches to the poor and needy.

In 1919 Mr. and Mrs. Horwitz moved to Wichita Falls, where he has been a successful businessman and a most active participant in all types of philanthropic activities. Indeed, Mr. Horwitz has been active on not only the local level, but also on the State and National levels.

In Wichita Falls, Al continuted his interest in the Salvation Army, serving on the board and periodically as chairman of the board. One of his most significant activities with the Salvation Army has been his promotion and direction of the Salvation Army Christmas basket program over many years.

Although Mr. Horwitz devotes much time to the Salvation Army, he has been and is still active in many other organizations. He is one of the originators of the USO in Wichita Falls, and has actively served it for many years in various capacities. At one time he was the only civilian on the USO council serving three agencies—the YMCA, the Jewish Welfare Board, and the Salvation Army—simultaneously.

Other local activities include membership in the Chamber of Commerce, participation in United Fund drives, participation in the Antidefamation League, including a term as State chairman of that organization, membership in B'nai B'rith, membership in the American Legion, and support for the arts in Wichita Falls such as the symphony and the civic theater.

An example of his concern for his fellow man is a program he originated several years ago arranging for free medical attention for impoverished citizens, as well as his participation in the Wichita Family Council, a group devoting time to counsel couples with marital problems.

In addition to his many local activities, Al Horwitz finds time to serve on the State level with the same devotion. For the past several years he has worked untiringly for the State hospital program in Texas through the volunteer council of the State hospital program in Wichita Falls. His influence has also been used to obtain a former U.S. Government hospital for use as a TB hospital in Tyler, Tex. Mr. Horwitz added greatly to the physical comfort of the State hospital at Wichita Falls by obtaining a $25,000 appropriation from the State for chairs and settees.

On the national level Al Horwitz has been sending patients for years to the National Jewish Hospital in Denver, the City of Hope in Duarte, Calif., and the Leo Levi Memorial Hospital in Hot Springs, Ark., where they receive free treatment and care they would not otherwise have obtained. It is said of Mr. Horwitz' concern for his fellow man in a recently prepared biography:

> The fortunate ones who come to Mr. Horwitz' attention receive more than care for tuberculosis, asthma, heart, cancer, or arthritis. They receive his friendship and sympathy, both of which start Al Horwitz on a quick, quiet campaign to see that his charges are provided with the essentials they might need, including spending money and a few non-essentials just to make their lives brighter.

As I have called attention to the devoted community service of Al Horwitz, Mr. Speaker, so also would I like to direct attention to the contributions of his wife, Sarah.

Having married Al in 1918, Sarah moved with him to Wichita Falls in 1919, where she became active in all aspects of community service. She participated in the Council of Jewish Women, an organization dedicated to furthering human welfare in the community. During her membership in this organization Mrs. Horwitz has served in numerous offices including the presidency. Another area of community service in which Sarah has been active is the support of the day nursery program in Wichita Falls. A life member of the board of the Wichita Falls Day Nursery, she has been a member of the Mexican Day Nursery since its inception.

Other activities of Mrs. Horwitz include participation at the organizational meeting of the Wichita Falls chapter of the League of Women Voters, and continued participation in that organization through the years. That Mrs. Horwitz is very interested in hospital work is evidenced by her membership in the Wichita Falls General Hospital Auxiliary and the Bethania Hospital Auxiliary. Other civic activities include membership in the Woman's Forum in which she has held various offices, membership in the Federated Missionary Society, a position on the board of directors of the YWCA, and membership in the American Legion Auxiliary. She, with her husband, actively support the Wichita Falls Symphony League. A board member of the Red Cross for years, she presently serves on the board of the Dallas chapter of the women's committee of the National Jewish Hospital. An active participant in the National Council of Christians and Jews, Mrs. Horwitz has been on its board since its inception in Wichita Falls in 1940. Along with her husband, she has been active in many United Fund drives. One of her most recent projects was serving as chairman of the 1966 Mother's March for the March of Dimes in Wichita Falls.

Mr. and Mrs. Horwitz belong to Temple Israel. He has served as president of its congregation and has been a member of the Temple's Board of Trustees. Mrs. Horwitz has served as secretary of the congregation and was president of the Temple Israel Sisterhood.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be able to say that these distinguished, unselfish, and faithful civil servants are residents of my district. I only wish that there were more untiring humanitarians such as the Horwitzes in our Nation. Mr. and Mrs. Horwitz, through their 48 years of community service in Wichita Falls, in the State, and in the Nation, have indeed accomplished what all of us should strive to do—make this Nation a better place in which to live—and should serve as shining examples of individuals who can always find time and energy to serve their fellow man.

The Late Honorable J. Arthur Younger

SPEECH

OF

HON. W. R. HULL, JR.

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 13, 1967

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, the death of Representative J. ARTHUR YOUNGER, of California, is a great loss to his friends, to California, and to the Nation. But his achievements will endure in the years ahead as a monument to his patriotism, his devotion to duty, and to his integrity.

His passing is a great loss to this body, and especially is it felt by the people of the 11th District of California whom he represented so long and so well in the House of Representatives.

Those who knew and worked with him respected him for his wisdom and dedication to America's most noble principles. The Nation and State which ART YOUNGER served have lost a sincere and dedicated public servant, and his presence and his service will be sorely missed.

What Better Ally?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1967

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, history shows that whenever the Soviets are strongly resisted, they withdraw. I believe we can attain the same result if we apply this policy to the Middle East.

I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following item which appeared in the July 1967 issue of the Monthly Investment Letter of Hayden, Stone, Inc.

The article follows:

The 24th Psalm:

"The earth is the Lord's and the fullness thereof,
The world and they that dwell therein.
For he hath founded it upon the seas
And established it upon the floods.
Who shall ascend into the hill of the Lord
Or who shall stand in his holy place?
He that hath clean hands and a pure heart,
Who hath not lifted up his soul unto vanity
Nor sworn deceitfully."

WHAT BETTER ALLY?

When a man believes his own lies, he is considered to be neurotic, and when he tries to force these lies on the world around him, he is put away. In our opinion, the Soviet leaders are wholly sincere in their presentation of what they conceive to be the truth; they are not lying, in the ordinary sense—they are simply reasoning from distorted premises to the false conclusions that result from 50 years of an anti-world neurosis. One must not be too harsh in condemning the present Russian propaganda; it is of a piece with their 50 years of untruth. The important thing is to resist, not their name-calling, but their acts, and the record shows that whenever they are resisted, they withdraw. The post-war Soviet take-overs in Eastern Europe were not resisted, and the Communist dictatorships are still there, creating poverty and misery on an unprecedented scale for 100 million people; the subsequent Communist attempts were resisted—in Iran, in Greece, in Malaya, in West Berlin, in Austria, in Korea, in Quemoy and Matsu, in Cuba, in Africa, and in Indonesia—and in every case, the Communists eventually withdrew. The Soviet high command, like the U.S., is realistic enough not to want a major confrontation or a major war; they want only political revolution throughout the world and Communist control subsidized by and directed from Moscow. In the present Middle East crisis, the Russians will again withdraw if only we act with the firmness that they respect. We know no reasonable formula that the Russians and the Arabs will accept—but we think that a *strong* U.S. commitment to Israel, in our own interest, will solve the problem for years to come. With the Russians one has to be definite; they don't understand nuisances.

Address Delivered at Commissioning of U.S.S. "Samuel Gompers"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1967

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, Samuel Gompers is one of the great men in American history, and a fitting tribute was paid to him and what he stood for when the U.S.S. *Samuel Gompers* was commissioned on July 1, 1967, at the Puget Sound Naval Yard, Bremerton, Wash. AFL–CIO Secretary-Treasurer William F. Schnitzler voiced the tribute on that occasion.

Mr. Speaker, I insert the address of Mr. Schnitzler in the RECORD as follows:

Three years ago this month the President of the AFL–CIO and the Secretary of Labor certified that the keel of the USS *Samuel Gompers* had been well and truly laid at the Puget Sound Naval Yard.

A year ago many of us participated in the launching of this vessel that bears the name of the founding president of the AFL.

Today, this vessel formally joins the active fleet of the United States Navy—and it is a proud day for all of us.

The great pride with which the AFL–CIO salutes this vessel and the United States Navy is not only because it bears the name, of the first leader of organized labor in America. It is because, in a real sense, that this vessel and this Navy typify the principle for which Gompers stood.

At the time of the keel-laying, George Meany recalled that Gompers was a man of peace, who realized that peace among men and security among nations could only be assured by the strength of the United States. Those words, in the light of events of the last three years, and of the last three months, have even greater significance today.

As we gather to honor this man and celebrate this moment, it would mock the memory of Samuel Gompers if we were to look upon this vessel as an implement of brute power rather than as an instrument for peace.

It would be an injustice to the causes he cherished, if the name of Samuel Gompers were to be displayed to the world solely as an expression of our awesome military capability.

Instead, the USS *Samuel Gompers*, as we know, represents the armor of security that we must give to ourselves and the free world until man is able to conquer and eradicate the scourge of war.

Gompers was a man of peace, who realized that war is a plague more cruel and more destructive than any economic or natural disaster. And so he fought to combat the causes of war with the same fervor he gave to combatting the causes of man's social ills: starvation, joblessness, slums, ignorance, disease.

It was as the leader of American labor that Gompers sought to secure the peace at the end of World War I. And out of that effort came one of his greatest monuments, the International Labor Organization, which he helped found and which continues today as a specialized agency of the United Nations. This organization, which seeks to achieve standards of fairness, decency and justice among all the working people of the world, can be an effective instrument toward eliminating much of the suffering and want in each of the nations of the world. Gompers saw this half a century ago.

At home, Gompers gave equally of himself in behalf of the belief that our nation, could become a great humanitarian power. He believed that if the working people prospered they could free themselves from the slums, they could lead worthwhile lives; their children could receive schooling, they could survive the diseases of childhood and they could conquer the afflictions of their fathers. It was in this era that child labor laws, workmen's compensation, industrial safety laws and, most important, the gospel of united action, flowered and grew.

In this respect, Gompers succeeded far beyond the goals he dreamed of as an immigrant youth wrapping tobacco into cigars in an unheated New York loft and studying at night in a wretched slum.

Today we are all part of the fulfillment of Gompers' dreams. We are a nation of great affluence. But—speaking for the labor movement—we are also the heirs of Samuel Gompers, and the job is not yet finished.

To say that—to note that many of Gompers' dreams are still not achieved is, in a real sense, to pay the highest tribute to him. He was at once a practical man and a dreamer. He dreamed of a better world and he worked to achieve it—a step at a time. But he never lost sight of his goals.

Nor has America—nor has the American labor movement.

Abroad, we seek strong, democratic nations. And to this end American labor devotes considerable of its resources and the know-how of its people to translating this search into tangible results.

At home, we seek to carry forward—a step at a time—the quest for a more rewarding life in a peaceful world.

In the three years since the keel-laying of the USS *Gompers* and in the months that the labors of thousands of men were shaping this vessel into being, our nation has taken several steps forward.

In these months we have seen the Civil Rights Act and the Voting Rights Act become law; we have seen Medicare become law; we have seen the enactment of elementary and secondary education aid as well as higher education legislation; we have seen implementation of the one man-one vote principle; we have seen expanded programs to deal with air and water pollution. These are only a few of the achievements. There are many others, each of which would have had the fullest encouragement of Samuel Gompers.

So, as each great scourge gives way grudgingly to forces that Gompers helped rally and set into motion, let us pledge that the USS *Samuel Gompers* will always symbolize our nation's constant pursuit of humanitarianism and peace.

This ship bears a proud name and she flies a proud flag. She will sail on the seas of the world as a symbol to all men of freedom and hope—for all men at all times.

It is our hope that she will know only calm seas and fair winds. But we know that if the waves grow rough and the winds grow cold, the USS *Samuel Gompers* will be worthy of the fine tradition of the men who built her and of the name she bears.

Wiretapping and Eavesdropping

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD H. POFF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1967

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I quote herewith an editorial from the July 11 issue of the Roanoke World News, published in Roanoke, Va., which ventilates and illuminates the smog which too often surrounds the question of electronic surveillance conducted by law-enforcement officers under proper court orders:

THIS MATTER OF EAVESDROPPING

Another boon to criminals, especially those engaged in organized lawbreaking, comes from *Attorney General Ramsey Clark's* new edict banning all wiretapping and almost all eavesdropping by federal agents. Only cases involving national security are exempt from the regulations.

Now, wholly unregulated wiretapping and unwarranted snooping on citizens by governmental agencies are not to be condoned. In 1965 President Johnson issued limitations on eavesdropping which seemed to be sound and acceptable. Attorney General Clark's rules go beyond the President's curbs.

All agencies of the federal government are affected by the regulations but affected more than any others are law enforcement agencies, which the Supreme Court seems to delight in hamstringing.

Federal agents have grown to depend increasingly on eavesdropping electronic devices in recent years because courts have held other forms of eavesdropping to be unconstitutional.

Under some interpretations of the recent Berger bugging decision by the Supreme Court, the court moved toward banning all eavesdropping by law-enforcement agencies.

It is highly interesting to note that the majority decision in this controversial case was written by *Justice Tom Clark,* father of the Attorney General. Justice Clark appeared to be saying two different things in his opinion. One was that the New York State law under which Ralph Berger was convicted of a bribery conspiracy was unconstitutional because it was "too broad in its sweep" and other was to set up requirements for a valid law that would be impossible to meet.

Justice Black, whose dedication to Constitutionalism is unquestioned, in his dissenting opinion ripped Justice Clark's opinion to prices. Certainly eavesdroppers are obnoxious, Justice Black admitted, but, he contended, "they are assuredly not engaged in a more 'ignoble' or 'dirty business' than are bribers, thieves, burglars, robbers, rapists, kidnapers and murderers . . ."

He made the additional points that "to deal with such specimens of our society, eavesdroppers are not merely useful, they are frequently a necessity" and that "crimes, unspeakably horrid crimes, are with us in this country, and we cannot afford to dispense with any known method of detecting and correcting them unless it is forbidden by the Constitution or deemed inadvisable by legislative policy—neither of which I believe to be true of eavesdropping."

Neither do we. But the fight against crime is being crippled by the Berger decision written by Justice Tom Clark and the new regulations imposed by his son, Attorney General Ramsey Clark.

Teenager of Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. G. ELLIOTT HAGAN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1967

Mr. HAGAN. Mr. Speaker, in view of the extraordinary amount of unfavorable publicity given the teenager of today, I would like to submit for the RECORD a letter from Mr. Bill Cunningham of Savannah, Ga.

The inspiring community program described in his letter, in my opinion, should dispel some of the fears in American minds that our young people have evolved into a pattern of revolt toward authority and a lackadaisical attitude toward community service.

The letter follows:

SOUTHERN BELL TELEPHONE AND
TELEGRAPH CO.,
Savannah, Ga., July 13, 1967.

Hon. ELLIOTT HAGAN,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: At this writing, Savannah is blessed with a very marked difference between the teen-agers here and in other areas where unfavorable publicity has too often classified our young people as rowdy, destructive and lawless.

During the past three months, thirteen groups of teen citizens, in as many areas in Savannah, have organized to clean up their neighborhoods. Under the guidance of Mrs. Betty Washington of the Chatham County Health Department and Chairman of the Youth Committee of the "Keep Beautiful Savannah Clean" Committee they have picked up 200,000 pounds of litter. Nearly every Saturday, weather permitting, they have cleaned up streets, lanes and vacant lots.

Adults have organized councils and these women plan where to clean up, then organize the teens into groups and supervise the work.

The City Manager awarded citations to groups and individuals at a recent dance sponsored by the Chamber of Commerce in appreciation of the good work. The newspapers, radio and TV stations have had special programs and news items for the public to view and hear.

Burl Womack is attempting to have a program on "Monitor" in the near future.

This is such an outstanding gesture that our teens are showing here, that I would like to recommend for your consideration the possibility of calling this to Mrs. Johnson's attention. It ties in directly with her "Make American Beautiful" program.

The fever is catching on in Savannah and more service stations, places of business, schools and individuals are working to beautify their areas.

The City and County have put on additional help and are doing more than ever before to clean up and trim up streets, roads and lanes.

The Garden Club Councils are taking up the challenge and big things are expected from them.

I have many pictures of the teens at work. Am enclosing one typical picture. Incidentally while most of the groups are Negro, we only refer to them as teen-age citizens.

If you feel that this program is worthy of promoting nationally and we can give more information or pictures, please call on us.

Doug Guthrie or Picot Floyd will bear me out on above statements.

Very truly yours,
BILL CUNNINGHAM,
Public Relations.

Proposal for a Redwood National Park

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1967

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, a column of keen interest to those people who appreciate and support the preservation of our natural resources, written by Mr. Wes Lawrence of the Cleveland Plain Dealer on June 22, 1967, is worthy of serious consideration.

The last paragraph of his column raises a very important question and I agree with Mr. Lawrence. I hope the Members of Congress agree also.

Under leave granted, I insert this column in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues:

WHAT RIGHT TO CUT REDWOODS?

(By Wes Lawrence)

Some weeks ago I urged support of one or another of the proposals for a Redwoods National Park to save a decent portion of the remaining giants that grow nowhere else in the world. Subsequently Henry A. Merlo, president of the California Redwood Association, addressed a letter to The Plain Dealer asserting that my column "may have given your readers an erroneous impression."

"Mr. Lawrence stated that only 250,000 acres of the coast redwood forest remain," wrote Mr. Merlo.

"There are not only as many redwoods as ever, but there may be more trees today than when man first began utilizing them, according to the authoritative Society of American Foresters. The range of the coast redwood remains the same 2 million or 1.4 million acres (depending on definition employed) that were here originally. The amount of old-growth redwoods is about 750,000 acres, says the National Park Service. The amount of virgin or primeval forest is 300,000 acres, according to NPS. Private tree farms in the redwood region total more than 815,000 acres.

"The amount of redwood land now withdrawn from harvesting in state parks, Muir Woods National Monument and dozens of other government preserves total more than 140,000 acres. Altogether, various government agencies own a quarter-million acres of coast redwood.

"We who live, work and play in the redwoods fully appreciate The Plain Dealer writer's concern for the future of our forests. These are noble trees, having provided for man's economic and esthetic needs for more than a century and a half. But the concern is unnecessary. The redwoods are in good hands. The best of the trees have been preserved in the 220 square miles of government parks and reservations . . ."

Now I feel certain that Mr. Merlo is well aware that when conservationists talk of saving the redwoods they are not talking about those hundreds of thousands of acres of second and third growth redwood trees that Mr. Merlo includes in the redwood forest. Conservationists are talking about the virgin, primeval forest of trees up to 2,000 years of age and up to 367 feet in height which remain in private hands and which the private owners intend to cut, and are cutting, for lumber.

Whether these great trees cover 250,000 or 300,000 acres is not the point in dispute. Only one-sixth of this virgin redwood acreage is protected in state parks, and a minor portion is in federal hands. Some of the best and highest of the virgin redwoods are in private hands and subject to destruction if they are not taken into a national park.

It is true that the harvesting of these primeval giants will make jobs for people in the area. But at the present rate of harvesting, these trees will provide jobs and tax income for only 20 to 30 more years. If they are saved in a national park they will produce permanent income from tourism and recreation. And the lumber industry and those dependent on it will, of course, continue to thrive on the vast acres of young redwoods under modern forest management.

The important question to be decided is whether any generation, for whatever temporarily worthy purpose, has a moral right to destroy what it has taken nature two milleniums to produce. In my opinion, we have no moral right to deprive posterity of a single ancient redwood now standing.

Secretary Freeman Says American Farmers Provide Breadbasket of the World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1967

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, we hear frequent references to the military might and the firepower of the United States of America.

The fact is, however, that the United States is also the world's principal food power. The Honorable Orville Freeman, Secretary of Agriculture, said in a recent article that North America has clearly emerged as the breadbasket of the world.

Because of the interest of my colleagues in this matter and because of the interest of the American people, I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from this article in the U.S. News & World Report and Foreign Affairs be reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The article follows:

FOOD—AMERICA'S "SECRET" WEAPON: A FORCE MORE POTENT THAN ARMS

(By Orville L. Freeman, Secretary of Agriculture)

North America's dramatic emergence over the past generation as the world's principal supplier of food can be illustrated with a half dozen numbers.

During the late 1930s, three of the world's seven major geographic regions supplied virtually all of the grain moving into the world market.

Latin America, with exports of 9 million metric tons yearly, was the leading food exporter, and grain exports were an important source of foreign-exchange earnings.

North America and Eastern Europe—including the Soviet Union—were each exporting 5 million tons yearly.

Most of the grain exported from these three regions, principally wheat and corn, went to Western Europe.

Thirty years later, the pattern of world grain trade has been altered beyond recognition.

As of 1966, Latin America, with net grain exports of 2 million tons, was scarcely self-sufficient. Exports from Argentina were largely offset by imports into Brazil and other smaller importing countries.

Eastern Europe, including the Soviet Union no longer exported grain, but, on the contrary, was an importer; in 1966, the area imported some 14 million tons, largely from Canada.

Of all the changes in the pattern of world grain trade between the late 1930s and 1966, the change in the position of North America was most pronounced.

As shown by the accompanying table, net grain exports increased from 5 million tons to 60 million tons, providing in 1966 some 85 per cent of the combined grain exports of the net exporting regions. Australia has substantially increased its exports, but its share of the total has remained at about 12 per cent.

North America has clearly emerged as the breadbasket of the world.

About three fourths of North America's grain exports originate in the United States; the remaining one fourth, coming from Canada, consists largely of wheat. U.S. grain exports are presently rather evenly divided between wheat and feed grains. Significantly, the United States alone could export easily the entire 60 million tons yearly if it were to remove all remaining production constraints.

World grain trade by major geographic regions

[In million metric tons]

	Estimated		
	1934–38	1960	1966
North America	+5	+39	+60
Latin America	+9	0	+2
Western Europe	−24	−25	−23
Eastern Europe (including U.S.S.R.)	+5	0	−14
Africa	+1	−2	−3
Asia	+2	−16	−30
Oceania (Australia and New Zealand)	+3	+6	+8

Note.—Plus net exports; minus net imports. Minor imbalances between world imports and exports in a given year may be due to rounding or variations in reporting methods used by various countries.

Several factors have contributed to North America's growing importance as a source of food for the rest of the world. Three of these stand out.

On the demand side, both the forces identified by Malthus and the adverse influence of Marxian thought on agriculture in the Communist countries have contributed to the steadily growing excess of food consumption over production outside North America.

On the supply side, the massive application of science to agriculture in the United States has resulted in an impressive increase in its capacity for producing food, making it possible to respond to growing needs abroad.

Malthus first described the threat of uncontrolled population growth in 1797, nearly 170 years ago. His theory that population would tend to grow geometrically while food production would increase arithmetically has proved valid throughout much of the world. Half a century after his gloomy prognosis, Ireland's population was sharply reduced by a famine.

To the agriculturist, this Malthusian arithmetic is frightening. A less developed country today is, almost by definition, one with a rapid rate of population growth. There are not many exceptions. The impact of modern health measures has reduced death rates, but comparable reductions in birth rates have not been achieved.

Even a population growth rate of 3 per cent could be tolerable if there were vast areas of fertile, well-watered land to be brought under the plow. But, unfortunately, most of the frontiers have long since disappeared, and the supply of new land which can be brought into production quickly and cheaply is fast diminishing.

The world food problem is, however, more than a race between food and people. In reality, it is a race between the production of food and the demand for food. There are two reasons for the sharp increase in the world demand for food: Population growth is one; the other is rising per capita incomes.

In some countries, rising incomes are generating more growth in the demand for food than is population increase. This is certainly the case in Japan, where incomes have risen 7 per cent annually over the past decade, but where population has grown less than 1 per cent annually. The same is also true for many countries in Europe, particularly West Germany, France, Sweden and Italy. To construe the problem merely as a race between food and people fails to grasp the whole issue.

In no country prior to World War II had population-growth rates or per capita incomes risen rapidly over an extended period.

High, sustained rates of growth in both population and income per person are largely a postwar phenomena, and, to make things more difficult, they have occurred simultaneously. The result, in recent years, has been a rate of increase in demand which the world's farmers have not matched.

COMMUNISTS EXPLOIT AGRICULTURE

Actually, Marx himself had little to say about agriculture. He was a city boy, primarily interested in diagnosing the social ills of early industrial societies. It was largely his followers who assumed that agriculture, like industry, could be readily organized on a large scale under state control. And it was they who went on to exploit agriculture in order to provide the basis for industrialization. Agriculture was given neither sufficient inputs nor incentives.

The Communist countries are beginning to pay dearly for this policy. Food shortages have become a drain on their foreign exchange and a drag on their economic growth. The decision to organize agriculture on a large-scale, authoritarian basis has cost the Communist countries literally billions of dollars in inefficiently used resources and lost economic growth.

Khrushchev's rise to power was closely followed by several efforts to cure Russia's farm ills. The machine-tractor stations were abolished; large areas were planted to corn in an effort to emulate successes in the American Midwest; and vast areas of virgin land were plowed and planted to wheat in areas of marginal rainfall. Output did increase from 1954 to 1957, and, in 1958, Khrushchev promised the Soviet people that they would soon surpass the American in per capita production of meat, milk and eggs. At the same time, however, investment in agriculture was reduced.

In the following years, output stagnated at 1958 levels. Yet, in 1963, when I visited the Kremlin, Khrushchev was still bragging loudly. That year drought struck, accentuating an already weak position, and, in 1964, the Soviet Union imported more wheat than any country in history. Khrushchev was out of office before drought occurred again in 1965.

The dramatic reversals in Chinese agriculture, following the Great Leap of 1958 and during the early 1960s were equally abrupt.

Mainland China, is perhaps ominously, suffering from both the influence of Marx and the forces identified by Malthus.

Offsetting the effects of the forces described by Malthus and the adverse influence of Marxian thought on food production has been the impressive development of North America's capacity for producing food. Several factors have contributed to this.

To begin with, the United States has an excellent piece of agricultural real estate. Its Midwest, or corn belt, is one of the largest areas of fertile, well-watered farmland in the world. The only other areas even remotely approaching it in both size and inherent fertility are Northwestern Europe, the pampas of Argentina and the Gangetic plain of India.

Not only did we start with good farmland, but we have done an excellent job of developing it. Through scientific soil and water management we have made inherently fertile soils even more fertile.

Perhaps the most important single factor contributing to our unparalleled productivity has been the family farm. As a production unit, it is the most efficient yet devised. Other forms of production organization are in use or have been experimented with, but most have not worked well. This is particularly true for most of the systems embodying very large production units such as collectives, communes or haciendas. The family farm, where the social unit and the production unit are identical, provides a stronger link between effort and reward than any other system. As a result, they are continuing to grow in both size and efficiency.

Although many of these production units run up to several hundred acres in size and have assets frequently exceeding $100,000, they are not corporate farms. They are still family units, owned and operated by the family, using mostly family labor. The number of large corporate farms is exceedingly small, and actually declining.

Inevitably, the agricultural successes of the North American breadbasket and stagnation in Communist agriculture have affected the balance of power between East and West. Indeed, North American food and our capacity for producing it have been instrumental in tilting the scales in favor of the West.

About the same time as Khrushchev's 1958 promise of a better diet and, implicitly, a better performance in agriculture, the Soviet leaders were also challenging the United States to a general economic competition. This was to replace the more overt military and political competition characterizing the earlier stages of the cold war.

In some areas of economic competition, the Soviets are performing exceedingly well. The overwhelming advantage we once enjoyed in the production of steel has been narrowed; the generation of hydroelectric power has increased rapidly in the Soviet Union, narrowing the gap between the two economies; in the space race, we do not know whether the language first spoken on the moon will be English or Russian. But in agriculture there is no contest. The United States, with scarcely 6 per cent of its people still on the farm, is feeding 200 million Americans, 60 million Indians and the equivalent of at least another 100 million people in other parts of the world.

The Soviets, by contrast, with close to half of their labor force still tied to agriculture, are importing grain to provide bread for their people. If we were as far ahead of the Russians in the space race as we are in agriculture, we would by now be running a shuttle service to the moon.

The impressive food-producing capability of North America and our growing lead over the countries of the East are beginning to have an impact on the countries of the third world.

WANTED: "FOOD, NOT SLOGANS"

During the early postcolonial years, many of the newly independent peoples could be satisfied with slogans and flag waving. Now they are hungry; they want food, not slogans.

Rising rice prices in Jakarta helped to undermine Sukarno. Empty shelves in the food shops of Accra contributed to the overthrow of Nkrumah. More and more, the less developed countries are turning for assistance to those with food and food-producing know-how.

The growing food deficits common to nearly all the Communist economies are causing them to become politically and militarily vulnerable.

During the early 1950s, the Communist Chinese did not hesitate to intervene massively in the Korean conflict, but today, though they have threatened to intervene in Vietnam, in fact they have not done so. Nor do I think they will. During the early 1950s, China was self-sufficient in food production. During the 1960s, however, it has imported 5 to 6 million tons of grain annually. In addition, its dependence on imported fertilizer has increased to the point where it is now the world's leading importer.

The embarrassing food shortages plaguing almost every Communist economy are causing governments to invest more resources in agriculture, with the result that production is likely to increase. The Soviet Union enjoyed a bumper crop in 1966. This is not to say, however, that it or any of the other Communist countries will become a leading grain exporter. The pressure for internal improvement in diets, as the standard of living improves, is too great. Some very substantial gains in grain production will be required before the Soviet Union can satisfy the growing desire of its people for more meat, milk and eggs.

As agriculture failed in one Communist country after another, and they turned to the West for food imports, the Communist strategists in Moscow must have faced a dilemma as they plotted their take-over of the world. What if they were successful? Who would be left to feed them?

As the East-West ideological conflict begins to fade, it is clear that a new North-South polarization is beginning to take shape between the have and have-not countries. This new polarization—which is essentially economic rather than political—threatens to be a pervasive and divisive force. . . .

POVERTY—HUNGER—RIOTS

Those countries which are more advanced and which have stronger purchasing power have been increasing their per capita consumption. In several countries where purchasing power is weak, either because of a lack of income or lack of foreign exchange, per capita consumption has declined. Two drought years are only a partial explanation of why per capita food supplies in India in 1966–67 were 5 per cent below those of the early 1960s.

Since World War II, and more particularly since passage of Public Law 480, the 1954 enabling legislation for our food-aid program, the United States has been attempting to alleviate world hunger by shipping food abroad. By the end of 1966, about 176 million metric tons of food worth 15.7 billion dollars had been shipped abroad under concessional terms. Despite this massive program, we are still as far from solving the problem as when we began—perhaps further than ever.

Without an adequate supply of food in the developing countries, the prospects for economic and political stability are not good.

HOW TO HELP FARMING ABROAD

If we are ever to solve the world food problem, we must now begin concentrating in earnest on increasing food production in the less developed nations. We have a pretty good idea of what is needed. In varying proportion according to particular situations, the hungry countries need: increased quantities of fertilizer and other farm chemicals, improved varieties of seeds, increased availability of water, added credit, productive price policies, improved marketing facilities, and expanded research and education. What makes progress so difficult is that most of these must be brought together at the same time and place.

It is well recognized that these inputs are in short supply in most of the less developed nations. But one key item that is perhaps less well recognized is the lack of trained agriculturalists.

Skilled and educated manpower is essential in every phase of a program designed to improve the production and marketing of agricultural products. Yet in virtually none of the less developed nations is the supply of trained manpower in agriculture anywhere near adequate.

In many cases, there is only a handful of educated researchers, planners and extension workers. Colleges of agriculture are few and their output small.

Until the less developed nations can build up cadres of trained personnel of their own, the logical approach is to make use of agriculturalists from the advanced nations. The United States has, for many years, been loaning know-how through AID [Agency for International Development] and its predecessor agencies, and through programs operated by State universities and private consulting organizations. More recently these programs have been broadened to include the Depart-

ment of Agriculture, through the establishment of an International Agricultural Development Service which is financed by, and works closely with, AID.

As a nation, we must cease asking how much is will cost to solve the food/population problem and begin asking how much it will cost if we fail to solve the problem in the allotted time. Time is the critical dimension.

Today's hungry countries must compress the progress of centuries into decades, and decades into years, if they are to feed their rapidly multiplying peoples.

Our aid is essential. As a nation, we must now exercise the same imagination and resourcefulness which brought us to our current position of world agricultural leadership. We must devise more effective ways of linking our skills in producing food with the needs of the less fortunate multitudes abroad. The challenge has never been greater, or the stakes higher.

(NOTE.—The foregoing excerpts are reprinted by permission of the Council on Foreign Relations, Inc., from the July, 1967, issue of "Foreign Affairs" quarterly.)

The St. Louis Globe-Democrat Looks at the Panama Canal Situation and Does Not Like What It Sees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 17, 1967

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that hearings are to be held shortly by the Committee on Foreign Affairs on the proposed Panama Canal Treaty, I thought it might be useful for the Members to know what the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, one of two widely read newspapers of St. Louis, is saying about the matter. The position this great metropolitan newspaper has taken is the same as that contained in letters I have received from practically every section of the country.

Two news stories and two editorials of the St. Louis Globe-Democrat in recent days are as follows:

[From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, June 27, 1967]

REPRESENTATIVE SULLIVAN ASSAILS PANAMA CANAL PACT, CALLS IT GIVEAWAY

(By Edward W. O'Brien)

WASHINGTON.—Rep. Leonor K. Sullivan (Dem.), St. Louis, assailed the new Panama Canal treaty Monday as a "giveaway," and urged the Senate to refuse ratification.

She warned in a House speech that the new agreement "only opens the way to surrendering the canal to the Republic of Panama."

Mrs. Sullivan implied that treaty provisions are rigged to deceive the American people into thinking that this government would receive a "fair payment" if the Republic of Panama decides in the future to expropriate the canal.

In truth, she said, Panama would pay for the canal "out of higher tolls collected in most instances on shipping to and from the United States."

"We would be paying ourselves out of our own pockets for the privilege of having the Panama canal taken away from us—and how we would pay!" she said.

Mrs. Sullivan reacted angrily as chairman of the Panama Canal subcommittee on the House Merchant Marine committee.

She has often visited the canal, which has been under the clear and exclusive control of the United States.

In recent months, she has made a series of critical speeches in which she tried to head off the treaty which finally was announced Monday by President Johnson.

She has said many times that the Republic of Panama is not mature or competent enough to operate the canal and that the probable consequence of surrender of United States sovereignty will be seizure of the canal by Panama and deterioration of the facility.

She was informed early Monday that the new treaty would be disclosed later in the day. She made her speech on the House floor soon after the White House announcement.

She said she doubted that the United States negotiators were awake to "the full danger of expropriation."

"I intend to make sure that the Senate does realize it before it acts on this treaty," she said.

The House has no power over the treaty. The Senate, however, must ratify it by a two-thirds vote before the treaty becomes effective.

Mrs. Sullivan said thhe Administration should have learned from the history of the Suez Canal since Egypt seized the waterway in the mid-1950s.

The Suez has been closed twice in the last 10 years, she said, as it is "subject to the whims of the Egyptian government."

The current closing is costing the United States a great deal of money in higher shipping costs on foreign-aid grain, and is curtailing the flow of Middle East oil to Europe, she said.

The consequences to the United States of a single nation's sovereignty over the Panama Canal "would be vastly greater," she said.

"Right now the Panama Canal is the property of the United States—of the government—and not subject to seizure by Panama," she said.

"But under this treaty the canal becomes the property of a non-American-government authority and on the soil of Panama rather than under the American flag."

[From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, June 28, 1967]

NO PANAMA SURRENDER

It is reported the United States and the Republic of Panama have reached an agreement by which the United States would turn over control of the canal to Panama in exchange for the right to build a new canal through that country at some future date.

This would be an extremely bad bargain and the United States Senate should refuse to ratify this surrender to Panama.

Representative Leonor K. Sullivan of St. Louis has called the treaty a "giveaway" that would permit Panama to seize the canal and even close it should it elect to do so. She is right.

The Johnson Administration apparently has learned nothing from the history of the Suez Canal since it was taken over by Egypt. Under the unstable Gamal Abdel Nasser it has been closed twice in the last 10 years.

There is only one way the United States can assure the continued security of the Panama Canal and that is to continue our ownership and operation. This was the basis of the 1903 treaty and there is no reason to abrogate the agreement simply because Panama wants the canal.

[From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, July 7, 1967]

MRS. SULLIVAN IS NOT ALONE IN PANAMA CANAL CAMPAIGN

(By Ben F. Meyer)

WASHINGTON.—Against considerable odds, Rep. Leonor K. Sullivan (Dem.), St. Louis, one of 11 women in the House, is leading a campaign for rejection of a new treaty giving Panama sovereignty and partial control over the Panama Canal.

Her battle cry: "remember what has happened to the Suez Canal. Remember what happened to Cuba."

Recalling nationalization of the Suez Canal, 74 years under British control, one month after the London government ended military control in 1956, and Communist control of Cuba, Mrs. Sullivan says: "how can anyone tell what will happen to the Panama Canal or to Panama itself, once the United States surrenders sovereignty over the Canal area, and control of the canal?"

She says she considers the president of Panama, Marco Robles, to be one of the best in the nation's 66-year history.

But, she says, "it is not news to anyone that Communists are active in Panama."

She says the proposed treaty would remove control of canal operations from the Panama Canal Co., a U.S. government corporation managed by the Department of Defense. "Authority would be placed in a nongovernmental organization with no future control possible by the U.S. government, or by the U.S. Congress," she says.

"I am not alone," says Mrs. Sullivan, "in opposing the treaty."

But it is the Senate and not the House which passes on such agreements. In addition, she is taking on the powers of the White House and key Democrats in both branches of Congress.

EXPERT ON CANAL

Because Mrs. Sullivan is an expert on Panama Canal affairs, however, her opposition has been echoed by some members of both houses of Congress.

Agreement of Panama and the United States on a draft treaty was announced by both governments June 26. However, the draft has not been made public, although copies of it are in the hands of some members of Congress, Mrs. Sullivan among them.

The Congressional Record refers to Mrs. Sullivan as "the gentlewoman from Missouri." She is gentle and soft-spoken but her colleagues say she can be very effective, and at times persistent, and they cite a long string of legislation she has supported for better protection of the consumer.

Rep. Daniel J. Flood (Dem.), Pennsylvania, who shares Mrs. Sullivan's views about the canal told the House recently: "I would only hope that the male members of this distinguished body had the intestinal fortitude in dealing with this problem that the gentlewoman from Missouri has exhibited for the past several years."

Mrs. Sullivan is not unaccustomed to politics. She is the widow of the late Rep. John B. Sullivan, and was his campaign manager and administrative assistant in five election campaigns. After his death in 1951, Democratic leaders in St. Louis felt a woman could not win, and they put a man in the race. He was defeated by a Republican, Rep. Claude Bakewell. In 1952 Mrs. Sullivan ran, defeating seven candidates in the primary, and trouncing Mr. Bakewell in the general election.

In her fight on the canal treaty, she says "I am doing what I can."

THREE TREATIES

Panama-U.S. negotiators actually agreed on drafts of three treaties. One concerns the operation of the present canal, a second deals with rights for a sea level waterway if Panama is chosen as the site for it, and a third concerns U.S. military bases in Panama to defend the waterway. Her fight is on the treaty governing the present canal.

It has the endorsement of Sen. J. W. Fulbright (Dem.), Arkansas, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, who expects to start hearings on the three pacts late this month.

Sen. Strom Thurmond (Rep.), South Carolina, shares Mrs. Sullivan's views.

Sen. Allen J. Ellender (Dem.), Louisiana, has said he intends to take a long look at the treaties when they come up for ratification.

[From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, July 11, 1967]

MRS. SULLIVAN'S GOOD FIGHT

It is ironic, but not surprising, that a woman in the House of Representatives—Missouri's Representative Leonor K. Sullivan—should have to lead the fight against an ill-advised Panama Canal treaty that reportedly will seek to surrender control of the waterway to the Panamanian government.

It is ironic because it is the Senate which will be asked to approve this agreement. The reason it isn't surprising is because Mrs. Sullivan is an expert on Panama Canal matters.

Though the Johnson Administration so far has tried to keep terms of the agreement secret, word leaked out of the plan to turn management of the canal over to Panama, possibly in exchange for the right to build another sea-level canal through that country.

Mrs. Sullivan points out what happened to the Suez Canal when Egypt took its operation away from the British. It was closed for the first time one month later, and right now it is closed again. Gamal Abdel Nasser uses it as one of his weapons in the fight with Israel.

Communists and rabid Panamanian nationalists undoubtedly would find some pretext in time to try to close the Panama Canal to the United States should our government be so foolish to turn over control to Panama.

Mrs. Sullivan is to be highly commended for pressing her intelligent fight to protect this vital United States lifeline. There already is evidence her strong opposition is encouraging members of the Senate to delve into this smelly business.

They aren't liking what they find, and chances appear good that an attempt to turn the canal over to Panama could be turned back.

Concerning Reader's Digest Story on Congressman Kirwan

SPEECH

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 12, 1967

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of my colleague from California calling to the attention of the House the unfair, biased attack on the gentleman from Ohio in the June issue of the Reader's Digest.

It appalled me also to read such a distorted story and to realize that millions could be misled because of the prejudiced viewpoint of one editor.

My respect for the efforts of MIKE KIRWAN in encouraging the best possible development of our Nation's resources is great. I have watched him work for projects far from his home district but which in the final tally would be of immense benefit to our country.

The Ohio-Lake Erie Canal has received the same rigorous examination as any project in, for example, my home State of California. It has been recommended by the Corps of Engineers, whose work I regard very highly, and valid studies have shown it will pay its own way.

The facts in this case deserve a far more truthful treatment than that given to it by an editor who tries to smear any honest attempt of our Government to better conditions at home. I am glad this matter has been brought up, and I hope that followers of the Reader's Digest will heed the remarks made here.

The Apollo Mess: Staged for a Rerun?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1967

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the House-Senate conferees will soon be meeting to resolve differences between the House and Senate versions of the 1968 authorization bill for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, I am inserting the following article from the June 19, 1967, issue of Chemical Engineering magazine on the subject of NASA and the Apollo program:

THE APOLLO MESS: STAGED FOR A RERUN?

(NOTE.—This article departs from CHEMICAL ENGINEERING's usual policy, and incorporates an editorial point of view. It is based on extensive research through available sources, and offers constructive insight into the engineering and management aspects of our space program. Although written by Senior Editor Robert Davison, this article includes the efforts of many members of the CHEMICAL ENGINEERING staff.—CALVIN S. CRONAN, *Editor-in-Chief*.)

A lack of effective technical feedback may be breeding new hazards for our space program.

As NASA mops up in the wake of the Apollo-204 tragedy, two urgent questions loom: How could it have happened? Will it happen again?

Administrative confusion, more than technology, triggered the accident that took the lives of Astronauts Virgil I. Grissom, Edward H. White 2d, and Roger B. Chaffee. This was confirmed in the 2,375-page final report of the Apollo Review Board. And there will be future oversight disasters, regardless of patch-up work on the Apollo capsule—unless NASA management learns to communicate with and between the many technical skills essential to space engineering.

Admittedly, it is tough to coordinate our $5-billion/yr. space empire, but not impossible by modern management techniques. Will NASA meet the challenge? Can it correct the system that permitted gross safety oversights? Perhaps more important, will NASA rely more on chemical engineers and benefit from their interdisciplinary approach to technology? Are there new roles opening for chemical engineers in materials selection, safety, design, fire protection and systems planning?

But most perplexing: Why did NASA disregard its own warnings?

NASA on the Carpet—The Apollo Review Board failed to identify the underlying cause that permitted the January 27 conflagration.

Representative Donald Rumsfeld of Illinois charged that the Apollo Review Board "failed to examine, or at least report on, the fundamental conditions which permitted the accident to occur. It is inconceivable to me that they could exist without their being the direct result of serious and fundamental defects within NASA." And Representtaive Kenneth Hechler of West Virginia called for "sweeping changes and tightening up of administration of the space agency and its contractors."

Industry experts contacted by CHEMICAL ENGINEERING blame many of NASA's woes on managerial high-handedness. Among the complaints leveled at NASA:

There is duplication and lack of over-all coordination in safety organization; two separate safety programs—manned and unmanned; duplication without coordination in safety at Langley, Houston, Edwards, Huntsville, Moffett and elsewhere; rivalry between safety and fire protection.

Contractors are allowed to ignore the lessons of previous contractors, being determined to do it by themselves, and better.

Work starts from scratch: Twenty-five years of experience with oxygen atmospheres by the Navy and Air Force mostly overlooked; industry know-how with oxygen ignored; a deaf ear given to suggestions ("You just don't give advice to NASA"); major old-line oxygen companies given no significant role in spacecraft environmental design.

Pet vendors are nurtured; few among the non-pets are heard.

Favored vendors are allowed to raid key men from NASA for their technical and political (NASA organization) know-how.

Recommendations by researchers are often overruled to achieve mechanical and structural success.

The anxiety of many was stated by Representative Olin E. Teague of Texas, head of the House Subcommittee on NASA Oversight. He charged that the Apollo Review Board report was a "broad indictment of NASA and North American and the whole program."

Fog in the Crystal Ball—At February hearings by Rep. Teague's House Subcommittee, Dr. Robert C. Seamans, Jr., deputy NASA administrator, testified, "Continued alertness to the possibility of fire had become dulled by previous ground experience and six years of successful manned missions."

NASA administrator Webb told the House, "In moving ahead to utilize the resources made available to us, we have to take technical risks in the development of equipment and in establishing our schedules. But we have not knowingly accepted a higher level of risks in order to meet our manned-flight schedules . . . we have taken no risks as to the lives or safety of the astronauts that we could find a way to avoid."

Astronaut Frank Borman, a member of the Apollo Review Board, said that his work on the investigation of the Apollo accident convinced him that "there were hazards present beyond the understanding of either NASA's engineers or astronauts."

And testifying before the Senate Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee headed by Senator Clinton P. Anderson of New Mexico, Dr. George E. Mueller, head of manned space flight, said, "It was not through overlooking the problems that we arrived at the accident. It was rather that our specifications did not take account of the specific event."

In April, before the House Subcommittee for NASA Oversight, Mueller admitted that design and inspection procedures were inadequate. He said, "If more-thorough testing of flammable materials used in the cockpit had been conducted, the accident might not have happened." He also said, "If engineers had carried out full-scale fire tests in a mockup version of the spacecraft, they would have realized the hazards of such materials in pure oxygen."

Assuming Catastrophe—Oldtimers in industrial oxygen work follow Murphy's Law: If it can happen, it will. For a pure oxygen atmosphere, laboratory risks evaluations of ignitable materials are not enough. The total system must be considered—How much is there of the material; What are the system conditions; Are all sources of ignition eliminated? And the big questions: *What if it ignites anyway? What then?*

As for NASA, however, the Apollo Review Board said: "The underlying design approach in Apollo was to control the known risk of fire . . . by isolating and rendering safe all possible ignition sources . . . led to the use of several solid combustible materials within the spacecraft, including nylon and polyurethane foams." There were 70 lb. of flammable materials in the fatal Apollo command module, mostly nylon.

Space-chamber mishaps were not new. The first such fire occurred five years ago in an oxygen-rich space chamber at the School of Aerospace Medicine, Brooks Air Force Base, San Antonio, Tex. Two crewmen in prototype space suits entered the chamber, which was at 5 psi. oxygen. A power tube overheated, and its plastic base ignited. Fumes alerted the crewmen, and both escaped without injury.

Soon after, two crewmen in pressurized suits with closed helmet visors were in the same chamber at the same conditions. A glow appeared behind the instrument panel. Within seconds, the rear of the panel was in flames. Both men passed out from the heat and smoke. One suffered from severe smoke inhalation when he opened his visor.

The third fire took place four years ago at the Aircrew Equipment Laboratory at Philadelphia's Naval Air Center. Four men in shirtsleeves were in a 10-ft.-wide space chamber, pressurized at 5 psi. oxygen. An overheated light bulb burned out. When it was replaced, flame shot from the fixture. One crewman tried to snuff out the fire with a towel, but the cloth caught on fire and burned so vigorously that the man's clothes ignited. An asbestos fire-blanket was thrown over him, but it too burned. Flaming insulation from the light fixture dripped onto a bunk. When a crewman tried to beat out the bunk fire, his skin began to burn. Quick action from the outside saved the four men. And only when the oxygen was pumped out of the chamber did the fire stop.

Ignition for these three fires was caused by electrical failure. The January 27 Apollo incineration is thought to have started from an electrical arc through abraded Teflon insulation. The "most probable" cause of the ignition in the January 31 oxygen-chamber death of two Air Force men at Brooks Air Force Base was a Teflon-insulated work-lamp cord arcing against the aluminum floor.

How Secret the Risk?—There were numerous warnings. Early in the space program, fire prevention experts urged that NASA study how to control the spread of fire by proper design and structural arrangements within the cabin. They further recommended the use of full-scale fire-detection and protection tests. Both procedures have now been adopted by NASA.

The hazards of oxygen-saturated clothing were reported by the New York Naval Shipyard in *National Safety News*, September, 1957. Frequent injuries occurred during work aboard ships because of oxygen leaks and the ignition of oxygen-saturated clothing. Oxygen content of as little as 8 to 14% above normal created hazardous conditions of "major proportions."

Other published warnings of the dangers of oxygen-rich environments have been available for many years from the National Safety Council, the Compressed Gas Assn. and the National Fire Protection Assn.

More striking, however, are NASA's own warnings in its 1964 publication, *Space-Cabin Atmospheres, Part II—Fire and Blast Hazards*. Some pertinent excerpts from this publication are:

1. ". . . a statement defining the hazardous nature of any gaseous environment must include a very rigid definition of the entire system."

2. ". . . increasing the percentage of oxygen at any total pressure will not only decrease the minimum spark energy (for ignition), but also extend the limits of flammability to a much wider range . . . from 21% to 100% oxygen, the minimum required spark energy decreases by three orders of magnitude."

3. The table, "Preliminary Screening Tests of Materials for Possible Use in 100 Percent Oxygen Atmosphere" reports that nylon fabric burned completely, as did polyurethane foam.

4. Of the five major potential fire sources listed, one was "electrical wiring."

5. "Examples of combustible materials that should be minimized or possibly eliminated from space cabins" include: nylon, polyethylene, Teflon. "No material which supports combustion in high-oxygen environments after the ignition source is removed should be used . . ."

6. Basic cabin design should reduce ignition sources and "Prevent sparking and arcing of electric or electronic equipment . . . by use of [among other things] abrasion-resistant electric wiring . . . All electric and electronic equipment and wires should be considered as ignition sources, regardless of how well they are protected."

Chewing Gum and Baling Wire—The list of engineering shortcomings in the Apollo-204, many of which disregarded NASA's own warnings, includes:

Extensive distribution of combustible materials in the cabin: contoured couches with nylon covering and polyurethane foam; space suits with inflammable nylon and rubber; polytheylene bags for waste; nylon netting and fasteners to collect and stow gear in the cockpit.

Vulnerable wire transmitted spacecraft power; Teflon electrical insulation was easily damaged or penetrated by abrasion.

Vulnerable plumbing carried a combustible and corrosive coolant. Soft solder (400 F. melting point) for joints in oxygen and ethylene glycol coolant lines was easily damaged by bumping—coolant leakage had plagued the spacecraft in previous tests.

No vibration test had been conducted of complete flight-configured spacecraft.

Significant engineering changes are planned. Pressurized oxygen will not be used in prelaunch operations. Ethylene glycol coolant may be replaced by water. Combustible materials will be replaced where possible with non-flammable materials. Nonmetallic structures will be arranged to maintain fire breaks within the cabin. Flammability tests will be conducted with full-scale mockups of the new configuration, and a new quick-exit escape hatch will be built.

Musical Chairs—Around Houston, the story goes that on the day of the fatal accident, the oxygen was only 90% pure. The director of the experiment wanted to stop, but the astronauts objected. They told him to assume that it was nitrogen, which it normally would be, and to proceed with the test. Yet in the past, explosions had occurred when liquid oxygen boiled away to leave a concentration of hydrocarbon contaminants.

This did not cause the fatal fire, but does illustrate a most important recommendation made by the Apollo Review Board—the need for better definition of responsibilities.

As an example, for months the grapevine had it that NASA was disappointed with North American Aviation as the prime contractor for the Apollo capsule. But as recently as late 1966, NASA officials denied their disenchantment with the firm. Yet, Major General Samuel C. Phillips, NASA's Apollo program director, had a different story this April. He told the House Subcommittee on NASA Oversight that in 1965 he was so disturbed by North American's performance that he had considered taking away part of its $2.8-billion share of NASA space program contracts. He didn't, he said, because the company improved.

But it was a recent error by North American that delayed the initial Apollo flight from last November. Methanol was used to pressure-test Apollo's titanium fuel tanks. Eighteen of the tanks passed, but the next two failed from stress corrosion (*Chem. Eng.*, Dec, 5, 1966, p. 69). The technical literature of 10 years earlier had reported that methanol caused stress corrosion in titanium.

Further shrouding the management of the Apollo program was a bewildering array of administrative omissions. Outstanding among those reported by the Apollo Review Board were:

Lack of definition of the respective responsibilities of the organization involved.

Adequate safety precautions neither established nor observed for the test.

Fifty-six major changes in test procedures the day before the fatal fire, with most of the workers likely not familiar with them.

One hundred and thirteen significant engineering orders not accomplished at the time the command module was delivered to NASA; 623 engineering orders released subsequent to delivery.

Established requirements not followed with regard to the pretest constraints; list not completed and signed by contractor and NASA personnel prior to the test—oral agreement only.

Noncertified equipment items installed in the command module.

The August 1966 test specification not updated for changes.

Lack of emergency fire or rescue teams at the launching area.

A number of equipment checklists unchecked.

Howling in the Wilderness—Safety is only as important as management decrees. Its essential element is top-management authority by a responsible safety director who can coordinate the many skills needed to oversee a safe system.

Management and safety experts contacted by CHEMICAL ENGINEERING feel that the Apollo failure was more a breakdown in coordination than in technology. This problem is not unique to NASA, and is often found in large commercial organizations, particularly those in which management is individualistic, rather than systems-engineering oriented.

Systems engineering is the only answer for complex situations where equipment, skills and techniques must be composited for a unified purpose. It identifies distinguishable elements, their cause-and-effect relationships, functions to be performed in each case, and required trade-offs among resources. It reduces the chances for oversight and appraisal gaps.

Among the federal services, the Air Force is the recognized leader in the use of systems engineering (AFSCM 375–5, the Air Force Systems Command Manual, *Systems Engineering Management Procedures*, March 10, 1966).* Though NASA follows some of the principles of systems engineering management, one element is missing: effective *auditing*. When management operates from the top down, it cannot "hear" problems at the lowest levels. Astronaut Gus Grissom was frustrated at not being heard during a period of spacecraft problems in late 1966, according to *Electronic News*. When Grissom complained that there was lack of harmony in the program, a close friend asked him why he didn't complain officially. Grissom replied, "I've been howling in the wilderness for years."

In the administrative pecking order, hardware falls at the bottom of the pyramid, and these contractors are seldom heard. The solution: Continuous *auditing* superimposed on a systems evaluation concept. The characteristics of auditing are:

1. Construction from the top down (administration).

2. Implementation from the bottom up (wee voices).

3. All information cross-pollinated (between skills).

4. Continuous (no lapses).

With *auditing*, professional employees

---

*Available from Supt. of Documents, U.S. Govt. Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402. Price: $2.75.

must rate each system or situation they meet as *not critical* or *critical*. The next higher person can overrule a *critical* rating, but assumes the responsibility for failure. Not only does the system give a chance for all to be heard, but it assigns responsibility.

The Chemical Engineer in the Space Program

Exciting opportunities beckon as we approach long-duration space flights to Mars and beyond. The chemical engineer is vital to the space effort because of his knowledge of heat transfer, reactivity, corrosivity, containment and combustion, power generation, materials properties, toxicity, and systems reliability. A few of the myriad of out-of-this-world problems seeking creative solutions are:

Chemical propulsion—Fuel-oxidizer mixing for combustion efficiency and stability; pressurization systems; thrust-chamber cooling; design criteria for industry . . .

Fluids handling—Cryogenic storage; seals and bladders; long-term outer-space stability for extended space trips; handling propellant spillages; preventing explosions and fires . . .

Special coatings—Third generation reentry ablatives; thermal control of temperatures by radiant energy absorption and emission; high-temperature cermets and ceramics; prevention of outgassing and plating-over of windows . . .

Life support—Foods for long space flights; environmental control of cockpit temperature, air, water, toxicity . . .

Miscellaneous—High-temperature adhesives for reentry ablatives; control for effects of man's exudations on electronic devices; shielding for nuclear engines; coolants that will not corrode or contaminate the metals containing them . . .

Open Letter to Grandfather Lyndon B. Johnson Points Way to Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1967

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the world recently was treated to an example of the strength and power of international grandfatherism.

Through the medium of television the American people saw grandfather Lyndon B. Johnson and grandfather Alexei Kosygin exchange their views on the delights and pleasures of their grandchildren at the Glassboro summit conference.

Grandfatherism provided a common ground—something they could discuss agreeably and set the tone for a generally friendly atmosphere.

In this connection another distinguished grandfather, writer, editor and publisher—Mr. Coleman A. Harwell, of Cookeville, Tenn.—has written a most delightful and yet, serious, open letter to President Johnson, entitled "From One Grandfather to Another."

Mr. Harwell points out that following the Glassboro conference the President announced with great pride that he and the Soviet Premier had concluded that they "wanted a world of peace for our grandchildren."

This beautifully written open letter was published in the Cookeville Citizen, and under unanimous consent I include it in the Appendix of the RECORD because of its interest to my colleagues and to the American people.

The open letter of Publisher Harwell to President Johnson follows:

From One Grandfather to Another

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Keeping up with your activities takes more time than most people can give to it and understanding the implications of all you do requires a lot more understanding than most of us have.

That is why it is reassuring when some event in which you are involved is akin to our own experience putting us for a change on the same basis.

The two major events involving you in recent days were the arrival of your grandson, Patrick Lyndon Nugent, and your conversations with Premier Alexei Kosygin of Russia. These two occurrences were about as dissimilar as could be in human affairs. The interesting thing about them, however, was that one of them made the other a lot more comprehensible.

Consider, for instance, the plight of the average person trying to figure out what you and Mr. Kosygin said to one another in your 10 hours together Friday and Sunday afternoons. Even though you were almost alone much of the time, with only the interpreters present, we can't imagine his telling you what he really thought of President Nasser and we can't imagine your telling him exactly what you thought of Premier Ky.

We also doubt that you chided him about his Communist pal, Mao Tse-tung, or that he teased you about your old buddy General de Gaulle. Or that either of you tried to bully the other with your ability to destroy his country, and everything else, with your nuclear power.

We wonder how you approached him on matters in Vietnam and how he went about trying to persuade you that Israel should restore to the Arabs the territory they lost the other day. We wonder, too, if he explained to you that he was going back to Moscow by way of Cuba just as window dressing for the folks backhome and that he sent old President Podgory to hug Nasser for the same purpose—or did he take it for granted you'd guessed that already?

We wonder if he asked you to explain why so many newspapers in your country spent nearly a week ribbing you because you hadn't been able to arrange a conference with him, and then, when you did arrange it, it spent about as long saying your conversations (the whole 10 hours of them) didn't amount to much anyway.

As we say, we were puzzled by a lot of things. But then, on the day your first conference was announced, your grandson stole a big piece of headlines by being born. As was to have been expected, you acted exactly like every grandfather should. And premier Kosygin did the same.

You burst the buttons off your vest, fired telegrams to all concerned, shipped a prize heifer calf to the day-old boy and threw in a 1000-acre spread near the LBJ ranch for good measure. We're not suggesting that many grandfathers do things that big, but all of them know the feeling.

Mr. K. played his part in fine fashion. He showed up with a gold cup for the youngster and lost no time in reminding you that he has 18 years seniority on you as a grandpa.

All of that was really fine. But the big thing concerning your grandson also concerned the conference. After the four and a half hour meeting Friday, you told the world you had said to Mr. Kosygin the very thing that is in the minds of grandfathers everywhere—the writer being no exception. You told him, "You don't want my grandson fighting you and I don't want you shooting at him."

That night in Los Angeles, you made the most telling point of all, announcing that you and Mr. Kosygin had agreed that "we wanted a world of peace for our grandchildren."

Some people say that because you and Mr. Kosygin did not settle the Vietnam war on the spot or bring a peace settlement to the Middle East, the meeting of Glassboro accomplished nothing. We don't believe that.

We believe that when the Chiefs of State of the two most powerful nations in the world talk ten hours and agree they want "a world of peace" for their grandchildren, a great deal has been accomplished. And we believe much good will result from the simple and understandable statement.

As one grandfather to another, we say, Thank you!

Respectfully yours,

COLEMAN A. HARWELL.

Give Westmoreland What It Takes To Win

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1967

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, James G. Stahlman, president and publisher of the Nashville Banner, is one of the Nation's ablest newspapermen and his publication is widely recognized for the quality of its product. A recent editorial from this publication entitled "Give Westmoreland What It Takes To Win," is a clear portrayal of the facts. This editorial makes sound reading and I include it for reprinting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

[From the Nashville Banner, July 14, 1967]

Field Commander Knows the Needs: Give Westmoreland What It Takes To Win

In consulting General Westmoreland prior to any precise decision on the number of men needed to supplement U.S. forces in Vietnam, President Johnson shows respect for the superior military knowledge of an able commanding officer.

If there is, in fact, no disparity between the Westmoreland figures and the estimate presented by Defense Secretary Robert S. Mc Namara, the White should further clarify the apparent discrepancy. If there is, it should be resolved in favor of the former's view—remembering that as between the two, he is the military expert.

He is the man in the field who bears the responsibility for operational decisions. He lives with that daily, around the clock—an assignment committed to his hands on the basis of unquestioned qualification. His is an informed judgment, keenly analytical and factual, and forgoing guesswork.

Any information on which the Secretary of Defense rests a conclusion in this particular would have to stem, for accuracy, on the estimate supplied by the commander and colleagues in that field. He could not possibly derive superior knowledge elsewhere—or by brief excursions and cursory inspections there. Nor by riffling statistical showcards substantially different from those presented by the competent military command.

President Johnson's implicit confidence in General Westmoreland, restated Thursday, is not misplaced. It is shared by the whole nation, whose sons are fighting under his leadership—and whose concern is for the victory in Vietnam which Westmoreland and his men can win if furnished what it takes—and freed of what are called "limited objectives" short of that victory.

Any conflict at arms engaging 460,000 American men, and edging toward the half-million mark, is not a minor war. It is not a mere "police action," as the Korean affair mistakenly was called. It is a major military operation, regardless of how we got into it, and must be won.

The Joint Chiefs of Staff know how to accomplish that. So do commanders in the field; the ground forces, the Naval units, the Air Force and Marine Corps—the total team there assigned a security responsibility whose magnitude forbids any crippling devices or straitjackets making a mockery of sacrifices to date.

If we are going to continue sending ground troops there, they shouldn't be sent to continue to die for a war that has no prospect of ending.

There are ways of getting it over. Regardless of who thinks what about it, Hanoi and Haiphong should be bombed and a blockade put on to interdict all shipment of material to the Viet Cong. Until that is done, the military partners of that side, and others capitalizing on it, will continue supplying the enemy with weapons that are prolonging the war and enlarging the sacrifice of blood and substance.

Vietnam: Fencing the North

SPEECH

OF

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 10, 1967

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, in the New Republic for July 8, Mr. Andrew Hamilton, a writer on military affairs for Newhouse newspapers, has written a most interesting article on the idea of seeking to establish a physical barrier to the infiltration of men and supplies into South Vietnam from the north. Mr. Hamilton appears to be sympathetic to the President's fear that a cessation of the bombing in the north would give Hanoi a military advantage, but he points out that this situation would change if such an effective barrier to infiltration could be established. He further argues that the high cost of the barrier would be less than the cost of aircraft losses over North Vietnam plus the cost of bombs dropped.

I commend Mr. Hamilton's article to my colleagues and other readers of the RECORD, as follows:

VIETNAM: FENCING IN THE NORTH

(By Andrew Hamilton)

With the presidential campaign barely more than a year away, there are signs that Mr. Johnson is planning to add something new to the war effort which could eventually change the nature of the Vietnam struggle. The new factor is a "barrier" of electronic devices around Vietnam to monitor infiltration of men and supplies from North Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia, and to permit rapid border enforcement. If the electronic wall were to curb infiltration, the residual arguments for continued bombing of North Vietnam would lose whatever validity they might still have.

The impression grows that under present strategy, neither the many battles in the South nor the air war against the North are going to bring an end to the fighting. One no longer hears much about that "light at the end of the tunnel" which glimmered fitfully last fall. General Westmoreland has sent Washington his estimates of the number of additional American troops he could use, mostly for more search and destroy operations. These are said to run from one more division up to four or five, in descending order of priority. But there is no evidence that General Westmoreland guarantees that any number of additional troops will produce victory within a year or 15 months. The retraining of South Vietnam's 'Army (ARVN) for "pacification" duty has turned out to be a far longer-term project than the optimists expected last fall, and one begins to hear about all sorts of new organizational schemes to make better use of ARVN's manpower.

The bombing campaign against North Vietnam has run for nearly 30 months. Well over $1 billion worth of American aircraft has been lost to enemy fire or in accidents; at least another $1 billion in ordnance has been dropped on or shot at North Vietname; more than 500 American pilots have been killed or captured; most of the North's industry has been hit and at least partially destroyed, and its roads, railroads, bridges and waterways are under constant attack. Yet the enemy force in South Vietnam keep growing slowly, according to publishd intelligence estimates. The intensity of conflict in the South is also growing. The North Vietnamese leaders seem fully prepared and able to sit out another year or more of bombing, both to prove that they will not submit to coercion and to see what the American presidential election will bring. Pondering this, the President must at times be tempted to believe that "more of the same" will bring only more of the same—another year or more of "this bloody impasse," as he called it last month, with a settlement not perceptibly nearer. Not the best record to run on.

But Mr. Johnson believes that a negotiated settlement is no more attainable than a military victory in the short run. In the opinion of the officials who estimate Hanoi's intentions, the North Vietnamese government would agree to "talks," if the bombing of North Vietnam were stopped. They doubt, however, that the "talks" would lead to "negotiations" during which Hanoi would back away from any of its aims—certainly not until after the US elections. The estimate of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, which the President can hardly ignore when he has troops in the field, is that Hanoi would take military advantage of the cessation of bombing to increase infiltration of men and supplies in the South, in hopes of achieving a major tactical victory that would have maximum political impact in Washington and Saigon. So when the military are asked about ending the bombing, they growl "over our dead bodies," and they mean that literally.

Thus, the President is told that the safest way to fight the war in the South is to continue bombing the North, relentless pressure countering relentless presssure. At the same time, he is also being given a highly unfavorable assesment of the bombing as a costly and inefficient counterinfiltration weapon. (According to the air force chief of staff himself, most bombing raids against North Vietnam achieve a "700-foot CEP"—circular error probable. This means that only half the bombs drop within 700 feet of their targets.) Moreover, persistent bombing is poisioning relations between the US and other nations, particularly the Soviet Union and contributes to holding up such vital matters as talks on limiting deployment of anti-ballistic missiles or a Middle East settlement. Nor is it bringing Hanoi to the conference table. Moreover, Mr. Johnson is told it is morally repugnant to a lot of Americans who are not the demonstrating sort. Curiously enough, this assesment is coming from the Pentagon, although not from the Joint Chiefs of Staff. It is held not only by Department of Defense civilians, but by some lower-grade officers.

For several years, the Defense Department has considered various schemes for blocking the infiltration from North Vietnam by physical barriers. Most were discarded as too static, too costly in terms of manpower, and not likely to have the same military or (it was hoped) political advantages as bombing. The military, in particular, were opposed to the barrier plans. But the idea remained as a possible alternative to the bombing strategy, and as possible insurance against the reintroduction of infiltration following any political settlement. For these reasons, a major research program named "Practice Nine" was started by Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara last year to determine whether new detection and warning devices could be developed that would make a barrier "cost effective."

"Everybody and his brother," according to one research official, has been called in to deliver opinions on the feasibility of the sensor technology required and on the "trade-offs" between a barrier and bombing, as well as to do the engineering. Combinations of airborne and ground-based sensors have been studied to determine the best way to detect foot infiltrators, bicycle and pack animal traffic under dense jungle canopy in wild, rough terrain. When the sensors detect such traffic, they would alert observation posts or planes which could order artillery fire, air strikes and helicopter-borne troops to stop the infiltration. Barbed wire, minefields, strongpoints and other standard barrier devices would be used where the terrain permitted. Where it did not, mine-activating sensors could be installed along infiltration trails, along with sensors to call in air strikes and reaction forces.

An electronic fence of this sort would make use of improved night observation devices using light intensification techniques; personnel detection radars which see moving targets by means of the Doppler shift, and which have been used successfully at ranges of several miles to aid in protecting isolated Special Forces camps in Vietnam; seismic detectors that can be remotely placed to pick up ground tremors caused by marching men; magnetic detection devices; infrared sensors; ultraviolet sensors; acoustical amplifiers; "electric eye" beam-breaking devices and other gadgetry. Some would have a radio link to rapid data-processing equipment, which would analyze the patterns for estimates of the amount and kind of traffic.

WHERE WOULD IT BE BUILT?

Army studies have determined that a "reasonably impermeable barrier" using this sort of technology could be constructed at a cost of $1 million a mile, including manning costs which make up 80 percent of the total. And even if the cost estimate doubled, officials have said, it would be cheaper to build a barrier around the the 600 miles of South Vietnam than to lose another 600 attack aircraft over North Vietnam, at $2 million a plane plus the cost of bombs dropped.

The same sensor technology can be used to improve the efficiency of search and destroy forces in South Vietnam, which one defense official describes as very low. By helping to pinpoint enemy forces, camps and tunnels, he said, the technology "can improve search and destroy by a factor of 10."

Advances in sensor technology, notwithstanding, the barrier plan remains controversial. Some find repugnant the concept of a "Berlin wall" built by the United States, although the arguable point is made that the Berlin wall was designed to keep people in while this wall would be designed to keep them out. The military are no longer so strongly opposed to the idea, but they don't want to take men from search and destroy operations and tie them down guarding the barrier. It is thought that a barrier of any length would require three to four divisions of airmobile troops (more than two divisions are now on border duty). Also, they believe the barrier should stretch from the South China Sea across the northern tip of South Vietnam and then on across Laos to the Mekong River, instead of ending at the Laotian border. But that is ruled out; the Laotion government firmly opposes the plan. An alternative is to turn the barrier south along South Vietnam's western boundary. But this is very rough territory, where installation of the barrier would be more difficult and its effectiveness more open to question. Finally, some of the sensor devices will not be available for at least a year, if then. Technologically, they present "magnificent problems," one official notes.

Nevertheless, the Administration apparently is preparing to field-test the electronic barrier on a major scale, beginning just south of the demilitarized zone between North and South Vietnam. Already, Marines have cleared a seven-mile strip between Gio Linh and Con Thien which is being widened to 500 yards. This will be sowed with mines, barbed wire and sensors and covered by concentrated artillery. According to reports, the strip will next be extended four miles from Gio Linh to the coast, then westward. It might then be carried south along the boundary.

Officials think that, using present technology, a barrier covering the major infiltration routes can be installed within a year. If this is done, and it proves effective, the President will perhaps be in a position to deescalate, then stop the bombing without risking major trouble in the South from infiltration. This might be the formula to solve the current impasse, and, conveniently, it would be available for use just about the time the presidential campaign picks up momentum during the fall of 1968.

In the 17th century the rival war lords of the Trinh and Nguyen families, rulers respectively of North and South Vietnam, fought constantly with each other. But the Trinh, although stronger, were unable to overcome the Nguyen and seize the South. Historians attribute the successful southern defense in part to two huge walls built across the coastal plains by the Nguyen in the 1630's, near the narrow waist some 25 miles north of the present demilitarized zone. That division of Vietnam, according to Bernard Fall, lasted 150 years. But it did not bring peace. The learning curve in Vietnam is very flat.

"In Washington" Leaves Town

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. GOODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1967

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following column, "In Washington," by Lucian C. Warren, of the Buffalo, N.Y., Courier-Express.

As this Congress works on through the hot summer, I am delighted to read that Mr. Warren, who serves as the distinguished chairman of the Standing Committee of Correspondents, has demonstrated his usual good sense by taking his family on a cross-country camping trip. His column makes interesting reading and I am pleased to share it with my colleagues:

IN WASHINGTON—WRITER CROSSES UNITED STATES ON SCENIC VACATION TRIP

(By Lucian C. Warren)

It's supposed to be patriotic to avoid foreign travel and spend your vacation dollars in America. That's just what your Washington observer has been doing for the last month and herewith a report.

Despite scoffing by some of our friends, your correspondent, his wife and a daughter elected to scorn conventional forms of public travel in favor of a three-year-old automobile and to eschew for the most part hotels and motels by making use of a tent, air mattresses, sleeping bags and portable eating equipment.

The camping equipment stood the trip better than the Jitney, whose occasional malfunctions cost in repairs at least a portion of what might have been paid out in public transportation.

Nevertheless, when we checked in at home last Sunday evening, we had logged nearly 10,000 miles on a delightful coast-to-coast trip that took in the better known national parks and had time to spare for certain side trips.

Although we spent too many of our vacation dollars on automobile repairs, our outlay for accommodations proved to be extremely modest.

For $7, one can acquire a federal recreation permit good for a year, entitling the bearers to camp at any national forest or park and see the sights at any national monument. For those few points in the trip where national forest and park camping facilities are not available, private camping facilities are offered at a rate usually not in excess of $2 per night.

This is not elegant traveling. One does share bathroom facilities—sometimes of the most primitive kind—with other campers. What's worse, one shares the great outdoors with pesky mosquitoes, despite the help of insect repellants and screened-in tents.

Just the same it was a great adventure.

Cooking at an open fireplace is great sport and it's easy to understand why so many modern restaurants make so much of chargrilling food.

We found that one can sleep well on the floor of a tent with properly pumped-up air mattresses and well-zipped sleeping bags, no matter how bad the weather.

Our first day's trip took us from Washington to the Great Smokey National Park in Tennessee, a jaunt that included a noonday stop at Natural Bridge, Virginia.

We had been advised that especially on weekends it pays to reach national park camp grounds well before sundown and this was brought home that first day. Despite an early start, we reached the park too late for the choice campsites.

As we traveled through the mountainous park terrain en route to our campsite, we witnessed a mother bear and her cub raiding a garbage can.

It should have been a good warning, but later at Yosemite National Park in California our portable icebox was left overnight outside our tent on the assumption it was animal-proof.

The assumption was a grievous error. Through long observation, Bruin has come to recognize portable iceboxes as a repository for goodies.

We were awakened at 3 a.m. by a clatter outside. The noise came from our icebox as it was propelled over and over on the ground by the bear until the catch came loose.

As we peered out, he lumbered off with a pound of bacon in his mouth.

While he polished off the bacon, we managed to retrieve our icebox and were about to place it in the car trunk when Bruin returned for another snack. We will never know whether the alarmed waving of flash lights or the reduced supplies in the icebox made the bear change his mind. In any event, to our great relief, he shambled off into the night and soon we could hear the clatter of other iceboxes as the bear continued his nocturnal raid.

During the balance of the trip, our icebox was safely locked in the trunk each night.

Space will not permit a detailed travelog, but the itinerary also included a two-day inspection of the sights and sounds of New Orleans. At Carlsbad Caverns, the grotesque underground formation competed as an attraction wtih the nightly exodus of thousands of bats.

The Petrified Forest and Painted Desert, the Grand Canyon of the Colorado, the gambling casinos of Los Vegas ("invested" a mite here in roulette and blackjack), Disneyland, Sequoia and Yosemite National Parks, California's redwoods, Oregon's Crater Lake, Washington's Mount Ranier, Wyoming's Yellowstone Park, South Dakota's Black Hills, Mount Rushmore and the Badlands—these were other great stops along the way.

There was also an unforgettable night at Lake Mead, Nev., in Hoover Dam country. The thermometer read 107 degrees and despite pleasant swims in the cool lake, this was not rated as among our more enjoyable camping spots.

Lake Mead's heat, and marauding bears notwithstanding, your correspondent returns to work refreshed and humming "O Beautiful for Spacious Skies" in knowing fashion.

John E. Tolman Makes Plea for Integrity of Social Security Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 12, 1967

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, if social security is to survive as an actuarially sound program, its funds must be protected against raids by those who would make of it a mammoth welfare project. Its future depends upon making those funds a source of security for the benefit of its contributors.

I recently received a letter written by Mr. John E. Tolman, of San Antonio, executive vice president of First Financial Life Insurance Co. It contains a very sound and thought-provoking discussion of this subject, and I commend it to my colleagues as a message well worth reading.

The letter follows:

I received a brochure from the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, copy of which is attached, and if this is true, I wish to add my voice to those who disagree with the change in concept of social security.

While the insurance business was very much against social security when it started in, I believe 1937, there has been a complete change in feeling towards it. As a matter of fact, I think it has been very helpful to the sale of insurance. Furthermore, it has allowed a large number of the American public to have something that approaches a reasonable amount of insurance when combined with private insurance programs. The private insurance industry has not as yet fully covered the needs of the American public and frankly I doubt that it can, or at least that it can in the foreseeable future. I also have to doubt that the Federal Government can cover all the needs of the American public in terms of either life insurance or a guaranteed income in the form of an annuity, however financed.

I must object to that portion of the change in social security; the concept of a test of need and also some relationship of benefits to wages earned. Although I have no particular objection to some flattening of the relationship, that is, a higher amount paid to the lower income folks and a smaller amount in comparison to wages earned paid to the higher income folks. The concept of relating this to a needs test is where I have to quit and get off this ride. I have found as a fundamental principle that there seem to be a very large number of people in this world who are not interested in working for a living even though an opportunity to do so is afforded them. I resent having to provide a living to a man who will not work. If he is not able to work due to education, I have no objection to helping him educate himself. If he is disabled, I have no objection to helping him through his period of disability and helping him through his rehabilitation, but for the man who will not educate himself when given the opportunity for the man who will not rehabilitate himself when given the help, I feel that these folks are a drag upon society and I will not lift my hand to help those that will not help themselves.

Historically, the social security fund benefits have been on a pay as you go basis and the accounting for these if my understanding is correct is that they are entirely separate from the general fund. I object strenuously to passing the social security deductions from my pay check into the general fund so that the whole welfare poverty program can be beautifully buried under the guise of social security. Surely sometime the great American public must come to the realization that it is not the great corporations, the very rich, that in the final analysis pay for all of the programs which they want, it is the ultimate consumer that pays for them. I know our company and I am just as sure that all other companies that are at least successful will follow the same pattern simply passed on increased taxes, be they payroll, federal income tax, excise tax, real estate tax, school tax, highway tax, etc., etc., etc., on to the ultimate consumer in the form of price increases. You must never lose sight of the fact that if the corporations are going to continue to pay you taxes to carry on the poverty program, etc., first they must take in more dollars than they spend. The day that the automobile industry does not do this, is the day that you will have the greatest depression that you have ever seen. If you take away too much incentive, you will also take away the people who have the ability to do the managing and to do the promoting of businesses, the promoting of unions, the politicians. In every organization which I have been associated, there has been a very few people who have the ability to run a business on a profitable basis, and running a business on a profitable basis is what provides jobs for the great number of people in this country. The last company that I was with had over 4,000 employees. I was one member of a six man management team at the top of the organization. Unfortunately in this organization there were not over twenty more people in the entire organization that had the ability to operate the general management of the company.

Don't put a premium on mediocrity, put a premium on genius and ability.

Don't ask me to work to support the person who won't.

Don't put a needs test on social security.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN E. TOLMAN,
Executive Vice President.

Dodging the Draft Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 17, 1967

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial that appeared in the July 10 issue of the Hutchinson News, Hutchinson, Kans., relating to the failure of the Congress to meet up to its responsibilities in removing the inequities and unfairness of certain provisions of our draft law.

The editorial follows:

DODGING THE DRAFT ISSUE

Congress is at all times unbelievable. It soared clear out of the spectrum this session when it "reformed" the draft.

At one blow, Congress ignored a year of debate and deep public concern over draft inequities. It turned thumbs down on the administration's proposals. With one exception, it succeeded only in compounding the confusion, and the unfairness.

That exception is to reverse the order of conscription, beginning with 19-year-olds rather than with older men. This does allow more room for planning in a young man's life. But even this change has been made by a Presidential order, not by an express act of Congress.

Congress denied the administration any authority for a lottery, which would have done much to bring a sense of fair play to the draft, and would reduce the six-year drag eligibles now face before knowing what their obligation will be.

Congress also declined to set national standards for draft boards. These, at the least, would have brought some uniformity among draft procedures in Georgia and Kansas.

Other draft rules, including the highly questionable academic exemption system, simply were re-enacted for another four years.

The possibility of replacing the draft with volunteer military was hardly even faced.

All in all, an incredible performance. And a thoroughly irresponsible one, considering the millions of young men, and families affected by an obviously unfair system.

Results of 1967 Public Opinion Questionnaire in 12th Illinois Congressional District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT McCLORY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 17, 1967

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to report the interesting results of the 1967 public opinion poll which I recently conducted in the 12th Congressional District of Illinois.

In April 1967, I distributed approximately 140,000 questionnaire cards to the residents of the 12th Illinois District, an area comprising Lake County, McHenry County, and Barrington and Hanover Townships in Cook County. By May 31, 1967, a total of 15,854 properly marked cards were returned and tabulated. These represented about 12 percent of the distribution. Additional returns are continuing to arrive in my Washington office, even now.

This year I utilized a special IBM punchcard so that the questionnaire returns could be machine tabulated. Also, the use of automatic data processing equipment made possible a more careful and accurate analysis of the questionnaire replies.

In addition to 10 questions on issues of significance to the Nation, the 12th District citizens were asked to identify themselves by age group, occupation, and party preference. This personal information made possible an interesting analysis of returns on the basis of the individual's age, political affiliation, and occupation.

One of the most interesting questions is that dealing with the United States' policy and presence in Vietnam. Altogether 87.8 percent of the 12th District citizens approved the present or even stronger American involvement in Vietnam: 62.9 percent favor using sufficient military power to clear South Vietnam of Communists; 9.7 percent favor greater use of air and sea power; 7 percent favor holding South Vietnam; and 8.2 percent favor continuing the present policy. Of special interest was the similar viewpoints of citizens of different ages, occupations and political preferences.

Mr. Speaker, I should add that the political party response to the questionnaire—which appears to be overwhelmingly Republican—is not indicative of the true Republican-Democratic proportions within the 12th Congressional District. The ratio of Republicans to Democrats in the 12th Illinois District is not 6 to 1 as the questionnaire returns suggest, but more like 2 to 1 or 3 to 1—at this time—as recent election results show. If, for political reasons, some normally Democratic voters have declined to respond to the questionnaire which I circulated, this is—of course—regrettable. Very few of the great national issues are to be decided along strictly partisan lines. As Representative in the Congress of both Democrats and Republicans, I have been anxious to receive the views and to give appropriate recognition to the position of both Republicans and Democrats on the various issues. I am suspicious that many of those voters—24 percent of the total—who described themselves in the questionnaire as "independents" may, in elections, support various Democratic candidates. This would make the ratio of Republicans to Democrats more consistent with the ratio as revealed on election days.

In the face of a threatened tax increase, the questionnaire returns are most persuasive. Twelfth District citizens have voted better than 9 to 1 against the proposed 6-percent surcharge tax increase. Even a larger percentage prefers to have our economic problem resolved by reducing nondefense spending.

The response to the proposal to transfer some of our national holidays to Monday, in order to provide the benefit of 3-day holiday weekends, was most enlightening in view of the forthcoming hearings in both the House and the Senate. The better than 2 to 1 support of the Monday Holiday bill appears quite uniform among all age groups, as well as among those in blue-collar and white-collar occupations. However, those engaged in agriculture have little sympathy for setting Memorial Day on the last Monday in May or Veterans' Day on the first Monday in November. There is no direct explanation of this seeming indifference, but it undoubtedly indicates that for farmers and related occupations, business goes on as usual and crops and stock are to be tended, whatever the day or the date.

Responses of the 12th District citizens on other highly controversial issues, upon which the 90th Congress will act, appear in the sumary which follows. Included are such subjects as tax-sharing, tax credit allowances for private job-training programs, studies looking toward eventual United States' adoption of the metric system of weights and measures, utilization of automatic data processing by the Congress, and possible increase of East-West trade in nonstrategic goods.

In addition to the generous response to the questionnaires, the poll produced more than 5,000 individual comunications—many of which have required individual replies. These personal expressions indicate the broad citizen interest throughout the 12th Congressional District in our national affairs.

The conscientious responses submitted by almost 16,000 residents of the 12th Illinois District are attached for the information and possible guidance of other Members of the House. I can assure my constituents and you, Mr. Speaker, that appropriate respect for these opinions will be reflected in the votes which I cast during the remaining months of this 90th Congress.

The questions and the tabulated results are:

General questions

[In percent]

	Percent	Yes	No	No answer
1. Do you favor tax sharing (remitting percent of Federal taxes to State and local governments with no strings attached)?		57.8	35.8	6.4
2. Do you favor President Johnson's request for a 6-percent (surcharge) income tax increase?		9.4	87.7	2.9
If not, which do you prefer:				
(a) Reducing nondefense spending?	89.8			
(b) Adding to the national debt?	5.6			
No answer	4.6			
3. Do you favor more 3-day holidays by setting Memorial Day and Independence Day on Mondays?		68.7	27.7	3.6
Answer by age group:				
Age 20 to 35		69.3	28.6	2.1
Age 35 to 50		70.0	27.4	2.6
Age 50 and over		67.6	27.5	4.9
Answer by occupation group:				
Blue collar		68.1	28.9	3.0
White collar		73.5	23.2	3.3
Agriculture		36.5	56.4	7.1
Professional		67.0	29.9	3.1
4. Do you favor an income tax credit for employers providing job training programs?		65.6	29.4	4.8
5. Do you favor a study of possible adoption by the United States of the metric system of weights and measures?		59.6	34.4	6.0
6. If a satisfactory peace in Vietnam is not negotiated soon, which courses of action do you prefer?				

	Total	Vote preference group			Age group			Occupation group			
		Rebublican	Democrat	Independent	20 to 35	35 to 50	50 and over	Blue collar	White collar	Agricultural	Professional
(a) Withdrawal of U.S. forces even if a Communist takeover results	7.3	6.6	7.7	8.8	5.6	6.9	8.9	5.7	6.0	8.0	10.3
(b) Maintain areas now controlled by South Vietnam Government by holding actions	7.0	6.1	9.7	8.1	7.3	6.9	6.9	4.4	6.3	3.9	10.8
(c) Apply sufficient U.S. military power to clear South Vietnam of Communist aggressors	62.9	66.1	56.7	59.2	67.1	64.4	59.1	65.5	66.1	60.8	57.6
(d) No increase of ground forces but wider use of air and sea power	9.7	10.5	7.3	8.8	8.8	9.6	10.5	11.0	9.4	11.8	8.7
(e) Halt the bombing and shelling of North Vietnam unconditionally	2.6	1.7	3.5	3.9	1.8	2.3	3.2	2.7	2.5	3.9	2.0
(f) Continue present policy	8.2	6.7	13.6	9.3	8.2	8.0	8.5	8.6	7.8	8.9	8.3
No answer	2.3	2.3	1.5	1.9	1.2	1.9	2.9	2.1	1.9	2.7	2.3

	Yes	No	No answer
7. Do you favor removing the "earnings limitation" which now reduces the benefits of those on social security who earn extra wages?			
Total	79.8	17.7	2.5
Age 20 to 35	74.4	23.2	2.4
Age 35 to 50	80.5	17.3	2.2
Age 50 and over	82.7	14.5	2.8
8. Do you favor establishing a 3d U.S. mint in Lake or Cook County to meet the Nation's continuing need for more coins?	67.6	25.0	7.4
9. Do you favor establishment of an automatic data processing facility to provide Congress with ready access to better information?	76.3	17.3	6.4
10. Do you favor increased East-West trade in nonstrategic goods?	57.5	37.8	4.7

Personal questions

	Number	Percent
1. Occupation group:		
(a) Blue collar	3,109	19.6
(b) White collar	6,852	43.2
(c) Agriculture	337	2.1
(d) Professional	4,403	27.8
(e) No reply	1,153	7.3
2. Age group		
(a) Age 20 to 35	3,425	21.6
(b) Age 35 to 50	6,306	39.8
(c) Age 50 and over	5,587	35.2
(d) No reply	536	3.4
3. Vote preference group:		
(a) Republican	9,473	59.8
(b) Democrat	1,725	10.8
(c) Independent	3,805	24.0
(d) No reply	851	5.4

Note.—Total questionnaires tabulated, 15,854.

If There Were Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1967

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Lithgow Osborne, an eminent newspaperman and publisher of the Citizen-Advertiser of Auburn, N.Y., on June 6, published an editorial entitled "If There Were Union." In it he dealt with the Middle East crisis which continues to perplex the western world and illustrates how the problem would have been met had the nations of NATO been federated along the lines suggested by Clarence K. Streit, author of "Union Now."

Here is the text of Mr. Osborne's excellent editorial:

IF THERE WERE UNION

War in the Middle East finds NATO a shambles with its members divided.

Unity would exist if Clarence K. Streit's proposal for Federal Union of the free North Atlantic countries had been listened to and acted on.

What has happened to NATO proves Streit's contention that alliances between countries which tenaciously cling to so-called "national sovereignty," are never enduring. Never have been and never can be. Alliances are formed to meet a crisis; once the crisis passes—or seems to pass—the strength of the alliance also passes.

After nearly 20 years, the unity among the Western democracies which would enable Arab aggression to be dealth with—or which would have prevented its ever arising—is obviously lacking.

Streit, a seasoned newspaperman and correspondent of the New York *Times* at the League of Nations, wrote and published "Union Now" in 1939. In it he advocated a federation of the free peoples bordering the North Atlantic as the only sure way of protecting themselves against totalitarian aggression as practiced by Nazi Germany, Communist Russia and Fascist Italy.

"Union Now" was printed in millions of copies and dozens of languages. The war came and the aftermaths of war. Streit's ideas survived because they became even more valid with the threat of Western civilization posed by the rise of an expansionist Russia as the dominating power in Europe.

Streit's proposals received the support of many leading statesmen here and abroad. These included U.S. Supreme Court Justice Owen Roberts, John Foster Dulles—but only before he became Secretary of State—and Christian A. Herter, Congressman and Governor of Massachusetts and later Secretary of State and many others, including hard-boiled senators.

Streit's basic thesis was relatively simple. Federations, as compared to alliances, can endure between peoples with similar political philosophies; and they will bring greater strength to those who participate—as witness the American Federation of 13 quarrelling states in 1789, the Swiss Federal Republic consisting of four ethnic strains speaking different languages, the union of Australian States, the union of the two different ethnic and lingual sections of Canada.

"Union Now" proposed a federation between the countries bordering the Atlantic, confined in the first instance to those which had had long and successful experience in popular representative government. In domestic matters each member should be free to have whatever political forms it chose. For instance, England, the Low Countries and the Scandinavian Countries could remain monarchies. But the federal Atlantic government should be responsible for the conduct of foreign affairs and defense; and there should be free trade throughout the United States of Atlantica, and a common currency.

The North Atlantic Alliance seemed a start in that direction. In the present crisis, it is divided and impotent—as Streit predicted. The United States and the other Atlantic democracies face the Arab-Israeli war with no common policy and without the strength that unity brings.

In the modern world, national sovereignty, as we have known it, is an anachronism and a dangerous illusion. The free world has paid and is paying a high price for its continuing worship of this clay-footed idol. It is likely to pay a still higher price.

Thoreau's Message After 150 Years

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1967

Mr. MORSE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, on July 12 we marked the 150th anniversary of the birth of Henry David Thoreau, the Concord, Mass., writer and exponent of civil disobedience. In the New York Times of July 15, Brooks Atkinson noted the irony and wisdom of the decision of the U.S. Post Office to issue a commemorative stamp in honor of the occasion. I include the article in the RECORD at this point.

THOREAU'S MESSAGE AFTER 150 YEARS

(By Brooks Atkinson)

By issuing a commemorative stamp for the 150th anniversary of the birth of Henry David Thoreau (July 12, 1817), the Government has performed a magnanimous deed. No one has ever spoken more contemptuously of government than Thoreau. It is impossible, he said, to be associated with "this American Government" without being disgraced.

His bitterness was provoked, one, by the Mexican war, to which in his opinion "the people would not have consented" at the outset; and, two, the institution of slavery. Denouncing the Mexican war, he declared that the time had come for honest men to rebel. Concerning slavery, he remarked. "This question is still to be settled—this Negro question, I mean: the end of that is not yet."

In 1967 the Vietnam war and the struggle for civil rights represent two ideas that alienated him from society in the nineteenth century.

When the Fugitive Slave Law of 1850 compelled Massachusetts to acquiesce in the institution of slavery Thoreau stepped up his opposition: "My thoughts are murder to the State and involuntarily go plotting against her." Although he spoke those words in special circumstances in 1854 they sound just as violent today. Perhaps the United States Post Office Department did not make a search of Thoreau's works before it commissioned Leonard Baskin to design the commemorative stamp.

YANKEE ATTITUDES

In the 150 years since Thoreau's death his reputation has undergone a complete right-about-face. James Russell Lowell doubted that Thoreau had a healthy mind. Robert Louis Stevenson rejected him as a prig and a skulker. In those days Emerson was the accepted Yankee philosopher; his optimism and benevolence expressed the mood of the time. During most of his life Thoreau lived in the shadow of his illustrious neighbor; and the sale of his works was overshadowed by the sale of Emerson's works for many years after both of them had died.

But the situation changed between the two World Wars. It appeared that Thoreau had been telling the truth all along. It was true that most men lead lives of quiet desperation. It was true that we live in a hurry with a waste of life. In his own time most people regarded Thoreau as a misanthrope and curmudgeon—ludicrous, harebrained, eccentric, clownish, to use adjectives that were flung at him.

But his "Civil Disobedience," which he—a very provincial Yankee—wrote at the age of 31, became a handbook for Gandhi and at one time for the British Labor party in this century, and it has been a strong influence in the civil rights movement of the last few years. "Unjust laws exist," he exclaimed. "Shall we be content to obey them . . . or shall we transgress them at once?" That anarchic stance had already cost Thoreau one rather folksy night in jail, but since then it has sent a lot of other people to less neighborly jails all over the world.

He was a militant solitary. When Emerson asked him to attend a Saturday Club meeting in the Parker House in Boston, Thoreau replied that the only room in Boston he visited with alacrity was in the Fitchburg Depot where he could get a train to take him out of town. Now many of his admirers and followers attend meetings in his honor.

Today the Thoreau Society, which was founded in 1941, will hold its annual meeting in Concord, visit Walden Pond and discuss the rather prickly man who lived there from 1845 to 1847 in a small house he built with his own hands. The members of the society are invited to visit with a second Thoreau organization—the Thoreau Lyceum at 48 Belknap Street, which would like to raise enough money to buy the land next door where, in the so-called "Texas" house, Thoreau lived with his mother, father and sisters before the family pencil business succeeded.

LIVED AS HE PREACHED

And so there are two paradoxes about him. The Government that Thoreau despised has issued a commemorative stamp in his honor; and a society of cultivated Americans meets every year to do homage to a man who avoided meetings. The paradoxes can be accounted for very simply. Thoreau lived the life he preached with incomparable purity; and he wrote a classic that contains not only his philosophy of independence but great valor, great knowledge and wisdom, great beauty and cautious hope.

It took eight years to sell the 2,000 copies of the first edition of "Walden" that appeared in 1854. Probably two thousand copies of "Walden" are now sold every week. An obscure citizen of Concord has become a powerful American. As he phrased it: "Any man more right than his neighbors constitutes a majority of one already"—a bold nineteenth century maxim that has turned out to be prophecy.

The Courage Demanded on the Battlefield

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1967

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, an editorial appeared in the Alameda, Calif., Times Star on Wednesday, June 28, which I feel should be of great interest to all.

It is entitled "An Alamedan Displays Courage," and relates the experience of Bruce Skelly, of Alameda, while acting as leader of a U.S. Army fireteam near Khanh Duong, South Vietnam.

I commend it to your reading:

AN ALAMEDAN DISPLAYS COURAGE

A 22-year-old Alamedan has been honored for displaying courage in the face of a situation that would have filled the hearts of many with terror.

Bruce Skelly, son of Dr. and Mrs. Frank Skelly, 1726 San Jose Ave., Alameda, while leader of a U.S. Army fire team that was under intense fire near Khanh Duong. South Vietnam, ran forward despite heavy fire to retrieve a wounded member of his fire team.

Alhough wounded by a bullet which was deflected from striking his heart by a Bible in his breast pocket, Skelly returned to his post and continued to direct his fire team while receiving medical aid. Then he walked the three-hour journey through woody terrain so that other wounded men could be borne on litters to the evacuation zone.

It may not sound like much recited on paper, but there are not too many people who would like to live through it.

In addition to displaying extraordinary bravery, Skelly, like hundreds of thousands of young Americans, went through long months in the combat zone without relief, bothered by all the minor irritations, ticks, heat, aching limbs, and by the constant fear of the unseen enemy.

That young Americans are able to withstand these terrors and to display such courage shows that they just as their predecessors, are not lacking the courage demanded on the battlefield.

We salute them for their courage and we hope for the day when it will no longer be necessary.

Mrs. Pellegreno's Flight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1967

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to be present in Newton, Kans., on Sunday, July 9, 1967, when 8,500 citizens welcomed Mrs. Ann Pellegreno on her return from an around-the-world flight on which she followed the route of Kansas aviatrix Amelia Earhart. State and National leaders were among those who gathered at the Municipal Airport in Newton, Kans., for the Amelia Earhart flight commemoration celebration, and I thought it would be especially fitting at this time to include in the RECORD the following editorial that appeared in the Wichita Eagle on Tuesday, July 11, 1967:

MRS. PELLEGRENO'S FLIGHT

The adventuresome round-the-world flight of Mrs. Ann Pellegreno, celebrated in Newton Sunday, not only captured the imagination of people everywhere, but it proved at least two things.

Because the pilot is a woman, it demonstrated to the satisfaction of all the allegedly gentler sex that a woman is quite as competent at the controls as a man, and the ladies are reasonably bucked up by this assurance.

More important, it demonstrated the progress made in aircraft instrumentation in the past 30 years.

Mrs. Pellegreno's plane was an identical twin of the one in which Amelia Earhart attempted the same flight in 1937. But it had the modern instruments that the Atchison aviatrix lacked. Mrs. Pellegreno made it. Miss Earhart did not.

Perhaps the lack of instrumentation was not the only reason Miss Earhart was lost. As to that, we'll probably never know for certain. But the Michigan housewife's flight did show beyond question that the new instruments make flying far easier and safer than it used to be.

Mrs. Pellegreno doesn't know as yet whether she has been able to cast any light on the disappearance of Miss Earhart. But whether she does or doesn't, her flight is nevertheless memorable.

Antiriot Bill

SPEECH

OF

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 13, 1967

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, in last Thursday's New York Times, Mr. Tom Wicker discussed in a perceptive way the so-called antiriot bill which will be coming before the House later this week. His article gives a useful perspective on the whole problem of riots and points out the virtual irrelevance of this proposed legislation.

I commend the article to my colleagues and other readers of the RECORD:

IN THE NATION: THE DEADLIEST POLLUTION

(By Tom Wicker)

WASHINGTON, July 12.—The other day in Cincinnati the Rev. Fred Shuttlesworth—once a lieutenant of Martin Luther King in the nonviolent upheavals in the South—told Gene Roberts of this newspaper that the basic reason Negroes rioted was that "they say, 'we've already tried nonviolence and we're still where we are.' "

Even Senator Edward Brooke of Massachusetts, always a moderate, warned at the N.A.A.C.P. convention in Boston this week that the failure of public officials to respond adequately to the needs of Negroes was "an invitation to violence." And Roy Wilkins, who has risked his leadership to stand for reason and understanding, told the N.A.A.C.P. that Congress's refusal to pass open housing and other needed legislation was "creating the atmosphere" for violence.

IS GRATITUDE DUE?

This will outrage those whites who believe that the civil rights legislation of recent years ought to have "satisfied" the Negroes, and that "these people" are only proving themselves beastly ingrates by rioting in the streets. The fact is, however, that all that legislation has yet to produce real gains for ghetto Negroes in employment, housing or education; and while Southern Negroes finally have the right to vote and eat grits in the local cafe, and a small percentage of them can even send their children to adequate schools, why should they be grateful for that? What gratitude is due a thief who steals your money, keeps it for a few generations, then grudgingly gives a little of it back under court order?

LONG COLD WINTER

During this season's rioting in Buffalo, Mayor Frank Sedita pleaded for "just a few days" to find jobs for unemployed Negroes. He was willing enough to find jobs to *end* violence in the long, hot summer; but why had jobs not been found to *prevent* violence in what Martin Luther King calls the "the long cold winter"?

In an even more myopic answer—or nonanswer—to the ghetto, the House may bravely pass this week an "anti-riot" bill that would make it possible to jail and fine anybody who crosses a state line "with intent to incite street violence and rioting."

This political popgun is aimed squarely at Stokely Carmichael, described by its sponsor, Cramer of Florida, as a giant of a fellow whose itinerant rabble-rousing has left in its wake "thousands of Negroes whose blood is simmering and waiting for a chance to riot."

Even assuming that Carmichael and other supermen actually caused the trouble in Los Angeles, Cleveland, New York, Chicago, Rochester, Buffalo, Tampa, Lincoln, and points west; even assuming that local authorities could not, in that case, deal with them in the manner of Atlanta, which put Carmichael in jail; even assuming the constitutionality of the bill's language and intent; even assuming all these dubious propositions, the truth of this bill still is to be found in the words of Representative Celler of New York, who at least tried to block it.

Nevertheless, he confessed to the Committee on Rules, "I don't want to be in a position of opposing this bill."

That is what Shuttlesworth and Brooke and Wilkins, none of whom ever threw a Molotov cocktail or stoned a loanshark's office, were talking about. A Congress representing a dominantly white society, that will not pass even a diluted open-housing law or provide increased protection for civil rights workers, but which does not "want to be in a position of opposing" a demagogic antiriot bill, is unlikely to persuade unemployed, slum-dwelling, poorly educated, often ill-fed and ill-clad Negroes that they can get relief from the law before they can get it in the streets.

SQUEAKY WHEELS

Shuttlesworth told Roberts about a new park being built in the riot area of Cincinnati. "A lot of people think they got that because of rioting, and I think they are right," he said. "Nonviolence didn't get it."

And the final tragedy is that while violence produces jobs in Buffalo and a park in Cincinnati, it also produces untold hatred and suffering and bitterness. Thus white myopia and black despair work together to pollute a nation's soul.

Ted Yates' Fire Team

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1967

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the late Ted Yates had been a Marine, and as a Marine had operated as a unit of a fire team, a group of men, each with a specific assignment in an assault on an enemy strong point. He carried this method of operation into his reporting assignments for NBC and under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article by Charles Hoagland of NBC about Ted Yates' fire team in the Middle East.

[From the White House News Photographer, June 1967]

HOAGLAND DESCRIBES MIDDLE EAST FIGHTING—CALLS BATTLE FIERCE, DAMAGE DEVASTATING; TED YATES KILLED DURING FIRE FIGHT IN JERUSALEM

(By Charles A. Hoagland, NBC)

Ted Yates liked to call us a "fire team." We had made some pretty spectacular trips together and could work as a smooth unit. With Ted as producer director, Jim Norling as cameraman and me as sound engineer, we had traveled South America, and in Santo Domingo, put together what proved to be the 1966 WHNPA Grand Prize winner. We had also worked together on the Guatamala guerilla fighter story and were happy with the results.

Now we were heading for a three month stay in the Middle East. The plan was to spend three months in the area doing two one-hour documentaries from both the Arab side and the Israeli positions. Added to the team were Bob Rogers as associate producer, Carl Robinson as unit manager and Fred Tepper as electrician.

When we arrived in Cairo late in May, we realized the situation was much worse than most people at home knew. It didn't take long to figure that the shooting could start at any moment. Still, we tried to go ahead and function as best we could.

We covered everything in Cairo that the Egyptians would allow, but it was mostly straight stuff with the Government controlling and managing everything we did.

When King Hussein of Jordan arrived on the scene and signed a pact with Nasser, we realized that there wasn't much point in staying in Cairo. So, planning to return later, we took off for Amman, Jordan.

Just a few hours after our arrival, we got our first dose of the anti-American feelings in the Middle East. We covered a rally for the head of the radical Palestine Liberation Group who had just been returned from exile in Beirut. The rally was violently anti-American and particularly nasty in denouncing President Johnson.

On June 5th, we left Amman to film a sequence in an Arab refugee camp in Jericho. As we drove through the Dead Sea area, we noticed a heavy concentration of tanks, guns, trucks, communications setups and all the other ingredients of war. Despite all this, life seemed to be going on and people were trying to act normal.

Trying to work the camp was a lost cause. We were told that the hostility directed toward us was "because of the present situation." Then in mid-morning, we were notified that the war had started and Cairo was being bombed.

We assumed that the military forces we had seen would move toward Jerusalem, so Ted sent Carl back to Amman to set up communications there. The rest of us headed for the Intercontinental Hotel in Jerusalem to establish a headquarters there. The hotel which is in Jordan, is on the Mount of Olives, overlooking the old city. It is high on a hill and gave us a vantage point overlooking both the Arab and Israeli sectors of the city.

When we arrived, we found another NBC crew at work filming the last guests leaving the hotel. It was being taken over by the Jordanian government and most of the civilians were being removed.

Things were still fairly quiet at this point. Our drivers were translating the news from the radio, and there was still no word that Jordan had entered the war. The hotel was in a state of confusion with the moving of the people out, and we considered it a major victory to find some breakfast. It was a short lived victory, however, as we were interrupted with the news that the war had come to the Intercontinental.

We ran downstairs, picked up our gear and rushed outside and started filming. Ted and I were in the garden area in front of the hotel, facing the old walled city. We crouched down, and could hear machine gun bullets whizzing by. Ted had just finished a bit on camera when the lead really started to fly, so we beat a hasty retreat to the upper driveway of the hotel where the rest of the crew was.

Then all hell broke loose and we were smack in the middle of a fire fight. We all hit the deck. Ted, Jim and I were in the driveway area near the hotel, with our only protection a five inch curb. Bob and Fred made it behind one of the cars parked in the driveway. At the front of the hotel, at the edge of the driveway, there were a number of columns. Jim had a camera set up on a tripod near one of them. When the barrage started, and everyone fell flat, Ted and Jim were head to head on the ground.

Then something happened. Ted either tried to change positions or raised up momentarily. I heard Jim yell, "My God, Ted's been hit." So many things were happening so fast that we didn't know how badly he had been hurt. We all tried to scramble, but when the power went off during the fire fight, the doors of the hotel locked electrically. Someone threw a potted plant through the glass door and several of the boys made it inside the hotel. I was pinned down and couldn't move in any direction.

A short time later there was a lull in the fighting and we were able to get four men to crawl out and pull Ted into the hotel. He was alive but badly wounded. Meanwhile, Bob Rogers with the aid of a Jordanian soldier flagged down an ambulance and was able to get Ted to a hospital. He was well cared for, on an operating table less than an hour after being hit, but it was all in vain. He died later that night.

I joined the rest of the crew in the employes' quarters in the lower part of the hotel. It was about the safest place there was since the entire front of the place was glass and one close hit could have cut a man to sheds. It wasn't until later in the afternoon that we were able to get out gear from in front of the hotel and start working again.

One of the things we filmed was an Israeli air attack on nearby positions. We noted that the Israeli pilots never dropped their wingtip tanks. They made all of their approaches close to the ground and straight out of the sun. The Jordanian troops didn't see them until they were hit. The Israeli pilots were obviously well trained in their work. They destroyed positions with greater effectiveness. One of the planes was shot down by ground fire during the attack.

Following the air raid, things quieted down for a while—until nightfall. Then it started all over again.

Make no mistake; it was a six day war, but not a phony war. The first 48 hours held some of the most vicious and terrible fighting and dying imaginable.

That night there was no sleep. Mortars, machine guns, bombs and flares all through the night. The firing was steady and was more intense than earlier in the day.

At first light, we decided to make a break for Amman. Just as we were about to leave the firing swerved in our direction again and we took several rounds near our car. We had to retreat again to the hotel.

Then the radio announced that American and British planes were helping the Israeli Air Force. The once friendly faces turned very unfriendly. During the first hours of the shooting, the radio had broadcast many reports of spectacular Arab victories, and the Jordanians were naturally elated. Their elation made things easier for us.

Yet, through our field glasses some strange things were going on. Jordanian tanks and jeeps had suddenly disappeared from view. Then the Jordanian flag atop the museum was lowered and the Star of David was raised. Then some villagers passed by the hotel saying, strangely enough, that the Israeli army was approaching.

The reports of the victories then changed to charges of U.S.-British intervention.

We knew the time had come to get out of there before we were shot by our once helpful friends. Even our drivers, who had been through a lot with us, refused to have anything to do with us. The situation was ugly and getting steadily worse.

The NBC hard-news crew had managed to get one car out by the wall of the hotel and we made a break for it. There were seven of us who piled into that small car to head for Amman.

This was one of the hairiest rides I have ever had. It started with our having to run a gauntlet of fire between the Jordanian and Israeli positions to get to the main Jordan road. As we drove onto the road, a round exploded right over our heads—we thought the car roof would be blown off. This was the first of many close ones.

There was only one way back—through the Dead Sea area. As we drove, the Israeli Air Force came in with pass after pass against Jordanian armor. Everytime we heard an airplane, we dove from the car until the plane had passed over. We spent a lot of time in ditches beside the road.

Over the entire route, we passed nothing but burned out or burning trucks, jeeps, tanks and command posts. This was the story all the way from Jerusalem to the Jordan River. The accuracy of the Israeli pilots was incredible. They hit the vehicles but nothing else. We saw only one crater in the road on the entire trip, and it had several burned out trucks in it.

The trip was to prove a prelude to what we were to experience in the city. As we arrived at the outskirts of Amman, we were stopped by a policeman who informed us that Amman was being bombed. We finally fought our way into the city and back to our hotel. We were immediately warned by the U.S. Embassy people to remain at the hotel—the situation was a bad one for Americans—they were pretty unpopular. We remained under virtual house arrest for about four days.

As the war news got worse, they harassed us more. Our cameraman Jim Howard had his radio confiscated—he was accused of transmitting information to the enemy. Bob Connally, NBC correspondent, was charged with taking pictures during an air raid, but Bob never owned a camera in his life. Each day a different crew would be accused of something and hustled into the police station for questioning. We couldn't prove it, but we're sure that during air raids, when we all had to go to shelters, things were taken from our personal effects.

Then on Sunday, June 10th, about 1,000 of us were loaded on trucks, busses and station wagons and taken to the airport. They carefully drove us around the outskirts of the city so that we couldn't get a look at anything that might be going on.

We were flown out and landed in Teheran, Iran.

Somewhere in Jerusalem there sit several cameras and recorders we hope to see again someday. In the hotel in Amman there sits, presumably, 48 other pieces of equipment and supplies, that we really don't expect to see again.

Now we're back and on the job. There are more documentaries to come. But the fire team isn't the same—our champion is gone.

Prevent Trouble in the Streets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. TUNNEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1967

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Art Townsend, editor of the Precinct Reporter, in an editorial on May 25, 1967, points out the moderate and constructive course to be followed by communities to prevent trouble in the streets during the summer. I commend to the attention of all the Members this article:

PREVENT TROUBLE IN THE STREETS

Common sense dictates that we should act responsibly now rather than wait and react to incidents that may happen this Summer. To act responsibly now means that the city fathers should plan and impliment programs of action that would benefit and involve the youth in wholesome activities.

It is not enough to say there will be expanded recreation opportunities this Summer. The recreation Summer programs should be thoroughly publicized, special efforts should be made to contact the teenage segment of our population and solicit its active participation, and these programs should be well supervised.

It has been suggested that a community relation bureau be established in all local law enforcement agencies. It is important that confidence in our police be rejuvenated, and that the citizenry be reassured that law enforcement officers are there to protect them rather than to do harm and to harrass. To accomplish this, there must be greater contact and a greater degree of good rapport between law enforcement agencies and the people.

Other communities should follow the lead of the city of Hemet and do a thorough survey of facilities (public and private) that could be utilized in helping the teenage segment of the population. The chances of incidents involving teenagers this Summer could and should be minimized. But, it cannot be done solely by using longer and harder night sticks by the police. It cannot be done solely by increasing the number of police officers. It cannot be done by preaching to the teen-ager. The adult population must show that it is willing to face reality, that it does recognize the problems of our teen-agers, that it is willing to cooperate in working with the teen-ager to solve their problems. The adult population must show the teen-agers that it cares and wants to help.

The local merchant and other possible employers of the teen-ager must stop discriminating against the teen-ager and show their willingness to work with the youngsters from all sections of town and without regards to race, creed or conomic status in life. Solutions to problems confronting the teen-ager must be of concern to the total community. Official city fathers in all communities must assume the leadership and give official sanction to a total effort. A stitch in time will save nine. . . If we act responsibly now, we will not have to react to incidents involving teen-agers this Summer. The youngsters, in many thousands of ways, have issued a challenge. The adult population, accepting and facing reality, can and must meet the challenge and make this a better community for all citizens to live in.

Minnesotans Share "Adventure in Christian Service"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1967

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, nearly 2 years ago I was pleased to meet the Sheldon Sandager family of Hills, Minn., here in Washington. They were en route overseas to do volunteer work in the program called World Brotherhood Exchange. The July issue of Lutheran Witness carries a most interesting article about the inspiring work of this exceptional family. As author James Hoxeng points out:

> To take two years off, pay their own way, and learn to work in a foreign culture requires a real leap of faith.

I am proud to include the article about my constituents for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

ADVENTURE IN CHRISTIAN SERVICE

(By James Hoxeng)

When parents consider travel, five kids can pose a problem. When the prospect is to travel halfway around the world for a year of work at an agricultural experiment station and hospital complex in Ethiopia, the problem begins to look insurmountable. And when one considers spending a whole year away from home and job just to do something for nothing—it's absurd!

But that's exactly what the Sheldon Sandagers of Hills, Minn., decided to do. In August 1965 they and their children set out for the ancient kingdom of Ethiopia, a land they had never seen. They became volunteer workers in the program known as World Brotherhood Exchange (WBE).

This summer the Sandagers are completing their second year of service in Ethiopia. They had intended to stay just one but because of the need agreed to remain another year.

LEAP OF FAITH

Sheldon teaches Ethiopian farmers about modern agricultural methods, fertilizers, machinery, and the like, while Elnora, a registered nurse, filled in at the Selek-leka hospital during a time when the staff badly needed assistance. Their five youngsters, from Beth, 16, down to Mike 6, attend Good Shepherd School in Addis Adaba. (Beth has now graduated and attends Beirut Women's College in Lebanon.)

True, the Sandagers are an exceptional family. To take 2 years off, pay their own way, and learn to work in a foreign culture requires a real "leap of faith."

It would be untrue, however, to say that these people are unique. For years—yes, centuries—some people have been doing almost exactly what the World Brotherhood Exchange program is now challenging Christians to do. On their own, certain rugged individualists have gone forth to help others in the human family in the cause of advancing Christ's kingdom on earth. They have built, plowed, taught, healed, and preached. And they asked nothing in return.

Asking nothing in return is the singular and beautiful hallmark which distingushes WBE and a growing number of similar programs. Volunteers pay their own travel costs to and from the place they serve—and for some who take their families along this is no mean sum! While they serve, they receive free housing and sometimes a subsistence allowance from the host church or mission. Essentially, however, their service is gratuitous. The only tangible "reward" comes in the form of a small wall plaque recognizing their participation in the program.

NEW GRASP OF OLD IDEA

The World Brotherhood Exchange program was incorporated in 1961 as an independent agency for the recruitment and placement of people like the Sandagers. Under the guidance of Pastor Conrad S. Braaten, founder and executive director, WBE worked mainly with the through The American Lutheran Church.

Speaking at banquets, at meetings of organizations, and from church pulpits, Pastor Braaten pointed to both the vast need for direct volunteer Christian help and the tremendous potential extant in our congregations across the continent to meet that need. Here was a chance, WBE spokesmen urged, for 20th-century Christians to get a new grasp of what it means to be the *laos*, the people of God. For 5 years WBE continued as an independent agency serving mainly ALC fields.

Then on January 1 of this year WBE became an office in the Division of Mission Services of the newly formed Lutheran Council in the U.S.A. As a part of this cooperative agency WBE now challenges and recruits Lutheran lay people to offer themselves for service on mission fields and in indigenous churches in emerging areas of the world.

By its nature the business of voluntary service leads to crossing synodical and denominational borders. The needs are specific and demand skills and backgrounds which are often available only in a broad market. WBE thus takes its place as the Lutheran program of short-term voluntary service among several such church-related programs in operation today.

ALMOST ANTHING—FOR NOTHING

Since 1961 more than 180 volunteers plus their dependents have traveled under WBE auspices to missions and the young churches around the world to give of themselves. What do these people do? "Almost anything" might be the most appropriate answer.

WBE volunteers have served as secretaries, superintendents, builders, dentists, publishers, printers, librarians, mechanics, nurses, teachers, technicians, administrators, electricians, physicians, and in other capacities. The general rule is that they go somewhere far from home—to do what they're good at—for a little while—for nothing.

Workers stay from less than 2 months to more than 2 years. They work wherever there are ongoing projects or programs which need their help. As an office in the Lutheran Council in the U.S.A. it would be possible for WBE to place volunteers in any of the fields of the participating bodies or in others if there is no appropriate Lutheran placement opportunity.

RESPONSE TO FELT NEED

Why did this program come into being? The answer can only be: it is a response to a felt need. From many countries, but especially from North America, people are reaching out in active concern for the physical and spiritual well-being of others.

The seemingly irrational impulse to go a long distance to do something for nothing for a little while and then come home—it can be persuasively argued—is a real reponse to the Holy Spirit's prodding. (And it needn't be a long way in terms of actual miles either, for the number of miles between, let us say urban California and an Arizona Navajo reservation, scarcely measures the gulf between them.)

Much is being done; much more can be done. Few know this better than the Sandagers' family back in Minnesota. It is no accident that Sheldon's brother Victor and his family are planning to leave for a year's service as soon as Sheldon and family return this summer.

J. Arthur Younger

SPEECH

OF

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 13, 1967

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, the recent passing of J. ARTHUR YOUNGER leaves everyone who knew him with a deep and personal sense of loss. To know ART was to respect him and admire his many admirable qualities. ART was a big man in every sense. He was big physically; had a big, warm smile that seemed to take in the whole world. ART was big in the sense that he never denigrated the accomplishments of others. In a word, ART was what we would all like to be in Congress.

J. ARTHUR YOUNGER faithfully served the 11th District of California for nearly 15 years. He served all of America as well. As second-ranking minority member of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, he came to be recognized as an expert in the fields of domestic and international trade and commercial law.

ART was a conservative in the best sense of the word. He knew that government cannot do everything for the individual. ART realized that most of our problems can be solved through individual initiative.

Yet, he was a most progressive Member of Congress. ART was the "father" of the Department of Housing and Urban Development. Shortly after being elected to the House, J. ARTHUR YOUNGER introduced a bill for the establishment of a Cabinet-level Department of Urbiculture to be devoted to the problems of welfare of city dwellers. He was ahead of his time and the bill was defeated. But it was the inspiration for the eventual creation of the new Department of Housing and Urban Development.

ART was an exceptionally hard worker. He was nearly always the first to arrive at any meeting of a committee or subcommittee. ART did his homework and was one of the best informed members of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. He always carried more than his share of the load. His questioning during hearings was to the point. His invaraible courtesy to witnesses made the work easier and more significant.

It was my great privilege to serve with ART on the Republican Task Force on Education. Members of the task force constantly turned to him for advice and guidance in this extremely vital area. His long experience and deep understanding of the importance of education to the life of the Nation, contributed materially to the success of the task force.

It was my privilege to be associated with ART at the weekly prayer breakfasts in the House. If any Member of the House deserved the encomium "Christian gentleman," it was J. ARTHUR YOUNGER. His sincere Christian beliefs illuminated every facet of his life.

I was struck by what my colleague, Mr. HUNT, said of his first meeting with ART. Our late colleague from California told Mr. Hunt that there would be many moments when he would be perplexed and would wish guidance on a vote. ART told Mr. Hunt:

> I want to tell you that emblazoned over the Speaker's rostrum there are inscribed the truest words ever spoken, "In God We Trust" and when the moment arises, place your trust in your God as I have all these years.

ART lived and functioned by placing his trust in God.

Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in expressing sympathy to his wife, Norma, and to the other members of his family.

Congressman Horton Praises Damascus Temple, A.A.O.N.M.S.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK HORTON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 17, 1967

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues are surely aware, Washington was the host city last week to the 93d Imperial Council of the Ancient Arabic Order, Nobles of the Mystic Shrine, and to tens of thousands of Shriners.

On Wednesday, of last week, it was my pleasure to present a flag which had flown over the capitol to 3 members of the color guard of Damascus Temple, A.A.O.N.M.S. of Rochester, N.Y., the Temple to which, I am proud to say, I belong.

The members of the Damascus Temple color guard who received the flag were Nobles William D. Staples, Randall G. Beachner, and Robert J. Gabel.

They are three of the more than 400 Damascus Temple Shriners who were on the pilgrimage to the national convention.

Damascus Temple is the second oldest temple in the Shrine jurisdiction. Its charter is dated in 1875.

Because of its seniority, Damascus Temple was one of the first units whose colorful band and Shriners thrilled and delighted the many thousands of people who watched last Thursday night's parade up Pennsylvania Avenue.

Damascus Temple this year is under the able leadership of Potentate Clayton F. Kaul.

Potentate Kaul is assisted by these elected members of the Divan—

Chief Rabban Barton S. Horner.

Assistant Rabban James B. Scobell.

High Priest and Prophet Robert L. Anderson.

Treasurer Norman H. Selke.

Recorder John W. Cummings.

Oriential Guide Leonard Parker.

Other Shriners who head units in Damascus Temple, and who are on the pilgrimage to Washington, are—

Patrol Captain William J. Cox.

Legion of Honor Captain Le Roy Wilson.

Band Director John W. Cummings.

President of Director's Staff Douglas McLean.

Director of Director's Staff Ralph I. Oatman.

Director of Musical Unit Charles B. Benedict.

Horse Patrol President Leland Pflanz.

Horse Patrol Captain Theodore Hamilton.

Color Guard Captain Karl Lemperle.

Patrol President Charles Jack.

Chanters President Anton Hanson.

Shrine activities which the public saw last week were highlighted by the parades, and emphasized high spirits, good fellowship, and enjoyment of life.

I can attest to the enjoyable aspects of being a Shriner.

But the public is not as aware of the serious aspects of Shrine activities.

The 3,500 members of Damascus Temple in Rochester, for example, are deeply involved in the operation of two Shrine Hospitals for Crippled Children. One is located in Springfield, Mass.; the other in Erie, Pa.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to draw the attention of my colleagues to the worthy activities of the Shrine, and of Damascus Temple of Rochester, N.Y.

United States-State Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 17, 1967

Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, last week a number of my colleagues and I took the floor to discuss some of the grave problems of executive branch operations which now undermine the effectiveness of so many of our myriad Federal programs.

Our critical area in which reform is urgently needed is that of liaison and simple communications between the Federal Government and the States. Improvements in this area are especially essential as long as our 50 Governors must deal with the profusion of programs, agencies, and requirements which has sprouted in the past few years.

The present administration's efforts to improve intergovernmental liaison were assessed recently in an editorial in the Baltimore Sun of June 19. Because this editorial raises some very pertinent questions, I would like to call it to the attention of the Congress:

> UNITED STATES-STATE RELATIONS
>
> President Johnson seems as concerned about Washington's uneven relations with the 50 state capitals as with foreign capitals, and rightly so. Whether his innovations in this field prove as meritorious as his concern remains to be seen.
>
> To start with, he has seen fit for the State Department to assign an ambassador to the states. The man given this assignment is Winthrop G. Brown, former Ambassador to Seoul. It will be interesting to learn whether he finds mutual understanding more difficult to establish with American governors than with Korean generals, or less. The State Department, of course, is most properly interested in getting American foreign policy across to Americans. The chief new contribution of the Kennedy Administration was the "background briefing" for community opinion molders, a way of flattering them into listening to tedious if authoritative lectures about difficult subjects they planned to have strong opinions about. Now we get an ambassador.
>
> Mr. Johnson has had his own man on state affairs, former Gov. Farris Bryant of Florida, who liked the states so well he decided to go back to his own. The President's latest innovation, possibly to fill the gap left by Mr. Bryant, is to assign state liaison work to members of the Cabinet, possibly on the ground that they haven't enough to do, since the Cabinet no longer really functions as one.
>
> But each of these men is the top executive

of an important Federal bureaucracy, and that is a fulltime job. Neither the Secretary of Defense nor the Secretary of State should be made to worry about Iowa's highways or Montana's mental health, or even relations with the Governor of California. And the Secretaries of Health, Education and Welfare, of Housing and Urban Development and of Agriculture, who should worry about such things, should consider all the states, not just a chosen half dozen.

In the last analysis there is no end run around the departments and agencies that carry on the day-to-day relations with the states. A small coordination office might oversee their workings, to unclog bottlenecks and clear up obfuscations. The trouble with the Johnson approach is that by adding connections instead of clarifying those that exist, he might end up with even murkier waters.

Soviet Objective Is Demise of NATO

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1967

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the Copley newspaper columnist, Dumitru Danielopol, in a recent column issued a timely reminder that the prime Soviet foreign policy objective is the demise of NATO—the Atlantic alliance—and an equally helpful warning that talk of dissolving alliances as a means of pleasing Communist power centers helps the Soviet cause.

Here is the text of his column:

SOVIET OBJECTIVE IS DEMISE OF NATO

(By Dumitru Danielopol)

WASHINGTON.—Is President Johnson's foreign policy undermining Western Europe and NATO? "Western Europe is not yet won, it is disputed," said Ambassador Andre Francois Poncet in an April Paris interview. "Your adversaries are much more able, they are winning."

Nine weeks and 15 countries later I come to the conclusion that the French Academician is right. U.S. policies are hurting Western Europe and the Atlantic Alliance.

Almost everywhere one goes in Europe he realizes that anti-American sentiment is gaining impetus.

And so is neutralism.

This is particularly true in the Scandinavian countries where the Soviet Union has invested considerable money and effort to alienate Governments from the United States.

The main aim of the Russians is to destroy NATO. Norway and Denmark are particular targets.

After a similar tour last year we wrote in this column:

"It is about time President Johnson awoke to the facts that his points are just not getting across. . . .

"Until Americans realize that this struggle with world Communism is primarily a psychological struggle we are in trouble."

We are in trouble.

And it is worse than in 1966.

Communist propaganda is using the Vietnam war as a wedge to alienate us from our friends and the Administration's policies of "detente" with the Communist world have touched off a helter-skelter rush to the east among small countries. No one wants to be "left behind". Everyone listens to President Johnson's words, but seems to ignore the fact that Congress refuses to pass any east-west trade legislation.

When the President of the United States gives the impression that Communism is no longer dangerous it is bound to have effect in Europe. And that was the impression Mr. Johnson gave in his "peaceful engagement" speech last Oct. 7.

"Let us look ahead to the task that confronts the Atlantic nations," the Presiden said. "We must turn to one of the great unfinished tasks of our generation; making Europe whole." He talked of "a continent in which alliances do not confront each other in bitter hostility. . . ."

What do the Russians think of this policy of detente?

In his April Karlovy Vary speech Leonid I. Brezhnev, Secretary General of the Communist Party of the USSR, said:

"What does experience teach? It teaches in particular that the 'cold war' and confrontation of military blocs, the atmosphere of military threats seriously hamper the activity of revolutionary forces (i.e., Communism).

"In conditions of international tension in bourgeois countries, the reactionary elements become active, the military raise their heads, anti-democratic tendencies and anti-communism are strengthened."

In other words the "cold war" hinders Communist penetration in non-Communist countries, and strengthens the anti-Communist forces.

"The past few years," Brezhnev said "have shown quite clearly that in conditions of slackened international tension the pointer of the political barometer moves left . . . the increase in the influence of the West European Communist parties is most directly correlated with the reduction of the tension which has taken place in Europe."

In his own words, Brezhnev shows how fallacious is the theory that "detente" helps the West and in particular the United States.

If one still believes that the Soviet Union has abandoned the idea of a Communist Europe just listen to Brezhnev:

"The historic aim of our movement is socialism and communism. We are convinced the working class and peoples of Western Europe will sooner or later set out on the road to socialism.

"Communists of the Soviet Union . . . consider it to be their sacred duty to do all they can to facilitate the struggle of the working class . . . for peace, democracy, national independence and socialism."

In order to achieve this the Kremlin must first destroy NATO, get American troops out of Europe, the sixth fleet out of the Mediteranean.

"Let us agree now to liquidiate the military organizations . . . Brezhnev says." There is no justification whatever for the constant presence of the U.S. fleet in the water washing the shores of southern Europe."

Let's stop deluding ourselves and follow-the-leader Governments in Western Europe.

As long as there is a Communist regime in the Kremlin, a united Europe can only mean a Communist Europe.

Need for Changes in Certain HEW Practices

SPEECH

OF

HON. BENJAMIN B. BLACKBURN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1967

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, a recent report of the administrator of the Baptist Memorial Hospital in Jacksonville, Fla., has been brought to my attention. The report clearly shows the need for changes in certain practices of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. In particular, it is important to the continued independence of our hospitals that HEW cease accounting practices which result in the consumption of profits and depletion allowances by medicare.

These changes might well be accomplished through the Social Security Amendments of 1967. Accordingly, I have taken the liberty of forwarding the report to all members of the House Ways and Means Committee, together with an explanatory statement.

Because of the concern of the Nation with the effect of changes in our social security laws, I am inserting the report and my explanatory letter in the RECORD following these remarks:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., July 14, 1967.

Hon. WILBUR D. MILLS,
Chairman, Ways and Means Committee,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I have recently received a communication from the pastor of one of the leading Baptist churches in my District. He advices me that by reason of his position as a member of the executive board of the Southern Baptist Hospital Board he has become aware of certain practices by the Department of Health, Education & Welfare which were causing financial difficulties for hospitals.

Reverend Bryan Robinson, pastor of the Clairmont Hills Baptist Church in Decatur, Georgia, has forwarded me a copy of a report prepared by the Administrator of the Baptist Memorial Hospital in Jacksonville, Florida. This report points out that the Department of Health, Education & Welfare varies the percentage of reimbursement paid to hospitals for Medicare patients, so as to permit absorption by Medicare of any profits or depletion on capital equipment which the hospital may otherwise charge its paying patients. In effect, the hospital is penalized for any efficiency which might result in a profit. The hospital is also having its allowance for depletion of capital equipment assets consumed by Medicare patients. This, of course, will ultimately result in the hospital being forced to turn to the government for assistance in replacing capital assets. Such a result would further increase the power of the federal government to regulate hospitals and make management decisions. I am taking the liberty of enclosing a copy of the report for your information and advice.

I personally hope that your influence will be used to prevent any further encroachment upon the management of hospital affairs by any agency, whether State or Federal.

Sincerely,

BEN B. BLACKBURN,
Member of Congress.

BAPTIST MEMORIAL HOSPITAL,
Jacksonville, Fla., June 22, 1967.

To: Board of Directors.

Re: May, 1967 statement of admissions and patient days, balance sheet, and statement of income and expense.

The month of May continues our previous heavy schedules. We exceeded in patient days and numbers of patients a similar period last year in all areas except Intensive Care Unit.

Accounts receivable continue to be reduced in accordance with our reduction schedule. They are now at $1,117,250.00, excluding the reserve. This represents approximately 58 days of business on the books. We are endeavoring to keep this moving in the downward direction toward 45 to 50 days on the books, and should level off somewhere around a million dollars.

You will note in the Income and Expense statement we continue to experience a loss of income in the cast room. We have discovered some administrative problems in that area and are taking steps to correct them.

In all other areas we are ahead of the budget on income and behind it on expense, and hope we can maintain this balance and good financial picture to the end of the year.

The most serious financial problem we face is evident on page six of the Statement of Income and Expense under the section headed "Medicare Discounts." The Blue Cross of Florida, our fiscal intermediary with the Federal Government, has indicated to us that, based on our 1966 audit, we can only be reimbursed 83 per cent of a patient's bill on all Medicare patients. This percentage is determined by a formula developed by the Social Security Administration which is designed to reimburse the hospital for "reasonable costs" of providing the service to Medicare beneficiaries.

During our budgeting for this current year, we forecast based on 93 per cent that we would write off approximately $83,000.00 to Medicare discounts. We are now changing our forecast to show that this will be a figure near $236,000.00. In order to adjust for the eight months ending in May, we have revised this amount by $100,815.25 over and above what we already had charged to this account. By throwing all this into the month of May we actually showed a net loss in operating income during that month. Of course, it takes the effect of reducing our eight-month net experience by that amount.

We are also billing now on the basis of 83 per cent so we will not come up at the end of the year with a great amount of money to pay back to the Federal Government. The $100,000.00 represents a contingent cash liability which will be due when we are finally audited for this year's experience. We are trying to decide whether to hold that amount as a liability or to begin reimbursing the Federal Government at this time. I will report to you later on further outcome of this matter.

The House of Representatives Ways and Means Committee is considering amendments to the Social Security Act which would assist us in dealing with the Medicare program and would change, to some extent, the financial experience we are having. Congress is considering recommendations by the American Hospital Association to increase the improvement factor in the Medicare formula from 2 per cent to 10 per cent, to change some difficult administrative problems in handling outpatient accounts and accounts wherein a full-time hospital physician staff member is involved, and is considering a revision of the basic Medicare formula itself which should be beneficial to our type of operation. Congress is also considering an amendment opposed by the American Hospital Association wherein depreciation is allowed as an expense under the Medicare reimbursement formula, that the depreciation a hospital accrues because of Medicare patients would be put into a trust fund which would then be administered and spent only on benefit of the hospital after approval of a state planning agency.

When I reported this to the Executive Committee of the Board in New Orleans in June, it urged I make this information available to Mr. Harrell so he could pass it on to all members of the Board of Directors for any help they can give with congressmen from their areas of the country. Mr. Harrell and I have discussed this matter and agreed I should make this information available to you at this time in this manner. Additional reports will follow. We are in favor of the first three items and hope the Ways and Means Committee and Congress will act favorably on them. We are unalterably opposed to the matter of a state agency telling us how to spend depreciation funds and hope Congress will act unfavorably on this.

Mr. Wilson and I will have a comparative report on Medicare and non-Medicare experience of the hospitals for you in the August Board meeting.

In the meantime, we shall try to keep you informed on this and other matters.

Respectfully submitted,
GEORGE MATHEWS,
Administrator.

Trial Balloons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLARK MacGREGOR

OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 17, 1967

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, during April and May of this year the U.S. Department of Agriculture conducted a series of farm policy conferences. During the course of these sessions Secretary Freeman advanced various "trial balloons" which could conceivably result in total subjugation of the American farmer to the will of the Federal Government.

Mr. Frank Heffelfinger, of Minneapolis, president of the Grain and Feed Dealers National Association, spoke as follows of the Secretary's "trial ballooning" before the Wisconsin Feed, Seed, and Farm Supply Association in Milwaukee, Wis., June 19, 1967:

SPEECH BY FRANK HEFFELFINGER, PRESIDENT, GRAIN & FEED DEALERS NATIONAL ASSOCIATION TO WISCONSIN FEED, SEED & FARM SUPPLY ASSOCIATION, MILWAUKEE, WIS., JUNE 19, 1967

Our industry considers itself forged into an unbreakable, interdependent link with the producers—the farmers and ranchers—of this country. Many of the businesses that serve the farmer today, had their origins nearly 100 years ago when agriculture was little more than a way of life. It is obvious that they have performed valuable services for their farm customers or they would have ceased to exist many years ago.

Because of this close relationship that exists between the farmer and the grain and farm supply business, we sincerely support and encourage the efforts of the USDA and the Secretary of Agriculture to explore new ideas to improve the economic health of agriculture today. Since the Secretary said in a speech before the National Press Club in Washington, D.C., May 16, that he welcomed the comments of others as to the merit and usefulness of his ideas, I hope that he will accept my remarks in the objective manner in which they are intended. In that talk he called it "brainstorming", but I call it "trial ballooning". During the months of April and May, Secretary Freeman launched enough trial balloons across the country to make it look like the air over Memorial Stadium at the University of Minnesota at kick-off time on Homecoming Day when all the spectators release their helium filled balloons at the same moment. During these launchings, Mr. Freeman made certain inferences that in my opinion are so clearly misleading I feel they cannot go unchallenged. In Washington on April 25, referring to the 7% drop in farm prices, he said that the decline had to be endured by farmers in the face of—and I quote, "spiraling production costs from the *administered* (my emphasis) price segment of the economy".

What I object to is the use of the word "administered". I'm sorry to say that the inference is very clear that the Secretary believes there is a segment of the industry that supplies input items for the farmer and that there are absolutely no competitive pressures that exist within that segment so that everyone simply sets his price to the farmer with a handsome profit and that's all there is to it. In actual practice nothing could be further from the fact. How many times have those of you in the farm supply business seen sales tickets that a farmer will show you of, let's say, a fertilizer grade the same as the one you're selling, and everything else is equal except the price is $5/ton less 10 miles down the road.

The main purpose of the farm policy conferences conducted by the USDA in April and May was to share ideas with different groups and presumably to test reaction to ideas that have been advanced over the years for improving economic conditions on the farm. Considering that farmers are in the worst cost-price squeeze since World War II, these conferences were indeed timely. However, during the course of these meetings, Secretary Freeman advanced three plans under study in the Department—any one of which could lead to eventual subjugation of American farmers to the will of the Federal Government.

The first is a National Farm Bargaining Board established under the same authority for farmers as the National Labor Relations Act is for labor. The Board would set all the rules for a group of producers—including who would represent each producer group. The bargaining agent selected by the Board in Washington would set the prices. Finally, if the Secretary of Agriculture felt that prices were getting a little out of line he could simply order the group to discontinue its holding action and to unload. The result would be very simply to give the Office of the Secretary of Agriculture the power of a despot over the country's largest industry.

Furthermore, and even more basic in my opinion, is the fact that the idea of the Farm Bargaining Board fails to take into account one of the fundamental characteristics of farming in the first place. The one universal quality of the American farmer and rancher is his almost tenacious individualism. It goes back to the homestead days and it hasn't changed since. Now this doesn't mean he should starve to death—economically speaking—on his own farm, but it certainly doesn't mean that he should or would sell out his birthright to a Bargaining Board in Washington. A National Farm Bargaining Board would not be in the best public interest nor would it be in the best interest of the farmer. However, it would serve the purpose of concentrating inordinate amount of power in the hands of the Secretary of Agriculture.

The next specter resurrected by Mr. Freeman on his regional conferences was the Marketing Agreement. The Department again has them under study to broaden their scope and authority. What does broaden authority mean? Is it the ability to invoke marketing agreements on major commodities without grower referendum? The possibility is suggested of obtaining more flexible authority to make adjustments in producer allotments and marketing quotas. While some producer approved marketing orders are in existence today, the turkey producers and the wheat producers have lately showed how they feel about federally supervised National Marketing Agreements. In spite of this the Secretary continues to press for marketing orders as a means of strengthening American agriculture. The effect of National Marketing Orders is very simply to subsidize the inefficient producer while limiting the productivity of the efficient producer and at the expense of the consuming public. If this is an exaggeration then why did Secretary Freeman say on May 16—and I quote, "the marketing order carries within it necessary antitrust exemptions. No other adjustments are necessary to create a favorable legal climate for effective bargaining associations."

When I read those words, I was absolutely appalled. What Mr. Freeman is suggesting is legalized monopoly with his office determining who can produce what, and how much—or how little, and with his office having the final approval and veto power over the price. I submit to you that American Farmers do not need, do not want, and will summarily reject this kind of government decreed universal regimentation.

The last idea explored by the Secretary of Agriculture has to do with the possibility of Producer Marketing Boards. This would be a National Board, presumably, that would have the power to regulate production and marketing of a given commodity. It would be able to negotiate prices and other terms of sale. The farmer-rancher operating under a marketing board produces for one market and one market alone—and that is the federal government. Similar boards do exist in other countries including Canada and that's exactly what the situation is there with respect to wheat, rye and barley. And what about the structure of the marketing system in Canada? While admittedly it may be argued what caused it, nevertheless, the fact is there are virtually no small, or medium sized companies left—whether investor owned or cooperative—that are engaged in the grain marketing process in Canada.

When the Canadian farmer made the transition from an open competitive market, he gave up a lot of freedom to the Wheat Board. It now tells how much he can market, at what price and to what town it is to be delivered. He can specify where he wants to make his delivery but if he wants to change his mind, I am told it is practically impossible to get permission to make a change during the process. Canadian cattlemen, on the other hand, have steadily resisted all attempts to include their industry under a Marketing Board.

The Secretary of Agriculture's proposals for a National Bargaining Board, expanded marketing agreements, and Farm Marketing Board, were reported by the National Commission on Food Marketing that he referred to during the regional conferences. The final report of the Commission was highly controversial and was sharply dissented to by six members of the 15-man Commission. Three of the six dissenters said the proposal of the Commission "would harm the long-term interests of agricultural producers. It would harm the nation. The Commission made no studies which would validate a current or future need for, or the potential effect of such a proposal."

The United States government does have a role in agriculture and it's an important one. That role, however, does not include institution of laws and regulations which suffocate the marketing system. The most disturbing feature of the suggestions of the Secretary of Agriculture is his apparent inference that somehow the present marketing system is not doing an efficient, and effective job of moving food from the producer to the consumer, when in fact our system is the most efficient in the world.

The competition that exists today in our industry is the very best assurance the farmer can have that he will receive the top dollar for his products and the least cost for his input items. It all boils down to one simple thought. Which system is going to be the best for the farmer. On the one hand he deals with a number of different grain marketing and farm supply businesses that are vigorously competing for his business—with all that implies. One the other hand, regardless of what you call it, Bargaining Board, Marketing Agreement, or Marketing Board, the determination of how much is produced, who gets to do it, and what price is paid, will eventually be made in Washington in the Department of Agriculture.

My bet is that hard as it may be at times, the American farmer will stick with an open, freely-competing system because he will feel that only in this way can he deal first hand, face to face, with the factors of price and cost. Only in this way can he really have personal control over his farming and ranching operations.

Guarantee Minimum Income

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1967

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, in these days much thought and discussion revolves around the problems of poverty, and solutions to these problems, such as the guaranteed annual income, the negative income tax, and many similar proposals. One of the more imaginative and thoughtful proposals has been made by Mr. Mathew L. Gelernter of Los Angeles, and is contained in a letter to me which I am including with these remarks. Mr. Gelernter has obviously devoted much thought to this matter. Although he is not an economist, but a workingman intimately aware of and concerned about these problems from personal experience, his suggestions show sophistication about the needs of our society and how to meet them, which is unusual.

The letter follows:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BROWN: I suggest that person born in the U.S.A. and therefore an American citizen, be recognized as a human being, the living economic cog in our whole machine of quantitative assets.

I suggest that the combination—human being and American citizen—are the essential assets, which in its millions of combinations of daily living, totalizes itself economically in our Gross National Product.

Viewed as such, it would constantly increase our Gross National Product, if every one of our citizens, as an economic and human right, were guaranteed and paid by the treasury of our country, the minimal income described as a necessary deduction from the Income Tax—namely, $600 per year.

Therefore, I recommend, support and desire our government—through the agency of the States—pay $50.00 per month to every human being over 12 years old, born in the U.S.A. (A rough estimate of paying this sum to approximately 150 million persons over 12 years, would be 7½ billion a month, or about 90 billion dollars per year.)

SOME OF THE SOCIAL AND POLITICAL EFFECTS

With the establishment of the Equity Fund, every boy and girl in the country, for whom the fund would have an escrow arrangement, will develop a new sense of participation, a feeling of being part of this great country. An attitude will quickly develop that the future is an open road, full of great possibilities, rather than one full of blockades.

One of the first rewards of Equity would be a cohesive family life from its very foundation. Preparation for a full and satisfying education would be a natural part of the family pattern.

A family of four with two children over 12, would make this family economically independent in the selection of a good home. Having the basic sum of $200 a month as a guaranteed income, would allow for a selection of homes on the lowest possible mortgage cost. Also, the selection of the area, schools, and other amenities to serve their best interests would be their decision. Slums throughout the country would disappear and hopefully all the evils that flow from being ghettoized will finally be met by a fullness of life in a free society.

FIDUCIARY AGENTS

I propose that the sovereign states be the fiduciary agents of Equity, as a Measure of returning to the States those acts and activities best used that are nearest the people. The $50 a month so distributed should have no restrictions whatever on its use, by any agency of the state, country or local governments. The recognition of a native born, live human being should be all that the Federal Government require.

The phrase "no restrictions whatever" means exactly that—even to the people incarcerated in jails or prisons, hospitals or hopelessly incapacitated.

The economic structure of the Nation as it exists now, should in no ways be changed. All Tax forms, business enterprises and entities would continue as before, subject to all the factors that are now present.

I propose that 6 months following the date of a functioning Equity, that all State agencies such as welfare, old age, charity and any other agencies having areas of activity in respect to programs for the financial relief of persons in the respective States, shall remove from all those roles all native persons and liquidate all agencies. To those for whom the $50 is inadequate arrangements of a supplementary nature under State, County and Local joint planning should be set in motion at that D day.

If the age of qualification is set at 5 years rather than 12 years—some other great possibilities present themselves—this would call for an outlay of 10 rather than 7½ billion dollars per month.

I propose that a local bank be the fiduciary agent, best able to act as escrow agent, for all those from the age of 5 to 15. The bank would have the responsibility of holding in trust 50% of the $50 for all those not yet 15 years old, and the other 50% would be available to the parents for the daily needs of the family.

With this type of arrangements, a local bank, given the necessary Federal and State franchise would very soon amass the kind of funds that would invite, investigate and finally support through the mortgage form, housing and business ventures. The ethnic groups such as Negro and Mexican-American and even Appalachia, have rarely been able to share in the advantages of a very low mortgage costs, so vital and necessary in building areas of homogenious living.

A local bank in these ethnic and cultural areas, owned and operated by kindred people obviously would be more attuned to the spirit and the type of funding required. Equity would make this possible.

The possibilities that would be available in such areas as Watts, Chicago, Atlanta, East Los Angeles, etc., are enormous.

MATHEW L. GELERNTER.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

Appropriations: Savannah River Plant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1967

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, Aiken County, with its great Savannah River plant, was added to my congressional district in 1966 through redistricting. Since that time I have visited the Savannah River plant in Aiken on two separate occasions. My latest visit was recently in the company of my illustrious friend, the Honorable Chet Holifield, of California, former chairman and now vice chairman of the Joint Committtee on Atomic Energy, and my warm friend, a very able member of the Joint Committee, the Honorable Mel Price, of Illinois.

Both of these distinguished gentlemen, Mr. Holifield and Mr. Price, were members of the original Committee on Atomic Energy, which was created in 1946—more than 20 years ago.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud of the personnel at the Savannah River Atomic Energy Plant. I do not know of a more efficient, patriotic, and dedicated group of men and women anywhere. They are conscious of their important role in our Nation's defense, and they are looking to the future with the certain knowledge of making a great contribution to the peace of the world.

Let me especially remark on the superb security measures at this plant, and the devoted service of the security guards, which I observed on my visits.

I cannot let this opportunity pass without tribute to E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co., and the splendid personnel associtated with them who have contributed so much to the defense of this country and who will play a leading role in both defense and peaceful use of the atom in the future.

At the nuclear conference in this area in May 1967, which I attended with Representatives Holifield and Price, the cooperation was very evident between the officers of this plant, the Atomic Energy Commission, and private enterprise. This huge complex, covering over 200,000 acres with an investment of nearly $3 billion, depends upon huge Government investment and the know-how of private industry working hand in hand.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to say today that this project on the Savannah River is a bellwether example of creative partnership between Government and private enterprise, the cornerstone of our American way of life.

The Savannah River plant, as I have discovered on my several visits, is not only a key military installation, but also a leader in finding peaceful uses for the atom.

The fuel for the world's first atomic battery was produced in this plant, and has proved itself in use—from the improved tracking of ships at sea to the monitoring of American space satellites in orbit around the earth. This same fuel—plutonium 238—will someday power a cardiac pacemaker for heart patients. In addition to this role in the effort to cure heart disease, daily research is being conducted at the Savannah River Plant to diagnose and cure other diseases, including cancer. Thus the work at Aiken, which began as a measure for national defense, now leads the Nation in its assault on disease and the quest for space exploration.

Another area of expansion is nuclear generated power. With the joint venture of Duke Power, South Carolina Electric and Gas, Virginia Electric Power and Florida Power at Parr Shoals and with Duke Power Co.'s Keowee-Toxaway project in Oconee and Pickens Counties, my district could well become—and I am proud of this fact—one of the key nuclear areas of the world.

Already for fiscal year 1967 the Federal expenditures for atomic energy in my hope State of South Carolina alone were $100 million. Most of this investment was in the Savannah River Plant in my district. This area, chosen for its suitable terrain and ample endowment of mineral-free water, has truly stepped forward to greet the atomic age. I congratulate all members of this project in their selection last year for the new Isotope Development Laboratory, and hail the continuing expansion of this needed program in fiscal year 1968. We in Washington are attentive to the accomplishments at the Savannah River Plant and the continuing need for support in this venture, and I personally pledge my support and cooperation.

For fiscal year 1968, I am happy to say that expenditure in this area will exceed $103 million. This increase over 1967 is a tribute to the productiveness and dedication of all members of the nuclear program in my State and to congressional awareness of the growing need for their skills.

Mr. Speaker, as I rise in support of this appropriation, let me commend Dr. Glen Seaborg for his splendid job in presiding over the Atomic Energy Commission. It is a job demanding the highest skills of both the scientist and the manager, and Dr. Seaborg has filled it admirably.

I can support this appropriation without cuts and without exception. We cannot play politics with national defense. And I feel that every dollar of this appropriation is well invested—to insure our national security and to spearhead the effort to conquer disease, explore space and provide a better life for all Americans.

Illinois Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1967

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, since there is a possibility that the Congress will be asked to consider legislation calling for a Federal tax increase, I deem it of special interest that the 75th General Assembly of the State of Illinois adopted a resolution petitioning the Congress of the United States to call a convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide for a refund to each State of 10 percent of all Federal taxes collected therein without any control or restrictions on the use of such funds. I believe this resolution is extremely pertinent and practical and insert it in the Record at this point:

Senate Joint Resolution 40

(Offered by Senators Broyles, Arrington, Berning and Krasowski)

Whereas, The Federal income tax and numerous other taxes levied by the federal government have imposed a heavy and distressing burden upon the American taxpayer by funneling into the federal treasury too much of the prime potential local tax revenue; and

Whereas, In 1965 the approximate federal taxes from Illinois was over seven billion dollars and in 1966 the taxes increased to over eight billion, and the estimated take from Illinois taxpayers for 1967 will be approximately nine billion, three hundred and ninety six million and a like proportionate amount from each of the other states; and

Whereas, For many years state and local governments have been in a desperate financial condition which constitutes an emergency which has been compounded by this depressing impact of federal taxation which is pushing the states' tolerance to extremes; and

Whereas, This severe emergency could be alleviated if the states were given their rightful share of the total tax revenue by a system whereby the federal government of the United States would make a simple refund to each state of 10% of the federal taxes collected therein, without restrictions in any manner and without curtailing or interfering with necessary present or future programs of federal and state functions; and

Whereas, Since these tax funds are the taxes from the people and rightfully belong to the people, this refund is not to be considered a federal loan, or gift, or any form of federal aid and these funds shall not be restricted or controlled in any manner and they should be simply returned to the states from which collected; and

Whereas, Polls show that 70% of the people want Congress to approve the return of federal tax revenue to the states in order to finance urgently needed state and local services, for it is generally accepted that the states can do a better and more economical job since they are closer to their problems; and

Whereas, It may be necessary and proper to make suitable adjustments for the smaller or lower income states in accordance with present federal policy; and

Whereas, In 1965 during the Seventy-fourth session of the General Assembly, Illinois was the first state in the United States to pass a similar resolution which aroused nationwide interest and we are hopeful of total success in 1967; therefore, be it

Resolved, By the Senate of the Seventy-fifth General Assembly of the State of Illinois, the House of Representatives concurring herein, that we respectfully petition the Congress of the United States to call a convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide for a refund to each state of 10% of all federal taxes collected therein without any control or restrictions on the use of such funds; and be it further.

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded by the Secretary of State to the two Illinois United States Senators, to every member of the United States House of Representatives from Illinois and to the Governor of each of the other forty-nine states.

Adopted by the Senate, March 20, 1967.

Senate concurred in House Amendment, June 21, 1967.

Samuel H. Shapiro,
President of the Senate.
Edward E. Fernandes,
Secretary of the Senate.

Concurred in by the House of Representatives, June 15, 1967 as amended.

———— ————,
Speaker of House of Representatives.
Fredric H. Selcki,
Clerk of House of Representatives.

Texas War Hero

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1967

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, it is with special pride that I call the attention of the House to the outstanding heroism and dedication of Marine Cpl. Domingo Trevenio, a constituent of my district.

Corporal Trevenio, a native of San Marcos, Tex., recently experienced a harrowing ordeal while serving his Nation in the jungles of Vietnam.

Wounded and dazed from heavy fighting with the Vietcong, Corporal Trevenio continued to defend his position under the most adverse conditions.

It is apparent from the report of his ordeal that a man of lesser courage, stamina, and love of his country would not have remained so dedicated to his duty.

I take pride in the actions of Corporal Trevenio as I do in the actions and devotion to duty of all our American fighting men in Southeast Asia.

At this point I would like to insert for the RECORD a news report of Corporal Trevenio's tale of survival.

The article follows:

[From the Austin (Tex.) American-Statesman, July 8, 1967]

MEMBERS OF BRAVO COMPANY—CENTEXAN TELLS OF VIET SURVIVAL

CORPUS CHRISTI, TEX.—Reality seemed strange and undesirable to Marine Cpl. Domingo Trevino last Sunday.

He was surrounded by jungle foliage, blood flowed from wounds in his back and left leg. His hands were tied behind his back by members of the North Vietnamese unit that had badly mauled Trevino's Bravo Company of the 9th Marines.

Little did he realize then that in five days he would be reunited with his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Domingo Trevino Sr. of San Marcos in his native Texas.

The 20-year-old San Marcos native told his story Friday after arriving at the U.S. Naval Hospital in Corpus Christi. He said Bravo Company started out about 8 a.m. Sunday to sweep an area near Con Thien, about two miles below the demilitarized zone between North and South Vietnam.

Trevino was a radio operator at a forward command post which normally is protected by other units. "We started drawing heavy sniper fire and direct fire. We were pinned down in an open area along a trail," he said.

"The North Vietnamese were in the jungle all around us—dug in. We fired back, but every few minutes someone (in his unit) got hit. We were spread out along a trail and never got a chance to dig in. There was only brush for protection," he added.

Trevino's first wound came about three hours after the firing started. A bullet, probably fired by a sniper in a tree, crashed through his leg. He said the shooting soon slowed down and he could hear nothing except scattered machine-gun fire.

"I thought they had killed everybody," he said.

The loss of blood and heat from the midday sun caused Trevino to lose consciousness. When he awoke, he turned and saw several North Vietnamese firing a machine gun nearby. Instead of keeping quiet, the veteran of 20 months of Vietnamese fighting lifted his M16 rifle and fired an entire magazine—17 bullets—at the enemy.

He was unable to reload and one of the numerous rounds fired at him struck him just below the right shoulder. His flak jacket slowed the bullet and probably saved his life. About half a dozen North Vietnamese swarmed over him, tying his hands behind his back and dragging him off into the jungle.

"I don't know how far they dragged me," Trevino said as he opened his blue hospital shirt to show rope burns on his arms and scratches and bruises.

"I passed out several times as they were dragging me off," he said. He said the captors were all young and wore "greens about like ours."

Trevino said his captors finally dropped him by a large tree and disappeared into the jungle. He lay there alone for about two hours, passing out and then regaining his senses.

He finally awoke to hear a tank moving through the jungle. He yelled for help and several U.S. infantrymen, walking with the tank, spotted him.

"They just looked and passed on by because they were at the 'point,' but the guys behind them came and picked me up," he said.

Because Trevino had his hands tied, his rescuers apparently thought he had been tied and then shot. At least two news reports of the battle told of how he had been tied to a tree, shot and left for dead.

Alewife Fish Pollution in Lake Michigan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1967

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I have, pending in the House of Representatives, a bill to solve and eliminate the dreadful pileup of a species of dead fish, alewives, on the shores of Lake Michigan and also on some of the adjoining Great Lakes.

I ask unanimous consent to accompany my remarks a letter which I have received today from Mr. John E. Mitchell, director of the Department of Natural Resources in the State of Indiana. When I was home this past weekend, numerous inquiries were made as to the solution and reason for the accumulation of the dreadful dead alewives on the shore of Lake Michigan. The accompanying letter is the best explanation for the same that has come to my attention.

My particular interest is in obtaining adequate funding to permit control of the alewife menace, a herring-like fish which now exists by the billions in the Great Lakes.

With controls, this fish could be a valuable commercial species and serve as forage for more desirable fish, such as the coho salmon, lake trout and whitefish and so forth.

Uncontrolled, as it is now, the alewife is a pest. It is estimated that about half the adult alewife population die off annually. The dead bodies litter beaches, clog intakes, cause odor problems in or near the business districts and harbors of cities on the shores of Great Lakes.

Further, this species, which seldom grows more than 9 inches long, is preventing the fishing resources of the Lakes from recovering from the losses caused by the lamphrey eel scourge of 2 years ago which now is under control.

Alarmed by the magnitude of this problem, last year I wrote to Secretary of the Interior Udall asking that the Federal Government undertake a crash program—similar to that used against the lamphrey—to control the alewife and restore an ecological balance to the Great Lakes.

In his reply the Secretary recognized the seriousness of the problem and acknowledged that the alewife now has the upperhand. Control, he stated, would require a "massive and sustained effort."

Believing that such an effort might best be undertaken through cooperation and coordination between the Great Lakes States and the Federal Government, I introduced a bill which would authorize the Secretary to cooperate with the affected States in conducting research into the problem and carrying out action programs of control. The measure authorizes a $5 million Federal appropriation which would be expended on a matching basis with the States acting individually or together in an interstate compact to combat the alewife.

I believe, however, that the Department of the Interior, through the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, should intensify its own efforts at combating the alewife.

According to figures provided me by the Bureau in 1966, expenditures on alewife control, principally in Lake Michigan, are about $200,000.

This amount falls considerably short of being the massive and sustained effort which Secretary Udall admitted would be necessary if any headway is to be made against the alewife.

Local health officials and water pollution specialists are interested in an immediate and effective end to the problems caused by the alewife die-off, even if that means elimination of the species from the Great Lakes.

State conservation officials, on the other hand, see the alewife as a good food source for the desirable game fish they are stocking in the lakes. To them, the most effective use of Federal funds would be for purchases of trout, whitefish and salmon fingerlings with which to "seed" the lakes.

Commercial fishermen, on the other hand, are interested in Federal programs directed toward the commercial use of the alewife.

Because of the conflicting interests involved and the multifaceted nature of the alewife problem, I believe a coordinated Federal-State attack, remains the best hope of a satisfactory solution.

In that regard, a proposal has been put forward by the Midwest Federated Fisheries Council, representing the Great Lakes fishing industry. This proposal calls for a crash program of research and development by the Bureau of Commercial fisheries requiring an expenditure of $720,000 for 34 new full-time scientific staff positions and $180,000 for the construction of a multipurpose research vessel for the Great Lakes.

State of Indiana,
Department of Natural Resources,
Indianapolis, July 13, 1967.

Congressman Ray J. Madden,
Indiana, District 1,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Madden: No doubt you are aware of the serious health and environmental problem caused by the annual die-off of a species of fish known as alewives now inhabiting Lake Michigan and washing ashore in prodigious numbers. The alewives have come into the Great Lakes from the ocean, and established themselves very successfully due to the lack of predator fishes in the lakes, particularly in Lake Michigan and Lake Superior.

In the past, the Lake Trout served as predators on any new species that tended to build up in excessive numbers. However, when the sea lamprey came into the Great Lakes and pretty well destroyed the lake trout, the build up of alewives and other trash fish became possible. A great deal of success has been attained by the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and the Great Lakes' States involved. Already the lake trout, steel head trout and white fish are making a noticeable comeback in the Great Lakes. However the recent cut in the Lamprey Control Budget of some $100,000 will be a serious setback to this program. If the Lampreys are not controlled, and the predator fishes not allowed to come back in sufficient numbers to control the alewives, these fishes will continue to pile up on the shores of Lake Michigan. Your support for the needed funds in the Lamprey Control Program would be appreciated.

Yours truly,

John E. Mitchell,
Director, Department of Natural Resources.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Code of Laws of the United States

Title 44, Section 181. Congressional Record; arrangement, style, contents, and indexes.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the Congressional Record, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the Congressional Record semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

Title 44, Section 182b. Same; illustrations, maps, diagrams.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the Record without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the Congressional Record the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily Record as follows: the Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided,* That the makeup of the Record shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the Congressional Record, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the Record shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the Record issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the Record for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the Record of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the Record shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the Record style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the Record.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the Congressional Record any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent Record is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the Congressional Record the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the Congressional Record.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the Congressional Record shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the Official Reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the Official Reporters of the respective Houses.

The Official Reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the Official Reporters in the next issue of the Congressional Record, nor to Records printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the Congressional Record by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the Congressional Record which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the Congressional Record, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H–112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the Record at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the Record should be processed through this office.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the Record.

Appendix

Why Young People Resist the Errors of Their Elders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GERALD R. FORD
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 18, 1967

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, our distingiushed colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL] delivered the July 4 opening day address for the the 1967 season of Chautauqua Institution, located in his congressional district.

His comments raised the question "Why Young People Resist the Errors of Their Elders." His views are worthy of note by all of us and I am pleased to insert them at this point in the RECORDS

WHY YOUNG PEOPLE RESIST THE ERRORS OF THEIR ELDERS

(By Hon. CHARLES E. GOODELL, of New York)

I want to thank all the people of Chautauqua for their hospitality the last five days. This is the first time in all the years in my attendance at Chautauqua that I have taken the opportunity to stay over night, and as I said a few minutes ago to some friends, "You can't really get the feeling of Chautauqua—I am convinced—without being here all day enjoying its opportunity." I must say one of the more difficult aspects of the last few days has been the constant chant of the children that we must not leave, and I am sure that this will guarantee that we will return.

I chose this topic because of the context of our times—unrest, riots, disillusionment, bitterness, divisions in our ranks.

In mid-June, a small group of men met in one of our greatest cities. They were concerned about the long-hot summer ahead. They themselves were responsible men. They were angry—angry about injustices. There had been rioting, property damage, personal injuries. These were leaders of opinion, and yet guns and ammunition were handed out at this meeting. A major topic of their discussion was civil rights, and they decided that violence was the only way to promote their end. One man after that meeting strolled through the slums of the city. He returned to his hotel room and began to write these words: "When in the course of human events, it becomes necessary. . . ." That was the context then, one hundred and ninety-one years ago, when Thomas Jefferson, in behalf of a committee, began to write the Declaration of Independence.

I could not, in this year 1967, come before you and deliver words of hollow patriotism, discussing emotional issues without substance—the substance that I feel and I trust you must feel—with the problems that close in upon us. I believe in patriotism. I am among those who feel a little extra coarsing of the blood and tears in my eyes when I stand for the National Anthem, when I view the symbol of our country, the flag, and listen to "God Bless America" being rendered. I even enjoy it when I sing it myself!

But we meet today at a time when, without overstating it, I think we can say the confluence of events—people—inertial forces of history—are carrying us almost helplessly along a course that could be disastrous.

On the Fourth of July, I like to revel in the fact of the potential greatness of our country for the future. I like to revel in the greatness of our past. Recently, I visited Brazil and some other South American countries. It is interesting to note that Brazil was founded before this country; has comparable resources; is larger in size than this country, excepting Alaska. And yet, it is a developing nation in 1967, and we are the leaders of the free world. Something happened in this confluence of events, people and inertial forces of history that made us destined to be the leaders.

I chose the title, "Why Young People Resist the Errors of Their Elders," first of all, because obviously for time immemorial young people have resisted the errors of their elders. I am not speaking of adolescence or childhood. I am speaking of the young adults who want a new way, a new course. There are more than 80 million Americans today who are under 19 years of age. The future is theirs. Young people always are more concerned about the future. Young people come upon us in waves each year—over the top—out of school, and they, for a few brief moments at least have a new view—undistorted by the wisdom of experience. It is not always, obviously, the right view. In this year 1967, there is a little bit more involved. There are new dimensions to the problems young people are resisting. There are new dimensions to the errors of their elders.

I think young people have a sense of the contradictions and injustices, as you and I did, but the new dimensions involve affluence amidst poverty; the cipherdom, if you will, of individuals in our society; the incubus of potential total disaster which rides with us day and night; the inexorable movement of forces that makes all of us feel helpless, particularly the young. I know that they don't always articulate this, and I hesitate to try to characterize young people as a group, as I would hesitate to characterize this group here today, or the American population as a whole. And yet there are some generalities that apply.

Let me make it clear that I don't talk about the generational revolt simply in terms of the raucous, slovenly, rootless hippies, if you will. They are a surface eruption—pimples on the skin of young society. Perhaps at times pustular enough to be boils or carbuncles, but nothing more. And yet they are a visible indication of a sense of unease—of unrest among our young people.

The Wall Street Journal recently carried an article on the subject of what's going on in the United States, particularly among young people. Whether you call it "pop" or "op" or "psychedelic"—"drug drunk hippies"—whether it is LSD or the new magic formula STP (somebody translated this serenity, tranquility and peace), the new drug does not last just 12 hours, it gives you a full weekend on top of the world; the Wall Street Journal said: "Whatever you call it, it's distinctive feature is 'mindlessness'." It chose one word to characterize our age: The Wall Street Journal used "vulgarity". The Wall Street Journal also pointed out one aspect—high fashion—which it said had grown sexless. It pointed out that high fashion, like art, is an index of society's frame of mind. I quote the Wall Street Journal: "While gowns have seen many a quirk over the generations, and are capable of being abruptly changed tomorrow, the remarkably ugly mechanistic things being designed for women today must rate some kind of award for crudity." Apparently though, the Wall Street Journal's one distress with today's high fashion is that it lacks the redeeming feature of being sexful, with which I differ.

There are new dimensions and contradictions in society today. The pace of change has accelerated. From Adam to Eisenhower, the entire fund of human knowledge accumulated has been doubled in the last ten years. We have doubled the fund of human knowledge as accumulated from Adam to Eisenhower.

Affluence is taken for granted by our young people. It would appear the whole economic motive that has driven this country to heights of greatness may be outmoded. Many of our young people consider the economic motive to be immoral and irrelevant. When you consider that fifteen years from now—1982—20% of our people working will be able to produce all the material goods that our society can consume, you must begin to wonder whether the economic motive can continue to be the controlling and driving force of our society.

Our young people are concerned about somebody like Colonel Nasser possibly getting his hands on nuclear weapons. Do you blame them? They are concerned about credibility—not just the crediiblity gap between the people and their government, but the credibility gap between people and commercial advertising. The credibility gap between people and those who manipulate the imagery of our age. It goes beyond politics. They are concerned about pat answers, "untalk", as they call it, or "hontalk", about basic issues. I am sure many of them sense an injustice, as I do, in the fact that a young boy can be picked up for an auto theft and get a greater punishment than a Bobby Baker, who steals millions, or a Senator Dodd. They are disturbed with all of these indications of corruptness among a few, but corruptness none the less, in high places. They are disturbed that Congress still balks at adopting a Code of Ethics.

I am sure they are concerned about crime. They are involved in crime. It is a shocking fact that the most serious crimes—the seven most serious crimes listed by the FBI—are committed by the young. Do you know what age group commits the most serious crimes per year in this country? The fifteen-year olds! And a close second, the sixteen-year olds! They must be concerned about the matrix of crime, the matrix of permissiveness in our society. Injustice, yes, that causes some crime—the juxtaposition of poverty and affluence, yes, that cases some crime—and certainly we must not leave out the sociological theories to the effect that crime is society's fault. The sociological theories that dehumanize and de-individualize criminal behavior. It is not the individual who commits the crime, it is society, they say. What can we expect from young people brought up with that concept?

And I am sure today the young people are resisting the errors of religion. I speak with deep sincerity and sadness on this subject. The eternal verities are still there, and stand firmly, but our religious institutions have not found the means to apply them in a sensible and meaningful way for our young people—as a matter of fact—for our general population. We find religious leaders stumbling into politics, into legislative issues—when they do not even understand and cope effectively with the problems in their own immediate bailiwick—their own immediate responsibilities—the moral problems of our age, the dehumanizing of our people.

Certainly our youth are upset about Vietnam, and I could spend the afternoon discussing this. But how do you explain to young people that they are going to be called upon to fight ten, twelve thousand miles away for their country—the most powerful country in the world, against a nation of 15 million people—and asked to kill and maim? How can you explain to these young people that this is the destiny of our nation? Let me hasten to add that we are in Vietnam, and I am not about to try to solve this problem here this afternoon, but I do not want to leave the impression that I would advocate that we get out of Vietpam, to cut and run. None the less, the complexities, the emotional and intellectual validity of our Vietnamese posture, account for a great deal of uneasiness and confusion among our people.

Civil rights leaders: If I don't leave any other impression here today, let me point out the tragedy of the civil rights movement. Today, the civil rights movement is desperately in need of real leadership—responsible leadership. Leadership that inspires excellence in its people, instead of inspiring them to rally to get part of the loot, to get their so-called "share."

And our young people are aware of other things. Social Security which is not insurance. They know it is a tax system. They are going to pay for it. They will work until they are 44 to pay the taxes necessary for their retirement, and then from 44 until 65 they are paying for other people. Now, they don't resist this; I do not mean to imply this for a minute. And yet, they think there must be something wrong with an insurance system that gives them that kind of return. A so-called insurance system, Social Security, that freezes people into poverty. You cannot continue to receive Social Security benefits and earn enough money, on the average, to escape from poverty in this country above the accepted guideline of $3,000 a year.

They are concerned about a government that avoids direct taxes and imposes each year on the average a 3% sales tax on all its people, hurting the most those who are retired and those who are poor. The 3% sales tax, of course, is not called a sales tax and is not enacted by a legislature. It is called inflation, and it is automatic. You pay it in increased prices, but it has exactly the same effect on all of us as if Congress assembled at the call of the President and enacted a 3% sales tax.

The young are concerned about our economic machine. You know, it is an irony of history that Marx predicted capitalism contained the seeds of its own destruction, and would fall of its own weight. Marx was wrong. Capitalism may fall, not because of its inefficiency, not because it exploits the people, (the "proletariat" in Marx' terms), but because of capitalism's efficiency and competence. There is a danger here. Are we embracing expansion for expansion's sake? Are we so concerned about Mega-enterprise, as it has been termed recently—big business expansion—that we are losing sight of the importance of human development—that we have lost control of these major forces in our society: big government, big labor, big universities, big business? It is a question that is asked by the young people today. They do not accept the truism, if you will, that private enterprise and big business are necessarily good for our people.

And how do we explain the errors of our elders in setting up the welfare system in its present form which dehumanizes, destroys all initiative, promotes resignation among its beneficiaries? These are serious questions.

Recently, I engaged in a panel discussion with a lady who was chairman of a County Board of Supervisors. She said that a few days before, the telephone in her house had rung. Her husband answered, and it was one of her old swains of twenty years ago. They had a little conservation—the husband and her old boyfriend—and the boyfriend said: "Has Gladys retained that lovely figure she used to have?" The husband immediately responded, "Oh yes, she has not only retained it, she has more than doubled it." That is the way a person in public life feels today about our problems. They are more than doubling, despite our efforts.

They tell the story of Pericles, listening to one of his students, when Pericles was in his eighties. He finally stopped the student and he said, "Alcibiades, you sound just like I did when I was young." Whereupon Alcibiades said, "Oh, Pericles, how I wish I had known you when you were at your best." And then, there is the story of the minister's daughter whose mother came upon her drawing on a piece of paper. The mother said: "What are you doing, Dorothy?" She said: "I am drawing a picture of God." The mother said: "Oh Dorothy, nobody knows what God looks like." Dorothy replied, "They will, when I am finished." This is the confidence of youth. This is their feeling that they can bring new approaches and new answers to meet our problems.

Somebody said the other day, "If we are not careful, we may be creating The Empty Society. A society that is empty of the human values involving individual responsibilities." We as a people in this country put 133 million tons of pollutants into the air every year—one hundred thirty-three million tons. Our metropolitan areas are choking in traffic, choking on the air and the filth, struggling with the slums and the crime, the riots and the corruption.

A Peace Corps enrollee returned this spring and went back to his suburban family. When he came to visit me he said: "I can't stand it . . . the emptiness, the lack of reality in that life." Is this what we are creating in our country? A country that now has to spend $26 billion a year fighting crime? Where it is estimated that $50 billion in profits goes to organized crime a year? And when those people tell me that it is society's fault that we have so much crime, I ask them a question that they have yet to answer to me persuasively. Why, if crime comes only from slums and poverty and human suffering, why do we have so much more crime per capita today than we had in the depths of the depression, when people were really poor and suffering in this country? There is no easy answer.

I have recited a number of things that I believe are wrong in our society. This is not a full listing, obviously, and it is not a balanced listing. It's an unusual thing to do on the Fourth of July, our Independence Day, when we should swell with pride in our accomplishments. I say that time and history are running too fast for us to be obsessed with self-satisfied, self-glorifying statements. We have a critical era ahead of us. Arthur Kessler once likened a social circumstance to an explosion. He said: "A process, which once past a critical limit, shows this type of catastrophic acceleration, in physics, is an explosion." And he went on to say that if a dispassionate observer observed us today, he would feel that civilization is on the verge of explosion. We talk about explosions in crime and population, explosions of automobiles on clogged highways—explosions of problems. All of these things beset us. Ogden Nash wrote some verse about the ungainly diving bird of the Northern Seas, whose wings regressed to the point where it could not fly anymore, known as the Auk. Nash said: "Consider the Auk, becoming extinct because he forgot to fly and could only walk; Consider man, who may well become extinct, because he forgot how to walk and learned how to fly before he thinked."

I chose the topic "Why Do Young People Resist the Errors of Their Elders", because it is important that we recognize those errors ourselves, and encourage the young to resist them, to bring new insights and new innovative approaches to reversing those errors. Our problems, as a society, abound. We must face them squarely and move forward.

Thomas Jefferson had a great message for the downtrodden of his age. His message was not violent revolution but change—constant change. Change that is reasoned, that is understanding, but, where necessary, change that will even overthrow the powers that be in government. Interestingly enough, today we have so lost sight of our heritage in this country that we shy away from Jeffersonian revolution throughout the world. The greatest appeal this country has in the developing areas of the world is our heritage—that we were willing to stand up as a people and fight for justice and the downtrodden—that we stood up for the unalienable rights of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. Those words ring with meaning to the average Latin American, for instance. And yet, within the last few months, in discussing this with one of our AID administrators in Latin America, I looked at a booklet he had written on United States policy, and on the Declaration of Independence. There was not a single word about Jeffersonian revolution. I asked him why. His answer, "Oh, that's what we are against." That is *not* what we are against. That is what what we must be for, if we are to survive in a world that is compressed so small that problems ten thousand miles away become our immediate problems.

John Stuart Mill, some years ago, observed optimistically: "The despotism of custom is on the wane. We are not content to know that things *are*. We ask whether they *ought to be*." John Stuart Mill—We ask whether they ought to be—we are not content to know that things are.

The human being is supposed to be the only animal that laughts and weeps, because the human being is the only animal struck by the difference between the way things are, and the way things ought to be. That is basically the source of humor and the source of sorrow.

A philosopher recently said: "A nation's greatness resides not in her material resouces, but in her faith, will, intelligence and moral forces." Herbert Hoover put it this way: "Our purpose is to build in this nation a human society, not an economic system."

It is our challenge. A challenge that is crucial for our young people—that we find ways of channeling the great economic machine that we have to human purposes—beyond the purpose of providing for our material wherewithall. The genius of our economic system *can* be harnessed and *can* be transferred to human ends.

The essence of religion is that a man is isolated with his God. It is one-way private line with God. Party lines do not do any good. This is the essence of individual responsibility. It is the essence of our faith that human beings are not automatons.

Today, the most critical challenge is to contain the forces of bigness in our society—big government, big business, big labor, big everything—to contain them so they do no longer dehumanize our people.

I call upon you, young people of all ages: Resist the errors of our past. Build on the foundation of our triumphs of the past. We can and will direct the tremendous fund of human knowledge that has doubled in the last ten years to the creation of a *truly humane society*. This is the kind of declaration of independence I believe is necessary for our country today.

May I conclude in the incandescent words of the Declaration of Independence of 191 years ago: "for the support of this Declaration, with a firm reliance on the protection of divine providence, we mutually pledge to each other, our lives, our fortunes, our sacred honor."

Thank you.

Sing Out, America: Youth Stages Tuneful Rally for the Land of the Free

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 18, 1967

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, making our songs tell the world the true story of our country is an art that is practiced to perfection by a troupe of youthful musicians who have won international renown in the "Sing Out." "Up With People" is the theme of their zestful performances, which are making an important contribution to the creation of a fair image of America. The dramatic story of how this remarkable musical uplift developed and what it is accomplishing is told in a recent Reader's Digest article.

Believing that my colleagues and others will find this article both interesting and significant, I include it in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The article follows:

SING OUT, AMERICA

(NOTE.—It started with one young woman's protest against the misleading image a minority had foisted on her generation. Now the Sing-Out has become an exuberant way of expressing to the world the vibrant idealism and wholesomeness of America's finest youth.)

(By Clarence W. Hall)

On a midsummer day in 1965, a youth conference at Mackinac Island, Mich., was proceeding as planned. The aim of the gathering, sponsored by the Moral Re-Armament movement, was "to give youth a goal and purpose for their lives and make them responsible and patriotic citizens." The speakers—statesmen, business leaders, scientists, educators, athletes—all urged the youngsters to prepare for future leadership.

Then, suddenly, a college coed stood up. She was beautiful, animated—and indignant. "It seems to me that leadership is needed *right now*," she said. "I'm fed up with the image of American youth being created by beatniks, draft-card burners, campus rioters and protest marchers."

She paused to catch her breath, then went on: "You and I know that such scruffy types don't represent us. But does the public? Do the people of other countries? We need to do something spectacular to change this image."

The response from the audience was electric. High-school and college youths spoke up from all over the assembly. Said John Everson, a track star from Iowa State University: "The loud-mouthed, pacifist minority scream about what they're against. Why don't we stage a demonstration of what we're *for*?"

Richard "Rusty" Wailes, a 1956 and 1960 Olympic gold medalist in rowing and one of the conference's directors, inadvertently suggested the kind of demonstration needed when he said, "If we're going to debunk the myth of a soft, indulgent, arrogant America and show the world that we care about tomorrow, we've got to sing out our convictions, loud and strong!"

INSTANT SMASH

That phrase—"sing out"—provided the keynote. Other conference business went by the board as MRA leaders set to work to assemble a show that would travel across the land, expressing in song its commitment to God and country. The Colwell brothers, a trio of folk-singers who had written more than 300 songs and sung them in 48 languages around the world, were invited to create "Sing-Out '65." They passed up a fat Hollywood contract to accept, saying, "If we can help set a generation on the move to build a better world, count us in."

From the thousands of young people eager to be in "Sing-Out," a cast of 130 singers and instrumentalists was selected, representing 68 colleges and high schools in 41 states. These recruits, together with a crew of young technicians skilled in staging, sound and light engineering, gave up scholarships, turned down job offers, sold cars, emptied savings accounts to help launch the venture.

After weeks of drilling under the Colwells and famed British producer Henry Cass, a veteran of the prestigious "Old Vic" company, "Sing-Out '65" boarded a "showboat" to cruise Cape Cod's seashore resorts. An instant smash hit, the youngsters went on to face their first mass audience at the New York World's Fair, next played to a packed house at a concert in Washington, D.C., sponsored by 95 members of Congress.

Then they hit the road in earnest, whistle-stopping access the country aboard a train in cars labeled "Sing-Out '65 Express." They appeared before 15,000 at the Hollywood Bowl and another 7000 in the Los Angeles Sports Arena. At the request of the Los Angeles Board of Supervisors, harassed by the racial nightmare in Watts, they sang before thousands of Negro teen-agers and were credited by one supervisor with "doing more for this riot-torn territory than all we've been able to do so far." One young Negro who had taken part in the riots said, "I measured my life against what these kids represented, and was ashamed, I went to stores I'd looted and offered to pay for the things I'd taken. Now I want to help show a new image of my community to the world." Soon afterward, he joined other students to create "Sing-Out Los Angeles," a local unit that is still going strong.

"UP WITH PEOPLE!"

Critics have reached for superlatives to describe "this different type of youth, ready to work for the stuff of which this nation is made." The late Walt Disney called their production "the happiest, most hard-hitting way of saying what America is all about that I have ever seen or heard." The Hollywood *Reporter* observed: "Their precise singing to modern tempos easily puts their weirdly garbed commercial contemporaries in the shade." At the U.S. Naval Academy, the midshipmen gave "Sing-Out" a "hats-in-the-air" salute and a 41-minute salvo of applause. Said one: "You show the thing in America most worth defending."

"Sing-Out's" electric appeal can be ascribed to two factors: its music and the enormous gusto of its performers. The songs in the repertoire are originals—many written by the Colwell brothers—and each tune is set to a lively beat, with choruses that invite audience sing-alongs. The zestiest favorites are "Up With People!" plugging brotherhood and praising the power of ordinary citizens, and the rousing "Freedom Isn't Free" with its toe-tapping chorus: "You got to pay a price, you got to sacrifice for your liberty." Every song makes a tuneful pitch to patriotism, a challenge to worthier living or higher national goals. There is a ballad memorializing the ride of Paul Revere; there are songs demanding "Which Way America?" and debunking racial prejudice; there are skits satirizing modern youth's kookier aspects.

But it's the Sing-Outers' high-spirited exuberance that really makes the show. Arriving in a town, they spill off buses or trains or planes at full speed, each racing to perform his specified task to ready the show. From a 48-foot trailer truck plastered with Sing-Out signs they unload all the heavy and complicated equipment that accompanies them everywhere. Whether working in rainstorms, on football fields, in opera houses or theaters, they display a swift efficiency that enables them to set up the show from scratch in two hours or less.

At show time, the Sing-Outers don't emerge on stage—they explode onto it, racing to their places like a football team after a half-time pep talk. And for two hours, as they zip through 30 or more numbers, the stage is a whir of constant movement. "We are moving, and we won't stand still," affirms one of their songs. "We have got a mighty job to fill! The world's awaiting to be remade—by every girl and gay young blade."

In 18 months, "Sing-Out"—in some places presented under the title "Up With People!"—has spread its unabashed patriotic spirit over 350 college and high-school campuses, and at 81 military bases in the United States and Canada. It has also, at the invitation of governments and national leaders, toured Japan, Korea, West Germany, Austria, Spain, Puerto Rico, Panama, Jamaica, Mexico and Venezuela. Everywhere it has created a sensation.

"We knew we had a lively show, with a challenge that the world's youth would respond to," says J. Blanton Belk, Jr., U.S. director of MRA. "But we had no idea how deep and universal was the yearning among the world's youth for a call to greatness."

TO CAPTURE THE WORLD'S YOUTH

In October 1965, they performed before standing-room-only crowds at the Tokyo Olympic Gymnasium and at Japanese and American army posts. At Waseda University, a center of anti-U.S. disturbances, "Sing-Out '65" got an especially thunderous ovation. Many students stayed after the program to talk with the cast—among them a leftist leader who shouted, "If this is America, we are all for it!"

In West Germany, the acclaim was even warmer. At a reception for the Sing-Outers in the German Parliament, former Chancellor Konrad Adenauer told them: "I count on you to capture the youth of the world with this program." Later, taken for a tour along the Soviet Zone border near the Helmstedt checkpoint, the troupers set up their sound equipment and went to work. East Germans crowded to their side of the barbed wire, shouting greetings. Dispersed by guards, they retired to rooftops and listened at windows, waving handkerchiefs. The next day an East German newspaper huffed: "Yesterday all traffic was stopped at the checkpoint because of a gang of Americans singing inflammatory songs."

There are now three full-time U.S. traveling casts, with 150 youths in each. These have inspired and trained more than 160 regional Sing-Outs, involving some 10,000 youths. The original group has produced a one-hour TV spectacular seen by 100 million Americans last summer and another watched by 25 million in Germany.

Moreover, the casts that have appeared abroad have left a string of foreign Sing-Outs in their wake. Following a visit to Caracas, for example, 400 volunteered for a Venezula Sing-Out; in Puerto Rico, "Sing-Out San Juan" recruited more than 1000. Japan's version, "Let's Go '67," sent a cast to the Philippines and Indonesia (the first non-Red students invited there since the recent anti-communist revolution) and inspired the formation of similar groups in Formosa and Korea.

To help locally sponsored groups get started, the traveling shows make available a book called *How To Create Your Own Sing-Out*, containing the music and lyrics of all songs used, technical tips on staging, lighting, choreography and use of sound equipment. Also, they often leave behind a few veterans to see that the requisite pace, spirit and technical excellence are maintained.

EDUCATION PLUS EXCITEMENT

To keep the full-time casts on the road costs money—almost $2,500,000 during 1966. Underwritten by the MRA movement, Sing-Out is supported in large part by modest contributions from thousands of Americans, plus gifts from industries and foundations which consider it an investment in the nation's future. Neither leaders nor cast members receive salaries, and Sing-Outers make their own props and costumes. Transportation is usually paid for by the host cities; lodging and meals are provided by private citizens in whose homes the young people are billeted, or by business, civic and church groups. Sales of tickets help to cover costs, as do sales of literature, films and recordings of the show.

To keep up with their schoolwork, each cast has its own "high school on the road," with a faculty capable of teaching 36 different subjects. (College students who take a year off to travel with a troupe lose a year on campus, but most make up for it by studying diligently en route.) And as one student pointed out: "We've traveled 19,000 miles, observed a dozen cultures, talked with leaders of many states and countries. No other education could be more exciting or rewarding."

You can't belong in the company of these eager young people without realizing that something other than snappy tunes and good direction has sparked their performance. For the spirit that animates their show can't be stage-managed; it has to come from within. "This is vastly more than a show," one observer told me. "Call it a revolt against the cynicism which has diluted our traditions. Call it a show of spirit in favor of bold new standards and purposes for us all."

William Storey, a young Negro who was a member of one of the toughest youth gangs on Chicago's West Side before joining Sing-Out, says: "The kids in Sing-Out seem to have an answer to hate and violence. I decided to do something to help spread that answer. Now I find it takes more guts to stand up for what is right than it did to take part in gang fights."

Commitment to Sing-Out's ideals does not stop with participation in the show. After their years of travel, many Sing-Outers apply themselves with new zeal to their studies, tackle tough problems in home, school and community relations. As one of the youngsters wrote recently in their international publication, *Pace:* "Our generation is looking for ideas we can believe in and fight for. We want peace, but not at the price of freedom. We'd rather be challenged by hard work and sacrifice than mothered by society. Ours is a generation on the move, ready to be disciplined, ready to dare."

One of the warmest tributes to the Sing-Out movement comes from former President Dwight D. Eisenhower. "We all know something of youth's power to help shape the course of nations," says Eisenhower. "I recall one instance when I came in contact with this power. A group of Japanese students came to see me. They had been participants in the Tokyo riots which caused the Japanese government to rescind an invitation I had received to visit that country, thus definitely interfering in the diplomatic relations of the two nations. Having later embraced Moral Re-Armament, they came to offer me their apologies, hoping now to exert influence for good instead of harm.

"This same spirit of conciliation lives in young America's Sing-Out explosion. The loyalty, patriotism, understanding and enthusiasm of these young men and women are bringing new and needed inspiration to our country and to the world."

Suicide in the Slums

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 18, 1967

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, for the past few days I have found myself in a state of utter perplexity while listening to the never-ending reports of bloody Negro rioting in Newark. The following editorial which appeared in the July 17 edition of the Washington Post has helped to explain my bewilderment. The author tells us in no uncertain terms that the Negro is actually hurting himself in areas far more essential to his well-being than good public relations:

SUICIDE IN THE SLUMS

Crowds have rioted, through history, for an astonishing variety of purposes. Some have been explicitly revolutionary, like the celebrated crowd that marched on the Bastille. Most have had much narrower political aims. In the 1830's, in the English Midlands, there were towns that remained perfectly peaceful except when the government attempted to enforce its infamous New Poor Law; then the mob gathered, even in the face of armed troops, to seize the welfare authorities' papers and quite literally to run them out of town. Other riots have had clear and specific economic goals, to lower the price of wheat or to force the rehiring of men laid off at the mill. Some crowds have been deliberately homicidal; any of a hundred lynchings would be an example.

The most curious aspect of the Newark riot, and the long succession of Negro slum riots over the past three summers, is the extraordinary extent to which they have been, not revolutionary or homicidal, but purposeless and suicidal. In these peculiar riots the mob has never marched out of the slum to attack the symbols of community authority, whether bastille or city hall or police headquarters. There has never been a manifesto, or a list of stated grievances; the people who explain articulately the reasons for the riot are rarely the rioters. All of these riots, however violent and destructive, have turned inward on the slum itself, and the chief victim has always been the slum and its people. Certainly there has been looting and burning of businesses run by whites; but these are the stores on which Negro customers depend. When the white shopkeeper can no longer get insurance and credit on normal terms, it is the Negro consumer who pays.

Both Governor Hughes of New Jersey and Stokely Carmichael have used the word "rebellion" to describe the Newark disaster. It may be a rebellion in the psychiatric meaning of the term, but it is certainly not a rebellion in the political sense. It is not an attempt to replace one public authority with another; it is merely a blind outburst.

The slums of Newark are squalid, aging and intensely depressing. But it is a bit too easy to suggest that the riots are caused by bad housing and poverty alone. Cities have always had slums, but the slums have only occasionally rioted. Poor and ill-educated though they may be, the young people who riot are not nearly so wretchedly poor and ill-educated as their parents a generation ago. These youngsters have come far enough to feel a sense of change, but not far enough to see the evidence of improvement. They have abandoned their parents' code of restraints, but the life of the big city slums has given them precious little to replace it.

The remedy begins, of course, with the restoration of order, and the strengthening of social programs to do what they can. But it will also require, no doubt, changes in the style of city government in this country. Highly, centralized, impersonal government does not work to the benefit of the slums; the governments of the big cities will now, if they are wise, consider the advantages of very substantial decentralization. The present theory of political representation appears to be defective; for the people who have rioted in Newark, and dozens of other American cities, clearly feel themselves utterly unrepresented and impotent in their city governments. These rioters differ from most rioters throughout history in that they believe themselves harmed little by the worst of defeats and benefited little by the best of successes. The expression of this despair is a highly unusual style of riot that becomes not only wantonly destructive, but profoundly self-destructive.

Continental Sculpture Hall: A Monument of Achievement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT DOLE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 18, 1967

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, it is a commendable characteristic of Americans that they revel in the success of the handicapped and disadvantaged among us.

A victim of physical disability and the story of achievement in spite of it, is the story of Miss Inez Marshall of Portis, Kans., in my congressional district.

An article in the second issue for 1967 of a publication of the Kansas Department of Economic Development features Miss Marshall and her creation, Continental Sculpture Hall.

Miss Marshall's work is drawing widespread attention and tourist interest. Her accomplishments are most noteworthy, and I am inserting "Continental Sculpture Hall" in the RECORD at this point:

CONTINENTAL SCULPTURE HALL

You have to give Inez Marshall credit for being a most unusual woman. She has specialized in occupations normally reserved for men, such as trucking, blacksmithing and barbering. In her hometown of North Branch, a small Quaker settlement just south of the Nebraska line in Jewell county, she was once acknowledged the best automobile mechanic for miles around.

But all that was before the accident some 30 years ago. Now Miss Marshall has a new and even more unusual occupation, as a stone sculptress.

Her recently opened Continental Sculpture Hall at Portis features an amazing display of handiwork carved from solid limestone. Exhibits range from tiny figures of only a few ounces to an 800-pound replica of the home in which the Last Supper was held—complete with Jesus and His disciples.

Sculpture Hall is a Kansas "first" but even more unusual is the artist herself and what she has managed to accomplish with a twisted spinal column and an almost useless right arm.

The story has its beginnings in the late 1930's. Before that Miss Marshall had worked in her father's blacksmith shop at North Branch. She also became proficient at overhauling Model-T's in the North Branch garage of her brother, Ray, who now lives in Fremont, Neb.

Inex and Ray began hauling wheat to Iowa by truck returning with loads of corn. It was on a return trip from Sioux City that fate stepped in to change Inez Marshall's life.

"I was driving day and night," she recalls. "About two miles south of Lyons (in Northeast Nebraska) I dozed off, missed a bridge and went into a ditch. The truck overturned.

"I managed to crawl out, and some traveling men took me to a doctor. He sewed up my head and sent me back. I walked a block to a wrecker. He turned the truck back over, and I remember paying him. I remember, too, that a farmer scooped the corn back onto the truck for me.

"I got back in and drove home. But I *don't* remember anything about that trip, not even stopping to buy gas. Everything else was black until I arrived at my folks' home. Next morning I couldn't get out of bed."

Inez spent the next 18 months in bed. Twenty-one doctors tried without success to determine what was wrong. Finally, she says, the 22nd doctor diagnosed her trouble as a broken back.

Inez has lived with pain ever since. She can't walk more than a couple of blocks without resting. Because of her twisted spinal column, she can't pick up anything without turning her entire body.

About six years ago, misfortune struck again. An accidental brush against a nail on her front porch rendered her right arm useless. She can move the finger of her hand, but not her arm.

Yet, despite these problems, Inez manages to carve unbelievably lifelife objects from chunks of stone sometimes weighing as much as 1,000 pounds.

Her interest in stone sculpturing was accidental in itself. During the time she was bedridden, her father would carry her to the front door where she could, sit and look outside.

One day she noticed a small rock in the yard and asked her father to bring it to her. She borrowed his pocket knife and began to carve aimlessly. A replica of a little squirrel emerged.

Her work tools today are just as simple. She relies on knives, chisels, hammers, saws, hand braces and bits and specially bent screwdrivers.

A tour through the Continental Sculpture Hall is unforgettable. There is, for instance, an old couple in a covered wagon pulled by two horses. The couple, their horses, the harness and the chassis of the wagon are all carved from stone. The heads of the man and his wife turn. It's all scaled to about half normal size, including the holdup man who stands nearby.

A church required 3,000 hours of carving. And that doesn't count the many more hours it took to carve the minister, organist, congregation, pews and altar. It all weighs 400 pounds.

An exact replica of a 1917 Model-T roadster weighs 600 pounds. The detail is startling, right down to wheels turned by the steering wheel, foot pedals, transmission, engine, chassis, tool box with hinged lid, doors that open, movable gas and spark levers, crank, a hood that lifts on either side, gas tank and threaded radiator cap. The radiator holds water and the lights work. And it's all carved from stone.

Her limestone comes primarily from Jewell county. Friends help bring it to her workshop across the street from the museum. Neighbors Bob Fulton and Thelma Stewart are so enthusiastic about Miss Marshall's talent that they have provided the spacious, well-lighted building now housing her creations.

Most of her works are carved from one solid piece. When working on the replica of a building, for instance, she completes interior carving by reaching through the doors and windows. But when more than one piece is involved, even her bonding mortar is made of rock—a compound of ground limestone and native rock that blends right in.

She begins at the top of the rock and works downward. She uses no drawings, no power equipment, and no molds. The finished piece is painted in natural colors with latex or enamel paint.

To use her right hand, she places it on her knee and puts her foot on a rock at the desired height. She moves her immobile hand by moving her knee.

Other noteworthy displays include huge three-dimensional "paintings" weighing hundreds of pounds; a log cabin with a wood-burning stove; a 5-piece minstrel orchestra; a domestic scene of Abe Lincoln and his family, all life-size; a two-story hospital—11 rooms in all—complete with operating room, nursery, hospital staff, patients and babies; and a little red country school house which has children playing outside at recess. Inside are desks, blackboard, potbellied stove and a school bell that rings. Windows open and close. There are even two outdoor privies.

There's a rock guitar which can actually be played and, finally, there's an eye-catching black table, interlaced with silver, carved as a memorial to John F. Kennedy. The table's ornate designs are symbolic of the late President's life. A tape recording explains the symbolism.

The large, attractive hall still has plenty of room for more exhibits, and Miss Marshall plans to keep carving them. Future projects include full-size figures of Eisenhower and Kennedy, a 15-foot painting of the birth of Christ, and a violin which a Lindsborg musician has promised to use in a recital.

Some 1500 people have toured the museum since it opened at its new location last August, including a number of visitors from foreign countries. In spite of its location off the beaten tourist paths, Portis seems destined to become well known as the site of a unique attraction.

The Johnson Foreign Policy: Flexibility and Firmness for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 18, 1967

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, in a brief but clear analysis of recent world events, Ralph McGill, distinguished American newsman wrote:

> It now is possible for one of the world's two great powers to talk with the other . . . . There is a new U.S. policy. Hopefully, prayerfully, it may work better than those of the past.

I, too, believe there is a new U.S. policy for peace. It is to explore every means to peace, keep your powder dry and make your commitments clear to friends and foe alike.

This is what President Johnson did at the summit meeting with Premier Kosygin.

It is what he did in announcing the American position on the Middle East.

And it has been the same for our commitments and position on Vietnam.

Leadership in U.S. foreign policy is today stronger than it has been for many years.

It is flexible enough to encourage and seek negotiations—from strength.

There is a dialog between the East and West today which did not exist 10 years ago under a Republican President.

Many positive international benefits have resulted from that dialog—treaties on outer space use, Russian-American air travel agreements, the possibility for expanded East-West trade.

Our country has sacrificed none of its commitments and none of its principles as it has sought accommodation between East and West.

As Mr. McGill said in his article—entitled "Foreign Policy Stronger Now Than Under Dulles"—East is talking to West, and in this there is great hope for the future.

I insert in the RECORD Mr. McGill's perceptive article from the Detroit News on the improvement in American leadership in foreign affairs:

FOREIGN POLICY STRONGER NOW THAN UNDER DULLES

(By Ralph McGill)

A brief prelude is helpful to a discussion of Glassboro and the Johnson-Kosygin talks.

On the day of their first conversions the Indians in New Delhi were bodily ejecting a Chinese diplomat. He had been stripped of his immunities and declared a "foreigner." This caused the ejeced diplomat Chen Luchich to shriek and shrill, shouting, "Down with Indian reactionaries . . . Down with running dogs of American imperialism and Russian revisionism. . . ." The foreigner's baggage was inspected and he was cleared through customs. Seven other Chinese diplomats and staff members took the plane, all ousted because of Peking's expulsion of two Indian diplomats.

India's president angrily attacked the United States but a fortnight ago. Her government is unstable due to chaotic agricultural and industrial failures. Indian Communist parties have made advances.

The Communist world continues to reveal the development of nationalist communism, rather than a monolithic ideology housed in the Kremlin temple in Moscow. China itself is shaken by the winds of resistance to Mao's dogmatism. Middle European Communist states are increasingly more insistent on a form of national independence.

These items are background to understanding the failure of Secretary of State John Foster Dulles' Cold War policy. It was as rigidly structured as are Mao's "principles" of today. Secretary Dulles attempted to divide the world, and the nations, into an anti-Russian and a Communist bloc. In his time communism was changing, but it still had the image of Stalin's monolith.

Dulles' policy was a failure, as was Stalin's. Dulles' lack of imagination has plagued us and our allies ever since. His policy was utterly inflexible. It was based on the false premise that Communist nations were not influenced by events.

The damage done by the Dulles policies is not yet calculated. There were early protests against them. In 1953 Winston Churchill was outraged by Secretary Dulles' inflexibility. Efforts then were being made to set up a European Defense Community.

In the Churchill records is his statement to some of his staff after seeing President Eisenhowever who was "converted" and Dulles who was not yet ready, Lord Moran quoted Churchill: ". . . I cannot make it out. I am bewildered. It seems everything is left to Dulles. It appears the President is no more than a ventriloquist's doll. . . . Dulles is a terrible handicap. . . . He preaches like a Methodist minister and his text is always the same: that nothing but evil can come out of a meeting with Malenkov." (Malenkov was one of the temporary Soviet leaders to follow Stalin.)

President Kennedy was trying, until death took him, to escape from the chains forged into American policy by the Dulles Cold War fixations. The policy did not permit any accommodation to change. Secretary Dulles apparently refused to admit the possibility of even evolutionary development.

Today's communism is still communism. But it is not Stalin's communism. In Russia communism has accepted the consumer and his needs as a priority. This itself breaks with the pure Marxist ideology as the Chinese are quick to say. (They are the more shrill about it because they know that they, too, eventually must do the same.)

President Johnson, with no fanfare, but with enormous patience and careful evaluation by himself and a staff of superior ability, cut the Dulles bonds. It was never possible to divide the world into two "camps." It was, and is, possible to carry on diplomacy with flexibility that permits valid movement and compromises.

The most obvious example is the simple policy statement that nations which are a part of hostilities must be a part of the peace. In other words, peace cannot be imposed. A war "victory" does not necessarily mean peace—as this nation has learned.

It now is possible for one of the world's two great powers to talk with the other. What the talks may or may not lead to is for the future. But it now is possible to have discussions. There is a new U.S. policy. Hopefully, prayerfully, it may work better than those of the past.

Norman McFadden

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH M. McDADE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 18, 1967

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, I am certain that every Member of Congress is thoroughly familiar with the remarkable group of men who make up the Veterans of Foreign Wars. These are men who, by their very admission to the VFW, carry an automatic guarantee of personal excellence. They have not only served their country well, but have done so on the far-flung battlefields of the world.

But the VFW is not merely a social club. It is certainly the most vigorous promoter of fine legislation for our veterans. It is also a living testimonial for all young Americans to see, a testimonial that speaks of patriotism and the profound love of country we hope to see in our youth.

Last week, in Pennsylvania, the VFW chose as their State commander Mr. Norman P. McFadden.

Norman McFadden is a most unusual man. It goes without saying that his selection as State commander has come only after a long history of really outstanding service in the VFW. And Norman McFadden gave that time and that service while serving with distinction as a lieutenant in the Pennsylvania State police.

I am taking this occasion, Mr. Speaker, to join Lieutenant McFadden's wife, the former Susan Kuzma, and their daughter, Kathleen, in the pride they must feel to see this fine family man so honored. It is a pride in which the whole Commonwealth of Pennsylvania can share. I know that the VFW will be well served in the next year through the presence of Norman McFadden as its commander. They could not have chosen a finer man.

Mr. Speaker, I here append an article on this subject taken from the Scranton Times of Saturday, July 15, 1967:

AREA TROOPER ELECTED STATE LEADER OF VFW

Norman P. McFadden, lieutenant in command of the traffic division of State Police Troop R at Dunmore Barracks, was elected state commander of the Veterans of Foreign Wars at the concluding session of the VFW's 48th annual state convention today in Pittsburgh.

For the past year, Lt. McFadden was state senior vice commander.

A former resident of Lattimer Mines, Luzerne County, McFadden is a graduate of West Hazleton High School and a veteran of World War II, during which he served with the Navy in the Atlantic and Pacific.

He is a 28-year state police veteran with experience in various fields of police work. Much of his time was spent as a criminal investigator. Prior to taking charge of the traffic division at Dunmore he headed the troop criminal investigators.

He joined the VFW as a charter member of Abington Memorial Post in 1946 and later transferred to Shopa-Davey Post, Peckville, where he held every post office. He is a former commander of the VFW 10th District, former senior vice commander of the Anthracite Counties Council and former state sergeant at arms. He also served on state credentials, finance, bylaws and ritual committees.

McFadden, who resides at 448 Main St., Peckville, is married to the former Susan Kuzma of Beaver Meadows. They have one daughter, Kathleen, a student nurse at State General Hospital.

Friday the convention delegates blasted Sen. Joseph S. Clark's proposal for an American unilateral ceasefire in Vietnam, calling it "suicidal."

A convention resolution said Clark's proposal would lead to the slaughter of American soldiers fighting in Southeast Asia.

The resolution, plus one calling for a constitutional amendment circumventing a U.S. Supreme Court ruling banning loyalty oaths for college teachers, was introduced by State Supreme Court Justice Michael A. Musmanno.

Musmanno is the undeclared challenger for Clark's seat in next year's democratic primary.

Musmanno said the amendment would permit the states to "dismiss, discharge and adequately punish teachers who advocate the overthrow of the government despite the academic freedom theorized by the Supreme Court." The VFW also passed this resolution.

Still another resolution approved by the veterans supported Illinois Republican Sen. Everett Dirksen's proposed constitutional amendment allowing required prayers in public schools.

L. B. J. Puts Faith in LL.B.'s

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 18, 1967

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, America's legal profession is playing an important and significant role in our Federal Government. As President Lyndon B. Johnson observed at a recent meeting of the Lawyers Conference on Crime Control, an LL.B. has almost become necessary to work for L. B. J.

In paying tribute to members of the profession for their public leadership in this and other fields, the President cited our country's lawyers for the degree in which they bring "cool heads and understanding hearts" to the consideration of public questions. His address on this occasion is of such broad general interest that I include it in the Appendix of the RECORD.

This Presidential address, which was given on May 13, and is published in the July issue of the American Bar Association Journal, follows:

LAWYER'S AND THE PUBLIC

(By President Lyndon B. Johnson)

Eight members of my Cabinet were trained as lawyers. You notice I said trained. Two others, who are not lawyers themselves, have lawyers acting for them as undersecretaries. So you have just about succeeded already in making an LL.B. necessary to work for L.B.J.

But the problems of any President require skills that good lawyers generally have in abundance; that is, the ability to analyze a problem objectively and the ability to solve it fairly and expeditiously.

Yet for all their skills, lawyers in government have not escaped criticism either. Some people say that the lawyer is trained to react, and only to react, to problems, not to create the new instruments for progress that our people need. Some feel the lawyer is temperamentally unable to say how something can be accomplished, that he too frequently is known to say, "You just can't get there from here."

My experience with lawyers is otherwise. In dealing with civil rights problems, with transportation, with poverty and with education, their legal insight and their foresight have been invaluable to me as President. Lawyers are today supplying a very important creative force to every sector of this nation's policy. I will be glad to testify to that in open court.

Public safety is an area of particular concern to your profession. Past and current Presidents of the American Bar Association have had a major part in improving the fairness of our courts and our correctional systems. Many among you contributed to bringing three really landmark programs into being during my first three years in the Presidency:

First was the Criminal Justice Act, providing lawyers to poor defendants in federal courts and giving them the right to competent, concerned counsel.

Second, the Legal Services Program, in the Office of Economic Opportunity. Through local Bars you have provided the manpower and initiative for more than 200 community legal service agencies. They have helped the neediest among our people cope with wrongs that they just had to tolerate before.

Finally, the Bail Reform Act, a reform that exists today because of the partnership of understanding between the private Bar and the Federal Government.

Now you are considering another urgent proposal. I do want you to consider it and consider doing something about it, putting your shoulder to the wheel and helping us while we have time, helping us before it is too late. The proposal is the Safe Streets and Crime Control Act which I sent forward to Congress earlier this year.

We tried to design a flexible program that leaves ultimate responsibility where it belongs, in the local governments, but that also provides the means and the impulse for reform. It provides an incentive for greater efficiency and for greater fairness in the police force, in the courtroom, in the jail and in the reformatory.

In great part this program is based on the conclusions of the national crime commission, for which I am deeply in your debt because several of your most distinguished members took part in the deliberations of that commission. I hope you will help to explain the need for it and the reasons behind it. I hope, too, that you will work to improve the criminal codes in your state—to make them more responsive to the real needs of criminal justice.

Reducing crime is a matter of great urgency for the people of this nation, and for your state, your city, your community and in your own block. We must find better ways to secure their safety—to prevent crime, as well as to punish it—to preserve public order without denying private rights. Finding those ways will require cool heads and understanding hearts. For 200 years that description has fitted the best American lawyers. I believe it still does—I know it still does. I believe that the country will benefit greatly from your work.

I am very, very proud of my country and the contribution that the members of the Bar have made to it during the period I have tried to lead it.

I was reading last night about some of the concerns the American people have. There are many concerns. There are many frustrations. There are worries that we carry with us. Some have more than others. But uppermost in everyone's mind is how we can have peace in the world. We Americans are not the only ones to make that decision. There are other people who participate in it, too. We are just a small group of 200 million out of 3 billion. We cannot control the other fellow's conduct, as we have found so many times in our history. But we are trying to lead and by precept and example to do what we can to hasten the day when there will be peace throughout the world. If any of you lawyers or any of you thinkers or any of you with logical brains can contribute to it, we will welcome it. We need any suggestion and any help that you can give.

Next to peace, I guess the thing that is troubling our people more than anything else now is crime. I didn't originate it. I am not responsible for it. I didn't start it. There is not a great deal I can do about it. But I am doing everything I know to do. I want to do more. If you have any ideas where the President can with propriety act where he hasn't, I welcome those suggestions.

I am very proud that some of the best legal minds in this nation spend a lot of their vacation time voluntarily working for their country—some of them in the rice paddies of Vietnam, some of them in the slums of our cities and some of them in the national capital. You haven't been slackers. You haven't dodged your President's request. You have always responded. I don't have a great deal of difficulty finding men to become federal judges or appellate judges. I suppose in due time I can even find one for the Supreme Court.

It is not because there is more money in those hills, but it is because of the great propriety in your profession—the great opportunity you have to serve it and to help bring justice to the world. You don't have to wait until you are tapped for a lifetime job at a low salary that has overwork. You can take all of that money you are making now and serve your country, too.

You can serve it by helping us find a way to peace in the world.

You can serve it by leading your community.

You can serve it by giving people the judgment, the balance and the freedom from hysteria that they do need in times like this.

And you can serve it by setting an example—providing the leadership and initiative to help us solve this problem of crime which has crept up on us and which is so monopolizing our attention these days.

There is no one who can do more about those things than the lawyers of this nation. There is no group which, I believe, has become or is becoming more socially conscious and more understanding of their obligations than the members of the Bar.

That is why I came over here today on a rather busy day—to tell you that your President is proud of you and that your nation is better because of you.

The Need for a More Modern System of Military Justice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 18, 1967

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, it has been more than 19 years now since adoption of the Elston Act, and 17 years since adoption of its successor, the Uniform Code of Military Justice, both of which greatly improved this Nation's system of military justice. These measures were the outgrowth of the many bitter complaints made by service personnel who had served in the Armed Forces during World War II and against the manner of administering a system of military justice which had changed little from the time of the Revolutionary War.

Actually, the American War Articles—enacted shortly after the Revolutionary War, in 1806—were borrowed without substantial change from the British Articles of War of 1765, which in turn were almost a literal translation of the Roman articles. Although the 1806 American War Articles have been greatly revised, it should be of interest to note that provisions can still be found in the Uniform Code of Military Justice identical to passages of the British Articles of War of 1765. And—while the Uniform Code of Military Justice has worked well in its short history—a multitude of recent Supreme Court, civil, and military court decisions have already made it outdated. In fact, recently there have been cases of U.S. district courts granting writs of habeas corpus based on the inability of military justice to keep pace with high civilian court rulings.

Throughout the past 15 years there have been many code amendments suggested, some of which have found their way into legislative form; and hearings have been held on proposed amendments in both the House and the Senate. In the U.S. Senate, the committee chaired by the distinguished senior Senator and great former jurist from North Carolina, the Honorable SAM J. ERVIN, has for the past 6 years given this matter considerable attention.

The first major revision of the UCMJ was suggested in 1953 when the code committee, composed of the Judge Advocate Generals of the several services, as well as the Court of Military Appeals, proposed 17 changes. Since then the code committee has continued to recommend necessary changes, and has sought enactment of two specific measures I have sponsored in the House. To date however, only two minor changes in the UCMJ, have been adopted by the Congress.

In the last Congress I was proud to introduce the first truly omnibus military justice proposal since approval of the UCMJ. This bill, which included among its provisions my two earlier bills, was designed to improve the workability and effectiveness of the code, and contained most of the code committee's earlier recommendations. I reintroduced the omnibus bill on the opening day of the 90th Congress as H.R. 226, with some modification; most notably the elimination of certain provisions relating to administrative discharges, since I felt the need for enacting these provisions into law had been remedied by the December 20, 1965, Department of Defense directive on administrative discharges and dismissals.

H.R. 226, the omnibus bill, is divided into four titles.

The provisions of title I make numerous substantive and procedural changes in the Uniform Code of Military Justice. In some cases these provisions would change the form and procedures of the military courts, and in other cases would increase the qualifications or alter the organizational status of military lawyers and members of courts-martial. For example, section 1 of title I would provide that persons who are charged with having committed certain offenses while subject to trial by courts-martial, but who were not tried for such offenses by a court-martial and who are no longer subject to military jurisdiction, may be tried upon indictment in the U.S. district court into which they are first brought, if the offense was committed outside the United States, or in any U.S. district court in which an element of the offense was committed, if the offense was committed within the United States. Persons who have been tried for the offense in a State court, or whose consent would have been needed for trial by court-martial, are not subject to this section.

Generally speaking, Federal criminal statutes were not intended to apply extraterritorially, and to provide an American forum for trial of civilian employees and dependents with the Armed Forces abroad. Congress in 1950 enacted article 2(11) of the Uniform Code of Military Justice. Thereafter, the provisions of article 2(11) were held unconstitutional by the U.S. Supreme Court, and today there is no American court, military or civil, that has jurisdiction to try American dependents or civilian employees for serious crimes committed abroad. Since the Supreme Court has held that the forum provided cannot be a court-martial, the only logical remaining place for trial is the Federal district courts.

Other sections of title I would require each military service to establish a field, or trial, judiciary system, staffed with experienced legal officers, assigned and responsible directly to the Judge Advocate General of their service, who would perform primarily duties of a judicial nature, and would change the present title of "law officer" to that of "military judge," thereby enhancing the impartiality and competence of law officers who preside over courts-martial. These provisions will insulate law officers from command influence, and assure the accused serviceman of due process, fairness, and impartiality in his trial. Title I also resolves the continuing problem of command influence on courts-martial by broadening the prohibition of such influence in article 37, the urgency for which was indicated just a few days ago by the decision of the U.S. Court of Military Appeals in the case of United States against Wright. Title I also provides additional rules for obtaining witnesses and other evidence for trial. Other sections of title I provide for creating single-officer general and special courts-martial in those cases where the accused waives trial by the military equivalent of a jury; guarantee accused persons an opportunity to be represented in special courts-martial by legally trained counsel where a bad conduct discharge may be awarded; establish pretrial procedures in courts-martial to expedite the judicial proceedings and resolve prejudicial issues prior to trial; seek to encourage the use of nonjudicial punishment in lieu of the summary court-martial; rename and enhance the stature of military review boards by emphasizing their judicial role as guardians of the rights of military personnel; lengthen by 1 year the period during which a petition for a new trial may be made; and make other necessary procedural changes in the Uniform Code of Military Justice.

Title II of the bill would provide that any person serving with, employed by, or accompanying the Armed Forces outside the United States, who commits a crime specified in the Uniform Code of Military Justice, shall be tried in the U.S. district court where found or first brought. The statute of limitations for noncapital crimes would be 3 years, with the maximum sentences being those authorized for the same offense under the UCMJ.

Soon after World War II several incidents of serious crimes by former military personnel were discovered, but the perpetrators of these crimes were determined to be immune from trial because they were no longer subject to court-martial or American civil court jurisdiction. To remedy this the Congress enacted article 3 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice.

The need for enacting the provisions of title II is brought about by the Supreme Court's decision in the now famous case of Toth against Quarles, where the Court held courts-martial jurisdiction over ex-servicemen, as provided for in article 3 of the UCMJ was unconstitutional. However, the Court did not preclude authorization of jurisdiction to the Federal district courts, and the provisions of title II would permit trial to take place in an American tribunal, where every constitutional safeguard would be guaranteed. In those cases where the alleged crime occurred abroad, the necessity of delivering or extraditing the accused for trial would be considerably less, since an American court would also have jurisdiction to try the accused for the same misconduct.

Title III would consolidate the three separate service boards for correction of military records into a single full-time civilian staffed board, with authority to correct any military record, including authority to correct the findings and sentence of courts-martial not reviewed by a board of review. Presently, the separate boards may only recommend corrective action with respect to findings and sentences of a court-martial, they are staffed by part-time members, and are frequently characterized by a lack of uniformity in the application of governing statutes and departmental directives. A unified correction board, empowered to set aside, modify, or expunge the findings or sentence of a court-martial would provide more competent, uniform, and effective review of the records of trial by court-martial.

Title IV would create a Judge Advocate General's Corps for the Navy. Under current Navy practice officers with legal training, and performing law specialist duties, are placed in the restricted line, special duty category. Thus, legal officers must presently be line officers as well, and the provisions of title IV would afford the Navy lawyer greater independence and encourage more lawyers of the highest ability to choose the Navy as a career.

In speaking of the separate Navy Judge Advocate General's Corps proposal, Admiral Mott, who recently retired as Judge Advocate General of the Navy said:

> I think a Judge Advocate General's Corps will make it easier to recruit lawyers, it will be easier to retain them, and we will be able to give our client, the Navy, better service.

Adm. Wilfred Hearn, the present Judge Advocate General of the Navy, is a strong supporter of establishing a separate Navy Judge Advocate General's Corps.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the enactment of H.R. 226 into law would result in major improvement in the quality and administration of military justice, and will greatly enhance the rights and protections afforded to servicemen. With 3.4 million men and women presently in uniform, and over 400,000 of them engaged in combat with enemies of the United States, it is of national importance that the Congress extend to these patriotic Americans the same basic rights they are now defending.

ADA Urges Poor To File as Bankrupt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 18, 1967

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, in a July 14 Washington Post article, Sue Cronk indicates how a local civil rights organization—ACT—has beaten the Great Society to the punch. For a long time we have been wondering how to "live modern, spend more than you make." Julias Hobson, the leader of the militant left-wing civil rights group, has started developing programs to encourage people to avoid their creditors. Hobson's plan is to encourage local merchants to lower their credit-rating standards at the same time debtors are filing for bankruptcy.

It would seem as though Mr. Hobson could spend his time more prudently if he were to encourage low-income families to avoid accumulating a lot of burdensome debts in the first place. His bankruptcy plan will do little more than prevent low-income families from ever establishing a credit status.

The article referred to follows:

ADA URGES POOR TO FILE AS BANKRUPT

(By Sue Cronk)

Thousands of low-income Washingtonians will be urged to file bankruptcy suits next month in a campaign sponsored by the militant civil rights organization ACT and the Greater Washington Chapter of Americans for Democratic Action.

The objects of the campaign include:

Freeing debt-ridden ghetto residents of their financial obligations to "gyp joints" and giving them a chance to make a clean start.

Stimulating the development of consumer education programs for the poor and drafting consumer protection legislation.

Encouraging reputable merchants to lower their credit-rating standards and to go out and aggressively solicit trade from low-income families.

"Since low-income families cannot meet the established, unrealistic credit-rating standards imposed by reputable merchants," ADA Chairman Donald Green said yesterday, "they are channeled directly into the hands of unscrupulous merchants who sell inferior products at inflated prices. Consequently the significant buying power of these families is dissipated."

Green suggested that it would not be unreasonable to expect reputable merchants themselves to subsidize consumer education programs.

The campaign, he said, was sparked by ACT Chairman Julius Hobson.

Green said that a poor person swamped with debts could go to Federal Bankruptcy Court and file a petition for $51. No down payment is necessary and the fee can be paid in installments, he said.

"It's a very uncomplicated procedure," he said. "Immediately upon filing, a person's debts have been wiped out. He no longer owes his creditors."

The Darlington Autopsy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 18, 1967

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, lawyers often and truly observe that justice delayed is justice denied. The AFL–CIO News used that thought in a recent editorial discussing the National Labor Relations Board ruling in the case of Deering Milliken & Co. in Darlington, S.C.

Mr. Speaker, I am including the editorial in the RECORD as follows:

THE DARLINGTON AUTOPSY

Many years ago a union leader, describing the pace of justice in labor board complaints, told a Senate committee: "In these cases the NLRB does not hold hearings; it conducts autopsies."

The words are painfully relevant to this week's unanimous decision by the board that Deering Milliken Inc. had indeed closed its Darlington, S.C., unit after the 500 workers there voted for union representation in order to discourage union organization at its 26 other plants.

In accordance with practice, the board directed that back pay (less earnings) be given to the workers from the time the mill was closed until they are hired, or placed on preferential hiring lists, at other Deering Milliken units.

As a legal victory this is welcome, even though it will undoubtedly have another run through the courts. For the workers directly involved, its immediate value is at best dubious.

The Darlington mill was closed in October 1956, nearly 11 years ago. The mill was the only substantial source of employment in the town. What has happened to the 500 workers and their families? Where are they now? Over all these years, of what use to them, in their own lives, was the fact that by legal standards they were absolutely right?

An ancient adage of the legal profession is "justice delayed is justice denied." Darlington has earned a place among the classic proofs.

If the rights and the livelihood of workers are to enjoy the meaningful protection contemplated by the National Labor Relations Act, adequate remedies must be swiftly applied when violations occur. Autopsies are not enough.

Patriotism Far From Dead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN W. EDWARDS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 18, 1967

Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, in these troubled times we as Members of Congress receive letters from our constituents covering a wide range of subjects. In our free society, candid expression of opinion and the unrestricted publication of opinion are important to our continued growth and well-being.

I would like to insert at this point in the RECORD the following letter sent to me by one of my constituents, a college student and a loyal American, whose letter reflects serious thinking and food for thought:

JULY 9, 1967.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN EDWARDS: I hope you can answer a question for me. Several months ago, a "priest" defected to the Soviet Union. He criticized the United States and its policy in Viet Nam. The Russians had a propaganda field day thanks to this "priest". Just recently this traitor returned to our country. I would like to know why some action was not taken against him. Did he lose his citizenship? If not, why not?

I am a college junior and have a few words to say. My peer group, neighbors, and friends are disgusted with what is happening in our great country. They are "fed up" with the lack of patriotism shown in this country and the fact that nothing is done about it. That communist dupes burn draft cards, burn our flag, contribute money and supplies to the enemy, and nothing is done about it. They are using the very freedoms that Americans have died for to destroy this country. Surely something can be done, must be done, to stop the demonstrations. They would not be allowed in a declared war. Some special provision should be enacted to stop them in this "police action" we have undertaken in Viet Nam. You can't fight a war with peacetime rules. These dissenters build the enemy's resistence while weakening our morale. Americans want a change! Please convey this message to your fellow congressmen. Let them know that patriotism is far from dead! Tell them the American people are tired of people who enjoy the freedoms of our country but who won't fight for them. Tell them Americans want a change. I would also like to express my appreciation to you for your bill which makes it a violation of the law to desecrate our flag. It was a needed law and a step in the right direction. I hope there will be others. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely yours,

MICHAEL O. REED.

Oil Production: What It Means to Kansas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT DOLE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 18, 1967

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, a major element in the economy of Kansas for some 30 years has been the production of oil and natural gas. Ellis County in my congressional district continues to be one of the Kansas leaders in oil production.

On July 7, the thriving city of Hays, the county seat of Ellis County, celebrated its centennial. One of the activities on that day was the oil industry mayors' luncheon. The speaker for this event was Mr. Tom Schwinn, executive vice president of the Kansas Independent Oil and Gas Association. He summarized in a most effective way the history of oil development in Kansas and its present-day significance. He also emphasized the threat to future oil development as a result of policies of the Federal Government permitting increasing oil imports.

I insert Mr. Schwinn's speech in the RECORD at this point:

FOR A VIGOROUS OIL INDUSTRY IN KANSAS

It is a genuine pleasure for me to be asked to make a few remarks here in Hays today. May I also assure you that John Knightley, the President of KIOGA, and I are honored to help celebrate the centennial of the city of Hays, Kansas.

Oil, of course, has been of historic importance to Kansas for more than 100 years following its discovery in Miami County near Paola in the early days of the Civil War shortly after the Drake discovery in 1859 in Pennsylvania. Nearly 30 years elapsed, however, before significant oil production was established in Eastern Kansas in the late 1880's. That event kicked-off what has since been called the mid-continent oil boom. Events in Kansas proceeded apace until 1915 and the discovery of the giant El Dorado Pool. Then a strange thing happened. The oil industry permitted itself the foolish luxury of believing that there was no oil in Kansas west of U. S. Highway 81. That foolish consistency about an almost mythical dividing line has led to a whole series of economic and political problems for our state, the end of which is not yet. And, I don't need to spell them out to an audience in Hays, Kansas, of all places.

So it was that the vast oil provinces of Central and Western Kansas were to wait another twelve years for discovery and development. The Carrie Oswald strike in Russell County in 1927 changed all of that—and a lot of thinking too. Ellis County was waiting in the wings and 1928 was the year. On November 11, 1928, the Hays Daily News carried a story, "The biggest thing that ever happened to Ellis County was the discovery of Oil in 1928". How farsighted that journalist was!

To the end of 1965, the latest available published figures, the State Geological Survey credits Ellis County with a cumulative production of more than 285,000,000 barrels of crude oil. Yes, the journalist knew what he was talking about. But even he could probably not foresee that in 1966, nearly thirty years later, Ellis County would continue to lead the state in annual production. Again, yes, The discovery at the William Shutts farm 16 miles northeast of Hays was quite an event in the life of this country and to the State of Kansas.

The collateral benefits of the vast ocean of oil that has been pumped from beneath the surface of Ellis County are of even greater significance, although more difficult to spell out with precise accuracy. I need not describe the employment this industry has provided for more than two generations. Nor need I attempt to speculate on the amount of bonuses, rentals and royalties with which the landowners of the county have been favored for three decades. It is interesting to note too that the mechanization of agriculture has coincided almost exactly in point of time with the growth of the petroleum industry in Western Kansas. Taxes are another key factor in this total picture. In 1966 the producing industry paid a total of $1,370,911.00 in taxes to Ellis County or more than 40% of all the general property taxes levied and paid in that year.

At this juncture I should acknowledge that in the past year or so there have been some disputes between the oil industry and county and state officials about the proper level of assessment of oil properties. These differences are gradually being ironed out. I needn't tell any businessman or government official here that tax equalization is perhaps the knottiest problem in state and local government today. When the 1963 legislature passed the 30% law it opened a whole pandora's box of problems for all segments of the economic community. We stand firm on our assertion that the oil industry desires to and will pay its fair share of the taxes levied in areas in which production obtains. In that regard it is perhaps no different than agriculture or commercial enterprise. The problem arises in adjusting equities throughout the broad spectrum of the total economy. In this regard one fact should be kept in mind. Kansas has 50,000 oil wells producing slightly less than 6 barrels per day apiece. Thus, statewide the production is marginal. Onerous and unjust taxation is one factor which will force the premature abandonment of literally thousands of these wells. It is therefore to the interest of all to perpetuate the life of these wells so that they may continue to be a source of revenue, jobs *and* taxes.

Having previously referred to the fascinating history of oil in Ellis County, I should not overlook the opportunity to refer to the change in which the industry has been caught up in recent years. Most of the early exploration here was conducted by major oil companies and they continue to own and operate many of the better properties in the county. Nevertheless, for more than a decade now exploration has been carried on almost exclusively by independents.

It may thus be stated rather categorically that the future of the oil industry in this area rests upon the dreams and efforts of the independent producer. These are the people who historically have found 85% of the crude reserves in the United States. They will continue to do so granted several minimum conditions.

The first of these is a realistic price for a barrel of crude oil. In Kansas today we are selling our crude for a top of $3.06 per barrel, at least 7 cents below the peak of 1959. In the interim our costs have soared in all the basic materials and services which we require to find, develop and produce crude oil. Taxes, too, have risen. Yet having permitted other increases, the federal government last Fall used its mighty power to attempt to roll back a modest 8 cent per barrel price restoration in crude oil postings. Again in February of this year the President's Council of Economic Advisors and the Interior Department used threats to roll back a modest one-cent increase in gasoline prices. Had that modest advance been permitted to stand unchallenged, producers could reasonably have expected another modest but long over-due restoration in crude prices. Both actions by the government were defended by officials as being in the public (sic consumer) interest. But, they were less than candid when they failed to point out that in a 30 cent gallon of gasoline only 7 cents represents raw material costs. On this basis, nearly a 50 cent increase in crude prices would be necessary to justify a further increase in gasoline prices.

What has been the result of this decade of artificially low crude prices: An alarming decline in drilling activity. In 1959 there were on the average 169 rotaries running in Kansas. This year the figure has been as low as 29.

Evidently in this high risk business many people have felt that the incentives were not sufficiently attractive to warrant the effort and money to go out and look for oil. I say this with a good deal of assurance because no reputable body of geological thought holds that this country is drilled up. As a matter of fact, using improved science, the industry's wildcat success ratio in 1966 was up significantly. Interrelated with a static crude price has been the flight of the major companies to overseas areas. Having once contributed much to the joint effort in Kansas in the way of leases, farm-outs and support money, they now do very little thereby further deepening the problem. This development leads to the second factor: A stable oil import problem.

Our own Congressmen Dole and Skubitz have said it better than anyone else in Washington on not one but several occasions. Having developed vast sources of crude oil, it came to be the corporate interest of these vast international companies to import ever-mounting quantities of cheap foreign crude oil. Yet the basis for the oil import program is to preserve a healthy domestic oil industry for the security of the United States. At this point managements' responsibility to its stockholders did not coincide with the interests of the country. The folly of this foolish reliance upon such sources has been adequately demonstrated in recent weeks by swift-moving events in the Middle East. The end of the crisis is not yet here, but it will be as available stocks of crude oil in consuming countries are used up. I predict also that another illusion will be exploded by the end of this month. The United States, including Texas and Louisiana, no longer has and adequate reserve producing capacity to meet this nation's needs in time of emergency. Yet top officials in Washington and the public have been lulled into a false sense of security by major company blandishments that the reserves are here. Allowables, having been upped dramatically for the month of July, it will be interesting in August to reflect on just how much *additional* oil is available, and even if available, whether it can be transported in existing facilities to the places where needed.

World events have dramatically made the case for the independents this summer: Domestic oil is reliable, foreign oil is not. This statement does not even consider the larger question of our national involvement to protect such overseas interests. The consuming public and the federal government need to ponder these matters.

The Agricultural Producers Marketing Act of 1967

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

Hon. G. V. (SONNY) MONTGOMERY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 18, 1967

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing for appropriate reference, legislation entitled "The Agricultural Products Marketing Act of 1967," which is designed to protect further the right of farmers to join together in associations for the discussion of mutual economic problems in an effort to improve their lot. It seems to me that anyone engaged in any aspect of agriculture would sympathize with this broad objective.

I have accorded this matter very serious study in recent months. Other Members of the House have introduced similar legislation and a bill of this nature has been introduced in the Senate with a number of cosponsors. In my opinion, the bills which have been introduced thus far have certain shortcomings. As a consequence, my bill differs from them in certain respects. First, I believe that purchasers of agricultural products and other handlers should have the right to compete for the producers with whom they do business through offering monetary inducements and better services. Such competition based on merit can only be a benefit to agricultural producers. Accordingly, I have incorporated in my bill, a provision, not found in similar bills, which is designed to insure that the measure would not impede competition on this plane.

Second, in my opinion, criminal penalties and suits for treble damages constitute unduly harsh sanctions. This fact has been recognized publicly by several sponsors of the legislation and other Members of Congress who have expressed a sympathetic interest in the principal objectives of the legislation. Accordingly, my bill provides only for injunctive actions by private parties and by the Government and for suits for actual damages incurred by private parties as a result of violations of the act.

Finally, I am introducing this legislation because, as I interpret its provisions, all that it would prohibit is unfair treatment of producers solely because of their membership in an association. It also is my understanding that this legislation does not force purchasers of agricultural products to deal with a marketing association of producers, nor does it prevent purchasers from choosing the producers with whom he wants to deal. The bill only prohibits a purchaser from refusing to deal with a producer because of a producer's decision to join a marketing association.

It is on the basis of this understanding that I am introducing this bill. If in the future, it should appear desirable that these interpretations be specifically incorporated in the bill in order to avoid confusion and misinterpretation, I, for one, would recommend that Congress undertake to adopt appropriate amendments.

James Armstrong

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH M. McDADE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 18, 1967

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago I visited my alma mater, the University of Notre Dame, at Notre Dame, Ind. I do not have to say that the return to my old university was a source of great joy; but the joy was increased immensely by the nature of the visit. It was to join in a celebration to honor Mr. James Armstrong, the executive secretary of the university's alumni association, on the occasion of his retirement.

In the more than 40 years during which Jim Armstrong worked as the executive secretary, the University of Notre Dame has grown in size and distinction. Throughout this period of growth, Jim Armstrong contributed notable services, and he will be remembered by the thousands of alumni who came to know him and respect him.

I know Jim's wife, Marion, as well as his five sons, Brother Philip, John, Richard, Gregory, and Douglas were all proud to see Jim honored by the university and its alumni. Jim has been one of that unsung army of heroes who have worked quietly with the alumni of all the great universities of this Nation to build the magnificent educational institutions we are so proud of today.

I know, Mr. Speaker, that you and all of my colleagues here in the Congress join with me today in wishing Jim well in his years of retirement. It is a retirement he richly deserves.

Mr. Speaker, I am appending a release from the University of Notre Dame on the subject of Jim Armstrong:

> The University of Notre Dame and its Alumni Association have established an endowed scholarship in the name of James E. Armstrong, the executive secretary of the University's Alumni Association who is retiring Aug. 1.
>
> The announcement was made by the Rev. Theodore M. Hesburgh, C.S.C., president of the University, at the annual campus alumni reunion banquet Saturday (June 10) attended by some 1,200 alumni.
>
> Armstrong, who became the first full-time alumni secretary in the University's history in 1926, was also given a 1967 automobile by past and present members of the Alumni Board and a European trip by his Notre Dame classmates of 1925.
>
> The trip will include an opportunity for Armstrong and his wife, Marion, to visit one of their five sons, Brother Philip Armstrong, C.S.C., who is Superior of a high school in Ghana, West Africa. The other four Armstrong children—John and Richard, Los Angeles; Gregory, Fresno, Calif., and Douglas, Mishawaka—were guests at the banquet.
>
> Tributes to Armstrong were delivered by several persons, including Robert Michaud, president of the St. Joseph Valley Notre Dame Club; Frank O'Malley, professor of English; Ambrose Dudley, head of the Notre Dame Alumni Association; Alan MacCarthy, director of development for the University of Michigan and immediate past president of the American Alumni Council (AAC); Congressman Joseph McDade of Pennsylvania, a Notre Dame alumnus; and the Rev. Howard Kenna, C.S.C., head of the Indiana Province of the Congregation of Holy Cross. More than

100 telegrams of congratulations were received by Armstrong, who was unaware that this year's banquet was to be a "surprise party" in his honor.

Armstrong, 64, served as president of the AAC during 1962–63 and has held many important posts in professional organizations dealing in alumni and development areas.

The Baltic Question

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. BRASCO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 18, 1967

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, the New York Times recently published an open letter to Soviet Premier Aleksei Kosygin from the Committee To Restore Lithuania's Independence. The letter cites Mr. Kosygin's address to the United Nations General Assembly on June 19, 1967, in which he accused Israel of continuing aggression. In this accusation, he misapplies his own definition.

The Soviet Premier defines continuing aggression as attempts "to interfere in the internal affairs of independent countries and peoples, to impose on them, from the outside, political concepts and views alien to them on the social order." In view of this definition, the Committee To Restore Lithuania's Independence believes that Mr. Kosygin would do well to consider his own Government's continuing aggression against Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia.

The annexation of the Baltic States by the Soviet Union was pre-determined by the Ribbentrop-Molotov Pact of 1939. The agreement stated:

> In the event of territorial and political rearrangement in the areas belonging to the Baltic States, the northern boundary of Lithuania shall represent the boundary of the spheres of influence of Germany and the U.S.S.R.
>
> While the attention of the world was focused on the Blitzkrieg in the West, the Soviet Union imposed its 'sphere of influence.' On June 15, 1940, troops and tanks of the Red Army poured into the Baltic States. Moscow hastily set up puppet governments. A single list of representatives, hand-picked by Moscow, was proposed to the 'liberated' countries . . . The decisions of the 'elected representatives' to 'request' incorporation of three Baltic States into the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics were prepared in Moscow and carried out by the occupying Red Army.

Yet, in his address to the General Assembly, Mr. Kosygin insisted that the Soviet Union has always followed a policy of respect for all peoples, and that among the fundamental principles of the policy of the Soviet Union is the belief that "every people enjoys the right to establish an independent national state of its own."

In view of such an unequivocal statement of policy, clarification of the following questions is in order:

Why has the Soviet Union continued to violate the sovereignty of Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia?

When will the Soviet Union apply the principles of the U.N. Charter to the Baltic States?

When will the Soviet military and administrative apparatus be withdrawn from the territory of the Baltics?

When will the Soviet Union desist from its policy of Russification and Sovietization of the Baltic peoples?

When will the Baltic victims of mass deportation be allowed to return to their homelands?

When will the Soviet Union cease interfering in the political, social and religious life of the Baltic States?

The Baltic Republics have a right to preserve their own languages, religious freedoms, traditions, and political aspirations. Will measures be enacted to correct the gross injustices imposed by Stalin on the Baltic Nations and restore their independence?

Space Safety

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN N. ERLENBORN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 18, 1967

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Speaker, radio station WBBM in Chicago has broadcast an editorial in regard to my neighbor and colleague, the gentleman from Illinois, Representative DONALD RUMSFELD, and his proposals for safety in space.

I include the editorial as part of my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

SPACE SAFETY

(*Broadcast* Thursday, July 13, 1967, at 9:50 a.m. and 10:53 p.m.; *Delivered* by Mr. E. H. Shomo, CBS Radio vice president and general manager of WBBM radio)

Illinois Congressman Donald Rumsfeld wants some special safeguards to cover the U.S. space program. WBBM Radio agrees with Rumsfeld.

But the Ntaional Aeronautics and Space Administration is strongly opposed to the whole idea. Rumsfeld wants to create an independent safety review board. It would monitor NASA operations and try to find potential dangers that have escaped the notice of NASA.

Rumsfeld's second proposal is to require that NASA keep both the House and Senate space committees fully informed about the status of all NASA operations.

Frankly, we do not see anything sinister in either proposal. In fact, we think both ideas are very sound. But NASA—for some still unexplained reason—is fighting very hard to prevent them from becoming law.

Rumsfeld's proposals, in part, are designed to prevent NASA from ever again allowing private contractors to turn out the worst sort of production such as they did in the Apollo program. Furthermore, NASA deliberately kept Congress in the dark on just how badly the Apollo program was doing in 1965 and in 1966.

If it were not for the tragic death of three astronauts in an Apollo capsule, we might never have known about the shoddy work and planning that went into that project.

If NASA can manage to handle billions of dollars of public funds, it seems to us that this agency can also manage to be held publicly responsible for how it uses the money.

It is not what we know about NASA operations that is harmful, it is what we do *not* know which is a danger. NASA officials have no business trying to pressure Congress into killing off the Rumsfeld proposals.

Thank you.

Political Angle on the Wheat Crop

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 18, 1967

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, in the July 16 edition of the Sunday Star, I ran across an interesting editorial which seems to suggest that L. B. J. is toying with the idea of running a corn flakes ticket in the next election. Apparently the President is confronted with conflicting interests: the success of the war on hunger program in 1967 and his continued control of the bread basket in 1968:

POLITICAL ANGLE ON THE WHEAT CROP

Another record crop of wheat is highballing to market in more than 640,000 boxcars. The flood of wheat eventually will be vast enough to form a train which would stretch on mainline track from New York to San Francisco and back to Chicago.

The Department of Agriculture on July 11 estimated the wheat crop at a new high of 1.5 billion bushels, 285 million bushels more than last year and 139 million more than the previous record set in 1958. The revised estimate is 100 million bushels higher than previous calculations.

The wealth of wheat enabled Secretary of Agriculture Freeman on June 23 to announce a 13 percent reduction in wheat acreage for the 1967–68 crop year. The cutback was good politics.

Farmers prefer to plant less acreage to wheat in hopes of higher prices, Joseph W. Fichter of the Ohio Farmers Union says. "Farmers cannot afford to risk an increase in production without assurance of a price that will pay for the expanded production."

Some farm commentators view the Kennedy Round wheat agreement as a "sellout" of American farmers. Others are skeptical. The influential Farm Journal, which incidentally called the acreage allotment on the nose at 59 million acres, says:

"Those higher minimum wheat prices negotiated in the Kennedy Round aren't really guarantees, after all . . . If they (exporting countries) can't agree on how to keep prices above $1.73 (a bushel), then any country can sell for less—and take the wheat business unless other exporters follow the price down."

The administration is in a jam with farmers in general. The parity ratio hit 72, lowest parity figure in 34 years, in April. When parity ratio is at 100, the farmer is considered to be getting a proper return for his products in relation to the prices he has to pay.

The ratio bounced to 74 in May and stayed there last month. The rise in farm prices announced on July 17 could move the index up another notch.

The World Food Panel of the President's Science Advisory Committee on June 17 reported that the world faces a food crisis of "staggering proportions" by 1985 unless affluent nations immediately undertake a "massive, long-range, innovative effort unprecedented in human history."

James A. Perkins, chairman of the President's Advisory Committee on Foreign Assistance Programs, wrote the President on June 22 that it was "unthinkable" that the United States would reduce its own food production. Perkins said his committee "cannot believe that this country would so flatly turn its back on starvation." A day later came the announcement of the wheat acreage cut.

Assistant Secretary of Agriculture Dorothy H. Jacobson on July 3 answered Perkins. She said no food aid request had been turned down for lack of food. Production in excess of the current wheat crop, Mrs. Jacobson said, would cause either a higher cost to taxpayers or lower prices to farmers, or both.

Two wheat acreage increases last year, each of 15 percent, replenished dangerously low wheat reserves. But they pushed the price down nearly 10 cents to $1.49 on the farm by mid-June.

Thus does politics becloud Mr. Johnson's War Against Hunger. Next year's wheat will be harvested only a few months before the November presidential election.

Problems of the Watts Community

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEL CLAWSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 18, 1967

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Benjamin F. Peery is president of the Coordinating Council of Wattes, a member of the advisory committee of the seventh district police department, and a member of the board of directors of the new Watts hospital. His wide experience in the area, his special knowledge of problems faced by the Watts community, as well as his reputation for fair and independent judgment qualify him uniquely to speak with authority on the operation of the antipoverty program in that troubled section of Los Angeles County. Accordingly, I commend to the attention of my colleagues in the House who will be called upon to approve an extension of the war on poverty this year, Mr. Peery's advice to a subcommittee of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee on May 12, in Los Angeles. The statement follows:

Members of this honorable committee: it is accepted in this community that the Poverty Program is a dismal failure except in the areas of Head Start Programs, certain Teen Posts, a group known as Watts Happening, and high salaries for the right people.

Our concern for the moment, however, reaches beyond the intolerable situation that exists in the administration of poverty program funds. The taxpayers and home owners in this community are fearful of an uncomprising attitude against the rehabilitation of the devastated area by persons associated with Westminster Service Center, a Poverty Fund supported institution located in the heart of Watts.

Every attempt to promote jobs, encourage industry or engage in any venture in private enterprise is violently opposed by persons connected with Westminster. I cite a case in point. Raymond Jones, a Negro Watts Businessman, owned a block of deteriorating buildings on Central Avenue, a street mostly dedicated to commercial purposes. He made application for a zone change in order to build a small shopping center in a neighborhood where there was a lack of stores or services. The supermarket that had provided such services was burned during the riots and has never been rebuilt. Persons associated with Westminster House claques, most of whom had no vested community interest, crowded the Council Chamber and temporarily defeated the measure. Only after long and laborious efforts on the part of citizens truly interested in community development was the matter finally concluded and the zone variance granted. In another instance, H. C. (Chad) McClellan, a past president of Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, gathered the heads of larger industries in the Los Angeles area and instituted a program that resulted in supplying jobs for over 12,000 persons in the Watts area. Every device possible has since been used to discredit Mr. McClellan's effort and insult hurled at the man himself by persons associated with or friendly to the programs of Westminster.

Recently the Southern Pacific Railway proposed a program to bring industry into Watts to provide jobs for community resiresidents. In a mass meeting held to inform citizens of the progress of the proposal, persons associated with Westminster openly stated that they were opposed to the program—that they had arms similar to those in army use and that twenty one hundred would come out from under the rocks if the industrial park program became a fact.

In a similar but unrelated program on the part of the Watts Redevelopment Group, composed of citizens of the community, appointed by the Mayor to suggest and supervise in the rebuilding of the destroyed business area have encountered strenuous opposition from persons associated with Westminster.

Recently a Priest associated with Westminster House appeared on a TV program called Newsmakers. He stated that stockades were being built by the L.A.P.D. to contain Negroes. Although the charge was denied by the Police Officials subsequent efforts were made to indoctrinate Jordan High School Students.

During the past three years several members of Westminster Board have resigned, giving as a reason: "they did not like what they saw going on there." Citizens are gravely concerned over the increasing number of young people who refuse to recite the Pledge of Allegiance to our flag at public meetings. They fear that it augurs ill for the future of us all. They are alarmed at the increasing number of youth who are embracing atheism, in the light of the fact that religious influence has been the very foundation of educational advancement among our people. In insecure wonderment they note that Westminster has (so I have been told), close to one hundred employees, but very few persons in key positions have lived in Los Angeles although there is a plethora of capable local candidates for such employment. They are amazed that the Presbytery of California has failed to render unto Caesar things that are Caesars. That while dominating large sums of money to Westminster they have by their acquiescence encouraged the growth of atheism and disrepect for the things dear to the heart of those who feel that we have a real stake in America. Westminster is funded by the government in taxpayers money.

There is an almost tragic contrast when we see groups who without the assistance of Federal Aid, are struggling, using their own meager resources to keep alive the dignity of a distressed community. Organizations like Watts Positive trying to cast an image of community respect. Community Pride, using their private resources in an effort to encourage their neighbors to take pride in their homes and their possessions—to build a community that knows no shame. Destiny—that fine group of young men who make personal sacrifices that they might teach disadvantaged youngsters the meaning of true sportsmanship and those small virtues that make a man equal to his fellows.

Those unfunded PTA Groups who sometimes deny themselves that deprived school children might have food. The C. of C. laboring to free business from its shackles, forged in the white heat of disorder. Watts is at a crossroads. It must choose to develop in the normal American Way, or become a permanent reservation of poverty.

Gentlemen of this honorable committee: I respectfully urge you to make an investigation in depth of the activities, the programs, the handling of funds and for what purposes they are spent at Westminster, lest those responsible for the poverty program bear the onus of perhaps using public funds to promote civil disobedience.

BEN PERRY.

One War Was Not Fought

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 18, 1967

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, the July 6, 1967, edition of the Cassville (Mo.) Republican includes an editorial entitled "One War Was Not Fought." It describes what might have occurred if the administration's ground rules for fighting the war in Vietnam were applied to the Middle East. The editorial should be on Secretary of Defense McNamara's "must" reading list. The editorial follows:

ONE WAR WAS NOT FOUGHT

We've been wondering what would have happened had the Israelis fought the Arabs using the ground rules that restrict our men in Vietnam. Let's say there had been a phone call from the chief of state of Israel to the commanding general when the action in the Middle East was building to a crescendo, like the following:

Hello, is this General Dayan? This is the Premier, calling from Tel Aviv.

General, we are getting some disturbing reports about the way you're running the war against the Arabs and I'd like to offer a few sugegstions. As some of my advisers point out, there are a lot of serious political considerations that you're ignoring completely.

I know you're in the middle of things and these advisers are far from the action, but look, General, you just can't ignore world opinion. And world opinion is dead set against winning wars, escalation, and things like that. Do you want us to start getting demonstrations here, like in the United States?

But that's only part of it, General. You also overlook the fact that nowadays you don't fight a war to win but to get your opponent to the negotiating table.

You think what you're doing is going to get Nasser to sit down with us?

All right, General, I know our people want victory. But why can't you give them something to cheer about without being so destructive? Never mind smashing up equipment they're buying on the installment plan from Russia. Turn you fliers loose in the Sinai Desert and let them blast away at the rocks. Or maybe they can find an oasis somewhere. But make sure there aren't any people around. We have some fellows in the Foreign Relations Department who'll start holding hearings if they suspect we've injured any civilians. And that fellow from CBS-television in New York may show up to do a series about civilian casualties.

And there's something else, General. Some of the guys in the computer department are unhappy about the cost-effectiveness aspects of this war. They say it's out of balance. So you'd better stop and prepare some studies to show what we're getting for what we've invested. Send it in quadruplicate and then stand by in case we need you back here for hearings.

Now look, General, I know you're supposed to be the military leader. But there's more to a war than fighting and you know what Truman had to do with MacArthur when he forgot that. So if you can't stand the heat you'd better get out of the Sinai.

Or maybe what I mean to say is, cool it. If you can't fight a war without making people mad at you, we'll get someone who can.

Robert C. Moot Assumes Duties as Administrator of Small Business Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 18, 1967

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Robert C. Moot, a knowledgeable and experienced Federal executive, has been appointed Administrator of the Small Business Administration by President Johnson. As his Deputy Administrator, Mr. Moot has chosen another experienced Washington executive, Mr. Howard Greenberg.

I take this means of wishing Administrator Moot and Deputy Administrator Greenberg the very best of good luck as they assume the leadership of this important one-stop shop for small businessmen in our Federal Government.

They are assuming significant and vital responsibilities inherent in the commitment of this Congress and the Federal Government to aid, counsel, assist, and protect the Nation's 5,000,000 small businessmen in every way possible under our statutes.

I know that the members of the House Small Business Committee, which I am honored to serve as chairman, look forward to working closely with Administrator Moot in the achievement of our basic objective of strengthening American small business.

In view of the interest of my colleagues and of the American small businessmen in the activities of the Small Business Administration, under unanimous consent I insert the official announcement of these appointments in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The announcement follows:

Robert C. Moot, who was confirmed by the United States Senate on July 13 as new Administrator of the Small Business Administration, today announced that he will appoint Howard Greenberg as Deputy Administrator of the Agency.

Moot, who had himself held the post of Deputy Administrator since last December, was nominated by President Lyndon B. Johnson to succeed Bernard L. Boutin, who resigned to enter private industry in his native state of New Hampshire.

Greenberg, who is 56, was appointed July 5, 1966, as SBA's Associate Administrator for Investment, with responsibility for the Small Business Investment Company program.

At the same time, Moot announced he will promote Glenn R. Brown, 39, from Deputy Associate Administrator to Associate Administrator for Investment, succeeding Greenberg.

Moot said of the appointments: "Howard Greenberg brings to the demanding job of Deputy Administrator a wealth of experience in Government, financial management and small business. Over the past year he has done an outstanding job in helping this Agency to meet the mandate given it by Congress and the direction of President Johnson to work with and assist America's nearly 5 million small businesses. Mr. Greenberg has my full confidence, and will work very closely with me in implementing the programs and directing the operations of SBA.

"Glenn Brown has worked closely with Howard Greenberg on the SBIC program for the last year. He is known and respected in the SBIC industry and, I am confident, will continue to make a major contribution in assisting small business in this important area."

During his 30-year career in Federal service, Greenberg has held a variety of increasingly important positions.

Early in his career, he served in the Department of the Interior, Office of Price Administration, War Assets Administration and the Housing and Home Finance Administration.

He joined the General Services Administration at its inception in 1950, helping establish its financial system. In 1953, with the establishment of the Small Business Administration, Greenberg was called upon to assist in development of financial controls at SBA.

He returned to GSA where he served until July of 1962 when he was named Associate Director for Management for the Peace Corps. In 1963, he returned again to GSA where he was appointed Commissioner of Utilization and Disposal, managing a property inventory of over two billion dollars.

Greenberg holds degrees of Bachelor of Commercial Science and Master of Commercial Science from Benjamin Franklin University, where he later lectured as an assistant professor. He and his wife, Rose, and their daughter, Cynthia, reside in Bethesda, Maryland.

Brown joined SBA in August of 1966 as Director of Western Area Operations in the SBIC program, and was promoted to Deputy Associate Administrator in November.

Previously he served as Southwestern Area supervisor for the Economic Development Administration. He also was a trial attorney for the Department of Justice and an assistant attorney general for the State of Texas. A native of Jacksonville, Texas, he is a graduate of the University of Texas, where he received his bachelor's and law degrees.

He and his wife, Peggy, have six children and live in Arlington, Virginia.

Many Job Corps Achievements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. McFALL
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 18, 1967

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, the Stockton Record of Stockton, Calif., recently described in an editorial the important accomplishments of the federally sponsored Job Corps.

The Job Corps is one of many programs administered by the Office of Economic Opportunity; however, as the editorial indicates, the young enrollees have built an impressive record in the past year.

I am glad to bring this timely editorial to the attention of my colleagues:

MANY JOB CORPS ACHIEVEMENTS

A Job Corps volunteer is not very likely to make headlines unless he does something he shouldn't. This is a pity because, on the whole, the Job Corps has been building up a rather impressive record in the past year. The conservation work done by Job Corpsmen includes developing hiking and bridle trails, building roads and recreation facilities in national parks, beautification, erosion control, and other improvements for natural resources protection. In addition, Job Corps volunteers have also provided sorely needed services in disaster emergencies.

They have fought forest fires in New Mexico, saved wildlife caught in the recent oil tide on Cape Cod, kept access roads to hospitals open during severe blizzards in Wyoming, and so on. During the past year corpsmen in Interior Department camps took part in fighting 38 forest fires and helped in 15 rescue missions, four flood disasters, one tornado and two major harvest crises.

Job Corps labor has accomplished an estimated seven million dollars worth of conservation work. That figure is almost half of the total cost of operating the 38 centers. It's good to know that, when given a chance, these underprivileged young people not only can work, but can do needed work well.

Procrastination as a Public Policy Has Cost Billions—When Will Nation Awaken?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES J. HOWARD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 18, 1967

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, one of the finest editorials I have ever read was printed in this Sunday's New Jersey Asbury Park Press. It is entitled "Procrastination as a Public Policy Has Cost Billions; When Will Nation Awaken?" This editorial clearly enunciates the cause of most of the problems our Nation faces today, that of being too late with too little. The 89th Congress for the first time in generations made a bold attempt at solving the many domestic problems that face us and it was willing to make the necessary sacrifices to bring about these solutions. It seems that the 90th Congress, however, is returning to the ostrich-type of legislating or lack of it, in hoping that if ignored the problems will go away. But they will not go away and there will continue to be poison in our air and water, poor housing, lack of freedom and equality for many Americans, until and unless, Congress takes the lead in continuing in full measure the efforts made by the 89th Congress. I commend this fine editorial to my colleagues:

[From the Asbury Park Sunday Press, July 16, 1967]

PROCRASTINATION AS A PUBLIC POLICY HAS COST BILLIONS—WHEN WILL NATION AWAKEN?

There is a general disposition to postpone all action until a crisis develops and then to take desperate measures to ameliorate it. In almost all fields of public policy there is little anticipation of developing problems and even less preparation to cope with them. The result is a tragic loss of lives, of money, and of the well-being of millions of citizens.

Costly proscrastination has become the keynote of public policy. Rather than grapple with a problem in its early stages a dilatory government and an apathetic citizenry succumb to the false hope that a major crisis will not arise. When it inevitably does they are shocked at the damage and then take the costly action that would not have been necessary had relatively inexpensive corrective measures been applied before the crisis struck.

We see it in racial relations, in air and water pollution, in public transportation, in community planning, in water supply and sewage disposal, and in almost every other facet of public policy.

Major cities, including Newark, are counting their dead, assessing material damage, and suffering incalculable spiritual damage as the result of race riots and violence that could have been avoided had the causes that prompt them been confronted in the past.

The air in many urban centers is not fit to breathe because there was not even a reasonable effort to curb pollution before it reached critical stages.

Beaches are being closed in Monmouth County and tremendous areas have been condemned for shell fishing because for decades it was temporarily cheaper to dump human and industrial wastes into the nearest bay or on beaches than to provide adequate sanitary disposal facilities.

A failure to provide a highway system commensurate with a rapidly expanding traffic load is responsible for a shocking slaughter in traffic accidents and an economic loss beyond estimate. Similarly a failure to rescue railroads from deterioration to the point of dilapidation has produced an excess of public inconvenience and economic stagnation. And now that the need for improved mass transit has been belatedly recognized the job of rebuilding the railroads will be many times the cost of having maintained them in years past.

Everywhere, and especially in New Jersey, there is a need for expanded public facilities ranging from schools to highways to public transportation to institutions to care for the unfortunate. With constructions costs mounting at a rapid annual rate, these facilities could have been built in the past at a fraction of the present cost and they would have served as a splendid investment in the public safety and well-being and in economic gains that would have speedily amortized them. But by ignoring the problem as it approached and adopting procrastination as a public policy we have forever lost the advantages improved facilities would have supplied. And we are confronted with a desperate need to build them now at a much higher price than they would have cost if undertaken when the need first became obvious.

The best way to combat a disease is to catch it in its incipient stage before it reaches critical proportions. Medical authorities agree that early detection and treatment of cancer offer the best chance of a cure. But in public policy we habitually wait for the crisis and then take desperate measures. At the best such treatment is long and costly. At the worst, despite large expenditures in time and money, it comes too late to remedy the situation.

The underlying causes of racial disturbances could have been erased years ago with appropriate action. The construction of a highway system equal to the traffic load over the past several years would have saved countless lives. Modernization of the railroads and other mass transit media would have given us an adequate public transportation system now rather than having burdened us with the cost of reconstructing it. Had we started planning, zoning, and enforcement of rigid building and health and fire codes years ago the blight and grotesque urban sprawl against which we are now waging a losing battle could have been avoided. In fact, with foresight and a readiness to act most of the pressing problems now calling for drastic and desperate action could have been solved before they reached the critical stage. Such action would have cost millions. To repair the damage done by delay will now cost billions.

Procrastination and an abysmal lack of preparation is plaguing us now. But if that be water over the dam, let's make sure that by continued indifference we do not visit the plague upon our children and their children.

GOP Attack Perils Poverty Programs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 18, 1967

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following article by Carl Rowan, entitled "GOP Attack Perils Poverty Programs," published in the July 17, 1967, issue of the Detroit, Mich., News:

GOP Attack Perils Poverty Programs

(By Carl Rowan)

Washington.—The blinding forces of political ambition and racial chauvinism are teaming up again in the U.S. Congress, and the result may be a tragic escalation of social strife in America.

The Republicans and Southern Democrats seem determined to combine their votes to abolish the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO). They have a good chance of achieving the declared GOP goal of "eliminating or redirecting existing programs" in the war on poverty.

Under the guise of reducing the federal bureaucracy, the Republicans want to take whatever survives of the war on poverty and spread it out among older departments and agencies like Labor, Agriculture and Health, Education and Welfare.

Not only would this be short-sighted, but it goes against what I think is the traditional American sense of justice. Businessmen, farmers, organized laborers, veterans and many other groups have long had departments and agencies in Washington whose specific task was to look out for their interests.

But the weakest, least articulate "minority group" in America—our 30 million poor people—have had nothing until OEO came along. They need a voice in Washington.

Americans living in rural squalor and the despair of big city ghettos are going to get precious little from Washington under the best of circumstances. They will get even less if the poverty programs are denied central direction, if they are dispersed among several agencies where fighting poverty will surely find a lowly place in the priority of things.

Still, OEO is in danger, a fact that accounts for President Johnson's sudden spate of public appearances with Sargent Shriver, director of OEO.

The President has thrown himself into a major public relations campaign to save the program that is the flagship of his Great Society.

OEO is highly vulnerable to Republican assaults because the war on poverty has been escalated so rapidly, and spread to so many fronts, that millions of Americans don't know which program does what, or how well, or at what cost.

The terms Vista, Upward Bound and Community Action have only the vaguest meaning to most taxpayers. Thus, when the Republicans charge that in three years "the poverty war has spent $4 billion of the taxpayers' money and created a poverty bureaucracy of 91,000 administrators," congressmen sensitive to the moans of the taxpayer get nervous.

Republicans have picked up support for the abolition of OEO from Southerners because OEO has the image of being created to "help Negroes." This view persists, ironically, despite the fact that it is in the South that so many poor whites are being helped through various poverty programs.

The battle shaping up is history repeating itself. Just as the Republicans found that they could not attack social security and other Roosevelt New Deal measures directly, so today we find that they dare not attack frontally the various programs administered by OEO.

The head start program, designed to give underprivileged kiddies a reasonable chance in the race we call the pursuit of happiness, is one of our country's most significant educational innovations in a generation. What American can attack an Upward Bound program that will send to college this fall 6,000 youngsters who were on the verge of becoming high school dropouts two years ago?

But the Republicans must have an alternative to the "Great Society" for the 1968 elections. Moderate Republicans like Reps. Charles Goodell of New York and Albert Quie of Minnesota, who are the spear carriers for the assault on Johnson's programs, know they can't go to their constituents and say: "I voted against Head Start, and legal services for the poor, and the neighborhood medical centers" that offer decent health opportunities to many poor people for the first time in their lives.

So what the Republicans are saying is that the programs generally are all right, but the agency created by the Democrats to administer these programs is all wrong. They will say to their voters: "I was all for these programs to help the poor people; all I did was get some of those bureaucrats out of those fat jobs and save some money so you can get some more service."

That would seem to offer Republicans the best of both worlds. But if they wind up merely mangling a program that already was a half-century late in arriving, what seemed to be a clever political opportunity will turn out to be another debacle.

Rail Strike Legislation

SPEECH

OF

HON. HENRY C. SCHADEBERG

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1967

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, because I was firmly convinced that the well-being of our Nation was truly at stake, I voted for compulsory arbitration to settle the rail strike. I am no happier today than I was yesterday with the lack of any constructive alternative to the precipitous action we were forced to take.

It was stated by spokesmen in the administration and in the Congress that the conduct of the Vietnam war would suffer if the strike were to continue. I agreed generally with such a premise but I did pose a question we should all ask. Are we in a war? We are actually in a conflict being managed by the White House alone. The President and his appointed advisers, like the ever optimistic Mr. McNamara, are calling the shots with little if any consultation with congressional leaders. Congress itself has been bypassed except to be called on to react to every Presidential action, yet Congress alone has the power to declare war.

In the rail strike as well as Vietnam the Congress finds itself in a position of doing exactly what the President wants or of letting the boys down in Vietnam. The same trap has already been laid for us with the upcoming request for a substantial tax raise. I for one wish to state that I will not vote for a tax increase which obviously has no real bearing on the conduct of the Vietnamese conflict. As I have said before, it is obvious that the administration only wants to insist that the taxpayer tighten his belt while the administration loosens its own belt.

Kosygin's Words at Glassboro Recall Reds' Panmunjom Tune

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 18, 1967

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

KOSYGIN'S WORDS AT GLASSBORO RECALL REDS' PANMUNJOM TUNE

(By Vice Adm. Ruthven E. Libby, USN, ret.)

It is interesting that the Central Committee of the Soviet Communist party chose to issue its new policy declaration, prepared in anticipation of the 50th anniversary of the Russian Revolution which comes this November, concurrently with talks at Glassboro, N.J., between Soviet Premier Alexei Kosygin and President Johnson, which, according to Kosygin, "both sides believe to have been useful."

The Kremlin's policy manifesto, while somewhat milder in tone than the previous issues, still defines "peaceful coexistence" as including wars of national liberation waged against the West. Once more the United States is charged with "criminal aggression" in Vietnam. Once again the finger is pointed at us as "the main enemy of the national liberation movement." And yet again we are treated to the familiar Communist line that the Soviet military might "creates a real counterbalance to the aggressive forces of imperialism and is a major factor in the struggle for the prevention of a new world war and the maintenance of peace."

As for the "summit meeting" itself (and I wonder why they didn't hold it in Summit, N.J.?), it is to be hoped that President Johnson is right in his optimistic declaration that it is fair to say that it had made the world "a little less dangerous."

But on the basis of the published accounts, and of Kosygin's asseverations immediately following the breakup of the talks, it is difficult to find any grounds for such hope.

Once more the current Soviet price for any temporary reduction in world tensions has been spelled out clearly: Hand over South Vietnam to the Communists; declare Israel an aggressor and strip her of all the territorial gains acquired incident to her recent successful effort to defend herself against the abortive Arab attempt to destroy her.

The music is the same as I listened to for seven long months in the truce tent at Panmunjon; only the words are a bit different.

It would appear that the summit meeting could be considered useful only on the off chance that it convinces the President and his advisors of the utter futility—not to say folly—of trying to deal with the Communists on the basis of ethics and decency.

These are completely abstract terms which have no substance to a Communist, and no amount of wishful thinking on our part can alter this unhappy fact of life one iota. It is impossible for a Communist to have either and still be a Communist.

For example: Kosygin's lengthy assault on the West and upon Israel in the emergency session of the General Assembly was a tissue of lies from the beginning to end. This he very well knows—but what is particularly revealing to those who are not up on Communist dialectics is that he knows we know it.

To a non-Communist, knowingly telling inflammatory lies in a forum dedicated (theoretically) to preserving the peace would be somewhat embarrassing—but Kosygin couldn't care less. He was merely showing the world once again that like every Communist, he believes the end justifies the means.

By the same token, the Soviet tactics of trying to convince the Arabs that they should now rearm and have another crack at driving the Israeli into the sea is not indicative of a burning desire on the part of Kosygin and the Polituburo for world peace—as the West defines peace. And parenthetically, French President Charles de Gaulle, by joining Moscow in this shameful charade, must share the blame for the tragic results if these tactics succeed.

The only conceivable connection between Vietnam and the Middle East (which Kosygin declares are inseparable) is that each again demonstartes that in the Communist lexicon, military assaults launched by Communists on any level are not aggression, but that action by the free world to defend itself against such onslaughts is.

Perhaps it is not out of order to remind our administration of the well-known Communist definitions of "peace" as the state of affairs where the Communist takeover of the world is proceeding on schedule, and "lasting peace" as the situation which will exist when this takeover has been completed.

Were the current mess in the Middle East and its less than edifying aftermath in the General Assembly to persuade Washington to adopt a more realistic and tough-minded attitude toward the United Nations, and to conduct our foreign affairs in a less adventitious manner, the world would indeed "be a little less dangerous."

Last year Charles B. Marshall, sometimes member of the State Department's Policy Planning Staff, told a Congressional committee (anent conditions in South Africa) that some of the "purely declamatory resolutions we have been persuaded to concur in at the U.N. from time to time . . . are related to foreign policy about in the way that a man's New Year's resolutions form a part of his biography."

Yet they get wide publicity in the South African press and serve further to exacerbate relations with a country with which, by every consideration of common sense and mutual interest, we should cooperate fully.

Last week that country's foreign minister pointed out that while tensions were building up in the Middle East, the U.N. wasted its time in a special session on South West Africa "struggling with the phantoms and ghosts of its own imagination." Its only contribution was to withdraw the task force which had been placed in the Middle East for the very purpose of maintaining the peace." Although continuing South Africa's long-established policy of non-interference in the affairs of others, the minister did point out that the current situation emphasized once more the importance to the world of the sea route around the Cape of Good Hope.

For the third time in the past 30 years, South Africa has to step in and help solve the traffic problems caused by the closure of the Suez Canal to shipping.

Profiting from the lessons learned in the 1956 crisis, shiphandling and ship supplying facilities at Cape Town, Durban, Port Elizabeth and East London, South Africa, have been increased from two to four times their former capacity, and even without the recurring Suez closures, the importance of the Cape route is bound to increase because of the trend toward mammoth tankers and bulk carriers too big to transit the canal when it happens to be open and or available to western shipping.

It is little wonder that Minister Hilgard Muller told his Parliament: "We hope that the time will arrive when it will be fully realized how essential it is that the sea route around the Cape must be kept open and safe . . . It is simply incomprehensible that those who benefit from our action (in keeping it open) do not see that we must be assisted in carrying out this task as well as possible and not be impeded in doing so."

It is indeed.

Ladies' Diamond Jubilee, S.C. Sokol Youth Slet, and Four Slovak Conventions Enrich Year of Faith

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 18, 1967

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, the week of July 23 will be one which is most significant to the Slovak community of America. During that week the First Catholic Slovak Ladies Union will celebrate its diamond jubilee and the Year of Faith and 11th Centenary of the Arrival of SS. Cyril and Methodius. I am sure that my colleagues will be most interested in the following article from the Good Shepherd of Passaic, N.J., which briefly summarizes the activities planned for the national convention. The recital of events is testimony to the excellent work done by a fine and worthy organization.

The article follows:

LADIES' DIAMOND JUBILEE, S.C. SOKOL YOUTH SLET, AND FOUR SLOVAK CONVENTIONS ENRICH YEAR OF FAITH

(By John C. Sciranka)

The Year of Faith and the Eleventh Centenary of the arrival of SS. Cyril and Methodius in Rome, are observed in the month of July by a Diamond Jubilee of the First Catholic Slovak Ladies Union and its 29th National Convention at the Hotel Sheraton-Cleveland, Cleveland, Ohio, and the 23rd National Slet, Track and Field Meet and the 20th National Convention of the Slovak Catholic Sokol at Hotel Pick-Congress, Chicago, Ill.

The Sokol Youth will meet for the Physical Fitness Program on July 20, 21 and 22 at the Morton West High School Stadium, Berwyn, Ill.

Here are the highlights of the four most significant events in the life of the American Slovaks in this the Year of Faith, besides the National Convention of the First Catholic Slovak Union of the U.S.A. and Canada, scheduled for Philadelphia in August. It is the largest Slovak fraternal organization in the world. Also, the Slovak Catholic Federation Convention and the Slovak League 60th anniversary celebration, both held in Cleveland recently.

SLOVAK LADIES WILL CELEBRATE DIAMOND JUBILEE AND CONVENTION IN CLEVELAND

Abiding by the rule "ladies first," the following program is taking place in Cleveland, O., for the Diamond Jubilee celebration:

On Saturday, July 22, Convention Ball will take place at the Sheraton-Cleveland, O. The famous Sammy Kaye and his Swing and Sway Band will entertain.

On Sunday, July 23, pontifical mass will be celebrated by Most Rev. Bishop Clarence G. Issenmann at the St. John Cathedral at 3 P.M. Rt. Rev. Msgr. Michael M. Tondra, Supreme Chaplain, will preach. Most Rev. Bishop Andrew G. Grutka, Supreme Honorary President of the Union will be present at the mass with other prelates and priests.

On Sunday evening Convention Banquet will be held at the Hotel Sheraton-Cleveland, O., with greetings from Mrs. Susan Matuscak, Supreme Secretary, Mrs. Elizabeth Lipovsky, Supreme President, will be toastmistress. Invocation will be pronounced by Bishop Grutka. Rt. Rev. Msgr. M. K. Mlynarovic will deliver the "toast" to the 'Diamond Jubilee. Mayor Ralph Locher and Bishop Issenmann will address the gathering. Msgr. Tondra will make the presentation. Mrs. Frances L. Mizenko will sing, accompanied by Mrs. Anne Fusillo, editor of "Zenská Jednota". Rt. Rev. Abbot Jerome Koval, O.S.B. will give the benediction.

Entertainment will be by Jack Morton Productions, Inc., creators and producers of Fine Entertainment with this cast of The Volantes, Lori Wilson, Sasha Tormas, Bob McGrath and Jimmy Joyce. Music by Al Russ and his orchestra.

The Convention will open on Monday morning. Masses will be celebrated every morning in the Hotel by Msgr. Tondra and other priests.

On Wednesday, the delegates will observe the feast of their patroness, St. Anna at Our Lady of Levocha Shrine, Bedford, O., where they will be the guests of the Vincentian Sisters. Abbot Koval will concelebrate Slovak Liturgy. Luncheon will be at the Lumen Cordium High School. The delegates will also visit the Villa Sancta Home for the Aged, Beachwood, O.

The Convention will continue until Thursday after the election and installation of Supreme Officers will take place.

The organization was founded in Cleveland, O., 75 years ago by Mrs. Anna Hurban and eight Slovak women with the aid of Rev. Stephen Furdek. Now it has a membership of 96,000 and assets of 42 million dollars and with the modern Home for the Aged. Over 460 delegates are attending this Convention.

SLOVAK CATHOLIC SOKAL HAS 10-DAY PROGRAM IN CHICAGO

The Slovak Catholic Sokol has a 10-day program in Chicago, Ill. It will open on Wednesday evening, July 19, when 600 drillers will congregate with their commanders and commandresses at the Hotel Pick-Congress.

Here the holy mass will be celebrated for the drillers and delegates each morning at the hotel by the Rt. Rev. Msgr. Emil R. Suchon, Supreme Chaplain of the organization. The Physical Fitness Program will take place at the Morton West High School Stadium, Berwyn, Ill., where the drillers will be transported each day.

On Saturday evening a Youth Victory Dance will take place at the Pick-Congress Hotel with two orchestras. The Sokol Queen will be crowned. Mrs. Mary Piroch, Ladies Supreme Vice-President, will be in charge of the crowning ceremonies and also is arranging a Handicraft Exhibition with Mrs. Tony Hietko, local chairman.

On Sunday morning, Most Rev. Aloysius Wycislo, Auxiliary Bishop of Chicago as representative of His Eminence John P. Cardinal Cody, will celebrate pontificial mass at St. Michael's Church, assisted by the local pastor, Rev. Armand Gress, O.S.B., Rev. Daniel Romancik and other prelates and priests. Rt. Rev. Msgr. Emil R. Suchon, Supreme Chaplain will preach. Dinner will follow in St. Michael's Parish Hall.

The National Slet will take place on Sunday afternoon in Berywn, Ill., where Joseph G. Prusa, Supreme Secretary and General Chairman will welcome the participants. Paul C. Fallat, Supreme President, will speak for the organization. Mayor Dolezal will welcome the guests and Congressman Donald Rumsfield will deliver the principal address.

The Physical Fitness program is under the supervision of Stephen C. Burican, Supreme Commander; Mrs. Irene Matuschak, Supreme Commandress; Frank Petruff, Supreme Sports and Athletic Director and members of the Supreme Technical Board. Over 600 drillers will take part in the picturesque mass exhibition.

On Monday morning at 8 a.m. Chicago Time, Rt. Rev. Abbot Thodore G. Kojis, O.S.B., supreme honorary chaplain, will celebrate pontifical mass at the hotel. Msgr. Suchon will preach. The Convention will formally open with the welcome address by Joseph G. Prusa, general chairman; John Kedzuf, local chairman. Paul C. Fallat, Supreme President, will deliver the keynote address.

The business of the Convention will follow. On Monday evening delegates will be guests of the local committee at St. Simon Parish of which Rev. Daniel Romancik is pastor and Rev. Richard Skriba, assistant pastor.

On Tuesday afternoon the delegates will visit the Slovak Benedictine Sisters Convent at Tinley Park, Ill.

On Wednesday evening a Convention Banquet will be held.

There are over 360 delegates and supreme officers attending the convention.

The Slovak Catholic Sokol was founded in Passaic, N.J., on July 4, 1905, with 43 members. One of them, the only living founder, Mr. Andrew Klukosovsky of Clifton, N.J., will be the guest at the Convention. The organization has assets of 22 million dollars and a membership of 52,000. It publishes the Katolicky Sokol weekly and the Priatel' Dietok monthly for the youth.

The last convention of the organization was held in Chicago in 1924.

We felicitate both the Slovak Catholic Sokol and the First Catholic Slovak Ladies Union and wish them success in their deliberations and God's blessing.

The Late Honorable J. Arthur Younger

SPEECH

OF

HON. WILLIAM C. WAMPLER

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 13, 1967

Mr. WAMPLER. Mr. Speaker, it is with heavy heart that I rise to pay tribute to our departed colleague, the Honorable ARTHUR YOUNGER, of California.

I came to know ART YOUNGER during the first days of the 83d Congress when we were both freshmen Members of the House of Representatives. Although there was a disparity in our ages, I came to know and to respect him as a fine Christian gentleman.

After an absence of 12 years, ART YOUNGER was one of the first to greet me when I returned as a Member of the 90th Congress. He welcomed me back to the Halls of Congress and in typical fashion, offered me friendly assistance in reestablishing here in Washington.

I remember well our conversation in which we reminisced about our previous congressional service together. He also told me of the trip he and Mrs. Younger enjoyed to Africa after the adjournment of the 89th Congress. It is obvious that he and Mrs. Younger enjoyed traveling, and had traveled extensively in our country and abroad.

Mr. Speaker, the 11th District of California has lost a true representative of the people, and the entire Nation has lost a prudent and dedicated public servant.

As the poet Tennyson said, "The finger of God touched him and he slept." I am sure that those of us who were privileged to know ART YOUNGER are richer and blessed by that experience.

I wish to extend to Mrs. Younger and the family my deepest sympathy.

Rural Electrification in Vietnam Assisted by U.S. REA Leaders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 18, 1967

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, we all know the tremendously effective job of our rural electric cooperatives have done in America—their role in the growth and progress of our rural and smalltown areas.

However, the current issue of Tennessee magazine discusses another phase of the activities of the leadership in this great rural electric activity which is richly deserving of commendation.

This phase of their activity deals with the rural electrification efforts in Vietnam, assisted by such leaders in the field as Mr. J. C. Hundley, manager of the Tennessee Electric Cooperative Association and Mr. Paul Tidwell, manager of the Meriwether Lewis Electric Cooperative, Centerville, Tenn. These men and others are doing a great work in this area.

Because of the interest of my colleagues and the Nation in general, I include the article, "Co-op Electrification Precedes Peace in South Vietnam," in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The article follows:

CO-OP ELECTRIFICATION PRECEDES PEACE IN SOUTH VIETNAM

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Nations, the majority of whose citizens are poorly educated, whose standards of living are extremely low, and whose futures look far from bright—such nations are often the ones which are subject to attack, either militarily or with such ideologies as Communism. Our Federal Government has long recognized this, as evidenced by its foreign aid programs, but it wasn't until a few years ago that an agency of the Government, the Agency for International Development, in cooperation with the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, launched a concerted campaign to help electrify unserved areas of these underdeveloped nations, meaning the rural, village and small town areas, many of whose residents have never seen an electric light. At least two Tennesseans, Paul Tidwell, Manager of Meriwether Lewis Electric Co-op, Centerville, and J. C. Hundley, Manager of the Tennessee Electric Cooperative Association, Nashville, have made overseas trips to conduct surveys preliminary to rural electrification in the nations which they visited. Other co-op officials throughout our nation have given of their time and talents to help bring the blessings of electricity to underdeveloped nations throughout the world. The electrification program of one such nation, South Vietnam, has one cooperative energized and others nearing that stage. The story which follows, in two installments, is the story of rural electrification in South Vietnam, a blessing which can help so many people in this small, underdeveloped nation as an instrument for progress which is preceding the peace for which we hope and pray for and for all nations everywhere.)

Rural electrification is coming to Vietnam. It can't happen soon enough for approximately 42,500 families who will become members of three recently-founded cooperatives in the war-torn country. To these people, who rely on oil lamps for light and who generate power by the use of strong arms and legs, the prospect of electric power is an exciting one.

Already one hamlet near Dalat, 174 miles north of Saigon, has been energized, while another hamlet nearby is currently being wired for electricity. Only the delayed completion of a pole-treating plant is preventing the electrification of other hamlets whose inhabitants have already joined into cooperative associations. So far, there are 19,950 paid-up members.

The idea of taking electric power to a pre-selected group of Vietnamese families was discussed in 1965, when President Johnson promised that the U.S. government would help complete an electrification program. The National Rural Electric Cooperative Association (NRECA) had formulated plans for such a program following arrival of its representatives in Vietnam in 1965.

Under the NRECA plan, carried out under a non-profit contract with the Agency for International Development (AID), three distribution cooperatives were formed in Vietnam in 1965.

The largest cooperative has been established approximately 90 miles south of Saigon, at Long Xuyen, where 25,000 families will benefit from the new electric power. As there is no ready source of electricity at Long Xuyen, two 1500 kw generators are now being installed. The generators were shipped to Saigon, loaded into trucks, and taken by convoy along a Viet Cong-controlled highway to their destination.

A second cooperative has been established at Tuyen Duc, a vegetable growing area north of Saigon. In addition to hundreds of small farms, a large tea plantation is located at Tuyen Duc, where approximately 10,000 families and associated industries will receive electric power.

A third cooperative is located only 20 miles northeast of Saigon on Highway One. This cooperative has been set up in the Duc Tu district, only a few miles from the giant new American military base of Long Binh.

Duc Tu is composed of 16 hamlets in which approximately 7,000 families will eventually have electric power. According to the cooperative advisor, Louie E. Sansing, a former co-op manager from Hamburg, Arkansas, the only thing holding up electrification is the lack of poles.

"These people are really anxious and they keep asking why the delay." Mr. Sansing said. His job is to keep in touch with the board members, help advise the cooperative, and act as liaison between the various interested parties.

As cement poles are too expensive for use in Vietnam, a pole-treating plant has been shipped from the United States and should be ready for use by July or August. There is plenty of good timber available in Vietnam, and the poles can be treated and shipped to the cooperatives much more cheaply than would be the case if cement poles were used.

However, all kinds of obstacles have prevented the immediate construction of the treatment plant in Phan Rang, a coastal town 175 miles north of Saigon. After several delays in New Orleans, the pole-treating plant was shipped to Vietnam. Due to the priorities of military equipment and the carelessness of some Army dock workers, the treatment plant was unloaded on the beach, where it was submerged by the first high tide. Some of the equipment has been looted on the way, and salt water corroded the rest.

NRECA workers have been spending months trying to make the plant functional. If all goes well, it may be ready for operation by mid-summer.

In the meantime, cooperative members are wondering why there is no electricity. To meet this growing need, an attempt is now being made to persuade the U.S. Army to lend some poles which were shipped from the United States.

Rail Strike Legislation

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN W. WYDLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1967

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, this weekend Newsday published a story by Judge Samuel I. Rosenman relating to the most important domestic issue of the moment. The timing of this story, coming as it does on the eve of a nationwide crisis caused by a threatened railroad strike, was most appropriate. The article is well written, well thought out, and deserves the attention of my colleagues in the Congress and all citizens in the Nation who are striving so hard to find a solution to the nationwide strike affecting the national interest. I am therefore placing it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on this day when the Congress is being called upon to take emergency action to protect the public:

A BETTER WAY TO HANDLE STRIKES

(By Samuel I. Rosenman)

Mr. O. Citizen (O for Outraged) picks up his newspaper on June 15, 1961, and reads that this is the 24th day of a national maritime strike. Hundreds of ships are idle, cargo is piling up, much of it is rotting, international contracts cannot be fulfilled, thousands of American firms are being severely strained. The secretary of labor had told the President only eight days after the beginning of the strike that it would imperil national health and safety if it continued. And it had, for 16 more days.

Mr. Citizen mutters: "Something has to be done about this immediately, and also to prevent it again in the future. There's got to be some law about it."

But in the months and years that follow, he still reads of threatened strikes, or of actual long strikes, in stevedoring, bituminous coal mines, atomic energy plants, basic steel mills, newspapers, the New York City subway and bus system, long-distance trucking, meat packing, communications, fabricating steel mills, aircraft manufacturing. And each time Mr. Citizen complains that something must be done about it.

Quite apart from danger or inconvenience to the public is the immense loss to the striking workers and their employers. In 1965, for example, in all industrial disputes 3,963 work stoppages occurred which involved 1,550,000 workers. Idleness amounted to 23,300,000 man-days. Of these strikes, 221 lasted 90 days or more. They averaged 25 days.

There was a time within memory when it was difficult, if not impossible, even to form a union strong enough to strike. Lack of union funds, the right of an employer to discourage or even to fire anyone who joined a union, lack of individual savings, competition among workers for one job, the activities of professional strikebreakers and strong-arm men, the alacrity of many courts to grant injunctions against strikes—these were shameful items in the American past in labor-management relations. There was no semblance of bargaining equality between an employer and an employe.

That era is behind us.

Starting with the once-revolutionary principle that a man was entitled by law to join a union of his choice, and to bargain collectively, equality of economic strength between management and labor was gradually established. Today unions sit around the bargaining table not as suppliants, but as equals.

It was my great privilege to play an active role—albeit rather anonymous—in some small part of this progress since 1933. I take great personal pride in this growth of the labor movement. I am sure that this article will bring down upon me the criticism, if not the imprecations, of all my friends in the labor movement. But what I urge here cannot be dismissed as coming from an old reactionary or labor baiter.

My thesis, boldly and broadly stated, is that—with labor equality insured by our many labor laws—the right to strike should be curtailed when it is in conflict with the public interest, and that some form of final compulsory decision must be provided.

I would limit it—at least initially—to certain well-defined industries: transportation by land, sea and air; manufacture or production of any material necessary to national health or security; communications; and essential public, municipal and state services such as police, fire, sanitation, subways and buses, hospitals, and public health and welfare agencies.

By compulsory decision, however, I do not mean compulsory arbitration by an ad hoc appointed board of arbitrators. I mean by a separate system of labor courts and a separate labor judiciary with the sole function of deciding labor disputes.

To the outraged citizen who demands a law, to prevent further stoppages I reply: There is a law—in fact, several laws—but these laws do not prevent or stop strikes often enough. Besides, and equally important, the laws never prevent all the distress and economic disarray which even a threat of a strike in a vital industry brings about.

What are the present laws?

There is the Railway Labor Act of 1926, which covers disputes involving railroads in interstate commerce and airlines in interstate or foreign commerce. When disputes are not settled, the National Mediation Board (three members appointed by the President) tries to bring about a settlement or to suggest compulsory arbitration. If arbitration is rejected (as it almost always is) and there is substantial danger that commerce may be interrupted to deprive any section of the country of essential transportation, the board notifies the President. The President may then create a Railway Emergency Board to investigate and report within 30 days. During these 30 days, and the next 30, no strike or lockout or change of employment rules can take place. This is the so-called 60-day "cooling-off" period.

There is the Taft-Hartley Law of 1947, to deal with nontransit disputes that might result in a national emergency when an entire industry, or a substantial part of an industry, is involved. If the President sees a peril to the national health or safety, he may appoint a board of inquiry to investigate and report publicly on the issues—without recommendations. He then directs the attorney general to get a court injunction, which is usually granted. For the next 60 days, the parties are supposed to negotiate with the assistance of U.S. mediation services. During those 60 days the President may reconvene the board to make a further public report. In the next 15 days the National Labor Relations Board must hold an employes' election on the final management offer, and must report the results within five days. Thus a cooling-off period of 80 days is provided. If the workers do not accept, which is usual, the parties are then free to strike or lockout and the President must give Congress his recommendations.

From 1947 through 1966, Taft-Hartley was invoked 24 times—10 by President Truman (whose veto of the act was overruled by Congress), seven by President Eisenhower and six by President Kennedy. Injunctions had to be obtained from the courts in 20 of these disputes. Settlements were reached during the cooling-off period in 10 disputes, in seven the strikes began or were continued even after the cooling-off period. In the same 20-year period, 109 emergency boards were set up under the Railway Labor Act.

In addition to the major federal statutes, many states have laws dealing with mediation, fact-finding and settlement of intrastate industrial disputes.

I have had personal experience with these boards. In 1946 I was appointed to one by the mayor of New York City, who was faced with an imminent subway and bus strike. On July 15, 1949, President Truman appointed me to a three-man special board when a steel strike was to take place the next day. On June 26, 1961, President Kennedy appointed me to a Taft-Hartley board in a national maritime strike. In 1963 President Kennedy appointed me chairman of an emergency board under the Railway Labor Act.

Among my colleagues on those four boards were Clark Kerr, then president of the University of California; Carroll Daugherty, James J. Healy, David L. Cole and Nathan Feinsinger, all experienced labor arbitrators and conciliators of outstanding reputation.

So I have had ample opportunity to observe the process at work. I have been in many long sessions with the parties separately and jointly. I have seen the parties come closer together, but have also seen their tempers heating up instead of "cooling off."

I am convinced that there eventually comes a time, after all the collective bargaining, mediation, fact-finding and recommendations have failed, when some third entity must come in and settle those parts of a labor dispute on which the parties cannot or will not agree.

Until now the only way, other than by consent to arbitration, has been to send the matter to Congress. This happened in the 1963 rail dispute, and has already happened twice in 1967.

The 1963 situation, involving railroad firemen, shows how desperately the government tries to avoid compulsory arbitration until it is up against the gun. And what happened in 1963 is being repeated—and even compounded—by what is now going on in the railroad industry.

The principal question in dispute in 1963 was whether the railroads should have the right to discontinue by attrition, pension, or job retraining and relocation the services of firemen who used to stoke steam locomotives but who were no longer necessary on diesel freight trains. Here's a chronology from 1959, when it all began:

November 1959. Notice served by railroads of a change in rules re: firemen.

Oct. 17, 1961. Creation of a presidential commission representing management, labor and the public. (Outside the Railway Labor Act, it did not have powers to decide but merely to recommend.) It devoted 13 months of study, had 96 days of hearings, took 15,306 pages of testimony and examined 319 exhibits totaling 20,139 pages.

Feb. 2, 1962. The commission's recommendations were reluctantly accepted by the railroads but not by the unions.

April 3, 1963. Creation of a Railway Labor Act board, of which I was chairman.

May 13, 1963. Our report issued. No settlement was reached and a strike became imminent involving 94 per cent of railroad employes.

June 5, 1963. President Kennedy persuaded the parties to maintain the status quo through July 10. The secretary of labor and the National Mediation Board intervened from June 4 to July 10, 1963, and there were about 100 meetings. No settlement.

July 9, 1963. One day before the deadline, the President suggested final arbitration by his former secretary of labor and then associate justice of the Supreme Court, Arthur J. Goldberg. The carriers agreed, but the unions did not.

July 10, 1963. The President got both sides to agree to an extension to July 29, and to his appointment of a new committee of six members of the Labor-Management Advisory Committee to review the facts and report. There is no statute providing for this third committee.

July 19, 1963. This committee reported. No settlement.

July 22, 1963. Seven days before the next deadline, the President finally sent a message to Congress asking legislation. Extensive congressional hearings took place while further mediation was attempted, and the deadline was postponed to Aug. 29.

Aug. 29, 1963. On the very eve of the strike, Congress passed a joint resolution calling for compulsory arbitration of the firemen issue by a new seven-man board (the fourth board) and further negotiation of the other issues. The arbitration award was to be valid, however, for only two years.

The new board held hearings again and made its award, providing for eventual elimination of the firemen. The railroads accepted it; the unions rejected it. The award was unsuccessfully challenged by the unions up to the U.S. Supreme Court.

The award of this board was carried out, but the legislation provided that it lapse on May 7, 1966. The entire matter is before us again just as it was back in 1959, unsettled and a fruitful source for a national strike, even though the other issues were settled by the intervention of President Johnson.

During all the developments following the President's message of July 22, 1963, which clearly provided for compulsory arbitration, all the political figures in the White House and on Capitol Hill kept insisting—with solemn face and without a smile—that they were not really exercising compulsion, but were providing for a continuance of collective bargaining. Of course, this was pure political hokum which fooled nobody, and certainly not the unions.

Now take a look at 1967, and you will see the same kind of shilly-shallying again at play in another threatened strike by six different union representing 137,000 nonoperating railroad shop workers. Indeed, it is a little more ridiculous:

1. An Emergency Railway Act board made recommendations for a settlement, which the unions rejected, and a strike was set for April 13.

2. The President asked for agreement extending the 80-day deadline, but the unions refused.

3. The President then asked Congress to extend the deadline for 20 days until May 3. It did—on April 12, a day before the deadline.

4. Congress, at the President's request on April 30, nearly the last moment, again extended the deadline to June 19.

5. On May 3, the old deadline, the President sent a message to Congress asking for legislation to (a) outlaw any rail strike until Jan. 1, 1969, (b) provide a new, five-man board to seek a negotiated settlement within 90 days, and (c) if none was reached, the board would make a final decision to take effect immediately and remain effective until Jan. 1, 1969.

Of course, anyone could see—as did all the disputants—that the entire plan was compulsory arbitration if further mediation by this third panel failed. (It would take effect, however, only until Jan. 1, 1969.) But both the White House and the Department of Labor called it "extended collective bargaining and mediation to finality."

Organized labor ridiculed this description of the proposed legislation, and proceeded to fight it bitterly in Congress. The railroads approved the legislation, but pointed out that it was only a temporary palliative—as the last arbitration on the railroad firemen issue had proven to be—and repeated their demand for a peramnent compulsory arbitration law.

The bill is having a hard time in Congress, which of course has recognized the proposal for what it is—compulsory arbitration. It can feel the labor leaders looking over its shoulders, insisting on the right to strike and tie up the nation's economy, unless there is seizure by the government. Of course, seizure has nearly always proven a fine weapon for the unions, for they have a better chance of getting what they want from the government than from the railroads. Seizure really solves nothing permanently, and is a much more drastic departure from the traditions of a free economy than the President's proposal.

The Senate passed the bill substantially in accord with the President's message. But not the House. There, after bitter debate, the bill was emasculated by striking out the final compulsory feature. In effect, if therefore is nothing more than an adjournment of the strike for 90 more days. As this is being written the bill is going to a House-Senate conference. The unions agreed to postpone the strike from the deadline of June 19, until such time as Congress agrees on a bill, and have proceeded to fight the compulsory feature as it had so successfully in the House.

This passing-the-buck between the White House and Capitol Hill is a repetition of the 1963 railroad crisis. Congress is justifiably irritated at having to shoulder the responsibility for individual labor disputes with all its political liabilities, a function which is executive rather than legislative.

Congress, consisting of 535 members, is by its very nature unqualified to find a fair settlement; it does not have the time or facilities, and it will of necessity be actuated by politics. It should not be called upon for these ad hoc emergency strikes, any more than in the many functions which it has delegated to the respective administrative agencies, such as granting television and radio licenses (FCC), fixing rates and regulations for interstate electricity and gas (FPC), and many others.

This is the fourth time in the past year that Congress has had to come to grips with a strike measure. Everyone knows that the only ultimate solution is some form of settlement by compulsion; yet all hope that by delay there may be some so-called voluntary settlement.

The President, in his annual message of 1966, promised to propose general legislation to prevent emergency strikes. This promise was made in the midst of the disastrous subway strike in New York City. The President, however, has failed as yet to carry out his promise. He appointed a task force to advise him on how to meet the problems generally and permanently, but he has not published the task force's recommendations—if it made any.

The President says that he has not yet found a satisfactory permanent proposal. Of course, if what he means is legislation "satisfactory" to management and labor, he is looking for an impossible Utopia. But it is equally important to find one "satisfactory" to the public and fair to both sides—and that is easy. Neither he nor the congressional leaders, however, want to make the first jump into the cold water of compulsion.

Now it seems that the President has given up and has asked Congress to find a "satisfactory" permanent solution—which he has not been able to do—for emergency strikes. It is difficult to see how or why Congress should undertake this politically dangerous chore when the President, after 17 months of striving to contrive a "satisfactory" law, passes the buck to Capitol Hill.

Even if no strike occurs on the railroads, it is obvious that the economy has been damaged by the uncertainty, the delay and the hazard of planning ahead. This is true of threatened strikes in all industries. Cooling-off periods are fine, but the public gets no share of the cooling. Opposition to compulsory arbitration has come with equal intensity from widely diverse ends of the political and economic spectrum. The subject has made as incredible a set of bedfellows as can be imagined: Wayne Morse and Barry Goldwater; the AFL–CIO and the National Association of Manufacturers.

Morse in 1953 said on the floor of the Senate that compulsory arbitration "attacks in my judgment some basic foundations of economic freedom in this Republic." In the same debate Goldwater said, "It can mean price control, wage control, quality control, and even place of employment control." The AFL–CIO has said that "compulsory arbitration means loss of freedom." And the NAM has said that it "violates the American concept of freedom, under which the government is the servant rather than the master of the people."

Of course, these statements are all emotional and grossly exaggerated. I am sure the same kinds of charges were made when the federal government was advancing—in violation of "freedom of contract"—to abolish child labor, limit hours of labor for women in industry, establish decent minimum wages and many other items of social legislation that are now accepted as normal areas of concern by the government.

Labor seems to overlook the fact that in two out of three major fields of industrial strife, it has voluntarily and without too much persuasion given up its "economic freedom" and its right to strike. There are three principal categories of labor disputes, all of which were formerly used as causes for strikes. These are (1) jurisdictional disputes as to which union should represent the workers in a plant or industry, (2) "grievances" arising out of the performance or nonperformance of existing labor contracts, and (3) making, renewing, or reopening of basic labor contracts.

By now, the first two categories have largely been abolished as causes for strikes. Nearly all labor contracts contain provisions that any dispute about the meaning or application of the contract, or grievances, should be determined by compulsory arbitration, either on an ad hoc basis or by referral to an agreed upon "impartial chairman" or "impartial umpire." This is quid pro quo for a no-strike clause in the contract. With respect to industries under the Railway Labor Act, grievances or problems of interpretation or applicability are referred by statute to the National Railroad Adjustment Board for decision.

The only category of disputes not covered by statute or agreement is the making of a new contract. The arguments against any form of compulsory arbitration in this category are well-known, and have been advanced in many places. Of course, most Americans would prefer settlement by collective bargaining. They would not even object too strenuously to strikes in some localized industry where there would be no substantial impact. When, however, the American people are faced by the national stagnation which must result from strikes like the 116-day steel strike in 1959 or the 36-day longshoremen's strike in 1963, or the railroad strike threatened in 1963 and now again in 1967, they will insist that the national interest prevail, and that such strikes be nipped in the bud by some form of compulsion.

The better way to handle a national emergency conflict—the way all economic and personal conflicts are settled in a democracy—is by judicial determination.

What I propose is a new judicial system of courts—labor courts—with jurisdiction solely over industrial strife, including strikes. This would be confined initially to industries affecting interstate commerce, threatening the health or safety of either the entire country or such portion of it as the statute may provide, and also to essential municipal services like subways and buses, etc., which have been stopped by a strike.

The essential feature of labor courts is that the judges would have the same title, dignity, respect and standing as all the other federal judges. This would require that they be appointed by the President for life, and confirmed by the Senate in the usual way; that their time be devoted exclusively to labor cases; that they have the same salaries, the same retirement privileges, all necessary clerks and assistants, and the same dignified courtrooms and chambers as other U.S. judges. They should be empowered to assure orderly hearings by contempt proceedings and, in all respects, have the same public standing and expertise in their particular field of labor as any other federal judicial officers. They will become qualified specialists in particular industries, and know the history of labor relations in those industries.

Labor courts' decisions should have the effect of judgments, enforceable by substantial fines, and appealable to a Federal Labor Court of Appeals consisting of the same type of specialized labor judges with powers to affirm, modify or reverse.

Labor court decisions should be conclusive and binding on both sides. In that sense the result will be the same as by compulsory arbitration. Yet I hazard a guess that most of the present rejection and abhorrence of compulsory arbitration by management and labor will gradually diminish and finally disappear.

I am sure that there is seldom the same complete confidence in an ad hoc board of appointed arbitrators as there is in a U.S. judge. There is naturally a great reluctance by both sides to have their economic future, and possibly their survival, placed in the hands of three men haphazardly appointed for one specific case. This reluctance is sometimes even greater with management than with labor, although labor protests more loudly.

The men usually appointed under the statutes or otherwise are necessarily part-time people. They all have their main economic interest elsewhere. Many of them are lawyers with busy practices; many are college professors whose main concern is not the disputes before them. Many of them (including myself) know practically nothing about the industry involved in the dispute, or of the history of labor relations in that industry. They have to begin from scratch, and learn the necessary background. While they are willing to serve as a matter of public duty, they still have their normal vocations to which they will return—hopefully as soon as possible. Some serve without pay on a job which may consume many weeks of seven 12-hour days. Those who are paid receive a small fraction of their normal earnings. It is a particularly thankless job because neither side, except in rare instances, is satisfied with the recommendations or findings, and they both publicly abuse the board.

Many of these board members hold jobs as professional "impartial chairmen" or "arbitrators" in different industries. They have been appointed on consent for a year or two by both sides of a labor contract, to pass upon grievances or disputes arising from the contract. Many industrialists privately fear that some of these persons tend to be partial to labor because they look to labor for its consent to be an impartial chairman. Whether there is any truth in this charge or not, it is enough if a substantial part of management believes it to be true.

Yet the same industrialist who views compulsory arbitration with suspicion feels perfectly content in submitting controversies—often involving matters of greater importance to him than an increased wage scale—to a U.S. judge. And he is quite prepared to abide by the judgment, feeling that this is the way of life in a democracy.

Labor, on the other hand, is more deeply concerned over the fact that compulsory arbitration makes unions give up their right to strike. From this premise, the conclusion is reached by union leaders, usually without any real analysis or reasoning, that our system of collective bargaining must come to an end under labor courts or compulsory arbitration. They also assert that compulsion must result in price-fixing, and eventually a regimented economy.

Nothing in my proposal calls for any interference with the give-and-take of collective bargaining. Unions will continue to require the same equality of strength, even though they cannot strike. For before a labor controversy reaches the end of the judicial process, both sides have to try to reach a settlement on as many of the issues as possible by collective bargaining. Only items on which agreement cannot be reached will have to be resolved by the court. Individual employes or even weak unions cannot do this kind of bargaining successfully. They must be strong enough to amass all the facts with which to sit opposite management at the bargaining table. They must be able to employ the best of economists, lawyers, statisticians and bargainers. And they must have even greater resources if they have to go to court on a long, protracted trial.

It is not true that collective bargaining must stop when the right to strike is taken away. That is not true in the Australian system of labor courts. That is not true of any other kind of civil dispute or litigation in our courts. For every case actually tried, there are scores which are settled before litigation, during litigation, and even in the course of trial. These civil settlements are all the results of vigorous bargaining. A party settles for less because he fears that the court may decide against him and thus he will lose all. The weaker his case, the smaller his settlement. So each side, in negotiating, marshals his facts and his law, argues justice and equity with the other, and then takes a look at the strength or weakness of his opponent's case.

Labor argues that if left alone to strike it can do better than with government intervention. That may be true, but even that is subject to debate in many cases. But, if true, what is just about that kind of result? A man in a civil suit settles, but not because he is afraid that his adversary will compel him to do so by force or violence, or by economic warfare, which is really what a strike is. Why should justice in a labor dispute depend upon who is stronger in a strike?

Each side in a strike wants something. A strike will not determine however, which side is more justified, or reasonable, or intrinsically entitled to win. The union members have to eat; the union feeds them as long as it can. The richer the union, the longer it can hold out. Management in a strike has to meet overhead, fixed payments, demands of customers, and an outraged public calling for its services. The stronger it is, the greater its reserves, the longer it can hold out. Propaganda pours out of both sides, expecting that the power of public opinion on one side or the other will help it prevail. In actual practice, neither side wins all it has demanded (and really never expected to); a compromise is reached after untold damage is done to each other, to the economy and to the public.

How does this really differ in essence from the medieval trial by battle in which the strongest was declared the winner of a dispute? I concede that public opinion may in some cases help toward a settlement. This is the basic argument for fact-finding. But how much does the public really know about the issues of a strike and where justice lies, despite columns or pages of fact-finding statistics? On boards where I was a member, I used to take home hundreds of documents, charts, briefs, analyses of wages and profits in various industries, historical background material and legal briefs. It took me many hours just to read this material. I came to certain conclusions after heated arguments with each side, and sometimes even after warm colloquies with my colleagues. What can the general public know about any of this as a basis for forming an opinion? How many newspapers print the fact-finding material?

And how realistic is the claim that public opinion brings about a just settlement? Was there ever a more unified public opinion than the cry of outrage at the union responsible for the 1966 subway strike in New York City? Did it have any effect on the union? Of course not. The entire strike was illegal under the laws of New York State from beginning to end, yet the union won. It won only because its employer, the City of New York, just had to provide means for citizens to get to work.

A dispute between individuals can be settled in one of three ways: (1) by agreement, (2) by outside determination, or (3) by a fist fight behind the barn. A strike is an enlarged, organized fist fight, without violence or physical injury but with plenty of blows. Centuries ago, civilized man, in the pursuit of justice, gave up this kind of combat.

What has given workers strength has been union, the ability to speak with a collective voice. That strength labor courts will not impair, but will increase. That is obvious because the court can deal with only one litigant—a union. So it will be essential to the proper workings of the court that there be strong, united, well-led unions to speak and act for their members. That has been the experience in Australia, where unions are relatively just as strong as they are in this country.

Not only is collective bargaining not jeopardized; it will remain an absolute necessity if labor courts are to be adequate to fulfill their functions.

But, the unions argue—and so does some management—collective bargaining will become a farce; neither side will retreat from its best offer, because it knows that a third party will finally have to decide it anyway, and suspects that he will probably merely split the difference.

To this there are two answers:

1. This is not what happens in other kinds of civil litigation. It is true that neither side makes its best offer of settlement at first. But as negotiation proceeds, and as a judicial determination draws near with the possibility presented to each side that it might lose much more than a reasonable offer or demand would give it, they come down to rock-bottom settlement terms. There is no reason why a different course should follow in a labor negotiation. The experience in Australia with labor courts has been that bargaining often continues right down to trial.

2. The contention that the presiding judge will ask what the best offer on each side is and merely split the difference constitutes a libel on our judicial tradition. I was a trial judge myself for 10 years, and I have had trial experience as a lawyer for 35 years. I have not personally met a single judge guilty of that practice after a trial. Besides, there is no reason why a judge should ever know about the offers on either side. Settlement offers are inadmissible as evidence in a court. And procedural arrangements can be made, if necessary, for the trial of any case to take place before a judge who has not tried to settle the dispute in discussion with the litigants.

I submit that the time has now come to end the strikes and stop the damage, and to substitute the reason and considered judgment of the courtroom for a verdict based only on strength and resources. Giving up rights like the right to strike—even more ancient rights—for the general good and welfare of the community is nothing new in civilized countries. The right to send your children out to work to help the family bank account instead of to school; the freedom to make contracts with workers on any terms mutually agreeable; the right to put up a building on your land of any height or bulk you wish; the right to deal in securities at arm's length in the good old way before the 1929 crash; the right to use in speculation other people's money entrusted to your care; the right to overproduce crops and to use your farmland as you wish without all the bother of agricultural regulation—all of these rights and hundreds of others were given up because the public interest was served by their surrender.

I submit that the interest of the public in any labor strife which effects its health, security or safety justifies—nay, requires—the same surrender.

What about price-fixing, which the opponents of compulsion say must follow any imposition of settlement? Do not wage increases caused by strikes do just as much to fix prices? Of course they do. Do you often see wage scales go up unless they are followed by price rises? Of course not. Almost every settlement of a major dispute, and especially of an emergency dispute, has been announced by the appropriate government official with the expression of a pious hope that prices would remain static. But they seldom have.

Five years ago I visited Australia. There I met several labor union leaders and discussed with them the workings of the labor courts in their country. They were well-satisfied with their experiences, and with the results they have achieved. The arguments usually advanced in the U.S. against any form of compulsory arbitration were dismissed by them as contrary to their experience with labor courts.

In this country, we have had the present haphazard system a long time—too long. The American public will welcome any reasonable change which will put an end to the needless economic waste which comes from strikes. And in the long run, I am confident that both labor and management will join in the welcome.

The Late Honorable J. Arthur Younger

SPEECH

OF

HON. CHARLOTTE T. REID

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 13, 1967

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I share the deep sorrow with all Members of this House feel at this time in the loss of our colleague and good friend, J. ARTHUR YOUNGER.

Truly a distinguished American has gone from our midst; and though his chair is vacant, he still will live on in the memory of all who had the honor to call him their friend. Many of you in this Chamber have had the privilege of working with him for many more years than I, but those of us who were newcomers to the Congress will never forget the hospitality of his welcome, the wisdom of his counsel, and his unswerving dedication to the preservation of the principles and ideals on which this Nation was founded and which we know must be perpetuated for the future.

All of us have admired his quiet competence, and the great legacy of public service he leaves behind is a living inspiration for us in the days ahead. The people of his district and State have lost a faithful and devoted servant, and I join with them in extending heartfelt sympathy to Mrs. Younger and all members of the family.

Whose Interest Is at Stake?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. GURNEY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 18, 1967

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, oftentimes people in political and public life talk about the interests of labor and management, of employer and employee. They do indeed have interests, often paralleling and sometimes on a collision course.

These interests are generally well represented in legislative battles and at the bargaining tables when labor and management are seeking to gain their points of view.

However, there is a great segment of our population which belongs to neither labor or management in the strict sense of the terms, but who have a great interest when points of difference are being ironed out between the two.

This segment is the general public which is greatly and vitally affected by the price of the goods and services which they buy. These prices are the result of the productivity of labor and management in reaching their goals and resolving their differences.

I have recently received an interesting and provocative letter from a constituent who sets out the concerns of the individual citizen, a concern which is increasing with rapidity and intensity as the wage-price inflation spiral whirls about the Nation.

I believe my colleagues will be interested in this letter, which I share here:

ORLANDO, FLA., *July 14, 1967.*

Hon. EDWARD GURNEY,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. GURNEY: Walter Reuther today is meeting with the Automobile Industry's in order to lay claim for his 1.4 million autoworkers to a larger share of industry's "unconscionable profits."

I would like for you in the name of your constituents to lay claim to our share. It is time for Industry, Labor and the public to recognize that the profits from increased productivity are a result of public schooling, public transportation, and public policy as well as capital investment, management methods and Labor's sweat.

Should profits from increased productivity be distributed to thousands of management, 1.4 million union members, 3 million stockholders or 200 million Americans?

Lower prices instead of raising wages. All Americans, widows, orphans, and retirees would benefit as well as the autoworkers. Our autos would sell better in world markets. The balance of trade would be helped.

Higher wages on the other hand, help union members at our expense. Our export position suffers and foreign autos sell better in America.

All Americans—your constituents among them—deserve to be spoken for and to be heard, in the talks in Detroit. We have been absent from that table long enough.

It is our taxes that build roads for better distribution of goods, our taxes that teach management and labor, that build schools and teach children to read, to want and to drive automobiles, our taxes that support peace in the world to enable industry to concentrate on production. Rising productivity should not be the sole preserve of organized labor.

Does the Republican party want to speak for the unspoken-for Americans? We are they. Taxpaying consumers that have watched organized labor appropriate too long that which is at least partially ours. We have watched taxes and prices rise, the value of the dollar fall and gold flee because our rightful needs have gone unrecognized and undefended.

Yours truly,
Hamilton A. S. Bartlett.

U.S. Citizens Should Heed Trumpet Calls to Duty and Responsibility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 18, 1967

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, there is much food for sober thought for all American citizens in the Independence Day sermon by Dr. Walter R. Courtenay, pastor of the First Presbyterian Church of Nashville, Tenn., as published in the Nashville Banner.

Dr. Courtenay voices a powerful call for a revival of the American sense of Christian responsibility. Because of the urgency and timeliness of his message, I include portions of Dr. Courtenay's sermon in the Appendix of the Record.

Excerpts from Dr. Courtenay's July 4, 1967, sermon follow:

U.S. Citizens Need Clear Trumpet Call to Study

(By Walter R. Courtenay, D.D.)

"If the trumpet gives an uncertain sound, who shall prepare himself for the battle?" I use this quotation from First Corinthians because we are living in a time of uncertain sounds. We lack current trumpets that alert us, arouse us, and direct us toward the duties that are certainly ours as citizens, and as members of the Christian Church.

Your life and mine is a trumpet in our society, a bugle, if you please. It has a distinct place in America today. Yet, many of the bugle calls of our personal lives are muted. Many are unclear. Many are creating disorder rather than order. Many are sounding the charge when the mess-call is all that is needed. Many are announcing retreat when the charge is what is in order. Many are sounding taps when it ought to be reveille.

Each life that is Christian in any deep sense ought to know the trumpet calls of God, and the trumpet calls of responsibility. Each life ought to avoid confusion in the use of the calls, and each life ought to avoid indecision. "For if the trumpet gives an uncertain sound . . ."

That which is true of the individual's life is certainly true of government. It is very difficult for us in our day to know what our government is saying. We are bewildered as we try to decide whether what is being sounded is for the national good, or merely for the advantage of the Administration in power or the one that is trying to get into power.

I turn, for example, to the crime problem in Washington, D.C., the capital city of this nation. One of our congressmen, a few weeks ago, wrote his constituents urging them not to come to Washington this summer on vacation because, he said, the streets are unsafe. One can believe it when he stops to realize that as bad as the crime situation was in 1966 in Washington, it has now worsened to the extent of forty-one per cent.

I hear no clear trumpet in Washington calling men to do something definite and concrete about the situation that exists there. Unfortunately, in a time when our Negro people are striving for recognition, places of responsibility, and the opportunity of participating to a larger degree in the life of this nation most of the offenders in Washington are of that race. This, unfortunately, is true in all the large cities across America today, a definite embarrassment to the better people in the Negro race, a definite embarrassment to our government, a definite embarrassment to all of us. We are tolerating these people to say and do things today that would not be tolerated if they were white, all, I presume, for the sake of votes, rather than the ordering and re-ordering of society. Such activities are not caused by poverty or lack of educational opportunity, but primarily because of meanness in human nature, laziness, and the desire to loot and to destroy.

There is something quite different between a quiet demonstration and a riot that burns down buildings, loots stores, and forces businesses to close their doors, and unless there is a trumpet call in America now to put an end to this stupidity, we are headed for anarchy, and we will be unable to save our nation from that minority of our people, white and black, which is unworthy of citizenship within this nation.

* * * * *

I turn now to Vietnam, and the Great Society, where our national prestige stands versus votes in 1968. Our people are divided concerning Vietnam simply because there is no clear, certain trumpet being sounded. There has been no declaration of war. There has been no harnessing of our powers to win. The nation is not behind the effort—not, really!

The only positive trumpet sound I hear in our day is Jewish, not American, and they have earned the right to freedom and to space. They have proved that right by what they have done agriculturally, industrially, educationally and culturally within the boundary lines of Israel. Anyone who has been to Israel or has read much about it must recognize the fact that they have used their time, their talents and their money better than any other nation on the face of the earth, including the United States of America.

The Vietnam war ought to end, but it must end on a note of victory for the West. It must end with victory on the side of those who have been willing to confront Communism in the jungles, and until there is a clear trumpet sound in the United States that is free of political considerations, our sons are going to continue to fight, to suffer, and to die in the jungles of southeast Asia, without any hope of our ever winning.

* * * * *

It seems to me that we have to decide which is to receive the concentrated attention of our people, the war in Vietnam or the programs that make permissiveness a destructive part of every area of domestic life. So much of our time and concern are being consumed by complainers and complaints that do not really matter. So much is spent on placating those who make no valid contribution to any part of American life that I wonder when we are going to honor those who are loyal rather than those who are disloyal, those who are patriotic rather than those who lack patriotism, those who are for God, country and peace, rather than those who are for indecency, atheism, disorder, and a dole society.

Our nation cannot go on permitting people to flaunt law and order, and there must be an end to the burning and looting of business establishments. But where does one hear a trumpet sounding a clear call to put an end to our complacency and stupidity? There must be an end to the molesting of citizens and the increase of crime, but where do you hear a trumpet calling us to order? Authority continues to deteriorate, vulgarity and sloppiness continue to increase.

There is a continuing irresponsibility among the leaders of Negroes, teenagers, college students, yes, and college administrators, that is frightening, and the big trumpets are silent or sounding calls that do not make sense to rational men.

* * * * *

I then turn to The Church. The Church was established and organized by God to be His trumpet. As long as the trumpet continues to give an uncertain sound, who is going to prepare himself for anything?

We have a Book, and that Book is supposed to be our text of Truth. It is only depository of the divine revelation made to us by God through Jesus of Nazareth. It is our only authority for the church's existence, the church's message, and the church's mission. It is the only hope we have of a beter world and a better day.

What does the Book say? The Book has much to say about God as the Creating God, much to say about God as a Creative Person, God as a Revealing God, God as a Redemptive God. It also makes clear that God is a God of Law, a God of discipline, and a God of punishment. Last, our God is a helpless God, for if people will not heed His call, if people will not obey His commandments, if people will not follow His path, if people will not emulate His example, if people will not seek to fulfill His purposes, if people will not trust His will, there is nothing He can do about it. He must let man make his choices and take the consequences, and so must we!

The Book in which we put our trust and from which we draw our purpose and our power is not obsolete. It has much to say to modern man, and nothing quite so essential as the fact that modern man, in spite of all, is still a sinful creature in need of the saving grace of Jesus Christ. And there is saving grace through faith in Him whom God did send! That is what the New Testament trumpet keeps saying. That is the church's conviction, even though our Christian lives carry all too little dampness born of baptism and the tears of Christ. We need faith in Jesus Christ to be modern! That is a fact! Above all else we need that, for we cannot rightly be related to one another until we are properly related to God.

Words of Lincoln for Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 10, 1967

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, the following remarks by President Abraham

Lincoln are most appropriate for our times, and I take this opportunity to call them to the attention of my colleagues and the readers of the Record.

> We have been the recipients of the choicest bounties of heaven; we have grown in numbers, wealth and power as no other nation has ever grown. But we have forgotten God. We have forgotten the gracious hand which preserved us in peace and multiplied and enriched and strengthened us, and we have vainly imagined, in the deceitfulness of our hearts, that all these blessings were produced by some superior wisdom and virtue of our own. Intoxicated with unbroken success, we have become too self-sufficient to feel the necessity of redeeming and preserving grace, too proud to pray to the God that made us. Abraham Lincoln.

Reorganize the Executive Branch

SPEECH

OF

HON. E. ROSS ADAIR

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 13, 1967

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in support of H.R. 69 and similar bills which have been introduced by my Republican colleagues. It is high time that the House of Representatives takes steps to establish a new Hoover-type Commission and make recommendations for overhauling the gigantic Federal bureaucracy which is dominating the Nation.

Without any apparent rhyme or reason, in recent years, the executive branch of the Federal Government has created too many boards, bureaus, and commissions in an effort to take care of the public's business. As a consequence, the Nation is topheavy with Federal agencies with overlapping power and duplication. There is so much confusion, redtape, and lack of direction as to what the Federal Government should do and not do for the people, that it has become imperative for Congress to step in an put some commonsense in governmental operations.

It was 20 years ago that Congress approved the first Hoover Commission. Unfortunately, many of the reforms that were proposed and enacted into law are not now enforced or functioning. Instead of eliminating excesses in the Government, the Federal bureaucracy has grown and become more intricate. We must put a stop to all of this. Rather than bigness, overlapping, and duplication, we must simplify. This can be done if we pass the proper legislation and create a new Hoover Commission with authority to weed out unnecessary boards and bureaus and restore the proper guidelines for the three branches of constitutional government. The executive has usurped too much authority and, in many instances, Congress has stood idly by and let the executive and judicial branches take over some of its prerogatives.

I think the public, too, is sufficiently aroused to the threat to their freedoms because of the size of the Federal bureaucracy to add the weight of their opinion to our decision. I urge my colleagues to review the important work which was accomplished by the first Hoover Commission. When this is done, I am confident we will obtain the necessary votes to create a new Commission. This will answer the crying need for action.

Japan and the Pacific Community

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1967

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, earlier this summer the Japanese Economic Mission to the U.S. Midwest visited Washington, D.C. A particularly memorable event of that visit was an address by the mission's chairman, Mr. Kazutaka Kikawada, on world trade to the United States-Japan Trade Council on June 30. Mr. Kikawada spoke of the great increase in trade between the United States and Japan in the last 10 years and expressed the hopes of the Japanese nation that trade will continue to flourish between the two countries.

Mr. Kikawada, further, put the significance of Japanese-American trade into the perspective in which I believe it must be seen:

> The triangular economic relationship between the United States, Japan and Australia can serve as a nucleus for a broader Pacific Community, embracing, in addition to Canada, New Zealand and the developing countries of Asia. . . . When we speak of a Pacific Community, we do not mean an inward looking and restrictive trading area, tending to divide the world still further into rival trade blocs. Regional cooperation through trade and aid, mutual assistance and self-help, joint investments and other forms of economic cooperation—this is what I have in mind when I speak of the Pacific Community.

This is a very important point. We have a great opportunity and responsibility with regard to our neighbors to the west. The industrialized nations can, through careful consideration and generous action, help the less developed countries of Southeast Asia direct themselves to positions of self-sufficiency and stability.

I wish to congratulate Mr. Kikawada on his inspiring comments and commend to the consideration of my colleagues the full text of his address:

Address by Mr. Kazutaka Kikawada

I am greatly honored to have been extended this opportunity to speak to such a distinguished audience. It is a special pleasure for my colleagues and me to be here in the capital of the free world at the culmination of our Economic Mission to the United States Midwest.

I wish to thank our host, the United States-Japan Trade Council, which is playing such an important role in mutual understanding and cooperation between our two countries, especially in the field of trade.

For us, such understanding is an essential element of an abiding business relationship. In order to foster such a feeling, we have spent the last three weeks visiting your Midwestern states and meeting with political and business leaders and representatives of your news media.

The Midwest is vital to Japan as a market and as a supplier. But, frankly, we began our trip with the realization that our relations with that area were not nearly as close as they should be and with the belief that it was rather protectionist-oriented in trade policy.

Now, I am pleased to say that preliminary steps have been taken toward the formation of a permanent Japan-Midwest businessmen's association. I wish there were some way to include representatives of American labor and agriculture. We also talked with members of state trade missions that had recently visited Japan and found that others were about to be sent. We were repeatedly told by state officials of the necessity for expanded international trade and of their growing awareness of the need for a liberal trade policy.

We talked about the changing nature of Japan's food and feed consumption, with its heavy reliance on imports, and about our industrial modernization, with its quality products and requirements for imports of the most advanced equipment. And we heard from your businessmen and state officials about their products and requirements. Indeed, the more we said about what each needed and had to offer, the more I became convinced of the complementary nature of our two economies. While progress of industrialization, based on this complementary relationship, inevitably creates some competitive frictions, it more often creates harmonious development and contributes to the prosperity of our two countries.

With our two-way trade tripling in the last decade to reach $5.3 billion last year, the United States is Japan's largest trading partner. We rank second only to Canada as a market for your exports. Today, our exports are produced mainly by modern technology rather than inexpensive labor. Quality products from our heavy and chemical industries now account for 61% of our exports. This change is also reflected in our imports, as Japan is becoming an increasingly mature market for numerous varieties of your advanced industrial goods, as well as a wide range of consumer goods.

We will also remain a good cash market for your agricultural surpluses and raw materials, so that total U.S. exports to Japan are expected to reach $3.1 billion in 1970 and $4.6 billion in 1975.

The trade surpluses enjoyed by Japan in the last two years contrast with the traditional trade pattern between our two countries that has seen the United States accumulate a $2 billion surplus in the last decade. We are already seeing a return to the traditional pattern as the Japanese economy recovered from its recession, and imports from the United States increased 23% in the first quarter over the comparable period last year.

Because of the scarcity of natural resources in Japan and the need for foreign exchange, it is evident that we must sell our products on the world market in order to buy these imports from you. Therefore, we are gratified at the success of the GATT negotiations. We must now build on the results of the Kennedy Round to eliminate non-tariff barriers and to seek a solution to the problems of the developing countries that is compatible with the policies that have proven so successful in the post-war period.

I am happy to tell you that the Japanese Government has adopted a new policy on the introduction of direct foreign capital, to go into effect tomorrow. It represents a significant further liberalization of Japan's practices in this field, but does not do all that some foreign companies have been asking.

An automatic approval system is to be applied to new joint ventures in 50 different categories. Seventeen of these will be open to 100% foreign ownership, with a 50% limitation on the remaining categories. The Government further relaxed restrictions on portfolio investments and set guidelines to eliminate most of the "red tape" with respect to decisions on those applications still subject to screening.

Obviously one cannot adequately summarize such an important decision or the reasons dictating the form it takes. Let me say only that the phenomenal pace of our economic growth has created imbalance and weaknesses in certain sectors of the Japanese economy that make complete and sudden liberalization impossible. This is especially true with respect to medium and smaller scale firms that are inadequately capitalized and lack the managerial skills to compete internationally. Therefore, there is the widespread fear that existing Japanese enterprises would not be able to compete in their own country with the prestige, skills and above all, massive financing of your great corporations. What I wish to emphasize to this distinguished audience, however, is that this is just the first step and we are officially committed to review developments in one or two years, and I expect that we will complete substantial liberalization by 1971. Liberalization must be carried out in accordance with the progress of our economic development.

It is to the problems and promise of Asia, and the new significance of a U.S.-Japan partnership in that area, that I wish to address myself principally today. This subject is particularly important now because of the quickened interest your country has taken in the whole of Asia.

I believe that the triangular economic relationship between the United States, Japan and Australia can serve as a nucleus for a broader Pacific Community, embracing in addition Canada, New Zealand and the developing countries of Asia. Foreign Minister Miki and my colleague Mr. Mizukami are leading exponents of this concept in Japan.

When we speak of a Pacific Community, we emphatically do not mean an inward-looking and restrictive trading area, tending to divide the world still further into rival trade blocs. Regional cooperation through trade and aid, mutual assistance and self-help, joint investments and other forms of economic cooperation—this is what I have in mind when I speak of a Pacific Community.

We have already jointly launched the Asian Development Bank; and the first Ministerial Conference for the Development of Southeast Asia and the Conference on Agricultural Development in Southeast Asia were held under the aegis of Japan last year. Businessmen and political leaders, such as Congressman Hanna, have advocated private Pacific Basin organizations.

Any discussion of Asia would be less than complete—and less than candid if it ignored the laregst country, in Asia, Mainland China. As you know, China is the fountainhead of our culture. Before the Second World War, China was Japan's largest export market and source of supply. But now, even with increases in recent years, Mainland China and the Soviet Union together account for only about 6% of our total trade. Japan observes the restrictions on exports of strategic goods to Communist China agreed upon with the United States and other Western countries.

Foreign trade affects the very existence of our country; therefore, we believe that trade with Mainland China, on a strictly commercial basis, is important to our economy and should be developed. But we also believe that the gradual development of normal trade in peaceful goods between Japan and Mainland China may well result, in the long run, in developing new contacts, new thoughts and new opportunities in that closed society—for the day when the forced "Cultural Revolution" has given way to inexorable economic evolution, as seems to be happening in the Soviet bloc countries.

But until that day dawns, we must proceed with the development of other countries in Asia, for instability and deprivation are the seedbed of Communism. I should like to give you my views for providing for the well-being and stability of Asia.

In Asia today, massive hunger that threatens man's basic right of survival is added to an anachronistic social structure that defies the crying need for development. Patient efforts must be made by government and by businessmen, who act as effective and socially conscious organizers of the private sector, in order to break the chains of this system. Simultaneous training of professional engineers and technicians is imperative if businessmen are to fully play their part.

The first order of business under a new system is to remove the chronic state of hunger existing in Asia. While food aid is an important and humanitarian measure for the stability of Asia, it by no means provides a basic solution. Instead we must engage in a form of aid that will give impetus and confidence to the Asians to help themselves toward self-sufficiency. The essential element of such aid would be to lay a productive foundation for Asia's agriculture. The industrialized nations often seek through aid to develop markets for their own products, and the recipient nations readily accept this in their rush to industralize. In this connection, President Johnson deserves praise for shifting the emphasis of U.S. aid policy from industrialization to more fundamental development.

On our part, we keenly feel the need to create a new machinery whereby the business communities in the advanced nations of the Pacific Community, led by those in the United States and Japan, may coordinate their assistance in a manner designed to shatter the stagnation of Asian societies. We further suggest that this machinery give priority to comprehensive aid for agricultural development.

Fortunately, Japan's technology, experience and psychology is compatible with the agricultural structure in Asia's monsoon belt. We are capable of providing fertilizers and agricultural chemicals, farm machinery and, perhaps most important, technical assistance. And Japan proved that even in Asia, a stable modern society can be formed on the basis of democracy and free enterprise.

As compared with the West, Asian countries are different ethnically, culturally, indeed even in their reasoning process. Therefore, for a variety of reasons, the Japanese are in a position to be the most effective coordinator of the Pacific Community's aid to the developing Asian nations, and we feel some obligation to shoulder that burden.

As a private businessman, I know that effective demand is an essential element of the free enterprise system, and that showcase industrial projects without a market bring no dividends and are a waste of resources. It is from this conviction that I have offered my belief that the modernization of agriculture should be the immediate aim of our aid to Asia. Once this need is met, then we can jointly turn to gradual development of industry.

If we can intensify our cooperative arrangements, if we can fully exploit our agreements in the Kennedy Round, and if we concentrate and harmonize our aid resources into a unified program, we will have made a substantial contribution to the stability and prosperity of Asia, and hence to the world in which we live. Ultimately, we wish to propagate in Asia a love of freedom and a spirit of self sufficiency. For these noble ideas, cherished by both the United States and Japan, are responsible for our growth and prosperity today, and are the motive power that ensure our well-being tomorrow.

Perry's Values Ignored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1967

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, Gun Week, an informative newspaper for sportsmen, recently gave in its editorial column a sound analysis of the value of the national rifle and pistol matches held annually at Camp Perry in Ohio. This editorial exposes the fallacies of the arguments against these matches and is well worth reading. I submit it for reprinting the RECORD:

PERRY'S VALUES IGNORED

Capitol Hill snipers who would shoot down the National Rifle and Pistol Matches held annually at Camp Perry, Ohio, would do well to study a report prepared in 1966 for the Department of the Army.

Although instigated by foes of the Director of Civilian Marksmanship programs, the report prepared by independent Arthur D. Little Co. researchers revealed—to the chagrin of the program's detractors—there is significant value in the National Matches and other DCM programs. Instead of criticizing the programs, the study recommended their expansion!

Although critics of DCM programs have attacked them on the basis of the alleged $3 million annual cost, the Little Report found the actual net cost of all programs, including Camp Perry matches, was about $475,000—or $1.14 per DCM-affiliated club member, based on 417,000 members in 1965.

The National Matches were budgeted at $2.7 million, but the Little Report questioned including $1.46 million pay and allowances for military support personnel as part of the cost. These payments would be made no matter where the servicemen were stationed.

The report also said another deduction—$1.68 million from sale of out-of-date firearms—should be allowed, bringing the total cost of all DCM programs to about $475,000.

While critics of the DCM programs have pointed to "technological advances" of the nuclear age which supposedly make the foot-soldier obsolete, the Little Report said "the Army's Light Weapons Infantrymen and the Marines are almost certain to be employed in any 'shooting war' in which our nation becomes embroiled. Since the basic individual weapon of such combat arms is the rifle, it is important the men in such units become thoroughly proficient in its use."

The report added that surveys of records at Army training camps showed that servicemen with previous firearms training, not necessarily through DCM-affiliated clubs, were better marksmen, better soldiers, were more likely to volunteer for combat arms, and most importantly—less likely to become casualties in combat!

What's more, units containing DCM-trained personnel had better average and individual marksmanship records, indicating the trained shooters either shared their knowledge or freed instructors to give more time to those unfamiliar with guns. Thus the benefits of the DCM program was spread well beyond the number of pre-service participants, producing better-trained units more effective in combat, more likely to survive combat.

Apart from the life-saving value of preservice firearms marksmanship training, the nation points with pride to the six medals, including two Gold Medals, won by the U.S. Shooting Team during the 1964 Olympics. It is significant that half of the U.S. Olympic Team consisted of Army Marksmen, many of whom perfected their skills at the Camp Perry matches.

The Little Report found the process of preparing for the Camp Perry matches, the Olympics and other contests stimulates a continuing source of knowledgeable and qualified marksmen and potential military instructors.

Therefore, the Little Report recommended the DCM programs "be emphasized more and pursued even more effectively to reach a greater percentage of those young men likely to enter military service."

In addition to the military value of the matches, police departments and civic-minded organizations nationwide have found the disciplines of marksmanship training an excellent means of combating juvenile delinquency.

The dream of competing at Camp Perry is an important factor in sustaining the interest of these youngsters. Incidentally, unless they are among the handful picked as members of state teams, they attend at their own expense—which is considerable—and not at government expense on a "fat-cat junket" as some misinformed—or malicious—critics have claimed.

It would seem that if the Administration can spend thousands of dollars per graduate in its Job Corps and similar youth projects it should be able to spend $1.14 each, and even more, for a proven program which—aside from all other benefits—will increase a soldier's chances of survival in Viet Nam jungles.—A.J.

Leftists Demonstrate Against Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 18, 1967

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, in a recent issue of the Jewish Press, a news item appeared which told of an anti-Israel demonstration to be held in the near future.

It came as no surprise that the organization that intended to sponsor the demonstration, the Ad Hoc Conference Committee on the Middle East, is a creation of the extremist Youth Against War and Fascism, a pro-Chinese, violently Marxist organization, violently opposed to American policy in Vietnam.

I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following news item which appeared in the July 14, 1967, issue of the Jewish Press.

The item follows:

LEFTISTS DEMONSTRATE AGAINST ISRAEL

The extreme Left in the United States, already totally committed to the Arab cause, plans to hold a demonstration against the Jewish State, in front of the Israeli Mission to the U.N., located at 15 East 70th Street. The protest will be held on Friday, July 14, at 5:30 P.M.

Though the leaders of the demonstration have been trying to hide the identity of the real sponsors of the demonstration, the fact is that the Ad Hoc Conference Committee on the Middle East—the supposed organizer—is a creation of the extremist Youth Against War and Fascism, a pro-Chinese, violently Marxist group. This group is a violent opponent of American policy in Vietnam and, three weeks ago, picketed a meeting at Manhattan Center, handing out leaflets proclaiming that Vietnam and Palestine were similar areas of American imperialism and that Israel was the lackey of the United States and other forces of reaction.

The secretary of the Ad Hoc Conference is Rita Freed who made an hysterically inaccurate attack upon Israel at a meeting June 21 in New York where the Conference was supposedly formed. Her number, for those wishing to register their objections, is WA 6-2490.

Captive Nations Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 11, 1967

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, this week we observe the ninth annual Captive Nations Week. I wish to pay tribute to the memory of the many thousands of people of east and central Europe who died, struggling to escape from communism, during the Soviet takeover of their countries in World War II and after. Since the Communists crushed the independent nations of eastern and central Europe, the citizens of those nations have been waging a war, in their hearts, to regain the rights of free thought and free expression which they had held so dearly.

Today, more than 25 years after their enslavement, they continue their gallant struggle. As our silent allies behind the weatherbeaten Iron Curtain, they have maintained an ever-increasing determination to once again join the free world. History, I am sure, will vindicate their struggle.

We have seen in eastern and central Europe a slow, but persistent, process of evolution away from Communist domination. This process has eased the grasp of communism in some areas and will eventually also ease the grasp in the Baltic countries and elsewhere. Yet the fight must continue, and we in the free world must also continue to stand fast by our pledges to defend freedom and self-determination wherever it may be pursued.

President John F. Kennedy once said:

> This country must never recognize the situation behind the Iron Curtain as a permanent one, but by all peaceful means, keep alive the hopes of freedom for the peoples of the captive nations.

President Lyndon B. Johnson also realized the plight of the captive nations when, in a state of the Union address, he said that the principle of U.S. foreign policy is the "support of national independence, the right of each people to govern themselves and to shape their own institutions," because "the insistent urge toward national independence is the strongest force in today's world."

We must continue to support the oppressed nations, not only because of their struggle to be free, but because their Communist oppressors have repeatedly violated their promises of freedom and independence to the nations captured before and after World War II. Soviet Russia has deprived the nations within its own borders of the right of self-determination.

The U.S. Congress, by unanimous vote, has recognized the tragedy of the millions suffering in those oppressed states by adopting a resolution designating this week as Captive Nations Week.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad to participate in this observance because, in this way, I can demonstrate my support of these people in their struggle and efforts for survival.

OEO and Shriver Commended by Mexican-American Organization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 18, 1967

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, the League of United Latin American Citizens held their national convention on June 22-25, 1967, at Phoenix Ariz. At this gathering, the varied and complex problems facing the Mexican-American throughout the United States were thoroughly discussed.

One of the topics of deepest concern to the many participants at the convention was H.R. 10682, the GOP "Opportunity Crusade." As we know, this Republican stratagem would completely eliminate the Office of Economic Opportunity, the only Federal agency responsible for representing the interests of 35 million poor Americans at the highest levels of the Government. The bill would thus kill the central headquarters of the war on poverty, and atomize the entire antipoverty effort by scattering programs and responsibilities across the executive branch. OEO, the independent advocate, organizer, coordinator, and innovator, would cease to exist. The poor would be told they are not entitled to a voice in Washington.

The Office of Economic Opportunity has worked both extensively and effectively within the Mexican-American communities. The successes of this agency are self-evident. There is little doubt that the demise of the OEO would have a negative impact upon the forward thrust of the Mexican-American community toward greater progress.

I direct the attention of my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, to the following resolution which very clearly reflects the great admiration and respect felt by this commuity toward the Office of Economic Opportunity and its Director, Sargent Shriver.

LULAC RESOLUTION

Whereas, the office of Economic Opportunity has, among Federal Agencies, been one of the most sensitive and responsive to the needs of the Mexican-American people, and

Whereas, unlike many older, bureaucratic Federal Agencies, the Office of Economic Opportunity has provided for the democratic involvement of people in solving their own problems and has maintained the flexibility to respond, with a minimum of red tape, to the special needs of impoverished Americans, including Mexican-Americans, and

Whereas, there is a real and immediate danger of a retreat in the War on Poverty in the form of a proposal before the United States Congress to abolish the Office of Economic Opportunity and turn parts of the Poverty Program over to older Federal Agencies.

Be it resolved as follows: That the League of United Latin American Citizens.

1. Is strongly opposed to any dismembering of the Office of Economic Opportunity;

2. Urges the Congress, for the good of the American people to maintain the Office of Economic Opportunity as a separate agency;

3. Urges the Congress not only to continue the OEO, but to appropriate additional funds to expand the war on poverty;

That the League of United Latin American Citizens

4. Goes on record as commending Sargent Shriver and the Office of Economic Opportunity for responding quickly and efficiently to the needs of the American people with sympathy and integrity unmatched in the Federal Government;

5. Goes on records as especially commending the OEO migrant program for the extraordinary success it has had in coming to the aid of a hitherto forgotten and exploited people, the American farm workers, many of whom are Mexican American;

That the League of United Latin American Citizens

6. Is directed to send copies of this resolution to each Congressman and Senator from the Southwestern States;

7. Urges each individual Lulac Council to contact its Congressman to express the strong support of Lulac members for the Office of Economic Opportunity and its migrant program and to urge the Congressman to show his concern for his Mexican American constituents by voting for continuance of OEO and additional anti-poverty appropriations for its migrant program.

Adopted on the 25th day of June, 1967 at Phoenix, Arizona.

Signed:

Roberto Ornelas,
National President.

Witnessed:

Belen B. Robles,
National Secretary.

Expanded Federal Meat Inspection Questioned

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENN R. DAVIS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 18, 1967

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, a longtime personal friend of mine, Mr. Donald N. McDowell, who has spent 20 years with the Wisconsin State Department of Agriculture, appeared before the House Agriculture Committee on Monday representing the National Association of State Departments of Agriculture.

Later this week, Mr. McDowell will meet with officials of the U.S. Department of Agriculture in the annual airing of mutual problems affecting both the Federal Department and the various State departments of agricultural promotion and enforcement.

Mr. McDowell, in his testimony before the House Agriculture Committee, reported on the policy determination of the National State Departments of Agriculture, as follows:

In brief, the policy position of the National Association of State Departments of Agriculture is as follows:

1. We are opposed to the manner in which federal meat inspection jurisdiction and enforcement would be splintered at the federal level between the U.S. Department of Agriculture and the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Public confusion will result. We at the state level want to work with one agency and are sure that affected industry feels that same way. Sole responsibility should be continued in USDA.

2. We are opposed to the manner in which the bill encompasses purely local activities. If enacted, the established and developing state meat inspection programs would be superseded and would undoubtedly be discontinued. Federal pre-emption or exclusion of state jurisdiction over local matters directly conflicts with a declared federal policy of cooperative assistance for states. We doubt that this proposed extension of federal responsibility is either practical or economically feasible. Federal jurisdiction should be continued only over *interstate* and foreign meat activities and *not* over *intrastate* work.

3. NASDA, in general, favors the cooperative financing provisions of the Act if administered with discretion and it would, of course, have to oppose rigid restrictions if such were imposed on the states.

Mr. McDowell then submitted 10 specific amendments to H.R. 6168, which would bring the proposal into conformity with the policy position of the National Association of State Departments of Agriculture.

Because I know Mr. McDowell to be a man of broad knowledge and complete integrity, I highly commend his suggestions to the careful consideration of the Agriculture Committee.

Defining "Limited War"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD RUMSFELD
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 18, 1967

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, the imaginative and thought-provoking proposal of the gentleman from Massachusetts, Representative Bradford Morse, and seven other Republican Congressmen for a phased deescalation in Vietnam has elicited a considerable amount of favorable press comment throughout the country. One such reaction came in an editorial in the July 13 Chicago Daily News.

As I indicated on the floor, when it was being discussed, I welcome this initiative as a positive contribution to the national dialog on the Vietnam question. In my opinion, the press comment to date on the idea is leading to greater public understanding of the problems and pressures we face in Vietnam. The sponsors deserve much credit for their efforts which are making this possible.

I submit for the Record the text of the Daily News editorial:

Defining "Limited War"

While Defense Sec. McNamara is saying little publicly about the results of his latest trip to Vietnam, the indications are that he plans to keep a fairly tight lid on manpower increases.

We hope he does. For two plain facts must be faced regarding the escalation so far. One is that it has failed to bring the desired result of negotiations toward a settlement. The other is that the investment to date has upset the whole balance of U.S. domestic and foreign commitments, diluting and weakening our efforts in places where they should have been sharp and strong.

The imbalance might be tolerable if the war in Southeast Asia were a traditional-type war where one simply pressed on full force toward final, "total" victory.

But McNamara evidently perceives, as did Rep. F. Bradford Morse (R-Mass.) and a group of Republican colleagues in a report Monday, that a limited war has its own set of imperatives, most of which have thus far been ignored.

The first imperative listed by the Republican congressman is that the diplomacy accompanying the Vietnam war "must not risk expansion to total war," for the obvious reason that total war would produce mutual destruction on a scale to obliterate the objectives sought in the limited war.

The pressure now being applied by nearly 500,000 American troops and the combined, intensive efforts of the Navy and Air Force would have been ample to smother the Communist force that was faced a year or two ago. But the Communist effort has risen to match the U.S. escalation. And the Communists are piped into sources of supply that can presumably match any U.S. effort right up to the brink of total nuclear war.

If this is McNamara's conviction, he can be expected to give increasing attention to the other imperatives of limited war. These are: (1) that an atmosphere of mutual confidence must be fostered, (2) that each side must be permitted to preserve "face" and claim the initiative, and (3) that the effort must "be susceptible to presentation, verification and implementation through the private channels of diplomacy."

The Republican congressmen made clear in their report that there could be no significant relaxation of military pressure that would alter the balance in the enemy's favor, and they specifically warned against a complete halt in bombing as involving "great military risk."

They did feel that a phased, reciprocal de-escalation was within the realm of the possible. If McNamara shares that view, there could be a significant new effort to break out of the vise.

That Is Why We're Here, Debbie

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JEROME R. WALDIE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 18, 1967

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, A1c. Charles E. Nokes, is a young constituent of mine who, after his service in Vietnam, visited me in my Washington office. During our conservation, I asked him the inevitable question, "What do you construe our objectives in Vietnam to be and do you believe we belong in that conflict?" This wounded veteran replied to me by showing me a copy of his hometown newspaper, the Concord Transcript, wherein a letter the airman had written from Vietnam to his 4-year-old daughter, was reprinted.

I ask permission that this article and letter be included in the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, as an example of the strong belief held by one of our combat men in the justness of our Vietnam position. I am not suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that Airman Nokes has expressed to his 4-year-old daughter all the reasons why we are in Vietnam or why we should remain there. Neither has Airman Nokes given the many philosophical and global reasons that are frequently offered against our presence in that beleaguered country. But what he has done is express a wonderfully sympathetic and humanitarian concept as the justification for his personal presence in Vietnam. He is entitled to have his words read by many, other than his 4-year-old daughter.

THAT IS WHY WE'RE HERE, DEBBIE

It's like this—Serving with the Air Force in South Viet Nam and wounded in action only a day before he was scheduled to return home to his wife and four children, Airman F/C Charles E. Nokes, a former carrier boy for The Daily Transcript, learned that his four-year-old daughter, Debbie, was asking her mother (the former Mae Belle Snyder of Concord) why her father wasn't home—and why she couldn't go visit him.

Nokes, who went to school at Pleasant Hill High School and now lives at McCord AFB near Tacoma, Wash., replied with the following letter to his little daughter who misses him very much:

"Hello DEBBIE, Your mother told me that you want to know why daddy can't be home with you.

"Since you are only four years old, you might not understand all of what I write. Only in the future will we all know if it is worth the sacrifices we must make today.

"Debbie, here in Viet Nam, there is a little girl named Kim Lyn. She is like you in many ways. Except she has to work.

"Her father was killed by the Viet Cong two years ago. He was a farmer near Bien Hoa. Her older sister was degraded, then mutilated. That was when her 'pap san' was killed, trying to stop this.

"Debbie, she is only 7 years old. She has no mommy, no daddy, and no sister. She has no dolls to play with. She probably wishes she had a brother or sister. She would not take them for granted like so many of us in America.

"She wants her mommy and daddy too. She would never talk back to them, if only she could have them back.

"Her life is empty.

"There are many children like Kim Lyn here, Debbie. They all work so they can eat, instead of playing. They cannot cry, their tears are all dried up.

"Daddy is here trying to help all these children, and the children of the future, so this will not happen to them as it has in the past.

"This little country is very hot. It is about 115 degrees nearly every day. The mosquitoes here come in waves like a flight of planes. There is bubonic plague even here in the outskirts of Saigon. There is leprosy and malaria here too.

"The people here do not have enough medicine for the sick. They can't go to a doctor each time they are 'not feeling well.'

"They even have to steal food to eat, because the Viet Cong uses their farms and rice paddies to put bobbie traps in.

"Some day, Debbie, it just might not be this way anymore. Some day, they might be able to have mommies and daddies, brothers and sisters. Some day they might have enough food and medicine.

"Then, after that, they can start to make a place where they can forget some of the terrible things that have happened to them. To forget all of it would be to invite it to happen all over again.

"I do not like being away from you and your brothers and mommy. But I am glad there is something that I can do to help even a little. Then I can come home to you.

"Until then, Debbie, daddy loves you very much.

"DADDY."

Doctors in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 18, 1967

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, a year ago this month the American Medical Association assumed responsibility for recruiting, preparing, and scheduling physician volunteers for tours of duty in civilian hospitals in South Vietnam under the AMA volunteer physicians for Vietnam program. The program had been launched in September 1965, by the Agency for International Development. Since that time a total of 269 physicians, including general practitioners and specialists of every kind, particularly orthopedic surgeons badly needed to treat war-injured civilians, have each served 60-day tours of duty in 16 provincial hospitals in various parts of the nation. A number have signed for a second and third tour; some have stayed nearly a year.

The humanitarian contributions of these dedicated men of medicine—they serve without pay—cannot be estimated. It is enough to say that they have alleviated the physical and mental suffering—psychiatrists serve there, too—of thousands of innocent victims of aggression in that tiny corner of Asia. The heartbreaking need for doctors in that bloodsoaked land is clearly appreciated by a reading of the AMA's physician-recruiting statement:

> Twenty-five years of war and insurrection in the area now known as South Vietnam has placed tremendous health burdens on the people. To the ever-present diseases and malnutrition of Southeast Asia have been added war injuries, disruption of whatever public health measures existed, and a serious lack of doctors and nurses as more and more of the country's approximately 1,000 physicians were called into military service. Today only about 350 physicians are left to administer health care to 15 million Vietnamese civilians.

Needless to say, the physician need grows unceasingly as the Vietcong turns more and more from direct battle confrontation with American and South Vietnamese armies to guerrilla warfare. When villages are sacked, who but the skilled surgeon can close a gaping missile wound, set a shattered bone, or heal burned limbs?

At the American Medical Association's 116th annual convention on June 18, held in Atlantic City, 19 physicians who had just returned from service in Vietnam were introduced to the assemblage. Each of the 19 physicians had his own private impressions of his experiences in South Vietnam. They were most appropriately summed up and expressed by Dr. Malcolm E. Phelps, of El Reno, Okla., who, as field director of the program, acted as spokesman for the group.

Mr. Speaker, I include herewith the speech of Dr. Phelps:

REMARKS OF MALCOLM E. PHELPS, M.D., FIELD DIRECTOR, AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION VOLUNTEER PHYSICIANS FOR VIETNAM PROGRAM, BEFORE THE HOUSE OF DELEGATES OF THE AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION, ATLANTIC CITY, N.J., JUNE 19, 1967

This past year I have had the privilege of witnessing true American ideals—demonstrated by deeds.

I have also had the opportunity of observing American physicians in their devoted duty for the benefit of mankind.

As Field Director of the Volunteer Physicians for Vietnam program I would like you to share, with me, the admiration and respect that our colleagues have earned for our country and our profession in a far off land which is the victim of terror, aggression and the atrocities of subversion; where plunder and pillage are rampant; where plague and pestilence abound.

These volunteer physicians, laboring tirelessly, with meager supplies and equipment, antique buildings, primitive surroundings, and in a hot, humid climate, were besieged by hordes of ill, infirm and injured human being seeking their skilled services. These volunteer physicians disregarded personal hardship and danger to ease pain, save lives and diminish deformity of these grateful patients.

From September 15, 1965 until the 10th of May, 1967 (combining those physicians who served under the auspices of Project Vietnam, administered by Project Hope of the People-to-People program, as well as those in the AMA Volunteer Physicians for Vietnam Program), 269 of our American men of medicine have devoted their time and talents to this tremendous undertaking.

Eleven have served two tours of duty, and one individual has served three. Two have remained an extra 30 days and one for 12 additional days. At least four have returned to Vietnam to serve on a long-term basis of at least one year.

No accolade that these 269 have earned, or that we could ever properly pay them, compares with the almost divine reverence that these devoted American doctors have earned in the heart of those forlorn "foreigners" who have benefited so greatly from their abilities.

The harvest of admiration and respect that has been reaped for our country, our ideals and our profession can never be measured, but it is my firm conviction—and I am certain this conviction is shared by many others—that the medical program carried out in Vietnam is by far the most successful program in existence in demonstrating our willingness to make sacrifices to preserve freedom in this world. This is the strongest testimony that could be given. It attests far more loudly than words that ours is a true compassion for our fellow man. If more could see, as we have seen throughout Vietnam, the bloody bestiality of the Communist aggressors, if more could witness the purposeless slaughter of innocent people, whose only desire is to till their fields and maintain their homes, then more would become emotional, as we became emotional, when we read in the daily paper of some of our citizens enjoying the comfort, safety and freedoms of America, unwittingly and stupidly aiding and promoting the Communist cause. Their demeanor and their demonstrations encourage the enemy, prolong the war and are, at least indirectly, responsible for an additional sacrifice of lives, both American and Vietnamese.

If any have doubts about the future of our country or have lost faith in the younger generation, they should see the American serviceman in action. His bravery, his competence and his spirit, combined with his compassion, instill a confidence in the future of our country that can be found in few other places. He has made us proud of our birthright and our heritage.

To you, members of this House of Delegates, officers, and members of the Board of Trustees, to all the members of the American Medical Association, and especially to Dr. Charles Moseley and his staff, I offer my sincere thanks for their advice and encouragement; and, of course, to the U.S. Agency for International Devolpment, for its cooperation and assistance. All of you have made it possible for me to experience the most interesting, the most challenging, the most fascinating though, on occasion, the most frustrating episode of my lifetime. I am truly grateful for this opportunity. More than ever I am proud of our ideals, our flag, and our country. Yes, I am proud to be an American.

Declaration Against Racial Discrimination

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT TENZER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 10, 1967

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, on March 15, 1967, a distinguished New Yorker, the Honorable Charles H. Silver, adviser to the U.S. delegation in the Human Rights Commission and consultant to the mayor of the city of New York, delivered an address on "Implementation of the Declaration Against Racial Discrimination."

The statement was delivered in Geneva, Switzerland, before the United Nations Commission on Human Rights. I commend the statement to my colleagues in the House.

Mr. Silver's remarks are particularly pertinent, since I plan to join with a Member of my colleagues in sponsoring a House resolution supporting United Nations' sanctions against Southern Rhodesia.

Mr. Speaker, I insert the full text of Mr. Silver's remarks at this point in the RECORD:

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION AGAINST RACIAL DISCRIMINATION

(Statement by Charles H. Silver, adviser to the U.S. delegation in the Human Rights Commission)

This session of our Commission has established a notable record in opposition to apartheid and to all violations of human rights. We are discussing the punishment of war crimes which led to the destruction of millions of innocent persons. Under this item of our agenda we are considering the implementation of the declaration against all forms of racial discrimination. That declaration calls for the elimination of all discrimination based on race, color, descent, or national or ethnic origin.

The growing concern of all who deplore the continuing limitations placed on man's freedom continues to focus on the attitudes of religious, cultural and racial prejudice still practiced against various groups in a number of countries in the world today. Although I address myself particularly to the position of the Jews, my remarks are equally pertinent to the victims of apartheid and to all minorities and groups who may not everywhere be permitted to preserve their identity and to transmit their heritage. It is proper that the seriousness of this situation be noted by this Commission as we near the international year for human rights.

In the world today, many racial strains and cultures are uniformly acknowledged and actively encouraged to develop their native language, literature, and art, while others, particularly the Jew, have been singled out to be confronted with obstacles and oppression. Even in areas where officially they have been recognized as an ethnic group within the national structure, continuing obstacles and oppression thave confronted them.

The world has observed restraints on religion which have resulted in the closing of many historic houses of worship and the imposition of obstacles to the training of future religious leaders and teachers. The inevitable result is a spiritual and intellectual loss to future generations.

Wherever the printing of prayer books, the publication of literature, the production of dramatic or musical performances, the teaching of history and religion to the young have been restricted, the result is that the vital resources of a rich cultural legacy are being stamped out.

Such special restrictions, applied in almost every sphere of activity within such a cultural minority induce a subtle but intensive erosion which results in the calculated breakdown of basic rights.

In a number of cases censorship has prevented sympathetic co-religionists in other nations from sending teachers and religious publications to their brethren. Whole communities have been isolated from their kinsmen in other parts of the world. Their members have been prevented from rejoining their relatives in Israel and elsewhere. Government action has prevented the renewal of bonds with the pitiful remnants which still remain of families that were torn apart by the tragic events of recent history.

We appeal on just and humane grounds for the end of any policy of ethnic, racial and religious suppression wherever it may be found. It contradicts the lofty, ethical and humane policies of true social justice which must be our dominant concern.

We plead for equality of every ethnic and racial group.

We urge that Jewish citizens everywhere be permitted to enjoy the same privileges accorded to all peoples.

We urge the removal of restrictions that deny the right to any group to practice, enhance and perpetuate its religion or its culture.

We urge the restoration and maintenance of synagogues and churches, cemeteries, social and welfare institutions, communal organizations, schools, and seminaries.

We urge the creation of an atmosphere of freedom in all countries so that all peoples, without distinction as to race or creed or color, so that Jews and other minorities be allowed freely to associate with related groups in other countries. We trust, too, that anti-semitism and other forms of discrimination will be combatted whenever and wherever they manifest themselves.

And finally, we hope that permission will be granted to families of Jews and other minorities separated during the war to be reunited with their loved ones without undue hindrance or distress. We hope likewise that families separated through apartheid and similar practices will no longer be denied the right to a family life.

We ask the same measure of freedom—no more and no less—that is granted to all other people in a civilized society. We put forth this statement in the confident belief that it benefits the dignity of man.

We do not indict any nation's humanitarian, moral, and political principles. We appeal to the worthy goals and high ideals which the community of nations has set forth for its guidance in the declaration and the convention the elimination of all forms of racial discrimination, the ideals contained in the charter of the United Nations and the Universal Declaration on Human Rights.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Speaker, the elimination of discrimination based on race, color, creed, descent, or national or ethnic origin must be a basic part of the foreign as well as domestic policy of the United States. The oppression of minority groups cannot be tolerated or recognized at this period in the history of the world.

The honorable Charles H. Silver, our spokesman at the Geneva sessions of the U.N. Human Rights Commission, has made a significant contribution to the cause of a better understanding between the peoples of the world, by speaking out in clear and understandable terms, against racial discrimination throughout the world.

The Increased Use of Chemical Warfare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 18, 1967

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, the vast amount of money spent for research on the development of chemical and biological weapons by the Defense Department, mostly at Fort Detrick, has more than tripled since 1961.

The frightening extent to which the chemical weapons are now being relied upon in modern warfare and the horrors which accompany these gases are the subject of an article written by columnist Marquis Childs, who traces the use of gas from the time of World War I to its employment by Egypt in the present conflict in Yeman. Childs alludes to the potent new gases being developed by the United States and, he also deplores the heavy reliance U.S. military forces in Vietnam place on napalm bombing—an action he considers to be as inhuman as the use of gas. It is in this respect that I call to the attention of my colleagues to Mr. Childs' article which appeared in the June 22, 1967, Watertown, Wis., Daily Times:

NERVE GAS IS NEWEST WEAPON TO BE TESTED IN WARFARE

(By Marquis Childs)

WASHINGTON.—In an isolated corner of the world inhabited only by primitive tribesmen a new terror of modern warfare has been tested for the first time. The Egyptians have bombed Yemeni villages with nerve gas, technically a V-agent, killing and seriously injuring several hundred men, women and children.

If after the horror piled on horror of this century mankind still has a conscience that can be aroused there may yet be time to stop short of disaster. Genocide as a way of warfare—an accepted convention in the contest between nations—is the threat inherent in the V-agent. Used by Arab against Arab in the Yemini war, as verified by the International Committee of the Red Cross, a wholly Swiss committee, it causes a special revulsion.

The threat of this new agent of mass death is underscored by what is apparently a fact, as yet officially unconfirmed, that quantities of nerve gas contained in artillery shells were stored in the Sinai Peninsula just prior to the Arab-Israeli war. It was not used. If it had been used the Israelis' frantic last-minute efforts to obtain gas masks and supplies of the only known antidote could hardly have prevented large casualties.

What happened in the Yemen and what might have happened in the Sinai must be seen not as an isolated incident but as one more step in a succession in which science has put itself at the service of death. It began on April 22, 1915. A strange green vapor released from German artillery shells floated across the trenches held by the French at Ypres.

FLED IN PANIC

Coughing, choking, dying, as the chlorine gas penetrated their lungs the French fled in panic. They left a four-mile gap in the line. But, because of the failure of earlier small experiments on the Polish front, the German high command had had little confidence in the outcome of this first gas attack and was, therefore, not prepared to take advantage of the break.

The steps down the steep and slippery slope are only too well known. In World War II the Nazis exterminated 6,000,000 Jews, Russians and Poles in a calculated policy of genocide. In August, 1945, the United States dropped the first atomic bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki, with dead and maimed in each city from 70,000 to 80,000. There were those, including men of the highest responsibility such as Secretary of War Henry L. Stimson who opposed using the bombs on civilian populations, and the question whether Japan was not already close to the point of capitulation is still debated.

Now and then a chance news story reveals the climate of the times better than a hundred speeches. Such a story in The New York Times recently told of an encounter between an American correspondent in Germany and a German charged with war crimes in a Nazi concentration camp. We understood each other now, the German said, because we see that you are doing in Vietnam what you accused us of doing in the second World War. This anecdote confirmed the reports of visitors to Germany who find many Germans equating the American bombing of North and South Vietnam with a form of genocide such as was practiced in the German death camps.

NAPALM DEATH

Napalm rained down on Vietnamese peasants has its place in the parade of horrors with no foreseeable end. The news photographs of children burned and scarred by napalm have had a fateful impact on world opinion.

The despairing question being asked today is whether there is any leadership visible that could start back from the slope threatening to end in total destruction. The poison gases of World War I were as innocent as cap pistols in comparison with the new V-agents. These new gases, odorless and colorless, are in the arsenals of the great powers, with the United States spending a sizable sum each year on chemical warfare.

Where the Egyptians obtained the nerve gas, which appears beyond their scientific capability, no one can say with certainty. An international convention drafted in 1925 outlawed the use of poison gas. Egypt signed that convention in 1928. Gas was not used in World War II if only because the circumstances of that war were not conducive to its use.

The death wish is part of the popular jargon of the age of Freud. Fleeing from his native Vienna as the Nazis took over, Freud saw not single individuals, disturbed and desperate, bent on suicide, but humanity itself in search of self-annihilation. This might be put down to the despair of a prophet who had suffered much. But each step in mass destruction since 1915 lends weight to his despair.

Constitution Should Be Studied

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. G. ELLIOTT HAGAN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1967

Mr. HAGAN. Mr. Speaker, my friend and colleague, the Honorable Jack T. Brinkley, of the Third District of Georgia, called my attention to the following letter from L. S. Williams, Ph. D., now serving as superintendent of missions of the Columbus Baptist Association, Columbus, Ga.

Dr. Williams, a native of Screven County in my district, and a noted educator and clergyman, makes a point in his letter worthy of the attention of all Americans.

The letter follows:

Columbus Baptist Association,
Columbus, Ga., July 10, 1967.

Congressman Jack T. Brinkley,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Brinkley: I sincerely share your concern for some of the un-American attitudes and practices by individuals and groups in our country. Since there are many contributing causes there will have to be numerous angles to the solutions.

In my judgment, ignorance is one part of the problem. This is true in a special way, it appears to me, concerning the Constitution of the United States. I believe that many and probably most people whom I know have never read the Constitution or they have not read it in recent years.

In connection with the recent Fourth of July, I did a little home work. It bothered me that I was so ignorant of the facts concerning the writing and the ratification of this wonderful document. Growing out of this reaction was a new sense of appreciation for what the founding leaders had done for us.

Let me express a conviction that has grown deeper and stronger over the past twenty years. I believe that our citizens throughout the nation should be encouraged to study our Constitution; that copies ought to be made available in large quantities. I am not suggesting that the government should make these free. If there would be a charge it ought to be a small one.

In addition to the contents of the Constitution itself, there ought to be a discussion of the tensions and conditions which prevailed out of which the Constitution emerged. This should be brief but it should present some background facts.

I personally believe that the Fourth of July might well be called Independence and Constitution Day. On this annual occasion, all the people ought to be urged to make a careful study of the Constitution. There are many needs in our land, to be sure. One is a growing understanding and comprehension of the Constitution.

An illustration comes to mind. A group of ministers of various Christian faiths met to discuss a court ruling. They said that the Court had ruled prayer out of the schools. Obviously this was a misstatement. After a lot of heat and talk had been used, one man said, "How many of you fellows have read the ruling of the Court?" Only one man had read it.

Some time back, a man was in my office. He was 44 years old. Even at this age, he was exploring the possibilities of going to college to prepare for a profession. We were talking about some preliminary examinations which are given before admission. To be specific, I telephoned the registrar at Columbus College for some sample questions. One was this: "What is meant by The Bill of Rights?" This man had never heard the expression. My belief is, he is one of a vast multitude.

How would you feel about making a survey by mail concerning this matter of the Constitution? It seems to me that at least three questions could be asked fittingly. They might be like these:

1. Do you own a copy of The Constitution of the United States?
2. Have you ever read The Constitution of the United States?
3. How long has it been since you read it the last time?

It would be interesting to go out among the people in Muscogee County and ask the questions of people at random. If this would have any meaning value, I would be glad to take a sample to see if my guesses are at all valid.

Much may be available in this direction. However, I am not aware of any efforts on the level and in the direction of my thinking as presented in this letter,

Please be assured again of my appreciation for you in every way both personal and in the manner of your service as your Congressman.

Faithfully yours,
Leslie S. Williams.

Hon. J. Arthur Younger

SPEECH

OF

HON. HORACE R. KORNEGAY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 13, 1967

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, I share in the sadness felt by the membership of the House in the passing of our colleague, Congressman J. Arthur Younger. It was my privilege to serve with him on the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and to share membership on the same Subcommittee on Communications and Power of the committee. We also shared an interest and enthusiasm for the House weekly prayer breakfasts, where he was a faithful attendant and an inspirational and dedicated participant.

Art Younger was one of the most gentle, most respected, and most effective individuals I have ever had the privilege of knowing, and he rendered significant service to his committee, to the Congress, to his district, and to any group in whose activities he took part. I deeply appreciate his friendly consideration of me, as a younger Member of Congress and of the committee on which we served, and I will always hold his memory in great respect and affection. My sincere condolences go out to his wife in these sad and trying days of her bereavement.

United States Keeping Supersilence on Superjet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 13, 1967

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, Jack Mabley, one of this Nation's most highly respected journalists, has written an excellent exposé of how pertinent information on the supersonic transport which this Nation will help finance is being held from the public.

I believe every Member of Congress should familiarize himself with these facts which appeared in the Chicago American. I voted earlier today for the motion to recommit the transportation bill because this was the only way I could help reduce the appropriation for this wasteful development. I sincerely hope some way will be found to stop the spending of funds on this supersonic transport. We recently were threatened with the placement in mothballs of the nuclear ship *Savannah* because it is too expensive to operate.

To those who think the *Savannah*—which was built at a cost of almost $200 million of taxpayers money—is a white elephant, I say you have not seen anything yet until we see the billions of dollars of taxpayers money which will be spent on development of the SST—the biggest white elephant ever conceived by this Government.

Mr. Mabley's article clearly demonstrates how right I am. The article follows:

UNITED STATES KEEPING SUPERSILENCE ON SUPERJET

(By Jack Mabley)

The Federal Government, thru the Federal aviation agency, is conspiring to keep the public from learning unpleasant information about the supersonic transport plane.

It is important that the future victims of the supersonic transport plane—individual citizens, with the help of newspapers—combat this conspiracy of silence.

We will pay billions of tax dollars for developing this plane which is becoming known as the Edsel of the air. We also will be victims of the sonic boom it will create if this gigantic government boondoggle continues.

The most unpleasant fact about the S. S. T. is the boom, which engineers haven't even begun to lick. The next negative is the cost of development, which has soared from the original billion dollars to an estimated 4.5 billion before the first flight sometimes in the 1970s.

The Wall Street Journal reported, "Economic studies done by several outside research concerns and just delivered to the FAA are so critical of the project's optimistic financial assumptions—including those about market demand, likely fare levels, and the balance-of-payments effect—that the FAA decided to keep them secret."

William Proxmire, the Lake Forest native who became Wisconsin's Democratic senator, says the FAA is giving the American people a supersonic snow job.

"The FAA apparently has concluded that the task of muffling the boom is impossible," Proxmire said, "or that they are content to build a plane that would be limited to ocean flights, which drastically reduces the chances it would become a commercial success, or that the public is just going to have to learn to live with the boom, no matter how disturbing or destructive it may be."

Well, I am joining that part of the public which isn't going to get snowed into accepting the sonic boom—not without a fight.

The American S.S.T. would fly at 1,800 to 2,100 m.p.h. Two major engineering problems are an exterior metal which will not melt at these speeds, and shielding from dangerous radiation in the air at the 70,000-foot altitude to be used by the S.S.T.

The plane would save time. Passengers flying from New York to London or Paris would save about 3 hours in the air. By the time the S.S.T. is in service—if it is—the 3 hours saved in the air may be lost by 3 additional hours getting to and from the airports on the ground.

For a fraction of the cost of the S.S.T. the government could build rapid transit systems, such as monorails, connecting airports with downtown areas.

These S.S.T. planes will have passenger capacities about the same as planes now flying commercial routes, so obviously they will have to charge high fares to help pay at least part of the cost.

Meanwhile, a "jumbo jet," which will carry from 400 to 1,000 passengers, and is so practical that the aviation industry is paying development costs, is expected to be in regular service by 1971.

This plane will fly farther nonstop than the S.S.T., will not make a sonic boom, and because of the capacity is expected to be immensely profitable, even at fares lower than today's.

It is folly to authorize the enormous spending of money, manpower, and engineering skills on a project of such dubious expectations as the S.S.T. Even if they should work out the technical and financial roadblocks, the sonic boom which this plane would create is intolerable.

Every living creature in a path 50 miles wide would be subjected to this thunderclap which is capable of cracking buildings.

I've been storing today's indignation for about 6 months, but it seemed a good time to unload it to coincide with the organization of the Citizens League Against the Sonic Boom, 19 Appleton St., Cambridge, Mass. 02138. This is a group of persons who are rebelling at being treated like sheep, and are fighting back. They're looking for other Americans who care enough to be angry.

Job Corps Women Get Involved

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1967

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I should like to bring to the attention of my colleagues a heroic deed performed by two young ladies from my district in Brooklyn, N.Y., who are making a better future for themselves at the Cleveland, Ohio, Job Corps Center for Women.

Carol Vincent of 426 Baltic Street and Wanda Martinez of 91 Luquer Street in Brooklyn, went to the rescue of a woman who was being attacked by three men and were instrumental in the capture of the men. Too often I think we hear stories of misbehavior by Job Corpsmen being given wide publicity, and it is heartening to hear of acts by corpsmembers to actually prevent crime. We are all very concerned about the rising crime rate in the Nation and here we have an example of two young women—private citizens—who took an active part in crime prevention. I include the following article about their efforts which appeared in the Corpsman newspaper of June 15:

CORPSWOMEN RESCUE VICTIM OF NIGHT STREET ATTACK

In the past few years there have been many incidents all over the country in which people have stood by and watched while a crime took place. These people did not help the victim or call the police, and an innocent person usually suffered.

One night recently in Cleveland, Ohio, three teen-age hoods attacked a woman on a dark street. It was their bad luck to be spotted by Wanda Martinez and Carol Vincent. These two Cleveland (Ohio) Corpswomen rushed in, saved the woman, sent two of the thugs running and held the other one until the police came. The two that got away were soon caught, and, thanks to the quick thinking and courage of the two young Corpswomen, a crime was prevented.

Both Wanda and Carol are from Brooklyn, New York. Wanda, who is 18, is studying to be a reproduction clerk, and 20-year-old Carol plans to become a psychiatric nurse.

All Unnecessary Cruelty in Which Our Government Is a Prime Offender

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 18, 1967

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, throughout our country, our Government continues to approve plans for public buildings which cruelly and unnecessarily prohibit the entrance of the ill and the crippled. Architects generally have been forward-looking in designing new types of buildings and new esthetic and engineering improvements in buildings. Some, a few, have thought of the crippled in their new designs; but the vast majority have not insisted on public buildings being enterable by the crippled, the aged, and the ill. Many times the calls of the crippled and the ill are the most urgent. Something must be done to correct this architectural deficiency now.

Even as far back as 1908 when the Cannon Building was built on Capitol Hill, a ground-level entrance was provided at the front of the building, for easy access to all. It is true that they also provided scores of marble steps for those who can use them. Maybe these steps are architecturally beautiful; but at least a usable alternative was offered. I once spent almost 2 years of my life in the city of Hot Springs, Ark., recuperating from an illness. Even the curbs at street crossings there are designed for easy movement by the ill and I would like to see their thoughtfulness more universal.

Mr. Speaker, I have joined Senator BARTLETT, of Alaska, and others in the introduction of legislation (H.R. 6589) which would insure that federally financed public buildings are reasonably accessible and usable by persons who are physically handicapped; and I sincerely hope that this legislation will soon become law. I include at this point an excellent article by Dr. Walter C. Alvarez on this subject:

BUILDERS TOO OFTEN IGNORE THE CRIPPLED

(By Dr. Walter C. Alvarez)

It is unfortunate that our architects—with their love of building beautiful staircases leading up into great public buildings—have made it impossible for millions of crippled persons to go into these buildings. A person with arthritis or an artificial leg, or a bad heart, may find himself or herself unable ever to enter his city's great public library, or his state Capitol, or his church, or even a big store, if it has only a revolving door.

There are some 22 million people, or perhaps one in 6 in this country who cannot enter our public buildings unless perhaps the architect thought to build a doorway leading to an elevator. Many crippled persons never can go to a football game or to an opera, and crippled children cannot go to school or to college because they can't go up and down stairs to the several classrooms. They may not be able even to get into the building.

I know of only one man, Henry Vascardi of Albertson, N.Y., who because he was once crippled himself, knew that in upper rooms in thousands of homes, there are children left all alone, who cannot go to school because they cannot climb into a school bus, and if they could get to a school, they could not go up and down the many stairs. Vascardi designed a bus for these children which lifts them up, wheelchair and all, and he has designed a school for crippled children which is all on one floor.

About 1959, a campaign was started to awaken community planners, architects, builders, legislators and civic leaders to the fact that they must not build a great public building into which a considerable percentage of their people cannot ever climb. In 1961, new plans were approved by the American Standards Association, and in 1965 President Johnson appointed a National Commission on Architectural Barriers, which will report at the end of this year.

As George Nicholas, vice president of the Lobsenz Public Relations Co. in New York, writes me, the results are promising, but not yet good enough. All of us must get back to the idea of "architecture for everybody."

In many places, what are needed are ramps, doors wide enough for wheelchairs, and nonslip floors. The cost of making the changes will not be great. Incidentally, it is astounding that even in many hospitals, the floors are so beautifully polished that even a strong young person can easily slip and fall and break a bone.

In Rochester, Minn., the home of the Mayo Clinic, at every corner of the downtown streets there is a little ramp which enables the users of wheelchairs to get up or down. Also, there are warmed tunnels under the sidewalks, designed for the comfort of elderly persons who cannot tolerate well the below-zero temperatures of the winters.

Convict the Killers for a Change

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD J. IRWIN
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 13, 1967

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Alfred Baker Lewis, a constitutent of mine and a highly intelligent and articulate individual, recently wrote for the Chicago Daily Defender a very penetrating and enlightening article entitled "Convict the Killers for a Change." I could say a great deal about the contents of this article, which appeared in the Chicago Daily Defender in three installments on July 3, 5, and 6. However, because of its length, I would like at this time to enter the article in the RECORD so that it will be available to all my colleagues:

CONVICT THE KILLERS FOR A CHANGE

(By Alfred Baker Lewis)

One of the civil rights bill introduced in the Senate this year would make it a Federal crime to assault or kill civil rights workers or Negroes trying to exercise their rights. The evidence shows that the bill is needed. There is a long record of killing and attempted killing of civil rights workers in certain sections of the South, with nothing being done in the state courts to those who did the killing. In fact in parts of the country, it is apparently safer to shoot Negroes trying to exercise their rights than it is to shoot deer out of season so far as the state courts are concerned.

Harry Moore, the state organizer of the NAACP in Florida, and his wife were lynched on Christmas Eve in 1951 as a Christmas present to the NAACP in that state. He had been active in getting Negroes to vote, and in trying to gain equal pay for Negro and white teachers when they had equal qualifications. To be sure, the climate of opinion in Florida is very different now. Negroes were not scared away from voting by this lynching so that the NAACP has been able to multiply Negro registered voters in Florida by more than ten times since his death; and lynching is bad for the tourist business. But those guilty of the crime are still laughing up their sleeves at the state authorities in Florida, for nothing was ever done to the lynchers.

In early June of 1963, I went with Medgar Evers, the state organizer of the NAACP in Mississippi, to put a wreath on the grave of Reverend George Lee, who had been the President of the Belzonia, Mississippi branch of the NAACP. He had been ordered by the White Citizens Council to stop getting Negroes registered to vote and to take his own name off the voters' list. He refused. Two days later, on May 7, 1955, he was shot and killed on one of the main streets of Belzonia in daylight. Nothing ever happened to his killers. The same year that Reverend Lee was killed, Lamar Smith, an NAACP Leader in Brookhaven, Mississippi was shot at noon on the court house steps. Nothing was done to his killers.

Gus Curts, another NAACP leader in Mississippi who had been getting Negroes to enroll as voters, was shot but only wounded. It was reported that the sheriff was waiting at the hospital for him evidently to finish the job by shooting him "while attempting to escape" in case the would be killers did not end his life, but his friends instead drove him to the hospital in the all-Negro town of Mound Bayou, where he recovered. But he felt he had to leave the state for his health and has been set up in a little business in Chicago by the NAACP and is making a living. Nothing ever happened to those who tried to kill him.

A week after I was with Medgar Evers, on June 12, 1963, he was assassinated. The police found the fingerprints of a White Citizen Council member from Greenwood Mississippi, named Beckwith, on the gun used to kill him, but the state of Mississippi could not convict the man whose fingerprints were found on the murder gun.

In Birmingham, Alabama, on September 15, 1963, the Sixteenth St. Baptist Church, which had been used for civil rights meetings, was bombed. Four colored girls, Cynthia Wesley, Denise McNair, Carol Robertson, and Addie Collins, were bombed to death while attending Sunday School in the Church. The mother of one of them lost her mind as a result. No one was ever arrested for the killings.

That same day two Negro boys were shot by a couple of whites. One of them, Virgil Ware, was killed. The whites who did the killings were arrested, tried, and convicted. The state court judge sentenced them, for a deliberate killing, to seven months in jail, and they did not serve that ridiculous sentence. He put them on probation. He said they came from good families.

Apparently those who did the bombing and killing in Birmingham felt safe (accurately as it turned out) in doing so because in that city over a few previous years, sixteen Negro homes and businesses had been bombed, and of course no one was indicted for these crimes.

In Philadelphia, Mississippi, on or about June 21, 1964, Mickey Schwermer, Andrew Goodman, and James Chaney, were lynched and their bodies were no found until August 7th. It is known who did the job, for someone pointed out to the F.B.I. where they were buried and they could not have been found otherwise. It is a safe bet that those who did the killing did not hire undertakers to bury them, but buried them secretly themselves in the dam of a newly made pond. So whoever saw the burying or took part in it saw and knew the lynchers. But no effort was ever made to indict them in the state court. They have been indicted in the Federal Court on the charge of conspiring to deprive their victims of their civil rights, namely their right to live. But conviction depends on a confession. As experience with the killers of Lieutenant Colonel Lemuel Penn, described hereafter shows, this may prove to be unreliable.

In Selma, Alabama, Reverend James Reeb, a white Unitarian minister from Boston, was clubbed to death on March 9, 1965, while he was in town to take part in civil rights activity there connected with trying to get Negroes enrolled as voters. Those who were charged with killing him were acquitted.

Jimmie Lee Jackson was shot on February 14th in Marion, Alabama, while trying to protect his mother from being beaten by an Alabama state trooper when state troopers broke up a voters' registration in Marion. He died February 26th, of his wounds. The Alabama state trooper of course was never indicted.

Outside of Athens, Georgia, on the night of July 11, 1964, Lieutenant Colonel Lemuel Penn, a Negro reserve officer from Washington was gunned down by persons supposed to be members of the K.K.K. while returning by car with some companions from Army manoeuvre in Louisiana to his home in Washington. One of the killers confessed, but evidently some members of the K.K.K. visited his family while he was in jail and told the family what might happen to them if he stood by his confession. So he repudiated his confession at the trial, and the only one of the killers who was tried in the state court was acquitted.

In the little town of Haynesville, Alabama, between Selma and Montgomery, Mrs. Liuzzo, who had participated in the march on Montgomery and was bringing home one of the participants, a young Negro named Leroy Moton, was shot and killed on March 25, 1965, by some men who had been trailing her because she was riding with a Negro. She was the wife of a trade union leader in Detroit. One of those who was in the murder car, Gary Thomas Rowe, was an agent of the F.B.I. who had succeeded in gaining membership in the Klan. He gave evidence at the trial and pinned the shooting on Collie Leroy Wilkins, Jr. But the defense counsel waved Mrs. Liuzzo's membership card in the NAACP at the jury, and the jury at the first trial failed to convict and at the second trial acquitted him. Later the same man was tried in the Federal Court at Montgomery, Alabama, for conspiring to deprive Mrs. Liuzzo of her civil rights—i.e. her right to live. Somewhat to the surprise of those who follow these cases, the killer this time was convicted and sentenced to 7 years in jail. A Negro who killed a white woman of course would have been sentenced to death in the state court, if not lynched.

O'Neal Moore, a Negro deputy sheriff of Bogalusa, Louisiana, was killed by night riders on June 2, 1965. The white supremacists did not want any Negroes among the law enforcing officials. Naturally no arrests were made.

Late in November, 1965, the homes of Kelly Alexander, the head of the North Carolina State Conference of NAACP Branches, and his brother, who had just been elected to the city council in Charlotte, were bombed. Luckily no one was killed although the houses were very badly damaged. The bomb shattered the window of the room in which Kelly Alexander's two sons were sleeping and drove fragments of glass like spears into the wall opposite the window. Luckily the two boys were sleeping under the window, so that the broken slivers of window glass, driven across this room by the bomb explosion, passed over their heads. If they had been sleeping on beds at the opposite wall of the room they would have been killed.

On January 10, 1966, Vernon Dahmer, the head of the NAACP branch in Hattiesburg, Mississippi, who was active in getting Negroes to enroll as voters, was firebombed to death. His wife and daughter who were with him in the house were badly burned and had to be hospitalized, but were not killed. Besides the crime of registering Negroes to vote, Mr. Dahmer, was an "uppity nigger" in the opinion of too many whites because he had a good business and a good home. Here something has happened to the killers, for the agent of the F.B.I., not of course the local or state police, have rounded up some thirteen members of one of the Klan organizations and will try to have them indicted and tried on the charge of conspiring to deprive Dahmer of his civil rights. Any trial in the state court would almost certainly not lead to a conviction, judging from past experience.

The killers may not even get convicted in the Federal Court. For the Federal Court judge in Mississippi is as much opposed to equal rights for Negroes as any state court judge. He is a friend and protege of Senator Eastland of Mississippi. President Kennedy felt he had to appoint him as a Federal Judge on Eastland's insistence, in order to get Senator Eastland, who is head of the Senate Judiciary Committee, by seniority, to allow his committee to vote on confirming the appointment by President Kennedy of Thurgood Marshall, formerly the general counsel of the NAACP, to be a justice of the Circuit Court of Appeals.

Samuel Young, Jr., who had served a term in the Navy and was a student at Tuskegee University in Alabama, was shot and killed by a white gasoline station worker on January 5th, of this year, apparently because he insisted on using the toilet. In the county where Tuskegee is located there is a majority of Negro voters. So it is possible that there would be a conviction when the alleged killer, Marvin Segrest, was brought to trial. Unfortunately, the members of the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee, understandably angered by the killing, ran unwisely a number of demonstrations in the City and aroused a good deal of hostility to the killer. His lawyer therefore moved for a change of venue, and the court granted it. Alabama being what it is, there was no conviction.

These killings have not stopped. When I was returning from a speaking tour for the NAACP to Texas and back I spoke at a mass meeting in Natchez, Mississippi, in February. After the meeting I shook hands with our former branch treasurer, Wharlest Jackson, and congratulated him on being upgraded to a better job in the Armstrong Tire Company, to which he was entitled by seniority but which has formerly been held only by whites. A few days later he was bombed to death for having been given "a white man's job". A number of Klansmen work in the Natchez factory of Armstrong Tire Company. So far nothing has happened to those who did the job.

About a year before that, the NAACP branch president in Natchez, George Metcalf, had had a bomb planted on him which did not kill him, but merely disabled him for life. He had been conducting a successful boycott there which induced the Natchez merchants to agree to hire Negroes as salespeople. Nothing ever happened to those who planted the bomb. Evidently this immunity from prosecution emboldened those who more recently did the successful killing job on Wharlest Jackson.

This partial list of shootings, bombings, lynchings and attempted killings is enough to convince anyone who has not been brain washed by the anti-civil rights propaganda of the John Birchites that a bill to make killings a Federal crime in circumstances where it is likely that the state courts will not or cannot give protection to civil rights workers is reasonable and necessary to accomplish justice.

We must stop this series of unpunished killings for the honor of our country as well as for the sake of decency and justice.

The attempt to do so was part of the 1966 proposed civil rights bill, which was killed by a filibuster in the Senate after having passed the House of Representatives.

The Southern Senators, aided by reactionary Northern Senators, such as Senator Dirksen, the leader of the Senate Republicans, who took part in or supported that filibuster, were in effect condoning and defending the continuation of unpunished murder. If enough of their constituents say that to the Senators and Representatives who voted against the civil rights bill, it may be possible to get at least this part of the bill passed by this Congress.

John Quincy Adams

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 11, 1967

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BURKE], in observing the 100th anniversary of the birth of a great American, John Quincy Adams. Ambassador, Congressman, Senator, Secretary of State, and President, Adams was a truly remarkable statesman and patriot.

As just one example of President Adams' noble legacy to our Nation's history, I would like to speak of one of his lesser known qualities—a brave and forthright respect and sympathy for the rights of minority groups. This characteristic of the gentlemen from Massachusetts is best illustrated by the Georgia-Indian controversy of the mid-1820's.

Pressure from wealthy plantation owners in the South caused the Indian Office to proclaim the Treaty of Indian Springs between the United States and the Creek Indian Nation. Signed in 1825, before Adams took office, the treaty was approved by the Senate. But the Creeks repudiated it and charged fraud. When after investigation, Adams found the Indians correct—the treaty has been signed by a Creek with no authority to agree to such a pact—he denounced the agreement as void.

Adams' respect for the Indians' rights was not widely shared and his action crippled him politically in the South and West. Historians, in fact, cite this incident as a contributing factor in President Adams' reelection defeat of 1828. This generation of Americans would do well to emulate John Quincy Adams' understanding and courage.

The residents of the 11th District of Massachusetts have reason for pride in the quality of their public servants as exemplified by John Quincy Adams and their present representative, James A. Burke. As did his illustrious predecessor, Congressman BURKE enjoys the respect and esteem of all his colleagues in the House of Representatives for his ability, integrity, and patriotism.

WCBS Radio Discusses Dissent and Public Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 18, 1967

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, at a time when dissent is being equated with disloyalty in many quarters and even the Congress of the United States undertakes to punish symbolic acts of dissent, it is reassuring that one of our major television stations has broadcast an editorial maintaining the clear right of free expression, even for the most unpopular and misguided of minorities. I am pleased to include the text of a WCBS editorial of July 4 on dissent and public policy.

WCBS RADIO DISCUSSES DISSENT AND PUBLIC POLICY

The mood of the nation is wary and distrustful. We have become accustomed to seeing prospects of imminent disaster in the vision of collegiate dissent that echoes from our radios and flickers across our television screens. If misguided social rebels stupidly burn draft cards or flags for the benefits of a gawking public, we assume American youth is in revolt against the lawful commands of government. But this is not necessarily so. It is easy to forget that the eddies and currents of protest in American life are strong. There is, as there has always been, vocal dissent from national policy. There is today, especially among our youth, a grave questioning of our role in Southeast Asia, indeed our national destiny. Yet we should not equate dissent with disloyalty; nor should we underestimate the moderation and good sense of the American people to reject false values.

On this day . . . it would be well to remember history. The Declaration of Independence, which brought this nation into being, was and remains a revolutionary document. The Declaration IS the right of dissent. This right was later embodied in the Constitution and has become the bedrock of American democracy. Our great legal documents make no distinction between what is acceptable speech and unacceptable speech. Our traditions and our laws were designed to protect minorities and dissenters. We accept in this nation the unique political philosophy of majority power coexisting with minority rights . . . rights, in Jefferson's words, which "equal laws must protect, and to violate would be oppression." Still there are some who will say it is necessary to the self-preservation of the state, in troubled times, to suppress or silence opposition to national policy. For this view we can find no justification. Concern for the safety of the state does not require an appeal to the most desperate of political expedients.

The historian Henry Steele Commager has written . . . and his words bear repeating . . . that the purpose of freedom of speech "is not to indulge those who want to speak their minds. It is to prevent error and discover truth. There may be other ways of detecting error and discovering truth than that of free discussion, but so far we have not found any."

Representative Ancher Nelsen's Constructive Leadership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 18, 1967

Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, real legislative leadership is a quality far easier to recognize than to define. Certainly it includes intelligence, perspective, sensitivity, and commonsense, qualities which we have been fortunate to find in so many of the men who have held high positions on congressional committees at critical times.

In a letter published in the Washington Star on July 15, Mr. John A. Nevius, program chairman of the Committee for Forward-Looking Republicans, justifiably praised the work of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NELSEN], the ranking minority member of the House District of Columbia Committee. Listing several of the many proposals which ANCHER NELSEN has guided through the House, Jack Nevius concluded that his "concern for our people and talents at political compromise give promise of a new era in constructive legislation by Washington's 'city fathers.' "

It is a great privilege for me to serve with Mr. NELSEN on the House District Committee, and I share completely this estimate of his qualities and contributions to better government of the Nation's Capital. I would, therefore, like to call this well-deserved tribute to the attention of the entire Congress:

THE NELSEN BLOCK

SIR: Our appreciation goes to Miss Shirley Elder for her perceptive report on the expanding role of Rep. Ancher Nelsen and the fellow Republicans he so ably leads on the House District Committee. Thanks in part to GOP resurgence in the 1966 elections, Mr. Nelsen's forces now have the strength to muster a majority on the committee in favor of progressive legislation for our city.

While adhering to traditional Republican principles like individal initiative, private enterprise and trying to make sure no tax dollars are wasted, this self-styled "simple farmer's" experience and responsible conservatism reflect real sensitivity to the rapidly changing urban problems of the city he helps run. Recently, he has carved out a record of which all Republicans can be justly proud, and there is more to come.

Besides the three examples Miss Elder cited, he and his fellow Republicans deserve most of the credit for enactment of our liberal arts and technical colleges and minimum wage bills last year. Similarly, they steered D.C. Medicaid through the House this year. Coming up soon are two items through which his support is expected to extend the voting franchise of Washingtonians: Congressional representation and the interim nonvoting delegate in the House. His devotion and new-found strength deserve much of the credit for the fact that the House has already passed 21 D.C. bills since January, while the Senate has completed only one so far.

Flexible though its membership may be from one proposal to the next, the "Nelsen block" is rapidly emerging as a powerful force on the House District Committee whose concern for our people and talents at political compromise give promise of a new era in constructive legislation by Washington's "city fathers." We local Republicans are both pleased and proud.

JOHN A. NEVIUS,
Program Chairman, Committee for Forward-Looking Republicans.

Pastor Osmar Lehenbauer's Sermon at Concordia Lutheran Church, Fort Wayne, Ind., the Sixth Sunday after Trinity, July 2, 1967

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. ROSS ADAIR

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 18, 1967

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, this year because of the trouble and unrest in many parts of the world, the Fourth of July has or ought to have a greater than usual significance. This was very well pointed up in a sermon given by Pastor Osmar Lehenbauer, at Concordia Luthern Church, Fort Wayne, Ind., on July 2. It is my hope that many people will be as favorably impressed as I was by Pastor Lehenbauer's sermon, and I include it herewith:

PASTOR OSMAR LEHENBAUER'S SERMON AT CONCORDIA LUTHERN CHURCH, FORT WAYNE, IND., THE SIXTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY, JULY 2, 1967

Text: "Righteousness exalteth a nation: but sin is a reproach to any people" (Proverbs 14:34).

In Christ Jesus, dear citizens of the kingdom of heaven and citizens of a free and noble land,

One hundred and ninety one years have now passed since the signing of a piece of paper called the "Declaration of Independence." This declaration, adopted on July 4th, 1776, signified that the United States of America were free and independent states, and thus the 4th of July continues to be celebrated as the birthday of our country as a free nation.

While the writers of this document and other leaders following them held firmly to the truth that "all men are endowed *by their Creator* with certain unalienable rights, (that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness,)" and relied on "the protection of Divine Providence" to support their declaration, and even went so far as to have "In God we trust" inscribed on our coins, this same acknowledgment of dependence upon God is no longer quite so evident in our country. Man—not God—is given the credit for bigger and better yields of grain, technological advances in the fields of science and industry and medicine and the race into space. Clothing manufacturers like to imply that man-made fibers are much, much better than God-made fibers (as though man has created these out of nothing). Only less than half of those who claim to acknowledge God come to His house once a week, while the other half is too busy enjoying the blessings of a God-blessed and bountiful land.

It is because of this attitude in which our country has been taking God so much for granted that you and I should all the more do all in our power to bring Christ to our nation and our nation back to Christ. In this connection and on the basis of our text, we ask the question:

WILL AMERICA ALWAYS BE "THE BEAUTIFUL"

Most of you, I'm sure, are patriotic enough to have sung many times, "O beautiful for spacious skies, For amber waves of grain, For purple mountain majesties Above the fruited plain. America, America, God shed His grace on thee, And crown thy good with brotherhood From sea to shining sea." And America is not only a beautiful land, but a bountiful one as well. Her beauty and bounty, however, has not consisted just in those things which are visible to the naked eye, but also those qualities of courage, persistence, perseverance, and faithfulness to the God who gave us this nation.

Thus it would appear as though Solomon could have been prophetically thinking of the United States when he wrote the words of our text under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, when he said, "Righteousness exalted a nation." Have you ever stopped to realize, for example, that if the world's population were condensed into just 1000 people, there would be only 60 Americans, and 940 representing the rest of the world; but that the 60 Americans would possess half of the world's income, while the 940 would have to share the other half? The sixty Americans would have a life expectancy of 70 years . . . the remainder less than 40 years on the average. The Americans would have 15 times as many possessions per person as the rest of the world combined. The Americans would be rich and well-fed . . . the other 940 would be hungry most of the time.

We could go on, but this should suffice to show just how richly God has blessed this land of ours—how He has made it beautiful and bountiful beyond compare.

Our country is beautiful in other ways. We have the kind of freedom in this land that millions of others throughout the globe are totally ignorant of. For example, if you lived in Communist China or Cuba or Russia, you could be assured that the slightest move you made that was at all suspicious would be reported to the nearest authority. People in those lands no longer know what it means to be able to move about freely from one place to another without an inspection, to be able to say what you think without being thrown in jail, to be able to worship as you please.

And these are just a few of the benefits of living in a land which for many years looked to God for guidance, and because of living in moral uprightness that called a spade a spade and sin, sin has been more than amply rewarded by God from whom all blessings flow. We can come to no other conclusion than that God is given now today blessing us because of the faith of our fathers who had a greater fear of God than of men and to whom the words, "In God we Trust" was more than just an empty slogan.

Yes, as we look at the variety of food on our table each day, as we see racks upon racks of clothing in store after store, hundreds of different appliances and gadgets that add comfort or entertainment to our life—as we see all this and much more we can surely see how God has kept His promise to reward those who walk in the paths of uprightness and truth.

But wait a minute now—wasn't Germany once a great and powerful nation, richly endowed with might and main, and couldn't her citizens have sung "O beautiful for spacious skies . . ." just as well as we here in our land? And how about Britain, this tremendous world power, with colonies all over the globe, and a navy that controlled the seas for many a year. Weren't both Germany and Britain once beautiful and bountiful and blessed by God because of their living in an upright and godly way? Why did they fall? Could it be because of what Solomon says in the last part of our text, that while "righteousness exalteth a nation, sin *is* a reproach to any nation." Would you be willing to go along with that? Would you concede that both Germany and Britain, once both world powers, once the mothers of many churches throughout the world and the home base from which many missionaries were sent, lost their beauty and their power because they began to take God too much for granted. From what we hear of England and Germany today—how churches are empty and religion is practiced mainly by older people and perhaps some younger families, we can assume that they have not only taken God for granted but that they have largely forgotten Him entirely.

Thus we think it is quite necessary to ask, "Will America always be beautiful?" Not because we are concerned about the natural beauty of our land, but because we are concerned about whether God will continue to bless us in the same measure as He has in the past.

Just a moment ago me recounted some of the blessings of our land, but there is also another side of the story. In his message to Congress in February, President Johnson presented the following statistics: 5.5 million children under 6, and 9 million more under 17, live in families too poor to feed and house them properly. More than 4 million children will suffer physical handicaps and another 2 million will fall victim to preventable accidents or disease. One million young Americans will drop out of school this year—many to join the unhappy legion of the unemployed.

In a slightly different vein, the FBI reveals this horrifying timetable of crime in our country: Five serious crimes are committed every minute. A murder every hour. An aggravated assault every 2½ minutes. A robbery every 4½ minutes. An auto theft every minute. A burglary every 27 seconds. One in every six young men under 18 will be taken to juvenile court for at least one offense this year.

Add to this the fact that one out of every four marriages continues to end in divorce, that damage amounting to millions is caused through riots and other disturbances, that more and more young people are depending upon drugs, accepting such things as Playboy magazine to determine their moral standards, burn their draft cards, denounce the government, and in general show very little patriotism or love of God at all, and you have to wonder how long America will continue to be called, "America, the Beautiful".

It is difficult to live in a land of freedom like ours. It is easier to shirk responsibility than to assume it. More and more citizens seem to be accepting therefore another version of the 23rd Psalm, parts of which read something like this: "The Government is my shepherd. I need not work. It allows me to lie down on good jobs . . . Yea, though I walk through the valley of deficit spending and laziness, I will fear no evil, for the Government is with me . . . Surely, the Government shall care for me all the days of my life, and I shall dwell in a fool's paradise forever."

A Christian has no right to absolve himself of his responsibilities in a democratic community. Even as Paul urges us to pray for all that are in authority, so also we must work for good government if we want to keep the blessings which God has given us here in America. Experience teaches that democracy dies from negligence, apathy, general indifference, materialism, and selfishness, and it can survive only as we see ourselves not just as subjects who are to obey the laws of the land but as sovereign citizens who help to make these laws and see that they are enforced. We are to be a salt and a light in every social relationship, and this must certainly include government. Our prayer for good government becomes meaningless and a blasphemy if we are not willing to do something about good government.

If any group of people are in a position to change the direction in which our nation seems to be going, it would be the Christian people of our country. We have been saved by the blood of Christ to serve not just God, but also our fellow-men. We have the Bible which tells us what is pleasing to our Father in heaven, and what constitutes justice and mercy among men. We have His holy commandments which tell us the difference between right and wrong good and evil. Thus the Church holds that her members, as citizens, should take an effective part in public life by doing their full duty as citizens.

In accordance with what the Apostles Paul and Peter tell us in their Epistles, the Augsburg Confession states: "Of Civil Affairs they teach that lawful civil ordinances are good works of God, and that it is right for Christians to bear civil office, to sit as judges, to judge matters by the imperial and other existing laws, to award just punishments, to engage in just wars, to serve as soldiers, to make legal contracts, to hold property, to make oath when required by the magistrates, to marry a wife, to be given in marriage."

We who are Christian citizens can contribute to the strength of a nation by becoming involved instead of sitting back, by not only helping good candidates become elected to office, but by running for an office when we are qualified and thus applying Christian principles we have learned. It is not the duty of the Church to interfere in politics, but it is the responsibility of the individual Christian to assume his rightful role in government. We can also take the lead in having a proper respect for law and for its official representatives. People who sneer at policemen; people who cheat on their tax returns; landlords who violate housing codes; parents who set bad examples by their own disrespect for the law, or who wink at their own children's minor offenses, can find no justification for their actions in Scripture and do nothing but weaken a nation's moral fiber.

As a Church we have no right to force our religion on those around us. But surely we who know the love of God in Christ, we who know the damning results of sin, we who have been made strong through the Gospel and have the power of the Holy Spirit in our lives to work that which is truly good—we can help to restore righteousness to the nation.

But we can do it in an even greater measure as we seek to lead people to the knowledge of their Savior. For as the Apostle Paul tells us in His letter to Timothy, when he says that we are to pray for kings and all that are in authority, he says that we should do this so "that we may lead a quiet and peaceable life in all godliness and honesty. For this is good and acceptable in the sight of God our Savior; Who will have all men to be saved and to come unto the knowledge of the truth."

Men must be told that our home here on earth is only a temporary one—that while it is good and wonderful to live in a beautiful country like America, this too will one day come to an end, and we must prepare ourselves for an even more beautiful country that awaits us in heaven.

If this is our goal—and it should be that of every true Christian—then we who are heavenly citizens first and foremost will also be good citizens in this world and do all in our power to keep America beautiful in accordance with the will of God and obeying Him above all.

We will then also take an avid interest in the affairs of our Church, for we know that the Church can perform wonders in the world as long as it continues to preach God's Word in its truth and purity and not only lead men to Christ but help them to walk in Christ. Thus what happens at the Convention of our Synod in New York next week ought to concern each and every one of us. What happens there can help to determine whether America will be beautiful also for our children, and whether we in years to come will have that righteousness which exalts a nation and brings her blessings from God.

May we then not only remain firm in our faith in the True and Living God, but also live and practice our faith both as citizens of the heavenly kingdom and as citizens of the land we love. God grant it for Jesus' sake. Amen.

The Disquiet of the Majority More Than the Fury of the Minority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 18, 1967

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, like most everyone else I got rather far behind—over the Fourth of July recess—in my normal reading tasks, so that the following guest column by James A. Perkins, president of Cornell University, as published in the July 1 edition of the New York Times, has just come to my attention.

President Perkins is a distinguished American who, in addition to his duties at Cornell, my alma mater, also serves as a member of the general advisory committee of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. I am not at all sure that I would agree with his tentative conclusion, as expressed in his column, however I would most certainly agree that his well-reasoned analysis of why—as he puts it—"the consensus required to support our peace-keeping strategy has been seriously eroded," makes a good deal of sense as all of us wrestle with the problem of what, exactly, went wrong in Vietnam.

The currently stalemated situation there—which both President Johnson and General Westmoreland insist is not a stalemate, though I do not know what better to call it—is putting new pressure on the validity of the whole concept of "controlled" or "limited" warfare, and it is obvious that we again stand at some sort of crossroads now, as the President and his military advisers wrestle with the problem of how many more U.S. troops would be enough to hold whatever initiative we now have, as well as how many, conversely, would be too much from the standpoint of economic and political reasons of as vast import to the people of South Vietnam as they are to us.

This is a hard question—a very hard question to answer, Mr. Speaker—and there is ample reason to agonize over it as most of us are doing. For the answer, be it right or wrong, will have an affect not only on the murkily immediate future of our costly and frustrating effort in Vietnam, but also on the long-range future foreign policy that this Nation will follow that will "light us down in honor or dishonor" as a nation that not only dreamed a dream of peace for all men but knew how to make that dream a reality.

This is a time, most certainly, for realism and for utter honesty on the part of the administration. It is a time for looking at the hard facts of our difficult and dangerous situation—and it is a time for Presidential leadership of the highest possible caliber. If any of these factors in this essential equation should be missing in the days ahead, I can only assume that the "disquiet of the majority"—as Mr. Perkins puts it—will continue to grow, and it is this, as he says, rather than the "fury of the minority" that poses the greatest danger to our social fabric.

Under leave to do so, I now append to these remarks both the Perkins column and two others that I believe are pertinent to this discussion, the first an editorial from the Wall Street Journal for July 14, 1967, and the second a column by James Reston, also from the New York Times, but from its July 12 issue:

Topics: The Disquiet Americans and Local Wars

(By James A. Perkins)

Over a decade ago we abandoned the grand strategy of the threat of nuclear war on the U.S.S.R. as the most effective means of keeping the peace. With a sigh of relief we moved to the current doctrine of controlled and essentially non-nuclear deterrence. We would now keep the peace at the perimeter of the U.S.S.R. and China by applying only that limited amount of force necessary to forestall aggression.

It is all too clear that we adopted this theory of controlled deterrence without a full realization of its complications for the American consensus. It was enough that this policy took us out of the horrors of a nuclear strike in answer to limited and local aggression. It seemed like a return to some level of rationality—which, in large measure, it was.

PUBLIC UNDERSTANDING

But our present strategy turns out to have its own peculiar difficulties. Unseen and largely unexamined, they are now enormously complicating both public understanding and public support of the war in Vietnam. They may well plague any military efforts in the future.

The fact that the United States is both a liberal democracy and a *status quo* power gives it a double reason for approaching problems of foreign policy from a position of military restraint. Public supprt of military action requires the presence of strong, clearly understood imperatives.

DANGER TO HOMELAND?

In the case of the first imperative—the existence of a present and demonstrable danger to the homeland—the possibility of a nuclear war made the domestic danger all too acute. By contrast, the prospect of a controlled local war at an ocean's distance from the United States reduces the element of fear. Such a war is geographically remote; the danger is less apparent, the public temperature goes down, and with it the pressure of our first imperative.

The second imperative—the existence of an identified enemy—was evident in the reactions of the American people before we entered World War II. From 1933 to 1941 the Nazis managed to arouse our passions in full measure. But local wars on the perimeter tend to involve antagonists whom we barely know and, therefore, cannot reasonably either fear or hate.

The third imperative—the theat to long-time friends whose welfare is close to our hearts and with whom our ties are well established—is perhaps the weakest of all. In case of nuclear war, Gen. Pierre Gaullois of France, for one, believes that no country will come to the aid of another, because the instinct for self-preservation is more compelling than friendship.

Finally, this controlled-war strategy presents difficulties of quite another dimension: we have discovered that local wars do not stay small or local. The opposition does not quit on the first display of a limited counterforce. Increased military pressure may be required, and there is no logical way out of the succeeding cycle of escalation. Local wars almost immediately become important weights in the international balance of forces, which in turn determine the prospects for peace or war everywhere. Thus today the development of the war in Vietnam is an essential ingredient in the dangerous caldron of the Middle East.

For these reasons the consensus required to support our peace-keeping strategy has been seriously eroded—a circumstance that leaves the field largely to those who would solve the problems either by unrestrained force or by complete capitulation. It is the disquiet of the majority more than the fury of the minority that is dangerous for our social fabric. Only the naive can believe that force may not be required to keep the peace, but only the blind can believe that force will be supported in a democracy without a public acceptance of a strategy that requires the use of force.

FORESTALLING WAR

It seems clear that we must re-examine our strategy of controlled deterrence in the light of the grave deficiencies our recent experience has uncovered. A return to the strategy of central war is unthinkable. But we may have to give more attention to public understanding, to the importance of international support and cooperation, and to the need for increased development assistance as a more effective way of forestalling the circumstances that invite aggression. In the end, we may well feel as restrained in the invocation of limited deterrence as we earlier did in the application of massive retaliation.

A War's Progress

The familiar talk of progress in the war is emanating from Washington and Saigon in the wake of Secretary McNamara's latest visit to Vietnam. Yet Americans are probably wise to take it with at least as many grains of salt as they have the previous protestations of the same kind.

One sign of progress, according to Mr. McNamara, is that more South Vietnamese roads are being opened up to both military and civilian traffic. Another is thought to be the heavy fighting around the misnamed demilitarized zone, the theory being that the Communists are concentrating there because it is getting so hard to sustain action farther south.

It is practically impossible for the layman—and apparently difficult for the military in this confused war—to tell whether such developments represent actual progress in the sense of bringing the war to an end any time soon. Other reports are pessimistic; they suggest that the war is at best stalemated and that the U.S. and its allies are not doing as well this year as they did last year.

In any event, we think Senate Democratic leader Mansfield's somber warning the other day is a safer guide to public thinking than the Administration's speculations.

"The fact is," the Senator said, "that reports of progress are strewn, like burned-out tanks, all along the road which has led this nation ever more deeply into Vietnam and Southeast Asia during the past decade and a half." The promise of progress has been present as the casualties increased from 10 a year to "10 an hour of every hour of every day" and the cost of the war has risen from a few hundred million a year to some $25 billion.

Now, Mr. Mansfield believes the U.S. once again is approaching a fork in the road on Vietnam. This is attested to in the current agonized soul-searching in Washington over how many more American soldiers to send into that jungle war; yesterday afternoon President Johnson and Gen. Westmoreland said they had agreed on a number but wouldn't divulge it. Here again, some of the pessimists doubt that even, say, 250,000 more could necessarily turn the trick.

As for Senator Mansfield, he said he supposed the U.S. could put in another 100,000 or 200,000 or even more. "There are a lot of young Americans, even though the supply is not unlimited." Also, the U.S. could mine the harbor of Haiphong and level the city of Hanoi.

But before doing those things, he insisted, the Government should decide at what point it intends to raise taxes, apply wage and price controls, tighten draft exemptions, call up the Reserves and "make the countless other adjustments in our national life which are implicit in further extensions of the American involvement."

Those are very heavy prices to pay for a relentless escalation of the most ambiguous war America has ever waged. Especially in view of the great unanswered question: What the escalation may have in common with any U.S. objectives in Vietnam or Southeast Asia.

It's the question that has always chiefly bothered us. The longer the war goes on and the wider it gets, the greater the danger that it may work against, rather than for, U.S. interests. The nation may be depleting its human and material resources out of all proportion to any conceivable gain, while the real enemy, Red China, sits on the sidelines. The U.S. may be weakening, instead of strengthening, itself against the day when perhaps greater efforts may be demanded of it.

No more than anyone else do we see how the U.S., by now so deeply involved, can abandon the battle or otherwise end the war in the face of continuing Communist intransigence. Nor do we rule out the possibility, remote though it seems, that some military breakthrough in America's favor might be in the making; that would indeed be progress.

As it is, and grim as it is, we think the nation would feel somewhat better about the war if it were sure the Democratic Administration is tackling the hard questions with the unblinking realism of men like the Democratic majority leader.

Washington: The Echoes of Isolation

(By James Reston)

Washington, July 11.—The opposition to the Administration's policy of intervening in foreign conflicts is obviously rising. The supporters as well as the opponents of the Vietnam strategy on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee unanimously warned Secretary of State Rusk against risking intervention alone in the Middle East war, and even the extreme hawks in the Senate have condemned the Administration for sending three C–130 transports and 150 soldiers into the latest uprising in the Congo.

This raises two fundamental questions just at the time when the Administration is analyzing General Westmoreland's request for at least 100,000 more troops in Vietnam:

1. Is the Administration really "strengthening the forces for peace in the world," as it claims to be doing in Vietnam; or,

2. Is it inadverently encouraging the forces of isolation in America by its Vietnam policy, and thus weakening the forces for peace in the world?

RUSSELL AND STENNIS

One thing is fairly clear in Washington. The support for the Vietnam war in the Congress is far greater than the support for the policy of getting involved in such wars in the first place. Nobody in the Senate has backed the President on Vietnam more strongly than Senators Russell of Georgia and Stennis of Mississippi, but they were inordinately severe, and maybe even unfairly critical, of the President for making another move to try to keep the peace in the Congo.

The Administration's position is that it is committed under the Charter of the United Nations, under various treaties and under the Truman Doctrine to do whatever it can to maintain peace anywhere in the world. And it interprets this commitment as binding on the United States, even if other members of the United Nations or other signatories of treaties such as the Southeast Asia pact, refuse to join in collective measures to keep the peace.

Thus Washington acted alone at first to restore order in the Dominican Republic, is carrying on the Vietnam war without the help of its most powerful Southeast Asian treaty allies, and is intervening again in the Congo by itself.

GO IT ALONE?

It is this tendency to "go it alone" if necessary that is now coming under increasing opposition in Washington, and this raises a fundamental problem. For, in the absence of swift and effective preventive action by the United Nations or regional security organizations, there is no other country that has both the power and the will to keep small uprisings from growing into larger conflicts, and in Africa even into widespread racial warfare.

Nor is there any evidence that the U.S. war effort in Vietnam is stopping the Communist expansionist probes elsewhere. They are going on now in the Middle East, in Thailand, Korea, Hong Kong and Eurma, not to mention Bolivia, where it is reported that the U.S. is also engaged in anti-guerrilla operations.

Nevertheless, the growing isolation of the Western allies is reviving echoes of isolation in the United States—not the old isolation of avoiding all political commitments outside the Western Hemisphere, not the old hostility to all overseas alliances, but a rising hostility to the idea of intervening in uprisings in such places as the Congo and Vietnam.

Also, the greater the sacrifices in Vietnam, the faster this opposition to intervention grows. The Administration itself felt the power of this opposition in the Middle East crisis, and reacted, accordingly, with great caution. Moreover, this caution proved to be popular in the country, and this point certainly was not missed in the White House.

THE COMMUNIST AIM

The hard facts, however, remain. The need for "strengthening the peace forces in the world" was never greater than now. But Vietnam is not really building a long-range policy for keeping peace. In fact, it is weakening the American will to intervene. In the short view, this policy may prevail—it may even win this war—but the struggle over the borderlands in Asia and the Middle East is just beginning, and this Congo campaign cannot be carried on indefinitely at the present level of violence without losing support in the United States.

John Quincy Adams

SPEECH

OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 11, 1967

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with my good friend and distinguished colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. BURKE] in paying tribute to a great citizen.

John Quincy Adams, the son of the second President of the United States and himself the sixth President of the Republic, was above all an American. He foresaw a Nation based upon liberty and freedom which would stretch from ocean to ocean. From this vision he never strayed. As a young Senator, his support of the Louisiana Purchase led to condemnation by his Federalist colleagues from New England who had urged him to follow a sectional rather than national policy. His continued support for the territorial expansion of the new nation eventually alienated him from his former partners and led him into the party of the Jeffersonian Republicans.

As a Republican Secretary of State, his advocacy of freedom was not limited to the United States, and he worked for recognition of the right of peoples everywhere to throw off unrepresentative and tyrannical governments. Adams, one of the principal authors of the Monroe Doctrine, rejoiced at the end of Spanish colonial rule in South America.

A man of uncorruptible integrity, he steadfastly refused to become the partisan of any political faction. His bluntness made him somewhat unpopular among his colleagues, but he never compromised when he felt the interests of the Nation were at stake. In all of the many positions in which he served his Nation and his God, he did what he believed was right without regard to the political consequences.

After his defeat for reelection to the Presidency in 1828, he planned to retire from public life; but in 1830, he accepted a nomination to the House of Representatives with the proviso that, if elected, he be allowed complete independence. Following his subsequent election to Congress, Adams embarked on what may have been the most monumental part of his career. The next 17 years were marked by a continuing fight against slavery and for the preservation of American liberties. A firm nationalist, Adams was an even more stanch believer in the principles for which the country stood. When the right of petition was circumscribed by the infamous "gag rule," Congressman Adams used every resource at his disposal to eliminate this violation of the first amendment. It was to his credit that he helped forge the link between the issues of freedom of speech and slavery, a tactic which significantly aided the antislavery forces. Adams had always believed the Declaration of Independence to be as much a part of the law of the land as the Constitution and that slavery was therefore antithetical to the American idea of universal equality. His untimely death in 1848 temporarily left a void in the meager ranks of those fighting what he termed the southern slavocracy, but the vacuum was soon to be filled by Charles Sumner and other proteges of Adams.

John Quincy Adams, Senator, Secretary of State, President, and Congressman, led perhaps the fullest career of public service of any American, past or present. His greatest memorial has been the growth of the continental American Nation dedicated to freedom and premised on the idea that all men are created equal.

Mastandrea Named New York City Veteran of the Month

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 18, 1967

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of this House the honor which was recently bestowed upon a good friend of mine, Frank J. Mastandrea, who was recently named "New York City Veteran of the Month."

Frank's recognition was recently written up by Stars and Stripes, and I would like to insert the story from the June 22, 1967 Stars and Stripes in the RECORD at this point:

> Selected as New York City "Veterans of the Month" was Frank J. Mastandrea, of Bronx, N.Y., shown assisting his Eminence Francis Cardinal Spellman and Miss Denise Diffley, New York State Poppy Princess, in the review of the New York County Loyalty Day Parade. Mastandrea, who has served as District commander of New York District 2, VFW, and has been commander of Catholic War Veterans Post No. 390, is presently commander of O'Reilly Post No. 396, Catholic War Veterans. He has been cited for his service to youth in the Police Athletic League and is National deputy chief of staff of the VFW. He is presently a delegate to the Constitutional Convention of the State of New York.
>
> As an active leader in the veterans' movement, who belongs to several other veterans organizations, Mastandrea has been described as the "veterans' voice in the State Constitutional Convention." He has introduced numerous measures for the consideration of the Convention which have strong bearing on veterans' rights and American security. Among the propositions submitted by Past Commander Mastandrea are one requiring an oath of loyalty as a condition to public employment; payments of bonuses to members of the Armed Forces while on active duty; tax credits for men in the Armed Forces; and civil service preference for all veterans.

He has also introduced important propositions protecting communities against being split for political purposes, and the assurance of notice to property owners of any matters affecting their zoning or property rights.

Past Commander Mastandrea has been a foremost spokesman for the preservation of the Surrogate's Courts in New York. He has pointed out that these courts, which have the solid endorsement of the State VFW and other veterans' organizations, have provided service to the community since colonial days. He has also pointed out that the VFW, which solidly endorses these courts, is opposed to consolidation of these separate courts, because of the keen interest and participation of veterans' organizations in matters affecting widows and orphans of veterans.

In introducing Past Commander Mastandrea to the distinguished group at the Loyalty Day breakfast, which preceded the parade at which the above was taken, presiding officer and Past State Commander Heyman (Sandy) Rothbart, said "Frank Mastandrea deserved his designation as 'Veteran of the Month' because he has worked indefatigably on veterans' causes over the years. All of us know that as veterans, we can call on Past Commander Mastandrea, regardless of political party or affiliation in the knowledge that he will always work with the best interest of veterans."

His Eminence, Francis Cardinal Spellman, has honored the Loyalty Day parade in New York by his presence and participation over the years. His influence has been a primary consideration in the continued effectiveness and growth of the New York parade, which is the godfather of all of the Loyalty Day parades throughout the Nation.

President Johnson Deserves Commendation for Taking Steps To Prevent a "Torrey Canyon" Disaster in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 13, 1967

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, my attention has been called to an Executive Order issued by President Johnson on May 26 ordering all agencies of Government to prepare for him within the next 90 days a report on how this Nation can avoid the kind of havoc that was wreaked on the English coast last year when the oil tanker *Torrey Canyon* cracked up and spilled millions of gallons of oil into the sea.

I believe President Johnson deserves the highest commendation of the American people. Here is a man beset with the heaviest of responsibilities in trying to bring victory to Vietnam and the myriad domestic problems. Yet, the President has the foresight to concern himself personally with the possibility of a major oil spill in the United States.

I believe the President's Executive order gives us a measure of his broad knowledge and deep concern for the people of our nation.

The President's directive was sent to the Secretary of Interior and the Secretary of Transportation. It cited the oil spill off the coast of England and also the oil slick off Cape Cod, which created serious problems along beaches on the east coast. The President's directive states that both agencies take prompt action to mobilize resources within the United States to avoid the consequences of a possible major oil spill within our area.

The directive also stresses the seriousness of the problem and directs both the Secretary of Interior and the Secretary of Transportation to report to the President within 90 days of the emergency plans they have established to deal with this type of a disaster. The directive further states that emergency procedures should not be limited to oil spillage alone, but should include recommendations to deal effectively with all other forms of major pollutants in the waterways.

In effect, Mr. Speaker, the President, through his directive, said "go" to all the agencies of Government to develop a crash program for dealing with major water pollution.

I am particularly grateful to the President because the people of Chicago rely entirely on the extent of an adequate supply of fresh water from Lake Michigan.

I am advised by Capt. John Natwig, who is captain of the port for the U.S. Coast Guard in Chicago, that a major oil spill in the Chicago area could seriously impair our availability of water for both human and industrial consumption. Captain Natwig, working in group association with the Corps of Engineers and all city agencies in Chicago, is now making a report consistent with the President's directive to see how the Chicago area would deal with a major disaster similar to the *Torrey Canyon* disaster.

A survey is now underway to see what equipment is available in the Chicago area and similar studies have been undertaken throughout the country.

The information assembled thus far shows that we have only very limited facilities to deal with a major oil spill. In Chicago, private industry dealing with the shipping of petroleum has some facilities to cope with this problem and the Chicago Fire Department has indicated it can deal with a small oil spill; but our ability to deal with a major oil spill is extremely limited and could create serious havoc.

While a major oil spill would confine itself primarily to the surface waters of Lake Michigan, the danger to a city like Chicago comes in the effort to remove the oil slick. Chemical facilities which are now used to deal with the problem would cause the oil to sink below surface level and it is this chemically treated oil that could create problems at the intake of our water cribs which pump water from Lake Michigan to the city.

A corollary problem in trying to deal with a major oil spill is that detergents used to break down the oil particles also kill fish in the lake. These dead fish cause a serious problem as they clog the crib intakes.

Private industry has not as yet found chemicals that can successfully dissolve a massive oil spill without some of the cited efforts mentioned heretofore.

We in the Great Lakes ship oil, particularly petroleum, all winter long so that this is a problem that can confront us throughout the year. Part of the study now underway includes density of traffic and establishment of procedures which would reduce the probability of a major oil spill to an absolute minimum.

Mr. Speaker, in a world troubled with major military conflicts, we Americans sometimes tend to overlook the fact that nature itself can play havoc with our existence. I must say that it is a source of great comfort to me to know that our President has taken time to order the proper agencies of Government to plan sufficiently ahead in an effort to avoid a possible future disaster.

This may not seem like an important problem when placed with all the other problems confronting our Nation; but actually the denial of fresh water to a large community such as Chicago for any length of time could have disastrous results.

We in Chicago have been comfortably sitting back smug in the feeling that because we have Lake Michigan in our front yard we shall never experience any great problem with water. The *Torrey Canyon* disaster demonstrates how wrong such smugness can be.

I shall await the report to the President with great interest and I am sure that all Americans are grateful to the President for initiating this important action.

The problem we now are experiencing with alewives gives us an indication of what problems can develop in the Great Lakes. I am certain that we could be faced with disaster if our large oil tankers should break up near Chicago and disrupt our normal flow of fresh water. That is why I believe we cannot wait any longer in developing emergency measures to deal with this possible eventuality. It will obviously require tremendous ingenuity to develop adequate remedies. The *Torrey Canyon* disaster has shown us how difficult it is to deal with this problem.

Philippines-American Friendship: Ambassador Blair Speaks to the Manila Rotary Club

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 18, 1967

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, as one who has long been concerned about, and interested in, the maintenance of strong ties of friendship between the United States and the Philippines, I was pleased to read a recent speech by our U.S. Ambassador William Blair, Jr., to the Manila Rotary Club.

The occasion was Fil-American Friendship Day, celebrated June 29, 1967. In his remark, Ambassador Blair reviewed the common experiences of the past which demonstrated the interdependence of our two nations, the present status of our mutual relations, and outlines a future rich in potential for continued cooperation.

An earnest, hard-working diplomat who is sincerely seeking the best possible relations between the United States and the Philippines, Ambassador Blair is well qualified to enunciate the mutual aims of our two nations in Asia.

I am pleased, therefore, to insert in the Record at this point the text of Ambassador Blair's remarks, and urge the attention of my colleagues to them:

Speech by Ambassador William McCormick Blair, Jr., on Fil-American Friendship Day, June 29, 1967, Rotary Club of Manila

I am profoundly grateful for Rotary's invitation to be your guest speaker on Philippine-American Friendship Day.

There are those who question the so-called special relations between our two countries, but the indisputable fact is that our relationship has been a long one and, for both of us, a uniquely close and deep one. The intimacy of our association for almost seventy years means that our relations must be special, even though the specific content of those special relations is continuously changing. You would like to see the relationship changed in particular ways. So would we. At times there are those who wish to see those emotional elements eliminated. This is impossible. You cannot make the Bataan march together and not have a highly emotional content to certain aspects of these relations. They range over an extensive area of mutual interest and today are particularly significant because the ideals of human freedom and the objective of human progress shared by both nations are being tested not far from here. The free peoples of Asia are locked in mortal conflict with the forces of a communist tyranny which seeks to expand its totalitarian empire through ideological subversion and military force.

Let us not forget that the United States is a Pacific power and that it has an enormous stake in the outcome of Asia's struggle against tyranny. It also has a stake in the drive which animates Asia's people to strive for a brighter future.

The United States looks out Westward to Asia from its Pacific Coast and within embattled Asia there is no people whom we know as well or who understand us as well as the people of the Philippines. Thus, in this moment of history when events in Asia are so crucial and critical and when the United States' involvement is so great, the condition of the relationship of the Philippines and the United States is, indeed, important and significant to both nations.

I think that the state of our relationship is good—on the whole, very good.

Periodically during the course of the Philippine-American relationship, public forums and public media have resounded with the clash of polemics, with the expression of grievances. Some of these grievances have been honestly felt and honestly uttered. Some have been simulated, with no particularly sinister end in mind. All too many have been simulated for a variety of reasons, none of them intended to benefit either nation. Significantly, however, throughout these public storms, qualified and dedicated public servants of both governments have continued their quiet work at conference tables, evolving mutual programs, advancing mutual projects, moving steadily forward toward mutually sought goals, all unflurried, never distracted from their constructive common effort. This, to me, best illustrates the depth and durability of our special relations.

Through our joint efforts a number of issues have been resolved in the past three years or are well on the way toward mutually satisfactory resolution.

We have reached agreement on the question of criminal jurisdiction with respect to incidents involving United States military personnel in the Philippines. There are bound to be incidents when, for example, we have, as we do, at Clark Field a family of 60,000 people, including American servicemen, their dependents, and our Filipino friends and co-workers—25,000 at Subic; 5,000 at Sangley and over 2,000 at Mactan. But I submit that these incidents have been relatively few and far between.

We have entered into agreements relinquishing some of the base lands which are no longer needed for military purposes by United States forces—25,000 acres at Clark Field and one-fourth of Camp John Hay.

The Rusk-Ramos Agreement, signed in Washington last September, reduced the term of the United States use of the bases here in the Philippines to a period of 25 years.

We recently have taken action on veterans benefits and claims. Since last December almost all eligible Filipino veterans and their dependents have been receiving almost twice as much money in their monthly benefit checks.

We have just completed two agreements involving almost $16 million for the implementation of projects under the $28 million Special Fund for Education, and are hard at work on the remaining project proposals.

The United States is increasing its military and economic assistance to the Philippines. This assistance has included such notable items as high speed boats to help in the anti-smuggling campaign, new modern aircraft for the Philippine Air Force, the turnover a few days ago of engineering equipment for the Engineering Construction Battalions, and an increasing participation by AID in the very encouraging program which is now going forward in the Philippines in the field of rural development and increased agricultural productivity.

In enumerating these instances of our response to your requests for assistance, or of our cooperation in ventures of mutual interest, it definitely is not my purpose to brag of our generosity or solicit your gratitude. It is rather to illustrate the scope and diversity of concrete and tangible cooperation characteristic of the special relationship some are inclined to dismiss as a euphemism.

It might also be useful and pertinent at this point to reaffirm the basic philosophy of our various aid programs as stated by our highest ranking government officials over the years, as well as by my predecessors and myself. We do not regard aid, whether grant or loan, as a gift or reward or token of esteem. If the American foreign aid program, launched after World War II is noted by historians as an unprecedented multibillion dollar humanitarian experiment in international relations, we take pride in that judgment. But our own view of aid is that of a practical investment in developing the kind of world in which we prefer to live, the kind of world in which we are likely to flourish, a world of peace and freedom devoted to the well-being of man and to the protection of his individual right to realize to the fullest his human potential as a creature of God. We are investing in the world's economic growth and political stability, in its education and public health, to make of it a community in which our own people, as well as all others, can find happiness and security.

As a practical investment, therefore, it is clear that our aid programs are guided by practical criteria. First, we welcome and enlist the participation of all other nations whose resources permit. Second, as sound investment practice dictates, we direct the flow of our aid investment to those areas where it can be promptly and efficiently made productive in realizing the larger objectives, or where it is needed urgently to protect an endangered existing investment.

There is more to be done here in the Philippines and more changes to come. The period ahead will not be an easy one. Our negotiations on bi-lateral issues will of course be carried out against the background of conflict and conflagration in Southeast Asia. And these negotiations coming up in the near future are important and complex. There will be those who will attribute unworthy motives; and there will be those who will seek to distort and demean the efforts we both are making.

But I think the record of the past augurs well for the future when we will be entering into negotiations on such comprehensive matters as the regulation of our trade and investment relationships after the expiration of the Laurel-Langley Agreement in 1974. And negotiations will be continuing on various matters pertaining to the U.S. military bases in order to insure that our agreements concerning these bases are kept up to date and in tune with the times.

It is, I suppose, customary in talking of the Philippine-American relations, to concern one's self primarily with the bi-lateral aspects of those relations. But there are other perspectives one should examine if we are to appreciate the full dimensions of the inter-relationships between our two countries.

The U.S. looks out over the Pacific area from roughly 120° west longitude, while the Philippines views the Pacific from roughly 120° east longitude. Both have vital interests in what transpires in the vast rim of the Pacific and in the area which it encompasses. Both have crucial roles to play in that enormous area; and both have vital national objectives to achieve there. Our interests interlock at many points, and there are also many points at which they do not even touch; but there is no point, of which I am aware, at which our vital interests are in conflict. I can see no prospect of conflicting interests as the Philippines moves out, as it has been doing in the past few years, to take an increasingly important role in this Asian scene. Nor can there by any conflict of interest emerging from the future growth of the Philippine economy and national strength.

President Johnson himself most eloquently and precisely stated U.S. policy in Asia on the eve of his departure for the Manila Summit Conference. He said, "What is America's role in this new emerging Asia? The answer is this. We can help. We must help. We are helping. But we see our role as that, not more. Asia will provide its own leadership. We shall cooperate with that leadership. Our role is that of a Neighbor among equals—a partner in the great adventure in bringing peace, order and progress to a part of the world where more than half the human race lives. As long as danger threatens," said President Johnson, "our strength shall back our commitments in Asia. Yet, we seek no special status or privileges, no primacy, no territory, no base rights in perpetuity."

If it can be said, as I assert here confidently today, that there is a fundamental harmony in Philippine and American foreign policy objectives, it can also be said, and with much greater force, that there is is a fundamental desire on the part of Americans to see Filipinos achieve at home what they want for themselves and for their children.

During the years that I have been in the Philippines, I have spent a great deal of time traveling in the country and had many, many enjoyable and rewarding experiences. I have visited every province in the Philippines. At least I had until they split them up so fast that I couldn't keep up. Someone said that the reason I have traveled so much is because I like to review troops and pretend I am Governor-General.

The only reason I have traveled throughout the Philippines has been to see the people of this country, to get to know them and to learn about their hopes and fears. I have come to understand the concern of both President Macapagal and President Marcos for the millions and millions of people in this country who have not yet received the full blessings of liberty. I know and you know that the average Filipino today is not having an easy time. I know too that your government wants to improve the well being of the average Filipino; to increase his productivity and the income he receives for his labor, to make available to him the benefits of modern scientific agriculture and industry; and to give him improved public health services, irrigation systems, highways, schools; land reform—in short, to give him confidence and hope in the future.

People who are the severest critics of the United States hold the view, if I interpret them correctly, that this progress must be achieved in accordance with Philippine aspirations, Philippine directives and under Philippine administration and control. And of course, we agree with that. If one thing is clear it is that only the Filipinos can solve their problems, we can help. We want to help—and we are helping. But that is all we want to do. Certainly we don't want to tell you how to conduct your affairs. We know we couldn't even if we wanted to and, in any event, we have enough problems of our own.

And this, too, is an American view which has been stated again and again and again by American leaders. Assistant Secretary of State William Bundy in January 1965 said, "Our objectives are those of the free nations of the area—that they should develop as they see fit at peace and without outside interference. We would hope that this development will be in the direction of increasingly democratic institutions, and that there will be continued and expanded ties of partnership and contact with ourselves and with other nations of the free world. Yet, we know that Asia will develop as the leaders and the peoples of Asia wish it to develop, and we would not have it otherwise."

There is another illusion I would like to try to lay to rest. None of us are against the development of a strong nationalistic movement in this country. On the contrary, we are fully convinced that you can never effectively set about the tasks of nation-building except in the spirit of nationalism. Without a strong nationalism, you cannot possibly hope for the development of a civic consciousness that will bridge the gap between individual or family interests and that of the nation, nor can you hope to develop the vital spirit of self-sacrifice which has been an essential ingredient in the creation of every great nation. What we do think is an error is to feel, as some Filipinos have candidly stated, that until you destroy our good name or good record in this country you cannot create a valid national identity of your own. I would argue that this is seriously misleading, and directs the attention of the nation to complaints, self-pity and destructive criticism rather than to sacrifice and self-reliance.

One of our major differences is in the economic content of your nationalism, as expressed by some of its interpreters. Again, I think we should be frank with one another. It is your right, of course, to set the terms on which American business operates here; you can even exclude it altogether. But you cannot go it alone, unless you are prepared to accept a standard of living that no one here has yet dared to suggest should be tolerable. There are several other countries, which you may be able to interest in assisting you, but I can assure you that if their intention is not subversion, they will ask for the very same assurances that American capital has sought.

We are often told young Filipinos have no recollection of the United States' role in World War II or in the immediate post-war period; that they have little recall of the colonial period; and that the United States cannot coast on its reputation. I agree and we don't want to. But I would remind my friends that there is also a new generation of Americans—of American businessmen. The capital which they control is not inexhaustible and it will go where it is welcome. They are looking now and investing heavily in Australia, Taiwan, South Korea, Thailand and Malaysia. They will invest in a larger measure here also if the climate is attractive. Of course it is your prerogative to determine when and under what conditions you will invite foreign capital. It is equally the prerogative of foreign capital to make its decision on the basis of where it is welcome.

Americans recognize, one might say almost as an article of faith, that if the Philippines are to succeed in strengthening their nation and securing the blessings of liberty for all their people—not just some—it can come about only through the enlightened efforts of Filipino patriots to do that themselves and that our role is only to help.

The strength of America's belief in the general proposition that Asian nations should be free and independent and able to conduct their own affairs in their own way is proven and demonstrated in the blood of our sons who are dying in Vietnam and in the treasure which we expend there. About half a million American young men are in Vietnam today and billions of American taxpayers' money has been spent in Vietnam, not because we want to control that country, but because we want it to be free, and because, by helping Vietnam retain its freedom, we are helping to guarantee the freedom of other countries in Asia, and to defeat the Communist tyranny which threatens that freedom; and I know that it is because the Philippines believe in the same things, that you Filipinos have sent your PHILCAG contingent to Vietnam.

Why does America evince this passion for the freedom of other nations—nations across the vast expanse of the Pacific from the United States itself? It is because we believe that our own American way of life can thrive and prosper best in the environment of a world of free nations, also aspiring to a world in which the rights of the individual will be safe-guarded and his opportunities to develop his own full potential will be cherished and enhanced.

It has been said that Americans have an obsessive fear of Communism, that we are too preoccupied with Communism as an enemy. This view is not supported by the record of our free discussion and examination of Communism, both as theory and in practice, and it misses the point in identifying the enemy we are committed to fight. We do not like Communism as a philosophy of social organization any more than we liked Fascism or Nazism because it degrades the individual to a material equation, his rights and needs subordinate to an all-powerful State. We reject Communism because it has failed miserably by comparison with free societies in furthering the well-being of its citizens. In the free market of ideas and under honest scrutiny of its practice to date, we have no doubt that it will be rejected in favor of an open society of free men.

What we are committed to fight against in our own defense and in defense of our friends is the Communist conspiracy, the conspiracy which Communists themselves consider too evil and treacherous to advance under their own banner. We are committed to fight a Communist export, the professional wrecking crews, the saboteurs and manipulators who take on whatever guise and whatever cause affords them invisibility while they pursue their systematic weakening and destruction of the very free institutions that harbor them. We are committed to fight the professional sowers of fear and distrust, of chaos and unrest, those who goad free men to desperation only to drive them into the arms of a coldly materialist tyranny unprecedented in the history of despotic rule.

But what America is for is much more important than what America is against.

What we Americans have inherited from our forefathers is the uniting strength of fidelity to an idea. We were born dedicated to the proposition that man must be free and our greatest leaders—the Washingtons, the Jeffersons, the Lincolns, the Roosevelts—were not great because they achieved purely American purposes but because they were able to speak for humanity at large and extend their vision to the whole family of man.

This is the vision which finds the United States pouring out its treasury in an effort to help other people throughout the world. This is the vision which finds our young men fighting and dying in Vietnam. And this is the vision which I hope in the years ahead we will find the Philippines and the United States working together and sacrificing together in a joint effort to achieve a world free from war and untroubled by hunger or fear.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the Record.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the Congressional Record, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

Appendix

Clinton, Mass., Memorial Day Exercises

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 19, 1967

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein the text of an address I delivered in my hometown of Clinton, Mass., on the occasion of the recent Memorial Day observance in that community.

I was honored and pleased to be able to participate in the simple, but deeply impressive and moving exercises conducted in Clinton to honor the gallant and brave of every American war.

My remarks in part follow:

My esteemed friend, Attorney Raymond J. Salmon, Reverend Fathers and members of the Clergy, members of the Board of Selectmen and Town officials, Gold Star Mothers, officers and members of the Veterans Council and Veterans Organizations, leader and members of the United States Army Band, our Clinton High School band, Boy and Girl Scouts, school children, fellow citizens and friends—

It is always a very great honor for me to join in these very impressive Memorial Day exercises to pay our heartfelt tributes of gratitude, love and affection to the gallant and the brave of every American war, who served our country with total loyalty and their fullest measure of devotion.

It is with special pride and honor that we welcome here today to take part in our Annual Clinton Memorial Day program, the outstanding, very distinguished United States Army Band, one of the truly greatest musical organizations of its kind in the world. We are very grateful to them for their inspiring presence which will contribute so much to our exercises.

And we are very thankful to our great Veterans Council of Clinton, and all those who assisted them in the splendid arrangements of this gathering.

Our beloved Town is part of one of the oldest communities in the nation. Since early Colonial days, the spirit of patriotism and the spirit of freedom and American individualism have flourished here inseparably and vigorously and, thank God, these sentiments are as strong and vibrant today as ever before.

Since the founding of this nation, young men, and later young women, of Clinton and this area have served in every war, and have in large numbers rallied to the call of our country, whenever it was in peril, and whenever determined enemies were seekig to destroy and conquer this nation.

Down through the years, in every hour of crisis, encouraged and sustained by all our people, of every village, hamlet, city and town, brave, resolute young men have responded to defend our homes, our institutions and our precious liberties from the hungry savage grip of the tyrant.

Many have given their blood and their lives to keep the lamps of freedom burning brightly in this community and this nation. From the earliest days, down to the very present there have been those in overwhelming numbers, who eagerly came forth to offer their all, if need be, on the sacred altar of American liberty.

It is for these heroes of every war and conflict, who offered or gave their lives for this country that we gather today in prayer, in gratitude, in words evidencing undying remembrance, to make it known once again that their struggles, their sacrifices, their superlative love of country, their readiness and their willingness to give everything, even life itself, to perpetuate this great free nation and the shores, the homes, the safety and the liberty which it enshrines, has not been forgotten. Indeed these noble contributions to country will never be forgotten.

Feeble indeed are our words to portray the triumphs and the immortal contributions of these gallant men and women.

Never to be forgotten in the annals of our country and in the hearts of our people are the sacrifices, the glories and the tremendous achievements of those of every race, color and creed, and every shade of opinion and conviction, all mothers' sons, who died, or were willing to die, before they would yield to the lash of tyranny, or to the domination of those who would enslave the people and the nation of which they were so proud.

Many of these young heroes fought and died, firm in the conviction that they were not only fighting for democracy, freedom and justice, but that they were fighting to end all wars for those who came after them and establish permanent peace.

In the light of what is going on now in the world, this is indeed an ironic fact, because even as we talk, and gather, and pray, and express our gratitude here today, for those who have served our country so gallantly in the past, American boys are once again dying in the name of freedom in lands far from the shores of this country, far from the hallowed beautiful spot where we meet to honor their brother heroes of previous generations who spilled their blood for the country.

The scene is somewhat different now. The enemies are not the same. The cause has changed but little. It is the old story—the struggle between those who seek freedom and the right to live as free men and women, and those who seek to overpower and subjugate them.

Fortunately, the day has not come, and it will never come, when true Americans will yield to the lash of the tyrant, or succumb to the insidious conspiracy that Communist zealots seek to impress upon the whole world, to shackle our own country and every other country in the debased serfdom of the radical, police state.

Free American citizens realize that their right of citizenship is the most precious political possession in the world, because it means, not only their right to dictate the course of this government, and select representatives of their own choosing, but also to live asc free beings, unfettered and untrammeled by power-crazed Commissars eager to consign them to the rubbish heap of Communist oppression.

We love peace and we are pledged to work for peace, and we will make every contribution in our power to bring peace, not only to our own country, but to all the nations of the world.

But we love freedom too, and America will never cease to protect and preserve the safety, security and freedom of this nation and defend the rich blessings of opportunity, prosperity and justice that it has brought to our people in a measure never before equaled in all history.

So, my friends, on this great day of recollection and remembrance, when the whole nation pauses to pay tribute to our honored dead, as we lay garlands of flowers and decorate their resting places with the flag of our country, as we pour out once again in a chorus of national loyalty and devotion, our gratitude to these honored dead, let us be mindful of the fact we must stand firmly and boldly in our time, as they did in theirs, to be worthy of the great sacrifices they rendered, so that we too may preserve this great citadel of liberty, unblemished, untarnished and intact, for this generation and hand it down to those who come after us.

Let us always gratefully remember our veterans and their dear ones, and let us always be true, loyal and grateful to them, because by their blood and sacrifice they have made possible the great blessings we enjoy today.

And let us especially remember this year the boys who paid the supreme sacrifice in far-off Vietnam, because they have carried on in the finest traditions of our country. They have carried our banner high.

Let us hope that through their sacrifices and their devotion to the cause of country and to the principles of freedom and justice, before long, with God's help, the shadows of war will be lifted and this nation and the world will be blessed with the enduring sunlight of peace and amity among all nations.

In the name of our honored dead, who fought and died for freedom and peace, may our nation and all nations soon live in a peaceful world.

Report No. 4: A Strategy for a Livable Environment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 19, 1967

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, in concluding my remarks about the HEW Task Force report, "A Strategy for a Livable Environment," I wish to examine the financial aspects of improving our living surroundings.

Last year I commented that "virtually billions and billions of dollars in a 10- to 20-year program" would be necessary for the "reclamation and maintenance of clean air, clean water and healthy soil." HEW's report calls for $2.5 billion over a 5-year period for carrying out various grants-in-aid projects, employing additional departmental personnel, and increasing research and development expenditures for environmental protection.

One billion dollars would go for grant-in-aid programs in fields such as solid-waste disposal and water improvement; $1 billion for increased pursuit of research and development in overall environmental protection; and $500 million for additional departmental personnel, as well as program grants for State and local planning.

The task force budget recommendation is open to criticism in one regard. There is no justification for it on the basis of its place in a total environmental program. Obviously such a justification cannot yet be determined. However, the task force budget recommendation may also be premature in light of the context in which it now asks us to deal with environmental problems.

The task force report recommends that in the future the President submit to Congress one environmental protection proposal. I agree with this suggestion and will comment further on it later. My concern at this point is over what is apparently an inconsistency between a budget recommendation and a technique for approaching problems.

If we are to take the task force report seriously we must expect that its authors are committed to aproaching the problem of our deteriorating environment from an ecological point of view; a point of view that demands total comprehension of the problem before a commitment to resolving it is made. Yet the task force in advance of any total study encompassing all present problems and activities asks Congress to commit itself to financing one agency's program.

Unless I misread the report, we can expect the authors to believe that it would be most desirous for the President to include in his to-be-proposed environmental protection act a $2.5 billion authorization for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Would this not, however, be self-defeating and contrary to the total approach concept? If each Department and agency, in a vacuum, determines its environmental budget and program and merely attaches it to a so-called comprehensive environmental protection package, it makes the concept of one environmental bill meaningless.

Where is the coordination? Where is the integration, common aims, assignment of priorities within the total picture, and the incorporation of an overall program both within and outside of the Federal Government?

A commitment to HEW in advance of an overall environment plan is not consistent to the theme of the task force report. The first and more logical step is to have the President now make operative the proposed Council on Ecological Advisors who should immediately busy themselves with preparing a total report on the condition of the environment and the type of national commitment it will take to bring the environment up to the standards that the council should propose.

Once this has been done, HEW and the other departments and agencies will better know what role they must play and how much money they will need.

Before concluding my remarks, Mr. Speaker, may I make two final suggestions. First, I believe that it is, as the report says, time for an intensive, concerted "comprehensive approach toward environmental health protection."

Ideally, by combining the many pieces of legislation dealing with environmental protection, we would save ourselves much work in the future. Instead of being forced to consider many multipurposed bills to ward off polluting influences, we could consider our annual omnibus bill. At the same time, we should strengthen administrative authority in carrying out existing legislation while simultaneously establishing a special committee on environmental problems which would be charged with close legislative supervision on a day-to-day type basis. This would be an attempt to keep the Administration fully aware of our wishes while concurrently keeping ourselves informed of current administrative desires so that hopefully we would have a relatively smooth road in getting through legislation designed to prevent further environmental deterioration.

Second, I should like to suggest a continuing conference on assessing the needs of man's environment. There are two ways I can think of to implement such a recommendation. First, there might be a yearly conference among government agencies, private foundations and corporations, and all other interested parties for the purpose of formulating precise cost figures annually for the many environmentally related programs in which we are all involved. Or, perhaps better yet, such conferences could be held on an even more regular basis—such as quarterly—and could include constant exchanges of ideas and comparison of research notes by the top men in such fields as water, air, odor, noise, and radiation pollution. In that event, a certain quarterly meeting should be set aside for consideration of financial requests with other meetings devoted to the crucial exchange of ideas.

Included within the report is the most pertinent recommendation that there should be a "White House Conference on Financing Local Government," a call with which I wholeheartedly agree. The conference's purpose would be to "explore ways for cities and other units of local government to raise adequate funds to finance essential governmental activities on a metropolitan and regional scale." Such a conference might come up with some imaginative and innovative suggestions which might even revolutionize national and local government relations, perhaps a bold step in the direction of "cooperative" or "creative federalism."

Mr. Speaker, I am looking forward to joining with colleagues of similar disposition in helping formulate a single Environmental Protection Act and hope that we may have legislation in this area before too long.

FCC Ruling on A.T. & T. Costly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 19, 1967

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, the recent ruling by the FCC requiring a reduction of $120 million on interstate telephone calls was most unfortunate. It is an attempt to penalize progress and efficiency. In simple language, it tells the A.T. & T., "If you will improve your service through more efficient methods, you will receive no reward, but will be penalized." The FCC is placing a premium on inefficiency of operation. The A.T. & T. has been able to borrow money at 5½ percent based on a long record of earnings. The current rate on most borrowing by utilities and other corporations is running from 6 percent to 6½ percent. If they are allowed to earn but 7½ percent, there is no possibility of maintaining a very reasonable dividend rate to the preferred and common stock. Furthermore, there is absolutely nothing left with which to retire their debt.

I have had considerable personal experience with price-fixing regulatory boards in California, and time after time I have seen them penalize an efficient, low-rate operation, while granting large increases to inefficient, high-rate utilities. These regulatory boards have little interest in promoting efficient operations, but are simply interested in what a company can earn on its capital. These rulings destroy all incentive of management to provide the highest type of service at the lowest public cost.

Mr. David Lawrence wrote an excellent article on this subject, which appeared in the Washington Star on July 18. Under unanimous consent I include this article following my remarks:

FCC RULING ON A.T. & T. COSTLY

Latest estimates indicate that a ruling made a fortnight ago by the Federal Communications Commission may prove to be the most costly the national economy has experienced at the hands of the government in recent years. Not only will the U.S. Treasury lose approximately $80 million a year in tax revenues hereafter, but the loss in market value of the stock of the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. will run from $2 billion to $8 billion, depending upon the length of the period measured.

This is a high price for the American people to pay in order to make a saving of approximately three cents on a $1 long-distance call.

There are 3.1 million stockholders of the telephone company. Since the FCC decision was announced on July 5, the market value of the stock has fallen by $2.2 billion. This, however, is only part of the loss to stockholders. For on Oct. 27, 1965, when the Federal Communications Commission started its investigation, the stock was selling at $67 a share, and it has declined from that date by about $14 a share. This 22 percent drop means an aggregate loss in market value of the company stock of $7.8 billion.

While there is no indication that the present dividend rate of $2.20 will be cut, it is predicted that dividends will probably not rise as rapidly in the future as would have been possible with a higher rate of earnings.

What has happened is that a governmental agency has told a private company not only that its rates to the customer must be reduced but that, if more efficient and better methods are discovered which permit the company to earn more money, it will not be allowed to make a larger profit than before. Its rate of return on invested capital is not to be permitted to go above 7½ percent. This puts a penalty on efficiency and ingenuity as well as on the use of technological improvements.

Nowhere in the Constitution is there any provision which permits the government to fix a ceiling on the profits of certain segments of private industry. Taxes can be imposed or duties placed on imports, but all this must be done uniformly. To say that some private companies are not to be permitted to earn more than a fixed percent on their investment is to impair incentive and discourage improvements in service.

The $80-million-a-year loss caused by the FCC ruling arises out of the reduced receipts by the Treasury in the corporate taxes collected from the telephone company. Other losses also will be derived from the drop in excise taxes on lower telephone toll charges and in personal income taxes because higher dividends will not be available due to the rate cut. This doesn't take into account the loss in revenue which would have come to the Treasury through capital-gains taxes as stockholders sold shares that appreciated in value. Now there will be less revenue because of tax credits obtained when capital losses are sustained on the shares sold which have gone down in value.

It is too early to appraise the total damage that may be done from an investor standpoint by the latest FCC ruling. But prospective investors will consider whether, when in a good year the market value of the stock goes upward, this may be followed the next year with an FCC ruling compelling the company to lower its rates still further and diminish its profits.

Many people will wonder whether all this uncertainty and loss to the Treasury is necessary in order to save three cents on a long-distance telephone call.

Several countries of the world have government-operated telephone systems, but they are not efficient. Visitors from foreign lands are amazed at the remarkable telephone service available to the American people through privately owned companies.

Muncie Gear Builds 3 Millionth Rocket Part for Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 19, 1967

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, one of the key defense industries for the Vietnam war is located in the 10th Indiana Congressional District at Muncie, Ind.

I refer to Muncie Gear Works, Inc., which manufacturers a vital component of our helicopter and jet rocket weapons.

Muncie Gear will produce this week its 3 millionth rocket fin and nozzle assembly for the 2.75-inch rockets.

The occasion will be marked by a brief observance at the Muncie Gear plant on Thursday.

It is a personal disappointment for me not to be present due to the congressional schedule of business. However, I am pleased that representatives of the Defense Department will attend the ceremonies.

Muncie Gear is now turning out 200,000 assemblies per month, a phenomenal figure in view of the fact that the rocket components went into production just 2 years ago.

The fin and nozzle assembly is the tail section of the folding fin aerial rocket, primarily an air-to-ground weapon, used extensively by Army helicopters and Navy fixed-wing jets in the Vietnam war.

We are extremely proud of the role that Muncie Gear is playing in this struggle against Communist aggression, and salute the hundreds of Muncie Gear employees for their contribution to this effort.

The July 16 issue of the Muncie Star carried a concise story about the Muncie Gear homefront success story, and the article follows:

MUNCIE GEAR BUILDS 3-MILLIONTH ROCKET PART FOR VIETNAM

(By David Iliff)

Completion of the 3 millionth rocket fin and nozzle assembly for the Defense Department by Muncie Gear Works Inc., on Friday has written a happy ending chapter to the plant's home-front success story. The occasion will be marked by ceremonies at the plant on Thursday.

Things didn't always look like they would turn out this way.

When the Army asked Muncie Gear in June, 1965 to bid on a contract to make the fin and nozzle assembly, they were in desperate straits because of escalation of the U.S. commitment in Vietnam. A "crash program" was developed at the Muncie plant and by October the crucial parts were moving toward the war zone.

Now the factory turns out 200,000 assemblies per month with surprisingly little trouble and has just been awarded a contract extension which will keep the production lines busy at least through next April.

The fin and nozzle assembly is actually the tail section of the folding fin aerial rocket, primarily an air-to-ground weapon, used extensively by army helicopters and navy fixed-wing jets in the Vietnam war.

Vice President Ray Abrams explains that helicopters particularly use these 2.75 inch rockets to clear areas of enemy fire before they make tactical or rescue landings. They are carried in quantity on all missions, mounted 24 in each of two pods on the choppers, or 19 in each of four pods on the jets. Since they're used a lot, there is a continuing and critical need for more.

The rocket was developed and used extensively during the Korean War. At that time Muncie Gear made the motor and tube which holds the propellant fuel as well as the fin and nozzle assembly. These parts were stockpiled after Korea and none were made for nearly 10 years. Then suddenly, the U.S. commitment to defend Southeast Asia drained the stockpiles and the rocket assemblies were in short supply until production could be resumed.

Production manager Dick Herbert tells how the "crash program" got underway. Government-owned equipment started rolling into a virtually empty section of the Muncie Gear plant at 700 E. Wysor St. in July, 1965. Production lines were organized around a nucleus of about two dozen people who had worked on the fin and nozzle assemblies during the Korean conflict. By October, 1965, the first finished assemblies were being shipped to the army ordinance base at Camden, Ark. and the Navy center at McAlester, Okla.

For a time shipments went out every day and the plant turned out every assembly possible. Now, with five other contractors supplying the same parts, production has stabilized at 200,000 per month, leaving the plant in truckloads lots of 20,736 each.

The munitions work has been a big boom to the company, as well as the community. The 50-year-old firm, which got its first ordinance contract during World War II, has hired nearly 500 more workers and is operating three shifts a day. Non-defense production is now limited to a marine outdrive for boats.

At times the factory has also produced other parts for the same 2.75 inch rocket and it is still supplying some of the other prime contractors with enough fin and nozzle assemblies for them to fulfill their contracts.

"We're extremely proud of our work force," Abrams said this week, and our relations with the Defense Contract Administration Services and military personnel have been excellent. Just last week when the new commander from Ft. Benjamin Harrison was here, his subordinates told him Muncie Gear was the one defense plant in Indiana which is always on schedule with its contracts.

A number of these defense officials, from Ft. Ben and Picatinny Arsenal in Dover, N.J., the buying agency, will be in Munice Thursday for brief ceremonies marking the production of the 3 millionth unit since 1965. Indiana's senators and Rep. Richard Roudebush have also been invited to attend.

Muncie Gear made its millionth fin and nozzle assembly on Sept. 8, 1966. No. 2 million came off the line Feb. 1 this year. There wasn't any celebration either time, but this week it will be different. The 3 millionth unit was plucked from the production line Friday just before it reached the government inspectors, and it will be permanently housed in the Muncie Gear exhibit case.

It's one the boys in Vietnam can proudly do without.

The 19th Concert Season of the Decatur Civic Chorus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENJAMIN B. BLACKBURN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 19, 1967

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, at this, the 19th concert season of the Decatur Civic Chorus, I ask you to join me in paying special tribute to one of the finest choral groups in our country. It is a matter of great pride to me that the Decatur Civic Chorus had its beginning in the city of Decatur, and is made up of residents from all over De Kalb County, which I am privileged to represent in Congress.

The Decatur Civic Chorus is truly a "civic" organization. The Lions Club of Decatur gave it the encouragement and financial assistance which saw its start in 1949, and it continues to serve the community with mutual appreciation. It is made up of 60 members, ranging in age from 17 to 68, and represents a real cross-section of professions including teachers, engineers, business executives, housewives, students, and secretaries. These are people who have something in common—they all enjoy singing, and are as at home with Bach as with musical selections from the Broadway shows.

Over the years, the chorus has presented concerts throughout the State of Georgia, has made a tour of 3d Army installations in the Southeastern States, has sung with the Atlanta Symphony, and taken part in church and various civic programs too numerous to mention. The chorus feels that one of their most rewarding experiences is the yearly concert they give at Christmastime at the Atlanta Federal Penetentiary.

At the present time, plans are progressing with great anticipation for the second attendance of the chorus at the International Eisteddfod Music Festival in Llangollen, North Wales, in July of

1966. The chorus has a special reason for wanting to return, other than because they feel the southern part of the United States, with its fine offering of spirituals and folk music, should be represented. The first trip to the festival, in 1958, had moments of great disappointment. After making the long trip to Wales, the chorus found that its entry was lost, and they could not sing in the competition. This resulted in worldwide publicity, and although they could not be considered in the competition, the chorus was invited to give a concert during the festival, and they sang before an audience of 15,000 people. The evening turned out to be a memorable one for both the chorus and the audience. Even though most of the listeners could not speak English, a rapport was established. The audience reacted with understanding and emotion. To quote Director Mary Ann Sharp:

> Something happened and suddenly we were in tune and the audience could feel our songs. We closed with the number, "No Man Is an Island." Most of the listeners were foreign and couldn't understand the words, but they got the message. They cried, we cried, and it was wonderful.

"No Man Is an Island" has since been the theme song of the chorus because "it brought tears to the eyes of the listeners at the music festival in Wales."

In addition to concert preparations, the chorus is busy with various fund-raising projects to help defray travel and other expenses connected with their appearance at the festival. As in 1958, they will give concerts in other European countries. There is the possibility, too, that they may sing before members of our Armed Forces in Germany, something the chorus would particularly like to do.

Since 1949, the Decatur Civic Chorus has gladdened the hearts of countless numbers of people with the joy which comes from hearing good music. To all who give so generously of their time and talents to make the chorus possible—I salute them. To Mrs. Dale Clark, beloved director emeritus; to Director Mary Anne Sharp; to Accompanist Mrs. W. Edward Garrison; to the new president for 1967–68, Richard H. Wright, and his officers; to Business Manager Leonard G. Vaughan, and to all the members of the chorus, my very best wishes for happy singing at the forthcoming concerts, and special wishes for success at the music festival in Wales next year.

Capt. Finn Ronne, U.S. Navy, Retired, Speaks at 153d Anniversary of Norwegian Independence in Brooklyn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH L. CAREY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 19, 1967

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, on the 17th of May, the 153d anniversary of Norwegian independence was celebrated in McKinley Park, in Brooklyn, with 100,000 people viewing the parade of 5,000 marchers in the flag-covered Bay Ridge section. The main speaker at the celebration was Capt. Finn Ronne, Norwegian-born polar explorer, now retired from the U.S. Navy.

Captain Ronne's father, Martin Ronne, was a veteran of the famous Amundsen expedition when the South Pole was first reached in 1911. He was also a member of Admiral Byrd's first Antarctic expedition in 1928—the only one in the party who had previously been in the South polar region.

Following the death of his father in 1932, Captain Ronne joined Admiral Byrd on the latter's second expedition serving as a ski expert, dog driver, and trail radio operator. He is now a veteran of eight Antarctic expeditions and four to the Arctic. His wife has the distinction of being the first woman to spend a year in the Antarctic.

Captain Ronne's books, "Antarctic Conquest," and "Antarctic Command," together with many volumes of scientific data gathered during his expeditions, have made a major contribution to geographic and scientific education.

Captain Ronne is the recipient of many recognitions for his contributions in the polar areas, including three congressional gold medals; U.S. Navy Legion of Merit; the "Elisha Kent Kane" Gold Medal of the Philadelphia Geographical Society, and the Explorers Club Merit. He was also knighted by King Olav of Norway with the Royal Order of St. Olav.

Lowell Thomas has remarked:

> Finn Ronne's story is one of the greatest tales of exploring of our time. He is a legendary Antarctic figure with over thirty years in exploration.

Although Captain Ronne's address was delivered on May 17, his self-effacement is such that it was only after repeated effort and urging that he consented to have the text printed in the RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, I believe our colleagues will find his words both timely and inspiring, and I include them in the RECORD, as follows:

MAY 17 ADDRESS OF CAPT. FINN RONNE, U.S. NAVY, RETIRED

It is with pleasure and honor that I am here today to celebrate with you the Norwegian Constitution-Day. I extend greetings to all Americans of Norwegian background—and to those who left Norway—searched and found their fortune in this great land across the Sea.

Norwegians all over the world commemorate this day, the 153rd year since their fight for freedom was won as they broke away from Danish colonialism which had lasted 400 years. For decades—prior to 1814 when Norway's constitution was signed at Eidsvoll, there had been a growing feeling of national self-reliance among the Norwegian people. They were tired of being governed from Copenhagen by Union Kings. There is little doubt that the action of the American colonies in declaring their independence from England and their Constitution of 1787 inspired the Norwegian nation and all its people to draw up their own constitution and declare their independence as a sovereign state. It proclaimed the ancient Kingdom of Norway to be a free, independent, and inalienable state, and its form of government to be a limited and a hereditary monarchy. The constitution which was signed on the 17th of May, 1814—although amended—is still in force today.

Many of the important articles and provisions in the constitution of 1814 were directly based on the American constitutional documents which were at hand as the men at Eidsvoll started their discussions. Records bring to light the interesting fact that Christian Magnus Falsen, the father of the Norwegian Constitution, was a great admirer of the then rather new American Republic and its distinguished leaders. Two days after the signing of the Norwegian Constitution, on May the 19th, 1814, Falsen's wife gave birth to a son. As a token of his admiration for George Washington and Benjamin Franklin, Falsen gave the boy the name of George-Benjamin.

The stirring events that took place in 1814 henceforth were to be linked with the name Eidsvoll—now generally regarded as Norway's "Hall of Independence". This day is not only a symbol of Norwegian love of country, but also keeps alive the memory of the men who met at Eidsvoll in 1814 and signed the historical document.

Many of us who migrated to America will remember the happy and carefree days when we celebrated this day back in Norway. Banners were waving, bands playing and sporting events took place after the flag-covered parade. In bringing this memory with us to our adopted land, we also remember the glorious Saga of the coming of our forebears from the land of Thor. Leif Erickson came early—almost 500 years before anyone else from Europe. We are, naturally, proud of the Viking exploits and have long celebrated them in speech and songs. Leif Erickson distinguished himself by doing two things that had never been achieved before. First, he made man's first voyage across the Atlantic. Second, he discovered the mainland of the North-American continent—the previously unknown existence of the western half of the world.

The Nordic voyages to Vinland as recorded in the Icelandic Sagas date back to 986 and bring to light the birth of a boy, named Snorri—he being the first American known to be born here of European parents. However, in spirit, Leif Erickson was the first American. His blood was that of a race of pioneers. These sturdy people have carried on this Viking spirit through the centuries. As a result of their inborn search for adventure, the modern Vikings have extended their views world-wide and made those ancient Nordic virtues a part of the American heritage.

Originally, Norwegians came to realize their destiny in a new life—in the great open and undeveloped spaces of America. They left their small mountain valleys and hamlets in the old country and crossed the hazardous Atlantic Ocean in small and crowded ships. Wave after wave of enthusiastic emigrants joined the westward movement for the lush meadows and sun-drenched prairies across the land, from the Atlantic to the Pacific. In the mid-west, these Americans from Norway became successful farmers for the most part. Many helped to build railroads across the plains and over the Rocky Mountains. The discovery of gold in California was as strong and attractive a force as the finding of the rich, black soil of the middle-west had been before. Norwegian Mormons, seeking religious freedom, marked the routes to Utah and the far-west. More than one-million Norwegians came to America the first 100 years. Except for Ireland, Norway gave to America a larger proportion of her people than any other nation during this period.

Let me say to you—No European contribution to the racial conglomeration of America was more American before it passed Ellis Island, than the group from Norway. Freedom from class-lines, love of liberty and the appreciation of personal worth are inbred characteristics of Norwegian history and life in the valleys and in the fjords. The pioneering of the Norwegian emigrants on the physical frontiers of America paved the way for their sons and daughters to make outstanding contributions in the fields of art, science, medicine, literature and engineering. As the frontier era faded into the past they have made impressive contributions to the American professional life. With courage and endurance they helped to build tunnels and bridges, skyscrapers and factories in many of the American cities; and they played leading roles in shipping industry, and construction-work as engineers and architects. They also made contributions to American Government and politics at all levels. Hundreds have been Mayors of American cities, and more than two-dozen men of Norwegian ancestry have sat in Governors chairs. Many have served in the United States Senate and the House of Representatives. Our Vice-President is of Norwegian ancestry on his mother's side.

Thus—in little more than 130 years, the dreams of our ancestors have come through in generous measure. The Norwegian-American Saga has been a thrilling one, and a credit, not only to the Americans of Norwegian background, but to Americans of other European ancestry. In a concerted and cooperative effort—we all contributed so greatly to mold this great nation of ours. Never before in the history of mankind has a nation of pioneers grown so fast to become the greatest nation on earth.

Today—here in Leif Erickson Square—you have demonstrated again that the independence of your old country or the land of your fore-fathers is close to the hearts of all Americans. It gives us a renewed assurance that the close relations between the peoples of our two free countries rest upon a feeling of personal friendship. In this connection I wish to express the thoughts and sentiments that prevailed here in America when Norway was first invaded back in 1940. In a speech, praising the Norwegians for their spirit and resistance they put up against the enemy, the late President Franklin Roosevelt said:

"If you want to know why the war is fought—look to Norway! If you want to know what this war is about—look to Norway! If you want to know what democracy means—look to Norway!"

This intimate understanding is natural because the United States and Norway, with 13 other nations have joined forces to defend our common ideals through the North Atlantic Alliance. Only through mutual understanding can this Alliance of ours be a truly effective one—and what better expression can be found than the fact that the Constitution Day of Norway is being celebrated by Americans in Chicago, in Seattle, in Minnesota, in almost all parts of the United States.

On the other hand, in many cities in Norway, the American 4th of July is celebrated every year with speeches and festivities. Four years ago, I had the honor of extending greetings to the Norwegian people in Sandefjord from the Norwegian-Americans who naturally keep the relationship close to their hearts.

Therefore, let us rejoice, as we once again celebrate together this 17th Day of May, that both Norway and the United States of America are still the lands of the free and the home of the brave—and let us resolve ever to keep them so.

In conclusion, let me thank you all, each and everyone of you for this great privilege the Norwegian-American 17th of May Committee of Greater New York has given me with this address today, my fellow countrymen!

Valedictory Address by Kwok-Sing Aubrey Li

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 19, 1967

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, we have all been depressed in recent days as a result of the Communist-conspired riots in Hong Kong and the tragic warfare in the Mideast. Indeed, as one looks about it is of interest to see a ray of light as we look on the national scene. Therefore, it gives me great pleasure to place before my colleagues a very splendid statement by a young man, Mr. Kwok-Sing Aubrey Li, who delivered the valedictory address at the Hun School of Princeton, a fine preparatory school in my district. I think there is much that the nations of the world might learn from the happy example of the brotherhood which Mr. Li describes in relating his experiences to the Hun School.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to set forth Mr. Li's address as follows:

VALEDICTORY ADDRESS

(By Kwok-Sing Aubrey Li, June 4, 1967)

Dr. Perkins, Mr. Poe, members of the Board of Trustees, Dr. Chesebro, honorable guests, and fellow students, it is indeed a great privilege to have the opportunity to say a few words on this memorable but sad occasion. "Memorable" because it marks the end of our high school career; "sad" because we have to leave the security of Hun and enter into a strange world with new horizons.

I came to Hun School from Hong Kong, where over 97% of its four million population is Chinese, and there are no college preparatory schools. Perhaps this is why I appreciate all the more what the school has done for me, and what it means to me, because I come from such a different background from that of the majority of my class. You have probably read about the riots in Hong Kong two weeks ago. The strong anti-foreign propaganda fostered by the left-wing elements took advantage of the inadequate information and false impressions of Great Britain and the United States on the part of the Chinese people. The foreign students here and I, fortunately, are able to see the real image of America, and to get a better personal understanding of American culture. During my years at Hun, I have experienced not only the progress in my studies and self-discipline, but also the forming of friendships and the development of my character in the classroom as well as on the playing field.

I have found that in an international community such as Hun, people from ten countries can live, work and learn together in close harmony. The line of our soccer team, for example, consists of an American, an Arabian, a Japanese, a Mexican, and a Chinese. It is interesting to note that we have students of the Jewish and Moslem religions playing together as a team, while at present in the Middle East these two religious groups are on opposing sides. I have also found that despite differences ranging from our religious and political viewpoints to our sense of humor, many of us have ideals and principles in common. For instance, we all recognize the enduring virtues of benevolence, righteousness, propriety, wisdom, and sincerity. These are, in fact, the Five Virtues of the Chinese, first expounded by Confucius.

The fact that people of different races and nationalities can co-exist peacefully in our small-scale United Nations is an inspiration which leads us to hope that peace can be possible in this war-torn and troubled world.

Although we have been far from perfect as a senior class, nevertheless we have tried our utmost to set a good example to the underclassmen, and to maintain the high reputation of Hun School. In a short space of time we have seen our school grow both in size and enrollment as well as gain more friends and supporters, and we are proud to have been a part of this development. We think that Hun has a great potential of becoming an even better school.

Now we are at the threshold of entering into a larger community, with bigger challenges and heavier responsibilities. I feel that under the guidance of the faculty, we have been well prepared for the future, whatever life may bring us. On behalf of the Class of 1967, I wish to express our heartfelt gratitude to Dr. Chesebro and to all members of the faculty for their wise counsel, their patience and understanding, which have guided us to this day. We hope that, wherever we go, we will always be a credit to The Hun School of Princeton.

The Pacific Basin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 19, 1967

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, the development of regional cooperation within the Pacific community is a matter of utmost concern for me. As I have stated many times, the surest path to stability in the Pacific basin is through programs of exchange and mutual assistance. For this reason, I find the report of Mr. R. W. C. Anderson, executive director-general, Australia-Japan Business Cooperation Committee, entitled "The Pacific Basin Economic Organization—From Concept to Reality," to be a source of great encouragement.

The idea of the Pacific Basin Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development is a sound one. During the period of organization the five most highly developed nations of the Pacific community will comprise its membership: Japan, Australia, Canada, New Zealand, and the United States. Once this group has established a solid base of cooperation, the workings of the organization will expand to include the lesser developed nations.

An extremely encouraging aspect of the PBOECD is that it will be relatively free of government influence. It will be controlled and operated by groups of private businessmen. In this manner, a true sense of private cooperation may be realized.

No feelings of indebtedness to or control by a foreign power can be foreseen through the workings of the Pacific Basin Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. Businesses do not operate on charity, nor do they seek to attract any unstable government into an international alliance. The only relation that the PBOECD will establish with international politics will be an attempt to build stability in the nations of the Pacific basin.

I submit Mr. Anderson's article for the RECORD. I am certain that it will be of interest to all who are concerned about the development of the Pacific community.

The article follows:

[From the Journal of the American Chamber of Commerce in Tokyo, May 5, 1967]

THE PACIFIC BASIN ECONOMIC ORGANIZATION—FROM CONCEPT TO REALITY

(By R. W. C. Anderson, executive director-general, Australia-Japan Business Cooperation Committee)

WHAT IS THE PACIFIC BASIN ORGANIZATION?

The Pacific Basin Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development is an exciting, potentially rewarding concept. Initially it is being aimed at establishing effective areas of economic cooperation between the advanced nations of the region and to assist the area's lesser-developed countries.

It is exciting because of its sheer challenges; potentially rewarding in that the developed nations can pool resources to their mutual benefit and to the benefit of the under-developed countries concerned.

The Pacific Basin Organization's origins date back to 1964 when the idea first was sparked in discussions between members of the Australia and Japanese Business Cooperation Committees.

This body comprises distinguished Japanese and Australian representatives from a wide range of industrial, commercial and primary interests.

Each year, the Joint-Committee meets in either Tokyo or Canberra to discuss at businessman-to-businessman level relevant matters of economic and sociological interest. The first joint meeting was held in Tokyo in 1963 and the fifth meeting was held during April in Tokyo.

The Joint Committee envisages that no Government interests will be involved for the time being in their plan for a Pacific Basin. Government-to-Government contacts already are well-provided in the area through such organizations as ECAFE, SEATO and the new Asian Development Bank as well as the many well-developed diplomatic channels.

Participation in the initial stages of its operation will be limited to the region's five most economically-advanced nations—Japan, Australia, New Zealand, Canada and the United States.

But this does not mean it will be purely a "rich man's club." It must, and will, work to the common good of all countries in the area.

BASIC POLICY FORMULATION—BOTH SIDES

The examination of the statement of Japanese and Australian attitudes to the Pacific Basin Organization will show that there exists sufficient agreement on its scope of operation and its basic objectives so that the concept can be translated into one of practical reality. The principles expounded by both sides since the scheme was first formulated show only too clearly the willingness of Japan and Australia to fully develop the concept. From the time of the *Second Joint Meeting* in 1964 it was formally agreed that the Organization would not be aimed at establishing a Pacific free trade area. Except through bilateral trade links between the various pairs of countries, both sides agreed that the five advanced nations of the region were not inseparably joined up with one another in their trade. The Japanese firmly believe, as do the Australians, that because there is no basis for liberalizing capital and labor movements between the five nations it would be extremely difficult to establish a close relationship along "common market" lines. But it is possible to establish a loose system for more vigorous cooperation.

Australia put forward the plan that the Pacific Basin Organization should be serviced by a permanent secretariat which would arrange for an interchange of relevant economic and social information between those countries concerned.

Possible objectives mentioned by the Japanese side included the exchange of economic information, trade expansion, mutual understanding of economic policies, greater understanding and cultural interchanges, technical and capital exchanges, and a system for cooperation among private circles in the nations concerned.

Both sides agreed unanimously that cooperation should first be started at the private level. In developing their views on the secretariat, the Australian committee believed it could be responsible for certain projects which would include pest control, water conservation, standardization of commercial procedures and the rationalization of shipping.

A year later at the *Third Joint Meeting* both sides felt the need to proceed in small stages. They believed that certain basic, well-thought-out policies should be formulated. The Japanese reiterated the early Australian proposal that the organization should have a permanent secretariat. In fact, they believed each of the participating nations should have its own national Committee and that a fully-represented general assembly would meet in one of the principal countries each year.

The Japanese side also put forward the proposition that panel or Committee meetings should be held while the general assembly was in session. Such panels could then frankly discuss, state and then act positively on matters relevant to the scheme. National representatives, nominated by each national committee, could consist of the working committee. Two or three persons per country could be enough to form such a body.

The Australian paper engendered the idea of examining the feasibility of setting up a consortium of Japanese and Australian business interests to undertake a large-scale development project in Papua, New Guinea. The Australians strongly pointed out the need to select a project which would fit in with the overall development planning for the specific country under consideration. Their representatives put forward several projects which they considered had potential. These included fertilizers and cement works based on natural gas, metal smelting, fishing and processing and forestry. The Australians, however, suggested that any such project should have a strong orientation toward export and be commercially profitable undertakings in their own right.

Other objectives envisaged by the Japanese at this particular meeting included the promotion of tourism and the general advancement of international trade through the organization.

They put forward the following steps for implementing the scheme's plans: that the Japan and Australian Business Cooperation Committees would intensify their activities so as to smooth out any existing problems in order to pave the way for the Pacific Basin's full realization; the organization could then be expanded; following this, approaches would be made to the lesser developed countries of the region, or for Government assistance.

The Australian sub-committee proposed that an investigating consortium be established. They suggested this consortium examine the practical ways by which the Japanese and Australian business interests could assist the development of Papua, New Guinea. They then recommended that three or four large Australian firms, together with a similar number of Japanese companies, form such a consortium to probe private investment possibilities in the region. They suggested also that invitations be sent to appropriate organizations in the United States, Canada, New Zealand, Malaysia and the Philippines to seek observers to attend the Fourth Joint Meeting which was held in Canberra the following year.

At this meeting the Australians extended their views on the Pacific Basin Organization by declaring that any further development of the concept would need to be made outside the Australia-Japan Business Cooperation Committee. They put forward the idea that if it was to become an effective independent force the organization should be at a different level with its own secretariat. They urged, however, that the closest links should still be maintained with the Australia-Japan Business Cooperation Committees and other interest organizations. At the Canberra meeting the Japanese extensively examined the possibilities of a Pacific free trade area.

The estimates of a leading Japanese academician, Professor Kojima, were quoted to, and considered by, the meeting.

His estimates held that should the Pacific Basin free trade area become a reality, then trade within the area would advance $3.2 billion.

This, he stated in 1963, corresponded to 23 percent of a total trade among the five nations in question, and to 10 percent of the total for the same countries, which account for an expanded trade.

Using this figure, he estimated an increase of 2 to 4 percent in raw material trade, a 37 percent rise in light industry products and a 39 percent lift in heavy chemical industry products.

However, at the *Fourth Joint Meeting* the Japanese agreed with the strongly-held Australian view that it would not be feasible for the operation of such a Pacific Common Market. The official joint view was that the five Pacific nations were constituted differently from the six nations of the European Economic Community and, therefore, the formation of a Pacific Economic Common Body would not produce the same benefits as found in the trading blocs of Europe. It was maintained that there was an increasing emphasis throughout world trade on regional blocs and it seemed that the advanced nations of the Pacific Basin should attempt, in no matter how small a way, some type of international cooperation that would best serve their own future development and the advancement of the lesser-developed countries in the Pacific Basin Area. The Japanese also believe there should be a more systematic exchange of technical information and personnel between countries of the region. Consideration also could be given, they said, to the establishment of regional trading centers and joint-venture arrangements to set up new or expand existing industries.

WHAT HAS BEEN ACHIEVED

Purposely, both Committees have proceeded in small steps so as to lay the firmest foundations upon which to formulate a solid policy for the Pacific Basin ideal.

The scheme has been vigorously and frankly discussed by the Japanese and Australian Committees since 1964.

Mr. Shigeo Nagano, Deputy President of the Japanese Committee, and Mr. R. W. C. Anderson, Executive Director General of the Australian side, have been the guiding hands behind the scheme since its introduction.

New ground was broken at the *Fourth Joint Meeting* when observers from Canada and New Zealand attended the Pacific Basin sub-committee's discussions.

The idea was for them to gain a clearer insight into the scheme and give preliminary consideration to their respective organization's particular future role with the Pacific Basin Organization.

Two significant decisions emerged from the 1966 Joint Meeting: That a Pacific Basin Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development be formally established; and that official invitations to attend the Fifth Joint Meeting of the Australia-Japan Business Cooperation Committee and the inaugural meeting of the Pacific Basin Organization in Tokyo during April 1967 be extended to the appropriate commercial and industrial organizations of the United States, Canada and New Zealand.

One of the most interesting and practical aspects of the Pacific Basin Organization development to date has been the 10-day survey mission by the Japanese to Papua, New Guinea in the early part of 1966.

This fact-finding survey was set in train by the Pacific Basin Organization sub-committee. The Japanese delegation was led by a Committee member, Mr. M. Nishikawa, while the Australian members were headed by Mr. V. Hancock, representing the plywood industry.

The delegations reported their findings back to the *Fourth Joint Meeting* and salient points to emerge from the mission were:

New Guinea could be a test-case for the seriousness of the advanced countries toward the lesser-developed nations.

The area's timber resources were extremely rich and offered vast potential. Timber was the logical point to start from when considering Papua, New Guinea development. There were, however, many hardships to overcome, Apart from financing operations, difficulties involved the scarcity of the area's skilled labour resources, the small-scale timber milling facilities, the high fixed capital investment attached.

Other avenues for potential Papua, New Guinea development included agriculture, tourism and mining.

Another more extensive survey mission should be formed in the not too distant future to delve even further into the area's potential and problems.

CONCLUSION

The need to adopt and implement the proposals already set down for the establishment of a Pacific Basin Organization for Economic Development is obvious.

Considerable detailed thought has been given to its basic principles. Now we must act, for to transform past words into future practical reality is of paramount importance to all nations in the Pacific region.

In the words of our New Zealand counterparts:

"There is no doubt that two-way trade among Pacific nations will grow and that the chain of communications will thicken.

"Moreover, the firm belief has been expressed that the more advanced countries of the Pacific Basin have a tremendous responsibility both to themselves and the rest of the world in facilitating the development of economic and cultural relations between the Pacific nations."

This is the solid basis for the new organization which should warrant the most earnest and strong support of the business committees of the five countries which will from the start form the Pacific Basin Organization.

The Panama Canal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. ALLEN SMITH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 19, 1967

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial regarding the Panama Canal which I want to bring to the attention of the Members and which was written by Mr. Don Carpenter, editor and publisher of the Montrose Ledger and Glendale Independent, both in California, date of July 12, 1967:

MOSTLY POLITICAL

(By Don Carpenter)

NEEDED: LEADERSHIP

Granted that President Johnson knows a lot more about the Panama Canal than we do, but why give it away? It makes no sense to us; does Mr. Johnson know that much more about it?

The United States of America constructed and owns the Panama Canal. Any retreat from that position is a degree of surrender. However, surrender of the Panama, on a graduated scale, began years ago, when then-President Dwight Eisenhower failed to understand that the Canal Zone was and is under the domination of the United States. . . . Somehow, one seems to recall these days, the words of Kipling:

"Far called, our navies melt away,
"On dune and headland shrinks the fire. . . ."

It's a feeling of withdrawal and futility, of surrender—of courage in the face of defeat. But, defeat, nonetheless America is backing down.

The Panama Canal, a remarkable engineering and political achievement, was completed by America during her golden age. Now, during the age of historical apologists, the feat is being depreciated. Men who turned not a single shovel of earth, who felt not a single mosquito bite, who never risked their lives, are criticizing those who did. Trained in the art of apology instead of patriotism, they are ready to sell the achievements of America for "international acceptance." Yet, they do not understand that those who preach such acceptance, would not recognise it. In short, compromise with communism begets compromise, surrender begets surrender.

The United States has no apologies concerning creation and operation of the Panama. Yet, "liberal" after "liberal" has tried to give away the "big ditch". Currently, the Administration has asked for ratification of another treaty that would surrender absolute sovereignty over the canal. The only agitation for such a surrender has been Communist inspired—no Americans have been clamoring for a give-away of this magnitude.

With each day, leaders of America seem to be more in the position of apology. No longer are we willing to take a positive stand and stick with it. We have the Berlin Wall, Cuba, the assassination of our President, the retreat in Laos, the mess in South Viet Nam, the tragedy of Hungary, the loss of Arabian oil to Communism, the trade with the enemy, the support of those who trade with the enemy, the withdrawal of armed forces from France, the withdrawal of missiles from Turkey, the pro-Communist Test Ban Treaty, the pro-Communist Consular Treaty, the destruction of subversive control machinery within the United States, the open warfare in our streets, the rise of our crime rate, the refusal of officialdom to punish known-criminals, the draft card burners, the strikes amongst those who supply our troops, the slaughter of American troops without retaliation to known points of supply—and so on. We look in vain for a place where America has taken a stand and made it stick. We are amazed when the Prince of Butchers, Kosygin, enjoys greater safety in New York than President Johnson enjoys in Los Angeles.

No, we should not surrender the Panama Canal, mainly because it is ours. And secondly because it will be a surrender to Communist pressure, not to little Panama.

General Douglas MacArthur said that there are no great men—just ordinary men who rise to leadership when the need presents itself.

The need is now.

Discover America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVID PRYOR

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 19, 1967

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. Speaker, now that we are at that time of year when millions of Americans across the country will be embarking on their annual vacations, I would like to pay a much-deserved tribute to the service station operators of the land for their role in the great "discover America" program.

I think—and hope—that when the final statistics are compiled on this year's tourist trends, we will see that the "discover America" appeal is really scoring with vacationers.

Every State stands to benefit from this, as well as the Federal Government and the national interest in a favorable balance of payments. My own State has some prize attractions to offer those who enjoy scenic beauty, State parks, historic landmarks, and colorful folklore. The Ozark Trail, for example, which crisscrossed Arkansas, is one of the heritage trails being featured in the "discover America" program.

Anyone who appreciates the peace of unspoiled nature will find a trip on the Ozark Trail a richly rewarding adventure. We can promise scenery second to none, recreational opportunities that will make vacationers forget the cares of the workaday world, and, above all, people so warm and friendly that the time spent with them will remain among the most pleasant memories of a visitor's life.

The petroleum industry is one of the most active participants in the "discover America" campaign. This is only right and natural. According to the Census Bureau, 90 percent of the recreational trips in the United States are made by automobile. But the petroleum industry that stands to gain from this program, and is doing so much to publicize it, also makes another great contribution toward its success. This comes through the efforts of those members of the industry who directly meet the motoring needs of the traveling public—service station operators.

In Arkansas we have 2,500 service stations all over our State. We are fortunate that they are almost invariably run by businessmen of high caliber and real dedication. The service station, as we all know, is a tremendous factor in making everyday driving more pleasant, more convenient, and a good deal safer than it could otherwise be.

But it is in the field of vacation travel that the service station plays a very special role. In our State—and everywhere else that I have visited in the United States—the typical service station operator is a one-man welcoming committee and information bureau for his community. He is the man visitors naturally turn to as a friendly and helpful source of the touring tips they need to make their stay in the locality happy and comfortable. His distinctive contribution to pleasant and convenient traveling conditions adds tremendously to the basic appeal of the "discover America" campaign. And, speaking for Arkansas, I can assure you that our service station operators are doing their full part to make vacation travel in the United States a thoroughly enjoyable experience.

As a schoolboy, I had the pleasure of working part time in a local service station in my hometown. I feel that through this experience I gained a little better understanding of the work, problems, and challenges of the service station operators.

The gasoline dealers of Arkansas and other States deserve this tribute, this recognition of the underlying importance of what they are doing. They deserve to have their achievements put in true perspective. This is just one example—but a very good one—of how Americans who go about their work quietly, faithfully, and diligently can make a contribution of historic significance to the Nation and to the future well-being of their fellow countrymen.

Farm Bureau Federation

SPEECH

OF

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 18, 1967

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the information presented to the House today by my able colleague from New York [Mr. Resnick] is indeed disturbing.

Certainly it would appear that Mr. Resnick's charges against the American Farm Bureau Federation were serious enough to merit careful inquiry and should not have been brushed aside—as requested by the representative of the federation—by the Committee on Agriculture in a manner which seemed to constitute a rejection of the charges and a rebuke of my colleague from New York.

The gentleman from the 28th District from New York is courageous and outspoken, and he is relentless in his pursuit of the public interest. I am sure that his constituents will recognize his outstanding qualities and will not be misled by hasty and unfair attacks upon him.

Spirit Versus Strength

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 19, 1967

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, throughout the cold war era, anti-American propaganda has been a frequently relied upon and deftly employed bit of Communist strategy. And who can deny that this colossal "Communist persuasion" has caused us seemingly never-ending frustration? Since 1945 we have been racking our brains for new and more effective ways of communicating our position to the world's wavering neutralist nations. Because such countries find their needs satisfactorily alleviated by riding two "gravy trains" at once, most of our attempts to "set the record straight" have gone in vain. To make matters worse, it now seems that our allies are beginning to weaken under the continuous pressure of the Communist's verbal onslaught.

The following editorial which appeared in the July 6 edition of the Peoria Journal Star seems to suggest, and most appropriately, that a certain British journalist may have been momentarily victimized by some rare, deluding "spirits" while trying to analyze the "fighting spirit" of the North Vietnamese.

The editorial follows:

SPIRIT VERSUS STRENGTH

Another of those chosen few has written from Hanoi, after three months in North Vietnam. This time, it is a British journalist.

He quotes the prime minister there as saying the "stalemate" in the war is a problem for the U.S. and not for them. They don't "worry about it."

He quotes a high-ranking army officer of North Vietnam as saying that the U.S. has expected to win because of its "military superiority", but has failed to consider the factor of the "fighting spirit" of his forces, and he proclaims that the "military superiority" will never overcome this "spirit"—and the U.S., sooner or later, will withdraw.

He criticized American leaders for thinking only "physical strength" counts.

This is an interesting premise when, in fact, the "stalemate" exists because we calculated it that way, wishing them to change their minds, and not wishing to smash them, utterly.

It is absurd to speak of Vietnamese "spirit" standing up to the American armed forces and being superior to all that we have—just as it has been absurd for people to cry out that Vietnam is absorbing all our military capabilities and leaving us exposed everywhere else.

There are less than half a million men of the U.S. armed forces in Vietnam. There are another almost half million along the Asian periphery from Korea, Japan, Okinawa, and the Philippines to Thailand.

There are a quarter of a million still in Europe, another quarter of a million in the Atlantic fleet.

And there are almost 2,000,000 under arms right here in the United States, uncommitted.

Meanwhile, we have undergone nothing resembling a mobilization.

And the 10 to 15 per cent of our men under arms, actually on the scene in Vietnam, are fighting under careful rules and restrictions, to boot.

What these people are really saying is: "We don't think the U.S. has the spirit to continue doing this much, nor the nerve to try much more."

And what they are seeking to do is convince us that they have a capability they don't really have, to help damage our spirit.

Why Not Safety in Space?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 19, 1967

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives, in passing the NASA budget recently, saw fit to include two important amendments.

One would set up an Aerospace Safety Advisory Panel and the other would require the head of the Nation's space program to keep Congress informed of problem areas in the space program.

This bill is now before a House and Senate conference and it is my hope that these two amendments can be retained.

I want to submit two editorials, one from the Chicago Sun-Times and the other from the Chicago American regarding these amendments.

The editorials follow:

[From the Chicago Sun-Times, July 17, 1967]

WHY NOT SAFETY IN SPACE?

The fire in the Apollo spacecraft that caused the death of three astronauts on Jan. 27, has been thoroughly investigated. The investigation showed evidence of poor management, sloppy workmanship and inept safety precautions.

This week House and Senate conferees are expected to begin ironing out differences in their versions of the space agency authorization bill. Rep. Donald Rumsfeld (R-Ill.) has proposed two amendments that face rough going.

One amendment would set up an "Aerospace Safety Advisory Panel," to review potenial hazards in manned space craft.

The other would require the head of the nation's space program to keep Congress "fully and currently informed" of problem areas in the space effort. The House voted 258 to 157 for the amendments. The Senate dumped both.

Rumsfeld said, "Both of these amendments have been opposed by the hierarchy of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration."

The investigation of the Apollo tragedy showed an appalling disregard for safety procedures and practices. The objections to the Rumsfeld amendments made by NASA—that a safety committee would have trouble keeping itself fully informed, that the NASA program does not present hazards to the general public and thus a safety committee is not needed, and that the NASA safety record is so "good" that it needs no such guidance—are specious.

The joint Senate-House committee which will review the space agency authorization bill should keep the safety amendments in the bill, no matter what NASA says. As Rumsfeld points out. "What is NASA afraid of?"

[From the Chicago's American, July 12, 1967]

CHECKING ON NASA'S MISTAKES

House and Senate conferees next week are to take up a remarkable question: Whether Congress should require an independent checkup on how well the National Aeronautics and Space Administration is doing its job, or should tactfully ignore the request for fear of annoying some NASA officials. Unlikely as it seems, there is a real possibility that the conferees will take the second choice and decide, in effect, that safety for American astronauts ranks second to the continued peace of mind of the NASA hierarchy.

At issue are two amendments in the NASA authorization bill that were introduced by Rep. Donald Rumsfeld [R. Ill.]. One would establish an independent advisory committee on safety, which would make sure that all space activities were subject to scrutiny by an objective panel of non-NASA experts. The other would require NASA's administrator to keep Congress "fully and currently informed" on space activities. Both amendments were adopted by the House, by neither is in the Senate bill; the conference next week is to decide whether to keep them in or knock them out of the final version.

A single fact, it seems to us, should be enough to convince Congress of the need for these amendments: Last Jan. 27, three astronauts were trapped in a flash fire aboard their Apollo 204 space craft during ground tests at Cape Kennedy and were seared to death.

The tragedy resulted largely from a decision that it was safe to use pure oxygen—which intensifies burning—aboard the Apollo. The decision proved incredibly reckless—by hindsight, of course, but apparently hindsight is the only way of gauging NASA's mistakes. The NASA investigating board found that no "positive method" existed for identifying possible hazards in test operations.

As Rumsfeld observes, larger and potentially more dangerous operations are being planned, including one that involves operating a powerful nuclear reactor in space.

Aside from safety questions, we see no reason to think that NASA is immune from boondoggling, back-scratching with favored contractors, or any other of the cozy practices that grow up in government agencies with fat contracts to hand out. Congress has a responsibility to check up carefully on this agency's operations—and the fact that NASA officials are opposing Rumsfeld's amendments is one more reason for supporting them.

Local Actor, Nun Stars of Honored Telecasts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD D. McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 19, 1967

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, last week, in testimony before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I added two amendments to the administration bill on educational television. These amendments would allocate funds specifically for children's programs and other educational programs which are locally produced.

As testimony to the high quality of some of the children's educational programs on public television, I include Mr. Speaker, the following article from the Buffalo Courier-Express of June 23, 1967, commending two local talents, Jack Paupst and Sister M. Dorothy Horan, who star in programs which have been cited for the coveted Ohio State University award of excellence:

LOCAL ACTORS, NUN STARS OF HONORED TELECASTS

(By Jack Allen)

A local actor and a teaching nun are stars of two local television programs which today will receive coveted Ohio State University awards for excellence.

The programs honored are "Mr. Whatnot," a series for children which has completed its first year on educational Ch. 17, and "Focus on Art" on the same station.

WNED-TV's director of instructional broadcasting. Tony Buttino, will accept the awards in Columbus, Ohio, today.

The actor who stars in "Mr. Whatnot" is Jack Paupst, who has appeared in many local theater productions. But his regular job, perhaps more vital, is that of supervisor of education for the mentally retarded in the Buffalo public schools system.

Paupst's ability to communicate in a meaningful and enjoyable way with youngsters is the key to "Mr. Whatnot's" success.

The show appears on Ch. 17 Monday, Wednesday and Friday evenings at 7, and at 10:30 in the morning and 1 in the afternoon in the Buffalo and area schools served by WNED's instructional programing.

Station officials say "Mr. Whatnot" has been the most popular local series ever produced. The first 45 of the 90-program series and the prize-winning segment were produced by Dennis Steinmetz, who is now in Philadelphia as assistant director of the "Mike Douglas Show."

Henry C. (Bud) Senke is present producer. "Mr. Whatnot" was produced in cooperation with the Buffalo public schools with funds provided under *Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act*. Seymour Abeles of the city schools is project co-ordinator.

Puppeteer Jim Menke also has been a factor in the success of "Mr. Whatnot," which is aimed primarily at the city's core-area schools and economically underprivileged children in the kindergarten-through-third-grade age group.

The Ohio State Awards are in their 39th year of giving recognition to the nation's radio and TV stations, commercial and educational, for excellence in educational and public-service programing.

"Mr. Whatnot" won in the category of "personal problems," defined as "the relationship of an individual to his environment."

The citation said the program "is masterful for its simple, unobstrusive but effective presentation of purposeful skill for the primary school child."

The other local prize-winner, "Focus on Art," is conducted by Sister M. Dorothy Horan, SSJ, chairman of the art department at Buffalo Medaille College.

Hers is a 28-program in-school series which appeared on Ch. 17 Wednesday afternoons at 1:05 and Fridays at 1:30. The 20-minute segments will be shown on the new New York State network next fall.

More than 200 local stations, in addition to networks, submitted entries in the Ohio State competition this year. Sister Dorothy's series won an award in the fine arts and humanities category.

She is believed to be the first nun to win an Ohio State award. She said her series is designed to explore the world of art design and architecture at the sixth-grade level, and to stir the creative impulses of children.

Sister Dorothy, who studied in Italy, has shown slides of that nation's art and architecture to her child audience.

In granting her one of only two awards out of 36 entries in the instructional category, the Ohio State committee said:

"The program presents a thoroughly competent teacher who is able to communicate her information with delightful enthusiasm. The manner in which graphics are presented to the viewer reveals a particular sensitivity for the optimum use of television."

Partial credit for the production of "Focus on Art" goes to producer-director Lou Presti, now at educational station WENH at Durham, N.H.

At that station also is Bill Brady, former Niagara Falls school teacher whose "American Literature" series a few years ago won the first Ohio State award for WNED.

Gadabout Gaddis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM D. HATHAWAY

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 19, 1967

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I take this occasion to pay special homage to a distinguished American, Mr. R. Vernon Gaddis, better known to millions of his fellow citizens as Gadabout Gaddis, the flying fisherman.

As the Izaak Walton of the 20th century, Gadabout produces some of the most unusual, refreshing, and wholesome entertainment available to television audiences. With camera and airplane, this venerable and enviable sportsman has updated the fisherman's text.

Probably no other living American has a more perfect knowledge of where the "big ones are biting" than has Gadabout Gaddis. Probably no one else has covered the Nation's streams and ponds so thoroughly. Certainly no one has ever before told so many fish stories to so many willing listeners.

Each year from October through April, Gadabout presents a weekly television show seen by an estimated 45 million people. His audience, idle or would-be fishermen and lovers of natural beauty, view from their living rooms the quiet beauty of America's streams and lakes, and listen to Gadabout's dry commentary on fishing.

It is no wonder that most people think of Gad simply as an entertainer, a personality. He is an entertainer of the first rank, but beyond this he is dedicated to other serious purposes.

Gadabout is one of our Nation's foremost conservationists. For many years, he has waged a one-man war against pollution of our lakes, rivers, and streams. He has toured the country many times, utilizing all the major communications media—press, radio, and television—to stress the need for antipollution efforts by every individual citizen. He has battled pollution with the fierce resolve and unyielding integrity of one who has a profound love of nature and our precious water resources.

For his efforts in this regard, Gadabout received a citation from the Bureau of Reclamation of the U.S. Department of the Interior which was personally presented by Commissioner Floyd E. Dominy. He has also been honored by Gov. John A. Volpe, of Massachusetts, and Edward T. Breathitt, of Kentucky.

Gad is a hard-sell salesman of the value of fishing as a family activity, one which can provide a common familial interest and make for closer family relationships. In addition, he has fostered, whenever possible, his desire to have adults "take a boy fishing." He feels adults should spend more time with children, and interest them in wholesome, rewarding activities such as fishing, which could be a prime deterrent to juvenile delinquency. Gad has conferred with law-enforcement officers all around the United States, helping to start programs such as this.

During World War II, Gadabout entertained an average of 1 million servicemen each year, showing his films and sharing his fish stories. He is himself a veteran of World War I, having enlisted the day the United States entered the conflict. He became a flying cadet and won his wings.

Gadabout was born in Mattoon, Ill., a long way from Maine, but I am proud to say that 2 years ago this fine gentleman who knows and loves the most idyllic parts of the Nation, chose to make Bingham, Maine, his official residence.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this opportunity to pay tribute to Gadabout Gaddis, whose love of the sport and art of fishing has enriched his life and the lives of millions who have followed his adventures on lake and stream. He has been, and is, dedicated to the task of leading others along the paths on which he has found such deep satisfaction and of preserving the resources which have afforded them. I am proud that he has chosen Maine as his place of residence. He is remarkable for many reasons, not the least of which, that he has become internationally famous for enjoying himself, for doing what he loves best, "going fishing."

The Kee Report: Weather Reporting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 19, 1967

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include last week's public service television and radio newscast, "The Kee Report." The subject discussed is weather reporting.

This is Jim Kee, bringing you the Kee Report.

Perhaps the most common expression of the American people is the old saying that everyone talks about the weather but no one does anything about it. The use of this phrase points up the fact that most of our plans are at the mercy of the elements.

Despite a few attempts to bring rain in drought areas, or to break up gathering hurricanes, it is still pretty much true that people must take the weather as it comes. However, in this age of rapid scientific advancement, there is a belief in some quarters that mankind may be compelled to take up the job of weather-making in self-defense. This prediction is based on the fact that man's conquest of the air and of outer space may cause abrupt and costly changes in normal atmospheric conditions.

It is an open secret that in the past, local activities have adversely affected local weather. The great drought of three decades ago in the Plain States was due in large measure to the fact that the land had been stripped of its trees. In the same way, experience has demonstrated that changing the course of a stream or river for irrigation purposes quite often produced a serious drop in the local rainfall.

There is no proof to sustain the oft-repeated charge that large atomic explosions produce severe atmospheric changes. But they might if such explosions become commonplace. There is no evidence that the growing fleets of airplanes and spacecraft travelling faster than sound may have affected the weather for good or bad. But if these fleets keep on growing in size and numbers, many experts believe they could cause harmful atmospheric changes. In the same way, there is a growing belief that smog and air pollution are definite factors in local weather-making.

Faced by these conditions, the Federal Government is taking a careful look at the whole business of atmospheric conditions. Uncle Sam has a few pilot projects experimenting with the manufacture of artificial weather. But the most recent development is a step-up in the time-honored Government function of weather reporting.

A new radar network is being developed to improve the warning system now in use to alert inhabitants to the dangers of floods, hurricanes, tornadoes, or violent storms. It is estimated that these natural disturbances cause more than $10 billion in property damage each year and take more than 500 lives.

Our citizens in the Fifth Congressional District know from painful experience the cost of flood damage. An improved alert system is hardly as effective as a good flood control project. But warning given in time could save many lives and much property.

The first step in the improved warning system was the purchase of eight modern weather radars that can measure with accuracy the intensity of storms at more than 100 miles. The radar findings will be hooked into the forecasting system by other modern instruments called repeater scopes. This system is now being used in tornado country but eventually it will be extended to the whole country.

Weather-making is still a project for the future but in the meantime, improved weather reporting will be most welcome.

Thank you for listening.

Walt Disney Appreciation Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED REINECKE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 19, 1967

Mr. REINECKE. Mr. Speaker, one of the great citizens of my home State of California, a great American known and loved around the world, was the late Walt Disney. The Legislature of the State of California has instructed the Governor to proclaim July 17 of every year as Walt Disney Appreciation Day. For the information of the House, I enclose a copy of the proclamation:

Whereas the motion picture screen, placed before an artist, can become a canvas upon which highly original and creative works are painted; and

Whereas Walt Disney used the motion picture as an art form, making the screen glow with his inventive animated works of art; and

Whereas the stories he animated on the screen produced enduring films which will long continue to entertain the people of the world; and

Whereas Walt Disney motion pictures, whether animated or conventionally photographed, consistently and without exception presented entertainment for the entire family; and

Whereas the genius of Walt Disney was extended beyond the motion picture screen and television tube to Disneyland and its many delights for people of all ages; and

Whereas Walt Disney was a warm human being who communicated enduring values and the highest ideals to the minds and hearts of people everywhere; and

Whereas the Legislature has requested the Governor to proclaim July 17, 1967 and every July 17th thereafter Walt Disney Appreciation Day;

Now therefore, I, Ronald Reagan, Governor of California, do hereby proclaim July 17, 1967, and every July 17th thereafter Walt Disney Appreciation Day, and suggest appropriate observances.

Aircraft Noise Abatement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB H. GILBERT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 19, 1967

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, while I am told the supersonic transport will be used mainly on long-haul overwater routes, there is no assurance that after the program gets under way it will not be extended to overland areas. I cannot help but be deeply concerned over SST noise, just as I am concerned at the present time over aircraft noise over our urban residential areas. I am not convinced the SST will cause less noise, as has been said here today. There is also a question of safety in the densely populated areas adjacent to our airports where these planes would land. If I am correct in assuming that an afterburner will be used for the needed extra thrust on takeoff, then will we not have more noise than ever? We had been told the jet planes at Kennedy and La Guardia Airports would be quieter than the prop ones, but this has not been the case.

In spite of testimony before the committee and statements made here on the floor today, I have reservations about accomplishing, through this program, the reduction of aircraft noise. The noise of low-flying jet aircraft in my district and other areas near La Guardia and Kennedy Airports in New York has become an intolerable and unbearable situation.

I have proposed in my bill, H.R. 618, that the Government conduct extensive aircraft noise abatement research. I understand some research is being done. I would like to see more done, and suggest it be extended to the supersonic transport, to assure our city residents that they will not be faced with more aircraft noise and additional hazards.

The sonic booms generated by the supersonic transport tests over Oklahoma City caused smashed windows, cracked plaster, and brought thousands of complaints and lawsuits. I realize that reducing the noise and hazards is a major problem for industry and the designers of the SST. However, I have urged in the past, and I do so now, that we take more steps in the field of research to reduce aircraft noise and to improve our aircraft noise standards.

OEO Effectively Run

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 19, 1967

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, those who contend that the war on poverty is a source of political patronage with big payrolls and no accomplishments are deceiving themselves as well as being grossly unfair to a program that is bringing hope and opportunity to thousands of destitute Americans.

The falsity of this criticism was demonstrated recently in an article by Agis Salpukas, appearing in the New York Times on July 13. Mr. Salpukas reported an investigation made by Nassau County ombudsman Samuel Greason, who found absolutely no basis for charges of payoffs or abuses in the effective program being run by the Nassau Economic Opportunity Commission. Mr. Speaker, I quote from the article:

> The 79 year-old former judge [Mr. Greason], who is a Republican, said that poverty workers were hired on a basis of ability and that many others volunteered for the work.

Mr. Speaker, so that my colleagues might have the opportunity to read this enlightening article I include it at this point in the Record.

NASSAU OMBUDSMAN REPORTS NO EVIDENCE OF POVERTY PAYOFFS

(By Agis Salpukas)

MINEOLA, July 12.—The Nassau County ombudsman said today that he had found no basis for charges that the county's antipoverty program was a source of political patronage with big payrolls and no accomplishments.

The nation's first ombudsman had been asked to investigate the poverty program last March by County Executive Eugene Nickerson after the supervisor of the Town of Hempstead, Francis T. Purcell, had charged that the program was "all salary and no action." Both Mr. Nickerson, a Democrat, and Mr. Purcell, a Republican, are seeking re-election in November.

In his first report to the public after a year of service, Ombudsman Samuel Greason said he had found no proof of payoffs or abuses in the program run by the Nassau Economic Opportunity Commission. The 79-year-old former judge, who is a Republican, said that poverty workers were hired on a basis of ability and that many others volunteered for the work.

"You don't see much of that in the county any more," he added.

PURCELL STILL DISAGREES

In an interview, Mr. Purcell said that Mr. Greason had not "dug deep enough" and he still believed that the program was staffed with many people who received their offices as a reward for political services and therefore were not interested in helping the poor.

Mr. Greason said that he had handled 490 cases this year. Only one out of five people who came to his office on the fifth floor of the County Executive Building in Mineola had a legitimate complaint, he said, and the most common valid grievance was about delays in getting welfare checks.

Mr. Nickerson, who sat next to Mr. Greason at a news conference held in the County Executive Building, thanked the ombudsman "for pointing up shortcomings and helping us to perfect the instrument of government to better serve the people."

Mr. Nickerson said that he had already directed the Nassau County Attorney's office to come up with proposals to amend the administrative code dealing with tax liens on property.

HEARS EVERY COMPLAINT

Mr. Greason said he had found many people who had failed to pay taxes on their property had not been notified of foreclosure because the letters were mailed to wrong addresses. He recommended that they be sent by registered mail.

Speaking slowly in short concise phrases, the ombudsman said that he personally listened to every complaint, and then picked up the telephone to call the highest official concerned with it. Mr. Greason said that he could not recall one instance where he had not received cooperation.

Honoring Ray Moore

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENJAMIN B. BLACKBURN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 19, 1967

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, a long record of reporting in the Atlanta area is held by the editor and founder of Dixie Business, Mr. Hubert F. Lee. As a young man in 1923 in the early days of radio, Mr. Lee participated in a program on the WSB radio station.

Forty-four years later, in 1967, Mr. Lee once again brings to the fore the excellence of the WSB radio station and its staff.

I include Mr. Lee's editorial on Mr. Ray Moore, news director for WSB and 1966 winner of the Public Service in Reporting Distinguished Service Award, at the end of my remarks:

THE EDITORS OF DIXIE BUSINESS HAVE THE HONOR OF ANNOUNCING RAY MOORE, WSB–TV, 1966 WINNER OF THE PUBLIC SERVICE IN REPORTING DISTINGUISHED SERVICE AWARD, AN ILLUMINATED SCROLL

PAST WINNERS

Keeler McCartney, Atl. Constitution, 1952.
Ralph O'Leary, Houston Post, 1953.
Max B. Shelton, Houston AP Bureau, 1954.
No award, 1955.
Stephen Trumbull, Miami Herald, 1956.
Pohn Pennington, now Columnist of the Atlanta Journal, 1957.
Ted Pearson-Ed Lee, Mobile Press-R, 1958.
Jack Nelson, Atl. Constitution, 1959.
Norman Shavin-Mike Edwards, AJ&AC, 1960.
Martha Frances Brown, DeKalb New Era, N. DeKalb Record, Decatur, Ga., 1961.
Hal Hendrix, Miami News, 1962.
Charles Pou, Atlanta Journal, 1963.
Paul Jasper, Pensacola News, 1964.
The American War Correspondent, 1965.
Ray Moore, WSB–TV, Atlanta, 1966.

I WALKED TODAY

In honoring Ray Moore for "Public Service in Reporting" the editors of Dixie Business honor all the men and women of WSB–Radio and WSB–TV we have held in high esteem for 45 years since WSB went on the air March 15, 1922 . . .

The 20th century of strife and contrasts of the Holy Land was shot last year in his documentary "I Walked Today," the news director of WSB–TV is cast in the role of "War Correspondent as a dogfight between Israeli and Syrian jets disturb the sky over the border area.

With WSB–TV since 1952, Ray is news director. He is married to the former Mary Cunningham and they have 3 sons, ages four to seven.

Ray won the Brenda Award, given by Theta Sigma Phi, Atlanta Chapter, headed by Pearl Weathers.

Something for Nothing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 19, 1967

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, the following advertisement by the Warner & Swasey Co. of Cleveland, which appeared in the July 24 issue of U.S. News & World Report, expresses an economic truism in everyday, down-to-earth language in a way that politicians envy. I hope this message reaches all our people and that they will support the reelection of Members of this body who seek to cut out the waste in Government spending.

Principally because of the Vietnam war, but also because of many unnecessary, expensive Federal programs,. the deficit in the current fiscal year is estimated will run more than $20 billion. Every year the deficit gets higher and inflationary pressures increase and people lose more of what they have left.

This will keep right on until Government spending is limited to Government revenues. The Great Society free spenders who pretend to be helping the American people are in fact feeding them sucker bait by promising them something for nothing. This is a pure mirage, as Warner & Swasey so aptly point out in this advertisement:

YOU CAN'T BEAT SOMETHING-FOR-NOTHING—UNTIL YOU FIND IT'S NOTHING

When you offer me higher wages, security for my old age, part of my rent, free—I'd be foolish not to take it all and want more, wouldn't I?

Until I learned (too late) that I was paying for my "free" rent in higher taxes all my life; and that my high wage (no one demanded I produce more, to pay it) increased costs and the prices I had to pay so I was paying my own bigger pay and that of others, too; and that my old age "security" evaporated when dozens of government "plans" brought inflation to wipe out savings and security.

"Something for nothing" is sucker bait and can never be anything else—and the fish who take it have only themselves to blame for getting hooked.

Captive Nations Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 19, 1967

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, this week, July 16–22, the ninth annual Captive Nations Week will be celebrated in ceremonies all through the United States. When it unanimously voted in 1959 to establish this observance, Congress intended this week to fulfill two purposes. First this would be a time for us in America to especially remember the plight of those millions of people imprisoned behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains. Second, this would be a time for us to express to these captive people our deep sympathy and firm support for their desire for individual freedom and national independence.

Too often we who live in this Nation "under liberty and justice for all" forget what life without freedom can be. During Captive Nations Week we have an especially good opportunity to reawaken all Americans by showing them what it is like to live under a system of government that does not respect the value of the individual. For the people under the domination of communism, there is no constitutionally guaranteed right to freedom of speech, press, or religion. Instead the citizens of these countries are subject to the whim of the men governing the nation at any one time. There can be no question that in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union, the conditions under which the people live have improved since the worst days of Stalin's despotism. The governments of Eastern European nations are no longer complete puppets of Moscow. In certain situations the national interest of their countries and not that of the U.S.S.R. dictates what policy should be followed. Of course what that interest is, is defined by men in no way responsible to the people they govern. Also during the past decade there have been efforts to increase some of the consumer goods available to the average worker. During the past 10 years there has been times in the Communist nations when artists and writers have been able to create more according to their own genius and less within the confines of "socialist realism." Yet the terrifying aspect of all these little steps toward a slightly freer society is that a policy decision by one or two men or a change of leaders by death or coup d'etat can destroy completely every gain. Just in the past few days there have been several newspaper articles analyzing a possible struggle for power within the Kremlin between so-called hardliners and softliners. Tomorrow a new Stalin might appear, or instead a new Khrushchev, willing to allow a few slight improvements in the life of the people living under communism.

We in the United States must recommit ourselves vigorously to pursue every practical means available to us to aid these people in their struggle for lasting and complete freedom for themselves and for their nation. The knowledge of our support may help them to keep hoping and striving for liberty despite any setbacks. It has been the experience of this Nation that every man can have a happier and fuller life under a system that allows him freedom to be himself and to have a voice in how he is governed. Over the past two centuries this conviction has spread to Europe, South America, and most recently Africa and Asia. The Iron and Bamboo Curtains cannot keep this message. The captive people want their freedom and neither they nor we shall rest until they are free.

Tax Program Promises Equity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 19, 1967

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I want to again urge the House to adopt a positive attitude toward the tax increase proposed for this year. Much has been said and will be said about the cost factor of the Vietnam war and the attendant problems of inflation, but I am concerned, in addition, over another specific result that we can very easily predict in the absence of some tax effort—a repeat performance of 1966. The year 1966 represents a very impressive and forceful example of the horrendous effects on the homebuilding industry when the Nation relies too heavily upon a monetary policy to solely check the problem of budget deficits and the threat of inflation.

We have not yet recovered from the damaging effects of the 1966 experience, and, unfortunately, we are already looking at the development of exactly the same kind of tight money situation. Mortgage rates are inching up, and our informed sources from the savings and loan industry are already predicting that Treasury bills and corporate bonds will again be placing pressure upon savings causing the capital flow to once again go against the homebuilder and the home buyer.

Homebuilding has been struggling to reach last year's rather low level of building in my own State. The optimists have been moving toward a pickup in early 1968, but I am afraid it is not going to happen. Discounts and bonds are again rising on FHA-insured mortgages and this is bound to be a deterrent in the turnover of homes. Without some dynamics in the moveup-ratio by the top echelon of homeowners, we can easily predict that there will be an equal deterrent in the total construction of homes for the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, a tax increase will provide the Government with the needed funds thereby not forcing it to go to the money market. That is the only way we are going to maintain the gap between the returns from mortgages and dividends for savings deposits and the yield of the money market's instruments.

The volatile quality of today's capital was most clearly indicated in the 1966 experience. We will be repeating that unfortunate and disruptive experience in the absence of some tax relief.

May I point out to my colleagues that when the homebuilding field suffers, there is a massive side effect in two other wide-spread economic segments in America. These segments include the manufacturers of building materials and the many home furnishing manufacturers and retailers which provide the furniture and fixtures that many homes attract.

The second thing that a tax program will accomplish is equity, for it is hard to justify placing the burdens of our expenditures on selected segments of our economy. These selected segments, by the way, represent not only the homebuilder and the perspective homeowner but also the small businessman and the fixed income persons all of whom are equally and adversely affected either by inflation or increased money costs.

A balanced program of monetary restraint and equitable tax increases and adjustments will provide the best answer for the total American economy for the period that lies ahead. As one singularly interested in the homebuilding field, I trust the judgment of the Congress will be to support an intelligent tax reform tax increase program.

Address by Gov. Ralph M. Paiewonsky, at the Commencement Exercises of the College of the Virgin Islands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 19, 1967

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on June 11, 1967, the commencement exercises of the College of the Virgin Islands were held in St. Thomas.

Most inspiring was the commencement address presented by Gov. Ralph M. Paiewonsky to the graduating class.

In his address, Governor Paiewonsky expressed his hope that the graduates of this class would recognize their responsibility to the public interest and serve their Nation and community as well as themselves.

I commend those remarks to the attention of our colleagues, as follows:

ADDRESS BY GOV. RALPH M. PAIEWONSKY, AT THE COMMENCEMENT EXERCISES OF THE COLLEGE OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

Dr. Wanlass, platform guests, members of the Board of Trustees, Overseers, members of the faculty, graduates, students and friends, Dr. Wanlass' call to me yesterday, asking me to make the commencement address, set in motion a whole chain of thoughts and reminiscences. Of course, my first reaction was one of disappointment that the distinguished and gifted Congresswoman, Edith Green, could not be here with us. She would, I am certain, have delivered a challenging and timely message. But that thought brought to mind another address delivered here at the first college commencement in June of 1965 by the Nation's first lady, Mrs. Lyndon Johnson. Both she and her message were inspirational. Mrs. Johnson brought honor and prestige and world attention to a college that was just attempting to flutter its academic wings, and we shall all be eternally grateful for her presence on that eventful day.

I thought, too, of Judge William Hastie's brilliant remarks of last June. One of our most distinguished and learned native sons, Judge Hastie wisely spoke of the importance of keeping politics out of the educational spectrum and gave, not just the graduates, but all of us, ample food for thought.

And then I mused, "What can I possibly say to these fine young men and women, what can I offer them that, like those who preceded me, will be truly meaningful and well remembered. How can I convey some new dimension of enlightenment or purpose?"

And I remembered, too, some of the brilliant writers and lecturers who have come to this center of learning in the Caribbean, including such men as Theodore Sorensen and Arthur Schlesinger. And I ran over in my mind the list of members of your faculty, assembled from the highest academic centers on the mainland, who dispense their knowledge and thought to CVI students, and at that moment, the thought of successfully imparting to you some modicum of truth that you would carry with you seemed remote, indeed!

But then, as I pondered over the needs of this nation and the world, and as I thought of the qualities of this new generation of young Americans, I recalled the words of a former President of the United States who was also a college professor—Woodrow Wilson—and I remembered that Professor Wilson had said, "Every man sent out from a university should be a man of this nation as well as a man of his time." And I realized that here was a theme that has even more application today than in Wilson's day, and one that should be most meaningful to today's graduates.

What did Wilson mean when he said, "Every man sent out from a university should be a man of his nation as well as a man of his time?"

He meant, I believe, that the college which graduates the nation's future leaders is that college whose purpose is not merely to graduate students into the millstream of economic life and a materialistic society, but whose overall purpose is to educate its students to a genuine understanding of the meaning of a free society.

He meant, I believe, that the future leaders of this country are those who recognize their responsibilities to the public interest and who believing that serving the nation and the community's interest is more important and more satisfying, and in the end, more spiritually rewarding than serving their own.

Is my message to you, then, a call to public service?

Yes, in a way it is. But it is much more than that!

It is an earnest attempt to have you recognise that our nation's future greatness and the world's security hinge on intellectual awareness of the importance of public responsibility.

How does this awareness come about?

It comes through unhampered freedom of discussion and inquiry, which is the very heart of a free university and the very soul of a free intellect. And you have developed that freedom here.

It comes about through a basic belief in, and an understanding of, our democratic way of life and your college and these islands are testing grounds of this self-determination in action.

It comes about through the acceptance of leadership roles—in college, in community life and in public life.

And what kind of leadership does this imply?

John F. Kennedy once said, "The pursuit of knowledge itself implies a world where men are free to follow out the logic of their own ideas."

He said, "It implies a world where nations are free to solve their own problems and to realize their own ideals."

The future of the world community rests with nations who feel secure in their own independence. And the future of these nations is founded on men who feel secure in *their* own independence.

This independence can only be based on knowledge, and this knowledge comes from learning.

And so, my young friends, the ball swings back to you!

You have knowledge . . . the result of a good education.

You have independence . . . the result of your knowledge and of the community, the nation and the world within which you live.

And you feel secure in that independence.

Do you not then have a responsibility to your community, and your nation, and your world . . . to lead? I believe you do!

And what you also have, then, is a great potential, tremendous power that eventually, I hope, will be directed to some ultimate public purpose.

Yes, your community and your country need you, and this is after all, a call to serve. Yet it is, when you think about it, the most natural call in the world.

Your parents nutured you, raised you, cared for and loved you; and you feel the desire to give to them in return.

Your teachers gave of themselves to you, inspired you, advised you, provided the spark, then fanned the flames of your desire for knowledge; and your graduation today is your gift to them in return.

Your church guides you and comforts you, uplifts you and gives you spiritual inspiration; and you support it, not just with offerings but with time and love and service.

Just so, does your nation need you to vote for the leaders of your choice, to help pay for the privilege of living in a free society, but most of all, to contribute your thoughts, your ideas, your criticism, your energies to better government at all levels.

The late President Kennedy once said, "Nothing is more stirring than the recognition of great public purpose. Every great age is marked by innovation and daring, by the ability to meet unprecendented problems with intelligent solutions. In a time of turbulence and change, it is more true than ever that knowledge is power, for only by true understanding and steadfast judgment are we able to master the challenge of history."

Just this week, one of the top national magazines featured the first in a series of articles on America's "action-intellectuals", those scholars in and out of government who exercise a considerable influence over the laws and policies of the United States. The writer, Theodore White, states, "The new ivory tower. For them it is a forward obser- action-intellectuals have transformed the vation post on the urgent front of the future." "No tactical manual," he says, "or operational guide describes how the action-intellectual operates. Chance, impulse, ambition, discontent and public spirit all lead such men by a dozen different paths to the seats of power. Yet all paths start from the dynamics of modern knowledge."

And so, members of the graduating class of 1967, I ask this of you:

That you do not hoard your thoughts.

That you do not cease to acquire knowledge.

That you continue to express your honest opinions.

That you reject cliches and oversimplifications.

That you respect every other man's right to his own kind of independence . . . and every nation's.

That you question, criticize, but most of all, participate, in the shaping of your community's and your country's and your world's future.

Will this effort on your part, if you give it, make a difference?

It must!

Will it take time?

Indeed, you may not see the results of your labors in your lifetime and your children may well have to accept this same challenge and this burden, too.

Quite recently, in a speech at the White House, President Johnson greeted sixteen young White House Fellows, who are part of a program established by the President in 1964 to inspire participation in government. His words sum up best what I have been trying to tell you: "Every one of you," he said, "is a representative of his generation. The spirit of that generation today is first of all a questioning, critical spirit, skeptical of promises and rather impatient with results. It is a spirit which may sometimes overly concern your elders, but it is a spirit that your country needs. It is the motive power behind every forward step that a man or a country must make. There is only one catch: The sternest impatience, the greatest power of speech, the most noble outrage against injustice, all would be only good intentions unless Americans, young and old, involve themselves, unless they go into the field with that 'Message to Garcia,' unless they translate their best ideas into practical achievements."

And then the President said, "I would like for you to have a vision and a dream. Then I would like for you to have the ability to carry it out and see it executed; for the frustrating process of molding ideas into action is a most rewarding venture."

Many speakers have recalled the famous story of a French Marshal Lyautey, who once told his gardener to plant a tree. The gardener objected, saying that the tree was slow-growing and would not mature for at least one hundred years. To which the Marshal replied, "In that case, there is no time to lose. Plant it this afternoon."

My friends, there *is* no time to lose. The result of your efforts on behalf of a better world may be a century away, but let us plant our trees this afternoon.

I congratulate you on your achievement here at the College of the Virgin Islands, and I wish you success in making *your* world a better one for *you* and for all of us.

May God bless you.

Who Died in Vain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. TUNNEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 19, 1967

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to place in the RECORD an editorial written by Mr. Fred L. Eldridge, editor and publisher of the Corona Daily Independent. This was written on Memorial Day, and it contains some thoughts for all of us to ponder.

The editorial follows:

Who Died In Vain

Today is the day when we mourn our dead.

We go to the cemeteries and put flowers on the graves of those members of our families who have departed.

But especially we mourn as we honor those who have died in our various wars.

The veterans groups do the honors, and Medal of Honor winners are sought as speakers. A great deal is said about veterans not having died in vain.

We submit that every veteran has died in vain if his successors are killed in subsequent wars. The only rational idea in support of a war is that winning the war will create conditions to end war. At least, we think this is surely the case at a time when we have the means to destroy civilization itself, rather than only 8.5 million people as was the case in "the war to end wars" known as World War II.

Most of us these days are pretty good at winning wars. We Americans surely are. The Russians are. The Germans have been very close twice this century, and the British, for a small island nation, have been superb when the chips were down.

But nobody knows how to win the peace. Nobody knows how to establish the world order of law statesmen talk about vaguely. While the establishment of such an order of law would not guarantee peace forever, if such law were enforceable through an international police force and courts of proper jurisdiction, the human race might have a fighting chance to live through the generations without watching the flower of its youth destroyed every few years as they have throughout our period of great scientific and technological enlightenment in the 20th century.

But scientific and technological enlightenment is not enough if the peoples of the world and their leaders cannot learn how to live together.

"Jerusalem, Built as a City Which Is Bound Firmly Together" (Psalms 122: 3)

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 19, 1967

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the New York Board of Rabbis, founded in 1881, is the largest representative rabbinical board in the world, encompassing all three denominations of the Jewish faith—Orthodox, Conservative, and Reform.

On July 3, 1967, the board issued the following enumeration of the acts of desecration committed by the Jordanians against sacred and holy Jewish sites.

I commend the item to the attention of our colleagues as follows:

"Jerusalem, Built as a City Which Is Bound Firmly Together" (Psalms 122: 3)

For nineteen years, whose voice was heard to shatter the silence surrounding Jordan's desecration of Jewish Holy Places in and near Jerusalem?

Whose voice was lifted as the pall of silence fell over sites venerated by Jews through centuries of suffering and perseverance?

Below is a list of some of the acts of desecration carried out by the Jordanians after their invasion across the Jordan River in 1948.

The ancient Jewish quarter was ravaged and not a single Jew allowed to remain.

Every single Jewish institution in Jordanian-occupied Jerusalem was destroyed or defiled.

Not one of old Jerusalem's seven great main synagogues and not one of the dozens of smaller Jewish houses of worship survived Jordanian rule.

Graves in the cemetery on the Mount of Olives were bulldozed by Jordanians building a road through it for tourists. The remains were never reburied. Tombstones were used as flooring for Jodanian legion barracks and fortifications. The cemetery is in abject ruin.

The entry to the Tomb of the Patriarchs in Hebron was mined. The Hebron Jewish cemetery was razed, to be used for growing vegetables. The mass grave of those murdered in the Arab pogrom of 1929 was obliterated.

The Tomb of Simon the Just and the Sanhedrin caves were desecrated and littered with filth. The local Mukhtar (Mayor) Abu-Mustafa Sheikh Rashad explained this: "The Government in charge till now (Jordan) wanted it that way."

This is part of an appalling record, committed by Jordan and condoned by the silence of others. To this must be added the sealing of the Western (Wailing) Wall from the Jews, the sealing of the Mosque of Omar and Mecca from Israeli Moslems.

During nineteen years, Jordan did all this. Israel's record, on free access to Nazareth and Jerusalem is, on the other hand, impeccable. We are therefore convinced that the people who made Jerusalem the center of the world millenia ago, will keep Jerusalem's Holy Sites open to all faiths in dignity and respect.

Panama Canal Treaty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 19, 1967

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, we have been and are continuing to provide materiel to countries which in turn are delivering it to the Vietcong, who are using it in killing our boys.

Now we propose to give away the Panama Canal to render additional aid to our enemies, and hinder our own defense.

Mr. Speaker, when Abraham Lincoln stated that "If destruction is to be our lot, it will come from within," he was making a prophecy which is being fulfilled in our time. He did not indicate that we would commit suicide, but that we would act in a manner as to provide the tools of destruction, knowingly or unknowingly, to the eternal enemies of human freedom.

When Khrushchev said that he would "bury us," he did not dream that we would furnish the shovel with which to dig the grave. Soviet Russia has been and continues to be the mortal enemy of America, but we continue to give to Russia economic and military aid which has been and continues to be the source of destruction to our military forces in Vietnam, where our real enemy is the Soviet Union.

It is safe to say that 80 percent of the casualties to our American soldiers in Vietnam are inflicted by armaments made by Russia and her satellites. The administration continues to grant export licenses for the shipment to Russia and its satellites of a long list of strategic materiel, which finds its way into the Soviet arsenal of destruction. Under any definition, this is treason. If this suicidal course is not stopped immediately, together with stopping the delivery of these armaments to North Vietnam, the unnecessary slaughter will continue.

If Secretary McNamara continues to refuse to permit the military genius in America to win the war, according to the best military strategy, we should get out of South Vietnam, and return our boys to their families. Secretary McNamara has made nine trips to Vietnam, and he is no closer to a solution today than he was 8 years ago. It is time for a change.

And now comes the Panama Canal Treaty. For 10 years we have been on an appeasement course with Panama. The security of our country, and indeed the entire Western Hemisphere, is dependent upon our absolute ownership and control of the Panama Canal Zone. We should turn a deaf ear to so-called world opinion which is generated by the Communists. Under world opinion, we are charged with being imperialistic. If it takes imperialism to secure the safety of this country, let us be imperialistic. Alger Hiss first advocated, during the formation of the United Nations in 1945, that the Panama Canal should be internationalized. How that would suit the Communists. His suggestion failed, but the head shrinkers in the State Department have been implementing his suggestion ever since.

The Panama Canal Zone was bought and paid for by the United States, and is as much a part of the United States as is Alaska, which we purchased from Russia. We have been surrendering the Canal Zone piecemeal. In July 1945, President Truman proposed at Potsdam that the United States should give the Panama Canal to the U.N. In 1955, we increased our annuity payments to Panama from $430,000 to nearly $2 million. That same year we gave Panama $25 million worth of real estate and promised to build a $24 million bridge across the canal. Panama was not satisfied, and demanded 50 percent of the gross revenue, not the net.

In 1958, by the good graces of Dr. Milton Eisenhower, we told Panama that we would recognize its sovereignty over the Canal Zone, but the opposition in Congress refused to go along, so the Canal Zone was invaded and the Panamanian flag was planted in the Canal Zone. Shortly thereafter, the wizards in the State Department said that we would concede Panama's titular sovereignty in our Canal Zone. Thereafter, Congress passed a resolution to the effect that there should be no change in the traditional interpretation of our treaties with Panama. The intent of this resolution was that we should not permit the flag of Panama to be flown in the Canal Zone.

But in 1960, in spite of this resolution, President Eisenhower ordered that the Panamanian flag should be flown in the Canal Zone. In 1962, President Kennedy ordered the raising of the Panamanian flag over the American Canal Zone Administration Building. In 1963, the State Department agreed to permit the Panamanian flag anywhere in the Canal Zone; to recognize Panama's sovereign right to issue papers of authorization to foreign consuls operating in the Canal Zone; to use Panamanian postage in the Canal Zone; and to grant Panamanians in the Canal Zone all privileges equal to those of U.S. citizens, including U.S. social security benefits.

In 1963, our Canal Zone Governor ordered that the U.S. flag could no longer be flown at the U.S. courthouse or over American schools in the Canal Zone, nor could they fly the American flag at the Gamboa War Memorial inside the Canal Zone. Communists continue to incite riots by the Panamanians inside the Canal Zone in order to enforce their demands.

The three new treaties, which will be up for ratification by the Senate soon, will grant joint sovereignty, control, and operation of this vital and strategic canal. The first treaty abrogates the original agreement with Panama, the Hay-Bunau-Varilla Treaty of 1903, which guarantees our right to exercise our sovereignty in the Canal Zone in perpetuity. The second treaty provides the conditions under which a so-called sea level canal may be built, if such a canal should ever prove feasible. The third treaty concerns status-of-forces agreements for the defense of the canal, the Canal Zone, Panama, and the Western Hemisphere.

Joint sovereignty can result in sabotaging our control and the closing of the canal to military and commercial ships. This would be disastrous. Our warcraft would have to travel 10,000 miles additional to move from the Atlantic to the Pacific, or vice versa. This would be intolerable. There are Castro revolutionaries operating in Panama, and a takeover of the Republic of Panama by Castro poses a clear and present danger.

The United States can survive only by maintaining a superior military establishment and using that military power under the direction of our Joint Chiefs of Staff, not under the direction of the State Department, nor of Secretary McNamara.

A Nationwide System of Trails

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 19, 1967

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, as our urban centers and suburban areas grow ever more concentrated, as megalopolis stretches across our land devouring more and more of our open space, the necessity to preserve and develop our natural areas for recreational use becomes ever more critical.

More and more attention is being drawn to this need by both political leaders and publications of various kinds. They are greatly concerned about the urban dweller who rarely sees an unpolluted sky, who never experiences the solitude and beauty of the forest.

A nationwide system of trails has been proposed to enable our citizens to enjoy these natural assets. Under unanimous consent I include the following article by Eugene A. Kelley, entitled "Quiet Trails Through the Wilderness," from the May 1967 issue of Agenda, the magazine of the Industrial Union Department, AFL-CIO.

The article referred to follows:

Quiet Trails Through the Wilderness

(By Eugene A. Kelley)

It may be a man's subconscious nostalgia for Eden or it may be a profound need for getting away from noise, traffic and tension. Whatever it is, millions of Americans find contentment and relaxation in strolling through a wooded parkland or in purposeful hiking along established trails that stretch for miles.

Walking for pleasure is second only to driving for pleasure among the recreation activities of Americans. Billions have been spent and more will be spent to build ribbons of concrete that stretch from one ocean to the other. Against this vast expenditure which can be amply justified, only a pittance has gone for constructing or planning trails that would be safe for walkers and cyclists.

It now appears that trails will be established under federal auspices. Measures before Congress, backed by strong Administration support, would establish a nationwide system of trails. The key element in the system would be a network of national scenic trails.

These have been defined as extended trails which have natural, scenic or historic qualities that give them recreation-use potential of national significance. Such trails might typically be several hundred miles long, have overnight shelters at appropriate intervals, and be interconnected with other trails to allow the free enjoyment of extended hiking and riding activities.

There is something of the adventurer or discoverer in most of us. Exploring unfamiliar areas, quiet and unspoiled, is an ideal way to satisfy an urge common to young and old. An important feature of the national scenic trails is that they would be within the economic reach of all of our citizens.

The trails would be laid out to open to unaccustomed eyes the scenic grandeurs of ridge lines, mountain tops, pastoral areas, streams that tumble and cascade or glide placidly past, and the majesty of lakes and seashore. The trails would be built to harmonize with the natural areas they cross.

Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall and Agriculture Secretary Orville L. Freeman, whose departments are cooperating in advancing the cause of the scenic trail system, have both testified enthusiastically in favor of enabling legislation.

Secretary Udall declared: "A nationwide system of trails will open to all the opportunity to develop an intimacy with the wealth and splendor of America's outdoor world for a few hours at a time, or on one-day jaunts, overnight treks, or expeditions lasting a week or more.

"A system of trails carved through areas both near to, and far from, man and his works will provide many varied and memorable experiences for all those who utilize the trails."

Land acquisition costs for the four proposed national scenic trails are estimated at about $9,985,000. Development costs for the first five years are set at approximately $20 million, with annual operating and maintenance costs for all four trails after the first five years expected to be under $1.2 million.

A figure of less than $10 million for land acquisition is extremely modest and is based on the need to obtain land along those portions of the trails not already in public ownership. In such portions, it is estimated that about 25 acres per trail-mile might have to be acquired to give a right-of-way averaging about 200 feet in width.

Trails have always been integral to the development of our country. The first trails, they tell us, developed long before there was a country; made over the centuries by the restless movements of the vast buffalo herds in their quest for new grazing land, and later by the migration of the Indians as the seasons and their needs dictated.

Other trails have profound historical significance; their names still evoke stories of adventure, courage, bold imagination and sometimes of disaster. Many historians consider the Lewis and Clark expedition of 1804–06 as the single most important event in the development of the western United States, securing as it did the Louisiana Purchase and extending the young nation's claim to the Pacific Northwest. The Lewis and Clark Trail extended from St. Louis, Mo., to Oregon and Washington and the shores of the Pacific, then back.

Private non-government groups have been active for many years in the establishment and maintenance of trails. Probably the best known trail developed under private auspices is the world-famous Appalachian Trail that stretches for 2,000 miles across 14 states from near the Canadian border in Maine to Georgia.

Harold Allen caught the inspiration of the Appalachian Trail with this description: "Remote for detachment, narrow for chosen company, winding for leisure, lonely for contemplation, the Trail leads not merely north and south but upward to the body, mind and soul of man."

Quite logically, the Appalachian Trail, so long sustained by private groups in cooperation with the Forest Service and the National Park Service, would be one of the initial four national scenic trails established by the pending legislation.

The others:

The Continental Divide Trail, extending 3,100 miles generally along the Continental Divide from Silver City, N.M., to the Canadian Border.

The Pacific Crest Trail, extending 2,350 miles along the mountain ranges of the West Coast states from the border of Mexico to the Canadian line.

The Potomac Heritage Trail, reaching 825 miles along the Potomac River from its mouth in lower Chesapeake Bay to its headwaters in Pennsylvania and West Virginia.

Interior would administer the Appalachian and Potomac Heritage Trails and Agriculture would direct the Continental Divide and Pacific Crest Trails. Each office would select rights-of-way for the trails within their jurisdiction and provide appropriate markers.

These will be trails in almost every respect. They will be designed primarily for the walker and the cycler. The use of motor vehicles by the general public along the national scenic trails would be prohibited to preserve sanctuaries against traffic hazards, air pollution and those who might want to look-and-run.

It would be tragic indeed if Viet Nam or the race to the moon were to shunt passage of legislation preserving so much of our nation's grandeur for the leisurely, contemplative pace of the weekend walker. Generations that will follow us can be forgiven in advance of their displeasure with us if, looking at old photographs, they observe how we squandered and dissipated their heritage.

Brought to mind is the exchange that took place during the 1965 meeting of the National Association of Home Builders. A builder remarked, "I still think that it is good to save trees, but I don't understand why."

To which Dr. Abraham Kaplan, a philosopher, answered, "What is so good about it is that it is not experienced as the product of a design committee nor as the results of the efforts of an association of builders."

Population explosions, sprawling subdivisions that each year devour new reaches of countryside diminish what remains to Americans in terms of their natural, pristine land mass—mapped long ago as slightly more than 1.4 billion acres.

Proportionate use of this vast land area has changed relatively little in our century nor will it be altered too significantly by 1980. Urban areas, defined as communities of 2,500 or more population, occupied 23 million acres in 1900, 42 million acres in 1950 and will take up 60 million acres by 1980.

Public recreation areas covered only five million acres in 1900 but had expanded to 46 million acres by 1950 and by 1980 are expected to encompass 76 million acres. In land-use maps it is interesting to note that from the turn of the century to a projected 1980, grazing, which is a rankly inefficient use of the land, has had and will continue to have the largest allocation of our area.

The land planner is coming into his own and, it is hoped, will provide ample space for Americans to tramp amid comparative seclusion at their own gait from seashore to the majestic heights above the timberline. Thomas Carlyle, quoted by Josiah Strong in "Our Country," written in 1885, was mildly scornful of American faith in the efficacy of democracy or any other political theory. The reason, Carlyle said, "why your laboring folk are so happy is that you have a vast deal of land for a very few people."

We no longer have a very few people and the people are not compelled to work the long hours they did in Gordon's time or Carlyle's. A shorter workweek is inevitable, affording more and more millions an opportunity to get away from automation, regimentation, sweltering asphalt and the oppressive burdens of enduring them.

They will go—if the national scenic trails are established—to spots within easy travel where they can look at the clean sweep of a mountain range against a cloud-flecked sky or at the shimmering surface of a rustic lake or the seemingly endless reach of an upland meadow. They will get to these delights afoot or by cycle, unopposed by the demands of the clock, with time to let the eye roam from the arch of trees above to sidestep the clump of violets boldly disputing with them the path's center.

They will go by the millions. Some of them will be trained naturalists able to give Latin names to the flora they encounter. More, though, will admit they wouldn't know a poplar from a pawpaw tree but this will never detract a whit from their soul-satisfying pleasure with what they see and feel about them. In another way they are saying, "I may not know much about art but I know what I like."

There surely must be some deep-rooted significance in that man has given the names "Sea of Tranquility" and "Sea of Serenity" to two major areas of the moon's surface. There are few such place names on his earth except for those titled by imaginative developers of suburban acreage.

The costs for establishing and then maintaining national scenic trails available for countless Americans to enjoy is small indeed, especially when contrasted with the vast sums deemed essential to probe outer space of highly dubious value.

The Congress should act without delay to implement this ambitious program which can contribute so much to the physical and mental health of so many. Gratitude will not be long in arriving from those who discover the pleasures of a trail system nor from those who will use it many years from now, all of whom will say with Omar Khayyám that "wilderness were paradise enow."

Dr. Brzezinsky Comments on U.S. Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 19, 1967

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, in a recent issue of the State Department Bulletin, an article by Dr. Zbigniew Brzezinski, entitled "The Implications of Change for United States Foreign Policy," appeared. In this provocative and enlightening article, Dr. Brzezinski raised a number of important points which bear consideration in establishing our foreign relations.

We are all aware, I am certain, that our world is a world of rapid change. Often, however, we fail to recognize many of the qualities that make our era rather unique in world history. These factors must be examined in any effort toward achieving world peace.

Dr. Brzezinski points out that the United States stands today as the only true global power. Only our Nation is involved, in a real sense, throughout the world. Western Europe, the Soviet Union, and Communist China have become more or less regional in their spheres of influence and much more preoccupied with internal problems.

Second, Dr. Brzezinski says the role of universal ideologies in international relations is waning. The problems confronted by various nations differ so radically that one set of doctrines cannot be realistically applied throughout the world. Further, in many instances, the most strategic concerns are material in nature and expediency becomes the overriding consideration. In this regard, social and political differences among the world powers lose their significance in the establishment of alliances.

At the same time, Dr. Brzezinski says we are witnessing the decline of the importance of the nation-state ideal. Man has—since the beginning of time—sought to organize himself into some sort of group. A view of world history reveals a trend toward the expansion of this grouping: from the family, to the village, to the town, to the province, to the nation. Today we see a mounting orientation toward regional associations. This trend is driven by myriad contributing factors—among which economics and communications appear most significant.

Mr. Speaker, this point is one of special importance to me. I have long been concerned that we develop more regional agencies in the Pacific community. I agree with Dr. Brzezinski that a growing desire for this sort of organization and affiliation exists; the underdeveloped nations especially seek to cooperate in progress toward stability and integrity. If this thrust is met by a complementary desire from the developed nations, such as ourselves, we stand to make great gains. In this way, we have before us the opportunity to bring lasting peace to the Pacific community. The means are simply a spirit of mutual friendship and assistance. The end would be a group of nations, corporate in some senses, but individually able to stand alone, responsibility.

We may look with pride to many achievements already realized in this regard. The United Nations established in 1952 the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East—ECAFE—in order to promote regional cooperation in trade, in commodity production and export, in shipping, and in industrial development; much progress has come from this agency.

More recently we have seen the establishment of the Asian Development Bank, "a long-range development plan for all of Southeast Asia, led by Asians, to improve the life of Asians." Many other regional organizations have contributed to the spirit of "community," including the Mekong River Basin development project and the Asian and Pacific Cooperation Council; and more are in the planning stages. At the same time, trade among nations has increased vastly and assistance from countries with strong economies to underdeveloped nations has flourished. A real foundation has been cemented—what remains is for the nations of the Pacific community to work together in the construction of a solid edifice of friendship and cooperation upon it.

These three qualities of the present world situation have great importance for the formulation of American foreign policy. We have a responsibility, as the foremost global power, to remain involved in world affairs, yet the nature of that involvement requires serious consideration. The spirit of our efforts must be one of community. We must work in cooperation with other nations—both the underdeveloped and the stable countries of the world. We must strive vigorously to reconcile differences existing on all levels. We must address ourselves, essentially, to narrowing the gap that exists today between the leading governments and from there establish a basis for lasting friendly relations. Only through a sincere spirit of cooperation among the world's developed nations can we ever hope for lasting world peace.

Mr. Speaker, I commend to the consideration of my colleagues Dr. Brzezinski's article. I congratulate him on his fine effort.

The article follows:

THE IMPLICATIONS OF CHANGE FOR FOREIGN POLICY

(By Zbigniew Brzezinski)

(NOTE.—"What is really changing in international politics?" In his remarks before the Department of State's national foreign policy conference for editors and broadcasters on May 22, Mr. Brzezinski, a member of the

Department's Policy Planning Council, analyzed five major changes in international politics and their implications for U.S. foreign policy. His remarks were made on a "background" basis, and he has edited them for publication in the Bulletin.)

International politics is dominated by crises. The result is that we often mistake these crises for the reality of international politics. Going from crisis to crisis, we simply lose sight of the more basic and often more important changes that imperceptibly reshape the world in which we live.

It is useful, therefore, sometimes to pause and ask in a detached way: What is the nature of our era? What is really changing in international politics? By posing these questions we become better equipped to discuss the implications of historical trends for U.S. foreign policy. Definition of a broad framework of that kind in turn enables us to see in sharper relief our true interests and goals in specific regions of the world, such as Europe or Asia. Accordingly, in these remarks I would like to first turn to the problem of change in international politics and then discuss the implications of these changes for the U.S. posture in world affairs.

As I look at international politics, I see five major changes taking place, together fundamentally altering the nature of international relations in our day. The changes are not obvious, because they are slow; but their cumulative impact is most important.

WANING OF IDEOLOGICAL CONFLICTS

1. *The first involves the waning of ideological conflicts among the more developed nations of the world.*

Since the time of the French Revolution, conflicts between states have been profoundly emotionalized by mass struggles induced by a mixture of ideology and nationalism. Where that mixture was particularly intense, as in the case of nazism, the conflicts which resulted were particularly bloody and destructive. By and large, during the last 150 years or so relations among the more advanced states, particularly in Europe, have been poisoned by the emotionalizing impact of absolute doctrinal answers concerning most of the basic issues of humanity.

This condition is waning due to a variety of factors.

First of all, nuclear weapons have necessitated greater and greater restraint in relations among states. The realization of the enormous destructiveness of nuclear conflict has had a most sobering effect on statesmen. Hitherto one could calculate the cost and the potential advantages of war; today, this simply is no longer possible, and thus even the most bitter ideological hatreds have to be restrained by common sense.

Secondly, just as important, we are realizing more fully that social change is such an enormously complex and interrelated process, with so many variables, that it cannot be reduced to a few simple ideological formulas, as was the case in the early stages of industrialization. Ideological attitudes are thus giving way to a problem-solving, engineering approach to social change.

Thirdly, communism, the principal, and until recently the most militant, revolutionary ideology of our day, is dead—communism is dead as an ideology in the sense that it is no longer capable of mobilizing unified global support. On the contrary, it is increasingly fragmented by conflicts among constituent units and parties. This has contributed to ideological disillusionment among its members. Communist states, Communist movements, and Communist subversion are still very important on the international scene, but Communist ideology as a vital force is no longer with us.

Revolutionary movements in different parts of the world instead relate themselves more specifically to local radical traditions and try to exploit local opportunities. Thus, the common doctrine and its alleged universal validity are being diluted by specific adaptations. The process is destroying the universal appeal and global effectiveness of ideology.

All of that, cumulatively, prompts the waning of the ideological age in relations, particularly among the developed nations. The role of ideology is still quite important in relations among the less developed states, where problems are simpler, where issues can be translated into black-and-white propositions, and where absolute doctrinal categories still appear superficially relevant.

SHIFT IN FOCUS OF VIOLENCE

2. *Closely connected with the waning ideological conflicts among the more developed nations of the world is the decline of violence among these states.* During approximately the last 150 years, the international scene has been dominated by conflicts fought principally among the more advanced and largely European nations of the world. The focus of violence today is shifting to the third world. Increasingly, conflicts are either between some of the developed nations and the less developed nations; or increasingly, instability in the underdeveloped world is itself the source of global tensions. It is thus a basic reversal of the dominant pattern of the recent past.

The new restraint on violence displayed by the more advanced states in relations among one another is also largely due to the nuclear age. It should be acknowledged that without the presence of nuclear weapons a major war probably would have erupted in the course of the last 20 years. Given the range of conflicts, the frequent tensions, and the occasional clashes between the United States and the Soviet Union, in almost any other era in history a war between them probably would have ensued. The presence of nuclear weapons has introduced an overriding factor of restraint into relations among the more advanced states and has helped to preserve world peace.

This restraint is still largely absent insofar as relations among the less developed states are concerned. Moreover, the ideological passions and the nationalist tensions have not yet run their full course; and consequently the propensity toward total reactions, total commitment, and total violence is still quite high.

Without discussing the pros and cons of the Vietnamese war, it offers a good example of the generalization made above. It reflects the shift of focus in global affairs from conflicts between the developed states to a conflict that involves a wealthy and highly advanced country in an effort to create regional stability. The unwillingness of the Soviet Union to become totally involved in the conflict stems from the greater realization of its own interest in preserving peace in the nuclear age and also from the gradual waning of its ideology, which weakens its sense of total identification with every revolutionary movement in the world.

TREND TOWARD POSTNATIONALISM

3. *The third generalization is the proposition that we are witnessing the end of the supremacy of the nation-state on the international scene.* This process is far from consummated, but nonetheless the trend seems to me to be irreversible. It is not only a matter of security interdependence among allied states. It is also a matter of psychological change. People through history have expanded their sense of identification. At first, men identified themselves with their families, then with their villages, then with their towns, then with their regions and provinces, then with their nations. Now increasingly people are beginning to identify with their continents and regions. This change has been induced by the necessities of economic development and of the technological revolution, by changes in the means of communication—all of which cause people to identify themselves more and more with wider, more global human interests.

GLOBAL POWER OF THE UNITED STATES

4. *The fourth major change which has taken place in our times is the emergence of the United States as the preponderant world power.* The conventional view is that since 1945 we have seen three basic stages of international development: First of all, U.S. nuclear monopoly; secondly, biopolarity, based on two homogeneous alliances rigidly confronting each other; and now increasingly polycentrism, with many states playing the international game.

I submit that this is a wrong perspective; in fact, the sequence has been the opposite. The first postwar era—1945–50—was essentially a polycentric era. The Unied States was largely disarmed. It had a nuclear monopoly, to be sure, but its nuclear power was essentially apocalyptic; it was not applicable—it was only usable in circumstances which everyone wished to avoid—hence it was not politically relevant. The United States was disarmed, it was only beginning to be involved in Europe, hardly involved in Asia—and there were still two major empires on the scene, the French and the British. The Russians were asserting their regional control over Central Europe, but they were not yet involved in Asia. Asia itself was in turmoil. This truly was the polycentric era.

It gave way to the era of bipolarity, of dichotomic confrontation, if you will, between two alliances—one led by the Soviet Union, one led by the United States. The Soviet Union during this time acquired nuclear capacity, and under Khrushchev it misjudged its nuclear power and attempted to pursue between 1958 and 1962 a policy designed to assert Soviet global supremacy. These years were dominated by the Soviet effort to throw the West out of Berlin, to put missiles in Cuba and to force a showdown. However, Khrushchev discovered in 1962 that the Soviet Union still had only apocalyptic power. Its nuclear power was not relevant when faced with U.S. power, which by then had become much more complex and much more usable in a far greater diversity of situations.

Thus in the last few years the United States successfully stared Khrushchev down in Cuba, it protected its interests in the Dominican Republic and in the Congo—and today it is doing it in Viet-Nam. Yet the Soviet Union did not dare to react even in the area of its regional domination: Berlin. Today, the Soviet Union is in effect a regional power, concentrating primarily on Europe and on the growing danger from China. Our power during this ensuing period has become applicable power, with a long-range delivery system, with the means of asserting itself on the basis of a global reach.

Moreover, recent years—and this is much more important—have witnessed continued economic growth in this country; they have seen the expansion and appearance on the world scene of U.S. technological know-how. Increasingly, the U.S. way of life, our styles, our patterns of living, are setting the example. Today, if there is a creative society in the world, it is the United States—in the sense that everyone, very frequently without knowing it, is imitating it. However, paradoxically because the United States is the only global power, it finds it increasingly difficult to concentrate its resources or its policy on any specific region of the world. This often creates sharp, dilemmas and difficulties with which we will have to live because our involvement is also a major factor of stability in the world.

THE GROWING FRAGMENTATION OF THE WORLD

5. *The fifth major change involves the growing fragmentation of the world, not only between the developed states and the under-*

developed—which is, of course, much talked about—but the increasing fragmentation of the developed world. I have particularly in mind the growing difference between the United States and the rest of the advanced world. The United States is becoming a new society, a society no longer shaped by the impact of the industrial process on social, economic, and political life. That impact still shapes European life; if you look at the changes in the nature of the European political elite, if you look at problems of employment or unemployment or welfare, if you look at efforts to create greater access to education in Europe—all of these are manifestations of the impact of the industrial process on a formerly rural and traditional society.

The United States is no longer in this kind of historical era. Increasingly, our social dilemmas are of leisure, well-being, automation, psychic well-being, alienation of the youth (usually from well-to-do middle-class families). All of that is connected with a standard of living which has become relatively stable and high, connected with a society which is well-to-do but in many respects has new dilemmas of purpose and meaning. We are becoming, in effect, a post-industrial society, in which computers and communications are shaping more and more our way of life. Our education and our image of the world are shaped more by television and less and less by sequential, logical media such as books and newspapers. If the Europeans are today experiencing the automobile revolution—which extends physical mobiltiy—Americans are undergoing an electronic revolution, which extends our senses and nervous systems.

All of this induces new perspectives and new attitudes and sharpens the difference between us and the rest of the developed world. It also creates underlying tension, in addition to the obvious problems of foreign policy, such as the Kennedy Round, the problem of NATO, the problem of East-West relations, and so forth.

U.S. FOREIGN POLICY IN A TIME OF CHANGE

If there is any merit in this highly generalized analysis of the nature of change in our time, what are its implictaions for U.S. foreign policy?

First of all, we should not become ideological latecomers. We have traditionally been the pragmatic society, free of ideological shackles. It would be unfortunate if now we suocumbed to internal and external ideologization, either because of belated anti-Communist rigidity at a time when the Communist world is becoming fragmented or because of radical reactions to internal dilemmas, the new dilemmas of our society that I spoke about. It would be unfortunate if these new dilemmas, inherent in the United States' becoming a new type of society, were irsponded to on the basis of essentially irrelevant, outmoded, 19th-century ideological formulations. Yes, this is the great danger, particularly with the New Left, which is looking for ideological guidance and only too often turns to outmoded anarchistic, Trotskyite, or nihilistic doctrines, doctrines completely irrelevant to the new dilemmas of our society.

Secondly, in our foreign policy we ought to avoid the prescriptions of the extreme right or the extreme left. The right only too often says, erroneously, that to protect a better America we ought to stay out of the world. The New Left says that to build a better America we have to stay out of the world. Both are wrong, because today our global involvement and our preponderance of power is such that our disinvolvement would create international chaos of enormous proportions. Our involvement is a historical fact—there is no way of ending it. One can debate about the forms it ought to take, about its scope and the way it is applied, but one cannot any longer debate in absolutist terms should we or should we not be involved.

Thirdly, we should not underestimate, because of our own historical formation, the role of revolutionary nationalism in the world. While we have to pursue the task of building a world of cooperative communities, we have to realize that revolutionary nationalism is a stage of development which in many cases cannot be avoided. We should therefore be very careful not to get overinvolved in conflicts, with the result that we are pitched against revolutionary nationalisms, making us appear as impediments to social change.

This raises the extremely complicated issue of intervention. Under what conditions should we or should we not intervene? It is extraordinarily difficult to define clear-cut criteria; but as a broad generalization, it might be said that intervention is justified whenever its absence will create regional instability of expanding proportions. It has to be judged largely on its international merits and not in terms of specific domestic consequences within individual states. It is that distinction which justifies intervention—it is that distinction which warrants our involvement today in the effort to create regional stability in Southeast Asia.

Fourthly, in seeking ties with the developed nations of the world, particularly with Western Europe, we have to emphasize in addition to specific political and security arrangements, increasingly efforts addressed to the fundamental social dilemmas which are inherent in the widening gap between the United States and Western Europe. We ought to try to share and distribute our new knowledge and technological skills, because this is the unique asset of the postindustrial society. At the same time we should try to make the industrial societies more aware of the novel character of our problems. By learning from us they can perhaps avoid some of our difficulties. We have to forge new social bonds, especially between our younger generation and the younger Europeans—and urgently so, for we are at a time in history when the two continents find themselves in different historical eras.

Finally, to apply these remarks cumulatively and briefly to Europe: Since the ideological age is waning, since the developed world is increasingly becoming the zone of tranquility, since the United States is playing a predominant role in the world, and since we are in a new historical era which gives us special assets, it is our task to develop a broader approach for Europe, the purpose of which, as the President said on October 7th,[1] is to end gradually through reconciliation the cold war, a remnant of the civil war that has divided the most advanced parts of the world for the last 150 years.

Thus we need to adapt the Atlantic concept to the post-cold-war era. We should strive increasingly to shape a community of the developed nations which will contain four basic components: The United States; a more homogeneous and integrated Western Europe in close ties with the United States but also in increasingly close linkage with Eastern Europe; an Eastern Europe which will gradually begin to stand on its own feet and engage in subregional integration more independently of the Soviet Union while in turn retaining its ties with the Soviet Union; a Soviet Union which would also be drawn into constructive relationships with Western Europe and the United States.

Only by developing such a community of the developed nations, of which Japan should naturally be a member, can we try to assure a measure of order to a world which otherwise will be increasingly dominated by chaos.

If we look 20 years ahead, we can see clearly a challenge to the survival of organized society in several parts of the world. When we look 20 years ahead in the developed parts of the world and particularly in the United States, where the scientific, technological, medical, and chemical revolutions are progressing most rapidly, we can increasingly see a challenge to the individual as a mysterious, autonomous human being.

We cannot effectively respond to these twin challenges if we are at the same time preoccupied with ideological and doctrinal conflicts which no longer have much relevance to the fundamental concerns of our day. Given the traditional American quest for human freedom and today's U.S. global power, we have the opportunity and the responsibility to take the lead in responding to these twin challenges.

Saratoga

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLETON J. KING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 19, 1967

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, Saratoga Springs, N.Y., the oldest and most famous of all American spas, is still going strong. While visitors no longer pack their finery in a Saratoga trunk, throngs are as numerous and lively as ever, for Saratoga, just as in the Gay Nineties, is "where the action is."

For those who want "action" in the special sense meant by "improvers of the breed," there is the thoroughbred racing under the auspices of the New York Racing Association throughout the month of August. There is also a full schedule of harness racing from June through October.

Since pre-Revolutionary days, Saratoga has been known throughout the world for its healthful baths and healing waters. The State maintains a beautiful complex for those wishing to take its baths.

While horseracing is still the No. 1 attraction of the city, a new business came on the scene last year and is luring more and more visitors to this city of health, history, and horses. I am speaking of the new Performing Arts Center in Saratoga Springs. Having received national publicity since its official opening in 1966, the Saratoga Performing Arts Center has provided moments of magnificent artistic achievement to countless people from all over the United States.

I wish to take this opportunity to salute Governor and Mrs. Nelson A. Rockefeller and all those who helped in the establishment of the Saratoga Performing Arts Center. Their recognition and encouragemen of the creative arts, has been a real boon to Saratoga Springs and has further enhanced New York State as the music capital of the world.

One of the finest articles I have read on the new performing arts center was written recently by Mr. Frank Sullivan, a distinguished writer and native Saratogian, whom I have had the pleasure of knowing for many years. While regarded as a humorist of the first rank, he is also a man of charm, vitality and warmth, known and loved by all. I know of no one who is held in higher regard than Frank in my hometown. We, in Saratoga, are proud of him.

---

[1] For President Johnson's address at New York, N.Y., on Oct. 7, 1966, see Bulletin of Oct. 24, 1966, p. 622.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include Mr. Sullivan's stimulating article entitled "Saratoga," in which he has offered a persuasive appraisal of the Saratoga Performing Arts Center.

The article follows:

SARATOGA

(By Frank Sullivan)

In the 1930s Dr. Serge Koussevitsky came to Saratoga early for several summers, leased a house and took a thorough rest cure and course of mineral baths. Then, relaxed and restored, the maestro journeyed on to Tanglewood to lead his Boston Symphony in the August concerts there. I felt at the time that it was a friendly and neighborly thing for my home town, Saratoga, to act as physician and masseur and get Tanglewood's illustrious chief in top shape for the season, and I was glad, remembering the many pleasant evenings when I had sat on the lawn at Tanglewood listening to him and the Boston Symphony make splendid music. At the same time I had a slightly envious feeling that since Dr. Koussevitsky found Saratoga so healthful and attractive he owed it to us to stay here, send for his musicians and give his concerts to Saratoga. This was the last word in pipe dreams and wishful thinking. Other Saratogians and friends of Saratoga had something of the same kind of dream of a summer music festival for the Spa but at that time nobody saw any possibility of the dream becoming reality.

But it has. Wonderfully and bountifully it has come true in a measure to astonish the most incorrigible optimist. In July of 1966 the Spa became the summer home of the illustrious New York City Ballet and in August came the great Philadelphia Orchestra. I could not say just when the dreaming and the wishful thinking left off and someone took that first actual step leading to 1966 and the birth of The Saratoga Performing Arts Center. So many have had a share in it that it would be invidious to single anyone as the master mind, but one thing is clear. If Governor Nelson Rockefeller had not thrown the influence of the State behind the Saratoga Performing Arts Center, and if in addition he and his brothers had not made such handsome personal contributions, the task would have been much more difficult. The State contributed the site on which The Saratoga Performing Arts Center stands and spent nearly a million dollars readying it. It was fitting that it was Governor Rockefeller who officiated at the groundbreaking for The Saratoga Performing Arts Center amphitheatre on June 30, 1964.

For me, I think the first tangible evidence that something very fine might happen came one autumn night a few years ago when an audience crowded the Spa Theatre to hear Edward Villella talk about the ballet and to watch him and Patricia McBride dance excerpts from familiar ballets, to music from a record player. It was a miniature ballet perfomance in itself, by two artists whose stature has steadily increased as their careers progress. (Notice that I did *not* say their stature had progressed by Leaps and Bounds; it took some self-control to refrain, but I managed it! Many of those present that night were more or less familiar with ballet. Some were not. But for many of us that was the moment when Saratoga Performing Arts Center became a reality; a tiny reality but a reality nonetheless.

The Saratoga Performing Arts Center is the greatest boon Saratoga has been granted in many a year. In fact it is one of the four great milestones in the long history of the resort. The first, on a day in 1767, when Mohawk braves, whose tribe had long known of the healing powers of the waters at Saratoga, carried their ailing friend, Sir William Johnson, here. He was the first white man to take the cure, and it worked. He arrived on a litter borne by his Indian friends and left, able to walk. Thus was the Spa launched on its long career as a health resort. The second milestone? That came on a summer day in 1863 when the first race was run at Saratoga, starting the resort on its century-long career as one of the greatest racing centers in the country.

The third milestone came in 1909 when New York State put a stop to the depletion of the springs by private interests, took over ownership of them and began the development of the Spa park in a glade of which the handsome Saratoga Performing Arts Center amphitheatre now stands. And now, the fourth milestone, the coming of The Philadelphia Orchestra and the New York City Ballet tc make the Spa their summer home. Long may they thrive here!

The Saratoga Performing Arts Center is the symbol and precursor of a new era in Saratoga, a token of its emergence from the past and its entrance upon a future its friends hope will be as notable as its past was. The old days are gone, not only in Saratoga but everywhere. The advent of the automobile at about the turn of the century marked the beginning of the end of the tranquil Saratoga of the great hotels to which guests came in June and settled down to stay all summer, taking the waters, walking out to the racetrack or rocking placidly on the verandas of the hotels. Those hotels disappeared one by one, anachronisms succumbing to the March of So-Called Progress. First went Congress Hall, the Kensington, the Clarendon, the Windsor and others. Then, in 1946, the famous United States fell victim and last and perhaps finest of them all, the Grand Union, which was knocked down in 1952.

Knocked down unnecessarily, it is said. Learning that the Grand Union was to go, a wealthy friend of Saratoga whose family has long been prominent in racing offered to buy the hotel, planning to restore it. But the wreckers who had got possession of the hotel reacted to this generous offer by hoisting the price; the philanthropist withdrew, and the hotel came down. So runs the story. That tragedy still rankles Saratoga.

The town has been noted for its elm-shaded avenues. They are not as elm-shaded these days as they were before the confounded elm blight arrived, though Saratoga is not alone in suffering from this pest. Many elms have had to be taken down but new trees—maples, this time—are being planted to replace them. A series of fires has also plagued the town in the past decade and Broadway still bears the scars. One of the worst destroyed Convention Hall, a majestic auditorium which in its lengthy life had been host to many historic political conventions and other gatherings. A new convention hall and civic center is planned.

The big hotels on Broadway gave the street a kind of grandeur which was lost when they departed. If the visitor who comes to see the ballet or hear a concert comes into town and notices an undue number of gaps where buildings had stood, they are not all the results of fires. An urban renewal project is underway and unsightly old buildings in the center of the town are being razed. The planners hope eventually to give Broadway a handsome face lift.

Gone is Canfield's, the most sumptuous palace of chance Saratoga has ever seen. The Casino still stands, in Congress Park, and is now the property of the city. Canfield's was a dignified establishment and Richard Canfield himself was a dignified-looking man, so sedate that the painter Whistler called him "His Reverence." As a boy in short pants, along with others of my set, I would stand outside the Canfield entrance in that Pleistocene Age to watch the Vanderbilts and other swells drive up for dinner and an evening of roulette or faro. The only celebrity we appleknocker urchins could identify was Lillian Russell. How could even a small boy miss that lovely and opulent vision? But we never crowded around for autographs, as the intrepid youth of today would. We would have gotten our ears pinned back by the Canfield gendarmerie if we had. One remembers too the raucous and frenetic gaiety of the 1920's when the town was wide open and the roulette wheels clicked at a dozen plush casinos, and some not so plush. Gone are the croupiers of yesteryear but the citizen bent on speculation can of course still try his luck at either the flat track or the Raceway, where the trotters perform in the evening. All this quite legally now, with the benison of the State—and with an internal revenue agent close by the pari-mutuel window to collect Uncle Sam's share in case you win more than $600.

The Spa has never been blessed with anything like the Performing Arts Center. The nearest approach to a resident orchestra Saratoga has seen was conducted by Victor Herbert at the turn of the century. It played nightly on the court veranda of the Grand Union during the season. There is a pretty story that Mr. Herbert was strolling in the garden of the hotel one night after his concert when he overheard a young lover say to his lass (or vice versa) "Kiss me again!" Inspired by love's young dream Mr. Herbert went instantly to his room and composed his famous "Kiss Me Again." Aged parties will recall with nostalgia Mme. Fritzi Scheff singing that tender love song in "Mlle. Modiste." Others more recently may have undergone less inspired renditions of the classic by off-key sopranos under the delusion that they could trill it as well as Fritzi did.

Before The Saratoga Performing Arts Center became a reality there were a few Nervous Nellies who feared the ballet and the orchestra could not compete with the races. They suspected the summer visitors would be too busy evenings figuring tomorrow's winners. These Cassandras were wrong. Visitors attending the races here last summer were diligent patrons of the Saratoga Performing Arts Center and wealthy summer cottagers and horseowners have from its inception been among the most generous contributors to the more than $4,000,000 it took to establish The Saratoga Performing Arts Center. In any case there could be no thought of depending entirely on Saratoga patronage. The Thruway and the Northway superhighways have made access to Saratoga many times easier than it was even a few years ago, and enables the Saratoga Performing Arts Center to draw its audiences from an area with a population of 25,000,000.

Thus Saratoga moves briskly into a new era. The Saratoga Performing Arts Center moves through its second season. The old racetrack out Union Avenue observes its 104th birthday this year, and is going stronger than ever. Skidmore College, which from modest beginnings a half century ago has occupied an increasingly large sector of the town's center, has outgrown that area and is bursting at the seams. So it made the intrepid but wise decision some years ago to pack up bag and baggage and move two miles to the other side of town, to a new campus affording plenty of room for the expansion Skidmore must be prepared for in the coming decades. The move is well under way and in due course the handsome new campus will be occupied. It may be some kind of a first that an entire college stages a moving day on so grand a scale but it is all being done smoothly and expeditiously under the direction of Dr. Joseph C. Palamountain, Skidmore's new and energetic president.

Last year the talkative brook in Geyser Park near The Saratoga Performing Arts Center amphitheatre struck Maestro Ormandy as a potential disturber of his concerts and engineers accordingly took appropriate steps with dams and other contrivances to hush its babbling while the concerts were on. The rains have been copious this spring and the brook has been behaving boisterously, in a manner one feels sure that Alfred Lord Tennyson, sole proprietor of the poetic rights to brooks, would frown on, but no doubt the engineers will rise to the occasion and squelch the brook again. Maestro Ormandy has one consolation: airplanes are not a menace here. I recall the intermittent bedlam at the Lewisohn Stadium concerts when airplanes from LaGuardia Field roared overhead in the middle of a symphony.

So godspeed to Balanchine and Ormandy and the Saratoga Performing Arts Center in their second season.

Captive Nations Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 19, 1967

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, since the founding of our Republic, U.S. citizens have proudly proclaimed their belief in man's right to live in freedom with individual liberty. The great patriots of our American Revolution, the authors of our Declaration of Independence, Constitution and Bill of Rights were inspired by a single precept—that all men are created equal, that they have inalienable rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. In order that Americans might be free to determine their own destiny, our forefathers molded a democratic government, of the people, propelled by the principle of government by the consent of the governed. Since the birth of our Nation, the American people have prospered under this form of government. For nearly 200 years, government by the consent of the governed has elevated the United States of America into a position of being the strongest, most prosperous nation in the world today. We Americans have faith in self-government. The daring experiment of our American colonies was unequivocally successful.

It is for this reason that we so adamantly deplore the situation of the many subjugated peoples on this earth. It is for this reason that we cry out against all forms of dictatorship and tyranny over the mind of man. It is for this reason that, in 1959, the U.S. Congress issued a resolution proclaiming Captive Nations Week. Each year during the third week in July, the people of the United States and the free world give special tribute to some 23 nations whose citizens are not free. We extend to these captive peoples our heartfelt compassion and we reassert our strong belief that no government of one nation has the moral or ethical right to impose its governing system on the peoples of another nation.

The week of July 16–22, 1967, is the ninth observance of Captive Nations Week, and we of the Congress, together with all U.S. citizens and freedom-loving peoples the world over, rededicate ourselves to the cause of liberty for all mankind. In the words of President Johnson's last Captive Nations Week proclamation:

> We give renewed devotion to the just aspirations of all people for national independence and human liberty.

Emergency Labor Dispute Situation

SPEECH
OF

HON. ROBERT TAFT, JR.

OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 17, 1967

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, when the railway labor dispute of 1963 came to the floor of the House of Representatives with a recommendation that amounted to compulsory arbitration, I stated as follows:

> The President's message to the Congress, and the Joint Resolution introduced pursuant to that message, amounts to nothing more than compulsory arbitration and "passing the buck" until after the 1964 election. The adoption of the Administration's resolution seems sure to weaken rather than strengthen the collective bargaining processes in transportation, and perhaps sets a precedent in all industries.

Unfortunately, this prediction has turned out to be true, and the course of labor relations in the railroad industry has been downward ever since. It has now arrived at a point where the administration says, and the Senate echoes, that no solution other than compulsory arbitration is possible. To me this is defeatism and admission that we are unwilling to face up to the realities of the entire emergency labor relations picture in the United States today. That picture, unfortunately, has developed to the point where, in a major industry, there are few disputes that can be settled without intervention by the Government on one side or the other. The difficulty with this is that the prospect of governmental interference being virtually assured, or even worse, the compulsory arbitration being certain as it is under House Joint Resolution 559, neither management nor labor will have incentive to lay their cards on the table to see where areas of agreement may be arrived at and what eventual settlement can be worked out between the parties.

In spite of the Vietnam war and the delay that has already occurred as a result of the brief strike that we have had, it is my feeling that the Congress can and should immediately find a better solution. As a temporary expedient, the alternative offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], offered this opportunity and continues to offer it. For these reasons, I could not support House Joint Resolution 559, since it is my conviction that it will lead to a weakening of collective bargaining; and collective bargaining is an absolute essential of our private enterprise system. Sooner or later, the Congress is going to have to face up to this situation. Let us hope that even though House Joint Resolution 559 is about to become law, we will continue in this session of Congress to seek for better solutions to the emergency labor dispute situation.

Fairness Doctrine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 19, 1967

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the South Carolina Broadcasters Association, meeting at their 20th annual summer convention, unanimously adopted a resolution opposing the Federal Communication Commission's recent application of the fairness doctrine to cigarette advertising. This resolution is a most timely expression of the views of the South Carolina broadcasters, and I was highly impressed with its thoughtful and well-considered message. I commend it to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress, to the people of the country:

> RESOLUTION UNANIMOUSLY ADOPTED BY SOUTH CAROLINA BROADCASTERS ASSOCIATION, MYRTLE BEACH, S.C., JULY 10, 1967
>
> We, the Broadcasters of South Carolina gathered for our State Convention, are aware that the Commission's ruling in the WCBS-TV case has as its basic and worthy objective the attainment of an informed audience with respect to controversial issues of public importance. The ruling does not require the broadcaster to provide equal time to those who oppose his advertising of cigarettes, nor does it force upon the broadcaster the selection of any self appointed adversary.
>
> Nevertheless we view with deep concern the novel extension of Commission authority to stand in judgment of articles of commerce, as distinguished from issues of public controversy.
>
> The American system of broadcasting is made possible by advertiser support. Advertisers will not long remain in radio and television if each paid announcement triggers a contentious reply.
>
> The Commission action discriminates against broadcasting. Newspaper, magazine and other important advertising media—all beyond reach of the Commission's jurisdiction—will continue to afford the cigarette advertiser an unhampered means to convey his message.
>
> The Federal Trade Commission is a more appropriate administrative body to protect the public health and to regulate advertising copy. The rulings of that agency—and its Cease and Desist orders are issued after deliberate hearings involving expert knowledge, and access to laboratory analysis. Moreover, the F. C. C. and the broadcaster have historically taken notice of F. T. C. rulings, and broadcasters have required conformity to these rulings on the part of their advertisers.
>
> Therefore, be it resolved—that the South Carolina Broadcasters Association—respectfully expresses to the Federal Communications Commission:
>
> 1) its solemn conclusion that the Fairness Doctrine should not be applied to the advertising of articles of commerce, and
>
> 2) that the Commission should promptly clarify the practical application of its cigarette ruling by making it abundantly clear that the broadcasters' judgment will alone determine whether he has discharged his responsibility to inform his audience,
>
> 3) and finally, that the Commission will henceforth rely upon the Federal Trade Commission or other appropriate federal agency, having jurisdiction over all advertising media—to regulate the advertising of products in interstate commerce.

Mr. Truett Thomas, of Big Spring, Tex., Wonders What Has Happened to Our Country

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1967

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, last year I made an address in Dallas to the chamber of commerce entitled "What Is Happening To Our Country?" It was received with an overwhelming response which served to point out to me that there were a great deal more concerned citizens than I thought there were.

Today's mail brought me a letter from Mr. Truett Thomas, of Big Spring, Tex., a veteran of World War II, a patriotic citizen, and one who is concerned with the state of our Nation, and one who gave his only son in Vietnam. I commend it to every Member of this body for their consideration.

The letter follows:

BIG SPRING, TEX.,
July 11, 1967.

Hon. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. TEAGUE: Having just finished reading your remarks to the House of Representatives on April 28, 1967 regarding Vietnam, I would like to take just a few minutes of your time regarding Vietnam and other world situations.

Here is a little background on myself. I am 57 years of age and a veteran of World War II. I am not now a member of the Democratic Party, the Republican Party, the John Birch Society or any other organization that is not one hundred per cent for Americanism as was first outlined in the original Declaration of Independence. In other words, I am an American for America. My boy was killed in service in Vietnam on the 14th of April 1966 and I would like to console myself by realizing that he did not die in vain. We have numerous citations, medals, etc.; including the Bronze Star, Purple Heart and some Vietnam medals which testify of his service to his country.

For years I was Adjutant of the local American Legion Post, Howard County 355, and immediately following World War II the American Legion stood for something as did many organizations at that time. I think you realize without my saying, that all organizations including our Federal Government have deteriorated patriotically speaking beyond the point of no return. As a veteran of World War II and an active member of the American Legion my prime objective for years and years in Big Spring, Texas has been that of fighting communism. I agree with you one hundred per cent that communism must be eradicated in Vietnam the same as other parts of the world. But, Mr. Teague, let's face reality and call "a spade a spade" and "communism communism" regardless of where it may be found. I see no difference in a communist in North Vietnam or Washington, D.C. or Big Spring Texas. So, this brings me to the question that I have wanted someone to answer since the death of my only son in Vietnam. *Why spend our boys lives and untold billions of dollars fighting communism in Vietnam and at the very same moment aiding, abetting, condoning, financing and protecting communism in the United States?*

I say that our Federal Government is doing all of these things to assist communism in the United States when they not only permit but foster and perpetuate victory marches, riots, strikes and many other forms of communist-backed activities. I can remember at the end of World War II, had someone burned the American Flag or destroyed it in any manner, they would have been handled promptly and permanently right on the spot. What has happened to our "good ole American way of life" when it was right that we handled people for belittling our flag, our nation or our Government in any shape form or fashion.

Let's face it Mr. Teague, a few of you honest law makers in Washington have lost control to the communist-sponsored elements who have tied this country up in such manner that it will never be straightened out. I believe that we should have a law which would make it an automatic sentence of deportation to anyone belonging to the Communist Party in the United States. But, if such bill were proposed, I dare say that you would not get a total of six votes in both houses for passage of such bill; and if it were passed, before it could be signed it would be declared unconstitutional by the highest Tribunal. I reiterate—I hate communism in every shape whether it be in the Supreme Court, the White House or our local church—a communist is a communist regardless of his habitant. You and I know the war could be won in Vietnam in a matter of hours; so, please tell me why this war must be prolonged taking the lives of our men and costing us billions of dollars while we cultivate communism on every hand in the continental limits of the United States?

I gave my only son, what has Washington, D.C. given?

Sincerely,

TRUETT THOMAS.

Captive Nations Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. WILLIAM STANTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 19, 1967

Mr. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, we have observed Captive Nations Week annually since 1959 because it is legally provided for in Public Law 86–90. In so doing we are not merely indicating a mechanical expression of regret and sympathy for the plight of the captive millions in Eastern and Central Europe, in Asia, and in the Caribbean. As a people placing a supreme value on our rights to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness and on the right to self-determination, we feel a sincere and personal desolation at the condition of the peoples of such countries as Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, Albania, North Korea, North Vietnam and Tibet.

A popular belief today is that Communist Russia has relaxed her grip on the captive satellite countries behind the Iron Curtain. Yet nation after nation still languishes under the whip of Communist tyranny; millions have borne for decades and still must bear the bitterness of economic deprivation, political oppression, and religious persecution. Occasionally a Captive Nation will rise in rebellion against its oppressor, only to be quickly smothered by the harsh hand of Communist colonialism.

However, the battle between Communist imperialists and peace-loving nations is not always a flagrant conflict. More often it is a subtle aggression, pitting mind against mind, ideology against ideology—for communism can only triumph when it has totally indoctrinated the individual and has made entire peoples slaves of party propaganda.

We condemn the policies of communism which deprive proud peoples of national and individual liberties, which have no respect for individual convictions, which destroy human dignity. We pay solemn tribute to the captive nations of the world, many of whom have been forced to serve their Communist masters through decades of anguish. A majority of the youth in the Communist world have never had the opportunity to experience the freedom and strength of democracy. Their only contact with the liberties cherished by all Americans has been through the memories of parents and aged relatives. Many of these unfortunate victims of communism will die without regaining the nationhood they covet and the civil liberties which are rightfully theirs.

The privileged citizens of the United States can hardly imagine the barren existence led by the captive peoples. But nonetheless we fight beside them in spirit in their battle for liberation, and we will never be content until they join us in the ranks of free nations.

Postage Stamp in Honor of 250th Anniversary of Israel Putnam, American Patriot

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 18, 1967

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, next year marks the 250 anniversary of the birth of the American patriot and Revolutionary War hero, Israel Putnam. The deeds of this defender of democratic ideals are so legendary that they have become incorporated into our national folklore.

His exploits include the oft-repeated account that, upon hearing the news of the battle of Lexington and Concord, he left his plow in the middle of the field he was cultivating and started for the scene of action without even taking time to change his clothes. At the battle of Bunker Hill it was Israel Putnam who gave the famous order, "Don't shoot until you see the whites of their eyes."

Putnam was born on January 7, 1718, at Danvers, Mass. He settled in Brooklyn, Conn., around 1740 and lived there the remainder of his life. He served as a second lieutenant and captain in the French and Indian War and later was promoted to lieutenant colonel. Following this he was active in the Sons of Liberty, and in 1774 was named chairman of the Committee of Correspondence in Brooklyn, Conn. Putnam is credited with the arming of Connecticut after the seizure of munitions at Boston by General Gage in 1775. He also served in command at Bunker Hill. Upon joining the Continental Army when the Revolution started he was appointed to the rank of major general. He died on May 19, 1790, in Brooklyn, Conn., at the age of 72.

Israel Putnam embodied the spirit of freedom-loving men of all centuries and epitomized the essence of the bravery and sacrifice which gave birth to our Nation and have sustained it ever since. His willingness to come immediately to the cause of liberty at its hour of greatest peril and his unselfish devotion in his Nation's service have been a continuing source of inspiration for our citizens.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the 250th anniversary of the birth of this great American patriot should be observed by the issuance of an appropriate commemorative postage stamp. The valiant sacrifices which our Armed Forces are making in Vietnam today are in the great traditions of patriotism established by men such as General Putnam. By noting the accomplishments of this noble son of Connecticut, we shall be giving added meaning and dignity to the accomplishments of our present-day heroes.

I am therefore introducing today a bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the anniversary of the birth of Israel Putnam.

Department of Transportation Appropriation Bill, 1968

SPEECH

OF

HON. HASTINGS KEITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 18, 1967

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 11456) making appropriations for the Department of Transportation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes.

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Chairman, I, too, would like to congratulate the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND] for his splendid handling of the difficult job of subcommittee chairman—he has done a fine job of navigating in treacherous waters.

And I, too, Mr. Chairman, am concerned about the proposal contained in this bill to construct two high-endurance Secretary-class cutters at $14.5 million each instead of one cutter and one $12 million oceanographic vessel.

The oceanographic research vessel was to have replaced the obsolete *Evergreen*, a 30-year-old ice patrol vessel now used for both ice patrol work and scientific data collecting.

If the proposed appropriations go through—to build the cutter instead of the research vessel—it will mean the *Evergreen* will not be decommissioned as she should be. Work in rigorous arctic climates calls for a sturdy and safe ship with up-to-date equipment.

The Merchant Marine Committee, on which I serve, reviewed the Coast Guard recommendations and concurred that the new oceanographic vessel was much more necessary than the additional cutter.

In the past, our oceanography program has been so fractured that it needed coordination. Because of this scattering of responsibility, Congress approved the creation of a Marine Resources and Engineering Development Council under the chairmanship of Vice President HUMPHREY. This council is now in being and is currently reviewing our Nation's objectives in the field of oceanography.

I have reason to believe it would agree that the Coast Guard's new oceanographic vessel could play a vital role in our overall oceanography program. I hope the Appropriations Committee can make the necessary study to which they refer in their report on the coordination of oceanographic activities. If they check with the Marine Resources Council, I believe the committee will conclude that construction of an oceanographic vessel is more urgent than construction of an additional cutter.

I hope that an amendment will be accepted restoring the oceanographic vessel.

Panama Canal Treaties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 11, 1967

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, quiet diplomacy and friendly persuasion all too often go unheralded, while any international failure is prominently headlined and deplored.

Recently, after 2½ years of patient negotiation, the United States and Panama, quietly and without fanfare, have agreed upon three new treaties for the Panama Canal. They are designed to remove inequities which have been constant irritants to friendly relations with our Central American neighbors ever since the Canal Zone was established.

A recent editorial in the San Francisco Chronicle reminds us of the opportunity we now have, with both magnanimity and goodwill, to support our Government's very sensible and constructive proposal for operation of the Panama Canal.

Mr. Speaker, this editorial follows:

NEW PANAMA TREATY

Our 1903 treaty with Panama, going back to the time of Theodore "I took the canal" Roosevelt, has been renegotiated and embodied in three new agreements which have been reached after 2½ years of effort. A new understanding with Panama had to be arrived at if friction over the canal was to be removed, and it is very much to the credit of the Johnson Administration that it has produced one.

The Panama Canal has never enjoyed an entirely unclouded legitimacy. By replacing its original birth certificate with a new one, the negotiators intend to give Panama a share in the administration, management and operation of the canal and so hope to eliminate the tension and bad feeling that brought on riots in the Canal Zone in 1964 and led to a three-months break in diplomatic relations.

There will be three new treaties. One provides for the surrender of United States sovereignty over the Canal Zone, which Roosevelt took "in perpetuity" and which has stuck in the craw of every Panamanian since. It would give Panama a share in running the present canal and any future one, and reportedly would place the canal in a U.S.-Panamanian authority. The other treaties deal with arrangements for a sea-level canal and for the defense of the zone and its neutrality.

A great deal of spreadeagle oratory will be heard before these treaties are ratified by the Senate, but they will eventually have to be accepted because what the Panamanians, correctly or incorrectly, consider Canal Zone imperialism cannot survive.

Progress in Automobile Liability Insurance Noted

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM T. CAHILL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 19, 1967

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, on many previous occasions I have directed the attention of the House to the complex social problems presented by automobile liability insurance and regulation of this industry by the several States. On those occasions I have indicated my conviction that State regulation of the insurance industry has often been insufficient to protect the public's interest in reasonable rates, a competitive insurance market and a solvent, responsible industry.

However, I should like to note that recently, in my own State, New Jersey, steps have been taken which will do much to promote the public's interest in effective insurance industry regulation.

Although not required by law to conduct public hearings on applications for insurance rate increases, State Banking and Insurance Commissioner Charles R. Howell has adopted such a policy of free expression where major rate increases are sought.

The first public hearing on a proposed rate increase took place yesterday, Wednesday, July 19. In another unprecedented act, Governor Hughes appointed special counsel to represent the public interest in opposing a 20-percent rate increase requested by the National Bureau of Casualty Underwriters.

It was my great pleasure to appear before the commission. I found the proceedings to be conducted in the objective, dignified atmosphere necessary to appropriately balance the insurance industry's interest in a reasonable profit with the public interest in fair rates and adequate coverage. In adopting this policy, Commissioner Howell has not only assured the New Jersey public of a forum where it may present its case, but also he has assured that the commission's decisions, now and in the future, will be made with full knowledge and presentation of the necessary facts.

It is indeed a tribute to the progressiveness of the New Jersey Legislature and the administration of the New Jersey Department of Banking and Insurance that no insurance company insolvencies have occurred, and that concellation or nonrenewal of policyholders on the basis of race, age, and nationality are prohibited in New Jersey. It is evident that public hearings on proposed rate hearings will serve to continue and more effectively enforce such policies.

In commending Commissioner Howell, I can do no less than express my hope that other State insurance commissioners will permit free expression and presentation of the public's views and analyses in the ratemaking process.

Job Corps Contribution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 11, 1967

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, a letter to the editor of the July 1, 1967, issue of the Corpsman newspaper at the Gary Job Corps Center recently came to my attention.

It was from a graduate of the center, Pvt. Ken E. Price, who is now an Army paratrooper in Vietnam. He writes the editor of the Corpsman to praise the staff of the Gary Center for working so sincerely and diligently with him and to salute the Job Corps and all those associated with it.

Significantly, he also writes that his years at the Gary Center—which many of you know is located in my congressional district—were the most wonderful of his civilian life. He reflects that he feels the staff at Gary really cared about someone who wanted to improve himself.

It is very heartwarming for us to know of a letter such as Private Price's and it gives great satisfaction to know our efforts and those of the Job Corps meant so much to this young man.

Many underprivileged youngsters have never had anyone really care about them before they came to Job Corps, and it is evident from the young soldier's letter that the center was able to supply this basic need.

It is also evident that the center went much further by giving back to society a capable, responsible American who now feels that it is his duty to defend the commitments of the Nation that gave him a second chance.

A copy of Private Price's letter follows:

FROM VIETNAM

Well, here I am writing you a short note at last. I arrived in this country the 23rd and have been on the go ever since. The weather is hot plus it's still winter. Our winter here is hotter than a Texas summer.

I still think of you wonderful people at Gary. That is the only place I really feel at home. I walked through life for two years there and it was the most wonderful experience of my teenage years as a civilian. People there care about someone trying to improve himself. Sometimes I feel that if the world had more people who work sincerely with a person as those at the Gary Center do, then there would be a brighter place in life for everybody.

This is a U.S. soldier talking from his heart and with experience, saying to the Corpsmen that the Job Corps is a place where every person can find a hope and a chance for a new and better life, no matter what was in the past. I salute each person working with the Job Corps and all the Corpsmen who are working to better themselves.

Pvt. KEN E. PACE,
U.S. Paratrooper.

VIETNAM.

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Pvt. Pace is a former Gary (Tex.) Corpsman.)

Populations of U.N. Member Nations

SPEECH

OF

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 26, 1967

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, the following table gives the population of each of the 122 nations that are members of the United Nations organization. Under leave to extend my remarks I include this table, as I am certain that many of my colleagues will find the data interesting, informative, and instructive.

Please note that 62 members, a majority, have a total population of 148,722,000, considerably less than that of the United States. If we add six more members to make 68, we find that they have a total population of 196,813,000, almost 3,000,000 fewer than that of our own country.

Eighty-two members of the international organization have a total population of 323,504,000 and cast two-thirds of the votes.

California, the largest of the 50 States of the United States in population, has 18,918,000 inhabitants. Ninety-five of the members of the United Nations have fewer, ranging from the Maldive Islands' 98,000 to South Africa's 18,881,000.

New York City, the headquarters of the international body, has a population of 7,960,000. Each of the 69 smallest members of the United States has fewer inhabitants, although these countries comprise seven more than a majority of the organization's total membership.

The United States has more than any single one of the 121 other countries, except India, that are enrolled in the United Nations, yet any individual member can kill our vote—even the Maldive Islands, which have considerably less than a fourth as many people as I represent in the Congress of the United States.

The table follows:

United Nations members population

[In thousands]

1. Maldive Islands	98
2. Iceland	192
3. Barbados	245
4. Malta	317
5. Luxembourgh	333
6. Gambia	338
7. Kuwait	467
8. Gabon	470
9. Botswana	576
10. Cyprus	598
11. Guyana	647
12. Congo (ex-French)	840
13. Lesotho	859
14. Trinidad and Tobago	975
15. Mauritania	1,000
16. Liberia	1,066
17. Mongolia	1,087
18. Panama	1,287
19. Costa Rica	1,463
20. Togo	1,650
21. Libya	1,677
22. Nicaragua	1,685
23. Jamaica	1,827
24. Albania	1,865
25. Singapore	1,890
26. Jordan	1,976
27. Central African Republic	2,088
28. Paraguay	2,094
29. Dahomey	2,244
30. Sierra Leone	2,290
31. Honduras	2,363
32. Lebanon	2,490
33. Somalia	2,500
34. Israel	2,635
35. New Zealand	2,698
36. Uruguay	2,749
37. Burundi	2,800
38. Ireland	2,881
39. El Salvador	3,000
40. Laos	3,000
41. Rwanda	3,073
42. Chad	3,307
43. Niger	3,433
44. Senegal	3,490
45. Guinea	3,500
46. Ivory Coast	3,500
47. Norway	3,741
48. Bolivia	3,751
49. Dominican Republic	3,754
50. Zambia	3,780
51. Malawi	4,000
52. Tunisia	4,458
53. Guatemala	4,575
54. Mali	4,576
55. Finland	4,626
56. Haiti	4,660
57. Denmark	4,835
58. Upper Volta	4,858
59. Yemen	5,000
60. Syria	5,120
61. Cameroon	5,210
62. Ecuador	5,326
A majority of the members has	148,722
63. Cambodia	6,300
64. Malagasy Republic	6,336
65. Austria	7,255
66. Uganda	7,551
67. Ghana	7,740
68. Sweden	7,789
Less than population of United States	196,813
69. Cuba	7,833
70. Saudi Arabia	8,000
71. Bulgaria	8,227
72. Iraq	8,262
73. Greece	8,500
74. Byelorussia	8,533
75. Chile	8,800
76. Venezuela	9,030
77. Malaysia	9,395
78. Belgium	9,499
79. Kenya	9,643
80. Hungary	10,160
81. Nepal	10,294
82. Tanzania	10,515
A two-thirds majority has	323,504
83. Ceylon	11,232
84. Algeria	11,290
85. Peru	12,011
86. China (Nationalist)	12,767
87. Netherlands	12,921
88. Morocco	13,323
89. Australia	13,705
90. Sudan	13,940
91. Czechoslovakia	14,194
92. Afghanistan	15,350
93. Congo (ex-Belgian)	15,986
94. Colombia	18,068
95. South Africa	18,881

United Nations members population—Con.

[In thousands]

96.	Romania	19, 105
97.	Yugoslavia	19, 756
98.	Canada	19, 919
99.	Ethiopia	22, 590
100.	Argentina	22, 691
101.	Portugal	23, 064
102.	Iran	24, 190
103.	Burma	25, 246
104.	Egypt	30, 054
105.	Thailand	30, 591
106.	Turkey	31, 391
107.	Poland	31, 619
108.	Spain	32, 403
109.	Philippines	33, 477
110.	Mexico	42, 231
111.	Ukraine	45, 100
112.	France	50, 769
113.	Italy	52, 931
114.	Nigeria	57, 500
115.	United Kingdom	61, 725
116.	Brazil	84, 679
117.	Japan	98, 710
118.	Pakistan	104, 138
119.	Indonesia	108, 000
120.	Soviet Union	178, 236
121.	United States	199, 693
122.	India	499, 000
	Total	2, 456, 000

Figures include overseas provinces, colonies, etc., in case of France, Netherlands, Portugal, United Kingdom, etc. Note that Byelorussia and Ukraine, each of which has a vote, are listed separately from Soviet Union, whose total population is 231,869,000.

Captive Nations Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LARRY WINN, JR.

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 19, 1967

Mr. WINN. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in observation of the third week of July as Captive Nations Week. It is difficult in the extreme for most Americans to understand what it is like to be deprived of the individual freedoms upon which our society is based and it is easy to take for granted the fact that a third of the population of the earth live under political systems in which these liberties are denied and denigrated by Communist systems of government. Who among us could ever be content to live under a system in which he was unable to express criticism of his leaders in the press, in which he would not be free to join an independent labor union, or worship God as he chose. Recall, if you will, that it was only last year that the Poles, traditionally a people of deep Christian roots, attempted to celebrate the anniversary of a thousand years of Christianity in Poland. The Communist government of that captive nation attempted to put every impossible impediment in the way of the success of that deeply significant celebration, and would not even allow Pope Paul to come to Poland to officiate. Nevertheless, despite all the efforts of the Communists, hundreds of thousands of Poles, of all ages, joined in the celebration of the Christian millennium showing the world that their deep devotion remains even after two decades of Communist rule.

If ever any of us feel that the observation on our part of Captive Nations Week has no meaning let him remember the determination of the Poles not to let their religion die in a state where to express anything but mindless acceptance of the official Communist dogma that "religion is the opiate of the masses" is an act of extreme political and personal courage fraught with danger. It is an honor for me to rededicate myself to the principles of personal freedoms and to express my deepest hope that the time will soon come when all men everywhere can join us in living in free societies under governments expressing the will of the people which they serve.

America's Crucial Lesson

SPEECH

OF

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1967

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the Commissioner of Education, Harold Howe, recently gave the commencement address at Shaw University in Raleigh, N.C.

I think the Commissioner's message to the Shaw graduate deserves wider attention, and I hope Members of Congress will take a few moments to read it and I now insert it in the RECORD:

AMERICA'S CRUCIAL LESSON [1]

(An address by Harold Howe II, U.S. Commissioner of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare)

First of all I want to tell you how pleased I am to be here. My two years of residence in North Carolina brought me an acquaintance with its countryside and its people—and this opportunity to renew that acquaintance is a great personal pleasure. It is more than that—it is a chance to express my appreciation to many people who have helped me to understand some of the problems of America, problems about which I shall speak at greater length today.

Another reason I am glad to be here stems from a brochure about Shaw University which I saw just recently. Its opening paragraphs read as follows:

"In 1963, when Dr. James E. Cheek came to Raleigh to assume the presidency of Shaw University, there was justifiable reason to wonder why he bothered to come at all. The century-old private school was some $300,000 in debt; most of the buildings were in an advanced state of deterioration; student and faculty morale was at an all-time low; and the school's accreditation was about to be removed.

"Some people thought that Dr. Cheek had come to Shaw to supervise the orderly liquidation of the aged college."

Such candor is rarely encountered in publications sponsored by educational institutions. As one who has read a great number of them, I can tell you that the usual college catalog leaves the impression that there are only three eminent institutions of higher education in the western hemisphere: Oxford, Cambridge, and Apex State Teachers College. And Oxford and Cambridge, one reads between the lines of the catalog, keep looking nervously over their shoulders in jealous and frightened appraisal of each new academic triumph registered by Apex. It is refreshing almost to the point of shock to have a college or university forthrightly admit that it has problems. I suspect that homely truth pungently expressed remains the best kind of public relations.

It is now apparent to anyone who has the least acquaintance with Shaw that Dr. Cheek did not come to Raleigh to preside over the orderly liquidation of anything. In the past four years, he has shaped a provocative, distincitve educational program of which this graduating class is the first product.

The point I wish to stress, however, is that I was most attracted by the institutional honesty exemplified in that brochure. Today I want to try to match that candor by being candid with you in my remarks about our most agonizing domestic problem: racial justice in the United States. It is a problem to which I have had some exposure during the past couple of years although I am a strict amateur in it compared to most of you.

Our contemporary civil rights movement is comparatively new. Although such organizations as the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People and the Urban League have been working to improve the condition of the American Negro for decades, it was not until the middle 1950's that the civil rights movement took on a new direction and urgency as the result of the Brown decision by the Supreme Court. Every American is familiar with such names as Selma, Montgomery, and Birmingham, and their significance for the rights of Negro Americans.

It may interest you to know, however, that the revitalized civil rights movement had significant origins here in North Carolina. Four Negro college freshmen helped give it birth by deciding one night in their dormitory that they had had enough of gradualism. The next day, they walked into a dime store in Greensboro, sat down at the lunch counter, and ordered a cup of coffee.

That simple request—denied first by a white woman and then by an anxious Negro woman, both employees of the store—led within months to similar demonstrations in cities throughout the North and South. It led too, to a melancholy sequence of retaliation. The extraordinary courage with which civil rights demonstrators met violence, refusing to let hatred push them to reciprocal violence, finally touched the conscience of this Nation and resulted in changes which might have taken decades to produce without the demonstrated self-sacrifice of young men and women who were clearly seeking the rights which were theirs under the law but denied in practice. They succeeded in arousing the conscience of this Nation, and they focused that conscience in a way which produced the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

That Act was a genuine triumph for the American political system, proving that a majority, if properly awakened, can vote to safeguard the rights of a minority. It represented a major change in ways of thinking and feeling—a change which was 100 years overdue.

And perhaps because this beginning of social reform exhausted so much emotion, many white Americans felt that by supporting this single piece of legislation, they had done all that could be expected of them. They seemed to conclude that the civil rights revolution was over, and that our society could once again relax in the conviction that racial equality would inevitably proceed from an act of Congress.

Now we know that the passage of laws will not alone solve a problem with a history as long and agonizing as the denial of equal opportunity to our Negro citizens. Slow, patient effort is necessary to bring the law into operation, to determine through the courts what it means and what it does not mean, and to help people make those adjustments in accustomed practice which the law requires. To those whose expectations have been raised, the demand for further patience, for a renewed gradualism, has seemed unreasonable and at times unbearable. They have sought new ways of expressing their demands, and particularly in our cities, their understandable frustrations have sometimes turned to violence.

---

[1] At the 102nd Annual Commencement Exercises, Shaw University, Raleigh, North Carolina, 3 p.m., Sunday, June 11, 1967.

The dimensions of that violence have been astonishing; and yet no one, it seems to me, can realistically profess astonishment at its outbreak. Negro frustration has been simmering for years, and Negro requests for justice have for the most part been met by apathy at best and repression at worst. Having sown the wind, America is now reaping the whirlwind.

The roots of this violence are easy to find, but I do not see how any sane man, white or Negro, can maintain that it will lead to further progress toward racial equality. It is clear that millions of white Americans who supported the civil rights movement in the early 1960's have since become disenchanted with the direction of that movement and particularly with the excesses of racial disturbance throughout the land. Some Negroes counter by saying that the violence in our cities has not really changed any white minds; it has merely provided them with a convenient excuse for *claiming* that they have altered their viewpoints.

That may be. The essential point, however, is that in a democracy, the majority rules; and in this imperfect Nation of imperfect humans, we cannot expect the mass of whites to tolerate violence indefinitely, even though their own past action or lack of it may have contributed to racial disturbance. Continuing violence in our cities will inevitably lead to sharp repression and to white resentment that they may wipe out many of the civil rights gains we have achieved.

I do not state this belief as a threat, merely as a hard fact which all of us should recognize. We must keep in mind the final goal, which is that of equal opportunity in every facet of American life. The destruction of property may give vent to long pent-up feelings, but it does not advance justice. As in every other variety of human struggle, it is possible in the struggle for civil rights to win the battle but lose the war.

I do not come before you today simply to advise you against violence, for violence is one of the obstinate conditions of mankind, particularly among the frustrated and immature and uneducated, irrespective of race. But I do want to place before you my concern that as you leave this place of learning—as you build your life and raise a family, and as you continue to confront the problem of racial injustice—that you not allow short-sighted points of view to drive a wedge between you and the millions of white Americans who sincerely want to lift the blight of racism from our Nation.

In the past few years, as the advocates of violence have raised their voices over the quieter insistence of the earlier civil rights demonstrators, we have been introduced to the concept of "black power." The definition of black power depends upon the man who is doing the defining.

At one end of the spectrum of definition, black power means a concerted effort by Negroes to focus their votes and their purchasing power to influence legislation and employment opportunities. It means a demand for introducing Negro history into our textbooks, so that white and Negro children alike will realize that the American Negro fought for and paid for a country which has long ignored his just claim to full citizenship and full respect. It means a demand for better schools, so that Negro youngsters do not begin their working lives with the handicap of inferior education.

All these demands are fully justified. They mean that the American Negro intends to take advantage of the political, economic, and social weapons to which his citizenship entitles him.

But at the other end of the spectrum, black power means separatism, a sharp division between Negroes and whites. It is a kind of racism in reverse. Human reactions being what they are, it is easy to understand why the concept of separatism should have gained support. But regardless of the many justifications which might be advanced to support it, this form of black power seems to me to promise only greater frustration and greater agony. It will perpetuate the ghetto, not eliminate it. It will harden the divisions between the races just when we have some reason for believing that American Negro and American white are closing the gap that separates them. Perhaps most important, it postpones the day of ultimate victory—the day when a man's achievement is circumscribed only by his personal merit.

As college graduates, you have an opportunity denied the uneducated masses of frustrated Negroes living in our rural and urban ghettoes. You can use your education to break out of the economic and social circumstances which always consign the illiterate and the poorly educated to lives of unfulfilled hope and purposeless longing. For education makes it possible for a man to expand his sympathies, to achieve a feeling of confidence in himself even in new and strange circumstances.

Every one of us is born with a set of social limitations. Each of us is born into a specific community, into a specific circle of family and friends. Because this community is familiar to us, because it represents security, to step outside this comfortable circle and risk an encounter with the new and strange requires considerable courage. If a man is satisfied with his present mode of life, of course, there is no reason for him to gamble.

I doubt that many of you here are satisfied with the normal prospects for life as Negroes in America. Your futures must surely seem circumscribed by a dozen forms of racial discrimination that limit you in your choice of jobs, your choice of homes, your choice of horizons.

And yet the very fact that these limitations exist makes it all the more important, for you and for the children you will have, that you determine to break out of the boundaries prescribed for you by racist attitudes. Under normal circumstances, the white college graduate of average intelligence can in general look forward to a reasonably comfortable working career without relentlessly extraordinary exertion on his part. As long as he shaves every day, puts on a clean shirt every morning, and applies himself to his job with an acceptable amount of conscientiousness, he can expect rather steady advancement and a gradually increasing income.

The Negro college graduate has no ground for similar complacent optimism. If he is employed by a white corporation, he may very well wonder whether he was hired on the strength of his abilities or on the desire of the company to exhibit a token Negro here and there as proof of its progressive attitudes. He can wonder how far he will advance; he can with cause suspect that there is an unstated but nonetheless definite limit to his salary and his responsibilities. He can expect snubs from hostile whites and embarrassment from the well-meaning coworker whose exaggerated friendliness has a phony air about it.

Such a gloomy prospect might well make any educated Negro despair of white America, and tempt him to remain at home, in the black America in which he was born and raised.

But some American Negroes have not given up. They have continued to direct their heads and their hearts and their abilities against the barriers of white ignorance and resistance until they have broken through, to better jobs, better homes, and better lives. In doing so, they have opened doors for other Negroes, and they have helped to clear the road their own sons and daughters will have to travel.

And their courage, finally, has made it easier for white Americans to accept Negroes as countrymen entitled to full citizenship. You must realize that what appears to you as white hostility is sometimes nothing more complex than white ignorance. White children and Negro children grow up segregated from each other. They assume that segregation implies some kind of dangerous difference, and not understanding that difference, they fear it. You must realize that millions of whites are not only interested in eliminating racial injustice, but are positively anxious to do so. The problem is that they do not know how to go about it.

You must teach them. One of the paradoxes of the civil rights problem is that the traditional denial of opportunity to the Negro has offered the white an unparalleled opportunity to learn, to grow, to develop and mature. Some whites regret the fact that 11 percent of the population is Negro—not because they resent Negroes, but because they feel that a sizeable Negro minority in the United States has presented us with a social dilemma other nations have not had to confront.

A more perceptive view, it seems to me, is that this dilemma is one of the most fortunate things that could have happened to the United States. A colleague of mine at the Office of Education recently speculated on the course of American history for the next 100 years and concluded that world leadership during this period would depend on the degree to which the people of our Nation learn to understand the desires and sensitivities of other populations, three-fourths of which are not white. He continued his speculation with this observation:

"We in the United States have an unmatched opportunity to learn to live together with other races and nationalities. If we can, we can lead the world. If we can't, we can expect to be pushed aside. I have a hunch our Negroes may be saving our lives in the long run by pressing for integration now. I hope they keep it up relentlessly. I hope the Mexican-Americans, Indian-Americans, and Puerto Ricans get in there and push, too. But mainly I hope we of the white majority can see what a great chance we have to develop a competence that will become ever more essential, not just in international relations but in government and business as well."

My colleague ended his crystal-ball gazing with a hypothetical question: "Do you want your child to be with it in the next generation? Then get him out of that all-white school."

The question was obviously addressed to white parents, but it has the same implications for Negro parents.

I hope, however, that you will not wait until you are parents before you accept the other implications of this brief guess at the history of the future. Strong and prosperous as America seems today, it is destined for slow decline unless all of us learn to live with each other.

White Americans and Negro Americans are all sitting in the same big classroom. We have a most difficult lesson to learn, and you must help teach us.

A Changing World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 19, 1967

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Byron R. White, Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, made the graduating address at the first commencement exercises of Langley High School at McLean, Va., on Saturday, June 10. My daughter was a member of the graduating class and, therefore, I was privileged with my family to hear this great, timely, and challenging address so ably delivered by Justice White.

I commend to my colleagues in the Congress and to the people of our country Justice White's superb address:

A CHANGING WORLD

(An address by Byron R. White, Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, at the Langley High School Commencement, McLean, Va., June 10, 1967)

Mr. Hertzler, graduates, parents, faculty and friends of Langley High School, I had only a few blocks to travel here, the same few blocks that many of you graduates had to come. But I would have agreed to a much longer trip to be here, for the very simple reason that the arrival of another generation on the scene is an important event, not only to you who have finished your high school training, but to all of us, especially to us who are called the older generation. Your mothers and fathers may not appreciate that classification, but none of us can deny the facts of life.

All of us, I think, are all too well aware of the degree to which each of you will determine the future. Change, very rapid change has overtaken the world, this country in particular. This remarkable acceleration began when many of us were much younger. Change is, therefore, neither strange, abhorrent nor avoidable as far as we are concerned. The point is, however, that the race is a very fast one, a race perhaps only for the young and the swift. At least, it is a race for those who are prepared for it. I do not mean to suggest that everyone need be a sprinter or perish, but I should not mince words in suggesting to you that there are not just one, but several races now in progress, in which all or most of you graduates will participate whether you like it or not. And the results of the contest will determine to a great extent your own destinies and those of your children.

Change has made the world a world for the young, not only because of the energy and resilience which existence today requires, but for still another distinctive reason which has emerged in the last decade. "Change" as we speak of it, is a convenient way of talking about that whole collection of factors which have brought complexity to almost everything we do. Behind the most simple aspects of everyday life, like going to the store, to the movie, or for a ride, or building a house, or turning on the lights or the water, or going to the doctor or doing our everyday work, there is the most towering complexity, aimed, perhaps at making life more fruitful, even simpler, but nevertheless requiring a degree of competence which would has astounded our ancestors. Just to run the country and survive from day to day calls for trained intelligence from all of us.

Beyond the routine, however, there are matters which seem to have mystified the generation just ahead of you. It is our hope that you can do much better with these issues. We say for ourselves that we too had problems, in the form of depression and war, that had never been faced before. Perhaps it has always been that the present must manage legacies from the past but we are now facing what seem to be a collection of quite unyielding and intractable problems, for which the country has as yet no viable solutions. Many people today sense an intense need for an absolutely new and historically unmatched degree of insight and intelligence. Moreover, the major current conundrums not only invite and demand the attention of extraordinary competence but also the cooperative effort of men and women of many different skills and understandings. Our principal preoccupations—war and peace, freedom and equality both at home and abroad, continued prosperity, the growth of the world's population, the management of technology—these and many other issues on our list of urgent concerns await the attention of you young people who have been trained and educated in the modern world. There is hardly any comparison between the training you have so far received and that which your parents enjoyed. There is far more contrast than likeness. The contrast is even sharper with respect to the educational years still before you. You have been exposed to far more than your predecessors, and you will be exposed to far more in the years to come. This is not, perhaps, an unmixed blessing, but it is a fact, not only a necessary but an exciting fact. Wherever our problems came from, whoever is to blame for them, they are in the last analysis your problems too. Their solution poses the most inexhaustible demand for talented and well motivated individuals that the world has yet experienced. That need will be satisfied from your generation or it will not be satisfied at all. Hence my interest, and the interest of the country, in you and all of the others who have reached this important stage in their careers. The challenge is yours.

Actually, what I am saying is nothing more than an expression of the underlying conviction of those who settled this land and who determined, based on their own experience, to create and perpetuate the system we have. The principle is that our real wealth is not in our natural resources, our lands, our forests, mines or rivers, but in our people. There have been some major arguments about the matter, but the long range judgment of this country is that morally, as well as economically, the most rewarding and most satisfying investment is the investment in our human resources. Free man with choice and with the opportunity to develop and apply his talents has been our most successful formula. The idea has been, first, that given the right circumstances, human capability is almost unlimited and second, that human beings are entitled to those right circumstances. Not all people will respond. As a matter of fact, many will not, and they have every right to decline. But enough have responded, and will respond, to make the whole effort worth the candle.

This country now spends almost $50 billion a year on all levels of education, public and private, incomparably more than just a few years ago and incomparably more than any other country in the world. In 1869, there were 16 thousand high school graduates, 2% of all 17 year olds. A century later, the figures are over 3½ million graduates or 72% of 17 year olds. In 1870, a little over 1½% of the 18 to 21 year olds were enrolled in higher educational institutions. In 1963, the percentage was 38½% of this same age group. In 1869, there were hardly and PhD degrees granted in the entire country. In 1963–1964, there were 14,490 doctorates conferred. One hundred years ago, there were 50 thousand people in colleges and universities. There are 5½ million today and the figure is going up at a rapid rate. Americans in higher education outnumber those in higher education in all of the rest of the world combined. American colleges and universities have a larger population than Demark, Ireland or any of the independent nations of the United Nations. There are 21 hundred colleges and universities in the country and over 2 million teachers at all levels of education.

These are not boastful figures, but only an indication of the degree to which this country depends on the development of human beings. For us, this is not only a practical necessity but it is what the people demand and what they will have. And it is what you in turn will demand and will have for your children.

We have also attempted, not always successfully, to distribute power, both political and economic power in a similar fashion, not only because we have feared concentrations of authority and influence but because widely held power will for most purposes produce the best long range results. Such faith in mass competence may not have great historical support outside our own communities and even here it is still being put to the bitter test by events swirling around us at this very moment. But we have succeeded much more often than we have failed. The system has so far worked. Whether it will continue to do so depends on many things. But the major element will be your own development and your own response. I have no doubt, and neither does anyone else, that in a scant few years a good many of you will be in positions of great responsibility and will be setting the tone and the character of the future. Thus it is only fitting that we congratulate you and wish you Godspeed.

If you have not passed beyond our control, you will probably do so very soon, as is only natural. From this time forward it will be much more of a mutual affair. If you will permit, we shall make every effort to uphold our end of the bargain. I have, in turn, every confidence that you will do likewise. In fact, I suspect that you will do much more than that. I hope you will.

Department of Transportation Appropriation Bill, 1968

SPEECH

OF

HON. ROBERT TAFT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 18, 1967

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 11456) making appropriations for the Department of Transportation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to say a few words in support of the SST aircraft as being in the best interests of all of the people of the United States. A number of times here on the floor, I have heard it said by opponents of the SST program that not more than 5 percent of our people will in any way benefit from such a program. This is akin to saying that only those who use airplanes in the United States have been benefitted by the U.S. aircraft industry. This is completely belied by the tremendous number of employees of the industry, its key position in our national industrial picture, the enormous favorable balance of trade which it has created, not to mention the prestige and leadership that it has given our Nation throughout the world.

As with the general growth of the aviation industry, the SST will benefit all Americans; and, on that basis, it is justified as a priority expenditure on a reasonable basis even at this time of financial crisis. To turn away from the program which has been so carefully developed and moved ahead with private participation would indeed be a tragedy and a setback for our country. Frequently, I have heard our Foreign Service officers and private representatives overseas testify to the fact that there is no single influence and presence more important to American interests than the presence of U.S. planes, service facilities, and personnel in the farflung corners of the globe. This program merits our support.

It is Time To Act on the President's Plan To Reorganize the District of Columbia Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 11, 1967

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, for years the Congress and the executive branch and the American people have agreed publicly and privately that the District of Columbia must have a new form of government to face the modern problems which confront it.

For years Washington, D.C., has been treated like an orphan of the U.S. Government.

The time has come for us to see that Washingtonians have the tools with which they themselves can lift their city to the level of efficiency and dignity befitting a Nation's Capital.

President Johnson has worked hard to bring Washington into the mainstream of American governmental life.

He has asked Congress to allow a transformation and modernization of Washington's present Commission government into a strong executive-council form which can act and administer needed programs in education, health, crime prevention, housing, job and economic development.

He has asked for funds to move those programs forward.

Just the other day the President appealed on television to the Congress to permit "the people of the District, to take their proper place in a progressive America."

We must do something for Washington now.

We ought to heed the words expressed in editorial opinion by two of Washington's most prominent radio and television stations—WMAL, the Evening Star station, and WTOP, the Washington Post station. They said: "The District needs the President's reorganization plan right now."

The District does need the President's reorganization plan right now.

It has needed it for many years. And it is the responsibility of the Congress to reject the disapproval resolution which has been introduced in this House and which would deny Washington the efficient and effective local government it needs.

Washington needs much more than a new form of local government. But this plan is the first step.

The text of the television remarks on the District reorganization plan made by President Johnson, and the texts of two editorials from stations WMAL and WTOP supporting the President's recommendations follow:

Television Remarks of the President Concerning Governmental Revisions for the District of Columbia, July 10, 1967

The government of our nation's capital must be reorganized. It is high time to move it out of horse-and-buggy days and into the Twentieth Century.

Washington is America's fastest growing metropolitan area. Yet its people are burdened and its progress imperiled by the drag of antiquated government. Today our capital stumbles along, hobbled by wasteful and inefficient practices installed as *a temporary solution* 93 years ago—just after the Civil War.

This is shameful. It must stop. The people of the District must be allowed to take their proper place in a progressive America. The reorganization plan I sent to Congress offers that bright promise.

Divided authority will give way to a single, strong executive.

Tangled and confused lines of responsibility will be straightened and cleared.

With stronger leadership and broader representation, crime can be controlled, the streets can be safer, the people can have better housing, and better health.

I urge the Congress to support and approve this sensible and timely plan. I ask the people of the District to waken to their grave responsibilities—and the great opportunity now before them.

Here in our hands is the long-awaited chance to replace a jerry-built government of the 1870's with a new government for the new problems of the 1970's.

Time and opportunity will not wait. We dare not lose the chance they give us now.

WMAL Editorial on the District Reorganization Plan

Strip away all the camouflage and you find that President Johnson's plan for reorganizing the District Government should go into effect. Opposition in Congress seems based on political expediency or personal pique.

The House of Representatives should not disapprove the reorganization plan. The resolutions of disapproval introduced by Congressman John McMillan and Joel Broyhill should be resoundingly defeated.

Before the resolutions of disapproval are voted on, we urge Congressmen to take a look at the pitiful state of the present, lame-duck District Government. If any government ever needed reorganization—this is it.

If there are flaws in the President's plan, the House District Committee will have plenty of time in the future to make corrections.

The District needs the President's reorganization plan right now.

WTOP Editorial on the District of Columbia Reorganization

No local subject is more important to the District of Columbia than the fate of the President's reorganiaztion proposal.

This plan, which would create a single commissioner and an appointed nine-member City Council, is the best way in sight to improve the caliber of D.C. government.

The plan is not perfect; the President is limited in what he can do to reform the District Building bureaucracy; without genuine self-government, municipal progress in Washington will continue to be limited.

But reorganization is a step forward and we are watching anxiously as congressional debate continues. The situation at this July 4th holiday break seems to be this:

Shortly after July 10th, the House Government Operations Committee probably will vote to reject a disapproval motion on the reorganization plan, a motion filed by Representatives John McMillan and Joel Broyhill. This committee action would improve chances that the House itself will not reject reorganization.

Meantime, the House District Committee is continuing its deliberate deliberations on a reorganization plan of its own. If it wants to make a constructive contribution, the District Committee ought to concentrate on legislation to improve reorganization, not attempt any spoiling action against the President's basic plan.

The administration, for its part, is beginning the practice of those persuasive arts designed to convince Congress that the President is in dead earnest. One action the White House ought to take is to announce formally that the nine-member City Council would include at least three registered Republicans. This, we think, would help encourage GOP support on Capitol Hill.

Such support will be needed because the issue is touch and go. Sometime late next month or early in August it will be decided whether District of Columbia government is to be improved, or whether this city will continue to limp along under a municipal system which would be tolerated nowhere else in the United States.

The Helicopter and Its Great Future Potential for National Security and Commercial Use

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD J. IRWIN
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 13, 1967

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, a huge and particularly important industry in my State of Connecticut is the production of helicopters by Sikorsky Aircraft, located on the edge of my district in Stratford.

Thousands of residents of my district travel to and from Sikorsky daily to work and I am thus tremendously aware of what this great industry means to the economy of my State, as well as my district.

Much has been said and discussed about the possible future contribution of helicopters to aviation and to transportation generally and I must agree with Lee S. Johnson, division president of Sikorsky Aircraft, who predicts the continued growth of helicopters for national security as well as for the many commercial uses for which it offers great potential.

Recently, Mr. Johnson was interviewed by Vertical World magazine, the interview appearing in the May issue of the publication. For the edification of my colleagues who may be aware of the great job helicopters are doing in Vietnam but who may not have thought about the place of this amazing aircraft in the future of transportation, I would like to enter Mr. Johnson's interview in the RECORD at this time. The interview follows:

Is the helicopter passé?

Very few people ask the questions—Is the automobile passé? Is the train passé? Is the bus passé? Why, any longer, do you people ask—Is the helicopter passé?

The question itself, for one reason or another, has been asked too often and by too many "we can conquer the universe" types. The question itself when asked too often has had and continues to have a debilitating impact on helicopter progress, because the question implies "pie in the sky" substitutes for the helicopter that many people construe as just around the corner.

All current transportation systems are passé. It has been said for example, that by the time any aircraft reaches the operational stage it is already obsolescent. Ten, 20, 100 years from now, the automobile may be an absurd memory.

So when one asks the question is a system passé, it would be well advised to qualify the question by adding a time frame reference. This is our way of saying that the helicotper now and in the foreseeable future is not passé. To the contrary, helicopters have a buoyant future and will play an ever-increasing role in the movement of people and things.

Would you discuss the rigid rotor and stowed rotor?

For many design concepts, the rigid rotor may be a proper solution. Similarly, for many design concepts, a stowed rotor may be a solution. Neither the stowed rotor nor the rigid rotor is likely to make all other design concepts passé. Both concepts have advantages and disadvantages, and both are subject to a designer's choice.

How do you answer the airlines' complaints about the helicopter's poor economics?

We would answer in many simple and sophisticated ways. A simple way would be to refer to your history of fixed-wing aircraft and the time required to achieve profitable results. A more sophisticated answer would involve a detailed operations analysis and cost study that would show mathematically the relationship between cost and return revenue.

Any evaluation of helicopter economics should not be made by comparing them to fixed wing aircraft, as is frequently done by airlines and is the basis of the general opinion that the helicopter is expensive. Such comparisons are invalid because helicopters are not designed to do the same type of air transport mission as fixed wing aircraft. Instead they provide supplementary services rather than competitive ones. They provide transportation which, although short in distance, is often long in time, from the airport to a heliport closer to the traveler's final point of origin or destination, as an alternative to the traveler going by surface. To compare the cost per mile of this segment of his trip to that afforded by the fixed wing aircraft that may have carried him several hundred miles, is just as unfair as comparing the per mile cost of carrying an air mail letter across the country, to carrying it the last few miles in city traffic or in a mail truck, or even for the final distance in the postman's satchel.

What is the optimum Skycrane size?

This question would have more meaning if a time frame were attached. A plot of helicopter growth in terms of size will show that for the early '70 period, cranes may range in size from five-ton payload capability to perhaps 40-ton capability. As an upper size indication, the plot shows that the payload capability will range from 20 tons to 40 tons. This implies an all up weight of 80,000 lbs to 160,000 lbs. These sizes are certainly feasible technically. There is no single optimum size. There are optimum sizes to do different jobs.

How about U.S. Government support for export sales?

Due to a dearth, in the last few years, of new development projects, our national leaders must eventually assume prime responsibility for any reduction in export sales. France is moving briskly in the helicopter area with good products. The Soviets, with very impressive aircraft, are flexing their worldwide helicopter export muscles. The United Kingdom is beginning to move after a period of consolidation, and Japan, in the Far East, is always aggressively searching for opportunities. Without aggressive and brilliant utilization of our resources in terms of development, manufacturing and marketing, we stand to suffer a decline in our export business.

A commercial V/STOL—when will we see it?

We can already see a commercial V/STOL in the form of helicopters operating in New York, Chicago, Los Angeles, San Francisco, Greenland, Great Britain, Belgium, Australia, USSR and other parts of the world. We will continue to see better V/STOL when our industry produces them. By the nature of our world today, this is most likely to happen when our national leaders provide encouragement and aid in developing new aircraft systems. Commercial helicopters are now being used for a variety of jobs such as oil exploration, power line construction, traffic control, police work, firefighting, aerial photography (especially for television commercials and for motion pictures) and agriculture. The Helicopter Association of America is made up largely of commercial helicopter operators—companies ranging in size from small one- or two-helicopter outfits to such large operators as Petroleum Helicopters Inc., Okanagan Helicopters Ltd., and Rotor Aids. All of them are making a profitable, nonsubsidized living from the operation of commercial helicopters. The use of V/STOL aircraft to help solve the problem of urban transportation is rapidly approaching the stage where it will no longer be a "luxury" for a few travelers, but will be a necessity for many.

Is industry still willing to participate financially in the commercial V/STOL?

Yes.

What is your prediction on the military helicopter V/STOL market by 1975? The civilian market by 1975?

Between now and 1975 we expect that from 12,000 to 20,000 military helicopters will be sold and from 3000 to 5000 commercial helicopters.

How would you describe the outlook for small companies trying to enter the industry?

I would say the outlook is poor. In fact, the present helicopter manufacturing companies will themselves be hard pressed to maintain their position in the industry as the major aerospace companies seek to enter the vertical lift aircraft field. Several have already done so or are attempting to do so with varying degrees of success. Small companies should be prepared to compete with the older helicopter companies (with their years of rotary-wing experience) and with the giant fixed-wing companies with their strong backgrounds and reputations.

What impact do you see on industry as a result of the Army/Air Force agreement.

The impact is not significant.

In military V/STOL, what is the best propulsion approach?

The rotor for vertical lift and for propulsion is the best bet for the foreseeable future for most applications. For the long-range future, it is my belief that significant advances in power plants (such as extremely lightweight and high-power turbine engines) as well as revolutionary changes in power plant philosophy will lead eventually to some rather phenomenal types of vertical lift aircraft.

We've backed away from the 200 by 200 foot vertiport. What about land costs downtown?

Of course, land costs are high downtown in most cities. However, a most important point should be noted here: of the 52 largest cities in the United States, 48 are located on rivers, lakes or oceans. Thus the floating, or barge-type heliport, would appear to be ideal as a means of bringing vertical lift aircraft right into downtown, or near downtown, areas without the problem of high land costs. Other large cities in the U. S. are located in desert or plains areas where heliports could easily be built without facing the penalties of downtown land costs. Generally, I would say that for large-scale operations from city-center to city-center with vertical lift aircraft, the best bet will be the waterfront terminals.

The claim is made that noise is making both onlookers and passengers nervous. What is the answer?

I feel that technology will provide, and is already providing, the answer. The turboshaft engine, for example, is not only far more efficient for helicopters, but is far less of a problem from the noise viewpoint. Certain types of rotor systems produce quite noticeable noise, while certain other types do not cause such problems. The obvious answer is to concentrate on the refinement of those types of rotor systems which to date have proved to be the most quiet.

Regarding the Skylounge, what is the possibility of a $4 fare, airport to downtown, as has been predicted in Los Angeles?

Fine. The possibility is good provided the ticket is sold as a part of a trip fare.

What are the major problems facing the helicopter industry today?

We are faced with many problems. One is the problem of convincing our national leaders that vertical lift aircraft have a vital and legitimate place in the overall planning for future transportation. Others are our own industry problems of high development and manufacturing costs and resultant low profits. We do not view such problems as increased payload and speed as major problems; we know we can do better in those areas and have designs on the boards which are well within the capabilities of our present technology. The problem is merely to apply the new materials, designs, methods and techniques so that we can come up with aircraft that will be lower in cost, easier to maintain, quiter and will have less vibration. I submit that this is a relatively minor problem compared with the larger difficulty of convincing the powers that be that vertical lift aircraft have a most vital contribution to make to the future of transportation, especially in urban areas.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Appendix

Pittsburgh's Participation in Public Broadcasting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 20, 1967

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, when I introduced my bill, H.R. 10408, the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967, last spring, I said that the city of Pittsburgh, which has long been recognized as a world leader in industrial and scientific research, also has had first priority in communications. WQED, the Nation's first community educational television station began in Pittsburgh in 1954; WDUQ, Duquesne University's educational radio station has been serving Pittsburgh since 1949. We are now prepared to enter a new era in communications; the passage of this bill will help promote high-quality television and radio broadcasting over a noncommercial educational broadcasting system.

At this point in the RECORD I insert my testimony on the bill before the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, and the testimony of Mr. William T. Gladmon, director of development, WQED-WQEX, Pittsburgh, concerning the specialized adult education programs in operation on WQEX, and the role he envisions for the future.

The material follows:

TESTIMONY OF HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD, BEFORE THE INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE COMMITTEE, ON H.R. 10408, PUBLIC BROADCASTING ACT OF 1967

Mr. Chairman, it is a great pleasure for me to be here this morning to speak on behalf of the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967, and to introduce Mr. William Gladmon, the Director of Development of America's first community educational television station, WQED, which was launched in my city of Pittsburgh in 1954.

When I introduced my bill, H.R. 10408, last Spring, I said that I envisioned a new era in communications where every American will have the opportunity to enjoy greater diversity and choice in public service programs, political issues and debates, as well as entertainment, music and drama. I also said that I believe that this legislation will permit the full growth and development of our communications resources, bringing the best of public affairs programs to all of the people, through the maximum use of the creative leadership and facilities already available in our community. Mr. Gladmon will develop this idea further in his testimony as he discusses the specialized business and industry training programs available on WQED's sister station, WQEX, Pittsburgh—but first, I ask the Committee's indulgence for a few comments.

First, I don't think it can be emphasized too strongly that the legislation we are considering today—which has the personal support of the President and the endorsement of the Ford Foundation and Carnegie Commissions—is not a reflection that commercial networks have failed to do the job. Rather it is a recognition that there is a new job to be done. There is a new audience forming in America which has actually been spawned by mass communications, an audience which is more demanding, more critical, and more eager to test innovations. The Public Broadcasting Act is intended to provide the nation with a way to respond to this new audience and to bring the great promise of electronic communications to dynamic reality. I think it is significant that CBS has already pledged $1 million towards this effort.

Second, communications genius, Marshall McLuhan has said that we are living in an age of "allatonceness", the time of the simultaneous happening. And I agree. However, while television is immediate and visual and, in that sense, has perhaps had greater impact in imparting information and understanding, we must not forget radio—the first medium to carry the news into homes on a nationwide basis. A little known, but significant service rendered by educational radio, is the free distribution of many of its programs to commercial stations throughout the country. I am proud that WDUQ, at Duquesne University in Pittsburgh, which has been serving our community since 1949, is one of these stations. This legislation recognizes the great contribution of educational radio by offering for the first time federal grants for construction of noncommercial radio broadcasting facilities—and by its name, "The Public Broadcasting Act of 1967", not just the Public Television Act of 1967.

One of the strongest and most necessary points of this legislation, I believe, is the intention to assist in developing a strong interconnection system, whereby such programs as "Kaleidoscope," the daily, one-hour program produced here on American University's WAMU, specializing in short features, news, music, agency reports and interviews, can be broadcast to other educational affiliates and commercial stations upon request.

Finally, I am proud that Pittsburgh has been in the game since the beginning. A Pittsburgher served on the Educational Television Stations Committee on a Presidential Commission which drafted a first report to the President in 1965 (Mr. Leland Hazard, Director of Pittsburgh Plate Glass Company); Pittsburghers participated in the First and Second Conferences of Long-Range Planning of Educational Television Stations (Mr. George Follansbee, Chairman of the Board of Directors, Pittsburgh ETV Stations, and Mr. Joseph D. Hughes, Administrative Trustee, Richard King Mellon Foundation); a Pittsburgher is a current member of the Board of Directors of the Educational Television Stations Division of National Association of Educational Broadcasters (Mr. Donald V. Taverner, President, WQED-WQEX); a Pittsburgher serves on the Subcommittee on Radio Development of the Pennsylvania State Advisory Committee on Educational Broadcasting (Mr. B. Kendall Crane, Director of WDUQ Radio); and I am delighted to note that a Pittsburgher is represented on the newly-formed National Citizens Committee for Public Television, chaired by Mr. Thomas P. Hoving, Director of the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York (Mr. Leland Hazard).

Mr. Chairman, I would like to request that the report of the Pennsylanvia State Advisory Committee on Educational Broadcasting, which discusses Pennsylvania's plans for a statewide educational radio network designed to intensify teaching at all school levels, provide special education for adults, and for school drop-outs; offer in-service teacher training programs; provide cultural and informational programs, be included as part of my testimony.

I urge immediate passage of this legislation to provide for greater participation in this new area in communications.

And now, Mr. William Gladmon, the Director of Development, WQED-WQEX, who has been a pioneer in the development of management training via television and who is responsible for the development of management training, medical education and other forms of adult education at WQED-WQEX.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

A REPORT TO THE HOUSE INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION LEGISLATION, JULY 20, 1967

My name is William T. Gladmon and I am the Director of Development for educational television stations WQED-WQEX in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. I appreciate this opportunity to report on an area in which I personally have been involved for almost five years—an area which has *not* been specifically mentioned, to my knowledge, in either these hearings or the Senate Hearings. I feel this is an area which, if given the proper resources and development, would prove to be one of the greatest educational tools yet developed.

I shall make my comments brief and to the point, and shall be happy to discuss in greater detail any of the subjects on which the Committee may have questions.

The area I want to bring to your attention is really untitled—some call it Continuing Education Via Television, Adult Education, Specialized Training, Up-dating of Professionals, Postgraduate and Undergraduate Training and Ongoing Adult Training. Of all these, I prefer to title it Specialized Adult Education—a way in which to keep an individual informed and growing in his or her particular field.

When I talk about Specialized Adult Education I refer to all kinds of professional and vocational areas. Among the major developments via educational television are the fields of nursing, postgraduate and undergraduate doctors training, dental, police and fire training, personnel and management development, credit and non credit college courses, credit and noncredit teachers courses and law training. I am quite sure that there are numerous other areas that are presently being developed throughout this country.

I would like to say a few words about what is happening in some of these fields. In the police and fire area we find an expanding program being done by New York City officials. Each week thousands of policemen and firemen are receiving some on-the-job training via television. There was another police program developed in Buffalo, New York, but it had to be dropped because of a lack of funds. The Los Angeles Fire Department now has a major proposal for the use of television as a training media, and it may be on the air at this time.

In the field of college credit courses, we find that the Chicago educational station, WTTW, has been broadcasting undergraduate college credit courses for approximately eight years. Think of all the people, because of economic or health reasons, that could benefit from such a service. I believe the latest figures show some 80,000 people in the Chicago area have taken courses via television. This development is a complete story in itself. KTCA in St. Paul has also done an outstanding job working with and developing undergraduate nurses training courses. At one time they had over 300 video tapes in such fields as anatomy, pharmacology, biology and in other related medical areas, KTCA was also one of the first to develop the concept of management training by television.

How are we going to inform doctors who live 50 miles from metropolitan areas of the latest developments in their field? How are we going to keep engineers up-dated? How are lawyers going to keep up on local, state and federal changes? How are we going to keep, say, 250 million Americans knowledgeable of changes in federal law or new Health and Welfare programs? I understand we have that problem in Medicare right now. What about the returning nurse that has been away from her profession for 15 years? How do you convey to her the changes which have taken place? All fields today are in need of a better communications system. I am sure you are all aware that the explosion of knowledge is almost unbelievable.

Let me take a few moments to report to you a few facts and figures relating to the growth of training in the various professions.

Dr. Elmer W. Engstrom, Chairman of the Executive Committee, Radio Corporation of America, stated that ". . . the total cost of training to industry is now about $18 billion annually, and will reach $25 billion by 1970. By way of comparison, the yearly cost of running all the colleges and universities in the United States is about $9 billion."

John W. Macy, Jr., Chairman of the U.S. Civil Service Commission, also made some pertinent comments about governmental training which are indicative of the entire field, of course. Some of his quotes are:

"The Commission (U.S. Civil Service Commission) coordinates the interagency training offered by other agencies, in addition to conducting courses of its own. During the year ending June 30, 1966, a total of 65,000 Federal employees participated in these courses, 22,000 of them in courses given by the Commission."

Macy also reports from a paper by the National Commission on Technology, Automation and Economic Progress which states that:

"*Half* of what an engineer has learned today will be obsolete in 10 years.

"Half of what he will *need* to know 10 years from now is not available to him today.

"*80 percent* of modern medical practice was discovered in the last 20 years.

"Knowledge is now accumulating at such a rapid rate that it will *double* in the *next 15* years."

The National Association of Manufacturers has stated clearly that we will need at least ". . . three million new managers by 1975 based on the additional 20 million humans that are expected to be in the work force." This article went on to state that despite the vast amount of company training being done on the job, at colleges, and universities it does not scratch the surface of the need for much broader manager development facilities along more quantitative lines.

The American Society for Training and Development, which is a nationally recognised, non-profit, training organization, has grown from a 3900 membership to an almost 6000 membership in the last three years. This growth in membership exemplifies the greatest amount of interest that has taken place since its beginning 23 years ago. At the last National Convention, some 1800 people representing just about every state in the union and over 40 countries participated. The American Management Association, in the last 10 years, has made tremendous strides both as a professional organization and as a developer of management resources. In 1957 their operation budget was 7½ million dollars; today, in 1967, it is approximately 20 million dollars. The total membership today is over 50,000.

I mention the above organizations and figures to indicate to you the tremendous emphasis now being placed on the training of human resources.

It is quite obvious to me that educational television, as a communicator, could carry adult education into a new dimension.

I would now like to develop for you a kind of case study that relates to WQED and the Pittsburgh area.

Almost five years ago when we at WQED began to explore the possibility of broadcating Specialized Adult Education, we found that one single item made the leadership community ready and willing to investigate a new teaching tool. This one item was need—the need to find a way to reach the masses in their particular fields.

The rapidly expanding economy of our nation and the complexities involved with these economic expansions have created a need for improved managerial practices. Our programming is designed to help organizations in this directon.

It has been realized in recent years that a manager's or supervisor's training background in formal education is not enough for him to keep his company or department progressing and functioning smoothly. He must now keep himself will-informed and up-to-date with the modern, complex and ever-changing techniques of management.

In September, 1964, after many months of planning, WQEX began televising its first formal management series. These programs were put together expressly to help managers keep abreast of what is happening in the management world today—new concepts, ideas and often a completely different view of the over-all management picture. After just three years of operation in the management field, we find that 158 companies enrolled 6,000 managers or supervising personnel.

We feel that WQEX affords an unusual opportunity for business and industrial leaders in the personnel development field to add a new dimension to in-house training. Through educational television, outstanding lecturers can bring to the local conference room new knowledge, skills and attitudes.

The distinguished leaders who join the discussion groups by television may present an illustrated lecture, perform a laboratory demonstration, conduct a role play or a T group, explain a detailed drawing or other complex design. They have found WQEX to be a highly versatile and effective training tool.

Due to the pioneer work of WQEX, management training via television is now being used in many areas of the country. We feel gratified that our initial experiment in management training through television has given training management another tool in the development of human resources.

It would be misleading for me to let you think that WQED–WQEX has organized and developed this total concept by itself. The work that has been carried on by the South Carolina State Educational System is outstanding. The need for management knowledge in that area is tenfold of that in the Pittsburgh area as evidenced by the enrollment figures in management courses. You will recall that I mentioned an enrollment of 6000 people over a three year period; South Carolina on a statewide basis has enrolled as many as 3100 management personnel in one course.

The American Management Association's Media Department, under the direction of Mr. Daniel C. Cady, has for the last four years been supplying concepts, direction and funds for management programs.

I have been unable to collect accurate figures or information on the areas of the country that are engaged in this activity. I am informed, however, that Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Maine, upstate New York, Pittsburgh, St. Paul and Cleveland are engaged in this program. San Francisco, Boston and other areas are now setting up management committees and working toward the institution of adult education.

Because of the lack of manpower and funds, we have been unable to make a scientific study on the benefits of such a program, but we have found the following nine points to be beneficial:

1. It provides access to top-level instruction from leaders in business, industrial and academic worlds. It brings leading professors or speakers, by way of television, into the plants. These experts could never afford the time to cover all the engagements required of them.

2. It provides the opportunity for a company to establish a training medium, if such a program is presently non-existant.

3. A television production studio can lend itself to excellent presentations which may not be available to individual firms because of a lack of teaching technology and visual aids.

4. It is economical.

5. It reduces the costs of sending large groups of employees out of the office or plant to special seminars.

6. It saves thousands of hours in developing courses by the training department.

7. It makes the community more aware of keeping people better trained and up-to-date.

8. Television acts as a springboard for active discussion.

9. The inter-exchange of group or department ideas. This may be one of the most important benetfis realized because we found departments of both large and small companies that had never sat down together to discuss their problems.

The case study which I have just presented to you in the management training area could naturally be applied to any other educational pursuit.

We at WQEX are also engaged in broadcasting a one-hour once-a-week program in postgraduate medicine. Some 1200 doctors in 70 hospitals participate for 33 weeks a year.

Dr. Campbell Moses, Director of Postgraduate Medicine at the University of Pittsburgh and Medical and Science director for the American Heart Association, made the following statement:

"Educational television has proven to be immensely useful in keeping doctors abreast of advances in medical practice. The technic, pioneered in Utah, has since then been widely applied in Pittsburgh, South Carolina, Buffalo, Boston, California, Oklahoma and Arizona. By reaching large numbers of physicians simultaneously it is possible to inform a large proportion of the medical public at one time and thereby take advantage of the concept of "critical mass" to reinforce "doctor to doctor" education. In Pittsburgh we have used this technic for more than four years and not only to present continuing examples of the best medical practice, but also each week to call attention to local outbreaks of contagious diseases, to announce the availability of new drugs and also, and most importantly, to immediately alert physicians to new information about drug reactions as this material is released by the Food and Drug Administration. The ability to communicate with physicians via television goes a long way toward bridging the gap between laboratory discovery and bedside application."

Under the guidance of the Director of Continuing Education in the field of nursing at the University of Pittsburgh, we have been broadcasting a one-hour program for the last two years. This program is geared to the professional nurse employed by the general hospital. Its main objective is to provide more information on mental health concepts, such as caring for problem patients. Our survey shows we are reaching 40 to 60 hospitals and 500 to 800 professional people.

We have not even really begun to explore the potential of this tool and the ways to harness its power. All of our work to date has been trial and error. We work constantly without sufficient funds, qualified staff and facilities to carry out such a program.

With a well developed concept, this could reach even the smallest of communities. The further you go from a metropolitan area, the more such a service is needed.

No one station, at the present time, is in a position to do little more than to meet its every day operations, its budget and its problems.

I feel that a national group, maybe the Public Television Corporation, is needed to set up the criteria, studies, research, the mechanism to bring the resources that are needed to make educational television a true and integral part of the Adult Education Program.

American Policy in the Middle East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 20, 1967

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Marver Bernstein, the dean of the Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs of Princeton University delivered a perceptive address to the recent National Emergency Conference on Israel, sponsored by the Conference of Presidents of Major Jewish Organizations.

I urge my colleagues to read his analysis of U.S. policy in the Middle East.

The text follows:

AMERICAN POLICY IN THE MIDDLE EAST

(By Marver H. Bernstein)

Without a major change, American policy in the Middle East will fail—as it failed to prevent the Arab-Israeli war of 1967.

A brief perspective of what American policy has been in the past may offer some guidance in the mammoth task of achieving a basic shift in that policy.

The overriding goal of American policy had been to maintain a prudent security equilibrium in the Middle East and to promote internal stability in the region.

These terms are very imprecise. They confer maximum discretion on the President and the State Department, not only because the Executive Branch must struggle to maintain its initiative *vis-a-vis* Congress, but also because the fluidity of the Middle Eastern situation requires it. The American interest lies not in instability but in peace. The critical issue, of course, is stability for *what* and on *whose terms*.

How was the goal of a prudent security equilibrium to be reached or promoted? Essentially, four approaches were utilized:

The *first* was guarantees of the independence and territorial integrity of Israel.

The *second* included a pattern of actions and policies designed to minimize Soviet and Chinese penetration of the Middle East.

The *third* was the use of foreign aid as a tool for maintaining equilibrium, reducing Soviet penetration and promoting economic growth.

The *fourth* was the maintenance of open channels of communication with Arab governments to enable the United States to exercise some influence over their behavior and beliefs. In this connection any overt alliance of the United States with Israel would have appeared to polarize the Middle East and send the Arab states rushing off to Moscow.

What have been the main characteristics of American policy in the Middle East? Here, in outline, are some nine features of that policy:

1. In the effort to maintain an equilibrium in the Middle East which is at least neutral with respect to the United States-Soviet conflict, the American position often seemed very kind to the Arabs and very harsh toward Israel. Why was this the case? Part of the answer lay in recognizing that Israel is pro-United States and Nasser is usually anti-U.S. It seems striking and ironic, therefore, that the United States should have rewarded its enemies more than its friends. In any case, as columnist William S. White wrote, "Any notion that our foreign policy in the Middle East is run with special tenderness for Jewish feelings is one of the special idiocies of our time." [*The Washington Post, Jan. 29, 1965*]

Be that as it may, the main drift of the policy of three Administrations had been one of exceptional kindness to Nasser's Egypt, not primarily because the United States strongly preferred Egypt to Israel, but because United States conception of the problems of achieving a security balance in the Middle East required it.

2. On February 1, 1965, Under Secretary of State George Ball told the Senate Appropriations Committee: "What happens in the Near East is of critical importance to our strategic sea, air and land routes, to our vast oil investment; to the security of Israel and other countries in that area." The United States position reflected a tendency—shared with other Western countries—to overrate the political, military and economic importance of the Middle East.

To be sure, the Middle East is the link connecting three continents; it is the intersecting point of land, water and air routes; it does contain the major oil reserves of the world. But these have all become less rather than more strategic on the contemporary scene. The demand for oil has increased greatly in recent years, but so have resources outside of the Middle East increased greatly—in North Africa, in Iran, in South America, in Canada and elsewhere; and natural gas discoveries have also helped to supply the growing needs of European industry. While nuclear energy is some distance off, and the demand for oil will increase in the years ahead, we seem to give more attention to protecting American oil investments in the Middle East than considerations of military strategy require.

3. A pedestrian and obvious fact of contemporary Middle Eastern history is the persistent inability of Arabs to unite politically despite the strong belief that unity is their natural condition. But there is a conception that is not so obvious; the persistent notion that Arab unity would be in the interests of the United States and its allies, and also the interests of Israel as well as the Arab countries, despite the fact that a unified Arab world would seem more likely to be anti-U.S. than either neutral or pro-U.S.

The dominant theme of Nasser, as the top leader of Arab nationalism, has been Arab unit. Unity has been held forth as the ineluctable destiny of the Arab world. But clearly, Arab unity has been the exception, not the rule, in Arab history. The factors that divide and distinguish the Arab countries appear to be far more substantial than the one factor that unites them—hatred of Israel. As Abba Eban recently wrote, nothing has divided the Arab world more than the effort to unite it.

The U.S. position had maintained that a prudent security equilibrium in the Middle East was more likely to be achieved under conditions of Arab unity than Arab diversity an political pluralism. The case usually rested on the view that economic growth would be fostered by unity and would itself create pride in economic achievement and thereby minimize or reduce anti-Israel slogans as the goal of unity.

However, a strong case could have been made that a pluralistic diverse Arab world of separate governments could more easily accommodate an Israel-Arab understanding. A Middle East convulsed by an Egyptian bid for centralized control scarcely seemed a congenial setting for achieving such understanding.

4. The U.S. experience in the Middle East postdated the full-blown emergence of the Palestine issue. The United States, compared with England and France, has had only minimal experience in dealing with Middle Eastern problems. Perhaps because of its lack of regional experience, the U.S. has been tempted to be overly impressed with psychological and sociological factors in the Arab picture; for example, the trauma and bitter frustration of the Arabs resulting from their humiliating defeat by the Israelis; the dream-like quality of their hopes and fears; their enormous pride and sense of personal dignity; and the great gulf between their verbal ferocity and their timid deeds.

Awareness of these factors may help to account for the tendency of the experts to have discounted the militancy reflected by the violent statements of Arab leaders. Among knowledgeable experts there was often a characteristic paradox in value judgment; an admiring attitude regarding Arab culture and historical development and sympathy for strivings for personal dignity; and at the same time bitter disappointment with the lack of Arab achievement and fulfillment.

Caught in this value paradox, the experts in the State Department often seemed to interpret Nasser's violent aims as merely hortatory—not really to be taken seriously. We were often not quite such what Nasser really meant; hence, his words were rarely taken to mean what they plainly said. Israel is scarcely to be criticized if it took the view that it could not discount the plain meaning of the words as completely as the diplomats appeared to do.

5. Clearly, the American experts in international affairs tended to believe that Israel had exaggerated in assessing the immediacy of the threats to its existence. Why? Part of the answer lay in the respect for Israel's effectiveness as an independent nation coupled with a lack of confidence in the capacity and human resources of Arab countries.

Perhaps another part of the answer is that the United States has been more acutely aware than many Israelis of the unsettling effects of Israel's policy regarding retaliatory or preemptive raids and attacks. The United States believed that Israel exaggerated threats to its existence and was therefore too quick in embarking on retaliatory raids. The American view had been that Israel was insufficiently aware of the consequences, adverse to the interests of Israel and the West, flowing from its militancy. World opinion often perceived the killings but not the provocation, and the U.N. machinery had not proved to be helpful to Israel in evaluating Arab complaints and charges.

6. There was a tendency to exaggerate the consequences of Nasser's strong and spirited drive for modernization and industrialization. The fact is that time had been running out for Nasser. Military expenditures had become almost insupportable. The Yemeni campaign had been a dismal failure and ex-

tremely costly. The population explosion had run ahead of the pace of economic growth. The level of economic activity had increased in absolute amounts but had declined on a per capita basis. In this context the inner logic of Nasser's position seemed to move toward war of military expansion.

7. Nasser proved to be a very formidable opponent in dealing with the United States. He has been a first-rate bargainer and bluffer. He effectivley manipulated the U.S. and Soviet Union in order to obtain maximum financial and military aid for Egypt. He knew that he had advantages in bargaining only in the context of crises, which he has been very adept at manufacturing.

Nasser succeeded in using the cold war to internationalize Arab affairs. He thereby gained a lever to exact better terms from both the West and the East. The American goal of Arab unity in turn played into the hands of Nasser whose policy could succeed only by making Arab unity a leading international issue. Nasser effectively demonstrated Egypt's nuisance value by showing that he was dangerous and had to be bought off at a high price.

There are some elements of high tragedy here. Nasser has been personally incorrupt, a highly effective ruler who led Egypt through a major social revolution. He developed new industries, exterminated the great landowners, bolstered the educational system and nurtured a new middle class of military officers, young professionals and bureaucrats.

On the other hand, labor productivity in Egypt stayed very low, consumption pitifully low. Poverty remained intense. Egypt was not slowly catching up with a Western standard, but rather was steadily falling behind. The country lived on borrowed money and neither capitalism nor Communism seemed to work. It was critically important that Nasser keep up the morale and perquisites of the new middle class, but he was unable to do so in the context of economic retrenchment.

The economists advised Nasser that such retrenchment was mandatory for economic survival. But as a military leader of high ambition with a mission to fulfill, he may have thought that his only way out was through continued expansion in Israel or elsewhere.

8. The case for financial aid to Egypt and other Arab countries could well have been justified by general humanitarian considerations; otherwise it was rather weak.

The basic postulate of foreign aid is that Western security is promoted best by helping countries maintain independence and becoming viable economically; and if the West does not help, the East will. The United States also appeared to believe, with some justification, that however hostile Nasser may be to the West, anyone replacing him would probably be worse.

Yet, had Nasser received no aid whatsoever from the West, it is difficult to imagine that he could have been more hostile.

9. In 1964 and 1965, in contrast to the French and West German attitudes and policies toward Israel, a noticeable wavering and weakness as well as some clumsiness showed up in London and Washington in their dealings with the excesses of the Egyptians and the Syrians.

Certainly, American reaction had been very cautious when American libraries went up in flames. U.S. diplomats appeared to have considered German recognition of Israel in 1964 as a matter of doubtful wisdom. They also urged Israel not to resort to arms in meeting the attacks of the Palestine Liberation Army, and not to resist Arab water diversion projects. The State Department seemed to take the view that it would be a long time before a determination could be made as to whether the Arabs would really be violating the Johnston Water Plan.

The Israelis had a valid claim in believing that the United States preferred to avoid strong clear action strengthening Israel's security, and at the same time be willing, however reluctantly, to tolerate intolerable effrontery and vilification on the part of Arab leaders. It was to be expected that Israel would often be disappointed with the attitude of American officials toward its security needs. In the minds of American officials Israel's needs always had to be measured against the probable reaction of Arab leaders.

It was a dominant consideration in the Eisenhower-Dulles policy that the Arabs were more fearful of Zionism than of Communism. Dulles believed that the United States had to counter the Arab belief that the United States supported aggressive expansion of Israel. Recognition of this belief and fear inhibited American action and policy in Israel. At the same time the United States was ready to use economic aid to influence the government of Israel. Thus, it delayed for a long time the move of Israel's Foreign Ministry to Jerusalem; it stopped hydro-electric development on the Jordan River; and its reactions to the Quibya Raid of October 1953 did deter subsequent militancy on the part of Israel.

Given the deep complexity of Middle Eastern issues, it has been difficult for American Jews to understand U.S. policy. I do not mean approval, but understanding. The main difficulty has been the failure to understand that the American attempt to achieve a prudent security balance in the Middle East prevented the United States from meeting Israel's security needs as, Israel defined them. Israelis tended to understand better than American Jews did why it was inevitable that the American response to Israel's stated security needs fell short of Israel's demands.

This brings us to the present crisis. How did American policy of friendly detachment and concerned neutrality express itself just before and during the outbreak of war? The record shows the following:

The United States would not permit the annihilation of Israel. But short of that decisive threat, it undertook no initiative unilaterally.

The United States did not expect war between the Arabs and Israel and thought that the Israelis had exaggerated Nasser's threats of extermination.

The United States did not expect the United Nations to arrange an accommodation, but it nevertheless turned to the U.N. to avoid diplomatic isolation.

It became uncertain in the weekend in early June before war broke out whether the United States could hold Israel in check without making some strategic commitment to Israel.

The United States actively explored various proposals to reopen the Gulf of Aqaba through some face-saving compromise that would recognize Egypt's sovereignty over the Strait of Tiran, yet assure Israel's access to the sea. It also considered Thant's proposal to place U.N. truce observers on both sides of the Arab-Israel frontier.

The United States became increasingly perturbed by the emergence of the Soviet Union as the champion of the Arabs, by its historic expansionist drive toward the Mediterranean, and by its attempt to control half or more of Europe's oil imports.

Repeated guarantees of Israel's security failed to prevent the present hostilities, and Israel consequently saw a better chance to resolve the issue of national survival through war rather than diplomacy. Events would seem to support Israel's strategic judgment.

What lesson is to be learned from this review of the American posture of concerned neutrality and friendly detachment in the Middle East?

It can be stated simply that the traditionally ambivalent U.S. policy failed.

Therefore, the President, the State Department and the Congress must be advised and persuaded to use the opportunities provided by Israel's military victory to achieve a massive reduction of the tensions that underlie the war.

It means a recognition of the illusory character of Arab unity and the political unreliability of Arab leadership.

It means a lifting of both the blockade of the Gulf of Aqaba and the Suez Canal.

It means, above all, a peace treaty between Israel and each of the Arab states that recognizes the legitimacy of Israeli statehood.

It means a readjustment of boundaries to meet Israel's urgent security needs, including the Gaza Strip, the area around Latrun and the hills directly to the north and west of Jerusalem, and the Old City of Jerusalem itself, with appropriate guarantees for the safety of Christian and Moslem holy places.

These objectives will not be achieved if the United States conforms to its traditional policy of concerned neutrality. Effective movement toward achieving Israel's legitimate goals calls for a substantial shift in American policy.

The obstacles to such a marked change in policy are indeed great. They include:

American preoccupation with Viet Nam.

The horrible complexities and confusions of foreign policy-making in the United States.

Traditional Foreign Service sympathy for Arab interests.

The heightened enmity of the Arab countries for Israel.

The considerable Afro-Asian support of the U.A.R.

The unfriendliness of the U.N. arena for the resolution of issues directly involving Israel.

But there are also some factors influencing the kind of policy change that circumstances now require. One is the emergence of new leadership in Israel composed of men who have been taught to rely not on international guarantees but rather upon their own courage, initiative and resourcefulness. Another is the strong moral, political and financial support of American citizens for the continued independence and security of Israel free from the dangerous challenges that have persisted for nineteen years of statehood.

Out With Tradition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 20, 1967

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call your attention to an article from the July issue of California Librarian that deals with a new concept in libraries that the Los Angeles Public Library is currently trying. With the help of the Federal Library Services and Construction Act, this project attempts to improve library service and contact in the culturally deprived areas of Los Angeles by the use of supplemental specialized librarians who try to awaken the reading interests of the children and their parents by such unorthodox methods as Classic Comics books and library-centered informal community programs. In addition, bookmobiles and elementary school library classes help to encourage a more general interest among the people of these areas. The fresh ideas of this progressive librarianship are commendable, and I hope that other communities will benefit from the methods employed.

Under unanimous consent I include this article in the RECORD:

OUT WITH TRADITION

(By Michelle R. Vale)

I

Comic books in the library? A good-looking, bearded, male librarian? Librarians spending more time working in the community than working in the library? The answer is an emphatic yes!

The Los Angeles Public Library has budgeted funds of $519,536 under the Library Services and Construction Act for a project to improve library service and increase library contact in culturally deprived areas of the city. The project uses three different approaches to reach target groups: bookmobile service to "poverty pockets;" special service within the library region which serves the central city; and concentrated branch library activity in two poverty areas of the city, Venice Beach and Lincoln Heights. All three services have been operating since mid-July 1966.

The emphasis of the Los Angeles program is the branch library approach, now being tried in Venice, a beach area of mixed racial groups, and Lincoln Heights in East Los Angeles, which has sixty per cent Mexican-American population. Three specialized librarians have been assigned to Venice and three to Lincoln Heights branches in addition to the regular professional staff of two in each branch.

The added children's, young adult, and adult services librarians are not given routine staffing assignments in the branches. They function as catalysts between the local neighborhood and the library, discovering and awakening a public not previously library users. For very frequently this public cannot read.

In the disadvantaged areas, books may be feared because they represent the unknown; and yet people need the information which books contain. Contrary to most librarians' belief, many persons' lives may, in fact, seem complete without reading books. The situation does not lessen the need for literacy.

Our daily lives dictate the necessity of reading. Passing a driver's license test to accept a job at a distance from home; knowing how best to divide up a salary among the consumer needs of a family; and studying for a civil service examination to get a job with a decent salary—these things require the abracadabra of reading. The library programs in the two Los Angeles City branch libraries are aimed at satisfying such needs. The librarians in the project are involving themselves and, by extension, the library in local community activities. They are learning what the needs of the disadvantaged really are and are focusing their programs to meet those needs.

A gay Cinco de Mayo festival celebrating Mexican independence was held in the yard of the Venice Branch last spring and saluted the area's twenty-five per cent Mexican-American population. The city recreation department was glad to supply a mariachi band. A resident of Los Angeles gave tamales. Teen groups ran the game and food booths. Films of Mexico, borrowed from the Mexican Tourist Bureau in Los Angeles, were shown continuously in the library. About 1,000 people enjoyed this new library-community day. The local city councilman attended too. Aware of what the library was doing, he was so favorably impressed that he later appeared before the library commissioners and succeeded in obtaining funds to permit the opening of the branch on Saturday mornings.

II

This type of library activity cannot go on during the conventional 9:00–5:30 working hours; but then the job to be done here is not the usual job of the librarian. It requires some unlikely and perhaps unorthodox hours and efforts, while the librarians have free rein to experiment in the process. The library administration purposely made the operation of the project unstructured in terms of "how" the goals were to be accomplished.

Mr. Harold Hamill, Director of the Los Angeles Public Library, and his staff drew up the original proposals of library service to the disadvantaged. When the California State Library accepted the project as part of the state plan under the Library Services and Construction Act, Mrs. Johanna Sutton was selected as Project Coordinator. Mrs. Sutton had been in the system as the Vernon Branch Librarian and at that time was making community contacts in her own area to extend the services of that branch library.

Mrs. Sutton's first job was to select people to work with her. Staff members of the Los Angeles Public Library were given an opportunity to express their interest in working in the project. The enthusiastic response made outside recruiting unnecessary. For a few, new positions meant a promotion; for the rest, the positions were lateral transfers. But for all, librarians and clerks alike, there is a singular mission—a desire to bring books to more people.

III

Although the goal is a unified one, each member of the project staff works in his own way to achieve the group objective. The project children's librarian in Lincoln Heights, Mrs. Marcia Linville, works primarily with Head Start classes and the schools. This library has a basic staff of two librarians to cover the forty hours a week the library is open, so the staff children's librarian was never able to give adequate service to all the schools. Now Mrs. Linville schedules the maximum number of classes possible in the library every week to try to acquaint every child with books. Project funds are also being used to strengthen the entire book collection in this branch. Multiple paperback copies of popular children's book titles, such as those in the "Curious George" series and others, are being purchased under the program.

"Young Writers of Venice" is an original publication started by Mrs. Selma Benjamin, the project children's librarian at the Venice Branch. Stories and poems written by the children in the area are given exposure in this typewritten monthly, which is also illustrated by the children.

The children's librarians assigned to both the branch projects are using Classic Comics as a way to reach children. Comic books traditionally are not bought by the Los Angeles Public Library. However, the librarians in the project are not restricted by the library's general policies. The two children's librarians decided to experiment with using comic books and found them a good first step in acquainting the non-reader with books. A librarian reported that a child who was very interested in the Classic Comics version of *Treasure Island* was delighted to learn that there was "more" to the story and was eager to read it.

Both the Venice and Lincoln Heights Branches have increased the size of their adult foreign language collections, which are borrowed from the central Los Angeles City Library. Particular emphasis has been placed on Spanish language books because of the large Mexican-American population in both areas. Signs in Spanish direct patrons to "Libros en Español."

In the Venice Branch the adult services librarian, Don Roberts, sees his role as community-oriented; he meets with as many formal and informal groups as he can. On Friday nights he arranges family programs which feature folk singers, guitarists, or whatever he feels is wanted.

The importance of the library becomes evident in many unexpected ways. An example is a group formed of previous teen-age gang members in Venice. A businessman gave them a rent-free place to meet, and a church group provides the funds to keep it going. The "guys" play pool, and some also learn how to get a driver's license. There are shorthand classes for the girls. When the group wanted to know how to run a meeting, the Library provided a copy of *Robert's Rules of Order*, which helped bring order out of chaos.

This kindling of a community interest in the library is beginning to show in the general book circulation of the Venice Branch. Five months after the program started, circulation was up thirty per cent. Circulation increased from 5,811 in April 1965 to 7,593 in April 1966.

IV

The real value of the special programs cannot, however, be objectively measured by statistics. The librarians continue to experiment with and to learn from their approaches. They share their successes and failures with the rest of the project staff and with the staff of the entire Los Angeles Public Library.

It is difficult to predict the long-term results from the branch pilot projects, the special bookmobile service which began last summer and the program in the central region. But when you see the longing for knowledge of three teen-age boys from Juvenile Hall as they pore together over a science book in the library, you know there is much work to be done.

Other programs for the disadvantaged in Oakland, California, and in New York, Indiana, Ohio, and Wisconsin are also conducted with Library Services and Construction Act funds. Most of these programs are aimed at poverty sections in metropolitan areas, but some are focused on rural areas, such as the program in Wisconsin for extending library service to migrant families.

Librarians working in these projects are image smashers. They are energetic and creative librarians finding new ways of carrying on the best traditions of good librarianship in a new society.

Hon. Emmet O'Neal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM O. COWGER

OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 20, 1967

Mr. COWGER. Mr. Speaker, many friends and associates of former Congressman Emmet O'Neal were saddened on the occasion of his recent death. Congressman O'Neal represented my district of Louisville, Ky., for five consecutive Congresses, serving here in Washington from January 3, 1935, to January 3, 1947. He was a lifelong Democrat who not only served in the Congress of the United States, but was also honored with the appointment to Ambassador to the Philippines from 1947 to 1949. The Honorable Emmet O'Neal was born in Louisville, Ky., on April 14, 1887, attended our public schools, was then graduated from Centre College in Danville, Ky., attended Yale University, and graduated with a law degree in 1910 from the University of Louisville. During the First World War former Congressman O'Neal served overseas in the U.S. Army as an enlisted man in the 5th Field Artillery of the 1st Division. His Army service included the years 1917 to 1919 and he was separated from the Army as an officer in the 103d Field Artillery of the 26th Division. He returned to the practice of law in Louisville and was first elected to the 74th Congress. In 1953 he was appointed Chairman of the Corregidor-Bataan Memorial Commission. Until his death he was actively engaged in the practice of law in Washington, D.C.

Former Congressman Emmet O'Neal served well his city, his State, and his Nation. His many friends in Louisville and in Washington pay respect to his memory.

The People of Cleveland Really Care

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 17, 1967

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, much publicity has been given to Cleveland's Hough area and to the drab conditions in which the residents of that area live, and especially to the neglect of the children and teenagers. It seems to me that due credit may not have been given to those citizens of Cleveland who are attempting to help the people of the Hough area. Therefore, I have obtained leave to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Plain Dealer on Monday, July 17, which follows, and gives credit to those sturdy citizens of Cleveland who are making a dedicated effort to better the lot of the less fortunate:

THE HUMAN TOUCH IN HOUGH AID

One of the bright spots in the drab picture of Cleveland's deprived neighborhoods has been the awareness of some unions, some business firms and some churches of the urgent need for help "here and now."

Businesses and unions have tried to help, on individual bases, usually with rehabilitation of physical property. Some religious denominations have participated in programs but only through financial contributions. Other churches are in "planning" stages of help, some plans realistic and some vague.

But, as related in The Plain Dealer, a few individual churches have provided on-the-scene aid beyond the ordinary devices.

In the Hough area, Calvary Presbyterian Church, Our Lady of Fatima Catholic Parish and St. James Episcopal Church—for example—are working with some 20,000 children under 14 years of age.

Primarily they are providing recreation for the youngsters, filling a great void in the lives of the area's boys and girls.

Calvary Presbyterian, under the Rev. John Bruere, for the third year has a program offering games and food to the children, a program that goes right into the neighborhoods and operates on vacant lots.

Our Lady of Fatima Church runs a six-week summer day camp. The activities include little trips to the zoo, to beaches, to day camps, to Metropolitan Park. These are events which may be routine for other children. To children in poor areas, these are initial excursions into real living; the trips are educational, spirit-lifting.

St. James Episcopal Church, with the help of Ursuline nuns, has a five-week recreational program that features arts and crafts classes.

These organizations are located within the blighted area, a fact that undoubtedly makes them more mindful of the needs of the residents. Just the same, their programs not only are a service to the community but also illustrate that involvement doesn't hinge on a government loan or government project. The way always is open for the human touch.

Maine Sugar Refinery Questioned

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 20, 1967

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I have previously expressed myself on the $2,250,000 loan made during the last half of 1966 by the Economic Development Administration to the Maine Sugar Industries of Easton, Maine, to convert an existing beet sugar factory to a cane sugar refinery. It was my opinion at that time, and it is my opinion now, that this loan is in violation of section 2 of the EDA Act that provides that loans shall not be made when the effect in substance is merely to transfer employment from one section of the country to another section.

With the two refineries in my district continually operating under capacity I am fearful that employment in the Boston refineries will be curtailed when the Maine plant refines sugar on a year-round basis. It is absurd to provide cheap Federal loans in order to create employment in one place when by so doing you eliminate employment somewhere else.

In addition to this $2,250,000 conversion loan it was my understanding that the EDA guaranteed a working capital loan for $1,800,000 which was made at the same time. From testimony at an Appropriations Subcommittee hearing on April 6, 1967, it would appear that working capital loans in the amount of $3,600,000 rather than $1,800,000 were guaranteed by the EDA. This discrepancy has motivated my letter to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON], chairman of the special subcommittee appointed to investigate the EDA program, which I would like to have incorporated in my remarks.

I would also like to have incorporated in these remarks an excellent objective article on the Maine sugar industry by Don Larabee, which appeared in the Quincy, Mass., Patriot Ledger on June 7, 1967.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., July 19, 1967.

Hon. ED EDMONDSON,
Chairman, Special Subcommittee on Economic Redevelopment Program, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR ED: In regard to the Maine sugar plant, it has been brought to my attention that a discrepancy of $1,800,300 exists between the figures EDA presented to your subcommittee and those it presented to the Appropriations Subcommittee.

In statements before the Appropriations Subcommittee on April 6, 1967, Mr. James Sharkey, Director of the Office of Business Development, indicated that the total possible exposure of the Government in the project would be $12,345,300.

In statements EDA presented to your subcommittee, and contained in your interim report dated March 8, 1967, however, Government exposure totaled $10,545,000—$1,800,300 less than that indicated to the Appropriations Subcommittee.

Does this $1,800,300 represent an additional loan that has not been brought to the attention of your committee or is there an error in the figures? I would appreciate it if you would have your committee staff investigate this matter and advise me.

As you recall I earlier suggested that public hearings be held on all EDA loans in excess of $100,000. I believe this recommendation would be in the public interest. Have you had a chance to give it any additional thought?

With warm regards,
Sincerely,
THOMAS P. O'NEILL, Jr.,
Member of Congress.

[From the Quincy (Mass.) Patriot-Ledger, June 7, 1967]

UNITED STATES ASSISTS NEW AROOSTOOK INDUSTRY: MAINE SUGAR REFINERY QUESTIONED

(By Donald R. Larrabee)

WASHINGTON.—Like the one-industry textile towns of New England, Maine's one-crop "potato county"—Aroostook—finally has diversified in hopes of solving its economic problems.

SOUR NOTES

The local citizenry have shown great enterprise and initiative but it's doubtful if much would have happened without an astounding $8,745,300 in federal assistance. Maine is suddenly in the sugar refining business—not only from beets, which are homegrown, but also from cane which must be shipped from the South and transported hundreds of miles.

The promoters can thank the Area Redevelopment Administration and its successor-agency, the Economic Development Administration, for the sweet smell of success. It is a vague smell at the moment and some congressmen from other areas question the soundness of the federal investment. To put it mildly, the deal has left them a little sour.

The story was unraveled by the House Appropriations Committee at a closed budget hearing last month. Several bewildered lawmakers wondered how the government could justify spending money on a cane sugar plant in such a remote inland area. The last time the committee examined the matter, Maine was only going into the beet sugar business.

Officials of the Economic Development Administration (EDA) defended their loans to the Maine company. They said this was the reason Congress created the agency—to uplift the economy in certain depressed sections which were lagging behind the rest of the Nation.

FEDERAL COMMITMENT

The initial investment was in the neighborhood of $6 million from Uncle Sam for establishing a refinery to process the sugar beets which Aroostook expected to grow on some 33,000 acres allocated to Maine by the Agriculture Department.

But an energetic promoter, Fred Vahlsing Jr., who heads the Maine Sugar Industries Inc., went back to the EDA and said he could convert the operation to a year-round business with a little more money to install cane sugar refining machinery. EDA has thus far put up $8,745,300 for the combined operation and is prepared to cover an additional $3,600,000 in commercial bank loans in case the enterprise fails.

The federal government's total possible "exposure" at the moment is $12,345,300. No other New England state can claim such success.

What the congressmen from other areas can't understand is how it will be possible to make a nickel on the deal with all the expense of hauling cane sugar to a northern inland refinery and then moving the finished product many hundreds of miles to populated heavy-consuming areas. At first glance, it appears to be an uneconomic proposition.

Rep. Elford A. Cederberg, R-Mich., predicted that the loan will never be repaid. Rep. Mark Andrews, R-N.D., told EDA officials they would still be behind the eight-ball, even if the railroads hauled it for nothing. Andrews said it makes as much sense to launch a cane sugar refinery in an inland point in Maine as "trying to get 4,000 acres to grow potatoes in downtown Brooklyn."

The EDA insists, however, that this will prove to be a good example of what a community can do, with Federal help, to revitalize its economy. When the full allocation of 33,000 sugar beet acres is planted, there will be an estimated 410 jobs in the refinery operation and some 2,000 other jobs in the agricultural and hauling phases. By having the cane sugar available for processing during the slow months, all of these jobs presumably will be year-round and full-time.

YEAR OF TESTING

The government is not demanding any principal payments for a few years, only the interest, until the operation gets on its feet. Meantime, congressmen like Rep. Thomas P. O'Neill of Cambridge, Mass., with two old line can sugar refineries in his district, and Rep. John Rooney, D-N.Y. with a similar operation in Brooklyn, are beginning to worry about the jobs that may be lost because new employment opportunities are being created in Maine.

The government experts see no problem. They say consumption is going up every year and the competition won't hurt. Actually, this will be a year of testing in the sugar beet fields of Aroostook County. The potato farmers were reluctant to diversify last year and planted only 3,500 of the 33,000 acres alloted to Maine by the federal government.

The allocation runs for three years and if it isn't used, the Agriculture Department can take it away and give the acreage to some other state. There are predictions, though, that with spud prices slumping, the Aroostook farmers will get into the beet business in a big way this year. If so, Maine could well be on its way to a sweetened economy.

Captive Nations Week

SPEECH

OF

HON. ROBERT V. DENNEY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 19, 1967

Mr. DENNEY. Mr. Speaker, this week we observe the annual Captive Nations Week. In 1959, the Congress gave unanimous approval to legislation recognizing the manifest tragedy of the Communist takeover in east and central Europe.

Many countries fell to the Communist movement some 25 years ago. Now we can do no less than to annually reaffirm our faith in the perseverance of our democratic liberties and to encourage those oppressed peoples to retain hope for the removal of the Iron Curtain.

In view of the war that we are now fighting in Vietnam, it is altogether necessary that we acknowledge the threat presented by international communism. We need only look at the recent history of the captive nations to readily predict what would happen in Southeast Asia should we abdicate our responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad to participate in the captive nations observance. I can only call for a renewed vigor on the part of our Nation to give encouragement and hope to those now held in Communist bondage.

The Uninsured Motorist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. TUCK

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 20, 1967

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful for the privilege of including in the Record an article by Charles Arthur Taylor III, that appeared in the South Carolina Law Review, volume 19, 1967, No. 2, page 269.

The acts of uninsured and irresponsible motorists pose serious problems throughout the country. Twenty-eight States have enacted laws designed to protect citizens against damages caused by negligent, uninsured motorists.

The Commonwealth of Virginia was one of the first States to enact legislation on this subject. Both Virginia and South Carolina have well-defined uninsured motorists acts, providing reasonably adequate protection.

Charles Arthur Taylor III, a native son of Virginia, is a law student at the University of South Carolina. He is to be commended for his clear legal analysis and the careful preparation of this fine article. Its publication in the South Carolina Law Review is evidence of the article's importance. I congratulate this outstanding law student upon his excellent contribution.

The text of Mr. Taylor's article, with footnotes, follows:

INSURANCE—UNINSURED MOTORIST ACT—DEFINITION OF UNINSURED MOTORIST INCLUDES INSURED MOTORIST WHOSE INSURANCE IS BELOW MANDATORY STATUTORY LIMITS*

(By Charles Arthur Taylor III)

A. INTRODUCTION

Shortly after the introduction of the use of the automobile as a means of transportation, the dangers inherent in these vehicles were recognized. Their development and expanded use necessitated the utilization of the state's police power to enforce reasonable standards of road conduct. Law enforcement officials today control the issuance of licenses, speed of vehicles, rules of the road, and other related matters through a host of statutory regulations designed to curb highway accidents. Attacking from another front, state legislatures have attempted to shift the burden of loss from the injured party to the insurance company, an organization especially designed to absorb loss and distribute it throughout society.

Uninsured motorists have always been a problem for the losses they cause have largely gone uncompensated. Victims of negligent uninsured motorist suffered from the increasing number of accidents caused by hit-and-run drivers, operators of stolen cars, cars driven without the owner's permission, unregistered cars, and out of state motorists. The nation's great concern for a solution to this dilemma has prompted state legislatures to re-evaluate automobile liability insurance statutes.

In recent years significant progress has been made toward protecting citizens from uninsured and financially irresponsible motorists. Among several solutions proposed or attempted have been financial responsibility laws,[1] compulsory insurance,[2] unsatisfied claim and judgment funds,[3] and the Saskatchewan Plan.[4] Because of its dislike for state-imposed programs of compulsory insurance and public unsatisfied judgment funds, the insurance industry's plan was the uninsured motorist endorsement.[5] New Hampshire, in 1957, became the first state to require that uninsured motorist coverage be made a standard feature of every policy of automobile liability insurance issued in the state.[6] At the present time there are twenty-eight states which have enacted similar uninsured motorist acts.[7]

Designed to further close the gaps inherent in compulsory insurance and financial responsibility legislation, this insurance coverage is intended to provide, within fixed limits, financial compensation to innocent persons who receive injuries, and the dependents of those who are killed, by the wrongful conduct of motorists who, because they are uninsured and not financially responsible, cannot be made to respond to damages.[8]

Under the uninsured motorist acts,[9] licensed insurance companies, as a condition of their doing business in the state, are required to provide uninsured motorist liability endorsements in their automobile liability policies. The Standard Insurance Policy uninsured motorist endorsement provides that the insurer agrees:

"To pay all sums which the insured or his legal representatives shall be legally entitled to recover as damages from the owner or operator of an uninsured automobile because of bodily injury . . . including death . . . sustained by the insured, caused by accident, and arising out of the ownership, maintenance or use of such uninsured automobile." [10]

To recover under an uninsured motorist endorsement, the insured must have; (1) sustained injuries, (2) which were caused by an uninsured motorist, (3) from whom he would be legally entitled to recover. An "uninsured automobile" is defined by the Standard Policy as:

"[A]n automobile . . . [to] which there is . . . no bodily injury liability bond or insurance policy applicable at the time of the accident . . . or with respect to which there is a bodily injury liability bond or insurance policy applicable at the time of the accident but the company writing the same denies coverage thereunder . . . or a hit and run driver." [11]

According to the Standard Policy an "uninsured automobile" does not include an insured automobile or an automobile which is self-insured within the meaning of the financial responsibility laws.[12]

Under the coverage, the insured may file suit against the uninsured motorist, if known, but he must notify his insurer.[13] Determination of liability and damages in most states is made by agreement between the insurer and the insured, or if agreement cannot be reached, arbitration is available, and finally resort to the courts may be had. It should be noted, however, that some states, including Virginia[14] and South Carolina,[15] expressly reject arbitration clauses in automobile liability policies. But, to the extent of its payment to its own insured, whether by agreement, arbitration, or judgment, the insurance carrier is subrogated to the right of the insured to recover against the unin-

---

Footnotes at end of speech.

sured motorist.[16] For this reason the uninsured motorist endorsement has been said to be less like a liability policy and more like a surety bond.[17] It should also be noted that although these statutes are remedial in nature,[18] they are not intended in any event to provide insurance for the uninsured.[19]

B. THE PROBLEM

Problems of statutory and policy construction have recently been flooding the courts. Among the questions being presented is whether a negligent driver is to be considered "uninsured" if he has liability insurance which is under the minimum statutory limits, and where the statute appears to be silent, may the insurance carrier define an uninsured automobile to mean only one to which there is *no* automobile bodily liability insurance applicable at the time of the accident?

This problem was squarely faced by the Supreme Court of Rhode Island in the recent case of *Allstate Ins. Co. v. Fusco.*[20] The insured was covered by Allstate's "Crusader Policy" which contained an uninsured motorist endorsement, similar to the Standard Policy Endorsement,[21] as required by the Rhode Island Uninsured Motorist Act.[22] The policy also provided that the maximum limits of liability would be 10,000 dollars for any one person and 20,000 dollars for any single accident, thus conforming to the minimum prescribed statutory limits.[23] The insured's uninsured motorist endorsement defined as "uninsured automobile" as one as to which "no bodily injury liability insurance [is] applicable at the time of the accident." [24]

The insured was killed while riding as a passenger in an automobile owned operated by Baumgardner whose insurance policy with Transamerica Insurance Company had coverage limits of 5,000 dollars for any person and 10,000 dollars for any single accident.[25] The insured's wife, made a beneficiary under the terms of the amendatory endorsement, made demands on Allstate for payment of the difference between the basic limits of the two policies claiming that as to such difference Baumgardner was an uninsured motorist for whose negligence Allstate was required to respond in damages.[26] The trial Judge agreed with Allstate that Baumgardner was not an uninsured motorist because of Allstate's definition of an "uninsured automobile" as one which had *no* bodily injury liability insurance.[27] The Supreme Court of Rhode Island reversed this judgment in a case of first impression.

In deciding for Mrs. Fusco, the court reasoned that Rhode Island's Uninsured Motorist Act expressly provided that all automobile liability policies delivered or issued for delivery to a motorist in that state should include an uninsured motorist endorsement allowing the insured the right to recover damages for bodily injury resulting from the negligence of an uninsured motorist. The court further stated that this statute, by specific reference to another section,[28] incorporated minimum limits of liability of 10,000 dollars for any person and 20,000 dollars for a single accident. The court pointed out that in Rhode Island it had been held that the legislative requirement of financial responsibility, as a condition precedent to the operation of motor vehicles on public highways, was a valid exercise of the police power of the state,[29] and that in such cases where the legislature has acted on a subject within its constitutional power, public policy is what the statute enacts.[30] The court recognized that since the legislature had found it: "advisable in the public interest to require insurance carriers authorized to do business in this state to provide protection against the negligent operation of uninsured automobiles in favor of those motorists who voluntarily contract with licensed carriers for liability coverage,[31] such contracts were required to conform to the statutory conditions imposed by the legislature.[32] Justice Powers, speaking for the court, held that as a matter of public policy and legislative intendment "no bodily injury insurance applicable at the time of the accident," as Allstate had defined an "uninsured automobile," had to be construed to include any difference between liability insurance carried by the tort-feasor, Baumgardner, and the minimum limits required by the legislature.[33] The court could see no weight in Allstate's argument that it would be fully liable if Baumgardner had no insurance, but it should be fully exonerated because he had some insurance.

C. EXPRESS, CONTRADICTORY AND AMBIGUOUS STATUTORY DEFINITIONS

Generally, all uninsured motorist acts are alike in that they require all automobile bodily injury liability policies to include uninsured motorist endorsements obligating insurance carriers to respond, within limits set by the legislature, for damages caused by uninsured drivers.[34] Problems arise immediately, however, when one tries to determine what the legislature intended by an uninsured motorist.

The twenty-eight uninsured motorist acts, at least with respect to the definition of an "uninsured automobile," may be conveniently divided into three classes: (1) Those which expressly define an "uninsured automobile" as one which does not have automobile bodily injury liability insurance or bond in the minimum statutory limits applicable at the time of the accident; (2) Those which define an "uninsured automobile" as one which has *no* automobile bodily injury liability insurance or bond applicable at the time of the accident: and (3) Those which do not expressly define an "uninsured automobile."

Georgia,[35] Kentucky, [36] New York,[37] North Carolina,[38] South Carolina [39] and Virginia [40] are examples of the first group. Since it was one of the first states in this group to enact the statute, Virginia will be taken as an example. The Virginia statute states:

> "The term *"uninsured motor vehicle"* means a motor vehicle as to which there is (i) no bodily injury liability insurance and property damage liability insurance, both in the amounts specified by Section 46.1–1(8), as amended from time to time." [41]

Various writers on the subject correctly concluded that by the terms of such a statute, an automobile, driven by a resident or a non-resident, would be recognized as uninsured if it had lower limits of liability than the statute commanded.[42] A recent federal case, [43] recognizing this fact, considered a negligent out of state motorist, carrying insurance providing less coverage than the Virginia statute required, as being an uninsured motorist. Noting that, by the terms of the statute, a vehicle is considered uninsured if it is covered by less than the statutory limits, the court held the insured's carrier liable under its uninsured motorist endorsement.[44] Georgia, Kentucky, North Carolina and South Carolina have substantially the same definitions of an uninsured automobile in their acts and they would no doubt find little difficulty reaching the same result by following this plain meaning approach. The New York statute [45] is not so clear, but at least one lower court in that state seems to have reached the same conclusion by a process of legal gymnastics and definition juggling.[46] The remaining question, whether the insurance carrier may define away this obligation in the case of an accident involving a negligent motorist carrying some insurance, is clear. If the above named states recognize that the definition of an uninsured motorist, as expressed in the statutes, means any automobile not insured up to the statutory limits, the well-recognized rule is that such statutory requirements are read into each policy issued, and become, by implication, a part of the contract which cannot be contracted away by either party.[47]

California's Uninsured Motorist Act defines an uninsured automobile as one "[on] which there is no bodily liability insurance or bond applicable at the time of the accident." [48] Despite this fairly plain language, in a California case,[49] the court considered the definition in conflict with the legislature's intention that the statute afford the injured party coverage up to the statutory limit [50] required by the financial responsibility law. For this reason the court construed the definition to include an automobile carrying insurance or bond in limits less than the financial responsibility requirements. California also recognizes the general rule that the statutory sections are, as a matter of public policy, incorporated into and become a part of the insurance policy itself, as if it were written therein.[51]

The vast majority of states have uninsured motorist acts which neglect to define an uninsured automobile.[52] In such states, it could be argued, as it was in *Fusco*, that a negligent driver carrying insurance below the required statutory limits nevertheless carries some insurance, and therefore should not be considered uninsured for purposes of the uninsured motorist act. The *Fusco* case is clear authority for rejection of this argument. There is virtually no case law in this area. One possible explanation for this is that most states providing such coverage ordinarily permit arbitration clauses in the insurance contract. Thus the vast majority of claims rarely reach litigation stages.[53] Virginia [54] and South Calorina [55] stand as notable exceptions to this general rule.[56]

The underlying reasoning of the *Fusco* case seems to be acceptable in light of the general rule requiring insurance contracts not to offend rules of law or contravene public policy.[57] This rule limits the general proposition that, in the absence of ambiguity, the terms of an insurance policy should govern its interpretation.[58]

It is contended that the courts in jurisdictions not expressly defining an uninsured automobile in their uninsured motorist acts will either accept the *Fusco* decision as controlling or at least follow its public policy argument. This position seems only natural when one considers the legislative history of these acts, their remedial nature and the tendency among the courts to liberally construe contracts in favor of insureds.[59]

D. THE SOUTH CAROLINA ACT

Current estimates of the number of declared uninsured motor vehicles compared with the total automobiles registered, coupled with estimates of the number of automobile accidents involving uninsured motorists, demonstrates that South Carolina needed legislation such as the Uninsured Motorist Act,[60] which was enacted in South Carolina in 1959.[61]

The South Carolina act, patterned after the earlier Virginia act,[62] specifically defines an "uninsured motor vehicle" as one as to which there is no bodily liability insurance in the amounts of 10,000 dollars for any one person and 20,000 dollars for any one accident applicable at the time of such accident.[63] Considering the plain meaning of the definition in the South Carolina statute, there should be litle controversy on this point.[64] Writers [65] have consistently recognized that, by its plain meaning, the South Carolina act "requires minimum coverage and should a motor vehicle carry liability insurance in an amount less than the amounts specified, such motor vehicle would be considered an uninsured motor vehicle." [66] Furthermore, it has been held by South Carolina cases, construing other portions of this law, that insurance contracts which conflict with the mandatory statutory requirements are void, and the pertinent provisions of the statute prevail as much as if expressly incorporated into the policy.[67]

Footnotes at end of speech.

South Carolina's statute now expressly provides that: "The Chief Insurance Commissioner may prescribe the form to be used in providing such [uninsured motorist] coverage and when prescribed and promulgated no other form may be used." [illegible] Pursuant to this delegation of authority, Chief Insurance Commissioner William P. Austin, in 1963, issued a bulletin prescribing Forms A724c and A725c, as published by the National Bureaus of Casualty Underwriters, as the Protection Against Uninsured Motorists Endorsement for use in South Carolina. All insurance companies licensed to write casualty insurance were further ordered to file these endorsements with the South Carolina Insurance Department in accordance with the statute.[illegible]

Both Forms A724c and A725c define an uninsured automobile identically as follows:

"An automobile with respect to the ownership, maintenance or use of which there is, in the amounts specified in the South Carolina Motor Vehicle Safety Responsibility Act, . . . [no] bodily injury and property damage liability bond or insurance policy, applicable at the time of the accident with respect to any person or organization legally responsible for the use of such automobile." [illegible] Thus, South Carolina's act, by statutory definition and State Insurance Department order, clearly precludes an insurance carrier issuing policies in this state from defining an uninsured automobile so as to exclude from coverage accidents with drivers who have insurance coverage lower than the statutory limits.

E. CONCLUSION

To insurance carriers, the *Fusco* decision is another thorn in the industry's side. The result was just, although it may yet be argued before another court that such a legislative intent as the *Fusco* court found should have been legislatively manifested rather than inferred by the judiciary in the name of an appealing but undefinable term called public policy. The *Fusco* rationale, however, seems to be the only logical approach to the problem. How could it be fairly argued that a responsible, insured victim should be denied recovery from his insurance company when involved in an accident with a negligent motorist when the tort-feasor had some insurance and allowed recovery when the tort-feasor had no insurance?

---

[*] Allstate Ins. Co. v. Fusco, 223 A.2d 447 (R.I. 1966).

[1] These laws involve a regulated system of proof of financial responsibility. Today, every state has some form of financial responsibility statute as a partial solution to the problem of the irresponsible motorist. For an alphabetical listing of all the states except Alaska and the relevant statutory citations, see Ward, *New York's Motor Vehicle Accident Indemnification Corporation: Past, Present, and Future,* 8 Buffalo L. Rev. 215, 218 n.8 (1959). This type of statute is unquestionably constitutional as a valid exercise of police power. See Annot., 35 A.L.R.2d 1011 (1954).

[2] Massachusetts, New York, and North Carolina have compulsory insurance laws, and Connecticut, Maryland, and Rhode Island have similar laws applicable to minors. Insurance Advocate, Nov. 28, 1964, p. 22 (Chart, Automobile Financial Responsibility and Related Laws, compiled by the Law Department, Association of Casualty and Surety Companies, October, 1964). This type statute is also a constitutionally valid exercise of police power. See 2 R.C.L. 1171 (1914); Annot., 39 A.L.R. 1028 (1925); Annot., 69 A.L.R. 397 (1930). For a concise history of this type legislation, see Risford and Austin, *The Problem of the Financially Irresponsible Motorist,* 24 U. Kan. City L. Rev. 82 (1955).

[3] Unsatisfied claim and judgment fund laws are operative with variable forms in Maryland, New Jersey, New York, and North Dakota. These are funds under state control which allow a resident, injured by a financially irresponsible motorist in the state, to recover limited compensation. See generally Loiseaux, *Innocent Victims 1959,* 38 Texas L. Rev. 154 (1959); Plummer, *The Uncompensated Automobile Accident Victim,* 24 Ins. Counsel J. 78 (1957).

[4] For an analysis of this new plan see Lang, *The Nature and Potential of the Saskatchewan Insurance Experiment,* 14 U. Fla. L. Rev. 352 (1962).

[5] One writer on the subject has attributed the recent development of the uninsured motorist endorsement to "the clamor of sociologists for the protection of the innocent victim, the threat of legislatures to enact compulsory insurance laws, and the fear of insurance companies that they would be forced to underwrite undesirable risk. . . ." Hentemann, *Uninsured Motorist Coverage,* 12 Clev.-Mar. L. Rev. 66 (1963).

[6] N.H. Rev. Stat. Ann. § 268:15 (1966).

[7] The states are: Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Michigan, Mississippi, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Virginia, and Wisconsin. National Association of Independent Insurers News Memo, June 6, 1966.

[8] The purpose of the uninsured motorist acts is to provide "adequate compensation for injured insureds when other sources are lacking," Hobbs v. Buckeye Union Cas. Co., 212 F. Supp. 349, 351 (W.D. Va. 1962); "to correct the evil that arose because victims of uninsured negligent drivers were left without compensation for their damages," Drewry v. State Farm Mut. Auto, Ins. Co., 201 Va. 231, 235, 129 S.E.2d 681, 685 (1963); and "to provide financial recompense to innocent persons who are injured and to dependents of those who are killed because of the wrongful conduct of uninsured motorists," American Universal Ins. Co. v. Ranson, 59 Wash. 2d 811, 812, 270 P.2d 867, 868 (1962). See Annot., 79 A.L.R.2d 1252 (1961).

[9] For detailed accounts of the history, development, provisions, and recent cases of the uninsured motorist acts of several states, see generally: Chadwick and Poché, *California's Uninsured Motorist Statute: Scope and Problems,* 13 HASTINGS L.J. 194 (1961); Doar and Richardson, *The South Carolina Uninsured Motorist Law,* 15 S.C.L. Rev. 739 (1963); Ward, *New York's Motor Vehicle Accident Indemnification Corporation: Past, Present, and Future,* 8 Buffalo L. Rev. 215 (1959); Comment, 48 Calif. L. Rev. 516 (1960); Note, 14 U. Fla. L. Rev., 455 (1962); Note, 39 St. John's L. Rev. 321 (1965); Note, 47 Va. L. Rev. 145 (1961); Note, 48 Va. L. Rev. 1177 (1963); Comment, 7 Wm. & Mary L. Rev. 106 (1966).

[10] Part IV, Protection Against Uninsured Motorists, Coverage J, Policy Form 3650(p) (rev. 1–63). The Standard Policy uninsured motorist endorsement (hereinafter referred to as the Standard Policy) was promulgated by the Joint Committee in connection with the National Standard Policy Provisions Program of the Mutual Insurance Rating Bureau and the National Bureau of Casualty Underwriters.

[11] *Ibid.* The author understands that various revisions of the Standard Policy are made periodically, but is uncertain of the number of states which still permit the use of the uninsured motorist endorsements which define an uninsured automobile as one with *no* automobile bodily liability insurance. The Fidelity, Casualty, and Surety Bulletins indicate that the definition should cover an automobile insured for insufficient limits, to the extent of the insufficiency, when the tort-feasor's insurance coverage is less than required by the financial responsibility law. Uninsured Motorists, Fidelity, Casualty & Surety Bull., Feb. 1963, p.4.

[12] Standard Policy, *supra* note 10.

[13] Standard Policy, *supra* note 12, Conditions.

[14] Va. Code Ann. § 38.1–381(g) (Supp. 1966).

[15] S.C. Code Ann. § 46–750.37 (Supp. 1966).

[16] Standard Policy, *supra* note 13, Conditions.

[17] Comment, 48 Calif. L. Rev. 516, 520 (1960).

[18] Diamond v. Motor Vehicle Acc. Indemnification Corp., 235 N.Y.S.2d 505, 509 (Sup. Ct. 1962); Fidelity & Cas. Co. of N.Y. v. Harlow, 191 Va. 64, 68, 59 S.E.2d 872, 874 (1950).

[19] State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co. v. Drewry, 191 F. Supp. 852 (W.D. Va. 1961); Southern Farm Bureau Cas. Ins. Co. v. Fulton, 244 S.C. 559, 137 S.E.2d 769 (1964); Laird v. Nationwide Mut. Ins. Co., 243 S.C. 388, 134 S.E.2d 206 (1964); Drewry v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co., 204 Va. 231, 129 S.E.2d 681 (1963); Nationwide Mut. Ins. Co. v. Harleysville Mut. Cas. Co. 203 Va. 600, 125 S.E.2d 840 (1962).

[20] 223 A.2d 447 (R.I. 1966).

[21] The Allstate policy provision is as follows:

"Section II—Protection Against Bodily Injury By Uninsured Automobiles—Coverage S—Bodily Injury Benefit Insurance Allstate will pay all sums which the insured shall be legally entitled to recover as damages from the owner or operator of an uninsured automobile because of bodily injury, sustained by the insured, caused by accident and arising out of the ownership, maintenance or use of such automobile."

Note that Allstate Insurance Company does not include the words "or his legal representative" in their "Crusader Policy" as does the Standard Policy. Allstate Ins. Co. v. Fusco, *supra* note 20, at 448.

[22] R.I. Gen. Laws Ann. § 27–7–2.1 (Supp. 1965), in part reads:

"No policy insuring loss resulting from liability imposed by law for bodily injury or death suffered by any person arising out of the ownership, maintenance or use of a motor vehicle shall be delivered or issued for delivery in this state with respect to any motor vehicle registered or principally garaged in this state unless coverage is provided therein or supplemental thereto, in limits for bodily injury or death set forth in section 31–32–6 as amended, under provisions approved by the Insurance Commissioner, for the protection of persons insured thereunder who are legally entitled to recover damages from owners or operators of uninsured motor vehicles and hit-and-run motor vehicles because of bodily injury, sickness or disease, including death, resulting therefrom, provided that the named insured shall have the right to reject such coverage."

[23] R.I. Gen. Laws Ann. § 31–31–7 (Supp. 1965).

[24] Allstate Ins. Co. v. Fusco, 223 A.2d 447 (R.I. 1966).

[25] R.I. Gen. Laws Ann. § 31–31–7 (Supp. 1965). This statute was enacted about three months prior to this accident. The statute raised the minimum statutory limits required for an automobile liability insurance policy from $5,000/$10,000 to $10,000/$20,000. Allstate claimed that a notice from the registrar of motor vehicles concerning the new applicable limits stated that on January 1, 1965 and thereafter, until such policies as that delivered to Baumgardner had expired, all such policies would constitute financial responsibility. The court dismissed the contention of Allstate's reliance on this notice, stating that whatever problem of bookkeeping the registrar may have intended to spare insurance carriers, he could not impair the substantive rights of insureds who had negotiated with such carriers after January 1, 1965. Allstate Ins. Co. v. Fusco, 223 A.2d 447, 451–52 (R.I. 1966). This view seems to be out of step with

the scarce but recent authority on this point. See generally Ball v. California Auto. Ass'n Inter-Ins. Bureau, 20 Cal. Reptr. 31, 201 Cal. App. 2d 85 (1962); 1961 Op. Att'y Gen. Fla., 061–101; Note, 47 Va. L. Rev. 145, 153 n.51 (1961).

[26] Prior to the trial, this contention was made to Allstate by Mrs. Fusco who, as the surviving spouse, was made the decedent's beneficiary by the terms of the "Crusader Policy" amendatory endorsement. Mrs. Fusco's claim being denied by Allstate, she then proceeded with arbitration, as required by the policy when the parties were unable to agree. Allstate countered that even though Baumgardner's liability coverage was less than that of Allstate's, the automobile in which the decedent was killed was not "uninsured" as defined by Allstate's policy. It further contended that, in any event, Mrs. Fusco's argument did not come within the contemplation of the arbitration clause. Allstate then instituted the present action to enjoin the defendant, Mrs. Fusco, from pursuing her arbitration demands. Allstate Ins. Co. v. Fusco, 223 A.2d 447, 448–49 (R.I. 1966). It should be noted again that most states allow these arbitration clauses, although South Carolina and Virginia expressly invalidate them in automobile insurance contracts.

[27] 223 A.2d 447, 449 (R.I. 1966).

[28] R.I. Gen. Laws Ann. § 31–31–7 (Supp. 1965).

[29] Berberian v. Lussier, 87 R.I. 226, 139 A.2d 869 (1958).

[30] Allstate Ins. Co. v. Fusco, 223 A.2d 447, 450 (R.I. 1966). The court cited Chicago Burlington & Quincy R.R. v. McGuire, 219 U.S. 549 (1911) and Parchen v. Chessman, 49 Mont. 326, 142 Pac. 631 (1914).

[31] Allstate Ins. Co. v. Fusco, 223 A.2d 447, 450 (R.I. 1966).

[32] *Ibid.*

[33] *Id.* at 450–51.

[34] N.H. Rev. Stat. Ann. § 268:15 (1966), the first uninsured motorist act, is a typical example.

[35] Ga. Code Ann. § 56–407.1 (Supp. 1966).

[36] Ky. Rev. Stat. § 74 (Baldwin 1966).

[37] N.Y. Ins. Law, §§ 600 to 626.

[38] N.C. Gen. Stat. § 20–279.21(b) (3) (Supp. 1966).

[39] S.C. Code Ann. §§ 46–750.33, 46–750.31 (3) (a) (Supp. 1966).

[40] Va. Code Ann. § 38.1–381 (Supp. 1966).

[41] *Ibid.*

[42] See Doar and Richardson, *The South Carolina Uninsured Motorist Law*, 15 S.C.L. Rev. 739, 742 (1963); Note, 12 Drake L. Rev. 119, 121 n.21 and accompanying text; Note, 47 Va. L., Rev. 145, 149 (1961); Note, 1962 Wash. U.L.Q. 134, 138.

[43] White v. Nationwide Mut. Ins. Co., 361 F. 2d 785 (4th Cir. 1966).

[44] *Id.* at 786. It would seem that valid compliance with another state's statute would not preclude use of the *White* rationale.

[45] N.Y. Ins. Law, §§ 600 to 626.

[46] Cruzado v. Underwood, 39 Misc. 2d 850, 242 N.Y.S. 2d 74 (Sup. Ct. 1963).

[47] 13 Appleman, Insurance Law § 7382 (1943).

[48] Cal. Ins. Code § 11580.2.

[49] Taylor v. Prefered Risk Mut. Ins. Co., 37 Cal. Reptr. 63, 225 Cal. App. 2d 80 (1964). The case seems to have overcome the harsh results predicted if the plain meaning were followed. See Chadwick and Poche, *California's Uninsured Motorist Statute: Scope and Problems*, 13 Hastings L.J. 194, 195 (1961).

[50] Cal. Ins. Code §§ 16059 and 16541.

[51] Hendricks v. Meritplan Ins. Co., 22 Cal. Reptr. 682, 205 Cal. App. 2d 133 (1962).

[52] *E.g.*, Ala. Code Ann. tit. 36, § 74(62a) (Supp. 1966); Ariz. Rev. Stat. Ann. § 20–259.01 (Supp. 1966); Colo. Rev. Stat. Ann. § 72–12–19 (Supp. 1966); Fla. Stat. Ann. § 627.0851 (Supp. 1966); Ill. Ann. Stat ch. 73 § 755a (Smith-Hurd 1965); La. Rev. Stat. § ·1406(D) (Supp. 1966); Mich. Stat. Ann. § 500.3010 (Supp. 1966); N.H. Rev. Stat. Ann. § 268.15 (Supp. 1966); Ohio Rev. Code Ann. § 3937.18 (Page Supp. 1966); Pa. Stat. Ann. tit. 40 § 2000 (Supp. 1966); R.I. Gen. Laws Ann. § 27–7–2.1 (Supp. 1965); Wis. Stat. § 204.30(5) (Supp. 1966).

[53] See generally, Miller, *The New "Uninsured Motorist" Endorsement to Family Automobile Policies—The 1960 Look*, 24 Ins. Counsel J. 134 (1957); Plummer, *Handling Claims Under the Uninsured Motorist Coverage*, 1957 Ins. L.J. 494.

[54] Va. Code Ann. § 38.1–381(g) (Supp. 1966).

[55] S.C. Code Ann. § 46–750.37 (Supp. 1966).

[56] See notes 14 and 15 *supra* and accompanying text.

[57] 13 Appleman, Insurance Law § 7381 (1943).

[58] 13 Appleman, Insurance Law § 7384 (1943).

[59] 13 Appleman, Insurance Law § 7401 (1943). The rule, recognized by almost all jurisdictions, is that insurance contracts must be liberally construed in favor of the insured or his beneficiary if possible, and strictly construed against the insurer.

[60] As of October 31, 1966, there were 12,195 declared uninsured motor vehicles, an estimated 920,000 overall registrations, and an estimated 6,500 automobile accidents involving uninsured motorists. Statistics obtained from Uninsured Motorist Section, South Carolina Highway Department.

[61] S.C. Code Ann. §§ 46–750.33, 46–750.31(3) (a) (Supp. 1966).

[62] Laird v. Nationwide Mut. Ins. Co., 243 S.C. 388, 392, 134 S.E.2d 206, 208 (1964).

[63] S.C. Code Ann. § 46–750.31(3) (a) (Supp. 1966) (incorporating by reference § 46–750.32).

[64] One recent Federal case, noting the clarity of the South Carolina statute; defined an "insured vehicle" as one as to which there is "bodily injury liability insurance and property damage liability insurance, *both in the amounts* specified in § 46–750.13" (now § 46–750.32). American Liberty Ins. Co. v. DeWitte, 236 F. Supp. 636, 639 (E.D.S.C. 1964).

[65] Note, 12 Drake L. Rev. 119, 121 n.21 (1963); Note, 1962 Wash. U.L.Q. 134, 138.

[66] Doar and Richardson, *The South Carolina Uninsured Motorist Law*, 15 S.C.L. Rev. 739, 742 (1963).

[67] *E.g.*, Pacific Ins. Co. of N.Y. v. Fireman's Fund Ins. Co., 247 S.C. 282, 285, 147 S.E.2d 273, 275 (1966); Williams v. Pennsylvania Nat. Mut. Cas. Ins. Co., 246 S.C. 396, 400, 143 S.E.2d 797, 799 (1965); Southern Farm Bureau Cas. Ins. Co. v. Fulton, 244 S.C. 559, 564–65, 137 S.E.2d 769, 771–72 (1964); Laird v. Nationwide Mut. Ins. Co., 243 S.C. 388, 395–96, 134 S.E.2d 206, 209 (1964).

[68] S.C. Code Ann. § 46–750.33 (Supp. 1966).

[69] Bulletin No. 12–3, Protection Against Uninsured Motorists Endorsements, Chief Insurance Commissioner William F. Austin, December 19, 1963.

[70] National Bureau of Casualty Underwriters, Protection Against Uninsured Motorists Insurance, South Carolina Policies A724c and A725c, II(c) (1).

Ralph R. Roberts

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 19, 1967

Mr. McCORMACK. I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished gentlemen from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA]. Ralph Roberts has been a friend of mine for over 40 years and I am proud of that friendship that eixsts between us. Ralph Roberts served the U.S. House of Representatives with distinction for many years. He is one of the few men that I have ever known to have attended both the U.S. Naval Academy and U.S. Military Academy. In World War I he served our country in the U.S. Marine Corps.

Ralph Roberts served as a secretary to a Member of Congress from Indiana from 1923 to 1925 and was secretary of the Democratic congressional committee from 1925 to 1930. He was elected Doorkeeper of the U.S. House of Representatives for the 78th and 79th Congresses. He was then elected minority clerk in 1947 and Clerk of the House for the 81st, 82d, 84th, 85th, 86th, 87th, 88th, and 90th Congresses.

Ralph Roberts was without a peer as an administrative officer and he served this House and country with dignity, integrity, and with a high sense of excellence which will be long remembered. It has been a pleasure indeed and an honor, to have been an associate of Ralph Roberts, and I heartily join my colleagues in expressing gratitude for the fine performance that he always gave to the U.S. House of Representatives.

The Real Nature of the World Revolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 20, 1967

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, one of the best analyses I have read of the Vietnam war has been written by Mr. Arthur Larson, a former Presidential adviser, and director of the Rule of Law Research Center at Duke University. In his article, "The Real Nature of World Revolution," which appeared in the Saturday Review of June 3, 1967, Mr. Larson discusses the question of the right of legitimate debate, as well as our misunderstanding of the nature of the current world revolution and the relation of the Vietnam conflict to it. It is thus gratifying to find the views of a private citizen who, through his thoughtful analysis, may provoke us to a reassessment of our involvement in Vietnam.

Under unanimous consent I include this article in the RECORD and strongly urge my colleagues to consider its implications:

THE REAL NATURE OF THE WORLD REVOLUTION—COMMUNISM AND INDEPENDENCE MOVEMENTS ARE RECEDING BEFORE A THIRD WAVE: THE DRIVE FOR HUMAN RIGHTS. WHAT DOES THIS PORTEND FOR U.S. POLICY, ESPECIALLY IN VIETNAM?

(By Arthur Larson)

I happened to look out the window of my fortieth-floor office one day and noticed, several floors above me, a window-washer recklessly moving about on his scaffolding without using a safety belt. I repeatedly shouted suggestions at him on how to avoid the danger he was risking and he repeatedly ignored my suggestions. A little later I saw him falling headlong past my open window and as he went by he uttered these words: "Now please let us not rehash past mistakes; I am only interested in what you would do *now* if you were in my position."

This is a parable, of course, and not a true story, as the reader will have gathered from the length of the speech made by the descending window-washer. The point of the parable is simply to sum up how some of us feel when, in the course of the continuing Vietnam debate, we are told that no comment is legitimate except that which presents a viable alternative proposal on what to do right now. I have been presenting alternatives for five years, in books, booklets, symposia, speeches, and articles—several of them in these pages. But to limit current discussion to immediate alternatives ignores the fact that there are two principal reasons—not just one—for the great debate on Vietnam. The obvious reason for the debate is to find the best way to bring the war to a satisfactory end. But the second reason, perhaps even more important in the long run, is to learn how to avoid making a similar mistake in the future.

If it is off limits to discuss the mistakes of the past, or indeed if it is insisted that no mistakes were made, then we may find the agony of Vietnam repeated in other parts of the world for years to come. The dictum that those who ignore history are condemned to repeat its mistakes was never more apt than here.

Two cardinal mistakes stand out above the many that could be cited. The first has been the subject of several of my articles in SR between 1962 and 1965: the refusal to handle the Vietnam problem through United Nations channels from the moment Secretary Rusk and President Kennedy in 1961 announced that it was a threat to the peace in spite of the requirement of Article 37 of the United Nations Charter that, when other methods have failed, threats to the peace "shall" be referred to the Security Council.

The second cardinal mistake was a fundamental misunderstanding of the nature of the current world revolution and the relation of the Vietnam conflict to it. The American action in Vietnam is based on the theory that the revolutionary situation there is the prototype of the revolutionary situation in much of the rest of the world. From this follows the conclusion that Vietnam is a testing ground of a global struggle, and that what happens in Vietnam will determine what happens in perhaps dozens of other countries. The true fact is that the revolutionary situation in Vietnam is unique. The word "unique" is deliberately chosen here with full recognition of its etymology: there is only one of it.

To demonstrate why this is so, it is necessary to begin by identifying three "world revolutions." These three, classified by their primary motivations, are the revolutions of communism, nationalism, and human rights. The theme of this article is that, of these three revolutions, except in two or three places, the only one that has *independent* contemporary revolutionary vitality is human rights.

As to the first, the communist world revolution, it never did have, and certainly does not have now, a coherent independent motivation. The communist revolution is essentially a parasitic movement. It attaches itself and attempts to ride to success on whatever might be the most promising true revolutionary or other force operating at the moment. In its original Marxist version, the communist revolution was to take place first in the most advanced industrial societies, utilizing the force of the discontent of downtrodden industrial workers due to a combination of overproduction and maldistribution. (It is significant that, with the various translations of *The Communist Manifesto* at the time, it never occurred to anyone to translate it into Rusian.) Lenin, and more recently Khrushchev and his successors, tried to show how communism could flourish in the least advanced countries by identifying communism with the force of world-wide anticolonialism. This attempt failed, principally because the United Nations took over the role of patron of the decolonialization process. Under Stalin, communism was a sort of adjunct to the primary force of Russian nationalist expansionism.

The second world revolution has been that of nationalism, with the goal of national political independence. It is this development that in a few years has been principally responsible for the addition of seventy new nation-states to the membership of the United Nations. The swiftness of this process has made it easy to overlook the fact that, with only a couple of exceptions, the world nationalist revolution has been completed. It has been completed in Asia, except, as we shall see, for what is going on in Vietnam. It has been completed in Africa, except in Angola and Mozambique, with Rhodesia in a somewhat unclassified position. It was completed in Latin America long ago for the most part, with a few recent additions.

The mistake that has been made by the United States, and in this it has been joined by the Chinese Communists, is to assume that in most of these countries there still remains something resembling the original quantum of revolutionary force, needing only a few manipulations by a handful of sinister communist agents to turn it into a second revolution comparable to the first. What this overlooks is that in all these countries there is now an indigenous Establishment. Their own leaders, frequently those who rose to power as a result of the original revolution, now control almost all physical, administrative, and political force in the country. They control the army, the police, perhaps even an air force. They do not want a second revolution, thank you. When the Chinese Communists, who were once conspicuous in many of these countries, began to be suspected of interest in promoting such a second revolution, they were thrown out in one country after another, with Indonesia and Ghana being the most conspicuous examples.

The breathtakingly rapid completion of the liberation-from-colonialism revolution has also caught the Russians with their slogans down. "Wars of national liberation" was to be the rubric under which global revolution should proceed. But national liberation, in any reasonable sense of the term, is now mostly an accomplished fact. The slogan now has to be tortured into covering somehow the idea of replacing one home-grown regime with another. That may or may not be some kind of "liberation," but it is certainly not "national" liberation. Except—once more—in Vietnam, where what might appear to be a home-grown regime in Saigon is actually a military group that fought on the side of the French against the forces of national independence.

In a revolutionary situation only two kinds of force count. One is sheer military force. Failing this, there must be an overwhelming if intangible surge of mass will and emotion so great that eventually even military power recedes before it. Such a force was the passion for political freedom and national independence. But if that force has spent itself in achieving its goal of an indigenous government, and if that indigenous government also has a virtual monopoly on military and police power, what force remains that can possibly compete with these and upon which can be built within a few years another revolution upon a revolution?

Indeed, when these two sources of force—intangible revolutionary fervor and physical power—have themselves come into competition after independence, it has invariably been the latter that has won out. No one could have embodied more fully the charisma and power attendant upon the leadership of a nationalistic revolution than Nkrumah and Sukarno. Yet when this source of power, which had prevailed against the colonial masters, was pitted against the indigenous Establishment it went down in defeat. It is quite possible that something of the same sort is now being acted out in the People's Republic of China. Mao is apparently trying to rekindle the original revolutionary fires, but even with all his prestige and posters and booklets he is learning the same lesson of the unpopularity of a second-run revolution.

We are now ready to appraise the relevance of all this to the Vietnam question. The situation in Vietnam was unique because it was the one place in the world where the nationalistic revolution had not been allowed to complete itself. The pristine force of nationalism was and is still in full play. All the most potent components of a successful nationalistic revolution were present in more than usual abundance. There was the charismatic leader, Ho Chi Minh. There was a high level of nationalistic fervor, developed over a long history and most recently under the stimulus of Japanese and French imperialism. There was a clear objective: a unified and independent nation. There was well-developed military power, seasoned and disciplined fighters, considerable stocks of weapons, and no lack of confidence and morale. They had for all practical purposes defeated the French in 1954, after inflicting 172,000 casualties. The completion of the revolution of national independence seemed to be within reach.

At this point the United States cuts into the story. By the time the major American military effort was undertaken there was no other place, except the Portuguese territories in Africa, where the force of nationalism had not run its course. There was, therefore, no other place where this unique threat of combined communism and nationalism could come into play. The central theme of American involvement: "If we can't stop the communists here we can't stop them anywhere" will have to go down in history as the most tragic misjudgment of our times.

But to say that the world revolution of nationalism has largely run its course is not to say that the age of revolution is over. Far from it. There remains the unfinished revolution of human rights. This is the real world revolution of today and tomorrow. The future of the United States—and of any other country—will turn on how well it learns to understand this revolution and to find the right relation to it.

The first thing we must understand is the most obvious. The successful completion of a nationalist revolution (and certainly of a communist revolution) is not by the same token the successful completion of a human rights revolution. Sometimes there is a high degree of coincidence between the two. For example, the American Revolution resulted in both political freedom for the American colonies and enhanced personal freedom for individual Americans, through the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. But Americans should not for this reason confuse the two revolutionary achievements in other settings. In Latin America the basic revolution of political independence goes back 150 years for a number of republics, to the revolt of the Spanish-American colonies under Simon Bolivar from 1810 to 1824. And yet, because of the failure to overcome the gulf between the aristocratic elite and the impoverished masses, the unsatisfied demand for human rights in Latin America is still one of the most explosive forces in the world today.

The driving energy of the human rights movement takes different forms in different parts of the world. In Latin America, as just noted, it is seen in the struggle of the impoverished many against the privileged few. In the newly developing countries of Africa and Asia it is the gigantic task of raising living standards in spite of economic, educational, managerial, and almost every other kind of backwardness. In the Eastern European countries and Russia it is the change of their economics from state-demand to consumer-demand economies, with the inevitable wrenchings away from socialist dogmas and toward market incentives and private enterprise practices. In the United States it is the racial revolution.

Although the manifestations of the human rights drive take these varied forms, and although the danger of violence also varies widely from area to area because of the varying speed of response to these demands, there can be only one American policy as to them all. The United States must be found on the side of human rights. To be found on the other side, for any reason, is to invite eventual defeat.

This should be a congenial enough role for Americans, if they have not forgotten their traditions as a people. These traditions stood us in good stead during the world revolution of national independence. We took our stand firmly alongside the colonies aspiring to nationhood, sometimes to the intense annoyance of our oldest friends, such as the British, the French, and the Dutch. We are finding it harder to adopt as forthright a posture in the world revolution of human rights. There are several reasons for this, of which three may be mentioned: diplomatic ineptitude, economic shortsightedness, and blind anti-communism.

In spite of the efforts of succeeding administrations, we still cannot seem to get our diplomatic representatives abroad to concentrate on "tuning in with" the right people—"right" in the sense of getting us on the right side of the human rights story. It is so much easier to hobnob with the titled, the wealthy, the beautiful people than to get next to the discontented students, the intellectuals, the young struggling professionals, the reformist politicians, the labor leaders, not to mention the workers and the peasants. As for economic shortsigthedness: Central to the whole job in the newly developing countries is the provision of vast amounts of capital, technical assistance, managerial and skills training, and all the other ingredients of economic development and nation-building. We cannot begin to do this total job for all countries at once but we can do much better than we have been doing. Merely quantitatively, we could well afford to double our investment immediately in view of what is ultimately at stake.

As for blind anticommunism: Communism, as noted earleir, so far as its revolutionary potential is concerned is a parasitic movement. It would now like to attach itself to the world human rights revolution and borrow its force from this immensely potent source of social change. The only way to prevent this is to get there first ourselves if possible. But if we do not get there first—that is, if we see some communists already busily working on that side—let us never again, as we did in the Dominican crisis, thereupon automatically take up our position on the opposite side. Rather, we should consult our own traditions and interests, and if these place us on the human rights side of the struggle we should—always within the limits imposed by the rule against interference in internal affairs—crowd the communists out and by our support of the movement remind the world once more who the true sponsors of individual right and freedom are.

It was said earlier that the Vietnam pattern could not repeat itself elsewhere in today's world—in the sense of displaying the merger of nationalism and communism as revolutionary forces. If, however, as a result of our own ineptitude and miserliness and indiscriminate anticommunism the revolutionary potential of unsatisfied human rights reaches an intensity comparable to that of the nationalistic fervor that produced the anticolonial revolutions, and if the United States takes up its stand on the side of entrenched privilege while the communists are left a clear field to ally themselves with the vast majority of the population, the Vietnam pattern could be reproduced elsewhere, with the human rights drive substituted for the independence drive. The danger of this is probably more imminent in Latin America than anywhere else. The Castro revolution is the prime example of this combination.

Never in history has the basic pattern of world revolution changed so many times so swiftly. It is asking quite a lot of our leaders and spokesmen to throw away speeches only twenty years old on "Communism as the Great Fountainhead of World Revolution" and speeches only ten years old on "Nationalism as the Great Fountainhead of World Revolution," but that is what they are going to have to do if they are not to be one or even two revolutions behind the times.

TVA Land Dealings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. E. (BILL) BROCK

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 20, 1967

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, since the introduction in 1965 and again in 1967 of my bill to permit recourse to jury trial in Tennessee Valley Authority land condemnation proceedings, H.R. 4846, I have received thousands of letters from organizations and private citizens pleading that action be taken on the measure.

In fiscal 1967, the Tennessee Valley Authority acquired 45,367 additional acres and 404 miles of transmission line easements. Conservative estimates for the volume of land to be acquired by the TVA in fiscal 1968 far exceed the 1967 figure, and concern over the lack of appeal to jury trial by landowners who question the fairness of the price awarded for these lands is growing at a proportionate rate.

Recently, landowners in Franklin County, Tenn., whose lands have been acquired by the TVA for use in the Tims Ford project testified in regard to their dealings with the Tennessee Valley Authority.

The following excerpts typify the feelings of the overwhelming majority of citizens with whom I have communicated, and I urge my colleagues to take a few minutes to seriously consider the views expressed.

TESTIMONY OF FRANKLIN COUNTY LANDOWNERS ON TVA LAND DEALINGS

". . . to be engaged in a suit with a Federal agency and have the government by-pass a decision of peers in favor of a ruling by another Federal panel promises only a decision predictably disadvantageous . . ."

"TVA didn't offer us enough to buy back—not even half. They say our house and barn is valued at $350. Our house is only seven years old, electric heat, and all modern conveniences."

"If they would only leave us what is above the high water mark—that would be a lot more than what they offered us. If our land above the high water mark was covered, the city of Winchester would be covered . . . I think a twelve man jury would help us a lot. I believe they would be more fair and understand."

"I had the farm appraised by bonded appraisers before TVA appraised it. TVA's appraisal was $19,900 less than the bonded appraisers."

"This whole thing has caused untold hardship on me, especially in this quick possession area and having to make decisions quickly."

"They insisted that I take what they offered me . . . I want a jury trial. That's one thing I want. They condemned my land and took it and cut what they had offered me."

"Our deed called for 207 acres but TVA says 181 acres. We think we need a twelve man jury. We think we would get a fairer trial. We think it is our Constitutional right."

"They are taking something over 47 acres for an average of less than $75 an acre. We feel that our water supply would be worth that much. I think that a jury trial would increase our chances of getting fair pay for our land."

"I feel like the people whose land is condemned by TVA, or some other government agency should have the right to a jury trial. We have 250 acres of land and half of it won't be covered with water, but they intend to take it all for the purpose of reselling it to defray the cost of building the dam."

"A trial by jury is a basic right that was incorporated in the Constitution and the laws that set up our great country, and I think that it is fair and proper that the TVA should not be made exception to this rule."

"The ASCS air map says our farm consists of 306 acres, and the TVA says we have 264 acres. They (TVA) said if we didn't accept their first offer it might not be as good as the next time—and it wasn't. We feel that it is only right to settle this with a twelve man jury rather than a three man commission."

"This is a move advocated and promoted by vested interests. If we believe in a jury system, it should operate in all endeavors and there is no endeavor greater than the ownership of public property."

"They have offered me about $300 an acre, but I had been offered $400 for it about 3½ years ago. They are taking all of my land, but the water won't cover all of it, and the road won't take all of it. But, they say this upland is too valuable for me to keep."

"Now, I think that the people ought to have a twelve man jury trial where they are not satisfied with their price . . . it would be 6 to 10 years before we could get our money if we did go into condemnation."

"They don't have to take all of our home—they are just wanting it for their own use. We want a twelve man jury to decide what we get for our place. This is the only right way to do it."

"They even took my springs that wasn't going to be covered by the lake. I think we need a jury trial. It may not do me any good, but it might help somebody else."

Certainly, these people are deserving of an appeal to a jury trial, and passage of a bill granting them this right is long overdue.

Captive Nations Week

SPEECH

OF

HON. E. ROSS ADAIR

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 19, 1967

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, the week of July 16–22 has been set aside as Captive Nations Week. In due course, the President will issue his proclamation to that effect. However, one has to take notice that with each passing year the Presidential proclamation seems to become weaker and less to the point. Are we only committed to freedom on this side of the Iron and Bamboo Curtains? To what purpose do we in the Congress pass resolutions when their intent is ignored?

Last year House Concurrent Resolution 416 was passed by both bodies. This resolution urged that the President "direct the attention of world opinion at the United Nations and at other appropriate international forums and by such means as he deems appropriate, to the denial of the rights of self-determination for the peoples of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania." To the best of my knowledge nothing of the sort has been done.

Has Ambassador Goldberg forcefully brought to the attention of the General Assembly the situation in the captive nations of the Soviet Communist empire? We all know the answer—he has not. While the Soviet Union was demanding that Israel retreat, was Ambassador Goldberg on his feet demanding to know what steps the Soviet Union was taking toward granting self-determination to its captive nations. No, he was not. No "winds of change" blow over the steppes. We sit idly by and watch the communization of these captive nations in silence.

Therefore, I call upon the President and those in authority to make this Captive Nations Week a meaningful one in order to show that these people who suffer in silence have not been forgotten.

More on the Congo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 20, 1967

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, on July 11 past I took the floor of this House to challenge the assignment of three U.S Air Force planes to the Congo, at which time I commented:

> Every time there is an eruption in some part of the world, Uncle Sam puts on his police uniform, picks up his night stick and rushes to the place of disorder.

James J. Kilpatrick, the journalist, wrote an interesting article on this Congo situation, and it appears in the July 18 issue of the Evening Star. I submit this article to the Record and suggest that my colleagues read it over.

The article follows:

ANSWERS DEMANDED ON INTERVENTION IN CONGO

(By James J. Kilpatrick)

As this is written, the uprising in the Congo appears to have subsided. In the lull, it is imperative that Congress and the people demand some straight answers to questions about the three U.S. transports and 150 American servicemen who were sent to Kinshasa ten days ago. Presumably they are still so assigned.

What in God's name, or in President Johnson's—they seem to get confused from time to time—are they doing there? How on earth can this impulsive intervention be condoned?

The story first broke on July 5, in an AP dispatch from Kinshasa: "Two unidentified planes landed a group of foreign commandoes today and occupied the airport at Kisangani in the northeast Congo, President Joseph D. Mobutu said today." The story went on to quote the government radio as saying paratroopers had been dropped at Bukavu.

This was the story as the world first understood it. But President Mobutu, in the short word, lied. He was still working on the lie on July 6, when he denounced "invaders sent from Western countries." On July 7, he was able to report "a great victory" on the part of his loyal troops. Indeed, they had "destroyed the two invasion planes." It was a marvelous convenience.

It was not until July 8 that the truth began to emerge. There had been no commandos, no invaders, no planes. What happened, apparently, was that a group of about 800 Katangese gendarmes, aroused by Mobutu's contrived kidnapping of their old leader Moise Tshombe, feared that the Mobutu government would obtain Tshombe's return from Algeria in order to kill him. They rebelled. Then they forced, or persuaded, about 250 of Mobutu's own white mercenaries to join the revolt.

In brief, this was an internal matter if there ever was one. There never was any significant threat to American nationals. There was not a breath of Communist involvement. No issues were drawn of morality or principle.

But on Sunday, July 9, Johnson personally ordered the U.S. transports and servicemen sent to Mobutu's support. The first explanation, given privately to questioning senators that afternoon, was that their mission was to save American lives. This was baloney. The second explanation, filtering out of a closed committee hearing on July 10, was that Johnson was making a political gesture to demonstrate that there was no white conspiracy against the Mobutu government. The third explanation, a day or so later, was that the President thought it necessary "to preserve the integrity of the Congo."

This won't do. The United States has no obligation whatever to support the Mobutu regime or to preserve the territorial integrity of the Congo. By every indication, Mobutu has imposed upon the Congo the most tyrannical administration that synthetic nation has known in the seven troubled years of its existence.

But the character of the Mobutu regime is irrelevant to the question of U.S. intervention. The United States holds no divine commission as policeman to the world. Our responsibility ends with honoring treaties and with preserving our own security. To send logistical support to the Congolese government, under the fraudulent circumstances of the recent rebellion, is to set a precedent that cannot be defended in morality or in law.

The first rule for nations that carry the big stick is to walk softly. Here the President came rushing in with stomping boots. Temporarily, he may have made a friend of Joseph Mobutu. With friends like that, who needs enemies?

Dr. R. Glenn Reed, Jr., of Marietta, Ga.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. DAVIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 20, 1967

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I take great pride in calling the attention of this body to the outstanding record my personal friend and constituent, Dr. R. Glenn Reed, Jr., of Marietta, Ga., has established for himself as president of Kiwanis International during the past year.

I insert in the Record the following article which documents in more detail the excellent service which has been rendered by Dr. Reed:

Dr. R. Glenn Reed Jr., a Marietta, Georgia dentist and businessman, and one of the youngest men ever to head Kiwanis International relinquishes his post as Kiwanis President on July 31. When he leaves he will have chalked up one of the most significant, and productive terms of office that any Kiwanis leader has ever had.

Dr. Reed and his wife visited Japan where the President chartered the new Kiwanis club of Nagoya; the Philippines where he chartered the new Kiwanis club of Quezon City; Denmark where the Copenhagen club was chartered; and Brussels where the President was principal speaker at a meeting of Kiwanis clubs in Europe.

Late in his term of office the couple visited Colombia where Dr. Reed chartered the new Kiwanis club of Bucamaranga, and Nicaragua where the Managua club was chartered.

Three of these clubs represented the first in their respective nations—Copenhagen, Bucamaranga, and Managua.

Dr. Reed's administration saw the addition of three countries to the Kiwanis roster to bring the total to twenty-three. (Kiwanis has served outside its home countries of the United States and Canada only since 1962.)

In addition, the young President's leadership of Kiwanis saw a revitalization of the organization's concept of service to the community, and a surge of increased membership. In the first six months of 1967 Kiwanis added more than 6,000 members to its roster—an almost unprecendented high in membership development.

Dr. Reed's major emphasis as Kiwanis president was encouragement of all Kiwanians in all clubs to redouble their community service efforts. To that end he and Mrs. Reed visited all of Kiwanis' thirty districts and participated in hundreds of Kiwanis club meetings, ladies nights, banquets and the like.

Dr. Reed's term of office included the fiftieth anniversary date of the establishment of Kiwanis in Canada (November 15, 1916); and the President helped the Kiwanis Club of Hamilton, the first in the country, to mark its achievement through the presentation of a scroll of appreciation to Prime Minister Lester Pearson.

Climax to Reed's presidency came during the period June 25–29th when he presided at the 52nd annual Kiwanis International convention in Houston, Texas. The convention, which saw more than 17,000 people—Kiwanians and their families—gather in the Texas metropolis for one of the most successful conventions in Kiwanis' history.

Dr. Reed will continue as a member of the Kiwanis International Board of Trustees in the capacity of Immediate Past President for a period of one year. He is succeeded to the Presidency by James M. Moler of Charles Town, West Virginia, an educator and banker.

First Lady "Tall" in Own Right

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OMAR BURLESON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 20, 1967

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, an editorial appearing in the June 14 issue of the Abilene Reporter-News, Abilene, Tex., entitled "First Lady 'Tall' in Own Right," is an article which I feel worthy of being included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

FIRST LADY "TALL" IN OWN RIGHT

Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson was given an honorary doctor's degree at Middlebury College in Vermont Monday, and she contributed something of her own at the convocation.

Her contribution came in a speech in which she quite effectively spoke about protests and protestors.

She did it in a positive, rather than a negative way. She saluted protestors—but only "working protestors" committed to finding solutions to injustice and inadequacy.

And Mrs. Johnson added she knows one such working protestor very well—"my husband."

She spoke on a subject that key officials of the Johnson administration have tried to avoid—the rising trend of demonstrations on everything from war to man's inhumanity to man.

It is easy, she said, to be "a protestor with a picket sign."

"All you do is show up and walk. No one is going to stop you.

"What is tough is to be a working protestor" committed to finding solutions to raise the level of society, for that takes some effort, some thought, some giving, and patience.

Mrs. Johnson's Middlebury address provokes some thoughts on the role she fills and how she fills it.

In a unique way differing in either great or small degree from all her predecessors in our times, Mrs. Johnson is a distinctive First Lady. She is definitely a public and political asset to her husband.

Mrs. John F. Kennedy was young, beautiful, exciting, socially oriented and she, too, was a public asset to her husband. Except for her impact on the arts, her influence was greater on fashions and hair styles than on public thought and affairs. She did invoke admiration and adoration on official visits abroad which she was privileged to make with President Kennedy.

Mrs. Dwight D. Eisenhower was beloved as Mamie, but undertook no public role other than that as the President's wife and White House hostess.

Mrs. Harry S. Truman was totally withdrawn and never had a relationship with the press or public.

Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt was an activist who involved herself in many public matters, notably social and economic reforms. She traveled the nation widely, spoke often, wrote a newspaper column and often stirred controversy, some of which may have discomfited her husband. In later years she served her country as representative to the United Nations.

Mrs. Johnson seems to incorporate to an extent many of the good qualities of the earlier First Ladies, while avoiding the problems of some. She is gracious, even flawless, as hostess beside her husband at White House state and social affairs. She is well educated, mature and knowledgeable in both public and political affairs. Thus she speaks with wisdom and restraint, careful not to put herself or her husband in the vulnerable position.

She has had notable effect in inspiring beautification across the land, and particularly in Washington itself.

At Middlebury, it seems to us, she was at her best when, in an academic environment, she twitted those who keep the country in turmoil through agitation rather than application of constructive efforts for change.

Mrs. Johnson will be remembered as a great public figure in her own right.

Truck Lease Spending Seen Topping $1 Billion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 20, 1967

Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, we are constantly beseiged with commercials on television promoting the rental of automobiles and the jovial competition between "No. 1 and No. 2" in the field.

A recent article in the Boston Herald-Traveler, written by William D. Laffler, financial editor for the United Press International, points up a trend in truck leasing about which many, perhaps, are not aware.

For the general information of my colleagues I recommend this timely article:

TRUCK LEASE SPENDING SEEN TOPPING $1 BILLION

(By William D. Laffler)

NEW YORK.—Truck leasing has become such an important way of financing transportation that it is estimated American business men will spend more than $1 billion for vehicles they do not own.

The Car and Truck Renting and Leasing Assn. predicts that before this year is over there will be about 400,000 trucks rolling under either long-term lease or short-term rental.

Leasing companies also rent trucks to customers to help them meet peak-period requirements.

Many of these trucks show the name of such leading leasers as Hertz, Ryder System, ITT-Avis, National Truck Leasing System and Berman Leasing Co.

The Hertz Corp., which leases more than 27,000 trucks and conducts the nation's largest leasing operation, foresees greater popularity for leasing as industry grows.

"Leased trucks represent only a small percentage of the country's 15-million trucks, but the leased-truck population is growing at a faster rate than is the over-all truck population," Lester Jampol, Hertz's vice-president for truck leasing, said.

Jampol said one of the most popular arrangements is the full-service lease.

Under this arrangement, the lessor furnishes vehicles, fuel, oil, maintenance, emergency road service, storage, washing, painting and lettering, tires, registration and inspection, insurance and replacement vehicles.

"We furnish everything except the drivers," Jampol said.

The finance lease offers only the vehicle, with the lessee responsible for costs and maintenance.

"By contrast, the comprehensive package provided by full-service leasing, in effect, takes the lessee out of the truck business, allowing management to focus directly on its own business," Jampol said.

"Such leasing puts truck fleet problems in the hands of a team of specialists who keep the fleet operating efficiently."

Jampol said there is a myth that full-leasing can be enjoyed only by large companies. On the contrary, he said, a number of Hertz trucks is leased to companies which operate only one to five trucks.

Like the Ryder System, Hertz's full service arrangement offers painting and lettering the trucks to the specifications of the lessee so they appear that the lessee owns them.

In 1947 Soviets Sang a Different Tune

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 20, 1967

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, we are all familiar with the position Russia has taken in the Middle East, but I think it would be interesting to view the Soviet's stand toward Israel when the question of establishing a Jewish State was before the United Nations in 1947.

I commend to the attention of our colleagues a very interesting article written by David Benarone for the July 6, 1967, edition of the American Examiner. In his article, Mr. Benarone presents excerpts from the address of Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko given before the U.N. in 1947.

The article follows:

IN 1947 SOVIETS SANG A DIFFERENT TUNE

(By David Benarone)

UNITED NATIONS (WUP).—The current debate on the Mideast crisis in the special emergency session here prompted this writer to look into the UN archives of two decades ago for records pointing to Soviet support for the establishment of the State of Israel.

Among the several Soviet speeches recorded is one which brought much courage and joy to world Jewry.

This historic address was delivered by Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko, the USSR Ambassador to the world organization. In the light of Moscow's current pro-Arab policy, it is worth noting what Gromyko had to say in 1947. Excerpts from his famous address follow:

"The Jewish people suffered extreme misery and deprivation during the last war. It can be said, without exaggeration, that the sufferings and miseries of the Jewish people are beyond description. It would be difficult to express by mere dry figures the losses and sacrifices of the Jewish people at the hands of the Fascist occupiers.

"In the territories where the Hitlerites were in control, the Jews suffered almost complete extinction. The total number of the Jews that fell at the hands of the Fascist hangmen is something in the neighborhood of six million. Only about one and a half million Jews survived the war in Western Europe. But these figures, which give an idea of the losses suffered by the Jewish people at the hands of the Fascist aggressors, give no idea of the situation in which the great mass of the Jewish people find themselves after the war."

This is Gromyko speaking, and it might be well that today he be reminded of his stand at that time. The Soviet leader goes on with his pro-Jewish recital:

"A great many of the Jews who survived the war in Europe have found themselves deprived of their countries, of their shelter, and of means of earning a livelihood . . . It may be asked whether the United Nations, considering the very serious situation of hundreds of thousands of Jews who have survived the war, should not show an interest in the situation of these people who have been uprooted from their countries and from their homes. The Organization of the United Nations cannot, and should not, remain indifferent to this situation, because such an attitude would be incompatible with the high principles which are proclaimed in our Charter—principles which envisage the defense of the rights of men, irrespective of race, religious convictions and sex. This is the time to give help, not in words, but in deeds . . .

"Regarding the necessity of concerning ourselves with the situation of the Jewish population, which is without shelter . . . the Soviet delegation considers it necessary to draw the attention of the General Assembly to the following circumstances: The experience of the past . . . has shown that not one State of Western Europe has been in a position to give proper help to the Jewish people and to defend its interests, or even its existence, against the violence that was directed against it from the Hitlerites and its allies. This is a very serious fact, but unfortunately, like all facts, it must be recognized.

"The fact that not a single Western European State has been in a position to guarantee the defense of the elementary rights of the Jewish people or compensate them for the violence they have suffered at the hands of the Fascist hangmen explains the aspiration of the Jews for the creation of a State of their own. It would be unjust not to take this into account and to deny the right of the Jewish people in the realization of such an aspiration. It is impossible to justify a denial of this right of the Jewish people."

Although Mr. Gromyko had proposed the creation of one dual, democratic Arab-Jewish State, he did note in his speech that "if it were found that this plan was unrealizable on account of the deterioration of relations between Jews and Arabs . . . then," he added, "it would be necessary to consider an alternative solution," namely the creation of "two independent separate states—one Jewish, and one Arab."

The historic Partition decision was voted upon on November 29, 1947. The Soviets know full well that the Arabs rejected the decision; that they went to war on May 14, 1948, and have remained belligerent ever since.

Flag Revives Thoughts of Our Nation's History

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 20, 1967

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, just recently our country celebrated another anniversary of its independence. To many Americans, this was a day on which to fly our flag; to some Americans, every day is a day to fly the flag.

They fly the flag because they are proud of our Nation. I wish I could say that more Americans unashamedly were as proud.

America has not been without error, and loyal citizens today are questioning whether she is not making some errors now.

Based on our firm belief in "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness" for all mankind, we can be justifiably proud of our country's motives and ideals. Is there another nation in the world that has sacrificed so much in two world wars, in Korea, and presently in Vietnam, for the cause of freedom? Is there another country in the world that has given so generously to help underdeveloped nations and starving peoples?

For such a nation we should be grateful, and thankful. We can be proud of her. We should fly the flag every day to show that we are.

With permission, I include the following article which appeared in Everybody's Column of the Buffalo Evening News, Buffalo, N.Y., on May 27, 1967:

FLAG REVIVES THOUGHTS OF OUR NATION'S HISTORY

To those who would burn our flag I ask, what do you see when you see our flag?

I see Bunker Hill and Valley Forge. I see Gettysburg, and Antietam, Argonne Forest and Flanders Field, Iwo Jima and the Coral Sea. I see Korea and Porkchop Hill, Vietnam and fresh blood being spilled for freedom's sake.

I see the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier, Washington and Lincoln Memorials. I see mighty mountains and great plains, great rivers and lakes. I see great railroads, airlines and networks of roads uniting us into a great nation.

I see great cities with buildings touching the sky. I see our young astronauts flying into outer space.

How anyone can see all this and still burn our flag and draft cards is beyond me. They certainly don't belong in America.

Freedom isn't something handed out on a platter. It is something fought and died for. Without the sacrifices of millions before us, there just wouldn't be a United States.

The next time you see our flag go by, stand up tall and straight and, if a tear comes to your eye, don't be ashamed, for then you are an American.

AN AMERICAN.

The Los Angeles Job Corps Center for Women

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 20, 1967

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, the Los Angeles Times recently featured a story about the success of the Los Angeles Job Corps Center for Women which I know my colleagues will find useful and informative.

Job Corps, as one of the Office of Economic Opportunity programs, is demonstrating daily its success in developing one of America's greatest natural resources: our young men and women.

As the Times article points out, more than 800 young women have gone through the 1-year program at the Los Angeles center. Seventy-five percent of these young ladies are now gainfully employed as a result of their Job Corps training and experience.

When we realize that the Job Corps enrollees are from the lowest income areas of our Nation, I think we can take considerable pride in the progress and low rate of dropouts that occurs in the Job Corps training programs. Only 3 percent of the girls drop out of the Los Angeles women's center program.

I am particularly pleased to include the complete article from the July 3 Los Angeles Times, written by Mr. Bob Rawitch, which so thoroughly demonstrates the success and progress the Job Corps is bringing in the OEO struggle against poverty:

FEW DROPOUTS HERE: WOMEN'S JOB CORPS SUCCEEDS

(By Bob Rawitch)

Entering its third year of operation, the Los Angeles Job Corps Center for Women is one of the most successful of the 115 training centers in the United States.

Recent Job Corps statistics show that nationally 53% of the graduates for a six-month period in 1966–67 were employed. In the past two years the Los Angeles center shows 75% of its graduates presently employed.

Also, while the national dropout rate is approximately 11%, the local center has only 3% of its girls leave the program.

Miss Mary Doolittle, director of the center here, reports that more than 300 women have graduated from the program since it opened its door in June 1965.

MOST ARE DROPOUTS

The Job Corps is a residential training program for young men and women between the ages of 16 and 21. Most of the participants are school dropouts without sufficient employable skills to sell in the labor market.

Founded by the federal Office of Economic Opportunities, the center, 1107 S. Broadway, houses 320 women.

The director attributes the low dropout rate to "having a social climate which is a 'therapeutic community'."

"We try to adapt the center's program to the needs of the individual girl rather than make her conform to a set program," she said.

Professional counselors and resident advisers are assigned to each residential floor to provide guidance and counseling to the girls 24 hours a day.

The successful job placement record of the center here can be attributed to a "fine staff and being located in a large city with a greater variety of vocational training opportunities," Miss Doolittle says.

Approximately 70% of the women are trained in the center, 20% are in on-the-job training with local businesses and other groups and 10% are in the city's trade and technical schools.

Of the girls who have taken training in an outside business, 90% are hired permanently by that firm once they have completed their training, she said.

TRAINING COST CUT

Nationally the Job Corps has come under heavy criticism at times for discipline problems. However, no apparent problem exists locally, according to Miss Doolittle.

"We really have no more problems than any high school or college sorority and, because there is such close supervision, we probably have fewer disciplinary problems," she said.

During the two years of operation only seven girls have been arrested and only four were convicted. More than 800 girls have gone through the program.

"We have never had a problem with narcotics and have never had any physical fights," she said.

The cost of training a woman has been reduced from $9,000 per year at the inception of the program to approximately $5,000—one of the lowest figures in the country, according to the director.

A recent 30% reduction in federal funds is partly responsible, she said, but she attributes a great deal of the savings to "long hours by the staff, attaining a degree of expertise in administration, and the volunteer administration, and, the volunteer help of several hundred Los Angeles residents who aid in tutoring."

Numerous "firsts" have also been accomplished by the local center including placing the first corpswomen as airline stewardesses, lady barbers, fashion designers and radio-TV servicewomen.

An Educator's Viewpoint on the Middle East Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GUY VANDER JAGT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 20, 1967

Mr. VANDER JAGT. Mr. Speaker, because of the extreme seriousness of the Middle East situation, it is important that every opportunity be taken to become, whenever possible, informed on news and different viewpoints related to it.

A constituent of mine, a high school principal from Baldwin, Mich., offers several thoughts in a recent letter to me. I believe my colleagues will find the letter which follows of significant interest:

BEIRUT, LEBANON,
July 3, 1967.

Congressman GUY VANDER JAGT,
U.S. Congress,
Washington, D.C., U.S.A.

DEAR GUY: My family and I are spending a few weeks in the Middle East before returning home and going to Guam for two years. War broke out here while we were on our way. We met hundreds of refugees in Europe being evacuated from all of the countries in the Middle East. We took the opportunity to talk with these people as well as to Jewish people returning to Israel and Arabs returning to their homes in the various Middle Eastern countries.

We arrived in Beirut, Lebanon, one day before the fighting stopped, the day of the demonstrations against the United States and Great Britain. We were the only Americans going to the Middle East. Beirut was and still is under Marshal Law. The local people are all amazed to see Americans here, but everyone is very polite and helpful. They ask us to tell other Americans that it is safe to return to Lebanon. As you know Guy, I have always been interested in International Affairs and, in the Middle East in particular. I was in the Middle East in 1960–1961 as a Post Graduate student at the American University of Beirut. At that time I traveled through out the Middle Eastern countries and made many friends.

I am sure you will remember I expressed my deep concern about the direction events are drifting in the Middle East when I talked to you last, in Baldwin on May 30th. Some times we, students of history who maintain that interest in our daily lives, see events in a different light than do these whose training and interest are in another field.

Unfortunately people in United States do not understand the significance, the tremendous significance to us and to our country of the present historical events here in the Middle East. It is impossible to understand the significance of present events except through an historical understanding of the Middle East, the Jewish Religion, the Moslem Religion, the Christian Religion, a history of the various countries, their people and culture and very important at this time, an understanding of the Russian action and aspiration in this area. Recently I wrote an historical article explaining Russian action in the Middle East. I sent the article from here, Beirut, Lebanon, to the Grand Rapid Press. If it was published perhaps you could read it.

Let me say this much concerning Russian actions in the Middle East. By giving the Arab Nations obsolete armaments they have accomplished several things. (1) They obtained high grade cotton and other quality merchandise in return, (2) they have made heroes of themselves among the masses, (3) they have made villians of the United States, (4) they have further weakened the Arab Nations, prevented a strong local leader from dominating the Arab people in the Middle East and increased their influence and the dependency of the Arabs on Russia.

It is so easy to gain the wrong impression about Russian armaments in the Middle East. We always hear about the SAM antiaircraft missiles, latest model tanks, and the MIG 21 and later model SU–7 Jets. These are the weapons we are interested in, the weapons Egypt and other countries like to display and brag about. We don't realize those weapons are too few to be effective, that most of the armaments are out dated WW II tanks and obsolete Mig–17's and Mig–19's. With a few exceptions the local citizens in the various Arab countries are unaware of this themselves. They think Russia is giving their leaders the best and latest armaments.

Why can Russia gain so much from a financially sound business deal when we get kicked in the teeth every time we hand out a free dollar? Most Americans think the Russians backed a losing side in the Middle East, that Russia then cooperated with United States in helping to end the war. The truth is Russia won in the Middle East. It is difficult to see how she could have won more. If Nasser had won he would have become a strong leader in the whole Arab Middle East. Did Russia want that? Unfortunately most Americans think so. If Nasser had won, Russia would have lost. Nasser has jailed local communists in Egypt for years. Russia wants weak, divided nations in the Middle East. She wants to extend her influence in these divided and weak nations. She wants to prevent the emergence of a strong leader who might unite these nations. She wants to discredit the United States in the Middle East. Russia accomplished all of these goals. The Arabs lost the war in the Middle East. United States lost a great deal of influence as well as bases in the Middle East, but Russia, Russia was the big winner. She won far more than did tiny, victorious Israel.

Russia is playing for high stakes; bases in the Mediterranean. When Russia obtains bases at Latakia, Syria, Algeria, Egypt and on the Red Sea our Government may wake up. Russia did not lose in this recent war. Russia is not cooperating with the United States, except at our expense. Russia has been trying to obtain bases in the Mediterranean and in the Red Sea for hundreds of years. Russia is so close to this ancient goal now. As usual our government will realize this too late.

Here is the situation that is developing in the Middle East now. Russia is so close to her age old goal of warm water outlets in the South, that she can smell the salt water all the way to Moscow. The United States can not afford to allow Russia to obtain these bases. This is a real keg of dynamite and we don't control the keg. Even Russians do not control this keg of dynamite. It is in the hands of the most highly emotional people in the World, The Jews and the Arabs. Russia realizes this, but the stakes are high. The United States doesn't even know what is going on. Something must be done or this keg of dynamite will explode. If it does it may well set off hydrogen bombs in the United States and all over the World. The fuse to this keg of dynamite is Jerusalem and it was recently lit by Israel. The keg must be defused. If it is not, God help us.

Sincerely,

DON SPOHN.

Gary Job Corps Center Succeeding in Poverty War Role

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. J. PICKLE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 20, 1967

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues three articles that appeared in the Showcase section last weekend of the Dallas, Tex., Morning News.

The first of the three articles, all of which were written by the News' Austin bureau correspondent, Stewart Davis, is particularly interesting because it shows that the Gary Job Corps Center's role in the war on poverty is a successful venture in getting young men off the streets, trained, and into jobs paying living wages.

It also provides a realistic, firsthand report on the current activities at Gary and academic capabilities of the center.

It is particularly pleasing to note that center's director, Wallace Dockall, says that the operating costs have been cut during the last year while accumulating a record of accomplishments.

The second article is interesting from the point of view the center has been playing in formulating innovations in public school education.

This residual effect, I believe, will be most helpful in keeping to a minimum the number of youngsters who will be forced to drop from school and seek the help of the Job Corps to become productive members of our society.

And finally, I believe there is no more impressive aspect of the center's work than that reported in the final article. It is doubly impressive to know of the confidence and jobs being acquired by the Corpsmen when you realize that most Corpsmen comprise the "dregs" of America's classrooms and were the students who sat in the back of their classrooms—if they were in school at all.

Under unanimous consent I include all these excellent stories in the RECORD, and I hope that all those who are sincerely interested in learning of the effectiveness of the Job Corps will give them their careful attention.

The articles follow:

CENTER CUTS COSTS: GARY CORPSMEN SUCCEED

(By Stewart Davis)

SAN MARCOS, TEX.—The Gary Job Corps Center here has cut operating costs during the last year, while accumulating a record of accomplishments.

The average annual cost per trainee has dropped from $5,200 to about $4,000, said Wallace Dockall, director of the center.

Dockall attributed the decrease to a general tightening of administration and economy-minded purchases.

He said that heavy earth-moving equipment, for example, was purchased as military surplus at a savings of about $1.5 million. The equipment is used in an instructional program.

Dockall points to a recent sampling of 428 Job Corps "graduates" as evidence of the potential economic benefits of the program.

The 428 trainees were hired at an average wage of $1.82 per hour. In one year, their combined income would be $1,620,236, and their income taxes, calculated at 15 per cent, would be $243,035.

The trainees were at the center for an average of nine months at an average cost of $3,900 each, a total cost of $1,669,200.

"From those figures, you can see that these corpsmen would pay their total training cost in taxes in seven years," said Dockall.

Since the national average cost of a person on relief is $2,823 a year, these 428 corpsmen could have cost the states $48,329,760 in welfare payments during their 40-year work lives if they had stayed unemployable.

This projection does not count the loss of the potential productivity of the young men.

So far, the study of the 428 young men has revealed that 200 are still on their original jobs, 51 have transferred to new jobs, 25 were fired, 42 went into the military and two died.

There were 108 corpsmen who quit their first job, and the researchers are trying to trace these corpsmen to see how they have fared.

The trainees have found jobs at wages ranging from $1.12 an hour for a tailor to $4.72 per hour for a welder.

The center's placement office receives up to 400 requests a month from businesses seeking graduates of the training program.

"The demand is up to 15 times greater than we can fill," Dockall said.

About two dozen firms have come back to the center to hire additional corpsmen, he said. Dallas Airmotive, for example, has hired 12. Collins Radio and Texas Bitulithic have hired eight. Ling-Temco-Vought has hired three.

One firm in Kansas has hired 27 graduates.

These are the kinds of statistics, Dockall said, which show that the Gary Job Corps Center's role in the war on poverty is a successful venture in getting young men off the streets, trained and into jobs which pay living wages.

The Gary center is the largest in the nation. There are nine other urban centers for men and 18 for women.

About 11,000 young men, ages 16 through 21, have come to the center since it opened March 3, 1965.

In most cases, the youngsters were school dropouts who were unable to find jobs. They had an average of eight years education and a fifth-grade reading level.

They had little motivation and no positive attitudes toward working for a living.

About 6,000 of the trainees have graduated to jobs in the open market. There are about 3,100 trainees at the center. Around 2,800 corpsmen have quit or been discharged for disciplinary, medical or other reasons before completing their training.

Dockall said these figures show a positive output of about 75 per cent.

The center offers 38 kinds of vocational training, ranging from brick layer to commercial artist, from bulldozer operator to machinist.

The most popular courses are those dealing with automobile repairs, heavy equipment operation and welding.

Dockall said when the center opened, most courses were designed to be taught over a two-year period. The time for instruction has been reduced to fit the actual staying power of the trainees, he said.

Most courses can now be completed in nine to 18 months.

Academic education is woven into the vocational training. There are, in effect, 31 kinds of mathematics and English programs to fit the 38 vocational courses.

"We try to show the corpsmen that academic education is something they can use in their work," said Dockall.

Arithmetic problems for a welding student, for example, focus on the actual measurements and calculations which a welder would be expected to make on the job.

Instructors try to motivate corpsmen by showing the practical application of the lessons.

The knowledge is conveyed in a noncompetitive atmosphere. Instructors avoid asking a student questions which would embarrass the student in front of the class.

Each student competes only with himself, learning step by step those things necessary for him to become employable.

Work habits are established by a class schedule which encourages, but doesn't demand promptness, neat appearance, observance of safety rules and respect for superiors.

Instructors stay away from authorization demands which seem to backfire, causing students to rebel. Instead, corpsmen are given an explanation of the benefits of adhering to a positive attitude toward work.

A remedial reading class is part of the schedule of corpsmen who have less than a sixth-grade reading level. The class has shown phenomenal results. Non-readers achieve a sixth-grade reading level in about four and one-half months.

The class relies on the same kind of electronic equipment used in high schools and colleges for instruction in foreign languages. Gary instructors have adapted the tape recorders and sound booths to education in the fundamentals of English, with as many as 36 youngsters working on different lessons at the same time.

With a printed list of words before them, students listen to the teacher's voice on a master tape, record their own voices pronouncing the same words and replay the tapes to learn what mistakes they made.

Teachers can monitor any circuit to check on the progress of students and to answer questions. Each student can get individual attention not available in a typical school classroom.

In addition to vocational-academic training, special courses offer the corpsmen the opportunity to qualify for a General Educational Development (GED) certificate, considered by many employers as the equivalent of a high school diploma.

About 500 corpsmen completed the special 16-week course leading to the GED exam during the past year. About 95 per cent passed the exam.

Corpsmen are required to learn to swim, a program initiated after two trainees drowned in the nearby San Marcos River.

The trainees also receive first aid training, health education, driver training and instruction in citizenship, including a working knowledge of government and the responsibilities of the individual citizen.

After hours activities include speech classes, personal finance courses, music, Explorer Scouts, military drill teams, choral groups, sports, crafts and hobbies.

"We try to teach the corpsmen how to use their leisure time," said Dockall. "We hope to expose them to activities they will want to do the rest of their lives, rather than spending their time and money in a bar."

Dockall said disciplinary problems have decreased in the past year since he has received authority to discharge errant corpsmen without getting clearance from the Office of Economic Opportunity in Washington.

Off-center arrests average about 50 per month. This is about two per cent of enrollment, less than the proportion of people who get in trouble with the law in the general population.

Based on the number of visits to nearby towns, the percentage of misbehavior actually turns out to be about one-half of one per cent.

Chronic offenders are discharged.

Corpsmen who do not get into trouble receive weekend passes and, occasionally, weekday passes, to go to nearby cities for shopping and recreation.

They must abide by strict curfews, and a corpsman who does not return to the center is considered away without leave and subject to dismissal.

After six months, a corpsman is eligible for a 24-day furlough, with paid travel expenses to his home and back to the center.

The students receive their food, clothing and shelter, medical and dental care, plus $30 monthly taxable spending money.

They also receive $50 per month, which is held by the center until graduation. The students have the option, however, of sending $25 of this money to their families. In this case, the government matches the $25 dollar for dollar, which means a student's family can receive $50 monthly, while the center bankrolls $25 monthly for the student.

The $30 monthly spending money goes mostly for entertainment and personal hygiene (tooth brushes, shaving cream and other items), but in some cases the corpsmen have dug deep into their pockets for charity.

Two years ago, the center played Christmas host to 500 orphans in San Antonio, in conjunction with a program sponsered by the San Antonio Jaycees.

The corpsmen noticed that the children were spending their Christmas money mostly for necessities.

When they got back to the Gary Center, the corpsmen raised $450 and sent it to the orphanage with instructions that the money be spent on toys for the kids.

At first, the corpsmen sought charitable projects as leisure-time activities. Now, they receive numerous requests for help.

The young men seem to have a soft spot for people, especially youngsters, who are less fortunate. The corpsmen have staged talent shows for the past two years to raise funds for Christmas packages for disprivileged children in San Marcos.

A corpsmen-operated car wash yielded about $300 toward construction of a pavilion at Travis State School in Austin. The young men landscaped the grounds of several San Marcos churches and cleared the site for the new Austin YMCA building.

Another landscape project at Crockett Elementary School in San Marcos was estimated to be worth $10,000 to the school district.

Several corpsmen have taken part in heroic rescue efforts which in one case resulted in the deaths of two corpsmen.

The two young men drowned while saving a Corpus Christi couple from an undertow on a Padre Island beach.

Another corpsman, now serving in the Army in Korea, was credited with saving the life of a man who touched an electrical power line. The corpsman revived the man by applying resuscitation.

The youngster received a Red Cross award for his alert action.

There have been no deaths from training at the Gary Center, although 10 corpsmen have died since the center opened. Two of the deaths were from natural causes. The others occurred in traffic accidents, drownings, and similar mishaps.

There has been one disabling accident at the center. A youngster was paralyzed when he fell during an exercise on a trampoline. The use of the trampoline has been discontinued.

TEACHERS LEARN AT GARY: INNOVATIONS FUNNEL INTO SCHOOLS

(By Stewart Davis)

SAN MARCOS, TEX.—Students aren't the only people who go to the Gary Job Corps Center here.

Thousands of teachers from across the nation, and educators from many parts of the world have traveled to Central Texas to witness the War on Poverty's experiment in lifting unemployed young men from the depths of social and economic poverty.

Sixty public school teachers are working as instructors at the center this summer.

"Their experience is bound to carry over to their schools at home," said Wallace Dockall, director of the center.

"I am convinced that the insight our educational system gains into the high school dropout may well turn out to be the hidden treasure of the Job Corps program."

Dockall said he feels an important part of the Job Corps is the funneling of information about successful innovations into the public school system.

At Harper, Freeport and several other Texas cities, math and reading programs patterned on Gary's individualized system have been installed in public schools.

School districts have been supplied with reading, math, science and general educational development materials for use in adult basic education (literacy) programs.

Similar materials have been supplied to the Texas and federal prison systems.

The Gary Job Corps Center has sponsored workshops on techniques for teaching the disadvantaged in Carrollton, Huntsville, San Marcos, San Antonio and numerous other Texas cities.

College classes, in which Gary employes are enrolled, have been invited to come at night and on Saturdays to participate in center sponsored workshops.

Dockall said there is a "dire need in our system of public education to devise better methods to cope with the so-called educational deprived, socially deprived and economically deprived.

"Without a higher education or vocational training, they possess no marketable skill," he said.

Dockall emphasizes that education should not be limited to the concept of universal academic education.

"It is meant to include vocational and social education," he contends.

The Job Corps is the first large-scale attempt to experiment with innovations in teaching vocations to the disadvantaged.

"The fact that there were no precedents to follow at the time programs were being developed may be the best thing that has ever happened to us," said Dockall.

"Experimentation and deviation from certain established standards became a must."

CORPSMEN ACQUIRING CONFIDENCE FOR JOBS

(By Stewart Davis)

SAN MARCOS, TEX.—Joe David, 21, of Seattle, Wash., is typical of the students at the Gary Job Corps Center here.

Joe is a member of the Nookta Indian tribe and the son of a retired commercial fisherman.

He quit school in the ninth grade, "because I felt like I wasn't getting anything out of it."

His girl friend's mother was a social worker who recognized Joe's artistic talent. She suggested that he join the Job Corps.

Joe has turned down three job offers in order to complete an 18-month course in commercial art next January.

He has received a General Educational Development certificate, an equivalent to a high school diploma.

Joe hopes to work as an illustrator for a department store in the Pacific Northwest, while keeping alive his interest in fine art and the tribal art of his Indian heritage.

Joe Jennings, formerly a building contractor, is typical of the instructors at the center.

Most of them have come from the working ranks of industry.

Jennings spent most of his life as a general contractor, building homes in Houston and Corsicana.

He teaches job corpsmen how to be brick layers, a skill acquired in about eight months.

There are 36 students in his class. Since the course started in April, 1966, there have been 17 "graduates" who have taken good-paying jobs.

"Brick laying consists of knowing how to use the tools and materials," said Jennings. "We need to get the student to be proficient enough to judge his own work.

"By using his level and plumb line, he knows whether he has done a good job."

It is this kind of self confidence which many instructors like to discuss.

"I can make a man employable in six months, and he could go out and earn no less than $2 an hour, but I don't like to let them get away that soon," said Dan Owczarzak, instructor in the advanced machine shop.

"I try to keep them nine months to a year. They become more valuable to themselves and their employers when they have more training."

Owczarzak teaches his class how to use five machines; the lathe, milling machine, shapers, simple surface grinders, column drill press and the precision drill press.

He said a good machinist has a "feel" for his machine, a sensitivity to the dials and controls which can produce metal objects within a tolerance of five-thousandths of an inch.

James W. Shocknessy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1967

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, Ohio's James W. Shocknessy is a gentleman who goes about his task with zeal and dedication. He has recently been reelected to his fourth term as chairman of the Ohio Turnpike Commission. He has proven his ability and versatility in bringing to reality one of the finest turnpikes in the country. Millions of tourists have used this great roadway and can attest to the excellent planning, and convenient facilities which dot the highway and add to the pleasure of its use. The Ohio turnpike has made it possible for many Ohio families to enjoy short weekend trips to places of historical interest.

Mr. Shocknessy's outstanding ability has been recognized by both Cleveland newspapers, the Plain Dealer and the Cleveland Press, by editorial comment, which, by leave obtained, are included:

[From the Plain Dealer, July 13, 1967]

SHOCKNESSY AGAIN

It is a credit to his ability and dedication that James W. Shocknessy has been re-elected to his fourth term as chairman of the Ohio Turnpike Commission.

Shocknessy, who was first elected to this post in 1949, is the only chairman the commission has ever had.

He took the job at a time when Ohio highways were regarded as among the worst in the nation. With little delay and no hint of scandal, Shocknessy got the Ohio Turnpike built.

He has continued to do a masterful service in keeping the road maintained. The turnpike's financial operation has been a model for other states.

Shocknessy has excelled in many other tasks. Among his most recent undertakings has been service on the board of trustees of Ohio State University and expediter of Interstate-71.

His re-election to the Ohio Turnpike Commission is deserved.

[From the Cleveland Press, July 13, 1967]

A TIP OF THE HAT

Under the forceful, alert and intelligent guidance of James W. Shocknessy, the Ohio Turnpike has more than kept up with the changing times. Now, with Shocknessy being re-elected to his fourth term as turnpike chairman, the commission announces forward looking plans that should continue to make the turnpike one of the best-managed superhighways in America.

In Honor of Captive Nations Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 20, 1967

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, on July 17, 1959, Congress unanimously passed Public Law 86-90 proclaiming Captive Nations Week. It was done to demonstrate that the American people, with few exceptions, will never forget the nations subjugated by the Russians and held under the heel of Communist tyranny.

I know it is the sincere hope of the vast majority—if not all of those whom I represent—that these nations someday throw off the Red yoke and achieve the freedom and independence which is the birthright of every man.

Since the end of World War II and continuing to the present, a good many new countries have been joining the family of nations. Most of these countries were formerly parts of the British, French, Belgian, and Dutch Empires. The disintegration of these empires gave independence to millions of peoples living in Africa, Asia, and South America, and in the islands of the seas.

Between World War I and World War II, over a fifth of the land area of the globe, containing one-fourth of the world's population, was part of the British Empire, although the ties between London and several of its larger components were being gradually loosened. Today most of this vast empire is either completely separate from Great Britain or associated only through the Commonwealth. While some of the Commonwealth members give allegiance to the Crown, the largest member, India, does not.

The following table gives the area and population of the nations that were part of the British Empire on December 31, 1945, but are now independent of London:

Nation	Square miles	Present population
Burma	261,798	25,246,000
Ireland	27,136	2,881,000
Israel	7,993	2,635,000
Jordan	37,737	1,976,000
Rhodesia	150,333	4,330,000
South Africa	471,819	18,298,000
Southwest Africa [1]	318,261	583,000
Sudan	967,491	13,940,000
Western Samoa	1,097	135,000
Total	2,243,656	70,024,000

[1] Administered by South Africa

The following list gives the area and population of the nations that were part of the British Empire on December 31, 1945, but are now independent and maintain membership in the commonwealth of nations. Australia, Canada, and New Zealand are also members of the commonwealth, but they are not included below as they were independent in 1945 except for their loyalty to the king.

Nation	Square miles	Present population
Barbados	166	245,000
Ceylon	25,332	11,232,000
Cyprus	3,572	598,000
Gambia	4,361	338,000
Ghana	92,100	7,740,000
Guyana	83,000	647,000
India	1,261,813	499,000,000
Jamaica	4,232	1,827,000
Kenya	224,960	9,643,000
Malaysia	127,672	9,395,000
Malta	122	317,000
Nigeria	356,669	57,500,000
Pakistan	365,529	104,138,000
Sierra Leone	27,925	2,290,000
Singapore	225	1,891,000
Tanzania	362,844	10,515,000
Trinidad and Tobago	1,980	975,000
Zambia	290,587	3,780,000
Total	3,233,069	722,071,000

The following table gives the area and population of the nations that were part of the French empire in 1945 but are now independent of France:

Nation	Square miles	Present population
Algeria	919,591	11,290,000
Cameroon	183,591	5,210,000
Dahomey	43,483	2,244,000
Guinea	94,925	3,500,000
Ivory Coast	123,483	3,500,000
Laos	91,428	3,000,000
Mauritania	397,683	1,000,000
Niger	459,073	3,433,000
Togo	21,853	1,659,000
Total	2,335,110	34,836,000

The following list gives the area and population of the nations that were part of the French Empire in 1945 but are now independent and maintain membership in the Frehch community:

Nation	Square miles	Present population
Central African Republic	240,540	2,088,000
Chad	490,733	3,254,000
Congo	134,749	840,000
Gabon	102,317	470,000
Malagasy Republic	226,657	6,336,000
Senegal	76,124	3,490,000
Total	1,271,120	16,478,000

The following list gives the area and population of the nations that were part of the Belgian empire in 1945 but are now independent:

Nation	Square miles	Present population
Burundi	10,707	2,800,000
Congo	905,063	15,986,000
Rwanda	10,169	3,073,000
Total	925,939	21,859,000

An area that was part of the Dutch empire in 1945 is now independent:

Indonesia: Square miles, 735,268; present population, 108,000,000.

The nations that have become completely independent of Great Britain, France, Belgium, and the Netherlands control areas totaling 6,239,973 square miles and have a total population of 234,719,000. It is true that Great Britain does not recognize the independence of Rhodesia; however, it is, for the time being at least, a fait accompli.

An additional 4,504,209 square miles are included in the countries that maintain membership in the Commonwealth or are part of the French community after having been colonies of Great Britain and France.

Altogether, almost a billion people live in the many nations that have severed the political ties that previously bound them to several colonial powers.

While Great Britain, France, Belgium, and the Netherlands have granted independence to most of the peoples over whom they formerly ruled, another empire refuses to relinquish its control over vast areas and many millions of people. What makes this especially reprehensible is that the ruling powers of that empire have been among the most vociferous critics of the other colonial powers.

While the Communists took over a huge area when they seized power in Russia in 1917, they soon added to their already vast territory by annexing such free nations as Armenia, Byelorussia, and Ukraine. In 1940 they added the independent Baltic countries, Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania to the Soviet empire. These six subjugated nations alone contain 391,787 square miles, with a total population of 62,230,000. Millions of other people who live in the Soviet empire are just as anxious to be free from Communist tyranny as the people who lived in Russia before 1917 yearned to be free from the tyranny of the czars.

The following table gives the area and population of the free nations that were taken over by the Soviet empire after the Communists came to power:

Nation	Square miles	Present population
Armenia	11,306	2,134,000
Byelorussia	80,154	8,533,000
Estonia	17,413	1,273,000
Latvia	24,695	2,241,000
Lithuania	26,173	2,949,000
Ukraine	232,046	45,100,000
Total	391,787	62,230,000

Besides the countries that have been incorporated into the Soviet empire, a number of other nations are satellites of Moscow, their rulers being mere puppets whose strings are pulled by their masters in the Kremlin. Several other countries are under the control of Communist China.

The following table gives the area and population of the nations that are satellites of the Soviet empire or Red China:

Nation	Square miles	Present population
Albania	11,100	1,865,000
Bulgaria	42,823	8,227,000
Cuba	44,218	7,833,000
Czechoslovakia	49,371	14,194,000
East Germany	41,816	17,048,000
Hungary	35,919	10,160,000
Mongolia	604,247	1,087,000
North Korea	46,540	12,100,000
North Vietnam	61,293	18,100,000
Poland	120,359	31,619,000
Romania	91,699	19,105,000
Yugoslavia	98,766	19,756,000
Total	1,248,151	161,094,000

Mr. Speaker, whether the representatives of the American people sit in the Congress of the United States or in the highest councils of the executive branch, let them continually demand that the Communist imperialists relinquish their hold on the countries they have taken over and on the satellite nations where their stooges carry out orders from Moscow and Peking. To fail to make such demands unceasingly is to betray the meaning of Captive Nations Week.

Arab Documents Tell of Plan To Murder Israel Civilians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 20, 1967

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, a recent article appearing in the Jewish Press told of an Arab plan to murder Israel civilians living is designated areas. The fact was disclosed after Israel soldiers captured top-secret Jordanian military orders during the recent war in the Middle East.

I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article which appeared in the July 14, 1967, edition of the Jewish Press.

The article follows:

ARAB DOCUMENTS TELL OF PLAN TO MURDER ISRAELI CIVILIANS

In the sweep of Israeli military forces, captured Jordanian military operational orders were found. These orders told a grisly story. The Jordanian toops were to wipe out the civilian inhabitants of the Israeli population centers!

Special battalions were given the assignment to destroy methodically specific villages and all the inhabitants. No woman or child was to be left alive!

The orders were top secret and kept only at the Brigade level until it was decided to activate them. This opportunity never came.

When Israeli troops captured the Jordanian West Bank, orders in identical style were found in the top secret files of all seven brigade headquarters. Had Jordan been victorious it would have meant wholesale slaughter.

Orders discovered at the Ramallah headquarters, north of Jerusalem, assigned the Reserve battalion to destroy Motza, an Israeli village of some 300 people. The village is three miles west of Jerusalem on the highway to Tel Aviv.

The captured orders read, "Top Secret: Battalion Headquarters: A. The intention of the headquarters of the Western Front is to carry out an attack on the village of Motza, to destroy it and kill all of its inhabitants.

"B. The Reserve Battalion of the Brigade shall carry out an attack on the Motza village, destroy it and kill its inhabitants on receipt of the code from the Brigade."

The battle plans of the Arab forces was drawn way back in May of 1967. One set of orders captured by the Israeli forces, dated May 18, 1967, tells of the air oprerations that would have been necessary for the conquest of the Southern Negev and that of cutting off Eilat.

The orders read:

"TOP SECRET

"U.A.R.
"Eastern Area Command H.Q.
"Chief of Staff's Bureau
"No. td/3/1967/124
"Date: 18 May 1967

"BATTLE ORDER NO. 3/67

"1. An offensive operation is planned for the cutting off of the southern Negev area and to conquer Eilat.

"2. The following air power will be allocated for exploitation by the Ground Forces O. C. for the benefit of the operation.

"a. 27 fighter-bombardment squadron sorties from 2 and 12 Air Brigades stationed at 2 bases, Nos. 248 and 249.

"7. Air forces will bomb Eilat air field, the radio station, and oil storage areas in an effort designated for that purpose by the Air Forces O .C.

"(Signed) LIWA (General) PILOT Abd El Hamid Abd Al Salaam Daghidi, O. C. Eastern Air Command."

In other captured documents, detailed plans for the bombing of civilian areas were enumerated.

Captured Syrian officers admitted that they had been prepared to move into the G'alabina-Durig' at area to prepare attack positions for the full Brigade. The date was set and the war machine in position.

On the morning of May 6, 1967, the 123rd Brigade was to start attacking with two battalions, their objective being to capture Ayelet Hashahar. This attack was to be supported by tanks from the Syrian 44th Brigade Artillery. Simultaneously the Syrian 8th Brigade was to attack Kfar Hanassi.

According to the plan, Syrian forces were to cross the Jordan in rubber boats and establish a bridgehead on the west bank. A bridge which was made ready was to be set up once the bridgehead was established, to enable the passage of tanks.

However, May 6 never did arrive because the Arab groups could not coordinate their plans. At that time U.N. observation teams in the area kept a watchful eye. The attack had to wait until the U. N. troops were pulled out of the area.

The troops left and the plan was readied for enactment, but Israel's swift action in destroying Jordan's military might averted the attack.

Ralph Roberts

SPEECH
OF

HON. J. EDWARD ROUSH

OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 19, 1967

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to echo the sentiments expressed by my colleagues concerning the long and faithful service of the former Clerk of the House, Mr. Ralph Roberts. His tenure of service covered many years and during those years he brought a great measure of honor and integrity not only to himself but to the House of Representatives which he so dearly loved.

Every Member whose service coincided with his has been the recipient of his concern and his help many times. No one is more conscious of this than I. I shall never forget his loyalty, his keen sense of justice, and his willingness to do that which was fair and right. Indiana is proud of this Hoosier who gave so many years of dedicated service to the country. He has our respect and our best wishes for many years of continued good health and happiness.

Captive Nations Week

SPEECH
OF

HON. LUCIEN N. NEDZI

OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 19, 1967

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, one of the basic tenets of American foreign policy is, or should be, to support the just aspirations of people everywhere. Our support cannot and should not always be military. But in every case it should be moral.

This week, Congress observes Captive Nations Week. This observance annually draws the support of scores of Congressmen who together reflect the spectrum of American political thought. Some of these Members do have so-called ethnic blocs in their districts, it is true, but their primary motivation for speaking out is the opportunity to proclaim sympathy, in a meaningful way, with the principle of self-determination.

There has been editorial criticism of Captive Nations Week, with particular emphasis on "pseudo states." Admittedly, as in adversary proceedings in a court of law, you weaken your case when you mix weak arguments with strong arguments, advocates of the week weaken their case when they include as captive nations people who are not and never have been a nation.

But there are real captive nations. I include in that term people with long national histories as well as lingual and cultural identities, who are denied the right to choose their own form of government. Certainly the nations of Eastern Europe fall into this category.

In my judgment, it is properly within the framework of our foreign policy to point out that in country after country in Eastern Europe, non-Communist majorities are subjected to rule by Communist minorities which took power by ugly and conspiratorial means. Recognition of this fact helps us maintain a proper focus as we engage in a policy of "building bridges."

I believe in a policy of "building bridges" as long as we are free of illusions. The encouragement of internal liberalization and external contact among the Captive Nations seems likely to be more rewarding than a policy of unremitting hostility. Such encouragement, however, should be given with a caveat in mind, and that is the unrepresentative character of the various regimes.

The attitude of the U.S. Government is important. The people of Eastern Europe do look to us. We should not underestimate the vitality of patriotic and nationalistic feeling there. Their fidelity to the Communist cause is thin indeed. It is politically wise and morally correct therefore to "stay the route," to keep informed about Eastern Europe, and to prevail.

In my view, Captive Nations Week is a serious observance and I am pleased to have an opportunity to participate in the reaffirmation by the U.S. Congress of the principle of self-determination.

U.S. Arms Sales—I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 20, 1967

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, it is an absurd and futile effect of military diplomacy when both sides of a conflict make war on each other with American weapons. This has happened in Latin American border disputes, in the Indo-Pakistani conflict, and in the Middle East.

Neil Sheehan has begun a series in the New York Times which traces the dealings of the U.S. Government as an arms merchant. It used to be claimed that armaments manufacturers caused wars. Mr. Sheehan shows how the principal arms salesman in the world today is not a private entrepreneur but the U.S. Goverment.

I am including Mr. Sheehan's first article, from the New York Times of July 19, which I commend to the attention of my colleagues:

[From the New York Times, July 19, 1967]

A Huge Business: Armament Sales—United States Is Principal Source of Weapons for Other Lands—46-Billion in 17 Years

(Note.—This is the first of a series of articles on international dealings in arms.)

(By Neil Sheehan)

Washington, July 18—The five belligerents in the Middle Eastern war—Israel, the United Arab Republic, Syria, Jordan and Iraq—altogether had about 3,300 tanks, more than Hitler employed in the invasion of France in 1940.

Nazi Germany manufactured its own tanks. The Middle Eastern combatants did not. They obtained theirs from the Soviet Union, Britain, France and the United States. Their warplanes, artillery, trucks, signal equipment and the great bulk of their small arms and ammunition were supplied by the same sources.

With these foreign arms, 679 of Egyptians, Jordanians, Syrians and Iraqis were killed. In Sinai, Israel's French-built Mirage and Mysière jets destroyed the Egyptians' Soviet MIG–21 fighters and Ilyushin bombers. On the Jordanian front, both Israelis and Jordanians drove into battle in American-made Patton and Sherman tanks.

The Middle East is only one of several troubled undedeveloped regions where wars have been fought, or may be fought, with foreign weaponry. The United States, which shared third place with Britain and followed the Soviet Union and France as a supplier to Israel and the Arab countries, has been the principal source of arms for the whole world.

In late April, two portly men in the international arms sales business, one a millionaire and the other a $25,000-a-year Defense Department official, were sitting in a sparsely furnished office on the fourth floor of the Pentagon when the telephone rang.

Henry J. Kuss, Jr., the civil servant, picked up the telephone. In a few minutes he had arranged the final details of a $40-million weapons sale. His listening visitor was Samuel Cummings, the founder, owner and president of the International Armaments Corporation and the world's leading private seller of arms.

"We don't get many deals like that," Mr. Cummings said later.

From mid-1949 through June, 1966, the United States sold $16.1-billion in weaponry and gave away $30.2-billion more in arms and military equipment. The $46.3-billion total, which does not include private sales arranged outside of Mr. Kuss's office, is about $4-billion more than all the grants and loans under the regular economic assistance program since the middle of 1948, including the Marshal Plan.

EXCEEDS ARMY STOCKS

The export of rifles, carbines and submachine guns alone is more than enough to provide a gun for each of the 3.3-million men on active duty in the United States Army, Navy, Air Force and Marine Corps. The 19,827 tanks exported are substantially more than the Army has in its active and reserve inventories.

Under the guidance of Mr. Kuss, the export pattern has also been radically altered over the last six years. Where grant aid accounted for most exports in the nineteen-fifties, sales now outnumber grants by more than 200 per cent.

Between mid-1961 and June, 1966, Mr. Kuss and his assistants have sold $11.1-billion in weaponry, 89 per cent to North Atlantic Treaty Organization allies and to Australia and Japan. Sales fell to $1.5-billion in the fiscal year closed June 30, 1967, but Mr. Kuss intends to recoup and to maintain a volume of about $2-billion a year until 1975.

The sales plus grant aid have made the United States Government the world's leading supplier of arms—nearly $3-billion a year.

Since World War II, the marriage of Government and the armaments industry into the so-called military-industrial complex has transformed the international arms trade. The private arms salesman is a midget compared with the Government salesman. Mr. Cumming's annual sales are, he says, well below $100-million, an obviously substantial amount but a pittance beside the Government business.

The Government defends its sales as a means of arming allies against the Communist military threat, promoting overseas political interests and easing the gold drain.

As the cold war atmosphere has dissipated, the Governments's salesmanship has come under attack.

The Arab-Israeli war has been seized by upon by critics as evidence that the United States, with the Soviet Union and the other arms-exporting nations, has promoted arms races in the Middle East, Asia and Africa, fostering regional instability and encouraging local wars.

FOREIGN EXCHANGE DIVERTED

The flow of arms, these critics assert, also impedes social and economic progress by diverting precious foreign exchange from development projects.

"If nothing else," said Senator Eugene J. McCarthy, Democrat of Minnesota and a persistent critic of arms shipments, "the Arab-Israeli war should convince us to re-examine our entire arms sales and military assistance programs."

What motivates these arms sales? For Mr. Cummings the answer is simple—profit. He has no illusions about the effects of a trade that has netted him millions over the last 14 years in second-hand arms deals.

"You get rather cynical in this business," he said.

From his headquarters in Monaco, Mr. Cummings sells about a quarter of a million small arms and small cannons—everything from pistols to 20-mm. guns—each year to sportsmen, collectors and non-Communist foreign police forces and armies.

One enterprising safe-cracker used a 20-mm. antitank cannon he bought from International Armaments to blast open a Brinks Company vault in Syracuse in October, 1965.

Mr. Cummings's company, with 17 affiliates and subsidiaries, also acts as a broker for the sale of larger items, such as tanks and jet fighter-bombers, from one country to another.

Mr. Cummings explained that he did not manufacture arms. He simply takes advantage of the world's arms races to buy and sell the surpluses that result when a new generation of weapons replaces older models. His sales are approved in advance by the British or United States Governments.

Defense Department statistics on the flow of Government arms from the United States over the last 18 years give substance to his explanation. Among these exports are 16,630 aircraft, including 8,300 jet fighter-bombers; 38 destroyers, 24 submarines, 258 destroyer escorts and three aircraft carriers; 19,827 tanks and 3,055 other armored assault vehicles; 1.4 million carbines, 2.1 million rifles, 28,496 submachine guns, 71,174 machine guns and 30,668 mortars, 26,845 artillery pieces and recoilless guns of all types, and 45,360 missiles, including 14,251 of the air-to-air heat-seeking type in use over North Vietnam.

MORE SURPLUSES DUE

Mr. Cummings noted that some 5,000 tanks and about 1,000 jet fighter-bombers would enter the European surplus market by 1970.

He already has customers who are eager to acquire these items in Asia, the Middle East and Latin America. The Government's sales add to this surplus constantly and create pressure on Europeans to recover the foreign exchange spent on American weaponry by selling their second-hand arms elsewhere. For Mr. Kuss, the Government salesman, the sales motivation is different. He epitomizes the transformation of the international arms business from a primarily private to a predominantly Government business since World War II. A trained civil servant who has spent 23 years in Government employ, he finds the impetus for his work in the bidding of his Government and in his desire to perform his task well.

TITLE IS COMPLICATED

His title is Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Logistics Negotiations and he refers to his work as the "promotion of mutual security."

Mr. Kuss assets that the two principal objectives are to "promote the defensive strength of our allies" and to ease logistics problems by fostering common weapons systems. It is apparent that, when he has his way, such common weapons systems are largely American-designed.

He concedes that "we also have a balance-of-payments problem," but relegates this to third place as reason for the sales.

But sales earn dollars, easing the gold drain and helping the United States maintain large troop deployments overseas. Without the dollars, the pressure on the Administration from Congress to reduce troop commitments would undoubtedly increase. As Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara remarked in Congressional testimony last year, the arms sales are made "for gold, if you will."

TWENTY COMPANIES PROFIT

Because weapons exports constitute less than 5 per cent of the total American defense business, the profits earned for the 20 major United States armaments companies are often overlooked.

The sale to Britain, concluded last year, of $2-billion in advanced F–111 multipurpose attack jets, F–4 Phantom fighter-bombers and C–130 Hercules transport aircraft has brought sizable contracts for General Dynamics McDonnell and Lockheed Aircraft, which manufacturer the planes.

In a speech in the spring of last year to the World Affairs Council in Los Angeles, Mr. Kuss said that the more than $9-billion in sales he had made by then would bring nearly $1-billion in profits to American industry and about 1.2 million man-years of employment spread through the 50 states and the District of Columbia.

Merchant Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 20, 1967

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to testify before the Merchant Marine Subcommittee of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries in favor of my bill, H.R. 3053, on July 12, 1967.

The merchant marine of the United States has been for some time, and is today, in a serious state of decline. If it is ever to resume its position as leader of the maritime nations of the world, this Nation must have an independent Maritime Administration to promote its interests.

The following is my testimony to that effect which I presented before the Merchant Marine Subcommittee:

TESTIMONY OF THE HONORABLE ROBERT N. GIAIMO BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES, JULY 12, 1967

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to have this opportunity to testify in support of H.R. 3053, a bill which I introduced to amend Title II of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, to create an independent Federal Maritime Administration, and for other purposes.

If enacted, my bill will establish the Federal Maritime Administration as an independent agency. The head of the Administration will be appointed by the President subject to Congressional approval. The newly created agency will have transferred to it all functions which are currently the responsibility of the Secretary of Commerce.

The Maritime Administrator will appoint a Deputy who will be Acting Administrator during his absense or disability. However, the Deputy will at no time sit as a member or acting member of the Maritime Board which will also be established by my bill. My intent, Mr. Chairman, is that subordinate employees be excluded from participating in those matters which require completely independent judgment.

As I have stated, H.R. 3053 will establish a Maritime Board within the Federal Maritime Administration. This Board would administer the subsidy award function of the Maritime Administration and would assume all responsibilities which are at present vested in the Secretary of Commerce.

The Maritime Subsidy Board, as it is now called is composed of the Maritime Administrator and two subordinates in the Maritime Administration. All actions taken by the Maritime Subsidy Board are subject to review by the Secretary of Commerce. The existing organizational structure, in my opinion, is wholly inadequate since contract rights arising out of maritime subsidies are, in fact, subject to determination by but one man, the Secretary of Commerce, and not by the independent group judgment of the Board.

As proposed in my bill, the Maritime Board will be composed of three members: A Federal Maritime Administrator, who shall be Chairman of the Board, and two additional members who will be appointed by the President subject to Congressional approval. Not more than two members of the Board will be from the same political party.

My proposal reflects my deep concern for the future effectiveness of our merchant marine. The situation has become so critical that the survival of a genuinely private United States shipping industry may be considered to be at stake. There is an immediate need to face the problem of defining, synthesizing, and updating public maritime policies in order to keep pace with the industry's changing economic and political environment. Enactment of my bill would insure that the basic and proven principles of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 are effectively implemented through vigorous prosecution by an independent Federal Maritime Administration.

The most persistent problems with which the government maritime program has been concerned in the past have dealt with the establishment of proper boundaries between the public and private sector of the industry. There have also been problems of definition of proper roles, obligations, rights and privileges of the various parties in interest. This confusion has become a barrier to their effective operation.

In merchant shipping, the government has come to exercise a determining role in every major facet of the industry's activity. Government is the industry's major customer; it monitors its competitive practices, supplies its credit, underwrites its costs, trains its officer personnel, develops its technology, arbitrates its labor disputes, is responsible for its safety, and even provides a complete program of free medical care for its workers.

Mr. Chairman, the ability of the government to meet these problems depends on the effectiveness of its machinery for public policy development and administration, the quality of its personnel, and the political environment within which they operate. A sound organizational structure is particularly important to a program as extensive and complex as government aid to merchant shipping. Appropriate administrative procedures are required to assure that the proper problems are brought before the proper people at the proper time, and that a fair hearing is given to all legitimate interests. Most importantly, Mr. Chairman, there must be a mechanism which will assure that the maritime program will be responsive to the nation's changing needs.

The prerequisite to a constructive relationship between industry and government is a thorough restructuring of the present program. This is the approach which is needed to fulfill the nation's maritime goals. Mr. Chairman, my legislation will correct the obvious deficiencies in the organizational structure of the executive agency which is charged with the promotion of the maritime interests of the United States. It is my sincere hope that your Committee will include this legislation in your recommendations to the whole House.

The Baltic Question

SPEECH

OF

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 19, 1967

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the chief coordinator of the Committee To Restore Lithuania's Independence, Mr. Anthony Mazeika, has called to my attention his organization's open letter to Premier Kosygin, which appeared in the June 22 edition of the New York Times. I wish to include this letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the attention of my colleagues:

THE BALTIC QUESTION—OPEN LETTER TO PREMIER KOSYGIN

On June 19, 1967, the Soviet Premier, Aleksei Kosygin, in addressing the United Nations General Assembly, accused Israel of continuing aggression by occupying the territories of the United Arab Republic, Syria and Jordan.

Mr. Kosygin defined continuing aggression as attempts "to interfere in the internal affairs of independent countries and peoples, to impose on them, from the outside, political concepts and views alien to them on the social order."

The Soviet Premier is adept at defining continuous aggression, for his state has a long record of conspiracy against the sovereignty and territorial integrity of independent nations. While vituperating against the State of Israel, Mr. Kosygin would do well to consider his own government's continuing aggression. The most conspicuous victims of joint Soviet-Russian and Nazi German aggression are the Baltic States of Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia.

The annexation of the Baltic States by the Soviet Union was pre-determined by the Ribbentrop-Molotov Pact of August 23, 1939. The agreement stated: "In the event of territorial and political rearrangement in the areas belonging to the Baltic States (Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania and Finland), the northern boundary of Lithuania shall represent the boundary of the spheres of influence of Germany and the U.S.S.R."

While the attention of the world was focused on the Blitzkrieg in the West, the Soviet Union imposed it's "sphere of influence." On June 15, 1940, troops and tanks of the Red Army poured into the Baltic States. Moscow hastily set up puppet governments. A single list of representatives, hand-picked by Moscow, was proposed to the "liberated" countries. To insure the election of the Communist candidates, tens of thousands of people were arrested on the eve of the elections as a threat to those who might protest by refusal to vote. The decisions of the "elected representatives" to "request" incorporation of the three Baltic States into the the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics were prepared in Moscow and carried out by the occupying Red Army.

In their zeal to impose their alien system on the Baltic States, the Soviets deported or liquidated 700,000 men, women and children from Lithuania alone, between June, 1941 and March, 1951. Not withstanding this inhuman oppression, the peoples of the Baltic Nations persevere in their aspirations towards personal freedom and national independence.

While addressing the General Assembly, Mr. Kosygin unequivocally stated, "In the course of its 50 year history, the Soviet Union has regarded all peoples, large or small, with respect; every people enjoys the right to establish an independent national state of its own. This constitutes one of the fundamental principles of the policy of the Soviet Union. While upholding the rights of peoples to self-determination, the Soviet Union just as resolutely condemns the attempts by any state to conduct an aggressive policy toward other countries—a policy of conquest of foreign lands and the subjugation of the peoples living there."

In view of the above facts, we request the Premier to clarify the following questions:

Why has the Soviet Union continued to violate the sovereignty of Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia?

When will the Soviet Union apply the principles of the United Nations Charter to the Baltic States?

When will the Soviet military and administrative apparatus be withdrawn from the territory of the Baltics?

When will the Soviet Union desist from its policy of Russification and Sovietization of the Baltic peoples?

When will the Baltic victims of mass deportation be allowed to return to their homelands?

When will the Soviet Union cease interfering in the political, social, and religious life of the Baltic States?

Mr. Premier, the Baltic Republics have a right to preserve their own languages, religious freedoms, traditions and political aspirations. Will you enact measures to correct the gross injustices imposed by Stalin on the Baltic Nations and restore independence—or are your noble words addressed to the General Assembly mere hypocrisy?

Right of Congressional Inquiry

SPEECH

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 18, 1967

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of those who are disturbed by the recent action of the House Committee on Agriculture in "disassociating" itself from the remarks of the chairman of the Rural Development Subcommittee.

I have not personally investigated the financial operations of the American Farm Bureau Federation, and thus cannot and will not, make any accusation as to its misrepresenting itself to both the Internal Revenue Service and the Congress.

However, our colleague from New York has undertaken an investigation of this matter, and I am sure he had good reason to ask an official probe. This is his prerogative, and certainly his responsibility if the facts demand such action.

This prerogative, and this responsibility, fall to each of us in different circumstances. And it is disquieting to me to see a precedent established which may discourage and deter anyone in this body from accepting the duty of speaking out and investigating any pertinent facts relative to our legislative responsibilites.

Pittsburgh's Mayor, and President of U.S. Conference of Mayors, Hon. Joseph M. Barr, Speaks on Poverty

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 20, 1967

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago it was my privilege to testify on behalf of the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1967 and to urge that the Office of Economic Opportunity be retained as the central administrative and coordinating agency for the programs that constitute the war on poverty. I said that the legislation has had particular significance for Pittsburgh, and that I am proud that Sargent Shriver has often called our program, "a model for the Nation." The key reason for our program's success was the foresight, leadership, and direction of our mayor—who is also the president of the U.S. Conference of Mayors—the Honorable Joseph M. Barr—who organized the Mayor's Committee on Human Resources, Inc., a full year before the legislation was enacted.

I include at this point in the RECORD Mr. Barr's remarks in his dual role, testifying before the House Education and Labor Committee, to urge the retention of OEO as the central agency for the war on poverty, and to emphasize the importance of maximum local discretion in the use of funds for the heart of the program—community action programs:

REMARKS BY MAYOR JOSEPH M. BARR, MAYOR OF PITTSBURGH, AND PRESIDENT, U.S. CONFERENCE OF MAYORS, HOUSE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR HEARINGS ON THE ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1967

I am Joseph M. Barr, appearing before you today in a dual capacity, as Mayor of Pittsburgh and spokesman for that City and its citizens and as President of the U.S. Conference of Mayors, which represents some 500 cities with a population of 30,000 or more.

At the annual 1967 June meeting of the Conference in Honolulu, the mayors and municipal officers of this nation's cities adopted several resolutions strongly supporting the war on poverty. With your permission, I would like to submit them for inclusion in the record of these hearings.

You will note that the Mayors' Conference stressed the need for renewed authority of the Office of Economic Opportunity to serve as the central agency for a coordinated war on poverty at the national level and the importance of maximum local discretion in the use of funds for Community Action programs.

We municipal officials realize the anti-poverty program as administered for the past two and one-half years has not been without difficulties. While there have been occasional administrative snafus, in Washington and in local communities as might well be expected with any creative new effort, we submit that the principal problem has been one of inadequate financing rather than any basic shortcoming in the administration of this Act by OEO.

It is our conviction that by its very nature, the anti-poverty program—and particularly the Community Action phases of it—demand the greatest flexibility at the national and local level.

Without this freedom to exercise local knowledge and initiative, differences from one community to another cannot be accommodated and innovation is stifled.

The fundamental concept of the war on poverty was that local people know their problems best—and are best able to develop solutions to those problems.

We sincerely suggest that what we *don't need* are more categorical programs; rigidly drawn legislation which attempts to specify every approach to the problems of poverty can hamstring the national effort to find solutions.

At the present time, the funds for local use at local discretion are severely limited. The priorities fixed by Congress and the central OEO for such admittedly worthwhile programs as Headstart and Upward Bound restrict the funds available.

No one questions the worth of these programs. But we submit that the poverty program functions best when the decisions on how to spend whatever funds are available are left to the local leadership.

For as Sargent Shriver has stated, "A war on poverty can be declared in Washington, but it must be won elsewhere—in the local community".

Poverty is everyone's problem—and we are pleased that this year's amendments to the anti-poverty law stress the need for increased mobilization of community resources.

One of the soft spots in poverty programs across the country has been the absence or sporadic participation of private industry. There are many ways in which profit-making businesses can play a more effective role in community action efforts, particularly in the fields of job development and economic growth.

We have barely touched the potential of the private sector in the war against poverty.

In terms of the funds allotted for the poverty program, it is my belief that this nation's commitment to eliminate poverty deserves the highest priority in domestic programs before the Congress.

It would seem that a nation that can set aside $43 billion for the completion of an interstate highway system by 1971 should be thinking in terms of a similar amount to fight the national shame of poverty and deprivation.

I am not here to run other federal programs into the ground. I am suggesting that the solution to the plight of American cities—and particularly the poor living in those cities—is fundamental to the future of our society.

A well fought poverty battle needs to be well planned. Such planning is virtually impossible faced with the uncertainty of funding from one year to the next. This holds true at all points from Washington to the city neighborhoods.

It is obviously difficult to administer a local Community Action program, to recruit qualified personnel, to train sub-professionals, to insure continuity at every phase, not knowing whether the same funds will be available 12 months from now.

Above all, the poor themselves deserve better than the prospect of year-to-year insecurity.

We believe that the Congress can demonstrate its agreement that the plight of the poor is the nation's number one concern by authorizing funds on a basis longer than the present year-to-year allocation.

One of the more disturbing deficiencies in the proposed Economic Opportunity Law is the change in the funding formula from 90 per cent federal–10 per cent local to the 80 per cent federal–20 per cent local base, thereby doubling the obligation of the local community.

This requirement is a step backward in the fight against poverty—a change which is producing administrative havoc and severe financial problems in urban communities, large and small.

This increased obligation falls at a time when most American cities are investing more and more of their local resources in such wide-range efforts as housing, job development, health services and urban rebuilding.

You all know of the acute money problems confronting our cities. To double the local share requirement is to run the risk of having many communities either reduce or even drop their anti-poverty efforts at a time when such efforts should be strengthened and expanded.

As a result of this formula revision, Pittsburgh, for example, has submitted legislation to the State Legislature calling upon the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to provide matching funds to help the local communities meet the 20 per cent requirement. But that bill has been buried in committee and its prospects are dim.

In view of the mounting municipal financial burdens and the reluctance of states to respond adequately to urban needs, we strongly urge the Congress to revise the financing formula to the original 90–10 concept.

* * * * *

At this point, I would like to share with the members of this Committee what the Economic Opportunity Act has meant to Pittsburgh and its citizens in two and one-half years of operation.

In Pittsburgh, the Community Action Program is administered by a private, nonprofit corporation called the Mayor's Committee on Human Resources, Inc.

We chose this mechanism for the simple reason that City government in Pittsburgh does not include health services, education, welfare, and employment—which as you can readily appreciate, are the essential components of a concerted effort to attack the causes and conditions of poverty.

This poverty agency, which is wholly independent from city government, consists of 22 board members, including representatives of labor, business, churches, education, civil rights organizations and representatives of eight designated community action neighborhoods.

In each of these neighborhoods, in turn, a broad-based citizens committee, heavily representative of the poor themselves, helps to create, to operate, and to review all programs within those areas.

This entire program was started as a nonpartisan venture—and has been scrupulously kept that way.

Very briefly, here is a summary of activities completed or underway in Pittsburgh, activities, mind you, that did not exist prior to the passage of the Economic Opportunity Act.

Some 30,000 children from disadvantaged areas are participating in special compensatory education programs that include preschool classes, tutorial programs, reading clinics and special classes for the mentally retarded and emotionally disturbed.

Employment centers have been established in eight neighborhoods, providing walk-in opportunity for employment, enrollment in manpower training courses, the national job corps, neighborhood youth corps, and other training. We have made it easier for the poor and unemployed to find a job.

More than 600 persons previous unemployed have been trained and employed as sub-professionals in their own neighborhoods by the community agencies providing services there. Their employability provides visible hope for the families and children with whom they work.

Over 15,000 persons are receiving comprehensive health and family services, including training in child-care and home management.

Legal aid services are now available for hundreds of families and individuals who up to now could not afford professional guidance.

Hundreds of Pittsburgh citizens in poverty areas are participating in the decision-making that directly affects their lives and their community's well-being. They are learning that their views do count, that they can help direct and evaluate every service offered under this program.

This summer, through a combination of Labor Department and OEO funded programs, we will provide employment for nearly 4,800 youngsters and expand recreation facilities to serve approximately 25,000 persons throughout the City.

Shortly, a comprehensive $4-million employment program will get underway that is designed to train, motivate and make employable some 2,000 hard-core unemployed who up-to-now have not been reached or helped by traditional manpower programs.

Similar to other metropolitan areas, the City of Pittsburgh has both an in-school and out-of-school Neighborhood Youth Corps program.

The out-of-school Youth Corps, which has fluctuated between 400 and 750 high school drop-outs was established as a Bureau of the Mayor's Office.

Many of these youngsters and the adult staff are housed directly across the corridor from my own office. I see them coming to work, and going home, and have personally observed the progress and development of many of these young people.

In the two-year period that the City of Pittsburgh Neighborhood Youth Corps has been in operation, the two million dollar investment of federal funds has been more than repaid by the transformation of many of these young persons from rejected, rebellious unemployed, and in some instances delinquent school drop-outs, to employed and useful citizens.

Specifically, under two City contracts totaling approximately $2,250,000, seventy-five per cent of the federal funds have gone directly into the pockets of the youngsters and their families.

Approximately 50 per cent of the young people graduating from the City of Pittsburgh Youth Corps terminate for permanent employment.

Another 10 to 15 per cent leave the program for vocational training. Some of our high school drop-outs with the help of counseling and remedial education have continued on to college.

In the in-school Neighborhood Youth Corps Program, operated by the Pittsburgh Board of Education for a two-year period for 1,000–1,500 young people, the drop-out rate was reduced to a little over one per cent, and grades, attendance, and attitudes of Youth Corps enrollees were above the general school average.

In addition, the work projects of the Neighborhood Youth Corps, both in-school, and out-of-school, have benefitted every citizen in the City.

Probably most dramatic has been the creation of 18 tot lots or small playgrounds in the City of Pittsburgh on public property. Empty City-owned lots abandoned to "junkers," and the debris of ghetto living were cleaned by Youth Corps enrollees, transformed by planters, play equipment, trees, and shrubbery. These lots provide not only play space in crowded urban areas, but also new vistas to the residents of the area.

However, the Neighborhood Youth Corps is only one part of Pittsburgh's Economic Opportunity program. Each part supports the other. The upgrading of our deprived young people requires more than a job.

Work programs alone are not enough; these young people also require medical, health, and family services, and the citizen support of the Community Action Agencies.

Effective recruitment of the hard core unemployed Youth or Adult can best be done at a neighborhood level. It is the grass root citizen based Economic Opportunity teams that know the byways and alleys of our disadvantaged areas, and bring to such programs as the Neighborhood Youth Corps the youth who need this kind of training and encouragement.

Unfortunately, the success or failure of any program is too frequently judged by statistics alone. We are encouraged by the statistics of the City of Pittsburgh, but we are more encouraged by the cooperative efforts between the Citizen Community Action agencies, and Bureau of Work programs, such as the Neighborhood Youth Corps, which have produced less than 100 feet from my own desk an exciting and meaningful program in youth training.

I don't want to create the impression that the Economic Opportunity Program has been one long idyllic honeymoon in Pittsburgh. We have had the predictable share of frictions, misunderstandings, administrative confusion at the local and federal levels—nor is the program without its critics.

Indeed, there are times, particularly when the sting of what I consider irresponsible criticism is fired at City Hall, that I momentarily wish that Community Action had never been conceived.

But there are many more times, when I have been grateful for this federal commitment that has made possible a comprehensive approach that we estimate has touched the lives of 55,000 men, women and children for the better in our community.

Let me hasten to add that I realize our experience in Pittsburgh is by no means unique—and certainly no reason for self-satisfaction.

We have barely scraped the surface of the poverty problem in Pittsburgh—much less the rest of the nation—and the enormity of needs unmet and problems unsolved leaves no room for satisfaction.

Perhaps, the real measure of this war on poverty lies in less tangible terms. For now we, as a matter of national policy, are seeking to provide the poor with choices, to give them hope. OEO funded programs are stimulating experiments and innovations in fighting poverty.

One concrete result of the 30 months of OEO operation is that this nation now better understands the depths and dimensions and complexity of poverty and at the same time the poverty program has planted hope that millions of people never felt before.

As you can judge from this brief report, we in Pittsburgh are strongly in support of the Economic Opportunity program as administered by OEO. Indeed, we would wish to see this effort expanded and strengthened even beyond what is proposed in the legislation before you.

But I must repeat, there is one complaint, one criticism that is heard at every level of this operation, from the neighborhoods, from the members of the Pittsburgh poverty board, from municipal officials across the country.

That complaint is simply that federal funds should be allotted to the local community to be used by that community as it sees fit, with as few strings as possible.

The tendency of the Congress as well as the central OEO office to earmark funds for special programs—and thereby diminish the discretion of local community action agencies—is the single greatest criticism I am aware of.

* * * * *

At this point in history, our great nation is caught up in a crowning irony.

Here we are, the richest and most powerful nation in the history of the world and our number one concern in July, 1967, is the threat of violence in our cities—a violence that finds its roots in the grievances and deprivations which so cruelly afflict one-fifth of our citizens who live in poverty.

The "long hot summer" has become a national scare word.

The question confronting this nation, the President, the Congress and every state and local official is what can we do to make the "long hot summer" just a weather report?

What does it take to commit this nation to long-term positive programs, like the Economic Opportunity Act, adequately financed, administered with vision and flexibility, so that we city officials don't find ourselves scraping for extra funds in order to install water sprinklers or portable pools or some other make-shift in order to cool things down?

I refuse to believe, as I said at the Conference of Mayors convention, that rioters and vandals on the streets are more persuasive with the Congress than are the Mayors and municipal officials of this nation.

I refuse to believe that this nation is not endowed with conviction enough, concern enough, wisdom enough, to produce a better response than emergency actions—as necessary as they are.

It is in this spirit that I ask for this Committee's support of the Economic Opportunity Act as recommended by President Johnson and as administered by the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Antiriot Bill Will Encourage Law and Order

SPEECH

OF

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 19, 1967

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 421) to amend title 18 of the United States Code to prohibit travel or use of any facility in interstate or foreign commerce with intent to incite a riot or other violent civil disturbance, and for other purposes.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill to curb out-of-State agitators from stirring up riots. I think it is well to begin with a short review of our American heritage—government by law. The American way of doing things, Mr. Chairman, is law—the law of the Constitution and the law of the statute book. Americans do not live by the law of the jungle. And the tradition of law and order has served this country well. History will record that no nation has done more for the poor, the outcast, and the downtrodden than the United States of America.

When the opponents of this bill say it violates the constitutional right to free speech and assembly, let me point to Newark last week. Where in the Constitution, I ask them, is the right to kill 23 innocent people?

And when the opponents of this bill claim that we must blame riots on poverty and prejudice, I need only to remind them of the last 35 years of American history. Law after law and program after program have been enacted to deal with these problems, and never has there been a greater concern with the problems of poverty than at the present time. No, Mr. Chairman, we cannot blame the civil insurrections of today on neglect and poverty.

Let us look at a few of the growing violent disturbances of recent years.

In May 1963 at Princeton University, 1,000 students rioted, burned bus benches, rolled a 1 ton generator down a busy street, trampled flower beds and a fence at the home of the university president, and trampled the yard of the Governor of New Jersey. These young men, from the well-to-do "best families," had gotten started with firecrackers and pranks.

In November 1966, 200 students at Harvard University surrounded the car of Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara. Like a bunch of revolutionaries, they tossed his car from side to side, forced him out, and hooted him down when he agreed to answer their questions. Their complaint: he had refused to debate Robert Scheer, the bearded beatnik editor of a leftist magazine.

On April 15 of this year tens of thousands of students from the best schools and the best families went to New York City to protest the war in Vietnam. They went to a great square of this great American city and burned their country's flag.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot see how anyone can blame these incidents on poverty and prejudice.

There is one more incident, Mr. Chairman, which I believe helps to explain this distressing lack of respect for law and order.

In November 1965 students at the University of California at Berkeley began a series of demonstrations which have brought that university to the brink of ruin.

A leader of the demonstrators, Bettina Apetheker, had this to say:

> I have been for a number of years, I am now, and I propose to remain a member of the Communist Party of the United States.

Our young people, just like the people of the ghetto, are being swayed by hardcore, traveling agitators to forsake the American way of justice under law. It is not natural for American youth or any other part of the American community, to give up at once both their good manners and their faith in the credo of our country. It could never happen without agitation and the loathesome psychology of the mob.

When surrounded by jeering peaceniks at Harvard, Secretary McNamara told them that he had once been a student leader, but that he had been "tougher, and more courteous." The following day over 2,700 students at Harvard joined in sending the Secretary of Defense a letter of apology—a gesture that I know to be the true spirit of an American youth when left alone with his own conscience. We know that peaceniks and cardburners are a small, hard-core minority.

What is true of student demonstrations has been just as true of the riots in the big cities. Violence has come to the cities, not in the depression years of the thirties, but in the prosperous years of the sixties—the era of the professional troublemaker.

In the morning newspaper a few days ago, I saw the bloody head of Leroi Jones, writer and agitator, prominently displayed in the middle of the Newark rioting. This agitator has said that "all white men are devils"; he has recommended rifles to Negroes as the answer; he has called the President of the United States unprintable names.

It is time to stop excusing wrongdoers by apologizing for their backgrounds. The world has good men and evil men, and the evil men must be stopped.

It is time to take the handcuffs off law officers and put them on the hands of traveling troublemakers, who descend on our communities to burn, pillage, steal, and maim or murder innocent people.

It is time to admit the truth about this problem and to take action against selfish and irresponsible men who would turn the misery of the poor and tragedy of violence into headlines for themselves.

Mr. Chairman, this bill, of course, is not a panacea for civil disturbances. We must continue at the same time to address ourselves to all problems of American life. We must look for further ways to strengthen the agencies of law and order, and we must continue to act against those who are disloyal to the American way. We must honor our law enforcement personnel and act to double their pay and procure greater numbers of men for law enforcement. This bill is only a beginning.

There is a time for protest, but there is also a time to rebuild. It is always easier to tear down and difficult to build, so we must train the youth of our country in constructive ways.

Let us all support local and State law enforcement agencies. These dedicated men, with our help, can cope with local crime and local demonstrations. It is, however, extremely difficult for local forces to deal with traveling agitators who can sweep down on communities by the thousands, with journeyman radicals who preach the Communist line and the web of violence that is terrorizing our cities. To protect our youth, and all our citizens, I strongly urge my colleagues to support this bill.

The 55th Anniversary of Estonian Boy Scout Movement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. HOWARD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 18, 1967

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, it would do us well at this time—Captive Nations Week—to call to public attention the fate of the peoples of several Eastern European countries. I refer specifically to the Estonians who, since their flight from Russian domination, have managed to maintain their ethnic identity and their ethnic pride through the extention of their national organizations.

This year marks the 55th anniversary of the Estonian Boy Scout movement, its 27th year in exile. The occasion is being noted by the opening of the Friendship Camp of World Estonian Scouting in New Jersey. Its name, Koguja, signifies "one who gathers"; and as a focal point of scouting, Estonian youths from all countries will meet there in a truly worldwide gathering for 10 days.

Mr. Speaker, the State of New Jersey is honored to be able to call this meeting to the attention of the Congress of the United States. For it is in this way that we are able to demonstrate our support and our sympathy for the peoples of this captive nation.

Education Means Innovation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 19, 1967

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, all too often demands for educational reform have gone unheeded by those who use rapid growth and overcrowding as an excuse to resist innovation and retain classroom methods and facilities that are at least 30 years behind the times. Because education is a vital part of human life, there is resistance to experimentation and a tendency to leave advancement in methodology to the business world where there is less fear of failure. Yet it seems paradoxical to continue to educate our children with techniques of the past to live in a world of the future.

Fortunately, there are those who have not only recognized this crisis, but have taken important steps to deal with it. It is, therefore, with great pleasure, Mr. Speaker, that I commend the Fountain Valley School District project to my colleagues and wish to insert in the RECORD this article from the California School Board's publication of June 1967 as an excellent presentation. I am hopeful that others may take note of the daring and important innovation and may profit from the project's successes.

FOUNTAIN VALLEY EDUCATION MEANS INNOVATION

The time is coming, if it is not already here, when danger signals are flashing—signals that say something is out of phase, that most public schools may be lavishing vast and increasing amounts of time and energy preparing students for a world that no longer exists.

The line of action for education lies in capitalizing on and developing human powers—powers such as "time-binding"—the use of which makes each man unique from all others. This momentous power is the means by which one individual can benefit from all the knowledge, the wisdom and the experience of other persons throughout history.

Just as the needs of civilization and society are complex and ever changing, the potential of the individual as a "time-binder" will vary widely. It is a significant function of education to strengthen to its highest degree this power in each individual so that he may contribute as an active participant, not a passive onlooker, to the fulfillment of society's needs as well as to his own fulfillment.

What kinds of programs accomplish these objectives? California School Boards asked this question, and among the responses was invariably the Fountain Valley School District in Orange County. Evidence of that district's success is its selection as the first demonstration center for the National Education Association, and demonstration center for the Kettering Foundation's League of Cooperating Schools, such films as "The Cutting Edge of Teaching" produced by the U.S. Office of Education, and "Make a Mighty Reach" produced by the Kettering Foundation, which feature the district, awards from the California Psychologists Association for "Educational Excellence," the Exchange Club for American Heritage Programs, and special recognition from the California State Department of Education for building design. Fountain Valley was asked to present feature presentations by the California Elementary School Administrators Association, the Department of Elementary School Principals (NEA), Individualized Instruction Conference in San Diego, and the Third International Curriculum Conference, St. Catherine's College in Oxford, England.

Solutions to the perplexing problem of keeping education in step with a fast changing world have been analyzed by the board and administration of Fountain Valley who believe that the following questions must be answered to plan an educational program for the future:

Is it one that is life-oriented and therefore geared toward the development of problem solving, analysis, inquiry, and decision-making skills?

Will it be one in which the student is actively and intimately involved as a participant rather than being spoonfed a package of facts which may very early become obsolete?

Is it built on a student's successes as an individual rather than on his failure at a rigid norm?

Will it be one that is designed with the involvement of the community and will it be in step with the community's demands?

"The Fountain Valley School District has been the most rapidly growing area in Orange County during the past 10 years—at a rate of 2,380%. During the last three years the board, staff and community have really 'pulled together' to provide quality education while faced with the huge task of building schools, employing personnel and establishing teaching programs. . . . There has obviously been a great deal of time and energy invested in developing this school district. The County Board of Education, and the County Schools staff is certainly proud of the leadership Fountain Valley has shown in Orange County."

Dr. D. S. Stylianou,
President, Orange County Board of Education.

"Fountain Valley has demonstrated effectively that it is possible to cope with unusual problems and still engaged in forward-looking, innovative educational activity. Unfortunately, some school systems in America have used rapid growth, overcrowding, and difficulties in securing competent teachers as excuses for not keeping abreast of the times in developing educational programs. Superintendent Beaubier and his staff have come to grips with these problems aggressively, while moving forward toward the frontiers of new practices in education. . . ."

John I. Goodlad,
Director, Research and Development Division, Institute for Development of Educational Activities.

"The community of Fountain Valley has recognized the importance and the values of the work being done in their schools and has actively supported in every way, and particularly in regard to financing, the efforts of their school district personnel. In times of financial difficulty this strong community support represents the highest type of accolade for public education."

Dr. Robert Peterson,
Superintendent, Orange County Schools.

BUILDING PROGRAM

"There are several features of the Fountain Valley School District's program that make it outstanding among the nation's school systems. The buildings, themselves, for example, each constructed on plans developed cooperatively by architects and school personnel, are especially well adapted to meeting the needs of all the children. No child or groups of children has to wait for some moments before or after school to get help. He goes at once to the center room where an especially able teacher and one or two students or adult sub-professionals are available."

Gertrude Noar,
Educational Consultant, Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith.

The 11 schools in the district, all constructed since 1963, have reorganized the use of space so that six to eight classrooms are clustered about a core room called a Learning Center. The Learning Center is used as a resource and teaching center for maximum utilization of the buildings to implement the instructional program.

INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM

"Individual needs of students are given the highest priority in planning and programing by the board administrators, and staff of the FV school district. Mutually, they have developed a program along with community participation which encourages teachers to recognize the individual differences of students, and which provides the facilities and aid needed by teachers to follow through so that their youngsters are actually educationally challenged at their different levels."

DR. PETERSON

"In the past year I have visited many schools in the US in search of innovative practices in staff utilization and staff development. We have selected 160 demonstration centers for our national project, The Year of the Non-Conference—Emphasis: The Teacher and His Staff. In these centers teachers and administrators are testing out new and more efficient and effective ways to utilize the talents available in a school and community and to develop the kind of school and community environment which helps teachers teach well and children learn.

"The FV school district was the first demonstration center selected. . . . The administrative leadership is imaginative and sound; the teaching staff participates in a genuine and helpful way in planning and carrying out the program; parents are directly and appropriately involved as volunteer aides; the community is providing strong support for the school system.

"However the most exciting and significant thing happening in the FV schools is that each child is getting more individual help and attention and the talents of the teachers and other staff members are being utilized more effectively and efficiently than they are in the conventional school programs."

Dr. Don Davies,
Executive Secretary, National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards, NEA.

The first casualty in this changing process has been one of the whole business of teacher-led instruction—the shift has been from teaching to learning. Instruction here is personalized through techniques of *pupil placement*, academic *diagnosis*, *prescription*, and constant *evaluation*. The prime effort is to match the student with the necessary and appropriate materials, concepts, and people to provide for individualized instruction.

"The district's looking ahead was not confined only to the enlargement of the student population, but in the field of education. They embarked on a program of individualized instruction and other new innovations that have not only been the talk of the County, but its impact on the educational community has been felt throughout the State.

"I am proud to represent a district whose people, teachers, administrators, and school board members have the courage and self-determination to accept the local responsibility of improving the educational system, and who have therefore contributed so much to the continued quality education in California."

Robert H. Burke,
Assemblyman, Seventieth District.

"Taking up the new tools of our modern technology and adapting the techniques, the materials and even the building facilities to make these tools effective, FV is showing all of us how we can do in an improved and more relevant manner the job of educating our youngsters. . . . We have surveyed their plants, tasted of the spirit of those involved and witnessed the results in the performance of their pupils. It moves us to say to the other districts in California: Go you and do likewise."

Richard T. Hanna,
United States Congressman, 34th District of California.

THE CLASSROOM PROGRAM

The class grouping arrangement allows the teacher to spend more than one year with the children in order to expand and more personalize the program.

Such equipment as the tape recorder with headsets function much as a "second teacher" to provide skill lessons in phonics or mathematics, spelling or enrichment materials. Tapes are prepared by the teacher for immediate skill lessons, provided by the district for more general needs, or commercially prepared.

Pupil-teacher conferences are conducted during class time for the purpose of identifying academic problems or successes and to prepare a foundation for individual and small group assignments or lessons. These individual conferences permit personal evaluations in the form of an analysis for growth. This analysis can be converted into an ongoing profile developed on each child to continue effective personalized prescriptions.

Self-directed learning activities include individual contracts, self-selected reading with follow-up and evaluation, small group discussion with summary and evaluation, research, experimentation, creative dramatization, projects, debate, that place more responsibility for learning with the individual child.

COORDINATING TEACHER

The Coordinating Teacher is selected on the basis of being a master teacher and an expert in interpersonal relations. Ten percent additional salary is paid for assuming this responsibility. The Coordinating Teacher is not assigned to a regular classroom but works with the teachers and children in the classroom cluster by cooperatively diagnosing the academic programs for the children, evaluating pupil progress, and scheduling children for instructional purposes. She develops and participates in cooperative teaching programs, implementing new methods and special programs.

AUXILIARY PERSONNEL

In the Learning Center is a teacher aide who serves as a secretary and non-instructional assistant to the Coordinating Teacher and other cluster teachers. Her responsibilities include clerical work, filing, duplicating, circulating and retrieving materials, recording systems, and operating audio-visual equipment.

In addition to this paid aide program is a volunteer program of approximately 1,000 parents who work in service capacities to the schools and district for approximately four hours each day.

CURRICULUM MATERIALS CENTER

In a program geared to the needs and interests of individual children, it is essential to have a storehouse of ideas, materials, and equipment. In FV the Curriculum Materials Center operates an in-service, dissemination and work area for the teachers and teaching programs of the district. It is staffed with certificated and classified personnel who are highly skilled in the areas of curriculum implementation and human dynamics.

"The FV school district staff, with the liberal use of a variety of audio-visual aids, described certain features of their program at the recent California Elementary School Administrators Association state conference. Following the meeting, one principal wrote on his evaluation sheet . . . 'Fountain Valley! . . . who do they think they are?' The question was relevant, although the writer's inference was clear. He was, as a proper 'traditionalist,' offended by the confidence and skill with which these professionals discussed their solutions to educational problems. There appeared in them no hesitation, no doubt that they had the answers, and right answers at that.

"Two things are clear to me after close inspection of the operation of their school district: (1) they have a substantive, exciting and productive program for boys and girls, successfully implemented by an outstanding staff, and (2) no reluctance to sell this program to their community and anyone else who will listen. This is a rare and valuable combination of characteristics, unique in our school Establishment.

"FV . . . not only knows who they are but they know what they're doing! They deserve a thoughtful look, encouragement and commendation from their colleagues.

THOMAS D. WOOD,
Executive Secretary, CESAA.

"There is much talk in American schools about innovation. One school system which has taken national leadership in actually accomplishing innovation is the FV school district, under the leadership of Dr. Edward A. Beaubier. It is a pleasure for me to salute the FV school district and Ed Beaubier for their very substantial contribution toward a better educational system."

DON WHITE,
Executive Vice President, National Audio-Visual Association, Inc.

"Our City of Fountain Valley is very proud of the FV Elementary School District. I believe the success of the District is due to a combination of circumstances which begin basically with the people of the community and their fine attitude toward education. . . . this district is an outstanding example of modern educational programming which makes the best use of the talents of its school children."

ROBERT D. SCHWERDTFEGER,
Mayor.

"Conversation ten years ago, or even five years ago, about FV seemed to always bring the question, 'Where is it?' This year hundreds of school board members, administrators, teachers, and educational research people have come to our schools from as far away as Hawaii and New York and also such countries as Japan, Germany, England, Canada, and Israel. Recently, the Director for the Texas Governor's Committee on Public Education and committee members spent the day analyzing our program.

"Before growth first started in 1963 (250 enrollment), the school board and administration organized a master plan for the school district and agreed upon the type of educational program that would provide the best possible basic education for the children coming to FV. (Current enrollment is 6,700.)

". . . Our community has given a great amount of support during these few short years in passing bond and tax elections along with considerable interest in the various teaching programs. The number of parents and the work they do without pay in health and safety areas, in library materials, and making aids for the teachers is truly inspiring."

MRS. NAOMI JONKMAN,
Clerk, Board of Trustees.

U.S. Arms Sales—II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 20, 1967

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, Neil Sheehan's first article in a New York Times series on the international arms trade provided statistics on the extensive armaments dealings of the U.S. Government.

Mr. Sheehan's second article traces the complex system of credit incentives employed by a special office of the Department of Defense to stimulate arms sales. The Defense establishment of this country should be promoting international tranquility rather than contributing to the arms race in this fashion.

I urge my colleagues to read this article from the New York Times of July 20:

U.S. ARMS SALES SPURRED BY LARGE FIELD FORCE AND COMPLEX CREDIT SYSTEM

(By Neil Sheehan)

WASHINGTON, JULY 19.—The United States Government has become the leading purveyor of arms to the world, with total sales of $12.6-billion since the middle of 1961. How has Washington done it?

Henry J. Kuss Jr., the Defense Department arms salesman, declines to discuss the techniques in detail, but it is possible to piece together from a number of sources some of the ways in which sales are generated.

The most obvious manner is direct action by Mr. Kuss's office. This has taken place under a number of forms, but two of the most successful have been the offset method, which Mr. Kuss originated, and the technique of persuading and then helping allied countries and other possible clients to project their miliary planning on a five-year basis, as the United States does.

Mr. Kuss developed the offset method after the Eisenhower Administration attempted and failed in late 1960 to persuade West Germany to reimburse the United States directly for the foreign exchange costs of maintaining American forces there. During the negotiations, Mr. Kuss discovered in conversation with Franz Josef Strauss, at that time Bonn's Defense Minister, that West Germany would be willing to make large weapons purchases if the American forces there would handle supplies for the developing Bundeswehr, the West German armed forces, and if Washington would agree to train thousands of German pilots, missile technicians and other specialists in the United States.

SENT BACK AT ONCE

While returning to the United States with the American delegation Mr. Kuss suggested that he be allowed to work out an arrangement with Mr. Strauss. He was sent back to West Germany immediately and in early 1961 negotiated the first two-year offset agreement. Bonn agreed to purchase and pay for $1.35-billion worth of American arms and training by the middle of 1963, enough to compensate for the gold drain caused by American troops in West Germany during 1961 and 1962.

The agreement with West Germany was Mr. Kuss's first major sale, and it undoubtedly started him on the way to his current prominence. It led to a total of $4.05-billion in West German arms-purchase commitments.

The West German Air Force had an unhappy experience with F–104 Starfighters it purchased through Mr. Kuss. It made unwieldy modifications on the aircraft and encountered problems with maintenance and pilot training. The result was that 61 of the planes crashed and the airforce chief resigned last fall. Budgetary complications from the arms purchases contributed to the fall of former Chancellor Ludwig Erhard a short time later.

West Germany has not placed orders for the final $500-million of its arms purchase commitment, although it has pledged to do so. Under a new agreement West Germany obtained the right to buy $500-million a year in United States Treasury bonds instead of arms. It has said it will continue arms purchases, but only as needed.

FIVE-YEAR PLANNING ENCOURAGED

The technique of encouraging and aiding other nations to do their military planning on a five-year basis also generates obvious opportunities for arms sales. The United States has worked out such five-year military projections with all the members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and many of the 55 nations that receive military-assistance grants, with Japan, Sweden, Australia and a number of other states.

The projections are drawn up by the NATO planning experts or by American military-assistance and advisory groups with their counterparts in foreign armed forces. Visiting United States military delegations and teams of experts from Mr. Kuss's office also take part.

The flow of information to Mr. Kuss's office identifies potential sales and the very existence of a five-year plan helps to persuade the country involved to purchase arms.

Military-assistance groups employ 12,353 servicemen and civilians overseas. The groups function to some extent as on-the-spot salesmen. Mr. Kuss's six sales team are organized by country and by region for Europe, the Middle East, Asia, Africa and Latin America so that they will remain familiar with the characteristics of their areas.

The Army, the Navy and the Air Force each maintain separate central arms-sales offices to assist and supplement Mr. Kuss's teams.

CREDIT FUND AVAILABLE

Where the NATO countries and Japan and Australia are concerned, Secretary McNamara has reinforced Mr. Kuss's efforts through the five-year plan. He has exerted continuous pressure on these nations to modernize their forces and meet their treaty commitments. Other refinements include having generals accompanying Mr. Kuss's team to extol the merits of American equipment to Europeans. The sale of one weapons system leads to relationships that produce more purchases.

The combination has been potent. So potent, in fact, that after Britain lost out to Mr. Kuss in a $37-million tank sale to Italy in the spring of 1965, Prime Minister Wilson publicly complained that the "high-pressure salesmanship of the Americans" had "unbalanced the situation" in the Atlantic alliance.

The ability of Mr. Kuss to extend large and very liberal credit terms to his clients has been another important factor in his sales.

With a revolving arms-sales credit fund of $383-million, established by Congress in 1957 and expanded over the years, the Defense Department is able to extend $1,532,000,000 in credits. The law requires that only 25 per cent of the credits be covered by the fund. Mr. Kuss can thus guarantee loans from private banks at commercial interest rates or extend direct United States Government credits at interest charges varying from nothing to commercial levels.

The Export-Import Bank has been another important and separate source of credit for Mr. Kuss. According to Congressional testimony by senior officials of the Administration, the Eximbank, at the request of the Defense Department, has either actually lent or committed itself to lend $2.6-billion to foreign countries for arms since 1963.

In the fiscal years 1966 and 1967, arms loans constituted more than 25 per cent of the bank's lending business.

The loans are both direct and indirect through the Defense Department under a device called the "Country X account." Under this system the bank opens a line of credit, usually at 3 per cent interest, to the Defense Department which Mr. Kuss then uses to finance the sale.

By June 30 the bank had made nearly $1-billion in direct loans and $591-million in Country X loans. Seventeen countries, 12 underdeveloped, were the recipients, including Jordan and Israel, countries that fought each other last month with their American weaponry.

The extent of the bank's involvement in the arms-sales program set off strong protests this week and an inquiry in Congress that could lead to restrictions on the bank's ability to lend money for weapons.

With such flexible credit devices, Mr. Kuss is able to "sweeten" a sale by making package loans, mixing the interest rates and offering long-term credits. Britain, for example, will pay for her $2-billion in purchases over 12 years.

INTANGIBLE ELEMENT AT WORK

Weapons sales are generated a number of other ways. The government of an underdeveloped country may decide it wants to improve the quality of its armed forces and approach the American Embassy there to obtain weapons. The Ambassador may then decide to support the request for political reasons and convince the State Department of the wisdom of the sale.

The exposure of tens of thousands of officers from scores of countries to American military doctrine and weaponry through training courses under the military assistance program is an intangible but probably significant element in creating an appetite for United States arms. From the middle of 1949 through the middle of 1965, 243,250 foreign officers and enlisted men took American training courses at bases here and abroad.

Finally, there is undoubtedly considerable basis for Mr. Kuss's argument that his sales result not from "super salesmanship" but from "super-buyers"—the European nations, Australia and Japan.

The immense scale of the American armaments industry and the long production runs sometimes enable another country to obtain a weapons system from the United States for 30 to 40 per cent less than what it would have cost the buyer to develop and produce a comparable weapons system at home.

It has been estimated, for example, that Britain saved about a billion dollars in research and development and production costs by deciding to buy two billion dollars worth of American F–111 multipurpose jets, F–4 Phantom fighter-bombers and C–130 transports rather than to produce similar planes herself.

The much larger amount of money spent by the United States on research and development—$3-billion to $4-billion a year, compared with $855-million for France, West Germany and Britain combined—often gives an American weapons system a distinct technological edge over comparable European-produced arms.

The American salesman can also point out to his customers that the quality of United States weaponry has been proved first in Korea and now in Vietnam.

Mr. Kuss spends about 90 days a year traveling outside the United States on business. He represents Secretary McNamara on the special Cabinet-level committee on trade expansion and is vigorously attempting to interest more American industries in arms exports through seminars organized by a Pentagon-sponsored group called the Defense Industry Advisory Council Committee on Military Exports.

He is expanding joint weapons development and production programs with the Europeans as a technique for maintaining sales momentum and is promoting a scheme that might well become the best sales device of all—a defense common market, integrating the American armaments industry with that of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization allies. The Europeans, featuring the integration with the American giant would, in fact, mean absorption, have shown little interest in the concept.

In his speeches Mrs. Kuss likes to portray his efforts as laying the groundwork for the ideal arms sales environment of the future. He seems to assume implicitly that the central world arms race between the industrialized Western nations and the Soviet Union will continue indefinitely, with greater opportunities and challenges for the adept arms salesman.

"We and our allies," he told the National Security Industrial Association in the fall of 1965, "will place in position for the 1975–85 period a new breed of industries, engineer-diplomats, capital and labor practiced in the tasks of using the common market approach to bring the economy of scale to an increasing number of production programs."

Critical Situation in Textile Imports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1967

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial of the air by Mr. Martin Karant of WKPT radio station in Kingsport, Tenn., and a newspaper column by Mr. Lawrence Fernsworth, the Capitol reporter for the Johnson City Press-Chronicle and the Morristown Gazette-Mail which serve my district.

Both articles comment on the critical situation that textile industries are facing because of the rapid rise in imports, and I am sure that they will be of interest to my colleagues and the readers of the RECORD.

TARIFF CUTS ON TEXTILES WILL BE FELT HERE

(By Martin Karant)

In the course of the Kennedy Round discussions regarding tariffs, this country agreed to cut the duty on a number of products that will affect us in a most direct manner, right here in the area of upper East Tennessee and southwest Virginia.

The U.S. agreed to tariff reductions of as much as 21 percent on cotton textiles to 15 percent on man-made cloth. It is easy to see how this move could affect local industry such as the Borden Plant of J. P. Stevens Company, Tennessee Eastman and the various shirt and dress plants in the area. Lower tariffs generally mean more imports coming into this country from Hong Kong, Japan and many other nations with far lower labor costs than ours.

We note that the market prices on a number of polyester-cotton blend fabrics is already depressed. More tariff reductions will certainly tend to further depress this market. That could, of course, directly affect the sale of polyester fibers by Eastman.

We also note that a shirt manufacturer has gone out of business in the Rogersville area. Whether or not this is as a result of price competition from foreign manufacturers we do not know . . . but it is easy to see how it could be.

An official of the DuPont Company said that a slowdown in the market for textile fibers is definitely expected. He said that such a slowdown is already here and strikes them "right where we live." Increased imports will aggravate that condition.

The biggest factor in costs in America is labor. We pay our workers far more than comparable workers get in any other country, hence the actual cost of production here is not balanced by import duties under the best of circumstances. When these duties are cut still more, we can expect more foreign labels and less American-made labels in many of our products.

We are aware of the need to attempt to meet our responsibilities in international trade and of the "balance of trade" figures being in our favor in many cases. Yet it would appear that it is not too wise to force our own industries into economic hardships while boosting those in foreign lands. Is not our first responsibility to our own industries? We think so.

If the government lowers tariff rates, it should also control quantities of goods brought in under the lower rates. *Quotas* on such goods appears to be the logical answer.

We hope our officials will seriously think about it!

[From the Johnson City (Tenn.) Press-Chronicle, July 5, 1967]

CONTROLS ASKED—TEXTILES BOW TO TARIFF BLOW

(By Lawrence Fernsworth)

WASHINGTON.—A further blow has been inflicted on the textile industry in the United States, including synthetic fibers in which a number of Tennessee counties are heavily involved, by the latest Kennedy Round tariff reduction, in the view of the American Textile Manufacturers Institute.

The agreements signed at Geneva, and just disclosed for the first time, "make it all the more important for the government to move quickly and effectively to place realistic controls on textile imports," says a statement issued by the institute.

IMMEDIATE NEED

"There is a serious and immediate need," it says, "for our government to open negotiations now to implements its long-range textile program, which calls for effective quantitative controls on textile products of all fibers. This must be done to reverse the alarming trend of textile imports."

This is in line with recommendations made at the recent meeting of a Tennessee delegation, mainly from Elizabethton, with Sens. Albert Gore and Howard H. Baker Jr., and Rep. Jimmy Quillen of the 1st District.

Beaunit Fibers has plants in Elizabethton.

At that meeting Dr. Rowland F. Kirks, general counsel for the institute, said:

"The time is ripe for the President to direct the Secretary of State to meet with the textile people and work out a plan that would afford protection to manmade and wool fibres.

And it is time to enact legislation on this question."

LEGISLATIVE FUNCTION

Sen. Baker coincided with the view that it was time for Congress to step into the question. He said that by the Constitution "tariff making, including the setting of quotas are the function of the legislative branch. It lies in the executive branch only to the extent that it is delegated thereto by Congress."

Quillen taxed the State Department with "beating around the bush" and with lack of candor in discussing the question with members of Congress from textile states.

The latest statement of the textile institute complains that under previous schedules textile imports have reached a level of 2.8 billion square yards annually while the decline in U.S. textile exports has resulted in a $800 million deficit.

"The steady rise of imports the past five years," it said, "shows clearly that there was no need for us to lower our textile tariffs to make our market more accessible to imports.

"Imports of man-made fibre products have increased by 726 per cent since 1961, the year before passage of the trade expansion act. The Kennedy round did little to encourage exports from this country because the many non-tariff barriers erected by other countries were not removed."

Emmet O'Neal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1967

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it was with deep sorrow that I learned of the passing of my good friend, Emmet O'Neal. His death brings to an end a most brilliant career as a lawyer, legislator, and diplomat and last but not least, a patriotic citizen and devoted family man.

Freddie and I felt very close to Emmet and Glessie and I know that his absence will be greatly felt. In his role as Ambassador to the Philippines, he was most helpful to me in my assignment to the Veterans' Affairs Committee in understanding the problems of our Philippine veterans. While he served only 2 years in that capacity his deep compassion for the problems of others afforded him an insight that not many people possess.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the obituary which appeared in the Washington Post on July 19, 1967.

EMMET O'NEAL, LAWYER, LEGISLATOR AND DIPLOMAT

Emmet O'Neal, 80, a former U.S. ambassador to the Philippines and former Congressman from Kentucky, died at his home after a heart attack Monday. He lived at 2311 Connecticut ave. nw.

Born in Louisville, Mr. O'Neal graduated from Yale University and the Law Department of the University of Louisville in 1910. After receiving his law degree he practiced in Louisville and also operated an investment brokerage firm.

During World War I, Mr. O'Neal enlisted in the 1st Division of the Fifth Field Artillery and later served as a lieutenant in the 26th Division of the 103d Field Artillery.

Mr. O'Neal was elected to the House of Representatives in 1935 and served for 12 years, including membership on the Appropriations Committee.

In 1947 he was appointed ambassador to the Philippines, serving for two years. Later he resumed law practice in Washington.

Mr. O'Neal was active in the American Legion and was chairman of the Corregidor-Bataan Memorial Commission until his death. He was a member of the Chevy Chase Club here.

Surviving are his wife, Glessie M.; two daughters, Mrs. William Fraser of Washington, and Mary H. O'Neal of the home, and four grandchildren.

Captive Nations Week

SPEECH

OF

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 19, 1967

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, for the ninth year, the United States is now celebrating Captive Nations Week. Each year since 1959, we have set aside this week, and we have told the entire world that we will continue this observance until, in the words of our Joint Congressional Resolution, "such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world."

Through the years, we have been joined by freedom-loving peoples throughout the world in this observance—people in Asia, Latin America, Western Europe, and Africa. Just last year, Argentina and Australia added themselves to the growing list.

Now, midway through the year 1967, we find ourselves once again proclaiming to the world the thought which was put so well by President Kennedy, when he said:

> This country must never recognize the situation behind the Iron Curtain as a permanent one, but must, by all peaceful means, keep alive the hopes of freedom for the people of the captive nations.

However, we must recognize this year as being more than merely the time of the ninth annual observance of Captive Nations Week. This is the year when, for a brief week, we saw the world closer to World War III than it ever has been in the past quarter century.

This is the time in the history of freedom and democracy when a tiny nation fought an incredibly fast fight to end an immediate threat to the entire human race.

And now, this is the time when Soviet brinkmanship is revealed once more for the reckless, deadly, selfish thing it is, as the U.S.S.R. once more pours arms into the troubled Middle East, to continue the germination of the seeds of death and destruction.

For 8 years past, we have renewed our dedication to the eventual freedom of the people of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, the Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, East Germany, Bulgaria, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Soviet Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Edel Ural, Cossakia, the Chinese mainland, Tibet, Turkestan, and North Vietnam.

We have recognized the threat of Castro-Communist encroachment in Venezuela, Peru, Guatemala, and Bolivia, and the constant efforts of Red power to extend itself into the developing nations of Africa.

Now we must add to the list of the victimized, the people of the Arab Nations. Mind you, I say the people, not their leaders who, for personal gain and hopes for power, have become the puppets of Moscow brinkmanship.

Left to their own conclusions, under leaders dedicated to the welfare of their own nations, the Arab peoples would eventually see the benefits of freedom and democracy. Stirred up by the dictators who control and direct their thoughts and actions, the Arab peoples were plunged into one bloody and destructive war, and are now being directed toward greater bloodshed and destruction.

The Arabs who hate with the thoughtless passions engendered by their puppet leaders are also captive peoples. They are also captives of Soviet dedication to a path with but two alternate ends—world domination, or world destruction.

There can be no more appropriate time than Captive Nations Week for the United States, as the strongest champion of freedom and democracy, to make its position unmistakably clear in the Middle East—in support of one of the world's smallest free nation, Israel.

And this is also the time for a total reassessment of our policy toward the U.S.S.R. We must determine whether our hopes for reciprocity are futile, and whether our efforts toward bridge-building and coexistence are based on myths and fallacies.

For that reason, I am today introducing a resolution similar to the one introduced by my distinguished colleague from Indiana [Mr. BRAY] last week calling for such a review of U.S.-U.S.S.R. policy. It is a resolution which should be speedily passed and promptly implemented.

Captive Nations Week

SPEECH

OF

HON. THOMAS J. MESKILL

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 19, 1967

Mr. MESKILL. Mr. Speaker, it is fitting and proper that we set aside this time for the annual observance of Captive Nations Week. It helps us get things into perspective. It draws the attention of the country to the fate of nations and peoples who come under the peoples who come under the grip of Communist tyranny.

This observance on the floor of the House serves notice to the world that the American people remember and deplore the plight of hundreds of millions of persons throughout the world who are forced to live as virtual slaves of the Red Empire.

It reminds us that no civilized society is secure, that no freedoms are safe in a world half of which is dominated by aggressive, totalitarian regimes.

The continued captivity of these nations is living witness to the emptiness of Communist claims to be the people's movement. All the lipservice which Communist leaders pay to the cause of national liberation and self-determination of peoples is shown to be utterly hypocritical.

No Communist regime has ever been set up on the basis of popular election. Membership in the Communist Party is limited to a tiny fraction of the Communist-dominated populations, a reward given to an elite of obedient and efficient servants.

Here, in this citadel of freedom, let us ponder the fate of these countries and these nations. And let us remind ourselves that eternal vigilance is the price of freedom.

Let us also remember that when we talk of relaxing our attitude toward Communist regimes through wider commercial and cultural exchanges, it is the regimes that would be benefited, not the people.

To the degree that we build up the economic strength and political position of these regimes, to the same degree we increase the power which they have over their captive subjects.

Let us not forget the walls these regimes have built to keep their people in. Let us remember the artists and writers they have put in jail. And let us not forget the massive Soviet armies—some 26 divisions—which are encamped in Eastern Europe ready to strike at any moment.

Today's observance should be regarded not as a traditonal exercise no longer relevant to the world situation. It is rather a solemn remembrance of the millions of our fellow men living in thrall to Communist overlords. And it is a solemn rededication to the basic principle that all men are created equal before the laws and with equal rights to frame those laws.

I am proud to participate in this observance and proud to reaffirm these principles for myself and on behalf of my constituents.

Last Sunday, in Hartford, the Connecticut Committee for the Captive Nations adopted a resolution which I am glad to endorse and offer at this point in the RECORD:

RESOLUTION, CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK, 1967

Whereas, the imperialistic policies of Russian Communists methods (direct or indirect), through deceit and fraud, through force and murder, have led to the subjugation and enslavement of the peoples of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, Mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Serbia, Croatia, Slovenia, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, Cuba, Mongolia, and others;

Whereas, the Russian Communists are actively and vigorously supporting aggressive oppression in many parts of the world, including armaments for the war against South Vietnam, arms and technicians for the Syrians, Iraqi, and Egyptians to foment war in the Middle East, supporting Egyptian oppression of the freedom-loving Yemini including the atrocities of gas warfare, and the active development of Russian bases in Somaliland, Algeria for the purpose of defeating the desires and aims of freedom-loving Africans, Arabs and South Koreans;

Whereas, Russian aggression since 1917 and treacherous violation of almost all of its international pledges and agreements;

Whereas, the Russian Communists have created the greatest colonial empire in history, this being accomplished by the forcible dominance of the majority by a small minority;

Whereas, the observance of Captive Nations Week enables us to speak for the many millions of people who are under the heel of this Communist tyranny;

Now, therefore, we strongly urge the full, thoughtful, and prayerful observance of Captive Nations Week and we further urge and demand that a review of the United States' policy be made with respect to the USSR and its Communist empire before the United States finds itself to be one of the captive nations under the influence and domination of the USSR. To accomplish this urgent review, we strongly support the Resolution of Congressman Edward J. Derwinski H. Res. 666, calling for a Congressional review of United States' policy toward the USSR.

WCBS Discusses Newark Rioting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 20, 1967

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, for the past few days the Nation and the world have been viewing the scenes of rioting in New Jersey with shock and disbelief.

No matter what the underlying causes might have been nothing can justify the scores of people who have been killed and injured, and nothing can hurt the Negro cause more than what we have witnessed in the last week.

I commend to the attention of our colleagues a WCBS editorial which was broadcast in New York City on July 14, 1967, concerning the Newark rioting.

The text of the broadcast follows:

WCBS DISCUSSES NEWARK RIOTING

We acknowledge that there are underlying causes to yesterday's outbreak of rioting in Newark.

We acknowledge that a massive effort is required to meet the needs of the Negro in America.

But we wish to make perfectly clear our absolute belief that order must be maintained, and that rioting must be discarded as a political tactic.

People were killed in Newark, scores injured. Hundreds were arrested. There is belief that rioting bred of hatred and despair prompts some form of corrective action; a few more jobs; a new housing project; another school. And perhaps it does. The fact of violence speaks to the white man in unmistakable terms, and the Negro knows it. But there is a danger to the Negro cause, which is the cause of all Americans, that violence will beget counter-reaction; that the immediate gains from violence as a political tool will be nothing as compared to what will be lost in future gains.

We believe the energy we see unleashed in violent forms must, to be effective, channel itself into legitimate protests. If there is a Negroe leadership capable of doing this, it must rise to the challenge and come forward. We believe there is in this country today powerful sentiment for a just and equitable society. We believe this society will evolve; that it cannot help but evolve. But the nation will not, and by rights cannot, tolerate promiscuous looting and arson by any segment of the population. It is in the nature of things that force will be met by force. Let us again reiterate that no properly constituted government can permit what amounts to public insurrection.

Let's Stop the Tariff Cutting That Aids Our Enemies

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 1967

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, following negotiations with the international trade set in Geneva, this country is in for another round of tariff concessions beginning next January 1. For a quarter-century the State Department has continually whittled away at the tariff barriers intended to protect the jobs of the workers of this Nation, and somehow Congress has dutifully submitted.

The latest concessions are doubly deplorable because they will benefit nations which traffic with U.S. enemies while adding hardship to domestic business and labor. Perhaps, at last, Congress will rise to take corrective steps, for American lives are involved in this new debacle at the tariff table.

What the concessions amount to is that governments whose flags fly from the masts of ships standing in at Haiphong and Havana have been rewarded with a promise that their products will find easier access to American markets. Furthermore, the administration's hopes of subjecting Fidel Castro's government to economic paralysis through trade boycotts by non-Communist nations have been dashed by some of the very countries which have most to gain by the tariff cuts scheduled to take effect next January 1.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the State Department's strange propensity for continually giving greater preference to foreign commodities at the expense of this Nation's economic health, Congress must take action if only to keep faith with servicemen whose safety is endangered by cargoes of those transports serving the North Vietnamese. Congress must now insist on utilizing every available means to repudiate the State Department's gratuitous treatment of those serving the Red military cause. Protective levies, quotas, embargoes, and other devices already being utilized by other countries involved in international commerce must be adopted to protect American steel, coal, machine tools, glass, farm products, and other commodities unable to compete with cheap foreign labor and alien subsidies and tax policies.

I should like to call attention to a current attempt of the Pennsylvania General Assembly to promote the general welfare and stimulate the economy of the Commonwealth by requiring that all public bodies include in contracts for construction, repair, and maintenance a provision that only steel products made in the United States be used. One of the countries setting up the biggest howls against the proposal is a major customer for Communist Cuba's exports. At the conclusion of my remarks I should like the Record to include a column, "U.S. Friends Aid Castro With Trade," by Carl T. Rowan, appearing in the Washington Evening Star on June 23 of this year.

Mr. Speaker, even if traffic with the enemy were not at issue, my study of the purchasing policies and practices of foreign governments that prohibit use of U.S. products in public works is all the supporting evidence necessary to justify rigid import controls through congressional action. That study was made in the preceding Congress, but it is still available to any of my colleagues who are not familiar with the various ways in which American exports and balance of payments suffer through ridiculously inequitable policies—all of which are blissfully ignored by the State Department.

The Rowan article follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star, June 23, 1967]

U.S. Friends Aid Castro With Trade

(By Carl T. Rowan)

U.S. officials were certain in 1962 that they could choke communism out of Cuba by tightening an economic noose around the neck of Fidel Castro.

This was why, in order to get Soviet offensive missiles off the island and end a threat of nuclear war, President Kennedy promised former Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev that the United States would not invade Cuba.

But the notion that Castro's regime could be broken through a rigid economic boycott has turned out to be a serious miscalculation. For, thanks to some crucial financial help from the United States' best friends, Cuba shows no signs of economic collapse.

The Soviet Union is, of course, Castro's number one economic saviour. The Russians will buy 3 million tons of Cuban sugar (half the entire harvest) this year at six cents a pound, or well over twice the world market price.

But it is Britain, Spain, France and Japan that have given Castro an economic breakthrough that permits him to thumb his nose at Uncle Sam as he boasts of fomenting strife in Venezuela and the rest of Latin America.

At the end of 1966 Cuba had only $50 million left in hard currency. Some American analysts again figured he might soon be on the rocks. But Castro today can draw upon $140 million worth of credit extended by the countries of Western Europe.

Britain ripped the first great gap in what the United States hoped would be a crushing economic boycott. Over American protests, the British sold Castro 900 Leyland buses with government-backed credit two and one-half years ago.

France came along with $20 million in credit for trucks and heavy roadbuilding equipment.

Spain began purchasing Cuban sugar at 6½ cents a pound, a price even higher than the Soviet Union was paying. Spain has paid by providing Castro with trucks, buses and several large fishing trawlers.

These fishing trawlers are used primarily to haul Cuban agents, commandoes, arms and supplies to Latin countries where Castro has pledged to export his revolution.

Recently, when hopes were renewed that Cuba was feeling the economic pinch, Britain came through with a five-year $39 million government-backed loan for construction of a fertilizer plant in Cuba.

Japan is the best non-Communist purchaser of Cuban sugar, buying more than 450,000 tons a year. It was not by accident, then, that Venezuela picked a Japanese ship as the first victim of a boycott it has begun to express Venezuelan anger at the way non-Communist nations are financing Castro's efforts to undermine democracy in Venezuela.

For Cuba's non-Communist trading partners, the economic benefits seem to override political considerations. Castro makes his loan payments without delay, thanks to Soviet support. So West Europeans continue to make favorable credit arrangements with the knowledge that they are gambling on Russia's credit rating, not Castro's.

The net result is that Cuba's gross national product is now back to the level of 1957, which was a good year for Cuba. Population increases mean that the per capita GNP is still 10 percent below 1957, but there are no economic woes of the sort that might spark an anti-Castro uprising.

Cuba is having some trouble cutting and processing canes, but sugar production this year will probably exceed 6.2 million tons, the second best year since Castro came to power.

The Cuban people no longer have pork, Coca-Cola or many other items they were used to, "but no one is hungry," according to recent diplomatic reports.

The poor are better off because Castro has dragged down the level of living of the rich.

It seems clear that the bearded dictator has used vast supplies of Soviet arms, a ruthless police state system and vitally needed economic help from the West to make Cuba a fairly secure bastion of communism.

It is also clear that Cuba's main mission is to export communism to the rest of the hemisphere.

And that may yet put Castro and his Soviet supporters on a collision course with Uncle Sam.

House Joint Resolution 559

SPEECH

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 1967

The House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 559) to provide for the settlement of the labor dispute between certain carriers by railroad and certain of their employees.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, mine has been a long and happy marriage with labor. For much over 60 years I have made my humble contribution to the cause of labor. For much over 60 years labor has been my friend. Labor has supported me in every election. Labor has given me help and counsel and strength when I needed it. And always, Mr. Chairman, I have given everything in me, of heart and mind and body, to the toilers in the days and years of this long struggle to reach upward to a higher plane of welfare and dignity.

Always, Mr. Chairman, I have believed that compulsory arbitration is the graveyard of labor. It likewise is the enemy of forward-looking management that has found that in voluntary cooperation with labor is the surest road to a sound national economy and happy society.

For much over 60 years I fought for labor. It has been a long, hard battle.

Now if we go back to compulsory arbitration, we are setting back the clock. We are digging the grave for the hopes that we have built all these years.

Yet, Mr. Chairman, this to me is a sad day. I know that the great and dedicated, the God-fearing man in the White House, has his troubles. I do not think any President of ours was ever more heavily laden, and I do not think that any President of ours ever has spent more hours in prayer humbly seeking Divine guidance than President Johnson.

I for one cannot turn back.

The great and noble Speaker of the House and the great and noble majority leader know with what faith and fidelity I have leaned upon and been guided by counsel.

But today, Mr. Chairman, I am voting "no." I who have been blessed with many years, during which labor has by sacrifice and struggle and suffering gained its foothold in the sunshine, cannot vote to return to compulsory arbitration and thus turn back the clock. No, Mr. Chairman, I will look at that clock as I vote "no," and I will say, "Mr. Clock, I am not turning you back. If you go back to the 'yesterdays,' it is not my vote that sends you back." That is all.

Alcoholism Is Disease, Not Crime, Fulton Judge Rates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. G. ELLIOTT HAGAN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1967

Mr. HAGAN. Mr. Speaker, across the Nation, the problems of alcoholism are receiving extraordinary attention as more and more citizens look upon this fourth major health problem in the United States as a growing danger to the country's general welfare.

No less attention is being focused upon alcoholism in Georgia, where its leaders are becoming increasingly aware of this great national problem.

This is especially gratifying to me, since the Georgia Commission on Alcoholism grew out of legislation I was privileged to introduce as a member of the State legislature.

I would like to submit for the Record, an article from the July 15, 1967, Atlanta Journal, which reports the finding of a Fulton County jurist that chronic alcoholism is a disease, not a crime:

Alcoholism Is Disease, Not Crime, Fulton Judge Rules

(By Junie Hamilton)

A Fulton County Superior Court judge held Friday that chronic alcoholism is a disease, not a crime, and that its victims cannot be convicted legally of public intoxication and loitering.

Judge Jack Etheridge, on a writ of certiorari, reversed the decision of Municipal Court Judge R. E. Jones that "Skid Row" drunk Jack Dunlap, 57, was guilty of public drunkenness and loitering on March 29.

The decision was the result of a long-anticipated American Civil Liberties Union of Georgia test case designed to end what

Judge Etheridge called "life sentence on the installment plan" for alcoholics.

"There will be vast misrepresentations of what the issues are in this case," Judge Etheridge said in rendering his decision. There will be those who will say every drunk is going to be set free. I reject this approach."

He described Mr. Dunlap as a person "who is homeless, a person who has been arrested countless times and who goes to the stockade for a few weeks and then goes back on the streets, he's a person who has no family, a person who is in bad health who has been taken to the city stockade and placed on work details which jeopardize his health."

In answer to prosecuting attorney Thomas Choyce's argument that the city has no facilities to provide for treatment of alcoholics, Judge Etheridge said it is not the prerogative of a court of law to decide a case on the basis of its social implications but rather to decide only whether the specific defendant on trial is guilty of a crime or not.

"I take no position as to facilities," the judge said. "I have no knowledge of that. That is a governmental responsibility."

"A person should not be stigmatized as a criminal when he is diseased."

The test case was heard before City Court Judge Robert E. Jones on May 12, and Judge Jones found him guilty of infraction of the city codes but suspended punishment and granted the certiorari writ to the Fulton Superior Court.

A May 2 drunkenness charge also was heard on May 12 and punishment was suspended.

In city court, Mr. Dunlap, under oath, said drinking had cost him his career as a salesand and then a buyer and that he "gave up my family" a few years ago and moved into the Union Mission.

He told the court he had "tried every angle I know" to cure his disease, but "I don't seem to be able to. . . ."

Dr. James Alford, head of an Emory University alcoholism project, said he had examined Dunlap and found him to be suffering from heart defects, arthritis, emphysema, mild diabetes, and the "disease of alcoholism."

For some time, several county and city groups have been studying alcoholism and the type of service which needs to be provided to alcoholics in Atlanta and Fulton County.

Under the Plan of Improvement, all health services are to be provided by the county for both the city and county, but county officials say the task is too large for any one government and will probably take the combined efforts of city, county, state and federal governments.

Friday's decision will mean government officials will have to move immediately to provide medical and rehabilitation services for alcoholics.

Attorney Albert M. Horn represented Mr. Dunlap in the test case, which sets a precedent for Georgia. Friday's hearing lasted approximately an hour.

Castelo Branco

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD J. IRWIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 13, 1967

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, it has been said that heavy is the yoke of responsibility and I do not think this ever was more true than in the hectic career of the late Marshal Castelo Branco, of Brazil, an unloved man whose stern discipline nevertheless unquestionably saved his nation from possible economic chaos.

Marshal Branco led Brazil as the result of a military coup, yet never was militaristic as the leader of the Brazilian people. Rather, this man who sacrificed personal popularity deliberately to do his duty brought to his government an iron hand that forced upon his people an unpopular but nevertheless successful economic austerity.

Marshal Branco was perhaps in the theater of world politics the true exponent of the sporting axiom preached by the fiery baseball manager, Leo Durocher, that "nice guys finish last."

Marshal Branco certainly was not a "nice guy" in the generally accepted usage of the phrase—and he did not finish last in his leadership of his nation.

He was a man of intense integrity who possessed, when needed for the good of Brazil, the virtues most potently needed at a given moment.

I would like, Mr. Speaker, to enter into the RECORD at this time an editorial in the New York Times for July 19, which pays further tribute to Castelo Branco, a tough but honest and thoroughly loyal leader of Brazil.

The editorial follows:

CASTELO BRANCO

Marshal Castelo Branco of Brazil, a man of complete integrity, served his nation well in a time of crisis, but he did not endear himself to his countrymen. This was his deliberate policy. He spurned popularity in doing what he felt was a necessary duty and he will be honored even by those who do not grieve for him.

To many Brazilians who chafed under his stern rule from April 1964 to March of this year he was like a dose of bitter but healing medicine. When he came into office through a military coup, there was relief at seeing an end to the thoroughly corrupt and shiftless regime of President Joao Goulart. When he left office there was another sigh of relief, but he could say with Shakespeare's Coriolanus: "You should account me the more virtuous that I have not been common in my love."

Humberto Castelo Branco was a soldier with a soldier's virtues of courage, honor, discipline, patriotism and devotion to duty. As so often in history, the time brought forth the man who was needed.

Yet politics and statesmanship demand other and different virtues—or perhaps abilities—which Castelo Branco lacked. This was especially true among the easy-going, warmly human, live-and-let-live Brazilians. Democracy was not a way of life the Marshal understood or admired, so his regime was undemocratic.

It was a military government in a nation that never was militaristic. He was, if not anti-intellectual, certainly not intellectually inclined, and therefore his high-handed treatment of students, professors, writers and scientists outraged the academic world. He approved an economic austerity and orthodoxy that was generally successful, but not exactly popular.

For these reasons his successor, Artur Costa e Silva, although himself a soldier, promised to "humanize" the Brazilian Government. The new President has not had time to do much of anything as yet, but he was surely counting on his predecessor's advice.

Marshal Castelo Branco evidently felt that his task had been done. His sudden, dramatic death would not have seemed unfitting or untimely to a soldier like himself whose mission had been accomplished.

Recommendations for NASA Authorization Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1967

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I would like to suggest at this time a basic position for the House conferees on the NASA authorization bill. As you know, this House passed the authorization bill for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration with several amendments on June 28, 1967. NASA had requested $5.1 billion. The Committee on Science and Astronautics reduced this amount by $107.8 million and the House further reduced the authorization by $201.4 million on the floor by overwhelming votes on my amendment and motion to recommit. This should have resulted in a House-approved authorization of $4.79 billion. Through a parliamentary ruling that a total in a bill can be amended only once, however, we are left with a bill where the total figure is greater than the sum of the line items. Because of this unique ruling and its resultant complications, I would like to outline here what I believe should be the guiding policy of the House conferees.

Since we are forced to abide by the false House total of $4.93 billion in conference instead of the sum of the line items in the bill of $4.79 billion, the House conferees have a higher total figure than the Senate version of $4.85 billion. Instead of being $60 million below the Senate as the House amendments would indicate, we are required by the parliamentary ruling to negotiate from a total $76 million above it. In view of the obvious intent of the House to reduce the authorization to $4.79 billion, I feel that it should be a major guiding principle that the conferees aim toward a final sum no greater than the Senate figure of $4.85 billion. Any other action would directly violate the intent of the House.

Within the artificial limits imposed by the parliamentary ruling, I propose that the conferees work so that no research and development project be killed or crippled to uselessness. Economies can be effected primarily in the procurement of hardware, which can be deferred until a time of less fiscal austerity.

I have persistently recommended a reduction of $25 million on the Apollo program and favor the position of our committee for a 1-percent cutback there. On the purchase of hardware for the Apollo applications program, I agree with the Senate figure allocating $334.7 million and reducing the future stockpile of Saturn launch vehicles now. NASA has yet to advise me of any action to obligate the $6 million which the Congress provided for the advanced missions program last year. As of July 1, the end of the fiscal year, NASA had not obligated 1 cent of the money, and I think we should reach a compromise with the Senate for $1.5 million on advanced missions.

I favor restoring the Sunblazer project in the conference report for both the research and development funds and the construction of facilities necessary to continue this important study program. I also favor the retention of the Mariner-Mars mission for 1971 and recommend the adoption of the House position on the lunar and planetary exploration of $142 million.

We in the House reduced the funds for Voyager by $20 million, leaving $50 million in the program. I believe that the full $50 million should be retained in conference rather than kill the project. I have checked with NASA on this, and they advise that the Voyager program can be initiated effectively with the lower sum. Again I assert that we do not want to kill any of the projects which might bear the fruits of discovery essential to our Nation's performance in space in the 1970's. This policy means cutbacks in other areas and forces the deferment of some specific missions planned for fiscal year 1968, but it leaves us with all projects intact and in operation. I therefore favor the House figure of $41.8 million on bioscience and the figure of $94.5 million on space applications.

I recommend a compromise between the House figure of $72 million and the Senate figure of $157.7 million for launch vehicle procurement at $150.7 million, the figure which the House committee originally reported for this program of unmanned missions. In the space vehicle systems and the electronics systems we should stick to the general economy reductions of $1 million each. Likewise in the basic research I favor the general reduction by the House committee of $2 million.

As a part of the House policy to encourage the development of new fuels, propulsion systems, and reusable boosters, I recommend that the House conferees approve the full $74 million for nuclear rockets and the full $49 million figure for chemical propulsion including the 260-inch solid fuel booster. In addition we should accept the Senate figure of $45 million for space power and electric propulsion systems. The House conferees should hold to the House figure of $290 million for tracking and data acquisition.

In the construction of facilities section of the bill, I favor the House total of $16.5 million for the nuclear rocket development station and the $2.9 million which the House authorized for the Goldstone location.

By following the above recommendations, the House conferees will adopt a position giving a total of exactly $4.851 billion and equal to the Senate authorization figure. It has not been easy to put together such a compromise position which reflects so well the will of the House and the preferences of many of the committee members. But my proposal would effect the maximum economy possible under the parliamentary situation prevailing while it would also provide the essential funds for research and development to advance the state of the art in space propulsion and exploration. The program is a compromise. It does not kill a single ongoing program of research and development which might prove fruitful in the future. It requires the economical deferment of several purchases of hardware and, it gives us the opportunity to take a long and close look at the missions planned for the Apollo Applications program before we become committed to buying extra boosters.

What is not absolutely essential for research and development should be deferred until the economy and the war in Vietnam permit. When Congress is raising the debt limit, and the President is proposing tax increases and reductions in domestic spending, I believe the House conferees on the NASA authorization would do well to follow my recommendations for maximum economy in the space program. The conferees should arrive at a final negotiated figure no higher than the Senate approved total of $4.851 billion which should have been the maximum possible authorization for NASA.

In addition to the line item figures which are to be considered at conference, I would like to state my support for the House safety and economy measures put into the bill on my motion to recommit. I recommend that the House conferees adopt a position which brings full consideration to the formation of an Aerospace Safety Advisory Panel. I strongly agree that NASA should keep the Committees on Aeronautical and Space Sciences and Science and Astronautics fully informed of its activities and budgetary transfers. Likewise I think there is substantial merit in the proposal to examine the relative costs of contract services and civil service capabilities in service contracts of more than $100,000. We must keep both safety and economy well in mind while we attempt to direct our Nation's space science program toward maximum achievement.

Bombs Versus Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 20, 1967

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, James Wechsler, in the New York Post of July 11, reported that U Thant is still convinced that a pause in the bombing of North Vietnam would lead to serious negotiations "in a matter of weeks."

There is little left to bomb. The saturation bombing of the north has only proven that the real adversary is in the south, and that he is tenacious beyond a price we can easily pay; that regardless of where the war is carried, the Vietcong will be in South Vietnam.

I invite the attention of my colleagues to Mr. Wechsler's column, which betrays a mixture of resignation and faint hope. It once again lays down the case for a suspension of the bombing, with additional support from Secretary General U Thant. The text follows:

BOMBS VERSUS PEACE

(By James A. Wechsler)

UN Secretary General U Thant has privately told associates in recent days that he remains convinced that a U.S. cessation of the bombings of North Vietnam would lead to peace negotiations in "a matter of weeks."

Word of his position has undoubtedly been transmitted in one way or another to Secretary Rusk and other high officials. Presumably President Johnson is aware of his estimate.

Amid the high-pressure drive being waged by the U.S. military for a large new commitment of manpower to Vietnam, Thant's position assumes new significance. He is described as concerned by the apparent lack of any authentic signs of an American diplomatic offensive. While he is said to feel that no purpose would be served by raising his voice anew at this juncture, a fatalistic sense pervades the UN. Barring an unusual and unexpected outcry from Defense Secretary McNamara after his current journey to Saigon, there is widespread belief that the military will win the new battle of the Potomac (where most of our Vietnam victories have been won) and that a further escalation is near.

What is happening is that the Pentagon establishment, as suggested here last week, is threatening open rebellion against the civilian authority if Gen. Westmoreland's demands for manpower are rejected.

At the same time the men who should be engaged in the quest for new peace initiatives, such as Rusk and Presidential aide Walt Rostow, who emerged anew on "Meet the Press" Sunday as brain-truster in charge of military rationalizations and public sedation, show no disposition to challenge the deadly cycle. They invite no reappraisal of our diplomatic position. They profess to hear or see nothing except new evil on the other side. Their rhetoric furnishes scholarly justification for continued pursuit of the dead-end course outlined by the generals. The President seems determined to listen to no other voices.

Watching Rostow's bland, uninspired Sunday performance on Channel 4, one dreamed of a moment when Mr. Johnson would call in someone like John Kenneth Galbraith along with Rostow and invite them to debate their positions in his presence, with no time limit. One even wondered why the President fails to listen at length to U Thant in such a setting. But perhaps it is too late for such mediative exercises.

Those who have conferred with him recently do not depict Thant as the recipient of any dramatic new information to sustain his belief that a bombing-halt is the key to negotiations. They report only that he believes the situation is unaltered since the time when he declared, in response to UN Ambassador Arthur Goldberg's assertion last December of our readiness to follow his counsel, that our bombs—no matter how much punishment they inflict on Hanoi and environs—are inflicting fatal injury on the prospect for peace talks.

There is coincidental current support for U Thant's evaluation in the news from the Stockholm "international peace conference," where a delegation from North Vietnam and the Viet Cong put forward a three-point resolution calling for an end to the bombings, discourse with the Viet Cong and a return to the Geneva accords—but avoided any demand for a unilateral U.S. withdrawal. In private conversations the delegation, according to journalist Sidney Lens, gave the clear impression that there could be early talks if the bombings ceased.

U Thant's recurrent stress on the point reflects his view that a grave failure of U.S. diplomacy is a miscalculation of Hanoi's definition of "reciprocity." Time and again Dean Rusk has contended that our bombers will be grounded if there is a "reciprocal" gesture of de-escalation from "the other side." But Thant has patiently tried to explain on many occasions that, in the judgment of many Asians, the equation would be valid only if Hanoi and Moscow aircraft were bombing U.S. territory—or even Saigon.

He has also quietly indicated (at the risk of being branded pro-Asian or un-American by the Rostow set) that Hanoi may take a certain pride in the capacity of its people to absorb the mounting fury of U.S. raids, and that the refusal to negotiate under such fire may be a decisive symbolism.

No doubt Rostow and his strategic bomb-squad will provide the answers if Mr. Johnson is troubled by the report that U Thant believes the road to negotiation is still open. It will be explained again to the President that only our growing demonstrations of air-power have induced any feigned mellowness in Hanoi; let us not quit while we are ahead (as we allegedly have been so often before).

But as the U.S. contemplates another consignment of young men into the blood-drenched mire of Vietnam, haunting questions remain. Would a bombing-halt (without any elaborate timetable such as proposed by eight cautiously critical Republican Congressmen yesterday) be more hazardous than another escalation? In simpler terms, have Dean Rusk and Walt Rostow exhibited any wiser gift of prophecy—and subtler understanding of Asian complexities—than U Thant?

Is it too late to ask such questions? Is the only remaining subject of debate how many more young men must follow those who have died before them while Saigon's generals play political games for private power?

Panama-American Treaties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 20, 1967

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, now pending before the Governments of both Panama and the United States is the ratification of treaties dealing with the Panama Canal. In view of the hearings on this matter scheduled next week by the House Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs, I believe it is most timely to call to the attention of my colleagues a speech delivered by the former Governor of the Panama Canal Zone, the Honorable Robert J. Fleming, Jr. Governor Fleming's address was delivered to the Foreign Relations Association in New Orleans, La., on June 3, 1965.

I believe that the observations of Governor Fleming regarding the history of the original treaties between the United States and Panama in 1903 and his clarification of other issues relative to Panamanian-American relations will prove worthy of consideration.

As our country's highest representative in the Canal Zone, Governor Fleming had a unique opportunity to study the situation firsthand and observe what is truly in the best interests of improved Panamanian-American relations.

Governor Fleming's address follows:

This talk tonight will not be a technical discourse on the Panama Canal, one of the world's greatest engineering achievements. I am continually amazed—having been in the business of public projects for quite some time and knowing of the pressure always to build it smaller, build it cheaper, eliminate this, and eliminate that—by the vision of the men who designed the Canal and the technique of the people who built it. And, from a viewpoint of some experience in the management of governmental operations, I am equally amazed at the skill and ability of the people who operate it. It is a complex operation which works without undue clanking or clashing of gears. With that bow towards the technical excellence and the operational efficiency of the Canal, my purpose today is to let you judge why the Panama Canal has become a problem and to give you some of my personal ideas as to what should be done. I will cover some history, trace developments of tensions, and follow this up with some looks into my own individual crystal ball. Parenthetically, we have much material here on the technical and financial aspects of the operation for those of you who are interested, and I will field, after the meeting, any questions you want to toss for as long as you want to toss them!

Now for the ancient history. Two active treaties affect the Panama Canal and the United States' position in the Canal Zone. A third treaty, never ratified, has affected thinking since it was rejected; it is present like the ghost of Banquo at the banquet. Chronologically these treaties are: the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty with Great Britain which is the foundation of American policy on an Isthmian canal; second, the Hay-Herrán Treaty with Colombia which was rejected and is now the ghost at the banquet; and third, the Hay-Bunau Varilla Treaty with Panama which is the basis for our presence in the Canal Zone and around which our disputes with Panama revolve.

In the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty of 1901, Great Britain withdrew from her Isthmian canal programs in favor of the United States. In return the United States agreed that it would build and operate the canal as an international public utility with rights of transit open to ships of all nations without discrimination. I consider that this treaty establishes the international aspects of the Isthmian Canal, and our scrupulous adherence to its principles have demonstrated U.S. policy. The Hay-Herran Treaty, negotiated with Colombia for the construction of a canal through Colombia's Province of Panama, was rejected in 1903 by the Colombian legislature. This triggered off reactions both in the United States and the Province of Panama. The upshot was that the Panamanians revolted, the Colombians claim they were prevented from controlling the situation, the United States recognized the Republic of Panama and immediately concluded with it the Hay-Bunau Varilla Treaty of 1903. Practically as soon as it was ratified the Panamanians began to attack some provisions. This dissatisfaction has increased over the years until this Treaty has now become to the Panamanians a bitter festering sore which affects all their relationships with the United States. They feel that we took advantage of them, and to support this belief they cite two facts: the first is the Hay-Herran Treaty never ratified. It is Banquo's ghost at the banquet because its terms would have been more favorable for Colombia than are the terms of the 1903 Treaty for Panama. The second argument cited by Panama revolves around the conditions of negotiation of the 1903 Treaty. Bunau Varilla was a Frenchman who had been employed by the French canal company and who owned stock of that bankrupt company. During the revolution he had been designated an official representative in the United States of the Panamanian government. When Panama decided that it was time to negotiate a canal treaty with the United States, the Republic sent a delegation of negotiators to the United States. This team arrived too late: Bunau Varilla had already negotiated the 1903 Treaty. Panama claims this Treaty was presented with a take it or leave it attitude. They took it and have been complaining ever since. Panamanian agitation for change and American resistance can and have become a vicious cycle. Some circles in Panama blame the United States for all of Panama's shortcomings, and some circles in the United States react unreasonably to gambits which the Panamanians openly intend to be provocative.

There was one treaty revision in 1936, and another in 1955 which met many Panamanian desires but which left others unsatisfied. The two countries went further along the road of modifying this situation in the past couple of years. President Chiari of Panama visited President Kennedy in June of 1962 for a frank discussion of our relationships. They agreed to appoint a Joint Commission of two representatives of each government to meet to discuss problems and seek solutions within the framework of the existing treaties. The former American Ambassador to Panama, Mr. Joseph S. Farland, and I were the two American representatives. We met almost once a week for over a year, sometimes oftener, for frank discussions of any problems which the Panamanians wanted to raise. These discussions are the basis of what I am about to tell you of the Panamanian side of the disagreement. I am exposing you to their point of view, not because I agree with it but so you can judge why a disagreement exists.

Panama states its case in a series of what they call "aspirations." These divide down into first, emotional and nationalistic aspirations, and second, economic aspirations. The economic aspirations further divide down into two classes: those involving the Canal itself, and those involving Panama's geographical position. The nationalistic or emotional aspirations result largely from Panama's frustration about the sovereignty clause in the 1903 Treaty. Briefly, Panama wants the United States to recognize that it has some degree of sovereignty over the Zone. It wants to have the Panamanian flag flown jointly with the American flag in the Zone; it wants the Panamanian flag with the American flag as a flag of courtesy on foreign ships transiting the Canal; it wants Panamanian postage stamps used in the Canal Zone postal system; and in general Panamanians resent that a foreign jurisdiction spreads right across their country. Panamanians do not take these emotional desires lightly and have built up a terrific head of steam over them. Perhaps as a result of what Panamanians consider long frustration on the sovereignty issue, recent public statements have become stronger.

Next are Panama's economic aspirations involving the Canal itself. Briefly, Panama wants a greater shake of the assumed profits of the Panama Canal. We now pay Panama slightly under $2 million annuity for the Zone and for the Canal. Panama knows that this amount is less than we pay for other concessions which the Panamanians consider less valuable to the United States than the Canal. And our present organization presents us a propaganda liability. The Panama Canal Company is a government corporation with the trappings and outward appearances of a commercial American corporation. Everyone knows that an American corporation exists to make money for the stockholders, and in Panamanian opinion the United States has in the Panama Canal Company a corporation which is making money for the United States Treasury. This belief is not confined to Panama; it is widely held all over Latin America. And in spite of all our public information efforts we cannot erase the idea that the Panama Canal Company exists to put dividends into the Treasury. Otherwise reasonable and thinking people who have discussed this problem with me have just closed their minds to any explanation and have come up with the statement that everything was all right between the United States and Panama until the United States formed the Panama Canal Company to make money out of the Panama Canal. Panama wants more of these assumed profits. And as a subsidiary effect Panama wants to participate in various businesses now operated by the Canal Company. Panama knows that it is contrary to American policy for our government to compete with private industry. Panama also knows that the Panama Canal Company operates retail stores; that it sells and services television sets, radios, and refrigerators; and that it operates a repair business for privately owned vehicles. Panama thinks that these activities compete with Panamanian business, and Panama wants the United States to cease this so-called competition.

The other and more important class of economic aspirations involves Panama's geography. Panama considers its geography as one of its principal economic assets, and the people of the Isthmus had been exploiting this economic asset long before the 1903 Treaty established the United States in the Canal Zone. This Isthmus formed part of the route for transporting the treasures of Peru to Spain. Steamship companies brought mail and passengers to one side of the Isthmus, transported them overland and then embarked them again on ships. The Panama Railroad was completed by an American capitalized corporation in 1855 and for years was a most lucrative investment paying dividends of about 17% annually. Present day Panamanians argue that the American position in the Canal Zone is athwart their geographical asset and denies Panama the opportunity of profiting from it. In the two treaty revisions of 1936 and 1955 the United States agreed in part with the Panamanian contention that it is entitled to enjoy this geographical asset. Panama argues that we have been slow in withdrawing from commercial operations which Panama thinks it should do.

Going back to the Joint Commission to which I referred earlier, I believe that we had improved relationships between Panama and the United States. This was true up to August 1963. But between August 1963 and January 1964 the situation deteriorated to the point where the stage was set for the riots of January 9th, 1964. I, of course, have intimate knowledge of events which occurred during that time. And I also have some deep and abiding scars on my soul because of events which I do not think need have happened. Admittedly my views are biased, but they are informed. I think that one reason for the rapid deterioration of relationships was that responsible Panamanians began to doubt the good faith of the United States government.

They began to believe that somewhere between the local level where we were trying to work out agreements and the level of President Kennedy who had agreed that he would seek improvements, solutions were running into roadblocks. I do not think that this is true, but certain happenings lent some credence to this Panamanian belief. As one example, only after a most exhaustive legal analysis, we had made an agreement personally approved by President Kennedy, on the flying of Panamanian flags in the Zone. Shortly after we started to implement it I was sued by an employee of the Panama Canal Company seeking to enjoin me from carrying out that agreement. The suit was not decided in favor of the government for about nine months. All this time I was under instructions to refrain from carrying out the flag agreement to avoid prejudicing the suit, and this curb endured through the 60-day appeals time. Originally, the Panamanians had accepted this challenge of Presidential authority with some degree of understanding. But before the final expiration of the action, they were beginning to question whether we intended to carry out that flag agreement. There was no country outside the United States affected by President Kennedy's assassination more than Panama. To Panama, he appeared to be the first President who sought to see their point of view, and his assassination was a tremendous emotional blow here. With the beginning of suspicion that solutions were being blocked, the assassination of Mr. Kennedy seemed to Panama a loss of their first and only real friend.

Other actions also contributed to the deterioration of relations. A Panamanian owned English language newspaper devoted itself to stirring up difficulty between the United States and Panama. Some Americans got sucked into this campaign and wrote voluminous letters to the editor. If a Panamanian did not reply equally provocatively then the editor himself replied to keep the controversy alive. In spite of everything the authorities could de we could not get those letter writers stopped, and they succeeded in working up an excellent climate for "Let's you and him fight." Panamanian presidential politics also affected the situation. Under their Constitution, the President could not succeed himself, but obviously as President he would have a great deal to do in selecting the coalition's choice as a candidate. The former president could not decide between three leading contenders so his solution was to pick a fourth man. This pleased no one, angered the three leading candidates, and almost resulted in a blowup of the government coalition. This all set the stage for a small demonstration against the United States. Such demonstrations have long been a fact of Panamanian political life; point the finger at the United States and then the domestic hue and cry dies down.

This then was the general climate when students from the National Institute came into the Zone on 9 January and met a group of American students in a highly emotional situation. A demonstration followed in Panama and got completely out of hand; the Panamanian authorities would do nothing to control their people, and Panama had three days of most vicious rioting.

Now that brings us up to the present. In saying we have problems in Panama I am not like the proverbial old maid looking under the bed hoping to find a problem. We have them and they aren't going to go away merely if we ignore them. There are obstacles in reaching solutions to those problems. The remoteness of the Canal Zone from the United States is one obstacle; it is difficult to arouse informed interest even though the problem involved here is of great importance to 190 million Americans. There are groups both in the Zone and back home which for reasons of principle or self-interest resist changes, and there is emotionalism on both sides of the question. America has given the world a tremendous example of American initiative and knowhow in the construction and operation of the Panama Canal. But our performance in the related mission of establishing good relations with our neighbor Panama has been much less successful and our general reputation may become tarnished unless we improve this performance. There are many things we can do to overcome the obstacles I have mentioned and to arrive at a solution to these problems. But to my mind a most important single thing we must do is to secure the cooperation of a responsible Panamanian government.

President Robles of Panama is a man of decision and has demonstrated his desire to cooperate. President Johnson is likewise a man of decision, and his statement of December 18 is one of the most statesmanlike ever made by an American President. That statement has charted a new United States policy toward Panama. But we still have a lot to do to flush out that policy statement, and this will require some sophistication. It also requires that we raise our sights. I also think it requires that we take some preliminary actions on the American side of the fence. There are certain paradoxes based either on existing law or in commonly accepted beliefs about the Panama Canal which must be faced. The first of these lies in the possibility of a conflict between the basic law governing the operation of the Canal enterprise and the essential interests of the United States. Briefly, the law which set up the Panama Canal Company requires that it be operated as a business enterprise and imposes on it certain financial obligations. I have no desire to quarrel with the gods of business and efficiency, but I will state categorically that sometimes things which are good for the balance sheet of the Panama Canal Company can be most adverse to the national interest of the United States. Another preliminary action should be an objective determination of the essential interests of the United States. I believe that some which have been advertised as essential will not, on examination, prove to be essential. And I believe that other interests much more essential could be compromised if we take them too much for granted. Another preliminary action should be to initiate a campaign of public discussion in the United States particularly in echelons of our government which will affect our ultimate action. Those of us close to this problem know our present situation and we know that pressures and tensions are mounting. Everyone will be better off from some open discussions rather than waiting for an explosive situation full of recriminations. And the United States should state firmly that it will protect its employees whose economic conditions might change due to political factors over which they have no control. One reason is simple loyalty to our own people.

I said earlier that the Panama Canal is an outstanding example of a successful government operation. The credit for that is due to the people who are now operating and maintaining the Canal. Our employees have given their loyalty to the United States and our government should do no less for them. And a second reason is one of self interest for our government. We have seen in other areas of the world the results of frustrated resistance to moderate changes. Such frustration injected into our relations with Panama could make a delicate situation most difficult. Some of the factors leading up to January of 1964 were aggravated by the lack of assurance of our employees.

And we should reaffirm our responsibility to the users of the Canal. Our operation of the Panama Canal as an international public utility carries an obligation to insure that the tolls for transit are just and equitable. Years ago, these toll rates might have been the unilateral responsibility of our government, but now, as a practical matter, we must consider the interests of others and our obligation of impartiality. The rates are important, but even more important is the fairness and impartiality with which these rates are applied. History has many examples of local authorities using their geographical position to impose tolls as a means of levying tribute or plain extortion. The authority which controls the establishment and collection of tolls in an Isthmian canal has the power to play God with the users of that canal. And by varying the tolls according to cargoes, the toll setting authority could become a dictator over the economies of South America. Whether this responsibility is specifically stated or not is immaterial; we have accepted the responsibility of protecting the interests of other canal users.

But the most important requisite for any solution to this situation is the cooperation of a responsible Panamanian government. And here I stress the words, cooperation and responsibility. Prior to January 1964 and for many months thereafter we had neither cooperation nor responsibility in the Panamanian government. The present Panamanian government has shown its desire to cooperate. But we must understand that what it can do is limited by internal political factors which it must resolve. The strongest of these internal political factors is the long held belief of the Panamanians that they have been frustrated in their attempts to discuss Canal issues with the United States. With this belief anti-Americanism can be and often is whipped up almost at will by demagogues across the border. In order for the Panamanian government to cooperate with us it must have some shield against this vulnerability to demagoguery. I think providing such a shield will require consideration, sophistication, and rather dramatic action on our part. If there is any one place in the world where cooperation with the American system should be a demonstrable asset, it should be in Panama, and yet we do not now have a demonstrable asset. The situation now is challenging us to make it such a demonstrable asset and meeting that challenge requires that we raise our sights much higher than we previously had them set.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Code of Laws of the United States

Title 44, Section 181. Congressional Record; arrangement, style, contents, and indexes.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the Congressional Record, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the Congressional Record semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

Title 44, Section 182b. Same; illustrations, maps, diagrams.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the Record without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the Congressional Record the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily Record as follows: the Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided*, That the makeup of the Record shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the Congressional Record, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the Record shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the Record issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the Record for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the Record of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the Record shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the Record style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the Record.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the Congressional Record any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent Record is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the Congressional Record the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the Congressional Record.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the Congressional Record shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the Official Reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the Official Reporters of the respective Houses.

The Official Reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the Official Reporters in the next issue of the Congressional Record, nor to Records printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the Congressional Record by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the Congressional Record which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the Congressional Record, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H–112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the Record at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the Record should be processed through this office.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the Record.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the Congressional Record, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CALIFORNIA

Pete G. Salamunovich, Avalon.
Laurence R. Saldecke, Crestline.
Robert A. Lucas, Jr., Dorris.
William T. King, Dunsmuir.
Ellen L. Frey, Empire.
Reuben Haas, Imperial Beach.
Jack K. Lewis, San Bernardino.
Oley E. Little, San Pedro.
Joyce T. Turney, South Pasadena.
Millard M. Fletcher, Valley Center.

CONNECTICUT

Joseph J. Perrotta, New Britain.

FLORIDA

George H. Howell, Jr., Fort McCoy.
Mary K. Beck, Jennings.

GEORGIA

Alton R. Ertzberger, Bowersville.
C. Austin Atkins, Jr., Smyrna.

HAWAII

Shigeko O. Ishibashi, Makaweli.

IDAHO

Mildred T. Poland, Athol.
Gary N. Gunter, McCammon.

INDIANA

Wendell J. Van Riper, Noblesville.

IOWA

Bruce O. Luett, Baldwin.
Delbert W. Ploy, Thornton.
Mary E. Meggers, Walker.

KANSAS

Morris D. Crouse, Albert.
Fay E. Roberts, Council Grove.
Donald C. Zimmerman, Oberlin.
Donald E. Zeller, Paxico.
D. Jay Overocker, Jr., Protection.

KENTUCKY

Virginia M. Hendrickson, Fourmile.
Jesse D. Ward, Midway.

LOUISIANA

Clarence A. Rousse, Jr., Buras.
Irvin R. Gauthier, Hessmer.
Anthony J. Collette, Krotz Springs.

MAINE

Donald A. Hamilton, Bar Mills.
Joseph E. Howell, Ellsworth.
William J. Flynn, Raymond.

MARYLAND

Eugene D. Racz, Henderson.

MASSACHUSETTS

Peter P. O'Connor, Barre.
Bernard J. Griffin, Bondsville.
John S. Poole, Jr., North Eastham.

MICHIGAN

Roy P. Leonardi, Alpha.
Gerald P. Hollaway, Augusta.
Urban R. Whalen, Big Rapids.
Bertha M. Kurtz, Comins.
Edward T. Steinmetz, Crystal Falls.
Beatrice G. Vatter, Decker.
Charles I. Heavilin, Fennville.
Margaret L. Espie, Hanover.
Mamee L. Davis, Hickory Corners.
Gerald L. Veldman, Hudsonville.
Marvin J. Kirk, Manchester.
Lawrence A. Stachnik, Maple City.
Alfred L. C. Pullen, Marion.
Evelyn L. Schoner, Mecosta.
Zane F. Miller, New Troy.
John J. Steimel, Northville.
Geneva E. Smith, Omena.
Delos R. Griffin, Oshtemo.
Ruth M. Lawler, Otisville.
Irene A. Simpson, Presque Isle.
Robert L. See, Romeo.
Loy H. Roe, Rudyard.
Donald J. Urbain, Saint Charles.
Elanor L. Tanner, Salem.
T. Gary DeVar, Waterford.
Frederick G. Hamlin, Watervliet.

MINNESOTA

Melvin L. Corneliussen, Comstock.
Louis C. Matter, De Graff.
Arthur H. Bickel, Dundas.
Joseph W. Kallestad, Frost.
Kenneth L. Quandt, Grand Meadow.
Lorn F. Knuth, Sherburn.
Lambert J. Hamerski, Winona.

MISSISSIPPI

Owen E. Medley, Jr., Smithville.
James L. Box, Stewart.
Doris L. Wilson, Vossburg.

MISSOURI

J. Ross Reger, Harris.
William G. Carroll, Hazelwood.
Ralph C. Martin, Pacific.
Donald J. Pasaka, Sikeston.

MONTANA

Alverd R. Marcure, Frenchtown.
Lucille T. Roullier, Ronan.

NEBRASKA

Evelyn A. Black, Beaver Crossing.
Glen V. Severin, Crete.
John J. Cloidt, Jr., Plattsmouth.
Ferris C. Preble, Sidney.
Edna R. Schufeldt, Whitman.

NEW YORK

Robert E. McMahon, Belfast.
Victor F. Mann, Jr., Harrison.
Donald P. Havern, Newtonville.

NORTH CAROLINA

James M. Bond, Edenton.
Thomas W. Britt, Harrellsville.
Elbert L. Lippard, Kannapolis.
Georgia Anne Winfield, Pantego.
Lenward E. Thomas, Robersonville.
David B. Wood, Spring Hope.
James R. Speece, Union Grove.
Alvin C. Blalock, Warrenton.

NORTH DAKOTA

Gordon L. Vaagen, Taylor.

OHIO

William E. Lewis, East Sparta.
Harold H. Hottle, Hillsboro.
Ruth V. Kowalewski, Holloway.
Harold L. Miller, Mount Cory.

OKLAHOMA

James R. Orr, Antlers.
Dona L. Smith, Arkoma.
Howard A. Bailey, Porum.
Edward L. Floyd, Quinton.
Doyle W. Trimm, Stuart.

OREGON

Wilbur L. Shutes, Boring.
Quentin B. Viegas, Fossil.
Thomas F. Tomlin, Vernonia.
William S. Sullivan, Wilsonville.

PUERTO RICO

Doris Disdier, Patillas.

RHODE ISLAND

Elizabeth M. Logan, Slatersville.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Robert L. O'Harra, Florence.
Mary B. Scheider, Hilton Head Island.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Charles R. Swartz, Wessington.

TEXAS

John H. Wood, Dimmitt.
Marie B. Toombs, Maple.

VERMONT

Arthur S. Jones, Shaftsbury.

VIRGINIA

Rubye R. Turner, Arvonia.
Trula S. Altizer, Bishop.
Robert L. Leith, Manassas.
Margie H. Alexander, Port Republic.
Bernard R. Mullady, Springfield.
Alonza J. Moore, Jr., Tangier.

WASHINGTON

Lucy L. Currie, Indianola
Delbert R. Hirschel, Latah.
Eugene A. Brewer, Jr., Medical Lake.

WEST VIRGINIA

Sarah I. Kiger, West Liberty.

WISCONSIN

Harold W. Pechan, Avoca.
Arthur N. Hall, Shullsburg.

MINT OF THE UNITED STATES

Marian N. Rossmiller, of Colorado, to be superintendent of the mint of the United States at Denver.

Appendix

"World Friendships Through Flying" Theme of Women Pilots at Ninety-Nines International Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 21, 1967

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, emphasis in today's headlines is on hostilities in the world, but the Ninety-Nines first international convention brought together women pilots from 12 diverse countries on five continents. The significant sessions in Washington, D.C., proved that though there are administrative and political differences between governments, there can be the friendliest of rapport between peoples. The gathering focused attention on the theme "World Friendships Through Flying." It also spotlighted the exciting progress of women in aviation since 1929, when the organization was founded with 99 charter members, to the 3,000 members in 25 areas of the earth today.

The progress was dramatized at ceremonies in the Smithsonian Institute on July 1, the 30th anniversary date of Amelia Earhart's flight. Thanks to Adm. Willard Smith and the cooperation of the U.S. Coast Guard, the delegates had the first direct broadcast between Howland Island and the United States—via radio from the Coast Guard cutter *Blackhaw* at Howland to Honolulu, then by satellite—*Lani Bird II*—and telephone to Washington. First Admiral Smith talked with Capt. Billy Read on the *Blackhaw*. Blanche Noyes, Betty Huyler Gillies, and Jackie Cochran, all past presidents of the Ninety-Nines and still actively flying—Blanche Noyes and Betty Gillies are charter members—spoke with Captain Read and asked him to transmit a message to the Ninety-Nine Ann Pellegreno who was approaching Howland Island in her Lockheed Electra, the same type plane Amelia Earhart was flying. Captain Read replied:

> She is in range now. Would you like to speak with her directly?

And from her plane high over the Pacific, Ann talked to the audience sitting in the new auditorium in the Smithsonian's Building of History and Technology. It was indeed a thrilling climax to months of planning.

Commendation is deserved for Mrs. Fay Gillis Wells, chairman of the successful convention. She is receiving another fine token of her service in that she is to be the recipient of this year's Amelia Earhart Memorial Award given each year in honor of Miss Earhart to the woman who has made an outstanding contribution to aviation and air travel. This award will be presented to Miss Wells in New York City on July 23.

The Ninety-Nines contribution to 1967 International Tourist Year, with its theme "Tourist Passport to Peace" is the "See the United States of America Invitation Folio." Each folio contains a proclamation-invitation from the Governor of each State and the representatives from the territories noting the contribution by women pilots to the progress of aviation and inviting the peoples of the world to visit the United States and his State or territory in particular. Commissioner Walter Tobriner and Governors of 17 States proclaimed the time of the convention—June 28 to July 4—as a time of special recognition for the Ninety-Nines. Opposite each invitation in the folio are photographs of each State, showing its variety and beauty. These folios will be presented by the Ninety-Nines to representatives of the governments where there are Ninety-Nines. Pan American World Airways provides the shipping and the U.S. Travel Service is coordinating with the Ninety-Nines for proper presentations.

Six of the overseas Ninety-Nines are now on their cross-country, getting-to-know-you tour, which is taking them through Atlanta, Nashville, St. Louis, Kansas City, Atchison, Wichita, Phoenix, and Los Angeles. They will return to the east coast via a northern route.

Three of the pilots flew to Miami, the Bahamas, San Antonio, Oklahoma City, Wichita, Denver, and Los Angeles.

Eight of the overseas Ninety-Nines competed in the Powder Puff Derby, taking them from Atlantic City to Martinsburg, W. Va., Cincinnati, Carbondale, and Springfield, Ill., Tulsa, Amarillo, Albuquerque, Flagstaff, Palm Springs, and Torrance, Calif.

The rest of the 37 did not have time to remain for the tours. However, after an early bird breakfast, sponsored by Northeast Airlines at Dulles International Airport on July 2, and the planting of three trees, donated by the Holly Society of America, 22 overseas Ninety-Nines were flown to Florida as guests of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. They had a special tour of Cape Kennedy July 3 before returning to Washington.

Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY declared accurately in his official statement:

> Few groups better exemplify the spirit, the zest, the adventure of travel than the famed Ninety-Nines, the international organization for women pilots. Their friendship in flying unites their skills and interests across space and time, over boundaries and barriers. . . . As they enjoy the Discover America program, the Ninety-Nines will be far more than passive spectators; they will bring many parts of the world with them; they will strengthen friendship and understanding; they will lift our spirits high in "ceiling unlimited" for peace and good will.

It was my privilege to participate, with Najeeb E. Halaby, former Federal Aviation Agency Administrator, John W. Black, Director, U.S. Travel Service, and David Thomas, Deputy Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration, among others, in the recent convention banquet. Mrs. Wells, Storer Broadcasting Co. news correspondent, was the delightful toastmistress, at this banquet tribute to world travel and world friendship among peoples.

Robert Louis Stevenson followed trails that took him far from his hills of home. Friendly natives of Samoa fashioned a path for him, calling it "the Road of the Loving Heart." In this manner they told Stevenson of their love for him. Today, as in that era, there is the need for the understanding heart. Global air travel—nonmilitary, of course—requires a world at peace in which to develop; yet, only through travel can a world of peace in the sense we are discussing be realized.

The airplane reminds us that, through living together as neighbors, peace can be achieved and held fast. An enlightened citizenry, traveling between the United States and other nations of the world, as neighbors, will make certain that we each perform our role in history well.

Mr. President, I sense that we are joined in the hope that these interesting and intrepid women pilots have sparked the beginnings of world friendships which will nuture and grow over the years. As Prince Albert said, when 1967 was declared "International Tourist Year."

> Man is the thing that counts, and travel can have a meaning and a value only if it is the highroad leading to more beauty and light and more friendship between men on this little planet earth.

Captive Nations Week

SPEECH
OF
HON. ALBERT W. WATSON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 19, 1967

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, tragically, it appears that the plight of those nations behind the Iron Curtain is as severe today as it was 8 years ago when Congress enacted a law establishing Captive Nations Week. In fact, the ideals incorporated into Public Law 86-90 seem to have been forgotten, since the very intent of that law is being thwarted by efforts to "build bridges" of trade between this Nation and the Soviet Union.

During the observance of Captive Nations Week, which is presently taking place, it seems appropriate for Congress to rededicate itself to the principles of the original resolution which placed this body on record as opposing peaceful coexistence with the Soviet Union until the nations forced under its blanket of tyranny were set free.

I can think of no better way to apply this noble concept than to turn down any efforts to increase trade with the Moscow government so long as it persists in virtually enslaving some 20 nations as well as supplying war materials to North Vietnam, a nation at war with the United States.

We must not let Captive Nations Week degenerate into a forum for vague and useless commemorations. Captive Nations Week should symbolize a call to battle—an active battle against the international Communist conspiracy. A congressional resolution condemning East-West trade would be a positive step in winning such a battle and would prove to the enslaved peoples of the world that this Nation will never accommodate the evils of communism.

Mr. Speaker, earlier this year I introduced a sense-of-Congress resolution to set aside any consideration of further increases in East-West trade. As we observe Captive Nations Week, I invite my colleagues to introduce a similar resolution as a pledge to the millions of people behind the Iron Curtain that we shall never condone or support in any way their Communist captors.

McNamara and Combat Needs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 21, 1967

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an editorial entitled "McNamara and Combat Needs," published in the Newport News, Va., Daily Press of July 18, 1967.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

McNamara and Combat Needs

Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara makes it sound like rather a simple task to increase the number of combat troops on the anti-Communist side in South Vietnam without (1) mobilizing the reserves, or (2) substantially higher draft calls. It is a matter, he says, primarily of putting troops already over there to more effective uses, and getting our allies to provide more men.

The latter of these expedients seems the easier to arrange; at least, the Saigon regime appears to be in a mood to heed Washington's desire for an addition of 100,000 men to its militia and regular army. However, there'll still be the problem of training them and in stilling high morale. And sharp questions have of late been asked as to whether South Vietnam has been using the men it already has in uniform with sufficient vigor.

The extent to which added assistance can be expected from our other allies depends on consultations now in progress. However, the most willing source in the past has been South Korea which faces a threat of aggression from its Communist neighbor to the north and is already providing a large force in relation to the size of its population.

As for Mr. McNamara's hope, after his visit to the war zone, to achieve a better balance in numbers between the support troops and the ones actually doing the shooting, it does appear logical that the buildup has proceeded at such a pace as to create some inefficiencies in manpower use. And the logistical machinery has now been to a large degree been set up, which makes this the obvious time for re-evaluation of troop assignments.

But some military informants in Saigon—who for obvious reasons don't want their names divulged—think their boss in the Pentagon is overly optimistic as to the amount of fat that can be trimmed from the American support forces. And the same sources are critical of the Secretary's proposal to put South Vietnamese civilians in rear-echelon jobs, and with good reason—it does look like a chancy endeavor, one that might install Viet Cong where they could do a great deal of harm.

It is truly remarkable how often the ideas of the Secretary of Defense on the conduct of this war run counter to those of military officials. This continuing disagreement, in which the President evidently plays the role of moderator, is a source of fearful worry for those Americans—most of us—who can make no pretensions of being experts on military matters. There'd be less of this worry if the casualty figures weren't mounting and an end to the war in accordance with our nation's commitments were in sight.

One, Two, Three Strikes You're Out—When Supreme Court Plays Ball

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE SKUBITZ

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 11, 1967

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, the average citizen in this country is very concerned about the direction taken by the U.S. Supreme Court in recent decisions. I know that every Member of this body has received letters to verify that concern. Seldom, however, have I read such original thought depicting this concern as in the following letter to the editor by Mr. Joe Cleveland of Peru, Kans. Mr. Cleveland's letter was published in the Sedan Times-Star. I hope my colleagues will take a moment to read it. If the matter were not so tragic, it would truly be hilarious. It calls to mind that the human race survives through our ability to perceive humor even in the most serious of our situations. I commend this letter to the attention of my colleagues in hopes that it will produce a thought—as well as a laugh.

The letter follows:

Letter to Editor

Peru, Kans.

To the Editor:

Here's how baseball might be played if the U.S. Supreme Court were the umpire. (Supreme Court, as umpire, in parentheses.)

"And now our national anthem." (We will not have the national anthem since it might increase team pride and the will to win.)

Batter hits home run. (Out! Batter hit ball to right field instead of left.)

Shortstop commits error and throws his glove to the ground. (Shortstop will be fined for mentioning God.)

Batter hits two-bagger. (Runner must return to first base under "one man one base" rule.)

Pitcher throws strike (Ball! Pitcher had plotted with catcher to deceive batter just before making pitch.)

Perfect double play. (Safe! Double play void because base runners were not notified previously of possible double play attempt.)

Second base steal questioned by opposing team. (Safe! Must always protect the criminal.)

Pitcher picks off runner at first base. (Safe, Pitcher discriminated against other players by throwing to first base.)

Pitcher fakes pick-off play at third base. (Balk! Take home.)

Game called at end of six innings because of rain. Team B wins over Team A 5 to 4. (Team A is declared winner since Team B's manager is religious and probably had prayed for rain so he wouldn't lose the game in later innings.)

Joe Cleveland.

Only Gods and Beasts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 21, 1967

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I wish to make available to Senators an editorial published in the Columbia Record, of Columbia, S.C., on July 18. The editorial dismisses superficial causes and reasons for riots. It properly focuses attention on the real culprits and brands them "criminals who would destroy our right to coexist and progress without conflict." Those who, without regard for the welfare of his neighbor and fellow man, loot, destroy, and kill should not be placated but should be rebuked, deterred, and prosecuted. The arguments used to justify riots could be used to justify revolution by all Americans.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Newark: Only Gods and Beasts

Only two kinds of beings, said Aristotle, can live outside of a civil society—gods and beasts. Men are not gods. Hence, Governor Richard Hughes properly said of the Newark riots: "The line between the jungle and the law might as well be drawn here as well as any place in America."

The masses of criminal humans in Newark had become not gods, but beasts of the jungle.

They murdered fellow human creatures and they slew freedom. For order can exist without freedom, but freedom cannot exist without order.

As usual, there was the cry of "police brutality." But let's get something straight. Right now. The moment any person—no matter his color—refuses to obey a lawful order of the appointed protector of our social order, *he* becomes the brute; he compels force to be inveighed; he transforms a conflict of opinion into conflict of physical violence.

The rioters of Newark were, and are, criminals and an abomination to our society. Unfortunately, the notion of rioting in many of our Negro communities across the land has become a fad. It is easy. Any idiot can cause a riot. Only the reasonable man can perform the hard labor necessary for genuine social progress.

Once again we hear the call for palliatives—pro-housing measures, pro-education—which have all been tried and found wanting. What is urgently required is something a little more simple: a return to the alteration of our society by evolution rather than revolution.

Revolution destroys the very system we've created—as a people—for genuine redress of grievances. And *all* Americans, not only Negroes in supposed "ghettos," have sufficient grievances to revolt. Those who have been economically blessed in our society are often frustrated by what they consider to be "unjust" taxation. Should they take guns in hands, concoct Molotov cocktails, to release their frustration? The middle-class of America, Negro and white, suffers as much (or more) than any other because of rising taxation and inflation.

Respect for the law as the primary method of change in our society is utterly essential. Stupidity, violence, extremism, rioting cannot be made profitable. If they are, then they become the *primary* method of progress.

Americans must reject revolution and brand rioters for what they are, criminals who would destroy our right to coexist and progress without violent conflict.

Law protects minorities and creates justice. Only gods and beasts can callously ignore and flaunt the law. And men are not gods.

Opposition to Antiriot Bill

SPEECH

OF

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 19, 1967

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 421) to amend title 18 of the United States Code to prohibit travel or use of any facility in interstate or foreign commerce with intent to incite a riot or other violent civil disturbance, and for other purposes.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I must rise in opposition to the so-called antiriot bill, H.R. 421. There are many reasons why I feel opposition to this bill is warranted, but one in particularly especially motivates my opposition. This bill, when it is passed, and I have little doubt that it will pass, will have little or no affect on the true cause of the social unrest and rioting which has evidenced itself over the last few years. It ignores the true cause of the violence, the looting, the killing. These disturbances are a symptom, a symptom indicating that there is something frightfully wrong with our society. It is our responsibility to interpret that symptom correctly and accurately. This bill is merely a patent-medicine approach to the problem and does not treat the actual causes of the social sickness in our country. The true cause of this tragic problem is extremely complex and requires a great deal of study before it may be treated. It involves generations of inferior education, subhuman living conditions, lack of job opportunity except in the most menial and lowly fields, and a generally degrading and hopeless way of life. It is the sum total of these conditions which creates the setting and atmosphere from which riots erupt. It is mere naivete to assume that Stokely Carmichael or any other one of the radical black-power advocates possesses the power and is so accomplished a public speaker that he can by merely addressing a group of people, bring about the enormous destruction which we have witnessed in our cities.

The conditions already existing in the cities themselves must be such that those who riot see violence as their only outlet for frustration and anger. If these conditions did not exist, cries of "black power" and "get whitey" would fall on deaf ears. As long as these conditions continue to exist, it does no good to remove the Carmichaels for they are not the cause, but merely a symptom. If they are removed, others will surely rise to take their places. I reiterate, as long as the conditions exist there will always be those who will see as their only way out the path of violence and they will continue to urge others to join them. Our responsibility, then, is to address ourselves to these true causes, for when they are properly treated, the violence will be at an end, and until they are are cured, it shall continue.

In addition to this primary objection that this bill attacks the symptoms of the problem and not its causes, I have other basic objections to it. Briefly, I believe it infringes upon the rights guaranteed to every citizen by the first amendment of the Constitution. This bill, although it attempts to avoid violation of the first amendment by excluding the advocacy of ideas or expressions of belief from its definition of inciting a riot, is still in contradiction with the Supreme Court's interpretation of the amendment. The Court has consistently ruled that the right to free speech goes beyond the "mere advocacy of ideas or the mere expression of belief—Terminiello against Chicago. This bill also violates a basic requirement of criminal law that the intent and the criminal act must be contemporaneous. That is, a person could be prosecuted under this act for committing an overt act inciting a riot years after he crossed the State boundary. This violates the due process clause of the Constitution—United States against Fox.

H.R. 421 is so vague that, as the able gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA] has pointed out, three boys fighting over a watermelon could constitute a riot and be prosecuted under this act for a Federal offense.

In addition, no matter what proponents way to the contrary, this bill provides a potential danger to both the labor and legitimate civil rights movements. As was pointed out to me in a correspondence I received from the International Brotherhood of Teamsters:

> It is a union's business to advertise grievances and the way it advertises is the picket line. We abhor violence, of course, but sometimes it does occur due to the extreme anti-union feelings that a picket line often generates. Therefore, this bill could apply to labor union organizers who clearly do cross state lines with the intent to set up a picket line with the knowledge that a public disturbance is always a possibility. They would be affected by this law even if they were not the direct cause, nor even at the scene, of the disturbance.

I should like to note that the AFL–CIO, Teamsters, and United Mine Workers all oppose this bill as a potential danger to them in pursuing the legitimate grievances of their members. The same sort of dangers are contained in this bill in regards to civil rights activity. Unfortunately, violence is always a possibility in organizing people to fight for a better life. This bill would leave conscientious civil rights organizers subject to prosecution for violence which they did not intend, since the bill makes no distinction between one who urges his listeners to riot and one who speaks before a hostile audience which is inclined to riot against him.

I must also note my amazement at the actions of some of my colleagues, who on every occasion in the past have stanchly defended the doctrine of States' rights and now desert it when it is in need. This act represents the encroachment of the Federal Government into local law enforcement, an area which I am under the impression has been reserved to the States. I am sure that, whatever else those communities which have been blighted by riots have lacked, they have not lacked sufficient laws and regulations against violence. Our local authorities have done an intensive and, in most cases, admirable job of bringing to justice those who have committed acts of violence. I do not see where they lacked authority in their operations. And yet, we are told that we have a duty to enter into this area of government heretofore reserved to the local governments. It seems significant that to this date neither I nor any of my colleagues whom I have contacted have received any pressure whatsoever from our local law enforcement officials to see that this law is passed. It is not necessary, and it is an encroachment of power which is not warranted.

And what would I offer as an alternative to H.R. 421? I would offer a renewed and vigorous recommitment to those programs which are working to alleviate those conditions which lie at the actual root of violence and destruction. What is needed is increased commitment to the education of the residents of our ghettos, increased commitment to the opening of job opportunities, increased commitment to providing adequate health facilities and housing, and a general commitment to the creation of an environment in which these people can develop a sense of participation, sufficiency, and hope. This is where our commitment must lie if these outbreaks of lawlessness and violence are to be prevented.

In conclusion, I must reiterate that this bill will not solve the problem of riots, but will only represent an infringement of constitutionally guaranteed rights. It will endanger the legitimate activities of labor unions and civil rights organizers. It is a further encroachment on the rights guaranteed to the States under the Constitution. Gentlemen, I urge you to join with me in opposition to this unneeded, ineffective, and constitutionally questionable bill.

The Red Role in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 21, 1967

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "The Red Role in Vietnam," written by Raymond Moley, and published in the Lynchburg, Va., News of July 20, 1967.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE RED ROLE IN VIETNAM

(By Raymond Moley)

While Americans may well rejoice that the Soviet Union's performance in the Middle East has so far met with embarrassing frustration, they should temper their elation by considering the Russian role in Vietnam. For without the massive and continuing Soviet aid to our enemies there, our military effort would have been successfully completed many months ago. Instead, our forces are meeting ever stronger resistance, our casualties on land and in the air are mounting and our commanders are demanding massive reinforcements.

Almost every week the dispatches tell us that some new weapon has appeared on that bloody scene, and Hanoi is more confident than ever that it can win without negotiation.

The decisive factor in the strengthening of North Vietnam is the stream of Soviet cargo ships that is pouring supplies that arm our enemies, kill our fighting men and bring down our planes.

Late last year the Applied Physics Laboratory of the University of Washington at Seattle published a most significant and thoroughly documented survey of Russian merchant shipping. In the course of this detailed report, reference is made to the part played by the Soviet merchant marine in bringing war materials to North Vietnam:

"At least 26 Soviet ships have brought various kinds of material aid into the ports of Haiphong and Hanoi in the last year. Some of these ships have made more than one appearance. Because of the shallow draft in the North Vietnamese ports only fairly small Russian ships have been used. Most of the ships are dry-cargo ships ranging from 3,000 to 11,000 gross tons and sailing mainly from Odessa.

"The Russians are using the 'Nikolaev' dry-cargo carrier quite frequently between Odessa and Haiphong. This ship, like the 'Poltava,' has exceptionally long hatchways and could carry ballistic missiles. American military 'sources' admit that at least two such dry-cargo ships are regularly arriving in Haiphong, but have not revealed what cargo these ships are carrying.

"Oil is being shipped to North Vietnam in the small-tonnage tankers of the 'Kostroma' class (8,229 gross tons). At least three tankers of this class, the 'Kostroma,' the 'Komsomol' and the 'Poti,' as well as a smaller tanker, 'Sinegorsk' (3,330 tons), are regularly supplying Haiphong with Russian oil.

"According to Russian radio broadcasts the Soviet Union is supplying North Vietnam all types of cargo with its merchant fleet. Such equipment includes coal, fertilizer, sulphates, oil, marine engines, machine tools, dump trucks and lifting cranes of up to 16 tons capacity. No doubt the Russian aid via the sea lanes will increase in the next few months to fill the vacuum left by ships flying the British flag which have in the past been the main carriers in the North Vietnamese trade."

Following that, the report lists the names of the Russian ships engaged in this deadly trade.

Once more, without risking the life of a single Russian soldier, the Soviet Union is contributing to our losses and frustrating our efforts to save Southeast Asia from Communist control and to keep open access by the free world to the Indian Ocean.

The demand of our generals for reinforcements emphasizes our deficiency in shipping. Two out of three troops go by sea, and 98% of material. The Military Sea Transportation Service of the Navy has performed miracles in the past year and can handle additional troops and their equipment.

The building of great ports in South Vietnam has cut the waste that has characterized the past use of war shipping. But we have already broken 166 dry cargo ships out of the mothball fleet, and we are dangerously near the bottom of that reserve. It is very costly to put those old ships into service, and their history has been one of breakdowns at sea and long tows to port for repair. That means delay and upsetting of plans.

A Conservation Ethic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 11, 1967

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, science and technology have given modern man vast powers to alter the natural environment. To use these powers without careful consideration of the ecological consequences and without a lively respect for nature is to run the risk of committing a series of costly and damaging blunders.

This and other notable insights are expressed forcefully in a recent article by Michael Frome. The article, taken from the spring 1967 issue of the George Washington University magazine, follows. I include also a biographical sketch of the author which accompanied the article:

A CONSERVATION ETHIC

(By Michael Frome)

The controlling force in the lives of the ancient Cherokee was a natural religion. Every animal, stone and tree was believed to have its own spirit and a particular reason for being. Ceremonials were devoted to fulfillment of man's role in the grand design of the universe. The Green Corn Dance, for instance, was a two-week-long thanksgiving celebration held in the seventh moon, when the first corn ripened and became fit to eat. Enemies were forgiven, fires extinguished, and new fire kindled by the shaman, or priest, then fires were lit on each family hearth. The first fruits were deposited in the council house for the poor, who might otherwise have no corn for winter. On the main day no voices were heard until nightfall, when the whole town assembled to watch the shaman sacrifice the new fruit, express thanks for the sweet beneficence of earth, and pray for the spirits to bless the corn and meat during the year.

Searching farther back into the history of man on this continent, one finds the people known as Wandering Hunters, who crossed the dry land passage of the Bering Strait, had few impersonal, artificial instruments to cloud their views of natural forces. Their movements were intimately related to the Pleistocene climatic swings—vast natural pulsations, like the beating of a pump, the heaving of a sea, the throbbing of a heart, stirring life within thousands of miles of shifting ice fronts, driving life southward with icy winds, drawing it north as cold and dampness were replaced by warmth and drought. Those people could feel the rhythms, the cycles, the continuum between the hours of their lives and centuries of time. Their early rituals, dances, lustrations, ceremonial hunts—these natural expressions bound the generations with the stars and seas and all living things.

In contrast, within the past century, even the past half-century, Americans have moved rapidly into a shell of artificial, mechanical insulation. We have lost touch with our surroundings and the essence of creation. We ascribe to science and engineering the highest of all talents. We are conditioned to accepting the generator and computer as the source of blessings, and, it is assumed, whatever problems one devises the other will resolve. As for nature it must be harnessed, managed, improved upon, reshaped, never left to its own.

Thus we are welcome to overexploit and pollute the environment, to invade without discipline, to construct buildings and cities along known earthquake fault lines and in flood plains, to unleash immense mining machinery with foreknowledge that it will destroy mountains and rivers. In the event of damage to our civilization, we are geared to anticipate that engineers and limitless public funds will put the pieces together—to be knocked askew once more.

What we are trying to do is to replace a natural environment with a synthetic one. Pesticides have reached the polar regions and the deepest part of the ocean, altering the ecological balance in the remotest corners; but why not, when we are presently preparing to devour the riches of the sea as we already have those of the land?

Why not, indeed, when Federal agencies, which are supposed to express the public conscience, are outdoing each other with programs to advance the synthetic? I will cite the energetic aspiration of a branch of the Fish and Wildlife Service in the Department of Interior to poison the population of coyotes and other predators into extinction in behalf of the sheep industry and its own self-perpetuation. Where the predators are virtually gone and rodents have spread, this agency is now promoting artificial rodent control. When the rodents are gone, it is safe to say that it will be something else, with the controllers employing a new laboratory creation, a new machine, a new management approach intended to render the atmosphere more antiseptic and sterile. Along the way they are certain to place into use the insecticide heralded in *National Wildlife* as the kind that destroys only the "bad" bugs while leaving the "good" bugs unscathed.

In the meantime, we are robbing the earth of much of its interest and attractiveness. We are robbing man unborn of the spiritual re-creation derived solely from nature's own resources and handiwork—but, alas, unlike the primitives, who felt themselves as part of the design of eternity, we are unable to project beyond our own fleeting period.

Emerson defined the true conservation ethic as a concept of mortality and the integrity of the human spirit. "To the poet, to the philosopher, to the saint, all things are friendly and sacred, all days holy, all men divine," he wrote. "For the eye is fastened on the life, and slights the circumstance. Every chemical substance, every animal in its growth, teaches the unity of cause, the variety of appearance."

Conservation is both a science and a philosophy, but the latter is essential to the former. It is true that conservation in its modern technical application represents the means of protecting and renewing ample natural resources for the material needs of human-kind. Without it, the unlimited survival of the species can hardly be assured. But there is the older form of conservation, more comprehensive, patient and intellectual. As Prof. Arnold Henry Guyot of Princeton wrote one century ago, the natural scientist must be a philosopher as well, and the source of his philosophy the unity of earth, with all its "living tribes of the waters and the land" fulfilling their purposes and preparing for other developments beyond them.

Lacking this rounded approach, conservation falls short of serving its full obligation. Consider the scientific aspect alone as discovered and defined early in the century by Gifford Pinchot. "Conservation," he wrote, "is the foresighted utilization, preservation and/or renewal of forests, waters, lands and minerals, for the greatest good of the greatest number for the longest time." This is valid as far as it goes. Pinchot in his chosen field of forestry instituted a system of planning and management where only planlessness had prevailed and his constructive influence was felt in much broader spheres of land use. But the tragedy is that he unknowingly sired a school of conservation engineers who have too little grasp of philosophy or appreciation of the humanities. Impelled by their training they must forever demonstrate man's conquest of nature; they despair at vestiges of primeval land left "idle," when such land can be managed.

Thus at times the poorest performers in conservation are not necessarily the free enterprise profiteers, but the management-minded agencies of the Federal Government. The Bureau of Reclamation, for one, is convinced that the waters of the Colorado River, already harnessed on most of its course, are being utterly wasted because they flow freely and untamed through the Grand Canyon. Pinchot's own agency, the United States Forest Service, cannot stand to have a scrawny forest of virgin lodgepole pine survive in the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness of Montana without the blessing of sustained-yield harvest. The National Park Service has joined a senseless political scheme to gut the Great Smoky Mountains with roads and over-sized campgrounds and transforms this finest wilderness of Eastern America into—by the word of one of its own officials—a "playground." The Tennessee Valley Authority, which has the kind of power for comprehensive regional design which Pinchot envisioned, feels obsessed with the need to pour one concrete dam after another, whether needed or not, destroying beautiful mountain streams and thrusting smokestacks and factories on pastoral valleys.

The ultimate effects on the land and its inhabitants are fearful to anticipate. Without a more firmly established conservation ethic, we are not equipped to undertake development of the resources of the sea or exploration of the lunar surface. Mechanically and technically, we have the skills to move in any direction, but the intellectual, moral and spiritual levels lag behind. We need to reach the point where the immense mining machines are controlled and scaled down, and so too the ship-borne machines used in hunting whales—perhaps I should say mining of whales—on the high seas; and so too pesticides must be controlled in order to sustain the cycle of all life on earth. We need to take serious stock through ecological research of where we have been, what changes have been wrought in the natural balance, and what measures must be taken to assure our future.

The fact is that we now have the power to effect changes in the total environment of man. It is also possible that, before we learn the full extent of this power, we may commit blunders that injure the entire human race.

For example, more than half the fuel ever burned by man has been burned in this century. Consequently, it appears likely that the carbon dioxide content of the atmosphere has increased by at least 10 percent in this period and that the gas is being released into the atmosphere more rapidly than it can be absorbed by green plants or dissolved in the oceans and eventually precipitated. Now, the only reason the earth's atmosphere contains oxygen for us to breathe (and oxygen to burn fossil fuels) is that it is constantly given off by green plants. Should we reach a point at which the rate of combustion exceeds the rate of photosynthesis, the oxygen content of the atmosphere must start to decrease.

We cannot afford to surrender endless millions of acres of photosynthesizing vegetation by building concrete highways and factories that consume more oxygen. Nevertheless, our government insists upon thrusting industry on the peoples of Africa and South America, and on those of Appalachia and the Indian reservations. This country may be well established as the global fountainhead of science and technology, but in such moves there is not the slightest consideration of the science of ecology. Nor is there any application of human engineering, considering that we are dealing with a rare and dwindling species of humankind, the free-spirited people, whose ways we should conserve and study, rather than destroy.

In summary, we have always been governed, and continue to be governed, by the natural laws that controlled the lives of primitive peoples, and that still control the lives of wild animals and wild plants. We need to replenish air and water. We need to maintain the soil nutrient cycles that are basic food production. In this age, we now need to fathom controls of population size and rate of growth. We need to recognize that, despite the ingenuity of automation and electronics, whether applied to agriculture, transportation or communications, when the generator fails, man must revert to the day-and-night cycle and we need to appreciate and understand it more.

But these are material questions. Man, above all, is a creature of intellect and a spiritual being. The further we move from the natural ways of our ancestors, the more we should safeguard the slender primeval places as fountains of sustenance and renewal to the soul.

Biographical Sketch of Author

Michael Frome, former student, 1946, is today one of the country's foremost writers on conservation and travel. His book, *Strangers In High Places—the Story of the Great Smoky Mountains,* which appeared last year, has been praised as the finest work on any single National Park. He is also author of the new *Rand McNally National Park Guide* and of *Whose Woods These Are—the Story of the National Forests,* and is presently at work on a new book for young readers on predatory animals. His monthly column in American Forests, publication of the American Forestry Association, is known in conservation circles as a continuing source of constructive criticism.

Mr. Frome's interest in travel and conservation was heightened by his experiences and travels as a navigator in the Air Transport Command during World War II. He worked as a reporter on The Washington Post in the forties, and is particularly remembered there for his dispatches from Prague and Warsaw during a post-war period when American correspondents behind the Iron Curtain were few in number. He later joined the American Automobile Association as a writer and publicist, where he found himself traveling and writing about conservation and beautification as well. He says that "travel and conservation are indivisible. We must conserve in order for the traveler to enjoy." In fact, he says, "conservation can become good business." His work on billboard control at the AAA is credited with helping in the establishment of state and national controls on billboard displays.

Mr. Frome is a contributing editor of Changing Times, the Kiplinger Magazine, and is a frequent contributor to Holiday, Woman's Day, and other leading national magazines. He considers his domain all outdoors and writes from first hand experience. This is why he prizes a pair of plain Wellington riding boots (which always need to be resoled), and a pair of low hiking boots. Although rural nature is his delight, he learned to ride horseback in town—in Washington, D.C.'s Rock Creek Park, to be exact.

Within the past year, Mr. Frome has roamed the continent from the Aleutians to the Everglades. "You must have been reared in the country, of course?" is a rhetorical question he answers with a loud no. He is from New York City.

As for mixing travel and holidays, Michael Frome approves of this but says he has "no personal holidays"—except those spent with his family at home in Alexandria, Virginia.

Government Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 21, 1967

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Government Spending," published in the Williamsburg, Va., Gazette of July 21, 1967.

There being no objection, the editorial ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Government Spending

Maurice H. Stans, who was director of the budget in the Eisenhower administration, recently released some current spending statistics which were printed in the *Chicago Tribune.*

Some of Mr. Stans figures, which he says show that rising government costs are not caused by defense spending:

"The 1968 budget contains 22 billion dollars for Vietnam;

"Since 1960, including that 22 billion, expenditures for national defense are up 68 per cent;

"Since 1960, nondefense expenditures of the government are up 97 per cent;

"Since 1960, expenditures for national welfare and health programs are up 210 per cent."

Mr. Stans also made these comparisons:

"Since 1960 the population of the United States has grown by 10 per cent;

"Since 1960 the personnel comprising the civilian burocracy of the federal government has grown by 25 per cent;

"Since 1960 the cost of government payrolls, including military, has grown by 75 per cent;

"Since 1960, the total of all government spending has grown by more than 83 per cent."

The Late Honorable John McNaughton, Newly Designated Secretary of the Department of the Navy

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 19, 1967

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I join with the gentleman and my colleagues in expressing great sorrow over the tragedy that occurred today.

I must also associate myself with the remarks made by the gentleman from California [Mr. Don H. Clausen] and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Davis] in speaking of the rights of general aviation.

While I can well understand the feelings of the gentlemen from New York in advocating a restriction of the use of public airports to air carriers, I might add that to do so would be akin to restricting the use of public highways to common carrier operations and refusing to permit private automobiles on the highways.

Indeed, we do have a problem in the use of air space, and that problem will become more and more severe as time goes on, as our fleets of private and carrier aircraft continue to grow.

This is the first major air collision, if I am not mistaken, in several years. I believe that we can point with pride to the safety record that has been made and the record that is being made by the Federal Aviation Administration, by general aviation and by our carriers in maintaining safety in air operations. I feel we should withhold judgment on this particular accident, certainly until all the facts are known. I hope that the Congress will not take precipitous action that might lead to restricting the use of our public airports to any particular segment of aviation.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. STRATTON. I thank the gentleman.

Department of Transportation Appropriation Bill, 1968

SPEECH

OF

HON. CHARLES E. WIGGINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 18, 1967

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 11456) making appropriations for the Department of Transportation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes.

Mr. WIGGINS. Mr. Chairman, I owe a word of explanation to my colleagues because of my vote against the motion of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Laird] to recommit H.R. 11456—the Department of Transportation appropriation bill of 1968—with instructions to reduce the sum appropriated by 5 percent.

On the surface, it would appear that my vote is inconsistent with prior votes before this House upon which I have uniformly supported Republican-sponsored "5 percent recommittal motions."

All of us, I am sure, are keenly aware of the necessity of a careful review of requests for appropriations during this period of spiraling government spending. This I have endeavored to do and when excessive sums appeared in requests made to this body, I have never failed to record my vote to reduce those sums to a proper level.

In the case of the Department of Transportation appropriation bill, however, I was impressed by the thorough and tightfisted manner in which the Subcommittee on Appropriations had approached its task. Appropriations were cut by the committee by $191 million, or approximately 11 percent, below the sums appropriated last year to operate the agencies covered by this bill. A careful review of the sums recommended by the committee indicated no discernible "fat" which economy-minded Members might have trimmed from the bill, beyond minor cuts of approximately $21 million.

These possible savings which I supported in the committee totaled approximately 1 percent of the aggregate amount requested in the bill. If economy-minded Members cannot pinpoint unnecessary spending in excess of 1 percent of the bill, I fail to see how we can logically vote for a 5-percent general reduction in the funds available.

The motion to recommit which I could not support was, I believe, primarily a gesture made for the purpose of maintaining a uniform Republican posture of economy. Normally, I will support these efforts, but first I must be shown that a 5-percent cut is possible and still preserve the integrity of programs which are necessary and in the public interests.

Tribute to a Cappella Choir

SPEECH

OF

HON. GARRY BROWN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 13, 1967

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, today here in the House of Representatives I would like to pay special tribute to a group of fine young Americans, the A Cappella Choir of Central High School in Battle Creek, Mich., and their director, Afred G. Richards.

Of all the high school choirs in the United States, this choir was the only one designated to represent the United States of America at the International Choir Festival at the Hague, Netherlands, this summer.

Pitted against 69 other choirs from 12 countries, the a cappella singers from Battle Creek not only won the highest point total ever awarded at the festival but by their conduct won the hearts and respect of the festival audiences at the Hague. The Battle Creek singers scored 406 points out of a possible 420. Never before had a choir scored more than 400 points. In addition, the choir received four standing ovations at the final concert and was the toast of the Dutch critics.

It was a long, hard road to the Hague and a less determined group of youngsters, sponsors, and parents never would have made it. There was no money set aside to send the choir to Europe. However, in a short period of time, the citizens of the Battle Creek area, in a gesture of love and appreciation, accumulated well over $50,000 from individual donations to send the choir abroad.

Mr. Speaker, I am truly proud of these 100 singing ambassadors of good will and the entire community of Battle Creek.

Their accomplishment is evidence of the kind of youth America produces.

Their accomplishment is another testimonial to the basic spirit of community pride which motivates every good American.

Their accomplishment should be an inspiration to all those who believe the way to achieve world peace is through the exchange of people, rather than governments.

Congratulations to all who made this feat possible.

Captive Nations Week

SPEECH

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 19, 1967

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, since 1959, the third week in July has been proclaimed Captive Nations Week. Each year since then, we, in the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, have reaffirmed our devotion to freedom, individual and national, and the right of all states to self-determination. The rights of individual and national freedom are cornerstones of our heritage. The right of states to self-determination is a corollary of these foundations of our national principles.

In the days of the czars and, later, in the days of the Soviets, Albania, Armenia, Bulgaria, Byelorussia, Czechoslovakia, Croatia, Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Serbia, the Ukraine, have been taken over against their will.

Terrorism, mass deportations, subjugation have been the instruments by which the Soviet has endeavored to obliterate all sense of national and cultural consciousness among these countries held in bondage.

Yet, despite the cruelty of their oppressors, these captive nations have held resolutely to their national identity and their native culture.

We, and the free nations of the world, assure these captive peoples that our pride in our national and individual freedom will make us each year more steadfast in our determination that the blessings of freedom shall be extended to the captives of Soviet imperialism and tyranny.

Friday, July 21, 1967

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Senate took up interest equalization tax bill.

See Congressional Program Ahead.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S 9943–S 10032

Bills Introduced: 18 bills were introduced, as follows: S. 2134–2151. **Page S 9944**

Bill Reported: Report was made as follows: H.R. 6098, extending for 2 years tax on acquisition of stock and debt obligations of a foreign issuer, with amendments (S. Rept. 405). **Page S 9944**

Bill Referred: H.R. 11456, fiscal 1968 appropriations for the Department of Transportation, was referred to Committee on Appropriations. **Page S 9910**

Bill Reference: When S. 2138, authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture and the Surgeon General to provide food and medical services on an emergency basis to prevent suffering or loss of life, was introduced today, order was entered that it be referred to Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and if and when it is reported by that committee it will be referred to Committee on Agriculture and Forestry unless that committee requests that such reference be waived. **Page S 9944**

President's Message—Weather Modification: President transmitted with his comments the 8th annual report of the National Science Foundation covering activities during fiscal year 1966 in the field of weather modification—referred to Committee on Commerce. **Page S 9909**

Legislative Appropriations: By unanimous consent, it was agreed that conference report on H.R. 10368, fiscal 1968 appropriations for the legislative branch, will be considered on Monday, July 24, with 1 hour of debate thereon between 1 and 2 p.m., equally divided. **Page S 9915**

Medals: Senate passed with amendment S. 1909, to provide for striking of medals celebrating the 100th anniversary of the completion of the first transcontinental railroad. **Page S 9910**

Taxation: Senate made its unfinished business H.R. 6098, extending for 2 years tax on acquisition of stock and debt obligations of a foreign issuer. **Pages S 9924, S 10017**

Indians: Senate concurred in House amendment to S. 1191, providing for disposition of judgment against the U.S. recovered by the Southern Ute Tribe in Colorado, after adopting Allott amendment thereto to provide for immediate distribution to this tribe of certain claims funds. **Pages S 9923–S 9924**

Confirmations: The following nominations were confirmed: John L. O'Marra, of Oklahoma, to be an Assistant Postmaster General; Marian N. Rossmiller, of Colorado, to be Superintendent of the Mint at Denver; and 140 postmasters. **Pages S 10032–S 10033**

Nominations: Senate received nominations of Leonard Unger, of Maryland, to be Ambassador to Thailand; and Oren Beaty, of Arizona, to be Federal Cochairman of the Four Corners Regional Commission.

Senator Williams (Delaware) entered motion to reconsider action of Senate on Monday, July 17, in confirming nomination of Simon F. McHugh, of D.C., to be a member of the Subversive Activities Control Board, and the President was requested to return the nomination to the Senate. **Pages S 9911, S 10032**

Program for Monday: Senate met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 3:09 p.m. until noon Monday, July 24, when its unfinished business will be H.R. 6098, extension of interest equalization tax, but between 1 and 2 p.m. it has been agreed by unanimous consent to consider conference report on H.R. 10368, legislative appropriations for fiscal 1968. **Pages S 9915, S 10032**

Committee Meetings

(*Committees not listed did not meet*)

APPROPRIATIONS—INDEPENDENT OFFICES

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee continued its hearings on H.R. 9960, fiscal 1968 appropriations for independent offices, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development, receiving testimony from Rosel H. Hyde, Chairman, and Robert E. Lee, Kenneth A. Cox, and Nicholas Johnson, members, all of the Federal Communications Commission.

Hearings continue on Monday, July 24, when officials of the FPC will be heard.

Appendix

A Message From the Job Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 24, 1967

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks there has been much discussion here in the House about the Office of Economic Opportunity and its programs across the country.

We have talked about appropriations, authorizations, budgets, and expenditures. Today, I offer a little different perspective entitled "A Message From the Job Corps."

It is a simple and poignant accounting of one young man's life before he was given what he calls "that second chance" in life.

The young man, Jesus Luna, a native of Mexico, had been a citizen of the United States for just 1 week before he enrolled in the Job Corps and was assigned to the Camp Atterbury Job Corps Center, Edinburg, Ind.

Despite a high school education, he was unable to speak really passable English. He had little or no vocational training. And he had little hope for the future.

Today, Jesus is an electronics technician with the Westinghouse Defense and Space Center and is now working at the McDonnell aircraft plant near St. Louis.

Before he was graduated from the Atterbury Center, he wrote for the Columbus, Ind., High School publication, the Triangle, a brief account of his experiences. It is a success story in every sense of the word—success for the young man, for the Job Corps, and for the people who operate the Atterbury Center.

It reads as follows:

A MESSAGE FROM THE JOB CORPS

(EDITOR'S NOTE: The Job Corps Hospitality Program was initiated to create mutual understanding and develop friendly relations between JC Centers and surrounding communities.

(Nineteen-year-old Jesus Luan has submitted this explanation of the trainee's life to further this effort.

(He is enrolled in the electronics course at Atterbury Job Corps Center. He recently passed a test in Indianapolis giving him his third class FCC license.

(He is now studying for second class. He was recently elected president of the Atterbury Advocates, a group of young men who make public speaking engagements and act as tour guides. He is also a member of the Spanish Club.)

I'm nineteen years of age and have been in Job Corps for ten months. I was born at Juarez, Chichuahua in Mexico. My father worked at the railroad at that time. After me followed three brothers and one sister which made the family a little larger.

When I was eight years old my mother decided to give us a good start in our lives, so we became residents of the U.S. At first I made pretty good grades in school but as the years went by, I started thinking of other things besides school.

We are now nine brothers and four sisters in my family. My father is a brick-layer. Although this is a good paying job, he only works part of the time.

I'm second to the eldest in my family. One main reason I came to Job Corps is because of my family. This way I help myself and help a little in my family.

I did graduate from high school, but did not know enough of what I was supposed to have learned. In the first place, I come from a Spanish speaking family, city and school which was like a resistance on my English vocabulary.

Every time I said something in English or tried to, my friends would laugh and joke about it, so I never really had any practice speaking English correctly.

Second, in school my teachers were very good, but the system they went by was too fast for me and I guess many others.

If I didn't catch something the first day, it was too bad because the next day it was different title, chapter or a different subject to study or read. So most of the time I was left behind and got real low grades.

My parents got to me for doing so and I decided to get better grades next time anyway I could, quick and easy.

Most of the time (and I hate to admit it) I copied from someone else or made friends with the teacher. There were many other reasons that kept me down.

When I joined Job Corps I didn't realize how much it was going to help me. I had just become a citizen of the U.S. a week before I signed up at the Youth Opportunity Center for Job Corps.

When I received my notice that I was to leave on a Tuesday morning to a place called Camp Atterbury Job Corps Center at Edinburg, Indiana I was a little scared, for I had never been away from home this far before.

When I arrived here and was assigned to my dormitory in orientation, which is where you go first, I felt funny and started thinking too much of home.

I saw many guys were just like me, homesick, and lying on their bunk beds thinking. When I got a bit more aquainted with my fellow Corpsmen they could hardly make out a word I said.

After two weeks in orientation taking tests and instructions and deciding on what vocation to take, we were assigned to our regular or permanent dorm and class schedule.

There are many things older people don't realize about young ones. Some seem to forget that they were once teenagers.

They don't seem to realize that some young men and women never do have a chance to really express their ideas and feelings as individuals.

We do things the way we do because we don't really know anything else. We've been doing things since we were kids and that's the only thing we know how to do. You realize that if you don't have some self respect or self confidence you can't make it in life.

You can't just let yourself loose and get pushed around my everyone and do things that you really don't want to do, but sometimes you feel there is no other way.

That is why I came to Job Corps, because I realized that going the way I was going had no future in it. I never really thought I would stay in Job Corps, but I thought I'd give it a try, since they told me it was on a voluntary basis.

It seems amazing to me the way I have progressed and learned here in Job Corps. I guess if you're given a second chance to better yourself in life, you feel in debt to yourself if you don't take that second chance.

Kentucky's Facilities for Research and Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 24, 1967

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, on Tuesday of last week, Miss Katherine Peden, the very able commissioner of the Kentucky Department of Commerce, presented testimony before the Subcommittee on Government Research of the Committee on Government Operations.

In her prepared statement, Miss Peden outlines the important steps that Kentucky has taken in recent years to bring about its broad based economic growth and development. She describes the steps that the State is taking to increase its research and development capability so necessary to attract future industrial development. She also points out, as I have pointed out in the past, that Kentucky's share of Federal research and development expenditures is not commensurate with the State's facilities and trained personnel, particularly with respect to our universities.

Miss Peden's statement shows first, that Kentucky's share of Federal research and development activities has been one-tenth of 1 percent or less of total Federal expenditures; second, that Kentucky's six universities received only slightly more than $11 million in Federal research and development contracts in 1966; and third, that only one of 30 major Kentucky industrial research laboratories and firms surveyed performed federally sponsored research in 1966.

This is significant in light of Kentucky's rapidly growing industrial sector, whose 268 new plants invested $653 million in Kentucky since January 1, 1964.

I know that the members of the subcommittee wil want to give Miss Peden's statement their close attention and study. I am hopeful that the committee findings will demonstrate the need for providing a wider distribution of Federal research and development expenditures that now exist in our Federal programs. Not for the sake of distributing Federal largess, but to engage the full abilities of trained and capable men and women throughout our country.

I ask unanimous consent that Commissioner Peden's statement be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement of Katherine Peden, Commissioner, Kentucky Department of Commerce, Before the Subcommittee on Government Research of the Committee on Government Operations of the U.S. Senate, July 18, 1967

My name is Katherine Peden. I am Commissioner of the Kentucky Department of Commerce. This Department is the official economic development agency of the Commonwealth of Kentucky.

Kentucky in recent years has taken positive action to create and support programs designed to maximize her economic development. In these programs we have made a maximum effort consistent with our financial resources. We have willingly and fully accepted our responsibilities as a state in this regard as we feel this is proper. A combination of state action, private enterprise, and the support of Federal programs have brought sound and satisfying economic growth in Kentucky. We are at long last moving into the main current of the nation's economy. But much remains to be done before Kentuckians realize their full economic potential.

Research and development programs are more and more becoming the cornerstone for economic growth. In these programs Kentucky lags well behind what is desirable. And this, of course, has serious implications for our future growth. We must increase our research and development capability if we are to create the innovative industries which are needed to stimulate expansion in our future economy.

Again, we have accepted our responsibility for self-improvement in research and development. Our ability to move forward in this respect depends to a large measure on the strengthening of our universities and colleges. To this end the people of Kentucky, through the state legislature, have for several years supported a massive program for improvement of our state universities. This year's appropriation to state supported colleges and universities is six times what it was 10 years ago.

In addition to Kentucky's effort in support of higher education, state funds have been used to create Spindletop Research—a private, not-for-profit, applied research institute. The efforts of Spindletop Research to become viable in its five years of existence have been supported primarily by agencies of state government.

Despite these strong efforts toward increasing our research and development capability, Kentucky's success has been limited. In this area state support alone has not been sufficient. For anything resembling full success, strong support is also required from the massive federally supported research and development program. Such support has so far been niggardly.

Spindletop Research recently surveyed 30 major firms and the institutions of higher learning in Kentucky in regard to participation in Federal research and development activities. The full Spindletop report is attached as a part of this statement. Following are pertinent excerpts from the report.

1. Kentucky's share of Federal research and development activities has been 1/10 of one percent or less of total obligations for several years. There has been no noticeable improvement in Kentucky's share as a result of President Johnson's letter of last summer.

2. Kentucky's six universities received only slightly more than $11 million in Federal R & D contracts in 1966.

3. Only one of thirty major industrial research laboratories and firms surveyed performed federally sponsored research in 1966. This is significant in light of Kentucky's rapidly growing industrial sector which saw 268 new plants invest $653 million in Kentucky since January 1, 1964.

It is apparent that Kentucky's share of R & D expenditures is meager. And I am sure that we do not stand alone among the states. This lack of R & D activity can be a serious deterrent to growth in states such as Kentucky.

I respectfully urge this Committee to give serious consideration to a wider distribution of Federal research and development activity. We in Kentucky are committing our resources and energies to the objective for growth. Our success can be accelerated by additional research and development activities.

Katherine Pedan,
Commissioner,
Kentucky Department of Commerce.

Draft of Information To Be Presented to the Subcommittee on Government Research of the Government Operations Committee of the U.S. Senate, by Katherine Peden, Commissioner, Kentucky Department of Commerce

Kentucky's participation in federal research and development activities is a matter of record through 1964; the share has been one-tenth of one percent, or less, of total obligations for several years. To determine whether the President's letter of last summer has had any impact on Kentucky's participation, we have surveyed the Kentucky companies, educational institutions, and non-profit institutions capable of performing research for government agencies. The results of this survey are extremely disappointing, especially in the industrial sector. Of the nearly 30 major firms contacted, one reported government R&D contracts in 1966.

Participation by Kentucky's six universities has likewise been disappointing with the 1966 total of slightly more than $11 million. Nearly all of this research and development was performed by two of our universities—Kentucky and Louisville—with about 8½ and 2½ million dollars, respectively. The third type of performer, nonprofit institutions, is represented in Kentucky by Spindletop Research, in Lexington. The total federal research and development contracts with Spindletop in 1966 amounted to $189,000. Since Kentucky has no federal R&D installations, other than the small medical research facility at Fort Knox, the above figures approximate the total Kentucky participation in federal R&D—nearly $11¼ million. This total is nearly identical with the 1964 level of activity in Kentucky.

To obtain an estimate of federal obligations for research and development in the calendar year 1966, we averaged the fiscal year 1966 and the fiscal year 1967 estimates provided by the National Science Foundation in its publication, *Federal Funds for Research, Development and other Scientific Activities, Volume XV*. The resulting estimate for the calendar year 1966 was $12,559,000,000 for total extramural R&D expenditures. According to the National Science Foundation's estimates, federal R&D obligations to industrial firms amounted to 63% of the total in fiscal 1966, 12% to educational institutions, and 5% to other institutions. It is particularly significant that, while the industrial sector has shown continued rapid growth, our survey revealed that only one of the 30 industrial research laboratories and major companies surveyed performed federally sponsored research in 1966. Kentucky's lack of participation in the industrial sector is even more difficult to understand in view of our rapid industrial progress. Since 1964 industry has invested $653 million in 268 new plants employing 27,800 people in Kentucky. Although we are proud of these accomplishments, the fact that Kentucky's industrial community has had no boost from federal R&D funds has limited our ability to attract the type of firms which perform R&D, or serve those which perform R&D. This condition severely inhibits our ability to form a well balanced industrial development program.

Even more serious, perhaps, than the lack of federal R&D activity by industry is the meager participation by our universities. We cannot help but feel that our chances for obtaining the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Laboratory would have been greatly enhanced by a stronger participation of the University of Kentucky in federally sponsored basic research, especially in the fields of physics and chemistry. This laboratory, like similar facilities which have gone elsewhere, would have had an incalculable beneficial effect on the University of Kentucky, our university and community college system, and the technological future of the Commonwealth.

We are convinced that our ability to attract research facilities, both public and private, is to a large measure dependent upon the strengthening of our universities and colleages. To this end, the people of Kentucky, through the state legislature, have for several years supported a massive program for improvement of our state universities. A 30% rise in the University of Kentucky's participation in federal R&D since 1964 is an indication of the vigor of the efforts of Dr. John Oswald, University of Kentucky president. Similar efforts at other state universities have yet to show this kind of results.

The research capability that exists on the staffs of our universities is critically underutilized. If Kentucky's economic, technological, and social progress is, as we believe, related closely with the strengthening of our university system, it is evident that the federal government can play a most important part through more extensive utilization of our talents in federal R&D programs.

Kentucky's efforts to bootstrap itself into the modern technological age have included the formation with state funds of a private, not-for-profit, applied research institute. The efforts of Spindletop Research to become viable in its five years of existence have been supported primarily by agencies of Kentucky state government. Its efforts to increase its ratio of federally sponsored research have been generally unsuccessful in spite of acceptable, and even outstanding, performance in many fields.

This is a critical time in Kentucky's proggress. We have invested a large share of our limited resources to become competitive with other areas of the U.S. The results are gratifying but insufficient to sustain our momentum.

I asked to speak to this Committee because it was evident to me that President Johnson's letter has had no impact in Kentucky and that the findings of this Committee could be of special importance in our efforts to develop a well rounded industrial community in Kentucky.

Universities contacted

Morehead:	
AEC	$10,000
NSF	7,000
OEO	1,400
Total	18,400
Western: DOD	45,000
Eastern	None
University of Louisville:	
AEC contracts	29,365
TVA contracts	6,748
Air Force grants	8,511
Office of Education grants	35,393
Public Health Service contracts	41,243
Public Health Service grants	1,726,760
NASA grants	141,487

Universities contacted—Continued

University of Louisville—Continued	
U.S. Army contracts	$92, 997
NSF grants	319, 629
Total	2, 402, 133

University of Kentucky Research Foundation:	
Agency for International Development	33, 392
AEC	48, 876
U.S. Agriculture Department	1, 314, 331
U.S. Commerce Department	138, 282
U.S. Department of Interior	392, 575
OEO	384, 719
NASA	442, 491
National Institutes of Health	2, 930, 093
NSF	582, 944
Peace Corps	621, 003
U.S. Public Health Service	436, 995
TVA	11, 000
Air Force	42, 477
Army	117, 253
Navy	15, 000
U.S. Office of Education	894, 469
U.S. Department of Health	92, 133
Total	8, 498, 033

Murray:	
Research Division of Children's Bureau	3, 000
U.S. Fish and Wildlife	20, 000
U.S. Fish and Wildlife	14, 000
AEC	17, 000
Total	54, 000

Kentucky State	None

State agencies contacted

Agriculture Department: USDA (Stat. Services)	$17, 000
Child Welfare: OEO	105, 967

Economic Security:	
HEW demonstration project	22, 350
HEW research	2, 700
Total	25, 050
Education:	
Vocational Rehabilitation Administration	418, 334

Demonstration project—No research grant is used to finance a project to demonstrate the effectiveness of medical rehabilitation services on handicapped children in eatern Kentucky: Some report will be written on project's results.

Fish and Wildlife:	
Yearly appropriation from U.S. Department of Fish and Wildlife; finances such things as study of deer diseases, attempts to determine amount of fish in lakes	$121, 700
Highway Department: Bureau of Public Roads	257, 058
Commerce Department: Office of State Technical Services	25, 000
Mental Health: U.S. Health Department	94, 379

Industrial Firms Contacted

Acme Newport Steel.
Allied Chemical Corporation.
American Air Filter.
American Radiator and Standard Sanitary Corporation.
American Synthetic Rubber Corporation.
American Tobacco Company.
Ashland Oil Company.
Brown and Williamson Tobacco Company.
CTS Corporation.
Catalysts and Chemicals.
Celanese Corporation of America.
Girdler.
Votator.
Tube Turns.
Du Pont (Neoprene).
Endochrine Consulting Laboratory.
General Electric—Owensboro.
Huntington Alloy Products.
P. Lorillard.
IBM.
Irving Air Chute.
Lenk Manufacturing Company.
Mason Rust.
National Distillers.
Radio Chemistry, Inc.
Reliance Universal, Inc.
Reynolds Metal.
Roll Forming.
Texas Instruments.
Varian Associates.

Spindletop Research Agency contracts, 1966

Economic Development Administration	$18, 000
Economic Development Administration	64, 200
Office of Telecommunications Management	25, 000
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	54, 000
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	5, 656
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	22, 500
Total	189, 356

The Same Old Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 24, 1967

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include herewith an editorial from the Carthage, Mo., Evening Press for July 14, 1967. With no false modesty, it represents years of observation in both the executive and legislative branches and is the only reasonable interpretation of the current detente.

THE SAME OLD STORY

Congressman Durward G. Hall in his This Week in Washington well sums up U.S.-Russian relations as follows:

The performance of Soviet Ambassador Kosygin before the United Nations this week should remove any further doubts about the wisdom of administration policy in trying to "build bridges" to the east.

Those in the official life who are most sadly grieved and confounded by Russian actions in the Mid-East are the same officials who were hailing a few months ago a new era of good feelings with the Soviet Union . . . in spite of all evidence to the contrary in Vietnam. The Soviet Consular Treaty . . . which has gone nowhere (since its ratification by the senate), merely contributed to the illusion.

Important administration officials and more than a few newspaper columnists have badly misjudged the intentions of the Soviet Union. Even U.N. Ambassador Goldberg is not to be excluded from the list. Throughout the entire Mid-East crisis he has acted in the U.N. as if we were dealing with some misguided friend who has strayed from the path of righteousness. Every time the communists have unleashed a blast at the United States we have responded by "turning the other check," and suggesting that after the Russians have made their propaganda points with Nasser, they will join us in a real effort to restore peace in the Middle East.

In other words, our basic problem remains the same. The administration fails to realize that when the communists say they're out to bury us . . . they really mean they're out to bury us. All the pious hopes to the contrary will not change the fact that the intentions of the Soviet Union are no different from those of Red China which has now developed a hydrogen bomb. The only difference is that the Soviets have a greater appreciation of our own power, and therefore are usually more subtle in their tactics and strategy. The invectives unleased against the United States in the United Nations this week could just as well have been uttered by Mao Tse-tung as by Premier Kosygin.

Somehow, without the slightest basis in fact or evidence, the illusion has persisted among the Doves that were it not for Red China, Russia would deliver peace to us overnight in Vietnam. If this were so, then why does she not do it now by cutting off Ho Chi Minh's supply of arms? Ho's government can wage war in Vietnam only because of Russian fighters, Russian arms, Russian vehicles and Russian anti-aircraft installations.

Russia's support of Nasser is like her support of Ho Chi Minh . . . selectively adequate for the aims to be achieved, and those aims are the termination of American influence and prestige in the Near East and the Far East, through the use of second parties for as long as it takes to do it.

The continuing crisis in the Mid-East may at least help to dispel the euphoria which has clouded opinion in both the U.S. and Western Europe on the long range intentions of the Soviet Union.

The pity of it all is that while the weight of argument and fact are overwhelmingly in support of U.S. policy, we hesitate to use these arguments in the forlorn hope that the communists will eventually take a softer line.

The great irony is that in an effort to restore Soviet prestige in the Arab world following Nasser's military debacle, Russia is resorting to a vehicle which they themselves have always declared to be illegal.

Russia, which is delinquent in its dues to the U.N. and has refused to contribute one ruble to that organization's peacekeeping force, now presumes to try to mobilize the U.N. to serve its policy purposes.

In 10 years the United States has paid more than $81 million to keep the U.N. buffer force in the Gaza Strip, and in the same period shelled out $386 million, or more than 70 percent of the total expense for assistance to Palestine refugees.

Proposed Closure of Glasgow Air Force Base, Mont.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 24, 1967

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, the hearing on the bill, S. 1602, last Friday brought testimony from the Bureau of the Budget as follows:

S. 1602 deals with the difficult local problems associated with the closing of a military base, in this case the anticipated closing of Glasgow Air Force Base near Glasgow, Montana. While we are certainly in agreement with the objectives of assuring that the dislocations and economic problems involved in the closing be mitigated or avoided, and that residual facilities will be utilized for their highest and best use, we have serious problems with the program outlined in S. 1602 for achieving that objective.

The bill would create the Northwest Regional Services Corporation, a wholly-owned Government corporation whose powers would be exercised by a three-member board of directors appointed by the President. The bill provides that, when Glasgow Air Force Base is no longer needed for military purposes, it will be transferred to the Corporation. The Corporation would then be directed to carry out 21 specified training, rehabilitation, testing and research programs at the base and would be authorized to develop a private industrial complex at the site. Provision is also made for conducting "any other programs which are within the purposes of any Federal law and are carried out in cooperation with the department or agency of the United States administering such law."

The mandatory requirement that a large number of programs be carried out at the Glasgow facility presumes that this is feasible. Careful study would be required to determine whether the site is suitable for those programs and whether a separate corporation is a necessary or desirable means of administering them.

The location of the base and its distance from any major urban center, among other things, make it questionable that professional and scientific personnel could be attracted to conduct the prescribed programs. And, based on past experience, it would be difficult and perhaps undesirable to attract trainees and people in need of rehabilitation to such a remote area. We also doubt that all the programs which S. 1602 directs be carried out would be compatible for the same site and that a single organization could effectively manage them.

It should also be noted that a number of the programs involved are not normally carried out directly by the Federal Government. They are grant-in-aid programs to assist State and local government and private organizations to provide services and facilities. We do not believe it is feasible to require grant-in-aid recipients to operate their programs at Glasgow, if that is contemplated, nor we do believe it would be appropriate on the other hand for the Federal Government to undertake direct provisions of such services in this instance.

With respect to those programs included in S. 1602 which are normally carried out directly by Federal agencies or their contractors, particularly major research and testing programs, we have no reason to believe that it would be appropriate either to transfer them to the Glasgow site or to expand and possibly duplicate them there.

We recommend that the problems associated with the base closing at Glasgow be dealt with through the normal procedures that the Department of Defense has established for that purpose. The Department has adopted policies to protect displaced career employees involved in base closings and, through its Office of Economic Adjustment, stands ready to work with local groups and officials to establish a single representative organization with which it can work, in advance of the closing date, to develop a plan to mitigate the economic impact of the closings. Federal agencies having programs which could be brought to bear are involved in such planning.

Also, while the Economic Development Administration has advised that the Glasgow closing will probably not qualify Valley County for designation as a redevelopment area under the sudden-rise provisions of the Public Works and Economic Development Act, its technical assistance is available for nondesignated areas found to be in substantial need of such aid.

There was a reminiscent quality about the text of this testimony that recalled a recent document I had read. I found it and invite it to the attention of the Senate. But first a comment as to the origin of the following document.

When Christopher Columbus first suggested to Queen Isabella that a short route to the Indies might be found by sailing west instead of traveling overland to the east, she referred the question to the Spanish Bureau of the Budget. The Senors of the Budget, as it was then called, made a report. The original has been lost, but the custom had already been established that one who proposed some new venture or introduced legislation to be acted upon by the Spanish royal family would get a Thermofax copy of the fifth carbon. It is this copy that was delivered to Columbus himself and accompanied him on all his voyages. Water stained and sun faded for many years it was thought to be indecipherable, but so expert have modern office staffs become in reading illegible material supplied through modern electronic copying machines it was readily transscribed, and the following is a translation:

Your Majesty: One Christopher Columbus has suggested that inasmuch as the world is round it might be possible to sail westward across the ocean beyond the Azores and the Gates of Hercules and find a shorter route to the fabled wealth of the Indies. In accord with standard operating procedure (SOP) you have requested the Senors of the Budget (SOB) for an opinion as to the desirability and feasibility of such a proposal.

In the first place this deals with a matter that can be disposed of purely on a local level. Everyone knows that the world is not round and a brief session with the local Inquisition and application of normal procedures of rack and thumb screw will speedily disabuse Senor Columbo of his mistaken concept.

We are in accord with the desire of your Majesty to find a shorter trading route so that our great nation may benefit from the spice and the gold and the jewels of the Indies. We are in agreement with such objectives and hopes. However, we must point out that there is no evidence that the Indies really exist but in the traveller's tales of one Marco Polo.

This Columbia would have a fleet of three ships to sail westward. At this particular time you must realize that we are busily engaged in assembling an Armada and need every ship available for that purpose. Of course, we don't need to remind you that there is a war on.

But even if the local Inquisition does not convince Senor Columbine of the error of his ways it would nevertheless ~~be~~ impossible to assemble the requisite crew for such an expedition. It is questionable that any seafaring man would be persuaded to accompany the expedition and probably undesirable to ask them to do so because based on past experience we have found that ships that sail into the west fall off the end of the earth and are destroyed and the crews upon them are devoured by monsters that lurk in the void.

We doubt that any economic benefit could come from such an expedition even if the ships and crew were able to escape the almost certain fate that awaits them.

It should be noted that Spain is developing a substantial coastwise trade. That this trade is confined to the Mediterranean and customary procedures should not be violated. Major urban centers such as Lisbon and Barcelona are growing in population and their growth should be encouraged rather than a futile expedition to remote and isolated areas that can never be of any benefit to the glory of Spain. We recommend that Colimbo be encouraged to use his vivid imagination and his experience in seamanship for the greater benefit of Spain by trying to establish a trade route to Lisbon.

The Rich Exploit Poverty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 24, 1967

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, a letter to the editor of the Ponchatoula, La., Enterprise explains quite poignantly why the poverty program is accepted as a farce by the American people.

Does inflation only decrease the buying power of the rich folks dollars? Or, can it be that the poor are too proud to get involved in this flasco.

I include the letter to the editor as part of my remarks in the RECORD.

LETTER TO THE EDITOR

The ENTERPRISE,
Ponchatoula, La.

DEAR EDITOR: As a taxpayer, I feel that it is my duty to let the people of Tangipahoa Parish know my observations of the so-called Floridana Economic Development Association, Inc., 104 South Second Street in Amite.

I invite you to drive down the street and observe the employees through the large open window. Be there around 8:30 a.m. and see how many loyal employees show up on time. Notice the exhibit of new Mustangs, Buicks and Volkswagens that anti-poverty funds purchased.

These cars are parked as closely as possible to the front door. I have observed the office staff daily since January. This is the only office in Amite that exhibits its employees. The last few months have given me the impression that the office staff are continuously engaged in a party.

I've noticed news releases in the paper about programs that are being funded.

Friends, do not be deceived. Ads will be published in the paper for hiring of personnel. Your new director, assistant, and the new secretary are the ones who prepare the ads.

The staff members are selected before the money is funded. "Qualifications of Employment", that is a laugh! If the political front wants you hired, you'll get the job. As a former employee said to me sometime ago, "We achieve our objective, we make the rich richer and the poor, poorer."

The cost program is shared by local people furnishing 20% and the O.E.O., furnishing 80% of any program that is approved. The 80% is paid by you and me, the tax payers.

The 20% local share is very interesting. It is provided with in-kind contributors, such as volunteers, bookkeepers and secretaries. A prominent physician has a wife on F.E.D.A. records as a bookkeeper and the director of one of the poverty programs has a wife listed as a secretary. One of the women has not been in the office this year, and another woman came by one day to eat lunch.

One of the employees is earning $1000.00 per month, plus 10c a mile that he travels, and is currently enrolled as a scholar at SLC.

A few employees are underpaid but most of them are overpaid. A few are paid slightly above or below the poverty yardstick. Only two employees out of 11 meet the poverty requirement.

We need a poverty program, but we need it administered by personnel who have experienced it.

Friends, these are all cold, true facts. Just rear back to your bar stool, whatever your bar stool, whatever the case may be, and listen. One lady working for N.Y.C. has a husband who is vice-president of a bank, and she has two children currently enrolled in N.Y.C. and employed at the Hammond State School.

Don't let anyone shoot you a line about qualifications, just hire a staff of people who need the work.

Go to the F.E.D.A. office, look at the work programs and see who audits the books. The auditor may even tell you who makes the entries in the ledger.

Who knows! this article might help us get a good poverty program that will assist low-income groups. The staff might even try working for their salaries. They might even get to the office at 8:30 a. m.

Go visit the office and look at the Headstart supplies in the store room. I've been told that Lyndon's Headstart Dearies may even enjoy electric choo-choo trains this year.

To round off and make a summary of the whole mess, I see that a bank uses the taxpayers' Xerox machine for a small rental fee. Now, we understand why some banks progress.

An Honest Taxpayer,

Mrs. RUBY B. CORKERN.

Volunteers in the Job Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD M. KENNEDY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 24, 1967

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I invite the attention of Members of Congress to two letters written by Mrs. Colby B. Kalloch, of Eastham, Mass.

Mrs. Kalloch, a grandmother who has "retired" on Cape Cod, writes that when the Wellfleet Job Corps Center was established, she and 70 other retired people found a wonderful opportunity to serve underprivileged American youth by acting in a volunteer capacity. Thus, these boys get additional individual attention, and people like Mrs. Kalloch get the satisfaction of knowing that they have had a very real part in helping these youths become productive citizens. We can see from Mrs. Kalloch's letters that the young men at Wellfleet are deeply appreciative of her efforts on their behalf. Many graduates of the Wellfleet Center keep in touch with her and visit her whenever they can. In Job Corps and Mrs. Kalloch, these boys found someone who cared.

These letters are a heartwarming indication of what the Job Corps can mean both to the deprived youth to whom it gives a new lease on life and to the many citizens who are eager to give their time and services in some useful endeavor. I am very proud both of the Wellfleet corpsmen and of constituents of mine like Mrs. Kalloch. I commend her letters to Members of Congress and ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOING STEADY

EASTHAM, MASS.

On this my second anniversary as a Reader Volunteer at the Wellfleet, Massachusetts Center I want you to know I am "going steady" and enjoying the association.

I am a grandmother and supposed to be "retired" here on lovely Cape Cod. We "retired" (over 70 of us) found a wonderful opportunity to serve our American youth when the center was established here.

We find by teaching a boy on the one-to-one basis instead of the classroom method we get better results. We can help him at the exact moment of doubt or frustration and so clear up his problem, thereby avoiding the buildup of mistake on mistake.

Our greatest reward is to hear a boy say "I can read—how about that?"

I have been at Wellfleet long enough to see many rewarding results. In many cases I keep in touch with boys who have gone from us to Urban Centers, jobs and even overseas to Korea and Viet Nam.

To have a boy write and say he's made P.F.C. in less than seven months and know his pride in himself! Well, if he were your very own you couldn't be happier. The boy in question could not read when he came to us. He is his own man now.

It never ceases to amaze me how many of our graduates think of Wellfleet as "home." Not only do they keep in touch by letter and phone calls, but some have come back to the Cape to visit.

A boy has to know someone cares. At Wellfleet we do care and show it.

A fine program, the Job Corps.

Mrs. COLBY B. KALLOCH.

EASTHAM, MASS.,
April 28, 1967.

Mr. W. P. KELLY,
Director Job Corps,
Washington, D.C.

DEARS SIR: I have had the good fortune to serve as a volunteer reader for the past two years at the Wellfleet Camp.

The point of my writing you is that I appreceiate the fact that the Corpsmen are not always on the receiving end but on the giving.

Just two weeks ago my grandson was in the hospital and there was great concern for his condition. The hospital was in Pittsfield, Mass. I went there to be near him.

I wrote to Mr. Edling to explain why I could not attend a council meeting. He passed my letter on to Mr. A. Brazzell who in turn let the boys know.

The response was very touching.

Cards of "get well" wishes came to Donald in flocks. The most poignant of all was these boys who have so little, took up a collection and had Mr. Brazzell send a check for Don to get something for his comfort. I learned since I returned that several boys offered prayers.

Needless to say I shall never forget the kindness.

Sincerely,

Mrs. COLBY B. KALLSCH.

Legal Services Organization Judged a Success in Indianapolis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 24, 1967

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, nearly 2 years ago this administration continued its efforts to bring equal opportunity to all of our citizens by establishing the legal services program under the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Judging its record of performance, the legal services program is not only one of the newest but it is also one of the most successful of the war on poverty programs.

There are now 290 legal services programs operating in 48 of the 50 States. In the last fiscal year, 340,000 clients received legal services. Federal costs of the programs exceeds $29 million to date.

Perhaps typical of the legal services programs operating throughout the Nation is the one which began about a year ago in Indianapolis and has just been evaluated in a comprehensive article appearing in the Indianapolis News.

The article of July 17, by news reporter Mike Brooks notes that largely because of the legal services program, "No longer is one's right to counsel based solely on the thickness of his wallet. Even the poor—white or black—have such a right."

Because of the importance of the legal services program in the war against legal injustice in Indianapolis and throughout the Nation, under unanimous consent, I insert the Indianapolis News article at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

POOR GET HELP FROM LEGAL GROUP

(By Mike Brooks)

It seems only yesterday that the justices of the United States Supreme Court ruled every American citizen had the right to counsel on his day in court.

And it was only yesterday if one considers that it was in 1963 in Gideon vs. Wainwright that the high court saw fit to recognize a right that became effective in 1791 with the ratification of the U.S. Constitution.

Other landmark decisions have followed Gideon and the ramifications have been great. Today, it is still too early to assess the impact.

But the weight of the decisions on Lady Justice's scales has tipped the legal profession in a new direction.

No longer is one's right to counsel based solely upon the thickness of his wallet. Even the poor—white or black—have such a right.

Last year, according to an American Bar Association report more than 825,000 civil and criminal cases involving the nation's indigent were handled through legal aid and defender offices. Major support for legal aid to the poor came through the Legal Services Program of the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Legal services has funded more than 200 local operations such as the one that is operated in Indianapolis as part of the war on poverty.

Consequently, Gideon vs. Wainwright has opened new doors to the poor right here in Indianapolis.

HOUSE LOOKS LIKE OTHERS

One of those doors is the entrance to a two-story frame house at 1540 English. The house blends well into the neighborhood—it's a part of it. It resembles most of the homes in which Southside residents live.

On the first floor of the house is a neighborhood Community Action Against Poverty office. Upstairs is one of five Legal Services offices in Indianapolis. This one is administered under contract by the Indiana University School of Law, Indianapolis Division, and is known as the Southeast-Southwest Office.

Here the wheels of justice spin. At the helm is a 1933 graduate of Harvard who for 30 years has been a practicing attorney.

His name: Samuel R. Rosen.

His position: Managing attorney.

He says things like, "If we're going to preserve democracy the poor must have representation."

He is aided and guided in his work by Patrick Butler, an I.U. law professor whose specialty is legal aid to the poor.

Also in the office are an investigator, Kenneth Watts; a social service worker, Floyd Elliott; a stenographer, Cynthia Winters, and senior law students, learning to ply their trade in a practical and not just theoretical way.

Rosen and Butler have talked their way to clients—at schools, PTA meetings, churches and to just any crowd that will listen.

TALKS BEGIN TO PAY OFF

The talks are paying off. Last month the office handled 65 new cases.

Only about 10 per cent of the office's clients are Negro, the remainder being white persons of Appalachian backgrounds.

To be eligible for the free legal advice the prospective client must fit the schedule ranging from an individual with an earning power of $2,000 a year or less to a family of eight on an annual income of $6,00 or less.

Most of the cases handled to date are civil actions but the LSO attorneys are on call for criminal cases. Since persons accused of felonies who are poor may have court-appointed defenders in Indiana, criminal action work would be limited to misdemeanors and in felony cases up to the point of arraignment.

LSO HAD BEGINNING PROBLEMS

LSO presented some sticky problems in its infancy two years ago. A New York Times legal reporter wrote: "When a standard (of indigency) is finalized it may find a man with a $7,000 income, a wife and four children, seeking free legal advice from a $6,500-a-year lawyer."

But Rosen points out that LSO "leans over backwards not to compete with the bar." Twenty per cent of the prospective clients that seek LSO help are found to be economically ineligible and are referred to the Legal Aid Society, which in turn secures them an attorney they will pay.

And LSO attorneys—there are 11 in the five LSO offices in Indianapolis—are paid on a scale nearly equal to what law firms in the metropolitan area pay.

With the birth of LSO it was argued that through legal aid societies, defenders' office and by individual practicing attorneys who sought no fee that the poor were being helped. But Trial a magazine of the American Trial Lawyers Association, commented "At best, though, these went little beyond the scratch-the-surface state."

Members of the legal profession now are working with and not against the movement. And as promised by OEO's leader, Sargent Shriver, the independence of attorneys and the traditional lawyer-client relationship are being safeguarded.

The kinds of cases that LSO will handle include almost every conceivable legal problem the poor could encounter from contractual agreements to domestic problems and bankruptcy.

JUVENILE CASES SHOW HIKE

Juvenile cases are increasing, Rosen said, as are marital cases. "This goes with poverty—but we will not go through with a divorce action until the social service worker has talked with both spouses," he said.

"We talk their language—talk on their level," he said.

To a distressed wife whose marital problem may be past the hands of the social worker:

"He is the father of your kids. If we can we'll save him . . . if not, the hell with him and we'll get you the divorce."

"He may or may not be a sadist . . . we'll get him to a psychiatrist."

Rosen readily admits, however, that most of the marital actions are necessary despite the presence of a social service counselor present in only one other LSO office in the country.

The problems of the poor are numerous, he said—lack of money, education, drunkenness, etc.

"We're sticking our fingers in dikes that are leaking in a hundred places and catching only two of them."

OFTEN ONLY REFEREES NEEDED

In many instances, Rosen said, he and his assistants need only to be referees. Despite the many failures, marriage counseling, he feels, is doing the greatest good.

Much of the refereeing is done between neighbors. They get miffed at each other and need only a mediator, rather than court action, to settle their differences.

The majority of the cases being handled by Rosen's Southside LSO office now involve nonsupport actions and custody fights over children.

Much advising is done on sales contracts and on purchases. Many adoption cases are handled along with parental neglect actions in the juvenile court. With increased urban renewal, there has also been an upsurge of cases involving condemnations.

Rosen and Butler both agree that the response of the people has been great. The poor, especially those of Appalachian heritage, are not ones to seek out help. Help must come to them. And once they are convinced such help is a friend and not a foe, they can begin looking to a brighter future.

As part of the war on poverty, legal services, to be sure, is one of the most important community resources.

But even more important, as Rosen says when he talks about preserving democracy, LSO stands as a weapon in the war against legal injustice.

McNamara's Visits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 24, 1967

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "McNamara's Visits: The Record," published in the U.S. News & World Report.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MCNAMARA'S VISITS: THE RECORD

Since the spring of 1962, Defense Secretary McNamara has made nine trips to Vietnam. Here is what he said about the outlook during or following each of those trips:

April-May, 1962: "There is no plan for introducing combat forces in South Vietnam."

He added that he was "Tremendously encouraged" by progress in the war, and saw no reason for a major increase in military aid to the South Vietnamese.

September-October, 1963: Said the White House in a statement following a trip to Vietnam by Mr. McNamara and General Maxwell Taylor, then Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff: "Secretary McNamara and Genreal Taylor reported their judgment that the major parts of the U.S. military task can be completed by the end of 1965, although there may be a continuing requirement for a limited number of . . . training personnel."

December, 1963: Mr. McNamara said he was "optimistic as to the progress that can be made in the coming year."

May, 1964: Mr. McNamara said "excellent progress" had been made toward defeating the Viet Cong.

After reporting to the President, he said it might be necessary to send "certain additional U.S. personnel" to Vietnam, but only to expand the training of South Vietnamese forces.

July, 1965: "The over-all situation continues to be serious," the Secretary reported. "As a matter of fact, in many aspects there has been deterioration since I was here (in Vietnam) last, 15 months ago . . . But the picture is not all black by any means. The Vietnamese people continue to be willing to fight . . . and die in their own defense."

November, 1965: "We have stopped losing the war."

October, 1966: "I see no reason to expect any significant increase in the level or temper of operations in South Vietnam, nor do I see any reason to believe that deployments of U.S. forces to that country will change significantly in the future."

U.S. forces in Vietnam at that time: 331,000. Now: 466,000.

July, 1967: In Vietnam on his ninth trip, the Secretary was quoted by the British news agency Reuters as saying more progress had been made in the war in the last nine months than in the previous six years.

Who Is the Enemy?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 24, 1967

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the double standard of misrepresentation comes into clearer focus. Sooner or later our leaders must make a positive declaration of who the enemy is because their actions belie the common defense and aspirations of our people.

Anti-Communist, progressive, and peaceful Rhodesia receiving no taxpayers aid and threatening no American, we boycott as if at war.

But where at war, in Vietnam—with 12,000 plus of our young men dead—the label of the exercise becomes academic, we not only refuse to call for a boycott or economic sanctions against North Vietnam, we defend the right to trade with our sons murderers. And should one of our fliers happen to bomb a supply vessel our official policy is to apologize and pledge to avoid future "incidents."

Are we not now in concert with our sons murderers?

Mr. Speaker, I insert here in the RECORD the Associated Press release of July 15, 1967:

SOVIETS GET U.S. PLEDGE ON SHIPS

MOSCOW, July 15 (AP).—The United States has promised the Soviet Union it will take "extraordinary measures to minimize damage" to Soviet ships in the Vietnam war zone.

The U.S. Embassy said today that it delivered a note to the Soviet Foreign Ministry on Thursday acknowledging the possibility that some U.S. fire aimed at Haiphong installations had accidentally hit the Soviet ship Mikhail Frunze June 29.

The note added, however, that "the risk of unintentional damage to vessels in the area of hostilities cannot be completely eliminated."

The U.S. note was in reply to a protest filed by the Soviets June 30 demanding "effective guarantees that similar attacks" would not occur and "strict punishment" for the pilots responsible.

The Frunze charge was the second within a month. On June 2 the Soviets claimed that U.S. planes had intentionally attacked the Soviet ship Turkestan off North Vietnam and that one sailor had been killed.

The United States admitted there was a possibility that it had accidentally hit the Turkestan and promised to try to avoid future incidents.

The most recent Soviet protest said a fragmentation bomb had been dropped on the Mikhail Frunze. It did not mention any death or injuries among crew members.

The U.S. reply said an investigation had "established beyond doubt that any damage that may have been sustained was inadvertent."

Headstart Program Gets New Lease on Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 24, 1967

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, we shall be debating in the next few weeks legislation to extend the antipoverty program and its operating agency, the Office of Economic Opportunity. You are all aware that a concerted effort will be made to demolish the Office of Economic Opportunity and parcel out its constituent programs to the various executive departments of Government. This despite the fact that the heads of these departments have unanimously testified before our Committee on Education and Labor that these various programs should remain under the direction of the Office of Economic Opportunity. Among those programs is Headstart. It has come to my attention that associations of school superintendents in some of our States are petitioning their respective Governors to urge that Headstart be transferred to the Office of Education. I do not for a moment question the good faith of the school superintendents in this regard. However, I do think that in making this effort they are ignoring the fact that Headstart is not simply "an educational" program. Headstart is, of course, involved with education, but it has a great many other elements as well, relating to health, parental participation, and other social factors.

I am pleased to place before my colleagues an account of a Headstart program operating in my district in Phillipsburg, N.J. This excellent account was published by the Free Press, a newspaper which has distinguished itself for its enlightened coverage of its circulation area.

The article:

Headstart Program Here Gets New Lease on Life—Parental Participation Increases, Enrollment Shows Substantial Gain

Fresh and vigorous emphasis on parental participation in Project Head Start across the nation has given the local program new life.

Salvatore C. Patti, project director here, reports a dramatic increase in enrollment is a testament to Head Start's value as a phase of the nation's "anti-poverty" program. To support his case he compares statistics of this year and last, his first as project director.

"Last year we were funded to handle about 50 children, and nine showed up the first day," he says. "After some of the teachers and I had gone around and knocked on some doors, we got the enrollment up to between 36 and 40 children." But even then, absenteeism was high. "This year we have about 60 children attending regularly, and if we had the money we could add another class of 15 children." The reason? Parental interest and participation.

"We have 15 mothers assisting as classroom aides," says Patti, "and the value of the program has spread by word-of-mouth."

For persons still unfamiliar with Project Head Start, which is in its third year, it should be explained that the six-week summer program is meant to enrich the cultural, social and educational lives of preschool children from economically disadvantaged homes. The object is to give the children experiences new and otherwise unavailable to them, so they'll begin school on equal footing with others of comparable age but wider experience.

But the children are not the only beneficiaries. "We've shown parents where they could go to get help to help themselves," says Patti. The active interplay between children, teachers and parents has given the local program a new lease on life, and suggests that parental involvement as teacher aides in public schools may be the coming thing.

Being scrubbed from Project Head Start's image is any sign of bureaucratic control. Patti met last week with parents to form a Policy Advisory Committee which will play a lead role in operation and planning of the program. The organizational meeting was postponed until this Wednesday after parents expressed a desire to study the present operation more closely.

The committee could—if parents so arrange its bylaws—assist in program planning, voice or investigate grievances, help prepare applications for federal funds and even influence the appointment of a program director.

Gene Pambianchi, director of Head Start delegated agencies within the Northwest New Jersey Community Action Program's three-county area, reports that the Phillipsburg program is the most advanced as far as parental participation is concerned. Its facilities rank among the least adequate, however.

Those facilities include four classrooms in Reese School and are donated as the town's "in kind" contribution to the program. Bus transportation is supplied by the Phillipsburg Board of Education at cost. Project Head Start's sponsoring agency here is the Department of Public Affairs, one of five town departments. (There are 13 Head Start programs in the NORWESCAP area of Hunterdon, Warren and Sussex counties. Eight are administered by delegated agencies, five are administered by NORWESCAP.)

Attending the surge of parental participation in the local program are other improvements, including baby-sitting services for mothers volunteering as classroom aides and improved kitchen facilities.

While many Head Start agencies saw their budget requests trimmed this year, the Phillipsburg program was one of few to receive an increase—from about $12,000 last year to $17,129 this year.

The staff includes four teachers, four teacher aides, a social worker, a nurse, Patti and more than a dozen volunteers. The ratio of adults to children is one-to-five. And although the program here carries through only six weeks in summer, a conscientious record is kept on each child subsequent to his enrollment in kindergarten. These records disclose that children from economically disadvantaged homes—children who before the advent of Head Start lagged behind their classmates—are now moving into the regimen of classroom life with controlled exuberance, no longer shy and reluctant to participate in class activities.

Not the least of Head Start's contributions is its medical and dental services. Each child is given a thorough medical exam by Dr. Herman Smith, while Dr. Geaton DeMartino performs the dental exam. Like the follow-up on classroom performance, the health services are continued even after the summer program ends. Health defects of all kinds are discovered early in the lives of children because of the exams.

Guidelines for participation in the program as prescribed by the Office of Economic Opportunity and are two in number: first, the child must come from a family with an annual income not exceeding $2,000, with an additional allowance of $500 for each dependent (a family of four, then, may have an income of not more than $3,500); second, the child must be enrolled in kindergarten for the coming school year.

Children attending this summer's session come from not only Phillipsburg, but from neighboring communities as well. Forty-five are transported by bus.

Arriving at 9 a.m., the children are occupied by a "a quiet activity" conductive to settling them after the bus ride or walk to the school. At about 10 a.m., they receive a snack, then two of the four classes repair to either the Reese School play area or the Mercer Street playground, while the other classes participate in the free play, availing themselves of the many toys which have been donated for their use. Later a school activity is supervised. It might include dancing or listening to records, followed by a rest period. At noon, a hot lunch catered by Arthur Tron is served. Patti praises Tron as one who provides bountiful meals which often exceed the local program's budget, the extra expense being absorbed by the local caterer. Arts and crafts follow lunch and continue until the day's session ends at 1 p.m.

Getting underway this week will be field trips meant to broaden the cultural horizons of the children. Trips have been planned—and will be taken, time and budget permitting—to Brensinger Pool, where children will enjoy a picnic; to Trexler Park; to Wild West City, and to the Philadelphia Zoo.

A full understanding of Head Start cannot be gleaned from surface explanation, says Patti. Its implications and its ultimate effects are far reaching, but staff members and volunteers who attended a weeklong breifing prior to the start of this year's program—immersed as they were in the project's conceptual background—were won over completely by experts in social service, psychology, education and medicine. "You had to be there to really understand the dynamism that has gone into Project Head Start," says Patti, who has nine years of teaching experience in the Phillipsburg school system and now teaches economics and driver education at Phillipsburgh High School.

The growth of Project Head Start here indicates that parents of children enrolled in the program place store by it, even if muckrakers don't.

Memorandum on the Current Political Situation in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN G. DOW

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 24, 1967

Mr. DOW. Mr. Speaker, in line with the very close interest that all of us are showing in the forthcoming elections in Vietnam, let me enter in the RECORD a very recent account by a competent observer of how the matter stands through the early part of July.

The report below was made by Robert S. Browne, assistant professor of economics, Fairleigh Dickinson University, Teaneck, N.J., former AID official in South Vietnam, 1958–61. This account makes some penetrating observations. It reflects the fact that the military candidates have a distinct advantage. However, it is clear that substantial sentiment exists for a cease-fire. Whether this sentiment will be allowed full play under circumstances that obtains in the summer and the election is a question. I hope that Americans will exert their influence for a redress of the imbalance which evidently exists between the military and the civilian influences at election time.

I have introduced a resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 412, calling for Congressmen to observe the election process in Vietnam. Professor Browne, toward the close of his report, would seem to discourage such a measure. I still believe that the congressional visit would have merit. Otherwise the sole official American interpretation of the elections will be that of the executive, however sincere. Would it not be better to implement the concept of checks and balances by having a small congressional group in order to assure that one viewpoint only is not related back to us?

Professor Browne's report follows:

MEMORANDUM ON THE CURRENT POLITICAL SITUATION IN VIETNAM

(By Robert S. Browne)

I have just returned from an 11-day visit to South Vietnam. (I was in Vietnam from June 29–July 10). I found the presidential election to be the principal focus of interest at this time, and the political situation to be extremely agitated. The consolidation of the Thieu and Ky tickets was perhaps only the first in a series of political upheavals likely to take place between now and September, when the presidential election is to be held.

On June 30, some 17 electoral tickets were approved by the Constituent Assembly to compete in the presidential race, including the single military ticket of Thieu/Ky. All of these tickets must be subjected to a second approval by the government itself, no later than July 19, and it is expected that some of the tickets will be eliminated at that time. Several of the tickets are of no national significance (although these may not be the ones to be eliminated), the candidates being personalities of strictly local prominence, or totally unknown. In some cases these candidates are believed to have submitted themselves on the instructions of the military government so as to disperse the civilian vote. (A mere plurality, not a majority, is required for election). The major tickets are (1) Thieu/Ky; (2) Tran Van Huong/ Mai Tro Truyen; and (3) Duong Van Minh/ Tran Ngoc Lieng. Probably not a major contender but of very special symbolic importance is the ticket of (4) Au Truong Thanh/ Vu Han Huyen.

Without exception, the Vietnamese seem to view this entire election as an extremely critical event in their country's history, for it *could* provide the *first* popular expression of the true wishes of the Vietnamese people since independence. Such a popular expression is felt to be crucial for it is only through such a response that there is any hope of rallying and uniting the masses of the people—whether for prosecuting the war or for satisfactorily negotiating its conclusion. Since independence, Vietnam has been ruled only by imposed governments or fraudulently elected ones (Diem). As a result there is already great skepticism toward the democratic process and another rigged election would probably kill the tender plant of democracy for the indefinite future while simultaneously assuring a continuance of the apathetic attitude which the people have toward the Saigon governments which speak without a popular mandate. Because they attach so much importance to this election, the Vietnamese are very concerned that it be an election in which the people have faith—i.e., that it be an honest election in every sense of the word. To them it is a slim last chance in a desperate situation.

Unfortunately, the Vietnamese with whom I spoke (of various political persuasions, including several of the candidates themselves) seem to be fairly certain that the opportunity will be muffed, and they largely hold the U.S. to blame. They say it will be muffed because the Thieu/Ky ticket is destined to win—to win not because of any great popularity of Thieu and Ky, but because of the invisible but efficient machine which they have at their disposal to assure their victory. Like President Diem, the military government has a well controlled and greatly feared secret police network which covers the country; most provincial and district chiefs are Thieu/Ky appointees and are either military officers themselves or beholden to the military. As incumbents, Thieu and Ky also have the tremendous resources of the government and of U.S. assistance at their disposition as well as the tacit moral support of the U.S. In the present climate of South Vietnam, any one of these advantages by itself could insure victory—and do so in ways which would not be easily visible to foreign observers. In the current situation, there is hardly need for such crude tactics as switching or stuffing ballot boxes and other detectable malpractices such as were used by President Diem in his stubborn insistence on having 85–95% of the vote. With a dozen or more candidates in the field, the winning ticket will probably need to poll no more than 20% of the votes, although to make the mandate look more impressive, the military is expected to assure itself about 40–50%. (More than 50% would probably be considered too blatant.)

The Vietnamese are desperate at this double prospect (1) that the critical opportunity to assess popular wishes will be missed, and (2) that the unpopular military government will be legitimized in the world's eyesight and condemn Vietnam to more years of inconclusive butchery. Rightly or wrongly, they feel that if this happens, the U.S. will be to blame. Only the U.S. has the power to force the elimination of the military ticket, and the removal of this ticket is widely believed to be the sole means for assuring an honest plebiscite. The present policy of the U.S. Embassy, which is to announce its complete impartiality among the candidates and its intention to keep its hands off the election, is considered to be mere words so long as the military ticket is also the incumbent government and therefore is the direct and sole benefactor of the U.S. support. The inevitable conclusion is that the U.S. is unwilling to risk a fair electoral competition and still prefers to cast its lot with a military solution to the Vietnam war. To the civilian canidates and to most other Vietnamese with whom I spoke, this is a self-defeating policy, for they feel that the military government lacks both the maneuverability and the popular support needed for either a military victory over the Front or for satisfactory negotiations with it.

The Vietnamese readily admit that it is also not easy to create a civilian government with wide popular support, but they feel that it would be criminal to fail to try, for hope lies only with such a government. The consensus seems to be that retired general Duong Van Minh, now in exile in Bangkok, offers by far the best hope for forming such a government. Popular with the army, popular with the Buddhists, (Tri Quang told me that his Buddhists, who have not yet announced whether or not they will boycott the elections, would readily support a popular candidate like Minh if the elections were to be honestly run), and reasonably well thought of in Washington, his major opposition would come from the incumbent military leaders whom he would replace and from some of the right wing Catholics who hold him responsible for Diem's overthrow and death. Presumbaly, he would form a civilian government. Several of the civilian candidates have expressed a willingness to withdraw from the election in favor of Minh if he is permitted to run.

As the major threat to Thieu and Ky, Minh presents a grave dilemma to the military junta. They would like to disqualify him and to keep him in exile. Washington can exert its influence to see that Minh is permitted to return home and to run, just as it could exert its influence to have the Thieu/Ky ticket disqualified so as to offer the nonincumbents a fair competition. The standard Embassy reply to such suggestions is that these are strictly internal questions for the Vietnamese to decide. Embassy spokesmen also delight in pointing out that we do not disqualify incumbent American presidents from campaigning for reelection. This really is no answer at all, because the U.S. is not a police state which confers almost limitless powers into the hands of the government in power. South Vietnam is such a state, and the test of Washington's sincerity in desiring a way out of the Vietnam impasse will depend on its willingness to recognize this reality and not to hide behind inapplicable platitudes.

A word about the candidacy of Au Truong Thanh. One hour before the filing deadline Mr. Thanh, a former minister of Finance and of Economics in the Khanh and Ky governments, filed to run on a bold peace ticket—the "cease-fire" ticket, with a slogan of "no more bombs". This was a daring act in a country which, by its own admission, does not tolerate public talk of neutrality and classifies all anti-war efforts as communist inspired and therefore illegal. Mr. Thanh consciously placed not only his freedom but his very life in great jeopardy by this candidacy. He did so because he felt that peace is the major issue in the election but feared that no one would dare even mention it during the campaign. Mr. Thanh has neither an organization nor funds adequate to get his message around the country, so he does not expect to be a very serious contender. Although he is highly respected in Washington and Saigon as one of South Vietnam's leading economists, he does not have a national reputation. His candidacy is purely symbolic and he might well throw his support ultimately behind another ticket in an effort to unify the country around the most popular candidate. In fact, however, his ticket will likely be eliminated by the government in the July 19th listing on some pretext—probably on charges than Thanh is a tool of the communists.

ACTION

(1) Both to protect Mr. Thanh's life and to encourage those who dare speak out for peace where it is truly dangerous to do so, I would urge all sympathetic Americans to send Mr. Thanh telegrams of support. Address: Mr. Au Truong Thanh, 413/1 Vo Di Nguy, Saigon. He has requested such support.

(2) There is little that the Vietnamese can do to render their elections an honest competition, but there is much that Washington can do. I urge all interested persons and groups to exert whatever pressure they have on Washington (State Department, White House, Congress) to convince it of the importance of using the great power which the U.S. unquestionably has in South Vietnam (a) to see that all candidates, and especially those, such as Minh and Thanh, who are feared by the ruling junta but who perhaps speak most accurately for the Vietnamese masses, are permitted to contest the elections without restrictions, and (b) to see that the built-in advantages which the

Thieu/Ky ticket has are effectively neutralized. Suggested means: Disqualification of the Thieu/Ky ticket; replacement of the incumbent Thieu/Ky government by a provisional government charged with the responsibility of organizing the elections; replacement of General Nguyen Ngoc Loan, the chief of the national police, by someone not beholden to the military junta. (A specific proposal offered by some, but not endorsed by all, of the Buddhist leaders is that the elections be abandoned altogether and a compromise government be set up headed by Duong Van Minh but with the prime ministership given to a pro-junta, pro-American general such as Nguyen Duc Thang or Huynh Van Cao.) Foreign observer teams should definitely not be considered an effective deterrent to election fraud, for the most serious types of fraud are scarcely detectable by foreigners. Some of the candidates even feel such observer teams to be harmful, for they risk giving a stamp of approval where it is totally unmerited.

It is my feeling that it is in America's interest, as well as in Vietnam's, that genuine popular government emerge from these elections, even at the risk that a government with a popular mandate might well have ideas about Vietnam's future which differ from Washington's prescription. One of the fundamental dilemmas which Washington faces in Vietnam is that a Vietnamese government which enjoys sufficiently wide popular support to deal effectively with the NLF either militarily or politically will, by the same token, be in a position to act somewhat independently of Washington. Unsatisfactory as this may appear to our Embassy people, damaging as it may be to their pet projects as well as to General Westmoreland's detailed plans, a Vietnamese-directed show is still a far healthier situation than is the present one and is unquestionably in the best interest of the U.S. when viewed in long range, rather than short range perspective.

NOTE: Subsequent to completion of this memo, I received word that one of the major candidates, Mr. Tran Van Huong, has just pronounced in favor of a cease-fire. Further details not available at this time.

Letters From Average Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. McCLURE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 24, 1967

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. Speaker, I am beginning to get a great deal of mail from people who are not associated with any political or economic group—the persons we speak of when we refer to the average American. Their statements are spontaneous rather than organized, and the message is invariably the same; reduce Government spending, quit coddling the criminal, stop building bridges to the Communist bloc.

Typical of the letters I have received is one that came in last week from constituents of mine in Boise. They say they are not—

Members of any group, just concerned Americans. We are tired of the socialistic, power-grabbing, free-agency thieving type of government we are getting. Please do all you can while in your high position to rectify this tide of brotherly love toward communism and free handouts to those who are too lazy to even seek employment. I think we should take the money from the giveaway programs and return it to the people in the form of tax relief where it can be put to proper use in private enterprise. Thank you from an Idaho voter, Ira C. and Eunice Buchanan.

I think that many of those who hold responsible positions in the Government fail to recognize the depth of the unrest sweeping across this country. Those who so delude themselves are not likely to hold those positions a great deal longer.

Kudos for Transportation Department, Customs, Immigration, and Public Health Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 24, 1967

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, a considerable number of international charter flights were scheduled to use the Long Beach, Calif., airport as port of departure and port of entry this year. Already congested Los Angeles International Airport, 40 minutes away on the freeway, could not handle these flights without considerable delay and inconvenience to passengers. But to use the Long Beach facility required the concurrence of the Customs, Public Health and Immigration Services, each operating as a part of a separate department of the Government. Although these agencies could agree on the matter of processing nighttime arrivals, they could not as to daytime arrivals. Funds available to these services to carry on their responsibilities have been lamentably short in relation to increasing workload caused by burgeoning international traffic.

I called upon Secretary Allan Boyd of the new Department of Transportation to use his good offices to see if, somehow, arrangements could be made and concurrence obtained to meet the needs and convenience of the many hundred international passengers affected. Secretary Boyd immediately responded and assigned the task to his able Assistant Secretary, Donald Agger. Secretary Agger went to work at once with considerable skill and diplomacy. Commissioner of Customs, Lester D. Johnson repsonded with equal skill and alacrity, as did other responsible officials of the Customs Immigration, and Public Health Service both in Washington and southern California. Within the space of 7 short days the necessary road blocks were cleared away and the required arrangement made to process the flights involved.

This is an outstanding example of excellence, understanding, cooperation and leadership on the part of all the fine public servants involved. They deserve the highest commendation and I take this means to offer it to them.

Surgeon General Warns on TV Radiation Dangers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 24, 1967

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, last Friday the Public Health Service, through an announcement by Surgeon General William H. Stewart, makes it abundantly clear that the situation of X-radiation as emitted from some General Electric color television sets is a potential hazard to human health.

We have for 2 months waited for a finding when indeed the problem is much older than that. These General Electric sets were on the market last September and Public Health was supposedly looking into the matter since General Electric brought it to public light in May.

Yet we now find out that these sets have been found to be emitting radiation far above the recommended level, much to the contrary of the May statement from PHS which took a rather casual attitude toward this situation.

A chart enclosed in the Surgeon General's statement showed that out of 185 tubes tested, a major portion of them were found to be emitting X-rays which could produce exposures in excess of limits recommended by the National Council on Radiation Protection and Measurements.

In fact, 11 tubes emitted between 500 and 5,000 milliroentgens per hour, four emitted between 5,000 and 50,000 milliroentgens per hour, and one emitted more than 50,000 milliroentgens per hour. This when the recommended level is 0.05 per hour.

Mr. Speaker, we have neglected this problem far too long already. I hope that our hearings into the situation will result in immediate action by the Congress in passing legislation which I have sponsored along with Congressman JOHN JARMAN, aimed at establishing safe levels of radiation and procedures to make sure that no products violate these levels. I would also like to include for the RECORD the statement issued by the Surgeon General.

The statement follows:

About 9,000 General Electric large-screen color television receivers which may be leaking excessive amounts of X-radiation have not been located for modification despite intensive search by the company's distributor-dealer service organization, Surgeon General William H. Stewart of the Public Health Service reported today.

"Tests made in laboratories of the National Center for Radiological Health suggest that a large percentage of the receivers not yet located for correction by the company leak X-rays at levels representing a potential hazard to human health," Dr. Stewart said.

Corrections have been made in more than 90 percent of the approximately 112,000 receivers which were in the hands of dealers and customers when the company discovered that some sets were leaking X-rays from shunt regulator tubes, Dr. Stewart said.

The receivers in question are large-screen color consoles and table models purchased between September 1, 1966 and May 31, 1967.

Small-screen color and black and white receivers are not involved.

"Persons who purchased their large-screen General Electric color television receivers between September 1, 1966 and May 31, 1967 and whose sets have not been corrected, should disconnect the sets and immediately notify a General Electric dealer or service agency or, in the event neither can be reached readily, their State or local health departments," Dr. Stewart said.

General Electric's entire distributor-dealer organization and about 80,000 independent service men were mobilized to locate and correct receivers without charge in owners' homes as soon as company tests revealed X–ray leakage. An incentive program was initiated to accelerate the set correction effort.

"We feel that the company has done an outstanding job in correcting these sets," Dr. Stewart said.

The National Center for Radiological Health has tested 185 tubes of the type associated with the radiation. A major portion of the tubes was found to emit X–rays which could produce exposures in excess of limits recommended by the National Council on Radiation Protection and Measurements.

DISTRIBUTION OF X-RADIATION MEASUREMENTS FROM SHUNT REGULATOR TUBES FOR COLOR TELEVISION RECEIVERS

Radiation level[1]	Test sample 6EF4 tubes		Test sample 6LC6 tubes		Total test sample	
	Number of tubes	Percent	Number of tubes	Percent	Number of tubes	Percent
Less than 0.5[2]	4	4	38	43	42	23
0.5 to 5	28	29	35	39	63	34
5 to 50	30	31	16	18	46	25
Above 50	[3] 34	36	0	0	34	18
Total	96	100	89	100	185	100

[1] Values shown are readings in milliroentgens per hour taken 9 inches below the base of the tube by an end window geiger probe calibrated to X-ray energies. Tubes provided by the General Electric Co.

[2] In July 1960, the National Council on Radiation Protection and Measurements recommended "that the exposure dose rate at any readily accessible point 5 cm. from the surface of any home television receiver shall not exceed 0.5 mr. per hour under normal operating conditions."

[3] 16 of 34 tubes emitted greater than 500 mr./hr.; 11 tubes emitted between 500 and 5,000 mr./hr.; 4 tubes emitted between 5,000 and 50,000 mr./hr.; 1 tube emitted greater than 50,000 mr./hr. Results obtained using calibrated film technique.

The School Board and Program Evaluation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GUY VANDER JAGT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 24, 1967

Mr. VANDER JAGT. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased and proud to insert in the RECORD a paper by Mrs. Joanne Harvey, treasurer of the Board of Education of Cadillac, Mich. Mrs. Harvey is a leader in education, and she has devoted much of her time and effort to problems in education, not only in Cadillac, but in the entire State of Michigan. The paper that was recently presented during the National School Boards Association's Annual Conference in Portland, Oreg., follows:

THE BOARD AND PROGRAM EVALUATION

(By Joanne Harvey)

"Education will make progress to the extent to which it utilizes and is guided by the results of evaluation."

Historically, evaluation of the education program has been a recognized problem from the earliest days of American Education. From early Colonial time to the present day, attempts to judge the success of the schools have been made. Just twenty-two years after the first Colonial settlement, the General Court of Massachusetts showed its concern for the adequacy of the education which the children of the Colony were receiving. "This Cort taking into consideration the great neglect of many parents and masters in training up their children in learning and labor . . . do hereupon order and decree, that in every town ye chosen men appointed for managing the prudentiall affaires of the same shall henceforth stand charged with the care of the redress of the evill to take account from time to time . . . expecially of their ability to read and understand the principle of religion and the capitall laws of this country." Although this decree referred to the most common type of education in the colony—that done by parents and employers—it demonstrated a number of very basic evaluative principles. First, responsibility was placed squarely on the shoulders of the elected representatives of the people. Second, these representatives were to "take account" periodically; and, third, these representatives were to judge the status of the children on the basis of clearly defined objectives—the ability to read, and the ability to understand religion and the law. These same principles hold equally true today. We, as board members, are ultimately responsible for the caliber of education in our district, we must "take into account from time to time" and we must evaluate on the basis of clearly defined objectives. And the hardest to achieve of these of the clearly defined objectives.

Who is it that determines the objectives of our schools? A generation ago this was a relatively simple problem, but today there are many forces, both good and not-so-good, that are pushing and tugging at the schools: Russia's startling technological advances; Conant's study of the American high school and junior high; books of doubtful bases such as Bell's *The Crisis in Education* or Smith's *And Madly Teach;* commercial suppliers of school materials out with a hard or soft sell for hardware or software; foundation executives; and, probably most important, the multitude of government programs. How schools are to cope with the increasingly more potent role that the federal government is playing in determining the goals of the school is the subject for a Special Interest Clinic by itself. At the recent AASA Convention Harold Spears, San Francisco superintendent and outgoing AASA president, discussed the national theme or directives that schools have little choice but to follow. He cited the 1955 *Johnny Can't Read* emphasis, followed by the gifted, then compensatory education, and, now, quality education. Spears said, "In spite of our pride in being a nation with no centralized system of education, in each of these instances we have dropped local curriculum planning to follow a national theme . . . In no time at all, with no official directive, we are jigging to the same tune, improvising curriculum like made until the new beat comes through."

Today schools are continuously being asked or urged to expand their activities into areas which are not primarily educational. We teach the children manners and morals because some homes do not want to teach them; we give children hot lunches because many mothers are not home at noon; we are urged to straighten out, through our guidance counselors, family problems adversely affecting the children. We serve as fund raisers for worthwhile charities; as recreation directors to keep children out of mischief after school hours; as insurance agents for health and accident insurance; and as a distribution center for everything from fire prevention literature to the bible. We constantly receive requests for students to participate in American Legion poster contests, Jaycee oratorical contests and a host of other pet projects. I do not mean to imply that this is all bad, some of it is very worthwhile, but the net result is that the school day becomes so filled with extraneous matters that the teachers have a difficult time doing the teaching they were hired to do. To avoid this, the board must do some hard-headed thinking and take a firm stand on what it decided are its responsibilities and objectives—always keeping in mind the needs of the community and the resources available to the board.

We as school board members are, by definition, lay members of the community we serve. We are not trained specifically for the jobs we hold and we often have professional or vocational backgrounds far removed from public education. Yes, since ours is the responsibility to evaluate the educational program, we must do our homework with real dedication and keep informed about educational philosophy and new trends. A board member must understand what constitutes a good program, otherwise he will have no standards against which to judge the existing program. We must be familiar with many aspects of our own school systems of which we previously had only cursory knowledge. The board member must be prepared to consider with an open mind, the recommendations of the professionals in his school district regarding the school program. Unless we as board members are willing to do these things, we will lose control of our local school systems.

Since boards are placed in the position of evaluating the evaluation done by its professional staff, it is important that boards understand certain basic facts regarding evaluation. First, we should never lose sight of the fact that the primary function of evaluation should be stimulation for improvement of instruction. One educational writer has made the following eight points concerning evaluation: it should be systematically planned; appropriate to the philosophy, objectives and environmental factors of the individual schools; should use sound criteria; should use a variety of evaluative methods and devices; be as objective as possible; a continuing process; and, most importantly, involve participation in appropriate ways by all who are effected by it.

One device often misused in evaluation is student results on standardized tests. Standardized test results should be used as a measure of growth rather than a status symbol. It has been proven that such tests have little value in distinguishing between a superior and an inferior school. Test results should be viewed in terms of individual growth patterns and capacities so that the problem of underachievement can be helped. An education writer has said, "the success of an education system can, or should, no longer be measured in terms of the number who pass or fail in examinations, but by the degree to which it has been able to discover the abilities and needs of pupils and has provided for them the type of education from which they are capable of profiting."

Another method used in program evaluation is the involvement of citizen committees. Many communities have found that participation by lay groups in the study and evaluation of education programs has contributed much to community understanding of educational needs and willingness to support education. Such participation must be handled judiciously and should serve to educate the public to modern educational practices and to the extent to which lay members may make a valuable contribution to education. Certain areas lend themselves well to lay participation: guidance services, health services and school plant, to name a few. Also, specific curriculum areas can lend themselves to study and evaluation by lay citizens whose vocation or avocation involve specific skills taught by the schools; for example, the industrials arts program, business and secretarial skills program, and the music and art programs. Of course, the pitfall here is that some of these people look at the field rather narrowly and want undue emphasis put on their particular interest or skill. Frankly, it's when the results of evaluation are apt to lead to increased school taxes, that most boards strive for the greatest citizen involvement.

Still another technique used in program evaluation is the employment of an outside agency or university to conduct an evaluation. In my personal opinion this should be used only rarely. If the purpose of evaluation is to bring about change, and I believe it is, the people that will be affected by any change should be involved in the study and formulation of recommendations. An outside specialist used as a consultant to a faculty and/or citizens committee, excellent. In fact, sometimes very necessary to avoid a compounding-of-ignorance. But to do all the work and make final recommendations, no.

The board's role in program evaluation, in my opinion, should be prodders, synthesisers, interpreters and climatizers. Prodders of the staff and administration who often hesitate to modify a program or introduce new methods for fear the community is not ready for change. Synthesisers of the ideas of the staff, the community and the educational innovators. Interpreters between the community and staff, receiving many of the pressures from each group and interpreting fairly each group's ideas and positions to the other. And, finally, climatizes in the most important role is to create a climate that encourages study, analysis and change.

In conclusion, let me state that there is no best way to evaluate a program or a school. Communities differ. People differ. Boards of education differ. And school problems differ. Each board, administration and faculty, working with parents and pupils, must determine the most appropriate organization for self study and evaluation. It is said that the discontented are the ones who make the world progress. Let us out of our discontent strive to improve the educational program in our district, in America and in the world.

On Second Thought

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 24, 1967

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include herewith a short statement from the front page of the Carthage, Mo., Evening Press for July 14, 1967, wherein master farmer Gene Poirot sums up succinctly and analytically our current farm dilemma. His feature, "On Second Thought," quite often appears in his hometown paper, is self-explanatory, and is submitted for the consideration of all who represent producers, agribusiness, and consumers:

ON SECOND THOUGHT

(By Gene Poirot)

The president's science advisory committee of more than 150 members say in three volumes that the world food problem disaster already started can be reduced by:

1. Returning fertility to cropland. "Cropland restoration."
2. Irrigation. "Water conservation for irrigation."
3. Better seeds, insecticides, etc. "The science of agriculture measured by growing a suitable crop."
4. A market incentive to grow more than just farm family subsistance. "A second market pegged at a minimum wage fair price."

The quotations are from Congressman Hall's bill HR10742. It says our farm problems can be solved by offering the farmer a second market, cropland restoration and water conservation for irrigation at a fair price when proven by growing tons of a suitable crop according to the science of agriculture. After more than one year's study the President's Panel of Scientists approved these basic principals on a world wide basis.

War Against the Farmer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT V. DENNEY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 24, 1967

Mr. DENNEY. Mr. Speaker, as the representative of the First Congressional District in Nebraska, I am particularly proud and privileged to have a large number of farmers in my constituency. I have long been very impressed with the contribution that rural communities make to our total American society. Foremost among these contributions is the belief that a man should be mainly self-sufficient.

It is therefore very distressing to witness the plight of the farmers in my district and in America. War has been declared against poverty, crime and rats by the Johnson administration.

Now, sadly, it appears that President Johnson and Secretary Freeman have declared war against the farmer.

A constituent's views are always strongly considered in my office. Recently, I received the views of a farmer from a very productive area in my district. It is on farmers like this one that our Nation's agricultural strength is firmly based. I include the text of his letter in the RECORD at this point:

> How do you think a farmer lives? Hard work and no food? Machinery is too high and livestock and grain too low. Livestock should be kept up all the time. Why is everyone *trying* to push a small farmer off the farm? He could be the happiest person if prices were good enough so he could live decent without high land taxes and income tax. When will all this end? We will be next to leave the farm. Wages in town are good but farm prices are always low. Why did food stores go up again? *Our prices didn't.*

Mr. Speaker, our Nation runs the risk of losing the stability and self-sufficiency that our farmers have afforded us. We must come to their assistance. If we do not, the road ahead for the farmer now caught in the price-cost squeeze must be in one of two directions: A losing of his self-sufficiency and the subsequent heavier dependence on governmental programs or moving to the urban centers and adding to their congestion and complexities.

Conference Report on Senate Joint Resolution 81—Providing for Settlement of Railroad Labor Dispute

SPEECH

OF

HON. HERVEY G. MACHEN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 24, 1967

Mr. MACHEN. Mr. Speaker, this House has passed the rail strike legislation which it had earlier rejected.

I voted for the bill. At this point, I could see no other choice. However, I think it was proper for the majority of this body to have rejected the same legislation earlier, for we had every right to expect reason and responsibility from the bargaining parties. We know now that this was not the case.

The effects of the strike were quickly felt. Beginning late Saturday night, paralysis spread quickly throughout the Nation's rail network, and by Monday morning the work stoppage's potential for creating economic havoc was evident. It also became increasingly clear that it posed a threat to the national security.

Conditions imposed by the strike were more than inconvenient for commuters and other passengers. In the Washington area alone, some 5,000 commuters were stranded, and the nearly 30,000 rail passengers who normally use Union Station on weekends were fighting for already overloaded airplane, bus, and highway facilities. Mail service across the Nation was sharply curtailed, and industry was girding itself for a severe economic shock.

The Secretaries of Defense and Transportation calculated the danger posed to the war effort in Vietnam, and the possibilities of substitute modes of freight transport. They estimated that over 40 percent of the freight shipped by the Department of Defense, excluding petroleum products transported by pipeline, is moved by rail.

During the first 9 months of fiscal year 1967, Defense rail shipments totaled 5.4 million tons. This came to about 20,000 tons or some 625 carloads per day and traffic scheduled for the next few weeks was estimated to reach over 3,000 carloads; all in ammuntion, weapons, vehicles, rations, and other supplies for our men in Vietnam.

Secretary of Transportation Alan S. Boyd, declared that a system of priorities for freight shipments and efforts to use other forms of transport would not suffice. He said that the other modes could be expected to absorb only 10 percent of the normal rail traffic at best, and traffic was expected to be heavier than usual.

In these circumstances, with the Nation's rail traffic ground to a virtual halt, crops threatened with spoilage, industries threatened with shutdowns, and supplies and ammunition for our men in Vietnam stalled in transit, we had no choice but to take immediate action to end the strike.

As a conscientious member of the House Committee on Armed Services, my choice was clear. Having on one occasion voted to authorize funds, and later to appropriate the funds to sustain the men we have committed to war, I could not on another, ignore conditions which would deprive them of material support. We had to act.

The question is why was this thrust so precipitously upon the Congress? The answer lies in the threefold impasse which had plagued these negotiations from the start.

First there was the virtual breakdown of collective bargaining. A small segment of labor, some 40,000 workers out of over 500,000 railroaders, refused to temper its demands, in the hopes of Government seizure to prevent the effects of a strike. Management was unconcerned about the wage demands, had applied to the ICC for rate increases to cover anticipated costs, and sat back, in the words of newspaper columnist Joseph Kraft, "hardly engaging in collective bargaining at all." They wanted Congress to impose a permanent system of compulsory arbitration which would eliminate their responsibility to engage in collective bargaining.

Second, I must say quite candidly that there was a stalemate in the Congress. There were those who adamantly stuck to the administration's proposal for a one-shot emergency compulsory arbitration bill—there is no other word for it. This became the Senate version of the bill.

The House measure omitted the provision of compulsory arbitration for a final settlement, and when the bill went to conference, the Senate refused to budge; knowing full well that the rail strike which loomed on the horizon would create sufficient pressures to ram the Senate version through the House.

A number of my colleagues have commented on this, both in the Chamber and in private. Of course, we harbor no bitterness, but to my way of thinking this method of handling the matter left much to be desired.

It just was not right. A bill which a majority of my distinguished colleagues had seen fit to support was not given due consideration.

In the end, the Members of this great legislative body deferred to the Senate when there was no alternative—for certainly some legislation was preferable to none. We upheld the national interest. Surely this act of statesmanship was the highest form of honor to ourselves as legislators, and to the dignity of the House.

Third, the most disconcerting, was the absence of permanent legislation which could have been applied to the labor-management dispute. Surely, the President's state of the Union message in 1966 gave us reason to expect comprehensive and permanent legislation on the problem. With all appreciation of the necessarily complicated features of such a proposal, I must express deep concern that the measure has not been forthcoming.

In summary, the present act provides no permanent solution. It is not even the best short-term one, for it imposes wage restraints on the workers without touching the profits of the railroads. Thus it would tend, over a prolonged period, to favor one side in the dispute over the other.

It should be noted here that this does not imply any personal preference on my part for the position of either party to the dispute. My only concern is for the basic concept of fairness in the settlement of industrial disputes which has become so deeply embedded in our tradition of free collective bargaining. Certainly we must preserve this system, and in cases involving the national security if we do intervene, we must keep in mind the essence of its evenhandedness.

Let us not lose sight of the continuing need for legislation which will either safeguard the public interest in collective bargaining, or provide a system of arbitration which would artificially induce the conditions of a strike on both bargaining parties, while maintaining rail service.

Is Tax Rise Inevitable?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 19, 1967

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, in the July 13 edition of the Paterson, N.J., News, an editorial comment appeared on the question of tax increases this year.

Under unanimous consent, I include the editorial, "Is Tax Rise Inevitable?" in the Record at this point:

IS TAX RISE INEVITABLE?

The two ways to look at that "inevitable" federal tax rise have been sketched by the political partisans in this field.

Gardner Ackley, chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, says the tax rise is inevitable to avoid high interest and inflation. Melvin R. Laird, chairman of the House Republican Conference, says it's inevitable because the President asked and got a $22 billion raise in the national debt ceiling, to lay the base for the deficit spending that will necessitate a tax rise.

However, we want to argue the fact that the tax rise is not yet inevitable. Not only were the House Republicans unanimously against raising the national debt ceiling, but many Democrats joined them in their demand that the President cut domestic spending to a point where a huge boost in the debt ceiling would have been unnecessary. Also, Chairman Wilbur Mills of the tax-writing House Ways and Means Committee, warned that his support of any income tax boost would be conditioned on a corresponding decrease in non-defense spending and reliable showing that the economy can stand an income tax increase.

The proposal for a tax increase has lain dormant while the economy was expected to boom the second half of the year. The boom has not yet materialized, but the Administration is beating the drums for the increased taxes nonetheless. It behooves taxpayers to support the demand for cuts in spending first, else they will wind up this year not with a six per cent surtax to pay for the war in Vietnam, but an even bigger tax for the huge expenditures at home.

Remarks of Vice President Hubert Humphrey at Desalinization Plant Dedication, Key West, Fla., July 20, 1967

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 24, 1967

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, our energy-filled, dedicated Vice President, Hubert H. Humphrey, has again given of his tremendous abilities in dedicating the Westinghouse Desalinization Plant at Key West, Fla. Westinghouse and the Vice President are to be congratulated for their part in this historic event.

This is another example of 'industry and government cooperation to build a better America. This is the first time a U.S. municipality has looked to the sea for its entire supply of fresh water. President D. C. Burnham and his Westinghouse team should be saluted for this pacesetting step forward and I commend this speech for all to share, as follows:

REMARKS OF VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT HUMPHREY, AT DESALINIZATION PLANT DEDICATION, KEY WEST, FLA., JULY 20, 1967

I am happy to be here with you today to join in the dedication of this magnificent new desalting plant.

And I am privileged to bring you this special message from the President:

"The dedication of Key West's new desalting plant is an event of historical significance. The occasion marks the first time that a U.S. municipality has turned to the sea for its water supply. The plant to be placed in operation today incorporates the latest technology that scientists and engineers from both Government and industry have been able to devise. Through their wise application of new technology, the citizens of Key West will have their own local supply of fresh water, at a fair and economical cost.

"Your new plant represents more than just the sweet taste of clear water for an entire local community. It is also a splendid example of Federal, State, and private industrial cooperation to meet the needs of our people. Other nations will also look to this plant as a prototype to help advance their own technology in the urgent search for a low cost supply of fresh water.

"While this is the first municipal sea water conversion plant in the United States, inland communities are already desalting brackish water and putting it to use. Before this decade is ended, I am confident that desalting plants will have greatly increased the quantity and quality of fresh water in the United States and around the world. The operation of this fine new plant thus marks a turning point in mankind's desperate need for vast new sources of life-sustaining water. I extend my best wishes to the citizens of the State of Florida, the people of Key West and the members of the Florida Keys Aquduct Commission for their demonstrated leadership in this practical and history-making achievement."

Ladies and gentlemen, this is indeed a happy occasion for Key West, for the Florida Keys Aqueduct Commission, and for the Westinghouse Electric Corporation.

The plant we are now dedicating is the largest single-unit desalting installation in the world today.

It represents a giant step forward in a brand new technology which is destined, I believe, to yield benefits for mankind at least as great as those bestowed by the development of electricity.

As Chairman of the National Council on Marine Resources and Engineering Development, I have kept in close touch with progress in the desalinization field. It has been nothing less than sensational.

Indeed, Mr. Koenig, the very name of your Commission is a measure of the pace of this progress. When it was established a few years ago, people were still thinking in terms of aqueducts, a technological concept thousands of years old.

Today, that Commission is engaged in doing what once occurred only in miraculous legends—bringing forth fresh water from the sea.

The need for new sources of fresh water is acute and increasing all over the world today.

Right here in the United States there are more than a thousand communities making do with brackish water which is hardly fit either for human consumption or for industrial use.

Still more communities experience frequent water shortages from natural causes—droughts or storms like Hurricane Donna, which disrupted your water supply in 1960.

Here we see the beginnings of a whole new industry, serving an immense market—and, I understand a highly competitive one.

As a staunch believer in our free enterprise system, I welcome this competition. I say—let all companies interested in this field compete, and compete vigorously. That is the way the interests of the nation will best be served.

This plant gives Key West a great distinction. But I urge you to enjoy that distinction while you can, because there are much bigger things to come.

There is already planned, for 1973—just six years from now—a desalting plant off the coast of California that will deliver 150 million-gallons of water a day. It will use nuclear power, and will generate great quantities of electricity as well.

The experts tell us that by 1980—only 13 years way—we will have nuclear-powered plants capable of turning out a billion gallons of fresh water daily, at a cost of 10 cents per gallon.

This is good news for America. Our water consumption is increasing so rapidly that by the 1980's we may have reached the limits of dependable water supply from traditional sources.

This nation has taken the lead in the field of desalinization, a fact of which we can all be proud.

And we can be especially proud that we have determined to share this life-giving technology freely with other nations.

President Johnson has many times reaffirmed his determination that, "We here will do our share, and do more, to see that the peaceful promise of nuclear energy is applied to the critical problem of desalting water and helping to make the desert bloom."

We are, for example, currently engaged together with Mexico and the International Atomic Energy Agency in a joint study for a nuclear-powered fresh water and electricity plant. It will serve the needs of California and Arizona, north of the border, and Sonora and Lower California south of it.

Water—and the need for water—overflows all ideological barriers.

The United States and the Soviet Union, under an agreement recently renewed, have exchanged information and experts in this field.

A "Water for Peace" Conference held in Washington this spring was attended by 64 hundred delegates and observers from 94 nations.

We are establishing, in the Department of State, a Water for Peace Office to lead and coordinate this nation's efforts for worldwide progress in the development of pure water resources.

The need is everywhere, but particularly in the developing countries. Paul Hoffman, who heads the United Nations Development Program, has said:

"At least 60 of the under-developed countries and territories associated with the United Nations face forms of water shortage which in time can only be met from non-traditional sources: That is, from brackish and salt-water sources.

Water shortage in these countries, where the vast majority of the people live on the land, means that tens of millions of potentially fertile acres can not be tilled.

It means that oppressive landlord-peasant relationships are inescapable—that millions of humble cultivators cannot experience the pride of tilling their own farms.

And it means starvation.

But consider this exciting possibility: Economical nuclear desalting on a large scale produces, as a byproduct, vast quantities of electricity.

In many arid regions, there is at present no market for this electricity. But the production of fertilizer, another essential ingredient for successful agriculture, requires a great deal of electrical energy.

Our Atomic Energy Commission is therefore considering a comprehensive plan for the establishment of massive multi-purpose atomic energy centers which would produce both fresh water and fertilizer, as well as other chemicals.

The electricity could also be used for pumping and as power for other industrial enterprises.

This idea is only in its initial stages. But at the present rate of technological progress, multipurpose atomic energy centers will be a practical possibility by 1975 or 1980.

Bold programs such as this could convert the semi-arid regions of the world into flourishing agricultural *and* industrial areas, providing food, employment and prosperity for millions of people.

In a world fraught with tension, the new technology of desalinization provides a beacon of hope. For it is truly a technology of peace. It has no military application whatsoever.

It can be used only for the fulfillment of age-old human needs, and therein lies its revolutionary promise.

Trenton Dropout Wins Scholarship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 24, 1967

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, as we all know, it is always open season 12 months out of the year for the antipoverty program. The critics bombard us with accounts of its alleged shortcomings. Seldom, if ever, do they advance accounts of its successes. Therefore, it gives me great preasure to place before my colleagues an article from the Trenton Evening Times from July 18 which tells a heartening story of two youngsters who were motivated by their experience in the Neighborhood Youth Corps to return to school and who are now headed for college.

The article is as follows:

FOR "UPWARD BOUND" PROGRAM: TRENTON DROPOUTS WIN SCHOLARSHIPS

Two Trenton youths who dropped out of school, joined the Neighborhood Youth Corps and are on their way to college are now winners of scholarships awarded by the Almeta Lexine Club.

The boys, James York, 20, of 29 Sheridan Avenue, and Ervan Cheek, 17, of 38 Oak Street, have received the scholarships to help them attend Upward Bound programs this summer at Princeton University and Trenton State College.

Mrs. Louis Meyers, chairman of the club made up of neighborhood women, said the scholarships will enable the youths to attend the Upward Bound programs without any financial loss to their families.

The scholarships will supplant the money the youths would have earned in the Neighbor-six-week Upward Bound programs.

Upward Bound is a program that attempts to combine educational and physical training projects to develop the leadership ability of city youths.

York dropped out of 10th grade at Trenton High School several years ago. But as a member of the neighborhood Youth Corps, he earned his high school equivalency diploma and scored high in college tests.

Cheek is still working on his high school equivalency but is expected to enter Mercer County Community College in the fall.

The Almeta Lexine Club is a group that works social and charitable projects. The money for the scholarships was raised at a benefit concert given by Peg Leg Bates.

Department of Transportation Appropriation Bill, 1968

SPEECH

OF

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 18, 1967

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 11456) making appropriations for the Department of Transportation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, I want to express my support for the Department of Transportation appropriation bill before us today. I would also like to offer my sincere commendations to the Transportation Subcommittee chaired by the distinguished Representative from Massachusetts, the Honorable EDWARD P. BOLAND.

Being from the east coast, I know only too well the pathological state in which our railroads currently find themselves. As megalopic replaces metropolis, our urban mass transit systems are fast becoming inadequate and obsolete. Also, the increased volume of air traffic is fast rendering our airports incapable of carrying their heavy load. All these problems are very complex and of great moment. The cohesive coordination of our transportation facilities and the well-focused attempts to relieve the difficulties we face is a highly important job.

The Department of Transportation has done well in working towards this, during its first year of operation.

Safety and efficiency in the operation of our mass transport network are criteria that transcend dollar outlays. This coupled with the reasonable nature of the request and the coherent and responsible manner of presentation, lead me to lend my support to this bill.

President Johnson's Predictions About Medicare Come True

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 24, 1967

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. One year ago, President Johnson declared a bill of rights for older Americans. "Let us start here and now," he declared, "to build a new ideal of what ought to be the meaning of growing old. Let us here proclaim a bill of rights for older Americans. Let us make it our guide in the years ahead."

Today, 1 year later, one of the most vital programs to insure this bill of rights—medicare—celebrates its first birthday. This program, passed by the 89th Congress after a 21-year battle, became a reality for 19 million older Americans on July 1, 1966.

The successful fight waged by President Johnson and his administration for this program was based on the fact that half the aged couples in American and almost four out of every single aged American who were hospitalized before medicare, incurred medical costs in excess of $1,000.

What this means to an ill senior citizen is demonstrated by statistics that show 3 million elderly couples have incomes of less than $3,000 a year; 1.9 million couples live on less than $2,500 a year; and nearly 6 million individuals live on less than $1,800 a year.

The President, those of us in the Congress, and the thousands of elderly Americans who desperately sought medicare were continually rebuked by those who issued dire warnings that this program would "ruin" the medical profession, would create chaos and overcrowded hospital conditions, and would generally spell disaster for the free enterprise system.

Today, we can assess these warnings for what they were: Empty propaganda. Medicare has worked, and worked very well indeed.

As the Catholic Standard noted in a recent editorial:

> Of course, there has been an increase in hospital usage among the elderly. But the increase has been within reasonable limits. Statistics show that there has been an increase of 15 to 20 percent in hospital use by those qualifying under Medicare, but this has resulted in less than a 5 percent increase in total hospital use.

The editorial continues:

> The first 12 months of Medicare have yielded some very impressive statistics. Four million persons have benefited from in-patient hospital services. For these services, $2.4 billion has been paid to hospitals and 25 million doctor bills amounting to $640 million, have been paid . . . The remarkable success of Medicare in the first year is a source of hope and inspiration to all Americans.

Yes, the voices of the doubters have been silenced. Medicare has proven to be what President Johnson predicted it would become: A major source of help and security for older Americans and a shining example of America's quest to become a truly enlightened humane society.

Under unanimous consent I insert into the RECORD this excellent editorial from the Catholic Standard:

> ONE YEAR OLD
>
> This past week Medicare observed its first birthday in a very quiet manner. When it began just one year ago, the atmosphere was not quite the same. Opponents of the medicare program were predicting that so many people over 65 years of age would rush to the hospitals for free service that hospital care would inevitably break down. There were even hints that Medicare would quickly ruin the medical profession in the United States.
>
> Of course, there has been an increase in hospital usage among the elderly. But the increase has been within reasonable limits. Statistics show that there has been an increase of 15 to 20% in hospital use by those qualifying under Medicare but this has resulted in less than a 5% increase in total hospital use.
>
> The first 12 months of Medicare have yielded some very impressive statistics. Four million persons have benefited from in-patient hospital services. For these services, $2.4 billion has been paid to hospitals and 25 million doctor bills' amounting to $640 million, have been paid. Medicare also has played an important role in integration. Intergration as required under the Civil Rights Act of 1965 must be in effect in a hospital before it can benefit from Medicare. Medicare also has enabled Negro doctors to serve in hospitals where they can qualify.
>
> No doubt there are faults in Medicare. Perhaps the program demands too much paper work. It may demand too much of certain hospitals. But these are small worries when we consider that millions of Americans are getting quality medical care, many of them for the first time in their lives. The remarkable success of Medicare in the first year is a source of hope and inspiration to all Americans.

No Conflicts When Pollution Reduction Is the Goal

SPEECH

OF

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 19, 1967

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, last week in the Wall Street Journal, July 17, and in U.S. News & World Report, July 24, I noticed a couple of articles dealing with possible remedies for automotive exhaust pollution.

The Journal reports on a rumor circulating in Detroit that General Electric is quietly at work on developing a marketable electric car. U.S. News & World Report suggests, on the other hand, that conventionally propelled autos are far more obsolete, and that various new engines and gasoline mixtures will make the electric car unnecessary.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that we in Congress should applaud all efforts that free enterprise makes in helping solve our very great air pollution problems. It does not seem that there is an irreconcilable conflict, in my estimation, between conventionally powered cars and electric cars—or even fuel-cell propelled vehicles. Rather, it is imperative that all companies involved continue their assiduous efforts to decreasing the amount of pollutants discharged by our motor vehicles.

Thus far, the bulk of criticism directed at electric cars has been that their range is not far and that they need constant battery recharging. It appears, however, that—at least according to the rumors circulating about the General Electric car—speeds of up to 90 miles per hour and ranges of more than 200 miles before the power source needs recharging would be feasible. According to the Journal, General Electric is currently dismissing these rumors, but "Detroiters insist GE's disclaimers are a lot of hogwash."

If GE is on the verge of a technological breakthrough in producing a marketable electric car, then I applaud their efforts. But, I am not advocating electric cars' taking over the roads completely. Rather, I agree with many experts who think that the electric car's most productive role will be in short trips, particularly shopping expenditions by housewives.

There are a number of advantages for an electric car. One, of course, is the lack of pollutant emissions. Another beneficial byproduct of the electric car is that it produces less noise than conventional cars. Just as important, the electric cars are relatively small and consequently take up less parking space. This is critical in urban areas as a related problem in our urban environment is finding the most productive use for land spaces. Certainly, having large parking lots is not the most worthwhile way to use our land. If shopping centers can be geared to electric car parking—which will not happen until electric cars are accepted as respectable second cars—then perhaps shopping centers could have small park areas for children to play in while parents shop. On the question of speed, electric cars are supposed to be limited in speed, the rumor of GE's potentially 90-mile-per-hour vehicle notwithstanding. This, in my opinion, is no detriment, as we do not need speed demons for city driving anyway. However, integration of electric cars and conventional cars on the highways does pose a potential problem and I hope that forward looking corporations and Government agencies attempt to explore that problem now.

In the U.S. News article, we are given a rundown on devices to help eliminate car smog emissions. The article begins succinctly enough:

> The automobile industry's answer to smog: better gas engines, not electric cars.

As I mentioned previously, however, I believe that the electric and conventional cars are not mutually exclusive. I hope that such provincialism rapidly becomes a part of the thought of the past, for I believe there can be no room for such a limited either or attitude in the future.

Quoting Henry Ford II, the article says:

> Within 10 years, air pollution from autos will no longer be a significant public problem—

Adding that sources outside the industry are somewhat more "restrained" in their estimates. Whatever, it is gratifying to note that there have been a number of smog devices in recent years. My home State of California recently approved 13 smog device models for the coming year. Unfortunately, it has been found that they do not operate at 100-percent efficiency and their efficiency rating rapidly drops off after the first year. It is, of course, a constructive step to have these various devices, but let us not rest on our laurels. Free enterprise must develop even better, more efficient, and more durable devices for the future if we are to hope to combat the auto's contribution to the most troublesome plague, smog.

Another possible and hopeful approach to reducing pollution, emanating from current auto research, are the various gasolines which have been found to be less smog producing than others. It is my firm hope that further developments in discovering a completely "smogless" gasoline will continue.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, the Senate last week passed the 1967 Clean Air Quality Act. I hope that we in the House can take a good look at that measure, and continuing in our concern with man's environment, adopt at least its basic provisions. At the same time, I call on the President to, in the near future, work out an integrated approach to solving the ills of our environment.

Comments From the Fighting Front

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 24, 1967

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, recently I received a letter from a lance corporal now serving in the thick of fighting in Vietnam. Today's headlines are often occupied with comments by persons who have not actually engaged in the fighting. Perhaps it would be worthwhile for the Congress to hear from the men actually on the front lines. For obvious reasons, I have withheld the name of the lance corporal who wrote to me. The letter follows:

> DEAR SIR: Sir, for several years I have studied Viet Nam extensively. Now that I have completed seven months of service in the Republic of South Viet Nam I feel qualified to comment on what I have long believed to be a frightful series of errors in the conduct of this undeclared war.
>
> I am appalled that the war in Viet Nam is being directed by civilians and not by the military men of proven ability who have devoted their lives to the defense of the United States. I will not take your time speculating on the reasons for this deviation from the accepted methods of winning a war. The purpose of this letter is to express with growing shock the realization in myself and others that the United States is not fighting to win.
>
> Sir, to my knowledge the port of Haiphong has not yet been bombed nor blockaded by our superior Naval forces. Multi-million dollar aircraft are confined to bombing trucks, dirt roads, bridges, and push carts instead of striking the main sources of supplies—the North Vietnamese ports.
>
> Why did we give the enemy time to build up the heaviest concentration of anti aircraft defenses in the world around their major target areas? Graduated bombing is suicidal for our pilots and loses shock effect on the enemy. The unnecessary loss in planes and pilots is staggering. Now, even the North Vietnamese Air Force is being built up, yet some of their air fields have yet to be bombed. The flow of supplies to the south grows constantly. We are fighting better equipped enemy units every month and losing more men.
>
> A long war will bleed needed resources from even a country as great as ours. With concrete evidence that the Soviet Union is providing massive aid to North Viet Nam, our government still extends the hand of friendship. This, even with Soviet arms pouring into the Middle East and other potential trouble spots, and the serious possibility that our military forces might have more wars than they can handle. The cost to the U.S.S.R. is small in proportion to the price the United States must pay.
>
> While our effort goes into Viet Nam, the Soviets forge ahead with ever more advanced nuclear war heads and a working anti-missile missile system. The U.S. is losing her numerical superiority in ICBM'S, falling behind in warheads, and anti-missile missile systems. The X-ray effect is one disquieting example of sudden advances in Soviet technology.
>
> It is paradoxical that the wealthiest nation on the face of the earth uses cost/efficiency for defense with no value for the life of man. This, in the face of the fact that we make up but a fraction of the world population, and must rely on superior technology to survive.
>
> Certainly it would seem that there are many strong reasons to make an all-out effort to win the war in Viet Nam. Many of my friends are dead now and I have come close to death. Sir, I enlisted for two years because I believe we are right in defending the Republic of South Viet Nam. I have a wonderful wife waiting at home; some of my dead friends did too. All the sacrifice and still no all-out effort. Victory has no budget. Victory is not easy; it takes courage and risk. The ultimate cost of anything less than complete victory will be far greater than victory itself.
>
> Sir, this is a long letter; I hope you read it and I anxiously await your reply.
>
> Respectfully,

Captive Nations Week

SPEECH

OF

HON. MARGARET M. HECKLER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 19, 1967

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, Americans in the United States, in Europe, in Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, in Vietnam, and other areas of the world celebrated the beginnings of the American dream of July Fourth. Regardless of their present location in the world, the thoughts of all Americans returned to contemplate the meaning of freedom in American political society.

Two weeks after the Fourth of July, we recognize not a celebration but a sad reminder—a week set aside to remind all Americans that there are peoples throughout the world who are deprived of their basic rights under totalitarian regimes. Through overt and covert aggression Communist Russia has succeeded in crushing and subjugating the national independence of Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, and other nations in and out of Eastern Europe.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot afford to forget these peoples who live under totalitarianism. We must continue to renew and rededicate our efforts to the cause of universal freedom. We must keep alive the hopes of freedom for these subjugated peoples.

What's a Billion?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 24, 1967

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, a recent editorial in the Christian Science Monitor undertook the difficult task of attempting to explain the meaning of a billion dollars. The editorial follows:

> WHAT'S A BILLION?
>
> One of the hardest things for most of us to do is to appreciate the extremely large figures which are so casually bandied about today. With billions of dollars being spent for this or that, the average person has great difficulty visualizing what's involved. A sum of $998 million sounds larger than $3 or $4 billion.
>
> Perhaps we can help a little. Most people can conceive of a thousand without much trouble. Simply put, a thousand rows of a thousand dots makes a million. A billion (1,000,000,000) is simply a thousand squares, each square containing a thousand rows of a thousand dots.
>
> Now if we've got that, we can begin to comprehend some of the specific sums so frequently encountered today:
>
> There are over 3 billion people in the world. (We can imagine 3,000 squares, each one containing 1,000 rows with 1,000 people in each row.)
>
> It is now thought that the earth's crust was formed about 5 billion years ago, that the first life appeared on earth some 3 billion years ago, and that higher animal life has existed for approximately 2 billion years.
>
> Each year the earth travels .6 billion miles around the sun. Pluto, the most distant planet in our solar system, is, on an average, 3.7 billion miles away. Except for our sun, the nearest star to earth is roughly 26,000 billion miles away. (Light, moving at a speed of 5,878 billion miles a year, takes close to 4.4 years to reach this nearest star, so it is 4.4 light years away.)
>
> Turning from people, time, and space, to money, America's gross national product (GNP) for 1965 was $681.2 billion. The estimated public debt in 1967 is $321.7 billion. Estimated federal government expenditures for 1967 (the administrative budget) come to $112.8 billion. Over half of this total, $60.5 billion, goes for national defense. Actual military expenditures for fiscal year 1967 for the war in Vietnam will amount to some $24 billion.
>
> For comparison, the National Aeronautics and Space Agency (NASA) will, it is esti-

mated, spend 5.3 billion in 1967, the Post Office Department between $.7 and $.8 billion. In 1965, General Motors showed yearly net earnings of over $2 billion. American Telephone and Telegraph and Standard Oil of New Jersey were each well over $1 billion. America's gold reserve is $13.2 billion.

Even though we may not ourselves be billionaires, we can at least have some vague idea what that means.

Comments on the Riot Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 24, 1967

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert in the Appendix of the RECORD for the information of my colleagues an editorial from the Knoxville, Tenn., News-Sentinel which comments on the antiriot bill that we passed last week:

THE RIOT ACT

It may be, as some opponents said, that the House merely was waving into the wind when it passed this week a so-called "antiriot" bill.

The aim of the bill is to prosecute for criminal offense anyone who crosses a state line or uses the mails or phones with "intent" to instigate a riot. Proving intent is a pretty iffy proposition.

The bill passed the House 347 to 70. A similar measure was overwhelmingly approved by the House last year, but got lost in the Senate.

As the opponents said, the bill may be "futile" or "unnecessary"—every state has an antiriot law.

But it was an expression of public alarm and disgust over the riots which have beset the country—in 19 cities, it was pointed out in the House, just since April 1. Speeches for or against the bill (mostly for) took up nearly six hours in the House—a sure sign of what the congressmen have been hearing from home.

Regardless of how useless or unneeded the law may be (if the Senate should agree to it) the arguments against it were oddly curious.

The opponents said the bill was "unconstitutional" because it violated the right of free speech. But free speech is not a license to murder and loot and vandalize.

They said it violated the due process clause of the Constitution. But even a savage rioter can not be convicted except by indictment and trial. Due process is a system, not an exemption for some crimes.

And some argued that this was an invasion of State's Rights—many of them being the same congressmen who have voted for dozens of laws which expanded the Federal Government's intrusion into local affairs.

A few argued simply that the only remedy for riots was to get at the "root causes." No doubt slums, idleness and similar factors create a prime setting for hoodlumism—but they do not justify homicide, arson, burglary and wanton destruction of little businesses in which people have invested lifetimes of effort and money.

Whether or not the bill, if it becomes law, would accomplish much, it is an expression of public protest against the shameful and vicious disorders of the last many months. In that light, it could have some value, if only as a warning; and it hardly can do any harm.

Government Gun Grab as Ancient as China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 24, 1967

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an excellent guest editorial by Mr. Gordon Charles, which appeared in the Trenton, Mich., Times, a fine weekly publication of broad distribution in the 16th Congressional District of Michigan, published by my distinguished friend, Mr. Kenneth R. Weidner. This editorial merits careful reading and speaks most clearly on a subject of great current interest:

GOVERNMENT GUN GRAB AS ANCIENT AS CHINA

(By Gordon Charles)

Do you think that crime and the threat of a government grab for guns is something new?

Don't kid yourself! Despite the passing of almost 21 centuries, government still contains many shortsighted men. Proof is offered from "The History of the Han Dynasty, 124 B.C." which had this to say:

The Imperial Chancellor, King-sun Hung, petitioned the Emperor, saying: "The people should not be allowed to possess bows or crossbows. When 10 bandits bend their crossbows to the full, a hundred officials dare not advance . . . If the people are not permitted to possess bows or crossbows, then thieves and robbers will carry only short weapons, and when two groups carrying short weapons meet, the larger number will be victorious.

"In your subject's humble opinion, it will be advantageous to forbid the people to carry bows or crossbows."

When the Emperor sent down this suggestion to his council for discussion, an elder, Shou-wang, replied saying:

"Your subject has heard that when the ancients made the five kinds of weapons, it was not for the purpose of killing each other, but to prevent tyranny and to punish evil. When people lived in peace, these weapons were used to control the fierce animals and to be prepared against emergencies. If there were military affairs, then these weapons were used to set up defense and to form battle arrays . . .

"Your subject has heard that the Sage Rulers brought the people together and practiced shooting to demonstrate instruction, and he has never heard any prohibition on bows or arrows.

"Furthermore, the cause for prohibition is that the bandits use them to attack and rob. The crime of attacking and robbing is subject to death; yet that they have not been stopped is because the great lawbreakers do not care, indeed, to avoid severe punishment.

"Should the suggested prohibition be enforced, your subject fears that wicked persons will still carry weapons and the officials will not be able to stop them from carrying them, and that the good people who keep their weapons for self-defense will encounter the prohibition of the law.

"This will make the power of robbers exclusive and take away the means of defense of the people . . ."

When the petition was presented, the Son of Heaven questioned the Imperial Chancellor, Hung, who promptly withdrew his suggestion.

Pretty smart cookies back in those days, weren't they?

Labor-Civil Rights Unity Called Essential in Battle on Poverty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB H. GILBERT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 24, 1967

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, the desegregation of Central High School in Little Rock, Ark., is one of the milestones in the history of American civil rights. One of the young Negro students who took part in that event was Ernest Green, now director of a joint apprenticeship training program in New York City. Recently, young Mr. Green called for unity between the American labor movement and others interested in civil rights in the war on poverty.

Since I belive that all of us would like to ponder what this young man said in his address, I include excerpts from it, as printed in a recent issue of the AFL-CIO News, in the RECORD as follows:

PAST IS PROLOG—LABOR-CIVIL RIGHTS UNITY CALLED ESSENTIAL IN BATTLE ON POVERTY

(The following is excerpted from a speech before the Arkansas AFL-CIO convention in Hot Springs by Ernest Green, one of the Negro students who desegregated Little Rock's Central High School in 1957. He is now director of the joint apprenticeship training program in New York City sponsored by the A. Philip Randolph Institute and the Workers Defense League in cooperation with the local AFL-CIO and Building & Construction Trades Council.)

I want to thank you for your generous applause which is much more friendly than the one I received on the day, several years ago, when I made my first public appearance in the politics of Little Rock. But that, as you may well remind me, was a different kind of audience, and you may well consider my presence before you as another example of the fact that it has been the fate of the labor movement to be asked to deal with problems that other people create. I'm sure the labor movement in Arkansas had no idea in 1957 that one of the ghosts of the events that took place at Central High would one day come back to haunt them.

Yet, in all seriousness, there is something very appropriate and symbolic about my being here. To me it symbolizes the part that labor has played in the freedom struggle as well as the part it is now being called upon to play in the new stage of the alliance between black and white poor.

With specific reference to the Negro, my presence here is also a reminder that the Negro by himself can take his own revolution only so far and no further—that by himself he can fight for better public education desegregated public facilities, and voting rights, but beyond those points he can go no further without the active, willing, and energetic cooperation of a larger coalition of forces, the chief element of which must be the trade union movement.

Almost a decade before the civil rights movement reached its peak, nine of us in Little Rock took our lives in our hands by attempting to desegregate that school. Why? Because we believed at the time that Central High offered, in a way that the all-Negro schools did not, the best chance of preparing ourselves for a better future.

The events of the past 10 years have made some significant changes. There were those who said in 1957 that we would wreck the school system. But I am glad to notice that Central High School is standing, and that standards have, if anything, improved. People can now eat in whatever restaurants they please, and stay in whatever hotels they can afford. This convention is integrated, and we all know that it wasn't too many years ago that integrated facilities for any meeting, including union meetings, were not available. (I know the Arkansas AFL–CIO was a pioneer in this.)

Yet, all of these changes have not altered the basic economic problems of most of the people.

The slums of the South and even some in the North are occupied not by Negroes alone but also by whites. Both are victimized by inadequate jobs at substandard pay. Both want better education, which they either can't get or can't afford. Both are being cut back and being cut out by automation. Both are being used by union-busting industries as the cheapest source of labor in the South. Both are being forced to work in shops where unions cannot bargain, and if it weren't for a federal minimum wage, black and white workers in the South would still be earning less than a dollar an hour.

It is no accident that those who sought to establish the labor movement in the South were terrorized by more beatings, killings, and maimings than they encountered in any other region of the United States. It is no accident that there are more economically depressed whites living in the South than there are poor Negroes. It is no accident that the South is the bastion of right to work laws that still impair the effective functioning of the trade union movement; and it is no accident that the crime rate in white southern slums is as high and in some instances higher than in Negro slums.

Though Negroes tolerate the existence of these conditions no more than anybody else, they are not surprised by it; they understand how the system works, and what it is trying to do. But it would seem to me that the social and economic deprivation that blights the lives and futures of so many white families in the South is too high a price to pay to maintain a sense of whiteness.

If all this is true, then there is no alternative but that Negroes, white workers, and farmers must unite behind the labor movement in its struggle against unemployment, low wages, discrimination, union-busting and poverty.

My own experience with the building trades in New York City only emphasizes the fact that we are desperately in need of an alliance between civil rights and labor to help create more jobs and improve standards of living; and as we are seeing in New York on a limited scale, this alliance can work. But we must go further, and strive towards uniting black and white working people behind programs to tear down slums, rebuild sections of our cities, and call for full employment programs.

This same kind of cooperation can and should take place in Arkansas as well as in other states. Otherwise there will not be enough jobs for the black worker and no more for the white worker, and they will both be left to scramble and fight against each other for the few jobs that will exist.

No one can dispute the contributions that unions have already made to the achievement of a better standard of living for millions of our people, including Negroes. Yet we need a policy of non-discrimination from all unions. We need to work together for higher wages for the poor and full and fair employment. We need more apprenticeship openings.

I have no illusions. I know the problems are not easy. You in the labor movement have met the challenge of social crisis before, and there is no reason why we cannot do it again.

No Discrimination in Building Trades Unions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 24, 1967

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, all of us have heard the repeated and untrue charge that the building trades unions in this country are closed to nonwhite youths. Recently William F. Schnitzler, secretary-treasurer of the AFL–CIO, discussed this false contention in detail. So that all of us may have the opportunity of learning the real facts about this issue, I am inserting in the Appendix the text of Mr. Schnitzler's address before the seventh biennial Middle Atlantic States apprenticeship and training conference in Norfolk, Va., as follows:

It is a pleasure for me to come before your conference and be given this opportunity to meet with many old and new friends from the Middle Atlantic States.

This conference is on problems and accomplishments of apprenticeship and training in the area that runs from Pennsylvania to North Carolina and westward to West Virginia—six states and the District of Columbia.

We here represent that which is typically American. In these six states there is the industrial north and the rural south; the poverty of Appalachia and the affluence of suburbia; the complex life of megalopolis and the simple existence of the pastoral community. We have "right-to-work" states and free states; runway plants and responsible firms. We have high quality, efficient apprenticeship programs and jack-of-all-trades handymen. We have stable companies with long histories of industrial peace; we have fly-by-night anti-union operators. They're all here—a part of the society that we have made, full of promise and beset by problems.

But weighty as the problems may be in these states, our nation, our government, labor and employers are aware of them and are seeking solutions. This fact alone makes solutions possible. This fact alone marks the great progress that we are making in our nation.

Ten days ago I was in another Navy town, Bremerton, Washington, for the commissioning of the USS Samuel Gompers. And during those ceremonies—while touching on the achievements of Gompers in his lifetime—those of us present were made aware once again that united pursuit of problems was not a virtue until quite recently. Our nation did not always accept a collective responsibility to its citizens—nor did many others.

There was a time not long ago when workingmen and their children lived amid wretched slums, disease, ignorance and primitive conditions while the breadwinner suffered the toil and insecurity of the wage system.

That was the depressing environment in which Samuel Gompers lived. And it was in that environment that Gompers and men like him built the first fragile structure that became the American labor movement. They brought together men of differing backgrounds, of divergent ethnic and cultural origins, of many languages and many degrees of skill. They brought together mechanics' societies, fraternal, burial and social groups, workers' lodges and trade unions, and they built the forerunner of today's AFL–CIO.

Gompers and his associates overcame the most burdensome of problems in the face of incalculable odds; and for those problems they did not solve, they provided the machinery whereby succeeding generations could cope with them. Yes, we still have slums, disease and illiteracy, but they are giving away—and rapidly—to a united onslaught, made up mostly of organizations represented here today.

An important weapon in that fight—yesterday and today—has been apprenticeship and training. Apprenticeship programs are of themselves evidence of industrial peace and mutual understanding. They represent well-paid workers, an assurance of security in liberal fringe benefit programs and protectives against erosion of wages or work standards.

In this atmosphere—this environment—workers for generation on generation have found the means for a better life, a new life, a secure life for themselves and their children after them.

The problems of workingmen—of the poor and their children—are not new to the apprenticeship programs. There has been, however, a great deal of attention paid to these programs since enactment of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, with its guarantee of equal opportunity in employment.

In the two years that this title of the law has been in effect, enemies of unions, panacea-peddlers, ill-informed politicians and ax-grinders have fallen upon the apprenticeship programs with glee. The selfish unions, they say, refuse to allow Negroes to become apprentices. Unions, they say, keep the doors closed, stifling the Negro's attempt to help himself out of poverty. Such criticism makes a lot of headlines, but I say this is sheer, unadorned bunk.

I want to say here and now that the American labor movement need never be defensive nor ashamed of the great good the union-employer apprentice programs have done, both as the training ground for millions of youths from all backgrounds and as the means of breaking the poverty cycle for thousands of minority groups today and in the future.

Until America's schools improve the quality of education for Negroes and other minorities and raise these youths' qualifications—and send far more on to college—the union-employer apprentice programs will serve as the single greatest road to success and security for Negro youths in America.

Labor's apprentice programs provide education, a skill, an excellent income and a secure future. Not a dead-end job, but a meaningful career. Our apprentice programs provide a means of escape from poverty, both for the worker and his children. Our apprentice programs provide the opportunity for young men from minority groups to become sought-after craftsmen and supervisors. (Statistics show that an apprentice has a 50–50 chance of becoming a supervisor within two years after he is a journeyman.) Our apprentice programs open the door for a man to become a contractor in his own right and employ other youths as apprentices.

The vistas that are open to Negroes, Puerto Ricans and other disadvantaged youngsters in America who participate in apprentice programs are almost limitless. And we in the labor movement can be proud of every program we have established and proud of every young man we have made into a craftsman and sent into the working world.

Who dares to criticize the goodness of these programs and the young men they are helping? Certainly not the anti-union employer who race-baits his workers to keep out a union and then hires a Negro in the mail room to demonstrate that he has lowered the color bar. Yet too often the plaudits for enlightened self-interest have gone to just such an employer; and too often the brickbat of scorn has been thrown at the union. I let you decide who has made the genuine contribution.

It is not that the facts are unavailable. They are there for all to see, but there are those who do not want to see. As Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz told the Building and Construction Trades Department legislative conference in Washington last month, it is unfortunate that the word is not being put forth of the accomplishments of the apprenticeship programs in behalf of minority youths. He said he would settle for just ten percent favorable stories—for which there is a wealth of material available—instead of the almost 100 percent negative stories which appear at the present time.

At that same conference, Mr. Wirtz said that it is totally unfair for the finger of racial discrimination to have been pointed at the building trades for the last four years. There has been, he said in praise, as much serious effort in the building trades to meet this problem as there has been in any other American institution in the labor movement or outside the labor movement.

I can report that within the AFL–CIO, with no exceptions, a fully cooperative attitude by all AFL–CIO unions, each having pledged itself to a program of non-discrimination to which it has diligently applied itself and is making successful.

But still the stories continue.

A favorite numbers game is to charge that there are no Negroes, or one, or five, or ten, or whatever the figure may be, in a particular union's apprenticeship program. The facts—if any—are usually distorted; the story with the true picture doesn't get into the paper. Such accounts not only dishonor the building trades unions, they do a disservice to potential Negro apprentices who are thus discouraged from applying.

It would be far more helpful to the Negro youngster if an attempt were made instead to understand the apprentice program and help make it work. But the headline is the story; the smear becomes the accepted fact.

To this I say without reservation, as a member of the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity and as Chairman of the AFL–CIO Civil Rights Committee, that if all problems of employment for jobless Negroes and non-whites were handled with the same concern for an individual's needs and rights as are the apprenticeship programs, the festering sore of racial unrest would be largely healed.

It is time that we put to death the myth that apprenticeship programs are sanctuaries of lily-white youths, following in the carefully directed footsteps of their fathers.

Similarly, there is no special preference for Negroes or other minority groups. Apprentice programs are opportunities for the best qualified young men in the area to become journeymen and craftsmen in a particular skilled trade.

The pity is that the industry is so limited in total employees that the number of apprentices—white, Negro, Puerto Rican—will never number more than a few thousands.

If this were a program of tremendous scope embracing numbers equal to those new workers who each year enter the auto industry or the steel industry or the communications industry, we could swiftly solve a sizable part of the problem of training qualified young Negroes and other non-whites for meaningful employment. The auto factories have hired, and the auto workers union has taken into membership, 842,200 workers in the last four years.

Against this let's put into perspective this whole matter of apprenticeship. There are an estimated 50,000 apprentice openings yearly, but the dropout rate has consistently been around 50 percent, which leave about 25,000 men to complete their apprenticeship and become journeymen each year. Civil rights groups and others who have been actively involved with Negro participation in these programs have set a hoped-for goal of 15 percent apprenticeships by non-whites. That is, they hope that they can eventually put forth this number of qualified youngsters to take the examinations and pass. They have stated, however, that this long-range goal can be attained only if the quality of public education of Negroes improves and a larger percentage of Negroes who are qualified show an inclination to enter the apprenticed trades. Most Negroes who can qualify for the tests have set their sights on college or some other advanced training program.

But assuming that the magic number of 15 percent participation is attained, that would mean that 7,500 apprentice openings yearly would be filled from minority groups. When the 50 percent dropout rate is factored in, only 3,750 non-white journeymen would be graduated each year.

So, 3,750 apprentice-to-journeymen each year from minority groups is a hoped-for maximum. This is hardly in numbers sufficient to provide a major impact on unemployment. This is hardly the panacea that the uninitiated believe the apprentice program can be for Negro youths.

Today there is a minimum of 111,000 jobless male non-white youths between 16 and 21.

Contrast with this a hoped-for maximum of 3,750 graduates yearly of non-whites in apprentice programs.

There must be other solutions.

But not only are the number of apprenticeships few in relationship to America's work force of more than 72 million, but there is a genuine problem to find qualified applicants for programs currently under way.

Now, I'm sure that there are a lot of young fellows—Negro and white—who would eagerly accept a journeyman's card in the electrician's union or the plumber's union if it were offered to them. But who would hire these follows? The union could swell its dues-paying ranks by the tens of thousands, but it would be a terrible fraud upon these youths. They obviously would be unable to perform their jobs and for this they must be trained. But unless they are schooled in the basics of education, they cannot fathom shop math, read a blueprint nor comprehend the ever-changing problems of the trades.

No one in his right mind suggests that engineers' licenses or airline pilots' licenses be handed out at will to disadvantaged youngsters. Yet, somehow, because our work is done in overalls, it is different. We say there is no difference.

It is simple. A young fellow must have a basic education to become an apprentice. If he does not have it, the blame should be laid to our school system, not at the door of the union. If a young fellow cannot get into a college or an engineering school, we do not throw rocks at the place of higher learning. We take a look at his school, his grades and his college entrance examination. They usually tell us the sad story.

There are, of course, young Negroes and non-whites who are qualified and who want to learn a skill and make their careers as electricians or plumbers or carpenters—and we want them to do so. But, despite reports to the contrary, there are not thousands of these youngsters standing outside a high barrier marked "keep out," while inside thousands of apprentice jobs are left unfilled because there aren't enough white qualified youths. This simply is not the truth; it simply is not the desire of the union.

After all, it is an axiom in the labor movement that you fill the job with a union member or the boss fills it with someone off the street. To let jobs go by default is hardly the way to protect high standards of craftsmanship and union conditions.

Instead of that imaginary high fence, there are actually recruiting campaigns being undertaken to insure that these programs are fully utilized and every potential apprentice be given the opportunity to compete for the openings.

But it has been found that in order to get youngsters of minority backgrounds who are potentially qualifiable for apprenticeship programs, they have to be found, brought forth and informed. It is not easy.

There has to be a concerted—and sincere—effort made by agencies, schools, organizations, churches and unions to make young men aware of available apprenticeship programs. Young men have to be made aware of the desire within the industry for their potential skills. The youths have to be made aware of the system of selection and when and where tests are to be given.

This is being done, and with great vigor throughout the United States wherever legitimate apprenticeship programs are under way.

In many instances commendable work is being done in preparing youngsters for the tests. Sometimes the help comes from unions, sometimes from joint programs and in other instances from totally independent organizations. These tutoring programs have been very worthwhile. Certainly no one can quarel with tutoring, with preparatory programs to familiarize youngsters with the problems they will face in the examination and refresh their grasp of math and other related subjects. This is fine. This is commendable.

But let me caution here that we must be careful of the label that is given to this sort of prepartion. In some quarters it is called pre-apprenticeship training. I frankly feel this phrase should be avoided entirely because it is misleading and can be confused with other programs.

There is one program, for instance, whereby young men are put to work at lower levels of pay, at lower levels of work and with lesser qualifications than the normal apprenticeship pqrogram. To some, this is pre-apprenticeship.

And then there is a third operation where young men are put on job sites where there are apprenticeship programs, but these youngsters are employed in capacities where they do menial labor, take part in no program of training and fulfill no evidence of preparation for apprentice work.

What sort of apprentice training these youngsters are engaged in, I fail to see; to some persons this is referred to as pre-apprenticeship.

So, we must be careful of the phrase. The important role, to my way of thinking, is to fill the positions in the established, high-standard apprenticeship programs, and to do so we must make as much information as possible available to potential applicants. We have found that where youngsters have been properly informed, the number of young men to sit for the tests and to pass them increases dramatically—including the candidates from minority groups. Consequently, the number of non-whites to flow into the trades has become considerably greater. And, in so doing, an exhaustive study of the Negro in apprentice programs has disclosed that there is no discrimination nor resistance to anyone who passes the examination. Whoever passes the test and goes to work is accepted fully.

The only resistance is the refusal by unions to dilute or erode the apprentice standards of training that are applied equally to all.

In the District of Columbia, where I have seen at first-hand how the program works, the Apprenticeship Information Center, since it opened in 1963, has placed 789 youths in accredited apprenticeship programs. More than 58 percent of these youths were from minority groups. They came to the Center as referrals by schools, churches and neighborhood centers.

In the D.C. program, the unions have set qualification levels at what they have learned is the realistic need of the prospective apprentice in a particular trade. In some instances, a high school education or its equivalent have been found to be necessary to prevent wholesale dropouts. In others, a ninth grade education has been found to be sufficient.

The apprenticeship information program—excellent as it is—revealed not the shortcomings of the union programs, but the woeful failings of the D.C. educational system. The many hundreds of applicants who failed to qualify were found, for the most part, to be unable to read sufficiently well to cope with the tests.

Near to Washington, in Baltimore, there is LEAP—Labor Education Advancement Program—a program established by the Urban League and the AFL–CIO with the aid of a Ford Foundation grant. Working in conjunction with the Department of Labor, the Baltimore Building Trades Council is recruiting 300 disadvantaged Baltimore youths to participate in the educational preparatory program aimed at placing them into apprenticeable construction trades.

Farther north, there is the pioneering program of the Workers Defense League, which has the full cooperation of the AFL–CIO, and was set up in conjunction with the A. Philip Randolph Education Trust and the Department of Labor.

The Workers Defense League program took itself into Brooklyn's Harlem in 1964—into the Bedford-Stuyvesant section—and through its educational preparatory program enabled 74 youngsters from minority groups to enter apprenticeship programs. These men are now working as apprentices in sheet-metal, elevator construction, electrical, printing, stone derricks and ironwork. Similar programs of the Workers Defense League are now being undertaken in Buffalo and New Rochelle.

But all is not achieved by these methods alone. Local 3 of the IBEW in New York has more than 200 non-white youngsters in training at this time, all of whom were recruited through the customary channels. Other unions are also carrying out long-standing programs where youths of minority groups have always made up a sizeable percentage of those being trained.

Let's look at some other cities. In Philadelphia, 64 Negroes have entered construction apprenticeships; in Chicago, there are about 100 new Negro apprentices in training; in Oklahoma City 13 youngsters from minority groups entered construction trade aprenticeships this month alone.

Meanwhile, in Detroit, the Trade Union Leadership Council, in cooperation with the building trades councils there, is carrying out a program of training some 200 Negro youth for apprenticeship examinations; and in Phoenix, Arizona, union bricklayers are carrying on training-to-apprenticeship for 20 disadvantaged youths.

These examples are few, I know. I am also aware that among those who are critical of the apprenticeship programs, there is an inclination to find little that is praiseworthy in the apprenticeship establishment, as they choose to call us. They point out that those of us involved in operating these programs are likely to emphasize the absence of qualified Negro applicants and to emphasize the relative progress that has been made despite great difficulties. To this charge I plead guilty.

But by the same token, according to an in-depth study of Negroes in apprenticeship programs by Professor Ray Marshall at the University of Texas, the civil rights spokesmen are also likely to emphasize discrimination by unions, by employers and by apprenticeship agencies and see a minimum of change.

The professor said the problem was too complex for such simple explanations. I agree. But he also pointed out that anti-discrimination legislation—the Civil Rights Act—only stops discrimination, it does not cause affirmative action to take place.

The fact that affirmative action is taking place at the instigation of the labor movement in conjunction with community organizations, schools, government and civil rights groups, should mute some critics. But most important the affirmative action should help produce the needed apprentices and tomorrow's craftsmen.

This step beyond non-discrimination and into participation and encouragement of Negroes, Puerto Ricans and other non-whites is evidence of good faith and of a genuine desire to prove that apprenticeship programs are open to all who can qualify.

That is the goal of the AFL–CIO and it is, I am confident, the goal as well of all who truly believe in apprenticeship.

Sending U.S. Planes to Congo Was Wise Decision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 24, 1967

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I regarded as wise and judicious President Johnson's decision to send three transport planes to the Congo to help quell the rebellion there earlier this month. My feeling was that the planes and the small number of men they carried were a well-justified means of preventing a mutiny by white mercenary troops from growing into a widespread racial war.

According to a report in the July 20 New York Times, the planes apparently had the desired effect of providing a calming effect at exactly the right time. The article follows:

CONGOLESE HAIL U.S. PLANES' ROLE—THEIR AID CALLED DECISIVE IN MERCENARIES' COLLAPSE

(By Henry Tanner)

KINSHASA, THE CONGO, July 19. The Johnson Administration's decision to send three United States military planes to the aid of President Joseph D. Mobutu's army is universally praised here as a gamble that paid off.

Congolese officials cite the American C-130 transports as one of the principal reasons why the revolt of their white mercenaries in Orientale Province collapsed after only eight days.

European diplomats and businessmen note that the arrival of the planes had a calming influence at the very moment when an anti-white radio and press campaign threatened to take hold among the Congolese population of Kinshasa and Lubumbashi, the two main cities.

A neutral observer today called the American move a striking example that "very little power can go a long way" if applied judiciously and at the right time.

The United States Joint Task Force Congo consisting of 150 men and the three planes, arrived here on the morning of July 10, five days after the start of the mercenary uprising in Kisangani and Bukavu.

One of its first missions was to drop several plane-loads of Congolese paratroopers and their equipment, including trucks, in Yangambi, about 60 miles from Kisangani.

Another unit of paratroopers—the Congolese Armys' elite—was flown into Bukavu, from which the mercenaries had withdrawn before.

From there the Congolese threatened the Maniema, a region controlled by one of the mercenary leaders, Maj. Jean Schramme, a Belgian planter. He had organized his fief as a redoubt where the mercenary force could hole up if things went wrong.

It was this deployment of the Congelese airborne troops that prompted the mercenaries to break off the fight in Kisangani and retire to Major Schramme's area, according to the testimony of several of the 13 European newspapermen who were detained in Kisangani during the trouble there.

The mercenaries, according to their voluntary guests, also heard the radio announcement that Ethiopia would send fighter planes.

Communications Workers of America Convention Receives Useful Statement on Economic Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 11, 1967

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the 29th annual convention of the Communications Workers of America last month received a comprehensive statement on economic policy.

Because this statement contains a useful summary of the performance of the economy so far this year as well as a number of valuable projections and policy recommendations, I include it hereafter:

STATEMENT ON ECONOMIC POLICY TO THE 29TH ANNUAL CONVENTION OF CWA

PERFORMANCE OF THE ECONOMY THUS FAR IN 1967

"Readjustment" is the keynote word in evaluating the performance of the American economy thus far in 1967. After six years of record-breaking expansion (1961-66), a combination of pressures and imbalances which developed during the latter half of 1966 have slowed perceptibly a number of sectors in early 1967—and brought serious cutbacks in several major industries, notably housing construction and auto manufacturing.

Clearly a critical factor in the easing off of the growth boom last year was the decision of the Federal Reserve Board in December of 1965 to boost the prime interest rate by one-half percent. It is perhaps giving too much weight to monetary policy decisions to say that this move, ill-timed though it may have been, was *the* precipitating factor in the trends which beset the American economy in late 1966 and early 1967. But at the very least we can observe that the tightness of money and the soaring of interest rates to 40-year record highs last year, which followed the Federal Reserve Board's action, might well have been substantially moderated, had the Board not been so heavy-handed at so critical a juncture.

The tightening of the supply of money, culminating in a little-publicized but extremely serious money crisis in August of yast year, had its most direct effect on private home construction—where new housing starts in 1966 were well below those for any previous year of the present boom. The rate of new construction of houses in October of 1966, even allowing for the normal slowdown in the fall months, was roughly half that in October of the previous year. Housing starts have begun to pick up again in 1967, but full recovery to 1965 levels is not likely before early next year.

Inventory build-up—and the need to "work down" inventory accumulation—was the major problem facing the business sector of the economy as 1967 began. Unprecedented expansion of our productive capacity, via an increase of 80% in expenditures for new plant and equipment over the last six years, coupled with operation of that expanding capacity at levels of 90–92% in 1966, produced a dangerous "overhang" in goods-on-hand toward the end of 1966.

Dire predictions of recession and slump appeared in the more conservative business publications at year's end, as forecasters thought they saw a majority of the economic barometers pointing to foul weather. The "storm" has not materialized, but we have had cloudy and unsettled conditions, in the form of the "readjustment" noted above.

Gross National Product, the total volume of goods and services purchased throughout the economy, increased by $4.4 billion in the first quarter of 1967, measured in current dollars. All of this increase in GNP represented the effect of price rises, however—as evidenced by the $500 million decline in *real* GNP (measured in 1958 dollars) in the first quarter of this year, as against the fourth quarter of 1966.

The major factor in this leveling off of output has has been the "balancing" of production with sales, both at the manufacturing and the retail levels. The Industrial Production Index of the Federal Reserve Board, which compares quantitative output within the manufacturing sector against an index base (and therefore has no price "bias" in it), declined 0.3 percent in April of this year, 2 percent below the peak figure reached last December—but 1.25 percent above the production Index level of April, 1965. There is, as we might expect, a close correlation between industrial production, as reflected in this index, and the rate at which Gross National Product increases.

Manufacturers were using only 85 percent of their capacity in April, as the decline in the Production Index suggests. Operating at lower volume and at slightly higher unit costs, the corporate sector showed a decline in profits, both before and after taxes, in the first quarter of 1967—for the first time since the boom began in February, 1961.

The most critical measurement of the economy's performance from labor's point of view, of course, is the rate at which we are able to provide jobs for all those seeking work. Here the "readjustment" has, thus far, been less severe than had been feared as the year began. The unemployment rate stood at a seasonally adjusted 3.7% in January—and has risen only one-tenth of one percent in the five months since, to a figure of 3.8% in mid-May.

However, as the Bureau of Labor Statistics notes, two "cushions" have operated to keep the unemployment rate from rising faster. One is that employers have tended to reduce hours of work, as production schedules were cut back, rather than lay off employees. The second is that, as the economy is "readjusting," fewer workers have tended to enter the job market; the civilian labor force has increased about 800,000 since January, less than half the 1,700,000 rise expected on the basis of seasonal trends. We carefully note, however, that these "cushions" are temporary in their effects—reflecting the uncertainty which characterizes the economy thus far in 1967, but representing no assurance that unemployment may not become an even more serious problem in the months ahead.

Overriding the discernible trends in the civilian economy thus far in 1967 is the commitment in defense expenditures which will be required of the American people. As measured in the national income accounts version of the Federal budget, the rate of defense spending rose $13 billion last year and over $4 billion in the first quarter of this year.

Where events in the Middle East, as well as in Vietnam, will take us in the next few months is, in large part, conjectural at this point—but we in CWA stand firm in our recognition of America's obligations, and of the sacrifice which is necessary to meet them. We insist only that such commitment be shared equitably among all sectors of this economy.

PROSPECTS FOR 1967

The President's Council of Economic Advisers projected a "slow" first half for 1967, in their report issued last January—with an upswing in the last six months which would take the economy to a GNP level of $787 billion for all of 1967.

At a meeting on May 21st—some five months later—the Business Council (a select group of corporation executives which operates as the Executive Branch's sounding board in the business community) foresaw a 1967 Gross National Product of $778 billion. While the Business Council had the benefit of five months of hindsight, we would nonetheless label such a prediction as conservative.

What is needed to "turn on" the American economy again—and to make the projection of the Council of Economic Advisers more nearly attainable—is a buttressing of those forces in our society whose vitality is critical to meaningful growth. What is the source of that vitality, and how has it been vitiated? An important clue, we submit, is found in the following figures.

Corporate profits before taxes in 1960 came to $49.7 billion—or *12.0%* of total national income. By 1966, profits before taxes of all corporations had risen to $82.3 billion—constituting *13.5%* of total national income last year.

Total wages and salaries paid to employees (including pension, health, and welfare contributions by employers) amounted to $282.8 billion in 1960—or *68.2%* of national income. Payments of wages and salaries, including such fringe benefits, were $413.1 billion in 1966—but that figure represented *67.7%* of total national income—a decline of 0.5% over the proportion going to employees in 1960.

Is one-half of one percent a significant decline? It comes to better than $3 billion, measured in terms of total national income in 1966. That's a big number, spread around the country.

But let's talk about people—working people—and let's put people on the same basis as profits.

If wage and salary payments had gone *up* the same 1½ percent by which profits went up in the last six years—instead of declining one-half percent—*every man and woman in non-farm employment would have been ahead $176—per person—in 1966.*

There, we submit, is a critical insight into where and how the vitality of this economy has been sapped. Labor's share—and that is one way of looking at total wage and salary payments—has been slipping, while the profits share has been climbing in these six years of unprecedented boom.

Couple this diminished slice of the pie for working people with an increase in the proportion of after-tax income which our citizens have been holding aside in the form of savings, and it's no wonder that inventories are still high.

Government reports indicate that savings as a percent of spendable income went up 1.2 points in the first quarter of 1967—from 5.3% for all of 1966 to 6.5% in the January-March period this year. Figures just released by the Census Bureau show that the ratio of inventory to shipments by manufacturers in April hit the highest level since the 1960–61 recession. Put these two items together, and it doesn't take an economist or a government statistician to figure out what's happening.

People—CWA members, AFL–CIO members, unorganized workers—are "readjusting" their own families' economics. They are playing it cautious for the moment, waiting to see what develops—and meanwhile putting more away in savings than they did last year. Total consumer credit outstanding, as one might expect, showed a decline of 2.1% in the first three months of 1967—as people paid off their loans and cars, and waited before making further commitments.

People are worried about where prices are going—and not without reason. After holding almost steady from October 1966 to February 1967—the increase was only 0.3 in five months—the Consumer Price Index has started moving up again—as every housewife knew even before the Bureau of Labor Statistics released the figures. The Index climbed half a point (0.5) in March and April, and now stands at 115.3 of the 1957–59 average.

Again it doesn't take a statistician to tell us that what we gain in our pay checks gets too easily eaten up in the supermarket—and that what counts, therefore, is the progress we can make in purchasing power—in the goods and services we can afford and are willing to buy. And therein lies the vitality which is at the heart of the growth and progress which began in February of 1961.

As we move into the second half of 1967, what we're looking for—we in CWA and our brothers and sisters in the AFL–CIO—is confidence and assurance that the economy will move forward as we know it *can*—as we know it has these last six years.

This kind of dynamic is put into operation by a host of individual decisions in the free economy—in a budget conference at the kitchen table, at the city hall in our community, across the bargaining table with the company, at a banker's office in Wall Street, in the halls of Congress, in the office of the President of the United States.

We know what we have to do across the bargaining table to keep that dynamic moving—and we shall make full use of the strength and vitality of CWA when the appropriate moment comes.

Our purpose, while we are gathered here in our 29th Annual Convention, is to make clear our collective thinking at the national level—to set forth those precepts which, in our view, should guide those decisions at the Federal level which will put the economy back in full gear.

We state these precepts in terms of specific issues, recognizing that our task here is to establish a point of view—and that the position which CWA will take on a given issue at the time a decision is required must be determined by the circumstances and the choices available at that moment.

POLICY PRECEPTS—1967

To comment on every issue now before the President and the Congress which bears on this basic need for a renewed dynamic in our economy would fill a book in itself. We touch here on those decisions which are to us most fundamental in their effects and most immediate in their urgency.

MAINTENANCE OF FREE COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

We oppose any effort, by legislative or administrative action, which would inhibit the parties at the collective bargaining table from negotiating to a conclusion the issues before them—or which would tip the balance between the parties by partisan interference in such negotiations.

We recognize the interest of the Federal government in the collective bargaining process and in assuring responsible action by all parties. We submit, however, that the first obligation of our national labor relations policy must be to assure the maximum feasible latitude to collective bargaining—and that any restraint imposed in the name of the national interest must bear equitably and reasonably on both parties.

Within this context, we support the full use of the picket line as an exercise of free speech—including specifically the ban now imposed on "situs" picketing.

Our concern in protecting collective bargaining is geared directly to the basics of the economic process. Expansion of purchasing power must start with those best equipped to protect their own economic well-being—the members of trade unions and their families. By raising the level of the economy in their communities, union members provide the leverage needed to raise the consumption base for all citizens.

WAGE-PRICE GUIDELINES

A direct corollary of our support for free collective bargaining is our rejection, in any form, of the straitjacket which has been tied with wage-price guidelines.

The genius of our labor relations policy is its recognition of the multitude of variables which bear on any given collective bargaining decision. To apply an inflexible formula to the "approved" results of this process is to emasculate the very principle of free association and free negotiation.

TAXATION

The Administration faces a formidable task in mounting a revenue policy for fiscal 1968 which will meet our expanding obligations at home and abroad—without draining resources from the private sector so drastically that the "readjustment" turns into a downslide.

Estimates of the deficit in the administrative budget for the year ending June 30, 1968 range from $24 billion (by Secretary of the Treasury Henry Fowler) to $29 billion (by House Ways and Means Chairman Wilbur Mills). *Fortune* magazine translates these figures into an estimate, on a national incomes account basis, of some $20 billion in 1968.

An increase in Federal revenues quite clearly must be contemplated by the Administration. We submit that any proposal for increased taxation must include at least these considerations:

(1) That additional revenues enhance, rather thna deteriorate, the progressive structure of our tax system—in a word, that ability to pay must be the criterion and equality of sacrifice the watchword;

(2) That the Administration and the Congress face up at long last to those fundamental reforms needed to close the loopholes in our present tax structure. We cite in particular the flagrant but technically legal evasions which occur under our present capital gains tax system, the avoidance of tax burden through distribution of assets as "gifts," and the accelerated write-off of resources permitted under depletion allowances;

(3) That the level of additional taxation in the corporate sector take account of the relief which the Congress has provided this year to the business community via re-institution of both the 7% investment credit and the accelerated depreciation guidelines.

In assessing the relationship between tax policy and economic growth, we believe that more serious consideration must be given to the allocation of resources in the form of new plant and equipment which is spurred by the 7% investment credit. This credit is now applied across-the-board on an unselected basis. What we propose is that criteria be established by which tax incentive might serve as a channel, to guide investment into those sectors where new capital goods will assure a better balance or "mix" as the economy moves forward.

Such criteria might appropriately include (a) a determination of those regions least attractive to investment at the present time, either because of location or level of economic development; and (b) a higher incentive for industries willing to expand or to locate in the inner-city centers of our metropolitan areas (thereby bringing jobs to the hard-core unemployment neighborhoods, where transportation is often a major bar to job-seeking).

Investment incentive in the form of tax relief will not guarantee, of course, that such investment will be made; we submit, however, that social objectives ought to be as significant as purely budgetary objectives in the planning of tax policy.

A FLOOR UNDER THE ECONOMY

A number of proposals have been offered for the establishment, as a matter of conscious policy, of an income floor under the American economy. We salute such experimental thinking, whatever may be the immediate obstacles to their implementation.

President Johnson recognized this dialogue in his 1967 Economic Report, noting these proposals for guaranteeing minimum incomes in his discussion on helping the disadvantaged. We applaud the President's commitment to encourage further study of the "merits and disadvantages" of such plans.

There is no question in the minds of CWA members as to the capacity of the American economy to achieve newer and higher ground in the years just ahead. What is needed is the will—the spark—and the unity of purpose.

To help to find these vital ingredients we pledge our unremitting efforts.

Wealth of Niger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 20, 1967

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the African Subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Affairs I have stressed on numerous occasions the great natural wealth of Africa, much of it as yet uncharted.

In the July 1967 issue of Perspectives Nigeriennes, the sprightly publication of the Office of Information of Niger, appears the following interesting account of rich uranium deposits newly discovered in Niger and the plans for their disposal:

President Diori Hamani arrived in Paris on July 2, and on the 5th he had talks with General de Gaulle for over an hour.

On leaving the Elysée, he said: "I can tell you that we talked about coming to an agreement on the exploitation of uranium deposits discovered in the northern part of Niger.

"We believe that an agreement between both governments will settle the terms of exploitation and of Niger's and France's share in this exploitation. I shall be signing the agreement myself on behalf of my country at the end of the month".

Under its terms, France will be the priority customer, but once her needs have been covered, the remainder will be exported elsewhere. Niger's newly-discovered uranium deposits are extremely rich. The first deposit which will be worked, and which represents only a small proportion of the whole, contains 20,000 tons of uranium metal which is identical with the famous Colorado deposits. The content of the deposits was first put at 1.5 to 2 per thousand but has now been definitely established at 2.5 per thousand.

The working of the Nigerian deposits will have important consequences, for the future needs of Niger and the international market.

CROCODILE 100 MILLION YEARS AGO

Equally interesting, although touching the wealth of faraway history instead of the wealth of the future, is an article in Perspectives Nigeriennes on animal life in Niger 100 million years ago.

It long has been believed that the continent of Africa was the birthplace of man, thus giving us all a common heritage of African descent, but as far as I have been informed about as far back as anyone has gone in his tracing of the human race is a million years. I am extending my remarks at this point to include the article from Perspectives Nigeriennes that traces the African crocodile back some 100 million years. The article follows:

It is already two years ago since geologists of the French Atomic Energy Commission discovered to the south of Ténéré near Agadès, an impressive deposit of vertebrate fossils belonging to the lower cretaceous period, 100 million years ago.

Listed among the findings of a young researcher from the Paris Natural History Museum, is the Iguanodon, an ancestror of the Iguana which walked on its two hind legs, and whose head, which terminated in a beak, was 25 feet above the ground. It was herbivorous.

The dinosaur also lived on vegetable matter, and was the largest of all, sometimes reaching a length of 120 feet. The most interesting findings of all, however, were the remains of a crocodile of unknown species. Forty-five feet long, it outmeasures any known crocodile either past or present. Nor is it a case of one isolated example, as the fossils discovered at Gadoufaoua include many of this species. The fossils are in an extremely fine state of preservation, and, by studying the sediment surrounding them, it has been possible to reconstruct the Agadès landscape during the secondary era: it was an essentially marshy region with luxurious vegetation.

It seems, then, that this particular area of Niger is to become a key site in Paleontological studies.

Alongside the fossile findings, evidence of neolithic men (9,000 to 3,000 BC) has been unearthed: harpons, spear-heads and fashioned flint. The location of these tools, together with many remains of fish, have led to the conclusion that a lake formerly existed in the region.

AGADÈS, CAPITAL WITH A HISTORY

Mr. Speaker, I am further extending my remarks to include the following article by Gilbert Houlet in the July issue of Perspectives Nigeriennes:

"Agadès, the capital with a marvellous past, still contains lingering memories of raids and wars waged by its sultans. It is a town which has remained intact, a visitor wandering through its narrow winding streets will find himself reliving the pages written by the great explorers of the beginning of the century: Laing, Barth and René Caillé.

In a large open space in the centre of the town stands the busy market, even more striking in its typical aspect. The everyday produce being sold there tends to perplex the outside observer: salt, for instance, which has been carried by camel over hundreds of miles, and is sold in the form of columns complete with chapters; medicines derived from plants and strange powders; richly coloured often elaborately tooled camel seats, invariably decorated with the Targui cross.

We leave the market and go into a jeweller's shop with an entrance so tiny that we must stoop to get in. Sitting uncomfortably on the ground, we watch a ring being made. First of all it is cast, and then engraved, and if the final product is not of the greatest delicacy, that is only due to the fact that the tools used have remained unchanged throughout the centuries. Besides rings and pendants, here are also made the famous Agadès crosses, models of which are to be found all over Africa, as well as in Paris jeweller's shops.

Among the famous buildings which have come down to us from the town's turbulent and brilliant past is the mosque, built in the 16th century, and the only remaining religious building of three that the town boasted. It is made entirely from baked earth and is in the form of a large enclosure of low walls flanked by huts and a fine sugar-loaf minaret, eighty feet high and bristling with spikes. Inside, an earthen staircase leads up to the top from where there is an outstanding view over the whole town, with the plain vanishing over the horizon to the south, and the Air mountains rising in the distant north. At the foot of the mosque are the mins of the former sultan's palace, which today is little more than a line of crumbling walls and a three-story building with narrow windows. Another architectural curiosity is the collection of houses grouped around the market-place. These are also made from baked earth, decorated with arab-inspired motifs in relief, and have terraced roofs with openwork balustrades.

Rats

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 20, 1967

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, today's Washington Daily News carried an editorial that clearly defined the intent of the House debate on the so-called rat extermination bill. The point to be made is that costs have to be halted somewhere. On the fact that most cities already have rat extermination programs, it just does not seem to me that it is necessary for the Federal Government to become involved in something that already is being accomplished locally. The Federal Government is faced, by some estimates, with a deficit in war cost projections of $6 billion, and an overall budget deficit rated by some to be as high as $30 billion in fiscal year 1968. Mr. Speaker, I could not support an expenditure of $40 million for getting the Federal Government into the rat extermination business. I call to the attention of my colleagues the July 24, 1967, editorial, Rats, which follows:

RATS

Just as was predicted on the floor of the House at the time, President Johnson acts as if he intends to make a political issue of the House defeat last week of his so-called "rat extermination" bill.

The way the President talks of it the issue is rats vs. children. This strikes us as unfair to the majority of House members who voted down his bill.

It is true there was some levity in the House debate—facetious questions about whether there would a Federal "rat commissioner," and other corny cracks. But nobody denies rats are a genuine menace—they are dirty, they lug disease, they often bite small children, they are foremost among our pests.

But what the House was trying to say, in voting down this $40 million bill, was not that the majority favors rats, or has any lack of sympathy for a campaign to get rid of them.

This bill was only another in a great string of legislation over the years in which the Federal Government has moved into local affairs lock, stock and barrel of borrowed money. In this case, right into the garbage cans—for one of the vague provisions cf the bill was that the Housing and Urban Development Department would undertake to "improve" garbage collection.

It was just that the House finally decided a line had to be drawn somewhere.

Moreover, four other Government agencies already have "rat control" programs of some description, apparently not very effective ones. The House noted that despite the millions or billions the Government pours into hundreds of so-called local-aid programs, the results rarely are comparable to the spending. In this case, the House simply concluded—on the basis of past evidence—that this would be just another Federal program which would grow and grow, while the rat population grew right along with it.

The 207-to-176 vote by which the President's rat bill was defeated was not a vote in defense of rats; it was merely a register of House opinion that the Government wouldn't turn out to be a very good ratter.

U.S. Arms Sales—III

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 24, 1967

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, last week I inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD the first of two articles by Neil Sheehan, of the New York Times, concerning the international arms trade. The final article in this series appeared on July 21. It deals with arms sales by the industrialized countries to developing nations. Most of these sales seem to originate in economic competition among the great powers, but they have explosive consequences for their recipients in the third world war. For example, the United States sold A–4 jets to Argentina to prevent her from buying from Britain; this prompted Chile to acquire jets; when the United States would not sell, Chile bought the equipment from Britain which was originally offered to Argentina. This in turn led Peru to seek jets, and we are now endeavoring to dissuade her.

Mr. Sheehan noted the economic burdens these arms spirals impose. He also discusses the sales of private merchants, which are relatively minor compared to Government dealings.

Today the New York Times published an editorial which discusses the interpretations of this traffic in arms.

The import of this trade should not be lost upon Congress. Every effort must be made to end the arms race and to achieve disarmament under effective international control.

The final article by Neil Sheehan published on July 21 and the New York Times editorial of July 24 follow:

PRIVATE DEALER DOES A BRISK BUSINESS IN SURPLUS ARMAMENTS

(By Neil Sheehan)

WASHINGTON, July 20.—"While Mr. Nasser's tanks were still burning," said Samuel Cummings, the world's leading private arms merchant, "we were already negotiating with Israelis for the light weapons."

These "light weapons" were about 70,000 Soviet-made rifles and several thousand pistols. They were abandoned along with large stocks of ammunition by the fleeing troops of President Gamal Abdel Nasser, of the United Arab Republic during the Arab-Israeli war last month.

Mr. Cummings, president of the International Armaments Corporation, intends to purchase the bulk of the captured weapons and ammunition from the Israeli Government for sale to sportsmen and collectors in the United States and other non-Communist countries.

WAR WITH IMPORTED WEAPONS

The Arab-Israeli war, fought entirely with imported weapons was but one manifestation of a growing international problem—the rapid build-up of conventional arms in the developing countries.

In the five-year period ended June 30, 1966, the United States, through the Defense Department's arms salesman, Henry J. Kuss Jr. a much bigger arms merchant than Mr. Cummings, $11.1-billion worth of weapons, 89 per cent of which went to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization allies and to Australia and Japan.

No percentage breakdown is available for the $1.5-billion worth sold in the fiscal year ended June 30. Mr. Kuss intends to maintain sales of about $2-billion a year until 1975. Sales combined with grants totaled about $3-billion a year in arms exports.

The Administration defends the sales as necessary to strengthen allies, to promote political objectives and to ease the United States balance of payments.

Mr. Kuss professes puzzlement at the increasing concern in Congress and elsewhere over his operations, a concern which has been deepened by the Arab-Israeli war—the third since 1948.

A "NATURAL OUTGROWTH"

"It was such a natural outgrowth of what the United States had been doing all along," he said, referring to the vast grant aid program of the nineteen-fifties, when the United States distributed $17-billion in arms free of charge.

"Congress complained for years" about giving away arms, he said. "Why the complaining now that we're selling them?" he asked.

One of the complaints was by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. A staff study in January said:

"In Europe, American arms salesmanship has often been zealous to the point of irritation and overpowering to the point of encouraging the Europeans to compete more aggressively for the arms markets in the underdeveloped regions of the world."

The usual Defense Department reply to this criticism is that only 11 per cent of the arms have gone to the underdeveloped countries. All sales in this category, they maintain, are carefully coordinated with the State Department and the other responsible Government agencies.

But 11 per cent of the $11.1-billion in sales as of June 30, 1966, means that arms worth $1.22-billion were sold to the sensitive underdeveloped regions in the five-year period. About $998-million of this $1.22-billion has gone to the most explosive areas—the Middle East, India and Pakistan.

SECONDARY SALES PROBLEM

There is also growing evidence that the sales to European allies are worsening the serious surplus problem there, with the result that the Europeans sell their second-hand weapons to the developing countries in order to recover some of the foreign exchange they have handed to Mr. Kuss for new American arms.

The United States has already been pushed into one arms sale in Latin America, 25 A-4 Skyhawk jet attack bombers to Argentina in 1965 to prevent the Argentines from diverting foreign exchange for British planes.

Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara acknowledged uring Congressional testimony in April, 1966, that the sale had been made for economic reasons.

What relationship did the sales have to the maintenance of internal security in Ar-Argentina?, Mr. McNamara was asked. "The answer is nothing," he replied, "absolutely nothing."

He explained that the alternative would have been to see Argentina purchase planes from "another nation at a much higher price, which would involve a much greater diversion from her economic resources."

A CHAIN REACTION

The sale to Argentina prompted Chile, which has always considered Argentina a potential threat, to ask for Skyhawks too. Since the planes could not be supplied because of the Vietnam war, Chile paid Britain, the "other nation" that had made the original sales offer to Argentina, about $20 million for 21 Hawker-Hunter jets.

The Chilean purchase then led Peru to seek jets as well. The United States offered the Peruvians 15 old-model F–86 jet fighter-bombers. The Peruvians turned down the offer. They wanted more modern planes and they are reported to be prepared to purchase supersonic Mirage fighter-bombers from France.

The acquisition of Mirages by Peru could heighten the arms competition, since the Latin countries now possess only subsonic jets.

Mr. Kuss inadvertently provided some testimony last year on why the Europeans are seeking to recover foreign exchange spent on American weapons.

He told the Los Angeles World Affairs Council "that while military exports constitute less than 5 per cent of the total defense business in the United States, they constitute a much more significant proportion of the balance of the free world's defense business, running 15 to 20 per cent average and sometimes 50 to 75 per cent of individual or country defense expenditures."

European nations are also selling their own newly manufactured and second hand arms to the developing regions because Mr. Kuss's aggressive salesmanship and the superior quality of American weapon have hurt sales by the Europeans to each other.

After Britain lost out to Mr. Kuss on a $37-million tank sale to Italy in the spring of 1965, Prime Minister Wilson decided to intensify Britain's arms export business.

France is exporting about 40 per cent of her aerospace production, much of it to the developing countries. Paris has ignored the United Nations arms embargo against South Africa and since 1963 has sold that country about $300-million in jet fighters, tanks and helicopters and is expected to sell submarines there soon.

Israel's 250 fighters and 50 bombers were all French-made—Mirage, Mystère, Ouragan and Vautour models.

A study of the international arms traffic published in October by the Institute of Strategic Studies in London estimated that as of 1965 about $1.2-billion worth of arms was flowing annually into the underdeveloped regions.

This total included about $450-million from the United States, both sales and grants, $400-million from the Soviet Union, $200-million from France and $150-million from Britain. The flow from the Soviet Union has grown since 1965.

In sales alone, Defense Department statistics show that American arms purchased by and actually delivered to the developing countries have increased 13 times over five years from $34-million in the 1962 fiscal year to $444-million in the 1966 fiscal year.

Italy, West Germany, Canada, Sweden, Switzerland and Belgium are providing additional weapons in smaller but still significant quantities.

The problem of controlling the flow of arms to the underdeveloped regions has been complicated by the burgeoning demand since World War II.

The number of independent states has risen from 50 to 120. Each new nation seeks arms, for everything from an independence day parade to crushing an internal rebellion or pursuing a territorial dispute with a neighbor.

SUPPLY AND DEMAND RISE

The supply of weapons and the number of suppliers have swollen along with the demand. Until 1955, the United States and Britain exercised a virtual monopoly over arms traffic to the so-called third world, and an informal but reasonably effective control was enforced.

Over the last decade this gentleman's agreement has collapsed as the Soviet Union, France and the other European countries have become active suppliers.

Australia and Japan can be expected to join the ranks and China will probably become a significant supplier soon.

Although profit has been the primary motive for the European nations' sales, Moscow and Washington export arms to the underdeveloped world for primarily political purposes.

In the Middle East and North Africa, the United States shipped tanks, antiaircraft missiles, armored personnel carriers and other military equipment to Israel and to the conservative Arab states, Jordan and Saudi Arabia. Washington has also been arming Morocco and has supplied the great bulk of the equipment for Iran's armed forces.

The Soviet Union has concentrated on arming what are called the radical Arab states—Egypt, Syria, Iraq and Algeria.

Egypt and Saudi Arabia are supporting opposing factions in a civil war in Yemen.

Washington has agreed to sell the Iranians $135-million worth of F–4 Phantom jets, the most advanced of operational American fighter-bombers, to MIG–21's Iraq has received from the Soviet Union.

Algeria and Morocco last fought a border war in 1963 and they appear to be preparing for a second round. The United States has now promised to sell Morocco F–5 jet fighters while the Soviet Union steadily pumps more tanks and MIG–21's into Algeria.

Arms have sometimes gained the major powers considerable influence with the recipient nation. This has been the case for the Soviet Union in Egypt and Syria and for the United States in Jordan, Saudi Arabia and Ethiopia.

But in other instances, the arms shipments have brought negligible influence.

At least $1.5-billion worth of American arms, almost all of it free, did not prevent Pakistan from drifting toward China in 1965. The $1.2-billion in Soviet arms to Indonesia did not inhibit President Sukarno from adopting a pro-Chinese foreign policy in 1964 and 1965 to the dismay of Moscow.

USED WEAPONS ON REDS

Ironically, the Indonesian Army then used Russian weapons both to massacre the Indonesian Communist party, Moscow's long-range hope there, and to depose President Sukarno after an abortive Communist coup d'état in September of 1965.

Perhaps no instance illustrates the manifold pitfalls of arms diplomacy so well as the Soviet experience last month in the Middle East.

The $1-billion in weapons to Egypt and the $800-million to Syria, Iraq and Algeria since 1955, much of it virtually given away, did buy the Soviet Union influence with President Nasser and the Syrian leaders. But the arms did not bring Moscow control, and Soviet prestige with the Arabs suffered when Moscow did not intervene militarily to save them from defeat.

With at least half of its investment destroyed or captured by the Israelis, the Soviet Union now faces the prospect of having to invest another billion to rearm Egypt and Syria to retain its influence with their leaders or perhaps even to prevent these leaders from being overthrown from within.

PRODUCE INTERNAL PROBLEMS

Then there are internal problems that arise in the recipient countries.

Social and economic progress are often hampered by the diversion of large amounts of foreign exchange for weapons. The entrenchment of military bureaucracies that resist social change and acquire vested political interests is also a frequent result.

Indonesia is an example of a country whose economy has been beggared by the impossible task of supporting large armed forces that cannot even maintain and use their MIG–21 jets, medium range bombers, tanks, submarines, destroyers and a cruiser.

A study by the United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency estimated that the developing countries paid out about $4-billion in foreign exchange for debt service in 1964, which was equal to about "one half of all the new economic aid extended to them that year." Much of this debt had been incurred for armaments.

India is attempting to reschedule her very large foreign debt payments, partly because of heavy arms purchases.

Yet very little has been done by the United States, the Soviet Union and the other industrialized nations to begin bringing the dangerous proliferation of conventional arms under control.

LATIN AMERICAN EFFORT

Only in Latin America has the Administration made a serious effort to impose control on conventional arms.

At the Punta del Este meeting in mid-April, the Administration attempted to persuade the Latin-American states to pledge not to purchase or manufacture supersonic aircraft, naval vessels heavier than destroyers, missiles or tanks over 30 tons.

The Latin-Americans balked and the conference finally settled for a somewhat vague statement that the separate states would "avoid military expenditures that are not indispensable in order to carry out the specific missions of the armed forces."

The United States has behaved in the opposite fashion in the Middle East and North Africa, where its arms shipments have significantly increased over the last three years.

The latest Arab-Israeli war has now led the Administration to appeal to the Soviet Union to cooperate in imposing a limitation on arms traffic to the Middle East. President Johnson has also proposed that the United Nations ask all of its members to make public any future shipments to the area.

The Soviet Union has given no evidence of wishing to cooperate and has already begun rearming Egypt and Syria.

Secretary of State Dean Rusk has made clear that without Soviet cooperation, the Administration intends to continue its policy of arming both Israel and the conservative Arab states.

Similarly, the United States has evolved no long-range policy to deal with the growing problem of surplus arms. The State Department simply grapples with each case as it arises. The most recent prominent example occurred last year when West Germany sold 90 surplus F–86 jet fighter-bombers to Iran, and Iran in turn shipped them to Pakistan.

Although Washington eventually persuaded Pakistan to send the planes back to Iran, the incident indicated that American control over the ultimate use of weapons through agreements tends to weaken as the surpluses accumulate.

This issue is becoming steadily more complicated because of the practice of granting manufacturing licenses to foreign countries.

Canada originally produced the F–86's that West Germany sold to Iran. Canada is now manufacturing Northrop F–5 fighters under license and the Netherlands will begin producing them soon.

Japan, West Germany, Italy, The Netherlands and Belgium either have produced or are producing Lockheed F–104 Starfighters, and Italy is manufacturing M–113 armored personnel carriers and M–60 tanks. At least 1,400 Starfighters have been manufactured abroad.

About three months ago, Mr. Cummings, the private arms merchant, wrote a letter to the State Department. He asked to what developing countries he would be allowed to arrange sales of the 5,000 tanks and 1,000 jet fighter-bombers he estimates will enter the European surplus market by 1970.

A long-delayed reply finally informed him that the department could give him no advance permission. He was told that he would have to approach it on a case-by-case basis.

It was also made clear to him in conversations that the department would prefer him to make no transactions at all.

As an American dealer, Mr. Cummings makes no sales that are not approved by the Government.

"In other words," he said, "the State Department doesn't have a policy. They have their heads stuck in the sand. They are hoping that all those planes and tanks will just go away some night like a bad dream. Well, they won't. The Europeans aren't going to dump those arms in the sea. They're going to get their money back."

"If I don't get permission to arrange the sales," he said, "then my distardly European competitors will sell them."

[From the New York Times, July 24, 1967]

Feeding the Arms Race

Some members of Congress are beginning to ask searching questions about America's government-sponsored, booming international arms business. It's about time. A series of events in recent years has cast serious doubt on some of the basic assumptions that underlie the arms aid and sales programs. In a number of situations, it is clear that the decision to sell or give American arms has done more harm than good to the interests of the United States.

In a series of articles on the arms business, Neil Sheehan reported in The Times last week that this country has given away or sold $46.3 billion worth of arms in the last seventeen years. Weapons sales in the last fiscal year totaled $1.5 billion and the Defense Department's supersalesman of arms, Henry J. Kuss, Jr., says he intends to boost that figure to $2 billion a year for the next eight years.

Administration spokesmen argue that arms sales and aid have helped to strengthen free world defenses against Communist aggression. They point out that 89 per cent of recent arms sales have gone to members of the NATO alliance. In most cases, such sales unquestionably have given American allies more and better arms for their money because of superior American research and the efficiency of mass production. But these advantages have been bought at a price that is becoming increasingly dear for the alliance and the world.

Aggressive sales tactics have provoked growing resentment among European countries who fear the political consequences of overdependence on the United States for arms and the economic implications of increasing American superiority in the technologies associated with arms development. Instead of bowing meekly to the American drive for dominance in the arms field, the Europeans have entered the international arms competition with determined vigor, further aggravating the worldwide arms race.

The United States is also shipping increasing amounts of weapons to the developing nations—1.2-billion dollars' worth in the last five years—in the name of "mutual security." This is an area of the arms business particularly open to question. Sometimes arms aid is justified in terms of political expedience, for the purchase of political influence. More often than not, such influence proves to have been an illusion, as when Pakistan cast her lot with Red China against India; or, in the case of the Soviet Union, when Jakarta's generals used Russian arms to suppress a Communist uprising.

Certainly some arms sales and aid will continue to be prudent where proved friends are seriously threatened and for as long as the Soviet Union refuses to cooperate in curbing arms races, as in the Middle East.

But the search for alternatives, such as arms limitation and the development of effective United Nations peace-keeping forces, must be pressed with vigor and imagination. To continue to peddle arms with the reckless enthusiasm that has characterized American policy in the recent past is to settle for a solution to the problem of international insecurity that is demonstrably self-defeating.

Exercise in Logic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 12, 1967

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Chicago Tribune, in this morning's edition, carried a very fascinating editorial which speaks for itself. In view of the fact that it pertains to a number of issues which will continue to have the interest of the House I insert it in the Record at this point:

Exercise in Logic

Newark is in New York City's back yard, and indeed provides an airport which helps serve the city. So, because there were riots in Newark which claimed 24 lives and caused millions of dollars in property damage, the New York Times has chosen to worry out loud about the spiritual health of Illinois.

True, Newark is a 20 minute bus ride across the Hudson river from New York, and Illinois is some 700 miles away, so that the connection is not readily apparent, but the New York Times was equal, after a fashion, to the difficulty.

"Newark's grim reminder of the nation's real needs," it states, "makes particularly abhorrent the pork barrel politics that won out when the Senate voted to approve Weston, Ill., as the site for what is scheduled to be the country's largest atom smasher. But credit goes to Senators Pastore, Javits, and their colleagues who exposed the real issues at stake, and who won a moral victory when the vote margin in Weston's favor proved much narrower than had been expected.

"Much of the Senate debate centered properly around the open housing issue and the failure of the relevant Illinois and local authorities to provide adequate assurance that Negroes will be able to get housing on a par with whites in the neighborhood of this giant machine. There were numerous towns and cities with appropriate open housing regulations that would have been delighted to have the atom smasher."

It is not to be inferred that the Times is necessarily opposed to pork barrel projects, if the atom smasher can be so classified. It is opposed to them only when New York does not get them, and so is Sen. Javits, who exerted himself mightily to keep the nuclear accelerator from going to Weston simply because he would have been happier to place it at the Brookhaven National laboratory on Long Island, or elsewhere in New York state.

Further dissection of the Times argument would disclose that, while New York City may have an open housing ordinance, so does Chicago, and that, while Newark has no open housing ordinance, Weston and two adjacent communities Wheaton and Joliet, do.

Also the Rev. Martin Luther King has publicly stated that he knows of no city in the nation that has done more than Chicago to advance the cause of open housing, and that for that reason no marches would be required here. He and Mayor Daley have both paid tribute to the efforts of the Leadership Council for Metropolitan Open Communities, whose activities embrace the city and its environs, so that Weston, 30 miles away, would certainly be comprehended.

Altho Newark has no open occupancy ordinance, Don Mal 'Afronte, administrative assistant to Mayor Hugh Addonizio, explains that this is no deficiency because a state open occupancy law prevails. Therefore, if the Times argument has validity, Newark should have been insured against the very troubles which it conceives may sometime afflict distant Illinois, only it didn't turn out that way.

The imperfections of Times logic are sufficiently demonstrated by the facts, but it has another arrow in the editorial quiver. The Weston accelerator, it argues, is a "luxury" because [1] we are in a war in Viet Nam; [2] there are riots in the streets, at least in its neighbor city; [3] "millions of Americans lack proper housing, adequate medical care, and essential educational opportunity," and [4] "the budget cutters are in full cry."

We wonder if the Times would have still felt that way had Sen. Javits been successfull in his efforts to snatch the atomic "pork barrel" for New York.

But This One Will Help

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD D. McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 19, 1967

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of the House of Representatives an editorial that appeared in the New York Times last Wednesday, July 19, 1967. It was on that day that the House passed the so-called antiriot bill. The editorial cites the need for effective gun-control legislation as a measure to combat urban rioters, a provision that was unfortunately not part of the bill passed by this body.

The editorial follows:

But This One Will Help

If ever a message came through clearly, it was the crack of rifles, shotguns and even automatic weapons in the hands of lawless rioters in Newark. But one circumstance that led to their criminal actions—the possession of these arms—was in most cases perfectly legal.

How many more police officials and innocent bystanders will fall under the rifle fire before Congress and the states get the message? How many more self-righteous statements will be issued by the gun lobbyists—completely distorting the meaning of the constitutional right to bear arms—while citizens are shot down like deer in the hunting season? Of course it was criminal for the rioters to pull the triggers—but why should those guns have been in their hands in the first place?

New Jersey has a strict gun-control law requiring investigation and clearance of all prospective buyers of rifles and pistols—but when darkness fell the law meant nothing. It is almost as easy to buy and transport a killing weapon from one state to another as it is to smuggle a carton of cigarettes to avoid the tax. That this is not one city's or state's problem was underscored when more than forty persons from Manhattan, Brooklyn, and Staten Island were rounded up in Newark carrying rifles and revolvers.

An Administration bill, stuck in Congressional Committee, prohibits mail-order sales of firearms and over-the-counter sale of hand guns to nonresidents of a state, calls for disclosure of identification and age of purchaser of firearms from Federally licensed dealers. While this would not ban rifles, and more stringent registration would be required by the states, at least it would help to control the sale and possession of dangerous weapons.

The anti-gun bill should precede consideration of an antiriot bill (see above). The leadership must come from Congress itself. Legally armed rioters are a corollary of the sharpshooters' lobby on Capitol Hill.

Hazards Encountered by OEO's VISTA Workers

SPEECH

OF

HON. THEODORE R. KUPFERMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 20, 1967

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Office of Economic Opportunity has tried several interesting new approaches in its work against poverty. One of the OEO programs that is of particular significance is VISTA—Volunteers in Service to America.

An article from the New York Post, of July 12, illustrates rather well some of the hazards and opportunities that VISTA service presents to its volunteers.

I would like to include in the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, the following article from the Post for the benefit of my colleagues who would like to know more about the day-to-day operations in the VISTA program:

GAMBLERS HARASS VISTA—ROCKY'S NEPHEW STAYS ON JOB

(By Mike Pearl)

A young nephew of Gov. Rockefeller is working as a volunteer social worker in the midst of a campaign of terror waged by East Harlem gambling racketeers.

He is Laurance Rockefeller Jr., 22, son of Gov. Nelson Rockefeller's brother who is one of the nation's leading conservationists.

In an attempt to force the block community programs of Volunteers In Service To America (VISTA) to move out of East Harlem, one volunteer worker's automobile was burned and 14 shots were fired into a meeting hall used by the group.

While Rockefeller himself has not been bothered, many of his co-workers have been threatened and harassed and several have moved out of the neighborhood.

The terror tactics began two months ago when a policy runner was arrested on 119th St. near First Ave.

"The guy who runs the book blamed the arrest on the 'do-gooders'. He felt their being in the neighborhood had activated more than normal police attention," and one police official close to the investigation.

TOO MUCH BLUE

"The word went out," the official said. "There's too much blue (policemen) around here. Get those————do-gooders out of here."

VISTA workers began receiving threatening phone calls. On June 9 an automobile belonging to Stefan Larkin, 23, a VISTA block worker, was set on fire and destroyed.

A 16-year-old neighborhood boy was arrested for arson.

"He is only a tool," said Capt. William J. O'Rourke of the E. 126th St. Station House.

O'Rourke said the youth was quickly bailed out for $1,500 by a man with "a long record" of policy arrests.

"This man who provided the bail has a personal dislike for VISTA workers," O'Rourke said.

Last Thursday, the night before the arson suspect was due to appear at a hearing in Criminal Court, 14 shots were fired into the front door of 336 E. 119th St., a meeting hall used by VISTA and other community action groups.

"This was an attempt to scare witnesses from testifying," the police official said.

NO ARRESTS

The hearing was postponed until Aug. 3.

Police investigation found the remains of several bullets they believe came from a .30 cal. rifle. Although several persons have been questioned in the shooting, no arrests have been made.

According to David Borden, the 31-year-old director of Block Communities, Inc., 2109 First Ave., Larkin was forced to move away from East Harlem because of numerous threats on his life.

"But he still comes gack to work with the residents," Borden said. "Whenever he comes back to 119th St. a couple of detectives are not too far away. The police have the block under heavy surveillance."

Borden said that Larkin's life had been threatened because "the racketeers don't want police on the block."

Larkin's car was set afire after a meeting of local citizens at which 130 signatures were collected asking for more police protection.

The Block Communities, Inc. is part of a program which calls for volunteers to live in the block where they work to encourage residents to work in community activities and help them take advantage of city services.

Young Rockefeller, like Larkin, is a VISTA volunteer, working for Block Communities, Inc., for $50 a month.

Despite trouble and violence going on around him and other block workers, Rockefeller said he enjoyed helping the tenants help themselves at E. 121st St. where he lives and works.

Borden himself, after receiving several threats, moved his wife and children out of the city.

A neighbor of young Rockefeller, block worker Charles Lucas has received many threats from racketeers, Borden said, "but he

"This is a pretty classic situation," said a police official.

stayed on the block."

"This is the type of thing that happens the moment anyone tries to do something good in an area where racketeers are active."

The police official said that many of the people in the numbers racket couldn't understand why what they were doing was illegal.

"They want to know how this kid's uncle (the Governor) can run a lottery and they can't," he said.

Conservation Through Cooperation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 24, 1967

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, July 16, I had the privilege of attending a ceremony dedicating 58-acre Powell Pond, in Glen Cove, N.Y., for the purpose of perpetual conservation.

The funds and initiative for assuring the perpetual preservation of this beautiful location in the Third Congressional District were solely private. It is indeed rewarding and encouraging to see several groups of private citizens work together in the valuable effort for conservation of our remaining green spots and unimproved waterways.

Involved in the conservation of Powell Pond were: The North Shore Bird and Game Sanctuary, which has assumed responsibility for maintaining the pond and its shoreline; the East and West Island Associations of Glen Cove; and the Matinecock Rod and Gun Club. Special mention for private efforts went most appropriately to Mrs. Junuis P. Morgan, of Glen Cove; and Miss Jane Powell, who officially dedicated the pond in the memory of her parents—Mr. and Mrs. Francis Powell. Besides the involvement of the groups and individuals mentioned there were also individual contributions to enable the bird and game sanctuary to purchase the property from approximately 200 people.

If such selfiess private efforts for conservation could be realized throughout the United States we would be much more successful, much more rapidly in our effort to assure the maintenance of our valuable natural resources. I commend to my colleagues' attention the fine work done by interested and active citizens to conserve the valuable resource of Powell Pond, in Glen Cove, N.Y.

Ralph Roberts

SPEECH

OF

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 19, 1967

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, Ralph Roberts was Clerk of the House when my father served in Congress and Ralph Roberts was Clerk when I came to Congress. Ralph Roberts has been a kind and good friend to both of us.

The fact that Mr. Roberts hails from the hills of southern Indiana, the place of my father's boyhood, makes even greater our affection for him. Ralph Roberts served the House well. All Members miss him.

Captive Nations Week

SPEECH

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 19, 1967

Mr. MORSE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, it is with regret that I join my colleagues once again in marking Captive Nations Week. It is with regret because there are still so many men and women who long for freedom and who work actively toward its achievement, yet who are oppressed by governments directed from outside their own land.

We are constantly aware of the struggles going on in central and eastern Europe, but it is well to set aside a week to remind ourselves and our fellow Americans of their steadfastness and dedication to liberty.

Our own freedom is less because all the peoples of the world do not share in its fruits. Let us resolve once again to support the aspirations of the peoples of the captive nations.

Monday, July 24, 1967

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Senate worked on interest equalization tax bill.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S 10035–S 10066

Bills Introduced: Seven bills and three resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 2152–2158; and S. Res. 145–147.

Page S 10037

Resolution Reported: Report was made as follows:

S. Res. 147, authorizing printing of a report by the Department of Agriculture entitled "Parity Rates Positions of Farms" (no written report)—referred to Committee on Rules and Administration. Pages S 10036–S 10037

Legislative Appropriations: H.R. 10368, fiscal 1968 appropriations for the legislative branch, was cleared for President's signature when Senate, by 62 yeas to 21 nays, adopted conference report thereon.

Pages S 10066–S 10076

Subversive Activities Control Board: S. Res. 145, authorizing Committee on Appropriations to investigate the work of the Subversive Activities Control Board, was submitted, considered, and adopted.

Pages S 10100–S 10103

Taxation: Senate considered, but did not complete action on, H.R. 6098, extending for 2 years tax on acquisition of stock and debt obligations of a foreign issuer. All committee amendments were adopted en bloc which were then considered as original text for purpose of further amendment.

Pending at adjournment was Williams of Delaware amendment to limit extension of the legislation to 1 year rather than 2 years.

By unanimous consent, it was agreed that on Tuesday, July 25, following Senate's convening there will be 50 minutes of speeches on matters unrelated to H.R. 6098, following which there will be a period of routine morning business with speeches limited to 3 minutes.

Pages S 10076–S 10080, S 10106–S 10114, S 10123

Confirmations: Senate confirmed nominations of Walter W. Wilcox, of Maryland, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Commodity Credit Corporation; and of Warren M. Christopher, of California, to be Deputy Attorney General.

Senator Williams of Delaware withdrew motion he had entered on Friday, July 21, that Senate reconsider its action of Monday, July 17, in confirming nomination of Simon F. McHugh, of D.C., to be a member of the Subversive Activities Control Board. Page S 10156

Record Vote: One record vote was taken today.

Page S 10072

Program for Tuesday: Senate met at noon and adjourned at 5:29 p.m. until noon Tuesday, July 25, when, following 50 minutes of speeches on other matters, Senate will resume consideration of its unfinished business H.R. 6098, interest equalization tax. Pages S 10123, S 10156

Committee Meetings

(*Committees not listed did not meet*)

APPROPRIATIONS—INDEPENDENT OFFICES

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee resumed its hearings on H.R. 9960, fiscal 1968 appropriations for independent offices, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development, having as its witness Lee C. White, Chairman, Federal Power Commission.

Hearings continue tomorrow to hear HUD Secretary Weaver.

HOUSING

Committee on Banking and Currency: Subcommittee on Housing and Urban Affairs resumed its hearings on numerous pending bills dealing with housing, and related matters. Witnesses heard today were Walter J. Kelliher, mayor of Malden, Mass.; John Gilliland, president, Mortgage Bankers Association; Dwight Townsend, the Cooperative League of the USA; Dr. David Mullins, president, University of Arkansas, representing numerous educational associations; Dorothy Height, National Council of Negro Women; Clarence Mitchell, NAACP; and Harold Wise and Irving Hand, both of the Institute of Planners.

Hearings continue tomorrow.

TRANSPORTATION

Committee on Commerce: Subcommittee on Surface Transportation held hearings on S. 752, clarifying exemption with respect to transportation performed by agricultural cooperative associations for nonmembers,

Appendix

The Fourth of July in Nevada—Address by Robert Fox, Sparks, Nev.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALAN BIBLE
OF NEVADA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 25, 1967

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, this past Fourth of July I was privileged to be in Nevada and to participate in two separate Independence Day celebrations, one in the State capital, Carson City, and the other in Winnemucca, a northern Nevada ranching and mining city. In Carson City, it was an old-fashioned family picnic style of a program, while in Winnemucca, it was the more traditional Fourth of July program, replete with speeches and bands and patriotic performances.

The old-fashioned Fourth, they say, is dying out. The colorful parades, the flowery speechmaking—even the firecrackers—are supposed to be passing into American history.

This may be the trend. But there are still plenty of old-fashioned Fourths. And anyone who participates in one can never fail to be inspired. It's old-fashioned patriotism in action.

I spoke briefly during my appearances in Nevada, but I was more impressed by another Fourth of July speech at Winnemucca. It was given by Mr. Robert Fox of Sparks, Nev., who heads the State DeMolay organization. He described his talk as a mixture of John F. Kennedy quotations, U.S. Constitution, and just plain patriotism. I was impressed by his words, and I asked him to send me a copy of the address. Mr. Fox has done this, and I ask unanimous consent his Fourth of July address be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

HERITAGE
(By Robert Fox)

One hundred and ninety one years ago today "a Declaration of Independence" was adopted by our leaders in the Continental Congress.

On June 7, 1776, Richard Henry Lee had introduced a resolution in the Continental Congress, "that these United Colonies are, and of the right, ought to be free and Independent States."

The theory of independence is as old as man himself, and it was not invented in "Independence Hall" in Philadelphia—But it was in this hall, that the theory became a practice—that the word went out to all, and Thomas Jefferson's phrase, that "The God who gave us life, gave us liberty at the same time," was in fact.

We read "We hold these truths to be self evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

These words embrace the ideal philosophy of life—because by them man is released from the slavery that had held him for so long in a peculiar bondage.

And because they inspired people of many European countries to fight for their own freedom.

And because we today stand as a protective rampart for all small and freedom loving countries of the world—

And because the world of today—the world of culture and civilization that followed the "old world of the 18th century" was largely born in this document.

Though we like to think of ourselves as a young country—this is the oldest republic in the world. When the United States was founded there was a king in France, and a czar in Russia, and an emperor in Peking.

They have all been wiped away—but the United States has survived.

Today on our 191st anniversary of this country's establishment as a free nation you should be very proud Americans—

Proud of the privilege of being a citizen of this great country.

Proud of your rich heritage of freedom, opportunity, and the rights of free men bequeathed to us by our founding fathers.

Proud of the example of courage, sacrifice, and struggle set by early Americans who fought tyranny and oppression to establish a haven for the oppressed.

Proud of the eternal truths written on tablets of everlasting stone—The Declaration of Independence, the Bill of Rights, and our mighty Constitution.

Proud of the statesmanship and patriotic example impressed so indelibly on the pages of our National Archives by Franklin, Washington, Lincoln and the many others who served to make America great.

Proud of the record of our legislators on the national level.

Proud of the record of your country in never having fought a war of aggression—always in defense of the right, always in behalf of the down troden.

Proud that it has ever been merciful to the defeated—extending the hand of aid and friendship to assist in rebuilding the ruins left by war.

Proud that the public school teachers instilled in us a love for the stars and stripes, reverance for our war heroes and the pioneer builders of our great land.

Proud of the millions of God fearing, hard working, liberty seeking, emigrants who came here to tame the wilderness, unlock its native resources, rear their families, and worship without fear.

Proud of the free enterprise that has fostered research, promoted invention, stimulated industrial expansion—contributing so greatly to our present standard of living.

Proud that your country abolished slavery and is still engaged in outlawing injustice, eradicating wrongs, and expanding civil rights.

Proud that there is opportunity for every person to reach high goals through his own ability and effort.

Proud of the unexcelled institutions of learning and the great generosity of fellow citizens in providing means for education so that none may be denied the benefits of higher education.

Proud that our forefathers established the principle of separation of church and state. That every person may worship according to the dictates of his conscience.

Proud of the young Americans who have not lost the inspiration of past example and who will carry on to greater heights.

Proud of those brave men and women who in the cause of freedom, have shed their blood, that future generations may profit by their sacrifice.

And our flag stands as the symbol of our pride—proud in her beauty and inspiring to all our nation's people—I know all of you good citizens can say without reservation, "I swear allegiance."

Proud in the assurance that "under God" our beloved country will demonstrate its world leadership by an example of selflessness, helpfulness and generosity to less fortunate people all around the world and that our flag will be the freedom symbol.

I am most proud of the organizations who are the leaders in this wonderful celebration.

I am proud of *you* my fellow Nevadans, who supported this great display of civic and national pride—it is my fervent hope that this celebration be an established tradition in Winnemucca with all the supporting organizations lifting high our country's flag.

It is tradition to let the bells of all the churches ring out the sweet music of freedom on this day.

Democracy is a difficult kind of government. It requires the highest qualities of self-discipline, restraint, a willingness to make commitments and sacrifice. And it also requires knowledge.

Thomas Jefferson once said "That if you expect a people to be ignorant and free you expect what never was and never will be."

We can solve a good many of our problems—I think they are manmade and they can be solved by man. We must not keep our attention so fixed on those great issues of war and peace or of space, which are most important, but also concern ourselves with what happens in the United States.

Peace does not rest in the charters and covenants alone—it lies in the hearts and minds of all people. So let us not rest all our hopes on parchment and on paper.

Let us strive to build peace.

Exercise your privileges as Americans—vote—and know your elected representatives.

Acquaint yourselves with the teachers of your children. Join the Parent Teacher Association. Lead your children by example to a reverance for our rich heritage of freedom. Teach them the meaning of this anniversary.

It is well to remember that this nation's first great leaders—our founders—Washington, Jefferson, Madison, Monroe, Mason, Bryant, and all the rest, were not only the political leaders of this country, but were also among the most educated citizens that this country ever produced.

This is a blessed land—and America today stands for the principle that a government, of the people by the people, for the people, will live only where its people realize, the responsibilities and burdens of freedom are as nothing compared to the chains of slavery.

India's Annual Grain Losses to Animals Are Said To Match Its Imports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 25, 1967

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, before too long the House will be considering the so-called foreign aid bill. It might be well for some to consider where this so-called aid is going, and what it is for.

An article in the July 23, 1967, Washington Post confirms what I have been saying, that all of our so-called grain aid to India goes to maintain sacred cows, rats, and other animals, while they use starvation among humans to play upon American pity.

The article is as follows:

INDIA'S ANNUAL GRAIN LOSSES TO ANIMALS ARE SAID TO MATCH ITS IMPORTS

(By Warren Unna)

NEW DELHI, July 13.—If India were able to control the rats, squirrels, birds and monkeys currently making themselves at home on her precious grain she would be able to save 3 to 5 million tons of food a year—the very amount she now has to import during an average, non-draught year.

This is the estimate of India's National Rodent Control Committee in a study begun in January 1966, completed a year later, but still to be approved and released for publication by the various governmental ministries involved.

The Committee members, who include government officials as well as scientists, recommend that rodent control be an intergovernmental matter under the food, agriculture, health and land protection officials and not just left to India's 16 states to police in an uncoordinated way.

One Committee member, H. A. P. Parpia, director of the Central Food Research Technological Institute in Mysore, sounded the rodent damage cry more than a year ago and was heavily criticized as an alarmist. Parpia would go so far as to urge the creation of "Rat Ministry."

India's rat population has been estimated at anywhere up to 3 to 5 billion. But the Committee members think all estimates are wild guesses.

American officials here are inclined to believe that even the estimates on saving grain from rats is high conjecture: they say if a tally of all the "if only" loss savings were made, it would add up to 95 per cent of India's entire crop.

The National Rodent Control Committee found in its field studies that, contrary to foreign impressions, the religious Indian is not so loath to destroy animal pests which threaten his food supply and income. In Kanpur, an industrial city near this capital, a 3-year rodent control program has succeeded in reducing the number of rats, according to the Committee's secretary, K. C. Patniak, deputy director general of the government Health Ministry.

Indian sewer rats grow to a weight of several pounds. The Committee found that national attention until now has been focused on rats as conveyors of bubonic plague and that this disease, in fact, is now negligible.

The Committee found that the Food Corporation of India grain storage warehouses in the cities were adequate. But no estimate has been made in the report of what additional facilities should be built in the rodent-infested countryside, nor how much they might cost.

"But if even only a part of the 3 to 5 million tons we lose a year could be saved, this country would be marginally on the self-sufficient side," Committee Secretary Patnaik declared.

U.S. Combat Troops in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 25, 1967

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "An Error Cleared Up," published in the Richmond Times-Dispatch of Monday, July 24, 1967.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN ERROR CLEARED UP

Nationwide publication of the statement that only 71,000 of the 469,000 U.S. servicemen in Vietnam are combat troops has led many Americans to wonder how this could possibly be correct. It isn't.

Astounded by the 71,000 figure, The Times-Dispatch asked Sen. Harry F. Byrd, Jr., who recently visited Vietnam as a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, concerning its accuracy. Senator Byrd expressed doubt that it was correct, and launched an immediate inquiry through retired U.S. Army Col. Forrest Rettgers, his special assistant, who commanded a combat battalion in Korea.

Col. Rettgers talked with officials in the Department of Defense and elsewhere, and his conclusion is that whereas nobody can give an entirely accurate figure as to the number of U.S. "combat troops" in Vietnam, a realistic figure would be 230,000, or half of our force there.

Col. Rettgers says the 71,000 figure apparently was arrived at on the basis of the old rule in earlier wars that "only combat infantrymen were permitted to earn combat infantry badges." Since there are 80 infantry battalions, both Army and Marine, in Vietnam, with an average strength of about 900 men each, this figures out to 72,000.

But this total takes no account of the battalions of artillery, engineers, armored units and military police which are exposed to combat daily. Persons assigned to guarding bases are subjected to hazardous fire "almost every evening." Furthermore, many individuals in transportation truck companies, also listed as "logistic support troops," have been attacked on the road, and have been given high decorations for defending their motor pools from the Viet Cong at night.

Efforts to arrive at an accurate figure are double difficult in a jungle, rice paddy and guerrilla war of the type that is being fought in Vietnam. Nobody knows where the front is in many areas, and almost anybody in the armed services may come under attack.

Col. Rettgers concedes that any figure is bound to be a "guesstimate," but he thinks 230,000 is not too far off. Certainly 71,000 is far too small, and not remotely accurate. Nobody can find out who put out that fantastic total in the first place. It is stated, emphatically, that Defense Secretary McNamara never did so, and that some "official in Saigon is responsible."

The 50th Anniversary of Company H, 3d Infantry Regiment, New Jersey National Guard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES J. HOWARD

OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 25, 1967

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a great honor—and a great pleasure—for me to bring to the attention of my colleagues the 50th anniversary of Company H, 3d Infantry Regiment, New Jersey National Guard. This group of brave men, 50 years ago, played a central role in American history which none of us will ever forget.

Five decades ago, on the battlefield of France, they fought the war which, more than any other historical event, shaped this 20th century.

In the summer and fall of 1918, each member of Company H, 3d Infantry, New Jersey National Guard, offered his country the greatest sacrifice a man can offer. The men of Company H risked their lives, and 25 gave their lives, to make the world safe for democracy—to preserve that which is at the heart of the American way of life—liberty.

The beginnings of Company H are found before the turn of the century. The earliest seed of Company H was the McKnight Rifles, the first semimilitary organization in the city of Asbury Park, N.J. Members of the group, in 1896, became Company A, 3d Infantry, the first State unit.

At the outbreak of the Spanish American War, Company A embarked for Sea Girt, N.J., to join the main regiment. These troops reached Rome, Ga., when the war ended, and returned to Sandy Hook, where they were mustered out in February 1899.

However, upon return to Asbury Park, the men of Company A reorganized and took the name which they would garnish with honor and fame: Company H, 3d Infantry, National Guard of New Jersey.

In 1915, with Europe engulfed in a bitter and growing war, Company H began an era of vigorous military preparation. The company expanded. Between 1915 and 1917 recruiting was at its peak. In those years it was the ambition of every youth of military age in the shore area to be a member of Company H.

As the flames of war raged in Europe, President Wilson tried vainly to lead the belligerent nations to peace. However, German U-boat atrocities increased and U.S. shipping was ravished on the Atlantic. Finally, after the sinking of the *Lusitania* with great loss of American lives, on April 6, 1917, with the security of the United States threatened, and with liberty in Europe at stake, the United States declared war on Germany.

Fifty years ago today, by order of the President of the United States, the men of Company H left the armory in Asbury Park for Camp Edge, Sea Girt, for induction into Federal service. It was a proud day for the citizens of the shore area who turned out to bid their boys farewell.

The march down Lake Avenue and Cookman Avenue to the railroad station was the beginning of a journey that would end on the battlefield of France for 25 members of the company—a journey which would leave many of the others with the scars of war.

Following a training period and a sea voyage aboard the *Pastores* and *Wilhemina*, the men of Company H arrived in France. There, in a short time, they received their first casualties by poison gas—a horror spared fighting men in wars since then. In October 1918, the company suffered its heaviest casualties. I will not try to describe the battles Company H fought or try to name and list its heroes and the decorations they won. They have been inscribed on the pages of history, a testament to the men of Company H—one for their descendants to inherit with pride.

The gallantry and valor they displayed was a source of inspiration and pride to the families and friends who greeted them on their return. Every member of the company had brought distinction upon the community in which he lived, but the members of the company did not rest upon their past record. From the ranks of Company H came many of the business and political leaders of the shore area. The courage and dedication they displayed on the battlefield was transferred to combating problems which arose from a rapidly developing modern society.

I am happy to have the opportunity to commend to my colleagues this group of fine men.

REA and Rural Telephone Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN L. McMILLAN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 25, 1967

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter I recently received from Mr. Arthur M. Williams, Jr., president, South Carolina Electric & Gas Co.

I think Mr. Williams' letter contains some very valuable information and I hope every Member of Congress will take a few minutes of his valuable time to read this letter since we have been considering REA and rural telephone legislation during the past 2 years. The Agriculture Committee held several months of hearings on the REA and Rural Telephone Bank proposals during the 89th Congress and approximately 3 months' hearings this year on this subject.

I believe Mr. Williams' letter will give some of the Members who are not well acquainted with this subject some information they should have before the House votes on any of these proposals:

SOUTH CAROLINA ELECTRIC & GAS CO.,
Columbia, S.C., June 22, 1967.

HON. JOHN L. MCMILLAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MCMILLAN: As you will recall, I recently wrote in generalities concerning the continued encroachment by the Federal Power Commission on the authority of the states to regulate local public utility matters and of the impingement of that Commission into management prerogatives. As you know, the Federal Power Commission has now proposed the enactment of a so-called "Electric Power Reliability Act of 1967."

I would like to comment fairly fully upon the bill since I think it offers a matter of grave importance to the electric utility industry as well as to the concept of just how far the government should go in regulating utilities—whether this function should include with it the authority to become an integral part of management.

The principal provisions of this bill apply to all bulk power supply systems in the United States. Bulk power systems mean those systems having facilities for the generation or *transmission* of power—this includes investor-owned REA, federal systems and the like. The bill would give FPC authority to set up regional planning committees and to have representation on the same. FPC now has authority to set up regional advisory committees and has done so—I am a member of the Southeastern Regional Advisory Committee. It also has an Industry Advisory Committee, but I think it is significant that they recommended this bill without consulting with the Industry Advisory Committee.

The bill would give the Commission even more control over the utility systems involved and would *make it a party* to the reaching of economic and engineering decisions. We feel very strongly that under the private enterprise system extant in our country that these are best made at local and regional levels by company management. There is already considerable delay in implementing any decision. These delays are due to financing problems, shortages of equipment and related matters. If FPC is given authority to interject itself into management, the delay and compromising that would result would deteriorate rather than improve reliability of systems.

Fundamentally, there is no great variance between FPC and the investor-owned utility views on the need for strong interconnections and regional coordination. We have been working closely with the FPC in this field for a long period of time. The results clearly indicate that impressive goals have been achieved on a voluntary basis and under the principles inherent in the system under which we have operated for years: *regulation* by FPC, but *managed* by the investor-owned corporation.

I think it is fairly certain to assume that the June 5 blackout of the Pennsylvania-Jersey-Maryland Pool triggered the FPC's introduction of this bill. I do not believe that FPC surveillance would have prevented this. As long as human beings and equipment operate systems, there are bound to be certain failures. The wonder is not that they occur, but, in view of the tremendous use of electricity and the complicated network of transmission lines, that they have occurred so seldom. I do not know where the blame lies for the June 5 outage, but I will point out to you the very dramatic restoration of service that did take place under traumatic conditions:

1. Ties to adjoining pools successfully supplied emergency power flows.
2. Due to unavoidable delays in completion of a 500 kv transmission line, internal PJM ties were not strong enough to maintain stable conditions during transient redistribution of power following the initial outage. Nevertheless, relay and protective systems operated according to plan.
3. Damage to power system facilities was relatively light and repairs were promptly made.
4. Restoration of system facilities and resumption of service was orderly and prompt.

One basic problem of the utility industry is that as long as the lights are burning few people recognize the good service they are getting. This is especially true because of our record of reliability and the safeguards we have set up against outages causing failures. In fact, F. Stewart Brown, Chief Engineer of the Federal Power Commission, testified before a Senate Committee on June 6 that the same area affected by the June 5 outage had experienced over the last 10 years "more than 200" equipment failures in which generators went off the line; yet, "*only once did any customer lose service.*" (Emphasis added) The reason for this, of course, is that the power systems involved were interconnected and coordinated.

The record of reliability of electric power systems in this country is the finest in the world. In fact, the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission paid tribute to this in his letter transmitting the proposed act to the President of the Senate. On p. 2, he said, "The electric utility industry, acting voluntarily, has made substantial progress toward the goals of adequate interconnection and coordination." President Johnson noted in his message on consumer protection that "Much of this effort is already being voluntarily undertaken by America's great electric power industry."

Frankly, I believe that the road upon which FPC has set itself will lead ultimately to an overall single national planning pool having authority to make management decisions regarding local utility matters all over the United States. This is similar to the way England's electric systems are operated; and, frankly, this has been rather a mess, including shortages of power and related matters. The utility industry in this country has achieved what we think is the best record of any group of utility systems and, at the same time, has continually brought down the average price of its product or kilowatt-hour—despite of the continuing rise of costs of most other commodities.

Equally vital, the proposed regulation, although ostensibly concerned with reliability, goes much farther. It would require the inclusion—at the behest of FPC—in power pools of small municipalities, REA's or government-owned systems which would not properly support the operation of the pool. You are too familiar with the financing and operations of investor-owned vs. publicly-owned systems for me to go into any details about this. The Federal Power Commission has expressed concern over the ability of these small systems to derive the economic benefit which the large utilities make available to most power pools.

This argument is untenable. The development and planning of a power pool is exceedingly complex and involves extensive negotiations among the participants to resolve an equitable decision of benefits. Obviously, the Federal Power Commission can force a member upon a pool, but the benefits and equalities which normally arise through negotiations will be missing. FPC now has control over the price at which power is sold through these systems in bulk to REA's, municipalities and similar entities for resale. Surely, they can thus be certain that the benefits and the economies are available to the purchasing systems.

Most of the government-financed systems already enjoy tremendous preferences—low interest costs on money, preference taking of power from federal dams, etc. And it should be remembered that the vast majority of taxpayers and citizens take their power from investor-owned utilities. Surely, they should not be asked to bear any further burden of these "preference" customers—while at the same time the "preference" customers can share in the economies of the large power pools by the purchase of power under prices regulated by FPC.

I am sorry that I have been so prolix, but I feel that this is a matter of vital importance to the orderly development of the utility systems of the United States and to the concept of free management under *regulated* vs. government management.

With best personal regards and all good wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,
ARTHUR M. WILLIAM, Jr.

Captive Nations Week

SPEECH

OF

HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 19, 1967

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, 9 years have passed since we first observed Captive Nations Week in this country. During each of those 9 years, we have paused to take somber note of the fact that the creeping black shadow of Soviet dictatorship has enveloped nearly 100 million people who yearn for freedom as much as we. Manifestly against the will of the governed, the countries of Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Ukraine, and others have disappeared from the political map as free and independent nations. Under overwhelming force their free governments have succumbed to tyranny. Social, cultural, political, and economic institutions, centuries in the making, have crumbled. People imbued with a deep and abiding love of freedom and democracy have been isolated from the free world of which they were so long a part and have been forced to live under the cruel hand of dictatorship.

None of this has changed during these last 9 years. The captive nations of Eastern Europe remain the victims of the Kremlin's brutal aggression, even while Premier Kosygin comes before the United Nations with crocodile tears to denounce the so-called aggression of the tiny State of Israel which is struggling for its very existence. Even while the Soviet Union rants and raves about U.S. aggression in Vietnam, this visible, unquestionable evidence of her own monstrous aggression stands clearly before the world. And she makes no suggestion that she give up these countries conquered and occupied illegally and by force.

Shortly after the Congress passed the Captive Nations Week resolution in 1959, I introduced a resolution calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations. I envisioned such a committee as one which would study the moral and legal aspects of Soviet control of the captive nations, gather information about conditions existing in those nations, and come up with constructive suggestions as to how the United States can help the people of these countries, through peaceful processes, regain their national and individual freedom. Such resolutions were introduced in the 87th, 88th, and 89th Congresses. Again in this Congress, I have introduced this resolution as a constructive and necessary first step in bringing the freedom we still seek to the people of these unfortunate nations.

My concern, Mr. Speaker, is that we not become lost in an ocean of words during these annual commemorations of Captive Nations Week, words which are well intentioned but which quietly fade away when the immediate object of our concern is no longer prominently before us. My concern is that the plight of the captive nations of the world be kept constantly before us and that action be taken now which is specifically directed toward finding a tenable solution to the problem. My concern is that the people of these nations know that we are not just concerned but are dedicated to assisting them in regaining their freedom.

Mr. Speaker, I call upon the Members of this body to make 1967 not just another year in which we commemorate the subjugation of the countries of eastern Europe and elsewhere in the world but also the year in which we take another positive step toward helping these freedom-starved people lift the yoke of Communist oppression. The enactment of House Resolution 100 is one positive step we can take.

Earl Warren Junketeer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 25, 1967

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, Chief Justice Warren and his lady are again abroad—again at the taxpayers' expense, and again behind the Iron Curtain for the State Department.

The constitutional theory of separation of powers into three separate branches is violated when the judiciary accepts the role of an errand boy with the State Department, which comes under the executive branch.

One thing for sure: the State Department confirms, by its appointment, the attitude of an overwhelming number of Americans who feel Mr. Warren's image and reputation are far more acceptable in Communist Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Yugoslavia than in the United States.

We may well wonder what new Communist legal theories he will return with this time.

I include, under unanimous consent, the news account from the July 17 U.S. News & World Report following my comments:

WARRENS ON TOUR: THIS TIME IN EUROPE

WASHINGTON.—Chief Justice and Mrs. Earl Warren are abroad once more—at public expense.

The Warrens arrived in Warsaw, Poland, on July 4 for a brief visit under the auspicies of the State Department's "American specialist" program. Earlier, they made short stays in Yugoslavia and Czechoslovakia.

A State Department official said the trip was the fifth that the Chief Justice has made for the program in the past 12 years.

Last spring, a flurry of congressional criticism arose after the Warren's visited South America as guests of the State Department. Mrs. Warren was listed in official documents as a "welfare-service volunteer," and the State Department said she met with women's groups and visited hospitals.

The grants to the Warrens cover travel costs and basic daily expenses. The Chief Justice, in the course of his official travels, meets with bar-association groups, lawyers and judges.

A spokesman for the State Department's Bureau of Educational and Cultural Exchange said that organization considers itself "fortunate" when a Government official of Chief Justice Warren's stature is willing to represent the United States abroad.

What You Got and Lost in the Tariff Slashes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 25, 1967

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, the American farmers were scalped, skinned, and quartered at the Geneva Conference. This was expected by those of us who were watching the proceedings.

Claude W. Gifford, economics editor of the Farm Journal, has prepared an article for the August 1967 issue of the Farm Journal which well analyzes the situation.

The article is as follows:

WHAT YOU GOT AND LOST IN THE TARIFF SLASHES

(By Claude W. Gifford)

Just how you came out in the greatest tariff reductions in our history is now becoming clearer since the signing of the Kennedy Round agreements on June 30.

U.S. farmers got a businesslike exchange of tariff cuts with Great Britain, Canada and Japan.

But in the face-off with the European Common Market U.S. farmers were scalped, skinned and quartered.

Soybeans, tobacco, tallow and some fruits are the U.S. farm commodities that gained the most in the exchange. Those that lost the most were feed grains, tomatoes, lamb, cotton, pork and cheese—with lesser harm to scattered other commodities.

Poultry, which had hoped to come out a winner, got very little.

Wheat, which our government has hailed as getting great gains, came up with precious little.

Let's look at how your own products fared in the major deals:

The United Kingdom cut duties mainly on soybeans, variety meats, canned fruit and raisins. Our main cuts were on their lime juice, marmalade and mustard. The cuts averaged about 50%. As with the other cuts in the Kennedy Round, they'll be spread over five years' time.

We gave these main cuts to European countries outside the Common Market: Swiss and Gruyere cheese from Switzerland; prepared meats, grass seed, sausage and some cheese from Denmark. We agreed not to raise the tariff in the future on olives from Spain and canned hams from Europe.

We got cuts in return on fresh lemons, raisins, canned cocktail—and a "freeze" on tobacco tariffs.

Japan cut the duty on soybeans from 13% down to 6%. The Japanese also made cuts in the tariffs on our safflower seed, almonds, lard, tallow and turkeys. Our main cuts were on their canned mandarin oranges, canned white peaches, dried mushrooms, frog legs and sesame oil.

We exchanged numerous cuts with Canada. We cut tariffs on Canadian carrots, maple syrup and sugar, blueberries, grapes, berry jams, apple and pear juice, mill byproducts, mustard seed, fresh apples, hay and other less important products.

Our major deals with South American countries lowered the gate on canned corned beef, fresh pears and some wool from Argentina; on canned beef sausage from Uruguay; winter peaches and melons from Chile.

Our cotton growers are hurt more than they are helped. It boils down to this: We gave up bigger cuts on textile imports than we got. Our main foreign suppliers are India, Japan and Hong Kong. Japan, no cotton raiser herself, gets two bales out of three of her raw cotton from countries other than the U.S. Hong Kong gets four out of five bales elsewhere. The textiles they ship here displace U.S. cotton.

We keep a world textile agreement that has let textile imports into this country soar in the last few years.

We cut the duty on lambs from $3.50 per cwt. to $1.70. New Zealand is our main supplier—about $2 million worth a year.

We made major cuts in tropical products as a good-will gesture to the emerging countries of the world. The tropical products that will come in more easily are such things as bananas, coconut, cashews, Brazil nuts, cocoa butter, vanilla beans, castor oil, winter melons, sesame seed, and a number of others.

We didn't demand anything in return from these countries.

Our biggest cuts on Common Market products were on canned tomatoes, tomato paste and sauce, Roquefort cheese, sheep's milk cheese, apple and pear juice, fruit juice, feathers and down, hops, flax, bristles, starch, pistachio nuts, champagne, vermouth, oriental tobacco, chicory, bulbs, cocoa and some animal feeds. We cut or froze tariffs on about 90 farm products where the Common Market is our main supplier.

The main cuts that we got from them were on our tobacco, tallow, offal and dried peas and beans. The biggest item by far is tobacco where they cut the duty 12½%—still, Rhodesian tobacco has a smaller tariff.

The big thing is what we didn't get from the Common Market. We got nothing on poultry and rice; very little on fruit. The whole thing was a disappointment.

The Common Market has built a big wall to keep out U.S. farm goods. They did it with a variable duty tariff—the worst kind. It isn't a fixed tariff of, say, 10¢ a bushel on wheat where you can trade cuts: "You come down a nickel on wheat and we'll knock 2% off our tariffs on wire."

Instead, they rammed their farm prices way up and said, in effect: The tariff will vary with the difference between your prices and our prices no mater what they are.

You can't leap-frog over that kind of tariff by growing something more efficiently than they do. We are locked out at their pleasure.

It hits our grain, mainly. The Common Market has been a big grain buyer. Now they'll raise more; buy less of their needs. We didn't even get a guarantee that they'll take so much grain a year—such as we guarantee other nations, that we'll take a fixed amount of meat, including a share of the growth of our meat consumption. We talked about getting such a guarantee for our grain in Europe; but we didn't get it.

Now the Common Market is talking about hiking their grain prices even higher—which will jack up the variable tariff. If they do it, this will stimulate even greater grain output there; dry up our outlets more. We didn't get them to freeze the target prices.

What did we get out of it to offset the Common Market deal? There has been a lot of talk about getting U.S. farmers a 21¢ higher minimum wheat price. But when the smoke cleared on June 30, what we really had was an agreement that exporters would get together and "talk it over" if prices got near the minimum. So actually we got no guaranteed floor price.

We also came home from Geneva with the idea the Common Market is going to pitch in with one million tons of food aid yearly for the hungry world. It's argued that this would open up a larger commercial market for our grain. But there's no teeth in the agreement to assure that they will put up this much aid. And there's no telling how much of it would merely come from extra production stimulated by those high variable tariffs.

The Hope for the Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 25, 1967

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, one of the larger gatherings during the Captive Nations Week just past was held in Kenosha, Wis., at St. Therese's Park last Sunday, in celebration of Wisconsin's Lithuanian Day. Our colleague who represents that congressional district, HENRY C. SCHADEBERG, delivered the main address at the park, and the text of his speech was very well received. I would like to place Congressman's SCHADEBERG's remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that we may all benefit from them:

THE HOPE FOR THE FUTURE

I want you to know that I deeply appreciate the invitation you have extended to me to share with you this occasion which gives me the opportunity to renew friendships and to touch base again with that segment of the people of the First District who through their own intimate experiences and those of loved ones have witness to make and a unique contribution to make to our great land as we speak on behalf of freedom and its extension to all in the world.

I'm sure that many of you here today of Lithuanian birth or descent are familiar with the little prayer book entitled "Mary Save Us." For those of you who are unfamiliar with it, it is a small booklet of prayers written by four young Lithuanian girls who were prisoners in Northern Siberia. The booklet was smuggled out of Russia, translated and printed here in the United States. The prayers tell us a sad tale of four young people far away from their homeland who ask God's blessing on their families and their nation and for mercy for their captors. Where these young ladies are today we do not know. We do not even know if they are still alive for the booklet is dated 1953.

Similar cases are known to many of you here today. When one reads reports of the Select Committee on Communist Aggression of the U.S. House of Representatives which were issued in 1954, one's imagination is staggered by the brutality inflicted on vast numbers of human beings by the Communist aggressors.

But I did not come here today to talk about tragedy or to tell you what you already know. It is my purpose to instill hope by recommending specific courses of action. The cause of returning to the victims of Communist enslavement their God-given rights is a moral and just cause and is certainly worthy of our persevering efforts.

As many of you know, this year is the 50th Anniversary of the Bolshevik Revolution. Already a concerted propaganda drive is under way from Moscow to tell the world of its fruits and benefits to mankind of the October Revolution of 1917. Two major statements, one on January 4 and the other on June 25, have been issued by the Central Party of the Soviet Union extolling the great gains to humanity of the 50 years of Communist progress. Listen to this excerpt from the June 25 statement:

"The strength of communism is inexhaustible, on its side is the truth of life. Only communism can solve the fundamental problems of social development, deliver mankind from oppression and exploitation, from hunger and poverty, from militarism and war, and establish on our planet democracy, peace and friendship between peoples, a life that is in keeping with the dignity of man."

Propaganda you say. Certainly. But the danger is in dismissing the determination and dedication contained in this passage to eventually bring about a world wide Communist society. One newspaper editorial, commenting on this June 25 statement of the CPSU, classified the various references to the doom of capitalism and U.S. criminal aggression in Vietnam as just hackneyed propaganda. The editorial then went on to conclude that, under certain conditions, there may possibly be a chance for continued peaceful co-existence. Just as in the case of the excerpt I just quoted, there are other statements in the June 25 document which tell the free world that there is only one way, only one solution, and that is an international Communist society. Yet some editorial writers, like the one just referred to, do not choose to believe that the Communist leaders are serious.

Here is where friends of the captive peoples can plan an important role in this important year. Their experiences and those of their friends and relatives under Communist aggression can help dispel and neutralize the avalanche of propaganda which the Soviets will be churning out this year. Letters to the editors' columns of local newspapers can recount the first-hand experiences of life under Communism. They can demonstrate for the uninformed and misinformed in this country what the true legacies of the October Revolution and the past fifty years truly are. When the Soviets mention their success in delivering mankind from oppression and exploitation, the brutal truth of Soviet oppression can be refuted. Every inhuman excess committed by the leaders of Communist governments is a true legacy stemming from the October Bolshevik Revolution. Imagine the wealth of material which is available for this important year: Soviet colonization and imperialism; terror as an instrument of Communist policy; famine and hunger; deportation; the slave status of labor; the right to vote; their failure to keep their word—deliberate breaking of their treaty obligations with other nations; their persecution of religion. The material is almost inexhaustible.

Then too organizations can pass resolutions and issue statements concerning the true legacies of the Revolution, for the various press media and for their elected officials whether local, state or national. The voices of friends and relatives of the captive peoples can be extremely valuable this year because they have learned by bitter experience the true nature of the Communist menace. How much more effective is the actual suffering of one victim of Communism in contrast to the views of some scholar lacking practical experience who claims that the Communists are mellowing while millions of human beings continue to languish in Communist chains?

You might ask, "O, what's the use? Didn't those in the free world see the butchery of Budapest in 1956 on film, in magazines and newspapers. Haven't Congressional committees publicized the tragedies of the Katyn Forest, Vinnitsa, the Korean atrocities? These are a matter of record for all to see and if they wanted to believe it they would.

I certainly can't blame you if you are so disheartened, for it would seem that many have forgotten the history of the past fifty years. Let me suggest that the Communist practice the same policies the Nazi did—Tell a lie often enough and the people will believe it. Let's you and me tell the truth often enough—repeat it and repeat it until the people believe it for what it is—The Truth. Let me briefly relate a case which I recently learned about in which hope and persistent action did pay off to a certain extent.

The Chicago Tribune of May 8, 1966, carried an exclusive report on prisoners of war in the Soviet Union entitled, "250,000 Still In Red Slave Camps." The article recounted a campaign to bring pressure to bear on both the Polish and Soviet regimes to return to their homeland thousands of Poles exiled to the Soviet Union during and after World War II. Approximately 4,000 questionnaires were sent to German prisoners of war who were returned to Germany from the U.S.S.R. when Chancellor Adenauer told the Soviets that normal relations between the Soviet Union and West Germany were impossible until the German p.o.w.'s were returned from Soviet Camps.

Radio Free Europe, through the questionnaires, received the names of prisoners from countries all over the world who were still languishing in Soviet camps. The Polish Division then initiated broadcasts into Poland, giving the names of Poles still being held in the Soviet Union. As you may surmise, the Polish Government at first ignored the broadcasts, for up until that time the party line had always been that the Soviet Union held no more Polish prisoners of war. More and more Polish citizens began to question the Communist officials about the validity of the charges. Even Russian soldiers, observers and advisers, then stationed in Poland in great numbers, were asked about the charges.

Finally in October 1955 Radio Warsaw referred to a certain number of repatriates from Russia, and a few weeks later stated that "Poles have been returning from the U.S.S.R. for several months now." In addition, the station added:

"We are certain that the number of returnees will increase in the near future."

The persistent action of Radio Free Europe finally began to show results. By the end of 1955, a total of 6,429 Poles were repatriated. The next year the figure jumped to 30,786 and in 1957 to a record 93,872.

Nor was this the end of the repatriation. In 1958—13 years after the war ended—85,865 Poles were returned from Soviet detention, and in 1959, 28,400 more.

While the results of this venture were certainly encouraging, Radio Free Europe believed that many more Poles were still being held in Soviet camps, even though the Polish government had stated that the repatriation had been completed.

Radio Free Europe went back to work again. In 1959 they again began assembling information on Polish p.o.w.'s still in Soviet camps. Finally, in February, 1966, the Polish Division Radio Free Europe determined that there was sufficient information to begin broadcasting again. According to the Chicago Tribune article, at the last count forty broadcasts had been made without any recognition from the Polish Government.

Although this case is by no means closed, and I intend to pursue it further, the number of Poles returned by the fine efforts of Radio Free Europe demonstrate what results can be achieved in the face of a discouraging situation.

According to data assembled by Radio Free Europe, also included among the inmates of the Soviet camps are Czechs, Hungarians, Germans, Russians, Latvians, Lithuanians, Estonians, Ukrainians, Finns, Jews, Bulgarians, Rumanians, and Kulmuks. The fate of these peoples is certainly a matter of great concern at any time, but especially during this 50th Anniversary year of the October Revolution when the Soviet Union is claiming credit for so many benefits to mankind.

This case is of special interest to me because in 1964 I submitted legislation, along with other members of Congress, which would instruct our Ambassador to the United Nations to seek to place on the agenda of the U.N. for consideration the issue of self-determination for the Captive Nations, including mainland China and Cuba. Part of this legislation sought to return to their respective homelands all political prisoners and exiles now in slave labor and prison camps. Needless to say, this legislation gathered dust and was never considered. This year I have again proposed similar legislation and I fully intend to do whatever I can to correct this basic error in our policy toward the captive peoples.

You would be justified in asking yourself what possible reason is there for not bringing to the attention of the world through the United Nations the moral right of the captive peoples of self-determination and freedom? When it is considered that the United Nations was founded to protect the cherished principles of self-determination and individual freedoms, your question would be fully justified.

Also, when it is remembered that the question of the admission of the brutal regime of Red China to the U.N. has been on the U.N. agenda a number of times over the past few years, why should not the free nations of the world at least insist on the consideration of freedom for the captive peoples, who have suffered so much in the last fifty years?

I cannot answer for all of the free nations in the U.N., but the United States has given an answer as to why we have not used our influence to have this issue discussed. Here is the answer given by the State Department to another Member of Congress who had introduced this legislation and who had asked for State's views on the merit of this proposal.

Here is what the State Department said:

"The Department of State believes that in the United Nations Soviet imperialism is most effectively exposed by timely and pertinent statements that relate Soviet imperialistic activities to a concrete issue being discussed before a major United Nations forum. United States representatives have delivered forceful and detailed attacks on Soviet imperialism during debates on the general question of colonialism. On numbers of occasions they have also called attention to Soviet imperial practice by linking a specific Soviet act or policy of repression with an individual item being discussed before a United Nations body."

I continue to quote the State Department statement:

"The essential problem facing the United States is to adapt existing capabilities most realistically and effectively to serve the interest of the United States in opposing and combatting Soviet imperialism. The proposed resolution, in the judgment of the Department of State would not further this objective."

Removing the meaningless diplomatic verbiage in the statement translated it means simply this—the State Department does not intend to recognize the danger of these Soviet Colonial policies which prevent the extension much less the preservation of freedom in the world.

If the State Department has delivered, as it says, "forceful" and "detailed" attacks on Soviet imperialism, these attacks have been State's best kept secrets. When was the last time you heard or read of a U.S. attack in the U.N. on the enslavement of Latvia, Lithuania, or Estonia? Do you remember the last time we deplored and called to world attention in the U.N. the deprivation of human rights in Russia, Hungary or in Bulgaria?

But I'm sure you remember that last year, as in years gone by, the subject of the admission of Red China to the U.N. made headlines in our newspapers and on our television newscasts.

The case of our policy toward Rhodesia is another good case in point. The United States has joined other nations in the United Nations in imposing sanctions on Rhodesia because the right to vote in that country is not extended to all its citizens. Our Ambassador to the United Nations has stated that in the case of Rhodesia there is definitely a moral issue involved. Without going into the merit of the Rhodesian issue, I am compelled to ask what has become of the moral issue in the case of the captive nations in which there are no free elections at all?

When we consider the tragic inconsistencies of our foreign policy in relation to the nations under Communism, we cannot blame anyone for despairing of just treatment for Communism's victims.

But as I said at the outset, I have come here today to recommend positive courses of action and not to sow seeds of despair. In the field of positive action we might well take a cue from the Communists themselves in their use of political action to bring about a predetermined goal.

Their takeover of Czechoslovakia provides a prime example of the use of popular opinion and action to bring about the comparatively peaceful fall of a free world government. I'm sure some of you are familiar with the document of Jan Kozak, the historian of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, which details how the Czech parliament was manipulated to play an important role in the downfall of the Czech nation. This document was reproduced by a House Committee (HUAC) and was entitled "The New Role of National Legislative Bodies in the Communist Conspiracy."

The principle of coordinated action from "above", that is from the parliament or legislative body, coupled with the pressure from "below," that is through the use of popular protests by means of fronts and clever propaganda, combined to help topple the Czech government. The Communists in Czechoslovakia carried out a principle expounded by V. I. Lenin as early as 1905.

Here is what Lenin said:

"To restrict, as a principle, revolutionary actions to pressure from below and to forego pressure from above, is anarchism."

Kozak elaborated on Lenin's principle in these words:

"A preliminary condition for carrying out fundamental social changes and for making it possible that parliament be made use of for the purpose of transforming a capitalist society, into a socialist one, is (a) to fight for a firm parliamentary majority which would ensure; and develop a strong pressure from "above," and (b) to see to it that this firm parliamentary majority should rely on the revolutionary activity of the broad working masses exerting pressure 'from below.'"

Now don't get me wrong. I am not advocating revolution or the use of devious means to gain an end. But I am sure that you can see the application of the "above" and "below" principle as it might be used here in the United States. Activity from above consists primarily in spelling out in definite terms a particular issue and implementing it with definite proposals or legislation. This is the specific vehicle around which the citizens, the below group, can rally around. It is then up to them to make their wishes known to the "above" faction and to strive to encourage others to do the same. It is necessary for individual citizens to inform their sisters, and their cousins, and their aunts of the need for cooperative action. As stated before, letters to the editors of newspapers, if published, can alert the local readers to the existence of such legislation and the need for widespread support.

In those organizations in which resolutions on current issues are permitted, resolutions of support enhance the cause by putting whole bodies on record as being in agreement.

Letters to your representatives, local, state and national, help such officials to learn the sentiments and wishes of their constituencies.

By these legitimate means, a legitimate issue is supported in a real and active fashion.

In the case of self-determination for the Captive Nations, the Assembly of Captive Nations in New York City has, for a number of years, been recommending the use of the United Nations agenda to bring the plight of the enslaved peoples to the attention of the whole world. As I have just previously stated, a number of Members of Congress had implemented this recommendation by drawing up and submitting concrete legislation for the consideration of Congress. In fact, one of the Presidential candidates in 1964 was a sponsor of this legislation.

Yet, how many voters outside of the friends of the Captive peoples even knew this legislation had been proposed? How many citizens would have been happy to endorse it and work actively in its behalf?

In another year we will again be in the midst of a presidential election. You will again be asked to make a selection of the best candidate to run this country for another four years. What will be your criteria for making your choice of the most suitable candidate for such an all-important position? Will a true concern for the captive peoples be one of your standards in making your selection? It is not too early to begin making inquiries. It is not a day too early to begin writing letters to those who might possibly be candidates.

At this point I should like to mention one definite obstacle to individual action. In a country in which the population is approaching 200 million, one might be tempted to ask just how effective is his little effort, or his individual letter to an official. Well, as you know, a congressman's main contact with his constituents is through the mail. Each day thousands of letters arrive on Capitol Hill, bringing messages to Members of Congress from all parts of the country. Some letters ask for help in solving a personal problem; others state their position on specific legislation; while still others provide information which in some cases proves useful to their representative. In each of these cases the correspondent believes that his or her problems or views are worthy of consideration.

But, on the other hand, consider the citizen who believes that his little letter or effort doesn't count. He can hardly blame the next-door neighbor who believes the same way. And neither of them can ridicule the third neighbor for holding the same view. Multiply this indifference over and over and the result is apathy.

Again I must say that I cannot blame you if you have become discouraged at the little progress made in extending the areas of freedom to those now under Communist domination. But, believe me, you are not alone. Take, for instance, veterans organizations. Although I haven't taken a survey of all such organizations, I know that the American Legion in which I served for many years as Post Chaplain, County and District Chaplain and Department Chaplain of the State of Wisconsin in 1957–1958, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, of which I am also a member and the Disabled American Veterans have passed resolutions at their national conventions last year supporting the Captive Nations. These three organizations alone have a membership of *nearly four million American citizens*. Let me read to you part of the American Legion resolution on the subject of United Nations. Relationship to Captive Nations. This resolution was passed at the annual convention of the American Legion in Washington, D.C. last year.

The resolving clause of the resolution reads:

"Resolved, by the American Legion in National Convention assembled in Washington, D.C., August 30-September 1, 1966, that the American Legion urges the President of the United States to instruct the U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations to demand, at the earliest possible date, that the United Nations enforce its Charter provisions regarding self-determination of all peoples, and that the Soviet Union, as the controlling power in world communism, be called upon to withdraw all of its troops, agents, colonialists and other controls from the Captive Nations, and to return to their respective homelands all political prisoners and exiles now in slave and prison camps within the U.S.S.R."

So you see that the fate of the Captive Nations has not been forgotten, I'm sure there are other organizations which are concerned about this issue and have so stated in their organizational statements. Here alone is a huge bloc of American citizens which can be counted on for help in working for the eventual release of the victims of Communist aggression. In turn, friends of the captive peoples can acquaint themselves with the policies of organizations, such as the veterans groups, and help them in whatever ways possible.

Another illustration of the policies of freedom which are supported by most veterans organizations is Resolution 14 passed by the Veterans of Foreign Wars at their 1966 national convention in New York City. The resolution concerned resisting communism and assisting our loyal allies in restoring freedom. Resolution 14 consisted of 21 recommendations to carry out this policy. Here is a sampling

1. Full support of Captive Nations Week
2. Carry out whatever measures are necessary to win in South Vietnam.
3. Aid to those who have refused to become Communist slaves in their own country and have become refugees from Red oppression, and encouraging restoration of freedom in their homelands by U.S. recognition of the free governments in exile.
4. Oppose all forms of trade, commerce, and financial assistance that will strengthen Communist nations.
5. Oppose any form of diplomatic recognition of Red China or Red Cuba.

These are just a few of the recommendations which the V.F.W. offered last year at their national convention to combat the global aggression of the Communist movement.

In the final analysis, regardless of the number of bills and resolutions or the various strategies which are devised to bring freedom to the captive peoples, the moral fiber of the American people will be the determinant of victory or defeat. I fully realize that for you here today, who are intimately acquainted with the brutality of Communism, the reliance on Divine assistance is of prime importance. When the protection of one's country and perhaps one's family have been taken from him, the only alternatives are usually recourse to the Divine Protector—or despair.

How a strong religious faith serves as an impenetrable suit of armor in adversity was graphically illustrated recently in South Vietnam. The syndicated columnist, Ray Cromley, writing from Vietnam, described the exasperation experienced by the Viet Cong in trying to subdue and win over Communities where religious faith was strong. In a secret document captured from the Viet Cong, a Red Viet Cong official talked of his many successes in consolidating important areas of South Vietnam for the Communist cause. But what concerned him deeply was his lack of success with hamlets controlled by religious people. The officer stated in the captured document that their efforts to win over the religious elements of the population had met with many difficulties. Columnist Cromley, in traveling through rural South Vietnam in 14 provinces, agreed that in communities where the people themselves have a strong and dynamic sense of religion, the Communists make no headway.

This is an excellent example for all America. We must realize that regardless of our military might, if we are to persevere in this fight for true peace with justice and freedom, it is mandatory that we recapture the zeal and dedication which motivated the Founding Fathers of the United States almost 200 years ago.

Pythian Boys Camp in Glen Spey, N.Y.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. BRASCO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 25, 1967

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, all of us are deeply concerned over the strife that has been evident in underprivileged sections of many cities this summer. It is unfortunate that the turbulence that has stricken these cities has tended to obscure continuing efforts by the private sector of society as well as by Government to develop programs that will bring new hope into the lives of the disadvantaged.

There are many organizations from coast to coast that are concentrating their efforts among young people, as they recognize full well that the youth of today must assume positions of responsibility tomorrow.

One such organization is the 87,000-member Grand Lodge of the Knights of Pythias, which for the past 26 years had provided free 3-week camping vacations for underprivileged boys at its Pythian Camp in Glen Spey, N.Y. Here, on a 250-acre site, more than 1,000 boys of every race, creed, and color take part in a well-planned, supervised camping program every summer.

The camp offers wholesome recreational, athletic, and cultural programs for deprived boys who might otherwise be forced to spend the summer months in idleness on hot city streets.

The success of this camp has been due in great measure to the able leadership of William Goldfine, the president of the camp's board of managers, and A. Martin Lerner, grand chancellor of the grand lodge, men of vision who recognize the importance of instilling in campers an understanding of the value of teamwork and good sportsmanship.

Perhaps the most unique aspect of the Pythian Camp philosophy is the desire to encourage every boy to recognize the ability and the finer qualities of his playmates. This is in line with the guiding principle at Pythian Camp, a "sound mind in a sound body."

To properly understand the contributions made by Pythian Camp, we must remember that childhood is a time when the fundamental ideas of tolerance and fair play can be implanted.

Pythian Camp, therefore, offers an object lesson in democratic principles in action, where all barriers of race, creed, and color are nonexistent.

The youngster returning home from a rewarding vacation at Pythian Camp does so with the realization that there are people who care about him, about his future, and about the general well-being of his family.

I therefore submit that we take cognizance of the excellent work of the Pythian Camp, which is so typical of organizations that are doing so much to enrich the lives of the underprivileged.

Theater, Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE BUSH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 25, 1967

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, I think it is most appropriate at this time for the Congress to be cognizant of a particular lady and her theater in Texas in light of the fact that we are presently considering amendments to the National Foundation for the Arts and Humanities Act of 1965.

This lady is Mrs. Johnny George, and the institution, of which she is permanent director, is Theater, Inc., of Houston, Tex. For nearly 14 years now, she has devoted all of her efforts as a professional director of the performing arts to her theater in Houston. I think that it is interesting to note that she has never been paid a salary for her work nor has she requested one. In fact, Mrs. George has refused many high-salaried, executive positions with national foundations, local and national institutions for the performing arts, and other equally notable organizations in which the creative and performing arts are concerned.

A sad interlude in the gleaming history of Theater, Inc., however, has occurred; the physical plant of the theater was almost totally destroyed by a fire last summer and Mrs. George was stricken by cancer. Fortunately, this great lady has almost completely recovered from the operation necessary to arrest the disease. She is, in cooperation with her fine board of directors and members of the private community, planning to rebuild the theater at a new location and, hopefully, she will have a totally modern plant in which she can continue her work in the community. She is considered by many to be the "first lady of Houston theater," and her endeavors in the past, with their unique aspect of artistic and financial success, are so widely applauded by the community that I am sure that the building and development program upon which the future of the theater depends, with appropriate support from all possible sources, will be another success for Mrs. George and her theater.

It is also very interesting to note that Theater, Inc., under the wise and very businesslike management of Mrs. George and her husband, Lorraine M. George—a Houston construction company president and banker—has never requested any support for its activities. The theater has carried on its operations with a limited budget obtained from only one source, the box office. In light of the Rockefeller Foundation report on the performing arts, in which it is carefully noted that almost none of the arts institutions in the country are able to support themselves by box office receipts alone and that they should not be expected to do so, I certainly believe that this fine lady has done an amazing job of attaining a high degree of success in a field where stability, financial, and otherwise, is the exception to the rule.

As I said before, Theater, Inc., has never accepted, in behalf of the theater, any public or private monies for any purpose. That was, however, before the fire which destroyed the theater, and it has always been an accepted fact in their planning program that should the theater decide to expand its operation, it would be necessary to seek outside support in order to accomplish this expansion. I would certainly hope that others would benefit from Mrs. George's experience in operating an organization such as this. Her record is worthy of notice.

Cigarette Advertising

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN L. McMILLAN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 25, 1967

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate my remarks with the remarks made on the floor of the House by my colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina, Mr. HORACE KORNEGAY, and several other leading Members of the House of Representatives, concerning a ruling recently made by the Federal Communications Commission on cigarette advertising.

I certainly want to commend the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KORNEGAY] for securing time for the Members to bring this important matter to the attention of all the Members of Congress.

It is rather difficult to understand why any Government agency would, at a time when the country is in dire need of additional funds, use its efforts to cut off one of its main tax sources.

At the present time the Federal Government collects approximately $3 billion in taxes from tobacco products; and, on the other hand, the Federal Government is spending several millions of dollars annually in an effort to block this important source of revenue.

Personally, I did not think the Federal Communications Commission had sufficient authority, under the present law, to require private enterprise to give free time to those who do not agree with the advertisements which are paid for by the advertiser.

I hope this matter can be thoroughly investigated to see if the Federal Communications Commission has been granted authority of this magnitude by the Congress.

It has only been a few years since we all joined our colleague, the gentleman from Arkansas, Congressman Oren Harris, who was chairman of the Interstate Commerce Committee at the time, in preventing the Federal Communications Commission from issuing similar orders requiring the word "poison" and a drawing of crossbones to be placed on every package of cigarettes.

Again I want to state that I am astounded and surprised to learn that our own Government is continuously trying to block one of our main sources of revenue.

High Interest Rates Mean High Unemployment, Expert Warns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 25, 1967

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, the tight money doctors are peddling their patent medicine again. Early this year, they were in hiding, as interest rates were falling. This summer, more than 3 million are unemployed. Yet the moneychangers are back in control of the temple of America. They preach that high interest is helping fight the old devil—inflation. But high interest does not fight inflation, it feeds inflation. It does not help the economy, it adds to unemployment. The new higher interest policy is uneconomic, unnecessary, unfair, and tragic for America.

It is uneconomic because interest is a cost of production. Increasing the price of money raises prices just as does raising the price of steel. Production is down, unemployment is up. The threat of inflation is a phony argument for a policy that hurts the worker, but helps the banker.

If rates had been lower last year, the Nation could have built another half million housing units despite the Vietnam war. This would have given jobs to another million men: for one-site construction, materials and supplies, and household appliances and goods. This would not have interfered with any other vital activity. America would have been more prosperous.

Instead, those who bought homes paid heavily for high interest, and for the "points" on the mortgage. "Points" are a discount on the mortgage. At 7 points, you sign for $10,000, but get only $9,300. The builder adds as much as $1,000 to the cost of the house to cover this discount. Each 1-percent increase in interest rates raises the interest charge on a $15,000 mortgage by $150 a year.

If you can get a 6.5-percent loan for 25 years today, total interest payments will be higher than the actual mortgage itself. A $15,000 mortgage will cost $101.29 a month, or $30,387 to retire. If rates were back at the old and reasonable price of 4.5 percent, the $83.38 monthly cost would be $5,373 lower over the 25 years.

So fewer people can now afford houses. Fewer are built. Fewer workers are employed. And the economists too often bless this by calling it a "trade-off" between full employment and inflation. Some trade. And the worker whose job is being "traded-off" is not allowed at the bargaining table. Nor is the guy who wanted to buy a house, but could not afford the higher interest. The money changers do all the trading for them both.

The higher interest charges are also unnecessary. Three million unemployed is not full employment. And if we had it, and needed to cut back on borrowing, there are better answers than higher interest. Economists and Government officials are equally guilty of failing to discuss the alternatives. Higher downpayments would restrain borrowing. So would shorter length loans that must be repaid faster. And banks could become more strict in granting loans. And when the economy approaches full employment, the Nation can also raise taxes.

High interest is unfair. It takes more from the workers, the farmers and the small businessmen. Most of the big companies are using their own money, so they are not hurt. The interest payments go to the wealthy few, and to the banks. The high interest goes to the 5 percent who own 85 percent of the Government bonds, for instance. It is the young and the minority groups who suffer most of the unemployment that high interest encourages.

But most of all, high interest is tragic for America. "The billions that go to interest," as Ed Hart, founder of the National Council, has warned, "mean that America cannot afford the money needed for schools, for urban renewal, for mass transit, for recreation and conservation. The more we have to pay moneylenders, the less we have for essential national services." This is even more true today with the cost of the Vietnam war.

Americans were promised a war on poverty. The hopes of tens of millions were raised by promises of good housing, better education, more jobs. As interest rates rise, these hopes fall. And it is no secret that the long, hot summers of protest and riot are the fruits of past delay and neglect. High interest rates lengthen the delay, encourage the neglect. They feed the resulting tragedies. The tight-money doctors are making America sicker, not healing her.

San Francisco Chronicle Editorial on Antiriot Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 25, 1967

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, last week the House of Representatives, responding to the slum riots and feeling the need to do something about these riots, passed a bill which I, along with the 69 other Members, felt unconstitutional and unwise. The riots which are breaking out all across this country are terrible and frightful occurrences. It is difficult in this time to maintain a rational view. I was, therefore, most encouraged by the editorial appearing in the San Francisco Chronicle on July 18. Under unanimous consent I include the editorial in the RECORD at this point.

The article follows:

THE RUSH FOR AN ANTIRIOT LAW

With the deplorable fury of Newark furnishing a pretext, Congressmen appear fairly certain tomorrow to pass the Cramer bill punishing anyone who moves across State lines, or uses telephones or other interstate facilities, "with the intent to incite a riot."

The need for a law like this is denied by Attorney General Ramsey Clark, who sensibly said it would have little effect in preventing riots. He said there was no evidence of interstate conspiracy to activate the Newark rioting, and for that matter, he said, riots are for the most part home grown. Common sense should teach anybody that.

The Justice Department has been consistent on the Cramer bill. Last year Assistant Attorney John Doar testified it was of doubtful constitutionality and would be of little use. Riot control, he noted, has historically been a state and local police matter. "Support your local police" might for once be good advice to those Congressmen who are in full, emotional cry to do something, not just stand there.

The Rats Come Every Night

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. HOWARD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 25, 1967

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday, during consideration of House Resolution 749, dealing with a Federal program of rat control and extermination, some Members of the House made light of what is a frighting and manacing problem to millions in this country. That rat infested homes, schools, streets, and even hospitals, exist in this country is tragic and not a joking matter. That rats lace the lives of thousands with fear and uninhibitedly spread disease is deplorable, not funny.

Many Members of the House have never faced this problem in their personal lives. But many less fortunate citizens face this problem daily.

I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues an article appearing in this morning's edition of the Washington Post which illustrates vividly what this problem means to all too many of our citizens:

HARLEM'S ENDLESS BATTLE—THE RATS COME EVERY NIGHT . . .

(By Jimmy Breslin)

NEW YORK.—At eight o'clock at night, the rats come up from the spaces around the sewer pipes under the boiler room where they have slept all day. They cling to the big rusted pipe and come up into the room and then they start up the pipes which are inside the walls of the five story tenement. The rats come for food and water in the apartments where the people live..

As the rats crawled through the building, many of the people who live at 220 East 111th st. in the part of New York called East Harlem were out on the sidewalk. Many of them talked about the trouble of the night before, when a man with a knife was killed by a cop up at the corner.

The neighborhood made the first motions towards a riot, then stopped when Mayor Lindsay arrived and plunged into the crowd. Now, two games of dice were played by men standing in semi-circles around the bottom of the stoop. Four men sat on milk boxes around a card table playing dominoes. Pedro Perdomo, in a yellow polo shirt and floppy field worker's hat, sat on a car fender and pounded a bongo drum held between his knees.

"Yare, yare," he sang out.

"Caro," four people yelled back.

TAKES OFF SHOE

Upstairs, in apartment three on the third floor, Cathy Marrero shrieked. Her husband Ebro broke in a smile. They had just chased two rats from under the kitchen sink and the rats had run into the bathroom and Ebro had slammed the door on them. Now, Ebro said. Now I have them. The rats always stay in the bathroom. licking water from the tub. They never crawl out of the room. Ebro bent down and took off his left shoe.

"Here," his wife said. She handed him a flatiron. Ebro shook his head no. He held the shoe up in his right hand and opened the bathroom door slowly, and slid inside. He slammed the door behind him. He began shouting, "Ho, ha, ho," while he beat the two rats in the bathtub to death with the shoe. The shoe sounded hollow against the sides of the bathtub.

Ebro opened the door and came out, his face and arms glistening with sweat. He pointed to the rats inside, in the bathtub. They were very small rats for East Harlem. They were much larger than mice, but still very small for East Harlem, where rats are very big.

"You came just in time," Ebro said.

"Do you chase them like this every night?" he was asked.

DOING THE DISHES

"Every night? now could you work in the morning if you do this?" he said. "They just came this time right out under the sink while my wife is doing the dishes. She started chasing them. So I chase too."

His wife came in with a handbrush and a paper bag. She swept the two dead rats into a paper bag. She reached over and emptied the two dead rats out of the paper bag and into the toilet. She flushed the toilet. She put the paper bag into the bathtub. Ebro lit a match and set the bag on fire. After the paper bag burned away, his wife took a bottle of disinfectant from the shelf and poured it all over the bathtub. The disinfectant smelled strong and Ebro left.

He walked out to the living room while his wife scrubbed the bathtub. To get to the living room you go first into the kitchen, then through the two rooms that have no doors or windows. A bed, and a crib next to it, was in each room. You come out into a small front room that has a linoleum floor. A broken couch, two rocking chairs and a stuffed chair covered with a plastic filled the small room.

A framed Army discharge certificate and pictures of John F. Kennedy and the Sacred Heart were on the wall over the couch. The two sooty windows were open to the hot air of the street and the sound of the bongo drum.

"The rats come every night?" Ebro was asked.

"All night long," he said. "You see into the kitchen from here? See the refrigerator? I have two by four wood holding it up. That is so we can get underneath it with a broom to chase the rats when they get under it."

"Don't you use a rat trap or poison?"

"The children," he said. "You cannot have traps and poison around with babies. No. Nobody uses traps because everybody has babies. Have you ever smelled a rat when he dies under the floorboards or between the walls? No way to bet him out."

"Why don't you try cats?"

CAT DISAPPEARS

He smiled. "The janitor got this big cat and put him in the boiler room. One morning he told me to come and look. There was cat fur all around the boiler room. And no cat. Huh. There are rats in the boiler room bigger than any cat."

"A dog then?" Sometimes dogs are good, sometimes they're not. Is more trouble than it's worth anyway. There are so many rats in this neighborhood for anything to work."

Ebro is 27. He works for the Railway Express Agency. His wife came into the room with cans of beer. Ebro and his wife sat and drank from the cans.

"Our baby is only three weeks," she said. "We keep him in bed with us. The other two, we have the crib set up high. No rats come there so far. But you still can't leave a baby alone."

"Has anybody been bitten by them?"

"Who hasn't?" Ebro said.

"What do you do when you get bitten?"

"Nothing," he said. "Oh, some people have had to go to the doctor. But with me, only nips."

"Come into the kitchen and be quiet and you hear them," his wife said.

SOUNDS IN THE WALLS

We went into the kitchen and drank beer from the cans and listened for what seemed like a long time but was only 10 minutes. Then there was this sound in the walls. A scratching sound. The tumbling, scrambling sound when one of the rats moved quickly.

It is a sound by itself. And when you are young, and you sleep on the side of the bed next to the wall and the rats scratch against the wall at your ear, you carry the sound with you for the rest of your life. It is something that is heard by people in every poor neighborhood in every city in the Nation. And it is one of the reasons why this is our longest of summers. Last week, the House of Representatives thought it all was a cause for laughter.

Thoreau on a Stamp

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 25, 1967

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, on July 12 a new postage stamp was issued by our Post Office Depatrment, commemorating the 150th anniversary of Henry David Thoreau's birth.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial which appeared in the Buffalo Evening News, Buffalo, N.Y., on July 21, 1967:

Thoreau on a Stamp

A new five-cent postage stamp commemorates the 150th birthday this month of essayist-philosopher Henry David Thoreau. The stamp, which depicts Thoreau with a beard, has kicked up a fuss because some people say it makes him look like a beatnik. Well, there's no denying that the man from Concord had a strong touch of radicalism.

But Thoreau, whose watchword was "simplicity! simplicity!" and who condemned the material superficialities of life as he saw it, would probably have wanted no part of petty arguments about his visage on a stamp. Indeed, it is more than likely that he would have cast a jaundiced eye over the whole business of being honored by the United States Post Office Department.

"For my part, I could easily do without the post office," he wrote in "Walden." He added that "I never received more than one or two letters in my life . . . that were worth the postage."

The new Thoreau stamp, however, will make any letter worthwhile if it causes people to reflect momentarily on the material obsessions which lead too many to "lives of quiet desperation."

The Cattlemen Have a Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 25, 1967

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, in spite of all the self-serving declarations being made by the administration, and those who were involved in the big agricultural sellout at Geneva, I think the people of America should be reminded again and again that the American rancher was sold down the river, and that until some definite action is taken by Congress to offset the action at Geneva the livestock business in the United States will continue to worsen.

Mr. Speaker, the cattlemen have a case. I have asked consent to insert in the Record the editorial of the Farm Journal for August 1967, which is as follows:

The Cattlemen Have a Case

Now that the Administration has done something about giving dairy farmers relief from competing imports, how about doing something for the beef men of the country? (Dairymen selling cull cows are involved too.)

The situation is clear enough.

Beef supplies are at a record per capita level.

The beef men themselves are trying to do something about it. The American National Cattlemen's Association is pushing a campaign to cut output 5% by selling at lighter weights both out of feedlots and off the range. In the early 1960s they were increasing their cow holdings around 5% a year, but in 1966 they got it down to a mere six-tenths of one per cent, and very likely have trimmed it even more by now. They are doing their part.

Prices of fed steers, while now back to around last year's levels following a big mid-winter dip, are still lower than they were 15 to 20 years ago! For the five years 1947–51 prices averaged nearly $30 per cwt.; for 1963 through mid-1967 the average has been just under $25, or $5 less. Meanwhile their costs are higher—a great deal higher, which is a further reason why their income is less than it was back in the 1940s. Who else is settling for an income less than 15 to 20 years ago?

Yet while all this is the case, the importing countries are pouring fresh, frozen and chilled beef onto the U.S. market at a rate just shy of the "trigger"point. At the same time they have increased their imports of canned beef, not included in the quota. The law, passed in 1964, allows them 110% of the average of a five-year period, 1959–63; further shipments would be prohibited. They are now shipping in almost the allowed quota. Meat imports for the first quarter of this year got up to around 5% of our beef supply (and more than that of the kinds under quota). It may not sound like much but when our domestic supply is brimming over it can mean $2 per cwt. or so, which can be the difference between profit and loss. Alarmed that we'd do something about it, the importers have recently slacked off a bit.

It's easy to see why importers are interested in our market. Lean cow beef in New York brings them around 38¢ a pound, whereas in Liverpool, England, they get 30¢ and at home 23¢. Packers in this country like beef imports, too. The live cattle cost less abroad than here, the boning also costs less, and by keeping beef in transit on ships they don't have to pay so much storage..

The Administration lines up on the importers' side. It doesn't want to do anything that might increase the price of hamburger, wieners and other ground meat, which is what most of the imported beef goes for. Consumers outnumber cattlemen, and scream louder, so both the Administration and Congress prefer to look the other way and ignore the cattlemen's problem.

Importers, packers and government all claim that beef imports really matter little anyway. U.S. producers make steaks and roasts, they say, while importers supply the ground beef market. There are two things phoney about that argument: (1) About one-third of U.S. beef carcasses go into the ground beef market; (2) Ground beef competes with higher-priced beef. When a housewife chooses hamburger she has just decided against a roast.

Cattlemen are not asking that all beef imports be eliminated; they just want them held to a reasonable level.

Here's their program:

1. Make the quota the "trigger point"—not 110% of the quota. What reason is there for that extra 10%?

2. Base the quota on 1958–62, not one year later; 1963 was a year of abnormally high imports—10% of our market supply. Why not use a normal period?

3. Include canned meats in the quota. Why allow a loophole such as "Colby cheese" was in dairy imports?

4. Include in the quota any beef purchased from importers for our military needs. Isn't this logical?

Some 70 bills have been introduced in Congress embodying these ideas. One by Senator Roman Hruska (R., Neb.) is co-sponsored by 37 Senators. It deserves prompt and favorable action. The cattlemen are on solid ground and their demands are both moderate and fair. We don't see how any reasonable person could claim they aren't.

Elsewhere in this issue Secretary Freeman denies that the Administration has a "cheap food" policy. If it doesn't, let it do something for the beef industry. That will speak louder than anything the Secretary has to say.

Firms Shy at Bid on Sub Engine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN N. ERLENBORN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 25, 1967

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Speaker, we in Congress have given the people in the Department of Defense great power over American defense contractors, including emergency powers to compel a firm to perform work, whether it wants to do so or not. The men who exercise this power must act with great good judgment and discretion, or else the ends which Congress seeks cannot be realized.

As evidence of this hazard, I submit herewith a news story by Allen Smythe, a financial columnist, which appeared in the Chicago Tribune and several other large daily newspapers:

Firms Shy at Bid on Sub Engine

The Pentagon is beginning to make serious use of the defense production act enacted by Congress to give the military emergency powers over industry when national security is involved. One provision permits defense officials to force qualified but reluctant manufacturers to accept essential contracts for military hardware.

Congress approved navy plans to build a new greatly improved prototype submarine. It will be at least a three year 100-million-dollar project. It is under the direction of the salty 68-year-old Vice Adm. Hyman Rickover, whose popularity is high in Congress but controversial in industry and part of the navy.

The greatly improved nuclear propulsion unit is expected to make the present 71-million-dollar fleet submarines and the 110-million-dollar Polaris submarines obsolete.

NONE WILL BID

General Dynamics is the prime contractor, Westinghouse will build the newly designed atomic reactor. However, none of the firms solicited would bid on the detailed specifications for the new turbine.

Congress held hearings on the problem and heard the emotional admiral accuse General Electric of being unpatriotic and wanting a 25 per cent profit.

The General Electric division at Lynn, Mass. has had the dubious honor of being called the best qualified contractor and has just been ordered to accept a contract. However, the law is not one-sided. The navy can state its requirements, General Electric will write the specifications, name the price, and have equal say about the delivery time.

The Pentagon may again invoke this authority in the defense production act to force a private shipyard to accept a contract to complete the submarine Pogy. The original contract was modified by over 70,000 work order changes.

The navy canceled the contract for this vessel with the New York Shipbuilding company of Camden, N.J., because of "a year's delay and poor workmanship." It was launched prematurely on June 3, 1967 and towed to the Philadelphia navy yard. No plans had been made to complete the vessel and it was not air conditioned or sealed as are reserve ships.

Frustrated admirals are now trying to find a shipyard that could complete the vessel. The huge Philadelphia navy yard is not qualified for nuclear ship work. The Portsmouth navy yard is very high cost and scheduled for closing.

This leaves only two private shipyards on the Atlantic qualified for nuclear ship building: the Electric Boat division of General Dynamics at Groton, Conn. and the Newport News Shipbuilding company. Both are frantic in their refusals to even talk about the Pogy.

Remarks by Gen. William C. Westmoreland Before South Carolina State Assembly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 25, 1967

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, on April 26, Gen. William C. Westmoreland addressed the South Carolina State Assembly and made a significant statement relative to his evaluation of the contributions of Negro servicemen in the war in Vietnam. Since it did not receive the publicity which marked his address to a joint session of the Congress, I would like to bring it to the attention of those who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The address follows:

REMARKS BY GEN. WILLIAM C. WESTMORELAND BEFORE SOUTH CAROLINA STATE ASSEMBLY, APRIL 26, 1967

Governor McNair, Speaker, ladies and gentlemen, of the Assembly of the State of South Carolina, ladies and gentlemen I want to thank the Governor, Speaker, and each and every one of you for the warm reception that you have accorded me and my mother on this occasion. My only regret is that my father, the late General James Ripley Westmoreland, could not be present here today. He had many friends among you, spent much time talking to you. He had great affection not only for the State and its people, but for the elected representatives of the people in the State Assembly.

The resolution that you passed to yesterday is deeply appreciated by me. It was in staunch support of our efforts in Vietnam. That resolution and this occasion are, and will always be, cherished by me and my wife. I accept the honor which you have given me in my own right, but I also accept in behalf of native sons of South Carolina who are serving so magnificently in Vietnam in support of the free people of South Vietnam in their confrontation with Communist subversion and aggression.

The presence of our military power has stopped the almost inevitable enslavement of the people of South Vietnam by the Communists directed from the North as a first step in the engulfment, by the Communists, of all of Southeast Asia. Your native sons are playing a major role in this just and noble commitment by our country. As I visit my troops in Vietnam, which I do as often as I can, the native sons of South Carolina usually make themselves known to me and this I appreciate. Therefore, I have observed and talked with hundreds of the sons, brothers, fathers of the citizens of our State who are serving their country on the frontier of democracy and freedom.

Their service is typical of that of all Americans, representing a cross section of our country and of our society. This includes all races, colors and creeds, and I say to the people of my native State and to the people of my country that the performance of the Negro serviceman has been particularly inspirational to me. He has served with distinction equal to that of his white comrades in arms.

The Negro serviceman, like all servicemen, has been a credit to the country. He has been courageous on the battlefield, proficient in a cross section of technical skills, and like his white colleagues, he understands what the war is all about. He is loyal to his country and supports its policies, and he is carrying out his responsibilities with a sense of responsibility.

The support which the people of South Carolina have given to our efforts in Vietnam is important, meaningful, timely and deeply appreciated.

I thank with all my heart Governor McNair, the Speaker, the Ladies and Gentlemen of the State Assembly, and through you, all citizens of the great State of South Carolina. Thank you.

American Legion Boys State of Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 25, 1967

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, American Legion Post No. 176, Springfield, Va., in my congressional district, recently sponsored some outstanding boys as delegates to the American Legion Boys State of Virginia, held at the College of William and Mary at Williamsburg, Va.

One of the boys, Thatcher Willey, 6708 Jansen Court, Springfield, was elected governor of Boys State, Virginia, 1967. Another boy, Jeoffery Wickman, 6212 Frontier Drive, Springfield, was elected to one of the two senate seats. A third, Craig DeAtley, 6428 Maplewood Drive, Falls Church, was elected to be one of two boys from Virginia to serve as representative to Boys' Nation. All three boys will represent Virginia at Boys' Nation, one as governor, one as senator, and one as statewide representative.

Craig DeAtley, in addition to election as statewide representative, served as editor in chief of the newspaper during the Boys State program. Upon his return he wrote a letter to his sponsoring post which I think is most inspiring, and which will be of interest to all Members of this body.

His letter follows in full:

FALLS CHURCH, VA., *July 17, 1967.*

AMERICAN LEGION POST NO. 176,
Springfield, Va.

GENTLEMEN: I am writing this letter to try and tell you what this week meant to me, but I cannot put into words what I felt, what I learned, what I gained. What I got out of Boys' State is the ultimate; it is something I will always remember and cherish for as long as I live. I want to thank you for making it possible for me to have the wonderful experience of going to Boys' State. I am sorry to say that when I first received news that I was chosen to go I didn't really comprehend what a great honor had been given to me, but believe me gentlemen, I know now that it is the greatest honor of my young life.

Sunday night began our week at Boys' State very appropriately, for that had been deisgnated American Legion Night. During the course of the evening the citizens of Boys' State became acquainted with the wonderful American Legion programs you have. We met many of your directors, post commanders, past and present, as they welcomed us and tried to make us feel at home. Sunday evening they, also, asked for volunteers to work on the Boys' State newspaper, "Statesman." Because I had previous experience in journalism and will be Editor-in-Chief of my school's newspaper, I decided to go. Twenty-five boys I had never seen nor met before chose me to be their editor. This was indeed a great honor and experience. I'm sending to you the five issues that were published. I'm proud to say Mr. Rardin and the other directors and counselors called it the best and most informative newspaper they could remember having. I cannot credit myself, but my fine staff and sponsors, Mr. Gates Richardson and Mr. P. M. Kilmartin.

Monday began at 5:30 with everyone full of enthusiasm, but still half asleep. During the course of the day we heard lectures on Americanism, City Government, County Government, Taxation and Vietnam. That night we were entaintained by 3 movies, two on space and one on gun safety.

Tuesday began the day that meant the most to me. Each party, Nationalist and Federalist nominated candidates for city positions and in the afternoon we held our first election. That evening we were addressed by George W. Passage, Editor of the Editorial Page—The Darly Press Incorporated. He talked to us about America and its Government press relationship. During the speech he told us that nobody today stands for something; they are against everything and everyone. He issued us a challenge to "Stand for Something," a challenge I will accept. He brought out that "As America goes, so goes the rest of the world." It was then I began to realize why I was there. I realized that someday we will lead our country and if we are not taught or educated today we certainly cannot lead others in the future. The world is looking for food, clothes and for hope, and it's up to the United States to give them all of these and more. The world is looking for a leader; America is looking to its youth to provide that leadership, and I'm proud to say 625 boys were ready then and are ready now to give their all to lead America and the world in the right way, in the democratic way. We all realized that a tremendous responsibility lies on our shoulders and the shoulders of all American youth and that America must not fail in its cause to provide freedom everywhere. Plainly, America must "Stand for Something," just as the American youth will stand for something good, prosperous, and wonderful. It will not be easy; for the price of freedom isn't free but through your Boys' State programs that cost will be paid.

After Mr. Passage spoke, the most inspiring event of the week took place. The Williamsburg and Richmond Chapters of "Sing Out," and "Up with People" put on a show for us and what a show it was. They completely captivated me and all the others present. We were so enthusiastic we made them sing their songs again with us joining in. I was so motivated that I was ready to sing out for my country, my God, and my freedom I love so much at any time. I cannot tell you accurately the feeling that I had, only that it was a feeling I never had before—A feeling of pride for my Country and everything it stands for, A feeling of wanting to give my all so that the freedom I now so dearly cherish cannot only be kept by our Country but given to all the other countries of the world as well.

Wednesday we learned about our legislative procedures and in the afternoon while the Federalists were touring Williamsburg, the Nationalists were holding their convention, nominating their candidates for the 3 state offices. That evening the Federalists conventioned and the Nationalists toured. I was deeply thrilled when I was nominated for Governor by my city, Washington. I was eliminated on the second ballot but felt I had lost nothing, for you don't come away from Boys' State a loser. The next day campaign speeches and the election highlighted the day. The Nationalist candidates for Governor, Mitch Willey, and Tom Tucker for Lt. Governor, won while Grant Cole won Attorney General for the Federalist party. That evening the mock trial of Frankie and Johnnie preceded a lecture by Judge Taylor on Court procedures.

Friday was marked by the Inauguration of our new Governor, a canine exhibition and the announcing that I had been nominated along with 11 other boys to go to Boys' Nation. My counselors, Mr. Duncan and Mr. Sadler, had nominated me to represent Washington City. I filled out several forms which asked about myself, my grades, extra curricular activities, and my hopes and ambitions for the future. In the afternoon I was interviewed by a committee of six past-post commanders. The questions asked me varied from what event meant the most to me at Boys' State, to the Arab-Israeli situation, to what I would do if I was given $1000. They told us no decision would be announced that night, so somewhat nervous and worried but hopeful nevertheless, I went to the Variety Show that night.

Because of my excitement, I was unable to eat my breakfast Saturday, so I went to the assembly to receive the good news or bad news whichever it was to be. After the other awards had been given out, Mr. Rex Tilloston, Chairman of the nominating Board of 6, came out to announce the two Boys' Nation delegates and the alternates. After informing the citizens of Boys' State that being selected to go to Boys' Nation was the highest honor Virginia Boys' State and the American Legion can give 2 individuals, he announced that I and Doug Kamero of Alexandria, Virginia, had been chosen to represent the directors, counselors, the American youth of Virginia, and the American Legion at Boys' Nation. I cannot tell you what it meant to me. Between a standing ovation and the shaking of hands, I was on Cloud 9 and all the other clouds there are. I was the highest honor other than being chosen to go to Boys' State that I have received in my life and I have received many wonderful awards. For being selected to represent my state, I received a medal. In the afternoon, during lunch, I talked to Mr. Rardin, the director, who presented me a tie clasp for the outstanding job I had done with the paper and for being chosen to go to Boys' Nation. Last but not least, I received congratulations and hand shakes from all the directors, counselors and citizens of Boys' State.

That in a nutshell is what happened to me and 624 other boys in a week that we always will remember. If there is any time you would like me to relate my experiences to you or any others, please feel free to call on me for I will be more than willing. I promise that I will represent Post #176, the American Legion, and the youth of Virginia to the best of my ability at Boys' Nation.

Once again I wish to thank you for giving me this and so much more. I developed friendships I will always remember, a pride in my country and all it stands for, and an appreciation of the American Legion and all its programs. Thanks so much. I will always be indebted to you.

Yours truly,

CRAIG DEATLEY,
Delegate to Boys' Nation.

Congressman Horton Notes Bob Addie's Column on "Paradise" in the District of Columbia Stadium

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 25, 1967

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, in these times of crisis when the problems of the Nation and the world weigh heavily on our minds, it is a pleasant change of pace to note the pleasure that one can derive from some very simple events. Last week Bob Addie, in a particularly well written column in the Washington Post, related the joy a group of children from the Columbia Lighthouse for the Blind experienced when they "saw" the Washington Senators play the Detroit Tigers.

His enjoyable human interest column, entitled "Paradise Is Many Things," follows:

PARADISE IS MANY THINGS

(By Bob Addie)

It's a long, long time from May to December, as we have been constantly reminded by pop singers. But it's a short, short time from little boyhood to teenhood.

Five years ago this month, I was at D.C. Stadium the day some youngsters from the Columbia Lighthouse for the Blind, all under 12, were disappointed in their efforts to attend a baseball game because it rained. As it turned out, it was an indelible experience for these kids, blind since birth.

The children went into the Washington clubhouse, met all the ballplayers, had lunch in the press room, and later went out to the field.

The kids wanted to try everything that day. They sat on the bench. They handled the bats and the gloves and the wondrous armor the catcher wears. They had heard and they had read. But they had not touched.

There was a little boy named Mike. He wanted to meet Jimmie Piersall, then with the Senators. "It has been my lifetime ambition in all my 11 years," said Mike, "to step the distance from home plate to first base."

It was a memorable scene. Piersall the clown, the "flakey" (or eccentric, by his own description) ballplayer, holding that little boy by the hand as they trudged to first base in the pouring rain.

Mike wore a yellow slicker and rain hat. Piersall was in uniform without a jacket. But the ballplayer stood out there on first base in the soaking rain with that little boy, explaining what a base really was.

There was Donnie, a fair-haired boy who was afraid he wouldn't get his share of autographs. And then there was Jolly Willie, lighting up the dreary day with his magnificent smile and cheerfulness. Everything delighted Willie, a little Negro boy with beautiful teeth.

They were all back at D.C. Stadium the other day when the Detroit Tigers played the Senators as guests of the Washington ball club. And this time they saw a game.

I sat with them for four innings. Before the game they lined up in the Presidential box just behind the home dugout. The Senators filed by the box, shook hands, gave autographs and answered questions. Later, the youngsters, about 25 of them, boys and girls, sat behind home plate and the protective screen.

Everybody carried a transistor to hear Dan Daniels and John MacLean broadcast the game. You never heard such a din. The kids cheered every ball and booed every strike on the good guys in the white uniforms. ("Blind bum," yelled Mike at plate umpire Lou DiMuro for calling Frank Howard out on strikes.)

Jolly Willie, that wonderful smile always in evidence, led the cheering section. "He's that way all the time," said one of his counselors. "Willie lights up our whole camp. Wherever he is there is laughter."

For some reason, Willie and his Columbia Lighthouse friends put their hands a few inches from their mouths when they cheer. It produces an odd effect and, of course, increases the decibels.

The young fans know their sports. They are familiar with all the beloved cliches of baseball. They never let up cheering the other day. If a Tiger got on base, there was the chant to double him up. If a Washington man was at bat, he was exhorted to get a hit—preferably a home run.

I told Mike that he looked like Bobby Mitchell, the Redskin star, "Ah," sighed Mike sadly, "Mitchell drops too many passes." Mike was silent for a few seconds and then asked: "Is Bobby Mitchell a nice guy?"

The salt of the earth, the best, he was assured.

"I really don't hate Bobby," Mike conceded. "I just get mad at him when he drops passes. I want our Washington teams to win real bad. I saw only one Redskin game last year. Football is harder to follow than baseball—I mean for me."

Some of the Columbia Lighthouse children will go to the Maryland School for the Blind this fall. Others will go to regular schools. Mike is one of these. He will enter St. John's High here and he's tremendously excited. ("They have great football teams at St. John's.")

These blind kids have the normal appetites of their more fortunate contemporaries. At the ball game they demolished a few dozen hot dogs, many bags of peanuts, and washed everything down with lots of cokes. They spent their own money, too.

There was, of course, a liberal mixture of Negroes and whites in the group. They held hands quite a bit. (It's a form of communication for them.) Maybe not being able to see also makes them color blind.

Don't talk "Black Power" to the blind. They know only too well the power of blackness. But the kids "saw" a ball game and a winning one in the fabulous streak of the Senators. Paradise is many things to many people.

Panama Canal Treaty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVE MARTIN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 25, 1967

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, the treaty which President Johnson has proposed between the United States and the Republic of Panama is not in the best interests of this country, nor of the world. Joint control with Panama would result in the difficulties which have arisen in recent years with the Suez Canal. For the benefit of all the Members, I am including with this statement, a copy of a letter from Dr. Ed Healey, a practicing physician in Panama. The letter was written to Dr. S. H. Brauer, a member of our Nebraska State Legislature. The letter follows:

DEAR DR. BRAUER: I am hoping you have influence with our U.S. Senators from Nebraska, and will be able to inform them on an upcoming treaty ratification that Johnson will try to get passed. Tonight I read that treaty . . . it has been drown up to convert the Panama Canal Zone from American control to a divided Panama-American control . . . this is not in America's interests!

For a bit of background, let me digress for a moment. The Canal was built by the USA at a tremendous loss of life . . . in constructing this engineering marvel the country of Panama was raised from a disease ridden tropical province of Colombia to her present vastly improved position. Malaria, yellow fever were eradicated and in doing so some of the noblest chapters of medical history were written. The superhuman feat of technical brilliance in lock construction stands today unmatched. Only last week 51 ships from 200 to 900 feet long were taken from one ocean to another through three sets of locks. The French failed in their attempt, as they have in other areas; it was American money, brains and lives that made this modern marvel out of what was a stinking swamp.

The builders of the canal were assured by President Theodore Roosevelt that there would always be a place for those Americans in the zone, and a place for their children and their children's children.

Panama has received not only priceless health benefits from the Americans' presence in the area but financially the country has reaped incredible rewards. Receiving slightly less than $100,000,000.00 per year in income of various sources directly due to the canal. But they are a greedy bunch. They want more. Several years ago, they wanted 50% of the gross revenues of the zone . . . a childish and naive request that got them nowhere, thank God. They found though, that it is the squeaky hinge that gets the grease . . . they rioted in 1964, a communist led uprising that all the politicians hoped to gain from. And gain they did! Although at that time Johnson said "no concessions could be granted under such pressure", it was less than six months later that he agreed to renegotiate a canal zone treaty. Currently the USA controls entirely the Zone, the new treaty that has been drafted transfers control to a binational (Panama-U.S.) administration. Abolishes the American control giving Panama lands, industrial plants, hospitals, housing developments and more free gratis. Other give aways include relinquishing the United States courts, police, school system, etc. As you probably know, the original investment to build the canal has not yet been paid off. The new treaty stipulates that this cost must simply be written off by the US. A $6,000,000.00 road must be built in Panama according to the treaty, the canal will be declared NEUTRAL by the new treaty with guaranteed passage of all ships . . . including warships of all countries . . . including China, Russia, etc. The new treaty provides that by 1999 all remaining property of the dual administration be turned over solely to Panama. This is in exchange for the right to spend our money to construct a sea level canal to be administered again by a joint commission with revenues going to Panama and the US.

I beg you to warn our Senators . . . no one will look out for the US but Americans and may God help us if the Washington Americans are not concerned. The current treaty need not be changed . . . we control the area now by law.

Please do what you can. Thank you.

ED HEALEY.

The House Reads the Riot Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 25, 1967

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that my opposition to the so-called antiriot bill was supported by a recent editorial in the Los Angeles Times. This editorial, entitled "The House Reads the Riot Act," appeared in the Friday, July 21, issue of the Times.

The editorial exposes the true impact of this bill, calling it a "dubious response to racial violence." While abhorring, as I do, the use of force or violence to solve the social ills of our society, the Times wisely recognizes that this legislation is no cure-all for stopping riots. I seriously doubt whether this bill adds anything meaningful to our preventive tools. The origins of a riot lie in deep-seated feelings of frustration and anger which are nurtured in the ghettos of our cities. Those who call for riots are a product of these ghettos, and they find willing audience among those who have no hope.

If the sponsors of this so-called antiriot bill had permitted a single improving amendment, then there would have been some among the 70 Members who opposed who might have supported an improved bill. Yet not one amendment was accepted. I commend the editors of the Los Angeles Times for seeing through the ambiguities and uncertainties of this legislation. I commend this editorial to the attention of my colleagues, as follows:

THE HOUSE READS THE RIOT ACT

In a dubious response to racial violence, the House has passed a federal anti-riot bill to "shut up loudmouths."

The measure, overwhelmingly approved 347–70, would prohibit the crossing of a state line with "intent" to incite a riot. Its author, Rep. William C. Cramer (R-Fla.), said his bill "would put the rabble rousers out of business"—and specifically referred to the militant Stokely Carmichael.

House Republican leader Gerald R. Ford (Mich.) conceded that the prohibition would be difficult to enforce. But, said Ford, "If it does nothing but shut up the loudmouths, it will be helpful."

Unfortunately, shutting up the loudmouths—even so offensive an outside agitator as Stokely Carmichael—will not in itself prevent rioting.

The frustrations that lead to civil disorder are not the result of inflammatory speeches. They will not be cured by silencing protest.

Neither can they be finally resolved through violence. And The Times strongly believes that those who cross the line from protest to incitement of rioting should be severely punished.

When the California Legislature was considering a new anti-rioting law last year, The Times insisted that the language be made specific and warned that no such law is a substitute for positive action on the root causes of riot action.

The House bill now goes to the Senate, where its fuzzy language should be subjected to searching inquiry as to constitutionality and effectiveness.

Senators should recall the words of Rep. Emanuel Celler (D-N.Y.), chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, who said Wednesday, "I consider this bill to be a futile gesture, neither preventive nor curative."

"The basic disorder is the discontent of the Negro, his disenchantment as to promises made but not fulfilled, the dreary slow pace by which he achieves equality.

"This bill will not allay his anger and frustrations. Instead it will arouse his anger and frustration more deeply. His leaders ask for better housing . . . You offer them jail. His leaders ask for better facilities for education. You read them a riot act . . ."

There must be a halt to the incitement of rioting. But it will have to be achieved through legislation that is enforceable and constitutional. It must never be done through suspension of the right of free speech.

And to prevent the ugly fever of violence, the basic sickness of hopelessness and poverty must be cured.

Praise for the Farmers Home Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY ROBERTS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 25, 1967

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I received a copy of a letter from the Honorable Jack C. Morgan, attorney-at-law in Kaufman, Tex., written to Secretary Orville L. Freeman. This letter was one of praise for the Farmers Home Administration activities in Kaufman County, located in the Texas Fourth Congressional District. This letter states very clearly why Mr. Morgan, and many more citizens who have worked with the Farmers Home Administration, find this agency to be one of the truly outstanding accomplishments of this Government. Having had the privilege of working with these people in securing loans from Farmers Home, I can add my personal endorsement of this agency for its fine work. More importantly, I can, like Mr. Morgan, state with firsthand knowledge that these water loans have done more good at less cost to the Government than any other conceivable type of Government loan or grant.

I congratulate the Farmers Home Administration for a job well done, and offer the letter to Secretary Freeman, which is as follows:

Kaufman, Tex.,
July 21, 1967.

Mr. Orville L. Freeman,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Freeman: I recently noticed a copy of the report for the Farmers Home Administration activities in Kaufman County, Texas. This office has touched *directly* over 2800 rural families through direct and water association loans. Population wise this would be near to 25% of the total population of the county. I know of no other government program that has directly affected the living standards of such a large segment of our people.

Primary and secondary benefit has been received by so many businesses in Kaufman County as to make a list of them impossible—plumbers, lumber yards, carpenters, electricians, contractors, land developers, title companies and banks. I doubt that every business in the county has not felt a direct benefit through increased business and earnings. This has all been possible during a time of tight money when this segment of the economy was suffering.

The program has offered good quality residences and dwellings for many of our families who have lived in substandard housing. Their appreciation is shown in the record of their payments. All of the payments on these loans are current.

Nearly all of the water loans are in areas where there is no well water available. Prior to the times these lines were built it was not uncommon to see our farmers hauling water—not only to drink—but for livestock. This was shocking.

Until the Farmers Home Administration came to the rescue I saw one town that nearly had to be abandoned because its wells went bad. Thanks to the loan new homes are being built with private financing and the community is growing in people and prosperity.

My observation of the F.H.A. program has been that they get to the heart of the local problem the quickest and with the least amount of overhead and expense.

Sincerely,

Jack C. Morgan,
Attorney-at-Law.

Through Your Back Door

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELMER J. HOLLAND

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 25, 1967

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, every year the Small Business Administration helps thousands of small businessmen—and women—with long-term loans. The loans range in size from a few thousand dollars to a maximum of $350,000 and can run for as long as 10 years.

In many cases these loans go to help an enterprising man or woman start a small business of his own. Such was the case of a loan SBA recently made to Mrs. Roberta Lewis, of 210 Delmont Avenue, Pittsburgh, a constituent, whose Hors d'Oeuvres With Roberta, have attracted customers throughout western Pennsylvania.

Mrs. Lewis is a most remarkable woman. She has had successful careers in TV and as a caterer, and is now writing a book about her experiences. Recently she conceived the idea of putting her talent as an expert cook to work by going into the business of making frozen hors d'oeuvres.

Mrs. Lewis, needing money for the purchase of equipment and working capital, applied to SBA's office in Pittsburgh for help. SBA approved the $10,000 Economic Opportunity loan last April and Mrs. Lewis' business is now off to a good start.

The Pittsburgh Post-Gazette in its issue of July 12 carried a feature article on Mrs. Lewis' new business. Because it shows so clearly how SBA loans can help enterprising men and women. I include in the Record the text of this feature story written by Post-Gazette staff writer, Zora Unkovich:

FROM MAID TO BUSINESS WOMAN

(By Zora Unkovich)

For more than 25 years Roberta Lewis has been jotting down notes—material to use in a book "Through Your Back Door." It's to be all about her experiences as a maid, later a cook, and finally as a caterer and "the first colored woman to appear on a TV commercial."

In the meantime, the "back door" has given way to the front door . . . her own trim entrance to the newly opened headquarters of "Hors d' Oeuvres with Roberta" in the Sleepy Hollow Shopping Center, Castle Shannon.

Mrs. Lewis, you see, has gone in the frozen food business—and such a specialized branch of it!

With the approval of the U.S. Food and Drug Administration and with the help of a loan from the federal Small Business Administration, she is packaging hors d'oeuvres. These are strictly gourmet . . . no bits of cheese on crackers.

Mushrooms are stuffed with beef and spices. Chicken livers come with bacon and water chestnuts. There are Swedish meat balls, sauerkraut mounds and cranberry sausage muffins . . . apricots, peaches, pears are wrapped in strips of bacon. Mexican flings (made in the U.S.A., of course) combine ground beef, yellow corn meal, flour, kidney beans, eggs, salt, spices, hot pepper.

Tiny salmon croquettes, turkey and chicken croquettes, beef horseradish cakes, as well, are found in the packages which look as if they contain elegant bonbons.

So far, Mrs. Lewis has ordered for her heat-and-serve specialties from such firms as the Epicure Shops of the downtown and Monroeville Kauffmann stores and from Allegheny Airlines.

Many of her neighbors at the center have come in to welcome her, she reports. While she was setting up the kitchen, they come to watch and to bring cold drinks. All of them had one question:

"What can we do to help?"

A year ago Mrs. Lewis was teaching a catering class at Manchester Center. This was part of the poverty program to retrain Americans for better jobs. Two of her last year's "graduates" now are in business on their own. This fall she'll be teaching a similar class.

When she finally gets to compiling "Through Your Back Door," (a Pittsburgh publisher is waiting for the book), she will tell about starting work for $5 a week. She was only 12 at the time, but she told her employer that she was 18.

Another of her early employers was "the town's best cook." Young Roberta would rush through the work of scrubbing floors and other cleaning so she could watch her employer cook. The observing process in all her jobs paid off. Soon she began preparing meals where she worked.

Through a New York agency, she secured a job one summer to cook at a home in the Thousand Islands. It was a mansion, really, with a staff of 18 servants. Her employer had never thought to check age. When she met the new cook, aged 21, she groaned:

But by the time the cook served her first meal of delectible lamb chops prepared in a tomato sauce, no one remembered her tender years.

One day a guest caught an 18 pound salmon. Cook Roberta didn't have anything in which to prepare it, but that didn't worry her. She took an old-fashioned boiler, the kind once used to "cook" clothes in, wrapped the salmon in cheesecloth, and prepared it in the boiler!

Her catering during the past quarter century has included some of Pittsburgh's most fashionable social affairs. The time she catered a debut party of 800 about 15 years ago, preparing food for both tea and dinner, she says, was one of the many events to train her for her latest project.

Her son, Thomas H. Lewis, Jr., a construction accountant for Alcoa Projects, is her "advisory board." He jokes that he "worked his way through Kentucky State on the football field." The other three Lewis children are Fred, 28, of Gary, Ind., an inter-state truck driver; Charmaine, 23, mother of three; and Bonnie Kathleen, 15, a South Hills student.

Mrs. Lewis has her own unique way of saying thanks to people who have helped her along the way. She presents them at Christmas with one of her favorite white fruit cakes which she calls "a good luck thing with me." Through the years the "thanks" have grown until last Christmas, the baking of the fruit cake took 265 eggs!

Progress for Georgia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT G. STEPHENS, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 25, 1967

Mr. STEPHENS. Mr. Speaker, on July 15, I had the pleasure of attending a ceremony inaugurating the last dial telephone system to be installed by the Southern Bell Telephone Co. in Georgia. This last manual conversion was made in Madison, Morgan County, in the 10th District I represent. Madison's first telephone exchange was established September 1, 1894, with 44 subscribers. Fifty years later the number of telephones had grown to only 375. But, in the last 20 years the service has boomed until today there are approximately 2,800 telephones out of the Madison exchange, including rural service to the Bostwick community.

Ceremonies marking this historic occasion were shared by city, county, and

State officials. Senator Brooks Pennington of the 45th district was master of ceremonies. Others attending were Madison mayor, Richard Norton; State representative, E. Roy Lambert; and Southern Bell officials: Georgia vice presidents, Frank T. Smith and William B. Bryan; district manager, Thomas Strickland; and madison manager, Ray V. Reece. The first official direct dial long-distance call was made by Nash M. Williams, president of the Madison Chamber of Commerce, to Harold Clotfelter in Rome, who is president of the Georgia Chamber of Commerce.

Keynote speaker was Commissioner William H. Kimbrough, Georgia public service commission, and as a special tribute to this memorable event, I insert his speech in the RECORD.

The speech follows:

Congressman Stephens, Senator Pennington, Representative Lambert, Mayor Norton, ladies and gentlemen—

It is always a pleasure to be in Madison . . . especially on an occasion as historic as this important step in the history of Madison, Morgan County, and our State.

I travel around Georgia quite a bit in working with other members of your public service commission and with the companies that provide telephone service. The most enjoyable trips are those which afford an opportunity to help celebrate progress in our State. We've seen a lot of progress in recent years and it is certainly good to join you in welcoming this new progressive step—the change from a manually operated telephone exchange to one of the most modern dial offices in the country.

The significance of this dial conversion reaches throughout the State for it marks the end of an era—the conversion of the last manually operated telephone exchange in Georgia. Your public service commission is as proud of this achievement as is Southern Bell and the State's independent companies.

In addition to the dial conversion, there is, of course, something extra special about what is going to happen to your communications here tomorrow morning. You will be able to dial many of your own long distance calls, and, the expansion of local calling to include Rutledge will certainly add immeasurable convenience and value to your telephone service.

Oliver Wendell Holmes once said, "I find the great thing in this world is not so much where we stand, as in what direction we are moving." He might well have been talking to citizens of this area because it is obvious that you have always known where you were headed—proud of your heritage and serenely sure of your future.

A driving spirit of progress has characterized Madison ever since its incorporation in 1809, and, its citizens have come through some difficult times . . . the Civil War . . . the plague of the boll weevil . . . the depression . . . and more wars.

The changing base of your economy through the years perhaps best illustrates this spirit of your citizens, when the boll weevil ruined cotton, they turned to peanuts, when the price of peanuts failed, they turned to peaches, corn, oats, hogs, dairy and beef cattle.

And while agriculture is still a mainstay of your economy, some foresighted citizens went to work to add to the economy with industry, Madison's plastics, furniture, textile and seed industries are proof of their success.

Back in the 1830's Madison began to grow and get rich when for a couple of years it was the terminus of the new Georgia railroad. A modern counterpart to this historical footnote appears to be in the making with the routing of I–20 near here.

I can't help but believe that if those early residents could return to Madison today, they'd be impressed and proud of their town. Your achievements are indicative of the spirit of citizens who know that their town cannot stand still.

The story of your telephone service parallels the story of your town and county, it's a history of faith and growth—a history we can all be proud of.

Southern Bell purchased the Madison exchange in 1897. Early growth in telephones was slow, when compared to recent years, but it was steady. By the end of 1945, there were 438 telephones in Madison. Five years later, there were 804 telephones here.

The fabulous fifties and soaring sixties saw the demand for telephone service here set new records. At the end of 1955, there were about 1,156 telephones.

Today, Madison has approximately 2,637 telephones, that's progress and reflects what's happened to your town in recent years.

Your new telephone services will serve to help bring Georgians closer together and provide Madison with the best telephone system anywhere. In addition, a most attractive telephone building has been added to the further enhancement of your town. And at Rutledge, there's a new building and switching equipment.

The things I've been discussing here tonight are examples of the progress and spirit that Henry Grady had in mind when he was talking about the "new South" and hailed a "new day in Dixie". No doubt Mr. Grady, even with his tremendous faith in his State, would be amazed if he could see what is happening here today.

We've reached new heights in development and improvement of our way of life. There can be absolutely no doubt that there is a bright future ahead as long as communities like this one continue to build for the future.

We at your public service commission are impressed daily with the convenience and flexibility of modern telephone service. This is something most of us take pretty much for granted and I think maybe this is good. The fact that we accept this convenience so matter of factly indicates that progress, improvement, dependability and moving ahead is the rule rather than the exception. This is good. We want it to continue this way.

A lot of money was needed to provide this modern dial office and services for your town and Rutledge. Mr. Smith tells me it cost more than $738,000 to convert Madison to dial service, inaugurate direct distance dialing and expand local calling to Rutledge. This surely is an indication of the faith the telephone company has in your community and county.

Madison's past is a history to be proud of. The present gives just as much reason to be proud. The forecast for the future is good and you are assured that your telephone company will grow right along with you.

Congratulations on your new telephone system, and a beautiful new building. It has been a privilege to be with you this evening.

Memphis Offers Opportunity to Those Willing To Work for It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DAN KUYKENDALL

OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 25, 1967

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Speaker, in these days when many are going about the land decrying the lack of opportunity, I am proud to present the record of Memphis, Tenn., the community I have the privilege to represent in Congress.

Memphis is proud of all its citizens, and no man is held back from gaining those goals in life which he can achieve through initiative, study, and work. Citizens of all races, creeds, and color have achieved notable success in Memphis and each, in his own achievement, has helped make our community a better place in which to live.

The Memphis Press-Scimitar has published a series of three articles showing how a man can get ahead in Memphis. Under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the first of the three articles, "A Man Can Get Ahead in Memphis."

MANY NEGROES CLIMB SUCCESS LADDER: "A MAN CAN GET AHEAD IN MEMPHIS"

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Lt. (jg) Friedel C. Greene, 25-year-old Memphis Negro Navy pilot patrolling the Gulf of Tonkin in the Vietnam War, recently told Scripps-Howard's veteran correspondent, Jim Lucas, he would return to his home at 207 Caldwell St., after his service because Memphis is a place "where a man can get ahead." The comment of the patriotic young serviceman caused The Press-Scimitar to take a look at how and why many Negroes—men and women—have gotten ahead in Memphis, where racial strife has been at a minimum. This is the first of a three-part series which will include information about the remaining roadblocks to more employment opportunities for Negroes.)

(By Kay Pittman Black)

Memphis is a place where a Negro man—or woman—"can get ahead," as do white citizens.

Examples are plentiful.

Negro men and women have increasingly moved into the mainstream of community life. Take a close look and you will find Negroes broadening from their traditional southern professions—teaching, undertaking, insurance, preaching—and, of course, thousands of manual labor, domestic and menial jobs.

You find now Negroes in high political office, in many important businesses, advertising, the legal profession, administration of affairs, in supervisory roles of government work, serving on important city and county boards and participating well in law enforcement.

DIMINISHING

There are still areas where inroads have not been made—particularly in some labor unions—but "white only" work is fast diminishing.

Memphis has many outstanding Negro leaders and "color barrier" breakers who have successfully worked in a climate of good race relations.

H. T. Lockard, a lawyer, first Negro since Reconstruction to be elected to the Shelby County Quarterly Court, now is a $17,500-a-year administrative assistant to Gov. Buford Ellington. The governor trusts Lockard, as a cabinet member, with some of his most important tasks.

HARD WORKER

There's Jesse Turner, a man who works 16 to 18 hours a day. He's now serving on the Shelby County Quarterly Court, is vice president and cashier of Tri-State Bank and president of the Memphis Chapter of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. He was born in Mississippi, the son of a Baptist minister.

ONLY ONE

Soft-spoken and generous with her time is Dr. Clara Brawner, the only Negro woman physician in general practice in Memphis.

Although she won't tell her age, Dr. Brawner admits to being "in my 30's."

Her father was a doctor. She was impressed as a child with how much help he was able to give people. Her mother was a registered nurse and "she impressed on me that just because I was a woman didn't mean that I ought to do nothing. She believed women, too, need to do things, be somebody." Her sister, Alpha Brawner, is a concert and opera singer with the New York City Center.

Criminal Court Judge Ben L. Hooks is a man of "firsts." An attorney and minister, he was the first of his race to be appointed assistant public defender and became the first Negro appointed to a judicial post in Tennessee's history.

Maceo Walker, a first-class conservative business executive, is president of the Tri-State Bank and president and chairman of the board of Universal Life Insurance Co., one of the largest predominantly Negro companies in the nation. He was the first Negro ever appointed by the City Commission—in 1961—to the Memphis Transit Authority Board.

T. H. Hayes, secretary-treasurer of Union Protective Life Insurance Co., succeeded Walker as the second Negro to serve on the Memphis Transit Authority Board. His firm, now in its 33rd year of operation, is said to have been "made in Memphis through prayer." Encouragement for its founding was discovered at the altar of Avery Chapel A.M.E. Church, then located on Fourth between Beale and Gayoso, say leaders of the firm. It employs more than 150 persons in Tennessee and Missouri.

LEADERS

Dr. R. Q. Venson, a dentist, and his wife, Ethyl, are outstanding community leaders. They organized the Cotton Makers Jubilee, which gave Negroes a part in the city's Cotton Carnival. Dr. Venson, who can remember when "a Negro was lynched and his head was cut off and dragged down Beale Street," said "things are much, much better now. But it took work, hard work." Mrs. Venson is the first woman to serve on the Memphis Housing Authority Board and is former coordinator of the War on Poverty committee.

Among the younger leaders in the city is A. W. Willis, attorney now in an integrated law firm. He's serving his second term in the Tennessee House of Representatives, was the first Negro elected to the House since reconstruction. A leader in the politically-powerful Shelby County Democratic Club, Willis is seriously thinikng of running for mayor of Memphis in the October election.

HARVARD GRADUATE

Russell B. Sugarmon Jr., a Harvard law school graduate, is a member of the House of Representatives and leader in the Shelby County Democratic Club. He in articulate, well-educated, with a button-down humor in the John F. Kennedy vein. Sugarmon and Willis are both members of the newly formed legal firm of Ratner, Sugarmon, Thompson, Lucas and Willis.

Sugarmon's wife, Miriam, is associate professor of Spanish and French at Memphis State University and recently received her Ph. D. from Johns Hopkins University in Baltimore.

Dedrick Brittenum, who heads Brittenum Associates Inc., in one of five Negroes who are broker dealers in securities in the United States. He got interested in stocks and mutual funds, he said, when he worked in the locker room at Memphis Country Club.

BETTER WAY

"I was working around money and heard men talking about it every day," he said. "I began to realize then there must be a better way to make a living and decided to find it." He believes he is one of the few security house heads in the country with just a high school degree.

Fred L. Davis is the only Negro employe in the county register's office. He holds a degree in accounting, is a leader in the Orange Mound Civic Club, the Shelby County Democratic Club. He worked his way through grade school, high school and college, winding up with a degree in business administration.

"I've worked in warehouses, as a dishwasher—you name it, I've done it," he said. "I used to go to the fields on a truck to chop cotton." He's a candidate for City Council in District 4, an area half white and half Negro.

Many Negroes are finding profitable and satisfying careers in Police and Fire Department work. Lt. R. J. Turner, a soft-spoken man, is in his 19th year with the Memphis Police Department. He's on the homicide squad. He has a high school diploma and is worried because "people nowadays don't want to get involved."

His younger counterpart is Edward E. Redditt, a detective and seven-year man with the department. He's a graduate of Lane College and is second in charge of the police department's community relations department.

Samuel M. Peace, 42, is one of the city's most successful real estate men. He worked his way through college—went to school at LeMoyne from 8 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. and then worked from 5 p.m. to 2 a.m. at the old Pig 'N Whistle. He kept that up seven days a week for four years and still managed to make the Dean's List in his major field of philosophy and religion.

FIRST

He was the first Negro hired by the Tennessee Department of Employment Security, worked as an interviewer for 10 years before forming his own real estate and building company. The first year out on his own in the real estate field he said he did better than $1 million in property sales. His company has sold more than 300 homes each year for the last four years and he employs 23 agents.

Dr. Hollis Price, a graduate of Amherst College and Columbia, has been president of LeMoyne College for 26 years and has seen many of his graduates go on to become valued members of the Memphis community.

Unlike many of his colleagues in education, Dr. Price feels that the student today entering college "comes with maybe better training but I don't think he's as highly motivated." That worries him as an educator and as a community leader.

IN EDUCATION

Many Negroes are in positions of administrative and supervisory leadership with the Memphis Board of Education. Typical is Maj. George L. Robinson, supervisor of the city school system's Reserve Officers Training Corps. When he was named to the post in 1966, Maj. Robinson became the first Negro supervisor in the city school system to have authority over instruction in predominantly white schools. He had been head of the National Defense Cadet Corps in Memphis—NDCC had units at seven predominantly Negro schools—before it merged with the ROTC. Prior to that he was a teacher.

John R. Arnold Jr., heads Arnold & Associates, the only Negro advertising agency in the city. His is the only Negro agency member of the Advertising Club and he thinks more Negro youth should enter the advertising field. "It's virtually untapped." He said there have been "eight or 10 Negro agencies started—and folded—since I went into the field in Memphis 16 or 17 years ago. I'm now the only one in the city and about the oldest one in the United States."

Making a success in First National Bank's management training program is Gene Fentress, 27. A college graduate with a major in health and physical education, Fentress was a teacher until his pastor, the Rev. James Lawson of Centenary Methodist Church, suggested that he ought to think of going into the banking field "because I got along so well with people." He said, "I had never thought of banking. I slept on his suggestion, went down to the bank, applied and got the job. I love it." He's now working in the customer service department, says he's found his "niche."

A TOP JOB

One of LeMoyne's top graduates is William F. Owen. He is now assistant general superintendent of mails, one of the top jobs in the department of under Acting Postmaster Lydel Sims. Owen entered the postal service as a mail handler in 1940, became a carrier in 1947 and then worked his way up through the ranks. A native of Memphis, he was last week named Equal Employment Opportunity information officer for the post office.

Professional nursing is another field now open to Negroes and one of Memphis' better known RN's is Mrs. Gerture G. Holley. The 37-year-old Mrs. Holley finished at Hampton Institute, Hampton, Va., after graduating from Manassas High School.

"My mother," she said, "was a laborer who wanted me to get an education. She worked to put me through nursing school." Now Mrs. Holley is one of the five nursing directors of E. H. Crump Hospital. She's held that position since October of 1964.

SINGER

Carla Thomas, Memphis-born singer who has sold more than three million records since her first hit in 1961, was voted the top female vocalist by the soldiers in Vietnam. Her father, Rufus Thomas of WDIA, has also sold several million records himself, is the only dj who has been featured internationally as an entertainer. When Carla made her first hit, "Gee Whiz," he father got stern. "No matter how much money you make, you're not getting out of college," he told her. So Carla, in addition to her career, is studying for a graduate degree at Howard University in Washington.

Shelby County's first Negro assistant attorney general, Arthur T. Bennett, started studying law because of an interest in the FBI. A university graduate, he believes his position should "be inspiring, especially to young Negroes in school, those planning to go to school and even those who haven't done much thinking about their future." The 34-year-old attorney said "these fields are opening up to Negroes and it's a case of having to buckle down and get the necessary qualifications."

PLANNER

Others in top positions incude L. F. Briscoe, the only Negro member serving on the Memphis and Shelby County Planning Commission. He's a jewelry salesman and businessman.

Gerald A. Fanion, 36, was appointed by the Shelby County Commission this year to head the newly created department of community relations. He had been employed as a post office mail handler more than 10 years and was granted a one-year leave of absence to take over the county job. Fanion, a graduate of Booker T. Washington High School, attended LeMoyne College and is a member of the NAACP.

Challenges and Opportunities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 25, 1967

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, at a time when we in Congress find it necessary to pass antiriot and respect-for-flag legislation because of the indefatigable efforts of those who clearly warrant being called traitors, it is indeed refreshing to hear a major address in support of patriotism and truly American ideals.

Mr. Charles Gould, of San Francisco, on June 26, 1967, presented a speech in Houston, Tex., at the Kiwanis convention attended by 17,000 Kiwanians and families.

Excerpts from his talk are quoted below and significantly end with a hope that our children and their children will live in peace and freedom, under God.

CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES

(By Charles L. Gould, Publisher, San Francisco Examiner, at Kiwanis International Convention, Houston, Tex., June 25–29, 1967)

I stand before you as a newspaper man, as a Navy man who has served in three wars. From the knowledge I have gained through these experiences I address you today. Hopefully, I will present some facts that will give a new perspective in our world.

This is an age of explosive growth and change . . . . the most exciting . . . . exhilarating . . . stimulating . . . frustrating and frightening hour in the history of mankind . . . . This is an age of instant evolution . . . . instant revolution . . . . instant communications . . . . and instant death.

Man has harnessed . . . the atom and holds destiny in the hollow of his hands. Man has made remarkable strides in conquering outer space . . . but how futile have been his efforts in conquering inner space . . . . the space in the heart and minds of men.

We have seen a steady erosion of past principles of decency and good taste. Our standards have lowered, our crime levels and social problems have increased. Parents, police authorities, educators and thoughtful citizens are deeply disturbed. Our youngsters are no better and no worse than we were at the same age . . . . but they have more temptations . . . . more cars . . . . more money. We have encouraged permissiveness . . . . indulged them . . . . granted maximum freedoms . . . . asked for a minimum in respect and in responsibility. Our courts have not helped . . . . in a desire to protect the rights of the individual (they) have too often ignored the rights of the many. Our nation's future is clouded if we fail to take prompt and proper action to curb those who defy our laws.

(However) we should recognize the truth that the vast majority of our citizens are honest, hardworking, law-abiding people.

Just as I am concerned with moral erosions and mounting crime problems, I am also concerned with sky-rocketing costs of big government and the invasions and intrusions of Federal Agencies into the private sector of our economy. (I believe) our nation's economic strength has been achieved . . . . through the tangible incentives inherent in our private enterprise system.

Definite financing on a persistent basis leads to inflation. Inflation is a narcotic. Once hooked, it's hard to break the habit. . . . Government costs have skyrocketed in recent years. In 1932 Federal expenditures were 4,000,000,000 dollars. In 1967 (the) Federal Government will spend in excess of one hundred and twenty-five billion dollars. . . . The *interest* on the Federal Debt in this one year will exceed $14,000,000,000 dollars, . . . more than three times the cost of running the entire Federal Government just thirty years ago.

Where does the money go? It touches the right . . . . the poor . . . . goes for payrolls . . . . for research . . . . for parks, housing, education and social services

(And it goes) to dozen of corporations who have Federal contracts. It goes . . . in large cities . . . small . . . rural areas fishing villages . . . every social, economic, political, religious and ethnic groups (experience) the role of government in the most expansive womb-to-tomb social dream in the history of the world.

Corporate profits (have) soared . . . personal incomes increased . . . the average guy never had it so good. But always lurking in the background is the threat of runaway inflation. Labor is on the march with greater demands. The warning signs are up.

Let us turn briefly to the world stage. Twenty-two years ago Hitler's dreams died. Peace had come. The United States turned its endeavors to stupendous tasks of achieving peace in the Pacific. . . . The end of World War II. . . . (a) resurgence of Communist aggression. . . . Red agents moved into Asia, Africa, Europe, South America and North America. There were battles in Greece . . . scrimmages in Iraq . . . there was Korea . . . Cuba . . . Hungary . . . Tibet . . . Laos . . . Pakistan . . . India . . . Rhodesia and Vietnam.

The Communists . . . battled . . . but not for peace. . . . The Iron and Bamboo curtains . . . enslaved Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, Poland, Albania, China, Czechoslovakia, East Germany, North Korea, North Vietnam, Cuba and Tibet disappeared from the family of free nations . . . (while) . . . the Western block has given freedom and independence to The Philippines, the Cameroons, Ceylon, India, Pakistan, Israel, Malaya, Nigeria, Somalia, Sudan, Togoland, Sierra Leone, Laos, Malagasy, Morocco, Ivory Coast, Senegal, Upper Volta, Mauritania, Tanganyika, Western Samoa, and a dozen other nations.

A few months ago I returned from a tour of Navy duty . . . in South Vietnam. It is a war difficult to describe. We face a cruel and cunning and resourceful enemy. However, let me salute the courage and fighting ability of our men. They are not only great fighting men . . . they are also great humanitarians.

In the Vietnamese conflict our President knows not the arrogance of power. He knows the agony of power. (our nation) has launched 28 peace-feelers. (The Communists) have turned aside our olive branch. Thus, the United States has no alternative. We must not falter. . . . We must always fight to win. . . . I do not seek a nuclear holocaust. . . . I seek to avoid these horrible possibilities . . . (and) I think this can best be accomplished by letting the enemy know exactly where we stand.

So long as we maintain (this) absolute power to retaliate, it is my firm conviction that the Communists will never launch a major attack. But we need more than military strength, we need moral strength. . . . We must each re-affirm our faith in our way of life. . . .

(For) those who say we have no ideology to match the promise of the Communists, let them read again the Declaraiton of Independence . . . carefully study the Constitution and our Bill of Rights. . . .

Let us again communicate these truths to our own people, and to our neighbors. If we do this . . . our national pride and our national prestige can reach new heights. And we can sleep at night in the comfortable knowledge that our children . . . and our children's children will live in peace and freedom, under God.

Officers From Maryland Killed in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 10, 1967

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Maj. W. Douglas Williams and Capt. Robert W. Swigart were killed recently in Vietnam. I wish to commend the courage of these men and to honor their memory by including the following article in the RECORD:

Funeral services for two United States military officers from Maryland who died recently in Vietnam were scheduled this week.

Major W. Douglas Williams, of Hampstead, was being buried today in the church cemetery after mid-day services in St. John's Episcopal Church in the Worthington Valley.

Services for another Vietnam casualty, Marine Capt. Robert W. Swigart, of Annapolis, will be held at 3 P.M. tomorrow in the base chapel at Fort Myer, Va. Burial will be in Arlington National Cemetery.

Major Williams, 33, was killed July 10 during ground action against an enemy force near Dak To, about 275 miles north of Saigon. Twenty-five men under his command were also killed during the action.

KILLED JULY 4

Captain Swigart was killed July 4. His thirteen-month tour of duty in Vietnam would have been completed a few days later.

Major Williams, who was serving his second term in Vietnam on a voluntary basis, was operations officer of the 4th Battalion, 503rd Airborne Infantry of the 173rd Airborne Brigade.

Born in Baltimore, the career Army officer attended Gilman School and entered the United States Military Academy after being graduated from St. Andrews School, Middleton, Del. He was a member of the class of 1956 at West Point.

MANY DECORATIONS

Major Williams's decorations include the Bronze Star, Air Medal, Army Commendation Medal with Oak Leaf Cluster, Combat Infantryman Badge.

Major Williams is survived by his wife, the former Juliana McHenry Thayer of Lancaster, Mass.; an infant daughter, Margaret Douglas Williams; his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Charles W. Williams, Hampstead; a sister, Mrs. Charles E. Wise, Washington; an aunt, Mrs. Ambler H. Moss, Lutherville; and an uncle, Francis R. Williams, Ruxton.

His wife is the daughter of Mrs. Charles Farnsworth of Lancaster, Mass., and the late Mr. Duncan Thayer.

She is the niece of Mrs. Joseph France of Upperco, Md., and Mrs. James McHenry of Worthington Valley, and the great-niece of Mrs. C. L. A. Heiser of Worthington Valley.

Captain Swigart was company commander of "M" Company, 3rd Battalion, 9th Marine Regiment. He entered the Marine Corps in 1953 after attending Pennsylvania State University.

SURVIVED BY PARENTS

Captain Swigart was the son of Rear Adm. and Mrs. O. R. Swigart, Sr., of Annapolis. His brother, Lt. Col. O. R. Swigart, Jr., is stationed with the Marine Corps in Hawaii.

Besides his parents and brother, Captain Swigart is survived by his wife, Mrs. Lorraine Eichelberger Swigart of Oceanside, Cal.; a daughter, Christine Swigart; and two sons, David H. Swigart and Robert W. Swigart, Jr.

Rat Extermination Act of 1967

SPEECH

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 20, 1967

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Rat Extermination Act of 1967 because I think that it is urgent that national attention be called and national impetus given to a program to eliminate one of the main threats to disease and instigators of damage to property—the rat.

Since the rat is bred where there is poor housing and sanitation, in areas of urban and rural poverty, it is logical for the Department of Housing and Urban Development, which has the prime responsibility for improving the physical environment of our towns and cities, to work with the local governments in establishing a coordinated attack to combat the nasty and dangerous rodent.

It is not intended that the Federal Government get involved in the full-time rat extermination business; therefore, it is proposed that the Government cover the first two-thirds of the cost of 3-year local programs to provide communities with an initial boost.

It is also recognized that nothing will be gained by giving money to communities carte blanche. They are required to submit plans, tailored to meet their own particular needs and requirements in such areas as building and sanitation codes; adequate garbage and refuse collection; maintenance of public activities and services; extermination; community education and organization; and a system of evaluation, indicating their own intention to follow through.

In Pittsburgh this year so far, there have been over 1,200 complaints concerning rats. And not all of these stemmed from rat bites, for rats do not have to bite to be harmful or transmit disease—they also contaminate food. The annual report of the Allegheny County Health Department, where Pittsburgh is located, shows an appalling 50 percent increase over the last year in reinspections of dwellings to abate garbage, rodents, and other nuisances.

The No. 1 environmental health problem in Pittsburgh is reported to be slum housing, and we all know this to be the habitat of the rat.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I deem it urgent to adopt H.R. 11000 to provide a comprehensive, sophisticated approach toward eliminating this No. 1 public health nuisance—who is certainly no laughing matter—Brother Rat.

The Moral Angle as Presented by Father William Lester, S.J.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 25, 1967

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, in these troubled times it is of utmost urgency that we retain a sense of morality. Those of us who make national policy in the U.S. Congress and in the executive branch could, I am sure, find solutions to many of today's difficult problems if we would only consult our code of morality and apply commonsense to it.

Recently I received a most pleasant introduction to a delightful column which runs in several California newspapers, including the Sunnyvale Standard in my congressional district and the Los Angeles Herald Examiner. The column is entitled "The Moral Angle" and is written by Father William Lester, S.J. Father Lester is a former track star, a carnival worker, a youth consultant, and a hospital chaplain.

As a youthful Jesuit, Father Lester has had years of experience explaining moral questions asked by people in all walks of life. He is a former chairman of the Classical Languages Department of Santa Clara University, and has spent 15 years of his life in religion as an educator, author, and lecturer.

Born in New Orleans, Father Lester was educated in Michigan, California, and Washington, finally accumulating 410 college credits for his Ph. D. when that degree normally requires only 210 credits. In his column, Father Lester welcomes questions of a moral nature which pertain to today's life from members of any religious denomination. His answers are based on the timeless viewpoint of traditional Judeo-Christian principles. Readers may address their questions to him and will receive printed short, succinct, commonsense answers which are based upon a strict code of morality.

Under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I have excerpted several of these questions and answers from both the Los Angeles Herald Examiner and the Sunnyvale Standard. I believe my colleagues will find the answers to be as refreshing and stimulating as I found them. The question and answers follow:

DEAR FATHER LESTER: I've been following the newspaper report of the standing court martial in Fort Jackson, S.C., for disloyalty against an Army medical officer.

Capt. Howard Levy, a dermatologist, refused to train Green Beret troops in the treatment of skin diseases they might encounter in Vietnam. Levy considers our prosecution of the war as unjust and against his conscience to help in any way.

Do you think he has any real moral basis to refuse this medical knowledge?

ROBERT N.

DEAR ROBERT: A doctor is free to treat skin diseases of war prisoners who are unjust aggressors. He is free likewise to treat or to instruct in treatment his own compatriots even though they should be the unjust aggressors, provided the medical help is not obviously forseen as making a continuation of unjust aggression possible.

If Dr. Levy thinks we are the unjust aggressors and his medical efforts would actually promote our injustice, he is morally bound to refuse his services. But, of course, what Levy thinks are facts and what in actuality are facts, may well be contradictory.

DEAR FATHER LESTER: An American neurosurgeon, Dr. M. Hunter Brown of Santa Monica, Calif., says 15 years of research has convinced him that as much as a third of the world's emotional diseases—including those causing sexual assaults and other criminal acts—could be cured by surgery.

He described the operation as selective and differing entirely in concept and execution from the frontal lobotomies of a generation ago. His audience, the second congress of the Australasian Society of Neurological Surgeons, was told that the operation was an "unqualified success."

Dr. Brown added: "Out of the tremendous amount of human misery we can now create happiness, which to any brain surgeon is a great source of personal satisfaction."

But I always thought happiness was sort of a moral matter. What about it? Can misery be dug out with a surgeon's knife?

JOE. C.

DEAR JOE: The only type of happiness the doctor can "create" through his scalpel is retrogressive to that of the child, idiot, or dope addict. In eliminating what he can in the anguish peculiar to humans, he eliminates at the same time the possibility of reaching the great happiness only mature humans can experience.

Anguish and happiness are psychological and are the effects basically of faculties which are immaterial.

But surgery cannot touch these faculties of intellect and will. It can only operate upon the organic matter which the intellect needs for proper functioning in this life. If this matter is eliminated or damaged man retrogresses towards pure vegetation.

DEAR FATHER LESTER: A clearly marked U.S. Navy ship was machingunned and torpedoed by Israel during the height of the Israeli-Arab war. At least 33 of our men were killed and the ship badly damaged. Israel says that she will "make amends."

Morally, what are "amends" in a case like that? How can "amends" be made to dead men?

KEITH M.

DEAR KEITH: Reparation for unjust damage is assessed according to guilt and ability to pay.

If the attack on our ship was fully deliberate and in no way justified, Israel is obliged to punish the individuals responsible, to see to the support of the dead men's families, and to pay for the damage to the vessel.

On the other hand, if the attack was purely acidental (for example, a case of mistaken identity not due in any way to negligence by the Israelis), there is no guilt and therefore no moral need to "make amends."

Responsibility for the attack could lie anywhere between the two extremes.

"Amends"—as far as they are possible—are made to the dead man's family.

DEAR FATHER LESTER: Dr. Norman Vincent Peale in his latest paperback discusses the New York courts' decision to allow the sale of a book which he thought, "No parent in his right mind would want in the home where impressionable children might read it."

He said that the courts shifted responsibility from the law to the individual. The courts acted on the assumption that the individual would be able to make the right choice. And Peale says this responsibility for self-control brings a great deal of satisfaction to the individual.

Does that mean that censorship is no good?

WALLY C.

DEAR WALLY: Censorship is good and within the legitimate power of government. But whether it should be applied at this time in this or that matter depends on circumstances. (The great danger is that censorship in eliminating one evil imposes a greater one.)

The more virtuous the citizenry the more it can be trusted to act properly on its own and the less need is there for censorship by government.

But are our citizens so virtuous today that government should impose no check to pornographic or any other normally harmful literature? Or without this check will our markets be flooded still more with salacious material?

Censorship is a legitimate means of putting a lid on evil. The practical what, when, where, and how of it demands a great knowledge of concrete circumstances.

Dear Father Lester: California Gov. Ronald Reagan, like a lot of his political cronies, says he wouldn't allow the Viet Cong at a negotiation table. But that's stupid and unfair.

Don't we have a moral obligation to include the Viet Cong?

Jim S.

Dear Jim: If it is true, as factual evidence so blatantly indicates, that the Viet Cong are unjust aggressors, then we are no more obliged to negotiate with them than we are with robbers of any kind.

No one is expected to negotiate with the man burglarizing his home. The burglar has no right to steal. But the owner has every right to stop him and see to his punishment.

Dear Father Lester: If it is ever proven that man evolved from an ape—where would that put morality?

A Student.

Dear Student: If it were ever proven that man evolved totally (body and soul) from an ape, traditional morality would go out the window.

However, a new moral order, based on the complete materiality of man, would take its place. Under the new order only fools would be kind, the wise would be cruel.

Dear Father Lester: In Rochester, N.Y., Eastman Kodak has a lot of trouble with a civil rights group called FIGHT.

FIGHT, organized by radical reformer Saul Alinsky, demands that Kodak agree to train and hire 600 unskilled Negroes who are to be selected and counseled by FIGHT.

Kodak already runs a training program in cooperation with several other poverty and civil rights agencies, and this new demand would give FIGHT almost exclusive control of its special training programs at the expense of the other agencies.

Kodak said "no" to FIGHT so now there's a real donnybrook shaping up.

FIGHT evidently has a lot of clergymen on its side. Also Stokely Carmichael.

How do you feel about the whole mess?

Ken D.

Dear Ken: At first glance, it seems a selfish power play by FIGHT. And the fact that Saul Alinsky and Stokely Carmichael are connected with it is nearly enough to wrap up that initial impression.

Kodak, as any employer, has a moral duty to avoid harming people by unfair discrimination in choosing employes. It must not reject qualified and willing workers solely on the score of race or color. Human worth is not measured by skin hue, and to act otherwise is harmful and unjust.

Is Kodak unfairly discriminating? It would seem not since you say that it is cooperating with civil rights and poverty agencies.

What right, therefore, has FIGHT to complain and demand the major (if not exclusive) share of future, special employees?

Absolutely no right, at least judging from the facts you presented.

Exploring the Universe in Infrared

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 24, 1967

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics since its inception, I have consistently advocated that NASA explore promising new developments and research proposals. We have sought to encourage NASA to develop new high-energy fuels, solid-fuel rockets, and nuclear propulsion systems. Along this line I would like to call attention to the excellent article on the new technique of infrared astronomy as published in Science News in April 1967:

EXPLORING THE UNIVERSE IN INFRARED

A new instrument that scientists are now just beginning to use for measuring infrared radiation from planets, particularly Mars and Venus, gives in one night observations that would otherwise take more than 150 years.

Scientists are normally cautious in their appraisals of new instruments and techniques, but they have used such phrases as "extremely impressive," "spectacular" and "brilliant" to describe the early results obtained with the multiplex interferometric Fourier spectrometer—MIFS.

The instrument's recordings of infrared radiation, when analyzed by a digital computer, can show chemicals present in the atmospheres of other planets when the concentration is as low as one part in a billion (see p. 381).

Dr. Lewis D. Kaplan of the Jet Propulsion Laboratory, Pasadena, Calif., says that although he had realized the MIFS was capable of detecting small amounts of the constituents of planetary atmospheres, the instrument was much more sensitive than he had dreamed.

Attached to a 1,000-inch telescope, (SN: 4/15) it could be used to detect extraterrestrial life from earth's surface, since life on any planet, including earth, affects the atmosphere. Such an earth-based exploration would not be "a rival to spacecraft methods, but rather complements them and is a prerequisite for their greatest effectiveness," three scientists closely connected with the development and application of MIFS suggest in the April SCIENCE JOURNAL.

The scientists are Drs. Pierre Connes, director of research at the Center for Scientific Research, Bellevue, France; Peter Fellgett, of the University of Reading, Reading, England, and James Ring of the University of Hull, Hull, England.

The effects life might have on a planet will be outlined in a forthcoming issue of ICARUS by Drs. Dian R. Hitchcock of Hamilton Standard Division, United Aircraft Company, Windsor Locks, Conn., and James Lovelock of the University of Houston.

Infrared observation of astronomical objects is difficult because the amount of energy radiated in this region is generally small. Moreover, if the observations are made from earth's surface, as most of them are, some of the wavelengths are blocked by the sea of air blanketing the planet.

The gases that are most likely to be indicative of biological processes are those that are clearly not in equilibrium with the environment. Since this implies compounds of high reactivity, the most promising gases for life-detection purposes are likely to be present in very small amounts.

Because of the increase in resolution obtained using MIFS, the chances of detecting such trace gases is greatly increased, making the outlook bright for eventually finding obviously life-related compounds by earth-based observations.

Stars that are very bright in infrared wavelengths, but very faint in ordinary visual and photographic light have recently been discovered using a new type of telescope that jiggles 20 times a second. Two of these objects have been found to have surface temperatures less than 1,200 degrees C. They are, nevertheless, true stars, producing their radiation internally at temperatures of 25 million degrees.

Even more recent is the discovery of what appears to be a new stellar planetary system in the process of forming. Dr. Frank J. Low and graduate student Bruce J. Smith detected the "pre-planetary" system using the infrared telescope designed for long-range observational work by Dr. Harold Johnson, research professor at the University of Arizona's Lunar and Planetary Laboratory.

The spectrum of light from a star or planet contains vital information on how the light is generated and what has happened to it on its travels through space until it is intercepted on earth. This applies not only to visible light, but to infrared and ultraviolet radiation as well as radio waves and, indeed, the entire range of electromagnetic radiation.

In the visible region of the spectrum, a spectograph disperses the radiation under observation, each wavelength being focused onto a separate portion of the photographic plate and thus under observation during the entire exposure.

In the infrared region, however, this cannot be done since photographic plates are not sensitive to such relatively long wavelengths.

A conventional infrared spectrometer, therefore, selects elements of the spectrum one at a time by means of an exit slit, focusing the elements successively on a detector, with consequent loss in sensitivity because any one wavelength is observed for such a short time.

Dr. Fellgett found a way to overcome this disadvantage, using a method known in communications engineering as "multiplexing."

This method, as used in trunk telephone circuits for example, takes a set of separate signals and marks each one by modulating it with a recognizable pattern. The signals are then added together and sent down a single telephone channel.

The modulation patterns enable the different signals to be separated at the receiving end.

A multiplex spectrometer can be made with a chopping disk that imprints a recognizable modulation pattern on each spectral element. All the wavelengths coming through the entrance slit can then be allowed to reach the detector at the same time.

A further refinement is the interferometric multiplex spectrometer, since it allows the light to enter through a large hole instead of a narrow slit. The light beam is split by reflecting mirrors into two beams that can be individually controlled and then combined in such a way that they interfere.

Dr. Fellgett reports that Dr. Janine Connes of the Meudon Observatory near Paris, with her husband Pierre, refined his experimental technique so that it could be used to study astronomical objects with an extremely high standard of accuracy and reproducibility.

The French team did this by applying the mathematical technique called a Fourier transformation to the spectrum obtained when the two beams are combined in an interfering way. The Fourier operation is sufficiently complex so that a computer is necessary to decode the information contained in the interferometric spectrum.

Not only can it be done, but it is now being applied to scanning the planets, with a sensitivity for Mars and Venus about 100 times that previously available.

The MIFS is only one of several new devices sensitive to infrared radiation now being widely used, along with optical and radio telescopes, to explore the structure and composition of the universe at wavelengths previously inaccessible.

To exploit this kind of instrumentation, the astronomers would like to see a 1,000-inch telescope built by international cooperation, calling it a "very good bargain" at approximately $15 million, which is about one-tenth the cost of soft-landing a 30-pound instrument package on Mars.

The 1,000-inch telescope would be constructed of building blocks of 120-inch instruments, mounted circularly to feed a single focus. The first one built could be used separately until the next was completed.

Houston Jumps to Ninth in Scientific Manpower

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB CASEY
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 25, 1967

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, with pardonable pride, I want to bring to the attention of my colleagues the news that my home area of Houston, Tex., has jumped from 13th to ninth place in the national ranking of science manpower centers.

And in the earth sciences, Houston ranks first in the Nation, with 6 percent of the U.S. total.

For those who have not seen Houston in recent years, it is difficult to comprehend the tremendous growth and vitality of our area. And we are indeed grateful that with our commercial development, with new additions to the great and growing skyline of our city, has come a strengthening of our scientific community, our institutions of higher learning, our great Texas Medical Center, and our Manned Spacecraft Center. There is little doubt in my mind, and that of our community leaders, that in coming years Houston will contend with the current leaders as our Nation's foremost science manpower center.

A news release follows:

HOUSTON AREA ADVANCES IN SCIENTIFIC RANKINGS

The Houston Standard Metropolitan Area has advanced from 13th to 9th place in the national ranking of science manpower centers, the Houston Chamber of Commerce learned today.

Houston moved ahead of Pittsburgh, Detroit, Minneapolis-St. Paul and San Jose, Calif., in the new edition of the National Science Foundation's biennial report, "National Register of Scientific and Technical Personnel" for 1965–66.

The Science Committee of the Houston CofC has been informed by the NSF that its Office of Economic and Manpower Studies now credits the Houston area with 3,236 scientists, an increase of more than 22% over the previous total of 2,642.

The only centers ranked ahead of Houston are: New York, 15,994; Washington, D.C. area, 13,330; Los Angeles-Long Beach area, 9,468; Chicago, 8,496; Boston, 7,852; Philadelphia, 7,009; San Francisco-Oakland, 6,686, and Newark, N.J., 4,659.

A Science Manpower Panel of the CofC Science Committee has been working with the NSF's National Register office for two years with the objective of improving the Houston area's standing in the national listings. Dr. Herbert C. Allen, Jr., is chairman of the panel.

Dr. Claude R. Hocott, chairman of the Science Committee, said the advance of the Houston region from 13th to 9th place in the national ranking clearly reflects the increasing importance of the area as a center of science competence.

The new report also reveals Houston as the nation's foremost center of earth scientists, with a total of 1,242, or six per cent of the U.S. total. Nearest to the Houston area total is that of the Washington, D.C., area with 1,093. Dallas trails with 404 and Fort Worth has 100.

The Houston area's 3,236 scientists are distributed among primary work activities as follows: research and development, 842; management or administration, 735; teaching, 248; production and inspection, 322; other (miscellaneous) 814; not employed, 154, and unspecified by respondee, 121.

The report also shows the median annual salary of scientists—all activities—in Houston is $12,500 per year, putting Houston in 23rd spot on the national salary scale for scientists. The best-paying jobs in the scientific community in the Houston area are in the management and administration of research and development activities, the report points out, with median annual salaries in the $15,500 to $16,000 range.

The new edition of The Register credits Houston with 806 holders of Ph.D. degrees in the scientific disciplines, ahead of Dallas' 503 and in 22 position nationally.

The biennial counts of scientific personnel are made on the basis of questionnaires mailed to individuals from Washington. Questionnaire recipients' names, however, must be known to the Register group so a questionnaire may be directed to him. The individual must then return the completed form to the Register office in order to be counted among the area's scientists.

Dr. Herbert Allen's panel of the CofC Science Committee will continue working with the Register group and with other professional associations and organizations in the Houston area to make certain the science manpower here is tabulated fully.

The Register will begin a new survey of all metropolitan areas in January, 1968.

Gen. Earl Rudder, Soldier-Hero, Retires From Military Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB CASEY
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 25, 1967

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago, on the historic parade ground at Fort Sam Houston, Tex., a gallant citizen-soldier closed out 35 years of military service to his country.

And a grateful Nation presented to Maj. Gen. Earl Rudder its highest peacetime award, the Distinguished Service Medal, in recognition for his military career.

We in Texas, share our country's pride in this great soldier, not only for his gallant and heroic wartime service, but for his years of building a great educational system as president of Texas A. & M. university system. Because many of my colleagues know General Rudder personally, it is my great pleasure to bring to their attention the following editorial from the July 21 Houston Post, which pays tribute to his many years of service:

GENERAL RUDDER RETIRES

Major Gen. Earl Rudder was a Texas-sized hero in the biggest war ever waged, and in his own lifetime, has seen his name go down in history.

As a young lieutenant colonel from Texas, he landed on the French coast on D-Day and led 200 Army Rangers up a 100-foot cliff to destroy enemy guns trained on the Omaha Beach. Half his men were killed or wounded, he received three wounds himself, but he survived to command the 109th Infantry Regiment at the Battle of the Bulge.

From 1954 to 1963 Rudder was commanding general of the 90th Infantry Division, United States Army Reserve Unit of Texas. Himself an Aggie, he became vice president of Texas A&M in 1958, president of the university in 1959, and president of the A&M University System in 1965.

Gen. Rudder was awarded the Distinguished Service Cross for the D-Day assault and an array of other medals: The Silver Star, Legion of Merit, Bronze Star Medal with Oak Leaf Cluster, Purple Heart with Oak Leaf Cluster, France's Legion of Honor and Croix de Guerre and Palm, Belgium's Order of Leopold with Croix de Guerre and Palm.

After World War II, while the millions traded uniforms for civilian clothes to go back to school or office or factory, Gen. Rudder was one of the thousands who stayed on reserve duty in readiness for recall should he be needed. The medal awarded him in July, 1967, was presented at ceremonies at Fort Sam Houston in San Antonio which marked his retirement after 35 years in the United States Army Reserve.

Gen. Rudder typifies the American who is willing to give his life for his country—and to give his life to his country. Americans can go about their daily business in the security that is built by such valiant men.

This week he received another medal—the Distinguished Service Medal, which is the highest award the nation can give for peacetime service.

As civilians who have enjoyed the security he helped to build, Houstonians express their appreciation to Gen. Rudder for 35 years of service. And Houston congratulates the A&M University System on having his continued leadership as president.

Speech by Daniel Z. Nelson, Executive Director, New York City Educational Construction Fund Schoolhouse, in the City Conference, Stanford University, Stanford, Calif., July 12, 1967

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 25, 1967

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on July 12, 1967, Daniel Z. Nelson, executive director of the New York City Educational Construction Fund Schoolhouse, addressed the members of the City Conference, meeting at Stanford University, Stanford, Calif.

Mr. Nelson discussed the problems facing New York City's schools, quite the same as those existing elsewhere, and the measures taken to meet these problems.

I commend to the attention of our colleagues the text of his speech as follows:

SPEECH BY DANIEL Z. NELSON, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, NEW YORK CITY EDUCATIONAL CONSTRUCTION FUND, SCHOOLHOUSE IN THE CITY CONFERENCE, STANFORD UNIVERSITY, STANFORD, CALIF., JULY 12, 1967

For more than three centuries we have been concerned with the education of youth in my city. When the Dutch burghers of New Amsterdam occupied Manhattan Island, they considered establishing public schools "so that the youth . . . may first of all be well instructed and indoctrinated, not only in reading and writing, but also in the knowledge and fear of the Lord." Ever since, we have been coping with the dual problems of programming and financing education."

New York City's long history in this field is not cited to suggest that we have evolved either bigger problems or better solutions than the newer cities represented at this conference. Our problems are similar to most of yours and far from solved, as previous speakers on this panel have suggested.

However, it is a healthy exercise to look back occasionally over the municipal shoulder through three centuries of developing a school system to serve a democratic society. It keeps one from beating the drums too enthusiastically over the permanence of any new solution when one sees, in the past, that educational policy moves in cycles like business and fashion.

Nevertheless, I hope this audience will tolerate a few enthusiastic drumbeats from me. The New York City Educational Construction Fund has been designed as an institution with sufficient built-in flexibility to serve a range of municipal purposes—while serving education first. It is my strong conviction that the Fund will continue to be, for the foreseeable future, an exciting tool for urban improvement while—I emphasize—serving education first. My reasons, I think, will be apparent before I finish.

Let me mention briefly some of New York City's problems on which the Fund will make an impact.

First, a shortage of land. To visitors who usually see only the Island of Manhattan, New York is a vertical town. To many of its residents who live in the other four boroughs and spend an hour each morning traveling to work, New York is a vast horizontal town, built up to its borders. The City is running out of sites for all kinds of construction. It must make maximum use of those still vacant and those scheduled for rebuilding. The Fund's program will thus aid the City by stimulating combined uses of land and creating air-rights sites for construction.

Second, rising standards and increasing costs of municipal services make it imperative that the City preserve and enhance its tax base. Yet, wherever most publicly-owned facilities, like schools, are built, the land is removed from the real estate tax rolls, a major source of the City's income. The Fund's program will creat income-producing properties over tax exempt schools. Later on, I shall discuss this element of the program in detail.

Third, the City's fiscal limitations inhibit capital construction at a time when its economic and civic health demands an improved physical plant, especially schools. The Fund's financing is not a charge against the municipal debt, which is limited by the State constitution. Its program, therefore, promises more schools, built faster, because the schools it finances need not be balanced against claims for other capital construction.

Fourth, the City's economy and its social vigor are linked in a common need for: an increasing supply of commercial space; an expanding housing inventory; and more and better educational facilities. To put it simply, the best interests of the individual and society are served by jobs, homes and schools. The potential for the ghetto especially stirs the planner's imagination. Applied with social skill, the combined-occupancy concept could become a way of advancing racial integration by attracting whites into segregated, non-white areas for schools, jobs and housing in the same complex.

The Fund's program will provide combined facilities in an uncommon relationship. The school will be operated by the Board of Education but owned by the Fund. The facilities above the school will be operated and owned by private enterprise. The intimate association of schools with the world of adults could produce unexpected benefits. Middle-income apartments combined with elementary schools should cement an identity of interest among parents and teachers. Office buildings combined with high schools will offer an ideal setting for the Board of Education's co-op program, which provides experience training together with skills training. High school students will now be able to work and attend school on alternate weeks in the same building, perhaps encouraging employers to participate in the school curriculum. The relationship of schools to business can be expected to raise our sights even higher in motivating and training youth for a career.

In advancing its several purposes, none of the Fund's relationships is stronger than its bond with the Board of Education. The Board approves all combined-occupancy structures developed under our program. It supervises the design and construction of the schools. Five board members function in a dual capacity. The President is Chairman of the Fund's trustees, and four other board members serve as trustees, thus assuring that the program directly serves the school system.

The program is further reinforced by the four public trustees, named by Mayor Lindsay. They bring to the Fund's affairs a combined background in commerce and development, plus a heavy emphasis on finance.

The Fund is an instrument of government known under New York State law as a public benefit corporation, and more commonly identified throughout the counry as a public auhority. Among its many powers is the authority to raise funds by selling bonds and bond anticipation notes to the investing public. So far, it differs in no important way from other public authorities. Further, the enabling statute and legal agreements preserve the structure of user lease payments common to public authorities.

However, the Fund has two unique sources of income which will enable it to provide most schools at little or no cost to the City. The Fund will receive payments for the use of air rights over the school in the form of either annual income or capital, depending on whether air rights have been leased or sold; in addition, it is authorized by statute to receive payments equivalent to the normal real estate tax on the non-school portion of the building during the 40-year life of the debt on the school. User lease payments—that is, rentals for the schools—will be required only when a decision has been made, for social or other reasons of public interest, to undertake a combined-occupancy structure unable to support the debt service on the school.

The element on which I earlier promised to expand—payments in lieu of real estate taxes—is novel to say the least. Its inclusion in the statute makes the entire concept workable, with no loss in any meaningful sense to the City. First, unless a facility is built above a school, the school site goes off the tax rolls; second, after the school debt has been paid, the facility produces direct income for the City by paying the normal tax; and third, the shortage of sites suggest that many of these commercial and residential facilities would not be built, at least, not within the City, unless the air rights available under the Fund's program provided the site. In effect, the Fund's program is likened to miniature urban renewal projects without requiring either Federal or local cash write-down.

Before I leave the topic of financing, it is worth mentioning that the tax-exempt bonds and notes of the Fund are expected to prove easily marketable. They are backed by an unusual security feature, a first lien on State aid for education to the City of New York. No one expects that a call on State aid will ever be made, but the bondholders will be able to clip their coupons secure in the knowledge that interest and principal will always be paid. From our point of view, this security feature assures us that the Fund's bond and note issues will be able to maintain a competitive position in the market place with those of long-established public authorities.

Now, I must mention a matter of great importance to the public interest, the selection of a developer. In this pioneering program he is going to pioneer with us in developing and operating compatible uses of the air space over schools. He will have to have experience and ability in school construction, and in the construction of commercial or residential buildings as well, for the combined-occupancy structure he undertakes will be designed and built as a single project.

In most instances the Fund intends to publicly invite developers to offer proposals. School sites considered appropriate for multiple use by the Board of Education and the Fund will be advertised. Proposals for development of those sites with combined-occupancy structures will be invited, reviewed and the best proposal selected. The Fund will base its decision on several factors, including the compatability of the air-space use with the school itself, and with the neighborhood; its financial feasability; and, how well the proposed plan serves the City's long-range social and economic needs.

A few exceptions to public invitation as the chief method of selecting a developer may be made—in instances when a developer has a legal interest in an appropriate site, or, even more rarely, when he has invested considerable money in developing an imaginative design or a novel use concept.

Like all innovating programs, there is much that is tried and traditional in the Fund's program, and a part that is new. For New York City, synthesis of these elements, old and new, has produced a method of multiple site use to accomplish important objectives.

You may question whether the idea is adaptable to your city. At present we do not believe it is necessarily appropriate even to every section of New York City. It may prove to be a workable tool if your city needs an expanded school building program but is inhibited by financial limitations from undertaking it, and if the shortage of sites is preventing the construction of commercial and residential facilities necessary for economic growth.

The program is urban oriented for the skyscraper city. It could one day be made adaptable to suburbia, where scarcity of land is beginning to be demonstrated in the gradual replacement of the one-family house by the two-story garden city, and the two-story garden city by the multi-story high rise city. It may never be appropriate for exurbia, where the village is only now replacing the farm, and the borders of metropolis are beyond the horizon and this century.

But here—speaking figuratively, in New York City—now, in 1967—and in the years we see ahead—the Fund's program is a practical way to build the schoolhouse in the city.

Animal Welfare: An International Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED REINECKE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 25, 1967

Mr. REINECKE. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a pleasure for me to bring to the attention of the House of Representatives information about a unique program of international relations being launched by my good friend Mr. George Crosier, general manager of the Los Angeles Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals.

In just a few weeks Mr. Crosier will be embarking on an extended tour to the Far East. He will visit the Philippines, Formosa, India, Thailand, South Vietnam, Hong Kong, and Japan.

He will be meeting with leaders in government, agriculture, animal sciences, business, and education to discuss this unusual and pioneering program.

The purpose of the international relations program of the Los Angeles SPCA is to assist in the promotion of a better understanding of the basics in the animal welfare field, to aid and counsel with all countries desirous of further developing and expanding the standards in their particular countries as it relates to management, animal control and general welfare, and to further devise methods for a mutual understanding in developing a worldwide program of general animal welfare acceptable to all who participate in its development.

The basics of such a program will be developed in such a manner that they will conform to Government rules and regulations covering the operation of such a program on a voluntary basis.

The world today has grown smaller due to the jet age and with our rapid growth, the animal welfare field must develop its cause on a unified basis in order that all countries interested in the field of animal welfare will be able to work jointly in a program of unification, making a general animal program a mutual effort throughout the world. This effort can only be accomplished by first studying and understanding problems existing in other countries.

We in the United States are expected to take the forward step in most phases of government and social economics. With the precedent already established, we are able to converse with people in other countries on all aspects of animal welfare with no fear of the implication that we are trying to force our policies or procedures on them. Such an animal welfare program will enjoy success in all countries participating in its development, thereby elevating to a new high the field of animal welfare throughout the world.

The pilot program which Mr. Crosier is developing will be accomplished by personal contact with leaders in various countries. He will seek to encourage their interest in the animal welfare field. He will seek to discuss voluntary programs within thhe existing laws of each country. The development of public education programs, the training of technical personnel, and the raising of funds for private action will be explored by him in these meetings. He will seek to develop basic standards for the transportation of animals throughout the world with particular emphasis on wild and exotic animals.

George Crosier has been in close contact with officials of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, with administrators of the international AID program, and with the U.S. Department of State. He has received the endorsement of these people for his efforts. During a recent visit to Washington, D.C., he conferred with the appropriate officials in each of the embassies of the nations he will be visiting. Their response to his ideas was enthusiastic.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to report on this program, and wish to extend to Mr. George Crosier the best wishes of myself and my colleagues in this House.

South Africa: A Sociopolitical Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 25, 1967

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, in the interests of peace, and to keep our boys out of unnecessary global wars, I was greatly surprised to learn that an Army major, a former instructor at the U.S. Military Academy, provided assistance in preparation of the controversial book, "Apartheid and United Nations Collective Measures—An Analysis," printed by the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, United Nations Plaza, New York, N.Y. See my remarks in the RECORD of April 20, H4492, April 24, H4556, and May 18, H5749.

Admittedly the major's participation was "intended as an analysis of sociopolitical problems which eventually may have to be confronted" as a result of the Department of the Army's policy to encourage their officers' outside scholarly activities.

Regretfully I have been unable to determine if the major has also prepared an analysis of Cuba, Red China or Russia.

So that our colleagues may be appraised of the cooperative ventures of at least one of our military officers, I ask consent to here insert in the RECORD my letters to the Department of the Army and replies from Maj. Gen. Melvin Zais:

MAY 16, 1967.

Gen. EARLE G. WHEELER,
Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff,
The *Pentagon.*

DEAR GENERAL WHEELER: As representatives of the Joint Chiefs of Staff attended the November 7, 1966, address on "Southern Africa in World Strategy" before the Cosmos Club by Dr. Robert Gayre of Edinburgh, Scotland, a copy of my remarks to the House of Representatives referring to it is attached for the information of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

The publication criticized by Dr. Gayre in his address is the booklet, *Apartheid and United Nations Collective Measures—An Analysis,* edited by Amelia C. Leiss under the auspices of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, United Nations Plaza at 46th St., New York, N.Y.

Among those whose assistance in preparing the general staff type of war plan against South Africa, a friendly country strongly anti-communistic in one of the key strategic areas of the world, is Major Sam C. Sarkesian, who is reported to be on the faculty of the U.S. Military Academy at West Point, N.Y. in the Department of Social Sciences.

The fact that a member of the West Point faculty should lend himself to an effort of this character is certainly incomprehensible and ought to cause more than a raising of eyebrows. Is not an Army investigation in order?

Sincerely,

JOHN R. RARICK,
Member of Congress.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY, OFFICE
OF THE DEPUTY CHIEF OF STAFF
FOR PERSONNEL,
Washington, D.C., June 5, 1967.

Hon. JOHN R. RARICK,
House of Representatives,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. RARICK: General Wheeler has asked that I reply to your letter of 18 May 1967 in reference to the participation by Major Sam C. Sarkesian, a former instructor at the United States Military Academy, in providing assistance in preparation of the booklet *Apartheid and United Nations Collective Measures—An Analysis.*

Major Sarkesian's participation in this study was a result of the Department of the Army's policy to encourage the officers who are on the faculty at the Academy to engage in outside scholarly activities which serve to enrich their background and broaden their perspective. Following this policy, it can be expected that some of these activities might deal with problems which are marginally controversial. It is considered that controversial problems of this type should not be the cause for limitation which would regulate scholarly endeavors for research. However, Department of the Army is deeply aware of its responsibility to insure that such outside activity by officers is in the best interest of scholarly research.

It appears that the Carnegie study was intended as an analysis of socio-political problems which eventually may have to be confronted, rather than as a study for overt action. While the preparation and conclusion of such a voluminous report will always be subject to the interpretation placed upon them by the readers, it was certainly not the intention of Major Sarkesian, when he participated in the project, to assist in any way in developing a plan which would advocate the use of miilitary force against South Africa.

I trust that this information will be of assistance to you.

Sincerely,

MELVIN ZAIS,
Major General, GS, Director of Individual Training.

JUNE 16, 1967.

Re Major Sarkesian, and "Apartheid and United Nations Collective Measures—An Analysis."

Maj. Gen. MELVIN ZAIS,
Director of Individual Training,
Department of the Army,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR GENERAL ZAIS: I am happy to have your letter explaining Major Sarkesian's role in providing assistance to the preparation of the Carnegie booklet, *Apartheid and United Nations Collective Measures—An Analysis,* and to have your assurance it was intended as an analysis of socio-political problems which may have to be confronted rather than as a study for overt action of military force against South Africa.

Since the invasion and occupation of Soviet Russia likewise presents a pedagogical socio-political problem which may eventually have to be confronted for defense of America and peace in the world, I would appreciate your advising me of the names of all military experts who have engaged in such an analysis and where I may obtain same.

Sincerely,

JOHN R. RARICK,
Member of Congress.

Department of the Army, Office
of the Deputy Chief of Staff
for Personnel,
Washington, D.C., June 23, 1967.

Hon. John R. Rarick,
House of Representatives,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Rarick: This is in reply to your letter of June 16, 1967, in reference to the participation of Major Sam C. Sarkesian in providing assistance in the preparation of the booklet, *Apartheid and United Nations Collective Measures—An Analysis.*

There appears to be some misinterpretation of my letter to you of June 5, 1967, on the above subject. Nowhere in my letter was it indicated or implied that the referenced study was one that presents a pedagogical socio-political problem which may eventually have to be confronted *"for defense of America and peace in the world."* I am, therefore, quite puzzled about your concern in reference to which military experts have engaged in such studies.

Furthermore, it would be quite in error to draw the inference from my letter of June 5 that an *"invasion and occupation of Soviet Russia"* falls within the definition of a socio-political problem, and I want to assure you that I have no intention of conveying such an idea.

An analysis of Soviet Russia, similar to that made of South Africa, may have been accomplished at some educational institution; however, I am sure you can visualize the enormous task involved in canvassing the many colleges and universities throughout the United States.

I regret, therefore, that due to the magnitude of the problem, I cannot be of more assistance to you on this particular subject.

Sincerely,

Melvin Zais,
Major General, GS, Director of Individual Training.

Congress Must Aid Our Cities and Our Poor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 11, 1967

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call to the attention of the Members an editorial from the New York Post of July 11, 1967, which forcefully points out the folly of slashing programs to aid our cities and to provide opportunities to our poor.

These programs, and the Office of Economic Opportunity which administers many of them, are essential if we are to reach the roots of the lawlessness and violence that have plagued American cities during recent summers.

The war on poverty needs to be invigorated and strengthened, not weakened and impeded.

The editorial follows:

The Congressional Fiddlers

While Congress fiddles, our cities burn.

The legislators have just returned from a relaxed July Fourth recess but the prospect is dismal for legislation that will help the metropolises meet the staggering problems of inflamed ghettos, polluted air, strangulated traffic.

In fact, if the Republicans have their way, they and their Dixiecrat allies will first gut and then dismantle the Administration's antipoverty program. They are too shrewd to do so by frontal assault. The GOP thrust is to transfer the functions of the Office of Economic Opportunity to existing federal agencies and cut the funds proposed for those functions.

Thus the Job Corps, which has enrolled 38,000 unskilled young people, would be "phased out," in the disarming GOP phrase, in favor of a traditional vocational training program. Abolition of the Job Corps would be "a national tragedy," Congress has been warned by responsible officials.

The warning is given weight by Roy Wilkins, the head of the NAACP. In strife-torn Buffalo, Mr. Wilkins told the NAACP convention, everyone agrees that the Negroes need about 2,500 jobs, "and they came up with 100 jobs for colored men."

Education, jobs and housing, Mr. Wilkins said, are the three priority needs of Negroes in the cities. If those needs are ignored, Congress will be chiefly to blame—and its enlarged Republican contingent will bear a special burden of responsibility.

The Greatest Tragedy of All

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 25, 1967

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, every American must be deeply distressed at the tragic and disastrous slum riots exploding across our Nation, destroying the cities of America and the people of these cities. The ghastly pictures of Detroit and Newark have shaken us all and today we must ask probing questions and take meaningful action to halt the violence and to begin rebuilding a just society.

Clearly one of the most sensible and penetrating words I have read of late was in this morning's Washington Post in the editorial "The Greatest Tragedy of All." It is a terribly difficult question which the Post requires us to resolve but one which we must attack with even greater vigor than before—and that is "not whether order will eventually be insured; certainly it will be insured. It is the manner in which this is done that must be our first concern. The question is whether a nation of free men can achieve order and social justice as well."

I urge my colleagues to read this editorial and I insert the full editorial in the Record at this point:

The Greatest Tragedy of All

This country is now coming into a bad time. In this fourth summer of slum riots, the sense of despair is beginning to rise steeply amidst a Nation struggling for remedies. Americans know only that the traditional rules are no longer holding, that the present solutions are not enough, and that a great deal depends upon the speed with which we can respond to a protest that, for all its urgency, is as incoherent as it is demonically destructive.

If these riots continue it will be a very bad time indeed for civil rights, for social legislation, and for the prosperous development of the great cities. The movement for racial equality has been forced onto the defensive. If the disorders persist, public authorities can be expected to resort to increasingly crude methods of repression, as the wanton use of firearms by police and National Guardsmen in Newark suggests. The contagion of riots will assuredly end in the reestablishment of order, throughout the Nation, but it may be order at a terrible price.

The Detroit riot is the greatest tragedy of all the long succession of Negro ghetto outbursts. In other cities it has been possible to seek causes in the ineptitute of governments, the hostility of employers and unions, the destitution of the slum's people. But Detroit is different.

For years Detroit has been the American model of intelligence and political courage applied to the governance of a huge industrial city. Mayor Cavanagh has gone further, over a longer period of years, to respond to the people of the slums than any other big-city mayor; and now Mr. Cavanagh is doubtless destroyed as a political leader. Detroit's gifted young Congressman Conyers, one of six Negroes in the House, was booed and pelted by the crowd.

Detroit's poverty program has been repeatedly cited as the most effective in the United States. Its police force is considered a model of temperate restraint. Its inner city schools are one of the country's leading examples of forceful reform in education. The United Automobile Workers have done more for racial equality than any other union in the history of American labor, and they have been met with the steady cooperation of the automobile manufacturers. Whatever the deprivations of Detroit, there is no racial discrimination. The city of Detroit was badly shocked by its fearful race riot in 1943. Over the past decade there has been no other large American city in which government, business and labor have devoted as much skill and effort to the cause of the Negro and the poor.

The sources of these riots lie beyond any easy explanations in the social and economic statistics. They are painfully similar to the riots currently endemic in underdeveloped countries. They are similar to the riots in the European cities of a century or two ago. It is never easy for cities to absorb large and sudden tides of rural immigration. That, of course, is the long view: the riots are a stage of social transformation, and the cities will ultimately pass through it.

But the long view is not good enough. Talk of social transformation is very thin comfort to those who died, and to those whose homes and shops were burned and looted. This country never long on patience in crises, now needs an immediate course of action.

Public order necessarily comes first. It is simply recognizing reality to say that every deeper remedy will be pushed aside until order has been reliably protected in Detroit, Newark, Plainfield, Waterloo, and every other American city, large or small. Everyone who lives in cities needs to understand that continued street fighting will ineluctably lead to the increased militarization of the police. That process of militarization can even be justified on the evidence of Newark, where frightened and vengeful police and over-armed National Guardsmen appear to have gone far beyond any permissible limits in their use of automatic weapons. This newspaper recently reported that one body contained 39 bullet holes, a number difficult to explain by any rational policy. Those 39 bullet holes suggest the atmosphere now prevalent in some of the less well-run urban police forces as the wave of rioting progresses.

Clearly, police need new weapons for riot control. Revolvers are not very useful to control crowds; the National Guard's machine guns and carbines ought never to be used in areas where women and children are likely to be caught in the crossfire. Some police authorities have experimented with temporarily debilitating chemicals that can be sprayed or hosed from a distance. Certainly police need training in riot control. Here are areas where the present Federal effort can be heavily expanded with great profit. And, of course, sniping will always be a danger as long as Federal and state law makes it possible for every criminal and every maniac on the continent to get a gun.

The continued riots, particularly in Detroit, will no doubt lead to renewed political attacks on the public programs of community action, job training, improved education and expanded housing. They have not prevented riots, it will be argued. But the answer is that they are all slow, difficult jobs in which the profit only appears over the long haul. The country is going in the right direction with its campaigns to end poverty and to build model cities. The country needs steady hands in this moment, and cannot let itself be baited or distracted by the black insurrectionaries or the white reactionaries who are, not for the first time, singing in close harmony.

The riots have done immense and irreparable harm to the fabric of the cities, and to the march for civil rights. The question is not whether order will eventually be ensured; certainly it will be ensured. It is the manner in which this is done that must be our first concern. The real question is the oldest question of the American republic, one that has been met many times, one that is always answered in a different way, and at a new cost. The question is whether a nation of free men can achieve order and social justice as well.

Western Washington State Achieves Success in Upward Bound

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 25, 1967

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, my own interest has been drawn to the success of the Office of Economic Opportunity's community action program at Western Washington State College called "Upward Bound," and I take this opportunity to share that success with my colleagues.

Western's program was one of 18 pilot projects designed to test the effectiveness of precollege programs for poverty high school students. It began by bringing to the campus in the summer of 1965, 50 11th grade students from Seattle and Tacoma ghettos and Washington State Indian reservations. Of the 50, 18 were Negro, 17 were white, 12 were American Indians, and 3 were oriental. The average high school grades for the group was a C—, clearly not typical of the typical college-bound American student.

The summer project consisted of an intensive academic program developed around subjects which are historically the most difficult for college freshmen. This was coupled with equally intensive program of cultural enrichment.

During the regular school year, the college Upward Bound staff organized tutorial centers in the high school districts and staffed them with volunteers from interested community action agencies, school district teachers, graduate students, employees of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and by VISTA personnel.

At the end of their senior year, 49 of the students returned to the campus for the second summer. The program was essentially the same except that each student was enrolled in one regular college class for which they were given credit for successful completion. No record was made in case of failure.

Western's trustees, sighting this project as one of the most important ever undertaken by the college, pledged admission to all Upward Bound students who successfully completed the program. Forty-four enrolled for their freshman year—four married, one enlisted in the Navy, and one transferred to nurse training—after considerable effort was made to provide adequate financial support. It is significant to note that under regular entrance requirements only four would have been eligible, and even they would have been unable to afford the costs.

The college's students responded to these youngsters by organizing a special tutoring society which proved most successful. Faculty members were available to the students as counselors. The administration reduced the minimum course load for Upward Bound youngsters who were in academic difficulty.

Everyone aggressively sought sources of financial support from service clubs, lodges, and private industry as well as Federal and State sources.

Perhaps the key to the success of this project was the enthusiastic support it received from all the elements of Western's college community. Western's students, faculty, administrators, and members of the community made possible this outstanding success.

Indeed it is hoped that the success at Western will generate the same sort of significant and remarkable change throughout American higher education.

Mr. Speaker, I take great pleasure in congratulating Western Washington State College for its efforts and successes in reaching these young people who have consistently been overlooked and for mobilizing all available community resources to propel them out of poverty for good. Upward Bound has proved itself at Western, and it is my sincere hope that it will serve as a positive example to the rest of the Nation.

Stronger Rural Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. G. ELLIOTT HAGAN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 25, 1967

Mr. HAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial by the Honorable Roy Chalker, editor of the True Citizen of Waynesboro, Ga., which was forwarded to me by Mr. Ruel I. Morris, Jr., district Farmers Home Administration supervisor for that area.

The editorial gives well-deserved praise to the Farmers Home Administration, an organization dedicated to the strengthening and preserving of rural America.

The editorial follows:

STRONGER RURAL LIFE

The theme of the National Farmers Home Administration Program Meeting held at Memphis, Tennessee, recently was "Strengthening Rural America." The three major objectives discussed in detail were (a) strengthening family farms (b) strengthening rural communities and (c) assisting in alleviating rural poverty.

The Farmers Home Administration has the loan authorities to have a tremendous impact on strengthening rural America in order that rural people might have a better place to live and enjoy the same sanitary water to drink, adequate housing, the same sewage disposal systems and also good recreational projects that our urban friends are enjoying.

The family farmer has been migrating to urban areas in great number for the past few years. Since the family farmer is considered the backbone of our Agriculture, this will undoubtedly have some effect on our food supply and family food budget. Farmers Home Administration has loan authorities to help these family farmers who are without adequate operating credit.

The local Burke county Farmers Home Administration office has made one Association loan and grant for a domestic water supply to a group of four families in the Bottsford Church area. The loan and grant funds were used to drill a four inch well and install a storage tank and distribution lines. The amount of the loan was $1600 and the grant $1600. There are other communities in this county without adequate water and sewer systems that could be helped by the Farmers Home Administration.

In the past year many rural Burke county families, with the help of FHA loans, have been able to construct modest homes, start or continue operating their farms with recommended amounts of fertilizer and insecticide applications, and purchase and/or improve farms.

The Farmers Home Administration has come a long way since 1961 in strengthening rural America although loan funds have been inadequate and FHA personnel very limited.

Congressional representatives and other governmental officials have visited many Farmers Home Administration projects financed throughout the State of Georgia and the nation by the Farmers Home Administration and are well aware that these are good dollars spent paying good dividends and really helping rural America. The job is only partially done to date and to really strengthen and preserve rural America, the Farmers Home Administration loan funds and Farmers Home Administration personnel must be increased sharply and immediately in order to get this important job done. There are a number of applications from rural applicants and rural communities that are being held in local FHA offices that cannot be serviced at the present due to lack of Farmers Home Administration funds and shortage of Farmers Home Administration personnel.

Commission on Political Activity of Federal Personnel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILLIP BURTON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 25, 1967

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, the Commission on Political

Activity of Federal Personnel recently concluded hearings in San Francisco. Some of the testimony was particularly cogent.

There was abundant testimony that the Hatch Act is based on an outdated premise of public administration which demands "neutrality" on the part of Federal employees. The articulate statement of Louis W. Jones documents the extent to which the Hatch Act prohibits Federal employees from making the kind of inspired contribution to their communities—and American society as a whole—that they have a desire and a right to make.

In my district one out of every 10 payrollees are Federal employees affected by outdated Federal restrictions on activities. Two million Americans are covered by the Hatch Act.

The testimony of Mr. Jones, and the recent editorial in the San Francisco Chronicle, that Mr. Jones and other witnesses inspired, are poignant reminders that the rights of our civil servants are being denied.

[From the San Francisco Chronicle]

HATCH ACT IS TOO CONSTRAINING

Most Federal employees—and there are more than a quarter of a million of them in California—would apparently like to be more active politically than the law allows.

Most observers drew that conclusion from hearings held in San Francisco recently before the Commission on Political Activity of Federal Personnel, headed by Arthur S. Flemming, president of the University of Oregon. To give Federal civil service workers freer status as political citizens would require the revision by Congress of the Hatch Act. This law, once widely praised for protecting Government employees from political pressure and the campaign-fund squeeze, is now blamed for preventing them from playing their part in community affairs.

Not only does the Hatch Act ban Federal employees from service in political party organizations, it has even been interpreted to forbid a Federal worker from writing a letter to the editor (though a court in that extreme case vindicated the letter writer). One witness pointedly testified that Hatch Act provisions "are like eliminating all sex in order to prevent forcible rape."

The climate of American government, it was agreed at the commission's hearings, has considerably improved since the Hatch Act was called into existence in 1939 to protect the Federal workers. It not merely shelters him but, in depriving him of the right to take part in local, State and Federal affairs, it deprives the community, particularly at the school board, city council, and other homely levels, from benefiting by his interest in public service.

"We are thereby losing the great reservoir of talent and expertise which exists among the more than two million Federal employees, and this great number of people, who could contribute much, have been deprived of some of their most fundamental rights," said Dr. Laurence H. Frommhagen of the NASA center at Moffett Field.

We agree with Dr. Frommhagen's recommendation to the commission for revising the Hatch Act to permit and encourage, at least at local government levels, the political participation of Federal civil service workers, except in cases where a financial conflict of interest could be shown to exist.

STATEMENT BEFORE THE COMMISSION ON POLITICAL ACTIVITY OF GOVERNMENT PERSONNEL, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., JUNE 30, 1967

(An independent bipartisan commission established by Act of Congress, and headed by Dr. Arthur Flemming, president of the University of Oregon and former Secretary of Dept. of Health, Education and Welfare)

My name is Louis W. Jones, and my address is 511 Verano Court, San Mateo, California. Thirty-three years ago, in Washington, D.C., I took the oath of office to support the Constitution of the United States and I have been a career civil servant continuously since then, serving both in Washington and field posts. For the past 19 years I have been a senior management analyst with the Department of the Navy and with the Atomic Energy Commission, and I have been cleared for secret work through extensive investigation.

I am not a member of any employee union or asociation, and my views here today are strictly my own. I am not a member of a political organization or club.

I am a member of the local chapter of the American Society for Public Administration and of the Western Governmental Research Association, and in my files somewhere I have a special written invitation to join the American Political Science Association.

I am not without qualifications to speak as a practitioner of the art of public administration, but today I want to speak from the heart, because the heart of the citizen is, I believe, the heart of the matter which your Commission is studying.

Being a descendant of Kentucky pioneer stock I recall my early days when the symbols of authority consisted of the Bible on the living room table and the long barrel rifle over the mantelpiece. Self-determinism, that is to say, political activity—and not necessarily *partisan* political activity—runs in my blood.

I found I did not like voteless Washington, and I found that I could not live in the stultifying atmosphere created by AEC management at Los Alamos.

I feel I have a citizen's responsibility in community affairs, in religious affairs, and in affairs of the nation, not just voting on issues but *speaking out* on them and helping clarify them, in the context of "one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

To me, citizenship is not just a right, not just a duty, and most certainly not a "privilege," as present Government literature would have me believe. It is an indispensable cornerstone of self-government, which means good government, and the highest form of patriotism—whether reflecting agreement with, or dissent from, the prevailing majority view.

It seems odd that in the 191st year of the republic there is any question at all about this.

During my lengthy public employment, which predates the Hatch Act, I have not once been the target of coercion from any political party or agent for a contribution either of money or of working time. To say that I need the Hatch Act to protect me from political exploitation is sheer nonsense. The basis of the Act is wrong: it's like saying that to protect me from being robbed, the Government must take away all my valuables.

This is the type of law—as in the case of some anti-Negro legislation—that works not against the perpetrator of the wrong, but against the victim.

The only threats against my job and career have come from Government itself, on the basis of the Hatch Act and the British philosophy of noninvolvement and neutrality that has been nurtured by this Act. All of my work for civic betterment, which has been extensive, has had to be undertaken with extreme caution, even furtiveness, because of a vague cloud of threats to my own economic security and that of my family.

Several years ago, while at my desk, I received a phone call from my Congressman charging that I had violated the Hatch Act by writing a letter to a newspaper. The letter was no more political than is my appearance here today. I challenged my Congressman to prove his charge, but he wrote me (I still have the letter) stating that he had nothing further to add. His charge was dropped but the threat to my job remained.

Still later, after court has vindicated a civil service employee in Texas for writing to a newspaper, I confronted my Congressman with the court's decision. He replied that there is no question about my right to express my opinions; it is principally a question as to whether I have a right to express my opinions *in such a manner as to influence anyone else.*

I have no quarrel with my Congressman, recently deceased, because I found that he faithfully mirrored the position of the United States Civil Service Commission in its imposition of restraints and disabilities on citizens who happen to be employed in the public service.

The Civil Service Commission prints and floods the country with these restrictions, particularly in election years. They say, for instance, that I may not participate in a political campaign, that I may not speak on issues—and may I note parenthetically that all *vital* issues eventually become political—and that I may not even give a neighbor a free ride to the polls to *register*, irrespective of how he wishes to register, whether under a party label, or as an independent. And then, with insufferable condescension, these regulations say I "may vote" as I choose, that I "may" write to my Congressman, or petition Congress, that I "may" *display a political picture in my home*, and that I may, even though inadvisable, wear a political button or use a bumper strip.

The Civil Service Commission goes far beyond the Hatch Act. I may not, without first getting "permission" from my employing agency, serve on my school board, or a library board, or on a college faculty, or as a town meeting moderator, or as a volunteer fireman, or Notary Public or—and mark this—even on my church board of trustees. The Department of the Navy, my employer, is the "sole judge," according to the Commission's regulations. It may grant or deny this "permission."

The naval commander at Puget Sound Naval Shipyard was moved to protest all of this under date of 23 August 1956. Said he, and I quote: "It is not understood how positions in religious or charitable institutions, as professors in educational institutions, or as members of local fire departments, are classified as 'political activity.' "

The commander also pointed out that about 60% of the entire wage-earning population of this county were Federal employees.

An alien in this country has greater constitutional rights than a citizen in the employ of the Federal Government.

Turning to the Bay Area, almost one in ten of the payrollees are Federal employees. They are effectively denied—under a vague and massive threat—participation in the political life of this metropolitan complex.

Some 30,000 citizens enter the employ of the Federal Government each month. Each is required to sign an Appointment Affidavit

(Standard Form 61) that he will abide by all of these restrictions. Aside from the Hatch Act, he must swear that he will not *even assert* the right to strike against the Government. Thus he is denied the opportunity to make a voluntary and patriotic no-strike pledge. This Affidavit lists "political activity"—not, may I emphasize, partisan activity—in a two-page list of punishable so-called "offenses."

One of the references in this Affidavit, Pamphlet 20, treats of political activity in terms borrowed from criminal law. For instance, and I quote: "Employees . . . are accountable for political activity by persons *other than themselves,* including wives or husbands, if, in fact, the employees are thus accomplishing by *collusion* and indirection what they may not *lawfully* do directly and openly. Political activity in fact, regardless of the methods or means used by the employee, constitutes the *violation.*"

The crowning irony is that the first item on this Appointment Affidavit is the oath to support and defend the Constitution of the United States.

Added to this, a publication of the Congress lumps political activity with corruption, and even Communism. I refer to Document No. 98, 84th Congress, 2nd session, titled "Federal Corrupt Practices and Political Activities," dated February 10, 1956, and issued by the Senate Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections.

As one conscientious fellow-employee told me recently, the restrictions deny the opportunity to do anything worthwhile.

Strangely enough, several forms of political activity are apparently subject to no governmental restriction whatever. Agencies have been known to urge their employees to write letters to the editor, and to Congressmen and Senators, in support of their agencies' programs. In other words, lobbying by employees as part of a campaign promoted by their employers is all right.

Even the Civil Service Commission encourages agency managers to "utilize" their rank-and-file employees as "salesmen" in contacts with the public. The Commission, in its pamphlet titled "Community Relations," published in 1958, suggests that such employees be given selected bits of information, and encouraged to join community organizations and clubs, and to join the luncheon circuit as speakers—to use "their roles as responsible citizens in the community" to "enhance the prestige of the agency" (the significant words and phrases are direct quotes). This, says Civil Service Commissioner Harris Ellsworth, constitutes a "valuable but *under-utilized* tool of good management."

In other words, political activity is all right when employees are serving as mouthpieces for those in positions at the policy level in Government agencies.

Further, the Civil Service Commission invites employees to join unions and associations to bargain collectively in terms of their own self-interest with agency managers. This form of controlled political activity by employees takes place on government premises on official working time—all with perfect safety. Employee associations may and do lobby and engage in *partisan* political activity so long as it is in their self-interest—apparently with impunity.

In short, the official position of the Federal Government is to promote individual expression that it *can* control, and to prohibit and punish all that it fears it *cannot* control. This is the disease of managerialism: intolerance of dissent and of protest—the doctrine that everyone in the Federal service must be a tool in someone else's kit: the doctrine that man's purpose is to serve the system, rather than the opposite.

We of course need to remind ourselves that the most significant improvements in our society almost invariably originate in responsible dissent and protest.

I say to members of this bipartisan Commission that the Hatch Act is another assault on freedom, is plainly at variance with the Constitution, and should be abolished. Every individual in the public service, precisely as in private employment, should be free to engage voluntarily in off-hours political or any other activity that is plainly not incompatible with his *particular* job or job-related conditions of work. To say that a worker in a Government rope factory cannot lawfully engage in partisan politics or campaigns, but that a worker in a contractor-operated rope factory of the Government can, insults one's intelligence.

No person's citizenship is negotiable.

If we abolish the Hatch Act, the remaining laws against bribery and coercion, and conflict of interest, will be more than sufficient to protect every person in Government, whether of high rank or low rank, from political exploitation.

This country needs more, not less, active participation in public affairs by civil servants. Such participation is not conflict of interest, not "dirty politics," but compatibility and community of interest.

The Federal Government employee should be protected, not oppressed, in his dedication to good government and to a better society. He should have the Constitutional Rights Section of the U.S. Department aid him in this regard, and he should have direct access to the courts. The Civil Service Commission is incompetent to handle such cases because it represents the managerial cultists who are the authors, the products and indeed, the victims of the present rules and who themselves seem to be afflicted with a pathological fear of freedom. The enforcement of the Hatch Act by this Commission has historically been discriminatory.

At a time when the Government needs bold, energetic, innovative and creative young men and women, it ruthlessly alienates them from the mainstream of political issues with its incessant drum beat of "thou shalt nots." It crushes out the most valuable thing the young person can bring to his government job—his idealism, his civic vigor, his civic conscience.

This brain-softening process has gone on so long that many rank-and-file employees have lost the will to protest, because this too is understood to be prohibited political activity. What is really being prohibited is the political activity of protest.

Within the Government the damaging effect of these restrictions is enormous. They foster venality, servility, spinelessness, self-seekingness, non-involvement, insensitivity—guilty silence. Crucial decisions are made by persons who, having their civic sensibilities crushed out, have only the interests and motivations of the mere job-holder. The collective innate wisdom of two and one half million civil servants is allowed no chance to exert itself.

Being a vital citizen requires, even under ideal circumstances, energy and courage. When confronted with the warning posters, and the appointment affidavit, it becomes easy, and "the thing to do," to decitizenize oneself, to trade one's freedom for beneficience, to prostitute one's citizenship responsibility for a paycheck.

We should remember that the revolt and independence of the American colonies was inspired by a refugee from the oppressions of the British civil service system—a man who was fired from his job for protesting. This was Tom Paine, world citizen, and a religious man, who demolished the institution of monarchy, who authored *Common Sense* and the *Rights of Man,* and who gave our nation its name: The United States of America.

This nation seeks to bring an example of freedom to the entire world, while at the same time hypocritically denying its own employees the most vital freedom of all: the freedom as individuals to work voluntarily for the betterment of mankind. It denies its employees the first right of citizenship, namely, the right to be responsible. It denies a large and wise segment of the nation the equal opportunity to be good citizens.

I urge this Commission to recommend complete abolition of the Hatch Act and its whole train of prior and subsequent abuses of citizenship rights.

EXHIBITS

Warning Posters of the U.S. Civil Service Commission.

Pamphlet 20, of the U.S. Civil Service Commission.

Appointment Affidavit, Standard Form 61.

A General Theory of Public Employment, by Arch Dotson, Public Administration Review, Vol. XVI, No. 3, Summer 1956.

Community Relations—A Guide for Federal Agencies, issued by U.S. Civil Service Commission, January 1958.

San Francisco Chronicle editorial and cartoon of January 6, 1957, titled *The Silenced Federal Worker.*

Federal Corrupt Practices and Political Activities, Document 98, 84th Congress, 2nd Session, Senate Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections, February 10, 1956.

Political Activities and the Public Service: A Continuing Problem, by Pamela S. Ford, published by Institute of Governmental Studies, University of California, Berkeley, August 1963.

Fixed Fight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 24, 1967

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, it is disturbing that so much hope is being placed upon South Vietnam's approaching presidential election. To be worth something, an election should be more than an exercise in public relations; it must be a means of offering choice between policies and insuring that a government possesses genuine legitimacy in the eyes of its people.

The election may be an essentially sterile exercise if it is merely a personality contest between contestants with nearly identical views. By excluding candidates such as General Minh and the economist Au Troung Trang, the regime has insured that the most salient dilemma—how to deal with the war—will not be confronted. Thus, the election is inevitably stillborn, and to artificially invest it with significance is only one more deception.

James Wechsler discusses this problem in the New York Post of July 24. I commend the article, entitled "Fixed Fight" to the attention of my colleagues.

[From the New York Post, July 24, 1967]

FIXED FIGHT

(By James A. Wechsler)

The inherent fraud in South Vietnam's approaching presidential election is another cruel betrayal of the war-weary people of a blood-drenched land. But thousands of young Americans serving on that bleak front are simultaneously being betrayed by our own government, which has voiced no audible protest against this dirty business. Many of our spokesmen continue to herald this shabby, sham balloting as proof of the quiet evolution of South Vietnamese "democracy."

It is a measure of the psychological attrition of this deadend conflict that virtually no leading American figures—inside or outside of Congress—have spoken out against the fakery of this plebiscite. One can almost hear the State Dept. mimeograph machines already preparing advance testimonials to the victorious members of the military junta who have so rigged the contest that no serious choices exist.

The truth is that any real electoral process ended when two men who might have posed a real alternative to the policies of the local war-lords were denied the chance to run. One was Au Truong Thanh, a distinguished economist who had served in the junta's government but whose quest for a negotiated settlement of the conflict rendered him a dangerous "neutralist" or even "pro-Communist."

The other was former Gen. Duong Van Minh, now living in exile, whose crime was a comparable disposition to seek an honorable peace with the Viet Cong. The presence of either Thanh or Minh in the race would have presented an authentic challenge to the Thieu-Ky ticket.

If the United States had, on its own or through the United Nations, challenged the exclusionary actions of the so-called Constituent Assembly, a genuine election might have been conceivable. But President Johnson and Dean Rusk chose to look the other way. And so Thanh and Minh, as well as numerous lesser candidates who dared to urge a negotiated solution, have been blacklisted with no significant outcry.

The crackdown can only be constructed as a confession—in both Saigon and Washington—that too many people in South Vietnam might have voted for the "peace candidates" if they had been allowed to do so.

The behavior of the Thieu-Ky operatives was predictable. Whatever their personal rivalries, they have a large stake in a "war-to-the-finish" policy, at least as long as they are assured that Americans will do most of the fighting. They can have no real peace in a peaceful Vietnam. But why did Washington spurn the possibility of a different outcome in the elections? Why has it tacitly ratified the fraud?

It has long seemed apparent that the only rational ending for this ghastly misadventure would be the free emergence of a Saigon government capable of negotiating a tolerable peace with the Viet Cong and Hanoi.

That was the assumption of many who believed that President Johnson rejected any fantasy of "total victory" and he meant what he said when he repeatedly pleaded for "some sign" of the adversarys readiness to come to the conference table.

U.S. acquiescence in the impending election deceit casts doubt on the whole spirit of the assumption. It strengthens the case of those who contend that we are resolved to exact some equivalent of unconditional surrender to justify the investment of our lost manpower and to affirm Mr. Johnson's manhood.

No doubt some expert sophists surrounding the President will explain that it would be an impropriety for the United States to "intervene" in the affairs of the Constituent Assembly. That is hokum. The war long ago became an American war; the junta survives only because it is Washington's baby. Above and beyond all that, every pious statement by Mr. Rusk and his deputies asserting that we are in Vietnam only to insure the right of the people there to "determine their future" is caricatured by an election in which they will be denied any chance to support men who might be capable of breaking the deadlock and achieving a compromise peace.

Apologists for the junta probably will retort that even the forms of democracy being observed in South Vietnam are superior to Ho Chi Minh's one-party system. One need offer no defense for that structure to observe that even Ho's harshest critics admit he could win an authentic election in the North— and it was General Eisenhower who conceded more than a decade ago that he would almost certainly have won a free contest throughout that divided land.

Mr. Eisenhower's past statements and actions render grotesque his newest declaration that the time is at hand for Congress to consider a declaration of war against North Vietnam. Where would we go from there? Why did Eisenhower go to Korea to pave the way for an inconclusive truce? Has he succumbed to the frenzy of frustration now afflicting too many other Americans as North Vietnam refuses to accept Dean Rusk's diagnosis that it is "hurting badly" and must finally sue for peace?

Hanoi may be bombed to its knees before this century ends—and possibly even before another presidential ballot here. But the election scandal in Saigon can only deepen the alienation of Americans from a war which has poisoned our national life and transformed us into front-men for a fraud. Somewhere in the land there must be men of consequence and independence who will cry out against this latest and most arrogant Saigon swindle.

John Cobb Cooper

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 24, 1967

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep sorrow that I note the passing on Saturday, July 22, 1967, of my longtime friend and space colleague, John Cobb Cooper. Professor Cooper was well known as a pioneer in the international law of our air spaces and a prominent authority on law in outer space itself. His publications and writings made a great contribution to our present air and space capabilities and achievements. I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the outline of the fine career of John Cobb Cooper from the New York Times of July 24, 1967:

JOHN COOPER, 79, AIR LAWYER, DIES—PAN AM EXECUTIVE DEVISED CODE FOR OUTER SPACE

PRINCETON, N.J., July 23.—Prof. John Cobb Cooper, former president of the International Institute of Space Law, who predicted that "chaos and conflict" would be inevitable in outer space unless "nationality" was established, died in his home here yesterday. His age was 79.

In his book, "The Right to Fly," written two decades ago, Professor Cooper provided one of the early documented analyses of a third of a century's efforts to develop air power for the uses of peace.

Professor Cooper insisted that air power could not be divided into good civil power and bad military power any more than flight through the air was limited by such natural boundaries as seacoasts, mountains and rivers.

OFFICER OF AIRLINE

He was well equipped to discuss the theory. As a legal scholar for many years at the Institute for Advanced Study here, he spent most of his adult life with aviation, first with the Navy during World War I and then with Pan American World Airways, of which he was to become a vice president before his retirement in 1946.

He drew up his broad concept of law for outer space six years ago while he was legal adviser to the International Air Transport Association. Relying on his background as professor of international air law at McGill University, he made these suggestions:

That the lower boundary of outer space be fixed at the point above the earth's surface where it is possible to put a satellite in orbit at least once around the earth.

That outer space should have the same status as the high seas, and nobody should be able to assert sovereignty over outer space or any celestial body in it.

That satellites and other space craft should have the nationality of the country that launched them, unless otherwise agreed.

That a country should have the right to take action in outer space for its self-protection and self-defense.

One observer called these suggestions "a down-to-earth solution for a far-out problem."

HEADED RESEARCH IN LAW

Professor Cooper was recognized as an authority in the field. He was a former administrator of the American Bar Foundation (the research body of the American Bar Association); a fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences and a member of the American Rocket Society, the Institute of Aerospace Sciences and the International Academy of Astronomics.

He was a graduate of Princeton, and he practiced law for 23 years in Jacksonville, Fla., where he was born. For many years he was active in civic and political affairs, having been a delegate to the Democratic National Conventions of 1916 and 1924.

Ten years later, he gave up the private practice of law to devote himself to aviation law and became a vice president of Pan American. He was the first chairman of I.A.T.A. in 1945, and the next year was named its legal adviser.

AIDED BY ROCKEFELLER GRANT

In 1946, the Rockefeller Foundation awarded him a grant to do research in international air law and related fields. He spent the next five years as an elected member of the Institute for Advanced Study. In 1951 he founded and became first director of the Institute of Inter-National Air Law at McGill University.

Professor Cooper had contributed to many American and international publications, including Foreign Affairs, The Yale Law Journal, Journal of Air Law and Commerce, International Affairs and Revue Française de Droit Aerien.

His wife, the former Martha Helen Marvel, whom he married in 1918, died five years ago.

Surviving are a son, John C. of Colorado Springs; two daughters, Mrs. Richard W. Baker, Jr. of Princeton and Jane N. Cooper of New York; a brother, Brig. Gen. Merian C. Cooper, U.S.A.F., retired, of Santa Monica, Calif.; a sister, Mrs. H. Plant Osborne of Jacksonville, and seven grandchildren.

A funeral service will be held at 2 P.M. Tuesday at Trinity Protestant Episcopal Church here.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Tuesday, July 25, 1967

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Senate passed bill on interest equalization tax.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S 10161–S 10223

Bills Introduced: 12 bills and two resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 2159–2170; S.J. Res. 97; and S. Con. Res. 34. Page S 10162

Bills Reported: Reports were made as follows:

H.R. 8718, providing for Federal Government payments to the D.C. for fiscal year 1968, with amendments (S. Rept. 406); and

S. 1003, to amend the Flammable Fabrics Act so as to increase the protection afforded consumers against injurious flammable fabrics, with amendment (S. Rept. 407). Pages S 10161–S 10162

Taxation: Senate passed (motion to reconsider tabled) H.R. 6098, extending for 2 years tax on acquisition of stock and debt obligations of a foreign issuer, after taking the following additional actions on amendments thereto:

Adopted: Long of Louisiana amendments of a technical corrective nature; and, by 45 yeas to 39 nays, McCarthy amendment to extend to trusts among living persons the same treatment as those involving estates created by wills; and

Rejected: By 34 yeas to 51 nays, Williams of Delaware amendment to limit extension of the legislation to 1 year rather than 2 years.

Senate insisted on its amendments, asked for conference with House, and appointed as conferees Senators Long of Louisiana, Smathers, Anderson, Williams of Delaware, and Carlson.

Pages S 10223, S 10230–S 10240, S 10245–S 10256

Legislative Program: Majority leader announced that on Thursday, July 27, Senate probably will consider bills dealing with the following: D.C. revenue; flammable products; and Export-Import Bank.

Pages S 10255–S 10256

Authority To Report: All committees were authorized during adjournment until noon Thursday, July 27, to file reports, along with any individual, supplemental, or minority views. Page S 10266

Confirmation: Nomination of Leverett Edwards, of Oklahoma, to be member of the National Mediation Board, was confirmed. Page S 10268

Nominations: The following nominations were received: Edward M. Korry, of New York, and Martin J. Hillenbrand, of Illinois, to be Ambassadors, respectively, to Chile and Hungary; numerous Coast Guard; and 60 Army in the rank of general. Pages S 10266–S 10268

Record Votes: Two record votes were taken today.

Pages S 10250–S 10251, S 10255

Program for Thursday: Senate met at noon and adjourned at 6:16 p.m. until noon Thursday, July 27, when it expects to consider the bills listed in "Legislative Program," above. Page S 10266

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

AGRICULTURAL PRODUCERS

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry: Subcommittee on Agricultural Research and General Legislation, in executive session, approved for full committee consideration with amendments S. 109, prohibiting discrimination against agricultural producer concerning his right to belong to an association of producers.

APPROPRIATIONS—INDEPENDENT OFFICES

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee continued its hearings on H.R. 9960, fiscal 1968 appropriations for independent offices, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development, with testimony in behalf of funds for his Department from HUD Secretary Robert C. Weaver, who was accompanied by his associates.

Hearings continue tomorrow on funds for NASA.

APPROPRIATIONS—LABOR-HEW

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee, in executive session, marked up and approved for full committee consideration H.R. 10196, fiscal 1968 appropriations for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

Committees on Armed Services and Appropriations: Subcommittees on Military Construction concluded joint hearings on S. 1241, fiscal 1968 authorizations for military construction, after receiving testimony from Gov. Tim M. Babcock, of Montana, on funds for Glas-

Appendix

Captive Nations Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 25, 1967

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, in commemoration of Captive Nations Week, I include herewith the text of my remarks before the Americans To Free Captive Nations, Inc., celebration at the Statue of Liberty on July 23, 1967:

REMARKS OF REPRESENTATIVE JOHN M. MURPHY, AMERICANS TO FREE CAPTIVE NATIONS, INC., JULY 23, 1967

This nation was founded on the principle that "all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are Life, Liberty, and the Pursuit of Happiness." These words, and the principle they set forth, although written in a declaration of one nation's independence, are a universal expression of the independence of all mankind.

It is fitting, therefore, that we celebrate Captive Nations Week in the United States, because the independence we were able to secure over 150 years ago is the independence that has been denied hundreds of millions of people throughout the world; our commitment to their freedom should be no less than our commitment to freedom at home.

It is not that some people do not desire freedom, for freedom is one of the most basic of human desires. Where freedom is absent in the world we find without exception that it has been replaced—with force or deceit—by some form of tyranny. No one voluntarily or willingly chooses to be enslaved.

The Russian subjugation of Eastern Europe begán behind the facade of a mutual defense assistance pact in World War II, twenty-five years ago. But any hope for Russian cooperation faded before the ink was dry on the pact. With unbelievable brutality and a total disregard for human suffering the Russians occupied the Eastern European nations. Throughout the war, the Soviets stripped the area of its entire industrial structure, even dismantling entire factories for shipment to Russia. After the war, what little doubt remained of Soviet intentions in Eastern Europe was quickly shattered. Instead of withdrawing their troops, the Russians began mass deportation of Eastern Europeans, and their replacement through Russian immigration. This process of Russification included the substitution of Russian language, laws, and customs—in effect, the total obliteration of the national identity of the Captive Nations. The result of the Russian tyranny is that today over one hundred million Eastern Europeans are enslaved.

This same process of enslavement has since occurred in other nations throughout the world, including Cuba, China, North Korea and North Vietnam.

The Soviets, of course, always have a ready justification for their illegal action. They often point to the "elections" held in the captive nations as evidence of popular support. But we all know, and the Soviets know, that an election with only one slate of candidates is no election at all.

They may claim that the elections show popular support, but there are plenty of signs to show that popular support is a myth. The Hungarian Revolt in 1956 is one example. No one can forget the brave Hungarian patriots who were viciously crushed beneath the cold steel tread of Soviet tanks. Nor can we forget the brave Poles who met a similar fate in the Polish October Days. Berlin is still another example; where else in the world can a government claim such popular support that it must build a wall to keep the population from deserting.

These are just a few examples of the spirit of freedom that still burns in the hearts of citizens of the captive nations. We must not let that flame die out, for a flame that can withstand the brutality of Russian tyranny and still survive must surely someday triumph.

But while we celebrate Captive Nations Week we should remember another reason for our commitment to freedom. We should be mindful of the many contributions to this country by people from captive nations. The greatness of the United States is founded on the many talents of a diverse people; we have benefitted from their skills and their culture and their devotion to freedom. Therefore, our celebration today should renew our spiritual ties with the people of Eastern and Central Europe.

I think this yearning for freedom which periodically slips over the Berlin Wall in the dark of nights or rises up in the streets in armed protest will eventually prove to be the trojan-horse of Soviet dominated Eastern Europe. Russia can physically oppress the people, it can wall them in, but it can never defeat the will to be free. As long as this will is alive, there is hope.

But we must do our part. We must give the captive people reason to hope. As President Kennedy once stated: "This country must never recognize the situation behind the Iron Curtain as a permanent one, but must, by all peaceful means, keep alive the hopes of freedom for the people of the captive nations."

We must never let them stand alone. Our strongest weapons in this struggle are truth, facts and ideas. The Voice of America and Radio Free Europe are vital to our purpose. Captive Nations Week is another way of showing our support. In addition, the United Nations must also be encouraged to press for freedom behind the Iron Curtain. We must never cease to work for their freedom.

A second task, of equal importance to freeing the people of captive nations, is to prevent other nations from being enslaved. This is our task today in Vietnam. We are taking a firm stand in this distant nation so that one nation will not impose its will on another. We must not, and will not, fail in this endeavor. In a larger sense, the struggle for freedom in Vietnam is a struggle for freedom everywhere. Regardless of the name of the country, we are committed to the proposition that all people shall have the right of self-determination. Today the line is drawn in Vietnam; who knows where it might be drawn tomorrow?

Therefore, as we celebrate Captive Nations Week, let us remember that our cause is freedom, whether it be for those who are enslaved, for those who are fighting to avoid enslavement, or for those who are already free. Our policy should be not only total opposition to tyranny in any form, but encouragement to free nations everywhere, especially those emerging nations for whom freedom is new and not yet firmly established. Our policy should be that once stated by Thomas Jefferson, when he said: "I have sworn eternal hostility against any form of tyranny over the minds of man."

It is in the spirit of Jefferson's words that we celebrate Captive Nations Week. Let us remember that our celebration must last more than one week a year if our cause is to triumph. We should use this week not as a one-shot celebration, but as the beginning of a full time commitment to the cause of freedom.

Toward Representation for the District of Columbia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 25, 1967

Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, congressional representation for the citizens of the District of Columbia is beyond a doubt the oldest item on our agenda of unfinished business. The residents of Washington have lacked their own voice in the National Legislature for 167 years, and this deprivation has become increasingly conspicuous as full suffrage and participation in our republican system have been extended to nearly every adult citizen of the States.

Now it appears that the 90th Congress may finally remedy this oversight. The extremely thoughtful and constructive hearings which began last week in the full House Judiciary Committee have already highlighted the unprecedented unanimity of support for District of Columbia representation among Members of the House from both parties, and among District civic groups from all points on the spectrum of public opinion.

In the lead editorial on Sunday, July 23, the Washington Star summarized the need for voting representation, the alternatives available, and the tremendous support which has developed this year. I would like to call this essay to the attention of the Congress as a perceptive review of the entire question:

A HOPEFUL START TOWARD REPRESENTATION

There is a long way to go before anyone begins thinking about a victory celebration culminating the District of Columbia's long fight to win voting representation in Congress. On the basis of last week's House Judiciary Committee hearings, however, there is a very bright prospect that this will be the session of Congress which finally sets in motion the constitutional amendment which is required to grant that right.

Some months ago, Chairman Celler of the Judiciary Committee told a group of Washingtonians that there is still a considerable "chasm of indifference" on the subject in Congress. This attitude is partially due, he said, to a skepticism as to whether District residents really want congressional representation—and really need it.

The manner in which Washington's citizens responded to the chairman's challenge last week, however, with more of the same to come when the hearings resume on Wednesday, ought to eliminate those doubts completely.

It is virtually unheard of, in this city, for organizations with the diversified interests of the Board of Trade, the American Civil Liberties Union, labor, the Home Rule Committee, the two competing local political parties and the Federation of Citizens' Associations to come together for any purpose. When the purpose is to express total agreement on a subject as senitive as District voting rights, and when these groups are joined as well by a parade of both Democratic and Republican legislators, only an unconscious Congress could fail to sit up and take notice.

The reaction of the Judiciary Committee itself is equally encouraging. Nearly a third of the influential committee's members, in fact, already are sponsoring one or another of the several versions of representation amendments. At the hearings, they raised a number of questions dealing with the degree of representation which the constitutional amendment should specify, and the manner in which District representation should be added to the present houses of Congress. Almost without exception, however, these questions were discussed in terms of how best to answer them—not at all as insurmountable problems.

The amendment with the broadest support—urged by President Johnson and cosponsored by several congressmen including Chairman Celler—would specifically authorize the District to elect one voting representative to the House, and permit Congress thereafter, at its discretion, to grant further representation in both the House and Senate. Six other proposals, however, also are pending—ranging from one which leaves the question of specific representation entirely in the hands of future Congresses, to one specifying immediate representation by two senators and the full number of House members to which the District would be entitled if it were a state.

What is the proper form for the amendment to take? The Star believes, as we have always believed, that District residents ultimately should enjoy the full representation, including two senators. We hope, therefore, that the constitutional amendment will move as far in that direction as Congress is willing to go.

Should Congress' willingness at this point stop short of that ultimate goal, however, as most members of Congress believe will be the case, no one should be dismayed.

For the pre-eminent, essential purpose of the amendment is to correct an unintentional omission in the language of the Constitution which for 167 years has senselessly precluded the District from *any* meaningful voice in Congress. The ball game will still be won if the amendment follows the pattern proposed by the President. The only essential consideration, in that event, is that the amendment's language leave no doubt as to Congress' right in the future to grant additional degrees of representation, without the necessity of amending the Constitution a second time.

The constitutional justifications for this action are too well established to require further repetition here. Too often in the past, however, the great practical importance of national representation—both to District citizens and to the Congress—has been glossed over. During the current hearings, this was a point to which members of Congress kept returning.

Chairman Celler commented recently that he receives a steady flow of District residents at his office seeking advice and help. "Were I to undertake all the chores requested," he said, "it might pre-empt all the time I must give to my own constituents; and what is true of me is true of all the other members of Congress. What recourse do I have but to send a supplicant to the District of Columbia Committee? Yet no one on the District Committee comes from the District."

Representatives Gude, Mathias and Broyhill, in their individual testimony, all cited instances of burdensome District "case work"—a load which they said is fair neither to their own constituents nor the District. Mathias commented that all congressmen constantly face a severe problem in dividing their time between national affairs and their alligiance "to their own purely local obligations." In regard to the District, he said, "we need people whose primary loyalty is to the people who elect them."

District Democratic chairman Tilford Dudley argued that most members of Congress are not fully aware of "the frustrations and often the anger of District citizens in having no place to go" to press their interests. Of course he is right. Nor, in any real sense, do the officials running the city have "a place to go." The District needs representatives, in positions of authority, to explain, to press and to vote for the city's needs—and to provide a channel through which Washingtonians also can participate directly in the making of decisions on national and international affairs.

Representative Nelsen of Minnesota, who has given far more than his share of attention to the District, accurately summed up, from Congress' viewpoint, the role of the District's man in Congress. "He would be intimately aware," said Nelsen, "of the many problems affecting the 800,000 citizens of the District. He would provide a close, regular and continuing liaison between the Congress and the local community. He would have a knowledgeable voice in presenting to Congress the District's position on such vital areas as taxation and school needs. Most of all he would have a vote."

Several members of the Celler committee questioned whether, at the time voting representation is given the District, the same privileges should be extended through the Constitution also to territories such as Puerto Rico.

But the fact, of course, is that a constitutional channel already may progress toward this right—as in the case of Hawaii and Alaska—by achieving statehood. The District, however, is neither a state nor a territory. It is a unique political enclave, under Congress' control, where the federal interest is paramount and inviolable. No matter what happens, it will remain so. And it is this distinction which requires the extraordinary process of constitutional amendment as the only means of achieving representation in the legislative body which ultimately controls District affairs.

In opening the House hearings, Chairman Celler noted that the anomaly of District inhabitants, found worthy of voting for President and Vice President but not for a voice in the national legislature, is "the one signifjcan omission" in this nation's effort to achieve universal enfranchisement. He asked on what basis this omission can be justified any longer.

The answer is that no justification exists.

Historic Past of Falmouth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HASTINGS KEITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 25, 1967

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, to most people, including many of my colleagues who have spent enjoyable respites from the hectic pace of the capital city, on Cape Cod, the town of Falmouth is a charming, fun-filled resort packed with tanned, relaxed vacationers intent on soaking up sun and swimming in the sound. Few, if any, of Falmouth's summer visitors take the time to become acquainted with the historic heritage of their host town.

Just a month ago, the Conant house, one of the oldest in Falmouth, was dedicated by the Falmouth Historical Society. Prior to the ceremonies, which were highlighted by performances and contributions by many diverse groups of Falmouth citizens, an essay contest was held among the schools. The best essay dealing with the historic past of Falmouth was chosen from among many admirable efforts, and I am pleased to bring to the attention of my colleagues the introductory paragraphs written by Alan H. King. Those who already know Falmouth will gain from this brief introduction to its past; those who have not yet had that chance will find their wanderlust teased by this sketch of an old New England, Cape Cod town:

CONCEPTION TO INCORPORATION

"Falmouth; Incorported 1686." To so many of us, this is the fromal beginning of our society, but otherwise, means little. Few of us have the opportunity to realize the trials and tribulations the early settlers faced in this new area, before incorporation became a fact. The events which lead up to this give us most of our religious background, cultures, and common laws.

In the early years of the 17th century, when religious persecution was at its height in Europe, the well-known group of separatists from the Netherlands and England departed the latter for a new life in the New World. The year 1620 now enters our history as the date these adventurers landed in what they had hoped would be Virginia, but actually was the coast of what we now call New England. The place where they landed was Plymouth. These "Pilgrims" could actually be called the first step in the history of Falmouth, Massachusetts.

A few years after this, other groups came to the new area, the largest of them being the Puritans, who settled and started the Massachusetts Bay Colony. These Puritans, from the area now called Boston, were not what one would call "promoters" of religious freedom, for persecution was great. Everyone who didn't conform to every Puritan rule, was considered to possess the devil in their bodies. Many of these people were banished, others executed in the squares. This intolerable situation led to revolt, and revolt led to factions in the government of the Colony. Soon groups of settlers fled the Bay Colony and joined the Pilgrims at Plymouth. Those who chose not to stay there usually started their own settlement.

It was one of the latter named groups with which we are concerned, for in 1637, a group of ten men, and their families set out from Boston. Instead of stopping at Plymouth, they traveled further south, and founded what is now Sandwich. This was a wise action on their part for they put the tolerant Pilgrims between the hard-shelled Puritans and themselves. So it was from the Puritans, and not the Pilgrims, that the first settlers of Cape Code came.

Others with the same problems of religion soon followed the original ten, so that this area soon became the "more advanced wing of a liberal congregationalism". The much persecuted at Boston, and the less-persecuted at Plymouth, could find refuge in the tolerant community at Sandwich where dissenters were persecuted unwillingly, if at all. It was from Sandwich that the first settlers came to Falmouth.

Interestingly enough, it was on the very first night the pioneers spent in Falmouth, that the first white child was born. The son of Johnathan Hatch and his wife, he was named Moses, it is said because he was born among the flags (probably at the flag swamp on the southern end of Fresh Pond).

The settlement continued to grow, and in 1659 permission to purchase land was granted to seven men, from Sandwich and Barnstable. In 1660–1, twelve other men's name appears in the records saying that they too had purchased property here.

The colony laws required that "no settlement be made remote from a place of public worship, unless the settlers be strong enough to support a minister of the gospel". Securing a minister proved to be their greatest problem for many years to follow. On top of this, the colony also required that, "the settlers of Saconsett, (one of the various spellings) apply themselves in some effectual way, as to cause an increase in their numbers". Additionally, because they were not yet strong enough, "the settlement shall, for the time being, belong to Barnstable." In the early 1680's, the settlers laid out lavish lots, one of which was 30 acres in what is now West Falmouth to be given to anyone who would preach the word of God. These were ment to attract new inhabitants to the area. Almost immediately, the Quaker church came into prominence in Falmouth. On June 4, 1686, the plantation known as Suckenesset, was given full incorporation as the town of Falmouth.

So the first, and probably the most important step in our history was completed. During the next century, Falmouth experienced the usual difficulties of a newly formed and growing community, not the least of which were religious problems. In a short history of this type, however, it is not practical to include a record of these events. Suffice to say that by 1774, Falmouth was thriving.

Newspaper Legend

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 25, 1967

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, in December of last year an item appeared in a publication of a Philadelphia club which has the historic name of "Poor Richards Almanac" which has since been reprinted in the Quill, the journal of Sigma Delta Chi, the professional journalism society.

I would like to share it with all the Members not only because it was written by a Philadelphia constituent of mine, but because it is a good story. It also illustrates the point that some of us would do well to remember when we are besieged by enterprising reporters.

It behooves us to please our constituents but, poor souls, they must please not only readers but editors.

The item follows:

A NEWSPAPER LEGEND

(By Al Blank)

Newspapermen love legends. Maybe it's because they spend so much time dealing with facts, wrestling with accuracy, digging for the truth. Or maybe it's because they spend so much time with their elbows propped on those slabs of moist mahogany across which legends (and hangovers) are born. Whatever the reason, the newspaper business is as full of legends as railroading, sports, ancient Greece, sex and other enduring human institutions. One of the perennial legends, told in newsrooms and press clubs told by rewrite men to copy boys and by police reporters to cubs, goes back to May 31, 1889.

That was the day the little Connemaugh River forsook its ordinarily placid course, encouraged by the crumbling of the South Fork Dam, and paid an unannounced visit on a small Pennsylvania town. The episode went down in the almanacs as the Great Johnstown Flood.

A city editor from a distant city sent a reporter to Johnstown to send back first-hand accounts of the devastation. The reporter did . . . with flourishes . . . Maybe his prose was swept away like the hapless frame houses of Johnstown. Maybe he had been influenced by pouring over stories of an earlier flood in a Gideon Bible found in the night table drawer of some high ground hotel, where he had holed up to compose his story. Maybe he had retreated to the hotel bar and his inspiration was more spiritous than spiritual. Whatever the reason, his story, cabled back to the city editor, began like this . . .

"God came out of the mountains today and set his ravages upon the city of Johnstown, Pa, As if from a huge pail, 20 million tons of water poured on the prosperous borough" . . . The wire went on to describe the 2,000 citizens drowned, the 75 houses "scooped from their foundations and crushed like eggshells."

But, it was that first line of the dispatch that rattled around in the city editor's brain. He mustered all of a city editor's humorous cynicism, developed from years of reading expense accounts and interviewing college girls who wanted to get into "The Newspaper Game" . . . and he fired off the legendary telegram to the reporter at Johnstown: *"Forget the flood, get me an interview with God."*

Perry's Values Ignored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 25, 1967

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an excellent editorial appearing in the magazine Gun Week of July 21, 1967, serving the fine sportsmen, conservationists, hunters, and shooters who enjoy that publication, pointing out the real value of Camp Perry, to the Nation, to our defense program, and to Americans everywhere who participate in the great sport of rifle and pistol shooting in all its abundant and varied forms.

The editorial follows:

PERRY'S VALUE'S IGNORED

Capitol Hill snipers who would shoot down the National Rifle and Pistol Matches held annually at Camp Perry, Ohio, would do well to study a report prepared in 1966 for the Department of the Army.

Although instigated by foes of the Director of Civilian Marksmanship programs, the report prepared by independent Arthur D. Little Co. researchers revealed—to the chagrin of the program's detractors—there is significant value in the National Matches and other DCM programs. Instead of criticizing the programs, the study recommended their expansion!

Although critics of DCM programs have attacked them on the basis of the alleged $3 million annual cost, the Little Report found the actual net cost of all programs, including Camp Perry matches, was about $475,000—or $1.14 per DCM-affiliated club member, based on 417,000 members in 1965.

The National Matches were budgeted at $2.7 million, but the Little Report questioned including $1.46 million pay and allowances for military support personnel as part of the cost. These payments would be made no matter where the servicemen were stationed.

The report also said another deduction—$1.68 million from sale of out-of-date firearms—should be allowed, bringing the total cost of all DCM programs to about $475,000.

While critics of the DCM programs have pointed to "technological advances" of the nuclear age which supposedly make the foot-soldier obsolete, the Little Report said "the Army's Light Weapons Infrantrymen and the Marines are almost certain to be employed in any 'shooting war' in which our nation becomes embroiled. Since the basic individual weapon of such combat arms is the rifle, it is important the men in such units become thoroughly proficient in its use."

The report added that surveys of records at Army training camps showed that servicemen with previous firearms training, not necessarily through DCM-affiliated clubs, were better marksmen, better soldiers, were more likely to volunteer for combat arms, and most importantly—less likely to become casualties in combat!

What's more, units containing DCM-trained personnel had better average and individual marksmanship records, indicating the trained shooters either shared their knowledge or freed instructors to give more time to those unfamiliar with guns. Thus, the benefits of the DCM program was spread well beyond the number of pre-service participants, producing better-trained units more effective in combat, more likely to survive combat.

Apart from the life-saving value of pre-service firearms marksmanship training, the nation points with pride to the six medals, including two Gold Medals, won by the U.S. Shooting Team during the 1964 Olympics. It is significant that half of the U.S. Olympic Team consisted of Army Marksmen, many of whom perfected their skills at the Camp Perry matches.

The Little Report found the process of preparing for the Camp Perry matches, the Olympics and other contests stimulates a continuing source of knowledgeable and qualified marksmen and potential military instructors.

Therefore, the Little Report recommended the DCM programs "be emphasized more and pursued even more effectively to reach a greater percentage of those young men likely to enter military service."

In addition to the military value of the matches, police departments and civic-minded organizations nationwide have found the disciplines of marksmanship training an excellent means of combating juvenile delinquency.

The dream of competing at Camp Perry is an important factor in sustaining the interest of these youngsters. Incidentally, unless they are among the handful picked as members of state teams, they attend at their own expense—which is considerable—and not at government expense on a "fat-cat junket" as some misinformed—or malicious—critics have claimed.

It would seem that if the Administration can spend thousands of dollars per graduate in its Job Corps and similar youth projects it should be able to spend $1.14 each, and even more, for a proven program which—aside from all other benefits—will increase a soldier's chances of survival in Viet Nam jungles.—A.J.

Closed Borders Can Provide a Good Life for Arabs and Jews

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 25, 1967

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, Meyer Levin, accomplished author and contributor to the Jewish Press, has written an article concerning his recent trip to the Middle East.

Mr. Levin specifically stresses that in spite of the war, the holy places and other points of interest have been restored and the area is now safe to visit. He also suggested various solutions to the Arab refugee problem.

I commend the following article to the attention of our colleagues, which appeared in the July 7, 1967, issue of the Jewish Press.

The article follows:

"CLOSED BORDERS" CAN PROVIDE A GOOD LIFE FOR ARABS AND JEWS

(By Meyer Levin)

BETHLEHEM.—What shall be done for the Holy Land? We have just toured with our family quite peaceably through virtually the entire area that was so mysteriously shut off, on "the other side," and we believe that the most helpful manifestation right now would be a rush of visitors, here. People should come not only for the most classic and beautiful of tours, not only to show concern for what is spiritually the most important area on earth, but also to see for themselves how simple it would be to provide a good life for both Arabs and Jews, to settle the refugees, to prevent further bitterness and bloodshed in the land of brotherhood and love.

This simple public manifestation, now that the tourist season is open, would save both Arab, Palestine and Israel economically. Right now, though everyone talks of a great season, the hotels remain empty. There seems to be a last hesitation to overcome, and for this, two questions should be answered.

1. Is it safe?

Answer: Yes.

2. Can one really see every place of importance?

Answer: Yes.

Already, the old city of Jerusalem teems with life, the shops and stalls are clean and if one did not know the history of the past month, one could hardly imagine there had been a war. In the Church of the Holy Sepulchre a stone-carver taps away at repairs that have nothing to do with the war. They have been going on for years, and the Greek, Armenian and Catholic priests declare that not one service has been missed.

TRUTH VERSUS PROPAGANDA

To the traditional Holy Land tour is added the fascination of seeing for oneself what has been true, what has been false, what has been propaganda in the disputes over Palestine. One may start with the worst spot of all, Gaza, an indolent, hate-infested town in a strip of miserable refugee camps where some 350,000 Arabs have been kept penned up. Living mostly on a Unrwa dole of four cents worth of flour and other foods per person per day. Yet Gaza also has a rich section of fine homes, of merchants and planters who own extensive orange groves in the strip.

One must go open-eyed rather than eyeless in Gaza, and even then it is hard to see the truth, for thousands of embittered refugee fighters have slipped back into their pajamas. Yes, they heard the broadcast conversation of Nasser and King Hussein, fixing up to say that British and American aid forces helped the Israelis. So do they still believe this happened? "Oh yes," says a hospitalized Arab, with a fixed smile. Another quite honestly tells a French visitor, "What do I want? Only to wait till next time, and kill all the Israelis. And that is the truth for 90 per cent of us here."

How can this be changed? Only by a change of life for these people. If the peace-loving comrade Kosygin would help the Arabs to build factories and a port in Gaza, with a fraction of the billions to be wasted on new armaments, all could change.

REBUILD LIVES

To rebuild the lives of these people would require only jobs, housing—not even a large-scale operation for the experts who have settled Siberia.

A glance at the map shows how a port in Gaza, connected by a short open corridor to Hebron, could serve the million Arabs on the west bank of the Jordan as well as all Arabia to the east.

Driving from Hebron to Bethlehem, to Ramallah with its rich effendis' villas and northward to Nablus, one has the greatest tourist surprise. The drive is through peaceful biblical landscapes of cypress, olives and vines, through pastoral valleys where donkeys are loaded high with fresh-cut sheaves of barley and wheat. Little boys sell fruit by the roadside; sheep graze on the hills.

One's first thought is: How sparsely populated, the land! Mile after mile without a village! How cruel it was to pen up the 1948 refugees in a few crowded camps in Jericho for 19 years, so as to deepen their hatred, when they could so easily have been settled, practically all of them in this area alone! So this was the secret behind the closed borders!

AREAS FOR SETTLEMENT

This area is as lovely as Galilee, a contiguous territory, rich with cooperative farm villages, bright with lights at night. And there is still another area for settlement that may require a little more preparation, but is potentially even richer.

Down in the Jordan Valley, if one drives past the large green oasis of spring-fed Jericho, one comes to an additional small area of green on the parched earth, a model farm that is a singular example of reclamation in what was once a wonderland of date palms and tropical fruits.

The reclaimed land is a farm school set up after 1948 by the Arab Development Society, under Musa Alami. With help from the Ford Foundation, the American I.C.A., church groups and others, teachers and students dug more than ten wells, producing irrigation water that is slightly saline, but usable for certain crops. Large cattle barns and modern poultry runs remind one of the Israeli sector.

VAST RECLAMATION

"The entire Jordan Valley can be reclaimed in this way," an instructor tells us as we drink cool, fresh milk from his dairy. "All the people in the camps could live quite well, if only we were allowed to settle them."

He is fascinated by our description of another farm experiment on soil much like his own, at the far end of the Dead Sea, where the Israel colony of Neot Hakikar uses the same sort of water for out-of-season tomatoes and for gladioli that are air-shipped to London.

"If we could only meet together and exchange ideas and experiences," says the instructor, with wistful hope. "Do you think it will now be possible?"

The active opinion of the world, demanding an end to political victimization of the Holy Land, can make this immediately possible. And the first step would be a giant wave of visitors, who can then say, "I saw it for myself. I know what can be done."

College Students Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 25, 1967

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, last week the Greenville, Tenn., Sun carried an interesting appraisal of our college students today, and I am happy to make this article available to my colleagues and the readers of the RECORD.

PUT THEM TO WORK; TAXPAYERS GETTING FED UP

More than just a few people in this community are proud of the fact that they "worked their way through college."

They make no secret of the fact that they obtained a higher education by waiting on tables, tutoring, typing, etc., and then supplemented that income by working hard at summer jobs.

In short, they got their education the hard way, without depending on federal aid and, in many cases, accepting little or no family aid. Those we know were not hurt by the extra effort. Indeed, it made them better qualified to compete when they left the ivy-covered walls.

Thinking about these good citizens we cannot help wondering about so many college people of 1967 and how those unwholesome types can spend so much time making demonstrations, holding love-ins, and in general making unmitigated nuisances of themselves. Where do they get all the free time for this hipstering?

Our sentiments were echoed recently by an engineering student. Watching thousands of disorderly young people milling around in a demonstration (in the course of which our American Flag was burned) he shook his head and remarked:

"I don't get it. How can they do all those things? March, smoke pot, stay up night after night yakking away and plunking guitars, making love, making trips to demonstrate? These are students? When do they study? In engineering we certainly don't have time for such nonsense, nor do they have time for it in medicine, law and other fields. Somebody must have rigged it so that an awful lot of college students don't have to do any work."

If those really are college undergraduates we see, it's about time somebody put them to work. If their professors can't give them enough studies to keep them out of mischief, maybe some of their grants and benefits should be reviewed.

With all that time on their hands, maybe they could use some of it to earn their keep, waiting on tables, washing dishes, etc.

Indeed everybody would benefit if these people had to do some work on their way through college. And not the least of the beneficiaries would be the taxpayers who are supporting a big chunk of the cost of the "education" of these academic bums.

—COLUMBIA HERALD.

The Need for Meat Inspection

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 24, 1967

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the need for revision of the Federal Meat Inspection Act is becoming increasingly evident through the hearings being conducted by a House Agriculture Subcommittee.

The use of diseased animals, contamination of carcasses during dressing operations, and employment of chemical additives and preservatives are the unpleasant facts found in a small number of our generally responsible meatpacking plants. The courageous gentleman from Iowa, Mr. Neal Smith, has introduced several bills, H.R. 1314, H.R. 1316, and H.R. 6168, which offer this Congress the opportunity to take positive action to protect the consumer from the irresponsible minority of meatpackers.

A Minneapolis Tribune editorial has clearly enunciated the problem we face not just in Minnesota but all over the Nation. I offer it for insertion in the Record at this point:

Those Abuses in the Slaughter House

"It makes me sick," was the reaction of a Minneapolis housewife upon reading in the Sunday Tribune about filthy meat slaughtering practices found in some Minnesota plants. She and other consumers have a right to be sickened and shocked over the lack of enough inspections to insure a safe total meat supply in this state.

Minnesota Agriculture Commissioner Russell G. Schwandt says the state does inspect meat plants twice a year or more for sanitary conditions. The state also runs tests of meat products to protect against adulteration. But Minnesota is one of nine states that do not require the crucial before and after slaughter inspections needed to keep out diseased animals, and to maintain a continuous check on slaughtering practices. Only the federal government does this here on meat bound for interstate channels.

In Minnesota, only 46 plants are federally inspected; 401 plants are not. The plant comparison exaggerates the problem because the large federally inspected establishments turn out the bulk of the meat products. The uninspected plants are mostly small operations. But this should not minimize the need for regular inspection of all plants. All meat should be safe.

A U.S. Department of Agriculture investigation showed what can happen from lack of regular inspections. Equipment was found to be unclean; pus, manure and urine had been splashed onto animal carcasses.

The shuddering result of such shoddy practices can be the spread of disease, such as salmonellosis—the increasingly prevalent cause of stomach aches often erroneously attributed to influenza.

The Minnesota Agriculture Department asked the 1967 legislature for $200,000 to increase its meat plant inspection program. It failed to win approval.

Congress and federal officials are prodding the states to act, possibly with the encouragement of federal aid. The Minnesota Legislature dropped the ball this year; it should not repeat the mistake in 1969.

The Greatest Tragedy of All

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 25, 1967

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, last night the city of Detroit was virtually gutted by roving bands of Negro rioters. Only 2 days of rioting have passed, but already the estimated damages have soared well over the $150 million mark, and the end is not yet in sight. President Johnson has responded by sending Federal troops into the area. And, after listening to some of the detailed reports of the violence in Detroit, I have no doubt that the President acted wisely.

The following editorial which appeared in this morning's edition of the Washington Post raises a few questions that all of us would do well to ponder. The most important question we must ask is "Why Detroit?" for several years now Detroit has been a shining example of interracial progress. The city's poverty program is far and away the best in the United States. Apparently, the untiring and dedicated action of thousands of Detroit citizens has gone unappreciated by the Negro rioters.

The Negroes keep talking about equality, but after last night's uprising, I must, in all candor, admit that I have not the faintest notion of the type of equal opportunity they are talking about. Usually Americans have been known to pursue equality by raising their position to the level of those they feel are "better off" in terms of opportunity. Because of this recurring inclination in our people, our Nation has been the most progressive nation the world has ever known. But now a new interpretation of equality appears to be upon us. No longer is it the intent of some of our people to heighten their position in society; rather they feel equality is best achieved by pulling others down to their level. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, the quest for equality, once looked upon as a pathway to progress, is rapidly becoming an avenue of destruction.

The editorial follows:

The Greatest Tragedy of All

This country is now coming into a bad time. In this fourth summer of slum riots, the sense of despair is beginning to rise steeply amidst a Nation struggling for remedies. Americans know only that the traditional rules are no longer holding, that the present solutions are not enough, and that a great deal depends upon the speed with which we can respond to a protest that, for all its urgency, is as incoherent as it is demonically destructive.

If these riots continue it will be a very bad time indeed for civil rights, for social legislation, and for the prosperous development of the great cities. The movement for racial equality has been forced onto the defensive. If the disorders persist, public authorities can be expected to resort to increasingly crude methods of repression, as the wanton use of firearms by police and National Guardsmen in Newark suggests. The contagion of riots will assuredly end in the re-establishment of order, throughout the Nation, but it may be order at a terrible price.

The Detroit riot is the greatest tragedy of all the long succession of Negro ghetto outbursts. In other cities it has been possible to seek causes in the ineptitude of governments, the hostility of employers and unions, the destitution of the slum's people. But Detroit is different.

For years Detroit has been the American model of intelligence and political courage applied to the governance of a huge industrial city. Mayor Cavanagh has gone further, over a longer period of years, to respond to the people of the slums than any other big-city mayor; and now Mr. Cavanagh is doubtless destroyed as a political leader. Detroit's gifted young Congressman Conyers, one of six Negroes in the House, was booed and pelted by the crowd.

Detroit's poverty program has been repeatedly cited as the most effective in the United States. Its police force is considered a model of temperate restraint. Its inner city schools are one of the country's leading examples of forceful reform in education. The United Automobile Workers have done more for racial equality than any other union in the history of American labor, and they have been met with the steady cooperation of the automobile manufacturers. Whatever the deprivations of Detroit, there is no shortage of well-paid industrial jobs free of racial discrimination. The city of Detroit was badly shocked by its fearful race riot in 1943. Over the past decade there has been no other large American city in which government, business and labor have devoted as much skill and effort to the cause of the Negro and the poor.

The sources of these riots lie beyond any easy explanations in the social and economic statistics. They are painfully similar to the riots currently endemic in underdeveloped countries. They are similar to the riots in the European cities of a century or two ago. It is never easy for cities to absorb large and sudden tides of rural immigration. That, of course, is the long view: the riots are a stage of social transformation, and the cities will ultimately pass through it.

But the long view is not good enough. Talk of social transformation is very thin comfort to those who died, and to those whose homes and shops were burned and looted. This country, never long on patience in crises, now needs an immediate course of action.

Public order necessarily comes first. It is simply recognizing reality to say that ever deeper remedy will be pushed aside until order has been reliably protected in Detroit, Newark, Plainfield, Waterloo, and every other American city, large or small. Everyone who lives in cities needs to understand that continued street fighting will ineluctably lead to the increased militarization of the police. That process of militarization can even be justified on the evidence of Newark, where frightened and vengeful police and overarmed National Guardsmen appear to have gone far beyond any permissible limits in their use of automatic weapons. This newspaper recently reported that one body contained 39 bullet holes, a number difficult to explain by any rational policy. Those 39 bullet holes suggest the atmosphere now prevalent in some of the less well run urban police forces as the wave of rioting progresses.

Clearly,. police need new weapons for riot control. Revolvers are not very useful to control crowds; the National Guard's machine guns and carbines ought never to be used in areas where women and children are likely to be caught in the crossfire. Some police authorities have experimented with temporarily debilitating chemicals that can be sprayed or hosed from a distance. Certainly police need training in riot control. Here are areas where the present Federal effort can be heavily expanded with great profit. And, of course, sniping will always be a danger as long as Federal and state law makes it possible for every criminal and every maniac on the continent to get a gun.

The continued riots, particularly in Detroit, will no doubt lead to renewed political attacks on the public programs of community action, job training, improved education and expanded housing. They have not prevented riots, it will be argued. But the answer is that they are all slow, difficult jobs in which the profit only appears over the long haul. The country is going in the right direction with its campaigns to end poverty and to build model cities. The country needs steady hands in this moment, and cannot let itself to baited or distracted by the black insurrectionaries or the white reactionaries who are, not for the first time, singing in close harmony.

The riots have done immense and irreparable harm to the fabric of the cities, and to the march for civil rights. The question is not whether order will eventually be ensured: certainly it will be ensured. It is the manner in which this is done that must be our first concern. The real question is the oldest question of the American republic, one that has been met many times, one that is always answered in a different way, and at a new cost. The question is whether a nation of free men can achieve order and social justice as well.

SBA Experimental Development Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TIM LEE CARTER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 25, 1967

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I recently had the opportunity to attend Community Day in Greensburg, Ky., to officially recognize the opening of the Small Business Administration's Operation Impact program.

Operation Impact is an experimental program designed to aid the local economy through the coordination of State, Federal, and private enterprise sources. Greensburg is one of four communities in the Nation selected for this program.

The citizens of Greensburg are enthusiastic about the economic growth potential of Operation Impact in their community and are rolling up their sleeves in preparation for participation in the program.

Basically Operation Impact expects to first stimulate employment with the location or expansion of industry. The increased payrolls will stimulate the local economy and provide the necessary growth incentive.

When Bernard L. Boutin, Administrator of the Small Business Administration, recently announced the enactment of the program he stressed that a high level of community support was necessary to the success of the program.

> We must have the backing of the people who live and earn their livings in the area, as well as the leaders of all the various segments of the commnuity to make this plan work. We can help them, and we will to the fullest extent, but they must help us with their active support and their best ideas.

Said Administrator Boutin.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to report that the citizens of Greensburg, Ky., are responding with their best efforts and fullest cooperation. They want to make the program a success.

Mrs. J. D. Gorin and Mr. Walter C. Gorin, editors and publishers of the Greensburg Record-Herald are giving the full editorial support of their newspaper to the program.

As evidence of the enthusiastic support for the program by the citizens of Greensburg I should like to have inserted in the RECORD the lead story from page 1 of the Thursday, July 13, edition of the Greensburg Record-Herald announcing the beginning of SBA's Operation Impact, as follows:

SBA LAUNCHES EXPERIMENTAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM HERE

The Greensburg-Green County industrial development potential increased considerably Monday when the "Operation Impact" offices of the Small Business Administration opened at 127 Public Square.

Operation Impact is an experimental program designed to aid the local economy through the coordination of state, federal and private enterprise sources. Greensburg is one of four communities in the nation selected for this program.

Greensburg has proposed 16 projects so far, including a motel, nursing home, airport, golf course, and chicken and milk processing plants.

Following nationwide TV and newspaper coverage last week phone calls were received locally from industries in different sections of the U. S., expressing an interest in locating here.

LOCAL ACTION NEEDED

Hobart Berry, SBA Industrial Specialist from Washington said Monday that "local participation is paramount to the success of the program."

A successful resource development program requires the concentrated efforts of all groups, agencies, organizations, and individuals in an area," he stated.

"The success of Greensburg improvement," he continued, "Will depend primarily upon the imagination, enthusiasm, initiative and leadership of the local people. If these traits are lacking, little can be accomplished by outside assistance and motivation."

The four SBA officials, who have staffed the local office since Monday have made it clear the program is not a cure-all, but they are anxious "to help the people of this county in every way in developing the local economy."

Greensburg was chosen for the program, an SBA official revealed Monday, "primarily because of the attitude of the local people." "We feel strongly," he said, "that the people are sincere in their desire to boost industrial development through any means at our disposal."

Other basic considerations were a labor surplus, a reported 5,500 men available in Green and adjoining counties, and a lack of projects which are a direct result and financed solely by federal aid.

SBA officials had for some time been quietly investigating 55 possible locations for the program. The possibility of Greensburg's being chosen was known among local government officials and community leaders, but was not generally known until the announcement of the selection was given nation-wide news coverage Thursday.

Financial aid directly from SBA is limited to loans. It makes no grants. However SBA can act as coordinators to put local people in contact with any government programs which offer grants. All other SBA programs, such as SCORE, Management Councils etc. are available for direct application for Greensburg.

Mr. Bernard L. Boutin, administrator of SBA has said, "No small businessman who is a client of SBA will ever be allowed to falter or fail for lack of management guidance . . ." SBA management assistance in every field will be available through the "Operation Impact" program.

Other federal agencies expected to take part at Greensburg or the other three "Operation Impact" locations are the Economic Development Administration, the Farmers Home Administration, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

The other locations of "Operation Impact" are the Warsaw-St. Lawrence shopping area of Cincinnati, the Gila River Indian Reservation in Arizona, and Russellville, Ark.

The Warsaw-St. Lawrence shopping area in Cincinnati, SBA said, is one of the oldest sections of the city with about 40 merchants serving 9,150 families. Its main problem, the agency said, is a steady loss of business to suburban and downtown stores, lack of parking space, credit, and financing to rebuild stores, lack of management skills in promotion and advertising.

Russellville is the keystone of an eight-county rural area between Fort Smith and Little Rock, and SBA said the area must be developed to provide facilities and numerous small businesses to accommodate the working population as well as a tourist influx expected from a new reservoir at Dardanelle.

The Gila River reservation, SBA said, lacks small business opportunities and job skills and has an average family income of about $700 a year.

Free Speech and the Peace Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 24, 1967

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of the Members of the House an issue which has, to date, received little attention—an issue, the implications of which, merit serious consideration not only by this House, but by all Americans. It is an issue which touches the essence of the Peace Corps—an agency whose very effectiveness turns upon its freedom, its openness and its independence from traditional bureaucratic procedures.

The implications are, however, broader than the survival of the Peace Corps. They touch one of our most basic rights, that of the free expression of ideas—a right, the protection of which, necessitates even greater vigilance during periods of national crisis. One need only recall recent harsh criticism, bordering on allegations of treason, of those opposing U.S. involvement in Vietnam to realize the necessity of preventing attrition of the right to speak.

Involved, as well, is the right—indeed the necessity, if we, as a nation, are to make intelligent decisions—of the American people to hear anything and everythink relevant to our self-government.

Raised, also, is the question, daily increasing in importance, but as yet receiving slight consideration, of the advisability of imposing the same restrictions on, public employees engaged in different activities. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that neither reason nor logic dictate that the rules concerning one employed in a certain governmental activity necessarily be the same as those applicable to one employed by that same government in a different activity.

Bruce Murray, until his recent dismissal, was a Peace Corps volunteer in Chile. As reported by James Wechsler in the New York Post, he was dismissed because he authorized a Chilean newspaper to publish his letter criticising a recent Peace Corps ruling which declared it improper for Peace Corps volunteers to sign, as Peace Corps volunteers, a "Negotiations Now" petition. Although so questionable as to appear implausible, signing said petition constituted, according to the Peace Corps' directive, an interference in Chilean politics.

As indicated by Clayton Fritchey in an article in the New York Post Mr. Jack H. Vaughn, Director of the Peace Corps, has reversed the policy as it applies to publications in U.S. news media.

But what of Bruce Murray? Given the facilities of modern communication such as the Associated Press and the United Press International, is the difference between publishing a letter, critical of U.S. policy, in a U.S. newspaper and publishing that same letter in a host, or other foreign, country newspaper so great as to warrant the dismissal of one who chooses the latter course?

For the benefit of my colleagues, I suggest serious consideration of the following articles—the first by James Weçhsler in the New York Post of July 18, the second by Clayton Fritchey in the New York Post of July 21:

[From the New York Post, July 18, 1967]

A Battle of the Peace Corps

(By James A. Wechsler)

Echoes of what will inevitably become known as the "Bruce Murray Case" may haunt the Peace Corps for a long time.

Murray talked quietly yesterday about the events leading to his recent dismissal from the Corps unit in Chile. He is a light-haired, genial, neatly-dressed young man, quite indistinguishable in outward aspect from ambitious contemporaries who drink martinis on the bar-car after a day's labor in Wall Street. He has neither the stereotyped tones nor brooding demeanor of a "case."

But the issues stirred by the fate of this political war casualty have created problems of conscience for many other volunteers and for serious men in the leadership of the Peace Corps.

Murray joined the Corps in 1965 immediately after receiving a master's degree in music at UCLA and, after training, was assigned to Concepcion, Chile, in October of that year. He taught music at the university there; he worked with the university orchestra and spent another part of his time in choral exercises with juveniles held in local prisons. He also devoted hours to teaching English at the local YMCA. Throughout this interval he lived in a Chilean slum. The diversity and dedication of his activity offer a renewed glimpse of the anonymous services being rendered by thousands of volunteers in so many places.

Then, last May after long introspection about Vietnam, he lost his anonymity. He and several others signed a "Negotiations-Now" petition circulated among volunteers. Soon thereafter an area representative of the Corps visited the group and read a letter announcing that it was improper for Peace Corps personnel to identify themselves as members of the Corps in signing such a declaration.

Murray thereupon drafted a lonely statement, asserting that the restriction violated both his personal rights and the spirit of the Corps. He sent copies to Peace Corps chieftian Jack Vaughn, two other officials stationed in Chile, and The Times.

About a week later a newspaper in Concepcion (El Sur) published a UPI dispatch describing the Peace Corps edict prohibiting volunteers from revealing their connection in signing any Vietnam dissent and reporting that one member of the group had asked to have his name removed. At this point Murray committed his explosive sin. He gave a copy of his letter to El Sur, which published it the next day. In doing so he made it plain that he was speaking only for himself.

Within 48 hours he was interrupted at an orchestra rehearsal by a Peace Corps aide and informed that he had been recalled to Washington. There were a series of amiable but futile meetings with Vaughn, and his deputies. Murray refused to agree to change his course and was politely but firmly "terminated." His present hope is to return to work for the University of Concepcion if his draft board approves.

Why did Murray fight so hard for the right to identify himself as a Peace Corpsman in challenging our Vietnam policy? Perhaps the better question is: why did anyone in Washington (was it the State Dept.) insist that he be punished and thereby dramatize a signature that would otherwise have received little notice?

Murray plausibly contends that his credibility in Chile (where left-wing forces continually try to brand the Corps as a nest of "imperialist spices" and CIA operatives) was at stake. The formal contention on which his dismissal was based—that he was "interfering" in Chilean politics—was a bureaucratic fantasy; the fact of life is that no significant segment in Chilean politics supports the U.S. position in Vietnam.

"When I left," Murray says, "everybody I knew was in favor of what I was doing—professors, the people I lived with, even people I met casually in the street. I never really met anyone there who backed our escalation in Vietnam."

More recently five Peace Corps volunteers in Ecuador, led by Paul Cowan, published a letter in The Times proclaiming their disagreement with our Vietnam stand. It is a measure of the surviving decency and ambivalence of the Corps' leadership that their heresy will not be punished.

In response to inquiry, a Corps spokesman in Washington said yesterday that the distinction was that they had been cleared because they had not carried their message to the press in Ecuador and that much of their protest was aimed at the Peace Corps itself. The point is well-intentioned if not well-reasoned.

One hopefully concludes that rational men have recognized the peril of a full-scale rebellion in the Corps and are finding ways to justify abstention from further reprisals.

So perhaps 25-year-old Bruce Murray didn't really lose the larger battle. The sad question is why any Washington bureaucrat ever believed anything could be gained by opening fire on him and undermining the integrity and character of an organization that has been—by deed rather than word—the worthiest voice of America in recent years.

[From the New York Post, July 21, 1967]

The Peace Corps Ruling

(By Clayton Richey)

WASHINGTON.—In politics, as the late John F. Kennedy and Fiorello La Guardia proved, there's nothing like admitting a mistake. It's disarming, and it clears the air.

The latest public official to discover this is the able director of the Peace Corps, Jack Vaughn, who has just saved himself of a lot of future trouble by sensibly reversing a ruling which abridged the free speech rights of Peace Corps volunteers stationed around the world.

It won't be necessary now for the American Civil Liberties Union or others to test in court the constitutionality of a recent order by Vaughn against volunteers openly criticizing U.S. Vietnam policy, and in identifying themselves as Peace Corps workers in doing so.

It still leaves in some doubt, however, the propriety of firing Bruce Murray, a 25-year-old volunteer from Newport, Rhode Island, who protested against our Vietnam policy in a letter to a newspaper in Chile where he has been serving. Despite Vaughn's having rescinded his original order, Murray will not be rehired.

On the other hand, Peace Corps officials say there will now be no punitive action against the five young volunteers in Ecuador who wrote a letter to the New York Times after the Murray dismissal in which they said, "We feel obliged to express openly our disagreement with the war in Vietnam, and to protest the Peace Crops ruling which denies us the right to identify ourselves as volunteers when taking stands on U.S. foreign policy issues."

Murray was one of 92 volunteers in Chile who were warned last month to disassociate themselves officially from a circular attacking the Vietnam war or face disciplinary charges. Vaughn said he had notified the group in writing that they were free "as individuals" to express their opinions to the President, to the Congress, or to the U.S. press if they "completely avoid" public identification of their "Peace Corps connections." They were told that "letters to the U.S. press for possible publication cannot include your Peace Corps connection."

The justification for firing Murray, but not the five from Ecuador, is that the Ecuador volunteers placed their letter in an American newspaper, while Murray had his published in a Spanish-language newspaper in Chile. Vaughn's new order, which goes out to the field this week, still forbids foreign publication.

In this connection, the agency says it is maintaining its "long-standing policy which prohibits volunteers from speaking on or engaging in the politics of the host country to which they are assigned."

Nevertheless, Vaughan appears to have gone a long way to meet the objections of the Civil Liberties Union which, in a message to President Johnson said, "The importance of protecting dissent in the midst of tension, which you yourself have endorsed on many occasions, points up the need for prompt action by the Administration in guaranteeing Peace Corpsmen their First Amendment rights."

Also in a message to Vaughn personally, the ACLU said: "A long line of Supreme Court decisions makes perfectly clear that government employment cannot be made contingent upon the relinquishment of the First Amendment right to petition the government and to express opinion."

An important part of the Peace Corps' "magic," according to Harris Wofford, formerly the associate director of the agency, "has been that its volunteers have been freer agents than ever seen before in any bureaucracy."

Volunteers, he says, go abroad not as ambassadors, or propaganda agents, or even civil servants. "They go as citizens free to agree or disagree with their President . . . to agree or disagree with American official policies . . . they are making visible what, for too many people around the world, has usually been invisible about America—our relatively open society."

In reversing himself, Vaughn is not only on firmer constitutional ground, but he may have headed off a protest movement among the volunteers which showed signs of spreading. A good day's work all around.

Patriotism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 25, 1967

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I have been extremely heartened by the material enclosed in a letter by Elmore Vincent Schueler, Steward, Teamsters Local 445 of Yonkers, N.Y. He wrote it to the skipper of the U.S.S. *Bainbridge*, our new nuclear-powered destroyer.

I believe that this letter represents the viewpoint and determination of the overwhelming majority of Americans.

That this type of letter has a morale effect is indicated by a letter that Capt. James H. Doyle, commanding officer of the U.S.S. *Bainbridge*, wrote June 25 to those interested in 8-month deployment of the *Bainbridge* with the U.S. 7th Fleet off Vietnam.

Captain Doyle says:

> On the subject of patriotism, I am enclosing a copy of a letter which I received recently from Mr. Elmore Schueler of Washingtonville, New York. It is a marvelous letter to which I can add nothing except to ask you to read it.

By unanimous consent I introduce in the Record the letter from this distinguished American labor worker:

May 14, 1967.

Dear Sir: Please excuse me for not knowing your name Sir, but time did not permit me to do so. It was my pleasure and honor to march with my men and fellow Teamsters for and in place of the officers and men of the USS *Bainbridge* on Saturday May 14, 1967. As you may know by now a parade was held this day to show any one and everyone just how the real Americans feel about our men at the War Zone in Vietnam, and the support we intend to give our men now and always. In just four days Ted Daley, Beacon, N.Y., head of our local union 445 got over 100 men to march in this fabulous parade.

Each barn that was represented picked a unit to stand in for, being an old can sailor myself I inquired and found out that your fine ship was over there. My men at Cooper Jarretts Newburgh, N.Y. overwhelmingly supported me in my choice of the USS *Bainbridge*, even though they consisted of three doggies, two fly boys and one jarhead. That's what I call interservice cooperation. I would like to tell you some of the highlights of the parade as seen through my eyes. After a two hour ride from Newburgh, N.Y. "our starting point" we assembled at 96th St., N.Y.C. and waited approximately three hours till our turn came to march. "In fact it seemed like old times, you know the saying hurry up and wait" but this time no one was complaining. We started our march at two P.M. Our lines took shape after the first block with Ted Daley leading us also Tony Elecca. All at once one of the men started singing "God Bless America" we all took it up and kept singing till the very end of the parade at 62nd St. We sang besides God Bless America, Let's Remember Pearl Harbor Over There, I'm a Yankee Doodle Dandy, America the Beautiful, Anchor's Away, Marines Hymn and as we passed the reviewing stand we sang Battle Hyman of the Republic. In the reviewing stand were 12 Medal of Honor winners and also our good Cardinal Spellman. To say the least it was a memorable moment. As I said the parade ended at 62nd St. and although we marched for 1 hour and thirty minutes it seemed like only a flash.

I think I can honestly speak for 100 percent of the people at the parade that day in saying we hope in our small way to show all our boys in Vietnam we're behind you all the way. We respect you and we pray God will protect you now and always. The parade went on full blast for nine (9) hours. In one unit alone 2,000 Negro youths marched, a group of Catholic Nuns said the Rosary aloud in another, the Jewish Vets and the Jewish people waited all day to march on account of their Holiday and started as soon as the sun went down. Yes, sir, captain, all Americans were there. I must say as just one American it was a day's Honor to march for you Sir and your men and all our men in Vietnam, and I will always remember it with everlasting pride.

Everywhere you looked that day our flag was flying high and proud. At least 200,000 Americans marched if not more for our fighting men in Vietnam, but also we were marching for ourselves, we wanted to show the world the same fighting spirit is not only with our men in Vietnam who have been and will be paying the supreme sacrifice for Duty, Honor and Country but it's also in the good Americans who aren't going to stand by while a very few "Cowards and Communists" make a mockery of the good old U.S.A.

All in all it was a 4.0 show for America.

I'll close now hoping and praying the very best for you Sir, and the crew of the *Bainbridge*. Keep up the good work. God Bless America.

Sincerely,
Elmore Vincent Schueler,
Steward, Teamsters Local 445,
Yonkers, N.Y.

Captive Nations Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 25, 1967

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, last week we in Congress joined all Americans in the observance of the ninth annual Captive Nations Week.

In his 1967 proclamation, President Johnson noted that the United States "from its founding as a nation has had an abiding commitment to the principles of national independence and human freedom."

Our celebration of Captive Nations Week is an occasion for Americans to remember that millions of people living behind the Iron Curtain are deprived of these basic freedoms.

The Communists have not, however, been able to destroy the desire of these captive peoples for their liberty. In fact more and more each year the Communists have been forced to respond to both an individual and national impulse toward freedom. The forces of polycentrism have made impossible the type of complete control over these nations that the Soviet Union once had during Stalin's era. Now the rulers of the Eastern European countries often follow policies based on their perception of the national interests of their own countries. For example recently Czechoslovakia established trade relations with West Germany despite the angry protests of East Germany and the Soviet Union. In the recent U.N. debates on the Middle East crisis Rumania did not follow the Soviet line.

For the individual citizen, life under communism has improved since the days of Stalin's tyranny. More attention has been accorded the consumer needs of the people. The excesses of the secret police have been curbed in some of the nations. Recently Rumania established a committee to oversee the operations of its police force, reputedly the most repressive in East Europe.

Despite these gains the people of the Communist-dominated countries still are deprived of the right of free speech, press, and religion. They still do not have the right to choose who will govern them; nor can they hold their rulers responsible for policies and administration.

History has made it clear that men will not accept forever the abridgement of their individual freedoms and national liberty. We in the free world must pledge ourselves to help these captive people in their constructive efforts to win their eventual freedom.

Your Degree

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. TUNNEY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 25, 1967

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. Speaker, in a recent editorial, Jack H. Scudder, of the Banning Beaumount Record-Gazette, pointed out the rights and responsibilities of good citizenship. His 10 questions on good citizenship deserve our thoughtful reflection.

I think his remarks are very pertinent and I include them in the Record.

Your Degree

Have you earned your B.C. degree?

We have been presenting editorials for several days on rights and responsibilities of citizenship. Now it's examination time.

Let's pretend that a bachelor of citizenship (B.C.) degree is being offered to everyone who passes a prescribed test. The test will be self-administered. And it's based on some citizenship standards offered several years ago to Rotarians.

Ask yourself these questions:

1. Am I well informed on local and world affairs?

2. Am I courteous, unselfish and friendly—getting along well with others—and a good neighbor?

3. Am I sincere and dependable and do I take an active part in a church or religious community of my choice?

4. Do I appreciate what others have done for me and accept responsibility for the future betterment of the community?

5. Am I fair and just in my relations with others?

6. Do I obey the laws of my community, state and nation?

7. Do I vote regularly and intelligently at election time?

8. Am I interested in the freedom and welfare of all the world's peoples and do my part to secure them?

9. Am I productive—rendering worthwhile service to my fellow man?

10. Do I set a good example to the youth of my community?

No cheating, now! Ten honest "yes" answers should earn you that B.C. summa cum laude. Why settle for anything less?

And if you want to earn an advanced degree or two in good citizenship, graduate efforts are possible in the fields of public service, service to youth, cooperativeness, standing up for what is right and a host of others.

Now, good graduates, go forth and make your society the finest in all history!

—J. H. S.

Wrong Way To Stop Riots

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 35, 1967

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, there is no question that the cities of this great Nation are seriously threatened by riots, and that the Americans of all races face danger. But this is a Nation founded on the rule of law and not the rule of men.

Congress, in attempting to legislate on this serious problem, I am afraid has missed the mark. The antiriot bill passed overwhelmingly last week, but it will do little to stem the tide that is running through city after city across this Nation. Most States have the legislation necessary to deal with riots. In fact, in my home State of Pennsylvania, a man who instigated the 1964 flareup in Philadelphia is currently serving an 8-year sentence for his role in the riot. This is 3 years longer than the Federal antiriot bill proposes.

The problem is not so much exporting riot from one State to another but rather the ability of inside agitation to stir trouble.

Nowhere have I found a more eloquent criticism of this legislation than the following editorial from the Philadelphia Inquirer which appeared on Friday, July 21, 1967:

WRONG WAY TO STOP RIOTS

Having pushed to passage the bill making it a Federal crime to cross State lines or use interstate facilities to incite a riot, the 347 members of the House who voted for it may have applauded themselves for a good day's work for the preservation of the Republic.

Actually, their performance was nothing but a useless gesture so far as getting to the root of the riots and taking realistic steps to prevent them are concerned.

Anyone found guilty of inciting to riot and violence to murder and arson, should be punished, and there are laws on the books to insure that. But the proposed law making it a Federal offense to travel from one State to another, or to use the mails or make a telephone call, with intent to incite a riot, is an exercise in mind-reading, and a clumsy one at that. Who is to determine the intentions of an individual—even a Stokely Carmichael—when he lifts a telephone or takes off on a trip?

The cry of "outside agitators" is raised on schedule whenever any community has outbreaks of violence and demonstrations against the authorities. It eases the local conscience to blame the disturbance upon outsiders, usually anonymous, who slipped into town for that purpose. Looking for someone from the other side of the State line to put in jail may divert the authorities in a riot-struck town but it won't come close to finding the cause of the rioting, or to preventing its recurrence. The "agitation" comes from the inside—far inside—without need of outside incitement or encouragement.

Public Apathy for Air Pollution Dangers Revealed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 25, 1967

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, 2 weeks ago the Senate unanimously passed S. 780, amending the Clean Air Act of 1965. It is my fervent hope that we in the House can give this bill prompt consideration and shortly clear it for the President's signature. Later in this article, I will enclose a succinct summary of the bill, as reported in this week's National Observer.

As we all know, Mr. Speaker, the various pollutants plaguing our environment demand solution—a solution now, instead of years in the future. While I am aware that the Senate bill will not terminate air pollution overnight, I do believe that it is a constructive step in broadening authority to deal with pollution trouble spots as well as increasing vital research funds.

It was shocking to note a Harris Survey, in Monday's Washington Post, which indicates that nationwide, only 53 percent of Americans believe that there is a significant amount of air pollution. Naturally, urban and suburban residents are more aware of the problem than are rural inhabitants. However, I believe that even in areas where pollution is not yet an overriding problem, prevention should be the essential concern.

If we do not continue and expand our attack against air pollution—as well as finding solutions for solid waste disposal, water pollution, and so on down the ever-expanding list of environmental challenges we currently face—the apathetic Americans of the Harris Survey will quickly become violent demanders of extreme and unreasonable action.

I am hopeful that the House will take immediate action in endorsing S. 780 and perhaps in further arousing the public to recognize the necessity for more research funds and smog control districts in order to help make our environment more livable.

It is my conviction, Mr. Speaker, that congressional leadership is essential as we attack the environmental problems which are facing us today. We should not be misled by seeming public apathy as revealed in the enclosed poll. I am somewhat dismayed by the figure that 65 percent of Americans believe that air pollution is necessary, as a byproduct of industrialization. It is interesting to note that the public does not think any level of government or free enterprise is making constructive progress in combating pollution. It is time for us to change that attitude.

The articles referred to follow:

[From the National Observer]

SENATE ACTION: CLEARING THE AIR

The Senate last week voted 88 to 0 to strengthen the Government air-pollution-control programs.

The bill, if it passes the House, would authorize $700,000,000 for the programs during the next three years. Here are its major provisions:

Standards: The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW) would be authorized to designate "air-quality-control regions," geographic rather than political areas that are affected by pollutants in the atmosphere. If the states in these regions failed to adopt air standards within 15 months after receiving Federal criteria and recommended control techniques from the Secretary, he could set air-quality standards in the regions.

The measure would also give the Federal Government power to set standards on automobile-exhaust emissions with a provision to waive these standards for any state that has already adopted such standards (only California has to date). The Secretary would expand the current HEW program of developing criteria that show the effects of various pollutants, such as sulfieds, on health and environment.

Enforcement: The Secretary would have the power to seek a court injunction to immediately halt contamination of the air in areas where pollution presents an "imminent and substantial danger to health." This is an emergency measure, designed to lessen the danger to residents suddenly engulfed by heavy smog, such as occurred in the New York City area last Thanksgiving. This provision could be used to close industries and halt traffic to reduce pollution during the emergency.

The bill would give the Secretary authority to seek court action against violators of the air standards set for air-quality-control regions 180 days after he ordered the violator to correct the problem.

Research: The measure would authorize a three-year, $375,000,000 program of research and demonstration programs for air-pollution control. HEW would be authorized to pay partial costs of experimental antipollution devices installed by private industries.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, July 24, 1967]

TAX COOLS DESIRE FOR POLLUTION RELIEF

(By Louis Harris)

The American people are upset by growing air pollution and want remedies taken to clean the air they breathe. But when pressed to put up $15 a year more in taxes to alleviate air pollution the public is unwilling to be taxed further for these new services by 46 to 44 per cent.

Fifty-six per cent of the American people believe there is a considerable amount of air pollution where they live. This figure rises to 72 per cent in the cities and 75 per cent in the suburbs.

By roughly 2-to-1 margins, the public accords a negative rating to the job done in curbing air pollution by local industry and the automotive industry.

Most in favor of a tax hike of $15 to finance air pollution control are the better educated, younger people, those in the upper income groups, suburban dwellers, and residents of the East. Most opposed are older people, those who live in rural areas, and in the South.

A cross-section of the public was asked:

"From what you know or have heard, do you think there is a lot of air pollution around here, some but not a lot, only a little, or hardly any?"

AMOUNT OF AIR POLLUTION

[In percent]

	Some, lot	Little, none	Not sure
Nationwide	53	40	4
By size of place:			
Cities	72	21	7
Suburbs	75	22	3
Towns	36	61	3
Rural	33	63	4

To determine popular theories of the causes of air pollution, the public was asked:

"Who or what do you think causes most of the air pollution around here?"

Causes of air pollution

	Percent
Motor vehicle exhaust	45
Industry smoke, fumes	40
Burning garbage, waste	9
Airplanes, trains	3
Dust and dirt	2
Insecticides	1

When asked to rate the job done by the private and public sector, the public showed it believes much more can be done to control air pollution:

JOB DONE ON CURBING AIR POLLUTION

[In percent]

	Positive	Negative	Not sure
Local industry	29	44	27
Federal Government	24	45	31
Local government	24	45	31
State government	23	45	32
Average citizen	23	48	29
Auto manufacturers	21	47	32

For all the dissatisfaction with the lack of action on air pollution, there is considerable tolerance of foul air as a necessary byproduct of local industry:

"It has been argued that if industry is to provide jobs in an area, it is likely to cause some air pollution, and therefore some air pollution has to be put up with. Do you agree or disagree with this point of view?"

Some air pollution necessary

	Percent
Agree	63
Disagree	25
Not Sure	12

Finally, the cross-section was aksed just what air pollution control was worth to them in individual dollar terms:

"Would you be willing or unwilling to pay $15 a year more in taxes to finance a federal program to control air pollution?"

	Willing	Unwilling	Not sure
Nationwide	44	46	10
By size of place:			
Cities	44	47	9
Suburbs	54	38	8
Towns	43	46	11
Rural	32	53	15
By income:			
Under $5,000	34	53	13
$5,000 to $9,999	43	47	10
$10,000 and over	54	40	6
By age:			
Under 35	52	38	10
35 to 49	46	44	10
50 and over	38	51	11

A Long and Sober Think on Vietman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THEODORE R. KUPFERMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 25, 1967

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, since my election to Congress and before that, I have continued to point out the error of our involvement in the war in Vietnam.

Among many other statements on the subject, I brought before this body the address by Prof. John Kenneth Galbraith entitled "Vietnam: The Moderate Solution," Congressional Record, June 28, 1967, page 8216; the editorial by publisher John S. Knight from the Miami Herald entitled "The Dirty Little War," Congressional Record, March 22, 1967, page H3234; and the editorial from Commonweal entitled "Getting Out," Congressional Record, January 12, 1967, page A93.

All of these statements had one significant point over and above showing how misguided is our involvement in the conflict in Vietnam, which continues to devour our young men and to waste our substance.

The one additional unifying theme was the fact that the voices being heard were respected voices, whose standing in the community could not be questioned.

There follows an editorial of Thursday, July 20, from the Pawling-Patterson News-Chronicle, the voice of the Central Harlem Valley in New York State, entitled "A Long and Sober Think," which fits this unifying theme. The editor and publisher of this fine local newspaper is Arthur B. Sederquist, Jr., and I commend his editorial to my colleagues:

A Long and Sober Think

Senator Mike Mansfield of Montana, the Senate majority leader, and tireless critic of administration policy in Vietnam, took another look at the policy last Tuesday following news reports that Gen. Westmoreland had requested additional troops to use in the far east war.

Sen. Mansfield's look at the new request was almost reluctant it seems to us, as if he knew that some of his colleagues were probably tiring of his frequent dissent.

"Once again the Secretary of Defense has gone to Saigon to make a firsthand evaluation of the situation in Vietnam," he said, as reported in the Congressional Record. "According to the press he heard the most encouraging reports of 'progress' toward our 'objectives' there.

"While I do not in any sense question the accuracy or the objectivity of the evaluations which he received, it must be asked in all frankness what is meant by 'progress' toward our 'objectives' in the context of the present situation in Vietnam.

"The promise of progress has been present as the casualties in our forces in dead and wounded have increased from less than 10 a year, to 10 a month, to 10 a week, to 10 a day, to 10 an hour of every hour of every day."

Sen. Mansfield said that he remarked on "these overlooked and negative statistics" not in criticism of our leaders in Vietnam or of the Secretary of Defense, or the President, but rather in the hope of introducing historic perspective into the consideration of the question of Vietnam "as we approach, apparently, another point of significant decision."

"Yes, we can put another 100,000 men into Vietnam, or, I suppose, 200,000 or even more; there are a lot of young Americans, even though the supply is not unlimited," he said.

"It is to be hoped, however, that before we embark on this course of expansion toward total war in Vietnam, we will pause for a long and sober think."

He concluded by saying that the situation in Vietnam is the most important problem facing United States today, adding:

"And that will continue to be the case, and all else will be subordinate, until this conflict can be ended in a fashion which preserves the integrity of political choice of the people of South Vietnam."

He was asked to yield by Sen. Aiken of Vermont, who observed: "It is unfortunate that the advice of the majority leader has not been accepted by the administration to the same degree as the advice of certain military leaders who have far more knowledge of weapons than they have of people.

Amen.

Intermediate School 201 and Urban Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 24, 1967

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, Prof. Preston R. Wilcox, of the Columbia School of Social Work, is the author of an interesting paper on the improvement of education in the urban ghetto which appeared in the Urban Review in July 1966. The Urban Review is published by the Center for Urban Education.

The article was prompted by the controversy over Intermediate School 201 in Manhattan, but it also raises the issue of community involvement in the formulation of public school policy. Professor Wilcox makes a provocative contribution to the discussion about the role of school, race, and community in the urban ghetto. The article follows:

The Controversy Over Intermediate School 201

(By Preston R. Wilcox)

Note.—I.S. 201—located between 127th Street and 128th Street and between Park and Madison Avenues in New York City—is scheduled to open in the Fall. The initials before the numeral mean that it is destined to be an "intermediate school", which is to say, it will serve children from the 5th through the 8th grade in accordance with the Board of Education's 4-4-4 plan for reorganizing the grade structure of the school system. Almost from the moment the Board announced its intention to build I.S. 201 on this site, the school has been the center of considerable controversy. Local community organizations such as Associated Community Teams (ACT), United Block Association (UBA), Massive Economic Neighborhood Development (MEND), Community Association of East Harlem Triangle, Inc., HARYOU-

ACT, and others have all voiced various degrees and kinds of protest to the opening of the school as currently planned. Built on stilts, with no windows facing onto the streets—its design has been viewed by some in the neighborhood as a symbol of the city's attitude to this impoverished area, the windowless facade standing for an averted eye. Other local spokesmen have pointed to the fact that the choice of this site for all intents and purposes guarantees that the school be segregated. In reply, the Board has conceded that I.S. 201 will have a student population of 50 percent Negro and 50 percent Puerto Rican, but Board spokesmen have asserted that there is no way around this unfortunate circumstance if the neighborhood is to have a new school at all.

(Late in April, the local school board for District Four (in which I.S. 201 falls) held an open meeting in the auditorium of James Fenimore Cooper Junior High School on Madison Avenue and 120th Street. Present at the meeting to listen to Parent Association representatives from almost every school in the District were Mayor John Lindsay, School Superintendent Bernard Donovan, and District Superintendent Daniel Schrieber. The attitle of the audience toward these leaders was distinctly hostile; speaker after speaker rose to demand action redressing their grievances against the public educational system of the city. More than one speaker referred to I.S. 201 as if its construction constituted a deliberate slap in the face of the community's pride and expectations. Superintendent Donovan defended the present plans for the school with firmness and vigor, saying that I.S. 201 would be provided with the best personnel and resources the Board could offer. From the remarks made following his presentations, however, it was clear that most of the local residents in the auditorium were not persuaded.

(Criticism of I.S. 201 voiced at the meeting seemed rather diffuse, with one speaker addressing the problem of segregation, another the problem of educational quality, another the "bad faith" of the Board. Several flyers being circulated among the audience reflected these concerns. But one longer paper seemed to touch on a problem which was all too evident at the meeting itself: the quite impersonal but real antagonism between these community representatives and the leaders of the school system.

(The author of the paper was Preston R. Wilcox, an Assistant Professor (of community organization) at the Columbia School of Social Work. Since the proposal contained in it has the support of several neighborhood groups with which Mr. Wilcox has worked closely over the past seven years, we are publishing this paper in the form of "an open letter", a presentation of one side of the controversy over I.S. 201.)

ONE VIEW AND A PROPOSAL

In this paper, I am going to set aside for the moment the issue of I.S. 201's segregated status and concentrate instead on what I see as an opportunity presented by the opening of this school to experiment with a new approach to relations between the community and the public educational system. This approach should not be construed as resignation in the face of continued school segregation, or as an acceptance of the "neighborhood school" as this is commonly regarded by opponents of integration. But if one believes that a segregated white school can be a "good" school, then one must believe that a segregated Negro and Puerto Rican school, like I.S. 201, can also be a "good" school. We must be concerned with those who are left behind and who will be left behind even if the best conceivable school desegregation program should be implemented. And behind my concern lies the conviction that one can be black (or white or Puerto Rican), reside and attend school in an enforced ghetto, and still be successfully educated to the limits of his potentialities.

I begin with the fact that the present public educational system is not training the vast majority of youth in the ghetto to anything like the limits of their potentialities.

If it is true that the public school system can do no more than it is already doing, then the communities of the poor must be prepared to act for themselves. The residents of the ghetto must seize the opportunity to assume a leadership role in the education of their own children, just as they must become involved in the direction of all programs set up to serve their needs. In this they claim only a chance to exercise, for better or worse, the same right which is exercised by some of those outside the ghetto. What this means is that "a community presence" be established at a high level of educational administration, and that an instrumentality be developed which would assure minority group parents of direct access to the channels of informed opinion and power.

In what follows, I am proposing a fundamental restructuring of the relations between school and community based on a radical redistribution of power. I am thinking of I.S. 201 and the population it will serve, but the relevance of what I propose to other schools and other communities should be readily apparent.

I suggest that a School-Community Committee be established at this school. It would be composed of individuals with close ties to, and knowledge of, the community. These individuals would be parents, local leaders and professionals in educational or social science fields who would be drawn from the community or outside it, if necessary. The Committee would be selected by parents of children enrolled in the school since these parents have already been alerted to their opportunity by the many neighborhood organizations in the area.

The first task of the School-Community Committee would be to screen and interview candidates for the position of principal. This may seem an extreme proposal, but it is essential if there is to be any cooperation between the school and the community. Moreover it is based on the fact that principals in the New York public school system have far more power and independence vis-a-vis the Board than is generally realized, or than they generally take advantage of. As such men as Edward Gottlieb and Elliot Schapiro have positively shown, the psychological stance of the principal toward his pupils and their backgrounds is a critical factor in his performance as an educator. A principal prepared to exploit his position for the benefit of his students is an inestimable asset to the community; such a man is the sine qua non of this experimental program. That the principal should be accountable to the parents of his students will be a new, and probably disagreeable experience for most men who have held this post in the New York system. But the man best suited for the role proposed here would be one whose devotion to education did not depend on his isolation from the community. Instead of being committed to the elimination in his pupils of all that he feels is repulsive in their backgrounds and values, this principal would be committed to utilizing these values as a resource for education.

Apart from selecting and supportively guiding the principal, the Committee would have extensive review functions. It would have access to all reports sent by school administrators to the District Supervisor and the Board of Education, and it would be empowered to hold open meetings to which parents and teachers would be invited to present their suggestions or complaints. Additionally, it would have the responsibility of providing a continuous review of the curriculum to ensure that it remains relevant to the needs and experience of the students and that it be sufficiently demanding to bring out their best possible performance.

Among the most important operational duties of the Committee would be the supervision and administration of all after-school and weekend programs held at the school. These activities should be directed on the one hand toward the students and on the other, toward adult members of the community. For the student, the Committee would operate remedial and enrichment programs in the school. Outside, it would take systematic responsibility for engaging the children in meaningful and effective community projects such as housing surveys, block cleanups, tutoral programs for younger children, publication of block newsletters, etc. The purpose of this effort, of course, would be to help the students adopt a positive stance toward their own communities and to stimulate them to employ their own intellectual resources outside the classroom as well as within. Students would also be assisted by the Committee in making career choices.

Reaching out to the adults, the Committee would first seek legal incorporation and work out procedures for annual elections to guarantee both continuity and representativeness. Then, as aspects of a thorough parent education and information program, the Committee would issue regular written reports to all community institutions and organizations, parents and other interested individuals, with regard to school enrollment, reading and mathematics levels of achievement, teacher turnover rates, curriculum content, and so on. In this way, parents will be enabled to measure the effectiveness of the educational program, and to better evaluate teacher performance. To relate the community to the school simply as an available, useful structure, the Committee might well sponsor a wide range of social events to be held there. The Committee should also concern itself with those larger issues such as police brutality and public safety, and the operations of the Welfare system, which impinge so critically on the lives of school children in the ghetto.

To provide a continuous link between the school staff and the Committee, the latter would be required to hire a full-time "educational expeditor." I apologize for the awkwardness of the title but it points up what would be his two most important qualifications: professional experience in education and an ability to get things done. He would be responsible for meeting with teachers and other administrative staff to hear and follow upon their problems and proposals, and to do the same for parents. As a representative of the Committee, he would also be permitted to make visits to classrooms at specified times, and to the homes of students. He would seek to involve local organizations in the affairs of the school and, as a means of meshing school and community even further, he would be in charge of training of local residents as "foster teachers." The latter would be recruited by the School-Community Committee to serve as advisors to specific classes in the school. They would be required to make home visitations, referrals for public and private welfare services, and to be involved in the after-school program.

There are a number of historical precedents for this scheme. One of them is very close to home, in Harlem. Leonard Covello, for whom, it is said, Fiorello LaGuardia built Benjamin Franklin High School on 116th St. and Roosevelt Drive, was one of the earliest advocates of the community-centered school. Before World War II, East Harlem was predominantly Italian and Covello was concerned lest a ruthless drive to "Americanize" the children of immigrants destroy "a great wealth of cultural resources" and, by an implicit process of invidious comparison, perpetuate in the minority population long-lasting feelings of inferiority. The school, therefore, should be sympathetically responsive to the customs and values of the community it serves. "In the concept of the community-centered school," he wrote in 1939, "we have, it seems to me, the ultimate objective of all education because it deals with the child in connection with his social background and in relation to all forces, disruptive as well as constructive, that contribute to his education."

More recently, in the Bannekar District of St. Louis, Assistant Superintendent Samuel Shepherd, Jr., has applied some of Covello's ideas to a school district which is 95 percent Negro in both pupil and teacher personnel. While Shepherd believes unequivocally in the educational value of school integration, he refuses to regard its continued postponement as an excuse for educational failure. By reaching toward the community's pride, he has effectively convinced parents, teachers and students that they do not have to be white to be a success.

Closer, operationally, to the experiment I am advocating, is the program of the Child Development Group in Mississippi. There, parents and local leaders among the black poor have been trained by nothern teachers and curriculum specialists to operate and set policy for their own Head Start program in eighty-four different locations. Their success in obtaining new funds from Washington, in addition to the attacks they have sustained from Senator Stennis, testify to their achievement.

In the light of the Mississippi experience, it might be asked why I do not propose that the people of the ghetto set up privately funded schools outside the public educational system. After all, in Jackson Heights, members of the Parents and Taxpayers Association have founded a recently accredited school in response to what they consider an evil of the present system. But whose public school system is this? If it belongs to the public, there should be no necessity for communities to set up parallel systems. Rather, the question is how can we alter the relationship between the administrators of the existing system and the people in such a way as to bring the services offered more clearly into line with what is desired by the clientele?

The experimental program I have outlined should go far toward answering this question. It rests on a hypothesis which many people will greet with skepticism and hostility: that a community can organize effectively around the process of educating its children and that it has the capacity to intervene directly in that process. Yet this hypothesis has been proven correct in other communities in the country, although I am not prepared to argue that it has been with invariably happy results. In New York City we do not elect our school officials and indeed the educational system has for so long been perceived as being "above" politics that its administrators are today alternately baffled and enraged to discover that they are squarely in the middle of it.

In the viewpoint of the ghetto, the problem is stated in terms of a fact: the present system has failed, and is failing, in its task of enabling minority group youth to seize the opportunities America holds out to its other citizens. Of course the fault is not entirely the system's. But what this experimental program offers is the possibility that, in at least one school in one community, the school administrators and teachers will be made accountable to the community, and the community made obligated to them, *in such a way that responsibility for successes and failures is shared*. In the process, one can expect the school in the ghetto to become what schools in more privileged areas already are, a reflection of local interests and resources, instead of a subtle rejection of them. For the operating philosophy of the existing system is too often manifested in a conscious or unconscious belittling of the values and life styles of much of its clientele. By granting that clientele access to the direction of the school, a vicious circle of blame and rejection may be broken. For the students at the school this should mean a significant change in the current pattern of rewards and punishments. Instead of approval being attached almost exclusively to matters of comportment and dress, rewards may come to be derived from one's obligation to his peers and community. We must find a better balance between scholarship and citizenship. Able to bring what is of value to him into the classroom, he may find there the courage to build on it. For the parents (and as many of them as possible should be enlisted in the program) an active participation in positions of influence in the school should help to bring about a change in their positions in the larger community.

Thus, beside all else, the School-Community Committee represents an effort to activate parents in the ghetto to assume a kind of responsibility which the dominant society has failed to exercise and from which they stand to gain the most, the education of their own children. This effort will be wrought with controversy and conflict, but it must be made.

WCBS Radio Urges Restrictive Federal Firearms Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 25, 1967

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the Senate Subcommittee To Investigate Juvenile Delinquency is presently conducting hearings on Federal firearms legislation. I am the sponsor of H.R. 5463, a bill to amend both the National Firearms Act and the Federal Firearms Act. Legislation of this type has been introduced in Congress for the past few years, but the powerful gun lobby has continually been successful in blocking any action.

The shocking and tragic events of the past week in New Jersey, and presently in Detroit and elsewhere in our country, speak even louder for the urgent need for immediate gun control legislation. The presence of rifles, machineguns, and handguns greatly added to the magnitude and violence of the rioting.

How many more riots, maimings and killings is this Nation going to experience before we enact effective firearms legislation.

I commend to the attention of our colleagues a WCBS editorial broadcast in New York City on July 18, 1967, concerning the need for gun control legislation.

The text of the broadcast follows:

WCBS RADIO URGES RESTRICTIVE FEDERAL FIREARMS LEGISLATION

As many of you know, major firearms legislation died in the last Congress. We have no doubt that rioting in Newark and in other American cities will spur the introduction of new and possibly more sweeping measures. The presence of large quantities of arms in Newark contributed to the severity of the disorder and was obviously a factor in the high toll of dead and injured. The powerful gun lobby, spearheaded by the National Rifle Association, stands four square in the way of meaningful gun legislation; but it is plain that the convenience of hunters and gun collectors must come second to the pressing need to keep weapons out of the hands of people of all races who should not have them.

This is, of course, easier said than done. The scope of the problem is large; rioting serves to place it in dramatic focus. In state after state there are virtually no restrictions on the sale of rifles and shotguns. Criminals can buy them. So can the mentally ill. It would be a clerical impossibility to screen potential gun buyers for criminal tendencies and mental disorders. Even if we had this sort of machinery, the easy availability of guns through mail order houses would erase any of the legal gains made on the state and local level.

The initiative must come from Congress. We believe the mail order sale of firearms to private citizens should be prohibited: this would probably cut interstate commerce in weapons to a trickle. Second, the sale of cannons, bazookas, mortars and the ammunition that goes with them should be banned by statute. Third, all gun purchases should be subject to a cooling-off period: days or even a week between ordering a weapon and delivery. Fourth, Federal registration of all firearms should be required, along with a computerized data bank that would provide local and state police with the names of gun owners on request.

New Jersey Governor Hughes, in deploring our lax gun laws, said during the height of the Newark rioting:

"Thanks to the Congress of the United States in delaying to adopt a gun control law, nothing could be simpler for persons intending to use them to order guns including submachine guns and automatic weapons; simply send off a mail order to some foreign state that doesn't prevent their sale and whether you're a narcotics addict or a mental patient or a convicted criminal or anything else there is nothing to impede your buying them."

What is ironic in the Governor's statement is that New Jersey last year passed a so-called "model" gun law. But model gun laws are worthless in one state if the neighboring states fail to develop similar measures. It is plainly an anachronism to allow Americans to continue to arm themselves. The days of the old West are gone. There are legitimate reasons for possessing firearms. But it is their indiscriminate sale and use that must be checked; and this can only be done effectively through Federal legislation.

Calendar for August

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 24, 1967

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is a great pleasure to call the attention of Congress and the American people to the very excellent program of the National Gallery of Art for the month of August.

The National Gallery is in every way the prominent center for the visual arts and the fine arts in our Nation's Capital, and we in Congress are certainly proud of its educational and artistic works. Therefore, I am inserting the August Calendar of Events for the National Gallery of Art in the RECORD today:

NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART—CALENDAR OF EVENTS, AUGUST 1967

New Exhibition: *15th and 16th Century European Drawings*. Central Gallery. August 27 through September 24.

New Publication: Catalogue. *15th and 16th Century European Drawings*. 64 pages, 8" x 9⅛", with foreword by A. Hyatt Mayor, 30 illustrations, $2.00 postpaid.

Continuing Exhibitions: *Gilbert Stuart,* (1775-1828), *Portraitist of the Young Republic.* Central Gallery. Through August 20.

Ginevra d'Benci by Leonardo da Vinci. New acquisition. Lobby B.

Recent Publications: Catalogue. *Gilbert Stuart Portraitist of the Young Republic.* 120 pages, 8½" x 9¾", with foreward by Edgar P. Richardson, 58 illustrations, catalogue notes, and index. $2.00 postpaid.

Ginevra d'Benci by Leonardo da Vinci. Booklet illustrated in color and black-and-white, with text by Perry B. Cott. 10 cents. Mail orders under $1.00, add 25 cents handling charge.

New Reproductions: Color Postcards: Sisley, *White Frost at Marly;* Cassatt, *Child in a Straw Hat;* Monet, *Banks of the Siene, Vétheuil;* Twachtman, *Winter Harmony;* Roger van der Weyden, *Saint George and the Dragon.* 5 cents each. Mail orders under $1, add 25 cents handling charge.

Daily Films: The American Vision: Weekdays, 2 and 7 p.m.; Sundays, 1 p.m. Art in the Western World: Weekdays, 4 p.m. In the auditorium. Each film, in color, runs about one-half hour.

Gallery Hours: Summer Hours. Through September 4: Weekdays 10 a.m. to 10 p.m. Sundays 12 noon to 10 p.m. Admission is free to the Gallery and to all programs scheduled.

Cafeteria: Summer Hours. Through September 4: Weekdays, Luncheon 11 a.m. to 2:30 p.m.; Snack Service 2:30 p.m. to 5 p.m.; Dinner 5 p.m. to 8 p.m. Sundays, Dinner 12 noon to 7:30 p.m.

MONDAY, JULY 31, THROUGH SUNDAY, AUGUST 6

Painting of the Week: Gossaert. *Portrait of a Banker* (Ailsa Mellon Bruce Fund). Gallery 40. Tuesday through Saturday, 12 and 2; Sunday, 3:30 and 6.

Tour: Introduction to the Collection. Rotunda, Monday, 11 and 3; Tuesday through Saturday, 11, 1, 3; Sunday, 2:30 and 5.

Sunday Film Lecture: *Aspects of Modern Sculpture. Speaker:* John Hand, Staff Lecturer, National Gallery of Art, Lecture Hall, 4.

MONDAY, AUGUST 7, THROUGH SUNDAY, AUGUST 13

Painting of the Week: Martin Johnson Heade. *Rio de Janeiro Bay* (Gift of the Avalon Foundation). Gallery 65, Tuesday through Saturday, 12 and 2; Sunday, 3:30 and 6.

Tour: Introduction to the Collection. Rotunda, Monday, 11 and 3; Tuesday through Saturday, 11, 1, 3; Sunday, 2:30 and 5.

Sunday Film Lecture: *Aspects of Modern Architecture. Speaker:* John Brooks, Staff Lecturer, National Gallery of Art. Lecture Hall, 4.

Inquiries concerning the Gallery's educational services should be addressed to the Educational Office or telephoned to 737-4215, Ext. 272.

MONDAY, AUGUST 14, THROUGH SUNDAY, AUGUST 20

Painting of the Week: Maurice-Quentin de La Tour. *Claude Dupouch* (Samuel H. Kress Collection). Gallery 54, Tuesday through Saturday, 12 and 2; Sunday, 3:30 and 6.

Tour: *Introduction to the Collection.* Rotunda, Monday, 11 and 3; Tuesday through Saturday, 11, 1, 3; Sunday, 2:30 and 5.

Sunday Film Lecture: *Aspects of Modern European Painting. Speaker:* Carleen Keating; Staff Lecturer, National Gallery of Art. Lecture Hall, 4.

MONDAY, AUGUST 21, THROUGH SUNDAY, AUGUST 27

Painting of the Week: Annibale Carracci. *Venus Adorned by the Graces* (Samuel H. Kress Collection). Gallery 33, Tuesday through Saturday, 12 and 2; Sunday, 3:30 and 6.

Tour: *Introduction to the Collection.* Rotunda, Monday, 11 and 3; Tuesday through Saturday, 11, 1, 3; Sunday 2:30 and 5.

Sunday Film Lecture: *Aspects of Modern American Painting, Speaker:* Troy Thomas, Summer Staff Lecturer, National Gallery of Art. Lecture Hall, 4.

Fifteen Thousand Respond to Poll by Congressman Albert H. Quie

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 24, 1967

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, every year since being elected a Member of Congress in 1958, I have distributed a public opinion questionnaire to my constituents in the First District of Minnesota. The responses from constituents on major issues facing the United States have proved to be extremely valuable.

This year the number of constituents answering the questionnaire exceeded 15,000 which illustrates the great concern they have with such overriding issues as the war in Vietnam, congressional ethics, and the rising cost of the Federal Government.

For example, I asked my constituents: "Please choose the one alternative you most favor for conducting the war in Vietnam." The answers were: A. Continue war at the present level—12.7 percent. B. Increase bombing of North Vietnam—69.6 percent. C. Leave at present level—17.7 percent. The fact that 69.6 percent of those replying to the questionnaire are in favor of increasing the bombing of North Vietnam, I believe, reflects a general feeling that the war should be brought to a conclusion.

Another question dealt with the way President Johnson is handling his job. Only 19 percent approved while 63.6 percent disapproved of his job performance. I believe this is especially significant.

The responses also reflected a strong sentiment to reduce nonmilitary spending while we are conducting a war in Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to place in the RECORD the 10 questions and the answers in my 1967 public opinion questionnaire:

1. Viet Nam War: Please choose the one alternative you most favor: A. Continue war at present level—12.7%; B. Increase bombing of North Viet Nam—69.6%; C. Stop bombing of North Viet Nam—17.7%.

2. Social Security: Benefits should be: A. Raised to match the rising cost of living with no tax increase—48.7%; B. Raised by 20% with a tax increase—13.7%; C. Left at present levels—37.6%.

3. Congressional ethics: The Powell and Dodd cases have reflected on the integrity of Congress. In these or similar cases, Congress should consider: A. Removal from the Congress—74.5%; B. Censuring but retention of seat—13.8%; C. Leaving problem to the voters—11.7%.

4. Farm: There has been some discussion about a ceiling on price support payments for larger farms. What do you most favor? A. Payment limitation—43.3%; B. No limit on size of payments—4.5%; C. An end to payments—52.2%.

5. Anti-ballistic missiles: The U.S. should: A. Build a complete $40 billion anti-missile defense system—31.9%; B. Protect part of the U.S. at less cost—23%; C. Negotiate with Russia to stop her anti-missile build-up—45.1%.

6. LBJ's job rating: Do you approve or disapprove of the way President Johnson is handling his job? A. Approve—19%; B. Disapprove—63.6%; C. Don't know—17.4%.

7. Drop in defense spending: When military spending drops, the U.S. should: A. Expand Federal domestic programs—9.5%; B. Return revenue to states—26.2%; C. Reduce Federal taxes—64.3%.

8. Postal rates: To reduce continuing deficits, the Post Office Department should: A. Raise rates on all classes of mail—5.6%; B. Raise rates only on so-called "junk" mail—74.4%; C. Become a non-profit government corporation—20%.

9. Draft: What change in Selective Service do you most favor? A. Adopt lottery system—23.5%; B. Keep present policies but tighten student deferments—59.5%; C. Change to a professional military corps—17%.

10. Federal deficits: The best way to hold down Federal deficits is to: A. Reduce domestic spending—70.6%; B. Reduce military spending—24.7%; C. Raise taxes—4.7%.

U.S. Policy in Southeast Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 25, 1967

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, a thoughtful addition to the debate over U.S. policy is Southeast Asia was provided by Capt. Harry F. Guggenheim, president and editor-in-chief of Newsday, in that newspaper this past Saturday.

Although Captain Guggenheim and I do not see eye to eye concerning American policy in Vietnam, it is clear that this essay by Mr. Guggenheim does provide an articulate and provacative representation of one point of view.

I include the essay by Captain Guggenheim in the RECORD at this point so the Members may have the opportunity to know the views and observations of this responsible and thoughtful American:

TRUTH AND VIETNAM

Where lies the truth in the war of words between the Vietnam hawks and doves?

Truth is always difficult to come by because there is no absolute truth. It varies with time and knowledge. Men reach their conclusions not by logic alone but by an intricate process entwined with emotions and personal experiences. These experiences are all very different, even for men living at one time and in the same place.

For example, one man is born in abject poverty and one with a silver spoon; there is the boy who fought nature on the farm and one who fought gangs on the city streets; there are the black and yellow and white men: the Protestants, the Catholic and the Jews; the ones who were reared in happy homes and the ones from broken homes; there are the men who are weak and the men who are the strong natural leaders. Each arrives at "truth" in his own way.

Most of our opinion-makers are men of diverse origins. They are to be found in the fields of politics, publishing, industry, small business, labor, jurisprudence, engineering, science, medicine, theology and the military. Moreover, they tend to approach inportant questions from the viewpoint of the particular field in which they are engrossed.

How, indeed, can they all reason together and hope to come to mutual conclusions?

This is especially difficult in the field of politics where men of diversity compete in the marketplace of public opinion for the support of the American people. Here, another impediment to common agreement emerges: the combativeness of politics.

THE PRESIDENTIAL YEAR

In the U.S., we elect a federal administration for a term of four years. Immediately after an election, the administration enjoys a brief honeymoon. At first, due to the popularity of a new President, opposition is guarded and reserved. But with the passage of time, the opposition party strikes out boldly to probe every weakness of the administration. A year before the election, it becomes open season on the President, and the political forces begin their most violent maneuvering. We are now in such a season, and there is little hope of reasoning together.

The war in Vietnam is the great political issue of the coming campaign both for ambitious and unhappy Democrats and for Republicans aspiring to take over the federal government. Seeking the truth in the war of words that will be heard between now and November 1968 is a task the average citizen will find baffling.

If, as Talleyrand once said, war is too important to be left to the generals, it is also too important to be left only to politicians. In our democracy, important decisions should be shaped by public discussion and opinion. That is why free speech must not be denied or otherwise impaired. The good judgment of the American people cannot be ignored in determining the truth about Vietnam.

Four federal administrations, three Democratic and one Republican, concluded that Asia was in danger of being taken over by international communism. The present administration determined to act with sufficient force to prevent Communist success in South Vietnam. Our policy stemmed from the desire to protect a small country under attack, to draw a line behind which New Zealand, Australia, the Philippines, Thailand, Malaysia, Japan and other small but independent Asian nations could flourish in safety, and to insure the security of our flank in the Pacific from a potentially beligerent China. When our Vietnam action began in force, we were called "paper tigers" and we were warned that we faced overwhelming defeat like the French. Now, after two years, we have forestalled a Communist takeover and are being called "murderous imperialists."

SECURITY AND PROGRESS

There have been valuable side benefits arising from our stand in Vietnam. Her own neighbors are far less fearful today of Chinese expansion. Malaysia, having cleaned its own jungles of Communist guerrillas after a bitter 12-year battle, feels secure to develop internally as a free nation. Indonesia rose up against Communist infiltrators and provocateurs. Burma, which had maintained good ties with China, is now at odds with Peking.

We are accused in Vietnam of interfering in a civil war. After throwing the French out of Indochina. Ho Chi Minh with Chinese backing imposed a Communist state on North Vietnam. More than 1,000,000 refugees fled south, only to discover in 1959 that Ho had designs on South Vietnam as well. Meanwhile, South Vietnam had been taken over by warlords with anti-Communist tendencies. They offered promises of eventual democratic action. They appealed to us for help in securing their independence. We responded, in a cause we considered just and for our own self-interest in the Pacific.

We have repeatedly been told by some critics of our military action that there is no "real" Communist threat in Southeast Asia, that we are obsessed with this notion and that the struggle in Southeast Asia is one of nationalism and not communism. If this is so, is it not because our military, political and economic aid to the South Vietnamese helped to rebuff the Communist threat?

Critics of our military policy say that we must negotiate a peace. There have been innumerable attempts to bring about a cease-fire and a conference. But the consequences of some of the critics' proposals would, in effect, mean that after winning the war, we could lose the peace.

We are told that we must make a new approach in our Asian policy; we must improve cultural, political and trade relations with China. Have we not undertaken this approach with only rebuffs from China? The latest evidence was our offer to send medical supplies to alleviate an epidemic of cholera in China. This was rudely refused and branded as an "American imperialist dirty trick." We must persist in our attempts to establish better communications with the Chinese people who have long ties of friendship with Americans. But we must not relax our vigilance toward the dangers of the regime led by dictator Mao, who has demanded "wars of liberation" for Southeast Asia and the rest of the world.

In addition to those with special motivations for wanting us to abandon our position, there are millions of people both here and throughout the world who are deeply moved by the horrors of war and demand an end to all war. This is a yearning in mankind that has become increasingly evident in modern times, and at this moment in particular. But how to end war? Surely not by shouting: "No more war. Stop the bombs. Yankees go home."

Because of the opposition of the Communist countries, the United Nations has no way to bring about a cease-fire. There can be no unilateral armistice, nor can there be a peace conference to bring justice to Southeast Asians, unless all the interested states participate. As long as there are in the world dictators intent on power, maintained by demagoguery, a unilateral cease-fire cannot bring peace.

There is no power today other than armed force to say to nations determined to subjugate their neighbors: You may go this far, but no further.

Critics also have expressed fear that our attempts to shorten the war by increasing military pressure on Hanoi may lead to a nuclear war. If China had the nuclear power and thought she might destroy the U.S., perhaps she would undertake such a mad adventure. This is not within China's present ability.

PEACE THROUGH STRENGTH

It is also apparent that Russia does not relish World War III any more than we do. She wants us out of Southeast Asia but not at that price. We can, however, continue to expect trouble from the Soviets. They demonstrated this at the recent sessions of the United Nations called in the hope of preventing an Arab-Israeli war. Russia and her supporters were not interested in a peaceful solution of problems in the Mideast. Their objective was to gain a dominant influence in Arab affairs, at Israel's expense, if necessary. Only the initiative, spirit and military elan of Israel saved that small nation from extinction.

Russia refused to join with the U.S. in keeping the peace in the Mideast, just as she refuses to join the U.S. in establishing an honorable peace in Southeast Asia for the benefit of the suffering humanity in that part of the world.

This war has been called a dirty war and the war of a great power against a small underdeveloped nation. All wars are dirty wars. We yearn for that day when war will be something from the barbaric past. The U.S. forces have used great restraint and their military actions have been carried out in an attempt to protect civilians in a manner never practiced before by a military power. Nevertheless the horrors of the Vietnam war are before us daily, dramatized to a far greater degree than that of any previous war.

In a world not ready for the management of international affairs by reason, we must not abandon our position of strength. There is no shortcut to peace, as there is no shortcut to the gradual civilization of men intent on pilfering and murdering their neighbors. Until men of good will from all nations, regardless of their political, economic and religious ideology, demand a cessation of all war, mankind must suffer wars. Wars, sought or unsought, are won only by the strong.

A Tribute to William S. Drake

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 20, 1967

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, death recently claimed one of the greatest public servants that my hometown, Austin, Tex., has ever had the privilege of knowing.

The passing of William Sherman Drake, a former mayor and city councilman, closes another chapter in a history of outstanding leadership that has been an integral part of the municipal development of the capital of the State of Texas.

Under unanimous consent I place in the RECORD an editorial from the Austin, Tex., American-Statesman in praise of the record of accomplishment of this dedicated public servant.

The editorial follows:

[From the Austin (Tex.) American-Statesman, July 21, 1967]

DRAKE GAVE LASTING PUBLIC SERVICE

William Sherman Drake rendered a lasting public service to his city as its mayor. He served as councilman and mayor at a time of substantial harmony in city government, and of notable progress in the city's growth and economic progress. His service was marked by good government, the fuctioning of the council-manager plan of municipal operation as it is supposed to work—a proper division of the responsibilities of policymaking in the council and of administrative housekeeping in the employed executive and the staff responsible to him.

Bill Drake contributed much more to Austn than his useful, unpaid services in municipal government. For many years, he headed one of the city's pioneer and major business concerns, and under his guidance it grew to earn recognition over the state for modern business and merchandising procedures by local, independent, home-owned firms.

He was a member of a family which has been among Austin's leaders for two-thirds of a century; and he in full measure contributed his share to the traditions of the family and the institutions in its charge.

Mayor Drake was a conservative in his personal politics, as he was in his business attitudes; but he did not, in public or private matters, permit that solid-based conservative attitude to react against or dissipate the progressive spirit of a progressive city.

We are privileged to look on Bill Drake and his career as proud possessions of the city, treasured symbols of good government and sound tradition and, a lasting monument of integrity and character and service in the heritage of Austin's trustees for the future.

Loosening the White Collar

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 25, 1967

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the white-collar worker—because he is increasing in number among the labor force of this Nation—has been the subject of considerable study, especially by trade union researchers.

A recent article in the American Federationist, the official monthly magazine of the AFL-CIO, written by Robert B. Cooney, assistant editor of the publication, discusses this subject in depth.

Under unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, I include Mr. Cooney's interesting analysis, in the RECORD, as follows:

LOOSENING THE WHITE COLLAR

(By Robert B. Cooney)

News item: "Teachers Union Wins Election in Baltimore"—Washington Post headline, June 17, 1967.

News item: "200 Mt. Vernon Teachers Ask for Jobs Elsewhere"—New York Times headline on teachers protesting low pay, June 17, 1967.

News item: "2,000 Demonstrate for Postal Pay Rise"—New York Times headline on city's postal council rally, June 18, 1967.

News item: 250 custodial workers at Harvard University strike for recognition of their union, the first strike in the 335year history of the school. June 1967.

News item: "Police Families Picket in Detroit"—Wives and children of Detroit policemen, 300 strong, picketed police headquarters today in a new phase of a drive to get their breadwinners more money. Washington Evening Star, June 19, 1967.

These current events are simply continuing a national pattern of the past few years. There has been an unusual restiveness running through America. In the midst of these happenings, it is difficult to gauge the depth of change or assess its full implications. But the news on any given day reflects discontent.

Public employes banned from striking decided they had to violate harsh laws to win their demands. Nurses strike in San Francisco. Hospital custodial employes in New York City and Maryland. Policemen in Detroit and firemen in Atlanta. Social workers in New York City and Los Angeles. Schoolteachers in most large and medium-size cities and college professors as well. Garbage collectors and doctors, too.

One of the most unexpected figures to be found in this ferment is the white collar worker, the "typical" worker in the labor force today. By 1970, one of every two workers will wear a white collar. His ranks will total 38 million.

Who wears this white collar? The group embraces an enormous job range. Of several people walking through the lobby of an office building, it would take a critical eye to identify the company president, the engineer, the bookkeeper, the clerk.

The managers and supervisory personnel aside, there remains an enormous organizing potential for the labor movement. The crucial questions now may be in the process of being answered. Is the white collar worker more receptive to unions? Is there widespread discontent among white collar employees? Is an indigenous leadership springing up to articulate white collar needs? Are unions available?

It might be helpful first to review the major obstacles which have stood between the white collar worker and the labor movement in the past.

THE WHITE-COLLAR ATTITUDE

The white collar worker has been a subject of study, concern and fascination ever since workforce trends made it clear he was becoming the dominant, the "typical" worker. What is this person like? How will he behave? What does he want out of life? Will he remain status-conscious and always be a follower? Will he continue to be politically neuter instead of voting his own interests? Will he unionize?

From the 1930s to the 1960s, there have been articles and studies which support every shade of expert opinion. Those who heard rumbles of discontent just after World War II wrote about "White Collar Workers on the March." One writer expressed his judgment in the title of a Harper's magazine article in 1957: "Why White Collar Workers Can't Be Organized." A professor looking at the coming tidal wave of students in 1962 answered affirmatively the title of his article, "Will the College Teacher Organize?" An expert observer writing in the early 1950s argued that the labor movement had reached the saturation point in membership. He predicted continued union failure among white collar workers because the latter were automatically granted the same gains won by blue collar workers and because of their strong status consciousness.

Upward mobility, the desire to be promoted and "get ahead" is probably the major reason for most white collar workers having remained outside of unions. This aspiration was reenforced by an air of superiority towards manual work, an attitude going back to feudal times. The more skillful employers recognized these ambitions, status cravings and sense of "differentness." White collar workers were paid salaries and used to enjoy many fringe benefits which the production worker lacked: paid vacations, holidays, sick leave and so on. And they also had relative employment stability.

Professor Albert Blum has reported on surveys which point up the extent of these attitudes. More than 75 percent of the white collar employes in a 1957 survey conducted by the Opinion Research Corporation said they viewed themselves as belonging more with management than with production workers. Other studies of white collar attitudes, he said, rate "opportunity to train for higher skills" and "firm promotion policies" high on the list of desirable management programs.

But what happens when the world of the white collar worker changes so drastically that he is forced, however reluctantly, to face the facts of life? With white collar workers now the majority group, the "typical" workers in the nation today, it becomes more apparent that all can't become chiefs. Illusion must eventually give way to reality.

Sociologist C. Wright Mills perceived this rising tension when he wrote in his book, "White Collar," in 1951:

"In the minds of the white collar workers a struggle has been going on between economic reality and anti-union feeling. Whatever their aspirations, white collar people have been pushed by twentieth century facts toward the wage worker kind of organized economic life and slowly their illusions have been moving into closer harmony with the terms of their existence.

"They are becomin gaware that the world of the old middle class, the community of entrepeneurs, has given way to a new society in which they, the white collar workers, are part of a world of dependent employes. Now,

"They are becoming aware that the world alongside unions and steelworkers and coal miners, there are unions of office workers and musicians, salesgirls and insurance cen."

Today's world of the white collar worker includes the same technological change and automation which has had such a great impact on production workers since the 1950s.

The machine is transforming the office. There are "invisible" firings or non-hirings as the same number of employes produce far more. The office workload is becoming more highly rationalized, the tasks more routine and boring.

At the same time, the ladder to the top is being blocked. The age of the computer and modern management techniques have given rise to a middle level made up of college-trained technicians and professionals. The lower grades of white collar workers now face a ceiling on their advancement. And it follows that grievances and needs submerged in the dream of promotion will find an outlet.

There are observers who feel that recognition that upward advancement is blocked will be the most important factor in moving many white collar workers toward unionism.

But another—and unanticipated—happening is that the new fast-growing class of technicians and professionals has shown it can be quick to organize into unions or associations to further its common interests. And proximity to unions is another key factor in developing a favorable attitude toward self-unionization.

Another reality facing white collar workers is that many earlier advantages they enjoyed either have been wiped out or are being quickly narrowed. The blue collar unions have raised wage levels considerably, have made rapid gains in such fringe benefits as paid vacations and holidays, severance pay, sick leave and health insurance and pensions.

In fact, the key advantage belongs to the worker with a union. The union worker has all his contract gains as a matter of earned right. What the white collar worker has been granted by management can also be taken away or reduced arbitrarily. A contract contributes a sense of dignity and self-respect which is crucially important.

As far as the employer is concerned, it appears most of the things management is doing and will have to do for its own purposes will enhance the prospects for white collar unionization.

Management will be able to "buy off" the white collar group less and less. As the office, technical and professional workers become a larger proportion of the firm's workforce, they represent a growing labor cost. As competitive pressures require it, management will try to rationalize this workgroup, make it more efficient, cut costs, and try to raise its productivity. A "good" management will regard the white collar group—which already outnumbers the production group in some manufacturing firms—like any other production worker group and so induce it to behave the part.

To illustrate. In the current issue of Michigan Business Review, management consultant Bruce Payne claims the efficiency of the average office ranges from 60 to 80 percent. In effect, it is asserted that, of every 100 office workers, 20 to 40 produce nothing.

"Today, less than 5 percent of the total clerical workforce in the United States is measured against accurate standards of a 'fair day's work'," Payne writes. "On the other hand, over 80 percent of the blue collar workers are working under some form of modern work measurement system."

The time and motion man is coming into the office, Payne predicts, because it is possible to measure and control office work accurately and economically. Companies using new tools of clerical work control have cut labor costs by 20 percent and more, he reports.

Since white collar workers are expected to total 38 million by 1970 compared to 28 million blue collar workers, Payne believes it is obvious where management must turn to cut costs.

Blue collar workers have been through all this. And they found their only protection against the time-study speed-up was their union. White collar workers are not likely to behave any differently.

In discussing how employers might preserve the white collar dream of upward mobility, Professor Blum claims that many are trying to train present employes for automation-age jobs and promote them on merit. And, he adds, many office employes are women who do not aspire to move upward as much as men and who have been less susceptible to unionism. If a firm promotes the men and lets attrition take care of the women, "management need have less fear and unions less hope that the white collar employes will sign a union card."

It so happens that women have been entering the labor force in large numbers, they are better educated and trained today and are likely to remain on the job as long as family responsibilities permit. Whoever thinks they will let themselves be bypassed or that they make poor union material might ask himself when he last won an argument with a woman.

And it might be noted that a merit system is not at all inconsistent with unionism. A professor who studied engineering unions noted that, in a case where the company based its proposed layoff system on seniority, "only at the insistence of the engineers was weight given to education and ability as well as length of service. . . ." It is also true that, when a union argues for an employe on promotions and grievances, fairness can replace favoritism. Thus a union can become the white collar worker's most reliable means of moving up in a more realistic context.

WHITE COLLAR GROWTH

The white collar occupations not only make up a majority of the workforce today. In the years ahead, white collar jobs will increase twice as fast as blue collar jobs. The U.S. Department of Labor, in its projections for the 1965–75 period, estimates an employment increase of 32 percent for white collar occupations and 14 percent for blue collar.

There are four basic white collar groups defined by the Department of Labor and this is how they are expected to grow:

[In millions]

	1965	Projected, 1975	Percent change
Professional, technical, and kindred	8.9	12.9	45
Managers, officials, proprietors	7.3	9.2	25
Clerical and kindred	11.2	14.6	31
Sales workers	4.7	5.8	23

As far as the organizable groups are concerned, the managerial group must be excluded as well as the supervisory personnel in the other groups.

The potential for union growth may be seen in these Labor Department projections:

Professional, technical and kindred

Personnel needs are expected to rise substantially in almost every field—teaching, health professions, social sciences, clergy and law and in engineering and natural sciences. In teaching, the largest profession, employment is expected to rise to 2.7 million by 1975, about a half million higher than 1965. By 1975, there may be a need for 1.5 million engineers—a rise of 500,000 over 1965—and the need for scientists may approach 600,000. The number of technicians working with engineers and scientists was about 625,000 in 1965 and this total may swell to over 1 million by 1975.

Clerical workers

The rising tide of communications, recordkeeping and paperwork is expected to more than offset the labor-saving effects of computers and other office machines. Thus clerical employment is expected to rise to 13.1 million by 1970 and to 14.6 million by 1975. The Labor Department foresees a rapid expansion of finance, insurance and other areas employing many clerical workers. Automation in the office is expected to have the greatest impact on those doing such routine work as billing, inventory control and processing of insurance records, bank checks and payrolls.

Sales workers

Sales employment is expected to hit 5.3 million by 1970 and 5.8 million by 1975. The underlying reasons for this increase are population growth and rising per capital income. Part-time sales jobs also will increase. These sales job gains are expected to outweigh self-service and other labor-saving innovations.

THE CREATION OF SPACE

The apparent white collar awakening is finding expression in a variety of forms. White collar people are joining unions which have been available a long time, like the Teachers and State-County. They have compelled professional associations and company unions to engage in strikes and union-style bargaining practices. And blue collar unions in manufacturing have responded by creating white collar and technical departments.

But one of the most promising developments was an action by organized labor at the highest level. In mid-1966, the AFL–CIO Executive Council authorized the creation of a white collar and professional council.

In March 1967, a founding convention called by 17 unions formed a council of AFL–CIO unions for Scientific, Professional and Cultural Employes (SPACE).

The 17 unions in SPACE represent about 400,000 scientific, professional and cultural workers. The SPACE constitution permits the affiliation of whatever portion of a union's membership is in this area, with a 1 cent per member per month tax financing SPACE activities.

The council set itself four primary functions. It will prepare and distribute literature on what unions can do for professionals and other white collar employes. It will carry on research on problems common to the member unions. It will sponsor conferences on matters of mutual interest and it will promote joint action on legislative goals.

The unions which founded SPACE are Actors Equity, American Guild of Musical Artists; Barbers; Broadcast Employes and Technicians; Communications Workers; Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers; International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers; Insurance Workers; Musicians; Office and Professional Employes; Operating Engineers; Retail Clerks; Seafarers; Stage Employes; State, County and Municipal Employes; Teachers and the Technical Engineers.

Other unions which sent observers to the founding conference included the United Auto Workers, Airline Dispatchers and American Federation of Government Employes. The independent American Nurses Association also was represented.

PROSPECTS FOR WHITE-COLLAR UNIONISM

Whether and when and how the white collar worker would move toward self-organization has been a subject for speculation over the decades. But the ferment of the 1960s has inspired fresh assessments.

Gus Tyler, who has just published a book called "The Labor Revolution," deals with the white collar group in what amounts to a theory of the stages of union growth.

"Organization waits until groups differentiate their interest from those of their employer," Tyler said recently.

"During the craft worker period from 1900 to 1935, 10 to 12 percent of the non-agricultural employed were represented. In the craft-industrial worker era from 1935 to the present, the percentage was doubled. Organization of the new worker may, within a decade, result in 40 to 50 percent of the labor force organized."

Tyler is quite confident that "labor's new growth will spring from unions dedicated to the organization of white collar, service, government-employed and professionals."

Tyler believes this has been happening for the past couple of years, pointing to teachers and government workers and nurses and office employes.

"I think it is picking up momentum," Tyler declares, "and by the end of the 1960s we will see a kind of revolution in the American trade union movement that is the equivalent of the revolution of the CIO in the mid-1930s and of the AFL in the 1900s."

Tyler calls it "a quiet revolution" but one he believes will have a significant economic and political impact because white collar groups already have shown themselves to be articulate and militant.

Similar optimistic views were expressed in "White Collar Trade Unions," a collection of essays published in 1966 and edited by Professor Adolf Sturmthal of the University of Illinois.

These essays, which examine developments in a number of industrialized nations, find the labor force changing from blue to white collar in all nations studied, with the process furthest advanced in the United States.

Professor Everett Kassalow of the University of Wisconsin wrote the chapter on U.S. white collar unionism. He finds the factors which retarded white collar unionism in the past now changing as office work is routinized, as unions and collective bargaining become more accepted and as the AFL–CIO adapts its techniques and strategy. He regards a government estimate of 2.6 million white collar union members in 1964 as rather low.

Sturmthal, in summarizing the essays, writes:

"International experience indicates that it is possible to organize white collar workers on a large scale even though they lend themselves less well to organization than most blue collar workers."

Another observer has no doubt about what has been happening in the white collar field, particularly among public employes.

"The 1960s have already earned the right to go down in labor relations history as the decade of the public employe," declares Jack Stieber, Director of the School of Labor and Industrial Relations at Michigan State University.

Stieber points out some of the subtle and pervasive influences which the newly-unionized workers might contribute:

"Government employes who join unions could change the image of the labor movement to make it more acceptable to white collar employes and technicians in private industry," he says. And, he adds:

"If the teachers of the United States join unions in large numbers, youngsters may reevaluate the role of labor in society."

In this connection, it should be remembered that an outstanding characteristic of the growing labor force is its youth.

In summary, the expert observers commenting in recent years see the basic preconditions changing favorably for white collar unionism. The long-cherished dream of promotion after promotion leading the office worker to the top ranks of management has burst. A more professional management will stress productivity in the office, try to cut back labor costs and trim status privileges, thereby increasing white collar discontent. The spread of unionism among teachers and government employes may furnish models for young people and office employes in private industry.

But a key factor consistently underestimated is indigenous leadership and a rank and file willingness to act. Groups of workers long exploited, dedicated in their jobs and professions, are finding voice and courage. Many are doing what some observers have said they would never do. Organizing.

Hospitals, Too, Are Victims of Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 26, 1967

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the propaganda drums are beating in Washington, ably directed by the administration, to blame the hospitals and medical profession for the growing cost of hospital care. In its July 23 edition the Harvey Tribune very properly, effectively, and clearly discussed the inflationary complications facing hospitals as it discussed the case of Ingalls Memorial Hospital, Harvey, Ill., which is a typical not-for-profit community hospital whose problems deserve our thoughtful review. I insert the editorial at this point in the RECORD:

HOSPITALS, TOO, ARE VICTIMS OF INFLATION

The cost of staying alive and healthy is steadily increasing along with just about everything else today and it came as no surprise to us to learn that "soaring operational costs" (see page one) had made an increase in the patient service charge at Ingalls Memorial hospital mandatory.

Hospital costs are a victim of arithmetic. During the past 20 years, hospital services available to the community have increased substantially, both in quantity and complexity. Rapid advances in medical science in the last 20 years have increased the complexity of hospital care. Hospitals are saving lives, curing diseases, easing pain and insuring good health at a bewildering pace.

And, the public continues to demand more and better services from hospitals. To meet these demands for improved care which medical advances are making possible, hospitals have had to hire more skilled personnel, buy new equipment and build more and better facilities.

At the same time, the cost of materials and supplies has been spiraling as an effect of the regular inflationary cycle.

Perhaps the major cause for increased hospital costs has been the demand in the labor market for skilled medical employees who are now needed for complex hospital care. With the inflationary economy of today, the hospital must be competitive in wage, salary and fringe benefits in order to attract and hold the quality of personnel necessary to provide efficient care.

The same percentage increase in the hourly rate paid to general industry personnel must be met by the hospital, because the hospital depends upon its labor to the extent that 62 cents of every dollar the hospital receives is paid out in wages and salaries to its employees.

Hospitals lack the opportunity to increase productivity per man-hour to the extent possible in industry. Many of the cost reducing techniques used in industry, such as automation, cannot be applied to the hospital. If hospitals hope to close the wage gap, there is no place for hospital costs to go but up.

The patient may see only a handful of the total number of persons directly or indirectly involved in his care. Yet, one patient's care may involve many hospital staff members from the registered nurse to therapeutic dietician, receptionist, lab technician, maintenance men, housekeeping employees and security officers.

Included in the hospital's daily service charge are morning coffee and three meals served at the patient's bedside; general nursing care; complete linen service; routine hospital supplies; specialized equipment; meticulous housekeeping under the direction of an executive housekeeper; admitting; medical records; incoming telephone service; and building maintenance—with hundreds of visitors passing through each day.

Because hospital charges are based on actual cost, the small surplus that is realized at the end of the year does not begin to pay for replacement of obsolete equipment or meet demands for new equipment.

Without contributions and the vast amount of service provided by volunteer groups in the community, such as the Women's Auxiliary of Ingalls Memorial hospital, costs would be higher.

While many of us take the not-for-profit community hospital for granted, the life or lives of our loved ones may depend in the next 10 minutes on the maintenance of our hospital facilities. We will undoubtedly hear more alarming reports of hospital costs increasing, but these costs need no apologies . . . only understanding.

Callous Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RICHARD D. McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 19, 1967

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, the Buffalo Evening News in its Saturday July 22 edition carried an excellent editorial regarding the action taken by the House of Representatives last Thursday in rejecting the so-called rat extermination bill. I join with this newspaper in expressing disappointment over this action. The defeat of President Johnson's proposal to assist in the control and extermination of rats is a blow to those wishing to clean up our Nation's slums.

The editorial follows:

CALLOUS CONGRESS

Rats are loathsome creatures that spread deadly diseases and, as a congresswoman noted, have killed more persons in the world "than all the generals in history." Each year, in the slums of America, these rodents bite thousands of children—some fatally. They are anything but a laughing matter—except apparently to some members of Congress.

Amid guffaws against creating a "rat bureaucracy" and a "high commissioner of rats," a House majority rejected President Johnson's proposed $40 million rodent extermination bill just one day after overwhelmingly approving legislation to crack down on riot agitation. Evidently it does not occur to many lawmakers that one way to help prevent a climate which agitators can exploit is to do something about rat-infested tenements in the nation's big cities.

The defeated bill would have provided federal matching grants to states and cities for rodent control. Opponents argued that this was a local rather than federal problem, but it should be apparent to all that slum conditions, in every aspect, are very much a matter of federal concern; and certainly it is ironic, as Mr. Johnson bitterly commented on hearing of the House action, to deny our children the same protection from predators that federal funds now give our livestock. To say, furthermore, as some economy-minded congressmen did, that the nation can't afford to undertake this relatively minor expense at this time is to exhibit a strange set of values and priorities.

But a special reason for regretting the House vote at this particular time is its psychological effect upon millions of slum dwellers during a period of spreading urban strife and anarchy. In voting to curb riots but to deny a modest program for improved rodent control, the House has shown at best a most unfortunate insensitivity to slum problems in their fullest perspective.

Illinois Man Awarded Congressional Medal of Honor Posthumously

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 26, 1967

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, a neighbor of mine from Lyons, James W. Robinson, Jr., made the supreme sacrifice in Vietnam. Sergeant Robinson was killed when he charged and destroyed a Vietcong machinegun nest during fierce combat with the Communist enemy.

The Congressional Medal of Honor, which is the Nation's highest military decoration, was awarded posthumously on July 12. It was presented to James W. Robinson, the sergeant's father, at ceremonies at the Pentagon. Also in attendance were his mother and brother, Thomas.

Mr. Robinson told those present that his son had a message for the American people. He said:

> The American people are soft, decadent, surrounded by gadgets in a world on fire.

The elder Robinson went on to tell of his son's great interest in foreign affairs and how he was strongly in favor of our efforts in Vietnam:

> He'd say, "All you have to do is get out a map and look at Vietnam, and you'll see it is the key to the Far East and it is worth any sacrifice to keep it."

Sergeant Robinson had previously been awarded the following other decorations: Purple Heart Medal, Good Conduct Medal, National Defense Service Medal, Vietnam Campaign Ribbon, Republic of Vietnam Military Merit Medal, Republic of Vietnam Gallantry Cross with Palm, Combat Infantryman's Badge, and a rifle sharpshooting badge. He served in the U.S. Marine Corps from 1959 to 1962 and enlisted in the U.S. Army December 9, 1963. He had been in Vietnam since 1965.

James W. Robinson, Jr., was born August 30, 1940, in Hinsdale, Ill. His attendance at Morton West High School, Berwyn, Ill., was interrupted by his service in the Marines. He earned four letters in football while in high school.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the citation which accompanied the Medal of Honor:

The President of the United States of America, authorized by Act of Congress, March 3, 1863, has awarded in the name of The Congress the Medal of Honor, posthumonously, to Sergeant James W. Robinson, Jr., United States Army, for conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity in action at the risk of his life above and beyond the call of duty:

On April 11, 1966, Company C, 2d Battalion, 16th Infantry was engaged in fierce combat with a Viet Cong battalion. Despite the heavy fire, Sergeant Robinson moved among the men of his fire team, instructing and inspiring them, and placing them in advantageous positions. Enemy snipers located in nearby trees were inflicting heavy casualties on forward elements of Sergeant Robinson's unit. Upon locating the enemy sniper whose fire was taking the heaviest toll, he took a grenade launcher and eliminated the sniper. Seeing a medic hit while administering aid to a wounded sergeant in front of his position and aware that now the two wounded men were at the mercy of the enemy, he charged through a withering hail of fire and dragged his comrades to safety, where he rendered first aid and saved their lives. As the battle continued and casualties mounted, Sergeant Robinson moved about under intense fire to collect from the wounded their weapons and ammunition and redistribute them to able-bodied soldiers. Adding his own fire to that of his men, he assisted in eliminating a major enemy threat. Seeing another wounded comrade in front of his position, Sergeant Robinson again defied the enemy's fire to effect a rescue. In so doing he was himself wounded in the shoulder and leg. Despite his painful wounds, he dragged the soldier to shelter and saved his life by administering first aid. While patching his own wounds, he spotted an enemy machine gun which had inflicted a number of casualties on the American force. His rifle ammunition expended, he seized two grenades and, in an act of unsurpassed heroism, charged toward the entrenched enemy weapon. Hit again in the leg, this time with a tracer round which set fire to his clothing, Sergeant Robinson ripped the burning clothing from his body and staggered indomitably through the enemy fire, now concentrated solely on him, to within grenade range of the enemy machine gun position. Sustaining two additional chest wounds, he marshalled his fleeting physical strength and hurled the two grenades thus destroying the enemy gun position as he fell dead upon the battlefield. His magnificent display of leadership and bravery saved several lives and inspired his soldiers to defeat a numerically superior enemy force. Sergeant Robinson's conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity, at the cost of his life, are in keeping with the finest traditions of the United States Army and reflect great credit upon the 1st Infantry Division and the United States Armed Forces.

San Fernando Valley Neighborhood Legal Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED REINECKE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 26, 1967

Mr. REINECKE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of the House the outstanding accomplishments and service of the San Fernando Valley Neighborhood Legal Services. Under the able direction of Mr. Stephen N. Besser, this program, operating under a Federal grant from the Office of Economic Opportunity, has rendered legal service to more than 6,000 people in the San Fernando Valley area of Los Angeles.

There are more than 1 million people living in our valley. Of these an estimated 116,000 are in an income bracket where they would be unable to pay for their own legal advice.

I am pleased that many private attorneys in my district have contributed their professional services to this program. This is one area in which concrete service can be given to those who need it from every circumstance.

I wish to commend Mr. Besser and his colleagues for their fine work.

Nowata County Mourns Civic Leader W. D. Burch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 26, 1967

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, one of northeastern Oklahoma's most dedicated civic leaders, W. D. Burch, Sr., is being widely mourned following his fatal heart attack in Nowata July 10.

Mr. Burch was a native of Tennessee, where he was born on March 7, 1894, but he had lived in Oklahoma since coming to Muskogee in 1900.

A member and deacon of the First Presbyterian Church in Nowata, he was also a county director of the Salvation Army, secretary-treasurer of the Nowata Lions Club and its former president, and active in the United Fund and the Chamber of Commerce of Nowata.

An overseas veteran of World War I, he was active in both the Veterans of Foreign Wars and the American Legion in Nowata. He played a leading role in the establishment of Nowata's civic center, Freeman Hall, and was one of the developers of the Nowata Lions Club swimming pool.

His survivors include his beloved wife, Hester; his daughter, Mrs. Kathryn Cummings of Muskogee; his son, Wesley D. Burch, Jr., of Bartlesville; two sisters, Mrs. Faye Hanks of Muskogee, and Mrs. Gladys Butler of Soper; five grandchildren and five greatgrandchildren.

Mr. Burch's contribution was recognized by the Nowata Daily Star in an editorial on July 11, and the text of that editorial follows:

W. D. BURCH

Not every community is fortunate to have a number of citizens vitally interested in its betterment. Nowata County has many men and women who give of their time and talents toward developing a still better place to work, live, rear a family, attend church and contribute to the general welfare of the community.

This description well fits Wesley D. Bruch, Sr., who died here Monday. He was not a long time resident in the sense he was born and reared here. He has been a working member of the Nowata County area since 1948, and he made his efforts count. He helped establish the Lions Club swimming pool, he was active with other civic minded citizens in securing Freeman Hall for a community center in which the Nowata County City Library is housed.

Burch had time for politics—as we all should—his church and community and family. We are sure he inspired others in the community to help in building a still better Nowata County.

Memphis Newsman Writes His Congressman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAN KUYKENDALL

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 26, 1967

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Speaker, a pertinent question as to the advisability of employing civilians to do the same work alongside military personnel is raised by Eldon Roark, who writes for the Memphis Press-Scimitar. Mr. Roark posed the problem in a letter to his Congressman which appeared in a recent column. I include it as a part of these remarks so as to share Mr. Roark's thoughts with other Members of Congress.

The column follows:

STROLLING: NOT SIDE BY SIDE

(By Eldon Roark)

(An open letter to Congressman Dan Kuykendall.)

DEAR DAN: Some time ago you asked us constituents to help you make up your mind on how to vote on certain big problems. I don't know whether our answers clarified your thinking, or whether we only confused you.

Anyway, I am assuming that you still want to hear from us, and I'd like to direct your attention to something I read in the Press-Scimitar the other day. Mike Miller, Scripps-Howard staff writer in Washington, was reporting on Defense Secretary Robert E. McNamara's trip to Vietnam. I quote the last paragraph—

"These sources said McNamara has tied Westmoreland's hands in Vietnam by limiting funds available to hire civilians for construction work and other support jobs. This has forced Westmoreland to do the work with military units, sharply limiting the flexibility of his combat force."

Dan, I think that the hiring of civilians to work alongside military men is a mistake, generally speaking.

During World War II, I went to Alaska as a Strolling reporter. The sensational Alaska Highway was under construction, and I did a series of columns on it. Private contractors were building the road, under supervision of the Army Engineers. So, civilians and soldiers were working side by side.

Well, Dan, I don't think I have ever seen a more disgruntled bunch of men than those soldiers. They were stuck up in that Far North wilderness, in clouds of dust, fighting gnats and mosquitoes, doing work that lacked the excitement and glory of war.

But the thing that was burning them up was the fact that civilians doing the same work they were doing—driving trucks, for instance—were making big wages, while they were getting the pay of Army privates, corporals and sergeants.

Civilians in "war work," you know, were exempt from the draft.

Another thing: The contractors were working on "cost plus" contracts. That is, they were paid the cost of the work, plus a big fee for their services.

So, the contractors hired the best civilian cooks money could buy, the best foods the market afforded. The meals served in their camps were feasts! Well, as they pointed out, they had to keep their men happy. They were civilians. They could quit and go home if they didn't like it.

The soldiers? Well, their chow was regular old Army chow. It was good in some camps, bad in others—but it didn't compare with the construction workers' mess. And, of course, soldiers who were dissatisfied with the whole setup couldn't quit.

Various kinds of inspectors who traveled the road—both Army and civilian—learned to time themselves so that they'd reach a construction camp at mealtime, instead of an Army camp. I soon got wise, too.

National Committee for an Effective Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. RARICK
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 26, 1967

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, among the many-splendored projects of the Committee for an Effective Congress is the Democratic study group, affectionately called DSG.

And judging from the recent news account of William Kling of the Chicago Tribune Press we can see why it is "effective"—it maintains a campaign kitty, special privileges and "push."

I insert the column from the July 16 Chicago Tribune following my remarks:

Taxpayer's Foot Dem Unit's Bills

(By William Kling)

WASHINGTON, July 15.—Operating in obscure Capitol hill quarters paid for by the taxpayers is a partisan research agency which maintains election-year political action units to give financial support to liberal Democratic candidates for Congress.

Called the Democratic Study group [D. S. G.], two of its four staff workers are listed on the public payrolls of three different Democratic congressmen. Its director, John Thomas Morgan, is paid by two Democratic House members. Morgan said salaries are supplemented with D. S. G. funds.

Altho D.S.G.'s three-room suite on the fifth floor of the Cannon house office building is larger than many of the offices of House members, the group is cramped for space. Filing cabinets and shelves fill the suite, and boxes filled with publications and other materials overflow into the corridor, where they are stacked along a wall next to a spare copying machine.

CANDIDATES GET $55,000

Technically, the group's 1966 political action unit, the D.S.G. Campaign fund operated from Morgan's home in Silver Spring, Md., a Washington suburb. Morgan said it disbursed about $55,000 to liberal Democratic candidates during last year's congressional election campaign.

Morgan's wife, Rita, served as the fund's secretary-treasurer. Some of the papers on the fund filed with the House clerk's office, as required by law, list Morgan's home as the address for the fund. Others list 523 Cannon building, D.S.G.'s address.

In 1964, when D.S.G.'s political action arm was called the Democrats for Sound Government, also using the D.S.G. initials, the fund was headquartered in the home of William Phillips in Kensington, Md., another Washington suburb. Phillips was at that time D.S.G. director but since has gone on to become head of research and publications for the Democratic national committee. It distributed nearly $40,000 that year.

COMMITTEE DRAFTS CODE

Some members of Congress think the activities of such groups as the D.S.G. worthy of investigation by a committee now engaged in drafting a code of ethics for the House.

D.S.G.'s two telephone lines are on the Capitol switchboard.

"Our job is to push the Democratic platform," Morgan told a reporter, who first had to show his pass for the House press gallery to identify himself after Morgan apparently suspicious about someone who would inquire about D.S.G., couldn't find the reporter's name in the congressional directory.

Morgan said D.S.G. frequently takes stands on legislation pending before Congress. Most of the bills are Johnson administration measures, altho D.S.G. does prepare material on other matters at the request of members, he said.

HAS 150 MEMBERS

D.S.G. now has nearly 150 members, all House Democrats, Morgan said, altho it had better support before Republican gains in the House in the 1966 elections. Before that, the group had 187 members. Dues are $50 a year.

Morgan said D.S.G. was organized informally in 1957 and became a solid organization two years later. It did not take an active part in congressional elections until 1954, he said.

Rep. James G. O'Hara [D., Mich.] was chairman of the 1966 D.S.G. campaign committee. He is now D.S.G. chairman.

Morgan is on O'Hara's congressional staff payroll for $361.37 a month, and also received $104.01 a month from Rep. William L. Dawson [D., Ill.], according to records of the House disbursing office.

TELL OTHER WORKERS

Other D.S.G. staff workers who, according to the records, are paid by congressmen, are:

1. Mrs. Theresa M. Corum, who receives $318.34 a month from Rep. William S. Moorehead [D., Pa.]; $241.43 a month from Rep. Morris K. Udall [D., Ariz.]; and $83.12 a month from Rep. Richard Bolling [D., Mo.], all members of the 1966 D.S.G. campaign committee.

2. Miss Patricia A. Krause, who gets $295.91 a month from Rep. Chet Holifield [D., Cal.], a 1966 campaign committee member; $147.97 a month from Rep. Lloyd Meeds [D., Wash.]; and $104.01 a month from Rep. William D. Hathaway [D., Me.].

3. Mrs. Patricia K. Mitchell, who is paid $104.01 by Rep. James J. Howard [D., N.J.].

Morgan defended D.S.G.'s work, calling the group "a counterpart of the Republican conference," which has no political action arm.

As the reporter was leaving, he noticed a volunteer worker addressing envelopes franked for free postage in the United States mails by O'Hara. On a nearby table was a stack of addressed envelopes franked by Rep. Frank Thompson Jr. [D., N.J.].

Questioned about whether D.S.G. used the frank for its mailings, Morgan said: "If it's going into the mails, we put a stamp on it, but this is house [inside] mail."

He laid his hand on the envelope pile. The top one was rubber-stamped "first class mail."

Ralph R. Roberts

SPEECH
OF
HON. WILLIAM T. MURPHY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 19, 1967

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate my remarks with those made by the gentleman from Illinois, BARRATT O'HARA, on Wednesday, July 19, 1967, regarding our mutual friend, Ralph R. Roberts.

Ralph has been a personal and political friend of mine since 1940. His many associations with me and other Illinois Democrats have always been of a high and remarkable quality. I speak for myself, and I am sure Ralph's other Illinois friends, when I say thanks for many jobs well done. I can only wish him the best in any future endeavor.

Headstart Gives Youngsters a Boost

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARVIN L. ESCH
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 26, 1967

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pride that I bring to the attention of the House of Representatives the extremely successful Headstart program that is underway in Monroe County, Mich. In this county, as throughout the Nation, Operation Headstart brings to small children the opportunity to break out of the cycle of poverty. It prepares them to face the challenges of school and the future.

Monroe County is fortunate indeed to have the services of many talented and dedicated educators in its Headstart program. The staff, headed by James Steed, has developed a most successful and interesting program for the youngsters. Their program has been described in full in the July 19 Monroe Evening News, of Monroe, Mich., and I would like to bring that article to the attention of my colleagues.

The article follows:

Headstart Gives Youngsters a Boost

Some 390 pre-school children aged 4 to 5 are participating in this summer's Project Head Start program in Monroe County. The program started June 19 and will conclude Aug. 4.

Project Head Start is a division of the Office of Economic Opportunity.

James Steed, director of the local program, said a quality Head Start project is designed to acquaint the children with their upcoming school experiences and provides the following:

A program to help both the child and his family. There must be the widest possible opportunities for parents to participate in program decisions and operations and themselves be beneficiaries of the program.

A comprehensive range of services which are critical to the child's development including medical and dental care, social services, nutritional support and a well-designed program of daily activities intended to meet the needs of the individual child.

A true community project involving cooperation among the professional and nonprofessional staffs, parents of the children, government agencies and all citizens who are able and willing to volunteer their time and skills.

There are 25 teachers and 25 teacher aides working in 11 schools or centers in the county. The Head Start office is at 105 E. Front St., Monroe, the location of the Monroe County office of Economic Opportunity of which Mrs. David (Irene) Finck is director.

Richard Carveth is head teacher of the Monroe Public Schools program with centers in Boyd, Lincoln and Orchard Schools.

John McClendon is head teacher in the Custer program with a center in Custer Elementary School and another in Mason Consolidated Schools District. Head teacher of the Jefferson Schools program is Dennis Rohrs. Classes are conducted in Jefferson and Airport Community Schools under his supervision.

Donald Labun is head teacher of the Dundee Community Schools program, with Dundee, Ida Public and Summerfield Schools offering centers.

Classes for the Bedford Public and Whiteford Agricultural Schools Districts are conducted at Whiteford where Wayne Falk is head teacher.

Mrs. Louise S. Miles is in charge of social services and Karl Furr is psyhcologist.

This year, the Monroe County Project Head Start program budget is set at $86,403 of which $69,033 is provided by the federal government and $17,370 by local funds.

Mr. Steed said the federal share is cash but the local amount is, instead, in the form of use of classrooms, school buses, playgrounds, cafeterias, gymnasiums, and audio-visual aids equipment of the various local school districts made available to the program. Expenses for using the facilities and all personnel employed are paid out of the cash allotment, however.

It was pointed out that the Monroe County Health Department and the Michigan Department of Health provide many services—such as immunization of children, nutritional instruction for parents and first-aid instruction for parents—at no cost.

Parent meetings are held on a frequent basis at the various centers where parents gather information to help their children make use of the knowledge they've gained from the program.

Classes are in session from 9 a.m. to 1 p.m. each weekday. A typical day for the children includes a discussion period at the opening followed by a planned activity such as making small projects or telling stories, playing with toys or puzzles in the classroom, a snack period, activity at the book center, outside supervised play on the playground (movies or film strips indoors on rainy days), rest time, activity in the music corner, lunch time and work with clay or color books or listening to records while waiting for the school bus to take them home.

In addition, several field trips are included, involving trips to community libraries, farms, fire stations and stores and picnics at parks.

Baltimore, Md., Soldier Killed by Mine in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE D. LONG
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 26, 1967

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Pvt. Douglas F. Peay, a 20-year-old soldier from Baltimore, was killed by a mine explosion in Vietnam recently. I wish to commend the courage of this young man, and to honor his memory by including the following article in the RECORD:

PVT. DOUGLAS F. PEAY

A Baltimore servicemen stationed in Vietnam was killed Tuesday when a bolt of lightning detonated a mine near where he was standing, the Department of Defense announced yesterday.

Dead is Army Pvt. Douglas F. Peay, 20, son of Mr. and Mrs. Willie Peay, 1111 East Twentieth street.

Defense officials sad Private Peay was killed while checking a grass cutting detail near his command's perimeter defense position.

Private Peay was a member of the 97th Artillery Group.

A 1964 graduate of Dunbar High School, Private Peay was a member of the high school's football team.

He was employed by the Bethlehem Steel Company before entering the Army in 1965.

Besides his parents, Private Peay, is survived by his wife, Carolyn Jones Peay; a son, Guy D. Peay; and a brother, Willie G. Peay, all of Baltimore.

Have We Forgotten Tshombe?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 26, 1967

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I wrote to the President and Secretary of State asking them to use their leverage with the Government of the Congo to obtain freedom for former Premier Moise Tshombe. The Chicago Tribune, in a very timely and thoroughly logical fashion in its July 26 edition, reviewed the situation in that country and properly calls upon the United States to use its influence on behalf of Tshombe. The article follows:

HAVE WE FORGOTTEN TSHOMBE?

Moise Tshombe appears to have lost his battle to avoid extradiction from Algeria to the Congo, where his political enemies have sentenced him in absentia to death for "treason." The former Congolese premier lost his appeal for freedom in a secret hearing despite the efforts of his lawyer, despite his having been kidnaped, despite the absence of any treaty of extradition—or even of diplomatic relations—between the Congo and Algeria, and despite international usage which denies extradition anyway in cases where the alleged crime is political.

In retrospect, it is obvious that Mr. Tshombe's battle was lost the moment his hijacked plane landed in Algiers and delivered him to a government which has never had anything but hatred for him.

Indirectly, at least, the United States bears a large share of the responsibility for Mr. Tshombe's troubles. We dignified the opposition to him years ago by joining a United Nations vendetta to dislodge his secessionist government in Katanga. We thus indorsed the myth that he is an imperialist "stooge," whereas in fact he is an educated and successful business man in his own right and favors friendly relations with the west because he knows that the Congo's own economic welfare depends on cooperation.

Later, when the Congo turned to him as premier and a rebellion broke out in the east, he allowed our government to send a "rescue force" to the interior ahead of his own troops. We thus strengthened his image as an imperialist stooge.

Therefore, there are moral as well as sound economic reasons for us to see that Mr. Tshombe gets a fair deal. Yet, instead of doing this, we intervened for no justifiable reason at all to help President Mobutu's regime put down a rebellion which broke out after Tshombe was kidnaped, presumably in his behalf. The Johnson administration offered first one excuse for doing so, and then another. The final one seemed to be that the rebellion was carried out by "foreign" agents; whereas, in fact, the rebellion was led by white mercenaries from the Congo's own army, in association with Congolese troops.

If in the course of this senseless venture we achieved any assurance of fair treatment for Mr. Tshombe it is not apparent. On the contrary, there is every indication that Mobutu [who seized control of the government illegally himself] intends to see that Mr. Tshombe is executed.

Our bargaining position is weak in Algeria, at the moment, because of the impression [which Algeria helped to foster] that we aided Israel in the recent war. But with all the help we have given and are giving to President Mobutu in the Congo, we surely ought to be able to do something for Mr. Tshombe. The time is getting short if a political lynching is to be averted.

Increase in Doctors' Fees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 26, 1967

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the rising costs of medical assistance were discussed by Leo Perlis, director of the AFL–CIO Community Services Activities Department, in a recent interview on the Mutual Broadcasting System.

Speaking on the AFL–CIO public service radio program, Labor News Conference, Mr. Perlis called attention to the way in which doctors' fees have increased.

I feel certain all of us would like to consider Mr. Perlis' statements, which follow:

LABOR NEWS CONFERENCE

FLANNERY: Labor News Conference. Welcome to another edition of Labor News Conference, a public affairs program brought to you by the AFL–CIO. Labor News Conference brings together leading AFL–CIO representatives and ranking members of the press. Today's guest is Leo Perlis, director of the AFL–CIO's Department of Community Services Activities.

Several weeks ago, more than 500 local representatives from all over the nation—as well as observers from public and voluntary health and welfare agencies—met in New York City to discuss community health problems, and formulate plans to help overcome them. Here to question Mr. Perlis about that 12th annual National Conference on Community Services, what developed there and what results can be expected to come from the meetings, are Alan Adams, Washington correspondent for Business Week magazine, and Harry Conn, editor of Press Associates, Incorporated. Your moderator, Harry W. Flannery.

And now, Mr. Conn, I believe you have the first question?

CONN: Yes, Mr. Flannery. Mr. Perlis, most Community Services Conferences over the years have been concerned with a number of areas of interest. According to Mr. Flannery's introduction, your primary theme this year was community health problems. Could you give us a little insight into this year's conference and how it dealt with these problems?

PERLIS: Well, this year's conference, Mr. Conn, was devoted entirely to the improvement of community health services. Our discussions revolved around such items as rehabilitation, alcoholism, mental illness, vaccination programs and things of that kind.

The conference itself was a forum which brought around the conference tables, delegates who are concerned with these health problems at the community level on a year-round basis.

ADAMS: Mr. Perlis, these are familiar problems to all of us and to all the people. Why does labor have a particular interest in them? What is labor's particular role in trying to resolve some of these problems?

PERLIS: Well, Mr. Adams, in the first place, of course, as we all know, health is indivisible. We are citizens of our communities and what affects the community affects labor. We are concerned with the health of our people and with the total health of the whole community.

Many of our people suffer from mental illness.

Many of our people suffer from alcoholism.

Many of our people need rehabilitation services, as do all other citizens. So, our program is designed to help develop the kind of community facilities and resources that will do a more effective job in meeting the particular health needs of all the people, including, of course, our own members.

ADAMS: Well, is this—in trying to achieve this—is this a legislative program? Do you work through federal and state and local governments?

PERLIS: Well, it's a program which takes into consideration the need for all levels of activities. It includes, of course, political action in some areas—legislative action—both federal and state—social action and education. Our particular interest in community services is largely social action, community organization and education.

When it comes to legislation, we refer to the proper channels within the AFL-CIO.

CONN: Mr. Perlis, can we get down to some specifics? Doctors' fees are a real problem today. I understand that in the last year, doctors' fees went up at a far faster rate than probably ever before, at least, in recent history. How would the community services program try to deal with this particular problem?

PERLIS: We have been concerned for some time with the business ethics of the organized medical profession. Doctors' fees have gone up unconscionably, and we have been trying to educate both our people and the physicians to the fact that these fees are exorbitant. The only way, it seems to us, that they can be solved in the long run, is through prepaid group practice medicine.

Perhaps, in the long run, the problem of medical care can be solved through a national health insurance program. But individual doctors and organized people need to take into consideration that they are not in business—that they are out to practice medicine—and that they ought to live up to their own ethical standards.

CONN: Mr. Perlis, I know that the community services program and unions themselves across the country have frequently met with local medical societies on this problem of fees, on control—quality control—on broad guidance and cooperation with the medical profession. What has been the general result of these meetings?

PERLIS: Well, many of our people across the country, Mr. Conn, have had meetings with the state and county medical societies on any number of problems.

For example, let's go back some years to the Salk and Sabin vaccines. In many areas we have had opposition from the state and county medical societies to mass vaccination programs.

FLANNERY: Could you go into which is Salk vaccine and the other vaccine, and what these are for?

PERLIS: Well, the Salk vaccine, Mr. Flannery, is the non-live virus anti-polio vaccine, and administered by innoculation. The Sabin vaccine is the oral, live virus vaccine.

The Salk vaccine, of course, was the first anti-polio vaccine approved by the Public Health Service and the March of Dimes. The Sabin vaccine was approved several years later.

Now, in attempting to develop mass vaccination programs, we found a great deal of opposition on the part of both state and county medical societies. It so happened that over the years, the individual physicians who are members of these societies charged a lot of money for these shots.

However, in some areas we found many physicians who, on their own, were willing to become part of community-wide efforts along these lines. So, it is not possible, to say that all physicians follow the same path. There are many individual doctors who, on their own, will join our community forces in order to do the right job.

CONN: Can you point to some specific instances of success in negotiations with local medical societies? I know that there are many individual doctors who frequently cooperate, but, have you had success with local societies?

PERLIS: Very few, Mr. Conn. The only one I can point to offhand—that I can remember—was some years back, in Maricopa County, Arizona. It had to do with anti-polio vaccine. The county medical society there did eventually join with the AFL-CIO central labor body's community services committee in doing this kind of a job on a community-wide basis. There have been others since that time. Other county medical societies, of course, have done this job on their own and in connection with boards of education. But in the early days, it was a pretty rough job.

ADAMS: Mr. Perlis, what would you describe as your eventual goal in trying to handle the problems of health? Would you consider that medical service should be nationalized? Should there be community centers set up to handle health problems and health services, rather than individual doctors?

PERLIS: Well, Mr. Adams, those of us who have been engaged on a voluntary basis over the years in seeing that medical services are brought to the people are convinced that under the present system, voluntary medical care simply does not really work. I don't think it's a question of eliminating the individual doctor. You can never eliminate, nor do we want to eliminate, the individual doctor, because without the individual doctor, there can be no good medical practice.

What we do want is a kind of procedure—the kind of system—where the individual physician can provide quality medical care at reasonable costs on a comprehensive basis. The only way, it seems to me, is through a national health insurance program—through prepaid group practice medicine.

ADAMS: You mean, under those circumstances, there would be no private fee between the patient and the doctor? It would be paid through medical insurance?

PERLIS: That's right—except that under our system, any physician who wants to provide private care on the basis of a fee can still do it, even though we may eventually have a national health insurance system.

FLANNERY: Mr. Perlis, supposing we come to one of the subjects you took up in your conference—alcoholism, for instance. What did you find out about alcoholism? Was there anything new? How did you handle this sore of thing, anyway? Did you have an expert talk on it?

PERLIS: Yes, we had a number of experts, Mr. Flannery. We had the head of the alcoholism unit of the U.S. Public Health Service, Dr. Jack H. Mendelson. We also had a representative from the National Council on Alcoholism. We had 10 workshops on alcoholism, with an expert in each. We found out, of course, as we have always known, that alcoholism is one of the major diseases in this country—perhaps fourth or fifth on the list, after mental illness, cancer and heart.

We also found out that while there is some knowledge as to why people become alcoholics, there is very little knowledge on how to cure them—if there is such a thing as a cure. Professional people believe that there is no such thing as a cure at this moment. People who are alcoholics can be arrested.

But, we in the labor movement and in industry must realize that there are any number of people in our plants and in our unions who are alcoholics—who use alcohol, perhaps as a means of escape, and that it is up to us to detect the alcoholic's problem and refer him to the proper agency for a possible arrest of his disease.

We have done this in any number of cases. The way to do it—the way to be more helpful—is to have the kind of facilities in our communities, whether they be AA's . . .

FLANNERY: Alcoholics Anonymous?

PERLIS: Alcoholics Anonymous—or clinics, or local committees on alcoholism. And also, within the plants, union-management committees that are outside the controversial arena of collective bargaining can help the individual alcoholic rehabilitate himself, so that he again becomes a useful member of society and a useful worker in the plant.

CONN: Mr. Perlis, did the conference go at all into the problem of preventive medicine? I'm thinking particularly of the multiple screening which some unions have worked out with management, in which they use the very latest electronic and technical science for massive medical examinations, with an eye to preventive medicine.

PERLIS: Yes, we did go into some of that. As a matter of fact, many years ago, we proposed multiphasic screening to our unions. We know that there is a problem, however, connected with it. We can go through the assembly line to find out if there is anything wrong with our hearing, our eyesight, our heart and so forth, but unless there are facilities in the communities to take care of these things at a reasonable cost, then we are still in trouble.

We have had throughout this country, a number of multiphasic organizations. For example, some of the medical care centers of the trade union movement, in a sense, are screening organizations. But screening alone doesn't mean much, unless it is accompanied by treatment and rehabilitation.

ADAMS: Mr. Perlis, while this conference dealt with community health services, as I understand it, the AFL-CIO's Community Services Department deals with many broad subjects. Could you give us an idea of what other areas you are working in, and how long the labor movement has been involved in such a program?

PERLIS: Well, Mr. Adams, let me answer the second part of the question first.

The labor movement has been involved in this sort of thing for many years—ever since the establishment of the labor movement. However, in a more organized fashion, the community services aspects of the labor movement are just 25 years old this year, dating from the time when, late in 1941 and the early part of 1942, the former CIO formed the National CIO War Relief Committee and the AF of L had a Labor League for Human Rights.

I don't want to go into a long history of these two organizations and their objectives but by and large, these two organizations, when actually merged, became, in a sense, the present Community Services Department of the AFL-CIO. In 1942, both organizations—the AF of L and the CIO organizations—joined in a pact with United Community Funds and Councils of America. At that time it was called Community Chests and Councils of America. The first labor staff representative with a United Fund or a Community Chest was appointed in 1942, 25 years ago, in Buffalo, New York, I believe.

ADAMS: Was this, in a sense, primarily to help in fund raising?

PERLIS: This was, in a sense, to help in fund raising, but also, to develop labor participation in community health and also welfare affairs. In a sense, it was a statement on the part of the labor movement that we are not going to do it alone—on our own—

that we are part and parcel of the total community—that we are citizens first, and that we are going to join with other citizens in doing the best and most effective job possible for the total community.

This, in a sense, is a departure, in many ways, for the American labor movement from other labor movements. And, over the past 25 years, we have become more and more integrated in the total fabric of community life.

CONN: Mr. Perlis, one new program I imagine you are familiar with intrigues me, but I'd like to hear your explanation of it. That is the psychological aid for taxi drivers taking place now in New York City. What is this all about?

PERLIS: Mr. Conn, I don't know much about this program. I think we all need some of that aid.

ADAMS: I want to pursue something for just a minute. For 25 years the labor movement has been going in this direction of coordinating with other groups. What other groups does labor work with in community services?

PERLIS: Well, we work with all groups. We work with the Family Welfare Association. We work with child welfare groups, with the Red Cross, with United Funds, with rehabilitation agencies, with public and private agencies of all kinds—YMCA's, YWCA's, Girl Scouts, Boy Scouts, Camp Fire Girls, many others. And, of course, we work with Republicans and Democrats, black and white, all faiths, and so forth, because we feel that a community, if it's going to mean anything at all, must really be a community of all the people and represent the total community—all the people—and be responsive to all the people's needs. So, in the community services program, we extend our concern and our interest to everybody who lives in the community.

ADAMS: Well, how big a group is this, from labor's point of participation? Do you have hundreds of union members, or thousands on local boards?

PERLIS: Well, we have I would say, at this point, about 75,000 AFL–CIO members serving on the boards and committees of local community health and welfare agencies. There are approximately 170 full-time community services people throughout the country. Many international unions have community services departments. A number of state organizations—state AFL–CIO bodies—have community services people. A number of international unions have mandatory constitutional community services committees in their local unions.

This is growing and developing.

It is my feeling that community services is going to be the future of the labor movement, in this way: that the future of the labor movement, Mr. Adams, lies in the complete identification with the health and welfare of the total community.

We have always felt that the labor movement is not just a trade union, it is also a community organization. And as a community organization, it must be concerned with the total health and welfare of all citizens in the community.

CONN: Mr. Perlis, under the community services programs, local union members have been trained in the various phases of dealing with problems that arise for the members or maybe for the community as a whole. Do you have any estimate as to the number of local union people who are active in this particular work?

PERLIS: Only rought estimates, Mr. Conn. There are really no statistics on it.

We have thousands upon thousands of trained union counsellors—people who are concerned with helping their fellow workers obtain health and welfare services. We have any number of trained consumer counsellors.

We have done some pre-retirement training.

We have thousands upon thousands of volunteers.

One-third of all the blood given to the Red Cross, for example, comes from AFL–CIO members.

In the area of fund raising, thousands upon thousands of AFL–CIO members are active in the local plants and local unions, raising funds for United Funds and Community Chests, and health and welfare agencies generally.

So it is very difficult to tell how many thousands of people are involved. In a sense, every AFL–CIO member is a volunteer.

FLANNERY: Would you say, Mr. Perlis, that every one of the Community Chest setups has been now integrated—that labor is integrated with them? You talked in the beginning about the man in Buffalo.

PERLIS: Oh, yes, I would say so. When I made reference to Buffalo I was thinking only in terms of full-time labor staff. There are now full-time labor staffs in about 105 comunities around the country. Now, there are many others, of course, that don't have full-time labor staffs. But they do have labor people on the boards, committees and so forth.

The newest full-time labor staff person was appointed with the United Fund in Tulsa, Oklahoma, about two weeks ago. This thing has grown, just in the past few months. A full-time labor staff has been appointed in Sacramento, California; in Jacksonville, Florida; in Tulsa, Oklahoma and other places.

ADAMS: This would seem to be a very costly process or program for the AFL–CIO. What does the labor movement get in return, in effect, from such a program?

PERLIS: Well, the labor movement gets several things in return.

In the first place, we get service for our members as citizens.

Number two, we get the feeling that we are also helping the total community become a much better place in which to live.

In the third place, I believe, that we are also putting the best face of the AFL–CIO forward—in other words, it is the by-product. It is sound community relations for the entire AFL–CIO. The whole point of view and philosophy of the AFL–CIO can be seen much better.

FLANNERY: Mr. Perlis, have you, at this time, any idea about the next subject to be taken up, or is it too early for that?

PERLIS: I think it is too early. This is something that AFL–CIO President George Meany and the Executive Council will have to approve. We don't know yet what the next subject is going to be.

FLANNERY: Thank you, gentlemen. Today's guest on Labor News Conference was Leo Perlis, director of the AFL–CIO's Department of Community Services Activities. Representing the press were Harry Conn, editor of Press Associates, Incorporated, and Alan Adams, Washington correspondent for Business Week magazine. This is yor moderator, Harry W. Flannery, inviting you to listen again next week. Labor News Conference is a public affairs production of the AFL–CIO produced in cooperation with the Mutual Radio Network.

National Crime Rate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT V. DENNEY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 26, 1967

Mr. DENNEY. Mr. Speaker, perhaps the most distressing domestic problem now facing the United States is the dramatic rise in the Nation's crime rate. At the present time, the Nation's crime rate is growing approximately six times faster than the population of our country. In 1966 there was a serious crime committed every 11 seconds.

The reasons behind this increase are several. The society-is-at-fault theory has some merit. Often better education and housing is badly needed. But the basic cause for this cancer in our Nation's moral fiber is that many people have lost respect for the law which must govern and protect our society. But why this loss of respect?

It is my belief that recent U.S. Supreme Court decisions have so entangled law-enforcement authorities in so-called criminal rights that there has been a terrible neglection of the public's right of protection. Respect is often based on fear, and unless the potential criminal fears swift, certain, and impartial justice, his respect for the law is lost.

Also, Attorney General Ramsey Clark, inexperienced at law enforcement, refuses to allow the use of electronic surveillance equipment. It is my firm belief, as a former FBI agent, that these devices, with the proper safeguards for civil liberties, can be invaluable in the fight against crime.

The vast majority of the citizens in the United States do maintain respect for law and order. If they did not, we would be in a state of chaos. If these law-abiding citizens will let their views be strongly known, Attorney General Clark and the Supreme Court may do something about this shocking increase in crime.

Unwise Firearms Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 26, 1967

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, a new drive is being mounted to have Congress enact strict firearms regulations in a hasty response to the outbreaks of violence in the past month. I trust that the Congress will not be stampeded into action which is constitutionally questionable and would not control those at whom it is supposedly aimed.

We must not confuse two separate issues. Certainly all appropriate action must be taken to halt this violence. Certainly we must make every effort to bring violators of the law to justice. Just because several weapons have been involved in these criminal riots, however, should not be taken as the green flag for a rush to enact restrictive controls. Regulating firearms is not the answer.

It is necessary for Congress to consider all sides to the question, including the neglected argument that while these firearms proposals cannot be shown to have any effect upon the criminal element which now misuses them, they will have an adverse effect and infringe upon the 50 million honest, law-abiding gun owners of the country. Let us take another look at cause and effect in the present situation, sort out the issues, and realize that we are not going to attack a very serious crime problem with unneeded and unwise firearms legislation.

South Florida Citizens Register Views in Burke Questionnaire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HERBERT BURKE

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 20, 1967

Mr. BURKE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I would like to enter into the RECORD the results of a poll I mailed to the citizens of the 10th Congressional District in south Florida.

This poll was dispatched 3 months ago and within a short period more than 35,000 replies were received and tabulated. The results were very interesting and I am sure will provide my colleagues an insight into the views of my constituents.

The questions on the polls covered several of major issues that plagued the Nation in April and still continue to provide debating fodder for all parts of American life.

I was most happy to receive such an overwhelming response to this poll and I feel the interest indicates a genuine concern by people from my district in the affairs of our country.

This interest was stimulated to a great degree by the wonderful cooperation exhibited by the media in south Florida who did a great job of urging citizens to take part in the Burke poll. Some of the daily newspapers even took the space and effort to publish my poll verbatim.

To give my colleagues the benefit of the knowledge I garnered from this poll, I am now including in the remarks a news release that accompanied the results and statistical breakdown of the answers for each of the 14 questions included in the poll, as follows:

NEWS RELEASE OF CONGRESSMAN J. HERBERT BURKE, OF FLORIDA, JUNE 10, 1967

WASHINGTON, D.C.—An overwhelming percentage of citizens polled in Florida's Tenth Congressional District favor "Escalation" of the Viet Nam war and indicated they want a quick war settlement.

Congressman J. Herbert Burke (R-10th, Fla.) released the figures from the poll this week after more than 35,000 replies were received in response to 14 questions of national and international importance last March.

On the important Viet Nam issue, 72.5 percent of the replies favored escalations in the war in all categories short of nuclear war. To back this up, 82.6 percent do not want a withdrawal of U.S. troops from Southeast Asia at the present time.

On the other hand an almost even number divided on the question asking "Should the U.S. hold out for unconditional surrender in the Viet Nam war?"

A surprising 40.7 percent indicated they would make concenssions to the Viet Cong if it would bring about the end of the war. This response matched with 49.6 percent who wouldn't make concessions.

Congressman Burke after reviewing the results felt the views on the war issue strongly indicate the people want a quick, honorable end to Communist aggressions in Southeast Asia.

In a related question to the war, 59.8 per cent ruled out any increase in income taxes or corporate taxes to finance the rising costs of the war.

On other subjects, 74.9 percent believe the U.S. should establish universal military service for all capable young men; 81.8 percent want tighter controls on the sale of guns; 85 percent feel the U.S. should discontinue foreign aid to countries who trade with our enemies; 59 percent don't feel it is our duty as Americans to feed impoverished nations; 66.5 percent feel the poverty program was not worthy of being continued; 69.4 percent favor tax credits to businesses and industry which would train young people; 66.7 percent feel all earning limits should be completely removed on those drawing social security; 92.5 percent want a strong ethics committee for the House; and 56.7 percent felt wiretapping and bugging should be outlawed except in cases where the national security demands it.

The strongest response was drawn on the ethics committee question as 92.5 percent replied they favor a strong committee as proposed by Congressman Burke. The Congressman urged through legislation creation of a committee that would call for full disclosures of a Member's financial statements and disclosures of all business interests which may affect his office.

The views were from citizens living in the heart of Florida's Gold Coast, covering all of Broward and the Northern silver of Dade County.

Rep. Burke thanked various news and broadcast media that publicized the poll as more than 35,000 citizens replied out of almost 200,000 questionnaires mailed to the District.

A series of profile questions indicated the majority of the replies came from age groups of 45–64 and 65 and up. Most replies came from the larger cities of Ft. Lauderdale, Pompano Beach and Hollywood but a good strong showing was cast from all sectors of the District.

"This large percentage of returns indicates to me that the people are very concerned about the issues," Burke added. "I shall consider these views when debates occur on the House floor."

A group of Georgetown University students tallied the polls and further tabulation will be completed to depict votes by age groups and party affiliation.

The survey will be submitted to the Congressional Record this week for the perusal of all Members of Congress.

35,619 QUESTIONNAIRES

	Yes	No	No opinion	Percent of those answering—		
				Yes	No	No opinion
1. Should the United States hold out for unconditional surrender in the Vietnam war?	16,261	16,302	2,956	45.8	45.9	8.3
2. Would you make concessions to the Vietcong if it would bring about the end of the Vietnam war?	14,446	17,608	3,465	40.7	49.6	9.7
3. Do you favor escalations in the Vietnam war in all categories short of nuclear war?	25,764	6,289	3,466	72.5	17.7	9.8
4. Would you approve a withdrawal of all U.S. troops from Vietnam at the present time?	5,908	29,326	284	16.6	82.6	.8
5. Do you believe the rising costs of the Vietnam war should be met by an income tax increase on individuals and corporations?	11,482	21,249	2,788	32.3	59.8	7.9
6. Do you believe the United States should establish universal military service for all capable young men?	26,608	6,941	1,970	74.9	19.5	5.6
7. Would you favor tighter controls on the sale of mail-order guns?	29,049	5,160	1,301	81.8	14.5	3.7
8. Should the United States discontinue foreign aid to countries who trade with our enemies?	30,200	4,468	851	85.0	12.6	2.4
9. Do you think it is our duty as Americans to feed impoverished nations of the world?	11,286	20,943	3,290	31.8	59.0	9.2
10. Do you think the poverty program is worthy of being continued?	8,961	23,627	2,931	25.2	66.5	8.3
11. Do you favor tax credits for businesses which would train young people in useful occupations as proposed by my Human Investment Act legislation?	24,645	7,484	3,390	69.4	21.1	9.5
12. Do you believe the earning limit of those drawing social security benefits should be removed?	23,688	9,740	2,091	66.7	27.4	5.9
13. Do you favor legislation as introduced by me which would establish a strong ethics committee for the House of Representatives?	32,880	801	1,838	92.5	2.3	5.2
14. Do you believe wiretapping and bugging should be outlawed except in cases where the national security demands it?	20,148	12,894	2,477	56.7	36.3	7.0

Captive Nations Week

SPEECH

OF

HON. G. ROBERT WATKINS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 19, 1967

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. Speaker, during this ninth annual observance of Captive Nations Week, we join the President and the Nation in reaffirming the commitment of the United States of America to the principles of national independence and human freedom.

As the privileged citizens of a sanctuary of democracy, we Americans cannot accept or condone Communist policies which deny dignity to the individual and freedom and justice to any peoples. We can only condemn those Communist powers which blatantly accuse the United States of imperialism, but which themselves bear blame for the captivity of such nations as Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, Albania, North Korea, North Vietnam, Tibet, Armenia, Georgia, Cuba, and other nations.

Millions in these valiant nations have passed decades enchained within the walls of Communist tyranny. These captive peoples deserve our most profound sympathy and admiration for they have endured their bitter plight with courage and strength.

It is thus appropriate on this occasion for us to renew our vow of support to our captive fellow men and to pledge ourselves once more to a vigorous moral and political offensive against communism.

A Victory for the Rats

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 26, 1967

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, the three R's used to refer to reading, writing, and arithmetic. Last week in the House of Representatives it was railroad strikes, riots, and rats. Perhaps by the time the House reached the legislation concerning rat extermination, it needed a good laugh. At least 79 percent of the House Republicans thought it a cause for mirth, and defeated the rule to even consider the legislation.

If a laugh is still needed, I recommend Art Buchwald's subtle article of July 25, "Capitol Punishment—A Victory for Rats," or for someone who does not think it is a laughing matter, Jimmy Breslin's not-so-subtle article of the same day, "The Rats Come Every Night," which points up rather dramatically the need for the House to reconsider the measure which was accorded such light treatment last week.

The articles follow:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, July 25, 1967]

A VICTORY FOR RATS

(By Art Buchwald)

Last week, the House of Representatives voted down an urban rat control bill by a vote of 207–176. The bill, which would have provided $20 million a year for the eradication of rats in slums, was a victory for U.S. rodent lovers who have been militantly fighting any legislation to control rats in the United States.

Elated over the vote was Walter Ferret, lobbyist for the National Rat Association, who said, "Congress's vote against rat control has spoken for the majority of the American people who are getting fed up with the Government dictating to them whether they should have rats or not.

"The Constitution provides that everyone shall have the right to keep rats in his home, and the NRA has been leading the fight to protect this constitutional guarantee."

"But don't you feel that rats are dangerous and can cause a great deal of trouble?"

"This is the propaganda put out by the anti-rat people. Most rats are safe and give pleasure to people. The few rats who cause all the trouble cannot be controlled by legislation. I see no reason why the American people should be deprived of rats just because there is an occasional rat incident that makes the headlines."

"Sir, one of the criticisms made by people asking for strong anti-rat legislation is that it is so easy to get rats these days. All you have to do is leave your garbage pail open overnight and you can have rats the next morning. Don't you think some laws should be made so rats won't get into the homes of innocent people?"

"I'd like to make the policy of the NRA very clear on this point, because our position has been so distorted in the press. The National Rat Association is not opposed to every law aimed at trying to control rodents. We are only opposed to those laws that would eradicate all rats in the United States, just because some people don't like rats.

"We would support a bill in Congress that would keep rats from getting into the homes of the wrong people. We think the police and local law enforcement agencies should be strengthened and that the rat problem should be Turned over to them.

"The penalties for misusing rats should be meted out to those anti-social elements in our society who have given honest rat fanciers a bad name.

"We can't lose sight of our history because of the hysteria of the do-gooders and the bureaucrats who think they can solve every problem though Federal law.

"This country has had rats since it was founded. There have been rats with the armed forces in every war. We have had rats in the Capitol and even in the basement of the White House.

"You kill all the rats in America and you'll leave this Nation naked and defenseless. Congress in its wisdom has seen fit not to fool with the rodent population of the United States and for this reason I can only say 'God bless our rat-loving legislators.' "

"That's a little strong, isn't it, Mr. Ferret?"

"It's not strong enough. We won this year but you can be sure we'll be under attack again next year. So I can't rest on my lobbying victory."

"Do you have any message for the American people?"

"Just this. Whenever anyone starts talking to them about anti-rodent legislation, I wish they would keep the NRA slogan in mind: 'The rats you save may be your own.' "

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, July 25, 1967]

HARLEM'S ENDLESS BATTLE: THE RATS COME EVERY NIGHT

(By Jimmy Breslin)

NEW YORK.—At eight o'clock at night, the rats come up from the spaces around the sewer pipes under the boiler room where they have slept all day. They cling to the big rusted pipe and come up into the boiler room and then they start up the pipes which are inside the walls of the five-story tenement. The rats come for food and water in the apartments where the people live.

As the rats crawled through the building, many of the people who live at 220 East 111th St. in the part of New York called East Harlem were out on the sidewalk. Many of them talked about the trouble of the night before, when a man with a knife was killed by a cop up at the corner.

The neighborhood made the first motions towards a riot, then stopped when Mayor Lindsay arrived and plunged into the crowd. Now, two games of dice were played by men standing in semi-circles around the bottom of the stoop. Four men sat on milk boxes around a card table playing dominoes. Pedro Perdomo, in a yellow polo shirt and floppy field worker's hat, sat on a car fender and pounded a bongo drum held between his knees.

"Yare, yare," he sang out.

"Caro," four people yelled back.

TAKES OFF SHOE

Upstairs, in apartment three on the third floor, Cathy Marrero shrieked. Her husband Ebro broke in a smile. They had just chased two rats from under the kitchen sink and the rats had run into the bathroom and Ebro had slammed the door on them. Now, Ebro said. Now I have them. The rats always stay in the bathroom, licking water from the tub. They never crawl out of the room. Ebro bent down and took off his left shoe.

"Ha," he said.

"Here," his wife said. She handed him a flatiron. Ebro shook his head no. He held the shoe up in his right hand and opened the bathroom door slowly, and slid inside. He slammed the door behind him. He began shouting, "Ho, ha, ho," while he beat the two rats in the bathtub to death with the shoe. The shoe sounded hollow against the sides of the bathtub.

Ebro opened the door and came out, his face and arms glistening with sweat. He pointed to the rats inside, in the bathtub. They were very small rats for East Harlem. They were much larger than mice, but still very small for East Harlem, where rats are very big.

"You came just in time," Ebro said.

"Do you chase them like this every night?" he was asked.

DOING THE DISHES

"Every night? how could you work in the morning if you do this?" he said. "They just came this time right out under the sink while my wife is doing the dishes. She started chasing them. So I chase too."

His wife came in with a handbrush and a paper bag. She swept the two dead rats into a paper bag. She reached over and emptied the two dead rats out of the paper bag and into the toilet. She flushed the toilet. She put the paper bag into the bathtub. Ebro lit a match and set the bag on fire. After the paper bag burned away, his wife took a bottle of disinfectant from the shelf and poured it all over the bathtub. The disinfectant smelled strong and Ebro left.

He walked out to the living room while his wife scrubbed the bathtub. To get to the living room you go first into the kitchen, then through two rooms that have no doors or windows. A bed, and a crib next to it, was in each room. You come out into a small front room that has a linoleum floor. A broken couch, two rocking chairs and a stuffed chair covered with a plastic filled the small room.

A framed Army discharge certificate and pictures of John F. Kennedy and the Sacred Heart were on the wall over the couch. The two sooty windows were open to the hot air of the street and the sounds of the bongo drum.

"The rats come every night?" Ebro was asked.

"All night long," he said. "You see into the kitchen from here? See the refrigerator? I have two by four wood holding it up. That is so we can get underneath it with a broom to chase the rats when they get under it."

"Don't you use a rat trap or poison?"

"The children," he said. "You cannot have traps and poison around with babies. No. Nobody uses traps because everybody has babies. Have you ever smelled a rat when he dies under the floorboards or between the walls? No way to get him out."

"Why don't you try cats?"

CAT DISAPPEARS

He smiled. "The janitor got this big cat and put him in the boiler room. One morning he told me to come and look. There was cat fur all around the boiler room. And no cat. Huh. There are rats in the boiler room bigger than any cat."

"A dog then?" "Sometimes dogs are good, sometimes they're out. "Is more trouble than it's worth anyway. There are so many rats in this neighborhood for anything to work."

Ebro is 27. He works for the Railway Express Agency. His wife came into the room with cans of beer. Ebro and his wife sat and drank from the cans.

"Our baby is only three weeks," she said. "We keep him in bed with us. The other two, we have the crib set up high. No rats come there so far. But you still can't leave a baby alone."

"Has anybody been bitten by them?"

"Who hasn't?" Ebro said.

"What do you do when you get bitten?"

"Nothing," he said, "Oh, some people have had to go to the doctor. But with me, only nips."

"Come into the kitchen and be quiet and you hear them," his wife said.

SOUNDS IN THE WALLS

We went into the kitchen and drank beer from the cans and listened for what seemed like a long time but was only 10 minutes.

Then there was this sound in the walls. A scratching sound. The tumbling, scrambling, sound when one of the rats moved quickly.

It is a sound by itself. And when you are young, and you sleep on the side of the bed next to the wall and the rats scratch against the wall at your ear, you carry the sound with you for the rest of your life. It is something that is heard by people in every poor neighborhood in every city in the Nation. And it is one of the reasons why this is our longest of summers. Last week, the House of Representatives thought it all was a cause for laughter.

Letters That Speak for Themselves

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 26, 1967

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I have been requested to insert the following letters in the RECORD, and I am doing so. The letters speak for themselves.

The letters follow:

NEW ORLEANS, LA.,
April 29, 1967.

LIFE,
Chicago, Ill.

GENTLEMEN: I have been re-reading the April 7, 1967, issue of *Life* and have come to the conclusion that you are responsible for a gross disservice to Our Country. In your exclusive article, *North Vietnam Under Siege*, with photographs by Lee Lockwood, you have given wide distribution to a series of subtle propaganda pictures with an almost unnoticable qualifying statement as to their truthfulness. On page 33 you say: "Lockwoods photographic report is not presented as the whole truth about North Vietnam at war, but it is a unique and valuable glimpse of a world rarely seen." You then go on with "An exclusive report including 12 pages in color" which at first aroused in me some feelings of compassion for the North Vietnamese. This soon turned to disgust as I studied the photographs more closely.

On page 33 you show "Alerted militia rush over bomb rubble three miles from center of Hanoi". You fail to note that the rubble is very clean; there is no smoke or dust in the area; the militia are very clean; and there is no reason for them to be armed or rushing anywhere.

I guess pages 34 and 35 are OK, and I guess that is an American bomb exploding. It looks like a column of smoke to me.

That may be bomb damage on page 36, but the "Scarred countryside on the alert for 'ma'y-bay-my' " is just a junk yard with some circular and rectangular foxholes. There are no bomb craters on page 37.

The bottom left of page 38 is really bad. The factory hands grinding berries and cooking dye with rifles slung over their backs are strictly grade B. I don't know why they carry their rifles while hard at work. I would stack mine in the corner. Again, I don't know why they even need the rifles. The same comments apply, in general, to the rice paddy workers with the rifles on page 39.

Pages 41, 44D, and your cover are somewhat inconsistent. The cover and 44D show a very clean street set up for outside photography—it is almost spotless. The park on page 41 shows quite a bit of litter.

I think you are very naive for publishing the article without additional explanation to your readers. If you were aware of these discrepancies, I am afraid you are irresponsible or seditious. In either event, you score pretty low with me.

Yours truly,

ROBERT L. MCINTYRE.

NEW ORLEANS, LA.,
May 11, 1967.

LIFE,
Rockefeller Center,
New York, N.Y.

GENTLEMEN: This is to supplement my letter mailed to your Chicago office on April 29, 1967 regarding your April 7 presentation of *North Vietnam Under Siege*.

Your cover picture shows neatly-dressed Hanoi residents, three of them looking toward the camera, hair in place, sweating out an air raid. I am afraid the entire scene is posed for the benefit of the photographer.

Your soldiers on pages 42 and 43 are unarmed while *your* militia and peasants on other pages carry rifles.

You show pictures of eight different U.S. airmen, yet the text of the story accounts for only one encounter by the photographer. The full-face pictures of Robinson, Jones, Black, and Perkins on page 44 all have the same backdrop and, judging by the enlarged noses in the center of each photograph, look like they were taken with a cheap camera.

I believe most of the pictures in *your* article were given to *you* by the North Vietnamese.

I would like to give you the benefit of the doubt and hope that, as an organization, you were just careless in your editing and judgment. I expect you will try to ignore my letters in the hope that I will eventually go away. I would like to see you come up with some believable explanation of the discrepancies in your article; if you can't, I would like to see you publish an admission of the discrepancies.

Your reputation as a responsible news medium is at stake.

Yours truly,

ROBERT L. MCINTYRE.

LIFE,
New York, June 7, 1967.

DEAR MR. MCINTYRE: Naturally we regret your feelings about Life's April 7 cover story, "North Vietnam Under Siege."

It's Life's aim to portray all aspects of the war in Vietnam and we feel this exclusive documentary by Lee Lockwood—the first American photographer allowed into North Vietnam since 1954—deserved the attention of our readers. To analyze and view the Communist opposition from every vantage is to gain valuable knowledge of how to combat him. Such an effort should never be misconstrued as support or sympathy. Our introduction firmly states that Lockwood's report does not try to be the whole truth about North Vietnam at war.

Mr. Lockwood was, of course, allowed to see and photograph only what the North Vietnamese officials wanted him to, but all of his pictures—and our captions—are valid. Our photograph on page 33 shows militia from a bicycle factory, who were dressed and armed to take part in a drill; a real air-raid alert was sounded, and they went scrambling to cover over rubble that had been bombed in December, 1966. The large photograph on pages 36–37 shows the same factory, with militia running out of ground shelters; just because there aren't any bomb craters visible in this view doesn't mean the factory wasn't destroyed by bombing—and it isn't "just a junk yard." Part of North Vietnam's military preparedness program is to arm the people and drill them constantly. Some of them therefore carry rifles even when working; moreover, if a plane bombing the rice paddy on page 39 were to be shot down, these men would have to rush off and try to find the American pilot. There is no discrepancy between the photographs of Hanoi streets with manhole covers and the photograph on page 41 of a park in Hanoi; if there ever was rubble on the streets, it's been cleaned up, and the litter on the beach—whether it's caused by bombing or, more probably, ordinary littering by people and nature—has no relevance to the streets in any case.

This report is but one facet of Life's coverage of the war; for your reference, I'm enclosing a listing of our material about it since 1954. Life believes the war is worth winning and that Communism must be contained in Southeast Asia. We've reiterated this belief many times, most notably in our February 25, 1966 editorial by our Editor-in-Chief, Hedley Donovan, a copy of which I'm enclosing.

Perhaps you saw our April 28 Letters to the Editor column which carried a sample of readers' response.

Sincerely yours,

EMILY SCHWAR
(For the Editors).

NEW ORLEANS, LA.,
June 10, 1967.

LIFE,
New York, N.Y.

GENTLEMEN: I would like to suggest that you publish my letters of April 29 and May 11, 1967 and your response of June 7, 1967, signed by Emily Schwab, relative to your article, *North Vietnam Under Siege*.

I believe this would be a very effective way to let your readers judge the validity of the article—perhaps from a somewhat different viewpoint.

Yours truly,

ROBERT L. MCINTYRE.

LIFE,
New York, June 28, 1967.

DEAR MR. MCINTYRE: Further to my previour letter about LIFE's April 7 cover story, "North Vietnam Under Siege," I'd like to reply to your additional letters to Life's editors.

Lee Lockwood was indeed in North Vietnam and took these pictures himself; he is a man of responsibility and integrity. As we say in our introduction, Lockwood "is candid about the limitations he worked under. What he was allowed to see and photograph was circumscribed by the foreign ministry." And I repeat our statement that we did not present his photographic report "as the whole truth about North Vietnam at war, but it a unique and valuable glimpse of a world rarely seen." For your reference, I'm enclosing a tearsheet of this introduction.

The only photographs Mr. Lockwood did not take are those of the U.S. prisoners of war shown on page 44. We state in our text that they were taken by a North Vietnamese photographer, using Lockwood's camera and film.

Sincerely yours,

EMILY SCHWAB
(For the Editors).

Desecrating the Flag

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 26, 1967

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Pointer, an outstanding independent publication serving communities in south suburban Cook County, Ill., in its July 20 edition, told a story which reflects the unfortunate thoughtlessness which often occurs but goes on to properly call our attention to the respect which we should have for the flag. I insert this editorial at this point in the Record:

DESECRATING THE FLAG

In a recent escapade, several unthinking youths displayed a lack of concern and degrading attitude toward the flag of our United States. Some of the flags pointing up the Riverdale Diamond Jubilee were taken down from the light poles on 138th and Stewart by teenagers on July 15 at midnight. Police were called, but when they arrived the boys were gone.

Again, on the same night at 1 a.m. at 137th and Indiana, police were called on a complaint and spotted a car going north on Indiana ave. There were 5 men in the car and they had the American flag hanging out over the side. Police stopped them and found Diamond Jubilee American flags in the vehicle.

Happily, none of the boys were from Riverdale. Police said they were from surrounding towns. However, it was shameful that three of the boys were servicemen, home on leave from the Navy. Was this a case of "we always hurt the one we love?" The police made the boys come back next day and put the flag and pennant back at 141st and Indiana and no charges were made against them.

It is to be hoped that these boys learned a lesson. Desecration of the American flag is a serious offense. Perhaps we should question ourselves, too. Do we as parents know enough about our flag?

Perhaps the most eloquent summation was uttered by President Woodrow Wilson 51 years ago when he said, "The things the Flag stands for were created by the experiences of a great people. Everything that it stands for was written by their lives.

"The Flag is the embodiment, not of sentiment, but of history. It represents the experiences made by men and women, the experiences of those who do not live under that Flag."

The Flag is the emblem of our nation, the symbol of our Liberty. When we desecrate it we also desecrate the United States of America and the freedom for which our men are fighting all over the world.

Water Pollution Control Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARVIN L. ESCH

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 26, 1967

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, I was distressed at the action taken by the House of Representatives yesterday in cutting back funds for the Water Pollution Control Act.

One of the most important, pressing, and far-reaching problems in our Nation today is the preservation and restoration of our natural resources. This program has called forth great enthusiasm and interest from local government officials. Local and regional governments have filed plans for construction which would fully utilize the $450 million authorized under the act.

It is, therefore, with a great deal of concern that I note the House action to cut back these funds by more than half to $203 million. The enthusiasm, support, and momentum for this program may well be hampered by this drastic and unwise action. Both the House and the Senate unanimously passed the higher authorization several weeks ago. Our action yesterday on the appropriation itself was a step backward from our commitment to clean up our Nation's water. The real losers from our precipitous action will be the small communities and suburban areas of our Nation who must turn to the Federal Government for assistance in their efforts to cut back on pollution. The Government's assistance will now be drastically delayed.

I hope that the Senate will reflect fully on the importance of our national commitment, restore full funding, and that the House, in conference committee, will accept full appropriations for this most significant program.

AEC Wins Seventh National Safety Council Award of Honor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 25, 1967

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the safety record compiled by the various participants in the atomic energy program since the dawn of the nuclear era has been a remarkable one—one in which I as a charter member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy have long taken great pride. In both the private industrial sector of the atomic energy program and in the far-flung nuclear activities of the Atomic Energy Commission, the byword has been "safety—first, last, and always."

It came as no surprise, therefore, Mr. Speaker, to learn recently that the Atomic Energy Commission has again been honored with the National Safety Council's Award of Honor—the seventh such award since 1950. The significance of this achievement takes on even greater meaning when one realizes that the safety record compiled by the Commission and its contractors in 1966—the award year in question—exceeded those of all previous years in the Commission's 20-year history. Noteworthy also is the fact that while literally tens of thousands of AEC and AEC-contractor employees daily use or work near radioactive materials, not a single serious radiation exposure occurred in AEC operations in 1966.

Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to congratulate the Commission and its contractors for this truly outstanding performance. It is one in which they can justifiably take great satisfaction and pride.

I am inserting an announcement published by the Commission summarizing its safety record for 1966 at this point in the RECORD:

JULY 19, 1967.

AEC AND CONTRACTORS' EMPLOYEES HAD SAFEST YEAR IN 1966

Employees of the Atomic Energy Commission and of its contractors had the safest year in AEC's 20-year history during 1966, a record year which again qualified the AEC for the National Safety Council's Award of Honor. This is the seventh time since 1950 that the Commission and its contractors have received the award.

More than half of AEC's contractors had no lost-time injuries during 1966.

Non-radiation hazards were the cause of fatalities and injuries connected with AEC operations during 1966. Of six fatalities, two were caused by falling objects, two by motor vehicles, one by an overturned tractor, and one resulted from burns. There were no serious radiation exposures in AEC operations during 1966.

The number of lost-time injuries during calendar 1966 for each million manhours of work by AEC government employees and AEC contractor employees was 1.54—more than 16% below the 1965 rate of 1.75. Of the 41 industries reporting to the National Safety Council in 1966 only one, the communications industry, whose rate was 1.26 for 1966, had a lower rate than that of the AEC. The average injury frequency rate for all of the industries reporting to the National Safety Council was 6.91 for 1966.

The AEC 1966 injury severity rate—the number of days lost in relation to each million manhours worked—was 244, also a lower rate than that for 1965 (304). The average severity rate for the 41 industries reporting to the National Safety Council in 1966 was 689.

There were no accidents involving AEC reactors during the year.

The motor vehicle accident frequency rate (accidents per one million miles) decreased from 5.87 in 1965 to 5.79 in 1966. More than 11,500 vehicles are taken into account in these figures.

Sixteen contractors earned AEC safety awards for exceeding one million manhours without a lost-time accident. Two contractors established near-perfect records—Westinghouse Electric Corporation, operator of Bettis Atomic Power Laboratory (Penn.) for the AEC, with 19,194,917 injury-free manhours, and Phillips Petroleum Company, operator of AEC's National Reactor Testing Station (Idaho), with 12,291,162 injury-free manhours.

Especially noteworthy was the record of AEC's Savannah River Operations Office. The principal contractor, E. I. duPont de Nemours & Co., and associated contractors, operated one full year without a lost-time injury.

AEC's record of fire loss and other property damage was good. In 1966 these losses amounted to $853,496 as compared with $3,415,069 in 1965. Sandia Corporation, an AEC contractor, won the National Fire Prevention Association Grand Award in an annual contest in which many plants compete. Among the participants are many of the largest American industrial concerns.

Nation Needs Responsible Citizens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 26, 1967

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Mattie Coney, of Indianapolis, Ind., is founder and executive secretary of the Indianapolis Citizens Forum. The forum has done a truly outstanding job of utilizing, encouraging, and inspiring citizens efforts to make their city a better place to live.

The following article by Mrs. Coney appeared in the July 24, 1967, Indianapolis News. The title, "Nation Needs Responsible Citizens," is more true today than ever before, as destruction and violence is unleashed in city after city across America.

NATION NEEDS RESPONSIBLE CITIZENS

(By Mattie Coney)

(NOTE.—Following is the mesage the Citizens Forum of Indianapolis sends to people in other communities interested in its program. Mrs. Coney is the founder and executive secretary of the organization.)

Never before in the history of our America has the need been as urgent for men and women of goodwill and character to organize and work with all their might in spreading the gospel of individual responsibility and Americanism.

Believe this with all your strength, heart and soul. America, your America, and my America, is the last great strength and hope that is working for the freedoms and dignities of the individual.

Our methods of operation are based on three sound principles, simplicity, truth, and responsibility.

One of the most significant features of your organization effort will be the explanation of your plans to your city officials. Call on your mayor, your chief of police, the fire chief, the head of streets and alleys, and the sanitation head; call on them individually. Get their goodwill and by all means get a commitment from them. Invite them to a collective meeting and keep them interested in your program. See that these officials get recognition after a job well done.

In simple terms and language give your block workers and citizens a true picture of their responsibility in being good American citizens. Do you leave a meeting of interested workers until you have gained some enthusiastic commitments.

The words, clean, soap, water, work, responsibility, and commitment are simple words; use them often.

Get as many articulate, dedicated people as you can to carry the message to as many different places as possible, namely churches, civic groups, schools, labor groups, etc.

Talk directly with the heads of the city services: Sanitation, street commissioner, health department, etc. Get a commitment from each for co-operation. Mayor John J. Barton gave his full support.

The Tuberculosis Association in our town gave us great help because they are definitely involved in the problem of getting people to voluntarily help themselves in cleaning up their own surroundings.

This program is not easy, neither were the results immediate. We started in 1964, and in 1965 we did have a five school area clean-up to see if the work could be done by sending out notices through those five schools.

This was done because our schools superintendent, Dr. George Ostheimer, gave his full co-operation and so directed the administration.

In 1966 we felt we should try a citywide clean-up campaign which netted over 42,000 tons of trash and debris including 900 refrigerators. Even that year there were many who did not co-operate or believe it could happen.

But this spring, 1967, we did it again.

This clean-up drive was co-ordinated by Mr. Richard Stern, our street commissioner, who got the trucks from the Park Department, Flood Control Department and Sanitation Collection Department to work in a 28-day crash clean-up drive that resulted in removing over 180,000 tons of trash and debris beginning April 3.

Cleanliness is a matter of pride that must be taught, and since we have so many people who have been steeped in undisciplined living for so long, it is simply a matter of education of the masses.

As a result of our observation, we have formed a 40-member citizenship committee as a part of the PTA in Indianapolis. This committee is made up in most part of retired teachers and dedicated civic-minded people who are visiting and observing what is being done in the schools to develop good citizenship.

This task, if you attempt it, will not be one devoid of hard work and often tears. But, with determination on your part, it can happen. It needs great leadership. You must knock on every door and be not afraid to give your message of individual responsibility.

No one is so poor that he cannot pick up paper, cartons, cans and bottles and put them in containers. No one is so deprived that he cannot be considerate of other people who live in the same conditions. No one is so under-privileged that he cannot wash his own body, and his own children's body, comb his and his children's hair and wash the clothes they have to wear.

No one is so culturally deprived that he has to loiter in front of business places and make it impossible for shoppers to get in and out of the stores to trade, or for people to use laundromats in peace. We believe everyone should be taught that places of business are not playgrounds for children and hangouts for teen-agers.

We have posters on buses to be read by those who cannot be contacted in any other way.

We wish to congratulate you upon your interest and your effort to improve and maintain our great country.

Youngest Freshman in 90th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 26, 1967

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, one of the youngest men to sit in the U.S. House of Representatives is the gentleman from Wisconsin's Sixth District, the Honorable WILLIAM A. STEIGER. As Congressman STEIGER has observed, "age does not make much difference" in the effectiveness of a Member of Congress. The Congressman is proving this daily as he goes about the business of representing the people of his district with skill and enthusiasm.

I offer for the RECORD at this point a news article from the Washington Sunday Star of July 23, 1967, describing the effective role Congressman STEIGER is filling in the 90th Congress.

The article follows:

YOUNGEST FRESHMAN IN 90TH CONGRESS

(By Woody West)

Bill Steiger is a "Brown-Bagger."

In addition to toting his lunch to the office in a brown paper sack frequently—the symbol of the time-haunted citizen—William Albert Steiger is 29 years old, thoughtful, articulate and poised. On his desk is a bronze statue of an elephant apparently trumpeting in triumph. Steiger is the youngest freshman in the 90th Congress, representing Wisconsin's 6th District in the House. The slender blond is a Republican who has been active in party activities since his teens and served six years in the state legislature before running for the House.

"By golly, you sure seem young to be in Congress," is a remark to which Steiger is resigned.

His habitat is a cramped suite in the Longworth Building where eight full-time staffers—one a summer college intern—seem to scramble like puppies for space. Steiger hustles through the long congressional day with elan, obviously enjoying it.

Capitol policemen traditionally halt traffic for members of Congress on Independence Avenue and Capitol Drive on the assumption that they may be walking to a quorum call. Returning from the Capitol to his office, Steiger stops at the curb as the "Don't Walk" sign flashes. Rep. Charles A. Mosher, a four-term Republican from Ohio, approaches and says, "Bill, you're the only member of Congress who observes that sign." Steiger laughs, but waits for the green light.

SERVED IN ASSEMBLY

The young Congressman graduated from the University of Wisconsin in 1960 with a degree in economics, and the same year ran successfully for the state assembly from his home town of Oshkosh. Two more successful campaigns for the legislature and, in 1966, he challenged first-term Democrat John A. Race and won the House seat with a 6,200-vote plurality. He was one of 47 Republican freshmen to take seats at the beginning of the 90th Congress.

Is being the youngest freshman a liability? Steiger doesn't think so. The three terms in the Wisconsin Legislature, he believes, were a "tempering process."

"That first term was an instructive as anything could be and I'll never forget it," he says. "I was anxious to do all kinds of things and I'm sure I talked too much—I know I talked too much. I got beaten down and I learned from it.

"I hope I'm able to translate that Wisconsin experience into the House—I have to look to and listen to the men who've been here far longer than I have because these are the men from whom I can learn," he says.

Steiger and his wife, Janet, live in an apartment on Capitol Hill. Mrs. Steiger, petite and assured, also is a native of Oshkosh. She is a graduate of Lawrence College in Appleton, Wis. and was a Fulbright scholar in medieval literature. Now, she says, she is the "chief volunteer" in her husband's office.

The 6th District abuts on the Milwaukee suburbs, encompasses seven counties in the dairy country and include industrial areas around Sheboygan and Lake Winnebago. It has a population of about 400,000.

AN ACTIVIST

Steiger has been an activist since high school where he held a number of class offices. He was a Wisconsin representative to Boy's Nation in 1955 and 1956, a national officer in the Young Republicans and, in 1960, assistant chief page at the Republican National Convention.

It has been seven months since the Steigers loaded their belongings into a U-Haul trailer and headed for the Nation's Capital.

"I'm finally learning my way around the Rayburn Building," he says. Steiger slides from a smiling ebullience to a somber reflectiveness. "Thanks very much—you're wonderful to call," he enthusiastically tells a caller as he accepts a speaking engagement. Then with serious concentration he turns quickly back to discussion:

"I think one of our main difficulties in this society today is that we often lose perspective. We compress things in 1967—radio, the papers, television bring things to Oshkosh as they happen—in Europe, in Asia, in Newark. I think we have a very serious problem just in terms of being able to step back and look at things. But if we don't lose sight of where we've come from and where we are today and where we're going, then I think the future is just fantastic. But this is going to be very difficult for people to handle."

But today, the most volatile issue is Vietnam: "I support the commitment in Vietnam—in terms of the South Vietnamese request for our assistance, in terms of a belief in the attempt to find a way for South Vietnam to determine its future and the kind of government the people there want without outside interference.

"I have the view that Vietnam must assume the first priority and at the moment, for whatever reason, it has not. I truly fear there is an increasing tendency to take an emotional view of the war. The refrain I've gotten over and over again from my constituents is, 'let's win or get out,' " Steiger says.

NOT CONVINCED

"I frankly am not convinced that a military solution is possible. I think the military effort that has been made and is being made will have to be aimed at achieving a point at which we can negotiate—to find a solution consistent with our commitment."

"I guess when all is said and done, I don't think we can be the policeman of the world or that we should be. But I do think we have obligations to ourselves and to others that are going to have to be fulfilled and some may well require commitment of American men. And I don't quarrel with that.

"Given the outlook and the current attitude of the Soviet Union and Communist China towards us, we're going to have to expect that these obligations are going to continue for quite some time."

Steiger dictates half a dozen letters after arriving at the office, leaves for an Education and Labor subcommittee hearing on amendments to a vocational rehabilitation act, traversing the maze of corridors into the Rayburn building.

He sits behind the hearing room desk with his colleagues, smiling occasionally, smoking, questioning as testimony is offered by witnesses. After the hearing recesses around noon, Steiger talks briefly with one of the witnesses and then leaves for a luncheon engagement with another GOP freshman, George Bush of Texas.

"I eat about half the time with a constituent or another member of Congress," Steiger says, "and the rest of the time I bring my lunch and eat in the office and try to catch up on correspondence."

The afternoon slips away in discussion with staff members on pending business, filming a one-minute television news spot for home stations, greeting a couple and their three children from Cedarburg. Steiger supplies the kids with books and pamphlets on the Capitol, escorts the family across the street to the House gallery and, on the way, pauses to have a group picture taken on the Capitol steps. Back to the office and the never-shrinking pile of papers demanding attention.

"I read every letter that comes into the office. It's helpful to me in getting an idea about what people are talking about and thinking. We try to answer every letter, even the 'crank' letters that every Congressman gets. There are a lot of different opinions in the world," Steiger grins, "and, who knows, they may be right."

Weekends, often as not, are spent in Wisconsin, speaking at dinners, meetings, making appearances at parades and civic events and holding office hours at the two offices he maintains in his district. To be seen is the sine qua non of the politician. Congressmen are provided six trips to their district each session; by the end of this month, Steiger will have spent 16 weekends in Wisconsin, "It gets expensive" he says.

The Steigers maintain an apartment in Oshkosh as well as in Washington and this has been part of the problem of adjustment. "I leave the brown shoe polish in Oshkosh and I leave the brown shoes here, or Janey leaves the measuring cups here that she was going to use in Oshkosh—it's that sort of thing."

Four times on the stump for William Steiger, four victories—what of the future? "You can't see beyond next year; you never can . . ."

But of this year so far, the freshman Congressman says, "I think I've been able to do more than I expected. I'm not about to try to remake the world—I can't do it and I wouldn't try to do it.

"But certainly you get a sense of accomplishment out of the work you can do for an individual constituent who has a problem; you get a sense of accomplishment in helping cities or towns or villages which have a problem with the government," Steiger says.

"AWESOME" JOB

It's early evening. A late rollcall vote is coming up. Ken Rietz, Steiger's legislative assistant and a high school classmate, urges him to go home to dinner and says he'll call when the vote is due. Steiger agrees and says he'll be in the office afterwards to chip away at the backlog from the July 4th recess.

How does it feel to be a member of the House of Representatives and still not 30?

"I guess age doesn't make much difference—to have this kind of responsiblity, this kind of opportunity is pretty fantastic. You have a greater appreciation—at least I do—of what we have done in this country and an even better understanding of what we haven't done.

"I think the only word that can really be used to describe it is 'awesome'.

"It's an awesome responsibility, it's an awesome job, and it's an awesome country," Steiger says.

Vista Success With Migrant Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 26, 1967

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, the contagion of riots and resulting despair that have shaken our Nation in recent days may well obscure the fact that in America there are yet those who are quietly and unselfishly working toward a better day for all of our people.

The moving story of one such person, Mr. Larry Kelly, a VISTA volunteer, was published recently in the St. Paul Pioneer Press. This young person from Minnesota has set an example that all of us can take pride in. I think it appropriate that this account be recorded in the RECORD:

SEEING THE WORLD AT HOME

(NOTE.—This story was supplied by the Office of Economic Opportunity. Larry Kelly's Allanville work was also filmed for VISTA's latest movie, As I Run This Race, a half-hour documentary. VISTA's first movie, A Year Toward Tomorrow, won an Academy award.)

ALLANVILLE, ARIZ.—It was like walking through fire the first time Larry Kelly toured Allanville, his first home away from St. Paul. It was August. Temperature, 115. No shade.

Scores of weather-beaten shacks dotted the desert. There wasn't a soul stirring.

Kelly, 22, a VISTA volunteer, almost applied for a transfer right there. He was assigned in August, 1965, under the Arizona Migrant Opportunity program (MOP). In 1966, despite his initial misgivings, he asked to stay another year.

He quickly discovered that plenty of people live in Allanville's hovels. Sixty Negro families settled in the community when the mechanization of cotton picking—the area's major crop—chased most of the migrants away.

A few lucky ones are employed. Most scratch up a meager living on farms. When not working in the summer, they usually stretch out in their shacks and try to keep cool. There's nowhere else to go.

Kelly and Bob Brevring, a volunteer from Cincinnati, Ohio, wanted to change the world for these poor laborers—to find them all better jobs, nicer homes . . . to release them from poverty.

The two moved right in, settling in one of two rooms in a sagging stucco shanty. Rent was $20 a month. They shared an outdoor spigot with neighbors—when the water was turned on.

One small well supplies the water for the more than 400 residents. Not only is it inadequate, but the water is unfit to drink. The people have to transport pure water from a service station in Buckeye. Each family is allowed five gallons a day.

Sharing a faucet was one way Kelly and Brevring got to know their neighbors, many of whom rarely left home except to dash water on their faces. The volunteers lived on the corner of Wino road and many of its inhabitants lived up to the name.

After they got to know a few people, Larry and Bob found welcome behind closed doors. They spent weeks calling on residents and met many decent, hard-working people who desperately wanted a better life.

Brevring got the youngsters together for recreation, while Kelly concentrated on older teenagers and adults. He visited more homes in the community and in surrounding migrant camps, picked onions and lettuce with the men and women in the fields and learned about their problems.

One urgent need was a place for the children to stay while their parents worked, so Kelly and Brevring helped build a day-care center. Working with 10 hired farm laborers under a professional builder, they constructed the multi-room center in a little more than six months.

The volunteers also helped to assemble a library and organize adult education classes.

Kelly feels strongly that lack of education is the greatest disadvantage of the poor. The seventh of nine children of a self-taught engineer, he and his older brothers and sisters worked their way through high school and college or business school. The family lived in Frog Town until Larry was in the eighth grade and his father, an Irish immigrant, earned a lucrative promotion in his field. The family now lives at 1720 Euclid st.

Young Kelly put himself through two and one-half years of college working as a bus boy, waiter, kitchen helper and motel yardman. He attended the University of Minnesota, majoring in education, until March, 1965, when his savings ran out and he couldn't find a part-time job to support himself.

Wishing to travel and, at the same time, help poor people in the same situation he'd been in, Kelly applied to the Peace corps. Immediately afterward he heard about VISTA. "I liked the idea," he said. "It was brand new. Also, I didn't know my own country and there's sure a lot of poverty here." After six weeks' training at the University of Colorado, he came to Allanville.

Since his arrival, he has worked with a number of teenagers, who, like himself have had a rough time getting through school. He has had some success getting a few dropouts back in the classroom, but one dropped out again and he fears the others might do the same. They aren't encouraged to stay.

He decided to try another approach. He and Brevring organized a neighborhood youth corps project in the community to find jobs for youngsters out of school. They can work for six months under this program before, hopefully, returning to school.

Kelly got one two-time dropout, a high school sophomore, a job cleaning up the education building; a Mexican-American girl, who left school in her senior year, manages a portable library in a nearby migrant camp;

and a 16-year-old freshman has a job in the day-care center. They each promised to go back to school in the fall and Kelly keeps in constant touch with them in hopes that they will.

Last August, Larry was appointed a VISTA leader over 55 Ariziona volunteers. He meets with each volunteer at least once a month and overseas projects at the Job Corps camp in Winslow, the Committee for Economic Opportunity in Tucson, the Guadalupe Community Action organization and MOP, which has 10 centers through the state. Although he has had to drop some of his personal contact work, he still sees the teenagers.

Kelly's second year with VISTA is up this summer and he hopes to leave something behind. He didn't change the world in Allanville. He found out very early that he couldn't but he stayed on for two years "to at least to be able to give back a little."

He maintains that his one year as a volunteer wasn't enough. "I only took in a little of what it's all about," he says. "I stayed another year to give it back and accomplish something." He hopes that after his two years the people in Allanville know "that there are some unprejudiced white people who care."

Kelly will still be able to keep in touch. He plans to finish college at the University of Arizona in Phoenix, 35 miles away, and remain to earn his master's degree in social work. He would eventually like an administrative position with VISTA, preferably in Arizona. He claims he likes the weather.

Public Works and Atomic Energy Commission Appropriation Bill, 1968

SPEECH

OF

HON. W. R. HULL, JR.

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 25, 1967

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 11641) making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, the Panama Canal, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Atlantic-Pacific Interoceanic Canal Study Commission, the Delaware River Basin Commission, Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and the Water Resources Council, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, I should like at this time to commend my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] and his subcommittee for their work on the public works and Atomic Energy Commission appropriations bill.

The public works and Atomic Energy Commission appropriations bill has added significance for me since a number of the programs contained in this bill affect my district in northwestern Missouri. Furthermore, the recent floods in this area emphasize the need to further implement the flood control and watershed projects in northwestern Missouri.

In the past few months approximately 645,000 acres in this area were covered by floodwaters from the Platte, Grand, Chariton, and Missouri Rivers. Estimated damage due to the flooding by these rivers totaled $56 million. Damage by the Platte, Grand, and Chariton Rivers to farmland in the Sixth Congressional District of Missouri, my district, amounted to $8 million and according to the Corps of Engineers only $350,000 in damages was prevented by existing Federal projects on these rivers.

The Corps of Engineers further estimated that $5,370,000 in damages from flooding on the Grand, Platte, and Chariton Rivers could have been prevented had the present authorized flood control project been complete. Yet, such figures as I have just quoted cannot measure the bitterness and frustration which have been left in the wake of the floods. Farmers have seen their corn, wheat, tobacco and soybeans carried off in the floods. Families have been forced to flee their homes before the approaching waters. Furthermore, who can calculate the secondary damages wrought by these floods—the reduction in income which must be borne this year by farmers in this region, the business loss suffered by merchants in the towns of the flooded areas, and the reduced tax collection which will be realized by the various governments, municipal to Federal.

A prominent woman in my district eloquently expressed the sentiments common to the people who have seen their lands and homes devastated year after year while Government protective measures were slow in coming. She said:

> People here know that war and poverty—that's a fighting word—cost; but they also know that that excuse is not good enough, for all they have to do is turn on their televisions and hear people in the Administration say, "We will help every under-developed country." They know too that much of North Missouri is under-developed, despite the fact it has what many a country yearns for—water, open spaces, places for industry, room for people to live, breathe and play. But it seems all this is expendable, and its people will be forced to join the misery of the already teeming dirty cities.

The Appropriations Subcommittee's recommendation of an appropriation of slightly more that $1.5 million will allow the Army Corps of Engineers to begin work on these flood control projects in northwestern Missouri and will demonstrate to the people of this area the Federal Government's concern for their plight. Granted this appropriation is no small sum, yet I respectfully submit that there exists a pressing and continued need to fully implement these projects.

I realize that there must be priorities in our spending, this year in particular. Yet, in considering these and future flood control appropriations, I would remind you that one of our highest priorities in the allocation of funds must be for flood control programs which aid people who are at the mercy of flooding rivers, not just occasionally, but in many cases, such as in the Platte and Grand River basins, annually.

I am happy to see that Mr. KIRWAN's subcommittee report has confirmed that we will not, nor ever will, fail to respond to the plight of citizens, such as those in northwestern Missouri, who are at the mercy of floods and disasters beyond their control.

Kentucky Editorial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. WATTS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 26, 1967

Mr. WATTS. Mr. Speaker, I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the editorial which appeared in the July 19 issue of the Mount Sterling Advocate which stresses the need for every citizen to become "involved" and to urge their legislators to exercise greater judgment and economy in the expenditure of funds.

This challenging editorial was written by the editor and publisher of the Mount Sterling Advocate, Mr. James W. Smith, Jr., one of the most outstanding and knowledgeable editors and dedicated citizens of Kentucky. While some people may disagree with some of the comments in the editorial, I believe the editorial reflects a knowledge of some conditions as they now exist. I commend the reading of this editorial to every Member of the House, the Senate, and the public generally.

If Man Stands Upright, a Backbone Is Required

The greatest need in America today is for a few million citizens who are willing to become "involved."

To become "involved" in 1967, a little work is necessary. "Backbone" is essential. Good, old-fashioned "guts" are better. A thick skin, while not essential, is desirable.

When one becomes "involved," he takes part in the operation of the public's business. He stands up and says what he thinks, and is not afraid to say it—out in the open, to his Congressman, Senators, legislators, as well as to his county and city officials. He is not afraid to be viewed as "behind the times" because of his convictions. He takes pride in being described as "different" when he disagrees with socialistic and communistic concepts of government.

He is not afraid to do battle with the wild-eyed idealists, who are incapable of distinguishing fact from fiction. He is not afraid to challenge the ideas and opinions of anyone. It does not matter from what level of government the "blessings" flow. They all are financed out of the same pockets. Regardless of whether the money is spent from Washington, from Frankfort or from Mt. Sterling, every dime of it comes from the same place.

Therefore, we are at a loss to understand why our citizens refuse to become "involved" to the extent of demanding a stronger voice in who spends their tax money, who gets it and how it is spent.

For example, the taxpayers in Mt. Sterling spend $245 a month for a fireman, who is on duty 24 hours a day, and $310 a month for a policeman, who works 12 hours a day and is on call the other 12. At the same time, these same taxpayers in Mt. Sterling do not object to paying a clerk $308 a month to hand out food stamps, or a secretary in the food stamp office $250 a month—more than they pay a fireman to protect their property day and night.

Our taxes pay two "poverty" workers $250 each a month to sit in an office, from which no benefits to the public ever will be derived, but we pay $5 a month less to the men we expect—and demand—to risk their lives in fighting fires.

We think nothing of paying a small army of "social workers" more per month to handle "cases" than we give to our policemen, upon whom we depend for protection of life and property on a 24-hour basis. Our taxes—not "federal money"—pay Dan Swartz $550 per month to "supervise" the "poverty" workers in Montgomery, Bath and Menifee Counties. We pay our police and fire chiefs less to provide us with services that we must have.

Our tax money is used to pay Gene Stathas $950 a month as the director of the Licking Valley Community Action Program, which we need only because some government clerk said we needed it. That is more than we pay our county judge, our mayor, or any other elected official in our county or city.

Can anyone justify the cutting of the "tax pie" in such a manner. Is there any justice in paying a "poverty director" more than we pay any of our local officials, and twice as much as we pay our chief of police?

Yes, our "social workers" get their paychecks from the state; our "poverty workers" get federal government checks. But, we send the money to Washington and to Frankfort before the checks are sent back to Montgomery County. All of the money comes out of the same pockets, but it doesn't go into the same pots.

Soon, a tax increase will be voted by Congress. We are going to hire more people to give away our money—at a faster pace. And, we are going to give salary increases to all of those who now are busily giving our money away.

What can we do about it? Nothing—unless people are willing to become "involved." If enough people become "involved," there will be no tax increase voted by Congress. Many of the needless programs will be halted, or have all of the excess fat trimmed. Elected officials do listen to the voters. But, the only people who are talking are those who feed at the tax trough.

It is our tax money. We can help decide how it will be spent. But, to get "involved," one must be able to stand upright. That, according to medical science, requires something called a backbone.

A Man Can Get Ahead in Memphis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DAN KUYKENDALL
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 26, 1967

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD I would like to include the second of a series of articles in the Memphis Press-Scimitar showing what the people of Memphis are doing to provide opportunity for all. In Memphis a man gets ahead when he is willing to study and learn and work for the things he desires in life. It is a tribute to all our people in Memphis that so many people of all races are getting ahead.

The second article of the series, "A Man Can Get Ahead in Memphis" follows:

NEGRO LEADERS POINT TO EDUCATION AS KEY FACTOR: A MAN CAN GET AHEAD IN MEMPHIS

(By Kay Pittman Black)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—"Memphis is a good city . . . A man can get ahead in Memphis." Lt. (jg) Friedel C. Greene, 25-year-old Memphis Negro Navy pilot in Vietnam, recently said this to Scripps-Howard reporter Jim Lucas about his plans to return to his home here. The Press-Scimitar today presents the second of three depth studies of how Negroes—men and women—have gotten ahead in Memphis.)

What does it take for a Negro to get ahead in Memphis?

This question was asked Negro leaders in the city. Time and time again the principal answer was education.

Next was drive, the willingness to work, the ability to keep one's eyes focused on stars. But, most important, they said, was to get a good education—To be prepared and well qualified to succeed in a chosen field.

Most of those interviewed had to scratch like cats to achieve their own education. Most held down many jobs, got many scholarships, to grind their way through college. Most came from humble homes. Poverty was their garment but not their goal.

JESSE TURNER

Jesse Turner, member of the Shelby County Quarterly Court and president of the NAACP, credits his parents with inspiring him to get an education.

"They believed everyone should be educated."

Neither his mother or father had a high school education but all of their nine children have college degrees.

He believes strongly in education and believes Negro youth should enter a field in which they are actually interested. They'll do better. Then they should prepare themselves well.

"A Negro can't be average and get anywhere. The Negro who gets into a traditionally all-white field has to be exceptional. His white counterpart can get the same job if he's average."

Good student

Turner went to LeMoyne College on an athletic scholarship. "I wasn't too good of an athlete but I think they kept me on the team because I was a good student."

He worked his way through college, selling scrap iron and metal, being a newspaper carrier and working at other jobs in the summer.

"I chopped cotton. You'd go out in the morning and work all day and get up the next day tired before you started. But there was work to be done and to be done well even if you didn't like it. Sometimes you weren't certain at the end of the week if you'd get paid. Sometimes you got a bad check. Now I read where they get rid of those weeds with chemicals. I can't believe that. I've got to see that sometimes."

Five children

Turner, 47, and his wife have five children.

As a tank company commander in the Italian campaign in World War II, Turner got a Bronze Star for bravery. He worked his way up from private to captain and was cited for leading his company safely across a mined field.

"Fear knows no color," is what he remembers about the war. And the MP's stopping him everytime he passed through Memphis asking him if he was "entitled to be an officer," he said.

Turner got a master's in business administration and accounting at the University of Chicago on the GI Bill of Rights. He was tops in his class in accounting. He returned to Memphis when he was 28 years old "for good, to settle down."

He thinks Negroes have a big problem to overcome. "Many times inspiration and aspiration are lacking. Not enough Negro students are going into business. There is a demand for them. Not one Negro has passed the CPA test here for instance, since I took it years ago and passed it and set myself up as a public accountant."

DR. HOLLIS PRICE

"There's more opportunity today than there was when I came along," said Dr. Hollis Price, president of LeMoyne for 26 years. "The Negro with ability and concern is in considerable demand in all fields."

Dr. Price said that in days gone by when a youngster said he couldn't go to college because he didn't have any money, the statement was true. "But that's not so any more. If they want to go to college, they can. There are all kinds of scholarships and grants. But they have to work at the high school level to take advantage of those scholarships and grants, by keeping up their grades.

Dr. Price feels that one area that many Negro students are overlooking is college teaching. "There is an acute shortage of college teachers," he said.

H. T. LOCKHARD

H. T. Lockhard, administrative assistant to Gov. Buford Ellington, agrees that "Memphis is a place where a man can get ahead."

He won a scholarship to LeMoyne. "If I hadn't it's doubtful if I would have gone to college. The scholarship by itself didn't fill the bill completely. I had a paper route and worked at Hotel Peabody. I worked part time at an undertaker's. In addition to college I worked an eight-hour day at some job all through college." The GI bill carried him the rest of the way.

Lockhard believes young people, particularly young Negro people, must "Learn baby, learn."

"I worked because I believed an education was important. I knew it was. And I understood there was no source I could look to, but myself, for help.

"I observe too often that increasingly younger people who really have the capacity to learn in some measure don't have the drive to make the sacrifices. They don't want to buckle down to temporary, menial type employment. They can't see waiting tables as a means to an end. I can't excuse anyone for passing up a job because the pay is inadequate or it isn't fancy enough."

FRED L. DAVIS

Fred L. Davis, 33, the only Negro employe in the county register's office, knew from the time he was in the sixth grade that the only way he could stay in school was to work. And work he did—waiting tables, chopping cotton, working in warehouses. But he got his degree in business administration from Tennessee State. "I held two jobs in college. I was always tired."

He grew up in the Florida and Trigg area.

"Trigger Slim was electrocuted when I was a kid. He killed a man robbing a liquor store. He was a hero to some of the kids. There were gangs then. Mother was religious and wouldn't let me run with them. She watched me like a hawk. Some of the boys had better minds than I did, but they never got away from Florida and Trigg."

Get up again

Why not? Davis shakes his head. "You've got to want hard. You've got to get an education. You've got to be knocked down and get up again, smiling and ready to go ahead."

He was always president of his classes in grammar school and high school. His wife was an accounting major. They met in college. She's now business manager of Owen College and they have three children.

EDWARD REDDITT

Another who knows hard work is Detective Edward E. Redditt, 37, a 7-year man with the Memphis Police Department and second in charge of the department's community relations department.

He tells you a man is judged on his ability in the police department, not his color. He believes education is the key that opens doors, but that it is also important to give people responsibility.

"Too much is put in front of kids. They need to have more responsibility." A college graduate, he said simply: "None of my people had ever graduated from college. I wanted to do better. This inspired me."

Reddittt thinks the people who cry out that man can't rise above his environment "are for the birds." He said, "Environment doesn't mean anything. Anybody can rise out of mud if he has enough energy to haul his foot up high enough. There's always that

10 per cent who can be born with a silver spoon in their mouths and tear up the finest hotel in town."

A. W. WILLIS

A. W. Willis, leader in the Shelby County Democratic Club and a second termer in the Tennessee House of Representatives, didn't go hungry as a child—"but I had to work to earn my spending money." His father and Dr. J. E. Walker organized the Universal Life Insurance Co. He went to Talladega College in Talladega, Ala., and got his law degree from the University of Wisconsin.

"My granddaddy was a slave in Georgia, freed when he was eight. Then his mother got a mule and a wagon, and settled in Mississippi. Granddaddy was a farmer in Mississippi. He had 12 children and managed to put all through college."

Stop running

He believes Memphis is a place where a Negro can get ahead. "It doesn't solve anything running from town to town. There are many opportunities in this city and many more for those who want to stay here and work for them."

He believes a good well-rounded education is important. "Negro youth must learn to use his vote in an effective way. America is based on the vote. That's what we're all about, that's our strength as a country."

"Even though Atlanta likes to boast of its forwardness, the fundamental ingredients of Memphis, I think, are better and would tend to give a Negro man more opportunity. I believe Memphis will probably rise to become one of the most progressive cities in the United States," Willis said.

Dr. R. Q. Venson, one of the organizers of the Cotton Makers Jubilee, is "going on 73." He moved to Memphis in the early 1900's to study dentistry and decided to settle down here "because I thought Memphis had a great future for both white and Negro. I was right. There are opportunities undreamed of today for the Negro youth who wants to take advantage of them and are prepared to do so."

"The great thing about America is that it is a government of minority groups. Father was a slave but he managed to make a comfortable living farming in Louisiana after gaining his freedom."

Venson believes "America is the only country in the world where a person like me could go where I've gone." But he went there on initiative, education and "a belief in service."

His wife, Ethyl, 22 years his junior, is the first woman to serve on the Memphis Housing Authority board.

MRS. VENSON

Mrs. Venson, a graduate of LeMoyne, has worked on various community service boards as a volunteer, serving with Shelby United Neighbors, Liberty Bowl, Heart Association, and the Red Cross, among others. She headed the War on Poverty organization.

"There are many opportunities for young people today," she said. "I can remember when you had to fight to get recognized as a member of a board of directors. Now I see young Negro people just walk into positions like that and take it as a matter of course. That's progress and I've lived to see it."

She, like many others, believes education is of prime importance but so is the "ability not to mind hard work."

Dr. and Mrs. Venson both say: "There's no kind of humiliation we haven't suffered as Negroes. But we don't think that's any reason we should go out and jump on someone else. You just have to rise above it and keep plugging. You can't give up."

JOHN ARNOLD

John Arnold, who has the only Negro advertising agency in the city and one of the oldest Negro agencies in the country, said: "Education is the key to it all. There is always a demand for qualified people. Sure, I've had to work hard. Advertising is a tough business, no matter what color your skin is. It's 20 times tougher if you happen to be a Negro. But that's no reason to give up. It's a wide open field for Negroes, one that is being ignored. But kids now, it seems to me, want to start at the top. That's not the way this field works."

SUGARMON

Russell Sugarmon, a Harvard Law School graduate, came from a comfortably situated family. He never missed a meal or had to work his way through college. But he returned to Memphis, his home, after college. "There weren't as many opportunities then as there are now—I wanted to help make some." He was one of the re-organizers of the Shelby County Democratic Club, and believes the Negroes ability to make his vote felt has opened many doors.

He believes the power of the vote is stronger than the demonstrations "because there's a chance of violence in demonstrations".

Sugarmon said that those with education can make it—"but what I'm worried about are the drop-outs, the ones who don't make it to college."

Ted Foedisch Reelected Pennsylvania State Commander of the American Legion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 26, 1967

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, very often I have seen constituents of various Members on the Hill and have overheard their comments of pride in "their" Congressman. I would like to be allowed a minute to turn the tables.

I happen to be proud of a longtime friend and fellow member of the Rhawnhurst-Castor Memorial Post No. 754. For Ted Foedisch has just been reelected Pennsylvania State commander of the American Legion.

Commander Foedisch, who also lives in my district, is a 22-year member of our post. He is its past commander and he also served as commander of the Legion's fifth district, which is composed of 21 posts throughout greater northeast Philadelphia, which is my congressional district.

Since 1961 when Ted was elected eastern vice commander of the Pennsylvania American Legion, he has served as chairman of its statewide membership and uniform and emblem committees. During the past 5 years he has been chairman of the Legions Keystone Boys State, a summer leadership encampment at Penn State University for high school seniors.

Ted Foedisch is the first Philadelphian to head a Pennsylvania American Legion since 1956. I might point out that the Pennsylvania Legion is the largest State unit currently boasting enrollment of 245,000.

Mr. Speaker, this time the honor was all mine. Last Friday when Ted Foedisch was chosen State commander in Pittsburgh and again last Sunday when I was thrilled to ride with him in a parade and join in a celebration for him at our Rhawnhurst-Castor Memorial Post.

Article by Rabbi Allan Summers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. REES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 26, 1967

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, a distinguished constituent, Rabbi Allan Summers, recently published in the B'nai B'rith Messenger an analysis of Egypt's right to be in the Sinai Peninsula. In the article, he examines the territoriality question from several different perspectives, and because of its timely interest, I would like to have the article included in the RECORD:

A STUDIOUS ANALYSIS OF EGYPT'S RIGHT TO BE IN THE SINAI PENINSULA

During the Middle East crisis, the public has been flooded with many conflicting reports concerning this crisis. So numerous and contradictory are the claims, that it became exceedingly difficult to discern who is right and who is wrong, who is the aggressor and who the victim of aggression.

As a student of history, I would like to point out a few irrefutable facts relating to this conflict. Let us first consider the crisis from its geographic aspect. In the past two decades we heard the loud cry, "Africa for the Africans!" Heeding this cry the colonial powers, Great Britain, France, Belgium and Portgual, granted independence to more than 50 new nations. Thus "Africa for the Africans" became a de facto international law. A corollary of this de facto law would be that no African nation has a right to extend its sovereignty to another continent. This being the case let us approach the problem of Egypt.

A glance at the map tells us that Egypt is on the African continent. And where is the Sinai Peninsula? Another glance at the mayp shows us that the Sinai Peninsula is part of Asia Minor. Thus, by merely studying a map it becomes clear who is the aggressor in this conflict. The map shows that Egypt, an African nation, has tried to extend its boundaries into Asia Minor.

Now let us study the historical aspect of our problem. Prior to World War I Egypt was a British colony. In 1922 Britain was entrusted with the mandate over Palestine. For the sake of administrative expedience Britain attached the Sinai Peninsula to Egypt. This vital fact has been well documented in an article published in the U.S. Congressional Record immediately after the Sinai conflict of 1956. According to the U.S. Congressional Record the Sinai Peninsula was never legally an integral part of Egypt. Hence, Egypt has no legal or moral rights to territory that is outside the African continent.

On the other hand, Israel's claim to the Sinai Peninsula is both legal and historic. Geographically, the Peninsula is a part of Asia Minor, bordering Israel. Historically, the Jewish people occupied the Sinai Peninsula for 40 years after their exodus from Egypt. It was in this desert that God first revealed himself to the nation on Mt. Sinai. Furthermore, concerning the southern boundaries of the Holy Land the Bible states: "and the border shall extend from Azman onto the River of Egypt (i.e. the Gulf of Suez)." (Numbers 35:5). Thus, the Bible clearly demarcates the Sinai Peninsula as a part of Israel.

For those who do not accept the historical validity of the Bible, but do accept the validity of conquest as a historical claim to an area, should recall that on November 6–7, 1956 Israel captured the entire Peninsula. Israel was forced to withdraw and surrender her newly acquired territory because of pressure from our then Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles. In return for Israel's withdrawal from this area, the U.S. government assured Israel's territorial integrity and free passage of Israeli ships through the Gulf of Aqaba.

The U.S. commitment as stated in 1956 has not been fulfilled, neither by the U.S. or by the U.N.

Israel's territorial integrity repeatedly has not been protected and free passage to the Gulf of Aqaba has been denied by Nasser. Once again the U.S. and the U.N. have not moved to defend Israel. Israel, in possession of the Sinai once again, is given no alternative but to insure her own territorial and economic integrity in retaining the Peninsula since no other nation or international body has lived up to its commitment to her.

Aside from the territorial conflict there are political and social reasons for Arab animosity toward the existence of Israel. For centuries Arabian tyrants, Kings, pashas and sheiks kept the masses submerged in poverty, ignorance and disease. Even the so-called revolutions that have taken place in these countries have only replaced the traditional dictators with "new colonels" who have carried on their tradition of exploiting the common people. Israel, practically at their doorstep, created a modern Western state, with a democratic form of government, universal education, and equal rights for women. The existence of the State of Israel has become a serious threat to the hegemony of the Arab potentates, who do not want their people to learn about the existence of the 40 hour work week, about social security and the right to strike. Hence Arab rulers instigate the masses against Israel.

Their main objective is to stop the spread of social reform which the Arab rulers regard as a dangerous disease. This explains why Arab potentates clamor for the destruction of Israel and cry for her obliteration. The essence of the struggle of democracy against medieval tyranny is embodied in the Mideast conflict. The "champions of democracy" must come to the aid of the only foothold of democracy in the Middle East.

White House Again Misstates the Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROGER H. ZION

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 26, 1967

Mr. ZION. Mr. Speaker, the administration's response to last week's House defeat of the rat extermination bill was, unfortunately, predictable, as usual. A sudden great outpouring of demagogic invective against the Republican Party and the responsible position taken on this measure was inevitable.

The Evansville Press, of Evansville, Ind., seeking to place the issue in its proper perspective, issued the following editorial on Monday, July 24. I place this editorial in the RECORD, as follows:

LINE HAD TO BE DRAWN: BILL'S HOUSE DEFEAT WAS NOT "RATS VERSUS CHILDREN'S DECISION"

Just as was predicted on the floor of the House at the time, President Johnson acts as if he intends to make a political issue of the House defeat last week of his so-called "rat extermination" bill.

The way the President talks of it, the issue is rats vs. children. This strikes us as unfair to the majority of House members who voted down his bill.

It is true there was some levity in the House debate—facetious questions about whether there would be a federal "rat commissioner," and other corny cracks. But nobody denies rats are a genuine menace—they are dirty, they lug disease, they often bite small children, they are foremost among our pests.

But what the House was trying to say, in voting down this $40-million bill, was not that the majority favors rats, or has any lack of sympathy for a campaign to get rid of them.

The bill was only another in a great string of legislation over the years in which the federal government has moved into local affairs lock, stock and barrel on borrowed money. In this case, right into the garbage cans—for one of the vague provisions of the bill was that the Housing and Urban Development Department would undertake to "improve" garbage collection.

It was just that the House finally decided a line had to be drawn somewhere.

Moreover, four other government agencies already have "rat control" programs of some description, apparently not very effective ones. The House noted that despite the millions or billions the government pours into hundreds of so-called local-aid programs, the results rarely are comparable to the spending. In this case, the House simply concluded—on the basis of past evidence—that this would be just another federal program which would grow and grow, while the rat population grew right along with it.

The 207-to-176 vote by which the President's rat bill was defeated was not a vote in defense of rats; it was merely a register of House opinion that the government wouldn't turn out to be a very good ratter.

POW's: Who Speaks for Their Freedom?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 26, 1967

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, as one of many former military prisoners of war of the National Socialistic German Workers Party, also commonly known as Nazis, I retain vivid recollections of the mental anguish of being deprived of my liberty in a strange land, the soul torture at the thought of being forgotten by my fellow countrymen. At gunpoint, compelled to toil at forced labor—to barely exist on a starvation diet planned as a security measure to sap a prisoner's strength and discourage escape—the longing for home and loved ones.

Yet, at this very moment, as we talk coexistence, human rights, and antipoverty, our fellow countrymen who have served our country languish in Communist prisons in North Korea, Red China, and North Vietnam—some wounded and many distressed with little encouragement or hope. They seek no fame, publicity, or fortune—they just want to come home.

How shallow the words: "world order," "social justice," "foreign aid," yet no initiative to help or return U.S. prisoners of war. The draft dodgers and disloyal demonstrators have constitutional rights—those who aid and abet the enemy gain ignomous fame by notoriety, but our boys who have escaped death to face future harrassment and torture are abandoned like an old worn out shoe or cast-off piece of equipment. They have no protection or encouragement. They walk by faith and not by sight.

If the State Department wants to continue playing games with the Communists, let us not belittle the mentality of the parents and families of our military prisoners by saying no help can be offered because we are not engaged in a "declared" war. Only a fool would believe that there is not a war in South Vietnam where men wearing the uniform of the U.S. Army, numbering over 12,000, have had their hearts torn out. To say that the war is not declared is academic—a play on words.

We at home owe a great debt to our living dead. Every forceful diplomatic pressure must be exerted to obtain their release and return to the United States and loved ones.

Mr. Speaker, I have received a resolution from the Alliance for Abandoned American Fighting Men which I include here in my remarks:

RESOLUTION OF ALLIANCE FOR ABANDONED AMERICAN FIGHTING MEN

Whereas: Article VI of the United States Constitution specifically states that provisions within treaties ratified by the U.S. Government become "supreme law of the land" notwithstanding contrary limitations of the Constitution itself: and

Whereas: The ratification of the United Nations treaty in 1945 has literally become a "Pandora's Box" nullifying Constitutional protection for men and women of our armed forces stationed in all parts of the World: and

Whereas: Notwithstanding solemn promises ratified at the International Conferences at Geneva (1954–55) that all-prisoners of war captured during the Korean Conflict (1950–52) would be unconditionally released, no pretense of compliance has been advanced by defiant Communist aggressors: and

Whereas: Repeated appeals on the part of parents, relatives and dependents of those unfortunate victims of Communist Outlawry have proven ineffective whether addressed through the U.S. State Department channels, or the United Nations: and

Whereas: With the continuation of the Communist "blue-print" to over-run and over-rule Southeast Asia, upwards of 400,000 of our young "American Defenders of Freedom" are daily placed in jeopardy of Communist brutality as administered by unscrupulous North Vietnamese.

Now therefore, be it resolved:

1. That the National Executive Board of the Alliance for Abandoned American Fighting Men (AAAFM) strongly endorses military operations against communist aggression in Southeast Asia including such military measures as may be required to achieve the territorial independence and integrity for South Vietnam.

2. That a more determined effort be made by our State Department, through diplomatic channels to acquire the release and Freedom from captivity those American Fighting Men of the Korean Conflict whose Constitutional protection was denied to them by reason of the fact that United Na-

tions action supercedes that of the U.S. Constitution: and

3. That there be proposed to and enacted by the Congress of the United States certain protective legislation similar to the uniform code of miliary justice, Public Law 506 applicable to American personnel captured in military operations other than in "declared warfare" to assure that the full force, authority and power of the United States of America shall henceforth be squarely committed to the attainment of Freedom from captivity of all Americans captured in such military actions past and future.

Respectfully submitted.

CARL E. CLIFFORD,
National Legislative Director.

Attest:

HENRY P. PARIS,
Executive Secretary.

Quality Health Care: Ability Versus Costs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 26, 1967

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, because medical care costs have been rising rapidly, President Johnson recently called a National Conference on Medical Costs. One of those who attended the Conference was Bert Seidman, director of the AFL–CIO Department of Social Security.

Mr. Seidman reported on this Conference in an interview on the AFL–CIO public service program, "Labor News Conference," heard on the Mutual Broadcasting System national radio network.

Since this is a matter of concern to all of us, I include a transcript of the interview in the RECORD at this point:

QUALITY HEALTH CARE: ABILITY VERSUS COSTS

Guest: Bert Seidman, director of the AFL–CIO's Department of Social Security.

Panel: Judith Randal, medical writer for the Washington Evening Star, Jerome Brazda, editor of the Washington Report on the Medical Sciences.

Moderator: Harry W. Flannery.

FLANNERY. Labor News Conference. Welcome to another edition of Labor News Conference, a public affairs program brought to you by the AFL–CIO. Labor News Conference brings together leading AFL–CIO representatives and ranking members of the press. Today's guest is Bert Seidman, director of the AFL–CIO's Department of Social Security.

Last year, medical care prices rose rapidly. During the first three months of 1967, those prices continued to rise—in some cases, at a faster rate than during 1966. Lowering the costs of medical services without impairing quality was the subject of a National Conference on Medical Costs last month in Washington, D.C., called at the request of President Lyndon B. Johnson. Here to question Mr. Seidman, a delegate to the conference, about its findings and how they can be applied to putting quality personal health care within the financial reach of more Americans, are Judith Randal, medical writer for the Washington Evening Star, and Jerome Brazda, editor of the Washington Report on the Medical Sciences. Your moderator, Harry W. Flannery.

And now, Miss Randal, I believe you have the first question?

RANDAL. Mr. Seidman, just what are the components of this price rise, and what relative part does each component play in the total cost spiral?

SEIDMAN. Well, I think we should first get some idea of just what has been happening to the over-all picture of medical costs, and then discuss the separate items one by one.

In the 10-year period of 1956 to 1966, the cost of medical care increased at a rate more than twice that for all items in the consumer price index—in other words, everything that people would have to buy—food, housing and all the other things that go into the standard of living.

Now, if you take the period from 1966 to 1967, the rise rate then doubled or tripled. In other words, for the past 18 months, prices which had already been rising at a rate more than twice as much as all other items, rose at the still faster rate of about two or three times as much as during the previous 10 years.

This gives some idea of the over-all picture.

Now, take physicians' fees and hospital charges—the two largest components of the over-all medical care price picture. From 1960 to 1965, physicians' fees were increasing about 3 percent a year. In 1966, they increased nearly 8 percent. And again, the same rate—or a faster rate—in 1967.

Hospital charges show the same general proportion. That is, hospital charges have gone up, in the past 18 months, about 2½ or 3 times more than they did in the 1960 to 1965 period. Hospital charges have gone up at a rate of about 17 or 18 percent a year. That is even faster than physicians' fees.

As to the picture of drug costs, it is a little harder to get information, because the official index deals primarily with drugs that were popular 6 or 7 years ago, rather than the drugs that are being bought now. But, if you take the drug picture, prices have also been rising at a very rapid rate.

For example, in a 10-year period—I don't have the figures right up to date—but the 10-year period from 1954 to 1964, the average price of drug prescriptions was rising at the rate, according to drug industry sources, of something like 30 to 50 percent, whereas the consumer price index for all items in that period rose by about 16 percent.

The general picture is what all our listeners know, Miss Randal. That is, medical costs have been rising very much more rapidly than all other prices. This is despite the fact that prices have been rising generally somewhat more rapidly in the past 1½ or 2 years than they had, say, during the previous 5 years.

BRAZDA. Al right, we will grant then, Mr. Seidman, that costs are increasing—statistics certainly show that. Let's try to get your views on why they are rising. What is behind this? Why don't we take them one at a time? Why are physician fees rising, in your estimation, especially over the last year?

SEIDMAN. Well, the problem is that there is really no control of physicians' fees. That is, the average person, despite all the talk about free choice of doctors, doesn't really have any choice as to the doctor he goes to. If he is under some kind of insurance program—if he is under Medicare—he goes to his neighborhood doctor or he goes to a doctor to whom he has been referred by another doctor. The doctors know this. And there is an insufficient supply of physicians.

The result is, that doctors' incomes have been going up at a terrific rate. I have been talking about physicians' fees, but the doctors' incomes have been going up even faster. The doctors' incomes have been increasing an average of 8 percent a year from 1955 to 1965, and undoubtedly, there was a much bigger rise during the past 18 months.

I don't think many people realize that one-third of all the physicians in this country are now earning more than $40,000 a year. It is a little rough on a worker who is getting maybe a 3 percent or 4 percent rise in income, and is earning $110 a week—not to speak of the elderly on Medicare, who have much lower incomes—to know that the doctor that they are going to is making that kind of money, and that his income is increasing at that kind of rate.

Now, the problem is, we don't have controls over medical fees. The doctors can charge just about whatever they want to.

BRAZDA. What would you suggest?

SEIDMAN. I think that we have a problem which we have to deal with in several ways. But the main thing that I would suggest is that there should be control, through fee schedules, of what are called "third parties," who pay for medical care. By "third parties," I mean, for instance, the government programs like Medicare, which is now paying something like $640 million a year to physicians for medical services to the elderly. I think doctors' fees ought to be controlled by some reasonable fee schedule, based on what fees are being charged in the communities, and some reasonable restraints on the increase in these fees.

BRAZDA. Well, the insurance companies already have fee schedules, do they not?

SEIDMAN. I was starting to say that some of the insurance companies do have them, but often there are what are called "income limitations" on that sort of thing. So, while the doctor can charge only the scheduled fee for a person with a certain income—and sometimes it is a rather low income and doesn't cover, for example, all workers certainly—the doctor can charge a higher fee for those at higher incomes.

But the worst thing of all, in my opinion, is that in a program such as Medicare, where you are dealing with the elderly group after retirement—after the age of 65, with very limited incomes—there is virtually no restraint on what the doctors can charge.

Now, it is true that under Medicare, Mr. Brazda, there are two systems of reimbursement. One is called "direct billing," and the other is "assignment." "Direct billing" is when the doctor bills the patient, and the patient then has to seek reimbursement from Medicare. The other system, called "assignment," is where the doctor agrees that he will accept what is called a "reasonable and customary charge"—the determination of the reasonable and customary charge from the insurance company or Blue Shield, which may be acting for the government as an intermediary in Medicare. To that extent, there is a limit.

But, this "reasonable and customary" charge is based on what doctors are charging. And if they increase their charges, this becomes the new prevailing level.

Therefore, there is no end to this cycle. We have got to put some brakes on this somewhere.

RANDAL. In that case, Mr. Seidman, what kind of an incentive system can you see to cover the insurance companies, so that this might be at least considered?

SEIDMAN. Well, I think that one incentive would be for trade unions in particular, and also management, to realize that they ought to be considering what they are paying for with the dollars that are negotiated in collective bargaining for health programs. Now, we have had the problem—many of our unions have had the problem in the past, Miss Randal—that they would negotiate so many cents per-hour for health programs, thinking that this would pay for the health needs of their members—at least, up to a certain point. Then they would find that because hospital charges were raised, because doctors' fees were raised—as a matter of fact, sometimes, almost at the moment this money became available—they would find that this was a treadmill, that they just couldn't keep up, and they would negotiate more money.

The employer, if he were paying for it, would be putting in more money, but the worker would be getting just exactly the same amount of medical care, and no more. He would have to pay the rest out of his pocket. And we find that in many cases, this means that as much as two-thirds of the total bill is paid by the worker out of pocket. The average runs about 40 to 60 percent.

So, in many of these programs, particularly those programs in which the insurance companies will pay on the basis of what the doctor charges, up to a certain point—what we call indemnity programs—workers are finding that they are just not keeping up, and that their medical care costs are not being met.

We think—and incidentally, a forward-looking employer representative at the Conference made this suggestion—that labor and management, who have an equal interest in this problem, should get together and perhaps bargain with the providers of medical care—the hospitals and the doctors—so that we begin to get some order in this picture.

Now, the government also has a responsibility, as I have already indicated, with respect to such programs as Medicare, where it can play a large role.

Randal. In view of the traditional way of doing business that doctors use in this country, how do you see this working out? Would you bargain with AMA, (American Medical Association), for instance, or would you bargain with individual doctors, or with group practices? Just what kind of machinery would you set up to do this?

Seidman. There are very many ways of dealing with this problem. Of course, we are really covering two different aspects of the problem at the same time. That part of medical care which is provided and paid for as a result of collective bargaining. This is on the private level. Then we are also talking about public programs, such as Medicare.

Now, the way in which you would approach this might be somewhat different in the two cases, although the principle is the same. That principle is, doctors must be made to realize that this is not a never-ending spiral—that they can't take the market for whatever they can get—that there must be some control on the fees they charge.

Now, these should be reasonable controls. But the problem that we face is that there are no controls at all, at the present time.

Let me read you a statement adopted by the House of Delegates of American Medical Association just last month. It is very interesting, because they are talking about hospitals. They say, "Historically, hospitals have been insulated from the discipline of the marketplace. The price of hospital care is a reflection of the hospital cost curve, and now these costs appear to be out of control. The hospital's privilege of automatically translating all higher costs into higher prices must now be questioned. Incentives for increased efficiency and productivity are mandatory."

I can agree with that 100 percent, Miss Randal. With respect to hospitals, I agree with the AMA.

But you know, you could change that paragraph, and every time the word "hospital" is used, just put in the word "physician," and it would be just as true, because the marketplace disciplines don't apply to doctors. Their prices are getting sky-high. They have no incentives for efficiency.

As a matter of fact, there are fewer incentives for efficiency for most physicians, unless they are in the hospital fewer incentives for those working in their offices than there are for the hospitals.

It seems to me that we have to begin to think about putting some real controls on this.

Labor and management can get together and help in this direction. The insurance companies have a role to play. Certainly the government has a role to play. And, so do all of us, as consumers.

Flannery. Mr. Seidman, wouldn't some of the other answers be group medical practice and other things? For instance, many of the things now done by doctors, being done by clerks, and nurses and various kinds of assistants.

Seidman. You are perfectly right, Mr. Flannery.

Flannery. This should reduce costs. Can we expect doctors' fees to come down then, when these things are done—if they are done?

Seidman. You talked about—group practice plans. What we mean, I think, by group practice plans, are those plans where the doctors operate as a group—where all the specialists, plus the general practitioner are represented in the group. Usually, where there is some kind of consumer control, and where there is a pre-payment system in which the individual patient himself, or his employer on behalf of him, pays a fixed amount to the group practice pre-payment plan—the organization—to provide comprehensive medical care.

Now, one of the reasons why this results in lower costs is that it is then possible to carry on more of the medical care outside the hospital. The most expensive type of medical care is in-hospital care. And the experience of group practice pre-payment plans has been that they have had a far lower rate of hospitalization than those types of systems which do not provide for comprehensive, pre-paid care.

Flannery. Were these subjects discussed at the Conference, Mr. Seidman?

Seidman. Yes. In quite a number of panels at the Conference, the question of group practice pre-payment plans as one important way of lowering the cost of medical care and improving the quality was covered. The general sentiment seemed to be strongly in favor of trying to expand group practice pre-payment plans. As a matter of fact, the report which the government issued prior to the Conference emphasized this as one important avenue.

Now, you also touched on the question of using the doctors' skills at their highest levels. We think this is also important.

It is possible for nurses, for the equivalent of the military corpsmen of the Army—the civilian equivalent—perhaps to be trained so that they can take over some of the work—some of the more routine work—which is now being done by doctors. This would improve the productivity of doctors, because they could then be doing that which they are really trained for and they alone can do. And at the same time, it would help to reduce the over-all costs.

Brazda. Mr. Seidman, before we get on to perhaps a couple of other topics, there is one question which I think is unanswered, and I think, begs to be answered. That is, you keep talking about controls over doctors fees. How are you going to put doctors in the employ of the government? Are you going to have regulations to control how much doctors can charge? How are you going to control the fees of a private practitioner?

Seidman. I think that the important way of controlling the fees of the private practitioner will vary, depending on whether it is a government program or a private program. But essentially, I think this can be done by establishing for each area, a fee schedule for the type of services provided by doctors.

This is already being done, as you mentioned, Mr. Brazda, by Blue Shield. The doctors accept this, up to a point, but they insist on charging far more than this in the Medicare program, and they insist on charging far more than this in the case of workers who are not at minimum levels of wages.

Brazda. This is what I mean. How are you going to stop them from charging more?

Seidman. I think that the doctors will participate in any program provided they are being treated reasonably. I think our experience under Medicare shows that. There was talk about a doctors strike and so on, but clearly, most doctors don't want anything of that kind.

The doctors, I think, if they know that people understand what is happening, also, if they know that people simply cannot afford to have this kind of spiral continue indefinitely—that they won't be able to purchase medical care—I think that doctors will recognize that they are killing the goose that is laying the golden eggs, and they will accept this.

But, we have got to get some real initiative and some real determination on the part of the government and on the part of private groups, including labor and management, if we are going to accomplish this.

Brazda. You are still talking about a voluntary effort, though, not compulsory?

Seidman. Oh, you can't force people to provide medical care, any more than you can force them to do anything else. But I don't think that most doctors will just opt out, if the government and if private organizations determine that they are not going to continue to pay these exhorbitant fees.

Flannery. It is generally agreed, isn't it, Mr. Seidman, that the first year of Medicare was quite successful?

Seidman. Yes, it has been a successful program. It has provided medical care for hundreds of thousands—millions of elderly—who could not have obtained it otherwise. There are problems, however, Mr. Flannery, and we are going to have to try to meet them.

Flannery. Hasn't Medicare also been an advantage to the doctor, in getting many bills paid, which they weren't able to collect before?

Seidman. That is certainly true, because Medicare reimburses the doctor now, 100 percent, where before, the doctor was frequently carrying the elderly—either not charging them at all, or, when they couldn't afford to pay, charging only what may be called token charges.

So, the amount of income that the doctor receives is now much higher, as a result of Medicare.

Flannery. Thank you, Miss Randal, and thank you Mr. Brazda and Mr. Seidman. Today's Labor News Conference guest was Bert Seidman, director of the AFL–CIO's Department of Social Security. Representing the press were Jerome Brazda, editor of the Washington Report on the Medical Sciences, and Judith Randal, medical writer for the Washington Evening Star. This is your moderator, Harry W. Flannery, inviting you to listen next week when Labor News Conference is again presented as a public service by the AFL–CIO, produced in cooperation with the Mutual Radio Network.

Upgrading Houses for a Better City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 26, 1967

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, the private enterprise that built most of our Nation's houses is beginning to recognize the potential in rehabilitating them.

I am proud that in my city of Pittsburgh, headquarters of 25 of America's 500 largest corporations, a consortium of farsighted businessmen and industrialists has put forward, under the aegis of ACTION-Housing, Inc., a bold plan for the rehabilitation and resale each year of

1,000 deteriorating but structurally sound houses.

In the belief that this plan and others like it offer the best hope for keeping our country's cities up to date, I insert in the RECORD at this point an editorial from the Pittsburgh Press of July 11, 1967, which briefly outlines the ACTION-Housing plan and its great potential. The editorial follows:

UPGRADING HOUSES FOR A BETTER CITY

How to provide modern housing in a way that will put it within the financial grasp of low-income, or even average-income, families is an old dream and an old problem of developers, city planners, sociologists and many others with a vision of a better community.

The many factors involved make the dream elusive—cost of materials, cost of labor, cost of mortgage money, land availability and costs, taxes and the addition of labor-saving devices in the home which have become necessities but add to the overall cost.

Yet this is a problem which must be solved in each large city, if that city is to keep pace with the times. We have come to the realization that we can't solve it merely by bulldozing older areas or replacing them with new suburban housing developments.

The most promising plan yet was unveiled the other day in Pittsburgh by the forward-looking ACTION-Housing, Inc. It calls for turning deteriorating or even dilapidated houses into modern homes that can be rented for about $100 a month or sold for about $12,000.

That calls for some close planning. It requires co-operation all along the line, from government, industry, labor unions, mortgage lenders and others. Fortunately, the strong civic backing enjoyed by ACTION-Housing seems to assure that sort of cooperation.

The housing group envisages a corporation which would buy up old housing and recreate it through low-cost methods. Amazingly, the plan calls for making new houses out of old in 30 days, at the rate of 1000 units a year.

A key element in the plan is the willingness of unions in the building trades to permit construction practices which cut across the old, rigid jurisdictional lines and also to agree to employment of minority groups.

Such co-operation has been pledged by Anthony J. Furlan, president of the Pittsbugh Building Trades Council. And previous experience points up the fact that this pledge is not just talk. The same council made an agreement six years ago which made possible the successful East Hills Park housing project.

There's a lot of work to be done. It is estimated that there are 40,000 housing units in Pittsburgh in need of rehabilitation, with 50,000 more in Allegheny County outside the city. If the community can engage in a continuous, year by year, renewal program, we can get the housing we need at the price we need, keep many men at work and, best of all, make sure the community keeps up to date.

What's Needed To Stop the Riots

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 24, 1967

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, in last night's Washington Evening Star, Paul Hope made some insightful comments on what we must do to stop the crime and violence that is erupting in cities throughout our land.

I am hopeful that we here in the House will begin now to take steps along the lines Mr. Hope advocates and begin to take constructive action toward building a better nation for all Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I commend his article to the attention of my colleagues and the readers of the RECORD, as follows:

NEEDED: A WAR ON WAR IN STREETS

(By Paul Hope)

If the United States ever gets done in, it won't be because there's a Communist behind every tree, as the John Birch president, Robert Welch, likes to believe, but because the greatest power on earth couldn't find a way to solve its race problem.

One thing the Great Society has plenty of are wars—on poverty, disease, hunger and ignorance; the war in Vietnam. It's about time to declare war on the sharply escalating war in the streets of the nation's cities.

One of the first things that seems to be in order is for leaders, black and white, to quit making excuses for lawlessness. Of course the Negro has been downtrodden and discriminated against for 300 years, but that doesn't give him the right to shoot up a city and loot the stores.

A man who makes a firebomb and throws it through a shop window is not doing it because his grandfather was a slave. A sniper who climbs on top of a building and shoots at firemen and lawmen—even at bystanders of his own race—is not doing it because he doesn't have a job. He's doing it just for the plain hell of it.

Nonviolent marches and picketing in behalf of a cause are one thing—pillaging a city is another.

It's time politicians quit offering the Negro pie in the sky and started real work on his problems.

The impractical hue and cry to get rid of the ghettos is a case in point. As a practical matter there is no way to get rid of the ghettos.

The government could spend $100 billion a year rebuilding cities and most whites still would live in one place and most Negroes in another—that's just a plain fact of life until both races really are ready to accept one another as true brothers and live, love and be happy together.

Slum clearance projects don't necessarily increase understanding or communication between the races. Look at the Southwest Washington redevelopment area where Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey lives in an expensive new apartment building.

Southwest Washington was a Negro slum until the bulldozers moved in and fancy new apartments and townhouses were built. Where did the Negroes go? They aren't living in the high-cost apartments or the $40,000 townhouses. They just shifted from the old ghetto to a new one.

Urban renewal projects have produced rows of 20-story apartment buildings for Negro tenants in Southside Chicago. About all that did was stack the ghetto skyward instead of having it spread out on the ground. The Negroes on the top floor may be closer to God but not much nearer to an understanding with the white people who run the city—and sometimes it's a long wait for the elevator.

The nation apparently is going to have to live with the fact that many of its major cities will be inhabited primarily by Negroes. The poor and the ignorant from the rural areas keep flooding into the cities looking for their pot of gold; and sometimes they're lucky if they can find a pot of beans.

The only real answer for the Negro in the ghetto is education. The economy can use only so many ditchdiggers, street cleaners and garbage men.

The solution to uplifting the minds and dreams of the Negroes and preparing them for jobs would seem not so much in prettying up the ghettos but rather in a massive infusion of money into the education systems of the troubled cities. Give a Negro an education and training so he can get a decent job and he will make his surroundings more comfortable on his own.

It seems time to quit worrying so much about racial balances in schools and concentrate on giving the Negro an adequate education wherever he happens to live.

If it takes one teacher to every five students instead of one to 30 to get the job done, then that's what should be provided.

If it takes a policeman stationed at every school to keep a lid on rowdyism in the classroom, then that should be provided, too. It probably would do more good having a policeman around to help keep order in the schools than on the street passing out traffic tickets.

Maybe it is true, as so often has been said, that many of the present generation of ghetto youth are lost. But that's no reason to lose the next generation.

If the cities are to have Negro majorities, the Negroes must eventually be given, and they must be able to assume, the responsibility for running them.

The firebomb and the sniper's gun must be traded in for a responsible place in society. The nation cannot afford to let lawlessness become a way of life in its industrial heartland.

Antiriot Training Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 26, 1967

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, crisis is piling on crisis throughout our Nation. Law and order have broken down. Anarchy and rioting and insurrection dot the map.

It is time for our national leadership to speak up against those who are causing this blot on America, our beloved Nation.

There is no doubt in my mind that those who are tearing down the basic institutions of our country—based on law, order and justice—are such as the H. Rap Browns and the Stokely Carmichaels, who openly call for riots upon riots in every part of the United States.

Only prompt, certain and sufficient penalties can bring a return to civilized behavior. Those in responsibility at the Federal, State and local levels must first crack down on those who incite riots. These people must be punished.

Also, Mr. Speaker, we must equip and train our law enforcement officers to deal with riots, anarchy and insurrection. It is apparent from local disturbances that our police officers and National Guardsmen do not have the needed training and abilities to cope with instant and dangerous riots such as the ones in Newark and Detroit. I have sponsored and pushed for legislation to assist local law enforcement agencies with modern methods of crime detection, and have vigorously worked for antiriot legislation, which has passed the House of Representatives.

There is another thing we can do in Congress. That is, the training of National Guard troops specifically in riot control techniques and furnish the necessary equipment so as to more effectively deal with riots and other violent disturbances. Today, I am introducing legislation to accomplish this. The Congress should set immediately to direct the Department of Defense to begin this training. The hour is late, and we must act to preserve law and order. A copy of the bill follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "National Guard Riot Control Training Act."

Sec. 2. The Congress hereby finds and declares that recent riots and other violent civil disturbances point to the need for the training of National Guard troops in riot control techniques so as to more effectively deal with such situations when called upon by the Governors of the respective States or the President of the United States.

Sec. 3. The Secretary of Defense is directed to initiate and conduct a program among National Guard troops of training in riot control and is directed to provide the necessary training, personnel, equipment and material for the riot control activities of the National Guard.

Sec. 4. Section 502(a) of title 32, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(3) participate in training for riot control."

Governor McNair Supports Appalachia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 26, 1967

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, South Carolina is fortunate to have a young, able, and dynamic Governor, one who is thinking of tomorrow and the future of South Carolina and our great Nation—Robert E. McNair.

Mr. Speaker, the following statement by Governor McNair was submitted to the ad hoc subcommittee on Appalachia of the Public Works Committee on which it is my honor to serve. Governor McNair's statement to the committee follows:

I would like to take this opportunity to endorse the Appalachian Regional Development program and urge its extension by passage of Senate Bill 602.

To date, South Carolina has received approval for $8 million in Appalachian funds for highways, vocational education facilities, land conservation, sewerage treatment facilities, college buildings, and regional health centers. Every one of the six South Carolina counties in the Appalachian region has benefited in some way by this ambitious program.

We have placed particular emphasis on building vocational education centers in South Carolina in order to expand the available labor resources and thereby attract industry to the area. Toward this end the Appalachian Regional Commission has granted South Carolina almost a million dollars under Section 211 of the 1965 Act for construction of five vocational schools. These will include the Spartanburg County Technical Education Center, the Spartanburg Area Vocational School, the Tri-County Technical Center at Pendleton, the Oconee County Area Trade High School, and Cherokee County Vocational School.

Construction of 44 miles of access roads in Pickens and Oconee Counties has been approved by the Appalachian Commission. This represents a total commitment on their part of $3,272,500 which will be 70% of the total building cost.

South Carolina also is moving ahead in the area of demonstration health projects. We have received a grant of $662,000 under Section 214 of the Appalachian Act for construction of a regional health education center. This new school, to be located on the campus of the Greenville Technical Education Center, will serve the six Appalachian counties in South Carolina, as well as the nearby counties in North Carolina and Georgia.

In summary, I am happy to report that the last two years have been a period of substantial progress for South Carolina due to the Appalachian Regional Development program.

Those two years, furthermore, have been marked by close cooperation and rapport between our State government and the Federal government. We have literally formed a partnership with the Federal government—not only in formulating policy, but in approving projects for public investment made in South Carolina and neighboring states. The initiative and final judgment as to whether a project should be funded for a given community, and whether it will justify the cost in state and local tax dollars is left with the state government. With a reasonable amount of counseling and assistance from Washington, we have, for the first time, an opportunity to guide the destiny of our economic development program.

The unique federal relationship that is embodied in the Appalachian program is further beneficial to South Carolina because it protects our particular state interest while it encourages responsibility on our part. It is an innovation in American government which I urge you to continue.

Finally, I would like to say that South Carolina will continue to do all that is needed to make the program a success. We endorse the changes proposed in Senate Bill 602 and believe that they will make the program work even better.

Robert E. McNair,
Governor.

On Diehards for Right-to-Work Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 26, 1967

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, the report prepared by the National Right to Work Committee, which was inserted in the Congressional Record on May 16, 1967, is a characteristic sample of the perennial misrepresentations and distortions regularly ground out by this assiduous group of diehards in behalf of so-called right-to-work legislation.

The occasion for this blast was an article in Seafarers Log inserted in the Record for April 20—page A1961—by Congressman Multer, of New York, reciting in some detail the historical lag in personal per capita income in States with right-to-work laws as compared with the Nation as a whole.

Without reproducing all this material as originally presented, suffice it to say that the latest figures on personal per per capita income released by the U.S. Department of Commerce—Survey of Current Business, April 1967—show that in 1966, per capita income in the 19 right-to-work States averaged $2,406, a figure $534 below the national average of $2,940 and $749 below the $3,155 average in the group of States without right-to-work laws.

TABLE 1.—POPULATION AND PERSONAL INCOME, 1966 (PRELIMINARY)

	Population	Total personal income (millions)	Per capita personal income
United States	195,857,000	$575,895	$2,940
Right-to-work States (19)	56,121,000	135,044	2,406
Nonright-to-work States (32, including District of Columbia)	139,736,000	440,851	3,155

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Survey of Current Business, April 1967, and the Bureau of the Census, Current Population Reports, Series P-25, No. 354, Dec. 8, 1966.

Astonishingly, the Right-to-Work Committee tries to enlist Secretary Wirtz in its cause by quoting him to the effect that he has no confidence in studies which purport to show the economic effects of having right-to-work laws or not having right-to-work laws.

It is fair to assume that among the studies in which Mr. Wirtz has no confidence is the hoary, although updated from time to time, set of statistical tables put out by the Right-to-Work Committee purporting to show that right-to-work States "lead the Nation in rate of economic growth: in the creation of new jobs in business and industry, in wage rate improvement in industrial jobs," and so forth. The "conclusions" from these tables are repeated in the present report.

In response I am attaching a commentary prepared in July 1965 by the AFL-CIO with respect to the edition of the tables being circulated by the Right-to-Work Committee at that time. In particular, we pointed to the false conclusions to be drawn by citing large "percentage" increases from very small basic numbers—See appendix A.

May I also refer to a portion of Mr. Wirtz' remarks in the same exchange with Mr. Scott quoted by the Right-to-Work Committee but conveniently omitted from its propaganda report. The rest of the exchange, directly following the portion quoted by the Right-to-Work Committee was as follows:

Secretary Wirtz. What it comes down to is this: If you take a percentage impression or picture of what has happened in the last 18 years, the right-to-work states show gains, larger percentage gains, economically during that period, because they start from a lower base.

If you take it in terms of absolute figures, they show a lesser gain during that period and a widening of the gap; I could supply quite a good many studies of that kind, but not with confidence.

Mr. Scott. It is true, then, that union members in right-to-work states have enjoyed a faster rate of economic progress than in non-right-to-work states?

Secretary Wirtz. Only because a 15-cent wage increase is a higher percentage if you start from a 90-cent base than if you start from a $2 base. But recognizing that, the statement is true completely.

Mr. Scott. Thank you.

As a group, right-to-work States not only have a lower level of per capita income but also lower wage levels. The figures for 1966 perfectly illustrate this fact. Using an unweighted average—weighted average would show even more glaring differences—average weekly earnings in right-to-work States came to $101.51 in 1966, as compared with a national average of $111.92 and an average of $114.87 in free labor States. On an hourly basis, workers in right-to-work States averaged $2.44 in 1966 as against a national average of $2.71 and an average of $2.78 in non-right-to-work States.

TABLE 2.—WAGES OF PRODUCTION WORKERS IN MANUFACTURING, 1966

	Average weekly wages	Average hourly earnings
United States	$111.92	$2.71
Right-to-work States (19)	101.50	2.44
Nonright-to-work States (32, including District of Columbia)	114.87	2.78

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Earnings, May 1967.

In 1966, there were only six right-to-work States with wage levels exceeding the national average or the average for New York. These six States—Arizona, Iowa, Utah, Kansas, Nevada, and Wyoming—are the among the least industrialized in the Nation. Together they accounted for a total of 481,000 workers in manufacturing while the remaining 13 right-to-work States, with below-average wages, accounted for nearly 4,234,000—88 percent of the total.

It is patently ridiculous to suggest that industry could "pour" out of such States as Arizona, Iowa, Kansas, Nevada, and Wyoming to New York, or anywhere else, since there is so little industry to "pour." New York, it may be noted, had a total of 1,903,000 workers in manufacturing in 1966.

Typical of the selective distortions made by the National Right-to-Work Committee is the weekly wage comparison cited between Jackson, Miss., and Fall River, Mass. Citing a large weekly wage differential in favor of Jackson, the statement omits the fact that the differential was entirely accounted for by long hours of work in Jackson which concealed lower hourly rates. In 1966, average hourly earnings in Jackson were $1.96 as against $2.05 in Fall River. For the State of Massachusetts as a whole weekly wages averaged $104.60, as against $78.85 in the State of Mississippi. Hourly earnings averaged $2.57 for Massachusetts as against $1.90 in Mississippi—U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Earnings, May 1967, page 111.

A wild assertion is made to the effect that the State of New York had "one of the lowest personal income increases of any State in the country during the past 5 years" and that none of the right-to-work States had smaller increases.

The truth is that between 1961 and 1966, per capita personal income in New York increased by $685—$9 more than the national average—and that increases in all except three of right-to-work States—Iowa, Nebraska, and North Dakota—were smaller. In 1966, New York's per capita personal income at $3,400 was the fifth highest in the country. The States above New York were all non-right-to-work States—District of Columbia, Connecticut, Delaware, and Illinois. Iowa ranked 21st, Nebraska 25th, and North Dakota 39th.

The assertion that "New York has a higher unemployment rate than all of the 19 right-to-work States" is simply a lie. Despite the tendency of industrialized States to have higher rates of unemployment than the more agricultural States predominating in the right-to-work group—see appendix B—the figures reported in the April 1967 Manpower Report of the President show that seven of the right-to-work States had rates at or above the 4.2 percent reported for New York. They are as follows:

	Percent
Alabama	4.2
Arkansas	4.5
Mississippi	4.2
Nevada	6.1
North Dakota	4.6
South Carolina	4.3
Utah	4.6

Reference to "industrial strife" in New York and other States as compared with right-to-work States was answered by President Meany in a memorandum for the Special Committee on Education and Labor, submitted June 10, 1965, from which the following excerpt is here reproduced:

> The incidence of strikes and lockouts in any particular state or region varies from year to year, depending on a wide variety of factors and special situations, of which the presence or absence of a "right-to-work" law is only one.
>
> In "right-to-work" Utah for example, the percentage of time lost on account of work stoppages was one of the highest in the nation in 1954 (0.66 percent), but was much lower in 1963 (0.14 percent). Similarly, in non "right-to-work" Michigan, time lost came to 0.83 percent in 1964 but was 0.12 percent in 1963.
>
> In 1964, work stoppages resulted in a national average of 0.18 percent of total working time lost. Of the 16 states in the Southeast and Southwest regions, only two—West Virginia and Florida—had percentages higher than this figure. In 1963, when the national average of time lost was 0.13 percent, 5 of the 16 states in the two Southern regions had higher percentages (West Virginia, Tennessee, Florida, Louisiana and New Mexico). In the other 11 states the percentage of working time lost was less than the national average.
>
> A very low level of strike activity cannot be taken as a necessary sign of "industrial peace" in areas where workers are relatively unorganized and unable to make effective protest against low wages and substandard working conditions. Suppression of unrest cannot be equated with true harmony in industrial relations, any more than the absence of civil rights demonstrations before the 1950s and 1960s can be taken as a sign of Negro contentedness with the status quo in race relations.

The statement quoted—and misquoted—by the Right-to-Work Committee from Mr. Meany's prepared testimony was taken completely out of context. Mr. Meany's point in his prepared statement was that the subject of union security is properly one of Federal jurisdiction rather than a partial preserve of the States. Like other labor-management issues, it is a proper subject for collective bargaining under uniform ground rules available through Federal law.

The entire quotation from which the excerpt was lifted—as well as doctored by the propaganda report—reads as follows:

> Let me turn now to the more general question of whether union security should be regulated by Federal or by State law. We think, of course, that it is a proper subject for Federal, and not State, legislation, just as much as the other issues dealt with by the National Labor Relations Act.
>
> The purposes of the act is to lay down for all industries affecting commerce a labor relations code which will promote industrial peace, minimize strikes, and raise the living standards of the working population, by protecting their rights to form unions and bargain collectively. The regulation of union security is, as the act itself recognizes, an essential part of any such labor relations code.
>
> Disputes over union security have been a frequent cause of industrial strife; union security is a major subject of collective bargaining; and sometimes a union security provision is essential to the very survival of a union in a specific workplace.
>
> The issue of union security is, in a practical sense, inseparable from many other issues dealt with by the national act, such as employer interference with the workers' free choice of a union; discrimination in employment to encourage or discourage membership; the obligation to bargain collectively, and so on.
>
> Singling out union security as a partial preserve of the States has caused continuing confusion and litigation. The States have had to be reminded, sometimes by their own supreme courts, that 14(b) does not permit them to regulate checkoff, hiring halls, or peaceful picketing. The confusion of State legislatures is understandable, for union security cannot rationally be separated from other labor relations issues.

A foolish attempt is made to suggest that migration of industry from such States as New York was in no way influenced by the low wage levels prevailing in the right-to-work States but was accounted for by the healthy economic climate of antiunionism. This point is supposedly "proved" by the fact Arizona with higher wages than New York gained 43,000 new jobs. In point of fact, during the 1948–64 period when New York lost 178,200 jobs in manufacturing, over four-fifths of the job gains in right-to-work States were concentrated in nine States with wages well below the national average—$2.53 in 1964—and even further below the average in New York—$2.60 in 1964. These States and their average hourly earnings in 1964 are shown in the table below:

TABLE 3.—INCREASE IN MANUFACTURING EMPLOYMENT, 1948-64

	Job increase (thousands)	Average hourly earnings, 1964
All right-to-work States	+1,084.9	
Texas	+191.0	$2.42
North Carolina	+143.4	1.75
Florida	+140.1	2.11
Tennessee	+99.5	2.03
Georgia	+95.0	1.92
Virginia	+69.7	2.04
South Carolina	+66.6	1.80
Mississippi	+50.3	1.76
Arkansas	+48.7	1.78
Total	904.3	
All other right-to-work States	180.6	

Source: Tables 2 and 4, furnished by Secretary Wirtz to Special Subcommittee on Labor, "Hearings," pp. 36 and 38.

Arizona accounted for exactly 4 percent of the total job increase in right-to-work States.

Current statistics indicate that the effort to sell industry on the benefits of low-wage economies and antilabor legislation is wearing thin. From the period 1964 to 1966, States without right-to-work laws gained 1,331,000 jobs in manufacturing as against a gain of 524,000 in right-to-work States. The State of New York accounted for 108,000 of the increase in free labor States.

The appendixes referred to follow:

Appendix A

Right-To-Work Statistics: Comments on Economic Information From the National Right-To-Work Committee

For the past several weeks, the National Right-to-Work Committee has been circulating a set of misleading tables purporting to demonstrate that economic progress is specifically associated with "right-to-work" legislation and that states with such laws are more prosperous than states without such laws. Statistics from these tables have been picked up and widely used in pamphlets, articles, and in letters to Congressmen to propagandize against repeal of Section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act.

These figures are grossly misleading in their construction and selectivity. The implied interpretations they carry are absolutely false.

The following material analyzes some of the most widely used of these figures and points out typical distortions.

The National Right-to-Work Committee's tables use the "right-to-work" list of states as of 1963, and in general make economic comparisons for the period 1953 to 1963. Almost all simply cite "percentage increases," with no reference to the basic numbers involved. Thus, impressive percentage gains are cited from very low levels and extremely misleading impressions given. It is facts, not percentages, that count.

Samples of frequently used propaganda items are given below followed by analytical comment:

PROPAGANDA ITEM

"While the country as a whole showed a 3.3 percent decline in manufacturing jobs in the period 1953–1963, the right-to-work states had an increase of 12.8 percent."

ANALYSIS

Manufacturing employment for the nation as a whole dropped between 1953 and 1963, due in large part to rising productivity, making fewer jobs available in the commodity-producing sectors of the economy. At the same time there has been a long-term shift in manufacturing from the older industrialized areas of the country—the Northeast and the Great Lakes regions—to the less developed areas of the South and West.

The "right-to-work" states are concentrated in America's under-developed areas, which, beginning with World War II, benefitted greatly from the placement of military installations and the growth of new industries related to national defense.

In addition, certain types of industries (such as textiles, apparels and shoes) seeking abundant and inexpensive manpower, ran away from the higher-wage industrial areas to the low-wage, right-to-work states. They were drawn by the low wages, anti-union atmosphere, and low standards of labor and welfare legislation. In addition, these states subsidized industry through revenue bonds and tax concessions.

PROPAGANDA ITEM

"The top three states in the nation in the rate of new jobs created by business and industry were "right-to-work" states (1) Nevada, (2) Arizona, (3) Florida."

ANALYSIS

This is a clear example of statistical lying. The most impressive "percentage" gains in employment in "right-to-work" states reflect very few jobs in absolute numbers. For example, Nevada, one of the least developed states in the country, recorded a 96 percent increase in non-farm employment from 1953 to 1963 but this represented only 69,400 jobs. The neighboring state of California, which twice rejected "right-to-work" legislation, added over 1½ million jobs in the 1953–1963 period.

PROPAGANDA ITEM

"In the period 1953–1963, per capita personal income in the right-to-work states increased 43.7 percent, while that of non-right-to-work states increased only 35.4 percent."

ANALYSIS

The truth is that "right-to-work" states lag far behind the rest of the nation in income levels, and that the "dollar gap" in per capita income has actually been increasing.

In 1963, per capita income in the "right-to-work" states averaged $1,998 as compared with an average of $2,623 in the other states.

Average per capita income in the "right-to-work" states rose by $589 in those 10 years, while in the rest of the states, the gain was $669. The "right-to-work" states fell further behind.

In 1953 they were $545 per person behind the non-"right-to-work" states and by 1963 they were $625 per person behind.

PROPAGANDA ITEM

"Hourly earnings by manufacturing workers increased 46.7 percent from 1953 to 1963 in the right-to-work states; for non-right-to-work states the increase was only 41.5 percent."

ANALYSIS

Percentages don't tell the story but the dollar figures do.

Average hourly earnings for the "right-to-work" states rose from $1.52 in 1953 to $2.23 in 1963, an increase of 71 cents an hour. In the states without "right-to-work" laws, average hourly earnings rose from $1.76 in 1953 to $2.49 in 1963, an increase of 73 cents per hour. Thus the differential widened from 24 cents per hour in 1953 to 26 cents per hour in 1963.

PROPAGANDA ITEM

"Six of the 15 states with the highest average weekly earnings for production workers are right-to-work states."

ANALYSIS

We could juggle statistics too by pointing out that the five states at the very bottom of this list were "right-to-work" states.

The important fact is: for the "right-to-work" states as a whole, average earnings were more than $10 a week below the average for non-"right-to-work" states.

Appendix B

Right-To-Work Statistics: Comments on Unemployment Rate Comparisons Furnished by the National Right-To-Work Committee

The National Right-to-Work Committee has been circulating propaganda to the effect that "right-to-work" laws have produced low unemployment rates in the states that have adopted such laws, as compared with states without "right-to-work" legislation.

Recently, the *Reader's Digest* published the following item, credited to the National Right-to-Work Committee:

"Unemployment rate in right-to-work states as of 1962 was 4.6 percent; in other 5.6 percent."

Another version of this approach uses 1964 figures, and claims a 4 percent rate in "right-to-work" states as against 5 percent in non-"right-to-work" states.

COMMENT

These bare comparisons are extremely misleading in the conclusion they suggest, as to the beneficial effects of "right-to-work" legislation. They ignore such basic economic considerations as the following:

1. As a group the "right-to-work" states have a much larger component of *agriculture* in their economies than the rest of the country. (In 1960, 13 percent of the population in "right-to-work" states lived on farms, as compared with only 5 percent in the rest of the country.)

Unemployment rates for those who seek a livelihood in agriculture, are much lower than average. In 1964, for example, the official farm unemployment rate was only 3.1 percent as compared with an average of 5.2 percent for the entire labor force, and in 1962 it was only 2.2 percent as against the overall national rate of 5.6 percent. These low unemployment rates in agriculture, however, conceal severe *underemployment* and poverty among both self-employed farmers—who technically do not experience "unemployment"—and those employed on farms for wages.

2. Historically, the rural areas of the nation (in which "right-to-work" states predominate) have "exported" population to the more highly developed urban regions (where non-"right-to-work" states predominate) in search of better wages and working conditions. These migrants have helped swell the ranks of the unemployed in the industrialized areas. Out-migration from the 14 "right-to-work" states in the South (excluding Florida) and the Plains regions totaled over 2.7 million in the 1950–1960 decade, according to Census figures.

3. Unemployment in non-"right-to-work" states has been aggravated by the movement of industries seeking the lower wages and substandard working conditions associated with "right-to-work" laws. New England and the Middle Atlantic states have been the areas hardest hit by the pirating of such industries as textiles, apparel, shoes and furniture to the low-wage "right-to-work" states of the Southeast. In addition, special factors such as the decline of mining employment (due to technological change) have had important consequences for unemployment in Pennsylvania and West Virginia.

Middle East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HASTINGS KEITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 26, 1967

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, despite the failure of the recent sessions of the United Nations to come up with a formula for a Mideast settlement, and despite the continued high tensions in that area, I believe that a few hopeful signs are beginning to emerge. An editorial in the Standard-Times of New Bedford, Mass., has sounded a cautious but optimistic note in pointing out that the General Assembly debates produced at least several broad areas of agreement.

Now that responsibility has shifted from the General Assembly back to the Security Council, I think we can expect the great powers to put their heads together and come up with acceptable compromises. The Soviet Union has been rebuffed in its attempts to win General Assembly approval of a one-sided and unjust condemnation of the State of Israel. The United States has now wisely left the door open for quiet agreements in the Security Council which will point the way to a fair settlement.

It is very much to the credit of the majority of the General Assembly nations that they would not be "buffaloed" by the Russians into supporting a solution which would be no real solution at all. As the Standard-Times article indicates, most of the delegations realized that compromises rather than condemnations are needed. For the interest of other Members of the House, Mr. Speaker, I am enclosing the text of the editorial, entitled "Middle East: Some Positive Notes":

Middle East: Some Positive Notes

The fire-breathing of Nikolai T. Fedorenko, chief U.N. delegate of the Soviet Union notwithstanding, elements of reason—admittedly, fragile threads, yet the basis of possible accommodation—appear to be emerging in the Middle East.

Leonid I. Brezhnev, general secretary of the Soviet Communist party, declared that, "We must do everything so that the flames of war do not break out again."

The governments of both Israel and the United Arab Republic have announced acceptance of Secretary General U Thant's proposal to station U.N. observers on both sides of the Israeli-Egyptian cease-fire line along the Suez Canal.

As a matter of fact, Israel agreed a month ago to the stationing of U.N. observers along the Israeli-Syrian cease-fire line.

King Hussein of Jordan, a disciple of moderation, seems to be inclined to pit his influence in the Arab world against that of President Boumedienne of Algeria and Syria's President Atassi, who have demanded continuation of the war against Israel.

Even within the United Nations, which has been paralyzed by propaganda and dissent, there are areas of wide agreement among members of the Security Council. Such agreement exists, as Britain's Lord Caradon has pointed out, on:

Establishment of the U.N. observer force between the opposing forces in the Sinai Peninsula, which certainly would tend to reduce the military "incidents" such as Saturday's nine-hour battle along the Suez;

Freedom of access to the holy places in Jerusalem;

Rights of innocent passage through international waters, including the Gulf of Aqaba.

It also is noteworthy, as U.S. Ambassador Goldberg informed the U.N., that a "substantial body" of world opinion believes that any withdrawal by Israel must be accompanied by an end to the state of war that has been maintained since 1948.

As for Israel, the government at Tel Aviv—in addition to indicating it would accept U.N. observers under some conditions—has demonstrated flexibility in at least two other areas.

Israel has extended until Aug. 10 the deadline before which refugees may return to the Israeli-occupied west bank of the Jordan.

And in Hamburg, Der Spiegel, the West German news magazine, published an interview with Israel Premier Levi Eshkol, in which he was quoted as saying that Israel intends to keep the Old City of Jerusalem and the Gaza Strip. Whatever else this means, it is a far cry from saying that Israeli troops will not withdraw from their present positions.

Fedorenko, for purposes best known to the Kremlin, may still waste U.N. time branding Israel an aggressor and talking about sanctions to force Tel Aviv to "comply" with the cease-fire ordered by the Security Council. But the world, including shattered Arab nations that will require a long time to recover from their defeat, has moved past Mr. Fedorenko's intemperature, if not violent, view.

Realistically, it may be because there is only one military force left intact—that of the Israelis—but the growing climate in the Middle East is for accommodation, not Fedorenkoism.

Academy Award Winner Proves Worthy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 26, 1967

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, the Vice President's efforts on behalf of the national youth opportunity program is having very beneficial and far-reaching effects. I would like to take this occasion to call to the attention of my colleagues a copy of a letter from, and newspaper clippings about, one of my constituents, Mr. Carl Ragsdale, president of Sundial Films, Inc., producers of the Academy Award-winning VISTA film, "A Year of Tomorrows."

It is refreshing and rewarding as well, in these troubled times to find men of industry with initative and foresight making way for the leaders of tomorrow. Both Mr. Ragsdale and the Film Producers Association should be applauded for their efforts.

Sun Dial Films, Inc.,
New York, N.Y., July 24, 1967.

Mr. Arthur A. Peltz,
Executive Assistant to Congressman Lester Wolff, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Peltz: As you are aware of the Training Program which we have initiated this summer, we thought that the enclosed clippings would be of interest to you.

The article in Show Business is, in light of our own deep concern in this area, of great interest to us. Having long recognised the grievous omissions in the academic programs offered to future filmmakers, and with an increasing awareness of the sincere desires of these young people for a more realistic apprenticeship and learning opportunity, we took it upon ourselves to contribute in some small measure, to the realization of these goals.

The second clipping, which was, incidentally, written by one of our trainees, appeared just the day before the announcement of Vice President Humphrey's latest endeavor on behalf of the National Youth Opportunity Program.

We applaud the action of the Vice President's Committee, and the participation of the Film Producers Association of New York, and look forward to learning of the outcome of the meeting held today in Washington.

We are pleased to report that our program is proving greatly beneficial to our three trainees; and, as we anticipated, to Sun Dial Films, Inc. The enthusiasm and diligence of these young people is heartwarming. It confirms our deeply held conviction that this generation is worthy of our trust and interest. Obviously, we are not alone in this belief, and happily, our experience shows that such belief is well founded.

Further, we look forward to being of assistance in whatever way we can, in seeing that this, and all programs which seek to provide professional training and experience for our young, become successful.

We wish to thank you, and Congressman Wolff for your interest and support in this endeavor.

With sincerest personal regards, I am,
Yours truly,
Sun Dial Films, Inc.,
Carl V. Ragsdale,
President.

Sun Dial Films Has On-the-Job Training

Responding to the recent "film explosion" among the "Now" generation, Sun Dial Films has initiated an on-the-job training program for college students. The Academy Award winning company believes that future filmmakers need exposure to on the spot conditions to really learn what film making is all about. "You just can't learn the business in a classroom where everything is insulated and controlled," admits the firm's pres., Carl V. Ragsdale. Aside from the technical training, the program aims at a more important lesson; that movie making is a business, and that money is what makes the cameras roll.

Ragsdale, who began his own climb up the movie ladder to success as a college photographer, nostalgically remembers being a young man looking for the experience necessary to break into the film field. When asked about the young people today, he said, "The kids today are great. They just need the chance to learn; we're responsible, we owe it to them to teach them what we've learned."

FPA To Meet With Humphrey on Film Program for Youth

Film Producers Association of N.Y., Inc., exec. dir. Harold Klein announced that he and Thomas J. Dunford, FPA pres., will be in Washington, D.C. Mon. July 24th at the office of Vice President Hubert Humphrey.

The Government is seeking the aid of film companies in furthering its National Youth Opportunity Program.

Recognizing that FPA producers are responsible for many documentaries, science, medical, as well as TV commercial films, Vice President Humphrey's assistant, Julius Cahn, wants the FPA to participate in the showing of selected films and in the training and placement of young adults in the motion picture industry.

It is hoped that Monday's meeting will result in a program being set up and implemented before the end of the Summer.

Why I Respect the Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 24, 1967

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to insert in the Congressional Record the following excellent essay prepared by Robert Suslowicz of McKees Rocks, Pa., on "Why I Respect the Law." Robert won a trip to Washington in the Allegheny County Bar Association's Law Day USA essay contest, and I believe that his fine work is an excellent tribute to his school, St. Francis De Sales High School, and his community, the city of McKees Rocks. We in our district are proud of this outstanding young man.

The essay follows:

Why I Respect the Law

(By Robert Suslowicz)

Imagine, if you will, a purely lawless society, a society devoid of laws or any enforcement of existing laws. The society itself is in mortal danger of extinction—both internally as well as externally.

There is no guarantee of survival for the society without law. Individuals within the society do not have justice or preservation of their rights because there are no restrictions on behavior of the members of the society.

The society cannot adequately guarantee the survival of its members; thus it cannot guarantee its own survival. Consequently, the purpose of the society is defeated!

Law is the protector of the rights of the members of the society and of the society itself. To accomplish this, law MUST be just and impartial.

This is essentially why I respect the law—law IS just.

Our law accomplishes its purpose because it is just. It can be no other way because to guard freedom, law must be unbiased and unprejudiced.

It is not possible, however, that law can have an adverse effect on society by the freedom that is taken away by the restrictions inherent in law.

This is the paradox of law: law which protects our freedoms also takes away some part of that freedom by its restrictive nature. In our society this is a necessary evil and, in fact, is inconsequential.

However, this points out the folly of an abundance of trivial laws—laws which do not guarantee freedom, but only restrict it.

This must be avoided, for a society with a superfluity of law is as ineffective as one with a complete absence of law.

Our law and the law of Communist-dominated countries are in contrast for this reason. Our law is a free, democratic law, guaranteeing freedom, whereas the tyranny of Communism is supported by a system of law designed specifically to strip individuals of their inalienable rights.

The law of Communism is the law of fear.

Ours is a law which I am proud to respect and uphold—knowing that the law is my friend and will continue to be so as long as this democratic system of law remains in America.

A Broader Effort on Job Bias

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 26, 1967

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, the chairmanship of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission will soon pass from one very able man to another, when Clifford L. Alexander, Jr., replaces Stephen N. Shulman.

Mr. Alexander, who is currently deputy special counsel to President Johnson, will take the reins at a crucial period in the development of the EEOC. The Commission has nearly completed processing a staggering backlog of job discrimination complaints, and will soon embark on technical assistance programs to aid businesses and unions anxious to get more workers from minority groups into better jobs.

Mr. Alexander's qualifications for the task he faces at EEOC were examined in detail in the July 15, 1967, issue of Business Week magazine. Under leave to extend my remarks, I insert the article at this point in the RECORD and commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

A BROADER EFFORT ON JOB BIAS

Clifford L. Alexander, Jr., a tall, handsome, 33-year-old Negro who grew up in Harlem and moved smoothly through an Ivy League education into a staff job in the White House, may have lots to say about company hiring practices in the next few years.

Alexander has been picked by President Johnson to fill a five-year term as chairman of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, and will take over EEOC at a turning point in the agency's dealings with business.

For two years, EEOC has been hard put to keep ahead of an avalanche of job discrimination complaints. Now officials expect to have their caseload under control by fall, and the commission is planning to put greater emphasis on technical assistance programs to get more workers from minority groups into better jobs.

Broader scope. Technical assistance programs encompass a wide variety of efforts to encourage employers and unions to go beyond the letter of the law in upgrading the employment status of Negroes.

In the future, the commission will do more than investigate complaints from rejected job applicants. It will also instigate its own programs designed to get companies to change basic hiring and promotion policies that may lead to unintentional discrimination.

Companies willing to help in hiring minority workers will come under such programs voluntarily. In other cases, EEOC is expected to employ the full panoply of publicity to spotlight industries that are lagging behind in an effort to get key companies to cooperate

In some instances, EEOC has already conducted such operations, including a program to help companies building new plants to find and hire minority workers. Another example is a forum it set up in South Carolina where state, city, local, and company officials met to talk about upgrading Negro jobs in the textile industry.

But these programs have fallen behind while the agency struggled with a deluge of complaints.

SCRUTINY

EEOC will begin singling out new areas for technical assistance later this summer when it finishes a computer analysis of employment patterns in individual industries. The analysis will show an industry's percentage of minority workers as compared with the population of such workers in the surrounding area. For example, one such analysis already released by the commission shows that Negro employment in petroleum refining was only about 1.5% in the San Francisco-Oakland area even though Negroes accounted for 14% and 31% of the population in the two cities, respectively.

At the same time, the National Urban League is making a study for EEOC which it will use as a basis for recommending priority areas on which the agency should focus. One of Alexander's own ideas is to create close ties between EEOC and federal job training programs. Then, if a particular company is unable to find qualified Negroes to employ, the commission could help link the company with a federal training program.

Alexander, whose parents were Harlem community leaders, was president of the student council in his Harvard undergraduate days where he received his B.A. (cum laude) in 1955, and president of the Phi Delta Phi international legal fraternity at Yale (LL.B., 1958). The fact that he is a Negro puts him one up with civil rights leaders who have been critical of EEOC in the days when it was helplessly overburdened.

BIG MOVE

His Harvard contact with McGeorge Bundy brought Alexander to Washington in 1963. He was a struggling lawyer on New York's West 55th Street when Bundy asked him to join the staff of the National Security Council. "I almost didn't accept," he recalls. He had been practicing just long enough to be gypped on a fee by a client in a criminal case, but he still saw a promising future as a lawyer. Once in the White House, he gradually phased out of Southeast Asia affairs and into such domestic problems as civil rights.

In his first test as an administrator, Alexander will be able to lean on another longtime Bundy aide and Harvard honors grad, Gordon Chase, 34, who is the agency's staff director.

Friends who worked with Alexander at the White House do not think he will fall down as an administrator. "He's even-handed and well balanced," says Lee C. White, who moved from the White House himself to become chairman of the Federal Power Commission. "Cliff has the easy-going type of personality it takes to get members of a commission moving together without friction."

Focus on data. Alexander says he does not plan to go around "branding Company X a bigot." Instead he will rely on factual information—such as EEOC's computer survey—to speak for itself.

Alexander's predecessor, Stephen N. Shulman, gets much of the credit for readying EEOC for a move into new programs. Aside from being bogged down in a backlog of cases during its first year of operation, the agency was also inexperienced, understaffed, and under financed. Moreover, the agency's first chairman, Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., quit before his term expired to run for governor of New York.

Shulman, who succeeded Roosevelt, quickly whipped EEOC into businesslike trim. A tough, hard-working former McNamara "Whiz Kid," he applied the lessons of cost-effectiveness, computerization, and efficiency he had learned at the Pentagon. The number of job discrimination complaints conciliated by EEOC jumped fourfold, and before he left the job this month, Shulman predicted that the commission would be operating on schedule by fall.

Power of persuasion. EEOC, which has no legal power to force employers to change discriminatory employment and promotion policies, must rely on conciliation and persuasion. In doing so, it takes four steps:

Analyzes complaints, approximately 17,000 in its first two years of operation.

Investigates those falling within its jurisdiction.

Decides, in written opinions by the five commisison members, which cases are worthy of action.

Negotiates with employers, unions, and employers to correct discriminatory situations, which may range from segregated facilities to segregated seniority lines.

Shulman claims "great changes" in streamlining each step. He saved eight days by eliminating double analysis procedures in which complaints were reviewed both in the field and in Washington. He conducted time and motion studies of investigations and came up with a model format for investigators. This has already chopped 10% to 15% off the time needed for investigations, he says, and he predicts the agency's productivity will double by late fall.

Breaking the jam. Today, EEOC has a backlog of 400 to 500 cases awaiting decision, and this bottleneck threatens to worsen as the speed of investigations picks up. Before leaving, Shulman hired 25 students about to enter their final year of law school to help write decisions and thus to help eliminate the backlog. Shulman also set into motion the training of investigators in conciliation techniques, and increased the conciliation staff from five to 31 men. He also asked Congress for 110 additional people (the House has authorized 75), which, it is hoped, will prevent a recurrence of the backlog.

Meanwhile, EEOC, in a contract with the University of Pittsburgh, is putting its decisions, conciliation agreements, and general counsel opinions on magnetic tape for storage. At a push of a button, this information will be retrieved by EEOC headquarters in Washington and by its 11 regional headquarters. This will not only speed up decision-making but enable regional directors to make their own decisions if the commission members decide to delegate this responsibility.

Shulman believes that putting EEOC on a business-like basis will open up the way for more dramatic moves into new technical assistance programs.

Obstacles. Still, despite Shulman's reforms, Alexander will face obstacles. EEOC will need more money as the number of complaints continues to mount, and Congressional conservatives may prove reluctant to give it more.

In addition, the lack of power to issue cease-and-desist orders has been a thorn in the agency's side. EEOC has settled only 43% of its conciliation efforts successfully to date. This means that nearly six out of every 10 complainants do not get the justice in jobs to which the commission believes they are entitled.

A bill to give EEOC cease-and-desist powers faces difficulty in the relatively conservative 90th Congress. Alexander is sure to keep pressing for this legislation, however, and he has the necessary access to the President to be assured of White House support.

EEOC officials say that there is a compelling reason for cease-and-desist powers. Their argument is that such powers would improve the conciliation process since businessmen, union leaders, and employment agencies will be more willing to bargain when they know the government carries a big stick.

Citation for the Under Secretary of the Navy Robert H. B. Baldwin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 11, 1967

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I consider it a high privilege to submit for printing in the Congressional Record a transcript of remarks by the Honorable Paul H. Nitze, Deputy Secretary of Defense, at the time of presentation of the Navy Distinguished Public Service Award to Under Secretary of the Navy Robert H. B. Baldwin. This took place on Monday, July 24, 1967. Secretary Baldwin has rendered outstanding service to the Navy and to our country. It is with great regret that I note his retirement for I am personally acquainted with the value and breadth of the contributions he has made. His has indeed been a distinguished career in public service.

Secretary Nitze's comments and the citation for Secretary Baldwin follow:

Transcript of Remarks by Paul H. Nitze, Deputy Secretary of Defense, at Presentation of Navy Distinguished Public Service Award to Under Secretary of the Navy Robert H. B. Baldwin, Office of Secretary of the Navy, the Pentagon, July 24, 1967

Mr. Nitze. Gentlemen, it is a pleasure to return to the Navy after three weeks' absence, because the occasion is one where we have the opportunity of honoring Bob Baldwin, who has been my Under Secretary of the Navy for two years and, for the last month has been Acting Secretary of the Navy. During those two years and this last month, he has carried the burdens of his office with acumen, dedication and energy, and has done an absolutely superb job.

It has been my view that the Secretary of the Navy and the Under Secretary of the Navy should act together as a team of two, each knowing everything the other did and each supporting the other. But, inevitably there there have been projects which one or the other of us take prime responsibility for, and before awarding him the Distinguished Public Service Award, I want to mention three or four of those things which Bob took primary responsibility for and executed in an absolutely outstanding manner.

Certainly one of them was the question of sea transport to Southeast Asia. When Bob took over, we had lots of problems. Port facilities weren't right. We had problems with the way in which the contracts were negotiated. We had this problem and that problem. And Bob worked into this and I think, as a team effort, the port facility problem was licked. I think the way in which the shipping was negotiated was greatly improved. Bob, I think, was singlehandedly responsible for the container service to Vietnam, and the relations between the Navy and the Maritime unions, I think, have never been better than they are today.

The second thing I think one might mention is naval aircraft. Obviously, it wasn't contemplated in the years past that the Navy would be called upon for really indefinite high-level use of naval aviation, and the problems of adjusting ourselves to that new requirement were manifold. Although we don't have all of our problems licked, Bob, working with OP-05 [Office of the Deputy Chief of Naval Operations for Air], the Naval Air Systems Command, the Bureau of Naval Personnel, the Marine Corps Headquarters, and the Office of Secretary of Defense, made immense progress in the procurement of our spares and overall programs.

I think a third, and the most important area, is the relationship with our men. Bob has dedicated himself to the habitability of our ships, the living facilities for the men, to our training programs, to the program that sees to it that we retain, select, and assign people in a way in which we make the maximum out of the magnificent resources that we have.

Bob has done all these things, and I think the first point I would make is that he has done them with rigor in getting the facts together and being sure that he got to the bottom of the problem and, secondly, a breadth of mind and forward-looking judgment with respect to the answers, which I think has been outstanding. So, it is with the greatest pleasure that the Distinguished Public Service Award is presented to Bob.

The Secretary of the Navy takes pleasure in presenting the Distinguished Public Service Award to the Honorable Robert H. B. Baldwin in recognition and appreciation of the distinguished services set forth in the following citation:

"For exceptionally meritorious conduct in the performance of outstanding service to the Department of the Navy while serving as Under Secretary of the Navy from July 1965 through July 1967. Mr. Robert H. B. Baldwin, through his dynamic leadership and imaginative and practical approach to managerial and organizational problems, has contributed greatly during a period marked by intensive operations of naval forces in Southeast Asia and major changes in Navy programs, to the functioning of the Office of the Under Secretary as the principal Civilian Executive Assistant to the Secretary of the Navy and to the overall capability of the Navy Secretariat. With tireless dedication, he has contributed to the solution of complex industrial and managerial problems in a variety of areas, including sea lift support for Southeast Asia, support and the management of aviation assets, production of munitions, and the establishment of better financial and inventory controls which have enhanced the capability of the Department of the Navy to support military operations. Through his efforts, the first 'container ship' service for military use was established. This service, since expanded, has had a significant impact on the logistics support of forces in the Western Pacific. In the areas of personnel education and training, his tenure has been marked by a reappraisal of training and educational practices, the establishment of Advisory Boards to insure an effective dialogue between the Naval Training Organization and the highest level of expertise available from civilian life, a broad improvement in the administration of naval decorations and awards, and the initiation of a variety of far-reaching studies which will have an impact on personnel policies for years to come. These and his many other contributions to the United States Naval Service, reflect great credit upon Mr. Baldwin and for these exceptional accomplishments he is awarded the Navy's Distinguished Public Service Award."

Remarks of Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey, at the Retail Clerks International Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 26, 1967

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, last week one of the highlights of the Retail Clerk's International Convention in Miami, Fla., was the appearance of Vice President Hubert Humphrey, and his stirring message about the future of America.

Vice President Humphrey's appearance was the highlight of a long list of distinguished speakers who addressed what is frequently referred to as one of the most important labor meetings of this country.

Under the impressive leadership of its president, James Suffridge, the Retail Clerk's International Association is today one of America's fastest growing unions.

Mr. Suffridge has brought to this union a scope of leadership seldom paralleled in the American labor movement. His initiative and abiding dedication to human dignity has brought respect not only for himself, but every member of the Retail Clerk's International Association and so it is no surprise that some of America's top Government officials besides the Vice President appeared in person at the convention.

The tribute paid by Mr. Humphrey and all the other speakers, including Secretary of Labor Willard Wirtz, reflects the high regard that we Americans have for Jim Suffridge and his Retail Clerk's International Association.

Mr. Suffridge and the membership of this union have welded together a leadership team which makes up the executive board of this inspiring union, which today brings guidance to the whole social structure of America. The officers of the Retail Clerk's International Association are among the Nation's most dedicated people who, through careful and dignified understanding, have brought to hundreds of thousands of Americans employed in the retail industry a new concept of opportunity and remuneration for their efforts.

The retail industry in America is one of the most significant segments of our economic and social structure. In the past quarter century, Jim Suffridge, his executive board, and the men and women who make up the Retail Clerk's International Association have brought new hope and new understanding in labor-management relations to this entire industry.

Vice President HUMPHREY, in his excellent remarks, brought the contribution of Mr. Suffridge and his organization into proper and sharp perspective.

The Vice President's inspiring message follows:

Remarks of Vice President Hubert Humphrey, Retail Clerk's International Association, Miami, Fla., July 20, 1967

I have not missed an RCIA convention since I went to the Senate in 1948. I am always glad to be invited back.

And many things have happened to me since we last met four years ago. One of which I am especially proud occurred about a year ago, when your executive board came to my office and made me a Gold Card member of the Association. That is a great honor, and I want to take this opportunity to thank you all for it.

Another thing that has happened to me since we last met is that I have been elected Vice President. This is the first chance I have had to thank all of you for the support you gave both President Johnson and me at the Convention in 1964 and in the election. Judging by my reception here today, I think we can expect to find some friends in RCIA in 1968 as well.

But today I would like to look past the election of 1968—even past the election of 1972—to ask some questions about the future.

I am not talking about the distant future. I do not mean to speculate about the entertaining curiosities we might expect in the year 2000.

I am talking about the future all of us will experience. I am talking about America in the mid-70's, when your children who are now in grammar school will be in college . . . When some of you will be buying your next house . . . When others will be retiring for a well-earned rest and seeking creative leisure.

I am not talking about your heirs or even about another generation. I am talking about you and me, about the kind of society *we* want for *ourselves*, as well as for those who come after us.

As we look ahead over the next decade, we can predict some features of the American scene with certainty.

There will be nearly 40 million more Americans 10 years from now.

This country will be almost entirely urbanized, with over three-quarters of our people living in cities.

The American industrial establishment, which has doubled in size in the last 15 years, will probably have come close to doubling again.

Communications will be both faster and cheaper than today. We will be quite used to having men land on the moon.

Tissue will be transplanted from one person to another with ease. Artificial organs will be relatively commonplace. Many types of cancer and mental illness will have gone the way of smallpox and polio.

Teaching will have been individualized for many students through the use of teaching machines.

These are the symbols of a powerful and wealthy society. They represent the material basis for unparalleled prosperity.

And they will be achieved more or less automatically because of the momentum of scientific and industrial development in the United States today.

These predictable gains will be symbols of power and wealth; but they will not necessarily be the symbols of a great democracy.

The real quality of the society you and I live in a decade from now will be evaluated in human terms, and very specifically by the degree of opportunity available to each individual American.

Will the liberties of an American citizen mean as much as they should to you and to those around you when measured in terms of real opportunity?

Will all of us have an opportunity to take advantage of advances in medical science—to be protected from sickness and to be cared for when we are ill?

There are some who say Medicare is enough. Nineteen million Americans are now covered by a program which was instituted only a year ago. Four million patients have received hospital care since the program started; 25 million medical bills have been paid. Some say:

"Medical care is a privilege not a right."

"Do any more and you will interfere with the rights of the individual."

Medicare represents great progress today.

But ten years from now we will be deeply shamed as a nation if the one-third of our population, who today have no regular access to doctors or dentists, are still deprived of medical care.

It will be unacceptable if illness can still mean financial disaster to the family of a working man or woman.

What about education and training?

Will every American have an opportunity to get all the education he can use?

Will we have training and re-training programs capable of giving people skills which will enable them to lead productive lives in an economy of rapid technological change?

Will your children now in grammar school be able to find a place in college?

Here again the record as of today looks pretty good. Six million Americans are in college, and a million of them are receiving some form of federal assistance.

Head Start has already given more than a million and a half youngsters a critically important boost toward successful educations and rewarding lives.

Job Corps centers established just two years ago have already sent over 60 thousand new workers, earners, and buyers into the economy, and over 41 thousand more are now in training.

But will this be enough a decade from now?

Will we still have poor schools in poor neighborhoods which can afford only poor teachers—schools which will turn bright-eyed youngsters into poor students, poor workers and poor citizens?

Will young people coming out of schools find jobs and hope, or unemployment and despair?

What about our cities?

Seventy per cent of the American people already live in urban areas, and the chances are very great that most of us will live out our lives in cities.

The Federal Government will supply over 10 billion dollars in grants and loans to cities this year for the improvement of urban life. That is almost three times the amount available in 1961.

But if each of us is to have a decent place to live at a price we can afford, we will need new urban housing units at the rate of 2 million a year a decade from now.

If we are not to waste our leisure hours getting to and from work, we will need transportation facilities to move 200 million people.

We will need more and safer airports.

We will need efficient rapid transit systems in the heavily populated urban corridors which by then will be a dominant feature of American Geography.

We will need parks and recreation facilities.

We will need clean air and clean water, neither of which we now enjoy.

Even as the physical and cultural facilities of our cities improve, we will still need more and better law enforcement.

Think about wages. Last year's amendments of the Fair Labor Standards Act increased the minimum wage of one dollar forty cents an hour at the beginning of this year, and it will be one dollar sixty cents an hour next year.

Four million retail store employees benefited from these increases and an additional 1.5 million, never before covered by minimum wage legislation, now enjoy this fundamental American right.

For the first time minimum wage protection was extended to some American farmers.

Now this is real progress.

We fought hard for it. Your vigorous campaign had a lot to do with the passage of those amendments.

But you and I know that this was only a step in the right direction, and that there are many more steps ahead of us.

A worker earning one dollar forty cents an hour is condemned to raise his family in poverty according to present Federal standards.

A dollar and forty cents is better than a dollar. But are we still going to be content ten years from now to guarantee our workers no more than a poverty income?

We cannot. And that is one reason why we need active, vigorous labor unions.

In the past, organized labor has always led in the struggle for decent wages and working conditions.

That struggle must go on, and the unions must continue to lead. They must continue to grow, and to extend their help and protection to the millions of American workers who still lack the benefits of union membership.

And let me say this to the younger union members: You have a special obligation to continue organized labor's historic struggle for the rights of all working men; for it is you who have benefitted most from the hard-fought victories of those who went before you.

I could list dozens of other areas in which the remarkable social progress of recent years has still to be nourished. Re-enforced and extended.

Civil rights—progress in the last few years has been enormous. Tomorrow it will not be enough. Ten years from now, no American will quietly accept discrimination of any kind.

Privacy—the Attorney General's recent limitation on the use of wiretapping re-enforces a fundamental constitutional right.

But what of private bugging? What about polygraph tests for prospective employees? Do we want these in our national or individual futures?

I have not even mentioned our relations with the rest of the world. A decade from now we will be an even more integral part of a world society than we are today.

Will that society be one of hunger, poverty, unrest and anxiety; or will it be a society of hope, of growth, of confidence, of individual dignity and peace?

Now I hear people every day, both in government and outside, who say that we have done enough.

"Rome wasn't built in a day."

"The majority are well-fed, well-clothed."

"Don't go any further or you'll destroy the rights of the individual."

"Enough for now."

These tired people usually use the war in Vietnam as their excuse for inaction on domestic issues. They say we can't afford to meet our national commitments abroad and at the same time build schools, train teachers, and open opportunities to the poor at home.

President Johnson does not agree with these tired people. He asked Congress this year for 26 billion dollars to finance programs specifically designed to aid the poor. That is an increase of 3.6 billion dollars over last year, or 14 per cent.

And I don't agree with these tired people either.

One reason is that we simply cannot afford to have almost 20 per cent of our people living in poverty, unable to purchase the goods we produce.

I remember my father telling me time and again when I worked behind the counter in our family drug store that our livelihood depended upon the prosperity of our customers. That is just as true today.

We cannot afford to let the energies and talents of one Negro child in an urban ghetto go undiscovered for lack of education.

We cannot afford to let one farmer while away his time on a sagging front porch in the midst of unplanted fields because he can't get tools, credit, seed, or land of his own.

We cannot afford to let one youngster end up in juvenile court because his father could not support his family or because his mother had to work to feed her children.

In case anyone doubts that an investment in *human* resources is important to prosperity, let me give you a statistic.

An economist named Denison recently completed a study of the reasons for American economic growth between 1929 and 1957. He found that 23 per cent of that growth was due to an improvement in the educational level of workers, and another 20 per cent was due to an "advance of knowledge" in general. A mere 15 per cent was attributable to expansion of capital equipment.

I know it does not surprise you to hear that improving men is worth more than improving machines.

While I am quoting statistics, I cannot resist giving you one more.

A recent study indicates that every dollar invested by Government—Federal, State or local—in health, education, housing, the development of natural resources, pollution control, and community development generates 2 dollars 40 cents worth of private investment and adds 10 dollars to the Gross National Product.

That is a return any banker would welcome.

But we are not a nation of bankers.

We are a nation which has grown and prospered on the basis of individual opportunity.

We are a nation which has discovered that the assurance of full human rights and opportunity for all does not detract from the well-being of the majority, but rather enhances it.

We are a nation which has slowly and painfully fought to insure those rights and opportunities, not because of an economic return but because they are right.

We are a nation that believes, in the words of Franklin D. Roosevelt, that "The test of our progress is not whether we add more to the abundance of those who have too much; it is whether we provide enough for those who have too little."

We have accomplished a great deal, but the job is unfinished. If we stop now, the proud progress of today will surely become the dismal inadequacy of tomorrow.

The tired people are suffering from something Geritol won't fix. It is a permanent inclination to like the present better than they expect to like the future, and to like the past even better than that.

They are never quite able to catch up. Just as they are grudgingly about to accept the present, it slips into the past.

They are saved from themselves only by the foresight and dedication of others. You know who they are.

I am not too tired to carry on the struggle for a better future.

Your administration is not too tired to carry it on.

And I know the RCIA is not too tired.

Jim Suffridge is a leading member of the President's National Advisory Council for the War on Poverty.

And this whole union has a long and outstanding record of energetic determination to meet the kind of challenges I have discussed.

As I look out over this convention today, I have no doubt that this nation will continue to move forward to fulfill the promise of American democracy.

News Behind the News

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD D. McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 19, 1967

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, the need for effective firearms control legislation has been well documented. Rioters, criminals, murderers, and so forth, use these deadly weapons regularly; weapons purchased easily and legally through the U.S. mail. The situation has reached frightening proportions.

The following article by Andrew Tully, which appeared in the Buffalo Daily Law Journal on July 19, 1967, clearly demonstrates the failure of present firearms controls. It deserves the attention of all Members of Congress.

The article follows:

NEWS BEHIND THE NEWS

(By Andrew Tully)

WASHINGTON, D.C., July 18.—As a collector of firearms advertisements directed at citizens who want to assassinate a President or liquidate a neighbor, my current favorite is the one in the recent issue of The Shotgun News headed: "Long Hot Summer Special." This one really talks the hoodlum's language, if in slightly better English.

Inserted by the mail order house of Ed Agramonte of Yonkers, N.Y., the advertisement offers a .45-caliber 30 shot semi automatic "completely legal" Eagle carbine for only $99.95. It also features purple prose concerning riot guns and automatic rifles, presumably for the assassin who doesn't quite have everything.

Presumably, the National Rifle Association, which believes the indiscriminate sale of firearms is a bit of fundamental Americanism, will have us believe that such weapons are intended solely to decimate the nation's population of rabbits and squirrels. But in some nervous quarters, advertisements of this kind seems to constitute incitement to riot.

RACIAL UNDERTONE

Everybody who has not been cast away on a desert island for the past several years understands the implication of the phrase "long hot summer." It designates, simply, the period during which white and Negroes are supposed to take to the streets with guns to decide in "High Noon" style who's boss. The criminal idiots on both sides who participate in such bloody showdowns probably don't need any reminder of where the best weapons can be acquired, but such advertisements in supposedly reputable journals do nothing to discourage their activities.

Of course, $99.95 is a lot of dough, but if a body saves part of his welfare check every month or robs an extra cigar store he can get it up in no time. After all, they've got TV sets and cars and hooch in the house, haven't they?

ARMED BY TAXPAYERS

Besides paying for such necessities, the taxpayers also pick up the check for firearms used by assorted revolutionary groups. At a Senate Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee hearing the other day, a New York prosecutor revealed that eight rifles seized from members of the Negro Revolutionary action Movement in Queens, Long Island, were supplied through the Defense Department's civilian marksmanship program.

Sixteen members of the Movement were arrested on charges of plotting the assassination of Roy Wilkins, executive secretary of the NAACP, and Whitney Young Jr., director of the Urban League. The eight guns had been obtained through the Jamaica Rifle and Pistol Club, which had been approved by the National Rifle Association for participation in the program. Meanwhile, eight more guns supplied by Uncle Sam, were seized from the Minutemen, an imbecilic right-wing military outfit.

M'NAMARA TURNS CHICKEN

Theoretically, these murderous weapons are intended for use at the NRA's annual rifle matches at Camp Perry, Ohio, which cost the taxpayers nearly $3 million a year. About 3,000 NRA members draw from public funds for travel expenses, lodgings and meals, and also are entitled to free ammunition, the loan of military firearms and the purchase of weapons at cost.

Defense Secretary Robert McNamara has said he is powerless to stop the rifle matches because of laws stating they "shall be held every year." This is twaddle coming from a strong man such as McNamara; the matches have been postponed before in time of war and hard times, and with a half-million Americans in Vietnam, and President Johnson demanding higher taxes Mac has all the excuse he needs to stop them.

I agree with Sen. Ted Kennedy that Congress has talked long enough about the need for firearms control legislation. When both firearms manufacturers and Uncle Sam combine to provide guns for any homicidal maniac or dope pusher who can steal a few bucks or sign his name to an NRA application, it's time for a touch of sanity on Capitol Hill.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402, at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided,* That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C. 20510

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey

Aiken, George D., *Vt*	
Allott, Gordon, *Colo*	
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.*	6 Wesley Circle
Baker, Howard H., Jr., *Tenn.*	
Bartlett, E. L., *Alaska*	
Bayh, Birch E., *Ind*	
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*	
Bible, Alan, *Nev*	
Boggs, J. Caleb, *Del*	
Brewster, Daniel B., *Md*	
Brooke, Edward W., *Mass*	
Burdick, Quentin N., *N. Dak.*	
Byrd, Harry F., Jr., *Va*	
Byrd, Robert C., *W. Va*	
Cannon, Howard W., *Nev*	
Carlson, Frank, *Kans*	Sheraton-Park
Case, Clifford P., *N.J*	
Church, Frank, *Idaho*	
Clark, Joseph S., *Pa*	
Cooper, John Sherman, *Ky*	
Cotton, Norris, *N.H*	
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr*	
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill*	
Dodd, Thomas J., *Conn*	
Dominick, Peter H., *Colo*	
Eastland, James O., *Miss*	5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La*	
Ervin, Sam J., Jr., *N.C*	
Fannin, Paul J., *Ariz*	
Fong, Hiram L., *Hawaii*	5519 Uppingham St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Fulbright, J. W., *Ark*	
Griffin, Robert P., *Mich*	
Gore, Albert, *Tenn*	
Gruening, Ernest, *Alaska*	
Hansen, Clifford P., *Wyo*	
Harris, Fred R., *Okla*	
Hart, Philip A., *Mich*	
Hartke, Vance, *Ind*	
Hatfield, Mark, *Oreg*	
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz*	
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa*	5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala*	
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla*	Sheraton-Park
Hollings, Ernest F., *S.C*	
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr*	
Inouye, Daniel K., *Hawaii*	
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash*	
Javits, Jacob K., *N.Y*	
Jordan, B. Everett, *N.C*	
Jordan, Len B., *Idaho*	
Kennedy, Edward M., *Mass*	
Kennedy, Robert F., *N.Y*	
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif*	
Lausche, Frank J., *Ohio*	
Long, Edward V., *Mo*	
Long, Russell B., *La*	
McCarthy, Eugene J., *Minn.*	5916 Bradley Blvd., Bethesda, Md.
McClellan, John L., *Ark*	
McGee, Gale W., *Wyo*	
McGovern, George, *S. Dak*	
McIntyre, Thomas J., *N.H*	
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.*	The Shoreham
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont*	
Metcalf, Lee, *Mont*	453 First St. SE.
Miller, Jack R., *Iowa*	5417 Kirkwood Dr., Bethesda, Md.
Mondale, Walter F., *Minn*	
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*	
Montoya, Joseph M., *N. Mex.*	
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg*	
Morton, Thruston B., *Ky*	
Moss, Frank E., *Utah*	
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak*	122 Schotts Court NE.
Murphy, George, *Calif*	
Muskie, Edmund S., *Maine*	
Nelson, Gaylord, *Wis*	
Pastore, John O., *R.I*	
Pearson, James B., *Kans*	
Pell, Claiborne, *R.I*	3425 Prospect St.
Percy, Charles H., *Ill*	
Prouty, Winston L., *Vt*	
Proxmire, William, *Wis*	
Randolph, Jennings, *W.Va*	4608 Reservoir Rd.
Ribicoff, Abraham A., *Conn*	
Russell, Richard B., *Ga*	
Scott, Hugh, *Pa*	
Smathers, George A., *Fla*	
Smith, Margaret Chase (Mrs.), *Maine.*	
Sparkman, John, *Ala*	4928 Indian Lane
Spong, William B., Jr., *Va*	
Stennis, John, *Miss*	
Symington, Stuart, *Mo*	
Talmadge, Herman E., *Ga*	
Thurmond, Strom, *S.C*	
Tower, John G., *Tex*	
Tydings, Joseph D., *Md*	
Williams, Harrison A., Jr., *N.J.*	
Williams, John J., *Del*	
Yarborough, Ralph, *Tex*	
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak*	Quebec House So.
Young, Stephen M., *Ohio*	

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Francis R. Valeo.
Sergeant at Arms—Robert G. Dunphy.
Chief Clerk—Darrell St. Claire.
Secretary for the Majority—J. S. Kimmitt.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences

Messrs. Anderson (chairman), Russell, Magnuson, Symington, Stennis, Young of Ohio, Dodd, Cannon, Holland, Mondale, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Hickenlooper, Curtis, Jordan of Idaho, Brooke, and Percy.

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Holland, Eastland, Talmadge, Jordan of North Carolina, McGovern, Montoya, Mondale, Byrd of Virginia, Hollings, Aiken, Young of North Dakota, Boggs, Miller, and Hatfield.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell, Ellender, Hill, McClellan, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Pastore, Monroney, Bible, Byrd of West Virginia, McGee, Mansfield, Bartlett, Proxmire, Yarborough, Young of North Dakota, Mundt, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Kuchel, Hruska, Allott, Cotton, Case, and Javits.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell (chairman), Stennis, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Cannon, Byrd of West Virginia, Young of Ohio, Inouye, McIntyre, Brewster, Byrd of Virginia, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Thurmond, Miller, Tower, Pearson, and Dominick.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Sparkman (chairman), Proxmire, Williams of New Jersey, Muskie, Long of Missouri, McIntyre, Mondale, McGee, Spong, Bennett, Tower, Hickenlooper, Brooke, and Percy.

Committee on Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Lausche, Bartlett, Hartke, Hart, Cannon, Brewster, Long of Louisiana, Moss, Hollings, Cotton, Morton, Scott, Prouty, Pearson, and Griffin.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Bible (chairman), Morse, Kennedy of New York, Tydings, Spong, Prouty, Dominick, and Morton.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Long of Louisiana (chairman), Smathers, Anderson, Gore, Talmadge, McCarthy, Hartke, Fulbright, Ribicoff, Metcalf, Harris, Williams of Delaware, Carlson, Bennett, Curtis, Morton, and Dirksen.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Sparkman, Mansfield, Morse, Gore, Lausche, Church, Symington, Dodd, Clark, Pell, McCarthy, Hickenlooper, Aiken, Carlson, Williams of Delaware, Mundt, Case, and Cooper.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Ervin, Gruening, Muskie, Ribicoff, Harris, Kennedy of New York, Metcalf, Montoya, Mundt, Curtis, Javits, Hansen, and Baker.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Jackson (chairman), Anderson, Bible, Church, Gruening, Moss, Burdick, Hayden, McGovern, Nelson, Metcalf, Kuchel, Allott, Jordan of Idaho, Fannin, Hansen, and Hatfield.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Eastland (chairman), McClellan, Ervin, Dodd, Hart, Long of Missouri, Kennedy of Massachusetts, Bayh, Burdick, Tydings, Smathers, Dirksen, Hruska, Fong, Scott, and Thurmond.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), Morse, Yarborough, Clark, Randolph, Williams of New Jersey, Pell, Kennedy of Massachusetts, Nelson, Kennedy of New York, Javits, Prouty, Dominick, Murphy, Fannin, and Griffin.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Monroney (chairman), Yarborough, Randolph, McGee, Brewster, Hartke, Burdick, Hollings, Carlson, Fong, Boggs, and Fannin.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Randolph (chairman), Young of Ohio, Muskie, Gruening, Jordan of North Carolina, Inouye, Bayh, Montoya, Tydings, Spong, Cooper, Fong, Boggs, Murphy, Jordan of Idaho, and Baker.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Jordan of North Carolina (chairman), Hayden, Cannon, Pell, Clark, Byrd of West Virginia, Curtis, Cooper, and Scott.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D.C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 4852 Hutchins Pl.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.
Mr. Justice Brennan, of New Jersey, 3037 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Stewart, of Ohio, 5136 Palisade Lane.
Mr. Justice White, of Colorado, 2209 Hampshire Rd., McLean, Va.
Mr. Justice Fortas, of Tennessee, 3210 R St.
(Vacancy.)

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—John F. Davis, 4704 River Rd.
Deputy Clerk—Edmund P. Cullinan, 4823 Reservoir Rd.
Deputy Clerk—Michael Rodak, 6311 Joslyn Pl., Cheverly, Md.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Rd.
Reporter—Henry Putzel, Jr., 3703 33d St.
Librarian—H. C. Hallam, Jr., 10927 Pleasant Acres Dr., Adelphi, Md.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS
JUSTICES ASSIGNED
TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Fortas. Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Connecticut, New York, Vermont.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Brennan. Delaware, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, West Virginia.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Alabama, Canal Zone, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, Texas.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Stewart. Kentucky, Michigan, Ohio, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: ——— ———. Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice White. Arkansas, Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Alaska, Arizona, California, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Washington, Guam, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice White. Colorado, Kansas, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Utah, Wyoming.

Appendix

Stiff Penalties Needed for Gun Misuse

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALLACE F. BENNETT

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 27, 1967

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement on firearms legislation which I made on July 20, 1967, before the Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency of the Committee on the Judiciary. Sportsmen and gunowners in general are very much opposed to the Dodd gun bill. However, this does not mean that there is opposition to imposing stiff penalties on those who willfully misuse guns. The statement expresses my views on this very important matter.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STIFF GUN MISUSE PENALTIES NEEDED

In considering firearms legislation, the Congress faces the very difficult task of resolving the vital question of freedom versus government controls. Related to this dilemma is the unfortunate and very perplexing crime situation in the United States.

Before any gun legislation is passed, I think it is necessary that the Congress define and understand the issue of constitutional rights as they apply to firearms. There has been considerable emotional appeal both for and against gun legislation. Much of this has been centered around the Second Amendment to the Constitution. May I, for the purpose of my statement, define what I think this amendment means? It reads: "A well regulated militia being necessary to the security of a free state, the right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed."

THE RIGHT TO KEEP AND BEAR ARMS

Unfortunately, this amendment is shrouded in controversy. Some people have taken the position that the amendment guarantees the right to keep and bear arms only to the militia. This, Mr. Chairman, I believe is both mistaken and dangerous. The amendment states that "the right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed." It does not state that the right of the militia, or the national guard, or the Army reserve, to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed. Consequently, I believe that the Congress must accept the amendment for what it really says and for what it intended to say. The people themselves have been guaranteed this right to keep and bear firearms. Thus any gun legislation which we consider must be considered in this context. We are not dealing with a hazy indefinite provision such as the "general welfare" or the "interstate commerce clause." We are talking about a specific limitation upon the powers of government.

POLICE STATE CONTROLS

I wish to emphasize that the Committee, the Senate and the Congress are dealing with a crucial and long-range issue in firearms regulations. Precedents will be set that could be used in future years to affect seriously the nature of our republic and the rights of our people. We must realize that to control the ownership of firearms carries with it the inherent future possibility of police-state controls. This requires a great deal of wisdom, understanding and thoughtful consideration.

Conversely, we now face, Mr. Chairman, a crime situation in this country which is fast becoming the greatest scourage of our national life. Some of it, perhaps a good part of it, is perpetrated by the persons misusing firearms, particularly hand guns. Thus as crime rates skyrocket each year there is a requirement and an obligation by the Congress and *by the states* to protect the general public from those elements in society who abuse it and perpetrate acts of violence against our citizenry.

GUNS ARE NOT THE CAUSE OF CRIME

Let me say very clearly and emphatically that we should not as a legislative body blame a gun itself for any crime or any acts of violence any more than we can blame a pen for misspelling a word. The time has come when the Congress and the American people must face up to the fact that crime itself must be attacked, reduced and punished and the causes thereof must be identified and eradicated.

We must realize, as I'm sure most people do, that crime in this country is encouraged by many recent Supreme Court decisions. We must further realize that many procedures and practices used by the courts are turning criminals loose to perpetrate a second, third and even a fourth crime while out on bond or parole for an earlier conviction or arrest. We must realize that the attitude taken by certain elements in our society that these people are sick and therefore not guilty is one reason why we have such a growing crime rate.

The point I am trying to make, Mr. Chairman, is that there are many causes of crime and to blame it entirely upon the ownership and possession of a hand gun or a rifle is to perpetrate upon the general public a mistaken piece of legislation and to limit unjustly, and I believe in a dangerous manner, a constitutional right. I will support a moderate firearms bill that will control effectively sales of guns through mailorder.houses to youngsters, to incompetents, and to criminal elements where they can be identified. I do not believe that in this category the Congress should include rifles or shot guns, with the exception of sawed-off shot guns. I think the Congress in this legislation should place the blame where the blame really belongs. We should write into any bill stern and severe penalties for the misuse of firearms and make doubly certain that persons found guilty of this offense are not allowed once again to perpetrate further crimes of violence upon our law-abiding citizens.

SEVERE PENALTIES SHOULD BE IMPOSED FOR MISUSE

In this context, I believe that any legislation passed by the Congress should contain severe penalties for the misuse of firearms.

For persons found guilty of using guns in the commission of crimes in interstate commerce or in violation of Federal law such as homicide, murder, kidnapping, rape, assault, robbery, burglary or extortion, I strongly urge the Congress to include the following penalties:

Persons convicted for the first offense should be imprisoned for not less than 5 and not more than 10 years.

Persons convicted for a second time or more, the prison sentence should be not less than 20 years.

HEARINGS SHOULD BE HELD IN WEST

As a final note, I think we should not forget that in this country a very large majority of gun owners and law-abiding citizens who purchase a weapon honorably and in no way use it to abuse either their constitutional right or their fellow Americans. I have recommended, as have members of the House of Representatives, that hearings be held in the Intermountain West to determine the views and the position of hunters and sportsmen and legitimate gun owners. It is my understanding that this has not been done. Mr. Chairman, I fear that the present gun legislation has been inspired by conditions which exist in large cities, and this, of course, must be considered very carefully for it represents a major part of the problem. However, I am quite convinced that an important segment of the gun owning public has been ignored simply because hearings have not been held in the rural and outlying areas of the country where gun ownership is an altogether different matter than it is in our large states.

American Legion Leader Virgil C. Fields Is Mourned

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 27, 1967

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, July 15, one of Oklahoma's outstanding American Legion leaders and citizens, Virgil C. "Peck" Fields, died at the age of 71 in Jay, Okla.

Peck Fields was a lifetime resident of Delaware County in Oklahoma, where he was born on December 22, 1895. Every active member of the American Legion in Oklahoma was familiar with his long and distinguished service as a leader of that organization, and recognized his significant contribution to programs and legislation benefiting American war veterans.

In his long life of serivce, Peck Fields took an active role in politics and in government, and he was a constructive worker for progress in his community and throughout northeastern Oklahoma.

Peck was understandably proud of the wartime record of his son, Maj. Virgil C. Fields, Jr., who was a command pilot of the 31st Fighter Group, 307th Squadron, and one of our country's most decorated World War II heroes.

Before his death in action over Anzio beachhead on February 6, 1944, Major Fields flew his Spitfire in 188 sorties, was twice wounded, and crashlanded once. His decorations included the Distinguished Flying Cross, the Distinguished Service Cross, the Air Medal with 15 oak leaf clusters, the Purple Heart with two oak leaf clusters, the European-African-Mideastern Campaign Medal with five bronze service stars and the World War II Victory Medal.

The Delaware County Journal, on July 20, reported the death of Virgil C. Fields with the following article:

VIRGIL C. FIELDS

Virgil C. "Peck" Fields, life-long resident of Jay died Saturday July 15, at his home here. He was 71.

A veteran of World War I, he was known over the district for his work in the American Legion. He was a long time member of the Jay post and was a former district commander.

He was a member of the Jay Baptist Church, the Masonic Lodge of Gravett, VFW and the 40 et 8 Veterans organization. Mr. Fields was born December 22, 1895, near Grove.

His son, Virgil C. Fields, Jr., for whom the Jay Legion Post is named, died a highly decorated fighter pilot in the World War II air fights over Europe.

Survivors include his wife, Merle, to whom he was married September 2, 1947; a brother, Lee Fields of Grove; and a sister, Mrs. George Hoggart, Pryor.

Funeral services were conducted at the Baptist Church here Tuesday afternoon with the Rev. Lynn Langston officiating. Burial was in Bethel Cemetery near Gravett with military rites conducted by the Jay Legion Post.

A $123 Television Set With $297 Interest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 27, 1967

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial published in the Life magazine, dated July 28, 1967, entitled "A $123 Television Set With $297 Interest."

Mr. President, in that connection, I wish to commend the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] for the able work which he did in presenting to the Senate and bringing about the ultimate passage of the truth-in-lending bill.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A $123 TELEVISION SET WITH $297 INTEREST

In one way or another most Americans owe money. The debt may be in the form of a mortgage on their homes, a loan to cover Johnny's college education or, just as likely, the result of buying goods and services on time. All this borrowing has been a major force in fueling America's postwar boom. It has enabled families who would not ordinarily be able to do so to own their own cars and appliances. But few of these families know how much interest they are paying, and, tragically, the binge of borrowing has emboldened loan sharks and slippery salesmen to take advantage of an often too-trusting public.

To put a check on those who abuse the consumer credit system, the Senate recently passed the truth-in-lending bill, which would require merchants and lending institutions to inform their customers of the annual rate of interest they will be paying and also the total amount of finance charges. This little bit of information should permit Americans to make more intelligent decisions about what they buy and borrow and on what terms.

It is amazing how bad our arithmetic can be. A recent survey of 800 families showed that they estimated their finance charges to be 8.3%, whereas the average rate was actually 24%. Most people go astray because, faced with a dizzying array of carrying charges and compound interest rates, they take refuge in the seductively simple out of merely judging whether they can afford the monthly payments. A few years ago a Jersey City electrical worker bought a television set on monthly payments of $17.50 per month. By the time he got through paying for it two years later, he had paid $420 for a $123 set.

The truth-in-lending bill will in no way impinge on the right of lenders to set their own rates. The act will be of primary benefit to the poor, who are the ones credit sharks find easiest to gouge. It won't repeal unscrupulous salesmen, but it will crimp their style and help to generate a new credit consciousness among shoppers. The House should pass truth-in-lending, a worthwhile piece of business regulation that will interfere only with those merchants who cloud the truth.

Poverty Plans for Now and the Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 27, 1967

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, the Kansas City Star recently published an editorial about the work of the Office of Economic Opportunity in the Kansas City area that I would like to share with my colleagues.

In my opinion, this editorial expresses some of the important progress and developments the OEO is bringing about in correcting many of our social and economic problems that particularly affect our Nation's cities and urban areas.

The OEO has initiated many programs of long-range significance to our country, including wide-ranging health and medical aid services that will be in effect very soon in Kansas City.

The editorial that follows from the Kansas City Star of July 4, indicates to me the extent of public approval and support that the OEO has gained in its efforts to provide a better life for all of our citizens.

The editorial follows:

POVERTY PLANS FOR NOW AND THE FUTURE

The summer poverty program in the Kansas City area is ready to move. Obviously it can't fill needs that have been building up for years. But it is a positive effort, and if not all the immediate targets are hit, there is greater hope for the long-range plans of the Office of Economic Opportunity and in other projects. Really meaningful health programs are on the way.

As for right now in Kansas City, the summer program includes the usual recreational efforts, job-finding plus some added ingredients. After last year's experience, it became obvious that many of the teen-agers who have spent their young lives on summer asphalt really weren't enchanted with camping trips out in the woods. First of all, most of them want jobs and the independence that pocket money can bring. As for recreation, not all are interested in spending a week or two communing with nature in the form of chigger bites and falling out of boats. The suburban ideal of camping for the children is not necessarily reflected in the wishes of slum children.

That is why the grant to the Twenty-fourth street council, an adjunct of the Council for United Action and people who live in the T. B. Watkins housing project, holds different and unusual promise. The grant will provide recreation and other activities for 1,300 children with an emphasis on Negro and African history and culture. The C. U. A. asked for this project and probably expected to be turned down. But now it is in the works and if it is handled well, it ought to be of great benefit.

The program to recruit youngsters in the poverty area to aid the police as a cadet corps in the event of riot situations is all to the good. The plan has been tried elsewhere, usually after violence had broken out.

There is no reason why Kansas City can't follow the formula in advance of any possible disturbances. We would guess that the key to success might lie in knowledgeable recruitment. The real leaders have to be sought out, and if they happen to have a couple of minor scars on a juvenile record, that should be no deterrent. In Tampa, Cincinnati and Atlanta, the effective "white helmet" leaders have been the leaders already in command. When the youngsters have been given a purpose and a real opportunity for responsibility, they apparently have performed beyond all expectations.

For the long run, the big events in the poverty effort concern health. The application for a health center to be established in the Wayne Minor court has been approved. It will bring diagnostic, dental, medical and social services to thousands of people who don't get them now. Beyond that, the Missouri Legislature has voted to move into Medicaid, which will bring similar help to thousands now on welfare. And don't forget that the people of Jackson County approved bonds for a new General hospital and Mercy hospital complex that will mean better health for tens of thousands over the years to come.

Admittedly, these are long-range projects, although the poverty program clinic should be in operation in six months and the Medicaid benefits will be available in the immediate future.

But if these services had been available a few years ago, frustrations and tensions might be considerably less than they are today. In the anxiety to jump into emergency programs right now, the projects that take a little more time ought not to be overlooked or underestimated.

Ray Dobson, Minot, N. Dak., Grand Exalted Ruler of the Elks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILTON R. YOUNG

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 27, 1967

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, we in North Dakota are very proud that one of our most able and respected citizens, Ray Dobson, publisher of the Minot Daily News of Minot, N. Dak., has been serving in the capacity of grand exalted ruler of the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks this past year.

His work in this capacity has received widespread acclaim from fellow Elks and others all across the country.

At the opening session of the recent Elks Grand Lodge convention in Chicago, Mr. Dobson dealt with a subject close to the hearts of all Americans. While his remarks are directed primarily to the Elks gathered for the convention, I believe that his thinking would receive nationwide acclaim and approval.

Mr. President, because Mr. Dobson's comments do such an excellent job of discussing the responsibilities of citizenship and the un-American acts that are occurring all around us today, I feel they would be of special interest to Members of Congress and Americans everywhere. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a portion of Mr. Dobson's address be included in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PARTIAL TEXT OF REMARKS BY BPOE GRAND EXALTED RULER RAYMOND C. DOBSON, CHICAGO, ILL., JULY 16, 1967

Come with me as a family for a moment now to a ward in a government hospital; And there let me introduce you to a youth barely out of his teens, wounded in combat.

And he tells us how grateful he is for the attention he has had showered on him by the Elks.

Perhaps he isn't aware, no one has told him, of the pledge given long ago by the Elks that 'so long as there is a disabled veteran in our hospitals, the Elks will never forget him.'

That boy with his torn body, given in defense of your freedom and mine, doesn't know we're thinking about a repugnant opposite to him.

A contract which angers and makes one ashamed that there are such persons in our nation.

The despicable and contemptible individuals who refuse induction into military service on some flimsy excuse. (And my words would be more descriptive if there were not ladies present.)

The harebrained persons who tear up their draft registration cards; or defile the Stars and Stripes under which they seek its blessings, but choose not to accept obligations.

Perhaps that diagnosis I heard was right.

All of them are suffering from back trouble—a great big yellow stripe right down the middle.

If there is an Elk anywhere in the nation—and I hope there isn't—who has the cockeyed sentiments that these undesirable individuals have, then I recommend:

'Turn in your card! We don't want you! Scram!'

And anything I've said goes double for those few, but too many agitators who leapfrog from city to city, spewing words of hatred, inciting others to loot and riot.

I think of them, with their Tom Thumb intellects, as being a detestable protruding wart on the nose of decent society.

But there is some satisfaction to be gained if you remember words spoken long ago.

'One wise man is worth more than 10,000 fools. To reason with a wise man is easy, with a fool, impossible.'

What do we need most in this country?

My answer is terse, and admittedly not all-embracing—

Tolerance, even if it has to be stretched like a rubber band;

Awareness that we get wisdom by looking on fools;

Rededication to the worthy principles which for 99½ years have served the Elks so well.

A determination that our second century shall far eclipse the first;

And finally, for the edification of those who defy our law and order, faster justice and punishment, and bigger, not smaller by court decree, billy clubs for policemen.

God bless you all, my good fellow Americans.

President Thomas Jefferson's Prophecy Being Fulfilled

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 27, 1967

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, a major problem confronting our educated society is to force our lives into untested goals at the expense of truth. A society welded by force of half-truths is like a mansion without a foundation—neither can long endure.

It is not what is being said and taught, but rather, what is overlooked or not considered. A half-truth can be much more dangerous than a lie.

We Americans are the victims of book burning. Not the physical burning of books, but the intentional omission of ideas and facts—the result having similar effect.

Abraham Lincoln has ably described the truth as "unpleasant and disagreeable," so his many works and speeches today would be called racist or extremist. Yet, to the searching intellectual, they exist in old books—they have been "burned out" of later editions, suppressed.

So, I find with the works of our great champion of the Democratic Party, President Thomas Jefferson, a man who never straddled the middle of the road or was neutral on any issue. A man who adhered to the God-given concept as the source of life and liberty as against the theory that government can guarantee anything but taxes.

On the walls of the Jefferson Memorial here in Washington, D.C., dedicated in 1943, are four panels, proclaimed to profess his philosophy. Jefferson, as a true Democrat, could not tolerate slavery, but his forceful arguments against private ownership of human beings was unsucessful.

Yet, because truth may not soothe all, panel 3 of his memorial omits the full text of his philosophy. What is there contained was from his works, but it is what is not contained in his quote that is being passed on to our people and children that denies the full truth to our people.

President Jefferson's complete statement on slaves—emancipation—as contained in the Jeffersonian Cyclopedia, page 816, published by Funk & Wagnalls in 1900, is as follows:

> It was found that the public mind would not bear the proposition (gradual emancipation), nor will it bear it even at this day (1821). Yet the day is not distant, when it must bear and adopt it, or worse will follow. Nothing is more certainly written in the book of fate, than that these people are to be free; nor is it less certain, that the two races, equally free, cannot live in the same government. Nature, habit, opinion have drawn indelible lines of distinction between them. It is still in our power to direct the process of emancipation and deportation, peaceably, and in such slow degree, as that the evil will wear off insensibly, and their place be, *pari passu*, filled up by free white laborers. If, on the contrary, it is left to force itself on, human nature must shudder at the prospect held up. We should in vain look for an example in the Spanish deportation, or deletion of the Moors. This precedent would fall far short of our case.—Jefferson mss. Rayner, 164.

The panel from Jefferson's Memorial, visited by hundreds of thousands of our fellow countrymen reads:

> God who gave us life gave us liberty. Can the liberities of a nation be secure when we have removed a conviction that these liberties are the gift of God? Indeed I tremble for my Country when I reflect that God is just. That His justice cannot sleep forever. Commerce between master and slave is despotism. Nothing is more certainly written in the book of fate than that these people are to be free. Establish the law for educating the common people. This it is the business of the state to effect and on a general plan.

Book burning leads to burning of private property and ultimately to the fulfillment of fears suppressed because of truth. Read once again the prophesy of Thomas Jefferson in light of contemporary events.

Buying Publicity for War on Poverty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 27, 1967

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial published in the Des Moines, Iowa, Register, dated July 22, 1967, entitled "Buying Publicity for War on Poverty."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"BUYING" PUBLICITY FOR WAR ON POVERTY

An unusual form of inducement—closely approaching bribery—is being contemplated to gain newspaper and radio publicity for a seven-county Office of Economic Opportunity program headquartered at Carroll.

Area newspapers and radio stations have been asked to agree to print or broadcast "any and all news articles and publications" submitted by the local OEO unit, Community Opportunities, Inc. In return, a credit of $1.50 per inch for newspaper stories and $4 a minute for broadcasts (based on advertising rates) will be made in the unit's budget as local "in-kind" services.

Ninety per cent of OEO financing is from federal funds, and 10 per cent must be provided locally. Local funding, however, may be in the form of volunteer services and donated office space and facilities. So far Carroll officials have had no trouble getting their 10 per cent, but they are worried about the future, when many programs will require 20 per cent local financing.

Six newspapers and two radio stations have agreed to the proposal and will let their stories be used as credit in the budget. They, in turn, will be credited for their help in a monthly newsletter. Most of the newspapers have reserved editorial discretion on stories submitted to them, and a Carroll OEO official said even unfavorable stories would count.

Although the Carroll program is apparently unique in Iowa, the idea was considered and rejected by the Polk County Community Action Council. State OEO officials did not know of this publicity plan and thought no Iowa units were using it.

This proposal is to be analyzed by the Kansas City OEO office for approval, and it should be quickly squashed. The best that can be said for it is that it is foolish. It is a naive effort to "buy" favorable publicity and dampen criticism of poverty war programs. It attempts to put newspapers and radio stations in the position of having to publicize the programs, regardless of merit, to assure their proper local financing.

It is surprising that a government office would propose such a policy, and we hope it gets no further.

The F–111 Proves Superior to Contemporary Aircraft, Authoritative Magazine Reports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JIM WRIGHT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 27, 1967

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, the authoritative magazine, Popular Aviation, recently offered some perceptive observations about the F–111 aircraft.

The magazine, in an article in its July-August issue, pointed out that even though the F–111 has been embroiled in controversy from its very inception, it nevertheless already has proven itself far superior in versatility, operational capability, and safety to contemporary aircraft.

In a related article, the magazine described the comprehensive flight test program to which the F–111 has been subjected. The author of this article is Val E. Prahl, manager of flight at General Dynamics/Fort Worth, prime contractor on the weapons system. Mr. Prahl himself has flown about 200 hours in the F–111.

Because I believe these articles will be quite interesting to Members of the Congress, I include them in the Record at this point:

The Swing-Wing F–111: The World's Most Advanced Fighter-Bomber, Developed for the Air Force and Navy, Is Rapidly Shaping the Future of Supersonic Flight

By now the man in the street must be convinced that F–111 is the name of a controversy that also involves an airplane. Research files bulge with books, magazine articles, congressional testimony and press releases about the General Dynamics' F–111, originally known as the TFX.

The controversy has been fueled by such a variety of motivations that it's almost virtually impossible to separate fact from fiction.

The airplane has had its share of perplexing development problems—the most troublesome of these being the matching of the airframe and inlets with the Pratt & Whitney TF–30 afterburning fanjet engines. The most publicized problem has been the weight of the Navy version, being built by Grumman Aircraft Engineering Corporation of Bethpage, N.Y.

But technical problems always have been and always will be associated with technological advancements and that's why development programs are required: to sort out and solve the problems, so that the improvements can be incorporated on the plane.

Often overlooked in the fascination of watching the airplane being developed and tested is the fact that the F–111 is alreday far superior to its contemporaries in terms of versatility, operational capability, and safety.

Also overlooked is that the requirements for the airplane were the toughest ever devised for a manned airborne weapon system. The F–111 had to be able to perform a greater variety of tactical missions than any other single aircraft; perform a supersonic low-level penetration mission that no other airplane could handle; and at the same time achieve standards of reliability and maintainability above those of any other supersonic airplane in the military inventory.

Frank W. Davis, president of General Dynamic's Fort Worth Division, describes the situation like this:

"We see small size, large load-carrying capability, very high speed, very low speed, rugged strength, light weight, sophistication and simplicity wrapped into one. It's a little like looking for a Volkswagen with Ferrari performance, Rolls-Royce appointments, and Mack Truck carrying capability."

In the broad sense, the basic design solution for these different requirements was simple: provide the pilot with the means of redesigning his airplane in flight to suit any situation he faces.

The basic design solution for a propulsion system to match this wide range of aerodynamic performance also was simple: combine a fanjet engine with a variable or modulated afterburner.

A jet engine with a fan is designed for maximum efficiency at low speed. An afterburner will provide maximum thrust for high speed and for short takeoff. Then the afterburner is modulated so the pilot can regulate fuel consumption even at high speeds. By combining this propulsion method with the F–111's aerodynamic characteristics, a completely new versatility would be achieved.

Successful incorporation and operation of the sweep wing is now record. Wing-sweep performance has been virtually free from fault since the flight test program began in December, 1964. More than 7,000 wing movements have been made during flight.

But matching the afterburning turbofan engines with the airframe turned out to be complex. Distortion levels in the air inlet and engine compressor produced engine stalls. General Dynamics went to work on improving the performance of the air inlets, and Pratt & Whitney set about improving the engines.

As the improvements were incorporated, development aircraft steadily expanded the F–111 flight envelope, including speed demonstrations to the design Mach borders. F–111s have now made more than 140 flights beyond Mach 2, indicative of the improved engine-airframe performance being achieved.

Delivery of the F–111's first TF30–P3 production engines this year produced further improvements in aircraft performance, especially in the area of maneuverability at different angles of attack.

Earlier this year, in tests at Edwards Air Force Base, California, the F–111A, the Air Force version, completed a series of supersonic flights at constant ground clearances of less than 1,000 feet over mountainous terrain. The F–111A is the first aircraft capable of maintaining this kind of low-level performance for extended period. The tests also marked the first time that an airplane had been flown under automatic control of an electronic system at supersonic speed at low altitude. The airplane's terrain following radar (TFR) system was used on these supersonic runs.

Other F–111 avionic systems have been performing just as well. The inertial navigation system has demonstrated accuracies nearly twice as good as required by the specification—performance as measured during hundreds of flights on different F–111 development airplanes. Also meeting or exceeding the requirements are the lead computing optical sight set and the attack radar system. The performance of these avionic systems assures the delivery of weapons on target.

When it comes to the variety of weapons and weapon loads that it can carry, the F–111 has no equal in its class. Weapon separation and launching tests with rockets, bombs and guns have been underway since May at Eglin Air Force Base, Florida, and so far are both successful and on schedule.

Short takeoff and landing capabilities were other important requirements for the F–111A. Some landings have been made with less than 2,000 feet of ground roll. Supporting this short landing performance are approach speeds of about 130 mph and touchdown speeds as low as 120 mph—more like a piston-engined transport than a supersonic jet fighter.

Takeoff performance has been equally impressive. With their wings set at 16 degrees, F–111s have had wheels off after using less than 2,100 feet of runway.

Other milestone achievements attained during development include stall speeds of less than 115 mph; level flight at altitudes above 59,000 feet, in-flight refueling (more than 40 successful hookups with a tanker ship made on a single flight); and proved reliability of the aircraft's basic systems—electrical, hydraulic and fuel.

The total range of performance is unprecedented and probably will not be matched for many years to come. But the real key to the F–111's operational success may be reliability and maintainability. In the past, reliability and maintainability considerations often have been subordinated to the performance requirements during the design of supersonic aircraft. This trend was reversed on the drawing board. What this has meant to the flight test program is evidenced by the more than 1,700 flights and 2,900 flying hours amassed by 21 development airplanes. The fast turn-around time—three flights by a development airplane on the same day has become commonplace—also attests to the built-in reliability and maintainability of the basic aircraft and its subsystems.

To help meet some of the most stringent maintainability requirements ever demanded, the F–111 has selftesters built into subsystems so that maintenance men can quickly locate and replace a defective unit. Access to all subsystems is provided through more than 300 access panels, most of them at ground level. Many of the electrical, hydraulic and pneumatic subsystems can be serviced through the main landing gear wheel well.

All production versions of the F–111 will benefit from another advancement that ranks in importance with the variable-sweep-wings and the afterburning fanjet engines. This is the F–111 crew module, produced by McDonnell Aircraft Corporation, that is both an operational cockpit and an escape vehicle.

Crewmembers can fly in shirtsleeves without need of pressure suits or other special flight clothing. The module also provides an unprecedented escape and survival capability. It can be ejected at zero speed and altitude, or at any point while in full performance.

In an emergency, an explosive chord shears the module from the fuselage, and a rocket motor powers it clear. The landing is cushioned by an inflated bag.

In water landings or underwater escape, flotation bags raise the module after it has been severed from the fuselage, automatically righting the module if it should be in an upside-down position.

The module, which can serve as a shelter on land or water, contains extensive survival gear for both crewmembers. Survival tests, with a two-man crew aboard, have been conducted successfully in Arctic waters.

Because of their design similarity, a great deal of F–111A flight test data is proving equally vaild for the U.S. Navy's F–111B version. This in turn is eliminating much flight testing that would otherwise be required for the Navy airplane.

Five F–111Bs are now flying. Three are assigned to the development program of the Phoenix missile system, primary armament for operational F–111Bs. Each F–111B will carry six Phoenix missiles for its fleet air defense role—four on wing plyons and two in the weapons bay. Phoenix, the most advanced missile of its kind in the world, is being developed by Hughes Aircraft Company for the Navy.

Successful test firings of the Phoenix from the F–111B have been made and the first production version (the sixth Navy model to be built) is scheduled for delivery in 1968 equipped with the Phoenix missile and its missile control system as originally planned.

The F–111B will be able to operate from the Midway, Forrestal and later classes of attack carriers. Wind-over-the-deck requirements for the F–111B will be substantially less than for the operational McDonnell F–4 and North American RA–5C.

Weight of the F–111B, an important factor in carrier suitability, is approximately eight percent over the original Navy specification. This does not restrict the airplane from carrier use. A combination of weight reduction as incorporated in other developmental Navy aircraft, together with high lift devices and engine refinements, are successful compensating improvements.

No deck, elevator or other modifications will be required for carriers from which F–111Bs will operate. The weight of the F–111 actually is quite close to larger carrier aircraft currently operating in the fleet.

Weight studies led to what is now known as SWIP—a super weight improvement program which entailed weight reduction throughout the airplane. SWIP resulted in weight savings of some 4,000 pounds in F–111Bs 4 and 5, and will be basic to all subsequent aircraft. Efforts were also undertaken to improve lift and resulted in a nine percent lift improvement that will be in all production F–111Bs.

In addition, the Navy airplane will use an improved TF–30 engine known as the P–12 which will provide added thrust and improved operating characteristics over the TF–30 development engines known as the P–1.

Flight testing has revealed a number of ways to further improve the F–111B's basic design. Among improvements requested by Navy evaluation pilots is improved visibility for carrier landing approaches.

This is being accomplished with three relatively minor changes: The pilot's seat will be raised about three inches to give him a higher vantage point; re-rigging of high-lift devices will lower the nose during approach; thirdly, the windshield slope will be increasing about eight degrees.

The net effect will be an improved view that also permits the pilot to take maximum advantage of the F–111B's excellent characteristics on low-speed approaches.

Next month the first production of F–111A aircraft will be delivered to the Tactical Air Command. Few persons would be surprised if some of these early production aircraft turned up for duty in Vietnam for combat test trials.

The technical advances embodied in the F–111 can be translated into "greater versatility" and "greater utility," which will give operational squadrons dramatic increases in range, payload and flexibility.

Defense planners have recognized already that the F–111 is an airplane with such wide capabilities that it is in class by itself, and initial orders for the F–111 bear this out.

The Department of Defense $1.82 billion contract now calls for 493 aircraft: 331 F–111A fighter-bombers (for the Tactical Air Command), 24 F–111B long-range interceptors (for the Navy), 64 FB–111 strategic bombers (for the Strategic Air Command), 24 F–111C (for the Royal Australian Air Force), and 50 F–111K (for the Royal Air Force).

However, the F–111 may have received the ultimate endorsement when the Boeing Company's variable-sweep-wing design was selected for this country's supersonic transport.

The F–111 Flight Test Program

(By Val E. Prahl)

Among the most interesting aircraft development programs currently in progress is the Flight Test Program of the F–111, an airplane that is being built for the USAF (the F–111A) and the U.S. Navy (F–111B).

To accomplish multi-mission objectives which include short take-off and landing distances, sustained supersonic operation at low altitudes, and a Mach 2.5 capability at high altitudes, the F–111 is configured and equipped with a number of unique design features and advanced systems.

With its wings swept to the forward extremity of 16 degrees, the F–111A has a wing span of 63 feet which diminishes to 32 feet when the wings are swept to the most aft position of 72.5 degrees. The airplane is about 72 feet long.

Thrust is supplied by two afterburning fan jet Pratt & Whitney TF30 engines. The main landing gear is a single strut arrangement on which two wheels are singly mounted. Both the main and nose gear retract forward, and are hydraulically operated. When the gear is retracted the main gear door also serves as a speed brake. An arresting hook, provided only as an emergency device, cannot be retracted. Full span leading edge slats and trailing edge flaps are on the wings and spoilers are installed for lateral control in flight, and as a landing roll brake on the ground.

Weapons may be carried in the internal weapons bay or on the four pylons under each wing (the outboard pylons are fixed, and the inboard pair rotate with wing sweep). The F–111B is similar with 80 percent of the same parts, but 3½ feet wing tips have been added to each wing.

Because of the similarity of the two airplanes, the major flight test effort is being conducted on only one model, the F–111A. The F–111B flight test program consists of tests required to develop the airworthiness of the airframe differences and equipment peculiar to the Navy.

In the initial design of the airplane the variable wing sweep feature appeared to be the most formidable task to resolve. It included such problems as providing a reliable mechanism with structural integrity and minimum effect on stability and control. Wing sweep is accomplished by two hydraulic motor driven actuators, each motor powered separately. The actuators are mechanically interconnected to insure synchronized wing sweep and to provide actuation in the event of failure of either system.

Wing position is commanded by a single wing sweep handle located on the left side of cockpit and controlled by a closed loop mechanical servo system. The wing sweep handle slides fore and aft, and motion of the wing corresponds to motion of the handle.

Because a change in wing sweep angle has significant effect on both the performance and handling characteristics of an airplane, flight testing a variable sweep wing airplane appears to be a staggering task. However, early analysis of the F–111 resulted in the conclusion that adequate test data could be obtained at six positions: 16, 26, 35, 45, 55 and 72.5 degrees wing sweep, and for each position there was designated a limit speed.

The major milestone of the wing sweep tests was the flight demonstration on January 6, 1965. As the wings were swept forward and aft, traversing to total wing sweep envelope, the smoothness of sweep operations and the almost imperceptible longitudinal trim change demonstrated the most successful feature on the F–111. Today wing-sweep operation is as routine as flap operation and more than 7,000 inflight wing sweep operations have been recorded.

From these early flight tests a general usage (in degrees) of wing sweep evolved: (1) Take-off—16; (2) Climb out—26; (3) Best subsonic cruise—26; (4) High subsonic operation—45; (5) Transonic to 1.1 Mach—55 to 60; (6) Above 1.1 Mach—72.5; (7) Landing—16 to 26 because this is the wing sweep envelope in which the flaps can be extended.

The control surfaces are conventional—with the exception of lateral control—all powered by two separate hydraulic systems. Longitudinal control is provided by an "all moveable" horizontal stabilizer and directional control by a rudder. Primary toll control is obtained through differential motion of the horizontal stabilizer, but when the wings are swept forward of 45 degrees, spoilers on top of the wing supplement the roll power. The control stick and rudder pedals are linked directly to the horizontal tail and rudder actuators, respectively, but electrical signals command lateral spoiler position. The stability augmentation system consists of triple redundant systems for the electronic circuits in yaw, pitch, and roll; self adaptive scheduling of the roll and pitch gains (the yaw damper has a single fixed gain); and command augmentation in pitch and roll.

One of the more impressive aspects of F–111A performance is its ability to take off and land at very low speeds. Though variable sweep allows operation at both high and low speeds, the low speed performance of the airplane is primarily a result of the high lift devices at the forward wing sweep position. These devices consist of full-span trailing-edge flaps and leading-edge slats and are unique to a supersonic fighter. The wing flaps are full span multisection Fowler-type flaps which extend to 37.5 degrees, each wing flap being hydraulically powered by a single hydraulic motor which is connected to a gear box located in the fuselage. This gear box drives a torque shaft which positions the flap sections by mechanical actuators. An electric motor is also attached to the gear box to provide emergency operation in the event of hydraulic failure.

To prevent flap asymmetry, a device senses relative flap position and causes the flaps to lock in place if an asymmetry occurs. Further flap operation is not possible until the device is reset on the ground. An interlock device with wing sweep locks the flap/slat handle to the "up" position if wing sweep is aft of the 26 degrees position and also prevents wing sweep past 26 degrees with flaps extended.

A single control handle positions the flaps and slats, but flaps will not extend beyond 15 degrees until the slats have reached 70 percent extension, nor can the slats be retracted when flap extension is greater than

15 degrees. Initial motion of the flap/slat handle from the "full retract" position causes the slats to extend; and slat retraction does not occur until the handle is returned to the "full retract" position, and the flaps have retracted to less than 15 degrees. As the slats are extended, a section of the wing glove area rotates to allow extension of the inboard leading edge slats.

The performance capability of the F-111 to sustain supersonic flight at low altitude is the primary key to its potential ability to penetrate enemy defenses. To go along with this capability a terrain following radar system (TFR) system is installed on the airplane to allow low level penetration at night, or in low visibility conditions. This system, operated both manually and automatically, provides low altitude terrain following and obstacle avoidance at pre-selected clearance levels by means of dual vertical scan radars. Both radars have an alternate horizontal scan mode capability. Each radar is independent in its operation; and two systems are provided for increased reliability and as a "fail-safe" feature.

To test pilots, the remaining portion of the test program may appear to be anti-climatic. 111 always affords opportunity for a new, But operation in the speed regime of the F— exciting experience.

Comptroller General Halts Purchase of IBM Computers After Reports of Excessive Costs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 27, 1967

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, it appears that the Honorable Elmer B. Staats, Comptroller General of the United States, once again has demonstrated the effectiveness of the General Accounting Office.

As revealed by the Washington Post, the Department of the Air Force was about to pay the sum of $114 million for a supply of IBM computers. Since other companies allegedly were willing to supply these computers for a price of only $60 million, the Comptroller General ruled that the Air Force must conduct further negotiations with bidders other than IBM before making the purchase.

Under unanimous consent I include the item that appeared in the July 15 issue of the Washington Post at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The article follows:

[From the Washington Post, July 15, 1967]

IBM-AIR FORCE DEAL ENDS AFTER PROTESTS

The General Accounting Office yesterday issued an order invalidating the proposed award of a $114 million Air Force computer contract to IBM.

Elmer B. Staats, Comptroller General of the United States included the order in a letter to the Secretary of the Air Force.

The order followed a three-week probe of the award by GAO after receiving complaints from other bidders that they would do the job for about half the price.

Staats said he believed the evidence showed that Honeywell, Inc., should have been considered by the Air Force to have been within the competitive range.

He ordered that "further written or oral discussions should be held with Honeywell as well as other (bidders) . . . within competitive range."

This means that the contract is once again up for grabs and this time the price tag will be around the $60–$70 million reported to have been bid by Honeywell.

A Defense Department spokesman said last night that the Air Force would comply with the decision and reopen contract negotiations with the four bidders.

The Air Force wants 135 computers to be placed in its various bases around the world to keep track of operations.

The controversy began on April 12 when the Air Force announced it had considered all the bids and proclaimed IBM the winner.

It was immediately deluged with complaints from the other bidders claiming their price were far below that of IBM.

The 45th Infantry Division Association Goes on Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 27, 1967

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, all Oklahomans are proud of our State's 45th Infantry Division, and the great figthing record of that division in World War II and the Korean war.

The Thunderbirds have an incomparable record of service to our country, and many men who have served in the division have continued their association with it as members of the 45th Infantry Division Association.

On June 24, 1967, in Oklahoma City, the association unanimiously adopted the following resolution as resolution No. 1, protesting a proposal of the Secretary of Defense for elimination of the 45th Infantry Division. All members of Oklahoma's congressional delegation have joined in protesting this proposal, and I believe the resolution states the feelings of most Oklahoma citizens. The following is the text of the resolution:

Whereas, our country has on the order of a half-million men engaged in the struggle in Vietnam, and the end there does not appear to be in our sight;

And, whereas, a time fuse is smouldering in the Near East and our un-committed armed forces would not be sufficient to undertake there a major engagement;

And, whereas, "a well regulated Militia, being necessary to the security of a free state," is a truth our constitutional fathers so clearly perceived that they declared "the right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed";

And, whereas, the illustrious history and grand tradition of the 45th Infantry Division are an invaluable weapon that ought not to be cast lightly aside but should be kept in a Division structure to assure our cherished freedom;

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the 45th Infantry Division Association in this twenty-second annual reunion assembled that we do with all the strength at our command express our opposition to the current proposal of the Secretary of the Department of Defense to eliminate our 45th Infantry Division.

Concern Over Riots

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 27, 1967

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that all the Members of Congress are getting an increasing volume of mail from their constituents expressing growing concern, alarm, and downright fright over the rampant rioting taking place in the large metropolitan cities in our country.

Many of these letters are born of frustration and many come from responsible individuals who have given very serious thought to what has happened and what ought to be done. One of these exceptionally fine letters has come to me from Mr. Joseph B. Doubet, 611 Lakewood Avenue, Peoria, Ill.

I insert the full text of Mr. Doubet's letter in the RECORD at this point, for it expresses my sentiments exactly:

PEORIA, ILL., *July 25, 1967*.

Congressman ROBERT MICHEL,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MICHEL: I wish to register my concern over the present rash of riots, insurrections—call them what you will—being experienced in a number of United States cities. More specifically, I would like to call your attention to my feelings regarding the apparent attitude of U.S. authorities and leaders, national and state, towards the current disturbances.

It is perhaps a sign of the times, and a sad testimonial to the current state of the nation, that I feel compelled to state that I am sympathetic to the general negro cause—fuller employment, a better standard of living, and freedom to work, play, and live as U.S. citizens fully entitled to the blessings of our country—before stating my views. In any case, I fail to understand how the current disturbances will further the negro cause. I fail to understand the apparent timidness of public officials, national and state, in dealing with the present situation. I fail to understand the apparent lack of strong public condemnations of the riots by the leaders, both public and private, of both the negro and white communities. It would appear that one of the most courageous persons in the United States at this time is Governor Hughes of New Jersey, who had the audacity and courage to publically label the rioters in Newark as "criminals." In the outpourings of apologists and sob-sisters explanations of why we couldn't expect different from people participating in the riots, I found Governor Hughes to be, indeed, most refreshing.

It is not, evidently, polite today to call a spade "a spade." In my opinion we had better start. We have at this time a revolution in process within the United States. It is not "a revolution in the attitudes of black and white." It is not "an earnest desire of a suppressed minority to achieve equality." It *is* a series of armed rebellions against established law and order. It *is* a revolution that could and, in my opinion is, destroying our country. It *is* an indication that certain segments of our country regard themselves above the law. It *is* an indication that in certain areas people in our country cannot own property with the reasonable assurance that their property will be safe from unwarranted attacks. It *is* an indication that there are people in our country who go to bed at night afraid for themselves and their families.

Things have come to a pretty pass. Aside from patriotic expressions, like freedom, liberty, etc., which have apparently become old-fashioned, it isn't *right* that the present situation should exist in our country.

Riots are wrong. People who participate in them are criminally wrong. People who encourage them are equally wrong. Leaders of the white and negro communities who apologize for them on the basis of past events are doubly wrong. Public officials who either do nothing, or do little, to marshal public opinion or the forces of government against the rioters betray their positions of trust. The enormity of this betrayal approaches, in my opinion, treason.

From what I have read, it would appear that the most common approach to solving the riot problem is that of "give." Every day somebody says that we ought to give this or that to the rioters: "We ought to take 10 billion dollars and tear down all sub-standard dwellings." "We ought to take a billion dollars and do this or do that." I am sure that people who make statements like these feel that they are right. I don't. I believe that the first thing that has to be done is to make a flat statement that any further riots, no matter how small, where they are located, or who they are perpetrated by, will be regarded as rebellions.

I am sorry if I seem old-fashioned and inhumane, but I am afraid that I would be tempted, if I were in a position to do so, to publicly state that I would withdraw all aid and welfare from areas that riot. I certainly wouldn't give rioters more. Somewhere, a long time ago, someone told me that one shouldn't bite the hand that feeds them. That appears still to be excellent advice.

I'd like more myself. Nothing would be more welcome than a few dollars to tide me over when the bills come due—say around April when Uncle Sam sends his. Unfortunately, however, no matter how tempted I might be, I can't riot. I'm not out of work. I know better, and I wouldn't have the benefit of self-appointed, do-gooder guardians to explain that "after all, how can you blame him; he got fed up."

Some way must be found to communicate with the lawless element in our society. They must be made to understand that decent people, no matter what their color, will simply not continue to tolerate the further breakdown of the moral and social standards of our country. It may well be that the only way this resolve can be communicated is through the medium of brute force. If that is the only way—let's use it. The opponents in this revolution are unreasonable, and unreasonable means may be the only answer to them.

Unless some positive means are found—and I don't consider more charity as positive means—I can confidently predict one of three ultimate results of the present situation:

1. The lawless element will win and will destroy this country.

2. The lawless will be placated with more and more charity—not a polite word, but a spade is a spade—and our country, as we know it, will cease to exist.

3. The decent people of this country will stage a revolution of their own.

Of the three alternatives listed above, I fear that No. 3 is the most unlikely—because decent people are too reasonable and reluctant to resort to drastic means.

It's sad, isn't it, when being decent is one of the major distinguishing features of a sucker in today's society.

JOSEPH B. DOUBET.

Representative Goodell Sees Need of Changes in Alliance Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER H. B. FRELINGHUYSEN
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 27, 1967

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, my distinguished colleague from New York, CHARLES GOODELL, was recently interviewed by the Washington Daily News on his views on the foreign assistance bill and the Alliance for Progress.

The interview, which was published on July 17, 1967, contains a good deal of food for thought as we approach the task of considering the foreign aid bill.

I commend this article to the attention of my colleagues.

The article is as follows:

REPRESENTATIVE GOODELL SEES NEED OF CHANGES IN ALLIANCE AID

(By Virginia Prewett)

As foreign aid comes up for a Congressional going-over, the many friends of the Alliance for Progress are rallying to defend it. Congressman Charles E. Goodell (R., N.Y.), one of the dynamic young leaders who helped renovate Republican House leadership by putting Rep. Gerald Ford in as Minority Leader, even proposes that improved Alliance aid be voted for more than one year at a time.

Rep. Goodell is sure that this development, so longed-for by AID officials and Latin Americans alike, can come about even in the face of Congressional dissatisfaction over foreign and in general if the philosophy and practices of the Alliance are better defined.

STUDY URGED

In an interview, Rep. Goodell told me that to do this a thorogoing joint House-Senate study of the problems of developing nations should be made.

Next he suggests that the Foreign Affairs Committee, which has first say on Alliance appropriations, should set up its own "satellite committees" calling on the expertise of a broad sector of the House, as for instance the committees dealing with agriculture, education, finance, etc.

"All of Congress votes the appropriations for foreign aid," says Rep. Goodell, "Getting its members more involved will prevent them from lashing out negatively when things go wrong."

Things do go wrong, Rep. Goodell told the House in a late June report on his extensive investigations in Brazil, where nearly half of current AID funds are going. His study illustrates the need for Congress to clarify Alliance philosophies and goals, he says.

In common with many observers, Rep. Goodell finds fault with the "macro-economic" planning of Brazil's former Planning Czar, Robert Campos, which still largely obtains. It fails to emphasize the human element sufficiently.

"To illustrate, too much went for school-building, where graft could creep in," points out Rep. Goodell, "and too little for educating teachers. Also, only 5 percent of the AID helps the rural area, where 60 per cent of the people live.

In contrast, he highlights a Columbian program in which self-help built schools at greatly reduced costs.

"We must see to it that Alliance programs reach the maximum number of people with change," says Rep. Goodell. "This can only be done with community action programs that motivate people to become themselves the generators of change."

He sees the major problem of Washington policy-making as "how to seed in from the top the seeds of change that will grow from the bottom."

Rep. Goodell insists this should be the top priority of the President and Congress this year.

Rhodesia: Loss to United States and British Businesses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. RARICK
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 27, 1967

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, indeed—when a friend, a market or something of value is dropped in childish spite it is hastily picked up by another.

The President's unwise economic boycott against our anti-Communist friends in Rhodesia has proven a political dud. Institution of these sanctions has been for naught except to accomplish the loss of U.S. prestige with responsible countries, as well as the loss of business to U.S. industries.

There has been a near-complete recovery by the Rhodesians, thanks to Germany, France, Japan, the Common Market, Italy, Netherlands, Switzerland, and Spain. I fear our former friends laugh at us—not with us.

For our colleagues' interest, I enclose a copy of recent correspondence received from Mr. D. Garner, from the Under Secretary of External Services to Rhodesia:

JULY 7, 1967.

Mr. JOHN MONTGOMERY,
Editor of the Columbia Record,
Columbia, S.C., U.S.A.

DEAR JOHN: Many thanks for sending me copies of your Rhodesian articles. I was particularly interested in your last piece "Rhodesia is Determined to Survive"—especially from the economic aspect.

For some time now the British Government has been stating how the sanctions are "biting" into Rhodesia's economy. Obviously, as you are aware, sanctions are having effect. Rhodesians are having to make do with a number of second rate imports purchased at high cost, and to sell some of their exports for whatever they can. But, due to the healthy diversification taking place in agriculture and industry, this picture is gradually changing. Indeed, recently, the "Rhodesia Herald" headline read "Rhodesia Earns Surplus on Visible Trade". And surely, this is the main point of the story. For it is the balance of a country's trade which provides the key to its survival—not a mere drop in its exports which can be met by replacing imports with new, locally produced lines. And Rhodesia showed a healthy trading surplus in 1966 of £21 million! Britain's Prime Minister Harold Wilson recently denied that other countries were taking over Britain's former trade connections with Rhodesia. Rhodesia's Minister of Commerce has this to say about it: "Mr. Wilson's statement in the House of Commons, as reported in the Press today, cannot be reconciled with the facts. As Rhodesia's imports have increased, and as Britain has imposed an embargo on exports to Rhodesia, it is difficult to understand his statement that Britain's trade has not been taken over by other countries; this is all the more surprising when it is appreciated that Britain was Rhodesia's principal source of imports prior to independence".

Bruce-Gardyne's recent article published in the 23 June edition of "The Spectator" has found one source of information, belated and very far from complete, on the progress of sanctions, that penetrates the smokescreen around Harold Wilson's dreamland. The facts, such as they are, are all available in the OECD's monthly statistics or member countries' overseas trade. The table below contains them:

The increase in some OECD member countries' trade with Southern Africa in the early months of 1967 (first quarter 1967 compared with first quarter 1966).

EXPORTS TO RHODESIA

Germany, plus 62 percent[1]; France, plus 100 percent; Japan, plus 62 percent[1]; EEC as a whole, plus 15 percent[1]; EFTA (less UK), plus 16 percent[1].

Swiss imports from Rhodesia were 107 percent up in the first two months of 1967.

EXPORTS TO SOUTH AFRICA

Italy, plus 59 percent[1]; West Germany, plus 35 percent[2]; Netherlands, plus 38 percent; Spain, plus 110 percent[2]; EEC as a whole, plus 60 percent.

Japanese imports from South Africa increased by 100 percent in the first quarter.

Mr. Bruce-Gardyne points out that, clearly, the OECD's statistics must be treated with considerable reserve. They are collated from information supplied by member governments; and while some of these may be quite ready to wink at the activities of enterprising businessmen among their nationals, they can have no incentive to create trouble for themselves by positively blazoning their contempt for United Nations resolutions (it is hardly surprising that the statistics of French trade show the most dramatic increase in exports, while those of Portugal indicate no change at all in the insignificant levy of trade which prevailed prior to UDI). It is obviously a safe assumption that the OECD figures wildly underestimate the real extent to which the UN embargo is being circumvented.

Nor is it sufficient to take the statistics of trade with Rhodesia in isolation. No one doubts that South Africa is now operating an extensive entrepot trade on behalf of her northern neighbour. The true measure of this trade can only be guessed at. The South Africans' own imports from western Europe and Japan have undoubtedly increased following relaxation of trade controls last year. But it is a little hard to believe that this alone accounts for the doubling of Spain's exports to the Republic, or the 60 per cent increase in the exports of the Common Market.

Mr. Bruce-Gardyne adds that the OECD figures are also slow to emerge. The May statistical bulletin, published at the beginning of June, still gave no figures at all for some member countries relating to 1967, while for others they stopped short at January or February. In only a minority of cases is it possible to obtain an indication of what happened during the first quarter of this year. It will be some months yet before any commodity trade statistics suggesting the extent to which Britain's partners are prepared to admit that their nationals are trading in goods subject to the UN embargo will be available. Nevertheless, the OECD's buleltins already offer sufficient confirmation of the impression brought back by most recent visitors to Rhodesia that Britain's trading partners have been quick to seize the opportunity offered to them to take over a profitable British export market. It is going to be increasingly difficult to maintain even the limited degree of compliance with mandatory sanctions which seems to have been achieved to date as the months go by.

It all boils down to the simple fact that if you drop something of value someone will quickly pick it up.

Best wishes,

D. GARNER,
For Under Secretary, External Services.

---

[1] January and February only.

[2] January only.

Chattanooga Lawyers Endorse Brock TVA Jury Trial Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. E. (BILL) BROCK
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 27, 1967

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, the past few months have witnessed a groundswell of interest in H.R. 4846, my bill to provide landowners facing TVA land condemnation proceedings with the right to a trial by jury. Hundreds of unsolicitated letters from individual citizens, and the endorsement of many civic and professional groups, as well as the Tennessee State Legislature, have demonstrated the widespread support this legislation enjoys.

Recently, another prominent organization entered the list of supporters when the board of governors of the Chattanooga Bar Association passed a resolution endorsing H.R. 4846.

I insert the text of the resolution in the Appendix to the RECORD:

RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS, CHATTANOOGA BAR ASSOCIATION

A Resolution endorsing H.R. 4846, being a bill to amend the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933 to provide that the right to trial by jury on the issue of just compensation may be invoked by either party in any case involving the condemnation of real property by the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Whereas, the principle of trial by jury is a cherished part of the system of jurisprudence of the American people and has, since the founding of the Republic, been considered the greatest bulwark of freedom of the individual; and

Whereas, the right to demand a trial by jury is generally available under the laws of eminent domain of the State of Tennessee and of the United States of America; and

Whereas, the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933 is unique in that it provides for the taking of private property under the powers of eminent domain by the Tennessee Valley Authority without granting to the property owner the safeguard of a jury trial, and in fact prohibits the use of a jury in such cases; and

Whereas, under the procedure now in effect under the Tennessee Valley Authority Act the compensation which the landowner will receive in such cases is determined by a three-man commission, with no right of appeal to a jury trial at any time; and

Whereas, it has been recognized in the federal courts that, aside from other objections, referring condemnation cases to a commission "tends unduly to prolong the proceedings, thereby causing vexation to all concerned and additional expense;" and

Whereas, legislation has been introduced in the Congress of the United States in the form of H.R. 4846, now pending before the Committee on Public Works, proposing to amend said Tennessee Valley Authority Act to provide that either party to such condemnation proceedings may demand a jury to determine the compensation to which the landowner may be entitled for the taking of his land;

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the Board of Governors of the Chattanooga Bar Association, in regular meeting duly assembled, that we reaffirm our belief in the principle of trial by jury, and that we hereby accordingly endorse H.R. 4846; and

Be it further resolved, that a copy of this Resolution be furnished to each member of the Committee on Public Works of the United States House of Representatives.

We hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution was duly adopted at a regular meeting of the Board of Governors of the Chattanooga Bar Association on June 27, 1967.

JOHN K. MORGAN,
President.
H. THEODORE MILBURN,
Secretary-Treasurer.

Population Growth and U.S. Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES H. SCHEUER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 27, 1967

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, one of the major problems facing mankind today is rapid population growth. No responsible man can ignore its importance. Therefore, I would like to share with my colleague excerpts from the remarks of my old friend, Richard N. Gardner, professor of law and international organization at Columbia University, in hearings before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, on the subject of population growth and U.S. foreign aid.

The remarks follow:

STATEMENT OF RICHARD N. GARDNER, HENRY L. MOSES PROFESSOR OF LAW AND INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION AT COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY, IN HEARINGS ON THE FOREIGN AID BILL BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, MAY 9, 1967

I am grateful for this opportunity to present my views on the world population problem and its relation to our foreign aid program. This is a subject in which I was deeply involved during my service from 1961 to 1965 as Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs. In December 1962, before the General Assembly of the United Nations, I was privileged to make the first offer of assistance on behalf of the United States Government to family planning programs overseas. In 1965 I was Chairman of the Committee on Population which presented recommendations for further U.S. Government action to President Johnson's White House Conference on International Cooperation.

I can sum up my message today very briefly: Although the United States Government is finally on record in support of voluntary family planning both here and abroad, its actual programs are still grossly inadequate when measured against the problem to be solved. To put it bluntly, the ratio of talk to action is far too high. As long as this continues to be the case, our foreign aid program is doomed to fail in its primary purpose—the achievement of living standards in the less developed countries compatible with minimum human dignity.

We hear a great deal these days about the "aid gap" and the "trade gap" and the "food gap." But none of these gaps can be closed unless we reduce the "family planning gap"—the gap between the number of married women who now have access to modern birth control techniques and the number that would make use of them if given the opportunity.

When I began to prepare this testimony it occurred to me that you might like to have a rough estimate of the size of the world's "family planning gap" and the cost of closing it. Strange as it may seem, I could not find these estimates in the available literature. With the help of a group of experts, I have come up with some figures, very rough approximations. To set the stage for our discussion, let me give you the principal conclusions:

There are 225 million married women in the world today who are subject to unwanted pregnancies;

One hundred and fifty million of these women are outside of Communist China;

These 150 million women have 37.5 million children each year;

These children represent 39% of the children being born in the world outside of Communist China; and

The cost of eliminating these unwanted pregnancies would be $2.1 billion annually.

Obviously, nothing like this $2.1 billion a year could be spent effectively now or in the immediate future. I simply present these figures to indicate the magnitude of the job ahead and to measure the adequacy of the $9 million being spent by the Agency for International Development on population control in the present fiscal year—a sum, by the way, which represents less than 4/10ths of 1% of our total foreign aid expenditures.

* * * * *

BASIC PRINCIPLES

Let me suggest the following basic principles which should guide the United States in dealing with this critical world problem:

First: we should be concerned with the quality of life.

The central objective of United States policy at home and abroad should be to promote the welfare and dignity of the individual human being. We must concern ourselves not just with aggregate statistics, but with the progress made in assuring each person a full and satisfactory life. This means not merely adequate levels of personal consumption, including food and housing, health and education, but the satisfaction of those political, cultural, and spiritual needs that are fundamental to all men.

The problems arising from present rates of population growth are not limited to the avoidance of famine and the achievement of increases in per capita income—important as those problems undoubtedly are. If the condition of the individual, and not gross statistics, is to be the measure of our progress, we must be concerned with the broader implications of population trends. So long as we are concerned with the quality of life, we have no choice but to be concerned with the quantity of life.

Second: we should seek the maximum dissemination of knowledge.

It has been estimated that at least two out of every three persons in the world as a whole, and about nine out of ten in the less developed countries, are without modern family planning information and services. We should seek to make information and services available to all these persons who wish to have them. If we do this, we will eliminate a particularly objectionable form of discrimination presently existing in the world today—discrimination against persons who are denied family planning information and services by virtue of limited educational, economic, or other circumstances.

Third: we should support freedom of choice.

Freedom to limit family size to the number wanted is a basic human right. Our aim should be to enable every couple to determine the family size it wants by means of its own choosing. Once adequate family planning information and services are available, individuals will be in a position to make decisions in the light of their own religious, ethical, cultural, and economic circumstances.

If we wish to make a success of our program of voluntary family planning, time is of the essence. The rate of world population growth is so great—its consequences are so grave—that this may be the last generation which has the opportunity to limit population growth on the basis of free choice. If we do make voluntary family planning possible in this generation, we may make compulsory family planning inevitable in some parts of the world in future generations. Such an outcome would be incompatible with the values of a free society and tragic in its consequences for the human race.

Fourth: family planning begins at home.

Our policy for dealing with population growth must be applied consistently at home and abroad. We should not ask other countries to do things we are not prepared to do ourselves. We should not give the impression that we are in favor of limiting the population growth of other peoples but not that of the American people.

We must practice what we preach if our words are to carry weight overseas and if our efforts overseas are not to be misunderstood. We can set an international example for other countries by making family planning information and services fully available to persons within the United States, with the understanding that there be no coercion and that in tax-supported facilities there be full freedom of choice of methods to be used in regulating pregnancy.

Of course, the principal reason for accelerating our domestic family planning programs has to do with the value of those programs in our own society. If it is good for Asian and African and Latin American women to be freed from the scourge of unwanted pregnancy, it is equally good for American women. Therefore, I strongly support the bills S. 1503 and H.R. 8461 introduced by Senator Joseph Tydings and Congressman Samuel Friedel, respectively, of Maryland, to increase voluntary family planning services in the United States.

Fifth: U.S. assistance to another country should be solely at the request of that country.

In family planning assistance, as in other types of assistance, the United States can only act with the consent and cooperation of the other country concerned. It is significant that the first call for international assistance in support of family planning came from the Asian countries in the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East. If international cooperation in family planning is to become a reality, it must originate in the needs and demands of the countries concerned.

Sixth: the principal responsibility for implementing programs of family planning in foreign countries must be taken by the people of those countries themselves.

In this area of foreign assistance, as in every other, we can only help people to help themselves. Our aid and advice in family planning can be an important supplement to domestic efforts, but it is bound to fail if those efforts are inadequate. The basic commitment in terms of policy and leadership and money and trained people must come from within the country concerned.

Modern forms of family planning are not going to be brought to Indian peasants by social workers from New York. People will only accept and apply strange and new methods of family planning if they are strongly endorsed by their own government and presented by individuals they trust and understand.

Seventh: family planning is not a substitute for foreign aid—what is needed is more of both.

Nothing could be more harmful to the acceptance of family planning overseas—nor more certain to frustrate the objectives of both family planning and foreign aid—than to suggest that the former is a substitute for the latter. In my judgment, we need more of both.

Unfortunately, some people think of family planning as essentially a mechanical problem, to be solved by means of some technological miracle. But as Dr. Frank Notestein, President of the Population Council, recently noted: "If, by a miracle, we learned how to make prayer an effective means of contraception, we would not have the organizational and educational machinery to make very efficient use of the discovery."

To bring modern methods of family planning to vast rural populations requires a network of health and social services which does not exist in most of the countries concerned. It requires administrators, communication specialists, doctors and paramedical personnel, vehicles, dispensaries, medical implements, communication equipment—as well as pills and intra-uterine devices. Moreover, the acceptance of family planning will be facilitated if it is not a separate program but rather one element in a total package of services of maternal and child care. A woman is likely to be interested in the pill or the I.U.C.D. when it is explained to her by the same health worker who has delivered her child.

* * * *

Eighth: United States assistance in the field of population should be related to the maximum possible extent to the work of multilateral agencies, particularly the relevant agencies of the United Nations.

United States assistance to other countries is often more effective when it is related to the work of multilateral agencies. This is particularly true in a field like family planning. Through multilateral cooperation we can share responsibility for action with other countries and promote a broad consensus on the nature of the population problem and what ought to be done about it. It is particularly important that family planning not become a cold war issue involving political ideologies, or a subject of disagreement between racial groups.

In our cooperative efforts with other countries, we should place the greatest possible reliance on the United Nations Secretariat, the United Nations Development Program, the United Nations Children's Fund, the World Health Organization, UNESCO, and the UN Regional Economic Commissions. We should also work through the institutions of the Alliance for Progress, the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, and various aid consortia such as the ones chaired by the World Bank for India and Pakistan.

* * * * *

PROPOSALS FOR ACTION

Despite the increasing urgency of the population problem, the fact remains that our foreign assistance program has barely touched this vital aspect of economic and human development. In fiscal year 1967 AID programmed less than $9 million for activities relating to population. Much of that $9 million was used for academic studies, statistical studies, and attitude studies—studies which are extremely useful but which do not in themselves increase the availability of family planning information or techniques for those who desire them. AID has provided a significant amount of aid going beyond studies only in Turkey in the form of jeeps for family planning workers and support for an educational effort. That single program in Turkey accounts for more than one-third of AID's Fiscal Year 1967 population budget ($3.5 million out of $8.9 million).

* * * * *

Well organized and effective nation-wide family planning programs must be developed in the less developed countries of the world beginning now. Without them, the new technological developments which have simplified and will further simplify contraception will be meaningless for these countries. And such programs will not develop unless the United States greatly expands its presently minuscule financial assistance for this purpose.

In 1965, a Committee on Population was formed as part of President Johnson's National Citizen's Commission to offer recommendations to the government during International Cooperation Year. I was Chairman of the Committee; the other members were some of the most knowledgeable persons in the United States in this field:

Mr. Eugene R. Black, Former President International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

Mr. Cass Canfield, Chairman, Executive Committee, Harper & Row.

Dr. Leslie Corsa, Jr., Director, Center for Population Planning, University of Michigan.

Mr. Gardner Cowles, Chairman of the Board, and Editor-in-Chief, Cowles Magazines & Broadcasting Co.

Mr. A. W. Dent, President, Dillard University.

Mr. William H. Draper, Jr., Partner, Draper, Gaither and Anderson.

Mrs. Albert D. Lasker, President, Albert and Mary Lasker Foundation.

Mr. David E. Lilienthal, Chairman, Development and Resources Corporation.

Mr. John D. Rockefeller, 3d, Chairman of the Board, Population Council.

Mrs. Edith S. Sampson, Circuit Court of Cook County.

Mr. George N. Shuster, Assistant to the President, University of Notre Dame.

Dr. Aaron Stern, Psychoanalyst.

I have with me today the report which our Committee presented to President Johnson at the White House Conference in December 1965. With the permission of the Chairman, I should like to have it included in the record at the conclusion of my statement. The key recommendation of our committee was the following:

"5. That the U.S. Government be prepared to make available upon request up to $100 million a year over the next three years to help other countries implement programs of family planning and strengthen national health and social services necessary for the support of family planning programs."

The Committee on Population is no longer in existence, and I have no mandate to speak for its members today. However, I believe they share my deep gratitude at the introduction by Senator William Fulbright of Arkansas, with 18 co-sponsors, of S. 1264. Both Senator Fulbright and Senator Charles Percy of Illinois, in presenting the bill, specifically cited this key recommendation of our committee, and their bill would substantially implement it.

I hope the Fulbright bill will be approved as an amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act. It authorizes the appropriation of $50 million per year for 3 years plus available foreign currencies for use in support of voluntary family planning programs in friendly foreign nations. It would be a major step forward if this Committee would give its support to legislation along the lines proposed by Senator Fulbright, as an amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act.

There are some who may say that $100 million or even $50 million plus available counterpart funds would be too much—more than could usefully be spent. I would strongly contest that view. While this might have been true a few years ago, it is not true today when many foreign governments are getting family planning programs underway. Once it is known that AID has substantially increased funds available to assist family planning efforts, uses for the money will be found.

I have prepared all illustrative one-year budget showing how the $100 million recommended by our Committee on Population might usefully be spent. This budget includes $20 million for training, $6 million for additional AID staff, $10 million for demonstration projects, $10 million for information programs, $15 million for commodities (including equipment, transportation, and supplies), $11 million for research and evaluation, $8 million for private nonprofit organizations and $20 million for U.N. and international organization programs. Broken down geographically it shows $42 million for Asia, $26 million for Africa, $19 million for Latin America, and $13 million for supporting assistance, training and the like in the U.S., including U.N. headquarters.

WANTED: A WORLD POPULATION PROGRAM

Let me say a few words about the allocation of $20 million a year in my illustrative budget for UN programs.

* * * * *

Like the United States government the United Nations has been slow to translate policy into program. Of the $120 million UN budget for 1966 only $1.8 million is devoted to population work—and even this sum is mainly for research and training related to statistics, demography and the economic aspects of population growth. Various UN agencies are spending small additional sums for population work, but except for two UNICEF projects totalling $800 thousand there is very little by way of actual implementation of family planning programs. The UN's role in direct support of family planning will continue to be very limited, in all probability, unless we and others take a new initiative.

I therefore propose the establishment of a World Population Program to enlarge UN efforts in the field of population. The United States should offer $20 million annually for such a program and encourage contributions from as many other countries as possible.

The World Population Program could help to expand the research and training programs now underway at UN Headquarters, in the Regional Commissions, and in Specialized Agencies; but most of the money should be used for field operations in direct support of national family planning programs. With the help of the World Population Program, the UN could undertake pilot or demonstration projects to get national or regional programs underway. Interdisciplinary teams drawn from different UN agencies—including doctors, administrators, communications specialists, economists, demographers—could work in model areas with host government personnel. Aided by advice and training from the UN on the organization, administration, execution, and evaluation of programs, the host countries could gradually learn to carry forward nationwide programs through their own efforts.

I would like to see the World Population Program administered by the Secretary-General of the UN, perhaps through the Administrator of the UN Development Program. The various UN agencies like UNICEF, WHO, and the regional centers would be given funds to execute specific projects, but a centralized budget and administration at UN Headquarters would encourage more effective teamwork in regional and country programs. If an efficient arrangement of this kind cannot be worked out, we may need to establish the World Population Program outside the UN and have the participating countries make contributions directly to individual UN or other multilateral agencies. To provide maximum flexibility, the present reference in the Fulbright Bill to "United Nations specialized agencies" should be changed to "United Nations agencies and programs, other multilateral programs," etc.

There is, I recognize, a general policy in the State Department and Budget Bureau against establishing new voluntary programs in the UN system. As a general rule this is sound, but exceptions are justified when they are necessary to do a particular job which we want to see done. We recognized the need for such exceptions in launching a separate voluntary program in WHO for malaria eradication, and in 1963 we made a voluntary contribution of $500,000 to launch a WHO research program related to family planning. This latter investment facilitated important studies by WHO Scientific Groups which have helped to encourage the international acceptability, from a medical point of view, of the pill and the I.U.C.D.

A new voluntary program is now a necessity if the UN system is to be effective in the field of family planning. As a practical matter, it will not be possible to get sufficient funds in the UN budget or in UN agency budgets for family planning in competition with other activities. The Director-General of WHO has already warned against diverting funds from WHO's customary activities to family planning efforts. Moreover, since certain countries have reservations about the use of their money for family planning, it is best to have a separate fund for this purpose for those who are prepared to contribute.

I earnestly hope the United Nations may prove adequate to this challenge. In the long run, it could prove to be the Organization's most vital contribution to human welfare second only to keeping the peace. On a matter of such transcendent importance to humanity as a whole—where international cooperation is such an obvious necessity—the United Nations should be at the very center of the picture.

Small Newspapers With Limited Circulation Should Be Exempted From Proposed Postal Rate Increases

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 27, 1967

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the Postal Rate Subcommittee of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service has under consideration proposals to increase the postal rates of small newspapers with limited circulations. It is my information that increases as high as 300 percent have been proposed on mailings by these independently owned newspapers.

In this connection, I have conferred with the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. DULSKI], and the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Montana [Mr. OLSEN], strongly urging and recommending that small, independent newspapers be exempted from any postal rate increase.

In addition, as chairman of the House Small Business Committee, I have joined with several colleagues on the committee in formally urging that the small newspapers receive every possible consideration in the determination of postal rates.

This is a most important matter—our

hometown newspapers are small businesses and are indispensable to our small towns. They are a vital part of the economic and social life of the small towns.

They are limited in resources and deserve every possible consideration in this most important matter of postal rates.

Moreover, the rural press contributes to maintaining our democracy. The decimination of the news and free press should not be impaired by burdensome restrictions.

Penalizing Proficiency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 27, 1967

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, there was a time when proficiency was considered a thing of merit, deserving the reward of a profit. Today, however, things have changed and proficiency is regarded as something of a sin, with the company making a profit being required to do penance and sacrifice that which has been gained through an exercise in proficiency.

Mr. Walter J. Campbell—editor of Steel—wrote an interesting editorial dealing with this matter in the July 17 issue of this publication. Because the article poses some delicate questions, I submit it to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the convenience of my colleagues. The article follows:

PENALIZING PROFICIENCY

The year was 1917. A death in our family necessitated a telephone call to California. That was an event.

The family solemnly gathered in the living room, amid stern warnings to be quiet. Dad cranked the wall phone, put the call through to the West Coast. Four hours later our party was on the line. Dad shouted loud enough to be heard west of Chicago without benefit of Mr. Bell's device. But, to our amazement, the message got through.

The cost was $19.80. Be assured that was a lot of money for the Clan Campbell in those days—when a good suit could be had for $8 to $12.

Today, such a call is routine. You dial it yourself in seconds. The cost is $2 during business hours, $1 at other times. That's a pretty sharp reduction during a period when the Bell System's wage and related costs have been going up thirty-fivefold.

All this is recalled by the finding by a federal government agency, after a massive and harassing investigation, that American Telephone & Telegraph has been making a little too much profit. It has been ordered to make less.

Over the years, AT&T has rated high as a well managed company. It has spent billions to develop and install better equipment and to improve its service. As the developments it pioneered paid off in better service and lower costs, AT&T has given much of the benefit to consumers in lower charges. And it has paid the federal government far more in taxes than it has paid its owners.

Contrast AT&T's performance with any foreign telephone system. In Russia, we paid the state-owned system four rubles ($4.40) just to try to call our office in Cleveland. We never did get through, but our four rubles were gone.

Or contrast AT&T's performance and charges with almost any government service. Take the U.S. Post Office Department. Rates for letters went up 150 percent while the Bell System's long toll charges were dropping 90 percent. And the service—well, many of our notices of coming events arrive after the event. But the Post Office never has been accused of making too much money. It has a long string of deficits.

We are puzzled. Is it the policy of our government to penalize the productive and the efficient and to reward the nonproductive and the inefficient?

A Man Can Get Ahead in Memphis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAN KUYKENDALL

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 27, 1967

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD I would like to include the third of a series of articles from the Memphis Press-Scimitar showing how the people of Memphis are working to get ahead. I am proud of the efforts of the city which it is my privilege to represent in Congress in doing its best to see that all of its citizens share in the opportunities. A man can get ahead in Memphis if he is willing to learn and to work for the things he desires. I am sure there are many other communities across this great land which do their best to offer opportunity to those who wish to seize it, but Memphis has a record second to none of goals fulfilled.

The last article of the series follows:

[From the Memphis Press-Scimitar, July 21, 1967]

SOME DOORS ARE OPENING SLOWLY—"A MAN CAN GET AHEAD IN MEMPHIS"

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—This is a special report on economic opportunities for Negroes in Memphis where racial strife has been at a minimum. The Press-Scimitar made an in-depth study following the comment of 25-year-old Memphis Navy pilot Lt. (jg) Friedel C. Greene, a Negro, in Vietnam that the Bluff City is a place "where a man can get ahead.")

(By Kay Pittman Black)

Doors are opening faster each day in Memphis to the qualified Negro.

That's the Negro with an education, an ability to work for what he wants.

But what about the others?

This worries many Negro leaders.

They say all people aren't really college material. Over and over, one Negro leader after another cited the inability of Negroes to get into some of the craft unions.

State Rep. Russell Sugarmon put it most succinctly when he remarked:

"What they need is a civil rights movement within the labor organizations."

Fred Davis, who is librarian in the County Register's office and has one of the top courthouse jobs occupied by a Negro, said:

"There's not a licensed Negro electrician or plumber. There's only one Negro painter at the Courthouse. No Negro has an automobile dealer franchise. These are areas where we still need to work."

SHORTAGES

Sam Peace, who is a real estate man, said:

"The building trades need to open up their apprenticeship programs to Negro youths. Builders are always facing shortages of qualified people. This would be areas they could draw from."

Jesse Turner, County Court Squire and president of the NAACP, worries because "the percentage of Negro drop-outs is much higher than white drop-outs." He thinks the labor unions have not desegregated their ranks as they should.

One top labor union official who didn't want his name used said, "It's a long story. But basically your top Negro and white youths are going to college. The crafts are getting the leftovers in both races. Many don't qualify for the long apprenticeship program, in truth. Some unions use the qualifications thing as a way to keep the federal government off their backs."

He added:

"Some unions are still lily white. Others, of course, are getting more technical and demand more intelligence than they did years ago. It's a big ball of wax no matter how you cut it."

MERGED

One labor official who spoke openly was Bill Hood, of the Carpenter's Union. Until a couple of years ago there was a Negro carpenter's local and white local. Now they have been merged.

He said, "Our union is always looking for qualified people. We have a lot of Negro members and always have several Negroes in our apprenticeship program."

Hood said their apprenticeship program is open to anyone who can pass the tests. He said the four-year apprenticeship required by the trade is "viewed by some as too long and they drop out along the way. For those who stick with it they can make a pretty good living as a carpenter. Some members make about $14,000 a year, and we had one apprentice make $12,000. But the average carpenter makes $7,000 a year."

Memphis Transit Authority has 450 bus operators, of whom 75 are Negroes, and all are members of Amalgamated Transit Union No. 713. First Negro operator hired by the company was John L. Smith, 35, of 1564 Shadowlawn, who is still on the job, operating on the 31 Crosstown, 4 Walker and other lines.

James O. Pope, 29, of 823 Woodland, was promoted from bus operator to a supervisor about six months ago—the first Negro to hold such a post with the company. Pope has been with the company three years. He graduated from Hamilton High, had two years at Owens College, and formerly worked for the American Finishing Company. He handles radio calls and describes his job as "helping to keep buses rolling smoothly, re-scheduling buses if they are delayed, and detouring them if necessary."

NINETY PERCENT NEGRO

A spokesman for the International Labors Union of North America, Local 1441, said 90 per cent of its 1,200 members are Negro. This union is composed of common laborers and semi-skilled laborers. Ellis H. Studdard, secretary-treasurer, is white. Its president, Ralph Nesbit; vice president, Jessie Miller, and business representative, John Grant, are Negroes. Miller, who lives at 707 S. 19th Street, West Memphis, is labor foreman on the just-started new interstate bridge.

The hod carriers union, chartered in 1903, merged with this union, chartered in 1941, in June 1965. Hod carriers number about 100 and only a few are white men, a spokesman said.

INTEGRATED

Local 71, American Federation of Musicians, which was chartered in 1898, has always had both white and Negro members.

In many other cities, separate locals for white and Negro members have merged in the last two years, said Charles S. Bishop, secretary of the local. He said the local has 600 white and 100 Negro members, and no tests are given, no stiff qualifications are required in order to join.

The Allied Printing Trades Council, of which Frank R. Council is president, includes the various skilled printing trade unions. It is not integrated. Asked why not, Council said, "I'd rather not say."

BOOKBINDERS

The International Brotherhood of Bookbinders, Local No. 172, was integrated four months ago when one Negro asked to join its four-year apprenticeship program. This local has about 60 women and 35 men members. Asked why the union was not integrated in the past, William E. Repperger, president, said: "I suppose it was because they (Negroes) didn't seek employment (as bookbinders)."

The percentage of Negroes in the Brewery & Soft Drink Workers Union No. 196 is "pretty high," and the union has been desegregrated for several years, a spokesman said. Among the brewery distributors, all drivers and some salesmen are Negroes. All drivers for the two soft drink distributors that are unionized are Negroes, but these companies have few if any salesmen, the spokesman said.

The Brick Layers Union No. 1 of Tennessee, 600 members, has some Negro members "and several of them have gold cards, 50-year memberships," a spokesman said.

A representative of the Painters, Decorators & Paper Hangers Local Union No. 49 would say only that "We admit them (Negroes) if they are qualified, and we have an apprenticeship program."

"We don't list the race, creed or sex of our 2,200 members," a representative of the Carpenter's Local Union No. 345 said, but asked that he not be quoted by name. He said separate locals for white and Negro carpenters have been merged since last year.

A spokesman for the Retail Butchers Union No. 452 said, "We have some Negro members—I don't know how many."

MANY

Amalgamated Packing House Workers Union No. 515 reports "many" Negro members, and said that percentage of Negro workers in many Memphis area plants ranged from 30 per cent to 100 per cent.

W. L. (Bill) Nelson, business agent of the Electrical Workers Union 1275, communications local in the TV and radio field, said the union has had Negro members "for several years."

C. H. Augustine, president of Teamsters Local Union No. 667, estimated that 25 per cent of its members are Negro, adding: "I've been in the union 26 years and in that time we have always had Negro members. James Hall, our business agent for about four years, is a Negro." This union is mainly for over-the-road drivers but also includes local pick-up drivers.

Teamsters Local Union No. 984 has 2,500 members and approximately one-third are Negro, said L. A. Pankey, secretary-treasurer. It has had Negro members for 16 or 17 years, according to Pankey, and includes warehouse, dairy, bread company and miscellaneous teamsters.

International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers Union 474, with 720 members, presently has no Negro members. But George A. Peek, business representative said, "We have six apprentice-applicants on file, to be admitted to our apprentice program when processed, and I believe they will come through. Membership is based on qualifications, high school education, and aptitude tests—aptitude tests given by the Tennessee Employment Service. We are in full compliance with the (federal) law.

VOTE BY GUILD

The Memphis Newspaper Guild voted some time ago to admit Negroes to its membership.

H. A. Wehrum, business manager of the Plumbers and Pipe Fitters union, would not say whether his union is desegregated. "Any comment about our union will have to come from our national headquarters in Washington."

An aide in Washington to union President Peter T. Schoemann said: "We have our doors open to all qualified candidates for apprenticeship. We always hear these general statements (about barring Negroes) and never get any specific charges. Our president told the NAACP last year to 'put up or shut up' and I can only reiterate that."

SMEAR CAMPAIGN

The aide said he believed the charges stemmed from "a smear campaign to slander our unions and break down the craft union system in the United States. They aren't interested in getting any Negro members in the union but in just breaking the union down."

When asked if there are any all-white unions in their ranks, he admitted there are. The aide was asked, "Do you mean that in the cities where these locals are located there aren't any qualified Negroes in the whole town."

He said again "Our unions are open to all qualified persons."

However, Negro leaders say that more doors could be opened if Negroes would take "bold steps" and enter into non-traditional fields.

Even though some say that a few Negroes working in an office represent "token" integration others including Dr. R. Q. Venson and attorney H. T. Lockard say, "That's one more than there used to be. Where one foot is others will follow."

OPTIMIST

Lockard, administrative assistant to Gov. Ellington, said "I'm impatient with those who get impatient with the pace. I'm an optimist. There is so much more opportunity for Negroes in Memphis today than there ever was. That's something to get optimistic about."

Turner believes that more Negroes should take an interest in going to college and majoring in business. He thinks Negroes don't consider this field because they are used to having the door closed to them. "There's a demand for good people in business. But, one must remember, only the exceptional Negro can make it, now."

Dedrick Brittenum, whose Brittenum Associates is one of five Negro securities brokers in the nation, believes too many young Negroes are overlooking the sales field.

"Negro youths need to go into the field of sales. There's no curtailment on what a man can do. He's as good as his ability and can go as far as he can take himself. Also good marketing people are always in demand. I think they're afraid to try this field because there's no apparent opening. They have to make one. I did."

WIDE OPEN

Lt. R. J. Turner, 19-year veteran with the Memphis police department assigned to homicide, said: "The law enforcement field is wide open to Negroes today. But many—white and Negro can't qualify. They have a record and we have to turn them down."

He said, "For instance, say there's a disturbance and 35 or 40 kids are involved. Some are just there looking on. But they're part of the crowd. We round 'em all up and they get a Juvenile Court record. Then they grow up and decide they want to be policemen. They can't. They have a record. We can't touch them.

"That's why we're always telling kids to keep their noses clean."

Only a few of the outstanding Negroes in Memphis have been cited in this series of three articles.

The heartening thing—and one that they are proudest of—is that searching out outstanding Negroes in the community is just as big a job as searching out outstanding white members. There are so many of them. The list is long.

And, to the community's credit and to the credit of the Negro and white leadership here, that list is growing longer every day.

For Negroes, then, as for their white counterparts today, one needs to be educated and trained. He needs a specialized field that can be used and is demanded by highly urban society.

He needs drive and initiative. The willingness to put in more than 40 hours a week when the job demands it.

J. Edgar Hoover Completes 50 Years of Service

SPEECH

OF

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 26, 1967

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, there are few people who have contributed more significantly to the safety and security of the United States than J. Edgar Hoover. Having served under him as an agent of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, I can testify personally to his capable leadership. His unsurpassed administration under seven American Presidents is an inspiration to those serving under him. His own unselfish service provides a great example to his coworkers.

Mr. Hoover's reorganization of the FBI upon his appointment as Director led to its development as an unparalleled law enforcement agency. The establishment of the central fingerprint bureau as well as the use of scientific detection methods has increased the efficiency not only of Federal law enforcement, but also that of State and local areas. The FBI has been almost unbelievably successful in dealing with criminals, Communist and Nazi subversion, and espionage, and yet has managed to stay outside of the political arena.

During World War II no major instance of foreign-directed sabotage succeeded, due, in the main, to the vigilance of the FBI. Since then a paramount FBI concern has been to watch the progress of Communist infiltration of the United States, to prevent its growth and to destroy its effectiveness.

The Nation owes J. Edgar Hoover a great debt of gratitude for his continuing and successful efforts against crime and subversion. The FBI has grown in stature and competence under his leadership and yet has remained within its rigid guidelines of noninvolvement in political affairs, not interfering in the freedoms guaranteed to citizens by the Constitution and the Bill of Rights.

An Executive order was issued by President Johnson in 1964 exempting Mr. Hoover from compulsory retirement for age. This was a tribute to his tremendous achievement. It was the American Government's recognition of our continuing need for his abilities. I want to congratulate J. Edgar Hoover on his 50 years of service to law enforcement. His contributions to our welfare and stability exemplify the finest kind of service a man can offer his country.

Why Give Stokely All the Credit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 27, 1967

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, Stokely Carmichael is the most distinguished civil rights leader in the United States. At least, he is one that has been honest with the American people throughout all the so-called revolutionary civil riots buildup—even his white soul-brother, Fidel Castro, has so proclaimed.

But there are many others, who through their devious tear-jerking appeals and created news images, can take pride in their contributory role in the insanity now sweeping our sick land.

The ashes and death of Detroit, Newark, Rochester, and a hundred other cities are no cause. They are effects—the result of breakdown of law and order, deterioration by the injection of poisonous ideas—foreign and alien to our people—into our morals and way of life. They are the direct result of minority pressure politics, which have sedated the strong majority and weakened Christian strength. When did all this humbug get started? It is not the fruits of a year but the crescendo of a planned production.

Remember the infamous Brown against Topeka Board of Education case ordered into law by the Earl Warren Court—not the law of the case, based on its facts—but the law of the land. The Brown decision, overruling more than 180 years of time-tried precedent, based on truth, logic, and centuries of reason, can be well treasured as the cause—the cause of the frightening effects now before us. The Brown decision damaged the United States far greater than all the cities burned and the lives lost, thus far.

And the champion of these smoking scenes resembling war destruction, that sell newspapers and provoke fear from your television—none other than the former chief counsel of the NAACP, Thurgood Marshall—who is at this moment awaits confirmation as a member of the highest Court of our land.

And Earl Warren, the political jurist, whose pork-barrel appointment has revolutionized America by the ordered abolition of local laws and customs long established to protect the peace is not without gory credit. The junketeer judge, who spends his State Department salary and expenses traveling to Communist countries, must not be omitted or go unnoticed through forgetfulness.

His leadership, backward to chaos and disorder, strains the qualities of intelligent reason for the existence of society. He has championed his brand of freedom to where his freedom is now free to destroy freedom. The ruins of which city should be dedicated to his ultimate success in the advocacy of distrust of law and his teachings to destroy to rebuild.

Then follow the Kings, the Farmers, the Pikes and the popular "change" crowd.

The National Council of Churches proclaiming a religious duty to refuse to obey laws against one's conscience might well ask themselves if such included burning homes and laying waste to cities to further increase the suffering plight of the poor.

Three hundred years of racial discrimination is another cry heard. Yet there is no Negro 300 years old alive, but there are many who are rich and successful because they live in the United States of America—work and accept responsibility to their people.

Poverty—who ever heard of so many poor people with guns, trained and disciplined like militia?

Words—like gasoline—are explosive and cause damage.

Politics have led the purposes of government far astray. No civilized people are going to take the ransacking of their nation without making a change. And it will be a change in leadership if a strong, firm hand is not immediately exercised.

Federal funds and projects are needed for jobs—but not blackmail rewards to subsidize the indoctrination of more agitation and inflammatory hatred. Our present plight was initiated by the intrusion of politics and government into so-called social justice. Additional interference into the lives, homes, and futures of our people can only serve like more gasoline to enlarge the fires in our land. The Federal role must move forward by restoring the affairs of society to the people themselves of their local governing body. The unrest and riots occurred when local government was abolished. Law and order can only return by restoring local control. Peace of mind is far more desired than dissention and being the subject of agitation and bickering or promises and a utopia unattainable in this life.

Mr. Speaker, I include, following my remarks, an article from the Washington Evening Star of February 15, 1967, by former Supreme Court Justice Charles E. Whittaker, which is most appropriate at this time.

CIVIL DISOBEDIENCE ENCOURAGED, WHITTAKER SAYS

A former Supreme Court justice last night accused President Johnson, Vice President Humphrey, Secretary of State Dean Rusk and American church leaders of encouraging violation of the law by civil rights demonstrators.

The attack came from Charles E. Whittaker, who retired in 1962, in the opening lecture of a three-part seminar on law, order and civil disobedience sponsored by the American Enterprise Institute, a conservatively oriented nonpartisan educational institution. The seminar is being held at George Washington University.

Whittaker cited a 1964 statement by Rusk: "If I were a Negro, I too would demonstrate."

Then he cited astatement by Humphrey last year that if he had to live in the slums "you'd have more trouble than you have had already, because I've got enough spark left in me to lead a mighty good revolt under those conditions."

Finally, he quoted the President's remarks in August 1965, to demonstrators at the White House: "I am proud this morning to salute you as fellow revolutionaries. Neither you nor I are willing to accept the tyranny of poverty. . . . I hope that you . . . will go out into the hinterland and rouse the masses and blow the bugles and tell them that the hour has arrived and their day is here. . . ."

Reasonable minds cannot doubt, Whittaker said, that such statements constituted an endorsement of civil disobedience, even though not intended as such.

Alluding to support of Negro civil rights movements in the South by "Northern whites," including ministers and other church people, Whittaker said their support of demonstrations vocally, physically or financially put them in a position where they "cannot now escape a measure of responsibility" for the results of the demonstrations.

Whittaker said he was sure that "a large majority of American Negroes are law-abiding citizens of good sense and do not subscribe to, and will have no truck with, the preachments of some self-appointed Negro leaders that have exhorted and incited Negroes to violate our laws. . . . My criticisms are of those misguided and irresponsible self-appointed Negro leaders who have exhorted and incited others to violate our laws, and of the relatively small percentage of our Negroes—usually the poorest and least educated ones—who have fallen under the spell of these leaders and have been carrying out their exhortations."

M–16 Rifle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. McCLURE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 27, 1967

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. Speaker, another Idaho boy in Vietnam, this time an Army sergeant, has made his views known on the M–16 rifle.

He says that the M–16 "jams from the slightest amount of dirt" and is generally unreliable. According to this man, the Chinese assault weapon supplied to the North Vietnamese is more reliable and carries 10 more rounds in its magazine. The sergeant says he and his unit prefer the World War II vintage Thompson submachinegun "because it still fires when dirty" and has deadly effectiveness at the short range employed in ambush action.

Our colleagues, who at this moment are investigating the reliability of the M–16, should remember that those who defend the rifle do so from the safety of their rooms in the Pentagon, and that the complaints come from the men in the field whose very survival rests on the dependability of the weapons they fight with.

I am well aware of the tests that have absolved the M–16 of every sin, malum prohibitum or malum per se. Nevertheless, you cannot argue with the combat soldier using the rifle. I prefer to take his word rather than that of Defense Department officials whose credibility in these matters is about on a par with the M–16 itself.

Hon. W. S. (Bill) Stuckey, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHIL M. LANDRUM

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 27, 1967

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, each new Congress brings a variety of new Members, all able and intensely concerned about the affairs of our Nation and the world. No exception, the 90th Congress received a large group of able young Americans each of whom his constituency and the Nation as well can respect and admire.

My own State of Georgia sent four able and dedicated young Americans to the 90th Congress. In these first 7 months of this initial session, these new Members have demonstrated their splendid qualities as Representatives in the Nation's Congress. While all Members try to evaluate the problems with which we deal here on the basis of the national good, we all know that every Member must pay special attention to the problems of his congressional district.

One of Georgia's fine new Members is Congressman W. S. (Bill) Stuckey, Jr., and he has initiated an activity in his district which, I believe, will be of interest to every Member of this body. His concern about the economic level and the educational welfare of his constituents has prompted the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Stuckey] to organize a development council designed to promote economic, educational, and cultural improvements in the Eighth Congressional District.

Mr. Stuckey proposed the Eighth District Development Council last summer, and the actual work of organization began the following January when a group of planners from over the State met to lay the groundwork. The organizations represented by this planning group, headed by Mr. J. W. Fanning, vice president of services at the University of Georgia, including the area planning and development commissions, the University of Georgia, Georgia Tech, the State chamber of commerce and the department of industry and trade.

By June 23 of this year, the Eighth District Development Council became a reality when representatives from each of the district's 24 counties, having been elected by county and city leaders, met in Douglas, Ga. At this first meeting in Douglas, designated to be the council's home because of its geographical relation to the rest of the district, the new members elected officers and approved the proposed bylaws drawn up by the preliminary planning committee.

Mr. Elton Brooks, of Coffee County, was elected chairman of the council. Mr. John Raulerson, Glynn County, was selected vice chairman; and Mr. Clayton Jay, Jr., of Ben Hill, will serve as secretary-treasurer.

Members of the nominating committee were Mr. John Laws, Appling County, chairman; Mr. John Raulerson, Glynn County; Mr. Brooks Blitch, Clinch County; Mr. Jerrie McCranie, Cook County; and Mr. Jesse Hamby, Bleckley County.

After the council has petitioned for a charter as a nonprofit organization, a full-time executive director can be hired to carry out the goals which have been set forth.

In addressing the newly elected members of the Eighth District Development Council in Douglas on June 23d, Congressman Stuckey told the group:

> I believe the fact that we are all here together this evening and the county and city leaders have responded so quickly in electing representatives, proves that the 8th District is prepared to take the initiative to pull itself up off the bottom of the economic ladder, and I know that we can do just that.

He continued:

> The success of the Development Council now depends on each of you here. . . . In the final analysis, the success or failure of our efforts will depend on the everyday courage, determination and dedication of each of you.

Mr. Stuckey emphasized that his role in the development council would be limited strictly to what assistance he might offer as the Congressman from the Eighth District.

In connection with this, Congressman Stuckey said:

> It is my very strong belief that the 8th District Development Council can only be effective if it is removed from political races as a body, and I want to state emphatically that this includes my own. I do not believe that this Council should become a political football. It should most definitely remain non-partisan as far as politics is concerned.
>
> In no way, do I intend to suggest or affect the decisions of this organization.

Congressman Stuckey has on numerous occasions praised the work already being done by the Area Planning and Development Commissions, the institutions of higher learning, the chambers of commerce and the department of industry and trade. He stresses the fact that the new Eighth District Development Council will not overlap the activities of these groups but will serve to coordinate their work. One of the main functions of the council will be to stimulate the economy in the Eighth District by encouraging new industry to the area.

Mr. Stuckey has already demonstrated his concern for his congressional district and for the people who live there in a very tangible way through his efforts in the creation of the Eighth District Development Council.

Carl Sandburg and Fred Schwengel

SPEECH

OF

HON. THEODORE R. KUPFERMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 26, 1967

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, Carl Sandburg was only a name, a figure, and an author to me. I had read a great deal of his material on Abraham Lincoln, and I vividly recall his white-haired presence at the inauguration of the late President John F. Kennedy.

His death, of course, was a great loss to our country, because I believe poets, historians, and biographers to be part of our country's treasure chest and Sandburg was all gold.

But as I reread the profound and moving statement (Record July 26 at Page H9477 et seq.) by the Congressman from Iowa, Fred Schwengel, I realized that just as Sandburg caught the spirit of Abraham Lincoln, so too had Schwengel caught the spirit of Sandburg.

Of course, we all know the interest of Fred Schwengel in government and history in the United States, but I commend especially to my colleagues, the Schwengel eulogy on Sandburg.

Job Corps Wins an "A" for Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY A. TAYLOR

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 27, 1967

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct the attention of my colleagues to an editorial which appeared in the Asheville Citizen, on Monday, June 26, 1967, about the Schenck Job Corps Center located in the district which I represent in Congress. When the three Job Corps centers were first located in western North Carolina many neighboring residents were critical and even hostile. But since that time the corpsmen have demonstrated to the home folks' satisfaction that corpsmen are no different from other Americans in their work and behavior and have made many friends.

The editorial follows:

> JOB CORPS WINS AN "A" FOR SERVICE
>
> When the first Job Corps camps were located in Western North Carolina, some of the neighboring residents were critical and even hostile. Since that time most members of the corps have demonstrated by their work and behavior that they are no different from other Americans.
>
> Recently members of the Corps put out a forest fire in the North Mills River area which threatened the home of Mr. and Mrs. Donald E. Kempton and could have caused injury to Mrs. Kempton's invalid mother. The grateful Kemptons later invited 50 Job Corpsmen to their house for a Sunday afternoon picnic and asked a Henderson County Commissioner to give official thanks to the men.
>
> Mr. Jackson's remarks are worth quoting. He said that, "At a time like this, many people would have pretended not to notice that help was needed, or would have pleaded they were too busy, or just would not have cared enough to help in a situation where there was no chance for personal gain . . . The fact that you were not only able, but willing to give your time and energy to putting out a forest fire—a project of importance to all citizens—that you did it . . . because it was there to be done and you did it selflessly . . . proves to me that we do indeed have good citizens among our young people. It is very comforting to know that in the tomorrows when some of us will no longer be around, there will be young people like you coming on to take over the respon-

sibilities we have today. Our country will be in good hands . . ."

In North Mills River, at least, the Job Corps has won lasting friends.

A Salute to Commissioner Samuel C. Jackson, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS

OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 27, 1967

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, 2 years have passed since the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission began its work to implement title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which forbids discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, sex, or national origin. Those of us who have followed the progress of this enforcement agency are aware of the contributions made by Commissioner Samuel C. Jackson, who recently began the third year of his 3-year appointment.

Circumstances have decreed that Commissioner Jackson should become a stable factor in the somewhat fluid development of the EEOC over the past 24 months, during which there have been numerous changes in membership and in the staff. Mr. Jackson has brought to the agency a fortunate combination of a close association with those who framed title VII, knowledge of labor law and labor relations, and expertise in civil rights matters. All of these have contributed to the remarkable ability he has displayed in discharging his duties as a commissioner in this important body.

Named in the summer of 1965 as one of the five original members—one of two Republicans—Mr. Jackson came to his post from a private law practice in his native Kansas. His work as institutional attorney and child welfare attorney for the Kansas Department of Social Welfare had further enhanced his understanding of human problems. Long active in matters involving human relations and civil rights, his contributions to the work of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People are known throughout the United States. A dynamic president for the Topeka branch of the NAACP, he had also served the organization as regional attorney and as a member of the national board.

During his 2 years as a member of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, Mr. Jackson has demonstrated a thorough knowledge and understanding of the phenomenon of employment discrimination, as it has been manifested in American society throughout our history, as well as the broad range of social problems that affect those who now seek recourse to title VII and to other legislation—Federal and State—designed to eliminate inequality.

At the same time, Commissioner Jackson can be wholly sympathetic to those citizens who form the "clientele" of the agency and yet be able to communicate with and relate to those in the business and labor worlds who are regulated by the legislation. The relationships he has established for the Commission and the good will he has engendered through his efforts have been possible largely because of his receptivity to differing points of view in contacts with all concerned and the constructive attitude with which he has approached all negotiations.

Repeatedly, Mr. Jackson has received high praise for untiring efforts to achieve the goal of equal employment opportunity, from all sectors. He has spent uncounted hours in the attempt to assist different groups which can have significant impact on the problem. Testimony to this fact can be had from a large number of individuals and organizations who have benefited by hearing him speak or by participating with him in consultations. Elected and appointed officials at all levels of government; businessmen and labor leaders; civic and fraternal groups; civil rights, educational and religious leaders; and citizens from all walks of life have commended his effectiveness and the reasoning clarity of his purpose.

From the top echelons of management in one of America's five largest companies came a typical accolade:

> Executives of businesses are sometimes quite removed from the policy personnel of the Federal Government, and this distance not only encourages a lack of knowledge of the Government's policies and problems, but also tends to breed a degree of suspicion or distrust of the motives of the units of the Government. The result is often a barrier between the Government and business which tends to impede the fulfillment of the objectives of both.
>
> Mr. Jackson's visit provided us with a better understanding of the problems the Commission seeks to solve and the responsibility of business to cooperate in solving those problems. His obvious dedication to his work, and the frankness and candor with which he discussed the benefits, pitfalls, and techniques of the provision of equal employment opportunity policies and practices not only has provided us with a better knowlegde of these areas, but it also afforded an intelligent stimulation to our people to concern themselves with this subject in their daily operations.
>
> By calling to our attention some specific employment complaints, Mr. Jackson was able to suggest areas of potential problems we might face in the future. This has offered us an opportunity to re-examine certain practices to avoid future difficulties, while at the same time furthering the goals of [the] Commission.

A large employers' association recognized that "often our elected and appointed officials are criticized for their shortcomings while their outstanding works are overlooked," and took the opportunity to commend Mr. Jackson for his "statesmanlike manner" in communicating its members' responsibilities under title VII in an honest, meaningful, as well as tactful manner.

Following Commissioner Jackson's recent address before an audience of hundreds in a large eastern city, an executive for a private agency deeply involved in civil rights and social problems commented:

> If all his presentations are as meaningful . . . . it must be agreed that he is a very capable ambassador for the Commission and its efforts to promote equal opportunity in employment.

Labor leaders, too, have recognized the worth of the Commissioner's efforts in seeking solutions to problems. The president of a large industrial union has stated that Mr. Jackson was able, through his participation in a conference program, to set the stage for an "exchange of ideas and priorities," a strengthening immeasurably the chances for overcoming problems.

Wide knowledge of the intricacies of the labor relations field and an awareness of the depth and extent of employment discrimination have enabled Commissioner Jackson to play an indispensable role in the development of policy and program for the EEOC, and thus to guide the establishment and implementation of procedures designed to serve those who are appealing in large numbers to the Agency.

The gratitude of civil rights forces for Jackson's work was perhaps best expressed in a recent newspaper column by Clarence Mitchell, Jr., of the NAACP:

> Mr. Jackson, a midwest Republican, is highly respected by GOP leaders. During the effort to gain passage of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, Title VII of which established EEOC, Mr. Jackson was an indispensable worker with Republican members of the House and Senate. An able lawyer and a hard-driving executive, Mr. Jackson has boosted the Commission's stock to an all-time high among fair-minded Republicans. (Column: From the Work Bench, Baltimore *Afro-American*, July 1967.)

The continued work of Commissioner Samuel C. Jackson will aid us in dealing with the basic problem plaguing our riot-torn cities.

Star-Telegram Tells How Community Action Program Battles Poverty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JIM WRIGHT

OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 27, 1967

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, all too often we hear the statement that if the poor really wanted to rise out of the conditions of squalor and poverty in which they live they would do so. There already exist, it is argued, ample facilities and programs to take care of their needs—that poor people are just too lazy to use them.

Those who believe this fallacy have closed their eyes to the degradation and suffering which beats down on the poor from the day of their birth. What these people desperately need, and what the Office of Economic Opportunity tries to give them, is a boost so that they can grab hold of the bottom rung of the ladder of opportunity and start to pull themselves up.

I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues an article written by Catherine Gunn in the Fort Worth Star-Telegram which points out that "some people do not know how to knock on the door of opportunity. Others cannot knock without help." The article explains how the directors of the eight neighborhood centers operating under the community action program in Fort Worth actively seek out these people and let them know of the services available to them.

One such family consisted of two adults and 18 children, existing on $60 a month and receiving no assistance. Surely nothing but a lack of knowledge would keep a family which has only $3 a month per person from using those resources which are available. I am grateful that in Fort Worth there are people willing to help those who exist in a prison of ignorance, illiteracy, fear, and mistrust. The article follows:

Action Program Helps Defeat Poverty

Some people do not know how to knock on the door of opportunity. Others cannot knock without help.

Take, for example, the mother of a youngster who was stealing school lunches so he and his brother and sister could eat like other children.

Or two old people lying on a floor. The woman was paralyzed from her waist down. One of the man's legs was missing.

Because misery often is cloaked by doors that stay closed to reality, a group of Fort Worth people have been going about trying to free the inmates of poverty. These are the directors of the eight neighborhood centers now operating under the Community Action Program.

They are finding people jailed by the circumstances of ignorance, language barriers, illiteracy, fear and mistrust.

The mother of the boy who was stealing school lunches had no idea what to do about the situation that prompted her son's actions. In the home were 18 children and two adults. Two of the older children had children of their own, and all were attempting to live on an income of $60 a month—a child support check from a father who sometimes didn't send it.

No one in the household knew that if the family were broken into three units, state assistance would be available for each group.

A way out for the handicapped couple living on an unkempt floor was found by the director of the area's neighborhood center. Now they are in a clean convalescent home and have three good meals a day—not just the flapjacks and beans the man with the amputated leg was able to manage now and then.

Each day, the neighborhood center directors are on the lookout for people such as these. Ministers, public school personnel and agency workers have provided the names of persons living in areas of the highest concentration of poverty. Others have been discovered by knocking on doors.

The neighborhood center officials are finding that many families or individuals know nothing of how to help themselves. For, as one director put it, if one cannot obtain food and other necessities, he cannot buy a newspaper, radio or television, nor can he afford books or a telephone.

Also, language barriers lead to half truths or misunderstandings. Illiteracy breeds fear and lack of trust.

Sometimes obtaining something as simple as a birth certificate proves "too difficult."

The neighborhood directors are finding that churches, agencies, clubs and individuals are more than willing to help. They now have about 90 such sources they can call on for help. But getting the needy person and a benefactor together is not always easy. One often shies from the other for a number of reasons.

The directors have concluded that the destitute frequently will talk with them more freely than they would with a relief agency. This, apparently is true because the needy feel the directors are not going to "take anything away from them"—their children, their home or whatever allotment they might have.

In turn, the directors perform an invaluable service in interpreting to relief sources the needs of people who were afraid or unable to speak for themselves.

In their rounds, they found a mother and father of a mentally retarded child, who did not know how to seek help for the child or for themselves in meeting the problems such a child often creates in a home.

The directors have found people sitting in the dark and doing without water because they did not know what to do about discontinued utilities. They have found people who needed medical care but could not get to a hospital or clinic and back home.

They have placed children in school for the first time and have returned dropouts to school.

One director was able to secure a "big brother" for a boy who was headed in the wrong direction.

Still another director is making it possible for children to enter the Head Start program by caring for them during after-school hours.

The center that has opened its doors during after-school Head Start hours requires the mothers of the children either to contribute four hours a week to volunteer service or help in some other way. Therefore, volunteers are being recruited directly from the low-income neighborhoods.

"Clothes are as important as food," one director stated. So some of the mothers made clothes.

Block clubs are being formed for a taste of social life. Women gather around a card table set up in a rocky little yard to talk while making something useful.

Baseball and softball teams are being organized, and girls are being taught to cook and sew.

Each center is serving as a focal point for poverty and poverty-related programs in the community. Each director is enthusiastic about the reception accorded their clients by local and state welfare and health departments and other sources, such as the Lions Club, which provides eye glasses, dental hygienists, CAP extension workers for Planned Parenthood Center, project aides from the Community Action home management program, and the Texas Employment Commission.

When the centers were planned, it was felt that once in operation, they would attempt to decentralize many of the traditional services that have been available through social welfare agencies. Their role would be (1) to help people become aware of resources available for their use and (2) to interpret to welfare agencies specific neighborhood needs.

The project is administered by the Bethlehem Center board. Mrs. Sybil Dodson is program director.

Target areas are designated by numbers. At the time the centers were established, one area had 2,031 families with incomes of less than $3,000 a year; 1,916 dwellings were substandard; 3,534 residents had less than an eight-grade education, 429 mothers with children under 6 were in the labor force; 506 persons were receiving Old Age Assistance, Aid for Dependent Children . or Tarrant County welfare department assistance, and 325 males and 267 females over 14 years were unemployed.

The total number of families in the area was 4,049. Of the 2,031 families with incomes under $3,000 a year, 487 had incomes ranging from nothing to $1,000 and 784 families $1,000 to $1,999.

The eight target areas have a total population of 84,000. The eight directors have had direct contact with 13,000. Their work has just begun.

It was hoped that when funds first were requested by the Community Council of Fort Worth and Tarrant County, the funding organization for CAP programs of the area, the areas would have a staff of 24 persons. Funds finally approved by the Office of Economic Opportunity, however, provided for one worker in each of the eight areas.

In January, the Community Council applied for funds that would enable each area to have three workers. So far, the additional grant has not been approved.

On May 31, additional funds were requested for a comprehensive health, manpower, self-help neighborhood improvement and community organization program.

Criticism of the Bethlehem Center board's current program has centered on the use of women as directors of the majority of the centers instead of an all-male staff. Also, center locations have been declared inadequate.

Adequate staff and better site locations will cause the program's value to increase proportionately, the supervisors feel.

CAP programs are encouraged to use personnel from within the poverty areas, and male workers are not always available.

Miss Josephine Beckwith, director of Bethlehem Center, has declared:

"The war on poverty is to provide opportunities for better living conditions, better educational opportunities, employment and all of the human needs with which society should be concerned.

"This includes," she said, "the opportunity for the disadvantaged people of any community to organize so that they might speak for themselves to the community, interpreting their needs as they see them. This comes about through neighborhood organization.

"However, in a neighborhood where there are 2,031 families making less than $3,000 a year, one neighborhood director cannot be concerned with the immediate needs of the people and perform all the anticipated programs necessary to lick the war on poverty," she said.

"I would say the establishment of a rapport, of confidence and the attempt to motivate people to help themselves has been the initial attack from the neighborhood center worker.

"There should be a reawakening of a feeling of self-worth so that one can accept the economic opportunities that are available," she said.

Gen. Lewis Walt: A Wise and Dedicated Servant of Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK BROOKS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 27, 1967

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, last week the Texas congressional delegation was honored with a memorable briefing on the Vietnam situation by Lt. Gen. Lewis W. Walt, of the U.S. Marines.

Our delegation was deeply moved by what this fine and devoted American had to say. As you know, General Walt served brilliantly in Vietnam from 1965 until recently as commanding general of the Third Marine Amphibious Force in the I Corps area, consisting of the five northernmost provinces in South Vietnam.

Amidst all of the confusion about our mission in Vietnam, it is refreshing to get the true story from a man who knows what he is talking about—a man who speaks from battlefield experience.

We have all heard how, in this incredible technological age, wars will supposedly be fought by remote control and by the push of a button. Well, Vietnam has taught us that the foot soldier is still our most indispensable force for national security. And this war has also emphasized that all of the computers and tabulators in the world cannot replace an inspiring and courageous general.

Lewis Walt is such a general. He enjoys the respect and affection of the Marines he led into battle.

Lewis Walt knows the enemy—but he knows the people of South Vietnam, too. He has planned and successfully executed slashing attacks—but he has also helped to plan and build peaceful economic, and social development in the countryside. He knows the Vietnamese as do few Americans. And he likes and admires them—and believes in their future.

General Walt's associates consider him to possess and ideal combination of practical combat experience, military leadership and managerial skill, together with a rare dedication, sincerity, and warmth. These traits blend into a rare leadership ability—perhaps best demonstrated in Vietnam where he led and organized the activities of all agencies—United States and Vietnamese, military and civilian—into productive and effective programs.

General Westmoreland has said of Lewis Walt:

> He's not only big physically, but big morally.

This sums up the kind of man the general is.

The general is an excellent speaker—a fact many Americans around the country are discovering for themselves. He has been meeting with civic and educational groups whenever possible, reporting on Vietnam and placing the conflict in true perspective.

Let me share with my colleagues some of his thoughts as expressed before the Texas delegation, and from other appearances across the country.

On the nature of the war in Vietnam, the general said:

> This is one of the most complicated, complex, frustrating, multi-sided efforts we've ever been engaged in . . . We're fighting it—and I mean our government and the government and people of Vietnam—in the political . . . sociological . . . economic . . . psychological . . . and military arenas—all at the same time.

General Walt believes that our objectives in the I Corps area to be both destructive and constructive. He says:

> We have to destroy the armed enemy. But, we have to positively assist the Vietnamese people to rebuild their country and to shape their own destiny.

He emphasizes that our military efforts in Vietnam are a "shield behind which reconstruction may start and have some chance of succeeding." We have to assist the people "to reconstitute their government and their social institutions, reconstruct their schools, their homes and their means for making a living. Make no mistake—both sides are after the people.

He has little patience with those who are overly critical of the South Vietnamese military. He says:

> They are short of manpower, of leadership, of trained personnel. Well, why shouldn't they be? Those people have been fighting this war for 18 years. I've got the fullest confidence in the potential of their armed forces.

And he says that in the I Corps area the Vietnamese forces have done "a magnificent job."

He emphasizes over and over that this is a battle to win not territory—but the minds and hearts of the people.

> "In this war a soldier has to be much more than a man with a rifle or a man whose only object is to kill. He has to be part diplomat, part technician, part politician—and 100 percent human being.

Our men have met this challenge. They are young and resourceful fighting men who can look the VC in the eye one day and show a villager how to build a playground for the children, the next.

The general says:

> I have never ceased to be amazed by the understanding of these young Americans. They've come to a totally foreign environment, met a people beleagured by 18 years of war, suspicious of foreigners, as far removed from the American experience as if they'd come from another planet, yet the American serviceman can grasp the plight of these Vietnamese, and he can sympathize with them and understand them.

Our troops, he says, are the ambassadors at the hamlet level. And they do a really superior job.

The general makes clear that he believes in the future of the South Vietnamese. I Corps, he says, was long believed to be a very poor part of South Vietnam because it has not been able to produce enough food for the people there. But, he says, this is not because the capability is not there. I Corps now has the only coal mine in South Vietnam—a mine taken from the Vietcong. This mine is now under government control and under U.S. protection. It is producing several hundred million tons of coal, and the Vietnamese are building a large thermal electric plant in the area to serve all five of the northern provinces with electricity.

At present, only the cities have electric power. But once electricity is installed in these rural areas, the farmers will be able to install water pumps in the rivers and pump water into nearby rice paddies. This means they will have two crops each year, instead of just one.

The Vietnamese are also building a fertilizer plant as a byproduct of the coal, and this fertilizer can be used by all of the rice paddies in I Corps area. The meaning of this, says the general, is that rice production will increase by nearly three times as much as is now presently produced, enabling Vietnam to better feed its own people.

He notes other fine economic potentials in the I Corps area: abundant sugarcane—a sugar mill is being started with American help; excellent fishing—a canning factory is being planned—and some of the world's loveliest beaches that could made the area "the playground of Southeast Asia."

These objectives, the general makes clear, will not be accomplished overnight. But he does think that we are headed in the right direction. In his words:

> We are making progress . . . and I am confident of the outcome.

Nor does the general predict a quick outcome to the fighting. The war, he feels, depends on two factors: First, how many troops the North Vietnamese Army is going to throw down on us and keep taking the terrible losses they are taking. Second, how many troops we are going to put in the country to stop them.

General Walt thinks we may be in Vietnam for as long as 12 to 15 years. He does not think the fighting will rage that long, but American forces will be needed to maintain security. He notes that our troops have been stationed in Korea for a long time. And he adds that South Vietnam has as much potential for economic and political growth as Korea, and a strong South Vietnam will give the United States a strong and valued ally in Southeast Asia to block Communist forces in that part of the world.

To Lewis Walt, there is no confusion or apprehension about America's commitment to the people of South Vietnam.

We cannot abandon these people. For, as the General said:

> If we withdrew it would only be a matter of a few days before the Viet Cong would be back in, and they would be killing.

I am proud of a country that is able to produce men like General Walt. And I am delighted that the American people now have an opportunity to see and listen to the General explain our hopes and aspirations for the people of South Vietnam. The General is neither a hawk nor a dove. He is only a peace-seeker—dedicated to a fair and prompt settlement of this costly and bloody war. But he is also committed to our seeing the job through until a settlement can be reached with the Communists.

And here, too, he reflects our Nation's hope that ways can be found to induce Hanoi to join with us in the search for peace. But until that day comes, Lewis Walt and others like him, will shoulder the burden of securing a decent life for a people and a country that have known little but war all of their lives.

He told us:

> The most dramatic change that I have observed out there in the past two years is the attitude of the people. Two years ago that Vietnamese people in I Corps were fraught with fear. Today, they are gaining confidence in their own government and in their own institutions and they see a much better world for themselves resulting from our presence in that troubled country.

Statement on the Middle East Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 27, 1967

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, we have been subjected to such a barrage of propaganda by the Communist nations and their Arab fellow travelers at the United Nations and elsewhere that it would appear that Israel, a free world nation of 2½ million people, sought to take over the vast lands of the estimated 450 million Moslems of the world.

The intended victim, Israel, successfully resisted a Communist-inspired and Communist-armed so-called war of national liberation. A Soviet plot to dominate the Middle East was frustrated by Israel valor and military skill. Israel is ready to discuss withdrawal from cease-fire lines on the basis of a permanent peace settlement and adequate, reasonable, security guarantees.

Yet we hear such a one-sided blast from the Communists and Arabs that the whole brutal spectacle of the Arabs ganging up on Israel before June 5 has become a desert mirage, a sort of "instant" distortion of history.

Israel refused to submit to aggression or to bow before the threats and taunts of Moscow. The Russians are using the Israel issue, emotionally volatile to the Arabs, as a device to penetrate the Moslem world. The Communists hope to exploit the Israel issue from Morocco to Indonesia.

The time has come, Mr. Speaker, to set the record straight. History is beginning to repeat itself. The Soviet Union has embarked on a massive program of resupply of jets and tanks to Egypt and Syria. Egypt already has received more than half of the number of jets destroyed by Israel.

The Russians have ignored the State Department's pious pleas for limitation of arms shipments to the region. It is obvious that the Russians have no moral concern for limitation of tensions. They want to stir up and exploit further Arab bellicosity and passions. They want to use the Israel issue for all its worth. They have discovered a gimmick to divert America from the unfinished task in Vietnam.

Failure by the United States to implement commitments to Israel has been noted by NATO allies. The West Germans observed that President Johnson failed to test the Egyptian blockade of the Strait of Tiran. Today the German press asks about the validity of our guarantees on Berlin. The wishywashy stand of the administration in the Middle East has undermined the strength of our commitments and eroded the value of the sacrifices in Vietnam by our martyrs.

The Russian fleet enters Egyptian ports and threatens open intervention. We make no answer. The Arabs see strength on one side, timidity on the other.

Let us be consistent. Communism is communism, whether in Southeast Asia or the Middle East. Moscow is still trying to bury us.

Russian actions speak louder than their words. President Johnson may be enchanted with his summit talks at Glassboro, N.J. But none of the alleged magic of personal contact has been revealed to us in the Middle East. The Soviet Union has shown not a spirit of Hollybush, but a spirit of guided-missile cruisers in Port Said and Alexandria.

The Russians are pushing for weak spots, trying to penetrate wherever we show weakness or confusion.

The time has come for us to draw a line in the Middle East. If not, we will permit the Russians to turn defeat into victory.

Let the State Department not become so mesmerized by hopes to restore relations with Arab nations now hostile to us that we appease both Arabs and Communists in a one-sided and disastrous bid for detente.

We are beginning to forget that the conflict in the Middle East started when the Arabs, armed and encouraged by Russia, decided to gang up on Israel, cut off her access to the seas, mass on her borders, and destroy that pro-Western democracy. Israel was termed an "outpost of imperialism" because of her friendship with America and the free world.

The world saw another saga of David dealing with Goliath. But Goliath is being revived.

I call attention of the House to the following transcript of actual statements by Arab leaders at the outbreak of the war last month. The Russians would rewrite history in the manner of "1984" to distort the facts. The time has come to refresh our insights on how the present situation came about.

The transcription of Arab statements of June 4 and 5 follows:

ARAB STATEMENTS PRIOR TO THE EGYPTIAN ATTACK ON JUNE 5, 1967

1. President Nasser of Egypt, 1730 GMT, June 4: "The Iraqi forces have moved and so did the heroic Iraqi Army and the Iraqi people. The whole Arab nation has moved. . . . We had to prepare ourselves for the decisive battle with the enemy and when we felt we were ready, we retrieved our right. The UNEF was evacuated and we returned to the Gulf of Aqaba, which we have closed. The UNEF is finished—it has left our country and it will not return again . . . Today we tell them (Israel) we are facing you in the battle and are burning with desire for it to start in order to get revenge for the 1956 treachery."

2. President Arif of Iraq, 1620 GMT, June 4: "Brothers and guests. God has imposed a Holy War on us. We will thus be participating with our brother strugglers on the borders of Palestine in the Arabs' great battle in our sacred land where our flags have been raised once more."

3. King Hussein of Jordan, 1600 GMT, June 4: "Today the Arab nation is moving as one nation to face its responsibilities. We are ready to fight to the end for our legitimate rights. The entire Jordanian people have risen to the level of battle."

JUNE 5, 1967—THE ARABS ATTACK ISRAEL

1. Amman Radio, Jordan, 0720 GMT, June 5: "The Arab nation has united its views and ranks to repel every aggression and restore the usurped rights and territory. Masses of our Arab nation: Rest assured and be joyful about the imminent return and liberation."

2. Amman Radio, Jordan, 1015 GMT, June 5: "Jordanian Royal Air Force planes have begun bombing targets in the enemy territory. The bombing is still in progress."

3. Amman Radio, Jordan, 1035 GMT, June 5: Proclamation by Joint Command: "The Jordanian, Iraqi, and Syrian air forces are carrying out joint air operations and bombing targets inside our occupied territory. The bombing is still in progress."

4. Amman Radio, Jordan, 1040, GMT, June 5: Proclamation of Jordanian military spokesman: "Our valiant forces have occupied Jabal Mukabbir in Jerusalem. The enemy is fleeing before our advancing forces south of Jerusalem. A great fire broke out in five settlements (in Israel) as a result of bombardment by our artillery."

5. Damascus Radio, Syria, 0715 GMT, June 5: "Arab brothers: The battle with the state of gangs has begun. To arms, O Arabs. To arms, masses of our people. The hour of the battle has struck and the march toward Palestine has begun."

6. Damascus Radio, Syria, 0725 GMT, June 5: "Comrades in arms in Cairo, Gaza, Sharm El-Sheikh, and Sinai, and masses of our people in Jordan. We are at your side in the glorious march towards Tel Aviv. Damascus, the people, the Socialist Arab Bath Party, are responding. Strike and we are on your side on the firing line."

7. Damascus Radio, Syria, 0745 GMT, June 5: "Brothers: Today is your day, the day of freedom and the day of the return. Millions of Arabs are backing you. Strike! Millions of free people in the world support you. Strike! The toilers and honest people bless your step. Strike! They bless you as you radiate fire and light. Strike. Strike. Strike!"

8. Damascus Radio, Syria, 0815 GMT, June 5: "Our Arab land, flame up and burn the invaders. Destroy them all. To arms, O Arabs! To the heart of occupied Palestine! Rendezvous in Tel Aviv, O Arabs! Crush the aggressor invaders, the Zionists, and crush the United States!"

9. Damascus Radio, Syria, 0900 GMT, June 5: Statement by the Supreme Commander of the Army: "The zero-hour has begun. Our planes are now shelling the enemy's cities, positions, and installations. O masses of our Arab people: Arab Syria has entered the battle. Syria is now engaging the enemy and destroying its positions. The Arab revolution will not retreat before fully destroying the Israeli existence in our Arab homeland."

10. President Al-Atasi of Syria, 1220 GMT, June 5: "Our present battle will be one of final liberation of the usurped territory from imperialism and Zionism. No international force can oppose the will of the struggling Arab people."

11. Damascus Radio, Syria, 1030 GMT, June 5: "At 1200 today a telephone contact took place between President Jamal Abd an-Nasir and Chief of State Dr. Nur ad-Din al-Atasi, President Abd an-Nasir emphasized that the Arab people in Egypt and their valiant army are determined to follow the battle to the end. Chief of State Dr. Nur ad-Din al-Atasi emphasized that the Arab people in Syria and their valiant army are determined to continue the battle until victory."

12. Damascus Radio, Syria, 1322 GMT, June 5: "Iraqi President Abd ar-Rahman Arif has contacted Chief of State Dr. Nur ad-Din al-Atasi by telephone. During the conversation the two leaders affirmed the two countries' determination to fight the battle of the Arab nation until victory is achieved."

13. Damascus Radio, Syria, 0455 GMT, June 6: "A direct telephone conversation took place last night between Algerian President Houari Boumediene and Chief of State Dr. Nur ad-Din al-Atasi. The Algerian President affirmed support of the Algerian Arab people, army, and revolution for the Syrian revolution in the fateful battle of the Arab nation, the battle for the liberation of Palestine."

14. Jidda Radio, Saudi Arabia, 2140 GMT, June 5: King Feisal: "The Saudi Arabian Kingdom considers Israel's presence in the heart of the Arab world a war against all the Arab world. Therefore, the Saudi Arabian Kingdom is in a permanent state of war against the existence of Israel until such existence ceases. Our forces' entrance into fraternal Jordan, the honorable battle they are now waging together with the other Arab forces in the fateful battle, and our employment of all our resources for this battle are but a confirmation of our declaration of war against the Zionist gangs."

U.N Expeditionary Force Against South Africa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 27, 1967

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the threat of war against South Africa as a tool to appease the many "fronts" being called nations in the United Nations organization has again raised its ugly head.

The American people will not permit the first American boy to become involved in another United Nations face-saving aggressive war. We want no compulsory draft or U.S. military personnel to serve in any United Nations expeditionary force.

No hearing has been permitted on H.R. 5479 which seeks merely to amend the United Nations Participation Act of 1945 to restore to the elected representatives of the American people; that is, Congress, the approval or rejection of sending American troops into battle—be it called police action or war.

Completely ignoring the will of the people inaction toward these hearings can but be implied announcement, that the State Department approves of the unelected U.N. world dictatorship by denying to the U.S. Congress any voice in the arbitrary and capricious use of American troops.

For these reasons, I have introduced H.R. 11465 calling for complete repeal of the U.N. Participation Act of 1945 as amended, in all aspects. Why talk democracy and human rights yet deprive the elected representatives of the mothers and dads from performing their obligation under the Constitution by having any voice in the determination of who and where our troops are committed and what we are fighting for or against?

Mr. Speaker, I insert the Chicago Tribune release of July 21 following my remarks:

NOW THEY'RE AFTER SOUTH AFRICA AGAIN

Stalled in its efforts to get back at Israel, the Afro-Asian clique in the United Nations has reverted to its crusade against South Africa. The special U.N. committee on "apartheid" has chosen this moment—as if the U.N. didn't have enough trouble already—to issue a detailed analysis of what a U.N. expeditionary force would be up against if it were to attack South Africa.

The communist-Arab coalition would no doubt welcome a face-saving diversion of activity just now, and the South African squabble is made to order for their purposes. The report was prepared by Abdulrahim Farah of Somalia, which is particularly sympathetic with the left-wing Arabs, and it states that South Africa has doubled its military strength since 1961, when the Afro-Asians started their campaign to punish South Africa for its domestic racial policies and to throw the South Africans out of South-West Africa, the former German territory which was given to them under a League of Nations mandate.

The report says that South Africa has also established a citizen force which will soon reach 100,000 and is manned thru compulsory military service.

The implication is that the longer the U.N. delays, the harder it will be to bring South Africa to its knees. Two years ago the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace belied its name by publishing what amounted to a battle plan for U.N. collective measures against South Africa. It contemplated a 30-day blitzkrieg with 93,000 ground troops and, as an alternative, a six-month naval and air blockade. The first would cost 94 million dollars, according to the study; the second 166 million.

Presumably the cost in men and money would be considerably higher now, but the Somalian report says nothing about who would provide this force. The hope, obviously, is that if the U.N. votes to undertake this absurd task, the United States will be maneuvered into supporting it. After all, we supported the resolution calling for a U.N. take-over in South-West Africa, and how else could it be carried out?

This question should have been asked before we got into the squabble in the first place. Having failed to do so, we had better make it abundantly clear now that we do not intend to get mixed up in a war against South Africa and that the Afro-Asians are on a dead-end road if they are counting on it. The gesture is as futile as nearly everything else that the U.N. has undertaken.

Dickey-Lincoln School Federal Power Project in Maine

SPEECH

OF

HON. G. ROBERT WATKINS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 25, 1967

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 11641) making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, the Panama Canal, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Atlantic-Pacific Interoceanic Canal Study Commission, the Delaware River Basin Commission, Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and the Water Resources Council, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. Chairman, despite the fact that in 1965 the Dickey-Lincoln project was rejected in the House by a record vote, it also came in for heavy criticism in 1966, another attempt has been made to fund it in the Public Works and Atomic Energy Commission Appropriation Act for 1968.

I cannot, in good conscience, support a proposal which I do not consider economically feasible. A statement made by the Electric Coordinating Council of New England last month that the project would mean both higher rates and higher taxes, plus the fact that the House Appropriations Committee staff report had "no recommendation" would seem to substantiate the contention of "economically unsound," and thus vindicate our position.

According to one of my worthy colleagues, who has made a painstaking and careful study of the project, it also would require a treaty with the Government of Canada to compensate them for flooded lands. Canada undoubtedly would demand some of the benefits, and until we could know just how much we would have to give our neighbor north of the border, no cost-benefit figures are realistic.

Mr. Chairman, we are faced with a huge Federal deficit and an ever-mounting cost of the tragic war in Vietnam. We cannot in justice deny our men over there anything which is needed for their survival, so we must pare to the bone all unnecessary spending at home. My efforts to defeat this project are predicated upon the need to save the taxpayers' money by refusing to fund a proposal where they would not get adequate returns for the amount expended.

President of Tennessee Municipal League Pushes Fight for Balanced Program of Government Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 27, 1967

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Robert A. McNees, president of the Tennessee Municipal League and a city councilman of Oak Ridge, emphasizes efforts to develop a balanced program of services at all levels of government in the July issue of Tennessee Town and City. Because of the interest of my colleagues and the American people in this most important matter, I include Mr. McNees' review in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

LEAGUE PRESIDENT REVIEWS 1966–67

(By Robert A. McNees, president, Tennessee Municipal League)

The Intergovernmental Committee of the Tennessee Municipal League and Tennessee County Services Association has become well recognized and respected throughout the state as the joint legislative agency of the two local government associations. We did not have a perfect score card in the recent Legislative session, but our program fared reasonably well. Adding this year's accomplishments to those of past sessions produces a really remarkable and impressive record.

Tennessee's cities and counties have adopted the position that there must be a balanced program of services at all levels of government in all areas of our state. We have urged recognition of the fact that there is a multiplicity of demands upon the public dollar, and that each interest should be treated fairly. In this endeavor we have had the cooperation of our friends in county government and generally, of the state government.

There is one disturbing situation bearing on this general philosophy of balanced governmental services which I feel constrained to mention. I refer to the continuing effort by organized education interests to deprive municipal governments of their lawful share of local county-wide sales taxes.

FORMULA CONSIDERED FAIR TO ALL

In virtually every county where the local sales tax has come to a vote, a vigorous campaign has been mounted by school officials and others to persuade the municipalities to surrender some or all of their revenue.

Let me make it perfectly clear that this is not the work of the Tennessee County Services Association. Our League and the County

Services Association agreed—when we jointly sponsored the enabling legislation—that the distribution formula in the law is equitable in the absence of unusual local circumstances.

This formula recognizes that counties have primary responsibility for public education, and it allocates all the first half of collections to the county for school purposes. The second one-half, under the formula, is divided according to whether the sales were made inside a municipality or outside. This part of the formula recognizes that there are many other demands upon local government in adition to public schools, and that local governments will funnel all new revenues into one service only at the expense of neglecting others.

The local sales tax is the only sizable new revenue source available to municapilities for many years—perhaps in our lifetime. However, public schools have been receiving increasingly large amounts of outside assistance from the state and federal governments. This is sure to continue.

The League in no case proposes to try to tell a municipality what it should do with its revenues. This is a matter for local decision. We are concerned that all municipal officials understand their rights under the law.

In most instances over the nation—in about 90 per cent of the some 3,000 locally-levied sales taxes—this is a municipal revenue source. The cities levy and keep all of the proceeds for muncipal purposes. We feel that the Tennessee formula is certainly equitable—even generous to other governmental interests. . . .

WON SOME, LOST SOME

The 1967 session of the General Assembly was unlike any other General Assembly we have seen in 27 years our League has been in existence.

We must admit some failures in the General Assembly. Some of our Intergovernmental Committee's program—the Local Government Platform—was enacted. Other bills are still in committee, to be considered again next year. None of our bills was killed outright. However, cuts in the Governor's state budget mainly reduced state funds for cities and counties.

On the success side of the ledger, here are some of the bills supported by our League which were enacted:

Utility franchise tax bill, aimed at preventing $15 millions of annual local losses as a result of court-ordered equalization of property assessments.

Statewide reappraisal bills, and bills aimed at strengthening the office of the tax assessor and helping local governments meet some of the tax loss from utility property.

Sewage treatment grants bill, authorizing the state to participate in the federal Clean Water program with 25 per cent grants for local projects—thereby reducing the local share from the present 70 per cent to 25 per cent. Unfortunately, however, no money for this purpose was appropriated!

Interlocal contracts bill, authorizing cities and counties to contract with each other, and with governments in other states, for activities they already are authorized to do separately.

Ambulance service bill, authorizing cities and counties to operate ambulance services, or to contract with private operators, and to regulate ambulance service.

Also—although TML had no policy position on the matter—many municipal officials were interested in the new laws permitting elections on legalized sale of mixed drinks in metropolitan areas and municipal option (rather than county-wide option) on operation of retail liquor stores.

Two pieces of bad legislation failed to pass. One was the rural electric cooperatives' bill to permit co-ops to continue serving customers who were annexed by a municipality. The other was the bill to permit local school boards to call a referendum on school budgets if the city or county did not approve them as submitted.

SERIOUS THREAT, MAJOR VICTORY

The rural co-ops' bill represented the most serious threat to municipal annexation and service rights since enactment of our nationally-acclaimed annexation law in 1955. If this dangerous precedent had been established—that of denying a municipality the right to grant a franchise or to acquire at fair prices the property of electric co-ops in annexed areas—then the way would have been cleared for depriving municipalities of any and all utility franchise and service rights. Annexation would become financially impossible and politically unaccepable.

IRRESPONSIBILITY, NOT INDEPENDENCE

The school budget referendum bill was opposed by our Intergovernmental Committee—as it has been in the past two sessions. The entire principle of throwing every budget issue up to referendum approval—which is what the bill invited—is unsound governmentally. Especially damaging was the provision of the bill allowing a school board to call a referendum on an increased school budget, overriding the budget approved by the county or city governing body—without including a vote on the necessary property tax increase to provide the additional money.

This is not fiscal independence, as some proponents of the bill have argued. Instead, it is fiscal irresponsibility. It amounts to passing the buck from the school board to the local governing body to reduce budgets for other functions or to levy a tax increase.

Only one bad bill was enacted—the tort liability bill requiring local governments to provide counsel for firemen and policemen and pay any damages awarded to a maximum of $50,000 for any person or $100,000 for any accident, except for willfull wrongdoing or punitive damages.

Air Safety and Noise Abatement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT TENZER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1967

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, congressional hearings are now being held on the problem of air safety. The recent tragedy at Hendersonville, N.C., which involved a collision between a small private plane—a twin-engine Cessna—and a Peidmont Airlines jetliner—a Boeing 727—dramatized the need for this congressional inquiry.

Since 1956 there have been 199 air accidents resulting in 669 deaths. Of these accidents, 160 involved general—private and executive—aviation planes. Of all air accidents, 75 percent involve private craft and the most recent tragedy took the lives of 81 persons, including the Secretary-designate of the Navy and his family.

Mr. Speaker, I have often addressed my colleagues in the House on the question of aircraft noise abatement. I want to make it clear today that I see no inconsistency in pursuing air safety and noise abatement with equal energy—remembering at all times that there can be no compromise with safety.

For urgent reasons of safety I suggest that the Federal Aviation Administration give serious thought to the diversion of all general aviation flights to secondary airfields.

In the New York metropolitan area I would support a ban on all private aircraft at Kennedy, La Guardia, and Newark Airports and a diversion of these aircraft to such secondary airfields as MacArthur Field in Suffolk County, Westchester County Airport, and Teterboro Airport in New Jersey, as well as others.

The great increase in air traffic at the major airports in the New York metropolitan area has made the joint use of these airports by both commercial and private craft an extremely hazardous business. About 75 percent of all air accidents involve general aviation aircraft, and I fear a repetition of the North Carolina tragedy at Kennedy or La Guardia because of the large number of private craft using these facilities.

There has been no evidence that aircraft noise abatement procedures have affected safety of aircraft. While safety must be the primary goal, I believe we can also establish noise abatement procedures without compromising on safety. The Secretary of Tarnsportation should use all his administrative existing authority to accomplish both these ends.

Results of Legislative Questionnaire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES V. SMITH

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 27, 1967

Mr. SMITH of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, as a freshman Member of this body I feel that in order for me to truly reflect the wishes of the people of southwestern Oklahoma who elected me that I should have the benefit of their viewpoint on many of the serious issues which we have, and are to face, in the 90th Congress.

In keeping with this, I forwarded to my district approximately 190,000 questionnaires listing questions which I thought would better enable me to represent those who elected me last November. To date my office has received over 18,000 replies which have been computed by my staff.

As well, the State Legislature of Oklahoma has recently seen fit to redistrict the State of Oklahoma, and because of this I also sent a separate questionnaire to four new counties in the newly created Fourth Congressional District in order to allow the citizens of Oklahoma, McClain, Cleveland, and Pottawatomie Counties to express their viewpoint. The results from these counties has been most gratifying.

Mr. Speaker, unless there is objection I include both of these questionnaires verbatim in the Record, along with the results computed by my staff:

Dear Friend: Since the State Legislature has seen fit to include your county within the new 4th District in which I will seek re-election in 1968, I hope that I am not being too presumptuous in asking your opinion on many of the serious issues in the 90th Congress.

In keeping with the concept that Government should be responsive to the the will of the people, I am asking you as an American citizen to advise me on these problem. These are only a few of the important issues facing our nation; but I would appreciate your answering the questions below, and making any comments you might have on the back of this sheet. It is not necessary for you to sign your name; but if you do, you can be assured that it will be kept confidential.

Sincerely yours,

James V. Smith.

RESULTS FROM THE PRESENT 6TH DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA (23 COUNTIES)

	Yes		No		No opinion	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
1. Should the United States—						
(a) Escalate the war in Vietnam?	3,080	77				
(b) Evacuate our forces in Vietnam?	360	9				5
(c) Continue a limited war in Vietnam?	360	9			200	
2. Under prevailing conditions, should the United States encourage trade with the alined Communist countries?	760	19	3,040	76	200	5
3. Do you feel that a serious effort should be made to reduce less essential Federal spending in preference to a Federal income tax increase?	3,640	91	280	7	80	2
4. Should a tax credit be allowed parents supporting students in college?	2,880	72	1,000	25	120	3
5. Do you favor removing the ceiling on earnings of persons receiving social security or veterans pensions?	880	72	1,000	25	120	3
6. Should the voting age be lowered to 18?	1,400	35	2,520	63	80	2
7. Do you favor the bussing of students between schools in order to bring about racial balance?	280	7	3,560	89	160	4
8. Do you favor the present minimum wage laws?	1,800	45	1,880	47	320	8
9. Do you favor Federal gun laws regulating the sale of weapons in interstate commerce?	1,640	41	2,200	55	160	4
10. Do you feel the present Secretary of Agriculture's policies and programs are in the best interest of the farmer?	520	13	2,440	61	1,040	26

Note: Total, 4,000.

Dear Friend: You and I are faced with many serious issues in the 90th Congress. In keeping with the concept that Government should be responsive to the will of the people. I am asking you as an American citizen to advise me on these problems. These are only a few of the important issues facing our nation; but I would appreciate your answering the questions below, and making any comments you might have on the back of this sheet. It is not necessary for you to sign your name; but if you do, you can be assured that it will be kept confidential.

Sincerely yours,

James V. Smith.

RESULTS FROM THE PRESENT 6TH DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA (23 COUNTIES)

	Yes		No		No opinion	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
1. Should the United States—						
(a) Escalate the war in Vietnam?	9,520	68				
(b) Evacuate our forces in Vietnam?	1,960	14				9
(c) Continue a limited war in Vietnam?	1,260	9			1,260	
2. Under prevailing conditions, should the United States encourage trade with the alined Communist countries?	2,380	17	10,640	76	980	7
3. Do you feel that a serious effort should be made to reduce less essential Federal spending in preference to a Federal income tax increase?	13,300	95	420	3	280	2
4. Should a tax credit be allowed parents supporting students in college?	9,960	69	3,500	25	840	6
5. Do you favor removing the ceiling on earnings of persons receiving social security or veterans pensions?	9,800	70	3,640	26	560	4
6. Should the voting age be lowered to 18?	4,200	30	9,380	67	420	3
7. Do you favor the bussing of students between schools in order to bring about racial balance?	1,400	10	10,920	78	1,680	12
8. Do you favor the present minimum wage laws?	6,440	46	6,300	45	1,260	9
9. Do you favor Federal gun laws regulating the sale of weapons in interstate commerce?	6,440	46	6,860	49	700	5
10. Do you feel the present Secretary of Agriculture's policies and programs are in the best interest of the farmer?	2,100	15	9,380	67	2,520	18

Note: Total, 14,000.

Eshkol Praises Johnson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 27, 1967

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I have had nothing but the highest praise for the way in which President Johnson handled the Middle East situation.

A recent article in the Jewish Press relates the text of an interview given by Prime Minister Levi Eshkol. In the interview, the Prime Minister expressed his satisfaction with the position of our President and the Nation in the recent crisis.

I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article which appeared in the July 21, 1967, edition of the Jewish Press:

Eshkol Praises Johnson Highly

Jerusalem.—The Jewish Press has received the exact text of an interview given by Prime Minister Levi Eshkol last week in which he dealt with various problems concerning Israel. Two vital areas were not mentioned in any of the United States newspapers but shed light on the feelings of the Israeli government leaders concerning the world situation.

Despite certain dissatisfactions in certain American Jewish circles with the conduct of President Lyndon B. Johnson during the recent crisis in the Middle East, Eshkol made it clear that he warmly thanked the United States for its actions.

In reply to the question "Are you satisfied with the stand of the United States" Premier Eshkol answered:

"I think, that the Americans and President Johnson are deserving of a hearty vote of thanks."

In addition, Eshkol made an unusually frank and bitter attack on the Soviet Union when said:

"I can describe the conduct of the Soviet Union in no other way than wicked . . . I cannot even for a moment think that the Russians did not understand the consequences of the Egyptian military buildup in the Sinai desert, the closing of the Straits of Tiran and the flights of planes over our borders and I cannot for a second imagine that they did not realize the truth and therefore I cannot help but consider their conduct and acts as wicked acts against Israel and the Jewish people throughout the world."

The Rats Come Every Night

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 27, 1967

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, on July 20 this body considered the question of proposed rat control legislation. This legislation was in effect rejected by the House with the defeat of a resolution to open general debate on the bill. At that time a number of my distinguished colleagues seemed to find a certain degree of levity in the situation, and expressed themselves in a manner which might have been more appropriate the day before when dealing with the so-called antiriot legislation. I feel strongly that the only levity which arises from this situation is the ironic humor which I feel as I view a representative body that can one day, aroused to a fever pitch, pass legislation which completely fails to deal with the principal causes of our urban crisis, and then the next day refuse to even consider legislation which would attack a problem that contributes significantly to the conditions of this unrest.

Certain of my colleagues also seemed to feel that the major factor in the problem of rat control is the unwillingness of the individuals most directly concerned in this situation to initiate action which would fully utilize the resources at hand to remedy the problem. Today I wish to introduce into the RECORD a recent article by the highly respected journalist Jimmy Breslin. In this article, which appeared in the Washington Post of July 25, Mr. Breslin describes a case of very highly motivated, imaginative individual action, which, for a variety of reasons, fails to solve the individual's problem, save for the moment.

I feel that this article presents the problem in a light which was overlooked by many in the debate of July 20. It illustrates the seriousness of a situation which plagues many Americans daily. Though the article describes only one household in New York City, I would certainly deem it unfortunate should my colleagues feel that these problems are necessarily restricted to one household, or to one neighborhood, or even to one city. The article follows:

HARLEM'S ENDLESS BATTLE—THE RATS COME EVERY NIGHT

(By Jimmy Breslin)

NEW YORK.—At eight o'clock at night, the rats come up from the spaces around the sewer pipes under the boiler room where they have slept all day. They cling to the big rusted pipe and come up into the boiler room and then they start up the pipes which are inside the walls of the five-story tenement. The rats come for food and water in the apartments where the people live.

As the rats crawled through the building, many of the people who live at 220 East 111th St. in the part of New York called East Harlem were out on the sidewalk. Many of them talked about the trouble of the night before, when a man with a knife was killed by a cop up at the corner.

The neighborhood made the first motions towards a riot, then stopped when Mayor Lindsay arrived and plunged into the crowd. Now, two games of dice were played by men standing in semi-circles around the bottom of the stoop. Four men sat on milk boxes around a card table playing dominoes. Pedro Perdomo, in a yellow polo shirt and floppy field worker's hat, sat on a car fender and pounded a bongo drum held between his knees.

"Yare, yare," he sang out.

"Caro," four people yelled back.

TAKES OFF SHOE

Upstairs, in apartment three on the third floor, Cathy Marrero shrieked. Her husband Ebro broke in a smile. They had just chased two rats from under the kitchen sink and the rats had run into the bathroom and Ebro had slammed the door on them. Now, Ebro said. Now I have them. The rats always stay in the bathroom, licking water from the tub. They never crawl out of the room. Ebro bent down and took off his left shoe.

"Ha," he said.

"Here," his wife said. She handed him a flatiron. Ebro shook his head no. He held the shoe up in his right hand and opened the bathroom door slowly, and slid inside. He slammed the door behind him. He began shouting, "Ho, ha, ho," while he beat the two rats in the bathtub to death with the shoe. The shoe sounded hollow against the sides of the bathtub.

Ebro opened the door and came out, his face and arms glistening with sweat. He pointed to the rats inside, in the bathtub. They were very small rats for East Harlem. They were much larger than mice, but still very small for East Harlem, where rats are very big.

"You came just in time," Ebro said.

"Do you chase them like this every night?" he was asked.

DOING THE DISHES

"Every night? How could you work in the morning if you do this?" He said. "They just came this time right out under the sink while my wife is doing the dishes. She started chasing them. So I chase too."

His wife came in with a handbrush and a paper bag. She swept the two dead rats into a paper bag. She reached over and emptied the two dead rats out of the paper bag and into the toilet. She flushed the toilet. She put the paper bag into the bathtub. Ebro lit a match and set the bag on fire. After the paper bag burned away, his wife took a bottle of disinfectant from the shelf and poured it all over the bathtub. The disinfectant smelled strong and Ebro left.

He walked out to the living room while his wife scrubbed the bathtub. To get to the living room you go first into the kitchen, then through two rooms that have no doors or windows. A bed, and a crib next to it, was in each room. You come out into a small front room that has a linoleum floor. A broken couch, two rocking chairs and a stuffed chair covered with a plastic filled the small room.

A framed Army discharge certificate and pictures of John F. Kennedy and the Sacred Heart were on the wall over the couch. The two sooty windows were open to the hot air of the street and the sound of the bongo drum.

"The rates come every night?" Ebro was asked.

"All night long," he said. "You see into the kitchen from here? See the refrigerator? I have two by four wood holding it up. That is so we can get underneath it with a broom to chase the rats when they get under it."

"Don't you use a rat trap or poison?"

"The children," he said. "You cannot have traps and poison around with babies. No. Nobody uses traps because everybody has babies. Have you ever smelled a rat when he dies under the floorboards or between the walls? No way to get him out."

"Why don't you try cats?"

CAT DISAPPEARS

He smiled. "The janitor got this big cat and put him in the boiler room. One morning he told me to come and look. There was cat fur all around the boiler room. And no cat. Huh. There are rats in the boiler room bigger than any cat."

"A dog then?" "Sometimes dogs are good, sometimes they're not." "Is more trouble than it's worth anyway. There are so many rats in this neighborhood for anything to work."

Ebro is 27. He works for the Railway Express Agency. His wife came into the room with cans of beer. Ebro and his wife sat and drank from the cans.

"Our baby is only three weeks," she said. "We keep him in bed with us. The other two, we have the crib set up high. No rats come there so far. But you still can't leave a baby alone."

"Has anybody been bitten by them?"

"Who hasn't?" Ebro said.

"What do you do when you get bitten?"

"Nothing," he said. "Oh, some people have had to go to the doctor. But with me, only nips."

"Come into the kitchen and be quiet and you hear them," his wife said.

SOUNDS IN THE WALLS

We went into the kitchen and drank beer from the cans and listened for what seemed like a long time but was only 10 minutes. Then there was this sound in the walls. A scratching sound. The tumbling, scrambling sound when one of the rats moved quickly.

It is a sound by itself. And when you are young, and you sleep on the side of the bed next to the wall and the rats scratch against the wall at your ear, you carry the sound with you for the rest of your life. It is something that is heard by people in every poor neighborhood in every city in the Nation. And it is one of the reasons why this is our longest of summers. Last week, the House of Representatives thought it all was a cause for laughter.

Present State of NATO Command

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 27, 1967

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, preoccupied as we are daily with our domestic problems, we at times forget that where forces of division seem to erect problems for us on the one hand, there are those areas where constant vigilance by NATO seeks to protect the kind of life we call democracy. As chairman of the Republican Committee on Western Alliances, I was pleased to read an article by Edgar Ansel Mowrer recently where he describes his impressions of the present state of the NATO command, now located in Belgium.

I should like to include the article entitled "SHAPE Headquarters at Casteau Aware of Russian Menace":

SHAPE HEADQUARTERS AT CASTEAU AWARE OF RUSSIAN MENACE

CASTEAU, BELGIUM.—Perhaps the best way to strengthen the North Atlantic Treaty Organization upon whose military might the future of the entire West depends, would be for the sceptics among our allies to visit the new home of SHAPE, 28 miles southwest of Brussels. For there they could not help learning that the Supreme Allied Commander Europe, General Lyman L. Lemnitzer, and his many allied associates are under instructions to defend the integrity of the member countries by all necessary means.

If this includes the use of first-strike nuclear weapons, so much the worse for the aggressor.

In Berlin, the U.S. minister, Brewster Morris, remarked to me that he was weary of the opinion voiced by certain of our allies, beginning with President de Gaulle, that the United States would never risk the destruction of American cities to save, say, Denmark.

A few hours in Casteau has convinced me that Morris is right: it is high time that our President ceased saying that the United States would "never strike first" when he knows that Washington and NATO reserve the right to meet any form of aggression by all necessary means even if this means using nuclear weapons first.

WOULD STRENGTHEN NATO

It would clear the air, silence the nuclear appeasers at home and do more than anything else imaginable to restore to NATO the vitality it had under President Eisenhower.

For SHAPE has not only successfully made the painful move from Rocquencourt, France, to Casteau, Belgium (at President de Gaulle's insistence) and nine months after the choice of that place, is well on the road to complete installation.

What was until last October, a one-and-a-quarter-square-miles piece of woods and training ground for Belgian troops has now become the working quarters of 3,100 SHAPE employees, 50 per cent of them Americans. Eighteen new buildings with more to come, houses for the members and their families both on the spot and in five neighboring villages, a number of apartments, all these are creating an impressive SHAPE complex which the contractors hope to finish before the end of this year. They thus reveal the earnestness with which the Supreme Allied Commander Europe and his foreign associates are steadily strengthening their preparations to deter if possible and to win if necessary any war launched by communist aggressors.

ON WORLD AFFAIRS AWARE OF RED DANGER

Not since I visited the American nuclear command at Omaha have I had such an impression of strength and determination on our side.

Moreover, it seems to me, nothing would do American and European appeasers and wishful thinkers more good than to spend a few hours listening to the SHAPE members describing what could be a growing rather than a diminishing Soviet danger.

The reasons are two. In the first place, these people know about all there is to know concerning the Soviet Union's rapidly increasing military buildup. And in the second place, unlike most civilian Kremlinologists in America, they pay attention only to what the Soviets do, never to what they say. For they note that even while at the United Nations, Soviet leaders glorify peace, they are furnishing 90 per cent of the arms used by North Vietnam and the Viet Cong and have committed themselves to the use of Russian naval force if necessary against Israel and have embarked upon a political-military campaign the aim of which is the exclusion of Western strategical and commercial interests from the entire Middle East, with the overthrow of the remaining pro-Western governments.

Compared with this fact, what Kosygin, Brezhnev and other Kremlin double-talkers say is just so much eye-wash.

This realism is unfortunately virtually unique in Western Europe and it seems to be becoming rare in America. So long as it exists at Casteau, free men everywhere can sleep more soundly.

A Time of Uncertain Sounds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
Hon. G. V. (SONNY) MONTGOMERY
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 25, 1967

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following sermon delivered by the Reverend Doctor Walter E. Courtenay at the First Presbyterian Church in Nashville, Tenn.:

A TIME OF UNCERTAIN SOUNDS

This morning I call your attention to a great text, "If the trumpet give an uncertain sound, who shall prepare himself for the battle?" I use this text because we are meeting in a time of uncertain sounds. We lack current trumpets that alert us, arouse us, and direct us toward the duties that are certainly ours as citizens, and as members of the Christian Church.

We are told that military trumpets were used by the Roman cavalry, and ceased to be used when the Empire fell. We know that the ancient shofar, the ram's horn or the cow's horn, was used by the Israelites in both battles and religious services. It is interesting that drums, until recent years, were used by both the armies and the navies of the world in the ordering of responsibilities. During the War Between the States, it was the drum that called men to action, to advance and to retreat. Drums continued to be prominent until the 16th century, but in the 17th century the bugle came into existence to be a louder, clearer voice of command.

I grew up to the sound of bugles, and bugles have always had specific meanings for me.

It was the bugle that announced reveille, time to get up. It was the bugle that announced chow time. It was the bugle that commanded advance, that ordered the charge, that announced retreat in battle, the retreat of the colors, and sounded taps when the day was done. With buglers there was no place for confusion. They were supposed to know the call to be used, and to use that call in response to a definite order. Each call was definite, distinct, and decisive, and those trained under the sound of the bugle were supposed to hear and to promptly obey.

The whole of life needs such an ordering. Only such an ordering can make for organization, sure purpose, unity and purposive progress. It is something we need in our own personal lives. For, as Christians, we, above all the peoples of the world, are supposed to hear and to obey the trumpets of God. As Christians, we are also supposed to remember that our own personal lives are bugles, bugles that say something to the world, and through which God is striving to say something to all mankind.

Your life and mine is a trumpet in our society, a bugle, if you please. It has a distinct place in America today. Yet, many of the bugle calls of our personal lives are muted. Many are unclear. Many are creating disorder rather than order. Many are sounding the charge when the mess-call is all that is needed. Many are announcing retreat when the charge is what is in order. Many are sounding taps when it ought to be reveille.

Each life that is Christian in any deep sense ought to know the trumpet calls of God, and the trumpet calls of responsibility. Each life ought to avoid confusion in the use of the calls, and each life ought to avoid indecision. "For if the trumpet gives an uncertain sound----."

That which is true of the individual life is certainly true of *government*. It is very difficult for us in our day to know what our government is saying. We are bewildered as we try to decide whether what is being sounded is for the national good, or merely for the advantage of the Administration in power or the one that is trying to get into power.

I turn, for example, to *the crime problem in Washington, D.C.*, the capital city of this nation. One of our Congressmen, a few weeks ago, wrote his constituents urging them not to come to Washington this summer on vacation because, he said, the streets are unsafe. One can believe it when he stops to realize that as bad as the crime situation was in Washington in 1966, it has now worsened to the extent of 41%.

I hear no clear trumpet in Washington calling men to do something definite and concrete about the situation that exists there. Unfortunately, in a time when our Negro people are striving for recognition, places of responsibility, and the opportunity of participating to a larger degree in the life of this nation, most of the offenders in Washington are of that race. This, unfortunately, is true in all the large cities across America today, a definite embarrassment to the better people in the Negro race, a definite embarrassment to our government, a definite embarrassment to all of us. We are tolerating these people to say and do things today that would not be tolerated if they were white, all, I presume, for the sake of votes rather than the ordering and re-ordering of society. Such activities are not caused by poverty or lack of educational opportunity, but primarily because of meanness in human nature, laziness, and the desire to loot and to destroy. There is something quite different between a quiet demonstration and a riot that burns down buildings, loots stores, and forces businesses to close their doors, and unless there is a trumpet call in America now to put an end to this stupidity, we are headed for anarchy, and we will be unable to save our nation from that minority of our people, white and black, which is unworthy of citizenship within this nation.

I turn also to our *welfare program*. It is amazing that in spite of the millions of dollars that we have spent on slum clearance, and on welfare, that the slums continue, and they grow larger. But, you see, slums, to some degree, are internal states in people and not just social phenomena, and the recipients of modern welfare are now organizing themselves into unions and committees for no other purpose than to get larger handouts from the federal government. I hear no clear trumpet out of Washington calling upon our people to resort to self-help, self-reliance and self-respect, the blessed trinity of Americanism that built so much greatness into this nation in its yesterdays.

We are living in a time when we are striving to do something about waste in America. We are striving to find solutions to the problems of air pollution and water pollution, but we are doing very little about the pollution of society by worthless people. We are spending millions of dollars annually to find answers to the problems of industrial wastes and community wastes, but we refuse to recognize that there is also in society human wastes.

It seems to me to be a pertinent fact of existence that a certain percentage of human beings are bound to end up as waste materials. In spite of all the help offered by homes, schools, churches, communities, psychiatrists, sociologists, and government agencies, a certain percentage is bound to end up being non-productive non-constructive, non-cooperative, wrongly motivated and wrongly willed. We do not like it, it is a conclusion most of us refuse to reach, but it seems to me that this is a conclusion that demands recognition.

Our concept of hell came to us from a place named Gehenna, a place just outside the city of Jerusalem, which was in reality the city dump. Into Gehenna they poured the wastes of the city, and there it was burned. Surely there must be in society a place for human wastes, for those human beings who are wastes as a result of the misuse of life. What to do with such I do not know, but to recognize the waste as a fact is in itself a beginning.

Man is always going to be accompanied by the problem of waste—wasted time, wasted efforts, wasted opportunities, wasted bodies, wasted minds, wasted souls. Man will always be plagued by the problem of sewage. In our day we strive to come to grips with the problem of the pollution of air and water, but what about the pollution of society and the people who constitute that pollution? The greatest pollution of our day is not of air or water, but of society.

We have been having some difficulties in Nashville with the Presbyterian-sponsored Market Place, a program created to deal with the hippies, the hoppies, the beatniks, and the useless. One congregation in this city is split asunder because of this program, and our own Session has asked Presbytery to close the Market Place and to re-direct our funds to the support of the Monroe Harding Children's Home. Presbytery has the total program under study and we await the outcome of its serious considerations. The sponsors have defended the program as a Christian attempt to reach these people for Christ, but as far as I know there has been no overt Christian emphasis in the program, no converts to Christ, and no persons added to the church or community usefulness. This concern for the unwashed, the unshaved, the unshorn, and the uninterested, may be worthy of our praise, but we have every right to question the methods used. But sometime soon we ought to become interested in congregations of normal people and not merely the abnormal few, the victim rather than the criminal, the raped rather than the rapist, the murdered rather than the murderer. The lessons learned in the Market Place demand a new program and a new emphasis.

In every society there is bound to be human wastes, and there is not much we can do about it, but let us recognize it. It seems to me that every American ought to know garbage when he sees it and smells it, and we do not need a government program to help us recognize it, although we may need a program to teach us how to deal with it.

I turn now to *Vietnam, and the Great Society,* where our national prestige stands versus votes in 1968. Our people are divided concerning Vietnam simply because there is no clear, certain trumpet being sounded. There has been no declaration of war. There has been no harnessing of our powers to win. The nation is not behind the effort—not really! The only positive trumpet sound I hear in our day is Jewish, not American, and they have earned the right to freedom and to space. They have proved that right by what they have done agriculturally, industrially, educationally and culturally within the boundary lines of Israel. Anyone who has been to Israel or has read much about it must recognize the fact that they have used their time, their talents and their money better than any other nation on the face of the earth, including the United States of America.

The Vietnam war ought to end, but it must end on a note of victory for the West. It must end with victory on the side of those who have been willing to confront communism in the jungles, and until there is a clear trumpet sound in the United States that is free of political considerations, our sons are going to continue to fight, to suffer, and to die in the jungles of southeast Asia, without any hope of our ever winning.

It seems to me that we have to decide which is to receive the concentrated attention of our people, the war in Vietnam or the programs that make permissivenes a destructive part of every area of domestic life. So much of our time and concern are being consumed by complainers and complaints that do not really matter. So much is spent on placating those who make no valid contribution to any part of American life that I wonder when we are going to honor those who are loyal rather than those who are disloyal, those who are patriotic rather than those who lack patriotism, those who are for God, country and peace, rather than those who are for indecency, atheism, disorder, and a dole society.

Our nation cannot go on permitting people to flaunt law and order, and there must be an end to the burning and looting of business establishments. But where does one hear a trumpet sounding a clear call to put an end to our complacency and stupidity? There must be an end to the molesting of citizens and the increase of crime, but where do you hear a trumpet calling us to order? Authority continues to deteriorate, vulgarity and sloppiness continue to increase. There is a continuing irresponsibility among the leaders of Negroes, teenagers, college students, yes, and college administrators, that is frightening, and the big trumpets are silent or sounding calls that do not make sense to rational men.

I then turn to *the church.* The church was established and organized by God to be His trumpet. As long as the trumpet continues to give an uncertain sound, who is going to prepare himself for anything?

We have a Book, and that Book is supposed to be our text of truth. It is our only depository of the divine revelation made to us by God through Jesus of Nazareth. It is our only authority for the church's existence, the church's message, and the church's mission. It is the only hope we have of a better world and a better day.

What does the Book say? The Book has much to say about God as the Creating God, much to say about God as a Creative Person, God as a Revealing God, God as a Redemptive God. It also makes clear that God is a God of law, a God of discipline, and a God of punishment. Last, our God is a helpless God, for if people will not heed His call, if people will not obey His commandments, if people will not follow His path, if people will not emulate His example, if people will not seek to fulfill His purposes, if people will not trust His will, there is nothing He can do about it. He must let man make his choices and take the consequences, and so must we!

The Book in which we put our trust and from which we draw our purpose and our power is not obsolete. It has much to say to modern man, and nothing quite so essential as the fact that modern man, in spite of all, is still a sinful creature in need of the saving grace of Jesus Christ. And there is saving grace through faith in Him whom God did send! That is what the New Testament trumpet keeps saying. That is the church's convictions, even though our Christian lives carry all too little dampness born of baptism and the tears of Christ. We need faith in Jesus Christ to be modern! That is a fact! Above all else we need that, for we cannot rightly be related to one another until we are properly related to God.

About 30 years ago Fortune Magazine carried a very fine article saying that what modern man needs is the sound of a voice behind him, a voice he cannot ignore, a voice he dare not disobey, God's voice.

I remember, too, that the King of England, during the dark days of the war, speaking to his people around the world, said in conclusion, "And I said to the man who stood at the gate of the year, 'Give me a light that I may walk safely into the unknown,' and he replied, 'Go out into the darkness, and put your hand into the hand of God, and that shall be for you better than a light and safer than a known way.' "

What we need today are authoritative trumpets and people who understand the sound of the trumpet and the order that it brings. We need it in our own personal lives, we need it in our government, we need it in our society, we need it in the church. "For if the trumpet gives an uncertain sound, who shall prepare himself for the battle?"

I find it difficult to make my peace with much that is part of modern life, and I cannot help it, for you see I was trained in this fashion: if you are somebody you dress like it, if you are somebody you talk like it, if you are somebody you think like it, if you are somebody you walk like it, if you are somebody you worship like it, if you are somebody you work like it, and if you are nobody it just does not really matter! So I cannot get used to vulgarity, indecency, cheapness, shoddiness, sloppiness, lack of patriotism, immorality, disrespect for authority. and indifference to God. I cannot get used to it in the physical, social, moral, governmental, or economic lives of our people, and I pray God, therefore, that a trumpet is going to be sounded that no one can ignore, a trumpet that will harness us for battle, and will determine for us and for the future the security of this land, its purity and its progress, and in the end the peace and freedom of the world.

Oregon Legislature Memorializes Monmouth-Dallas Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WENDELL WYATT

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 27, 1967

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, Oregon is thought by many to be a State with abundant water. Actually we have a very real drought problem which is most acute during the peak growing season of the summer months.

These drought conditions present a major problem to Oregon farmers. This problem can be overcome by irrigation systems which provide year-round water to the fields and growing areas.

The Monmouth-Dallas irrigation project, now before the Congress is a program that would reclaim many acres of productive farmland for year-round use. The future of this project is of concern not only to myself, but to thousands of Oregonians as well. Economic benefits to be derived from the system would be tremendous.

The Oregon Legislature has acknowledged the need for this Monmouth-Dallas irrigation project through a memorial passed in this year's legislative session. I herewith present that memorial to the Congress:

ENROLLED SENATE JOINT MEMORIAL 8

To His Excellency, Lyndon B, Johnson, President of the United States, and to the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress Assembled:

We, your memorialists, the Fifty-fourth Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent as follows:

Whereas bills for the Monmouth-Dallas Irrigation Project have been introduced in the United States Senate and the United States House of Representatives; and

Whereas the feasibility report of the Bureau of Reclamation shows a high degree of benefit ratio to cost for irrigation, water quality control and fish and wild life; and

Whereas voters of Polk County have approved formation of the Monmouth-Dallas Irrigation District, which district contains more than the irrigable acres required for the feasibility of the project; and

Whereas local organizations interested in irrigation, water quality control and fish and wild life have approved the project; now, therefore,

Be It Resolved by the Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon:

(1) We urge the expeditious processing through the United States Senate, and the United State House of Representatives of the authorization of the project by the Congress of the United States.

(2) A copy of this memorial shall be sent to the President of the United States, the Secretary of the Interior and the Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation, chairmen of committees of Senate and House of the United States for Interior and Insular Affairs, and to each members of the Oregon Congressional Delegation.

OREGON STATE SENATE,
Salem, July 18, 1967.

Hon. WENDELL WYATT,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WYATT: Enrolled Senate Joint Memorial 8 adopted by the Oregon Legislature April 25, 1967 urging favorable, expeditious congressional action on the proposed Monmouth-Dallas Irrigation Project is officially transmitted to you with this letter.

While Oregon may enjoy a fairly enjoyable position regarding its water resource, quality, and supply, it is seriously lagging in its irrigation development.

Information published by the National Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts predicts for the year 2000 a need for a 50 percent increase in irrigation for agriculture to meet the projected national needs in foodstuffs. The development of the Monmouth-Dallas project is a feasible part of this program.

Your favorable action on the petition carried in this Memorial is most respectfully solicited.

Sincerely,

CECIL L. EDWARDS,
Secretary of the Senate.

A Time for Responsible Leadership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HERBERT TENZER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1967

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, the tragic and disgraceful outbreak of riots in the United States has produced chaos and confusion at the very levels of society where responsible leadership is most urgently needed.

The Congress has failed to establish an agenda of priorities to deal with the root causes of the riots—programs to eliminate slums, to provide better housing, better educational facilities, and to strengthen the attack on poverty. A modest proposal to assist local governments initiate rat-control programs was rejected. The House also sharply reduced or eliminated urgently needed housing legislation while passing a $4.6 billion public works program.

President Johnson has said:

> Pillage, looting, murder and arson have nothing to do with civil rights. They are criminal conduct.

It is obvious that the overwhelming majority of Americans — black and white—deplore and condemn these riots.

It is also painfully obvious that the overwhelming majority of Americans did not anticipate racial trouble or riots. A recent Gallup poll, conducted only 2 weeks ago, showed that 78 percent of the residents of selected big cities did not expect any outbreaks this summer.

The concept of achieving a better life by force, by violence, by civil war, must be nipped in the bud and replaced by a revitalized social concern for all people.

Our initial task is to solve the immediate problem by restoring law and order. I support the use of Federal troops when requested by the Governor to quiet civil disorder. But let us not make the tragic mistake of facing only the immediate problem and forgetting about the long-term needs of our communities.

It is clear that Federal laws which attempt only to prohibit riots will have no effect. The Federal Government can and must play a major role in assisting the States and local communities restore law and order and preventing further outbreaks of violence. Emphasis must be placed on preventive measures within Federal jurisdiction.

Responsible leadership at all levels of society must be recognized and heeded. The Negro community should listen to the responsible voices which advocate a nonviolent approach to the problems which have discouraged the disadvantaged.

Black power must be condemned—just as white power can no longer be tolerated. Leadership—responsible leadership—in the Negro community and the white community must be joined into a new and dynamic "American leadership."

The greatest danger lies in the attitude of complacency and apathy found in so many of our communities.

Next to every affluent community in America—within a stone's throw from wealth—there is a community in which disadvantaged and frustrated people live in substandard conditions. In many cases neighbors are blind to this shameful and inexcusable poverty. We are blind to what lies at our back door. We are blinded because we did not find the time or the energy to become involved. Now we are involved. The riots have shocked all of us. The disgraceful conditions which preceded them did not. Now we must open our eyes to these disgraceful conditions and eliminate them.

A small select group of leaders cannot cope with the complex and difficult problems which have brought about this situation of anarchy in areas of our Nation.

The leadership must come from the grassroots—from among the citizens who thus far refused to become involved.

While law enforcement officers perform their duties of quelling the riots, we in the Congress should place partisan politics aside and work together to pinpoint the basic problems and to assign to them the highest priorities. While we cannot solve the problem alone, we can avoid making this tragic situation the subject of partisan debate rather than bipartisan action.

But laws alone cannot change the attitudes of our people.

Presidential commissions, speeches in Congress, and committee investigations, while important, cannot replace a sincere display of concern and a willingness to become involved by the majority of Americans.

Formulas and laws are proposed and significantly these proposals deal with the structure of our society, but not with the substance—the people. The solution to the problems lies with the people and with a broad based responsible leadership.

We must dedicate ourselves to a new effort to create a concerned society—a society willing to become involved in an all-out attack on the basic problems of the people.

There are no easy answers, but that should not deter us from our responsibility to explore every avenue toward a better society.

There'll Always Be a Chautauqua

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES E. GOODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 27, 1967

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article written by Raymond Schuessler and entitled "There'll Always Be a Chautauqua" from the August 1967 edition of the Ford Times. It deals with Chautauqua Institution which I have the honor to represent in Congress:

> Teddy Roosevelt once said, "There is nothing so American as Chautauqua." The name had already become a legend in his day. Now, 94 years after its beginning, the original Chautauqua resort continues to present its lofty heritage of culture and recreation to capacity crowds each season.
>
> Chautauqua, 75 miles southwest of Buffalo, has a loyal patronage that has set attendance records the past three out of four years, reaching a new high last year. Plans already are in action to renovate much of the historic village which will celebrate its centennial in 1974. Half a million dollars has been put to such use since 1964 and two million more is being raised for the project. Private homes and the natural beauty of the grounds are being face-lifted for the beginning of another century.
>
> "Mother" Chautauqua (an appendage it dislikes but must endure for the numerous offspring it once bore) lives on because its "Idea"—a plea for universal education—never died. As one of its founders said: "A college is possible in everyday life if one chooses to use it; a college in house, shop, street, farm, for rich and poor, a curriculum which runs through all of life."
>
> Like a quaint old village, the legendary cultural center is fenced in from the outside world. Thus protected, it has changed little. Along its narrow, winding, well-shaded lanes are immaculate Victorian homes which were much the same when visited by Mark Twain, Teddy Roosevelt, General Grant and William Jennings Bryan, whose silver-voiced oratory stirred the nation and almost made him president. Admission is a mere $1.50 per day or $45 for the eight-week season.
>
> Of course, time and new executive blood have brought some changes in the conservative image of the resort. In the early days, absolutely no smoking was allowed and no one was permitted to leave the grounds on Sunday. Some modern homes have intruded on the scene among the rococo white houses, and well-shaped girls in brief bathing suits stroll along the hallowed paths in contrast to rules that formerly discouraged such attire.
>
> The College Club, situated on the lake behind the Miller Bell Tower, which is the symbol of Chautauqua, jumps on weekends to the music of assorted "in" groups. The High School Club holds teen-style dances on Tuesdays and Fridays.
>
> But one cannot mistake the cultural echos of another era. Thorughout the citadel of culture are imposing buildings of learning: the classic Hall of Philosophy, a Greek temple of pre-Parthenon architecture, the Great Amphitheatre which seats 6,500 and

where seven U.S. Presidents and hundreds of foreign dignitaries have spoken, the imposing Hall of Christ set on the edge of a woods—all combine to present the aura of an American Athens.

"Chautauqua is a condensed city," one resident said. "If you took any city with well-developed cultural institutions and removed the slums and other undesirable features to produce a model, you would have Chautauqua. Although I do not believe that a Utopia is possible, Chautauqua is as close to one as I have ever seen."

The spark that created Chautauqua occurred in 1874 when John H. Vincent and Lewis Miller thought it might be nice to hold clases for Sunday School teachers out of doors. The experiment was so successful that additional clases, concerts, lectures and entertainment were soon added. A half century later, some 200 imitation Chautauquas were operating wherever there was a lake and a receptive audience.

Another form of imitation, traveling Chautauquas, first appeared about 1904. Unlike the original, these were commercial affairs, though they, too, provided lectures, music and dramatic entertainment—in this case in circus tents for residents of small villages. They proved to be highly popular, as 12,000 of these traveling Chautauquas reached an audience of some 35,000,000 a year during the mid-twenties. Countless mementoes must still exist in homes throughout the country as reminders of an era that suddenly vanished.

But "Mother" Chautauqua lives on and there is not a vacation spot in the country that can compete with its schedule of operas, plays, music, religious conferences, and classes in art, sculpture, ballet and hundreds of other subjects for every age. Its lectures, held in the Amphitheatre every weekday morning at 10:45, are world-famous. Chautauqua brought oratory in America to the level of an art. No other movement in history has more effectively illustrated the power of the word in the life of a people.

It has been said that in a democracy no policy can be superimposed; it must seep through the soil and nourish the roots. At Chautauqua, experiments were nurtured that have led to traditions in American culture. Here William Jennings Bryan delivered his famous "Prince of Peace" address. Here Frances Willard blazed the trail to the brave but fruitless experiment of national prohibition. Here Franklin Roosevelt made his ringing "I hate war!" declaration.

Much of what we know today as adult education received its start at Chautauqua. The first summer school in America was held on its grounds and America's first book club was also organized here, as Chautauqua began to circle the globe with what it termed "the high romance of education."

Chautauqua's dignity is not stuffy. Everywhere there is warmth and gentleness and understanding. In the small parks, glens and ravines you will find people strolling, resting, reading or basking in the sunshine.

Most of the people—whether you are talking about the 200 permanent residents, the 8,000 summer residents, or the 55,000 visitors who come each summer from all over the world—tend to be in the professions and creative fields, including teachers, student teachers, doctors, clergymen, writers and artists. Receptions held at frequent intervals during the season by various clubs assure everyone a chance to mingle and get acquainted.

It is easy to participate in Chautauqua. For example, on each Tuesday afternoon, the Chautauqua Literary Society has a sidewalk debate. As people gather, a microphone is passed around and someone proposes a statement. Naturally someone else disputes it, and soon a lively discussion is going on. Everyone has his chance to make a contribution and the results are often informative, always interesting—and sometimes amusing. The College Club has its own discussion on Sunday night, and this one usually gets quite heated.

More than anything else, Chautauqua is a music festival. In the morning, you may be wakened by the choral strains of the Columbus Boys' Choir. In the afternoon, you will hear the sound of scales coming from one of the 30 music shacks where individual musicians practice (and where Gershwin composed his memorable *Concerto in F*). Four evenings a week, free concerts are held in the Amphitheatre, played by a symphony orchestra of 60 men recruited from the great orchestras of the country. Last year, guest artists at Chautauqua varied from Marian Anderson to the Brothers Four, from Van Cliburn to Guy Lombardo. At Norton Hall, plays and operas are presented weekly.

Since Chautauqua describes itself as the place "where education and recreation meet," there is a wealth of activity available for the sportsman. Twenty-one-mile-long Chautauqua Lake is stocked with fighting muskies. Sailing, boating, hiking, Saturday baseball games, tennis, an 18-hole golf course, shuffleboard at the Sports Club, lawn bowling and two swimming beaches offer ample opportunity for the promised recreation.

The Chautauqua hills provide a beautiful setting for this unique town. And though you may have seen exquisite sunsets elsewhere, twilight as viewed from across the lake is truly awesome.

There is time to think and to learn here, and perhaps there are some who come to Chautauqua to do as Thoreau did at Walden Pond: "I went into the woods to live deliberately, to see if I could not learn what life was . . . I did not wish to live what was not life."

We Must Reject "Maginot Line" Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 27, 1967

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, a thin ring of antiballistic missiles around the United States could not save our Nation from nuclear destruction. We must devise a defense which will keep the tide of aggression away from the skies and the shores of America itself.

Mr. Speaker, I recommend a careful study of the following article by George Wilson which appeared in the Sunday Washington Post, to the Congress and to our military leadership.

Naval vessels equipped with antimissile missiles near the coasts of China and Russia is an idea worthy of immediate and earnest consideration.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps these antimissile naval vessels and units of the U.S. Air Force and Navy equipped to level any potential enemy's homeland might be a great deterrent to aggression and the very best defense for our people. I urge my colleagues to read this article by Mr. Wilson:

CLOSE TO LAUNCHING SITES—NAVY PROPOSES FLOATING DEFENSE AGAINST MISSILES OFF RUSSIA, CHINA

The Navy has entered the antiballistics race with a proposal to station ships equipped with antimissiles off the Soviet and Chinese coasts to intercept enemy missiles shortly after they are fired.

While Navy proponents claim their plan would only be an extension of, and not a replacement for, the Army's land-based Nike X program, the proposal reflects the increased interest of all three services in playing a major role in an ABM system.

The Air Force also has taken a new look at its earlier proposals. One of these would employ such airplanes as the giant Lockheed C–5A transport, as launching platforms to intercept enemy missiles.

Navy leaders argue that a close-in, ship-based line of defense would permit the United States to catch an enemy missile before it has time to break into a shotgun scatter of real and decoy hydrogen bombs. In addition, there would be fewer technical difficulties in tracking and finding enemy missiles.

The United States, Russia—and most likely Red China—are spending a lot of effort on making sure their long-range missiles can get through any defense.

Techniques range all the way from the old trick of blinding the defender's radar with clouds of metal chaff to making H-bombs that can maneuver on their own as they fly in at a target.

But the bag of penetration tricks does not open until after the missile is a safe distance off the launching pad. An antimissile from a nearby ship might be in time to catch the whole package—missile warheads and penetration aids—before they spread too far apart.

The Navy has enough faith in the concept—called Seaborne Anti-Ballistic Missile Intercept System, or SABMIS for short—to pay industry money to formalize it in paper designs.

Last week, several aero-space companies bid for the job; Aerojet-General; Boeing; a team of Hughes Aircraft and Lockheed; Ling-Temco-Vought; Martin-Marietta; McDonnell-Douglas and Raytheon.

The Navy expects to pick one or more of those firms by fall to conduct a six-month feasibility study of SABMIS. Then, Defense Department superiors willing, the Navy would be ready to move toward the hardware stage.

Besides the advantage of getting close to likely launching sites, Navy leaders see SABMIS as bargain-basement protection for neutral nations afraid of nuclear blackmail by Red China.

A bunch of SABMIS ships, goes this argument, could stand between Chinese missiles and a neutral like India. Then India might not feel compelled to build an ABM system, having money for economic development.

NOT WITHOUT DETRACTORS

SABMIS is not without its detractors in the Pentagon. One top weapons official said: "We're going to get a decision on our own ABM system before we start worrying about one for the Bay of Bengal."

But this opposition has not deterred the Navy's new Office of Strategic Defense Systems, headed by Rear Adm. George H. Miller. His office sees SABMIS as a system which could do for defense what the Navy's Polaris submarine fleet has done for offense.

The SABMIS fleet—like the Polaris subs—would be kept moving. Of course, the enemy might sink surface ships just before launching a missile attack.

Asked about this vulnerability, one Navy strategist countered: "This kind of warning would be worth the cost of SABMIS."

ESTIMATED AT $2 BILLION

Rough Navy estimates are $2 billion for SABMIS, counting the whole works—ships, radars and the missiles themselves.

Navy planners are thinking in terms of six to 40 ships for SABMIS, with a possibility later on of using submarines to launch ABMs.

In hopes of avoiding an Army-Navy fight, Navy leaders stress their system is not designed to replace the Army's Nike X. The

Navy would use the 400-mile-range Spartan missile for SABMIS and also the Nike X radar. The ships would be built with special armor against nuclear blast and fallout.

Building a Nike X missile defense around the United States is gaining Johnson administration support in the wake of Red Chinese nuclear tests.

Congressional demands for a $3-billion to $10-billion version of Nike X will intensify this week if the Joint Congressional Atomic Energy Committee releases as planned, its report on Chinese nuclear progress.

India Citizens Oppose Stand Against Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 27, 1967

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the writer, Mr. Gobind Beehari Lal, of the following article, which appeared in the San Francisco Examiner, July 6, 1967, has excellent credentials. He is a member of the staff of the San Francisco Examiner, science writer for the Hearst Newspapers, since 1925. He taught physics at a college of the University of the Punjab, before coming to Berkeley, for research at the University of California, before the First World War.

Mr. Lal was born in Delhi, India, and was active in the Indian independence movement, in India and in the United States, until 1947. He received a Pulitzer Prize for science writing for the Hearst Newspapers in 1937, a Guggenheim fellowship for history of science research in 1955, a special citation for "Distinguished Services to Medicine" from the American Medical Association in 1958. He knew Mahatma Gandhi, Jawaharlal Nehru and many other makers of independent India and has maintained close relations with Indian affairs. Mr. Lal's article follows:

[From the San Francisco Examiner, July 6, 1967]

INDIA CITIZENS OPPOSE STAND AGAINST ISRAEL

The majority of the people of India are opposed to the apparently pro-Arab attitude of the Indian Government.

The leading Indian newspapers and political and cultural leaders have openly condemned the Indian Foreign Office's pro-Egyptian statement, just before the outbreak of the Israel-Arab war.

People are asking the government: "When there was a war between India and Pakistan, what help did any of the Moslem counrties give India? Did not Iran and Indonesia and the rest show their partisanship with Pakistan, a fellow Moslem country?

OFFSET

The continued hostility between India and Pakistan is the key to most of India's foreign policies. It is to offset the influence of Pakistan with Moslem nations that Indian officialism goes out of its way to be friendly with these nations.

With cordiality with China, support of America, and of so many Moslem states, Pakistan presents to India a dangerous challenge. Indian diplomatic moves are largely determined by this phenomenon.

Following her own election as the Prime Minister, Madame Indira Gandhi, genuinely loved and admired by the Indian people for her courage, hard work, idealism, patriotism, education, and good looks—made a Moslem Indian the president of India. This despite the fact that only 10 to 15 percent of India's population follow the Islamic faith.

MOSLEMS

India's foreign minister, an internationally noted jurist, Dr. M. A. Chagla, is also a Moslem by faith. Both these topmost dignitaries are able men, but their positions are due to their faith.

The principle of excluding religion from political positions and jobs of state is usually observed in India; but it is also lost sight of in some crises.

What was the need of the Indian Foreign Office to make a statement favoring Egypt against Israel?

Leaving aside the present Israel-Arab conflict, it is important to understand the general historical background of the relations tween the Indians and the Jews.

ASYLUM

In history, when the Jews were persecuted by Europeans, they found welcome and generous asylum in India. About 2000 years ago, several thousand Jews, persecuted by Romans, fled to South India.

Here the Hindu king gave them land and made their leader a maharaja, and guaranteed to them fullest liberties allowed to Hindus.

Never was a Jew persecuted in Hindu India. Under British rule Englishmen of Jewish faith began to come for office or trade.

In the British established Indian colleges, Indian students were taught that "Shylock was a Jew," and Shylock was heartless.

EMPRESS

However, it was Benjamin Disräeli, Queen Victoria's prime minister of Jewish parents, who first made this queen "The Empress of India," at a lavish coronation ceremony in Delhi, in 1877.

After World War I, Lloyd George sent Lord Reading, a professing Jew, as the British viceroy of India—an action that many British conservatives condemned. So English statesmanship tried to use Jewish brains to thwart Indian independence.

However, a number of Jews prominent in the Labour Party and even in the Liberal Party of England were sympathetic to the cause of Indian independence.

AMERICA

But it was in the United States that the Jews, Americans, showed their most active and helpful sympathy with the Indian independence movement.

Many distinguished Jews aided the Indian cause, for example: Prof. Albert Einstein, U.S. Congressman Emanuel Celler, writers John Gunther and Mrs. Francis Gunther, Louis Fischer, biographer of Mahatma Gandhi, Rabbi Stephen Wise and so on.

Some of the most enthusiastic and effective Indian nationalists, like Dr. Taraknath Das of Columbia University, urged India, after her independence, to make an alliance with Israel.

Jim Robinson Played It Rugged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 20, 1967

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of the House the heroic exploits on the battlefield of a former neighbor, Sgt. James Robinson. Sergeant Robinson was presented with the Congressional Medal of Honor at ceremonies in the Pentagon recently. He was given the medal posthumously.

Jim, as I knew him, was killed on April 11, 1966, when he charged and destroyed a Vietcong machinegun nest during Operation Abilene. But I knew of his valor and worth long before his exploits in Vietnam.

Jim was a rugged, 210-pound tackle on our high school football team in the late 1950's, less than a decade ago. In 1958, he was named all-league tackle in a tough Chicago suburban conference. Even then he stood out. Even then he was rugged. Even then he displayed the courage which later was to claim his life. Robinson had always wanted to play professional football. He played in a far tougher game, war, which is not a game at all. But he proved his worth.

Speaking of the Congressional Medal of Honor winner, his spirit as a marine and as a soldier can be typified by the words of his high school football coach, who said:

> Jim was always in condition, ready for a tough game—a little bugged on physical fitness. He always contributed a host of tackles, even in defeat, and always played it rugged.

He knew what he was fighting for, too. Jim was deeply interested in foreign affairs and strongly in favor of the war. His father quoted young Jim as saying:

> All you have to do is get out a map and look at Vietnam and you'll see that it is the key to the Far East and worth any price to keep it.

Yes, Jim Robinson proved his worth and in so doing proved, too, the worth of thousands of former athletes who are now in the armed services.

We owe much to young men such as Jim Robinson and to the parents who nurtured and loved them. We salute them all.

Needed: A War on War in the Streets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 27, 1967

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the riots which have been raging throughout the metropolitan centers of our Nation, are tragic evidence that a new approach to the racial problem is drastically needed.

Paul Hope, writing for the Washington Evening Star, has analyzed the situation and suggested some changes to help prevent these same events from occurring in the future.

I commend to the attention of our colleagues Mr. Hope's article which appeared in the July 24, 1967, edition of the Star.

The article follows:

NEEDED: A WAR ON WAR IN STREETS

(By Paul Hope)

If the United States ever gets done in, it won't be because there's a Communist behind every tree, as the John Birch president, Robert Welch, likes to believe, but because the greatest power on earth couldn't find a way to solve its race problem.

One thing the Great Society has plenty of are wars—on poverty, disease, hunger and ignorance; the war in Vietnam. It's about time to declare war on the sharply escalating war in the streets of the nation's cities.

One of the first things that seems to be in order is for leaders, black and white, to quit making excuses for lawlessness. Of course the Negro has been downtrodden and discriminated against for 300 years, but that doesn't give him the right to shoot up a city and loot the stores.

A man who makes a firebomb and throws it through a shop window is not doing it because his grandfather was a slave. A sniper who climbs on top of a building and shoots at firemen and lawmen—even at bystanders of his own race—is not doing it because he doesn't have a job. He's doing it just for the plain hell of it.

Nonviolent marches and picketing in behalf of a cause are one thing—pillaging a city is another.

It's time politicians quit offering the Negro pie in the sky and started real work on his problems.

The impractical hue and cry to get rid of the ghettos is a case in point. As a practical matter there is no way to get rid of the ghettos.

The government could spend $100 billion a year rebuilding cities and most whites still would live in one place and most Negroes in another—that's just a plain fact of life until both races really are ready to accept one another as true brothers and live, love and be happy together.

Slum clearance projects don't necessarily increase understanding or communication between the races. Look at the Southwest Washington redevelopment area where Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey lives in an expensive new apartment building.

Southwest Washington was a Negro slum until the bulldozers moved in and fancy new apartments and townhouses were built. Where did the Negroes go? They aren't living in the high-cost apartments or the $40,000 townhouses. They just shifted from the old ghetto to a new one.

Urban renewal projects have produced rows of 20-story apartment buildings for Negro tenants in Southside Chicago. About all that did was stack the ghetto skyward instead of having it spread out on the ground. The Negroes on the top floor may be closer to God but not much nearer to an understanding with the white people who run the city—and sometimes it's a long wait for the elevator.

The nation apparently is going to have to live with the fact that many of its major cities will be inhabited primarily by Negroes. The poor and the ignorant from the rural areas keep flooding into the cities looking for their pot of gold; and sometimes they're lucky if they can find a pot of beans.

The only real answer for the Negro in the ghetto is education. The economy can use only so many ditchdiggers, street cleaners and garbage men.

The solution to uplifting the minds and dreams of the Negroes and preparing them for jobs would seem not so much in prettying up the ghettos but rather in a massive infusion of money into the education systems of the troubled cities. Give a Negro an education and training so he can get a decent job and he will make his surroundings more comfortable on his own.

It seems time to quit worrying so much about racial balances in schools and concentrate on giving the Negro an adequate education wherever he happens to live.

If it takes one teacher to every five students instead of one to 30 to get the job done, then that's what should be provided.

If it takes a policeman stationed at every school to keep a lid on rowdyism in the classroom, then that should be provided, too. It probably would do more good having a policeman around to help keep order in the schools than on the street passing out traffic tickets.

Maybe it is true, as so often has been said, that many of the present generation of ghetto youth are lost. But that's no reason to lose the next generation.

If the cities are to have Negro majorities, the Negroes must eventually be given, and they must be able to assume, the responsibility for running them.

The firebomb and the sniper's gun must be traded in for a responsible place in society. The nation cannot afford to let lawlessness become a way of life in its industrial heartland.

What Price a Soldier's Life?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 27, 1967

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, recently I introduced H.R. 5724 which provides some reasonable benefit for the survivors of retired military personnel who have devoted their entire lives to the service of the United States of America. Without going into the details of what benefits are presently available, let me summarize by simply saying that no class of Americans is as neglected as the survivors of a military retiree. In civil service, in private industry, in local government, the provisions for the survivors of retirees are much more generous.

Mr. Speaker, I am hopeful that the Department of Defense will recognize this inequity and see that it must be corrected if we are to be able to offer the incentive which attracts men to a career of military service. Until we do such things, we have no hope of eliminating the draft and creating a truly professional military service.

Mr. Speaker, recently in the San Francisco Chronicle-Examiner, Mr. Jerry Belcher, staff writer, wrote a fine article which gives a real insight into the disparity of treatment between military retirees and their survivors and civil service retirees. Under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include the article which appeared in the July 16 issue of the Chronicle-Examiner:

[From the San Francisco Chronicle-Examiner, July 16, 1967]

WHAT PRICE A SOLDIER'S LIFE?

(By Jerry Belcher)

A hero is dead, killed in action in Vietnam.

It happens every day. Last week it happened to 282 Americans, since 1961 it has happened to more than 11,000.

There is no way, of course, to put a price on a hero—and any man killed in action is a hero, at least to his family.

But in cold, economic terms, what does the death of a soldier mean to a soldier's family?

To put the question into human perspective, what did it mean to one of the 282 men killed last week—First Lt. Gatlin (Jerry) Howell of Alameda?

Lt. Howell was 31. He had served his time, fulfilled his legal obligation to his country, as an enlisted Marine before the war in Vietnam started.

He became a school teacher in San Francisco after that hitch and he married Nancy Ebert. But, as he said a few days before his death, he felt a further responsibility.

He re-enlisted, earned a commission. To do so he gave up his new home, took leave from his teaching job, left his pretty young wife. He was the father of two little boys.

On July 4, he volunteered to lead a rescue mission to bring back the bodies of fallen Marines in a bloody battle near Con Thien. He lived through that. But on July 7, he was killed by enemy artillery fire.

Nancy Howell received official word of her husband's death on July 10. Her two sons were too young to understand what the telegram meant.

On July 11, a solemn Marine Corps officer came to Mrs. Howell's Alameda apartment and presented her with a check for $3000. The Marine Corps called it a "death gratuity."

If Jerry Howell had not felt his sense of responsibility, had stuck to teaching, and died as the result of an on-the-job accident on campus, the check from the school department would have been for $4112.

If he had been a longshoreman, the check would have been $4640.

If he had been a street sweeper for the City of San Francisco, the check would have been made out in the amount of $4218.

If Jerry Howell had been an infantry private, the check would have been for only $1236.

UNTIL DEATH

But the immediate check is not all there is. Soon, Mrs. Howell will begin receiving monthly payments from the Veterans Administration—Dependency Indemnity Compensation. There are variations, but the widow of an officer of his rank and length of service will receive about $184 a month until her death or remarriage.

A private's widow would receive $137 a month. A five star general's wife, $386 a month.

By comparison, the widow of a San Francisco policeman of Howell's age and time in service (6½ years) would receive his full pay of $776 a month until the time of his retirement age of 55, after which she would get $338 a month for the rest of her life.

MORE THAN $200,000

For a man of Howell's age at death, in 25 years, that would amount to more than $200,000. The VA benefits to a soldier's widow would amount to less than $65,000. And if the soldier's widow remarries, she loses her benefit.

But that's not the whole fiscal story. There is Social Security and there is California State Workmen's Compensation to consider.

A serviceman's widow with two children will receive between $66 and $368 a month from Social Security. (Mrs. Howell probably will get between $250 and $300.) When the children reach 18, their benefits will end. If the widow remarries, her benefit will be cut off.

NOT ELIGIBLE

A policeman's widow, however, is not eligible for the Social Security benefits.

As for State Workmen's Compensation: A policeman is not eligible, and neither is a soldier. But a street sweeper or a longshoreman is. The family of a longshoreman or a street sweeper who dies in the line of duty will receive from the state up to $21,000 paid in bi-monthly installments of $140.

A serviceman's widow also will receive $10,000 from GI Insurance, but that, like Social Security, is paid for over the years by the individual.

Rabbi Smith Speaks for Rabbinical Council of America on Firearms Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 27, 1967

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent, I am extending my remarks to include the following statement by Rabbi Harold P. Smith, testifying in behalf of the Rabbinical Council of America before the Senate Subcommittee To Investigate Juvenile Delinquency on proposed firearms control legislation.

Rabbi Smith, whom I am proud to number among my constituents, is chairman of the legislative committee of the Rabbinical Council of America, the national headquarters of which is located at 84 Fifth Avenue, New York City.

My name is Rabbi Harold P. Smith. My home and pulpit are in the city of Chicago. I appear before this Committee in my capacity as National Chairman of the Legislative Committee of the Rabbinical Council of America, whose membership is approximately one thousand rabbis throughout this country. Estimating an average of three hundred families to each congregation, I represent approximately 300,000 families in the United States. I would not pretend we have sounded out all 300,000 families in the matter of Firearms Control Legislation, but I *would* say that such legislation would, without doubt, represent the sentiments and desires of an overwhelming majority of our parishoners, and the practically unanimous sentiments of the Rabbinic members of our organization which, meeting in Fallsburg, New York, in Annual Convention only three weeks ago, *unanimously* passed a Resolution urging the passage of this Firearms Control Bill.

I would also make clear at the outset that I am very much the opposite of an expert in Firearms, and have no desire to become any more familiar, either at the propelling or receiving end. (The closest I or my colleagues get to this kind of thing would be the few explosive big shots that every clergyman of every faith has in his Congregation.)

Nevertheless, in all seriousness, we are deeply concerned as clergymen that this legislation, which we feel to be a vital "must" for the safety and welfare of our citizens, shall pass in this session.

It has been said that "in most states today a man with murder in his heart and a few dollars in his pocket can, without a moment's delay, get the gun his wild impulses of the moment demand." It would be unfair imposition upon your time for me to reel off statistics that you undoubtedly have heard before in these hearings. Some of the better known ones cannot really be repeated too many times, such as the statistic that more people (750,000) have been killed by guns in America since 1900 than have been killed in all of the wars of our country's history combined, from the Revolutionary War through the current Vietnamese struggle.

I was awed—and somewhat shaken—by the information I garnered in an article in *Nation Magazine* to the effect that in the year 1962, our nation suffered 4,954 firearm murders, whereas in the Netherlands, where they have strong Firearms Control laws, *there was not*, in 1962, a *single* Firearms homicide *in the entire year*—nor, for that matter, in 1961 or 1960.

How can we as clergymen remain unconcerned or unaffected when each and every day over 50 people die in the United States from firearms—close to 20,000 for the year?

How can we as clergymen, whose central concern is the life and welfare of people, remain unconcerned when reports tell us that *every two minutes* somebody in the United States is either killed, maimed, beaten or robbed with a gun; when they tell us that in the Watts disorder, 72% of the arrestees had previous criminal records yet they had guns which the vast majority of them had purchased without difficulty; when the recent situation in Newark revealed enough guns in the hands of troubled and troublesome elements to resemble an insurrectionary army of revolution, however just their case may or may not have been?

How can we as clergymen remain unconcerned when figures released from government offices tell us that the national crime rate has doubled since 1940; and that since 1958 the crime rate has increased at a rate five time faster than the rate of population growth?

Your Committee was told in 1965 that in my own city, Chicago, where a local city permit *is* required to purchase a gun, over 4,000 persons had in the previous year bought firearms from only *two* mail order houses and of these fully 1,000 had criminal records. We in Chicago were recently appalled by the revelation that California mail order guns were recently traced to 13 customers in Chicago who had been previously arrested on murder charges and who had been refused a permit by our own Chicago police department.

Would you expect, gentlemen, that I as a clergyman from Chicago could be unconcerned about this? Or about the fact that last week in one of our Chicago courtrooms a man with a record of mental illness, standing on trial before one of our eminent judges, whipped out a mail-order gun and let loose a volley of shots at the judge whom, fortunately, he missed, and at a policeman whom, unfortunately, he did not miss and who now lies in critical condition in a Chicago hospital? How childish to say that it is not guns, but people, who do the killing, and that people bent on killing can kill with knives or even baseball bats! Had he thrown a knife or a baseball bat at the judge and missed he would no longer be armed and could no longer project destruction at a policeman without first being overpowered.

We may as well say that automobiles should not be licensed, or inspected for safety, or not be subject to safety laws, because it is *people* who drive the automobiles and kill, and that they would violate it anyway.

Those kinds of arguments are unworthy of the people who offer them up. *Of course* other weapons can kill, but every honest analyst of the situation knows that no other weapon is *so easy* to commit murder *with*, and especially from distances which makes other weapons powerless. Guns add the dimension of emotional distance to madness and the dimension of irrevocability to the act of momentary impulse.

We have lost four United States Presidents to bullets; yet, despite the diversionary arguments about other weapons, no U.S. President was ever killed by any weapon but firearms.

The legislation we speak of does not apparently seek to force anything on any State. It would help each State control gun traffic to the extent that it wants to. I would seek to regulate only the sale and distribution of weapons, but *leave the regulation of use to state and local regulations*. Above all else, it would break down the mail order octupus of destruction that has its tentacles in every nook and corner of our country, giving lethal weapons to children or to madmen and criminals; and it would curb the huge flow of imported weapons, which I understand reaches monstrous proportions. Why should *we* be the dumping ground for surplus castoff weapons of foreign countries? Where is the sense and the dignity to all this?

I am sure that other witnesses must have used their time to counter the myth that any control of firearms by law would infringe on the so-called constitutional "right to bear arms."

I was here in 1965 to testify in behalf of such firearms control as this. I said at that time that I had heard and read statements from opponents of this legislation complaining that we were emotionally charged because of the assassination of President Kennedy and should not therefore be stampeded into something emotionally motivated. I said then that I would feel deeply distressed and alarmed were we *not* emotionally charged-up *to the very depths of our soul* by such a cataclysmic tragedy as the assassination of our president, and that *failure* to become emotionally charged and *failure* to be motivated into action by such emotion would, at worst, constitute criminal negligence on our part, and, at best, unforgivable lethargy.

I, for one, shall *never* forget the feelings of grief and sorrow that blanketed this country after President Kennedy's sudden death. I offered up the opening prayer in the House of Representatives on the day when the House resumed its regular sessions after the grievous recess of mourning for the President, and I shall never forget the deep grief, the overcast pall of gloom and sadness that permeated every ounce of atmosphere in the halls of that august body and in the minds, hearts and souls of our legislators.

There might have been a measure of mitigation in our great pain if the President's assassination would have immediately resulted in legislative controls for the protection of American lives from the devastating consequences of firearms in the hands of irresponsible individuals like Lee Harvey Oswald. In a real sense, it could have given his death a meaning, and have gone down in history as a death that was not in vain, one that saved many thousands of American lives. But alas, this was not to be; and the stultifying fact confronts us that in the three and one-half years since President Kennedy's tragic death, some 60,000 Americans have been killed by guns on American soil—very much more than in Vietnam. And no one of us—legislator or clergyman—is free from the responsibility and blame for these deaths of violence.

The Bible, in Deuteronomy 21:7 says that in cases of homicide the community leaders, in a ritual therein described, must be able to say: "Our hands did not spill this blood."

Obviously, nobody would accuse the community leaders of having had an actual hand in the murders. The implication is—and the Talmud explicitly states this—that if they failed to take actions that they *might* have taken to prevent it, and had failed to do so, they shared in the guilt of that murder and were not in position to make the declaration:—"Our hands did not shed this blood." We—you and I—are not totally free of guilt if we have indiscriminately permitted guns to get into the hands of irresponsible people—criminals, juveniles, the mentally sick, dope addicts, and others.

It is time to assert that guns are not toys! They are deadly weapons and should be regulated accordingly.

Somebody once pointed out—and the realization of it appalls me—that when Lee Harvey Oswald planned and plotted the murder of a United States president, ordered, acquired and planted military weapons of devastating precision in a strategic position where he could mow down the President of the United States—and with full intention of doing so—, he had not yet broken a single law, until he pulled the trigger. If this is true, then our lawmakers and we, the people, owe ourselves and our country a deep soul-searching, that we have unwittingly permitted such an incredible situation to prevail. Our legislators—and this is being said with total respectfulness, for I hold them in great reverence—owe it to this country to rectify a situation where any criminal or madman can set about to assassinate the President of the United States and *get* the *help* of the government of the United States—which, in effect, is what happens when the government *permits* this madman to buy the necessary weapon with undeterred rapidity.

Let us be candid. It is bandied about all over the country—in newspaper editorials, in magazine articles, in the living room conversation of every city and hamlet, that the legislators are restrained from passing Firearms Control Legislation because of a very potent lobby by the National Rifle Association and others, which allegedly have strength and influence. I do not know if this is or is not true. In my own State of Illinois, I noted that the National Rifle Association supported Illinois Senate Bill No. 1350 for Firearms Control, which did, in fact, pass both legislative houses and now rests on the governor's desk. Assuming that the fine governor of our great State *does* sign this into law, it might still be highly ineffectiual because of the interstate possibilities for circumvention.

In any event, it becomes incredible that there should be even rumors—let alone fact—that any of our highly respected legislators, men of integrity and deep powers of discernment, shall have been prevented by *any* force of opposition, from using their legislative prerogative—nay, their legislative *mandate*—to protect our citizenry from wanton murder at the hands of the irresponsible, the criminal or the mentally sick.

The highest law enforcement officers of our land, including F.B.I. Director J. Edgar Hoover and the Hon. Nicholas D. B. Katzenbach when he *was* U.S. Attorney General—*as* well as the President's National Crime Commission—have repeatedly stated that they need such legislative assistance as Firearms Control to curb the ever-increasing crime rate. No less than the President of the United States has asked for such legislation.

It becomes difficult for us clergymen and citizens to understand that for thirty consecutive years legislators have been offering up legislative bills "to keep lethal weapons out of the wrong hands," as President Johnson put it, only to meet their ubiquitously inevitable fate of defeat. *Why*? One hears everywhere the terribly unfortunate statement of cynicism: "The powerful lobbies will never permit such legislation."

As clergymen who hold you, I repeat, in very high regard, we must submit to you that such skepticism and despair concerning the role of legislators in protecting our citizenry is dangerous and demoralizing.

All licensing and *all* controls must inevitably inconvenience somebody—possibly millions of somebodies—but this is part of the price Americans have always been willing to pay for the democratic process of acting for the greatest good of the greatest number—the common good of all citizens. *Why*, I ask you, gentlemen, should inconvenience, real or fancied, to gun owners or gun sportsmen, be the exception, when, in fact, it is the most *dangerous* of all exceptions?

Do not the devotees of *all* sports make sacrifices for the safety and welfare of our country? Our Chicago Cubs would be well up in first place today had not their star pitcher, Ken Holtzman, left in the middle of the season to serve his country?

Wherein lies the reason for the inviolable sacrosanctity of sportsmen whose instrument of recreation happens to be rifles, which, incidentally, are not to be denied them by the legislation in question?

I believe and know that many to this legislation are very sincere, upright people, entitled to their convictions. But we feel that the time has come for legislators to realize that the principle of the greatest good to the greatest number demands that this legislation now be enacted.

Gentlemen—in behalf of the very many citizens—the vast *multiudes* of citizens—who strongly favor this type of legislation but who simply cannot or will not muster the initiative to send letters and telegrams or to testify at hearings—I plead with you—and strongly urge you—*do* pass Senate Bill No. 1, with Amendment No. 90.

Please recall—and heed—the words of President Johnson when he sent to you, on February 6th of this year, a message, with these words:

"To pass strict firearms control laws at every level of government is an act of simple prudence and a measure of a civilized society. Further delay is unconscionable."

We believe that to be true—and so do very many millions of American citizens. We hope you will share that belief and act upon it.

Thank you.

It would certainly be in order here to take note of the realization that had Congress passed the bill proposed in 1960 by the then Senator John F. Kennedy, prohibiting the import of precisely the type of Italian telescopic-sight rifle which Lee Harvey Oswald used, that shocking assassination might never have taken place 3 years ago.

Tribute Paid to SBA Employees at Swearing-in Ceremonies for Administrator Robert C. Moot

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 27, 1967

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, earlier today I was privileged to attend an impressive ceremony, at which retiring SBA Administrator, Bernard L. Boutin administered the oath of office to the agency's new Administrator, Mr. Robert C. Moot, to his Deputy, Mr. Howard Greenberg, and to the new head of the small business investment program, Mr. Glenn R. Brown. On this same occasion, awards were granted to outstanding employees serving the agency not only in Washington but in all of the agency's field offices.

Under Mr. Boutin, the SBA has adopted new policies and implemented new programs that have permitted this important agency of the Government to be of increased effectiveness in serving the 5 million small business concerns in the United States. The awards for outstanding service awarded to nearly 500 employees constituted due recognition for the hardworking, dedicated, able staff that has helped bring about the accomplishments and achievements attained by this agency.

SBA released a press statement describing the ceremonies, and under unanimous consent, I ask that it be reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD as follows:

In a double-barrelled ceremony today Robert C. Moot was sworn in as SBA's new Administrator while the retiring Administrator Bernard L. Boutin presided over the Annual Awards Ceremony honoring outstanding SBA employees from Washington and around the country.

The ceremonies were held in the Departmental Auditorium on Constitution Avenue here in Washington, D.C.

Moot officially takes over as head of the independent agency on August 1 following Boutin's resignation which is effective July 31. Following the Moot ceremony, Howard Greenberg who will become the new Deputy Administrator, also on August 1, took his oath of office as did Glenn R. Brown who is succeeding Greenberg as Associate Administrator for Investment.

During the awards ceremonies, retiring Administrator Boutin presented gold medals for distinguished service, the Agency's highest honor, to four of its top officials. The medals went to Associate Administrators Greenberg, Logan B. Hendricks and Irving Maness and to Assistant Administrator William P. Turpin.

Greenberg, a 30-year government veteran, was cited for his "professional competence and perseverance in administering and improving the multi-million dollar Small Business Investment Program reflecting great credit upon the Agency and the Government."

Hendricks, the Agency's top financial expert received the award for contributions which resulted in "greatly expanded assistance to small businesses and prudent conservation of the public funds."

Maness, Associate Administrator for Procurement and Management Assistance was recognized for "zealously serving the Nation's small businesses by providing expert assistance with their management problems and . . . in the procurement of Government contracts."

Turpin, SBA's top administrative official, was honored for instituting "new operating concepts which are responsive to the objectives of the President, the Congress, the small business community and the national interest."

A total of 92 awards were presented including five silver medals for meritorious service. These awards went to Norman Abelson, Special Assistant to the Administrator; Henry A. LaMontagne, Community Liaison Specialist for the SBA's Northeastern Area (Boston Mass.); Howard W. Rogerson, Deputy Associate Administrator for Financial Assistance; Robert L. Stockment, chief of the Agency's training division and Philip F. Zeidman, the Agency's General Counsel.

Other top awards were: Area Office of the Year (Southeastern Area—Atlanta, Ga.); Regional Office of the Year (Charlotte, N.C.); Team Achievement Award (Houston, Texas); Unit Achievement Award (ACT Division, Jacksonville, Fla., and Forms and Publications Warehouse, Washington, D.C.); Public Contact Award (Leia Ann William, Omaha, Neb., and the Office of Management Assistance, Washington D.C.); Supervisor of the Year (John Kivlan, Washington, D.C.); and Suggesters of the Year, (Mary L. Bettencourt and James L. Webb, San Francisco, Calif.).

The Agency honored 45 of its Washington Office employees with Outstanding Service Ratings, eight received Superior Ratings, six were given quality increases and three received special act awards.

At the same time over 350 field office employees received honor awards in ceremonies held in the SBA's 81 offices throughout the country.

Air Collision Total Since 1956 Is Now 199

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 26, 1967

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the following is an Associated Press story which summarizes the extent of midair collisions in the last decade.

I have urged that civilian aircraft be separated from commercial aircraft at major airports. There is considerable discussion on this subject, and it is my hope that these statistics will add to the discussion. The article follows:

AIR COLLISION TOTAL SINCE 1956 IS NOW 199

WASHINGTON, July 20 (AP).—There have been 199 mid-air collisions reported in the United States since Jan. 1, 1956, and 102 of them have been fatal, causing 669 deaths.

The national transportation safety board said, in a summary of accidents since that date, that 160 of the collisions involved private or business planes—aircraft classed as general aviation.

TWO OCCUR IN 1967

However, eight of the collisions were between light planes and airliners. Two of these occurred this year—yesterday's collision over North Carolina, in which 82 persons were killed, and a March 9 collision near Urbana, Ohio, between a Trans World Airlines DC–9 jet and a twin-engine Beechcraft, in which 26 were killed.

Four of the airliner-general aviation collisions occurred in 1960, and one each in 1956 and 1966.

The board's records list only three times that an airliner collided with an airliner—one each in 1956, 1960, and 1965.

There were also three occasions on which airliners and military aircraft collided—one in 1957 and two in 1958.

The other 23 collisions were between general avaiation and military aircraft.

COLLISIONS FOUND RARE

Collisions are relatively rare among the various types of air accidents. Records kept by the civil aeronautics board for the period from 1955 thru 1966 show that there were 131 fatal accidents to United States scheduled air line aircraft, in which 2,270 persons were killed.

In the same period there were 5,359 fatal accidents in general aviation, in which 10,099 persons were killed.

The safety board's tabulation of mid-air collision, by year:

	Accidents	Fatal accidents	Deaths	Airliner-airliner	Airliner-general	Airliner-military	General-military	General-general
1956	17	11	161	1	1	0	1	14
1957	15	6	19	0	0	1	4	10
1958	16	12	86	0	0	2	2	12
1959	13	10	20	0	0	0	3	10
1960	26	10	152	1	4	0	2	19
1961	20	10	22	0	0	0	0	20
1962	19	9	27	0	0	0	2	11
1963	13	3	6	0	0	0	2	11
1964	15	7	12	0	0	0	2	13
1965	27	14	30	1	0	0	2	24
1966	14	6	21	0	1	0	0	13
Total	195	98	556	3	6	3	23	160

Unofficial figures for 1967 add four collisions fatal to 117 persons, two of them in the airliner-general aviation category and two between military and general aviation aircraft.

Nuclear License for Keowee-Toxaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 27, 1967

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, Duke Power Co.'s power rates are 20 percent below the national average. Therefore, I was shocked to learn that 11 North Carolina cities would oppose the granting of a license by the Atomic Energy Commission to Duke to build three nuclear units in its Keowee-Toxaway project.

This phase of Duke's $700 million project would cost $340,800,000 and has a completion date of October 1, 1970, with a completion date for all units of August 1, 1973.

The Keowee-Toxaway project, in Oconee and Pickens Counties, when completed by Duke would pay approximately $20 million annually in taxes to State and local governments. It would mean a lighter tax burden for every citizen in Oconee and Pickens Counties and even in the entire State of South Carolina. This revenue would provide better roads, schools, and hospitals and job opportunity in Appalachia. This project will provide rural and municipal water supplies and recreation unexcelled.

The granting of this license by AEC is even in the best interests of these 11 North Carolina cities as well as the entire area served by Duke. The granting of this license would assure cheaper power and a guarantee of power for expansion of old industry and the acquisition of new industry throughout this area. For every dollar invested by Duke in the generation of power, three additional dollars are invested in new and expanding old industry.

This is an effort by these 11 cities to thwart private enterprise—the lifeblood of their own economy and the welfare of their own citizens. In no manner would a granting of this license by the AEC to Duke violate the antitrust laws or restrain free competition in private enterprise. On the contrary, a denial of permission to Duke to expand and grow would promote higher rates and retard the development of private enterprise.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to report that construction on the Keowee-Toxaway project is progressing rapidly. My people are thrilled over the magnitude of this fantastic project and its future impact on the progress and development of the region.

Western South Carolina and the district it is my honor to represent are well on the way to becoming the nuclear center of the United States—with the Atomic Energy plant at Aiken, the nuclear plant at Parr Shoals, and with these forthcoming units at Keowee-Toxaway.

Mr. Speaker, I will oppose this move by these North Carolina municipalities to impede the growth and progress of my State of South Carolina, my congressional district, and particularly of Oconee and Pickens Counties.

I will urge my friends on the Atomic Energy Commission to grant this license to Duke Power Co. to construct the three nuclear units in its Keowee-Toxaway project, so that this superb development can continue ahead of schedule.

Automatic Data Processing and American Political Campaigns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 27, 1967

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, the American Heritage Foundation sponsored on May 18–19, 1967, a bipartisan midwest regional vote workshop at Detroit, Mich. One outstanding feature was a speech, "Automatic Data Processing and American Political Campaigns," by Robert L. Chartrand, information sciences specialist at the Library of Congress.

I include this instructive speech at this worthwhile affair as part of my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD:

AUTOMATIC DATA PROCESSING AND AMERICAN POLITICAL CAMPAIGNS

INTRODUCTION

The American political campaign—beloved as an institution and the recipient of prodigious efforts by persons in all sectors of society—increasingly demands precision management, planning, and organization in order to achieve a successful outcome. The contemporary candidate, whether challenger or incumbent, must perform the same rituals and evince support for the same facets of our heritage as his predecessors.

In the United States in the 1960 decade the candidate is faced, for the most part, with a constituency that is increasingly urbanized, mobile, and sophisticated. The average constituency today is 450,000 persons, and most projections indicate that this will double within forty years. In Rep. John V. Tunney's (38th) district in California, for example, the population increased from 370,000 in 1960 to 520,000 in 1966.

Although the rate of literacy is quite high (97.8%) among the American voting population, experience has proven that the voters must be motivated to go to the polls; indeed, only 62% of the eligible voters cast their ballots in the 1964 presidential election.

To mount a winning campaign, the aspirant to office must form a savvy, energetic organization capable of grasping and executing a predesigned campaign strategy.

Funds must be raised, information sources identified and tapped, communications with organization workers activated, and a taut schedule of key activities (speeches, press releases, personal contacts) devised and rigorously followed. Every tool and technique proven by vintage use or hailed as a new useful aid to the political practictioner are scrutinized and employed wherever possible.

Of prime importance is the acquisition, evaluation, and use of information that embodies four classical characteristics in that it must be timely, accurate, complete, and *relevant*. The campaigner must seek unbiased factual information and statistics, since "the greater the degree of objectivity in the campaign research process the sounder will be the foundation of data upon which intelligent campaign decisions can be based."

The ingenuity of our scientists and engineers has produced during the past two decades an impressive array of automatic data processing devices and techniques. During the same period, society also has witnessed the development of the so-called "systems approach" to problem solving. Emphasis has been placed in industry, and now is being focused in the poltical arena, on the utilization of these scientific discoveries and technological innovations. It is imperative, however, that the electronic computer and its associated capabilities be viewed within the proper perspective. As Senator Hugh Scott recently reminded his colleagues:

"The electronic computer and the systems techniques connected with its use are simply tools for use by the decision-maker. They are designed to help provide that information which is necessary to make balanced, accurate decisions."

THE ESSENCE OF AUTOMATIC DATA PROCESSING

All facets of society—business, government, industry, the academic world—are feeling the impact of automatic data processing. The computer is a tool for use by man, similar in many respects to the slide rule, the desk calculator, the telephone, and various printing machines. A definition of automatic data processing may prove useful at this juncture; it is the concept

"Whereby a machine or computer can accept information or 'input data,' process the data according to a predetermined 'program,' and provide the results in a usable form. In an automatic data processing system, the electronic computer is the heart or focal point of the system. An ADP system consists of a number of components including input, processing, storage, and ontput devices."

The preponderance of computers are "general purpose" in design, thus giving their users flexibility in asking for and getting specially tailored capabilities. These could include a provision for direct access (using a special keyboard) by the user to the computer or linkage with other persons and terminals, even in distant cities.

In using a computer, every operation must be planned with care, scheduled in a specified sequence, and monitored by an experienced operator. Sets of instructions are "coded" (i.e., set forth in a specially structured format) so that the equipment responds precisely as directed by its operators. There are two major types of computer programs: general purpose ("canned"), capable of performing certain tasks in a variety of application areas; and special purpose (for unique or "one-time" asks.) In ADP terminology, "software" is defined as "the ancillary techniques and aids (e.g., computer programs) needed for proper utilization of an ADP system."

In many instances, punched card installations are much more suitable for the political campaigner than more elaborate equipment. Professor Kenneth Janda cites the benefits of the punched card as a data-handling medium: speed, convenience, neatness, accuracy, permanency, flexibility, and reproducibility. Every effort must be made to ascertain in advance the cost versus performance factors. Groups with experience in using ADP equipment, such as the Committee on Political Education (COPE) of the AFL–CIO, often urge that "organizations contemplating a data processing system start on a minimum basis with rented or leased equipment."

The role of the human being in managing, programming, and operating the ADP system cannot be overstated. Expert personnel must be on hand to advise the political campaigner and his staff of the nature and utility of the equipment, for "it is both unintelligent and expensive. It cannot operate without being told what to do, and the costs of mechanization are so great that procedures must not only be specified in detail, they must also be optimally designed."

CAMPAIGN APPLICATIONS OF ADP

An energetic debate usually is in order when the subject of computers in politics is raised. Opinions, biases, experiences, interpretations are as numerous as the discussants involved. The campaign manager, the aspiring candidate, the political scientist turned advisor, the precinct worker—each individual offers a viewpoint based on a mixture of "hard knocks," hope, naiveté, and cynicism. On one thing all can usually agree: "If you can do it cheaper or faster with a pencil and 3 x 5 cards, use them."

There are many applications for the electronic computer and punched card equipment; each must be considered in terms of economy of operation, alternatives for manual versus machine performance, and a careful delineation of the quantity and quality of system output (products). Automatic data processing has proven to be of value to political campaigners in handling: constituent information, correspondence files, campaign financial data, listings of organization candidates and workers, indexed information on priority issues (international, national, local), survey (questionnaire) data and interpretations, selected information on the opposition, and a master file of party resources (e.g., literature, radio-TV-press coverage, VIP's available for spot appearances).

As the campaigner and his advisors wrestle with the problem of whether or not to use ADP, there are several guidelines which should be considered. Needless to say, the candidate with a rural, modestly populated district will view the feasibility question differently from the individual who is running for office in a high density, metropolitan area. Individual and party resources, both monetary and worker-wise, also must be assessed. Whether or not an ADP facility can be justified is dependent upon these factors:

1. The application(s) can be justified on the basis of savings in cost and/or enhanced value through performance to the party.

2. The immediate and long range value to the users. Sustained use of the equipment and programs, as well as the machineable data files, needs to be assessed.

3. The installation is scheduled far enough in advance to allow collection and keypunching of selected requisite data; preparation of special programs should be commenced in time to allow their completion by time of delivery of equipment.

4. The recruitment and training (where necessary) of key personnel, including volunteers capable of data collection, keypunching, and programming, should be performed well in advance.

5. The availability of the ADP facility for actual operational use by the party—additional users may request service, thereby upsetting prior scheduling—should be projected on the basis of an intensive analysis of use.

INFORMATION FOR THE CAMPAIGNER

During the course of any political campaign, whether in the primary or general election and regardless of the office being sought, the party and its chosen candidate strive to develop and adhere to an overall strategy. Although the prime objective, of course, is to win, there may be important secondary objectives. A good showing, even in a losing cause may provide a balance of power situation; similarly, there always is the consideration of building for the future, or trying to force a schism in the ranks of the opposition. In order to achieve these ends, the campaigner and his staff need to establish and maintain certain basic files of information.

In his *Handbook of Practical Politics*, Paul Van Riper identifies several types of files which are considered necessary and useful in the conduct of a typical political campaign: basic memoranda, candidate's speeches, research (on selected topics, (political literature (own party and opposition), clippings, candidate's correspondence, campaign manager's correspondence, and general correspondence. Duplicate files often must be maintained in order to guard against fire, other damage, or carelessness in data handling. Additional files may be created at the precinct level: constituent data, party financial data, mailing lists, schedule of local events, and party organization data.

The fact that such a series of files is created guarantees nothing, for no information system can supplant human judgment. The need for each file of information, the problems related to maintaining it on a current basis, the necessity for constructing an index so simple and yet so oriented that volunteer workers can use it, the criticality of controlling the material going into the file and being taken from it, and the ability to reproduce upon demand the printed or graphic material in the file—these are considerations which must be faced by the managers of the campaign.

Once an initial decision is made to utilize automatic data processing, further decisions will be required regarding the practicality of converting old files or creating new files for use by the decision-maker:

1. Which files are to be converted to machine-readable format, in order to expedite transfer of typed or hand-written information to punched cards or tape?

2. Can the user(s) of the file afford to wait while his requests for material are "batched" (i.e., several requests are collected and submitted to the ADP system for retrieval purposes at the same time) or is immediate access to the file absolutely necessary?

3. Is the required frequency of access by organization workers so high that the vital information and statistics cannot be placed on punched cards or magnetic tape, since that would remove said data from direct access by the file users?

4. Does the placement of key data on punched cards in coded form, where a letter or number is substituted for an entire explanatory phase, reduce drastically the usefulness of the ADP printout to the system user who may be a semi-trained volunteer?

5. Are the functions identified by the campaign staff for ADP utilization justifiable in terms of staff time, financial expenditure, response time, and flexibility under time pressures?

As the tempo of the campaign accelerates, the candidate and his staff find that they often can afford to wait on no one or any thing. Decisions must be made based on the information at hand. Opposition actions may have to be countered, a new rationale for pursuing a given issue supported by convincing facts. Intuitive judgment is an absolute prerequisite in political decision-making. The lines of communication between the organization and the candidate must be open at all times. The information provided to the campaigner and his manager, with or without the benefit of ADP, is only one input to the final process of decision-making. It should be remembered that:

"No amount of complex manipulation of simple, raw data with the aid of electronics can substitute for a carefully conceived systems of reports to management."

Thus, in determining *how* ADP should be used, there are four determination which the campaign organization must make:

1. Define the problem.
2. The manpower required.
3. The cost of the ADP system.
4. How to maintain the system.

CAMPAIGN FILES: THEIR CONTENT AND USE

Each campaigner, whether running for state, county, or metropolitan office, will have his own unique approach to campaigning, the use of information, and the preparation of files. A more detailed discussion of selected information files will indicate the type of information which has proven to be useful and the ways in which this information is applied during the campaign.

Constituent files

Complete information on each constituent is a goal of every campaigner, but unfortunately this is a goal never to be fulfilled. Building a comprehensive name file and keeping it up-to-date takes a fantastic amount of time and effort. In most areas today the names of the registered voters are available to the campaigner and in a few locations these names are maintained in machine-readable form. In Polk County, Iowa, the city of Des Moines was persuaded by a joint plea from the Republican and Democratic County Committees to place the names of registered voters on magnetic tape, which then would be made available to the committees.

Congressmen of both parties increasingly are commencing to learn the value of ADP handling of voter data. Congressman William E. Brock (Rep., Tenn.) has undertaken to establish a magnetic tape file entry for each adult in his district, with two punched cards recording the data for every family unit. In Ohio, in the only reported election (1966) where both candidates had utilized ADP in some aspect of the campaign, Rep. Robert Taft, Jr. used the results of an automated "voter census" in defeating John J. Gilligan who had sought to "build up a list of sympathizers, firm supporters and active workers to be inscribed on the computer's magnetic tape reels." Meanwhile, Rep Donald D. Clancy (Rep., Ohio) reportedly has had more than 80,000 punched cards prepared by volunteer workers. These cards contain the names, addresses, state legislative districts, ZIP codes, telephone numbers, and political preferences (where stated) of qualified and non-qualified voters.

At the national level, the Democratic National Committee has been operating a computer facility consisting of an IBM 1401 tape system, soon to be replaced by a System/360 (third generation) computer, for the benefit of the party Senators and Representatives who desire to have mailing lists handled via ADP. For each constituent, the following information can be recorded:

Name, address, constituent code, district, county (numeric), precinct, ward, party, registered, sex, age, religion, special interests, special problem, key union leader and member, party worker skill, party interest, veteran, office holder, occupation, corporate officer, firm supporter, nickname, organization affiliation, nationality, alien, key contributor, contributions (year to date), income group, homeowner, number of dependents, education, welfare recipient, office visitor—during year, dinner attendee (invitation list), legislative interest, Government worker, patronage.

In the early days of this operation, the DNC facility offered to keypunch the mailing list information without charge, but the load on the system has become so great that now the members must pay to have this done. All of the information entries listed above are not available because of the difficulty in obtaining much of the data. Yet, more than 80 Democratic Congressional members now have constituent file information, totalling more than five million punched cards, in the DNC system. File sorts can be run on the following patterns: alphabetically by last name, street number within street name, street name, ZIP code, city, district, ward, county within district, precinct within district, etc. The system user also can have a "constituent code" assigned for each voter, so that, for example, Mr. Joe Addison . . . 2533 E. Oakdale . . . Englewood, Colo. . . . 20208 would appear as "ADD1KEN251."

Various users of the DNC system have special needs for selective mailings, where the constituent's occupation may prove to be significant. In some cases, individual Congressmen have decided to handle their own "information systems" by hiring a skilled design programmer who will prepare the file data in a special way. Rep. Brock Adams (Dem., Wash.) currently is undertaking the establishment of his 135,000-name constituent file in such a way that it may be maintained with a minimum of effort and used both in mass mailings and future campaign activities.

Constituent files usually require a fairly high degree of maintenance activity as previously registered voters move, die, or fail to register, and new voters enter the district. Updating activity, according to the Republican National Committee estimate and corroborated elsewhere is between 18% and 20% annually.

It has become apparent to political practitioners at every level of activity that the benefits of ADP are very real. Not only can these devices manipulate massive quantities of data rapidly, but they afford a flexibility in retrieving desired data that often was prohibitive because of the tremendous number of man-hours involved. Finally:

Apart from their extended capacity, a great potential advantage of automated systems is that it is possible to alter material in the system without disrupting the whole system.

Correspondence files

One maxim in politics is that the politicians must know what the voters are thinking about, want, will support with their votes and dollars, and distrust or oppose. Correspondence files become the focal point for this type of information, and have been used with varying effectiveness and intensity by office holders, campaign managers, and those who seek office at all levels of political activity. Many offices record basic information—name, address, nickname if available, occupation, age, and sex—as well as the subject of the correspondence. Many politicians want to be able to mention specifically the subject of known interest to the constituent.

Placement of this information in machineable form has been performed on a trial basis in a few instances, but cost considerations and the necessarily dynamic nature of the file have forced a cautious approach. The initial cost for a 65,000 entry file, for example, is estimated at $6,000, which included the cost of keypunching, file establishment, programming, card cabinets, and the cost of cards of magnetic tapes. It should be understood that these are *initial* ("one-time") service and materiel costs. Other estimates involving the handling and ADP-oriented answering of 400 letters per day (featuring disc-type storage) indicate a cost of $4,400 per month per user where several users are sharing a system.

It would be accurate to infer that the incumbent usually has a heavier volume of correspondence by virtue of his recognized position, but history has shown that oftentimes the "outs" are careful to maintain significant files of correspondence with their supporters. A thorough, on-going analysis of these files may provide the political advisors with valuable information on trends in interest or bias, and the sampling provided may allow the campaign to follow the course of "using the past as our guide to the future."

Financial files

In politics, a "bed-rock" responsibility given campaign management is to raise enough money to produce the resources sufficient to win the campaign. Oftentimes, funds must be raised not only for local candidates but simultaneously for state and national candidates.

Automatic data processing has proven to be useful to the campaigner in planning his fund-raising effort, taking various "cuts" at the data on potential givers, and tieing the financial aspects of the campaign to critical issues affecting the constitutents. Rep. Bob Wilson (Rep., Calif.) uses the computer heavily in determining his constituents' "contribution capacity" on the basis of their occupations. This allows him to employ a strategy of selective fund-raising that is more effective than a haphazard approach.

Various types of reports which can be generated by a computer for use by the campaign finance committee include: lists of contributors, history of giving of various groups and individuals, special listing for specific activity areas (e.g., industrial complexes, minority groups), fund-raising progress reports, record keeping on expenditures, and inventory counts on mailing labels.

At the state and county level, as well as nationally, the electronic computer and its perpiheral equipment are providing the support—quickly, accurately, reliable—that the campaigner demands. In Texas, Republicans have "utilized EDP [ADP] widely and effectively in Dallas and other areas as an aid to local organizations and audits of strength," while in Los Angeles County, the United Republican Finance Committee has been using ADP to maintain records on contributors. The initial data input to the latter system consists of "three punched cards for each contributor containing: identification number, name, home address, firm name, firm address, political district numbers, a history of amount given and method of giving—membership, dinners, special gifts, etc."

Several states report that the amount of money raised due to the more thorough, timely handling of fund-raising efforts has increased significantly; for example, in Dallas County, the amount of money has tripled, and in King County, Washington, "all previous records of money raised have been greatly exceeded."

Experience with the new technology is showing that any assessment of value of utilizing ADP in fund-raising and the maintenance of financial records must be made within the context of more effective management control of resources and their application.

Campaign worker data files

The backbone of any campaign effort is the group of workers that comprises the organization. Men and women, young and old, they perform every conceivable task from assisting in answering letters or executing a broad variety of precinct coverage tasks to typing and manning the telephones at headquarters. The viability and effectiveness of the campaign operation depend on the acquisition, processing and use by these workers of the many types of information . . . information that might be considered the amalgam of the political organization.

"It is the binding togther of the entire organization into an effective, integrated whole, through the flow of information, that permits the information channel to serve as a means of improving not only the day-to-day operations but the projected operations as well."

The criticality of keeping the campaign team informed cannot be overemphasized. Each worker must know what to do, when to do it, and how to proceed. The campaign manager seeks to utilize to the fullest the talents of each worker and to this end the use of automatic data processing must be weighed carefully. In "Machine Politics," the COPE editors state:

"Just as automation can, in modern industry, free men and women from more routine chores to perform more demanding and rewarding tasks, so automation in the political process can free volunteers for more creative effort."

Various types of computer listings can be made available to the professional and volunteer campaign worker alike. In addition to registration data, "precinct walking lists" can be prepared, with street addresses listed in even and odd sequence. Such a report can be printed either on 3 x 5 cards (pocket-sized) or on regular page size paper. In addition to the name and street address, the worker should be able to write in such useful supplementary information as: telephone number, names and ages of unregistered household members, occupation(s), political identification, etc. At a later stage this data, when entered on punched cards, can be used in mass mailings or selective label preparation.

In many metropolitan areas and counties "domicile inventories" in ADP form are being established. This requires painstaking checks by the volunteer cadre of telephone books, voter registration lists, and city directories to obtain and record the latest information. In Louisian during the 1964 Presidential campaign, a concerted volunteer effort involving 20,000 workers allowed the Republican party to process over 500,000 cards.

In New York state, where the number of voters poses a major problem for both parties in terms of logistics, canvassing manpower, and data conversion for ADP processing, every possible mechanism known is under consideration for use by candidates. While the Republican State Finance Committee has begun development of an ADP system on the basis of a three-year plan which calls for placement of all registered Republicans on magnetic tape, the Democratic leadership—including such Senators as Senator Robert F. Kennedy, and Representatives John M. Murphy, Joseph Y. Resnick, and Jonathan B. Bingham—is using the services of the Democratic National Committee computer facility.

Continuity of contact with the voter increasingly is recognized as an acute problem, particularly in urban areas where mobility is high. Since the average voter has the option of voting in several different spheres—national, Congressional, state-wide, county, and perhaps township—cooperation between candidates at various levels often is useful since:

"National party activity in connection with the nomination of state and local officers serves to keep the national organization more alert and active, recruited more nearly up to maximum strength, the different parts better articulated and running more smoothly, than if it were called into service only once in two or four years."

Automatic data processing, then, can serve as a valuable aid to the campaign worker by storing and printing out that data which is collected, and later requested for retrieval. Hundreds of hours of laborious, manual handling of registration data can be replaced by the processing capabilities of an ADP system, and lists of workers, voters, and candidates can be prepared using special formats within a relatively short time. This can mean that on election day the worker can function at peak efficiency as lists of eligible voters are checked, rides are provided for ailing persons or those in remote locations, babysitting services are arranged, and last minute voters can be prodded into action.

Political research and issues files

The increasing complexity of the political environment, as has been noted, has posed serious problems for politically oriented groups in all areas of politics. More and more a candidate must be assertive, and less and less is he able to "straddle the fence" on important issues. The extent to which the voters make themselves heard and the degree to which the campaigners respond is, in the words of John Morley (in 1874) a reflection of "the magnitude of the issues and the height of the interests."

Meaningful research on the issues of local, regional, and national importance has become a significant aspect of the contemporary political scene. The national committees of both major parties maintain permanent research divisions which conduct studies-in-depth and prepare "fact sheets" on current issues. Not only is the "party viewpoint" set forth, but pro and con alternatives also are presented. Also, they conduct voting record studies of the members of Congress and prepare predictive statistical studies of the party posture and prospects in various political sections of the country. Although some state committees have research capabilities, this type of activity is not widespread. In California, a political demographic analysis (see Figure 5 for exemplary data) of all State Senate and Assembly districts has been prepared, which was necessitated by reapportionment action; this analysis placed emphasis on factors such as population characteristics, voting performance, and registration history since 1958.

The use of automatic data processing to index, store, and retrieve selective political research information represents a sophisticated demand upon the capabilities of the electronic computer. Many collections of valuable information have been placed on magnetic tape, in disc storage, or even on punched cards that would be useful to the political researcher. At the University of Pittsburgh, for example, a vast store of legal literature (nearly 90 million words) including such items as the entire text of the United States Code and the decisions of the United States Supreme Court since 1950 exists for use by anyone or any group.

In some cases, the records of past legislatures or of an individual incumbent may hold vital information for the campaigner. Also, the comprehensive information and statistics collected and processed by the U.S. Bureau of the Census (Department of Commerce) are available to the political research team, and may be found in a regular printed form such as the *Congressional District Data Book* (where 398 separate elements of information are presented in tabular form) or in machineable form. According to a recent survey, the Bureau of the Census has 10,047 reels of magnetic tape containing such diverse information as summary type County/City statistics for 1952–1956–1960 and County Business Patterns in summary form.

In addition to the national and state research efforts, there may be a requirement for a substantial county research activity which stresses collection and correlation of voting statistics, United States Bureau of the Census data, and other organizations' writings on population problems and characteristics. Professor Hinderaker declares that "no candidate should have to do this kind of research work himself . . . the data should have been gathered previously, interpreted, and used in the preliminary phases of campaign planning."

As the issues multiply and the demands on campaigner and staff mount, the importance of employing the ADP instrument becomes more apparent. The decision to do this must be based on a weighing of cost and performance factors and common sense. In addition, the reluctance of man to consider new ways of performing old tasks must be overcome. As Ithiel de Sola Pool of the now famous Simulmatics team says:

"The classic theory of democracy has always assumed that effective democratic decision making requires that human beings have as much information as can be available. All that machines do is provide more data to more people more quickly than otherwise. Questions have been raised about the morality of using advanced computer programs in political research. It seems ironical that people should view decisions made on the basis of confused guesses about what the public wants as more democratic than decisions made on the basis of careful compilations of information."

Biographical files

Throughout the course of any campaign, the candidate is seeking to impress the electorate with his personal and party assets. In many instances, the attributes of his running mate(s) may be of considerable value; for example, a popular national or state figure may agree to visit a locality and "boost" the local campaigner. The campaigner who maintains files of biographical information on his party candidates has a resource of value to tap. Similarly, information about the opposition candidates may provide information that could affect the outcome of the contest.

Expert opinion has stated that "when background characteristics are to be gathered and analyzed for scores (or hundreds) of political actors, punchcards should be considered." During the 1960 Democratic convention, card files were kept and maintained by the Kennedy staff on each delegate and delegation—name, residence, religion, occupation, etc.

Since an incumbent is judged by the bills he introduced, supported, or opposed, the challenger may seek to attack him on the basis of that record as well as on other grounds. Perhaps a candidate's background may reflect an abandonment of the party position on a critical issue or he may reverse himself on a stand taken in the past on an issue. ADP manipulation of data about the man, his record, and his views in some instances has assisted in turning up damaging inconsistencies and falsehoods. It should be noted that the cost of establishing a biographical file, with related public statements, would not be insignificant. Probably this could be justified only as part of a large scale (i.e., state-wide) operation.

Survey poll files

Every candidate seeking office should be able to qualify as one who is "concerned with methods of studying the opinions, attitudes, needs, and wants of various parts of the population." Although the first recorded polling with scientific sampling occurred in 1936, computers were not utilized in handling the acquired data until 1960. Polls may be conducted by professional pollsters (e.g., Roper, Gallup) interviewing selected citizens, by mass mailings to voters in a given district, or by door-to-door campaigns conducted by volunteers who ask for attitudes on certain issues of current interest. The validity of these data, as might be inferred, varies considerably.

In an effort to allow his constituents to "speak out on specifics," Rep. Bob Wilson (Rep., Calif.) mailed out to district residents—Democrats, Republicans, and independent voters—a questionnaire dealing with the Vietnamese situation. Congressman Wilson directed that the 22,000 returns be processed on modern ADP equipment; in this way, he noted in a speech to the House of Representatives, the data was not "subjected to the tedious and error-prone methods of tabulation sometimes followed in congressional offices in the past."

The establishment and maintenance of a file of survey data, readily accessible to the campaigner, is being given a high priority by an increasing number of political candidates. The value of directly obtaining survey data in ADP form has been recognized in several parts of the country. Congressman Joel Broyhill (Rep., Va.) places his questions to the voters in punched card format, where the recipient can answer any of the 12 questions by punching out an already perforated square (yes or no). In a recent mailing to 100,000 constituents, Congressman Broyhill noted that his response increased from a normal level of approximately 15% to 22% (plus 3,000 letters.)

Thus, the use of automatic data processing in recording constituent opinion data and then processing it in order to discern patterns, interest groups, or lack of support is receiving increased usage by political campaigners. Experience is proving that acquisition, processing, storage, and retrieval of this information for campaign uses is often best accomplished through the use of ADP.

File data commonality

In each of the various files discussed above there is often a repetition of various types of data: constituent name, address, sex, age, etc. Automatic data processing traditionally has lent itself to the expeditious handling of such repetitive data, thus reducing duplication of staff effort, storage space, by introducing multiple file utilization, and inter-file data element sharing. The graphic depiction of instances where key data elements appear in more than one file is contained in Figure 6.

Once the desired data are captured in ADP form, and the proper programs are written, the system is able to give the campaigner a flexibility—within a time frame never before deemed possible—in information retrieval that previously would have seemed incredible.

SIMULATION AND MODELS USING ADP

The use of computer simulation as a social research technique apparently first took place in the Presidential campaign of 1960. The so-called Simulmatics project—since the subject of numerous magazine and newspaper articles of varying merit, and a novel featured an innovative technique for handling public opinion poll data by utilizing computer technology. The determination was made by the Democratic Party that this endeavor would allow useful testing of existing theories of opinion inception and interpretation.

The terms "simulation" (or "simulator", "to stimulate") and "modeling" have caused unending confusion and discussion for a number of years. With the advent of ADP, the problem was compounded inasmuch as new, more esoteric definitions came into being. *Webster's Dictionary* defines "simulator" as: "a laboratory device that enables the operator to reproduce under test conditions phenomena likely to occur in actual performance." Professor Pool cautions that "Simulation is a way of using scientific theories, not a substitute for them." His definition of computer simulation is useful:

"Simulation is a technique that is appropriate when so many variables are simultaneously in operation that simpler methods of calculation fail. It is a technique used when the . . . complex of variables . . . make an analytic solution impractical or impossible. A computer can count, compare, list, add, subtract, multiply, divide. A computer performs no operation that the analyst who has programmed it cannot also perform. Its merit is that it does these things fast, tirelessly, without forgetting its preliminary results."

It is interesting to note that the establishment of The Simulmatics Corporation as the pioneer is a new, challenging field was performed without much fanfare. William McPhee's concept of simulating electoral behavior, after discussion with Edward Greenfield and Ithiel de Sola Pool, took the form of a model, but one that was not designed to answer the action questions that politically oriented users might ask during a campaign. The innovators agreed, however, that the model was feasible, and that emphasis should be placed on items about which:

1. a candidate has genuine strategic alternatives;
2. the behavioral sciences have some relevant theories; and
3. the necessary data existed.

The research data for this project was based on 50 (later amended to 65) questionnaires and code books from national surveys and punched cards from 100,000 (later 130,000) individuals. These data were reduced to a 480 x 52 matrix, with the number 480 representing types of voters—e.g., "Eastern, metropolitan, lower-income, white, Catholic, female, Democrat"—and the number 52 representing what the project called "issue-clusters." These included such political issues as attitudes towards the United Nations, foreign aid, and McCarthyism; another category featured such public opinion indicators as vote intention.

The value of this project to the Democratic Party has been widely discussed, but there seems to be consensus that the system's output was useful at times to the campaigners. In some areas of inquiry, the project provided findings which proved to be highly accurate in the light of election post-analysis. In other instances, more modest results were forthcoming.

The ground rules for undertaking computer simulation have not varied significantly during the past several years. The Republican National Committee, Committee on Data Processing stresses that: "Simulation measures a candidate's potential impact on the electorate based on possible positions he can take regarding an issue." Therefore, in order to justify simulation three conditions must exist:

1. Some substantial hypotheses about the voters being simulated must exist;
2. Calculations must be so numerous that only a computer could possibly handle the data; and
3. There must be available previously taken public opinion interviews from within the political entity being simulated.

It is recognized that relatively few campaigners are in a position to create and utilize a computerized model of their voting constituency. However, some state-wide or large metropolitan area environments are of sufficient complexity and scope that a model of voting behavior could be justified. Two basic types of data sources are available to the campaign model builder:

1. Time-dependent voting statistics are available from previous elections in an aggregated manner; and
2. A complete detailed tabulation of the final vote in each election precinct with subtotals by county and state.

In the case of most national pollsters, no attempt is made to sample each state on a representative basis; the emphasis is placed on treating regions representatively. The Republican National Committee, Committee on Data Processing defines a "nationwide sample" as consisting of 1,600–2,000 interviews. Five basic informational factors are set forth as being necessary for a simulation model: socio-economic status, race, sex, urban-rural, and party; these factors when correlated in all possible combinations would establish 36 voter types. This range of constituent categories probably would serve adequately the great majority of interested campaigners.

Building a voting model takes careful planning well in advance of the target election. Criteria and directions for information collection—whether initial action using survey methods or transcribing from official records—are mandatory if the data base is to be trustworthy. Conversion of the captured data to a machineable form no longer poses hazards, if adequate verification procedures are followed. The programing of the model requires skill to ensure flexibility and versatility in retrieving desired data on the basis of several combinations of parameters. Machine time will be required to "debug" (check out) the new programs, and to perform the actual retrieval exercises. All of these steps take time, money, and people.

Three significant processes are represented in the voting model: "(1) response to external political stimuli; (2) mutual influence of individuals within the immediate social environment of one another, for example the influence of family and friends on each other; and (3) the 'learning' over time of the habit of partisanship is acquired."

In summary, the campaigner and his advisors must consider most carefully *before* engaging in creating a voting model the benefits to be derived versus the allocation of resources necessary to complete the undertaking. For the candidate in such areas as New York city or state, Illinois, the Los Angeles area or metropolitan Detroit the investment may be worthwhile. The electronic computer in this new, still experimental capacity has a definite role to fulfill. A model of individual voting behavior is especially adaptable to ADP:

"It lends itself to rapid logical manipulation of sizeable numbers of units ('voters') arranged in complicated structures ('communities') through long sequences in processes ('eras' or 'generations'). These manipulations are intended to help analyze problems in electoral dynamics of a complexity too great to be easily understood—at first, and without such aids—by more conventional verbal and mathematical methods."

ADP ON ELECTION DAY

Perhaps in no other field of endeavor is the use of automatic data processing as widely heralded nor akin to the interest of the public at large than on election day. The rivalry between the titans of the broadcasting industry, especially NBC and CBS, has increased in intensity with each election. Each company strives, through the creation of an elaborate data monitoring, collection, and processing mechanism to be the first to issue the correct predictions as to the winners in key contests. Cost would appear to be no object; in the 1964 Presidential primary contest in California, nearly $1 million were spent "to buy armies of poll-watchers, field interviewers, technicians, commentators."

The Presidential elections, of course, involve the most extensive preparation and expenditures. Each network has its own special unit assigned to election coverage and prognostication, in addition to special advisors (e.g., Louis Harris for CBS) and a complex of electronic equipment for communication and manipulation of selected data. Since voters are active in multiple time zones, ballots are being cast in Nome, Alaska seven hours behind polling places on the eastern seaboard that are closing their doors.

Management emphasis increasingly has been on checking the voluminous data that is transmitted to the ADP complex from far-flung points. Consistency and repeated checks to prevent gross errors include verifying that:

(1) codes and formats are valid;

(2) votes for each party and number of reported precincts are greater than the comparable number in the previous message;

(3) total vote from an area does not exceed total registrations;

(4) the percentage vote split between candidates does not change too sharply; and

(5) the average vote per precinct is reasonable.

The employment of computers in elections has given rise to protests that voters casting ballots in the western areas of the United States, for example, may be swayed unduly by reported voting trends (where

ADP was employed) in the eastern portion of the Nation, but no conclusive evidence has supported the claim.

Computer-based election predictions continue to arouse debate in all sectors of our society. As directed by the human planners and operators, the computer can aid in the three major components of projection: data gathering, model formulation, and computer programming.

POST-ELECTION ANALYSIS

The practical campaigner, either as winner or loser, usually engages in a certain amount of soul-searching and anlysis of his team's effort after the dust of battle has settled. Unless he is a one-time candidate who does not relish a return to the political wars in the foreseeable future, he and party colleagues will conduct a post-mortem on the election. Performance factors will be scrutinized and judged; was the political organization strong enough and did it perform in the important areas; were the mass mailings to the constituency correctly worded and timed for maximum impact; could the ADP capability better have been put to other uses, such as electro-mechanically dissecting the statements of the opposition for incongruities?

A "dollars and cents" evaluation of money spent on mass media advertising, or door-to-door campaigning, or ADP machine rental may be useful in campaigns to come. And the question may be asked: was the cost of placing all of that data in machineable form and the cost of programming and processing that data really worth it? The experienced candidate and his campaign manager, together with systems experts, should enumerate the strengths and weaknesses of the system that was evolved. The opportunity to test new theories or exploit new techniques will, under the American system, present itself in the not too distant future.

PRACTICAL CONSIDERATION IN USING ADP

Virtually every political group that becomes enamored of the possibilities of using automatic data processing makes some initial mistakes that are both costly and discouraging. Some of the often repeated errors in judgment are:

1. Purchasing equipment before an operating system is outlined, especially before suitable data is converted for machine manipulation;

2. Thinking and talking in terms which reflect the glamour described in superficial articles in the public press; for example, the notion that an ADP system really isn't complete without numerous remote, desk-top consoles;

3. Trying to do too much too fast in too many areas; a single "pilot system" such as the one being developed in the state of Colorado by the Republican National Committee affords an opportunity to learn how to build a system step-by-step;

4. Considering the task of data conversion as a "one-time" task; experience indicates that file maintenance is a constant drain on an organization's resources. File activity of nearly 100%—due to data element changes on such items as address, local union affiliation, etc.—has been the norm at COPE.

System costs need to be spelled out, with particular emphasis on the difference in costs between having the job performed by a commercial service bureau, which can provide all facets of ADP support, and establishing an in-house capability.

As noted earlier, the size and capability of an ADP installation should be linked closely with the user load, as determined *before* selection is made. Queueing problems (i.e., too many customers) often arise soon after the facility becomes operational, and system users become disgruntled when forced to wait days or even weeks for service. A professional installation manager should be employed and given full authority to schedule and control operations. Additional programming effort after the "housewarming" should be anticipated; this disturbs many organization managers who would like to think of programming as a "one shot" affair.

An informal maxim in developing any ADP system is to "start small and move slowly." One method that is gaining increasing usage is the establishment of a "pilot system." COPE reportedly is engaged in developing three such systems: one, comprising the entire state of Pennsylvania; two, the nine-county San Francisco Bay area; and three, the greater Washington, D.C. area comprised of the District of Columbia, two adjoining counties in Maryland and two in Virginia. Such efforts as these and the state-wide voter registration in Colorado on the part of the Republican party, reflect the emphasis and resources being placed on the development of practical ADP-oriented information systems in politics.

SUMMARY

The political milieu of the 1960 decade is both challenging and often confusing to the professional and amateur activist. Faced with a population that is on the move and that has many competing demands on its time, the campaign leadership must strive to find new ways to "stay on top" of the situation.

Modern technology is allowing those interested in politics to do many things which were virtually impossible in the past. Sampling techniques often have proved to be invaluable in establishing a campaign strategy. The placing of key constituent, financial, and organization data in computerized form has allowed the candidate and his staff to retrieve meaningful information on a quick time basis. Finally, systems methodology has enhanced the ability of the political practitioner to better perceive the often intricate relationships between elements of the campaign.

There is a marked trend, as witnessed here at the Midwest Regional Vote Workshop, for leaders in business, labor, politics, and civic affairs to get together and compare notes. Each group has a positive stake in America's future. As the Nation's capabilities and responsibilities increase, there is a recognized need to increase the base of understanding and activity among the citizenry.

The role of automatic data processing and systems analysis in politics has yet to be defined. Thoughtful persons are learning about and evaluating those applications of the new tools and techniques which can help them. The strength of the United States is vested in its people, its incomparable natural resources, and the spirit of innovation and industry which has placed it in a position of world leadership. With the advent of twentieth century technology, the constitutional procedures for self-determination may be augmented in ways that will allow those responsible for political fulfillment to better cope with the hallowed challenges of the political maelstrom.

The Linchester Mill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROGERS C. B. MORTON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 27, 1967

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, one of the oldest businesses still in existence in the United States is located in my district in Maryland.

Linchester Mill, owned and operated by Capt. Frank S. Langrell, is situated on Hunting Creek in Caroline County. The mill is a picturesque landmark on the Eastern Shore, and is worthy of consideration for designation as a national historic site.

I include in the RECORD an article about "The Mill at Linchester," written by Mary Warren, which appeared in the June issue of the Maryland Conservationist.

The article follows:

THE MILL AT LINCHESTER

(By Mary Warren)

The oldest business enterprise in continuous operation in the United States—that's quite a claim to fame! And, it belongs—not to one of the long-established and great industrial "giants" of this country as we think of "big business" in America. Rather this distinction apparently is merited by an ancient grist mill on Maryland's Eastern Shore that has been grinding corn meal since before the Revolutionary War.

The Linchester Mill on Hunting Creek is near Preston in Caroline County. Nestled in its picturesque woodland site, the mill is virtually hidden from the highway, though a scant 100 yards from it. Travelers motoring along Maryland Rt. 331 might observe the roadside marker, installed by the Maryland Historical Society that identifies the nearby historic site. The sign bears this inscription:

"Linchester, circa 1681. Since the establishment of Hunting Creek Grist Mill prior to 1681, a mill on this site has served farmers. Known during the Revolutionary War as Murray's Mill, it supplied provisions to the Continental Army. Linchester also was a colonial port of entry."

Little information appears to have been written about the Linchester Mill. However, there is sufficient evidence that the mill was operating prior to 1681. One reference indicates that it might date as early as 1670.

Closest runner-up to the Linchester Mill in antiquity was the Perot Malting Company of Philadelphia, founded in 1687 as Anthony Morris' Brew House. The firm had as its slogan, "Seven years older than the old lady of Threadneedle Street," a term used by Britishers for the Bank of England, established in 1694. Since it is affirmed that the old Linchester Mill operated on its present site for more than 280 years, this predates the Pennsylvania venture by at least six years. Further, the Perot concern ceased its operations in 1962.

Captain Frank S. Langrell, now in his early 80's, is the Mill's owner and operator. He acquired the property in 1914. The old mill and "Cap'n" Langrell are synonymous, for he has been associated with it since his 'teens. Perhaps this makes him eligible for the honors for "longest record of continuous employment with a single business!"

Each weekday finds Cap'n Langrell on the job from early morning till dusk, tending to his various duties since he operates the business single-handedly. He is Miller, Millwright, Maintenance Man, Business Manager, Bookkeeper and Salesman. In order to take care of this latter duty the Mill is closed on Thursdays. The spry octogenarian loads sacks of ground meal and flour into his pick-up truck and then spends several hours on the roads in Caroline and Dorchester Counties distributing his product to neighboring consumers.

Of course, if you stop in at the Mill, you can make your purchase right there. Incidentally, residents of the area attest to their conviction that the corn meal from the Mill is "the best you can find anywhere."

The Mill bears ample testimony to its years. In its dark and dusty interior, intricate, flour-white webs are woven as if time had etched its lacy, ageless pattern as an everlasting memorial. The great iron water wheel, which Captain Langrell recalls installing when it was brand new in 1918, is rusting. Frosted, time-mellowed implements and tools of the trade, long since out of use, lie scattered about.

Here, at the Linchester Mill, is the tremendous opportunity to preserve what may be America's only remaining water-powered grist mill in operation. The educational factors alone are worth considering. Grist mills, that provided the flour for household use, were essential requirements when colonists were moving into and settling an area. Here at Linchester, we are able to see, to touch, to watch a "living" museum—the real thing, one of the earliest industries developed in the newly-emerging nation.

Another intimate link with history is the narrative that can be told of the flour milled at Linchester and shipped in response to an urgent plea from General George Washington to the patriot army, hungry and suffering the blast of winter at Valley Forge.

An era of vast importance to Marylanders and to the Nation, while still being nurtured and tenderly cared for under the loving supervision of its venerable proprietor, may fall into further stages of decay and possibly even be lost forever through wanton destruction by vandals.

What is the future of Linchester Mill? Assuredly, this living landmark is worthy of recognition. With the "progress" of contemporary living, many such priceless structures are thoughtlessly destroyed, either by ruthless developers and land speculators and/or by citizens who give little forethought to the protection which these timepieces of years gone by cannot bespeak for themselves.

Loss of Linchester Mill must be averted. Such a loss would be irretrievable, a page from American history destroyed forever. We should respond to the poetic exhortation by Thomas Dunn English and "keep the mill a going!"

Air Pollution Control Bill Will Receive House Consideration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 25, 1967

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I am most pleased to note that on August 1, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce will commence hearings on various bills to help combat air pollution.

Of special interest the committee will be concerned with S. 780 which passed unanimously a couple of weeks ago. I urge the committee to reach an enlightened decision of these measures as quickly as possible. Everything that we in Congress do to help further the battle against air pollution is a constructive step forward.

In southern California just last week, an area generally acknowledged to already have the most effective antismog programs in operation, citizens' eyes were watering, vision was obscured by smog dense enough to warrant the calling of a "smog alert." It is time, Mr. Speaker, for Congress to greatly expand Federal efforts in pollution abatement as well as to encourage increasing State and local participation in antipollution offensives.

While the committee deliberates the air pollution bills, I believe that we in Congress should continue thinking about enacting the recent HEW task force recommendation that a unified Environmental Protection Act be shortly enacted.

As I have stated in previous comments, it is time for us to take a most active interest in improving the quality of our environment. It is most deplorable that a majority of citizens believe that we in Congress and the Federal Government in general, are not doing all that is possible in attempting to combat the scourge of air pollution. The time for action is now, Mr. Speaker.

Carmichael in Havana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 26, 1967

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial is so convincing that it needs no further introduction. I concur fully with its conclusions, and while I do not want to be one who goes around saying "I told you so," I was among the first Members of this Congress to call attention to the subversive activities of Stokely Carmichael.

I can only renew my demand of the other day that now that his full colors have been shown in publicly proclaiming that he will be become Castro's lieutenant in America in exporting the Communist revolution onto our shores, if Stokely Carmichael ever has the nerve to come back to the United States, he should be tried forthwith, on a charge of treason.

There can be no further question that this man is ready to sell out his country to the enemy.

The Star editorial follows:

CARMICHAEL IN HAVANA

The well-publicized arrival of Stokely Carmichael in Cuba and his lavish expressions of support for the Castro brand of exported revolutions serve to clear up two troublesome questions. His journey and his statements remove all doubt about Carmichael's political orientation. And they go a long way toward explaining his motives in exhorting American Negroes to rise up in suicidal rebellion.

Carmichael has now, quite simply and unequivocally, stated his political position. Whether a card-carrier or not, he is for all practical purposes a Communist. Castro and the evanescent Che Guevara are his heroes. Already—according to Carmichael—the guerrilla tactics of the Cuban revolution have been applied in the Newark riots. And, he said, "we are preparing groups of urban guerrillas for our defense in the cities. . . . It is going to be a fight to the death."

Until Carmichael declared himself, there had been one major mystery about his tactics of violence: What did he, as a spokesman for the Negro cause, hope to gain for his followers? That was the question raised yesterday by four Negro leaders—Martin Luther King, Roy Wilkins, Whitney M. Young Jr. and A. Philip Randolph—in their joint plea for an end to the rioting.

"Who is without the necessities of life when the neighborhood stores are destroyed and looted? Whose children are without milk because deliveries cannot be made? Who loses wages because of a breakdown in transportation or the destruction of the place of employment? Who are the dead . . . ?" The answer, quite obviously, is that the Negro is the loser.

And the answer to why Carmichael, the primary advocate of black violence, preached his sermon of self-defeating race hatred is now equally obvious. Carmichael was not a fighter for Negro rights. He was a worker for communism. And those who heeded him were not followers who had his loyalty. They were sacrifices to a cause.

Violence in the cities of the United States is the food on which communism grows fat. The greater the carnage, the greater the propaganda value. And the fact that Negroes were the principal battle victims was not important. What mattered were the headlines in Europe, in Africa, in South America—the embarrassment and damage that could be inflicted on the United States of America.

It would, of course, be a tragic error for anyone to expand the revelation of Carmichael's motive into a general indictment of the drive for Negro rights. The fight for equality in education, in housing, in employment opportunity, is a just and an honorable fight. And the fact that one militant leader has shown himself to be a traitor to the cause of civil rights cannot be seized upon to discredit the entire movement.

The Carmichael incident should, on the contrary, serve to strengthen the legitimate battle for full civil rights. Other Negro leaders, motivated by a sincere desire to deliver to their followers a just degree of participation in this nation's rich life, now can and should disassociate themselves completely from Stokely Carmichael. And Carmichael's heirs should now re-examine, in the light of his newly revealed motivation, the legacy of black power and race hatred that he has left them.

When they do, they will recognize the obscene structure Carmichael has built from legitimate frustrations, hopes and dreams. And when that realization comes, the end of the bloody, ruinous, senseless riots should be at hand.

A Train Ride to the Top of the Tallest Structure in the United States, the Gateway Arch at St. Louis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 25, 1967

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, the Bi-state Development Agency, which operates the public transit facilities in the St. Louis, Mo.-East St. Louis, Ill., area, has placed into operation the most unusual train in the United States, one which has been described as combining elements of an elevator, mine hoist, and Ferris wheel. The train consists of eight cylindrical cars, or capsules, each carrying five passengers. The new facility operates in the soaring and spectacular Gateway Arch, designed by the late Eero Sarrinen as the theme and centerpiece of the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial administered by the National Park Service in St. Louis.

The Jefferson National Expansion Memorial is rapidly becoming one of the great tourist attractions of this country. Millions of people each year visit the arch, even though it is still incomplete inside and stands in a vast area of mud and weeds. Unfortunately, the Interior Department appropriation bill which we passed this year did not include funds recommended by the President for continuation of the work on the arch, but that is another story and, I am afraid, one which reflects poor judgment on the part of the Appropriations Committee.

Nevertheless, millions of tourists are making the Gateway Arch part of their itinerary when they are in the St. Louis area and we are delighted to have them. It is too bad that in visiting this memorial to the opening of the West, the exhibits that will make the arch meaningful—the historical data and the motion pictures and other displays—just cannot be shown until more funds are provided to complete the interior, including the Museum of Westward Expansion.

But, when you come to St. Louis, Mr. Speaker, as I hope you will, you can now ride to the top of the 630-foot-high Gateway Arch and enjoy a remarkable view from the highest manmade structure in the United States and also experience the most unusual train ride in the country. I can say that it is a never-to-be-forgotten experience, as all of us who have made this journey to the top of the arch can attest.

NEW YORK TIMES ARTICLE BY RICHARD JACOBS

Recently, the New York Times carried an article by Richard Jacobs, of the staff of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, on the train trip to the top of the arch. Because of the great investment by the people of St. Louis who have financed one-fourth of the cost, and by the Government of the United States in paying three-fourths of the cost of the arch, I am sure the Members will be interested in reading this article to see what the Federal funds have helped to pay for. However, the train operation was financed entirely by Bistate Development Agency revenue bonds, without Federal contribution.

Under unanimous consent, I submit for the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the article, "A Ride Up the Arch," written for the New York Times by Richard Jacobs of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch and reprinted in the Post-Dispatch on July 20, 1967, as follows:

A RIDE UP THE ARCH—REPORTER DESCRIBES TRIP IN TRAIN TO BE OPEN TO PUBLIC NEXT MONDAY—RICHARD JACOBS IN THE NEW YORK TIMES

ST. LOUIS.—Construction of the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial, commemorating America's westward growth seems to be taking nearly as long as the actual winning of the West. Anyone born the year that President Franklin D. Roosevelt first designated this part of downtown St. Louis as a historic site is now 32 years old, and the memorial on the west bank of the Mississippi river is still unfinished.

However, the Gateway Arch, the gleaming, 630-foot-high centerpiece of the park, is almost ready to begin receiving visitors on a paying basis.

Outwardly, the arch, the tallest one in the world, was completed about 20 months ago. However, the late Eero Saarinen designed the structure with a double purpose: It is pot only a monument, but an observation point as well. Its hollow stainless-steel legs are curving elevator shafts, within which special cable-drawn "trains" ascend to an observation chamber at the apex of the arch.

This complicated $1,000,000 system, which combines elements of an elevator, mine hoist and Ferris wheel, has been three years in the making and is still being perfected. Many target dates have passed, but one of the two trains has been running for some time. Its passengers have been construction workers, visiting officials and journalists. Normally, the ascent takes four minutes and the descent three.

The trip begins in an underground lobby beneath the arch. Each train consists of eight cylindrical cars—they are essentially five-passenger capsules—linked together and drawn along guide rails by cables.

Passengers sit on modernistic molded seats placed in a rather cozy semicircle. The gray interior is pleasant, but plain. After the sliding doors, which the passengers face, are closed, the train moves forward, turns on a 35-foot radius and begins its climb up the leg of the arch. It rises 356 feet at 12 degrees off vertical, and then traverses an arc to the observation chamber atop the arch. The train travels only half as fast as a standard elevator, but the ride seems swift.

Exiting at the top, visitors may be surprised at the amount of room in the observation chamber, which is eight feet wide and 65 feet long. The floor and ceiling curve visibly, and there are 16 recessed window slits on each convex wall. One must lean well forward to peer out of these windows; sightseers subject to vertigo may find that their pulse rates have speeded up.

The view is as spectacular as the arch itself, which can be seen 30 miles away on a clear day. Spread out to the west is St. Louis, now undergoing an extensive urban-renewal program. Readily identifiable in the immediate area are the historic Old Courthouse, where the Dred Scott slavery case first came to trial in 1846, and Busch Memorial Stadium, the city's new baseball park.

To the east, just across the Mississippi, is the industrial expanse of East St. Louis and the new 100-acre site of the National Museum of Transport, now near Kirkwood, Mo.

Some visitors have found the ride to the top of the arch a trifle harrowing, but Robert C. Beal, projector engineer for the Planet Corporation of Lansing, Mich., contractor for the train system, describes it as "an interesting ride; there is nothing frightening about it."

The trains were scheduled to begin operating more than two years ago. Mr. Beal says the early target was unrealistic in the light of the knotty engineering problems involved. Because the arch is a nonuniform curve with sections that diminish in size as they approach the apex, the engineering calculations alone were formidable.

At the top of the arch, the trains must fit within an inch of the confines, and the shape of the structure makes it difficult for the workmen to maneuver. In the early stages of construction, the interior of the arch was as dark and damp as a mine, and as hot or cold as the temperature outside. Delays, owing to what Mr. Beal calls "nuisance problems," were numerous.

But Mr. Beal insists that stoppages of the trains have not been a recurring problem. When they do occur, they normally can be corrected in 10 minutes or less, he says, adding, "The chance of passengers experiencing anything worse than a relatively short detention is extremely remote."

One reason contractors are under pressure to get the system into public service as soon as possible is that as much as $1700 a day in revenue from the train rides is being lost. That is the amount that the Bi-State Development Agency, which issued revenue bonds to pay for the system, hopes to take in during the tourist season.

Fares for the train rides will be $1 for adults and 50 cents for children under 12.

In addition to the train system, there is a winding stairway to the top, and, in each leg, an elevator to the 372-foot level. They are for use only by workers or in emergencies.

The best time ever clocked for reaching the top by way of the 1076-step stairway is 10 minutes 58 seconds. The record-holder is a construction worker. It takes ordinary men 30 to 45 minutes, and it can easily take 15 to 20 minutes just to descend the stairs.

The arch has been designated by the American Society of Civil Engineers as the outstanding civil-engineering achievement of the year.

Letter From D. Lewis E. January, President of the American Heart Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 27, 1967

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, in the course of hearings conducted by the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee on the Comprehensive Health Planning Act amendments, representatives of the American Heart Association were questioned for their views. In response to an observation made by me regarding the participation of voluntary health organizations in financing such programs, I have received a letter from Dr. Lewis E. January, president of the association, which I feel should be recorded for the reference of our colleagues.

Since the official hearings record does not include this statement, I include it in the RECORD:

AMERICAN HEART ASSOCIATION, INC.,
New York, N.Y., June 2, 1967.

Representative CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR.,
Longworth House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: In the course of questioning Dr. Thomas W. Mattingly, one of the American Heart Association witnesses testifying before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on May 3, you made the following observation:

"It occurs to me that there is a possibility here, as these programs (Federally supported health programs) become increasingly Federal or continually Federal—that is, a participation that is envisioned to go on forever and get larger in terms of total dollars forever—that private voluntary health organizations may face a drying-up of resources through which they operate or with which they operate."

Dr. Mattingly responded to one element of your question as follows:

"Certainly the private sector of medicine should continue to play an important part in these areas. They should not ever completely turn them over to government agencies."

There is a second element to the question, however, which must be answered with a reference to the nation's need for voluntary health agencies such as the American Heart Association.

The American Heart Association, you probably know, gave full support in 1948 to the formation of the National Heart Institute.

subsequently we have repeatedly encouraged the growth of this institute to its present size. We have also appearing during the intervening years before Congressional Appropriations Committees to urge central specific inceases in the budgets of the National Heart Institute, of the Heart Disease Control Branch, and of other granting agencies dealing with the cardiovascular diseases. We have consistently taken this stand because we recognize that the national effort to control the heart and blood vessel diseases, the nation's Number 1 health enemy, demands the fullest collaboration of the voluntary health agency and the resources of the Federal government.

The second reason for the continuing existence of the American Heart Association is its ability to remain flexible in planning and carrying forward vital basic and clinical research. This flexibility is more characteristic of the voluntary agency than of the government establishment. Additionally, the voluntary agency has an ability to improvise, to experiment, and to test new approaches which also is not always possible for governmental agencies.

Furthermore the American Heart Association, with 35,000 physicians and scientists among its 75,000 members, and with 2,000,000 Heart Fund volunteers in its service, provides a most effective and efficient mechanism for sensing the health needs of a local area, for reaching into the nation's communities to deliver to physicians and the public the latest knowledge about the heart and blood vessel diseases, and for giving guidance and help in the development of community services, including the implementation of heart and stroke rehabilitation programs.

We believe, additionally, that the American people will continue to support a voluntary agency such as the American Heart Association so that it may contribute not only expertise to our society but also express grassroot views and desires concerning the use of government monies for health—a function performed when we, as agency officers and spokesmen, appear before your committees in Congress as expert witnesses.

May I point out that the American Heart Association came into being as a national voluntary health agency at approximately the time that the National Heart Institute was organized. During our first campaign we collected $800,000 through voluntary public contributions. In the 19 years that have elapsed, each Heart Fund campaign collection exceeded that of the preceding year. In the 1966 campaign we reached a peak of $34,500,000. We expect the 1967 campaign, conducted this past February, to approach the $36,000,000 mark. Thus the growth of the National Heart Institute at no time has impeded the parallel growth of the American Heart Association.

By virtue of this pattern, and for the specific reasons enumerated above, we do not believe that the growth of Federal spending in the health field will tend to dry up or even to decrease the public contributions to the American Heart Association or to any voluntary agency which is directing its full and honest efforts to help control a devastating health problem.

We would be pleased, if this is agreeable to you, to have this letter inserted as an addendum to our testimony of May 3 so that the record will show a comprehensive answer to your important question and observation.

With many thanks for your interest in the work of the American Heart Association,

Sincerely yours,

Lewis E. January, M.D.,
President.

Clean Water Plan Fouled by Redtape and Red Ink

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 27, 1967

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert in the Appendix of the Record an excellent editorial appearing in the Detroit Free Press, July 10, 1967, regarding water pollution control funds.

The article, entitled "Clean Water Plan Fouled by Redtape and Red Ink," points out the problems facing the Michigan State Water Resource Commission in its assault against water pollution.

The article follows:

As We See It: Clean Water Plan Fouled by Redtape and Red Ink

An assault against the pollution of Michigan's rivers and lakes was scheduled to start recently at a State Water Resources Commission meeting in East Lansing.

It didn't make much of a splash.

The frustration of the commission's efforts helps explain why there are "cussers and doubters" who believe that Washington and, for that matter, Lansing have a twisted set of priorities.

Under strong prodding from Washington, it looked until earlier this year as if Michigan was going to do something significant about water pollution. The U.S. Public Health Service had labeled the Detroit River a $200 million mess. The commission reported that raw, untreated sewage was being dumped into some of the state's most scenic rivers.

Congress had passed a water pollution bill calling for federal grants of $450 million a year for four years, including $19 million a year for Michigan, Gov. Romney was planning to call for state spending of nearly $10 million. The federal law provides fod 50–25–25 federal, state and local financing, so the prospect was for investment of some $40 million annually for water pollution control.

The commission called for grant applications from local communities and the response was enthusiastic. The commission has received some 105 requests covering projects totaling some $205 million.

Meanwhile federal and state money started to shrink. The Vietnam war led President Johnson to cut domestic programs. Antipollution funds were cut to $200 million and Michigan's share became less than $7 million. If Michigan appropriates $3.5 million, the size of the grant program will then be only $14 million.

At that rate, it would take fully 15 years to finance the projects which local municipalities want to undertake immediately.

So the commission is faced with the agonizing task of selecting a few purified islands from a rising sea of pollution. Detroit was given a high priority rating, but this apparently will have little value. The Department of Water Supply's projects would cost $111.5 million.

The drying up of federal funds has undercut anti-pollution efforts in still another way, according to Loring F. Oeming, executive secretary of the commission.

City officials are unwilling to go ahead and pay for pollution controls entirely from local funds when there is a federal program under which $1 in local money can be matched by $3 in state and federal money. Yet only a small fraction can get the grants. The result is that cities aren't installing water pollution controls which, without the federal act, they would have gone ahead and done on their own.

This tangle has greatly complicated the work of the commission, For it is setting out aggressively to enforce compliance with new water purity standards.

Already the commission has gone to court to compel Lake Orion to install sewage treatment facilities. In the Oakland County court test, the circuit judge ordered the municipality to make improvements—but conditioned on its receiving federal funds.

If this precedent is established, the commission might as well give up. For its authority would extend only to the small percentage of water and sewer districts capable of qualifying for grants and they usually are already willing to make improvements, providing three-fourths of the money comes from Lansing and Washington.

The assault against water pollution is floundering in red tape and red ink before it even gets started.

Captive Nations Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 24, 1967

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, the Greater Cleveland community observed Captive Nations Week on the Public Square in Cleveland the evening of July 17. The following is my statement on that occasion:

Captive Nations Week

(Statement of the Honorable Michael A. Feighan, U.S. Representative)

The compelling issue of our times is peace, that is, peace with justice for all nations and all people.

Mankind has witnessed the ruthless march of imperial Russian communism for almost half a century. This march has overrun and occupied no less than a score of once free and independent nations. Three other nations have been forcibly divided by this Red tyranny. Nearly one-third of all humanity is now enchained against their will behind the iron and bamboo curtains. The Russian Communists boldly assert they will not stop their march until all the world is their captive empire. This situation is responsible for the dangerous tensions which grip the world and threaten another armed conflict.

In our quest for Peace with Justice we have tens of millions of allies within the Russian Communist empire. These are the people, the common man, of the captive, non-Russian nations. They call out to us for emancipation from the tyranny and Godless system which has been imposed upon them by subversion, terror, and military force. Their political goals are the same as ours—liberty, freedom, and national independence.

The aspirations of the people of the captive, non-Russian nations stand as a powerful deterrent to war. The non-Russian people comprise the overwhelming majority of the population behind the iron and bamboo curtains. No Red dictator will dare to launch a new world war in the certain knowledge these captive peoples are firmly allied with freedom's cause.

It is, therefore, imperative that we keep alive the aspirations of the people of the captive nations, to manifest our concern for their present plight and to strengthen our alliance with them. The official observance of captive nations week by the people of Greater Cleveland is a fitting way to express our support for the just aspirations of these people.

Great numbers of citizens in our community have family ties in many of the captive nations, particularly Poland, Hungary, Ukraine, Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, East Germany, Armenia, and Croatia. They know well the flight of their friends and relatives living under Communist rule. It is necessary that all Americans understand the plight of the captive nations and the aspirations of the people of these nations for freedom and national independence. For it is in this understanding that we, as a nation, shall find the key to peace and justice.

People of Greece Hate Reds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 27, 1967

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, of necessity, due to the confusing application of foreign policy, I have been persistently urging that we give effective cooperation to the Government of Greece. A renowned international journalist who has made a special study of this issue is Dumitru Danielopol, of the Copley Press. I wish to insert at this point the following article by Mr. Danielopol, which appeared in the June 19 edition of the Monrovia, Calif., Daily News-Post:

PEOPLE OF GREECE HATE REDS

(By Dumitru Danielopol)

ATHENS.—The people of Greece have good reasons to hate Communism.

As they put it here they had "three turns" with the Reds.

Whether the military revolution of April 21 saved Greece from a "fourth turn" or whether it was an exaggerated response to a crumbling political situation may never be proved. But it is not hard to understand why Greeks are nervous about any Communist maneuvers.

Russia eyed Greece as a Red satellite long before the end of World War II. It was the obvious route to the warm waters of the Mediterranean, a means to outflank an always hostile Turkey.

During the war the communists had two organizations in Greece, the EAM national front of liberation (sounds familiar?) and its military wing, the Elas national popular liberation army.

"They were supposed to fight the Germans, but they had only a few unimportant skirmishes with the Nazis," said a veteran of Greece's guerrilla wars."

Their main objective was to eliminate the true democratic resistance movements which fighting the enemy."

One of these, EDES, was led by General Zervas, another led by Col. Psarros. The latter was destroyed by the Communists in the Greek mountains.

"Psarros was executed, and the anniversary of that date is still celebrated by the Communists in Greece," said an official.

While the Germans held Athens and the big cities, the Reds tortured and killed tens of thousands of Greeks in the provinces when they refused to buy Communist ideas.

The Churchill-Stalin deal or swap that gave Romania to Russian Occupation while the British were to take care of Greece, did not stop the Reds from pushing for their objectives in this country.

They opened the "second turn" with Communism as soon as the Germans began to retreat. Athens never saw war until the Nazis left. British and regular Greek army units landed to fight the Germans had instead to take on the hostile Communist guerrillas. The Reds were everywhere.

For 20 days they controlled four-fifths of the city of Athens.

British Prime Minister Winston Churchill on a visit to Greece at that time had to travel in a British tank to be safe from Communist snipers.

Thousands of Greek hostages—most of them educated—were taken by the Reds and marched northward. Later they were found dead in a collective grave, mutilated, tortured. Some had been slashed to death with tin can covers.

An allied mission lead by Sir Walter Oitrine of Britain, inspected the remains and testified on Communist bestiality.

The Communists lost the "second turn" when Britain spurred in troops and eventually broke the Red reign of terror.

Under Allied supervision elections took place in Greece in 1946 and a plebiscite to decide the fate of the exiled King George and the dynasty, was held at the same time. The people voted to return the King to Athens.

But the Communist were not inclined to accept elections and plebiscite. Greece was too big a prize. They soon after opened a new attack on the forces of law and order. The first blow came in March 1946 in an attack on the office of the gendarmerie on Mount Olympus.

This was the kick off of the "third turn."

It lasted until 1949. This time British help faltered, but President Truman declared the Truman doctrine and poured in arms and aid that finally turned back the Communists.

"There was not one single American soldier fighting on Greek soil during this period," Greek government officials point out. "We fought our own battle with the help of Gen. James Van Fleet and his advisers who organized the Greek forces and armed them."

The war was a long one because the Reds found shelter across the 800-mile frontier Greece has with Communist Albania, Yugoslavia and Bulgaria. The situation was much like that which confronts U.S. troops on the border of Cambodia.

The losses to Greece in human life and property were tremendous. They far outstripped World War II damages. The Reds kidnapped 26,000 children in an effort to terrorize and demoralize the country. Deporting them to Communist countries where they have been indoctrinated with Marxism to form a potential "fifth column."

One of every three families lost at least one member deported or killed by the Communists.

If these people over-react to new Communists threats, they have good reason.

Ralph R. Roberts

SPEECH
OF
HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 19, 1967

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, in his 43 years of service to the House of Representatives, Ralph Roberts performed his duties in a dignified and honorable manner.

As a friend of 20 years duration, I commend his faithful service to this body and to the Nation. For the future, I wish him many years of good health and happiness.

The Mexican-American: An Awakening Giant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 17, 1967

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a very moving and thought-provoking article by our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Texas, HENRY B. GONZALEZ, entitled "The Mexican-American: An Awakening Giant," which appeared in the July issue of the U.S. Department of Labor's Employment Service Review.

In applauding the Johnson administration's concerted campaign against poverty, and its continuing efforts to assure full educational, employment, and economic opportunities for all our citizens, Congressman GONZALEZ emphasizes the encouraging progress now being made by the Mexican-American community of the Southwest.

The heartwarming message of this excellent article can well be summed up in Representative GONZALEZ' own stirring words:

> Americans of Spanish surname, who have furnished the muscles that turned much of the Southwest from arid desert into miraculously productive farmland, who laid the foundations of our cities, and who have willingly laid down their lives to defend it all, now know that the great American dream, so long denied, can be theirs.

The article follows:

THE MEXICAN-AMERICAN: AN AWAKENING GIANT

(By Congressman HENRY B. GONZALEZ of Texas)

Human society is by nature dynamic; it is in a constant state of change. Old generations pass on, and new ones emerge; old customs change as they become irrelevant to existing conditions; even languages change because old words become inadequate to express new events. Yet, amid all this change, there remain depressing constants: The poor remain poor and, for some, life is only a procession of identical days, and hope does not exist at all. Among the poorest of the poor is the Spanish-surnamed population of America.

Concentrated in the Southwest, these 5 million people know all too closely the cold hand of hunger and the despair of a day when there is is no work to be had. The plight of the Spanish-surnamed American can be outlined in a tragic litany of statistics. In a country where the rate of unemployment is below 4 percent, this minority experiences unemployment of 8 percent; in places the figures is twice that high. In a country where a job means hope, this minority finds a large percentage of its workers underemployed, underpaid, or both. Many who are lucky enough to have jobs have no hope of advancing, because the Spanish-surnamed minority is, in general, undereducated and without the skills necessary for finding a good job or advancing. Many struggle against ill health. Others face the harshest kind of discrimination, and a few are hapless victims of exploitation. The absence of opportunity and the inability to grasp what opportunities exist plague them.

Statistics can measure only tangibles. The effect of degradation on a man's soul has yet to find expression in a mathematical table. There is no machine to explain what happens to a man when he loses hope, or when he abandons the idea that tomorrow may bring better things. Nor is there any way of reckoning the tragic cost incurred by the waste of human talents that have never reached their potential, of lives that have never been able to contribute their full value to society. But no one should need a yardstick to measure the depths of despair among the Spanish-surnamed. It should be enough for a man of conscience simply to know that it exists, and this knowledge ought to drive him to action and cause him to seek ways to renew the vigor of life and hope where it is perilously close to fading away. There need be no accurate measurement of the cost to all men when some men begin to feel that tomorrow, if it comes, will be no better than today.

There is a whisper of change in the Southwest today. Americans of Spanish surname are beginning to seek an identity of their own, and they are searching for definable goals. They are anxious to reclaim hope, and ready to bring into reality the promise of the future. They are beginning to know what the American dream is, and they are ready to claim it for their own, as have so many other minorities before them.

Much of this renewed vigor has come about because of the commitment of the Johnson Administration to campaign against poverty and all its evils and ills. It is the war on poverty that has made it possible for so many Americans of Spanish surname to see hope over the horizon and to know that there are attainable improvements in life. The realization that there are attainable goals has caused them to seek goals that are even higher, and better, and farther away.

An administration that has committed itself to bringing about social change immediately faces several difficulties. In the first place, not everyone is in favor of social change; it upsets comfortable patterns of the past and it creates general unrest. Men who are suddenly no longer willing to remain poor are not happy with things as they are, and may (and very likely will) make demands that would have been unheard of in earlier times. Secondly, a government is not the best instrument for bringing about social change. Not all civil servants are dedicated to the new ideas implicit in programs that are innovative. Many men to whom the administration of the war on poverty is entrusted are timid generals; they are fearful of making mistakes, fearful of arousing controversy, fearful of contradicting ideas of their superiors, and anxious to win promotion. Taken together, these inhibitions cause government in general to have slow reflexes, and new programs in particular to have a striking similarity to old ones. Then, too, a great many administrators know all too well that this program, too, will pass—very likely before they do.

COMMITTED TO IDEA

Despite the general difficulties of using government as the instrument of social change, the Administration is committed to the idea, and this commitment has produced striking results. There are young men learning new skills in the Job Corps; there are Neighborhood Youth Corpsmen learning how to learn and work, and getting pocket money for their pains (badly needed skills, and even more badly needed money); there are Volunteers in Service to America learning how it is to be poor, and trying to teach the poor that there really is a way out of the trap of poverty; and there is more than that.

Most of all, there is a reviving feeling among the poor, and among the Spanish-surnamed, that it really is possible for things to get better.

If a man is so poor that he exists on the borderline of starvation, life is a day-to-day matter. He feels lucky if he has enough to eat. Such a man, struggling with all his wit and strength to get a meal or two, has no time to think about the future, and if he gets a few cents ahead, he is likely to spend his pennies seeking the relief of pleasure. After all, there may never be another chance to have some fun. On the other hand, if a man is in a state of more or less tolerable poverty, he does have some time to think about the future. He is able to feel resentment that others have more than he is able to possess; he is able to dream of having more tomorrow than he has today. Such a man is capable of having hope, and capable of yearning for tomorrow to come, because it may very well be a better day. The Spanish-surnamed population, more and more, is unhappy with the present and ready for tomorrow, and new opportunity, to come.

Having provided the sustenance of hope and the fires of ambition, the Government must now take steps to see that the new dreams of the Spanish-surnamed American population are turned into realities. No man's hunger is satisfied if he is only shown a menu: food alone will suffice. The vigor and leadership that have so far been offered must be continued, even redoubled.

Count Leo Tolstoy observed the tragedy of paper reforms in the Russia of 1812. He wrote, in War and Peace, of a young aristocrat, Count Bezushov, who had inherited a vast estate. He was a reformer and something of a mystic. He decided that he would bring a new order of life into being on his property. So Bezushov ordered his overseer to provide schools for the peasants on the estates, and medical care for them, and all manner of other reforms calculated to make human beings and reasonably free people of the serfs. But the Count lived in Moscow and St. Petersburg and never visited his estates. The overseer did very little about instituting reforms, and in fact conditions for the serfs got worse. The Count did not know this because all he knew was what the overseer told him, and the overseer sent glowing reports of progress. Promises and the best of intentions, without leadership and energetic administration, can never produce real results.

Americans of Spanish surname, who have furnished the muscles that turned much of the Southwest from arid desert into miraculously productive farmlands, who laid the rails and plucked the cotton, who dug the ditches and laid the foundations of our cities, and who have willingly laid down their lives to defend it all, now know that the great American dream, so long denied, can be theirs. Having done so much to create this hope and vision, the Administration must pursue its course to open new opportunities. The penalty for failure will be great, for the power of human aspiration may well overcome the saving grace of patience. But the rewards of success will be even greater. No one really knows what the cost has been of permitting misery and degradation to exist for so long. The only way of finding out is to help these millions of willing and able people to realize their full potential, and give their full measure to our country's wealth, and take their fair share from it.

Air Safety Article by Associated Press Writer Blaine Powlee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 27, 1967

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I have often stated my belief that Congress and the American people need to know more, much more, about ideas, attitudes, and development in the field of air safety. Recently, a seminar was conducted as part of the program of the inaugural convention of the International Society of Barristers. I feel that the ideas expressed by the panel of experienced men are worthy of consideration, and I wish to include in the Record the Associated Press account of their views:

Air Safety

Chicago.—A panel of aviation law specialists agreed today that near collisions of airplanes are far more frequent than generally known and that development of air safety devices lags "far behind the development of the industry."

They said that while air travel still is "acceptably safe," it is nowhere near as safe as the airlines' "admirable job of publicity" has led the public to believe.

The Federal Aviation Agency's air traffic control system, they said, is still "using the same hardware as we had 10 years ago, with planes now three times as fast."

The panelists included men experienced in the air, in flight control and in litigation involving air crashes.

The seminar was part of the program of the inaugural convention of the International Society of Barristers, an organization of trial lawyers whose membership is by invitation only.

The first session of the two-day seminar was devoted to stating the problem of air safety. Later sessions will develop recommendations for legislation, procedures and equipment which spokesmen said will be sent to affected public agencies and legislators.

Francis M. McDermott, with 22 years experience with government agencies, primarily in air traffic control, told of the frequency of near collisions. He said such reports by pilots "dried up" after the FAA announced each report would be investigated. McDermott, of McLean, Va., said pilots feared they would grounded pending such investigations.

Donald W. Madole, a pilot, former FAA attorney and later attorney for American Airlines, predicted the air congestion would get worse. He cited a projection that airline fleets will increase by 75 per cent to 3,500 planes and general aviation by 100 per cent to 180,000 aircraft by 1977. Madole also quoted a Swedish air safety expert, Capt. Boe Lundberg, as predicting that in the near future a major air disaster somewhere in the world will be a daily occurrence.

Madole said the air traffic control system has "the same hardware as we had 10 years ago, with planes now three times as fast. The only thing different is that the operator has a little better headset."

Lee S. Kreindler of New York City, a lawyer who specialized in air crash cases, said the coming jumbo jets and supersonic transports will "add to the existing problem—a problem compounded by the greater range of speeds." Kreindler said development of safety devices lags "far behind development of the industry."

Kreindler said he knew of a $30,000 anticollision device being developed but said this would communicate only with another plane so equipped.

The New York lawyer said only a small percentage of planes are equipped with transponders, a device which makes radar detection and control more effective. He estimated the cost of equipping all aircraft with such devices at $300 million.

McDermott brushed off talk about anticollision devices as something that merely serves "to take the heat off the FAA."

Madole joined in with, "we still don't have a return on the hundreds of millions of dollars we put into the FAA" to develop a control system that would prevent collisions.

Two other lawyers who specialize in air crash cases joined Kreindler in criticism of airlines' safety publicity, calling it "deceptive to sell the public on the idea that it is safer to fly than to drive."

Craig Spangenberg of Cleveland said airlines use a passenger-mile basis for their claims, but on per hour travel time basis, flying is not safer. Spangenberg said rail travel is safest of all, and bus travel next.

Kreinlder elaborated on what he called the "built-in deception of the (Passenger-mile) statistics:" An airliner carrying 100 passengers New York to Los Angeles would on a single flight build up 300,000 accident-free passenger miles—equaling a man's 30-year accident free record in a car if he drove 10,000 miles a year.

Irving G. Swenson of Chicago, counsel for Northwest Airlines in litigation arising out of the Tell City, Ind., air disaster, said it is difficult to get a "meaningful comparison" of air and auto safety.

Using air travel Chicago to Miami for an example, he said it would be necessary to compile accident records of all persons who drove cars from Chicago to Miami within a given period of time to make such a comparison.

L. B. J. Must Stop the Riots

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. GURNEY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 27, 1967

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, the riots and violence in the streets of our cities across the land are of desperate concern to us all.

A particularly thoughtful editorial appeared in Tuesday morning's Orlando Sentinel and I want to share it with my colleagues:

L. B. J. MUST STOP THE RIOTS

Since April 1 there have been 20 riots in as many cities across the land, and there is no end in sight.

What we are witnessing is a condition bordering on the state of anarchy where people are disregarding established laws of the nation and rules of society and are killing, maiming and looting to their heart's content.

It is not alarmist to say that if this condition continues this nation will eventually fall into the hands of its enemies.

Unrest in the cities has been blamed. It is certainly true that crowded housing conditions, lack of employment opportunities, and absence of recreation facilities may be contributing factors.

With the millions the federal government is spending on its poverty war, in time these lacks can be remedied. But doing good is not going to eliminate the professional agitator, the man who profits by riots, the man who very likely is paid or encouraged by the Communist party to see that riots take place.

The antiriot bill passed by the House and now in the Senate will help identify and punish the riot organizer who moves from state to state. It should become law.

But stronger measures, or measures of a different kind, are also needed. The individual states cannot cope with what appear to be spontaneous riots followed by looting, death, injuries and vast property damage, but the federal government can.

The President has not expressed himself sufficiently about this problem, and he should. The President should take the leadership in a strong approach to the problem of riots. He should call in the governors of the states, the Department of Justice. He should announce that this government is determined to end the reign or anarchy in the land.

He should say that Americans can no longer tolerate crime and violence in our streets and that the necessary steps will be taken to maintain order and protect the lives and property of citizens.

The alternative is chaos and death of the republic.

WMAL Editorial on the Commissioners' Art Fund

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 27, 1967

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, during the week of July 9, 1967, WMAL broadcasted an editorial concerning a bill which I had previously introduced to establish a cultural enrichment program for the District of Columbia youngsters.

The bill would provide Washington children with the opportunity to become acquainted with the best of our Nation's culture. The text of the editorial follows:

COMMISSIONERS' ART FUND

(Broadcast during the week of July 9, 1967)

Legislation to establish a Commissioners' Art Fund for Washington children has been lying virtually unnoticed since January. Yet this bill, designed to improve the cultural experience of countless children, deserves enthusiastic recognition and support.

The measure is sponsored by New York Congressman Abraham Multer, who points out that many cities conduct cultural enrichment programs for children. The Multer bill would provide Washington youngsters with concerts and theater, through which children would become acquainted with the best of our national culture. The Commissioners' Art Fund would also provide money for competitions to discover new talent and encourage young people to pursue excellence in the arts.

In Washington, cultural deprivation among children is a recognized weakness and, thus, we believe the Multer bill is vital. Washington civic organizations should rally behind the Commissioners' Art Fund plan and should urge its early adoption by Congress.

United States Condemns Use of Poison Gas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 27, 1967

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, less than a month ago I expressed to my colleagues my deep concern over the use of poison gas by the United Arab Republic against the people of Yemen.

Because of my interest in this problem I wrote to Ambassador Arthur Goldberg and asked him to instigate an investigation of the charges against the United Arab Republic and take whatever appropriate action might be necessary.

I have received a reply from Ambassador Goldberg, and so that my colleagues may be aware of the U.S. policy in this regard I include the letter from Ambassador Goldberg in the RECORD at this point:

U.S. REPRESENTATIVE
TO THE UNITED NATIONS,
New York, N.Y., July 24, 1967.

Hon. LESTER L. WOLFF,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. WOLFF: Thank you for your letter of July 19 concerning the use of poison gas by Egypt in its war with Yemen.

I can assure you that we share your concern over the growing number of indications that gas is once again being used by the UAR Air Force against the local population in Yemen. As you may be aware, the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) has confirmed that the "U.S. News and World Report" article which you entered in the Congressional Record of June 29 was indeed a valid Red Cross report. The ICRC also announced that copies of the report were sent to the Governments of the United Arab Republic and Saudi Arabia as well as to both sides in Yemen. In addition, the Red Cross issued a statement on June 2 calling on the Yemeni combatants to give a solemn pledge not to use poison gas.

The United States position on this matter is quite clear and corresponds to the stated policy of almost all other governments throughout the world as reflected in the voting (91 in favor and 4 abstentions) on UNGA Resolution 2162B of 1966 which condemned the use of poison gas in warfare. The use of poison gases is clearly contrary to international law and we would hope the authorities concerned in Yemen heed the request of the ICRC not to resort in any circumstances whatsoever to their use.

In addition to the ICRC's findings, the US Government has been giving close attention to detailed information on the January gas bombing report involving Kitaf, which the Saudi Arabian Government provided to the UN and which was published as a UN document on April 6th. This report contains a number of indications that poison gas was used on that occasion. We are deeply disturbed at press reports that the agent used may have been some new type of nerve gas as this would introduce an entirely new weapon, not previously employed by any nation of the world.

While thus indicating its strong concern over reports on the use of gas in Yemen, the United States has not taken the lead in the handling of this matter at the UN. Saudi

Arabia, the neighboring country most directly affected and the source of much of the evidence, has already furnished detailed information on the question to the Security Council. However, the countries in the area have not yet formally requested UN consideration of the issue, either in the General Assembly or the Security Council. Nevertheless, the United States is continuing to urge all parties to abide by the ICRC request and to refrain from any use of poison gas.

Sincerely yours,

Arthur J. Goldberg.

Blare of "Freedom" Has Tinhorn Ring

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 27, 1967

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the Appendix of the Congressional Record an excellent article by Sydney Harris that appeared in the Detroit Free Press, July 12, 1967.

Mr. Harris tells about the interesting attitude of an old friend—whose name I have deleted—toward "less government interference."

The article, entitled "Creating 'Vigilantism' Where None Exists," follows:

[From the Detroit Free Press, July 12, 1967]

Blare of "Freedom" Has Tinhorn Ring

(By Sidney Harris)

My old friend has been bleating about "freedom" for more than 30 years. Ever since the early days of the New Deal, he has been calling for "less government interference."

What he means is less interference with him. He's quite content to see much more government interference with other people. In fact, he writes long and heated letters to his congressmen about it.

He wants tougher laws against men who oppose the draft. He thinks the government should send them to jail. He wants a government crackdown on pugnacious labor leaders. He would like to have the cops round up all the beatniks and put them away somewhere.

He thinks that war dissenters ought to be muzzled. School dropouts ought to be forced to go to work. Teachers who wear beards and quote "inflammatory" literature in classrooms ought to be dismissed. Theater owners who show dirty movies ought to be shut down.

He is for stronger police laws, more military actions, compulsory labor arbitration, more vigorous censorship, and the abolition of all obnoxious picketing. If possible, he would like to have the FCC ban all radio stations from playing rock-and-roll music.

What kind of "freedom" does he really believe in? The freedom to be ———, to look like him, dress like him, think like him, believe like him, and get rich like him.

"Hands off" is his motto when the government proposes to restrict in any way his freedom to run a business, manage a property, pay taxes, or engage in any sort of fiscal frolics.

"Hands on" is his motto when he looks with disgust at antics of criminals, labor leaders, agitators (anybody who wants to change the status quo is by definition an "agitator"), beatniks, dropouts, and all people who wants different freedoms than he wants.

It has never occurred to him that maybe the reason no one had paid much attention to his bleats for "freedom" over the last 30 years is that it is perfectly obvious even to a moron that he wants only his kind of freedom.

Not once in all that time has he joined a committee, or signed a petition, that was to help somebody less affluent, less advantaged, less able to cope with the immensity and complexity of the power structure.

If he had, perhaps we could believe him more. Anybody can be for his own kind of freedom; but unless we respect it for those we dislike or disagree with, nobody else will follow us or have faith in us.

For Total Mobilization To Solve Urban Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 27, 1967

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, the people of the United States today face the greatest internal crisis they have known since the Civil War of a century ago.

The senseless violence that is spewing out of the ghettos of city after American city, the resulting death and property destruction, and the near total breakdown of the forces of law and order—something that approached a state of anarchy in both Newark and Detroit—make such a conclusion well-nigh inescapable.

I have listened in this Chamber, this week, as my colleagues have risen, one after the other, to agonize out loud about the terrible nature of these events and to express their sense of disbelief that such things could be happening here in our beloved Nation.

This I can understand, for I share their agony—the sense of disbelief and bewilderment.

And yet, Mr. Speaker, I am disturbed even further by the seeming parallel between the attitudes of helplessness and hopelessness, as well as of anger, and the efforts to affix political blame for what is transpiring as well as the piecemeal "solutions" that are being proposed here in the midst of our mounting crisis, and the attitudes and posturing of those of our great-grandfathers who served in this Congress a little more than a century ago as the Union their great-grandfathers, in turn, had established moved inevitably toward disruption.

The urgency of our present crisis clearly demands something far better than this of us. Any attempt to fix the blame, now, for what is happening around us reminds me, for all the world, of two drivers arguing in the street over who was at fault for the accident they have just had while their critically injured passengers lie unattended and uncared for.

So the "plague on both your houses" editorial as carried in yesterday's edition of the New York Times, was probably called for and, under leave granted to do so, I now include it as part of these remarks:

While Cities Burn

The nation has cause for deep concern if the leaders of both political parties are unable to forget political considerations when murder, arson and looting are sweeping some of its major cities. This grave domestic crisis demands a level and a quality of mature leadership that have been shocking in their absence.

Because he holds the highest office and therefore bears the highest responsibility both to act and to set an example, President Johnson offended most conspicuously in his pussyfooting response to the debacle in Detroit. He shilly-shallied for several hours in ordering the Army units into action in the city despite the pleas of local officials that troops were urgently needed. And when he did act, Mr. Johnson issued a proclamation and a personal statement both of which were clearly designed to place the entire political responsibility on Governor Romney.

It is no disgrace to either the Governor, a Republican, or to Mayor Cavanagh, a Democrat, that the situation in Detroit slipped out of local and state control. The fact that Governor Romney may be the Republican Presidential candidate next year may explain but cannot excuse President Johnson's nervous political posturing at this critical time.

But if the President's conduct was hesitant and strangely lacking in the quality of leadership, the statement issued by the Republican Coordinating Committee is a flagrant outrage. It is the most transparent kind of seedy politics to assert that these terribly difficult and complex problems, decades and even centuries in the making, have erupted "since the present Administration took office."

This shabby statement insults the nation's intelligence when it asserts that President Johnson's veto of a loosely drafted "crime-control bill" for the District of Columbia contributed to an upheaval a thousand miles away in Detroit or that the ludicrous anti-rioting bill already passed by the House would do the slightest bit of good.

"The root causes of discontent," the statement declares, "are of immediate and continuing concern to all of us." The Republican leaders nowhere state what those "root causes" are. There is not a single word about jobs, housing, health, care, education or other urban problems. Instead, the statement is replete with demagogic tales about unspecified factories manufacturing Molotov cocktails and unidentified riot organizers touring the country.

Because the statement was so misleading and so irresponsible, Senator Dirksen, that thick-skinned, battle-hardened political veteran, evidently could not bring himself to face up to a defense of it to skeptical reporters and ran away from his own press conference. It is no credit to either of them that former Governor Dewey shared in the drafting of this document and that former President Eisenhower associated his name with it.

It now appears that Congress will appoint a bipartisan joint committee to inquire into the riots. More good would be accomplished if the conservatives in both parties would re-examine their consciences and their voting records on the model cities bill, the rent-subsidy program, the rat-control bill, and many other measures before Congress. The new committee can accomplish little if its members from both parties do not rise above the execrable level established by Washington's political leaders in recent days.

Believe me, Mr. Speaker, I don't take any pleasure in such editorial spankings of either my party or yours, or our respective leaders and spokesmen—but I believe it does us well to heed them, for ours is the common responsibility, now, in deciding what can and is to be done, and we ought to be preparing to get at our task in as objective, constructive, and cooperative fashion as possible.

But there was another reason beyond that of publicly admitting we have both been "taken to the woodshed," that prompted me to insert the above editorial. That reason is because I believe the Times erred—and in doing so detracted from the force and effect of its appropriate criticism—when it felt impelled to add that sentence to its final paragraph which referred to the "good that would be accomplished if the conservatives in both parties would (now) reexamine their consciences and their voting records on the model cities bill, the rent-subsidy program, the rat-control bill, and (the) many other measures before Congress."

This is a line I have also heard some of my colleagues adopt here, in their remarks, this week—but it does not constitute a very valid argument if what we are searching for beyond, first, the restoration of law and order in our riot-torn cities, is a long-range solution that gets at the causes—the root causes—of the riots themselves. The reason it does not is that what the Times is talking about is a "crisis gimmick-programs approach designed—primarily—to quiet and contain the ghettos."

Now those last 11 words are not mine—and that is why I have put quotation marks around them. I found them, in of all places, on the same editorial page of the Times in a published letter to its editor from Prof. Kenneth B. Clark, of New York City, whose remarks make more sense to me right now than anything I have heard here or read elsewhere the past few days. That letter was entitled "For Total Mobilization To Solve Urban Crisis," which I have adopted as the title of these remarks and, under leave again to do so, Professor Clark's letter is now set forth:

FOR TOTAL MOBILIZATION TO SOLVE URBAN CRISIS

To the EDITOR:

The reputation of The New York Times for incisive and distinguished editorials was enhanced by the series of editorials (July 16, 17 and 18) concerned with the difficult and complex problems inherent in the tragedy of Newark. These editorials are significant contributions to public education and should be required repeated reading for public officials responsible for the future of American cities.

If it is possible to salvage any positives from the tragic consequences of past neglect, discrimination and pervasive insensitivities which made Newark inevitable, old postures and explanatory clichés must give way to a serious and dispassionate search for solutions to critical urban problems.

In seeking the solutions to the problems of our cities and ghettos, the choices before us are limited. First, we can increase the number of state police, National Guard or Federal troops, which are easily available to put down "insurrections" within the ghettos and thereby turn them into compounds of frustration and discontent. Second, we can continue a crisis gimmick-programs approach designed to quiet and contain the ghettos. Or third, we can seek serious long-term solutions to longstanding problems of crime and delinquency, criminally inferior education, subhuman housing and dangerous unemployment.

SAME BENEFITS FOR ALL

Solutions consistent with a tough-minded self-interest of the privileged and with humanity must assure that the people of our ghettos have the same access to democracy, justice and mobility and the same choices which American democracy has provided for all other ethnic groups.

When our society was confronted with the threat of national survival implicit in an archaic approach to military defense and when our Government sought to meet the new challenges of space exploration, we demonstrated the seriousness of our concern by mobilizing the best brains available and providing them with the necessary financial resources and independence to do the necessary planning, research and development, and to seek and recommend appropriate solutions.

The problems of the stability of our cities and the problem of the ghettos are in a real and concrete sense equal in their threat to the survival of our nation. Our scientific and industrial genius needs to be organized now just as the nation organized its nuclear scientists for Los Alamos and its defense strategists at RAND.

The decision which America makes must now be made affirmatively and not by default. What we decide to do will determine whether the American experiment in democracy can work or must remain a mockery.

KENNETH B. CLARK,
President, Metropolitan Applied Research Center and Professor of Psychology, the City College.

NEW YORK, *July 21, 1967.*

As you will note, Mr. Speaker, Professor Clark states we have three general choices concerning what is to be done about our developing crisis. The first of these, as some here are already suggesting, is to pour Federal moneys into "beefing up" State and local police forces. Even granting the urgency of bringing order out of chaos, this is, at best, clearly no "solution."

Professor Clark's suggestion for a second choice is—as I have already mentioned—the continuation of that "crisis gimmick-programs approach designed to quiet and contain the ghettos." I know I will get into an argument if I should attempt to relate the programs and pending bills the Times was talking about all into this category—so I will not even try that being content, instead, to point out that the same, again at best, offer only very distant and very partial "solutions." Certainly, this is true about the model city program which may prove to be the best of the several new approaches Congress has indicated a willingness to try. However, even if that program were now fully funded it would be well for the critics of those of us who supported its partial funding to remember that Secretary Weaver has even yet, not made up his mind as to which American cities are going to be favored with model cities funds.

The rent-subsidy program has already been amply debated here, so suffice it to point out that there are existing alternatives to it that are funded and that are working and that—in the mind of some of us, at least—there are also pending proposed alternatives, such as the Percy homeownership plan of which I am a cosponsor, and which, if we had it now, might be of substantial value in rebuilding some of the devastated ghetto areas that we are undoubtedly going to be asked to help rebuild.

And, finally, as to that pesky "rat-control" bill, perhaps it was a mistake from the standpoint of images for the House to have turned it down. But what the liberal press has failed to realize, in its criticism of this action, is that the House Members who so voted were voting not "for rats" or "for economy-in-government," as has been suggested, but against the burgeoning categorical-grant programs Congress has been indulging in lately to the serious detriment of local flexibility in trying to meet local problems. And I do not know if it really matters now but, with Detroit so very much on all our minds, would the critics of this House action—including the Times—mind too much taking public note of the fact that Detroit, well prior to its recent trouble and all on its own, had practically cleaned up its own rat problem, reducing the incidence of rat-infested building by a whopping 96 percent?

In my view, Mr. Speaker, what the Detroit situation now demands of us is not passage of a rat-control bill but a thorough reexamination of the whole governmental and social structures on which we may too long have relied. For, as Charles Orlebeke, executive assistant to Michigan's Gov. George Romney, said about that city's tragedy:

> We've got to try to see what went wrong. This is more than the wreckage of a city. It is a wreckage of our cliches, and that means a lot of things that the sociologists talk about.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think Professor Clark had a real point in suggesting to us, as our remaining third choice now, that we stop thinking in terms of "gimmick programs" that we evidently cannot resist overselling in our desire for votes or in our hope that they will somehow help "keep the lid on," and that instead we get down to work—mobilizing our undeniable scientific and industrial genius just as we did before in matching the Russian space challenge and in unlocking the secret to nuclear power—to find serious, long-term solutions to the longstanding and vastly complex human problems that, unsolved, will continue to tear at the very fabric of our society.

I confess I do not know how to get such an effort going. It would not be easy—enamored of those old cliches and so trapped in our own verbiage as we are; but perhaps if one or another kind of congressional investigations into the riots as now proposed gets started it might point us in that ultimate direction.

But I deeply believe that such an all-out effort must be made—and that on the success of it may well depend the future of what Professor Clark calls the American experiment in democracy.

Amend the Meat Inspection Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 25, 1967

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, last week I introduced a bill, H.R. 11480, to amend the Meat Inspection Act in order to provide for cooperation with appropriate State agencies with respect to State meat inspection programs.

At that time, I indicated that the deplorable situation in the inspection of meat packing, processing, and slaughtering plants in Pennsylvania was one of the best arguments for passage of an even tougher Federal meat inspection bill.

Inspection in Pennsylvania is at best catch-as-catch-can. Philadelphia and a handful of other cities like Reading and Wilkes-Barre have control over the condition of meat shipped into them. But consumers in the rest of the State have few assurances in the quality of the meat they buy.

The State has 30 inspectors for all food, and spends only $200,000 specifically for meat inspection. This means that Pennsylvania is operating at the same level it was in 1915 when it passed its present weak voluntary law.

Pennsylvania, with 1,263 meat processing or slaughtering plants, has only 132 subject to Federal inspection because they deal in interstate products. Another 54 are subject to inspection which they pay for themselves—because they ship into Philadelphia and other communities requiring inspection. The remaining 1,000 plants are inspected only for licensing purposes.

With more than 4.5 million hogs, cattle, calves, and sheep slaughtered each year and only eight veterinarians working in the meat hygiene division of the State health department, full protection of the public is impossible.

What is worse, fully 25 percent of the fresh meat and 50 percent of the processed meat in Pennsylvania come from plants not subject to inspection.

Modern science has led the way for meat from animals to be doctored with coloring, emulsifiers, chemicals, and drugs so that they can pass for quality foodstuffs. Not only is the public being duped by this kind of corner cutting, but the honest operators who run quality shops are forced into situations of unfair competition.

I have been told that it is not uncommon for dead, diseased, or disabled cattle to be dragged to the slaughterhouses and ground up for beef in my State. Such shocking conditions rest squarely on the shoulders of State officials who have allowed them to exist. However, it is pretty clear that the States are moving too slowly and that Federal legislation is now the only answer to give the public the protection needed.

Should meat inspection legislation pass, the American public is in the debt of Representative NEAL SMITH of Iowa, who, 7 years ago, started the fight to move meat packing and processing out of the last vestiges of the jungle described by Upton Sinclair at the beginning of this century.

My bill, H.R. 11480, is a companion to Mr. SMITH'S H.R. 6168, which extends Federal inspection standards to plants handling intrastate meat. In effect, this legislation would provide for Federal-State agreements under which the Federal Government would pay 50 percent of the costs and supply technical assistance to States willing to create and enforce Federal standards. Such a cooperative arrangement might be an incentive to my own State to pass the mandatory meat inspection legislation which is ready for introduction in the general assembly. Certainly Pennsylvania, and most of the 25 other States lacking mandatory regulation, could benefit from higher standards.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402, at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20510

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey

Aiken, George D., *Vt*	
Allott, Gordon, *Colo*	
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.*	6 Wesley Circle
Baker, Howard H., Jr., *Tenn.*	
Bartlett, E. L., *Alaska*	
Bayh, Birch E., *Ind*	
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*	
Bible, Alan, *Nev*	
Boggs, J. Caleb, *Del*	
Brewster, Daniel B., *Md*	
Brooke, Edward W., *Mass*	
Burdick, Quentin N., *N. Dak.*	
Byrd, Harry F., Jr., *Va*	
Byrd, Robert C., *W. Va*	
Cannon, Howard W., *Nev*	
Carlson, Frank, *Kans*	Sheraton-Park
Case, Clifford P., *N.J*	
Church, Frank, *Idaho*	
Clark, Joseph S., *Pa*	
Cooper, John Sherman, *Ky*	
Cotton, Norris, *N.H*	
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr*	
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill*	
Dodd, Thomas J., *Conn*	
Dominick, Peter H., *Colo*	
Eastland, James O., *Miss*	5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La*	
Ervin, Sam J., Jr., *N.C*	
Fannin, Paul J., *Ariz*	
Fong, Hiram L., *Hawaii*	5519 Uppingham St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Fulbright, J. W., *Ark*	
Griffin, Robert P., *Mich*	
Gore, Albert, *Tenn*	
Gruening, Ernest, *Alaska*	
Hansen, Clifford P., *Wyo*	
Harris, Fred R., *Okla*	
Hart, Philip A., *Mich*	
Hartke, Vance, *Ind*	
Hatfield, Mark, *Oreg*	
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz*	
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa*	5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala*	
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla*	Sheraton-Park
Hollings, Ernest F., *S.C*	
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr*	
Inouye, Daniel K., *Hawaii*	
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash*	
Javits, Jacob K., *N.Y*	
Jordan, B. Everett, *N.C*	
Jordan, Len B., *Idaho*	
Kennedy, Edward M., *Mass*	
Kennedy, Robert F., *N.Y*	
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif*	
Lausche, Frank J., *Ohio*	
Long, Edward V., *Mo*	
Long, Russell B., *La*	
McCarthy, Eugene J., *Minn.*	5916 Bradley Blvd., Bethesda, Md.
McClellan, John L., *Ark*	
McGee, Gale W., *Wyo*	
McGovern, George, *S. Dak*	
McIntyre, Thomas J., *N.H*	
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.*	The Shoreham
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont*	
Metcalf, Lee, *Mont*	453 First St. SE.
Miller, Jack R., *Iowa*	5417 Kirkwood Dr., Bethesda, Md.
Mondale, Walter F., *Minn*	
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*	
Montoya, Joseph M., *N. Mex.*	
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg*	
Morton, Thruston B., *Ky*	
Moss, Frank E., *Utah*	
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak*	122 Schotts Court NE.
Murphy, George, *Calif*	
Muskie, Edmund S., *Maine*	
Nelson, Gaylord, *Wis*	
Pastore, John O., *R.I*	
Pearson, James B., *Kans*	
Pell, Claiborne, *R.I*	3425 Prospect St.
Percy, Charles H., *Ill*	
Prouty, Winston L., *Vt*	
Proxmire, William, *Wis*	
Randolph, Jennings, *W.Va*	4608 Reservoir Rd.
Ribicoff, Abraham A., *Conn*	
Russell, Richard B., *Ga*	
Scott, Hugh, *Pa*	
Smathers, George A., *Fla*	
Smith, Margaret Chase (Mrs.), *Maine.*	
Sparkman, John, *Ala*	4928 Indian Lane
Spong, William B., Jr., *Va*	
Stennis, John, *Miss*	
Symington, Stuart, *Mo*	
Talmadge, Herman E., *Ga*	
Thurmond, Strom, *S.C*	
Tower, John G., *Tex*	
Tydings, Joseph D., *Md*	
Williams, Harrison A., Jr., *N.J.*	
Williams, John J., *Del*	
Yarborough, Ralph, *Tex*	
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak*	Quebec House So.
Young, Stephen M., *Ohio*	

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Francis R. Valeo.
Sergeant at Arms—Robert G. Dunphy.
Chief Clerk—Darrell St. Claire.
Secretary for the Majority—J. S. Kimmitt.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences

Messrs. Anderson (chairman), Russell, Magnuson, Symington, Stennis, Young of Ohio, Dodd, Cannon, Holland, Mondale, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Hickenlooper, Curtis, Jordan of Idaho, Brooke, and Percy.

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Holland, Eastland, Talmadge, Jordan of North Carolina, McGovern, Montoya, Mondale, Byrd of Virginia, Hollings, Aiken, Young of North Dakota, Boggs, Miller, and Hatfield.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell, Ellender, Hill, McClellan, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Pastore, Monroney, Bible, Byrd of West Virginia, McGee, Mansfield, Bartlett, Proxmire, Yarborough, Young of North Dakota, Mundt, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Kuchel, Hruska, Allott, Cotton, Case, and Javits.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell (chairman), Stennis, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Cannon, Byrd of West Virginia, Young of Ohio, Inouye, McIntyre, Brewster, Byrd of Virginia, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Thurmond, Miller, Tower, Pearson, and Dominick.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Sparkman (chairman), Proxmire, Williams of New Jersey, Muskie, Long of Missouri, McIntyre, Mondale, McGee, Spong, Bennett, Tower, Hickenlooper, Brooke, and Percy.

Committee on Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Lausche, Bartlett, Hartke, Hart, Cannon, Brewster, Long of Louisiana, Moss, Hollings, Cotton, Morton, Scott, Prouty, Pearson, and Griffin.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Bible (chairman), Morse, Kennedy of New York, Tydings, Spong, Prouty, Dominick, and Morton.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Long of Louisiana (chairman), Smathers, Anderson, Gore, Talmadge, McCarthy, Hartke, Fulbright, Ribicoff, Metcalf, Harris, Williams of Delaware, Carlson, Bennett, Curtis, Morton, and Dirksen.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Sparkman, Mansfield, Morse, Gore, Lausche, Church, Symington, Dodd, Clark, Pell, McCarthy, Hickenlooper, Aiken, Carlson, Williams of Delaware, Mundt, Case, and Cooper.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Ervin, Gruening, Muskie, Ribicoff, Harris, Kennedy of New York, Metcalf, Montoya, Mundt, Curtis, Javits, Hansen, and Baker.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Jackson (chairman), Anderson, Bible, Church, Gruening, Moss, Burdick, Hayden, McGovern, Nelson, Metcalf, Kuchel, Allott, Jordan of Idaho, Fannin, Hansen, and Hatfield.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Eastland (chairman), McClellan, Ervin, Dodd, Hart, Long of Missouri, Kennedy of Massachusetts, Bayh, Burdick, Tydings, Smathers, Dirksen, Hruska, Fong, Scott, and Thurmond.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), Morse, Yarborough, Clark, Randolph, Williams of New Jersey, Pell, Kennedy of Massachusetts, Nelson, Kennedy of New York, Javits, Prouty, Dominick, Murphy, Fannin, and Griffin.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Monroney (chairman), Yarborough, Randolph, McGee, Brewster, Hartke, Burdick, Hollings, Carlson, Fong, Boggs, and Fannin.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Randolph (chairman), Young of Ohio, Muskie, Gruening, Jordan of North Carolina, Inouye, Bayh, Montoya, Tydings, Spong, Cooper, Fong, Boggs, Murphy, Jordan of Idaho, and Baker.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Jordan of North Carolina (chairman), Hayden, Cannon, Pell, Clark, Byrd of West Virginia, Curtis, Cooper, and Scott.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D.C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 4852 Hutchins Pl.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.
Mr. Justice Brennan, of New Jersey, 3037 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Stewart, of Ohio, 5136 Palisade Lane.
Mr. Justice White, of Colorado, 2209 Hampshire Rd., McLean, Va.
Mr. Justice Fortas, of Tennessee, 3210 R St.
(Vacancy.)

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—John F. Davis, 4704 River Rd.
Deputy Clerk—Edmund P. Cullinan, 4823 Reservoir Rd.
Deputy Clerk—Michael Rodak, 6311 Joslyn Pl., Cheverly, Md.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Rd.
Reporter—Henry Putzel, Jr., 3703 33d St.
Librarian—H. C. Hallam, Jr., 10927 Pleasant Acres Dr., Adelphi, Md.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

JUSTICES ASSIGNED

TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Fortas. Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Connecticut, New York, Vermont.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Brennan. Delaware, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, West Virginia.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Alabama, Canal Zone, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, Texas.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Stewart. Kentucky, Michigan, Ohio, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: ——— Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice White. Arkansas, Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Alaska, Arizona, California, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Washington, Guam, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice White. Colorado, Kansas, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Utah, Wyoming.

Appendix

In Commemoration of the 50th Anniversary of the 33d Infantry Division

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 20, 1967

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, this month marks the completion of 50 years of service for the 33d Infantry Division of the Illinois National Guard. During this half century the 33d has made an admirable record, having participated in World War I, World War II, and the Korean war.

During the First World War it took part in the following battles: the Somme offensive, Lorraine, Meuse-Argonne, Verdun, St. Michiel, Chipilly Ridge, and Hamel Woods. It participated in the battles of New Guinea, Wake-Sarmi, Moratai, Baguio, and Luzon during the Second World War.

The 33d Infantry Division is directed by several able generals who served under the command of the chief executive of our State, Gov. Otto Kerner: Maj. Gen. Leo M.. Boyle, adjutant general; Maj. Gen. Francis P. Kane, division commander; Brig. Gen. Richard T. Dunn, assistant division commander; Brig. Gen. John R. Phipps, assistant division commander.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the history of the 33d Infantry Division:

HISTORY OF THE 33D INFANTRY DIVISION

The original 33d Infantry Division was activated at Camp Logan, near Houston, Texas, in July of 1917. The division was formed out of units of the Illinois National Guard. It is the second oldest division of the Army, the 1st Division was formed just a few months before the 33d. Hurriedly organized and trained, the division was sent overseas, in May of 1918, and assigned by units to serve with the Australians at Amiens. After initial overseas training, the division went into combat on its own, in the Verdun, St. Mihiel, and Meuse-Argonne offensives. Successful compaigns were fought at Chipilly Ridge and the Hamel Woods. During World War I, members of the 33d Division were awarded nine Medals of Honor and 194 awards of the Distinguished Service Cross. It took 3,987 prisoners and sustained casualties of 887 men killed in action, with 5,499 wounded in combat. While preparing for shipment to France in 1918, members of the division were trying to dream up an identifying symbol for its organizational baggage. At this time the painting detail discovered it had only black and yellow paint. One of the members remembered that during the Spanish-American War one of the Regiments had marked its equipment with yellow crosses to prevent the Moros from pilfering it, a device which worked, since yellow was taboo to the Moros. Another of the detail contributed with the idea of a black circle, a symbol used to mark gas containers, which meant "danger" or "beware" or just stay clear. It was a natural idea for the division to adopt the cross and circle symbol for their shoulder patch when divisional insignia came into use during the war.

Until 1946, the 33d Division represented the largest single organization of the Illinois National Guard, thus naturally inheriting the nickname "Prairie Division."

In March 1941, the 33d was again inducted into Federal Service, and trained at Camp Forest, Tenn. With the outbreak of World War II, the 33d was rushed to duty on the West Coast. Here it trained while on coastal defense duty. In July, 1943, the division was shipped to Hawaii. Subsequently, it joined the Sixth Army in New Guinea for its first taste of World War II combat in the Wake-Sarmi Operations. Its next combat assignment was in the second battle of Moratai. Capture of this island gave General MacArthur an additional step toward the Philippines.

In February, 1945, the Division entered the Philippine Campaign with the mission of taking Bauguio, summer capital of the Philippines. It took three months of constant fighting, nearly all of it in mountain jungle land, to accomplish this task. The liberation of many thousands of Japanese-held prisoners was the Division's reward in this campaign. In the process, 15,000 Japanese were killed. Among those freed by the Division was Brig. Gen. Manuel Roxas, Gen. Mac Arthur's former aide, and later to become President of the Philippines.

The division was involved in mop-up fighting until the close of the war. In February, 1946, the division was inactivated in Japan.

In World War II, members of the 33d Division received three Medals of Honor and 39 Distinguished Service Crosses and 502 silver stars.

Reorganization of the 33d as an Illinois National Guard unit was started once more in November, 1946. Late in December, 1946, the 44th Infantry Division was activated as a second division in the Illinois National Guard. Some of the units formerly with the 33d were incorporated into the 44th.

The 44th Division was inducted into Federal service in February, 1952, to serve during the Korean Conflict. The Division remained on active duty for two years, many of its members seeing combat duty with units in Korea. Upon return to state control, the 44th was inactivated and its members and units integrated into the 33d. This move was accomplished in March, 1953.

Since that date, the 33d Division has undergone several structural changes to keep pace with regular army modernization.

Democracy in the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 31, 1967

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Democracy in the U.N.," published in the Richmond Times Dispatch of July 27, 1967.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEMOCRACY IN THE U.N.

GAMBIA, BOTSWANA, LESOTHO, DAHOMEY, RWANDA, and MALAWI.

They are among the 122 members of the United Nations. Each has one vote in the General Assembly, just as does the United States.

The Maldive Islands have one vote. That vote represents 98,000 people. The United States' ambassador to the UN casts a vote for approximately 200 million people.

REP. HAROLD R. COLLIER of Illinois points out that the 62 smallest nations have a *combined* population of 148,722,000—far below that of the United States. In fact, you can add six more nations before you get a combined population that equals ours.

Each of the 52 smallest U.N. member nations has fewer people than the state of Virginia.

Except for India, the U.S. is the largest U.N. member in population. The Soviet Union is listed at 178,236,000 people. For other purposes, the population of the Soviet Union is usually given as much higher than that, but in such instances the figures include Byelorussia and the Ukraine, each of which appears separately in the U.N. listing because each has a vote.

By the way, what's all that talk about one man, one vote?

Personal Initiative May Not Be Dead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 26, 1967

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I am extremely happy to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Alameda Times-Star on Tuesday, July 18, 1967, entitled "Personal Initiative May Not Be Dead."

The editorial recites the story of World Airways and its dynamic president, Edward J. Daly.

Mr. Daly has built World Airways into the leading contract air carrier in the country. He has done it by using initiative and imagination, as the editorial exemplifies.

The editorial follows:

PERSONAL INITIATIVE MAY NOT BE DEAD

While Federal agencies, State agencies, regional agencies and local agencies hold a seemingly-endless series of meetings on how to put more idle people into productive capacities for the sake not only of themselves but the community as a whole, an East Bay businessman is quietly moving ahead on his own to help solve the problem.

He is Edward J. Daly, president of World Airways, Inc., which is doing a tremendous volume of aerial freight and charter business from Oakland International Airport.

Daly appears to be proceeding on the fundamental theory that in cases where everyone wins, no one loses.

As a highly-successful airline operator, he is very much aware of a shortage of skilled personnel to fill the myriad technical jobs which are essential to maintaining and servicing the sophisticated aircraft his company flies.

So, he is forming the World Institute of Aeronautics, an aviation training school to be operated as a wholly-owned subsidiary of World Airways.

The primary function of the school will be to train East Bay residents who either are unemployed or under-employed, for aviation jobs. Initial emphasis will be placed on the training of mechanics. Later, Daly says, the Institute will be expanded to offer courses in many different phases of aeronautics.

It is anticipated that the Institute will be in operation next Jan. 1. World Airways will work with various State and Federal agencies in developing a system for selection of individuals for training. He estimates that in a three-year period, approximately 500 persons will be trained for jobs as airframe and powerplant mechanics.

World Airways will thus have a new source of skilled personnel and 500 persons who presently are unemployed or are holding down low-paying, menial jobs will move into productive, lucrative work.

All this, without calling on Uncle Sugar to do it for them.

Can it be that the age of individual initiative is not quite dead?

Progress by Army Materiel Command

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 31, 1967

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, today, 12 of the 17 combat divisions of the Active Army are serving in overseas areas as part of our Nation's forward strategy. A large part of this combat strength, plus the necessary supporting forces—a grand total of more than 400,000 men—are carrying out our national policy in South Vietnam.

To keep those fighting men supplied with the weapons and munitions of war, and, in addition, provide the materiel to feed, clothe, shelter, and bathe them, to minister to them, to give them some of the amenities of our bounteous American way of life, and to provide hospital facilities for the sick and wounded, calls for a tremendous logistics effort.

A major portion of the required materiel support is being provided by the U.S. Army Materiel Command, which tomorrow will celebrate its fifth anniversary. Assisted by the wholehearted and able support of American industry, the 180,000 dedicated personnel of the U.S. Army Materiel Command have, during the past 5 years, continually distinguished themselves by their contributions to our national security.

AMC's commander during its proud 5-year history has been Gen. Frank S. Besson, Jr., an outstanding logistician, transportation authority, and military manager. Under his able leadership, the Army Materiel Command has effectively responded to the urgent requirements of Vietnam; continued its worldwide supply support of our Army and its allies, and also established new levels of effectiveness and economy. The success of this effort can be judged by General Westmoreland's observation, made in a speech to Congress in April, when he said:

> Both the enemy's problem and our success can be attributed in large measure to our unprecedented logistic base development during the last two years.

I know that AMC is dedicated and determined to further build on and expand that base, to insure that our combat troops lack for nothing in battle.

A summary of the important progress being made by the Army Materiel Command is contained in a news release, issued on the occasion of its fifth anniversary. I ask unanimous consent that the release be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARMY MATERIEL COMMAND COMPLETES FIFTH YEAR OF OPERATION

As it observed its fifth anniversary today, the U.S. Army Materiel Command (AMC) exhibited an increased capability to provide the weapons, supplies, and equipment needed by the Army in performing its missions. New and improved items now under development or entering the Army inventory reflect the positive steps taken by the Command to enable the fighting forces to meet all the demands placed upon them.

Commenting on the five-year record established by AMC, General Harold K. Johnson, Chief of Staff of the U.S. Army, said:

"During the five years since its organization, members of the Army Materiel Command have continually distinguished themselves by their contributions to our national security. No Army can successfully function in the field without the proper tools and equipment with which to do the job. The successes of our fighting men in Vietnam attest to your ability to innovate and to produce and provide them with high quality materiel. Your achievement in fulfilling this added responsibility while at the same time streamlining your organization to reduce costs is a superior accomplishment."

In keeping with the worldwide assignment of Army units, AMC has made important changes in its means of supplying materiel and transmitting supply management data to the field. The Command also has tested products which will help the soldier to shoot, move, see and communicate better than in the past and has developed items which will assist in protecting his health and safety.

General Frank S. Besson, Jr., Commanding General of AMC since its inception, further streamlined his organization during the past year with the phasing out of the Army Mobility Command and the designating as major subordinate commands the Army Tank-Automotive Command at Warren, Michigan, and the Army Mobility Equipment Command and Army Aviation Materiel Command, both headquartered at St. Louis, Missouri.

Additional reductions were made in the number of facilities under AMC. Of the original 278 taken over from the Army's Technical Services in 1962, AMC reduced that total to 177 in the fiscal year just completed. Fourteen facilities were phased out in the past year.

The Zero Defects Program, designed to motivate all personnel from executives to shop workers to be more quality conscious, brought forth many suggestions from AMC employees to identify potential causes for error. In the past year more than 6,900 suggestions were submitted, and more than 5,000 were adopted by management.

A team from AMC's Cold Regions Research and Engineering Laboratory (USA CRREL) recorded a major scientific achievement in FY 1967 by drilling through the polar ice cap and bringing up samples of intermingled sand, gravel, and stones. At a site 140 miles out on the ice cap from Greenland's upper northwest coast, the team drilled to a depth of 4562 feet and obtained its samples 12 feet below the ice sheet.

The cores of silt and stone and the ice cores recovered in the drilling process provide a vertical profile of polar history dating back at least 10,000 years. The cores are undergoing analytical study at USA CRREL's Hanover, N.H., Laboratory. Information sought from the samples includes changes in precipitation and temperature, composition of the air throughout the ice, salt nuclei content, dustness of the atmosphere, and frequency of major volcanic eruptions down through the ages.

To achieve greater mission effectiveness, the AMC held its first Customer Assistance Conference in Washington, D.C., May 3-5. It provided a forum for the Command's customers worldwide to present their views on materiel and logistic support. AMC made presentations pertinent to assistance in all logistic fields and the latest developments in organization, missions and materiel.

Customer Assistance Offices are in operation at U.S. Army Headquarters in the European, Pacific and Vietnam Commands. The Vietnam Office has a sub-office in Okinawa. These activities assure effective working relationships on all logistic matters by providing a source of information and assistance and by coordinating matters of mutual interest to AMC and the Commands.

During FY 1967 AMC provided assistance to the Defense Supply Agency, which requested storage space to facilitate support of operations in Southeast Asia. AMC made available the following: Sharpe Army Depot, 807,000 net sq feet open space; Umatilla Army Depot, 650,000 net sq feet covered space; Sierra Army Depot, 182,000 net sq feet covered space; Navajo Army Depot, 600,000 net sq feet covered space.

AMC initiated a new concept in the transmission of supply management data to the field by the use of microfilm. Selected logistics management data, extracted from the Army Master Data File, covering the total 1,181,354 Federal Stock Numbers, were placed on 13 microfilm cartridges. This film and the required readers were provided to selected Seventh Army units in Europe early in March 1967 for user feasibility tests. The tests were later expanded to several Continental U.S. installations, including Fort Hood, Tex., and to activities at Cam Ranh Bay, Qui Nhon, and Saigon, Vietnam.

Procurement capabilities have been improved through techniques which save both time and manpower. Simplified techniques for use in procurements up to $10,000 have been authorized, saving 30 to 45 days of procurement lead time for repair parts for Southeast Asia.

In support of the field forces, AMC agencies completed development of these items during the past year:

A spike-resistant combat boot with a stainless-steel plate laminated between two leather insoles. This 10-inch-high boot provides protection against a variety of antipersonnel foot penetrating devices, including poisonous spikes, barbed spikes, nails, and tropical thorns.

A lightweight rucksack, 4 lbs lighter than the standard item, consisting of a water-repellent nylon duck combat pack and a rectangular aluminum frame with provisions for a removable shelf that permits carrying heavy loads. With the new rucksack, the soldier can carry either a full marching load or a lighter combat load.

A 420-gallon-per-hour lightweight water purification unit which weighs approximately 1000 lbs and can be sling-loaded under a helicopter. Action is being expedited to provide these units for use in Vietnam.

Other developmental projects on which AMC reports progress include:

A new ground based surveillance radar set, the AN/PPS-5, which will greatly increase the capability for battlefield detection of hostile vehicular and foot troop movement in periods of darkness or low visibility caused by inclement weather. The set can locate vehicles at ranges up to 10,000 meters and foot troop movement at ranges in excess of 4,000 meters. A limited quantity of sets is in production for early delivery.

A vehicle-launched bridge 30 feet long for use with the M113 tracked vehicle. Development has been completed through the Engineer Development Testing phase. Review of this bridge by the Army in Vietnam has resulted in a request for the item.

An airborne acoustical ground fire detector, capable of visually warning an aircraft pilot that he is being fired upon, which was developed and type classified in a five-month period. The device weighs about three lbs.

During the year construction of a pulse reactor facility was completed at Aberdeen Proving Ground. It will be used for materiel radiation experiments.

A number of significant actions in the field of Army aviation occurred during the past year. The AH-1G Hueycobra, featuring greater firepower, speed, range, and endurance than armed UH-1's, went into quantity production near the end of FY 1967.

During April the first units of OH-6A Cayuse helicopters were deployed to units at Fort Knox, Ky.

In May, the first production model of the CH-47B Chinook was delivered to the Army. Significant improvements in this later model are increased speed and payload and longer ferry range.

The Army formally accepted the first U-21A, a twin turboprop, fixed wing airplane, on 16 May. The U-21A is capable of taking off and landing on an unsurfaced minimum-of-preparation airfield 1,000 feet long.

Also in May, the Army unveiled a radically new armed combat aircraft, the AH-56A "Cheyenne," that will take off and land vertically like a helicopter but fly forward with the speed, ease, and maneuverability of a fixed-wing plane. The first of these winged rotor-bladed aircraft was rolled out ahead of schedule. With the first flight planned for later this year, the first AH-56A is now in a series of extensive ground tests.

Five world aviation records were claimed for the Mohawk, the Army's standard aerial surveillance and target acquisition aircraft system. One record, for straight line distance, was set when the Mohawk was flown non-stop from Fort Lewis, Wash., to Sherbrooke, Canada, a distance of 2422 miles, at almost 255 miles per hour.

Other Mohawk records included an average speed of 292 miles per hour over a 100 km closed circuit course, time to climb to altitudes of 3000 and 6000 meters, and sustained altitude in horizontal flight of 32,000 feet.

The Army composite aircraft development program moved into the project definition phase this year. Evaluation was completed of conceptual studies for a composite research aircraft combining the hovering capability of the helicopter with the range and flight efficiency of the conventional fixed-wing aircraft. Two proposed configurations—the "tilting rotor" concept and the "stopped stowed rotor" configuration—have been selected for further analysis and component investigation.

The CH-54A Flying Crane deployed to Vietnam, has proven its worth many times over by recovering downed aircraft having a total valuation in excess of $90,000,000, or many times the original investment. Six Flying Cranes, the largest helicopter in the Army, were procured in the FY 66 program with deliveries completed in May 1967. Maintenance training has been established at Ft. Eustis, Virginia, and pilot training at Ft. Rucker, Alabama, to support RVN personnel requirements.

Several armament subsystems for the AH-1G Hueycobra armed helicopter were bought in FY 1967. One of these, the XM-28, is a rotating turret mounted on the nose which can fire at angles up to 110° to the right or left. The twin-gun turret counts either two 7.62-mm machineguns, two 40mm grenade launchers or one of each.

A production contract was awarded for the XM129 40mm grenade launcher, a greatly improved successor to the launcher currently used in the M-5 helicopter armament system. The new, electrically driven launcher fires grenades at a rate of 425 shots per minute.

The first of eight prototypes of the Battle Tank being fabricated in the United States and Germany will be delivered during the latter part of 1967. Engineering and service tests will follow, and Advance Production Engineering plans now are being implemented.

More combat units were equipped with the new FM series radios during the past year. These include the AN/PRC-25 "walkie-talkie" and its vehicular counterpart, the AN/VRC-12. Affording combat forces 920 channels, these high-performance sets offer significant advantages in weight reduction, reliability, reduced size and complexity and power requirements. The first Single Sideband sets have also been fielded in Vietnam.

The Initial Defense Communications Satellite Project (IDCSP)—the nation's worldwide military satellite communications system—was expanded during FY 1967 to a network consisting of Air Force satellites and a surface complex of nine Army terminals located across the globe. Acting for AMC, the Army Satellite Communications (SATCOM) Agency provided the ground terminals and conducted the system evaluation program. SATCOM also continued to exercise the AMC action responsibility in the tri-service tactical satellite communications (TACSATCOM) program. The agency designed and built in-house small, experimental TACSAT terminals installed in jeeps, ¾ ton trucks, and vans.

AMC expanded its communications capability, adding another 396 Automatic Voice Network (AUTOVON) telephone lines at AMC installations to the 730 existing AMC lines. AMC pioneered in the Automatic Digital Network (AUTODIN) system by installing the first IBM 360-20 AUTODIN Militimedia Terminal at the Army Mobility Equipment Command Headquarters.

Substantial progress was recorded by the Automatic Data Field Systems Command (ADFSC) in the developmental study of its three major systems: The Tactical Fire Direction System (TACFIRE), the Tactical Operations System (TOS), and the Combat Service Support System (CS3). During March Contract Definition Contracts for TACFIRE were awarded to three companies. A contract under the TOS program calls for mobile automatic data processing equipment to be supplied to the Seventh U.S. Army. An Equipment Contract Award under the CS3 program was placed during May with equipment delivery scheduled for April–June 1968.

Initial delivery of Field Artillery Digital Automatic Computer (FADAC) systems to Southeast Asia was scheduled for this year. More than 100 FADAC systems have been deployed to U.S. Army Europe.

The first DIMATE (Depot Installed Multipurpose Automatic Test Equipment), a fully automatic test set directed by a digital computer, was placed in operation as a production tool at the Tobyhanna Army Depot. DIMATE can diagnose failures in better than 95% of Army electronic materiel operating in the DC to 400 MHz (MegaHERTZ) frequency range. DIMATE #2 is being installed at the Sacramento Army Depot.

The Army completed deployment during the year of a new Air Defense Fire Distribution System, designated the AN/TSQ-51. This system, developed by the Army Missile Command, performs the functions of an Army command post controlling and coordinating the fire of NIKE HERCULES air defense units. Deployment of the AN/TSQ-51 has increased the capability and flexibility of U.S. air defenses with a reduction in manpower requirements.

The Army's new Defense-wide management responsibility for engine generators for all military services was assigned to the AMC project manager for Mobile Electric Power. A major objective of the new project manager will be the establishment of a Department of Defense standard family of electric power generators, ranging from 0.5kw to 2,000kw. The standard family is to consist of high quality, rugged generators, and will minimize logistics support by limiting the types of generators entering the supply system. There are about 300,000 engine generators in the Department of Defense inventory, and projected requirements will increase this total to an estimated 400,000.

AMC and some of its activities were honored by awards presented in the recent year. The Army Award of Honor for Safety, the Army's highest recognition of effectiveness in preventing accidents, was presented to AMC for FY 1966. AMC now has won this highest award twice.

An AMC-sponsored and produced motion picture won the top award, "The Golden Atom," in the 1966 International Electronics, Nuclear Telecommunication and Motion Picture Ressegna which is held annually in Rome. The winning film, entitled "Laser-Miracles With Light," was produced by the Army Pictorial Center for the AMC Director of Development.

Letterkenny Army Depot was one of six Defense installations reaching the finals in competition for the Secretary of Defense Conservation Award for 1966. Letterkenny received the Department of the Army Chief of Staff Award for its natural resources conservation program.

During May a contract was awarded for the initiation of the SAM-D (Surface-to-Air Missile Development) advanced development program. This new air defense missile system is under development by the Army with Navy participation. It is designed for battlefield and continental air defense against aircraft and short range missiles. It is planned that SAM-D eventually will replace the Nike Hercules and a portion of the Hawk air defense systems.

Design and development of a new Perimeter Acquisition Radar (PAR), a major subsystem of the Nike-X missile defense, was contracted for this year. PAR is expected to increase significantly the range at which the Nike-X system can detect targets. It is to be a third phased army radar in the Nike-X system, the others being the multi-function array radar and the missile site radar.

Under Army Missile Command management, minimum modification will be performed to convert the Lance missile to an Extended Range Lance (XRL) miscsile. The decision to develop the XRL extends application of the Lance concept which offers reliability and low cost associated with a free rocket but provides the range and accuracy of a guided missile. Lance, the first Army missile to use pre-packaged storable liquid propellants, can be transported by plane or airdropped; it has maximum ground mobility and a swim capability.

Other significant actions during AMC's fifth year of operation include:

Implementation of a program to establish a world-wide capability to monitor aircraft components by analysing for wear metals contained in samples of used oils. Three laboratories have been set up, and three more are to become operational in FY 1968.

Submission by contractors of 462 Value Engineering Contract Proposal (VECP's) during the first 10 months of FY 1967, with a potential dollar value estimated at $60 million. Approval was given to 250 VECP's valued at approximately $15 million.

Assistance to service personnel in locating their families on or near AMC installations prior to departure on unaccompanied tours of duty. Nearly 300 service families of absent sponsors were provided adequate excess family housing quarters on AMC installations.

Action by the AMC Chaplain in conceiving and conducting the first preaching clinic for chaplains and the first command-wide training course for chaplain assistants in the history of the Army.

In an anniversary message today to AMC personnel assigned to his command General Besson said:

"The Army Materiel Command will be five years old on 1 August 1967. Even as AMC was being born in 1962, increased military support for our Allies in Southeast Asia was also beginning. The last two of our five years have been largely committed to an unprecedented logistics response to a major military build-up in Vietnam.

"Our fighting troops there continue to tell us that we are giving them what they need. I realize that this has not always been easy; it has been possible, however, because the men and women of AMC, like those we support, have been willing to go to the second mile with the resources available to us, and, in spite of short deadlines and long hours, have refused to grow weary of the struggle.

"I want to thank each of you for your part in achieving AMC's distinguished five year record. New challenges, even more exciting and exacting await us in the next five years. The Army's and the Nation's trust is well placed as they give us the opportunity to meet these challenges."

Israel and Vietnam: Are They Different?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 31, 1967

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, it seems strange when we reflect upon the American reaction to the Middle East crisis, that so many Vietnam doves became Middle East Hawks. Many claim that the reason for this change is due to the differences between the two wars.

I commend to the attention of our colleagues a very interesting article written by Meir Kahane for the July 14, 1967, edition of the Jewish Press, indicating their similarity:

ISRAEL AND VIETNAM: ARE THEY DIFFERENT?

It is most difficult for man to admit that he has been wrong. The rabbinical injunction, "Let a man forever be G-d fearing privately and publicly and admit the truth," is hardly a thing we rush forward to obey. And so, we usually choose another course. We refuse to admit error and instead, rationalize our actions. Far from admitting defeat we explain why all we have said was, is, and will always be correct. When faced with intellectual Dunkirks, we become adept at avoiding discreditation. In the face of logical catastrophe, we ignore facts and choose self-rectitude over reason.

And so we come to the question of Vietnam and Judaism. The question is a little different today than it was two months ago; the problem is a little more disquieting and embarrassing to those who a little while ago were so strident in their opposition to the war. The difference, of course, is the recent Middle East war where a small nation was thrown into the cauldron of annihilation at the hands of aggressors that were committed to terror and murder from without her borders and where the United States was implored to help the tiny state. The fact that the intended victim proved to be more than equal to the task of beating off the wolf is irrelevant. What matters is that—never before have so many doves displayed such sharp talons and such ferocious beaks. The metamorphosis of the timid Vietnames dove into the audacious Middle East hawk was truly astonishing.

Is one to believe then, that the war against aggression in Vietnam has at last won favor in the eyes of the doves? May we believe that the opponents of the United States stand in Vietnam have seen the light? The Messiah will soon arrive.

Faced with an embarrasing contradiction in position, the doves—that breed which refused to be more than temporarily shaken by the Hitler-Stalin pact; who were only momentarily panicked by Mao's ingratitude in throwing off their "agrarian reformer" description of him! who were only briefly nonplussed when Castro turned out to be not the cross between Thomas Jefferson and Robin Hood they had assured all of us he was—have once again demonstrated their remarkable ability to dust off their battered intellectual dogmas and continue on their merry way.

The new slogan is: Vietnam and Israel—There Is a Difference, and the theme was hammered home to us two weeks ago in New York's Manhattan Center by a group of Reform Democrats who oppose the war in Vietnam. Faced with the problem of defending their stand for peaceful defeat in Vietnam while demanding American intervention and military victory in the Middle East, the flustered gathered to explain why it was different.

The reasons were not surprising: Our commitment to Israel was stronger than to Vietnam; Israel was a democracy; the war in Vietnam was a civil war, etc., etc., etc.

This article is not the place to answer these points—that will come some other time. What is more important is the fact that, while these assorted intellectuals were endeavoring to spell out from their ivory tower the difference, the people who really count—the Communists and the Marxists of the world—were once again embarrassing the peaceniks by saying exactly the opposite. Indeed, at the moment that the meeting was taking place, leftists were handing out leaflets outside the hall, leaflets that read:

Vietnam-Israel, The Similarities!!!

It is most instructive and enlightening—a hundred times more so than all the lectures given in Manhattan Center—to read one of the leaflets given out by the pro-Peking, pro-Hanoi Youth Against War And Fascism gang, which knows more about the true nature of the war in Vietnam than Senator George McGovern (main speaker at the Reform Democrat meeting) and Marya Mannes (who bitterly attacked United States policy as immoral) will ever know—or admit. The text of the leaflet follows:

"The basic similarity between Vietnam and the Mideast is the overriding desire of the U.S. government to crush any popular liberation movements which might become a threat to current or future financial investments. The U.S. carried out aggression through its Israeli puppet regime just as surely as it earlier used the Diem puppet dictatorship with only the help of U.S. "advisors."

"It should be noted that Israeli Defense Minister Moshe Dayan recently returned from a U.S. sponsored trip to Vietnam (Ed. Note—amidst so many lies it may seem absurd to pause and point out just one, but we feel compelled to explain that Dayan went to Vietnam as a correspondent for the Israeli paper, Maariv) where he called for the stepped-up bombing against the Vietnamese people. The techniques he learned there, along with his U.S. supplied napalm bombs, were so effective in killing tens of thousands of Arab people that the U.S. Sixth Fleet was merely kept on the ready and the U.S. ground forces were not needed this time.

"The progressive and anti-war movement must be united in opposition to U.S. aggression wherever it occurs . . ."

The totalitarian Youth Against War and Fascism clique was merely echoing the words of its Chinese masters. In a message to Jew-hating Ahmed Shukairy, Premier Chou En-Lai said, in part:

"I believe that having taken up arms, the revolutionary Arab people of Palestine and the entire Arab people will not lay down their arms, and like the heroic Vietnamese people will fight on unflinchingly, resolutely and stubbornly until final victory.

"At the present, the situation of the anti-imperialist revolutionary struggle throughout the world is excellent. U.S. imperialism is heavily beseiged by the Vietnamese people, the Arab people and the revolutionary people of the whole world . . . The Chinese Government and people will always stand on your side in carrying through to the end the just struggle against U.S. imperialism, British imperialism and their running dog Israel."

And so, once again the opponents of United States policy have been embarrassed. Vietnam and Israel, they say, are different, but the Communists refuse to go along with the wishful illusion. In the eyes of the Marxists-Leninists, all the world is an entity, an indivisible stage for conquest. All wars against the United States or western or democratic influence are part of the great plan to establish Communist hegemony on earth. Whether Vietnam's political fabric differs from that of Israel is irrelevant; whether commitments are equal or less equal or more equal is immaterial. The main thing to bear in mind is that international communism fights in many areas. Yesterday, it chose Vietnam. Today, it chooses the Middle East. If we lose the war in the former, we may yet, G-d forbid, see bitter fruit harvested in the latter. If certain liberal forces still are unable or unwilling to see this, all of us will be the sadder for their blindness.

Dow Comments on Flag Hysteria

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN G. DOW

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 31, 1967

Mr. DOW. Mr. Speaker, some people have said to me that the recent House of Representatives vote on the bill which set up punishments for desecration of the flag is a measure of patriotism. The vote on the bill in the House was 385 in favor of making flag desecration a Federal crime punishable by heavy penalties. I was among the 16 opposed to this bill. It was not a measure of patriotism. All Members of the House are patriotic. It was strictly a bill to fix the level of punishment for desecration of the flag.

My feeling is that the descration issue has aroused more hysteria than it deserves. When people send me letters on the subject of my vote, I am replying as follows:

Thank you for writing me a letter relating to the Flag Desecration legislation.

I wish I could agree more closely with your views on this subject. However, I don't feel that the few cases of flag burning and whatnot are such a tremendous problem in our Country of over 200,000,000 loyal Americans. By making so much of this, we are taking another step in forcing conformity of thought and action on our people. While nothing in the legislation proposed is that objectionable, I—as an old-fashioned freedom-loving, American—shy away from laws that could be used to trip people up or influence their personal conduct.

To me, this is the kind of thing they do in the totalitarian states. It is a type of Old World thinking. My ancesters came over here to be free and not to live in a place where the laws suggest a police state. The desecration law suggests to me the kind of tyranny over the mind of man, which Thomas Jefferson opposed. To our forefathers' credit, they did not have laws—that related to petty little actions, habits and misdeeds—where you could make a mountain out of a mole hill.

This kind of legislation is another part of the war hysteria that is taking our Country down a dangerous path which some day we are going to regret. Besides, it gives men in power still another device to use against people whose views they do not like. It provides another mechanism to hamstring dissent, even though the greatness of America is founded in part on the willingness to let the other fellow have his say.

I know very well that you are inspired by the highest motives of patriotism. I think the difference is that you have one view of what contributes to patriotism—and I have another. I am sure that your intentions are of the highest, and I hope mine are too.

You can't legislate patriotism. It has to come from the heart.

With appreciation of the expression contained in your letter, I remain,

Sincerely,

John G. Dow.

The American Nightmare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 31, 1967

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, one of my constituents, Mr. Harlen E. Pennington, of 801 South Western Street, Peoria, Ill., wrote me this past weekend of his concern for what is happening in our country these past few weeks. He has a knack for poetry and I would like to have printed in the Record at this point his latest work, entitled "The American Nightmare":

The American Nightmare

Night after night I have this dream,
It seems I hardly sleep;
I always dream of a wild-eyed mob
A comi'n up the street.
It seems to me there's hundreds,
With bottles, bricks and rocks,
I run to the telephone
And hurriedly call the cops.

They say the cops are busy,
Tied-up all over town;
Say there's a revolution
But they will put it down.
They tell me not to worry,
They're sure I'll be alright;
Just let them burn my house down
And not to start a fight.
Hey you, I hollers loud
I need your help, and quick;
Crash! goes a window,
Busted by a brick.
Gettin' more excited,
Louder do I yelp!
Sorry, is the answer,
Can't give you any help.

Then a flash like lightnin'!
A blast with a deafnin' sound;
The crash of fallin' timbers
And yellin'! all around.
Now I don't own a firearm,
The State has took my gun;
To stay and die is stupid
So we get set and run.

We scramble to the auto,
At sixty make a turn,
Ahead there is a bon-fire
This too late I learn.
I hear the crash of pistols,
The baby starts to cry;
I says, O God save us
Please don't let us die.

Down I puts the throttle,
Am really goi'n fast;
A bottle hits the windshield
Then there is a crash!
Stars blaze before me
Then suddenly I wake,
Wet with perspiration
In frenzied fear I shake!

Now did I have a nightmare?
Will call the cops and see.
Buzz, buzz goes the telephone
Then a voice answers me . . .
This message is recorded,
Thank you for your call,
The police have evacuated!
That's all . . . that's all . . . that's all!

No Simple Solution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 31, 1967

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, the recent riots and violence have troubled and concerned all of us. Certainly the disorder demands that we pause and reexamine our efforts which have been aimed at preventing the violence which has occurred.

A realistic assessment of the situation as it exists today was made by the WMT station in Cedar Rapids, Iowa, in a recent editorial. The editorial follows:

No Simple Solution

Perhaps the biggest problem in the racial turmoil which grips the country again this summer is that too many people are looking for easy answers. A start on the ultimate solution may rest in frank recognition that there aren't any.

The hoodlum who hurls a rock or fire bomb into a white business establishment and the racist who shouts "Ship them all back to Africa" represent the gross extremes of the "simple solution" philosophy.

Whatever the frustrations and injustices of the ghetto slum may be—and they ARE inconceivably bad—they can only be made worse by fire-bombing, sniping and looting. But anyone who thinks the white majority can turn its back on the conditions which have festered out of racial bigotry is as misguided as the looting vandal.

The idea that the civil rights laws which have been passed are the panacea for all of the country's racial ills is part of the fallacy of "simple solutions". The laws were needed and provide the legal framework from which government can force recognition of minimum, basic human rights. But no one has ever been able to legislate attitudes and no law can bring about an overnight reversal of the prejudice, neglect and abuse of centuries. No matter how militant the cry for redress may be—these things will only change gradually. Every rock that is thrown and every sniper's bullet fired—slows the process.

Society will demand and *get* the application of enough force to control the violence. In the process old attitudes will be hardened and new hatreds born. The ghetto slums, the poverty, the inadequate education and low job skills which imprison much of the negro population are a fact of existence which cannot be burned, or wished, or legislated away overnight.

The negro people say—and rightfully—that they cannot wait forever to be released from the bonds of racial, economic and social repression. But no matter how much men of good will may wish it—that release will not come easily or automatically. There is no simple solution. Yet a solution must come. In the final analysis it will come largely out of the efforts of the negro people themselves to gain and exercise political and economic power—to build and to educate . . . and to assume their rightful share of responsibility for the common good. In these efforts we believe the number of white men who are willing to help is sizeable.

To those who are not—the signs should be clear enough that violence—even though it accomplishes nothing—is the court of last resort for the victim of perpetual injustice.

Cohoes Native Dies—Viet War Veteran

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL E. BUTTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 31, 1967

Mr. BUTTON. Mr. Speaker, Maj. Kenneth C. VanBuskirk, Jr., of Cohoes, N.Y., died recently at Alameda Air Force Base, Calif., where he was on special assignment after returning from Vietnam. I wish to commend the courage of Major VanBuskirk and to honor his memory by including the following article in the Record.

Cohoes Native Dies—Viet War Veteran

Maj. Kenneth C. VanBuskirk Jr., 31, of the Army, who formerly resided at 42 Continental Ave., Cohoes, died suddenly Monday night at Alameda Air Force Base, Calif., where he had been serving on special assignment.

A native and lifelong resident of Cohoes prior to entering the service, Major VanBuskirk was graduated from LaSalle Institute, Troy, in 1953 and from Niagara University in 1957, receiving the degree of bachelor of science in business administration. He had been in the ROTC program at Niagara and following his graduation was commissioned a second lieutenant.

He was graduated from the basic infantry officers course at Ft. Benning, Ga. and later served at Ft. Devens, Mass. In 1960 he was sent to Berlin, Germany, where he served as commander of the 2nd Battle Group of the 6th Infantry.

Subsequently the officer returned to Ft.

Benning, where he acted as a member of the Advisory Committee to the Rangers.

Going to South Vietnam in June, 1966, Major VanBuskirk was senior adviser to the South Vietnamese Rangers for about a year.

He was awarded the Combat Infantry Badge, the Bronze Star, the Air Medal for 100 missions in support operations and the Commendation Medal given by the South Vietnamese government.

Now It's Punishment Before Conviction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 31, 1967

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, recently the Department of Agriculture continued its highhanded tactics by banning the Austin Co., which has offices in Greenville, Tenn., in my district, from dealings through the Commodity Credit Corporation.

The Department has chosen to penalize this company before the court has had an opportunity to determine whether the charges are true or false, and I deplore such actions. Since when do we hold that guilt is presumed until innocence is proven?

I call upon the Department to stop its actions until the case has been heard in court.

Mr. Speaker, in this regard, I am inserting an editorial from the Greenville, Tenn., Sun:

NOW IT'S PUNISHMENT BEFORE CONVICTION

Should a man be punished for alleged violation of the law before he is convicted?

According to the action of the Department of Agriculture this week, this must be the new view of a vast and powerful branch of the federal government.

A few weeks ago the Department of Agriculture brought charges in a New York Court against a Tennessee company. The case will be heard in Federal Court either in New York or Tennessee. The company denies the charges, but can only take their defense to the court.

Now along comes action by the Department of Agriculture in banning the company from dealings through the Commodity Credit Corporation. In effect, they have said we are going to punish you even though our charges have not been heard or upheld in court.

The Austin Company buys a vast amount of tobacco on markets in Tennessee, Kentucky, Virginia, North and South Carolina and Georgia. They sell much of this tobacco abroad. For practical reasons, export tobacco must go through the Commodity Credit Corporation in reaching foreign buyers.

We deplore the action of the Department of Agriculture in penalizing this company by banning their operations through the CCC, before the court has had an opportunity to determine whether the charges are true or false. The effect will be to remove from the export market one of tobacco's biggest buyers and exporters, thereby severely hurting the tobacco farmer.

This smells of dictatorship, harassment and is contrary to the long established principle in this country that a man is "presumed innocent until proven guilty."

We call upon the President and the Congress to straighten out the fuzzy thinking of the Department of Agriculture in making this precipitate and unfair ruling. Let the courts decide the case before the penalty is handed down.

If Man Stands Upright, a Backbone Is Required

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. M. G. (GENE) SNYDER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 31, 1967

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, a July 19 editorial in the Mount Sterling, Ky., Advocate contains words of wisdom and food for thought for all of us. The editorial appears below, and I commend it to the attention of our colleagues and all readers of the RECORD:

IF MAN STANDS UPRIGHT, A BACKBONE IS REQUIRED

The greatest need in America today is for a few million citizens who are willing to become "involved."

To become "involved" in 1967, a little work is necessary. "Backbone" is essential. Good, old-fashioned "guts" are better. A thick skin, while not essential, is desirable.

When one becomes "involved," he takes part in the operation of the public's business. He stands up and says what he thinks, and is not afraid to say it—out in the open, to his Congressman, Senators, legislators, as well as to his county and city officials. He is not afraid to be viewed as "behind the times" because of his convictions. He takes pride in being described as "different" when he disagrees with socialistic and communistic concepts of government.

He is not afraid to do battle with the wild-eyed idealists, who are incapable of distinguishing fact from fiction. He is not afraid to challenge the ideas and opinions of anyone. It does not matter from what level of government the "blessing" flow. They are all financed out of the same pockets. Regardless of whether the money is spent from Washington, from Frankfort or from Mt. Sterling, every dime of it comes from the same place.

Therefore, we are at a loss to understand why our citizens refuse to become "involved" to the extent of demanding a stronger voice in who spends their tax money, who get it and how it is spent.

For example, the taxpayers in Mt. Sterling spend $245 a month for a fireman, who is on duty 24 hours a day, and $310 a month for a policeman, who works 12 hours a day and is on call the other 12. At the same time, these same taxpayers in Mt. Sterling do not object to paying a clerk $308 a month to hand out food stamps, or a secretary in the food stamp office $250 a month—more than they pay a fireman to protect their property day and night.

Our taxes pay two "poverty" workers $250 each a month to sit in an office, from which no benefits to the public ever will be derived, but we pay $5 a month less to the men we expect—and demand—to risk their lives in fighting fires.

We think nothing f paying a small army of "social workers" more per month to handle "cases" than we give our policemen, upon whom we depend for protection of life and property on a 24-hour basis. Our taxes—not "federal money"—pay Dan Swartz $550 per month to "supervise" the "poverty" workers in Montgomery, Bath and Menifee Counties. We pay our police and fire chiefs less to provide us with services that we must have.

Our tax money is used to pay Gene Stathas $950 a month as the director of the Licking Valley Community Action Program, which we need only because some government clerk said we needed it. That is more than we pay our county judge, our mayor, or any other elected official in our county or city.

Can anyone justify the cutting of the "tax pie" in such a manner. Is there any justice in paying a "poverty director" more than we pay any of our local officials, and twice as much as we pay our chief of police?

Yes, our "social workers" get their paychecks from the state; our "poverty workers" get federal government checks. But, we send the money to Washington and to Frankfort before the checks are sent back to Montgomery County. All of the money comes out of the same pockets, but it doesn't go into the same pots.

Soon, a tax increase will be voted by Congress. We are going to hire more people to give away our money—at a faster pace. And, we are going to give salary increases to all of those who now are busily giving our money away.

What can we do about it? Nothing—unless people are willing to become "involved." If enough people become "involved," there will be no tax increase voted by Congress. Many of the needless programs will be halted, or have all of the excess fat trimmed. Elected officials do listen to the voters. But, the only people who are talking are those who feed at the tax trough.

It is our tax money. We can help decide how it will be spent. But, to get "involved," one must be able to stand upright. That, according to medical science, requires something called a backbone.

Power Lobbies Fight Dickey Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER N. KYROS
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 31, 1967

Mr. KYROS. Mr. Speaker, the people of Maine are greatly disturbed at the intensive campaign of deliberate misinformation by the private power monopolies which preceded the House's rejection last Tuesday of planning funds for the greatly needed Dickey-Lincoln hydroelectric power project. Seldom has a project of such unquestioned need and demonstrated benefit been rejected by this House. The Portland Sunday Telegram, the most widely read newspaper in my State, yesterday expressed the feelings of Maine's people at this unfortunate vote, and raised several questions frequently being asked in my State.

The unremitting opposition of the private power giants to this vital project is even more distressing when their record of demonstrated laxity and inadequacy is considered. For example, the Federal Power Commission's report to the President stated:

> The power failure of November 9, 1965 revealed deficiencies in equipment system planning, operation and maintenance, and preparedness for emergencies. There were problems with control equipment; there was a more-or-less lack of auxiliary or emergency generating equipment; many transmission interties proved to be inadequate; there were few well-developed plans for quickly balancing load and generation (load shedding and,

in special cases, disconnection of generation); and provision for quick restoration of service in the event of system failure was often inadequate.

I join with the Portland Sunday Telegram in decrying the conduct of the private power interests. Their dedication to the defeat of Dickey is another clear indication of how little these monopolies are concerned with the welfare of the people they are supposed to be serving.

I am pleased to be able to bring this timely editorial to the attention of the Members of the House, as follows:

POWER LOBBIES FIGHT DICKEY AGAIN

Private electric companies mustered every ounce of their political muscle from every quarter of the nation to fight tooth and nail for the defeat of the $229 million hydroelectric power project at Dickey-Lincoln.

They succeeded in part this past week. Funds for the final planning of Dickey-Lincoln were axed by the House. To sink the axe deeper, to make Senator Smith's and Senator Muskie's herculean task of restoring the cuts in the Senate still more difficult, the Republican minority leader insisted upon an unusual roll-call vote. And the planning funds of $1.7 millions were defeated 233–169. Maine and New England consumers of power are the losers. Maine is the prime loser.

We ask these questions: If Dickey is as inefficient as the private utilities claim it would be, why are they so frightened by it? Is not the very intensity of their attack on Dickey the strongest possible argument that an efficient, competitive Dickey might offer power at lower rates? In New England, private power interests have their last stronghold in the nation. Are they hell-bent to kill Dickey-Lincoln so private companies can keep the monopoly and won't have to compete in their rates with public power?

Threat to Domestic Tranquillity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July, 31, 1967

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, the tragic and horrifying street rioting we have witnessed in recent days is a threat to the domestic tranquillity the U.S. Government is responsible for maintaining.

In this regard I would like to call to my colleagues' attention the following statement by the Department of New York, Polish Legion of American Veterans to the effect that the group "Does not condone the rioting of the present days. It is a definite case of insurrection and revolt against the American way of life. We who have fought for the preservation of life and liberty during the last few wars deplore this open defiance of the rights of liberty and American citizenship."

Certainly the looting and killing in our streets is inconsistent with the democratic process our country has been built upon. It is not only inconsistent with all that we value but it is a threat to the order we have built. Thus I commend to the attention of the Members the statement by the Department of New York, Polish Legion of American Veterans.

Moscow and Peking Vie for Hanoi's Allegiance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. McFALL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 31, 1967

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, an extremely interesting article by Victor Zorza, considered to be one of the leading British authorities on Russian affairs, appeared in the July 30 issue of the Washington Post.

Because of the potential importance of Mrs. Zorza's observations to every American, I wish to call it to the attention of all.

The article follows:

MOSCOW AND PEKING VIE FOR HANOI'S ALLEGIANCE

(By Victor Zorza)

LONDON.—Moscow and Peking are locked in the final stages of a fierce struggle for the allegiance of the North Vietnamese leadership, which is divided between those who want to accept Russia's advice to begin negotiations with the United States and those who insist that the war must continue.

For many months the struggle has been fought in deep secrecy, with only occasional hints of it filtering between the lines of the Communist press. But now, with the climax approaching, the protagonists are addressing themselves almost openly to the Vietnamese leaders, and are even appealing to the Vietnamese people.

Clearly, Moscow and Peking know that the final decision is about to be taken in Hanoi and that once taken it will not be easily reversed. Hence the new intensity of the struggle.

A Moscow broadcast in Vietnamese warned, in effect, that Peking was trying to take over the management of the country's affairs and of the war. Chinese leaders, Moscow Radio told the Vietnamese people, "are plotting to assume the leading role in regions where the National Liberation movement flourishes, chiefly in Asia."

Since the "liberation movement" certainly "flourishes" in South Vietnam, Moscow was telling the Vietcong leaders that Peking was trying to take over their organization. Moscow Radio also made it clear that the Chinese were wrong to insist that the Vietnamese must continue the war, although it sought to disguise the present relevance of the argument by referring to something that supposedly happened in 1948.

"Attempting to grasp the leading role in Asia in 1948," Moscow Radio said, "the Mao Tse-tung clique urged the Communist Parties to engage in armed struggle, in spite of the fact that conditions were not favorable for them to secure victory."

REMEMBER INDONESIA

Moscow radio also made it clear to Vietnamese listeners, by reminding them of what happened recently in Indonesia, that Peking was trying to interfere in the leadership debate in Hanoi. It recalled that "the Chinese leaders interfered directly in the internal affairs of the Indonesian Communist Party" which had found itself, as a result, "in dire straits."

Peking's ulterior motives were pointed out in another broadcast, not beamed directly to Vietnam but presumably reflecting the warning which the Russians are conveying privately to Hanoi: "China, which her present leaders depict as an example of socialism to the whole world, is turning again into a yellow dragon which, just as under the old Chinese dynasties, is ready to pounce on its weaker neighbors. The policy pursued by the Chinese People's Republic toward neighboring countries has acquired the character of great power dictation."

Five days after the Moscow broadcast in Vietnamese, Peking Radio beamed its reply directly to Vietnam. This criticized, in effect, Hanoi's policy of maintaining a strictly neutral attitude between Moscow and Peking and called on it to denounce the Soviet betrayal of the Vietnamese struggle.

The "wicked schemes of the Soviet revisionists who pretend to support the Vietnamese people but actually intend to sell them down the river," Peking told Hanoi, "must be unmasked." the United States was making use of the "peace talks hoax" with Soviet support, said the broadcast, but the Vietnamese people had shown that they could be neither threatened nor fooled—Peking's way of saying they must not allow themselves to be taken in.

FRIENDSHIP WITH RUSSIA

Hanoi's official policy is to hail the friendship with Russia and to give grateful thanks for Soviet help. Its press has pointedly refrained from praising China's "great cultural revolution" and has even denounced, in a rare warning to the pro-Chinese elements in the Vietnamese Communist Party, the "deification" of unnamed party leaders.

Peking, which has long accepted this situation, has now decided to challenge it in public, showing again that it believes that the struggle in the Vietnamese leadership between the pro-Chinese and pro-Soviet factions—which means pro-war and pro-negotiation—is approaching a climax. Since Hanoi will not officially allow pro-Chinese views to be published in Vietnam, Peking has now taken to quoting "articles" written by "Vietnamese friends" for unidentified newspapers as endorsing the Chinese line.

And now comes the announcement by the official Chinese news agency, attributed once again to "a Vietnamese friend," that in the face of a revisionist conspiracy, "the Marxist-Leninists of Vietnam must study and grasp the thought of Mao Tse-tung, and use it as a guide to action."

The "revisionists," presumably, are those members of the Hanoi leadership who have banned the study of Mao in Vietnam—for the study of Mao is merely a political code, in this context, for sticking to the Mao line on the continuation of the war.

The "Vietnamese friend" makes it clear that he is speaking on behalf of a political faction when he announces that "we definitely believe" that Mao's thought is a guide to the revolution in Vietnam—that is, to the way the war in Vietnam should be fought.

Only by applying Mao's thought "can we unswervingly defend the purity of Marxism-Leninism"—that is, defeat the revisionists in the Vietnamese leadership. For the revisionists "are engineering the peace talks fraud for the purpose of undermining the morale of the Vietnamese people, and throttling the war of resistance."

VIETNAMESE AGAINST VIETNAMESE

Therefore, as a "Vietnamese friend" explains in another unattributed article, "the revisionists must be denounced, because they are following the counter-revolutionary double-dealing policy of selling out the Vietnamese people."

These attacks are ostensibly directed at Soviet revisionists, but it is clear from the context that they are being launched by Vietnamese against Vietnamese.

The signs suggest that the trouble is about to culminate in a victory for one side or the other, so it may appear that the best course for the United States is to sit tight in the hope that the peace faction will prevail. Hanoi might then agree to negotiations on America's terms—that is, it would suspend infiltration in exchange for the suspension of the bombing.

Something of the hard-line objections to this course, which must have been voiced in the Vietnamese politburo, has also been indicated by the Chinese press. In February, when the suspension of bombing and of infiltration was almost agreed as to result of Soviet Premier Kosygin's visit to London, the Peking People's Daily openly denounced the initiative—which that time had come from Hanoi.

"Can it be said," the People's Daily reported, "that the suspension of bombing is the crux of the Vietnam question? Certainly not." So much for the North Vietnamese foreign minister's proposal. The crux of the matter, Peking said, was that United States forces should withdraw from Vietnam—the very precondition on which the Hanoi statement was no longer insisting.

To the Communists, stopping infiltration means they might never be able to resume it—just as, to many rational people in the United States any suspension of the bombing now would mean that it might be difficult, if not impossible, to resume it.

The negotiations, resulting from the suspension would be used, in the view of Peking—and therefore, in the view of the Hanoi hawks—"to bind North Vietnam hand and foot," so that the United States could "do what it liked in South Vietnam."

The warning was clear: "If South Vietnam is lost, North Vietnam will be lost, too, sooner or later . . . once this beast of United States imperialism heals its wounds, it will some day spring upon North Vietnam."

To the United States and its friends in the West, this may seem like a travesty of everything America stands for. To the hawks in Hanoi, it will seem like a very good argument that they should not agree to stop infiltration, even in exchange for the suspension of bombing.

This debate has been lost again and again by the Vietnamese doves in the past. It may, therefore, seem that if it is lost this time they will live to fight another day, when reason finally prevails, and both infiltration and bombing stop.

It may also be argued, however, that if the hawks win again, they will make sure this time that they suffer no further obstruction from the doves.

If history is any guide—and there have been many such leadership debates in almost every war on record—the hawks are more likely to prevail because, short of complete military defeat, the more militant section of the leadership is also the more politically powerful in wartime.

But if the bombing is suspended, in my opinion, there is a good chance that Hanoi doves may prevail on the hawks to agree to negotiation. Several such chances have been missed in the past, with a fearful penalty paid in human lives. If the present opportunity is not taken—and taken quickly—it may not recur for a long time.

Gateway Arch at St. Louis Is Tallest "Monument," Not "Structure"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 31, 1967

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, in the RECORD of July 27, at pages A3835–A3836, there is an extension of remarks of mine containing an article from the New York Times describing the train which carries visitors to the top of the gateway arch at the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial in St. Louis. The article was accurate, but an error in the caption and the remarks I placed in the RECORD makes a claim for the arch which was a bit too extravagant and requires correction.

I referred in the caption to "A Train Ride to the Top of the Tallest Structure in the United States, the Gateway Arch at St. Louis," and later in the text of my remarks stated that it was the "highest manmade structure in the United States." In both instances, the word "structure" should have been "monument."

Put Violence Down

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT E. JONES

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 31, 1967

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the recent rioting, looting, and violence which has marred many of this Nation's cities is of deepest concern to me and the people in my district.

There can be no discontent worthy of the destruction and death which has resulted.

The immediate need was thoughtfully and forcefully set forth in a recent editorial by Mr. James E. Hutsell in the Huntsville, Ala., Times.

I commend his words to the attention of my colleagues and insert it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point:

PUT VIOLENCE DOWN

Commentators, who usually feel impelled to wrap up every crisis with an easy phrase, report that racial violence has caught up official Washington in "a deep, pervasive uncertainty."

We suppose that's true. But, if so, it's because that same officialdom is coping with political nose-counting and unwillingness to offend millions of highly race-conscious voters.

For our part, we continue to maintain a deep and pervasive certainty about that same rioting and what to do about it.

Control it. Put it down. With whatever amount of force is necessary.

We are quite aware that there are wellsprings for protest. We know that many things can tap them. We know steps must be taken to diminish the sources of those springs.

But first it must be made clear to all who attempt to exploit us by violence that this nation's first concern shall be with law and order.

Let there be hard-nose law enforcement.

In the riots that tear cities asunder, we are dealing with criminals—criminals engaged in murderous assault, in looting and in wholesale arson. They are crimes for which justifiably hard penalties are on the books. And determined efforts must be made to capture, convict and sternly sentence those who engaged in criminal activities in the riot-torn cities.

We must all remember that a relatively small percentage of Negro citizens are in these riots or give them even token endorsement. We must recognize that the decent Negro citizen becomes the great loser by the action of these insurrectionists. Unless we do remember, we would be making it easier for anarchy to stoke the fires of hate.

But it must be made abundantly clear that we shall refuse to endure violence or to bargain on terms dictated by the lawless.

Thant Warns on Vietnam "Holy War"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN G. DOW

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 31, 1967.

Mr. DOW. Mr. Speaker, we should not fail to note the words of caution and of wisdom spoken by Secretary General Thant of the United Nations yesterday in Greensboro, N.C. Mr. Thant is to be admired for telling the American people forthrightly that they ought to change their thinking about Vietnam. It is clear from his words that the United States has a responsibility of its own, that is not dependent on a response from "the other side," as we call North Vietnam, to move for peace. The Secretary General's advice calls for a cessation of bombing and of the isolation of China from the rest of the world.

An account of the Secretary General's speech appears in the New York Times of today's date. Portions of the account appear as follows:

(By George Dugan)

GREENSBORO, N.C., July 30.—Secretary General Thant warned tonight against viewing the fighting in Vietnam as an anti-Communist "holy war."

It is nationalism, and not Communism, the United Nations Secretary General declared, "that animates the resistance movement in Vietnam against all foreigners, and now particularly against Americans."

In a speech at the Fourth World Conference of the Religious Society of Friends (Quakers), the Secretary General said the Vietnam conflict could not be resolved until the United States and its allies recognized that it was being fought by the Vietnamese, "not as a war of Communist aggression, but as a war of national independence."

Mr. Thant spoke in the Greensboro Memorial Coliseum before an audience of 8,500. Of these, 1,000 were delegates to the Quaker meeting.

CHINA'S NUCLEAR GAINS NOTED

He told the Quakers that only when Communist China became a full member of the United Nations would the prospect for world peace look brighter.

Earlier, in a news conference, Mr. Thant said that if the Vietnam war went on indefinitely there were "grave prospects" of Chinese involvement.

He also said that should there be a cessation of bombing, "meaningful talks" between Hanoi and the United States could begin within a few weeks.

The Secretary General reminded his audience that China recently joined the "nuclear club." And, he added, its advances in the development of nuclear weapons have come as a surprise to qualified observers in this country and elsewhere.

"It bodes little good for the interest of world peace and security to perpetuate the isolation of China and keep her cut off from normal contact with the rest of the world," he said. "I believe that the time must come when China can play its part as a member of the international community on equal terms with others, and the sooner this happens the better."

But, Mr. Thant warned, an "indispensable" first step must be taken before China's membership in the United Nations can become a fact.

He defined that step as a "détente," or relaxing of the strained relations between the United States and the Soviet Union.

How To Avoid a Riot

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DON EDWARDS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 31, 1967

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, some prophetic words were written in the San Jose Mercury of July 19, 1967, regarding the health of our city and the potential for its explosion into violence and destruction. The goal is clear, they say, that that is to assure quality education, meaningful job opportunity, and decent housing on an equal basis to all citizens. It is essential, meanwhile, to keep open contact and communications. Only by recognizing these basic needs will we avoid the kind of alienation and hate which leads to breakdowns such as have occurred this summer and will undoubtedly continue to strike other cities which sit still and allow their own mounting degeneration.

This editorial follows:

HOW TO AVOID A RIOT

Author Robert Conot, who is considered something of an expert on riots, doesn't believe San Jose is in any immediate danger of becoming another Watts or Newark, which is encouraging.

However, applying Conot's yardstick for measuring a community's riot potential, San Jose's safety is, at best, comparative and conditional.

As Conot expressed it:

"San Jose is perhaps the youngest major city in the country. You seem to have a high employment rate, a fast and expanding economy and a high per capita income . . . I think San Jose is really probably very lucky, because you have a tremendous industrial activity here and, as a consequence, a reasonable tax base."

The point is well taken: persons with jobs and the hope of bettering their lot in life are less interested in rioting than those who have abandoned hope of bettering themselves within the existing social framework.

San Jose is, indeed, fortunate in this respect. However, a major economic downturn, or a failure of industrial growth to keep up with expanding population, could wipe out this margin of safety within a comparatively short period of time. This, in turn, leads to Conot's two points of warning.

A community which wishes to avoid trouble will provide education of such quality that it qualifies all those willing to work for decent jobs. Then it will see that those with jobs are not denied decent housing.

The interrelationship here is close, so close that it is almost a chicken-egg situation.

Completely open housing is the only way to avoid creation of de facto segregated schools. And segregated education not only violates the Constitution; it is considered a contributing factor to the functional illiteracy which prevents many minority group members from getting and keeping good jobs—which in turn keeps them out of "good" neighborhoods.

In San Jose, every effort should be bent to make every neighborhood school a model of educational excellence. Greater efforts should be made in so-called disadvantaged neighborhoods than elsewhere, since this is the first step toward breaking down the poverty-illiteracy-poverty cycle that helps produce ghetto patterns.

The city's school authorities, business, labor, civic and rights' organizations leaders should maintain the closest working contacts now—when the danger of violence is minimal—so that San Jose can grow into the sort of open community that need never fear trouble from its own citizens.

As Conot observed, correctly:

"I think the key aspect for a city such as San Jose is to keep communications open to all minority groups so problems can be solved as they arise. Don't let problems pile up until they explode—if you take care of a pimple it never grows into a boil."

Passes Draw Youngsters to Stadium

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES A. BURKE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 31, 1967

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, may I bring to the attention of the Members of the U.S. Congress an article that appeared in the Washington Post today. I am pleased to see the Washington Senators baseball management making these empty seats available at baseball games to our most disadvantaged youngsters. I have been in touch with the White House and many others concerned with the problems of our teeming tenement districts and I have pointed out one area where steps can be taken to assist the poor youngsters in our Nation.

This can be done throughout the entire country. None of us expect the people running these sporting events to carry the full expense of this program. Our Federal Government, the State, and local governments can come in for a share of the expense. Yes, the business community can also share in this wonderful effort to direct our youth in a way that will take them away from the dissident forces that are today so evident.

I trust that steps will be taken to enlarge this program of free tickets to baseball games, football games, hockey, basketball, and soccer for the poor youngsters in the Nation.

PASSES DRAW YOUNGSTERS TO STADIUM

The Washington Senators had 2382 new rooters Sunday as needy youngsters turned out for the ball game with free passes.

Five thousand tickets were made available for the doubleheader with the California Angels, according to Joseph R. Burke, Senators' treasurer and business manager.

Another 5000 will be passed out by the District Recreation Department for the Tuesday and Wednesday night games with the Minnesota Twins, Burke said. Four thousand Washington area youths attended the Saturday night game on passes.

Free tickets may be made available for the Senators' other 12 games in August if District of Columbia and stadium police reports on the four-day free pass experiment reveal no problems. Burke said the ball club is willing to let needy youngsters fill ordinarily empty seats at the team's home games, but wants to make sure there will be no problems with supervision or transportation.

He had no report of trouble Saturday or yesterday.

Consumer's Bill of Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GERALD R. FORD
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 31, 1967

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Richard DeVos, president of Amway Corp. in Ada, Mich., and one of my constituents, recently addressed the National Association of Direct Selling Companies and presented a "Consumer's Bill of Rights."

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include Mr. DeVos' address:

CONSUMER'S BILL OF RIGHTS

We, as an industry (direct selling), come closer to symbolizing the free enterprise system than any other industry in the world today. We come closer to making opportunity available to the average person, because, we reach down to the last common denominator. Regardless of race, color or where they are, or what they've got or their education, we extend to all people an Opportunity.

We believe that the American consumer is a bright and intelligent individual. That he is quite capable of making decisions which are sound as long as he is given adequate facts to back them up.

We believe people built America, not government. That America is great because individuals were free to grow and do the things they chose to do. And, as such, we believe the consumer deserves something we call the *Consumer's Bill of Rights.*

We believe this association should extend itself beyond member companies into the hearts and minds of people who sell our products and to those who come under our influence throughout a year's time. We must rise up to the cause of free enterprise and rally the customer to the cause, because even though government legislation may be hampering our rights to do business as we see it, far beyond that, they are hampering the right of the individual American to live the way they choose to live.

So, as we champion their cause, their rights, we need not worry about ours. Here is a *Consumer's Bill of Rights*—

CONSUMER'S BILL OF RIGHTS

The Consumer must have: The right to be a free consumer; The right to benefit from traditional competition; The right to choose from many markets; The right to free, unmanaged markets.

The Consumer must have: The right to be asked to buy; The right to personal service; The right to make buying decisions; The right to select what to buy; The right to decide where to buy; The right to determine when to buy; The right to choose how to buy; The right to patronize who serves them best.

The Consumer must have: The right to cast consumer ballot through purchases of goods and services from individuals and companies who satisfy consumer wants in the manner consumers alone determine best.

America, as I said, is a great land, not because of the Republicans, not because of the Democrats, not because of labor or management, not because of black or white, or Protestant or Catholic.

America is great because the average American is a dedicated, God-fearing person. This country was built by people—intelligent people, through blood, sweat and tears, and—this organization, with its great concept of individual responsibility, can represent all of those people if we will truly join together to remember that it's the people who believe in free enterprise that built this great land.

The 125th Anniversary of U.S. Naval Ordnance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 31, 1967

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, on the 19th of July, the Secretary of the Navy designated the month of August 1967, as a commemorative period for celebrating the 125th anniversary of U.S. Naval Ordnance. It was on August 31, 1842, that President Tyler signed into law the bill establishing the original Bureau of Ordnance and Hydrography.

As established, the Bureau of Ordnance consisted of one captain, who was chief of the Bureau, one clerk, and three draftsmen. They were located here in the Washington Navy Yard. Today, this very active worldwide command, now known as the Naval Ordnance Systems Command, which is under Rear Adm. Arthur Gralla, U.S. Navy, utilizes the efforts and resources of roughly 40,000 people.

Prior to 1842, Navy ship commanders obtained their own ordnance with funds provided them for the outfitting of their ships. However, with the establishment of the Navy Bureau of Ordnance, that Bureau has been responsible for the development of naval guns, torpedoes, and missiles which have been so devastating in war and continue to provide the power which protects the sealanes so vital to our national and economic well being.

I congratulate Admiral Gralla and the very effective group he heads in the Naval Ordnance Systems Command on the occasion of this anniversary, and under unanimous consent include the proclamation of the Secretary of the Navy in the RECORD at this point:

JULY 19, 1967.

From: Secretary of the Navy.
To: All Ships and Stations.
Subj: 125th Anniversary, United States Naval Ordnance

1. *Purpose*. To designate the month of August 1967 as a commemorative period for celebrating the 125th Anniversary of United States Naval Ordnance, and to outline the scope of the celebration.

2. *Background*. The United States Navy is preparing to commemorate the 125th Anniversary of United States Naval Ordnance. On 31 August 1842, President Tyler signed into Law the bill establishing the original Bureau of Ordnance and Hydrography. It is appropriate that the historical panorama of naval ordnance development receives maximum public awareness during the 125th anniversary month.

3. *Action*. The month of August 1967 is designated as the 125th Anniversary month of United States Naval Ordnance. All ships and stations will observee the anniversary at appropriate occasions throughout the month. Recognition of the exploits and achievements of naval ordnance during the past 125 years will be noted in public speeches, statements, open house ceremonies and other public events whenever feasible.

4. *Cancellation*. This Notice is cancelled 1 September 1967.

ROBERT H. B. BALDWIN,
Acting Secretary of the Navy.

Vine City Project Fails, Negroes Say

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BENJAMIN B. BLACKBURN
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 31, 1967

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, the fact that riots have raged throughout this Nation during the past week is history. The fact that further looting, murder, and arson are in the picture of the future is well know. In times of crisis such as this, everyone searches for a scapegoat. Quite naturally, everyone attempts to determine cause and effect. There will be time for research; but the time for corrective action on the part of all responsible citizens in the United States is now.

There are those who have chosen the Congress as a scapegoat. They remain content to cast blame; and they continue in their failure to accept responsibility. It is my feeling that this Congress must not play the role of a scapegoat.

The refusal of Congress to approve funds for such wasteful programs as the Rat Extermination Act is not to blame. Neither is the questioning by Members of Congress of poverty program efficiency to blame. Questions are also being asked by people in the city of Atlanta, Ga.; and I insert the text of an article which appeared in the July 28, 1967, issue of the Atlanta Journal in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD following these remarks:

VINE CITY PROJECT FAILS, NEGROES SAY

(By Bill Winn)

The Atlanta Metropolitan Grass Roots Council, composed of representatives from predominantly Negro civic organizations in the city, labeled Economic Opportunity Atlanta's poverty program in Vine City "a complete failure" Friday, and also demanded that slum landlords clean up housing on Walnut Street in the ghetto.

The Rev. Clyde Williams, president of the council, said some Vine City residents were angry "because the millions of dollars poverty program failed to meet their needs."

He told a press conference that the council plans "to contact proper authorities requesting that further funds be withheld until a thorough investigation is made of the poverty program."

The Rev. Mr. Williams also had some harsh words for Atlanta's proposed Model City program:

"We understand that the Atlanta Model City program is about to be approved. We have sent a telegram to U.S. Secretary of Housing and Urban Development Robert Weaver requesting that he withhold approval of the program until the following stipulations are met:

"One, that Negroes from the indigenous areas be placed in decision and policy making positions in the program.

"Two, that some of the money to be used in the program be housed in Negro banks.

"Three, that Negro lawyers, contractors, plumbers, electricians and architects also be used in the program."

The Rev. Mr. Williams said the council, and its affiliate organization, the Vine City Council, is particularly concerned about housing conditions on Walnut Street.

"These houses are not fit for human habitation," he said. "They are health hazards and firetraps, and we call upon the city administration to inspect these houses and act immediately" to have them cleaned up. He named two white landlords whose houses on Walnut, he said, are particularly bad.

The Grass Roots Council has long been at odds with EOA. In April, the group picketed EOA and called for resignations of EOA board members.

Last week, the council took on Atlanta Police Chief Herbert Jenkins and called for his position to be filled either by election or by appointment with tenure review every four years.

The council is circulating a petition and hopes to get 100,000 signatures to force the Atlanta Board of Aldermen to change the method of filling the police chief's position.

As Freedom Dies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES B. UTT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 31, 1967

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, occasionally an article or a poem is written which expresses the sorrow and frustration of a nation over the continued and bloody war in Vietnam—a war which is considered by many to be more political than military. There is scarcely a family in America which is not touched with sorrow and grief over the heavy casualties inflicted on our American youth.

Such a poem appeared in the Patriot, of Jackson, Miss., and I was so impressed by the thought which it conveyed that I reproduce it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for its thousands of readers to examine:

AS FREEDOM DIES

(By Terence Reeder Miles)

Sleepers, awake! The bell has long since rung.
Your slumber is your death . . .

Out of the sacred battlements that rang
With freedom, now the deadly fang
Is bared to strike. Awake! Our cherished land
Once safe and fearless, innocent and grand
Is wrapped with evil chains so slyly forged
On secret anvils . . . While you slept, they gorged
Their pockets with your wealth, and sucked your blood
And bound you in a snare called "brotherhood". . . .

America, the fine, the undismayed,
Where are your laughing sons? Betrayed . . . betrayed!
Bleeding and torn upon a foreign hill
Bleak with despair, remote from home . . . to fill
An empty bargain with a scheming "friend"
Who knows the senseless slaughter will not end
Until your youth is spent, your strength undone
Your land made captive . . . . and no victory won.

Awake, my country! Listen to your dead
They cry and reach hands agonized and red
With martyrs' blood to snatch you from the fate
Of slaves! They cry: 'Awake! The hour is late!"
And yet you sleep . . . you sleep! Oh foolish men!
Too blind, too careless! Who will fly again
The flag you lose? Who will set you free?
Who will rebuild your broken liberty?

The bell is silent now. The guns are loud . . .
There is no answer from the sleeping crowd.
The masked deceivers smile and spin their net
Teaching their captives that they must forget
The ancient ways of freedom, and deny
Their flag, their country, and supinely lie
Under the shelter of an alien's rope
Secure, unquestioning, and stripped of hope.

Oh, land of light! Oh, refuge of the brave
Who crossed the mightly oceans, here to save
Their treasured freedom, how your star has dimmed!
How cheap has grown the liberty that hymned
Your name across the world! How dark the sky
Where once your proud Old Glory used to fly
Unchallenged and unmatched with eagle keen
Guarding her folds! How sad the darkened scene
. . . as freedom dies . . . .

Ky Threatens Vietnamese Elections

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER L. WOLFF
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 31, 1967

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, the South Vietnamese elections for a President and Senate are rapidly approaching and I am becoming increasingly fearful that freedom will not prevail in Vietnam.

According to an article in the July 28 edition of the Washington Post, Premier Ky has made it clear the military junta will not accept victory by a civilian candidate. It is threats such as these that prompted me to introduce House Concurrent Resolution 382 to send a team of congressional observers to Vietnam at election time.

Free elections in South Vietnam are a necessary first step toward creating a climate for peace in all of Vietnam. Thus the importance of the fall elections cannot be overstated, since the freedom of the vote may be a sign of the outlook for peace in Vietnam. Under these circumstances the threats to democratic processes by Ky and other are most distressing.

It is ironic that at the the end of the article I have reference to, the Washington Post placed a small dispatch reporting that U Thant has refused to send United Nations observers to the Vietnamese elections. I believe this would be a proper role for the United Nations to undertake, but in that organization's failure to act I do maintain that the United States should undertake to assure the impartiality of the voting.

So that my colleagues may be fully aware of events in Vietnam and to call their special attention to Premier Ky's threat to the freedom of the elections, I include the article from the July 28 Washington Post in the RECORD at this point:

KY TO UPSET ANY ILLEGAL VIET ELECTION—THREATENS COUP IF NEW PRESIDENT WINS BY TRICKERY

SAIGON, July 27.—Premier Nguyen Cao Ky said today that if any opposition ticket in South Vietnam's presidential election should win by "trickery" he will overthrow it.

Ky's threat of a possible coup d'etat came as a report circulated that South Vietnam's generals—who seized power two years ago in a coup that put Ky on top as premier—are forming a committee that would preserve their power in the remote event that a civilian ticket wins the Sept. 3 election.

In another development, Ky told newsmen that, after talks between South Vietnamese government leaders and touring White House emissaries Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, and Clark Clifford, there was agreement that South Vietnam increase its troop level by 65,000 men to 700,000.

PRESSURE BY UNITED STATES

On July 21, Ky said he hoped to put 55,000 more men into the armed forces. The higher figure of 65,000 apparently resulted from pressure by Taylor and Clifford, who were sent on a trip through Southeast Asia to get more allied support for the war.

Ky also announced that in his talks with Taylor and Clifford he agreed to an October summit conference of the seven allied nations fighting in Vietnam, either in Bangkok, Thailand, or Seoul, South Korea.

If the summit were held in October, it might come while Ky is still premier. Though the presidential election is Sept. 3, the South Vietnamese Embassy in Washington said that if the Thieu-Ky military ticket wins it probably will be sworn in on Nov. 1, the anniversary of the overthrow of the Diem regime in 1963.

In Washington, White House Press Secretary George Christian reiterated that the decision to hold another summit conference similar to the one held in October of last year in Manila is a "long-standing" one, but that the location and time of a new meeting are still under study. Thailand last week called for a Fall summit.

MANILA VISIT OFF

White House advisers Taylor and Clifford announced today that they have canceled their trip to the Philippines, which was to have been one of the six stops on their tour. A U.S. Embassy spokesman in Bangkok, where the two envoys now are meeting with Thai leaders, said the Manila trip was canceled at the behest of Philippine President Ferdinand E. Marcos, who has already announced the Philippines will not send more troops.

Taylor and Clifford will next visit New Zealand, Australia and South Korea.

In his talk with newsmen today, Ky said he would not put up with illegal tactics in the election. "If the crooked and the corrupt use other tricks to win in the presidential election, I will stage a coup d'etat," he said.

Both Ky and Thieu have said previously that the armed forces would not accept a civilian government that "does not live up to the aspirations of the Vietnamese people" or one that is neutralist or pro-Communist.

Already seven of the 18 aspirants for president have been refused a place on the ballot. Among those disallowed by the National Assembly were former Premier Gen. Duong Van (Big) Minh, who is in exile in Bangkok, and Au Truong Thanh, who actively sought negotiations to end the war.

The Associated Press, which reported the generals' maneuvering to hold onto power, said informed sources reported that the committee the generals are forming would serve as a so-called "kitchen cabinet" if their own military ticket wins the presidential election.

Making up the generals' ticket—which most observers believe will win—are Lt. Gen. Nguyen Van Thieu for president and Ky for vice president.

On the military front today, action was sparse.

The Vietcong, using a new Russian-made rocket that has pinpoint accuracy from six miles, bombarded the headquarters of the 1st Infantry Divisions's 1st Brigade at Phuocvin, about 35 miles north of Saigon. Also bombarded with the new 122-mm. rocket and mortar shells were two South Vietnamese installations.

In the air war in North Vietnam, two Air Force Phantom jets battled with two Communist Mig-21s 37 miles west of Hanoi. American pilots said they probably shot down one of the Migs with rockets.

In Washington, Defense Department officials said that a 13-mile free-fire zone carved from the junge just below the Demilitarized zone is being extended another 10 miles westward. The zone, about 650 yards deep, was cleared to expose infiltrating Communists to Marine artillery fire.

THANT BARS OBSERVERS FOR SAIGON'S ELECTIONS

UNITED NATIONS, N.Y., July 27.—Secretary-General U Thant has turned down a request from South Vietnam to send U.N. observers to the presidential elections in that country scheduled for Sept. 3, a U.N. spoeksman disclosed today.

The Saigon government said it made the request to "testify to our determination to hold free and honest elections."

Emmet John Hughes, Critic of Our Vietnam Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THEODORE R. KUPFERMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 25, 1967

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, Emmet John Hughes, the well-known writer for Newsweeks magazine, in the July 10 issue, has a thought-provoking article entitled "The Vietnam Isolationists," which so well points out the absurdity of our Vietnam policy.

He adds to the list of respected and intelligent critics heretofore detailed in my statement on "A Long and Sober Think on Vietnam" to be found in the RECORD of July 26 at page A3764.

I commend Mr. Hughes' article to my colleagues:

THE VIETNAM ISOLATIONISTS

You were ready to fight Facist aggressors in the 1930s or Communist aggressors in the 1950s. But—you deplore such force in Vietnam in the 1960s. . . . You approved all use of American power since World War II to save Berlin or Greece or Korea. But—you decry its use to save Vietnam. . . . You profess an American duty to see that Israel does not drown in a sea of Arab chauvinists. But—you deny any duty to keep Vietnam from disappearing in a sea of Chinese Communists. . . . You are a critic with a freak double standard. . . . You are—an isolationist.

The American critic of his nation's Vietnam policy has led a rather wearying life, these past five years. He has had to speak forth to break a vast, hollow silence, as the opposition party has proven too fearful to oppose. He rarely has been able to rouse official apologists to dialogue more serious than the ludicrous insinuation that critics rather than makers of national policy bear the moral burden for the ordeal of soldiers in the field. And he has lately heard his government wrench this dialogue with a tantalizing fantasy: the charge that all critics, as they carp over a policy of strength, betray the narrow vision and weak nerve of old isolationists.

The indictment has a perverse merit. It dramatizes the distance between officials and critics in their very understanding of the fabric of modern history. And so the critic must retort. . . .

The key resource of American policy in Vietnam has not been strength but luck. For this has been an exercise critically turning on contingencies beyond U.S. control: the domestic turmoil in China, the success of Hanoi resistance without Chinese intervention, and the fortune of the Kosygins in controling Soviet extremists. Such huge hazards easily explain the President's famous private confession to his daughter: "Your Daddy may go down in history as having unleased World War III." And it requires a vivid imagination to construe such decision-making by nail-biting as proof of national strength or global vision.

The castigation of critics as isolationists entails a kind of witless incantation: a war is war is a war. The chief White House chanter in this vein has been Prof. John Roche, who has passed a garrulous year trying to prove the profundity of Vietnam policy. As he recently argued: "Just because we have cultural links with Israel is no reason to excommunicate the Asians. It's just another manifestation of the liberal-isolationist syndrome." But this amateur effort in mass psychiatry bizarrely sets the White House to competing with Kosygin and de Gaulle in confusion of the Vietnam and Middle East conflicts. In any case, the insistence that all U.S. military ventures must be equally virtuous poses the absurd question: would critics be chastised as isolationist for opposing nineteenth-century-style forays in Central America to set up congenial puppet dictators?

It is not the critics but the makers of policy who have abruptly broken with the past in defining U.S. foreign commitments. In all previous crises since World War II, the U.S. purpose has been to *defend* sovereignty. Here—and here alone—the avowed aim is to *establish* a sovereignty where none has previously existed. The President himself has compared these years in Vietnam with the American nation-building labor from 1776 to 1789. There is no precedent whatsoever for a U.S. effort to export such an enterprise.

It requires a mockery of history to cite resistance to aggression in the 1930s or the 1940s as source and reason for current policy in Vietnam. *Then,* the liveliest and proudest hopes of the American people included: the forging of a world community, the nourishing of democratic change and the quickening of national liberation—whether by underground armies fighting Nazis or colonial guerrillas fighting empires. *Now,* the official credo for Vietnam reads quite differently: the U.S. right to wage war no matter what the U.N. thinks, the disdain for "national liberation" as a Communist obscenity and the practice of democracy as defined by Marshal Nguyen Cao Ky. These are harsh simplifications. Yet they suggest the absurdity of citing yesterday's spirited dreams as today's sovereign values.

There appears, finally, only one true isolationist on the scene: the zealot cheering Vietnam policy. For it is he alone who *isolates* the Vietnam conflict from its historic context. He alone conceives it as a self-justifying show of muscle and resolve. He alone fancies some military settlement here attainable without some political settlement with China—whose *isolation* he approves. He alone appraises the struggle largely apart from its cost in world opinion or in Soviet relations. And he alone fancies that an indulgent world will forgive the Saigon junta as but an *isolated* deviation from the kind of democracy that America favors for all mankind.

It is a century since Thoreau gave advice for a man quite as valid for a nation: "Probe the earth and see where your main roots run."

The makers of Vietnam policy have preferred to claw at the surface of one cruel crisis.

The critic stays committed to keeping the earth in mind.

Monday Holidays

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 25, 1967

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, the confusion and inconvenience created by the arbitrarily assigned dates for certain of our national holidays are strong arguments for plans advanced by several of our colleagues for scheduling all holidays except Christmas and New Year's on Mondays.

Most of the proposals deal with well-established holidays like Washington's Birthday, Memorial Day, Independence Day, Veterans Day, and Thanksgiving Day. As an editorial in the July 8, 1967, Pittsburgh Press pointed out, the dates on which we now observe many of these holidays have little or no connection with the events they commemorate.

None of the proposals includes a holiday to celebrate the great explorer and discoverer, Christopher Columbus, whose achievements make him worthy of an annual national observance. I urge the Judiciary Committee, after its August 16 and 17 hearings on the Monday holiday bills, to give serious consideration to including in whichever proposal it approves, a Monday holiday to be known as Columbus Day. Such action would please both those in favor of Monday holidays and those Americans who feel that Columbus Day should be a national holiday.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I insert the July 8 Pittsburgh Press editorial at this point in the RECORD, and urge my colleagues to give careful attention to its arguments for Monday holidays:

MONDAY HOLIDAYS

The influential voice of the United States Chamber of Commerce is now among those favoring a plan to schedule all holidays—with the exception of Christmas and New Year's—on Mondays. A bill to shift most national holidays to Mondays has been introduced in Congress and is scheduled for hearings next month in a House Judiciary subcommittee.

Except for Christmas and New Year's, there is no good reason why holidays should be observed on the dates on which they are now scheduled. Washington's birthday was originally celebrated on February 11, its date under the Julian calendar. Memorial Day, originally set aside to honor the Civil War dead, has no special connection with any historical event on May 30. Independence Day could just as easily be celebrated on the first Monday in July, since the Continental Congress actually voted for independence on July 2, 1776, and not until August 2, 1776, did members sign the Declaration. Since Veterans Day is now held in tribute to all veterans, the November 11 date, signifying the ending of World War I, no longer has the significance it once did. As for Thanksgiving, the first such observance in 1621 was actually held in October; and in subsequent years the date was changed many times.

By the scheduling of most holidays on Monday, Americans would gain three-day periods for recreation every year; business would have an unbroken work week; and at the same time the commemorative purposes of the holidays would be preserved.

Businessmen Participating in the Community Action Programs Meet in Washington, D.C., on June 14

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 31, 1967

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on June 14, of this year, 50 businessmen serving on local councils of the community action programs, met in Washington, D.C., for an all-day session chaired by Ralph M. Besse, chairman of the board of the Cleveland Electric Illuminating Co.

At the meeting, the members unanimously adopted a resolution to be presented to the Congress concerning the Office of Economic Opportunity.

I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following letter written to me by Mr. Besse, the text of the resolution, and the list of those who attended the June 14 meeting:

THE CLEVELAND ELECTRIC
ILLUMINATING CO.,
June 22, 1967.

Hon. ABRAHAM J. MULTER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MULTER: As you know, a large number of businessmen are serving on the local councils of the Community Action Programs throughout the country.

The members of the Business Leadership Advisory Council to the Office of Economic Opportunity have felt for some time that these businessman participants in the Community Action Programs should be called together to exchange ideas, reflect constructive criticism and present their views to the staff of the Office of Economic Opportunity.

This was done last week and I had the pleasure of chairing a meeting of more than 50 such businessmen in an all-day session in Washington. I enclose the list of those who attended.

At the close of the session several of those present suggested that the group should reflect its views on the pending legislation in the Congress affecting the Office of Economic Opportunity. As a result of this discussion in which many people participated, the enclosed resolution was presented and unanimously adopted.

I thought you would be vitally interested in the views of businessmen who are closest to the Community Action Program attack on poverty.

Cordially yours,

RALPH M. BESSE.

RESOLUTION TO THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY THE COMMUNITY ACTION SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE BUSINESS LEADERSHIP ADVISORY COUNCIL CHAIRED BY RALPH M. BESSE, CHAIRMAN, CLEVELAND ELECTRIC ILLUMINATING CO.

Whereas those in attendance at this meeting are representatives of a variety of business interests throughout the Nation;

And whereas we are actively engaged in the War on Poverty through service on Community Action boards and through private efforts to alleviate poverty in our own communities;

And whereas we are vitally interested in the continued success of the Community Action Program;

We therefore strongly recommend:

(1) that the Office of Economic Opportunity, whose work is really just beginning, remain intact and that it be the central organization to lead the efforts in the War on Poverty.

(2) that the funds recommended in the President's message to Congress for the Office of Economic Opportunity effort for the coming year be passed by Congress.

(3) that this include the maximum amount of versatile funds for Community Action.

ATTENDEES AT JUNE 14 BLAC/CAP MEETING

Francis Quillan, Senior Vice President, Prudential Insurance Company of Newark, Newark, New Jersey.

Robert E. Katz, Director of Urban Program, Westinghouse Defense and Space Center, Towson, Maryland.

Frederick Lee, Vice President, Olin-Mathieson Chemical Corporation, Washington, D.C.

Frank Plummer, President, First National Bank, Montgomery, Alabama.

Floyd Delaney, Chattanooga-Hamilton County CAP, Chattanooga, Tennessee.

Will Hellerman, Vice President, Nationwide Insurance Company, Columbus, Ohio.

William B. Collier, Jr., President, Collier-Lewis Realty Company, Chicago, Illinois.

Dr. William Sharp, Combined Insurance Company of America, Chicago, Illinois.

Marshal G. Hardesty, Vice President, Iowa Electric Light and Power Company, Cedar Rapids. Iowa.

Max E. Ingeman, First Security State Bank, Salt Lake City, Utah.

Marvin Buckels, Executive Vice President, Denver, Colorado.

Norm Nicholson, Vice President, Kaiser Company, Oakland, California.

Dr. Edward Ballard, Bank of Finance, Los Angeles, California.

Edward M. Barrett, Secretary and General Attorney, Long Island Lighting Company, Mineola, New York.

Paul J. Johnson, Chairman, Community Renewal Team of Greater Hartford, Hartford, Connecticut.

Charles T. Williams, Vice President, Schenley Distillers, New York, New York.

John R. Taylor, John R. Taylor Company, Incorporated, Greensboro, North Carolina.

Albert V. Hampton, President, Family Savings and Loan Association, Los Angeles, California.

Martin Abelove, 851 Broad Street, Utica, New York.

E. J. Schuett, Executive Assistant to the Vice President for Technical Services, Trans World Airlines, Incorporated, Kansas City, Missouri.

Frank L. Cavan, Labor Relations Staff, Ford Motor Company, Dearborn, Michigan.

Charles A. Womack, P.O. Box 521, Danville, Virginia.

Paul M. Lund, Assistant to the President, Illinois Bell Telephone Company, Chicago, Illinois.

Rodney E. Austin, Personnel Manager, R. J. Reynolds Tobacco Company, Salem, North Carolina.

James H. Davis, III, President, Kanawha Block Company, Charleston, West Virginia.

Charles W. Garrison, Senior Vice President, Bambergers, Newark, New Jersey.

Harold E. Boehm, Towmotor Corporation, Cleveland, Ohio.

Jack Gordon, President, Washington Federal Savings & Loan Association, Miami, Florida.

Lorenzo N. Hoopes, Vice President, Safeway, Oakland, California.

Mike Zapponi, Lake County Community Action, Lakeport, California.

Harry M. Oliver, Jr., Vice President, Marsh & McLennan, Incorporated, Chicago, Illinois.

Richard Bennett, Bennett Pontiac, Great Falls, Montana.

Pablo Ayub, M.D., 1201 West Missouri, El Paso, Texas.

Joe Renders, Public Relations, Great Falls, Montana.

Ethel Payne, United Beauty School Owners and Teachers Association, Incorporated, Chicago, Illinois.

John C. Farrar, Attorney at Law, Rapid City, South Dakota.

Milton K. Cummings, First Vice Chairman of the Board of Directors, Community Action Agency, Huntsville, Alabama.

Jesse Robinson, Robinson Research, Compton, California.

Arthur White, Vice President, Daniel Yankelovich, Incorporated, New York, New York.

Miss Pat Goldman, U.S. Chamber of Commerce, Washington, D.C.

Tom B. Scott, Jr., President, First Federal Savings & Loan, Jackson, Mississippi.

J. M. Gaston, President, Dallas County-City of Selma Economic Opportunity Board, Selma, Alabama.

John Herndon, Beaufort-Jasper Economic Opportunity Council, Ridgeland, South Carolina.

John Wheeler, President (BLAC member), Mechanics & Farmers Bank, Durham, North Carolina.

Juan Lozano, Mexico.

George Esser, Jr., Executive Director, North Carolina Fund, North Carolina.

Wright Elliott, National Association of Manufacturers, New York, New York.

BLAC MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE

Arthur Gartland, Cronin & Gartland & Company, 15 Broad Street, Boston Massachusetts.

Cabell Brand, President, Ortho-Vent Shoe Company, Salem, Virginia.

Olcott Smith, Chairman, Aetna Life Insurance Company, Hartford, Connecticut.

Vernon Alden, President, Ohio University, Athens, Ohio.

Ralph M. Besse, Chairman of the Board, Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company, Cleveland, Ohio.

Herman Toll

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 27, 1967

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, it was saddening last week to learn of the passing of the Honorable Herman Toll, a former Member of this body from the State of Pennsylvania. Herman Toll was a fine, warm Philadelphian, greatly respected by all his colleagues. He was truly admired, Mr. Speaker, for the tremendous battle he put up against ill health—refusing to submit to it as he went about his business as a Member of this House and the House Judiciary Committee. Toward the end, though, Herman had to retire as his illness finally won out. A good legislator and a fine man, he will be sorely missed by his family, his colleagues, and all the people of his district in Philadelphia. To his lovely wife and sons I extend my deepest sympathy.

Loose Guns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD D. McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 19, 1967

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, Detroit police have told investigators for the other body that they had stopped "dozens and dozens of people" entering Detroit from out of the State and confiscated many guns. More than 500 persons arrested during the Detroit riots had felony records and most of them brought handguns into the city. One small car was bringing in a veritable arsenal of weapons from Ohio, the investigators reported.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, the firearms control bill I have introduced in the House would prohibit the interstate mail-order sale of firearms to individuals, ban dealers from selling handguns to nonresidents of a State and tighten controls on imports of weapons.

The most effective civic group advancing the cause of a reasonable gun bill is the National Council for a Responsible Firearms Policy. And Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include a statement from the National Council entitled, "Loose Gun Controls Escalate Urban Riots," at this point in the RECORD:

LOOSE GUN CONTROLS ESCALATE URBAN RIOTS

(A statement by the Executive Committee of the National Council for a Responsible Firearms Policy, July 25, 1967)

Weak firearms laws at the national level and in most of the states escalate the violence of urban riots, just as they have long been magnifying the problem of crime across the nation.

Riots in the cities may be for the most part a matter of internal combustion, but the easy availability of guns, which our country seems on the whole undetermined to bring under reasonable control, contributes dangerously to the igniting of these explosions and to the level and duration of their violence. In some cases, the particular states themselves lack adequate gun control laws. In all cases, the serious shortcomings of federal law have magnified the negligence of state and local governments which lack adequate controls. They have also provided wide loopholes in interstate commerce which nullify or seriously weaken the gun control efforts of those states and localities that have attempted to act responsibly in this matter.

How much more gun violence, in city riots or anywhere else, will convince the nation's legislators at all levels of government that the most responsible and effective control of gun availability is an urgent necessity? Placing the riot problem in proper perspective, it should be recognized that adequate firearms measures should be motivated not by vindictive reaction to racial uprisings, but by an earnest effort to cope effectively with the overall problems of crime and violence facing the nation. Most firearms deaths are due to murder, suicide, and other causes not associated with rioting.

We are amazed that those who oppose such measures fail to comprehend the dimensions of the *public interest* with respect to this issue. Those who support such measures appear to have greater respect for the gun and its potentialities than do those who identify themselves as rifle and gun enthusiasts.

It Is Supposed To Be Their War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 31, 1967

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, as one who for about a year now has been interested in the idea of a "buffer zone" across the narrow neck of Vietnam just south of the 17th parallel—and who has been doing his lonesome best to promote this proposal—I am, naturally, most pleased to note the increasing support for such an idea as expressed by the majority leader in the other body, a person far more influential than I with both the administration and the American people.

As I have often stated before on these pages, I have believed that such a strategy—that far too many critics have automatically related with some sort of "jungle Maginot line" that would be as costly as it was ineffective—was both possible and practical. Beyond that, I have stated my constant belief that such a strategy would permit us to control the continuing flow of men and supplies from North Vietnam to the Vietcong in a far more effective manner than our aerial bombing of North Vietnam military targets or the Ho Chi Minh trail—which bombing has also been an undeniable international irritant—has turned out to be; in addition to which, the erection of such a "buffer zone" would return us to what would be essentially a defensive posture, consistent with our ambition to restrict the war in Vietnam to "limited" warfare, however that might be defined.

It does seem to me that the administration is gradually moving in this direction—and I have noted Hanson W. Baldwin's comments to this effect in the July 21 edition of the New York Times.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I cannot be sure that this sort of strategy, if actually adopted, would tend to facilitate an acceptable solution of our dilemma in Vietnam. All I can say is that I believe it would.

Hence, I am encouraged by the recent additional expression of interest in such a strategy on the part of the distinguished majority leader in the other body as reported in the July 26 edition of the Christian Science Monitor and, under leaves to do so, I now include that report:

MANSFIELD BACKS VIET BUFFER PLAN

(By Godfrey Sperling, Jr.)

WASHINGTON.—Sen. Mike Mansfield, coming to the defense of the Vietnam buffer-zone concept, says that cost and manpower needed to man such a defensive line "has been exaggerated" and that "there is no reason why the South Vietnamese Army could not be placed along the parallel."

In an interview in the Senate Majority Leader's old Senate Office Building office, the Montana Democrat said:

He rejects the Eisenhower proposal for a declaration of war, calling it "a dangerous suggestion." In his opinion it would escalate the war, create pressure for a land invasion of North Vietnam by the United States and its allies, and make legal the quarantine or mining of Haiphong Harbor. "Also, it would bring us infinitely closer to a direct confrontation between the United States and China."

He proposes what he calls a "threefold combination" as an approach that would be effective now in Vietnam. This would include the extension of the 17th parallel all the way across Vietnam, the use of the Cooper formula of limiting bombing to the Ho Chi Minh Trail at the 17th parallel, and asking the UN Security Council to take up the United States resolution of January, 1966, on Vietnam.

He feels that United States air bombardment has failed and that this threefold plan would be more effective than bombing and cutting the flow of men and material from the North.

He sees little likelihood that the United States will be able to get additional commitment of troops to Vietnam from its allies.

He says he is certain that the overall policy decision on waging the Vietnam war, is still pending: "A reassessment, based on what future policy will be, is being undertaken." The Senator said he had seen the President quite recently.

Addressing himself specifically to the buffer-zone concept, the Senator said:

LINE EXTENSION REPORTED

"I am quite sure the President and Secretary McNamara have been giving this matter their most serious consideration for many months. And recent reports seem to indicate that the line is being extended beyond the original Ky concept of the first 10 miles for additional mileage which will take it more than halfway across the 17th parallel dividing the two countries.

"It is my understanding that such techniques as mines, electric fences, and seeing eyes are being used for detecting purposes. And I'm hopeful that this will be continued clear across the 17th parallel.

"With the Cooper proposal [Sen. John Sherman Cooper (R) of Kentucky] added to it, it would be my opinion, not to be necessary to go all the way across Laos because the Ho Chi Minh trails are confined to the eastern part of Laos. Furthermore, these trails in Laos have been and are being bombed from bases in Thailand, and therefore the Cooper formula would be perfectly logical.

"I do not advocate the building or construction of the line along the Laotian-South Vietnam border because that would be too expensive, call for too much manpower, and create difficult questions with Cambodia.

MANDATORY COURSE?

"All the factors make it mandatory, in my opinion, that the line go straight across the 17th parallel westward into Laos—and not southward along the Laotian-Vietnam frontier.

"If need be—if the Cooper plan did not do the job—then the line could be continued westward to the Thai-Laotian border."

Here the Senator said that it was the military that "has raised the question of manpower." "There is no reason," he said, "why the South Vietnamese Army could not be placed along the parallel, if need be, in an integrated force with other allied troops.

"After all, it is their country, it is supposed to be their war, and it is about time they undertook their responsibilities in their own defense."

Looking at the manpower numbers needed, the Senator said: "In my opinion the cost and manpower needed to man such a defensive line has been exaggerated. And it is my further opinion that the combination of the defense line and the Cooper formula would take the place of air bombardment of the North and would be more effective in decreasing the inflow of men and material from North Vietnam into the South.

LIMITATION SIGHTED

"In all candor, in-the-air bombardment of the North has failed in its two chief objectives: (1) to halt or decrease the penetration of men and material into South Vietnam, and (2) to bring Hanoi to the conference table."

Of his proposal to combine the 17th parallel buffer zone with the Cooper plan, the Senator said: "The net result of these two suggestions would be to confine the activity to South Vietnam which we are pledged to defend and uphold."

On bringing the Vietnam issue before the UN, the Senator said that this would cause the Security Council "to invite all participants, direct and indirect . . . which would include mainland China and the NLF . . . and to have all the cards laid out on the table" to see if the Security Council could act effectively.

On the future course of the war, as it will be carried on from Washington, the Senator said:

"The administration still is wrestling with this problem and has not reached a hard and fast decision on what its future policies will be.

MANPOWER ASSESSED

"However, it is reasonable to point out that there are very few military targets of any significance left. And because of this, if for no other reason, I would assume that a reassessment, based on what future policies will be, is being undertaken."

On manpower for Vietnam:

"As for as manpower is concerned, I doubt very much whether the allies will send in any additional increments of substance to those already committed.

"While Premier Ky has announced that 50,000 men would be added to the South Vietnamese Army, and that there would be a stepup in training procedures, I doubt that very much, if any, assistance will come from that area."

And of the consequences:

"It appears to me therefore that the only additions of consequences may well have to come from the United States. This, I think, is open to serious question because the net results will be that the war may well become more American and less South Vietnamese."

To go a bit further with this, Mr. Speaker, it would also be appropriate, I believe, to now include the Christian Science Monitor's editorial for that same date—entitled "Bombs or Barriers." It seems to me that this alternative strategy needs to be considered by all of us—and the administration—along with such meritorious proposals as that recently made by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE], for deescalating the level of the Vietnamese war, which proposal has received substantial support and with which I am in at least tentative sympathy. I say this because, obviously, we are in a badly stalemated situation, and need to consider whatever alternatives are available to us to break out of it.

Under leave granted to do so, the Monitor's editorial already mentioned is now set forth:

BOMBS OR BARRIERS?

Barriers or bombing? It is apparent that Washington has now begun to face up seriously to the choices represented by these two words. In short, should the United States go on with its attempt to maintain military pressure on North Vietnam by bombing or should it seek to isolate the North from the South by some kind of a barrier or swath?

We have long felt that the swath concept, if workable, would be superior to bombing in every way. It is essentially a preventive rather than an aggressive mode of warfare. It would lend substance to America's repeated statements that it has no wish or purpose to injure or destroy North Vietnam. It could get the United States "off the hook" so far as the controversial bombing of the North is concerned.

For this reason we are delighted at the increasing number of factual reports which speak of efforts to test such a barrier, in both South Vietnam and South Korea. We urge, as we have urged a number of times in the past, that Washington give high priority to determining whether such a swath is feasible.

We note with interest the word from Washington that the United States has developed weapons, equipment, and techniques which have drastically cut the rate of its plane losses over North Vietnam. We say this, not because we believe that this bombing has proved to be of great military effectiveness (it hasn't) but because it underlines the ability of the United States to build highly sophisticated battlefield gear. Such gear, integrated into a defensive barrier, strikes us as being the best means of hampering infiltration from North Vietnam into the South and of going after the jungle-hidden Viet Cong.

Bombing will not win the war. It may even stand in the path of peace talks, although that remains to be proven. Under these circumstances we cannot recommend too strongly that Washington bend every effort to substitute sophisticated ground weaponry for the bombing of the North. It could bring the war to an earlier end.

A Brief Course About Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 26, 1967

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Edward C. Welsh, Executive Secretary of the National Aeronautics and Space Council, is as conscious as any man in the United States of the space effort of this country.

He has been intimately connected with its since before the establishment of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and can speak with authority on this subject.

On July 20, before the third annual AIAA joint propulsion conference, he delivered an address entitled "A Brief Course About Education," and I include it as a part of these remarks for the benefit of my colleagues:

A BRIEF COURSE ABOUT EDUCATION

(By Dr. Edward C. Welsh, Executive Secretary, National Aeronautics and Space Council, at the third annual AIAA joint propulsion conference, Washington, D.C., July 20, 1967)

When your President invited me to participate in this third annual AIAA Joint Propulsion Conference, I tried to think of reasons why I should decline. I thought of some, and they were very persuasive. But what was more persuasive was the honor and opportunity which the invitation presented for talking briefly with such knowledgeable people as are assembled here today.

SPACE PROGRAM GROWTH

This nation has a vigorous and progressive space program and it will continue to have such a program as far into the future as reasonable imagination can project. I make that prediction in spite of the hazardous waters through which NASA's FY 1968 budget has been, and still is, sailing. I believe that what is happening to the NASA budget is a temporary dip in an upward trend. Also, I believe that that dip is largely due to factors that have little to do with the merits of the national space program.

It is true, and unfortunate, that NASA's FY 1968 budget will be the lowest which that agency has had in the last five years. Yet, the budget which NASA will receive will be almost 2½ times as large as the total of all NASA's budgets through the five fiscal years of 1957, 1958, 1959, 1960, and 1961. And that is not so very long ago. Admittedly, those years of substantially lower budgets were during a period when this nation was showing insufficient imagination and initiative about space. Fortunately, the situation has improved greatly during more recent years.

EDUCATION OF GENERAL PUBLIC

As I said just a few moments ago, it is an honor and an opportunity to attend meetings such as this when professionals in aeronautics and space matters get together to exchange viewpoints and share knowledge. Yet, there is an abundance of such meetings among professionals as compared with the extreme shortages of useful discussion explaining our space and aeronautics objectives, projects, and benefits to those whom we might call nonprofessionals. It is the Parent Teacher associations, the Chambers of Commerce, the League of Women Voters, the Service Clubs, and other similar associations which need the attention of those who know about and understand the vast and beneficial impact of this technological revolution.

BUDGET PROBLEMS

The recent difficulty with NASA's budget in the Congress is, in a sense, a case in point. Government authorities, particularly from NASA, spent days, weeks—yes, months—explaining, testifying, and debating with members of the Congress individually and with committees in active session. As a result, many members of the Congress understand what the Apollo program is, what is expected from the Voyager program, and what are some of the missions of the Apollo Applications program. There are those also who have some inkling of the value of the Defense Department's MOL program. But not enough of our legislators seem to have sufficient comprehension of the vast benefits flowing from space activities. And if many members of Congress and very many of their constituents don't know about these benefits, then they may well feel justified in cutting back on the amount of money to be spent.

Budget cuts, based on a lack of information, are particularly disturbing during these days when we have such a great ability to communicate. I do not accuse anyone in particular of not having done more than he or she has done to make clear to the general public, as well as to the members of the Congress, how an active, progressive space program benefits all members of our society. But I do say that it is indeed discouraging to find that it was after the Congress had proceeded to make sizable cuts in the President's budget request for NASA, and only after such action had been taken, that some members of the private sector of our society came rushing in to ask what they should do to help.

RESPONSIBILITY

As I see it, it is just as much the job of company management and of labor unions to explain the significance of technological progress which characterizes our space efforts as it is for representatives of the Government to do so. I would state parenthetically and for emphasis that the leadership of the Aerospace Industries Association has indeed been doing a fine job along these lines. But, the participation must be greater than that. For years now, I have been urging that the aerospace companies of this great nation engage in what I have referred to as institutional advertising. This means educating the public about the space program—not confining their advertising to superlatives about their individual spacecraft and launch vehicles, and nozzles, and ablative materials, etc.,—but rather operating from the conclusion that if the space program is worth doing and if their companies are efficient and progressive, then they will indeed benefit in greater profits and more business as a result of their general educational campaign.

I would extend that recommendation to many more companies than just those in the aerospace industry. Surely the majority of all companies benefits from the stimulus to our gross national product which comes from the space program. Surely, across the board from company to company, regardless of the nature of the business, a healthy, expanding, and vigorous space program tends to help them—not only because their customers will also have more funds but also because the rapid advances in technology create a generally healthier and more progressive economy. Consequently, I urge that every group learn as much as possible about the national space program and then, having understood it, explain it to the people in the communities in which they live and do business, if they believe that the merits of the program justify such effort. I am putting this on the basis of responsibility to your communities, and, on that basis, everyone should know more about the national space program. This includes both the civilian and defense activities in space.

INFANCY OF PROPULSION

Now it may seem that all I have said so far has little to do with propulsion but, if you think that you couldn't be more wrong. Surely, the name of the space game is propulsion! But if you can't justify the technological advances, the missions and the payloads, and the payoffs from the program, you surely will have a tough time justifying further advances in the field of propulsion. And, remember, we are just in the infancy stage of propulsion for space missions. I am certain that you are aware of the vast potential for advances in this field. I am confident that you recognize the great but as yet undeveloped areas in the chemical, electrical, and nuclear fields. I have no doubt that you are cognizant of the necessity for lowering costs, increasing specific impulses, improving reliability, and devoloping reusable systems. But, being aware of these things is not enough. Discussing the technicalities of your trade is interesting and useful but, by itself, will not keep the program going. Hence, I urge each of you to take a new look at what your job is, as you represent industry, universities, and Government itself. And, if your eyesight is keen and your sense of dedication high, you will see that more than just an exchange of knowledge between experts is needed. Yes, we also need a sharing of understanding with our fellow citizens.

SPACE BENEFITS

How many times a week do you point out the following, and to how many people?

First, that the often used argument that we should spend on Earth rather than out in space is sheer nonsense. It is all spent here!

Second, that less than 1% of the gross national product is being spent for the entire space program, and that spending for such purpose generates more employment, more production, more technological advances, and makes the U.S. wealthier than does any other program except possibly our educational system.

Third, That the potential of space for increasing the known quantity and the effective use of our food, mineral, and water resources is alone sufficient to pay the costs for the entire space program.

Fourth, that the individual who urges that space expenditures should be reduced so that the funds might be spent for other purposes—such as housing, and the lessening of poverty and crime—is approaching the problem in a negative way, as space activities generate both technology and funds to help solve those problems.

Fifth, That medical instruments and electronic instrumentation, improved as a result of the space program, offer opportunities to revolutionize the equipment of clinics, hospitals, and doctors' offices and that, with computer-aided diagnosis, the possibility of more nearly automated hospitals should help meet the shortages of both doctors and nurses and at the same time improve the quality of the individual patient's care.

Sixth, That we are using the dimension of space to increase our alertness to dangers and to lessen the likelihood of aggressive action by others; and, in so doing, we find that space progress is making a major contribution to our national security.

Seventh, That, as a result of the aerospace revolution, the rate of invention has been increased, the quality of goods has been improved, and the potential for a higher standard of living has been underscored.

Eighth, That the space program has brought us many new and improved products and services, including transoceanic communications, global weather reporting and forecasting, improved forest fire detection and observation of natural resources, and many new metals, alloys, and plastics as well as vast improvements in electronics.

Ninth, That the national space program has indeed been a catalyst and stimulus to education throughout the entire country, while at the same time increasing greatly our supply of basic knowledge.

Tenth, That our aerospace leadership has shown people throughout the world that the most successful nation is one which offers individual freedom, encourages private enterprise, acknowledges its failures as well as successes, and provides a government to serve rather than to rule.

Eleventh, That the national space program can properly be labeled as a worldwide ambassador for peace, since space activities offer a substitute for aggression, as well as provide major tools for international cooperation, arms control, and disarmament.

Twelfth, That the systems analysis approach, brought to such a high degree of development in the national space program, can contribute to community planning, improvement of police and fire-fighting organizations, and modernization of transportation. In addition, this management approach is applicable to the distribution of power and handling of cargo, the more effective use of our natural resources, the elimination of water, air, and soil pollution, and many other vital fields for bettering man's life.

I ask again how many times a week and to how many people have you pointed out and explained such important propositions as those I have just listed? Indeed, how many companies in all our aerospace industry have used those or similar points in making effective educational instruments of their advertisements?

CONFIDENCE AND SPEED

As you can readily observe, I have great confidence in the growing technological competence of this nation and in our ability to afford even greater investments in such growth in the near future. I see this country as being successful in maintaining leadership in technological growth and leadership in accomplishments through the use of that technology.

But I warn that we cannot afford to wait or even slow down in this era of technological competition. We cannot afford to do less than employ to the maximum our managerial techniques, trained personnel, modern facilities, and technical knowledge in the solution of the many complex problems which confront our cities, our states, and our entire nation.

HUMAN VALUES

As I see it, space exploration in its broadest sense and in all of its ramifications can become a powerful force for international friendship and cooperation. Such influence would penetrate effectively the social, the economic, and the other policy spheres. This space program is indeed the most dramatic national effort ever undertaken within a peaceful context. With its dedication to the benefit of all mankind, it serves daily to strengthen the cause of peace and human welfare—great values which are beyond precise measurement, but are nevertheless very, very real.

I know from personal experience that some of us get a bit tired of hearing ourselves repeating what should be obvious facts again and again, and many of you get tired of listening to the repetition. But some things need to be said, and the more often they are said, the greater the impact. We are in a world in which, if we do not continue to discover and progress, we deteriorate. This technological revolution in which we find ourselves and in which we are participating is not a luxury. It is a necessity, if this world is to survive and grow and prosper. What is more, the survival of our way of life and, yes, even of life itself is not guaranteed by technological progress alone. Rather, it depends upon the twin effort of technology plus the sane and effective use of that technology. This means that we have to meet the challenge of keeping our ethical and political standards up to the level reached by the technology of the space revolution. We must look to the future and get busy now! We have no time to waste!

We must understand and, then, having reached that state of comprehension, we must add daily to the numbers who share such understanding.

Thus endeth my sermon.

An Objective Analysis of the Vietnam War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERVEY G. MACHEN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 31, 1967

Mr. MACHEN. Mr. Speaker, the Baltimore Sun in a news analysis on July 28, 1967, performed a distinct public service by presenting a forthright and objective discussion of the Vietnam war to date as seen by Ernest B. Furgurson.

I highly recommend the reading of this news analysis, not only by my colleagues, but by every American who is concerned about keeping our commitment in Southeast Asia.

At this point in the RECORD I insert the commentary by Mr. Furgurson:

VIET PROGRESS IMPRESSIVE SINCE U.S. 1965 COMMITMENT

(By Ernest B. Furgurson)

WASHINGTON, July 27.—With a solemn acknowledgment that "this is really war," President Johnson committed the United States to a major combat role in South Vietnam two years ago tomorrow.

Now, 11,649 dead Americans later, neither military authorities in Saigon nor civilian leaders in Washington are any more willing than they were then to predict when the fighting might end. If anything, they are more reluctant to do so.

HALF A MILLION SOON

This reluctance cannot be expected to inspire confidence in Americans at home as the number of their sons and husbands in Vietnam grows—from 75,000 then, past 280,000 a year ago, near 480,000 today, to more than half a million soon.

But it is not, either, an attempt to screen the purported fact that the struggle can never end satisfactorily, as it has been characterized by many opponents of the war. It is a more correct and defensible stance than would be any attempt to estimate when American troops could come home.

Gen. William C. Westmoreland may have been on less defensible ground when he said two weeks ago that there had been "tremendous progress." He was discussing events of the past year, and would have been more accurate had he omitted that adjective.

IMPRESSIVE BETTER WORD

Yet those who have been able to inspect the situation at intervals would have to agree with him if he had chosen to label the progress impressive, rather than tremendous. This is particularly true if the comparison begins at the time of Mr. Johnson's press conference of July 28, 1965.

While American officers are the first to concede that their success in Vietnam does not seem dramatic on a map, the most orderly way to begin assessing Westmoreland's progress is geographically, from the First Corps area in the north to the Fourth Corps area in the south.

Two years ago, the Americans flag was flown in the five northernmost provinces only above three enclaves, the Marine bases at Da Nang, Chu Lai and Phu Bai. As in the rest of the country, the allied effort concentrated on defense of such strongpoints. The Viet Cong were unmolested on the coastal flats, and in the foothills and mountains west of Highway 1, which could be traveled only along certain stretches, in armed convoys.

MOST SERIOUS EFFORT

In the mountainous Second Corps area, the enemy was making its most serious effort to split South Vietnam in half along Highway 19, from Qui Nhon through the Mang Yang pass and Pleiku to Cambodia. Friendly holdings were symbolized on maps only by dots, never by broad lines or circles. The Government border outpost at Duc Co, below the mass of Chu Pong Mountain, was under violent siege.

Around Saigon, the Third Corps area was blotted with long-time Viet Cong base areas whose very names had the ring of hell to Government forces which never dared assault them: Zone D, the Iron Triangle, the Ho Bo woods, Cu Chi. From such sanctuaries, the enemy made sorties at will, in units of steadily increasing size, against the capital and outlying district towns.

The Fourth Corps area, the Mekong Delta, lay ripe and productive, mostly for the enemy, which taxed foodstuffs moving on every canal. There, in the rich, populous Delta, the tired South Vietnamese Army was making its greatest efforts, but it was not quite maintaining a status quo.

"MOST PAINFUL DUTY"

Without massive American intervention, the war was about to be lost, irrevocably. The Saigon Government told Washington so, and in agreeing, Mr. Johnson said that to send youth into battle was "the most agonizing and most painful duty of your President."

But, he added, "if we are driven from the field in Vietnam, then no nation can ever again have the same confidence in American promises or American protection. . ."

The build-up began. In August, the marines crushed a Viet Cong regiment in Operation Starlight, the greatest American success to that date. In October, the newly arrived 1st Cavalry Division leapfrogged in pursuit of the North Vietnamese regulars, also newly arrived, who had tried and failed to take Plei Me.

There followed the battle of the Ia Drang Valley, in which United States forces won an "unprecedented victory" and themselves were hurt so badly that that week's death toll stood as a record even long after the total American troop strength had doubled.

It hurt, but it also marked a turning point. Never since then has the enemy been able to take and hold the offensive in any part of South Vietnam.

Westmoreland has insisted that the Viet Cong and North Vietnamese regular units must not be allowed to roam at will through the unpopulated jungle, massing when and where they want to, thus holding the initiative. He has stretched thin the friendly forces securing populated areas in order to pursue the enemy toward the borders.

There are those, particularly ranking marines, who think that holding those populated areas and "pacifying" them should have first priority. Westmoreland would like to do both, to hold them and to search out and destroy the main forces in remote hiding.

This takes manpower and this is why he is asking for more maneuver battalions. And he will get them from one source or another because he can point to what his strategy has accomplished.

The main highways that were being sliced apart two years ago are now in use, and not just by convoys. The enemy base areas, especially those close to Saigon and along the central coast, have been bulldozed into checkerboards, dotted with forward airstrips, swept repeatedly. American brigades have set up permanent headquarters atop some of them.

North Vietnamese involvement, at first mostly cadres, then replacements, then battalions, later regiments, has reached the multi-division level. It shows no sign of slackening.

It is head-on combat between American units and these regular North Vietnamese divisions that has sent United States casualty totals higher than the South Vietnamese in several recent weeks. And yet, the disparity remains only temporary, it is an illogical symptom of the success of Westmoreland's strategy.

These casualties are being taken mostly along the country's edges, by the Marines near the demilitarized zone and by the 4th Infantry Division* east of the Cambodian border in the highlands. These are empty wastelands, far from the cities, villages and canals that are the prizes in this war. Except for damaging yet militarily insignificant motar attacks and small-unit raids on outposts, the enemy is much less active in those populated areas.

MORE CAN HOLD THEM

The problem is to hold the enemy main forces away from the population. More American battalions can hold them, and if Westmoreland is correct in asserting that the huge logistics base built up in two years has now reached a plateau then those battalions can be fielded with a proportionately smaller investment of additional soldiers.

But, it may be countered, this still implies an indefinitely prolonged commitment of an indefinite number of Americans. The allies' hope is that South Vietnam troops ultimately can take over, fighting the enemy out along the country's borders while simultaneously securing the villages where pacification work is under way.

BUT IT IS IMPROVING

This cannot be done by the Government's Army today. But it is improving. Tough penalties for draft dodging and desertion, both urged by Westmoreland, have cut the rate of those crimes greatly. Upgraded training of junior officers is taking effect. More officers are being promoted from the ranks—an important incentive to NCO's who have spent years as sergeants.

The substitution of South Vietnamese soldiers for Ameriacns, Koreans, Australians and others in every foxhole in South Vietnam will take a long time. No one in authority pretends otherwise.

But anyone examining the chart of impressive—not tremendous—progress in the past two years can believe that the next two years will see strong efforts in that direction.

Those who did not accept at face value Westmoreland's early prediction that it would be a long war are certain to be discouraged by now. But those who will concede that a war of, say, ten years must be won in one-month and one-year steps must acknowledge that such steps are being taken.

U.S. Assistance to the Congo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 31, 1967

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, a recent article in the Los Angeles Times dealt in some depth with the isolationist response to President Johnson's dispatch of three cargo planes to the Congo during the recent insurrection there. This response is of some concern to me because, as I have said before, I regard the sending of the planes as a wise and proper action that may have prevented a larger conflict from developing. The author of the article is professor of law, director of the African studies center, and chairman of the chancellor's committee on international and comparative studies at the University of California at Los Angeles.

The article follows:

THE "KITTY GENOVESE SYNDROME"

(By Paul O. Proehl)

The Kitty Genovese syndrome is the fear of involvement which permitted a score of bystanders to witness a murder without going to the victim's aid.

It has permeated American life far beyond New York, and the interpersonal level. It has even been made somewhat fashionable by modern theories of existentialism. At home, the thin veneer of social concern which covers the self-interest and prejudices of most of us has been penetrated by frustration and impatience at the slowness or seeming impossibility of solving difficult social problems. The current racial crisis and the reactions of white Americans, including liberals, to its escalating violence, is an example. The virtual rejection of the war on poverty by the majority of Americans—the "haves"—is another.

In foreign affairs, we have known the syndrome by the name of isolationism, and more recently as neo-isolationism.

The dispatch by President Johnson of three U.S. cargo planes with crews and a small complement of guards has dramatically shown how shallow our commitment to the maintenance of international order is. The fear of involvement has never lain very deeply below the surface of congressional consciousness. It has risen again and again, particularly when results were slow in coming or it was evident that we were not "loved" for what we were attempting to do.

THE FEAR SURFACES

The uneven history of foreign aid programs is witness to that; but since World War II we have always been able to recover from intermittent lapses into isolationist thinking.

Stimulated by the doubts and anguish of the Vietnam war, the Kitty Genovese syndrome now threatens to establish itself in our foreign policy. It will not be easy to force it to retreat. Congressmen are posing questions as to our "interest" and "obligations" in the tortured Congo. Fears are expressed on Capitol Hill that the three planes are the opening gambit in a new Vietnam. (One can ignore the objections of certain southern senators, Vietnam-Hawks, who would not have cried out, it can be safely assumed, if the planes had been sent into the Congo to rescue Whites, as in early 1965.)

The Congo issue is clouded by or closely related to several issues besides Vietnam and the ill-founded fear of Soviet "counter-intervention."

One such issue is the military campaign of the Nigerian government to undo the secession of eastern Nigeria, which now calls itself Biafra. Another is the Middle East crisis. On a much broader and hgher scale, is the question of the role of the United States as the world's leading power and the employment of power in world politics and specifically in Africa.

OTHER ISSUES CROWD IN

Dean Rusk has reportedly given reasons for the sending of the planes to the Congo: The protection of Americans; the preservation of the integrity of the Congo; and the stemming of "anti-White feelings" in the Congo and elsewhere in Africa. None of these seems really plausible.

First, the protection of Americans is hardly a realistic basis for Gen. Mobutu's request. However, such protection might be incidental to preserving the Mobutu government and putting the mercenary-led troops out of action. But the availability of three cargo planes to move troops (which is their specific and announced mission) would hardly seem to be a meaningful contribution to this objective.

As to the matter of anti-White feelings, these have plagued the Congo since independence, and the employment of White mercenaries by the Tshombe forces is merely the latest manifestation of a bitter racial confrontation. Nowhere among the new nations of Africa have Black and White been so pitted against each other. This is very probably the cause of the present crisis, in the kidnapping of Tshombe, who is ironically a symbol of this hostility.

But is the allaying of anti-White feelings a sufficient reason to wish U.S. involvement in the Congo?

Hardly, except to conterbalance the effect of the 1965 American-Belgian rescue operation, which was plainly for the benefit of Whites in the Congo, not the stability of the nation. It was a humanitarian move, to be sure, but it had heavy racial overtones. But if, as the result of what some White men have done in the Congo, the White is disliked or hated, we cannot overcome that by sending in three cargo planes. That is too simplistic. Furthermore, we are not ourselves a "White" nation, but a mixed one, and our purposes are not to serve "White" interests, but American and humanitarian ends.

Hopefully, these coincide.

To preserve the stability of the Congo rings truer as a reason for our action, except that, again, the contribution of three planes and 126 men to this objective is doubtful. Given the nature of the mercenary-led action and lack of communications in the Congo, the rapid movement of troops by such planes might be inconsequential. However, this is a military question. If they thus serve, that reason is sufficient.

While the Nigerians see a parallel to their problem of the revolt of the eastern region and fret because we refuse to supply the Nigerians with arms, the fact is that our act in the Congo is particularly meaningful by reason of our refusal to accede to the Nigerian request.

We are committed at once to the principles of self-determination and of national integrity, which are often at odds.

The first puts us on the side of African colonies in their struggle for independence, but also makes it difficult, especially in view of the events which brought on the secession of Biafra, to aid in putting down the ethnically and linguistically different Ibos in their desire to split away and form an independent state of Biafra.

The second militates against our aiding the Ibos.

But neither principle provides us with a ready rationale to refuse the Congolese request for logistical support. Tshombe and the White mercenaries cannot support a claim to "self-determination." The military action of these forces do not represent a revolt, but an intervention whose purpose is to subvert the Congolese nation. The alternative, then, is to say "A plague on all your houses," and to retreat from requests for help in repelling threats from foreign interests to the stability of friendly nations because "we do not want to become involved."

There is no doubt but what the United States was given the first option to respond with aid. Had we refused, "Mobuta would undoubtedly have asked the Soviet Union for support. The possibility of Soviet intervention on the side of Tshombe is, after all, rather far-fetched. This is not, as some would readily label it, a strictly cold-war response.

The readiness of the Soviet Union to move into an African vacuum and exploit it unilaterally has been too well demonstrated in Guinea, Ghana, and the U.A.R. to be refuted. They have sown economic hardship and political chaos wherever they have gained a foothold—and always in brazen self-interest, peddling obsolescent passenger planes, military equipment, and machinery, and importing in turn the very minimum of tropical African products—and always on hard terms.

Happily for Africa, these entrepreneurs of disorder have lost almost all influence they once had south of the Sahara. In the northern tier, among the Arabs, they have opportunistically established a rapport with a group of nations whose hatred of Israel has blinded them to the realities of Soviet sympathy and assistance.

We have, in fact, transcended much of the old cold-war ideology in our foreign policy.

POWER—A BROAD TERM

We would do better if the American people as a whole abandoned the lingering idea of battling an alien ideology and accepted rather than challenge of putting an end, as best we can, to chaos and its urgly fruits—hunger, disease, lack of opportunity—whether the source of chaos is the Soviet Union, China, or France. And, it would be good if we came to appreciate that this campaign takes time, and money—and lives.

We have not demonstrated such patience, even in seeking solutions to our domestic problems. One Stokely Carmichael can still, overnight, undo the concern for the American Negro so patiently built up by the civil rights leaders, the President, and our judiciary, and so vital to our nation.

Why us?

Because we have power, and power begets either communal responsibilities or opportunities for self-aggrandizement. We have abjured the latter, but we cannot escape the former without surrendering our power and our vitality. To do so is to give the world over to chaos in which new centers of power struggle for pre-eminence.

Power does not mean military power alone, It means, rather, the economic power upon which our ability to help the developing nations rests. The beneficent use of power, in turn, depends on maintaining the sense of humanitarian commitment and involvement which can move us to massive foreign aid and technical assistance.

Vietnam?

WILL THE PUBLIC AGREE?

Vietnam is an excuse, not a reason, to shun involvement, whether in Israel, had it been required, or in the Congo. Stability over a wide area in Asia—in Korea, Malaysia, Singapore, and Indonesia, among others—is an ancilliary but direct result of the American action in Vietnam. From the supply of planes to the Congo we may hope to establish an image in Africa of objectivity and consistency, in contrast to the rank opportunism of the Soviet leadership and of De Gaulle. We may thus persuade some African nations of our objectivity and consistency in attempting to resolve the Middle East crisis and other threats of disorder that are bound to arise in the future.

What is not so clear is whether the American people and their congressmen can be persuaded that such action, as indeed in Vietnam and Santo Domingo, are necessary and hopefully beneficent uses of power from which we cannot back away. As is most human action, these are apt to be imperfect and costly, and sometimes they may fail.

But it is our humanity, in a better sense, which we cannot deny by immobilizing ourselves.

Call it do-gooding, call it meddling. Power will be exercised. The question is, ultimately and simply, which nation will exercise it, and for humanists and genuine liberals, which nation will exercise it most beneficiently. These arguments are obviously not addressed to those who may claim to have real doubts on the latter question.

An Open Letter to Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 26, 1967

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, my constituent, Joann H. Bierman, of 2745 35th Avenue, Oakland, Calif., has asked me to present to the Congress an "open letter," which she sent to the Vice President, the leaders of the House and Senate, and the Chaplains of the respective bodies.

I know of no better way to bring this letter to the attention of my colleagues than to insert it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The letter expresses the deep concern of its author, a concern that I am sure is poignantly felt by every Member of Congress.

The letter follows:

OPEN LETTER TO THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES, WASHINGTON, D.C.

OAKLAND, CALIF., *July 27, 1967*.

Attention: Representative GEORGE P. MILLER.

DEAR CONGRESS: Now is the time for all congressmen to put aside their chairmanships and specialties and to find and to establish a solution to the *unemployment* of the black people and the other minority races in these United States.

Since the United States is considered a Christian Nation and if we even begin to consider ourselves true disciples of Christ we must follow two great commandments: "You shall love the Lord your God with all year heart, and with all your soul, and with all your mind." And the second commandment is like unto the first commandment, "You shall love your neighbor as yourself."

How shall we define love? Today there is a difference between the thing we know as love and the all-embracing love which Christ epitomised in His own life. Jesus Christ's love was such that the *Good of the Other Loomed Larger than His Own Need to Give.*

We the people of the United States can't and should not tolerate lawlessness and evil and those (both black and white) who break the laws of this land should be punished *with justice*. However, the *Congressmen* who represent the people (both black and white) must establish a solution to the just needs of the black people in order that the black people may live a life whereby they may obtain greatness, independence and respect for themselves. The black people are crying for work—just like the white people did during the depression years. Many white people were not able to find work during the depression years and did not work until the government created work and jobs. How many years have the black people been in a depression? What would the white people's reaction have been if the white people had been in a depression as many years as the black people have been?

Congress should create jobs and work for all unemployed, working-age men, who are willing and want to work.

Tuesday evening, July 25, 1967, the newscasters reported that there was $200,000,000 property damage in Detroit. Twenty-six thousand men could have been employed as laborers 5 days a week, 8 hours a day, 12 months a year at $4.00 per hour for that amount of money. Wednesday nite, July 26, 1967, the newscasters reported that the property damage estimate had doubled. Add to those millions of dollars the property damage estimate for the other cities in America who have suffered and figure out for yourself how many men could be working 12 months. *Work can be created by Congress*. The possible job list is endless.

I would like to take this opportunity to suggest that every Congressman review Chapters 5 through 7 in the Book of Matthew in the Holy Bible and that each and every Congressman ask the Lord for wisdom in this troubled hour. Please remember that the Lord has promised wisdom and knowledge to all those who ask with faith. (James 1: 6, 6)

Respectfully submitted.

JOANN H. BIERMAN.

Two Army Paratroopers From Maryland Killed in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 31, 1967

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Sgt. David P. Crozier and Pfc. Clifford G. Burch, two Army paratroopers from Maryland, were recently killed in Vietnam. I wish to commend the courage of these men and to honor their memory by including the following article in the RECORD:

Two Army paratroopers from Maryland, one from Middle River and the other from Langley Park, have been killed in Vietnam, the Defense Department reported.

They were Sgt. David P. Crozier, 23, whose mother, Mrs. Eunice Klaburner, lives at 511 Myrth Avenue, Middle River, and Pfc. Clifford G. Burch, 19, the only son of Mr. and Mrs. Gordon S. Burch, of 1712 Merrimac Drive, Langley Park.

Sergeant Crozier, who was on his second tour of duty in Vietnam, was killed in action Monday, and Private Burch was one of seven paratroopers killed Sunday near Dak To when American artillery fire fell short of its target.

Both men were members of the 173d Airborne Brigade.

Sergeant Crozier had volunteered for an extra six months in Vietnam after his first year was completed in April. He had won the Purple Heart for a shrapnel wound during his first tour of duty.

CAREER MAN

He was a career Army man, his mother said last night, having enlisted in 1962 after finishing the eleventh grade at Kenwood High School. During his last year at Kenwood, he played soccer.

"He said he wanted to go back to Vietnam because he believed in what we are doing there," Mrs. Klaburner said. "He even talked once about staying there for the duration of the war."

Sergeant Crozier was born in Baltimore and grew up in the Essex-Middle River area.

Besides his mother, he is survived by his father, Thomas D. Crozier, of Jacksonville, Fla.; a brother, Thomas, and a half-sister, Peggy Klaburner.

Pfc. Burch had been in Vietnam since March 4 and had been in the Army exactly one year the day he was killed. He had been trained at Fort Bragg, N.C.; Fort Gordon, Ga., and Fort Benning, Ga.

IN STEADY COMBAT

Before he was killed, he had just returned from a five-day leave in Hawaii, his mother said last night. He had been in steady combat during his months in Vietnam.

"He tried not to make us worry," Mrs. Burch said. "He said it was tough and they were scared, but we'll fight and we will win."

Pfc. Burch was born in Washington and grew up in Prince Georges County. After graduating in June, 1965, from Northwestern High School in Adelphi, Md., he attended the University of Maryland for one semester. He wanted to return there after finishing with the Army.

For about six months before enlisting in the Army, he worked as an apprentice plumber in the Langley Park area.

Job Corps Is for Girls, Too—Philadelphia Bulletin Reports on Program Operations in That Area

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 25, 1967

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, most of our colleagues know that the Job Corps trains young women as well as young men. But most probably do not know how many girls are in the Job Corps, or the philosophy of the Job Corps in training the young women who are enrolled.

An amendment to the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 stipulates that at least 23 percent of Job Corps enrollees be women. There are now almost 10,000 women in the Job Corps, and this figure is expected to increase by next year, when an estimated 25 percent of all Job Corps enrollees will be women.

These figures are very significant. Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson has said: "When you teach a woman, you teach a family."

This is especially true in the Job Corps, because all the women enrollees take courses in care of the home, and in family life, in order to develop women who can create happy, healthy homes. Corpswomen learn to shop wisely, to prepared attractive, nutritious meals, and to preserve food; they learn about health, grooming, the purchase, care, and repair of clothing; child care and development; and home decorating.

Therefore, with the tools provided by basic education, vocational education, and home and family life courses, a corpswoman is equipped to help her parents' family and eventually her own family when she graduates. An article from the June 10, 1967, issue of the Philadelphia Bulletin by Carol Innerst discusses some of these facts about women's Job Corps centers and explains the basic setup of the program.

I am very interested in, and proud of the work the Job Corps is doing in centers for young women in St. Louis and elsewhere, and I commend Carol Innerst's article to my colleagues, as follows:

[From the Philadelphia Bulletin, June 10, 1967]

JOB CORPS IS FOR GIRLS, TOO—25 ASSIGNED BY OFFICE HERE

(By Carol Innerst)

"I never knew the Job Corps was for girls, too," said a recent graduate of Germantown High School.

Arnetta Rimes, 17, of 5430 Baynton st., learned that girls could join the Job Corps, when she when into the Philadelphia Bureau of Employment Security office at Broad and Stiles sts. looking for a job.

In a few weeks, she will be on her way to one of the many Job Corps training centers in the country to learn how to be a practical nurse.

"It really doesn't make any difference where I go," she said, "as long as I go."

AGREEMENT REACHED

The State Bureau of Employment Security recently reached an agreement with the Job Corps to recruit and screen female candidates for the Corps. Before the agreement, the Bureau offices served only male Job Corps applicants. Women in Community Service, Inc. and the AFL–CIO also recruit female candidates for the Job Corps.

All unemployed or underemployed youths, both male and female, 16 through 21, who are not in school, are eligible for the Job Corps. Preference is given to disadvantaged youth.

Candidates need not be high school dropouts. The girl or boy may be a graduate with insfficient skills to hold a fulltime job.

"So far we've assigned 25 girls to the Job Corps from this office," said Lou Roncace, Job Corps representative in Philadelphia. We've sent them to Maine, to Ohio "and West Virginia."

Pennsylvania has two Job Corps Centers—Drums in Luzerne County, for women, and Blue Jay Forest in Warren County, for men. Assignments usually are not made to camps in the enrollee's home state.

OTHER SKILLS TAUGHT

Besides the training as a practical nurse which Miss Rimes will receive, the Job Corps also trains nurses' aides and dental assistants, and offers women remedial education and courses in general clerical work, typing, shorthand, bookkeeping, operation of data processing machines and switchboards, food service and beauty culture.

Corpswomen (and men) receive $30 a month, minus taxes, for spending money. Another $50 a month is banked for each trainee or sent to her family.

Members may serve up to two years, but are graduated whenever the camp feels they are ready to compete in the labor market.

The Job Corps was established through the federal Economic Opportunity Act to increase employability of youth.

My Most Unforgettable Character

SPEECH

OF

HON. KEN HECHLER

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 13, 1967

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday was "Page Pitt Day" in Huntington, W. Va., and at Marshall University. Scrolls, plaques, proclamations and a warm reception accompanied the day to honor Marshall University's famous professor of journalism.

The occasion was also marked by the release of a fascinating article which is the lead story in the current issue of Reader's Digest. It is entitled "My Most Unforgettable Character". It is written by Professor Pitt's wife, Mrs. Virginia Daniel Pitt.

Almost blind since the age of 5, Professor Pitt has charged through life and inspired hundreds of journalists under his tutelage. "It's results, not excuses, that count in this life!" he frequently says.

While teaching with Professor Pitt at Marshall, some of his enthusiasm and energy, which rubbed off on everybody, affected me a great deal. I spent a long evening at home with Professor and Mrs. Pitt, just before deciding to run for Congress in 1958, and they both gave me some advice I have never forgotten.

West Virginia is proud of Page Pitt. Long may he wave!

[From the Reader's Digest, August 1967]

MY MOST UNFORGETTABLE CHARACTER

(NOTE.—"It's *results*, not excuses, that count in this life." The story of Page Pitt, West Virginia's remarkable professor of journalism.)

(By Virginia Daniel Pitt)

I was 16 that morning some 30 years ago when I first walked into the urgent, demanding, wonderful world of Prof. W. Page Pitt. I had come to study journalism at Marshall University in Huntington, W. Va., and to me, a naive freshman, the man standing in the center of the huge U-shaped copy desk seemed formidably impressive. Though he was "old"—36—with prematurely white hair, his neatly clipped crew cut, flaring mustache and natty tweed suit made him look more like an Ivy League fashion model than Father Time. It's a good thing I approved of him, for I had just met my future husband.

"Welcome to Journalism 201," he said to the class with a smile. "If you've heard that I'm a slave driver, you've heard correctly. Anybody not prepared to give me his best can leave right now.

"As a personal note," he went on almost casually, "I must ask you not to raise your hands in this class. I can't see them. Please speak up and identify yourself by name."

37+

I exchanged startled glances with the other members of the class. We had expected a great deal from this course in journalism. How could we get it from a teacher who was blind?

As I pondered this, my attention strayed. I didn't listen as Professor Pitt talked on. Then, abruptly, he stopped. "All right, students," he said. "Write a one-page news story on what I just told you." Only two out of the class of 20 could comply. It was the last time I ever flunked a quiz by worrying about what Page called his "inconvenience."

THE REAL HANDICAPS

Professor Pitt had only three-percent vision. He could barely count the fingers of a hand held 12 inches from his face, or distinguish between daylight and darkness. He read by holding a newspaper close to his face and squinting through an instrument that had three magnifying glasses stacked on top of one another. Even then, he could make out just a few letters at a time.

Despite his handicap, he had developed his own mysterious method of navigation. He charged around campus with such vigor that we practically had to run to keep up with him. He radiated confidence and *joie de vivre*, hurling himself at life with joyous determination. And he expected us to do the same.

One day a classmate with more curiosity than tact asked, "Professor Pitt, which would you consider the worst handicap—blindness, or deafness, or no arms and legs, or—?"

There was a smoldering, ominous quiet. Then Page exploded. "None of those things! Lethargy, irresponsibility, lack of ambition or desire—they are the real handicaps. People who know what their shortcomings are and want to do something about them are the lucky ones, because they can usually *arrange*—" he savored the word—"to overcome their trouble. But those who limp through life on two or three of their eight cylinders are the ones to be pitied. If I don't teach you anything but to *want* to do something with your lives, this course will be a magnificent success!"

Our newsroom in the basement of Morrow Library was damp and dimly lighted, and much of our equipment was old and crude, but Page never gave us time to complain. Our typewriters chattered constantly as we tried to outdo the professionals at reporting, headlining and layout. "You're not here to learn to be mediocrities," he would growl. Then, turning on us his clear, deceptively saint-like blue eyes, he would say, "If I send you out on a story and you can't get it because you have broken a leg, call me before the ambulance comes and I'll forgive you. But don't give me excuses! They wound me, and explanations pour salt in the wound. It's *results*, not excuses, that count in this life!"

A BIG BEAR OF A BOY

This was Page Pitt's credo, and gradually I discovered how valiantly he had "arranged" to live up to it. He was five years old in 1905 when a mastoid infection took 97 percent of his sight. Since he balked at attending a school for the blind in his native New York City, his mother tutored him at home. When he was 12, the Pitts moved to Shinnston, W.Va., because they had learned that the public schools in that coal-mining community accepted children with limited vision. Starting in the third grade (four grades behind boys of his age), Page began to inveigle his schoolmates into reading him his lessons. It was a practice he continued to follow throughout college and graduate school.

Refusing to be left out of sports, he played first base on the school team—the ball was always thrown to him low and bounding through the grass, so that he could catch it by sound. As a second-string football tackle, he cut quite a swath in the line, for he was a big bear of a boy.

By the time he was 16, Page was working summers at the Willard Coal Mine—"catching" (braking and coupling up) empty coal cars that came rumbling at him down a grade. He "arranged" to do this by putting a white handkerchief on the track about 20 feet from the point where he had to stop each car. When a descending car passed over this blur of white and blotted it from his view, Page, running alongside, would pull the brake bar and stop the car just short of the waiting empties. One day a gust of wind blew the signal handkerchief away; Page never pulled the brake, and there was a terrible pileup. After this, he was given a job where sight was unnecessary. He was stationed two miles back in the drift mine where, in total darkness, he would listen to the chugging of the water pumps and report any stoppage. It was drab, dangerous work, but Page was earning money for college.

In 1921, Page entered Muskingum College in New Concord, Ohio, where he learned to admire two arts: journalism and teaching. At 26 he combined the two, becoming Marshall University's first instructor of an unprestigious course called feature-writing. But how, he was soon wondering, could he teach kids to be professional newspapermen until he had been one himself? Two years later he took a leave of absence and went to New York City where, while earning his master's degree in journalism from Columbia University, he worked as a reporter for several big newspapers.

On a visit to New York in 1932, during the Lindbergh kidnapping case, Page wangled his way into the office of Lindbergh's attorney, Col. Henry C. Breckinridge, who had announced that he would not see reporters. Breckinridge, curious, began pumping him: "Why are you in this business when you can't see? How do you get around New York?" Quietly Page answered all the queries, then said, "Now, Colonel, will you answer a few of *my* questions?" Breckinridge realized that he had little choice—and Page scooped his competitors.

Later he was offered a job by a wire service at twice his college salary, but he chose to return to Marshall as head of his department.

SCREAMS IN THE CLASSROOM

To Page Pitt, journalism was not a trade but a profession that carried a much responsibility as law or medicine. "You are training here," he told us gravely, "to become the chief architects of public opinion and policy, the main guardians of human rights and freedoms."

Some of his lessons in journalism were as elaborately contrived as the inventions in Rube Goldberg's cartoons. One morning, our class heard the hysterical cries of a student in the corridor: "You've flunked me and ruined my life!" An instant later, Prof. A. Otis Ranson of the speech department flung himself through our classroom door, the "angry" student at his heels. As Ranson kicked over a wastebasket—*boom!*—two milk bottles fell off the doortop and splattered. The aggrieved student whipped out a banana and pointed it at Ranson. A policeman in the hall fired two blank cartridges. A girl started screaming. Finally Professor Ranson and his "crazy assassin" tumbled back out into the corridor and were gone.

"Now!" said Page triumphantly as we gaped in amazement. "Please answer some questions on what you just saw and heard." What was the argument about? What did the attacker have in his hand? Who screamed? To about 30 such questions he got a lot of wrong answers.

"Aha!" said Page. "You have just proved what I've been telling you—that eyewitness accounts at scenes of violence are often inaccurate and can't be relied upon. Remember, always take such accounts with a grain of salt." That such wild demonstrations sometimes brought half the university running into our basement didn't bother Page at all. He knew he had taught us something in a way we could never forget.

ROBINS AT 9 O'CLOCK

When I graduated from Marshall in 1940, Page got me a job with the Cincinnati *Post*. But soon I began to realize that he was much more to me than just a professor. Fortunately, he discovered similar feelings and our romance, after I learned to make some minor adjustments, flourished.

At first, forgetting about his almost nonexistent sight, I'd say, "Look at that robin." "Where, where?" he'd ask, whirling in confusion. Then, "Damn it, Ginny, say, 'Look at that robin at nine o'clock or six o'clock'!" With specific directions, Page would whip out his 20-power telescope, focus it, and spot, mistily in its limited circle, the bird, the flower, whatever I wanted to share with him. In 1942 we were married. Soon the children, Colston and Ginny Page, came along, and they, too, learned to say, "Look, Dad! Look at that flower—at six o'clock!"

Page has more hobbies than any other man I know. Before we were married, I'd planned to give up bridge, assuming that he couldn't share that pleasure. What a joke that turned out to be! He had won so many duplicate bridge tournaments that his trophies would fill two bushel baskets. He plays by pressing the cards close to his "good" eye and memorizing them. Then his partner calls out each cards as it is played.

My husband also plays excellent chess. He beats me at bowling, and is an absolute nut on camping and fishing. Nor have I escaped being a "golf widow." Page consistently breaks 100 by having his caddie point out the direction of the pin and estimate its distance. The fact that he can't see is no excuse, he says, for not breaking 80: "I just can't remember to keep my head down and hold my left arm straight!"

Through the years, I've watched him set the same goals he would have set had he possessed 20-20 vision, and I've seen him reach and exceed them all. Under his leadership, the Marshall journalism program has grown from a single class of five students in 1926, to 25 undergraduate and four graduate courses enrolling 150 students and employing five teachers in 1967. By sheer force of personality he has converted his department from a onetime "academic stepchild" to one of the most colorful and successful of the nation's departments of journalism.

PASSED WITH FLYING COLORS

Recently we saw our longtime dream come true: the journalism workshop moved out of the basement it had occupied for 30 years and spread itself sumptuously over nearly two floors of Marshall's new, eight-story Academic Center. And last September there were more personal triumphs. Retiring from the chairmanship of his department, Page, at 66, became free to teach full-time. Letters of congratulation poured in from old grads all over the country. When Page wandered into the newsroom of the *Daily Mail*, the afternoon paper in Charleston, our state capital, everyone stood up and applauded (11 out of the news staff of 15 had been Page's students).

But there was one thing that he liked best about all the excitement. I realized what it was after reading to him the Huntington *Herald-Advertiser's* feature article on his 40 years of accomplishment. "Ginny," he said, "are you sure you haven't left something out?"

"What do you mean?" I asked.

"Hasn't there been one single mention of a handicap?" When I assured him that there had been none, his face suddenly lighted up, he slapped his thigh resoundingly and grinned. "Ginny," he said, "I guess we've passed the course."

J
11
'R
appx
v113
aug-Sept
1967

Appendix

You're 21, Jobless, but Brave

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 31, 1967

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, newspapers across the country are currently devoting a good deal of coverage to the predicaments in which jobless young men find themselves. We read nearly every day of the terrible effects of the frustration born of hopelessness and unemployment among our youth. Were it not for the kind of hope represented by the story I have in mind today, the overall picture would be grim indeed.

Two years ago Ross Nunez, a young man from east Los Angeles, was an unemployed and unskilled high school dropout. Today, thanks to a fortuitous blend of his own courage and the antipoverty program, Ross has both a high school diploma and a good job.

Mr. Speaker, Ross Nunez left school out of necessity after his father died. Like other young men who must grapple with hardship early in life, Ross learned the obstacles of insufficient education and lack of job skills. He learned how vitally important it is to have a chance to be helped with timely and farsighted assistance.

There are countless numbers of young men like Mr. Nunez. Even though they may be unemployed and in need of certain assistance, they possess the determination and ability to benefit tremendously from worthwhile economic opportunity programs. When these young men secure productive positions in society we all are the beneficiaries.

Ross Nunez' story appeared in the Los Angeles Herald Examiner and is indicative of the many forward-looking programs of the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Under unanimous consent I insert this article into the Congressional Record:

You're 21, Jobless, But Brave

(By Cliff Blackburn)

Two years ago, the world was a pretty grim place for a 21-year-old East Los Angeles Mexican-American.

Ross Nunez was an unemployed and unskilled high school dropout.

Ahead of him stretched a lifetime of low-paying, dismal, dead-end jobs.

Today, Nunez has a high school diploma and holds a good job at a service station. And he's up for promotion to lead salesman.

Q: What made such a radical change in this man's life in such a short time?

A: The Economic and Youth Opportunities Agency at 207 N. Breed St., part of the anti-poverty program.

But for Ross Nunez, it wasn't a Cinderella, rags-to-riches sort of thing that happened overnight. It took courage and lots of hard work to be a "graduate" of the East Los Angeles project.

Nunez, who lives at 309 Cheesebrough Lane, was pretty leery of the idea at first.

He'd been forced to quit school in the 11th grade because his father had died. He knew that to even break even in life, he had to stay out of trouble.

"At first I wouldn't join the program," he told The Herald-Examiner, pausing at his work at the station at East Third Street and Gage Avenue. "I was afraid that being with lots of other guys I'd get into trouble."

But his interest in autos led to cautious inquiries about the project.

He enrolled at the EYOA and was placed by his counselor in a special service station attendant program.

Unlike some vocational and pre-vocational courses offered at the project, this program was designed for the student in immediate need of a job.

Mornings, Ross and his fellow classmates were trained in actual service station operation, including minor auto repairs.

Afternoons were devoted to paperwork, with specially tailored lessons designed to meet Board of Education high school standards as well as to familiarize the students with the bookwork involved in gas station operation.

He completed the course in three months.

It wasn't long before he was employed at a starting salary of more than $100 a week.

And now the world isn't such a grim place to this East Los Angeles man. "You know, in a couple of years I'd like to have my own gas station," he said. "I'd like to be in business for myself."

Job Corps at Camp Breckinridge, Ky.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL D. PERKINS
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 1, 1967

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, in past weeks we have heard considerable discussion about the effectiveness of our Federal antipoverty programs in dealing with the enormous problems of the disadvantaged Americans. I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues a report on the Breckinridge Job Corps Center in Kentucky which shows the dramatic success of the work going on there to train 1,800 young men to be productive members of society. This center exemplifies the nationwide success that we continue to read of all the Job Corps centers.

The report which I have referred to was written by the distinguished Member of the House, Representative Frank Horton, from the 36th Congressional District of New York. The distinguished Representative has firsthand knowledge of this success story from his recent visit to the center to deliver the commencement address to a graduating class of 34 young men. His report indicates that these high school "dropouts" are on the road to developing a commitment, not only to a useful occupation, but even more significantly, to a better way of life which emphasizes the breaking away from a poverty-welfare existence and moving upward to independence and self esteem.

I would like to urge my colleagues to read Congressman Horton's findings at Breckenridge and for the benefit of those who have not seen his article, I include it in the Record:

Salvaging the Nation's Rejected Youth

(By Congressman Frank Horton)

A few days ago, I had the opportunity to see a new edition of the American dream taking shape in the state of Kentucky. People from Rochester and the 36th Congressional District are closely involved in making the dream come true.

Early in 1966, Graflex, Inc., one of the fine corporations in the 36th District, contracted with the Federal government's Office of Economic Opportunity to take over operation of the Men's Job Corps Center in Breckenridge, Kentucky.

When I arrived last week in Breckinridge at the invitation of Graflex board chairman Gaylord C. Whitaker to tour the center and deliver a commencement address, about 1,800 young men were being trained in 11 different occupations, including general automotive repair, service station operation, small and marine engine repair, automotive sales, auto repair, welding, heater and burner repair, electronics, landscaping and nursery work and the culinary arts.

"Give a man a fish and you feed him for a day. Teach a man to fish and you feed him for a lifetime." That's the Breckinridge philosophy which Mr. Whitaker voiced at the commencement exercises and it is working.

A typical Job Corpsman entering the camp is between 16 and 21 years old, has a reading level equal to a fifth-grader, has completed only 7 years of formal schooling, is 7 pounds underweight and, in most cases, has never held a steady job. Nearly half are from broken homes, half come from families on the relief rolls and 8 out of 10 never have been examined by a doctor or a dentist. Ten per cent have been punished for a serious crime.

The Job Corpsmen have their own student "government" with officers and regular meetings to consider camp affairs. Combine this with the valuable training received in many manual arts, and you have the beginning of a man of responsibility. I was greatly impressed with the dedication and enthusiasm of two of the student leaders who served as our guides during a tour of the Breckinridge camp, Governor Noah Williams and Sandy Phillips, Secretary of State, both studying electronics.

I addressed a group of 34 Corpsmen who spent about 9 months at the camp. The investment made in them, both in money and manpower, is significant. But it represents only a fraction of the cost which local, state and federal governments would have spent in maintaining them through relief programs if they did not receive the fine training available there.

Seven out of ten stay in the program and complete it. Arrest rates for Job Corps graduates are about half the national average. The benefit that the Job Corps gives in re-creating human dignity is, of course, immeasurable. Certainly, there are problems in the administration of some centers. But this is inevitable, considering the vastness of the program. The Job Corps system works—I am convinced of that.

At the commencement ceremonies, I told the graduates and spectators: "You are the living examples of the success of this program. The fact that 34 graduates stand ready today to go into the job market means that both you and Breckinridge have confidence that you have successfully learned a valuable occupational skill. My only advice to you is that you apply the same hard work toward developing this skill after you leave here as you applied in learning the skill under the guidance of the Breckinridge staff. As businessmen from Graflex and other successful companies have told you, there is no substitute for a skilled, honest and reliable worker."

The Breckinridge operation is a prime example of the way in which private industry and the Federal government can cooperate to make this country move forward. Graflex took on this job with the confidence that it could do the job well. That confidence has been borne out, and I am proud of my Graflex constituents for their contribution. The Job Corps programs, while far from perfect, is a realistic answer for the nation's disadvantaged youth. Hope has replaced despair, and economic equality is the result.

Address by Gov. Richard J. Hughes, of New Jersey, Before the 75th Anniversary, Convention of the International Longshoremen's Association, Miami Beach, Fla., July 20, 1967

SPEECH
OF
HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 25, 1967

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, we have all been shocked and saddened by the violence that has wracked our cities and towns in the past few weeks. Much has been said and written about these events, including a good deal by persons who have not had to bear the terrible responsibility of bringing order out of chaos. I am proud to place before the House a recent address by Gov. Richard J. Hughes, of my home State of New Jersey, in which he shared with the International Longshoremen's Association the impressions and thoughts which he obtained while combating the recent disorder in Newark. The Governor's speech is as follows:

ADDRESS BY GOV. RICHARD J. HUGHES, OF NEW JERSEY, BEFORE THE 75TH ANNIVERSARY CONVENTION OF THE INTERNATIONAL LONGSHOREMEN'S ASSOCIATION, MIAMI BEACH, FLA., JULY 20, 1967

When I first accepted the gracious invitation of your fine President, my good friend Teddy Gleason, to come down here to Florida and address this 75th Anniversary Convention, I had planned to talk with you a little about the needs of our times and the responsibilities which they give to all of us as fellow citizens of this great nation to work together toward the common good. Now, recent events in my State of New Jersey give added emphasis, added significance, and added urgency to what I was going to say.

In 1831, Alexis de Tocqueville, a Frenchman who had come to the United States to observe at first hand the workings of our democratic system, observed:

"As soon as several of the inhabitants of the United States have taken up an opinion or feeling which they wish to promote in the world, they look out for mutual assistance; and as soon as they have found each other out, they combine. From that moment, they are no longer isolated men, but a power seen from afar, whose actions serve as example, and whose language is listened to."

These words are still true today, and they apply to the International Longshoremen's Association. 75 years ago, a group of men, out of common need and common desires, banded together to found this Association. From that time on you have no longer been isolated men but the kind of power to which de Tocqueville referred, whose actions, whatever they may be, serve as an example for other men and whose voice is heard. This implies for all of you as members of this Union a special responsibility, for the Association's actions affect not only its members but also society as a whole. Today, in this nation we face complex and difficult challenges which profoundly touch the lives of all of us and, therefore, require all of us—and especially those of us who by virtue of public office or affiliation with private organizations have a special ability—to lend our efforts and our resources to effect constructive social change. So I come before you today to enlist your aid and your support—and the aid and support of all good men—in doing what must be done for the good of this nation and all its people.

There is presently manifesting itself in our society a polarization of thought and action. By this I refer to that phenomenon wherein small segments of the general population who hold extreme views are making themselves heard and their presence felt above and beyond the reasonable voice of the majority. This nation was founded upon the principle of reasoning together and it is a great nation today because throughout its history men have reasoned together, have demonstrated attitudes and actions which contribute to the benefit of society as a whole. Today, all this is threatened by a small minority—perhaps 1% or less of the American people—and it is now time for the other 99% of Americans to speak up, to act, to counter the damage which is being wrought against the common good.

The events of last weekend in my State's largest city of Newark, like similar events in other cities throughout the nation in recent years, are outgrowths of a very real crisis which faces us in America today—one that has been termed by some the "crisis of the cities." Newark is not unique. On the contrary, for good or ill, its problems are the very same problems which face so many of our cities. Therefore, all good Americans need to feel a grave concern for what happened in Newark and all of us must seek out the causes. For in this way, I think we can develop an understanding, an awareness which will enable us to meet the urban needs which comprise the most serious domestic challenge facing this nation at the present time.

The criminal participants in the riots in Newark—the ambushers of firemen, the killers of children, the mass looters—amount to approximately 1% of the Negro population of that city. In the same way, the whites who do their best to make such situations worse—the haters, the advocates of slaughtering innocent Negroes, the drunks bearing meat cleavers and bent on killing—all of these amount to an equally small percentage of the white population. This is true throughout the nation—a vocal, militant, anti-American minority, comprising again a small percentage of the population, violently forces its will on the vast majority of good Americans.

This small percentage is not composed of white men who hate black men or black men who hate white men, but of criminals who hate the things for which America stands, and, having contempt for their fellow man, reject the law and its authority and the freedom which all Americans should enjoy in raising their families and living their lives in peace.

We cannot afford to tolerate such a thing. It is time to extinguish the flame of violence and to keep the flame of justice, freedom and liberty alive in this land. It is a time to insist on the rights of all Americans, a time for all of us to work together to create an America where all can get decent employment, decent shelter and decent education. It is a time for us to face the truth about the massive problems which we face and to find new and imaginative approaches to solving them.

Our first task in the face of a riot situation is, of course, to demonstrate unequivocally that we will not tolerate disregard for law and order and violence, whether on the part of Negroes or whites, that endangers the lives of innocent people. That is why, when the Mayor of Newark called for my help in that City, I called in the National Guard and the State Police to assist local law enforcement officers in restoring peace and protecting the lives and property of all innocent citizens, Negro and white alike.

But while force is often necessary in the immediate face of violence, it cannot be the primary answer to our problems. As in the midst of the rioting in Newark we immediately talked to hundreds of people including leaders of all segments of the community—Negro as well as white—in an attempt to resolve immediate differences and moved to meet immediate public needs such as critical food shortages, so, too, must we now immediately recognize the fact that many of our problems are the inevitable results of decades of neglect, apathy and indifference and take bold actions to remedy deficiencies which plague our society.

Now that the violence, the sniping, the arson and the looting in Newark have subsided, all of us must take a long hard look to find the real causes of this situation and similar situations elsewhere. We are living in a time of unprecedented prosperity which is shared by the greatest numbers of our people. Yet, trapped in the ghettoes of our cities are vast numbers of people who cannot share in this abundance. They have no resources to purchase the material goods which are displayed before them everywhere in store windows and advertisements on television and in the mass news media. They cannot even break out of the ghettoes to obtain the education or the employment which would enable them to begin to live as their fellow citizens live and as they deserve to live. Instead, they are trapped in hopelessness and futility and, for some, a deep resentment which festers slowly until it is ignited by the slightest spark.

The real villains in the Newarks, the Watts, the Harlems, in the overall deterioration of our communities, are greed, indifference and, perhaps, all of us who are content in our complacency to avoid thinking about the situation until it is forcibly brought to our attention by events like those which occurred in my State last week.

In the last two years much has been done. Consider for example, the fine programs of the war on poverty. I am proud that my State of New Jersey can boast of the best anti-poverty program in the nation, and I remember escorting the First Lady of our nation on a tour around our urban areas and showing her just what can be done through such efforts. I am proud to tell you that my State of New Jersey can also boast of one of the strongest and most comprehensive civil rights laws in the nation. Not long ago this law was extended to prohibit discrimination in the sale and rental of virtually all housing—a measure which I must point out was enacted only after decades of opposition and only through the enlightened and courageous action of the political party to which I have the honor of belonging. Not long ago, New Jersey enacted an optional rent control law which enabled municipalities to curb slum landlords who feel no shame in charging those who least can afford to pay exhorbitant rent for dilapidated and often rat-infested shelter. And we have done much more, not only in New Jersey but in the nation as a whole.

And yet, in the aftermath of Newark I think there can be no doubt that much, much more remains to be done. Perhaps out of the tragedy of the Newarks will come encouragement for the intensive efforts that are already going forward to meet the crisis of our cities.

I want to take this opportunity to express publicly my personal appreciation and the appreciation of my State to our great United States Attorney General Ramsey Clark who met admirably our after-midnight calls for his assistance. For example, he quickly arranged for aid to the victims of the rioting from the American Red Cross and for a mobilization of assistance from the Small Business Administration. Later, he met for several hours with our New Jersey Commissioner of Community Affairs, Paul Ylvisaker, to review the entire situation in our State, giving much thought not only to how he could help New Jersey meet our immediate needs but also to what he and other federal officials might learn and apply to prevent further such outbreaks elsewhere in the nation. The Attorney General also was instrumental in enlisting the full cooperation and assistance of high ranking officials of other federal departments which has resulted in the most constructive joint effort New Jersey has ever experienced with the federal government.

Neither New Jersey nor the federal government is in a position to forget riots. Rather, we must repair the grave damages brought against the innocent and we are already at work to find the causes of the disturbances and effect constructive remedies. John Forrer, an extremely capable young man who formerly worked with the United States Bureau of the Budget and who is now on the staff of the Department of Community Affairs, is coordinating, from an office in Washington, federal-state efforts and will soon—perhaps within twenty-four hours—announce specific grant in aid programs. We have met with leaders of our New Jersey Congressional Delegation, who have pledged their full cooperation. Our State government, primarily through the Department of Community Affairs, is working closely with our local Mayors of both the communities involved in the disturbances and those with similar problems. In an effort to serve as a conciliator and, in some cases, as a receiver, dispenser, and expediter of grants and other assistance. For, we have a unique opportunity and a vital need to bring about constructive action without delay, and, if we fail to do so, we jeopardize in a very real way the future of our society.

A great President and former Governor of New Jersey, Woodrow Wilson, once said,

"Liberty does not consist in mere general declarations of the rights of men. It consists in the translation of those declarations into definite action."

We can no longer afford to equivocate. Rather, it is imperative that such definite action be undertaken without hesitation or delay. So I ask your help and the help of all good men—I want to enlist the energies and the efforts of all responsible Americans in working together to create an America wherein our ideals are become realities. For the ultimate test of our society, the ultimate test of America's greatness, is in the quality of the lives of each and every one of our people.

Pentagon Security Breakdown

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN T. MYERS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 1, 1967

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Speaker, our colleague, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROUDEBUSH], has revealed a glaring loophole in Defense Department security clearance policy.

After stalling for 15 months, Defense finally announced secret clearance for a member of the W. E. B. DuBois Club, an organization which the Justice Department and FBI have described as a Communist-front organization.

This entire story was reported in the July 29, 1967, issue of Human Events. All Members of Congress should be apprised of this situation. The article follows:

PENTAGON SECURITY BREAKDOWN

Ever since the Kennedy-Johnson State Department began firing or easing out such topnotch security experts like Otto Otepka, veteran investigators in the Capitol have become alarmed at the department's security programs. But Foggy Bottom, it turns out, is not the only place where there is cause for concern.

Last week *Human Events* discovered fresh evidence of still another startling breach in national security standards, this time in the heart of America's military establishment. Within the Defense Department there is the Industrial Security Clearance Review Office, whose major purpose is to check out persons in industry or universities working on defense contracts. But this critical "watchdog" agency has a novel approach to security matters.

Far from being very disturbed by those with leftist backgrounds, it has consciously given a secret clearance to a known member of a Communist-dominated group. Moreover, the evidenct suggests that the Defense Department's security-gathering apparatus is either completly ineffectual or a victim of sabotage.

The story of ruptured Pentagon security actually begins some 16 months ago when Rep. Richard L. Roudebush (R.-Ind.) requested the Defense Department to find out why Robert Arthur Niemann, then an engineering graduate student and research assistant at the University of California at Los Angeles, possessed a secret security clearance to work on an Air Force defense contract when, in fact, he belonged to the W. E. B. DuBois Clubs. The DuBois Clubs have been termed "Communist controlled" and "subversive" by FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover. The U.S. attorney general on March 4, 1966, petitioned the Subversive Activities Control Board to order the DuBois Clubs to register as a Communist-front organization.

Fifteen months after Roudebush had queried the department came a supposedly complete reply. A few weeks ago, the Indiana solon received from the office of the assistant secretary of defense a letter dated June 29, 1967, signed by Joseph J. Liebling, director for Security Policy. The Liebling letter read, in part:

"In March 1966 Mr. Niemann's statements regarding his recent joining of the DuBois Club [sic] of America were brought to the attention of the Defense Department. Because he held an active Department of Defense secret clearance, the chief, Defense Industrial Security Clearance Office, initiated a complete background investigation of him. Upon completion of that investigation, his case was referred to this office for determination of his eligibility for clearance.

"The Screening Board of this office, having considered all the available information, now has determined that continuation of Mr. Niemann's secret clearance is *clearly consistent with the national interest*." (Emphasis added.)

The letter did not deny Niemann was a member of the DuBois Clubs, whose house organ, *Insurgent*, says it draws its inspiration from Fidel Castro; indeed, the DuBois Clubs membership is *affirmed*. But the Liebling communication explains that the Screening Board concluded Niemann "does not have a sympathetic interest in the Communist movement" and that his "well-publicized joining of the DuBois Club [sic] constituted nothing more than a protest against the attorney general's action . . . an action which he regarded as unwarranted governmental interference with the activities of a political organization."

In 1966, it is true, Niemann had explained his reasons for joining in an open letter to then Atty. Gen. Nicholas Katzenbach. He said he had "always been an active Democrat" and had previously chosen not to "join the DuBois Club [sic] because of my ideological differences with some of its policies."

However, Niemann continued, "since your action is aimed at frightening people out of joining the DBC, I must follow the King of Norway [sic], who, during Nazi occupation of his country, appeared in public wearing a Jewish armband to show his contempt for a similar act of suppression."

Niemann's belief that prosecution of a Communist-controlled group is an act of evil on a par with the slaughter and prosecution of the Jews is intriguing—and parallels the thinking of militant anti-American, pro-Communist groups in this country.

But even more fascinating than Niemann's rhetoric are his radical political activities which appear far more extensive than the Liebling letter suggests. Here, in fact, is some information on Niemann not conveyed by the Defense Department to Rep. Roudebush but checked out by *Human Events* with security experts and Niemann himself:

Although there is no evidence that Niemann is a Communist, the red-bearded UCLA graduate student participated in numerous leftist activities, worked with known Communists and helped whip up anti-Viet Nam demonstrations.

Niemann voted in 1966 for Dorothy Healey, the well-known leader of the Communist party in Southern California. Contacted by telephone in Los Angeles, Niemann was told that at least two persons had heard him say he had voted for Healey (who campaigned for tax assessor of Los Angeles County by distributing buttons with her picture and the words: "Vote Communist.") Asked if this were true, Niemann replied: "It is a fact that I voted for Dorothy Healey for tax assessor."

Niemann was campus leader of "Friends of SNCC" on the University of California at Los Angeles campus, even though Negro friends of Niemann warned him to shy away from this militant organization. SNCC's recently resigned leader, Stokely Carmichael, openly aligned the organization with the pro-Peking Revolutionary Action Movement (RAM) and Communist elements in Puerto Rico.

For the past several years Niemann has been on the staff of *The Movement Press*, a publication that has long been a part of the SNCC operation. The *Press'* main targets are the CIA, the House Committee on Un-American Activities, the police and the war in Viet Nam. Its main hero is Stokely Carmichael.

(In December 1966 the *Press* notified its readers that it was separating from the national organization so "National SNCC won't get sued for anything we say. We are still very much a part of SNCC.")

The *Press'* office manager is the daughter-in-law of San Francisco's prominent Communist Archie Brown; its cartoonist is Frank Cieciorka, who also draws for the DuBois Clubs' official magazine, *Insurgent*, and its staff includes: William Mandel, who took the Fifth before the House Committee on Un-American Activities in 1960 when asked whether he was a member of the Communist party; and Michael Folsom, who has been an editorial assistant to *Insurgent*.

But Niemann's affinity for such radical organizations and colleagues does not end there. Niemann admitted to *Human Events* he has worked with the Peace Action Council, whose chairman, Irving Sarnoff, has been labeled as a Communist by the House Committee on Un-American Activities. (Sarnoff's reply: "I would not add to the committee's stature by denying or accepting anything it says.")

It was the Peace Action Council, in fact, which sponsored the wild anti-Viet Nam war rally on June 23 outside the Century Plaza Hotel in Los Angeles where President Johnson was attending a Democratic fund-raising dinner. Some 10,000 demonstrators who gathered illegally in front of the hotel became so militant that Secret Service agents were on the verge of executing an evacuation plan which called for LBJ to be rushed through a rear door to a waiting helicopter.

After the demonstrators refused to move from the front of the hotel, police dispersed them, arresting 45 in the process. Reporters on the spot say the demonstrators turned into a mob, cursing, stoning and spitting upon police. Reports from undercover agents later revealed that a number of the "peace" demonstration leaders had instructed persons to trigger a clash with the police.

Niemann not only admits he took a vigorous part in the demonstrations, but later founded the "June 23rd Movement" to spring those arrested. He was quoted by Dial Torgerson of the Los Angeles Times:

"We will demonstrate at the arraignments of those arrested by the police. . . . We will affirm three principles: (1) the right of people to demonstrate in any way we see fit against the immoral war in Viet Nam; (2) the right of demonstrators to defend themselves against unwarranted attacks by police; and (3) the right of demonstrators to protect others against unwarranted attacks by police." Torgerson said Niemann declared that "defend" and "protect" meant such things as "grabbing a policeman's stick if the officer attempted to club a demonstrator."

Just six days after the anti-war rally, Joseph J. Liebling, the Defense Department's director for Security Policy, sent Roudebush the letter claiming a security Screening Board, "having considered all the available, information, now has determined that continuation of Mr. Niemann's secret clearance is clearly consistent with the national interest."

Security experts are stunned at the actions of the Defense Department in the Niemann case, and the whole controversy has provoked a number of as yet unanswered questions.

Liebling insists there was "a complete background investigation" of Niemann. If so, did the investigation uncover the extensive history of his radical activities? If not, then, the Defense Department obviously needs some new investigators.

But if the background investigation did reveal his affinity for radical causes, why, then, is Niemann's secret clearance "clearly consistent with the national interest"? And if Niemann can obtain a secret clearance with such a preponderance of left-wing activities, how many other Niemanns are now working under Defense Department contracts?

Pittsburgh's Neighborhood Youth Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1967

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, the goal of the Neighborhood Youth Corps is to give young people of disadvantaged background, between the ages of 16 and 21, sufficient training to enter the permanent job market, or to provide sufficient motivation for the enrollees to return to school to continue on a long-range educational goal. Since the program was originally funded for Pittsburgh in 1965, more than 1,500 youths have been aided in this manner, and the tangible statistics show that almost 50 percent have graduated from the program into some form of employment; approximately 10 percent have returned to full-time day school, including college; over 200 high school dropouts have applied for high school equivalency examinations; almost all enrollees have had at least 6 hours of remedial or vocational training a week. And this has been a two-way street, because the record reflects that the city of Pittsburgh and its citizens have been the beneficiaries of many extra services performed by the enrollees in their assignments to city and cooperating agencies.

Mr. Speaker, the present contract for this program expires on August 15. I include at this point in the RECORD the annual report for the Neighborhood Youth Corps of Pittsburgh, 1966–67—which will appear in two installments—to urge continued funding for this obviously worthwhile program, not only because of the statistics which speak for themselves, but also for the new hopes and outlooks it has extended to young people which cannot be measured by a computer.

Part I of the report follows:

ANNUAL REPORT OF CITY OF PITTSBURGH NEIGHBORHOOD YOUTH CORPS, 1966–67—I

The City of Pittsburgh Neighborhood Youth Corps was originally funded July 28, 1965 as an out-of-school program and as of January 1, 1967 has serviced approximately 1,500 young persons including the 400 enrollees in the current program. The present contract expires August 15, 1967.

The total community impact of the Neighborhood Youth Corps can only be partially explored at this early date. Almost 50% of the terminated enrollees have graduated from the program to some form of employment. Approximately 10% have returned to full time day school, including college. Over 200 high school drop-outs have applied for the high school equivalency examinations. Almost all enrollees entering the program since June 1966 have had at least six hours of remedial or vocational training a week.

These are tangible observable achievements. However, it is impossible to estimate the ultimate value of the program to those young people who for the first time in their lives have managed to actually complete a program—or the extent to which a clerical or planning assignment has changed the self-image of a girl or boy. And it is difficult to estimate the change in attitude toward society engendered by money in one's pocket.

Nor can the benefit to the community be measured by enrollee statistics alone. Close to 2,000 vacant lots and hill-sides have been cleaned, cleared and in some instances improved by Youth Corps enrollees.

Two Planning and Research projects on City lots and streets have been partially manned with Youth Corps staff. A technical library in Traffic Planning has been assembled entirely with Youth Corps personnel.

And most importantly, as enrollees working for the City of Pittsburgh, these young people, frequently stranded on the periphery of community life, have achieved a sense of participation in the government and activities of their City.

Therefore, the following summaries of the tangible statistics of the program can only be part of the story of the joint Department of Labor-City of Pittsburgh Youth Training Program.

1. THE FEDERAL CONTRACT

The first contract with the United States Department of Labor was approved July 28, 1965 for a six month period in the amount of approximately one million dollars to cover the enrollment of 950 young persons.

The City's contribution was set at 10% of the total grant.

Because of the brief period of the initial contract, and uncertainties of whether additional monies would be available for the continuation of the program, enrollment reached its peak in November 1965 with 624 enrollees.

From February 1966 to August 15, 1966, the original contract was extended for short additional periods of time with small supplementary grants of federal funds to employ 500 enrollees.

In order to keep the program intact, the City contributed funds and "services in kind" in addition to the original quota of 10% for both equipment and supervisory costs.

In June 1966, the City of Pittsburgh received an additional allowance under the first contract for a separate summer component for 150 out-of-school enrollees.

Including all extensions, supplements, and the summer program, the federal grant under the first Neighborhood Youth Corps contract totaled 1,269,718 dollars.

The City's contribution, including "services in kind", for the first contract totaled 305,226 dollars.

On August 15, 1966 the City of Pittsburgh received a second federal contract for 939,970 dollars to continue the program for 400 enrollees to August 15, 1967. The summer program for 150 enrollees funded under the first contract continued simultaneously until December 2, 1966.

The actual monies contributed by the City of Pittsburgh and the United States Department of Labor are as follows:

SUMMARY OF CONTRACTS

	City		Federal	
	Contract figure	Expended, Dec. 31, 1966	Contract figure	Expended, Dec. 31, 1966
1st contract: Completed Dec. 2, 1966	$194,734	$305,226	$1,269,719	$1,267,717
2d contract: To expire Aug. 15, 1967	184,160	47,255	939,970	197,985

The City's contribution has been both "services in kind", and cash outlays. The following cash amounts have been specifically appropriated to the program in the 1965, 1966, and 1967 Appropriation Ordinances:

1965	$75,000
1966	130,000
1967	130,000

City funds have been used for the rental and purchase of equipment and to provide materials for the buildings of parklets and tot lots. Approximately 50% of the work supervisors in the program are regular employees paid from the normal City budget.

As of December 31, 1966 more than one million dollars have been paid directly to approximately 1,500 past and present enrollees in the City of Pittsburgh Youth Corps.

In addition to the City of Pittsburgh Neighborhood Youth Corps, the Health and Welfare Association has a program for approximately 100 out-of-school young persons and the Board of Education and the Catholic Diocese operate in-school programs.

2. FEDERAL GUIDELINES

While the Neighborhood Youth Corps is under the primary jurisdiction of the United States Department of Labor, it is a part of the total Economic Opportunity Program and is specifically designed to provide employment and training for disadvantaged, unemployed Youth between the ages of 16 and 21.

As with all federal economic opportunity programs, basic policy such as the financial eligibility of each enrollee, is established in the Federal Contract, and the Rules and Regulations of the funding agency. The Neighborhood Youth Corps is under the jurisdiction of the U.S. Department of Labor.

Eligibility for an enrollee from a family of four has been established at $3,000 per year, and since January 1, 1966 emphasis has been placed on the recruitment of School Drop-outs, and seriously disadvantaged young people.

The enrollees are paid $1.25 per hour, work a 32 hour work week, and are enrolled for a base period of six months. Under the terms of the contract each enrollee is entitled to six hours a week of supportive services, and may be re-enrolled in the program for additional six month periods up to two years to pursue specific educational goals.

The objective of the program is to provide through both the work assignment and supplemental training sufficient experience to enable the young person to either secure private employment at the end of enrollment, or to return to vocational or academic studies.

3. RECRUITMENT

In order to reach the young persons most in need of the program, recruitment has been channeled through the Pensylvania Bureau of Employment Security, the Youth Opportunity Centers, and the Neighborhood Employment Offices of the Mayor's Commission on Human Resources.

At the beginning of the program Neighborhood employment offices consulted the backlog of files and selected young people most in need of the program. Some enrollees have been recruited by block workers and other Social Service Agencies. A few are referred from Juvenile Court.

In addition, when the Action Housing Neighborhood Youth Corps of 50 enrollees was disbanded, these young people were accepted en masse into the City of Pittsburgh program.

Despite the low rate of unemployment in the Pittsburgh Labor Market Area and the stepped-up draft calls, due to the war in Vietnam, there appears to remain a group of young people unable to secure employment. Beginning August 1965, 1,700 referrals have been made to the program.

With only 400 job slots it is impossible to serve all of the girls who apply for the program.

In addition to regular sources of recruitment, a small group of approximately thirty slow learners, retarded and handicapped young people, meeting the financial eligibility guidelines, have been employed on an experimental basis.

As of January 1, 1967 the breakdown of all enrollees recruited from the various Neighborhood Centers was as follows:

Northside-Manchester	351
Hill district	335
Homewood-Brushton	242
Southwest Pittsburgh	184
East Liberty-Garfield	170
South Oakland	84
Hazelwood-Glenwood	74
Lawrenceville	46

4. WORK ASSIGNMENTS

The 426 enrollees, currently enrolled in the program, perform a variety of jobs, ranging from housekeeping and maintenance on City buildings to assisting in the Computer Section of the Department of City Planning.

5. WORK SITES

Departmental Assignments for payroll purposes are as follows:

Mayor's office	106
Public works	119
Parks and recreation	85
Lands and buildings	59
Public safety	44
Carnegie library	12
Civil service	1
Total	426
Boys	224
Girls	182

These figures are fluid and vary from month to month.

In an effort to simplify payroll procedures the Mayor's Office carries enrollees for Departments and Agencies using enrollees on a temporary or limited basis or where the number of enrollees is not sufficiently large to warrant a separate payroll.

Twenty-six enrollees are assigned to six different federal offices in downtown Pittsburgh.

Thirty enrollees perform a variety of functions at the Veteran's Hospital in Oakland ranging from pharmaceutical and laboratory assistants to kitchen aides. All of these hospital positions represent "on-the-job-training".

Twenty-five enrollees are assigned positions in the Economic Opportunity Offices and Neighborhood Centers. These positions range from Nursery Aide for pre-school youngsters to the Homewood Urban Housing Re-location program.

Enrollees are also assigned to the Departments of City Planning and Water, Carnegie Museum, the Commission on Human Relations, and the Bureau of Police.

6. WORK ACCOMPLISHMENTS

In emphasizing the variety and diversity of Neighborhood Youth Corps work assignments, the benefits to the City and the Cooperating Agencies require equal consideration.

The Neighborhood Youth Corps is a two way program. While the young person is receiving training, the City and its citizens are the beneficiaries of extra services.

For example, under the normal City budget, the Department of Lands and Buildings did not have staff to process neighborhood complaints on the dumping of trash, refuse, etc. on the lots and hillsides owned by the City or the three taxing bodies.

In August 1965, thirty boys, two foremen, and two trucks were assigned to respond to citizen complaints, particularly in the congested neighborhoods.

This special maintenance group expanded to over one-hundred enrollees and seven foremen, under the special summer program, cleaned or improved more than 2,000 city-managed lots and hillsides. In certain areas citizen groups and block clubs cooperated with the Neighborhood Youth Corps teams to remove community eyesores. Retaining walls were installed or repair, brush, debris, and similar unsightly rubble was removed.

Eight vacant areas were converted into small informal block parklets or tot lots with playground equipment or park benches for the older citizens. The eight lots include three in the Hill District, three in the Northside, and one each in East Liberty and Hazelwood. Parks and Recreation supplied the playground equipment and trees and shrubbery were planted with Urban Beautification funds. With the use of Youth Corps labor, the borrowing of City equipment and the cooperation of all affected departments, the cost of these improvements averaged between $1,500 and $2,500 per parklet.

Eight additional lots will be selected for conversion into parklets for the spring and summer of 1967.

In the Department of Parks and Recreation enrollees have been assigned to the Zoo, Aviary, and Conservatory in the Bureau of Administration, 20 Recreation Centers in the Bureau of Recreation, and to the majority of City parks in the Bureau of Grounds and Buildings.

Enrolles have helped to prepare Spring and Fall flower shows, have planted and maintained floral exhibits in parks, and have cleaned, maintained and improved the trails in the larger City parks. Basic maintenance of swimming pools and park buildings has been included in this program.

In addition, a special group of enrollees received on-the-job training in tree pruning, and three of the boys involved in the tree pruning program have passed the Civil Service examination for tree pruners, and are on the regular City payroll.

Similar backlogs of work have been accomplished in the Department of Public Works. The boys have helped in the maintenance of streets, and in the clearing of weeds and rubble along City highways and hillsides. As one small example, the hillsides along Bigelow Boulevard, a major City artery were cleaned and improved.

Youth assigned to the Asphalt plant expedited resurfacing projects throughout the community. Another group has been assisting in the maintenance of bridges.

In addition, twelve boys assigned to the Public Works Department have worked in the Bureau of Engineering on a City-wide Street Survey and Planning project. This Neighborhood Youth Corps group, assigned in mid-summer of 1966, replaced a group of college interns.

Similar accomplishments can be listed for every City Department. In City Planning the lot-block file of all City property was updated and prepared for computer storage by a special Neighborhood Youth Corps team of fifteen enrollees. Four girls received on-the-job training as keypunch operators, and a program estimated for a two year span was completed in six months.

All City buildings, including the Northside Library, the police stations, and fire houses have been housecleaned with Neighborhood Youth Corps personnel.

A group of boys working in the Water Department have helped to clean and maintain the Northside reservoirs.

Male enrollees in the Department of Public Safety, assigned to the Traffic Planning Sign Shop, have assisted in the maintenance and installation of traffic signs and equipment, and serve as aides to regular City work crews. Female enrollees have performed clerical duties with the Bureaus of Police, Traffic Planning, Fire and Building Inspection.

Twelve to fifteen young people have been assigned to the Carnegie Library since the inception of the program. In the spring of 1966, work programs were also established at the Museum with emphasis on training for scarce museum skills.

Youth Corps enrollees also service the Neighborhood and Central Offices of the Mayor's Commission on Human Resources.

Enrollees assigned to the Economic Opportunity Office in Homewood, Hazelwood, Perry Hill Top, and Oakland are directly engaged in neighborhood activities such as housing re-location services, pre-school and nursery programs etc.

Perhaps the greatest testament to the important supplementary role of the Neighborhood Youth Corps in performing essential services is the reluctance of supervisors and Bureau Chiefs to relinquish the services of Neighborhood Youth Corps enrollees at the termination of the six month period of enrollment.

While City employment was not the objective of the program, 45 young people have performed with such excellence in City departments and cooperating agencies that they have been terminated from the Youth Corps to assume the job of regular City employees.

7. EDUCATION

From the inception of the program efforts have been made to develop a meaningful education program for each enrollee to both increase job skills, and to provide for upward mobility. While some of the enrollees require basic remedial education, others have the capacity for both post high school, and even college level training.

During the first year of operation, enrollees were attending either the regular adult evening vocational classes, or the Adult Remedial courses conducted at night by the School Board of the City of Pittsburgh.

A few enrollees registered for classes at private educational institutions.

Beginning in June 1966, the Extension Division of the Pittsburgh Board of Education organized special Neighborhood Youth Corps training classes to provide Remedial Education in the basic skills supplemented by training in office procedures.

During the summer of 1966 a six week session was held at Fifth Avenue High School for both the City of Pittsburgh and the Health and Welfare enrollees. Each group attended classes one full day a week.

At the conclusion of the summer session 110 enrollees applied to the Board of Education to take the high school equivalency test.

Beginning in October 1966, the School Board established a similar Neighborhood Youth Corps training school at Connelley High School with three full time teachers and one full time school counselor.

While basically a remedial education program, typing and other office skills are integrated into the basic academic subjects.

Every enrollee is assigned six hours of school at the time of the initial interview.

8. SUPPORTIVE SERVICES

The Neighborhood Youth Corps grant does not include funds for supportive services other than the employment of three counselors and one Assistant Coordinator.

Hon. Christian A. Herter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1967

Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, this Nation lost a great statesman with the passing of the Honorable Christian A. Herter, of Massachusetts. He was an accomplished, dedicated, and devoted public officeholder and continued to serve his Nation until the time of his death.

Christian Herter served honorably and well in our State Department at the beginning of his long and varied career of public service. He served as a member of the Massachusetts State Legislature and was Speaker of that body. He served here as a Member of Congress for five consecutive terms and compiled a most distinguished record here. He was admired and respected by all who knew him in the Congress. His leaving this body to return to Massachusetts was regretted by members of both parties. He served two terms as chief executive of the State of Massachusetts. He then returned to the State Department as Under Secretary and finally as Secretary of State.

His abilities were recognized by leaders of both our great political parties and by many of those here who numbered him among their friends.

Mr. Herter served as Secretary of State under President Eisenhower. He was then appointed Special Assistant for Trade Negotiations by President Kennedy, a post he retained under President Johnson. His efforts on behalf of international trade expansion for this country will long be remembered.

He is missed not just here but throughout the world.

My deepest sympathy is extended to his family.

Work or Welfare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1967

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, the riots that have taken place throughout the country vividly demonstrate that public welfare programs alone will not quiet social disorders. Some of these disorders have occurred—as in the case of Detroit—where public welfare programs were well developed and oriented to the needy of the community.

Unquestionably there are deep meanings to these social disruptions that have not yet been diagnosed. In order to cope effectively with the causes and solutions, public officials must deal with the people fairly and squarely—the people must be informed that there is nothing about public welfare programs which magically solves problems, and they must be reminded there still is no suitable substitute for hard work as an answer to overcoming poverty.

Mr. Speaker, an article appearing in the July 27 issue of the York Dispatch touches on this matter in a very interesting and constructive manner; hence, I take the liberty of inserting it into the Record:

Too Long on Promises

As expected, the Negro riots that are churning in American cities are spawning political bickering.

Republicans are charging that "widespread rioting and violent civil disorder have grown to a national crisis since the present (Johnson) administration took office."

No doubt about that.

Nor is there any doubt that Lyndon B. Johnson has offered and obtained from congress more social legislation involving civil rights than any other president in history.

The real issue is not what has Johnson done, but how has it been done?

Have people been led for political reasons—votes—to expect a Utopia?

Our impression is that the political leaders of America, those Democrats holding power as well as some Republicans seeking power, have deceived the underprivileged people of America into believing that public welfare alone will give them better lives.

Somewhere along the line, the word "work" has been dropped from the vocabulary of political speakers. Yet Mr. Johnson will be unable to build a Great Society without it.

People must be encouraged to prepare themselves for a new tomorrow. Politicians should be honest enough to tell voters the truth—that while a few more dollars or frills may be added to a welfare program, only training or work will overcome poverty.

We've got to get back to basics: First, law and order, then a helping hand rather than promises of bigger and better handouts.

Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1967

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL D. PERKINS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1967

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, during the past few weeks the Committee on Education and Labor has been holding hearings on H.R. 8311, the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1967.

Numerous great national organizations have come forward to support the continuance of the antipoverty program now being administered through the Office of Economic Opportunity. And in addition, many eloquent letters and testimonials have been received supporting the OEO work.

Few are more eloquent than a letter received a few days ago from Mr. Dore Schary, national chairman of the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, and I would like to see it included in the Record so that all Members will have an opportunity to read it.

The letter follows:

Anti-Defamation League
Of B'nai B'rith,
Washington, D.C., July 14, 1967.

Hon. Carl D. Perkins,
Chairman, House Education and Labor Committee, Rayburn Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Perkins: The Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith welcomes the opportunity to submit this statement in support of the war on poverty and to join with the many religious, educational, civic, labor and other organizations who are united in their determination to help conquer and bring an end to poverty in the United States.

The Anti-Defamation League is the educational arm of B'nai B'rith which was founded in 1843 and is America's oldest and largest Jewish service organization. Its program is rooted in the religious teachings of Judaism; man is a creature of God and all

69 487 AA A 30

men are equal before Him; the dignity of the individual is God-given and must not be violated—teachings which are shared by all the great religions in America and which undergird the constitutional guarantees of freedom and equality.

On March 16, 1964, President Johnson in a special message to Congress charted a new course for our nation when he called for a "national war on poverty" and committed the country and its resources to an all-out effort to build an America in which every individual would have the opportunity to share in the abundance of our society and the chance to develop to his fullest potential. At its first annual meeting after the President's historic message, the National Commission of the Anti-Defamation League, recognizing that poverty was the foe of freedom and equality of opportunity, the twin goals to which the League has been dedicated since its birth, gave its endorsement to the war on poverty. This year we reaffirmed our support for the anti-poverty program as a major aspect of the fight for equality of opportunity and freedom from discrimination.

It is not our purpose in this brief statement to document the case for continuing and expanding the war on poverty. The need to do so is beyond question. Even those who would make major changes in the present program acknowledge their commitment to the effort to eradicate the cancer of poverty from the American scene.

Although we have only made a bare beginning in the war on poverty, the successes and advances have already been many and substantial. The Second Annual Report of the Office of Economic Opportunity which the President transmitted to the Congress on June 22 tells the dramatic story of how the anti-poverty program has made it possible for many of America's poor and disadvantaged for the first time to break out of the cycle of poverty.

A new vocabulary and new concepts—Headstart, Upward Bound, Vista, Job Corps—unheard of before OEO came into existence not quite three years ago, are now commonplace in the American lexicon. But they are more than mere words and ideas. They have given new meaning to the lives of millions of Americans and opened new vistas for the less fortunate among us.

These programs are the offspring of the creative imagination and proven leadership of the Office of Economic Opportunity. This, therefore, is no time to dismember or weaken either the program or the OEO as some of its critics would do. Rather, it is a time to strengthen OEO as the central agency for coordinating and directing the war on poverty, and to give it adequate funds so it can be even better equipped to do battle with the deep rooted problems of poverty.

On March 14 when the President sent his message to Congress recommending a $2.06 billion appropriation for the Office of Economic Opportunity for this fiscal year—a 25 percent increase over the prior year—ADL expressed its fervent hope that Congress would respond to that plea. Today we renew the hope that the Congress will do its share as a full partner in the war on poverty by providing the needed authority and wherewithal to enable the Office of Economic Opportunity to continue the job that must be done. As the President so eloquently stated in transmitting the OEO's Second Annual Report to the Congress, "A light has been turned on. We must keep it aglow."

We respectfully request that this statement be included in the printed record of the hearings.

Sincerely yours,

Dore Schary,
National Chairman.

The Dangers of Wearing a Badge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN V. TUNNEY

OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 1, 1967

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. Speaker, two recent editorials in the Indio Daily News and the Imperial Valley Post Press dealt with the perplexing problem of law and order and those men who enforce it.

I believe them to be apropos and include them in the Congressional Record for the reading of my colleagues:

[From the Indio (Calif.) Daily News, July 20, 1967]

THE DANGERS OF WEARING A BADGE

The comparison is inevitable.

Sarcely one month after the cold-blooded "execution" of Border Patrolmen Theodore Newton and George Azrak, one Highway Patrol officer is killed and a second wounded in a volley of bullets on Highway 86.

The incidents occurred within 100 miles of each other. Both cases involved law enforcement officers who were carrying out routine assignments.

There is no evidence to suggest a direct link between the two murders. And Southern California is in the grip of no sinister criminal conspiracy.

Yet the comparison is a valid one.

Around the country law enforcement is facing unprecedented opposition from several sources.

Summer rioters cry "police brutality" at first sight of a badge, and unload with fire bombs and guns on officers who are often unarmed.

The U.S. Supreme Court is in an agony of decision over the rights of arrested persons, and the trend of recent judgments has pointed toward greater protection for citizens charged with law-breaking.

The crime rate is going up.

Though the issue can scarcely be resolved by a brief editorial statement, it is clear that the United States is going through a time of testing.

If history repeats itself, the solution when it comes will probably be to the advantage of justice and in the best interests of the most people.

One small fact, however, should not be overlooked in the meantime.

Behind the badge a law enforcement officer wears is simply another Mr. Average Citizen, who in most cases tries to carry out an unpleasant job to the best of his ability.

He probably has a mortgage on his house and is making payments on a car.

Often he comes home at the end of a hard day to a wife and children.

It would not be unfair to say he reacts to violence the way most people react.

Efforts are increasing nationwide to upgrade the quality of police protection. The minimum educational requirement is on the rise, and trainees are schooled in psychology as well as the law.

But the fact remains that each time an officer dons his uniform and goes out on patrol, he is faced with the possibility of being killed on some lonely roadside—the victim of a thug's bullet.

A man who faces this type of threat 24 hours a day is worthy and deserving of all the possible support all law abiding citizens are capable of giving.

He deserves our good faith as he goes about providing a necessary—and often thankless—service.

[From the Imperial Valley (Calif.) Post Press, July 20, 1967]

THE WORST KIND OF A REMINDER

Yesterday's death of a California Highway patrolman on Highway 86 near Imperial only again points up a fact that most citizens choose to forget every day: that a law enforcement officer puts his life on the line during every moment of duty.

This fact is not an easy one to recognize or accept. For many ordinary citizens a patrolman is someone you slow down for—perhaps when nudging the speed limit on the highway; someone who is easily identifiable in his uniform, but not easily identified with; someone who is a "symbol of interfering authority," hardly ever an integral person.

Certainly, friends and relatives of law enforcement personnel cannot easily forget the inherent dangers; yearly scores of widows and fatherless children across the nation testify in unheralded sorrow to the sacrifices made by their husbands and fathers.

Of course, the men themselves can never forget these dangers. They realize that no matter how innocuous the circumstances, their lives are in jeopardy, whether they merely be halting motorists for an inspection check or telling a homeless traveler to move along. We "ordinary citizens" tend to overlook these situations as dangerous and even when law enforcement personnel enter recognizably dangerous situations, such as riots, roadblocks and the like, we may tend to slough off the attendant risks in such endeavors by proclaiming, "That's what they get paid for, anyway."

So what is a life worth, anyway?

Definitely when the threat to one's very existence is a daily part of the routine, a life deserves respect. And in these days of rising disrespect for law enforcement in general and those who elect to perform this necessary task in particular, it is well to remember exactly what law enforcement personnel represent: a belief in freedom through law. That is a belief worth living and dying for.

How great our burden of sadness when we realize that yesterday's tragedy must serve as that reminder.

Political Responsibility a Never-Finished Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES HARVEY

OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 1, 1967

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, I believe the Members will find the following message, excerpts from a statement made by Creighton Holden, chairman of the board, Michigan State Chamber of Commerce, at the Midwest Regional Vote Workshop of the American Heritage Foundation on May 18–19, 1967, at Detroit, of particular interest on business and labor's stake in American politics. I am most proud to point out that Mr. Holden, of St. Clair, Mich., is from Michigan's Eighth Congressional District. He is a distinguished citizen and has provided outstanding leadership. I would also mention that these qualities were recognized just a few days ago when he was named to another term as chairman of the board, Michigan State Chamber of Commerce. His comments follow:

POLITICAL RESPONSIBILITY—A NEVER FINISHED BUSINESS

This conference of Republicans and Democrats, industry and labor, and a wide variety of interested groups, represents many shadings of political opinion. These differences are inherent in the very nature of a free society. But we are not gathered here to exacerbate our differences.

Today, the accent is on the positive, on the things which unite us, on aspiration which all Americans share for our country's welfare. And it is in this spirit that I approach the subject of this luncheon.

"Business and Labor's Stake in American Politics" offers a particularly inviting area in which to build some bridges of understanding and suggest some common goals to pursue.

Our economic system is indivisible and all its component parts are mutually dependent. It is axiomatic that profits make jobs and jobs make profits. This is a simple economic fact of life.

Business—individual enterprise, management and risk capital—furnishes the creative, sustaining growth force in our economic system. Labor provides an indispensable function in the production of goods and the furnishing of services and its purchasing power is essential to the economy.

Both business and labor, therefore, have a vital interest in the healthy functioning and growth of our economy. Here is a common goal dictated by enlightened self-interest—one which certainly can be advanced in the national interest. Here is where business and labor have a common stake in American politics.

Government is the framework in which our economy must operate. Mr. Reuther and I may not agree on how much government is required on these matters for the public good. But since this is "Unity Day" in Detroit, let us focus on our broad base of mutual interest.

Yet in the field of government—politics, if you will—business and labor find themselves more frequently as antagonists than as proponents of a common cause. Publicly, the dramatic manifestations of industrial conflict dominate the scene, obscuring our underlying community interest. And the compelling need of business to produce profits for its investors, and labor to produce results for its membership, has developed into a constantly escalating tug-of-war which could threaten the well-being of our economy.

You know the story. It's been headlined again and again in the Nation's press. This is a situation that makes no sense in terms of the legitimate interests of business and labor—or the more basic considerations of public interest. As citizens of the leader of the Free World, we all carry a special responsibility in changing our industrial "cat and dog" image. This cannot be done by public relations gimmicks: It can only be done by demonstrating that our system works.

I, therefore, welcome this opportunity—in this unique gathering—to speak out frankly and, I hope, constructively. The time has come for some industrial statesmanship, to make some beginning in the right direction, and then to tackle the formidable tasks that are the joint responsibilities of both industry and labor. Let's open the doors which have been closed for too long and let in the fresh air of reason.

I would like to see business and labor begin a dialogue to determine areas of common interest—especially in relation to government—and then do something about them together!

There is no need for formalities, or any form of organization structure. All that is required is a willingness to get together periodically and talk—informally, off-the-record and, hopefully, in a spirit that measures up to the challenge.

Let us concentrate on those areas which would seem to require joint consideration, and let us avoid the pitfalls of the obviously controversial. But let us begin *now!*

I speak as an individual, but I am confident that responsible businessmen will welcome this opportunity. And I am equally confident that the responsible leaders of organized labor will also respond to the challenge. I say this because I have faith in the good sense of the American people. I know it may take a little time—and we may develop a few ulcers in the process—but we've everything to gain and nothing to lose by making a beginning. And Michigan is the place to begin! Why is Michigan the place to begin? Simply because the world looks to us for leadership in the field of industry and labor.

This is also an appropriate forum to state some things which need to be said about the special responsibilities of business in public affairs.

Business must continue its traditional role in safeguarding and expanding its contribution to the national welfare—and do so vigorously. But it's not enough to concentrate on business problems alone. We are corporate citizens of the American community. We have a vital stake in good government, schools, roads, air pollution, urban development, and the other issues confronting our country. And we must let our voice be heard.

Labor has played an active and influential role in American politics. It's just a mark of my good character that I refrain from saying "too active and too influential." But labor does not hold any proprietary rights to social progress. Progress is everybody's job and business has made an incalculable contribution to the Nation's progress in raising our standard of living. Providing jobs at unprecedented levels, and managing the greatest economy in the history of civilization. Nevertheless, there is much more than we can do, namely, by getting involved in our political process and providing fresh, strong leadership to public affairs.

One of the most heartening developments in American business has been its expanding activities in public affairs. This must be intensified as a major responsibility to the society in which we are an integral part. We must work with all elements of the community, especially with labor. Fortunately, the areas of business and labor's common interest in politics far exceed the areas of disagreement.

Both business and labor are interested in good government.

Both want efficiency in government.

Both want honest and competent public officials.

Both are interested in greater citizen involvement in politics.

Both have a common interest in developing an informed electorate.

Both want to see qualified candidates stand for public offices.

Both have a vital stake in the methods and procedures by which candidates are selected.

Both have an interest in housing, education, health, highways, clean air, clean water, war and peace, taxes, spending, and other issues of the day.

We may differ at times as to the best method for achieving these goals, and as to the nature and extent of the role of government in attaining them, but we should agree on basic objectives.

The trend, for three decades now, has been to look to government for the solutions of our great problems. So let's just be reasonable. You and I are not going to change this. But, by participation in public affairs and all-out involvement in the politics of this great land, you and I can insure that the solutions will come *through government* and not *by* government.

If we work together—wherever the circumstances permit—our potential service to the Nation can be of historic significance. With all my heart, I say to you: Let's try it—and let's keep working at it—until we make it work!

Boost Mail Rates Fairly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BYRON G. ROGERS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1967

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I have received a number of protests from residents of my district about the schedule of postal rate increases recommended by the House Post Office Subcommittee. I am in full accord with their sentiments.

They cannot understand why the subcommittee has seen fit to raise the cost of other classes of mail much more substantially than bulk third-class rates, which already are disproportionately low. Neither can I. The administration had submitted a suggested schedule which would have corrected some of the existing inequities and more or less balanced rates with costs for each class of mail. The subcommittee has discarded this eminently fair approach to a longstanding problem.

In an editorial in the July 28 edition, the Denver Post has pointed out the inconsistency of the subcommittee's recommendations. I would also call attention to the Post's admirable acknowledgement that newspapers should pay the full cost of the service they get.

Mr. Speaker, I append the text of the editorial:

BOOST MAIL RATES FAIRLY

Somehow, we have a feeling John Q. Public is not going to approve fully of the way a House Post Office subcommittee went about raising mail rates the other day. Neither do we.

In order to reduce a whopping deficit and improve postal service, the Johnson administration has proposed a raise of roughly 20 per cent on most classes of mail rates.

As the bill came out of the House subcommittee, however, changes had been made. Instead of airmail rates going up one cent next year, from 8 to 9 cents per letter, the boost would be two cents—a percentage raise of 25 per cent.

But raises on third-class "junk" mail—advertising circulars, samples, etc.—were cut back so rates would go up only about 8 per cent a year over a three-year period. The administration had proposed a 31 per cent boost in these rates, effective Jan. 1, 1968.

The subcommittee's version, we submit, is not the fair way to go about reducing the deficit of $1.2 billion the Postoffice Department ran up last year. The department figures that the biggest single chunk of the deficit, $309 million, is attributable to third-class "junk" mail. Present bulk third class rates cover only 61.2 per cent of handling costs for that class of mail.

The next largest chunk of that $1.2 billion deficit, incidentally, is attributable to regular second-class mail, mainly mass-circulation magazines and newspapers. Last year the loss on handling this class of mail, the department figures, was $236 million. These publications, which pay only 29.3 per cent of their fair share of mailing costs, are due for a 23 per cent boost.

First class mail, by contrast, pays 103 per cent of what it costs to handle it now; would pay 1233 per cent if postage for a first class letter were raised, as proposed, from 5 to 6 cents per ounce.

Air mail, which now pays 105.3 per cent of its costs at 8 cents per ounce, would pay 118.5 per cent if the rate were boosted to 9 cents, as the administration proposes, and around 130 per cent if boosted to 10 cents, as the House subcommittee suggests.

By law, rates on first class and air mail must cover the costs of handling, plus "an additional amount representing the fair value" of the preferential treatment it receives. But when that extra amount gets up to 30 per cent, it seems to us it's getting out of line.

The Post has long favored making all major senders of commercial mail—newspapers, magazines and direct mail advertisers—pay the full cost of the service they get. The administration proposal was a sizable step toward that goal.

We hope that Congress, before it finishes with the postal bill, goes back to the administration's concept of increased fairness in rates.

A Pattern in Riots

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1967

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I think it is imperative that President Johnson's newly appointed urban riot committee at least consider the possibility that Communist agitation in America is a contributing factor to the recent outbreaks of violence. When two responsible newspapers such as the Chicago Tribune and the Sunday Star print editorials suggesting that the Communists might be partially responsible, then I consider it a suggestion not to be taken lightly.

I am including the editorials from the July 28 Tribune and the July 30 Star at this point in the RECORD in hopes that those assigned to investigate the riots will arrive at explanatory conclusions more convincing to the public than rejected rat extermination bills.

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Tribune, July 28, 1967]

A Patten in Riots?

Rioters ripped thru the Negro district of Newark. For days and nights they burned and looted vast areas in Detroit, sniping at policemen. The shooting, burning, and looting spread to other cities in a rash of racial violence. Was there any discernible pattern to this madness?

At a news conference yesterday, former President Eisenhower suggested that the Federal Bureau of Investigation should be asked to find an answer to this question. Only the day before the Republican coordinating committe, the party's highest policy making body, had declared that mounting evidence indicated the riots in city after city may be the result of "organized planning and execution on a national scale."

If they are, some of the young "black power" militants seem bent on taking credit for what they call rebellions or insurrections in the cities. One black extremist, Stokely Carmichael, former chairman of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating committee, made this claim from the safety of communist Cuba even as his successor in S. N. C. C., H. Rap Brown, was arrested on a charge of inciting racial disorders in Cambridge, Md.

Carmichael, in Cuba to attend a communist-sponsored meeting of hemisphere left-wing organizations, declared that Negro militants applied the tactics of guerrilla warfare in the Newark riots. Other urban guerrillas are being prepared to fight in other cities in a "struggle to the death," Carmichael said.

At Newark, in a clandestine meeting with reporters for Life magazine, a gang of Negro snipers who had been shooting at policemen and firemen blandly confirmed that they were in fact just such guerrilla fighters.

Recruited in Mississippi, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and California, the snipers told of having deserted the "nonviolent" movement to take up direct action with guns. Sniping, they argued, could do even more for their cause than putting the torch to the cities.

If the Newark guerrillas preferred rifles and shooting, H. Rap Brown, S. N. C. C.'s current national chairman, still advocated fire. As he was being hauled off to jail in Washington, after his airport arrest by the FBI on a fugitive warrant, Brown screamed at reporters: "We built this country up and we'll burn it down.

If these riots are rebellions, as the young black militants describe them, then, in the eyes of one of their heroes, Adam Clayton Powell, the ousted Harlem congressman, "they are a necessary phase of the black revolution."

The voices of a few moderate Negro leaders struggled to be heard above the voices of barbarism. In a joint statement, the Rev. Martin Luther King Jr., A. Philip Randolph, Roy Wilkins, and Whitney M. Young Jr. called for an end to all rioting and mob law. Such violence, they said, only destroys the Negro community and its people.

The FBI should take ex-President Eisenhower's suggestion that it find out who is running the riots. It is difficult to imagine who could possibly benefit more from organized anarchy than the Communists and their fellow travelers.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, July 30, 1967]

Are the Riots Spontaneous or Planned?

As the rioting eased off, at least temporarily, in Newark and Detroit, not to mention a score of other cities large and small, both official and public attention in Washington began to focus on the story behind the killing, the burning and the looting.

What brought on this "time of violence and tragedy" in July, 1967? Were the riots more or less spontaneous eruptions on the part of oppressed Negroes? Was there at least some measure of planning and organization behind them? Did the Communists play a part, and if so what was their role?

It is doubtful that all of the questions can ever be answered. But the effort will be made. There is much pressure on Capitol Hill for an investigation by some congressional committee. And the President acted on Thursday night to establish an 11-member commission to conduct an investigation in his behalf.

In the address in which he announced the appointment of this commission, Mr. Johnson said that "the only genuine, long-range solution for what has happened lies in an attack—mounted at every level—upon the conditions which breed despair and violence. All of us know what they are: ignorance, discrimination, slums, disease, not enough jobs . . ."

This, as far as it goes, is true enough. But there are two things to be said about it. One is that this is indeed a long-range solution. It will take a decade or more to remedy the conditions enumerated by the President. Nor can the riots in places such as Detroit and Plainfield be explained away by reference to slums and lack of jobs. For those conditions were not present in any significant degree.

Furthermore, if even one of these riots was the product of some other cause than slums and unemployment, this country cannot wait 10 years to uncover that cause and destroy it. The price which will have been exacted by continuous rioting is much too high.

What we have in mind is the rather widely held belief that at least some of the riots, and perhaps the worst ones, were planned, organized and directed by sinister forces embarked upon a policy of rule-or-ruin.

The President passed this over lightly. He said his commission will have access to facts gathered by the FBI and that J. Edgar Hoover's agency "will continue to exercise its full authority to investigate these riots, in accordance with my standing instructions, and to continue to search for evidence of a conspiracy."

This is a somewhat ambiguous statement. As far as we know there has not been a full-scale investigation of the riots, and since, the authority of the FBI is supposed to extend only to violations of federal law, what did the President mean when he said the agency will "continue to exercise its full authority" to investigate the riots? Furthermore, the comment that the FBI will "continue to search for evidence of conspiracy" implies that no such evidence has yet been found.

Perhaps there has been no conspiracy, and if not it follows that there would be no evidence of one. For our part, we are not aware of the existence of any such evidence in the strict sense of the term.

There is, however, a considerable body of information to suggest that there has been a conspiracy.

In the absence of any planning or organization or training, it is difficult to account for the widespread sniper activity in Detroit. In a dispatch from Havana a few days ago, Stokely Carmichael is quoted as follows: "In Newark, we are applying the tactics of guerrilla warfare. We are preparing groups of urban guerrillas for our defense in the cities." Chicago's Mayor Daley has said: "We know this is a national program of outlawry and violence." Some other local officials have said much the same thing.

In its issue of July 28, Life magazine tells of a "clandestine" meeting between its reporters and some of the Newark snipers. These snipers belong to an organized group of former civil rights workers in Mississippi. According to the magazine, one of the snipers said there were more than 50 members of the group, more than half coming from Newark. "Others had been moved in for the action from California, Ohio, Pennsylvania." This certainly is not inconsistent with the remarks attributed to Stokely Carmichael in Havana.

More positive indications of organization and conspiracy can be found in a book by Phillip Abbott Luce, until recently an active Communist. The Luce book, "Road to Revolution," is reviewed on Page G–3 of today's Star.

Exposés by former Communists are suspect, as Whittaker Chambers learned in the Alger Hiss case. But The Star has been reliably informed that Luce's break with the party is real.

In any event, what he has to say is interesting. It can be and should be checked out carefully.

Luce begins by saying that the Communists are "counting on the premise that most Americans will discount the possibility of a guerrilla war in their country. The notion of a guerrilla war in the United States is so outrageous and improbable to Americans that they would receive it as the product of a deranged mind." Well, many Americans and most "responsible" Cubans felt the same way, to the subsequent dismay of the latter, when Fidel Castro and his tiny band of followers first went ashore in Cuba.

Luce, noting that Communists exploit

trouble rather than incite it, goes on to spell out in detail the Communist plan to foment racial trouble in this country and then to exploit it through guerrilla tactics. He reminds us that a grand jury which investigated last summer's Cleveland riot found that "the outbreak of lawlessness and disorder was organized, precipitated and exploited by a relatively small group of trained and disciplined professionals at this business." He also recalls that the Harlem riots in 1964 produced similar findings and that one Bill Epton, a Communist, was indicted and convicted of criminal anarchy for his role in those riots.

None of this may amount to "evidence" in the legal sense as far as this month's riots go. But, taken together, it strongly suggests that there is a conspiratorial underpinning of the current riots, and it is a possibility which deserves more serious attention by the investigators than is invited by the President's casual reference to it.

A crucial matter at stake now, or so it seems to us, is the struggle for control of, or direction of, the Negro community. Who will prevail? Such men as Martin Luther King Jr., A. Philip Randolph, Roy Wilkins and Whitney M. Young Jr.? Or will it be the H. Rap Browns and the Stokely Carmichaels?

A great deal more than the future of civil rights depends on the answer. It is conceivable, quite conceivable, that what really hangs in the balance is the choice between a race war in the United States and a state of affairs in which the white and colored communities can live togetther in peace.

This is why it is so important to put politics aside and dig up the truth, the whole truth, about the riots and their causes. And this is why it is also so important for the members of Congress and the people they represent not to yield to what the President spoke of as "fear and bitterness"—to any state of mind which would indefinitely delay reconciliation and reconstruction at a dreadful cost in human lives and human values.

In Tribute to John E. Franson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1967

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, on July 22, John E. Franson, forest supervisor of the national forests in Mississippi, succumbed to a heart attack. He was a good and respected friend, and an outstanding leader in promoting the conservation and use of forest resources in Mississippi.

During his long years of dedicated public service with the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Forest Service, he also applied his professional skills on national forests in Michigan, New Hampshire, and Pennsylvania.

He inspired fellow employees and State and county officials to actions aimed at better protection and conservation of natural resources. He did an exceptional job of communicating to public officials and the public, all activities and accomplishments on the national forests.

Mr. Franson's leadership manifested itself in the initiation of progressive management programs on the Mississippi national forests and in a strong spirit of cooperation with the State's public and private agencies directed toward better mutual understanding and working relationships. This resulted in such achievements as improved wildlife habitat, an effective range management program, more road construction and better road design, fewer forest fires and less damage to the State's natural resources, and jobs for people on forest beautification and recreation projects.

Indeed, the State of Mississippi has lost one of its most ardent champions of conservation. His good works remain with us.

Vietnam Is Something Else, Says Veteran

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1967

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, it is difficult to imagine American fightingmen being sent into battle with the restriction that they cannot fire upon the enemy until fired upon by themselves.

It is difficult to imagine American soldiers under orders to withhold their fire while Vietcong set up gun or mortar emplacements, and do nothing about it until the Communist enemy opens fire on the Americans.

These and other incredible restraints on our men are detailed in a startling interview with a Vietnam veteran published this past weekend by the Muncie, Ind., Press.

This is the type of news that the Congress is not getting from the administration and its chief architect of the no-win, Edsel-type war, Robert Strange McNamara.

A 41-year-old Seabee who is a veteran of World War II, Korea, and Vietnam explains vividly why we are not winning in Vietnam, and how American lives are being jeopardized and lost in an impossible military situation.

This excellent article by Mr. Warren Collier of the Muncie Press should be read by every Member of the 90th Congress.

The article follows:

VIETNAM IS SOMETHING ELSE, SAYS VETERAN

(By Warren Collier)

Fighting wars is nothing new for Darrell Hines, 41-year-old veteran of both World Wor II and the Korean Conflict, but he agrees that the Vietnam War is something completely different from all others.

Hines, who is home on a 36-day leave visiting his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Hugh Hines, 2108 S. Jefferson, has seen 11 months of action in Vietnam and still doesn't understand what it's all about.

VIETNAM YOUTH "RIDE HONDAS"

"I'm not anxious to go back, but my orders say I have to," he told a reporter.

He can't understand why one side in the war uses a road for convoys 12 hours a day, then gets off the road so the enemy can use it the next 12 hours.

He says U.S. troops are not allowed to fire at the enemy unless fired upon, and he can't understand why.

He can't understand why 18 and 19-year-old American youths are being drafted to fight in Vietnam and Vietnamese youths of the same age "are riding Hondas and stealing off Americans."

Hines didn't have to get into the Vietnam Conflict. He served with the U.S. Navy both during World War II and the Korean Conflict, then enlisted in the Seebees 15 months ago when he read that instructors were needed.

He said he has done very little instructing.

"As a matter of fact—Seebees are supposed to be builders, but we do very little building either. Mostly, we fight."

Hines, who is ranked as a Builder Second Class, asserted:

"There is nothing like this war—this is nothing like any other war. Some of the people who kill or try to kill us at night work for us during the day."

SHAVED BY DAY, KILLED BY NIGHT

He said in one instance, after a night raid, the body count revealed one man was a daytime barber for the American troops.

"He was shaving us and cutting our hair during the day and trying to kill us at night," Hines said.

Hines said purpose of the Seebees is to build where it is needed and said his duties have taken him throughout the conflict, fighting side-by-side with Marines, Army and Navy.

He said almost all the fighting is done in jungles and rice paddies.

"There are a lot of Viet Cong being killed, but it is estimated it takes 17,000 rounds of ammunition for every one," he said.

Despite the handicaps, Hines said morale of the American troops is "extremely high."

"The war is hard to figure out, but the morale of the troops is very good," he said.

He said when troops sail down the river it is designated "which side is friendly and which side is enemy."

He asserted:

"FRIENDLY SIDE SHOOTS AT US"

"The big trouble with that is, it seems as though it's always the friendly side shooting at you. You are not allowed to fire back because that side has been designated as the friendly side."

He said "they" set the policy, but couldn't identify who "they" are.

"When you're sailing down the Mekong River and 'they' say the port side is friendly and the starboard side is enemy, that's the way it is—even if the friendly side is shooting at you and there is no noise from the enemy side."

He said "why" is something none of the troops have been able to figure out.

Hines said regular troops cannot carry arms while on leave in Saigon, but said there is almost constant danger from Viet Cong terrorists.

"The hotel I live in was blown up twice—the first time they killed 37 Americans," he said.

He said U.S. troops are encouraged to remain in small groups of not more than two or three.

"Grenades are hard to get and the Cong won't use one unless he thinks he can kill several U.S. soldiers or South Vietnamese," Hines said.

BOMBS PLANTED IN BIKE BASKETS

He said a favorite manuever for the Viet Cong is to plant an explosive with a timer in a bicycle basket under a pile of homemade bread, then park the bike against a building where South Vietnamese or U.S. troops are gathered.

"By the time it goes off the person who parked the bike has disappeared and no one knows who is responsible," he said. "They usually kill a few people."

He said a maid pulled the pin on a grenade, wrapped it in mud and allowed the mud to harden. She put it inside a U.S. sergeant's shower. When the sergeant showered the water and steam softened the mud, the detonator was released, the grenade exploded and the sergeant was killed.

Hines said "rules of procedure" allow U.S. convoys to use roads from 6 a.m. until 6 p.m.

then the Viet Cong use the same roads from 6 p.m. until 6 a.m.

CONG STEALS OUR GASOLINE

The same is true of air strips.

"The Cong don't have many planes, but they sometimes use our gasoline for their vehicles," he said.

One of his favorite gripes is drafting of young men here to fight in Vietnam, while the young Vietnamese are "having a good time."

"They are taking the young kids in this country and making them go over there and fight," Hines said. "Vietnamese kids of the same age are riding Hondas down the streets and stealing off of us. It's their country and they should be the kids who are doing the fighting."

He said U.S. soldiers have now learned to use leather bands on their watches instead of stretch bands.

"They steal your watch off your wrist or your ring off your finger," he said. "They'll even cut the pocket out of your trousers and take your billfold without you knowing it."

Hines said it's difficult for the troops to understand why they cannot fire at the enemy until they are fired on.

"We can watch the Viet Cong setting up a gun or mortar position in a field and can't do a thing about it until they fire at us," he said.

"THEY CAN'T ANSWER, EITHER"

When he was asked "why" such a policy was established he answered: "You could ask 400,000 soldiers and Marines why and they couldn't answer either."

Hines said:

"You just couldn't believe how the war is fought. It's like you stepped across a line and hit me in the nose, then jumped back across the line so I couldn't do anything about it."

Hines is due back in Vietnam early next month, but cautioned:

"Don't make me out to be a hero. There are a lot of dead kids over there."

The 45th Birthday of Radio Station WJAG, of Norfolk, Nebr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT V. DENNEY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1967

Mr. DENNEY. Mr. Speaker, if our democracy is to maintain its strength and vigor it must be grounded in a strong public interest. As we all know, newspapers and radios contribute strongly toward an informed citizenry and, therefore, to strong public interest in our Nation.

Radio station WJAG, of Norfolk, Nebr., has recently celebrated its 45th birthday. It is to this station's 45 years of continual public service that I call the attention of my colleagues.

One of the oldest stations in the Midwest, WJAG has not changed ownership since it obtained its first Federal license on July 26, 1922. Founded by Gene Huss, and now directed by his son, Jerry Huss, this broadcasting organization has been expanded over the years to four stations now called the Beef Empire stations.

Bob Thomas, a good friend and another second-generation son of the station, is the very able vice president and general manager of the Beef Empire stations. His father, Art Thomas, was a past manager of WJAG.

Mr. Speaker, WJAG and other stations like it have made the job of representing our constituents well considerably easier by their continual efforts to educate their listeners on the issues and events of our country. It is fitting and proper that we recognize WJAG's contribution in this area as she celebrates her 45th birthday.

High Interest Rates Mean High Unemployment, Expert Warns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1967

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, on July 25, 1967, I inserted a statement in the RECORD concerning the meaning of tight money. Inadvertently, the first paragraph which credited the author of this article was omitted. Because I want the author to receive proper credit and because this article has been distributed by Press Associates, Inc., to nearly 300 labor publications, I ask that the entire article be reprinted today.

The author of this article is Dr. Byron L. Johnson, a former Member of the House of Representatives from the State of Colorado. He is presently professor of economics at the University of Colorado and chairman of the National Council for Sound Monetary Policy.

The article, entitled "High Interest Rates Mean High Unemployment, Expert Warns," follows:

DENVER (PAI).—The tight money doctors are peddling their patent medicine again. Early this year, they were in hiding, as interest rates were falling. This summer, more than three million are unemployed. Yet the money-changers are back in control of the temple of America. They preach that high interest is helping fight the old devil—inflation. But high interest doesn't fight inflation, it feeds inflation. It doesn't help the economy; it adds to unemployment. The new higher interest policy is uneconomic, unnecessary, unfair and tragic for America.

It is uneconomic because interest is a cost of production. Increasing the price of money raises prices just as does raising the price of steel. Production is down, unemployment is up. The threat of inflation is a phony argument for a policy that hurts the worker, but helps the banker.

If rates had been lower last year, the nation could have built another half million housing units despite the Vietnam war. This would have given jobs to another million men: for on-site construction, materials and supplies, and household appliances and goods. This would not have interfered with any other vital activity. America would have been more prosperous.

Instead, those who bought homes paid heavily for high interest, and for the "points" on the mortgage. ("Points" are a discount on the mortgage. At 7 points, you sign for $10,000, but get only $9,300.) The builder adds as much as $1,000 to the cost of the house to cover this discount. Each 1% increase in interest rates raises the interest charge on a $15,000 mortgage by $150 a year.

If you can get a 6.5% loan for 25 years today, total interest payments will be higher than the actual mortgage itself: A $15,000 mortgage will cost $101.29 a month or $30,387 to retire. If rates were back at the old and reasonable price of 4.5%, the $83.38 monthly cost would be $5,373 lower over the 25 years.

So fewer people can now afford houses. Fewer are built. Fewer workers are employed. And the economists too often bless this by calling it a "trade-off" between full employment and inflation. Some trade! And the worker whose job is being "traded-off" is not allowed at the bargaining table! Nor is the guy who wanted to buy a house, but couldn't afford the higher interest. The money changers do all the trading for them both.

The higher interest charges are also unnecessary. Three million unemployed is *not* full employment. And if we had it, and needed to cut back on borrowing, there are better answers than higher interest. Economists and government officials are equally guilty of failing to discuss the alternatives. Higher down payments would restrain borrowing. So would shorter length loans that must be repaid faster. And banks could become more strict in granting loans. And when the economy approaches full employment, the nation can also raise taxes.

High interest is unfair. It takes more from the workers, the farmers and the small businessmen. Most of the big companies are using their own money, so they aren't hurt. The interest payments go to the wealthy few, and to the banks. The high interest goes to the 5% who own 85% of the government bonds, for instance. It is the young and the minority groups who suffer most of the unemployment that high interest encourages.

But most of all, high interest is tragic for America. "The billions that go to interest," as Ed Hart, founder of the National Council, has warned, "mean that America cannot afford the money needed for schools, for urban renewal, for mass transit, for recreation and conservation. The more we have to pay moneylenders the less we have for essential national services." This is even more true today with the cost of the Vietnam war.

Americans were promised a war on poverty. The hopes of tens of millions were raised by promises of good housing, better education, more jobs. As interest rates rise, these hopes fall. And it is no secret that the long hot summers of protest and riot are the fruits of past delay and neglect. High interest rates lengthen the delay, encourage the neglect. They feed the resulting tragedies. The tight-money doctors are making America sicker, not healing her.

What Is This?—Blackmail?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1967

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, in February 1959, Lyndon Johnson, then Senator, urged a group of members of the National Rural Electric Cooperatives, meeting in the Capital, to fight for their rights in Congress, saying:

> I don't know how many beer bottles you folks have, but the time has come when you must ask no quarter and give none. Fight them . . . in the corridors of the Capitol, in each House, generate public opinion, support your organization—and eventually, if necessary, use your beer bottles.

Democrat Congressman THOMAS G. ABERNETHY, on the House floor on July 25, 1967, criticized the President for seeking minority votes by joining their chant, "We Shall Overcome."

Vice President HUMPHREY, speaking in New Orleans on July 18, 1966, stated:

> If I had to live in a slum, I think you would have had more trouble than you've had already, because I've got enough spark left in me to lead a mighty good revolt.

With top leaders of our country making such statements, it is easier, to understand, but no less reprehensible, when militant civil rights leaders travel the country making inflammatory statements and speeches.

Stokely Carmichael, now showing his true Red color in Havana, in a speech in Florida referred to the bricking up of walls where formerly windows had been broken by Molotov cocktails. He said:

> We are coming back next time with dynamite.

In Havana he said:

> This fight is not going to be a simple street meeting. It is going to be a fight to the death.

His successor as head of the Student "Nonviolent" Coordinating Committee, H. Rap Brown, is presently free on bail, accused of inciting the Cambridge riots. Among many inflammatory statements of which he is quoted were:

> I don't know who burned the school down, but you should have burned it down long ago.

And—

> You better get yourselves some guns.

When arrested, he said:

> We built this country and we'll tear it down.

At a more recent press conference, Brown stated:

> If Washington, D.C., don't come around, Washington, D.C., should be burned down.

Max Stanford, field chairman of the Revolutionary Action Movement—RAM—a highly secret all-Negro, Marxist-Leninist, Chinese-Communist-oriented organization, had been in frequent contach with Stokely Carmichael. He threatened to "disrupt the whole country," and called for "burning down Washington," and said:

> If we don't get justice, we're going to tear this country apart.

Since 1961, according to the Library of Congress, there have been 128 riots of national importance in the United States; some involving Negroes, some whites, and some both. Most of these were racial disturbances.

With each new riot, a representative of the Urban League, or the NAACP, or CORE, or some other Negro group, blames it on the lack of Federal spending for poverty elimination, and states emphatically that riots will continue until massive funds are channeled into the ghettos.

What is this? Blackmail? How can anyone define it in any other terms? Have Americans become so conditioned to such illegal pressures that they no longer speak up? When Castro demanded ransom, we paid it in spite of a great outcry from those who retain a spark of the American spirit and courage which prompted those immortal words, "Millions for defense, but not one cent for tribute."

And since then we have witnessed repeated use of this dirtiest of all pressure tactics in both national and international affairs, and with each failure to oppose it, blackmail has come more to be considered an honorable means of obtaining that which logic and argument cannot convince has merit.

The answer to these grasping, ungrateful, power-seeking leaders should be for Congress to declare that help will be forthcoming in direct proportion to the degree of self-help evident in an area. It does not cost anything to clean a place up; it takes only effort to clear weeds and remove trash; it requires but one thing to start an improvement program, and that is desire. Then, and only then, when the effort has been started, should funds be provided for grass seed, for building materials, and for other necessities, and for job training.

Spending of massive sums in urban renewal types of slum clearance is but a temporary wash job unless it is accompanied by massive efforts by those who have influence—the white and Negro leaders of the area—who will devote their talents to uplifting the slum residents to self-sufficiency. How much more constructive and really helpful would such a leader be than one who exhorts to murder, robbery, and arson.

The funds spent for welfare, antipoverty programs, job training, housing, and urban renewal have run into the billions. The projects have been sold on the basis of helping to eliminate the ghettos, the slums, and poverty generally. As project upon project has been added, and million dollars upon million dollars, so have riots increased in size, intensity, and numbers.

The idea has proved wrong, just as the welfare state throughout history has failed. Yet, with every new disturbance, the same voices are heard condemning those who will not vote for enlarging the very plans which have failed so miserably.

Congressman ABERNETHY rightfully criticized the liberal elements of both parties for sowing the seeds of rebellion. The riots are the result "of the political bidding contest the two parties have been engaged in, in their all-out effort to get the minority racial vote," he said. In spite of all the assistance given, the situation worsened because, as he said, "The black power boys came back for more, and more, and more, and more."

As Dr. Joseph Jackson, great Negro leader of the National Baptist Convention, says:

> No sociologist has yet told us what corrupts the human spirit more, poverty or wealth. I am convinced that men have the power to withstand and defy an evil environment.

We hear that these ghettos are tinder dry, and just waiting for a spark to ignite them into an inferno, that such ignition is spontaneous when conditions get to a certain combination of elements, just as a fire starts by spontaneous combustion in a home. Rubbish. Consider the "elements" of the Detroit riot.

Police raided an after-hours drinking establishment at 5 o'clock on a Sunday morning—nice lawful endeavor, so the police were wrong in interfering. "Spontaneously," 200 bottle-and-rock-throwing persons gathered at 5 a.m. Then, again "spontaneously," fires erupted throughout the neighborhood. Firemen raced to the scene, and, as they got out to begin battling the blazes, sniper fire broke out from the rooftops. It was a consistent pattern throughout the area—but it was "spontaneous."

Again I say, rubbish. Unrehearsed mobs do not gather and then disperse through an area, with individuals each doing the identical thing in an identical way at an identical time. Our police departments in these major cities are not the "town constables" of bygone days. They know what is going on, and how it is being done, and would have the situation in hand, if they were not forced by higher authority to use kid gloves.

FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover, now in his 50th year in that agency, can hardly be considered ill-informed. Describing the Negro riots, he said:

> Communists and other subversives and extremists strive and labor ceaselessly to precipitate racial trouble and to take advantage of racial discord in this country. Such elements were active in exploiting and aggravating the riots, for example, in Harlem, Watts, Cleveland, and Chicago.

Our Attorney General, the top law-enforcement official in the Nation, thinks our crime is merely a social problem. So long as he thus continues to think, just so long will hoodlums, whether so-called civil rights leaders or not, continue to enforce their demands upon society by the pure and unadulterated blackmail now being used.

Today, according to some estimates, there are 15 million poor families. Give them each $5,000 a year, for a total cost of $75 billion annually, and what would we have? One hundred seventy-five million people would be poorer; the 15 million families would have lost that much more self-respect and self-reliance, and riots would increase. Instead of being thankful for the $5,000, many would be looking at those making $10,000 and would be rioting to force additional "massive Federal funds" to eliminate the ghettos of poverty.

One of the basic problems is that the administration promised far more than it could give, legislatively or financially, and gave far more than could be responsibly absorbed. The Negro people can be helped, but self-help must be accompanied by self-responsibility, and remain a major portion of the assistance program. In the meantime, insurrection must be stopped, and now is the time.

Newark: Lesson for the Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1967

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, in these times of turmoil and violence throughout America, we must be firm in our uncompromising support for law enforcement and the immediate cessation of lawlessness, for the successful functioning of society demands the maintenance of order and citizen responsibility.

But we cannot react to these conditions with the passage of punitive legislation that would further frustrate the communities of which the rioters are only a small part. Likewise, we cannot indiscriminately heap rewards on these areas because this would encourage the other depressed communities to riot in the hope of Government funds.

Rather, we must try to understand the reasons for the rioting and make a sincere effort to solve the problem with the future of society in mind.

I, therefore, call your attention to the Los Angeles Times article "Newark: Lesson for the Nation," and insert it into the RECORD:

NEWARK: LESSON FOR THE NATION

Little can be said about the Newark and Plainfield riots that has not been said before, but repetition does not detract from the essential truths which define these tragic incidents. These are truths the American people must accept and act upon, for what is at stake is nothing less than the kind of nation we are to have.

The violence, the arson, the looting we have been witnessing can never be condoned or justified as legitimate expressions of grievances. Whatever its motivation, lawlessness must always be put down as quickly as possible, for it is something that threatens the basic processes by which men undertake to live together in something approaching civilized society.

But simply to condemn lawlessness, and specifically the anti-social behavior of young Negroes in the nation's cities, is not enough. It is not even a starting point.

These outbreaks must be seen more as effects than causes of the problems we face. Until those causes are understood and adequate steps are taken to eliminate them, the processes and meaning of civilized society will equally be endangered.

It is no secret that environment in many ways determines human behavior. For the urban Negro that environment, shaped through more than three centuries of our history, too often is one in which poverty, joblessness, discrimination, ignorance and brutality predominate. Frustration, anger, the proclivity toward violence that have become frighteningly commonplace spring largely from these conditions.

Newark was virtually a classic laboratory example. It is a city with a majority Negro population, but one which is for the most part politically impotent. Unemployment, poor housing, high crime rates are the statistical evidence of its problems, and this evidence is repeated elsewhere in the nation.

Halting the violence, punishing the perpetrators are necessary steps, but they alone won't resolve the underlying causes of the explosion. This is the overwhelming fact we must face.

The prescription for dealing with these casual conditions is not new. A massive investment by all levels of government and by private enterprise to attack the roots of the crisis is an urgent necessity. Jobs, housing, better schooling and improved police-Negro community relations are imperative.

Most of all, perhaps, there must be a determined act of will by the white population to understand, and not simply to condemn, what is behind the urban Negro problem. For how that problem is faced will do much to decide the future of our society.

G. W. F. Cavender Promoted to National Rural Development Post

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 26, 1967

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, Mr. G. W. F. Cavender, formerly director of the Farmers Home Administration in Tennessee, has been promoted to the position of chief of FHA's National Rural Area Development Division.

Mr. Thomas A. Lemond has been promoted to Mr. Cavender's former position as State FHA Director in Tennessee.

Mr. Cavender is a dedicated, highly qualified leader in rural development, and Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman is to be commended and congratulated for his appointment of Mr. Cavender to the national post as Director of the national rural development effort in the FHA.

Mr. Cavender knows the need—he knows the programs available—he knows the significance of rural development—and he will, I am sure, make a major contribution to this most important work. In this connection, Mr. Nat Caldwell, a distinguished writer, journalist, and economic development leader, has written an article in the Nashville Tennessean in regard to these appointments.

In view of the importance of these developments to my colleagues and to the Nation generally, I insert Mr. Caldwell's articles in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The article follows:

USDA PROMOTES TWO TOP STATE RURAL AIDES

(By Nat Caldwell)

Two of Tennessee's outstanding rural area development leaders, G. W. F. Cavender and Thomas A. Lemond, were promoted yesterday by U.S. Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman.

Cavender, Tennessee state director for the Farmers Home Administration for the past five and a half years, was promoted to chief of FHA's national rural area development division.

Lemond, for the past six years consultant in rural development for the Rural Electrification Administration, a USDA division, is to succeed Cavender.

The two have worked closely together in a number of projects that have won Tennessee national recognition for extending utilities to rural areas, paving the way for industrialization.

Freeman said the appointment of Cavender to the national post was another step by the department "to end the migration of rural people to large cities by helping small communities revitalize themselves."

As an assistant to FHA Administrator Howard Bertsch, Cavender will be responsible for directing the agency's outreach function, including assistance to rural area planning and development groups, help in extending services of numerous federal agencies to rural areas, and help in drawing up economic development plans for rural areas and in carrying them out.

This work is in line with President Johnson's directive to federal agencies to help meet unsatisfied rural needs.

The recent announcement of the Carrier Corporation's big $15 million heavy duty air conditioning plant at Morrison, a Warren County village, followed a collaboration of FHA and the Caney Fork Electric Cooperative in procuring an industrial water supply for Morrison.

Bertsch came to Tennessee a year ago for a tour of the six Warren County utility districts financed by FHA. At the time he predicted major industrial development would follow the extension of water supply and heavy duty electrical service to the six communities, including Morrison.

At the time he disclosed to Tenneessee FHA personnel that he would seek to obtain Cavender as his national assistant in the rural areas development activity.

Lemond has been assigned by REA to assist in demonstration development projects ranging from industry recruiting to recreation projects throughout the Appalachian area of 10 states.

Cavender has conducted indoctrination courses for Department of Agriculture officials seeking to broaden their development activities in every section of the country in the past three months.

After holding every type of post in the agricultural agency field from county agent to assistant state commission of agriculture, Cavender expressed "deep regret" at leaving Tennessee for a Washington assignment.

"But I expect to continue deeply interested in the progress of Tennessee's rural areas and, of course, will return here to live upon my retirement from the federal service," Cavendar added.

Lemond, a Trenton druggist and farmer before he joined REA as a part time consultant six years ago, said he anticipated that the principal goals of FHA in Tennessee will continue as they were under Cavender.

Clarence Redmond, rural area development representative for Caney Fork Electric Cooperative, which has received national recognition for its successes in creating new rural jobs, said:

"The rural people of Tennessee and the nation will expect a sharp increase in rural job opportunities as a result of the promotions given to two of the most successful leaders in this field.

"For the past several years we have expected that FHA would come through with the credit for our rural water systems. Now Warren, Lawrence, and several other Tennessee counties are witihn shouting distance of 90% water service for all their rural citizens. We are setting our sights now on extension of sewer service where needed and on industrial development."

Fred Vinson: Congressman from Kentucky—A Political Biography: 1890–1938

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL D. PERKINS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1967

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, those of us who knew that great Kentuckian, Fred M. Vinson, are pleased to see the important place he is being given in the history of the 1930's and 1940's.

In that connection, I wish to call the attention of the House to a doctoral dissertation on Fred Vinson written by a Chief Master Sergeant in the Air Force, John H. Hatcher.

This gentleman, who comes from my

district in Kentucky, will receive his doctor of philosophy degree at the University of Cincinnati next month on the basis of his dissertation dealing with the former Chief Justice. He will be the first Air Force airman to receive a doctoral degree while on active duty. Sergeant Hatcher, who is 42 years old, is currently assigned to the Headquarters, U.S. European Command, Stuttgart-Vaihingen, Germany.

Mr. Speaker, I include a brief summary of his dissertation on Fred M. Vinson in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

FRED VINSON: CONGRESSMAN FROM KENTUCKY, A POLITICAL BIOGRAPHY: 1890–1938

ABSTRACT

On a September afternoon in 1953, Frederick Moore Vinson, thirteenth Chief Justice of the United States, was laid to rest in a hillside cemetery in Kentucky's Big Sandy Valley, far from the scene of national power where he had spent most of his adult life. The simple rites befitted Fred Vinson for this was the way in which he lived his private life and conducted his public career. His entire adult life had been given over to public service. From the minor local post of Kentucky Commonwealth Attorney, he was elected to the United States House of Representatives in 1923 and, with one two-year interruption, remained there until his resignation in 1938.

From 1938 until the end of his life, he was a prominent figure in national political life, but strangely never developed a large national following. He commenced his judicial career as an Associate Justice of the United States District Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia via Presidential appointment. Chief Justice Stone designated him Chief Judge of the United States Emergency Court of Appeals on March 2, 1942, and Vinson served in both capacities until his resignation May 27, 1943, to become Director of the Office of Economic Stabilization, in which capacity he served until March 5, 1945. He was Federal Loan Administrator from March March 6 to April 3, 1945; Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion from April 4 to July 22, 1945; and Secretary of the Treasury from July 23, 1945, to June 23, 1946, at which time he became the thirteenth Chief Justice of the United States. His rise in the national power structure had been steady and showed many signs of logical culmination in the White House.

The dissertation examines the background, childhood, early local career, and the fourteen years Vinson spent in Congress. He was an outstandingly successful product of the American political system; therefore, the dissertation concerns itself with that system and Vinson's formative years upon which his later eminence rested. He was raised in an atmosphere of courtrooms and politics in a section where these things are a way of life. His early school experiences taught him that his intellectual strength and unusual talents were most effective when concealed and employed with seeming casualness. By the time he moved into adult political life his arts of persuasion and compromise were well developed.

Vinson's first five years in Congress were not distinguished for their legislative output. However, it was during this period that he made the successful transition from county courthouse politician to national statesman. After his 1928 defeat in the Hoover landslide, he spent two years perfecting a district political organization which maintained him securely in Congress for the next eight years and continued to do his bidding long afterwards. He remained a potent force in Kentucky politics until his death.

His basic conservatism endeared him to the Southern conservative Democratic bloc and his open admiration of Franklin Roosevelt made him welcome to New Deal ranks. He differed with the President on the single issue of treatment of America's war veterans. This climaxed in open rebellion over the 1933 Economy bill and payment of the World War I bonus. In all other matters, he followed White House instructions faithfully and effectively. While supporting all New Deal legislation, Vinson figured prominently in the construction of the AAA, the Social Security system, legislation affecting the bituminous coal industry, and was prepared to take up the "court fight" in the House pending action in the Senate. His main work in the New Deal Congresses, however, was with the tax-writing Ways and Means Committee. Regardless of the merits of increasing taxes in a depression period the reforms which Vinson forced into the American tax structure were long overdue and have endured.

The dissertation suggests that Vinson's talents were political rather than legal, that he was a loyal supporter rather than a daring innovator. It further suggests that his years in the Congress served as an apprenticeship for his later roles in the national government. Vinson's private papers for the pre-1938 period have been destroyed and his later papers have been sealed by the family. Primary materials found in other collections were of considerable assistance, but the weight of evidence presented rests largely on several hundred interviews conducted over a three-year period and the records of the Congressional Committees on which Vinson served.

A Great Sailor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 11, 1967

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, Louis Stockstill a very able writer, has appropriately paid tribute to Adm. David L. McDonald in the current issue of the Journal of the Armed Forces. He concludes his statement with the salutation, "Well done." I am confident that the entire Congress joins in the same salutation. I submit his editorial comment for reprinting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

A GREAT SAILOR

(By Louis Stockstill)

David L. McDonald was not quite 18 when he entered the U.S. Naval Academy, and had not yet celebrated his 22nd birthday when he departed with his new commission for duty as a junior officer aboard the battleship Mississippi in June 1928.

Next week—on 1 August—as he approaches his 61st birthday and the anniversary of his 43rd year in Naval uniform, he returns to Annapolis to relinquish the highest post a Naval officer can hold.

In the long span of years from midshipman to retirement as Chief of Naval Operation, Admiral McDonald has watched the decimated fleet of the post-WWI period expand and grow into the two-ocean Navy of WWII, and steam into an eventual position of world dominance on the seas, moving ever closer to the nuclear fleet of the future.

For the last four of those years, he has stood at the helm and guided the Navy through the tides of dynamic change. He has worked indefatigably not only to improve ships and weapons and to revamp and strengthen organizational and management functions, but to develop enlightened personnel policies.

As a young officer, David McDonald learned the hard way about some of the Navy's "people" problems. He served in the grades of Ensign and Lt(jg) for more than eight years and was a Lieutenant for another 5½. By 1946, after 18 years' service and as a result of the speedier promotions of WWII, he was a captain, earning princely basic pay of $357 per month. He had to wait 11 years and 7 months for his next promotion.

The sacrifices he made along the way, both for himself and for his family, are all too apparent. So, too, is the obvious fact that he was guided by the challenge of career service, rather than any promise or prospect of financial reward.

Once he had reached the top, however, he did not forget about those still making the long, arduous climb. As CNO, he saw to it that the Navy made renewed efforts to improve both the challenges and the rewards of career service. Creation of the highly effective Alford Task Force and its probing study of ways and means to retain more career Navy men, is but one example of the concern he felt for people.

His successful fight to prevent reduction of the carrier force was no more important in many ways than his equally successful efforts in winning hazardous duty pay for flight deck personnel.

But there can be no realistic summary of his achievements as CNO, just as there can be no capsulized version of the other 39 years he spent in uniform. That would take a book. And even then it might not tell all of the little things that made him—in the words of the President—"a great sailor."

Along with the Navy and the other Services, we salute him. "Well done," Admiral.

Historic Eagle Restored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LARRY WINN, JR.

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1967

Mr. WINN. Mr. Speaker, my friend and constituent, James B. DeMasters, of Overland Park, Kans., has become widely known for his patriotic endeavors. He has composed a motto with 13 words, which explains the American bald eagle, our national symbol, "As the eagle lives nobly and high, our ideals should also be high."

And through Mr. DeMasters' efforts, our most historic stuffed eagle—over 160 years old—has been restored by the Smithsonian Institution for eventual display at Independence Hall. The Architect of the Capitol has a complete file on this work.

Under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Aetna-Izer, July 1967 issue, published by the Aetna Life & Casualty Co., of Hartford, Conn.:

HISTORIC EAGLE RESTORED

Thanks to an Aetna agent in Kansas City, the eagle that served as the model for the United States military insignia and other government art will soon be on display in Independence Hall at Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

In 1962 James B. DeMasters, who is interested in patriotic emblems, learned in a conversation with Conrad Wirth, director of the National Park service, that a stuffed eagle was stored in the basement of Independence Hall.

Mr. DeMasters later wrote to Mr. Wirth suggesting the eagle be put on display. Ensuing correspondence revealed that the eagle had been part of the living menagerie kept by Charles Willson Peale in his Philadelphia museum. After its death in 1805, Mr. Peale mounted it and put it on display.

A year later at the request of Benjamin Latrobe, architect for the capitol being built in Washington, Mr. Peale sent drawings of this American bald eagle to be used as a model for the frieze in the House of Representatives. Two years later the War Department asked Peale to paint the eagle in oils so it could be used as a basis for insignia and regimental flags.

Now almost 160 years later, Mr. DeMasters was assured that the forgotten eagle would be restored and placed in a position of honor.

Independence Hall is currently being rebuilt by the National Park Service and the whole area is being restored to its appearance at the time the Declaration of Independence was signed. When this restoration is complete, the eagle will be put on display in Independence Hall.

Mr. DeMasters received letters commending his efforts from Vice President Hubert Humphrey, J. Edgar Hoover and other government officials.

Centennial of Service of Sisters of St. Benedict in Southern Indiana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROGER H. ZION

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1967

Mr. ZION. Mr. Speaker, the little community of Ferdinand, Ind., in my district has been the home, for a century now, of an order of the Sisters of St. Benedict.

This wonderful body of nuns has performed countless service for the people of southern Indiana. They are about to celebrate the centennial of this service and I am proud to ask that my colleagues mark this occasion.

Max Olinger, of the Huntingburg, Ind., Independent, has written of the festivities planned to mark this anniversary. Under unanimous consent I place this column in the RECORD, as follows:

(By Max Olinger)

This summer the Sisters of St. Benedict of Ferdinand, Indiana, are celebrating their 100th year of service to Southern Indiana. A full week of centennial celebration is planned from July 30 to August 6. Rarely during this "Century of Service" have they made any appeals for funds or support. During this time they have provided nuns for education in our grade schools, educational facilities and personnel for high school students and college girls, personnel for our hospital, and a location for women's religious vocations. This September they are taking a giant step forward by providing a four year coeducational college for all the youth of our area.

The people of Huntingburg have been especially fortunate in having had their services both in the grade school system at St. Mary's and more recently in their excellent operation of our hospital and nursing home. Thousands throughout the land can fondly recall their guiding hand in their various educational, musical, religious, and medicinal efforts.

The comfort of having an excellent hospital is a priceless asset to each individual and to our community. When sickness or accidents occur, one can't begin to put a value on the medical aid and comfort they provide. Upon completion of the new hospital, Huntingburg will have the most modern and best of medical facilities that can be provided.

There will also be a further expansion of the nursing home and extended care for our aged. All this will be provided through the efforts of the Sisters of St. Benedict. Upon completion of the new St. Joseph's Hospital, a training program for nurses will be provided for the youth of our area. This joint effort between the hospital staff and St. Benedict's College will be another very valuable service to our city and to Southern Indiana.

A Salute to the President of Girls' Nation, Miss Cathy Johnson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BUCHANAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1967

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to call to the attention of the Congress the election of Miss Cathy Johnson of Birmingham, Ala., as president of Girls' Nation.

Cathy, who has just finished her junior year at Shades Valley High School, is the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Edward C. Johnson. She is a member of the National Honor Society, French National Honor Society, French Club, American Friends Service Club, pep squad, History Club, a representative on the student council, and will be president of usherettes at her school next year.

A straight "A" student, Miss Johnson is a member of the Shades Valley Presbyterian Church in Birmingham. Prior to her election as the national president, Cathy was elected Alabama Governor of Girls' State and led the Alabama delegation at the 21st annual session of Girls' Nation, now in progress at American University.

Girls' State, culminated by Girls' Nation, is the youth citizenship training program conducted annually by the American Legion Auxiliary to give high school juniors experience in the process of government, preparing them for their approaching citizenship responsibilities.

Girls' State sessions are held each year in State capitals in which high school juniors chosen for qualities of leadership set up their own miniature city, county, and State governments run by the rules of procedure based on State and local law. From Girls' State two senators are selected to represent their consituents at Girls' Nation.

Mr. Speaker, it is a fact that the future of our country rests with our youth. The girls participating in the Girls' Nation convention are preparing themselves for the role they will soon assume in their society. With young people of the quality of these fine young ladies in the Girls' Nation convention taking an active interest in public life, America can look to the future optimistically.

We in Alabama are especially proud of our delegation and of Miss Cathy Johnson. She represents the type of high-thinking, progressive leadership we in Alabama would like to be characteristic of all our political leaders. It is natural then that we have followed with interest the rise of this outstanding young lady. It is with great pride that the people of Alabama salute Miss Cathy Johnson on her election as president of Girls' Nation.

Results of 1967 Public Opinion Questionnaire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. HUNT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1967

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, as a freshman Congressman, I felt it was extremely important to me to know the feelings of the people I represent in the First Congressional District of New Jersey, and for this reason, I distributed a public opinion questionnaire to my constituents.

Their responses have proven to be extremely valuable and show the great concern they feel about the many serious issues facing our country.

The question which seemed to arouse the greatest amount of interest and comments among my constituents was the one involving the war in Vietnam, a matter of concern to all of us. Sixty-nine percent of those polled favored mounting a strategically sound effort for military victory: 17 percent favored holding key positions and trying to negotiate a settlement; only 7 percent favored continuing our present course, and 7 percent favored withdrawing as soon as possible.

Mr. Speaker, I place in the RECORD the seven questions and the answers to my 1967 public opinion questionnaire:

[Results in percent]

1. What should we do about Vietnam?

Continue our present course	7
Mount a strategically sound effort for military victory	69
Hold key positions and try to negotiate a settlement	17
Withdraw as soon as possible	7

2. Do you favor a surtax of 6 percent on personal and corporate income tax?

Yes	13
No	87

3. Do you favor expanding trade with communist oriented countries?

Yes	27
No	73

4. Do you believe the executive branch of the Government is providing the people with adequate, factual, information about what it is doing?

Yes	22
No	79

5. Do you favor sharing of federal taxes with state and local governments without federal control?

Yes	53
No	47

6. Do you favor the establishment of a new Hoover-type commission to help stream-

[Results in percent]

line and reorganize the Federal Government?

Yes	78
No	22

7. Do you favor taking politics out of the Post Office Department, and requiring Postmasters and others to be selected on merit alone?

Yes	95
No	5

Wharton Hoch: 1908–67

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1967

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorials of memorial tribute to Wharton Hoch, editor and publisher of the Marion County, Kans., Record, who died on Saturday, July 22, 1967.

He was the son of a former Member of Congress, the Honorable Homer Hoch. Wharton Hoch distinguished himself as a respected member of the Kansas journalism fraterity.

The following eulogies were written by newspaper associates of Mr. Hoch on the Florence, Kans., Bulletin, and the Peabody, Kans., Gazette-Herald. They exemplify the high esteem with which Wharton Hoch was held by those who knew him best in the field of journalism in Kansas.

The editorials follow:

[From the Florence (Kans.) Bulletin]

The Lord has gained a gentle soul, and the world has lost a wonderful man. Wharton Hoch, Marion Record editor and publisher, well known and well liked throughout Marion county, and the state, died Saturday after a lengthy illness. He was a man of many talents, greatest of them being the ability to be friends with everyone. Even differences of opinion were easy to resolve with a man like Wharton. He had many friends and practically no enemies, and lived a life that was an example to his lesser fellowmen. He will be missed by his family, his fellow workers, and his friends all over Marion county. During his last serious illness, he was concerned for the safety and welfare of citizens in Marion who were threatened with a flood during June. He vowed to us that when he got well he would push for construction of a levee around Marion to protect the city from flood waters, even though his home was not in the district. May this spark of unselfishness and concern for his friends live on in his children and his friends. He truly believed and lived, "Love Thy Neighbor." No greater tribute can be paid to a man.

[From the Peabody (Kans.) Gazette-Herald]

A PERSONAL TRIBUTE TO A FINE INDIVIDUAL

Last week we lost a great and good friend when Wharton Hoch of Marion, dean of Marion County publishers, succumbed to a heart condition that had plagued him for several years. The loss is a great one to us personally, but Marion County and this section of Kansas suffered a considerable loss as well. Wharton Hoch is the type of man sorely needed and difficult to find in small town journalism and small town civic life.

In an age when fewer and fewer quality young people are willing to fight it out in the small town newspaper field, we can hardly spare a not-old-in-years and very young in heart bastion of weekly journalism such as Wharton. He was one who had every chance to take the big city road. He was partially raised in large cities, educated in Chicago and Washington, D.C., spent some years away from his native Marion. But finally, with his deep wisdom, he came home to make the Marion County Record into one of Kansas' finest and most respected weekly newspapers.

One only needed to see the respect in which he was held by his peers in the newspaper profession in the state to appreciate his stature.

Wharton was, perhaps, the epitome of the "transition" editor in Kansas. He was one of those who brought the profession into a semblance of order from its rather chaotic beginnings in the state. The first editors were either fire-eating politicians or converted printers. Wharton was neither. He was a perfectly capable printer and he could write a perfectly flammable editorial, but he was one of those professionals who took the responsibilities of publishing so seriously that he weighed his words against community good rather than personal feelings. He studied, organized, researched, pondered—and he served his community extremely well.

But you could never appreciate Wharton Hoch fully unless you knew him as a friend, as we were fortunate enough to do. And what a friend he was, indeed.

Philadelphia Door Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. HAMMERSCHMIDT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1967

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article published in the Building Supply News of June 1967. This is an interpretive report by the editors of Building Supply News of the Supreme Court's disposition of the Philadelphia door case. Hopefully, this will shed some additional light on this important matter.

The article referred to follows:

PHILADELPHIA DOOR CASE

The future of prefabricated elements of building construction was dealt a severe blow by a 5-to-4 decision of the United States Supreme Court (April 17, 1967), upholding the "work-preservation clause" of Carpenters Union contracts in the Philadelphia area. These contracts ruled out the use of doors that had in any manner been prepared at the factory for more rapid installation so as to minimize the use of on-site labor.

The question revolves about the definitions of secondary (illegal) and primary (legal) boycotts. Specifically, boycotts in support of the "clause," were said to be lawful under Section 8(b)(4)(B) of the National Labor Relations Act; and the complicity of project contractors in agreeing to the clause was held to be legal under Section 8(e) of the same act.

The case originated when the National Woodwork Manufacturers Association on June 13, 1963, filed unfair labor practice charges against the union before the National Labor Relations Board. Later, the case was joined by numerous parties potentially affected by the NLRB decision.

Justice Brennan, joined by Chief Justice Warren and Justices Fortas and White, and supported by a concurrent opinion of Justice Harlan, wrote the majority opinion. A vigorous dissent was registered by Justice Stewart, joined by Justices Black, Douglas and Clark.

MAJORITY VIEWPOINT

The rationale of Justice Brennan's majority opinion was that the union's sole objective was the preservation of work for its members, and that the boycott of the prefabricated doors involved only a "primary" dispute with the contractors. The Court stated this conclusion as follows:

"The determination whether the 'will not handle' sentence of Rule 17 and its enforcement violated Par. 8(e) and Par. 8(b)(4)(B) cannot be made without an inquiry into whether, under all the surrounding circumstances, *the union's objective was preservation of work* for Frouge's employees, or whether the agreements and boycott were *tactically calculated to satisfy union objectives elsewhere.*

"That the 'will not handle' provision was not an unfair labor practice in this case is clear. The finding of the Trial Examiner, adopted by the Board, was that *the objective of the sentence was preservation of work traditionally performed by the job-site carpenters.* This finding is supported by substantial evidence, and therefore the union's making of the 'will not handle' agreement was not a violation of Par. 8(e).

"Similarly, the union's maintenance of the provision was not a violation of Par 8(b)(4)(B). The union refused to hang prefabricated doors whether or not they bore a union label, and even refused to install prefabricated doors manufactured off the job-site by members of the union. This and other substantial evidence supported the finding that the conduct of the union on the Frouge job-site *related solely to preservation of the traditional tasks of the job-site carpenters.*" (*Emphasis added.*)

The Court reached this result by reasoning which appears to repudiate the plain language of the statute (the boycotting of one employer to prevent the handling of products made by another employer is expressly prohibited); and appears to have misread the *Allen Bradley* case (which was a pure product boycott of prefabricated electrical fixtures); and appears to have ignored the many decisions under the Taft-Hartley Act holding that an objective of work preservation is not a defense where the union boycotts the products of other employers. Further, the Court appears to have ignored the embargo and trade-resistant effects of product boycotts and the injury to manufacturers and their employees and to the public interest.

DISSENTING VIEWPOINT

Criticizing the majority's view,[*] Justice Stewart, speaking for the four dissenting Justices, said:

"The Court undertakes a protracted review of legislative and decisional history in an effort to show that the clear words of the statute should be disregarded in these cases. But the fact is that the relevant history fully confirms that Congress meant what it said, and I therefore dissent."

Stating the law as it had always been considered to be until the recent "work preservation" decisions of the Labor Board, the dissenters said:

"The courts and the National Labor Relations Board fully recognized that Congress had intended to ban product boycotts along with other forms of the secondary boycott, and that it had not distinguished between

---

[*] Actually, Justices Brennan and Stewart each had three unqualified supporters. Justice Harlan concurred with Justice Brennan, without accepting his argument. In effect, there were three distinct viewpoints among nine judges.

'good' and 'bad' secondary boycotts. In a 1949 decision involving Par. 8(b) (4), the Board stated that 'Congress considered the "product boycott" one of the precise evils which that provision was designed to curb.' The courts agreed. In *Joliet Contractors Assoc.* v. *Labor Board,* 202 F.2d 606, cert. denied, 346 U.S. 824 the Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit held that a glaziers' union boycott of preglazed sashes to preserve work they had traditionally performed was an unfair labor practice under Par. 8(b) (4).

"A similarly motivated boycott of prefabricated doors by construction workers was likewise held illegal by the Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals in *Labor Board* v. *Local 11, Carpenters,* 242 F. 2d 932. There were no court decisions to the contrary prior to the 1959 amendments to the Taft-Hartley Act. Although it made extensive other changes in Par. 8 at that time, Congress did not disturb the law firmly established by these decisions. The conclusion is inescapable that the union's boycott of the prefit doors in this case clearly violated Par. 8(b) (4) (B)."

The dissenters pointed to the simple truth that the majority "substituted its own notions of sound labor policy for the word of Congress."

EDITORIAL REACTION

Criticism of the decision has been quick and caustic. On April 21, *The Wall Street Journal* editorially stated:

"Perhaps the Supreme Court's decision upholding union contracts that ban prefabricated materials fits the Alice-in-Wonderland presumptions which currently govern labor union regulation, but the decision is also a telling commentary on that regulation."

"In this case, however, he (Justice Brennan) remarked, 'Before we say that Congress meant to strike from workers' hands the economic weapons traditionally used against the employers' efforts to abolish their jobs, that meaning should plainly appear.'

"That stuff in the law explicitly prohibiting contracts which ban another employer's products, it seems, was too ambiguous.

"Well, maybe so. Maybe Congress needs to write that Philadelphia carpenters cannot refuse to hang doors produced by members of the Woodwork Manufacturers Association on Tuesday, Wednesday or Thursday. Maybe, indeed, it ought to struggle with the wording of its legislation until it is so clear the NLRB and the courts cannot twist a limitation on unions into a license to do precisely what the limitation banned.

"But while the English language is one of man's prime achievements, even it is not capable of miracles."

On April 24, John M. Johnston said in *The Chicago Daily News:*

"The decision is a setback in our national march toward better ways of doing things. Materials fabricated at the factory by machinery and mass-production methods have gained because more uniform quality could be had at lower price.

"The Philadelphia carpenters gain work for themselves by refusing to install factory-made doors. But they deprive unionized factory workers of wages earned by making doors, and they deprive the public of an economy.

"Prefabricated houses, bringing more comfort and convenience for the family dollar, have been a longtime dream. But if even the doors have to be made on the spot, the chances lessen for moving entire kitchens into place. . . .

"Perhaps the union attitude is understandable, but however human the motive, unions should no more be permitted to block progress than the canal-boat operators were allowed to prohibit railroads.

On April 19, *The Washington Post* stated:

"Each side has marshaled formidable arguments for its views from the legislative history behind the act. In fact, however, as Justice Harlan noted, 'Congress was not squarely faced with the problem this case presents.' The mystery is why the majority felt it necessary, in the face of this 'opaque legislative record,' to conclude that the words of the statute do not mean what they say.

"The outcome seems to rest on a conclusion that Congress could not have intended to restrain collective bargaining at a point where union members are fighting to protect their jobs. But it is certainly no less reasonable to conclude that Congress did intend to protect the public against product boycotts which obstruct the free flow of goods and throttle the growth of our economy.

"Apparently Congress itself will have to say the last word."

AN EARLY WARNING

It should be of some interest that in Building Supply News in August, 1965, there appeared an editorial on this subject, then in litigation, entitled; "Back to the Pyramids."

In this editorial it was said that:

"Unless construction technology is to be forced 'back to the pyramids,' it is incumbent that the petitioners be upheld and the unions be denied. Any time a union is allowed to claim an hour or more of job work for a task that can be easily done—as has been proved—in eight minutes or less, the construction industry dies piecemeal. With job pay scales averaging between $4 and $5 an hour in major metropolitan areas, and steadily rising, it doesn't take a trained mind to discern what fate a decision favorable to the union would entail, not only to the manufacturers, wholesalers, dealers and contractors, but to the union membership itself. In the end the victims would be the consuming public; and the public interest would be adversely affected."

Both the majority opinion and Justice Harlan's concurring opinion virtually invite Congress to correct the uneconomic effects of product boycotts by new legislation. The Court's reluctance to give the plain language of the present law its intended effect will make the drafting of new adequate legislation difficult—but it can be done. Consideration is already being given to the introduction of corrective legislation.

THE NUB OF THE SITUATION

The exact scope and effect of the decision will not be known until it has been applied in subsequent cases. However, having received the Court's blessing on "work preservation" boycotts, the unions may be expected to boycott prefabricated products with impunity whenever it serves their purposes.

The core of the decision seems to be that if the union can show an objective of work preservation, it will be free to boycott prefabricated products—by agreements or strikes—unless the union has a dispute with, or is trying to affect the labor conditions of, an employer other than the immediate employer, i.e., a so-called "secondary" objective.

The question of vital interest is: What types of objectives and union conduct in the future will be deemed unlawful under the Court's "primary-secondary" rationale? The unions will undoubtedly seize on the Court's great emphasis on "work preservation" in an attempt to expand their boycott immunity as far as possible.

On the face of it, a union's boycott of customers or suppliers in furtherance of the union's dispute with a manufacturer of the boycotted product appears to be unlawful. Also, a union boycott of products because they are union-made, or are made by the wrong union, or do not bear a union label, etc., would seem to be unlawful, without question.

Further, it appears that, under the Court's decision, a boycott of products because they are made under so-called "substandard" labor conditions would be unlawful. Such an objective is directed to the labor conditions of employers other than the immediate employer.

The Court touches lightly on the difference between "work preservation" and "work acquisition," but states that it does not decide the legal effect of this difference. It has been held several times by the Board that a boycott *to acquire* work necessarily affects and deprives employees of other employers of work and should certainly be considered a "secondary" objective.

From a practical standpoint, it may be that the simple factor of economics will afford some protection against union assertion of product boycotts. For instance, it is often to the substantial advantage of both contractors and their employees to use prefabricated building components.

If a contractor's employees and the union can be convinced that the contractor will be able to get the job only by bidding on a prefab component basis, the union might be willing to agree in writing that its members will handle and install these products, in order for them to get the work.

In areas where prefabrication in a factory is done by members of the same union that represents the contractor's employees, it is difficult to see how the union could successfully claim that its boycott is solely for the *work preservation* of its members. The boycott would obviously be for the purpose of taking work from part of the union's members and giving it to other of its members.

In this situation, the Court's "work preservation" immunity probably would not apply. Further, as a practical matter, it should be possible in many cases to induce the union itself not to take boycott action which would prevent the use of products made by its own members.

Remedial action to be sought in Congress—which the majority decision of the Court seems to invite—will need to come to grips with all of the questions that the Court's decision raises.

The objectives of the Great Society will not be realized—will in fact be defeated by—the kind of road blocks set up in the present Court decision.

The decision for or against present building technology, let alone the technology of the future, is placed squarely in the lap of Congress, which has to decide momentous questions about the future of our cities, towns and rural areas for the next several decades. Presumably, these vital decisions can no longer be left to the processes of litigation between unions and employers.

Paul Harvey Cites Salina's Economic Resurgence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT DOLE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1967

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, the announcement by the Department of Defense in November of 1964 that Schilling Air Force Base was to be phased out in 6 months cast a pall of gloom over the city of Salina, Kans. This fine city in my congressional district had come to rely heavily on the payroll of the base to maintain the community's economy. The prospect of the loss of income created many anxious moments for Salina's citizens, not to mention the problems created by the departure of thousands of personnel assigned to the base.

The dramatic recovery of the community from this economic setback has drawn nationwide attention.

Recently, Paul Harvey, the famed radio commentator, who served as a radio announcer for a Salina radio station at one time, commented on the miraculous job of the community in turning adversity into prosperity.

Mr. Speaker, I include "The Bootstrap Cities," an excerpt from Mr. Harvey's broadcast of July 6, 1967, in the RECORD at this point:

THE BOOTSTRAP CITIES

If there is a common denominator in the lives of men the world calls successful it is that they get up when they fall down. This is true of cities, too.

I have seen dozens of cities in the United States dependent on a crutch—leaning heavily on an adjacent military installation. When that crutch was removed all faltered, some fell—and some picked themselves up again to stand taller and more secure than theretofore.

Moses Lake, Washington converted a vacated air base to our nation's first facility for airline crew training.

Springfield, Massachusetts leased a vacated armory to industry.

Lincoln, Nebraska adapted its former air base to a Job Corps Center.

Harrisburg, Pennsylvania is supplanting the Old Olmsted Air Force Base with a regional jet airport, a major university campus and several industries.

Port Clinton, Ohio's old Erie Army Depot now houses a new industry.

In Waco, Texas—on the site of now-closed James Connally Air Force Base—a major vocational-technical institute is re-using those facilities.

In Mobile, Alabama, they're leasing former Air Force buildings to industry.

And in Salina, Kansas perhaps the most dramatic demonstration of all.

Five years ago when I visited Salina I toured its big, busy SAC base, Schilling. Schilling represented 20% of the city's population and 20% of its payroll.

Then, two years ago, the big birds flew south forever. Salina, stunned, staggered and fell to its knees.

No power on earth can keep a first-class town down. In two years, Salina, Kansas has picked itself up, dusted itself off, and almost totally erased the unexpected economic deficit.

Aircraft, commercial and private, is using that beautiful three miles ribbon of runway. Schilling's 8,000 acres of former buildings are refilling with industry, a technical institute, a state rehabilitation center, a vocational technical school and a state Highway Patrol Academy.

The degree to which Salina turned its dark cloud silver-side-out so impressed the Pentagon that "The Salina Story" has been published by the Department of Defense as a template, a blueprint for other cities similarly stricken.

For example, Salina's unprecedented use of former military housing. 735 housing units, mostly duplexes, previously officer housing—is now a housing complex for "waiting wives."

While husband is overseas, the wife and children may live in one of these handsome, modern, recently constructed dwellings—paying only her government housing allowance, usually $105 per month.

The "waiting wives program" was instituted by a gallant Base Commander, Col. Mike Scanlon, who went ahead and did it first—and got permission afterwards. Any community with surplus housing can emulate this example.

One wife brought twelve children, though they average five-plus children per wife. One family came from Alaska. He went on to Vietnam, leaving his wife and nine children in Salina.

There is a waiting list, but the occupancy rotates, of course, as the husbands' tours of duty end.

Thus has Schilling Air Force Base been converted from a 200 million dollar white elephant to a multiplicity of purposes worth potentially much more than before.

Thus Salina, reshaping its swords into plowshares, came out of the fire heat-tempered and better than ever.

A Letter Presented to U.S. Marines by South Vietnamese Soldiers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON H. CLAUSEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1967

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, several days ago I received a letter from a constituent, Mrs. J. Lee Chaille, of San Anselmo, Calif. In her letter, Mrs. Chaille told of hearing from her son in Vietnam, in which he described a letter presented to him and other marines of his unit from a unit of South Vietnamese soldiers. In addition, Mrs. Chaille was kind enough to furnish me a copy of the original message which her son had sent home.

At first glance, it is obvious that this letter from the South Vietnamese soldiers to our Marines of the 1st Battalion, 5th Regiment was not professionally done. It reflects the difficulty both sides have with the language barrier but more than that, it contains a vital message for every American. In the belief that other Members would be interested in reading it, I include the full text in the RECORD:

QUESON DISTRICT,
June 6, 1967.

Officers, Noncommissioned Officers and Marines of 1st Battalion, 5th Regiment:

In the past few years the communist had sown the death and sufferings to the people of Queson. The battle-field was full of powder smoke, the villages were full of savage slaughters. The communist didn't refuse any inhuman affairs. They applied all the ruses they have in their acting. They have used treachery and crafty means however it is inhuman, however it is anti-evolution, to plunder, to massacre and to develop their influence.

They announced that they acted for the right of the people but in fact their only aim was to develop their own communist doctrine, an inhuman doctrine betrayed to the value of human kind. They are still burning temples, pagodas, destroying christianity, destroying freedom. That is why, today, you Marines and we ARVN, we love freedom, we love peace, and stand together to fight against communist not by theory, not by word but by our own life.

Each drop of your blood which drops on our father-land will grow and bloom for the "Freedom Tree". Each piece of your bone which falls down upon our country will be one stone to build the basis of democracy. For our part, we have to protect and defend the independence of our nation with our red blood and our white bone; but for your part, you wear war clothes and leave your lovely country to sacrify for freedom, for peace of the world, for the friendship between your country and ours.

We are moved and grateful to your people and your fighting against communist to bring wealth and peace to our country. Words are not enough to show you our gratitude and your people but what we can do is to engrave it into our heart. Our history will have glorious pages about you and your people, in the same time, we will mark disgraced and insulted marks to communist that will never fade even for thousands of years.

On behalf of military, political cadres and people of Queson we bow our head to your heroes who had died for our country and we will be close to your side any time to kill our last enemy—the communist—to defend, to protect, to build the rural life of the people of Queson.

God bless you and your family.

Vietnamese-American friendship forever.

Carl Sandburg

SPEECH

OF

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 26, 1967

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, the Nation is saddened by the loss of one of her most honored and beloved writers, Carl Sandburg. A poet, a singer of American folk tales, and a Pulitzer Prize biographer of Abraham Lincoln, Carl Sandburg held a special place in the hearts of his countrymen. His was a uniquely authentic American voice. "He celebrates what is best in us," Henry Steel Commager wrote of him, "and recalls us to our heritage and our humanity." Many of us here in the Congress will remember his moving address on February 12, 1959, before a joint session commemorating the 150th anniversary of the birth of Abraham Lincoln.

Mr. Speaker, it is in this respect that I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues an editorial eulogizing the late Carl Sandburg which appeared in the July 26, 1967, Madison, Wis., State Journal:

ROUGH AND GENTLE POET—A LOT OF LINCOLN IN SANDBURG

Poet for the people, biographer, novelist, singer of folk songs, and teller of tales—He was Carl Sandburg, a man with shaggy hair who retired to a goat farm.

He was the son of an immigrant who roughened his hands at any work that would put bread on the table.

He was a milk wagon driver, a barbershop porter, a worker in a tin shop, and in the winter he carved some of the cold into blocks of ice to be stored in sawdust for next summer's use.

He was a dish washer, a railroad section hand, a toiler who followed dusty harvest and reaped folk songs along the way, storing them in his own personal granary for use years later.

He was a soldier, a salesman, a political party organizer, an advertising manager, an aide to a Socialist mayor, a foreign correspondent, editorial writer, and a goat raiser.

He was all that, and more.

He put Chicago into words for the world to see and feel—from its stockyards and sprawling railways to its loud laughter of youth, the "City of the Big Shoulders."

He pulled Abraham Lincoln out of a fog of myth and gave him back to history as he really was, a warm man but a human one with frailities.

There was a lot of Lincoln in Sandburg, just as there was a lot of Chicago in him—"under his ribs the heart of the people."

Like Whitman, he heard America singing; and like Ulysses, he was a part of all that he had met.

But he could be the despair of newspaper editors by disappearing at a labor convention, overwhelmed by the importance and the excitement.

If he had never written anything except his grand scale biography of Lincoln, from the prairie years through the presidency and the assassination, he would have been honored and remembered.

He could be rough, as with his Chicago poem; or gentle, as with his Fog coming "in on little cat feet." And he could answer critics with defense of slang: "a language that rolls up its sleeves, spits on its hands, and goes to work."

Carl Sandburg did not ask much: "a little love in the home and a little affection and esteem outside the home."

The love and affection for him now remain a legacy that will grow and grow as long as the story of America is told.

Sp.4c. Edward J. Wise Succumbs to Combat Wounds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1967

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Sp4c. Edward Joseph Wise, a young soldier from Street, Md., was recently killed in action in Vietnam. I wish to commend the courage of this young man and to honor his memory by including the following article in the RECORD:

HARFORD SOLDIER DIES IN VIETNAM—EDWARD J. WISE SUCCUMBS TO COMBAT WOUNDS

STREET, MD., July 31.—Spec. 4 Edward Joseph Wise, 19, of Street, has been killed in action in Vietnam, the Defense Department announced today.

Specialist Wise died July 27 from wounds he received in combat, his mother, Mrs. Mary A. Dunaway, said.

Born in Baltimore, he moved to Street, Md., when he was in the fourth grade. He graduated from the North Harford High School in 1965.

He worked for a year as an electrician for the Chesapeake Electric and Plumbing Company in Dublin, Md., before he was drafted last October. He received his army training at Fort Bragg, N.C., and Fort Jackson, S.C., and left for Vietnam March 27.

He was a member of the 25th Infantry Division and won a combat infantryman badge in June. He was promoted to Specialist 4 two weeks ago, his mother said.

"He knew what he was fighting for. He died to fight communism," his mother said.

Specialist Wise was described as an outdoor boy who loved hunting by the assistant principal at the North Harford High School. "His family was very important to him, he said.

In addition to his mother, he is survived by his stepfather, William Dunaway; two sisters, Miss Eileen Dunaway and Miss Mary Dunaway, and six brothers, Kenneth Dunaway, Harold Dunaway, Michael Dunaway, Timothy Dunaway, Gerald Dunaway and Stephen Dunaway, all of Street, Md.

The War Profiteers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1967

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, one of our distinguished colleagues, the Honorable HENRY B. GONZALEZ, has been a longtime leader in the congressional fight to curb wartime profiteering.

In an article in the August 1967 issue of the Progressive magazine, entitled "The War Profiteers," Mr. GONZALEZ charges that "the sudden and tremendous upsurge in procurement" for the war in Vietnam in the past 18 months has loosened Government procurement practices and set the stage for profiteering.

He notes that "in fiscal 1966 prime contract awards soared to $38.2 billion, an increase of more than $10 billion" over fiscal 1965, and that estimate for prime contracts in fiscal 1967 range as high as $45 billion.

Mr. GONZALEZ asks if the Renegotiation Board, the Government agency created in 1951 to beat back the profiteers during the Korean war, will be able to do a thorough job in recovering excess profits from Vietnam war contractors.

The issues that Mr. GONZALEZ raises in his thoughtful article are of great concern to this body. Therefore, I insert the article in the RECORD at this point and urge my colleagues to give it their close attention:

THE WAR PROFITEERS

(By HENRY B. GONZALEZ)

During a war, it is necessary for a nation to mobilize both its human and material resources—men, arms, equipment, and other supplies. But there is a crucial difference in the ways by which men and property are pressed into service for war.

Men are drafted. If they are in the prescribed age bracket and otherwise qualify, they are mobilized, willing or not. The civilian who is conscripted into the military sacrifices the comforts of his family, his home, his job, his security, and possibly his life. The individual has no opportunity to bargain or negotiate for his pay and benefits. His compensation is fixed by law and it is pitifully low.

Property, on the other hand, is purchased, much of it through the awarding of contracts by the government, usually at great profit to corporations.

One would suppose that those persons who supply the government with property in time of war would be willing to do it without exacting execessive profits. In light of the heavy sacrifices by those who go to war, those who do not fight but who benefit from the war by doing business with the Government should at least be expected not to take advantage of the situation by profiteering.

But the facts make it clear that profiteering is taking place on a considerable scale and there is evidence that it is on the upswing.

"War profiteering" apparently is an unmentionable subject in Washington. Even the independent Renegotiation Board, established in 1951 to beat back the profiteers during the Korean War, prefers the term "excess profits." Nevertheless, the Board made determinations of excess profits in the amount of $24.5 million in fiscal year 1966. This money was returned to the U.S. Treasury by private contractors. In addition, $23.2 million was received by the Government through "voluntary refunds" and "voluntary price reductions" in connection with renegotiation proceedings. These recoveries, although small, are all the more remarkable in light of what Congress has done to the Renegotiation Board since it was created in 1951.

War profiteers grow fattest and richest when elected public officials, the press, and other news media ignore the issue. It is in the absence of public attention today that the profiteer can successfully push his special interest legislation with one hand while pocketing "excess profits" with the other.

There was a time when war profiteering was a more glamorous and a more newsworthy issue. Some of us can recall the headlines made by the then Senator Harry S. Truman with his extensive Senate investigations into profiteering during World War II.

The War Contracts Price Adjustment Board, predecessor to the present Board, recovered more than $11 billion dollars in "excess profits" from private contractors doing business with their Government during World War II. More than $800 million was recovered in the aftermath of the Korean War. The real question is, how much got away?

The reason that profiteering increases in time of war is easily understood. During such periods the Government's need for supplies and materials increases suddenly to great heights. The requirement for speed in production eliminates the opportunity for often long, cautious negotiations, careful surveys, and other steps which sound purchasing policy otherwise requires. The practice of inviting bids for Government contracts is set aside; competition decreases and often disappears. The forecasting of costs of production becomes impossible except as a matter of guesswork. As a result, contractors, in seeking to guard against contingencies and often for less justifiable reasons, skyrocket their costs. It is during this crucial time, when the nation's need is greatest but its ability to proceed with caution is least that negligent and unscrupulous dealings are widely practiced.

Senator William Proxmire of Wisconsin, chairman of the Economy in Government Subcommittee, recently said that when he found out how the Defense Department is currently spending its enormous budget—an annual average of $1,600 for each American family—it "shocked me out of my chair."

No better example of the taking of "excess profits" exists than the one documented by the case of *Boeing Airplane Co. v. U.S.*, decided by the United States Tax Court in 1962. Boeing had attempted to charge, as a legitimate expense on its Government contract for military aircraft, the cost of the design, development, and construction of the prototype of the 707 commercial airliner.

Another item claimed by Boeing as a legitimate expense against its contract was $629,000 for "institutional" advertising, selling expense, and entertainment expense. The court found that the "institutional" advertising consisted in Boeing keeping its name before the public as a producer of commercial aircraft. This is not a new practice. Then Senator Harry S. Truman wrote in *The Progressive* in 1943 of parallel abuses in World War II, and pointed out that "the advertising costs the corporations practically nothing because the taxpayer foots the bill."

In the Boeing case the selling expenses were incurred in connection with its commercial business, and the entertainment expense was in part for the purchase of meals and the general entertainment of visitors and business associates. None of these items was allowed by the court.

Boeing had appealed a $9.8 million determination of excess profits by the Renegotiation Board. The court determined that Boeing owed the government not $9.8 million, but $13 million in excess profits, underscoring the weakness, or at least the moderation, of the Renegotiation Board. But renegotiation cases seldom reach the courts. If they did there might well be more Boeing-type cases.

A North American Aviation, Inc. case, decided by the Board in 1962, held that the company had received excess profits in the total amount of $16.5 million. And a $10 million refund of excess profits was obtained from General Motors in 1958, as a result of a Congressional investigation into the production of the F081F airplanes.

It is no surprise, then, that there is a movement to abolish the Renegotiation Board, or that among the strongest members of the movement are the aerospace industries. In a letter dated March 23, 1966, the Aerospace Industries Association of America, Inc. stated to the House Ways and Means Committee:

"This association is convinced that expiration of the [Renogotiation] Act would not harm the nation's defense effort and would not increase the cost of procurement."

It is the level of procurement and the relative rate of procurement that determines the profiteer. As an obvious example, Government procurement reached record high levels in an extremely short period with the outbreak of World War II. A similar situation occurred with the Korean War. Vietnam, until recently, has been somewhat different. It is the sudden and tremendous upsurge in procurement that loosens up Government—mainly Defense Department—practices and sets the stage for profiteering. For Vietnam there was no sudden upsurge until last year.

For several years preceding 1966, procurement and prime contract awards by the Department of Defense had remained at a high but a fairly steady level. In fiscal year 1964, prime contract awards totaled $28.7 billion. In fiscal 1965, the figure even declined, to $27.9 billion. But in fiscal 1966 prime contract awards soared to $38.2 billion, an increase of more than $10 billion or approximately thirty-nine per cent in a one year period—a sudden and tremendous upsurge.

The figures for the first six months of fiscal year 1967 show a twenty-eight per cent increase over the 1966 figures. The best estimate projects about a twenty per cent increase for the full year, which will place prime contract awards for 1967 at $45 billion. This amount will be the highest dollar amount in any year since World War II, including the Korean period. Inevitably these increases will add a greater workload to the Renegotiation Board and will hopefully result in large recoveries of excess profits. But how well-equipped is the Board to do a thorough job?

The Government's earliest attempts to curb profiteering resulted in the Vinson-Trammell Act of 1934. This law, as later amended, fixed profits on shipbuilding at ten per cent and on aircraft at twelve per cent. Unfortunately, neither the Vinson-Trammell Act nor subsequent attempts to restrict excessive profits by building safeguards around the contract itself worked as intended. Vinson-Trammell contractors simply padded their costs to defeat the statutory percentage limitation on profits. Cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts; lump sum contracts; escalator clauses; permitting price adjustments in accordance with fluctuations of labor and other costs; and letters of intent to negotiate a formal contract were all tried without material success.

With the experience of World War I, when profiteering reached a zenith, and the failure of Vinson-Trammell, still fresh in Government circles, the principle of renegotiation was introduced at the outset of World War II. Under the Renegotiation Act of 1942 the Government reserved the right to renegotiate wartime contracts by procurement officials. Thus, a contractor may be called upon to refund to the Treasury that portion of his profits for the fiscal year examined—on contracts with Government departments named in the Act—which are determined by the Board to be excessive.

The Renegotiation Act of 1951 made the Board independent for the first time. But the Act is temporary and must be renewed every two years. The 1951 Act was strong and sound. It enabled the Government to recover more than $800 million in connection with contract awards during the Korean War, in addition to large voluntary refunds.

Beginning in 1954, however, a series of amendments was pushed through Congress with the intent of *reducing* the ability of the Board to do the job intended. For example, under the original Act, contractors whose prime contract awards totaled at least $250,000 during the fiscal year were subject to renegotiation. The 1954 amendments raised the floor to $500,000. In 1956 the floor was again raised, to $1 million.

An even more serious limitation on the Board's ability to police the profiteers is the multitude of exemptions that have been inserted into the Act. Contracts for "durable productive equipment," meaning machinery, tools, or other productive equipment with a useful life of more than five years, are exempt. There is an exemption for "Standard Commercial Articles or Services"—articles customarily maintained in stock by the contractor, the commercial non-governmental sales from which constitute at least thirty-five per cent of the total sales of that article during the fiscal year. This covers a huge range of products and services.

Other limitations now include an exemption for construction contracts let by competitive bidding, a five year carry-forward loss provision, and elimination from the Act of a number of Government agencies which were originally covered. These agencies include the Coast Guard, Department of Commerce, Tennessee Valley Authority, Bureau of Mines, Bureau of Reclamation, and the Canal Zone Government.

There is a time lag of about eighteen months between the awarding of prime contracts and the time they come before the Renegotiation Board for review, if they ever do. So the impact upon the Board's activities as a result of the huge step-up in Defense procurement for Vietnam has not yet been felt. When it does hit, it will confront a Board hamstrung not only by statutory limitations and with its jurisdiction narrowly defined. It will also find a Board seriously reduced in manpower. The Board's activities are conducted today with less than twenty-five per cent of the personnel it had during the Korean War.

The profiteers who intentionally gouge the Government for excessive profits during a time of war are also guilty of consciously withdrawing efficiency from our industrial capacity. These private-businessmen profiteers are in reality guilty of sabotage.

It is a peculiar system of national values when young men are vilified and sent to the penitentiary for refusing conscription—a method of coercion the opposition to which was responsible in large part for the formation of the United States—while contractors and corporate executives are permitted to stay home and profiteer off the people in a time of war. In light of the heavy sacrifices made by the men who do the fighting and dying, one would expect that those who do business with the Government would not take advantage of the situation by profiteering.

Our history has been one of rampant war profiteering, and I am convinced, as even the limited annual reports of the Renegotiation Board reveal, that profiteering is going on now, is increasing, and will continue to increase unless something more realistic is done to stop it. For this reason, I have introduced legislation to put some meaning into renegotiation. My bill, H.R. 6792, would bring the floor for contracts subject to renegotiation back down to $250,000, eliminate the all important standard commercial articles exemption, eliminate the competitive bid-construction exemption, eliminate other exemptions with respect to subcontracts, and place TVA under coverage of the Act.

These changes would restore the Board to approximately the condition it was in and the strength it had at the outbreak of the Korean War. There is no excuse for not taking proper safeguards against profiteering. By confining the Board the way it is restricted at present, we have, in effect, locked up the policeman on the beat in the middle of a crime wave.

But powerful forces are moving to do just that. Last year a serious effort was made to kill the Board by not extending the Renegotiation Act. The Act was extended, until 1968. An even more serious effort to kill it will surely be made next year. In the meantime, an investigation of the Renegotiation Act was authorized. Both the law and the Board have been examined and investigated several times. The latest Congressional investigation of the Board was as recent as 1962.

What we ought to be investigating is not the Board, but profiteering itself. A full-fledged Congressional investigation into profiteering, in which the names of contractors and corporations who have taken excessive profits in the past would be revealed, and in which the appropriate officials could be examined, would be both a revealing and an enlightening lesson. It could lead to important new legislation.

Police Quitting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1967

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the Metropolitan Police force is decreasing in size continually. The force is presently short 352 men, and as this rate increases so does the crime rate.

WMAL broadcast an editorial during the week of July 2, 1967, concerning this most urgent issue.

I commend the text of the editorial to the attention of our colleagues.

POLICE QUITTING

Congress, the Commissioners, the courts, the White House itself better get cracking before there is no Metropolitan Police Department to guard this crime-wracked city. The disclosure that the police force is short 352 men is another example of why the District crime rate soars every month. Higher salaries and a vigorous recruiting campaign have done nothing to slow the exodus of trained and experienced officers.

Veteran crime expert Malachi Harney recently told Congress in no uncertain terms why police quit. Harney explains that police quit most often because they are not allowed to do their jobs. A cry of "police brutality" goes up if an officer tries to protect himself. Judges put plocie on the defensive—but release known criminals on technicalities. Government officials refuse to back up policemen—but bend over backwards to soothe dissidents.

It will take a long time and many changes to undo the harm that has been done. But officialdom must begin protecting the rights of society by giving police a reasonable chance to do the job for which they were hired.

The House Reads the Riot Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 1, 1967

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the Los Angeles Times, published by Mr. Otis Chandler, ran an excellent editorial on Friday, July 21, 1967, entitled "The House Reads the Riot Act."

I believe that all of us should read this editorial and be guided by the sage advice given to the Members of Congress.

THE HOUSE READS THE RIOT ACT

In a dubious response to racial violence, the House has passed a federal anti-riot bill to "shut up loudmouths."

The measure, overwhelmingly approved 347–70, would prohibit the crossing of a state line with "intent" to incite a riot. Its author, Rep. William C. Cramer (R–Fla.), said his bill "would put the rabble rousers out of business"—and specifically referred to the militant Stokely Carmichael.

House Republican leader Gerald R. Ford (Mich.) conceded that the prohibition would be difficult to enforce. But, said Ford, "If it does nothing but shut up the loudmouths, it will be helpful."

Unfortunately, shuting up the loudmouths—even so offensive an outside agitator as Stokely Carmichael—will not in itself prevent rioting.

The frustrations that lead to civil disorder are not the result of inflammatory speeches. They will not be cured by silencing protest.

Neither can they be finally resolved through violence. And The Times strongly believes that those who cross the line from protest to incitement of rioting should be severely punished.

When the California Legislature was considering a new anti-rioting law last year, The Times insisted that the language be made specific and warned that no such law is a substitute for positive action on the root causes of riot action.

The House bill now goes to the Senate, where its fuzzy language should be subjected to searching inquiry as to constitutionality and effectiveness.

Senators should recall the words of Rep. Emanuel Celler (D–N.Y.), chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, who said Wednesday, "I consider this bill to be a futile gesture, neither preventive nor curative."

"The basic disorder is the discontent of the Negro, his disenchantment as to promises made but not fulfilled, the dreary slow pace by which he achieves equality.

"This bill will not allay his anger and frustrations. Instead it will arouse his anger and frustration more deeply. His leaders ask for better housing . . . You offer them jail. His leaders ask for better facilities for education. You read them a riot act . . ."

There must be a halt to the incitement of rioting. But it will have to be achieved through legislation that is enforceable and constitutional. It must never be done through suspension of the right of free speech.

And to prevent the ugly fever of violence, the basic sickness of hopelessness and poverty must be cured.

Amendment to Elementary and Secondary Education Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 1, 1967

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, one of the outstanding newspapers in the State of New Jersey is the Hudson Dispatch, published in Union City. For many years this newspaper has provided editorial leadership in Hudson County and, in addition, has provided equal coverage for all of its readers, young and old, the sports fan and the housewife, as well as serving the needs of a community widely diversified ethnically and religiously.

One of Hudson Dispatch's most popular features is a weekly column entitled "Para Ti," which is written by Manuel Perez and is widely read by Hudson County's Spanish-speaking community.

On July 28, Mr. Perez devoted most of his column to a bill which I have introduced to provide an amendment to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act to serve the needs of America's 2 million schoolchildren who speak English as a second language.

Mr. Speaker, these children have ability in the same proportion as all other children, and for this Nation to allow their God-given talents to go to waste is nothing short of a crime. By helping these children to grow to their full potential we are, in fact, helping all Americans.

I would like all Members to read Mr. Perez' article, which follows:

"PARA TI"

(By Manuel Perez)

Desde Washington, D.C. . . . Nos informan de las oficinas del Congresista de N.J., Dominick V. Daniels, que el ha exhortado a miembros legislativos en la capital para que pasen legislaciones pendientes favoreciendo ciertos programas especialmente planedos para los mas de dos milliones de estudiantes en escuelas americanas que no hablan Ingles como lengua nativa.

En testimonio dado al Subcomite Genral de Educacion, el veterano Congresista del condado de Hudson hizo un fuerte llamamiento para anadir una nueva seccion al Acto de Educacion Elemental y Secundaria, el cual trata de remediar los problemas que tengan aquellos estudiantes que no hablen Ingles aun.

En las propias palabras de Daniels:—En verdad es una triste situacion el hecho de que el pueblo american no use a su completa capacidad nuestros recursos naturales—rescursos no meramente en el sentido de petroleo o depositos naturales, sino recursos humanos—capabilidad intelectual y sentido comun. Me parece que la habilidad de hablar el idioma nativo de uno es un valor inapreciable, si puede se complementado con poder hablar el idioma Ingles iqualmente.—

El programa legislativo del Congresista Daniels autorizara el establecimiento de:

1) Proyectos para investigar ciertos aspectos en este terreno-educacional.

2) Un intensivo programa pre-escolar especialmente creado aquellos que no hablen Ingles.

3) La ensenanza de ambos idiomas Ingles, y el se habla en la casa, para que los estudiantes puedan hablar a la perfecion las dos lenguas manteniendo ambas culturas.

4) Programas para atraer, recrutar, y entrenar proseores quienes sean practicos y hayan tenido algun experiencia con estudiantes que no hablen Ingles.

5) Programas en los cuales participaran miembros de la comunidad para establecer una mayor cooperacion entre la escuela y el hogar.

Permitir que los talentos dados a nosotros por Dios sean malgastados por la sola razon de que el estudiante no esta perfectamente ajustado a nuestra sociedad de habla Ingles, es una necedad criminal. Mi programa no solamente sera beneficioso al estudiante individual, sino para la sociedad en general. Invertir en programas educacionales, es la mejor inversion que esta nacion hacer—agrego Daniels.

Que tal les parece si le escribimos al Congresista Dominick V. Daniels, Congress of the United States, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C., y le expresamos nuestro agradecimiento por sus esfuerzos en llevar a cabo mejores programas educacionales para nuestros estudiantes? . . . Yo le voy a escribir en cuanto acabe estas lineas, asi que espero Uds. hagan lo mismo, O. K.?

OEO Program Is Praised

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JULIA BUTLER HANSEN
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 1, 1967

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, in response to recent attacks on the Office of Economic Opportunity, many constituents have written to me, praising the antipoverty program and urging funding of it. This week I received another such letter, a very moving one, from Judge Ross R. Rakow, of the Washington State Superior Court for Klickitat and Skamania Counties.

Judge Rakow writes that he was highly skeptical of the OEO at the time of its conception, or as he worded it, he "put it down as a wild, psychotic dream—a phony giveaway." But after seeing the results of the local community action program, he paid a tremendous tribute to it:

> If the astonishing accomplishments in Klickitat and Skamania Counties are at all typical . . . this program . . . represents one of the strongest strides forward toward social justice . . . ever made in our history.

I agree with Judge Rakow's conclusions, and I believe it would be unconscionable to cut back any of the antipoverty programs. I urge my colleagues to carefully consider Judge Rakow's remarks, which follow:

Hon. JULIA BUTLER HANSEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JULIA: It occurs to me that among all the gripe letters, petitions for special favors, and sassy commentary upon the state of affairs in our fair country, there should be one kind, objective comment upon some one of the government's doings. I therefore would like to take a minute to share with you a surprise that I have had.

When the Office of Economic Opportunity was established and its goals and purposes became known, I was among those who put it down as a wild, psychotic dream conceived by some nitwitted theorist with no practical appreciation for the problems of society, and suffering a bit of detachment from reality. In short, I thought it was a phony giveaway with little chance of success on any meaningful basis.

Against this prejudiced background I have observed and carefully analyzed the results of our local Community Action Committee and the work that they have done. If the astonishing accomplishments in Klickitat and Skamania Counties are at all typical nationwide, this program, whatever its cost and however frequent its abuses, represents one of the strongest strides forward toward social justice for the poor and ignorant ever made in our history and its accomplishments continue to grow in a geometric progression of individual care and attention on the poverty level where it is most needed.

Julia, I am proud to be one of the small voices among your constituents to testify as to these good works. I hope my comments will give you additional confidence and encouragement with which to defend the program's opponents.

Best regards.

Sincerely yours,

Ross R. Rakow.

Republicans and Rats

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. O'HARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1967

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, a couple of weeks ago, most of the Republican membership in this body decided to make a party issue of the Rat Extermination Act of 1967. Seventy-nine percent of them refused to permit that bill to come to a vote. They demonstrated party solidarity. And by doing so they killed—or tried to kill—one more positive program to help the poor and the ctiy dweller across the Nation.

The Republicans say they are against rats. Yet, they refused to let this body vote the modest sum of $20 million for a Federal assistance program to control and eliminate rats.

The Republicans also say they are for Federal aid to education. Yet, most of them supported proposals which seriously threatened the continuation of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

The Republicans say they are for helping the poor, yet they propose bills which would dismember the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, the Republican vote against the Rat Extermination Act of 1967 is part and parcel of the same vote against people and cities which the Republicans have been casting for 50 years.

They have demonstrated again that they are out to retard President Johnson's progressive domestic programs—thus they vote against rat extermination, children, and the poor.

When the people get all the facts on the callous Republican vote against rat control, there is going to be a popular reaction which will surprise even the most hardened of my Republican colleagues.

The Republican vote against the Rat Extermination Act of 1967 is a vote against the cities.

Mr. Speaker, it almost amounts to a vote against health and for disease. Certainly, it is a vote against urban rehabilitation.

And it is an insult to all of us in the body who want to move America forward by supporting President Johnson's compassionate urban programs.

Mr. Speaker, I urge those of conscience in this House to reconsider the Rat Extermination Act and vote the modest 2-year assistance program the President has recommended.

I Am an American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1967

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, as the popular saying goes, we are "a nation of immigrants." Humanity has come from every corner of the globe to build America and to share in her fabulous abundance. We can be thankful that things have fared well for most of our people.

Wave upon wave of immigrants have arrived upon our shores, or crossed over our borderlands to settle the immediate locality or to go inland to forge a life for themselves. Generation after generation of Americans have been born to these millions of immigrants—each new birth having produced one additional fellow American, one more citizen.

To the sons and daughters of our immigrants, there has always developed, in varying degrees, a question of identification. For some, the question has been easily answered. For others it has been more difficult. The cult of the hyphenated American has been imposed and perpetuated both from outside a particular community, as well as from within the community itself.

And who are the "hyphenated Americans"? Almost every nationality group has, at one time or another, been the object of such identification. Some have liked it—others have not. It is a highly subjective matter. I suppose in each case it has been a question of time, place, person, and circumstances, to name a few. I, personally, agree with those who maintain that we are all Americans in the first instance and hyphenated Americans in the second.

I would like to share with my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, the similar views of a young constituent of mine who shows great insight for someone so young. Dolores Diaz is an eighth grader at the Brightwood Street School, in Monterey Park, Calif., and is the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Rigoberto Diaz, 936 Ridgeside Drive, Monterey Park:

I Am an American

(By Dolores Diaz)

I think it's about time Mexican-Americans learn the truth. They are not Mexican-Americans. They are Americans of Mexican descent.

All over the United States where children have Mexican parents, they consider themselves Mexican-Americans. They have been born in the United States, however, not Mexico, so they are Americans of Mexican descent.

At some high schools the kids let everyone call them Mexican-Americans when they should say "I am an American of Mexican descent, not a Mexican-American!"

But don't get the wrong idea about this story. If children are born in Mexico and then come to the United States, they *are* Mexicans. Later, when they get married and have children, their children will be Americans of Mexican descent if they are born in the United States.

For a long time, I considered myself a Mexican-American. Recently my mother told me that I was not a Mexican-American. She said that was an American of Mexican descent. Now when someone calls me Mexican-American I say "I am not a Mexican-American, I am an American of Mexican descent!"

I'm not saying I am not proud of being of Mexican descent. All over the United States there are people of different descents, but we are Americans *first!*

The New Federal Newspaper

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1967

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, it will not be long now until our newspapers and magazines will be taken over and operated by the Federal Government, subsidized by the taxpayers.

And why not? We have watched the FCC muzzle free speech on radio by enforcement of the "fairness doctrine," and the buildup of the tax-free educational TV monster with programed policies—why not socialized newspapers and magazines? Good competition—taxpayers financing free news?

The newspaper people, it seems, will not awaken until too late.

A precedent has now been established with a planned OEO grant of $179,000 to Community Action, Inc., of Boone, N.C., to publish a weekly newspaper—distributed free—even to those who cannot read. Possibly so that they do not suffer any effects of discrimination by being passed over. I include the release from the Asheville, N.C., Citizen following my remarks:

Precedent To Be Feared

The editor of the Asheville, North Carolina, Citizen has reported one of the most disturbing federal business expansions that has come along yet. It seems that the Office of Economic Opportunity has provided a grant of $179,000 to Community Action, Inc., of Boone, N.C., to publish a weekly newspaper and distribute it free to everybody in four counties ". . . including those who can't read." Weekly newspapers in the area already cover community news. The official objection is that not enough people subscribe to them and read them.

The Asheville Citizen comments that, "If the OEO can publish a weekly newspaper in Northwest North Carolina . . . Washington can . . . develop—gradually, insidiously—a federal press, financed by taxpayers' money and telling the American people only what it wants them to hear. That is not likely? No it is not likely. It is still possible. That is the prime tactic of dictatorship, with a controlled press the main tool." This is an intolerable precedent in a nation where individual liberty depends to such a great extent upon the independence and freedom of expression of thousands of weekly and daily newspapers. Their role as the public conscience and watchdog of government is absolutely irreplaceable.

Masterpiece of Vituperation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD D. McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1967

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, colleagues, newsmen, and others frequently ask what kind of mail I am receiving on the firearms control bill I am sponsoring. I invariably reply that most of the mail is favorable to my position but that a vociferous minority vehemently objects to the bill.

This week I received a letter which falls into this latter category. It can only be described as a masterpiece of vituperation. The writer describes me as "a cheap crook, a cheap shyster, a demagog, and a blatherskite." He charges me with "moral degeneracy, disloyalty, dishonesty, and general gutter lowness."

I was partially relieved to find that I am not the only Member of the House he vilifies. He is generous—almost indiscriminate with his abuse.

> One can never stop being appalled—

He writes—

> at the gutter low caliber of finks the state of New York sends to Congress, all finks to a man regardless of political party.

The writer, whose identity I will protect, proposes the following:

> You and every other lousey fink behind this anti-gun dustup should be indicted for treason—

And adds that—

> the House Committee on Un-American Activities should investigate the subversive elements trying to impose these anti-gun laws.

Mr. Speaker, as a historical contribution to the high-level democratic dialog now going on on the issue of firearms control, I include the full text of the letter I refer to at this point in the RECORD:

JULY 31, 1967.

HON. RICHARD D. MCCARTHY,
U.S. House of Representatives.

DEAR SIR: Re: Your proposal to revoke the tax exempt status of the National Rifle Association.

I wish to express my complete contempt for you as a cheap crook, a cheap shyster, a demagogue and a blatherskite. You and every other cheap shyster advocating the imposition of communist fascist anti gun laws fail completely to make any case for your treasonous and un American proposals. This is because no case can be made for the infringement of the right of every law abiding American to own and use arms for lawful and proper purposes. You do beyond a reasonable doubt prove your own moral degeneracy, disloyalty, dishonesty and general gutter lowness. In more enlightened times contemptible curs such as you were tarred and feathered and rode out of town on a rail. One cán never stop being appaled at the gutter law caliber of finks the state of New York sends to congress, all finks to a man regardless of political party. You are a low down disgrace to the Irish race and along with a lot of lace curtain airs and cheap arrogance are no better than the rest of us shanty Irish. Same goes for the Kennedy trash.

On this gun laws issue the whole issue is the inviolate 100% American right to keep and bear arms as guaranteed by the constitution as opposed to communist fascist gun control laws. Be well assured that patriotic Americans will not stand idly by and let a bunch of you cheap shysters subversives and dirty crooks from back east impose these subversive anti gun laws. Those who scurrilously attack the National Rifle Association by their action prove themselves cheap crooks totally lacking in honor, honesty, morals and scruples.

You of the anti gun crowd play dirty, being without honor, morals or sense of decency. But you are not all that big. Honest, loyal, 100% Americans can and will defeat any and all anti gun proposals with the ignomomy they so richly deserve so long as we remember you are all cheap crooks and don't turn our backs on you. You and every other lousy fink behind this anti gun dust up should be indicted for treason.

Yours with contempt.

——— ———.

P.S.: The house committee on un American Activities should investigate the subversive elements trying to impose these anti gun laws.

Riots in Milwaukee, Wis.

SPEECH

OF

HON. GLENN R. DAVIS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 31, 1967

(Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, if you had asked me to identify the one large American city where race riots would not occur, I would have named Milwaukee, Wis.

Sadly, I must report that the riots came to Milwaukee last night. They came in a manner that indicated thorough discipline, planning, and preparation. Molotov cocktails were widely, indiscriminately, and cruelly used. One aged woman is dead and one other body, tentatively believed to be that of a policeman, charred beyond immediate recognition, has been found. More than 100 arrests have been made. The National Guard is in the city. There is no panic, but there has been violence, arson, and death.

Mr. Speaker, each such incident makes it more clear that these are not isolated nor coincidental riots. These are part of carefully developed plans to intimidate decent citizens, to blackmail the Government of this Nation.

The Cramer bill must be passed.

The confidence of our law-enforcement officials must be restored. The blatant cry of anarchy, "Give us what we want or else" must be repudiated. Respect for law, adherence to the orderly processes of government of law, must be the prerequisites of any concessions to those who are threatening this Republic and its institutions.

Pentagon Stymied

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1967

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, Allen M. Smythe, a financial expert in the Washington area, has given an apt appraisal of the situation at the Army base in Boston. Although his article was written some time ago, it is no less true or timely today; therefore under unanimous consent I insert it in the RECORD:

[From the Globe, June 26, 1967]

PORT PUSH SNARLED—PENTAGON STYMIED ON HUB ARMY BASE

(By Allen M. Smythe)

Frustrated defense officials, who thought they had solved the problem of giving an economic push to the Port of Boston, have found their plans snarled by legal and political puzzles that even Pentagon computers can't solve.

Officials in Washington do not know whether to blame their own plans, local politics and congressional interference, or dock wage disputes between management and labor.

Here are the proposed plans:

The 61.8 acre Army Base would be completely turned over to the port authority under a lease that would only cover maintenance costs.

The Army would spend $1.5 million on Building 32, an empty warehouse, at the Boston Navy Yard to construct new headquarters, offices, lecture halls, and drill rooms for the nearly 5000 National Guard and Army reserves now using the inadequate Army Base.

The First Naval District at Boston would be consolidated with the Third Naval District in Brooklyn and the space used for other needed Navy Yard activities. This would involve a job loss of 144, and the transfer of 104 employees to Brooklyn. Similar closing of Naval Districts are to be made at Philadelphia and Seattle.

Here is what happened:

Cong. Mendel Rivers, chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, and a good friend of Speaker McCormack, in a surprise move placed a rider, Section X, in H.R. 9356, the Naval Construction Bill which would prevent the transfer of the Boston Naval District to Brooklyn. It would also prevent the moving of 119 employees of the Fourth Naval District in Philadelphia to Norfolk, and 101 employees from the Seattle Naval District to San Francisco.

Next Thursday Pentagon officials will attend hearings on Title X and ask that it be removed. Later the supporters will have their say.

Gov. Volpe and Sen. Edward Kennedy have notified the committee that they will testify for Title X. The governor and the two senators from Pennsylvania and Sen. Jackson of Washington will join them in asking for no change in the proposed legislation. It still must survive Senate action and a possible presidential veto.

Encouraged by this delay, some Navy enthusiasts have pointed out that another survey is being made to study modernization needs of all Navy Yards, including Boston. They want any construction on Building 32 held up until the survey's recommendations are made.

Pentagon suggestions to the port authority that the 2.6 million square feet of building space on the Army Base would be ideal for cargo storage and particularly for the new ship container use has caused dock workers and their management to plan for special privileges. The port authority appears indifferent.

The 61.8 acres of property in the Army Base originally cost $1.3 million in 1918. About 14.7 acres is under water as berth space. The buildings cost $22.5 million and power and sewer facilities cost $1.8 million more. The total is $25.6 million and many believe the property is now worth double that.

To have title to any surplus Federal property, the city must negotiate with the General Services Administration under laws with strict rules and priorities. However, Congress can and does pass special legislation in many instances for disposal of surplus military property.

A Meaningful Commencement Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. REES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1967

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I would like to present to Congress the address by Mr. Michael S. Josephson who was the graduate student valedictorian at the recent UCLA commencement in June. This statement is, I believe, an excellent analysis and demonstrates the need for greater participation of college graduates in the area of politics and government.

The address follows:

Commencement Address by Michael S. Josephson, Graduate Student Valedictorian at the UCLA Commencement, June 14, 1967

In delivering the commencement address to the 2,600 men and women who will officially receive advanced degrees today, I feel like a man trying to give Noah a lecture on the dangers of floods. During 6 to 10 years of college, one becomes tired of the traditional praises and platitudes of graduation speeches. We have already heard that we are among the world's intellectual elite; that we are the leaders of tomorrow and the hope of the future. Such proclamations, however, have been neither convincing nor encouraging.

The first thought, that we are part of the world's intellectual elite is almost depressing. The idea that we are the hope of the future is definitely depressing. If both of these statements are true, what does that mean for the future? If we are the smartest this world has, why don't we know how to solve the problems of poverty and civil rights? Why don't we know how to attain world peace? And, if these questions seem only rhetorical, we must ask; If we can't provide these solutions, who can?

We have spent years educating ourselves to increase our abilities of judgment and understanding. We have distinguished ourselves in our society on the basis of these abilities. But, ironically, this extensive training does more to hamper than help our decision-making abilities. The fewer the variables the easier the decision. The intellectual, on the other hand, is burdened with knowledge of the inherent defects of people and society. He knows all the reasons why certain problems are insoluble—all the reasons why things can't be done. We know there are no panaceas and that Deus Ex Machina hasn't worked since Sophocles. Unfortunately, the cynicism that we invariably develop during our education often creates the illusion that nothing significant can ever be done. As a result, the cynical intellect does nothing—not because he knows too little, but because he knows too much.

Yet the fact remains, if we do not solve the problems of our society, no matter how difficult, we leave the task to lesser minds and their simplistic solutions.

It is a tragedy that today so many bright and capable young people are only too eager to abdicate their positions as heirs apparent to a troubled world. They justify their attitude on two different grounds. First is the idealist who realizes that his ideals can never be fully attained. He knows that any attempt to achieve them within our political system leads to compromise and failure. Rather than tarnish his ideals, this intellect "drops out."

Second is the intellect who disassociates himself from the problems of the world by assuming the role of the pragmatist, deciding that, since he can't change his society, he might as well make the best of it. This intellect "digs in."

I suggest that both of these approaches are selfish rationalizations which evade the obligations of education.

This country cannot afford the luxury of a self-indulgent intelligentsia, a silent intelligentsia. The consequences of such silence are evident. Where was the voice of reason in the 1940's when this nation, overcome by paranoia, plucked Japanese-Americans from their homes and carted them off to internment camps? Where were the intellectuals? Where was the voice of reason in the early 1950's when Joe McCarthy turned our country into an arena for fear, suspicion and persecution? And where is the voice of reason now that we have committed over 450,000 of our young men in an unjustifiable war?

The requirements of reason and the obligations of the educated extend beyond a duty to protest. Objection to an unreasonable policy is not enough. Affirmative alternatives must be posited. The present Vietnam situation provides a case in point. It is undoubtedly valuable to dramatically demonstrate opposition to the present fruitless policy of the Administration, and I hope many of you will join in that endeavor after these ceremonies, but we should recognize that the demand for an immediate, unconditional withdrawal from Vietnam is as shallow and deficient as the hawkish policy of total annihilation. Neither position is feasible. The intellectuals of this land must develop workable solutions or they surely will not be developed.

The burden of assuring that this nation is ruled by reason falls upon every person who has the ability to discern rational policies from irrational ones. No intellectual can avoid his responsibilities by hiding in some remote corner of the groves of Academe. One can "drop out" in a laboratory on a university campus as well as a pad in Haight-Ashbury.

At the very least, every one of you must demand more from a political candidate than an Ipana smile and empty slogan. You must keep informed, you must question, you must probe. You must needle the candidates and force them to think beyond the basics to the subtle ramifications of their positions. You must demand more than simplistic solutions to serious problems.

If you fail, the result is clear: our nation will be run by men like Sam Yorty, George Murphy and Ronald Reagan. I don't think that this country can long withstand the impact of such leadership.

Our system cannot tolerate illogical and inappropriate solutions to real problems. While we can endure the argument that there should be tuition in the University of California because the state needs the money and the students can afford to pay, we cannot tolerate an argument supporting tuition on the theory that it will punish undisciplined students and rid he University of undesirables.

The minimum responsibility of each member of the intelligentsia is to serve as watchdogs to prevent the effectiveness of such sophistry. The greater task, however, is to take an active part in the shaping of our society.

In January of 1961, a young and vibrant President ripped the cobwebs from political idealism. He articulated the issues of our time and pledged to confront them with vigor and tenacity. With the inauguration of John F. Kennedy, the nation was made to feel the potential power of a committed, concerned and intelligent generation. With the inauguration of President Kennedy, the intellectuals were induced to channel their cynicism toward constructive ends, to discover solutions as well as problems.

When Kennedy was assassinated less than three years later, the whole world was moved with the realization of the mortality of youth. His death brought home, with brutal eloquence, the meaning of unfulfilled promise.

The shock of this event is something we will always have in common. It was made more dramatic by the transition from President Kennedy to President Johnson. While we could identify with Kennedy, whether we agreed with him or not, we feel alienated from Johnson. Where Kennedy's style and charisma commanded confidence, Johnson's approach and character breeds doubt and distrust.

As a result, there has been a tendency for intellectuals to withdraw from their active roles and resume their positions as critics. Their confidence was shaken by the vivid proof of their human frailty. It is absolutely essential, however, that all intellectuals recover from this violent blow.

We must not sulk and mourn the passing of an all-too-short era. The complexity of our world requires, more than ever before, the leadership and impetus of its intellectuals.

The phrase "leaders of tomorrow," can have no application to any of us after today. Our time is now. The burden is ours.

Although we know that the world will never be perfect, we know that it can be better. Within our heads is the power to make it so. For the sake of all of us, use that power.

A New Awareness of the World in Which We Live

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD J. IRWIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1967

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, the vast network of communications systems linking distant continents together today has given Americans a new awareness of the world in which they live.

And this awareness has fathered an insatiable curiosity about the philosophies, problems, objectives, customs, and traditions of other nations and peoples.

Through newspapers, magazines, and other periodicals, the most primitive aborigine in the deepest jungles of Africa becomes a very believable person with social, political, and economical problems just as real as those which face Americans themselves.

Concern for and interest in people of other nations among an informed society is certainly understandable, since knowledge spawns tolerance and understanding. These are key ingredients in a free world society characterized by international friendships.

On the other hand, misapprehension and mistrust are dangerous seeds being sown by those who would profit by promoting suspicions among nations. Such intrigue must not go unchallenged.

While government and free enterprise organizations are actively working to establish highly favorable relations with other peoples, we must reach out in other directions to find new methods of promoting a more favorable national image. This is a responsibility which should be borne by every American.

Each of the more than two million Americans who travel abroad each year has the opportunity to perform a real service for his country. Through his personal contacts with the residents of foreign nations, the individual tourist becomes an extension of our diplomatic service and an ambassador-without-portfolio in the countries through which he is traveling.

Many American travelers possess impressive credentials, such as the knowledge of customs, traditions and language of foreign nations. Obviously, they are well equipped to serve the best interests of their country while traveling abroad.

Unfortunately, other Americans are ill equipped to represent their country while visiting other nations. They are indifferent to the values of individual diplomacy and this indifference contributes to the success of those who would create suspicions about our great Republic.

A growing awareness of what constitutes the highest standards of individual diplomacy has given birth recently to a number of privately-financed programs whose explicit purpose is to educate the American tourist of his responsibilities while traveling abroad.

One such program is being conducted today by Club Internationale, a nationwide vacation club whose members save in advance for low-cost, luxury vacations. The club is headquartered in Washington and, within less than 3 years, has grown in membership to more than 15,000 persons in 35 chapters across the United States.

Club Internationale was established explicitly for the purpose of placing foreign vacations within the financial range of those who might not normally be able to afford them. But beyond the vacation program itself, the club sponsors a unique people-to-people program designed to equip members with the essential tools of effective individual diplomacy.

Through programs sponsored by individual chapters of Club Internationale, members have the opportunity to participate in language lessons and cultural studies and to correspond with people in whose countries they will be visiting. And special arrangements with foreign governments permit members to actually visit in the homes of foreign nationals in order to savor more fully the customs and traditions of various foreign countries.

These principles of good international relations are further reflected through other activities. For instance, one Club Internationale chapter has adopted an Equadorian child through the Foster Parents Plan, Inc., and is helping to pay for such essentials as his education, food and clothing.

Such programs are certainly worthy of our recognition and support.

Rail-Shopcraft Dispute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 26, 1967

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, even as the special five-member Mediation Board named to seek voluntary or mandatory settlement of the wage dispute between the Nation's railroads and the six shopcraft unions get down to business, I am reminded of the irreparable damage that has been done.

To my knowledge, the only agreement that has been made between the railroad and the union negotiators after their initial meeting on July 25 was to meet again in an attempt to mediate a settlement.

As these meetings continue, I am hopeful that both parties will be mindful of the responsibility they have shouldered.

In this light I would like to commend to the attention of my colleagues a Washington Post article which appeared last week in my hometown newspaper, the Austin, Tex., American-Statesman.

The article follows:

EVERYONE LOST IN RAIL SHOP DISPUTE

(By Frank C. Porter)

WASHINGTON.—Everyone lost in the lamentable railroad shopcraft dispute—the unions, management, public and the government. But the biggest casualty of all was the institution of collective bargaining itself.

Collective bargaining is not dead. But it is bleeding pretty badly. And unless it wants a dead patient, the Johnson Administration needs to do some hard thinking about binding up the wounds and nursing it back to health.

There will be interminable argument over who is to blame for the inept handling of a year-long dispute that brought the nation's first nation-wide railroad tieup in 21 years. Many will charge that the fault lay with the unreasonable demands and belligerence of the International Association of Machinists, AFL–CIO, and its two top leaders, President P. L. (Roy) Siemiller and Vice President Joseph W. Ramsey.

Others will blame the equally hard line of the chief management negotiator, J. E. (Doc) Wolfe, and the carriers' unabashed campaign for a government-dictated settlement.

And there will be criticism of the Railway Labor Act as inadequate, of the Congress for its schizoid indecision followed by what some call panic legislation, and for the antiquated and anachronistic state of relations in general between the 24 railroad unions and more than 100 major carriers with which they bargain.

The most serious charge of all will be leveled at the White House itself—that, by putting expediency before principle, the Administration precipitated the very crisis it sought to avoid. The argument runs like this:

As in the cliche about the convicted murderer of his parents asking for clemency because he was an orphan, President Johnson asked Congress to provide a compulsory settlement on grounds collective bargaining had failed. But collective bargaining, in the view of many, failed precisely because the White House made clear earlier that it would not tolerate a strike.

This played directly into the hands of the carriers, which had been lobbying assiduously for a compulsory arbitration law. Thus insulated from the effects of a work stoppage, the only real weapon a union has to back its contract demands, management had no incentive to bargain. In fact, there had been precious little bargaining in the whole history of the shopcraft dispute.

By this implementing carrier strategy, the White House appeared to be putting itself in management's corner, destroyed any credibility there might have been about its impartiality in the dispute and so antagonized unions that any lingering chance for a voluntary settlement was reduced nearly to zero.

As if the situation were not already bad enough, the Administration further compromised its neutrality and alienated the unions in the week following its request for an enforced settlement.

Transportation Secretary Alan S. Boyd violated a cardinal rule of mediation by launching a personal attack on President Siemiller of the machinists. The Defense Department refused to even discuss a union plan to move critical commodities in the event of a strike until Congressional pressure forced a meeting.

And the White House rejected Congressional proposals for seizure of the railroads as "inequitable" to management, although the government has invoked seizure on at least four previous occasions to avert a strike and pave the way for voluntary agreements.

Once the unions, impatient over the glacial pace of Congressional deliberations, struck and the Administration and companies won their compulsory settlement law, thereby ending the walkout, it was the time for the White House to be magnanimous.

Instead, President Johnson surprised those who had never counted vindictiveness among his more prominent faults by appointing the rail unions' worst enemy, Sen. Wayne Morse (D-Ore.), to head the board that will dictate settlement terms if no voluntary agreement is reached by Oct. 16.

It is difficult to reach any other conclusion than that offered by the machinists' Siemiller, who complained that Johnson was rubbing salt in the unions' wounds.

With his usual penchant for balance, the president did appoint AFL–CIO President George Meany to the five-man board. But even this was a slap in the face. Meany was publicly and strenuously opposed to any dictated settlement that didn't put equal inhibitions on management. And here was Johnson asking him to help dictate it.

The foregoing argument, culled mostly from union sources, glosses over the Administration's most telling point. The President and his lieutenants had warned that a national railroad strike would be "unthinkable," "intolerable," "ruinous"; it would sell out our boys in Vietnam and bring the economy to its knees.

Critics of White House policy claim that even this is a misrepresentation of the issue. They cite these points:

Congress almost to a man agreed a strike must be averted or halted promptly if started.

The difference was over means. A sizable minority felt a dictated settlement inimicable to human freedom and held out for a third strike moratorium without a compulsory settlement—a measure that passed the House once but failed on the second go-around.

The Administration's extravagant adjectives might have been appropriate to a strike lasting a week or more. The two-day walkout produced no such dire results, however, although its effects were admittedly costly and disruptive. But this is the painful price a democratic society must pay from time to time to preserve its economic freedoms.

In this connection, the rail unions never had a chance to test their central thesis; that absent any assurances to the employers that Uncle Sam would settle their labor problems for them, a voluntary settlement would have come without a strike or within a very few days after one was called.

The central worry of many legislators is that the new law, taken together with the compulsory arbitration enacted in 1963 to deal with the railroad fireman dispute, has set a precedent that may be applied to more and more disputes in more and more industries—all on the facile principle laid down by Johnson and Senator Morse in the recent dispute that "the public interest must take precedence over private interests."

Repeated federal intervention in labor's right to strike can lead to further dangers such as the demand for countervailing constraints on other groups and sectors of the economy.

George Meany, for example, suggested that if railroad workers are told they must go back to their jobs under pay and working conditions not of their choosing, then private interests should not be allowed to operate the railroads for a profit. The roads should be nationalized.

The prospect of public ownership of the railroads is hardly immediate. But Meany's warning should give carrier management, fresh from what he calls their "hollow victory," some pause.

A "Thank You" to Chief Layton and the Highly Professional Members of the District of Columbia Police Force

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1967

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, we have all been shocked and saddened by the rioting and destruction in our Nation's cities. Fortunately, those living in our Nation's Capital have thus far been spared the wanton killing and destruction of property which has been so prevalent during the past 4 years. In this light it is indeed refreshing to see the outstanding manner in which the District of Columbia police force has responded whenever duty has called upon it. As an illustration, I would like to insert an article from the front page of today's Washington Post in the Record at this point:

Police, Firemen Pelted—50 Youths Held in District of Columbia Outbreak

Fifty Negro youths were arrested early today after a four-hour outbreak of violence that started when police and firemen were stoned at a fire in the Second Precinct.

Teen-agers broke windows with bricks and bottles and started to move into the downtown area, but were stopped by police at 7th and K Streets nw.

Police reported that the crowds of more than 100 youths were dispersed by 2:45 a.m. and the situation appeared to be under control, aided by sporadic rainfall.

Affected was an area of Washington bounded roughly by Q Street nw. on the north, 4th Street on the east, M Street on the south and 9th Street on the west—in the heart of the Shaw urban renewal area.

Six significant fires in the area, including one two-alarmer, kept firemen and police on the move beginning at 11:15 p.m.

The first fire which appeared to be a routine fire, gutted two unoccupied floors above a used furniture store at 1307 7th st. nw. Commissioner Walter N. Tobriner said the trouble apparently started there when the flames attracted about 300 spectators.

Shortly thereafter, fires broke out in buildings and autos in the area.

All but the furniture store fire were controlled quickly and held to single alarms.

Shortly after the fires broke out, gangs of youths started breaking into stores along 9th Street.

There were incorrect reports of gunfire that turned out to be firecrackers tossed by teen-agers into ash cans.

Crowds of youths raced back and forth through the area, which the police saturated with officers that rapidly dispersed the groups.

One group of 100 youths ran down 7th Street toward the downtown department stores.

Officers corralled them at 7th and K Streets on the Public Library grounds. One youngster hollered, "Let's go to 14th and T," and the crowd surged back uptown, where police broke it up.

The angry youths, many of whom shouted Black Power slogans, spilled into the adjoining 13th Precinct. Capt. Charles Monroe, Precinct commander, said there appeared to be wanton destruction of windows but no significant looting. He said his men kept the teen-agers moving.

Bull horns were used to disperse the running youths, who were told they would be arrested if they did not leave the streets.

A police spokesman said that what vandalism was committed was done by "a bunch of kids taking advantage of a tense situation."

No off-duty policemen were called in, but the entire Tactical Force—which normally goes off duty at 1 a.m.—and the K–9 Corps were deployed to the trouble spots.

Between 11:24 p.m., when the fire at 1309 7th st. nw. broke out and 2:52 a.m., the Fire Board received 22 fire calls. Fourteen of these were in the trouble area in the Second Precinct. Of the 14, 3 were false alarms.

Police considered only six of the fires of any consequence and city officials believed that five other significant fires were set by youths.

Here are the 11 actual fire calls from the trouble area as they were logged:

11:24 p.m.—1309 7th st. nw. 2-alarm.
11:50 p.m.—1417 Swann st. nw. 1-alarm.
1 a.m.—930 O st. nw. Auto set ablaze.
1:07 a.m.—1113 7th st. nw. 1-alarm.
1:12 a.m.—Safeway Store in 1200 block of 6th st. nw. 1-alarm.
1:20 a.m.—441 N st. nw. gas station and junkyard. 1-alarm.
1:22 a.m.—L between 6th and 7th sts. nw. auto set ablaze.
1:25 a.m.—10th and N sts. nw. 1-alarm.
1:36 a.m.—500 block N st. nw. 1-alarm.
1:41 a.m.—1107 11th st. nw. 1-alarm.
1:49 a.m.—707 M st. nw. 1-alarm.

Mr. Speaker, throughout my career as a government official, and in particular when I was mayor of the city of Omaha, I have felt that the best way to preserve law and order was to let potential troublemakers know that swift and sure enforcement of the law would follow any criminal infraction. In my experience, and I believe the incident of last night and early this morning lends credence to this argument, strict law enforcement is the surest short-range deterrent to outlawry and disorder. While I am, of course, aware of the fact that the summer is only half over, I feel that Chief Layton and his men are due the strongest commendation for their professional enforcement of the law. I would like to be among the first to commend the chief and his men for their outstanding performance last night and every night in the face of a most difficult situation.

I also extend my good wishes and heartfelt support to policemen all over the United States for their work this summer in protecting the vast majority of our law-abiding citizens who respect and uphold the law.

House Hearings on Consumer Credit, Truth-in-Lending Legislation To Begin Monday, August 7, 1967

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1967

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, House hearings on S. 5, the truth-in-lending bill passed by the Senate on July 11, and on a comprehensive consumer credit protection bill, H.R. 11601, will begin next Monday, August 7, 1967, in the Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

So many requests are coming in from organizations wishing to be heard during the hearings that it will be necessary to schedule afternoon as well as morning sessions, even though there may be interruptions in the afternoon sessions because of business on the House floor.

S. 5, as passed by the Senate, requires an annual percentage rate disclosure on all finance charges in credit transactions except for first mortgages, open end or revolving charges such as made by department stores, and on transactions on which the cost of credit is $10 or less. Business and commercial credit transactions are also exempt.

H.R. 11601, which I introduced as chairman of the Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs, joined by five other subcommittee members as cosponsors—and cosponsored, also, in a separate bill, by numerous other Members of the House—contains all of the disclosure requirements of S. 5, but none of its exemptions except for business and commercial credit transactions. Thus, it includes first mortgages and revolving charges, and does not set a minimum figure for coverage.

BROAD COVERAGE OF CONSUMER CREDIT PROTECTION BILL

In addition, H.R. 11601 would establish a Federal ceiling of 18 percent on the annual percentage rate of any consumer credit transaction, unless the States have lower ceilings. Also, it would prohibit the garnishment of wages for the satisfaction of debts; it would create a National Commission on Consumer Finance to make an investigation of the entire consumer credit industry; it would also give to the Federal Reserve Board of Governors standby powers to restrict or regulate consumer credit in periods of national emergency, and to establish minimum margins for trading in commodity futures contracts.

In view of the far-reaching nature of some of the proposals in H.R. 11601, and in view of the fact also that the House committee has not previously held hearings on truth-in-lending legislation, we intend to make every effort to provide an opportunity to those organizations which want to be heard on this legislation to testify before us.

However, we do not plan to permit the hearings to drag out over a long period of time. Hence, we are requesting witnesses to submit their written statements in advance for inclusion in the record and for review by members of the subcommittee prior to the hearing, so that we can devote the time to questioning of witnesses and, thus, speed up the proceedings.

I have assured President Johnson, Speaker McCormack, Chairman Wright Patman of the parent committee, and others who are anxious to have effective truth-in-lending legislation enacted in this session, that we will do our best to get a good bill out of the subcommittee reasonably soon. Whether it will contain all of the provisions of H.R. 11601 will depend largely upon the nature of the information we are able to develop in the hearings beginning next Monday.

The schedule of witnesses will be made public after confirmation of tentative assignments has been received from prospective witnesses with whom the subcommittee has been in contact.

COSPONSORS OF CONSUMER CREDIT PROTECTION BILL

Consumer Affairs Subcommittee members who have joined me in introducing H.R. 11601 include Representatives Henry B. Gonzalez of Texas, Joseph G. Minish of New Jersey, Frank Annunzio of Illinois, Jonathan B. Bingham of New York, Democrats; and Seymour Halpern of New York, Republican.

An identical bill, H.R. 11806, introduced by Representative Abraham J. Multer of New York, ranking member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, is cosponsored by Representatives William A. Barrett of Pennsylvania, Peter W. Rodino, Jr. of New Jersey, Henry S. Reuss of Wisconsin, Leonard Farbstein of New York, Roman C. Pucinski of Illinois, William F. Ryan of New York, Fernand St Germain of Rhode Island, Benjamin S. Rosenthal of New York, Robert L. Leggett of California, Spark M. Matsunaga of Hawaii, James J. Howard of New Jersey, Joseph P. Vigorito of Pennsylvania, Patsy T. Mink of Hawaii, Joseph Y. Resnick of New York, James H. Scheuer of New York, and Frank J. Brasco of New York, all Democrats.

Numerous other bills on consumer credit pending before the subcommittee are restricted, as is S. 5, to credit disclosure requirements only.

A Letter From an Independent Businessman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1967

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I recently received a copy of a letter written to George J. Burger, vice president of the National Federation of Independent Business. The letter was written by an independent businessman in Reno, Nev.

In his letter, Mr. J. W. Teipner, who has had over 50 years in the petroleum industry, expressed very accurately the problems facing independent businessmen.

For a long time I have been concerned with the problems facing people like Mr. Teipner, and I have sponsored legislation for many years to prohibit the so called "company store," which not only results in higher cost to the buying public, but also makes it almost impossible for the independent small businessman to exist.

One area of flagrant abuse in this regard is the automobile tire industry. In this Congress I have sponsored H.R. 3079 which would prohibit the manufacturer of automobile tires from selling his own product at retail in competition with his wholesale customers. This bill is currently pending before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, which I hope will schedule it for early action.

I commend Mr. Teipner's letter to the attention of our colleagues.

The letter follows:

July 6, 1967.

Mr. George J. Burger,
Vice President, National Federation of Independent Business, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Burger: I have read the copy of letters sent to Congressman Walter Baring and written by Mr. Bernard Boutin, Administrator to the Small Business Administration with considerable interest.

He states that small business suffers for lack of funds, poor business judgment and no technical experience. He is correct and it is fast becoming worse. No businessman who has money, or who has money to loan would consider the financing of a new small business. Why should they? You only have to look at the community and see the small businesses that have folded in only the past year.

Bakeries, dairies, drug stores, hardware and many others. Fifty percent of the present service stations would lock up tomorrow if they had to pay the rentals to the oil companies that an independent has to pay to his landlord. These rent subsidies are in fact nothing but a *rebate* any way that you look at it.

Quoting from memory, I recently read an article that stated that of the thousands of corporations in the United States, now only 200 of them controlled 60% of the markets. And each year going to a smaller number of corporations and larger share of the market.

Note the two periodicals that are enclosed where Dealers in California and Utah are bringing suit against two major oil companies.

A great many of us wonder just what good the Small Business Administration is in helping small business. I understand that loans are sometimes made to small business but if these people were not constantly being gobbled up by the big concerns there would be no need for loans.

If dual marketing was prohibited you would then see the tremendous expansion of all business, both large and small, that would do more for our economy than any other thing we could do.

Take Sears stores, for example. They now handle shoes, men's clothing, women's goods, pottery, electrical goods, sporting goods, auto supplies, hardware, plumbing supplies and fixtures, photographic supplies, insurance, etc. And they have financial interests in many of these concerns or at least buy at lower prices than do many of their competitors.

Our President says that we must have higher incomes taxes and that we need them to pay for the vast expenditures that are being made daily by our government. One good source is to stop the oil companies from their dual marketing where they are taking huge losses in trying to support a host of new retail outlets throughout the country and which these losses are written off in tax deductions. Millions and millions of dollars are wasted this way every year and it does not increase their overall sales one iota. And hundreds of stations in every state in the Union are vacant for lack of dealers who cannot corral enough customers to make a living. And the oil companies keep on building more and more of them.

Is it not the work of the Small Business Administration to foster and help small business? Yet every day small business is receding. They have hearing after hearing and from the results it would seem that a lot of ways can be found that prohibits the way to stop dual markets and no constructive way to make dual marketing illegal.

The claim has been made that small business cannot compete due to lack of this and that. Did Ford, General Motors, and all the other large corporations start out as a big concern? Did they not all start from small business? Why not give the small man a chance and not just a few huge corporations gobble up all the markets. There is still enough for everyone.

Take another example—the new large grocery concerns. They buy up independent bakeries, (three of them threw in the towel in my city) dairies, canning concerns, purchase farms, etc. Also handle unrelated items such as hardware, electrical supplies, petroleum products and numerous other items. How in the world can *independent small business hope to compete.*

It is claimed that this is *free enterprise.* But is not this type of free enterprise actually *killing all medium and small free enterprise?* And the claim for the tremendous growth of our economy in the past, If this is true, why destroy it now.

The abolition of dual marketing possibly would not apply to all business, but it certainly could apply to a good many. Take oil companies for example where all the major companies are competing with one another in building thousands of new outlets, losing millions of dollars that are written off in taxes. The oil companies lose some, the government loses taxes and the consumer pays the bills. Everybody loses and *not one gallon more is consumed.*

Our Government does prohibit some mergers of large corporations because it might work out to the detriment of other large firms, but no restrictions are placed on so many other mergers that are related to the survival of small independent businesses. Our newspapers attest to the many such mergers of totally unrelated concerns.

And again, why should not the grocery chains stick to grocery and good items, and not pick off the cream of a dozen other unrelated products. Clothing stores handling jewelry, hardware, petroleum, restaurants and even liquor.

The few motor companies have cleaned out their competition. A few tire companies have done the same. How long will it be before all of us will be the working slave of some large corporation. We are close to the turning point now of imitating some of our South American neighbors with only two classes of people—the very rich and the very poor. On our case, it will be the wealthy controlling the huge corporations and the rest of us working for them. And that could include our government as well.

Again, I offer my thanks for your help and consideration.

Kindest regards.

Very truly yours,

J. W. TEIPNER.

Growing Air Peril

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1967

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, the recent collision of a commercial airliner with an off-course private plane over Hendersonville, N.C., with its tragic loss of life, was dramatic evidence that our skyways are now as dangerously crowded as our highways.

It was also a fearful demonstration of how woefully inadequate our national air control system is for the amount of traffic it must now monitor.

While we have spent billions on our highways, and millions to encourage and develop other forms of ground transportation, we have neglected techniques for controlling our sky-borne traffic.

As the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette pointed out in an editorial July 21:

> Congress should give closer attention to the problems facing the FAA, and better ways of preventing accidents should be investigated.

I insert the editorial at this point in the RECORD, and urge my colleagues to give it their close attention:

GROWING AIR PERIL

The death of 82 persons in the air collision over Hendersonville, N.C., could have been prevented. As the chief of the Federal Aviation Administration tower at nearby Asheville Airport said, the smaller of the two planes was several miles south of where it should have been. Why?

This country is suffering from traffic problems in the air as well as on land. Five to nine incidents of planes flying too close to each other in the Boston-to-Washington air corridor are reported each week. Unreported cases are said to be more than double that.

There are more than 200,000 air-flights of all kinds in the United States each day. More than 99 per cent of the aircraft take off, fly and land safely. But by 1975 there will be 400,000 flights a day. The FAA, which operates 305 airport control towers in the U.S. has begun to realize that air traffic is growing faster than the system for controlling it.

In March, the National Association of Government Employees (which includes 5,000 to 6,000 FAA staff members) charged that control towers are "seriously underequipped, undermanned, undercompensated and underadministered." The FAA claims that the charges are exaggerated.

In March, 26 lives were lost when an airline plane and a business jet collided in Ohio 22 miles from the airliner's destination on a Pittsburgh-to-Dayton run; and now a similar costly accident has occurred in North Carolina. Congress should give closer attention to the problems facing the FAA, and better ways of preventing accidents should be investigated. Further, there should be restrictions on small planes using airports catering primarily to larger craft.

There is already a prototype of an airborne anti-collision system. It is said to be too costly. But so is the loss of life in air collisions. This design or something like it will have to be put into use to meet the growing peril.

Knoxville Expands Adult Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1967

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, our Federal Government has a lot of theories as to how to combat poverty and unemployment. It has always been my opinion that we could better and more permanently solve these problems by training people to work at a trade or craft rather than through handout programs.

Prior to coming to Congress I was mayor of my home city of Knoxville, Tenn., and I had firsthand knowledge of what vocational and adult education can do for the people. I worked closely with Mr. E. N. Aslinger, director of vocational and adult education for the city school system, and I have never known a more knowledgeable person or a more dedicated individual in the education field. I would like to call my colleagues' attention to an article in the Appalachian Advance of June 1967, concerning this successful training program in Knoxville.

The article referred to follows:

KNOXVILLE EXPANDS ADULT EDUCATION

Educational planners in Knoxville, Tenn., needed no crystal ball to tell them their need for a $1.8 million area vocational school now under construction.

More than 6,000 adults annually are taking advantage of a wide variety of courses already established and running smoothly. And that number is increasing yearly.

No adult in need of training is forgotten in the Knoxville master plan for adult education. Courses are provided for adults having less than an eighth grade education as well as those seeking skills in more technical fields.

Adult education isn't a "new toy" to the Knoxville Board of Education. Since the early 30s, this field of education has had hardy support from the governing fathers.

There's no doubt of its impact on the city. The unemployment rate, once as high as 7 per cent, is now less than 3 per cent. "The adult education program now enjoys a fine reputation in the business and industrial world," says E. N. Aslinger, director of Vocational and Adult Education.

"Last year, seven adults who were graduated from evening high school went on to college and are doing well," Aslinger said. "This should prove we're not just running a diploma mill."

KNOXVILLE THEORY

Knoxville schools are operated on the theory that, in the end, education doesn't cost; it pays. This same theory spills over into the adult education field.

The program is divided into no less than 11 principal divisions and scheduling is done on a day and night basis.

The Adult Distributive Education Division, covering the various facets of business and merchandising, works closely with firms in the community to provide an area of instruction that will be beneficial to both employer and employee.

Instructional areas range from merchandising techniques to business law and on to the physchology of working with people. More than 500 people annually are enrolled in this category of instruction.

Another 500 adults yearly brush up on their homemaking skills in the Adult Home Economics Center. Recently included in this area of instruction were three classes in occupational home economics providing for training in alterations, drapery making and apartment management.

An average of 75 to 80 adults are graduated annually from the two evening high schools in Knoxville. Enrollment at the two schools totals 400. Added to this academic program is the Basic Adult Education Program for those who haven't completed the eighth grade.

The evening high schools work closely with the day high school officials so that married students who enter the evening school immediately following their departure from day school don't lose time or credits.

The Fulton Area Training Center currently is schooling 300 adults in such occupational areas as auto mechanics, electricity, machine shop, drafting, welding, refrigeration, small gas engines, radio repair, appliance repair, television repair, shoe repair, and leather craft.

PLACED 85 PERCENT

Although employment is not guaranteed after graduation, 85 percent of those completing courses at Fulton have found jobs in the field for which they were trained.

For those already working but seeking additional skills in their own job or in preparation for another job, an Evening Trade Extension is provided. Six-hundred persons currently are pursuing this line of training in such fields as carpentry, electricity, sheet metal, plumbing, and painting. More technical courses are availaable in electronics, machine drafting, tool design, and industrial electricity.

A fast-growing program is one set up in practical nursing. Much of its growth has been caused by the great demand for child and invalid care. Although the program was originally designed to train nurses for work outside the hospital, 93 percent of its graduates have, nonetheless, found jobs waiting for them there.

The Multiple Youth Project, conducted under the Manpower Development Program, is aimed at the training of high school dropouts in hand skills and attitudinal improvements. Youngsters between the ages of 17-21 who have been out of school at least a year are eligible for this program.

The new vocational school, just four miles from the heart of Knoxville, will be completed in September and ready for occupancy next January. It is owned by the State of Tennessee but the Knoxville Board of Education will contract annually to operate it.

Adults from a six-county area surrounding Knoxville will be served.

Officials are planning for 1,000 adults and out-of-school youths at the new facility.

Under the master plan of the expanded facility, better coordination of the various vocational areas will be possible at a reduced cost. Space will allow the offering of additional office practice courses not now feasible in the widely scattered areas where training is offered.

In effect, the City of Knoxville will provide a two-year post graduate training in a trade or industrial vocation for students who don't plan to attend college.

As the tools of industry become more complex, the adults of Knoxville no longer need to bemoan the fact that they are being held back by a lack of training. The knowhow for better job opportunities is there for the taking.

Mrs. Marie Hart, National President of the American Gold Star Mothers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 24, 1967

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues that one of my constituents, Mrs. Marie Hart, recently has been elected national president of the American Gold Star Mothers, Inc. I congratulate her on this recognition.

The American Gold Star Mothers, Inc., is a national, nondenominational, nonprofit, and nonpolitical organization incorporated in 1929. The founding group was composed of women who had lost a son or daughter in World War I. Later, the membership was opened to mothers who had lost a son or daughter in World War II and was again opened after the Korean conflict. Presently, mothers of Vietnam casualties too are eligible for membership.

The primary objectives of this organization are—

> To keep alive and develop the spirit that promoted world service, to maintain the ties of fellowship born of that service and to assist and further all patriotic works, to inculcate a sense of individual obligation to the Community, State, and Nation, to assist veterans and their dependents whenever possible, and to aid, in any way . . . men and women who were wounded or incapacitated, to perpetuate the memory of those whose lives were sacrificed, to extend needful assistance to all Gold Star Mothers, and to maintain true allegiance to the United States of America.

In summation, the American Gold Star Mothers is a group dedicated to carrying on the work of their sons and daughters who died to make this world a better place in which to live.

The philosophy of the Gold Star Mothers is commendable. Rather than the sense of personal loss attributed to mourning symbols, the gold star is a symbol of honor and courage. The gold star indicates that one has offered the supreme sacrifice to his country and to his family.

Thus, these women provide a great service to the United States. They represent great personal fortitude and dedication at a time usually marked by overwhelming personal grief. They possess that high degree of character necessary to suppress individual sorrow and strive collectively for the common good of our Nation. I am deeply impressed with the members of this most worthy organization.

I am confident that Mrs. Hart, who first joined the American Gold Star Mothers in 1945 and who has since occupied both the local and national offices, will very capably carry on the laudable work and attain the goals of her organization.

The Public Broadcasting Corporation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1967

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a most constructive and thoughtful article on educational broadcasting by the Reverend John McLaughlin, S.J. This article, entitled "The Public Broadcasting Corporation," is featured in the July 1, 1967, issue of America. It is an incisive and masterful exposition of the beneficial possibilities of the proposed Public Television Act of 1967 and of the factors to be weighed during the process of our legislative consideration. I highly recommend the reading of this article by my colleagues and by all who are interested in educational broadcasting.

THIS IS THE PUBLIC BROADCASTING CORPORATION

(By John McLaughlin)

"I can think of few proposals exceeding its importance," said Sen. Mike Mansfield (D., Mont.) about the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967 when the measure arrived on the Senate floor in mid-May. Sen. Warren Magnuson (D., Wash.), who introduced the bill, and Sen. Jacob Javits (R., N.Y.) both regard the act as "one of the most important steps Congress has ever taken for the future of the United States." Sen. Charles Percy (R., Ill.) termed it "milestone legislation," and Sen. Edward Kennedy (D., Mass.) characterized the subcommittee's report on the measure as "superb."

During the Subcommittee on Communications hearings, some eighty witnesses said similar things. The praise is not mere forensic blandishment. Not only is the legislation excellent; it is intriguing. "There is no direct precedent in our history," the Carnegie Corp. has noted, "for such a channeling of public funds to a medium so intimately involved in First Amendment considerations."

The Public Broadcasting Act of 1967 is an adroit and subtle translation of President Johnson's Feb. 28 message to Congress. In that message, he called for an extension of the Educational Television Facilities Act of 1962, increasing Federal funds to $10.5 million in fiscal 1968 (three times more than for the current year) and the creation of "a Corporation for Public Television authorized to provide support to noncommercial television and radio." The President's recommendations, in turn, were based on the Carnegie Commission's study of last January and the earlier reports of the Ford Foundation, by far ETV's greatest benefactor.

If enacted, this measure stands to modify radically the broadcasting climate of the United States. Whatever affects the broadcasting climate has significance for American culture generally. At present, the American people are giving per week to radio and television a staggering one and one-half billion hours.

For the average American, television alone claims three out of every 24 hours, one week out of eight, almost one-fourth of his waking hours. Color TV is bloating the phenomenon. According to latest surveys, the average color television household is spending over 44 hours per week (more than six hours per day!) with living color turned on.

Not all of this is mute entrancement before the tube, either. Roper Research Associates studied some 2,000 adults aged 21 or over and discovered that of all news sources, TV is the most believable. In addition, 64 per cent said that TV is their major news source (college and upper income people, 62 per cent)—the figure is up 6 per cent in three years.

Educational television (not to be confused with instructional television, ITV, the in-school type) is growing still faster. Wilbur Schramm, director of the Stanford Communications Institute, notes that from 1961 to 1966 the ETV audience doubled; 15 million people watch some kind of ETV weekly, and the average weekday evening-hour audience is probably between 700,000 and one million.

Those who allege that TV, independently of other forces, radically affects our lives are usually naive, as social scientists point out. Nevertheless, one can readily concur with Dr. James R. Killian, head of the Carnegie Commission on Educational Television, who said that there "isn't any question" that our absorption with TV is having an effect upon our life experience. What Dr. Killian and his commission proposed to do with their monumental report of last January was to make the "benign aspects . . . in the total television system . . . more meaningful." To this end, the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967 was drafted.

At the outset of the hearings before the Subcommittee on Communications, Sen. John O. Pastore (D., R.I.), subcommittee chairman, observed: "ETV has been chronically underfinanced, under staffed and underprogramed." The cost of one hour of commercial programing in prime time is greater than the majority of ETV stations can budget per year on all operations. Moreover, there are too few educational TV stations. Only some 70 per cent of the population is penetrated.

The Educational Facilities Act has relieved this situation considerably. Five years ago, there were 80 ETV stations on the air or under construction. Today there are 130, with 46 more under construction and 25 others represented by requests for grants. In February of this year, the FCC expanded its allotment of the number of channels reserved for exclusive ETV use to 633 reservations, and so far only one-fifth of these have been activated.

Title I of the current legislation will move in the direction of bringing these channels into existence. The $10.5 million will be funneled into individual States this year, under more flexible provisions than the ETV Facilities Act of 1962, for the construction of facilities for both ETV and, for the first time, educational radio, the poor sister of ETV, but an incredibly potent and selfless communications medium. This section of the bill has to do only with hardware, and the funds will be administered by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, just as under the ETV Facilities Act of 1962. HEW's administrative record in this regard is first-rate.

Title III of the Public Broadcasting Act is also related to HEW. This section authorizes the Secretary of HEW to arrange for a massive study of instructional television under an appropriation of $500,000. All types of ITV transmission will be investigated (broadcast, closed-circuit and 2,500 megacycle) to determine how they interrelate, and how they combine with videotapes, films, discs, computers and other educational gear. When the report is submitted in June 1969, it will serve as a guide for future Federal spending.

The Carnegie Commission took an admittedly "ambivalent" attitude toward the present accomplishment of instructional television. While recognizing that ITV's contribution to education could be "massive," it observed that until now the role played in formal education by instructional television "has been on the whole a small one." The report noted that ITV deficiencies "go far beyond matters of staff and equipment." It charged that instructional television has never been "truly integrated" into the educational process. "With minor exceptions," it said, "the total disappearance of instructional television would leave the educational system fundamentally unchanged." The study that is called for under Title III of the Public Broadcasting Act will clear the air. Those involved with ITV are firmly, and probably rightly, convinced of its value, and they hope that HEW's report on Title III will do for ITV what the Public Broadcasting Act and the Carnegie Commission study did for ETV.

Title II of the Public Broadcasting Act is the most exciting, controversial, innovative and ticklish segment of the legislation. It provides for the instituting of a Federally chartered corporation that is neither an agency nor an establishment of the U. S. Government. This corporation will contract for the production of ETV and radio programs; make payments to noncommercial ETV and radio stations for programming and other operating costs (not hardware); establish and maintain a library for ETV and radio programs; disseminate information about noncommercial TV and radio by publication of a journal; arrange for interconnection facilities for distributing and transmitting programs; and finally, submit a comprehensive annual report to the President, for his review, and after him to Congress. The annual report will list the corporation's activities, operations, and (this year at least) how it spent its appropriation, which in 1967–68 will be $9 million. (By 1980, according to the Carnegie Commission's projection, the corporation's budget will be $104 million.)

The problem of insulating the corporation from the Federal Government is the greatest problem facing the Public Broadcasting Act. Dr. Killian, of the Carnegie Commission, insisted on this in his testimony at the hearings: "The [Carnegie] Commission categorically affirmed that the corporation must be private and nongovernmental and that it must be insulated to the greatest possible degree from the threat of political control." President Johnson had said this in his Feb. 28 message to Congress. "Noncommercial television and radio in America," the President affirmed, "even though supported by Federal funds, must be absolutely free from any Federal Government interference over programing."

Consequently, there are strong conflict of interest provisions in the bill. No political test may be used in selecting the officers. The corporation is prohibited from contributing to any political party or candidate for elective public office, and may not engage in any political activity. The corporation is nonprofit, and its assets may not accrue to the benefit of the members except as salary or "reasonable compensation for services."

Despite such provisions, some witnesses felt that the insulation could be further strengthened by modifying the mode of impaneling the corporation's membership. The original form of the legislation required that all 15 members of the board be appointed by the President, subject to Senate confirmation, with staggered terms of office. At the hearings, several witnesses (including this writer) voiced concern that if the President were to appoint the full roster, at a minimum the corporation's image would be jeopardized—not to mention other possible graver dangers. The objections were heard and the amended legislation, approved by the Senate, provides that the President will appoint nine members to the boards, subject to Senate confirmation, and these nine will elect the remaining six, who will not be subject to Senate confirmation. This is a slightly modified form of the impaneling mechanism recomended by the Carnegie Commission.

On the day the Senate voted on the measure, Sen. Vance Hartke (D., Ind.) proposed an amendment to provide that three of the 15 members of the board of directors of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting be associated with the operation of noncommercial educational radio and TV stations. Hartke argued that one of the primary objects of the bill should be to guarantee that "responsibility for the programing in the local community will be solely at the discretion of the individual local stations." Sen. Pastore voiced no objection, and the amendment was carried by voice vote. The Hartke amendment weighs in on the side of decentralization in the total system of public television, and that is of considerable significance, as will be seen later.

Another aspect of insulating the corporation from the Government concerns funding. For the coming fiscal year, the corporation will be financed by moneys derived from the general tax fund of the United States. Consequently, the bill provides for a financial statement to be submitted to the President, who in turn will pass it on to Congress. The question of future funding is outside the purview of this bill, but the matter nevertheless arose repeatedly at the hearings.

To contine appropriations from the general tax fund is undesirable, as Dr. Killian correctly noted. "It is absolutely essential that there be freedom of action on the part of the corporation," he said. Hence it is imperative, he continued, that the corporation "not be subject to the annual review by the executive branch of government, the budgetary review, or the review by Congress."

For this kind of insulation, some type of dedicated tax will have to be devised. Such a tax mechanism has been used by Congress before. Revenues from defined sources are gathered by the government and put in the Treasury for specific outlays. As the Carnegie Commission has noted: "Such mechanisms maintain intact the ultimate Congressional control over the use of public funds [i.e., Congress can rescind the arrangement altogether] but permit the funds to be transferred outside the usual budgeting and appropriations procedures." The point of this safeguarding is to prevent Congress from tinkering with public television's programing.

What kind of dedicated tax it is to be remains an open question. The Carnegie Commission prefers an excise tax on individual television sets. I would hold for a franchise tax on commercial station licensees. Dr. Joseph A. Pechman, Director of Economic Studies at the Brookings Institution and on leave from Yale, studied possible tax revenues for noncommercial television. Of the proposals that Dr. Pechman has offered, a 3-per-cent gross receipts tax on radio and television revenues appears most acceptable.

"With broadcast revenues approximately $3⅓ billion," he stated, "a 3-per-cent gross receipts tax would be just enough to raise $100 million at 1967 levels of activity. Such a tax would not be onerous under current and foreseeable conditions. It would doubtless be shifted fairly promptly in higher charges to advertisers, who would in turn attempt to recover the tax by shifting it forward in the form of higher prices to their consumers. . . . Even if as much as a third of the tax were not shifted and had to be paid out of the industry's profits, after-tax profits would not be greatly affected."

Even if the 3-per-cent gross receipts tax is not shifted at all, it still appears equitable. Since the commercial interests have largely spawned the condition in which public television has become a necessity, and since their profits are notoriously healthy (in 1965, $570 million before taxes), it is they, it would seem, who deserve to feel the pinch, not the individual TV-set purchaser. It is instructive to note, also, that Dr. Pechman in his summary prefers the 3-per-cent gross receipts tax to the proposed excise tax on the sales of radios and television sets because of "political practicability and administrative feasibility," as well as "equity and economics."

To this same end of insulation, a proposal was made early in the hearings by Fred Friendly, television consultant to the Ford Foundation and former president of CBS News, that appears enlightened. It is that the projected $30- to $60-million yield from the satellite rental system proposed by the Ford Foundation should be given to the Public Television Corp. Under such an arrangement the satellites would be controlled by a nonprofit-making body, which would carry Public Broadcasting programs free and lease some of the channels to commercial networks. The revenue derived from the leasing process—"a people's dividend," as McGeorge Bundy calls it—would revert to Public Broadcasting's news and contemporary affairs offerings. This provision would move this hypersensitive service into still deeper insulation from the government. It is interesting to note, too, that this figure of $30 million tallies almost exactly with the budget appropriation for news and public affairs programing of one of the three major commercial networks for 1967.

The plan hinges, of course, on whether the satellite control is vested in a profit-making entity (like the present contenders, Communications Satellite Corp., A. T. & T., Western Union) or a non-profit-making one (the proposal of the Ford Foundation). At the hearings, Dr. James O'Connell, telecommunications adviser to the President, appositely noted that this question should wait upon further research and analysis. Furthermore, as Dr. O'Connell emphasized, conventional networking procedures are quite adequate for present commercial and noncommercial broadcasting needs.

An opinion may be briefly registered at this point, however. The idea of the domestic satellite system being in the hands of a nonprofit corporation appears to articulate smoothly with the concept that the airways are part of the public domain. Significant revenues derived from the use of that domain ought to go to a struggling public-service instrument with the potential and worth of public television. Commercial interests have already gained a lion's share of the profit yield from the public's atmosphere.

The foregoing considerations relating to the future funding of the Public Broadcasting Corp. are beyond the present scope of this bill, it should be stressed. On Feb. 28, President Johnson said: "Next year, after careful review, I will make further proposals for the corporation's long-term financing." During the hearings, Sen. Hartke urged a little more speed. "It's my own opinion," he said to McGeorge Bundy, "that if you do not write into this legislation at this time this second step [a dedicated tax], the second step next year will be the appropriation of a larger amount."

Then, with perfect timing and in even tones, Chairman Pastore lectured those assembled on points of administrative procedure. "Wouldn't it be denying the President," he said, "the latitude he needs as Chief

Executive to study this? Don't you think that this would be . . . a rebuke to the President's message? He has asked Congress to give him a year to make a proposal in this regard. . . . It might do this bill more harm than good. . . . If we attempt . . . to write in a dedicated tax, we will be usurping the jurisdiction of another committee. . . . Whether or not you are going to have an excise tax on television sets, whether dedicated or not, will have to originate in the House. It will have to go before the Ways and Means Committee, and then before the Senate Finance Committee. . . . Therefore, Gentlemen, I think we ought to be a little cautious about the suggestions that we are making here today that go beyond the jurisdiction of this committee."

It is for shows of astute intelligence such as this that Sen. Pastore won such vigorous applause from his colleagues when the bill reached the Senate floor. Sen. Yarborough said that the chairman had done an "outstanding job" in steering the bill to passage. Sen. Javits congratulated Chairman Pastore on the "speed and thoroughness" of his subcommittee's handling of the legislation. Sen. Mansfield characterized Mr. Pastore as a lawmaker of "abundant skill" and one "whose many examples of legislative ability are those to which we all may aspire."

Chairman Pastore's dogged, no-nonsense insistence on clarity ("Gentlemen, let's take the twists and turns out of all this"), his realistic language ("this is seed money to get the show on the road"), his fixity of resolution and disarming sense of humor kept the hearings moving at a sustained, rapid but humane pace.

The second major problem the subcommittee had to probe was the relationship of the corporation to the individual stations. The subject came into focus when the subtle and complex issue of interconnection was raised. Interconnection is a term used to describe the linkage or networking of the various ETV stations. The original language of the bill, used in an apparent effort to protect the autonomy of the individual stations, prohibited the corporation from direct dealing with common carriers for providing the interconnection.

To understand the subtleties of this matter, one must first understand the Carnegie Commission's philosophy of public television. When conducting research for their findings, the members of the commission inspected no less than 92 educational television stations in 35 States. These visits doubtless imbued the members with the stations' own philosophical attitude that they must not lose their autonomy to the proposed Public Broadcasting Corp. At all costs, they must remain self-determining. Many of these stations have had long histories of great economic struggle. The prospect of "one eager hand on the big switch"—of a master network feed—as one witness observed, has always been anathema to the individual stations.

So the commission's report insists on individual station autonomy, on preserving the "richness and diversity of programing commensurate with the richness and diversity of American society." The heart of the Public Broadcasting system, then, should be in the community. "Educational television is to be constructed on the firm foundation of strong and energetic local stations," the report declared. Thus, centralization of programing and live simultaneous transmission—networking as we understand it from commercial television—are not stressed by the Carnegie Commission. Nevertheless, the commission does allow that there are many instances when simultaneous networking would be appropriate.

To the Carnegie Commission, then, interconnection is simply closed-circuit distribution of programs to stations autonomously empowered to accept the programs for simultaneous broadcast, videotape them for delayed transmission or reject them altogether. Dr. Killian saw this freedom of the individual station and the decentralization of the total system as being menaced by the original language of the bill, which prohibited the corporation from having networking authority If the power to network was entrusted to another entity by law, logically a production entity, then this would effectively link production with distribution, he argued, thus making integral the elements of a networking system that the commission wished to avoid. Hence, if the autonomy of individual stations is to be protected, the authority to interconnect should be entrusted to a comporation imbued with the philosophy of a decentralized broadcast-system, and not to be a production entity.

But at least two other witnesses, John White, president of National Educational Television (NET), and Jack McBride, head of the Nebraska ETV Network, have read the same evidence entirely differently. Both objected to giving networking power to the corporation because such centralization, they alleged, would lead to disturbing the autonomy of individual stations. Mr. White argued that the same corporation that would be doing the networking would also be disbursing funds to the local stations for their regional programing. If the stations refused to carry the corporation's networked programs, the corporation might seek reprisal by reducing the licensee's dole.

E. William Henry, former chairman of the FCC, sided with Dr. Killian and favored an operational corporation—but for antithetical reasons. "The corporation," he said, "must not look like a lion and squeak like a mouse." He felt it was impractical to talk in terms of a "major effort" to create a public corporation and then "limit its power to simple policy formulation and to being a conduit for funds." For this reason he favored giving the corporation operating network authority. Under questioning by Chairman Pastore, he agreed that the ultimate decisions with regard to program acceptability were to be made by the indivdual station that would be using the program.

Fred Friendly and McGeorge Bundy are still more convinced of the importance of a highly centralized system and a power-concentrated corporation—also for reasons opposite to Dr. Killian's. Both Mr. Bundy and Mr. Friendly stayed out of the discussion at the hearings, however. They were clearly on an errand of peace. "There are no inconsistencies whatever between [the Carnegie Commission's] report and the findings of the Ford Foundation," Mr. Bundy stressed. "There is a marginal difference of emphasis on the relative importance of interconnection, but we believe that this is best left to the test of experience."

Although nothing was mentioned at the hearings about the "marginal differences" with the Carnegie Commission, Fred Friendly earlier this year had written instructively that he was concerned that the Carnegie report's emphasis on decentralization could turn out to be a local "anesthesia." "Local autonomy," he declared, "already excuses some commercial stations from carrying civil rights reports, United Nations debates and even birth control documentaries. Of course, a station is the final authority, by law, on what it broadcasts. But the price of autonomy need not be the emasculation of a live NET network at birth. Crucial issues such as Vietnam, space and national politics require a national news organization with depth of personnel and facilities—and ability to get on the air: *nationally and immediately.*"

To assist in resolving the matter, the subcommittee petitioned the aid of the three heads of the commercial networks: Dr. Frank Stanton, of CBS, Julian Goodman, of NBC, and Leonard Goldenson, of ABC. They concurred in the judgment that the corporation should be authorized to deal directly with the common carriers on the matter of interconnection. Mr. Goodman greatly influenced the subcommittee when he wrote in a letter: "Efficiency, sensible administration and simplicity of operations would be served by enabling the corporation to make these arrangements [i.e., interconnection] directly with the carriers providing the service."

The upshot was that the subcommittee amended the bill (by removing one word) to allow the corporation operational authority to arrange for its own networking, but at the same time, in its report, hedged by saying that the corporation might exercise its interconnection responsibility "by special contractual arrangements." This was not really fudging, however, but a skillful ploy in the legislative history of the measure to guarantee full flexibility to the corporation.

The net effect of the amendment is simply to stress that the total responsibility for all parts of the system—including interconnection—ultimately resides with the corporation's board. Such a clarification is all to the good. In time, the prediction of E. William Henry, which appeared to have slipped out by accident in his testimony, will probably come true. "What makes this corporation most exciting," he said, "is the possibility of a live network unfettered by commercial considerations." If that powerful, centralized noncommercial network does happily come into being, how ironical it will be that Dr. Killian, the arch-exponent of a decentralized system, by his strong lobby for giving the corporation, the power to control networking, was largely responsible for the amendment that produced a centralized system.

Nevertheless, the legislative history written during these hearings, as well as the Hartke amendment, will keep the autonomy of the individual stations relatively inviolate. They will certainly be unlike the commercial affiliated TV outlets in that there will be no such coercion from the PBC "network" to accept its programing.

The Public Broadcasting Act was approved by the Senate five weeks after the legislative hearings began, with only one recorded dissenting vote, that of Sen. Strom Thurmond (R., S.C.). "The bill provides maximum protection from the interference of Congress," said Sen. Thurmond, "but it provides none at all from the manipulations of the executive branch, or worse yet, from capture by an ideological minority opposed to the programs of both."

Sen. Norris Cotton (R, N.H.), who sits on the same side of the aisle as Sen. Thurmond and is a member of the Subcommittee on Communications, silenced his objection by noting that if abuses develop, we can "instantly and immediately" do something about it. "First," he said, "we can make very uncomfortable and give a very unhappy experience to the directors of the corporation. Second, we can shut down some of their activities . . . in the appropriating process of Congress."

With Senate passage, the bill has now moved to the House, where the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, under the chairmanship of Rep. Harley O. Staggers (D., W.Va.), will probably conduct hearings directly on it, once his committee is disentangled from the hearings on public health legislation. In view of the exhaustive scrutiny given the act by the Senate, and the momentum the bill has generated, and the President's desire for its passage, the House Subcommittee on Communications will probably not hold separate hearings. If the Committee on Commerce gets the bill by early June, there is some hope that it will be passed before the end of the month.

If any of the issues relating to pay-television that are currently circulating in Washington become involved in the House hearings, passage of this bill would quite probably be slowed down. Such a joining of issues would be a singularly unfortunate mistake. Toll-TV is something entirely separate from public television and ought to be held completely distinct from all provisions of the Public Broadcasting Act.

What effect will the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967 have upon U.S. culture? First, it will upgrade television programing. The signs are already visible. Since the beginning of the year, when the Carnegie Commission put ETV into the spotlight, there has been a spate of perceptive documentaries. Next season, almost 300 specials are planned fur the three commercial networks, an extraordinary increment. Just as the BBC in Britain was helped by the arrival of Independent Television, so too, the competition here between public TV and commercial TV will elevate our programing.

Secondly, Public Broadcasting will doubtless improve the quality of our religious programing, so much of which is simply a case of the bland leading the bland. As Fred Friendly told this writer: "Public television is an eminently congruous platform for religious news and analysis programs." The Public Broadcast Laboratory of NET, which will begin interconnected operation on alternate Sunday afternoons, will analyze in depth religious issues of topical concern. Av Westin, the president of PBL, sees religious questions as newsworthy, and he defines "news" as "that which interests people." Since Public Broadcast Laboratory is the probable forerunner of the Public Broadcasting news and contemporary affairs programing itself, perhaps it is not over-optimistic to see in this development an augury of what will be included in the future of public television.

The over-all effect of public television will be a legitimizing of the medium. As Sen. Hugh Scott (R., Pa.) humorously noted at the hearings: "I am one of the great number of people in this country who have television sets and who join in the general apology. When someone comes in for a visit, [I say] 'We never look at it' . . . 'We hide it behind the door. We don't keep it in the living room.' " When PBC arrives, that vast national apology will be over.

[John Mc Laughlin, S.J., who will join the staff of America next September as an assistant editor, testified before the Senate Subcommittee on Communications at the hearings on the Public Television Act of 1967.]

Martin Luther King-Ville

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1967

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, Martin Luther King will now have his own utopia for the faithful of his Ebenezer Baptist Church in Atlanta—thanks to the beneficence of the American taxpayers.

There is to be a modest rental charge, but this slight obstacle could be removed by passing the rent subsidy bill or increasing welfare checks.

Does anyone suggest this Federal project will pass the assessment of racial quotas? If not, perhaps the NAACP will enjoin construction and occupation because of segregated bias and can prevail upon a Federal judge to bus in white statistics or compel the necessary percentage to move in. No church-state or constitutional question presented. Poverty justifies all.

Mr. Speaker, I include this newsclipping from Mr. Magill's Atlanta Constitution for August 1, 1967, at this point in the Record:

KING'S CHURCH TO SPONSOR $1.8 MILLION URBAN RENEWAL

Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. formally committed his church Monday to sponsor a $1.8 million urban renewal project in a contract with the Atlanta Housing Authority.

King said a job-training course will be part of the development with residents taking part at all levels.

The Ebenezer Baptist Church, where King and his father are co-pastors, won development contract for the 152- low and moderate income housing units for the Rawson-Washington area.

The 7.8-acre project will include garden apartments, town houses and a 12-story high-rise apartment building.

The rental range will be $55 to $110 a month.

Muldawer & Patterson are the architects.

The development will be handled under the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development's 221(d)(3) program.

Captive Nations Week, 1967, and a Special House Committee on Captive Nations

SPEECH

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 24, 1967

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, since the 1967 Captive Nations Week began this past third week of July, data has been flowing in steadily showing the scope and depth of a movement that has already assumed important international proportions. In the period ahead increasing amounts of such data will be received from both domestic and foreign sources.

As in past years, one of the chief themes of the 1967 week was the necessary creation of a Special House Committee on the Captive Nations. This action is long overdue. With the clear Russian penetration of the Middle East and its triggering of the Arab-Israel conflict, one would think that this action would have been spontaneously undertaken. Soviet Russian imperiocolonialism use a variety of techniques and subterfuges to extend the list of captive nations and thus expand its empire, including the technique of war by proxy, as seen in the Middle East. It is high time that we concentrated on the fundamental power source of Soviet Russian imperiocolonialism, namely, the numerous captive non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R. itself. And this would be one of the sterling accomplishments of the proposed special committee.

Mr. Speaker, along with many other Members, I call again for the leadership to spur on the Rules Committee to consider now the measure for a Special Committee on the Captive Nations. Also, I request that the following data on the 1967 Captive Nations Week be printed at this point in the Record:

First. July 17, New York Daily News editorial entitled "Captive Nations Week."

Second. Resolution of the Chicago Captive Nations Day festivity on July 15.

Third. Chicago Tribune article of July 16, entitled "50,000 See Annual Captive Nations March in State Street."

Fourth. Two letters on captive nations issues which appeared in the July 18 Chicago Tribune.

Fifth. July 13 release from the mayor's office on the Chicago observance.

Sixth. Article from July 18 edition of Cleveland, Ohio, Plain Dealer, entitled "4,000 March for World Freedom."

Seventh. A letter which the Washington Post refused to publish as a reply by Walter Pretka to its July 10 editorial on "Captive Congressmen."

Eighth. Article entitled "America's Shame: The Captive Nations," from Freedom's Voice, a publication of the MacArthur Freedom Association.

Ninth. July 24 press release from the National Captive Nations Committee commemorating the week at the Statue of Liberty.

The material follows:

[From the New York Daily News, July 17, 1967]

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

The observance began yesterday. It was decreed by Congress in 1959, lest we forget the slave empire the Communists have overrun in the past 50 years.

It is supposed to be accompanied by a ringing proclamation from our Chief Executive. But as our Washington columnist, Ted Lewis, pointed out recently, this has been toned down to almost a behind-the-hand whisper by successive Presidents.

Instead we talk of thaws, détentes, reproachments and building bridges to these tyrants who have sworn to bury us. With wishful thinking and weasel words we try to transform the Communist Agre into a Jolly Red Giant.

Whenever we are tempted to take such pipe dreams seriously we should think of the millions of victims of our let's-get-along-with-the-Russians agreements at Yalta, Tehran and Potsdam.

We talk of "peaceful coexistence." What of their right to peaceful existence? And will the foundations for our "bridges" be the crushed spirits and broken hopes of those "huddled masses yearning to breathe free"?

CHICAGO CAPTIVE NATIONS DAY RESOLUTION, SATURDAY, JULY 15, 1967

Whereas, the Senate and the House of Representatives have authorized the President of the United States of America to proclaim a Captive Nations Week, and the same has been done for the past eight years; and

Whereas, the Russian and Chinese Communist world continues on its' road of persecution, aggression and enslavement, and through these means has succeeded to subjugate many nations and ethnic groups, creating a vast colonial empire; and

Whereas, Communism continues to threaten the peace, security and independence of the Free World, having succeeded in a complete take-over of Cuba, encouraging subversive conspiracies in Latin America and Africa, and conducting open, aggressive warfare in South Viet-Nam, neighboring countries of Laos and Cambodia, and most recently in the Middle and Near East;

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the Chicago Captive Nations Week Committee, to urge the United States to adopt a national policy, which would encourage the aspirations and movements for national self-determination of all peoples enslaved by the communist imperialism, by an expressed and unequivocal commitment of the United States of America to support, by all means possible, such aspirations for national freedom;

Be it further resolved, that convinced of the indivisibility of freedom and peace, we consider the restoration of the sacred rights of all the nations based on principles of democracy, self-determination and sovereignty within thei rrespective ethnic boundaries, as of paramount importance for stability, freedom and security of the entire world;

Be it further resolved, that we support unreservedly the United States' determined resistance to communist aggression in South Viet-Nam, and that we salute members of the United States and Allied Armed Forces, escapees from the Captive Nations, and their sons among them, fighting for men's freedom; and

Be it further resolved, that the United States Ambassador to the United Nations, place on the agenda of the United Nations the following proposals:

1. the abolishment of slave labor, mass deportations, and all concentration camps.
2. the return to their countries all the deported and exiled who survived the communist ordeal.
3. free elections for all enslaved nations under the supervision of United Nations Organization.

Be it further resolved, that we oppose the admission of the Chinese Communist regime to the United Nations Organization;

Be it further resolved, that we oppose "One-Way Bridges" and the establishment of Russian Consulate in Chicago;

Be it further resolved, that special efforts must be made by the United States towards an awakening and strengthening of moral forces, particularly at a time when we are faced by an unparalleled loss of ethical concern and incredible callousness towards the enslaved, abandoned to their ordeal;

Be it further resolved, to appeal to the United States authorities to undertake utmost efforts in the interest of the preservation of freedom, and of sacred values in educational institutions. In order to stop the spread of communist encirclement, it is not enough to give help to the underprivileged countries, but to correct the under-developed minds in our own country. It is appalling to see how free men let themselves be used in the service of the blood-stained Red Empire.

Be it further resolved, that the United States government stop trading with the communist countries because in so doing, it helps them to tighten their grip on the enslaved. Whatever is gained at great risk by the desperate, enslaved men and women through sabotaging Soviet economy, is destroyed through trading.

Be it further resolved, that this Committee reiterates its support for the establishment of the permanent Captive Nations Committee (House Resolution 211) and Freedom Academy, which would demonstrate to the entire world that the United States of America will not cease in its efforts until all the Captive Nations are able to enjoy their God-given rights in their sovereign states.

Viktors Viksnins, General Chairman; Prof. A. Voobus, Chairman of Resolution Sub-Committee; Mrs. Ulana Celewych, Secretary; Taras Shpikula, Ukraine Representative; Mrs. Vera Romuk, Bielarus' Representative; Bernhard Averbeck, Germany Representative; Roksanda Panich, Serbia Representative; Vaslav Kubicek, Czechoslovakia Representative; Sandra Sela, Croatia Representative; Dimitry Gunia, Georgia Representative; H. Yeusuf Azem, Albania Representative; Kit Shent Mui, China Representative; Hon. Paul Chung, Korea Representative; Birute A. Vindasius, Lithuania Representative; Anton Ondrus, Slovakia Representative; Leonids Neimanis, Latvia Representative; Alexander Koepp, Estonia Representative; Ivan Klitnyj, Cossackia Representative; Henryka Grajewska, Poland Representative; Georg Marinev, Bulgaria Representative.

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Tribune, July 16, 1967]

FIFTY THOUSAND SEE ANNUAL CAPTIVE NATIONS MARCH IN STATE STREET

Americans from captive nations carried flags of those nations down State strees yesterday along with signs calling for freedom of their native lands.

They were marching in the annual Captive Nations parade. American flags flew proudly at the head of each marching unit, and banners proclaiming support for United States service men in Viet Nam.

FIFTY THOUSAND SEE PARADE

A crowd, estimated by police at 50,000 persons, lined State street three and four deep to watch.

Among the largest delegations in the parade of more than 10,00 persons were those from Korea and Lithuania. The Korean Karate institute presented a demonstration in which one man pulled a car by a strap held in his teeth and another smashed a cement block with his head.

Queens reigned over colorful floats, and women marched in native costumes of reds, blues, and greens.

HONOR VIET VETERANS

Men who have served in Viet Nam rode in cars near the front of the parade. The crowd at the reviewing stand cheered them as the United States Navy band played "My Country 'Tis of Thee."

Robert Witcher, state commander of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, headed the V.F.W. delegation which led the parade.

In addition to Korea and Lithuania, the nations represented included Bulgaria, the Baltic states, Serbia, Slovakia, Estonia, Poland, Ukraine, Croatia, Bielarus, Albania, Latvia, Cossakia, Slovenia, Armenia, Georgia, Germany, Czechoslovakia and China.

Rep. Roman C. Pucinski [D., Ill.], told more than 200 persons attending a luncheon in the Hilton hotel after the parade, "We are able to work together as Americans because we have one bond that holds us all together—we are all free.

"There were no draft card burners, no flag burners, on State street today. There were Americans who understand that Viet Nam is a battle in a continuing war against communism . . ."

"God grant that the spirit you demonstrated today would become infectious and spread thruout the country and thruout the whole world.

"God created men to be free and no Communist is going to change that."

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Tribune, July 18, 1967]

U.S. TOOLS FOR RUSSIA

AURORA, July 6.—Willard Edwards' "Capitol Views" column in today's TRIBUNE is timely in revealing the mechanism and motives involved in moving the east-west trade bill thru Capitol hill.

"Loyal opposition" leader in this particular venture, Sen. Thruston Morton (R., Ky.) envisions prosperity for Kentucky as the United States steps up the sale of machine tools to the soviets. Morton says "Cincinnati is the machine tool center of the world. You'd be surprised to know how many Kentuckians cross the river to work over there."

Perhaps in November, 1968, Sen. Morton will be surprised to learn that Kentuckians choose not to trade loyalty to their fighting men for the tainted riches resulting from selling highly strategic machine tools to the communist enemy.

Furthermore, it is hardly realistic to classify such deals as "sales," since the soviets require credit from the United States government Export-Import bank, and, in event of default, Mr. and Mrs. American Taxpayer will be picking up the tab for this aid to the enemy.

Scrap iron to Japan was minor league compared with this operation: Remember Pearl Harbor!

ROBERT M. GREGG.

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Tribune, July 18, 1967]

KHRUSHCHEV'S REMARKS

CHICAGO, July 13.—I was shocked to read this morning of some remarks by the discredited Communist, Mr. Khrushchev, about former Presidents Eisenhower and Kennedy and former Vice President Nixon. I am sure that each of them, in their time, took care of the number one Communist when he was flying high. But I think red-blooded Americans who boiled as I did when reading Mr. Khrushchev's remarks should write letters to the papers telling Mr. Khrushchev that Americans choose their own officers, and are in no need of any outside influence [such as he claimed to have exerted in behalf of Mr. Kennedy] to elect or reject any candidate for officer of this great nation.

JAMES M. BURR,
Deputy Sheriff, Cook County.

RELEASE FROM OFFICE OF THE MAYOR, JULY 13, 1967

Chicago's Captive Nations Week Committee appointed by Mayor Daley to sponsor the Captive Nations Week program in Chicago including the annual parade on State Street to be held at 12:00 noon, Saturday, July 15th, was announced today.

Viktors Viksnins of the United Latvian Association was named Chairman and Mrs. Ulana Celewych of the Ukrainian American Association was named Secretary.

Committee members named with others to be added are:

HONORARY COMMITTEE

Governor Otto Kerner, Mayor Richard J. Daley, the Honorable Edward J. Derwinski, the Honorable Daniel Rostenkowski, the Honorable Roman Pucinski, the Honorable Frank Annunzio, Professor Lev. E. Dobriansky, His Excellency Most Rev. Vincentas Brizgys, the Honorable Paul Chung, the Honorable Petras P. Dauzvardis, the Honorable Wei-min Lee, His Excellency Most Rev. Aleksander Nowytzkyi, Colonel Jack Reilly, Jacob J. Wolf, Frank D. Savickas, the Honorable John C. Kluczynski, Mr. Frederick E. Merritt, Mr. Joe Martin, Dr. L. B. Dzinich, Dr. Peter Hletko, Mr. Walter A. Kollacks, Dr. Chester Piekarczyk, Dr. V. Romuk, Mr. Anthony Rudis, Mr. Ray Soden, Mr. Paul Quirico, Rev. John Beretta, Mrs. Ulana Celewych, Mr. Juhon Holberg, Mr. Viktors Viksnins.

ALBANIA

Rev. Hafizi Yousuff Azem, Dr. Faton Gashi, Mr. Yaup Xhezaj, Dr. Isa Sejdinaj, Dr. Kugia.

ARMENIA

Mr. Art Kushdilian.

BULGARIA

Dr. George Paprikoff, Mr. Jordan Georgiev, Mr. George Marinov, Mr. Hristo Gelov, Mr. Anthony Bielenis, Mr. William Puntus, Mrs. Vera Romuk, Mr. Nick Zyznieuski, Mrs. Tania Novik.

CHINA

Mr. Kit Shent Mui, Mr. Pack H. Wong, Mr. Albert K. Leong.

COSSACKIA

Mr. Andrew Kozlow, Mr. Ivan Klitnyj, Mr. Andreas Mazanow.

CROATIA

Mr. Joe Stimac, Mrs. Ivanka Simatic, Mr. Martin Rukavina, Mrs. Sandra Sola.

CUBA

Mr. Arturo Olivera, M.D., Mr. Augustin Rey.

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Mr. Vaclav Kubicek, Mrs. Vlasta Vraz.

ESTONIA

Professor Dr. A. Voobus, Mr. Alexander Koepp, Mr. Oskar Kookla.

GEORGIA

Mr. Dimitri Gunia.

GERMANY

Mr. Bernhard Averbeck, Mrs. Isabella Erbe, Mr. Dieter K. Schroeder.

HUNGARY

Dr. Frederick Nagy, Mr. Paul Quirico, Rev. Kornel Tessenyi.

KOREA

Mr. Ki Young Shim, Rev. G. K. Un, Mr. Song W. So.

LATVIA

Mr. V. Landmanis, Mr. Leonids Neimanis, Mr. A. Vanags, Mr. Voldemars Lagzdins.

LITHUANIA

Mr. Karolis Avizienis, Mr. J. Ingaunis, Mr. J. Pakalka, Mr. Leon Pakusta, Mr. Leonas Prapuolenis, Mrs. Biruta Vindasiena.

POLAND

Mr. Walter Stepien, Mr. Boleslaw Bilogan, Mr. Kazimierz Lukomski.

SERBIA

Mr. Robert Vyjovich, Mrs. Roksanda Panich, Mrs. Joan Bulativich.

SLOVAKIA

Mr. Rudolf Bado, Mr. Milan Blazek, Mr. Anton Ondrush, Mrs. Anna Vizza.

SLOVENIA

Mrs. Gizella Hozian, Dr. Ludwig A. Leskovar, Father Vendelin Spendow, O.F.M.

UKRAINE

Mr. Taras Shpikula, Mrs. Ulana Celewych, Dr. Wolodymyr Nechaj, Mr. Theodosij Nosiewych.

[From the Cleveland (Ohio) Plain Dealer, July 18, 1967]

Initiate Captive Nations Week: 4,000 March for World Freedom

Four thousand Greater Clevelanders marched for freedom last night in Public Square.

The colorful parade initiatived Captive Nations Week ceremonies which drew more than 25,000 persons to the Square.

Members of 19 nationality groups, most from Central and Eastern Europe but also from Cuba, North Korea, Ireland and China, marched in orderly appeal for freedom and self determination for their native lands.

The marchers assembled at Public Square for speeches by civic and religious leaders.

Mayor Locher spoke of the "tragic fate" that had come to the nations behind the Iron Curtain. He predicted, "if we work together we may once again see the people of these nations leading free and productive lives."

Gov. Rhodes, scheduled main speaker, sent word from Columbus legislative matters had prevented him from attending.

"The newspaper industry is synonomous with freedom," said Thomas R. Guthrie, assistant to the publisher of The Plain Dealer and representing the paper at the ceremonies.

Guthrie said the loss of a free press means the loss of freedom for a nation.

County Auditor Ralph J. Perk, chairman of the Nationalities Movement of Cuyahoga County, sponsor of the rally, expained the purpose of the affair.

"Our objectives," said Perk, "are to unite the nationalities and to strengthen the whole movement so we can better influence U.S. policy in bringing freedom to the captive nations."

A resolution by the Captive Nations Week Committee, read by Dr. Michael S. Pap, director of the Institute for Soviet and East European Studies at John Carroll University, was adopted at the rally.

The resolution urges President Johnson to take up the cause of the captive nations "until all these nations are free and independent again."

Mayors of several suburbs and Bishop Clarence G. Issenmann of the Cleveland Catholic Diocese were also on the platform.

To the Editor,
The Washington Post.

Dear Sir: In spite of the tremendous expenditures of blood and treasure our Nation is called upon to make daily in Vietnam to prevent the fall of still another nation to Communism, the propoents of our bankrupt foreign policy continue to talk in terms of "rapproachment," "detente," "bridge-building" and the like regarding our relations with the Soviet Union. These policy makers apparently fail to realize that it is primarily Moscow that sustains Hanoi's effort to "liberate" South Vietnam to Communism in the same classical pattern which was long ago blueprinted in Moscow.

Starting from the tiny Duchy of Muscovy in the 15th Century, the Russian Tsars using various excuses and employing the means of deceit, terror and ruthless conquest of nations, expanded the Russian Empire to the borders it occupied at the start of World War I.

Upon the occasion of the collapse of that empire, approximately a dozen non-Russian nations included therein proclaimed their independence. Imperial Russia, now shrunken to its ethnic borders and controlling the destiny of Russian subjects only who, incidentally, comprised less than half of the population of the original empire, embarked on its next phase of expansive conquest.

Clothing historical Russian imperio-colonialism in the insidious disguise of Communism to both confuse resistance in the Free World and win support therein for World Communism, Russia, now "Soviet Russia," invaded and conquered its first victim, Ukraine, in 1920 and reincorporated through conquest the remaining non-Russian nations in the so-called "Union of Soviet Socialist Republics" by the beginning of World War II. Following the war and employing the tactics developed through centuries of experience, nations of Eastern and Central Europe, Asia and finally Cuba, fell before this ruthless enemy.

Recognizing Soviet Russia as the chief enemy to world peace, courageous members of the House and Senate in 1959 enacted into law by a joint resolution of Congress the Captive Nations Resolution (Public Law 86–90). The Resolution requests the President to issue a similar proclamation each year until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world. President Johnson, in complying with this, has issued a proclamation designating the third week of July of this year (July 16–22) as Captive Nations Week. This is the ninth consecutive year the President of the United States has issued such a proclamation.

The Captive Nations Resolution not only names the nations of Eastern and Central Europe, but specifically recognizes and names the dozen non-Russian nations in the Soviet Union. The inclusion of the non-Russian nations in the Soviet Union in the Resolution is the reason for the bitter tirades and denunciations launched by Moscow against the Resolution each year since its passage. As Moscow knows the Captive Nations idea, properly implemented, forms the basis for a winning Cold War policy since its points up the key issue in achieving this end result—the "disunity" of the Soviet Union.

Premier Kosygin, like all leaders in the Kremlin, trembles at the thought of Captive Nations Week. In the recent talks held at Glassboro it has been reported that Kosygin tried to prevail on President Johnson not to issue a proclamation this year in order to "improve" East-West relations.

Recognizing the importance of Captive Nations Week observances a number of foreign countries now issue their own proclamations.

The idea of the Week has transcended our own borders and promises to awaken countless other individuals and nations to the historical character of Russian imperio-colonialism. Captive Nations Week is truly Soviet Russia's nightmare and freedom's hope!

Walter Pretka.

[From Freedom's Voice]

America's Shame: The Captive Nations

If ours were an enlightened self-interest, what would be the normal position to take on the captive nations? We would work continuously to promote their freedom and to publicize their present enslavement.

Why?

The captive nations are testimony to the fact that we cannot do business with Communists. Americans should remember that there is not a single nation or territory under Communism which did not have relations with the Soviets. Moreover, the more high-sounding the treaties and agreements made with the Soviet empire, the quicker and more absolute was the enslavement. By exploiting the captive nations for the lessons they can teach, we learn that:

1. Red Russia cannot be contained by disarmament pacts, cultural exchanges, windy debates, give-and-take agreements, appeasement.

Rather, the seed of communism's destruction lies within itself. The conquered are longing and planning for their freedom. To shake hands with a Khrushchev, a Brezhnev, a Kosygin—or with the one who may soon replace them and start the cycle over again with friendly smiles and lofty proposals—is to snuff out the captive's spark of resistance, a weapon against our own enslavement. Even for our own sake, therefore, we should work to keep Americans aware of the present state of the captive nations and of the best natural hope for our victory which comes from them.

2. The strongest advantages of the enemy are not military, but political and psychological.

It was not armed might that locked the galling chains about the necks of the captive nations. Although Russia's greatest conquests occurred in times of war, the armies came second. First there came subversion in government, education, and communications. In government, the puppets of appeasement assured the people that peace, friendship, and freedom were to be the gifts of cooperation with the Reds. In education, traditional moral standards and patriotism were held up for examination as curiosities, and then suppressed. In communications, what the people could not know was not reported and what they could know was subtly distorted.

The string about each nation's throat became a cord, the cord became a rope and the rope eventually became an iron chain. The captive nations are watching the thread around America's throat. If we but listen to their cries, perhaps we shall snap the string before it becames a chain. Certainly, we must be totally prepared militarily, but no amount of armed might will protect us if we rot from within.

If all we know is what is in the refrigerator, what is on TV, how much gas is in the car, and which cigarette pleases most; if all we have time for is luxury, then we should hoard well our comforts, for we have not long to enjoy them. We must take time, in the name of enlightened self-interest, to learn and teach the lessons of the captive nations, to win this Soviet-declared war of politics and psychology.

3. To work for our own preservation, we must work toward the liberation of the captive nations.

Communism is a cancer. A man who is told that he has lung cancer would be a fool to take steps to protect his heart with never a thought about curing the cancer. It is foolish to talk about keeping ourselves and the rest of the Free World from Communist domination without planning the liberation of the enslaved nine hundred million Freedom Fighters.

Declaring military war is not the way to free them. Waging ideological, political, and psychological war is the way. The Free World must become absorbed, in international dealings, with the subject of the captive nations. Every crack in the Iron Curtain must become an echo chamber for freedom's voice. Every reliable report of Red suppression of the enslaved must become subject to investigation by the Free World.

Next time one of the captive nations breaks the slavery chains, we should be ready to recognize the new government and to send in American representatives and real "foreign aid." It is our obligation to elect representatives who will do this. It is our obligation to make the present representatives of the Free World aware of the need for nonviolent aggresion on behalf of the captive nations.

War is what will result from appeasement: war when we can only lose. A strong, unyielding stand today will make war unnecessary. From within and without their prisons, the people will rise to drive back to hell the father of lies with his false philosophy.

The sufferings of the captive nations are beyond comprehension. Justice and charity demand that we preface any evaluation of "peaceful co-existence" with consideration of the plight of every captive nation.

It is not practical, it is not just, it is not Christian to negotiate on other matters without insisting on freedom for the enslaved; for by doing so we write off the millions who look to us for help, we invite further Communist aggression, we become slowly reconciled to surrender by default.

There is only one standard for America: if a policy advances the cause of freedom, let us pursue it vigorously; if it injures the cause of freedom, let us reject it vehemently. In the words of John Donne:

"No man is an island unto himself. Every man is a piece of the continent . . . a part of the main.

"Every man's death diminishes me because I am involved in all mankind.

"Therefore, send not to learn for whom the bell tolls . . . it tolls for thee."

The American public has been conditioned to consider Communist "governments" as the legitimate representatives of their people.

Neither our schools nor our press and television want to tell Americans the true historical facts behind the rise of communism:

Of the part the USA played at Yalta, Potsdam, and Teheran in betraying once-free peoples to Red slavery;

Why the USA—with the mightiest war machine the world has ever seen and in sole control of atomic power at the end of WWII—did not use its might to back up a demand that all the Reds return to their own borders. American boys shed their blood in Korea and Vietnam for this sin of their politicians;

Why the USA has worked to keep Communist governments from falling apart by providing aid and trade;

Of the immense regions of this world retained under the control of Red "governments" only through torture, concentration camps, genocide, terrorism;

Of the Red-enslaved areas marked with gibbets, crosses, prisons sanctified by the blood of so many Christian martyrs;

Of the murder of almost 100 million human beings by the Red Fascists;

Of the reasons for the strange silence of the "United Nations" on these crimes that shout to heaven itself for retribution.

Captive Nations Author Lauds Israelis for Preventing More Captive Nations in Middle East

Supporting Arab interests as well as Israel's, the author of the Captive Nations Week Resolution (Public Law 86–90) stated yesterday, "All free men, including the vast majority of the Arab world, should laud the Israelis for preventing the emergence of captive nations under Russian domination in the Middle East." In a speech commemorating the Ninth Observance of Captive Nations Week at the Statue of Liberty, Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, a professor of Georgetown University and chairman of the National Captive Nations Committee in Washington, told his audience, "If Israel were vanquished, the entire Middle East would have come under the imperio-colonialist control of Moscow. Israel's victory was a victory for national freedom generally and for free Arab opportunity in particular."

Captive Nations Week is being observed during this period in all sections of the country and also abroad. Congress, which legislated the resolution in 1959, celebrated the event last Wednesday. President Johnson proclaimed the Week on July 12.

The Georgetown professor urged the Administration to initiate debate in the U.N. on Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism, as called for by President Kennedy in September 1961 and in part prepared by Adlai Stevenson's memo on the subject in November of that year. "Such a debate," he said "would impress upon Arab leaders the scope of Russian colonialist exploitation of some 40 million Muslim brothers in the USSR. Nasser, Arif and others are playing with fire in their dependence on the Red Empire to advance their insular goals."

Relating Vietnam, the Red Empire, and the Middle East adventure together, Dr. Dobriansky also urged Congressional hearings on U.S. policy toward the USSR. He pointed out, "Such hearings would be unprecedented because we've never had any since the USSR was founded in 1922–23." Resolutions to this effect have recently been submitted in the House of Representatives.

This year's observance has highlighted the exposure of the fraudulent 50th anniversary of the Russian Bolshevik revolution, which takes place this November. The theme was underscored at the rally here by the advertised publication this October of Dobriansky's book, *The Vulnerable Russians*, as an "American answer to the '50th.'"

Communications Workers To Observe 1968 as International Year for Human Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 12, 1967

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, the General Assembly of the United Nations has invited all its member states to ratify before 1968 the conventions already included in the field of human rights. Although the U.S. Senate has never ratified any of the Human Rights Conventions, four of these treaties are now pending before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. In view of the fact that 1968 has been designated as the International Year for Human Rights, it is essential that the Senate pass these treaties.

Mr. Speaker, it is in this respect that I would like to recommend to the attention of my colleagues a resolution adopted by the Communications Workers of America at their 29th annual convention held in Kansas City, Mo. in June 1967 which calls upon its members to observe 1968 as the International Year for Human Rights:

International Year for Human Rights

On December 12, 1963, the General Assembly of the United Nations designated the year 1968, which is the twentieth anniversary of the adoption and proclamation of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, as International Year for Human Rights. On December 20, 1965, this same body reaffirmed its belief that 1968 should be devoted to intensive national and international efforts and undertakings in the field of human rights, and also to an international review of achievements in this field.

The Universal Declaration of Human Rights has proved to be a valuable and effective instrument and source of inspiration for new legislation and judicial decisions in many countries, as well as a milestone in the history of the United Nations' activities in the field of human rights.

The United Nations has called upon the governments of all countries and the people of the world to intensify the struggle to safeguard fundamental freedoms and human rights, as well as to assure the complete and immediate elimination of such violation of human rights as racial discrimination and the policy of apartheid.

The advancement of human rights leads toward the strengthening of peace throughout the world and to friendship between peoples. Therefore, be it

Resolved: That the Communications Workers of America renews the dedication of its members and governments to the manifold concerns for human rights within our respective countries and the growing world community, and thus, to provide larger measures of justice and freedom, and to make for greater peace on earth; and be it further

Resolved: That the Communications Workers of America calls on its members to observe 1968 as International Year for Human Rights.

Idaho to Host XII World Jamboree of Scouting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HANSEN

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1967

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, today, August 1, the XII World Jamboree of Scouting opens in Farragut State Park, Idaho. It marks the first time that such a World Jamboree has been held in the United States. Naturally, we in Idaho are proud of the fact that our State is hosting this event—but that pride is tempered with the knowledge that nowhere in the United States could a better site be found for it.

Mr. Speaker, the theme for the 1967 Boy Scout World Jamboree is "For Friendship," a theme I believe to be particularly appropriate at this time due to the misunderstandings and tensions that exist around the world. It is to be hoped and prayed for that through the historic event starting today, the 14,000 Scouts and Scouters from nearly 100 nations participating in fellowship, will gain a knowledge and understanding of each other and each other's problems that will help lessen these tensions as each reports back to his own people.

For an excellent account of the XII World Jamboree, I enclose an article from the August 1967 Readers Digest. The article gives some idea of the tremendous amount of work entailed in setting up an operation the size of this Jamboree. Interestingly, it mentions the town and lake most closely associated with the encampment in north Idaho—Coeur d'Alene and Lake Pend Oreille—which were named by the early French traders.

The traders, who apparently were very shrewd and who drove hard bargains, were called by the Indians the "pointed hearts." Translated by the traders, this became Coeur d'Alene. Pend Oreille—or "hanging from the ear"—was the name given by the traders to Indians of the area who wore pendant ornaments in their ear lobes. Eventually, the lake came to bear the same name.

The article follows:

JAMBOREE 1967

(By James Lincoln Collier)

(NOTE.—This month, for the first time ever, the United States will play host to the Boy Scouts of the world—14,000 of them from 100 nations. For ten days their campsite in the Idaho mountains will be the focus for fun and friendship.)

In Gloucesteshire, England, a 15-year-old boy named David Jones who has hardly ever been out of his hometown—"I went to London once"—packs and repacks his small bag in anxious excitement.

In Johannesburg, South Africa, a Bantu named Philemon Kumalo pores over a book of American Indian lore, painstakingly memorizing an Indian dance.

In Cyprus, a 17-year-old boy named Andreas Kyriakides puzzles over an unfamiliar charcoal stove, in the hope of broiling shish kebab.

And in Coeur d'Alene, Idaho, a bone-tired adult named Bob Billingston, his eyes weary from lack of sleep drives once more across a 5600-acre piece of countryside set smack-dab in the heart of northern Idaho's evergreen mantled mountains, seeing for the hundredth time that a thousand and one things are all in place. In a very few days David Jones, Philemon Kumalo and Andreas Qyriakides, along with 14,000 other Boy Scouts and their leaders, are going to descend upon Billingston to participate in the first World Jamboree ever held in the United States.

Billington's problem is nothing less than to erect a little city, complete with bank, barbershop and soft-drink machines; fill it with people; feed, house and entertain them all for ten days; and then, when they leave, take the little city down and pack it away. To complicate his problem his guests come from 100 nations, speaks at least 26 different languages from Finnish to Swahili, eat at least six different basic diets, and worship in many different religions.

The occasion is the Twelfth World Jamboree, being held August 1 to 9 at the old Farragut Naval Base, now a state park, near Coeur d'Alene. It is the first chance the Boy Scouts of America have ever had to show the world what they can do, and they are determined that their guests will have an absolutely smashing time.

To make sure of this, they have been planning the event for more than three years. The attention given to the minutest detail is staggering. For example, several thousand of the boys will be traveling from their ports of entry across the country by bus. Every single restaurant these boys will stop at—about 1000 eating places all told—has been inspected by the host scouts for cleanliness, cost and good taste.

However, the food problem really will begin when the scouts arrive at the Jamboree site. The menus Oren Felton, commissary service director, and his cohorts have worked out should give the overseas boys a thorough taste of American cooking. One night the scouts will barbecue a ton of salmon and more than two tons of beef. For other dinners they'll eat fried chicken, beef stew and steak. And of course they'll get lots of sandwiches, including that great American classic, peanut butter and jelly.

The scouts will cook and eat in groups of nine—an eight-boy patrol plus one leader. At mealtime each patrol will send a boy to a central area to draw supplies—and cooking instructions, which are issued a day in advance. They'll need them: how many Dutch boys could cope with something called Western Jambo Burgers without a guidebook!

The shopping list that Felton and supply chief Jim Gelwicks have put together for the Jamboree begins with 2600 specially designed cookstoves and 65 tons of charcoal, and runs on through 23,616 bananas, 36,736 loaves of bread, 175,808 quarters of milk—that's a swimming-pool full—11,000 pounds of sugar, 1440 containers of pepper, 5904 pounds of steak and 10,627 pounds of hot dogs. Precise figuring on food is a must. One extra hot dog per boy, and you have enough leftovers to feed a small town.

One of the major planning tasks has been arranging for the visiting scouts to meet American families. Most of the boys are landing in the United States a week or two early in order to do some sight-seeing. Our scouts have arranged for all of them to visit in the homes of American scouts. Jim Sands, the man in charge of working out these arrangements, says, "The response has been tremendous. The boys from abroad are eager to see an American home, and people here have been overwhelmingly generous. We've had far more offers of homes than we have guests to use them."

On July 30, 10,000 guests, about 4000 American scouts, and assorted volunteers will begin arriving either at Spokane, Wash., 55 miles from campsite, or at Coeur d'Alene, Idaho, 25 miles south. Coeur d'Alene (pronounced Core Delane) is a town of about the same size as the Jamboree, and it has been in a tizzy over the event for months.

The man with the job of meeting 14,000 people is Walt Hooper. "We've got 50 buses, 50 trucks, and a fleet of brand-new cars lent to us by the Chrysler Corp. But we're not just meeting these people. We're also setting up but routes to carry the boys around the 5600-acre campsite. Then we've arranged to have a full-scale professional rodeo for them at the Kootenai County Fairgrounds just outside Coeur d'Alene. That means carrying 14,000 people 24 miles and back. We'll have the buses running back and fourth all day on a tightly arranged schedule."

The Farragut campsite lies on Lake Pend Oreille (pronounced Ponderay), a body of water 40 miles long. Says Bob Billington, "For the first time at a World Jamboree we're going to have a full program of aquatics. One of the things we think the boys will enjoy is fishing. We've had 20,000 trout donated for the Jamboree. They presented a little problem at first. You can't just turn them loose in the whole lake—the boys would never find them. So we had a cotton-string net 648 by 45 feet made up. We'll stretch it across a little cove near the campsite to keep the fish in."

The Jamboree's temporary city will include a complete bank in its own building, run by a professional staff, to exchange foreign currency, cash traveler's checks, and deal with the financial problems of the Jamboree administration, itself a million-dollar-plus operation. There will be a large-scale telephone switchboard manned by 18 scouts, pressrooms and darkrooms for the press services. There will be two trading posts, two helicopters, a chopper pad. There will be 1150 flags, 21,000 pennants, a special airmail postcard, 1750 precut picnic tables, 34,000 Jamboree emblems, 17,000 neckerchiefs, 60 bullhorns, 7400 tents and 400 precut two-holers. There will be 25 volunteer doctors, four barbers and, it is hoped, one President of the United States, Lyndon B. Johnson, who has been invited to speak at the closing ceremonies.

Then, of course, there will be religious services. No fewer than 30 chaplains will hold services for many different faiths—including Roman Catholic, various Protestant denominations, Jewish, Muslim, Mormon and Buddhist. Some of the services will be translated into four languages.

Every evening there'll be campfires, programs or shows, some of them scheduled for a natural arena which will hold 50,000 people. In the opening show, the hosts are going to cut loose with a spectacular 18-minute fireworks display. Most national groups will put on displays of handicrafts, folk arts or scout lore sometime during the Jamboree.

"The theme of the Jamboree is 'For Friendship,'" explains Bob Billington. "And though it sounds as if the boys have an awful lot to do, we've made a point of leaving a lot of open time so that they can just wander around getting to know other kids from different countries."

For many boys, the $50 fee to attend the Jamboree is insignificant compared with travel expenses, which from Australia, for example, will run to $800 each. It takes a lot of adult help to raise these fares. In Finland, groups of mothers have baked cakes and knitted pullovers to be sold at a special Jamboree fund-raising bazaar. In Ethiopia, the government is providing scholarships for four boys. In Germany, Scoutmaster Norbert Ungemach began canvassing his boys' parents for money four years ago. The 12 boys in his group have been selling newspapers and delivering groceries to add to the fund. As a result, Ungemach will be able to bring his entire troop to the Jamboree.

Behind the fishing, fireworks, rodeo and Jambo Burgers is a serious point. "Fostering friendship and understanding of others will be an objective of each activity and ceremony throughout the Jamboree," says Bob Billington. "No scouting event has ever offered greater opportunities to advance the cause of goodwill and understanding."

He is echoed by Secretary of State Dean Rusk: "When you draw together 14,000 scouts from 100 nations, you do something central toward building peace in the world."

What We Can Learn From Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. CLEVELAND

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1967

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, as the American involvement in the war in Vietnam grows in intensity, and the accompanying frustrations appears to increase, one of our greatest needs is to maintain a constructive dialog on the subject. We must do everything possible to encourage discussion and debate on the Vietnam war, toward a meaningful solution to the problem. Anything that adds to the information and ideas in the dialog is a service to the country. Just as I recognize the absolute need to preserve full freedom of discussion and debate, so do I call for it to be responsible.

An excellent contribution was made recently by the Reverend Paul H. Beattie, of the Concord, N.H., Unitarian Church. His sermon is especially noteworthy, because his attempt to give genuine guidance to his parish takes account of the realities of the situation. He avoids the stereotyped views that we hear so much. He ends by basically supporting the administration's position on the war. Yet, in reaching that conclusion, he makes observations which reach to the core of the problem, and which deserve to be heard.

I present the sermon as an addition to the dialog on the proper role of American foreign policy:

What We Can Learn From Vietnam

No sane man can view the present war in Vietnam with anything less than anguish of heart and mind. War is hell, has always been hell, and modern war with its impersonal machines of destruction, and its explosive flash of napalm, sends forth a terror that cannot be symbolized even by the mythical picture of a place beneath the earth where men burn perpetually without being consumed.

No position of this war can rest with easy conscience, because men and women and children are being destroyed while the precious resources of the earth are wasted. In this regard the absolute pacifist retains a moral integrity which the rest of us lack. But even a pacificist must face the grim and unanswerable question as to whether his pacificism will contribute to a prolongation of this grueling debacle. Yet, in spite of the uneasiness of every conscience at this moment we must try to come to grips with this war and the issues it raises. If my incomplete thinking can unlock some thought of yours, awaken some constructive response in you, so that all of us can "take heart," recognize the "frontiers across this history" and "cross over"—I will be grateful. Somehow, out of the agony of the present we have to walk toward peace, and the ultimate hope, seen by all prophets and seers, of a world freed from war.

There is not a man that I know who does not want this war to end. We might differ on the why of this war, on how it can best be terminated, and as to when, but we all want it to end. There are many on the other side who would not like to see it ended. One of the great decisions of the next few days, months, years—must consist at arriving at a formula which will bring cessation.

There are at least two duties we all share. One is to work as well as we can to find that formula. For some, this will mean conscientious objection, peace vigils, and even jail. For some, it will mean a call for de-escalation and negotiation. For others, this will be supporting the present administration, or even to suggest escalation. Most people look for a negotiated settlement—of some kind—as soon as possible, but the terms of this settlement vary.

The second duty, it seems to me, that we all have—is the duty to bring forth out of this agony some good. Just as in our personal life we must try to make adversity the servant of character, so in our public life we must learn from our suffering, and transmute that suffering to make it serve the good. And this is what I mean when I suggest that we must learn from this war in Viet Nam. Here are some of the things I think we should learn.

First, we have learned how the great machinery of the nation state, once set in motion for war, even a limited war, grinds inexhorably ahead. We see, in this case, how with a troubled China, a police action could lead to nuclear holocaust. We see how with both Russia and America, by pouring materiel into Viet Nam could create a perpetual state of limited war, such as is pictured in Orwell's 1984. Super powers are capable of maintaining a perpetual conflict in a far away place, which none dare escalate, and which neither can negotiate. By a contrast with the Kennedy-Khrushchev confrontation in Cuba, we have learned that the more distant, imprecise, our foreign policy goals are, the more dangerous, difficult and long lasting will be any resort to force.

Second, we have learned that American foreign policy, both in the government, in the news media, and in the public forum, has been inadequate. As a people we were naive, easily taken in by political moralizing and rationalization. This is true of those who absolutely disagree with our present policy, and this is true of the policy statements of our government. We lack realism. I believe that there are many facts or realities in Viet Nam which the government has refused to consider. I believe that the present position of our government could be stated in much more honest and realistic terms. By this I mean that our administration could make a better, more subtle, more honest case for what it is doing than it has. The same can be said, perhaps even more so, about those who dissent.

Let me mention a few of the factors in the situation that have to be clarified if there is to be hope for a more rational, effective foreign policy. To begin with, we have failed to recognize the nature of the world emerging in Asia, Africa, and South America. These peoples want to emerge from the sleep of poverty and underdevelopment. In spite of our vast aid programs we have not given *enough* of the right kind of self help, in the right way. If ten years ago we had put the money we are putting into Viet Nam today toward the peaceful development of Southeast Asia, perhaps we would not be fighting this war.

We waited until the last desperate moment to save by force what we might have saved by foresight, by using the same resources we are using for war for peaceful development. Ho Chi Mien could have been the Tito of Asia, had we grasped the opportunity to create a buffer state to Red China.

We have to understand that there are many kinds of communism, and that in some cases we have to help people opt for the kind of communism or socialism that is more compatible with our system and that will be most capable of retaining and expanding some of the great freedoms of western society.

We have to learn to give aid in such a way that we will create social change in the countries aided. Relying on our trust in democratic principles, and in the right of the individual to better himself we must give aid which will further these principles, instead of giving aid to prop up corrupt and hopelessly contemptable regimes. This is not impossible, or visionary, it can be done if we make it our goal.

If there is a moral question, which will be asked of our generation it will be this—what happened after Viet Nam? Did we make the same kind of financial commitment for peace that we made for war—in Southeast Asia, in Africa, in South America? *That* is the war that must be won, not only in pacification programs during war, but in all of the countries that are struggling to attain a human condition that is worthy of the name. We are the Status Quo power of the age, the question is whether we can be a citadel of freedom, which will help the common people of the world to gain freedom, the freedom from economic want that is a pre-condition of all other kinds of freedom. The kind of vision and mobilization of resources that this will take is staggering, but so is the prospect of endless Viet Nam. Perhaps we ought to give more of our aid through the U.N. Can the American people be awakened to this task?

Let me say a little about what is called the ideological conflict between our system and the communist. There are people who have a very rigid, dogmatic stance toward communism. They see communists under every bush, at home and abroad. For them, the communist threat is a boogy man of their imagination which can drive them in any direction. These people are irresponsible. On the other hand, there are those people who, in dissenting from our stance in Viet Nam, refuse to recognize any ideological conflict between our system and the communist. This is utterly irresponsible, to be living in an island of abundance and freedom, to be living in one of the few major powers of the world—the only super power—that allows radical dissent—and to fail to see that there is nothing essential and vital at stake in the confrontation between the communist and non-communist world.

Surely, there is a kind of freedom, to think, to discuss, to print, to gather and associate—in this country and in the west, that is one of the treasures of the whole of human history. We have reached an accommodation with Russia. But, Russia is not a free society, not really. Was there dissent, marches or vigils in Russia when she rolled tanks into Hungary? China is even more frighteningly unfree. She has the capacity, and almost the economic necessity, of raising a vast human society which would pattern itself on the ant hill, which perpetually survives by robotizing, organizing, and programing all individuals into an unbreakable pattern.

Ultimately, we can reach an accommodation with communism, peaceful co-existence and cooperation is a realistic hope. But, we must stand for a kind of freedom and individualism that is unique and important. The challenge is to do this in ever more effective and peaceful ways.

I am not saying that we should rebuild the world in our own image. Each people has to set its own goals, achieve its own solutions. But we can make it possible for the emerging nations to choose a little more freedom, a little more individuation, a little less collectivism. And ultimately we can only really succeed in doing this if we do it peacefully. These, then, are some of the things that I think we can learn from Viet Nam.

To turn back to the grim reality of the actual war we are fighting I would say this. At this point in time, given the realities of our internal political situation, and of the world situation, I do not see any course that President Johnson can follow other than the one he is following. A process like this war, once set in motion, tends to stay in motion. Speaking relatively, and in the jargon of power politics, he has followed a moderate course. We are not pursuing the goals of selfish empire as did the 19th century imperialism. There may come opportunities for negotiation or arbitration of this disptue which are viable for both sides. As these arise we will all hope that some kind of an acceptable settlement can be made. Our president has stated again and again that he wants to negotiate. But the fact is that the broad spectrum of opinion on both sides cannot find an adequate ground for negotiation.

We are in for a long and bloody conflict. We can hope that this administration will be willing to seriously consider all imaginative and perhaps useful approaches which might lead to a negotiated settlement. We ought to continue to hope that some kind of U.N. involvement might materialize. Certainly, if the war continues to drag on with no change we might try a unilateral cessation of bombing—with air observation and a promise that bombing will resume if it becomes apparent that the North is making no response and is, indeed, using the cessation of bombing to mass supplies and troops for continued warfare. The other side, also has a responsibility to come to the conference table.

As the war continues pressures within our nation will continue to mount. The cries for withdrawal will become more shrill and cries to go all the way and wipe them off the map will also become more shrill. A worsening of the possibility of a solution must be guarded against on the home front. The right, and the value of the dissenter ought to be recognized and accepted. The dissenter is going to have to police himself so that he does indeed work for his goals and not against them. The right, and the value of those who support the administrations policy ought to be recognized. But the cry for continual escalation must be checked, or if calculated escalation occurs, it must rationally be demonstrated that it can achieve its objective. This situation is ambiguous—there does not seem to be an easy way out. One of our jobs as religious liberals will be to have the faith and the strength to try to keep the situation from being worsened—due to frustrations and anguish on the right or the left. And there are some important long term lessons we can learn from Viet Nam, as I have tried to indicate. We need more clear long term foreign policy goals—we need the vision to implement them.

I do not feel that this is a prophetic sermon, I do not know if any of it comes home to you. You may know more about Viet Nam than I do—or have some answers—that I do not. I will not apologize for telling you where I live on this subject, or that I am confused, bewildered, and unsure. Perhaps you feel that way, perhaps you do not. I hope we can share our thoughts and feelings—and even our uncertainties and bewilderments—in some kind of a productive way. In our ministery we must be honest, and reflect things as we see them.

When we reach our limits of knowledge, understanding, and direction, the poet can sometimes speak to us, and to carry us forward in a difficult life. Archibald MacLeish speaks—in words of hope that I do not fully understand, but which carry me forward. "What is required of us is the recognition of the frontiers where the roads end. We are very far. We are past the place where the light lifts and farther on than the relinquishment of leaves—farther even than the persistence in the east of the green color. Beyond are the confused tracks, the guns, the watchers. What is required of us, Companions, is the recognition of frontiers across this history, and to take heart: to cross over—to persist and to cross over and survive. But to survive. To cross over." (Notice he does not just say—to survive—but to survive to cross over.) We must learn from Viet Nam—so that we can cross over.

And, more explicitly, MacLeish says, "The young dead soldiers do not speak. Nevertheless. . . . They have a silence that speaks for them at night and when the clock counts. They say: We were young. We have died. Remember us. . . . They say: Our deaths are not ours; they are yours; they will mean what you make them. They say: Whether our lives and our deaths were for peace and a new hope or for nothing we cannot say; it is you who must say this. They say: We leave you our deaths. Give them their meaning."

No one dare be self-righteous—or self-justifying in considering the present war. We must all be humble and troubled before man's incapacity to live in peace. Yet, we must strive "to cross over."

Dividends From Space

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 27, 1967

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it was commented editorially in the Monday, July 31, 1967, Daily News that we are realizing far more benefits from our space program right here on earth than most people realize. It is significant in this editorial that the Scientific and Technical Information Division of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration was singled out to exemplify the rate at which NASA is disseminating these benefits to American industry.

This significant and balanced view of the dividends that our space program is paying is a reminder of the importance that our national space effort has assumed in our American industrial and cultural life. I commend this editorial to your reading, as follows:

DIVIDENDS FROM SPACE

Mingled with pride in our space achievements have been some never silenced grumblings about the lack of practical benefits from the billions lavished on our beyond-the-skies programs.

It now appears that the nation is collecting some dividends from research carried out by and for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

Some of the results, as detailed in a recent issue of News Front, a management news magazine, are visible in American homes right now.

Perhaps the best known is a new line of kitchen utensils fashioned from the same material that science developed to keep missile nose cones from burning up during reentry fromspace into our atmosphere.

A lot of the food, toys and what not that we buy these days are packaged in a thin, tough plastic film first employed in those balloon-shaped Echo space research satellites.

Some space technology, too, has proved adaptable for more earthy needs. While the results are not as visible to the consumer's eye, they have been important to many industries.

A process dreamed up by space scientists to turn out insulators needed for high temperature operations also worked out fine for a company making pipe bowls. The metalworking industry reaped the benefits of a Nasa-engineered method for taking dents out of large tanks.

The roster of space "spinoffs" is impressive and likely to grow. This is not too surprising since our whole space program is a—Vast Research Laboratory—encompassing everything from life sciences to the industrial processes necessary to turn out extremely sophisticated and often delicate equipment.

It is to Nasa's credit that it has not left to accident or chance the opportunity to wring immediate good from its many-sided endeavors. It has taken positive steps to see that newly acquired knowledge is available to anyone who will take the trouble to seek it.

KNOWLEDGE STOREHOUSE

Each year, its Scientific and Technical Information Division lists and classifies about 75,000 research reports. A Technical Utilization Division then culls this mass for the kernels it thinks can be used by industry. These are written up in brief form and passed along to firms subscribing to the service.

It also maintains eight dissemination centers staffed with experts who dig out information and advise companies—for a fee—on how they can best use Nasa's knowledge.

Our space program is never going to pay for itself. No one ever expected that it would. But it is encouraging to know that Nasa is squeezing from it every practical bit of knowledge it will yield.

At any rate we are getting something more solid from our space efforts than any prestige we might gain by winning a race to the moon; especially since we and the Russians both seem to have lost that contest to Dick Tracy and Diet Smith.

Judge Wright's Decision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1967

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to call to the attention of the Members of this body the following article which appeared in the Sunday Evening Star, July 16, 1967, written by Dr. Alexander Bickel, professor of law at Yale University. Professor Bickel, one of this Nation's outstanding legal minds, sets forth in this essay his observations on the recent opinion in the case of Hobson against Hansen by Judge J. Skelly Wright of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia. The discussion regarding the proper role of the judiciary in education which this important decision has provoked should be of the utmost concern to each of us as legislators. I am certain that Professor Bickel's evaluation of the court's opinion will prove to be extremely enlightening.

[From the Sunday Star, July 16, 1967]

JUDGE WRIGHT'S SWEEPING SCHOOL DECISION

(By Alexander M. Bickel)

In a long, passionate opinion in the case of *Hobson vs. Hansen*, Judge J. Skelly Wright of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, sitting by assignment as a District judge, has roundly indicted the Washington school system and its superintendent, Dr. Carl F. Hansen, declaring the former, and quite possibly also the latter, unconstitutional. The opinion is a jeremiad and as such commands respect. The inner city of Washington, with its slums, its poverty, its juvenile crime and its schools, is a disgrace. Against this, Judge Wright cries out, from the heart. But Judge Wright is a judicial officer administering the Constitution, and the Constitution does not put at the disposal of judges the resources to prevent, abolish, or even allegiate poverty, juvenile delinquency, slum housing or rotten schools.

The Constitution forbids segregation enforced by law and requires federal judges to remove its vestiges. This involves no making of educational policy, and certainly no effort to rearrange a deteriorating social and economic environment. It involves removing the coercive force of the state as a cause of segregation, and then neutralizing its lingering effects. But with very few exceptions, federal judges other than Judge Wright have felt unable to tackle situations of massive *de facto* segregation in major urban centers. They have failed to act, because, as Judge Wright unwittingly demonstrates, they have no well-developed body of principles to fall back on in reforming such educational institutions as the neighborhood schools. They enter, in the area of *de facto* segregation, territory that is unfamiliar to them, in which they are not entitled to have special confidence in whatever answers they may evolve, for these are likely to reflect no more than their own personal preference or orders of priority. There was, in contrast, a good bit of history and principle to fall back on in deciding that legal segregation, coerced by the state, was unconstitutional. Judges have failed to act also because, even if they knew some answers, they would still lack the resources—the money, the personnel, the machinery—to put them into effect. This is not a question of being obeyed. Law always runs the risk of being disobeyed, as *Brown vs. Board of Education* often was. That case, however, was a "stop" order. When courts undertake to issue a "go" order as Skelly Wright has done, they need resources which are not at their disposal.

CHARGES COMPLACENCY

Judge Wright's indictment of the superintendent and the school administration is rife with imputations of bad faith but in the end it comes to rest on a charge of complacency only, not on a charge of intentional segregation. He condemns as unconstitutional the track system, optional school zones, teacher assignment practices, and in some measure the entire neighborhood school policy, but he does not quite come to hold that these features of the Washington school system were instituted or maintained in order to perpetuate segregation in the schools.

It seems quite clear to Judge Wright that the optional zones, for example, operate to allow white children in a relatively integrated neighborhood to escape from a predominantly Negro school into an integrated, but substantially white school. And yet it is far from clear that if the optional features of the zones were removed the result might not be more segregation than at present, either because rigid neighborhood lines would have that effect, or because more whites would simply flee. Moreover, the option is available not only to whites but to Negroes, and is availed of in some measure by both. Despite his imputations of bad faith, Judge Wright fails to prove his case concerning the optional zones.

One of the purposes of the track system of ability grouping is the remedial one of helping the slow and disadvantaged student. Another is to permit the quick to advance at their own pace. Judge Wright makes a persuasive case against the system as it operates in Washington. It is too rigid, it tends to validate its own predictions, which in turn are made on the basis of tests that yield much less certain a measure of true ability than is often supposed; and it does not fulfill its remedial purpose, because it is not supported by sufficient remedial resources. No doubt it could be improved and perhaps it should be abandoned. The difficulty comes in declaring a well-intentioned—and debatable—educational policy unconstitutional, either because one deems it wrong, or maladministered, or, for whatever reasons, a failure. If this is the function of the Constitution and of our judges, they have their work cut out for them.

THE INEQUITIES

Another portion of Judge Wright's opinion deals with supposed inequalities in facilities and quality of instruction between predominantly Negro schools in the District and the few predominantly white ones. Here there is no doctrinal difficulty. Whatever the intention behind them, demonstrable inequalities in treatment at the hands of government that run along racial lines are unconstitutional. They were well before *Brown vs. Board of Education*. The prior constitutional doctrine commanded equality in separation. The Constitution now forbids separation, but it has not abandoned the goal of equality. So the issue is a factual one.

As to physical facilities, the evidence seems to be neither here nor there. Negroes are vastly in the majority in the Washington school system, and in consequence they occupy some of the oldest and some of the newest buildings. But Judge Wright makes out a persuasive case concerning the distribution of teachers in the District.

The predominantly white schools have apparently had more than their share of experienced, tenured teachers. Whether this is a real advantage may be questionable, and the school administrators in Washington apparently do question it. But since experience is a criterion of competence in most professions, it is not easy to see why it should be discarded in the teaching profession. At any rate, the decisive consideration is that the Washington school system has not discarded it, but has simply tolerated a smaller proportion of experienced teachers in Negro schools.

Judge Wright is also persuaded that there is a substantial disparity in per capita expenditures per pupil among white and Negro schools, with greater expenditures, of course, in the white schools. To the extent that the disparity is real, it seems to be a function of the greater proportion of tenured—and hence higher salaried—teachers in the predominantly white schools. So it scarcely proves anything additional to that.

FACULTY INTEGRATION

Finally, though faculties and other school personnel are intergated in Washington, Judge Wright finds that white teachers tend to be assigned to white schools and Negro teachers to Negro schools. It is natural that in a school system with over 90 percent Negro pupils there should be a great majority of Negro teachers; and so there is—some 78 percent. Given these two large percentages, it is a mathematical certainty that there will be great concentrations of Negro teachers in predominantly Negro schools. And many Negroes feel—they made that clear in the dispute about School 201 in Harlem—that Negro pupils *should* have Negro teachers, who should displace as authoritative figures the white teachers who predominated in the past. Be that as it may, the preferences of white teachers for white middle-class schools do seem in some measure to have been informally respected by the Washington school administrators.

Judge Wright deals with these matters by forbidding the track system outright, and ordering abolition of the optional zones. As to teachers, he orders the Board to present a plan for teacher assignment which will fully intergate the faculty of each school. Since many of the white schools in the Northwest section are underpopulated, he orders the school administration to provide busing to the Northwest schools for such children in overcrowded, predominantly Negro schools, as volunteer for it.

But all this is, relatively speaking, less important detail. The main and most innovating thrust of Judge Wright's opinion is the proposition, which he adopts more squarely than any court has yet done, that *de facto* segregation as such is unconstitutional. And what does he propose to do about that? "Because of the 10-to-1 ratio of Negro to white children in the public schools of Washington," Judge Wright says, "and because the neighborhood policy is accepted and is in general use throughout the United States, the court is not barring its use here at this time." However he requires the school system to prepare and present to him a plan "to alleviate pupil segregation," and to "consider the advisability" of educational parks, school pairings, "and other approaches toward maximum effective integration." But what kind of maximum effective integration can there be in a school system in which Negroes constitute over 90 percent of the school population, and in which they may well ultimately constitute even more? In tacit recognition of this unanswerable question, Judge Wright adds that he will require efforts at compensatory education, to provide equal opportunities even in predominantly Negro schools. But how is Judge Wright going to see that effective methods of compensatory education are invented, how is he going to produce the trained personnel to apply them, and how, even if he could guarantee success, is he going to see to the financing of these efforts?

Here, then, is the heart of the matter. Judge Wright's remedy for conditions that he found to be unconstitutional is still in an early stage of development, but it is reasonably clear that he, no more than anyone else, has a remedy or can put one into effect. What then is the use of such judgments? What is the use of a hortatory constitutional pronouncement urging Washington, D.C., to solve its social and economic problems? Judge Wright's opinion might have been a document issued by some group of civic leaders or some foundation or research organization and whatever disagreement one might have had with this or that aspect of it one would have welcomed its attention to the school problem. But the Constitution and the judges who guard it have a well-defined role to play which no one else can play. They are to address themselves to those features of the society with which law can deal by defining rights, obligations and goals. No charitable organization and no study group can do that job, can invoke the power of government to those ends. It is no service to any worthy cause to saddle legal institutions with functions they cannot discharge and to issue in the name of the law promises the courts cannot redeem.

Opinion Poll on U.S. Policy in Vietnam Taken at Foreign Policy Association Luncheon Meeting, June 20, 1967

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1967

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on June 20, 1967, the Foreign Policy Association held a luncheon at the Waldorf-Astoria in New York.

At the luncheon, 400 people took part in an opinion poll on U.S. policy in Vietnam to determine the attitude of those attending.

I commend the result of that poll to the attention of our colleagues:

OPINION POLL ON U.S. POLICY IN VIETNAM TAKEN AT FOREIGN POLICY ASSOCIATION LUNCHEON MEETING, JUNE 20, 1967

At a luncheon sponsored by the Foreign Policy Association on June 20th, in the Grand Ballroom of the Waldorf-Astoria an opinion poll was taken to determine the attitudes of those attending on U.S. policy in Viet-Nam. The questionnaires were filled out at a luncheon, which featured a debate between Senator George McGovern and Senator Gale McGee on Viet-Nam. Following the debate the Senators were questioned by three prominent newsmen: Roscoe Drummond, Edward P. Morgan and Seymour Topping.

The luncheon guests numbered about 500 of whom 387 turned in the completed questionnaire. The audience can be characterized as a leadership group composed primarily of business and professional people who were assembled under the auspices of FPA. Eighteen major New York corporations reserved one or more tables which were hosted by senior corporate executives whose guests included important clients and/or other business associates.

The questionnaire asked the respondent to choose from 7 alternative positions that one which came closest to his own position with regard to U.S. policy in Viet-Nam. The alternatives are listed below along with the percentages, based on the 387 completed questionnaires.

	Percent
1. Withdraw unilaterally and unconditionally	12
2. Retire to enclaves	11
3. Give up bombing the North even if no negotiations take place	17
4. Present U.S. strategy OK	28
5. Increase the bombing	5
6. More troops, more bombs, get it over	25
7. Bomb Red China	2

Letter on Vietnam and Civil Disorder in United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK BRINKLEY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1967

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, Mr. and Mrs. Joe C. Roberts, of Byron, Ga., have written to me outlining their dissatisfaction with our apparent "no win" policy in Vietnam and their disgust with the rioting and civil disorder in America. Because their views represent the chagrin and feeling of frustration of many Americans, I submit a condensed version of their letter for the consideration of my colleagues:

BYRON, GA.,
July 28, 1967.

Representative JACK BRINKLEY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BRINKLEY: As the parents of a son in Vietnam who eats, sleeps and lives never knowing when a sniper will get him, I don't understand Americans who permit rioting in this country while he and millions of other American boys fight for us.

The President says the boys in Vietnam are fighting to keep Communists from taking over the world. I ask you, is there nothing the people of American can do but sit here and let our local rebellion continue?

I say, bring our boys home and let them clean up the Communists in the United States before helping other countries. If some members of both races want to fight and stir up trouble, why not send them to Vietnam where the action is. The most useless thing I can think of is for our national representatives to sit around and do nothing.

I have no objection to anyone having a good home or whatever they need as long as they get out and work for it. But it is maddening to work everyday and give it all to the government to support these rioters. They burn, loot and destroy what honest, hard working people have built over the years.

There are whites and Negroes that the Armed Forces won't have. Yet they refuse to work and support our Vietnam efforts. I just wonder if members of Congress have any idea as to what to do about this matter. I wish I could let the whole world know how I feel and there are many others who share my thoughts.

I think the people of the United States have let all the servicemen down with this rioting in the country. I'm proud of my son, but I think this is the most useless war we have ever had. I say, stop the war here and then help other countries.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. JOE C. ROBERTS.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402, at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Appendix

Bold Plan for the Mideast

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1967

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Bold Plan for the Mideast," published in the Richmond Times Dispatch of August 1, 1967.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BOLD PLAN FOR THE MIDEAST

The bold and imaginative Eisenhower-Strauss plan for building three nuclear-powered desalinization plants in the Middle East, seems to offer the best hope of getting something constructive under way in that part of the world. As of today, the hate-ridden situation there seems to be on dead center.

Ex-President Eisenhower and the eminent Virginian, Lewis L. Strauss of Culpepper County, former chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, are jointly responsible for this challenging concept. It is understood to be under study at the White House.

Water and displaced populations are seen as the two great problems of the Middle East, and this plan will, it is believed, go a long way toward solving both of them.

Two of the three nuclear-powered desalinization installations would be located on the Mediterranean coast and the other at the northern end of the Gulf of Aqaba. The first plant would produce water in volume about equal to that of the Jordan River and its tributaries, and the three combined would have an output about two and a half times as great.

In view of the near-miracles performed already by the Israelis in making the desert "blossom like the rose" by means of irrigation and scientific farming, it is assumed that the doubling and trebling of the available water supply in the entire region from Egypt to Jordan would transform vast barren and sandy areas. Not only so, but since the plants would, as a side line, produce substantial quantities of electric power, industry would be attracted. Thus the life of the average Arab could be revolutionized, and he could be enabled to move into the twentieth century.

By making possible the creation of productive farms where only nomads roam today, the plan would permit resettlement of thousands of now-destitute refugees under attractive conditions. Furthermore, they could be given work on the building of the three new plants, since these would call for much unskilled labor.

Financing of the projected plants would not be too difficult, as Messrs. Eisenhower and Strauss see it. Mr. Strauss, a financial wizard, has spelled out this phase of the program in some detail. There would be a chartered corporation like Comsat, with the United States government subscribing to one-half of the stock.

The other half would be offered for private or official investment in world security markets. The initial need would be for $200 million, and Mr. Strauss points out that "the completed project will represent rather less than one year's expenditure on the moon program."

White House reaction is being awaited, but one finds it difficult to imagine that the administration's response will be anything but favorable. Nobody supposes that this, or any other plan will solve all the major problems of the Middle East, but it could be the beginning of something very far-reaching. Modifications may be in order, of course, but the basic concept seems to have enormous potentialities.

One serious question mark is to be found in the attitude of many of the Arabs, who may prefer their time-honored "camel-and-date" culture to any more modern substitute. Since the time of Christ, and long before, they have clung to their ancient ways, and it could be that most of them would rather not change. But if they can be brought to see what possibilities lie in the Eisenhower-Strauss plan, it could be the beginning of a new era for the Middle East.

Milwaukee Journal Criticizes Antiriot Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1967

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, in view of the widespread and tragic rioting originating from the explosive ghettos in many of our cities, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues a timely and thoughful Milwaukee Journal editorial of July 22, 1967, which comments on the recently House-passed antiriot legislation.

MEANINGLESS ANTIRIOT BILL

The house of representatives has overwhelmingly provided its answer to rioting in the cities. It has again passed a measure to fine and/or jail anyone who crosses a state line or uses interstate or foreign commerce, including the mails, to incite a riot.

The measure, which is not expected to pass the senate, is all but unenforceable. In one sense it almost requires mind reading to prove that a man crossed a state line to incite a riot. The administration didn't want the measure. No state has asked for federal help to control rioting. In effect, this is a bill of attainder aimed at Stokely Carmichael, former head of the Student Nonviolent Co-ordinating Committee. Its author, Rep. Cramer (R-Fla.), admitted Carmichael was his main target.

But the most regrettable thing about the house action is that it indicates ignorance of why there has been rioting. In the first place, there is little indication that "outsiders" have played any important part in the recent rioting by Negroes.

Dr. Robert Coles of the Harvard health service, recently commenting on why the hungry, sick sharecropper children of the south become the ghetto rioters of tomorrow, said:

"In a northern ghetto, one sees how persistently sickness and hunger live on in adults—who doubt any offer, mistrust any goodness of favorable turn of events as temporary and ultimately unreliable. I fear we have among us hundreds of thousands of people who have literally grown up to be, and learned to be, tired, fearful, anxious, suspicious and, in a very basic, inflexible and tragic sense, unbelieving."

The great Negro migrations to the north have brought turmoil to urban life. Dr. Joseph Brenner of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology-Harvard health service calls these poor people "psychological cripples." As Dr. Coles puts it, many who come north with their illiteracy and disease and a sullen state of mind that "depression only begins to describe" go on brooding in strange urban surroundings. The doctors call it a "national disaster."

The answer to all of this is not unenforceable antirioting laws. It is the rehabilitation of a whole people who have been neglected for a century. If these were refugees from abroad, we would do the job without stint. These are our own people.

Dr. George B. Galloway, Congressional Champion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 2, 1967

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I wish to call to the atention of the Senate the editorial from this morning's Washington Post with reference to the death of Dr. George B. Galloway. The editorial tells of Dr. Galloway's great assistance to Members of Congress in dealing with many problems, and of his special interest in the reorganization of Congress and in home rule for the District of Columbia. Dr. Galloway had a long and distinguished career in public service.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GEORGE B. GALLOWAY

It is unlikely that any contemporary possessed a more detailed knowledge or a more profound understanding of the workings of the United States Congress than George Galloway, who died here a few days ago. Dr. Galloway, a professional political scientist, was primarily a scholar, exceptionally learned in the theory and structure of American political institutions. He added a wealth of direct experience to research, however. For a score of years he served as senior specialist in American Government at the Library of Congress. Many members of Congress—and many journalists and students as well—were the beneficiaries of his learning, his generous readiness to be of help and his sensitive understanding of the problems of a free society.

Prior to his service at the Library of Congress, Dr. Galloway was secretary of the Joint Congressional Committee on the Reorganization of Congress. In this capacity, he played an important and constructive role in the modernization of congressional procedures achieved under the Congressional Reorganization Act of 1946. He was an ardent advocate, among other things, of home rule for the District of Columbia. Behind a certain scholarly dryness of manner, there lurked in George Galloway a wealth of wit and quiet humor; and all that he did was informed, moreover, by a disciplined fervor for human liberty. His books and his lifetime of study constitute an invaluable legacy.

Guns and Rancid Butter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1967

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that the President and his spokesmen do not have practical programs and obviously then do not have answers for the problems that beset us in international and domestic areas of crisis. One of the stale cliches of the so-called Great Society has been its "guns and butter" slogan. The Chicago Tribune very effectively analyzes this hollow phrase in the following editorial which appeared in its August 1 edition. I insert it in the Record at this point:

Guns and Rancid Butter

Asked on television Sunday about the race riots, Secretary of State Rusk replied that the United States is "a nation of great resources" which can carry on the fight against communism in Asia and at the same time "meet our problems here at home."

This is the same message we have been getting from the administration ever since President Johnson assured us in his 1966 state of the Union speech that "we are a rich nation and can afford to make progress at home while meeting obligations abroad." But at that time Mr. Johnson was addressing himself to a challenge which was mainly economic—namely, whether any country, even the wealthiest, can carry on the second most costly war in its history and still afford to plunge ahead with Great Society programs as if the war did not exist.

Today Mr. Rusk offers the same assurance against a backdrop of nightly lawlessness marked by murder, arson, and looting. The question is no longer simply whether our resources can stand the strain [and anybody who tries to borrow money these days will find reason to wonder]. It is also whether the Great Society programs are accomplishing what they promised. Conditions in the cities seem to be deteriorating in more ways than they are improving. Disrespect for the law is epidemic. Is this what Mr. Johnson calls making progress? He promised that we could have guns and butter, too; is this what we get in place of butter?

For two years, leading Democrats, in their more realistic moments, have been questioning the efficacy of the Great Society. Sen. Mansfield, the Senate majority leader, has occasionally called for a thorough overhaul of programs already adopted, including those aimed at the rehabilitation of cities, to eliminate "rough edges, overextensions, and overlaps" resulting from hasty, ill-conceived, and overrated programs which have led more often to frustration and disappointment than to progress.

The riots are probably the most serious domestic problem we face today. If we could be sure that more promises and more dollars and more legislation would provide the "instant remedy" which the poor and especially the Negroes have been led to expect, it would be well worth straining our economy to achieve it. But they won't. The worst riots have broken out in the cities with the most ambitious federal programs. Looters arrested in New York have been found to be employes of a local, federally-financed anti-poverty agency. The mayor and police director of Newark have accused local anti-poverty agencies of helping to foment the rioting there, and their charges cannot be dismissed lightly.

We are indeed a nation of great resources, but the resources that we need at the moment are at least as much emotional and moral as material. Rioters and potential rioters must somehow be persuaded that federal programs alone are not going to provide them with education, jobs, color television sets, and new automobiles. The expectations created by the reckless promises of politicians must somehow be moderated. And the politicians themselves must refrain from making further promises which they should know by now cannot be fulfilled.

Admittedly, these things will not be easy. But to go on calling for more programs which we cannot properly afford in order to carry out new promises which cannot be fulfilled within the endurance limit of an impatient generation is insane, and Mr. Rusk is contributing to this insanity.

Hobson's Bankruptcy Campaign

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1967

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, many areas of our major cities are now lying in complete ruin, the fires still smoldering from the riots of the past few weeks. Many civic leaders are presently concerned with avoiding riots in areas which have not as yet been affected, and with preventing similar outbursts of violence in the future.

A well-known "misleader," Julius Hobson, has suggested that the poor file bankruptcy to wipe out debts. This idea may help these people in the immediate present, but the long-range effects would be disastrous.

During the week of July 9, 1967, WMAL radio in Washington, broadcast an editorial concerning the true effects of Hobson's ill-conceived suggestion.

I commend the text of the editorial to the attention of our colleagues, as follows:

Hobson's Bankruptcy Campaign

Civil rights figure Julius Hobson's latest campaign could backfire tragically against the very people Hobson seeks to help. Hobson has urged the poor to file bankruptcy to wipe out debts. He says this would create a "direct subsidy for the poor" and would help fight unsurious lenders. The fact is, however, that good credit is the best long-range subsidy a poor person can possess.

It is the people with smaller incomes who most need good credit. The alternative to credit is to pay cash for merchandise.

The Washington Credit Bureau says a person who goes through bankruptcy has trouble re-establishing credit with legitimate lenders for as long as 10 years. This means bankruptcy victims are often driven into the arms of shoddy merchants and loan sharks. Usurious lending rates should be controlled by law—not by a wave of bankruptcies.

Add up all the pros and cons and there can be only one conclusion. The people hurt most by a bankruptcy campaign would be the poor themselves.

Israel, South Africa Protect Their Citizens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1967

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, Israel, like other law-and-order countries, has learned the hard way how to preserve the peace against troublemakers—simply banish those who are dissatisfied and kick them out of the country.

In the long run this is simple, humane and for the best interest of all concerned. The majority of satisfied citizens of the banishing countries rid themselves of an enemy. The banished person is free to seek his own kind and there is no subversive threat.

The action is not unlike the successful program that has been carried on in South Africa—where the majority live in peace and are happy.

Obviously, Israel does not swallow the poison spread by U Thant, of the United Nations Organization, who espouses the hard-core Communist line of the right of a so-called national liberation minority to destroy established governments.

And at least, so far, that destructive demagog, the American Civil Liberties Union has not found a world order court to sound off in protest.

I include the special report of Ralph Magill's Atlanta Constitution in the Record:

Four Arab Leaders Banished From Jerusalem by Israel

(By James Feron)

Jerusalem.—Four Arab political leaders, including the former district governor of Jordanian Jerusalem, Anwar Khatib, were arrested and banished from Jerusalem Monday for alleged "incitement to subversion" against Israel.

According to their colleagues in the old city, the leaders were shown an order from the military governor's office for their removal to Safed and Tiberias for three months.

All were ordered "banished under police surveillance." The other leaders were:

—Dr. Daoud Husseini, a former member of parliament, one of the leaders of the former Palestine Liberation Organization movement in the west bank area of Jordan and a cousin of the former grand mufti of Jerusalem.

—Abdul Mushen, described as an Arab nationalist and Palestinian leader.

—Ibrahim Baka, a Ramillah lawyer who was also a P.L.O. leader.

MOVE IN UNREST

Monday's action was the strongest Israeli authorities have taken in fighting the growing mood of rebellion in the former Jordanian sector of Jerusalem, annexed by Israel, and in the occupied west bank area of Jordan.

The decision to move sternly against the Arab unrest was made in a recent series of cabinet sessions.

The Israeli authorities did not publish the names of these four banished officials but their identities were learned from sources in the old city.

SOME SURPRISED

There was some surprise expressed here over the banishment of Anwar Khatib, who was regarded as a moderate and has been one of the least outspoken of Arab leaders. Other former high officials in the Arab administration have openly advocated civil disobedience against Israel.

Khatib, ironically, is the son-in-law of the Arab leader most outspokenly in favor of cooperation with Israel, Sheik Muhammed Ali Jabari, the mayor of Hebron.

Sheik Jabari has been touring northern Israeli villages, where the population is predominantly Arab, as a guest of Israeli authorities. He said Sunday in Acre that he would continue to work for peace between Jews and Arabs in Israel and the Middle East.

The arrests shook the old city's Arab leadership. One leader said with a laugh that he was preparing to join the others in Safed and Tiberias.

Student Loans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1967

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include last week's public service television and radio newscast, "The Kee Report." The subject discussed is student loans for higher education:

STUDENT LOANS

This is Jim Kee, bringing you the Kee Report.

Several thousand young citizens of West Virginia are now making the first major decision of their lifetime. Having just graduated from high school, should they enter college—or call it quits and start looking for a good job?

It is my earnest hope that the great majority will decide to continue their education. The youngster who has a chance to go to college and decides against it may find out later that he has placed himself under a severe handicap. A college degree is no guaranty of greater earning power. But the fact is that most college gradautes do earn more money because they made the wise decision to continue their education.

In former times, many worthy students from poor families simply lacked the money to pay for higher education. But today the poorest youngster in America may have a college education if he can pass the entrance requirements. The means are available to give him all the financial help he needs to see him through college and through graduate school also.

I shall try to make this brief discussion a sort of refresher course for those high school graduates who are still in doubt about college and who may have fears that the financial load would be too great. To meet this kind of situation, a special loaning system is operated by the nation's institutions of higher learning, with financial help from the Federal Government.

Nearly a decade ago, Congress enacted what is known as the National Defense Education Act. This legislation was enacted on the sound principle that the country needed an adequate supply of trained manpower to meet its defense requirements. The major provision of this Act was a program of financial help for those students who wanted and deserved a college education. Since it started operating, this loan program has given financial aid to about one million students from low-income families.

This program of student loaning was broadened and strengthened by the Higher Education Act of two years ago. Depending upon the state in which he lives, the student may borrow each year of his college life a sum ranging between $1,000 and $1,500. The student in graduate school may borrow up to $2,500 each year.

These loan funds are administered by college authorities with financial help from Uncle Sam. The repayment terms have been made easy to avoid placing too heavy a burden upon the borrower. Repayment begins just after graduation but the Federal Government will pay half of the interest charges on the unpaid balance. Those who serve in the Peace Corps, the armed forces, or the Vista Program are exempt from repayment or interest charges during their term of service. Under certain conditions, those graduates who enter certain lines of teaching are excused from repayment of part or all of their loan indebtedness.

The student still in doubt should contact the college of his choice at once for details about the loan program. This may be his last chance to get the education he needs. The eligibility determination for loan is made by the Admissions Dean of the individual college or university.

Thank you for listening.

Kansas Gets Good Rating

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER L. MIZE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1967

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, a recent editorial in the Wichita, Kans., Eagle points up the good rating which the State of Kansas receives in several important categories in comparison to other States. The way Kansas measures up should appeal not only to industries looking for places to locate new plants, but to people searching for a place in which to settle and enjoy the good life, free of most of the frustrations of the ever-expanding megalopolis.

The editorial follows:

KANSAS GETS GOOD RATING

Comparisons aren't always odious.

Kansas came out bright as a sunflower and sweet as a rose in a graph-feature showing "How the States Measure Up," published in the July issue of Fortune magazine.

In the four columns which Fortune calls "Positive indicators of the extent of public services," Kansas ranks high. These are: Welfare (monthly payment per dependent child); Education (expenditure per pupil in public schools); Higher Education (college freshmen as per cent of 18-year-olds); and Mental Health (psychiatrists per 1,000 patients in public hospitals). In that last column, Kansas rank far above every other state but Iowa.

Four other columns are "negative indicators," Fortune said. "In each of these, the longer the bar, the worse the state's performance." Kansas had short bars in every column. They are: Crime Rate (crimes per 100,000 inhabitants); Highway Safety (fatalities per 100-million vehicle miles); Housing (per cent of housing classed as dilapidated); and Mental-Test Performance (per cent failed mental requirements for draft).

On General State Expenditure, Kansas is in the median range, with less than $200 per capita. That, of course, has risen since 1965, the year whose statistics were used.

On personal income, Kansas was among the higher-ranking states, edging bove $2,500 per capita.

Only in one category did Kansas fall down. That was in population, growth, measured from 1960 to 1965.

Obviously, not enough people know that Kansas is a pretty good place to live, as the Fortune graph demonstrates.

The Harvest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1967

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I do not mind saying that I find this unending and bitter hassle about who played politics in Detroit quite disgusting. What grieves me even more is the administration's attempt to shift the blame onto the shoulders of what H. H. H. calls a "go slow, take it easy" Congress. The following editorial from the August 2 edition of the Chicago Tribune suggests that the Johnson-Humphrey administration, by calling for increased civil rights expenditures, is actually falling prey to the political blackmail of black power. Rather than blame the riots on a lack of appropriated dollars, the administration should review some of their own riot-prone activities. Better yet, the administration should drop the blame question altogether.

Harry Truman used to have a sign on his White House desk that read "The Buck Stops Here." Right or wrong it is a political fact of life, and a President is better off living with it. Truman sure did.

THE HARVEST

President Johnson called a press conference while Milwaukee was dealing with the latest of a series of urban riots to say that "I think we are rich enough" to sustain both the war in Viet Nam and "our responsibilities at home." Vice President Humphrey, speaking before a flock of mayors in Boston, backstopped Mr. Johnson by blaming Congress for the flare-up in the cities.

Urging the mayors to get "righteously indignant," Humphrey asserted that "the delay, the 'go slow, take it easy' attitude" of Congress "aids and abets frustration in our urban slums" and "denies government—federal, state, and local—the tools and resources required to combat slumism."

The viewpoint that money from Washington can plaster over every sore in the body politic is common. In the Voice of the People today, for example, Prof. Eisner of Northwestern modestly proposes the expenditure of 50 billion dollars a year "and more" for a period of years to meet "public needs."

The other day Rep. Thomas G. Abernethy of Mississippi offered a few comments in the House on these theories. He said that congressional critics of his state and other parts of the south who formerly had been eager to pack their valises and head south at the slightest sign of trouble now were sitting quiet as the grave when disorders were afflicting their own areas.

"You know who is to blame for the racial mess America finds itself in today," he said. "We all know, and you know, it is because of the political bidding contest the two parties have been engaged in in their all-out effort to get the racial minority vote."

Recalling that President Johnson insisted a year ago on delivering a night message to Congress, Mr. Abernethy said: "Ah, the drama that was packed into that night! Remember his joining the chant, 'We shall overcome!' That was to be the night to sew up the racial minority vote from now on and forevermore. But it did not hold long. The 'black power' boys came back for more, and more, and more, and more.

"You have laid every gift, grant, concession, lure, and bid you can think of at their doorstep and at their feet. You have done so much of this you are just about out of something to hand them. . . . You are right in blaming one another."

Now the harvest is coming in. Does Mr. Johnson care to recall his speech of Aug. 3, 1965, to college students. He told them: "I am proud to salute you as fellow revolutionaries. . . . We want change. . . . I hope you will go out into the hinterland and rouse the masses and blow the bugles and tell them the hour has arrived and their day is here." The bugles have sounded, all right—in Newark, in Cambridge, Md., in east Harlem, in Detroit, in Milwaukee, and in dozens of other cities—and the day is here.

And Mr. Humphrey, does he care to recall his remarks in New Orleans, July 18, 1966? He then said that, if he had to live in the slums, "I think you'd have more trouble than you have had already, because I've got enough spark left in me to lead a mighty good revolt." Mr. Humphrey's services were not needed at the barricades. There were plenty of other volunteers.

And Sen. Robert F. Kennedy. His contribution, Aug. 17, 1965, was: "There is no point in telling Negroes to obey the law. To many Negroes the law is the enemy." That thesis has certainly been validated.

And when Mr. Johnson said in 1964, "We are going to try to take all of the money that we think is unnecessarily being spent and take it from the 'haves' and give it to the 'have nots' that need it so much," what kind of expectations did he think he was arousing?

He can look about him and find the answer.

NRA Executives Criticize Opponents of Markmanship Programs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1967

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD statements by two distinguished officers of the National Rifle Association—the first by the executive vice president, Franklin L. Orth, made in Washington, July 9, 1967, and the other by President Harold W. Glassen also made in Washington, June 29, 1967.

Mr. Orth's statement clearly sets forth important facts concerning the civilian markmanship program and national matches soon to be held this year at Camp Perry, Ohio, August 3 through September 1, 1967, and the NRA itself. The executive vice president briefly explains the widespread misapprehensions regarding the purposes and achievements of this program. Mr. Glassen's remarks explain what the NRA is and, equally important, what it is not.

It is my belief that Mr. Orth's and Mr. Glassen's statements answer the recent attacks of certain legislators on the NRA and the National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice while at the same time present interesting information regarding the NRA, the oldest sportsmen's organization in the United States composed of patriotic and loyal Americans who have always adhered to the principles of Americanism.

Their statements, which I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues, follow:

NRA EXECUTIVE CRITICIZES OPPONENTS OF MARKSMANSHIP PROGRAMS

WASHINGTON, July 9.—NRA Executive Vice President, Franklin L. Orth, today issued the following statement:

"While nearly half a million young Americans fighting Communism in Vietnam rely heavily on rifles, homefront attacks on civilian marksmanship activities that prepare our finest young men for military service have reached such a reckless pitch that the Communist Party, U.S.A., has openly joined in them.

"Patriotic Americans both in and outside public life are being increasingly misled by propagandists as to the purposes and accomplishments of the Civilian Marksmanship Program which has been sponsored since 1903 by the Army's National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice, assisted by the National Rifle Association as a patriotic service. The American public is also being deliberately misinformed concerning the National Matches conducted annually at Camp Perry, Ohio, and scheduled to be held this year Aug. 3-Sept. 1.

"To dispel this barrage of propaganda, which apparently is aimed at lowering the marksmanship level of American servicemen, present and future, the National Rifle Association feels that it is its duty to present certain facts concerning not only the Civilian Marksmanship Program and National Matches, but the NRA itself. Briefly:

"1. The Civilian Marksmanship Program represents the least expensive way of teaching many young Americans to shoot, because the NRA provides free of Government expense the necessary instructors, ranges and other aids. As one Congressman accurately expressed it in preventing a curtailment of appropriation last month, the NRA 'is actually subsidizing the U.S. Treasury' and not the other way around.

"2. Individual civilian competitors at Camp Perry are not subsidized in any way. They pay for their own travel, lodgings, meals, and entry fees. State teams, not exceeding 14 persons or a maximum of 700 individuals, receive 5c a mile travel and $1.50 for meals, or less than half of their actual expenses. In return, they attend the latest military combat marksmanship courses and act as instructors in their States.

"3. More than half of the $2,717,300 which has been quoted as the Government cost of the National Matches (1965 figure) represents an expense that would be incurred even if the matches were cancelled, as it consists of pay and allowances for support personnel who would in any case be called up for reserve duty annually. By crediting the overall program with other revenue including surplus arms sales, the net cost to the Government can be reduced to approximately $500,000. This represents an estimated cost to the Government of only $16.50 per soldier for civilian pre-induction marksmanship training.

"4. The NRA, in furtherance of such programs and of the national defense generally, feels duty-bound to oppose all proposals that might now or in the future impede or curtail the legitimate instruction and use of firearms by law-abiding Americans. It has been alleged without basis that the NRA is primarily a lobbyist group. Actually, the NRA is a self-supporting organization of more than 800,000 members, the largest sportsmen's association in the nation and perhaps in the world, and it devotes only about 3 percent of its normal revenues to legislative matters. Most of this is spent simply to inform its members of Federal and State legislation on firearms, conservation and related matters which, when constructive and in the public interest, the NRA traditionally supports. The organization's main concern is with firearms safety, in hunting, target shooting and in general, and with the proper use of firearms for legitimate pastime.

"5. Concerning pending bills in the Congress, the NRA is on record as supporting a series of reasonable measures which, from its long and respected experience in the firearms field, it sincerely believes should help curb the illicit use of guns by some 125,000 criminals without impairing the legitimate activities of an estimated 50,000,000 law-abiding gun owners.

"Despite recent misrepresentations by its critics, the NRA has always steadfastly adhered to the full principles of Americanism. It opposes extremists of all sorts and constantly screens NRA applicants and activities to exclude improper ones. In this respect, it cooperates closely with appropriate Federal and State agencies including the FBI and State Adjutants General.

"The NRA is in its 96th year, a venerable organization with the highest antecedents. President Ulysses S. Grant, 18th President of the United States, was the 8th President of the NRA, to cite only one. Americans of unimpeachable patriotism and of all walks of life have been proud through the generations to be NRA members.

"The final proof of the genuine Americanism of the NRA, if any is required, came recently in the form of a published attack on the organization in The Worker, official organ of the Communist Party, U.S.A., signed by two longtime avowed Communists, National Chairman Henry Winston and Party Secretary Gus Hall. These spokesmen openly attacked the NRA with typical distorted accusations and demanded that Federal appropriations for the Civilian Marksmanship Program be cut off.

"It is quite understandable that these opponents of the American way of life, whether in this country or in Vietnam, should be opposed to any program which improves the military efficiency of the American Armed Forces.

"What is saddening and sickening to many loyal Americans is to see their honest fellow-Americans misled into adopting a similar attitude and into attacking the very programs which help to defend our country."

REMARKS BY HAROLD W. GLASSEN, PRESIDENT, NATIONAL RIFLE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA, AT NATIONAL PRESS CLUB, WASHINGTON, D.C., JUNE 29, 1967

First, I'd like to explain what the National Rifle Association is, and what it is not.

It is the oldest sportsmen's organization in the United States. It is a non-profit membership organization. It's rate of growth is phenomenal.

Four years ago, when the current controversy over gun control legislation began, NRA had less than 500,000 members. It now has more than 800,000 members, a gain of more than 60 percent, and is looking forward to more than a million by 1971, the year it celebrates its one hundredth anniversary. We anticipate we will reach this goal before then, for our membership is increasing at an average of 80,000 per year. At this rate, today at least 200 persons will join NRA.

NRA members are sportsmen whose common bond is the sport of shooting. Most are hunters. Many are trap and skeet shooters. Several hundred thousand are serious target shooters, who work as hard to boost their scores as any golfer. Last year, American shooters took 17 gold medals in world events, establishing the United States firmly as the world leader in this international sport.

AIDS IN TRAINING SOLDIERS

NRA members are dedicated to the national defense. Criticism has been leveled at our organization for conducting shooting programs using surplus U.S. military rifles and ammunition. But the reasons for this program have been largely overlooked. The truth is that the NRA is a valuable adjunct to our military program, providing vital marksmanship training to young Americans who may shortly find themselves in battle.

Proof of the value of this program in training of combat troops was contained in a 1966 report by the Arthur D. Little Company, a private industrial and management research firm, which made a comprehensive study of the Civilian Marksmanship Program at the request of the Army.

Not only did the Little Report note that rifle training prior to military service better prepares a soldier to use a rifle, it said trainees who have been members of gun clubs are more apt to enlist, are more apt to prefer combat, are more confident in their ability to use a rifle, require less time from instructors for rifle training, and share their knowledge and provide coaching for those who need it most. It also found that outfits that have the greatest number of gun club-trained soldiers are likely to suffer fewer casualties themselves, and inflict more casualties on the enemy.

In short, it was the conclusion of the Arthur D. Little Company, after long study, that shooting experience and marksmanship training with military type small arms prior to military service contribute significantly to the individual solder's training.

The major problem with the program, according to the research firm, is that it should be expanded in order to provide our soldiers with the basic rifle training necessary to sustain them in combat.

These are some of things that NRA is.

Now, what is NRA not?

First, it is not a powerful lobby as it has been painted. Fortunately, its members are dedicated enough to protest long and loud when their sport is threatened. We keep our members informed on what is happening that could restrict their right to possess and use firearms. But it is their reaction that members of Congress hear, not the centralized voice of a Washington lobby. I have heard the complaint that the gun control bill has sparked more mail than any other issue in Congress. I see this as a healthy sign, that citizens are upset over a threat to their rights under the Constitution. They are using one right—the right of petition—to protect another—the right to bear arms.

WHO SHOULD OWN A GUN?

One thing I want to make clear: NRA is dedicated to the proposition that all American citizens of adult age have the right to keep and bear arms unless they have abused this right or unless they have been adjudged by proper judicial authority to be incapable. We believe that there are those who should not have a gun, but we oppose the establishment of authority that would permit arbitrary determination as to who is, and who is not, qualified to own a gun. The withdrawal of such a right should be subject to due process of law.

Because we believe in the right of the individual to possess firearms, we are vigorously opposed to several provisions of legislation proposed by the Administration and sponsored by Sen. Dodd and Rep. Celler that would unduly restrict the sale and possession of firearms.

This brings us to the second thing that NRA is not.

It is not opposed to gun control legislation.

It is opposed to the Administration bill. We agree in many respects with the intent of the legislation proposed by the Administration, and endorse some of its provisions, but several we cannot abide. Our members have been quite vigorous in their protests against these provisions. This legislation would virtually eliminate interstate commerce in firearms, except between Federally licensed manufacturers and dealers. We favor controls over the shipment of concealable firearms through the mails, and we have proposed our own legislative plan to accomplish this. But we are utterly opposed to a law that would eliminate sales across state lines completely.

The very premise of this legislation holds the key to what its sponsors want. It begins with a declaration that would put Congress on record that there is a causal relationship between the availability of firearms and the crime rate.

RECORD IS A PRETENSE

Gentlemen, there has not been developed in the four years of public hearings on proposed gun controls a record to show that such a relationship exists. Nevertheless, its supporters continue to press for its enactment on the pretense that such a record exists.

The Dodd-Celler bill's supporters have attempted to show, for instance, that a strict new gun law in the City of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, has worked wonders in reducing violent crime and murder in the last year or so. Our figures, obtained from the City Police Department, show just the opposite. They show that more persons were shot to death in Philadelphia in the year after the law was passed than were killed by firearms the year before the law went into effect. This at the same time that legitimate gun sales fell about 90 per cent! (See table.)

GUN HOMICIDES UNDER PHILADELPHIA GUN ORDINANCE

Year	Guns	Knives	Other	Total	Percent guns
Before new law:					
1964	62	62	64	188	33
Since new law:					
1965[1]	89	76	40	205	43
1966	69	61	48	178	39

[1] Ordinance effective Apr. 15, 1965. Thus, 3½ months of 1965 not under new law, 8½ months under it.

The NRA believes that these statistics show that the new law is not effective, as claimed by its proponents.

NRA FOUR-POINT PROGRAM

Rather than get bogged down in criticizing what NRA considers to be an unworkable bill, however, I believe I should outline to you the Association's position in favor of positive, effective and practical legislation on guns.

The NRA has proposed a comprehensive four-point legislative program that it believes will do the most to keep guns out of the hands of criminals and incompetents—and this, after all, is the intent of all such legislation today. These points have been introduced in the Senate and House by a number of members of Congress, some of whom are here today. I would like to take this opportunity to thank these gentlemen for their support of our position on behalf of the members of my Association and the estimated 50 million gun owners in the United States who are alarmed over attempts to pass the severe restrictions contained in the Dodd-Celler bill.

The four points that NRA has proposed to be enacted into law would—

(1) Provide a mandatory penalty for the possession or use of a firearm transported in interstate commerce or foreign commerce and used in the commission of a crime.

(2) Prohibit licensed manufacturers or dealers from shipping any firearm to any person in any state in violation of the laws of that state.

(3) Place "'destructive devices" (bombs, grenades, mines, crew-served military ordnance, etc.) under the tax and registration provisions of the National Firearms Act.

(4) Require that a person who orders a handgun by mail or over-the-counter in a state other than his own submit to the seller a sworn statement that he is over 21 years of age, is not prohibited by federal law from receiving a handgun shipped in interstate commerce, and his receipt of the firearm is not in violation of any state statute. The statement must contain the name and address of the prinicipal local law officer of the locality to which the handgun will be shipped, and the seller must forward the statement by registered or certified mail to that law enforcement officer. The seller must wait at least seven days following receipt of notification by the law enforcement officer before shipment can be made.

We believe these four measures would provide adequate safeguards over firearms. To go beyond them would cause undue hardship on legitimate sportsmen, without attacking the root of the problem.

I'd like to clear up another point, which has been seized upon by our opponents to discredit the NRA in recent weeks. In the May issue of its magazine, "The American Rifleman", NRA ran an editorial in which it reiterated its position that the American citizen is entitled to keep and bear arms and that this right will provide authorized law enforcement agencies with a reservoir of citizens prepared to take their place in the "posse comitatus". The "posse comitatus" is a historic heritage here and in other free nations. It consists of all adult male citizens who can be called upon by law officers to aid in keeping the peace in times of emergency.

Because of this editorial, NRA was accused in a syndicated "New York Times" story urging the formation of citizen posses or vigilante groups. This report was absolutely false, for not only did NRA not urge this, but it also made its position absolutely clear on this subject. In 1964, in a policy statement in the same magazine, NRA declared that the formation of such groups is "completely foreign to the tenets and purposes for which the NRA stands." That same statement declared: "The NRA does not approve or support any group activities that properly belong to the national defense or police."

I hope this clears this matter up once and for all, for everyone can see the damage that can be done to an organization's reputation when something that is completely in error gets such wide circulation.

NRA UNDER ATTACK

Today, because it has stuck its neck out to oppose restrictive legislation, the National Rifle Association finds itself under attack. We've been attacked before, and I daresay that we will be attacked again. We aren't particularly worried about this. We've been been around for almost a hundred years, and we're looking forward to another hundred years of encouraging a great organized sport and contributing to the national defense of the greatest country on earth.

What really disturbs us, however, is that the proponents of strict gun control legislation believe that the way to pass their bill is to attack those who believe otherwise.

This is not the American way, and we will fight these tactics even harder than the bill itself.

Race Problem Invited to Britain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1967

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, our equalitarian friends in Britain, so quick to condemn the peoples of United States, Rhodesia, and South Africa, have now invited the race problem to their own shores.

And they must not blame their problem on the United States or their colonies—because their own "soft on communism" leadership has begged the question. Britain's Ministers may soon consult with the South Africans and Rhodesians to be taught how to cope with the problem.

Mr. Speaker, I include the London account from the New York Times in the RECORD:

[From the New York Times, July 26, 1967]

RACIAL INCIDENTS PLAGUING BRITISH—5 ACCUSED OF INCITING HATE—CARMICHAEL CRITICIZED

LONDON, July 25.—Racial tension stirred by both whites and blacks in Britain was reflected today in Parliament and in proceedings in a country magistrate's court.

In East Grinstead, Sussex, five men were committed by a magistrate to stand trial on charges of publishing or distributing broadsheets with intent to stir hatred against colored immigrants. All pleaded not guilty and were released on bail.

In the House of Commons, several members gave notice that they intended to question the Government about the stirring of racial strife here by Negroes, including Stokely Carmichael, the American advocate of black power.

In the 11 days he was here, Mr. Carmichael addressed public meetings about the black-power movement in the United States. He also appeared on television, telling an interviewer that the Negro in the United States would no longer submit to being slapped around. In the future, the assailant will get his arm broken, Mr. Carmichael declared.

But he said nothing in public so inflammatory as a speech made in Reading last night by Michael de Freitas, British leader of the Black Muslims, who urged members of his audience to kill white men who attacked black women. Newspaper reports of his remarks shocked Britons, who had heard nothing like it before from Negroes here.

Victor Goodhew, a Conservative, is to ask the Attorney General to institute proceedings under the Race Relations Act against Mr. de Freitas.

With regard to Mr. Carmichael, one member of Parliament will ask the Home Secretary, Roy Jenkins, to see that he is not permitted to reenter Britain. Another will ask if Mr. Jenkins considers that Mr. Carmichael's speeches are contrary to the national interest.

In the magistrate's court, the prosecution said that the broadsheet, on sale at twopence, insulted colored immigrants and was "likely to make its readers hate them."

The sheets said colored immigrants were "potential rapists, torturers and mutilators." Referring to the West Indians and Asians who have come to Britain in the last decade, they said the immigrants were "taking the bread from the honest working man."

The accused men are Thomas Jones, Alan Hancock, Sindey Hardy, Geoffry Doniny, and Edward Budden.

Results of a Poll, First Congressional District of Arkansas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1967

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, for the past several years I have sent out a questionnaire to the people who reside in the First Congressional District of Arkansas. Out of 13,715 who received this year's questionnaire, 2,609 replies were returned to me, which is 18.9 percent of the total. The questions asked dealt with current domestic and international issues. In addition to the cooperative interest shown by the recipients of the poll, many newspapers of the district printed the questions by number in their columns. As a result, an additional number of people who were subscribers participated in the project.

One of the most encouraging aspects of the answers received to the 14 questions asked was the small percentage of the people who had "no opinion" on the issues involved in the survey. I was gratified at the responses to the questions asked, as this indicates that our people are well informed with regard to the vast problems confronting the Nation.

The responsibility of making decisions on legislative questions and issues is solely that the Member himself. Views and observations of constituents are very valuable in arriving at conclusions and determinations on bills upon which the Member is called upon to vote.

The results of the poll follow:

[In percent]

	Yes	No	No opinion
Do you favor:			
1. A National Teachers Corps to bolster school facilities in low income areas?	27	59	14
2. Schoolchildren being transported from one school area to another in order to assure racial balance?	3	96	1
3. Trimming down expenditures for the space program during years of heavy budget deficits?	79	16	5
4. Legislation bringing farm labor under the jurisdiction of the National Labor Relations Board?	9	83	8
5. A bill which would authorize a union to picket a construction site and as a result keep nonstriking workers off the job?	5	93	2
6. A bill to prohibit interstate travel of persons attempting to incite riots and violent civil disturbances?	94	5	1
7. Compulsory arbitration in the settlement of disputes in railway and other essential industries?	76	12	12
8. The Government's policy which opposes the admission of Red China to the United Nations?	70	15	15
9. Defending other Asian countries such as Cambodia, Thailand, or the Philippines if they are threatened by communism and ask our help?	61	23	16
10. The U.S. efforts to urge the control of births in fast growing countries where food is scarce?	77	15	8
11. A bill that would protect the right of privacy of criminals and law-abiding citizens by prohibiting wiretapping?	38	50	12
12. Detailed disclosure of all properties and assets of Members of Congress?	54	34	12
13. The establishment of a strict code of ethics covering Members of both U.S. Senate and House?	91	4	5
14. Political campaign funds for presidential elections derived from $1 voluntary checkoff on Federal tax returns?	17	73	10

Miss Mary Lou Rajchel Honored by Girls' Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. GURNEY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1967

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, we constantly hear about the hippies and their activities, the beatniks and longhairs who demand that everything be given to them.

Not often do we hear about the mass majority of our young people and the hard work they are doing, the real future leaders of America.

Today, I am pleased to point out that a young lady from my home city, Miss Mary Lou Rajchel, of Winter Park, Fla., has been honored by Girls' Nation here in Washington.

Mary Lou was appointed by the president of Girls' Nation to be secretary of labor.

Her appointment to cabinet-level rank in Girls' Nation reflects the wisdom of the Florida Girls' State in choosing Mary Lou to be a delegate to the annual Girls' Nation, which is sponsored by the American Legion Auxiliary.

This is the 21st annual session of Girls' Nation, the legion's youth citizenship training course in the processes of government.

Crosses, Row on Row

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN W. EDWARDS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1967

Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, an outstanding high school debater, Lemuel E. Hawsey III, of Lake Charles, La., gave an address while competing in the National Forensic League annual speech contest in Nashville, Tenn. It is thrilling to hear Mr. Hawsey deliver the address which he prepared, because of his masterful delivery and oratorical ability. However, in view of recent events relating to the country of France and, in particular, the recent visit by Gen. Charles de Gaulle to Canada and the publicity which resulted therefrom, I think it appropriate that Mr. Hawsey's speech be printed at this point in the Record for consideration by all Americans. The ties that bind America and France go back to the early days when young America was striving to wrest its independence from England. General de Gaulle seems to have forgotten, but I do not believe the people of France share his views.

The address follows:

Crosses, Row on Row

(By Lemuel E. Hawsey III, Lake Charles High School, Lake Charles, La.)

Unto Almighty God we commend the soul of our brother departed, and we commit this nation to the ground; earth to earth, ashes to ashes, dust to dust; in sure and certain hope of the Resurrection of its spirit.

This wasn't the first time and it probably will not be the last time that the spirit of France was laid to rest.

For centuries her armies had marched across the continent of Europe in pomp and glory. Her navies roamed the seas, and her influence was felt in all corners of the earth. The French spirit was born on a victorious battlefield and christened as grandeur. Grandeur was the word that the French had coined to describe the spirit of a nation that held the world in its grasp. Not even the defeat of Napoleon's armies could destroy this spirit. France lived on in reduced power, but with the same spirit of grandeur. Paris was the cultural center of the world; French was the language of the diplomat; and France had a share in destiny.

It was a hot, sultry day in August of 1914 when the spirit of France first faltered, and then was crushed and died under the heel of the German armies. For the first time in her history France's spirit of grandeur had been committed to the ground—earth to earth, ashes to ashes, dust to dust. America stood alone as a tower of strength and poured her lifeblood into France. Thirty-six thousand American men died for a land they had never seen, for a country whose language they could not even speak, so that French spirit of grandeur could rise from the earth, rise from the ashes of destruction, rise from the dust of their death.

But the French spirit had been reborn of a battlefield, and had found new life in death. France gave her everlasting gratitude to America and she announced to all of the world that fate had done her worst to France, for she had survived the war to end all war. With the help of billions of American dollars, the French spirit of grandeur blossomed as France thankfully secured herself behind the Maginot line.

A poet of the times looked back on that conflict and composed a poem that described not only that war, but struggle for France's spirit that would last for half a century more, as he wrote:

> "In Flanders Fields the poppies blow
> Between the crosses, row on row,
> That mark our place; and in the sky
> The larks, still bravely singing, fly
> Scarce heard amid the guns below."

In America happiness had been born again. Her people had little time for poets, and had but faintly heard the heartfelt thanks from abroad as they drove about in their Model T's, danced the charleston, and argued over prohibition. More little boys had been born to take the places of those who lay in Flanders Fields. They knew little of the past, and even less of the future as they swam in America's streams, walked through the streets of cities, and helped harvest her crops. Not only France, but all the world had found new life, and the world was big, wide, wonderful, place that had come alive.

An American song writer wrote: "The last time I saw Paris, her heart was young and gay." For death had struck. In one swift agonizing moment that spirit of grandeur died and Hitler held Europe by the throat. Those same American boys that swam in America's streams—found themselves as men drowning in the icy waters of the Atlantic while struggling to reach the beaches at Normandy; the same boys who walked through her streets—died in the rubble of the devastated city of St. Lo; and those same Americans who had wandered through golden fields bled to death in French hedgerows. They fought for the land they loved, and 184,000 of them died in France to free her from tyranny. They were returned to the earth, ashes to ashes, dust to dust, with the words of a poet ringing in their ears:

> "We are the Dead. Short days ago
> We lived, felt dawn, saw sunset glow,
> Loved and were loved, and now we lie
> In Flanders Fields."

After the last shot had been fired, and guns had been silenced forever, France once again struggled back to life. In two world restore France to the French. America poured 300 billion dollars into France so that the French franc could emerge as one of the strongest currencies in the world. The French spirit of grandeur had risen again from her war torn countryside, but it had received a mortal wound.

In 1954 France made her last bid for world leadership in a far away corner of the globe. All her hopes and dreams were crushed in defeat at Oienbien Phu. Her troops were forced to leave Southeast Asia, and now American soldiers are fighting and dying in their place in the God forsaken jungles of Vietnam.

Time had bypassed France. The fate of the world no longer hinged on the news from Paris. In a brief 40 years, centuries of pomp and glory had become nothing more than memories of a bygone era. Even her spirit, her grandeur was dying.

Last spring, as once again the poppies bloomed in Flanders Fields, French President Charles DeGaulle announced that he would restore the grandeur that was once France. He would save that dying spirit—for along with all Frenchmen he dreamed of a France that would lead the world in grandeur as she had done so long ago. He said that France would travel the road to leadership alone. That France had no debts and would pay no debts. And with one sweeping wave of his hand he denied the past and cut the heart out of the NATO alliance as he ordered that all United States troops leave France. All the world stood back in shocked disbelief as DeGaulle ordered that France's very lifeblood be pumped from her and they asked, "Will United States troops leave France?" That question has already been answered—Yes, they will, all but the 60,000 that are buried there. No man nor nation acting in Godless cruelty can blot those white crosses from the French countryside and destroy the memory of the men who lie there.

The final verse of that poem written over 50 years ago seems to be more of a prophesy:

> "To you from failing hands the torch
> We throw; be yours to hold it high.
> If ye break faith with us who die
> We shall not sleep though poppies grow
> In Flanders fields."

That torch, the torch of freedom, now lies and just a glowing ember covered by the sands of time. And so, once again, the nations of the world have watched as the spirit of France is committed to ground, earth to earth, ashes to ashes, dust to dust.

Corpsmen Walk to Town After Center Disturbance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVE MARTIN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1967

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I insert in the Record below, a story dated July 31 from the McCook, Nebr., Daily Gazette in regard to disturbances at the Job Corps camp at McCook. This sort of thing, I am told, has happened previously. I was also advised that at the Lincoln, Nebr., Job Corps Center, 44 young corpsmen from Watts refused to follow normal rules of conduct, and after a few days, had to be sent home as people who could not be helped. One incident which I am told occurred at the Lincoln Job Corps Center by the 44 young men from Watts was the dumping of their full trays of food on the floor in the dining room, and then arrogantly stating to one of the supervisors, "White man, you clean it up."

The following experience at the McCook Job Corps Center, and many other stories from other centers throughout the country, make it very doubtful if this is an effective and productive program:

Corpsmen Walk to Town After Center Disturbance

(By Bob Sailors)

Six members of the McCook Job Corps walked 11 miles to McCook this morning and complained to the police that they had been beaten up in a dorm fight at the center Sunday night.

Two more members walked to McCook later this morning, one without shoes, and said they didn't want to go back.

Another Corpsman was lying on a picnic table in front of the well-lighted canteen about 2 a.m. this morning. He told Red Willow County Deputy Sheriff Eugene Morris he was afraid to go into his dorm because "they are after my hide."

All eight complaining Corpsmen were whites. They said their trouble came from Negro Corpsmen.

Conflicting reports came from the center today after the incident which apparently started about 9:30 p.m. Sunday.

Center Director Clem Griffin said about six youths were involved in a brawl in a street in front of the administration building.

He said the fight had broken up by the time he reached the center at 10 p.m.

A camp worker had a different story, however.

He told Morris at the center early today that he broke up the brawl in Dorm H, adding that he had "no idea" how many youths were involved.

A Negro counselor, one of the first to talk to Morris, admitted about 2:30 a.m. that there had been "an uprising" but said it was all over by that time in the morning.

Morris, who was at the center to check on any damage or injuries, was asked to leave by one counselor who told the deputy he had no business on federal property.

Morris returned to the center about 3 a.m., after Griffin brought the six run-a-ways back from the McCook Police Department.

Griffin told Morris that a broken window and door on Dorm 4 had been broken for more than a week and that no damage occurred during the fight.

Editor John S. Knight Says President Johnson Should Think Less About 1968 and Give Strong Leadership to Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1967

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, in an editorial headed "Politicians, Promising Utopia, Shackle Citizens to the State" in the Detroit Free Press July 31, Editor John S. Knight very ably diagnoses some of the Nation's ills, warning that the United States is rapidly losing its moral fiber in succumbing to insidious influences.

I would like to recommend that my colleagues ponder the statements set forth in the editorial which follows:

POLITICIANS, PROMISING UTOPIA, SHACKLE CITIZENS TO THE STATE

Sir Thomas Moore wrote a book in 1516 about the imaginary island of Utopia which enjoyed the perfect political and social system.

In the centuries which followed, the theorists of many lands have tinkered with various concepts of the ideal society.

Some pin their faith on socialism, others try communism but most settle for a constantly expanding welfare state.

The basic thought behind all of these philosophies—usually politically motivated—is the forced dependence of the individual upon the state.

Even in so civilized a nation as Great Britain, the government provides security from the cradle to the grave. Collaterally, vigorous capitalism under the spur of competition is losing its thrust as government seeks to nationalize the United Kingdom's basic industries.

Uruguay, the nearly complete welfare state, is a prime example of fiscal irresponsibility. Its people, encouraged by the expediency of political leaders, demand ever higher benefits. The result is inflation, outrageous prices and ultimate bankruptcy.

We might all enjoy living in a world which demanded a minimum of effort with guaranteed security and high remuneration for doing as little as possible.

The only trouble with these utopian schemes is that they don't work.

Our concern, therefore, is found in the emulation by the United States of theories which have been tried without success in other countries.

Why should this nation which grew to unprecedented wealth and development under a free competitive system succumb to the soft theorizing of academicians and new day economists?

Even now, the flaws in President Johnson's Great Society are glaringly apparent. The President boasts of our high living standards, the low rate of unemployment and elimination of poverty. Yet we are existing in a virtual state of anarchy as law enforcement agencies appear powerless to prevent rioting and looting in our streets.

In New York City, 1,000 tax-supported social workers held a mass demonstration at city hall to pressure Mayor Lindsay into accepting their demands. Pickets carried signs calling the mayor a "pseudo-liberal" and "union buster." Taxation is so high in "welfare city" that scores of business firms have already left New York and more are on their way out.

President Johnson suffers from the delusion that any problem can be cured by spending a few more billions. Yet Detroit, which has the best anti-poverty program in the country, good relations between the agencies and the people and a city administration committed to helping the poor, did not escape the worst riots in the nation's history.

The Nation suffers from a decline of morality and the breakdown of respect for law and order.

As retired Associate Justice Charles E. Whittaker of the United States Supreme Court has said, "History shows that every society which became lawless soon succumbed and the evidences of each society's decay appeared in the toleration of disobedience of its laws and the judgments of its courts."

Stokely Carmichael and other anarchists are actively fomenting revolution with their open definance of our legal institutions.

But Johnson endures their insults, plays anti-Romney politics in Michigan and can think of nothing better to do than to pout and ask Congress for more money.

This is a sad commentary on a man reputed to be a strong President.

Our era of discontent, described by Sen. Robert Kennedy as the worst since the Civil War, will not be ended until the President resolves to end it.

The American people want something more substantive than phony reports on the progress being made in Vietnam and applying band aids to social cancers.

Decisions of the Supreme Court have placed shackles on law enforcement officers and encouraged "easy justice."

Union leaders enjoy ready access to the White House but give no heed to presidential wage guidelines. The National Labor Relations Board is notoriously oriented to labor's side.

Government bureaucracies fiddle around with investigations on automobile safety but never utter a harsh word about the drunks who cause the accidents.

The President, who once warned federal agencies against harassment, has permitted an orgy of investigations against both individuals and business.

Federal payrolls are growing at an astounding rate, yet the President says he is demanding economy in government.

Medicare is costing more than administration estimates, Social Security taxes will soon take another jump, the federal budget has become a joke.

True, President Johnson has more than his share of problems and we can sympathize with him.

But there can be no lasting solutions until he comes to grips with realities, thinks less about 1968 and gives stronger leadership to the nation.

For the United States is rapidly losing its moral fibre in succumbing to insidious influences which in time will destroy our precious institutions which have served our nation so well in the past.

Free Legal Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1967

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a recent public service television and radio newscast, "The Kee Report." The subject discussed is free legal counsel for those without the funds to pay for such services:

FREE LEGAL SERVICE

This is Jim Kee, bringing you the Kee Report.

As Americans, we have long been proud of the fact that equality before the law is a fundamental principle of our system of jurisprudence. In other words, when a wrong has been committed, the poorest man in the land has the same right to his day in court as the multi-millionaire.

A few years ago, however, it was pointed out that where the doctrine of equality is concerned, there is a serious lapse between theory and practice. Investigation disclosed that millions of Americans never instituted legal action to protect their interests for two potent reasons—either because they are unaware of their basic rights or because they lack the means to pay for counsel.

The public has been unaware of this situation. But it presented a golden opportunity to those shoddy characters who prey upon the weak and unfortunate to make their living. The poor man is an easy victim for this class of swindlers because, usually, he lacks the educational background to understand the nature of the swindler. As a result, in too many instances, he signs up to buy a motor car, or furniture, or other equipment on the installment plan at prices which have been inflated beyond reason. The honest businessman deplores such practices but the honest business man is in no position to police his dishonest competitors.

It is estimated that millions of dollars are extorted from the country's poorest people by such methods every year. An attempt to end this evil was started a few years ago by private legal associations. In some localities, legal counsel is provided without charge to those who do not have the funds to pay for such services. Now this service is being expanded with financial help from the Office of Economic Opportunity, the Federal agency set up to conduct the war on poverty.

This program is now operating in cooperation with the National Legal Aid and Defender Association, an organization set up by the legal profession for the express purpose of providing legal aid for the poor. In addition to extending help in individual cases, this organization is giving basic legal instructions at the community level. Once an entire community has been alerted, the swindler will have a much harder time in finding his victims.

There are now about 250 legal service agencies operating on funds supplied by the war on poverty. They are staffed by more than 1,200 lawyers. In this fiscal year, they will handle close to 300,000 cases. This is certainly a substantial beginning.

When this program first started, many feared that free legal advice would make substantial inroads on the income of private law firms. In most cases these fears have been erased. In the past, private law firms handled thousands of cases for the poor without compensation. Now these cases are turned over to the service agencies.

The National Bar Association and other private agencies are cooperating with the Federal Government in this program. Acting together, they should be able to correct a grave weakness in our legal system.

Thank you for listening.

The American Indian

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1967

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, many Americans who regard race mixing as a sincere solution rather than a politically motivated gimmick are unable to understand why all the fuss about the black man while the native American Indian goes unnoticed.

The answer to the Indians' plight may be that there are not enough of them to organize into a voting pressure group. They are too proud and independent and, in many instances, readily adapt with the white's civilization—so they do not count.

I insert the recent Associated Press story on the American Indian here in the RECORD for our colleagues attention:

INDIANS COMPLAIN OF POVERTY

SANDERSVILLE, MISS. (AP).—Indian leaders described poverty and hunger as the lot of the 80 Choctaws in the Bogue Homo settlement, smallest reservation in Mississippi.

The picture came from Emerik B. Boyt, who teaches in the settlement's one-room government school, and many of the 80 residents in the settlement in Jones County.

The one-room frame school building is the best building in the settlement, which is composed of a rickety tin church built by the Indians and 10 ramshackled houses dating back to the 1920s. The residents rent the houses for $50 a year.

Boyt, who teaches the 21 pupils, in the five-grade school said the Indians are left by the government to "take care of themselves," although the government has said it is planning to help with housing later.

The Indians expressed some bitterness with the federal government but not the state, Mississippi allows the Choctaws to take part in the food stamp program handled by its welfare department.

Some also receive welfare checks from the state.

Most, however, get no federal money.

Estelle Thomas, who recently returned from California to be with her elderly mother, said Indians in other states get welfare stipends from the federal government—"but not in Mississippi."

Huey Nickey, a son of 83-year-old Chief Billy Nickey, said his father's home was damaged by a tornado in 1957 and the Red Cross tried to help in the rebuilding but "the federal government said no."

Nickey said about 12 years ago the government gave the land to the Choctaw Indians whose headquarters are at the Bureau of Indian Affairs office at Philadelphia, 75 miles to the north.

Huey Nickey said the Indians' diet was poor, with their only meat coming from the hogs raised by a few of the families.

Both he and his brother Thomas Huey, agreed their people were hungry.

Forceful Statement by Governor Agnew on Riots

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 2, 1967

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend Gov. Spiro Agnew, of Maryland, on his forceful statement on riots issued Sunday. He pulls no punches and calls a spade a spade. The Governor will not allow any rationalizing to justify the current violence. Criminal activity will be treated with swift action.

I include the Governor's statement with my remarks at this point in the RECORD:

Our country is as much threatened by the lawless rioting in our streets as it is by our enemies abroad.

In such a serious time, the people of a state are entitled to a clear and direct statement of their governor's position. This is such a statement.

In the first place, it is evident that there is ample cause for unrest in our cities. There is still discrimination and, in too many cases, there are deplorable slum conditions. Our Negro citizens have not, and in many cases are not, receiving equal educational, job and housing opportunities.

The gains recently made, while good, are not enough.

I believe that responsible militants within the Negro leadership should use every means available to place legitimate pressure on those in authority to break the senseless and artificial barriers of racial discrimination.

But legitimate pressure—the power of the vote—the power of organized political, economic and social action—does not give any person or group a license to commit crimes.

Burning, looting and sniping, even under the banner of civil rights, are still arson, larceny and murder. There are established penalties for such felonies and we cannot change the punishment simply because the crime occurred during a riot. The laws must be consistently enforced to protect all our people.

If an angry man burns his neighbor's house, or loots his neighbor's store, or guns his neighbors down, no reason for his anger will be enough of an excuse.

WILL NOT BE TOLERATED

In Maryland, rioting or inciting to riot, no matter what wrong is said to be the cause, will not be tolerated. There are proper ways to protest and they must be used. It shall now be the policy in this state to immediately arrest any person inciting a riot and to not allow that person to finish his vicious speech.

All lawbreakers will be vigorously and promptly prosecuted.

Acts of violence will not be later forgiven just because the criminal after a while adopts a more reasonable attitude. The violent cannot be allowed to sneak unnoticed from the war dance to the problem-solving meeting.

No, the problem-solving conference must be reserved for those who shun lawlessness, who win their places at the conference table by leadership that builds rather than destroys.

RESPONSIBILITY HELD KEY

The problem-solving must be done by constructive militants such as the Wilkinses, Kings, Youngs and Randolphs—not by the Carmichaels, Joneses, and Browns. But it should include the younger responsible leadership as well as older, more established leaders. Responsibility is the yardstick.

It shall continue to be my firm policy to do everything possible to provide jobs, good housing and better educational opportunities for the poor and underprivileged, both Negro and white, in Maryland. I will meet with any responsible leaders to discuss the problems that confront us. I will not meet with those who engage in or urge riots and other criminal acts as weapons to obtain power.

In conclusion, I commend the citizens of both races who have continued to conduct themselves with intelligent restraint in spite of great pressure.

I share the sorrow of those who have suffered and who continue to suffer from the reckless acts of a few. For the confused and weak who seek to excuse, appease and rationalize for the criminals who threaten our society, I have only pity.

The Northeastern Water Supply Study—Long Island Hearings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. WYDLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 2, 1967

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, the Congress has authorized a study in depth of the water supply problems of the Northeastern United States of America. In connection with this study the Army Corps of Engineers has been holding hearings in the northeastern section of our Nation. At my request, they recently agreed to hold hearings on Long Island. These hearings were devoted to the future water needs of our area. There is no more important problem for our area's future growth, development, and happiness.

I was delighted to attend these hearings even though I had to fly from Washington to be present. I had been invited by the Army Corps of Engineers to open the hearings and make a statement of the position of our area in meeting its future water needs. Many people have written me for copies of the statement I made. I, therefore, wish to make this statement available publicly here in the House of Representatives. The statement follows:

I am pleased to open these hearings today in Nassau County and in the Fourth Congressional District on a topic of vital importance to the future economic growth of Long Island and to the health and welfare of the people who live here now, and who will live here in the years to come.

I am, of course, gratified that the Army Corps of Engineers saw fit to accede to my request for a separate public hearing on the water resources and supplies for Nassau and Suffolk counties. I pointed out that the needs of the Long Island area, as contrasted to those of the City of New York were distinct and separate and that these needs should be considered in their own hearings and in their own surroundings on Long Island. I thank the Corps of Engineers for acceeding to this request. I welcome them to my Congressional District. They are rendering an important public service to our area.

This is the 23rd public hearing held by the Army Corps of Engineers in accordance with Congressional directions for a Northeastern United States Water Supply Study. These studies began about a year ago in August of 1966. They are nearing conclusion as their first birthday is reached. We in Nassau and Suffolk counties, especially in Nassau county and still more emphatically in the Central area which is the Fourth Congressional District, have suffered three times during the last three decades from prolonged droughts. We are just now recovering from one of the worst.

The water table in our area stood just a matter of 10 months ago at the lowest level in history. In many places it and stream flow are still going down. Yet, our population continues to rise and commercial demand for cool fresh water continues to grow unabated. Every indication is that area needs will grow at an ever-increasing rate in the years immediately ahead. Our area is in desperate need of some good water management for the present and for the future. We must deal with the problems both of water supply and with the problems of water quality. In some ways, these matters are of course related.

Up to the present time it has been assumed that a provident God and a generous planet would satisfy all our water needs. The average homeowner when he turns the tap on in his home expects that pure water will come out of it as long as he keeps it open. He does not want to hear any excuses for the failure of this to take place. Yet many problems must be solved if this is to be accomplished. The problems are economic—they are political, as well as scientific and technical.

Long Island can be sure of two facts. One is that our population will continue to explode and second is that new industry will mushroom across the face of both Nassau and Suffolk counties. Our water needs will escalate but the outlook on Long Island is not basically a pessimistic one, it is rather an optimistic one, as there are many studies which indicate that our ground water supplies are great. There are untapped reservoirs beneath us even as we sit here today that could possibly maintain a population of ten million people in our bi-county area using our present resources, but that is only a possibility in an area in which we must have certainties. The plain fact is that many of the facts on which we rely are uncertain. Our estimates of population and industrial growth for the future are uncertain. Our needs, therefore, are uncertain, and the extent of our resources are also uncertain.

All this points to the need for an initial effort to obtain facts. We must undertake research and study and come forth with some concrete evidence on which proper planning development and construction can proceed.

Our possiblities have already been fairly well defined in certain broad categories:

I. In the first place we can expand our existing supplies of ground water, in addition to praying for rain that consists mainly of protecting our supply.

(a) Some efforts along this line have already been made in experimental attempts to prevent salt water encroachment into our fresh water supplies by the injection of treated sewage affluent back into the ground by a system of wells along our south and north shores. This recharged water injected into the ground maintains the proper interface between the fresh and salt water under us. Various combinations of wells and injections of fresh and salt water in various areas have been suggested. Before hard, extensive and expensive decisions are made, however, the research of basic facts must be undertaken and completed. We must have more than theories as a basis on which to proceed.

(b) We can also expand our existing supplies of water by a proper attack on the problems of pollution and by effective water pollution controls. This is an immediate need on Long Island and one that should be undertaken at every level of government without further delay.

We most assuredly need an immediate end to all cesspools and septic tanks being used by private homeowners. These must be replaced by municipal sewerage systems. This, of course, raises immediately serious financial and political problems. It is up to our units of government to convince the people the importance of sewers, not only as a means of ridding ourselves of unwanted wastes, but as a means of protecting our vital and necessary water supplies. Too often in the past there has been a failure on the part of our local governments to adequately deal with these problems from a political point of view. The recent tragic defeat by the voters of the sewerage systems in the western section of Suffolk and the failure to get started on the sewerage systems in the eastern area of Nassau are outstanding examples. There have, in addition, been local problems. One such is being suffered in the community of Massapequa where the water supply equipment was inhdequate. Public resistance delayed the needed construction of new water towers. Once the people were adequately informed of the importance of this equipment, its approval was obtained. The lesson is for public education and local leadership.

Industry must play a major part in pollution control. Not only the industry that is on Long Island now but that which is to come. Proper requirements must be imposed to see that these industries do not pollute our water supplies and a way must be found to help them adequately bear the costs of such purifying equipment and procedures.

I have long been an advocate of a federal tax credit for water pollution control. I still consider this a sound and progressive proposal. Certainly, municipal cooperation has proven effective in other areas of this country and of countries in western Europe and should be looked to as a way to meet this particular problem.

II. The second great area of promise for the future is the developing of new sources of water supply. There are two proposals.

(a) The first of these is the desalinization of sea water. Such a system works but the cost of such a program is still a problem and in the main an unknown. We do not know if it is economically feasible or desirable. Estimates for desalinated water range from 25 cents to $1.00 a thousand gallons to produce. This does not even include its delivery cost to the consumer. In contrast, the community of Westbury on Long Island now pays 30 cents a thousand gallons for water delivered to the consumer. Until the cost factor is controlled this source of water could only be considered an emergency possibility. The quality of the water, however, is so good that it might prove economical to mix it with low grade water to make potable water on an economical basis.

(b) Another recent idea that has been proposed to increase our water sources is to dam the Long Island Sound and to make it into the "Great Long Island Lake." The proposal is to build a bridge-dam across the eastern end of Long Island to Connecticut, close the western end, and filling the reservoir with fresh water from rivers. Although this is engineeringly possible, it raises serious problems of cost, pollution control and a change of the ecology of the area which have serious implications. I would put this strictly in the category of an emergency type solution. I doubt we have an emergency to justify such a drastic expenditure.

These ideas represent the alternatives we have to meet our future water needs. The choice between rests on facts which are unknown. We must get these facts as our first order of business. We need an effective instrument to obtain them.

Just as I have indicated to this hearing the difference between problems of Nassau and Suffolk counties and those of New York City in the question of water supply, so I must stress to this hearing now the commonalty of interests of Nassau and Suffolk counties in their water supply problems. It seems to me that county lines must not be considered in discussing water supply. Snow and rain falls on the two Long Island counties without regard for political lines. It must be used and utilized in the same way. Water drawn from a well in eastern Suffolk may well come from beneath Nassau soil and vice-versa. *It appears to me that a bi-county water supply agency is an urgent requirement of our area.* If legislation on the state level is necessary for such an agency, then I will urge our local legislators to prepare it at once.

We need, and I now propose, a Nassau-Suffolk Water Authority and Pollution Control Commission. We need an agency able to obtain the required research from the many sources now engaged in research. We need an authority ready to coordinate the needs of Long Island for the years immediately ahead and for the years of our children and grandchildren. Such an agency could indeed work with private enterprise and with municipal governments in seeking a unified program that will indeed meet the needs of tomorrow. It could make the proper choices for our "water-bed" area. I do not visualize such a commission as a seller of water but as a finder and protector.

On July 13th the House of Representatives passed the National Water Commission Act which will establish a seven member commission at the national level to look into the water supply problems of our nation of the next 25 to 50 years. This commission will study our requirements and the ways we have to meet them. I would hope our Nassau-Suffolk Water Authority and Polution Control Commission would be able to work with such a national water commission in solving the water supply problems at our local level.

In conclusion, I would say that Long Island is vitally interested in the hearings being conducted before you today. We know we need facts—facts about the amount of water that really lies beneath us; facts about the costs of bringing it to the surface; facts about the cost of comparative methods of supplying water; facts about the sources and control of pollution. We are optimistic, but we are also realistic. We know we have time to solve our problems but we know that we face a serious political problem in the fact that we lack an emergency which requires us to use that time wisely. We know that water is not only important to us economically and for our health, but on Long Island it is an important recreational item as well. It is an essential to life and the pursuit of happiness. We seek from you gentlemen some vision as to our needs in the future and as to the ways to supply them. We know we may have to reach some day into New England or into Canada to get the water we require. Any proposals to span the Long Island Sound by bridge or tunnel that may finally be approved should take into account the possibility that someday such a structure might be required to also carry water across our Long Island Sound. Such advanced thinking could save a great deal of money in the years to come.

Next year your study group will begin laying out the framework for long-range plans. I hope you will take seriously into account the future needs of the Long Island area. I know you have discovered that 10% of the water in the Northeast area is already being transferred between water systems. If you think this is necessary in our area, I hope you will make it clear to us.

Although we are optimistic we know that even though we have had a good rainfall this spring and summer on Long Island, our Long Island ground water level and stream flow have continued to decline. We intend to do what is necessary to protect the future.

Some of the most learned experts in Long Island water and water supply are in this room. Some of them I have invited just because of this vast knowledge. Others are here who are aware of the need but not necessarily of the means of satisfying that need. I wish to welcome everyone, knowing the work started today will not be completed today but that every word will be taken down and studied at length by the expert officers of this board. I thank you for your attention.

The Causes of Rioting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1967

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, many persons who have viewed the recent riots have sought to find simple answers. Frequently the finger of blame was pointed at the Congress for failure to act on more programs to provide greater benefits in the way of education, housing, recreation, and jobs. However, as a significant editorial in the Saturday, July 29, issue of the Chicago Daily News pointed out four out of 23 Negroes of a New York looting gang arrested last week turned out to be employees of city-sponsored antipoverty programs. Furthermore, as the recent report of the 1965 Watts riots disclosed, well-to-do Negroes are just as full of resentment and ready for violence as the poor, deprived Negroes. The report stated that—

> Resentment is just as, or more, likely to find expression in riot participation by those who are better off than by those who are disadvantaged.

This meaningful editorial should help avoid the pitfall which many have adopted that more money and more Federal programs could prevent the riots. The answer is more elusive than that. As the Daily News points out in its editorial, "The Causes of Rioting":

The Causes of Rioting

Gov. Kerner, as chairman of President Johnson's advisory commission to seek causes of the wave of riots, has a chance to perform an important public service.

For what emerges most clearly from all the millions of words uttered about the situation is that nobody really knows much about why these things happen or how to cure them. And the suspicion grows that most of the assumptions the politicians and pundits have made (present company not excepted) don't hold water.

The standard assumptions have been that young Negroes go into the streets and loot and riot because they have been deprived of education, decent housing and recreation and jobs to keep them off the streets.

Yet among 23 young Negroes of a New York looting gang arrested Thursday morning, four turned out to be employes of city-sponsored antipoverty programs. Whatever these four needed to make good citizens the answer clearly wasn't jobs alone.

That is a single case, but what gives it relevancy is the just-finished report on the 1965 Watts riots, growing out of exhaustive studies made over two years by experts of the University of California at Los Angeles.

The key finding was that well-to-do, successful Negroes are just as full of resentment and ready for violence as are the poor, deprived Negroes. "Resentment," the report said, "is just as or more, likely to find expression in riot participation by those who are better off than by those who are disadvantaged."

They did not conclude that jobs, better housing and education wouldn't help; quite the contrary. They simply concluded that after those imperative opportunities were provided, there would still be a massive problem left to solve.

Once this fact has been brought to light, the reasons are not hard to find. A Negro in Chicago who has whipped all the odds and won a law or medical degree will find that his troubles have just begun. He has separated himself from his fellow Negroes without winning real acceptance by the white community. He will encounter bias when it comes to winning a clientele, bias when he seeks a decent place to live, bias in the schools he wants his children to attend, bias in the clubs he would like to join.

In the face of all this, his fury is not likely to be any less than that of the Negro still denied a place on the bottom rung of the ladder.

The fact, of course, is that the Negro doctor or lawyer is not going to riot in the streets. But their children may do just that, and their children's greater access to education may lead them to a "respectable" career or, just as readily, to a leadership role in the protest movement.

These are discouraging findings, but if they are true—as they appear to be—they had best be assessed frankly by the Kerner commission and by all others seeking answers to violence.

Those answers will never be simple. If there is a conspiracy toward insurrection, that must be discovered and smashed. Law-defying leaders must be arrested and dealt with sternly; the rule of law is the final protection of Negroes and whites alike.

Mayor Daley is properly proud of the fact that some 20,000 Chicago children are enrolled in Head Start programs, while another 21,000 dropouts and other youths have found employment in the city's job programs this year. These are parts of the solution.

But all of the programs and all of the legislation that can be brought to bear will still fall short of a total solution, which is to make it possible for all citizens, black and white, to achieve status as dignified human beings. The final answer to that lies deep in the human heart, buried under layers of prejudice and fear. Making this clear is perhaps the most important task in the human rights catalog.

George B. Galloway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 18, 1967

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, with the passing of Dr. George B. Galloway, Members of this Chamber have lost a cherished friend and an extraordinarily competent aid. As senior specialist in American Government in the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress for many years, Dr. Galloway rendered invaluable assistance to many Members of Congress. As staff director of the Joint Committee on the Reorganization of Congress in the mid-1940's, he was instrumental in drafting the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, a landmark statute in the history of Congress. Among other books, he was the author of the "History of the House of Representatives," an authoritative work on our great institution.

But George Galloway will be remembered most for his generous spirit, his sense of idealism, and for his dedication to the institutions of democracy.

Mrs. Miller and I extend our heartfelt sympathy to Mrs. Galloway and their two sons in their great loss.

This morning's Washington Post includes an editorial which reflects the high esteem in which Dr. George B. Galloway was held in this community. I insert the editorial at this point in the RECORD:

George B. Galloway

It is unlikely that any contemporary possessed a more detailed knowledge or a more profound understanding of the workings of the United States Congress than George Galloway, who died here a few days ago. Dr. Galloway, a professional political scientist, was primarily a scholar, exceptionally learned in the theory and structure of American political institutions. He added a wealth of direct experience to research, however. For a score of years he served as senior specialist in American Government at the Library of Congress. Many members of Congress—and many journalists and students as well—were the beneficiaries of his learning, his generous readiness to be of help and his sensitive understanding of the problems of a free society.

Prior to his service at the Library of Congress, Dr. Galloway was secretary of the Joint Congressional Committee on the Reorganization of Congress. In this capacity, he played an important and constructive role in the modernization of congressional procedures achieved under the Congressional Reorganization Act of 1946. He was an ardent advocate, among other things, of home rule for the District of Columbia. Behind a certain scholarly dryness of manner, there lurked in George Galloway a wealth of wit and quiet humor; and all that he did was informed, moreover, by a disciplined fervor for human liberty. His books and his lifetime of study constitute an invaluable legacy.

Poland and Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1967

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, much of the reporting on the Middle East crisis contains the expected inaccuracies and oversimplification that present day journalists tend to provide. A very thoughtful commentary on the Middle East crisis and the position taken by the Communist distatorship in Warsaw was carried in the July 29 edition of the Polish American. In view of its penetrating nature I insert it in the RECORD:

Poland and Israel

The twenty-third anniversary of the Polish Communist regime was hallmarked several days ago with a statement by Prime Minister Jozef Cyrankiewicz to six Arab ambassadors promising "unchanging support of the Polish government and people for the righteous struggle" of the Arab countries against the so-called "efforts of imperialist aggression."

Since the present Middle East crisis stems in large part from the determination of certain Arab leaders to obliterate Israel, a logical question to ask at this juncture is whether the obliteration of Israel is also the objective of Prime Minister Cyrankiewicz and the government with which he is associated.

This, if answered in the affirmative, would most certainly represent a most remarkable and unfortunate departure from the entire Polish historic tradition—as should be evident to anyone with even the faintest knowledge of Polish history.

For centuries, Poland was a place of refuge for many thousands of Jews who sought sanctuary in a hostile Europe. Because Poland maintained an "open door" policy based upon religious and ethnic tolerance, its Jewish population continued to increase until, in the period between the two World Wars, it amounted to approximately ten percent of the nation's total population.

After the cataclysm of World War II—and the destruction of most of Europe's Jewry which was a part of that cataclysm—Poland's Jewish population virtually ceased to exist since most of its remnants migrated to Israel, where they were joined by refugees from many other lands.

And it is this new homeland—the state of Israel—which some would now have destroyed.

Reports from Americans returning from their summer vacations in Poland seem to indicate that most Poles support the Israeli position in the Arab-Israeli dispute—just as most of the Free World's public opinion seems to sympathize with Israel's determination to exist as a nation.

But the Gomulka regime, for whom Cyrankiewicz spoke, is apparently supporting a foreign policy which is contrary to the preference of most Poles. This, in itself, is merely another indication of that heavy Soviet Russian hand which continues to weigh upon Poland to the detriment of Poland's national self-interest and to the detriment of its international prestige.

The Communist government of Roumania has used the Arab-Israeli dispute as a means of increasing its independence from the Soviet Union by taking an active role in seeking a genuine solution to the Middle East crisis. It is unfortunate that Poland's Gomulka has been unwilling or unable to do likewise.

First Postgraduate Seminar on Advanced Tourism Studies of IUOTO To Be Held in Turin, Italy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1967

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, from July 29 to August 20, 1967, the first postgraduate Seminar on Advanced Tourism Studies of IUOTO—International Union of Official Travel Organizations, Consultative Status U.N.—will be held in Turin, Italy.

One of my distinguished constituents, Mr. Murray Vidockler, will be one of those attending the seminar.

I commend to the attention of our colleagues the text of a statement issued by the Travel Marketing Institute, which presents a short biography of Mr. Vidockler, and an explanation of the seminar.

The text follows:

> Mr. Murray Vidockler, CTC, President of All State Bus Company, operators of American Adventure Tours, has been invited and is attending the first postgraduate Seminar on Advanced Tourism Studies of IUOTO in Turin, Italy.
>
> The IUOTO (International Union of Official Travel Organizations, Consultative Status U.N.) has established this program for officials of national government agencies and future graduate level teachers of tourism. The seminar will take place from July 29th to August 20th, and includes well-known professors of economics from countries all over the world, including Czechoslovakia, on the other side of the Iron Curtain.
>
> Of the 103 U.N. member nations who could be invited by the trustees for this tourism development management program, there are only 25 English-speaking and 25 French-speaking postgraduate candidates.
>
> Mr. Vidockler says that he regards this as a great opportunity to participate and associate with such outstanding leaders in the economic comprehension of tourism. Tourism is the world's largest industry, has the greatest potential for export industries of developing nations, as well as those nations concerned with balance of payments problems.
>
> Mr. Vidockler specializes as a consultant in travel marketing, numbering among his accounts his own firm, All State Bus Company, and Brighton Travel Bureau, as well as Caledonian Airways, American Adventure Tours, Travel Times, and several hotels.
>
> He is also Executive Director of Travel Marketing Institute, a newly formed organization of senior marketing people in the travel industry. Mr. Vidockler is a member of the Institute of Certified Travel Agents, headquartered at Michigan State University, which awards the CTC designation.
>
> A 20 year member of ASTA, he is also an active member of NTBA (National Tour Brokers), an association of domestic tourism operators.
>
> A Baruch School, C.C.N.Y. graduate, he is now attending postgraduate courses in marketing and international business. His Master's thesis will be "Tourism, The Invisible Export".
>
> Mrs. Ruth Vidockler, his wife, is active in group travel at Brighton Travel Bureau. They have two children, Stuart, a graduate of M.I.T. and a senior in Systems Marketing at Harvard Business School, and Francine, a senior at Boston University. The family lives in Brooklyn.

What Jet Noise Means

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. WYDLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1967

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, for years I have been pointing out to the Congress the terrible problem caused to many areas of our Nation by jet aircraft noise. It is impossible for one who does not experience this noise personally to understand that it causes normal life to cease and becomes a totally dominant factor in life and the way it is lived in the jet alleys around our Nation.

No clearer example of this has been received by me than a letter I recently received from Pastor Roland J. Perez, of the Advent Evangelical Lutheran Church. Reverend Perez' letter was one of thousands I have received on this topic but it speaks very clearly about this matter. I think my colleagues in the Congress should read it with interest, sympathy, and a determination to do something about it.

> DEAR REPRESENTATIVE WYDLER: This letter is written out of a great sense of frustration and to a lesser extent indignation. Its subject matter is the harassment of my people in their homes, in their schools and in their House of Worship, by Jet Planes. I recognize that this is not an easy problem to solve, yet I get the distinct feeling that no one is really getting too excited about it. Every day I read reports how one Government body after another is powerless to put an end to what is in reality a vicious problem. Evidently the adage of many years ago, that is "The public be damned", is still not dead. I wonder if you could experience the actually painful noise, if then you would not be moved to some immediate action.
>
> Something is dreadfully wrong in our country when a minister cannot preach because of the noise of a commercial carrier. We would all be indignant if these same carriers were to erect a barrier across the doors of our Churches. Yet, in certainty, this is what is happening.
>
> I am not naive enough to assume that this letter will stand out from among the many others that you have already received on this problem. It is, therefore, perhaps just another drop in the whole reservoir of complaints that still must flood down upon a senseless and unfeeling segment of our economy.
>
> I would appreciate a response to this indicating what is really going to be done about this problem. I would respectfully ask that I be not sent a mimeographed reply, nor a reply geared only to soothing my ruffled feelings. That kind of nonsense has no place in a situation as sickening as this one.
>
> Very truly yours,
>
> ROLAND J. PEREZ,
> *Pastor.*

The Big Lie in the Middle East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1967

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I have had the opportunity to read a copy of a letter written by one of by constituents to a number of newspapers in various parts of the country.

His terse, perceptive, and forceful summation of some of the propaganda aspects of the Middle East crisis impressed me greatly, and I am sure my colleagues in this House will be as interested in, and enlightened by his statement as I was.

The writer of the letter is Jack Drasner of Flushing, Queens County, N.Y. He is a leader in community and veterans' affairs, and eastern vice president of the Society of the 3d Infantry Division, U.S. Army. I quote his letter here:

> Like everyone else I have been reading and listening to the news and views of what has transpired in the war "to drive Israel into the sea."
>
> Like everyone else I have gotten a bellyache from listening to the great lie technique made popular by Adolf Hitler which is being used over and over again by Kosygin, Federenko, Nasser, Hussein, etc. According to these great liars Israel was the aggressor instead of being the proposed victim of a genocidal aggression.
>
> Since these great liars miscalculated they now want to save their faces by re-writing history and perhaps convince enough voting delegates of the United Nations to compel Israel to lose at the "PEACE" Conference the security which they gained on the battlefield resisting aggression.
>
> Today Christian, Moslem, and Jew alike can freely visit and worship at their respective religious shrines in Jerusalem which was impossible for the last twenty years. This is something the atheistic Communists of Soviet Russia would like to prevent.
>
> What is it that Israel has asked from the world?
>
> All they want is to live in peace with their neighbors, to have the right that is accorded all other peoples to have free innocent passage on International Waterways which include the Straits of Tiran, the Gulf of Aqaba, and the Suez Canal. They want to be free from continued harassment and attack by their neighbors whether its nature be poisonous propaganda, guerrilla attacks, or a concerted military envelopment attempt.

The Voice of America should be strong, forceful, and outspoken in defense of what is right, true, and just. To be mealy mouthed and two faced in our public utterances to the great liars will not help the cause of Peace, Justice, Freedom, or Righteousness.

Communist Party Plots Against Us Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1967

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, reviewing the Communist Party demands against the President of the United States as set forth in the Worker for July 18, the American people can see for themselves that the party line tracks much of the controlled news and programing being broadsided against the taxpayer. The excuse to bellow exploitation to encourage more bloodshed and looting.

These are of the same stripe who kill our boys in Vietnam. Just where do they get any right to make demands on our country?

Again we find those who created the problem taking advantage of their chaos, "loud mouthing" their proposed solutions.

This bunch of anti-American rats should be banished from our country like the Israelis do their subversives. Let them go to Russia and see how far they get with their agitation and subversion.

Mr. Speaker, I insert a story from the Communist Worker for July 18:

CP AGAIN URGES LBJ ACT ON CAUSES OF GHETTO CRISIS

Following is the text of a statement to President Johnson, issued last week by Henry Winston, national chairman and Gus Hall, general secretary of the Communist Party, U.S.A., on the terror against Negro citizens in Newark, New Jersey:

Mr. President: Several weeks ago we addressed a letter to you regarding police terror raging in black ghettos over the country, We cited a whole Bill of Particulars. We called upon you to take emergency measures. Mr. President, We were not alone in calling your attention to this crisis. Practically all civil rights leaders—conservatives as well as radicals, have spoken out—among them were many of your local supporters. And still you remained silent. Since then in city after city police terror against Negro citizens has been expanding. Now comes police brutality in Newark, New Jersey, which now has reached disaster proportions. Sir: Your answer to this regime of terror is your readiness to send federal troops against the victims, and not the prepetrators of the crimes. Mr. President, once again we place before your office a series of proposals to meet the problems. They are:

As regards local police and the action of state and federal armed forces we demand:

1. The immediate withdrawal of all state troops and state militia and the withdrawal of your promise to aid these armed forces.

2. Immediate suspension and trial of all police officers guilty of crimes against the Negro citizens of Newark.

3. Purge of the police force of all known racists and fascist elements.

4. Immediate assignment of Negroes to all police policymaking bodies and positions of command.

5. The immediate impeachment and trial of Mayor Addonizio for dereliction of duty.

We demand:

1. The immediate procurement of 10,000 jobs for Negro youth in Newark to be guaranteed by city, state and federal governments.

2. That the federal government commandeer adequate housing space to meet the demands of all victimized Negro citizens in hotels and apartment houses.

3. That a system of food and cash relief be organized to meet the demands of all victimized and needy Negro citizens in Newark.

4. The formulation of a widespread building program in Newark of public housing, educational and recreational facilities and the appropriation of two billion five hundred million (2,500,000,000) dollars for that purpose.

Failure on your part to meet these proposals and others arising from democratic opinion in the country with a positive response will evoke the necessity for impeachment procedures. Once before in our history a Southern-born so-called moderate president by the name of Johnson was impeached for dereliction of duty.

NEWS CONFERENCE

The statement of Winston and Hall was released to the press at a news conference Saturday by William L. Patterson, chairman of the Negro Affairs Commission of the Communist Party, at the Party's New York headquarters.

"Newark has become the most vicious expression of governmental policy toward Negro citizens," said Patterson at the start of the conference. "Force and violence has everywhere become the answer of government to a demand for jobs, housing and adequate education.

"The situation in Newark has reached disaster proportions. The Negro section of that city has become a shambles and an armed camp occupied by enemy forces.

"The responsibility must be placed squarely upon the shoulders of the officials of city, state, and federal government. . . . The responsibility for Newark cannot be forced upon the shoulders of any Negro citizen."

Patterson pointed out that Newark has the highest unemployment rate of any large city in the nation; that although Negroes constitute a majority of its population (240,000 out of 400,000), no Negro occupies a policy-making position within the city government; and that its 1,500-man police force includes only 150 Negro officers.

Pointing to President Johnson's offer to give consideration to any request which Governor Hughes might make for federal assistance, Patterson asked:

"Does this include further repressive military forces? Is the national government to be called on only for more force and more violence? What has happened in Newark is the result of years of cynical neglect, of deaf governmental ears turned to the legitimate demands of Newark's Negro citizens for fulfillment of their constitutional rights. The need is not for tanks and guns, but for jobs, housing and recreational facilities."

Model Cities Hopes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1967

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, a few months ago this body rejected President Johnson's plea for full funding of the rent supplement and model cities programs. In recent weeks, it has refused even to consider a $40 million rat extermination program.

Some have praised these actions in terms of dollars saved for the taxpayers. Others have described them as examples of creative negativism, a term coined in a newspaper editorial.

But no matter how they are rationalized, the fact remains that these actions did not take into account the desperate needs of our slum areas and the significance of the affected programs to the residents of those slums. For example, our failure to fund the rent supplement program denied decent shelter to some 45,000 families.

In this perspective, I was delighted to read in a recent Congressional Quarterly that these programs, slashed deeply by the House, are destined for better treatment in the Senate. In the hope that many of my colleagues will reevaluate their positions on these programs, I insert the Congressional Quarterly article, entitled "Model Cities Hopes," at this point in the RECORD.

MODEL CITIES HOPES

President Johnson's controversial "model cities" program, recently slashed deeply by the House, appears headed for better treatment in the Senate.

Preliminary headcounts by the Administration have shown at least 10 of the 17 members of the Senate Independent Offices Appropriations Subcommittee and a substantial majority of the full Senate in favor of restoring the full $662 million authorization for the program in fiscal 1968. The House in acting May 17 on the fiscal 1968 Independent Offices—Department of Housing and Urban Development Appropriations bill had pared down the program to $237 million.

The Administration also hopes to win Senate approval of a second controversial appropriation—funds to expand the President's embattled rent supplements program. The House by an overwhelming 62-vote margin rejected the entire $40 million allotment. Administration headcounts show about the same Subcommittee line-up on supplements as for "cities" but no more than a bare majority of the full Senate in favor of the supplements plan.

Senate action on the appropriations bill is expected soon. The Independent Offices Subcommittee may vote on HUD appropriations next week and bring the bill to the Senate floor within two weeks.

During the House battle over the two appropriations, the Administration focused its lobbying effort on model cities. This left its flank exposed on the rent supplements plan. Administration strategists reasoned that they had only this session of Congress in which to get the two-year "cities" plan underway but already had authority to sign 40-year contracts with private nonprofit housing sponsors to pay up to $32 million a year in rent supplements.

For the Senate showdown, this strategy has been reversed. With model cities apparently out of danger, the Administration is going all out for the supplements plan. Because of the big House vote against the program, the Administration fears that only an impressive Senate victory can salvage any rent supplement appropriation in conference. "You could win the entire $40 million by a narrow vote," one Administration source said, "and still come out of conference without a penny."

Because the thrust of opposition to supplements has been on the basic concept of the program and not so much on the amount of funds involved, observers believe it unlikely that the Administration could win many additional Senate votes through the ploy of seeking a reduced appropriation. A spokesman for one special interest group supporting supplements said Republicans were "so determined to beat this program that they'd vote against it if the amount involved were no more than 10 cents."

Proponents of rent supplements argue that the program is necessary because public housing alone cannot begin to accommodate all of the nation's poor. In addition, they say, the program is superior to the public housing approach in that it allows subsidized tenants to live in housing projects with higher-income families who are not receiving supplements.

The result, proponents say, is that the low-income tenant is given an incentive to increase his income and to "catch up with the Joneses." Other arguments are that the program is cheaper than public housing since it brings in private enterprise to build and sponsor the projects and that it produces revenues for the community since the projects are fully taxable. This is in contrast to the tax-exempt status of public housing projects.

Opponents of supplements have countered that the program is a "socialistic give away" and is particularly unjustified at a time of mounting budgetary demands for the Vietnam war.

Some observers say that numerous members of Congress are so opposed to the concept of taxing one person to pay another's rent that they care little about any advantages the plan might have over traditional public housing. Another concern implicit in past debates has been that the plan might be used to further the objective of racially integrated housing.

The major argument in favor of model cities has been that the nation's urban areas are desperately in need of a massive attack on blight and that this can be accomplished only through the comprehensive and coordinated federal and local effort contemplated under the "cities" plan.

In addition, proponents argue, the needed therapy cannot be accomplished without treating the sociological factors causing an area's decay. The emphasis of traditional urban renewal programs on removing the physical factors simply is not enough, they say.

Opponents of the cities plan have contended that the program can have a substantial effect only if far more federal funds are committed than the level currently authorized. Consequently, they say, once the program gets started it will "mushroom" into a multibillion dollar federal commitment. As with the argument against rent supplements, they say that a time when the nation is at war is no time to begin such a vast undertaking.

Although chances appear good that the Senate might restore a large part of the House cuts in the model cities program and provide at least some financing for rent supplements, it is widely believed that the Administration will have to produce a minor miracle to win conference approval of funds for supplements.

Because of the House's overwhelming rejection of supplements, it is estimated that the Administration will have to win at least a 15- to 20-vote Senate victory to stand any chance at all of getting House conferees to go along. Such a margin would be far larger than in past Senate appropriations fights, where supplement funds were upheld by as little as one vote and never by more than 13. In view of the massive push the Administration is expected to put on, however, observers are reluctant to call the supplements money definitely out of reach.

The Law and Carmichael

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1967

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, as the President's Commission and various congressional committees delve into the growing anarchy in our major cities I feel that the following editorial, which appeared in the Chicago Daily News on Thursday, July 27, deserves special review. I insert it in the RECORD at this point:

THE LAW AND CARMICHAEL

"Treason against the United States," says the U.S. Constitution, "shall consist only in levying war against them or in adhering to their enemies, giving them aid and comfort."

In London this week Stokeley Carmichael, an American citizen, was quoted as saying:

"In Newark we are applying the tactics of guerrilla warfare. We are preparing groups of urban guerrillas for our defense in the cities. This struggle is not going to be a mere street meeting. It is going to be a struggle to the death."

At various other times, Carmichael has urged Negroes to refuse to fight in Vietnam declared, "We're going to tear the cities up," and said, "To hell with the laws of the United States."

In times past we have favored leaning over backwards to defend Carmichael's right to be as irksome as he pleased. We have been particularly leery of the antiriot bill now in Congress, which has as its principal aim to shush Carmichael.

But Carmichael's advocacy of guerrilla warfare in the streets of American cities prompts a new look, coming as it does in the context of bleeding, ransacked, fire-gutted cities. There is more than a suggestion here of cause and effect. Carmichael speaks out for "tearing the cities up" and the cities are torn up. Carmichael speaks favorably of the tactics of guerrilla warfare and snipers man the rooftops. Is not the fomenting of insurrection treason? It would seem high time to find out.

This precise issue was recently discussed in an exchange between Fred Vinson, head of the criminal division of the Justice Department, and members of the House Armed Services Committee.

Citing the Supreme Court's sensitivity as to prosecutions that might violate the First Amendment's guarantee of free speech, Vinson said that "this is a most difficult area of law because you're dealing with utterances and speeches."

But not only utterances and speeches. Now the scope has been broadened to include dozens of dead, thousands of injured, and damage and disorder on a scale to paralyze entire cities.

Presumably there is reluctance to prosecute Carmichael for other reasons, such as that the government doesn't want to make a martyr of him, and is hesitant to run the political risks involved in prosecuting a man who is manifestly a hero to many Negroes.

Those reasons for hesitancy would be understandable in other circumstances. But defiance has gone beyond tolerable bounds; a sense of impunity prompts bolder and bolder assaults upon law and order. The Negro's own cause is gravely harmed by the lawlessness now going on; progress toward racial justice can only be made in a climate of mutual tolerance and trust. We suggest the government deal with Carmichael as it would deal with any other citizen who behaved like Carmichael.

The Tortoise and the Jet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1967

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an excellent editorial that appeared in the July 21, 1967, issue of Science magazine.

The editorial explains the problems involved regarding the obscure island of Aldabra in the Indian Ocean. Aldabra provides the only remaining home in the Indian Ocean for the giant land tortoise and has been described as "scientifically, the most important area of its size remaining in that part of the world."

The problem results in the fact that the air forces of the United States and Great Britain have need for an airfield in that area and there is considerable doubt as to whether the island can remain a major breeding place for rare birds and other animals while at the same time provide the roads, harbor, and various other changes necessary for an airfield.

I wish to bring this exotic, but nevertheless important conservation issue to the attention of my colleagues.

The editorial, entitled "The Tortoise and the Jet," follows:

THE TORTOISE AND THE JET

The tortoise beat the hare. Can it also beat the jet? The racetrack is Aldabra, an uplifted coral atoll in the Indian Ocean, 260 miles northwest of Madagascar and 400 miles east of Africa. The tortoise is the giant land tortoise, and Aldabra is its only remaining home in the Indian Ocean. The jets are of the United States and British air forces, which want to develop Aldabra for military use.

Obscure and almost unihabited, Aldabra has a rich and unique ecosystem. It is the breeding place of the frigate bird for the entire Indian Ocean, and home of the last colony of flightless birds in the Indian Ocean. Of its 22 species of land birds, 12 species or subspecies are found nowwhere else. About a quarter of its species of invertebrates are believed to be found only on the island. Aldabra is a major breeding place of the increasingly rare edible green turtle and the hawksbill turtle. Of some 175 species of higher plants known on the island, 18 or more are unique. When still undisturbed, such islands provide ideal opportunities to study evolutionary processes. Aldabra is the ecologically richer of the last two nearly undisturbed uplifted coral atolls in the world. Raymond Fosberg, of the National Academy of Sciences staff, calls the island "scientifically, the most important area of its size remaining in that part of the world." The Royal Society is sending an expedition there in August and would like to establish a small, permanent research station.

With support from the National Academy of Sciences, the Smithsonian Institution, and several international organizations, the Royal

Society has proposed that Aldabra be totally preserved for scientific investigations, and in May it so recommended to the British Secretary of State for Defence. The air forces, however, need an airfield in that region and consider other islands much less satisfactory. The Secretary promised to consider the Royal Society recommendation and said that, if the decision is made to go ahead with military development, "our object . . . would be to make sure that changes in the ecosystem of the island are kept to a minimum."

But it is doubtful that there can be dual use. The atoll is too small. Road, harbor, causeway, and other construction would bring major physical alterations and connect the new separated islands of the atoll. The larger birds would be a hazard to aircraft, and some species would probably have to be exterminated. The home of the giant land tortoise is precisely the best part of the island for airfield construction. The suggestion that the airfield be surrounded by a wall seems unsatisfactory. A wall could exclude the tortoise, the flightless birds, and some other animals, but could not contain their imported enemies. Nor is temporary development and use a satisfactory compromise; once a species is destroyed, or an environment drastically invaded, there is no return to the original state. The current program to study what little remains of native Hawaiian plant and animal life is evidence of the need to study island ecologies before invasion brings ecological chaos.

Will the jet replace the tortoise on Aldabra? Perhaps. Military needs rightfully have high priority, and man has powerful weapons. He can win over tortoises, passenger pigeons, the blue whale, the Great Auk, the Moa, and other animals, and he can win most easily in the fragile ecology of a small island. The decision between the tortoise and the jet will be a governmental and a political one. The jet can win, but the more virgin areas we destroy, the more we impoverish our natural heritage. British and American government councils must weigh this fact in deciding whether to build on Aldabra or elsewhere.

DAEL WOLFLE.

WCBS-TV Editorial on the Riots

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1967

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the tragic effects of the recent rioting in some of our major cities may not be felt for quite a while yet. Aside from the loss of life and the destruction of millions of dollars of property, the greatest tragedy is that nothing was accomplished.

Indeed, the small minority of violent extremists who were responsible for the rioting, are also responsible for pushing the cause of civil rights backward. They have destroyed in a few days, what some of our greatest Americans have taken years to build up.

Perhaps the only accomplishment of the rioting is a widening of the emotional and physical gap between black and white.

On July 25 and 26, 1967, WCBS-TV in New York broadcast an editorial concerning the events of the last few weeks.

I commend the text of the editorial to the attention of our colleagues:

RACE RIOTS

All of us who have been committed to racial progress in this country; who have supported and encouraged the efforts of minorities to take charge of their own destinies can only look with dismay and apprehension at the incredible violence and destruction that wracked this nation this week.

The unfortunate result is not hard to predict—the walls of the ghetto will grow a little higher; the bigots will be reinforced, and gain a greater audience; and the middle class will grow more convinced that it should flee the city for the suburbs. The work of men like Lyndon Johnson and John Lindsay, whose dedication to uplifting the poor and promoting racial progress is clear and real, will get less and less support.

Tragic, isn't it, how the poor are doing so much damage to themselves.

Tragic, isn't it, that while their children are tearing apart their community, too many people in East Harlem complain about the behavior of the police rather than about the behavior of their children.

And the complaints are unfounded. Undoubtedly, there have been a few instances of provocative behavior by individual policemen. But reporters on the scene tell us that the New York City policemen in East Harlem have acted with firmness, but with restraint and discipline. There was no indiscriminate clubbing or shooting or pattern of ethnic slurs, despite provocation.

That's the kind of effective professionalism we expect from the New York City Police Department, and we're glad to take notice of it here.

Art Hobbs Pinpoints the Problem Behind Riots

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROGER H. ZION

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1967

Mr. ZION. Mr. Speaker, Art Hobbs, business editor for the Evansville Courier in his thoughtful column of Saturday, July 29, has analyzed the economic basis of the current crisis in American cities. The task of solving the why of these riots will consume the best attention of Congress in the weeks and months to come. For this reason, I commend Mr. Hobbs' column to my colleagues as must reading.

The article follows:

ECONOMICS IMPORTANT FACTOR IN EPIDEMIC OF DISORDERS

(By Art Hobbs)

One facet of the riots which have struck across the nation in the past few weeks is strictly economic. In each case, as law and order disappeared, looters hit stores to get things they desired but evidently lacked the money to buy.

These include furniture and other household products, food, and clothing.

Part of this, of course, is just lawlessness and part of it is a desire to get something for nothing. But frustration can also be read into these acts of rebellion.

Many of these people have migrated to larger cities to improve their income and then have found that the cost of living increase was stealing their extra money.

Part of this can be blamed on higher prices as a result of greater crowding in industrial centers. Most of it, however, must be laid at the feet of the federal monetary structure.

Once, when there were at least attempts to keep the budget in balance (before Johnson) inflation was a nasty word. Today federal economists claim a 3 per cent per annum rate of inflation is good, and right, and necessary for salvation.

This means that a worker who gets a 3 per cent per annum wage increase falls behind in real wages because the decreased value of the dollar affects government and increases taxes the worker must pay from that increase.

In addition, just as it was nearly impossible to keep the dollar at zero depreciation when that was the aim, it is also just as troublesome to keep the depreciation to 3 per cent now.

Therefore the depreciation mounts to 5, or 6, or 10, or 10,000 per cent and the worker slips further into the hole. The worker, with more money in his jeans, is still not able to buy that sofa, or refrigerator, or television he wants. Not only that, he is not able to buy the food he and his family needs and so he takes the opportunity to take when the opportunity presents itself in the form of riots which destroy government.

Another, and probably more important group to consider are the savers. These are those who stoke the fires of industry with their savings and provide money to build factories, homes, commercial buildings, and to supply them with goods and machinery.

When banks pay 4½ per cent interest per annum this returns to the saver $45 a year on a $1,000 bond. Depreciation, at 3 per cent per annum, takes away $30 per year. Tax increases to pay for more expensive, or just more, government leaves little, if any, of the remaining $15.

Much of the blame for this inflationary spiral, which amounts to an across the board tax on all, is laid at the feet of the Vietnam War and there is much to be said on this score.

Consider the other war. The so-called War on Poverty which has boosted the wages of sociologists beyond any pretense of true value, has not made much, if any, impression on poverty, and has helped jump inflation to the point where the true poverty stricken are becoming desperate and those just above the poverty line, but still self supporting, are being pushed into poverty.

This includes those on relatively fixed wages and those with fixed income from retirement funds, Social Security benefits, savings, investments and other money generated from earlier earnings and deemed adequate at the time the investments were made.

As Bill Cosby says in one of his stories about tonsils. "Your tonsils have not only lost the war, they have joined the other side and could kill you unless they are taken out." Just so, it appears the poverty fighters have joined the other side and are forcing more people into penury.

Pittsburgh's Neighborhood Youth Corps—Part II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1967

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I am today inserting in the RECORD part II of the 1966–67 annual report of the city of Pittsburgh's Neighborhood Youth Corps. I commend it to the attention of my colleagues, particularly those who feel that the Neighborhood Youth Corps program is either ineffective or aimed at the wrong persons.

The Youth Corps has made a concerted effort to reach those youths whose unemployability is a function of other, more basic problems. This "whole person" approach was summarized by New York's Mayor Lindsay recently when he said:

> If you only recruit youngsters who never had a problem or never will have a problem, then the program is a failure.

Pittsburgh's program has not been a failure. Indeed, its success has prompted the Labor Department to select Pittsburgh as one of four cities in which the benefits of Youth Corps enrollment will be analyzed in an intensive study.

The Pittsburgh Neighborhood Youth Corps annual report, part II, follows:

The City has had to rely on a wide variety of public and private agencies to service these young people as follows:

(1) Pennsylvania Bureau of Employment Security—specifically the Youth Opportunity Center.

(2) Pennsylvania Bureau of Vocational Rehabilitation.

(3) Allegheny County Health Department.

(4) Family Service Agencies situated in the various neighborhood centers.

(5) Clinics in various hospitals.

(6) Board of Education.

(7) Recreation Centers of the Catholic Diocese.

(8) Neighborhood Employment Office.

(9) Neighborhood Legal Services.

(10) Office of the Public Defender.

During the six month period of enrollment each enrollee receives an extensive physical examination by the Allegheny County Health Department, and is referred to the various hospitals and clinics in the area for supportive treatment. Approximately 50% of our young people require some additional medical or dental treatment.

All enrollees in the program are referred to the Youth Opportunity Center for aptitude testing, and for job placement services.

Enrollees with physical or mental handicaps are referred to the Pennsylvania Bureau of Vocational Rehabilitation to determine eligibility under the various training programs.

As has been described, all enrollees are referred at the time of enrollment to one of the schools operated by the Pittsburgh Board of Education.

In addition, where serious maladjustment exists referral is made to the Family Services agency operating in the enrollee's neighborhood. Upon termination of each enrollee a detailed summary is sent to the neighborhood for follow-up services.

However, supportive services take many forms, other than direct referral. Sometimes it is support at a court hearing and referral to the Public Defender, or Neighborhood Legal Services, in a few instances it may be visits to the Allegheny County Jail, in other cases contact with the enrollee may alert the worker to other family problems.

Even with a limited staff the Youth Corps Office has tried to reach the "whole person". Unemployability is frequently only a symptom of other problems of social maladjustment.

Two VISTA Volunteers have been assigned to the program since October of 1966 to supplement staff services.

9. JOB PLACEMENT

The goal of the Neighborhood Youth Corps is to give to the young person sufficient training to either enter the permanent job market or to provide sufficient motivation for the enrollee to return to school to continue on a long range educational goal.

While our enrollees range from the retarded to young people capable of college training, it should be emphasized that none of them were employable at the time of entering the program.

The Youth Opportunity Center of the Pennsylvania Bureau of Employment Security and the Neighborhood Centers of the Mayor's Commission on Human Resources have provided employment services.

In addition, the Youth Corps office has made specific contacts with both large and small private employers in the Community to develop job opportunities.

As of January 1, 1967 approximately 50% of the enrollees terminated from the City of Pittsburgh Neighborhood Youth Corps program were terminated into jobs with private industry or a governmental agency.

In round numbers including the armed services, more than 500 young people have left the program for employment. In addition, 31 ex-enrollees entered the Job Corps, and approximately 50 enrollees are either in Manpower Training Programs operated by the Labor Department, or are attending formal educational institutions.

Approximately 30 young people have left the program to enter college or junior college programs of study. Pre-enrollment visits have been scheduled for groups of enrollees to the Community College.

In an effort to correlate and fully assess the progress of the City of Pittsburgh Youth Corps, Pittsburgh is one of the four cities selected by the Department of Labor for an intensive research study on the benefits of Youth Corps enrollment.

One hundred and twenty-five young people have been selected for intensive follow up by the research staff of George Washington University, and it is to be hoped that within the next 2 or 3 months there will be a clearer picture of the benefits of the Youth Corps program.

Apart from employment statistics approximately 65% of the enrollees complete the six month period of enrollment.

For some of these young people this in itself represents an achievement. Six months of steady work will help to mitigate a police record, serve as a transitional period until marriage, establish more acceptable work habits, and perhaps restore confidence and self esteem.

Conversely excluding enrollees who leave the City, resign for reasons of illness, or care of a child or parent, approximately 25% of terminated enrollees leave the program because of inability to adjust to the work situation or for other reasons with a poor prognosis.

10. EVALUATION

In evaluating almost eighteen months of the Youth Corps program, immediate benefits can be assessed.

(1) Fifteen Hundred unemployed young people have received wages totaling more than one million dollars.

(2) Fifty per cent of the enrollees at the time of termination were in a position to seek and accept employment.

(3) All citizens have profited from the expanded services of the Youth Corps program.

However, the seriously malajusted young person, whether the maladjustment is social or psychological, requires more intensive services than is presently available under the Youth Corps program.

The referral process to established agencies is slow and there are still insufficient social workers, psychologists, psychiatrists, or even social agencies available to serve this kind of problem youngster.

In addition, many training programs are still pegged at too high a level to admit the high school drop-out or the young person with a poor record.

Federal financial guidelines have frequently excluded young people in need of the work experience. Accounting, reporting, and contract procedures have consumed an inordinate amount of staff time.

Perhaps the Neighborhood Youth Corps can be best summed up by the letter of a former enrollee.

"The Neighborhood Youth Corps has done a number of positive things for me.

"First, it has helped me gain more confidence in myself, and the things I do.

"Second, it has taught me how to work well with people.

"Third, it has given me a better outlook on life.

"Fourth, it has helped me gain more insight into what I want to be in the future.

"Last, but not least, it has given me a job and money in my pocket, and for this I will always be grateful."

Perhaps, this is all that needs to be said.

CITY OF PITTSBURGH NEIGHBORHOOD YOUTH CORPS ENROLLEES BY CENTERS

Dec. 1, 1966	September 1966 (male and female)	Dec. 1, 1966		December 1966 (male and female)
		Male	Female	
Lawrenceville Center	33	30	15	45
Manchester Center	--------	42	15	57
Northside Center	310	195	90	285
South Oakland	58	61	21	82
Southwest Pittsburgh	112	124	59	183
East Liberty-Garfield	162	118	52	170
Hill District	317	236	95	331
Hazelwood-Glenwood	44	43	29	72
Homewood-Brushton	218	175	60	235
Total	1,254	1,044	436	1,460

PITTSBURGH NEIGHBORHOOD YOUTH CORPS,
PITTSBURGH, PA.

Coordinator: Mrs. Marion K. Finkelhor.

Assistant Coordinator: Mr. William E. Mitchell.

Counselors: Mrs. Lee Marion Shelton, Mr. John Gooch, Mr. Raymond Hooper.

Office Supervisor: Mrs. Grace Malloy.

Secretary: Miss Florence Niedzwiecki.

Payroll Clerk: Mrs. Helen Porter.

Clerk-Typist: Miss Jacqueline Stewart.

DEPARTMENTAL COORDINATORS

Public Works: Mr. Pronty Ford.

Lands and Buildings: Mr. James Carroll.

Public Safety: Mrs. Ruth McCloskey.

Parks and Recreation: Mr. Sebastian D'Epiro.

Top Hat Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT TAFT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1967

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, recently the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's clubs made their Top Hat Awards to highly placed woman executives who work above and beyond the requirements of their business for general comprehensive of handicapped citizens.

It pleases me greatly to be able to report that among those recognized with this honor was Mrs. Jayne Baker Spain of Cincinnati, Ohio. Mrs. Spain has long been the president of Alvey-Ferguson Operations of Litton Industries, Inc., in Cincinnati. The recognition of her services to the handicapped in employment over many years read as follows:

In recognition of her outstanding contribution toward increasing employment opportunities for handicapped women and men. In April, 1966, Mrs. Spain was honored by the President's Committee for Hiring the Handicapped for her work with overseas blind, both women and men, and in June, 1966, she became the first woman to be appointed Vice Chairman of that presidential committee. From her position on the Ohio Governor's Commission on the Status of Women, Mrs. Spain energetically pointed out to all employers in the state their responsibilities under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act pertaining to equal employment opportunities for women, and through her efforts all Ohio employers are now being surveyed by questionnaire to emphasize this point and the necessity for compliance. Mrs. Spain has enhanced the role of the woman executive in business by her compelling and persuasive speeches, and by her appearance on many platforms and panels in this and other countries.

Mrs. Spain's friends and neighbors and the entire city of Cincinnati, State of Ohio, and the Nation are proud of this exemplary service provided by Mrs. Spain. I would like to include also at this point the most appropriate remarks made by Mrs. Spain in accepting the award:

In the fashion world, they often speak of the "hatty hat." It's the nature of woman that money is no object when she sets out to have one. Yet, even as she does so, she wonders if she'll leave the shop and immediately run into somebody with an $8.75 copy. With this Top Hat Award which you give to those of us you honor tonight, we get the *Hattiest hat* of all. There is no way this version can be cheapened.

Action-Housing's Annual Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1967

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to my colleagues' attention a pilot project in the Pittsburgh area which, I believe, could have far-reaching effects in eradicating the most fundamental and persistent barriers to housing and educational improvement in our cities.

Action-Housing, Inc., a nonprofit civic corporation, is proposing to create a profit-motivated development corporation through which private industry, with the aid of Government-insured loans, would rehabilitate urban neighborhoods. Action-Housing has already proven the feasibility of such a project by rehabilitating a block of 22 old but structurally sound rowhouses in Pittsburgh at a cost of $229,000 and renting the houses to low- and middle-income families at rentals only a few dollars above those charged before the improvements.

The development corporation envisaged by Action-Housing would undertake to rehabilitate 5,000 units in the Pittsburgh area over a 5-year period. If successful, I believe it could become a model for the Nation.

I might also point out that Action-Housing has contracted with the Pittsburgh mayor's Committee on Human Resources, Inc., to conduct a part of Pittsburgh's antipoverty program. It sponsors a summer and winter tutorial program for slow achievers utilizing 175 volunteer student tutors from a wide number of public and private high schools, colleges, and universities.

Action-Housing has issued a report on its activities and a prospectus of its future plans, dated January 1967, which I insert in the RECORD at this point. I believe it merits the close attention of my colleagues:

ACTION HOUSING'S ANNUAL REPORT

In essence, this report outlines present and future plans for ACTION-Housing, Inc., indicating the scope of the programs it is working to accomplish.

The large-scale private enterprise rehabilitation of old but structually sound housing is now, and will be in the future, engaging much of the attention of ACTION-Housing. Probably uniquely in the United States, this private nonprofit civic group has the knowledge and experience to initiate and coordinate such massive housing rehabilitation, which may very well be the answer to revitalizing the inner cores of the nation's cities.

As you probably know, on January 24th, ACTION-Housing sponsored a high-level conference on this subject, which was well-represented by management and research people of leading U. S. industries concerned with the manufacture of housing materials and equipment, industrial trade associations, financial institutions, and federal, state and city government officials connected with housing and urban development.

At that one-day conference ACTION-Housing presented a proposal suggesting a new corporation be organized by a group of large companies, either allied with or concerned with the building industry, to create an operating company to acquire, re-design, develop, finance, improve, initially operate and ultimately dispose of rehabilitable housing units.

Initial funding of $3 to $4 million would be provided by these companies allied with, or interested in, the building industry. This sum, properly applied on a leverage basis by use of governmental and private loan resources, could multiply the result of the undertaking far beyond that contemplated by initial capitalization.

The initial program envisions the rehabilitation of 5,000 units over a five-year period, in the Pittsburgh area, beginning after a first year of organization and planning. This program is intended to establish a prototype that could be repeated in urban centers throughout the nation.

We expect to convene another meeting in late June with presidents of a substantial number of companies attending. At that time a formal presentation will be made in the interest of obtaining commitments for the purchase of stock sufficient to fund and establish the operating company.

For these houses, in their deteriorating condition and without central heating, Cora Street families had been paying between $85 and $90 per month, for rent and utilities. Now these structures, completely renovated and fitted with modern facilities, rent for approximately $89 per month, with all utilities included except electricity. The rent charges also provide reserve funds for maintenance during the life of the mortgage, including replacement of ranges, refrigerators, plumbing, and other capital items.

ACTION-Housing is now negotiating for the possible purchase of a group of 60 additional houses for rehabilitation. If negotiations are successful, procedures would be similar to those of Cora Street. ACTION-Housing's Development Fund would be used for the cost of architectural and other planning and the purchase of the houses. Section 221(d)(3) of the National Housing Act makes available below-market interest rate mortgage money (3 percent) for housing rehabilitation to FHA-approved nonprofit organizations such as ACTION-Housing. This would be rental housing.

The negotiation for purchase centers around the final sales price of the housing. That sales price must be low enough to permit the amount of renovation required by FHA for mortgage purposes, and still result in a monthly rental that families of moderate income can afford.

Under the proposal ACTION-Housing would be the logical candidate to be coordinator, expediter and consultant to the proposed housing rehabilitation development corporation.

It should be noted that this proposal is a large one over and above ACTION-Housing's current undertakings and that it has nothing to do with this agency's own Development Fund. It does, however, indicate the scope of this agency's thinking toward achieving one of its goals—the revitalization of existing neighborhoods.

The next few weeks should see the completion of the rehabilitation of 22 structurally sound but more than 60-year-old houses on Cora Street in Homewood-Brushton. Five families have already moved in. Five more will move in during February.

Another of ACTION-Housing's three major goals is the providing of good new housing in good neighborhoods for families of moderate income.

Another important plan for the future, which is now in the formative stage, concerns this agency's participation in bringing about the rehabilitation of older housing, "for sale," State-wide. Here we will probably be asked to be consultants to the Department of Community Affairs, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, in developing a State-wide program for the Department's Housing Agency. This would be in addition to the previously mentioned Development Corporation whose rehabilitated houses would be marketed on a "for rent" basis.

A main purpose is to make mortgage loans possible, at terms they can afford, to families of moderate income, those with annual incomes of from $3,600 to $8,000. Surveys show that at least 30,000 Pennsylvania families are in this category.

The foregoing includes some of our major plans for the immediate future. There are others.

We are cooperating with the City administration in formulating a proposal to assure that Pittsburgh participates in the Model Cities program, if Congress passes the needed appropriation. ACTION-Housing's Executive Director is on the Mayor's Advisory Committee for this Model Cities endeavor. A representative of ACTION-Housing also serves as a staff member of the Mayor's Working Committee which is developing the formal application for Pittsburgh to the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

This is the last year of ACTION-Housings' five-year Neighborhood Urban Extension demonstration that began in 1963 in three Pittsburgh neighborhoods— Homewood-Brushton, Hazelwood-Glenwood and Perry Hilltop. Approximately 70,000 people live in these three neighborhoods. We will press to have this vital program refunded through grants from local and national foundations and Pittsburgh corporations. This was the source of funds for the original program.

In October, 1966 The Ford Foundation issued a report on eight Ford Foundation-assisted urban extension experiments. All but the program of ACTION-Housing was conducted by universities in various regions of the nation. The report stated:

"The most successful of the Foundation-assisted action programs in direct neighborhood services has been conducted not by a university but by a non-academic community organization, ACTION-Housing."

SUMMARY

To achieve its broad goal, ACTION-Housing, Inc., has three immediate major objectives:

1. Increasing the supply of good new hous-

ing in good neighborhoods for families of moderate income.

2. Bringing about the modernization of older housing and revitalization of aging neighborhoods.

3. Establishing a research base for future housing and urban renewal programs.

ACTION-Housing has developed new sources of private funds for the financing of new sales and rental housing, and the modernization of older homes. It has the effective cooperation of all segments of the housing industry—home builders, realtors, appraisers, lenders, labor, and materials suppliers. It also carries out broad neighborhood urban extension, tutorial and research programs under contract with such public agencies as the Mayor's Committee on Human Resources, Inc., under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, the City Planning Department, the U.S. Department of Labor, and others.

In initiating, coordinating and developing its comprehensive program, ACTION-Housing is part of a team of outstanding private, civic and public institutions and agencies. It is an associate member, with five other major civic organizations, of the Allegheny Seminar, a high-level advisory body of elected local government officials and civic representatives which assembles in conference to work out solutions to County-wide problems.

ACTION-Housing's activities include:

Creating the $1,600,000 Pittsburgh Development Fund through interest-bearing loans and grants from local foundations, banks, utility companies, corporations and department stores. The Fund, in accordance with provisions in the Development Income Note, has paid 4 percent annual interest to its subscribers.

Sponsoring rehabilitation of a group of 22 structurally sound but 60-year-old houses on Cora Street in Homewood-Brushton for rental to families of moderate income. Carried out without outside grants or subsidies, Cora Street is a precedent-setting prototype of private enterprise rehabilitation of existing housing. Fifty-two percent of Pittsburgh's housing inventory is more than 45 years old. Cora Street was made possible through the use of ACTION-Housing's revolving-loan Department Fund to pay planning and acquisition costs, and related fees, and through below-market interest rate FHA mortgage money (3 percent) under Section 221 (d) (3) of the National Housing Act.

Proposing the formation of a new corporation, capitalized at $3,000,000 to $4,000,000, to engage in the rehabilitation of structurally sound but deteriorating housing on a limited profit-motivated basis, in cooperation with the local, state and federal agencies. The proposal suggests a partnership between private enterprise and the public sector. Participating companies would purchase common stock or debentures, with policy established by a board of their selection. Management would be provided by the newly created operating company. ACTION-Housing, as a non-profit civic agency qualified in housing experience, would be consultant to the operating company, which would also have the assistance of a non-profit research organization formed to study and evaluate construction methods and material application for large-scale housing rehabilitation.

Launching East Hills Park—described by the Secretary of the national Housing and Urban Development Department as the "finest housing I have seen in this price class," a privately financed planned community and the first undertaking of the Pittsburgh Development Fund. It combines innovations in modern design, land use, financing, a precedent-shattering labor contract, and legal procedures which cut loan and closing costs. East Hills Park, which ultimately will include 1,200 houses and apartments occupying 130 acres at the eastern edge of Pittsburgh, is progressing rapidly through successive construction stages. The first 187 completed dwelling units are now occupied and construction is under way of 91 rental apartments. Another 192 rental apartments and 130 rental townhouses, of advanced design and architectural construction, are in the final working drawing stage.

Initiating, planning and implementing construction of Sheraden Park, a 188-unit private enterprise cooperative town-house development aided by Development Fund financing and the cooperation of the Urban Redevelopment Authority and the City of Pittsburgh, new design concepts and other innovations, as in East Hills Park. Sheraden Park is completed and largely occupied.

Sponsoring Spring Hill Gardens, 209 moderate rental apartments completed for occupancy in 1959. This privately built development was financed under Section 221 of the National Housing Act and has since been sold to a private enterprise firm.

Undertaking a full scale, five-year test demonstration in three Pittsburgh neighborhoods of the Neighborhood Urban Extension process, financed by a major grant from The Ford Foundation and by matching grants and contributions from local foundations and corporations, as well as the neighborhood people themselves. Now in full operation, the Neighborhood Urban Extension demonstration help citizens utilize the vast resources of the city to vitalize their aging neighborhoods, with emphasis upon organization of leadership, education and retraining for employment and securing of model public services. This demonstration program is being carried out in the Homewood-Brushton, Hazelwood-Glenwood, and Perry Hilltop neighborhoods of Pittsburgh, at the invitation of leaders in each neighborhood. In Homewood-Brushton and Hazelwood-Glenwood and in two other priority poverty neighborhoods, Lawrenceville and South Oakland, Community Action Programs are being carried out under contract with and financing by the Mayor's Committee on Human Resources, Inc., under the Economic Opportunity Act.

Carrying out, under contract with the Mayor's Committee, self-help home improvement programs in the five neighborhoods.

Working to improve housing and zoning codes, and to assure their enforcement, in coordination with other public agencies, private organizations and citizens' groups.

Issuing a major study, under contract with the City Planning Department, in exploring and making recommendations upon the housing aspects of the City's total Community Renewal Program.

Publishing annual surveys and supplemental reports on new residential construction for sale and rent in the Pittsburgh metropolitan area in cooperation with the local building industry.

Issuing the six-volume Urban Renewal Impact Study, which has been measuring the economic, administrative and social impact of overall renewal for Allegheny County.

ACTION-Housing derives approximately 91 percent of its total financial support from contracts, service fees and grants from foundations, industry and public agencies, the remainder coming from the *Community Chest-United Fund*. It has as a guiding philosophy the premise that its goal of good housing in good neighborhoods in Allegheny County can be reached only by mobilizing all of the resources of the community.

Food Stamp Program Praised by Participants

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1967

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the food stamp program has been given enthusiastic praise by its participants in Minneapolis. In the 11th month of its operation in Minneapolis—June 1967—over 1,800 purchases of stamps were made.

Participants in the old surplus food program called it a prison of beans, rice, cornmeal, and rolled wheat. The food stamp program gives a new latitude to meal planning and budget planning. It deserves a 3-year extension.

At this point in the RECORD I insert a report by the Minneapolis Star on the food stamp program in Minneapolis:

FOOD FOR AFDC FAMILIES: STAMP PROGRAM HAS PROBLEMS, BENEFITS

(By Maurice Hobbs)

Ruth Wind and Sylvia Thompson sat together on a violet couch in the shabby living room of the rundown duplex in which they live at 3201 Harriet Av.

The 13 children in their families ran in and out of the house and played on the lawn outside.

They were talking about the U.S. Department of Agriculture's food stamp program, which has been paying for extra food for them and their children in recent months.

"We can buy other things besides hamburger and beans," Mrs. Thompson said. "I buy pork chops and roasts. I can cook a large meal and not have everything starch."

"We can save the stamps," she said. "With cash on hand, you go and spend it. You can't keep money like you can food stamps."

The two women are on Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC). Mrs. Thompson, 33, has been on aid since 1963. Mrs. Wind, 27, has been on aid since 1964. Both are from Cass Lake, Minn.

UNSATISFACTORY

Before the food stamp program each was on the surplus commodity distribution program but found it unsatisfactory.

"On surplus you got a lot of beans and rice," Mrs. Thompson said. "You got to the point sometimes where that was all you had. With stamps you can buy what you want."

The stamp program began in Hennepin County about a year ago, Aug. 1, 1966. Under it families on relief, federally supported welfare programs and in marginal income families spend a portion of their food budget for food stamps.

They get an amount of "bonus coupons" in addition to the stamps, based on their income and family size. The stamps can be used to buy only food.

Persons in the program say they are happy with it. It provides more and better food than they could buy without it.

But the number of persons using the program is disappointing to welfare officials.

MORE SOUGHT

"It isn't quite what we expected," said Eugene Johnson, assistant director of the Hennepin County Welfare Department, which administers the program. "We're hopeful more will see the benefits of the program."

Some 3,950 households with 13,000 persons were certified to buy the stamps in June, Johnson said. This compares with some 7,287 relief and AFDC cases in the county in April, according to the latest state figures, including 3,526 persons in relief cases and 15,884 children in AFDC cases.

There are numerous problems with the program, but those who use it are quick to say that its benefits exceed the problems.

One problem that keeps people from using the program is the requirement to spend a certain portion of the food budget for stamps. Often the money just is not there or is needed for something else, some say.

At first persons on federally aided assistance programs had to spend 80 per cent of their food budgets for stamps, every month. That has been reduced, and the amount that must be spent is on a chart. A family of four, on AFDC, which would get a grant of $190 a month not counting rent, must spend $109 a month for stamps to participate in the program, for example.

Persons in marginal income families—net income of up to $290 a month in a family of four, for example—have purchase requirements varying according to income and family size. Persons on city relief must spend 80 per cent of their food budgets, which come in the form of a city voucher.

Another problem is that some of the national banks, which sell the stamps under a contract with the county that pays them 73 cents a transaction, will cash AFDC checks.

Mrs. Dorothy Johnson, county AFDC League president, said some of the women must take their checks to a Northwestern Bank branch, on which their checks are drawn, get them cashed and then go to a national bank to buy stamps.

RELUCTANCE

First National, Johnson said, "has indicated they have some reluctance to cash checks." The bank, he said, has "reserved the right" to require cash or a relief department voucher as part of the purchase.

He noted there have been forgeries of welfare checks and that "some institutions are wary of cashing checks for someone they don't know."

But overall, the participants say, the problems are minor.

The major portion of purchases of stamps in June were made by Minneapolis relief clients—about 1,800. More than 1,000 purchases were made by persons on federally aided assistance and some 800 by persons from marginal income families. Some families may purchase more than once a month.

"This is just like manna from Heaven," said a man who has worked for the Post Office 22 years. His take-home pay every two weeks is $229. He and his wife have 11 children, from a 7-month-old boy to a 19-year-old girl.

They also took part in the surplus commodity distribution before it was discontinued when the stamp program began. But it was not as good as the stamp program, he said.

"We'd get 40 pounds of flour a month," he said, "but my wife didn't have time to bake bread."

In the surplus program they also got beans, cornmeal and rolled wheat. The latter was usually cooked like oatmeal, and after the first few times many children refused to eat it.

"Now we're out of prison," he said. "We can eat what we darn please."

The food they buy is not much different from before, he noted. The children still like hamburger and wieners more than the pork tenderloin he favors. But there is more of it.

"We don't have to cut corners on food."

The Civil Rights Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1967

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, on July 11, I voted, as did a majority of this House, to extend for 5 years the Civil Rights Commission. Since it was established by Congress 10 years ago, the Commission, despite many difficulties, has fulfilled an important function. It is the only Federal agency which can independently survey and analyze Government programs to determine whether they are being implemented in a manner consistent with our civil rights laws. It has the ability to provide Congress with essential information on which to base further civil rights legislation.

The trials and tribulations of the Civil Rights Commission have been perceptively analyzed in the Atlantic magazine by Elizabeth Brenner Drew. I commend it to the attention of my colleagues and present it herewith for inclusion in the RECORD.

THE CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION

The role of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights is, by making studies and issuing reports, to move the U.S. government forward, inch by agonizing inch, on civil rights. Spasmodically, and somewhat surprisingly, it has done so. Up to now. It could, for example, travel south, discover that despite a voting rights law Negroes still were deprived of the right to vote, recommend more federal legislation, and help embarrass the government into action.

Now with a string of ostensible victories in the South set down in the statute books, the Commission has sallied forth into the vast, vague "urban crisis." The encounter has been an unnerving one for the commissioners. It demonstrates perhaps better than anything else the enormous gulf between the Negro in trouble and the white man who might do anything about it.

One difficulty lies in the very concept of the Commission, a group named not so much for its expertise—on the contrary, in fact—but for the prestigious and *allrightnik* authenticity its names will lend to controversial ideas. When famous deans, university presidents, and editors say that people ought not to be deprived of the right to vote, well, there must be something to that. The group should be ahead of the public in its thinking, but not so far ahead that it loses its audience.

To put the Civil Rights Commission in perspective, it is fair to recall that when it was established under the 1957 Civil Rights Act there were legitimate grounds for suspecting that this was the classic cop-out, a way of postponing action with further study. The suspicions were not alleviated when the judicious President Eisenhower carefully balanced the Commission membership between three Northerners and three Southerners. (This always reminds me of the Jules Feiffer cartoon of Mr. Eisenhower discussing the Little Rock crisis at a press conference. The President was warning against "extremists on both sides"—those who want to blow up the schools and those who want to keep them open.) But the Commission turned out to be a sleeper; few would have anticipated its strong reports on voting, schools, housing, administration of justice, and other racial issues. A good deal of this is of course attributable to the staff, a younger group dedicated full time not only to the furtherance of civil rights, but also to the education of the commissioners, who can devote but a fraction of their busy lives to the problem.

SAVIORS OR "FEDS"?

When the Commission scheduled a week of hearings in the San Francisco Bay area earlier this summer, the staff had decided that the time had come, as one put it, "to lower them a little further into the vat." In Mississippi, Negroes had welcomed the commissioners as saviors, and accorded them the respect and awe to which deans and presidents and editors have become accustomed. When the commissioners went to Cleveland last year to learn what a ghetto is, they heard a few rumbles of discontent, but nothing to offend their sensibilities too seriously. In San Francisco they were confronted with anger, suspicion, even scorn; they were annoyed.

Sitting there, high on the dais in what is called the Ceremonial Courtroom and resembles a paneled airplane hangar inserted in the nineteenth floor of the Federal Building, the commissioners seemed to many witnesses not so much saviors as just more representatives of the "feds," of "the man," come to look them over and go away and do nothing, and the witnesses had already had quite enough of that. "We get a lot of people," said Edward Becks, a Negro commuity organizer in east Palo Alto, "looking in our noses and ears and eyes and tape recording us, but we don't see anything after that. People come into the area," he continued, "and when they hear us giving different points of view they say, can't you get together, and when we try to get together, they say there's a power struggling going on."

"We're tired of being studied all the time," said Orville Luster, a soft-spoken middle-aged Negro who has had success working with teen-age groups. "All we get is a tremendous amount of beautiful reports that aren't even read."

Wilfred Ussery, national chairman of CORE, pointed out that in 1966 he had attended a grand White House conference "To Fulfill These Rights," but, "I have heard nothing since about moving that program. I am one who feels disenchantment with the system," said Ussery. "I would like to say that there is hope, but I don't see any hope. I am very serious about that."

"A LITTLE PILL"

The commissioners protested that they wanted "facts." "We're just trying to learn," Erwin Griswold, dean of the Harvard Law School, sternly told a group of high school students, all potential dropouts involved in a special project to keep them in school. "If you could present us with facts . . . mere expressions of emotion are not helpful, are not relevant."

"The facts," replied eighteen-year-old Patricia Delago, "are behind the emotions, pushing the emotions out."

Miss Delago, speaking quietly and rapidly, then gave the commissioners some facts, about crowded classrooms, prejudiced teachers, counselors who give a student five minutes of advice, usually that there is no point in pursuing a career. "You won't give the boys a measly job when they're sixteen or seventeen, but when they're eighteen you'll send them to Vietnam. You're like our doctor, and we get an appointment with you, and you give us a little pill to solve our problems. Then you say we'll be back in seven years. . . . You give us a half hour to listen to all our problems. We have to live with them all our lives."

"I would like for each and every one of you," said one of Miss Delago's fellow students, "to come out to our school someday . . . to see how we are being cheated out of an education. We walk down the hall just like packs of cattle, that's how small the school is. I want to ask you right now, What is going to happen to the people who drop out?"

Commission chairman John Hannah, president of Michigan State University, felt put upon. "We are here to listen," he said, his face reddening with anger. "We have to take whatever God gave us . . . to make you the best possible citizen. . . . An education is something that every person has to achieve for himself." Hannah droned on about what makes America great, about Founding Fathers. The students somehow did not find this an answer. "You look bored," said Hannah, growing angrier still, "we're going to terminate your part of the hearing. . . . This Commission has been the victim for the past twenty-four hours of some sideshows. Father Hesburgh can preach a better sermon than I can." The Reverend Theodore M. Hesburgh, president of Notre Dame University, another commissioner, did just that.

"Patricia," said Father Hesburgh, in low, mellow tones, "I want to say something. I've been in seventy countries. . . . I spent a lot of time recently in Latin America." Father Hesburgh gave a brief travelogue of Latin America, the fjords of southern Chile, and so on, and continued: "The one thing that we have in this country that they don't have is equality of opportunity. What you're getting now would look like paradise compared to what they get there. . . . Now I know it's not perfect here either," and that's "the only reason this group exists. We move all around this country. We all have ten full-time jobs. We look at these problems in our spare time, if there is such a thing. Freedom of opportunity is not something you get on a platter. This man next to me [Eugene Patterson, editor of the Atlanta *Constitution*] won a Pulitzer Prize this week. You don't get those with Green Stamps. . . . I hope you grab every opportunity you have, and I hope we can create more and more opportunities. We've all got to put down our buckets where we are." In a series of unfortunate remarks, the latter was an ill-timed recollection of a saying of Booker T. Washington's, a man who, one Negro remarked to me later, "didn't know how empty the well was."

SITTING DUCKS

A good part of the commissioners' discomfiture was at finding themselves sitting ducks for anger and frustration at the federal government, over which it had minimal influence yet whose identity it could not escape. And that identity, away from Washington—that other world where the well-laid plans are made—is not a happy one. The government, said one of the witnesses before the Commission, "speaks with a forked tongue."

A war on poverty is proclaimed, and the warriors retreat at the first skirmish; a school aid program focusing on the poor is begin, and in no time politicians talk about ending it. Executive orders on civil rights are issued, but they are not carried out. Federal programs to provide jobs and improve housing are enacted, but if local officials don't want to accept the programs, nobody can make them.

For years, for example, there has been a federal policy, recently reaffirmed in still another executive order, that there should not be racial discrimination in jobs provided through federal contracts. But neither the union leaders nor contractors who came before the Commission felt responsibility for translating the order into jobs for Negroes. "A union's primary responsibility," said Al Clem, business manager of Operating Engineers, Local No. 3, "is to its members." How many Negroes were in his union? "I have no way of knowing." Didn't the 1964 Civil Rights Act require unions to keep records by race? Yes, but the government forms had not yet reached the union.

James Childers, president of the AFL–CIO Building Trades Council, patiently explained to the Commission that Negroes were represented in the unions, perhaps "not as much as they would like to be—not as much as their leaders say they would like to be. They are represented as much as the Negroes want to be." Joseph Mazzola, business manager of the Plumbers Union, Local 38, said that although his union had twenty Negroes "that we know of" out of some three thousand members, and the NLRB had charged it with discrimination, the union "never" discriminated against minorities. What if a contractor wanted a federal contract and was told that first there must be a guarantee of more jobs for Negroes? "Naturally we would get in touch with our attorneys," replied Mazzola, "to protect the rights of our members."

"I think you're barking up the wrong tree when you say it's the contractor's responsibility," explained Morton Harris, administrative officer of the S. S. Silverblatt Company, which had won a $30 million Federal contract to build a Post Office building in Oakland. The Commission staff found that there were no Negro plumbers, or electricians, or steam fitters, or operating engineers, or ironworkers on the job. In a total work force of two hundred, there were eighteen Negroes. Mr. Harris believed that he had fulfilled his obligations under the executive order: he "personally" had sent the unions a copy of the order, and he had been assured by the unions that they were in compliance with the order.

Perhaps the representative of the Labor Department's Office of Contract Compliance, which has responsibility for carrying out the executive order, would explain to the Commission how the order was enforced. Vincent Macaluso, who flew out from Washington for the occasion, was full of good news about the Department's new "affirmative action program," and professed himself "confounded" by Mr. Harris' remarks. If a contractor has a collective-bargaining agreement which interferes with his performance on a government contract, declared Mr. Macaluso, "he should simply not do business with the government." Well, mused the Commission's counsel, some contractors didn't see it that way; had the government ever established its credibility by terminating a construction contract? "Not to my knowledge," replied Mr. Macaluso. "There is a feeling that after all the contractor is in a very hard spot." There is also a feeling, William Taylor, the Commission's staff director, reminded Mr. Macaluso, that the Department of Labor is "susceptible" to the craft unions, and that this inhibits enforcement of the order.

In 1962, after long delay and with much fanfare, President Kennedy signed an executive order forbidding racial discrimination in the sale or rent of federally financed or insured housing. The primary responsibility for enforcing the order was placed on the Federal Housing Administration, which insured mortgages, and which is part of the Department of Housing and Urban Development. The FHA decided that enforcement of the housing order was dependent on "citizen action."

NOT PERSONALLY MOTIVATED

Mr. Lois Matusck and Mrs. Lucy Buchbinder, two San Francisco citizens who took up the challenge, reported on the "rather frustrating" results of trying to help the government enforce its own policies. "I can call the HUD man," said one, "and he says I'm awfully sorry, I can't get this information for you. I couldn't make an appointment with the U.S. Attorney because they said one agency couldn't monitor another. . . . When I ask Washington I usually get a gung ho letter back . . ." but little happens. "At the district level," explained Mrs. Matusck, "the attitude of the personnel can water down the modified nonaggressive policy even further." The local FHA representative, "three times in my presence, said he was not personally motivated" to carry out the order.

Jack Tuggle, regional representative of the FHA, told the Commission that he was afraid that if the FHA singled out a specific FHA-backed subdivision developer and ordered him to comply with the federal nondiscrimination policy, it would be "stigmatizing" him; "it might serve as an attraction for excessive—I'll use the word 'imbalanced,' I believe that's a socially acceptable word now"—influx of Negro buyers. The FHA backs over 51 percent of the housing built in the Bay area, Mr. Tuggle pointed out, and he would not like to do "anything that would tend to cause us to lose our position in the market."

San Francisco had not applied for assistance under the new Model Cities Act, the most promising and comprehensive slum rehabilitation program yet. Mayor John F. Shelley, white-haired, pink-faced, surrounded by a retinue of aides and photographers, affably explained why not. The coordination of local programs required by the Model Cities Act could not be carried out without a change in the city charter, the mayor said, and he did not want "that kind of thing on the ballot at this time because I am a candidate for re-election."

MAKING TROUBLE

Officialdom, federal and local, has made it clear that one way to petition for the federal beneficence that has been promised back in Washington is to riot. Each spring, officialdom predicts a "long hot summer" and pledges special help to areas where there is trouble. This naturally makes making trouble a very tempting strategy. Even representatives of Mexican-American and Chinese communities in the Bay area suggested to the Commission that the possibilities of the riot cycle are not lost on their people.

The attitude has spread, said Larry Wong, a Presbyterian minister and poverty-program worker in Chinatown, "that until a community produces a riot the power people will not produce action." There was no attention to Hunter's Point in San Francisco, Mr. Wong pointed out, until the Negroes there rioted.

But the government also appears to speak with the "forked tongue" when riots break out. When trouble exploded at Hunter's Point last fall—citizens of the area say it was not nearly so serious as pistol-happy police and the press made out—Mayor Shelley sent a desperate telegram to the White House, asking for help. James A. Richards, a young Negro leader of a youth group trying to stabilize Hunter's Point, described the area to the Commission: "no recreation facilities, education facilities, cultural programs, health facilities, transportation facilities—it's just ole tore-down houses to put people there and keep it a ghetto, I suppose. . . . It wasn't a major riot, the way people tended to see it. The reasons behind it were major, and they still are."

What happened after the riot? People came out and "made false promises. Things are not getting better; they're getting worse." The commissioners did not press Mr. Richards for details; he talked nervously and quickly and inarticulately, he was not their kind of witness. "After the riot," he explained to me later, "I had meetings with representatives of all the federal agencies. They were taking surveys all over the place. They said they were going to find jobs. They talked as if there were going to be real security, but they left us standing the same way. Some got jobs working two, three hours in the Post Office. About three jobs with the Telephone Company. They never contacted me after that."

THE OTHER SIDE OF THE GULF

There is reason to wonder whether the commissioners understood Mr. Richards and the other young men and women like him any better for having come to San Francisco. "We want facts," Commissioner Robert S. Rankin, a Duke University political science professor, told me as the week-long hearings neared the end, echoing Dean Griswold, "but we're getting emotions." "The only thing I got out of these hearings," Chairman Hannah remarked, "is that the Mexican-Americans are upset with us."

Perhaps the gulf, continually widened by differences of class, by mutual frustrations, by the sheer passage of time, is now too great to bridge. Humble sharecroppers and civil rights leaders in Brooks Brothers suits are now a small and fading part of the picture. This is not to suggest that the issues the commissioners face would be simple but for a failure of understanding; far from it. Nor are they standing alone on the other side of the gulf; a great crowd of politicians and officials, most of America, in fact, is standing right there with them. Perhaps they learned more than they appeared to in San Francisco. The real point is that if they cannot grasp what the witnesses were telling them, if they can no longer budge the federal government and the nation, who can?

—ELIZABETH BRENNER DREW.

John Peter Zenger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1967

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues an editorial written in the East Side News, a weekly publication with wide distribution throughout my congressional district. This editorial, commemorating the 221st anniversary of the death of John Peter Zenger, was written by Mr. Abe E. Eisenstein.

JOHN PETER ZENGER

(By Abe E. Eisenstein)

Today (July 28) marks the 221st anniversary of the death of John Peter Zenger, famed East Sider and New Yorker, printer-publisher-editor, and America's first defender of the fredom of the press.

"Zenger the Printer—his work is done;
Soft be his slumber, through storm and stress
Guard we the prize of the fight he won—
Bulwark of freedom, a fearless press."

John Peter Zenger, a German immigrant, came to this city at the age of 13. His father died on shipboard and his mother, Johanna Zenger, with her three children moved into a house on Lower East Side's Cherry Street.

When he was 14, John was apprenticed to William Bradford, pioneer printer for The Colonies, for eight years. After his apprenticeship, he married Anna Catherine Maulin, of Cherry Street. When he was twenty-three years old, he was made a freeman of the city.

In 1726, Zenger set up shop for himself on Smith Street. Eight years later, he moved to Broad Street. The first arithmetic text printed in the colony, Peter Venema's Arithmetica, was brought out by printer Zenger in 1730.

In 1733, he became editor and publisher of the New York Weekly Journal. This weekly, unlike Bradford's Gazette, was highly critical of the then Gov. William Cosby's administration. One of the articles asserted in general terms that the liberties and properties of the people of New York were in danger. Gov. Cosby, in 1734, had Zenger arrested and imprisoned for criminal libel.

The court proceedings were conducted with the greatest unfairness and Zenger's attorneys, James Alexander and William Smith, were expelled from the bar. His ever-faithful wife, Anna, ran the journal during his stay in jail.

Brought to trial in 1735, John Peter Zenger was ably defended by the distinguished advocate in the colonies, Andrew Hamilton of Philadelphia. He demanded; "Shall not the oppressed have the right to complain? Shall the press be silenced that evil government may have their way?" "Not Guilty," said the jury.

This was the first successful assertion of the liberty of the press at a time when thought and speech were severely restricted. It led the future founding fathers to the press guarantee in our First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which became effective on Dec. 15, 1791.

In 1737, John Peter Zenger became public printer for the colonoy of New York and one year later of the colony of New Jersey. He remained the editor of the New York Weekly Journal until his death in 1746.

In 1953, a memorial for Zenger was opened in Federal Hall, at Nassau and Wall Streets.

We salute the memory of that courageous pioneer publisher, John Peter Zenger, and his wife, Anna, who led a crusade for freedom of the press.

Inside the Ghettos

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GILBERT GUDE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1967

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, in today's Washington Post, Mr. Joseph Alsop's article, "Inside the Ghettos," tells us very bluntly what action is required if we truly want to solve "the greatest domestic problem the United States has faced since the Civil War."

A careful examination of the problem shows that the passage of civil rights legislation, while necessary and proper, constitutes for the present only a pain reliever—an aspirin, which may somewhat alleviate the symptoms of the ghetto malady for the ghetto inhabitants, but will not cure the disease itself. Rather, the cure lies in a massive attack on the disease at the point where the affliction takes place, and we must, as indeed Mr. Alsop points out, attack the disease on all fronts, and now.

Education at all age levels is the most basic remedy needed. It will mean the extension of such programs as Headstart, greater assistance under title I—education for the disadvantaged—of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, other similar programs for elementary and secondary schools, and well planned adult education programs. It will also mean extensive housing programs, utilizing and expanding our existing programs such as those provided for under the Model Cities Act, and even more important, initiating bold new ones, such as the Percy plan of which I am proud to be a cosponsor. And we must also make every effort to create more job opportunities for the unemployed ghetto citizens.

Mr. Alsop's remarks are appropriate to the Washington metropolitan area—they are appropriate to all the great urban centers of our country. They are remarks which we should heed and act upon with deliberate speed.

INSIDE THE GHETTOS

(By Joseph Alsop)

There is just one key to the solution of the greatest domestic problem the United States has faced since the Civil War—which is of course the race problem in its modern, mainly urban form.

In essence, the key is simple. For the short run, at least every effort to offer justice to America's Negro minority must be concentrated inside the ghettos, where the need is unspeakably urgent. Consider the sheer horror of the statistics that depict the plight of our urban ghettos' Negroes—a plight which fully explains (but does not excuse) Detroit, Newark and all the rest:

In the average ghetto, up to 40 per cent of the adult males are jobless or have joined the ranks of the "hustlers"—which means the part-time numbers peddlers, dope pushers, male prostitutes and the like.

In the average ghetto, fewer than one in 10 of the Negro boys and girls who reach 18 each year are equipped to get and hold a decent blue-collar job, by receiving the equivalent of a normal high school education.

In the average ghetto, something like three-quarters of the people live in substandard housing, often hardly better than the housing in the slums of Calcutta.

If those figures do not make your hair stand on end for very horror, and if they do not make you blush for shame as well, you do not deserve to be an American citizen. And those figures also say, in clamant, harsh and brazen voice, that the ghettos are where the problem is, and the ghettos are where the effort must be made.

Great problems make strange bedfellows. You could hardly imagine stranger than the buccaneering progressive, Sen. Robert F. Kennedy; the virtuous liberal sociologists of Columbia University, Drs. Frances Fox Piven and Richard A. Cloward; and the aging, defeathered hawk, this reporter.

Yet this odd assemblage, plus a few "black power" shouters, comprise the overwhelming majority of those who want to put the practical horse—the horse of radical improvement of Negro housing, education and job opportunities *inside the ghettoes*—ahead of the moral cart, which is desegregation and integration. Integration and desegregation must always be the ultimate aims; but the right horse-cart relationship is vitally important, nonetheless.

Drs. Pivens and Cloward have written a series of deeply significant papers, showing that housing conditions in the ghettoes have continuously worsened, despite vast Federal and local expenditures. "The Achilles Heel of housing programs," they have courageously pointed out, "has been precisely our insistence that better housing for the (Negro) poor (should) be achieved by residential desegregation . . . Reformers must (instead) apply what political pressure they have to secure relief in the ghetto itself."

With tiresome repetition, this reporter has been saying the same thing about Negro education. For just as the important thing *now* is to give better housing to the millions of ghetto residents, so the important thing *now* is to give a decent education to the millions of children in ghetto schools, who have little or no hope of entering integrated schools.

As for Sen. Kennedy, he has not been quite so blunt as Drs. Pliven and Cloward. But he has boldly offered two brilliantly conceived bills, to tempt job-creating industry into the ghettoes by offering generous tax inducements, and to use the same inducements to secure privately sponsored reconstruction of substandard ghetto housing.

These bills belong to the tiny minority of measures aimed to improve conditions *inside the ghettoes*. Detroit, Newark and the rest have indirectly damaged both Kennedy bills very greatly, alas; for the resulting ghetto insurance rates will make it hard for housing and industrial investors to accept the inducements Kennedy wants to offer. Yet it is very clear indeed that Kennedy has taken the only practical approach.

Overall, what must be done is also very clear indeed. First (and for the long pull, most important of all), an immense national effort must be made to improve the ghetto schools, so that the next generation of our Negro minority will at last be equipped to peg even with the white majority.

Second (and again for the long pull), Sen. Kennedy's bills ought to be passed without argument, and probably in an expanded form. Third, however, emergency programs are also needed, now, this instant, without a moment's delay. Something like an urban WPA is needed to sop up that part of ghetto joblessness that is not hopelessly resistant. The sordid family welfare system must be boldly replaced. And a direct, national program of ghetto housing improvement is also required, so that we are at least making a quick start on this aspect of the horror.

Because we have been putting the moral cart before the practical horse, billions upon tens of billions have been poured out everywhere except *inside the ghettoes*. Now is the time to try the opposite tack, and not to count the billions when we do so.

Summertime, When the Politics Is Crazy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1967

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, it is often easy when so many events are occurring so rapidly to lose the proper perspective in dealing with them. Politicians, when engaged in the great game of government, tend to let themselves be carried away, sometimes to the point where it leads them in the wrong direction.

The nature of our society reflects upon the nature of our politics. A particular editorial from the August 1 issue of the New York Times comes to my mind at this moment. Mr. Russell Baker in his article, "Summertime, When the Living Is Crazy," has some very enlightening insights on the politics of this great body during the last month.

Mr. Russell, in a lighthearted manner, shows how the overall picture of the nature of our society is bordering on absurdity. I think it would be wise for my esteemed colleagues to pause for a moment and give their attention to this article.

Mr. Speaker, for the pleasure of my colleagues, I now insert this article into the RECORD:

OBSERVER: SUMMERTIME, WHEN THE LIVING IS CRAZY

(By Russell Baker)

WASHINGTON, July 31.—July, for those who may have missed it, was like this:

Race riots in a number of American cities disclosed the presence of a dangerously large mass of desperate and highly armed citizens, some murderously and others suicidally inclined, for whom government and the economic system work disadvantageously.

The great political organisms of America responded with the speed and flexibility that have accounted for the nation's flourishing history of survival.

FIXING THE BLAME

The Republican party formally blamed everything on President Johnson.

President Johnson blamed a great deal of it on Governor Romney.

Senator Thurmond blamed it on the Communists, but did not specify whether the hand of the Russians or the Chinese sect was at work. Senator Byrd, the West Virginian, recommended a good dose of lead for anyone caught carrying a bottle of muscatel from a burning liquor store.

The President also appointed a committee. This will make recommendations which Congress will decline to finance so that continuance of the rioting may be assured into 1968, thus providing both the President and the Republicans with a campaign opportunity to pin the blame on each other.

Nor was Congress inert to the threat of social breakdown. It was spending $27 billion to establish a governmental and economic system that would work advantageously for the citizens of South Vietnam. To offset the expense, it forbade the Administration to spend $30 million to control rats in American cities.

Negroes became more vocal than ever in their antipathy to Congress's tendency to spend more to save the Vietnamese than to save the American Negro. This antipathy was manifested at a Black Power conference in Newark when delegates manhandled a group of reporters for showing up to report—in words that even a Congressman could understand—the depth of Negro unhappiness.

H. Rap Brown, the leader of S.N.C.C. suggested that Negroes might usefully incinerate the entire country.

President de Gaulle did not publicly endorse Mr. Brown's suggestion. At the time it was made, he was otherwise engaged in promoting the secession of Quebec from Canada. Today, Europe; tomorrow, the world.

Having allied himself with Communist China, Islam and Quebec, de Gaulle had established himself as the most powerful threat to Western security since Russia forsook Stalinism for consumer satisfactions. Washington, however, still dozed. At the State Department, officials still assured the uneasy that de Gaulle, being an old soldier, would eventually fade away, and that the Pentagon missiles were still not being retargeted on Paris.

As to Vietnam, there were the familiar assurances that we were winning, this time from General Westmoreland and former Ambassador Lodge. The number of Americans wounded was averaging about 1,200 men per week. Secretary McNamara said he was neither pessimistic nor optimistic about the war. Everyone suggested it might go on forever.

The President's popularity polls rose.

MANIACAL MASS MURDERS OFF

On the highways, Americans continued destroying themselves in automobiles at the rate of approximately 50,000 persons a year, but mass murder by armed maniacs acting without socially oriented motivation was decidedly off.

SLAUGHTER WITH A FLAIR

In entertainment, the big box office draw continued to be James Bond, who tickled millions from coast to coast with his amusing cinematic techniques for piling the screen high with corpses.

In Nantucket, Mass., a young hippie vagrant who told the court he had been living there on table scraps to demonstrate that a man could live on what the average American throws in the garbage received three months in jail.

The severity of the sentence was not unjustified. Such demonstrations, if allowed to persist unchecked, could start people thinking about the nature of our society. Then we would surely be in trouble.

Customs Opts for Better Service to Public

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1967

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, back in the last century the sleepy California pueblo of Los Angeles utilized the harbor at San Pedro, some 10 to 15 miles away for such seaborne commerce as it needed. Customs facilities were established in Los Angeles because the harbor area was essentially uninhabited.

Today the city of Los Angeles is a thriving one of great population and congestion, but its harbor is still 10 to 15 miles away from downtown. Other vast changes have occurred in the surrounding areas. There is one continuous metropolis through the counties of Orange and Los Angeles of which the city of Los Angeles is but a part. San Pedro is now a busy harbor. An entirely new and even larger and busier harbor exists at adjacent Long Beach. Together these harbors serve the entire giant metropolis. Several years ago it became apparent that continuing to maintain the customhouse for these busy harbors in downtown Los Angeles was an anachronistic absurdity. The Customs service quite logically got an appropriation for a customhouse in the harbor area. The building has been built and the district Customs office will make the long overdue move into it on August 19. The relocated facility will be of true service to the entire two-county Los Angeles-Long Beach metropolitan area. The Customs service informs me that it will be able to provide better overall customs service to the area than ever before. It will be able to do so with enhanced cost effectiveness.

A few downtown Los Angeles diehards are fighting the move. The Customs service should stick to its decision. The interests of special interests should not be permitted to run down the better service ahead, nor to run up the cost of operating the facility.

Appendix

Highway Safety Standards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 3, 1967

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excerpt from the statement of Dr. William Haddon, Jr., director of the National Highway Safety Bureau, Federal Highway Administration, Department of Transportation, before the Subcommittee on Roads of the Committee on Public Works on July 18, during the course of our hearings on the progress of the highway safety programs. I referred to this statement during my remarks in the Senate today on the necessity of providing adequate funds for those programs.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPT FROM STATEMENT OF DR. WILLIAM HADDON, JR., DIRECTOR, NATIONAL HIGHWAY SAFETY BUREAU, FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION, BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON ROADS OF THE SENATE PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE, JULY 18, 1967

Mister Chairman and members of the committee, I am pleased to have the opportunity today to review the highway safety standards.

In developing the standards, we kept very much in mind the clear-cut requirements of the Act and the extensive legislative history dealing with the development of the standards, their administration, the program areas to be included, and the approach to be used. The heart of the Act is the requirement that "each State shall have a highway safety program approved by the Secretary, designed to reduce traffic accidents and deaths, injuries, and property damage resulting therefrom."

Mr. Bridwell has already discussed the administrative requirements and pointed out that those with respect to administration were important considerations in the development of the standards. They immediately raised the question of the levels of performance to be specified. If the programs of all States were required to meet all aspects of all standards by the end of 1968, this would necessitate standards approaching the lowest common denominator of present State and community programs. If, on the other hand, the standards were to set goals which the States could work toward, they could be set at much higher levels. This latter alternative was adopted as the only one which would adequately satisfy the purposes of the Act. As a result, the standards do not contain requirements for a time when full compliance must be achieved. A number of States already meet or exceed the performance levels for several standards. Other States cannot yet fully meet any of the standards and many do not have programs in some standard areas. Recognizing this, many States during their 1967 legislative sessions passed enabling acts which will allow them to broaden their programs well before December 6, 1968. I will discuss these later with respect to the individual standards.

The second statutory requirement enumerates the program areas to be covered by the standards. These include the improvement of driver performance through driver education, driver licensing, testing and examination. Driver education is doubly mentioned; being named as an area to be covered by a standard and as a required part of every approved State program. Additional areas named in the Act are accident records, accident investigations, vehicles registration, operation and inspection, highway design and maintenance, and traffic control. The initial standards were selected from these areas.

The Act also specifies that the standards are to be uniform and that they be expressed in terms of performance. The words "uniform" and "standard" are almost invariably linked in the Act. This requirement, taken together with the participation of political subdivisions, makes it clear that the standards must be written in terms of sufficiently broad to be appropriate for both State and local conditions and programs. The requirements "uniform" and "performance" are directly connected with the purpose of the Act, which is to assist the States and their political subdivisions to improve and expand their highway safety programs. The standards, therefore, specify what is to be done and not "how" or by whom.

This permits wide latitude on the part of States in developing new and increasingly effective methods for achieving reductions in highway crashes and their end results of human and property damage—methods most suited to the highly varied circumstances of the many State and local governments and the communities they serve.

Other statutory requirements deal with the manner in which the standards are to be developed. In fulfillment of those requirements, extensive consultations were held with the representatives of the States, with other Federal agencies, with representatives of associations of State and local officials, with private groups, institutes, associations, professional societies and others. This consultation took many forms, formal and informal meetings, correspondence, and even telephone calls, in addition to solicited formal comments from the States and the groups mentioned earlier. A chronology of this development process was included in our report to the Congress.

Under the general area of driver performance, we have developed three standards. The first of these, driver education, is responsive to a national need for the improvement of public and private driver education courses and for making such courses more widely available. The standard calls for—

Comprehensive driver training programs, meeting standards set by the State, available to all youths of licensing age.

Certification of instructors and licensing commercial driving schools.

Research, development, and procurement of practice driving facilities such as simulators and other tools for both school and adult training programs.

Training and re-training programs for adults.

The generally accepted driver education course now offers 30 hours of classroom instruction, with 6 hours of practice driving. At present, more than one-half the high schools in 39 States offer such courses. However, only 45 percent of the eligible students participate in such courses. In fact, there are only 18 States where more than one-half of the students receive driver education in the high schools.

Driver licensing is the second standard in the general area of driver performance. The objective of this standard is to stimulate improved licensing and related activities largely through the use of available methods. The standard calls for—

A driver licensing program to insure that only persons physically and mentally qualified may drive and to prevent needless denial of the right to drive.

Reexamination of all drivers at least once every four years for visual acuity and knowledge of rules of the road.

A medical advisory board to advise the licensing agency on physical and vision standards.

Continuing records of driver histories, and means for quick retrieval of these records.

Under this standard any licensed driver would only hold one license certificate. That is, he could not simultaneously hold licenses from several States. At present, 34 States formally subscribe to this practice either through specific legislation or by participation in the Drivers License Compact, or both. Reexamination of all drivers for at least visual acuity and knowledge of rules of the road was included in the standard to ensure that all drivers have at least minimum eyesight and knowledge to qualify them for safe driving. Reexamination for at least visual acuity at varying intervals is practiced by 18 States. During 1967, two of those States strengthened their laws in this regard, and four more adopted reexamination laws.

Motorcycle accidents have been rising sharply in recent years as might be expected from the increasing popularity of this type of vehicle. Although the operation of a motorcycle is very different from that of a 4-wheeled vehicle, any licensed driver is authorized to drive a motorcycle in most States. A disproportionate number of those injured or killed are young people; those in their teens and early twenties. The most serious injuries are those which occur to the head. They are often fatal; frequently disabling for life. It has been demonstrated beyond dispute that helmets can reduce the frequency and the severity of such injuries. Taking into account the nature of the injuries, the relatively low cost of proven ways of reducing their consequences and the need to reduce, if not reverse, the upward trend of death and disability inflicted largely on our young, the standard on motorcycle safety calls for—

Licenses and examinations specifically for the operation of motorcycles.

Approved helmet and eye protection for operators when operating cycles.

Seats, footrests, and approved safety helmets for motorcycle passengers.

A rearview mirror on all motorcycles.

Inspection of motrcycles similar to that for other motor vehicles.

As the end of 1966 only three States required helmets on all motorcycle operators. In the past 6 months, 24 additional States have enacted similar statues. The 14 States and the District of Columbia which issued special licenses for motorcycle operators prior to 1967 have been joined by 6 additional States through legislation enacted in the first 6 months of this year.

Several standards are responsive to the requirement that there be a standard on traffic records. Specific records are called for in the standards on Driver Licensing, Motor Vehicle Registration and Inspection, Alcohol, and Courts. The Standard on Traffic Records repeats many of these same requirements and calls for their use as a related group of facts in each State's overall collection and use of its traffic records.

The standard on Traffic Records has as one of its objectives the upgrading of all aspects of the accident information system, starting with the collection of raw data, followed by its encoding, storage, retrieval, analysis, and ultimate dissemination to users. The standard calls for: a Statewide system, and compatible local systems, to include all traffic data for the entire State, capable of providing summaries, tabulations, and special analyses of driver, vehicle, accident, and road records that are compatible for the purpose of analysis.

In our opinion, the improvement of accident record systems should have top priority in all States. These systems are badly needde to give us more information on which effective safety programs can be based and to evaluate the effectiveness of each new program.

The driver who drinks is one of the major problems affecting highway safety. Alcohol is known to be a factor in at least 50 percent of fatal crashes. The standard on Alcohol in Relation to Highway Safety calls for—

A program to reduce traffic accidents resulting from persons driving under the influence of alcohol.

Establishment by each State of specific test procedures for determining blood alcohol content.

The blood alcohol concentration at which a driver may be deemed to be intoxicated shall not be set higher than 0.10 percent by weight, the maximum concentration long recommended by professional groups concerned with highway safety.

A person placed under arrest for operating a motor vehicle while intoxicated, while under the influence of alcohol, or while his ability to drive is impaired by the consumption of alcohol, is deemed to have given his consent to a chemical test for the purpose of determining the alcohol content of his blood.

Alcohol content tests on adult accident victims, and drivers surviving fatal accidents to provide information as to the seriousness of the problem in each jurisdiction and baselines against which the success of control efforts can be measured.

This standard would not preclude a State from establishing a limit lower than 0.10 percent to define intoxication or impairment of ability to drive safely. During the first 6 months of this year, 5 States have enacted implied consent legislation, bringing to 24 the number who have this authority. The collection of information on blood alcohol content from accident victims on a routine basis will provide badly needed baseline information and will allow the States to evaluate the effectiveness of the programs they undertake.

The Act, as noted previously, specifically calls for standards covering motor vehicle registration, operation and inspection. Two of the initial standards are in this general area. Until recently there has been very little scientific evidence that supported the supposition that inspection systems contribute to highway safety. However, recent research demonstrates significant differences in State motor vehicle death rates clearly associated with the timing of introduction and frequency of vehicle inspection. Although much more specific information is needed, especially with respect to the extent to which various kinds of inspection contribute to overall results, it is clear that the inspection of motor vehicles has an important place in each State's highway safety program. Since the beginning of this year, 8 States have passed legislation calling for periodic motor vehicle inspection, bringing to 29 the number of States with this authority. In addition, 6 States permit cities to inspect vehicles by local programs. Another 6 States have random or "spot check" inspection programs. In addition, Maryland has a program of inspection for used vehicles at time of sale or when first registered in the State. Thus, 42 States and the District of Columbia have some legislative authority for motor vehicle inspection of one kind or another. And 2 other States are expected to adopt inspection statutes yet this month. The standard permits experimentation under certain conditions with these different kinds of programs. It calls for—

A program for periodic motor vehicle inspection of all registered vehicles for an experimental, pilot, or demonstration program approved by the Secretary of Transportation.

Every registered vehicle inspected at the time of initial registration and annually thereafter or at such intervals as may be designated by an approved program. We regard motor vehicle inspection programs as very high priority, particularly in view of a recent study by the Bureau of Public Roads which found that vehicle factors were prominent causes of 24 percent of single vehicle accidents on one of our major transcontinental routes.

The standard on motor vehicle registration is in response to the need for improved and adequate records systems developed so that vehicle owners can be identified rapidly for law enforcement and other operational and research purposes. The standard calls for: a motor vehicle registration and recordkeeping program to provide rapid identification of each vehicle and owner, and to make data, including gross laden weight of all commercial vehicles, available for accident, research, and safety program development.

Proper design, construction, and maintenance of streets and highways are important aspects of any effective highway safety program. Poor roads and inadequate maintenance can contribute directly to the likelihood of serious and fatal injuries once accidents occur. Accordingly, to encourage better design and maintenance practices and in response to the requirement in the Act, the standard on design, construction, and maintenance calls for—

Maintenance of streets and highways in a condition that improves safety.

Meeting approved standards issued or endorsed by the Federal Highway Administrator for modernization of existing roads and new highways.

Lighting of expressways and other major arteries in urbanized areas, breakaway or yielding sign supports, special guardrails and bridgerails, and signs at freeway interchanges directing motorists to emergency care facilities.

The importance of good design in reducing accidents has been demonstrated repeatedly. It is apparent in the dramatically lower death and injury rates on our newer highways, particularly those with access control. Additionally, the value of improved guardrail design and yielding sign supports in reducing the likelihood of death and injury once cars go out of control has been well established. The standard is consistent with the standards and policies of the Bureau of Public Roads and of the American Association of State Highway Officials, both of whom were very helpful in its preparation. Other features of the standard were taken from recommendations of the professional societies in the field. Although the values are well known, and there are well established standards in this field, it cannot be said that we have done as well as a nation as we could, or should, have in making our roads as safe and crashworthy as we know how. We will continue to work with the States and the Bureau of Public Roads to obtain more application of available knowledge in this area.

The standard on Traffic Control Devices is closely related to the design, maintenance and construction of highways and is another area where application seriously lags behind knowledge and national standards. The standard calls for—

Upgrading traffic control devices (signs, signals, markings) to conform with standards issued or endorsed by the Federal Highway Administrator.

Preventive maintenance, repair, and day-and-night inspection of all traffic control devices.

Standards have been in existence for over 30 years, but many States and local governments have failed to conform to them, even though 48 States, the District of Columbia and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico have either adopted the national standards or State standards consistent with them but adapted to local conditions

The Bureau of Public Roads requires conformance with the national standards on all federally-aided highways and this standard would extend that requirement to local roads and streets that constitute the 75 percent of the Nation's highways not on the Federal-aid system. The least we can do for the motorists of America is to give them a common set of rules and a common set of signs, signals and markings so that they can understand what is expected of them, what hazards await them and how they can find their destinations without confusion.

The Bureau of Public Roads and the State highway departments are already conducting a program for the detection and correction of high accident locations. Similar programs to remove hazards on roads and streets not on the Federal-aid highway systems should be instituted in all States. Accordingly, the standard on identification and surveillance of accident locations calls for—

A program for identifying and investigating high accident locations and maintaining surveillance of locales with high accident rates.

Measures to reduce accidents, and to evaluate safety improvements, at those locations.

Improvements at high accident locations have resulted in substantial benefit, often at very little cost. This is another move to assist responsible officials in applying proven methods.

As I mentioned earlier with respect to uniformity of traffic control devices, we owe the drivers of this country at least a common set of rules which they can rely on at all times and in all places. The standard on Codes and Laws calls for each State to have a program to achieve uniformity of traffic codes and laws throughout the State including rules of the road for all public streets and highways; and a plan for making the rules of the road consistent with those of other States.

Certain traffic court records should be a part of each central traffic records system. For this reason, the standard on Traffic Courts calls for the courts to notify the State traffic record system of all convictions for moving traffic violations. The standard also recommends that there be uniform accounting systems and court procedures, and that persons charged with hazardous moving traffic violations be required to appear in court. The implementation of this standard will make it possible for the licensing agencies to identify those drivers who repeatedly violate the law. Having done so, the agency can either deny a license to those who cannot, for one reason or another, drive safely, or assist those who can be helped to improve their driving, by for example, adult re-training programs. This standard is essential to the proper functioning of the driver licensing program which includes driver improvement.

The last standard in the initial group deals with emergency medical services and is response to the requirement in the Act for a standard on emergency services. These services could be greatly improved by upgrading the quality of personnel and equipment, and by better planning, coordination, communications and overall management. For many types of injuries the probability of death and the likelihood and severity of resulting disabilities are directly related to the elapsed time between the accident and the beginning of proper treatment. This standard has been carefully worked out in cooperation with the Public Health Service, and has been supported by representatives of the American Red Cross, the American Medical Association, the American Public Health Association, the American Hospital Association, and other major groups. The standard calls for—

A program to insure prompt emergency medical care for accident victims.

First-aid training for emergency service personnel and criteria for use of two-way communication systems for dispatching aid.

Comprehensive State planning of emergency medical services.

In summary, the inital standards outline a broad program of highway safety. The goals of the standards are a matter of national necessity. Some States are farther along than others toward achieving those goals. But every State must do far more than it is presently doing to make travel safer for all our citizens whether on foot or in the many vehicles which crowd our highways. Many States have already taken strong action, in anticipation of the standards, to improve their programs. The National Highway Safety Bureau will continue to work with every State to build the growing partnership that the President and the Congress envisioned and that has been started during the past several months.

Inter-American Development Bank Act Amendments of 1967

SPEECH

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 26, 1967

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 9547) to amend the Inter-American Development Bank Act to authorize the United States to participate in an increase in the resources of the Fund for Special Operations of the Inter-American Development Bank, and for other purposes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I support and will vote for this very necessary legislation which authorizes a U.S. contribution to the Inter-American Development Bank's Fund for Special Operations—FSO.

I believe the House should vote favorably on this legislation; and in order to help familiarize my colleagues with what will be involved, I want to address myself briefly today to H.R. 9547.

This bill calls for a U.S. contribution of $300 million per year for three years to the FSO which will need new funds by 1968 to continue its easy-term lending activities. The amount represents a $50 million increase for each of the next three years over the $250 million the United States has been contributing annually. The increased U.S. contribution will be matched by stepped-up contributions by Latin American member countries of the IDB.

There is no question in my mind that the proposed U.S. contribution is a prudent one. Although it would require an increase in our dollar commitment, the net gain which would arise from this proposal far exceeds the $50 million increase sought. Not only would it greatly enhance the economic development of our Latin American neighbors, but help to move these nations toward greater democratic stability and unity.

It is important to point out that the increased U.S. contribution will not involve budgetary expenditures for the United States until such time as the funds are disbursed under loans committed by the Bank since the U.S. contribution will be made in the form of a letter of credit.

Equally important are two other points about the U.S. contribution. First, it represents a declining amount of the U.S. share in the total IDB capital—from some 85 percent to 75 percent. Second, our balance of payments will suffer very little from the contribution, if at all, because the payment is tied to the purchase of goods and services in the United States and member countries only.

I am well aware that there is increasing skepticism these days about foreign assistance, particularly from those who argue that the world is ungrateful of U.S. foreign aid. This has not been so in the case of Latin America. These nations, more than any other group in the world, have generally supported the U.S. position.

If economies should be made in U.S. foreign aid, I believe that they should not be made in our contribution to the IDB. As you know, this contribution is the result of long negotiations with other Latin American nations and was reaffirmed at the recent Punta del Este Summit Meeting of Presidents.

If the Bank is to carry out its assigned mission, it must be provided with resources necessary for the task.

The IDB deserves the full support of the United States. The Bank provides an excellent example of the Latin Americans' willingness and interest in working together to help themselves. Since its beginning in 1960, the IDB has been one of the most important institutions of the Alliance for Progress. In the 7 years since then, the Bank has built an impressive record in contributing to self-help objectives of its member countries through: First, mobilization of internal financial resources at least equivalent to the total amount of its loans in fields related to its lending activities; second, the creation of new institutions, and the improvement of existing institutions in the Bank's program areas; third, the training of large numbers of people required for efficient public administration; and fourth, innovations leading to improved economic efficiency.

The additional resources that are asked for under H.R. 9547 will permit the Bank to expand its activities in the fields of agriculture and education. The Bank's current plans are to double its expenditures in agriculture and to substantially increase its expenditures in education. There can be no question of the need for greater efforts in these two areas.

The proposal before us tomorrow, if approved, will bring about one of the greatest steps forward in terms of Latin American self-help and economic independence since the IDB was started in 1959.

It is in the best interest of the United States to promote a sound, healthy, independent Latin American economy, one based on the growing philosophy of Latin American self-help. The legislation before us today, when enacted into law, will be a great step toward that end.

However, if we fail to keep the $300 million per year U.S. contribution intact, and if that amount is cut in any way, the economic loss to Latin America and indeed to ourselves will be great.

I strongly urge that we deal with this issue, by promptly and overwhelmingly, passing H.R. 9547.

Stokely Carmichael's Participation in Cuban Olas Meetings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 3, 1967

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the State newspaper of July 29, 1967, published in Columbia, S.C., contained an editorial entitled "Good Riddance," which suggested that Stokely Carmichael be denied reentry into this country on the grounds he entered Cuba without a valid passport.

Yesterday on the floor of the Senate I urged that Carmichael be brought to the bar of justice upon his return to this country. I strongly feel that such a step might discourage other such forays into the Communist world.

Also, the Washington Evening Star of July 31, 1967, published an Associated Press news story from Havana entitled "Cuba Parley Advocates Racial Guerrillas in United States," which further amplifies the seriousness of this entire problem.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these two newspaper articles be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOOD RIDDANCE

If Washington is really interested in getting rid of Black Power anarchist Stokely Carmichael, the opportunity seems to be at hand.

This evil-minded, itinerant rabble-rouser has gone up and down this land, sowing seeds of racial trouble with his separatist ethnic philosophy and his firebrand oratory.

His trail is marked by charred ruins of riot-torn urban areas and the bodies of black men who believed the devilish gospel he spread.

And yet, as they fall, fighting a senseless battle for a misguided cause, where is their leader?

He has ventured off into the Communist orbit, where doubtless he feels very much at home. After some rabble-rousing in Great

Britain, Carmichael has reportedly arrived in Havana via the usual Communist gateway of Prague, Czechoslovakia.

And what is he doing in Havana? He is attending a conference of the Organization of Latin American Solidarity, a collection of Communists called together by Castro in an effort to sell his idea of Red victory through guerrilla wars of "national liberation." To pass along some tips, representatives of Hanoi and the Vietcong are on hand.

And what is Carmichael saying there? According to the Cuban news agency, he said Negroes in the United States are organizing urban guerrillas for "a fight to the death."

Does such a pronouncement from such a forum indicate Carmichael's concern is for an improvement in civil rights? Or does it indicate something far more sinister—organized rebellion that the Communists can convert to their own purposes?

We doubt that many of the unthinking looters and killers who are fighting the bad fight in the asphalt jungles of America consider themselves to be pawns in a near-treasonous game of "national liberation." But it is not beyond the realm of possibility.

The silver lining on all this is that Carmichael is reportedly in Cuba without a valid passport. To travel there requires special authorization by the State Department.

Therefore, it should be easy to deny this West Indian native reentry into his adopted country. Carmichael and his pals would doubtless attempt to convert such an act into a role of martyrdom for Stokely. But such a straight-forward move might give pause to others of his ilk.

With H. Rap Brown, Carmichael's successor as head of the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee, awaiting trial, Adam Clayton Powell cooling it on Bimini, and Carmichael banned, the United States would be free of three men of proven ability to stir up the masses.

Perhaps then, cooler, more responsible, more *American* voices can be heard.

CUBA PARLEY ADVOCATES RACIAL GUERRILLAS IN UNITED STATES

HAVANA (AP).—Latin-American revolutionaries assembled in Havana today to echo Fidel Castro's call for guerrilla warfare from Detroit to Cape Horn. Stokely Carmichael, the U.S. black power advocate, is to be among the speakers at the nine-day meeting of the Organization of Latin American Solidarity.

Cuban President Osvaldo Dorticos is expected to deliver the keynote address at the opening session tonight. Prime Minister Castro is expected to wind up the meeting Aug. 8.

One key point in the agenda for the meeting calls for 'support of the Negro people of the United States in their struggle against racial discrimination."

Since arriving in Cuba last Tuesday, Carmichael has been calling for American Negroes to take up guerrilla-type operations. He has endorsed missing guerrilla leader Ernesto (Che) Guevara's call for creation of more Vietnams for the United States and said racial upheavals in Detroit, Newark and other U.S. cities should be considered Vietnams.

Big delegations from the Viet Cong and North Vietnam are among the observers. The Puerto Rican Independence Movement is represented by its executive secretary, Juan Mari Bras.

An estimated 125 of the expected 200 or so delegates had checked in early today. Observers from scores of left-wing groups and special guests will bring attendance to about 700.

Yugoslavia was excluded because it does not accept the North Vietnamese conditions for ending the Vietnam war. These were supported by the Tricontinental Conference of Asian, African and Latin-American revolutionaries that gave birth to OLAS in January 1966.

Eugenio Rodriguez Balari, executive secretary of the Cuban OLAS committee, said the main OLAS objective is to develop armed revolutionary fights against imperialism.

The Fight Against Jet Noise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN W. WYDLER

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 1, 1967

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, for years I have been fighting the serious problem of jet aircraft noise that affects the lives of thousands of our fellow American citizens. The basic and main problem in this fight is to alert the other Members of Congress to the enormity of this problem. Only those who have spent some hours in a jet alley around one of our Nation's airports can understand the fact that the jet aircraft noise of which I speak and which must be brought under control is of an intensity that will not allow normal life to proceed while it continues. A jet aircraft passing over your head every minute for hours on end at a noise level which drowns out all conversation and which creates an ear-shattering roar cannot be tolerated as a necessary part of a truly progressive society.

In recent years I have received more and more support in my fight against this terrible scourge. I was pleased and delighted, therefore, when the July issue of the magazine Airline Management and Marketing carried a long and serious study of this problem. The article was entitled "Decibels Demanding Attention" and was written by Irwin Hersey, the technology editor of the magazine. The fact this magazine is read by professional airline managers and marketing people makes its significance a great one for the possibility of future action.

What follows is the article written by Mr. Hersey:

DECIBELS DEMANDING ATTENTION

(*Public demand for reducing aircraft noise has reached a crescendo and the problem is now receiving scientific consideration.*)

(By Irwin Hersey)

Several weeks ago, Congressman John W. Wydler (R., N.Y.) gave the House Science and Astronautics Committee a taste of the kind of noise people who live close to airports are exposed to when modern aircraft take off and land by turning on a tape recording made recently at various points around Washington National Airport.

By the time Rep. Wydler had turned off the tape recorder and the shriek of a four-engine jet taking off had died away, he felt he had made his point to the committee that noise near jet airports today is "not only annoying, but so overwhelming that it becomes an exclusive part of life."

The NASA tape recording he used demonstrated noise levels of various jet aircraft taking off and landing. The loudest noise was the high-pitched whine of a jet at 500 feet about 2 miles from landing point. The New York Congressman noted at the hearing that many people in his district lived less than a mile from Kennedy International Airport landing points.

Rep. Wydler, whose own home is not far from Kennedy, has waged a long fight to get Federal agencies to do more research on jet engine noise abatement. Last year he waged an unsuccessful campaign to have $20-million in NASA funds specifically earmarked for noise research. However, since then, there's little doubt that NASA interest in the problem has picked up.

And high time, too, since aircraft noise seems to be on the verge of joining air pollution and automobile safety as national *causes celebres*. Citizens who live near Kennedy, Washington National, O'Hare, Los Angeles International, and other major airports are already up in arms.

At the moment, the problem is being attacked on two different fronts. The first is a technical effort spearheaded by NASA to develop a quieter jet engine, which, it is estimated, would take four or five years and cost some $50-million, or to develop new flight patterns which can help cut noise. The second is based on the premise that, even if a quieter engine is developed, the increase in air traffic, the continuing changeover from propeller-driven aircraft to jets, and the development of the SST and jumbo jets will mean more noise in the vicinity of airports, and the only thing that can be done about it is to reduce population density in such areas.

WHO GETS ANNOYED BY AIRCRAFT NOISE?

Perceived noise (decibels) stratum	Percent of stratum annoyed	Number of people annoyed	Percent of population annoyed	Number of people in stratum	Percent of population in stratum
103 plus	68	28,000	2	42,000	3
100 to 102	51	42,000	3	84,000	6
97 to 99	48	42,000	3	98,000	7
94 to 96	36	70,000	5	182,000	13
91 to 93	24	84,000	6	378,000	27
88 to 90	23	70,000	5	308,000	22
85 to 87	16	28,000	2	154,000	11
Up to 85	10	14,000	1	154,000	11
Total	-----------	378,000	27	1,400,000	100

TRAFFIC INCREASE: MORE NOISE, 1965-85

Increase	1965	1970	1975	1980	1985
Percent of passengers (1965=100)	100	200	400	800	1,000
Index of community nuisance (above 1965 figure), decibels	0	3	6	9	12

Meanwhile, a field which has not been marked by any undue activity in recent years is now getting a good deal of attention. In addition to development of a quieter jet engine, for example, legislation is pending in Congress which would permit the FAA to set noise standards for new planes coming into airline service.

Also, studies are under way on how to cope with the noise problem around Kennedy, O'Hare and LA International Airports, and these are expected to result in proposals by the end of the year by both FAA and the Department of Housing and Urban Development. FAA has tentatively concluded that Federal loans or grants to local governments will "apparently" be required to assure effective anti-noise programs, according to the recent government report on "Status of the Federal Aircraft Noise Abatement Program," prepared by an interagency committee for the President's Jet Aircraft Noise Panel.

The FAA has also indicated that the net costs of any Federal assistance should be recovered from "the aviation industry," which presumably means air travelers and shippers. Initially, FAA is expected to issue standards requiring relatively small noise reductions, and then make them progressively more stringent as technology advances. David D. Thomas, FAA Deputy Administrator, has told Congress that the standards set will depend "on what is possible."

Studies are also being made to determine what noise levels residents near airports are willing to accept. C. W. Harper, Director of the Aeronautics Division of NASA's Office of Advanced Research and Technology, said that complaints seem to soar when the noise level exceeds 100 decibels, or the point at which it begins to inhibit private conversation.

One of the problems seems to be that, while it is relatively easy to measure and describe aircraft noise in physical terms today, it is not quite so simple to make a quantitative estimate of the subjective reactions of individuals and groups to such noise.

This point was made in a recent study of aircraft noise near Washington's National Airport carried out by a team headed by Dr. Stanley Mohler, Chief of the Aeromedical Applications Division of the FAA's Office of Aviation Medicine. The study carefully noted that, in addition to aircraft noise levels *per se*, frequency of operations, time of day, ambient noise levels and other factors "complicate the total noise picture with respect to community reaction."

That's not the only thing that's complicating the noise-abatement effort, either. As Dr. Nicholas E. Golovin of the staff of the President's Office of Science and Technology has pointed out, the existence of conflicting interests among the various groups concerned with aircraft noise has inhibited any one group from taking the initiative. What results is a vicious circle.

Manufacturers of aircraft, for example, have until now found it difficult to make engine modifications because carriers claim they can not afford to pay for them. Also, some carriers insist for economic reasons on maximizing payloads to be carried by specific air-frame-engine combinations despite noise levels that may prove objectionable.

The situation is complicated still further by the fact that some communities which border on airports are simply unwilling, because of economic considerations, to resort to zoning changes. Instead, they argue that aircraft noise should be the concern of aircraft manufacturers and air carriers, and that noise reduction should be effected by making engines quieter, lighter loading, steeper take-offs and landings.

"The most obvious consequence of such conflicts," Dr. Golovin concludes, "is that local noise difficulties have continued growing in parallel with aviation-related investments, so that the difficulties and costs of possible ameliorative actions have also become progressively greater."

Nor is the situation going to get any better in the near future. Prof. E. J. Richards, Director of the Institute of Sound and Vibration Research of the University of Southampton (England), and one of the world's leading experts on aircraft noise, is not at all sanguine about the future. In fact, he thinks that things may get a lot worse before they get better—if they ever do get better.

As Prof. Richards acutely notes, the whole noise problem "resolves itself eventually into a judgment of the amount of loss of amenity which the airport-area community can be expected to relinquish in favor of the gain in amenity to the flying public and to the national economy."

Prof. Richards has made another interesting point, which is borne out by a survey of the aircraft noise nuisance in the London area, and that is that present noise-abatement procedures may actually be increasing, rather than alleviating, the nuisance by spreading it over greater distances.

Present procedures usually call for throttling back the engines when the noisiest areas directly under the aircraft are reached during takeoff. Prof. Richards points out that this practice also cuts the rate of climb, with the result that the nuisance, now less gross but affecting more people, spreads further afield. In addition, he feels that the total nuisance may not be changed as much as was first thought through use of such procedures, and that the efficacy of the technique should be re-examined, particularly with regard to such fast-climbing aircraft as the Concord.

While most present noise-abatement procedures are aimed specifically at lessening the noise in areas directly beneath the aircraft on takeoff and landing, the London survey found that the greatest absolute nuisance, in terms of numbers of people annoyed, came from aircraft flying over *realtively distant*, heavily populated areas at relatively low noise levels. The noise nuisance is widespread. Noise control should therefore not be limited only to small areas in the immediate vicinity of the airport.

Prof. Richards suggests use of what he calls an Index of Community Nuisance (ICN) in order to assess the degree to which aircraft noise is likely to be a problem in the future. The ICN is based on such factors as total daily thrust at an airport, path, forward speed, engine design, and population density in the vicinity of the airport.

Using the ICN, Prof. Richards comes to some interesting conclusions about trends in the growth of the noise nuisance, assuming that no revolutionary breakthroughs occur in take-off techniques or in the proportional relationship between engine power and noise.

WASHINGTON NATIONAL AIRPORT NOISE

Arrivals, by engine type and aircraft (231 measurements)

Type engine and aircraft	Sample size	Mean perceived noise (decibels)
2-engine piston	15	83
Convair 440	3	86
Martin 404	12	83
4-engine piston	37	88
DC-6/7	21	89
Constellation	16	86
Jets	120	87
B-727	94	88
BAC-111	13	87
DC-9	11	85
Caravelle	2	81
2-engine turboprop	8	83
Convair 580	2	85
F-27	6	83
4-engine turboprop	46	84
Electra	29	85
Viscount	17	83
Executive jet	5	84
Aero Commander	1	94
Lear	3	78

WASHINGTON NATIONAL AIRPORT NOISE—Continued

Departures, by Engine Type and Aircraft (846 Measurements)

Type engine and aircraft	Sample size	Mean perceived noise (decibels)
2-engine piston	48	90
Convair 440	8	90
Martin 404	28	90
4-engine piston	173	94
DC-6/7	113	94
Constellation	60	96
Jet	386	92
B-727	281	92
BAC-111	65	94
DC-9	29	88
Caravelle	11	97
2-engine turboprop	44	87
Covair 580	7	90
F-27	37	86
4-engine turboprop	172	88
Electra	127	87
Viscount	45	90
Executive jet	28	92
Aero Commander	9	91
Lear	4	92

First, take-off, and probably landing, nuisance in any populated area is basically proportional to the daily accumulated take-off thrust of all aircraft using the airport, and thus the concept of a limiting noise level at a single monitoring point is inadequate to make any real assessment of the noise nuisance.

Second, air traffic can grow either as an increase in movements or as a growth in the size of a smaller number of aircraft. However, the nuisance will depend on the number of passengers per unit take-off thrust at the airport. Thus, even if the number of movements diminishes through the use of jumbo jets, the nuisance will grow with a growth in the number of passengers using the airport if the thrust per passenger is constant.

Third, and perhaps most important, the advantages of preventing high population densities from occurring in the same area as high path factors are obvious, and not only near the airport, but along the entire early flight path. Moreover, while dispersion of take-off paths may reduce the nuisance for some kinds of poulation concentrations, it can not do so for all of them.

What the increase in air passenger traffic anticipated over the next 20 years is likely to mean in terms of increases in the ICN is illustrated in the table on page 43. Prof. Richards also notes that the growth of jet operations in the next few years from 20 to 60 percent of all operations will be the equivalent of a 5-decibel increase in ICN even if passenger traffic remains constant. Also, since the SST will utilize three times as much thrust per passenger as subsonic aircraft, the noise nuisance will increase in proportion to the total increase in daily thrust at the airport location.

Prof. Richards sums up his conclusions with regard to what we can expect in the way of aircraft noise in the future as follows:

Air passenger traffic growth is such that, even without any change in powerplants, an ICN growth of about 3 decibels can be expected every five years in any specific airport.

The changeover from piston aircraft to jets is likely to further increase the ICN by 2 to 5 decibels.

The use of jumbo jets will not alter the situation except for the fact that it will greatly increase the limit of passenger traffic at any one airport.

The SST is not likely to aggravate the noise nuisance in the direction of the runway if an extensive thrust-control procedure is used.

The full-throttle climb or acceleration technique is worthwhile only if it is coupled with severe throttling when the populated area is reached. However, the SST will increase the sideways nuisance by an ICN of nearly 8 decibles, making the need for elaborate silencers obvious.

The landing noise nuisance is likely to grow more rapidly than is the take-off nuisance, with the growth again related to total daily thrust at the airport. The present practice of taking off over areas which are not built up and landing over built-up areas should therefore be examined.

"Reduction of thrust seems to have been the savior of airports until now," Prof. Richards writes. Once this saving has been achieved, however, there seems no other means of curtailing the growth of ICN. It is therefore quite vital to control population density. A population reduction of 10 percent is equivalent, for example, to a 10 PNdB (Perceived Noise in Decibels) reduction in aircraft noise."

It is interesting to note that the Mohler study referred to earlier came up with some interesting conclusions with regard to the relative noisiness of jet and piston-driven aircraft.

The study found, for example, that restrictions in fuel load and power-management techniques on take-off can reduce the noise made by departing jet aircraft of the intermediate-range type to a lower level than that of older piston-driven aircraft of the four-engine type.

As the table on page 45 indicates, departing piston aircraft produced a higher mean PNdB figure (94) than did jet aircraft (92), despite the fact that the mean level for the jets was elevated somewhat due to the high readings for the relatively small number of Caravelles (3 per cent of all jets) operated at the airport during the latter part of the study.

In addition, turboprop aircraft produced a lower PNdB on departure than did any other type of aircraft. Executive jets, interestingly enough, produced a good deal of noise despite their small size, although the study notes that revised noise-abatement procedures being prepared for their use are expected to reduce noise levels from such aircraft appreciably.

In general, PNdB of arriving aircraft was found to be lower than in departing aircraft, as indicated in the table on page 45. Again, turboprop aircraft show up very well from the noise standpoint.

The argument about whether it is better to try to make a quieter engine or to change present take-off and landing patterns goes on, and there is little doubt at this point that both approaches have merit. However, as Dr. Golovin has pointed out, there is a difference between the two.

"Modifications can be made in the engine/aircraft combination to reduce noise," he writes, "without changing pilot procedures or discernibly compromising safety standards. Whereas changes in aircraft landing and take-off profiles appear to be much more sensitive to questions of flight safety and pilot acceptability.

"Thus, while presentations of recent research results along these lines . . . suggest a community noise-reduction potential comparable to that of engine/airframe modifications they also imply that much work remains to be done, both to prove conclusively that the proposed procedures are compatible with current flight-safety criteria and (perhaps more difficult) to persuade airline pilots and executives that such would be the case in routine commercial applications.

"On the whole," he concludes, "while such research appears to be clearly worthwhile and should therefore be generously supported, its results may provide community-noise pay-offs somewhat more slowly than success in suppression of engine noise."

Douglas engineers have found a way of absorbing some of the compressor noise by coating the air inlet with a layer of metal fibers which act as baffles, trapping the sound waves. The Boeing group is working on ways of changing the shape of the air inlet to eliminate the screeching sound which occurs when air is sucked into the inlet at high speeds.

Unfortunately, the quiet-engine project is not expected to be completed any earlier than late 1971 or 1972. In the meantime, efforts will be made to test some of the noise-reduction techniques now under study on a modified four-engine jet transport aircraft.

Karl D. Kryter of the Sensory Sciences Research Center of the Stanford Research Institute, in a comment on Prof. Richards' article, suggested that the magnitude of the aircraft noise problem could be judged by considering how much more intense such noise is, subjectively as well as physically, compared to every-day noises generated by other means of transportation. The graph on page 44, which shows some of these relations, is an eye-opener.

Perhaps the most interesting comment, however, came from F. W. Kolk, Assistant Vice-President for Engineering Research and Development for American Airlines who said:

"As an operator of transport aircraft, I have some difficulty with the ultimate conclusion apparently drawn (by Prof. Richards), which is that we must in essence depopulate areas around an airport either by removing the people or the airport.

"Airports must be located contiguous to large population centers if they are to serve their basic purpose of providing fast communications. Society needs to get the airport and the city to live together . . .

"I was disappointed in the lack of emphasis on introducing quieter aircraft. If the development of air transportation is to progress at the rates projected . . . we can maintain the status quo by averaging a 3-decibel lowering in noise level in each five-year period. Any further reduction in average noise level will be so much to the good.

"This is a challenge that the aeronautical industry must pick up. I firmly believe that quieter airplanes that now exist can be built, and that the conclusions one draws from reading Prof. Richards' article can be markedly altered by such an achievement."

That is the challenge. Can it be answered? The next five years will tell the story.

Our Asian Allies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 3, 1967

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Our Asian Allies," published in the Charlottesville, Va., Daily Progress of August 1, 1967.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR ASIAN ALLIES

President Johnson's two envoys now touring the Far East in the hope of obtaining larger allied troop commitments in Vietnam are meeting with far more cold shoulder than they are with success.

Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, who knows a thing or two about Vietnam, and Clark Clifford, one of the President's top advisers, are perhaps as good as any two the President might have picked for the task of getting needed additional manpower from closer to the scene, rather than pouring in more American troops. But the task assigned the two was indeed a prodigious one.

Philippine President Ferdinand E. Marcos, who of course is harried by a forthcoming election, came close to being rude to Gen. Taylor and Mr. Clifford. He cancelled a conference with the two, declaring that he had been to Vietnam not long ago and didn't need briefing from the Americans. What he meant, of course, was that he had no desire to expand his country's puny commitment with an election coming up.

In Thailand, Mr. Johnson's envoys were told by Foreign Minister Khoman that he saw no need for an allied summit conference this fall. In Australia, Prime Minister Holt said he wants the question of additional Australian troops for Vietnam left until the autumn summer conference.

We suspect that by now Washington is aware of the fact that it will be lucky to get a battalion out of its Far East allies for use in Vietnam, with the possible exception of South Korea of course. But this little country has contributed a substantial number of able fighting men already and it should not be considered unreasonable if they feel they have done enough.

The United States must be prepared to go it alone, or virtually alone. Not much help is in sight anywhere under present conditions. But what will the Philippines, Australia, Thailand and the others do if the day comes when the Communist claw menaces them? Why, they will scream for American men and arms to save them. Somehow, it makes one remember Kipling's Tommy Atkins, doesn't it?

Sixty-three Out of Sixty-four Witnesses Urge Continuation of Office of Economic Opportunity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 26, 1967

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Education and Labor has completed hearings on the Economic Opportunity Amendments for 1967 and the $64 question has been answered. Of the 64 public witnesses who addressed their remarks to the proposal that the Office of Economic Opportunity be eliminated, only one—only one, I repeat—called for OEO to be abolished.

On the 64 witnesses from outside the Federal Government, from all walks of life and from both political parties, only one spoke out against OEO as an independent agency to determine and serve the needs of the poor.

This solid support—63 to 1—should put to rest for good the suggestion that there is merit to breaking up OEO and placing its antipoverty programs under various other established agencies of Government. The idea did not make sense in the first place—and it did not make sense with the witnesses who appeared before the House Education and Labor Committee.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps the most significant aspect of the testimony before our committee was the testimony of Sargent Shriver himself. As Director of the OEO, Mr. Shriver told the committee that he has been able to fund only 14 percent of the funds requested by Detroit; only 6 percent of the funds requested by Hartford; only 12 percent of the funds requested by New York and only 40 percent of the funds requested by Atlanta.

Keep in mind, Mr. Speaker, these requests for funds are made by the local mayors and other local officials; not by someone here in Washington.

Mr. Shriver's testimony clearly shows how highly local communities regard the antipoverty program.

Outside Agitators in Civil Disturbances

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 3, 1967

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, a most succinct editorial concerning the recent rash of serious riots in northern cities, under the title "The North Meets the Outsider," was published in the Allendale County Citizen, Allendale, S.C., July 27, 1967.

Editor Tom O'Connor points out that many of the disturbances in the North are being fueled by outside agitators, as has been the case in the South for a number of years.

While many factors are involved in connection with these riots and no one cause can be applied to the various situations, it is nevertheless important to deal effectively with some of the causes as we see them. Presently before the Congress there is legislation generally known as the antiriot bill, which would make it a Federal offense for persons to cross State lines with the intent to instigate riots or other acts of civil disobedience.

While the bill will not serve as a panacea in this area, it is a step in the right direction and should become an effective tool in the hands of our law-enforcement agencies, who are having to maintain law and order in their respective areas of jurisdiction, as well as protect the rights of all our citizens.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE NORTH MEETS THE OUTSIDER

It is a little odd that complaints are coming from riot-torn northern cities to the effect that their troubles are being caused by outsiders. Complaints earlier from Southern communities, that outside agitators were stirring up minority groups and that all would be well if the mob makers stayed away, were ignored in the north or scorned as ridiculous.

Yet it is true, both in the north and the south, that the minority does not rise up spontaneously, to parade, to demonstrate, and eventually to riot, without the aid of professional agitators. These have come sometimes from militant minority organizations, and sometimes they have come from fronts composed largely of subversive elements dedicated to the downfall of our form of government.

Under that form of government the agitators and subversives are free to conduct their affairs as they see fit, so long as they refrain from overt acts which can be called attempts to overthrow the government. Under any other form, the agitators would be thrown into jail, or brought before firing squads, the moment they began their peculiar pressures.

Minorities, particularly Negroes, everywhere note changes in their conditions. The thoughtful ones among them recognize that these changes have not been brought about by mobs, but have been brought about by the desire of their fellow citizens to be fair, the gradual processes of education by which men learn of the better sides of their own natures, and the real effort being made by many Negroes to merit respect and even liking.

We do not know if this would have happened without the agitators and the rioters. We incline to the belief that it would have come about eventually, for man does not long keep the truth under cover.

It is also observable that no change wrought by force or imposed by law has actually contributed much of anything to the status of the Negro in America. In many instances his own contemptuous acceptance of these lawful "rights" has militated against their full and free acceptance by others. We refer to accounts of the conduct of students in integrated schools. These students rely too much on "rights" and so learn nothing of "merits."

In a society such as ours there are really no "rights" to which any man is freely entitled. Those so-called rights are privileges of citizenship, a state which calls also for responsibility.

Agitators, outsiders or no, contribute little to understanding of these basic truths. In fact their role is to hide the truth, replacing it with expedient symbols and slogans.

We sympathize with our northern brethren in their time of trial, but we find the methods by which they meet that trial unworthy of solid government and sound sense.

Weary of Being Pushed Around

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 31, 1967

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I call to the attention of my colleagues and the readers of the Record an editorial from the Knoxville, Tenn., Journal of Monday, July 31, 1967, which praises my good friend and colleague from the Second District of Tennessee, John Duncan, for his position on the proposed treaty with Panama in regard to the Canal Zone.

I commend Congressman Duncan for his courage in speaking out so forthrightly on this treaty, and I agree with him—we here in the House should have a voice in the decision as to whether or not the treaty should be accepted by the United States.

The gentleman from Tennessee, who is doing such an outstanding job, has given deep consideration and thought to the implications of this treaty, and I also concur in his view that approval of this treaty is not in the best interest of our country.

I am hopeful that the rest of my colleagues will heed Congressman Duncan's remarks, and join us in preventing favorable action on this treaty.

Mr. Speaker, I include the complete editorial at this point in the Record:

WEARY OF BEING PUSHED AROUND

Last week, in a speech on the floor of the House, Rep. John J. Duncan, of this district, advanced what appears to be a sound viewpoint with reference to the publicized plan of the Johnson Administration to give away the ownership of the Panama Canal. As the reader knows, the news has leaked out that negotiators named by the President and by the chronically unstable Panama government have drawn up new treaties that together provide for taking the latter government into full partnership in the ownership and in addition to substantially increase the "rental" paid to it annually. Moreover, it is understood that this matter of joint ownership would apply in the future should the US find it desirable to build another similar canal.

Representative Duncan, while noting that under the Constitution it is the prerogative of the US Senate to ratify or reject all treaties, called the attention of his colleagues to the fact that in the case of this particular act of appeasement to benefit World Communism (the characterization is ours) the House of Representatives has a constitutional part in final approval of the proposed treaties.

What gives the House both a right and an obligation to also pass on the treaty, Representative Duncan asserted, is the Constitutional requirement that the Congress—not simply the Senate—shall act on the disposal of any property that belongs to the nation. Since US taxpayers have an investment so far in the Panama Canal in excess of half a billion dollars, his view is that in order for the President to give the canal away he must have not only the approval of the Senate but the House as well.

We quote from Rep. Duncan's speech:

"I am sure that all members of Congress and all Americans have been deeply concerned by the announcement from the White House that President Johnson and President Marco A. Robles of Panama have reached an agreement . . . and that the agreement is to be signed and then presented for ratification.

"The agreement relinquishes control of the operation of the Canal to an independent body outside our own country and immediately upon its going into effect all the assets of the US, both real and personal property, become the sole property of that independent body to do with as they so desire including transfer and sale.

"Properties owned outright by the US Government in that area are valued at from $500,000,000 to $600,000,000. It is my understanding that the US has some $40,000,000 in currency in this property to be transferred. The agreement further provides that in 1999 all the property still owned by the operating company is to become the absolute and sole property of the Republic of Panama.

"I am well aware that the House of Representatives does not have a part in the ratification of treaties; however, this proposed agreement is more than just a treaty."

It seems likely that the kind of viewpoint expressed by our congressman in regard to the Johnson treaties has delayed their formal submission to the Senate.

The President and his men, in agreeing to the new treaties in this present form, underestimated the ability of the American people to recall that the documents are the end result of a Communist-inspired insurrection in Panama, centering around the Canal Zone. While basing his contention that both houses of Congress are required by the Constitution to pass upon the disposal of government property—this is at the heart of the treaties—Mr. Duncan is primarily bespeaking the resentment of the American people in having their government constantly pushed around by both Big Reds, such as Russia, and Little Reds, such as from time to time control the so-called governments of Panama.

People-to-People Music Groups Visit Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARVIN L. ESCH

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1967

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of the Members of the House some very significant and interesting events which will take place here in our Nation's Capital next week.

On Wednesday, August 9, Members of Congress and Capitol Hill area workers will be treated to a series of concerts given by some 250 young musicians, all of whom are good will ambassadors representing the people-to-people program. The purpose of their visit is to honor Government officials for the outstanding support they have given to this volunteer effort for international understanding founded by President Eisenhower in 1956.

The first group to perform will consist of 50 boys and girls who hail from Michigan, Ohio, and nearby States including the Providence of Ontario and who constitute the 1967 Musical Youth International band and choir. These outstanding youngsters have been giving concerts for the last 5 weeks in England, Wales, Hungary, Austria, and Germany and will arrive here Wednesday from several performances at Expo '67. In their journeys they have become veteran performers having appeared on radio and television including a broadcast over Radio Free Europe. More importantly, however, they have been promoting international understanding and friendships for which our Nation is greatly indebted.

The Musical Youth International will perform from 10 to 11 a.m. on the Senate steps.

The second group, the Cloverettes Bagpipe Band, will perform at 11 a.m. on the House steps. These 40 youngsters are from mideastern Michigan and received their training from Canadians. They have appeared in several Michigan parades and will also journey to Washington from an appearance in Montreal. En route they will entertain cadets at West Point.

Musical Youth International and the Cloverettes will join together in welcoming to this country some 75 singers from Heidelberg, Weislock, Mannheim, and Stuttgart, Germany, who will begin a 21-day U.S. concert tour here on the House steps at 11:30 a.m. With the German choir will be the mayor of Weislock and Professor Jaeckel of the University of Heidelberg, as well as two organists, a cellist, an alto soloist, and a 19-year-old pianist who won second place in the national German competitions. Included on the tour are stops in U.S. cities which are sister cities to some of the participants' hometowns.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to urge all Members of the House and their staffs to make a special effort to attend these concerts. Not only will it be an opportunity to enjoy some fine music but also it gives us a chance to pay tribute to these outstanding groups who have dedicated many hours to a highly worthy goal. People-to-people is one of the few international programs in which we participate that is uniformly welcomed throughout the world. Making each citizen an ambassador of good will seems to accomplish more than can be done through professional efforts alone, and as the world grows larger in population and more complex, we should rely more and more upon individual citizen effort.

We may never have enough individuals working to promote the objectives of international friendship and understanding, but those who do are certainly making major contributions and deserve the highest commendation for their efforts.

And so, Mr. Speaker, let us all demonstrate our moral support for these people and their objectives. I hope to see many of you out on the Capitol steps next Wednesday morning.

Resolutions of United World Federalists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1967

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the 21st General Assembly of the United World Federalists, held earlier this summer in Los Angeles, adopted several resolutions which I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues. These resolutions, reprinted under the title "Focus '67," are prefaced by remarks that are quite critical of U.S. foreign policy. But whether we agree with them or not, the proposals contained in the three resolutions are worthy of our scrutiny.

The full text of "Focus '67" follows:

RESOLUTIONS OF UNITED WORLD FEDERALISTS

United World Federalists intends to focus its program on the first practical step that can be taken *now* to make the United Nations capable of insuring world peace with justice under enforceable world law. The first practical step is the development of a United States foreign policy dedicated to that purpose. We are convinced that because the United States government does not now have such a policy, it does not have a foreign policy which can succeed.

The United States is the most powerful nation in the world today. It is committed to using its power to preserve world peace and to promote freedom and prosperity for all men. But it is not, in fact, doing so.

Far from succeeding in advancing its stated objectives, it finds itself in a constantly worsening position. U.S. strength is leading to fear of U.S. armed forces; U.S. wealth is being equated with economic domination; confidence in U.S. ideals is giving way to mistrust of U.S. motives.

We decry the failure of our government to face the fact that goals of United States foreign policy cannot be obtained by power politics, that world peace cannot be established by the sovereign use of national power.

Although the United States is the most powerful nation in the world, it is not powerful enough to make its purposes prevail, because in the nuclear age neither the U.S. nor any other country dares to push national power to an ultimate military decision. Power politics among nation-states as a way of managing international affairs is obsolete. Any government policy which relies on that system is bankrupt. We are appalled that our government has locked itself into a bankrupt system. We are outraged that our government has failed to take the lead in developing any alternate system.

The United States is betraying its own citizens when it does not make clear to them that the best hope of achieving peace is through a radical change in the structure of the United Nations. The system of power politics has proved tragically unworkable. We must adopt a system of world law and order for our own survival. Our government has an obligation to determine what changes in the U.N. Charter will be necessary to achieve that end.

The most powerful nation in the world owes a clear duty to its own citizens and to all mankind to lead in the effort to establish a world authority for the control of national power. If it does not do so, its declaration of faith in world law and in international peacekeeping institutions will no longer be believed by the rest of the world or by its own citizens.

U.N. CHARTER REVISION

The United Nations in its present form is no effective alternative to the world anarchy which currently exists. As now constituted, the U.N. can function only as it is permitted to function by the power politics of its members.

U.N. Charter revision, is therefore, our primary objective. We are convinced that fundamental changes which are necessary in the Charter cannot be made unless member nations first investigate and study them in depth. This study must take place both in the U.S. and within the U.N.—if we are to have meaningful public debate on Charter reform. It is an astounding commentary on the position of our own government that out of all its millions of employees it does not have one single high official presently giving his full attention to these changes.

We, therefore, urge both the President and Congress to take immediate steps to initiate this necessary study. Specifically we request that:

1) The President immediately appoint a United Nations Charter Review Commission to begin the study, to canvass individuals and organizations for their views on what changes in the U.N. are needed, and to publish its recommendations.

2) That the President submit these studies and reports to the Congress for action.

3) That the President urge other members of the U.N. to establish national commissions in their own countries for the same purpose of study and review.

4) That the President direct the U.S. representative to the U.N. to urge the United Nations itself to initiate a study of Charter Revision so that a conference looking to the ultimate adoption of essential amendments can be convened before disaster strikes.

VIETNAM

The American struggle in Vietnam is nightmarish proof that the unilateral use of American power cannot make our stated principles prevail, and that the ends and means are mutually exclusive. Every increase in power commitment by the United States creates opposition greater than the force which originally opposed it. The failure to internationalize the Vietnam problem before

Americans were directly committed is fundamental to the dilemma which now confronts us.

A military-industrial complex and negative approach to the challenge of militant communism seems to dominate American foreign policy. So long as it relies primarily on American military power, there can be no solution in Vietnam, or the Middle East, or any area where ideas and interests clash, and power vacuums exist. The more American power is committed in Vietnam, the more the rest of the world reacts against us. There is much evidence that many former friends are now convinced that the true aim of the United States policy is a vast American empire, with a "pax Americana" prevailing everywhere.

It is, therefore, essential to the goals of the UWF that the conflict in Vietnam be resolved. We urge the United States to end its direct military involvement through a negotiated settlement. A ceasefire must come first, and American initiative, at this point, is essential to obtain it. A concerted and obvious military de-escalation by the United States might set the stage for corresponding deescalation by the other side, and we urge that it be done now. In particular, UWF supports the proposals of U.N. Secretary General U Thant for cessation of bombing and for direct negotiations among all parties involved in the war, including the National Liberation Front.

United World Federalists believe that only world law can effectively replace national power, American or any other. We believe that a strengthened United Nations could be the institution needed, if its Charter were amended and its membership universal. Short of that, however, Federalists believe that some international body will have to structure the peace for Vietnam. The U.S. must state its willingness to abide by the decisions of such a body.

MIDDLE EAST CRISIS

The war between Israel and the Arab states has been a source of distress and concern to all Federalists. One fact has been overwhelmingly illustrated: that U.N. peacekeeping as implemented in the Middle East is and will continue to be a failure unless it is followed by the peaceful settlement of disputes underlying the conflict. Methods up to and including compulsory arbitration through the United Nations ought to be employed in order that all parties squarely face and attempt to resolve such questions as refugees, shipping routes, borders, and water supplies. The alternative is war.

UFW expresses its relief that the nuclear powers did not intervene in the conflict. However, their responsibility does not end there. The prime need is for the establishment of adequate security provisions for all parties concerned. Such provisions must be created by serious negotiations between the nations directly involved, as well as by members of the Security Council. The fact that complete lack of enforceable world law has twice forced Israel and the Arab states to resort to military power should persuade the nations to move immediately to United Nations reform. Only thus can they end the peril of nuclear war to which such crises can lead.

Deescalation in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 25, 1967

Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, newspaper editors, and columnists around the country have responded favorably to the proposal, made on July 10 by seven of my colleagues and myself, for an attempt at staged deescalation of the war in Vietnam. Many writers have emphasized, as we did in advancing this idea, that our suggestion offers an opportunity to review our Vietnam policies comprehensively at an especially important and possibly pivotal point in this difficult and costly conflict.

I am especially pleased that several distinguished papers serving Maryland have commended this statement. I would like to call the attention of the Congress to the following editorials, from the Baltimore Sun of July 21, the Central Maryland News of July 13, the Frederick Post of July 19, and the Hanover, Pa., Evening Sun of July 12:

[From the Baltimore (Md.) Sun, July 21, 21, 1967]

Rusk on Bombing

Secretary Rusk ignores one of the main points in the argument being made by a group of House Republicans, along with many other Americans, for a scaling-down of our bombing operations in North Vietnam. The point is that a move of this nature by the United States would be an affirmative effort to search for some solution, some way out of the present, increasingly unsatisfactory state of affairs. In brushing aside the proposal, Mr. Rusk reiterates the Johnson Administration's position, which is that North Vietnam has given no indication that it would take measures to scale down its own operations against South Vietnam, as a response to any such move we made, and that therefore another such effort on our part would be useless.

Certainly Mr. Rusk has strong evidence on his side to support his point that there is no sign that North Vietnam would respond as we would like. But that is not the whole story. The United States should be trying continuously to lower the level of the warfare, while maintaining our position in support of South Vietnam, rather than escalating it all along the line. Some authorities, as we have often noted, think the war may end eventually by flickering down and dying, rather than by formal negotiations or a North Vietnamese surrender. Our policy should be to keep open all avenues to a solution.

There is serious differences of opinion now as to whether the military benefits of the bombing operations, as they have been conducted during the past two years or more, justify their expense in lives and equipment. This applies, in particular, to the selection of targets. One can justify the bombing of supply routes to South Vietnam and of staging points near the demilitarized zone while questioning the net value of attacks in the outskirts of Hanoi and Haiphong, and farther north.

The Republican congressmen suggest that their proposal "may have a chance to succeed" in inducing peace negotiations because, among other things, it involves a minimum military risk to the United States and South Vietnam, it does not require North Vietnam to take the first step or to act simultaneously, it offers a means by which steps toward de-escalation can be taken slowly and verified, and it does not deal in threats or ultimatums.

The proposal is simply that, as a first step, the United States would halt bombing north of the Twenty-first Parallel (an area which would include Hanoi but not Haiphong) for 60 days. An affirmative response by North Vietnam could lead to other steps which would gradually bring the bombing closer to the border. As we noted, this offers, at the least, a possible way out of the present situation. It seems to deserve more attention than Mr. Rusk gave it during his press conference Wednesday.

[From the Central Maryland News, July 13, 1967]

On the Right Track

Rep. Charles Mathias of Maryland's Sixth District has joined with seven other GOP congressional colleagues in proposing a plan to de-escalate and subsequently end the Viet Nam War, preserving a free South Viet Nam. They propose a step by step ending of bombing in the North accompanied by step by step cessation of aggression in the South. We applaud the congressmen for putting forth their proposal.

Chances of overcoming the Oriental hordes face to face in the jungle are long range, if possible at all. So rather than fighting man to man on their terms, the U.S. should seek an alternative solution.

Someone somewhere in the United States must be capable of coming up with an acceptable solution for ending this difficult war. Whether the Mathias answer is the best one, we do not know. But we have hopes that someone can mastermind a workable plan that will terminate the foolish and tragic loss of American lives and American resources which are going down the drain in a seemingly needlessly prolonged conflict.

The Mathias proposal may at least start the ball rolling toward this type of eventual cessation of the war.

[From the Frederick (Md.) Post, July 17, 1967]

Escalate or Deescalte?

"We are winning the war—but . . ." was the message given to Robert McNamara by field commanders during the ninth visit by the secretary of defense to Vietnam.

The "but" translates into a call for still more troops—perhaps 100,000—to be added to the 466,000 there at present.

This number, we are told, is the minimum needed to complete the job begun by a relative handful of American advisors only a few short years ago.

Yet behind the now somewhat guarded and muted predictions of eventual victory for the cause of democracy lies the sobering belief of the generals that this many troops will be required solely to keep us on top of the Viet Cong and North Vietnamese during the coming months.

For the fact is that escalation has been met by escalation since the beginning. Communist troop strength is higher than it has ever been, despite the bombing of North Vietnam and ever-increasing battle losses.

McNamara described more than the immediate situation when he said at Da Nang:

"Our casualties are high but we have also inflicted high casualties on North Vietnamese army units."

What he described was the situation as it was in 1965 and 1966 and as it is likely to be in 1968. Only the numbers have been changed for the higher.

It is often forgotten that escalation is not the prerogative only of this country. Options open to the Communists include a step-up of terrorist bombings in Saigon and other South Vietnamese cities; the infiltration in even greater numbers of the large North Vietnamese standing army; the use of Communist "volunteers" from other countries; the opening of diversionary action in Korea.

This was emphasized by eight Republican congressmen the other day as they introduced a scheme for a de-escalation of the war that would steer a middle course between "those who would bomb more and those who would bomb less."

Representatives Morse of Massachusetts, Dellenback of Oregon, Esch of Michigan, Horton of New York, Mathias of Maryland, and Stafford of Vermont propose a halt to all bombing in North Vietnam north of the 21st parallel for 60 days. This would exempt the city of Hanoi but not the port of Haiphong.

If the North Vietnamese responded with a similar de-escalatory step, such as dismantling major supply depots along the Ho Chi Minh Trail, the United States would then end all bombing north of the 20th parallel for a like 60-day period—and so on down in five steps until the 17th parallel dividing North and South Vietnam was reached.

The staged de-escalation plan would produce a growing atmosphere of mutual confidence, think the congressmen. Its virtue is that most military targets are in southern North Vietnam.

Thus, should the North Vietnamese fail to respond to the first bombing limitation, bombing could be resumed north of the 21st parallel without having caused the military effort in South Vietnam any disadvantage.

Would such a plan work? The congressmen honestly didn't know. Their proposal is put forth not as a panacea for Vietnam but in the belief that the best chance for peace lies in small steps, taken quietly, that make the position of each side credible to the other.

That we are willing to invest another 100,000 men in Vietnam is probably quite credible—and acceptable—to Hanoi. That we are ready to de-escalate by small steps, however, is something that does not seem to have been made as credible to them as it might be.

[From the Hanover (Pa.) Evening Sun, July 12, 1967]

SOMETHING BETTER THAN NOTHING

None of the eight Republican congressmen backing a plan to cool down violence in Vietnam by degrees has anything to do with party leadership.

This gives them the option to speak freely. It gives other Republicans the option to kick the stuffing out of their proposal.

It also gives the general public a chance—and this could be important—to assess their proposal with a minimum of partisan prejudice.

It is a plan to let the undeclared enemy in Vietnam respond to an invitation to de-escalate the war by following the example of the United States. This side would quite bombing targets in North Vietnam for 60 days. If North Vietnam then showed signs of easing up its military efforts, a series of similar withdrawal moves would be undertaken, until military violence had ended.

Both sides could save face. Both sides would be relieved of an open-ended commitment to beat the other side into surrender.

The ultimate outcome would be like the outcome in Korea, where the United States maintains a massive garrison on a standby basis, though there has been no overt military violence since Dwight D. Eisenhower carried out his 1952 presidential campaign promise to stop the fighting.

It is significant in 1967 that the Johnson administration is where the Truman administration was in 1952. The Truman administration knew the public was growing intolerant of a war that fighting men could not understand. It knew something needed to be done but did not know how to go about it.

The eight Republican congressmen have proposed a plan to end the most recent U.S. adventure into Asiatic power politics. It is something better than nothing which is all that has been forthcoming from the Johnson administration.

The Johnson administration can think of nothing better than to promise to negotiate if the enemy makes the first move.

Rural Tennessee Banker Turns Questionnaire on Investment Bankers Association, Explains His Reasons for Support of FHA Programs

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 2, 1967

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, General Sessions Judge Floyd E. Freytag, a distinguished jurist and publisher of Wartburg and Morgan County, Tenn., has provided me with a response prepared by Mr. Riley Thomas, president of the Sunbright Bank & Trust Co., Sunbright, Tenn., to a questionnaire from the Investment Bankers Association which is most interesting and most indicative of the assistance which Farmers Home Administration is providing our rural areas.

The Investment Bankers Association had sent the questionnaire to Mr. Thomas in connection with the association's opposition to S. 1504, a bill to increase the authorization for loans by FHA to assist in construction of water and sewer projects in rural areas.

However, rather than accepting the position of the Investment Bankers Association, Mr. Thomas prepared a response that was highly commendatory of the programs of the Farmers Home Administration in this regard.

I am sure that the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, which is considering the increase of the authorization of these water and sewer loans, will be interested in giving consideration to Mr. Thomas' response.

Judge Freytag in his letter enclosing the questionnaire and response made this observation:

> I do not know what rural areas such as ours would do without these people (the Farmers Home Administration)—they have been invaluable to us and could do a great deal more if they had more funds to work with.

I am sure the committee will also want to appropriately consider the views and recommendation of this judge and community leader in this connection.

Because of the interest of my colleagues and of the American people generally in this matter of rural development, I insert the questionnaire, sent to Mr. Thomas by Investment Bankers Association, together with his replies and comment, to be reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The questionnaire and replies follow:

QUESTIONNAIRE

To all municipal departments, Investment Bankers Association.

Re S. 1504, a bill to amend the Farmers Home Administration program of financial assistance to communities under 5,500 to finance rural sewer, water, and recreation projects.

The Farmers Home Administration of the Department of Agriculture administers a program of financial assistance of insured loans, direct loans and grants to communities of under 5,500 to finance rural sewer and water projects, and recreation facilities. Our Special Committee of the IBA for over one year has been endeavoring to have the FHA modify some of their regulations which would allow investment bankers to compete for many of these projects. To this date we have had minimal success; however, our problems appear to be mounting as there is pending before Congress (S. 1504) legislation which would greatly increase the authorization of funds for these programs and would reduse the interest rate on the loans to 3¼%. Accordingly, so that we may best represent the members of the Association, we would appreciate your taking the time to answer the questions listed below and to provide us with any other information which you feel would be of interest and assistance to the Committee for this purpose.

1. To what extent have you lost projects which could have been financed at reasonable rates and terms in the private market? Please give us a list of those projects and a brief resume of background material where possible of each project.

If the FHA has not been active in your area please return this questionnaire, stating not a problem in your area at this time.

No projects lost to FHA. We have referred many projects and individual cases to Farmers Home Administration all of which have been helpful to us.

2. Have there been any active controversies involving FHA in your area? For example, have they underwritten bonds illegally or contrary to local custom, objected to engineering standards, or reduced sizing of pipe and other improvements below recommended or desired standards for public health and fire protection?

None. Our relationships with Farmers Home Administration and its local personnel have been excellent in every respect.

3. Do you know of any cases of firms that are not members of the Investment Bankers Association who have had a conflict with or lost business to the Farmers Home Administration? Be specific as possible or have them provide you with material to send in.

None. But we have gained in business by cooperating with the Farmers Home Administration.

4. Has FHA financed any swimming pools, golf courses, country clubs, etc. in your area? If so, please provide a brief review of the facts.

None. But one is needed and we would recommend that it be financed by a long term Farmers Home Administration loan.

5. Are you aware of instances wherein FHA Field Representatives have actively solicited business, or led a community into a government loan without sufficient investigation of the community's ability to obtain private financing? i.e. have approached officials, attended town meetings, council meetings, etc. to push the government loan and grant programs. If answer is yes, explain.

No. FHA personnel have worked closely with us and local organizations in the pursuit of our community's economic development program.

6. What is your IBA membership classification? What percentage of your underwritings are devoted to municipal bonds?

Commercial Bank.

7. Any general comments and material which you feel may be of assistance to this Committee in preparing to testify before Congress.

(1) We feel that of *all* the Government agencies and programs with which we have worked that the Farmers Home Administration is by far the most important, most necessary, and most cooperative in developing a sound local and community wide lending

program for rural people and low income people.

(2) We feel so strongly in favor of this program that we would like to see it developed into one of the most permanent of all Government agencies.

(3) The value of FHA is represented by its many services to hundreds of families in our area. FHA gives them what they need without being in competition with Banks or other lending agencies.

(4) Our local FHA personnel have been most cooperative and helpful to this Bank in working out the many rural problems that confront us daily. We work very closely together and keep in touch with one another.

Return this reply immediately as hearings are to be held on July 12th. If additional space is required to answer fully certain questions, use the back of this questionnaire or add additional sheets. Send to: Mr. Robert Dentz, Municipal Department, Investment Bankers Association of America, 425 Thirteenth St., N.W., Washington, D. C. 20004.

JAMES W. HEWARD,
Chairman, Special FHA Committee.
(Butcher & Sherrerd, Philadelphia.)

Oklahoma Farmers Union Speech Contest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. TOM STEED

OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 3, 1967

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, for many years the Oklahoma Farmers Union has sponsored annual statewide speech contests, with the winners receiving a trip to our Nation's Capital. This project promotes good citizenship by focusing attention of young people on governmental affairs, and it is always a rewarding experience for the Oklahoma congressional delegation to meet with these groups and hear some of the outstanding speakers.

Among those who came to Washington this month were Ronnie Schaefer, of Marshall, and Bill Stasyszen, of Tecumseh, Okla.

I am happy to enter the text of their remarks herewith:

FFA MAKES THE DIFFERENCE

(By Ronnie Schaefer, Marshall, Okla.)

What's the difference? What's the difference? Does it really matter one way or the other? After all, there are lots of other groups a boy can belong to. Is my community really any different than it would be without an FFA organization? These are a few questions that need to be explored and evaluated. Let me present some evidence. You be the judge.

Let us suppose that John, a typical boy, grew up in an average community. His background, his upbringing might be called average—neither a tremendous asset nor a definite hindrance. He was not a *bad* boy. But he was a *boy,* full of the usual energy and desire to "be somebody." John wasn't really good in school, and that probably accounted for the fact that he took less interest in it as years rolled by. Certainly school was no place for him to excel or gain the recognition which he craved. More and more hours were spent dragging Main, just goofing off. Maybe it was a combination of too much time on his hands, too little responsibility in things he could see purpose in and too little chance to be somebody—to excel in just one thing, at least. But the result is repeated far too often in America—John gets into mild "scrapes" at first, which sometimes lead to more serious difficulties later on.

Multiply John's story many times in a community. Is it any wonder that responsible citizens are concerned with what is happening to American life?

But, you say, what has this to do with the Future Farmers of America organization? Don't tell me FFA is a cure-all. Probably it is not.

Certainly no one thing can work for all communities. But let's see what might happen to John in my community.

John is still in a typical community. His homelife has not improved. But John is enrolled in agriculture and belongs to the local FFA. No, it's not required. But most of the boys do belong, and it sounds like a relief to have a class that isn't all book learning. Before long John has a beef calf as a project. It's really his (and the banker's)—even the responsibility of feeding and caring for it—a responsibility which can't be taken lightly. And preparing a calf for show takes time—time which might have been lost in "dragging Main". But it's worth all the time he put in it when John experienced the fellowship and sense of helpfulness which he felt with the other boys on the show circuit. And besides, here was a chance for John to prove he could excell at something—something not based on book learning, but on his ability to work and persevere. Call it his chance to show off—to be somebody, if you like. I only know that it's important to a boy—a necessary part of growing up.

What's the difference? FFA can be that difference. It may teach a boy to become a good sport who takes winning, or losing, in his stride rather than being a baby in the face of competition. It may teach him to be appreciative of help given to him by his community or an organization like Farmers' Union who want to encourage the right responses from young people rather than simply criticizing us for the mistakes we sometimes make. In my own community, by the way, the local Farmers' Union gives a special award to an outstanding livestock exhibit each year at our local show. This type of thing has meaning for us, and we deeply appreciate such opportunities to develop our leadership abilities.

Yes, and as FFA is doing all these things, one important by-product (if you can call it that) can be seen: the development of useful, responsible young men. Is this not the ultimate for which any organization should be striving? If we do not develop better citizens, does it really matter about farming practices, shop equipment, and the like? FFA gives us the chance to become the finest, the most dependable, young people we are capable of becoming.

That's the difference!

HOW MY ORGANIZATION PROMOTES GOOD COMMUNITY LIVING THROUGH THE EDUCATION OF YOUTH

(By Bill Stasyszen, Tecumseh, Okla.)

South Side Rocked by Shooting, Youth 15, Policeman are wounded; About 40 youths arrested.

Police arrest four area youths in connection with burglary—

Youths stage school riot—

School has high score in cheating—

In this era when you can't pick up a newspaper without reading of an incident of teenage violence, it is reassuring to note that organizations such as the 4–H Club and the Farmers Union are still actively building self-reliant, responsible, conscientious young adults, who are an asset to their community. These two organizations run almost parallel in their overall goal in providing a program which is an educational supplement to the home, church and school in contributing to the mental, physical, social and spiritual growth of our nation's youth.

Education is becoming more and more necessary at a time when mankind's fund of knowledge is growing and growing and growing. In the past 15 years alone man's body of knowledge has doubled. There is no slowdown in sight in any field you can name; electronics, religion, chemistry, mental health, aero-space and art. It includes computers and rockets, drugs and viruses, protons and neutrons. It covers the whole world of matter and the whole world of spirit.

America is a good place to learn. We who are building the American dream value knowledge. Thousands spend a great deal of time working to improve it. They know that in a democracy citizens must be well-informed if they are to carry out their responsibilities as free men and women. They need to understand their government and the complex and troublesome issues that beset society today. What is the meaning of Vietnam? What is nuclear fusion? Why is Communism false? What can keep our economy strong and prosperous? These and similar questions must be the concern of every American citizen today, and to attempt to answer them, he needs sound knowledge of many subjects.

There are over 45 million boys and girls of grade school and high school age in our nation seeking knowledge about the world in which they live. They know that such knowledge is necessary in building a happier and more productive life. The 4–H Club and the Farmers Union are helping to prepare these young people to be better citizens, community leaders and outstanding farmers. Their programs are designed to fit into the overall learning process aimed at giving these young people a better idea of the world in which they live, their duties and responsibilities as citizens of their community—the nation and of the world.

Scholarship programs and special achievement awards made possible through 4–H and the Farmers Union have given many deserving youths that little boost which is often times needed to make a higher education possible where otherwise it would not have been.

To all educational problems answers must be sought. If the American dream of justice and peace is to survive, if it is to grow ever more real and become the dream of men in other lands as well, then the citizens of America, who are the builders of this dream, must be well-educated. They must understand democracy thoroughly, and they must have the know-how to practice it.

From all aspects it seems that the Oklahoma 4-H program and the Oklahoma Farmers Union, who represent true democracy in action, will continue to build informed worthwhile citizens of our communities who will be capable of accepting the responsibility of leadership that Oklahoma will need to continue upward toward agricultural, industrial, and educational greatness.

Space Future Rests With Youthful Leadership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 27, 1967

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, back in 1960, our late President Kennedy gave this Nation, the Congress, and its leadership a challenge which started us on the path of world leadership in the field of space.

Somewhere, this challenge has been

lost, at least in the minds of some of our older citizens, according to a poll taken by a Louis Harris survey. Results of this poll were released in the Washington Post, and the August 2 edition of Space Daily carried a synopsis of the results Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the Space Daily synopsis:

SPACE FUTURE RESTS WITH YOUTHFUL LEADERSHIP—(AN ANALYSIS)

A Louis Harris Survey has been published in the Washington Post under the heading: "Space Programs Losing Support." At first reading the survey was a dismal venture into frustration for it did indeed indicate that our nation as a whole is losing interest in the space program. Most alarming was the survey's finding that a majority of the people would favor a discontinuance of the space program if the Soviet Union were not in competition, an increase of 10 percent in the last two years.

Further, the Harris poll found that 54 percent did not feel that it was worth while to spend "$4 billion" a year on space. Only 34 percent thought it was worth it. As for the Appolo program, only 43 percent favored the program and 46 percent opposed it.

AMBITIONS AND YOUTH ARE STRONGEST SPACE SUPPORTERS

There is a refreshing ray of hope and promise in the depressing poll by Harris. Under the classifications of age and financial worth of the respondents, it was found that youthful and successful minds present a strong majority in favor of the space program and Appolo. Harris found that 58 percent of those under 35 were in favor of our space efforts, with only 33 percent opposing our endeavors. Even up to the age of 50 years it was found that 52 percent favored our space competition. However, when the respondents were 50 or over only 26 percent support the space program, while 62 percent opposed it.

Harris also found that the more successful of the ambitious were behind the space program. We interpret successful, in this context, as being reflected in income. The majority of those with incomes over $10,000 (56 percent) were in favor of Appolo. From $5,000 to $10,000, only 45 percent stood behind Appolo. When the very low income responded (under $5,000) only 22 percent expressed approval of Appolo, with 64 percent against the effort.

There are indications, from what Rep. Gerald Ford has said in the past few days, that the Republican party will be contributing more and more opposition to the national space program spending in the months to follow as the Presidential election draws near and the Johnson Administration's spending programs come under attack. It also must not be overlooked that the recent "Fulton Amendment" attacks upon the NASA budget were identified as a GOP attack upon the space budget.

It will be sordid and depressing blemish on Republican history if it contributes to a diminishing of American quest for leadership in space exploration for political expediency. The responsible leadership of the GOP surely will not wish to go on record as the anti-space party. Rather, they should be proving that the party has a leadership with an imagination and far-sightedness as great as was Kennedy's when he put this nation on that competitive ocean with all the rewards of technology preeminence.

From the Harris poll two significant conclusions can be drawn: 1) Those who favor and support the national space program are young (in mind and/or body), ambitious, hard working, far-sighted, educated; 2) Those who oppose the space efforts are aging, tiring, lazy or uneducated or deprived and parochial. Or to put it another way: The youth and leadership of our nation are the space program's greatest supporters. And of course, it is these two qualities which are the greatest insurance that our space leadership enterprise will endure.

Therefore it would indeed be most unfortunate for the far-sighted Republicans of our nation to find in a future poll that devotion to the GOP is also to stand against the space program. Leaders are selected to direct the efforts of a nation such as ours because they are more gifted with the qualities that allow them to do what is best for all—to support those goals which they know are most beneficial and enduring to the common welfare, especially when it is beyond the less gifted to understand. The Democratic family as a whole, has demonstrated this leadership in the support of the space enterprise goal over the past seven years—true, national interest leadership by the Republican community must not give less.

While support of the youthful minds is one of the greatest assets any national goal could hope to acquire, a loss of its leadership can spell disaster for that goal. So it is that the greatest immediate threat to the National Space Program is not to be found so much in the atmosphere of the mass of antagonists in the Harris poll as in the eventuality of a change in national leadership to one that is anti-space or unresponsive to its need of priority.

Thurgood Marshall Unfit?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 3, 1967

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, so says the editor of the Southern Courier, a Negro paper published in Montgomery, Ala., courtesy of OEO funds from the southern regional council of Atlanta, Ga.

When a Southern Negro can analyze Thurgood Marshall's cronic illnesses—lying—then certainly no U.S. Senator can swallow his denial of knowing that Herbert Aptheker is a Communist.

If Marshall be ratified, he could cite the Communist Daily Worker in his judgments because he can always deny that he knew the Worker was Communist.

Mr. Speaker, I am inserting the editorial from the Southern Courier at this point in the RECORD:

[From Southern Courier, July 29–30, 1967]

IS MARSHALL QUALIFIED?

Thurgood Marshall's conduct before a U.S. Senate committee last week raised serious questions about his fitness to serve as a U.S. Supreme Court justice.

Marshall—the first Negro ever appointed to the high court—was questioned at length by Senator James O. Eastland of Mississippi and other members of the Senate Judiciary Committee. After the committee finishes examining Marshall, he is sure to be approved by the Senate.

Nonetheless, Marshall wasn't taking any chances last week. At one point, Eastland noted that Marshall, as a federal judge in New York once wrote an opinion citing a book by Herbert Aptheker, a Communist.

According to published reports, Eastland asked if Marshall knew when he wrote the opinion that Aptheker was a "leading Communist theoretician." The proper answer, it seems to us, would have been: "I thought the world had few enough good ideas, without quibbling about where they came from."

But instead, Marshall said he "positively did not know" who Aptheker was. And, he added, if he had known, he wouldn't have cited Aptheker's book.

One trouble with this answer is that it accepts Eastland's insidious reasoning—that if a judge knowingly cites an unpopular authority, he is a subversive or Communist or worse. By denying Eastland's accusation, Marshal made a much worse move—he agreed with the senator's theory.

But is it really possible that Marshall did not know about Herbert Aptheker? Aptheker is of one the best-known Communists in the U.S., and it is unbelievable that Marshall—or anyone else—could get to be a federal court of appeals judge without being aware of this. Besides, Aptheker was the subject of an important legal case that was in the courts while Marshall was a judge.

So either Marshall was one of the worst-informed judges in history, or he was lying last week in Washington. And a man who lies under oath is not fit to be a lawyer, let alone a Supreme Court justice.

Joe Parrott Is an Outstanding Leader

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON FUQUA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 3, 1967

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, I doubt that there is a Member of Congress who is not familiar with the effective contributions of the Jaycees in the field of philanthropic and governmental affairs, and I am particularly delighted to see my good friend, Joe Parrott, of Port St. Joe, Fla., elected to lead the State Jaycee organization in Florida. Although raised in a small community in northwest Florida, Mr. Parrott is a young man of broad vision and boundless enthusiasms. I predict that he will stand out among State Jaycee presidents serving throughout the Nation this year and go down in history as one of the Florida organization's great leaders of all time.

Mr. Parrott was recently recognized as an outstanding Floridian in very laudatory resolutions adopted by the State house and senate, and I would like to insert here in my remarks excerpts from pages 552 and 553 of the journal of the Florida Senate dated May 30, 1967, in which the senate commended this outstanding young man on his election as president of the Florida Jaycees.

SENATE RESOLUTION 1334

(By Senator Gibson)

A resolution recognizing Joe Parrott on his election as president of the Florida jaycees and expressing appreciation for outstanding service

Whereas, the Florida jaycees has traditionally been an outstanding organization of young men providing legislative and governmental programs for the betterment of Florida, and

Whereas, Joe Parrott of Port St. Joe, Florida, has through his indefatigable energies exemplified the jaycee motto of "young men of action", and

Whereas, Joe Parrott served the jaycees in exemplary fashion at the grass roots level as charter member and local president of the Port St. Joe jaycees, and

Whereas, the Florida jaycees have in the past two years been led to unparalled heights and achieved rare successes at a time when Joe Parrott served as state vice president and national director, and

Whereas, Joe Parrott's exceptional accomplishments and demonstration of the competency required of superior leaders, culminated in his recent election as state president of the Florida jaycees thereby reflecting credit upon himself and the state of Florida, now, therefore,

Be It Resolved by the Senate of the State of Florida:

Section 1. That the Senate of the State of Florida recognizes Joe Parrott as an Outstanding Floridian and commends hims for his vigorous, effective leadership culminating in his election as state president of the Florida jaycees and by this resolution manifests its appreciation for his generous, unselfish and exceptional contributions to legislative, governmental and other jaycee programs carried out at both the community and state levels.

Was read the first time by title. On motions by Senator Gibson, SR 1334 was read the second time in full and unanimously adopted.

Governor Lee Made Real Impact on Samoa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM STEED

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 3, 1967

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, one of our most distinguished career public servants, H. Rex Lee, has just concluded 6 years as Governor of Samoa. His outstanding work there in many fields, particularly in bringing educational television to the people of Samoa, has received well-justified national recognition.

Joe Carter, columnist for the Oklahoma Journal, Oklahoma City, Okla., paid tribute to Governor Lee in the following column, which appeared July 21:

PAGO PAGO'S PRIVATE SAVIOUR

(By Joe Carter)

The news dispatch was brief. There had been a luau in Pago Pago and Gov. H. Rex Lee had left American Samoa. Brawny Samoans had stood in the rain by the hundreds to see the silver PanAm jet carry him away. And, if I know Samoans, there were more tears than rain. Even in Pago Pago, which reaps 200 inches rainfall a year.

There was reason to weep. For Lee had done more for the island of Tutuila than any other single creature since the original creator. Lee had taken the American tradition of "doing unto others," mixed it with skilled know how and brewed a magnificent pot of U.S. policy for American Samoa.

The Samoans are the most huge of the Polynesian tribes. The women could fill an average door and the men are bigger. They wear lava-lavas and go barefoot in their South Pacific paradise. They also have an unwieldly native tongue and a determination to enter the 20th Century speaking the English language.

To show how the Samoan language is fouled, Pago Pago is pronounced pongo-pongo. From there, it gets worse.

Lee, like any other student of the Pacific, had seen these magnificent humans move into Hawaii or California and be crushed by the culture. They are good, intelligent people. But the change is too great unless education prepares them for the move.

This reporter saw the battered remains of one young Samoan father, blown to bits while illegally salvaging metal from a military firing range in Hawaii. He picked up a live shell and left a widow with two children. The Samoan was trying to scavenge a living in the modern world.

Lee recognized that he must educate the Samoans if they were to cope with the outside world without being blown to sociological bits. The decision was not his that they leave their paradise. He was determined that, if they did leave, they would be prepared.

But the 52 square miles of Tutuila are jungle covered mountains. So, up the side of one mountain went a tramway—an engineering feat by itself. Then Lee stacked a television antenna atop. He put TV sets in grass huts and beamed education to the village children. At night, after work, the adults watched English movies and learned the language. They got news.

Lee persuaded PanAm to furnish jet service to the island. Got the necessary runway and hotel accommodations installed so there could be a tourist trade. The economy needed the boost. Samoans are very poor.

The blond, somewhat short, native of Utah even took care of details like encouraging the locals to plant colorful flowers to break the tropical green monotony on the island. And, despite the hot and humidity, he lived without air conditioning. And he worked, worked, worked.

I once watched Lee bid farewell to his own child who was departing the Pacific to continue education on the mainland, U.S.A. It was the right thing to do, but I saw the pain in the face of the father when the youth departed. Then Lee became governor again and set about his tough lonely work.

Lee, a career man in the Department of Interior, knew how to unwind the red tape and get the materials and money to fight a war against ignorance, poverty and nature in the South Pacific. American Samoa had long been a trust territory of the U.S., but it took Lee to make Trust a reality.

And, so the news dispatch said, Lee left his adopted state. To the world, it was a minor story. But to the 20,000 or so gentle Samoans it was major.

One burly Samoan chieftain, who stood head and shoulders above my medium frame, once told me: "That Lee is our saviour." I don't remember that man's multi-syllable name, and he didn't mean "saviour" in a religious sense. But he was fervent in his belief in Lee, as were a lot of us news tramps of the Pacific.

Yes, the news dispatch was brief. It didn't even say where Lee was headed. But his impact will be felt when he arrives.

Pride, Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 3, 1967

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, The Department of Labor is guilty of a direct and deliberate affront to the House and Senate of the U.S. Congress in placing convicted felon Rufus Mayfield in a position of guidance and authority over 900 District of Columbia youth.

Secretary of Labor Wirtz should immediately rescind the Mayfield appointment and call to account the officials of his agency responsible for this deliberate insult to Members of Congress as well as to the decent youth of the District who will be placed in subservience to an admitted agitator who has continuously displayed reckless disrespect for law and human decency.

I have no objection whatsoever to the program of youth assistance outlined in the proposed plan today, except for a reservation about paying 14-year-old boys $56 a week, which will undoubtedly be more than their fathers earn in many instances. I object strenuously, however, and believe that Congress should also object, to this act of irresponsibility on the part of the Department of Labor. And it is my fervent hope that until such time as Rufus Mayfield is removed from his new position as "chairman of the board" of the Labor Department's new $300,000 "Pride, Inc.," that somebody will keep an eye on the cash register.

Very Dim and Very Dismal View of Central Arizona Project—Only Legislation Is Fully Justified

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 3, 1967

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, today's Los Angeles Times editorially comments succinctly on the grave defects in and errors of the isolationist approach toward the dire seven-State Colorado River water shortage embodied in legislation today before the other body, as follows:

PLAYING POLITICS WITH WATER

In legislative politics, the vote all to often has nothing to do with the virtues of a bill.

It will come as no surprise, therefore, if the U.S. Senate enacts an outrageous proposal masquerading as a regional water plan for the Southwest. Even the opponents of the bill concede that its sponsors have the votes for Senate passage.

The main—indeed, the sole—purpose of the measure is to authorize construction of the $768 million Central Arizona Project and to permit a massive diversion of water from the already depleted flow of the Colorado River. All other regional considerations have been subordinated to this one project.

Originally, the project was one element of an over-all regional water plan which recognized that future Southwest water needs could only be met through augmentation of the Colorado's meager supply. Such a plan was advanced by Interior Secretary Stewart Udall and received the support of all the states of the Colorado River Basin.

Pressure politics, however, have so eroded the plan that it now benefits only Arizona—and at the expense of the other basin states. Secretary Udall's far-sighted program, declared Sen. Thomas Kuchel (R-Calif.) has become "an instrument of myopic planning that forsakes a regional equitable solution for selfish expediency."

The present Senate bill has no provision for bringing new water into the Colorado from areas of surplus, no provision for financing any other basin projects except the CAP, and no realistic protection for existing uses of river water.

Even worse, California must not only give up water for the Arizona project but also subsidize it through 50% higher electric rates in Los Angeles, Pasadena, Glendale and Burbank, Kuchel warned. The decision to forego construction of

Hualapai Dam, he said, resulted in a "massive giveaway" to the three utilities that would build a substitute thermal power station.

Kuchel has the strong support of many other Colorado Basin members of Congress and of California's delegation and state administration. And fortunately, one of the strongest critics of the Senate bill is Rep. Wayne Aspinall (D-Colo.) chairman of the House Interior Committe, who announced that he will block the measure.

An effective regional plan can never be enacted unless Congress stops playing politics with water shortages.

Letter From Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 3, 1967

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to insert my remarks in the Appendix of the Record, I wish to include a letter from one of my constituents who is now serving in Vietnam.

All those who read this sincere letter of a young man who believes it is necessary to win the war in this area will be impressed by his honesty and forthrightness. Sp5c. James Yee is proud to be a defender of this great country. However, he is disturbed and frustrated when he thinks that there may be a real danger 20 years from now that his children, not yet born, may have to carry on in this confrontation on these same battlefields.

You will note that he asks for nothing except our all-out efforts to win the war in Vietnam. The letter follows:

Letter From Vietnam

Hon. James B. Utt,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: In belated reply to your letter of May 25, 1967, no, I am not in the hospital; I merely work here. Isolated as I am in the relative safety of our compound, the war is a sometime thing and only the shock of seeing an amputated limb leaning against a wall, put there by a nonchalant and hardened corpsman, reminds us of the carnage and agony that so typify this conflict. It is heartbreaking to see a young man, a high-school tackle of behemoth dimensions, reduced to being pushed about in a wheelchair because both legs have been amputated; or to see a beautiful 14 year old girl with her legs blown off at the knees by a mine.

Every soldier here in Viet Nam supports the alleged aspirations of this war because we have been led to believe that the purpose of this war is immediate victory, or if not immediate, at least victory.

But the more I see of this war, the more I begin to believe that this is a war of attrition. It is my belief, since I have no means at hand of refuting this belief, that President Johnson does not realize how fantatical the enemy really is.

As long as we continue our present strategy of enclave-type warfare, we will not pacify South Viet Nam for at least another two decades. Some may debate whether we are conducting "enclave" warfare, but what else can it be called when the United States has established elaborate military complexes throughout the country and sally forth from these modern castles to combat the Viet Cong and return again to rest and recuperate.

The compound here at Cu Chi is a little over a year old, but already signs of permanence are emerging. The buildings are getting bigger and are being constructed more competently for permanence. Wood and concrete and even aluminum has replaced canvas and hemp. Sidewalks are becoming quite common. And even a miniature golf course has been built. More time and effort is spent on improving the compound than in winning the war.

Part of the trouble lies in the war itself. Of course, everyone knows that this is not a real war. The main job of the Army and Marines is to patrol the countryside keeping the Viet Cong on the move and preventing them from massing. As long as the Viet Cong remain in their villages, they are undetectable and the increasing number of U.S. patrols has only served to drive the Viet Cong underground.

Once the Americans leave this country, the Viet Cong will emerge again. So, we are stuck here for as long as it takes for the Vietnamese people themselves to build a viable and secure government—and this will not take place in the immediate future. Ask any returning G.I. if he thinks the Vietnamese are capable of self-rule and he will snort contemptuously, unless he is more vocal and replies in invectives.

So, this war, when reduced to its elements, is a war of endurance. Can we outlast the Viet Cong in perseverance? Even when it means 20 to 30 years? Whether we can or not, the G.I. cannot. Right now the war is a new adventure. But if we are still here, killing and being killed, some ten years from now, disillusionment is sure to set in.

Needless to say, I am against the conduct of the war in its present format. Cambodia and Laos should be warned of the dangers of providing sanctuary for the Viet Cong and if this warning should fail to enlighten those two countries, the U.S. should extend the DMZ westward through Laos and Cambodia all the way to Thailand (and to hell with what the U.N. thinks. It is time to stop this slaughter!) thus denying the Viet Cong their sources of supply. If not this, President Johnson should lay all his cards on the table and tell the American people EXACTLY what to expect in terms of casualties, expenditures, etc.

This would be political suicide, of course, so I don't really expect LBJ to take this alternative. But it is a frustrating business to be over here and to see the U.S. proceeding so phlegmatically, so steadily, so ploddingly toward their goals. This is a leisurely-paced war and seems all the more unreal because of it. But the maimed and injured bring back the harsh realities.

It is a very real danger that twenty years from now my children may be over here fighting the same war we are now, and I don't even have any children yet. But what can we do? I am powerless to influence the planners of this war and can only do what we are told and hope I can survive.

Thank you for letting me sound off.

Respectfully yours,

Sp5c. James Yee.

Violence in Our Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 3, 1967

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, today I received a copy of a telegram sent last Friday by Mr. Frank E. Karelsen, of New York City, to the President's newly appointed Special Advisory Commission To Investigate Racial Disorders. Mr. Karelsen makes some pointed remarks on this and previous summers' outbreaks of violence in our cities. Our attitude and the riots themselves, he contends, cannot be separated from the national policy of violence and destruction in Vietnam.

I insert this provocative telegram in the Record at this point:

New York, N.Y.,
July 28, 1967.

Special Advisory Commission To Investigate Racial Disorders:

In analyzing the cause of racial conflicts throughout the Nation, emphasis has been rightly placed on the needs of the minorities in the fields of education, employment, and housing. This, indeed, is largely the cause of unrest and dissatisfaction. But it does not account for the sudden use of extreme violence to right these wrongs. Since our Government, through the mass media, emphasizes the successful counting of dead bodies (human beings) and the destruction of entire towns, including burning of homes, crops, and murder of Vietnamese women and children by bombing, it is, therefore, no wonder that persons taking part in these riots cannot see why they are not justified in pursuing similar methods to undo the grievances they believe have been fostered upon them. The daily reports from Vietnam minimize the moral evil of destruction and killing; thus, both whites and Negroes are incited to use violence. The brutalizing of our society by the Vietnam picture exacerbates lawlessness far beyond anything this Nation has ever known. Unfortunately, the enormous cost of the Vietnam war restricts to token sums the necessary expenditures to alleviate the fundamental causes for the unrest and discontent. Your panel can do a great service to the President and to the Nation by immediately exposing these facts in that they would stimulate efforts for peace even if considerable compromise with our adversaries is necessary to bring about the cessation of hostilities.

Respectfully submitted.

Frank E. Karelsen.

Poverty Warriors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 3, 1967

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, in its July 31 edition, Barron's National Business and Financial Weekly ran a front-page story, written by Washington Editor Shirley Scheibla, which should give the Members of this House a good idea of the part that the Office of Economic Opportunity has played in stirring up riots all across the Nation. I urge every Member of this House to read Barron's informative expose. The sooner we kick the poverty workers—perhaps we should call them the riot corps—off the Federal gravy train, the better off we will be.

Fortunately, the taxpayers of this country are making their views known—they are tired of seeing their tax dollars spent to bankroll black nationalism. Things have come to a sorry state of affairs in this country when law-abiding citizens have to worry about being killed by weapons paid for with their own tax dollars.

The story follows:

Poverty Warriors—The Riots Are Subsidized as Well as Organized

Marion Barry and Rufus Mayfield are angry young men. Former national head of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC), Mr. Barry in August, 1965, took part in a protest demonstration organized by the so-called Assembly of Unrepresented People. He was arrested and charged with disorderly conduct while leading demonstrators onto the Capitol grounds. "Riot power and rebellion power," he was quoted as saying last week, "might make people listen now." Mr. Mayfield is a Black Muslim. Twenty-one years old, he has spent most of the past eight years in prison for various offenses, including petty and grand larcency. This month Marion Barry acquired gainful employment. He was hired as a $50-per-day consultant by the United Planning Organization, top anti-poverty agency for the District of Columbia. Rufus Mayfield, according to Rep. Joel P. Broyhill (R., Va.), will serve as Barry's "back-up man."

While perhaps more arresting than most, these are not isolated instances. On the contrary, the files fairly bulge with equally radical cases in point. Thus, federal and state investigations of New York's Mobilization for Youth, pilot project for the Job Corps, disclosed that its staff included several members of the Communist Party. LeRoi Jones, who was taken into custody during the riots in Newark and charged with illegal possession of deadly weapons once ran a hate-the-whites Black Arts Theater which got $115,000 in federal funds from Haryou-ACT before police discovered an arsenal on the premises. The Southwest Alabama Farmers Cooperative Association of Selma, which the office of Economic Opportunity recently granted $700,000, numbers among its principals John Zippert and Shirley Mesher. Louisiana's Joint Legislative Committee on Un-American Activities recently documented Mr. Zippert's association with radical causes, including the Kremlin-financed World Youth Festival. According to the Alabama Legislative Commission to Preserve the Peace, Miss Mesher, a former coordinator for SNCC, is "a prime participant in the Black Panther movement designed to overthrow the government . . ."

Right after Watts (Barron's, August 23, 1965), we observed: "In the name of civil rights, a small band of ruthless men has not hesitated to stir up violence, break the law and undermine duly constituted authority. The so-called civil rights revolution . . . has begun to mean exactly what it says." Since then compelling evidence, including eye-witness testimony and the findings of a Cleveland grand jury, has shown that the riots are less spontaneous outbreaks than carefully planned subversion. To judge by the record, moreover, civil unrest is not only organized but also subsidized. Thanks to the Office of Economic Opportunity, the U.S. taxpayer now has a chance to finance his own destruction. The Great Society, so Newark, Detroit and scores of other smouldering cities suggest, cannot coexist with the American way of life.

Like the poor, slums and rats have always been with us. Only the devastating riots—and the professional agitators who prepare the tinder, await a spark and fan the flames—are significantly new. The 1964 outbursts in Harlem turned up William Epton, vice-chairman of the Red-Chinese-oriented Progressive Labor Party, who taught people how to make Molotov cocktails. Mr. Epton was convicted of criminal anarchy for his part in the riots. The Rev. Billy Graham called Watts a "dress rehearsal for revolution," a description in which radical spokesmen ever since have gloried. Last year's riots in Cleveland, charged Sen. Frank Lausche (Dem., O.) were the work of a "national conspiracy executed by experts." Shortly afterward a Cleveland grand jury, after hearing the testimony of detectives who penetrated the conspirators' ranks, found that "the outbreak of lawlessness and disorder was organized, precipitated and exploited by a relatively small group of trained and disciplined professionals." In a story on the Newark riots, the current issue of Life Magazine describes its reporters' "clandestine meeting with members of the sniper organization." Finally, SNCC's Stokely Carmichael, whose subversive interests range far and wide, openly boasts of what's afoot. After a quick trip to Prague, he landed last week in Havana. There he told newsmen: "In Newark we applied (guerrilla) war tactics . . . We are preparing groups of urban guerrillas . . . It is going to be a fight to the death."

So much for subversion, which the country will ignore at its own risk. As to federal subsidy of violence, an ominous pattern has emerged. From the beginning, as radicals recognized, the war on poverty, notably the Community Action Programs, had impressive trouble-making potentials. Somehow CAP has expanded much faster than OEO expenditures as a whole, surging from $246.5 million in fiscal '66 to an estimated $500 million in the current fiscal year. As noted above (much of the material comes from a forthcoming book, "Poverty Is Where the Money Is," to be published by Arlington House and written by Shirley Scheibla, Washington correspondent for Barron's), some of the money funded dubious ventures and put jailbirds and subversives on the federal payroll. Mrs. Scheibla cites other horrible examples: John Ross, member of the Progressive Labor Party, who served on an anti-poverty board in San Francisco; Howard Harawitz, member of a similar board in Berkeley and former member of the W.E.B. DuBois Clubs, which the FBI calls "Communist-spawned"; and a number of U.P.O. personnel in Washington, D.C., who turned out to be SNCC organizers and agitators.

Taxpayer-financed trouble has exploded in one part of the country after another. Last fall the mayor of Perth Amboy, N.J., accused the local anti-poverty leader of seeking "to foment and incite unrest, agitation and disorder," a charge which the city manager of Rochester echoed last week. Newark's police chief weeks ago warned that the city faced anarchy because of agitation by federal anti-poverty workers, several of whom were arrested during the riots. In New York City five marauding young Negroes, collared while looting stores on Fifth Avenue, worked for the anti-poverty program; one wore a sweater blazoned, after the OEO-funded agency, "Harlem Youth Opportunities Unlimited."

To fight riots with OEO grants, in short, is like fighting fire with gasoline. However, Sargent Shriver alone is not to blame. Some of the fault lies with local officials like New York's Mayor Lindsay (tapped last week to serve on the President's special advisory body), who repeatedly refused to condemn the appearance of his Human Rights Commissioner at the Black Power conference in Newark, as well as with Mayor Cavanagh of Detroit (first recipient of OEO aid and welfare state showcase), who tied the hands of the police for the first few strategic hours. On the federal level, the country should call to account the Office of Attorney-General and its three recent occupants: Robert Kennedy, who once wrote a letter to the head of an identified Communist front, seeking advice on a national service corps; Nicholas Katzenbach, who shrugged off all evidence of conspiracy; and the incumbent, Ramsey Clark, who testified against pending anti-riot legislation. The blame reaches right up to the official White House family, to Vice President Humphrey, who last summer said that if he lived in a rat-infested slum: "there is enough of a spark left in me to lead a pretty good revolt."

Law and order are the stuff of civilization; they are also the first duty of government. On the record, "liberals" of both parties, by tolerating subversion, have made a mockery of their oaths of office and forfeited the public's trust. Appeals to prayer are all well and good, but what this country needs is a political and philosophic call to arms.

Problem of Ratr

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 3, 1967

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, in view of the reluctance on the part of many of my colleagues in the House to consider the many problems created by the existence of rodents in our country, I feel compelled to share the following facts I have accumulated concerning rats, their characteristics and habitats.

There are two species of house rats now habituated to civilization in all parts of the world. The black rat is of light and slender build, about 7 inches in length, usually of a bluish black color, but sometimes grayish, and has quite large, thin ears. The brown rat, or Norway rat, is much heaver and larger with short rounded ears and a dull brown color. The black rat is the chief disseminator of bubonic plague.

Rats are aggressive, active, omnivorous, adaptable, and fecund—immensely successful as biological organisms. They have been known to destroy poultry, game, crops, and stored grain. Adults are fertile at all seasons and in warm places litters are produced at about 2-month intervals; in cooler places, at about 4-month intervals. Gestation is 20 to 25 days. The six to 22 helpless, naked young are born in a secluded site. They are weaned in a month and are ready to breed in 3 to 4 months. Rats have acutely developed senses, especially of touch and hearing, as befits essentially nocturnal animals. They climb with surpassing ease; this skill coupled with an ability to jump and a propensity to burrow and gnaw gains them entry to places inaccessible to many other small animals.

When driven by hunger, thirst, or foul weather, they are resourceful and unrelenting in their attempts to enter buildings, yet ratproof construction and adequate sanitation are the best methods of control. Rats may also be controlled by a coordinated and vigorously prosecuted program of trapping, poisoning, and fumigation. Because of their exceedingly destructive habits, rats are of enormous economic importance, causing millions of dollars in damage annually in the United States alone. They are also of importance in public health, having been implicated in harboring or in transmitting directly or indirectly more than 20 diseases, including typhus fever, plague, ratbite fever, hemorrhagic jaundice, tularema, rabies, trichinosis, and salmonellosis.

Probably the most well known of the diseases communicated by rats is the plague, or commonly referred to as the "Black Death" which in the 14th century caused the death of approximately three-fourths of the population of Europe.

Plague may take three clinical forms: Bubonic, pneumonic, or septicemic. The illness varies within the widest limits, exhibiting all gradations of severity from mere indisposition, which may pass almost unnoticed, to extreme violence, equaled only by fulminating cholera. The mild infections are always bubonic; the other forms are invariably severe and almost always fatal unless treated. The incubation period is usually 3 to 6 days; it may be as short as 36 hours or as long as 10 days. As a rule the onset is sudden and well marked.

Plague is carried from rodents to man through the common flea, when, failing to find a rodent host, will begin to infect man.

From 1345 to 1350, the infamous Black Death held Western Europe by the throat. More than 43 million deaths are on record during these 5 dread years and papal chroniclers of the day speak of no fewer than 200,000 depopulated towns laid waste and inhabited only by the beasts of the field. There is no reason to believe that the death toll of the period was in any way exaggerated—in fact, authorities consider that the figures might well have been an understatement. Medicine in the Middle Ages was in the hands of mystics; hygiene in the crowded cities was practically nonexistent; and although the rat was associated with the plague, no one suspected it of being the main carrier.

In Europe the disease became endemic and remained so until the 19th century. In 1665 London was ravaged, with 10,000 dying in a week, the shops closed and grass growing in the streets. In 1720 it traveled from Syria to Marsailles and killed 86,000 people. In 1770 it appeared in Moscow and killed 80,000. It appeared in the Balkan peninsula, in Greece, in Italy. It broke out in Constantinople in 1803, killed 150,000 and returned again in 1815 to slay 110,000. Messina suffered an epidemic in 1743.

Toward the end of the 18th century, Egypt was recognized as an established plague focus. Between 1783 and 1844, 21 epidemics occurred. In 1799, as many as 2,000 French soldiers in Egypt and Syria were wiped out. In India the disease first appeared in 1896 and was at first limited to Bombay. But it soon spread. Ten years after the appearance of plague in the subcontinent almost three and a half million people had died of it. The number of deaths in 1 week in 1907 was as high as 76,000, almost equal to the entire strength of the British Army in India at that time. Throughout history man has recognized the existence of a rat-society intermeshed within the framework of his own. He has also always been aware to a lesser degree of the threat to his health and wealth from rat-infestation, but without really understanding the true gravity of the threat. Consequently, control measures have often faced unnecessary difficulties, ranging from complete indifference to downright hostility.

To fight the rat menace effectively action must be taken against entire rat populations and not merely against individuals. Unless planned attacks against entire groups are carried out, piecemeal extermination will at the best give temporary relief. Permanent reductions in their ranks can be brought about only by radically changing the rats' environment: first, by sanitation designed to cut down the waste and, second, by blocking off rooms where foodstuffs and produce are kept. Ratproofing of buildings is a two-pronged weapon: it denies the animal entry to food supplies and at the same time stops it from settling in sewers, drains, and walls. This basic—and most effective—form of control compels a rat to expose itself to natural dangers and enemies—compels it to come out into the open, face attacks from cats, dogs, man, and in cities, expose itself to traffic hazards.

Well-planned measures, based on an understanding of its way of life, also subject the animal to biological limitations—in effect, the concept of the "survival of the fittest" can be brought into play. When rats compete among themselves for reduced food supplies, they inevitably thin their own ranks out in a struggle to stay alive.

GOP Self-Congratulation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH Y. RESNICK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 25, 1967

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, the GOP presidential candidates are beginning to make themselves heard again. This time they are attempting to make some political hay out of the tragic riots in Detroit.

Earlier this week, as you know, the Governor of Michigan tried to cover up his own party's indifference to the poor people of this Nation by laying the blame of the riots at the doorstep of President Johnson.

Yesterday, the Governor of New York, an avowed noncandidate for the Presidency next year, took it upon himself to praise Governor Romney for being "forthright, courageous, and effective." Thus, the pattern has been established.

Tomorrow, I fully expect Richard Nixon to be praising Governor Rockefeller's statement.

Saturday, if the timetable holds, Governor Reagan will be praising Mr. Nixon.

Where will it all end, Mr. Speaker? I suspect it will end early next week when Harold Stassen praises Governor Reagan for praising Mr. Nixon, for praising Governor Rockefeller, for praising Governor Romney. After that, Mr. Speaker, they'll start fighting among themselves as usual.

And we Democrats can go back to the work we have always dedicated ourselves to—building the Nation and striving to make a reality of the American dream. Mr. Romney's politically motivated criticism of President Johnson is examined in this article by Charles Bartlett:

[From the Evening Star, Aug. 1, 1967]

A POOR EXPRESSION OF GRATTITUDE

The bitter complaints by Michigan's Gov. George Romney that President Johnson was excessively slow in taking control in the Detroit riots must be measured against his frequent avowals of distaste for the concentration of power in Washington.

"The President's outlook, his whole career, have been totally oriented to Washington," Romney declared in a castigation of the Great Society in Pocatello last February. Romney maintained that Johnson does not understand the federal system because he has tried to bypass the states and run everything from Washington.

"I don't talk about states rights," Romney declared, "I talk about state responsibilities and the states have got to step up and discharge their responsibilities or they are going to lose more of them."

A lapse in this philosophy was apparent last Monday when Cyrus Vance arrived in Detroit with authority from the President to decide whether federal troops should be deployed against the rioters.

In their first meeting Vance asked Romney why he was holding 3,000 of his own National Guard troops in the barracks when they could usefully be assigned to troubled areas. "I was waiting for you to get here," the governor is reported to have replied.

This spirit of dumping the problem in Vance's hands seems to have prevailed from that point. He was obliged even to take the initiative of urging Romney and Mayor Jerome P. Cavanagh to commence the process of rebuilding community relations after the trouble had subsided.

Vance came to Detroit to function as a last resort. This is the prescribed role of the federal government under the 1792 law, which Congress drafted in a spirit of intense anxiety to avoid unwarranted intrusions upon state affairs. In arguing now that Vance should have brought his troops into action earlier, Romney risks a repudiation of his own philosophy.

The governor's anxiety to avoid the certifications that the law requires was politically understandable but legally tenuous. He refused to say in writing that the guard units were "unable" to control the rioting. Yet he himself, summoning the National Guard on the previous day, had proclaimed that "local law enforcement agencies are unable to protect" the riot areas.

The governor declined also to concede, formally or informally, that an insurrection was in progress. The 1792 law is specific in saying that an insurrection is the only cause that justifies a President in dispatching federal troops. Romney argued that insurance policies might be jeopardized by his use of the word but his caution seemed excessive in light of the companies' past readiness to compensate for riot damage.

The situation on that Monday was further complicated by the contrast between Romney's public and private statements. Publicly he was optimistic, telling a press conference as late as 8:30 on the night the federal troops went in that he was hopeful the National Guard would be able to keep order. A few minutes later he vehemently urged Vance to put the paratroopers on the streets.

These circumstances undoubtedly combined with the memory of the speech in Pocatello to stiffen the President's resolve to play a wary role in his dealings with Romney. They inspired Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara and the aides who drafted the President's statement to buttress the White House's legal position by underscoring twice the fact that Romney and other local officials had been "unable" to put down the riots.

But it was Vance who made the decision to delay the federal intervention. This was a personal judgment by a seasoned man of uncommon capacity and courage. From all accounts Detroit owes him much and Romney's attempt to make a political issue of the timing of the intervention is a poor expression of gratitude.

Welcome to William F. Buckley, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 3, 1967

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I welcome Mr. William F. Buckley, Jr., the prominent columnist, to the ranks of those of us who believe there is a limit in the manner in which dissent can be expressed under the first amendment.

In the column I commend to you, I draw attention to the fact that Mr. Buckley expresses exactly the thoughts I attempted to express in discussing the failure of the Department of Justice to enforce the laws which are now on the books, and which would take care of troublemakers and agitators.

The Department of Justice prefers, however, to let these people create strife, dissention, chaos, and anarchy under the umbrella of the first amendment.

I want to congratulate Mr. Buckley on his expressions, and I am sure after you have read the column, you will join me in congratulating him. The column follows:

"LITTLE CLOUDS" MAY ENGULF UNITED STATES

Headline: "SNCC Head Advises Negroes in Washington to Get Guns—Burning Capital Urged, If Needed—Brown Denounces Johnson and Racial Leaders Who Asked End to Violence."

And in the body of the story, an account of the previous day's speech by H. Rap Brown, chairman of the Student Nonviolent (sic) Coordinating Committee. Brown said all the things the headlines said he said. "Get you some guns," he said to his "perspiring, cheering" audience. If necessary, "burn this town down." If necessary to accomplish integration? Not at all. Integration is the last thing Brown has in mind. "You have to tell the (white) man if you come into my community you are going to come in with the intent of dying or you don't come in at all."

More cheers. "I say there should be more shooting than looting, so if you loot, loot a gun store." Was he really urging murder? Yes, he really was.

"You've got to decide for yourself if you kill your enemy because that is an individual decision. But the white man is your enemy. You got to destroy your enemy."

Anybody in particular? Well, even the unlikeliest target is suitable. "If you give me a gun and tell me to shoot my enemy, I might shoot Lady Bird," said the "affable but angry rights leader"—as he was characterized in an adjacent headline by the New York Times.

Now, the affable gentleman in question is free on $10,000 bail, on the charge of having instigated a riot in the city of Cambridge, Md. There is a corpus deliciti—an entirely ravaged section of town where Brown's soul brothers used to live. Needless to say, the $10,000 bail was instantly raised, and needless to say, the American Civil Liberties Union and other fastidious organizations will defend the release of Brown on bail and will, no doubt, file an amicus curiae brief at his trial urging the unconstitutionality of the Maryland law under which he has been indicted. Perhaps two or three years from now the Supreme Court will hear the case and judiciously weigh the pros and cons of putting Brown away somewhere, where he isn't likely to shoot Mrs. Johnson.

What happened to the doctrine of clear and present danger? It was, as every one used to know, enunciated by Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes as relevant to determining when a society is entitled to assert its rights over against those of the individual. It seems perfectly plain that there is a clear and present danger that bloodshed and property damage will follow in the wake of the affable rights leader Brown, and abundant testimony that exactly that followed him in Cambridge.

Why doesn't the judge instantly raise the bond on Brown, say, $10 million, just to reach for a round figure, with an imperative ring to it. Brown's lawyers (and how they would flock to him in our suicidally bent community!) could then argue as they like, giving the other side the right to argue the continuing relevance of the clear and present danger doctrine. But meanwhile, Brown would be in jail, not out lecturing in—

Episcopal churches, be it noted. The speech about shooting people was delivered from the pulpit of St. Stephen and the Incarnation Episcopal Church, in Northwest Washington, under the sponsorship of the Rev. William Wendt, the rector of the church, and with the specific sanction of the Right Rev. Paul Moore Jr., the Episcopal suffragan bishop of Washington.

"The church is a great place for all things," said Dr. Wendt, who perhaps will stage a black mass at St. Stephen's next week to drive home his point. When big live bishops and ministers invite bloodthirsty genocides to preach murder and hatred and the destruction of the Capital City within earshot of the halls of government, you have the scenario for a new account of the decline of civilization.

A thousand miles away, Brown's predecessor as head of SNCC, Stokely Carmichael, was also on a speaking platform shared with Fidel Castro, who was preaching the holy cause of hate-Americanism before a half-million cheering Cubans.

We are a very big and very powerful country, but we are nothing at all unless we assert our desire to survive, and that desire requires the reassertion of the doctrine of salus populi. A few more references by distinguished newspapers to the murderous Brown as a "rights leader," a few more fawning invitations to him to speak from a church of God, and the enemies of the United States will be entitled to believe that those little clouds no larger than a child's hand will soon engulf this country.

House Resolution on Southern Rhodesia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. BRASCO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 3, 1967

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to emphatically state my support for the bipartisan House resolution on Southern Rhodesia which affirms the support of Congress for continuing U.S. support for the program of sanctions voted by the Security Council of the United Nations and the support for the principle of majority rule before independence for the people of Southern Rhodesia.

Criticisms of the United Nations' sanctions against Rhodesia, both those allegedly grounded in international law and those appealing to the cause of self-determination are invalid.

The United Nations is duly empowered to employ these sanctions against Southern Rhodesia under article 41 of the United Nations Charter which deals with U.N. measures short of force. Contrary to the insistance of its critics, the Security Council's action does not violate paragraph 7, article 2 of the charter, which forbids U.N. intervention "in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any state."

First, the application of paragraph 7, article 2 "shall not prejudice the application of enforcement measures under chapter VII" of the charter, covering threats to peace. There is substantial danger of violence in the suppression of 94 percent of the population in Southern Rhodesia, by a 6-percent minority.

Second, Southern Rhodesia is not a "state" and has not been recognized as such by any government. Rhodesia has not even been granted diplomatic recognition by South Africa and Portugal, the two nations which have befriended the Salisbury regime.

Third, Britain had repeatedly offered independence to Rhodesia. London's sole conditions was that there be some provision made in the Rhodesian constitution for the eventual enfranchisement of the black majority. Ian Smith unilaterally declared independence from Britain in November 1965. At that time the self-governing powers held by Rhodesia reverted to Britain. Therefore, Britain is now legally responsible under the U.N. Charter relating to non-self-governing territories. Since Britain sought United Nations assistance after the Security Council determination of a threat to the peace, United Nations sanctions are legal.

Fourth, critics claim that the Salisbury regime merely exercised the right of self-determination. However, when 220,000 people take it upon themselves to declare independence for a nation of over 4 million, it is indeed a bizarre distortion of the concept of self-determination. It is in truth an illegal act, calculated to perpetuate the oppressive rule of a 6-percent minority over a 94-percent majority. The major African political parties, Zanu and Zapu have been declared illegal. African political meetings and demonstrations are outlawed by the Law and Order Maintenance Act and the Unlawful Organization Act. The Minister of Justice has the power of Preventative Detention and the press is heavily censored. The oppressive nature of Ian Smith's regime has been established beyond a doubt.

The justification for the U.N. sanctions against Southern Rhodesia can hardly be criticized. The only valid criticisms lie not with the sanctions but with the loopholes in them.

First, Rhodesia is still receiving all of the petroleum it needs from refineries in South Africa. Second, Zambia's transportation and communications system runs through and is dependent upon Rhodesia. Zambia risks economic strangulation if her diplomatic relations with Rhodesia become severed. An airlift for Zambia should be undertaken to enable her to cut off trade with Rhodesia in the event that sanctions are not effective within the next few months. Third, all possible steps should be taken to administer the U.N. sanctions so that the economic hardships created by them will not rebound and be passed on to the 4 million oppressed Rhodesian Africans.

In light of our responsibilities as a member of the United Nations to act under its charter to uphold its principles, I most emphatically affirm my support for the resolution endorsing the Security Council program of sanctions.

In view of the oppressive and illegal nature of the Salisbury regime, I most fervently wish to see it altered and to see the principles of majority rule instituted before Southern Rhodesia legitimately receives her independence.

The Rat Control Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 3, 1967

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, those of us who opposed the recent rat-control bill have been pictured in some of the press as hardhearted people laughing at the plight of little children being eaten alive by rodents in the so-called ghettos. This is typical of the smear tactics so often used to attack anyone who disagrees with the current theory that the cureall of the ills of the world is bigger and better Federal spending—with the accompanying Federal control. Under this theory there is something magical and something sacred about the spending of Federal funds, and anyone who thinks that there are some things that can best be handled by initiative at the local level, either individual, municipal, or State, is obviously a bigoted ignoramus.

Mr. Speaker, a letter has come to hand from a professional exterminator, one who has firsthand knowledge of the rodent control problem, that sheds considerable light in the fog generated by these editorial writers.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I submit below a letter dated July 31, 1967, from Mr. Stanley Schoninger, Sanitation Control Service, 254–15 Northern Boulevard, Little Neck, N.Y.:

SANITATION CONTROL SERVICE,
Little Neck, N.Y., July 31, 1967.

Re: Rodent control bill.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I have been actively engaged in the exterminating field for over 20 years. During this time I have supervised and engaged in work in Newark and Jersey City, New Jersey, and in the entire New York City Area.

The existing Federal agencies have the technical know-how of what should be done but the failure has been on the local level. The local level has the authority and laws to enforce conditions that would preclude rats from existing in an area. The U.S. Public Health Service's initial recommended procedure for rat control "Build Rats Out," which means good housekeeping practices to eliminate rat harborage and closing all openings in a building that would allow ingress of rats. Rats confine themselves to a 200′ limited area of their nest and are not necessarily migratory.

My objection to this program is not self-motivated because I earn my living killing rats, but I have seen numerous failures and boondoggling when Government attempts to supply services on a local level for a local problem.

Any additional expenditure would be unconscionable, inasmuch as several existing Federal agencies have the know-how and trained personnel to educate the local authorities in this problem.

$40,000,000 or $13,000,000, whichever the cost may be, should be allotted to the 1968 tax increase and give the taxpayer a little relief.

Please do not continue the ever-increasing load on the Federal level in an area where you do not belong.

Bring back peace, expand education and encourage health research—this should be your goal.

Very truly yours,
STANLEY SCHONINGER.

Riot "Excuses" Disproved

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. E. (BILL) BROCK

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 3, 1967

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, since the eruption of violence in Newark and Detroit, certain politically motivated persons have attempted to blame the riots on the Congress of the United States. Bitter because we have refused to waste the taxpayers money on some of their pet projects, they have launched a full-scale assault on the integrity and ability of this body, and attempted to make us a scapegoat for the problem which, in large part, their coddling of criminals and cynical bloc politics have created.

Such behavior, especially in the part of high public officials, is inexcusable. It is cheap partisan politics at its worst. But most of all, it is baldly dishonest.

The following article, which appeared in the August 1 edition of the Washington Daily News, points out the fallacy of the argument that riots can only be stopped by "buying off" the rioters with new and bigger Federal handouts.

If this were true at all, a riot would never have occurred in Detroit in the first place, since Mayor Cavanagh has been second to none in his efforts to corral Federal moneys for his city.

Mr. Speaker, because of the pertinence of this article to what has become America's prime domestic problem, I am inserting it in the Appendix of the RECORD:

TAKING THE KINK OUT OF RATS: "HAMELIN CITY" ENDS MENACE

(By Dan Thomasson)

If rats cause riots, Detroit should have been as serene as Hamelin after the Pied Piper marched thru.

The Motor City had a $1.8 million rat extermination project that has been heralded as a model for the rest of the nation.

President Johnson has implied the failure of Congress to pass his $20 million anti-rat measure last week could be partially to blame for the wave of civil unrest that has hit the country.

The House Banking and Currency Committee, however, in its report on the Administration rat-control bill cited Detroit's success with rats and said:

"The proposed bill could, with adequate local support, lead to comparable benefits thruout our nation."

Detroit, the Committee report said, launched a "starve out, clean out, build out, kill out" of rats which had:

Drastically reduced the incidence of rat bites. (Only 17 cases reported in 1965).

Practically eliminated the incidence of rat-transmitted disease such as Weil's disease. (There were no cases in 1966.)

Cut sharply the number of buildings infested with rats.

"Other benefits due to the reduction of the Detroit rat population include a direct savings of millions of dollars of damage to buildings, goods and other merchandise," the Committee said.

In addition to its model rat program, Detroit also has been praised by Congress for its outstanding anti-poverty program, which also apparently failed to stave off one of the worst riots in the nation's history.

Substitute for Gold Could Bring Disaster

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 3, 1967

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, there appear to be very few realists in this administration when it comes to considering our economic plight, both with regard to domestic economic policy and in our international relations. We appear to be engaging in very fuzzy thinking and extremely dangerous planning.

Mr. Speaker, the proposal to substitute a new international reserve currency for gold and dollars is a frightening prospect. This proposal appears to be impractical and unworkable, and is fraught with danger to our economy and the economies of the entire free world.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, this action is similar to those to which I made reference last week when the House passed H.R. 8630, to extend Presidential authority to "request" agreements to restrain foreign investments—and to exempt the parties from the antitrust laws.

In other words, every time we indicate fear in the adequacy of the American dollar and of our ability, through governmental action and the private economy, to stabilize our balance of payments and currency, we jeopardize the entire reserve system of gold and dollars. It seems to me that it is about time we dispense with these fear tactics and adopt sound policies designed to promote confidence in the stability of the American dollar and the American economic system.

Mr. Speaker, the following article by the distinguished economist, Dr. Melchior Palyi, emphasizes all aspects of this

subject, and deserves the careful attention of every Member of this House. His article appeared in the August 2 edition of the Chicago Tribune, and I commend it to my colleagues and, more particularly, to the Secretary of the Treasury and others in the executive department.

UNITED KINGDOM DENIES POSSIBLE DEVALUATION, BUT . . .

(By Dr. Melchior Palyi)

Backed by a monetary reserve of gold and gold-convertible currencies second only to that of the United States, the German mark is one of the world's strongest currencies. Domestic prices are rising slower in Germany than in most other countries; her exports are soaring and her payments balance is in good order. Yet, at the end of last June, the mark had been exposed to a short-lived but sharp pressure by foreign exchange operators who surmised that the Germans would combat their recession by money tinkering.

The attack on the mark was followed by a much more dangerous one on the British pound sterling—notwithstanding a spectacular improvement of the United Kingdom's payments balance.

By mid-July, the London press was editorializing about the imminent prospects of a sterling devaluation. The run was halted [momentarily] by the British treasury chief's announcement that devaluation is out of the question. It is, he said, no way out. It is "a flight from reality." Yet the distrust of sterling lingers on.

For many months, the price of gold in London, the world's central market for gold, has been kept by official interventions just under the permissible high of $35.20 an ounce. We are faced with a persistent flight of massive dimensions out from under the dollar—and not into other paper monies.

This unrelenting drift into gold spells catastrophe for the world's monetary system [or lack of system]. The facts are incontrovertible. The year 1966 was the first on record in which the combined gold reserves of all central banks—on this side of the iron curtain—declined. Every ounce of the 1.44 billion dollars of gold mined last year vanished; in addition the central banks actually lost gold to the tune of 95 million dollars.

FURTHER GOLD RESERVE DIP

In the first quarter of the current year the official gold reserves of the noncommunist world declined by a further 485 millions. Two monetary authorities are the most conspicuous gold losers, the British and the American—the reserve currencies which support the great majority of all other currencies.

In each year of the decade ending in 1964, some 40 to 60 per cent of the newly-mined gold vanished, presumably into hoards. In 1965, the rate of disappearance rose to almost 100 per cent; last year, the vanishing act passed the 100-per-cent mark and keeps accelerating.

This recent speed-up coincides with Secretary of the Treasury Henry Fowler's drumbeating about the danger of an imminent liquidity shortage on a world-wide scale and with his request, peppered with dark threats bordering on blackmail, that the gold-gaining countries must join with the gold-losers to create a new reserve currency, a substitute for gold. This means that the former countries should share the bankruptcy of the latter.

His request was rejected by the members of the European Common Market [France!]. However, after lengthy bickering a compromise has emerged. There will be no new reserve currency creation, but additional "drawing rights" in the International Monetary fund will be provided—in narrowly limited amounts and repayable [theoretically].

This dollop of more credit comes on top of the existing bilateral swap arrangements. In other words, we may get an additional subsidy, maybe up to 500 million dollars a year, which means very little indeed, when advance estimates of our 1967 payments deficit are running as high as 3½ billion dollars.

ACTIONS BACKFIRE

Fowler's strategy misfired and his tactics generated unexpected and highly undesirable results.

He has succeeded in attracting world-wide attention to the dollar's plight. By presenting the case of "liquidity shortage" as incurable—unless the monetary system of the world is revamped to suit our money-printing and global spending propensity—he has convinced many people abroad that the dollar is doomed. Hence, the rush into gold hoards that pushes up the price of gold and threatens to touch off a first-rate financial crisis.

No less an authority than a European central bank president, now retired, has referred to Secretary Fowler as "the potential gravedigger of the dollar." It is scant consolation that virtually all other currencies would be heading for the same grave.

Panama Giveaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 3, 1967

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the August issue of the Phyllis Schlafly Report contains an excellent summary of the proposed new Panama treaties. I share its alarm that vital U.S. national interests will be imperiled, and oppose the treaties.

Extracts from the text of this report follow:

GIVEAWAY OF OUR PANAMA CANAL—SECRET TREATIES IMPERIL U.S. RIGHTS

The Johnson Administration has secretly drafted a giveaway of U.S. rights and property that exceeds in harm to us the Roosevelt giveaways at Teheran and Yalta, and the Truman giveaways at Potsdam and Panmunjom. The new Johnson giveaway will be a military defeat for our country even worse than the Kennedy-McNamara defeat at the Bay of Pigs. The Johnson Administration is planning to give away the Panama Canal! This is the meaning of the three treaties with Panama presented to a closed session of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on June 29, 1967.

Woodrow Wilson used to say that the U.S. stands for "open covenants, openly arrived at." What a deception! The three new treaties with Panama are just the latest examples of *secret Democrat treaties, secretly arrived at.*

The plain fact is that the three new treaties, if ratified, will give U.S. sovereignty over the Panama Canal to Panama, will let Panama share with the United States in the running of the Canal, and will give Panama legal control over any new canal which might be built in Panama. The treaties will surrender U.S. control over a maritime thoroughfare which we built and which is essential to us militarily and commercially. Here are the main points of the principal treaty.

MAIN POINTS OF TREATY

(1) The treaty gives Panama sovereignty in a new "canal area", thereby abrogating the Hay-Bunau-Varilla Treaty of 1903 which guaranteed the U.S. *exclusive* sovereignty and control over the Canal and Canal Zone "in perpetuity".

(2) The treaty drastically reduces the size of the "canal area" and places it under the control of a 9-man board on which the U.S. would have a bare majority of one. Executive authority is put in the hands of a director general who might be American or Panamanian. This eliminates the present Panama Canal Company, a U.S. Government corporation.

(3) The treaty turns over to Panama all U.S. property in the present Canal Zone which is not included in the new "canal area". The unrecovered U.S. investment in the $1.9 billion Canal and the $3 billion Canal defense system would be written off.

(4) The treaty sharply increases annual payments to Panama from $1,930,000 to about $22,000,000 a year.

(5) The treaty gives control of defense, security, laws, police, and operation of the Canal to the new joint U.S.-Panama board.

A RED TARGET

The three new treaties will put the Canal at the mercy of the Panamanian radicals who already are attacking the treaties on the ground that they don't give away enough U.S. rights and treasure. The new treaties provide a standing invitation to a leftist regime in Panama to nationalize or expropriate the Canal completely, which the Red-infiltrated organizations in Panama are already demanding. Any Panama "guarantees" today may be as worthless as Nasser's "guaranteees" about the Suez Canal.

Appeasement of the Panama radicals has always tremendously increased our problems. In 1936 the Roosevelt Administration gave away without compensation many of our rights in Panama. In World War II it cost us a high price to get back the defense bases we vitally needed. For the past 30 years, the more concessions the U.S. has given Panama, the more the anti-Americans and pro-Communists have increased their demands, often punctuated with violence and even riots.

The 1967 treaties will make the Panama Canal a target for intensified subversion from Castro's Cuba. We have already seen several bloody samples of mob violence directed by Castroites and other Communist agitators. Many military and civilian authorities regard the new treaties as hopelessly inadequate for the protection of the Canal. The Canal could be overrun or destroyed before the U.S. could obtain permission from a Communist-infiltrated government of Panama to protect it.

There is absolutely no reason for Americans to have a guilty conscience about our treatment of Panama. General Robert E. Wood, one of the builders of the Canal and distinguished Republican leader, pointed out recently that "the U.S. has created all of the wealth that exists in Panama. American money and brains were responsible for building and operation of the Canal. Not even Panamanian labor went into building the Canal. . . . The Canal is vital to our defense. If we concede any of our rights there, we are finished."

Can we afford to relinquish the Panama Canal because a new sea-level canal, excavated by nuclear power, is nearing reality? The answer is no. According to a report of the Senate Commerce Committee, a decision cannot be made for another 3½ years, and construction of a new canal, if found practical, would require another 10 to 12 years. Even if nuclear construction is eventually found practical, it is prohibited by the Moscow Nuclear Test Ban Treaty negotiated by Averell Harriman and Khrushchev in 1963 and signed by President Kennedy. We could not use nuclear explosives to dig a new canal unless we secure the permission of the Soviet Union.

The Chairman of the Panama Canal Subcommittee of the House Merchant Marine Committee, Congresswoman Leonor K. Sullivan (D.-Mo.), assailed the new Panama Canal treaty as a "giveaway" and warned that it "only opens the way to surrendering the Canal to the Republic of Panama." Mrs. Sullivan implied that treaty provisions are rigged to deceive the American people into thinking that we would receive a "fair payment" if Panama decides in the future to expropriate the Canal completely. In truth, she said Panama would pay for the Canal "out of higher tolls collected in most instances on shipping to and from the United States. We would be paying ourselves out of our own pockets for the privilege of having the Panama Canal taken away from us—and how we would pay!"

THE LESSON OF SUEZ

Mrs. Sullivan said that we should have learned a lesson from the history of the Suez Canal since Egypt seized it in 1956. The Suez has been closed twice in the last 10 years, she said, as it is "subject to the whims of the Egyptian government." The costly consequences to the United States of Panamanian sovereignty over the Canal "would be vastly greater", she said. "Right now the Panama Canal is the property of the United States—of the Government—and not subject to seizure by Panama. But under this treaty the Canal becomes the property of a non-American government authority and on the soil of Panama rather than under the American flag."

Senator Strom Thurmond (R.-S. C.) warned that if the Panama Canal is stripped of U.S. control, it becomes immediately vulnerable to seizure by Castro-trained revolutionaries. Such an overthrow, he said, could make Panama another Cuba, a second Soviet military base in the Western Hemisphere. He summed up the urgency in these words: "I think it is clear to every member of this body that the retention of undiluted United States sovereignty in the Canal Zone is as important to the security of this nation as winning the war in Vietnam."

The Johnson Administration is now lobbying strenuously and cleverly for ratification of the three Panama treaties. NOW is the time to let your Senator know how you want him to vote.

Congressman Wydler's 1967 Opinion Poll Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. WYDLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 3, 1967

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, it has become a tradition in the "Fabulous Fourth" Congressional District to send reports to my constituents of my activities and once each year to ask them for their views on important current national issues by means of a questionnaire.

The questionnaire is now in its fourth consecutive year. I send the questionnaire to every resident who lives in the Fabulous Fourth Congressional District regardless of party. In this way I can truly test the prevailing opinion on great national issues.

Once again thousands of the people of the Fourth Congressional District have answered the questionnaire. The results have been carefully tabulated and I am busy answering the many comment that have been made to me on the questionnaires. The enthusiastic response once again proves that people do care about their Government.

I am now sending each person in the Fourth Congressional District a copy of the results of the questionnaire. These results show the prevailing opinions in our congressional district.

My reaction to the answers this year is that our district shows a determination to meet our commitments in Southeast Asia, but with a strong feeling that the war there should be brought to an end as soon as possible. Only 10 percent of the people would actually withdraw from Vietnam. A majority want to mount a strategically sound effort for military victory.

In other areas of foreign policy, there is an overwhelming and growing determination not to expand trade with Communist nations while they are supplying arms and aid to North Vietnam.

There is also hardening against participation of Red China in the United Nations because of its internal disorders and external policies.

On the domestic scene, our area shows an overwhelming opposition to the President's proposal for a 6-percent tax increase. There is continued support for my proposal to allow parents a tax credit for college tuitions.

Somewhat surprising was the strong approval of the use of wire tapping to control crimes of violence and subversion when done under court direction and supervision.

There is a sharp split on the question of draft deferment for students attending institutions of higher education.

Finally, and most surprising of all to me, was the two to one opposition to reduce the voting age from 21 to 18.

Once again my thanks and congratulations to those who joined in and made this questionnaire successful.

The success of this questionnaire makes it clear to me that the people of the district wish it continued and it will be sent once again early in the year 1968. It will be our district's fifth consecutive Fabulous Fourth questionnaire.

The questionnaire results follow:

RESULTS OF THE FOURTH ANNUAL "FABULOUS FOURTH" QUESTIONNAIRE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT, NASSAU COUNTY

		Percent	
FOREIGN POLICY			
1. What should we do about Vietnam? (Check only 1):			
(a) Continue our present course		7	
(b) Mount a strategically sound effort for military victory		56	
(c) Hold key positions and try to negotiate a settlement		27	
(d) Withdraw as soon as possible		10	
	Yes	No	Undecided
2. Do you favor expanding trade with the Soviet Union and other Communist bloc countries who supply aid to North Vietnam?	13	84	3
3. Do you favor participation of Red China in the United Nations?	30	66	4
DOMESTIC POLICY			
4. Would you have the Federal Treasury share some of its revenues with the States for locally administered programs?	61	33	6
5. Should a tax credit be allowed parents supporting students in college?	76	23	1
6. Do you believe that we should end our farm price support and crop curtailment programs?	64	27	9
7. Do you favor President Johnson's request for an increase in income tax through a 6 percent surcharge?	15	83	3
8. Do you feel there is a need for a truth-in-lending bill so that a borrower may know the true interest rate he is required to pay?	93	5	2
GENERAL			
9. Would you favor direct election of the President in place of the electoral college system now used?	78	17	4
10. Would you permit the police under court supervision to employ wiretapping and other electronic devices to control crimes of violence and subversion?	86	12	2
11. Do you favor draft deferments for students attending institutions of higher education?	55	42	3
12. Do you favor a proposed constitutional amendment to lower the voting age from 21 to 18?	31	65	4

Four Top Negro Leaders Ask End of Rioting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 3, 1967

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, one result of the recent rioting is the opportunity to judge which of the Negro leaders are sincere in the cause of civil rights, and which "leaders" are actually destroying this cause.

Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, A. Philip Randolph, Roy Wilkins, and Whitney M. Young have once again proven their sincerity by issuing a statement asking for the end of the rioting.

I do, however, disagree with one point which is made in the statement. It is claimed that the disabilities imposed upon the Negro remain because the white citizenry, in general, supports these restrictions. This idea is as exaggerated as is the idea that Negro citizens, in general, condoned the recent rioting.

I commend the text of the statement to the attention of our colleagues, as follows:

> Developments in Newark, Detroit and other strife-torn cities make it crystal clear that the primary victims of the riots are the Negro citizens. That they have grave grievances of long standing cannot be denied or minimized. That the riots have not contributed in any substantial measure to the eradica-

tion of these just complaints is by now obvious to all.

We are confident that the overwhelming majority of the Negro community joins us in opposition to violence in the streets. Who is without the necessities of life when the neighborhood stores are destroyed and looted? Whose children are without milk because deliveries cannot be made? Who loses wages because of a breakdown in transportation or destruction of the place of employment? Who are the dead, the injured and the imprisoned? It is the Negroes who pay and pay and pay, whether or not they are individually involved in the rioting. And for what?

ARE CRIMINAL ACTS

Killing, arson, looting are criminal acts and should be dealt with as such. Equally guilty are those who incite, provoke and call specifically for such action. There is no injustice which justifies the present destruction of the Negro community and its people.

We who have fought so long and so hard to achieve justice for all Americans have consistently opposed violence as a means of redress. Riots have proved in effective, disruptive and highly damaging to the Negro population, to the civil rights cause, and to the entire Nation.

We call upon Negro citizens throughout the Nation to forego the temptation to disregard the law. This does not mean that we should submit tamely to joblessness, inadequate housing, poor schooling, insult, humiliation and attack. It does require a redoubling of efforts through legitimate means to end these wrongs and disabilities.

We appeal not only to black Americans, but also to our fellow white citizens who are not blameless. The disabilities imposed upon Negro citizens are a century old. They remain because the white citizenry, in general supports these restrictions.

CONGRESS CRITICIZED

The 90th Congress has exhibited an incredible indifference to hardships of the ghetto dwellers. Only last week the House defeated a rat-control bill which would have enabled the cities to get rid of the rats which infest the slums.

And finaly, we support President Johnson's call "upon all our people black and white alike in all our cities to join in a determined program to maintain law and order, to condemn and to combat lawlessness in all its forms, and firmly to show by word and by deed that riot, looting and public disorder will just not be tolerated."

No one benefits under mob law. Let's end it now!

Signed by: The Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., president, Southern Christian Leadership Conference; A. Philip Randolph, president, A. Philip Randolph Institute; Roy Wilkins, executive director, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People; and Whitney M. Young Jr., executive director, National Urban League.

Lack of Public Involvement Hampers Police

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 26, 1967

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, from time to time we have seen reports of the difficulty our police encounter by citizens who fail to report promptly crimes which they might have witnessed.

I am sure it will come as little comfort to the American police, but I thought we ought to know that this is a problem not peculiar only to the United States. Sweden apparenly is suffering the same kind of apathy by the public, which impedes effective police work.

The Reuters dispatch which appeared in the New York Times follows:

APATHY OF THE PUBLIC IMPEDES POLICEMEN ON SWEDISH BEATS

STOCKHOLM, SWEDEN (Reuters).—Swedish policemen complain bitterly that crime-fighting has become harder in the last five years because the public will not help.

Kurt Lindroth, general director of the State Police Board, says that in the last year and a half there have been 941 cases of maltreatment of policemen, some very serious.

In 87 per cent of the cases, however, policemen were not injured and in only 5 per cent of the cases were the policemen off duty for more than two weeks.

What worries the authorities is that, in half of the cases, passersby simply watched.

The police believe that many of the beatings are the result of a deep feeling of hatred among young people of "anything official."

A Stockholm professor of criminology said many cases of attacks on the police arose from the simple fact that they wore uniforms.

In 1966, Lars Orrsten a policeman, was nearly killed by a gang of youths who pelted him with stones. He is back on duty after three months in a hospital.

"If anything happens," he says, "you get no help from the public. It is almost the other way round. If they think they can free a prisoner, no matter what he has done, they will do it."

A year ago, a gang of youths beat up Constable Stig Gullbrantz of Uppsala with planks. He was hospitalized for six months.

"I have never had any help in a fight," he said. "You are never so alone as when you are on the beat. Often you have to walk away from the scene with the prisoner. At best you can get a taxi."

Some observers think psychology should play a greater place in the training of Swedish policemen to improve relations with the public.

Mrs. Gunilla Cedermark, a police psychologist, said that police training now included a five-hour course on psychology.

"This is definitely not enough," she said.

Congress Curtails the Dole

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROGER H. ZION

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 3, 1967

Mr. ZION. Mr. Speaker, the rain of invective on those who dare oppose White House dole programs continues. Following defeat of the fiscally irresponsible rat extermination bill, the President turned loose his propaganda apparatus on every Member of the House who had the courage to express their dissent to this flagrant piece of duplication. Mary Benton, editorializing in the July 27 Corydon, Ind., Republican, comments as follows:

WHOSE MONEY IS THIS?

In Washington last week we saw and heard President Johnson shedding tears over the failure of Congress to grant him 40 million dollars to get rid of rats in slum America. A pestilence caused by cities and towns who refused to do their own housework properly or refuse to do it at all. A pestilence that was to be used as a means to more government dole—for to get rid of rats you must hire someone—a lot of someones—to rid the back alleys, country roads, and highways of trash put there by other humans.

Just why President Johnson thought that Congress would not see through this program and why he thought the American people would buy it is beyond this writer.

Millions of dollars are being doled out by the Department of Labor under the beautification acts, neighborhood youth corps, family management, etc, etc.

Programs that were brought into existence on the excuse that they were to show underprivileged Americans how to better their lives.

As the President wept, Secretary of Labor Willard Wirtz was releasing to the press a long list of organizations and schools to whom he was doling out a total of $3 million of "our dollars" for "an in-depth research and demonstration to find out what kind of job the Neighborhood Youth Corps has done."

Question—If the National Student Association rejected the funds of CIA just this spring what makes it so eligible to receive $47,208 grant to study the Youth Corps now?

Question—Why does it take $27,625 grant monies to study the Youth Corps by a benevolent organization like the Zeta Phi Beta Sorority of Goldsboro, N.C.? Wouldn't this money be better spent by putting Neighborhood Youth Corps workers on jobs that would clean up the trash and litter that breeds North Carolina rats?

Question—Wouldn't the $99,409 being granted to Western Reserve University of Cleveland, to do the same type of study, be better spent employing the nonwhites of this explosive city in beautifying their neighborhoods and thereby getting rid of at least one of their problems?

If anyone has the right to weep in these days, it is the U.S. Taxpayer who sees his or her money being spent in ever increasing amounts by a government that desires only to perpetuate itself in office through the dole system.

Whose money is this that the "weeping president" and the generous Secretary of Labor throws away on millions of duplicated programs?

Vietnam Elections: Heads We Win, Tails You Lose

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 3, 1967

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I called upon the Secretary of State to clarify the position of the United States on the pronouncements of General Ky and the other Saigon generals concerning the September 3 elections. They have not hesitated to say they are prepared to continue the military junta regardless of the outcome of the elections. An editorial in today's New York Times points up the travesty of the charade which is about to take place. It follows:

[From the New York Times, Aug. 3, 1967]

NEUTRALIZING VIETNAM'S VOTE

South Vietnam's ruling military junta seems determined to convert the Sept. 3 Presidential election—so widely touted as a democratic showcase—into a farcical matter of "heads we win, tails you lose."

Not content with virtually assuring a military victory at the polls by combining the two most powerful generals on one slate and by removing the names of their most serious challengers from the ballot, the junta has now let it be known that it is forming a "military affairs committee" which would continue to direct national policy no matter who gets the most votes next month.

This travesty on democracy is quite in keeping with the attitude long blatantly expressed by Marshal Ky. The present Premier and Number Two man on the junta slate has said more than once that if he isn't satisfied with the outcome of the election he will use force to change it.

It is also, unfortunately, not incompatible with the undisguished preference of the American Embassy for continued military rule in Saigon. Former Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge voiced this preference openly. The present Ambassador, Ellsworth Bunker, has been more discreet, but the feeling in Saigon is that Mr. Bunker is "neutral" in favor of the military slate. He is believed to have played an important behind-the-scenes role in ending the military split that threatened to give civilian candidates a fighting chance.

The heavy commitment in men and money that the United States has assumed in Vietnam gives it no right to dictate the outcome of the election, but it does require the exercise of American influence to keep the voting from turning into mockery.

President Johnson and other Administration spokesmen have for months hailed the elections as a major turning point in the war effort and a proof of the American resolve to assure self-determination for the Vietnamese people. Their hope has been that the establishment of a popularly elected regime in Saigon would rally the people to the Government and thus accelerate the military and pacification efforts. Others have suggested that the election could offer a promising avenue toward peace by bringing to power a Saigon Government willing to negotiate directly with the National Liberation Front.

If the junta is permitted to proceed with the present charade, nothing will change—in Saigon, in the somber conduct of the war or in the world's estimate of the legitimacy of American war aims.

Thant's Lopsided View

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 3, 1967

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the other day U.N. Secretary General U Thant again displayed his continued antagonism toward U.S. foreign policy. I insert in the RECORD at this point a very effective response which was carried in the Tuesday, August 1, edition of the Chicago Daily News.

Sec.-Gen. U Thant has beaten a lengthy retreat from his Vietnam position of last March. Then he proposed that the United States call a halt to bombing and that North Vietnam simultaneously stop sending troops into South Vietnam.

The United States accepted that proposal, and the North Vietnamese turned it down. Then Thant reverted to the position that the United States should call off its bombing first—that is to say, unilaterally.

On Sunday at a Quaker meeting in Greensboro, N.C., Thant took up a new position even more antagonistic to the United States.

Once more he proposed an end to the bombing as a first step; but he went on to assail one of the assumptions that form the foundation of U.S. policy in Southeast Asia. That is the assumption that the United States is helping South Vietnam defend itself against Red aggresssion.

The United States, he said, must recognize that the war there is one "of national independence," not a war against communism. He compared the position of North Vietnam to that of the United States in our own Revolutionary War. He said that nationalism, not communism, sparks the anti-foreigner resistance movement in Vietnam—"now particularly against the United States."

Thant is entitled to his own personal view of Vietnam, including his assessment of both American and North Vietnamese motives. He is not entitled to let these personal views color his judgment as United Nations secretary-general, and that is what he has done here.

The Communist nature of the Hanoi regime is not a matter for conjecture; Premier Ho Chi Minh's adherence to the Marxist doctrine is well-known and undenied; so is his objective of consolidating all of Vietnam into a single Communist state under his aegis.

It may well be true that Ho's brand of communism is not Peking's. It is probably also true that the North Vietnamese find Peking no more admirable than the United States, and it is undeniable that the Communists have been able to evoke a spirit of nationalism in both North and South Vietnam. They have traded on that ability many times, and frequently the people have lived to regret the confusion.

Thant is also correct in saying that Vietnam stands in the way of a U.S.-Soviet detente, which would be good for the peace of the world.

But he does not serve the cause of peace or detente by aligning himself and his office with those who find the United States totally malevolent in its role in Vietnam, and Ho Chi Minh totally right. He would serve peace far better by using his good offices to try to promote free-handed negotiations What he is doing makes it more difficult to talk on any terms except Ho's unconditional withdrawal demands—which the United States cannot accept.

Farsighted Conservation Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 3, 1967

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to your attention a recent editorial in the Boston Herald-Traveler concerning the purchase of more than 1,700 acres by the Nature Conservancy, Inc., to preserve the Mason Neck area of Fairfax County as a bird sanctuary. This farsighted action by the conservancy has saved the home of the bald eagle in the Washington area. This marshland, bordering the Potomac below Washington, is filled with cypress and black oak and is the home of the egret, heron, and many migratory ducks and geese.

Charles H. W. Foster, conservancy president, should be commended for making this large-scale purchase which has significance for all the Nation. A fascinating parkland and wildlife sanctuary will be assured when the conservancy buys another 220 acres nearby and sells the entire area in sections to the Interior Department, the Commonwealth of Virginia, and the Northern Virginia Regional Park Authority.

A great victory for conservation has been won and another bigger refuge is in the planning stages. This will be another great step forward in the never-ending fight for conservation. I am confident that efforts such as these will assure the preservation of our natural marshes and woodlands.

The editorial follows:

EAGLE'S REFUGE

The purchase of more than 1,700 acres of land by Nature Conservancy, Inc., to preserve the Mason Neck area of Fairfax County as a bird sanctuary must be ranked among the most encouraging victories this year for conservationists.

This picturesque region of marshland and cypress and black oak bordering the Potomac below Washington has a national significance. It is the last place in the Washington area where the bald eagle nests. In addition, it is home for countless migratory ducks and geese as well as the egret and the heron.

All this was threatened by land developers whose bulldozers would have opened the way for a community of 20,000. Following the usual pattern for speculation, the price of the land was steadily rising while local and federal governments deliberated.

Although three different agencies contemplated buying separate parcels of the land to preserve it, one problem lay in so-called severance damages. If any one group had moved alone, cutting up the area in a way that prevented development of other parcels, the action could have opened the door to damage suits with potentially costly settlements. Nature Conservancy has avoided this by its large-scale purchase.

The conservation group now plans to buy another 220 acres nearby and resell the entire package at cost in sections to the Interior Department, the Commonwealth of Virginia and the Northern Virginia Regional Park Authority as these bodies complete their own financing arrangements. The result will assure the creation of fascinating parkland plus a refuge for wildlife.

Charles H. W. Foster, Conservancy president, and William Lightsee, executive director of the Northern Virginia Regional Park Authority, deserve special commendation for working out this unusual rescue operation.

America at the Crossroads

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 3, 1967

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, solution upon solution to end the violence that has racked this country in past weeks have been set forth from nearly every quarter of the Nation.

The counsel and wisdom of all America is, of course, needed to meet the challenge that comes before us. While I stand firm in my belief for adequate law enforcement and the reestablishment of law and order, I am particularly impressed with the assessment voiced in an editorial in yesterday's Christian Science Monitor.

It stresses the need for responsible action in solving the greatest domestic crisis this Nation has faced since the War Between the States.

Under leave to extend my remarks I commend the following editorial to the attention of my colleagues:

AMERICA AT THE CROSSROADS

This is a time for all Americans, white and black, to rise above the psychology of hate, anger, fear, and retaliation. The greatest long-term danger in the rampage of urban riots is the poison it would release into the nation's mental atmosphere—the changes it would produce in the attitudes of Americans toward each other.

One leading newspaper says this summer may be "the point in time when the American Negro finally lost all hope in the white man." Some fear the mounting violence will provoke a white backlash compounded of fear, anger, and violent retaliation. Senator Case of New Jersey cites the danger that the riots could split the nation "for all time into two warring camps." These things simply must not be allowed to happen.

How can they be averted? There is a need for both honest soul-searching and intelligent action.

There is need for basic changes in white attitudes toward Negroes and Negro attitudes toward whites. The truth of human brotherhood under one God must be more fully accepted and practiced. Whites must recognize the deep feelings of inferiority and rejection so cruelly foisted on the black man by white society, and now so powerful in motivating violence—and reach out positively, compassionately, patiently, respectfully to bridge the gulf with genuine love and fellowship and practical help. Negroes must courageously reject the prophets of race hate who go up and down the country inciting to arson and pillage and preaching destruction of organized society; violence will only compound the Negroes' problems.

There is need to recognize that in many basic aspects the underlying problem is neither black nor white. The problem of the slums—noise, congestion, dirt, ugliness, injustice, unemployment—is the problem of our cities, vast and uncontrolled monstrosities producing environments intolerable for human habitation. Our whole society faces this growing urban challenge—and apathy, politicking, and conservatism must not be allowed to stand in the way of bold and drastic solutions.

There is need to counteract the contagion of violence. We live today in a supercharged mental atmosphere. Television, movies, novels, plays, and the press peddle and dramatize violence beyond all reason. Riots produce their own hypnosis. Police Chief Girardin of Detroit tells of people who looted on impulse they couldn't control; who now are ashamed and call the police to get rid of the new clothing and television sets they wake up to find in their homes. The answer to this mesmeric contagion is a profound respect for law and conscience. Without obedience to law, civilized society would revert to the jungle—and that helps nobody, black or white.

There is need to challenge and check the sudden trend toward a wholesale rejection of organized society. This trend is fostered by many segments of our society—mass media seeking sensation, the alienated young, a few intellectuals who would clothe hedonism and nihilism with elegant words. Such mental suggestions, polluting the atmosphere like swamp gas, encourage racial explosions. For all its ills, civilized society, and American society in particular, is worth saving. Solutions lie in the direction of patiently improving it—not senselessly destroying it.

There is need for prompt and decisive action to stop wanton violence wherever it occurs—action to maintain law and order. Delays caused by political cleavages or personal animosities, such as seem to have occurred in the Detroit situation, are inexcusable. While recent Supreme Court decisions have strengthened the civil rights of the accused, this trend must not lead to a prevailing permissiveness toward crime or to a timidity on the part of police that would tolerate criminal acts. The balance must be redressed.

There is need to avoid acts of stupidity and insensitivity which would exacerbate race relations. The merriment of congressmen in rejecting the rat-control bill disclosed an appalling ignorance of the state of present public thought and emotion, and of the problems and sensitivities of slum dwellers. This was but one of a number of recent incidents at the governmental level which have unwisely and unnecessarily inflamed Negro sentiment.

There is need for immediate and vigorous action—now—at the Federal, State, and local levels, both by governmental and private agencies, to remove the social conditions which cause riots—the unemployment, misery, and hopelessness of the ghettos. Apathy and delay are the enemies. It is time for the Nation to wake up to the danger and act decisively.

Underlying all of these necessities is the need for a greater spirit of love and brotherhood among men—expressed in practical channels of action. However ignored and dishonored at times, this is the spirit which has made the American commonwealth a melting pot and a bright chapter in history. Hate leading to fear, selfishness leading to apathy, anger leading to revenge, violence leading to retaliation will never solve anything. These won't help the Negro to be free, and they won't help white society to protect itself from destruction.

The words of the founder of this newspaper, Mary Baker Eddy, referring to the abolition of slavery in the United States, are eloquently apropos today: "A few immortal sentences, breathing the omnipotence of divine justice, have been potent to break despotic fetters and abolish the whipping-post and slave market; but oppression neither went down in blood, nor did the breath of freedom come from the cannon's mouth. Love is the liberator."

Neglected Cities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 26, 1967

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Raleigh N.C., News and Observer recently carried an excellent reprint of an article which appeared originally in the Winston-Salem Journal.

I think this article succinctly replies to the debate which we now are witnessing about who neglected the cities and set the stage for the riots.

The article which follows is self-explanatory:

WHO NEGLECTED THE CITIES?

We must thank the Republican leaders in Congress and the country for one of the more diverting moments in this dismal summer of 1967.

Those leaders met in Washington on Monday and put the blame for the destruction in our cities on President Johnson.

This must have been gratifying to Mr. Johnson, who has been trying for most of the past 20 years to persuade those same Republican leaders to become mildly interested in the problems of the cities.

As majority leader of the Senate from 1952 to 1960, Mr. Johnson contended with the persistent efforts of President Eisenhower (who signed Monday's Republican manifesto) to cut expenditures on public housing.

And as Vice President and presiding officer of the Senate and later as President, Mr. Johnson struggled with the same Republican while they were making a record that ran like this:

Housing Act of 1961: 5 Republicans in the Senate voted for, 27 against; 26 in the House voted for, 136 against.

Youth Employment Act of 1963 (creating the Youth Conservation Corps and the Home Town Youth Corps to take young people off the streets and train them for useful careers): 7 Republicans in the Senate voted for, 28 against.

Economic Opportunity Act of 1864 (War on Poverty): 10 Republicans in the Senate voted for, 22 against; 22 in the House against.

Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964: 6 Republicans in the Senate voted for, 24 against; 39 in the House voted for, 128 against. (Lack of adequate public transportation to places of employment was one of the grievances in the Watts area of Los Angeles which was swept by disastrous riots the following year).

Economic Opportunity Appropriation Act of 1965: 9 for, 20 against; 24 in the House voted for, 110 against. In the Senate the Republicans voted 8 to 1 in favor to the Dominick, Allot and Prouty amendments providing for substantial reductions in the appropriations.

Rent Supplements Act of 1965: 7 Republicans in the Senate voted for, 19 against; 26 in the House voted for, 11 against.

Model Cities Act of 1965: 9 Republicans in the Senate voted for, 9 against; 12 in the House voted for, 79 against.

Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 ('grants to states for low income school districts): 18 Republicans in the Senate voted for, 14 against; 25 in the House voted for, 96 against.

The record can be brought down to this month, when the House vote on the administration bill to provide a modest $40 million for rat extermination in the slums found 22 Republicans voting for and 154 against.

Vietnam Sealift Could Bog Down for Lack of Reserve Fleet Ships

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED REINECKE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 3, 1967

Mr. REINECKE. Mr. Speaker, the problems facing our merchant marine ore made abundantly clear in the crisis of shipping goods and supplies and ammunition to our men in Vietnam. The Department of Defense keeps telling us that we have enough ships to carry all the cargo needed in Vietnam. Yet other maritime experts, cited by the Houston Post in its July 30, 1967, issue, claim that we would have to literally scrape the bottom of the ship barrel if any more shipping was required.

The thought strikes me, Mr. Speaker, that if this country became involved in another military crisis, such as in the Middle East, or Latin America, or Europe, we would be in a terrible situation as far as our shipping of supplies is concerned.

This is just another example of the crisis in our merchant marine created by the shortsighted, careless, nonthinking administration of Johnson-McNamara-Boyd and company.

Here follows the article from the Houston Post:

ARE THERE ENOUGH ADEQUATE RESERVE FLEET SHIPS FOR VIETNAM SEALIFT?—BEAUMONT HAS A HUGE FLEET OF MOTHBALLED FREIGHTERS BUT ONLY THREE ARE VICTORIES

(By Al Prince)

Opposing views exist in Washington and elsewhere on whether the United States is nearing a critical shortage of reserve fleet ships available for the Vietnam sealift.

The Defense Department says there are enough ships left in the reserve fleet to handle the sealift operation. However, people outside the Defense Department say the reserve fleet is running out of available ships.

Washington officials indicated there are some 400 ships of all types from various sources being used to carry supplies to troops in Vietnam. Of those, 160 ships—mostly World War II Victory cargo ships—the reserve fleet ships that have been broken out of mothballs since December, 1964.

The Maritime Administration in Washington told The Houston Post that the reserve fleet has dwindled to only 28 Victory cargo ships of the type that have already been reactivated.

There are 22 other Victory cargo ships of a different type in mothballs, but their potential for the Vietnam sealift is uncertain, a Maritime Administration spokesman said.

The entire reserve fleet of more than 650 ships of all types not destined for scrap includes some 156 Victory ships—dry cargo and troop carriers—that "could" be reactivated for the sealift, the spokesman said.

"I wouldn't say all of these would necessarily be available. Naturally they took out the ones in best shape first," the spokesman said.

The reserve fleet also has 56 non-Victory cargo ships, ranging from small CIA's to large C3's.

"I'm not saying all of these are in the best condition," the spokesman said.

The reserve fleet also has 585 World War II Liberty ships in mothballs, although 387 Liberties are scheduled for scrap, the Maritime Administration said.

"Nobody officially talks about using the Liberties," the spokesman said. Their use is possible, he said.

However, he added, "if you get to that point you're in something major."

A larger U.S. troop commitment in Vietnam seems inevitable as the war of attrition wears on. There are 460,000 U.S. troops already in Vietnam, plus 54,000 from Allied countries.

The current ceiling of 480,000 U.S. forces is expected to be reached in three months. President Johnson has recently given a tentative promise for 100,000 more American troops for Vietnam within two and a half years.

More troops mean more supplies.

Yet, the Department of Defense told The Post that an increase in American troops in Vietnam in the near future would "not necessarily" require taking more ships out of mothballs.

Even if more ships were needed, there are still enough vessels in the reserve fleet to handle an increased sealift operation, the Department of Defense said.

However, there are persons outside the Department of Defense who have a different idea about the reserve fleet's potential for providing many more ships for the sealift.

Capt. Garth Read, chief of the Merchant Vessel Division at the Coast Guard's Washington Headquarters, said of the reserve fleet's potential:

"We don't have any more ships. We're near the bitter end."

Another person with a similar opinion is Capt. E. B. Hendrix, marine division manager for Lykes Brothers Steamship Co., Inc., the second largest subsidized U.S.-flag line.

"There's not a lot left in the way of ships to bring out," he said.

A spokesman for the Military Sea Transportation Service (MSTS) in Washington said of the reserve fleet's potential:

"We have enough to handle the present situation if it doesn't escalate too much."

MSTS has the job of deciding how many ships will be needed to carry supplies to Vietnam, based on the Department of Defense's troop needs. The Maritime Administration then determines where the ships will come from.

The majority of the reserve fleet vessels are either Victory or Liberty ships. Both types are of World War II vintage, giving them an age of 20 or more years. The average life span of a ship is 25 years.

Since the Victory ships were built near the end of World War II, they generally had been used less when they were put in mothballs. The slower Liberty ships generally saw far more service before they joined the "bone pile."

The MSTS spokesman was asked the length of service left for the ships that already have been brought out of the reserve fleet.

"That's anybody's guess. They're getting old now. If something wears out, there's a scramble to get new parts," he said.

The Defense Department said there were no immediate plans for adding any more ships to the Vietnam sealift. The sealift's capabilities have greatly improved in the last year, several Washington sources said.

Improved port facilities and handling procedures in Vietnam and a recent appearance of container ships in the sealift have eliminated a lot of delays in the sealift operation, the sources said.

The total number of ships operating in the Vietnam sealift appears to be somewhat of an elusive figure to obtain. A conservative estimate would put the figure at more than 400 ships.

There are 166 or 165 GAA ships in the sealift, depending on whether the Maritime Administration or MSTS is giving out the figure.

GAA stands for General Agency Agreement. These are government-owned ships that have been assigned to various U.S. shipping lines for operation to Vietnam.

Of the 166 or 165 GAA ships, 160 have been taken out of the reserve fleet.

In 1965, 59 GAA ships were added to the two put in operation to Vietnam in December, 1964. Another 88 GAA ships went into operation in 1966, and 17 have been added so far this year. That is a total of 166 since 1964.

MSTS has a nuclear fleet of 165 ships in operation today throughout the world. Ninety-one are cargo ships, which the MSTS spokesman said probably half—about 45—"get to Vietnam at one time or another."

Then there are 167 time-charter ships in operation to Vietnam. These are ships owned by subsidized and unsubsidized U.S. shipping lines that are chartered by the government for specified lengths of time.

The 160 ships being used in the sealift from the reserve fleet is small when compared with previous reactivations. During the Korean war, more than 500 ships were taken out of mothballs, the Maritime Administration spokesman said.

The cost of reactivating a Victory ship that has been in mothballs is about $500,000 today, the Maritime Administration spokesman said.

Some sources indicated that reactivating a Liberty ship could cost more, depending on its prior use and how well it has been preserved in mothballs.

Most of the Liberty ships that have been preserved fairly well while laid up would be suitable only for carrying cargo that does not have to get anywhere in a hurry, the spokesman said.

The average speed of a Liberty ship is 10 knots, compared to an average 15 knots for Victory ships.

The reserve fleet in Beaumont has 131 ships in mothballs, the Maritime Administration spokesman said. Three of the ships are Victory cargo ships. The rest are mostly Liberty ships, he said.

What happens if the supply of adequate reserve fleet ships is depleted some time in the future?

An increase in the number of time-charters would probably be the initial step, one source said. If the situation got real tight, the Maritime Administration, at the request of the Defense Department, could requisition all U.S.-flag commercial ships for the Vietnam sealift, the source said.

That wouldn't take a national emergency, he said, because "we're in a national emergency now. This is what we're operating under now."

Ullman Resolution To Set a National Housing Goal and Establish Stability in Homebuilding

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 3, 1967

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, I joined my able colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. OTTINGER] in introducing a resolution (H.J. Res. 762) to establish a national housing goal. The resolution directs the President to discuss in his annual Economic Report the minimum number of new starts required for stability in the homebuilding industry and the economic conditions required to meet this objective.

A close interrelationship exists between Government monetary and fiscal planning, the credit markets, the housing industry, and the general economic health of the Nation. To illustrate this relationship, let me trace briefly the tight money crisis of 1966 and its impact on the general economy.

TIGHT MONEY AND ITS EFFECTS

Last year, inaction and indecision by both the Federal Reserve Board and the administration permitted the money markets to reach the brink of a financial panic. The Federal Reserve Board shut off the money supply at the same time that money demands from the corporate economy reached an alltime high. Treasury borrowings were also high. In September, the President finally moved to restore a semblance of balance by adopting many of the ingredients of a monetary-fiscal mix which I and others in the Congress had recommended some months earlier. By suspending the investment credit, postponing some Federal spending, and coordinating Government borrowing, the administration and the Congress stopped further deterioration of the economic situation.

By then, the mortgage market had dried up, and the housing and lumber industries were taking the punishment for our economic excesses.

I have waged throughout my years in Congress a fight against high interest rates and overreliance on monetary restraint as an economic policy tool. As a Representative from the Nation's No. 1 lumber-producing State, I am especially aware of the impact of tight money on the homebuilding and lumber industries.

I do not need to remind the Members of this House of the subsequent collapse of new housing starts in the fall of 1966, and their painfully slow recovery since then.

The general consequences of this slowdown soon spread to related industries. Sales in the first 4 months of this year for built-in gas and electric ranges were down 39 percent from a year ago; all electric ranges, down 20 percent; built-in dishwashers, down 15 percent; disposal units, down 14 percent; refrigerators, down 12 percent. This representative list illustrates how quickly a recession in homebuilding can affect other large segments of our Nation's industrial complex and labor force.

IMPORTANCE OF OBJECTIVES

The Congress cannot permit a recurrence of last year's mistakes. But in order to plan against similar economic disasters, we must be fully informed of the policies and objectives of the administration.

As the gentleman from New York [Mr. OTTINGER] said Tuesday:

> Fluctuations in homebuilding do not occur by accident.

Government activities, which have often been permitted to proceed independently in the money markets, have a marked effect on the availability of mortgage funds. The Treasury, the Federal Reserve Board, and the Federal Home Loan Bank Board are all involved in financial operations which determine the conditions for borrowing long-term money. The Department of Housing and Urban Development, the Federal National Mortgage Association, the Farmers Home Administration, and other Federal departments and agencies are involved in underwriting and guaranteeing home purchases.

Unfortunately, in the absence of Presidential guidance, many of these agencies of Government have responsibilities which bring them into competition with each other and cause them to work at cross purposes. For example, the discount rate hike of December 1965, by the Federal Reserve Board was prompted in large part by financial conditions in some large New York member banks. The hike may have prevented a run on these institutions by holders of large certificates of deposit, but it also touched off an interest rate war with savings institutions which spread throughout the country and continued unchecked until the Congress clamped an interest ceiling on these instruments late last summer. The consequences of this unhealthy competition on credit markets, housing, and the economy in general are well documented.

If there had existed a firm directive—backed by the Office of the President—that it was in the public interest to provide a financial framework to meet a national housing goal, perhaps this dangerous situation could have been avoided. Other responsibilities of our monetary agencies would have been tempered by this important national objective.

HOUSING—A NATIONAL GOAL

The recent turmoil in our cities underscores the need for planning adequate housing for all of our citizens. Last year's White House Conference to fulfill these rights emphasized the importance of providing housing to low-income groups. By creating the Department of Housing and Urban Development at the cabinet level, the Congress recognized the Federal involvement in homebuilding. Sustained economic growth demands an accurate assessment of housing conditions and needs throughout America.

It is appropriate therefore that the executive branch spell out its housing goals each year, just as it outlines its fiscal program, its balance-of-payment policies, its employment and price stability objectives. The Economic Report of the President, presented at the beginning of each congressional session, is an ideal vehicle in which to present the requirements and objectives of our national housing effort.

PROMPT ACTION ESSENTIAL

Swift adoption of this resolution will remind the administration that the Congress has not forgotten the experience of 1966. It will notify the White House that the legislative branch is tired of seeking remedies to economic imbalance after the fact, and requires advance notice of a coordinated program of economic planning. The resolution will establish an important economic target for fiscal and monetary planning.

I recommend this legislation—House Joint Resolution 762—for the prompt attention of the House.

The Job Corps Is Helping

SPEECH

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1967

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, evidence of the very positive impact which the Job Corps Program is having upon hundreds of disadvantaged young men from the Eastbay area, was given in two articles appearing in the Oakland Tribune on June 23. The first article, entitled "Job Corps Center: Youths Learn How To Work," describes the accomplishments being made by the young men at the Toyon and Lewiston Job Corps Conservation Centers. The second article, "Oakland Job Corps Trainee Learning How To Be Cook," describes the way in which Toyon corpsman Tony Archulita has found the road to opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert these two articles in the RECORD:

JOB CORPS CENTER: YOUTHS LEARN HOW TO WORK

(By Norman Golds)

REDDING.—The long hot summer of joblessness and idleness will be a thing of the past for many Eastbay youths.

These are the boys and girls who are taking advantage of Job Corps. Some 500 Eastbay boys and 200 girls can be accommodated at Job Corps centers this summer. The centers are filled, but the turnover rate in the western region due to graduations is about 1,200 a month.

The western region includes seven western states and contains about a third of the nation's centers.

"The best thing a youngster who lacks job skills and education can do is to come to a Job Corps center," says Tom Schlaich, district field supervisor for five Job Corps conservation centers, including two near Redding.

Schlaich, who was with the California Youth Authority for 20 years, believes in Job Corps and he believes in the youth.

"Don't underestimate the ability of these kids," said Schlaich. "They'll meet your demands. They want status. The trouble is that no one has ever considered them important enough."

A trip to Toyon and Lewiston Job Corps conservation centers near Redding bore out what Schlaich was saying. It is a remarkable thing to see boys in their late teens intensely picking their way through a basic primer.

Many of these boys went through school to the 10th or 11th grade. Some graduated; nevertheless, they didn't learn to read or do simple arithmetic.

There are two types of Job Corps centers, urban and conservation. The urban centers, of which Parks at Pleasanton is an example, have received most of the publicity—and nearly all of the criticism.

Toyon and Lewiston conservation centers have capacities of 163 and 224 boys, respectively, and are typical of the 88 conservation centers in the country. Parks has over 2,000 boys. Smaller size obviously means more staff involvement with the boys.

Eastbay boys probably will not go to Toyon or Lewiston, although they could expect to stay within the western region. There are also several girls' camps in the region. It is Job Corps policy not to send the youth too close to home.

Toyon and Lewiston are at former dam construction sites. The old buildings are used, along with metal portable buildings. The scenery is beautiful and the air is pure. It's a new life for the boys in many ways.

The staff runs a tight ship.

"When the boys come in we tell them we have something to offer them," said Toyon's corpsman supervisor, Bill Emmett. "If they want what we have, and are willing to abide by the rules, they stay. If not, they can turn around and go right home. They came here voluntarily and are free to leave at any time."

About 20 per cent leave within the first few weeks, according to Murray Durst, Lewiston center director, but the vast majority stay and adapt readily to center routine.

The conservation camp offers a program of basic reading and arithmetic education, in addition to instruction in a trade.

"There is a strong relationship between education and the trades," said Schlaich.

"We can't send a man out to work in a gas station unless he can read and do simple arithmetic," he said. "Our program consists of alternating weeks of education and trades."

The boys' eagerness to learn is immediately apparent—and is equalled by the teachers' eagerness to teach.

"This is the most rewarding thing I have ever done in my life," said Mrs. Doris James, a Redding housewife who works as a volunteer arithmetic teacher.

"In public schools we have to push these boys into class. Here we have to push them out of class."

She said the boys take time during recess and lunch hour to do their work. "They take such great pride in each step of accomplishment," she said.

Why are the Job Corps conservation camps able to do what the public schools could not do?

"We don't want to be snide about the public schools," said Durst. "We know we have certain advantages. We have the boys in their total environment: residential work and education.

"There is no hazing here. The boys don't make fun of each other because they're all on the same level. In school a boy falls behind and becomes embarrassed about it. He is asked a question he can't answer so he wises off to the teacher to avoid embarrassment.

"And the boys here are isolated. We have no street corners or unpleasant homes to return to at night."

Corpsmen have the opportunity to learn a variety of trades. Toyon offers programs in building repair, carpentry, conservation, cooking, ground-keeping, janitorial, maintenance mechanic helper, mobile equipment operator, service station attendant, warehouseman, medical corpsman, laundry and masonry.

Some corpsmen move on to urban Job Corps centers for a higher level of training, although the conservation centers are working toward more terminal programs. Job Corps officials, working with local employment offices, help center graduates get jobs.

The boys also receive instruction in applying for a job. They have "role-playing" sessions in which they take the parts of job applicants and personnel managers. They discuss the importance of neatness and responsiveness during an interview.

The boys' ideas about jobs can be unrealistic. During a session on attitudes, Bill Schultz, the head teacher, asked a boy how money he expected to make on his first job. His answer was $4.50 an hour. Schultz explained that around $1.25 or $1.50 would be more likely.

The overall Job Corps success rate—getting and keeping a job—is 76 per cent, according to Durst.

"There are problems," he said. "We have a Negro boy from Savannah, Ga., who is doing nicely in the welding program. Negroes are not often hired as welders in the South. It's going to take a lot of phone calls, but we intend to find him a job."

Several boys from Lewiston were recently placed as mechanics trainees with American Airlines. Durst said they were doing very well and this was confirmed by a personnel official at the airlines.

Durst said one of the boys wrote that the most important things learned at Job Corps were to get to work on time, to wear a uniform and to take supervision.

"Getting to work on time is obviously understood by you and me," said Schlaich, "but it means quite a change for many of these boys. They are not used to getting out of bed in the morning. They are night people, to bed at 2 a.m. and up at noon. It's a radically different way of life for them to report to work at 8 in the morning."

"The boys are taught responsibility by being given responsibility," said Durst. "We don't go through their rooms waking them up in the morning and we have no formations. The boys must get themselves up, clean their rooms, eat breakfast and be at work or in the classroom at 8. If they're late they are punished through fines, work details or cancellation of weekend passes into town."

Punishment is levied for a variety of offenses and if a boy is repeatedly unable to conform to camp routine, he will be sent home.

Emmett walked past a boy who flashed a big smile at him. "I recently restricted him to two-weeks confinement," said Emmett. "It's amazing how readily they accept punishment, even though they can just walk out of here. This isn't a jail, we have no hold on them."

Fines come out of the boys' regular paychecks. All corpsmen, who are technically employes of the Federal Government, receive $80 a month. Fifty dollars is held in trust and given to them when they return home. The other $30 is given to them in twice-monthly installments, less withholding tax, Social Security and fines. Some boys also put a portion of this money in savings.

Staff members emphasized that projects carried on at Job Corps conservation centers are not "make work." They call it production work.

Carpentry students at the Lewiston center are turning out hundreds of picnic tables for the National Park Service. Two of them are destined for the John Muir Home at Martinez, for example.

Toyon corpsmen have completed a half-mile hiking trail at Whiskeytown Lake near Redding and are working on a five-mile trail on the other side of the lake. They are also building 500 campsites.

But one of the their greatest efforts will be the Judge Francis Carr Memorial at Whiskeytown Lake. Now under construction, it includes a parking area, rest room building, lighting around the perimeter of a circular driveway and an elaborately lighted fountain. It brings together on a single project boys who are learning a variety of skills.

Granville Tilghman, Toyon center director, said it costs about $5,500 a year for each boy at his center, which he said is about $1,500 a year less than the cost at urban centers. Tilghman figured the value of each boy's labor at about $2,500 a year.

"Compare this to the $10,000 a year it costs to keep a boy in the Youth Authority," said Schlaich. "And when the boy leaves the Youth Authority there is nothing to show for it. He goes right back to the gutter.

"We are sending useful citizens back to the communities. They will be productive people, able to hold jobs and pay taxes. They won't be on the welfare rolls and they won't be in prison. How do you compute this kind of economic saving for society?"

Some of the boys who come to the centers have had trouble with the law, but there has been little trouble at the centers.

Some incidents have taken place, of course. A possible racial flareup was averted recently by talking it out with the Negro corpsmen leaders, a group of boys who are given leadership responsibilities. Negroes make up about 65 percent of the total in the camps.

Thievery is often a problem where there are close living conditions, but not at Toyon Center. Officials said the boys do a pretty good job of policing themselves.

Relations with the city of Redding are handled through a council of local citizens that meets regularly with Job Corps staff. Programs, including dances, are planned.

The boys are free to go anywhere in Redding, with the exception of one tavern that was placed off-limits by the center itself. If a boy should get into trouble the police handle it as they would with any other person. Then. the boy is also punished at the center.

The boys have performed a number of community service projects. Most recently, they cleaned up the graveyard in Central Valley, a small town near Redding, for Memorial Day.

They are preparing to be good citizens of their own communities by being good citizens of the Job Corps community.

OAKLAND JOB CORPS TRAINEE LEARNING HOW TO BE COOK

REDDING.—Tony Archulita is a slender smiling young man who decided that he wanted to be a cook.

In a little over two weeks he will return to Oakland to look for a job as a cook. His prospects are good, say officials at the Toyon Job Corps Center. He is a pleasant, likable person and he knows his way around a kitchen.

Archulita is the only Oaklander at Toyon. Most of the corpsmen there are from the South. The Job Corps policy is not to send the boys too close to home under the theory that greater distance makes them think twice about leaving the center before their training is complete.

Archulita is an Oaklander by choice. He grew up in Denver, Colo., going to school to the 11th grade. Then he moved to Oakland and lived at 1244 E. 14th St.

He'll return, he said with a grin. His future wife lives in Oakland.

Archulita praised the opportunities to learn skills offered at the Job Corps conservation centers.

"It teaches us a sense of responsibility," he said. "And it makes a good reference when you go to get a job."

He said he had done some cooking before coming to Toyon, but said camp gave him an opportunity to improve his skill and his educational level.

"I also learned a lot of new recipes," said Archulita.

Veterans' Home Loans Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. BATES

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1967

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to learn that conferees on S. 16, the 1967 Veterans' Assistance Act, are expected to agree on a Senate amendment which will extend the housing loan provisions of the famed GI bill until July 25, 1970. I am sure that this will be heartily endorsed by both Houses of Congress.

Technically, this valuable Veterans' Administration-operated program expired for World War II veterans on July 25, 1967, and on that date the Haverhill, Mass., Gazette published an eloquent eulogy of it. I believe that this newspaper editorial will do much to make all who read it feel anew that this is something really worth while which merits revival and continuance by the Congress for the full 25 years after the end of World War II.

The editorial reads as follows:

[From the Haverhill (Mass.) Gazette, July 25, 1967]

VETERANS' HOME LOANS

After today, any World War II veteran whose "GI" housing loan has not been processed and guaranteed will no longer be eligible to get the government-insured loan.

Since the end of hostilities, and the passage of the "GI Bill," some 5,375,000 veterans have taken out loans insured by the Veterans' Administration.

There is no question now about the importance of the veterans' housing program, as a factor in the continuing economic health of the country since the end of the war.

The money put into circulation under the provisions of the bill has helped to raise the standard of living of almost everyone in the United States.

The comparative ease with which mortgage money became available contributed to the shift in housing emphasis from cities to the suburbs. It helped to keep the birth rate high by enabling veterans to get adequate housing.

Every business connected with housing construction and maintenance which prospered during the past two decades can credit the GI Bill with much of its success.

There had to be a time limit and it has now been reached, but the bill has served its purpose. It helped to rehabilitate the veterans by giving them added responsibilities

> and community obligations they would not have had without home ownership. It helped to keep the country on a steady return to normal after war production stopped.
>
> Haverhill and every nearby community benefited from post-war housing made possible by the VA loan guarantees.
>
> This is a good time to look back and commend the wisdom of the city officials who set up the land purchase program for veterans in Riverside.
>
> The combination of $1 lots and the Veterans' Administration housing loan program turned an undeveloped section of the city into one of good homes. It is a neighborhood where the owners obviously take pride in their property, where improvements have been made regularly.
>
> When we think of the added tax revenue which has come into the city treasury from this residential area, and when we think of the interest these property owners have taken in municipal government, we realize the value of the city and Federal governments' benefits for veterans.
>
> Like the educational program which put so many veterans through college, the section of the GI Bill which guaranteed mortgages has justified fully the faith shown in it by legislators who worked up and put the measure through Congress.
>
> We have received handsome dividends, not all of them financial, from the provisions of that post-war legislation. More education, more civic consciousness, better home conditions, increased community development—all are important contributions to the betterment of the country.
>
> The financial side cannot be ignored, either. The money the government put into its GI benefits spread throughout the whole economy, generating more activity and more spending and generally brightening the economic scene.
>
> Veterans were rewarded for their wartime service and, in turn they continued to work for their country after they had returned to civilian life. The program which ends today was the result of one of the best pieces of legislation we have had from Congress.

Wise Words From President Johnson on America's Responsibilities to Future Generations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 25, 1967

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the Philadelphia Inquirer said last Sunday in response to President Johnson's magnificent statement to a delegation from Boys Nation last week:

> With President Johnson, we hope the upcoming leadership in America will realize its responsibility—not only to its own fragile ego but to the generations and generations to follow.

The President told these youngsters that creative idealism and the courage to challenge the status quo have been part and parcel of American life.

We are not wreckers, we are builders, the President said. We rebuild society by changing laws, improving laws, and observing law. To do otherwise would be to invite disaster.

These wise words should be heeded by all Americans during this troubled period.

Under unanimous consent I insert into the RECORD this excellent editorial:

ALL THE YOUNG REFORMERS

> The President's talk with youthful delegates to the American Legion "Boys Nation" last Wednesday brought into focus an aspect of modern youth in our society which has been troubling many thoughtful citizens—and not only in those areas where misspent young energy has created hells on earth.
>
> Mr. Johnson noted: "America has always been a Nation of reformers and we have always been a people who knew and accepted the responsibilities that role demands. To be a reformer is to be responsible. It is to be a remaker, not a wrecker, of what man has made. It is be a restorer, not a destroyer, of truth and good . . . It is . . . to rebuild society by changing law, improving law, using the law lest we accidentally or willfully weaken the foundations of law and bring all that we have achieved crashing down upon our heads."
>
> It is not only in the Newarks and Detroits that this needs attention; many of the most publicized members of the younger generation are, if not hostile to the legal and social structure their predecessors have raised, at best indifferent to it. We doubt that this loud segment of mockers and smashers adds up to even a substantial minority, but it can, perhaps, set a pervading tone—and a lasting one.
>
> There is no question that younger hands must continually take over the numerous helms of authority and responsibility—whose else can?—and the attitude of the owners of those hands is a legitimate source of concern to their elders.
>
> It does not seem to us that the strongest democratic Republic on earth can have been so badly built as we are constantly told by young critics. But where do they propose to go from here?
>
> Teddy Roosevelt's roaring, vigorous trust-busting was a "scandal" to more of his contemporaries than just the boards of directors of big corporations. Yet this reform, as many others in this country's history, was accomplished in due course without blowing cities sky-high. It was the application of intelligence and earnest effort, not the opposite.
>
> With President Johnson, we hope the upcoming leadership in America will realize its responsibility—not only to its own fragile ego but to the generations and generations still to follow. Burned ruins comprise a miserable heritage to pass along.

Panama Canal Would Be Lost by America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD D. CLANCY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 3, 1967

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Speaker, in a perceptive article in a recent issue of the Cincinnati Enquirer, Editor Brady Black states that the United States, if it accepts the proposed Panama Canal treaties, should be prepared to lose the canal. Because of the significance of this article and the crucial nature of the warnings it contains, I commend it to the attention of my colleagues.

I have joined as a cosponsor of House Concurrent Resolution 389, which urges that the United States maintain its sovereignty and jurisdiction over the Panama Canal Zone because of my conviction that the best interests of this Nation will be served by retaining control over the canal. I believe the following article points out why the United States must protect its own vital interests:

PANAMA CANAL WOULD BE LOST BY AMERICA

(By Brady Black)

> The United States, if it should agree to abrogate the treaty which gave it in 1903 the right to build, operate and protect the Panama Canal, should be prepared to lose the canal.
>
> This is the situation:
>
> We live in the age of the big grab. The Suez Canal has been lost by the British, the Belgians have been pushed from the Congo, the French have been squeezed from Indo-China and from Algeria, one African colony after another has broken the umbilical cord to the mother nation, and in the United States Negroes are burning and looting and destroying to the point of appalling some of their own civil rights leaders.
>
> The Panama Canal is a tempting morsel to the hostile and revolutionary forces running amok in the world.
>
> There is a meeting now in Havana, Cuba, of something called the Organization of Latin American Solidarity, which supports armed resistance to what the organization calls the oligarchic governments of Latin America. The organization is Communist and what it means by armed resistance is armed revolution.
>
> Present at the Havana meeting, having arrived from the United States via Communist Czechoslovakia, is Stokely Carmichael, the agitator of such racial violence as Negro mobsters are engaged in at home. The Cuban news agency Prensa Latina quoted Carmichael as saying that American Negroes were being used in "a fight to the death" in the United States. U.S. racial problems are on the agenda in Havana.
>
> With such urban guerrillas spreading destruction in U.S. cities, and with a Communist conspiracy committed to armed rebellion in Latin America, it is fair to examine Panama's potential to honor any new agreements on the canal.
>
> Panama is a volatile nation of approximately 1¼ million population. It has a government which the Solidarity boys would define as oligarchic and thereby deserving of resisting with arms. Panama has the poverty and unrest which provide fertile soil for the cultivation of revolution.
>
> This unrest had an explosive test in January 1964 when it was fanned into anti-U.S. rioting. The rioting provided the pressure which led to the writing of proposed new treaties covering U.S. relationship to the canal.
>
> The Chicago Tribune, in a recent journalistic coup, published the texts of the three treaties which have been developed and are expected to go to the U.S. Senate and to the Panama national assembly for ratification.
>
> The weak points on which I make the suggestion that the United States, if it accepts the treaties, should be prepared to lose the canal are these:
>
> U.S. military forces deployed to defend the canal would have the use of defense areas and could take action outside of specified areas only with Panama's consent. A hostile government in Panama could withhold such permission while enemy forces, moving with the swiftness of the Israeli forces against the Arabs in June, overran and seized the canal.
>
> A hostile government in Panama, with Panama sovereignty, could nationalize the canal, unilaterally abrogate all treaties, and order the United States to get out. Any U.S. resistance would be at the price of the charge of intervention in Panama's internal affairs. There has been agitation for just such nationalization of the Panama Canal ever since Egypt thus seized the Suez Canal in 1956.
>
> Let us now consider how the United States got into the canal business in Panama.
>
> Spain held what is Panama for 300 years

until Panama became part of Colombia in 1821. Panama separated from Colombia from 1855 to 1885, rejoined and then quit again in 1903.

From 1880 to 1899 two French companies tried, without success, to build a canal across the isthmus. The United States bought their rights and offered Colombia compensation for a canal zone, but ratification of a treaty failed in 1903. When Panama shortly thereafter broke away, U.S. ships protected Panama from Columbia, U.S. recognition was granted, and a deal was made with Panama for us to build, operate and protect the canal.

The canal zone is a strip five miles on either side of the canal and 50 miles long. The 1903 treaty granted to the United States perpetual sovereignty over this strip. For this the United States granted $10 million compensation, annual payments of $250,000 after nine years, and a guarantee of Panama's independence. The wrap-up of the affair with Colombia did not occur until 1922 when the United States paid Colombia $20 million plus special land transportation privileges. Colombia agreed to recognize Panama. In effect then we militarily guaranteed that Colombia wouldn't molest Panama and finally paid Colombia to recognize Panama. We in turn paid Panama for a strip through which to build the canal and guaranteed annual payments.

The annual payments were increased from $250,000 to $400,000 in 1936 and to the present $1,930,000 in 1955. In 1955 the United States gave $24 million in real estate to Panama and agreed to build a $20 million bridge across the canal. Panama benefits from the canal an additional $82 million yearly, through employment of its citizens in the zone and through expenditures from the zone in Panama.

Under the proposed new treaties the United States would surrender $330.7 million in interest-bearing but unrecovered investments in the canal and certain U.S. property in the present zone.

The size of the canal zone would be shrunk and sovereignty would pass to Panama. Administration of the canal would pass from the present U.S. corporation to a board of nine members, five named by the United States and four named by Panama. The board would maintain and direct a force with exclusive police authority in the canal area. Panama and the United States would provide for the defense, security, neutrality, and continuity of operation of the canal. Tolls would be raised to the point where Panama would be receiving about $22 million and the United States about $10 million a year.

"Of Life, Liberty, and Pursuit of Happiness"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE SKUBITZ

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 3, 1967

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, the year is 1967 and almost daily, American citizens are further grieved by reports of casualties and deaths of American soldiers and all of us try to reason why. The reports often leave us with a sense of futility toward the efforts of our country and other nations of this world who work for peace while involved in battle. I commend to the attention of my colleagues the recent address of Dr. Paul W. Burres, American Legion post chaplain, Baxter Springs, Kans., whose thoughts on life and on death are very pertinent to all Americans, to all peoples who value freedom:

Often we hear it said in the effort to justify some act that might be questionable, "After all, a man has got to live, hasn't he?" If that were the guiding principle of our lives, there would be no monuments to our heroic dead, no medals of honor, no Memorial Day.

By the exercises of this day, by the stones of these monuments, by this flag flying over us, we are trying to say that there are values more precious than life, because life created in God's divine image has dignity and meaning, a sacred quality not dependent upon the number of years of its physical existence.

Whenever the aggression of foreign foes, the cruelty of tyrants, or even the blunders of our own national leaders threaten to destroy those values, we depend upon a generation of men who, in the depths of their hearts, love liberty more than life. And so they go out from among us for a time, some of them forever, to become—

"Heroes proved,
In liberating strife,
Who more than self their country loved,
And mercy more than life."

Once during a brief leave in Scotland, I saw in an Edinburg park, some words carved in stone that I have never forgotten. An artist had pictured in stone a great battle scene of World War I, and over it had carved these words: "If it be life that waits. I will live forever unconquered; if it be death I shall die at last, strong in my pride and free." It is this love of freedom that sustains men whenever they stand between their homes and that desolation of war.

There are pacifists among us who are sying that there is nothing worse than war; that war is the last word in cruelty, the ultimate in human degradation. They are almost right, but not quite, for there is one thing that is infinitely worse than war. For a people to become so selfishly intent upon their own pleasures, so obsessed in their own affairs as to be callous and unconcerned that the monsters of Cruelty, Starvation, Injustice, and Oppression are swaggering through the world with no one to challenge them—that, I say, is to have a condition of moral and spiritual decay that is worse than war.

If men are to be sustained in their unselfish service and heroic sacrifices for a better nation, a better world, they require more than material things. This is revealed in the following incident.

When Mr. Khrushchev was visiting the U.S. a few years ago, an official was showing him around and thought to impress our foreign visitor by taking him to see the latest developments in food processing. Then, to drive home his point, he said, "The strongest nation is the one whose people are the best fed, the best clothed, the best housed." If we really believed that we would be materialists the same as the Communists!

I had always believed that the strength of a nation lies in the character and ideals of its people—their honesty and integrity, their self-respect, their self-reliance, their willingness to work hard, and their thrift.

Patriots today must be alert so that our own government does not do so many things for our people as to destroy the very qualities that make a nation strong and great. When people cease to criticize a government for fear of biting the hand that is feeding them, democracy is weakened. When our people cease their efforts to influence governmental policies because they believe their neighbors will not vote against Santa Claus, then the bureaucrats have already taken control, democracy has bowed out, and the times are ready for dictatorship to take over.

We must be continually alert lest our freedom at home be lost by the poorly concealed bribes of extravagance and paternalism. We must be militantly alert to defend our dream of a better world wherever the rights and liberties of humanity are threatened or denied.

It is this dream of a better world that sustains all who have sacrificed for its realization in the past, even as today it strengthens the spirit of our fighting men in Vietnam. Because we believe that all people have a right to establish their own way of life without fear of outside aggression, we send out our wealth and our best manhood to the other side of the world.

We do this because we believe that freedom for the other man is more important than comfort and luxury for ourselves.

We do this because we know that freedom is a precious jewel in the crown of human meaning that is never fully paid for. Each generation is required in one way or another to make its own installment payment to keep that jewel bright and lustrous.

Those who believe in these precious rights must ever be ready to defend them with their blood, sweat and tears. When I see the bent forms and graying hair of our veterans of the past, I wish I might tell them to enjoy their well-earned rest, that nothing further is required of them. But as long as injustice walks abroad and man does not know how to be a brother to his fellow man, their service, even their sacrifice is still required.

War service should mean that a man has had a short course in the school of sacrifice, a degree from the university of hard knocks. It is then his privilege to put that disciplined and sacrificial spirit to work for the welfare of others, for patriots are expendable in peace as well as in war.

Such service and such sacrifice bring their inevitable results of loss and grief. Grief alone can be a hard and bitter experience, but when it is the afterglow of devotion and sacrifice, it can be ennobling and exalting. In the love and providence of God and supported by the sympathy of a grateful nation, it is possible to leave the bitterest dregs of our grief on the altar of sacrifice and let the flame of our common devotion consume away its pain.

To those for whom Grief has haunted the memories of the years, as well as to those for whom it is still a present pain, may we say a word of comfort. Whenever the burden of loss seems more than you can bear, remember there is a calm and sure repose, a refuge in the Eternal Presence. Though the work of our hands and the forms of our loved ones have perished—Truth will endure—that all noble faith, all holy adventure, all unselfish sacrifice will live on, cherished in the heart of God, and in lives made better by their service. It is this faith that sustains us as we live, gratefully proud of our nation's past and courageously hopeful of its future.

Reorganization Plan for the District of Columbia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 3, 1967

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues an editorial which appeared in the Washington Post of August 3, 1967. This editorial supports the decisive action taken yesterday by th Committee on Governmnt Operations in endorsing the Prsident's reorganization plan for the District of Columbia. The article rightfully commends the leadership of Congressman JOHN BLATNIK as chairman of the subcommittee which conducted hearings on this measure, and rightfully the Post calls attention to the strong bipartisan support for the plan.

In commending this editorial to my colleagues, I would remind them that this plan does not mean home rule for the District. It does mean, however, a more modern and realistic approach to governing a city of this size. And it could not be more timely to take constructive steps here in the Congress to improve the effectiveness of the District government and thereby make it more responsive to the needs of the people. I urge Members to give this plan careful study in the few days remaining before it comes to the floor.

The editorial follows:

TWENTY-SIX VOTES TO FOUR

President Johnson's Reorganization Plan for Washington has become an adversary test between this misgoverned city and the House District Committee. The judges will be the other members of Congress. And the Plan is to go into effect on Aug. 11 unless either house of Congress votes it down.

Mr. McMillan, of South Carolina, the chairman of the District Committee, has been leading a vehement effort to defeat the plan. The reason is, of course, that it threatens to strengthen the administration of the city and reduce his opportunities for the petty personal benefits to which he is accustomed. Some time ago Mr. McMillan introduced a resolution to defeat the plan. The House referred the resolution to a neutral authority, its Government Operations Committee, to be considered in detail.

Now after careful hearings, the Government Operations Committee has reported the resolution with a strong and sweeping recommendation to defeat it and let the President's Plan go into effect. The vote in the committee was 26 to 4. This vote is a staggering defeat for Mr. McMillan and his cronies who control the District Committee.

This heavy endorsement of the Plan is a victory for good government, under a strong and unified Executive, for the great city that is the National Capital. It is a victory for modern administrative practice. It is a victory for an appointed city council, and the principle that even in a voteless city the government needs to listen to the neighborhoods.

This endorsement of the Plan, is, conversely, a great defeat for the idea that the city ought to be run as a fishing ground of patronage and campaign contributions for the chairman of the House District Committee and his friends. It is a defeat for the idea that the social policy of this vast city ought to be left to military officers. It is a defeat for the tradition of weak and wasteful government. It is a defeat for Mr. McMillan personally, in his long vendetta against a city that defied him by enacting civil rights legislation for its Negro citizens.

The city is indebted to the strong leadership of Congressman Blatnik, the chairman of the Government Operations subcommittee that scrutinized the President's plan. It is indebted to a large group of Republicans, including Congressman Gude of Maryland, who made it clear that the welfare of the Capital is no partisan matter. It is indebted to the whole Committee for its cautious and unemotional scrutiny of the Plan.

The chances are now better than ever before that the House will vote to let the Plan go into effect. The Plan will not mean self-government for Washington. But it will mean a stronger, more effective and more responsive government. And that is achievement enough to bring credit to all who have helped carry it out.

Representative George Brown Speaks at Los Angeles' Town Hall

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 3, 1967

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, last Tuesday, August 1, my colleague from the congressional district adjacent to my own, the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN], spoke before Town Hall in Los Angeles on the subject of "Vietnam: What Next?"

The speech was well received and was given wide attention in the newspapers and on television and radio. The gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN], has given a thought-provoking statement of his views on the role that the United States is playing in Southeast Asian affairs.

Mr. Speaker, I include the speech at this point in the RECORD, and urge each of my colleagues to read GEORGE BROWN's remarks on this problem which is of such grave concern to us all:

VIETNAM: WHAT NEXT?

(A speech given by Representative GEORGE E. BROWN, JR., at Town Hall, August 1, 1967, Los Angeles, Calif.)

Mr. Chairman, members, and friends of Town Hall, it may sound trite for me to say this, but I am both pleased and honored to be invited to address you today. Not just because I am well aware of your large and distinguished membership and your thoughtful and enlightened approach to public affairs, although these are obviously important factors to me, but also because I have been for nearly 20 years a close observer of your activities, your reports and your recommendations on critical issues. For some of those years I have been a member of Town Hall, a participant in your section meetings. Frankly, during those years I never felt that I would ever achieve the eminence of being asked to address you on a controversial issue of national importance, knowing the high standards that you set for your guest speakers. So, you have given me, by your invitation, a little of the feeling of the country boy who made good. I hope that after my remarks I will still have the same feeling.

My topic today is Vietnam—What Next?, and I approach the subject in the role of a critic of current Administration policy. To be more precise, for critics of Administration policy are to be found on both sides, or all sides, I am a critic of the Administration's thesis, as indicated by its actions, if not its words, that there is a military solution to the Vietnam problem—that continued escalation at some point will secure our aims. You will have no trouble detecting the nature of this criticism throughout my remarks. I shall deal with my specific proposals for a solution at greater length later in my remarks. Before doing so I would like to lay the groundwork by discussing the current situation in Vietnam.

Vietnam policy is today in the process of receiving another thorough review by the Administration, or, to use a cliche, is in the throes of an agonizing reappraisal. Saigon has just experienced the ninth coming of McNamara, with a new message of salvation. The message this time is that we must make more efficient use of our manpower resources. General Westmoreland insists that this message could not be for him, since his Command is already functioning perfectly. His only need is for another 100,000 troops, in order to increase the momentum of his operations. However, the Administration wants him to settle for another 30,000 troops and just maintain his present momentum. They are afraid that any increase in momentum will put the 1968 budgetary deficit into orbit.

There is an interesting debate going on in the press as to whether "maintaining our momentum" means that we have reached a stalemate. Every Administration spokesman becomes indignant at this suggestion. New descriptions of our progress have been coined. The enemy, we are told, has reached a "crossover point", where his manpower build-up can no longer match ours. We are told, on the other hand, that *our* forces are achieving their objectives, while the enemy is not. The nature of these objectives is still left a trifle fuzzy.

Obviously, an increasing part of the criticism about inefficient use of manpower is aimed at the ARVN forces. We are incensed that the Saigon government does not increase troop levels by drafting 18 and 19 year olds. We are unhappy about the poor fighting qualities of much of the Vietnamese army. We are distressed at the casualty ratios, which now clearly indicate that the U.S. is doing the bulk of the fighting. And we are unhappy about the continuing propensity of the native soldiers to exploit the peasants rather than protect them.

After first denying that there was any possibility that the troop level could be increased, the Saigon government has announced plans for adding 50,000 more to the regional and popular forces. Training will be strengthened. The U.S. advisor detachment will be increased by 50%. It is probable that all of this is a political gesture to satisfy U.S. criticism, rather than an indication of major improvement. The fact that the Saigon Army from the beginning has been trained under U.S. Advisors, and according to U.S. Army doctrine, is rarely mentioned anymore.

There is a growing behind-the-scenes debate on the bombing of North Vietnam. Some followers of the LeMay-Power line want to unleash the Air Force to destroy North Vietnam's military targets completely. To these air power exponents military targets include not only Hanoi and Haiphong but also the irrigation systems, the dykes of the Red River, and all the works of man. As General LeMay said in a recent speech, the bombing should continue ". . . so long as there are two bricks still stuck together." A growing number of advisors, however, are urging a de-escalation or even the ending of the bombing of the North, for a variety of reasons. For one thing, the dollar value of the aircraft shot down over North Vietnam considerably exceeds the dollar value of all the targets destroyed. This hurts a man like McNamara, who thinks in terms of cost-benefit ratios. As it is now, the North's industrial capacity is over 50% destroyed, including 65% of her POL storage, 60% of her electric power generating capacity and most of her steel making capacity. In spite of this, infiltration to the South has increased, Northern morale is higher and the desire to negotiate seems to be nil. All of this is the exact opposite of the effect hoped for from the bombing. It is doubtful if the complete destruction of all observable targets would eliminate the fighting potential of the North.

Temporarily at least the President will follow his customary practice of going down the middle, making no change in the bombing policy, probably until after the September 3 elections in Vietnam. To do so would have an adverse effect on the morale of the Generals who are running for office with our tacit support.

Revolutionary Development, the current phrase for programs to extend the influence of Saigon over the peasants, is making little observable progress. Figures that I have seen indicate that less than 10% of the 14,000 or so hamlets in South Vietnam are securely under government control. Even in the large cities there is little assurance of safety from Vietcong attacks against government installations, largely because much of the urban population is sympathetic to them.

The highly touted elections scheduled for next month will undoubtedly come off with precision, as did last years elections; will elect a military slate to run the government; and will change conditions very little. The legislature will probably differ very little from the present Constituent Assembly which is composed largely of representatives of the land-owning and wealthy classes, and close supporters of the military. No other possibility exists when not only members or sympathizers of the National Liberation Front are prohibited from running or voting, but also neutralists, militant Buddhists and others with views unwelcome to the Generals.

All in all, the situation in Vietnam is best summed up by such items as the U.S. News & World Report heading on its July 17 article, which reads "Stalled War, Now What?" Or in the analysis of Ward Just, after 18 months in Saigon for the Washington Post, who said in June "This war is not being won, and by any reasonable estimate, it is not going to be won in the forseeable future. It may be unwinnable."

The optimistic reports of Administration spokesmen, continually seeking new ways to obscure the truth, are best described in the words of Senator Mansfield upon McNamara's return from his latest trip to Saigon. "Reports of progress are strewn like burned out tanks, all along the road which has led this nation ever more deeply into Vietnam and Southeast Asia."

A brief review of the escalating troop commitments to this war gives very little encouragement to hopes of military victory. Five years ago, in 1962, we reached the most favorable ratio of Allied to Vietcong forces in the war. The combined Allied strength was about 480,000 against 80,000 Vietcong, or 6 to 1. Only 10,000 U.S. troops were involved. The ratio has steadily deteriorated since then.

In 1963, 5.9 to 1, with 16,500 U.S. troops.
In 1964, 5.7 to 1, with 23,000 U.S. troops.
In 1965, 3.7 to 1, with 181,000 U.S. troops.
In 1966, 3.4 to 1, with 389,000 U.S. troops.

As of today, with nearly 1¼ million Allied troops, almost ½ million of them—U.S., the Army thinks that the ratio may be back up to about 4–1. We can not be sure of this, however, because of different infiltration estimates made by Westmoreland and McNamara. Westmoreland, seeking to justify another another 100,000 troops, says 8,000 per month may be infiltrating from the North. McNamara, seeking to justify a much lower increase, as well as give some weight to our massive bombing of infiltration routes, says it is only 1000 per month.

The deteriorating ratio of ground forces may possibly be made up for by the vast increase in air and sea power committed by the U.S. since early 1965. I say "possibly" because there is some evidence that by using this power, and by Americanizing the war, we may have contributed to the lowered morale of the Saigon troops, reflected by a desertion rate that runs at 15 to 25% per year, and we may have strengthened the determination of the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese to resist to the bitter end.

Casualty figures for the two sides now show about 12,000 U.S. dead, 50,000 Saigon troops dead, and an astronomical 210,000 Vietcong dead. Vietcong killed in this war, by Army figures, are about 70% of the total Vietcong troops committed to action, which number about 300,000. If you include the normal ratio of 2 wounded for each dead, the Vietcong dead and wounded during the past 6 years are about 630,000 or more than double the total number of Vietcong troops currently committed to combat. Another 80,000 have been captured, or defected to the Allies, by the U.S. figures. Civilian casualties figures in this war, while exceedingly difficult to come by, are generally estimated at one to two times the military casualties. Peasants removed from their homes and living in refugee camps are around a million, and increasing.

What all this means is that in this little "limited" war, which we watch on TV and casually read about in the morning papers, a level of death and destruction for Vietnam has been reached exceeding that of the worst of WWII on the countries of Europe.

And despite all this, there is nothing that looks like victory in sight. Here is the analysis of General Le May as given on April 10 to the Chamber of Commerce of Wichita, Kansas. "Basically, I think it would be fair to say that the Vietcong has gotten stronger—and we are the ones who are frustrated. The long, drawnout conflict has created dissension and dispute in America—and a greater sense of determination and purpose in North Vietnam."

Behind this dissension and dispute in America referred to by the General, lies a great lack of conviction that this is a just or moral war, or that any vital interest of the U.S. is at stake. It is agonizing to the conscience of America to recognize that we may be casually destroying a country primarily because it does not have the good sense to yield to our military power, not because we are threatened by it, or because of any great virtue on the side that we are supporting.

Just as today marks a time of re-appraisal by the Administration of our military policies in Vietnam, it likewise marks a time of re-appraisal by our citizens and by our political leaders of both parties. Perhaps a key element in that re-appraisal is the scholarly study of the Vietnam War prepared by the Staff of the Senate Republican Policy Committee in April. Never officially approved by the Policy Committee, it has never-the-less had tremendous readership. Because this study sets the stage for what should be a far-reaching analysis of our goals in Vietnam as a part of next year's political debate, I would like to quote its concluding sentences, which are largely in the form of questions for the American people.

I quote: "Does the Republican Party serve America best by saying that politics stops at the water's edge? That we must rally behind the President? Does bipartisanship mean that Democratic mistakes are Republican responsibilities?

"Republicans—for two decades—have believed the United States must not become involved in a land war on the Asian continent. We are so involved today.

"Republicans, in 1954, made a limited commitment to the South Vietnam Government. Under the Democrats our commitment has become open-ended.

"Before making any further decisions to support or differ with the President, Republicans might agree to seek hard, realistic answers to two basis questions:

"1. What precisely is our national interest in Thailand, Cambodia, Vietnam, and Laos?

"2. To what further length are we prepared to go in support of this interest?"

While the Democrats have always had their dissenters from Administration Vietnam policy, led by Morse and Fulbright, these questions have produced a stirring among the Republicans. Seven Republican House Members, led by another Morse, Bradford Morse of Massachusetts, have proposed a plan for gradual de-escalation of the bombing of the North.

Prominent Republican Senators, such as Aiken of Vermont, Case of New Jersey, and Cooper of Kentucky, have joined Hatfield of Oregon and Percy of Illinois in dovish criticism of the Administration. Romney is reported now to have called for a cutback in bombing and to have stressed that pacification must do the decisive job in the south.

Among the Democrats, the Hawks are beginning to sound like doves. Senator Frank Lausche of Ohio has announced that he now favors de-escalation of the bombing in North Vietnam, and Senator George Russell of Georgia, Chairman of the Armed Services Committee is quoted in Newsweek as saying "We need a new policy more than new troops in Vietnam." Senator Symington only last Thursday suggests that, ". . . we offer not only to stop the fighting in North Vietnam, but also the fighting in South Vietnam—and start negotiations from there."

What do the American People think about our course in Vietnam? One obvious observation is that the amount of frustration is increasing, and will increase even more as the citizen is hit by higher taxes and more casualties, compounded by an unsteady economy, as well as negro riots, hippie love-ins and assorted demonstrations. Most polls show that about 75% of the American people reject both all-out war, and withdrawal of U.S. troops on a unilateral basis, giving some support to the thesis that the President's policy is still the policy of consensus.

The Harris Poll in the July 10 Newsweek is typical. Harris shows, however, that this 75% is divided between those who want more military pressure and those who want more effort at negotiation, with those favoring more military pressure gaining on the negotiators. Likewise, among the other 25%, those favoring all-out war are gaining on those supporting a pull-out. I have done my own survey, by summarizing the results of 37 Congressional questionnaires taken over the last 4 months, in Congressional Districts in 20 different states. These polls are weighted in favor of the middle-western states, and Republican Congressmen, and include about a half million responses from about 5 million questionnaires mailed. I make no claim for the scientific precision of these polls, but their sheer magnitude gives them some validity. The results clearly shows a much smaller consensus, with only about 25% of the respondents favoring a course of gradual escalation as followed up to now by the Administration. More than half would favor some variation of a "fight harder and win" policy, all the way up to nuclear weapons. About a quarter favor the "de-escalate and negotiate" policy, with possibly 10% ready to withdraw. On the closely related questions of a tax increase to finance the war, however, there is about an 80% rejection by all the respondents. In a fairly carefully-worded questionnaire sent to voters in my own district, with six possible responses, only about 10% favored the present policy of gradual escalation.

It is my opinion that the obvious shift by the voter toward a more hawkish position, just at the time that more political leaders of both parties may be inclined to shift toward a more dovish position, poses a real threat to the policy making processes of this country. Such a voter shift quite obviously results from frustration and anger. The course it takes most easily is that of righteous indignation, a patriotic demand that our military might should prevail, and an increasing hatred of those foreigners who keep shooting and killing our boys as fast as we send them over there.

The groundwork has been sometimes unwittingly laid for this by the continuous Administration repetition that we are fighting only for freedom and democracy—against an invader from the North engaged in a conspirational effort to destroy its small neighbor, using the diabolical tactic of a Communist Chinese—inspired "War of National Liberation". All of these assertions are highly questionable oversimplifications of an extremely complex geo-political situation. Yet the American people *want* to believe in the rightness of our cause, and given a constant repetition of half-truths, they tend finally to reject the whole truth.

If the prospects of a speedy military solution are dim, as is the almost unanimous view of knowledgeable observers, what is the possibility of a negotiated settlement, given the present negotiating positions of the two sides? Will the Vietcong and North Vietnam join us at the negotiating table, accepting our oft-repeated assurance that we are ready for "unconditional" negotiations? The answer to this question is again, No.

The reasons for this are simply stated. The vast expenditure of U.S. planning, intrigue, effort and resources in Vietnam since 1954 practically demands that the Administration paint the situation there in terms of tremendously significant emotional issues—protecting freedom against tyranny—stemming the global communist tide,—defeating the Communist Chinese—created strategy, of "Wars of National Liberation", as I have just indicated. Hence it is true now, just as it was 13 years ago at Geneva, that our Government cannot accept a solution which results in a government other than the one we are supporting, *even if it were elected by the people of South Vietam in impartially supervised elections.* We rejected the path of supervised elections in 1956, and to go back to it now would make mockery of a course to which thousands of bureaucratic careers in the CIA, the State Department, the Pentagon and the Executive offices have been committed, and would deny the validity of the great motives we have ascribed to our involvement. Hence we have encouraged and accepted a South Vietnamese Constitution which makes Communism a crime, which even the U.S. has not yet done.

We hail with jubilation the results of elections in which Communists, Communist sympathizers, neutralists, militant Buddhists, and opponents of the Military Junta are permitted neither to run nor to vote. We make no protest over Premier Ky's statement that if an elected government sought to come to terms with the NLF he would overthrow it with the Army. We describe with horror the possibility of National Liberation Front participation in the Government in even the smallest way as "letting the fox in the Chicken coop."

By all these means we make it clear that to us "negotiation" means discussing where the Vietcong will turn in their arms and which routes they will take back to North Vietnam. And we describe this happy state of affairs as restoring freedom and democracy to South Vietnam.

The National Liberation Front sees these actions and accepts them as the true indication of our position rather than the generalizations made by President Johnson for domestic U.S. consumption. Their position, on the other hand, is that the South Vietnamese government is merely a puppet of the U.S., with no support from the people, and is both corrupt and dicatorial. Their aim is to root it out completely. Between these two extremes there can be no compromise.

To complicate the picture even more the Liberation Front and Hanoi completely distrust the U.S. To them our often-reported offer to negotiate is merely a cover to placate U.S. and international opinion, while continuing to escalate. They feel we betrayed the Geneva Agreements, just as France betrayed several agreements she made with the Viet Minh prior to 1954.

This explains in part Hanoi's insistence on specific actions, such as an end to the bombing of the North, before even considering further efforts to negotiate.

At one point in time, I felt that the election of a civilian government in South Vietnam would increase the chances of a negotiated settlement. I am now extremely dubious of that. The present military government, with advice and guidance from U.S. experts, has become quite adept at shaping the outcome of elections. By controlling who votes, who runs, who has access to the media and what they can say, it is hardly even necessary to engage in fraud to insure the proper results. High turn-out of the eligible voters can be insured by the rumor that those who do not vote may have trouble getting food rations. And if worse comes to worse, the advance threat by the Premier of a military coup against any unsuitable government should clinch the case.

I am, therefore, of the opinion that after the September 3rd election, we will see the same people performing the same jobs and following the same policies and practices. The only difference will be in their claim to legitimacy through an overwhelming mandate of the people in a "free" election—thus it was with Diem in 1955 when he received 98% of the vote in a rigged contest against the discredited Bao Dai, who ran from the French Riviera.

In view of those rather pessimistic assertions on my part, what do I see for the future?

As to a military victory, as I intimated earlier, I see no chance whatsoever. An enemy which we claim has roots in only five to seven million of the 14 million population of South Vietnam has suffered over 600,000 military casualties in the last 6 years, at least another 600,000 civilian casualties, and the evacuation of over a million of its women, children, and elderly. This is the destruction of one-third to one-half of its total base of support, according to our figures. Yet this enemy is now nearly 4 times as strong in numbers as it was six years ago, better trained and equipped, and apparently with higher morale. He has sanctuary in Cambodia, Laos, and North Vietnam. According to General Westmoreland, his manpower is replenished at rates as high as 8,000 per month from North Vietnam, in spite of the greatest aerial bombardment ever used against an enemy. Recruitment from the local peasants seems to remain at a high level. And if we should seek to destroy his sanctuary, especially in North Vietnam, the odds become dangerously high that we involve the 700,000,000 Red Chinese.

I am convinced that while neither China nor Russia wish to be involved in this war, they will commit troops if either Hanoi or the Liberation Front is faced with military destruction. In the meantime, they will provide an increasing array of military hardware and the training to use it. Reports of the use of 122 mm rockets of 6-mile range and pinpoint accuracy are only an indication of our potential problem if the U.S.S.R. should decide to supply North Vietnam with a full range of sophisticated military hardware.

Russia and China will also encourage military diversions on a world-wide scale. Those diversions may include the Middle East, Burma, Thailand, Hong Kong, Korea, the Philippines, various parts of Latin America, and possibly Africa. In this game of escalation and diversion the enemy enjoys a tremendous leverage because of the nature and location of the war, and of the tactics used. According to our military doctrine we require a superiority of 10–1 in manpower to control guerrilla tactics. Yet we fight at the back door of 25% of the human race as potential enemies. Because of the location of the enemy, our logistics problem is massive. Because of the sophistication of our technology, it is tremendously expensive. All these factors run our costs to 25 billion per year at present levels. The enemy's costs probably run to 250 million per year, or 1% of ours. One successful diversionary effort by the enemy involving another of the 50 or so "freedom-loving" nations to which we have made a "commitment," at a similarly remote part of the world, would require total mobilization of the American people and resources.

The present level of involvement in Vietnam has produced major impacts on American society, and will produce even more. An unhappy and frustrated people will be made even more unhappy by a major federal tax increase in the next few months. For Californians, this will be added to the largest state tax increase in history, which becomes effective today. Despite its size, the federal tax increase will not be enough to prevent the largest budgetary deficit in history, except for the years of WW II. This will increase government borrowing, increase interest rates, reduce the flow of residential mortgage funds, and have a generally unsettling economic effect.

An indignant Congress and an unhappy President will cut domestic expenditures for the War on Poverty, education, space, health, urban blight, and a variety of other programs, crippling many of them and saving 2 or 3 billion dollars, which will have an insignificant effect on the deficit. However, because the programs cut will be those widely hailed as the basis for a "great society", and for which expectations were for a great increase, rather than a cut, the resulting gap between expectations and performance will encourage more and bigger riots. These riots may cost the economy considerably more than the budgetary savings, if the estimates I have seen so far of riot costs are any indication.

At the political level I see very little chance for the re-election of President Johnson under the present circumstances. I likewise see very little chance of the Republicans nominating a candidate who will do any better. None of the three top Republican Presidential prospects—Romney, Reagan, and Nixon—have given a single indication of having a program that can cope with the crisis facing the U.S. and the world today. This country deserves better than what it apparently faces for next year from its great democratic system.

At the very minimum next year's election should provide a dialogue and a choice on the great issues of our time. Is Vietman really a great crusade, worthy of the full support of the American people? Or is it a tragic error perpetuated by a stubborn and arrogant Executive bureaucracy, from which we should withdraw with a degree of humility? Is the noble effort to create world order under law, conceived in WW II by the Great Powers, to be replaced by a new U.S. Imperialism? Is the Cold War to be the perpetual condition of mankind? Are the problems of poverty, race, urban decay and a society which massively befouls its own environment to be solved, as an example to all mankind, or be disregarded?

My guess is that these questions will be submerged in waves of rhetoric, rarely asked, and never answered in realistic terms for fear of alienating a voter. Yet they must be answered soon and adequately, if we are to cope with the present crisis of mankind. They are each related to the other, they require a political philosophy as different from the present as day from night, and yet nowhere on the horizon does there appear such a philosophy.

I have left until last a few brief comments about my own program for a solution in Vietnam. My previous remarks should have made clear my complete disillusionment with the course we have followed. I regard that course as a compound of all that is bad in American foreign policy. Yet as responsible citizens we should always try to answer the question "What would you do if you were making the decisions?"

Up until the present time I have always felt that, although I am a vocal dove in criticizing our Vietnam policy, I could fit within the limits of the concensus posture of the President. I have never advocated a U.S. pull-out of Vietnam. I have never urged turning the government over to the National Liberation Front. I consider our troops to be brave men doing an ugly job in the best way they can. I have accepted in good faith the President's verbal assent to the Geneva

Accords as a basis for negotiations, his support of free elections, his willingness to see Vietnam re-unified if the people desire, feeling that these provided an ample basis for settlement of the conflict. My most radical proposals have been for an end to the bombing of the North, negotiation with the National Liberation Front as well as Hanoi, and a government elected in an honest election with every citizen free to run and free to vote.

The iron logic of event has convinced me that I have been naive. I believe now that the President has accepted in fact and by his actions the position of those advisors who urge a military victory and the continuation in power of our hand-picked generals as the government of South Vietnam. I believe his political strategy is to seek to win the war, thus justifying his course of action and his tremendous commitment of U.S. resources, or failing that, to intensify Vietnam next year to a full-scale war in the hope that he will survive as a war-time President—none of whom have ever been defeated—according to his research.

I would rather retire from politics than support this course.

I now call upon the President to reverse his position and take the following steps:

(1) Order our half million troops, our massive air and naval fleets, to cease fire and stand fast. Announce to the enemy and to the world that our soldiers will fire only if fired upon, but if fired upon will take all steps necessary for their own defense.

(2) Ask the Geneva Powers to re-convene, under call of the co-chairman, to a neutral site in Asia, with the National Liberation Front participating as a belligerent.

(3) Participate in good faith negotiations as long as necessary to reach a settlement, making clear that he will be guided by the basic principle that the future of South Vietnam shall be determined by the freely-expressed decisions of its own people.

(4) Insist that the final agreement be guaranteed by the great powers, and adequate enforcement machinery provided.

I believe that these steps contain all that is necessary to achieve an immediate end to the war, and a political settlement which will satisfy the great majority of the American people. It allows the United States to seize the initiative. It builds upon the precedents of previous international agreements relating to the area, fragile and unsatisfactory as they have been. It adheres to the principle of self-determination of peoples, a cornerstone of American foreign policy. It remedies the cardinal defect of Geneva, the lack of guarantees by the participants, so that when France failed to carry out her obligations, the other great powers would have filled that gap. It places the U.S. squarely back on the side of enforceable world law, rather than as the self-proclaimed policeman of the world.

Undoubtedly there will be those who will say that this course would constitute surrender to the enemy. They are completely wrong. It does constitute a recognition that there is a military stalemate in Vietnam, which cannot be broken without the commitment of an unacceptable level of U.S. manpower and resources. It does constitute a recognition that in a war that is primarily political in its nature, the course of military escalation can lead to unacceptable possibilities of greater involvement. It may constitute a recognition that the U.S. made a mistake in seeking by clandestine means to subvert the Geneva Agreements of 1954.

This course will also require that the Administration admit frankly to the American people that most South Vietnamese feel that this is an anti-colonial war, not a war of Communist aggression—that the government we are supporting has no roots among the people, and never could have as long as it consists of generals who fought for the French, and landholders and businessmen who owe their wealth to the French—that all Vietnamese are inherently suspicious of the Chinese and highly unlikely to serve as lackeys of Chinese Communism—and that the course of Communism in Asia will be determined more by how honest and dedicated to the welfare of their people the government leaders are than by how big their armies are. All of these requirements fly in the face of myths promulgated by the Administration for several years.

But if our real goals in this tragic war are what the President claims they are—a government of South Vietnam acceptable to its own people, and a settlement of the problems of the area in accordance with the spirit of the Geneva Agreements—we will achieve them by the program I am now advocating.

Nor will this course endanger the safety of our men in Vietnam. If I thought it did, I would not advocate it. Our present military strategy is primarily that of "search and destroy". Under this doctrine we go to enormous effort to locate enemy concentrations, exposing our troops to great hazards and tremendous casualties. Then, having located them, we rush our battalions to destroy them, almost invariably on terrain and under circumstances favorable to the enemy. If, in order to satisfy the military, I need a more warlike description of my first point than "cease-fire and standfast", I would call it "sit and destroy" rather than "search and destroy". In other words, we can select the terrain favorable to our troops, protect it to whatever extent required, and engage in constant reconnaissance. If the enemy desires to continue the fight they must do it under our conditions, concentrating where our air and artillery can destroy them, rather than the opposite. While I am convinced that they would accept the cease-fire, I see no hazards to our troops remotely comparable to the present situation if they did not.

And the very fact that a half million American troops sit permanently astride their land compels them to seek negotiations. No other course is possible, since we cannot be removed by military means.

For the U.S. to end the war in Vietnam by its own initiative, and to institute the reconvening of the Geneva Powers under reasonable prospects for successful negotiations, would have such far-reaching benefits as to require another speech to explore fully. However, in order to conclude this speech on an optimistic note, I will mention four such benefits.

First, it would effectively balance the budget, by saving 10 to 15 billion dollars this year. Second, it would eliminate the need for a Federal tax increase. Third, it would allow for planning a major attack on our domestic problems in the next fiscal year. Fourth, it might get both me and President Johnson reelected next year.

The last reason alone makes a very strong case, as far as I am concerned.

New Jersey Riot

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 3, 1967

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, no matter what the reason for the recent rioting, no citizen has the right to use violence to better his conditions.

The truth is, however, that most of the rioters had no such idea in their minds when they were shooting at bystanders, looting stores, and burning everything in sight.

During the week of July 16, 1967, WMAL radio in Washington broadcast an editorial concerning the New Jersey riot, a clear example of violence for the sake of violence.

I commend the text of the editorial to the attention of our colleagues, as follows:

New Jersey Riot

(Broadcast during the week of July 16, 1967)

A Negro reporter, watching as downtown Newark, New Jersey, went up in flames, said: "They're just shooting at anything white."

That single sentence stated clearly what, if allowed to continue, can create untold tragedy to American society. To hate because of color has long been the doctrine of the Ku Klux Klan. Now Negro extremist groups are giving this destructive doctrine reverse English with ever-increasing success. It is morally wrong to hate a Negro because of the color of his skin. It is equally wrong to shoot white men because they are white. The American races must not allow lunatic fringes to lead or push them into warring camps.

We have no pat and easy solutions. But it seems obvious that the first order of business must be to restore order to the streets. No progress can be made in an environment of constant fear. Meanwhile, men of good will, both white and black, must continue to seek solutions to the very real problems of Negro housing, education and jobs. This work must go on rapidly—not because some youngster threw a molotov cocktail, but because it is morally and constitutionally right.

Boston's Newest School To Be Named in Honor of Speaker of the House John W. McCormack

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 18, 1967

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I read with great pleasure that Boston's newest school is to be named for Boston's most distinguished citizen. A man the people of Boston have seen fit to send here to Washington for nearly 40 years to grace these halls of Congress with his courage, intelligence, and kindness—JOHN W. MCCORMACK.

The singular honor bestowed on the Speaker comes after years of dedication to education, not only in Boston and Massachusetts, but dedication to the broad spectrum of education in America. I believe that this is the first time that a school in Massachusetts has been named for a living man. It is a fitting honor for a man who lives to the full measure for his God and his country.

It was JOHN MCCORMACK's hand that guided through the House the landmark Elementary and Secondary Education Act, which has been hailed as the important single event in the field of education of this century.

The boys and girls who attend the John W. McCormack School will do well to take example from their school's namesake. John W. McCormack has led our Nation to greatness by lending his greatness to this Nation. It might be time also to reflect how fortunate our country has been to have his steady hand, wise counsel, and courage to help guide it through a span of crises that has no comparison in history.

I include at this point in the RECORD an article from the Boston Public Schools Review which describes the new John W. McCormack School and the man for whom it is named:

BOSTON'S NEWEST SCHOOL TO BE NAMED IN HONOR OF SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE, JOHN W. MCCORMACK

The most expensive school building ever constructed in Boston and the largest single building to be undertaken since the completion of Hyde Park High School in 1929 will be named in honor of John W. McCormack, Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The school, on Mt. Vernon Street in Dorchester, is being constructed on a five-acre site, and will accommodate 1100 pupils. Total cost is three million dollars.

School Committee member William E. O'Connor presented the motion to name the new school on Mt. Vernon Street, the John W. McCormack School. The Speaker of the House, upon notification of the Committee's decision, expressed his gratitude to the members in a letter to Mrs. Louise Day Hicks stating:

"The high honor and tribute you and the other members of the School Committee have paid me pleases Mrs. McCormack and me more than I can adequately express in words. I shall always cherish this warm feeling of friendship."

The Honorable John W. McCormack is a lifelong resident of South Boston. He was born on Mercer Street, lived on Vinton Street and graduated from the John A. Andrew School. Speaker McCormack was elected to the Massachusetts House of Representatives in 1920, The Massachusetts Senate in 1923, and was elected to the 70th Congress to fill the unexpired term of Congressman James A. Gallivan. He was elected Majority Leader of the Congress in 1940 and Speaker of the House in the 87th Congress.

Speaker McCormack holds honorary degrees from Boston University, Holy Cross, Boston College, Tufts, Providence College, Stonehill, Georgetown, and the Catholic University in Washington, D.C. He has been honored as a Knight of Malta and holds the Peace Medal of the Order of Catholic Laymen. The Speaker lives at 726 Columbia Road, South Boston.

The new John W. McCormack School will house 32 classrooms, 4 special classrooms, a remedial reading laboratory, library, art room, sewing room, food laboratory, drafting room, special guidance and administrative offices, metal and electronics shops and science laboratories. The school will serve grades 4 to 8 and will be comparable to any in the nation.

Rev. Seido Ogawa Delivers Address at 50th Anniversary Celebration of Nuuanu YMCA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 25, 1967

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues an inspiring address which was delivered by the Reverend Seido Ogawa, executive secretary of the Hawaii Council of Churches, at the recent 50th anniversary dinner of the Nuuanu YMCA in Honolulu.

Mr. Ogawa emphasized how the Nuuanu "Y," once dubbed the "Oriental Y," has given substance to the leadership potential of the immigrant groups in the 50th State. He stressed how, for over five decades, the "Y" has provided the framework for the development of the sons and grandsons of immigrants from Asian nations and prepared them for roles of responsible citizenship in today's cosmopolitan Hawaii.

The Reverend Ogawa's dedication to youth, and his recognition of the need for greater emphasis on the spiritual and moral training of our youngsters, has earned him the gratitude and respect of all who know him.

Mr. Ogawa's address touches in a very personal and meaningful way upon what today's youth needs, in example and encouragement, to meet the complex problems of modern society.

In the hope that Honolulu's experience will be of some guidance to other cities in our country, I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full text of Reverend Ogawa's speech, as it appeared in the July 17, 1967, issue of the Honolulu Star-Bulletin.

"HAOLE Y" AND "ORIENTAL Y"

(By Rev. Seido Ogawa)

I recollect that as a youth I spent a considerable amount of time at the Nuuanu Y. Much of it was time when I didn't have anything special to do. I also recall many other occasions when I didn't spend time at the Y but agreed to meet friends there in order to go somewhere else—using the Y as a point of departure. I suggest that, especially from the standpoint of a youth, these are pretty good definitions of what a home is.

I further remember—at the level of feelings more than mind—that on some occasions we went to the old Central Y on the corner of Alakea and Hotel and that those visits were accompanied by vague awareness of discomfort and formality. It was roughly a feeling of being in a stranger's home compared with the feeling of being at home in the Nuuanu Y.

I don't mean to point up something negative or to raise any issue. I'm just thinking back. I'm sure that the old image of the Central Y as the Haole Y and Nuuanu Y as the Oriental hangout reflected the socio-economic distances of an earlier day. Yet, to accent the positive, there was wisdom and even necessity in the partly conscious partly subconscious, development which led to the establishment of the Nuuanu Y—on one hand as the integration and merging of separate, Oriental YMCAs, on the other hand as a Y with a focus on Orientals.

The formation of the Nuuanu Y had incalculable social consequences—broad and basic consequences—for the Oriental populace directly, and indirectly for all Hawaii. It provided a social and psychologically necessary home base, a place that one could feel possessive about, a point of convergence for human hopes and opportunities, a place of learning and of testing. It also provided a Western type of social setting and structure, with its assumptions and values, with a primary invitation to people from Eastern backgrounds to use it freely in the process of transition and change.

When we note how many of the key personalities of the first generation Oriental groups felt themselves deeply involved in and identified with the life and objectives of the Nuuanu Y, when we remember also how many of the second generation have moved in, through, and out of the Nuuanu Y to positions of influence in the larger community, the work of the Nuuanu Y is an important fabric of the life we have today in this community. If I were to summarize what I feel to be the significance of the Y in its first 50 years it would be in somewhat the following terms:

The Nuuanu Y helped to give substance to the leadership potential of the immigrant groups. Consciously or otherwise the attitude of the Nuuanu Y was that Oriental immigrants were not all "laborers" (at least not born laborers), that regardless of the initial auspices under which they came they represented at least a cross-section, a spectrum of talents and abilities, that among them were leaders as well as followers, that for the welfare of the immigrant groups as well as the community at large these people should be encouraged to develop to their maximum potential.

The Y offered support, encouragement and interested friendship. It offered the tools which immigrant peoples need for cultural adjustments—language classes, social graces, and supportive groups. It provided the framework for leadership to develop with the result that both the immigrant groups and the community benefited.

The second generation, the current older leadership of the Y, has carried on the leadership developmental process, not always as consciously aware of the sociological implications, taking more for granted, nevertheless appreciative of an institution committed to serve them. After a while many became less consciously dependent on or identified with the Y, but this is a natural process of weaning and independence. The truth remains that many who may not feel consciously indebted to the Y would acknowledge early and basic influences. The Y's work and backup have been a basic social and psychological necessity for the first and second generations in Honolulu.

And what about the Nuuanu Y today and tomorrow? I have some concerns. One is that every institution undergoes a process of attrition. It tends to lose something in the course of the years—something of the vision, the social dream, the determination to overcome, the feel for people and their needs—something of the intangible complex of motivations that spells the difference between a vital human organization and routine operation. And the more there is to look back upon with satisfaction the greater danger that we rest on past laurels instead of exercising critical self-examination, realizing that new times demand new dreams as the price of continued relevance. The YMCA, like the church, like social work, like education, has an honorable past but the question we must ask continuously is whether historic, past significance—on the part of church, education, or social work, or the Y—is sufficient for the opportunities and needs of today.

One of the things which identifies the Y's past is the disproportionately large number of outstanding men which it was able to attract and to help in developing. I'm not thinking so much of a particular area of human achievement, such as physical prowess, but of the whole man, the kind of man symbolized by the Y triangle. It seems to me that we are not addressed today, in the program of the Y, to the same broad objective of developing men of stature, men who stand tall. The strength of the Y in Honolulu is in the men who have helped build this community, the men who by their own height among men have helped to point the direction for others.

Admittedly this task is a good deal more difficult today. But the need is also far greater. The human landscape today is exceedingly flat and monotonous. There is an absence of landmark personalities, that is people who are identifiable above the crowd, who can help others to identify themselves. I have had a growing feeling that the so called "revolt of youth," the unexpected manifestations of youthful frustration, have to do with a hostility that is directed toward a society which is failing to set examples and to point directions.

Let me share a personal satisfaction. It has to do with the fact that my son has been enrolled in one of the classes in the self defense arts for five years. My satisfaction has to do with the kind of person the instructor is, a man with obvious poise of spirit—secure, self confident, and therefore humble—interested in helping young men to grow in similar poise of spirit, a man whose quiet manhood commands respect. I want my son to be like that, not needing to prove his strength or ability because he knows himself, able to think of others' needs because he doesn't have to be anxious about his own.

Somehow I feel that the genius of the Y is related to this kind of human relationship, that our necessary concern and focus must be on providing this kind of leadership—both staff and volunteer—on getting the kind of people who incarnate in themselves what the youth of today need, in example and encouragement, to be the real men of tomorrow.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 3, 1967

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD my newsletter, Washington Report, for the month of August:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman WILLIAM E. MINSHALL)

Even cynical observers of the Capital scene are amazed by the length of time—one full year—granted by the President to his National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders to answer his three basic questions about the riots ravaging our nation. The President's questions are: 1) "What happened?" 2) "Why did it happen?" 3) "What can be done to prevent it from happening again?" . . . *While we wait a year for the Commission's report how many more innocent citizens of all races will be killed or injured? How many more American cities will be pillaged and reduced to ashes by firebombs?"* . . . Answers to the President's questions are already a matter of record. The facts speak for themselves.

Facts: Communist Involvement. Testifying before the House Appropriations Committee February 16, 1967, FBI Director *J. Edgar Hoover* said: "Communists and other subversives and extremists strive and labor ceaselessly to precipitate racial trouble . . . Such elements were active in exploiting and aggravating the riots . . . in Harlem, Watts, Cleveland and Chicago." . . . 1964 Un-American Activities Committee hearings quote racial agitator and *FBI fugitive Robert Williams,* who fled to Castro's Cuba and now mails his publications from Red China to the U.S. via Canada: "During the hours of the day sporadic rioting takes place and massive sniping. Night brings all-out warfare, organized fighting and unlimited terror against the oppressor and his forces. Such a campaign will bring about an end to oppression and social injustice in the U.S.A. in less than 90 days." . . . *Stokely Carmichael,* speaking from Havana July 27, 1967: "We must internationalize our struggle and if we are going to turn into reality the words of Che (Guevara) to create, two, three or more Vietnams, we must recognize that Detroit and New York are also Vietnam." . . . *H. Rap Brown,* head of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, July 26, 1967, after his arrest for inciting a Cambridge, Md., riot: "These rebellions are but a dress rehearsal for the real revolution," and July 27, speaking in a Washington, D.C., church, *Brown* said: "black people" should do "more looting and shooting. If you're going to loot, loot yourself a gun store. You got to arm yourself, brother."

Solution: Arrest and prosecution of insurrectionists advocating the overthrow of our government. For this reason I introduced in 1966 and voted on July 19, 1967, for passage of the *Anti-Riot Bill* to invoke severe penalties on any person using interstate facilities for the purpose of inciting riots. This legislation now awaits Senate action. For this reason I also telegraphed the President and the Attorney General July 28 calling for the immediate apprehension and *arrest of Stokely Carmichael* the moment he returns to this country, to be held without bond on a charge of treason, even though we are in an undeclared war. For this reason I urge *strong anti-crime laws, better police pay,* and possibly *mobile anti-riot squads* at strategic locations near potential trouble spots. . . . I urge that the *U.S. Supreme Court* review its decisions which place justice to the criminal and anarchist before justice to the victim. According to official FBI records, national crime rates have risen by 62% since 1960.

Facts: Demagoguery to gain votes. The sudden dismay and alarm of high-ranking Washington officials ring false to those who recall that in August, 1965, *President Johnson* told demonstrators at the White House: "I am proud this morning to salute you as fellow revolutionaries. Neither you nor I are willing to accept the tyranny of poverty . . . I hope that you . . . will go out into the hinterland and rouse the masses and blow the bugles and tell them that the hour has arrived and their day is here." . . . And *Vice President Humphrey's* statement last year that if he had to live in slums "you'd have more trouble than you have had already, because I've got enough spark left in me to lead a mighty good revolt under those conditions."

Solution: A curb on inflammatory remarks by men in public office—Democrat or Republican; by legitimate civil rights leaders who represent just grievances by minority groups; and by clergymen who advocate civil disobedience and open their church doors to provide forums for such characters as Rap Brown. The political leader who treats the poor, and particularly Negroes, not as individuals but as a "bloc vote," and attempts to manipulate them through impossible promises, insults them not only as American citizens but as human beings. *The news media,* including radio and TV, has a responsibility to report the news accurately and impartially. But it increasingly has become a sounding board for the rabble-rousing Carmichaels, Browns and Floyd McKissicks, under the guise of "public service programming."

Facts: Sharecropper politics, promising grandiose handouts which seldom materialize. The first $1 billion of the Anti-Poverty Program went for "administration," but in fact lined the pockets of political appointees. *The poor never saw a penny of it.* Only about 10,000 youths have been "graduated" from the scandal-ridden Job Corps in three years at a cost of $54,000 each. Only 1 in 10 corpsmen has found a job through direct placement by Corps officials. Capitol Hill is hearing testimony that Office of Economic Opportunity workers in some cases contributed to racial and social unrest—Newark's police chief wired OEO's Sargent Shriver to that effect six weeks in advance of the riots there. Shriver never answered the telegram. . . . The Federal government has spent literally hundreds of billions of dollars on programs relating directly to the poor—$25.6 billion is earmarked for such purposes in this year's budget alone!—without achieving the desired results. An impersonal bureaucracy, with all its red tape and administrative costs, is bungling jobs which could be handled better and at less expense by state and local governments.

Solution: Education, job-training and intelligent social welfare aid in cases of proven need, administered by dedicated personnel who understand and can communicate the fact that *freedom's corollary is responsibility.* Generations of privation and slipshod schooling have created a society of both black and white Americans on public dole because of a lack of education, a lack of job skills and a lack of ambition. Education and incentive-building programs must be the tasks not only of the Federal government, but, more important, of state and municipal agencies which are closer to the problems involved. Private industry, local church and charitable organizations and private citizens must share in these efforts. Every American's rights are clearly written in the Constitution and underscored by numerous laws whose passage I have supported in Congress. Now is the time to emphasize responsible exercise of those rights, but not through bigger welfare checks or handouts. . . . *Overseers of the Great Society planation system* disregard a cruel aspect of their reckless spending—for those who must literally count every penny, the rise of nearly 12% in the cost of living since 1961 means less food on the table and fewer clothes for the children of the poor.

Facts: Rats vs Riots—not relevant. Pettifoggery as typified by the furor over the Administration's 2-year $40 million "Rat Control Bill"—rejected by the House in a 207-176 rollcall vote—creates false issues and disharmony. The legislation would, in fact, have served about only half of 1% of the nation's 18,000 communities and would have duplicated $3 million in programs now underway in four Federal agencies. Ironically, Detroit was cited by the bill's proponents as a model city in its municipally-sponsored and financed rat control program. Under it, Detroit has drastically reduced the incidence of rat bites, rat-transmitted diseases and rat-infested buildings. A Federal rat program would have been administered by the Department of Housing and Urban Development. *Since Cleveland has yet to come up with "workable programs" according to HUD criteria, the city probably would not have been eligible for aid.* Cleveland Health Department figures for animal bites during 1966, incidentally, reveal these statistics: 4,626 dog bites; 202 cat; 53 rat; 42 squirrel; 18 rabbit; 17 hamster; 9 mouse; 7 monkey; 4 guinea pig; 2 each, chipmunk, raccoon and horse, and, 1 each, oppossum and skunk.

Solution: Stronger local enforcement of building codes, garbage collection and littering, plus an all-out program to educate individuals in eliminating cause of rat infestation. City officials might well study the Detroit rat-eradication plan which has proven so successful. Some responsibility still rests with private citizens and the communities in which they live. For the Federal government to launch another multimillion-dollar program at a time when we have plunged $29 billion deeper into public debt can only add to inflationary trends which place the heaviest burden on the poor.

Summary: Americans of all colors and creeds must not heed the cry of the insurrectionist: "If we don't get change we are going to tear this country apart!" My compassion is boundless for the vast majority of loyal and industrious Negro Americans who go about their business peacefully, maintain decent homes and moral standards, and try to keep their equilibrium under a storm-cloud of hate-mongering by rabble-rousers of both races, ranging from Black Power advocates to the Ku Klux Klan. *Lincoln said: "There is no grievance that is a fit object of redress by mob law."* The more than 120 dead, the many thousands injured and the millions of dollars of property damage this year alone as a result of riots bear testimony to that truth. Americans must not look entirely to government to fill the moral vacuum which exists in our country today. We must not sacrifice ourselves, our children, or the future of our country as a free nation on an altar of greed, cynicism, hypocrisy, intolerance, indolence or political corruption. We must return to the proven virtues which made the United States great: honor, courage, self-reliance, self-discipline, industry, compassion for others, and respect for family and the laws of God and country. We must respond to the words of the Great Emancipator:

"We are not enemies, but friends. We must not be enemies. Though passion may have strained it, it must not break our bond of affection. The mystic chords of memory, stretching from every battlefield and patriot grave to every living heart and hearthstone all over this broad land, will yet swell the chorus of the Union when again touched, as surely they will be, by the better angels of our nature."

Missile Defense Misconceptions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1967

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the following letter to the editor appeared in the Greenville News, Greenville, S.C., on July 1. This excellent letter warrants the very earnest attention and careful study of our Defense Department, the White House, and the Congress:

MISSILE DEFENSE MISCONCEPTIONS

I take exception to a recent editorial on the need for a missile defense system. It is true that our generous Congress appropriated the billions needed for this project but only after reports that the Soviets were deploying such a system. Whether it was a case of keeping up with the Jonesvitches or plain fear, Congress was once again throwing away our taxes for nothing.

What is wrong with this nuclear nostrum? First, it would be outrageously expensive. With the free rein that Congress gives defense appropriations, it would soon become the largest single item on our budget. The Joit Chiefs of Staff have made many errors of judgment about weaponry in the past, and they are currently making a costly one. It would seem from our defense budget that they consider the best defense to be the most costly one.

With American lives at stake, cost alone could not be the deciding factor. It is an indisputable fact that, if we did start this program, it would be years before we could get our by then obsolete anti-missile system deployed. Also, it would not be totally effective. Some missiles would undoubtedly penetrate the system. This alone would be disastrous in an atomic war. But suppose that by some miraculous scientific breakthrough we did come up with a system that was 100 per cent effective in destroying enemy missiles. What would happen to the fallout?

No matter where we intercepted the missiles some of the deadly fallout would reach the United States. Also the system would not protect against airplanes flying too low to be tracked on radar. And an atom bomb dropped from an airplane is just as deadly as one delivered by missile.

We have little to fear from China. All of their atomic bombs were dropped from airplanes. Therefore, it is highly unlikely that they should suddenly develop a rocket capable of lifting a hydrogen bomb weighing several tons. Any airplane trying to bomb the United States would be quickly and totally destroyed.

To attack the United States the aging Mao would first have to stop the civil war that grips his country. Then to avoid total annihilation he would have to destroy many hundreds of square miles of United States territory, all United States held islands and our many bases around the world, including those in neutralist countries.

With this impossible military feat accomplished, China would face Polaris missiles, shelling from ships, bombs from airplanes in the air when the war started and from aircraft carriers, and war with Taiwan.

At the present time the United States has more than enough missiles to wipe out all life on the earth. Not even Russia's costly missile defense system, which has undoubtedly weakened the Soviet economy, could save that country from a mass missile attack.

We should be thankful that the Secretary of Defense has saved us from the economic ruin and false sense of security that an anti-missile system would bring. No country would dare attack another country knowing that the counterattack would reduce it to an atomic cinder, a mere memory. As in the past, the best defense is a good offense.

JACK FERGUSON.

CLINTON.

De Gaulle Is No Friend of the United States of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1967

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, Charles de Gaulle, the President of France, has gone to great lengths to demonstrate his lack of friendship for the United States and has interfered in the domestic affairs of our great and good neighbor to the north. Canada, which is this year celebrating its centennial, does not need gratuitous advice from De Gaulle and neither do we.

Twice in my short lifetime American men, materials, and money have helped to liberate France from her enemies. France still owes us $4,882,072,989 in principal and interest because of the help we extended half a century ago. Since the close of World War II we have sent France $9,409,000,000 under the various foreign aid programs, not to mention help furnished under programs that have not been broken down by countries.

Will we never learn that we cannot buy friends?

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a newsstory from today's New York News:

BRITISH THINK OLD CHARLIE'S HAD IT

(By Henry Maule)

LONDON, July 26.—The flat statement was made at a recent British cabinet meeting that President de Gaulle, 76, is becoming senile, that his hatred for the United States and delusions of grandeur have befuddled his thinking, Whitehall sources disclosed today.

The statement, was made when Prime Minister Harold Wilson reported on his visit to Paris in June. Wilson, shocked, stood up for his recent host.

Other cabinet ministers cited instances of sudden inexplicable shifts of policy by de Gaulle, attributing them to his advanced megalomania, in which he sees France as a great world power and himself as a dominant world figure.

For instance, it was pointed out that de Gaulle swore lasting friendship and cooperation with Germany on his last visit there; but he told Wilson that he wanted a Franco-British partnership because he was afraid that Germany would dominate Europe after his death.

Then he supported Israel and sold it huge armaments, but he suddenly switched to side with the Arabs and said Egypt had every right to close the Gulf of Aqaba.

But perhaps the most instances of his lack of clear thinking were given on his visit to Canada. First was his unnecessary crack at the United States when he landed, then came his open encouragement of the Quebec separationists.

A Matter of Enlightened Self-Interest

SPEECH

OF

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1967

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Henry Fluegel Silver of my State, a public spirited citizen and highly successful chartered life underwriter, recently wrote to me about the importance of developing multilateral assistance for the developing nations.

For the benefit of my colleagues and other readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I insert his letter herewith:

NEW YORK, N.Y.

Representative JONATHAN B. BINGHAM,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE BINGHAM: The mass poverty of the underdeveloped countries is almost beyond the grasp of our understanding. As a result, we have found it easier to pay lip service to our moral obligations than to take the practical and hard steps necessary to attack this problem meaningfully.

No country can hope to offer, indefinitely, food surpluses to the starving of the world on a unilateral basis. Even food aid organized on an international basis cannot be regarded as a permanent solution. The food surpluses of the high productivity nations will shortly be exhausted. Putting back into production their entire idle acreage will not begin to take up the slack in this race between need and available resources.

The financial and material aid needed by the developing nations over the next 15–25 years cannot be provided by any single nation. On the other hand, for the rich nations to simply increase their share of the aid required without consideration of the larger economic issues involved, is to throw good money after bad. The poor nations cannot profitably use this aid in a logical and well-planned development program if they continue to suffer under the burdens of an increasing debt-service, unfavorable foreign trade arrangements, and a shortage of foreign exchange.

The long-range planning now required can only be accomplished on an intergovernmental basis. Agencies within the United Nations are the obvious channels for the aid resources now required. If the United States were to initiate this step it could begin to erase the unfortunate and unfair image is has acquired as a neo-colonial and imperialist power. It would gain the confidence of the ordinary people of the world through two steps: its support of the United Nations, and its willingness to take action that implies some form of economic sacrifice. It is a matter of enlightened self-interest to embark on this path. Herbert Waters, the assistant administrator of the Agency for International Development put it cogently when he said: Hunger used to be the silent enemy of man. Starvation used to be the silent way of death. Not any more. Instead of silence, it can mean a resounding roar of violence."

As the most powerful nation on earth it behooves us to utilize our affluence and influence for the international general welfare. By so doing we ensure a decent world for our posterity to inhabit.

Sincerely,

Henry Fluegel Silver.

The Late Emanuel Ress, Political Poet Laureate

SPEECH

OF

HON. THEODORE R. KUPFERMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 27, 1967

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, my friend, Emanuel "Manny" Ress, the political poet laureate and button king, is dead.

He was a pioneer in the art of titillating the ticket in political situations. He knew all the politicians of whatever party and station, and was friend to all.

His buttons and slogans were "clean not obscene," and he would not have it otherwise.

Manny will be missed, and he would have appreciated the conclusion "Ress in Peace."

His obtituary from the New York Times of Wednesday, July 26, 1967, follows:

Emanuel Ress Dies Here at 59—Button King of Political Slogans—Composed "Win With Wilkie" and "We Need Adlai Badly" in Nonpartisan Career

Emanuel Ress, who was known as the "button king" for his energetic promotion of buttons with political slogans, died of cancer Monday night in the New York Infirmary. He was 59 years old and lived at 62-10 84th Street, Rego Park, Queens.

Mr. Ress, who sometimes called himself "the button baron—a sloganeer without a peer," headed the Emress Specialty Company of 64 West 23d Street, which also makes pins, tags, posters, auto bumper stickers and other slogan buttons.

A tall, baldish, quick-spoken man, Mr. Ress was a familiar figure at the national political conventions of both major parties.

"I don't care who wins," his six-inch lapel button proclaimed. "My business is buttons."

Mr. Ress often talked in slogans, perhaps because he thought and dreamt in slogans. "That's my business," he said before one convention. "That's what I need for the buttons I make—slogans."

He called his slogans "brevity with levity" and a book, "Campaign Fever," called him "the Shakespeare of the campaign buttons." He estimated that he had turned out 500 million buttons in his time and had shipped them to all the states, Puerto Rico and France.

COINED WILLKIE SLOGAN

Mr. Ress, who was born in Brooklyn, attended Columbia University. He became interested in political campaigns in 1940, when he was asked to coin slogans for banners, pins, buttons and posters for Wendell L. Willkie. He composed "Win With Willkie."

Then he quit working for a brokerage house to join the specialty house that produced his original buttons. In World War II he served as captain in the Army finance department overseas and received the Legion of Merit.

After the war he returned to New York and set up his specialty company. "I was determined to be bipartisan," he said, "and the more a party buys from me the more bipartisan I become."

He showed his bipartisan spirit in 1952 by countering "I Like Ike," which he said he had composed in 1947, with "We Need Adlai Badly." He was also ready with a song, "We're Looking Over Estes Kefauver Whom We Overlooked Before," and "Ike and Dick Sure to Click."

Mr. Ress kept himself posted on political trends by reading newspapers and magazines, staying in touch with leaders at local levels and visiting national conventions early as "a missionary." "I have to know what's going to happen," he explained, "so that I can have my buttons out on time."

When former President Dwight D. Eisenhower criticized the "sensation-seeking columnists and commentators" at the 1964 Republican convention, Mr. Ress's factory quickly punched out "Sensation-Seeking Press" buttons that kept appearing on the lapels of reporters throughout the campaign. Hours after the blackout in the Northeast, Mr. Ress was marketing a large black button that said: "In Memory of New York's Darkest Hour, Nov. 9, 1965."

Mr. Ress capitalized on the recent fad for wacky, irreverent buttons. Some of his "hippy-snippy-saying" buttons, as he called them, read "Speak British—Think Yiddish," "Sex Is a Means of Communication" and, with a picture of a man with an axe, "Support Mental Health Or—I'll Kill You."

Others, for controversial political issues, had these legends: "Make Love Not War," "Bomb Hanoi" and "Get Out of Vietnam" and "Black Power," "White Power" and "Green Power."

Mr. Ress maintained that "buttons should be seen, not obscene." Some people, he declared, are buying just for shock value. "Some even have four-letter words," he noted. "That's an awful thing to have in a store where kids gather. The button business has always been a fun business, and I resent cheapening it."

Perhaps the saddest of his buttons reads: "You Too Can Be Replaced By A Button."

Surviving are his widow, the former Betty Finkelson; his mother, Mrs. Rose Dunn, five brothers and four sisters.

A funeral service will be held at 12:45 P.M. today at the Riverside, Amsterdam Avenue and 76th Street.

The Cult of the Loser

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 24, 1967

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, the Wall Street Journal on July 21 printed an editorial which I feel deserves serious thought on our part.

The article deals primarily with the type of society we are creating here in this country—a society that is not great because it is not responsible.

I urge again, in view of the remarks contained in this editorial, that we stop and reexamine carefully and as completely as possible the path which we here in the Congress have laid out for our Nation's future.

Mr. Speaker, I am inserting this editorial at this point in the Record, and I earnestly ask every Member of this body to read it. Then let us all act to truly raise the quality of our society.

The Cult of the Loser

Occasionally these columns have remarked the strange inversion of values whereby the productive elements in society are increasingly criticized and the nonproductive citizens praised as paragons. From some of the reaction we get you might suppose we were incurable Scrooges adamantly opposed to any attempt at social uplift.

That's not the case, as it happens. And part of what we have been trying perhaps ineffectually to say is well put in a speech by President Miller Upton of Wisconsin's Beloit College, quoted in a recent issue of U.S. News & World Report.

"I have just about reached the end of my tolerance," the educator observed, "for the way our society at the present time seems to have sympathetic concern only for the misfit, the pervert, the drug addict, the drifter, the ne'er-do-well, the maladjusted, the chronic criminal, the underachiever, the loser—in general, the underdog."

Mr. Upton makes clear that he is certainly not against trying to help such people; it's only that he thinks the others might be given a little credit once in a while: "Not the wealthy, necessarily; not the ones in authority, necessarily; not the gifted, necessarily—just the doer, the achiever—regardless of his status, his opulence, his native endowment."

What has brought about this tendency to deride the successful and applaud the losers?

Without claiming to know the complete answer, Mr. Upton suggests that many more or less successful people—by no means all, of course—have developed guilt feelings, paradoxically even about the fact of having made their way in the world. They get in the habit of berating themselves.

He notes, for example, the ridicule showered on the famous (or as it sometimes seems nowadays, infamous) WASPs, itself a derogatory label for white, Anglo-Saxon, Protestant suburbanites. The interesting point about the abuse is that much of it comes from the so-called WASPs themselves, and not in the form of healthy self-criticism but as a sort of "sick self-immolation."

It might be added that there are possibly more concrete causes for what might be termed the cult of the underdog. In particular the nation has been infected for a generation or more with a philosophy of social irresponsibility; according to this creed, the society, and not the individual, is to blame for any anti-social behavior. It is logical enough, in that atmosphere, to go on to view those who do behave irresponsibly as perfectly good citizens, or as even more worthy than the achievers.

In any event, one of the unfortunate things about the reversal of values is not merely that it is a bit unfair to the people who work hard to try to make a decent life. It is also a disservice to the others, to the very ones that the community wants to help.

Every society will contain a minimal number that, often through no fault of their own, are beyond the reach of effective assistance. But many more could be helped, if society went about it in the right way. And that means not just doles but motivation.

It is a poor motivation, however, to preach social irresponsibility; it is no good for a loser to be told, in effect, that he need make no effort to better himself. What he needs is the kind of motivation that would make him aspire to the life achieved by the hardworking majority. Were such the attitude, it's a safe bet that far fewer would be on the growing welfare rolls.

Here again Mr. Upton has a useful comment. "It is important to recognize that the quality of any society is directly related to the quality of the individuals who make it up." Obviously it won't improve greatly if many individuals are left under the impression they have rights but no personal and social obligations.

That may be the worst aspect of the doctrine of irresponsibility. In looking down on achievement and favoring its lack, it threatens to dilute the quality of the society as a whole.

Conflict and Conscience

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 3, 1967

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues an editorial which appeared in the Los Angeles Times of July 30, 1967. This editorial supported the President's actions in creating an Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders, and stressed the compelling challenges facing the Commission as well as the Nation.

I also endorse the President's statesmanlike action in creating this Commission. He spoke for all Americans, regardless of political party, in challenging the Commission to make recommendations on this vital national issue.

The suddenness and magnitude of what has happened across our Nation this summer should give us all concern about the future of our cities. The urban disease which is present in our streets is far more advanced than anyone had believed. The President's Commission will be faced with the task of critically analyzing the causes of this disease and recommending new approaches for controlling its spread.

One of the initial concerns of the Commission is how to maintain respect for law and order. The President has stated that violence will not be tolerated and must be dealt with forcefully and swiftly. If the Commission, through its deliberations with law-enforcement officials, can develop more effective methods of combating violence once it erupts, order can be restored expeditiously, thus saving many lives and much needeless suffering.

But in combating the urban discontent, we cannot direct our attention only to the outward manifestations of this disease. We must move on to the far more difficult task of getting at its causes. The hostile environment created by the combination of a lack of education, widespread unemployment, and inadequate housing leads to a sense of alienation and a feeling of frustration. This condition cannot be changed overnight; yet if the Commission can find new ways of attacking these problems or better methods of implementing our present approaches, we can move a long way in giving these people hope for a better future.

The final task of the Commission may be the most difficult, yet it is probably the most vital. It must fire the conscience of the Nation to a new awareness and understanding of the problems in our cities, and to the sacrifices we must make if we are to meet them effectively. The future of our Nation may depend on whether we can overcome this challenge.

CONFLICT AND CONSCIENCE

"We have endured a week such as no nation should live through: a time of violence and tragedy."

Speaking to an anguished people, President Johnson warned that violence will not be tolerated in the cities—and that the conditions that lead to such tragedy must not remain uncorrected.

It was a somber President who spoke, and his words had far less of the politically partisan overtones that marred his address earlier in the week. In the face of a national emergency, there can be no such divisiveness or petty considerations as exhibited by congressional Republicans as well as Democrats.

The national emergency demands new action, new approaches, new urgency—and a rededication to the indispensable tradition of law and order.

To examine the causes of the terrible disorder in Detroit and other U.S. cities, Mr. Johnson appointed a special presidential commission and charged it with recommending "measures to prevent or contain such disasters in the future."

No such body has ever had a more compelling challenge. For in a very real sense, our survival as a nation depends upon finding the proper answers and in their proper implementation.

The first task of the 11-man commission will be to deal with the immediate problems: to identify the origins of the recent disorders, to determine if any conspiracy existed, and above all to find the most effective ways to contain and to control violence when it erupts.

"Let there be no mistake about it," declared the President, "the looting, arson, plunder and pillage which have occurred are not part of a civil rights protest . . . That is crime—and crime must be dealt with forcefully, and swiftly, and certainly, under law.

"It would compound the tragedy, however, if we should settle for order that is imposed by the muzzle of a gun . . . Not even the sternest police action, nor the most effective federal troops, can ever create lasting peace in our cities."

The President thus turned to the far more difficult task of moving beyond "the uneasy calm of martial law."

That task has been made even more difficult by the reaction of many members of Congress, who seem to feel—or believe that their constituents feel—that the rioting marks the total failure of efforts made to help the victims of poverty and discrimination.

If sufficiently widespread, this tragic disillusionment can defeat pending legislation that is worthy and frustrate future proposals that offer hope of treating the disease, not just its symptoms.

"The only genuine long range solution for what has happened," declared the President "lies in an attack—mounted at every level—upon the conditions that breed despair and violence.

"All of us know what those conditions are: ignorance, discrimination, slums, poverty, disease, not enough jobs. We should attack these conditions—not because we are frightened by conflict, but because we are fired by conscience."

The members of the Presidential commission well know the causes of the conflict. As governor, mayor and members of Congress, they know them. As representatives of the civil rights movement, industry, labor and law enforcement, they know them.

Their responsibility is to fire the conscience of the nation to a new awareness of the problems and to prepare the way for new solutions or the improvement of existing solutions.

The commission's efforts must not be used just to prop up support for all of the Administration's legislative program. There should be critical examination of these proposals, and there should be careful consideration of other possible solutions, either as crash programs or over a longer period.

And there must be a re-examination of existing programs, most of which have not fully achieved their original goals. Frustration in the ghetto is cruelly intensified when expectations are raised and then dashed.

At the same time, the commission will surely give new impetus to the enactment of critically needed legislation for the protection of all citizens—gun control and law enforcement support laws that are essential for safety in the streets of every city.

"There is danger," warned the President, "that the worst toll of this tragedy will be counted in the hearts of Americans: in hatred, in insecurity, in fear, in heated words which will not end the conflict, but prolong it."

Meeting that danger and overcoming it is the great challenge that confronts the members of the Presidential commission and every other American.

We dare not fail.

Iowa Legislature Acts on Billboards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 3, 1967

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, the Iowa General Assembly, in its last session, passed a resolution concerning the billboards, reading "Your Highway Taxes at Work," which mark highway construction projects involving Federal funds. The resolution points to the inconsistency of these billboards to the present program aimed at billboard control.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 52

(By Lucken, Hagedorn, Briles, Van Gilst, and Stephens)

Whereas, millions of federal and state tax dollars are being spent for highway beautification and billboard control programs; and

Whereas, federal law requires one of the most obnoxious of all billboards, namely: the erection of "your highway taxes at work" signs on construction projects involving federal funds; and

Whereas, the American public has very few illusions as to whose tax dollars are being spent; and

Whereas, national, state and local news media very ably and objectively provide the public with all the information required on these billboard signs and detailed information is available to interested citizens in county court houses; and

Whereas, the tax funds spent for the manufacture, erection and dismantling of these signs would serve public interests better if used for road improvement purposes; and

Whereas, the placement of these signs have in some instances contributed to highway accidents and have been used in many states for misleading political advertising in favor of incumbent politicians; and

Whereas, we consider the many thousands of dollars spent for these signs a public nuisance and a waste of public funds; now therefore,

Be it resolved by the Senate of the sixty-second General Assembly of the State of Iowa; the House of Representatives concurring;

That, we respectfully request the Congress to repeal this requirement by federal legislation and that copies of this resolution be sent to the Honorable members of the U.S. Senate, Bourke B. Hickenlooper, and Jack Miller, and the Honorable members of the Congress, Fred Schwengel, John C. Culver, H. R. Gross, John Kyl, Neal Smith, Wiley Mayne, and William J. Scherle.

We, Robert D. Fulton, Lieutenant Governor of Iowa and President of the Senate, Al Meacham, Secretary of the Senate, Maurice E. Baringer, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and William P. Kendrick, Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives, hereby certify that the above and foregoing resolution was adopted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the Sixty-second General Assembly of Iowa.

ROBERT D. FULTON,
Lieutenant Governor of Iowa, President of the Senate.
MAURICE E. BARINGER,
Speaker of the House.
AL MEACHAM,
Secretary of the Senate.
WILLIAM R. KENDRICK,
Chief Clerk of the House.

When the United States Went To War With the Arabs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 3, 1967

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, during the recent Middle East crisis, the United States avoided direct confrontation with the Arabs.

This was not always the case, however. As a matter of fact, the first war the United States was ever involved in under the Constitution, was against the Arabs.

I commend to the attention of our colleagues an interesting article written by David Schwartz, who describes United States-Arab relations at the time of President Washington's administration.

The article appeared in the July 27, 1967, edition of the American Examiner, and follows:

WHEN THE UNITED STATES WENT TO WAR WITH THE ARABS

(By David Schwartz)

The first war of the United States under the Constitution was against Arabs, the war with Tripoli in 1801 and not many years later, in 1815, there was a second war against the Arabs, the war with Algiers.

It was this trouble with the Arabs that led to the U.S. beginning the building of a Navy. The ship, the Constitution, more affectionately known as "Old Ironsides," the pride of the Navy, whose exploits were to be the theme of many a patriotic song was built primarily because of these troubles.

At the bottom of both of these wars was the addiction of the Barbary states for presents. Although Moslems, Christmas was all the time for them. They existed largely by piracy and unless the presents were satisfactory, any vessel entering the Mediterranean might be seized, say, as Nasser would have liked to seize an Israeli ship entering the Gulf of Akaba. The crews of the seized ships were held for ransoms. If not forthcoming, they were enslaved or killed.

America first had an inkling of the troubles ahead, when the first ambassador of America to England, John Adams opened his new office in London. There was a knock on the door and who should enter but the suave ambassador of the Arab states.

His Arabian Excellence fell over the neck of Mr. Adams like a long lost brother. Words could not express, he said, the admiration he entertained both for the country Mr. Adams represented and for Mr. Adams personally.

Cool John Adams was overwhelmed. What had he done to deserve so much affection from a person he had never seen before, but then, he figured, these people from the Levant, where the sun pours its rays so endlessly, cannot but glow with something of the same kindness and warmth.

But suddenly the face of the Arabian Ambassador turned pensive. It grieved him sincerely to tell Mr. Adams that his country was at war with the United States.

That was a nice kettle of fish. Americans had just finished the Revolutionary War—and now another war!

Mr. Adams was puzzled. Why? he asked the Arab ambassador. There had been no problems between the two countries, no provocation, no declaration of war. How could there be war?

(If Adams lived today and heard how Nasser wants to have the advantages of peace while at war with Israel, he might of course have been prepared for the peculiar turns that Arab logic takes.)

The Arab envoy explained that America had no treaty for the payment of blackmail, hence a state of war automatically existed.

While Adams was considering the problem in London, Jefferson, who was the American ambassador in Paris, was even more concerned. The chief work of his embassy favored an international force to patrol the waters and put an end to the piracy. Most of the nations gave their presents. Adams thought that this policy was perhaps the only recourse America had.

In 1785 two years before the Constitutional convention, two American vessels were seized by the Algerians with their crew of twenty-one sailors. A ransom of $2,800 for each was paid, the highest demanded of any nation by the Arabs, but before the negotiations could be completed eleven of the Americans had died in Algerian prisons.

In 1793, the Algerians seized ten American vessels and they were paid a ransom of about a million dollars, a tremendous sum in those days.

Jefferson as Secretary of State in Washington's Administration was continually faced by the problem. In a letter to Edward Ruttledge, he says the only answer is the use of force against the Algerians and in another letter to J. T. Callender, he wrote that the Algerians only understand two things "fear and money."

In 1801, the flag staff of the American embassy in Tripoli was cut. That was Tripoli's way of declaring war. Tripoli said the presents were not big enough. Jefferson loved peace so much, he talked of abolishing the Navy, but he was forced to send warships to Tripoli. A desultory sort of war was carried on for several years and finally the Dey became a little more agreeable. But the Algerians continued for years troublesome and in 1815, handsome, dashing and heroic Commodore Decatur, who was known to be adverse to taking any nonsense, entered Algiers harbor and gave the Dey the option of having his town blown up or paying damages and promising no further molestation of Americans. After that, he visited other Arab Deys—they had more days than a week—and he gave them the same option.

So came peace.

Towns and streets in early America were named after the hero of this war—Commodore Stephen Decatur. He was the toast of the young Union.

Try Carmichael for Treason

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 26, 1967

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, for some time now I have been demanding that the Justice Department proceed to indict Stokely Carmichael for treason.

In recent days we have had adequate reports emanating out of Havana that the actions of Carmichael, who is attending the Latin American Solidarity Organization Conference, come four-square within the meaning of treason, and I renew my demand that if Carmichael does, indeed, return to the United States, he should forthwith be tried for this crime.

Treason is defined as, first, the betrayal of a trust: perfidy, treachery; and, second, the offense of attempting by overt acts to overthrow the government of the state to which the offender owes allegiance, or to kill or personally injure the sovereign or his family.

I am including in the RECORD today statements made by Carmichael in Havana which, in my judgment, clearly constitute succinct evidence to have him tried for treason.

Here is a man who has gone to Havana illegally and in direct violation of Federal laws dealing with travel to Cuba.

Here is a man who is publicly consorting with Fidel Castro and the top Communist leaders of the Western Hemisphere.

Here is a man who is openly boasting that he and his followers have engaged in guerrilla warfare in the United States, and that he is even organizing more militant guerrilla warriors throughout America.

Here is a man that openly and publicly announces that he and his followers will organize a consciousness which would lead to the assassination of Lyndon B. Johnson, Dean Rusk, and Robert McNamara.

Mr. Speaker, if we are told by our Justice Department that there are insufficient grounds for the American authorities to move effectively against Stokely Carmichael, then I must say there is a sickening weakness in the legal structure of our great Republic.

I say this Nation should move against Stokely Carmichael and if he can, let him exercise his American right of proper defense.

I am not at all persuaded by those who would argue that to prosecute Carmichael would be to make a martyr out of him.

Such thinking is a total capitulation to treachery and perfidy.

Nor, Mr. Speaker, am I persuaded by those who would argue that to try Carmichael would be to incite others to riot.

Such surrender of our responsibility under law and order is to capitulate to mob rule.

I believe that every legal means must be used to stop Carmichael and put him him out of existence before we witness another major tragedy such as we saw in Dallas in 1963.

Stokely Carmichael has committed all of those acts which in the eyes of the law make him subject to a trial for treason. The courage of this Republic will be tested by the degree to which we will move against this traitor.

An Associated Press dispatch appearing in yesterday's Washington Star is but one of a whole series of dispatches which have come out of Havana quoting Carmichael as spreading his seeds of treason.

The article follows:

JOHNSON, AIDES THREATENED BY CARMICHAEL

HAVANA (AP).—Stokely Carmichael called yesterday for Negro guerrilla uprisings in U.S. cities and made threats against President Johnson, British Prime Minister Harold Wilson and other high U.S. officials.

Declaring that black power advocates "are moving into urban guerrilla warfare in the United States," the militant Negro agitator told a three-hour news conference:

"We have no alternative but to use aggressive armed violence in order to own the land, houses and stores inside our communities, and to control the politics of those communities."

U.S. REPORTERS BARRED

U.S. reporters were barred from the news conference, but Carmichael's remarks were quoted by Havana Radio, George Ware of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, and Felix Greene, a British citizen reporting for the San Francisco Chronicle.

Carmichael declared that Negro guerrillas "must develop a consciousness so that when people who are struggling get killed, the retaliation will be against the leaders of the West."

"Let us develop a consciousness that when they touch one guerrilla, Lyndon Johnson, Dean Rusk, Robert McNamara and Harold Wilson must pay the price," he said. "We are not waiting for them to kill us. We will move to kill them first or rather, we are working towards that goal."

BANNED FROM BRITAIN

He presumably included Wilson because the Home Office last week banned him from Britain.

"One good thing about the Vietnam war is that the United States has taught us how to kill," Carmichael declared later. "Our brothers returning from Vietnam are going to use that training well in the cities of the United States."

Asked about the role of white people in the Negro struggle, Carmichael replied: "The only whites we can use in our struggle are those who are ready to pick up guns with us to destroy the capitalist system."

Asked about the possibility that he might be assassinated, Carmichael said the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency has international license to kill and if the CIA continues to assassinate fighters and guerrillas, vengeance must be taken against Western leaders.

"SOME WILL BE KILLED"

"We are developing an international structure to combat the CIA," he said. "While developing that structure, some of us will be killed. It is important for our people around the world to know that if we are killed, no matter what type of death, the CIA has committed it, that the CIA is responsible."

The State Department is making preparations to revoke the passport of Carmichael, who came to Havana for the Communist-dominated congress of the Organization of Latin American Solidarity. The Justice Department is also investigating the activities of the 26-year-old militant, a native of Trinidad who was raised in New York's Harlem and the Bronx and is a naturalized U.S. citizen.

Frank Commentary on Causes and Cures for Riots

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 3, 1967

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, much has been said and will be said about the causes and cures for the riots sweeping the country. Too many of the comments I have read were not the frank and blunt commentary I believe is needed and would be appreciated by the public.

A very frank commentary, however, appeared in a column in the Polish American, written by its editor, Joseph Bialasiewicz, who incidentally is also active in the Democrat Party's nationalities campaigns in Cook County, Ill. While I do not concur with all of the points expressed in this column I believe it to be one of the most direct and practical articles that has come to my attention. The article follows:

Press reports concerning the latest racial outbreaks in various sections of the country contain some odd and curious linguistic terms—"uprising", "revolution", "upheaval" —which do not reflect the true meaning of what is actually taking place. Let us quote some more accurate press informations:

"Michigan: Negro outlaws engage federal paratroopers, national guardsmen and police in guerrilla combat" . . .

". . . an outbreak by roving bands of Negro youths who spread destruction over wide area of a business district and fanned out in residential areas. The rocktossing Negroes broke several hundred windows, set 11 fires and looted several establishments" (Grand Rapid, Mich.)

". . . a night of fire-bombing, looting, sniping, and brick and bottle flinging that left two Negroes shot to death . . . the city's largest gun store was broken into and looters escaped with seven shotguns and undetermined amount of ammunition" (Rochester, N.Y.)

". . . Negroes burned two blocks of their ghetto area, including homes, businesses, a church and a school and exchanged gunfire with police" (Cambridge, Md.)

"Roving bands of Negro youths stoned cars and stores and burglarized some stores." (Flint, Mich.)

And now let us ask what all this has to do with the civil rights aspirations of the colored population.

The President stated quite explicitly in his TV broadcast to the nation:

"Pillage, looting, murder and arson have nothing to do with civil rights. They are criminal conduct . . .

"We will not tolerate lawlessness. We will not endure violence. It matters not by whom it is done or under what slogan or banner. It will not be tolerated. This nation will do whatever is necessary to suppress and punish those who engage in it."

It would not be enough to state the facts about the latest disturbances and it would be also insufficient to condemn the instigators and their followers. There is an urgent need for the re-evaluation of the moral and ethical standards of the people who are creating these unwarranted and senseless conditions in our cities, damaging not only the image of the country and at the same time undermining their own cause but they are also disregarding the rights and privileges of other citizens.

The Republican opposition in Congress unfortunately undertook efforts to gain some political advantages of the existing chaos in big cities which might result in a distortion of the real essence of what is generally called a "hot summer."

There is no place for any partisan approach during this crisis because both political parties have the same public responsibility. If the Republican Coordinating Committee charges that "the President has totally failed to recognize the problem" then it should be stressed that numerous administration projects did not receive Republican support in Congress. Also one should not forget that the racial situation did not suddenly become the problem under the Democratic President but that it existed during previous administration under the Republican President, although it did not gain the urgent proportion of national crises.

When Republicans are accusing their political opponents, it might be judged as the opening salvo of the next year's presidential campaign, on the other hand, the Democrats are answering correctly, as speaker McCormack commented, that "those who today speak piously of anarchy in the streets have not hesitated to strike down some of the most progressive laws aimed at these problems."

The urgency of the Negro problem in this country calls for action based on realities and not on political maneuvering. Emotional approaches should be avoided because the futility of emotionalism, so much in evidence among the Negroes, brought about enough destructive and evil consequences.

Therefore, also, the American Civil Liberties Union must be advised not to preach fantastic and unrealistic slogans in its emotional actions on behalf of colored citizens who have flagrantly violated the basic civil rights of other people.

In Plainfield, N.J., 46 carbines have been stolen. The state troopers and national guardsmen have conducted a search under the direction of the state's attorney and confiscated some stolen and other weapons including rifles, pistols and sawed-off shotguns.

The ACLU argues about constitutional law and the violation of "individual rights under the Fourth Amendment" because there was a lack of warrants before arrest.

There was numerous evidence in many cities that weapons in the hands of irresponsible people cannot be tolerated. The ACLU is overlooking this aspect of the situation.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Code of Laws of the United States

Title 44, Section 181. Congressional Record; arrangement, style, contents, and indexes.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the Congressional Record, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the Congressional Record semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

Title 44, Section 182b. Same; illustrations, maps, diagrams.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the Record without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the Congressional Record the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily Record as follows: the Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided,* That the makeup of the Record shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the Congressional Record, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the Record shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the Record issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the Record for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the Record of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the Record shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the Record style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the Record.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the Congressional Record any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent Record is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the Congressional Record the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the Congressional Record.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the Congressional Record shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the Official Reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the Official Reporters of the respective Houses.

The Official Reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the Official Reporters in the next issue of the Congressional Record, nor to Records printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the Congressional Record by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the Congressional Record which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the Record.

Appendix

Making the Law an Ally in the War on Poverty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARLE CABELL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 3, 1967

Mr. CABELL. Mr. Speaker, one of the most promising and effective community action programs developed thus far to help disadvantaged Dallas citizens help themselves is the Dallas Legal Services project, which operates under an OEO grant and has the strong support of the State and local associations.

This program is the subject of an excellent article by Bert Holmes, associate editor of the Dallas Times Herald, which appeared in the Times Herald on July 25. The article, entitled "Making the Law an Ally in War on Poverty: Dallas Legal Services Project Helps Thousands, Builds Respect for Society's Rules," presents an informative picture of the way community action programs are constructively working toward a better America for us all. With permission, I insert Mr. Holmes' article at this point in the RECORD:

MAKING THE LAW AN ALLY IN WAR ON POVERTY—DALLAS LEGAL SERVICES PROJECT HELPS THOUSANDS, BUILDS RESPECT FOR SOCIETY'S RULES

(By Bert Holmes)

A fast-talking sheetrock salesman made quite an impression on the aged Negro woman living in a three-room shack near the West Dallas levee. She had worked for years as a maid and saved enough to buy her home. Now she survives only on her welfare check.

Barely able to read, the woman signed a contract for installation of the sheetrock. The price was $1,600, which probably was more than the shanty was worth. When she missed a payment, the owner of the note moved quickly to evict her from her home.

Only minutes before she was dumped into the dusty street, a representative from the Dallas Legal Services Project heard of the problem and intervened. He halted the eviction and had a reputable contractor inspect the sheetrock work. The contractor estimated the work was worth $200 and the Legal Services attorney negotiated a new contract for that amount.

The elderly woman is paying off the reduced note—and still living in her little home. She is one of 3,500 Dallasites helped last year by the two-year-old service, financed in the main by the federal government through the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Such home repair frauds are only a small part of the cases handled by the Dallas Legal Services Project but they are graphic examples of the effort to make the law work for those in poverty as well as for the more affluent.

This week a circular drafted by the DLSP is being distributed throughout South Dallas, where unscrupulous home improvement salesmen have been attempting to use the news of an impending code enforcement program to persuade residents to buy unnecessary repairs.

Those working in the Legal Services Project have found that the legal problems of the poor are similar to those of society in general—domestic relations, child support, contracts and debts. The only unique problem is in the relationship with welfare agencies.

The Dallas project has been able to work out some modification of rulings, particularly in the area of aid to dependent children. It has not handled a case contesting the residency requirements but a similar project in Connecticut obtained a court ruling holding that the six-months waiting period was a violation of freedom of movement.

In Dallas, eight attorneys headed by Walter Steele and assisted by 150 volunteers from the Dallas Bar Association, provide a wide range of services through five offices. One is downtown, at 301 N. Market. West and East Dallas have one office each and South Dallas has two. A sixth office will open soon in Grand Prairie.

The neighborhood offices vary their hours to suit the needs of their clients. One is open from 9 to 9 and all have one night session and a Saturday morning session. In addition, night meetings are held to educate neighborhood residents on their legal rights.

Finally, to insure that all who need help can find it, the volunteer lawyers man a "circuit rider" program. They take up a station and serve as initial contact with anyone who comes by, either on his own or as a referral from a friend or a social agency.

The community support for the legal services project has been magnificent in Dallas, Steele reports. In some cities there have been complaints of competition with lawyers in private practice but careful screening of cases and good liaison with the Dallas Bar has paid off here with the development of a cooperative atmosphere.

At the recent Texas Bar Association convention in Dallas, a Houston lawyer tried to get approval of a resolution condemning the legal services program's policy of assisting in divorce cases. The resolution died in committee.

Domestic relations cases, including divorces, account for a third of the Dallas project case load but Steele points out that this percentage parallels the general court load. He makes a valid point when he says that it is important to help the poor legalize their domestic relationships.

The cost of the Dallas program runs to 303,000 a year, with the OEO putting up $263,435. It is part of what the Harvard Law Review calls "the new wave" in legal aid for the poor. In 200 local projects (seven in Texas), attorneys not only represent the poor in a variety of cases, but also provide education, help draft improved legislation and aid in community action.

Their greatest contribution may be in building respect for the law. It will not come overnight but the flickering light from the fires of Detroit and Newark makes it clear that respect for the law needs all the nursing it can get. The poor of all races (and in Dallas as many whites are helped as Negroes) must learn to choose litigation rather than demonstrations, the law rather than lawlessness.

Activities and Facilities of American Freedom Center, Freedoms Foundation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 4, 1967

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the American Freedom Center, Freedoms Foundation, is located at Valley Forge, in my Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. Its activities and extensive facilities are well defined in a statement written by one of my constituents, Kenneth L. Pyne, who is a Russian language instructor at the Boyertown Area Senior High School.

I ask unanimous consent that an excerpt of the statement be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOR THE PRESERVATION OF FREEDOM

Cyrus Townsend Brady once remarks, "No spot on earth—not the plains of Marathon, nor the passes of Sempach, nor the place of the Bastille, nor the dykes of Holland, nor the moors of England—is so sacred in the history of the struggles for human liberty as Valley Forge." It seems only a matter of simple logic, then, that Valley Forge should have been selected as the site upon which to build the campus of Freedoms Foundation. General Bruce C. Clark described Freedoms Foundation as ". . . a catalytic agency in that its diffusion of the ideals and values of the American Way of Life sets in motion beneficient thoughts and actions in all fields of American endeavor."

When former President Dwight D. Eisenhower assumed the active post of Chairman of the Board of Directors of Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge on December 20, 1962, he said, "The mission of Freedoms Foundation is the perpetuation, undamaged, of all the values and aspects of human liberty, particularly in America. This is one of the noblest efforts to which any American can dedicate himself."

In 1949 Don Belding, Co-Founder and now Chairman of the Executive Commitee of Freedoms Foundation, prepared the American Credo illustrating the American Way of Life based on the fundamental belief in God, a constitutional government designed to serve the people, and certain political and economic rights which protect the dignity and freedom of the individual.

J. Edgar. Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, has unequivocally voiced his support of this outstanding bastian of American Freedom. He says, "Freedoms Foundation is strongly undergirding American ideals with a program for all citizens. I have seen at Valley Forge their great library files of patriotic materials for classroom teachers, school systems, community programs in all fields of Americanism—from pageants to economic education.

"These should be made available to the nation's scholars, educational administrators, public officials and the general public."

Employing the free enterprise principle of incentive and reward, Freedoms Foundation utilizes an Annual Awards Program to encourage and stimulate activities that increase understanding and appreciation of the freedom embodied in our way of life and the responsibilities we must assume as Americans.

Since its founding in 1949 as an eleemosynary corporation the Foundation has received some 1,300,000 entries in its National Awards programs. Nearly 16,000 awards have been made. Foundation representatives have addressed over 7,000 meetings in every part of the United States. Of particular interest are the teacher and school awards given to teachers, schools and school systems for outstanding performance in teaching our children the principles and heritage of America.

During the summer the Foundation conducts two two-week on-campus courses for children in grades four through eight on "Manners, Morals, and the American Credo." All classes include daily instruction about manners, personal conduct, patriotic ceremonies, spiritual guidance, responsibilities, the lives of exemplary, historic Americans, and George Washington's Rules of Civility. This program is under the personal supervision of Dr. Kenneth D. Wells, President of the Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge.

Reference and research work may be conducted throughout the year. The Center is now a depository for the accumulated wealth of awarded material from Freedoms Foundation's Awards recipients. It is unparalleled laboratory for teachers and students. Particularly unique is the J. Edgar Hoover Library on Communism, the largest public research center on communism in the nation. Other libraries include: The Norris D. Wright Library on Valley Forge; The Albert W. Hawkes Library on the Constitution; The Richard W. Sears Library on Free Enterprise; The George Washington Carver Library on the Contributions of the America Negro; and, The General Douglas MacArthur Library on the American Flag.

Not to be overlooked is the wonderful opportunity for schools, clubs, churches and other organizations to take field and study trips to the Freedoms Foundation. The Foundation is located only 30 minutes from Philadelphia and Independence Hall. Newly erected residence halls at the Foundation are available for persons on extended tours or research. Nothing has been forgotten in providing opportunities for all Americans to visit the American Freedom Center.

The Congressional Medal of Honor Grove has recently been established on the campus. Fifty-two acres encompassing the streams and hills hallowed by the early patriots of the Revolutionary War, have been designated, one section for each of the 50 states, Puerto Rico and the District of Columbia, as a permanent memorial to the recipients of the nation's supreme military award, the Medal of Honor.

This special area has been landscaped in a design approximating the map of the United States with each state identified in its appropriate location. Several miles of winding paths connect the 52 Memorial Squares, each containing an Honor Shaft, a permanent obelisk in the design of the Washington Monument.

The most recently constructed major building on the 100-acre American Freedom Center campus on the western edge of Valley Forge State Park, a short distance from General George Washington's Revolutionary Headquarters, is the Faith of Our Fathers Chapel.

The chancel and stained glass window of the Faith of Our Fathers Chapel are exact replicas of those in the Prayer Room in the United States Capitol used exclusively by Senators and Representatives. The Chapel provides a place for meditation, prayer and worship for *all* peoples—a wellspring of the spiritual resources essential to the strengthening and preserving of our Republic under God.

The Freedoms Foundation has real evidence of a revival of patriotic activities. This regeneration of constructive pride and resolute, responsible, patriotic devotion must be nurtured and encouraged, especially among our youth who will eventually determine America's destiny. How incumbent it is upon us all to be in the forefront of this patriotic revival.

Congratulations to Prof. J. F. Moore, Outstanding Citizen, on His 95th Birthday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 24, 1967

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, Saturday, August 5, 1967, is the 95th birthday of an outstanding gentleman and civic-minded American from our district in the southern part of Allegheny County in western Pennsylvania, Prof. J. F. Moore. On the occasion of his 95th birthday, I would like to congratulate Professor Moore on his pioneering spirit and on his full life of public service to the people of the South Hills area of Pittsburgh. He represents to us the generation of builders, innovators, and developers who worked to make our modern American community a good place to live in.

I would like to call the attention of Congress and the American people to a short biographical sketch of Prof. J. F. Moore, as we in the South Hills of Pittsburgh are certainly proud of him. I am sure everyone in our district joins me in wishing him a happy birthday and many happy returns.

PROF. J. F. MOORE

Prof. J. F. Moore, a pioneer in the development of the South Hills of Pittsburgh, is 95 on Saturday, though for those of us who know his clear mind, vivid memory, and sharp wit this hardly seems possible. Professor Moore came to Allegheny County in western Pennsylvania and settled in the South Hills of Pittsburgh when it was still a rural farming community. During his residence in the Brookline section of Pittsburgh the area blossomed into a thriving suburb. Through his work in education and banking, and his selfless service to church and community, Professor Moore played a key role in this development.

Born August 6, 1872, north of Pittsburgh, Pa., in Plaingrove Township, Lawrence County, he began his career as a young teacher in 1893 when he taught all eight grades at the Hultz School in Scott Township—now Mount Lebanon, Pa.

In 1900 he married the former Ada Montgomery. Their marriage was to be a long and happy one, ending only with Mrs. Moore's death in 1960.

Shortly after the turn of the century—by this time a veteran of service, both to his country and to many active schoolchildren—he was appointed principal for the schools of the borough of West Liberty, the position he held till his resignation in 1940. In this interval he helped the city select the ideal location for the South Hills High School and he proved himself to be a popular and efficient administrator.

The key to his enviable success as an educator lies in his concern for children as very special people. He said:

> Children look forward to things; therefore, we should train them to anticipate to be effective in our teaching. If we appreciated the things that attract little children, we could make them better children.

Always aware of the individual, even in his administrative position, he made sure that each child had a part in auditorium programs—not just the more talented or more docile ones.

This enthusiasm for children and education carried on through the family, passing from father to son to grandson. His son Charles was given an award for his outstanding work in education in California; and Charles' son is also a teacher.

Professor Moore's concern for children extended outside the school room as well. As the Brookline area became more heavily settled, he realized the importance of a safe and attractive area for play. The Moore Playground in Brookline is largely the result of his persistent efforts to guarantee space for the young people amidst a rapidly developing community.

His interest in young people made Professor Moore an enthusiastic "Scouter" from the time the Boy Scout movement first became popular in the United States. He was awarded the coveted Silver Beaver Award, the highest recognition in Scouting as a distinguished council Scouter. At 95, Professor Moore is still the chairman of Boy Scout Troop No. 206, of Paul Presbyterian Church in Brookline.

Years ago Professor Moore turned an old farm in Butler County, Pa., into a camp for young people, and every summer since then Scouts and other groups of youngsters go away from the city of Pittsburgh to fish, swim, play ball, and explore at Camp Moore.

Early in his life, Professor Moore decided that "to be engaged in school work was not going to deprive me of my responsibility as a citizen of this community." He has certainly been faithful to that promise.

The construction of a streetcar line tunneling under Pittsburgh's Mount Washington, then winding along West Liberty Avenue, marked the beginning of the transformation of the South Hills from a rural community to a progressive suburban section of the city of Pittsburgh. Professor Moore was one of the many citizens who worked hard for the widening of West Liberty Avenue, recognizing the future importance of this thoroughfare.

Professor Moore was also active in the campaign for an automobile tunnel through the mountain. When he first came to the South Hills, the men who worked in the city of Pittsburgh either drove their horse-drawn buggies to the top of Mount Washington, and took an inclined railway straight down its other side, or they commuted by coal train, jouncing into the city from Castle Shannon. The single most important factor in the development of the South Hills was therefore the construction of the mile-long Liberty Tubes, two parallel automobile tunnels through 500-foot-high Mount Washington.

The tunnel was not easily won. As early as 1910 agitation for a tunnel for vehicles other than trolley cars began on the south side of Mount Washington. Pittsburghers divided into several literally warring factions over the question. There were, of course, those who smugly opposed spending so much money "out there." Even those favorable to a tunnel could not agree on the best location

Professor Moore was a strong advocate of the tunnel and was always in the fore of the battle to obtain it. He was chairman of the South Hills Tunnel Association, a lobby of tunnel proponents, and success came in 1921 when the county began blasting for the Liberty Tubes.

Always an active citizen in the South Hills community of Brookline, Professor Moore served as secretary at the organization of the Brookline Board of Trade and has been a member and officer ever since.

In the midst of all his work in education and civic affairs Professor Moore embarked on still another career as a banker. In 1925 he and other interested citizens of Brookline obtained a charter and opened a bank in June 1926. He has served as a director of the Brookline Savings & Trust ever since. For 20 years, 1939–59, he was president and unofficial chairman of the board. In 1959 he resigned as president and was chosen as chairman of the board. At 95 he still enlivens the board meetings, and he just recently stopped visiting the bank every day. Professor Moore and his wife, recognizing the importance of a church to a blossoming community, helped organize the initial congregation of the First Presbyterian Church of Mount Lebanon, which became the Dormont Presbyterian Church.

Professor Moore also assisted the Paul Presbyterian Church in getting its start, serving as chairman of their building committee and later Sabbath school superintendent. He has further served God and his community as a member of the YMCA board of directors.

Still remarkably keen at 95 years of age, Professor Moore quips:

> The secret of true longevity and youthfulness is merely selecting the right ancestors and taking care of what they gave you.

White Motors Chief Forecasts Strong Sales

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 4, 1967

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, one of the leading segments of our economy, the auto industry, has consistently grown through the years and has remained a basic factor in measuring the economic pulse of our Nation.

Th able economist and columnist Eliot Janeway recently interviewed J. N. Bauman, president of White Motors Corp. The interview report by Mr. Janeway underscored the prominent position the truck manufacturers and the trucking industry have in our economy.

Mr. Janeway discussed with Mr. Bauman the growth which can be expected and which will be achieved in the trucking industry with more and more farm vehicles being manufactured. Increased sales also will be realized in the years ahead as the number of industrial users increase.

As chairman of the Committee on Public Works and its Subcommittee on Roads, I noted with interest that Mr. Janeway discussed the highway users taxes paid by truckers into the highway trust fund.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Eliot Janeway's newspaper column on his interview with J. N. Bauman be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the interview was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHITE MOTOR CHIEF SEES STRONG SALES

(By Eliot Janeway)

NEW YORK, July 5.—The big business news at midyear comes from the auto industry. Last spring's oversupply of new cars is working out into a "surprise" tightness of dealer inventories at the peak of the summer selling season—with auto strike uncertainties threatening to bring on a real car shortage. But while a major reason for the "mini-recession" of the last year in the private sector has been the auto slump, truck business has given a relatively strong defensive account of itself.

For a reading on this workhorse of the American economy, this column interviewed J. N. Bauman, president of White Motor corporation.

JANEWAY. Why do you think truck business has held up better than auto business in recent months?

BAUMAN. Probably one reason is that truck users represent a diversified cross-section of the industry and commodity markets, all of which aren't down at the same time. The petroleum business has been holding its own, and food business tonnage is steadily increasing. We feel now that a definite improvement is starting, and we look forward to a much more active year in 1968.

JANEWAY. What is the present state of the art in diesel engine design?

BAUMAN. Until recently, the only way to get more power and more speed was to build a larger and heavier engine. Now the new V–8s, which are smaller and more efficient, provide a 50 per cent turnover increase. Another improvement is an air pressure device which uses exhaust heat from the manifold to turn a blower and force air into the engine; this increases horse power nearly 20 to 30 per cent. Actually, the operators, with their wage problems, are leading the move to higher-speed engines: If a driver doesn't have adequate horse power, he just can't make his trip time.

JANEWAY. Does your company have foreign business?

BAUMAN. Yes, but at present it is mainly export. We would like to develop a facility, as either a joint venture or an individual effort, for serving the Common Market on a competitive basis. We can export into foreign markets like Belgium and France; but, after adding tariffs and freight, the price differential is very high. We really have to manufacture on the spot to be competitive.

FARM BUSINESS STRONG

JANEWAY. How is your farm business doing?

BAUMAN. Very well—actually about 6 to 7 per cent ahead of last year. We have been reasonably successful, I think, in integrating the three companies we bought in 1963—among them the Cockshutt operation in Canada. Free trade between this country and Canada on farm machinery has always existed, but the auto treaty has helped our truck division there. The more we produce and sell in Canada, and the more Canadian material we bring in for use in production here, the more finished product we can export duty-free into Canada. Variety of selection is very important in the Canadian market.

JANEWAY. What about the taxes diesel truck owners pay?

BAUMAN. There is a fuel tax, of course, the same as on gasoline, and also a use tax based on the weight of the vehicle. All the money goes into the highway trust funds. In effect, the truckers are pre-paying for the right to use highways that won't be built until sometime off in the future. I've heard that 1974 is now the projected completion date for the interstate highway—provided the money doesn't disappear somewhere else.

JANEWAY. What other lines does your company handle?

BUILDS STATIONARY ENGINES

BAUMAN. We build stationary engines for industrial power, and have recently moved into the total energy field. Total energy sales for 1970, are projected at 250 million dollars, of which we hope to take about 25 per cent simply because of our head start. I think we are the first company to offer a complete system, including a contract for management and maintenance. Also, by 1970, we will be making our own engines for our farm and truck equipment.

JANEWAY. It sounds as if from now on White Motor ought to be rated a growth company.

BAUMAN. We certainly hope to be. In six years, we have gone from 300 million dollars in sales to almost 800 millions, from a 10 million dollar profit to 32 millions, all during a robust economy. This year is sort of a test year. If we can maintain earnings this year, we will pretty well establish a new personality.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building,
Washington, D.C. 20515

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Speaker: John W. McCormack

Abbitt, Watkins M., *Va*	
Abernethy, Thomas G., *Miss.*	6278 29th St.
Adair, E. Ross, *Ind*	4000 Mass. Ave.
Adams, Brock, *Wash*	
Addabbo, Joseph P., *N.Y*	
Albert, Carl, *Okla*	4614 Reno Rd.
Anderson, John B., *Ill*	
Anderson, William R., *Tenn.*	3006 P St.
Andrews, George W., *Ala*	
Andrews, Mark, *N. Dak*	
Annunzio, Frank, *Ill*	
Arends, Leslie C., *Ill*	4815 Dexter St.
Ashbrook, John M., *Ohio*	
Ashley, Thomas L., *Ohio*	
Ashmore, Robert T., *S.C*	
Aspinall, Wayne N., *Colo*	The Towers Apts., 4201 Cathedral Ave.
Ayres, William H., *Ohio*	
Baring, Walter S., *Nev*	
Barrett, William A., *Pa*	
Bates, William H., *Mass*	
Battin, James F., *Mont*	
Belcher, Page, *Okla*	
Bell, Alphonzo, *Calif*	
Bennett, Charles E., *Fla*	3421 Rusticway Lane, Falls Church, Va.
Berry, E. Y., *S. Dak*	118 Schotts Court NE.
Betts, Jackson E., *Ohio*	
Bevill, Tom, *Ala*	6224 N. 35th St., Arlington, Va.
Biester, Edward G., Jr., *Pa*	
Bingham, Jonathan B., *N.Y.*	
Blackburn, Benjamin B., *Ga.*	
Blanton, Ray, *Tenn*	
Blatnik, John A., *Minn*	
Boggs, Hale, *La*	
Boland, Edward P., *Mass*	
Bolling, Richard, *Mo*	307 Warrenton Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Bolton, Frances P. (Mrs.), *Ohio.*	2301 Wyo. Ave.
Bow, Frank T., *Ohio*	4301 Mass. Ave.
Brademas, John, *Ind*	
Brasco, Frank J., *N.Y*	
Bray, William G., *Ind*	
Brinkley, Jack, *Ga*	
Brock, W. E. (Bill), *Tenn*	
Brooks, Jack, *Tex*	
Broomfield, William S., *Mich.*	
Brotzman, Donald G., *Colo*	
Brown, Clarence J., Jr., *Ohio.*	
Brown, Garry, *Mich*	
Brown, George E., Jr., *Calif*	
Broyhill, James T., *N.C*	
Broyhill, Joel T., *Va*	
Buchanan, John, *Ala*	
Burke, J. Herbert, *Fla*	
Burke, James A., *Mass*	
Burleson, Omar, *Tex*	
Burton, Laurence J., *Utah*	
Burton, Phillip, *Calif*	
Bush, George, *Tex*	
Button, Daniel E., *N.Y*	
Byrne, James A., *Pa*	
Byrnes, John W., *Wis*	1215 25th St. S., Arlington, Va.
Cabell, Earle, *Tex*	
Cahill, William T., *N.J*	
Carey, Hugh L., *N.Y*	
Carter, Tim Lee, *Ky*	
Casey, Bob, *Tex*	
Cederberg, Elford A., *Mich*	
Celler, Emanuel, *N.Y*	The Mayflower
Chamberlain, Charles E., *Mich.*	
Clancy, Donald D., *Ohio*	
Clark, Frank M., *Pa*	220 C St. SE.
Clausen, Don H., *Calif*	
Clawson, Del, *Calif*	
Cleveland, James C., *N.H*	
Cohelan, Jeffery, *Calif*	1202 Longworth House Office Bldg.
Collier, Harold R., *Ill*	
Colmer, William M., *Miss*	
Conable, Barber B., Jr., *N.Y.*	
Conte, Silvio O., *Mass*	5619 Lamar Rd., Washington 16, D.C.
Conyers, John, Jr., *Mich*	
Corbett, Robert J., *Pa*	
Corman, James C., *Calif*	
Cowger, William O., *Ky*	
Cramer, William C., *Fla*	6215 Beachway Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Culver, John C., *Iowa*	
Cunningham, Glenn, *Nebr*	
Curtis, Thomas B., *Mo*	
Daddario, Emilio Q., *Conn*	
Daniels, Dominick V., *N.J*	
Davis, Glenn R., *Wis*	
Davis, John W., *Ga*	
Dawson, William L., *Ill*	
de la Garza, Eligio, *Tex*	
Delaney, James J., *N.Y*	
Dellenback, John R., *Oreg*	6903 Crail Dr., Bethesda, Md.
Denney, Robert V., *Nebr*	
Dent, John H., *Pa*	
Derwinski, Edward J., *Ill*	
Devine, Samuel L., *Ohio*	
Dickinson, William L., *Ala*	
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., *Mich*	
Dingell, John D., *Mich*	
Dole, Robert, *Kans*	6136 Beachway Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Donohue, Harold D., *Mass*	
Dorn, Wm. Jennings Bryan, *S.C.*	2030 Laburnum St., McLean, Va.
Dow, John G., *N.Y*	
Dowdy, John, *Tex*	
Downing, Thomas N., *Va*	
Dulski, Thaddeus J., *N.Y*	347 Cannon House Office Building
Duncan, John J., *Tenn*	
Dwyer, Florence P. (Mrs.), *N.J.*	
Eckhardt, Bob, *Tex*	
Edmondson, Ed, *Okla*	
Edwards, Don, *Calif*	9201 Fox Meadow La., Potomac, Md.,
Edwards, Edwin W., *La*	
Edwards, Jack, *Ala*	
Eilberg, Joshua, *Pa*	
Erlenborn, John N., *Ill*	
Esch, Marvin L., *Mich*	11754 Gainsborough Rd., Rockville, Md.
Eshleman, Edwin D., *Pa*	
Evans, Frank E., *Colo*	
Everett, Robert A., *Tenn*	
Evins, Joe L., *Tenn*	5044 Klingle St.
Fallon, George H., *Md*	
Farbstein, Leonard, *N.Y*	
Fascell, Dante B., *Fla*	
Feighan, Michael A., *Ohio*	
Findley, Paul, *Ill*	
Fino, Paul A., *N.Y*	
Fisher, O. C., *Tex*	Calvert-Woodley
Flood, Daniel J., *Pa*	The Congressional
Flynt, John J., Jr., *Ga*	
Foley, Thomas S., *Wash*	
Ford, Gerald R., *Mich*	514 Crown View Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Ford, William D., *Mich*	
Fountain, L. H., *N.C*	The Westchester
Fraser, Donald M., *Minn*	
Frelinghuysen, Peter H. B., *N.J.*	3014 N St.
Friedel, Samuel N., *Md*	
Fulton, James G., *Pa*	
Fulton, Richard, *Tenn*	
Fuqua, Don, *Fla*	
Galifianakis, Nick, *N.C*	
Gallagher, Cornelius E., *N.J.*	
Gardner, James C., *N.C*	
Garmatz, Edward A., *Md*	
Gathings, E. C., *Ark*	
Gettys, Tom S., *S.C*	
Giaimo, Robert N., *Conn*	
Gibbons, Sam, *Fla*	
Gilbert, Jacob H., *N.Y*	
Gonzalez, Henry B., *Tex*	200 C St. SE.
Goodell, Charles E., *N.Y*	3842 Macomb St.
Goodling, George A., *Pa*	
Gray, Kenneth J., *Ill*	
Green, Edith (Mrs.), *Oreg*	
Green, William J., *Pa*	
Griffiths, Martha W., (Mrs.), *Mich.*	
Gross, H. R., *Iowa*	
Grover, James R. Jr., *N.Y*	
Gubser, Charles S., *Calif*	
Gude, Gilbert, *Md*	
Gurney, Edward J., *Fla*	
Hagan, G. Elliott, *Ga*	
Haley, James A., *Fla*	
Hall, Durward G., *Mo*	
Halleck, Charles A., *Ind*	4926 Upton St.
Halpern, Seymour, *N.Y*	
Hamilton, Lee H., *Ind*	
Hammerschmidt, John Paul, *Ark.*	
Hanley, James M., *N.Y*	
Hanna, Richard T., *Calif*	
Hansen, George V., *Idaho*	
Hansen, Julia Butler (Mrs.), *Wash.*	
Hardy, Porter, Jr., *Va*	
Harrison, William Henry, *Wyo.*	
Harsha, William H., *Ohio*	
Harvey, James, *Mich*	
Hathaway, William D., *Maine.*	
Hawkins, Augustus F., *Calif.*	
Hays, Wayne L., *Ohio*	
Hébert, F. Edward, *La*	26 Cockrell St., Alexandria, Va.
Hechler, Ken, *W. Va*	
Heckler, Margaret M. (Mrs.), *Mass.*	
Helstoski, Henry, *N.J*	
Henderson, David N., *N.C*	
Herlong, A. S., Jr., *Fla*	
Hicks, Floyd V., *Wash*	
Holifield, Chet, *Calif*	
Holland, Elmer J., *Pa*	
Horton, Frank, *N.Y*	
Hosmer, Craig, *Calif*	
Howard, James J., *N.J*	
Hull, W. R., Jr., *Mo*	
Hungate, William L., *Mo*	
Hunt, John E., *N.J*	
Hutchinson, Edward, *Mich*	
Ichord, Richard (Dick), *Mo.*	
Irwin, Donald J., *Conn*	
Jacobs, Andrew, Jr., *Ind*	
Jarman, John, *Okla*	
Joelson, Charles S., *N.J*	
Johnson, Albert W., *Pa*	
Johnson, Harold T., *Calif*	
Jonas, Charles Raper, *N.C*	
Jones, Paul C., *Mo*	1111 Army-Navy Dr., Arlington, Va.
Jones, Robert E., *Ala*	
Jones, Walter B., *N.C*	
Karsten, Frank M., *Mo*	
Karth, Joseph E., *Minn*	
Kastenmeier, Robert W., *Wis.*	
Kazen, Abraham, Jr., *Tex*	
Kee, James, *W. Va*	5441 16th Ave., Hyattsville, Md.
Keith, Hastings, *Mass*	5906 Harwick Rd., Woodacres, Md.
Kelly, Edna F. (Mrs.), *N.Y*	
King, Carleton J., *N.Y*	
King, Cecil R., *Calif*	
Kirwan, Michael J., *Ohio*	
Kleppe, Thomas S., *N. Dak*	
Kluczynski, John C., *Ill*	
Kornegay, Horace R., *N.C*	
Kupferman, Theodore R., *N.Y.*	
Kuykendall, Dan, *Tenn*	
Kyl, John, *Iowa*	
Kyros, Peter N., *Maine*	
Laird, Melvin R., *Wis*	
Landrum, Phil M., *Ga*	
Langen, Odin, *Minn*	
Latta, Delbert L., *Ohio*	
Leggett, Robert L., *Calif*	
Lennon, Alton, *N.C*	
Lipscomb, Glenard P., *Calif.*	
Lloyd, Sherman P., *Utah*	
Long, Clarence D., *Md*	

Appendix

Austin Gives Tribute to Outstanding Citizen, Miss Mary Rice, Public Library Director of Austin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 7, 1967

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, a longtime and faithful public servant of Texas will be retiring this fall. Miss Mary Rice has served the people of Austin for 23 years as director of the public library. To her position she brought humor, skill, and a deep sense of the value of books for the people. In her years there, the library has quintupled in size and added many branches and services. Miss Rice's dedication to the education and culture of the citizens of Austin has been unfailing, and Texas owes her a great debt.

I ask unanimous consent that a perceptive article about Miss Rice, by Ernestine Wheelock, published in the Austin American-Statesman, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MISS RICE LOOKS FORWARD TO RETIREMENT

(By Ernestine Wheelock)

Mary Rice, Austin's librarian for 23 years, talks in her delightful way about plans for retirement. She has an attic to clean, traveling to do and lots of books to read.

"The attic is the first thing on my schedule. It's been waiting for me a long time—my house was built in 1926 and I don't think much has been thrown away since then," says the librarian who will retire Oct. 1 as Austin Public Library director.

Miss Rice has given herself a month to get the attic in order. Then she will be off in November for her yearly visit to Mexico,, and, for the first time in her life, she won't have to hurry back. "November is the best time to travel in Mexico," she thinks. "The summer tourists have gone and the Christmas crowds haven't come."

Already looking toward next spring and another trip, the librarian has on her desk this week a book called "Coming to London." She and Miss Thelma Lockwood of Austin and Mrs. R. M. Blaine of Houston (the former Elizabeth Baker of Austin and a friend of Mary Rice's since they were five years old) are planning a European tour together.

Asked how she feels about leaving her job, the librarian says she doesn't know yet. "Ask me after Oct. 1. There's too much to do here at the library yet to think much about it. It still seems a long way off."

She's in the midst now of three big projects—preparing the annual library budget, getting together a collection of some 20,000 books for the new Oak Springs Branch Library and making plans for its opening in September, and getting a new Bookmobile in operation in September.

Mary Rice moved to Austin from Marlin before she was school age and attended Wooldridge and Austin High Schools and the University of Texas. After studying library science at Columbia University, she came to be Austin's librarian by way of Our Lady of the Lake College and Louisiana State University where she taught library courses and Texas A&M where she was assistant librarian.

Since 1944 when she became the director, the library has mushroomed with the city. At that time, the central library claimed one branch. Now it has seven branches, three stations and four mobile units. The staff has grown from 15 to 90, with hours of service increasing from 120 weekly to 580. The book collection has multiplied almost five times, from 50,000 volumes to 240,000. Book circulation has increased from 242,000 yearly to 1,300,000.

Miss Rice is more than pleased with Austin as a library town, and it has been a great satisfaction to her to see the per capita circulation here surpass that of all other large cities of the state. "People in Austin are interested in everything there is and they read books on everything," she says. "It's wonderful the way the people of all ages use the libraries and are vocal in their appreciation of the service we give them."

After her retirement, Miss Rice promises to be one of the library's best patrons and most ardent supporters. She is looking forward to doing a great deal of extensive reading. "Instead of reading reviews, I'll have time to read complete books and instead of skimming. I'll read more deeply," she comments.

She is hoping, too, to indulge other pasttimes that she enjoys, such as gardening, cooking and visiting.

She will continue membership in three organizations, the Open Forum, which is a woman's luncheon club, an art club and the LSD Syndicate—"a perfectly innocent investment club established by nine respectable women 12 years ago, long before the drug was heard of," the lively librarian smiles.

"This particular LSD," she explains, "stands for English pounds, shillings and pence, and the syndicate is a nonserious group which makes an investment on the recommendation of any one of its members. There's never any dissention, and we've been lucky enough to show a profit. However, we just about eat up our dividends since we get together once a month for dinner," she laughed. "We do wonder what the banks think when they see our dues checks made out to LSD Syndicate."

Wearing a black suit with a blouse to match her blue eyes, Miss Rice talked about things past and things to come as she sat in her office, a blue, gray and orange room decorated to harmonize with two handsome Japanese wall hangings. She thinks the thing she will miss the most after retirement is the association of the people she works with. "I will miss the contact with the public and being a part of something vital, growing and exciting, but most of all I will miss the wonderful people of the library staff," the librarian said.

The library's assistant director, Mrs. John McCurdy, whom Miss Rice describes as "my strong right and left arms" will be retiring the same day as the director. Mrs. McCurdy, wife of the former secretary of the University of Texas Ex-Student Association, studied library science at the university after her daughters were grown. She has been with the Austin Library for 16 years and is credited with developing the book catalog which replaced the bulky card catalog in the branch libraries.

Miss Rice will be succeeded as director by David Earl Holt, now director of the Waco-McLennan County Library.

The Steel Bandits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES R. GROVER, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 7, 1967

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago I had the pleasure of listening to seven teenage boys play on musical instruments made from 55-gallon steel oil drums. Although the instruments originated and were developed in Trinidad in the West Indies, these young Americans learned to play them in their hometown of Whitestone, N.Y. What I found to be of great interest is that sophisticated travelers to the West Indies generally feel that this steel band, the Steel Bandits, is the most versatile and musically talented group to be found anywhere.

It fascinated me to learn that it all began as a social worker's attempt to find exciting activities for teenagers who were part of a delinquency prevention program in the Lower East Side of Manhattan, in New York City. Having come in contact with a steel band quite by accident, Murray Narell, a former teacher and now a social worker, became interested enough to start his own steel band program in a settlement house. He saw in this activity the possibility of involving youngsters in a program which not only would occupy their energies in a constructive way, but also give them the opportunity to perform and thus contribute their services to their communities.

Before long Mr. Narell had a number of groups who were delighting audiences of all ages with music miraculously emanating from the converted steel containers. Mr. Narell and his colleagues observed that in the process of preparing themselves for these performances the youngsters had to force themselves to develop discipline and other positive standards of behavior which carried over to other areas of their lives.

Indeed, the praise they received was in most instances the first they had ever experienced. For the most part, these young people had failed in every aspect to make successful adjustments to the problems of everyday living. They were school dropouts, poor athletes, and most had police records. Their general outlook toward life was pessimistic, if not downright hopeless; and as a result they had little or no motivation to do anything about their future. As we have seen, however, the youngsters' participation in the steel band program seems to have catalyzed a major and positive reorientation of their heretofore dismal outlook and behavior.

Parenthetically, it is an interesting and perhaps valuable pedagogical lesson to note that these youngsters adopted these new attitudes and behavior patterns—those in fact generally necessary for even a modicum of success in our society—not because they were told by the powers-that-be, "This is the way; walk ye in it," but rather because they learned at firsthand through their concrete experience with the steel band program that such standards are necessary for success.

Mr. Narell, therefore, came to feel that steel bands should become a part of many educational and recreational programs all over the country, and even the world. These remarkable instruments, fashioned out of oil drums by West Indian tuners, are ideally suited for individuals with little or no musical background and can be taught very quickly. They are inexpensive, virtually indestructible, and many groups can use the same set of instruments. In spite of their primitive appearance, they need not take second place to any conventional set of instruments. They have a full range of musical notes and tone, are accurate in pitch, and have a most pleasing, mellow quality.

Due to his personal interest in the instruments, 5 years ago Mr. Narell's own sons, Andy, then 8, and Jeff, then 13 learned how to play steel drums, and before long formed their own steel band with a few of their friends in the suburb of Whitestone, N.Y. Andy Narell had an unusual talent for the instrument, and in spite of his age became the leading player in the band, carrying the melody to the accompaniment by the other boys. The group called the Steel Bandits played for PTA's, hospitals, and other community organizations and soon were in great demand. One of the vice presidents of Grace Line, Inc., whose ships sail to the West Indies and Latin America, Mr. Frederic P. Sands, happened to hear the Steel Bandits and was so impressed that he had his firm become a sponsor of this youthful musical organization. With his encouragement and support, the Steel Bandits have become the top steel band anywhere. They have appeared on nationwide television, are recording artists, and are in great demand for conventions, concerts, and country club dances. They have, in fact, played for Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey, and have appeared twice before the National Press Club in Washington, where they were received with tremendous enthusiasm.

Perhaps their most important and impressive performance to date came on April 15, 1967, when the Steel Bandits played a full concert on steel drums in New York City's Philharmonic Hall. Among their selections were: Mozart, Van Suppe, Bach, Chopin, and Liszt, in addition to calypso, rock and roll, and Broadway showtunes.

The New York Times music critic, Robert Shelton, reviewed the concert under the headline "Steel Bandits Play Musicianly Concert." He said:

> The steel band . . . has rarely been played with such finesse and musicianship. . . . The set of tuned pans played by the Steel Bandits produces a rather full-ranged, fluttery, gently percussion melody and harmony structure with an amazingly accurate pitch.

It is interesting to note that Mr. Shelton made no reference, nor allowance, for the fact that the musicians in question were all teenagers, ranging in age from 13 to 19.

Wherever the Steel Bandits play, there are numerous comments on their neat appearance, excellent school records, and polite manners, as well as on their fantastic musical ability. The boys are a credit to American youth. They have taken instruments invented by young Trinidadians, popularized them in our country, and have added their own innovations of style and interpretation, making their unique contribution to the music of the Americas.

The unusual success and achievement of the Steel Bandits and the settlement house bands which Mr. Narell organized have so impressed Mr. Frederic P. Sands of Grace Lines that in 1966 the company allocated funds to assist schools and social agencies to develop steel band programs as a community service. Under this new project, Mr. Narell's services have been made available to such institutions as a consultant. Mr. Elliott Mannette, a famous tuner and instrument maker, was brought to New York from Trinidad, and excellent instruments are now available for schools and institutions in this country which desire to start their own steel band programs at a minimum cost. A number of such programs are already underway and have proved to be a rewarding and highly successful activity.

Unfortunately, this worthy project is at present extremely limited. Mr. Narell sees the possibility of expanding the program to all parts of the United States, and especially to the culturally and economically disadvantaged areas.

National Debt Nonsense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 7, 1967

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an editorial entitled "National Debt Nonsense," published in the Southwest Virginia Enterprise, of Wytheville, Va., of August 3, 1967.

James A. Williams is editor and publisher of this excellent newspaper.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

NATIONAL DEBT NONSENSE

Not only is it utter nonsense, it is patently dishonest to decry criticism of our astronomical national debt as unwarranted concern because "we owe it to ourselves." However one interprets that facile and cryptic phrase, it simply isn't true.

First and foremost, of some $326 billion in funded national debt outstanding on 30 November 1966, $15.3 billion were owned by foreigners. It so happens that foreigners can claim payment in gold, and US gold holdings on that date barely exceeded $13 billion.

The statement that "we owe it to ourselves" naturally implies, and the unregenerate spenders want us to believe, that it will never have to be repaid. We may be able to send rockets to the moon, but it is improbable that we can talk those foreigners out of their $15.3 billion. Moreover, it will be a bit difficult to squeeze $15.3 billion out of our $13 billion gold supply. Unquestionably, those commercial bankers will not sit quietly by and see their depositors' funds delivered in irredeemable paper.

We hope, for the sake of insurance policy holders, depositors in mutual savings and loan associations, pension fund beneficiaries, etc., that their managements also take a dim view of the idea that US government bonds are not redeemable. We doubt seriously that those millions of Americans who own $75.9 billion will take kindly to the idea that what was sold them as a loan to their government is something that they "owe to themselves."

And where is the money coming from for social security since the "trust fund" for that agency is comprised entirely of government bonds?

If "we owe it to ourselves" why has the Congress appropriated some $120 billion just to pay the interest over the past dozen years? And why will the Congress appropriate more than $14 billion—an amount in excess of total government revenues in any year prior to 1943—just for interest for the current year?

Indeed, if "we owe it to ourselves," we all can retire, and live out the remainder of our days in style, needing only to endorse the drafts the government sends us in repayment. If the theories of the new economists are valid, such a luxurious leisure for all our citizenry would be possible. But the reality is that the repayment funds have to be collected from us, and our children.

AFL–CIO President George Meany Supports Statement by Four Civil Rights Leaders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 7, 1967

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, last week, I placed in the Record, the text of a statement issued by A. Philip Randolph, Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Roy Wilkins, and Whitney Young, urging an end to the rioting.

On July 27, 1967, AFL–CIO president, George Meany, sent a telegram to Mr. Randolph in support of the statement.

I commend the text of President Meany's statement to the attention of our colleagues, as follows:

> AFL–CIO President George Meany today sent the following telegram to AFL–CIO Vice President A. Philip Randolph:
>
> "The sober, thought-provoking statement issued by you, Mr. Wilkins, Mr. Young and Dr. King fully merits the support of all Americans. Let me assure you it is the position of the AFL–CIO.

"We will continue to push, with all the vigor at our command, for the adoption of legislation to meet the problems you outlined—to eliminate from the American scene disease, slums, unemployment, poor educational facilities and above all else, discrimination.

"As an item of first priority, America must aid the innocent victims of the rioters. Certainly they deserve, at the very least, the same help the government gives the victims of natural disasters. We urge the Congress, as an immediate matter, to amend the necessary laws to give them this assistance.

"We say to the Congress: Now is not the time for the cheap humor and complete stupidity shown by those members of the House of Representatives who voted to kill the rat-control bill. Nor is now the time for a minority of the Senate Judiciary Committee to engage in a racially-inspired attack on the nomination of Thurgood Marshall to the United States Supreme Court. Now is the time for action and statesmanship by passing the poverty, housing, education and civil rights bills proposed by President Johnson and restoring full funding for the Model Cities and rent supplement bills passed last year.

"My warm congratulations to you and your colleagues on a courageous, sensible statement."

The Middle East: Crisis and Opportunity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THRUSTON B. MORTON

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 7, 1967

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement entitled "The Middle East: Crisis and Opportunity."

This paper was approved by the Republican coordinating committee on July 24. It was prepared by the task force on the conduct of foreign relations, an arm of the coordinating committee.

I ask unanimous consent that the rosters of membership of both the coordinating committee and the task force likewise be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statements and rosters of membership were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MIDDLE EAST: CRISIS AND OPPORTUNITY

I. INTRODUCTION

Comprehension of the current Middle Eastern problem requires that it be viewed as having two separate and distinct facets, both wiht long-term implications for the United States:

First, the basic Arab-Israeli conflict which has resulted in three wars in the Middle East in less than 20 years;

Second, the historic Russian drive, constant under Czars and Commissars alike, to obtain a controlling position in the Middle East—a traditional aim conforming to Soviet tactics to create many trouble spots around the world to confuse and confound the free world.

However, in the recent Arab-Israeli war, the proponents of Middle Eastern instability (the Soviets and certain radical Arab clients) have suffered a crushing defeat. The resulting situation affords an excellent opportunity to the United States to work toward a lasting peace. This nation should not look to others for initiative in this difficult and critical task.

The task is not impossible, but the Administration must move sensibly and vigorously with policies appealing to moderate groups in every Middle Eastern country. It is outside pressure that has generated much of the radical and irresponsible leadership in the area; the United States now is positioned to encourage moderate, responsible Arab and Jewish leaders to discard the self-defeating politics of hatred and violence and to join in the pursuit of equitable, long-term solutions.

The Republican Party recommends these proposals to meet the Middle East situation:

II. REPUBLICAN RECOMMENDATIONS

1. *The United States should exert its influence to secure a Middle East peace settlement which will confirm Israel's right to live and prosper as an independent nation.*

Arab refusal to acknowledge permanent boundaries for Israel is an attitude hardly exceptional in the Middle East.

Most Arab states and Israel have gained their independence only since World War II. Ever since, difficulties over new boundaries have consumed the region. Two "neutral zones" were created in the oil-rich Persian Gulf area to help separate the oil-producing countries of Kuwait, Iraq and Saudi Arabia. The frontiers between Saudi Arabia and the states on the southern periphery of the Arabian peninsula are still undemarcated, and strife afflicts Yemen and Aden and threatens south Arabia. Algeria has provoked border clashes with two of its peaceable neighbors, Morocco and Tunisia. Morocco claims the entire country of Mauritania and adjacent Spanish territories. For years the Kurds have been militantly agitating for an independent state which would comprise lands detached from Iraq, Iran, Turkey, and possibly Syria.

Clearly, a stable Middle East awaits the permanent solution of *all* such boundary disputes, but most important of all is the Arab-Israeli dispute. These border problems can be best resolved by the parties directly concerned, employing, if necessary, the good offices of the United Nations or other third parties. Stability and peace require the parties to the Arab-Israeli conflict to agree upon permanent boundaries for Israel. Such territorial arrangements as are determined must provide security for all and permit the disengagement of opposing military forces. The United States should be prepared to join other powers in guaranteeing borders thus confirmed, in order to ensure the permanency of the peace settlement.

2. *The United States should join with international guarantee of innocent passage through international waterways, including the Straits of Tiran and the Suez Canal, as an inalienable right of all nations.*

This guarantee would help to undergird the strategic and economic viability of Israel, as well as the Arab states, and would remove a major source of conflict in the Middle East.

This recommendation reaffirms an explicit Republican view, which was clearly enunciated by President Eisenhower following the Arab-Israel war in 1956.

3. *The United States should join with other nations in pressing for international supervision of the holy places within the City of Jerusalem.*

Circumstances must be created which will provide the best protection of, and access to, the holy places so that freedom of religious worship in these places will be assured to peoples of all faiths. The holy places should not be the subject of political controversy. Their administration by a religious council comprising all directly-affected faiths is one solution that should be most carefully weighed.

4. *As an essential part of a permanent settlement in the Middle East, the United States should insist on, and aid in, the rehabilitation and resettlement of the more than one million Palestine Arab refugees who have been displaced over the past 20 years.*

Since 1948, $625 million has been spent by the United Nations Relief and Works Agency (UNRWA) to provide simple subsistence to the Palestine Arab refugees. The United States has voluntarily contributed $425 million, or more than two-thirds of the total. The U.S.S.R., the strident champion of the Arabs, has never contributed to this program.

Before there can be stability in the Middle East, a just and enduring solution of the refugee problem must be found. As the leading contributor to refugee support, the United States is uniquely situated to press powerfully for the permanent resettlement of all Arab refugees. Israel, as well as the Arab states, must share substantially in this effort. We, with other nations, should challenge the U.S.S.R. to prove the sincerity of its professed concern for the welfare of the Arabs by matching future U.S. contributions toward refugee rehabilitation.

5. *The United States should propose a broad-scale development plan for all Middle Eastern states which agree to live peacefully with their neighbors.*

The Republican Party would not willingly see the rehabilitation of the Middle East become a political issue in the United States. Our country's efforts to bring peace to that war-torn region should continue to be bipartisan. In this spirit we hope for vigorous Administration and widespread public support for the bold and imaginative Eisenhower Plan to bring water, work and food to the Middle East.

This constructive proposal would provide huge atomic plants to desalt sea water, the first of which would produce as much fresh water as the entire Jordan River system. This in turn would irrigate desert lands to support the Arab refugees and bring yearned for prosperity to both Arab and Israeli territories.

The Eisenhower Plan is sufficiently far-reaching to encompass all Middle Eastern states, and all should be invited to adhere. However, even if some should decline, the Plan could be initiated pending their later cooperation. The construction of the first plant would require the agreement of only two or three countries, such as Israel, Jordan, Saudi Arabia, or Lebanon. Once the immense benefits of the vast increase in water supplies become evident for all to see, it would be difficult for any Middle Eastern leader to deny his people the opportunity to share in the prosperity being created.

6. *The United States should make a determined effort to expose and isolate the radical troublemakers in the Middle East. We should aid only those states following non-aggressive, non-Communist policies.*

Republicans oppose the continuation of past attempts to win over leftist leaders by giving large amounts of aid. We believe our aid should not reward our enemies and, in effect, punish our friends.

Nasser has received more aid ($1,133.3 million) than Israel ($1,104.5 million), and nearly double the aid given to any moderate Arab leader (Jordan under King Hussein, for example, has received $572.8 million).[1] By contrast, the average aid given to the U.A.R. during the Eisenhower years was $31.6 million per year. The average yearly aid to Nasser rose sharply during Democratic Administrations to $172.1 million.

Republicans have long opposed such aid. On January 26, 1965, every House Republican voted to terminate all surplus food shipments to Nasser.[2]

---

[1] Analysis of these aid figures is a complex matter. The per capita figures are disparate—and the periods, types, and currency and payment requirements varied widely.

[2] *The New York Times, January 27, 1965.*

Moreover, at the outbreak of the Middle East war one-quarter of a billion dollars[3] was obligated for the seven Arab states which later broke relations with the United States, partially as a result of Nasser's false charge that American planes aided Israel. (See Appendix A, "The Administration Ignored Signs of Crisis in the Middle East.") Republicans believe aid should be reinstituted to any of these countries until the United States decides to reestablish diplomatic relations, restitution has been made for damages to American porperty and people, and allegations, which falsely impugn the good name of the United States before the world, have been retracted.

7. *The United States, in furtherance of peace in the Middle East, should strive with other nations for agreed limitations on international arms shipments to the area.*

Limitation on the wasteful and destructive arms race was temporarily achieved by the Tripartite Declaration of 1950 and the Eisenhower Doctrine of 1958. However, Soviet shipments of large amounts of sophisticated weapons to the radical Arab states have thwarted arms controls. There should be unrelenting effort to obtain Soviet adherence to a workable system of arms control in the Middle East. Their cooperation could be a significant indication of Soviet desire for world peace and East-West détente.

8. *The United States' leadership and diplomacy must be alert, firm and resourceful to prevent extension of Soviet imperialism into the Middle East and North Africa.*

The U.S.S.R. has suffered a serious reverse in terms of both power and prestige in much of the Arab world. The United States should now apply its own influence toward inhibiting the Soviets from again creating disturbances in this area.

Russian aspirations in the Middle East have not varied for centuries. Their major aim has been to obtain direct access to warm water ports, and to the Mediterranean Sea and the Indian Ocean. The emergence of many new nations in the Middle East following World War II provided increased opportunities for advancing Soviet interests. In 1945–46, the Soviet army moved into northern Iran, but troops were finally withdrawn after the U.S. and the U.K. objected in the United Nations. In 1947, as in 1877–78, the Soviets attempted to gain a dominating position over the Turkish straits, and in 1946–47, they tried to overthrow the Greek government. The United States responded decisively with its Greek and Turkish aid programs.

Following the death of Stalin, the Soviets sought to by-pass the Middle Eastern countries with which they share a common border and began cultivating Arabs further to the south. Since then, Soviet aid to the radical states in the Middle East has been dispensed on a massive scale. The U.A.R. alone has received about one-sixth of total Soviet economic aid. If economic aid to Algeria, Iraq, Syria, Somalia and Yemen is added, the total becomes $1,824 million or nearly one-third of total Soviet economic aid. In addition, Soviet military aid has clearly been on a massive scale.

Considering the traditional Russian goals and the vast Soviet military and economic aid to the area, it is not surprising that the Soviets are profoundly concerned over the results of the recent Middle East conflict.

One area of importance only incidentally affected by recent Arab-Israeli battles is the Red Sea, the vital link between Europe, Asia, and much of Africa. The Soviets are deeply involved in promoting instability along the Red Sea coasts in an effort to dominate this key passage. Via Nasser, the Soviets have supported a four-year war in Yemen; they are fomenting rebellion in Aden; they are arming Somalia to stir trouble in the critical region of the African Horn. It would seriously menace the Western position if Yemen and Aden were allowed to come under the control of hostile elements, whether Egyptian or Soviet. We believe the nation can rightly expect its leadership to have the capability and responsibility to avoid such a tragedy—a catastrophe for all the free world should Soviet designs be allowed to succeed.

APPENDIX A

THE ADMINISTRATION IGNORED SIGNS OF CRISIS IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Although Republicans reject categorically Arab and Soviet claims that the United States was in any way involved in the Middle Eastern conflict, either overtly or covertly, it is apparent that President Johnson's Administration cannot avoid all responsibility, or even some blame, for the events which have taken place. In fact, it appears that the Johnson Administration was so devoid of policy ideas on the Middle East that it could not have seriously affected the situation even if it had wanted to.

The following points give some idea of how badly the White House misjudged the Middle Eastern situation:

1) For the crucial three months preceding the crisis there was no United States Ambassador to the Egyptian government. Moreover, the post of Assistant Secretary of State for Near Eastern and South Asian Affairs was vacant from October 19, 1966 to April 7, 1967, a period of nearly six months just preceding the crisis.

2) When the new American Ambassador to Cairo, Richard Nolte, arrived on May 21 he was reported by the Baltimore Sun to have asked, "What crisis?" when questioned by a correspondent at the Cairo airport. The Sun comments that Nolte was simply reflecting the State Department's thinking, and his bland remark showed how little Washington appreciated the gravity of the situation even at that late date.

3) David G. Nes remained Charge d'Affaires of the American Embassy in Cairo even after Nolte arrived, because the new Ambassador never had an opportunity to present his credentials to President Nasser before the war started and diplomatic relations were broken. Nes, a senior career diplomat, was so disturbed by Washington's lack of interest in the Middle Eastern situation that he took the almost unheard of step of complaining to newsmen that his reports showing a crisis was developing had been totally ignored by the Administration.

4) A resume of events which Nes reported but which he claimed Washington ignored is highly instructive. Quotations are from the *Baltimore Sun*.

"Beginning in January Nes was convinced that Nasser was planning a major confrontation with Israel and the West. . . . The real tip-off to Nasser's intentions was a series of violently anti-American articles published in Cairo's authoritative *Al Ahram* early in March at about the time (U.S.) Ambassador Lucius Battle left without a successor being named.

"Mohammed Heikal, editor of *Al Ahram* and a confidant of Nasser, reviewed United States-Egyptian relations from 1949 to date. The Heikal articles indicated Nasser was headed for and wanted a confrontation with Israel and the West."

"Nasser apparently tested U.S. intentions in early April by precipitating the incident which resulted in the removal of the U.S. AID mission from Taiz in Egyptian-controlled Yemen."

"The final clue to his (Nasser's) intentions was his May 2 speech in which he characterized America as the enemy of Egypt."

Once the opposing sides had mobilized their troops, and even after hostilities had broken out, the actions of the Johnson Administration indicated that our efforts were poorly coordinated. Although it was perfectly obvious from the nature of the policy statements and military preparations on both sides that war was imminent, the Administration floundered about with a makeshift attempt to organize maritime powers of the world into a group which might convince Nasser to back down from his Gulf of Aqaba blockade.

Moreover, the Administration failed to see beyond the impending crisis and appraise the needs for a permanent settlement in the Middle East. Instead of adopting a flexible position, the President stated on May 23, 1967, that "the United States is firmly committed to the support of the political independence and territorial integrity of all the nations of that area."

This unilateral declaration even went beyond the 1950 Tripartite Declaration in which the United States, the United Kingdom and France guaranteed boundaries *but only on the condition that peace treaties were signed.*

During the first days of the conflict the Administration revealed its confusion by changing its stand on the war three times in one day. First, the State Department announced that the United States was "neutral in thought, word and deed." Second, a White House Press Secretary stated that this statement was "not a formal declaration of neutrality." Third and finally, Dean Rusk issued a clarification stating that by "neutral" we meant we were not going to become a belligerent, but this did not mean to imply that we were indifferent to the outcome of the war.

Beyond expressing great interest in Middle Eastern events, the Administration never said whether our sympathies were with Israel or the Arabs. By contrast, the declared Soviet postion was 100 percent pro-Arab.

By subsequent action, the Administration has as much as admitted that it still has no policy for the Middle East: a special committee has been established to study the Middle East, and Mr. McGeorge Bundy has had to be recalled from private life to direct this group's work.

Republicans wish to underscore our long-established opinion that the government would do better to rely on the judgment of our professional diplomats, who are familiar with the area in question, than to organize a new committee every time a new crisis develops.

Republican Coordinating Committee

Presiding Officer: Ray C. Bliss, Chairman, Republican National Committee.

FORMER PRESIDENT

Dwight D. Eisenhower, 300 Carlisle Street, Gettysburg, Pennsylvania.

FORMER PRESIDENTIAL NOMINEES

Barry Goldwater (1964), Post Office Box 1601, Scottsdale, Arizona.

Richard M. Nixon (1960), Nixon, Mudge, Rose, Guthrie & Alexander, 20 Broad Street, New York, New York.

Thomas E. Dewey (1944 & 1948), 40 Wall Street, New York, New York.

Alf M. Landon (1936), National Bank of Topeka Building, 1001 Fillmore Street, Topeka, Kansas.

SENATE LEADERSHIP

Everett M. Dirksen, Minority Leader.

Thomas H. Kuchel, Minority Whip.

Bourke B. Hickenlooper, Chairman, Republican Policy Committee.

Margaret Chase Smith, Chairman, Republican Conference.

George Murphy, Chairman, National Republican Senatorial Comm.

Milton R. Young, Secretary, Republican Conference.

Hugh Scott, Vice Chairman, National Republican Senatorial Comm.

HOUSE LEADERSHIP

Gerald R. Ford, Minority Leader.

Leslie C. Arends, Minority Whip.

---

[3] This figure includes some $200 million earmarked as aid and $51 million in outstanding Export-Import Bank commitments.

Melvin R. Laird, Chairman, Republican Conference.

John J. Rhodes, Chairman, Republican Policy Committee.

H. Allen Smith, Ranking Member of Rules Committee.

Bob Wilson, Chairman, National Republican Congressional Comm.

Charles E. Goodell, Chairman, Planning and Research Committee.

Richard H. Poff, Secretary, Republican Conference.

William C. Cramer, Vice Chairman, Republican Conference.

REPRESENTATIVES OF THE REPUBLICAN GOVERNORS ASSOCIATION

John A. Love, Governor of the State of Colorado, Denver, Colorado.

John A. Volpe, Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Boston, Massachusetts.

George W. Romney, Governor of the State of Michigan, Lansing, Michigan.

Nelson A. Rockefeller, Governor of the State of New York, Albany, New York.

Raymond P. Shafer, Governor of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania.

John H. Chafee, Governor of the State of Rhode Island, Providence, Rhode Island.

Nils A. Boe, Governor of the State of South Dakota, Pierre, South Dakota.

Daniel J. Evans, Governor of the State of Washington, Olympia, Washington.

REPUBLICAN NATIONAL COMMITTEE

Ray C. Bliss, Chairman, Republican National Committee, 1625 Eye Street, Northwest, Washington, D.C. 20006.

Mrs. C. Wayland Brooks, Assistant Chrmn., Republican National Committee, 1625 Eye Street, Northwest, Washington, D.C. 20006.

Mrs. Collis P. Moore, Vice Chairman, Republican National Committee, Box 225, Moro, Oregon 97039.

Donald R. Ross, Vice Chairman, Republican National Committee, 1406 Kiewt Plaza, Farnam at 36th, Omaha, Nebraska 68131.

Mrs. J. Willard Marriott, Vice Chrmn., Republican National Committee, 4500 Garfield Street, Northwest, Washington, D.C. 20007.

J. Drake Edens, Jr., Vice Chairman, Republican National Committee, Post Office Box 9385, Columbia, South Carolina 29201.

PRESIDENT OF THE REPUBLICAN STATE LEGISLATORS ASSOCIATION

F. F. (Monte) Montgomery, Speaker of the House of Representatives, State of Oregon, Salem, Oregon.

Robert L. L. McCormick, Staff Coordinator.

MEMBERS OF THE REPUBLICAN COORDINATING COMMITTEE'S TASK FORCE ON THE CONDUCT OF FOREIGN RELATIONS

Robert C. Hill, Chairman, United States Ambassador to Mexico, 1957–1961.

David N. Rowe, Vice Chairman, Professor of Political Science, Yale University.

Gordon Allott, United States Senator from Colorado.

Robert Amory, Jr., Deputy Director, Central Intelligence Agency, 1952–1962.

John B. Anderson, Member of Congress from Illinois.

Tim M. Babcock, Governor of the State of Montana.

Frances P. Bolton, Member of Congress from Ohio.

Arleigh A. Burke, Chief of United States Naval Operations, 1955–1961.

Lucius D. Clay, General of the United States Army, Retired.

Philip K. Crowe, United States Ambassador to the Union of South Africa, 1959–1961.

Joseph S. Farland, United States Ambassador to the Republic of Panama, 1960–1963.

Paul Findley, Member of Congress from Illinois.

Peter H. B. Frelinghuysen, Member of Congress from New Jersey.

Ernest S. Griffith, Dean, School of International Service, American University, 1958–1965.

Mrs. Cecil M. Harden, Republican National Committeewoman for Indiana.

Joe Holt, Member of Congress from California, 1953–1959.

Walter A. Judd, Member of Congress from Minnesota, 1943–1963.

John D. Lodge, United States Ambassador to Spain, 1955–1961.

Gerhart Niemeyer, Professor of Political Science, University of Notre Dame.

Nicholas Nyaradi, Director of School of International Studies, Bradley University.

Roderic L. O'Connor, Administrator, Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs, Department of State, 1957–1958.

G. L. Ohrstom, Jr., Investment Banker.

William W. Scranton, Governor of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, 1963–1967.

Richard B. Sellars, Republican National Committeeman for New Jersey.

Robert Strausz-Hupé, Director, Foreign Policy Research Institute, University of Pennsylvania.

Kent. B. Crane, Secretary to the Task Force.

Riots: Organized and Subsidized

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 7, 1967

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, in a hard-hitting editorial in its July 31, 1967, issue, Barron's Weekly points to compelling evidence to support the charge that the riots which have engulfed city after city across the Nation are less spontaneous outbreaks than carefully planned subversion. This highly respected business and financial publication also offers convincing proof that federally subsidized antipoverty warriors have been inciting and fomenting unrest.

I commend the editorial to the attention of my colleagues:

POVERTY WARRIORS: THE RIOTS ARE SUBSIDIZED AS WELL AS ORGANIZED

Marion Barry and Rufus Mayfield are angry young men. Former national head of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC), Mr. Barry in August, 1965, took part in a protest demonstration organized by the so-called Assembly of Unrepresented People. He was arrested and charged with disorderly conduct while leading demonstrators onto the Capitol grounds. "Riot power and rebellion power," he was quoted as saying last week, "might make people listen now." Mr. Mayfield is a Black Muslim. Twenty-one years old, he has spent most of the past eight years in prison for various offenses, including petty and grand larceny. This month Marion Barry acquired gainful employment. He was hired as a $50-per-day consultant by the United Planning Organization, top antipoverty agency for the District of Columbia. Rufus Mayfield, according to Rep. Joel P. Broyhill (R., Va.), will serve as Barry's "back-up man."

While perhaps more arresting than most, these are not isolated instances. On the contrary, the files fairly bulge with equally radical cases in point. Thus, federal and state investigations of New York's Mobilization for Youth, pilot project for the Job Corps, disclosed that its staff included several members of the Communist Party. LeRoi Jones, who was taken into custody during the riots in Newark and charged with illegal possession of deadly weapons, once ran a hate-the-whites Black Arts Theater which got $115,000 in federal funds from Haryou-ACT before police discovered an arsenal on the premises. The Southwest Alabama Farmers Cooperative Association of Selma, which the Office of Economic Opportunity recently granted $700,000, numbers among its principals John Zippert and Shirley Mesher. Louisiana's Joint Legislative Committee on Un-American Activities recently documented Mr. Zippert's association with radical causes, including the Kremlin-financed World Youth Festival. According to the Alabama Legislative Commission to Preserve the Peace, Miss Mesher, a former coordinator for SNCC, is "a prime participant in the Black Panther movement designed to overthrow the government . . ."

Right after Watts (Barron's, August 23, 1965), we observed: "In the name of civil rights, a small band of ruthless men has not hesitated to stir up violence, break the law and undermine duly constituted authority. The so-called civil rights revolution . . . has begun to mean exactly what it says." Since then compelling evidence, including eyewitness testimony and the findings of a Cleveland grand jury, has shown that the riots are less spontaneous outbreaks than carefully planned subversion. To judge by the record, moreover, civil unrest is not only organized but also subsidized. Thanks to the Office of Economic Opportunty, the U.S. taxpayer now has a chance to finance his own destruction. The Great Society, so Newark, Detroit and scores of other smouldering cities suggest, cannot coexist with the American way of life.

Like the poor, slums and rats have always been with us. Only the devastating riots—and the professional agitators who prepare the tinder, await a spark and fan the flames—are significantly new. The 1964 outbursts in Harlem turned up William Epton, vice-chairman of the Red-Chinese-oriented Progressive Labor Party, who taught people how to make Molotov cocktails. Mr. Epton was convicted of criminal anarchy for his part in the riots. The Rev. Billy Graham called Watts a "dress rehearsal for revolution," a description in which radical spokesmen ever since have gloried. Last year's riots in Cleveland, charged Sen. Frank Lausche (Dem., O.) were the work of a "national conspiracy executed by experts." Shortly afterward a Cleveland grand jury, after hearing the testimony of detectives who penetrated the conspirators' ranks, found that "the outbreak of lawlessness and disorder was organized, precipitated and exploited by a relatively small group of trained and disciplined professionals." In a story on the Newark riots, the current issue of Life Magazine describes its reporters' "clandestine meeting with members of the sniper organization." Finally, SNCC's Stokely Carmichael, whose subversive interests range far and wide, openly boasts of what's afoot. After a quick trip to Prague, he landed last week in Havana. There he told newsmen: "In Newark we applied (guerrilla) war tactics . . . We are preparing groups of urban guerrillas . . . It is going to be a fight to the death."

So much for subversion, which the country will ignore at its own risk. As to federal subsidy of violence, an ominous pattern has emerged. From the beginning, as radicals recognized, the war on poverty, notably the Community Action Programs, had impressive trouble-making potentials. Somehow CAP has expanded much faster than OEO expenditures as a whole, surging from $246.5 million in fiscal '66 to an estimated $500 million in the current fiscal year. As noted above (much of the material comes from a forthcoming book, "Poverty Is Where the Money Is," to be published by Arlington House and written by Shirley Scheibla, Washington correspondent for Barron's), some of the money funded dubious ventures and put jailbirds and subversives on the federal payroll. Mrs. Scheibla cites other horrible examples: John Ross, member of the Progressive Labor Party, who served on an anti-poverty board in San Francisco; Howard Harawitz, member of a similar board in Berkeley and former member of the W.E.B. DuBois Clubs, which the FBI calls "Communist-spawned"; and a number of U.P.O. personnel in Washington, D.C., who turned out to be SNCC organizers and agitators.

Taxpayer-financed trouble has exploded in one part of the country after another. Last fall the mayor of Perth Amboy, N.J., accused the local anti-poverty leader of seeking "to foment and incite unrest, agitation and disorder," a charge which the city manager of Rochester echoed last week. Newark's police chief weeks ago warned that the city faced anarchy because of agitation by federal anti-poverty workers, several of whom were arrested during the riots. In New York City five marauding young Negroes, collared while looting stores on Fifth Avenue, worked for the anti-poverty program; one wore a sweater blazoned, after the OEO-funded agency, "Harlem Youth Opportunities Unlimited."

To fight riots with OEO grants, in short, is like fighting fire with gasoline. However, Sargent Shriver alone is not to blame. Some of the fault lies with local officials like New York's Mayor Lindsay (tapped last week to serve on the President's special advisory body), who repeatedly refused to condemn the appearance of his Human Rights Commissioner at the Black Power conference in Newark, as well as with Mayor Cavanagh of Detroit (first recipient of OEO aid and welfare state showcase), who tied the hands of the police for the first few strategic hours. On the federal level, the country should call to account the Office of Attorney-General and its three recent occupants: Robert Kennedy, who once wrote a letter to the head of an identified Communist front, seeking advice on a national service corps; Nicholas Katzenbach, who shrugged off all evidence of conspiracy; and the incumbent, Ramsey Clark, who testified against pending anti-riot legislation. The blame reaches right up to the official White House family, to Vice President Humphrey, who last summer said that if he lived in a rat-infested slum: "there is enough of a spark left in me to lead a pretty good revolt."

Law and order are the stuff of civilization; they are also the first duty of government. On the record, "liberals" of both parties, by tolerating subversion, have made a mockery of their oaths of office and forfeited the public's trust. Appeals to prayer are all well and good, but what this country needs is a political and philosophic call to arms.

Federal Antipoverty Programs—The Wrong Approach

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 7, 1967

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Wrong Approach," published in the Richmond, Va., Times-Dispatch of August 6, 1967.

Virginius Dabney is editor of the Times-Dispatch.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WRONG APPROACH

Some months ago, the mayor of a large Midwestern city came to Washington to vouch for the effectiveness of federal anti-poverty programs.

"It is a well known fact," he told members of a Senate subcommitee, that his city "has avoided the civil disorder that has beset our other major cities for the past few summers." The mayor continued:

That didn't happen by chance: it is the result of careful planning and the implementation made possible through the economic improvement act. . . . These programs contributed to an orderly community and aided in the reduction of crime.

You may have guessed by now that the gentleman who made these statements was Mayor Jerome P. Cavanagh. The city he was talking about, of course, was Detroit, which has just experienced one of the worst examples of "civil disorder" in American history.

If the secret of averting civil disorder is funds from the federal government, then Detroit should have been one of the least likely spots for an outbreak of violence. Before the riots occurred in Detroit, Washington had spent more than $30 million on anti-poverty activities in that city. It had also pumped some $112 million into 28 urban redevelopment projects there. Obviously all this cash didn't insure Detroit against disaster.

The trouble, says Mayor Cavanagh, who has not changed his tune, is that even these large sums were not enough. Still insisting that federal funds are the secret of urban stability, he asserted on "Meet the Press" that a "highly reactionary Congress" bore the chief responsibility for what happened in Detroit.

If Congress has been stingy, as he suggested, and more money is the answer, then how much will it take to solve the problem of urban crime and violence with dollars?

Even before the rioters and looters did $500 million worth of damage in Detroit, Mr. Cavanagh had placed a $15 billion price tag on the cost of rebuilding his city. If the rest of the country required similar amounts, it would take between $1 trillion and $2 trillion to rebuild America's cities. And that would consume virtually every cent of federal revenue for the next 20 years at present tax rates!

Obviously money from Washington isn't going to solve the problem quickly, if at all. In fact, the whole idea that there is a direct cause and effect relationship between poverty and crime is open to serious challenge.

In 1939, average per capita income in the U.S. was $695, total government welfare spending was less than $10 billion a year and unemployment was nearly 14 per cent. Today per capita income is four times as great, unemployment is only one third as severe and the government is spending seven times as much on welfare programs—and *yet the rate of crime has doubled.*

We have not only failed to combat crime with cash. We may even have aggravated the problem by this approach. All too often welfare programs have eroded not only individual responsibility and initiative, but also the desire for self-improvement—the only sure path to genuine prosperity. They have likewise raised hopes and expectations beyond the government's ability to deliver. When a promised utopia fails to materialize, there is bound to be resentment and trouble—as is now altogether obvious.

An Important Person for an Important Job

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 7, 1967

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, the Office of Economic Opportunity is fortunate to have as its assistant director for the older persons program a dedicated and perceptive public servant, Miss Genevieve Blatt.

Miss Blatt joined OEO a few months ago after 12 years of service to Pennsylvania as secretary of internal affairs. Her post will entail a growing workload, because medical statistics show that each generation is living longer and that the problems of dealing with the elderly will continue to increase.

In an article that appeared in the Pittsburgh Press on July 23, 1967, Miss Margaret A. Kilgore, of United Press International, described Miss Blatt as "eminently qualified" for her difficult position.

The article also pointed out that—

> Miss Blatt's agency currently is hampered by a lack of funds until Congress acts on President Johnson's request to spend $2 billion during fiscal 1967–68 on the poverty program.

I insert the Pittsburgh Press article at this point in the RECORD, both to acquaint my colleagues with a gifted friend and to point up the importance of acting favorably on the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1967 to enable dedicated public servants like Miss Blatt to do their vital jobs properly.

The article follows:

PREJUDICE SNAGS AID TO ELDERLY: MISS BLATT'S JOB IS "OLD STORY"

(By Margaret A. Kilgore)

WASHINGTON (UPI).—A community builds a recreation center for the elderly, but poor old folk won't use it because they feel inferior.

Other oldsters won't use it because they don't want to mix with the poor.

What can be done?

A myriad of problems such as this confront Genevieve Blatt, the Federal Government's new assistant director for the older persons program in the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO).

"When you're dealing with the elderly you're facing a lifetime of habits and prejudices," Miss Blatt told UPI. "It's easy enough to say we'll spend money here or there, but dealing with people is another matter."

In the unnamed community above, which she cited as an example, the Federal Government and local interests built a community center where elderly persons could go, meet people of their own age group and mix socially.

It attracted a large group of educated, middle class, white persons who enjoyed it. But when community workers encouraged attendance by elderly persons from lower economic strata, they were uncomfortable. So were the newcomers. As a result, no one came to the community center.

"These are the kinds of problems we have to solve," Miss Blatt explained, "and I don't know how to beat it. But we must try."

With medical statistics showing that each generation is living longer, the problems of dealing with the elderly will continue to increase.

When Director Sargent Shriver of the anti-poverty corps named Miss Blatt to her current post, he chose a woman who is eminently qualified.

A tall, graying brunette, Miss Blatt, 53, was elected secretary of Internal Affairs in Pennsylvania in 1954, the first woman ever elected to a Statewide office in Pennsylvania.

She was re-elected in 1958 and 1962, but she lost a bid for a fourth term in 1966 to then State Commerce Secretary John K. Tabor by a margin of 67,000 votes.

A native of East Brady, Pa., and a lawyer, Miss Blatt won the Democratic nomination in 1964 for the U.S. Senate over organization candidate, Justice Michael A. Musmanno of the State Supreme Court. She later lost a close race to incumbent Sen. Hugh Scott, Philadelphia Republican.

Before she was named to her current job, Miss Blatt served on the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice.

Part of her job includes overseeing operation of "Foster Grandparents" program which has proven marginally successful by paying hourly wages to the elderly poor to befriend children in institutions and orphanages.

The Federal Government has spent between three and five million dollars during fiscal 1966–67 to operate about four dozen programs across the country.

She also finds it discouraging that so much of the money is being directed only to the elderly in cities with persons in the rural areas forgotten.

"Everyone assumes that in a small town, neighbors and relatives take care of you if you are old or sick," she observed. "And, fortunately, in many cases this is true. But the rural areas shouldn't be neglected in the interests of political considerations which favor the city dweller."

Miss Blatt's agency currently is hampered by a lack of funds until Congress acts on President Johnson's request to spend two billion dollars during fiscal 1967–68 on the poverty program. The Federal Government must have local co-operation, however.

In a recent speech to the 94th annual forum of the National Conference on Social Welfare, Miss Blatt urged: "I plead with every social agency, with every agency of government—Federal state and local—to pool resources, combine forces and together do, what none of them can do alone and do adequately."

She said that for too long local welfare agencies have concentrated their efforts on children and family problems without expanding their services for older persons.

J. Edgar Hoover—Public Servant No. 1

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 7, 1967

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, at this time we commemorate the completion of 50 years of distinguished public service by Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Throughout the Nation expressions of thanks are being extended to Mr. Hoover by a grateful people for his many contributions to the public well-being.

Typical of these expressions is the editorial which appeared in a recent edition of the Alhambra, Calif., Post-Advocate.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I submit the editorial for inclusion in the Record:

Half Century Heading FBI

The national well-being of the United States over the last 50 years has been profoundly affected by the dedicated service of J. Edgar Hoover. The half century of service which he celebrated yesterday has seen the very fabric of our national integrity and unity tested to the limit. Rock-like and unwavering, Mr. Hoover has been the voice of conscience and the enemy of crime.

Fifty years of public service are, by any standards, a tribute to selfless devotion to duty. In John Edgar Hoover, the 72-year-old director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the nation found the right man at the right time for the right job.

And at a time when the forces of crime and anarchy constantly endeavor to assert themselves and overthrow the laws of this nation, his implacable fight against them, through the institution he leads, is our first line of defense.

Not for him the double standard. Not for him the compromise with the criminality. Throughout his public life he has been the very acme of principle and honesty, and an example to all.

The law clerk who joined the Justice Department 50 years ago today later became the acting director of the Bureau of Investigation during its important formative years, before it was "federal."

He built the FBI from a fledging inexpert organization into the finest law-enforcement agency in the world. He created from a few widely dispersed agents the nucleus of a crime-fighting machine which has grown to more than 6,600 agents out of a total of 15,300 employes in 57 national divisions.

The FBI is J. Edgar Hoover. He is the epitome of his department's agents. Their exploits during the years from the Twenties of probitition to the Sixties of LSD have endured through many tests, with a dogged tenacity and commendable success.

It was Mr. Hoover who brought professionalism to police work, insisting on training and education for a job formerly and mistakenly regarded as requiring little of either.

He created the national academy which, since 1935, has been providing outstanding training for the "thin blue line" of police from all parts of the nation. It was under his direction that the national centralized fingerprint division was born, now used by all agencies. This year the giant computerized stolen vehicles section went into operation, aiding every patrolman.

The FBI has exemplified quiet, progressive efficiency and integrity. It has earned the respect of criminal and protected alike.

The strength stemmed from the God-fearing right, high moral principles, stern disciplines and unimpeachable code of ethics by which J. Edgar Hoover has shaped his life and his department.

Hunger Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 7, 1967

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include portions of an outstanding editorial which appeared in the News and Courier of Charleston, S.C., on July 13, 1967, entitled "Hunger Politics." I commend its reading to all Members of the House:

Hunger Politics

Reading between the lines of a report from Washington about making free food more readily available to hungry Americans, we detect a distinct trace of politics.

The Secretary of Agriculture's announcement of more liberal use of U.S. food stamps followed a report from a team of doctors who asserted they found hundreds of starving children in Mississippi. The story intimates that horrid white people are deliberately taking bread out of children's mouths in an attempt to drive out unwanted Negro population.

While we are not able to make unqualified denial that some people are poorly nourished in some parts of Mississippi—and no doubt in every one of the other 49 states—we are firmly of the opinion that the Southern region of the United States is one of the garden spots of the world when it comes to easy access to the necessities of life. Even those who sit under a breadfruit tree could be hungry if they lacked the energy or intelligence to feed themselves.

Nasser's Plan for Using Poison Gas in Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 7, 1967

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, it has been disclosed that the Egyptians made use of poison gas in their war in Yemen early this year, and intended to use gas in their war with Israel.

When Nasser discovered that he was unable to defeat the small and backward nation of Yemen, he decided to use a weapon long outlawed by all the nations of the world—poison gas.

When the U.N. refused to act after receiving reports that poison gas was being used by Egypt, the International Red Cross sent a team of doctors to north Yemen to investigate these reports.

I commend to the attention of our colleagues an article which appeared in the July 28, 1967, issue of the Jewish Press concerning this matter.

The article contains the substance of the report issued by the International Red Cross, and follows:

Nasser's Plans for Using Poison Gas in Israel—Secret Red Cross Report Verifies Egyptians Used Poison Gas

For the first time in modern history, a weapon outlawed by civilized nations, poison gas, was used by the United Arab Republic against civilians. This fact was recently revealed by the International Red Cross in a secret report, which is now in the files of the Jewish Press.

A Jewish Press staff correspondent who was in Israel when the Arabs capitulated on the Sinai desert had actually seen the poison gas cylinders, ready for instantaneous use.

The documented and unbiased proof of the use of poison gas by the United Arab Republic against civilians is now available to the public. It coldly and clearly reveals what the State of Israel faced from Nasser's forces and points up the narrow escape from horrible death that was the fortunate fate of tens of thousands of Jewish soldiers and civilians.

For several years now the United Arab Republic has intervened blatantly in the internal affairs of Yemen, setting up a puppet Republican government loyal to Cairo's bidding and sending in 50,000 troops to help smash the opposition Royalist forces.

At first it had seemed that a modern army, equipped with tanks and planes, could easily crush a ragged, primitive host of tribesmen. But, as the months dragged by, the Royalists continued to fight, taking a heavier and heavier toll of Egyptians. Hundreds of Nasser's troops perished and others were captured—only to have an ear or a nose cut off—and allowed to return to their fellow soldiers and spread panic.

The stalemate was not only costly to Nasser in terms of money (nearly one million dollars a month) but the fact that husbands and children failed to come home from the battle was costing him popularity at home.

In addition, the humiliation of being unable to defeat a backward army was too much for the Egyptian dictator to endure.

He therefore decided to use a weapon long outlawed by all the nations of the world, poison gas! Soon Egyptian planes began regular bombing runs against Yemeni villages. In January of this year, a raid on the town of Ktaf in Northern Yemen, killed 170 people. In the first week of January alone, the Royalists clamed that gas took the lives of 493 Yemenis.

On February 15, another poison gas attack was launched, this time against the village of Beni Salamah in Southern Yemen. The continued reports were so obviously true that it led to debate in the British Parliament where Prime Minister Wilson declared that he had evidence "strongly suggesting that poison gas had been used" in Yemen.

On January 31 of this year, the International Committee of the Red Cross took the unusual step of announcing its "concern over the alleged use of poisonous gas". It took the step despite lack of sufficient evidence because it was so completely convinced that the attacks had indeed occurred.

During this entire period the Cairo authorities vehemently denied that gas had been used by their troops. Despite this, the reports continued and grew in intensity. With the failure of any governmental agency to take action, private individuals made it their business to ascertain the truth or falsity of the gas stories. A number of individuals visited the area and confirmed in their minds that poison gas was indeed being used. They immediately sent private petitions to the United Nations Committee on Colonialism. Nothing more was heard of these petitions.

On March 7, the United States and Great Britain issued a blistering attack on the Committee. Lord Caradon, the permanent British delegate declared that a subcommittee that screened petitions to the 24-nation committee on colonialism had censored the private petitions and refused to circulate them to the committee because they were critical of the United Arab Republic.

In an indignant statement, Richard Johnson, the United States representative declared that there apparently existed a double standard on the committee that permitted circulation of petitions critical of Western nations but not of Asian-Africans.

Despite this, no action was taken as the Communist-Asian-African bloc consisting of the Soviet Union, Syria, Iraq, India, Yugoslavia and Tanzania supported the subcommittee's actions. The United Nations failure to hear the charges was so blatant that even the Saudian Arabian delegate, Jamil M. Baroody, attacked Secretary General U Thant for refusing to do anything about these charges or about the entire Egyptian aggression in Yemen where over 100,000 persons had lost their lives.

But while the United Nations refused to act, another international agency was quietly going about getting clear and irrefutable evidence.

The International Red Cross now sent a team of doctors to the town of Gahar in North Yemen following an appeal from the inhabitants who claimed to have been gassed on the morning of May 10, 1967. Their investigation was methodical and painstaking and a secret report was issued. The Jewish Press is in possession of this report.

The substance of the report follows:

The following statements were made by the inhabitants who witnessed the incident:

1. Seventy-five persons died of poison gas shorty after the raid.

They showed the following symptons: shortness of breath, coughing, pink foam at the mouth, general edema, especially the face; no physical injuries.

2. The undersigned doctors examined the four surviving victims and observed the following:

Subjective symptoms: burning eyes and trachea, internal thorax pain, extreme fatigue, anorexia.

Objective symptoms: dry cough, negative ausculation in two patients, sign of bronchitis in the other two, conjunctivitis, facial edema, no traumatic lesions, tympanum intact.

3. The undersigned doctors examined a corpse four days after death and 12 hours after burial.

Immediately, the common grave was opened, and well before the corpses were visible, there was a sweet penetrating smell . . . The bodies showed no traumatic lesions. The skin was pink. Advanced and general edema all over the body.

Examination of lungs: reddish-brown throughout, enlargement, consistence and fragility greatly increased, crepitation considerably reduced.

The undersigned doctors draw the following logical conclusions from their findings:

. . . The cause of death in the case of the corpse examined was pulmonary edema. The over-all consistency of the ICRC (International Committee of the Red Cross) medical mission's findings shows that in all probability this pulmonary edema was caused by inhalation of toxic gas.

(Signed) RAYMOND JANIN,
ICRC Doctor-Delegate.
WILLY BRUTSCHIN,
Doctor-Delegate.

Signed at town Najran, May 18, 1967.

The ICBM Threat From China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 7, 1967

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, there is serious concern about Red China's growing nuclear weapons capability.

As a member of the House Defense Appropriations Subcommittee I have felt compelled to speak out about this problem, such as in my statement to the House of Representatives June 13, 1967, on the fiscal year 1968 Defense appropriation bill, to emphasize that we must have action now to begin deployment of an anti-ballistic-missile—ABM—system.

Funding to begin deployment of the ABM system was provided in last year's Defense appropriation bill, and additional funds for this purpose are provided in the Defense appropriation bill currently pending in Congress. Secretary of Defense McNamara has, however, delayed ABM deployment.

The urgency of the situation has once again been underscored in the report just released by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. The Joint Committee found that Communist China may have a capability of attacking the United States with nuclear missiles within several years, possibly as early as 1970–71.

The Los Angeles Times, in a sobering assessment of the Red Chinese ICBM threat, calls for an immediate start on construction of an anti-ballistic-missile defense to counteract that threat. In reaching this conclusion the Times states that Secretary of Defense McNamara's reasons for delay in construction of antimissile system are overshadowed by the rapid Chinese nuclear buildup.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I submit this timely editorial for inclusion in the RECORD, because I know the subject is of great importance to the Congress and the entire Nation.

THE ICBM THREAT FROM CHINA

Based on information obtained from various intelligence agencies of the U.S. government, the Joint Congressional Atomic Energy Committee now reports that Communist China may have the capability to fire nuclear missiles at the United States within three or four years' time.

Although the committee feels any Chinese attack in the early 1970s would be of "a low order of magnitude"—i.e., perhaps only two or three nuclear missiles—there is still substantial cause for concern. As of now this country does not possess an effective antimissile defense system. Even though a Chinese attack would be "suicidal" in terms of the destruction a U.S. nuclear response would involve, the committee wisely does not rule out the possibility of such an illogical move by Peking.

The committee report differs, if only semantically, from the publicly expressed views of Defense Secretary McNamara, who believes that the Chinese will not have a "significant" missile capability until the mid-1970s.

The key word is, of course, significant, by which McNamara presumably means an ICBM force of 50 or 60 missiles. This belief does not rule out the possession by China, perhaps by the end of this decade, of an embryonic missile force capable of striking the United States.

There is one view, also expressed by McNamara, that the reliability of Chinese missiles in the 1970s would not be great, thereby reducing or even eliminating their military value. There are also some China specialists who argue that Peking wants a nuclear arsenal only for defensive or deterrent purposes, and for the great power status nuclear weapons carry.

No one can say for sure that these opinions are incorrect. But what must also be kept in mind is that U.S. officials have consistently erred in estimating the nuclear potential of China—as earlier they did with the Soviet Union. And, while China may be essentially defense-minded, there have been enough examples in Peking of what are, to the Western mind, irrational behavior patterns to preclude any positive judgments about what the Chinese may or may not do.

Given these considerations, it is imperative that the United States prepare for the worst. This means an immediate start on the construction of an antimissile system capable of counteracting a foreseeable Chinese ICBM threat.

Preparatory work on such a system has already been done, and reportedly there are funds in the defense budget directly tied to production of a system. But McNamara has hesitated before, despite congressional pressure, to go ahead with even a limited antimissile defense.

There are many reasons for the defense secretary's caution, including economic and domestic political problems; for example, what areas such a system would cover. Also, the Administration is seeking agreement with the Soviets to limit deployment of what would be an extremely costly full-scale missile defense force.

These considerations, however, are overshadowed by the possible danger of a rapid Chinese nuclear buildup. American security requires a rapid start on deployment of a missile defense system adequate to meet the potential threat from China.

Mayor John V. Lindsay's Address to the Congress of Cities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 18, 1967

Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, we are now engaged, as are countless Americans, in a sad and searching reexamination of our policies and attitudes toward the problems of our great cities. As we seek constructive responses to the destructive conditions of the slums, we can profit greatly from listening to the men who have been in the frontlines of the battle for order and progress.

One such man is our former colleague, the Honorable John V. Lindsay, who is making such an outstanding record as the mayor of New York City. Now in his second year in Office, Mayor Lindsay has become recognized nationwide as one of the most constructive innovators in city government today. His administration has shown a firm commitment to action and a farsighted understanding of how far reaching and intensive successful action must be.

In an address to the 44th annual Congress of Cities in Boston on July 31, Mayor Lindsay declared:

> To reestablish peace in our cities we shall be obliged to concentrate the full powers of both the public and private worlds upon bringing constructive, positive change to the areas of our cities where for decades most change has been for the worse.

While offering "no palliatives, no instant cures, no miracle drugs," he outlined the challenge to all public officials and concerned citizens which the violence of this summer has dramatized.

I would like to call this thoughtful address to the attention of the entire Congress, and include it in the RECORD at this point:

TEXT OF ADDRESS BY HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY, MAYOR OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK

(Speech made before the 44th annual Congress of Cites, July 31, 1967, Grand Ballroom, the Sheraton-Boston Hotel, Boston, Mass.)

Vice President Humphrey, President Tollefson, Mayor Collins, Dr. Wheaton, delegates to the 44th annual Congress of Cities, ladies and gentlemen:

It has been said that man is taught little by experience, but gains most of his wisdom through observation.

Although the aphorism is somewhat sweeping to be wholly factual, its substance serves to introduce my remarks here this morning. For they are addresed to our paramount crisis, one that several mayors have experienced, and all mayors have observed:

The march of violence through our cities.

Throughout the country, it seems, we are asking questions about the riots in the cities. Americans are shocked, they are angry, and yet they are puzzled. The Nation is asking: "What do they want? What do they hope to gain by violence? What caused this terror? How can it be stopped?"

If you go into the slums, you may find, as I have, that the people in the ghettoes what pretty much what everybody else wants. I am not talking now about the rioters, most of whom are more interested in creating chaos than advancing a cause. I am talking about the vast majority of the urban poor who are waiting—with accelerating impatiece—for progress to reach them. Their aspirations are more fundamental than ours, and certainly more obvious: They want a better place to live. They want jobs. They want the rats exterminated. They want the trash cleaned from the streets. They want the dope pushers and junkies arrested. They want more playgrounds for their children.

In short, they want to *see* something. They want visible, palpable evidence that their city cares about the conditions under which they live and is working to change them. They want to know that they and their children after them have not been already condemned to the ghetto; that, somehow, someday—someday soon, I might add—they will be able to obtain a piece of the action: To share in the material and intellectual rewards that others now enjoy in a free society.

If what I have just reported sounds not only basic, but generalized, it is because the nature of the ghetto does not lend itself to more exact interpretations. Life there is harshly complicated. The residents cannot be categorized by stereotypes or group think. They are individuals, and among them, resignation and militancy exist side by side.

The first attitude was exemplified by the middle-aged woman sitting on the front steps of her tenement when I passed by a few days ago. She looked up, neither smiling nor scowling. She simply nooded. She probably was on welfare, and possibly one of her sons already was in jail.

That woman, typical of many I have seen, wasn't going to start a riot. She had all of that taken out of her. She had given up. She had managed to accept, not without cynicism, the kind of life she lived.

Although the sidewalk in front of her was littered, she would not sweep it anymore. In the slums that job normally is reserved to the Sanitation Department. If she had some hope of change, she would not voice it. She would not ask much of anyone, but she would not give much, either. She embodied hopelessness and despair.

A totally different aspect of the ghetto earlier presented itself as I was walking down a Harlem street with a group of neighborhood youngsters. A boy about eight years old danced out in front of me, skipping backwards until he caught my attention. He pointed toward the rooftops. "Hey Mayor," he said. "Just keep looking up."

I don't know whether his advice was meant as a threat or a warning, but the distinction seemed almost academic. I was more interested in projecting the whereabouts of that boy in the summers to come, when he is in his teens. It gave me pause.

The boy's remark illustrates my principal conclusion about the bypassed areas of New York, one likely to be gained in the slums of any major city. And that is that our society has failed to reach the young men and women, the cop-taunters and bottle-throwers who have been in the vanguard of almost every outbreak of trouble in the cities.

The city is not getting to these teenagers.

The Anti-Poverty Programs have not included them.

The schools have not involved them.

The churches, the community groups, the neighborhood organizations—all have missed the teenagers and even younger children.

The failure is understandable, for how do you reach a 16-year-old dropout who has no job, no home address, no telephone, no father, and who belongs to no identifiable group or organization?

If we cannot answer that question, we cannot dismiss it, either. For these youngsters constitute the most serious, most inflammatory threat to law and order and to progress itself in our cities. If we are to save them—and ourselves—from still more trouble, we're going to have to get these youngsters back into school, find them jobs or at least hold out a chance to find a livelihood.

We're going to have to do it on a painstaking, street-level, block-by-block basis, and it will require enormous amounts of both money and time, neither of which the cities have in plentitude.

If there are cheap or easy solutions to the summers of fear in our cities, they have not appeared on the horizon, and it seems to me unlikely that they ever will. There are no palliatives, no instant cures, no miracle drugs to restore health to the blighted segments of our urban centers.

To reestablish peace in our cities we shall be obliged to concentrate the full powers of both the public and private worlds upon bringing constructive, positive change to the areas of our cities where for decades most change has been for the worse.

No city government, no mayor, can reverse that decline unassisted. The undertaking exceeds our abilities because it transcends the jurisdiction of any city. For what we are faced with is the introduction into our highly sophisticated, increasingly affluent society of millions of people who heretofore have been excluded—legally, socially, economically—from that society.

The public sector—state, Federal, municipal—is not capable of effecting that monumental transition in time. We need to enlist the private sector, which has given America the world's highest living standard and yet has not been brought into the struggle to raise 30 million individual Americans out of the lowest depths of poverty.

The private sector, until very recently, has tended to look upon city government as playing the role of custodian. The cities have been expected to supply the water, pick up the trash, put out the fires and, in general, act as the caretaker of an estate held by an absentee owner. City Hall's job was to stay out of the way as much as possible, and not rock the boat.

That aloofness appears to be breaking down, but we of the cities remain without a formal organization in which the public and private sectors can pool their talents and resources in the now desperate fight to save our cities from collapsing under the weight of their manifest, destructive problems.

We mayors have organizations such as our National League of Cities and the United States Conference of Mayors. Businessmen and industrialists have theirs. Labor has its own. Professional men have others. And some private groups, such as Urban America, play a tremendously useful role.

These groups are unavoidably insular and uncoordinated. We need a national organization to underwrite joint policies and programs; to speak authoritatively for all cities to those who hold the reins of power—in and out of government.

I have discussed this need over the past months with Mayor Joseph Barr of Pittsburgh, the new president of the United States Conference of Mayors, and several other mayors. The outgrowth of these conversations is the meeting scheduled for later today in Washington, at which 20 distinguished Americans will form a Coalition on the Urban Crisis. Its purpose will be to devise means by which the combined strength of this country's institutions can be brought to bear upon the deprivation that is corroding our cities.

The men attending will speak for this country's most powerful institutions—business, labor, religion, education and communications. Among them are: Andrew Heiskell, Chairman of Time, Inc.; George Meany of the AFL–CIO; David Rockefeller of the Chase Manhattan Bank; Henry Ford II; Archbishop John Dearden of Detroit and Dr. Martin Luther King.

Each representative clearly has succeeded in his own area of endeavor. We want to explore how the abilities represented by these individual achievements can be transferred to the resolution of national problems demanding the genius of America's finest minds. We hope to break ground tonight for the construction of a concerted, dynamic national crusade against the squalor and misery that have forced themselves once again upon the national consciousness.

My experience and observation have persuaded me that the key to success will be more jobs, and more people who can qualify for them. In consonance with that belief, one of our immediate goals is to induce the private sector—corporations and unions alike—to recognize the necessity and desirability of opening their doors to minorities.

It should be clear to objective individuals that if we are to prevent trouble in our cities, we shall have to do more than strengthen and modernize our police forces or control the shipment of guns or prosecute those who have broken the law. We shall have to do all those things, yes. But more importantly, we have to hurry to catch up with the centuries-old task of eliminating the slums; of helping people to reach a standard of living which reflects some minimal relationship to the wealth of our Gross National Product.

The truth, I'm afraid, is that we haven't made enough progress toward that goal. We started too late, in some instances, and were too hesitant or timid in others. In many cases, we have not directed our efforts wisely.

The crisis of our cities can be attributed to a large degree to the extraordinarily late assumption by the Federal Government of its changing responsibilities to a metropolitan, not agrarian, nation.

It was not until two years ago, for example, that the creation of the Department of Housing and Urban Development gave cities a voice at the Cabinet Table.

It was only three years ago that the Anti-Poverty Program was enacted—at a time when almost two million people were living in poverty in New York City alone.

A meaningful Mass Transportation Act was not enacted until 1964, and a serious Federal program against air pollution did not pass until the following year.

Only within the last decade has our Government truly begun to use its power and resources against the problems of the cities. Yet even today, neither branch of Congress has a Committee on Urban Affairs to oversee legislation dealing with the country's metropolitan centers.

My purpose in this brief review is not to attempt to blame the Federal Government for all of the travails and deficiencies of our cities. For many of our cities—New York among them—have not met their problems with sufficient imagination and decisiveness:

They have sometimes torn down entire slum neighborhoods for shiny new apartment buildings with rents beyond the capability of any dispossessed residents whose homes made way for the building.

Others have given young men and women vocational training for jobs that had disappeared because of automation. Others have made little effort to build swimming pools, baseball fields and parks in the poor sections where they are most needed. Still others have turned away from complaints of discrimination by city officials.

Most commonly, they have not convinced the people in the slums that their city was on their side. On the contrary, city governments have been largely absent from the ghettoes. Their chief presence usually has taken the form of a policeman. It has been his unhappy lot to be the lone representative of "the Man," "Whitey," "the Honkies" and by extension, the entire public and private establishment. We should not be surprised, accordingly, that the rioters have turned so viciously against the police.

In New York—if I may be permitted to refer to my city—we have been fortunate to have as the head of our Police Department Commissioner Howard Leary, who has brought to that office an invaluable expertise in community relations. Under his direction, New York's Finest have vastly improved the relationships between the patrolman on the beat and the residents of the neighborhood he serves.

During the disturbances we have undergone, the men of the Police Department have exercised both uncommon restraint and extraordinary discipline. They have conducted themselves as professionals, and that is partially due to Commissioner Leary's belief that professionalism is demanded of a modern-day police force.

The Commissioner's attention to new techniques, new sciences of police work is particularly gratifying to me, for in the final analysis, we mayors must be able to place complete confidence in our police officers when the chips are down.

At this point, I want to interject a brief report on the formation of the Presidential Commission to investigate urban rioting, on which I serve as vice-chairman.

To my way of thinking, the objectives of the investigation are threefold:

First, to obtain a profile of a riot; to find out what the riots have had in common—and, conversely, how they differed.

Second, to assess the effectiveness of law enforcement in the cities where riots occurred. One area of inquiry will be the working relationships among the local police, state troopers and National Guardsmen during the trouble. Another area for study will be the degree to which police relations with the neighborhoods played a part in either minimizing or exacerbating violence.

Third—and to me this is the all-important assignment of the Commission—we are to try to uncover the basic community attitudes and conditions that gave rise to the riots. The purpose of this report, as I see it, is not only to try to explain a past riot, but to assist in preventing them in the future.

Speed is essential. Events in the cities are exceeding our ability to keep pace with them. If the commission is to isolate the shortcomings of the cities, and to point out means of correcting them, we must move with due deliberation, but all possible haste.

The coming summer is our final deadline.

The plans and hopes I have described to you today can be shattered if this nation's response to the violence in our cities is one based upon retribution. The danger seems to be there, for some have said that the people in the slums are incapable of making use of what already has been done for them. Others argue against any additional assistance to the ghettoes because it will be interpreted as a reward to the rioters, a submission to extortion.

The mood seems to have influenced the Congress well before the firing and looting erupted in Newark, for it was expressed in the House of Representatives' votes to end the rent supplement program and to slash the Model Cities appropriation. Most recently, the House jocularly defeated a $20 million annual appropriation to kill rats in the slums.

More than 500 persons—many of them children—are treated for rat bites every year in New York City alone. I can't help but wonder how many of those children will visit the new National Aquarium in Washington, for which the House voted a $10 million appropriation only last year.

It may be—not only in Congress, but in legislatures and city councils—that a reaction will set in against the people of the Central Ward, or 12th Street, or Hough, or Watts, or Bedford-Stuyvesant, and that reaction will punish not only the lawless hundreds, but the law-abiding thousands as well.

Law and order must be upheld in the cities. A rioter can be granted no amnesty for the criminal acts he commits. Looting is nothing less than burglary, firebombs are instruments of arson and sniping must be judged for what it is—attempted murder. These acts cannot be tolerated as a form of social protest. They do not advance the cause of civil rights. They must be punished as provided by law. As Adlai Stevenson said, civil wrongs never achieve civil rights.

All that notwithstanding, fairness and common sense must be paramount. We must face the challeges that the cities have impelled upon us with a perspective worthy of an enlightened, democratic society.

Lacking those attributes, we may shackle the Anti-Poverty Program, roll back welfare assistance, slash appropriations for public housing and suppress or defeat any other social legislation that is directed toward the betterment of the cities, the ghettoes or the Negroes.

This country may be capable of that. It may undertake that vengeful course.

But when vengeance is done, the slums will still be with us. They will be no less fetid, depressing and explosive than they were before.

We mayors will retain sole jurisdiction over the jobless, the vermin, the pushers, the drunks, the garbage, the stickups, and the hundred other afflictions and evils of slum life. We shall preside without challenge over the breeding grounds of civil insurrection.

The only certain change will be that next sumer, all of it will be worse—more festering, more inflamed, and infinitely more perilous. The dangers should be known, and I hope that this assemblage of mayors can transmit them to those in our nation's capitol who would turn their backs upon the desperation that has been visited upon the cities.

In this summer of tragedy, as The President has described it, our cities and our nation should not attempt to stamp out unrest and strife by falling back upon the small, mean passions of vengeance. Both compassion and logic urge upon us a rededication to the principle—as yet unfulfilled—that every American is equal under the law; moreover, that every citizen deserves an honest start in his pursuit of happiness.

We must, of course, impose the administration of justice upon those who have looted, burned and slain. At the same time, we must recognize that so long as one group of Americans is consigned by color to the degradation of a bankrupt environment, no other group of Americans can extol with valid pride the many blessings of a freely-elected, popularly-sanctioned form of government.

In London last week, they were saying that the riots prove we Americans are an innately violent people. Brussels said we were putting down a revolution. And Communist radios reported that Army troops were engaged in a brutal masacre of Negroes.

The mayors of the United States, individually and collectively, have within themselves the power to repudiate those swift, gloating assessments. I would hope, in what we say and what we do, that we can show the true dimensions of this country:

That we can reaffirm that the people of the United States have the emotional precision to deal forcibly with vicious hoodlums and yet gently with errant children . . .

That we possess the humility to combat blind hatred with reasoned maturity . . .

And that we have the vision, the sensitivity and the courage to bear ourselves in accordance with the injunction that there is a time to break down and a time to build up, a time to get and a time to lose, a time to keep and a time to cast away.

It may be that this is a time when the cities of America finally come of age; when the chief executives of our cities can lead their communities from anarchy to order, from bitterness to understanding and from brutality to sanity.

The course of events in this country has given us the assignment of writing a dramatically important chapter in American history. It concerns nothing less than the most crucial domestic problems of our era—the achievement of full citizenship for American

Negroes and the preservation of the American city as the nucleus of our civilization.

The opportunity before us comes to very few men, but it can be exercised for the well-being of millions. In acting upon it, if we follow our conscience, we mayors can contribute greatly to our cities, our country and to the universal brotherhood of man.

For we should not seek merely to purchase peace in our cities from summer to summer; we should commit ourselves to a permanent investment in the attainment of ordinary justice for those to whom even common decency is denied.

Thank you.

Iowa General Assembly Presses for Uniform Motor Truck Registration and Fee Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 7, 1967

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, the Iowa General Assembly, in its last session, adopted a concurrent resolution calling on Congress to enact a uniform interstate motor truck registration and fee law.

A text of the resolution follows:

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 17

Concurrent resolution petitioning the Congress of the United States to enact a uniform interstate motor truck registration and fee law

Whereas, the several states of the United States have enacted a variety of motor vehicle taxes applying to interstate motor truck operations; and

Whereas, the taxes of the various states lead to inequity of application to the motor truck operators; and

Whereas, the administration of motor truck taxes for the various states is costly and difficult as well as controversial; and

Whereas, the national economy is greatly affected by the movement of goods in commerce and lack of uniformity in the variour states' truck registration and taxation laws tends to restrict such movement; and

Whereas, a substantial percentage of interstate motor truck traffic moves on federal interstate and primary highways; Now, Therefore,

Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the sixty-second General Assembly of the State of Iowa; the Senate concurring:

That the Congress consider the advisability of enacting a national motor truck registration law and road use fee system for interstate motor truck operation, replacing all such registrations, licenses and fees of the individual states; said registrations, licenses and fees to be prorated to the states on the basis of miles traveled in each state or other equitable basis, reserving to the states the registration and taxing of motor trucks engaged in limited, local interstate operation, and

Be it further resolved that an attested copy of this Resolution be forwarded to each member of the Iowa delegation in the Congress of the United States and to the Secretary of the Senate and the Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives of the Congress so that they may file same with the appropriate committee.

We, Maurice E. Baringer, Speaker of the House of Iowa, and William R. Kendrick, Chief Clerk of the House, hereby certify that the above and foregoing Resolution was adopted by the House and Senate of the sixty-second General Assembly.

MAURICE E. BARINGER,
Speaker of the House.
WILLIAM R. KENDRICK,
Chief Clerk of the House.

Something for the Birds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES V. SMITH

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 7, 1967

Mr. SMITH of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, the Sunday Oklahoman of Oklahoma City, Okla., on August 6, 1967, carried an editorial which reflects the feeling of many people. More and more editors are speaking out against the threat of wall-to-wall welfare, and more and more people are having the same reaction.

I would like to insert this provocative editorial in the RECORD:

SOMETHING FOR THE BIRDS

Anybody who has maintained a backyard bird feeder knows it doesn't take long for the word to get around in the feathered community.

In remarkably short order, his feathered clients begin arriving regularly at the appointed feeding time, and before many days have elapsed he discovers that he has created a welfare mentality in all of them.

Whatever they did earlier at the established feeding hour, they plainly were doing no longer. Instead of scrounging around on their own, they preferred to sit and wait for the free lunch they knew would be forthcoming.

People don't differ greatly from birds in this regard. For that reason, a question occurs concerning the real benefit the government will confer on the urban needy if it embarks on a tremendous new welfare spending program as a result of this summer's riots.

It's possible that wisely administered programs emphasizing self-help and education would be of some real value. But the usual political tendency is to minimize individual responsibility and encourage the less affluent to suppose their unsatisfactory station is attributable to something other than their own impoverishment of motive and skills.

Votes aren't so readily picked up from people who understand that their permanent betterment depends more on their own efforts than on any money the government can bestow on them. Because the government already is spending multiplied billions for direct welfare and for various self-help and educational programs, it's sometimes said the do-gooders may be hard put to think up any new schemes.

Such conjecture underestimates the nearly inexhaustible inventiveness of the big spenders. They're proposing now that the government provide a guaranteed job for everyone who says he can't find work elsewhere. They want a guaranteed income for everybody, regardless of whether he does anything to earn it. They're talking about bringing young and old alike under social security, with the financing to come from general revenues. They think the already steep progression of the income tax should be made even steeper in order to accomplish what they call "improved income distribution."

Leon Keyserling, who was chairman of President Truman's Council of Economic Advisers, is quoted thus in the August issue of Nation's Business:

"The United States is so rich that everyone should be living above the poverty level; this should be considered a nationwide universal right, a complement to the right to vote."

A question occurs concerning even the solvency, to say nothing of the supposed riches, of a nation that has been living beyond its means almost uninterruptedly for nearly 40 years. But anybody who contends poverty is something that can be eliminated by governmental fiat betrays less than a penetrating insight into human nature.

If the government took all the money away from the people who have it now and bestowed it on those who are penniless, the chances are that the fortunes of all concerned would return to approximately their present state if everybody lived long enough. The people who got the money from the government wouldn't know how to hang on to it, and those from whom it was seized would know ho to get it back.

Unless the do-gooders intend to deepen the dependency of the urban needy, they should think about making them better able to fend for themselves. Simply giving them more handouts is for the birds.

Why the District Committee Does Not Support Plan No. 3

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN L. McMILLAN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 7, 1967

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the Appendix of the RECORD at least one or two reasons why the House District Committee opposes Reorganization Plan No. 3.

It is my hope that all the Members of the House will read these statements made by persons who previously served as Commissioners of the District of Columbia, especially since we should have some evidence proving that the present form of government has not worked successfully before we make any drastic changes.

No government is any better than those administering that government.

The statement referred to follows:

WHY THE DISTRICT COMMITTEE DOES NOT SUPPORT PLAN NO. 3

(1) *The need for such reorganization of the D.C. Government, as is provided in the plan, has just not been established.*

Boiled down to its bare essentials, proponents' arguments for Reorganization Plan No. 3 is simply that a single executive plus a part-time 9-member council—all appointed by the President—will provide a more efficient and effective government of the District of Columbia than the present 3 Commissioners serving full time.

The appalling fact is that not a scintilla of evidence in support of this claim accompanied the plan to the Congress, or was presented before the House Government Operations Committee or the House District Committee.

No bill of particulars has been presented to the Congress itemizing wherein the present 3-Commissioner form of government is so deficient or defective as to require the drastice changes the President has proposed.

Your Committee questions the concept that 10 men (9 of them part-time) heading a government and performing policymaking functions, can achieve greater dispatch, efficiency, and effective execution of administration than three full-time Commissioners.

All the plan does is lodge greater control and authority in the President and thereby lessens the control and authority not only envisaged but specifically provided by the Constitution to be lodged "exclusively" in the Congress of the United States.

If the Reorganization Plan No. 3 has the merit its sponsors suggest, then why under regular procedure was it not transmitted to the Congress as a legislative proposal for the consideration of the appropriate legislative committees, in this case, the Committees on the District of Columbia.

The fact that it was not so transmitted and referred makes the whole plan suspect and supports the inference that it is a play for vesting in the President more power over the District of Columbia, in contradiction to the Constitution's mandate vesting in the Congress the "exclusive" responsibility for the government of the District of Columbia.

(2) Further argument is made on behalf of Reorganization Plan No. 3 that the present 3-Commissioner form of government is obsolete and should be replaced by a single executive and council such as exists in many other American cities.

Your Committee seriously questions the validity of efforts to apply forms of government considered effective in other large cities to Washington which is unlike any other municipality in America. Several types of mayor and council government and the territorial form of government were practiced in the District of Columbia from 1800 until 1874. However, they proved woefully inadequate and inefficient and nearly bankrupted the city, and Congress supplanted them with the present commission form of government.

The 3-Commissioner form of government in the District has proved to be an honest government, from the corruption, graft and shocking conditions which have existed in too many of the other cities referred to. Violence and major riots have occurred in over 19 cities throughout the land, yet these boast mayor and city council supposedly responsive to the peoples therein.

PLAN NO. 3 DOES NOT DEAL WITH THE REAL ISSUES

(3) The crux of any complaints lodged against the present system of government in the District of Columbia is the conflict that arises out of the dual interests of the Federal Government and of the District of Columbia Government in the Nation's Capital, as in areas under the cognizance of the National Capital Planning Commission, the National Park Service, the National Capital Housing Authority, the Redevelopment Land Agency, the Fine Arts Commission, and others.

But there is no solution in Plan No. 3 to the problems arising from any of these conflicts. Hence the plan is deficient in the major areas wherein administrative difficulty and disagreement lie. As to them, the House District Committee bill (H.R. 12065) specifically directs the Commissioners to conduct a study thereof and report thereon to the Congress within a year so that contemplative action may be taken thereon.

Is It Really Necessary?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 7, 1967

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, no doubt many taxpayers, now facing the possibility of a substantial increase in Federal income taxes, would agree with the following editorial from the Richmond, Va., Times-Dispatch:

CHAUFFEUR FOR LYNDA BIRD

Is it really necessary that the taxpayers of the United States furnish Lynda Bird Johnson with a private chauffeur on her junkets to Europe?

You may have seen that fascinating item in Earl Wilson's column on Friday, where he said:

Lynda Bird Johnson, George Hamilton and her three U.S. "security men" and U.S. chauffeur helped her have fun in London at a party Sammy Davis gave at London's hot spot, La Terraza, and later at the Mayfair Hotel, where he shows pictures.

We've become resigned to paying for several secret service men to accompany Lynda Bird on these expeditions. Rightly or wrongly, it has become standard practice for members of the President's family to enjoy this protection.

But a chauffeur! Lyndon Johnson is reported to be worth in the neighborhood of $14 million. He is also reported to have settled a goodly sum on each of his daughters.

If said daughters must have a "U.S. chauffeur" when they go abroad, either they or their parents should jolly well pay for it. With a federal tax increase apparently coming up, we are in no mood to be subsidizing the luxuries of the President's offspring.

Crabtree Falls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD H. POFF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 7, 1967

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, one of the beauty spots of Virginia lies in Nelson County where Crabtree Falls cascades some 3,000 feet down into the verdant valley below. Through efforts of many interested local citizens, the Crabtree Falls area is on the bring of incorporation into the National Park Service system.

I offer an account of the beauty of these falls by Delores B. Bausum appearing in the July 23 issue of the Roanoke Times, coupled with the invitation to those who seek the beauty of unspoiled nature to visit and view this majestic work of God's hand.

The article follows:

BEAUTY OF CRABTREE FALLS

(By Dolores B. Bausum)

As you journey through the Shenandoah Valley, you aren't likely to notice the small marker on Highway 11 at Steele's Tavern that points toward Crabtree Falls. But if you're a person who derives enjoyment from discovering unsung places of beauty, you'll want to seek out this inaccessible spot.

By starting from Steele's Tavern, 17 miles north of Lexington, and following State Route 56 twelve miles eastward, you arrive in an unsullied glen where another undistinuished sign announces Crabtree Falls. Only the green slopes of surrounding mountains, the shallow South Fork of the Tye River, and a narrow trail into the woods are visible here.

You need to hike just a short distance on the trail to see the lower falls, but you need to follow the trail's blue markings along a two-hour, circuitous climb to reach the top of the falls. The serpentine trail passes through a shaded forest of hemlocks, maples, poplars and laurel. Long-dead chestnut trees, now sfetooned with bright orange fungus, occasionally lie across the path. Jutting out of the mountain slopes are enoromus grey rocks that have been softened with slipcovers of velvet green moss; the remainder of the steep slopes are covered by a thick carpet of decaying leaves, green ferns and delicate wild flowers.

At several places the trail opens on views of the falls cascading down the mountain over precipitous rocky ledges, but alternating between these ledges are clear pools where Crabtree Creek glides along solemnly. At such pools you cross the creek on stone bridges and follow the trail on to the summit. Compensation for the toil of the ascent is the sight of the upper falls plunging down a 200-foot rock wall, the open view of the valley 3000 feet below, and the panorama of distant peaks which are now on your eye level.

For individuals who care to put forth the exertion of the journey, Crabtree Falls is a place of unspoiled beauty well worth exploring.

MSTS Order Goes to Yard That Isn't and the Qualifications of Shop Operator Are Questioned

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. BYRNE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 7, 1967

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on June 28, MSTS awarded four oil tankers to Falcon Tankers, Inc. Up to today, August 7, it has been over 40 days and Litton Industries still confirm that they have no contract with Falcon Tankers, Inc., of New York, but decline to elaborate on their reluctancy. It could mean that Falcon Tankers, Inc., is having difficulty in obtaining the necessary approval from Government authorities.

I feel certain that many of my colleagues share my views:

First. Litton Industries should by now at least decide on a yard for the building of these four tankers.

Second. As we know, this contract would cost the U.S. Government millions of dollars. Also, since these oil tankers are now in urgent demand, MSTS should have been extremely careful in examining the creditability of each applicant before awarding such a contract.

Third. I presume that MSTS will have no objections to furnishing information regarding the financial creditability and the operating experience of Falcon Tankers, Inc., in order to justify the awarding

An article from the Journal of Com-
of this contract.
merce of June 30, 1967, follows:

MSTS ORDER GOES TO YARD THAT ISN'T

(By Alan F. Schoedel)

Litton Industries was taken by surprise by the Washington announcement on Wednesday that four tankers, to be built for charter to the Military Sea Transportation Service, would be constructed at the shipyard Litton proposes to build at Erie, Pa.

Although Litton has options on city-owned property for construction of a shipyard at Erie, and engineering plans for the project are being drafted, physical work has not, begun at all, nor has there been a final decision to build the facility at the Lake Erie port, according to the company's headquarters in Beverly Hills, Calif. The four tankers are to be delivered by the end of 1969.

CONTRACT INCOMPLETE

In fact, the company said, it has not even completed the contract with Falcon Carriers, Inc., of New York, the operating firm for whom the vessels are to be built.

Litton said yesterday the ships for MSTS charter may be constructed at its existing Ingalls yard at Pascagoula, Miss. While Litton itself said nothing on this score, the deadline for delivery of the ships indicated that this is a probability rather than a mere possibility.

"We expect to contract to build four tankers for Falcon Carriers, Inc., of New York City, which will charter them to MSTS," a Litton announcement said yesterday.

Litton maintains shipbuilding operations at Pascagoula, Miss., and is planning a large-scale modernization program to automate its facilities there. Additionally, Litton is completing preparations for an automated shipyard at Erie, Pa.

"Upon consummation of the contract with Falcon Carriers, Litton will determine the location at which the ships will be constructed. It is anticipated that the four 33,000-ton-class ships will be delivered by December, 1969."

Under its plan at Erie, Litton would take over what is now the Duquesne marine terminal, a large cargo pier, and create its new shipyard around the foundations of this structure. Next year, the Port of Erie will move its general cargo operation from the Duquesne Pier to a 100-acre site now being made ready in the so-called East Bay area.

No date has been announced for completion of the conversion of the Duquesne Pier into a shipbuilding facility.

Building the tankers for military charter at Erie would, of course, restrict the vessels to a beam of 75 feet and a draft or not much more than 25½ feet, the limiting dimensions of the St. Lawrence Seaway locks and channels.

A 26,300-ton tanker built for one of the major oil companies at a Baltimore yard in 1963 had a beam of 78 feet.

INTEREST GROWS

Litton's interest in the Great Lakes, however, has been increasing in the past couple of years. Last February, the giant California organization acquired the Wilson Marine Transit Co., a 95-year-old carrier operating a fleet of 11 ships on the Lakes.

Litton also has been working for some time to establish a new shipbuilding operation on the U. S. side of the Lakes. Its officials have talked of installing revolutionary technological methods in vessel construction on the Lakes, employing something like the assemly methods used in the aircraft industry.

Three months ago, the city council of Erie said it had reached agreement with Litton on terms for property options and a real estate exchange, to make possible the shipyard project. It was estimated that it would employ 400 to 500 workers.

Our Youth and Its Job Potential

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 7, 1967

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, our Federal Government has been given the authority, through various types of legislation, to provide job opportunities and to combat poverty among the youth of this Nation.

While these programs are noble in themselves, it still is imperative that local areas contribute something to make them work and to implement them in their own areas.

In connection with local efforts to help the youth of our Nation, the mayor of North Bergen, N.J., Angelo J. Sarubbi, has initiated a plan whereby a survey would be made of all township industry to ascertain their needs for the youth of the area to fill job openings in their establishments.

North Bergen is a rapidly expanding community and I am proud of its endeavors in this undertaking. It was once a part of my congressional district, but was taken away from me as a result of the redistricting of the congressional districts. Nevertheless, I commend the mayor on his interest in the youth of the community and his desire to help them obtain jobs and training which could lead to permanent employment in the varied industry of North Bergen.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to acquaint my colleagues in this House of what this program intends to do and I include as part of my remarks a report from the Bergen Record, published in Hackensack, N.J., on this matter.

The article follows:

INDUSTRY STUDY PLANNED TO ASSAY JOB POTENTIAL—RESULTS OF SURVEY MAY HELP STUDENTS PREPARE FOR CAREERS, MAYOR SAYS

(By Anthony W. Petrovich)

NORTH BERGEN.—A survey of Township industries will be conducted with an eye to jobs for youth and future job market potential of the community.

Mayor Angelo J. Sarubbi said yesterday the survey will be the first in the community's history and will be accomplished with little or no burden to the taxpayers. The survey will include number of industries, employees, both male and female, and types of jobs filled at present.

The Mayor said, "We intend to find out the number of skilled, unskilled, clerical, technological, and professional help in each plant. In this manner we can learn the needs of each industry."

PRAISES INDUSTRIES

Sarubbi has visited several of the larger industries in the community. He said he is amazed at the numerous types of items and commodities manufactured in the community.

Sarubbi said, "We walk or drive by a plant in the Township every day, never realizing what is taking place inside. We are proud to have these kind of industries here and the Commissioners and myself intend to keep them in the Township."

The Mayor said his primary interest is to establish closer relations between his office and those who head industries. He said in this way the community might best serve the industries and the industries serve the Township.

Sarubbi said, "With such a program we might be in a position to provide many job opportunities for the high-school student either in part-time employment during the term or for summer vacations. This could lead to a permanent job for the student upon graduation."

The Mayor said co-operation of these industries may enable youths to acquire certain skills and occupational training, to prepare them for careers. He added that many of the high-school graduates go into the world without a plan.

SHIP SANS RUDDER

Sarubbi said a graduate without a plan is like a ship without a rudder, wandering aimlessly. These graduates go along and in many cases accept any type of employment just to be able to say they have a job.

The Mayor said, "This philosophy could be a waste of hidden talents that normally might have been brought to the surface during a summer vacation or part-time employment. Industry may have benefited if it could have trained such an employee and certainly the youth would have benefited.

"The assistance and co-operation of all industries will be appreciated. We will be mailing questionnaires to all the plants and industries in the Township. I have every confidence in their full co-operation."

The Humanity of Public Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. JOELSON

OF NEW JERSEY

Monday, August 7, 1967

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to insert an article from the Paterson News of July 26, 1967, about Andrew J. Gessner, the district manager of the Social Security Office in Paterson, N.J. It should serve as an example to Government employees that they must constantly remember that behind the paper and forms there are flesh and blood human beings, and that Government need not be cold and heartless.

The article follows:

LIFE'S GREATEST GOAL

(By Andrew J. Gessner)

One day in July while seated at my desk spending an idle moment in thought, my gaze fell upon the desk calendar in front of me. I saw that the date showing was several behind the current one, as usual. Habit, it would seem, is a strong motivating force. Automatically I reached out and flipped over the several pages of the days which had seemingly just flown by. While doing so, I suddently realized I had completely forgotten my work anniversary with Social Security. On July 7, I had had 30 years of service.

THE PANORAMA

When this thought occurred to me, I could not help but reflect on all that time and I asked myself, "What have I accomplished in all those years?" Groping for an answer, I envisioned the thousands of people with whom I had spoken and had assisted during those 30 years—people of every walk of life who represented every nationality, every color of skin, and every religion that could be found in the 30 cities and towns which my office serves. I had been in contact with the wealthy, as well as the poor, with the educated, as well as the illiterate. All of these people literally formed a parade in my thoughts and as it passed the mind's reviewing stand I said to myself, "Here at my work, I have seen the beginning and the ending of Life."

As my lips quietly moved over the words "beginning and ending of Life," I became somewhat philosophical and I found myself asking that fundamental question which I believe occurs to all of us at some point in life. "What is really the most important thing in Life?"

The question lingered but a moment when

a word flashed across my thoughts. Perhaps you guessed, yes, the word was Money. Thinking about it though, I recalled an interview I had one day with a gentleman age 65 who had called at the office to file his claim for retirement benefits. He asked one of the most logical questions applicants ask: "How much will I get?" When I answered, he responded by telling me how much money he had earned in these last 25 years. This man spoke of an amount in the six figures—better than $100,000.

HOW IMPORTANT IS MONEY?

However, all the time that he was talking, I studied him and saw in his face and eyes an expression which was conveying the thought that he was sorry he had devoted all his energy and attention to making money because now that he was 65 and had a lot of money, he was not sure that giving 25 years of his life had been worth it. This thought plagued me to the point where I resolved that if money does this to a person then surely it could not be the most important thing in life.

Having thus dismissed money, I queried myself further about what then is the most important in Life. The word Health came to the fore. I thought now I had hit upon the real answer. And as I mulled it over in my mind, I could see the many disabled persons whom I had helped. Surely I thought, if they had the opportunity each of them would say to me, "I would gladly give everything I own if only I had good health."

But almost at the same time that I envisioned them, I recalled another interview I had one day with a 75-year-old gentleman. He had come to the office to ask a question about Medicare. I gave him the information and he commented: "I don't really need Medicare." I naively asked him, "Why not?" To which came a straightforward answer: "I haven't seen a doctor in 50 years."

HOW ABOUT HEALTH?

Imagine such fortune—surely such a person, I thought, must take health for granted. Here was a man talking of not having seen a doctor since he was 25 years old. Then this somber thought crossed my mind. If both these extremes regarding health do in fact exist then not even health could be considered the most important thing in life.

Now I had really become perplexed. I thought if neither money nor health were the most important, then what it? It was at this moment that my thoughts changed from the philosophical to the religious.

Suppose, I said to myself, God granted me the privilege of realizing that when I went to bed tonight, it was to be my last day on earth. I thought of this for awhile and I saw a newspaper headline, "Man Killed in Crash!" This person never knew that today would be his last day. Then I also thought of the many aged persons who because of their very advanced years suffer a stroke or go into a coma. These persons at such a time are not aware of the things going on around them. And very often they linger for a time and pass on into eternity without ever realizing that fact.

However, I believe there are many persons to whom God grants the privilege of retaining their full faculties until the end of time. If I were granted that privilege what would I do? I was thinking of 11:45 p.m. when I usually retire—I could picture myself listening to the 11:00 p.m. news on TV, getting dressed for bed, brushing my teeth, and now as I lay in bed the realization came to me I had only 15 minutes of life left.

WITH THE END NEAR

What happens at such a time? Certainly one could not expect to do anything earthshaking in the remaining few minutes. I concluded that in all probability one's whole lifetime of memories and events parade through the mind. At the same time as I reviewed the events of my life, I envisioned the scale of justice and all the good things I had done were being placed on the right side of the scale, while the not-so-good things were going on the left side.

As I watched the scale seeking its balance, I thought that if the right side were heavier then a feeling of calm and contentment must come over a person and death would be peaceful and readily accepted. However, what if the other side were heavier? Surely, at such a time one would probably be worried and wonder about such things as heaven and hell and a life hereafter. In either event, at that moment, it is much too late to do anything about changing one's life. And as death came we would travel on the road we led in life.

THE MOST IMPORTANT

And as these thoughts and visions passed before me, it suddenly occurred to me that I was answering my own question: "What is the most important thing in life?"

Briefly stated, it is these things that we do for others, the things which place the weights on the right side of the scale that are important. These things can be done in many, many ways every day of our life and can be summed up in such words as kindness, courtesy, giving, listening, helping, loving, and many others.

Thinking of these things and knowing that this is the pattern of my life, a calm and warm feeling came over me as I closed my eyes and fell off to sleep.

Day of Final Reckoning Forecast

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 7, 1967

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, many persons have been confused as to whether or not deficits were of any consequence, because they have been told that deficits mean only that money is owed to themselves. Just recently, however, a 10-percent surtax has been recommended, and one of the justifications for this tax imposition is the prospect of a mammoth deficit.

From this, then, it would seem that deficits do matter, and that something should be done about them. One of the best ways to control deficits is to cut back on unnecessary spending programs. In this respect David Lawrence wrote an article that appeared in the August 4, 1967, issue of the Evening Star, and I feel this article should be inserted into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The article follows:

DAY OF FINAL RECKONING FORECAST

The Johnson administration is still not facing up to the fact that "butter and guns" during a war are impracticable and can only result in a floundering economy.

The President's message, proposing a surcharge of 10 percent on the taxes of individuals and corporations together with some other technical devices to increase revenues, does not go to the heart of the problem of inflation. Usually during a war, not only is an excess-profits tax imposed, but wage-and-price controls as well. The President has suggested cuts in certain expenditures, yet the total budget seems likely to go soaring upwards just the same.

The message sets forth a policy of trying "to provide the fairest and least disruptive means of sustaining—without inflation—America's unprecedented period of uninterrupted prosperity." The current, inflation however, is already noticeable as prices have been steadily rising, with higher wages being demanded at the same time. The President is promising that spending will be reduced, but members of Congress in both parties are skeptical about such a result.

The tax bill will not be passed until a little later in the present session of Congress when there is a clearer idea of just what the total federal budget is going to be. It seems certain, however, that there will be a tax increase, as this will be regarded by members of both parties as the lesser of two evils. There is a hesitancy, for instance, to pass wage-and-price-control legislation or to impose an excess-profits tax.

No plan that raises taxes is, to be sure, popular, though more harm is done by handling tax problems on the basis of what is politically advantageous or disadvantageous than by putting into effect a policy that will preserve some kind of economic equilibrium.

Johnson says the current projected deficit of $29 billion, if not offset by increased revenues, "poses a clear and present danger to America's security and economic health." He predicts that it could cause a spiral of inflation which would bring "brutally higher interest rates and tight money which would cripple the home builder and the home buyer, as well as the businessman."

But the real question is whether the $7.4 billion increase in revenues which will cut down the $29 billion deficit by about a fourth will produce in the minds of economic experts any feeling of confidence. For a $16 billion deficit is almost as ominous as one of $29 billion, since large deficits are becoming an annual affair.

Undoubtedly the Vietnam war is a big factor in the government's deficit, but this is not the whole story. The public is confused by the maze of figures and the constant reference to the Vietnam conflict as a war of prolonged expense. The Great Society's programs nevertheless have expanded steadily. Federal outlays and grants have been authorized on a truly unprecedented scale in American history. It is conceded that many of these federal appropriations are desirable, but it is being asked why the government shouldn't hold down domestic appropriations for two or three years, until it is practical for the Vietnam war expense to be substantially reduced.

It is obviously difficult for an administration who faces a presidential-election campaign within the next 12 months to suspend those domestic expenditures which mean votes in various areas of the country. So the new tax proposal and the size of the budget are designed to interfere as little as possible with the flow of government funds into the economy.

The tax measure will mean a relatively small diversion of private funds into the Treasury. The high rate of government spending will continue, and if "inflation" can ever be called "prosperity," then the two terms will coincide at least until after the 1968 election. Eventually there will have to be a day of reckoning, because the current fiscal policy is based largely on political expediency.

Thant on the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 7, 1967

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on August 1, 1967, I addressed the House concerning the removal of U Thant as Secretary General of the United Nations.

On August 3, 1967, an editorial appeared in the Washington Evening Star concerning U Thant's repeated impropriety and partiality in an address to the world conference of Quakers.

I commend the editorial to the attention of our colleagues as follows:

THANT ON THE WAR

U Thant, in his address to the world conference of Quakers, once again gave voice to his simplistic and biased version of the conflict in Vietnam. It is a conflict, he said, that cannot be ended until the United States recognizes it "not as a war of Communits aggression, but as a war of national independence"—more or less like our own American Revolution.

The impropriety of this is self-evident. As Secretary General of the United Nations, Thant is an international civil servant who is supposed to play a moderating, impartial, above-the-battle role in matters of controversy. But he has repeatedly demonstrated, as in his remarks to the Quakers, a penchant for airing his personal views and prejudices against our country's efforts to help South Vietnam maintain its independence.

This independence was solemnly guaranteed by the 1954 Geneva accords. When Thant pooh-poohs charges of Communist aggression in violation of those accords, and when he says in effect that America is "eroding" international morality by its stand in Vietnam, he is guilty not merely of offensive bias, but of historical distortion as well. Certainly, to say that the Viet Cong and the invading North Vietnamese represent "nationalism, and not communism," is to substitute fancy for fact. It is all reminiscent of how Mao Tse-tung and his forces, before they took over China and carried out a terrible purge of countless Chinese, were eulogized far and wide as good-hearted, liberty-loving "agrarian reformers."

Thant's thesis must greatly affront the free Vietnamese, including over a million refugees from Ho Chi Minh's north, who have witnessed the Communist strategy of terror—the systematic torture and assassination of hundreds and hundreds of their village chiefs, school teachers and other leaders vital to their national existence. These people have every reason to fear what would happen to them if Thant's "nationalists" conquered their country. And the same holds true for Burma, his own country, and for Thailand and other neighboring states.

The simple truth is that what the Viet Cong and the North Vietnamese are doing is as much an act of war, a criminal aggression, as the Communist invsion of South Korea in 1950. The Secretary General of the United Nations would be well advised to recognize reality for what it is.

President's Reorganization Plan for the District of Columbia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 7, 1967

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of my colleagues who are giving final consideration to the merits of the President's proposed reorganization plan for the District of Columbia, I have brought together in concise form a summary of this proposal based on the work of the Government Operations Committee in recent weeks. I am very much heartened by the gathering support for this plan in the House of Representatives. It is a modest yet effective step forward. It is the kind of modernization of District government which is long overdue, and which is rightfully the concern of the Congress. And it is a plan which offers a sensible method for improving the communication between citizens of the District and their government.

I earnestly commend this plan to the study and thoughtful consideration of my colleagues:

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA GOVERNMENT REORGANIZATION—REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 3 OF 1967

ADMINISTRATION REQUEST

President Johnson on *June 1, 1967*, sent to Congress Reorganization Plan No. 3 which would reorganize the District of Columbia Government, replacing existing three D.C. Commissioners with a *single* commissioner and a *nine-member city council*. He had first announced his intention of doing so in his special message to Congress, on D.C., transmitted Feb. 27.

The Reorganization Plan was referred to both the Senate and the House Government Operations Committees, which have jurisdiction over proposals submitted to Congress under the President's executive reorganization powers.

AUTHORITY FOR THE REORGANIZATION PLAN AND HOW IT BECOMES LAW

A reorganization plan automatically becomes law in *60* calendar days (excluding recesses of more than 3 days) *unless* disapproved by either the House or Senate.

Due to the July 4th 10-day recess, the time for disapproval action has been extended through August 10.

The disapproval resolution (H. Res. 512) is scheduled for consideration by the House on Wednesday, August 9. To support the Reorganization Plan, a "no" vote should be cast on the disapproval resolution.

The authority for such a reorganization is contained in the *Reorganization Act of 1949* (Chapter 9 of Title 5, U.S. Code), which provides expressly for reorganization of the Government of the District of Columbia or part thereof, except the courts. (Note: The District of Columbia Government was reorganized pursuant to this authority in *1952*.)

The reorganization statute was designed by Congress to obtain necessary and desirable changes in Federal and District government organization "more speedily . . . than by the enactment of specific legislation."

HOUSE COMMITTEE ACTION

Following over 60 days of intensive study and 5 days of hearings, the House Government Operations Committee on August 2 voted 26-4 to support the Plan and to recommend that the disapproval resolution be defeated. The Committee vote was bipartisan—Democrats 15 for, 2 against—Republicans 11 for, 2 against.

SENATE ACTION

Senate Government Operations Committee has held hearings. No Senate opposition has appeared and no disapproval resolution has been introduced. No adverse action expected.

SUPPORT

Plan No. 3 has broad support. It has been endorsed by all three present Commissioners, the Chief of Police (better leadership to fight crime), the Committee for Forward-Looking Republicans in the District, the Conference of Mayors, Executive Director of National League of Cities, a large number of District organizations, the Evening Star Broadcasting Station, Washington Post, and others.

PURPOSES OF PLAN

Gives District more effective, more efficient, more representative and more responsive government now.

Replaces outmoded Commisioner form of government with its divided leadership and crossed and clouded lines of authority and responsibility.

Establishes single Commisisoner to give the District Government strong, clear and decisive executive leadership.

Provides through the Council official representation for citizens of the District in the making of rules, regulations and budgets of their local government.

Separates executive and quasi-legislative (rule-making) functions between Commissioner and Council so as to allow greater attention to each function.

Allows President to search nationwide for best man to head up District of Columbia Government.

STRENGTHS OF NEW FORM OF GOVERNMENT

Strong executive leadership and new espirit.

Broadened citizen representation through the Council.

Increased capacity of D.C. government to draw top personnel into service.

Stronger representation for District in negotiations with other area governments and Federal agencies.

Unified approach to urban problems, reduction of overlapping and improved coordination of programs through single executive direction.

Training ground for city leaders through Council.

Increased capacity of government to learn of and respond to needs of citizens through nine-member council.

MAJOR PROVISIONS OF REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 3 OF 1967

1. *Replaces Board of Commissioners* with a *single*, strong executive and *a nine-member council*.

2. Congress retains full power to make all laws as well as the budget for the District.

3. Stipulates that District Council be responsible for *making rules* and *regulations* where Congress has delegated such authority and *reviewing*, Commissioner's budget and making revisions.

4. Sets following requirements for the nine council members:

A. To be *appointed* by President, *subject to Senate confirmation*. Appointments to be made with view to achieving council membership *"broadly representative" of community*.

B. To be nonpartisan, with no more than *six* members adherents of same political party.

C. To be residents of District for *three years* preceding appointment.

D. To serve *three-year* staggered terms.

E. To be compensated with following salaries: Chairman and Vice Chairman to receive $10,000 and $9,000, respectively; other seven members to receive $7,500. (Service expected to be part-time).

5. Provides that Commissioner of D.C. (Chief Executive) be responsible for administration, supervision of personnel, preparation of budget and organization of executive branch.

6. States that Commissioner:

A. Be *appointed* by President, *subject to Senate confirmation*.

B. Serve a term of *four years*.

C. May effect reorganization within lower structure of District government (similar to authority possessed by most Cabinet officials).

D. May *veto* any act (rule, regulation or budget revision) of Council. (Council *may override veto* by vote of three-quarters of members present and voting.)

7. Requires *Assistant to Commissioner* to be appointed by President, *subject to Senate confirmation*.

8. *Either* Commissioner or Assistant Commissioner *must be a resident of District for three years* prior to appointment. *Both must reside* in District *while in office*.

9. Provides that certain District agencies retain *same* general relationship to District government: Board of Education, Library Trustees, Recreation, Zoning Adjustment, Armory; Public Service and Zoning Commissions; Zoning Advisory Council; and Office of Recorder of Deeds. Does not change relation to District government Federal agencies with municipal functions such as Redevelopment Land Agency (RLA), National Capital Housing Authority (NCHA), and National Capital Planning Commission (NCPC).

10. Specifies that plan takes *full effect* upon appointment of Commissioner and at least six members of Council or later date as President may determine.

SUMMARY

1. The plan *does not provide for home rule*, as President Johnson pointed out in his message of transmittal. The plan does not—and could not—provide for elected city government. This can only be done by legislation.

2. The plan *does not affect the corporate status of the District of Columbia* but changes its top management.

3. If the plan takes effect, *Congress retains full power* to reverse, modify, or otherwise alter the reorganization madé under it.

4. The plan does provide for *more effective management* of District affairs through the *consolidation of executive authority and responsibility in a single Commissioner* and more responsiveness to the citizens of the District through the establishment of a *nine-member Council representative of the community*.

ACTION BY DISTRICT COMMITTEE

District Committee opponents of the Plan, after decades of inaction, have hastily devised a bill (H.R. 12065) designed to divert support from *Reorganization Plan No. 3* which *is needed now*. Ultimate fate of District Committee bill is highly doubtful, and it should not be used to prevent or delay the badly needed reorganization of the District Government:

The District Committee bill (H.R. 12065) Makes No Real Changes in the City Government and Cannot Do the Job).

The bill retains the three headed commission form of government with its divided authority.

The bill does not create a strong city executive as does Plan No. 2.

The bill does not eliminate overlapping and complicating assignments of responsibility in the three Commissioners.

The "managing director" set up by the bill does not have the strength or prestige to give this city the leadership it requires. The "managing director" is weakened further by having to check with three independent bosses.

(The single Commissioner set up by Plan No. 3 would have power to establish an office of general manager if desired.)

The District Committee bill does not separate executive and quasi-legislative (rulemaking) functions as does Plan No. 3.

The bill fails to give the chief executive authority to modernize the internal organization of the lower levels of D. C. government as does Plan No. 3.

The elected school board in the District Committee bill is an entirely separate matter which can be established by legislation whether or not the Reorganization Plan goes into effect. This legislation should be dealt with separately from the reorganization of city government.

Plan No. 3, if allowed to become effective, will bring *now* important and needed improvements in the structure of District government.

The District Committee bill is a very limited bill. It is subject to amendment in the House and Senate. It would undoubtedly be amended in the Senate to a point where it would become unacceptable in the House. The result would be stalemate and failure.

The Neighborhood Action Crusades: Where They Can Help

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. GOODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 7, 1967

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, the newspapers of recent days reflect numerous instances where the citizen participation envisioned by the neighborhood action crusade can help.

From a story in the Washington Post of August 4, by William Raspberry, comes the following:

> It wasn't exactly the kind of attitude you'd expect to find in a Washington ghetto, but the young men at the Harrison School playground were puzzled—and just a little hurt—that policemen from the nearby 13th Precinct station house never stop by.
>
> "There's no walking beat past the playground any more," Reg, 19, said. "Every now and then a scout car will cruise by but the only time the officers walk by is when they're on their way to their beat or going back to the precinct."
>
> The playground is in the 1300 block of V Street nw.; the station house is at 1620 V. But they seem to be a long way apart.
>
> Ricky, who is 21 and once got into a little trouble as a juvenile, said he thought he'd never see the day when he would care one way or the other about the fuzz. The six others in the group agreed.
>
> "Back in '64 and '65," Ricky said, "a policeman couldn't come through W Street and be nice. We'd jump on him. But it's not like that any more. Not since the ball games."
>
> The ball game reference was to the softball tournament dreamed up last summer during a conference with Commissioner Walter Tobriner, Police Chief John B. Layton and Marion Barry, former head of Washington SNCC.
>
> The idea was to get juveniles and police officers involved in some activity where they could get to know each other as friends. Instead of playing against each other, every team would include both cops and kids.
>
> Not a bad idea to begin with, it worked especially well in No. 13, where D.C. Recreation Department Roving Leader Harold Bell gave it a different twist.
>
> Most precincts depended on police volunteers to man the teams and, as a result, got only the "good guys" who never had any trouble with the neighborhood youngsters to begin with.
>
> Bell deliberately sought out the officers who had problems getting along on the beat. It was rough for a while, but it worked.
>
> "If you had told me before last summer that I'd ever stop to talk to (he named two 13th Precinct privates), I'd have told you you were crazy," Ricky said. "I wouldn't even've stopped if they'd called me. And if they didn't call me nice, they might have had a fight."
>
> Now, he and the officers are fairly good friends, largely as a result of the softball games.
>
> "I think it would be boss if they would just stop in and chat sometime," said Kirby, 21. "I really mean it; they have some pretty good officers over there, once you get to know them. 'Course, they have some cops who can't get along with anybody."
>
> Kirby, Ricky, Chico, Reg and Leo all agreed that they couldn't understand why the officers wouldn't try to get to know them better, if for no other reason than to make their own work easier.
>
> "You know you feel a lot better about an officer when he calls you by name," one of them said. "There's one private we call 'Crazy Man' who's like that. He knows all of us—even lends us money now and then. He's all right, but you don't run over him."
>
> Aside from Crazy Man (Andrew Johnson), not many officers have made the effort since last summer. The softball tourneys haven't been revived this year.
>
> Why? "Up to now, there's been no demand for a resumption," said Lt. Marshall H. Cook, director of the Boys' Club program and police coordinator for the softball tourneys last year. "I'd like to see it happen again; it was very successful last summer."
>
> Stan Anderson, head of the Roving Leader program and civilian coordinator of the tourneys, said pretty much the same thing. "The program hasn't been resumed because no one has taken the initiative to do it."
>
> So there it is. A program that accomplished some real good—to judge from a half-dozen young men on V Street—has been dropped just because nobody bothered to keep it going.

Today, policemen and other city employees are too busy to carry the burden of keeping these games going. Volunteers do this, and whenever possible members of the force could drop by for a few innings.

From the Washington Star of August 1 comes the following account of the local disturbances:

> The disturbance spread slowly at first. But within a half hour, police and fire communications units were swamped with calls.
>
> "They just threw a brick through a window in the 400 block of N Street . . . There's a car on fire in an alley between L and M . . . The Safeway windows are busted out . . . We're being stoned."
>
> The youths fanned out in small bands, but at least two large groups of from 50 to 75 persons each stayed together. The groups were seen storming down 7th Street along M Street, and then up 13th and 14th Street NW.
>
> They traveled from the 2nd Precinct into the 13th Precinct, where police drew a line at 14th and U Streets, ordered the crowd to break up and arrested some on charges of failing to comply.
>
> A number of civil rights workers and ministers turned out to help calm the youths. At 7th and N Streets, there was a group of five priests and ministers.
>
> One minister, who declined to be identified, said, "I talked to them for 15 to 20 minutes. They were just out for a little excitement and that's all it means to them."
>
> Julian Dugas, director of the Neighborhood Legal Service, which has set up one of the city's tension alert programs, and U.S. Marshal Luke C. Moore both were active in the area helping to calm the youths.

It is not evident that calming influences might well have aided in diverting these small groups from their rampant intent before the damage was done, just as these volunteers did after the riots had begun. An ounce of prevention is still better than a pound of cure.

From the Washington Daily News of August 3 comes this account of the testimony of a Tampa, Fla., police officer:

> A Tampa, Florida, police intelligence officer testified yesterday that teen age toughs working in concert with Poverty Program officials were instrumental in stopping racial disturbances that shook that city last June.
>
> Young Negro men from the streets of Tampa, some with police records, were or-

ganized into units which moved about racially tense areas and spread the word to "cool it", he said.

In the two illustrations of responsible elements of the community circulating among their fellow citizens, the trouble had begun and the damage had started. Why wait? Is it not better to inspire these same citizens to circulate in their own communities on regular schedules to defuse the tensions before the rise to a dangerous level?

These are but two illustrations of the type of activity which volunteers in the neighborhood action crusade might provide. This is a decision for the local communities themselves.

Let us not forget a basic principle of early Americanism, which deTocqueville noted more than a century ago. When Americans see a social need they have a genius for organizing a volunteer group to do the job. The crucial factor is people and their involvement, so that working together the burden is not too great for anyone to carry.

A Note on the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 7, 1967

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I thought that my colleagues and the readers of the RECORD would like to know how the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission conducts its business.

The manner in which it operates is shocking and unbelievable, to say the least, and I think it is time that we put a stop to the wild grab for power that this agency and many others are making. We cannot tolerate the inroads that they are making on the rights of our people.

The story related in the article I am inserting here in the RECORD will, with justification, horrify our people, and I hope we will make it absolutely clear that we will not permit these practices to continue, whether by the EEOC or any other Federal agency.

OFFICIAL BIAS: A NOTE ON THE EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION

As bureaucrats go these days, the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission has not gone very far. Created in mid-1965 to weed out discrimination in employment based on either race or sex, the agency boasts a budget of only $5.2 million and a staff of 314, smaller respectively than those of the Office of Coal Research and the Federal Crop Insurance Program. Personnelwise, EEOC has been something of a revolving door: its first chairman, Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., quickly resigned to run for Governor; his successor, Stephen N. Shulman, quit after nine months to go into private practice. While the Commission reportedly has received over 15,000 complaints, it has cleared up only a few hundred. "We're out to kill an elephant," Mr. Shulman recently was quoted as saying, "with a fly gun."

In the wrong hands, however, even fly guns can be dangerous. Last Monday Newport News Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co., the nation's leading builder of naval vessels, suffered the first strike in 81 years of doing business. On the following midnight, a riot, which injured over a score of people and was termed by local police the "worst disorder" in the placid history of Newport News, Va., broked out at the company's main gate. Newspaper accounts of the affair, which interrupted the construction of the world's largest aircraft carrier and led to the personal intervention of the Governor, were scanty at best. The walkout apparently began in protest over relatively minor grievances. However, union officials hinted that "other problems" lurk in the background. A Washington paper reported cryptically that "the issues go deeper."

Somehow nobody has chosen to identify the principal villain of the piece, which is none other than the fly gun-totin' Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. Backed by the firepower of the U.S. Department of Labor, which threatened the shipyard's government contracts, the Commission 18 months ago moved in on management. In particular, the agency coerced Newport News Ship into signing a so-called Conciliation Agreement, which, by pointedly favoring Negroes, for future apprentice training and on-the-job promotion, made a new kind of discrimination official policy. "Shipyard in South Induced to Make Up for Past Bias," read the headline. Since then, in the words of an old hand at the yard, EEOC has done its worst to "set black against white, labor against management and disconcert everybody." In the alien world of bureaucracy, size is no measure of virulence.

Labor-management relations at Newport News Ship began to suffer in mid-1965, shortly after the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission set up shop. The company, which does roughly half a billion dollars worth of work per year, largely for the Navy or the subsidized merchant marine, was a logical target. It's also located in the South. The Commission swiftly set about building a case. According to our man in Washington (actually a charming lady named Shirley Scheibla, who was born and raised in Newport News), EEOC that summer began knocking on doors in Negro neighborhoods soliciting complaints of job discrimination. It managed to get 41, which, for one reason or another, ultimately narrowed down to four. Thus armed, EEOC began to negotiate with the company. After months of fruitless discussion, Washington got tough. Pleading a "pattern of discrimination," EEOC took the dispute to the Justice Department. At the same time, Labor Secretary W. Willard Wirtz ordered the newly organized Office of Federal Contract Compliance to crack down on the yard. A week later the company caved in and signed the notorious Conciliation Agreement, which some have called a "landmark in fair employment practices."

That's one way to describe a document which, in barring discrimination, moved to substitute favoritism. Thus, Newport News Shipbuilding agreed to hire an outside "expert in job evaluation . . . who is acceptable to the Commission" to determine whether Negro employes are improperly classified or working at rates set arbitrarily low. To arrive at his findings, the "expert" took a "random sample" of white employment histories, and, if a Negro worker's status lagged behind the resulting profile, he was deemed a victim of discrimination. Presumably to compensate for past sins, the company had to draw up a preferred promotion list consisting solely of Negroes (exceptions had to be cleared with the Commission). As to apprentice training, a company-run school, once the community's pride, was compelled to drastically change its admission practices. Though the number of applicants traditionally has far outstripped the available openings. Newport News Ship undertook to seek recruits in Negro schools and through civil rights groups. It also accepted a quota system under which "the ratio of Negro to white apprentices in any given year should approach the ratio of . . . Negro to white in the labor area."

The first outraged reaction came from the unaffiliated Peninsula Shipbuilders Association, which, though the recognized bargaining agent for most of the 22,000-man work force, was not consulted. Though subsequently made a party to the pact, the union has never overcome its resentment. Two months ago P.S.A., denouncing a Labor Department release on the company's promotion practices as self-serving and false, threatened legal action to set the record straight. The white community—Newport News Ship is far and away the leading local industry—has been equally aggrieved. One graduate of the Apprentice School wrote the local newspaper to protest against the lowering of admission standards to which, he argued, a quota system inevitably would lead. Another reader, the Rev. Richard B. Sisson of Hampton Roads, put the issue squarely in the moral realm. "I am for equal opportunity for all citizens in school, jobs, housing and all other matters. That is why I find the terms dictated by the government to the shipyard odious. The quota system is just as iniquitous as the exclusion of Negroes some have charged the Yard with practicing previously . . . It will result in very definite de facto discrimination against whites, Indians, Asiatics and all other non-Negroes. Two wrongs do not make a right."

Even the Negroes, in whose behalf the whole exercise presumably was launched, have wound up frustrated and angry. Like all demagogues, the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission promised far more than it has been able to deliver. "You need a militancy in this community," Samuel C. Jackson, former NAACP bigwig and current EEOC Commissioner, told an audience in Hampton Roads. Thanks to official action, he added, 5,000 of the company's 5,800 Negro workers would get "substantial raises." Instead, according to the union, such rewards have gone to precisely 155. While trying to mind somebody else's business, moreover, the Commission has failed to attend to its own; some 78 cases of alleged discrimination brought by the union have dragged on far beyond the statutory 60 days. Linwood Harris, Negro co-manager of the Peninsula Shipbuilders Association represents the voice of the people: "The good the EEOC has done," he told Barron's prior to the strike, "is minute and not worth it because of the bad they've done."

Newport News is a relatively small place (though the company happens to be the sole remaining builder of U.S. capital ships). Yet what has happened there is a matter of national concern. Emboldened by its "success," EEOC is moving aggressively against other leading corporations. President Johnson has asked Congress to grant the agency power to issue cease-and-desist orders. Instead, to judge by the dismal record, we urge the lawmakers to hand down a stop order of their own.

The American Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK BRINKLEY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 7, 1967

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, a young man from Columbus, Ga., George H. "Buddy" Riddle, recently gave the following speech in the American Legion oratorical contest. It is particularly timely in these trying times and I find encouragement in his speech as given by one who reflects the vast majority of this excellent generation. We, in America, have every reason for deep pride in the caliber of our youth. Of course, we always find in the background of these fine young people, parents of excellent character who have imparted the principles shaping their children.

The speech follows:

THE AMERICAN WAY

"Which way American? Which way to go? This is my country and I want to know, which way America is going to go." Yes, which way America! This is the question that faced our forefathers 190 years ago as they stood on the threshold of a new experience. They chose the way of democracy; an ideal not then fully achieved by any other people in the world.

We Americans are, indeed, a fortunate people. Today we have a strong and prosperous nation capable of providing a higher standard of living than heretofore known. Our system of government, as provided for in the Constitution, seeks, to demonstrate that a democracy can function effectively, that it is the best means of establishing a free society and protecting the rights of the individual. But we must not for one moment take our strength and our freedom for granted. These blessings came to us because our forefathers tackled with courage and wisdom the problems involved in a great experiment in self-government.

The problem of securing independence was a momentous decision the early Americans had to face; and it was only after eight years of bloodshed and sacrifice in a war that was uncertain from the very outset that they earned the right to determine their own form of government.

The peace following the war brought with it staggering political and economic problems. Many people had serious doubts as to whether the new nation could survive at all. But gradually a strong society emerged on the basis of a carefully created frame of government, and the United States was ready to demonstrate to the world the effectiveness of a democracy.

Challenging problems have always been a significant feature of the American scene. Perhaps we would not be the great nation we are today if earlier Americans had not been forced to devise ways and means to overcome seemingly insurmountable obstacles. Thomas Paine once said, "What we obtain too cheaply, we esteem too lightly. 'Tis dearness only that gives everything its value. Heaven knows how to put a price upon its goods, and it would be strange indeed that so celestial an article as freedom should not be highly rated." No, indeed, the privileges that are ours by virtue of the Constitution should not be taken lightly. It is not the presence of troubles that threatens our American way of life but the fact that so few of us feel much of a sense of urgency to do anything about them.

It is sad but true, as former Justice Harlan F. Stone observed, that we often "Seek to escape from our problems by leaving them to be solved by chance or by those who have no more responsibility for the solution than ourselves."

We may be, without any doubt, loyal and patriotic citizens. We may realize the complex and challenging modern problems call for informed, courageous, and diligent effort. But too often, and with the best of intentions, we may inadvertently block or oppose intelligent action, simply because we do not know any better. But ignorance is no excuse in a democracy, for along with his privileges, every citizen in a democracy has certain responsibilities and duties.

To carry out these responsibilities and duties to the best of his ability a citizen needs to be well informed. He needs to search for the facts and to act on the basis of reliable information rather than unsupported opinion. If he wants good men in government offices, he should vote wisely and see to it that good men are elected, for the success of a democracy depends on the intelligent action of its citizens.

It is for us today, by understanding and friendship for the people of all parts of our country, to revere, uphold and put into practice the high aims of government which were forged and preserved by the brave men during the infancy of our nation. These aims demand that we seek not only our own betterment but the betterment of all; the good not only of our own group, our own section, or our own state, but the good of the United States.

The American Way gives us the rules for *establishing justice*. But whether we have justice depends on whether we obey these rules. Justice means that each person should be secure in the rights The American Way of life has ordained for him.

We can be sure of *Justice* only when we put aside all quarrels, bitterness and prejudice; when we are done with strikes and lockouts; when labor and capital learn that each prospers only when they work in sincere cooperation; when we are done with riots and marches and when the races have learned that respect and the acceptance of the worth of the individual; and not force is the solution to their problem.

"Our liberty is bounded by the lawful rights of our fellowmen. Our rights are the other side of our duties. The blessings of liberty belong to this and to all generations as a sacred trust, which we must hand down to the next generation, and they to the next."

"Honor, justice, and humanity forbid us tamely to surrender that freedom which we received from our gallant ancestors, and which our innocent posterity have the right to receive from us." This is my country and I *know* which way *I* want America to go.

Freeport Celebrates 75th Anniversary of Incorporation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT TENZER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 7, 1967

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, the village of Freeport, N.Y., was first settled in 1650 when Edward Raynor moved south from Hempstead in search of unused land to farm. Until 1650 Freeport was the home of the Merikokee Indians, who hunted in the forests which have been replaced by the streets and stores of this suburban community.

When the village was founded it was first called Port of the Great South Woods. Later the name was changed to Washburn's Neck, and then to Coe's Neck, to identify the two capes projecting into the waters of Hempstead Bay.

The rapid growth of the community during the 1850's made it necessary to decide on a permanent name. A series of town meetings resulted in the selection of the name of Freeport—perhaps because in colonial times the captains of trading vessels unloaded their cargo there to escape the heavy taxation imposed at larger ports along the Atlantic coastline.

This year Freeport celebrates the 75th anniversary of its incorporation. It has grown from a rural community with a population of 1,821 in the year 1892 to a thriving residential business and industrial community with an estimated population of 42,000.

Freeport is the boating center of Long Island and it has the largest waterfront development of any community in Nassau County, N.Y.

Freeport in the 1960's is facing the problems of an urban center located in the suburbs. It has made great strides in providing housing for its senior citizens, recreational facilities including a public marina for its residents and a progressive plan for urban renewal to eliminate the pockets of poverty which exist in every area of this size in the Nation.

As the Representative in Congress of the people of Freeport, I have been proud of the public concern and citizenship involvement shown by my Freeport constituents. The clergy, the elected officials, the local businessmen, the educators, and in fact all the people of Freeport are unafraid to speak out and to become involved in community problems and their solutions.

During the week of September 23 to October 1, 1967, Freeport will celebrate the 75th anniversary of its incorporation. Every evening of that week the Freeport Diamond Jubilee Corp. will present a historic extravaganza, featuring 350 citizens, which will depict the history of the village. Plans for the celebration also include a parade with floats and color guards from all branches of the armed services. The culmination of the week's activities will be the grand ball on September 30.

As diamond jubilee week approaches, I praise the people of Freeport for their accomplishments to date, but more important I pay tribute to them for their rejection of complacency and their determination to make Freeport an even better place to live.

Defense of the Economic Opportunity Loan Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JEFFERY COHELAN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 7, 1967

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, it is growing increasingly common to find criticisms of the programs operating under the Economic Opportunity Act.

Recently there appeared in the Wall Street Journal a critique of the Economic Opportunity loan program, designated specifically for small businesses which will create job opportunities in areas of high unemployment.

I was very pleased to see a rebuttal of this criticism, sent to the Journal's editor by Mr. R. F. Gully, senior counselor for the Oakland Small Business Development Center, whose fine record Mr. Gully recites.

In defense of a successful application

of the program's benefits, I include Mr. Gully's letter for my colleagues' review:

JULY 27, 1967.

EDITOR,
Wall Street Journal,
Palo Alto, Calif.

DEAR SIR: Your July 17th article on the Economic Opportunity Loan Program was extremely negative and deserves a rebuttal.

The fact that some of the loans are in default and that some of the funds were mismanaged does not mean that the entire program has failed. On the contrary, even if 20% of the businesses do go under, as you feel they might, the remaining 80% will necessarily be successful. Considering the fact that none of these borrowers were deemed worthy of any type of financial assistance before this program was established, we believe that this is indeed an accomplishment.

The Oakland SBDC was opened in April of 1966 and during that year processed 64 loans which were approved and funded by the SBA. The total dollar volume was $691,146, or an average of about $10,800 per loan. At the time that the loans were granted, 145 people, including 69 proprietors, were involved. As a result of the financial assistance, from 172 to 179 additional jobs were created which were filled primarily by people who had been unemployed and receiving some type of public assistance. The aggregate payroll is projected to be nearly $885,000 the first year of operations, exclusive of proprietors' profits.

In terms of state and federal taxes to be generated based on: a) business and personal income taxes of owners, b) employers' payroll taxes and c) income taxes paid by the employees themselves, the government will receive $311,282 the first year. In addition, interest payments will amount to over $26,500, so the total annual return will be nearly $338,000, or 48.9% of the principal amount loaned.

It is clear, therefore, that this is not a charity program and one should not be overly alarmed at a 20% delinquency factor. Incidentally, of the 64 loans outlined above, three have defaulted and seven more are over two months past due. Of the delinquents, five are keeping the arrangements made with the SBA for repayment and are not likely to fail; even so, our experience is not as bad as the New York office's seems to be. Offsetting these poorer cases are at least ten businesses which are already netting over $15,000 per year.

The social effects of a properly run E.O.L. Program are obvious; our purpose here is to show that the economic benefits can also be great. However, under SBA's current austerity policy, the impact of both is lost. There can be no such thing as a "safe" E.O.L.; the terms are, by definition, contradictory. But if viewed realistically, there can be a "good" E.O.L. program, if loans are made available to the people who really need the assistance.

Very truly yours,

R. F. GULLY,
Senior Counselor.

Neighborhood Youth Corps Puts a Girl in the Skies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 7, 1967

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, on the day after tomorrow, a 2-year-old girl from my home city of Pittsburgh will report to Eastern Airlines' stewardess training school in Miami to begin the fulfillment of her high school ambition.

Three years ago this attractive girl, Patricia Gilliam, was unable to locate any job, and her future looked uncertain. Then she joined Pittsburgh's first-rate Neighborhood Youth Corps, and her prospects quickly improved.

The Neighborhood Youth Corps gave Patricia, a bright, ambitious girl, the initial boost she needed. The rest she did herself. The NYC has done the same thing for thousands of other young people across our land. It is one of the best investments the Congress has ever made in the future of America.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I insert at this point in the RECORD the story of Patricia Gilliam's "takeoff," as told by Sam Spatter in the Pittsburgh Press of July 23, 1967. I urge my colleagues to read the story as an illustration of the value of the Neighborhood Youth Corps.

The article follows:

GIRL GETS OFF GROUND AFTER SLOW "TAKEOFF"—YOUTH CORPS TRAINING GIVES A LIFT TO HAZELWOOD MISS' AIRLINE HOSTESS GOAL

(By Sam Spatter)

It has taken Patricia Gilliam nearly six years, but now she's ready to realize her high school ambition.

The 21-year-old will become an airline hostess.

Patricia, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Henry Gilliam of 4943 Second Ave., Hazelwood, joins Eastern Airlines' stewardess training school in Miami on Aug. 9.

Not bad for a former Neighborhood Youth Corps enrollee who just several years ago, following graduation from Gladstone High School, faced an uncertain future because she was unable to locate a job—any job.

Pat's dilemma proved her best break.

A neighbor, who worked at the neighborhood employment office, mentioned the new Youth Corps program which the City launched in 1966.

Why not, said she, and signed up.

Pat was sent to the Young Men's and Women's Hebrew Assn. (YM&WHA) in Oakland where she was one of 15 Youth Corps members employed by the organization.

Although she had enrolled for a six-month term, Pat resigned from the Youth Corps after only four months at the Oakland "Y."

"We did a foolish thing," said Dr. A. J. Auerbach, executive director of the YM&WHA.

"We liked her work so much, we offered her a staff position. Instead of letting Uncle Sam pay her salary for another two months, we paid it."

The reason for this "drastic move" on the part of Mr. Auerbach's staff was quite evident.

Pat proved to be an efficient, energetic, enthusiastic worker. She did clerical, stenographic, typing and even switchboard work.

TOOK EVENING COURSE

After becoming a staff member, Pat decided to brush up on her stenographic skills and enrolled in an evening course at Robert Morris Junior College.

But while she worked at the "Y", her mind was always in the sky.

She had first applied for an airline job while in high school, and reapplied early last year.

Eastern Airlines was interested and invited her to take a physical examination.

Much to Pat's embarrassment, she flunked. She was 11 pounds overweight.

The rules said a 5-foot-5 girl must weigh not more than 124 pounds.

PASSES EXAM

Undaunted, Pat started watching calories. When Eastern's recruiter returned to town several months ago, Pat was trim and ready. And she passed with "flying colors." Dr. Auerbach was shocked last week when he opened his mail and found a letter from Pat. It was her two weeks resignation notice.

While all the staff members at the YM&WHA are proud of her accomplishments, her immediate boss, Sidney Adelsberg, head of the physical education department, glows with special pride. He has watched her develop into the bright young lady she is today.

Her departure leaves Dr. Auerbach with a problem. He had intended to enter her in the Miss Torch contest this fall as the YM&WHA candidate.

Pat, who received a job feeler from another airline after accepting Eastern's offer, may give her new employer a big bonus.

She is one of 13 children and many of them like to fly.

Vietnam Action Claims Soldier, Two Marines From Maryland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE D. LONG
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 7, 1967

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Lance Cpl. James G. McGovern, Pfc. John M. Dudley, and Pfc. Robert L. Johnson, three servicemen from Maryland, were recently killed in action in Vietnam. I wish to commend the courage of these men and to honor their memory by including the following article in the RECORD:

VIETNAM ACTION CLAIMS SOLDIER, TWO MARINES FROM MARYLAND

Two Maryland marines and an army man have been killed in Vietnam fighting, according to a Defense Department announcement yesterday.

The marines were Lance Corporal James G. McGovern, son of Mr. and Mrs. Gerald McGovern, of Riverdale, and Pfc. John M. Dudley, husband of Mrs. John M. Dudley, of York road, Cockeysville.

The other soldier was Pfc. Robert L. Johnson, son of Mr. and Mrs. Garnie Johnson, of Georgetown road, Baltimore.

SERVED 1 YEAR

Private Johnson, 19, was killed Tuesday while on patrol activities, the Department of Defense said in a telegram to his parents.

He had been in the Army for a year, and had been assigned to Vietnam for two months. He was a member of Long Range Reconnaissance Company, 4th Infantry.

Before being assigned to Vietnam, Private Johnson trained at Fort Jackson, S.C., and at Fort Gordon, Ga.

NATIVE OF BALTIMORE

A native of Baltimore, Private Johnson attended the high school division of Baltimore Bible College, and had planned to study for the ministry when he completed his Army service.

Beside his parents, Private Johnson is survived by a sister, Mrs. Jessie D. Youngbar, of Baltimore.

Lance Corporal McGovern, 18, was killed July 29 in action against an enemy force near Quang Tri. He had earlier been recommended for the Bronze Star.

He enlisted in the Marine Corps in 1966 after graduation from DuVal High School, Riverdale, and had been on duty in Vietnam for nine months.

ACTIVE IN BOYS' CLUB

Lance Corporal McGovern received his basic training at the Marine Corps Recruit Depot, Parris Island, S.C., and later underwent advanced training at Camp Lejeune, N.C., Camp Pendleton, Cal., and at Okinawa.

In Vietnam, he was a member of "H" Company 2d Battalion, 9th Marine Regiment.

While in high school, Lance Corporal McGovern was active in the Prince Georges county Boy's Club, and was a member of the club's football and baseball teams.

In addition to his parents, he is survived by a sister, Mrs. Jeannie Lynn, of Riverdale.

KILLED NEAR QUANG TRI

Private Dudley was also killed during action in the Quang Tri area. His death was attributed to a bullet wound in the head.

He enlisted in the Marine Corps in 1966 and received training at Parris Island, Camp Lejeune, and Camp Pendleton.

He was assigned to "F" Company, 2d Battalion, 9th Marine Regiment, and had been stationed in Vietnam since June 5.

A native of Frostburg, Md., Private Dudley spent the major portion of his life in the Millers (Md.) area, and attended Hereford High, Hereford, Md.

ACTIVE BOY SCOUT

While a high school student, he was active in the Boy Scouts of America.

Private Dudley and his wife had been married for four years and had lived two years in Cockeysville, Md., and one year in Glen Rock, Pa.

He worked for a while with the Whitehall Paper Mill, and later was employed by a canning company in Glen Rock.

Besides his wife, Private Dudley is survived by a daughter, Carol, and a son, John M. Dudley, Jr.; his mother, Mrs. Iva Dudley, of Stafford, Va.; his father, Samuel Dudley, of Millers; two sisters, Mrs. Sara Williams, of Glen Rock, and Miss Rose Dudley, of Stafford; and a brother, Samuel B. Dudley, of Railroad, Pa.

Congress Should Go on a 5-Day Workweek

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. MOSS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 7, 1967

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD, at this point, an editorial from the Sacramento Bee of July 29, 1967, entitled "Congress Should Go on a 5-day Workweek." The editorial follows:

CONGRESS SHOULD GO ON 5-DAY WORKWEEK

The three-day work week to which Congress has become accustomed sometimes acts to the detriment of the nation. It should be changed. This was illustrated recently in connection with congressional action on the railroad strike legislation.

House and Senate conference committee members met on a Thursday to discuss a bill which would have stopped the strike, scheduled by six railroad shop unions to start at midnight the following Saturday.

The committee members were unable to agree on a bill but they did not schedule another meeting for Friday nor was the House or Senate in session. The railroads consequently were shut down Sunday and Congress had to come back to work Monday to rush through the bill banning the strike after it began rather than before.

Congressional Quarterly, published in Washington, D.C., in a recent report noted Congress has continued to do most of its business on a three-day a-week basis despite recommendations for reform.

Senators and representatives for years have been known as members of the "Tuesday to Thursday Club." Understandably, some of the congressmen wish to have long weekends available to visit constituents but it is doubtful many of them do this weekend after weekend.

A House-Senate committee was set up in 1966 to recommend improvements in congressional operations. It urged Congress to go on a five-day week to handle the affairs of government more efficiently. The committee's suggestion has been ignored.

The law requires Congress to adjourn by July 31 each year but this has not been done since 1956 due to a loophole that waives the requirement in times of "national emergency". The five-day work week would help meet the legal adjournment date.

Another suggestion has been made that Congress take every August off to allow members to renew their acquaintance with the voters and have a summer vacation with their families, returning in September if necessary. This has merit, too, but the five-day work week should be imposed first.

Mr. Speaker, I want to express my most vigorous concurrence. My home is 3,000 miles from Washington, D.C. I like to go home. I enjoy spending time with the people I represent. I need closer contact with them and their problems, but I, and many of the other Members of this body, cannot have that close rapport because we are held here on far too many occasions when the House has no Monday or Friday business, of significance, scheduled.

Mr. Speaker, not only is floor business interfered with, but it is virtually impossible to schedule committee work sessions on those two days—Monday and Friday—because of lack of the necessary quorum to transact business.

Mr. Speaker, if we worked on a 5-day basis in the House and its committees we should be able to leave the District of Columbia by Labor Day at the very latest, and we would immeasurably improve the image of the Congress.

The leisurely pace of congressional business—especially in times such as we now experience—is not a defensible practice and far too often leads the public to conclude that Members are not working even though the details of our work and the heavy caseloads from our districts keep the majority of Members fully committed to heavy work schedules in their Washington or District offices on a 6-day and even a 7-day-a-week basis.

World War II and Korean Conflict Veterans' Educational Assistance Restoration Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LARRY WINN, JR.
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 17, 1967

Mr. WINN. Mr. Speaker, my attention has recently been directed to the fact that many World War II and Korean conflict veterans have failed to make use of the educational benefits that were available to them under two previous GI bills. As of June 30, 1966, there were approximately 19,484,000 World War II and Korean veterans in civil life. Little more than 10 million of that number had reecived any educational benefits under the two GI bills. The deadline for obtaining these benefits has long since expired.

There are undoubtedly a variety of reasons for the failure of approximately 9 million veterans to utilize educational benefits which a grateful Government had made available to them. Correspondence I have received seems to indicate that the returning citizen-soldier had successfully completed the transition from military to civil life without the necessity of drawing upon this readjustment benefit. Now, many of these same veterans have realized, to their dismay, that automation, relocation of entire industries, advancing age, and other reasons have sounded the death knell of the employment security they once enjoyed.

These men, in short, require retraining, whether it be a program of education or on-the-job training, to qualify them for employment in a new field of endeavor. It is my carefully considered opinion that this problem can be solved by once again making the educational benefits of the GI bill available to them. I have, therefore, introduced a bill that will restore unused periods of entitlement to educational assistance to veterans of World War II and the Korean conflict. I hope that this legislation will receive prompt and favorable consideration by this 90th Congress.

College Work-Study Program Deserves Federal Support

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD M. FRASER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 2, 1967

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, as the author of an identical bill, I urge the passage of H.R. 11945, a bill to set the contribution of the Federal Government to the college work-study program until August 21, 1969, at 85 percent.

Since enactment of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, the U.S. Government has provided 90 percent of the funds for the college work-study program. The program is an outstanding success. In my State, in fiscal 1967, 4,457 students received $3,144,475 in aid.

Without new legislation the Federal Government's contribution will drop to 75 percent and the success of the program will be seriously threatened.

I think a review of the program at the University of Minnesota reveals the danger now faced. In June 1966, at the University of Minnesota, 494 students were employed by 115 offices and agencies. But this year, with the reduction in the Federal contribution from 90 percent to 75 percent scheduled to take effect in August, the same number of students are placed at 187 offices and agencies.

Two problems are revealed. First, administrative costs are soaring. The average number of students per "job site" decreased from 3.8 to 2.6. For the institution which seriously attempts to supervise work projects, the increase in number of job sites dictates fewer contacts and less time given to student assistance.

The work-study program at the University of Minnesota is beginning to encourage more "low-income" students to enroll. They must receive adequate counseling and require job supervision during the early weeks of employment. It is clear that an increased number of job sites will preclude this close relationship.

Second, the threat of the increase in the employer's share to 25 percent has already resulted in employer's accepting an average of 35 percent fewer students per employer. Thus far, at the University of Minnesota, student-aid officers have succeeded in maintaining the number of students by increasing the number of job sites, but the saturation point is near.

The size of our student bodies is growing—the number of jobs must not remain constant but grow with equal rapidity. Young people who previously found the expense of higher education prohibitive have been told that the opportunities are now here.

We must not frustrate their hopes.

Forward-Looking Republicans Support Reorganization Plan No. 3

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 25, 1967

Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, since the question of approving Reorganization Plan No. 3 will be before the House this week, I would like to call attention to the reasoned, responsible endorsement of this plan which was made last month by the Committee for Forward-Looking Republicans.

This committee, chaired by Mr. Edward Burling, Jr., includes many prominent Washingtonians who have taken active roles in improving the District of Columbia and have demonstrated their interest in strengthening District of Columbia government. In many individual cases, support for this plan is based on long experience with the present commission form of government and on close acquaintance with the defects inherent in this 93-year-old system.

In a letter to our colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK], the committee concluded:

> The Reorganization Plan is a sound and significant step forward in bringing modern, effective and efficient government to the District of Columbia.

They further stated:

> The commission form of government is outdated, outmoded, and cannot do the job.

The committee cited a very pertinent observation made in 1948 by the House District of Columbia Committee, then chaired by the Honorable EVERETT M. DIRKSEN. I quote from that report:

> The present organic law, passed in 1878, . . . represents a crazy-quilt pattern poorly suited to the requirements of modern municipal government. . . . There is no clear separation of legislative and executive functions which students of municipal government consider essential.

Mr. Speaker, the need for reform is even more evident and urgent now than it was 19 years ago. Although Reorganization Plan No. 3 should be supplemented by legislation, primarily to provide for local election of some officials, the plan would make significant and constructive changes in the basic structure of government in the Nation's Capital.

I urge all Members to read Mr. Burling's thoughtful and persuasive letter, and insert it in the RECORD at this point, with a list of the officers and advisory board of the Committee for Forward-Looking Republicans:

COMMITTEE FOR
FORWARD-LOOKING REPUBLICANS,
Washington, D.C., July 10, 1967.

Hon. JOHN A. BLATNIK,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Executive and Legislative Reorganization, Committee on Government Operations, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BLATNIK: The D.C. Committee for Forward Looking Republicans was organized in the summer of 1964 as a medium through which financial assistance could be given to support the candidacies of moderate Republicans running for public office, principally for the United States Senate and House of Representatives, to help rebuild the local Republican organization and to support the cause of good government in the District of Columbia. The Committee has continued to function actively since its organization and we believe that our efforts have been effective in many instances.

We have carefully reviewed the issues which have been raised and discussed with respect to Reorganization Plan No. 3. Our analysis leads us to conclude that the Reorganization Plan is a sound and significant step forward in bringing modern, effective and efficient government to the District of Columbia. We respectfully urge the members of the Congress—and particularly those of our great Republican Party—to support this important move for better local government.

The District of Columbia is the home of some 800,000 citizens. Within the area of the District we find most of the same problems and potential as are found in other large American cities. The Chamber of Commerce of the United States, in its publication, "Modernizing Local Government," recently pointed up the problems facing urban America: Cities choked with traffic; millions of substandard dwellings; rising crime and delinquency rates; widespread social unrest; an environment becoming steadily more polluted; vast deteriorating commercial areas.

We know these problems are found to varying degrees in Washington. The Chamber stressed that, "unless local government is revitalized, our political and economic systems, as we know them, will have little chance to solve public problems effectively. Governments of yesteryear must be remodeled to fit not only today's but tomorrow's needs."

The actions to be taken under the Reorganization Plan are necessary to remodel the District's government to meet the needs of today and tomorrow. The existing structure of the District government is a vestige of yesteryear, designed to meet the conditions of the mid-1870's.

If Washington, like other large American cities, is to rise to its challenges—to fulfill its mission as the Capital of this Nation—it must have strong executive leadership. A three-headed executive is by its very nature conducive to delay and confusion. District agencies are divided among the Commissioners for executive leadership. This compartmentalization is destructive and self-defeating. No private business would willingly accept such a plan of organization. Local and Federal resources are wasted because three Commissioners are unable to give unified direction and to require coordination of activities cutting across traditional lines.

These infirmities of the District's form of government were pointed out in a Report on District of Columbia Affairs submitted to the Congress as long ago as 1908 by President Theodore Roosevelt, who stated that "a single head in place of three Commissioners . . . (will) . . . increase efficiency, determine responsibility, and eliminate delays and uncertainties inevitable under the present system . . ."

In 1948 the House Committee on the District of Columbia, Chaired by then Congressman Everett M. Dirksen, announced similar conclusions in adopting a proposal both for Home Rule and for reorganization of the District government. Among other defects of the Commission form of government the Committee pointed out that:

"The present organic law, passed in 1878, . . . represents a crazy-quilt pattern poorly suited to the requirements of modern municipal government. . . . There is no clear separation of legislative and executive functions which students of municipal government consider essential."

The Reorganization Plan will remedy these deficiencies. It creates the position of a single Commissioner who will be directly responsible to the President and the Congress for the effective administration of the District. The heads of District agencies, too, will have a clear focus of responsibility. Each will report to the same top man. The result of this organization change should be quicker, clearer decisions plus more effective administration.

The Commission form of government is no longer satisfactory for large, complex cities such as Washington. This is shown not only by the difficulties created by its continuing use here in Washington, but by its declining use throughout the Nation. Today none of the Nation's largest 27 cities, except Washington, still operates under this form of government. If the commission structure were an effective means of governing our large cities, surely the trend would have been slowed or reversed. We must conclude that many years of American experience, under many different political, economic, and social conditions, have led to a fundamental conclusion—the commission form of government is outdated, outmoded, and cannot do the job. There is no reason why the Nation's Capital, alone among the Nation's cities, should be hobbled by a system established in 1874 when the scope of responsibilities of city government was entirely different than it is today.

While there has been some criticism of elements of the plan, we believe these criticisms are not valid. Whatever substance they may have does not outweigh the value of the plan for good government in the District.

For example, criticism has been leveled at an important provision of the plan which gives the single Commissioner authority to organize the subordinate agencies of the District government. In our judgment this is vital if the District is to be organized to carry out present and future programs with economy and efficiency. This authority is no different from that which Congress has given to practically all of the heads of Cabinet Departments and to the heads of important independent agencies. It carries out one of the important recommendations of the Hoover Commission for better government.

Last year, for example, in creating the Department of Transportation, Congress gave to the Secretary of Transportation essentially similar authority to reorganize subordinate units of the agency. The year before the Congress gave the Secretary of HUD this basic reorganization authority. The power to group functions and activities for effective results is central to making District government a responsive instrument for civic progress. Congress, of course, retains full power to terminate this authority in whole or to reverse or revise individual actions by the Commissioner.

Another objection which has been made is that somehow the powers delegated to the Council under the plan will involve the Council in controversy and perhaps trespass over the line into the area reserved for the Congress. We do not see how this could happen any more under the plan than is now the case.

The Council is given only such quasi-legislative authority as is now vested in the three Commissioners—no more. There is no substantive change in the authority delegated by the Congress. Congress retains for itself the full responsibility to enact all legislation affecting the District appropriate funds, and make its budgets.

Indeed, in accordance with the best of counsel of students of municipal government, the plan separates these quasi-legislative functions assigned to the Council from the executive functions lodged with the Commissioner. Therefore, the plan should measurably reduce the chance for confusion.

We have considered these and other objections to the plan. They offer no ground for changing our opinion that the plan offers the best immediate step for bringing better government to the District. If it appears that further changes are needed, or indeed that elements of the plan can be improved, there is no bar to having Congress legislate directly on these points. In the meantime, the problems of the District increase. Prompt action is needed to insure that progress can be made to make the city one in which its residents will be proud to live and which all Americans will be pleased to visit.

Respectfully submitted.

EDWARD BURLING, Jr.,
Chairman.

OFFICERS AND ADVISORY BOARD OF THE COMMITTEE FOR FORWARD-LOOKING REPUBLICANS

OFFICERS

Edward Burling, Jr., Chairman; Mark Sullivan, Jr., Vice Chairman; Henry S. Robinson, Jr., M.D., Chairman, Executive Committee; Norman O. Jarvis, Philip H. Watts, Special Assistants to the Chairman; Samuel Biddle, Secretary-Treasurer; Ted Newman, General Counsel; Curtis B. Munson, Chairman, Membership Committee; Mrs. Neill Phillips, Chairman, Finance Committee; John A. Nevius, Chairman, Program Committee; Mrs. Kay Hanson, Chairman, Public Relations.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

The above officers plus the following: Charles K. Brown, Mrs. Mark H. Cornell, Arthur P. Hartel, George E. C. Hayes, Henry Lincoln Johnson, Barrington D. Parker, Peter R. Taft.

ADVISORY BOARD

Miss Sara Altherr, Richard Aurelio, Captain and Mrs. Peter Betin, Mrs. Raymond Cox, Mrs. Bertha Dahm, Julian R. Dugas, Charles Fisher, Rev. J. L. S. Holloman, Mrs. Katherine McCook Knox, Mrs. Constance McGregor, Rev. Jerry A. Moore, Mrs. John H. Morrison, Gerson Nordlinger, Jr., Courts Oulahan, David Peacock, Craig Peper, Mrs. M. Marie Rogers, Nelson Roots, Charles Stone, Mrs. L. Corrin Strong, Mrs. Mark Sullivan, Jr., Mrs. Ida Taylor, Robert H. Thayer, Henry Willard, J. Franklin Wilson.

Kerner for High Court

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 26, 1967

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the very highly respected and distinguished Rockford Star, which was founded in 1888 and has since guided the destiny of a large segment of Illinois, published an excellent editorial in its August 6 edition which I take the liberty of calling to the attention of my colleagues.

It is a source of great pride to me and I am sure to Governor Kerner that the Rockford Star expresses so high an opinion of the man whom President Johnson has selected to head the special Presidential Commission investigating urban rioting. I am certain the editorial fortifies the President in his wise selection of Governor Kerner for this difficult assignment.

The Rockford Star editorial—with which I thoroughly agree—follows. Mr. William K. Todd, publisher and editor of the Rockford Star, deserves highest commendation for his wise counsel.

KERNER FOR HIGH COURT

President Johnson should appoint Illinois Governor Otto Kerner to the next vacancy on the United States Supreme Court.

President Johnson's recent appointment of Governor Kerner to the chairmanship of the presidential commission investigating urban rioting focuses nationwide attention upon our two-term governor—a man possessed of eminent credentials.

Governor Kerner's appointment would be the best to the Supreme Court President Johnson has made since he took office.

There's no question about Kerner's judicial temperament, and he's a "political moderate" who has managed to resist Democratic machine bossism.

President Johnson certainly must have been aware of our governor's judicial qualifications—and rightly so—when he named him to head up the anti-riot commission—described by the President as a "very critical assignment" hopefully seeking to avert continued anarchy in America's cities.

The President assigned Governor Kerner a "task that is as profound as the ideal of democracy itself"—that of finding a solution to the civil riots which have been sweeping through city after city.

Kerner has a long record of efforts to achieve civil rights legislation—in an orderly manner—and pioneered crowd-control training while serving as a top-ranking officer in the Illinois National Guard.

As governor he has not been reluctant to support law enforcement in Illinois. Last summer, and the summer before, he called out the Illinois National Guard without delay to quell disturbances in Chicago. A week ago he sent guardsmen to Cairo, Ill. He has fought equally hard for open housing legislation and has sought to combat discrimination and poverty.

Earlier, he demonstrated ability to be firm and impartial as United States attorney for Northern Illinois, and later as a Cook County judge. In World War II, Otto Kerner had a distinguished record overseas, and then continued service with the Illinois National Guard, retiring in 1946 as a major general.

The presidential commission Governor Kerner heads has set about the business of probing urban strife. We have every confidence the commission will come up with meaningful success under his leadership.

When The Morning Star recommended Otto Kerner for governor of Illinois Aug. 21, 1960, we said:

"The Morning Star likes the record, the character, the preparation of Otto Kerner, the Democratic gubernatorial candidate. It will support his candidacy.

"This declaration is not made lightly by a newspaper which has consistently supported Repblican candidates over many decades . . .

"He has had an honorable career as a soldier, lawyer, jurist, humanitarian civic leader. He has been a leader in constitutional reform affecting the entire state.

"We feel he will be a governor for all the state."

We reiterate these same words today in proposing that President Johnson—at the first opportunity—appoint Governor Kerner as a justice of the United States Supreme Court.

Governor Kerner has served Illinois well. But we believe his judicial talent, deliberate manner, thoughtful philosophy and wealth of public service experience can serve our whole nation—not just Illinois—on the Supreme Court bench.

Without Firing a Shot

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE SKUBITZ

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 3, 1967

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, the Enterprise-Chronicle newspaper, in Burlingame, Kans., has survived and grown through 100 years of newspaperdom—it rightfully enjoys the respect of Kansans who read it. It has been a voice of the people. It is, therefore, quite pertinent and proper that I bring to the attention of my colleagues the editorial from the Enterprise-Chronicle of Thursday, July 27, appropriately titled, "Without Firing a Shot." If we are as interested in the views of the people as we profess to be, as our very title of "representative" suggests, then each of us should value from the following thoughts on the disturbing trend of riots in this country coupled with editor Wallace Emmon's comments on the resulting ineffective reactions from this Government. I commend this editorial to the attention of my colleagues:

WITHOUT FIRING A SHOT

Only the communists can enjoy "the long, hot summer" which is being brought about after threats of Negro violence leaders. There have been some "whities" killed along with the Black Power advocates but the greatest degradation lies with the inactivity of the administration, congress and the courts.

It was hard to understand that the Negro population would destroy their own areas, no matter how meager but the Detroit riots suffered downtown destruction until operating city businesses should be more apprehensive than ever in considering employment from their ranks.

Two factors of Negro violence make it a national problem. One is the decision of the administration to support the Negro "cause" which was backed by congress and the courts; the other is that the same three branches of federal government sit idly by and make no move to correct their mistakes.

Not all Negroes agree that violence is the way to "win friends and influence people." By Black Power methods, those leaders would take or destroy. The "non-violent" black leadership follows the practice of "the great lie" mouthing words of false friendship while encouraging individuals to revolt.

There is nothing American about street rioting. The nation prospered by substituting ballots for bullets. No other race coming to these shores has resorted to violence and they have received the same earned blessings as those who came before them. America has had no patron saint born of violence but the mixture of backgrounds gave strength in an abundant land.

The Negro race came a long way up from its tribal ways over the rocky road of slavery and subsequent period of adjustment as free individuals. But those who were left behind have done no better and those of Africa would no more trade places with those of the U.S. than the American Negroes want to go to Africa. If this fact can be accepted, it is the first step toward becoming first class citizens.

Jurisprudence erred in framing laws for specified classes. Ignoring the error does not make the problem go away. More "civil rights" legislation will magnify rather than diminish the clash of racial dissension. The forms of subservience take many shapes and turning one race upon another reverts to the axiom that "might makes right."

Black Power advocates ask a separation of the races but the request is based on an "or-else" basis. This is not the feeling of the whole Negro race—nor is the request in democratic form. Method, in this instance, is secondary to training and that training comes from the foreign source that has publicly said "We'll bury you."

Rioting must stop. If it cannot be controlled by Negroes themselves then it should be controlled by legislation with justifiable penalties. If that is not brought about, a clash is unavoidable—exactly as atheist communism would like—without firing a shot.

Peace Corps Achieves Early Success in Micronesia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 3, 1967

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, Mr. John Pincetich, Peace Corps Director in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, presented a 1st-year report on Peace Corps activities there to the Congress of Micronesia on July 19, 1967.

Despite the seemingly insurmountable problems faced a year ago, Mr. Pincetich reported remarkable success by the Peace Corps volunteers who were given assignments in the Trust Territory. During its 1st year of commitment in Micronesia, the Peace Corps has, among other things, completed an important public health census, accelerated and improved the teaching of English as a second language, worked on community development projects, helped establish new periodicals, and engaged in important youth work projects.

As always, I am impressed by the dedication and sincerity of purpose of our Peace Corps volunteers, and I think their outstanding work in Micronesia is worthy of the attention of the Members of the House. I am therefore pleased to submit for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a summary of Mr. Pincetich's report on the success of Peace Corps activities in Micronesia, as it appeared in the July 26, 1967, issue of the Honolulu Star-Bulletin:

A YEAR AFTER COMMITMENT—PEACE CORPS SUCCESS IN MICRONESIA CITED

A year after it was committed to Micronesia, the Peace Corps has 445 volunteers located on 80 of the 97 inhabited islands and 175 more volunteers in training on the island of Udot in Truk Lagoon.

Further, says John Pincetich, Peace Corps director for Micronesia, most of the foreseen difficulties facing the corps have not materialized.

In a speech to the Congress of Micronesia on Saipan last week, Pincetich, formerly of Honolulu, made these points:

"We heard there wasn't enough available housing in the villages, especially in the district centers. We would have to build.

"We were also told that Micronesian families would not welcome volunteers to share their homes.

"In the Marianas, Palau, Truk and Ponape today, volunteers are living in houses provided them by the community, renting existing houses within the community or living with families. Some construction was necessary in Yap and the Marshalls, but these houses are being turned over to local families as other volunteer arrangements are made.

"We are told that young Americans could not live adequately on our proposed living allowance. On Saipan, for example, it was said volunteers would require up to $200 per month to maintain a subsistence level of living.

"Our 45 Saipan Volunteers are now maintaining adequate health and living standards on their $80 monthly allowance. Where rent is required, an additional $10 per month is supplied.

"We were told that logistics would make it practically impossible to assign volunteers and install radios on many remote islands.

"Today, volunteers are serving on more than 80 of the 97 inhabited islands in Micronesia; each has at least access to a nearby radio.

"We were told that the variety of languages spoken in Micronesia and the absence of published languages materials would make it impossible to teach all languages effectively in a three-month period.

"Nine different languages were taught in the first training programs; materials were created, langauge informants were sent to the training sites. Depending on his assignment and language ability, every volunteer has some language proficiency, ranging from a working knowledge to fluency.

"So Peace Corps volunteers in Micronesia are doing just what Ross Pritchard said they would a year ago; they're living in local communities, on a comparable standard, speaking local languages and eating local foods.

"All this just didn't happen. Many people in many ways, large and small, in and out of government, officially and unofficially, helped. There is one other factor: Peace Corps in Micronesia has proved to be an idea whose time had come."

HEALTH CENSUS

Pincetich said the Peace Corps in its first year has completed an important public health census, accelerated and improved teaching on English as a second language, helped clean up Palau after the typhoon, worked on community development projects, helped establish new periodicals, pitched in a community radio stations and engaged in important youth work projects.

He said the Peace Corps has spent about $1.8 million in Micronesia so far, used a number of Micronesians on its staff, and now is seeking to enrich and improve programs already begun.

Programs now in preparation aim at increasing copra production by 50 percent in three years, and an evaluation of the long-range economic potential of fishing for Micronesia.

VOLUNTEERS' FUTURE

In closing his report to the Congress, Pincetich commented:

"Finally, in viewing volunteers' role for the future, it is important, as noted earlier, to understand the power of their presence. It goes beyond skills, whether they be strong or minimal. It is the essence of their youth: vision, dedication, impatience, sincerity of purpose.

"That presence cannot help but make an impact on Micronesia's youth. And as we look to the future of Micronesia, it is for the generations represented in this Congress to be the architects, but the youth of Micronesia—the generations to come—will be the builders.

"It is in them that must be instilled, more deeply, the qualities that will make for solid nationhood. And it is here that the power of the presence of Peace Corps volunteers may have its greatest impact in the years ahead."

High Court and the Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LARRY WINN, JR.

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1967

Mr. WINN. Mr. Speaker, one of the functions of a government is to lend stability to a society. This function is so important that any government which does not perform this task, can be said to be no government at all. An editorial in the Ottawa Herald recently, points out that the U.S. Supreme Court, due to some of its recent decisions, has given rise to a situation of instability in our Nation's court system.

I insert here that editorial and commend it to my colleagues' attention:

HIGH COURT AND THE LAW

Recently a retired legislator and district judge who is now 84 years old had this to say about returning to the practice of law:

"You advise a client about something that is very important to him, and then the next week the Supreme Court hands down a decision that changes the whole law. I wouldn't know how to tell a client anything that would be worth a damn."

This week at the University of Kansas, an assistant U.S. attorney told Kansas policemen that recent U.S. Supreme Court decisions have invalidated training officers have received as recently as three years ago.

He went on to point out that recent high court decisions have "put the defense lawyer right into the police station." What he was referring to were decisions which state that as soon as a person is restrained—arrested—he must be informed of his rights, that he can remain silent, that he can't be questioned if he doesn't want to be, that he has the right to immediate presence of a lawyer.

Most officers are aware of recent decisions, and confused by them. They have found it has made their jobs extremely difficult when it comes to solving crime.

Too, most criminals are also acutely aware of the recent decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court and rules laid down for protection of the individual.

The upshot is the burdens of proof have become almost overbearing for those charged with solving of crimes. Those committing crimes now hide behind the court decisions and laugh at the law and the officers who are supposed to enforce it.

It is no wonder that disrespect for the law is becoming flagrant in this country, that Americans are rioting against authority.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Code of Laws of the United States

Title 44, Section 181. Congressional Record; arrangement, style, contents, and indexes.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the Congressional Record, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the Congressional Record semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

Title 44, Section 182b. Same; illustrations, maps, diagrams.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the Record without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the Congressional Record the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily Record as follows: the Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided,* That the makeup of the Record shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the Congressional Record, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the Record shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the Record issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the Record for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the Record of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the Record shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the Record style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the Record.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the Congressional Record any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent Record is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the Congressional Record the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the Congressional Record.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the Congressional Record shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the Official Reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the Official Reporters of the respective Houses.

The Official Reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the Official Reporters in the next issue of the Congressional Record, nor to Records printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the Congressional Record by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the Congressional Record which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402, at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided,* That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the Congressional Record, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H–112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the Record at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the Record should be processed through this office.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates Printing Office, that their addresses may be who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government correctly given in the Record.

Appendix

Ninth District YD Runner-Up in State Speech Contest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 8, 1967

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, each year the Indiana Young Democrats sponsor an oratorical contest as part of the activities at their State convention. This year David Elder, one of the outstanding Young Democrats from the Ninth Congressional District, was first runner-up in the contest. In his excellent speech, David discusses the dilemma of the young person under 21 years of age who is asked to assume adult responsibilities but is not entitled to the legal status of an adult.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the text of his speech, "Wait To Be an Adult."

WAIT TO BE AN ADULT!

(By David Elder)

A young man was marching along with his rifle in his arms following the slow but steady pace with the rest of his countrymen who shared the duties of being a soldier with him. He was thinking about the freedom for which he was helping to fight for in this small country. Born in the country and raised on his father's farm in the foothills of Virginia, Thomas Blackstone had never been this far from home before.

He was glad he was a soldier because this was the only thing he could do as an adult. Because he was not 21, he could do very little else. Thomas Blackstone had faith in his country's political and military leaders for they were all doing their best and so was he. Thomas knew or cared little for world affairs, right now he was concerned about the coming battle tomorrow. They were hoping for a victory at Yorktown, that September in 1781.

The political leaders of Thomas' day copied from England the legal status for the population at 21. England made this decision in the middle 50's in the 13th century in the signing of the Magna Carta. In the past centuries, 21 was a good age for maturity. Today, 35 is also a good age of maturity for this population. But Thomas Blackstone and his age group *waited in order to be an adult*.

During the next two hundred years there was no reason to change this 13th century idea, even though everything else did! You had to show ownership, trust, responsible thinking, and much more in order *to be an adult*. I'm sure we all know of some 30-year old juveniles right now. Yet those who are mature and are under 21, yet fit in the categories of trusting, responsible, level-headed must *wait to be an adult*.

Compared to the frontier days where one day was completely different from the next and most settlers only lived from one to the next, today the population also lives from this day to tomorrow. Only we experience today in order to survive the tomorrow. In the preparation for today and living it through helps us over the hurdles of tomorrow's problems.

It is for our benefit that the 18 year old knows more than his father and grandfather when they were his age. This is because of the fulfillment of someone's vision for better education, capable government agencies, better transportation, and communication and the same ole' personal urge to move ahead. True, not everyone takes advantage of these services. But in comparison to the previous generation's acceptance to these advantages with the present generation, the ratio is about the same. For those who had the desire to move forward soon lost their burning flame for their cause when they had to *wait to become an adult*.

Today's society expects this 18 to 21 year old group to grow up. Sooner than the present society was expected to do the same. Father and grandfather today were not rushed into being an adult, but often slowed down. Does it seem fair that an age group is expected to behave like an adult when they cannot function as one.

England, one of the conservative countries in the world, is now investigating the possibilities of not only lowering the voting age to 18, but to lower the adult requirements in order to get a larger amount of adult population which are indeed more responsible. Among a lower voting age, is the right to sue another and to be sued, to be married without parental consent after 18, to own property, and of course to be taxed.

If we are looking into the future for this age group to develop the caliber of leader we need in the future to keep our country running efficiently then do not give this age group a lower voting age by itself. What does a vote mean when parents are responsible for them in a court of law, in a wedding ceremony, and on a loan application at a bank, when they are still under 21.

This age group will soon be given this country to run. Three more years of responsibility and experience will not hurt them in their search for the means of accomplishing this country's goals abroad and at home.

For more proven adults earlier in life, our legislative bodies must not draw the line of accomplishment at a lower voting age. Earlier responsibility leads to quicker maturity. Imagine how much we, as young adults, could have done if had three years more experience behind us. Yet we had to *wait to be an adult*.

This should be a reality for the coming generation very soon. For if they can marry, own real property, sue others for damages, and be sued by others, they will grow more and probably in less time than it took for us. And when that time does come for their complete acceptance of control, more will be ready to shoulder that great responsibility.

I wonder why they must wait to be an adult, when they are expected to act grown up, to die in battles, pay taxes, make a good home and living for their own families. Lowering the voting age is a step in the right direction. But not the first and last step to take. Because we demand for them to grow up sooner than other generations, then the full load of adulthood should be theirs. But until we realize that our children will make this country safe for our grandchildren and we give them the opportunity to grow when the age for this vital learning and experiencing is the best, they must *wait to become an adult*.

Detroit Meets the Challenge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT P. GRIFFIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 8, 1967

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, with selfless, determined teamwork, the people of Detroit are rapidly putting a great city back on its feet. Typical of the spirit which pervades Detroit in the postriot period are the thoughts expressed in an editorial entitled "Detroit's Business Community Faces Its Greatest Challenge," published in the Detroiter, a publication of the Greater Detroit Board of Commerce, on July 31. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DETROIT'S BUSINESS COMMUNITY FACES ITS GREATEST CHALLENGE

They laid it on the line—some with their lives. All Detroit expresses it deep gratitude to its indomitable policemen and fire-fighters, who have risked their lives consistently above and beyond the call of duty during Detroit's agony these past several days.

Your Greater Detroit Board of Commerce, representing commerce and industry in this area, acknowledges its indebtedness to these brave and determined men.

Doctors, nurses, technicians and hospital personel in all of Detroit's hospitals also deserve the highest commendation for their unstinting efforts in tending to thousands of injured and maimed—most of them innocent victims of this terrible and senseless tragedy.

No less commendable has been the unstinting efforts of our private utilities who have so magnificently kept the lifeblood of electricity, gas and telephone services available to this great city despite untold damage in the riot-torn areas—where even at the height of the destruction, their crews were doing everything possible to restore service in those areas.

And the cooperative efforts of 35 communities who volunteered their fire-fighters to aid Detroit's beleaguered and over-taxed fire department deserve special mention.

Much credit must be given to the vast majority of Negroes who, residing in or out of the beleaguered areas of our city, deplored the actions of the small minority of lawless whites and Negroes who went on a rampage of destruction.

Statistics about this tragic event will be gathered, collated, added, analyzed, published, quoted and commented upon for years to come.

But the real story does not lie hidden in the statistics no matter how often they will be reviewed, analyzed or quoted.

Statistics will define, in a measure, only the huge economic loss caused by the holocaust. They will not, however, even begin to measure the heartbreak that has resulted.

What is the damage done to the spirit of this once proud city? What damage has been done to the painstaking efforts of its leaders, black and white, who had taken and are taking important steps toward meeting the needs of our disadvantaged? What damage to those who believed that there was excellent communication only to discover shockingly and brutally that no dialogue short of force was possible with those lawless elements that were bent on looting, shooting and arson?

Ironically—the editorial in last week's Detroiter hailed the leadership with which our community is blessed. Today—all of the community's leaders are suffering from shock and disbelief over the great tragedy that has struck our community. This adversity, however, will serve only to re-emphasize the great dimensions of the problems, strengthen their resolve, and galvanize them to even greater efforts.

All of the human understanding, the great heart, compassion and the talents and resources of our community must be mobilized to this end—that all of our people must be brought into the mainstream of community life.

To do this, we must mobilize this talent and our resources to tackle the most immediate problems.

Already hard at work in the area of food distribution, so grievously crippled in the affected areas, is our Food Industry Council to assure our community of adequate supplies and to restore as quickly as possible—food distribution in the devastated areas.

In the economic rehabilitation of these areas—your Board of Commerce is prepared to work with and assist those agencies of government and business to bring the prostrated areas back to life.

Your Board of Commerce is marshalling its considerable resources to be the catalyst for their reconstruction.

With the exception of the loss of their homes, the greatest loss to many Detroiters in the ravaged areas will come from the loss of jobs which disappeared in the looting and arson of those establishments in which many of them were employed.

While finding employment for those rendered jobless through no fault of their own presents a sizable challenge—this is only a small measure of the overall employment problem presented by the disadvantaged.

Jobs will require the complete and undivided attention of the entire community. There is no better or quicker way to bring the disadvantaged into the main stream of community life than through jobs.

This means that your Board's programs already underway must be stepped up in size, scope and rate. It means pinpointing the disadvantaged, getting to them, motivating them to become trainable if this is required; to move those with skills into employment, and to motivate them to remain in employment. In short—to show them there is a way to join the mainstream—to be a part of their community.

This will require the concerted effort and aid of all Detroit area commerce and industry which, after all, is the main source of jobs. This requires recognition on the part of all commerce and industry that they have a vital stake in the success of this effort—as events of the past several days so dramatically and tragically emphasize.

Many of you will be called upon in the days ahead to give of your talents and efforts in this most important undertaking.

There is no other organization more admirably suited than your Board of Commerce to act as the catalyst and the organizational center around which these very necessary programs must be developed to tackle these most pressing problems.

We count on your aid to mobilize Detroit's best leadership and vast resources for action—action that will point out in no uncertain terms that Detroit, though its nose is bloodied, has not faltered but instead is moving steadfastly toward those high goals which it has set for itself.

Short of all-out war, this is the greatest challenge Detroit's leadership has ever been called on to face. There is no question that it will meet it head on—and successfully!

Tax Increases Not for Tax-Free Foundations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 8, 1967

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, could it be that the reported income tax increase against our people would not be necessary if the wealth accumulated in the special-interest foundations were taxed?

Why should our wage earners and workers be taxed to take easy money out of circulation when the foundations—free of taxes—are at liberty to dump their money into our economy at their will and pleasure and for their special purpose?

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include the release from the August 3 Evening Star on the Johnson City Foundation in the RECORD:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Aug. 3, 1967]

JOHNSON CITY FOUNDATION'S ASSETS MOUNT TO $643,000

(By Robert Walters)

The tax-exempt charitable foundation established in 1957 by President Johnson and his wife now is worth more than $643,000, according to reports on file with the Internal Revenue Service.

During the fiscal year ended June 30, 1966, the latest period for which records are available, the foundation's assets increased by $123,266. During that same year, its contributions to charitable causes totalled $18,124.

Known as the Lyndon B. Johnson Foundation prior to a 1961 change of name, it now is called the Johnson City Foundation. The figures for its fiscal 1966 operations come from the portion of its tax return which must be available for public inspection under federal law.

The law does not require disclosure of the names of those who support any foundation, but the Foundation Directory, the principal reference book in the field, lists the donors to the Johnson City Foundation as "Mr. and Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson."

PATMAN CRITICISM CITED

Because it has consistently taken in far more money than it has distributed during recent years, the President's foundation has placed itself in the category of foundations sharply criticized by a fellow Texan, Rep. Wright Patman, D-Tex.

Patman, as chairman of the foundation subcommittee of the House Select Small Business Committee, has issued annual reports criticizing the funnelling of money into tax-exempt foundations by individuals seeking to avoid payment of taxes on their income.

The Johnson City Foundation was established 11 years ago through a $100 contribution from Johnson and his wife. Until three years ago, it regularly listed the source of its income for public inspection.

Those reports showed that virtually all the income came from Johnson of the LBJ Co., of Austin, Tex., the firm controlled by the President's family which holds an interest in Texas radio and television properties.

By mid-1962, the foundation had assets valued at $227,789. One year later, the assets totaleld $317,330. The latest report shows assets of $643,553—more than double the 1963 figure.

The foundation's stated purpose is to "accept and disburse gifts for charitable, scientific, literary, religious and educational purposes."

During the last four years, however, its donations to other groups have ranged from $7,921, in fiscal 1963, to $18,124, reported in the most recent tax return.

At the end of the latest reporting period, most of the Johnson City Foundation's assets were invested in corporate stocks. The total in that category was $458,429.

OIL AND LAND INTERESTS

The second largest asset of the Johnson City Foundation in mid-1966 was a "royalty interest" investment in oil-producing properties located near Houston and valued at $95,616.

The foundation also reported holding "land and improvements" valued at $63,729. Although no explanation is offered for that item, it was disclosed in 1965 that the foundation had embarked on a program of acquiring and restoring three Texas homes associated with the President.

They are his boyhood home in Johnson City, his birthplace on the banks of the Pedernales River and a ranch once owned by the President's grandfather, Sam Ealy Johnson Sr.

TWO 1966 CONTRIBUTIONS

Two of the largest donations made in fiscal 1966 by the foundation went to a pair of religious institutions—$5,475 to St. Marks Episcopal Church and $4,000 to the First Christian Church of Johnson City.

The Southwest Texas Educational Television Council received $5,000 and the "Johnson City Courthouse" was listed as the recipient of $3,499.

However, officials at the Blanco County Courthouse, located in Johnson City, said they did not have any knowledge of receiving a contribution from the foundation.

The University of Texas received $500 and the Austin Symphony Orchestra was the recipient of $50 from the foundation. Donations of $100 were made to each of these groups:

Beth Brown Memorial Foundation, Harrison County Historical Society, Texas Fine Arts Association, University of Texas Ex-Students Association, Austin Equal Citizenship Corporation and the Settlement Club of Austin.

New Policies or New Leaders?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN T. SCHNEEBELI

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 8, 1967

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, in his editorial comment in the New York Times on Sunday, August 6, James Reston again reflects accurately the problems and frustrations confronting the American public. His analysis, which follows, is so comprehensive and realistic that it needs no further amplification:

NEW POLICIES OR NEW LEADERS?

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, August 5.—A nation is in trouble when its people feel helpless to deal with their major problems and do not know what to trust. This is the basis of our present bewilderment. The majority of our people are not indifferent to the crises of the cities and Vietnam, but in their personal lives, the vast majority of them are isolated from the riots in the cities and the casualties in Vietnam, and have left these agonies to distracted officials in whom they have little faith.

This is our present dilemma: the people cannot very well develop a strategy for the rebellion at home or the war abroad. Everybody can have an opinion but nobody can prove beyond reasonable doubt that he has the answer. Therefore, there must be faith, and this, for the present, is what we do not have—neither faith in our common purposes, nor in our old religious and philosophic institutions, nor in our present policies, nor in the men who are making or administering them.

EUROPE AND AMERICA

There is no escape from this in the pessimistic conclusion that the problem of ignorance, unemployment, and degradation in the American cities is beyond control. Other advanced industrial nations, much poorer than the United States, have made much greater progress with the urban challenge than we have.

"The teeming, disorganized life of impoverished slums," Daniel P. Moynihan of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology observes, "has all but disappeared among the North Atlantic democracies—save only the United States. It requires some intrepidness to declare this to be a fact, as no systematic inquiry has been made which would provide completely dependable comparisons, but it can be said with fair assurance that mass poverty and squalor, of the kind that may be encountered in almost any large American city, simply cannot be found in comparable cities in Europe, or Canada, or Japan."

THE PARADOX

Nor is it helpful to condemn everything that has been done in the United States. The fact is that this Negro revolution in America is taking place at a time of steadily improving Negro living standards, education, employment, health, and rising public services in general. In the early stages, revolution feeds on itself. The Negroes are the same as the whites in this. The more they are given, the more they demand, to the point of equality—it happened in the American Revolution, the Russian, the French, the Indian, and it is happening today with Walter Reuther's United Automobile Workers, who are making more money in less hours than they thought possible in the thirties, but will probably strike in the autumn anyway for a guaranteed annual wage and other benefits.

The unsolved problem, obvious for a very long time, which Lyndon Johnson will not face and which the people intuitively understand or seem to understand, is the problem of priority. It is true that the United States can spend more money on the cities and on Vietnam this year than last year, but it is not true that it can deal effectively with the war in Vietnam, the problem of the cities, the flight to the moon, the health, education and welfare of all the people, the new class war between the rich nations and the poor nations, pork-barrel appropriations for all the states and cities, veterans' aid, foreign aid, debt reduction and the balance of payments—all these things at the same time.

This is what the Administration is trying to do, and in the long run it is likely to be both bad policy and bad politics. Ordinary people, dealing with their own desires and budgets, know there is a difference between the two. They have to choose, and while the Administration insists on pretending it can do everything, somehow—though the people wish it were possible—they know it cannot be done.

So they are skeptical. They would like to believe we could do everything everywhere but they don't believe and therefore they are frustrated, knowing that something is basically wrong, but not knowing what to do about it, and not feeling that their leaders are either finding the answer or even telling the plain truth about the problem.

The truth, admittedly, is startling. We have not even begun to think, let alone to grapple, with the cost of dealing with the cities. A "Marshall Plan" for the ghettos, which Vice President Humphrey suggested the other day, is sadly inadequate. That plan cost us about $20 billion, whereas to achieve the goals Johnson has been talking about in the cities, will take hundreds of billions, a redistribution of wealth in this country, and probably a much steeper tax policy—which no politician has really faced—and a redefinition of policy in Vietnam.

THE FATAL FLAW

There is a fatal flaw in the Administration scale of the problems it is facing. It is defining goals but not providing the means to reach them, and the troubles in Vietnam and in the cities are beginning to make this gap clear to everybody who thinks about them even casually. This is why there is mistrust and frustration.

The President's answer to the cities is a committee and a tax hike. His answer to Vietnam is more bombing and higher draft calls, but the idea is getting around that these things are no answer either to the vast scope of either the Negro revolution or the war. The people are looking for new concepts now, and if they don't get them, they are likely to be looking for new leadership later on.

Riots Put Congress and Nation on Spot

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 8, 1967

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

[From the Detroit Free Press, Aug. 8, 1967]

RIOTS PUT CONGRESS AND NATION ON SPOT

(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—There is one over-riding question before the country and the Congress today: What are we going to do about the riots?

Are we going to do everything adequate to repress the riots and nothing adequate to reduce the causes of the riots?

Are we going to reward the rioters—unintentionally of course—by failing to do what is needed to improve the conditions which make it easier for rioters to stimulate violence?

Are we going to allow our outrage to impel us to do what needs to be done to control violence but deter us from doing what needs to be done to cure the ills which breed violence?

The answer to these questions will come primarily from Congress. How Congress responds to the crisis—whether it acts adequately only to punish but inadequately to heal—will determine whether more of the worst will be encouraged or averted.

Those who want to act to heal and not just to express are not in any way proposing to appease the rioters. In the wake of the riots, Congress should no nothing which should not have been done on its own merits before the riots.

If the post-riots Congress does not do better than the pre-riots Congress, we are in for trouble. Look at the record:

Congress approved the principle of rent assistance and has refused to appropriate a single penny to carry it out.

Two-thirds of the requested appropriations for urban technical assistance has been denied.

Open housing—no hearings even scheduled.

The War on Poverty; it is fighting for its life and neither house has yet passed a bill even authorizing its continuation.

When they are not unwishely tilting at each other, President Johnson and Gov. Romney of Michigan are giving the nation the same wise advice.

Says the President: "This is no time for angry reaction. It is a time for action, starting with legislative action to improve life in our cities."

Says the Governor: "We have failed to recognize the urgency of eliminating social injustice and human discrimination . . . we must create genuine equality of opportunity in education, in employment, in housing."

Nothing could be more harmful than for Congress to allow the riots to be used as an excuse to belabor, delay and dilute the strengthened continuation of the War on Poverty.

That's what its enemies, who never wanted it in the first place, are trying to do in attempting to smear it with exaggerated accusations that its employees have been inciting the riots. The fact is that out of the 6,733 persons arrested in connection with the riots in 27 cities, six were from among 12,128 paid poverty workers.

Why do you suppose Gov. Romney after the recent riots asked OEO Director Sargent Shriver to send 200 additional VISTA volunteers to Detroit at once? Because where the action is the War on Poverty is most needed. He began getting them the day he asked for them.

All of these measures together are the touchstone of whether Congress is going to act punitively or positively in face of the riots.

The voice of outrage is rightly saying today: "We will not tolerate violence. We will not permit lawlessness."

But the voice of outrage must also say: "We will not tolerate the conditions which produce violence and lawlessness."

In a Friendship Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. HUNT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 8, 1967

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, we hear a constant chorus of liberal voices telling us the only way to promote good will and friendship with other countries is to spend more of our taxpayers' money. Constantly, we are advised that the only answer to any problem is to spend more of our taxpayers' money. No matter what the problem is, we are led to believe that the answer to every problem is more Federal money.

Therefore, it was refreshing to me to receive the enclosed letter from Frank G. Harrington, senior vice president of the Insurance Co. of North America, telling me that his company has just spent $15,000 to sponsor three Scouts and a Scout leader from each of the countries of Portugal, Bolivia, the Congo, and Malaysia to the Boy Scout World Jamboree, being held this week in Idaho.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I submit the following letter from Mr. Harrington, for inclusion in the Record:

Insurance Co. of North America,
Philadelphia, Pa., July 19, 1967.

Hon. John E. Hunt,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Hunt: Just recently, our Chairman, Mr. Bradford Smith, Jr., sent a check for $15,000 to Mr. Thomas J. Watson, Jr., President, Boy Scouts of America. This money, to be used in support of The Boy Scout XII World Jamboree, August 1–9, 1967, will help finance the transportation costs for three scouts and a scout leader from each of the countries of Portugal, Bolivia, the Congo, and Malaysia.

This contribution is made possible through the Friendship programs of INA people. Competition among our 48 offices in the United States and Canada will produce winners in four different regions. These winning offices will play host to these young Scouts after they have taken part in the Jamboree in Idaho. It will be a great pleasure for INA people to meet them and to show them something of life in America.

I thought you would like to know about this quite different incentive program. INA people care deeply about the world in which we live. About earning their own way. About holding out a helping hand. About sharing. And it's been that way for 175 years.

With every good wish to you.

Sincerely,

Frank G. Harrington,
Senior Vice President.

Great Society Now Moving Into New Field

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACKSON E. BETTS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 8, 1967

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, a recent editorial in the Findlay, Ohio, Republican Courier expressed well another misdirected effort of the Office of Economic Opportunity and an extension of Federal activity into the dangerous precedent of a "Federal press." I share the concern expressed in this editorial that under the Great Society some of the very pillars of private enterprise and untrammeled expression are threatened.

I commend this important statement to my colleagues, as follows:

Great Society Now Moving Into New Field

The Asheville, North Carolina, Citizen has reported one of the most disturbing federal business expansions that has come along yet. It seems that the Office of Economic Opportunity has provided a grant of $179,000 to Community Action, Inc. of Boone, N.C., to publish a weekly newspaper and distribute it free to everybody in four counties ". . . including those who can't read." Weekly newspapers in the area already cover community news. The official objection is that not enough people subscribe to them and read them.

The Asheville Citizen comments that "If the OEO can publish a weekly newspaper in Northwest North Carolina . . . Washington can . . . develop—gradually, insidiously—a federal press, financed by taxpayers' money and telling the American people only what it wants them to hear. This is not likely? No, it is not likely. It is still possible. That is the prime tactic of dictatorship with a controlled press the main tool."

Is this the forerunner of more excursions of the Great Society into areas in such a manner that perils free enterprise? Is the Great Society exhibiting here its real aims and purposes?

Such a development as that going on in North Carolina constitutes an intolerable precedent in the nation where individual liberty depends to such a great extent upon the independence and freedom of expression found in a press that is free of government rule.

What Is a Commitment?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN T. SCHNEEBELI

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 8, 1967

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, as usual, Mr. Erwin D. Canham, editor in chief of the Christian Science Monitor, in an editorial of the August 3 issue, makes a lot of sense. His logical and persuasive outlook on our international commitments should be called to the attention of the administration, particularly the State Department.

The editorial follows:

What Is a Commitment?

(By Erwin D. Canham)

Who can bind the United States internationally?

On April 19, 1966, Vice-President Hubert H. Humphrey said that the United States at the Honolulu Conference in the previous February had "made a pledge to ourselves and to posterity to defeat aggression, to defeat social misery, to build viable, free political institutions and achieve peace" in Vietnam. "These are great commitments," he added.

Indeed they are. But did President Johnson, Vice-President Humphrey, Secretary of State Dean Rusk or any other members of the executive branch of government have the authority to make such commitments?

Sen. J. W. Fulbright, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, does not think so. He recognizes there is doubt on the subject. So he has introduced a resolution in the Senate which says: "It is the sense of the Senate that a national commitment by the United States to a foreign power necessarily and exclusively results from affirmative action taken by executive and legislative branches of the United States Government through means of a treaty, convention, or other legislative instrumentality specifically intended to give effect to such a commitment."

CRITICS GATHERING

The Arkansas Senator, a persistent critic of the administration's Vietnam policy and many of its other foreign policies, is supported by other senators of both parties who believe that the traditional role of the Senate has been eroded by the Presidents and the events of the last several decades.

The resolution, however, would merely be "the sense of the Senate." It would not be a constitutional instrument. It would not prevent the President from making "commitments," though it might be a barrier to carrying them out.

As a matter of fact, the governments of most other nations know that the capacity of the President of the United States to fulfill "commitments" to them is limited by his ability to get supporting legislation through Congress. The President cannot spend a penny that Congress does not appropriate.

LIMITATION RECOGNIZED

American presidents and secretaries of State have frequently used this constitutional limitation to avoid making binding commitments. In normal diplomatic interchange, they have often said: "Of course, you understand that we will have to get this through Congress."

But short of this power of the purse, there is a gerat deal the executive can do which Congress cannot possibly prevent. Sometimes he can put the nation in such a position that Congress would have no real alternative to backing him up. And, of course, the executive has to have a great deal of latitude. It is an increasingly fast-moving world. Actions have to be taken which could not conceivably be referred to Congress before disaster struck.

RESOLUTION COULD SERVE

Yet there is much validity in the interpretation of a commitment as a solemn undertaking in which both Congress and the President join. Certainly the purple rhetoric used by the Vice-President ascends to a level going far beyond a mere executive undertaking. These commitments need not necessarily be treaties, requiring a two-thirds majority of the Senate for ratification. In many situations, a resolution of the Senate would do.

It will be useful to have the air cleared through discussion of the Fulbright resolution. The position of the Senate in foreign affairs has certainly diminished. To "advise and consent," as the Constitution says, ought to be a powerful cooperative role. President Johnson, as a former Senator of tremendous experience and respect for the upper chamber's great role, should be willing to cooperate.

And the administration speechmakers could use less grandiose language, assert less grandiose "commitments." United States policy should not lapse into a new isolationism. One good way to prevent it is for the executive and the Congress to strengthen their mutual understanding of just what the nation is obligated to do, and just what it has not accepted. The people would like to know, too.

Wheat for India Spoiled

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 8, 1967

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, our Government, by law, can seek to guarantee food to the Indians, but we cannot guarantee freedom from Nature.

Needed to protect our charity are waterproof, ratproof, and ideological-proof bags.

I insert the story from the August 7 St. Louis Globe-Democrat in the Record for the interest of our colleagues:

Tons of U.S. Wheat Sent India Spoiled in New Delhi

New Delhi.—Thousands of bags of rotten American wheat are piling up in government warehouses here.

The wheat, which was shipped thousands of miles from American ports to Bombay, was spoiled by rain during the 960-mile rail journey to the Indian capital.

The wheat is unfit for human consumption. It is being stored in warehouses at Naraina, Shakti Nagar, and Pusa near New Delhi. The government now faces the decision of how to dispose of it.

Government officials say between 1000 and 2000 tons of American wheat, sold to India for Indian currency under the PL–480 program, are arriving in New Delhi every day to meet an acute flour shortage in the capital.

A high percentage of the wheat is being transported in open freight cars and is being spoiled. The Bombay area has had heavy rains in recent weeks as the moonsoon reaches its height along India's west coast.

One report places the number of bags of rotten wheat at 15,000.

Brookville VISTA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 8, 1967

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, the Ninth Congressional District is proud of its young people, especially so when one devotes his energies to the betterment of those less fortunate. Such is the case with Rose Ann Alig, of Brookville, who was featured in a recent article in the Connersville News-Examiner.

This excellent article describing Miss Alig's work as a VISTA volunteer follows:

BROOKVILLE VISTA

Reaching back into the past and another world, the old man on Baltimore Street told the young VISTA girl to "call the Farm Bureau and git them dogs and cats out of that apartment down the street—it's terrible, you kin smell it a mile away!"

Twenty-three year old Rose Ann Alig, VISTA Volunteer from Brookville, told the old man, "You mean call the Health Department," and added, "you do it."

"That's what you're here for," the man ranted, pointing his finger at Rose Ann. "Why don't you do what you're here for?"

"No," she said, "You call them. It's your problem."

And that, basically, is what Miss Alig's job is all about—getting people to take their problems in their own hads. She joined VISTA (Volunteers in Service to America) in September 1966, trained for six weeks at the VISTA training program conducted by the University of Maryland School of Social Work, and was assigned first to the Baltimore Education Department. She worked several months as a teacher's aid. But Miss Alig felt she wasn't seeing enough action in that project. She wanted to work more directly with people in the community. As a result, she was transferred to the Baltimore Community Action Agency (CAA), and is now in the thick of grass roots community organization, working out of a busy neighborhood center called "Project Pride." Over the past six weeks, her action and the action of the people of the neighborhood has resulted in the creation of a small community park, a much needed traffic signal and a happier, healthier summer for the many neighborhood children who have been signed up for summer camps.

Residents of Baltimore Street are part of a colony of migrant people from Southern Appalachia who live in crowded, furnished apartments in buildings that were once the single-family dwellings of Polish families. On nearby blocks—resented by the white people—are Negro families. The Southern Appalachians, who are largely of Scotch-Irish descent, began migrating to the northern cities in the 1940's, and the movement has gained momentum over the past fifteen years. Among the rural migrants are Lumbee Indians from North Carolina.

Illiterate and unskilled, many of the migrants who come to the city looking for jobs are unable to adjust to urban life. After generations of hardship in the hills, their health is often mad—malnutrition and tuberculosis are frequently discovered in migrant families. A large number have become welfare recipients.

Miss Alig visited a family of Lubee Indians to see about enrolling some of the children in summer camp. Their tiny apartment offered only basics—a place to sit and sleep. A young woman with hair in rollers sat on the bed so that one of the guests could have the only chair.

There are 11 children in the family, several of whom are mentally retarded. They should be in a special school for trainable children, but because of crowded conditions there is a waiting period of two years. As the family keeps moving, the children drop back to the end of the list. "We encourage people to stay in one place," Miss Alig said, "but it's true that the unskilled laborers are the last hired and the first fired. When they're out of work they go back home or move somewhere else."

The family with 11 children is typical of the Appalachian migrants and as the families move, the children must change schools, compounding an already difficult adjustment problem. A young girl of about fifteen, sitting on a stoop, shyly said she wasn't in school because she "missed the bus." Asked if she liked to read, she said, "Yes, but I never learned in school. I learned from my uncle. He got some books when he was in jail."

Because Miss Alig is a VISTA and her job is to serve the community, she has made friends with many people in the area. But most of the residents associate only with their own family groups—a carryover from Appalachian culture. Great personal dignity and strong family identity is a Southern Appalachian characteristic. Miss Alig and other CAA workers try to help the people achieve an additional identity—one with the community in which they live. Her method is to get people to talk about what bothers them—such as kids making noise in the streets—and ask, "Did you ever think of doing something about it?"

"What can you do?" is a usual reply.

She finds that the people had never thought of making requests of the city, nor had any idea of how to go about it. The tendency of the Southern Appalachians is to distrust all authorities and avoid any contact with officials.

But, before the Brookville VISTA had been in Baltimore six weeks, 300 people had signed a petition asking the city park authority to create a park out of an empty lot. Now the lot, usually littered with debris, is being cleared and equipped as a play area for children under the direction of the Director of Parks. Mrs. Regina Sloan, CAA VISTA supervisor, gives Miss Alig a large share of the credit for mobilizing the community for the park effort. "She is an excellent community worker," Mrs. Sloan said.

One of the most difficult jobs for Miss Alig and her fellow VISTAs is the development of indigenous leaders. "The Southern Appalachians hate to speak out on community problems in front of anyone except their family, for fear of ridicule," Miss Alig said. "It takes a man with a great deal of courage to make the hurdle."

One resident of Baltimore Street, although he cannot write, has become an eloquent speaker at neighborhood meetings, and was elected president of the committee which heads Project Pride.

"One of his most impressive acts of leadership was to lead a walk around the block to dramatize the need for a traffic light at an intersection where school children have to cross," Miss Alig said. "The people's first appeal to the city for a light was ignored. Then about 50 people walked around the block, quietly, for half an hour. They were stopped by police. But now they have a big new traffic light, with "Walk" and "Don't Walk" signals. They are extremely proud of that light. Getting it was a wonderful stimulus for community spirit."

Miss Alig will finish her service in VISTA in October 1967, and plans to visit Europe before returning to the University of Cincinnati where she has completed two years of study. She is the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Joseph Alig of Rural Route 5, Brookville.

If It Isn't Sedition, What Is It?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 8, 1967

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the editors of the Chicago Tribune for their August 5 editorial entitle "If It Isn't Sedition, What Is It?" Following a printed transcript of relevant portions of the United States Code, the author argues in no uncertain terms that the Congress should insist on the criminal prosecution of Stokely Carmichael and H. Rap Brown. While crooning around the District of Columbia, Brown told persistent news reporters that "violence is as American as cherry pie." Hopefully, Rap Brown will be made to understand that the United States Code is too.

The Tribune editorial follows:

IF IT ISN'T SEDITION, WHAT IS IT?

Whoever incites, sets on foot, assists, or engages in any rebellion or insurrection against the authority of the United States or the laws thereof, or gives aid or comfort thereto, shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than 10 years, or both.

If two or more persons . . . conspire to overthrow, put down, or destroy by force the government of the United States, or to levy war against them, or to oppose by force the authority thereof, or by force to prevent, hinder, or delay the execution of any law of the United States, . . . they shall each be fined not more than $20,000 or imprisoned not more than 20 years, or both.

Whoever . . . abets, advises, or teaches the duty, necessity, desirability, or propriety of overthrowing the government of the United States . . . or the government of any political subdivision therein, by force or violence, or by the assassination of any officer of any such government . . . shall be fined not more than $20,000 or imprisoned not more than 20 years, or both.—United States Code

A resolution introduced in the House calls for criminal prosecution on charges of sedition of Stokely Carmichael, the "black power" spokesman, when and if he returns to the United States from Cuba, where he has been attending a seminar on hemispheric revolution convened by Fidel Castro.

While there, Carmichael said, "In Newark we applied war tactics of the guerrillas. We are preparing groups of urban guerrillas for our defense in the cities. The price of these rebellions is a high price that one must pay. This fight is not going to be a simple street meeting. It is going to be a fight to the death."

He has also said that Negroes are "taking the offensive now," that they want to "settle the score," and that "we will kill first and we will aim for the head," specifying that President Johnson, Secretaries Rusk and McNamara, and others were marked for assassination. He exhorted American Negroes to take arms and fight, "from New York to California, from Canada to Mexico."

In an open message which he broadcast to Maj. Che Guevara, the Cuban guerrilla leader, whose whereabouts are unknown, Carmichael announced, "We eagerly await your writings in order to read them, digest them, and plan our tactics based on them. . . . Do not despair, my comrade, we shall overcome."

These utterances are clearly seditious under terms of the United States Code. They are a call to revolution. They openly urge political assassination of federal officers.

So are the pronouncements of H. Rap Brown, Carmichael's successor as head of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating committee. [He says "Nonviolent" can be put in quotations.] Brown has said, "There is a conspiracy to run black people out of America, but we are going to burn it down before we leave. . . . If Washington don't turn around, you should burn Washington down."

Brown has also said, "I consider myself neither morally nor legally bound to obey laws made by a body in which I have no representation. Do not deceive yourself into believing that penalties will deter men from the course they believe is right. We stand on the eve of a black revolution."

Congressmen said that Americans are "disturbed and angry at the timidity and inertia of the attorney general," Ramsey Clark. All the administration has talked of doing is revoking Carmichael's passport. Congress should insist on criminal prosecution, for what we face here is a summons to revolution.

Action Is Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT N. C. NIX

OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 8, 1967

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, it is probably unnecessary to state that all of us in this body are greatly concerned by the outbreak of riots which have been plaguing our cities in recent weeks.

There has been much said about the cause of the riots and the possible cures.

I am not going to elaborate on these speculations at the moment but I would like to bring to the attention of this body some excerpts from an editorial which appeared in the Philadelphia Inquirer on the date of Tuesday, August 1, 1967, entitled "The Danger of Backlash."

The editorial states:

> There is great danger, in the wake of the destructive riots and the threats of more to come, of a white backlash reaction against all Negroes. No one has to go very far these days to hear words of bitterness and revilement aimed at the Negro community generally without mention that the Negroes themselves have suffered most from the outbreaks and that only a small fraction of the Negro minority has participated in them.
>
> It has frequently been asserted that militant Negroes, by their excesses, are playing into the hands of the segregationist bigots by widening the gap between the two races.
>
> But it can also be said, with equal assurance, that whites who turn their backs on the Negroes because of the recent disturbances are playing into the hands of the extremists, who are eager for more riots, more violence and more hate.
>
> What is urgently needed is more, not less, understanding; more, not less help; more, not less, communication between the races, so that all Americans, white and black, can work together to erase the conditions which foster riots and lawlessness—not in some uncertain future, but quickly. Quickly.

One Step Forward in Support of U.S. Servicemen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 8, 1967

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, members of the Johnstown, Pa., Junior Chamber of Commerce, Inc., wanted to get a message to American men and boys serving in Vietnam. They thought it time for the folks at home to speak out in appreciation of our valiant fighting forces and to reassure them of our deep appreciation for their devotion and courage.

The Jaycees wanted everyone over there to know that everyone in the Johnstown area stands solidly behind our soldiers, sailors, marines, and flyers. So they provided space for signatures under this plain but profound communication:

> ONE STEP FORWARD
>
> We, the undersigned, take one step forward to sign this resolution as a pledge of our support for our valiant servicemen in Vietnam and around the world.
>
> Their courage and sacrifices shall not be in vian, let all who behold our signatures on this document know that we accept our full responsibilities as American citizens and hereby pledge our devotion to the principles on which this country was founded.

Last Thursday, I had the good fortune to be at the Pentagon when 32 representatives of the Jaycees delivered petitions bearing this word with signatures of more than 62,000 residents of the Johnstown area. The presentation was made to Lt. Gen. L. W. Walt, U.S. Marine Corps, as representative of the Secretary of Defense. General Walt, who formerly commanded the Marine force at Da Nang, South Vietnam, said he would forward the petitions to General Westmoreland for wide dissemination at the fighting fronts so that there will be no doubt about the loyalty and support of the great majority of Americans.

The Johnstown Jaycees, under the capable leadership of its president, James Edwards, and "One Step Forward" chairman, Charles Murtha, are to be commended for this outstanding demonstration. I salute them and the following named Jaycees who came to Washington for the ceremony. I am proud of them and of all who signed this tribute to those who serve our country:

Fred Sax, 1624 Linwood Avenue.
Frank Hull, 614 Railroad Street.
Frank Albacite, Jr., 816 Tener Street.
Calvin George Sellers, 1363 Frankstown Road.
Richard Yernaux, 2308 Franklin Street.
Fran Kelly, 305 Tioga Street.
Dave Hinton, 217 Mifflin Street.
Jack Leffler, 2280 Sunshine Avenue.
Robert P. Puricelli, 146 Coal Street.
Glenn Jeffries, 127 Lulay Avenue.
Fred Moyer, 925 Lina Street.
Robert Gardill, 453 Bantell Street.
Robert Ondick, 714 East Oakmont Boulevard.
Rev. Charles Densevich, 916 Broad Street.
Richard Koestler, 1821 Ruby Street.
I. Samuel Kaminsky, 2066 Dundee Lane.
Fred H. Smith, 422 Colgate Avenue.
Louis G. Galliker, 922 Luzerne Street.
Leroy Schilling, 890 Leisure Avenue.
Angelo D. Manolas, 701 Edwards Hill Apartments.
George Nassif, R.D. 2, Box 482.
Donald Schweitzer, YMCA.
Raymond Clites, in care of WJAC–TV, Hickory Lane.
James Widman, 517 Indiana Street.
John Ungar, 1620 Shelbourne Drive.
Robert A. Gleason, Jr., 92 Thoburn Street.
Charles Murtha, 340 Tioga Street.
John Deibert, 201 Diamond Boulevard.
James Edwards, 1201 Norwood Street.
M. Wayne Sherbine, 115 Keppler Drive.
W. Paul Hunter, 189 Lunen Street.
Eli Cvanjanovich, 121 Locust Street.

It is my hope that the project will take root in every State, in every community and hamlet throughout this Nation. Now as at no other time in our history, are expressions of moral backing and gratitude desirable and necessary as a true indication of how we feel about our unselfish patriots facing the common enemy.

Howard University Dismissals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 8, 1967

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, during the week of July 2, 1967, WMAL radio here in Washington broadcast an editorial concerning the recent dismissals of faculty and students at Howard University.

As intelligent people attending an institution of higher learning, they should know how to express their dissent in a reasonable manner instead of in disorderly demonstration. When the basic educational processes are disrupted, the causes of the disruption must be removed.

I commend the text of the editorial to the attention of our colleagues, as follows:

> HOWARD UNIVERSITY DISMISSALS
>
> Howard University officials were entirely correct in dismissing faculty members and students for their year-long disruption of the university's basic educational process. There is certainly room for dissent on campuses and Howard's administration has been enlightened in its willingness to listen to the views of students.
>
> But when meaningful dissent turns to disorderly demonstration, the university is right to act. Noisy demonstrations must not be allowed to replace honest debate as a way of achieving a goal. Boos and jeers must not replace logic. Masses organized into

mobs must nots push and shove their way with disregard of the rights of all in their paths.

We salute the Howard University administration for having the courage to uphold true educational purpose. That purpose is to train young minds to reason together, to respect differing opinions and to seek reasonable solutions through debate and logic—not demonstrations and jeers.

Ian Smith's Message

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 8, 1967

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, at the recent "Peace With Rhodesia" banquet held here in Washington, a message was read from the Rhodesian Prime Minister, the Honorable Ian Smith, explaining his country's position on the matter of independence.

I insert Prime Minister Smith's message at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

IAN SMITH'S MESSAGE

(NOTE.—Ian Smith's Message to the American People Read at the "Peace With Rhodesia" Banquet sponsored by the American-Southern Africa Council.)

In this letter I wish to extend my good wishes to all who are atending your dinner to promote peace with Rhodesia and all those American citizens who are helping my country, Rhodesia, to gain acceptance in its Sovereign independence and so restore the traditional friendship between our countries. In the past we have never fought against each other and twice in living memory have fought on the same side. I, myself, and many other Rhodesians, have had the privilege of serving under American Commanders in the last World War.

At this time it is appropriate to look at the similarities in the origins of our countries. The original settlers of both countries, who were predominantly of British stock, emigrated to lands that were for the main part barren wildernesses sparsely inhabited by relatively primitive peoples. In some cases your early colonies were established by Charter Companies as was Rhodesia. The first English Charter for settlements in America was that granted by King James I to Sir Walter Raleigh's Virginia Company in 1606 for the planting of colonies in Virginia. In 1889 a Charter was granted by Queen Victoria to the British South Africa Company, founded by Cecil John Rhodes, to exploit the Rudd Concession.

In due course the American colonies, resentful of interference from London, thousands of miles away, tried to obtain freedom from the rule of the British Parliament. After enduring economic sanctions (for that is what the Boston Port Act and other actions amounted to) the Americans took up arms against the British military and civil presence and declared their independence in 1776. From then on the United States spread across the whole width of America from the Atlantic to the Pacific, spreading Christian civilization and taming the wilderness until today the United States of America is the greatest Christian power in the world. After your Declaration of Independence you did not negotiate a "return to legality" and you designed your own Constitution to suit your own needs, without regard to the wishes or principles of foreign countries. Your Republican Constitution could hardly have met the principles of your allies, the Monarchies of France and Spain.

Rhodesia wishes to follow your praiseworthy example. Indeed, we have done so to a certain extent already. We have spread Christian civilization across our country, we have tamed or are taming the wilderness. We, too, resentful of interference from London and elsewhere, have made our Declaration of Independence. We have had to suffer economic and psychological war waged upon us by Britain and her allies although we have been spared the horrors of military action, if only for the reason that there was no British military or civil presence in Rhodesia. In fact there never has been. We, too, are now engaged in the task of producing a Constitution to meet our particular needs. A constitution that is suitable for Britain or for the United States is not necessarily suitable for Rhodesia.

The Constitution that will emerge from the task of our Constitutional Commission will have been made in Rhodesia, for Rhodesia, by Rhodesians, and I am certain you will agree that is for the correct way for a Rhodesian Constitution to be formulated. In the same way that the Constitution of the United States is the sole concern of the Americans who have to operate it and live with it, so the Rhodesian Constitution is the sole concern of Rhodesians.

We have to take into account that we are a multi-racial country, in the literal sense of the term; that we have social and cultural differences between our peoples. Some of us are as advanced in the arts and techniques of modern civilization as you are, while others are only just emerging from the primitive. We Rhodesians conceive it to be our duty to guarantee the rights and freedoms of all persons and communities and to ensure the harmonious development of Rhodesia's plural society.

In our task I am sure we are entitled to the sympathetic understanding of all men of good will and I am aware that we are receiving that in large measure from all those who have interested themselves in the wellbeing of Rhodesia and Rhodesians and that sympathetic understanding of Rhodesia will continue to grow.

I would remind you that you adopted your Constitution in 1787, eleven years after your Declaration of Independence. We hope that our new Constitution will be adopted late this year or early next.

In view of the foregoing and the similarities in our national origins and histories, it is difficult for Rhodesians to understand why the United States Government chooses, in this case only, to support the same colonial power that the Thirteen Colonies rebelled against.

Officers of your State Department have described the Rhodesian Declaration of Independence as "unprecedented." Surely your Declaration of Independence was and is the precedent? It, too, was unilateral. They have also talked about the Rhodesian Government "usurping" power. From whom did we usurp it since the British Government has never governed nor administered Rhodesia?

In the British House of Commons on 19th April, 1967, the Solicitor General stated "We (the British Government) are not the Government of Rhodesia." Later in the same debate, concerning the control of the Rhodesian Reserve Bank, he said: "Responsibility for the payment of interest on Rhodesian stock is not that of the bank or of the British Government. It is the responsibility of the Government of Rhodesia, although at the moment there is not one." This absurd statement was made by one of the senior British Law Officers! If there is no Government in Rhodesia, how does he or anyone else suppose that law and order, administration and the whole machinery of government continue to function. As my government was the Government of Rhodesia prior to Independence from whom have we usurped power?

I trust that soon our joint efforts will restore the former warm friendship that has, until lately, always existed between the Governments of the United States and Rhodesia. Warm friendship still continues between our peoples.

Again I thank you and all our American friends who are making such efforts to sustain us in our efforts to maintain our national freedom and independence against the evil machinations of those who, for their own purposes, are trying to destroy Rhodesia by economic warfare. Rhodesians will not let you down because we are going to maintain our national freedom and independence.

What Is a Policeman?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. HUNT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 8, 1967

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, I recently came across an item in the monthly newsletter published by the Civic Committee in Pine Hill, N.J., which in down-to-earth terms, describes a policeman. I was particularly impressed by the newsletter item because it comes at a time when our society must decide if we are to remain a country of law and order or if we are to be controlled by mob rule. This is the man—the policeman—who deserves our unending support and gratitude.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I submit the newsletter item for inclusion in the RECORD:

WHAT IS A POLICEMAN?

Policemen are human, believe it or not, just like the rest of us. They deliver lectures, babies, and bad news. They are required to have the wisdom of Solomon, the disposition of a lamb and muscles of steel and are often accused of having a heart to match. He's the one who rings the doorbell, swallows hard, and announces some bad news—then spends the rest of the day wondering why he ever took such a crummy job.

On TV a policeman is an oaf who couldn't find a bull fiddle in a telephone booth. In real life he's expected to find a "little blond boy about so big" in a crowd of a half million people. In fiction he gets his help from private eyes, reporters, and "who-dun-it" fans. In real life, mostly all he gets from the public is "I didn't see it". When he serves a summons, he's a monster. If he lets you go, he's "a doll". To little kids, he's either a friend or a bogeyman, depending on how the parents feel about it. His credit is good; this is very helpful, because his salary isn't. Policemen raise lots of kids; most of them belong to other people.

Policemen like days off, vacations and coffee. They don't like auto horns, family fights and anonymous letter writers. They have unions, but can't strike. They must be impartial, courteous and always remember the slogan "At your service". This is some times hard especially when a character reminds him "I'm a taxpayer. I pay your salary." But some times the most rewarding moment comes when after some small kindness to an older person, he feels the warm hand clasp, looks into grateful eyes and hears, "Thank you and God bless you, son".

This Is a Time for Commonsense and Responsible Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 8, 1967

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

[From the Michigan Chronicle, Aug. 8, 1967]

THIS IS A TIME FOR COMMONSENSE AND RESPONSIBLE ACTION

(By Whitney M. Young, Jr.)

I'm getting pretty annoyed about the way some people are using this summer's riots as an excuse to avoid doing anthing about the basic social problems which caused them.

Senseless and irrational as they are, the riots have shown America the deep frustrations and bitterness in the ghetto. These feelings are the result of joblessness, poor housing, poor schools and discrimination. The way to ease tensions is to improve these conditions, not to worsen them.

Injustice cannot be ended by blood and fire, but neither is justice served by vindictiveness and reprisals. It is especially wrong to deny justice to all Negroes because a few took part in irresponsible violence.

Too many Americans focus on the three percent who rioted, and are willing to make the 97 percent of Negro citizens who are law-abiding pay for it. But this is nothing new; Americans have always practiced a double standard for Negroes.

Let one Cassius Clay refuse to go into the Army, and 100 white boys who flee the draft by running away to Canada are forgotten. Let one Negro politician abuse his power, and dozens of crooked white politicians are forgotten. Let one Negro throw a brick in Detroit, and the thousands of Negro soldiers who are bearing the disproportionate burden of the fighting in Vietnam are forgotten.

It is time for reason to prevail. No other ethnic group in America is expected to be 100 percent perfect.

Rather than embark on a narrow-minded program of reprisals and denial of justice, America must embark on a sincere crusade to end the injustice of discrimination and the exploitation of the ghetto. Only a determined effort to create more jobs and better housing and decent education will end the underlying causes of rioting.

The overwhelming majority of Negro citizens reject violence and anarchy as a means of ending injustice. I hope the majority of other Americans will reject short-sighted reprisals and angry suppression of Negro rights as a means of dealing with the real problems which face us.

As President Johnson put it in his televised message to the nation: "This is not a time for angry reaction. But I think it is a time for action, starting with legislative action to improve the life in our cities."

We are in a race with time to end the poverty and bigotry which distort our national life. There is a need for reasonable men of both races to work together to solve these pressing problems. The frustration of the young won't be ended by cutting funds for youth programs, and the poverty of the jobless won't be helped by cutting funds for training programs. Constructive solutions to these problems are called for, and mean and petty reprisals won't solve them.

After World War II, many people wanted to take reprisals against Germany and Japan. But wiser men realized that if we made those countries prosperous, they would become more peaceful and we would benefit by expanded trade. So we poured billions into those nations to rebuild their economies. As a result, they are at peace with the world, and thousands of Americans are employed in the jobs as a result of the trade that came from their prosperity. A country like Germany now has no slums and little unemployment. Can we do less for our own cities?

America has to bring peace and prosperity to our neglected urban areas. The necessary programs—like job training and better housing and education—shouldn't be seen as expenses, but as investments which will yield great benefits to the nation.

This has been a summer of irrationality and violence. It is time for reason and common sense to take over.

Mail-Order Weapons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 8, 1967

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, for years I have sponsored legislation that would make access to firearms more stringent. In the 90th Congress, I introduced H.R. 5463, which would amend both the National Firearms Act and the Federal Firearms Act. In addition, I recently submitted a statement to the Senate Subcommittee to Investigate Juvenile Delinquency, which held hearings on this matter.

The powerful gun lobby has been repeatedly successful in showing that their concern over a small inconvenience is greater than their concern for the thousands of people killed each year by guns. I hope that they are not again successful when the Congress votes on this matter.

I commend to the attention of our colleagues an editorial on this subject which appeared in the July 29, 1967, issue of the Kings Courier, of Brooklyn.

The editorial follows:

MAIL-ORDER WEAPONS

A youthful, vibrant President. A 17-year-old girl about to enter college. A patrolman of the Precinct around the corner from your house. A store owner, proud of the business he singularly built up. What do all of these persons—unknown to each other—have in common?

They were all the victims of a deranged person's use of firearms. In one case it was a planned assassination—premeditated murder with a rifle bought through the mail. In the second case it was a freak and bizarre accident involving a man shooting at sharks also with a mail order rifle, the bullet richocheting into the skull of the girl.

In the third case it was a policeman who was shot while trying to apprehend a robber. And in the fourth case it was a store owner who was gunned down by a madman because he told him that he did not have any money in the cash register.

Three of the above-mentioned victims of the indiscriminate use of firearms died right in your neighborhood. This highlights one thing: the dangers of mail-order firearms are not to be scoffed at. They are not only the problem of people living in Dallas, Texas.

These is one person in our community who has the power to try to stem the tide of this huge industry, and that is your local Congressman. He or she must not be influenced by the massive lobby of the National Rifle Association. This group is in essence, fighting for its life. A great number of rifles brought and sold every year are ordered through the mails, and to eliminate the sale of mail order firearms would curb many of the Association's activities.

But the death list is mounting. Those dying from bullets from mail order firearms are doing so in ever increasing numbers.

Your Congressman must vote to ban this horrifying use of the mails. If this was proved by the assassination of President Kennedy, than maybe it was by the murder of the 17-year-old who had her life abruptly ended, without enjoying those pleasures which accrue during a lifetime.

Fomenting Insurrection

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 8, 1967

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to insert into the RECORD an editorial from the August 8, 1967, issue of the Washington Post entitled "Fomenting Insurrection."

In these days of "loose talk" and challenges to our fundamental rights, it is encouraging to read the sobering words of responsible journalism as evidenced in this editorial.

The editorial follows:

FOMENTING INSURRECTION

It may be great sport to travel around the world calling for a "revolution" or to trudge through the big cities proclaiming that riots are the "dress rehearsals for rebellion." But those who engage in such a sport carry a heavy burden. If they mean what their words say, they are walking close to the narrow line that separates loyal citizens from traitors. If they do not mean it, they are stirring up passions that will do them and others of their race no good.

It is the right of all Americans, written into the Constitution 175 years ago, to engage in the wildest kind of debate and to make the most foolish statements. The country's tradition provides a platform for all who may care to voice views disputing the policy of the Government or the conduct of the people. It even provides the opportunity to speak in favor of another form of government or against the Constitution that has served us well for almost 200 years. It does so in the deeply held belief that the majority of the people should have the kind of government they wish and that, if the people are freely exposed to all ideas, they will be able to separate the good from the bad and the wise from the foolish.

Because of this tradition, a Carmichael or a Brown is entitled to denounce the Government and the people in the vilest words. His thoughts and his language may be repulsive to all but a tiny handful of citizens. But he can say what he thinks without fear of prosecution and with only a moral responsibility for what he says. If his words stir up hatred against all members of his race, he must bear the moral responsibility. If his words mislead those to whom they are addressed, he must bear the responsibility for having abused the right to speak.

But there are limits on what a citizen can say and still claim his right to free speech. One such limit bars a man from inciting others to violence. It is hard to say precisely when that limit is reached. Much depends on the climate in which things are said and the tools available to those who listen. It is clear that a man could be prosecuted successfully for urging an already angry audience to pick up the rifles he had brought with him and go into the streets to shoot and kill. But it is not clear that he could be prosecuted successfully for telling a passive audience that they ought to go home and get their guns. Generally speaking, we like the rule of thumb that a man is free to say what he wants as long as the situation is such that there is time for other ideas to be heard and for reason to prevail over emotion.

Thus, those who are crying for the Government to prosecute Stokely Carmichael for his speeches in Cuba are missing the point of what free speech is all about. There is little chance that his advice, sent from afar by modern communications, presents a clear and present danger to the peace and order of the Nation. Carmichael may be a traitor in so far as he has gone abroad to consort with this country's enemies but he has not committed treason unless he organizes or conspires with others to launch an armed invasion or insurrection. We can only hope that he has forfeited whatever following and respect he once had through his open advocacy of communism.

The recent speeches of Rap Brown present a more difficult problem. He is already charged with inciting to violence in Maryland and some of his talk elsewhere has invited public officials to levy similar charges. It is inappropriate to express an opinion on his statement in Maryland since that case is before the courts. But it is not inappropriate to remind him and others who join him that a man must bear the responsibility for what he says. Those who incite to violence must not expect the Nation to sit quietly and let that violence erupt.

The Constitution does provide protection for those who talk of making trouble and of mounting an insurrection. But it provides no protection for those who carry their words through into action. Men who call for and organize rebellions must expect to be dealt with as traitors. Words sometimes carry all the effect of force and it is on that narrow line between free speech and incitement to rebellion that Mr. Carmichael and Mr. Brown are walking.

The Sixth District Speaks Out

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 8, 1967

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, again this year, as is my custom, I conducted a public opinion poll among my constituents. The response was overwhelming and unprecedented. Thousands of poll cards, and hundreds of letters came in a steady stream of mail that lasted for nearly 2 months. I wish to submit the results of the poll at this time.

IN VIETNAM—WIN

Seventy-nine percent favored doing whatever necessary to win in Vietnam; 9 percent want to hold present positions and try to negotiate; 8 percent say we should withdraw, and only 3 percent favor the present course of action. Only 1 percent did not answer this question.

Eighty-three percent were against increased trade with European Communist countries; only 12 percent were in favor of this part of the administration's bridge-building policy; 5 percent had no opinion.

Ninety percent are against recognition of, or trade with, Communist China; only 8 percent approved. Two percent did not answer.

Frequently there were comments that we should adopt a get-tough policy toward communism. There was practically no support of the administration's policy of committing hundreds of thousands of men, and billions of dollars, to fight the Communists in Vietnam, and at the same time seeking to expand trade with and "building bridges" to the very countries that enable Hanoi to carry on the war.

CUT DOMESTIC SPENDING—DON'T INCREASE TAXES

Eighty-seven percent said the Government should cut domestic spending to meet its expenses. Only 5 percent favored a Federal tax increase; only 5 percent favored deficit financing. Three percent did not respond.

Sixty-two percent favored Federal tax sharing with the States; 29 percent were opposed. Nine percent had no opinion.

Sixty-three percent approved individual income tax credits for higher education expenses; 32 percent did not. Five percent did not reply.

I received many comments on the subject of taxes in general. Practically everyone felt taxes were already far too high. for a complete overhaul of the tax laws. For instance the $600 exemption was frequently denounced as totally unrealistic and out-of-date with today's high cost of living.

BUILD AN ANTIMISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEM

Seventy-four percent favor a nationwide antimissile defense system, and only 18 percent oppose it. Eight percent had no opinion. "We must be ready for anything," was a typical comment.

BUT SLOW DOWN ON THE MOON RACE

I asked if we should continue our space program, aimed at landing a man on the moon by 1970. Fifty-eight percent said no; 35 percent said yes. Those opposed frequently cited the tragic and disastrous space capsule fire earlier this year. Seven percent did not answer.

THE MIDDLE EAST—NO DIRECT INVOLVEMENT

The poll went out at the time of the Arab-Israel war. Thirty-six percent said our actions in the Middle East should be economic and political measures only. Twenty-nine percent said we should stay completely out, with a strict hands off policy, and 27 percent thought the United Nations should handle it. Only 5 percent felt military intervention on our part would be sound, and 3 percent had no opinion.

OUR MAJOR PROBLEM TODAY

I asked the individual's opinion as to what our major problem today was. Thirty-four percent said Vietnam; 25 percent said inflation; 21 percent said crime. The remaining 16 percent cited such things as communism in general, overall moral decline, increasing power of the Federal Government over the lives of all citizens, and a weak, confused foreign policy. Four percent did not make a choice.

GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

Based on the tabulated returns, as well as on the many hundreds of detailed, precise letters, it is possible to draw some general conclusions as to what the people want.

First, if we start something, or get involved in it, we should go all out to finish it—win in Vietnam—and we should not attempt to do business as usual with the enemy—no trade with the Communists, no recognition of Red China.

Much of what the Government tries doing at home is unnecessary or unwanted—cut domestic spending—and, besides, the Federal Government cannot do it all—share Federal taxes with the States, and grant individual income tax credits for higher education expenses.

Keep our defenses strong, and be prepared—build the antimissile defense system—but be careful about giving too high a priority to prestige projects—go slow on the moon race. And, as was evident by the replies on the Middle East situation, we should be very careful about future foreign involvements.

Our people are willing to do whatever is necessary to keep our country strong and safe, and to honor our commitments both at home and abroad. But they do feel there is a limit to what we can do, or what we should attempt. There are many instances, to be sure, when the average person does not have access to all sources of information, but based on the comments that accompanied the poll returns, I find my district exceptionally knowledgeable and well informed.

This poll has supplemented the many other contacts I have with my constituents. It has encouraged many of them to let me know what they are thinking. I find it extremely valuable and helpful, and I am happy to bring the results to the attention of my colleagues.

Wilson Wright Receives Good Government Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON FUQUA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 8, 1967

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Jaycees have an outstanding program entitled the "Good Government Award." Through this medium, this great organization calls attention to public servants who exemplify the highest ideals of government service.

Recently, the Tallahassee, Fla., Jaycees presented their award to a close friend of mine, Wilson W. Wright, assistant attorney general of Florida.

This is a singular honor, for Tallahassee is the seat of our State government and the award could go to one of the 17,900 persons connected with State, county, city, or Federal Government.

Wilson Wright is one of those public officials who excells in public service and in his contributions to his State and Nation.

His energy and enthusiasm mark every job he has undertaken, and I might add that he has been exceptional at all of them. One wonders how he finds the time to do as many tasks as he sets for himself, and to do them so well.

The Florida Jaycees recognized him in 1961 as one of the five outstanding young men in Florida. In 1959 he received the Distinguished Service Award from the Tallahassee Jaycees.

He served as president of the Tallahassee Jaycees, and served as State secretary and national director of the Florida Jaycees. He is a past State president of the Young Democrats.

These are but a few of the highlights of the contributions of this young man. I want to join with his many friends and associates in paying tribute to that service, and particularly having been selected to receive the Good Government Award of the Tallahassee Jaycees.

It was well deserved.

Efforts To Combat Child Malnutrition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 8, 1967

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out one area of the foreign assistance program and food aid program in which we can all take pride. I refer to our efforts to combat child malnutrition.

Concern over child malnutrition is not a new development. But only recently have nations recognized the degree to which hunger and malnutrition can adversely affect sound economic development. Today new emphasis is being placed on this factor and increased energies devoted to tackling the problem.

There is increasing evidence of a working together by Government and private enterprise to utilize knowledge and technology to combat the devastating toll of child malnutrition. A unique war—the war against child malnutrition—can provide only more and better lives, as we wage it with greater vigor. If we retire from this war, casualties result. The war against child malnutrition is an effective use of a partnership between the U.S. free enterprise system and the Government. The Government called for the expertise of the private enterprise system to join in the conquest of child malnutrition. Out of this request, and the finest of Government-industry cooperation, there was developed a new produce called CSM.

What is this CSM which the Secretary of Agriculture described on July 26, 1967, as "a new, more efficient, more economical protein concentrate." CSM is being distributed by UNICEF, Church World Services, CARE, Catholic Relief, and many other voluntary agencies.

In a recent article in Today's Health, published by the American Medical Association, we find the following:

> CSM-Mix is one of the newest weapons in the Food for Peace Program's efforts to combat malnutrition. It was developed primarily for the infant (after weaning) and the school-age child.
>
> Maternal and child welfare programs, along with school lunch programs, are to have priority in receiving this food supplement through voluntary agencies. In view of the limited supplies of U.S. nonfat dry milk and other foods available for donation programs, it is hoped that CSM, along with a similar product called Ceplapro, will help in supplying protein and other much-needed nutrients.
>
> The mix, as the initials CSM would imply, is composed of corn meal (gelatinized), soy flour, and nonfat dry milk. It was estimated by the U.S. Department of Agriculture that three and one-half ounces would furnish a one-to-three-year-old child with 60 percent of his daily protein requirement, 62 percent of the calcium needed, and between 30 percent and 142 percent of the various minerals and vitamins, excluding vitamin C. The mix itself would supply one-fourth of the calories needed daily and costs about nine cents a pound.
>
> CSM is a powder which, since it has been precooked, can be prepared for consumption by merely adding it to boiling water for one minute. Ceplapro is much the same formula, although its shape is that of tiny, oval noodles. Yellow corn and wheat flour are used in Ceplapro instead of the gelatinized corn.
>
> In India and many other countries, CSM has been tried in such dishes as porridge, pancakes, and breads."

This great new product, is being universally applauded by the recipients in reports by the voluntary agencies distributing it. Those in Government, and those in private enterprise who have cooperated in bringing this new product to the world's malnourished, deserve the compliments of this body and of all our people. It is foreign aid at its best.

Little League "Series" Flourishes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN T. SCHNEEBELI
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 8, 1967

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, a recent article in the August 3 issue of the Christian Science Monitor outlines well the solid and rapid growth of Little League baseball. The annual world series of this international competition will take place in Williamsport, Pa., on Saturday, August 26, so the writeup is timely and of current import. Since the series site is only about 200 miles from Washington, the Members of Congress can enjoy seeing this classic with a short weekend drive into beautiful Pennsylvania country. The article by Michael Remas speaks itself.

The article follows:

> LITTLE LEAGUE "SERIES" FLOURISHES
>
> (By Michael Remas)
>
> FULLERTON, PA.—A group of kids playing ball on a corner lot aren't likely to draw much of a crowd. But it's a different story when the kids come from different parts of the world to play in the city of Williamsport, Pa.
>
> The occasion is the Little League World Series, and the "small fry" playing in it draw the eyes and ears of the world.
>
> The participating teams are made up of 12-year-old boys representing playoff championship teams from the North, South, East, and West sectors of the United States and from Latin America, Europe, the Pacific, and Canada.
>
> It's an event that swells the city on the Susquehanna River with tourists, public officials, baseball greats of the past, television crews, and sports writers.
>
> It will be that way again this year when the 21st annual series is held Aug. 22–26 at Howard J. Lamade Memorial Field in South Williamsport. Last year's title game drew some 20,000 spectators and a nationwide television audience that saw the Westbury Americans of Houston defeat West New York-New Jersey, 8–2.
>
> INAUGURATED IN 1939
>
> But Little League, like its name, had small beginnings.
>
> When Carl Stotz founded LL baseball in Williamsport with the help of a few others in 1939, the game consisted of three teams and a few dozen boys playing on a sandlot diamond beyond the outfield fence of Bowman Field, where the city's entry in the professional Eastern League still plays ball.
>
> But Stotz's game caught on. With more enthusiastic boys signing to play, the league expanded to four teams and played in a few different spots. Then it got its own field in Memorial Park, where the first LL World Series was played in 1947 and was continued until 1960, before moving to its current home along Route 15 in South Williamsport.
>
> Now international in scope, this 28-year-old organized game consists of more than 1,500,000 boys playing ball on some 40,000 teams in more than 6,000 leagues in 28 countries. And if you think thats' a lot of balls and strikes, keep in mind that the numbers are increasing annually.
>
> Perhaps the biggest boost to LL's growth came with the entry of U.S. Rubber Company into production of its "official Little League baseball show" in the late 1940's. The firm's advertising helped to spread the name Little League across the land.
>
> DIRECTED BY M'GOVERN
>
> By 1947 there were 14 leagues in Pennsylvania and another in Hammonton, N.J. Then things began to move fast. The next year found 94 leagues in 12 states. The total has increased ever since, with the expanded organization franchising leagues, handling league records, and overseeing the rules and regulations that make up LL membership.
>
> Little League has grown materially as well. From its small beginning it has progressed to a 33-acre site where a spacious diamond with a small grandstand and two large bleachers, practice fields, modern three-tory headquarters building, and camp and recreation facilities are located.
>
> The headquarters building houses Little League Baseball, Inc., a non-profit membership organization that maintains the international program. It is directed by Peter J. McGovern, president and board chairman.
>
> Four baseball camps are held at the site from mid-June to late August for boys 10 to 15 years who seek instruction in baseball, swimming, golf, tennis, and other forms of recreation. The camp site is located in a grove containing a combination recreation-mess hall, bungalows, swimming pool, and other facilities, including a Little League Hall of Fame and Museum.
>
> While Little League offers a boy a means of exercise and the experience of team competition, it also has helped contribute to professional baseball. LL headquarters reports that about 600 of its "graduates" are currently under contract to major-league clubs.

Hoboken To Honor Marconi Memory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 8, 1967

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, last week marked the 30th anniversary of the death of one of the truly great and significant men of the last century—Guglielmo Marconi.

We speak today of the revolution in technology and communications, but none of it would be possible without Marconi's precedent-shattering and pathbreaking inventions in the physical and electrical sciences. Marconi was the first man to ever file for a patent for wireless telegraphy based on the use of electric waves—and this only 71 years ago.

For the past 7 years, Magistrate Charles DeFazio, Jr., of Hoboken, has organized annual commemorative services for Marconi in Church Square Park, as one manifestation of his sincere dedication to the perpetuation of the memory of this unique inventor who helped alter the course of modern history.

I am sure my colleagues will find the following editorial—from the Hoboken, N.J., Hudson Dispatch of July 19—to be of much interest. We all owe Magistrate DeFazio a great debt for his part in keeping bright the name and memory of Marconi.

The editorial follows:

HOBOKEN TO HONOR MARCONI MEMORY

Thirty years ago tomorrow, Guglielmo Marconi, the "Father of Wireless," died at the age of 63 in Rome. For some inexplicable reason, the memory of the famous Italian inventor who pioneered today's great age of television and radio has become dimmed with the passing of the years except for an annual commemoration in Hudson's own City of Hoboken.

Tomorrow morning at 11 o'clock in Church Square Park, Fourth and Garden sts., in the "Mile-Square-City," memorial services will be held for the seventh year in honor of the inventive genius who made modern communications possible.

Two Hobokenites in particular deserve credit for the city's recognition of the inventor who "sparked" today's communications' marvels. They are John Minervini, who donated the life-sized statue of Sen. Marconi, which was dedicated on July 20, 1961, and former Magistrate Charles DeFazio Jr., who, when president of Hoboken UNICO Chapter, began the practice of holding the annual commemoration at the site of the Marconi monument.

Mr. DeFazio's dedication to keeping alive the memory of the "Father of Wireless" we happen to know first-hand has become just about his prime interest. Long before the date of the anniversary which he has determined will be perpetuated forever, the coordinator of the memorial service starts making certain that service, civic, church and fraternal groups will be represented, as they will be tomorrow.

This year, Mayor Louis DePascale has given his official efforts toward making the commemoration for 1967 outstanding. Quentin J. DeFazio, president of UNICO, too has assisted the coordinator of the observance. The mayor, city councilmen, Mr. Minervini and Rev. Armand Sorento, pastor of St. Francis Roman Catholic Church, will join in the Marconi tribute.

As a boy, Guglielmo Marconi took a keen interest in physical and electrical science. In 1895, when he was 21, an idea became firmly rooted in his mind that a system of telegraphy through space could be provided by means of electromagnetic waves.

In 1896, Mr. Marconi went to England and on June 2 of that year took out the first patent ever granted for wireless telegraphy based on the use of electric waves. A year later at the invitation of the Italian government, the inventor went to Spezia, where a land station was erected and communication with Italian warships was established up to a distance of 12 miles. From then, extension of wireless went on apace.

How it came about that Mr. Minervini gave to the City of Hoboken the statue in Church Square Park is most noteworthy. An ardent admirer of Mr. Marconi, the Hoboken businessman became aware in 1955 that a huge marble statue, depicting "Wireless Holding the Heart of the World," which had adorned the Italian pavilion at the 1939–40 New York World's Fair, had gone unnoticed on a Hoboken pier for more than a decade.

After the fair, it had been intended that the 12-ton, 17-foot high statue be returned to Italy. World War 2 broke out and the monument remained forgotten on the pier. Mr. Minervini financed a project to erect the statue in Church Square Park. His plans were jinxed and in the attempt to transport the huge marble memorial to the square, it broke in half.

Undeterred, Mr. Minervini increased his financial outlay to some $10,000 and hired expert sculptors to put the shattered pieces together. A final try at erecting the statue on a pedestal he had provided in the park failed and Mr. Minervini turned to plans for the life-sized memorial.

Dairy and Meat Import Bills

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 8, 1967

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, the voice of agriculture has been a multithroated one in which there have been several farm organizations and groups supposedly speaking for the total of agriculture. This has lead to a great deal of frustration and division of opinion among our rural people. Lately, there has been a change for the better.

It was my good fortune to be able to sit down with the leaders of the Farmers Union, the Farm Bureau, and the NFO in Meeker County, Minn., whereby they jointly cooperated in securing signatures from all farmers requesting rapid congressional action on dairy and meat import bills. Today, I have another incident to report carrying out this new theme of unity among our farm folks. These three farm organizations in the breadbasket of our Nation have set up a committee of the leadership of the three organizations to get a better joint understanding and cooperation on those things upon which they agree. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of gratification that I can report that they found more things that they are in agreement about than there are things that they disagree upon. I, therefore, insert in the Appendix the recorded account of the type of unification that is now going on in Kingsbury County, as reported in the July issue of the REA publication known as the Guardian:

Kingsbury County farm organizations, instead of fighting each other, are working together. They work together through the Kingsbury County Farm Federation.

It all began August 30, 1965, when a little black-robed nun, Sister Thomas More, a history professor at Holy Family College, Manitowoc, Wis., talked to farmers at Sioux Valley Electric headquarters, Colman.

"You've got to build a power structure," she told them. She said agriculture is the only segment of our economy that does not have a federated power structure. The government is federated through the 50 states, she said, labor through the AFL–CIO, and industry through the National Association of Manufacturers. Farm organizations are constantly bickering and fighting each other, she pointed out. Each of the 50 states is autonomous, sister said, and maintains its authority and identity within the federation of the United States, but that the federation of 50 states lends the strength and power of all to the one.

She suggested farm organizations, while retaining their identity and autonomy, federate to achieve power structure which she said is the only thing that will enable farmers to take their fair place in the economy.

The Rev. LeRoy Stadum, a Lutheran pastor at De Smet, came home and got some of his brother ministers together, telling them, "We ought to have a meeting like that." They got representatives of the Farm Bureau, Farmers Union and the National Farmers Organization together. (Kingsbury has no Grange.)

Out of that meeting came a resolution to form a committee of two members from each of the three farm organizations.

"We find there is a terrible lot of interest in it wherever we go," remarks Dale Gullickson, Lake Preston, one of the NFO representatives on the federation committee. The six farmers sit down once a month. "We don't know where we're going or how we're going to get there but we know where we want to go. We try to find common ground and when we can't find it we try to find out why there isn't any," they say.

"Where we want to go" is "to present a united front for agriculture to preserve the family farm," says John Hayden, (NFO), De Smet.

Says Gullickson, a former state representative from Kinsbury County, "We feel it has become necessary rather than a luxury for these organizations to get together for the preservation of the family farm. We all agree something has to be done.

"We sent a letter to our state and national heads asking them to sit down together," Gullickson says. But Dwaine Nelson, Kingsbury County Farm Bureau president, points out, "They are not going to do it until a majority of the counties give them a mandate. It's not going to come down from the top."

Adds Gullickson, "We're up against an organized society that does buckle down and do what is needed for their own good. They know what is coming up. But farmers are sitting there, a little island to themselves, thinking the world must beat a path to their door."

Hayden chips in, "We should have other organizations in our federation like the milk co-operatives and so on."

Gullickson predicts: "There is going to be a shortage of food but if they pay the price, we haven't begun to touch the production capacity of this country. If we let everything go with agriculture being unorganized and everything else being organized and the farmer getting what is left, there will be a shortage of food. But if the farmer gets a price through the unified effort of agriculture—which is the only way he is going to get it—there is no limit to what this country can produce. We've got the manpower and the mindpower. The need is coming up and you haven't got a price."

The meeting began in the fall of 1966 with the original idea that, to preserve peace, they would not discuss anything they didn't agree on. They soon found that they couldn't get anywhere by discussing only subjects on which they all agreed. So the agenda was broadened to admit disagreement. However, the majority does not rule. Any decision must be unanimous or it doesn't go.

Says Nelson, "As for accomplishing anything of importance, that's hard for one county to do, some other counties came down and they got a little hot. You can't accomplish anything that way."

"But it has created a better atmosphere in the county," says Hayden. "Our three organizations have sat down at the local level and proved they can get together."

Nelson observes, "It's just like neighbors: we have different beliefs but we can work together just fine. I respect their feelings and beliefs even though I don't have to agree with them."

The group is wide open to suggestions and ideas. "We'd like to help and encourage other counties with what little experience we have had," says Hayden. Outsiders could bring in new ideas."

On one occasion the federation invited representatives from each town in the county to sit in on a meeting to discuss the problems of business and how farmers and businessmen can help each other. "We'll have more meetings like that."

Gullickson concluded, "We as farmers must start swallowing some pride. We have got to give a little. Even when we don't agree, if your neighbor is doing something, do it with him. He may not be right. But you may not be right either."

The federation committee said anyone who wishes to sit in on a meeting may contact one of the members: Gullickson, NFO, Lake Preston; Hayden, NFO, De Smet; Nelson, Farm Bureau, Hetland; Ed Poppen, Farm Bureau, De Smet; Ronald Leonhardt, Farmers Union, Oldham; or Bernard Larson, Farmers Union, De Smet.

Federal Appropriations for Urban Areas Mount—Congress Responds to Needs and Problems of Our Cities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 8, 1967

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, there are those who are blaming Congress for the recent riots and violence in some of our major cities—charging that Congress has shirked its responsibility to our cities.

In this connection, and because of the interest of my colleagues and the American people in the record of the Congress, I include my recent newsletter, Capitol Comments, in the Appendix of the Record, as follows:

Federal Appropriations for Urban Areas Mount—Congress Responds to the Needs of City Problems

(By Joe L. Evins, Fourth District, Tennessee)

There are always those who blame Congress for the problems of the moment. Currently some officials are attempting to lay the cause of the recent riots and violence in some of our cities at the doorstep of Congress, contending that Congress has failed to adequately respond to the problems of our cities.

The fact that Federal appropriations for programs in metropolitan areas, including major cities, have increased 165 percent in less than a decade fails to deter these critics.

The facts are that Congress, within the past decade, has moved decisively to pass legislation and appropriations to combat urban problems in our large and small cities. Congress has funded many urban programs at increasingly higher levels each year.

President Johnson in his budget message for Fiscal 1968 pointed out that appropriations for programs in metropolitan areas have increased from $3.9 billion in 1960 to an estimated $10.3 billion in Fiscal 1968. This reflects an increase of more than $6 billion in seven years.

Our staff of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for Independent Offices and Department of Housing and Urban Development has prepared a list of appropriations for the past five years for some selected major housing and urban development programs (Fiscal 1964–68), as follows:

Urban renewal	$3,684,245,000
Low-rent public housing	1,176,917,000
Housing for the elderly and handicapped	275,000,000
Neighborhood facilities and college housing	1,556,000,000
Urban planning grants	134,662,000
Open space land programs	209,475,000
Grants for basic water and sewer facilities	365,000,000
Public facility loans	600,000,000
Urban mass transportation grants	620,000,000
Model cities program (1 year)	248,000,000
Total	8,867,299,000

These figures do not include approximately $2 billion authorized to finance the several housing loan programs of the Federal National Mortgage Association, more than $2 billion provided for anti-poverty programs of the Office of Economic Opportunity, and other billions appropriated for highways, eductaion, pollution control and many other programs—an estimated total of $23.8 billion in Fiscal 1968.

Certainly the Federal assistance programs for our cities, large and small, have played an important part in effecting major growth and progress. However, this assistance is not a substitute for local initiative and local leadership. This assistance is a financial incentive to assist local leadership in planning and carrying out various needed local municipal programs of growth and progress.

There are those who want Congress to do everything.

There are those who want Congress to do nothing.

And so traditionally the Congress has chosen a middleground—a mid-course between these extremes. As our population has has increased and shifted to major metropolitan areas, creating unprecedented problems in housing, health, blight, slums, crime and other areas, the Congress has passed measures to assist in the solution of these problems.

Congress continues to measure up to its responsibilities in providing assistance for urban areas. Congress this week is addressing itself to requests for further needed appropriations while also continuing its consideration of the Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice Assistance Act. This Act is designed to assist cities in strengthening their local law enforcement agencies and police departments.

There is no substitute for local leadership, local initiative and local responsibility. Congress can help—but the thrust for solution of municipal problems must come from the local level.

Sanctuary in Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 8, 1967

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, Cuba, now that the Monroe Doctrine has become passé, is but a refuge for hordes of international Communists, protected by our secretive "hip pocket" diplomacy. Just 90 miles off our shore they enjoy a sanctuary to plot when, how, and where to bury the United States.

With representatives of most nations of the world present, including the U.S. civil rights leader, Stokely Carmichael, a sort of United Nations international image is projected to instill fear in the heart of all freemen. Not fear of the Bolshevik, but fear from the soft policies and indecision of our directionless leaders.

How can any thinking American justify the inescapable conclusion that the might of the United States guarantees the godless Communists not only a military base of operation but an international command post in our hemisphere—our backyard.

Mr. Speaker, I include my resolution, House Joint Resolution 496, filed April 11, 1967, and pending before the Committee on Foreign Affairs, following my remarks, followed by the Washington Evening Star articles of August 2 and 3, and Dr. George Benson's column of July 29, 1967:

H.J. Res. 496

Joint resolution to prevent the subversion of the United States and the American continents as proposed by the Communist government of Cuba under Castro, and for other purposes

Whereas there have been many suggestions and several resolutions as to the procedure necessary to stop Cuba's Fidel Castro from subverting the American continents; and

Whereas Fidel Castro's Communist regime has, by its actions, merited the condemnation of the Organization of American States as an aggressor nation; and

Whereas the Castro government at the Tri-Continental Conference declared, openly for all to know, its intent to overthrow every legally constituted government on the American continent, including that of these United States; and whereas, it has already put into practice the revolutionary plans of the Tri-Continental Conference of Havana in Bolivia, Venezuela, and Guatemala; and

Whereas the citizens people of Cuba, terrorized by huge arms buildup and foreign mercenary troops, cannot regain control of their government without outside help from the nearly one million fellow countrymen in exile; and

Whereas it is to the best interest of these United States not to have an aggressive dictatorship, supported by foreign arms and troops, menacing our people with atomic missiles pointed at our cities; and

Whereas it is in the peaceful interest of the United States Government, as well as a moral obligation to all Americans, to prevent Latin America and the United States from becoming a battlefield for guerrilla warfare, as planned by Castro at the Tri-Continental Conference of Havana; and

Whereas it would be a waste of the American taxpayers' dollars to donate funds for the Alliance for Progress in Latin America while Castro is at liberty to organize, finance, and direct guerrilla bands to attack and overthrow these same governments we are trying to help financially: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the United States Government withdraw political recognition of Cuba's Communist government and thus encourage all Latin American countries to do likewise; and

That all governments who wish to participate in the Alliance for Progress must first withdraw political recognition of any Communist government in Cuba; and

That the United States State Department policy be clearly defined as no longer recognizing the Communist regime of Castro at Havana and that no reprisals will be taken against any Cuban in restoring freedom and constitutional government in their homeland Cuba; and

That any nation doing business with Cuba's Communist aggressor government of Fidel Castro will be subjected to an embargo by the United States in equal amounts to that country's imports to the United States; and

That the United States Government will recognize no government in Cuba until a truly constitutional government is established by free elections participated in by all Cubans.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Aug. 2, 1967]

CUBA EXPECTING CARMICHAEL FOR CONFERENCE ON REVOLTS

MIMAI, FLA.—Stokely Carmichael, American black power advocate, plans to attend next week's Havana conference aimed at brewing revolutions, the Cuban radio said today.

"We are going to be reunited with you in Havana because we think the Cuban victory is our victory and the courage of the Cuban people inspires our fight," the radio quoted Carmichael as saying in London.

Leftists and revolutionaries from throughout Latin America have begun arriving in Communist Cuba for the conference sponsored by the Latin American Solidarity Organization which starts July 31, the radio said.

Carmichael left Britain yesterday for Prague amid reports he was on his way to North Vietnam. For more than a week in Britain, he spoke at meetings in the Negro sections of London.

With an eye on racial violence in the United States, British Home Secretary Roy Jenkins ordered Scotland Yard to submit a full report on Carmichael's activities.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Aug. 3, 1967]

"GO TO HELL," CARMICHAEL TELLS STATE

MIAMI.—Stokely Carmichael today told the State Department to "go to hell."

In a post-midnight interview on Havana Radio, monitored here, Carmichael spoke contemptuously of possible State Department revocation of his passport because he went to Cuba without permission.

The Cuban interviewer referred to a statement attributed to Robert McCloskey, State Department spokesman, and to reports that U.S. customs offices were alerted for Carmichael's return.

The interviewer asked for Carmichael's position on "these threats against you personally."

"McCloskey is not my father, nor is he my mother," Carmichael replied. "I do not ask him for permission to go where I want to go. I go where I want, when I want, and I speak to whom I please McCloskey and the State Department can go to hell."

The government forbids travel by U.S. citizens to certain Communist nations including Cuba unless an exception is approved in advance. Carmichael did not seek such approval.

Carmichael was interviewed on Havana Radio's English-language service beamed to North America via short wave. On Tuesday he had barred U.S. reporters from his news conference.

In today's interview he repeated his prediction of "urban guerrilla warfare" by Negroes against the U.S. Government. "Our only answer," he said, "is to destroy that government or to be destroyed while trying to destroy the government. At any rate, we are going to start with guns to get our liberation."

The interview was a further manifestation of the VIP treatment being accorded the militant American Negro by Cuban officials. U.S. racial turmoil is being mentioned often by speakers at the Havana conference of the organization of Latin American Solidarity, which Carmichael is attending.

Havana Radio said the conference would be in committee work today, after a round of speeches by delegates at yesterday's plenary session. Carmichael, an honorary delegate, got a standing ovation after his speech. He pledged Negro support for Latin American revolutions.

The declared goal of the meeting is to create more Vietnams for the United States in Latin America. The closing session is scheduled for next Tuesday.

CALLS FOR CHANGE

"We seek with you to change bases of the world," Carmichael said in addressing the conference yesterday, the Associated Press reported.

"Our destiny cannot be separated from the Spanish-speaking peoples," he declared.

Carmichael said young Negroes are carrying the racial revolution in the United States today.

"It is the young blood that contains the hatred mentioned by Che," said Carmichael, referring to a recent message purportedly from Ernesto (Che) Guevara, the missing Castro lieutenant.

[From the Summit Sun, July 27, 1967]

THE GREAT DECEPTION

(By George S. Benson)

"People always have been and they always will be stupid victims of deceit and self-deception in politics . . ."

—NIKOLAI LENIN.

Published reports on Soviet Premier Alexei Kosygin's visit with Fidel Castro in Havana, Cuba, give dramatic evidence of the incredible success of Russia's propaganda conquest of U.S. policy-makers and a large part of the American press. One of the biggest-circulation news weeklies in America, recognized in the past for its cold-eyed appraisal of the duplicity of World Communism, pictured the Soviet boss as a "dove" wanting to halt Cuba's exporting of guerrilla warfare and revolution into Latin America, and Castro as refusing.

"Most reports indicate that the Russians and Cubans found virtually no common ground," said this influential news magazine. Then this astonishing remark was made: "The Russians are described as being wary of violence in Latin America. They prefer helping Communist parties become respectable." This reporting is in character with much of the journalism being published throughout America. It is a true echo of what our Government leaders are saying today. This "good, respectable" image for Soviet Communism is the image on which our foreign policy is based. Is it a true or a false image? And what are the dangers involved if it is false?

DANGEROUS IMAGE

I believe the image of a changed, trustworthy Soviet Communism as the basis for our foreign policy is dangerous and could be disastrous. For the next several weeks we shall devote ourselves to reporting results of considerable reportorial research into the facts of the "Great Deception" through which our Government leaders, the American wire services, the TV networks, and other important news outlets seem to have been bewitched.

We intend to use Kosygin's visit to Cuba and Cuba's threat to the free world (under Soviet control) as the focal point of our examination of the deception. The titles of some of our forthcoming columns will be: "The Russians in Cuba" . . . "The Missiles in Cuba" . . . "Castro's Biggest Export: Revolution" . . . "We Are Protecting Red Cuba."

GUERRILLA TRAINING HEADQUARTERS

The American press generally is reporting some facts on Castro's exporting of subversion and guerrilla warfare, but even these reporte are inadequate, frequently buried on newspaper back pages and ignored by the big TV network news programs. Almost invariably, in such relatively meager reportage, the observation is made that the Russian Red leaders deplore the "erratic" Castro's training of guerrilla bands for subverting, fomenting violence, and leading revolts against the Latin American nations.

I have the sworn word of one of the most respected men in international life that the U.S. State Department does not want Communist Cuba mentioned adversely—because it riles up the American people, and any overt action against Cuba would be contrary to U.S. commitments and would disturb our "good" relationship with the Soviet bosses. Our National Education Program staff has gathered voluminous sworn testimony from recognized authorities convincing any logical mind that Cuba is in fact not a harmless Castro-controlled and deteriorating island in the peaceful Caribbean but a constantly expanding fortress of World Communism, bristling with Soviet armaments, submarine bases, subterranean missile complexes, and operated as a Soviet outpost, under rigid Russian control, decisively strategic in Soviet plans for conquering the Western hemisphere.

FACTS EXAMINED

We have eye-witness testimony (which will be reported in subsequent columns) describing "Russian cities" in Cuba, vast underground missile establishments (built and operated today by Russians), a network of subterranean arsenals with huge tunnels and rail transport running sometime 60 miles and some containing under-mountain runways over which medium-size bombers and Mig 21's (made in Russia) roar, to take flight literally "out of the mouth" of caves like monstrous bats.

There is testimony (of authentic character) describing Russian missiles now in Cuba which measure 60-feet, the size of the IRBM 1500-mile missiles which Russia installed in Cuba in 1962 (then, reportedly, removed) and new missiles approximately 150 feet long—possibly the biggest Soviet ICBM's on which Russia has been developing multiple heads capable of instantaneous deployment, through cluster firings, all over a nation. The truth about Cuba constitutes a dramatic denial of the fiction on which much of our foreign policy is based. It spotlights the great deception which seems to have victimized our leaders and now is endangering our survival.

Michigan National Guard Commended

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GARRY BROWN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 8, 1967

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a moment today to salute the Michigan National Guard for its handling of the recent Detroit riot.

Since the ashes in Detroit's riot ravaged West Side have settled, there have been some allegations and criticisms regarding the conduct of the Guard. Some say they were too hard. Some say they were too slow. Some say they were too fast. Some say they made mistakes. And, maybe they did. But a lot of mistakes were made. Not just by the guardsmen. By many people.

But it must be recognized that the National Guard was moved in without time to prepare for its actions in the riot, and was immediately involved around the clock in subduing serious outbreaks of arson, looting, and sniping. An example of the type of constant action required of the Guard, which has been related to me, was a call from a police precinct station several blocks away from where the Guard units were deployed. The call requested troops immediately "if the precinct station was to be saved." At one point, the sniping was so intense that the police were also pulled out in the west end of the city and control left to the guardsmen.

Furthermore, it is my understanding that only about half these troops were actively training at Camp Grayling at the time of the riot—the rest were with their families at home when they responded to the call.

Contrast this with reports that Federal troops were deployed first to Selfridge Air Force Base and then to the Michigan State Fairgrounds fully 12 hours before they were moved into action.

Obviously, they had time for "staging" and a greater opportunity to contemplate their moves and better organize themselves for action.

It is also my understanding that the highly trained regular Army troops were put on patrol or standby duty mainly east of Woodward Avenue where there was far less action than the burning, looting, and sniping that took place in the 12th Street and Grand River Boulevard area on the West Side of Detroit.

In view of all this, I should think that some well-deserved thanks are in order for those gallant guardsmen who stood up to a ravaging mob for countless hours, would grab a cup of coffee, a cold sandwich, and a couple of hours nap—and then go out and do it all over again.

They had "what it takes" when it was needed. I, for one, am proud of all of them—and grateful. I shudder to think what the results might have been if the National Guard had not been there.

In particular, I would also like to congratulate Brig. Gen. Noble O. Moore, of Albion, who was to have ended his active military career at 12:01 a.m. Sunday, July 23, 1967. His last active duty was to have been the 2-week field training of the Michigan National Guard's 46th Infantry Division at Camp Grayling. The encampment ended Sunday. But, instead of spending his final hours receiving the congratulations and plaudits of his associates and in the quiet routine of administrative work, General Moore's last assignment was one which will be part of history.

Until Sunday, July 23, General Moore was the assistant division commander. But later that day he was in Detroit conferring with the Detroit mayor to discuss a riot-control operation in conjunction with the Detroit police department.

With the callup of guardsmen completed, General Moore took command of the task force which assisted Detroit police during the worst of the rioting that Sunday and the following day. When the National Guard was federalized and Regular Army forces brought in, General Moore's contingent came under Federal authority, but he retained command of his brigade.

While General Moore and his men deserve our heartfelt gratitude and thanks for the service they rendered, it must be emphasized that special attention should be given to the training of National Guard troops specifically in riot control techniques, and they should be furnished the necessary equipment so as to more effectively deal with riots and other violent disturbances. I would, therefore, hope that a program would be undertaken immediately to accomplish this. The hour is at hand, and we must act to preserve law and order.

Self-Employed Pension Plan Clearly Explained by Sylvia Porter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 8, 1967

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, in 1962, Congress enacted the Keogh bill, sponsored by our distinguished and respected colleague from New York, the Honorable Eugene J. Keogh, to encourage the establishment of voluntary pension plans by self-employed individuals. In the last Congress, and again under the sponsorship of Congressman Keogh, we liberalized the self-employed pension plan law.

As originally enacted by Congress, the Keogh Act permitted the self-employed to contribute to a pension plan a maximum of $2,500 in annual earned income, half of which was tax exempt. The 89th Congress liberalized the law to make the full set-aside of $2,500 tax exempt.

Mr. Speaker, I supported and voted for both the original Keogh Act and the liberalization legislation in the last Congress, because these laws give the self-employed an opportunity to defer payment of taxes on a modest portion of income until the time of retirement. Sylvia Porter, the well-known, knowledgeable, and perceptive columnist specalizing in economics, has written two "Your Money's Worth" articles explaining to the average self-employed how the Keogh Act plan works. I include these columns, printed in the Washington Evening Star yesterday and today, with my remarks in the RECORD:

[From the Washington Star, Aug. 7, 1967]

YOUR MONEY'S WORTH: SELF-EMPLOYED PENSIONS—I

(By Sylvia Porter)

If you are a self-employed businessman or professional, now is the time to consider or reconsider whether you should set up a retirement plan under the Keogh Act or H.R. 10 of 1962.

A major liberalization of this law, effective in 1968, improves the tax advantages of a pension plan.

Many self-employed, who have not felt it worthwhile to adopt a self-employed pension plan may now find this a most attractive way to provide for retirement needs.

Because this law is of wide significance and so many are unfamiliar with it, today's and tomorrow's column, with the co-operation of Leon Gold, chief tax expert of the Research Institute of America, are devoted to it.

PLAN EXPLAINED

An approved self-employed retirement plan will allow you to set aside and deduct on your income tax return 10 per cent of your earned income up to $2,500 each year. The amounts set aside earn income tax-free until they are distributed on your retirement. You pay tax on these amounts and the income they have earned tax-free when you collect the funds on retirement.

As a result the self-employed individual, can build up a fund for retirement at a faster pace and at a smaller tax cost than without the tax deduction for contributions and the tax exemption of the income of the fund.

As originally passed, H.R. 10 permitted deduction for tax purposes only half of the amount set aside. If you set aside $2,000 a year, for instance, you could deduct only $1,000 for tax purposes; you were taxed on the other $1,000, even though the money was put aside. This killed the value of the plan for most self-employed.

Beginning with 1968, you'll be able to take a deduction for the entire amount you set aside. If you set aside $2,000, you can deduct $2,000. In the words of Gold, "this 100 per cent deduction sweetens the retirement plan to the point where many self-employed will find it the quickest and least costly way of building retirement income."

OTHER CHANGES

In addition are these other changes:

1. Arbitrary restrictions on contributions have been lifted beginning with 1968 for businesses in which capital is a material income-producing factor. As long as personal services also are a material income-producing factor, the self-employed in this type of business may contribute 10 percent of his income subject to the $2,500 limit.

2. Authors, inventors and others whose personal efforts create property may now participtae in self-employed retirement plans without regard to technicalities in this compensation agreements. Now here are some questions and answers:

Q. Who can have a self-employed plan?

A. Generally, anyone who is a self-employed individual and who has earned income. You may have a plan whether you conduct your business or profession as a sole proprietorship or as a partnership and whether or not you have any other employees.

Your plan must be set up by the individual who owns the business or by the partnership, if it is a partnership. An individual partner cannot set up a plan himself.

If you are self-employed on a part-time basis, you can establish a self-employed retirement plan from part-time earnings, even if you are covered as an employe under another qualified employ benefit plan. If you're a lawyer working for a corporation and you have a practice of your own on the side, you can set up a plan to cover your self-employment earnings.

Q. Is there any age limit?

A. Not on setting up a plan. But business owners and major partners must start to receive benefits under the plan not later than the year in which they reach the age of 70½.

Q. How much can be put into a plan.

A. A sole proprietor or major (more than 10 percent) partner can set aside each year up to 10 percent of his earnings or $2,500, whichever is less. There is no overall lifetime limit.

Tomorrow: More key guides on self-employed plans.

[From the Washington Evening Star, Aug. 8, 1967]

YOUR MONEY'S WORTH: SELF-EMPLOYED PENSIONS—II

(By Sylvia Porter)

Because of major liberalizations of the Keogh Act of 1962, to become effective starting with 1968, self-employed professionals or businessmen may now find adopting a self-employed pension plan a most attractive way to provide for retirement needs.

Yesterday's column listed some basic facts. Today's, written with the co-operation of the Research Institute of America, adds details.

Q. How do you set up a plan?

A. The simple practical thing to do is to tie in with an already existing plan. Many banks, insurance companies, mutual funds and professional organizations have master or prototype plans which have been approved by the Treasury as qualifying for favorable tax treatment. To adopt such a plan, file a one-page form with the local District Director of the Internal Revenue Service. The Treasury then will approve the plan for you.

Another simple move is to adopt a bond purchase plan. To do this, file a one-page form with the Treasury.

Q. What if you want to set up a plan of your own?

A. You must go through the same cumbersome, difficult steps needed to set up a regular employe benefit plan and furnish all the information required by the Treasury. If you tie in with an approved master or prototype plan, most of these requirements will have been taken care of and you won't need to worry.

Q. When should you set up a plan?

A. If you're seeking the full tax reduction in 1968 and want to start to build tax-free earnings on your contribution, as soon as possible. You might now start the process of joining a master or prototype plan or creating your own plan.

If you are in the 50 percent tax bracket, the result of a tax-free buildup at 5 percent within your pension fund is equal to a 10 percent buildup outside the fund. Of course, this advantage will be reduced by the tax you must pay when the pension funds are distributed to you.

Q. Must you cover your regular employes?

A. Yes, if they have three years service—with one exception. The exception is for partnership plans which do not cover any partners with a more than 10 percent interest.

Whether or not employes must be covered is a vital point in your decision on whether or not to set up a plan.

If you have several employes, the cost of providing coverage for them with a contribution of 10 percent of their earnings more than offsets the annual tax saving to you. The only way to be sure about this is to work out the projected figures.

Q. How do you invest the money you put in the plan?

A. You can buy annuity, endowment and retirement income policies directly from an insurance company or you can buy face amount certificates (like annuities) from an investment company. Or you can set up a custodial account with a bank which will then invest your account either in annuities or in mutual funds. Or you can put the funds into a trust and if a bank is the trustee, it can then place the funds in various types of permissible investments. Or you can buy special U.S. Retirement Plan bonds. If you want a particular type of investment, you must shop around to find it.

Q. When can retirement benefits be paid out?

A. Most self-employed persons cannot draw benefits before age 59½ without incurring a penalty. Benefits must be distributed starting with the year in which the self-employed person reaches age 70½.

Q. What are some pros and cons?

A. If you are a successful self-employed person who has no employes with three years of service, the odds are you'll find a pension plan an excellent idea.

If you have employes, you must calculate the tax angles with utmost care. If you are in a lower income bracket, the tax benefits will be much less attractive. If you are a young professional or businessman, freezing funds for your retirement 30 or more years away can be a great burden.

Rats: A Serious Health Hazard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. HOWARD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 8, 1967

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I hope those of our colleagues who have recently questioned the seriousness of the health problem caused by rats in this country have by now had the opportunity to acquaint themselves with the facts. As much as we might like to think otherwise, rats are a very real problem for thousands of our fellow citizens, and we ought to be making a greater investment in the eradication of this health hazard.

I for one believe the House of Representatives made a very serious mistake when it refused last month to consider the proposed Rat Extermination Act of 1967. If this or similar legislation should once again be brought to the House floor, I trust that those who voted against taking up this very modest and needed measure will recognize the error of their previous vote and support the proposal.

For those who still doubt the gravity of the problem, I recommend an article which was carried in a number of newspapers recently. It was written by Associated Press Reporter Jack R. Miller, and appeared in the July 30 edition of the Courier-Journal & Times of Louisville, Ky. Under unanimous consent I include Mr. Miller's article at this point in the RECORD, as follows:

THRIVE IN SLUM: 90 MILLION RATS COST UNITED STATES $1 BILLION A YEAR

(By Jack A. Miller)

WASHINGTON.—The United States has about half as many rats as people.

Nobody knows the exact number, but they may be costing the nation close to $1 billion a year.

The House Banking and Currency Committee, terming its estimates conservative, recently reported about 90 million rats in the country and said each is causing about $10 damage annually.

Nearly all major American cities have serious rat problems, government officials say.

Elsewhere in the world the rat problem is worse. The World Health Organization estimates there is one rat for every person in the world, and in some countries—India for example—there are more rats than people.

Rats thrive in slum areas. Many poor people live in constant dread of rats. The greatest danger is rat bite, and it is little children—especially those in cribs—who are the most likely victims.

The House last week refused to consider a $40-million, two-year rat extermination program backed by President Johnson. The President criticized the House and remarked: "If we can spend millions of dollars to protect cows from screw worm, why can't we spend a little more money to protect our children from rats?"

One government rat expert, Dr. Allan W. Donaldson, says New York City reports 500 to 600 rat bite reports a year. Philadelphia, Cleveland and St. Louis all have been averaging more than 50 reported cases a year.

SERIOUS PSYCHOLOGICAL IMPACT

The real total is probably much higher. As the House committee noted, "Many persons are reluctant to report rat bite incidents and . . . many units of local and state government do not require such reports."

Donaldson, associate director of the U.S. Bureau of Disease Prevention and Environmental Control says an equally serious aspect of the rat problem is the psychological impact on people who live in rat infested areas.

"They're pests, they're dirty and they're frightening," he says. "The very existence of rats where people live is bad." He adds that rats are great spreaders of disease.

Rats flourish in the slums, Donaldson says, because this is where control measures are lacking.

But he says real reduction of the rat problem "is largely beyond the control of the individual or family."

"It's going to take action by the city governments," Donaldson said.

Letter From President of the League of Women Voters of the District of Columbia Urging Passage of President's Reorganization Plan No. 3

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 8, 1967

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I recently received a letter from Elizabeth S. Johnson, president of the League of Women Voters of the District of Columbia.

In her letter, Mrs. Johnson expressed her hope and the hope of the entire league, that the President's Reorganization Plan No. 3 would be accepted by the Congress.

Reorganization Plan No. 3 is a modest step toward self-government. On Wednesday of this week we will have before us House Resolution 512 calling for the disapproval of Reorganization Plan No. 3. I hope that all of our colleagues will vote against House Resolution 512 and thus show their approval of this plan.

I commend Mrs. Johnson's letter to the attention of our colleagues, as follows:

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS,
OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
Washington, D.C., July 28, 1967.

Hon. ABRAHAM J. MULTER,
House District of Columbia Committee,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MULTER: The League of Women Voters of the District of Columbia continues to urge acceptance of the President's Reorganization Plan #3 of 1967 which calls for a single commissioner and a nine-member council for the District of Columbia.

It is our opinion after careful consideration that a three-man commission form of government is not adequate to cope with the complexities of a large city. We are convinced that many of the delays, difficulties and frustrations we have encountered as we have studied and worked with the D.C. government are directly attributable to the present system. Three separate commissioners, each responsible for separate areas of the city, provide a fragmented response to overlapping problems.

We in the D.C. League of Women Voters believe that reorganization of the District government may be required at many levels. We have adopted as an agenda item for this year the study of the structure and function of the D.C. government and related independent federal agencies, and hope to come to some further conclusions in the near future. We welcome the prospect of study, hearings, and action by the District Committees as they too probe these areas. But the time is short. There is wide citizen support within the District for this first step. The President's Plan is ready now. It is possible now. As members of Congress responsible for the government of the nation's capital city, you have the opportunity to provide the framework for a better government for the District of Columbia. We urge you to do so by accepting the President's Reorganization Plan #3 of 1967.

Sincerely,

ELIZABETH S. JOHNSON,
President.

Treason by Any Name Smells the Same

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DON FUQUA

OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 8, 1967

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, is it treason to advocate the overthrow of the United States by guerrilla warfare?

Is it treason to threaten the lives of the President, the Secretary of State, and the Secretary of Defense?

Is it treason to advocate that race be pitted against race in a battle to the death?

The actions of Stokely Carmichael in Cuba are those of a traitor. The Tampa Tribune, Tampa, Fla., on August 3, 1967, printed an editorial which I think is excellent. This article speaks for itself and I would like to have it reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, so that more Americans might have an opportunity to read it:

BY DEED, A TRAITOR

"Treason against the United States shall consist only in levying War against them, or in adhering to their Enemies, giving them Aid and Comfort. No person shall be convicted of Treason unless on the Testimony of two Witnesses of the same overt Act, or on Confession in open Court."—Section 3, Article III, Constitution of the United States.

In the broad sense of the term there can be no doubt that Stokely Carmichael is guilty of treason.

Consider his latest statements at Havana, where he has been made an "honorary delegate" to a Communist conference on the tactics of revolution.

"We have no alternative but to use aggressive armed violence in order to own the land, houses and stores inside our communities and to control the politics of those communities," Carmichael said, referring to American Negroes.

He called for killing of the nation's leaders in retaliation for any action to suppress such an armed rebellion.

"Let us develop a consciousness that when they touch one guerrilla, Lyndon Johnson, Dean Rusk, Robert McNamara must pay the price . . . We are not waiting for them to kill us. We will move to kill them first—or rather, we are working towards that goal."

Could there be any plainer declaration of intent to overthrow the established government of the United States and murder its leaders?

Could Castro and his Communists (the enemies of this country) receive greater "aid and comfort" from an American citizen than that which Carmichael has given them?

The answer, to any sensible citizen, must be an unqualified No.

Whether Carmichael is technically subject to prosecution for treason is another matter.

Over the years, from the time of Chief Justice John Marshall, the courts have adopted a strict interpretation of the Constitution's definition of treason. It is almost imperative to prove that a citizen was actually engaged in making war upon the United States in order to convict him.

But there are other Federal laws which surely apply to Carmichael's conduct.

An 1861 law making it a crime to conspire to overthrow the government, make war against it or forcibly oppose its authority is still in effect. Carmichael and his partners in Snick would certainly appear to be in violation of this law.

Rap Brown, who succeeded Carmichael as head of Snick (Student Non-violent Coordinating Committee), has been guilty of urging open warfare by Negroes upon the government. Police hold him mainly responsible for a recent destructive riot at Cambridge, Md.

Investigators for the House Committee on unAmerican Activities say Snick instigated a riot last April in Nashville (where Carmichael spoke at two colleges) and in Atlanta last year.

In a column on this page today Rowland Evans and Robert Novak make a convincing case that Snick has become "the arm of the Castro government" in the United States. They believe it is being financed by Castro.

Shall this government sit by passively while men who are in the service, if not the pay, of a foreign enemy urge its overthrow and the murder of its leaders?

It cannot, we say, if it is to maintain law and order and respect for American institutions.

Committees of Congress now investigating the recent riots ought to ask Attorney General Ramsey Clark whether present Federal laws are adequate to send Stokely Carmichael to prison. If Clark thinks not, then it should be the immediate business of Congress to enact such laws.

The Rosenbergs were executed for delivering to Russia secrets of the atomic bomb.

Carmichael is attempting, with Communist help, to attack this country with his own H (for hate) bomb. It has the potential for so bleeding the nation that a weakened United States could fall victim to external enemies.

By any common sense interpretation, Carmichael is guilty of treason. And a traitor whose declared aim is to destroy his country should not go unpunished.

Cliff Alexander: A Leader for Equal Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JACOB H. GILBERT

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 8, 1967

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, in one of our leading newspapers not very many months ago, a leading civil rights leader was quoted as saying in a recent speech:

> No President has done more or said more, more plainly, on civil rights than President Johnson.

The President's choice of Clifford Alexander as Chairman of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission is a fine example of his leadership in behalf of equality.

As the New York Post noted:

> His (Cliff Alexander's) task will not be only to tackle job discrimination against Negroes nationwide, but also to remove barriers based on sex, age, religion or national origin. But in the context of today's development, the emphasis now must be on race.

Unemployment is one of the hardcore factors contributing to the social unrest of American society. Cliff Alexander will work closely with industry and government in helping them recruit minority employees. This, I think, will help to ease tensions in our cities.

President Johnson has asked Congress to give the Commission new powers to enforce its decisions. With this mandate, Mr. Alexander will write a record of accomplishment in the vital area of equal employment opportunities.

Mr. Alexander's appointment has won a deserved tribute from the Nation's press. Under unanimous consent I insert in the RECORD an excellent article from the New York Post entitled "The Word Is 'Equal' " that profiles the outstanding qualities of a dedicated public servant—Cliff Alexander:

THE WORD IS "EQUAL"

(By Ted Poston)

After all the shooting and shouting subsides in the current crop of racial disorders across the nation, much of President Johnson's hopes for racial reconciliation may rest on the shoulders of a tart-tongued young Harlemite who believes:

"Jobs are at the heart of three-fourths of the problems of the ghettos. This is the key area in the whole field of racial unrest."

It is the job of Clifford L. Alexander, 33, to see that those jobs are passed around more equitably. He is the new chairman designate of the federal Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

His task will be not only to tackle job discrimination against Negroes nationwide, but also to remove barriers based on sex, age, religion or national origin. But in the context of today's developments, the emphasis now must be on race.

In this new task, "young Cliff" Alexander (as his friends differentiate him from Cliff Alexander Sr.) can expect few kind words from such Black Power advocates as Floyd McKissick and Stokely Carmichael. Nor should he. He's had few kind words for them.

A couple of months ago, addressing the Long Island Negro Business and Professional Men's Assn., Alexander, speaking as a deputy special counsel to President Johnson, said of the CORE and SNCC leaders: "White society has developed a new Amos and Andy team—Floyd and Stokely.

"Floyd and Stokely entertain the living daylights out of masochistic white liberals whom they beat over the back . . . and at the end of all that they have no program at all."

Cliff Alexander is of Harlem, but not of its slums. Scion of a comfortable upper middle class family, he attended the proper schools—Fieldston, Harvard, Yale Law.

The senior Cliff ran the Harlem USO during World War II, managed the then-swank Riverton Houses (which Metropolitan Life built for Negroes who wanted to enter Stuyvesant Town and Peter Cooper Village) and is now a bank executive in Harlem.

His mother, the late Edith McAllister Alexander, the first Negro woman to become a Presidential elector (for Truman, 1948) was a veteran civic and social worker who, in a way, blazed the thorny trail that young Cliff must now follow.

After the Harlem riots of 1943, Mayor LaGuardia called her in to run his Mayor's Committee on Unity, the forerunner of our present City Commission on Human Rights. And Mayor Wagner paid tribute to her efforts in 1961 (four years before her death) when he cited her for "distinguished and exceptional services."

Now that Clifford Alexander Jr. didn't have his own contacts with the slums and the slum-dwellers. After getting out of the Army ("where I fought the Battle of Fort Dix"), he worked briefly in District Attorney Hogan's office and then became executive director of the Manhattanville-Hamilton Grange Neighborhood Conservation Project where, he says, "We got 2,000 housing violations removed by slumlords in a relatively brief time." He was also the first director of Haryou-ACT, pioneer anti-poverty project.

Alexander had more going for him than just a couple of influential parents. His old Harvard dean, McGeorge Bundy, remembered the bright young (and first Negro) president of Student Council and summoned him down to Washington to work in the Far Eastern Affairs Section of the National Security Council during the last months of the Kennedy Administration. And President Johnson, meeting him there, elevated him to Deputy Assistant Counsel to the President in August, 1964.

His marriage in 1959 to Adele Logan, the daughter of Dr. Arthur Logan, civil rights activist and community leader, not only united two of Harlem's most socially prominent families but also climaxed a storybook romance. It had started at Fieldston School and continued while he went to Harvard and she to Radcliffe.

They have two children, Elizabeth, 5, and Mark Clifford, 3.

Three Marylanders Die in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE D. LONG
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 8, 1967

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, three Maryland servicemen were recently killed in action in Vietnam. They were Pfc. Charles F. Brandenburg, M. Sgt. Theodore H. Dreyer, and L. Cpl. Charles G. Butler, Jr. I wish to commend the courage of these men and to honor their memory by including the following article in the RECORD:

THREE MARYLANDERS DIE IN VIETNAM—TWO SOLDIERS AND MARINE VICTIMS OF FIGHTING

Three more Marylanders—two in the Army and one in the Marine Corps—have been killed in action in Vietnam, the Defense Department said yesterday.

The war victims were identified as Pfc. Charles F. Brandenburg, of Frederick, M. Sgt. Theodore H. Dreyer, of Lexington Park, and Lance Cpl. Charles G. Butler, Jr., of Silver Spring.

Private Brandenburg died last Saturday from multiple wounds received when he was hit by metal fragments of an enemy hand grenade.

A native of Frederick and a 1964 graduate of Frederick High School, he was a good student who was frequently on the honor roll, his father said last night.

LEFT GOOD FRIDAY

After graduation he worked as a carpenter in Washington until he was drafted last September. He left for Vietnam on Good Friday when his family saw him off at Dulles Airport.

In frequent letters to his family, he described conditions in Vietnam and the difficulties of Army life, where he often worked from 5 A.M. until 7 P.M.

"They're running us to death," he wrote August 2 in a letter that his family received yesterday. "If they run us any harder, we might just as well give up. We won't have enough energy to fight."

He described a party that he and his friends had organized with all the steak and beer they wanted. They were to leave for the front the following day, he wrote.

ON LAST LEAVE

Private Brandenburg had returned to a home camp for several days rest after 120 days on "front lines" in North Vietnam, his father said.

His survivors include his wife, the former Connie Simpson; his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Charles Upton Brandenburg; a brother, Ernie Brandenburg; a sister, Miss Phylis Brandenburg; a grandmother, Mrs. Charles Brandenburg, and a great-grandmother, Mrs. Emma Plunkard.

Sergeant Dreyer, 32, who received a purple heart for injuries received when his armored carrier hit a mine June 4, died in August when his carrier again hit an enemy mine.

CAREER SOLDIER

Mrs. Rosalie Dreyer said she was told her husband was going to be recommended for the bronze star for his actions.

Sergeant Dreyer, a career soldier, had been in the armored and reconnaissance division of the Army since he enlisted fifteen years ago. Born in Brooklyn, N.Y., he graduated from East New York High School in 1952.

His survivors include his wife, Mrs. Dreyer; three sons, Russell, Mark and Michael; two daughters, Barbara Ann and Maureen, all of Lexington Park, Md.; and a brother, Kenneth Dreyer of Brooklyn, N.Y.

Lance Corporal Butler, 20 died of gunshot wounds in his neck and chest while he was on patrol last Thursday. A communications specialist, he had been in the Marine Corps about six months, his father said yesterday.

He had graduated last spring from Springbrook High School in Silver Spring. He wrote home frequently and three of his letters were received after the family was notified of his death, his father said.

In addition to his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Charles G. Butler, Sr., Lance Corporal Butler is survived by a sister Lynn, 12, a brother Bryan, 5.

Progress in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 7, 1967

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, since the major buildup of February 1965, we have grown used to statements from the administration that the next troop increase or the next escalation will achieve the objective in Vietnam. The President has just approved a troop increase of 45,000 men. What reason is there to believe that this increase will be any more successful than all of the escalations of the past several years?

The unending war, with vague goals, and vague promises of success, is growing all too reminiscent of Orwell's "1984," in which the population has grown used to a remote, eternal war. I should like to offer, for the interest of my colleagues, a brief catalog of optimistic statements on the progress of the war. Each may have sounded credible at the time it was offered, but the effect of reading them in succession, now, after nearly 5 years of promised success and increasing buildups, is chilling. The compilation is from the August 5 issue of the New Republic:

KEEP THE FAITH, BABY

Dean Rusk, February 1, 1963: "There are some definitely encouraging elements. The ratio of casualties between Government and Viet Cong forces, the ratio of arms captured or lost between the two sides, the steady extension of the strategic-hamlet program, the increasingly effective work of the Montagnards along the border areas—all those indicate some turning in the situation."

Dean Rusk, February 13, 1963: "The momentum of the Communist drive has been stopped."

Dean Rusk, April 18, 1963: "The South Vietnamese themselves are fighting their own battle, fighting well."

Dean Rusk, April 22, 1963: "There is a good basis for encouragement. The Vietnamese are on their way to success and need our help; not just our material help—they need that—but our sympathetic understanding and comradeship."

White House statement, October 2, 1963: "Secretary McNamara and General Taylor reported their judgment that the major part of the US military task can be completed by the end of 1965, although there may be a continuing requirement for a limited number of US training personnel."

Dean Rusk, November 8, 1963: "We believe that the present [Saigon] regime has moved promptly to consolidated public effort, that they will be able to resolve some of the internal difficulties that grew up, and that there will be a possibility that the people of that country will move in greater unity on behalf of the total effort."

Dean Rusk, February 24, 1964: "I think the resources and capabilities are there to get this job done on the present basis of assistance to the Vietnamese so that they themselves can handle this problem primarily with their own effort."

Dean Rusk, July 1, 1964: "I think they [the Viet Cong] have very serious problems—not only in fact, in terms of losses, disruptions, but in terms of morale. So I am not pessimistic about the situation."

Robert McNamara, November 19, 1963: ". . . Small numbers of the US personnel will be able to return by the end of this year."

Robert McNamara, February 3, 1964: "I am hopeful we can bring back additional numbers of men. I say this because I personally believe this is a war the Vietnamese must fight. . . . I don't believe we can take on that combat task for them."

Robert McNamara, May 14, 1964: "I think on balance the number [US training personnel needed in Vietnam] is not likely to increase substantially."

Robert McNamara, November 30, 1965: "The most vital impression I'm bringing back [from Vietnam] is that we've stopped losing the war."

Dean Rusk, August 25, 1966: "We are beginning to see some signs of success of this strategy. The Viet Cong monsoon offensive, which we know from captured documents it was their intention to carry out during the period of May to October, has not materialized because of Westmoreland's tactics of carrying out spoiling operations based on intelligence he has received as to concentrations of Viet Cong. . . . The number of defections this year has doubled compared to the past year. No doubt this is a sign of erosion of morale."

Dean Rusk, January 1, 1967: "I do believe that one basis for optimism is that the other side must surely now understand that they are not going to succeed in seizing South Vietnam by force."

Dean Rusk, April 16, 1967: "I think we have seen some very favorable signs that we are making headway on the military side, but that does not mean that the war is just about over. . . . I must say that I have been impressed by the doubling of the rate of defectors from the other side."

General Westmoreland, July 13, 1967: "During the past year tremendous progress has been made. . . . We have pushed the enemy farther and farther back into the jungles. . . . The ARVN troops are fighting much better than they were a year ago.

"The number of defectors coming into the government has substantially increased. The ratio of enemy personnel killed to those killed by the enemy continues to increase. . . . It has doubled during the past year.

"We have succeeded in attaining our objectives. . . . The enemy has not won a single, significant victory during the yast year, despite the tremendous effort that he has put forth."

President Johnson, July 13, 1967: "Suffice it for me to say that we are generally pleased with the progress we have made militarily. We are very sure that we are on the right track."

Dean Rusk, July 19, 1967: "The other side is hurting, and they are hurting very badly."

Robert McNamara, July 21, 1967: [Since last October] "substantial progress has been made in the political, economic and military area."

Legislative Questionnaire, 1967, Seventh District of California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 8, 1967

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, earlier this year I mailed legislative questionnaries to all postal patrons in the Seventh District of California. Over 15,000 residents responded. The returned questionnaires were tabulated by the statistical firm of Data Management, Inc., and the results have been widely reported in the press.

There has been considerable interest in the results of the survey, and in order to share them with my colleagues, I would like to insert in the RECORD the press release which summarizes the returns:

More than 33 percent of those responding to Congressman Jeffery Cohelan's 1967 legislative questionnaire favor intensified diplomatic efforts, including a unilateral bombing halt, to end the war in Vietnam.

Immediate withdrawal of U.S. troops from South Vietnam was supported by 28.4 percent; greater use of military pressures, including unrestricted bombing of North Vietnam, was backed by 24.8 percent, while 13.8 percent favored the present balance of military and diplomatic efforts; (2.4 percent indicated no choice of policy).

In a separate poll conducted at the request of the Berkeley City Council, Rep. Cohelan's questionnaire showed 38.9 percent of the responding Berkeley residents supporting intensified diplomatic efforts; 32.1 percent favoring immediate withdrawal; 17.4 percent backing increased military pressures; and 12 percent agreeing with the present level of military and diplomatic efforts; (2.2 percent expressed no choice).

(Note to editors: the totals of slightly over 100 percent result from some respondents checking more than one option.)

The responses of over 15,000 residents of Cohelan's 7th Congressional District make up the results released by his Washington office today. The questionnaire has been mailed to all homes in the 7th District in late March. The 13 percent return, which Cohelan noted was one of the highest yet to his annual legislative poll, was tabulated by the independent Washington statistical firm of Data Management, Inc.

Other Cohelan questionnaire results show support for new civil rights legislation, including "open housing," and for restrictions on the sale of firearms.

Increased trade between the United States and the Communist countries of Eastern Europe was favored by over 75 percent, while nearly 60 percent would approve of increased congressional surveillance over the CIA and other intelligence agencies.

Appropriately half of those responding expressed support for increased funding of education, war on poverty, manpower training, housing and mass transit programs. More than half favored decreasing or holding at present levels highway construction, farm subsidies and the space program.

Only air and water pollution control drew overwhelming support (81.3 percent) for increased federal funding.

Following are the results of Congressman Jeffery Cohelan's 1967 questionnaire poll sent to residents of the 7th Congressional District:

[In percent]

1. Vietnam: Which one of the following policies do you most favor regarding the war in Vietnam?

(*a*) Maintain our present level of military and diplomatic efforts	13.8
(*b*) Intensify our military efforts, including unrestricted bombing of North Vietnam	24.8
(*c*) Intensify our diplomatic efforts, including a unilateral halt to the bombing of North Vietnam	33.4
(*d*) Withdraw our troops from South Vietnam immediately	28.4
Blank	2.4

CITY OF BERKELEY ONLY

(*a*) Maintain our present level of military and diplomatic efforts	12.0
(*b*) Intensify our military efforts, including unrestricted bombing of North Vietnam	17.4
(*c*) Intensify our diplomatic efforts, including a unilateral halt to the bombing of North Vietnam	38.9
(*d*) Withdraw our troops from South Vietnam immediately	32.1
Blank	2.2

2. Civil rights: Major civil rights proposals are before Congress. Do you favor legislation to:

(*a*) Guard against discrimination in the selection of Federal and State juries and insure they are drawn from a cross section of the community?

Yes	79.8
No	10.2
Undecided	5.0
Blank	5.0

(*b*) Strengthen the enforcement powers of the Federal Equal Employment Opportunity

Yes	60.0
No	22.8
Undecided	10.4
Blank	6.8

[In percent]

(*c*) Prevent discrimination in the sale or rental of housing?

Yes	57.3
No	30.1
Undecided	7.2
Blank	5.4

3. Social security increase: Proposed amendments to the Social Security Act include an average increase in retirement benefits of 20 percent. Minimum monthly benefits would rise from $44 to $70 for individuals and to $105 for married couples. These benefits would be financed in part by an increase in the Social Security payroll tax. Would you favor this proposal?

Yes	67.4
No	20.8
Undecided	8.8
Blank	3.0

4. Missile defense: One of the most expensive and controversial defense issues before Congress is whether or not to appropriate funds to begin construction of an antiballistic missile (ABM) defense system. Although the Russians have begun a limited system, Secretary of Defense McNamara has argued that we do not need one at the present time. Several military leaders and Members of Congress, however, have argued in favor of it. Would you support:

(*a*) Intensive efforts to secure an agreement with the Soviet Union to halt construction of an ABM system by both sides?

Yes	78.5
No	7.8
Undecided	3.1
Blank	10.6

(*b*) Construction of our own ABM system if no agreement can be reached?

Yes	30.6
No	35.2
Undecided	15.4
Blank	18.8

(*c*) Construction of our own ABM system immediately without waiting to see if an agreement can be reached?

Yes	15.6
No	59.3
Undecided	6.4
Blank	18.7

5. East-West trade: Do you favor the Administration's efforts to "build bridges" to the Communist countries of Eastern Europe, such as Poland, Rumania and Yugoslavia, by increasing trade in non-strategic goods?

Yes	77.3
No	16.1
Undecided	4.1
Blank	2.5

6. Central Intelligence Agency: At the present time, the operations of the CIA and other intelligence agencies are, for security reasons, reviewed by only a few members of the House and Senate Armed Services and Appropriations Committees. Do you favor enlarging Congressional "oversight" of intelligence agencies by creating a permanent Joint Congressional Committee on Foreign Information and Intelligence?

Yes	59.4
No	27.8
Undecided	9.3
Blank	3.5

7. The Draft: Congress is presently considering a number of changes in the existing draft law, which expires at the end of June. Do you favor:

(*a*) Continuing the present selective service system?

Yes	14.9
No	54.9
Undecided	8.4
Blank	21.8

[In percent]

(*b*) Replacing the present "selective" system with a random lottery from among those eligible for service?

Yes	22.1
No	44.1
Undecided	10.4
Blank	23.4

(*c*) Reversing the present "oldest first" order of call and beginning the draft with 19-year-olds?

Yes	30.9
No	34.0
Undecided	12.2
Blank	22.9

(*d*) Establishing uniform national standards for classification, exemptions and deferments?

Yes	63.2
No	13.4
Undecided	4.6
Blank	18.8

(*e*) Granting no further student or occupational deferments, except in the case of well defined "hardship"?

Yes	30.4
No	41.6
Undecided	8.1
Blank	19.9

(*f*) Eliminating the draft and paying whatever salaries are necessary to recruit a professional, all-volunteer military?

Yes	42.0
No	34.5
Undecided	9.1
Blank	14.4

8. Gun control: Several legislative proposals to restrict the sale of firearms are before Congress. Would you favor:

(*a*) Prohibiting the mail-order sale of all firearms?

Yes	74.5
No	15.8
Undecided	3.9
Blank	5.8

(*b*) Prohibiting the mail-order sale of handguns only?

Yes	23.8
No	40.3
Undecided	5.2
Blank	30.7

(*c*) Prohibiting the sale of handguns to out-of-state residents?

Yes	53.3
No	19.1
Undecided	6.9
Blank	20.7

(*d*) Prohibiting the sale of firearms to anyone under 18?

Yes	72.8
No	11.5
Undecided	4.1
Blank	11.6

9. Revenue and taxation: Although the Federal budget is out of balance this year because of the costs of the Vietnam war, business activity also seems to be slackening. Under these circumstances, would you support:

(*a*) A surtax on individual and corporate income taxes to help balance the budget?

Yes	21.5
No	46.7
Undecided	16.1
Blank	15.7

(*b*) Restoration of the seven percent investment tax credit to stimulate business activity?

Yes	46.1
No	20.2
Undecided	20.1
Blank	13.6

[In percent]

10. Appropriations: The appropriation of funds for a number of major domestic Federal programs is determined each year by Congress. In general, do you favor increasing, decreasing or holding at present levels the following programs?

(*a*) Aid to elementary and secondary schools.

Yes	55.3
No	10.3
Undecided	29.1
Blank	5.3

(*b*) Aid to colleges and universities.

Yes	51.2
No	13.1
Undecided	30.0
Blank	5.7

(*c*) War on poverty programs.

Yes	48.1
No	26.9
Undecided	19.1
Blank	5.9

(*d*) School milk and lunch.

Yes	45.1
No	12.3
Undecided	36.1
Blank	6.5

(*e*) Manpower development and training.

Yes	58.0
No	12.7
Undecided	21.8
Blank	7.5

(*f*) Housing and aid to cities.

Yes	48.8
No	20.5
Undecided	23.5
Blank	7.2

(*g*) Mass transportation.

Yes	50.7
No	16.1
Undecided	24.9
Blank	8.3

(*h*) Farm subsidies.

Yes	13.7
No	48.4
Undecided	27.8
Blank	10.1

(*i*) Highway construction.

Yes	26.3
No	23.2
Undecided	42.9
Blank	7.6

(*j*) Space program.

Yes	15.1
No	47.5
Undecided	30.9
Blank	6.5

(*k*) Air and water pollution control.

Yes	81.3
No	3.6
Undecided	11.2
Blank	3.9

Plight of the U.S. Woolen Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CATHERINE MAY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 8, 1967

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation designed to limit imports of foreign textiles into the United States, and to put foreign access to U.S. textile markets on an orderly and fair basis.

My decision to introduce this bill is a result of my concern over the plight of the U.S. woolen industry. Woolgrowers and manufacturers have been faced with a steady annual increase of wool imports. For example, in 1964, wool textile imports equalled 22 percent of our domestic production, and by last year the ratio had increased to 27 percent.

Displacement of domestic markets and loss of grower income are the results of this continuing trend. I urge the Congress to take prompt action on this proposal to reduce wool imports to reasonable levels.

Under this bill, the President would be authorized to negotiate agreements providing orderly and equitable trade in textile articles, and including quantitative limitations on U.S. imports.

When a significant portion of U.S. textile imports are covered by agreements, the President would limit imports from any country not participating in such agreements.

The measure also provides that if the administration is unable to conclude negotiations on agreements within 6 months after the enactment of the bill, textile imports would automatically be limited to their average annual quantity for the period 1961–66.

Commission on Obscenity and Pornography

SPEECH

OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 7, 1967

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I most earnestly hope, and urge, that this House will promptly and overwhelmingly approve this vitally important bill before us to establish a National Commission with instructions to thoroughly review the grave problem of the publication and distribution of pornographic and obscene materials and make recommendations to the Congress for appropriate and effective remedial legislative action.

There is a growing national need for clarification of the problems arising from the sale and consumption of salacious materials. We must seek a course of moderation to avoid unrestricted censorship on the one hand and the unchecked distribution of obscene literature on the other.

Our basic freedoms of speech and the press must be safeguarded, but must also be reconciled with the need to protect our society, and particularly our youth, from the corruptible influences of pornography.

J. Edgar Hoover has stated:

> It seems to me, that the peddler who assaults our children's minds is as clearly a sexual offender as a man who molests a child's body.

I could not agree more, and believe it is imperative that we find an answer to the increasingly grave problem.

Mr. Speaker, statistics issued by the U.S. Children's Bureau indicate that in 1965, nearly 700,000 delinquency cases were handled by the juvenile and family courts in the United States. This was a 2-percent increase from the previous year, and a continuation of an upward trend that began in 1949.

In the past 10 years, delinquency cases have increased by 58 percent. By 1970 it is estimated that one out of nine children will come into contact with the juvenile courts or law enforcement agencies.

Because of these alarming statistics concerning our Nation's youth, I am most pleased that H.R. 10347 places special emphasis in dealing with the growing influence of pornography upon our youth.

Legislation is essential for numerous reasons.

The bill proposes that an advisory Commission be established whose purpose shall be, after a thorough study, to recommend effective, advisable, and appropriate constitutional means to deal effectively with the growing traffic in obscenity and pornography.

I believe it has been made unmistakably clear that the proposed Commission would not in any way function as a board of censors, nor would it interfere with constitutionally guaranteed freedoms. Instead, it would perform a distinct service for the Congress and for the Nation by laying the groundwork for a program to regulate the traffic in obscene materials.

I strongly urge once again that swift and favorable action be taken on this legislation to create a National Commission on Obscenity and Pornography in the urgent interest of the general public and paramount concern for the welfare of our American youth.

Statement by FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 8, 1967

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I submit for inclusion in the RECORD a statement by FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover which appeared in the August 1, 1967, issue of FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin.

In the statement, his Message From the Director, Mr. Hoover discusses law enforcement and how vital it is to recognize the significant role it plays in our communities and our Nation. He effectively refutes those who, for reasons best known to themselves, attempt to downgrade the importance of effective law enforcement.

The article follows:

MESSAGE FROM THE DIRECTOR

Often we hear the charge that law enforcement lives in a world of its own, out of touch with reality and the mainstream of our society. This is a baseless charge and should be refuted each time it is heard.

The truth is that law enforcement, by the very nature of its responsibilities, is in much closer touch with the public than are most other professions. The officer on the beat, the patrolman in the cruiser, and the sergeant at the desk know far more about people and what they are thinking than do the sophisticated theorists who issue "authoritative" appraisals of criminality from within ivory-tower offices.

It has also been suggested that law enforcement remains dormant while other professions forge ahead to new realms of achievement and growth. Some critics say that law enforcement is satisfied to mark time, insulate itself from change, and turn its back on progress. They imply that law enforcement is largely responsible for the Nation's crime problem. This may be an easy hypothesis to accept if a person is looking for a scapegoat. However, it is an erroneous conclussion, and it reflects the shallow reasoning of some who have little, if any, practical experience in or knowledge of enforcing the law.

For years, responsible law enforcement leaders have been waging a relentless, although often futile, battle to modernize and professionalize law enforcement. Their pleas, warnings, and exhortations for the most part have fallen on deaf ears. Only recently has the voice of law enforcement received any appreciable recognition—and this has come about mainly because crime has reached such proportions that it can no longer be ignored if our Nation is to survive.

The annals of law enforcement are replete with examples of achievements which show that progressive, effective enforcement, keyed to human relations, has been a continuing goal of career officials. While struggling without adequate funds and without public support, law enforcement has always been receptive to, and where possible has applied, all scientific developments and technological breakthroughs which would enable it to do a better job and to improve its standards.

Police officials know from experience that crime prevention and enforcement of the law are a bit more complicated than the supervision of a church picnic. Sociological dreamers notwithstanding, crime cannot be explained away. It can be given aliases, but by any other name it is still crime—violations of the laws of our land. And it is still increasing.

It is not surprising, therefore, to note that many who in the past chose to minimize the danger of crime and to ignore police pleas for help now quite charitably choose to place much of the blame for soaring criminality at the door of law enforcement. While law enforcement has its shortcomings, to charge that it is by choice out of step with progress is an admission of ignorance.

JOHN EDGAR HOOVER,
Director.

Antelope Valley Fair Boasts Unique Rural Olympics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED REINECKE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 8, 1967

Mr. REINECKE. Mr. Speaker, the Antelope Valley Fair has come to be the outstanding fair in Los Angeles County. Visitors come from all over the State to participate in the parade, the exhibitions, the competitions, and the shows.

The major event is the unique rural olympics. My good friend, and highly respected valley leader, Vern Lawson, describes the olympics very vividly in this account:

RURAL OLYMPICS

One of America's most unique competitive events is the Rural Olympics, held each year at the Antelope Valley Fair and Alfalfa Festival, which this year will be staged Aug. 31 through the Labor Day Weekend, ending Monday, Sept. 4.

The Antelope Valley, which lies in the 27th Congressional District, California, is a high-desert community located about 35 miles north of downtown Los Angeles. Although this area is widely known for its continuing contribtuions to the nation's aerospace endeavors—at Edwards Air Force Base and Air Force Plant 42 (Palmdale Airport)—the Antelope Valley is a rich agricultural land with alfalfa as the principal field crop.

Thirty-one years ago it was decided to establish a fairtime competition to offer ranchers and farm hands a chance to vie for cash prizes in their day-to-day rural tasks.

Today's Rural Olympics include such colorful and exciting events as tractor stake races in which men and women drivers weave high-powered tractors through a slalom-like course; two types of hay-loading competitions; a tractor race around an oval track, a Model T Ford race, an antique car race, a horse vs. tractor race, and a three-horse relay.

Now nearly one-third of a century old, the Rural Olympics changes from year to year to match the changing pattern of technology in agriculture, but at the same time retaining the flavor of America's rural yesteryears.

It is full of the sound and fury of men and machines in roaring, dusty, exciting competition to prove themselves in individual and team enterprise.

Deeply rooted in the soils of this nation's agricultural industry, the Rural Olympics exemplifies the finest traditions of manual and technological skills and hard work that bring forth America's great and bountiful harvests each year.

Doing It the Hard Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 24, 1967

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, in March I introduced H.R. 7615, to extend the period of validity of a passport from 3 to 5 years. A similar bill was introduced shortly thereafter in the Senate.

However, the Senate bill was amended with a provision that would eliminate the present requirement of State and Justice Department approval for travel in the United States by persons from Communist countries. This amendment has seriously impeded the passage of the original bill.

An enlightening editorial concerning this matter appeared August 5, 1967, in the Cleveland Press, as well as other Scripps-Howard newspapers. Under leave granted, I insert the article for the benefit of my colleagues:

DOING IT THE HARD WAY

A simple bill in Congress to save money and confusion in the issuance of passports is being cluttered with a provision which would make it easier—at least in theory—

for citizens of Communist countries to travel in the U.S.

Passport Director Frances G. Knight sought the passport bill to keep her office from being swamped. The number of passports issued has jumped from 867,378 in 1962 to more than 1,600,000 last year.

Under present regulations a passport is issued for three years and can be renewed for an additional two. The bill would eliminate the renewal period, making the original passport good for the full five years.

Action in Congress has been delayed indefinitely by a controversial amendment to eliminate a present requirement that persons from Communist countries may travel in the United States only with State and Justice Department approval.

This amendment is not likely to affect worthy efforts to "build bridges" one way or another. Approval by State and Justice is said to be almost automatic under present rules.

In any event, if change is considered, it should be effected through immigration legislation. Congress should kill the amendment, pass the extension and let Miss Knight get on with her work.

The Need for Antiriot Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 8, 1967

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the Record an editorial of the air which was presented on WKPT radio station in Kingsport, Tenn.

The editorial deals with the need for antiriot legislation which we passed last month. I am hopeful that the Senate will soon take similar action.

The editorial follows:

ANTIRIOT LEGISLATION NEEDED

The Congress should take immediate steps to debate proposed antiriot laws before this situation becomes far worse than it already is. If the Congress decides that these laws which have been proposed will help the situation, they should act at once. The nation has already been put on notice that we are in for a "long, hot summer." Freely translated, this means that those who go from city to city and state to state with nothing but violence on their minds have already put out the word that riots, looting and bloodshed are scheduled and that they will exceed the riots of Watts, Chicago and Cleveland.

Those who pretend to be leaders of the civil rights movements must surely recognize the fact that these riots can do nothing but *hurt* the cause. When we see and hear rioters and looters who are just children running out of stores they have gutted, arms laden with stolen goods many of them cannot even use, we wonder if the "leaders" aren't greatly concerned for their cause?

How can the use of Molotov cocktails thrown at passing cars of innocent people be condoned? How can sniping at police and firemen from windows and roofs be tolerated? How can they justify the looting of liquor stores to build up their courage and then sporting goods shops and pawn shops for guns to shoot innocent people?

It should be a federal offense for anyone to roam freely through the country inciting, aiding and abetting riots and civil disturbances which completely underminne our entire system of law and order. We care not what a man says about his responsibility to attain social justice . . . if in the process of attempting to gain his points he tears down our very foundations of law and order. There cannot be any justification for such actions and those responsible for them should be made to pay for them.

We hope our congressmen will take prompt action to bring these riots into the realm of federal law as well as state and local laws.

Congress Needs To Set New Antistrike Rules

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 8, 1967

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, there are better ways to settle labor disputes which vitally affect the public interest and Congress ought to be probing for them. That is the theme of an excellent editorial published July 19, 1967, in the Detroit Free Press, which asks that Congress give serious consideration to the proposal offered by my colleague, Senator Robert P. Griffin, which calls for a joint resolution to create a special House-Senate committee to delve into the situation. With permission, I place it in the Record at this point:

CONGRESS NEEDS TO SET NEW ANTISTRIKE RULES

Confronted with a nationwide rail strike which President Johnson said was snarling the country's lines of Commerce and jeopardizing its security, Congress quickly enacted a bill almost identical to one which had been before it since last May, a bill the President proposed providing for compulsory arbitration of the prolonged rail dispute.

The enacted measure provides for rail employes to return to work, for negotiations to continue and, if unsuccessful, for a special five-man panel to recommend a settlement. The bill thus ends the rail strike which was brief but devastating.

Now, in the wake of the strike, Congress ought to act on another proposal which has rested in the hoppers since April 11 when Michigan's Bob Griffin introduced it in the Senate. It is a joint resolution to create a special House-Senate committee to study industry-wide collective bargaining and industry-wide strikes and lockouts and to recommend ways for the public to protect workers, employers and itself from deadlock and impending strikes.

"I really believe that in the regulated industries, such as utilities and transportation, we're coming to some way to formulate solutions," says Sen. Griffin. He says it might be a new labor court or new regulatory agencies or new powers for old agencies. The Interstate Commerce Commission (ICC) sets rates. Sen. Griffin says that a joint congressional committee composed equally of Democrats and Republicans ought to explore whether the ICC should also set wage scales in cases of collective bargaining breakdowns.

Sen Griffin emphasizes two points in explaining his proposal. He says that this form of compulsory arbitration ought to be limited to the regulated industries and that in non-regulated industries the public's interest could be better protected, along with the rights of workers and of employers, by improving present collective bargaining arrangements, perhaps by breaking up concentrations of economic power. He says that any joint congressional committee delving into this difficult area should be bipartisan, as was the McClellan committee which explored labor racketeering, because only a bipartisan committee could hope to win acceptance of its recommendations in the whole Congress.

The idea for exploring better ways to settle labor disputes which vitally affect the public interest is not a new one with Sen. Griffin this year. He made a similar proposal as a member of the House in July of 1963 during the height of the railroad work rules fight. He repeated the proposal in 1965. But it's gotten nowhere. And this is a shame.

"We are faced with a national crisis," said President Johnson in urging Congress to end the rail strike. "The public interest must take precedence over private interests. The power to act now rests with the Congress."

In view of the rail strike and, what can't be ignored, the increasing unionization of public employes, Congress should act not only to end these sorts of strikes once they begin but it should also adopt machinery for preventing them from happening in the first place. Sen. Griffin should renew his call for a joint congressional committee to study the issue and make recommendations. Congress should respond to his call.

Buck Dumaine Returns to Railroading

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 8, 1967

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, all too often those of us who live and work here in Washington in daily contact with the great bureaucracy of the Federal Government forget the enormous contribution which an imaginative and talented leader can offer. I have had the opportunity to know just such a man as a personal friend, and I would like to take this opportunity to cite the example of Frederic C. (Buck) Dumaine, Jr., of Weston, Mass., as he prepares to return to a field in which he has accomplished so much. As president of the New Haven Railroad for 3 years, starting back in 1951, Buck Dumaine proved that supposedly insoluble problems could be dealt with successfully.

On the first day of August, the Holyoke Transcript Telegram, an excellent newspaper in the First District of Massachusetts, published an editorial wishing Buck Dumaine the best of luck as he returns to railroading after a long absence, as president and chief executive officer of the Delaware & Hudson Railroad. Today I would like to add my personal best wishes, and to bring this article to the attention of my colleagues. This is an expression of the confidence which I share with the many others who know both Buck Dumaine and railroading, as we welcome his return to that field.

BUCK DUMAINE BACK IN RAILROADING

So Buck Dumaine is back with his first love—railroading. The official announcement last week that Frederic C. Dumaine Jr., president of the Amoskeag Co., has been elected president and chief executive officer of the Delaware & Hudson Railroad, probably meant to the unfamiliar another financier was moving into a job which belonged to a railroad man.

Far from it. Buck Dumaine is a financier; but he's also a railroader. He took command of the struggling New Haven back in 1951 and in three years he was allowed to be its president that railroad took on new life, and began to make money. He chopped off the deadwood, improved passenger service, bought new cars both for the passenger and freight departments, rebuilt the road beds and all in all turned the aging New Haven Railroad around and began to drive it uphill.

Then came Patrick B. McGinnis, the silver tongued operator who persuaded enough of the New Haven stockholders that he could do better. McGinnis, who had a sad record of leadership with the Central of Georgia Railroad, proceeded, to send the New Haven on its way to its present state of bankruptcy. From there he moved to the Boston & Maine and set that railroad back a generation. He now is in jail.

While all of this was happening over a span of a decade, Buck Dumaine (he prefers to be called Buck) had to suffer the destruction of what he had done for the New Haven and for New England transportation. And suffer he did. Often we talked with him about the wrecking policies of McGinnis and how he would wince.

Now he's back where he belongs. He's leaving Weston for New York and we're sorry Massachusetts is losing him. But we know he will be happy and we know that the Delaware and Hudson Railroad will be getting able and imaginative leadership.

The Technical Aspects of Pollution Abatement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 8, 1967

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, during the second session of the 89th Congress, I had the honor to chair the Subcommittee on Science, Research and Development during extensive hearings into the technical aspects of pollution abatement. As a result of these hearings, the subcommittee prepared a report which helped define the role of science and technology in pollution abatement. As I said in my letter transmitting the report to the Honorable George P. Miller, chairman of the Committee on Science and Astronautics, the report "describes where the country now stands technologically with regard to pollution abatement and what it must do to improve its position."

The report said:

> The overall goal of pollution abatement is to restore and maintain the quality of the environment without disrupting the economy and the culture. This goal is ambitious and carries some aspects of both eating and having the cake. The very large price to be paid by each citizen for pollution abatement has not been fully realized as yet. Important means of obtaining the goal are the necessary facts and know-how to measure the qualities to be preserved and, to segregate contaminants (from the reusable resources) so they are not a disadvantage to us. More knowledge of the living world and of the result of man's actions is what is needed to achieve this two-part goal of waste management.

The need to approach our pollution problems with this goal in mind is well expressed in an article in the July 1967 issue of Public Relations Journal. In this article, Mr. Kerryn King, who is vice president, Employee and Public Relations Department of Texaco Inc., New York, and who is a member of the board of directors of the American Petroleum Institute, describes how the petroleum industry is working with the Federal Government and various other groups to solve our air and water pollution problems.

Under unanimous consent, I include the full text of Mr. King's article in the Record:

Crisis of Concern: Air and Water Pollution

(By Kerryn King)

The current "crisis of concern" over air and water pollution presents a classic example of the need for effective public relations—to keep open all channels of communication, to define common interests, and to establish an area of mutual understanding between everyone concerned, including business and industry, government, conservationists and the general public.

It was with this view of the situation that the oil industry undertook a public relations program to communicate its efforts to preserve and improve the quality of our environment. Its goal was to maintain an atmosphere conducive to the adoption of abatement or control measures that are technically sound, economically practical and socially feasible in order to prevent precipitous action that could do lasting harm to the public interest.

In the absence of such an atmosphere, positions tend to become polarized, to the benefit only of the demagogues and the self-interested, and to the cost of the public good, including the interests of business and industry and the cause of air and water conservation.

One of the basic facts of the pollution and pollution control problem was well expressed by Joseph L. Fisher, an outstanding conservationist and president of Resources for the Future, Inc. In the introduction to the RFF annual report for 1966, he said, "ideas about natural resources and their conservation cannot be expressed apart from people and their values, capacities, needs and culture."

The goal of the oil industry's approach to the problem, which is based on a recognition of "people and their values . . ." is thus the same as that stated in "Environmental Pollution," prepared by the Congressional Subcommittee on Science, Research and Development under the chairmanship of Representative Emilio Q. Daddario of Connecticut. Congressman Daddario said:

"The overall goal is to restore and maintain the quality of the environment without disrupting the economy and the culture. This goal is ambitious and carries some aspects of both eating and having the cake. The very large price to be paid by each citizen for pollution abatement has not been realized as yet. Important means of obtaining the goal are the necessary facts and know-how to measure the qualities to be preserved and, to segregate contaminants (from the reusable resources) so they are not a disadvantage to us. More knowledge of the living world and of the result of man's actions is what is needed to achieve this two-part goal of waste management."

In the same vein, Secretary of Transportation, Alan S. Boyd said, "let us not become so determined on ends that we grow indiscriminate in our means." And as a warning to those who might ignore the need for reason and reasonableness as expressed by Resources for the Future and the Daddario Report, he said: "We should never forget that some of the cleanest air in the United States can be found in ghost towns. . . . Air pollution beyond a certain level is injurious to the family. But so, in its own way, is unemployment."

Unfortunately, however, not everyone is approaching the problem with this same understanding, including some whose reactions are based solely on demagoguery or self-interest, but also those who are reacting in what they consider to be good faith. Among the latter are people calling for drastic action without regard to its consequences because of panic or a naive view of the problem. There are also those who do not want to do anything because they cannot recognize the urgency of the problem or accept any responsibility for contributing to its solution.

The extremists on this, as on almost any problem of public concern, are in the minority, but they represent a danger to sensible solutions because by polarizing points of view they make effective communications difficult. Thus, we find instances of some who might simply say that we must stop polluting our air and water being called soft-headed and against business, industry and progress, and instances of some who would simply warn that we should be careful not to harm our economy with excessive and unnecessary restrictions being accused of saying that we will have to put up with pollution as the price of progress. Secretary Boyd, for example, was editorially criticized as having "sold out" because he reminded us of the truism that ends cannot always justify means.

The oil industry does recognize the problems of air pollution, as they actually exist and as the public tends to believe they exist, and it has accepted the challenge they present. It has responded as individual companies and through its major trade and service association, the American Petroleum Institute. It spent some $250,000,000 on just air pollution control equipment and research during the last ten years, including an estimated $43,000,000 in 1966 alone. It is confident that through its own efforts and through the work of government agencies, and the automotive and other industries, the various pollution problems can be brought under control. And it is confident this can be done with solutions that are practical and economical as well as effective. It also knows that all such solutions do not now exist and cannot be developed without more research, money and time. It is putting major research and financial resources into its efforts; it must also be permitted enough time—time for research and time for the technology to develop so the results of research can be implemented.

Consequently, a major public relations problem facing the oil industry, along with everyone else concerned with air and water conservation, is the fact that public and official concern and demands for action are increasing more rapidly than the actual growth of the problem and more rapidly than the ability of all levels of government and industry to deal with it.

Surveys of public opinion make it clear that public awareness and concern are increasing rapidly—that air and water pollution now rank high in the public's listing of community problems. The paradox is that public concern has increased during the last few years when much more was done to reduce pollution than in any preceding period. The explanation has two parts: First, the public has been subjected to a massive campaign to "alert" it to the dangers of pollution, a campaign that is supported by many but that is carried on mainly by the Federal Government to generate support for specific legislative authorizations and increased appropriations. Second, actions taken to reduce pollution also serve to focus public attention on the problems being solved.

Much more serious is the behavior of some official agencies. There is not always an honest and frank meeting of minds to establish meaningful and reachable standards, and a recognition of the efforts of industry to meet them. Instead, there often is a pattern of some agencies using agreed-upon standards only as a basis for stricter standards, without any apparent regard to whether or not they are necessary, while ignoring or disparaging consideration of the problems of meeting them. The changing standards for sulfur control in New York City provide an example.

In 1965, a study by the New York City Council recommended a program to reduce sulfur content in fuels to 1.0 per cent by steps over nine years. In May of 1966, the Council enacted legislation calling for the reduction to that level in less than five years. Then, in January 1967, the Conference on Abatement of Interstate Air Pollution in the New York-Northern New Jersey Metropolitan Area recommended that by October 1, 1969, the sulfur content of fuels used in existing power plants be reduced to 1.0 per cent and that all other coal and oil used in the area be reduced to 0.2 per cent and 0.3 per cent respectively.

This practice is like raising the bar higher even before you are sure the jumper can clear it as it stands. It is done without consulting with industry in good faith, and without apparent regard for the enormous capital investments that often must be made to meet new standards and the enormous costs that the public ultimately must bear. It is estimated, for example, that meeting the sulfur standards proposed for the New York City area will cost the consumers over $150,000,000 a year. The rush to impose such standards, instead of a rational search for the most effective way to achieve the desired air quality, would seem to be lacking in a real concern for "people and their values."

The problems that can be caused by such overreacting—the loss of perspective and concern for the realities of the world in which pollution must be dealt with—is illustrated by the fantasy of the electric automobile. To give the matter some perspective, one of the most optimistic studies of the future of electric automobiles, that was prepared by the Federal Power Commission, indicates that they would account for only about two per cent of the vehicles in use in the United States by 1975. In other words, if nothing else were done to reduce vehicle emissions they would reduce vehicle-caused pollution by two per cent. Meanwhile, the technology is now available and steps are being taken to reduce gasoline-powered vehicle emissions by over 80 per cent—and work is underway that should lead to further reductions well before 1975.

Similar precipitous action is illustrated by the problem New York City has with apartment house incinerators. Beginning on October, 1951, New York City required all new apartment buildings of four or more stories or 12 or more dwelling units to have incinerators for burning garbage. This action helped solve part of the city's solid wastes disposal problem, but it aggravated its air pollution problem. When the City later awoke to the fact of how much incinerators were polluting the air, it established rigid emissions standards and required that garbage be carted away from apartments that could not meet the standards. The owners of such apartments are obligated to pay for such garbage removal services—except those who installed incinerators during the period when they were required. In those cases, the City has had to accept the responsibility for providing garbage removal services without charge.

The public relations problem illustrated by these two examples is that you get a better audience if you promise a panacea. And since there are no panaceas for air and water pollution, the oil industry has to demonstrate to the public in general and government in particular that while it is dealing with the problem with a sense of urgency, and with respect for its obligations to the public interest, it needs time for studies, research and development so that it can properly serve the many public interests involved.

Consequently, the oil industry has fully integrated its public relations efforts with its programs for air and water conservation. This reflects the simple fact that, in the long run, the only thing that will allay public and official concern and possible criticism of the industry is progress in reducing the problem. It reflects also that while the problem is primarily technological, any possible solutions will have many social and political ramifications. Integration is achieved overall through a special committee of the American Petroleum Institute's Board of Directors which is responsible for the several API committees and staff groups working in such general areas as research, and laws and regulations, and in more specific areas such as low-sulfur content fuel supplies and sulfur removal, refinery operations and tanker operations. That alone would be coordination not integration. In fact, however, there is day-by-day working together—many of the faces seen at a meeting to review a research project can be seen again at a meeting to review a script for a motion picture or testimony for a legislative hearing, for example.

A further consequence of the social-political-technological nature of the problems is the importance of the oil industry itself as a primary "audience," along with government and the general public. There is a continuing need for the industry to be kept informed—on pollution problems as they actually exist, on progress in reducing them, on public and official opinion, on the actions of legislative bodies and government agencies, on the work being done by related industries. The various committees of API and other industry working groups provide a clearing house for such information, but beyond that the API has a formal information program directed toward its member companies. It includes the preparation and distribution of a special "Air and Water Conservation News" newsletter, bibliographies on technical and popular articles, papers, reports and books, background papers on major aspects of the subject, and legislative reports; and the distribution of testimony and major speeches by industry and government officials; and, the distribution of publications and other material produced by its member companies.

The oil industry's relations with government are directed toward helping to develop solutions to the problems of air and water pollution and toward demonstrating the industry's concern and good faith. Aside from its formal participation in public legislative hearings, its relations are mainly that of offering technical assistance and collaborating on research projects and studies. The industry, for example, is sponsoring research at government facilities and cooperatively sponsoring research projects with government agencies, and nearly all 30 of the current API research projects have been reviewed in advance with government officials. Beyond this, it is working with all levels of government and has actively supported State and local air and water conservation measures.

The industry's program is definitely low-keyed as far as it is directed toward the general public. It has not mounted any general effort to convince the public of anything, only to assure it that the problem is recognized and that something is being done about it. It is concerned primarily that what is presented to the public be accurate, and in being accurate thus be fair. The API, for example, has developed information and material so that it and its member companies can service all media, and it is developing additional materials for educators, conservationists and other interested individuals. It has not, however, broadly distributed unsolicited material.

The oil industry, in brief, is not trying to "sell" any solution to the pollution problem; there is as yet no simple solution to be sold. Instead, it is trying to maintain communication and understanding so that all concerned can work to develop solutions that do recognize people and their values and that will serve all of their interests.

Arise and Act, Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 27, 1967

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, a number of my constituents have sent me copies of an editorial which appeared in the August 3, 1967, edition of the Dallas Times Herald calling for action on the part of the leadership of this great Nation in the trying times now facing us. They have asked that I place it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in order that all of the Members of this body may read it.

I am sure that the average Member has received as many letters as I have relative to the rioting and looting which has taken place in cities throughout our country and calling for preventive action. I believe it is time for all of us to meditate upon those actions of our forefathers which has made this country the powerful Nation it is today:

ARISE AND ACT, NOW

In the plainest words the people of the United States demand honest, strong leadership—and NOW.

Our future trembles on two thin and critical issues at this moment.

With shattering suddenness and severity this nation, by God's grace the most blessed in the world, is beset with internal and external problems that mock the very structure upon which we built a haven of individual rights and freedoms.

Its streets are bloody and its skies foggy with flame and smoke. Violence among its own has reappeared for the first time since the Civil War.

Eight thousand miles away hundreds of thousands of our best men are committed to a struggle against the foes of our freedoms. Some are black, some are white. They slog through hell every day and night to protect the "things" we are supposed to care about back here at home.

The issue is very simple for the men of Vietnam. They fight to live and, ironically, to shield us from evil. We give them in return—brother fighting brother, looting, sniping, arson, killing, ghettos, want, the treasonous screams of Stokely Carmichael and Rap Brown . . . and politics.

Quite a trade, isn't it?

It takes no ponderous reasoning to add all this up to one bitter conclusion—we are in trouble. We either win both of these struggles or we are in for interminable hell.

The people demand courageous, wise and just decisions from our leadership and not political vote juggling—and that goes from the President on down through both parties.

The people, if Washington doesn't know, don't give a damn about party politics at this hour. There is a fear in this home of the brave, and the only good thing about it is that it might lift us out of our affluent slumber and make us perform like Americans—the kind we used to know.

The whole, distressing picture boils down to one issue—leadership, firm and immediate.

It matters not to the depressed, disturbed Negro and white citizen whether the men with answers are Democrat or Republican. The same goes for the families of Vietnam warriors.

We have floundered in the mire of cold-patch decision in Vietnam and in cumbersome social programs in the United States. The result, to date, is unacceptable and appalling. The economy of the nation is beginning to shift and feint with the variable winds that blow from these problems.

It is a grim and unpalatable thought, but the emergency demands urgent decisions and controls. How far do we go before we sting the national conscience into action?

No one challenges spending great sums to accomplish great good, but we could be spending ourselves into corners from which we cannot retreat if real statesmen do not arise from partisan shadows and call a halt to unsound practices.

And statesmen do not always arise, unfortunately, until the people prod. We are all guilty—and the words are not trite. We never had it so good, in the main. But the penalties of political complacency and good times are showing up faster than we can handle them.

In this city of Dallas there are preponderantly good and decent people of all races. We have lived together in harmony and sometimes painful progress for generations. We never hated each other. We know there are problems and we are working at solutions. We need to step up the pace.

In this city of Dallas any man of any race can go where he pleases, do what he pleases as long as he plays by the rules of law and order. He is asked only to treat the other fellow as he would be treated. We build our city together, and we do it in the spirit of peace and understanding.

We live together to build, not destroy.

From this moment on every man of every race in Dallas should pledge to further help his neighbor be lifted from want, from disease, from fear and from the act of the criminal. Do not be afraid to protect the good.

We grieve for our sister cities which have known the tragedy of criminal action and we demand peaceful living for all under the cloak of law and order. Dallas knows the scar of community grief from the insane act of another criminal. It wants no more—and will have no more.

Justice will come from the souls of all our citizens if the leaders of these United States arise and smash the suicidal course we now travel.

This is no plea from the people—it is a command."

Commission on Obscenity and Pornography

SPEECH

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 7, 1967

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I want to express my strong support for H.R. 10347, legislation creating a Commission on Obscenity and Pornography.

As you know, for some years I have been deeply interested in the problem of dealing effectively with the traffic in pornography and smutty materials in our society.

As the result of research by myself and my staff, I have become aware of three relevant factors:

First, it is clear that the amount of obscene materials being circulated in America has increased dramatically in the past few years. Last year, for example, the Post Office Department received some 200,000 complaints from postal patrons about unsolicited obscene materials they or their children had received. That was four times the number of complaints received in 1960.

Second, it is evident that there is a real dearth of knowledge about pornography, the smut-peddlers who circulate it, the operations of their filthy industry, and, finally, the relationship between such materials and antisocial behavior. I myself have introduced legislation seeking to restrict the flow in unsolicited mail-order pornography through regulation of the buying and selling of mailing lists.

This is just one segment of a complex problem, yet the Post Office Department has admitted that it has insufficient knowledge about the mailing list business.

Third, our Nation must take effective action to stop this pollution in the bloodstream of our Nation. That is clear. Not so evident, however, is the means which should be used to get at the disease, without at the same time injuring other, wholesome parts of the body politic.

The Commission, I believe, will deal effectively with the national problems posed by pornography and obscene materials.

First, the Commission it creates will be a focal point for the complaints of a disgusted and alarmed American public.

Second, it can gather the information and data necessary to provide a full and undistorted picture of the smut industry and its effects on our society.

Third, the Commission can recommend realistic, practical, and constitutional remedies to the problem.

The Congress has acted against obscenity and pornography at various times in the past. Yet today we find the traffic in smut heavier than ever. The explanation, I believe, is in the piecemeal approach which we have sometimes taken to the pornography problem. What has been needed is an overall national master strategy—based on concrete scientific data and the best expert advice—to cope with obscenity in all its ramifications.

Passage of this bill should bring an end to the piecemeal approach. Through the establishment of this Commission on Obscenity and Pornography we will at last have an instrumentality for determining the whole problem and, on that basis, recommending solutions.

It is my hope that the differences between the House bill and a similar Senate passed proposal will be ironed out without difficulty, and the resulting legislation signed into law by the President before the month is out. Every day of delay may mean yet another mind poisoned by the smut peddlers.

Finally, I wish to commend the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. DANIELS] for his sponsorship of this proposal. Through his tireless efforts on behalf of this legislation, he has made a major contribution to the welfare of our people.

Former Senator Paul H. Douglas Endorses Credit Disclosure Features of H.R. 11601, Tightening Senate Truth-in-Lending Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 8, 1967

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, this morning it was the privilege of the members of the Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs of the House Committee on Banking and Currency to hear former U.S. Senator Paul H. Douglas, of Illinois, testify on legislation dealing with consumer credit, including the concept of truth in lending which he originated in legislative form 7 years ago and which he has fought valiantly to write into law ever since.

As I told the subcommittee and our audience in introducing Senator Douglas at the start of our hearing this morning:

STATEMENT BY CHAIRMAN LEONOR K. SULLIVAN, OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON CONSUMER AFFAIRS, HOUSE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY, AUGUST 8, 1967, IN OPENING SECOND DAY OF SUBCOMMITTEE HEARINGS ON H.R. 11601, THE CONSUMER CREDIT PROTECTION ACT, AND H.R. 11602, TRUTH IN LENDING AS PASSED BY THE SENATE

I was very pleased with the thoroughness and interest with which our witnesses yesterday opened this series of hearings into consumer credit legislation. From the line-up of witnesses today, I am confident we will learn a good deal more about this important subject. Every Member of this Subcommittee has sponsored one or the other of two major bills before us, which indicates that we *start* with the Senate-passed bill *as a minimum* on which every Member here can agree. How much more we can succeed in writing into the legislation will depend upon the information we can develop in these hearings, for I am sure there is, on the part of all of us, a willingness to look at the facts and not foreclose any idea without a hearing.

In seeking information on the subject of consumer credit, there is not better teacher in the country, and, I suspect, in the civilized world, than our First witness this morning—the economist who *invented* the Truth-in-Lending legislation, and who spent six long, hard, dedicated and remarkable years instructing the Senate Banking Committee, and the entire country, in the need for an effective law on credit disclosure. I think he succeeded finally in convincing everyone of that.

Former Senator Paul H. Douglas is a patient teacher as well as a brilliant economist, and we are about to enjoy a master class in a subject which can be made to sound incomprehensible when the purpose is to convince us that the problem is too complex to solve through legislation. We are counting on you, Senator to pierce the fog for us and advise us, out of your great wisdom in this field, how we can truly protect the American consumer in his use of credit. We welcome you to the House Committee on

Banking and Currency and are grateful to you for agreeing to come here this morning, for we are carrying on a work you started and we want your guidance.

Senator Douglas is still serving the people of the United States through official office as Chairman of the Commission on Urban Problems created by the Banking and Currency Committee of the House, and I might add, in the Housing Act of 1965. I am sure, Senator, that you see a very close connection between the problems of our cities and the problems which this legislation intends to solve.

H.R. 11601, CONSUMER CREDIT PROTECTION ACT, GOES BEYOND TRUTH IN LENDING

Mr. Speaker, we were not disappointed in Senator Douglas' testimony. He certainly did not endorse every detail of every provision of H.R. 11601, the Consumer Credit Protection Act, which I have introduced as chairman on behalf of half of the members of the subcommittee and which numerous other Members of Congress have cosponsored in companion bills.

H.R. 11601 contains such provisions as an interest rate ceiling, a ban on garnishment, standby credit controls, creation of a National Commission on Consumer Finance, a ban on "confession of judgment" notes, standby authority to regulate margins in commodity futures trading, and a provision dealing with the truth in advertising of credit terms.

None of these things I have mentioned was ever included by Senator Douglas in any of the truth-in-lending bills he introduced from the spring of 1960 until he left the Senate following the completion of his third term this past January.

Nevertheless, as our witness this morning, Senator Douglas candidly discussed all of these issues with us, expressing reservations on some features, opposition to some, and support for others. His testimony was extremely helpful, and under unanimous consent, I submit it for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

TESTIMONY OF PAUL H. DOUGLAS BEFORE THE HOUSE SUBCOMMITTEE ON CONSUMER AFFAIRS, BANKING AND CURRENCY, AUGUST 8, 1967

Madame Chairman and members of the Committee, I appreciate your inviting me to testify before your Committee. I had some hesitancy about accepting. I have always believed that ex-senators should fade away from Capitol Hill and not linger on as empty political ghosts. And, there is an added reason why a former denizen of the north side of the Capitol should not come over to the south side.

But Congresswoman Sullivan was so generous and hearty in her invitation that I swallowed my scruples and agreed to come. And, I hope you will not hold it against me that I am here.

I

I am of course tremendously pleased that the Senate passed a relatively good truth-in-lending bill on July 11, 1967, by the suprising vote of 92 to 0. It may have marked the beginning of the end of a long, long struggle and it was a great victory for Senator Proxmire and its supporters. For I introduced the first truth-in-lending bill as long ago as the Spring of 1960, But, despite six years of hearings and study, we were never able to get it out of the basement of the subcommittee except for one brief day when the full committee under the able generalship of its then chairman proceeded to knock it on the head and send it back to the dark cellar.

But times have changed. Public opinion has become informed. People are more and more coming to the conclusion that consumers should not be gulled by trickery but are entitled to the truth, and that this applies to borrowers as well as buyers. Caveat emptor has gone out of vogue. Perhaps also the realization that the people could be helped in this way without cost to the treasury was especially appealing when the need for improving American life was coming up against the budget restraints created by the war in Vietnam.

That we were stymied for so long was due primarily to the unrelenting opposition of most of the private lending and selling agencies. From the very beginning, we were fought by the personal finance companies, the dealers in durable consumers goods sold on credit, mail order houses, the department stores and retailers of soft goods, the Chamber of Commerce, the banks and the American Banking Association, the American Bar Association, and virtually all of the so-called financial and mercantile establishment. This was powerful opposition and it is no wonder that despite increasing popular interest and support we were never able to get a favorable vote.

It is being said by some of the former opponents of the bill that if I had been willing to compromise, the bill could have passed long ago and that only my stubborness prevented the opponents from joining the happy throng of supporters.

While I do not care about either praise or blame as long as a good bill is enacted into law, I must object to this remark. I was perfectly willing to compromise on less important features if I could only establish the essential point—namely to have the financial charges stated to buyers and borrowers as *an annual rate on the amounts actually owed*. But it was precisely this feature that my opponents were never willing to concede until now. They tried to argue that no one could compute the annual rate; that 3 percent a month was not 36 percent a year; and that 1½ percent a month did not equal 18 percent a year. They wanted to retain the growing practice of concealing both the price and interest rate on many durable goods such as automobiles, television sets, furniture and washing machines by the device of only quoting so much down and so much a month—only that and nothing more. They were reluctant to abandon the practice in the case of personal loans of the banks charging interest on the original amount borrowed rather than on the declining balance of the amounts actually owed. By this method they concealed the fact that the real rate of interest was approximately twice that which they actually quoted, and they were not averse to adding special charges such as finders fees, filing fees, credit life insurance at high rates, etc, etc.

During those six years of struggle, I was never once able to get our opponents to agree on the basic principle of the annual rate of the amounts actually owed.

It is a tribute to the merits of the democratic process, however, that gradually the public became convinced of the essential soundness of this simple principle. The abuses were becoming more important as the amount of consumer debt rose from 56 billion dollars in 1960 to 93 billion in the spring of this year, while mortgage debt on single family and those of less than 5 family units increased from 141 to 227 billion dollars. With the total personal debt rising to 320 billions—only 11 billion or 4 percent less than the national public debt of 331 billions—people slowly concluded that it was time to stop, look and listen. Support came from a number of public minded groups such as the credit unions, the mutual savings banks of the Northeast, the industrial unions and various consumers groups. Bless all of them and the hundreds of devoted men and women who rallied to the cause. Finally after our sub-committee held hearings in Boston and after a scandal involving the personal credit industry had besmirched leaders in the Massachusetts legislature, the public spirited citizens of that state got the legislature to pass a series of good truth-in-lending bills. These are now in effect and are apparently working well.

The opposition began to weaken. Senator Proxmire took up the battle after my defeat of last fall, gave able and devoted leadership, and finally got a bill through both the Committee and the Senate.

In order to get anything passed, against heavy odds, he had to agree to several compromises. The most important of these was the virtual exemption of most of the so-called revolving credit from the requirement of stating the annual rather than the monthly rates. Here the mail order companies, the department stores and the merchants who are now extending about $5 billions of such credit were simply too strong. It was impossible for Senator Proxmire to get his bill through unless he accepted the exemption. Having been voted down in Committee on revolving credit, it was a case of yielding on that point or else. He should not be blamed in the slightest. In a similar situation I would have done the same thing.

In order to reduce the danger that a larger and larger proportion of credit would be channeled through the revolving credit loophole, Senator Proxmire however was able to limit this exemption by providing:

(1) That it would not prevail where the seller had the right to re-possess the goods upon default in the schedule of payments. This barred the door to exemption for most of the sales of durable goods such as autos, television and radio sets, furniture, washing machines, refrigerators, etc. and tended to limit the exemption primarily to soft goods and credit cards;

(2) That where less than 60 percent of the initial price was to be repaid in the first year, this exemption was not to apply, or to state the matter in another way, when 60 percent of the purchase price is to be repaid within the year, exemption would be granted.

In practice these provisions will exempt Sears Roebuck but will include Montgomery Ward and Spiegels, the latter now owned by Beneficial Finance.

In order to smooth the way for his bill, Senator Proxmire also felt compelled to exempt first mortgage credit on homes as well as in those cases where the total finance charges came to less than $10.

II

It is fortunate however that we have two legislative chambers whereby one body can correct the errors and omissions of the other. Mrs. Sullivan and her associates have produced an able bill in H.R. 11601 which corrects some of the weaknesses which Senator Proxmire was unwillingly forced to accept, and they have added certain additional features of their own. To my eyes, the most important improvement in the Sullivan bill over the Senate bill is that it completely eliminates the exemption for revolving credit. It also omits the exemptions on first mortgage credit and on finance charges of less than $10 and includes both.

While the Sullivan bill, like that of the Senate, also gives the administrative jurisdiction over the measure to the Federal Reserve Board with its penalty of double damages for knowing violations, it also provides the additional power of issuing cease and desist orders. Then in addition H.R. 11601 requires truth in the advertising of credit and sets up a commission to study consumer credit. These are features which were never included in any Senate bill.

The Sullivan bill (H.R. 11601) also sets a maximum legal rate ceiling of 18 percent on consumer and personal loans; gives authority for the Reserve Board to regulate credit used in trading in commodity futures; and gives the President power to regulate other terms of consumer credit in periods of national emergency.

Finally in Title II, the Sullivan bill prohibits the garnishment of the wages or salary of an employee to collect an otherwise unpaid debt.

It is obvious that you have been giving this matter deep study for a long period of time. On the whole the Sullivan bill is extremely good and, except on a few doubtful points, it is intrinsically superior, as I hope to show, to the Senate bill.

We have all seen many funny things happen to good measures on their way to and through the forum. But as seasoned veterans well trained in parliamentary maneuvers, I am sure that you will not be led down the garden path by the honeyed words of crafty seducers to ultimate obfuscation. And, I also know that you are even more aware than I am of the dangers of stirring up added and otherwise non-existent opposition to the main principles by loading the ship with more burdens than it can carry into port. Thus I am sure we all have our eyes on the ball, namely the effective requirement of an annual rate on the outstanding unpaid balance of as large a proportion of consumer debt and personal loans as possible. With that as a guide, we cannot go wrong.

III

I am of course happy that most of the Republican members of your committee under the leadership of my long-time friend Bill Widnall have adopted the Senate bill (S. 5) lock, stock and barrel in their H.R. 11602. I only wish I had enjoyed the companionship of these genial and fair-minded gentlemen on our Senate Committee during the six frustrating years which we spent trying to get the simple basic principles agreed upon. Unless there are aces up their sleeves, which in our innocence we do not see nor even suspect, the Widnall bill should narrow the differences between us and make the issue not whether we can get any decent bill at all, but whether we cannot improve on Senate bill S. 5 and still get it adopted.

We should—and I hope we can—improve on the Senate bill, and I congratulate Mrs. Sullivan and her gallant co-sponsors for trying.

IV

1. The most important improvement which you have made over the Senate bill in your H.R. 11601 is to include revolving and open-end credit. There is every reason to do so. Revolving credit is increasing in importance, having apparently risen from 3½ to 5 billion dollars while the Proxmire bill was under consideration. The spreading use of credit cards is increasing this still further, and there is every prospect that this trend will persist. The rate now charged is 1½ percent a month on the amount due at the beginning of a monthly billing period. In spite of all the hair-splitting this is the equivalent of 18 percent a year, and there is no legitimate reason for not quoting this rate alongside and with the monthly rate. The same amount of free-riding on credit purchases within the previous billing month which is now granted under revolving credit would still be accorded the buyers—but no more and no less. If this practice is proper now, it would be proper then, and industry opponents cannot condemn this feature of the Sullivan bill without condemning their present practices. As is now true, credit would be measured from the date the service charge begins and not from the date of purchase. The existing free loading of credit up to the time that the service charge is made is probably reflected in a higher price. It would be wrong to charge customers twice, in interest as well as price, for the same service.

Therefore let the nonsense cease. There are twelve months in the year and a monthly rate of 1½ percent is an approximate 18 percent yearly rate and an approximate yearly rate is all the Sullivan bill requires. There is no point in attempting to refine the percentage to a thousandth of one percent or even to a hundredth of a percent. A tenth of a percent would be enough and even the nearest quarter of a percent.

A further powerful objection to the exemption given certain forms of revolving credit is that it would favor some mercantile establishments at the expense of others. Thus Sears Roebuck would be exempted, but Montgomery Ward and Spiegels included. The furniture industry would be covered, but department stores would not.

I think you will find many business and financial groups favor including all forms of consumers credit rather than merely including some types and excluding others.[1]

V

I should like to present a further brief summary if I may of twelve reasons why I believe revolving or open credit should be included without any exemption.

(1) A monthly rate is inherently misleading. It tends to minimize the cost of credit. A rate of 1½ percent a month sounds a lot cheaper than 18 percent a year.

(2) A monthly rate for revolving credit prevents a consumer from comparing the cost of revolving credit with alternative sources of credit which would be quoted on an annual basis. Why shouldn't a housewife know that her credit is costing her 18 percent a year? Perhaps she could borrow somewhere else at a cheaper rate.

(3) A monthly rate on revolving credit prevents a direct comparison with the interest earned on savings accounts. It might be more profitable to use savings which are only earning 4 percent a year rather than using the stores credit at 18 percent. A monthly rate obscures these comparisons.

(4) A monthly rate for revolving credit gives department stores an unfair competitive advantage over small stores which cannot afford revolving credit and which, therefore, must disclose an annual rate. A furniture store might be required to quote 14 percent a year on its installment contracts, while a large department store down the street, selling the same furniture, could quote 1½ percent a month. The furniture dealer's credit sounds higher, but it is actualy cheaper.

(5) The distinction between ordinary revolving credit and installment type revolving credit is essentially arbitrary and gives some revolving credit plans an unfair competitive advantage over other revolving credit plans. For example, Sears can quote 1½ percent a month, but Montgomery Ward must quote 18 percent a year. So must Spiegels.

(6) There are no valid reasons why an annual rate cannot be disclosed. It requires no extra computation or bookkeeping on the part of the store. Monthly statements would simply have 18 percent per year printed on them as well as 1½ percent per month.

(7) The claim that 18 percent a year is inaccurate is not true from the viewpoint of the consumer. The consumer must make up his mind to incure or avoid the service charge, not when he makes the purchase, but 30 to 60 days thereafter when the service charge is about to begin. This is the relevant decision time for the consumer to compare credit alternatives. When the rate is measured from this point in time, it will always work out to be 18 percent. This is the most meaningful rate for the consumer. If he can borrow elsewhere for less than 18 percent, it might pay him to do so and discharge his debt to the store.

(8) The Massachusetts Truth-in-Lending Law requires the annual rate on all revolving credit. There have been no difficulties. The credit manager of a Massachusetts store testified his firm had absolutely no trouble with disclosing the annual rate on revolving credit and believed such disclosure to be fair and accurate.

(9) Other knowledgeable groups support the annual rate disclosure for all revolving credit including the influential National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws. They have been working on a State consumer credit code for three years and have recommended S. 5 be amended to repeal the special exemption for revolving credit.

(10) Academic experts support the disclosure of an annual rate for all revolving credit. In fact, the retailers' star witness against the Douglas bill (Professor Richard Vancil of the Harvard Business School) has endorsed the revolving credit provisions of the original Proxmire bill. Professor Vancil is a leading expert on the mathematics of finance.

(11) Labor and consumer groups, including the AFL–CIO and the National Consumers League, support the annual rate for all revolving credit.

(12) Revolving credit is one of the fastest growing forms of consumer credit. Some have predicted that 50 percent of consumer credit will be revolving type credit within 5 years. Thus, the exemption, though small today, could grow into an enormous loophole.

VI

2. A second improvement in the Sullivan bill is to extend the requirement of truth to the advertisements of credit instead of confining them to the terms of the credit contract. As a matter of fact, advertising is a more important factor in leading people to sign up for credit than are the written terms of the contract or the guarded verbal statements of the salesman. A man's mind is commonly made up by the time he goes to the secondhand car dealer, the furniture store, or the finance company. By that time he is commonly "hooked."

The abuses in the advertising of credit are widespread. The emphasis is commonly laid on low down payments and on so much a month in dollars without stating the cash price of the article or the actual interest rate. Sometimes a monthly but not a yearly rate is given. Often the rate is advertised on the original amount borrowed or owed but not on the unpaid declining balance. It may be remembered that it was on this latter ground that the Federal Trade Commission years ago compelled General Motors to revise its advertising and that the Federal Circuit Court upheld the legality and constitutionality of this ruling. Incidentally, General Motors did not appeal to the Supreme Court.

Some years ago I had newspapers all over the country clipped on this very point of credit advertising and I assembled a chamber of horrors which I presented at a public hearing.

But I confess I never dared to include advertising in any of my bills because I was afraid that if I did so it would cause the newspapers to come out in active opposition to the bill and thus kill any chance of passage. Perhaps I was too fearful and was not sufficiently appreciative of the sterling idealism of the American press. You are far better judges. We certainly need a clean up in the advertising of credit as well as in the formal terms of sale and if you think it is safe to proceed, I would defer to your judgment.

3. I also like the way you include under your rules those credit charges which are under $10 as well as those over that amount.

---

[1] See the views stated in Revolving Credit Provisions of Truth in Lending. Hearing Before Committee on Banking and Currency, U.S. Senate, 90th Congress, 1st Session, on S. 5. June 23, 1967, 65 pp.

The $10 limit may still conceal a very high interest rate and by its very nature, this will weigh most heavily on the poor and the very poor, who necessarily must buy in small quantities at high prices and on usurious credit terms.

The relative abuses perpetrated upon these poor folks are far greater than on any other class and you will have to weigh these considerations against the extra trouble caused to small businessmen on small amounts and also with the harsh political realities in the country and here in the House and Senate.

4. I always included in my bills first mortgage credit on homes. I did not do so because of the annual rate, since the financial groups in real estate had always followed the correct policy of quoting it on a yearly basis on the unpaid balance. I did include home mortgage credit, however, so that the prospective house buyer could know the total amount which he was to pay for interest over the life of the mortgage. I was pleased that the real estate industry did not seem to be alarmed by this provision and that the Housing and Home Finance Agency adopted it at my suggestion in much of their literature. This did not seem to hurt the purchase of homes or the real estate business.

I will frankly admit, however, that somewhere along the route I fully expected to run into a roadblock on this issue and I was ready to throw this provision overboard if it because necessary to ensure passage.

The case for including home mortgages, however, has been greatly strengthened by the current practice of discounting these mortgages at given rates. If one agrees to pay 6 percent on a $10,000 mortgage for 30 years, but with a discount of 5 percent, and hence receives $9,500 in cash, the real interest rate which he is to pay is not 6 percent, but 6½ percent over the full life of the mortgage and 6⅔ percent if he pays out in 12 years. If discounts could be eliminated by letting the stated rate become the market rate, the case for including real estate mortgages would revert to the original purpose of knowing the total paid out in interest over the life of the mortgage. Until this is done, however, there will be a double advantage in knowing the annual rate as well as the total amount.

5. I think Mrs. Sullivan's idea of a public commission on consumer credit is excellent, and I am sure also that none of us want this to be used as a substitute for a good bill. It should instead be supplementary and a means of exploring new ground.

6. In theory I approve of Title II of H.R. 11601 which prohibits the garnishment of wages. A century and a half ago, as John B. McMaster shows in this *History of the United States*, there were tens of thousands of men put in jail up and down the Atlantic Coast for the non-payment of debts. They were frequently jailed for incredibly small amounts such as a dollar or less. The movement of Jacksonian democracy in the 1830's and 40's abolished this practice.

Garnisheeing wages has destructive results very similar to imprisonment. It often causes men to lose their jobs and shuts off needed income to their family.

But whether this prohibition should be put into effect now, and on the national rather than the state level, is another matter which I must leave to you. I am informed that only three states have such a provision at present.

7. The next important provision is the imposition of an 18 percent ceiling on consumers' loans.

I am compelled to say that I do not favor this provision for a variety of reasons. First, it has been my belief that if the borrowers and buyers could only be informed of the real cost of credit that the measure would then largely become self-policing, while the abuses would also be largely self-correcting. Publicity and complete comparability of rates and amounts would drive down usurious charges. And it would only need a minority of the buyers and borrowers to become credit and interest conscious for firms to compete for business by lowering the rates.

I tend also to be wary of direct price regulation by the government except in grave national emergencies such as war, since the rates would be inflexible and require a lot of red tape and policing to administer. In addition, there is a general tendency for the legal maximum charge to become the prevailing rate. This is seen in the fixation by the states of maximum interest rates on small loans. Here the ceiling has virtually become the floor.

I do not want to see this happen in the whole field of personal finance. Much and probably most of the credit could be extended profitably at far less than 18 percent.

8. By adding cease and desist procedures to the punitive damages provision of S. 5, the Sullivan bill strengthens the enforcement weapons which are at the disposal of the Reserve Board.

This may be needed and I see no substantive objection to it. You are the best judge as to political maneuverability.

On other subjects which I have not discussed, such as the regulation of commodity exchanges, and emergency credit controls, I do not regard myself as qualified to speak.

May I thank the committee again for inviting me to appear and to express my hope that Congress may pass a strong and meaningful bill. And on the basis of past experience I believe that in any eyeball to eyeball confrontation with members of the Senate the representatives of the House will more than hold their own in both resolution and astuteness.

Sgt. Rex Tipple Tells of Jungle War in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 8, 1967

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, by bits and pieces the American people are learning the facts about the administration's conduct of the Vietnam war.

This information is being brought home by the American fighting man who has had to endure a no-win policy.

Battlefield objectives, won after great sacrifice of life, are given up to the Communists. Our one great advantage—airpower—is withheld from major Communist targets.

After losing hundreds of American lives in savage battles to capture the iron triangle, political decisions in Washington gave back to the Reds this important objective.

The hometown newspapers of America are performing a great service with interview stories of the returning American soldier.

These stories contain the unvarnished truth, not cluttered with the self-serving propaganda issued by Robert Strange McNamara, the Harvard economist who rates his military knowledge above our best trained generals.

An outstanding example of this public service journalism was contained in the August 3 edition of the Richmond, Ind., Palladium-Item. Reporter Max Knight, a probing interviewer and able writer, has written a fine article after talking with Sgt. Rex Tipple, of Hillgrove, Ohio.

The article follows:

STARK REALITIES OF JUNGLE WAR IN VIETNAM UNFORGETTABLE TO SERGEANT TIPPLE, OF HILLGROVE

(By Max Knight)

UNION CITY.—Do not try and tell Sgt. Rex Tipple of Hillgrove, Ohio, that we are not in a full scale war in Vietnam. He knows better.

Sergeant Tipple lay in a clearing as an evacuation helicopter edged in for a landing and saw a rifle grenade kill his close friend Jack Beam only five feet away.

Tipple took a piece of shrapnel in his face and bears the scar as a remembrance of pure hell in jungle so thick you had to cut your way through.

As a squad leader, he was at the front when the Viet Cong ambushed his platoon and three buddies from Greenville, Ohio, were killed in a matter of minutes.

Don't try and tell Sergeant Tipple that war is not hell and that the United States is not fighting a major enemy. He just won't listen.

Tipple was drafted into service soon after being graduated from the Dayton Barber College in July 1965.

He was sent to Ft. Devens, Mass., for training and, along with his high school buddy Jack Beam, became a member of the newly formed 196th Infantry Division.

In July, 1966, this new light infantry brigade was shipped to Vietnam, landing at Vung Tau.

The men immediately were transferred to military aircraft and flown to Tay Ninh, some 18 miles from the Cambodian border and in an area thick with Viet Cong.

LET TIPPLE TELL IT

But let Tipple tell it in his own words:

"As we approached the landing field, we could see nothing but jungle. Mud runways had been cut for the planes to land and it took some nifty flying for the pilots to get us in without crashing.

"For the first month we were there, we did nothing but set up a base camp. Since it was the monsoon season, it poured and poured and poured. I do not believe I could ever again gripe about a dry spell in our weather here at home.

"We lived in tents. We built bunkers and defensive lines. We fought mosquitoes big enough to haul us away manually. All in all, we thought things could not be rougher.

"But as usual in such a case, how wrong we were.

"One month to the day, we went out on our first search and destroy mission. The Viet Cong hit us before we were much more than out of sight of base camp.

"For the next seven months, some platoon or squad from the 196th was under attack somewhere in the Vung Tau area every day.

"But, although taking a tremendous loss of men, we slowly pushed the Viet Cong from the area into a pointed piece of ground that would become famous as the Iron Triangle."

HE IS WOUNDED

It was on one of these drives that Tipple was wounded. The second platoon had moved ahead to check out an area when the Viet Cong sprung an ambush.

Tipple was ordered to take his platoon to the right and flank the enemy but as he moved into position, a second ambush was unleashed. It was here the three buddies from Greenville were hit.

It was a grenade fragment that caught Tipple above the right eye. He was evacuated to a base hospital by helicopter.

But two days later, Tipple hitched a ride with a helicopter and returned to his platoon. It was a week before the hospital discovered he was missing and another week before they found out what he had done.

"I couldn't see sitting in a hospital while my buddies were being shot up," said the sergeant. "My place was with them."

He told the field commander he did not realize he was supposed to get a release from the hospital before rejoining his unit. The entire matter was dropped.

His unit fought for 27 consecutive days in the final search and kill mission before the big push of the Iron Triangle.

But as his unit inched the Viet Cong back, large caches of food supplies were uncovered and base camps were found.

"It was then we first realized we were hitting not only the Viet Cong," said Tipple, "but that at least one unit of North Vietnamese regulars were in the area."

Every major unit in South Vietnam poured into the perimeter to help as the Iron Triangle unfolded.

"It was a month of the bloodiest battling any war ever produced before we overpowered the Triangle," said Tipple.

During this time, his squad was pinned down by heavy sniper fire as helicopters rushed into the area to evacuate the men to a rear area.

But again, let Tipple describe the few moments that will live with him the rest of his life.

"We saw the choppers moving in over the trees and I moved my squad to the specified position for loading.

"Jack (Beam) was by my side as we reached the open area but we no more than stopped when snipers opened fire on us.

"We hit the ground, actually not being able to get flat due to the heavy jungle growth.

"I remember hearing rifle grenades pop and the fragments whizzing by my head. I looked up as Jack screamed and realized one of the grenades had exploded only inches from him. He was dead by the time I could crawl the short distance to his side.

"Jack was always the lucky one. In school, he was the one with the luck. In basic, it was always Lucky Jack. My first thought was, 'Why Jack? It should have been me. I'm the unlucky one, not Jack.' It is a moment I will never forget."

Tipple went into shock at the loss of his close friend and was flown to a base hospital.

And when he returned to the field, he went with a new look at the war in Vietnam.

ONLY SIX CAME BACK

"Of the platoon that went over with me to Vietnam," said Tipple, recalling the 47 men who were all buddies, "only six came back."

Then the full bitterness came through in his conversation.

"We took the Iron Triangle. The North Vietnamese and Viet Cong were soundly defeated. In fact, the area became so secure, our unit was moved to Chu Lai to hold another secured area while the Marines moved into the demilitarized zone in another operation.

"So what happens? The politicians running the show decided we should pull out of the Iron Triangle and keep only a token force there. Today, less than four months after we lost hundreds of men taking the area, the Viet Cong are back there in force.

"There is no question that we should remain in Vietnam. There is no question but that we should win the war. But it is time the military was given the say-so and what is now being called an economic war becomes a war to liberate the South Vietnamese from the cruel Viet Cong.

"It will take a lot more men than we now have in Vietnam to accomplish this," said the sergeant.

Tipple said that not only were there not enough men to hold the areas taken but than in every case in which he was involved, there were few replacements sent to take the place of those soldiers either killed or wounded.

"When we lost a man, we did without," said Tipple.

Were it not for the air power, said the sergeant, things in Vietnam would be completely out of hand as far as the Americans are concerned.

AIR POWER VITAL

"Our air power is tremendous," said the sergeant, "and no amount of credit can fully compensate for what those men are doing.

"But," he added, "to a man, our unit believed we should put more pressure on the north by air and more men on the ground in the South.

"That way," he said, "we could win a war that now looks like it might go on for years."

Then with a determined look and with words that seemed almost forced, Tipple said:

"But we are not going to declare this as a full scale war and win it until the people here in the United States take an interest in what is going on in Vietnam.

"It seems the only ones interested are those who have sons, or husbands over there. If someone they know is killed, most seem to shrug it off and say, 'Isn't it a shame?'

"You are right it is a shame. It is more than a shame, it is an out and out crime."

Tipple is glad to be home. He considers himself lucky to be here with no more to show than a scar on his face and an even bigger one on his heart.

He is looking forward to marrying a licensed practical nurse at Reid Memorial Hospital in a few weeks and starting a new life as a barber in Richmond or Dayton.

"But as many veterans of World War II, the Korean War or the Vietnam War," said Tipple, "I will never forget those who were not lucky and will not have the future to look forward to as I now have."

"L'Aviazione Moderna e il suo Futuro Spaciale"—Modern Aviation and the Aerospace Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 7, 1967

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, those of us who have been longtime students of space science and advocates of continued research and development accents in the Nation's space program certainly welcome the recent book, "L'Aviazione Moderne e il suo Futuro Spaciale," by Dr. Franco Fiorio. This book is the most up to date and comprehensive volume on space developments both in the United States, Italy, and worldwide. Published by Editore Dr. Francesco Vallardi of Milano, the book is divided into three sections; the technical approaches to aerospace problems, air warfare, and outer space exploration and science.

As a Republican member of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics and a member of the United Nations Subcommittee for the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space, it is a pleasure to call this fine work to the attention of the Congress and the American people, and to insert in the RECORD a brief biography of Dr. Fiorio and a selected quotation from the book:

The Italian publishing firm Editore Dr. Francesco Vallardi of Milano, one of the oldest and most respected publishers of scientific and technical books in Italy, has presented last month a new volume of its "Dynamis" series on transportation techniques.

The title of the volume is "Modern Aviation and its future in space," written by Dr. Franco Fiorio who lives in Arlington, Virginia, and is well known in Washington and in American aerospace circles. Dr. Fiorio, who took his Ph. D. at the Politecnico of Milano in 1934, has come to the United States as an Italian Air Force Colonel, assigned to the Italian Embassy as Assistant Air Attaché, in 1949.

After his retirement, in 1957, he has been very active in the aerospace field, playing a key role in the San Marco Project, carried out in cooperation between NASA and the Italian Commission for spece research to the successful launching of the San Marco B satellite from a platform at sea off the coast of Kenya, last April. Furthermore, Dr. Fiorio has represented his Country in all the meetings of the Committee for the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space of the United Nations and of its Scientific and Technical Subcommittee. Recently Dr. Fiorio has served as one of the 12 experts in the Special Committee for the Organization of the 1968 United Nations Space Conference and in the Working Group set up by the UN General Assembly to assess the possibilities of navigation satellite systems.

Dr. Fiorio has been a Chairman of the National Capital Section of the American Rocket Society in its early times. He has been an Adviser, since 1958 of the Italian Ministry of Foreign Affairs on space matters. He also represents in the United States the Italian National Research Council.

As a sideline for his official activities, Dr. Fiorio is a correspondent of several Italian magazines and daily papers in order to promote a better understanding of space matters to the Italian public. In the United States he has presented several papers on space subjects to meetings of the American Rocket Society, of the American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics and others. His paper "Cosmosophy and world affairs" has been reproduced on the "Congressional Record."

The book "Modern Aviation and its future in space" draws from Dr. Fiorio's deep experience on the subject, to present a vivid picture of the challenges, possibilities and realizations of the aerospace activities of today. It is divided in three parts: the first one written with the purpose of giving layman an idea of the problems, difficulties and technical feats which need to be accomplished before a new airplane can be flown or a new spaceship launched into orbit. The sound barrier, the heat barrier, the new exotic materials and alloys, the miracles of molecular electronics and the logistic nightmares of operating the great space ranges are all described with a light touch, but with sufficient realism as to supply a lasting impression of the challenges faced by the aerospace scientists and technicians in their quest for progress.

The second part is an essay on the elements of air warfare, from the basic reasons of today's policy of a stabilized deterrent Force, to the particular aspects of air warfare, such as close support of ground troops in limited wars; air mobility of ground troops such as exemplified by the 1st Cavalry Division of the U.S. Army in Vietnam, to the important logistic activities of the transport aviation. In this part some chapters are dedicated to civil aviation and to its future developments, including supersonic and hypersonic planes for long and fast trips, and VTOL for mass transportation of the megalopolis.

The third part, contains a brief assessment of the space feats up to the beginning of 1967, a special chapter on Italian space activities and a crystal-ball look into the future of space activities.

There is no doubt that Dr. Fiorio's book is, up to now, the most comprehensive and up to date volume on aerospace matters existing on the market for the interest of non-specialists in the field: it is to be hoped that some American publisher will take the initiative of printing an English version of it as it is now available only in the Italian language.

Selected Quotation

In the political area of international relations space activities could one day bring about great changes in regard to relations among the nations of the world. In the preceeding chapters, several times the possibilities have been mentioned in regard to the use of new weapons, technology, and military space bases. It has to be clarified however, that although these possibilities do exist and are certainly useful to the professional military, our view is by no means certain they will materialize in an armaments race towards a cosmic conflict.

On the contrary, the development of armaments, the policy of the balance of power, the principles of deterrence and retaliation are all aspects of the political, economic and prestige competition between nations which may someday cease to exist. That day could be when the nations of our planet are deeply involved in space enterprises.

The magnitude of these enterprises is enough to tax deeply the intellectual, industrial, and financial resources of the whole human race for the next generation. Therefore it is hoped that instead of transferring into outer space the problems of the cold war and the dangers of the hot war the great powers will take the opportunity from the need of global space cooperation to forget their rivalries on earth and agree on joint exploration programs. This vision of the future would offer for the first time to humanity the prospect of a lasting peace.

If in the future, the nations of the world would jointly engage their tremendous resources towards the development of the economic, commercial and scientific potential of outer space, they would be forced to forget the traditional activities of the past, that is trying to destroy each other with apocalyptic weapons.

For these reasons, this book closes with a declaration of faith in the future of the human race as a corollary to the exploration and development of outer space. The new era which began on October 4, 1957 with the placing in orbit of the first artificial satellite from the earth is not yet 10 years old, but has already demonstrated the tremendous possibilities in space for the valiant souls who are not afraid of the unknown.

In this new Renaissance, we ought not to put limits therefore to our horizons, because this would mean to put limits to the ingenuity and aspirations 'of man—limits which he has never accepted for thousands of generations.

Customs Service Commended

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 8, 1967

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, deserved commendation of the U.S. customs service for intelligent actions to improve service to the public was made on August 3 by the Long Beach Independent-Press-Telegram in the following editorial:

U.S. Customs Commended for Action

Since these newspapers have bluntly criticized the Bureau of Customs from time to time, it is proper to acknowledge actions that correct Long Beach's two main grievances against that agency.

On Monday customs officials, without advance fanfare, quietly assigned crews to handle two daytime departures and one daytime arrival at the Long Beach Airport.

Twenty-four hours later the district commissioner of customs, William R. Knoke, announced that the bureau would revert to its original commitment by transferring the bulk of district services to the new customhouse on Terminal Island.

Until this week policy statements by customs officials indicated they were abandoning their obligations to Long Beach. They have now returned to their first decisions, which were sound, and are to be commended for it.

The Monday daytime service was the first of its kind provided at the Long Beach Airport. Customs crews promptly and efficiently processed the arrival of 251 Trans-International Airlines passengers from Frankfurt, Germany, and the departure of an equal number a short time later. A Lufthansa flight bound for Germany with 184 passengers was handled the same day.

Airport officials believe all questions have been resolved so that the overseas traffic there may continue to grow.

Similarly, the Terminal Island Customhouse will provide the services and house the personnel for which it was designed. More than 100 employees will be transferred from central Los Angeles, which will retain only the smaller staff appropriate to its location. The move to the waterfront center of activity, of course, makes sense.

There is no need to review the history of these disputes or to dispense credit to local officials and organizations that supported Long Beach's cause. They did perform excellent service, as did Sen. Kuchel and Reps. Hosmer and King. The important thing is that the customs officials in Washington and on the local scene—including Regional Commissioner Frank Creed as well as Mr. Knoke—have reached just and proper solutions.

I Am the Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT PRICE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 8, 1967

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, one of my constituents, Mary Rando of Friona, Tex., won a talent contest in the fall of 1966 with a reading by an anonymous author, "I Am the Nation." I have had the pleasure of hearing Mary Rando recite her declaration of what makes America, America, which she has given before 37 civic, youth, and church organizations in the region.

One of 18 children being reared by her mother, Mrs. Santos Rando, Mary is spending her summer working cotton and sugar beets with her brothers and sisters. Extra money from her hoeing and chores of housework goes to a special college education fund she has at the bank. Through "love gifts," her fund has grown from her prize money of $125—less a tithe to the Friona Baptist Mexican Mission, where she teaches a class of 10- and 11-year-old boys, and a payment on new furniture for her home—to $675.

I would like to enter "I Am the Nation" in the Appendix of the Congressional Record for the benefit of all of us:

[From the Amarillo (Tex.) Sunday News-Globe, Aug. 6, 1967]

"I Am the Nation"

I was born on July 4, 1776, and the Declaration of
Independence is my birth certificate.
The bloodlines of the world run in my veins, because
I offered freedom to the oppressed.
I am many things and many people.
I am the nation.

I am 195 million living souls and the ghost of
Millions who have lived and died for me.
I am Nathan Hale and Paul Revere. I stood at
Lexington and fired the shot heard around the world.
I am Washington, Jefferson and Patrick Henry.
I am John Paul Jones, the Green Mountain Boys and Davy Crockett.

I am Lee and Grant and Abe Lincoln. I remember the
Alamo, the Maine and Pearl Harbor.
When freedom called I answered, and stayed until
It was over, over there.
I left my heroic dead in Flanders' Field, on the
Rock of Corregidor, on the bleak slopes of Korea.
And in the steaming jungles of Vietnam.

I am the Brooklyn Bridge, the wheat lands of Kansas
And the granite hills of Vermont.
I am the coal fields of the Virginias and Pennsylvania,
The fertile lands of the West, the Golden Gate and
The Grand Canyon. I am Independence Hall, the
Monitor and the Merrimac.

I am big. I sprawl from the Atlantic to the Pacific.
My arms reach out to embrace Alaska and Hawaii . . .
Three million square miles throbbing with industry.
I am more than five million farms. I am forest, field, mountain and dessert.
I am quite villages and cities that never sleep.

You can look at me and see Ben Franklin walking down
The streets of Philadelphia with his breadloaf under his arm. You can see Betsy Ross with her needle.
You can see the lights of Christmas and hear the
Strains of "Auld Lang Syne" as the calendar turns.

I am Babe Ruth and the World Series.
I am 130,000 schools and colleges.
I am 320,000 churches where my people worship
God as they think best.
I am a ballot dropped in a box, the roar of a crowd
In a stadium and the voices of a choir in a cathedral.
I am an editorial in a newspaper and a letter to a Congressman.
I am Albert Einstein and Billy Graham.

I am Eli Whitney and Stephen Foster and Tom Edison.
I am Horace Greeley, Will Rogers and the Wright
Brothers. I am George Washington Carver, Daniel
Webster and Jonas Salk. I am Longfellow, Harriet
Beecher Stowe, Walt Whitman and Thomas Paine.

Yes, I am the nation, and these are the things that I am.
I was conceived in freedom and, God willing, in
Freedom I will spend the rest of my days.

May I possess always the integrity, the courage and the
Strength to keep myself unshackled, to remain a
Citadel of freedom and a beacon of hope to the world.
This is my wish, my goal, my prayer in this year
Of 1967—One hundred and ninety-one years after I was born!

Navy A-6 Intruders Bomb Rain or Shine Over North Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 11, 1967

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, most of us in the Congress have vigorously supported the A-6 aircraft program because we know of its importance as an all-weather aircraft. Its advanced electronics capability makes it invaluable to our forces in Vietnam. This is pointed up in a recent Associated Press dispatch carried in the New York Times on Thursday, August 3, which I submit for reprinting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

NAVY A-6 INTRUDERS BOMB RAIN OR SHINE OVER NORTH VIETNAM

ABOARD U.S.S. "ENTERPRISE" OVER NORTH VIETNAM.—Night in and night out and in the worst of weather, two-man crews in the Navy's new A-6 Intruders are carrying bomb loads in the air war over North Vietnam.

The Intruder goes anywhere anytime in the North, hitting power plants, rail yards, bridges and truck traffic.

The B-52, billed by the Strategic Air Command for years as the nation's all-weather bomber, seldom moves north of the 17th Parallel since these eight-engine planes would be more subject to MIG's, the Surface to Air Missiles (SAM), and rings of lax guns that protect North Vietnamese targets.

F-4 Phantoms, F-105 Thunderchiefs and A-4 Skyhawks of both services are most effective when the pilots bomb visually. With months of monsoon weather in the North, the bulk of these aircraft attack only when it clears for a few hours or a hole can be found in a cloud bank.

But every day two squardons of A-6's sort out the air defense problem.

"We use bad weather like a security blanket," said Lieut. (jg.) Kelly Patterson of Long Beach, Calif., a bombardier with the Intruder squadron aboard the Enterprise.

The Intruder aircraft is 60 feet long with a bulbous nose and canopy hunkering over two engines. It tapers to a fine tail with sail-like stabilizers and rudder. Its stubby wings have retracting foils and flaps that allow for stable and seemingly endless flight low or high altitudes. About 15,000 pounds of bombs and rockets can be hung on an A-6 belly and wings.

Inside, the pilot and bombardier sit side by side, contemplating eight square feet of radar scopes, a television set, defensive gear, dials, gauges, radios, and assorted indicators.

An inertial navigation system need only be told where it is starting from and where the target is. It will tell the crew how far away the target is and when they can expect to be there, and cue the combing radar.

Intruder crews often take out alone, pushing after targets 100 miles up the Red River delta, encountering flak and missiles sometimes for six minutes at a stretch.

Lieutenant Patterson's pilot is Eugene McDaniel, of Oceana, Va., who says "Happines is feet wet," referring to the time when the Intruder crew leaves the coast after a run.

However, the pilot adds:

"We got to hit them in a bigger way. We're pursuing the right course. We hit Thain Guyen (steel and power plants) and that's something it takes them a long time to build."

He and Lieutenant Patterson have flown 58 missions.

Can the War on Poverty Rise Above Partisan Politics?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. GOODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 8, 1967

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, Congressman GIBBONS, and I take pleasure in calling to the attention of the Members an excellent article written by a distinguished and objective social scientist with reference to the war on poverty and the opportunity crusade. The article is as follows:

CAN THE WAR ON POVERTY RISE ABOVE PARTISAN POLITICS?

(By Sar A. Levitan, the George Washington University)

(NOTE.—To appear in Poverty and Human Resources Abstracts, September-October 1967.)

Partisan politics, according to pious declarations by politicians, ends at water's edge. While this patriotic sentiment is observed more in its breach than practice, politicians normally rise above their narrow partisan interests in case of national emergency, and certainly in case of war. The domestic war on poverty, however, never achieved such a privileged status. Few if any issues on the Congressional agenda during the past three years engendered as much controversy as the antipoverty legislation.

Conceived and planned in the Executive branch, the Economic Opportunity bill was presented to Congress on March 16, 1964, as the first major Johnson program. Potent forces in the House of Representatives, led by the then Chairman of the House Education and Labor Committee, Adam Clayton Powell, contrived to keep the "war on poverty" a Democratic affair. Congressional considerations of the antipoverty effort generated a great deal of heat, but litle insights into the causes or the most effective means to combat the social ill. The Congressional debates on the war on poverty are not likely to be included among the more glorious hours of Congress or to add to its reputation as a deliberative body.

There is a glimmer of hope that the situation might change in 1967. True to course, Congress has before it two major measures for the continuation of the antipoverty program: one proposed by the Administration and the other by the Republican opposition. A closer examination of the two bills indicates that the substantive approaches are essentially similar and that the differences have been exaggerated.

The Administration has dropped much of the rhetoric which characterized earlier efforts and the sloganeering has subsided. On the other hand, the Republicans in the House introduced their own measure with a minimum of fanfare, indicating that the proposals are bargainable. In introducing their Opportunity Crusade—the Republican name for the antipoverty measure—the sponsors expressed the hope that their measure will receive bipartisan support and that the bill is "a collection of proposals and suggestions" and not "as a final or inflexible substitute" to the Administration bill.[1]

Other bills are likely to emerge from the Committees which held hearings on the enabling legislation, but these are likely to differ from one another only on details. The Administration has placed a price tag on the legislation and Congress is unlikely to exceed that limit. Even if the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee outbids the Administration, as it did last year, there is little possibility that Congress will agree to major program expansion. Moreover, after three years of experience, the major thrusts of the poverty program have been determined; constituents for each program have been established and radical changes within the current framework are not foreseen. Debates over the various legislative proposals focus on techniques and methods of presently operating measures.

This development does not necessarily suggest that the Economic Opportunity Act has exhausted the strategies to combat poverty. Indeed, new proposals meriting careful consideration have already been introduced. The proposals by Senators Robert F. Kennedy, Charles H. Percy and Abraham A. Ribicoff have received the greatest attention. However, given the present climate of opinion and budgetary constraints, these and other proposals are not likely to be considered by the 90th Congress and almost certainly will not be taken up during the current session.

Both the Administration and the Republican bills would extend the legislation for a period of three years, avoiding the need for annual review of the enabling legislation. If either bill, or a combination of the two, is adopted, legislative oversight will be limited over the next three years to the appropriations process.

The Administration is "running on its record" and its proposal to extend the life of the Economic Opportunity Act contains little innovation or real change. It proposes to raise the level of expenditures during fiscal 1968 to $2.06 billion, an increase of $372 million from the preceding year. The additional funds would bolster job creation programs and expand Head Start. Otherwise, the Administration bill focuses on placating public and Congressional criticisms of the legislation. Many amendments reflect administrative regulation and practices which are already in effect. These legislative amendments are designed to offer Members of Congress the opportunity to claim credit for tightening the poverty program and preventing future abuses. The proposed "changes" include the prescribing of screening procedures for the Job Corps; authorizing center directors to take disciplinary measures, even dismissing of corpsmen; providing for greater involvement of neighborhood communities in administering Job Corps centers; expanding the role of states and elected local officials in the operation of community action programs; and prohibiting the use of federal funds for illegal picketing and demonstrations.

The Republican Opportunity Crusade would not abolish the war on poverty, contrary to extremist attacks and misleading news reports. But it would dismantle the present Office of Economic Opportunity, transferring most of its activities to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. As a substitute for the OEO's present coordinating functions, the Opportunity Crusade would establish a Council of Economic Opportunity Advisers to the President, on a par with the Council of Economic Advisers. The bill provides essentially the same federally-supported programs initiated by the Economic Opportunity Act, with one serious omission. The Crusaders would abolish the EOA-sponsored adult job creation and training programs. This omission accounts for most of the $315 million "savings" proposed by the Republicans, who would authorize the expenditure of $1,745 million.

---

[1] Press Release by Congressmen Albert H. Quie and Charles E. Goodell, June 8, 1967.

The case for abolishing OEO is not persuasive. The agency has thus far concentrated on administering its own programs and can claim little success in achieving coordination of the antipoverty efforts. But it is not at all clear that a "high level" advisory council without any operating programs could achieve a greater degree of success. The planning and research staff of OEO already undertakes the tasks that the Crusaders would assign to the proposed advisory council, though its recommendations and the results of its research are normally not published. The same contraints of the research and planning arm of OEO would also be present in the proposed new council. Upgrading the present functions of OEO's research and planning arm would not necessarily improve its product or enhance its value.

Whatever the accomplishments of the existing Council of Economic Advisers, it can hardly claim credit for objective evaluation of on-going government programs or for spelling out future Administration plans. Like any other federal agency, the Council's pronouncements are subject to constraints imposed by the Administration.

The Opportunity Crusade is, however, not devoid of promising proposals and adoption of some new measures in the bill would strengthen the antipoverty effort. The poor would be better served by consolidating the Administration proposal with the Republican bill.

Though the Crusaders would abolish OEO while the Administration is adamant on continuing the agency, the two are not set on a collision course. The news media, buttressed by the occasionally distorted and exaggerated statements of the antagonists, have played up the differences ignoring the vast similarities in the two bills. The supporters of the Administration's Economic Opportunity Act and the Opportunity Crusade both recognize the need to coordinate antipoverty efforts. And both are committed to similar types of programs. Republican spokesmen have indicated that the abolition of OEO is a negotiable item, provided that agreement can be reached upon substantive programs.

There is even a possibility that the poverty program for the first time can receive bipartisan support. Both groups are interested in strengthening the antipoverty effort. The question is whether the antagonists can achieve a compromise which will attract sufficient support. The alternative may be a dismemberment of the antipoverty program with no winners, and the poverty clients of the various programs the major victims. It can be assumed that the Administration bill with some modifications will survive the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and pass the Senate. A different situation exists in the House. The Republicans and defecting Democrats may not be able to abolish OEO, but they are in a position to tack on various crippling and damaging amendments.

The pity is that those interested in strengthening the antipoverty effort can find grounds to combine their forces. Many provisions of the Opportunity Crusade would strengthen the youth job creation and training programs of the Administration bill. If agreement is reached on the substantive issues, the controversy of dissolving OEO and transferring its programs to different agencies could also be resolved. The Job Corps would be strengthened by greater involvement of state educational agencies in administering centers, as is proposed by the Opportunity Crusade. The Job Corps has not sufficiently utilized the educational and vocational capabilities of states. It could have avoided a great many problems if state agencies had been drawn into the administration of centers.

The data developed by the Job Corps indicate that some conservation centers in particular do a poor educational job. The situation may be corrected by turning these centers over to the state educational agencies. The Opportunity Crusade, however, goes too far and would turn the entire Job Corps program over to the Office of Education. The individual centers would be administered by state educational agencies. There is no need to transfer centers which are now successfully operating to new auspices.

There is also merit in the Republican bill in integrating, wherever feasible, residential centers for youths with area vocational schools and community technical schools. Such combined facilities would train both the poor and nonpoor, and day students as well as residential trainees. This will avoid segregating poor youths from the rest of the population. However, adequate safeguards must be provided to prevent the poor from being "screened out" of the facilities. Experience has shown that where programs are open both to poor clients and the more advantaged, a "creaming" process sets in, excluding the poor.

The Opportunity Crusade also calls for the establishment of Military Career Centers administered by the Department of Defense. Under this provision youths rejected by the Armed Forces could voluntarily enroll to receive remedial education and training. These experimental centers may give the military the experience and the capability to educate and train deficiently educated youths. When the Vietnam fighting ends, which we all hope will be soon, the military can be expected to raise its standards of draft eligibility. Unless the Armed Forces can develop an ability to train young men to meet its own standards, a great many disadvantaged youths will be excluded from military service.

Some may object to this proposal anticipating that the military will someday draft youths who are presently rejected. The objection could be based on several grounds. At the one extreme there are those who oppose involving the military in "social reform" work. There are others who object to relying upon the military as an educational institution.

But if the military does reach a stage where such youths are drafted, beneficial results may be expected to follow. This would not, of course, create any necessary inequity in the selective service system. In effect, however, those youths who were poorly educated would be required to continue their education in the armed services in order to fulfill their military obligation. As a matter of public policy, there is general agreement about the desirability of compulsory education for children when they reach school age. It is difficult to see valid objections to extending the same idea to youths who have failed to achieve a rudimentary education during the years of normal compulsory education.

The Neighborhood Youth Corps would be strengthened by incorporating some of the Opportunity Crusade proposals. The most promising of these provisions is the measure which would utilize federal funds to subsidize private employers to hire disadvantaged youth, paying up to 25 percent of their wages. The present law already permits private employers to employ NYC enrollees, but limits government assistance to reimbursing the costs of any training that is provided. Thus far little use has been made of this subsidy.

Many NYC enrollees have been assigned to "make work" projects, creating a serious problem. The public and nonprofit agencies that sponsor the vast majority of programs contribute only 10 percent of the cost of the projects which can be made in kind. In most cases, NYC supplies free labor. As a result, it is not surprising that NYC enrollees are frequently assigned to perform marginal work. This problem could be attacked by requiring public and nonprofit agencies sponsoring NYC projects to increase their contributions. There is, however, a danger that many NYC sponsors would be unable to raise the necessary cash, especially in areas which need NYC projects for out-of-school youths the most.

Extending NYC to private employers should improve the situation. It is unlikely that a private employer paying 75 percent of a youth's wages would hire NYC youth unless their services were needed. The 25 percent wage subsidization to the employer is not a gift. Hiring and keeping deficiently educated workers involves extra expenses to the employer, and the reimbursement would assist responsible employers to defray the added costs of employing youths qualified for NYC help.

The Crusaders also propose to transfer the Community Action Program, lock, stock and barrel to HEW. A special assistant secretary would administer the program. The proposal, however, would make no substantive differences in the CAP program. The Crusaders would permit CAP to continue to exercise maximum flexibility in selecting programs within the confines of their allocation. The bill does introduce an exception, requiring CAP to fund birth control programs. Since OEO has dragged its feet in this area, the statement of Congressional intent requiring more energetic support of family planning is not amiss.

If a bipartisan approach to the war on poverty is to be achieved, the Crusaders must also give ground. The focal point of controversy relates to the continuation of OEO. The Administration has made it clear that this is not a bargainable issue. And the Crusaders would lose little if they acceded to the Administration demand.

It would also seem that the proposed Republican "saving," eliminating the adult training and job creation programs, is difficult to defend. In light of the high unemployment in slum areas, the need for these programs seems evident. It is true that these programs rarely achieved the goals set by the legislation leading participants to subprofessional careers. The programs do, however, provide income maintenance to poor adults and enable participants to perform useful tasks. The recent increase in the level of national unemployment, though minimal, indicates the need for the continuation of a program in which the government assumes the responsibility as an employer of last resort.

The chief beneficiaries of a bipartisan approach to the federal antipoverty programs would be the disadvantaged. A nonelection year presents the best chance to achieve this laudable goal. The challenge is whether the Administration and Congress will avail themselves of this opportunity.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20515

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Speaker: John W. McCormack

Abbitt, Watkins M., *Va*	
Abernethy, Thomas G., *Miss.*	6278 29th St.
Adair, E. Ross, *Ind*	4000 Mass. Ave.
Adams, Brock, *Wash*	
Addabbo, Joseph P., *N.Y*	
Albert, Carl, *Okla*	4614 Reno Rd.
Anderson, John B., *Ill*	
Anderson, William R., *Tenn.*	3006 P St.
Andrews, George W., *Ala*	
Andrews, Mark, *N. Dak*	
Annunzio, Frank, *Ill*	
Arends, Leslie C., *Ill*	4815 Dexter St.
Ashbrook, John M., *Ohio*	
Ashley, Thomas L., *Ohio*	
Ashmore, Robert T., *S.C*	
Aspinall, Wayne N., *Colo*	The Towers Apts., 4201 Cathedral Ave.
Ayres, William H., *Ohio*	
Baring, Walter S., *Nev*	
Barrett, William A., *Pa*	
Bates, William H., *Mass*	
Battin, James F., *Mont*	
Belcher, Page, *Okla*	
Bell, Alphonzo, *Calif*	
Bennett, Charles E., *Fla*	3421 Rusticway Lane, Falls Church, Va.
Berry, E. Y., *S. Dak*	118 Schotts Court NE.
Betts, Jackson E., *Ohio*	
Bevill, Tom, *Ala*	6224 N. 35th St., Arlington, Va.
Biester, Edward G., Jr., *Pa*	
Bingham, Jonathan B., *N.Y.*	
Blackburn, Benjamin B., *Ga.*	
Blanton, Ray, *Tenn*	
Blatnik, John A., *Minn*	
Boggs, Hale, *La*	
Boland, Edward P., *Mass*	
Bolling, Richard, *Mo*	307 Warrenton Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Bolton, Frances P. (Mrs.), *Ohio.*	2301 Wyo. Ave.
Bow, Frank T., *Ohio*	4301 Mass. Ave.
Brademas, John, *Ind*	
Brasco, Frank J., *N.Y*	
Bray, William G., *Ind*	
Brinkley, Jack, *Ga*	
Brock, W. E. (Bill), *Tenn*	
Brooks, Jack, *Tex*	
Broomfield, William S., *Mich.*	
Brotzman, Donald G., *Colo*	
Brown, Clarence J., Jr., *Ohio.*	
Brown, Garry, *Mich*	
Brown, George E., Jr., *Calif*	
Broyhill, James T., *N.C*	
Broyhill, Joel T., *Va*	
Buchanan, John, *Ala*	
Burke, J. Herbert, *Fla*	
Burke, James A., *Mass*	
Burleson, Omar, *Tex*	
Burton, Laurence J., *Utah*	
Burton, Phillip, *Calif*	
Bush, George, *Tex*	
Button, Daniel E., *N.Y*	
Byrne, James A., *Pa*	
Byrnes, John W., *Wis*	1215 25th St. S., Arlington, Va.
Cabell, Earle, *Tex*	
Cahill, William T., *N.J*	
Carey, Hugh L., *N.Y*	
Carter, Tim Lee, *Ky*	
Casey, Bob, *Tex*	
Cederberg, Elford A., *Mich*	
Celler, Emanuel, *N.Y*	The Mayflower
Chamberlain, Charles E., *Mich.*	
Clancy, Donald D., *Ohio*	
Clark, Frank M., *Pa*	220 C St. SE.
Clausen, Don H., *Calif*	
Clawson, Del, *Calif*	
Cleveland, James C., *N.H*	
Cohelan, Jeffery, *Calif*	1202 Longworth House Office Bldg.
Collier, Harold R., *Ill*	
Colmer, William M., *Miss*	
Conable, Barber B., Jr., *N.Y.*	
Conte, Silvio O., *Mass*	5619 Lamar Rd., Washington 16, D.C.
Conyers, John, Jr., *Mich*	
Corbett, Robert J., *Pa*	
Corman, James C., *Calif*	
Cowger, William O., *Ky*	
Cramer, William C., *Fla*	6215 Beachway Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Culver, John C., *Iowa*	
Cunningham, Glenn, *Nebr*	
Curtis, Thomas B., *Mo*	
Daddario, Emilio Q., *Conn*	
Daniels, Dominick V., *N.J*	
Davis, Glenn R., *Wis*	
Davis, John W., *Ga*	
Dawson, William L., *Ill*	
de la Garza, Eligio, *Tex*	
Delaney, James J., *N.Y*	
Dellenback, John R., *Oreg*	6903 Crail Dr., Bethesda, Md.
Denney, Robert V., *Nebr*	
Dent, John H., *Pa*	
Derwinski, Edward J., *Ill*	
Devine, Samuel L., *Ohio*	
Dickinson, William L., *Ala*	
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., *Mich*	
Dingell, John D., *Mich*	
Dole, Robert, *Kans*	6136 Beachway Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Donohue, Harold D., *Mass*	
Dorn, Wm. Jennings Bryan, *S.C.*	2030 Laburnum St., McLean, Va.
Dow, John G., *N.Y*	
Dowdy, John, *Tex*	
Downing, Thomas N., *Va*	
Dulski, Thaddeus J., *N.Y*	347 Cannon House Office Building
Duncan, John J., *Tenn*	
Dwyer, Florence P. (Mrs.), *N.J.*	
Eckhardt, Bob, *Tex*	
Edmondson, Ed, *Okla*	
Edwards, Don, *Calif*	9201 Fox Meadow La., Potomac, Md.,
Edwards, Edwin W., *La*	
Edwards, Jack, *Ala*	
Eilberg, Joshua, *Pa*	
Erlenborn, John N., *Ill*	
Esch, Marvin L., *Mich*	11754 Gainsborough Rd., Rockville, Md.
Eshleman, Edwin D., *Pa*	
Evans, Frank E., *Colo*	
Everett, Robert A., *Tenn*	
Evins, Joe L., *Tenn*	5044 Klingle St.
Fallon, George H., *Md*	
Farbstein, Leonard, *N.Y*	
Fascell, Dante B., *Fla*	
Feighan, Michael A., *Ohio*	
Findley, Paul, *Ill*	
Fino, Paul A., *N.Y*	
Fisher, O. C., *Tex*	Calvert-Woodley
Flood, Daniel J., *Pa*	The Congressional
Flynt, John J., Jr., *Ga*	
Foley, Thomas S., *Wash*	
Ford, Gerald R., *Mich*	514 Crown View Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Ford, William D., *Mich*	
Fountain, L. H., *N.C*	The Westchester
Fraser, Donald M., *Minn*	
Frelinghuysen, Peter H. B., *N.J.*	3014 N St.
Friedel, Samuel N., *Md*	
Fulton, James G., *Pa*	
Fulton, Richard, *Tenn*	
Fuqua, Don, *Fla*	
Galifianakis, Nick, *N.C*	
Gallagher, Cornelius E., *N.J.*	
Gardner, James C., *N.C*	
Garmatz, Edward A., *Md*	
Gathings, E. C., *Ark*	
Gettys, Tom S., *S.C*	
Giaimo, Robert N., *Conn*	
Gibbons, Sam, *Fla*	
Gilbert, Jacob H., *N.Y*	
Gonzalez, Henry B., *Tex*	200 C St. SE.
Goodell, Charles E., *N.Y*	3842 Macomb St.
Goodling, George A., *Pa*	
Gray, Kenneth J., *Ill*	
Green, Edith (Mrs.), *Oreg*	
Green, William J., *Pa*	
Griffiths, Martha W., (Mrs.), *Mich.*	
Gross, H. R., *Iowa*	
Grover, James R., Jr., *N.Y*	
Gubser, Charles S., *Calif*	
Gude, Gilbert, *Md*	
Gurney, Edward J., *Fla*	
Hagan, G. Elliott, *Ga*	
Haley, James A., *Fla*	
Hall, Durward G., *Mo*	
Halleck, Charles A., *Ind*	4926 Upton St.
Halpern, Seymour, *N.Y*	
Hamilton, Lee H., *Ind*	
Hammerschmidt, John Paul, *Ark.*	
Hanley, James M., *N.Y*	
Hanna, Richard T., *Calif*	
Hansen, George V., *Idaho*	
Hansen, Julia Butler (Mrs.), *Wash.*	
Hardy, Porter, Jr., *Va*	
Harrison, William Henry, *Wyo.*	
Harsha, William H., *Ohio*	
Harvey, James, *Mich*	
Hathaway, William D., *Maine.*	
Hawkins, Augustus F., *Calif.*	
Hays, Wayne L., *Ohio*	
Hébert, F. Edward, *La*	26 Cockrell St., Alexandria, Va.
Hechler, Ken, *W. Va*	
Heckler, Margaret M. (Mrs.), *Mass.*	
Helstoski, Henry, *N.J*	
Henderson, David N., *N.C*	
Herlong, A. S., Jr., *Fla*	
Hicks, Floyd V., *Wash*	
Holifield, Chet, *Calif*	
Holland, Elmer J., *Pa*	
Horton, Frank, *N.Y*	
Hosmer, Craig, *Calif*	
Howard, James J., *N.J*	
Hull, W. R., Jr., *Mo*	
Hungate, William L., *Mo*	
Hunt, John E., *N.J*	
Hutchinson, Edward, *Mich*	
Ichord, Richard (Dick), *Mo.*	
Irwin, Donald J., *Conn*	
Jacobs, Andrew, Jr., *Ind*	
Jarman, John, *Okla*	
Joelson, Charles S., *N.J*	
Johnson, Albert W., *Pa*	
Johnson, Harold T., *Calif*	
Jonas, Charles Raper, *N.C*	
Jones, Paul C., *Mo*	1111 Army-Navy Dr., Arlington, Va.
Jones, Robert E., *Ala*	
Jones, Walter B., *N.C*	
Karsten, Frank M., *Mo*	
Karth, Joseph E., *Minn*	
Kastenmeier, Robert W., *Wis.*	
Kazen, Abraham, Jr., *Tex*	
Kee, James, *W. Va*	5441 16th Ave., Hyattsville, Md.
Keith, Hastings, *Mass*	5906 Harwick Rd., Woodacres, Md.
Kelly, Edna F. (Mrs.), *N.Y*	
King, Carleton J., *N.Y*	
King, Cecil R., *Calif*	
Kirwan, Michael J., *Ohio*	
Kleppe, Thomas S., *N. Dak*	
Kluczynski, John C., *Ill*	
Kornegay, Horace R., *N.C*	
Kupferman, Theodore R., *N.Y.*	
Kuykendall, Dan, *Tenn*	
Kyl, John, *Iowa*	
Kyros, Peter N., *Maine*	
Laird, Melvin R., *Wis*	
Landrum, Phil M., *Ga*	
Langen, Odin, *Minn*	
Latta, Delbert L., *Ohio*	
Leggett, Robert L., *Calif*	
Lennon, Alton, *N.C*	
Lipscomb, Glenard P., *Calif.*	
Lloyd, Sherman P., *Utah*	
Long, Clarence D., *Md*	

Appendix

Future International Economic Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VANCE HARTKE
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 9, 1967

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, recently the Foreign Economic Policy Subcommittee of the Joint Economic Committee held a series of very valuable hearings under the able chairmanship of Representative HALE BOGGS, of Louisiana. Much valuable information was secured at these hearings. Some of the most significant was the testimony of Dr. N. R. Danielian, president of the International Economic Policy Association. In my view, the suggestions he makes for future international economic policy might well point to the course of action that the administration and Congress should take.

So that it will be available to Members of Congress, I ask unanimous consent that the testimony be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the testimony was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FUTURE TRADE POLICY

(Testimony of N. R. Danielian, president, Internationl Economic Policy Association, before the Foreign Economic Policy Subcommittee of the Joint Economic Committee, July 18, 1967)

INTRODUCTION

I appreciate the opportunity to appear before this Committee which has taken on the important task of reviewing U.S. trade policy, particularly because I have just returned from an eight week trip to major European centers investigating this very subject. The suggestions contained in this brief paper are based on extensive studies of postwar trends in international trade and payments, backed by the experience of our member companies which comprise a representative segment of the American economy, production and employment. These companies are vitally concerned with the success of our foreign economic policy and the interest of free world security and prosperity. At the outset I think it important to state that they are "outward-looking" international business corporations with worldwide operations; therefore they have a stake not only in the growth and vitality of our own country but in that of other free world countries as well.

NEW FACTORS INFLUENCING THE INTERNATIONAL ECONOMY

New forces and conditions have emerged in the world since the Reciprocal Trade Agreements program was adopted, particularly since World War II, which require a review of U.S. foreign economic policy. The most important of these factors are:

1. The grouping of important trading partners of the United States into blocs, e.g., the European Economic Community (EEC), the European Free Trade Association (EFTA), and the Latin American Free Trade Area (LAFTA) which is to be merged into a Latin American Common Market, and other similar plans stirring in the Pacific, even in Africa, requires a reassessment of the basic premises of U.S. foreign economic policy.

2. Communist countries have ambitions to become major factors in world trade and investment under the principle of competitive coexistence, and they have asked for unconditional most-favored-nation treatment.

3. There is a rise of economic nationalism in the world which has hampered efforts to liberalize trade.

4. The important role that international corporations have come to play in world trade and investment is a new phenomenon, not yet clearly understood.

5. The importance of advanced technology and the conditions for its transfer in the course of world trade and investment are receiving worldwide attention and must be considered in any future trade policy.

6. The character of U.S. trade, both imports and exports, has changed radically since World War II, and the significance of this change for future trade policy needs serious study.

7. The demands of less developed countries for trade concessions from the developed countries pose new problems.

8. U.S. balance of payments deficits and their relation to trade policy have not received adequate attention.

SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS

Our analysis of the meaning of these changed conditions and emerging trends leads us to the suggestion that the United States should:

1. Adopt a conditional most-favored-nation policy in relation to developed countries and trading blocs, East and West alike.

2. Seek review and amendment of some of the basic postwar agreements, such as GATT, to conform with current realities.

3. Proceed with the organization of a North Atlantic Free Trade Association, starting with Canada, and later extending it to the United Kingdom and other EFTA countries, when (as seems probable) their bid for membership in the EEC fails. Provision should be made for associate membership for the Latin American Common Market, Australia, New Zealand, Japan and others under clearly defined conditions. Within the framework of this North Atlantic Free Trade Association, we should be prepared to offer less developed countries unconditional most-favored-nation treatment.

4. Codify the rules and regulations under which government-generated technology is made available abroad. This may require legislation to define and limit the conditions under which the results of government-financed research and development can be transferred.

5. Revise our antitrust laws and our tax laws and regulations so as to permit American business to compete more effectively abroad.

6. Avoid the cumbersome and rigid commodity agreements proposed by the less developed countries, because they will result in uneconomic allocation of resources. Instead, we should encourage them to direct their resources into more productive employment.

Let us now consider the reasons for these recommendations.

TRADING BLOCS

In the negotiation of GATT, the United States accepted the principle of unconditional most-favored-nation treatment. But in Article 24, we agreed to a provision which made possible trade blocs, permitting trade concessions to their members but not to outsiders, a patent violation of the principle of unconditional most-favored-nation treatment. GATT has really blurred the definition of a nation as understood under trade treaties. There are now some nations more favored than others. We must either redefine the meaning of the word nation, or develop a set of new principles which apply to trading blocs.

In the recently concluded Kennedy Round of trade negotiations, the EEC demonstrated how difficult trade blocs can be in multinational negotiations based on the unconditional most-favored-nation principle. They held up the negotiations for years while they put their own affairs in order. When they finally came to the negotiating table they made it clear that the internal agricultural policy, a highly protectionist one, which they had agreed on while making everybody else wait, was more important than the general liberalization of world trade and was not negotiable.

The importance of the discrimination inherent in trade blocs to the growth and distribution of world trade can be seen in Tables 1 and 2, attached. Since the EEC was formed under the Treaty of Rome in 1958, to 1966, world exports by value have just about doubled. The United States increased its exports by about 70 percent. However, the EEC saw its exports, including intra-EEC trade, go up by 130 percent. But, its exports to the rest of the world kept pace at about the world average, doubling during this period, while exports among member countries trebled.

Over the same period, imports of the United States doubled. Those of the EEC increased by 2.3 times. Here again, however, EEC's imports from the rest of the world grew at about the world rate, while imports from member countries trebled.

It is clear that the discriminatory arrangements possible in such a trade grouping make it possible to increase trade among the members while restricting the ability of those outside to compete.

We will not be able to deal effectively with such trading blocs as the EEC under the unconditional most-favored-nation principle. Letting them have the advantage of every concession we make to any other member of GATT leaves us with no basis for bargaining hard on important items of discrimination. We will have to come to bilateral negotiations with such groups on a conditional most-favored-nation basis if we are to hold our own.

EAST-WEST TRADE

The growth of trade between the Communist countries of Eastern Europe and Western Europe and Japan, and the clearly demonstrated interest of all the parties to see it increase further, make it obvious that we must anticipate the time when Communist countries become important factors in world trade and, perhaps on a one-way basis, investment as well. They have expressed an interest in normalizing trade relations with the United States: they ask access to our markets on an unconditional most-favored-nation basis; they want to buy up-to-date U.S. technology; they want access to U.S. credit sources. Our government has responded favorably on many occasions.

It is to be hoped that conditions may so develop that these goals can be realized. In its proper context we shall have some suggestions along these lines. But here we must consider the implications for U.S. trade policy of such developments.

I am aware of the fact that the Administration is recommending "conditional" most-favored-nation treatment, subject to bilateral trade agreements for short durations, renewable and cancellable for cause. But this does not meet their real desire for nondiscriminatory treatment.

Ultimately we must universalize our trade policy. But it is not feasible to extend unconditional most-favored-nation treatment to state-controlled economies.

They need not resort to tariffs or other indirect devices to control imports nor worry about cost of production in exports. It is difficult to envisage how, in such states, industrial property rights or investments, should they be allowed, could be protected, since the citizens of these countries have such limited rights in these matters. The only effective means of protection will lie in our ability to bargain hard, and if need be, to withdraw concessions. This could not be readily done under the unconditional most-favored-nation principle. Here again, we must resort to bilateral negotiations under the conditional most-favored-nation principle, with emphasis on reciprocity.

NATIONALISM

Nationalism, particularly in economic matters, is rising all over the world, in developed and developing countries alike. This can be seen in the efforts of the EEC, under French pressure, to attain agricultural self-sufficiency; local content requirements in most South American countries; and preferential treatment of indigenous trading companies in Japan. Continued adherence to the unconditional most-favored-nation principle leaves us without any adequate means of dealing with these increasingly important nontariff barriers to the growth of our trade. In response to such actions, emphasis must be placed on nondiscriminatory nationality treatment and reciprocity. To enforce this, the United States must make trade concessions conditional on some of these impediments being removed.

INTERNATIONAL CORPORATIONS

The rise of international corporations and their importance to world production and trade is inadequately understood. They are responsible for a substantial portion of our exports, and they have proved an effective means of spreading technical competence and economic progress.

International trade and investment are inextricably related. They are risky and expensive, requiring commitment of time, money and personnel, as well as experience in dealing with other peoples and governments. Traditional attitudes about small- versus large-scale business, however applicable at home, do not necessarily apply in world trade. We must help small businesses to pool their resources in foreign trade, and help the larger ones to do a more effective job. This may require a good hard look at our antitrust laws as they apply to foreign operations, and to tax laws and regulations as they apply to export business.

TECHNOLOGY

All the world, East and West, is aware of the advantages of technological progress as applied to large-scale business. In fact, most of the world envies U.S. industry, not only for its inventiveness, but also for its daring to take risks and apply up-to-date methods in production and marketing. This is the greatest comparative advantage the United States possesses in economic competition. But we cannot be complacent. There are all kinds of suggestions under discussion for the transfer of this technology to other countries. Western Europe, Eastern Europe, and the less developed countries all want access to this technology and know-how. This is now a major preoccupation in Europe, and engages the interest of NATO and OECD, as well as the COMECON and UNCTAD countries. And, of course, once they get it they expect to compete with us.

Much of this technology is in private hands, with proprietary rights which cannot be divested. In certain fields, however, such as atomic power, electronics, communications, space, computers, defense production, health and agriculture, the U.S. Government is in possession of valuable rights. It is in these areas where suggestions have been made for intergovernmental negotiations. What we do with these rights and how we dispose of them will have a profound effect on the competitive position of the United States. Here again, there is a whole range of economic and legal problems that remain unexplored. A codification of U.S. Government practice and legislative criteria as to when, where, and under what conditions the U.S. Government can dispose of such rights abroad is urgently needed.

CHANGING PATTERNS OF U.S. TRADE

A review of recent trade statistics of the United States shows that we have become primarily suppliers of agricultural raw materials, chemicals, raw and semifinished products, and machinery. We have become large importers of end-use consumer products. (See Tables 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7.)

This results from two factors. First, other countries exclude, by tariffs, quotas, variable levies, internal taxes and other devices, many of those products which we can produce economically; and, second, other countries are, in many products, simply lower cost producers than we are. We cannot accept this challenge indefinitely unless we are given a fair chance to compete where we have some advantages. Here again, a policy of reciprocity based on conditional most-favored-nation treatment is necessary.

AMBITIONS OF LESS DEVELOPED COUNTRIES IN TRADE POLICY

The ambitions of the less developed countries, as expressed in various forums, require sympathetic consideration. But what we undertake to do must be consistent with our own long-range economic strength and stability and must promise results in a foreseeable future. Commodity agreements are a rigid and uneconomic way of giving foreign aid and unjustifiably impose the cost on a selected group of consumers. They retard the reallocation of resources to more productive and useful enterprises and industries. We have learned from sad experience that more money is not the answer if it gets into the wrong hands or is used the wrong way and for the wrong objectives. Foreign aid with strict application of conditions for self-help, and under conditions which protect our balance of payments position, is more sensible, provided the money is spent on worthwhile projects, than commodity agreements or automatic compensatory financing.

Less developed countries also seek preferential treatment for their exports of raw materials and manufactured goods. This request might best be met by offering them unconditional most-favored-nation treatment under the North Atlantic Free Trade Association proposal.

U.S. BALANCE-OF-PAYMENTS DEFICITS

The persistent U.S. balance of payments deficits require that we consider all these factors. Clearly we are not earning enough abroad to do all the things we, as a nation, want to do. Unless the factors mentioned above are taken into account, we will not be able to earn the required sums to carry out our national objectives abroad.

The stark fact is that U.S. commercial exports are hardly enough to pay for our commodity imports. If you deduct the foreign aid induced exports and the military hardware sales from export figures, it is doubtful that purely civilian commercial imports and exports are in balance. It is the income on investments and services that is paying for a substantial portion of our government expenditures abroad. Unfortunately, this is not enough. The rest is financed by gold exports and borrowings.

What we need, therefore, is an international incomes policy and a foreign incomes and expense budget. All the factors mentioned above must be considered in this scheme. What trade policy will increase our income? What policies toward international corporations, their exports and investments abroad, will increase their contribution to international income? What policies in the transfer of technology will enhance our earnings and competitive position? What policies toward Eastern countries and less developed countries will improve economic and political conditions without undermining our economic strength and stability?

I hope this Committee will consider our suggestions and also add its prestige to the proposal that the Administration prepare annually, a foreign incomes estimate, and a foreign incomes and expense budget, and adopt constructive policies to enhance the income and balance the international budget.

The tables referred to follow:

TABLE 1.—GROWTH OF TRADE (EXPORTS) BY REGION AND SELECTED COUNTRY, 1953-66

[In billions of dollars and percentages [1]]

Year	Total world trade [2]		European Economic Community				European Free Trade Association				United Kingdom		United States		Canada		Latin America [3]		Japan	
			Extra-EEC		Intra-EEC		Extra-EFTA		Intra-EFTA											
	Amount	Percent, 1960 =100	Amount	Percent, 1960 =100	Amount	Percent, 1960 =100	Amount	Percent, 1960 =100	Amount	Percent, 1960 =100	Amount	Percent, 1960 =100	Amount	Percent, 1960 =100	Amount	Percent, 1960 =100	Amount	Percent, 1960 =100	Amount	Percent, 1960 =100
1953	$74.1	66	$10.1	50	$4.0	39	$10.1	72	$2.3	68	$7.5	78	$15.8	85	$4.2	81	$7.6	74	$1.3	[illegible]
1954	76.9	68	11.1	58	4.7	47	10.5	75	2.4	73	7.8	82	15.0	77	4.0	79	7.9	74	1.6	41
1955	84.3	74	12.7	66	5.6	55	11.6	81	2.6	76	8.5	87	15.4	79	4.4	85	8.0	78	2.0	54
1956	93.6	81	13.6	68	6.4	61	13.0	88	2.8	79	9.3	93	18.9	93	4.9	92	8.6	86	2.5	64
1957	100.5	86	15.3	75	7.2	66	13.7	90	3.0	83	9.7	95	20.7	98	5.1	93	8.7	89	2.9	72
1958	95.9	84	15.9	80	6.9	66	13.3	89	2.8	81	9.3	91	17.8	85	5.1	93	8.2	90	2.9	74
1959	101.4	91	17.1	90	8.2	82	14.0	94	3.0	88	9.7	95	17.4	85	5.4	96	8.3	96	3.5	[illegible]
1960	112.9	100	18.5	100	10.2	100	15.0	100	3.5	100	10.3	100	20.4	100	5.6	100	8.6	100	4.1	100

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 1.—GROWTH OF TRADE (EXPORTS) BY REGION AND SELECTED COUNTRY, 1953–66—Continued

[In billions of dollars and percentages [1]]

Year	Total world trade [2]		European Economic Community				European Free Trade Association				United Kingdom		United States		Canada		Latin America [3]		Japan	
			Extra-EEC		Intra-EEC		Extra-EFTA		Intra-EFTA											
	Amount	Percent, 1960 =100	Amount	Percent, 1960 =100	Amount	Percent, 1960 =100	Amount	Percent, 1960 =100	Amount	Percent, 1960 =100	Amount	Percent, 1960 =100	Amount	Percent, 1960 =100	Amount	Percent, 1960 =100	Amount	Percent, 1960 =100	Amount	Percent, 1960 =100
1961	$118.2	105	$20.4	103	$11.9	115	$15.7	103	$3.8	109	$10.8	102	$20.6	101	$5.8	109	$8.7	101	$4.2	107
1962	124.1	111	20.6	104	13.6	131	16.4	107	4.1	116	11.1	104	21.3	104	5.9	113	9.2	110	4.9	103
1963	135.3	119	21.6	108	15.9	152	17.6	116	4.6	122	11.9	108	22.9	114	6.5	124	9.7	113	3.4	147
1964	151.9	131	24.2	118	18.4	172	18.7	118	5.3	145	12.3	113	26.0	128	7.7	145	10.6	116	6.7	181
1965	164.4	141	27.1	131	20.8	193	20.7	128	5.8	156	13.7	119	27.0	129	8.1	149	11.1	121	8.5	235
1966	180.5	153	29.4	142	23.2	214	22.2	132	6.3	162	14.7	123	29.9	141	9.6	170	11.9	129	9.8	265

[1] Percentages are based on volume of trade data calculated in million metric tons.

[2] Excluding Soviet bloc countries.

[3] Including Cuba.

Source: European Economic Community, Monthly Statistics, 1967, No. 2, p. 17.

TABLE 2.—GROWTH OF TRADE (IMPORTS) BY REGION AND SELECTED COUNTRY, 1953–66

[In billions of dollars and percentages [1]]

Year	Total world trade [2]		European Economic Community				European Free Trade Association				United Kingdom		United States (f.o.b.)		Canada (f.o.b.)		Latin America [3]		Japan	
			Extra-EEC		Intra-EEC		Extra-EFTA		Intra-EFTA											
	Amount	Percent, 1960 =100	Amount	Percent, 1960 =100	Amount	Percent, 1960 =100	Amount	Percent, 1960 =100	Amount	Percent, 1960 =100	Amount	Percent, 1960 =100	Amount	Percent, 1960 =100	Amount	Percent, 1960 =100	Amount	Percent, 1960 =100	Amount	Percent, 1960 =100
1953	$75.9	62	$11.0	51	$4.0	39	$12.5	62	$2.4	68	$9.4	71	$10.9	73	$4.4	84	$6.5	79	$2.4	44
1954	79.3	66	12.1	57	4.6	47	13.1	66	2.6	73	9.5	72	10.3	68	4.1	79	7.4	93	2.4	46
1955	89.2	74	13.7	64	5.6	55	15.1	75	2.8	76	10.9	80	11.4	76	4.6	89	7.5	93	2.5	49
1956	98.5	79	16.0	72	6.3	61	15.8	76	3.0	79	10.9	80	12.7	82	5.6	107	7.9	96	3.2	61
1957	108.2	84	17.8	78	7.0	66	16.9	80	3.2	83	11.4	83	13.2	83	5.7	102	9.3	110	4.3	77
1958	101.4	83	16.1	79	6.8	66	15.7	81	3.0	81	10.5	83	13.2	87	5.4	93	8.5	102	3.0	63
1959	106.5	89	16.2	83	8.1	82	16.8	88	3.2	88	11.1	88	15.4	103	5.7	104	7.9	95	3.6	80
1960	119.1	100	19.4	100	10.2	100	19.4	100	3.6	100	12.7	100	15.0	100	5.7	100	8.4	100	4.5	100
1961	124.3	104	20.5	106	11.7	115	19.6	102	4.0	109	12.3	98	14.6	98	5.7	102	8.7	103	5.8	131
1962	131.7	112	22.4	118	13.4	131	20.4	107	4.2	116	12.6	101	16.2	112	5.9	106	8.8	107	5.6	125
1963	143.1	120	24.7	130	15.7	152	21.7	112	4.7	122	13.5	105	17.0	117	6.1	106	8.7	107	6.7	148
1964	160.0	132	26.9	139	18.0	172	25.6	121	5.5	145	15.4	117	18.6	124	6.9	121	9.6	115	7.9	170
1965	174.2	142	28.6	146	20.4	193	26.1	130	6.1	156	16.1	118	21.3	140	8.0	139	9.6	115	8.1	173
1966	190.9	155	30.7	156	22.9	214	27.2	(4)	6.7	(4)	16.7	121	25.4	(4)	9.1	(4)	(4)	(4)	9.5	208

[1] Percentages are based on volume of trade data calculated in million metric tons.

[2] Excluding Soviet bloc countries.

[3] Including Cuba.

[4] Not available.

Source: European Economic Community, Monthly Statistics, 1967, No. 2, p. 16.

TABLE 3

[In millions of dollars]

Year	U.S. trade in food and related products, beverages, tobacco, and live animals, 1946–66 [1]			U.S. trade in chemicals, 1946–66 [1]		
	Exports	Imports	Balance	Exports	Imports	Balance
1946	2,553	1,406	1,147	471	85	386
1947	3,423	1,740	1,683	819	94	725
1948	2,871	2,003	868	760	98	662
1949	2,587	2,087	500	755	106	649
1950	1,757	2,642	−885	711	152	559
1951	2,793	3,007	−214	972	175	797
1952	2,482	3,000	−518	802	208	594
1953	2,216	3,186	−970	799	252	547
1954	2,057	3,278	−1,221	986	260	726
1955	2,502	3,101	−599	1,073	270	803
1956	3,189	3,176	13	1,229	276	953
1957	3,165	3,467	−302	1,457	668	789
1958	2,952	3,646	−694	1,405	800	605
1959	3,172	3,649	−477	1,543	874	669
1960	3,458	3,491	−33	1,763	818	945
1961	3,716	3,521	195	1,787	732	1,055
1962	3,992	3,766	226	1,843	765	1,078
1963	4,421	3,942	479	1,922	705	1,217
1964	4,971	4,097	874	2,358	707	1,651
1965	4,521	4,013	508	2,402	781	1,621
1966	5,191	4,590	601	2,676	957	1,719

[1] 1946–56 data not fully consistent with 1957–66 data due to use of different series.

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Balance of Payments Statistical Supplement, (rev. ed.); and Overseas Business Reports.

TABLE 4

[In millions of dollars]

Year	U.S. trade in mineral fuels and related materials, 1946–66 [1]			U.S trade in crude materials inedible, except fuel, 1946–66 [1]		
	Exports	Imports	Balance	Exports	Imports	Balance
1946	752	162	590	1,058	1,836	−778
1947	1,275	260	1,015	1,300	1,968	−668
1948	1,149	432	717	1,126	2,282	−1,156
1949	870	485	385	1,508	1,709	−201
1950	777	595	182	1,601	2,758	−1,157
1951	1,392	601	791	1,957	3,917	−1,960
1952	1,303	690	613	1,559	2,998	−1,439
1953	1,041	762	279	1,244	2,520	−1,276
1954	970	829	141	1,649	2,170	−521
1955	1,141	1,034	107	1,555	2,639	−1,084
1956	1,508	1,282	226	2,022	2,696	−674
1957	1,814	1,556	258	2,533	2,766	−233
1958	1,071	1,641	−570	1,708	2,365	−657
1959	853	1,559	−706	1,823	2,925	−1,102
1960	814	1,571	−757	2,772	2,881	−109
1961	763	1,690	−927	2,761	2,550	−211
1962	799	1,825	−1,026	2,209	2,654	−445
1963	946	1,874	−938	2,472	2,672	−200
1964	911	1,996	−1,085	2,952	2,841	109
1965	947	2,222	−1,275	2,856	3,034	−178
1966	978	2,262	−1,284	3,076	3,266	−190

[1] 1946–56 data not fully consistent with 1957–66 data due to use of different series.

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Balance of Payments Statistical Supplement (revised edition); and Overseas Business Reports.

TABLE 5

[In millions of dollars]

	U.S. trade in machinery, 1946–66 [1]			U.S. trade in transportation equipment, 1946–66 [1]		
	Exports	Imports	Balance	Exports	Imports	Balance
1946	1,242	32	1,210	1,044	5	1,039
1947	2,303	54	2,249	2,155	6	2,149
1948	2,202	107	2,095	1,437	35	1,402
1949	2,296	114	2,182	1,129	13	1,116
1950	1,951	123	1,828	1,004	24	980
1951	2,462	186	2,276	1,384	40	1,344
1952	2,719	251	2,468	1,231	61	1,170
1953	2,746	246	2,500	1,273	58	1,215
1954	2,612	240	2,372	1,464	57	1,407
1955	2,860	277	2,583	1,586	97	1,489
1956	3,568	354	3,214	1,794	199	1,595
1957	3,976	431	3,545	1,784	431	1,353
1958	3,653	481	3,172	1,574	670	904
1959	3,685	673	3,012	1,497	957	540
1960	4,093	721	3,372	1,911	742	1,169
1961	4,488	786	3,702	1,651	573	1,078
1962	4,871	949	3,922	1,719	719	1,000
1963	5,065	1,036	4,029	1,744	751	993
1964	5,998	1,304	4,694	2,023	902	1,121
1965	6,906	1,799	5,107	3,214	1,148	2,066
1966	7,681	2,693	4,987	3,484	2,138	1,349

[1] 1946–56 data not fully consistent with 1957–66 data due to use of different series.

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Balance of Payments Statistical Supplemental (revised edition); and Overseas Business Reports.

TABLE 6.—U.S. TRADE IN OTHER MANUFACTURED GOODS AND OTHER TRANSACTIONS,[1] 1946–66 [2]

[In millions of dollars]

	Exports	Imports	Balance
1946	2,381	1,501	880
1947	3,858	1,728	2,130
1948	2,757	2,265	492
1949	2,644	2,214	430
1950	2,020	2,710	−690
1951	2,854	3,216	−362
1952	2,956	3,717	−761
1953	2,822	4,101	−279
1954	2,988	3,641	−653
1955	3,448	4,236	−788
1956	3,873	4,908	−1,035
1957	4,095	3,904	−191
1958	3,391	3,561	−170
1959	3,183	4,776	−1,593
1960	3,885	4,792	−907
1961	3,741	4,805	−1,064
1962	3,832	5,572	−1,740
1963	4,170	6,024	−1,854
1964	4,825	6,753	−1,928
1965	4,815	7,522	−2,707
1966	5,256	8,636	−3,380

[1] The combined total is calculated as a residual prior to 1957.

[2] 1946–56 data not fully consistent with 1957–66 data due to use of different series.

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Balance of Payments Statistical Supplement (rev. ed.); and Overseas Business Reports.

TABLE 7.—U.S. TRADE IN NONFOOD CONSUMER GOODS, 1946–66 [1]

[In millions of dollars]

	Exports	Imports	Balance
1946	1,075	489	586
1947	1,527	374	1,153
1948	1,131	461	670
1949	913	410	503
1950	808	556	252
1951	1,155	693	462
1952	1,019	715	304
1953	1,130	802	328
1954	1,144	830	314
1955	1,276	1,064	212
1956	1,314	1,260	54
1957	1,333	1,524	−191
1958	1,271	1,710	−439
1959	1,274	2,424	−1,150
1960	1,328	2,458	−1,130
1961	1,357	2,200	−843
1962	1,400	2,707	−1,307
1963	1,513	2,889	−1,376
1964	1,715	3,388	−1,673
1965	2,402	4,111	−1,709
1966	2,860	5,808	−2,948

[1] 1946–56 data not fully consistent with 1957–66 data due to use of different series.

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Balance of Payments Statistical Supplement (Rev. ed.); and Overseas Business Reports.

Danger of a Police State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN G. DOW

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 9, 1967

Mr. DOW. Mr. Speaker, I submit here for the Appendix the release that was sent to all news media in my district, in order to alert our citizens to the danger that laws restrictive of our liberties, coupled with our police role in the world, now presents for our Nation. The release follows:

DANGER OF A POLICE STATE

WASHINGTON, D.C., Aug. 5.—All Americans are deeply concerned about the violence in our cities, the hostilities in Vietnam, the high cost of living, and taxes. But these all combine to make still one more problem that worries me greatly. The danger I speak of is the danger that our country may take an easy way out of its trials by turning gradually into a police state.

You might say, "Mr. Congressman, as a loyal American, you should never admit such a possibility in our country." To answer that, I agree that America can avoid becoming a police state, but it can only be done if we are honest enough to recognize the danger.

When in Vietnam this summer, I interviewed Premier Ky, telling him that I thought our involvement in Vietnam and bases in many other countries might make us into a policeman for the world. General Ky's answer was very candid. He said, "You can't help yourselves."

To be a world policeman is a very costly business. Right now, with the billions spent for Vetnam, and the billions that it cost to solve the problems in our cities, I believe that we already have too much of a financial burden to shoulder. I am thinking of our expensive bases all over the seven oceans and other places, too. And then they say we will need $33 billion or so for an anti-ballistic missile system.

The worst danger—and the reason I am concerned about a police state—is our impulsive desire to stamp out problems instead of working them out. From sheer anger, the Congress is commencing to pass repressive legislation. Naturally, this doesn't do the job intended, but it is much worse than just useless—it is harmful to responsible citizens. The House of Representatives has just passed an interstate travel bill, for example—and which I opposed—that is directed at people who might start a riot after crossing state lines. In effect, this bill would keep all kinds of people who travel from expressing their honest opinions, or counselling organizations they represents, such as church and labor groups. It would not prevent riots in the cities, but it would squelch our freedoms. It would be truly "police-state" legislation.

Another bill of the same angry kind is the flag desecration bill. Aimed at a dozen or so unbalanced young men who have burned the flag on a few occasions, it would permit anyone with a grudge against you to hale you into Federal Court for acts like throwing away a red, white and blue streamer after a birthday party. Again, the small benefit of catching a few demented flagburners would not justify limiting the freedoms of us all. That is what I mean by our angry steps downhill into a police state.

There are more of these anger bills in the hopper.

Of course, force is temporarily necessary to put down the instant violence in our cities. (I will vote for the Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice Act which is now on the floor of Congress.) Yet it is a great mistake for Americans to believe they can deal permanently with tremendous social problems like those in Vietnam or in the American cities by perpetual force and policing. It isn't fair to our soldiers or to our law officers. For the problems are not wholly military and police problems.

In Vietnam we are beginning to see that we don't have much ability to cope with the problem there. It is only in part a military problem. It is also a political problem. The very fact that we have been asleep to the situation in our cities ought to tell us that we are not fuly qualified to understand a place so far and strange as Vietnam. I hope we are humble enough to realize that we cannot make over an ancient culture 10,000 miles away. Instead, we have to admit that our pocketbook isn't bottomless, and decide where our resources should be concentrated.

There are other reasons, besides, why we should not continue acting as a lone policeman in the world. America is already resented by our old allies who have no democratic voice in choosing us to be the policeman for everyone. As we spend money for more police actions around the world, it will place more strain on our economy and cut down on necessities for our families. In fact, being a policeman overseas will place such pressures on our society that it will require us to be even more of a policeman at home, with ration cards, wage and price ceilings and suppression of dissent.

Instead of becoming a policeman overseas, I hope we will put our American home problems first. Our poverty-level families, whether rural or in cities, need our help before we waste our wealth on bombing foreign people. More effort is necessary for rehabilitation of the cities so that the people there won't continue, out of desperation, to burn their own homes.

Solving the problem of our cities by force alone would also be a very expensive way of life, if continued for long. The cost of the necessary police, the constant danger due to resentment within racial minorities, and the hideous fact that "America the Beautiful" would have to live with this armed cancer in her great cities—all of these argue against continuing to exist with half of our country an armed camp. This kind of a solution in our cities might very easily lead to use of identification cards, limitation of travel and other restriction of individual liberties. This is the shameful way of doing in South Africa, where the white and black communities are now segregated.

Every white American ought to admit in his heart that possibly he has been too standoffish with members of other races. In the future, we must be willing to sell our homes to them. We must invite them into our fraternal organizations and our fire companies. We must help them with their needs, such as recreational places for their teenagers evenings and weekends. Such help can be given by individuals in communities. It doesn't depend entirely on Federal aid.

I cannot warn affluent Americans too much. Let us not rely on a hard heart or a policeman's billy as long-term remedies. Beware of angry people who offer hard-bitten solutions. There are all too many people talking this way. In the end it would be our undoing.

The two billion underfed and underprivileged people in this world will not allow us to stay a policeman for long. They will find enough force to counter us if we persist in placing our faith in force alone. All through history the multitudes have overcome those who kept them down. That is why I am concerned that we do not permanently take the policeman role either at home or abroad, but find a way to help those at home and those abroad who are rebelling. Even though they may be vicious and violent at times, let us admit that they may also have a little reason and a little justice on their side. If we recognize this, most certainly we will come through the ordeals of this present age, and, above all, preserve American Democracy.

Air and Sea Power Hold the Key

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 9, 1967

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Air, Sea Power Hold Key," published in the St. Louis Globe Democrat of Saturday and Sunday, August 5 and 6, 1967. The editorial relates to the position taken by the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] concerning the war in Vietnam.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AIR, SEA POWER HOLD KEY

Sending more United States troops to Vietnam without first using our air and sea power to maximum advantage is a mistake.

This, briefly, is the position taken by Senator Stuart Symington, as well as this newspaper.

Senator Symington reluctantly has broken with the President on this issue, feeling strongly that American airmen are still under heavy wraps in regard to targets they can hit in North Vietnam.

It would be wise, we believe, for the President to withhold execution of this order for new troops until testimony is heard at the Senate Preparedness subcommittee, in a few days, regarding how many important military targets have not yet been touched in North Vietnam.

To plan an even greater involvement of American men, now numbering 461,000 in Vietnam—with no plan for victory—is an untenable position.

Senator Symington quite rightly has called for removal of the shackles from United States air and sea power rather than continue to expand the stalemated ground war in which our men are prevented from taking the offensive against the enemy.

Though President Johnson is to be commended for continuing to stand firm against the Communists in Vietnam and the appeasers at home, he should recognize the war cannot be won by a protracted land fight that bleeds our manpower and our national resources, constantly increasing our commitments but never applying enough pressure to knock out the enemy.

Forthright Statement on Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 9, 1967

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of the Members of this House one of the clearest and forthright statements I have ever read describing the mess we are in over in Vietnam.

Writing in the Catholic newspaper Our Sunday Visitor of August 6, 1967, Father Daniel Lyons, S.J., sums up the cruel predicament the Johnson administration has gotten us into—a war which it cannot win—or will not take the steps to win.

Because of these policies, the lives of 11,000 young ment have been sacrificed. At the rate this administration is fighting the war, there will be 15,000 dead by December. In the end, unwilling to face the consequences of the firm and warlike steps needed to retrieve us from the morass of Johnsonian geopolitical ambition, this administration will doubtless negotiate—and negotiation from weakness such as ours must mean poor terms.

As Father Lyons says, "Our Government has no right to sacrifice American lives unless it adops a policy of winning." Unfortunately, I am afraid that we will never see that victory—and that more young American dead will be the price of "Great Society" foreign policy.

The statement follows:

FORTHRIGHT STATEMENT ON VIETNAM

It can no longer be said that the war in Vietnam is one of the most moral in which we have ever been engaged. It is now crystal clear that, no matter how good our intentions, we have no policy of winning. Three conditions are necessary for a just war: 1) the cause must be sufficiently serious; 2) the war must be a last resort; 3) there must be hope of winning.

Our role is doubtful from the moral standpoint because we are not taking the steps necessary to bring it to a just conclusion. The recent visit of our Secretary of Defense to Saigon brought this out very clearly. He stressed the need for "pacifying" the people of South Vietnam, when all they need is protection from aggression. He declared that "success or failure" in the war is up to the South Vietnamese themselves, when it is our own policy that prevents the war from being won. As Premier Ky recently observed, the war will be won or lost in Washington.

Our Ambasador in Saigon, Mr. Ellsworth Bunker, said there is no indication that Hanoi wants peace. She does not have to. Senate Majority Leader Mike Mansfield said, on Mr. McNamara's return, that we should view with skepticism any reports of progress. James Reston recently revealed that Israel's military victory in the Middle East "was achieved by defying Washington's advice."

REDS KEEP WAR GOING

The Soviet Union is putting $65 million worth of strategic supplies into Haiphong harbor every month. As long as the other side continues to escalate, and as long as we refuse to adopt a policy of winning, the war will continue. It is futile to think that the war is going to end, unless we surrender or unless we decide to win it. It is foolish to think that negotiation or pacification will bring the war to a just conclusion. North Vietnam will never give up unless she has to. Why should she? There is an old saying that "in the kingdom of the blind, the one-eye man is king." It recalls the contrast between our endless struggle in Vietnam and Israel's decisive action in the Middle East.

Vietnamese officials have privately complained for several years that Washington will not let them fight effectively. They complain that we will not let them start guerrilla warfare in the North. They complain that we will not let them close the harbor at Haiphong. They complain that we will not let them use any of the 600,000 troops on Taiwan.

OBLIGATION TO PROTECT

For more than two years our Joint Chiefs of Staff have unanimously declared that if we want to win the war we will have to close the harbor. Haiphong is only one of some 250 important targets in North Vietnam that Washington will not let our planes attack. Nor will we let the air force of South Vietnam touch any of them. South Vietnam has declared war on the North. It has every right to close the harbor, and it could do so within a few hours. But the White House will not permit it. Although we are only an ally, we will not permit South Vietnam to fight its war effectively.

The first obligation of any country is to protect its people when they have been attacked. The first rule in military science is to protect your country by carrying the war to the enemy. We have never let South Vietnam do this. There is a rule of thumb that it takes ten soldiers for one guerrilla. By invading North Vietnam the North would need ten soldiers for every one on the side of the South. You can never defeat an aggressor, even if you outnumber him ten to one, as long as you grant him sanctuary.

MORE MEN NOT NEEDED

There is no need to send more U.S. troops to Vietnam. All we have to do is fight the war effectively. The military would like to do so, but they are not permitted. Our soldiers are asked to give their lives in ever-increasing numbers, but they are not permitted to say a word about the no-win policies of Washington.

The Soviet Union is not the only offender supplying guns and ammunition to the enemy. During the month of May, seven British ships carried strategic materials to North Vietnam, in addition to ships from other American "allies." Such traffic could easily be stopped. Saigon would like to drop mines in Haiphong harbor. If she did, the ships would lose their insurance. But we will not permit her to do so.

Because Washington will not let our military fight the war in an effective way, the war has to be fought in a very costly way: costly in men, costly in time, and costly in materiel. The war as it is now being fought can never be won. It can easily be lost, however, through the gradual deterioration and demoralization of South Vietnam.

DETERMINATION MISSING

Washington will try to blame Saigon if the war is lost, but the fault will not be theirs. Moscow is apt to arrange a cease-fire next year in order to make our no-win-policy look good before the elections. But this would only postpone the problem.

As the Communist leaders have often told us, their whole strategy is to start more wars than we can handle. The main cause of aggression in the world today is our lack of determination to deal with it effectively. Our Government has no right to sacrifice American lives unless it adopts a policy of winning. Time is running out.

Russian Ambitions on the Sea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK EDWARDS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 9, 1967

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, for many months now those of us serving on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee have spoken of the ambitions of Soviet Russia on the world's oceans.

Russia seeks total supremacy on the seas, and to her this means not only naval military strength but merchant fleet superiority as well. In the Kremlin's vocabulary, merchant fleet strength and naval power go hand in hand, one being inseparable from the other.

In this connection I call attention to the following article which appears in today's edition of the Christian Science Monitor newspaper:

SOVIET NAVY GETS NEW ORDERS

(By Paul Wohl)

The Soviet Union, which today owns the second-strongest Navy in the world, has a new naval policy. Its purpose is the defense of Soviet "state interests" anywhere in the world and those of "members of the commonwealth."

In the past, the sole purpose of the Navy, according to the Soviets, was supposed to be the defense of the motherland. Now the Navy also may serve offensive purposes.

This year, statements on Navy Day (July 30) for the first time referred repeatedly to the need to "secure the interests of the Soviet state" and its "hundreds of freighters, fishing motherships and trawlers, which . . . plow the world's oceans every day."

Reference to the Soviet Union's worldwide maritime trade was made by Admiral-of-the-Fleet Sergei G. Gorshkov in a Pravda interview published on July 30.

These statements underlined last year's Navy Day pronouncement when Admiral Gorshkov spoke of "new ways for building up a modern ocean-going submarine, air and rocket missile fleet, capable of solving strategic tasks of an offensive nature."

The Soviet merchant marine is today the fifth, and probably the most modern, merchant fleet in the world. In 1961 it held 11th place among the world's merchant fleets.

PORTS VISITED REGULARLY

Soviet vessels now regularly visit more than 800 ports in 90 countries, wrote the Minister of the Merchant Fleet, Victor Bakayev, in Pravda, Aug. 1.

In addition to the defense of these far-flung shipping interests, the Soviet Navy "guards the interests of the socialist countries, members of the Warsaw Pact," wrote Admiral Vasily M. Grishanov in Izvestia of July 30.

The notion of the defense of Soviet interests is new in the Kremlin's political vocabulary. In the past, only capitalist states defended "interests" beyond their borders and those of their allies. The Soviets were concerned with security and legitimate rights, which included the rights of nations engaged in "just wars" of defense or national liberation.

Defense of the worldwide state interests of the Soviet Union goes much further and puts the Kremlin on record as a state with interests in the seven seas. This, Admiral Gorshkov told Pravda, "is undoubtedly one of the most outstanding signs of [our] sea power."

QUIET OBSERVANCE

As a whole, this year's Navy Day celebrations were restrained. None of the top leaders made a speech.

Only Defense Minister Marshal Andrei A. Grechko sounded an ominous note:

"Recently the situation in the Near East has become exceptionally acute," wrote the Marshal in his order to the armed forces and to the personnel of the armament industry on Navy Day.

His sharp sallies in connection with the Israeli-Arab conflict and insistence on "conditions of a growing war threat" at the graduation ceremonies of the Military Academy on July 5 were censored in the large-circulation press.

The most militant statement was that made by Admiral Gorshkov from the bridge of the rocket cruiser Kirov: The Soviet fleet "has the means, conventional and nuclear, to inflict a destructive blow on any aggressor. . . . The capitalist powers have lost their maritime supremacy."

Last year the Admiral merely claimed that "An end had been put to the complete domination of the seas by the traditional naval powers."

FORCES ON THE ALERT

Admiral Gorshkov's line was that the Soviet Navy would strike only if provoked. But naval forces had to be on the alert. "Reactionary circles of United States imperialism would like to transform the seas and oceans around our country into launching areas for their rockets and into an arsenal from which to attack our state. . . ."

For the first time, rocket-launching nuclear submarines were shown at this year's Leningrad parade. These subs, which resemble United States Polaris-type submarines, are believed to be the "blue belt" of defense of which the late Marshal Rodion Y. Malinovsky spoke at the 23d Communist Party Congress in 1966.

Other "firsts" at the naval parade were a ship on air cushions and "ultramodern" speedboats for the protection of heavy vessels.

Soviet nuclear submarines are "constantly in the various oceans and seas of the world," said Admiral Gorshkov.

The extensive inspection of the northern fleet by General Secretary Leonid I. Brezhnev, Premier Alexei N. Kosygin, and a galaxy of high officials in the first week of June was played up by all speakers as a sign of the growing importance which party and state attach to sea power.

Admiral Gorshkov bitterly denounced United States interference with Soviet merchant shipping in the Far East and the presence in the Mediterranean "for already a quarter of a century" of the United States Sixth Fleet, which he called "the initiator of many military conflicts."

"Sooner or later," the Americans will "have to understand that they have no mastery whatsoever of the seas. The flag of the Soviet Navy today flies proudly over the oceans."

It was in this connection that Admiral Gorshkov spoke of the "firm determination of the Soviet Fleet worthily to defend the state interests of the Soviet Union against encroachments by the imperialists."

NORTHERN SEA ROUTE HAILED

More important from a Western point of view than these pronouncements by admirals and marshals is the fact that the Soviets now apparently can use the northern sea route around Siberia during five months in the summer and early fall, which would allow them to shift part of their northern and Baltic fleets to the Far East in a comparatively short time.

It also is significant that Soviet shipbuilding, which hitherto concentrated on naval units (most merchant vessels were ordered abroad), now has extended its capacity sufficiently to turn out both naval and merchant ships.

Court Rulings on Lineups Hamper Police

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT V. DENNEY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 9, 1967

Mr. DENNEY. Mr. Speaker, there has been considerable expression among attorneys and members of the judiciary concerning recent rulings of the U.S. Supreme Court, involving criminal cases.

Our U.S. Attorney General, Ramsey Clark, has been quoted as saying that he does not think the Court's decisions will hamper the administration of justice.

Mr. Speaker, I think that Mr. Clark is wrong. What is more, I feel that he will see his mistake after he has been in office for a longer period of time.

It is interesting to note that Nebraska's veteran attorney general, Clarence A. H. Meyer, who is past president of the Association of State Attorneys General and who was named one of the outstanding attorney generals in the Nation, was quoted recently on this subject.

In the Omaha World-Herald of July 31, 1967, Mr. Meyer says:

My one concluding observation is that the Court (United States Supreme Court) presumably decides in these cases that a suspect is entitled to have a lawyer at his side just about all of the time, but I think what they (the Court) really decided for us is that the police need a full-time lawyer at their side.

It will be a sad day indeed if only lawyers can serve as policemen. But it seems to me this is the direction we are being taken by the U.S. Supreme Court.

I call to the House's attention the full interview with Mr. Meyer concerning the impact of recent Supreme Court decisions and I include the text in the RECORD at this point:

MEYER SAYS COURT RULINGS ON LINEUPS HAMPER POLICE—MEMO NOTES LIMITS ON USE OF EVIDENCE

(By Tom Ash)

Nebraska Attorney General Clarence Meyer says he believes United States Supreme Court rulings on police lineups might interfere with law enforcement more, he said, than other recent decisions.

In a memorandum to Nebraska law enforcement agencies, Mr. Meyer said the Supreme Court told law enforcement officials in effect, "you can keep on having lineups, and you can keep on having witnesses and victims take a look at the defendant at the police station to let you know whether you have arrested the right man, but if you don't do this exactly the way we say you should do it, you cannot use that evidence in court.

"This is the same device they used in Mapp vs. Ohio, Escobedo vs. Illinois, and Miranda vs. Arizona," Mr. Meyer said. "But these cases . . . potentially could cause a greater interference with effective law enforcement than Mapp, Escobedo, and Miranda combined, for the reason that some form of identification evidence is required in every case."

THREE REVERSALS

Decisions on three cases before the Supreme Court last month prompted Mr. Meyer's remarks.

A Eustace, Tex., bank was robbed by a man wearing a strip of tape on each side of his face. A suspect was arrested and placed in a lineup with five other men, all wearing similar strips of tape. The suspect was picked out by two bank employes.

The suspect was convicted by a Texas Court after the witnesses identified him in court as the man in the bank and in the lineup.

An Alhambra, Cal., policeman was killed when he walked into a bank during a robbery. A suspect was arrested after officers, acting on a tip, found incriminating evidence in his apartment.

The man was identified by the apartment house manager and three witnesses in the bank at a lineup and again during the trial.

A defendant was convicted of murder and sentenced to death by a New York State court in connection with the stabbing death of a prominent physician. The physician's wife was left in critical condition with 11 stab wounds.

The suspect was arrested the day after the slaying and taken to the woman's hospital room for identification. The defendant, accompanied by five police officers and two members of the District Attorney's staff, was the only Negro in the room. The woman identified him as the killer.

SIXTH AMENDMENT

The Supreme Court reversed all three decisions, calling the identification procedures illegal and a violation of the Sixth Amendment, the right to counsel.

In its rulings the Supreme Court held:

"—In addition to counsel's presence at trial, the accused is guaranteed that he need not stand alone against the state at any stage of prosecution, formal or informal, in court or out, where counsel's absence might derogate the accused's right to a fair trial.

". . . A major factor contributing to the high incidence of miscarriage of justice from mistaken identification has been the degree of suggestion inherent in the manner in which the prosecution presents the suspect to witnesses for pretrial identification.

". . . Moreover, it is a matter of common experience that, once a witness has picked out the accused at the lineup, he is not likely to go back on his word later on, so that in practice the issue of identity may for all practical purposes be determined there and then, before the trial."

ILLEGAL LINEUPS

In his interpretation of the Supreme Court ruling, Attorney General Meyer advised:

"If there has been an illegal lineup, neither an eyewitness nor the victim may testify in court that they recognize the defendant as being the person who committed the crime, unless the prosecution is first able to prove by clear and convincing evidence that the identification made in court was based upon observations of the defendant other than at the illegal lineup."

Mr. Meyer asked: "What do you do if all of your witnesses are in town only for the day, and the defendant's lawyer says he is too busy to come to the lineup? I don't know."

He added: "My one concluding observation is that the court presumably decides in these cases that a suspect is entitled to have a lawyer at his side just about all of the time, but I think what they really have decided for us is that the police need a full-time lawyer at their side.

OMAHA CHANGES

Omaha police have changed their identification procedure because of the Supreme Court rulings, Detective Inspector Richard R. Andersen said.

Before a lineup, showup or identification parade can be held, a suspect must be advised of his right to have a lawyer present, Inspector Andersen said. The lineup may be held if the suspect waives the right.

The ruling, intended only for felony cases, also applies to informal identification procedures, he said. Officers can no longer take a suspect back to the scene of a robbery for confrontation with the victim without a lawyer.

In the past, many innocent persons were released on the spot when the victim could not identify them. Now they must be arrested, booked and put in a lineup with their attorney present, one officer said.

The Supreme Court was not clear on whether the illegal lineup decisions apply to identifications made before a formal charge or information is filed. Inspector Andersen said. "We are assuming that it does and taking the necessary precautions. This is a gray zone, and it will probably take a test case to clear it up."

Care Helps Assuage World Hunger

SPEECH

OF

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 3, 1967

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, there has been much both written and said about the Federal Government's programs to alleviate the world hunger crisis. Private organizations, financed by public donations from individuals and groups, like CARE, Inc., are also making significant contributions in this area.

The following is a summary of the two basic CARE programs, the self-help program and the food crusade:

CARE

CARE's Self-Help Program aims at combining CARE food deliveries with tools and services in order to help the world's needy people build a beter life for themselves. CARE's American staff members in each area report specific supplies needed by institutions, groups and individuals engage in local improvement efforts.

CARE's goal for the 1966–67 program year, in its Food Crusade, was to help feed a total 40 million people in thirty-two countries. Wherever possible, local governments pay all or part of CARE's distribution costs. CARE utilizes food from U.S. Food for Peace donations of farm abundance, as well as buying food to match local diets and products donated by private firms.

Summaries of the programs being conducted as well as the problems they have encountered in some of the thirty-two countries where CARE operates follow:

I. MIDDLE-FAR EAST REGION

A. Ceylon

Political consideration held programming down until approximately a year ago. Several projects approved in the past six months concentrated on the need to increase agricultural production.

B. Hong Kong

A pilot project has been initiated here by the construction of a combination community center-feed store in a pig farmer's village. Corn is provided to the farmer at a reduced rate to encourage him to improve and expand his pork production. Tied in with this is a revolving fund established to provide credit to pig farmers to enable them to build proper sties.

C. India

CARE conducts a school feeding program that feeds nearly 9 million children daily in twelve states.

D. Iraq

CARE distributes seed packages, primarily to schools which receive U.S. commodities through CARE. Also working to develop projects in conjunction with FAO, but they are not firm yet.

E. Malaysia

Experimenting with a poultry program under which rural farmers are given a basic "kit," consisting of chicks, feed a heating lamp, waterer and fencing, which are provided by Peace Corps volunteers to farmers who have shown sufficient interest to build a simple shed and brooder. The first kits have proved to be a considerable success. Farmers have seen the wisdom of not allowing their chickens to run wild in the traditional pattern of "poultry raising," with its high mortality rate.

F. Pakistan

Last year, in conjunction with the East Pakistan Water and Power Development Authority and FAO, CARE provided two hundred improved plows to master farmers in clubs organized by the E.P.W.A.P.D.A. in its efforts to increase productivity in the district of Kushtia.

G. Philippines

CARE works closely in conjunction with the Philippine Rural Reconstruction Movement, which trains workers to teach and mobilize people in rural areas to overcome poverty, disease, illiteracy and civic inertia.

II. LATIN AMERICAN REGION

In this region, AID-Alliance for Progress have stepped into many of the project areas, such as school construction, on a large scale.

A. Dominican Republic

School feeding program that supplies standard kits to school gardens and playgrounds.

B. British Honduras

Broad effort to lessen the dependence on importation of food from outside the country by increasing domestic productivity.

C. Columbia

Most extensive feeding program in Latin America, composed of the standard kits.

III. AFRICA AND MEDITERRANEAN REGION

A. Europe

Scheduled for phase-out within the next several years.

1. Greece

AID's disapproval of further shipments to Greece of Title III flour, the mainstay of CARE's school-lunch programs, threatened to put the whole program in jeopardy. However, the Greek Government has decided to assume responsibility for continuing the program with its own commodities. For the past several years, efforts have been directed toward increasing food production, especially in rural areas.

B. Middle East

1. Cyprus

Since hostilities broke out between Turkish and Greek communities in December of 1963, CARE has had difficulty operating in an atmosphere of political neutrality and for a while became a target for anti-American feeling. The school feeding program resumed last year after President Makarios made a public statement in support of CARE, but fewer schools participated than before the disruption and no self-help programming was attempted. The situation has not improved and the mission is expected to close immediately unless a last-ditch attempt to obtain full cooperation from the Cypriot Government proves successful.

2. Egypt

This is one of the few missions where CARE is able to engage in family planning assistance. The program originated with a request from several private groups.

3. Jordan

CARE operates an institutional feeding program, in cooperation with the Ministry of Social Affairs. CARE is also in contact with most of the private Jordanian organizations, some of which were formed specifically to offer temporary relief to Palestinian refugees. One project under consideration is to provide seeds and agricultural hand tools to thirteen village cooperatives.

4. Turkey

Particularly concerned right now with providing relief to the victims of earthquakes, both the recent one and the one of August, 1966. In 1966, CARE immediately released 71,000 pounds of milk powder, bulgar wheat and flour after the disaster. In its normal operations, CARE is working closely with the Peace Corps, focusing on rural development. It has engineered a major break-through in the food-preservation industry, after three years of effort. Because of a limited market, no one has been willing to manufacture preserving jars locally. Imported jars are beyond the means of all but the affluent, and food preservation techniques are not generally known. Hence, thousands of tons of fruits and vegetables go to waste each summer, which could, if preserved, reduce the winter food shortages. CARE persuaded Turkey's largest glass concern to experiment with the manufacture of heat-resistant jars, while it made plans for teaching preserving techniques to the people. The response has been gratifying.

5. Israel

Israel's Law of Return, virtually an invitation to Jews all over the world to settle in Israel, has created a unique situation. Most of the immigrants in the past four years have come from the Orient and of these a very high percentage are illiterate, unskilled, very old or very young, mentally or physically disabled—and destitute. The Government of Israel is thus faced with an ever-growing problem of assimilating into its rapidly industrializing economy large numbers of unskilled and culturally backward people. There are two problems CARE faces here. The Government's sophisticated and often very costly requests often come into conflict with CARE's own philosophy of meeting *basic* needs. Also, important restrictions limit further the kinds of assistance CARE can render.

C. West Africa

"Least developed" of all CARE's areas of operation. There are four basic impediments to develop that clearly stand out: the climate, the poor quality of African soil, the tribal social structure and the absence of a developed infrastructure and civil service. Under tribal practice, land is held in usufruct by farmers with permission from their village or Paramount Chief. This has a negative effect on farmers' incentive to improve the land and also hinders the establishment of an agricultural credit system.

1. Liberia

CARE programs here include a food-for-work road construction project in the isolated southeastern county of Sinoe and a garden kit project.

2. Sierra Leone

An interesting project here is that of outboard motor maintenance and repair. A Peace Corps volunteer will visit the villages along the coast, in a launch provided by CARE, and repair outboard motors for a nominal fee, as well as offering instruction in outboard motor repair. It is hoped this will encourage more fishermen to purchase outboard motors, which would enable them to venture further from shore and thus increase their catch. CARE is also assisting the Cooperative Marketing Society of Kabala, the district capital of the northern province, by providing vegetable seeds, gardening implements, fertilizers, fungicides, insecticides, and two trucks so that the cooperative can increase its market potential and membership. If this project is successful, it could make Sierra Leone self-sufficient in its vegetable production.

These are only a few of the programs conducted by CARE, those directly related to alleviating the world hunger problem. Many more countries than mentioned above are served by some facet of CARE's overall program. CARE works closely with the governments of many of the countries involved or with local private organizations, in order to develop programs that can effectively operate to alleviate the specific problems faced by the individual countries.

The Poor Pay More

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 9, 1967

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, an excellent documentary film appeared on channel 28, in Los Angeles this past Monday evening which explored in depth one of the most painful aspects of poverty. The film, part of the NET Journal series, was entitled "The Poor Pay More," and portrayed the many ways in which the poor are forced to pay more for less. Paul Henniger, writing for the Los Angeles Times on July 28, previewed this outstanding presentation in a column which included mention of the ways in which the war on poverty is moving to meet the problem through consumer education and cooperative food-buying projects.

Mr. Speaker, as this article will be of considerable interest to many of my distinguished colleagues, I insert it at this point in the RECORD:

DOCUMENTARY SHOWS: POOR PAY MORE—AND GET LESS

(By Paul Henniger)

"It is an untidy, but irrevocable fact of American life that the poor pay more for less.

"All too frequently, when they sign an installment contract, or make a purchase, they pay higher prices, get exploited more often and receive worse quality merchandise than anyone else."

That's a sampling of the narration of an hour-long documentary on a domestic problem. "The Poor Pay More" is part of the NET Journal series, which Channel 28 is screening Monday night at 9:30.

NET launched the series of documentaries last fall, and each week the series has concentrated on a variety of domestic and international affairs. Mental illness, education, mass communications, international relations and the 20th-century woman have been subjects.

With this series, the NET network of more than 100 affiliated stations, has put on TV a public affairs series equally on a footing with those produced on the three commercial networks. Color would be the only "special" added attraction the commercial nets have over NET's endeavors.

"The Poor Pay More" is an excellently-produced program, and recommended for everyone who has ever wandered into a department store, supermarket or listened to the pitch of a door-to-door salesman.

The old Latin principal, "caveat emptor," let the buyer beware, has a somewhat deeper meaning when it concerns the poor. As writer-producer Morton Silverstein points out:

UNBEARABLE PRESSURE TO BUY

"The poor man's troubles begin precisely because he is poor. In a society where the pressure to buy is almost irresistible, the poor have to turn to long-term, high interest credit buying, the most expensive kind, as their only means of moving toward what has been called the better life."

The documentary shows how an anti-poverty agency called MEND—Massive Economic Neighborhood Development—which received funds for its summer consumer program from the federal government's Office of Economic Opportunity, contributed to the study.

An attorney, Steve Press, walks into two grocery stores, one in a middle class neighborhood, the other in a depressed area. He shows the same items in both stores, but points out wide differences in prices.

There are also graphic examples of how prices suddenly go up in certain chain stores on the first and 16th of the month, the days welfare checks are distributed.

Another revealing segment is devoted to the cunning salesman who preys on the poor with his double-talk about the advantages of owning a food freezer.

FREEZER—WITHOUT FOOD

One irate customer tells of the sales pitch and the plan he was conned into accepting, and ends up saying: "So, first of all, they sent the freezer over. That's the first they sent us. We waited six weeks for the food to come. Finally, when it did come, we got 16 bottles of ketchup, all kinds of toilet paper, nothing that we can eat, really."

Through the use of cleverly concealed cameras a furniture salesman is seen and heard softsoaping his customers.

The program includes interviews with experts from many anti-poverty groups on steps being taken to free the poor from economic bondage by consumer education courses and food-buying cooperatives.

Narrator Phil Sterling concludes with the hope for tougher legislation to protect the consumer, better representation and a stronger voice in his own affairs.

"At the core of all this, of course, is the fervent wish that morality could be as simply legislated as a consumer code," he adds.

The Kee Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES KEE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 9, 1967

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include last week's public service television and radio newscast, "The Kee Report." The subject discussed is our space program.

This is Jim Kee, bringing you the Kee Report.

The tragic death last January of three astronauts in a spacecraft fire set off a searching review of our entire space program which is still underway.

I believe this pause is widely approved by the public. Certainly, every engineering defect should be remedied and the margin for human error reduced to a minimum before brave men once again try to conquer the skies in their tiny spacecraft.

But while this engineering review is underway, and manned flights have been temporarily suspended, this is a good time to examine the entire space program and the reason for its existence.

The outer space program costs money, lots of money. It is, in fact, one of the most expensive programs ever undertaken by Uncle Sam and the cost will increase as the Apollo Moonflight Program gets into full swing. There are many who believe these costs should be drastically reduced and the money spent instead on an expanded War on Poverty. Behind this idea is the mistaken belief that the exploration of outer space is nothing more than a prestige race with Soviet Russia.

Let me emphasize that this view is entirely wrong. The space race is more than a luxury. It is, in fact, a grim military necessity, the neglect of which would threaten the survival of the United States. A distinguished citizen recently offered the best yardstick for measuring its worth. He said the real test is not what the project costs, but what the cost would be if we failed to compete.

The answer is obvious. Within a few years, manned platforms will orbit the globe. If they carried Communist nuclear weapons, these flying platforms could be the most devastating weapons in human history.

It was disclosed recently that President Johnson believes the pictures already taken by our space satellites are almost priceless from the standpoint of military intelligence. Since it started about ten years ago, the space program has cost about $40 billion. The Chief Executive believes that the pictures we now have may be worth ten times that amount in terms of national safety. That both the United States and Soviet Russia employ these high-flying camera spies is an open secret.

Before the advent of the satellites, this country was forced to rely on other methods of obtaining intelligence. You may recall that an airplane called the U-2, while engaged in an intelligence mission, was shot down over Russia about seven years ago. If you wonder why such projects are necessary, the answer is easy. It was another of these high-flying planes which a few years later spotted the Soviet missile build-up in Cuba and alerted this country to the gravest danger in American history.

Our military intelligence experts now face the problem of estimating what warlike preparations, aimed at our country, are taking place behind the iron curtain. The satellite spy pictures disclosed that many previous estimates were far off. The result was we were doing many things which were unneeded and neglecting other things which needed to be done. This situation has been corrected.

The space program will produce many peacetime benefits of great value to all mankind. But its primary purpose is to save our country from destruction.

Thank you for listening.

"No Defense" McNamara

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 9, 1967

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, at the end of World War II we changed the name of our Department of War to the Department of Defense. It now appears that Mr. McNamara might have another change in mind, for he consistently refused to aid the defense of our country by carefully avoiding for quite some time installation of an anti-ballistic-missile defense system. Such a position is so ludicrous as to be almost beyond the power of words to describe, but the following editorial from the Chicago Tribune sums it up pretty well:

"NO DEFENSE" MCNAMARA

One of the more curious aspects of life in the nuclear age is the effort expended by Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara to avoid installing an anti-ballistic missile defense system that has cost the United States 4 billion dollars to develop.

At his instigation, American diplomats are now busily engaged in trying to persuade the Russians that it is to the mutual advantage of both nations not to deploy ABM defenses even though the Soviet Union is installing a vast one called the Tallinn system. McNamara would have the Russians junk it.

In McNamara's strategy, the best defense is no defense at all. Commitment to build an ABM, his theory holds, would accelerate the arms race, thereby reducing a nation's security as the enemy rushes to adopt counter-measures. An ABM system, of course, is purely defensive.

According to McNamara logic, the thing to do is to stop the arms race by putting a Soviet-American "freeze" on ABM systems. Then neither nation would have a defense system against an enemy's missiles. The flaw in this military LSD trip is that the Russians are having no part of it. According to the American Security council, they abandoned the "no defense" nonsense years ago.

In a recent study on the military balance between the United States and the U.S.S.R. prepared for the House armed services committee a special committee of council defense experts, including 14 retired generals and admirals, exploded some of the myths about the ABM.

They recalled the report of Charles M. Herzfeld, director of the advanced research projects agency of the department of defense, to a European study commission conference in London on Jan. 15, 1966, a year before McNamara's band started its ABM "freeze" talks with the Communists.

Herzfeld told the Europeans that the United States argument against deploying ABMs because they would only accelerate the arms race was first put to the Russians "at least three Pugwash conferences ago." These are international meetings of world scientists, named for the first conference, held at Pugwash, N.S., in 1957.

On the first two occasions, said Herzfeld, "the Russians did not even understand the argument that there might be an advantage in not having a defense." The Russians aren't the only ones who don't. A number of American military experts can't understand this notion either.

The third time American scientists advanced this theory the Russians had an answer. This time, Herzfeld reported, the Russians said "it was too late." As American intelligence agencies learned later, the Russians by then were well along in deploying their first ABMs.

As the American Security council committee observed, they had "already opted for acceleration," not only thru their ABM system but by increasing their force of intercontinental ballistic missiles and developing a nuclear submarine strike force able to deliver missiles on American cities. Meanwhile, McNamara sits around waiting for them to see the light.

Poverty War Halves Youth Crime Here

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN YOUNG
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 9, 1967

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues an article from the July 31, 1967, Corpus Christi Times entitled "Poverty War Halves Youth Crime Here." The source of this information is a man who certainly should know, Sgt. C. B. Mauricio, head of the police juvenile bureau. Speaking of the decrease in juvenile crime Sergeant Mauricio reports that "We first noticed it last year when the summer activities of the poverty program were in full swing. But this year the results are nothing short of fantastic. I would say that juvenile crime in general has been cut in half by the OEO."

Mr. Speaker, with the current rash of irresponsible charges and vague rumors that OEO is financing civil disturbance and creating conditions which foster disrespect for law and order, it is indeed refreshing to see law officers testify to the proven effectiveness of OEO programs in decreasing crime.

The article follows:

POVERTY WAR HALVES YOUTH CRIME HERE—COMPLAINTS FROM WORST AREAS RARE NOW, JUVENILE BUREAU SAYS

(By Bill Walraven)

Juvenile crime has been cut in half by the war on poverty, Sgt. C. B. Mauricio, head of the Police Juvenile Bureau, said today.

"We first noticed it last year when the summer activities of the poverty program were in full swing," Mauricio said. "But this year the results are nothing short of fantastic. I would say that juvenile crime in general has been cut in half by the OEO."

The greatest decline has been in poverty areas where summer programs are in effect, "but the Southside has dropped radically, too, because of the large number of teenagers there who are involved in the summer activities in one way or the other"

He said juvenile crime increased briefly at the end of school, but by the end of 30 days when poverty programs began functioning fully, there was a very sharp decline in the number of calls for Juvenile Bureau detectives, he said

"The La Armada area used to give us fits," he said: "Now with all the Boy's Club activities, there crime activity is almost at a standstill. A few bikes have been stolen, and that has been the extent of the crime. Even the glue-sniffing has disappeared, Maurico said.

The Meadow Park area "is a center where the effects are really being felt. This was an area where glue sniffing was popular, where they hid under buildings and back in dark corners.

"We had been getting calls from schools where boys were hanging around with nothing else to do. These calls are pretty rare now, because the Meadow Park Center is active and they have the programs at the swimming pool.

"In the Molina area we had a lot of trouble with gang fights, boys picking on girls, of entry into vacant houses. Now they are going to the center there and they have a good program for them."

He said the work programs seem to be producing the most remarkable results. "We've got kids working who never knew what it was to earn a dollar before. We've got a lot of others waiting to get on. Some of them are working as swimming supervisors with no pay, just for the prestige.

"I will say that most of our calls today are on repeater types. These are the guys who will not take part in anything. But we're beginning to draw a few even from this group.

"The knife fight and the weapons ordinance violators and the serious types of assaults are at a minimum. These programs are allowing some of them to become accustomed to being around others. Every time they met before, there was a clash."

He said that the neighborhood center at Leathers housing unit "is buzzing all the time. We used to get calls there all the time to quieten some sort of troublemaker. Now there is supervision and the kids themselves are helping police it."

As for the neighborhood gangs that cropped up in about half a dozen of the deep poverty areas which are Corpus Christi's equivalent to the big city ghettos "where you have rent houses jammed together and families of 10 and 12 living in two-room houses," Mauricio said, "there is no trace of them at all. As far as we can see they just aren't there any more."

The summer programs should show up in fewer referrals by the juvenile detectives to the Juvenile Department and a sharp decrease in serious cases, he said.

Vietnam and the Sickness of the Cities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROGERS C. B. MORTON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 9, 1967

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, I am sure every Member of this House feels keenly a responsibility to search out the underlying weakness in our society which has produced across this great land shameful riots and displays of mass civil disobedience accompanied by a great destruction of property and even of human life.

Undoubtedly, the answer lies in our failure to establish realistic priorities in the programs we use to govern ourselves.

Where is the national interest? Is it at home in the environment of our civilization? Or is it on the moon? Or is it in the deserts of Egypt? Or is it in the villages of Southeast Asia?

Where do we compare the building of our civilization with our responsibility to defend it? These are the searching questions of the day.

The editorial of August 4 in the Wall Street Journal may be helpful in developing a better understanding even if it is only an understanding of the fact that something is wrong:

VIETNAM AND THE SICKNESS OF THE CITIES

There is a growing feeling that the nation's domestic problems are so grievous it should not be heavily involved abroad, particularly in Vietnam. While it is easy to sympathize with the sentiment, it can lead to some wrong conclusions.

As an indication of the attitude, President Johnson was asked at a news conference if we shouldn't rethink our priorities, spending more on the homefront and less in Southeast Asia. He replied that the U.S. is rich enough to meet its responsibilities at home without neglecting its responsibilities in the world.

This seems to us to miss the point. We doubt that the U.S. Government is in fact "rich" enough to mount costly new programs for the cities while pouring some $25 billion a year into the war in Vietnam. The Federal budgetary position is extremely bad; even if taxes are increased, it threatens worse inflation and an undermining of the dollar, which certainly is no help for poor people or anyone else.

In any case, the Federal programs for the cities, and the heavy spending so far, have largely failed, as the riots and continuing, physical decay attest. If the U.S. could somehow be relieved of its Vietnam cross; a hopeful course for aiding the cities and easing racial tensions would be to inject money into the private economy through lower Federal spending and tax reductions. That is how jobs are created, and job-creation is what has given prosperity to the great majority of Americans, including many Negroes.

More promising than additional Federal intervention in the cities is the approach taken by 22 prominent Americans who are setting up an emergency convocation in Washington later this month. Calling itself the Urban Coalition, the group includes I. W. Abel, president of the United Steelworkers, banker David Rockefeller and Mayors Joseph Barr of Pittsburgh and John Lindsay of New York.

The Urban Coalition also talks of revising national—presumably having in mind too many foreign entanglements—priorities and bringing more resources to bear on domestic problems. It wants Federal action, but at least it makes the important point that the private economy "must directly and vigorously involve itself in the crisis of the cities." It calls for "investments, job training and hiring and all other things that are necessary to the full employment of the free enterprise system, and also to its survival."

Given the present oppressive taxation and numerous governmental hobbles on business, it is only realistic to acknowledge a limit on how much more free enterprise can accomplish in the cities. Yet the Coalition is right in saying it can and should contribute to improving the political, social, economic and moral climate.

What the group calls the sickness of the cities suggests a couple of further comments on the connection between Vietnam and America's domestic difficulties.

The riots, and especially the rantings of the black-racist fanatics, are of course damaging the country's prestige all over the world. Specifically the question is being raised, and not only by foreigners, whether a nation having so much trouble running itself should be trying to save an embryonic nation half a world away and build it into a real nation. Whether, indeed, the U.S. any longer has the moral authority for that task.

The question is unfair, overlooking the fact that the riots are aberrations brought on by agitators and criminals, whereas public policy and most public opinion favors improving the economic as well as the legal lot of the Negro insofar as possible. Still, we would agree to this extent: If and when the U.S. ever gets free of Vietnam, it should concentrate on making America a better place for its citizens and worry less about saving every last piece of foreign real estate from communism.

In the final analysis, however, sound judgments on Vietnam cannot turn on civic disorder at home. If it is deemed necessary to the national security to resist communism in Vietnam, it should be done regardless of the domestic disarray. If it was not essential, then the U.S. should have foregone the involvement for that reason alone.

The trouble is that even before this summer's outbreaks of violence, many Americans felt that large-scale intervention in Vietnam probably was not essential to the national interest. Logical or not, the riots can only make them more dissatisfied than ever with that dismal enterprise.

Options in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 9, 1967

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, on several occasions I have urged the United States to initiate new efforts, to search for new options that could lead to a deescalation of the war in Vietnam, and to a peaceful settlement of this costly conflict. On May 4, in a speech to the House, I urged that we stay further military escalation and intensify, instead, the diplomatic, economic and nation-building initiatives that could bring about a cease-fire and honorable peace.

An editorial in the New York Times, which appeared last June 4, and a letter to the editor of the Times by Prof. James C. Thomson, Jr., appearing in the same edition, point out that constructive alternatives to military escalation have been and may still be available. An article by Tom Wicker, also appearing in the same issue of the Times, makes clear that the cost of the war continues or grows.

Mr. Speaker, these are timely and thoughtful contributions to our discussion and understanding of Vietnam policy, and I include them with my remarks.

UNTRIED OPTIONS IN VIETNAM

The Johnson Administration has increasingly challenged the assertions of its critics that there are—or have ever been—valid alternatives to the dangerous and unsuccessful policy of escalation it has been pursuing in Vietnam since February 1965.

A letter on the opposite page from Prof. James C. Thomson Jr. of Harvard, staff assistant to McGeorge Bundy, then the President's adviser for national security affairs, makes it clear that "constructive alternatives" were repeatedly proposed not only outside the Government but also inside, by the Administration's own experts. Unfortunately, they were unheeded.

The tragic turning point came between Election Day in November 1964, and February 1965. The policy of the Johnson Presidential campaign was reversed. An opportunity to open direct secret talks with Hanoi was rejected. Instead, the decision was made to bomb North Vietnam and to send the first of 450,000 American combat troops to fight a land war in Asia.

Two years later it was evident that the Communists had matched every increment in the American effort. Every upward whirl around the escalation spiral merely restored the military stalemate at a higher level of forces, cost and casualties.

Yet, when Hanoi last fall for the first time in two years showed an interest in direct secret talks, the Administration stiffened its terms, extended its bombing to the Hanoi area and disrupted an initial series of contacts conducted personally by Foreign Minister Rapacki of Poland.

Later, in February 1967, it ignored an indication from the Soviet Premier that Hanoi would come to the conference table if a bombing pause was extended. At the same time, it rejected an appeal from the British Prime Minister to give Ho Chi Minh something more than a forty-hour extension of the bombing pause to reply to the letter he had received from President Johnson only three days before.

Escalation now can hardly go much further. The target list, with the exception of the port of Haiphong and a few airfields, is virtually exhausted. Hanoi's will to resist has not been broken, nor has infiltration been reduced—the rate has more than tripled since the bombing began.

Further escalation can only force Russia's supply operation into greater dependence on China for transshipment. North Vietnam's planes might have to operate from Chinese bases, making Hanoi the political prisoner of Peking. A United States ground invasion of North Vietnam, if attempted, would almost certainly precipitate direct Chinese intervention.

The time has come, as Mr. Thomson's letter suggests, to try a new tack, to de-escalate and "to be as ingenious and relentless in the pursuit of peace as we are in the infliction of pain." A shift could hardly achieve less at more cost than the policy pursued for the last twenty-eight months.

WIDER ASIAN CONFLICT FEARED

(NOTE.—The writer, Assistant Professor of History at Harvard, was formerly a staff member of the National Security Council.)

CAMBRIDGE, MASS.,
May 23, 1967.

To the EDITOR:

As a student of Asian history and, until last autumn, an official of the Kennedy and Johnson Administrations in the field of Far Eastern policy, I write to express my alarm at the Administration's course of action in Vietnam. U Thant has warned that we may well be near the threshold of World War III. I reluctantly agree.

Two forces are at work which, if unchecked, can cause incalculable harm:

The first is the inherent dynamic of the quest for a military solution, a quest whose ultimate consequence can only be war with China and perhaps the Soviet Union. My layman's impression is that the Administration, despairing of a negotiated settlement, will give our military the step-by-step escalatory authority for which they have long pressed.

The second force is the inherent dynamic of the political process at home: the Administration's sensed need of a "solution," one way or the other, by the autumn of 1968. For all the talk of a long-protracted conflict, the facts of recent escalations belie such talk.

Add to these two forces the polarization between an apparent majority at home that sees the issue increasingly as "support for our boys" and a dissenting minority that sees few ways to influence policy except through civil disobedience and even violence.

The result is a nation, divided and distraught, that may trigger a much wider conflict with only the vaguest awareness of the issues, the stakes or the alternatives.

ALTERNATIVES REJECTED

My six years in the Federal Government revealed a melancholy truth that seems pertinent today: that at each stage of the Vietnam conflict, from 1961 onward, "constructive alternatives" have, in fact, been available and proposed, both within the Government and outside it; that at each stage such alternatives have been rejected as unpalatable; but that all such alternatives have become progressively more palatable in retrospect, once the opportunity to choose them has passed us by.

There are things we could and should have done a year ago, two, three and five years ago, that are infinitely harder to do today. I can attest that they were in fact proposed at the time, and that they were rejected at each stage because the short-term price of doing them seemed infinitely higher than the short-term price of not doing them and continuing, instead, on the same course. But the long-term price of not doing them turns out to be compounded daily and hourly. It is a price that bears no relation to the stakes.

Can we still learn from the bureaucratic record and, for once, call a halt before we have passed the point of no return? Or will the price of nonescalation—of de-escalation—be once more calculated as unsupportably high, as we plow on toward calamity?

The Vietnam conflict is a needless war—one that could and should have been avoided. Its resolution today certainly lies with men in Hanoi and elsewhere as well as men in Washington. But the men in Washington bear the paramount obligation.

For the greatest power on earth has the power denied to others: the power to take unilateral steps, and to keep taking them; the power to be as ingenious and relentless in the pursuit of peace as we are in the infliction of pain; the power to lose face; the power to admit error, and the power to act with magnanimity.

JAMES C. THOMSON, Jr.

IN THE NATION: WHOSE SKIN ON THE WALL?

(By Tom Wicker)

WASHINGTON, June 3.—It is only natural that President Johnson should take quiet satisfaction from the plight of those who have been accusing him of acting like a "policeman of the world" and an imperialist warmonger in Vietnam, but who now demand that he "defend the right of a small nation" against "aggression" in the Middle East.

In fact, to the extent that a desire for American action on behalf of Israel causes erstwhile critics to mute some of their more hysterical charges about the Vietnam war, the public climate will be healthier.

If this could be accompanied by a relaxation of the loudmouthed patriotism and pseudo-strategic bomb-rattling of the war's most fervent barkers, perhaps everyone could look at the situation more soberly and clearly.

SAD TRUTHS

This is needed because—even while the headlines from the Middle East reflect an ominous new threat—it is ever more apparent that, whatever its justification, the war in Vietnam is not going well and may never go well.

Last week, American forces suffered 2,929 combat casualties, the highest weekly toll so far; 313 of these were battle deaths, making a total of 1,177 killed in the last four weeks. These figures not only show the rising human cost of the war; they also make it plain that after nearly two years of American combat operations, and more than two years of the American bombing assault on North Vietnam, the opposing forces are not only strong and effective but have been able to take a major combat initiative.

This is their offensive in the I Corps region, forcing the redeployment of American troops, the weakening of other sectors, new pressures for additional troops, and such risky exercises as the Marines' expedition into the so-called demilitarized zone.

General Westmoreland's headquarters reported this week that, so far in the war, 1,398 planes and 888 helicopters had been lost—including a record 38 planes lost during May. North Vietnamese air defenses, therefore, are either stronger or more effective after long experience, or both; for instance the vaunted American B–52's now are having to be kept away from the DMZ, because the North Vietnamese have moved in Soviet surface-to-air missiles. All this suggests not only increasing strength for Hanoi, but its ever-tighter links to Moscow and Red China.

The situation in the "other war'" to make something out of South Vietnam is scarcely less bleak. American economic sources in Saigon now have acknowledged that the local economy is shakier than ever; prices are expected to rise by 50 per cent or more in 1967, although last year's reforms were expected to hold the increases to 30 per cent. A big new influx of American troops might, therefore, be an economic disaster for the country it was intended to save.

PROGRAM IN TROUBLE

The pacification program, on which so many American hopes are built, is in obvious trouble. Determined Vietcong and North Vietnamese attacks against the pacification teams have both reduced their effectiveness and exposed the fact that the South Vietnamese army can or will as yet offer them little protection.

Even Vietnamese political development, which only last winter seemed the most hopeful aspect of the situation, now has a potential for trouble. Both Marshal Ky and General Thieu have insisted on running for President, and no one can say what mischief this might yet breed.

It might cause factional political difficulties in the armed forces. It might cause one of the candidates ultimately to make an unsavory deal with the other, or even to take worse steps in order to clear the field. With the entry of the popular and able Tran Van Huong into the race, the military split may result in the election of a civilian President.

That would be a salutary development, taken in the abstract, as the South Vietnamese officer corps is unpopular with the peasantry and one of the chief targets of the Vietcong. Civilian, elected government in South Vietnam is, in fact, one of the major aims of the war.

But would the army actually allow a civilian government to take control in South Vietnam next fall? And if it did, would the army then give that government any real loyalty and service? How long might it be before a coup resulted—just as the army overthrew Huong's last government?

American support for the war, tenuous and uneasy already, probably would not survive a perversion of the election by the military, or a later army coup.

The war now is costing the United States an estimated $24 billion a year and big new troop increments would run the bill up again; depending on Congressional tax action, the budget deficit to be announced next summer already could run anywhere from $17 billion to $25 billion.

No wonder no one is talking, these days, about a coonskin on the wall. Whose skin, in fact, is being hung on whose wall?

The Negro in Revolt: What Now?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES A. BURKE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 9, 1967

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, may I take this opportunity to bring to the attention of the Members of Congress an article that appeared in today's Washington Daily News, written by one of the Nation's leading newspapermen entitled "The Negro in Revolt: What Now?" I commend this article for all to read. It is thought provoking. It is well written and deserves the attention of all to read.

The article follows:

THE NEGRO IN REVOLT: WHAT NOW?

(By Louis Cassels)

(NOTE.—Few writers have taken into their assignment a background comparable to Louis Cassels'. He has a deep commitment to human problems. His writing in the field of religion has won him several awards, the most recent being the James O. Supple Memorial award of the Religious News Writers Association. His column "Religion in America" appears every Saturday in the Washington Daily News.

(He also writes on social and economic problems and has had great experience in the general field of politics and government in 25 years with U.P.I.)

The black uprising in America's cities is far more extensive and far more serious than most white people like to believe.

It is not a passing phenomenon, stirred by "outside agitators." It is not a mere outburst of hooliganism by a "small minority of lawless people."

It is not a new phase of the civil rights movement—although it may disrupt indefinitely that attempt to gain equality for Negroes by nonviolent means.

What, then, is going on? And what can be done to wipe out the root cause?

COSTLY CRUSADE

The answer to the first question is so obvious that it can be missed only by those who dislike or fear reality. As to the second, there is a solution. But it is going to require something more in the nature of a crusade than a program. And the cost is going to be enormous even for a nation accustomed to thinking in terms of billions.

The cost of not doing it could be greater still.

After visiting riot areas in Detroit, Newark, Rochester, Toledo, Harlem and other cities and talking to hundreds of Negroes, public officials, social scientists and law enforcement officers, I am convinced we were all hasty in the earlier 1960s in describing as a revolution the Negro's struggle for equal rights before the law. This is the revolution. That was just a preliminary.

I know revolution is a shocking and ugly word. I use it deliberately. No lesser term seems adequate to awaken White America to the gravity of the crisis. Revolution is being used in this article, not in a casual way, but in its original sense of a violent attempt by discontented people to change the status quo.

BLOODY ALTERNATIVE

But the alternative is spreading bloodshed, massive property destruction and bitterness that could poison race relations for decades to come.

At this moment, the revolution is unorganized. There is no strategic plan, no central guidance. The only clear objective is a determination to give "Whitey" a bad time. They want to shape him up and make him realize that Negroes are fed up with overcrowded, overpriced, rat-infested ghetto housing . . . with menial jobs that won't pay for any of the luxuries which an affluent society constantly flaunts in their faces . . . with rude and sometimes abusive treatment by police . . . with irregular garbage collection . . . with inferior public schools that no white neighborhood would tolerate. Most of all, perhaps, they want an end to the constant, day-to-day humiliation that white people inflict on black people by little insults and condescensions, such as calling a grown man "boy."

Black power agitators such as Stokely Carmichael and H. Rap Brown and communists are trying to move in and capture control of the revolution. Their strident incitements to riot doubtless have contributed to a heightening of tension in many areas, and may even have supplied the sparks which touched off one or two riots. But professional troublemakers did not create the revolutionary situation, and so far they are not calling the shots.

This is not merely my opinion. It is also the conviction of FBI agents and military intelligence officials who have made exhaustive but futile attempts to find evidence that the urban rioting is being stage-managed by outside elements.

HOOVER'S REPORT

FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover last week officially informed the President's new special advisory commission on civil disorders that he had "no intelligence on which to base a conclusion of conspiracy."

Dr. Thomas Pettigrew, Harvard sociologist and expert on race relations, says white people would prefer to explain the riots in terms of a well-organized conspiracy because "they just don't want to believe that so many black people could be so angry."

But Dr. Pettigrew and other leading social scientists see the riots as a largely spontaneous expression of the fury which has been building up in the breasts of America's Negroes as hopes aroused by the civil rights movement remain unfulfilled.

"The riots are the result of a situation which is getting better, but not better fast enough," David Riesman, author of "The Lonely Crowd" and professor of social science at Harvard, said. He said oppressed people do not revolt as long as their situation seems hopeless, but only when they begin to glimpse the possibility of a better life still denied to them.

Dr. Joseph E. Seldin, University of Pittsburgh sociologist, said white people tend to exaggerate the gains which have been achieved by Negroes, particularly in the urban North. Northern Negroes have long had "civil rights" in the sense of being technically equal before the law. What they want, and do not yet have by a long shot, is economic equality—the chance to live as well as they see white people living.

"Even if the urban Negro is a little better off today than he was a few years ago, the gap between his material conditions and the rest of us is immense, and he is surrounded by affluence which emphasizes that gap more blatantly than ever before," said Dr. Seldin. Dr. Pettigrew found no signs of advance plotting in Newark and Detroit. But once a riot begins, he said, street gangs as well as leftist and black nationalist organizations move in to take advantage of it.

There is evidence some of the extreme black nationalist groups have cadres of trained snipers who come into a community after a riot is under way, to prolong the terror with rifle shots in the dark. It does not take many snipers to terrorize a city. Military officials estimated that no more than 100 were involved in the sporadic attacks which turned 200 blocks of downtown Detroit into a no-man's land.

MINOR INCIDENT

In nearly every instance to date, rioting has been triggered by some relatively minor incident. In Detroit, it was a police raid on an after-hours drinking spot in the Negro section. In Newark, it was the arrest of a Negro cab driver. Usually, it is not the incident itself but the wild rumors which accompany it that strike fire into the tinder of the ghetto's pent-up resentments. Thus, in Detroit, the false report got around that police had seriously injured one of the women arrested. In Newark, the rumor (also false) was that an arrested cab driver had been beaten to death.

The fact that such rumors can spread like wildfire, and be believed by Negroes, is a measure of the deep distrust of "Whitey's government"—and particularly its police department.

The myth that riots are carried out entirely by a tiny minority of hoodlums has been propagated by both whites and Negroes who are reluctant to acknowledge the scope of Negro disenchantment with American society.

There is some basis for the myth. The most conspicuous participants in ghetto riots, particularly in the early stags, are roving gangs of young Negroes, ranging in age from early teens to the late twenties, who are totally alienated from society and hostile to all forms of authority.

They hate white people (whom they call "Hunkies") with a consuming passion. They also hate black people who have "made it" in Whitey's world: These are invariably labeled "Uncle Toms." They are not concerned with voting rights, or desegregated schools, or job opportunities. They don't want to go to work, or go to school. They'd much rather roam the streets, talking tough and blaming Whitey for cheating them out of the abundant life they see advertised on TV. They are eager to believe any black power propagandist who tells they they are only taking what is rightfully theirs when they loot stores.

It is doubtless more than coincidence that a very large proportion of the burned-out stores in Newark, Detroit, Rochester, Toledo, Detroit, Harlem and Milwaukee bear Jewish names.

"There's a lot of anti-semitism as well as general anti-white feeling in this rioting," said Albert DeMayo, manager of Rabin's Quality Clothing Store on Joseph Avenue in Rochester. He said his store had been firebombed both in Rochester's big 1964 riot, and again in a small-scale disturbance this summer.

SMALL PERCENTAGE

Even when you count the older Negroes who join in briefly during the early "carnival" stage, the number of active participants in a ghetto riot is usually a small percentage of the total Negro community. The best estimates indicate that the figure rarely exceeds 10 per cent.

What about the remaining 90 per cent?

Many of them will tell you, with obvious sincerity and even vehemence, that they are more bitterly opposed to rioting than any white person can be.

Interviews with scores of white collar, jobholding, middle-class Negroes revealed that their dominant attitude is strikingly similar to that which prevailed among the better-educated white people of southern cities a few years ago when whites rather than Negroes were rebelling against law and order.

Every reporter who covered white riots in the early days of the civil rights movement remembers the eagerness of respectable white folk to have the world know that the disorders were being carried out by a minority of rednecks and toughs. But if you continued the conversation, many of them would reveal that while they disapproved of the "excesses" of the rioters, they sympathized with their basic anti-integration objective.

Today one encounters the same split reaction among middle-class Negroes. They cannot condone violence—they are genuinely shocked by it. But a great many think rioting may be the only way Negroes can finally convince white people that something must be done about slum housing, unemployment and discrimination.

Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., strongly deplores riots. But even Dr. King can sympathize with the deep-welling spirit of frustration that is being expressed in the orgy of destruction.

"A riot is the language of the unheard," he said in an interview. "It is the last desperate act . . . when the Negro says, 'I'm tired of living like a dog.' "

Scientific surveys of ghetto attitudes bear out a reporter's impression that the climate of opinion, even among less-deprived Negroes, is one in which rioters may find sympathy and at least tacit support.

PSYCHOLOGICAL NEED

Aside from calling attention to their grievances and serving as an outlet for their anger, rioting may fill another deep-seated psychological need for American Negroes. Several years ago, a French Negro psychiatrist named Frantz Fanon wrote a book called "The Wretched of The Earth," in which he propounded the idea that "violence is a cleansing force" for a man accustomed to being treated as a second-class citizen.

"It frees him from his inferiority complex, and makes him fearless and restores his self-respect," said Mr. Fanon.

Mr. Fanon's book has been translated into English and widely circulated in America by black power groups. Its impact is plain to anyone who talks to ghetto residents. In Detroit, even as the flames still licked the ruins of their neighborhoods, I encountered Negroes who took a grisly kind of civic pride in the fact that "our riot was bigger than Watts."

Several Negro clergymen and youth workers said it has become a badge of manhood for ghetto youths to go to jail for flouting Whitey's ideas of law, order and property rights.

Another indication that rioting may be an assertion of long-suppressed Negro malehood is contained in a report from the Lemberg Center for the Study of Violence at Brandeis University, Waltham, Mass. It shows that "riots are more likely to break out in Negro communities with a large proportion of newly-arrived Southerners."

This suggests that Negroes who have been subjected to fear and indignity in Alabama or Mississippi may compensate by throwing rocks and setting fires in Detroit or Newark.

THE REASON WHY

The Negroes who are rioting have specific grievances which they're eager to spell out to anyone who'll really listen.

I've listened to hundreds of them in the past two weeks. And the words were strikingly similar.

The ghetto Negro's Number One complaint is his difficulty in getting a job—not just menial work sweeping out a warehouse or picking tomatoes, but a good job that pays him enough to live in reasonable comfort. If you explain that he's not qualified for a skilled job because he has inadequate education, he'll remind you that it was Whitey who kept him, until recently at least, in segregated and second-rate schools.

Recent studies by the U.S. Department of Labor indicate that fewer than half the Negro men in a typical urban ghetto have full-time jobs paying as much as $60 a week. Four out of ten have no regular jobs of any kind. Unemployment is particularly severe among younger males—the group that is supplying most of the manpower for riots. Two years before Newark exploded in rioting, an official commission warned that 10,000 unemployed youngsters between the ages of 16 and 21 were walking the streets.

Housing is the second great grievance. "Despite all of the government programs that we hear about, the actual housing conditions of most urban Negroes are still deplorable," said Loftus Carson, of the Monroe County Human Relations Commission in Rochester, N.Y.

"Slum landlords are getting outrageous rentals for crumbling, rat-infested dwellings that are unfit for human habitation."

POLICE BRUTALITY

"Police brutality" is a third complaint frequently heard in the ghetto. If you pin them down to specifics, you find that a relatively small number of Negroes have personally experienced, or witnessed, actual brutality in the sense of police beating helpless people in custody. But a much larger percentage say that they, or people whom they know, have been insulted or treated with a degree of rudeness which white people rarely experience at the hands of law enforcement officers.

Outside a pool hall in Toledo, a 24-year-old Negro spat in disgust when he was asked about the black community's relations with police.

"Whenever they come down here, they call us (obscenities)," he said, employing one of the more revolting terms in our language. "If you're just standing on the street corner, talking to a friend aobut your date last night, they come along and shout for you to 'bust it up and move on.' "

Another young Negro chimed in:

"And if you don't trot fast enough to suit them, they get out and stick-whip you."

Toledo officials deny this and say that the city's police have displayed wisdom and restraint in coping with racial incidents.

Which version is closer to the truth? I can only report that in every ghetto I visited, a majority of Negroes seemed to regard the police as their enemy.

Often, the complaint is not that police are too aggressive, but that they are indifferent to crimes in which Negroes are victims.

It is also widely believed in the ghetto—with what justice it is difficult to tell—that Negro residential areas are discriminated against in other municipal services, including garbage collection, welfare programs, recreational facilities and fire protection.

Next to police and landlords, the favorite villians of ghetto residents are white storekeepers.

"They know we have to buy from them, because it's too hard to take a bus out to the big supermarkets in the white neighborhoods, and the downtown stores won't give us credit anyway," said a Negro auto worker who lives on Detroit's West Side.

"So they jack up prices and sell stale food and factory-reject clothes and other junk And if you have to buy on time, the carrying charges just eat you up."

WHAT CAN BE DONE

The next question is what can be done?

It is easier to find causes for the black uprising than it is to devise remedies.

There is no simple and sure solution. It will take a combination of measures, swiftly undertaken, to head off a national disaster.

The immediate necessity is to maintain public order. However deep the grievances which inspire it, rioting is a destructive act which hurts innocent people of both races, and jeopardizes the very fabric of civilization. As President Johnson said in his TV address July 28, "there is no American right to loot stores or to burn buildings or to fire rifles from rooftops . . . that is crime and crime must be dealt with forcefully and swiftly and certainly, under law."

Law enforcement officials have learned some painful lessons from past riots. One is that it takes a very finely balanced mixture of firmness and restraint to cope with a racial incident in the ghetto tinderbox.

If police get too tough too soon, it's like throwing gasoline on a fire. But if they lean too far in the opposite direction—as they did in Detroit, when they watched looters without trying to stop them—they invite a swift spread of disorder.

It has also been made clear that calling out the National Guard is not always an adequate solution. In some places, such as Cambridge, Md., Guard units have handled riot situations with great skill. In others, such as Newark and Detroit, it has been all too obvious that many Guardsmen have had very little military experience and riot training, whatever.

Untrained youths do not turn into battle-wise soldiers merely by putting on a pair of fatigues and a helmet. Skittish under fire, they are apt to respond to a single sniper shot—or even a firecracker—by spraying rifle and machine gun bullets at everything that moves. I feel strongly about this because I nearly got shot one night in Detroit when police and Guardsmen began shooting at a sniper or snipers whom they couldn't locate. Other bystanders, including a four-year-old child in an apartment and a woman tourist standing at a motel window, were killed.

There was a striking contrast between the West Side of Detroit patrolled by the National Guard and the East Side in which the seasoned paratroopers of the Regular Army were posted. The paratroopers never fired wildly. When a sniper opened up, they located the building he was in, surrounded it, went in and dug him out the hard way—without jeopardizing all the other residents by spattering the windows with bullets.

The lesson that Detroit Mayor Jerome Cavanaugh drew was that there should be a force of trained Federal troops available to big cities as soon as a riot begins. While President Johnson has not indorsed that idea, he has ordered the National Guard to begin training its men in riot control.

The FBI also is distributing to police departments a manual on riot control which includes badly needed advice on how to handle snipers.

Considered essential to future riot control is the legislation which has been pending in Congress ever since President Kennedy's assassination to impose curbs on the sale of guns and pistols.

"This country has to act to control firearms," Atty. Gen. Ramsey Clark said. "If Newark and Detroit don't demonstrate that necessity, nothing can."

INDEFINITE SIEGE

If armed repression, however efficient, is America's only response to the Negro uprising, its cities may be in for an indefinite siege of guerilla warfare.

"The aimless violence and destruction can be contained through military means, but only drastic changes in the life of the poor will provide the kind of order and stability that Americans desire," said Dr. King.

President Johnson expressed a similar view: "The only genuine, long-range solution lies in an attack upon the conditions that breed despair and violence."

Although no one can now envision all of the details of the required solution, it is already evident that it will involve a mammoth commitment of national resources, vastly exceeding anything the Administration or Congress has yet dared to propose.

Vice President Humphrey, trying to suggest the magnitude of the response needed, speaks of a "Marshall Plan" for urban America. The cost will be modest compared to the sums which the United States will need to expend if it seriously intends to seek a "genuine, long-range solution" of the ghetto's problems. But the cost of not solving those problems would be incalculably greater, solely in financial terms, not to mention lives.

Mayor Ivan Allen Jr. of Atlanta, has urged an increase of $30 billion a year in Federal spending for housing programs, job training, improvement of slum schools, and antipoverty projects which are directly beneficial to ghetto residents.

Many experts agree with Mayor Allen that it will take a massive step-up in Federal spending, on the order of 20 to 40 billion dollars a year, to make any real dent in the ghetto's problems.

COMPARED TO VIET

Some have pointed out that the money needed for this war against despair is approximately equal to the amount the United States is spending in Vietnam and on the effort to send a man to the moon.

Sensitive to this comparison, President Johnson asserted firmly that this country is "rich enough" to deal with its domestic problems "without surrendering our interests abroad."

There are no signs that Congress, in its present mood, will vote even a fraction of the funds proposed by Mayor Allen and others. On the contrary, Congress seems bent on curtailing even the "war on poverty" now under way. While the ruins of Newark were still smoldering, the House rejected—with jocular debate and whoops of laughter—an administration bill that would have allocated $40 million to control the infestations of rats—an important source of ghetto misery.

"Only a mammoth program can head off the developing trend toward revolution," Dr. Jack E. Dodson, associate professor of sociology at the University of Houston, told UPI. "But in the current context of American politics, I don't seriously think changes on the necessary scale wil be made.

"The United States is on the verge of being ripped apart. If we continue on our present course, I foresee a time when Negro slum areas will become reservations encircled by para-military police forces to maintain order."

Dr. Dodson hopes he will be proved wrong. And in that hope he is not alone.

VA Secretary Gets International Title

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 9, 1967

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, Minnesota is a verdant, naturally air-conditioned paradise where 14,000 fish-filled lakes reflect the clear sparkling blue of unpolluted skies. Majestic forests from the north march down to meet the rich green agricultural midlands. Pockets of iron ore, nickel, granite, and building stone intersperse the forest and farm lands. Prosperous industrial centers serving as gateways to the sea, a thousand miles to the northeast and a thousand miles to the south, provide happy employment for an ambitious population.

This, indeed, must have been the land of Genesis: "And God saw everything that he had made, and behold, it was very good."

Yet with all of these natural attributes, our North Star State considers its people as its greatest asset and the low record of rejection by selective service affirms this claim.

Mr. Speaker, today I would like to give recognition to one particular Minnesotan, a Veterans' Administration secretary, the only Government employee, mind you, ever to be named International Secretary of the Year, Miss Mary Ann Seibert, a constituent of mine from St. Cloud, in the Minnesota Sixth Congressional District.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert in the RECORD the following article which appeared in the St. Cloud Daily Times of July 14, 1967:

A St. Cloud Secretary is today one in more than 26,000. She is Mary Ann Seibert, 729 6th Ave. N., who was named International Secretary of the Year in Toronto, Canada, Thursday afternoon.

Miss Seibert, who is secretary to Dr. S. B. Lindley, director of the Veterans Administration Hospital here, was picked by the International Secretaries Assn., from a field of professional secretaries from all over the world.

She has worked at the VA Hospital here since 1954, before that was employed with a local granite firm and another government office. She is a native of St. Cloud and has a number of relatives living here.

Miss Seibert is the first government secretary to receive such an honor and the first to come from the Midwest.

She is a charter member of the St. Cloud Quarry Chapter of the National Secretaries Assn., and is a past president. Quarry Chapter has 24 members and is one of the smaller chapters in the international association, a member here said today.

To win the honor, Miss Seibert competed with every professional secretary in the International Secretaries Assn., which includes chapters in the United States, Canada, Europe, South America and Africa.

She was selected to represent the 13-state Northwest District in the competition in mid-June. Before that she was named for the Minnesota-North Dakota Division and the St. Cloud Chapter.

Selection of the secretary of the year at all levels, including the international, is based on a point system. A possible 50 points is earned from education, experience, active participation in NSA programs and projects and CPS (certified professional secretary) status.

Another possible 50 points is earned by appearing before a panel of three judges, one from management, education and secretarial profession. Judges award points on answers to three questions, plus appearance and poise during questioning.

The international competition was reduced to five candidates for the title before the 22nd convention began in Toronto Tuesday.

Closing the "Business Gap" in the Cold War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 9, 1967

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, recently my friend and constituent, William H. Rentschler, president of Martha Washington Kitchens, Inc., entered a winning article in the Schick Co. contest entitled, "Closing the 'Business Gap' in the Cold War." Mr. Rentschler's article sounds an overdue warning signal to American business to become more realistic and more active in promoting awareness of the Soviet bloc threat against free-world private enterprise and freedom.

I commend the article to my colleagues in the House and to every representative of American business—including both management and labor. I hope also that it will spur the Nation to the action which Mr. Rentschler has recommended in order that free-world private enterprise and humanity may emerge the victors in the continuing cold war.

CLOSING THE "BUSINESS GAP" IN THE COLD WAR

A 22-POINT PROGRAM

(By William H. Rentschler)

A nation assaulted from without strikes back to defend itself.

A tiny village under siege marshalls all its manpower and fights grimly for survival. Its people unite unquestioningly in a common cause.

It has always been so.

But the Cold War is different.

Often it seems not a war at all. Our nation prospers and plays. There is much affluence and the endless "pursuit of happiness." There is little sense of commitment.

And yet this Twentieth Century Cold War—strange and deadly, baffling and insidious—overshadows in its import all other wars in mankind's history.

Its end can be a world in bondage and despair.

It can create ashes and obliterate civilization.

Or it can result in a better world, in the extension of freedom to every land on the surface of the planet Earth.

The outcome—hopefully, frighteningly—is pretty much in our hands. America leads the Free World. This nation stands as freedom's beacon, as its protector, as an oasis of plenty, a garden of hope.

Only we can influence favorably and decisively the direction and outcome of the Cold War. No other nation on the side of freedom and right has the power and will to shape the course of this conflict.

No one denies our awesome power. But as for the will, the determination, the commitment, the sense of purpose—these are not always so clear.

Major elements of our society, some of our foremost leaders, walk hesitantly, uncertainly, less than confident of our rightness, unsure of our purpose, sometimes fearful, awed, depressed, despairing, frequently downright disinterested, preoccupied with a thousand other, lesser things, frustrated by an inability to force a short-term solution to a perplexing long-term challenge.

If it is true that only America among all the nations has, in the final analysis, the potential to bring the Cold War to a satisfactory and fruitful conclusion, it is equally true that the American business community has greater potential than any other segment of our society for exerting new, positive, and constructive influence on the direction and outcome of this "war of wars."

Today there is a yawning "business gap" in the Cold War.

Basically, government fashions, controls, and executes America's Cold War role and posture.

Business, when it worries about the Cold War at all, concerns itself chiefly with the Cold War's relation to the state of the economy, to its impact on particular industries, to such matters as taxes, defense contracts, labor supply, and inflation. Business generally does not take the "larger view."

Yet in reality, business is the only private segment of our society which is strategically positioned to influence significantly this nation's role in, and thus the direction and outcome of, the Cold War. No other segment has the scope, the resources, the cohesion, the probable long-range interest.

Business spans all America, and America "listens" to business. The business of America is *still* business. All of America's multitudes—young and old, black and white, Protestant, Catholic, and Jew, city-dweller and farmer, laborer and executive, housewife and student, teacher and civil servant, doctor and scientist—have a measurable stake in America's free enterprise system, and depend heavily on a thriving ascending economy.

Business, almost by definition, is capable of tough, hard-headed realism, clear thinking, skill in organizing big projects, long-term planning, adherence to clearly-defined objectives, and not infrequently, deep commitment to principle. Business, too, collectively and in some cases individually, is able to commit substantial resources—both men and money—to ventures it chooses to take on or sponsor.

These tools and talents can and should be combined by business to provide vigorous, meaningful Cold War leadership.

America's business community—despite some faltering first steps by a comparative few of the larger, publicly-held companies—has not mobilized its collective strength and resources, nor in fact, has it taken the time and effort and careful thought needed to define in any coherent fashion its possible role in influencing the direction and outcome of the Cold War.

To continue to ignore or skirt or avoid or reject this task is at once unwise, unenlightened, cowardly, and potentially even suicidal.

The American people must come to understand the Cold War as a subtle yet titanic and very real struggle for the minds of men, not only worldwide, but very much within the boundaries of these United States as well. If we are to lead the Free World, our people—as well as a handful of leaders—*must* comprehend the nature of the Cold War.

The issues and answers, laid bare, are reasonably clear and understandable, but often they are shrouded in fog and mist, vagueness and confusion. Some deride the very idea of the Cold War as outmoded. They dismiss it as passe. They tell us that we are backward and belligerent if we claim that the Cold War continues to exist. There are even those faintheurts among us who shudder when we use the word "enemy" to describe our Cold War adversaries.

Business is the only group which can, and is even remotely likely to disperse the fog and present the hard, cold facts of the Cold War in any realistic perspective.

It is our national government, of course, which must finally decide and execute America's Cold War strategy and policies.

But a popularly-elected government has enormous deficiencies in conducting such a campaign.

Government, where possible, seeks to avoid any clear-cut commitment to specific long-term objectives in the foreign policy field.

Government, for political and diplomatic reasons, seeks to preserve its maneuverability.

Government bends before political winds. Administrations pass. Philosophies change with the rise of new leaders.

All this tends to dissipate government's sense of unwavering purpose, and policies fluctuate.

So government walks a crooked path.

But those who prosecute the Cold War from beyond our shores are endlessly patient, undeviating in their purpose of world dominance. Their short-term strategies may vary, but their goals remain constant, while we vacillate and wobble and wonder, blow hot and cold.

The resources of our government in telling the American people its version of the Cold War are unlimited. But the story is often incomplete, inaccurate, and garnished with unwarranted reassurance, half-truth, and occasionally outright falsehood. Only business has the skill, capacity, sophistication, and perhaps determination to project with even remotely comparable effectiveness a truly realistic and objective picture of the Cold War's infinite complexity.

The American people do not understand the Cold War. They regard it as remote and far removed from them. They are not stirred to sacrifice and dedication as in a "shooting" war, where their homes and families are overtly threatened. They fail to grasp the nature of the Cold War enemy. They have no Hitler to detest. They are unsophisticated and untrained in interpreting the methods and strategy, the propaganda and purposes of the foe.

There is today a crying, pressing need for Cold War education. Uncertainty about our role in the Cold War has never been more widespread.

The American citizenry is increasingly puzzled, quite frequently deluded by the subtle shift in Cold War emphasis since the bloodier days of Stalin and Khrushchev. The crafty new leaders in the Kremlin, skilled propagandists all, assiduously seek to create a somewhat warmer, at times almost amiable "New Look" for Communism.

To all those millions here and around the world who fervently wish for peace, they dangle tempting lures and speak honeyed words. More and more, we think we see shafts of light piercing the hitherto impenetrable Iron Curtain. We hope and pray it is so. We clutch at patently insincere peace overtures. We feel sure the Soviets will respond favorably to our child-like gestures of good faith. We shrug off past duplicity. We are inclined to ignore the stark lessons of history.

It is at this point—now—that dependable Cold War education, hard-headed analysis are vital. Surely Communism is changing, say many Americans with characteristic hope and faith and optimism—changing the old ways, throwing off the shackles of a grim past, entering at last the portals of the civilized world, questing for brotherhood among its fellow nations. What is this "New Look" promoted by the canny propagandists in the Kremlin, by their unwitting dupes around the world, by well-meaning apologists for Communism, by unthinking citizens in our very midst?

THIS IS THE NEW LOOK

The blood baths and purges are remnants of the past, we are told, long gone and forgotten by all who seek peace in our time. Terror no longer stalks the streets of Communist cities. Russian Communism is evolving into a system which—while not exactly admirable or even impressive by our standards—is hardly as bad as we have been led to believe. Look what Communism has done for the Russian people since the end of World War II. Surely they are far better off today than at any time in their tragic, tumultuous history.

But look again

The Berlin Wall still stands, cruelly dividing a proud city, half-slave, half-free—and millions more throughout the civilized world live in bondage under the cruel boot of Russian Communism. Compared to the peoples of the Free World, Rusian citizens still lead a meager, threadbare, luxury-less existence.

THIS IS THE NEW LOOK

The Soviets are moving toward free enterprise, they tell us. Russia has introduced into its rigidly-controlled economy the profit motive and incentive system, hallmarks of American material progress, with praiseworthy results. Plant managers today are being urged to compete in terms of efficiency with other factories, greater emphasis is being placed on color and design, and goods are being produced to please and tempt the Russian consumer. Eventually, the argument goes, Russia will become a capitalist society and the great gulf between us will fade into insignificance. The old order changeth, and it is only a matter of time until Russia adopts a truly Western outlook.

But look again

All the profits—if any—go to the State. The plant manager is told what to produce and how much. Military needs come first. There is no free enterprise system or anything like it unless the Kremlin ordains it.

THIS IS THE NEW LOOK

Cultural exchanges and sporting events endear the Russian people to open-hearted Americans, who readily sense the common hopes and fears that bind all humankind. We thrill to their ballet dancers, their musicians, their artists and actors. We are impressed by their athletic prowess and the outgoing good sportsmanship of Russian athletes. So their system, we say, can't be all bad.

But look again

Their artists and athletes still defect when the chance arises, for they are eager to cast off the chains of oppression and enjoy the fruits of freedom. Said Soviet author Vallery Tarsis, as he inhaled New York's free air: "Stalin told us this kind of life would come to Russia in the next century. I dreamed it would come in the 22nd Century. It is unbelievable in our time there can be a place like America."

THIS IS THE NEW LOOK

Russian intellectuals, poets, writers, and professors make a valiant effort to "buck" the system, to speak out and express bold and often bitter criticism. Fragments of this dissent are permitted to filter through the Iron Curtain as "proof" that freedom of thought and expression does exist in Communist lands. Maybe, we say hopefully, they are relaxing the rigidity of their censorship. It will only take more time.

But look again

Intellectuals are still cast into prison or exile when they overstep a thin, nebulous, and undefined line in criticizing or lampooning the omnipotent State.

THIS IS THE NEW LOOK

Russia and Red China are at each other's throats, and we look on with satisfaction, type-casting the Chinese as the "bad guys" and the Russians as the "good guys" in this intra-mural struggle for dominance within the Communist. Look, we say, Russia is taking the "soft" line and they provide a buffer against our "real" enemies, the fierce and barbarous Red Chinese.

But look again

Russia continues its methodical campaign of subversion and works quietly in most instances with the Chinese Reds in ever extending the Communist sphere of domination. The real point of contention between Russia and Red China, points out Dr. Walter Judd, former Congressman, medical missionary in China, and specialist on Far Eastern affairs, is whether they will hasten the decline of capitalism by armed aggression, or whether they will mix subversion with patience until we topple from our own internal excesses, and finally, whether they will then cremate us or embalm us. The outcome of such a macabre debate can hardly be comforting to the Western world.

These are reasons why a concerted, massive campaign of Cold War education is imperative. We must effectively refute the subtle and persuasive propaganda barrage being launched against us, and we must frame a continuing, long-term response which will awaken the world to the rightness, morality, and essential unselfishness of our Cold War position.

It is obvious that the American people need guidance. They crave facts. If they know, if they have these facts, they will decide rationally and wisely when they are called upon to decide, for they have always responded with good sense and courage in such an atmosphere.

It is the first responsibility of business to offer this guidance, to provide these facts, to define the nature and scope and importance of the Cold War.

Business must conduct a massive campaign to dispel the myths and vanquish the cliches of the Cold War.

Business must mobilize national opinion behind sound, rational, clear-cut Cold War objectives.

Business leadership must state the case boldly, unwaveringly, repeatedly, and, where possible, collectively, to achieve maximum impact.

Business must help renew this nation's faith in its cause, in the rightness of its purpose, in ourselves as a proud, compassionate, and honorable people.

Business must inculcate in the American ctiizenry a sense of purpose and dedication—and kindle in our Cold War effort the spirit of a great crusade.

Business, without assuming the posture of the predatory hawk, must seek long-term victory for the cause of freedom.

This is no task for the short-winded. The marathon race we run may take many years, perhaps half a century or even more. We must pace ourselves. And we must never waver until we cross the finish line—first.

Ours is a noble, basic, very simple goal: the extension of freedom. We want for other human beings the chance to exercise the God-granted right to determine their own destines. We want to help them secure freedom from want and disease, freedom from fear and oppression. We have no wish for empire of gold, no wish to overwhelm any nation with sheer military might, no wish to impose our ideas or our methods or our form of government on these others.

If business states its dedication to the principle of freedom for all mankind, and pursues this cause with passion, a certain nobility will crown its efforts. Inevitably this will offset some of the more unflattering facets of the corporate reputation and, coincidentally, strengthen the broad cause of free enterprise.

Specifically, how can business influence the course and outcome of the Cold War?

Before suggesting specific programs which business can undertake, and specific areas in which business can contribute and work, it is important to consider the background of business participation in the public arena and to set forth a few basic guidelines.

Above all, business, in this momentous undertaking, must avoid temporizing and pussy-footing in defining and stating its Cold War convictions. Business must be willing to take bold stands, to state challenging positions, in short to be controversial where controversy is inevitable and perhaps even necessary.

This will not always be easy, but business cannot be effective in this vital role if it "hamstrings" itself by fretting endlessly about whether everybody will agree. That they will not is as certain as the sunrise.

Business at the outset must summon the courage to spell out its Cold War programs, its strategy, and its objectives just as clearly, concisely, and unmistakably as it would define and insist on meeting its corporate sales and profit objectives. If the approach is vague and nebulous, it will fall far short of even its most modest hopes and expectations and never really contribute anything significant and meaningful.

There is here a desperate need for "business statesmanship," a term widely used but a quality notably lacking in all but a relatively few corporations today. We can cite exceptions, and because they are so few, they loom disproportionately large and are widely publicized in the business press and business community.

The true business statesman is the corporate executive with the raw guts, the resolve the sense of dedication to advocate the course that he believes to be right even if it is unpopular. The business statesman is the leader who will stick to his guns in the face of government pressure, consumer boycott, and shareholder grumbling. He is surely not the businessman who readily bends before every breeze, methodically chooses the safe course, and carefully seeks out and adopts the noncontroversial position, for this is hardly the way we will proceed toward and eventually attain demanding, realistic Cold War objectives.

Nor is the business statesman one who seeks to roll back history, retreat to the 19th Century, repeal the social legislation of three decades, and define as some sort of Communist plot every undertaking at variance with his own hide-bound views. For this attitude and this image surely will scuttle before it leaves the dock any thoughtful, wide-ranging program of Cold War education proposed by the business community.

Labor has been infinitely more effective than business in the area of domestic political action because it outlines its objectives unmistakably, hard-headedly, in words of one syllable, and then follows up with a tough, no-nonsense campaign to meet them. Labor is strictly "activist" and aggressive; business considerably more theoretical and timid in the public arena.

Compare the approaches of these to major segments of our society:

Where labor hires paid political organizers, business runs full-page ads in the Wall Street Journal.

Where labor pumps dollars into crucial marginal Congressional districts, business kicks in to vague "Committees-for-This-or-That" which often lack real grass roots political punch.

Where labor *tells* its friends and members and beholden legislators how to vote, business relies on the "soft sell," unwilling to run the risk of offending anyone, and often doesn't even convey its views at all.

Labor leaders, educators, government officials, even clergymen, speak out forcefully and pointedly on the big national issues. Businessmen tend to speak collectively and quite impersonally through their more anonymous trade associations, whose viewpoints often are brushed aside and discounted as prejudiced and self-serving.

Labor speaks its mind on national goals, social legislation, and other broad matters far beyond its traditional concern with wage and working conditions. Labor sees as its province every aspect of national policy. Businessmen, despite some prominent exceptions, generally tend to be more parochial, often more technical, and rarely express themselves thoughtfully on great national and international issues.

To the average observer, to the man in the street, to the newspaper editor and reporter, the businessman all too frequently seems motivated strictly by matters of self-interest like taxes, tariffs, wage-and-hour laws, labor legislation. Too seldom does he appear to be genuinely concerned about humanitarian matters or global affairs. Too seldom does the businessman express the larger view, and all too rarely does he bother to state his beliefs to the community at large through church, service, and welfare organizations, even though these groups in many cases would provide large, admiring, and generally sympathetic audiences.

Long before he came into the Cabinet, the very articulate Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, John W. Gardner, stated most precisely a principal failing of businessmen and other leaders:

"Very few of our most prominent people take a really large view of the leadership assignment. Most of them are simply tending the machinery of that part of society to which they belong. The machinery may be a great corporation or a great government agency or a great law practice or a great university. These people may tend it very well indeed, but they are not pursuing what the total society needs; they have not developed a strategy as to how it can be achieved and they're not moving to accomplish it."

His observation applies particularly to a strategy for prosecuting and winning the Cold War.

Too many businessmen are "simply tending the machinery," as Secretary Gardner puts it, without taking a "really large view" of the need for a grand strategy to achieve our objectives in this frustrating Cold War, whose impact on our civilization, however difficult to dramatize, almost surely overshadows the long-term impact of any past "shooting" war and, for that matter, any other present national or international challenge.

How can the corporate chief executive—that lonely fellow who guides the destiny of a private business venture, answering in turn to his Directors, his shareholders, his employees, his customers, and the community at large—most effectively commit certain of his company's resources to assure that freedom's torch shall continue to burn here and perhaps some day in other, less fortunate lands as well?

From my vantage-point as President of a relatively small, closely-held company, I am convinced there is much of a positive constructive nature that American business can do. Some of what I shall propose here is by no means new, or it is novel only in part or in emphasis. Some is an extension of programs and ideas already advanced and in some cases underway. Some, hopefully, is new and challenging.

My proposals are not designed strictly for or beamed solely at the corporate giants, few in number, which dominate the commercial scene in terms of sales, assets, profits, and employees. Based on my own first-hand knowledge, many facets of this program are applicable to and practical for thousands of small and medium-sized firms whose participation would greatly increase the prospects for large-scale success in achieving Cold War objectives.

It is my firm conviction that the program outlined broadly in this essay—if elements of it are adopted widely by enough companies, large and small—has the potential to change for the long-term good the very course of the Cold War and lead us toward the sort of Cold War victory that would benefit all mankind.

First of all, each participating firm—whether employing 100 people or 100,000—should assign one man direct responsibility for that company's "Cold War Program." In the 400 or so larger companies which have Public Affairs Departments, the chief Public Affairs officers logically could be assigned to coordinate within his department an ambitious slate of Cold War activities. In smaller companies, a top corporate officer or other key employee, in some cases the President himself, could be designated to carry the ball. In any event, the responsible Cold War "general" in each company, for best results, should report directly to the chief executive officer on this particular assignment.

A specific program, with clearly-defined objectives, should be developed and agreed on, a budget should be authorized, and regular progress reports should be required. Any less formal program is likely to yield minimal results and evaporate within six months. On the other hand, a businesslike, no-nonsense approach—such as that which might attend the launching of any major, new corporate venture—would serve notice from the start that this is no casual, experimental whim or personal plaything of the "boss," but rather a deadly serious program which is expected to produce serious results according to plan.

Here, then, is that program:

1. Business should give prompt and overwhelming support to the Freedom Studies Center, possibly the most important single

development in the presently limited campaign to close the Cold War educational "gap." The success of this so-called "West Point of psycho-political warfare" will be dependent largely on business support. Token contributions are not the answer. What is needed are major pledges over a period of years, depending on the size and financial strength of the particular company, but certainly comparable in amount to major corporate grants to leading educational institutions. Companies should also consider an annual fund-raising campaign among employees for the Freedom Studies Center, along the lines of the Community Fund drive, thus giving rank-and-file employees the pride and satisfaction of participating personally in this noble and important effort. At the proper time, each company should send to the residence school of the Freedom Studies Center for special training the key employee charged with responsibility for the success of that company's Cold War program. Certainly nothing is more vital at this moment in our history than the rapid expansion of the Freedom Studies Center to provide training in Cold War strategies to the maximum number of qualified Cold War "combatants" and to develop competent leadership for the long, tedious struggle which stretches before us.

2. Business should use all its energy and practical political skill to force a favorable vote in Congress on the establishment of a so-called United States Freedom Academy. Business can and should be instrumental in marshalling public support to pry free from Sen. J. William Fulbright's Foreign Relations Committee the legislation authorizing this crucial adjunct to the overall Cold War effort. Large companies should assign their most effective Washington representatives to start rounding up the necessary support to dislodge this measure and bring it to a favorable vote. Key executives personally acquainted with influential Congressional leaders should make specific contacts on this particular bill. The need for such a training center in the art of political warfare is clear. The idea has long been supported by many top national legislators from both parties. The job now is to break the log-jam and force action. Business can take a lead role in making a reality this vital Cold War academy, which would equip American personnel overseas to counter effectively the efforts of Communist personnel trained intensively in the art of subversion, political, and psychological warfare.

3. Business should endow and sponsor "Cold War" professorships on college campuses and seek to establish "Cold War" courses as regular elements of the curriculum at the high school level as well. In some cases, individual companies themselves could endow such professorships; in other instances, smaller companies could join together to endow a "Cold War" professorship at a college in their immediate area. Business should encourage educational institutions to develop the Cold War as a historical specialty, just as some professors presently make a career of studying and interpreting the Civil War, the American Revolution, World Wars I and II, and other great wars throughout world history. The Cold War must get this sort of attention if we expect its importance and true impact to register on the populace at large.

4. Business should take the lead in stimulating the preparation of a frank, scholarly, objective and understandable text-book which traces the history and explains the origins and significance of the Cold War. Such a text could be periodically revised, updated, reprinted, and distributed widely for use on college campuses, in high schools, and by adult study groups.

5. Business should offer scholarships to students willing, anxious, and qualified to make the Cold War a major field of study in seeking a degree in political science, government, history, education, or even economics or a foreign language. Such students, on graduation, would be soundly grounded in the history and nature of the Cold War and might well be in a major position in private or public life to influence soundly the citizenry-at-large on matters relating to the Cold War.

6. Business should develop and sponsor carefully-documented, mass appeal TV and radio programs on important aspects and episodes of the Cold War. Serious consideration should be given to a continuing, 13-week "Cold War" documentary series for network TV, perhaps sponsored jointly by an "honor roll" of participating companies. Business should also develop and run in daily newspapers, college papers, house organs, trade journals, fraternal and service club publications, national consumer magazines, and other print media thoughtful, readable advertisements devoted to Cold War education. Ad campaigns of this sort should not be thrown together haphazardly, but should be worked out painstakingly with the corporate advertising agency and granted a specific beginning-of-year budget allocation, as part of the overall corporate ad program.

7. Business should support and participate in the activities of organizations and agencies (such as the American Security council, Radio Free Europe, the National Captive Nations Committee, and others) whose effectiveness is demonstrable and whose educational programs, public utterances, and continuing activities encourage sound, constructive, and realistic attitudes and actions in regard to the Cold War. Such support by business should not be on a scattershot basis, but, once a careful and satisfactory investigation of such an organization has been made, support and participation should be both ample and constructive, with responsible personnel being urged and in some cases assigned to take a role in the affairs of that organization.

8. Business should develop, procure, and distribute Cold War literature, films, and other informational and educational material on a continuing, unrelenting basis to employees, stockholders, customers, and the community at large. This approach to Cold War education should be a carefully thought-out part of the overall corporate employee and shareholder relations programs, and should be featured regularly in employee publications, mailings to employees, paycheck and dividend inserts, stockholder communications, reading racks, and bulletin boards.

9. Business should sponsor more contests, similar to this one, which surely has sparked much serious, creative, and constructive thought. Such competitive events should be beamed specifically at students, hourly workers, doctors, and other groups within our society, to stimulate their thinking and to focus their attention on specific ways in which they and their associates and organizations could aid in the successful prosecution of the Cold War. Colleges, labor unions, medical societies, and other trade and professional organizations could be enlisted to help develop interest and co-sponsor such contests. Sponsoring firms—like Schick in this case—would contribute challenging prizes. Such contests might generate sound ideas from previously untapped brainpower.

10. Business should consider the establishment of local "truth squads" to refute and explain Cold War myths, misstatements, propaganda, and misinformation which are prevalent throughout the nation today. A Speakers Bureau could fill requests for specialists on Cold War topics and actually solicit speaking engagements from schools, service clubs, ladies clubs, fraternal orders, religious organizations, and other community groups. A large national company could develop such programs in the communities where its plants are located. One-plant companies could do the job in their headquarters cities. If this approach is pursued aggressively, the grassroots impact could be substantial.

11. Business should seek to encourage the establishment of "Cold War Strategy & Action Committees" within various business-oriented organizations, such as local Chambers of Commerce, Manufacturers Associations, and industry trade groups. Cold War symposiums, panels, exhibits, and speeches could be arranged as part of the agenda at annual conventions of these organizations, which invariably draw industry leaders, get widespread press coverage, and attract the attention of the communities where they are held.

12. Business should sponsor "Town Meetings"—open to the public—on the "clear and present dangers" of the Cold War. Such community seminars could be sponsored, underwritten, and promoted by local corporations in cooperation with local public officials, educators, and others who would share the credit and bask in the limelight as masters of ceremonies, co-sponsors, and participants. The theme might be along the lines of "They *Still* Want to Bury You," and at least one main speaker knowledgeable in various phases of the Cold War could be imported to highlight the affair. Such a "Town Meeting"—properly staged—could have dramatic shock effect on a slumbering community.

13. Business should make effective use of prestigious public forums in which top corporate officials serve as directors, officers, and program committee members to get across wherever possible an authoritative message on the Cold War. Such officials can be instrumental in proposing and actually obtaining well-informed speakers who will draw large, influential audiences and relate the unvarnished facts of the Cold War. Such organizations as the Executives Club, Economics Club, Council on Foreign Relations, Rotary, Kiwanis, and others of similar stature offer effective forums to convey this vital message. As a college or school trustee, the business executive may have opportunities to suggest a Cold War expert as a commencement speaker or special guest lecturer. Myriad opportunities along these lines are available to the corporate leader active in his community.

14. Business should work constructively and in practical, down-to-earth ways for the election of solid public officials who perceive and understand the gravity of the Cold War. Businessmen should make absolutely sure that candidates for Congress, the U.S. Senate, major state offices, school posts, and local legislative seats have sound attitudes toward the vigorous prosecution of a positive Cold War program. Business should determine where candidates stand on the Cold War, and then should give meaningful, all-out support to the right men and women. Nothing in this struggle is more important than a constructive, realistic attitude on the part of those key officials who will make the decisions, cast the votes, and guide the direction of national, state, and local policies. It is vitally important to know where a candidate stands—specifically—before he gets business support and *before* he gets elected.

15. Business should avoid unreasonably strengthening the financial condition, technical "know-how," and national strength of "enemy" nations even though this may involve in certain cases specific corporate sacrifice. The national interest should supersede the strictly personal or company interest. The idea of trade with Iron Curtain countries—especially Russia and Red China—as a means of lessening tension, creating goodwill, and demonstrating our "good faith" has a most appealing ring. But it is the sheerest delusion to think for a minute that these "offerings," however gratefully received, will change the ultimate grand objectives of the Communist foe.

Whether we ship them grain or machine tools, light bulbs or silk dresses, we aid their cause, sometimes freeing for "war" production the very equipment which otherwise would necessarily be employed to satisfy the "consumer" demand in that particular Iron Curtain nation. Business should resist the temptation to aid the enemy cause through trade, even when government pressure becomes intense. Business should spell out clearly the dangers of selling or trading with the Communists, even when the products involved appear on the surface to be harmless or humanitarian.

16. Business should use every means at its command to strengthen the domestic fibre of America, recognizing that a strong, solvent, self-reliant, dedicated, well-informed nation is best equipped to resist the subtle onslaught of Communism, which has long held that capitalism will collapse from within because of its own inherent weaknesses and deficiencies. This means that business should insist on a sound national fiscal posture and sensible domestic policies which seek to sustain and help those who are not able to help themselves because of illness, age, destitution and personal calamity, but which do not weaken the financial fabric of the nation by squandering tax dollars on impractical, unwise, and unnecessary projects.

17. Business should employ its regular corporate lobbyists to influence legislation bearing on carefully-considered, clearly-defined Cold War policy, just as lobbyists seek to influence legislation which directly affects the firms they represent. Such activity would necessarily require careful handling and would involve painstaking documentation and top-level corporate authorization. Business should concern itself as much with the survival of its nation as with the survival of its corporate entity.

18. Business collectively should establish a continuing national "Symposium on the Cold War" and sponsor, perhaps once every fifth year, an historic conference of unprecedented proportions and prestige on the Cold War, whose participants might include towering figures like Pope Paul, the President of the United States, General Eisenhower, former President Truman, Dean Acheson, U Thant, prominent educators, business statesmen, military leaders, and others. Such a "summit" conference would focus worldwide attention on the critical nature of the Cold War. It should include "down-to-earth" seminars on the hard nuts-and-bolts aspects of the Cold War, as well as the lofty, somewhat more philosophical counsel of the "big name" speakers. Business should take the lead in launching and shaping such a dramatic venture.

19. Business, through its most prominent individual and organizational "voices," should ask the President of the United States to appoint a Business Advisory Council on Cold War Policy, which would consult periodically with and present its collective views to the President, the Secretary of State, the National Security Council, and other key government officials. This would give the Administration an opportunity to tap the resources and viewpoints of a knowledgeable, concerned segment of the American society and would logically extend the influence of business beyond the strictly economic and commercial spheres. To be most effective, such a committee should include representatives of both large and small companies in diverse fields, but should not be so vast numerically as to be unwieldy. Such a Council, once selected by the President with the advice of the business community, should be independent, frank in expressing its views, and not bound in any way to "clear" its recommendations with trade associations, other business groups, and unrepresented firms. New blood and fresh viewpoints should be injected into the Council once a year, with an annual turnover of perhaps one-third of the total membership. Such an advisory "arm" could expose government officials to a new dimension of creative, constructive thought on Cold War strategy and policy.

20. Business should grant leaves-of-absence to and supplement or fully underwrite the salaries of stable, competent, well-grounded executives and technical personnel to serve in government and accept a variety of vital Cold War assignments throughout the world. Business should solicit opportunities for such men to serve their country in this way.

21. Business should also provide qualified personnel to assist in the development of locally-owned private enterprise in underdeveloped nations, to train foreign personnel in the techniques of management, production, and financial control, to expose foreigners to American "know-how" and to demonstrate the worth and soundness of American methods. Business should increasingly where feasible engage in joint corporate ventures abroad with foreign firms, particularly those lacking in technical competence, and modern management techniques. This can be a most effective means of demonstrating the essential superiority of the "free enterprise" approach in commerce and industry.

22. Business should take precautions against loosing in foreign lands any prototypes of the "ugly American." Companies with personnal stationed abroad should take pains to assure that their representatives literally become "good will ambassadors" for their country. Foreign-based personnel should be properly trained in the customs, mores, and tongues of their foreign "homes," and then expected to help spell out to the local populace American policy and objectives.

This, then, is a Cold War program for American business, a program with some elements for virtually every American company, large and small. By embarking now on such a program with zest and determination and a sense of mission, each American firm in its own way can contribute importantly to "closing the business gap in the Cold War."

Let us pray no historian one day will record that the United States of America—and so the Free World—succumbed at the very peak of its power because it failed to summon its collective resources—its might, its men, its moral rightness—against the terrible forces of depotism and darkness.

The American business community—celebrated everywhere for its skill and ingenuity, its energy and drive, its unmatched achievement in creating material wealth and well-being—is uniquely equipped and, hopefully, determined to help assure that future historians instead will credit this nation with extending freedom throughout the world.

This is the question we must answer: Are we as citizens and business men, less than two centuries after our Declaration of Independence was ratified, willing, as were its signers, to pledge to each other and all mankind our Lives, our Fortunes, and our Sacred Honor, so that freedom will not perish from the earth?

This is the challenge—at once grim and exciting—which American business must mobilize to meet in the seventh decade of the Twentieth Century.

Riots Are Profitable

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 9, 1967

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, murder, arson, and robbery in our land are seemingly explained away as tools for social progress.

Talk all they want—the riots, the bloodshed, and violence will not cease until profit is taken out of revolution.

The commotion—the unrest—the agitation started with compulsory social legislation and programs financed by the taxpayers.

My fellow colleagues and countrymen, violence—blackmail is being used as a new industry and it pays. And when blackmail becomes profitable none dare call it blackmail.

Basic physics teaches that force is stopped only by force. Revolutions are either stopped or they succeed. Analyze the street warfare to the no win defensive war in Vietnam.

Cut the funds off. Once the fuel supply disappears, the profit is removed.

I insert the Washington Sunday Star articles for August 4 and 6, an editorial from the Richmond, Va., News Leader, and Edith Kermit Roosevelt's column for August 5 in the RECORD:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, Aug. 6, 1967]

JOB SESSION PACKS 'EM IN: "PRIDE" SHOWS—AND SO DO THE KIDS

(By Woody West)

Kids by the hundreds overflowed the auditorium at Terrell Junior High School yesterday, rolled in waves down the hallways and trickled down the stairways.

The agenda at the first meeting of the newly formed Pride, Inc., had one item: Organization.

But this, as the youngsters—most of them between 14 and 18 years old—rumbled and crested among the aisles, seemed about as simple as formulating the first law of thermodynamics.

The program for Pride, Inc., was developed by Marion Barry and Rufus Mayfield. Funding of $300,000 for it was approved by the Labor Department last week.

Its aim is to provide jobs for youngsters for the 5-week duration of the grant. The youths will be employed in neighborhood cleanup projects, beautification and rat control.

The District made available 500 two-piece green work uniforms, with a bush-type belted jacket, and these were distributed yesterday. The rest of the youngsters should have their uniforms—which are heavy enough to make the next requirement for the program massive amounts of salt tablets—by next week.

The 600-odd youngsters whose uniforms and applications already have been processed will begin work tomorrow.

"So when you go tipping down those alleys tomorrow, looking cool in your green uniforms," Mayfield, chairman of the youthful 17-member board of directors, told the sea of faces in front of him, "in our terminology—not the kind the middle-class Negro uses—don't you jive, just hang in there.

"If you've got trouble in the team, talk to the man—don't jump up and hit him—because he's your brother."

"We're going to prove something to the white power structure," Catfish Mayfield told the cheering youngsters. "We're going to prove that we—some of us with arrest records—can stand up independently. We're going to show that black people can have pride."

Barry was introduced to the youngsters by Carroll Harvey, on loan as project director from the District Community Renewal Program office and who maintained order with bull elephant bellows of "freeze," as "a reasonable radical, a radical with a program."

"This program," Barry told the youngsters, "says that you have to respect your fellow man before you can have pride in yourself. This program says you have to have respect for your race before you can have pride in yourself."

Seventeen area supervisors—"the top cats"—will direct initially 121 team captains, each of whom will have seven youngsters under him. The youngest of those enrolled—with 14 the minimum age—will earn $56 a week. Team captains will make $80 weekly, with supervisors to be paid $100.

The District Health Department will train about 40 of the kids for a week in rodent control methods before they go on the street.

The Health Department also has supplied medical teams which made physical exams Thursday and Friday, with volunteers from Freedmen's Hospital on hand today.

The District's Work Permit Office supplied a team to expedite permits and the Social Security Administration has had personnel on hand to get Social Security numbers assigned, said David Rusk of the Urban League, also on loan to the project.

Word of the program came to the youngsters by way of newspapers and television, from friends, from neighborhood workers at area playgrounds.

One of the youths, Ricardo Brown, 14, stood hesitantly, his green uniform jacket billowing about his slight body, as the team captain drew up the rosters.

Ricardo, of 700 Kenilworth Ave. NE., said he had earned money occasionally by hauling groceries from the supermarket but had never had a job before.

What is he going to do with $56 a week?

"First, I'll give half to my mother—half my paycheck, I guess," he said with equal parts uncertainty and expectancy, "and then I'll get some school clothes."

[From the Shreveport (La.) Journal, Aug. 5, 1967]

Trained Agitators—Anatomy of Riots

(By Edith Kermit Roosevelt)

WASHINGTON.—The groundwork for the racial riots throughout our nation was systematically laid out at least three years ago by professional agitators. The pattern which evolved in Newark, N.J., requires close study since it is being repeated in other urban communities.

As far back as 1964, Tom Hayden, former president of the Students for a Democratic Society (SDS), this country's most important "new left" group, set up a cadre for revolutionary agitation. He formed the Newark Community Union Project which is part of SDS's arm called Economic Research and Action Project. This is the same Tom Hayden who traveled to Hanoi in December of 1965 with Herbert Aptheker, the well-known Communist Party official, and Staughton Lynd, the controversial former Yale professor. They and their colleagues have thus consistently been coordinating guerrilla operations abroad and at home against the United States.

Hayden quickly gathered about him a hard core of young professionals involved in "the activator vocation" as they refer to it. These included Corinna Fales who left Goucher College in 1964 and received training in an SDS project in Chester, Pa. In an April, 1967, issue of the National Guardian, a pro-Soviet operational organ, she said in referring to Newark, "this is the place I want to change."

Phil Hutchings, a field secretary for the Students Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC), was one of the original activists in Tom Hayden's Newark Community Union Project. On May 27, of this year, in a special article for the National Guardian, Hutchings said that SNCC will attempt to form "freedom organizations" in the North similar to the one which Stokely Carmichael built in Lowndes County, Ala. Hutchings described a protest by the Office of Economic Opportunity's People's Action Group and let readers know that other "activist groups" had arrived in Newark. These included the Black Liberation Center and SNCC.

Jesse Allen became the Negro chairman of Tom Hayden's National Community Union Project. Allen wears two hats, serving also as chairman of the Area Board No. 3, financed by the Office of Economic Opportunity. Until recently, these poverty projects enjoyed almost complete autonomy from the city government. This permitted the revolutionary planners to realize their aim of establishing a power base or so-called "counter communities" within the poverty program. Their short-range aim is to make ever escalating demands on our whole national system, keeping the pot constantly boiling. The long term aim of the insurgents is to establish "parallel institutions" or a shadow government prepared to seize power as the Washington Administration is rendered more and more ineffective.

Meanwhile, as Mrs. Betsy Osth points out in her newsletter (P.O. Box 448, Berryville, Va.), the insurgents are able to get financial support from the federal government as well as the tax-exempt foundations. Mrs. Osth recalled that Newark's police director Dominick A. Spina had sent a telegram last May to Sargent Shriver, director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, warning him that members of the city's anti-poverty agency were fomenting violence using mimeograph machines and sound trucks. Spina's warning was ignored by an Administration that has all along persistently refused to recognize Communist and Socialist conspiracy within our borders.

Shortly before the riots broke out, the outside agitators had progressed to a point where they were able to organize a large coalition which included non-Socialists as well as pro-Communists. Working through this coalition, the agitators exploited such issues as a medical school and an administrative appointment within the board of education.

These same tactics are being successfully applied in other cities, taking advantage of the official policy of evading Communist implications. SDS Bulletin, Vol. 4, No. 2, gave some specific examples:

Cleveland. "Welfare mothers won concessions from the board of education on lunch programs and helped challenge the legitimacy of a middle-class war on poverty commission."

Chicago. The SDS worked with the white community and "extracted numerous concessions from the welfare system." The group is "building coalitions with an independent union of case workers and with the Southern Christian Leadership Conference's first attempt to take power in a northern city."

Cairo, Ill. "The project has succeeded in getting a brutal police chief removed."

Oakland, Calif. "Hundreds of people will come to a community meeting that's barely been announced and they will also come to meetings of another welfare rights organization sponsored by DuBois clubs (described by FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover as "a Communist-inspired Marxist oriented group")."

All these incidents cannot be considered in isolation, of course. Their coordination here and abroad and their endless repetition are having an impact. This strategy was recently reiterated publicly by Stokely Carmichael, former chairman of SNCC, at the incendiary Havana sessions. He said:

"If we are going to make a reality of Che Guevara's words about making two or three more Vietnams it should be known that Detroit and Newark are at least two more."

[From the Richmond (Va.) News Leader, Aug. 4, 1967]

Conspiracy: Fact or Fiction?

In searching for a pattern in the recent urban riots, congressional committees and the President's blue ribbon commission will not have to look far. A certain link between black nationalists, including the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, and the anti-poverty program can be discovered after the evidence has been sifted.

The record shows many instances of the use of anti-poverty funds to finance demonstrations and other protest movements, for instance. Congressman Jim Gardner of North Carolina has criticized anti-poverty workers in Newark for creating tensions that resulted in the riot there. His charges were denied by Sargent Shriver, director of the Federal Office of Economic Opportunity, despite the existence of a telegram sent by Newark's police commissioner to Shriver May 25, 1967, asking the OEO to crack down on anti-poverty workers in Newark or face the result of "riots and anarchy."

However, Mr. Gardner was not just whistling Dixie; he has documented proof of his charges. An anti-poverty worker still on Newark's OEO payroll made an inflammatory speech not long before the riot broke out, in which he predicted that "there is going to be blood running in the streets of Newark like there has never been anywhere else in America." The congressman also has affidavits from trustees and workers for the community action program in Newark, in which they swear that other antipoverty workers had been involved in demonstrations and protest meetings that culminated in the Newark riot. Snipers in both Newark and Detroit were well trained for their roles.

An article in *Barron's* this week reviewed the record of the Federal OEO in financing known agitators in the anti-poverty program. The former head of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, Marion Barry, currently is on the payroll, at $50 a day, of the United Planning Organization in Washington. Rufus Mayfield, a Black Muslim, also has been employed as a consultant by the UPO. In New York, the Mobilization for Youth was found to have several members of the Communist Party on its staff. The OEO's folly in financing a $115,000 Black Arts Theater, headed by radical LeRoi Jones, in Harlem to disseminate hate-white propaganda is well known.

Elsewhere, the OEO has provided a $700,000 grant to a farmers' coöperative in a Southern State. Among the coöperative's organizers was John Zippert, who has been connected by the Louisiana Committee on UnAmerican Activities with the Red-financed World Youth Festival. Another organizer in the coöperative was Shirley Mesher, a former SNCC coödinator who also has been active in the Black Panther movement. Communists and Communist-sympathizers also have turned up on payrolls of community action programs in California. One Communist was found earning $4,200 a year in the Louisiana anti-poverty program.

Moreover, last year, Fulton Lewis III revealed that $28,000 in OEO funds had been granted to the West End Community Council in Louisville, Ky., which was active in causing the open housing demonstrations there. One of the prime movers behind the Council was Anne Braden, who with her husband Carl, replaced Communist James Dombrowski as head of the Southern Conference Education Fund, successor to the Southern Conference for Human Welfare. The latter organization was cited by HUAC as a Communist front. Both Bradens have been identified as active Communists. The OEO promptly denied that Mrs. Braden was among the Council's leaders, but eight months later, Mr. Lewis learned from a Council employee that Mrs. Braden continued to be "very active" in the Council's activities.

Taken with the evidence supplied by former Communist Phillip Abbott Luce in his book, *Road to Revolution: Communist Guerrilla Warfare in the U.S.A.*, it appears that there may indeed be an organized conspiracy to bring about anarchy in this country, and that this conspiracy may be financed in part by anti-poverty funds. The civil rights movement has become very much a part of the anti-poverty program; the link is inescapable. One doesn't have to see Communists under every bed or to be obsessed by conspiratorial theories to suspect that the more militant Negro leaders, however unwittingly, are advancing the Communist cause. When they urge their followers to loot, to kill, and to destroy, they are playing right into the hands of the Communists, who know the value of the axiom that a house divided against itself cannot stand.

Joint Crime Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 9, 1967

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the urgent need for a Joint Congressional Crime Committee cannot be questioned. The events of the last few weeks have demonstrated that there is a great need for a reappraisal of the problems facing urban America.

On July 20, 1967, I introduced House Joint Resolution 650 which would create a Joint Committee To Investigate Crime. The committee would make continuing investigations and studies of all aspects of crime in the United States.

WMAL radio in Washington broadcast two editorials during the week of July 16, 1967, concerning the establishment of such a committee.

I commend the texts of the editorials to the attention of our colleagues, as follows:

Joint Crime Committee

The drive to establish a Joint Congressional Committee on Crime received a vital boost Monday, when Democratic House Whip Hale Boggs joined some 60 other supporters of the measure.

Representative Boggs is a key member of the House Democratic leadership. His support shows the importance of a Joint Congressional Committee on Crime first proposed by WMAL last November.

For crime has become our most serious domestic problem and the spiral of crime soars daily. Congress must launch a coordinated national attack to control lawlessness. But today Congress has no committee devoted exclusively to studying and understanding all the vast social, economic, legal and political questions that complicate a total national war on crime. This is why all Congressmen should follow Representative Boggs in supporting immediate establishment of a Joint Congressional Committee on Crime.

Joint Crime Committee

The urgent need for a Joint Congressional Committee on Crime has been dramatically recognized in Congress by both Democrats and Republicans. There are now 21 Senate sponsors of bills to establish the committee, led by Utah Senator Frank Moss and Maryland Senator Joseph Tydings. The drive for a Joint Crime Committee has been pushed aggressively in the House by Florida Representative Claude Pepper. More than 40 House members, including four committee chairmen, are supporting Representative Pepper's bill.

There is no question of the need for a Joint Congressional Crime Committee, similar to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. Texas Representative J. J. Pickle summed up the need when he said: "Crime has been given as the reason for supporting legislation ranging from gun control to poverty, but we have yet to address the real problem of crime itself."

To legislate intelligently against crime, Congress must coordinate all available information and its own efforts. A Joint Congressional Committee on Crime is the best way to achieve this coordination.

Rat Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 9, 1967

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, among the advantages some Members of the Congress have are those that put them on the mailing list of a number of companies and organizations.

Sometimes, I will agree, this is a dubious privilege. Other times, however, I for one am happy to be so honored.

Because I spend so much time here, for example, I get little opportunity to hear or view the editorial opinions on home radio and television stations. That is a shame for in Philadelphia's case, the comments I miss are often substantial. That is why I am pleased to receive printed copies of these editorials so I need not miss them even if I am not at home. One of these treats what many Members of the Congress considered a joke some weeks ago. The comments of WCAU–TV indicate that rat control is hardly a joke to the people of Philadelphia.

I offer the editorial in its entirety for the Record. Reminding my colleagues that the comments quoted also are in the Record previously.

The editorial follows:

They Had a Chance To Do Something

(Presented by Pete Duncan, WCAU–TV educational director, July 28, 1967)

(Film: Rats in living room)

This is a rat. Something foreign to many of us. But something too many people hear scurrying through their homes as they try to sleep at night. It's a growing city problem, a problem which in the past has evoked Presidential concern. Last night, it evoked Presidential disappointment.

(Film out.)

(Video tape of President Johnson's address to the Nation, July 27, 1967.)

"Last week in Congress, a small but important plan for action in the cities was voted down. The members rejected my request for $20 million to fight the pestilence of rats—rats which prowl in dark alleys and tenements and attack thousands of city children. The passage of this legislation would have meant much to the children of the slums."

(Video tape out.)

Well, the distinguished members of the House of Representatives (as they would probably like to be known) had a chance last week to do something—to actually do something to begin an overall national campaign against rats in large urban cities.

Amid a few impassioned speeches in favor of setting up the Rat Extermination Act of 1967, some duly elected representatives took the floor to apparently make fun of the problem.

At a time when large urban areas are struggling to maintain a calm, you don't take one of the very problems persistently present in those areas and make fun of it.

Here's what happened in the Halls of Congress on July 20th, 1967. Before the House can even debate a piece of legislation, the members must vote it onto the floor. The Rat Extermination Bill (co-sponsored by Congressman William Barrett of Philadelphia) never even made it to the general debate stage.

This is the Congressional Record for July 20th. It shows exactly what was said leading up to the vote on whether to even consider the extermination legislation.

Democratic Congressman J. A. Haley of Florida veered from the seriousness of the problem. He said: "—why not buy some cats and turn them loose on the rats."

Not very humorous to the mother of a baby attacked by a rat.

Delbert Latta—a Republican from Bowling Green, Ohio—said: "How about snake bite cases? How about bugs? Are we to forget about the people bitten by bugs? Should we start a bug corps?"

Republican Congressman Joel Broyhill of Arlington, Virginia, topped his comments by saying: "Mr. Speaker, I think the 'rat smart thing' for us to do is to vote down this rat bill 'rat now'."

Throughout, Congressman William Barrett of Philadelphia tried to defend his bill, but to no avail. Michigan Congresswoman Mrs. Martha Griffiths (in an eloquent statement) rallied to the cause, but to no avail.

Republican H. R. Gross from Waterloo, Iowa asked: "Who is going to run it? There is not going to be a high commissioner or administrator of the rats corps."

The illustrious Congressman from Waterloo needn't concern himself. No one is going to run it. The House voted against even considering the bill.

After the vote, one Congressman—T. R. Kupferman of New York—wanted to say something. He talked of rat-infested conditions in some areas. He ended his brief remarks by saying: "Mr. Speaker, I am ashamed of the vote today on this question."

WCAU–TV concurs with this statement.

Young and Valiant American Dies Aboard U.S.S. "Forrestal"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 9, 1967

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, we were all greatly shocked and saddened by the recent fire aboard the U.S.S. *Forrestal*. Among the young and valiant Americans fatally injured in that tragic blaze was Navy Airman Robert L. Zwerlin, 21, the son of Mr. and Mrs. William Zwerlin, of 49 Shore Road, Port Washington, N.Y.

Robert L. Zwerlin volunteered to serve his country and ended up paying the greatest possible service. He gave his life while in a war zone defending the principles we hold so dearly.

Robert L. Zwerlin was a graduate of Port Washington High School and had been a member of the Port Washington Volunteer Fire Department. Today in a funeral that cast a pall over all of Port

Washington, Robert L. Zwerlin was buried and honored by his many friends and his family. To these people we can do little more than express our most sincere and deepest condolences. They have suffered a loss that cannot be replaced and I hope that they find some solace in the knowledge that Robert L. Zwerlin died while serving his country.

Crew Shortage and Old Ships Delaying Cargo Deliveries to Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 9, 1967

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, those of us who are deeply concerned about the condition of our merchant marine, have been calling attention for some time to the need for an adequate replacement policy.

The difficulties we have been experiencing in moving our supplies to Vietnam have emphasized again the terribly outdated, overage condition of our ships, and the folly of placing any dependency in our reserve fleet. I cannot produce figures to prove that the shortage of crews is due to the condition of the ships they are being called upon to man, but I am convinced that is a compelling factor.

Because of the urgency of this matter, I would like to include in the Appendix an article in the Baltimore Sun, of August 6, by that paper's knowledgeable maritime editor, Mrs. Helen Delich Bentley, who spent several months in Vietnam earlier this year. I recommend that this be read by all Members.

A satisfactory replacement policy for these old vessels is one of our most urgent needs at this time.

The article follows:

WAR CARGOES DELAYED BY SHORT CREWS—VIETNAM-BOUND VESSELS ALSO IMMOBILIZED BY MORE BREAKDOWNS

(By Helen Delich Bentley)

WASHINGTON, August 5.—Delays of Vietnam-bound merchant ships are beginning to rise sharply again because of shortages of skilled crew members.

Other military cargoes are also being held up because of mounting and continuing breakdowns of the old ships serving the 8,000-mile pipeline from the West Coast of the United States to Southeast Asia. Some of these have become so bad, it was learned, that the Pentagon is considering returning about twenty to reserve inactive status.

During June and July, 70 vessels—fully laden with their cargoes for the war zone—sat idle for a total of 6,256 hours until the minimum number of mates and engineers were available.

VICTORY-TYPES

These 70 ships are out of the 172 Victory-type reactivated from the reserve fleet over the past two years as a result of Uncle Sam's military build-up in South Vietnam.

No central record is kept on the delays of privately-owned merchant ships which are under charter to the Military Sea Transportation Service because the agency charters them on a per diem basis. Only the port agents or the unions apparently keep records of holdups caused by crew shortages on these vessels.

The Maritime Administration said that on the 70 de-mothballed ships, the crews have lacked radio operators, cooks, wipers and firemen as well as mates and engineers.

MORE THAN DOUBLE

The total time lost in July was more than double that for the month of June and is expected to go even higher in August, according to Government sources.

The S.S. American Planter was held up the longest—336 hours—by the lack of both a third mate and third engineer. Two ships were delayed as much as 247 and 272 hours, with the others delayed for lesser periods.

In fact, it is getting so critical again that the Maritime Administration has reactivated its radio-television appeal for any man holding current seamen's papers and licensed to "do his part for Uncle Sam and sign up for one or two trips to Vietnam."

Since most of the military-carrying vessels for Southeast Asia load in and sail out of West Coast ports, the campaign was launched there last month. It was placed in key areas throughout the Gulf Coast earlier this week and is expected to be kicked off along the East Coast within the next week or two.

Our Country's 200th Birthday

SPEECH

OF

HON. ALEXANDER PIRNIE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 8, 1967

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, in this complex, fast-moving world, there is a tendency to concentrate so much on the future that we ignore the past. This should not be, for there is much to be learned from the events that have transpired in days gone by. Especially, is this the case when those events are associated with an undertaking of such unequalled importance as the fight for independence.

Monday, we affirmed our desire to profit from the past by enacting H.R. 8629 and providing funds for the work which will bring about the celebration of our country's 200th birthday. It will doubtless be a marvelous celebration, but it should be more than a mere commemoration. It should remind us that our countrymen of yesterday fought and died so that we might be free. We should recall that they sought a government of laws instead of one dictated by men. We must remember that the heritage which is ours was not gained without sacrifice and dedication to ideals and that it is not ours to keep just for the asking.

Our land is dotted with shrines and historic places which will play a significant role in the bicentennal. These areas, mounments, and buildings which were so prominent in our past are more than forgotten graves. They are living memorials to our proud and ancient heritage. However, all our pride will be but vanity if at the same time we do not dedicate our thought and action to the preservation of the ideas and ideals which these events and places represent. We must be ever mindful of them as we move into the coming decades, facing new problems and confronting new challenges. The dawn of a new era is upon us and we can face it more successfully if we truly appreciate our revered past.

Betty Furness, an Effective and Forthright Witness on H.R. 11601, the Consumer Credit Protection Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 8, 1967

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, as a woman, I was proud of the excellent statement made yesterday morning before the Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs of the House Committee on Banking and Currency by Miss Betty Furness, Special Assistant to the President for Consumer Affairs, on H.R. 11601, the Consumer Credit Protection Act. As chairman of the subcommittee and as initial sponsor of H.R. 11601, I was pleased to have the effective support voiced by Miss Furness on those features of the bill dealing with disclosure of credit costs and the advertising of credit terms.

Miss Furness showed great courage as well as patriotism in agreeing earlier this year to accept appointment to one of the most difficult, challenging, and important roles in Government. Her predecessor, Assistant Secretary of Labor Esther Peterson, made an outstanding record in pioneering this new post in Government. On the basis of the skill she displayed before our subcommittee yesterday morning, Miss Furness demonstrated that she also brings great talent and ability and warmth to this job. Her answers to our questions were direct and convincing.

Mr. Speaker, because of the widespread interest in the issues involved in consumer credit legislation, including full disclosure of credit terms and rates, I include the statement made to our subcommittee yesterday by Presidential Assistant Betty Furness, as follows:

TESTIMONY OF BETTY FURNESS, SPECIAL ASSISTANT TO THE PRESIDENT FOR CONSUMER AFFAIRS ON H.R. 11601, THE CONSUMER CREDIT PROTECTION ACT, AUGUST 7, 1967

Madam Chairman, members of the Subcommittee. I am grateful for the opportunity to be here today, to express my strong support for H.R. 11601. This bill is of vital importance to the consumer. It affects him where he is most sensitive—in the pocketbook. And if it is enacted, I think it will strengthen not only the borrower, but the marketplace as a whole.

I am on record in support of the *original* Senate bill, S. 5, and I am glad to see that you have, in the House bill, restored some of the provisions which were struck from S. 5.

I continue to believe that provisions for full disclosure are absolutely essential. At a time when our lives are run more and more on credit, the least we can do is permit a person to know exactly how much he will be paying for an item.

Clearly, that is not the case now. The number of personal bankruptcies, the number of unintentional defaults on payment, indicate that many people cannot manage credit as it is now constituted. With full disclosure often cloudy or nonexistent, the consumer is unable to determine precisely how much debt he can safely carry.

The creditor knows exactly how much money he will be receiving. It doesn't seem too much to ask that he reveal that figure to the man who will be paying him. We want the average consumer to be able to wisely and knowledgeably select the best creditor for him. Even a consumer who tries very hard to be a good comparison shopper for merchandise is now unable to cope with the complexities of comparison shopping for credit.

I think, Madam Chairman, that you have improved upon the Senate version of Truth-in-Lending in several respects, and I'd like to mention some of them.

You have asked that insurance charges levied on consumer credit be included in the total charge disclosed to the purchaser. This is indeed necessary if the true cost of credit is to be known. There have been reports in the press, as well as testimony before Congress, which indicate that excessive premiums are being charged for credit insurance. These premiums can amount to a substantial additional cost, and it's only fair that they be revealed to the prospective buyer.

You have asked that revolving credit not be excluded from the legislation, as it is in the Senate bill. I think the argument that revolving credit represents only a small part of consumer debt is based on specious logic. First, it is growing rapidly. Second, it affects those least able to bear the burden of excessive debt, the small purchaser. Third, if revolving credit is excluded, more and more businesses might switch to it as a loophole for avoiding full disclosure.

You have also helped the small purchaser by refusing to exclude credit charges of less than ten dollars. This is the area where the poor are subject to the most abuse.

We shouldn't discriminate against the man who purchases a small power saw, and who pays only eight dollars interest, in favor of the family that buys a seven hundred dollar set of furniture and pays a hundred dollars interest.

And if sales taxes can be readily computed on small amounts, so can finance charges.

You have—rightly, I believe—restored a provision demanding full disclosure of charges on first mortgages. Abuse in this area is especially damaging to the poor and uneducated.

Finally, I am particularly pleased with your provision requiring advertisements for consumer credit sales to include—as an annual percentage figure—the cost of finance charges. This will allow prospective buyers to begin shopping for credit at home, instead of on the spot.

It will encourage families to ground themselves in the differences between credit plans in the privacy of their own homes, rather than under the gun of a sales pitch. It will then lead to wiser selection.

And with any luck, the ethical ads of the low-cost lenders will ultimately drive down the rates of the higher-priced lenders.

There are some sections of the bill, Madam Chairman, which I feel would be better served by being deferred for further study. One, the question of garnishment of wages as a means of collection—is already under study.

I am aware that garnishment is an expensive, painful procedure which can cost a man his job, disrupt his family, and inconvenience his employer. But there *are* cases in which it prevents inequities against the creditor, and I do not feel, at present, that we can issue a blanket rule against it. It is currently being studied by the Attorney General, the Secretary of Labor, and the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Similarly, I do not think we are ready for a national usury law. Such a law would put a ceiling on all consumer credit, without regard for individual circumstances. Its ramifications would be so enormous—affecting such a large part of our economy—that I think intensive study is necessary.

Lastly, I think that the provision outlawing confession of judgment is premature. The full implications of it, too, have not yet been evaluated, and further study is indicated before a law is passed.

Rather than deal with these controversial subjects in the current bill, I feel that our immediate concern is for passage of the basic Truth-in-Lending legislation during this session.

Also, despite my enthusiasm for the objectives of Title Three of the bill, referring to a National Commission on Consumer Finance, I think it should be separated from the current bill.

I would like to see the work done, and the studies made. They would be invaluable in areas such as deficiency judgments, unconscionable contracts, licensing requirements, and debtors' remedies. But I think that before establishing such a commission, we should first determine whether such studies could be better and more economically conducted by existing organizations and agencies.

And again, since the passage of a full disclosure bill is my first concern, I wish you would consider treating the questions of the commission and the other matters not related to disclosure, separately.

If I may generalize for a final moment on this bill, I think it is a tribute to the concern and awareness of the new American consumer. Only a few years ago, our consumers were a placid lot—resigned to maltreatment, oblivious of injustice, and fatalistic about the way they were treated in the marketplace.

This is no longer true. The bills that are being introduced and the reforms that are being sought are all a testimony to a public that has finally decided to assert—and vocally, I might add—its rights.

We are becoming an affluent society of sophisticated consumers, and we are demanding new standards—standards that will differentiate between the fraudulent and the fair, between the legally permissible and the ethically wrong.

I think the disclosure portions of this bill provide an excellent example of those demands being met. They do not demand the unreasonable, only the fair.

I am happy to give them my support.

Thank you.

We Salute You, Ambassador Goldberg

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 9, 1967

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, 2 years ago, on July 26, 1965, Arthur Goldberg was appointed U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations.

He demonstrated his belief in truth and justice during the recent Middle East crisis, when he defended Israel's rights against the aggression of her neighbors.

I commend to the attention of our colleagues an editorial which salutes Ambassador Goldberg as a champion of justice and peace. The editorial appeared in the August 3, 1967, issue of the American Examiner, and follows:

WE SALUTE YOU, AMBASSADOR GOLDBERG

On July 26, 1965—two years ago—President Lyndon B. Johnson appointed Supreme Court Justice Arthur Goldberg as his UN Ambassador. Throughout this period the amiable Justice has distinguished himself in all the multiple aspects of global UN activities.

As a defender of truth and the rights of all peoples, the greatness of his soul was brought out clearly for the whole world to witness during all the recent UN sessions on the Mideast crisis. His voice was that of America as well as of the United Nations when he defended Israel's rights against the belligerency of the Arab States as supported by the Soviet Union and their friends.

Certainly, both the Arabs and the Soviets, with whom he is on personal friendly terms, can have no valid argument against this true American-Jewish champion of justice whose continuous password has been "Peace"—Shalom.

As for the Israel-Arab conflict, no one with a sense of justice could have misunderstood his concluding remarks made on the day the special emergency session adjourned. Said Goldberg, among other things:

"But we could not be so flexible as to give away fundamental Charter principles. We could not go so far as to blind ourselves to the fact that peace in the Middle East is indivisible and that the withdrawal of troops must be linked with the acknowledgement by every member of the United Nations in the area that each enjoys the right to maintain an independent national state of his own and to live in peace and security, and renunciation of all claims and acts inconsistent therewith, including claims or acts flowing from an asserted state of belligerency.

"Surely these two principles must go hand in hand. Both as a practical matter and as a matter of equity, one side cannot be called upon to abide by the rules of peace while the other side is left free to continue to assert the rights of war. This was the belief which underlay the Latin American draft resolution, which the United States supported."

We salute you, Justice Goldberg.

Just Some Facts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 9, 1967

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, with the confusion which often prevails in official Washington some recollection of cold, hard facts helps clear the air. An editorial which appeared in the July 29 edition of the Oak Lawn News, an independent publication serving Oak Lawn and Evergreen Park, Ill., calls to our attention some facts which we should ponder. The editorial follows:

JUST SOME FACTS

There are some important facts that we all should know about, facts that will help us to prevent a vastly higher level of Federal spending in the future. They are facts that are going up and up. They are:

1. Since 1960 the personnel comprising the civilian payroll of the Federal government has grown by 25 per cent.

2. Since 1960 the cost of government payrolls, including the military, has grown by 75 per cent.

3. Since 1960, non-defense expenditures of the government are up 97 per cent.

4. Since 1960, expenditures for national welfare and health programs are up 210 per cent.

These are just a few items that all Americans should consider. Facts that show there is a strong probability that government spending will double again in the 1970's, unless a major change in attitude takes place. It is being predicted that we will have a $300 billion Federal budget by 1980. We wonder if the people really want this much government. Are we willing to pay for it? Can we pay for it?

Your legislators in Washington would like to know what you think!

Fisheries: In Need of Help

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HASTINGS KEITH
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 9, 1967

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, I enclose in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Fisheries: In Need of Help," which offers a valuable perspective on the problems of our Nation's declining fishing industry. The editorial appeared in the New Bedford Standard-Times, a newspaper which has long been vitally interested in the problems of the fishing industry and which sees them from the viewpoint of our Nation's greatest fishing port—New Bedford, Mass.

Some of the industry's problems clearly must be solved by farsighted leadership within its own ranks. Among these are the need for conservation of commercial species and the need for a new industrywide marketing approach. Other problems, such as the need for innovation in the technology of fishing and active competition with foreign products, can only be met with Government assistance.

As the Standard-Times article points out, the conditions holding back the progress of our commercial fishing industry must be faced squarely by the Government as well as by the fishermen themselves. Hopefully, we are seeing the beginning of this important awareness.

The text of the editorial follows:

FISHERIES: IN NEED OF HELP

At the University of Rhode Island's Marine Frontiers Conference, Vice President Humphrey remarked, "I think one of our primary responsibilities is to find ways to expand our fishing industry. We let it lapse."

It is encouraging to know that the administration is sensitive to the rapidly growing need to re-examine and revitalize this industry, which is of major importance to Southeastern Massachusetts and to the nation generally.

As Oscar E. Sette of the U.S. Bureau of Commercial Fisheries has pointed out, one of the marvels of these times is that the United States, with its high standard of living, has managed to keep its products competitive in the world market.

However, one of the striking exceptions to this generality is the fishing industry. Ten years ago, 70 per cent of the U.S. fish supply came from the domestic fish catch. In 1964, this had fallen to 38 per cent and it undoubtedly is lower now. We are a net importer of fishery products by a substantial margin.

Searching for the cause of this, Dr. Sette concluded, ". . . a major (reason) is that the fishing industry, unlike most American industries, does not lend itself to the American genius for applying technology and systems research and management, which produce goods at prices competitive with those of the rest of the world despite our higher costs of materials and manpower."

What this means is that the U.S. industry experiences great variation in abundance, location and catchability of fish.

Too large portion of time is spent hunting for fish, and too little catching them.

And on occasions when the fleet comes upon good fishing, its landings glut the market and there either is a price reaction or, sometimes, a failure of the market to handle the fish.

Too often the net effect on the fisherman is an income less than his needs for keeping his vessel and gear in repair and replaced when worn out, and less than is needed to keep him and his sons in the fishery, while the higher income and greater security of shoreside employment offer a better life.

The effect on the processor or the wholesaler is a highly irregular supply of domestically caught fish. And since frozen fish have become a common international commodity, he can offset these irregularities by imports. Undoubtedly, this, as well as price advantage, has been a powerful factor in making this country a large importer of fishery products.

That's a sketchy outline of the problem. Any "expansion" of the industry, and certainly such development would be welcome, must begin by tackling these problems.

Attack on Rats

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED SCHWENGEL
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 9, 1967

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, recently the House voted not to consider the rat extermination bill. Much of the discussion and debate which accompanied that action and which has resulted from it has been rather emotional and has lacked rationality.

One calm and responsible editorial did appear in the August 5 edition of the Cedar Rapids Gazette. It sets forth the basic premise I have maintained, local responsibility.

The editorial follows:

ATTACK ON RATS

The recent rejection of a $40 million federal rat-control program by the house of representatives left a bad aftertaste more as something symbolic of regrettable value-judgments than as a death-blow to action toward improving slum conditions.

Unarguably, the national blight of rat-infested dwellings is long overdue for more attention. The U.S. has an estimated 14,000 rat-bite cases per year. Rats do roughly a billion dollars' worth of damage yearly to food and goods. They spread disease. Their presence in a residence is both a danger and a degradation. Eradicating them is a legitimate part of any health program undertaken in the public interest.

But if congress views it as too burdensome at the federal level, that should not rule it out altogether as a worthy effort at other levels.

Following the house's ill-timed, crudely handled killing of the program, in fact, New York state responded by launching a \$4½ million "total war" on rats using state funds alone. This amount was roughly double what had been expected under the proposed federal appropriation. Thus, instead of coming from taxpayers everywhere, New York's anti-rat environmental health investment will come from people whose environment receives the benefit.

With rat-control urgencies varying in degree around the country, there is nothing to prevent communities that need the action the most from launching it the same way as New York. If state funds can't be shaken loose, local funds may be available in some places for use against local conditions.

One rat-control approach that needs a closer look and harder push, in fact, is the focusing of local pressure on the point where it belongs, where it can be effective and where it finally lands—one way or another—anyhow: On the owners of buildings or houses infested by rats.

Through ordinance enforcement by local health authorities, owners can be forced to institute their own rodent-kill and cleanup measures as a public-health requirement. Neglect to do this can evoke additional persuasions: Rat-proofing done by the city, with costs assessed to the owners. Or condemnation steps that render the premises unrentable, uninhabitable, unprofitable until the needed cleanout comes.

Congress may have blundered in the way it laughed down rat control. But any city showing grass-roots care, compassion and awareness can correct that any day it wants to show it has the gumption.

Freedom Is the Fruit of Faith

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 31, 1967

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to make available to my colleagues and the readers of the RECORD the text of the inspiring sermon that the Reverend Richard B. Sims made on July 2, 1967.

Reverend Sims is the pastor of the Litz Manor Baptist Church in my hometown of Kingsport, Tenn., a position that he has held since 1955. He is a graduate of Vanderbilt University and Southern Baptist Seminary, having then served as pastor of a Baptist Church in Joelton, Tenn.

Married to the former Grace Everett, of Parkton, N.C., Reverend and Mrs. Sims have a daughter, Jacqueline, and a son, Bennett.

Reverend Sims is an inspiration to the entire Kingsport community, and his sermon which follows is one of the best I have ever read:

Freedom is the fruit of faith—faith in God, faith in man, and faith in freedom itself.

In 1751, when Pennsylvania was celebrating the Golden Jubilee of William Penn's "Charter of Privileges," the Assembly sent to England for a bell to be hung in the steeple of the State House. Cast in London, it arrived in 1752 and, when tested, cracked. Two young brass founders, John Stow and John Pass, who had a foundry nearby offered to break up the bell and recast it, adding an ounce and a half of copper to each pound of the old bell. In 1753, the new bell, found satisfactory, was raised into place. Around the top of this bell ran these words, "Leviticus XXV, 10—Proclaim Liberty throughout all the land unto all the inhabitants thereof." The Liberty Bell soon became a symbol of American freedom. When it pealed forth its brilliant tones from its deep throat it stirred the emotions of love for America and loyalty to the dream of her founders—equal opportunity for "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness" for all citizens.

Today the grand old Liberty Bell is about to crack again. The stress and strain of violence, lawlessness, crime, dishonesty, corruption, immorality, disrespect for authority, greed, and lust for power break down the structure that causes freedom to ring in the hearts of the people.

The vital element of democracy is faith and the basic ingredient of freedom is faith. The love of freedom has always issued from great minds who believed that men can be trusted when they draw their inspiration from God's revealed truth.

Liberty, an elusive dream for most people of civilizations past and present, is a real and genuine experience of men who have faith in the Author of liberty. Man, made in the image of God who is absolutely free, is a responsible being. He is endowed with emotion, intellect, and will. The will, though free, is influenced by both emotional and intellectual experiences. Further, the will is influenced by the ever-present Spirit of the living God. Freedom of choice implies both responsibility for the choice and accountability to our Creator who has made us free. Therefore, a person's freedom is proportionate to his willingness and ability to be a responsible individual. Freedom is primarily spiritual; secondarily, political. Spiritually, it is creative and causative. Politically it is a created result. Freedom and responsibility are like "love and marriage, horse and carriage," you can't have one without the other.

We are not free from our obligations to the past. Neither are we free from our responsibility to the future. Our Founding Fathers were students of history. They knew the dangers of government-controlled religion and religion-controlled government. They labored to establish, not religion, but religious liberty in America. Bancroft, in his *History of the Formation of the Constitution* wrote, "the American Constitution—withheld from the Federal Government the power to invade the house of reason, the citadel of conscience, the sanctuary of the soul, and not from indifference, but that the infinite spirit of eternal truth might move in its freedom and purity and power."

The battle for freedom in America is yet being waged and the enemy is more formidable than at any time in our history. Our forefathers shed blood to win freedom from European tyrants, their foreign overlords. Now, their twentieth century offspring are having to do battle to keep this freedom won. With a half-million men and billions of dollars we are seeking to ward off the enemy from without and at the same time we are altogether ignoring the more dangerous enemy within. The enemies of democracy have tutored us in the philosophy that is precipitating our downfall. The movement toward a collectivist society is daily snuffing out the life-breath of individual liberty. It is becoming apparent to more and more thinking people that the soul of America has been sold to those who advocate the philosophy, "the end justifies the means." Socialism, once a creeping paralysis has become a galloping, runaway horse that stifles free enterprise, destroys individual initiative, removes personal responsibility, strangles human conscience, denies personal liberty, disowns private right, alienates freedom of thought, and makes of the masses a herd of dumb brutes that need to be led about by pseudo-intellectual bureaucrats who assign to themselves power and authority to rob the people of the rewards of labor, the joys of victory in struggle, and the right to self-respect through self-reliance. The greatest sin of the whole program is the corruption of our total value system in America.

John Steinbeck some time ago wrote to Adlai Stevenson of his concern. "Americans, having too many things, spend their hours and money on the couch searching for a soul. A strange species we are. We can stand anything God and nature can throw at us save plenty. If I wanted to destroy a nation I would give it too much and I would have it on its knees, miserable, greedy, and sick . . . mainly, Adlai, I am troubled by the cynical immorality of my country. I do not think it can survive on this basis and unless some kind of catastrophe strikes us, we are lost. But by our very attitudes we are drawing catastrophe to ourselves. What we have beaten in nature, we cannot conquer in ourselves. Someone has to reinspect our system and that very soon . . . on all levels it is rigged, Adlai."

To press toward the mark of government-control is to scuddle the ship of democracy. Most of the American people are already asleep on the tranquilizing dream of the cradle to the grave holiday with the guarantee of perennial plenty, peace, and prosperity by Father State Almighty.

The concepts of freedom and democracy are rooted in the dignity and worth of the individual. The Christian faith is the embodiment of these ideas. It is time for America to "awake out of sleep," and see that our very way of life is at stake. Brethren, it is later than you think! For when Socialism and Communism have succeeded in poisoning the roots of democracy, the flower of freedom will have withered and died.

Far be it from me to suggest that the agencies of government should be hostile to the people; the poor, the downtrodden, the disenfranchized, the physically and mentally ill. On the contrary we pray that men of faith in God shall answer the call to government service with a view of implementing the principles of the dignity of man, the infinite worth of the individual, and the equality of rights of all men. Let the government stand beside the churches to give to all men proper incentives for creative living. Let both steadfastly encourage all men to be something, not merely to *have* something.

James Madison, our fourth president, a major architect of the American democracy and a strong proponent of the doctrine of separation of Church and State, believed that a man must have both the right of property and a property in rights. He asserted that a person's totality of possessions "embraces everything to which a man may attach a value and have a right." Therefore, individual rights to give creative expression to ideas in order to bring forth the fruit of genius must be both safeguarded and guaranteed by the government under the provisions of the Constitution of the United States.

It is my firm conviction, and I believe generally the Baptist position, that free men in a free society flourish best in a free Church and a free State. Our plea is not merely for a free Church but for free *men* who live and serve within the framework of universal moral and civil law.

True freedom consists not in escape, but in fulfillment; not in freedom *from* responsibility, but *in* responsibility; not in freedom *from* work, but freedom *to* work; not in freedom *from* law, but freedom *in* law; not in freedom *from* religion, but in freedom *to worship* according to one's own convictions.

Freedom, like love, must put on flesh and bones. If left in the realm of the abstract, it lacks the vital pulse that gives it meaning and value. The idea of liberty dawned not upon the land and seas, but upon the minds of men—men of a peculiar character possessed of great faith—men such as Abraham, Moses, Jesus, Paul, Luther, Knox, Roger Williams, Jefferson, Madison, and Lincoln—men who were saying essentially "The just shall live by faith." These men knew that liberty is a personal matter of the soul, that men who live by faith are released from the demons of fear, lust, and greed. They knew that merely changing a man's environment and external circumstances could not make him free. James Oppenheim has expressed it:

They set the slave free, striking off his chains . . . .
Then he was as much of a slave as ever.
He was still chained to servility,
He was still manacled to indolence and sloth,
He was still bound by fear and superstition,
By ignorance, suspicion, and savagery . . . .
His slavery was not in the chains,
But in himself. . . . .

They can only set free men free . . . .
And there is no need of that:
Free men set themselves free.

Our fundamental liberties are being undermined in subtle, devious, and diabolical ways. Among these is the freedom to think. Every year the Federal Government exercises greater control over our public schools and, therefore, over the patterns and philosophy of education. Herbert Hoover once wrote, "I am long since on record in opposition to Federal Aid to education for many reasons. Among them—if the Federal Government gets its hands on the schools, they will be in the hands of politicians to get votes and worse, the Federal Government would tell you what to teach. We have a magnificent school system managed by the people of the district. Why give that power to Washington?"

Federal aid means conformity to Federal standards and this means Federal control. Federally controlled standardization of educational techniques and materials means the ultimate rigging of the mind and loss of the ability to think.

Another liberty in great jeopardy today is freedom of the Press. What good is freedom of the Press in the journalist is merely a parrot of a depraved system of corrupted values? If the minds of editors and publishers are so secularized and materialized that truth is only that which sells copy we are nearer the bottom than we think.

The freedom to worship today is so taken for granted that few think that such a precious liberty could ever be lost. Our indifference to worship and spiritual service, our relaxing of moral restraints, our turning of liberty to license are dulling the cutting edge of the church's witness in the world. Some say that the Church needs the help of the State to finance its programs. But we must know that to accept funds from the Federal Government we must be prepared to accept Federal controls of the institutions which receive such help. To violate the principle of Separation of Church and State is to crack the "Liberty Bell." God, give our churches the wisdom to accept the responsibilities of independence, and follow the way of liberty through faith in our Lord, Jesus Christ.

While the Church does not need union with the State, the churches do need unity with Christ.

Before the Civil War, the West beyond the Mississippi had been opened up by explorers: next there followed a slow stream of pioneers, scouts, fur trappers, hunters, traders, and then settlers. And side by side with them rode the missionaries, who came to labor in their midst, building churches, courthouses, and schools. With the population rush to California, there arose a pressing need for a railroad connection to link the Atlantic and the Pacific; and when the Central Pacific and the Union Pacific railroads were finally joined at Promontory Point, Utah, on May 10, 1869 the entire continent rejoiced. Two trains, one from the East, one from the West faced each other across at a little gap in the track. The final tie was laid—polished laurel from California, with a silver plate commemorating the day. The last rail was put in place. A preacher prayed. The band played *America*. And then the last spike, of California gold, was brought. Leland Stanford, governor of the state and president of the Central Pacific, stood there, frock coated, high hatted, and bearded, with a silver sledge in his hand. As he pounded the golden spike with the silver sledge the telegraph operator pressed the key which sent the signal to the nation's Capital.

The two trains drew up slowly until their cow-catchers almost touched. The engineers shook hands, the bands played, the locomotives opened their whistles. Simultaneously, the telegraph signal dropped a magnetic ball on the dome of the Capitol at Washington. Bells rang in Independence Hall in Philadelphia. There was a salute of a hundred guns in City Hall Park in New York. The nation was wild with jubilation because East and West had been joined by the first Transcontinental Railway.

Now let me tell you this. East and West met first at Calvary when Jesus Christ the Son of God was crucified. The golden spike that pierced his *hand divine* drew the blood of the *King of Heaven* that unites men around the world in true love that issues in life, liberty, and brotherly kindness. The last signal He sent to the Celestial City rang the freedom bell in heaven. Salvation was completed, the Devil was defeated, death was destroyed, and man at last was free.

God save us all through Jesus Christ!
God save America!

> "Land where my fathers died
> Land of the Pilgrims' pride
> From every mountain side,
> *Let freedom ring.*"

Riots Attributed to Class Conflict

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 9, 1967

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, aside from the obvious racial factors which were involved in the recent rioting, class conflict also played an important part in much of the violence.

Evidence of this fact can be found in the interracial cooperation among looters, and the hostility exhibited toward the so-called black bourgeois by some Negroes in the lowest income brackets.

I commend to the attention of our colleagues, an article written by Carl T. Rowan which appeared in the August 2, 1967, edition of the Washington Evening Star as follows:

FUNDAMENTALLY, A CLASS CONFLICT

(By Carl T. Rowan)

Maybe a Southern background isn't essential for a President to respond to the rioting in Detroit and elsewhere with the restraint, compasson and broad outlook that Lyndon Johnson has shown.

But the fact that he is our first Southern President in modern times has to lend impact to his words of last Thursday: "This is no time for angry reaction. It is a time for action, starting with legislative action to improve life in our cities."

It took courage, personal and political, for the President to strike the posture of reason and farsightedness that he took in appointing a panel to investigate the riots. For reason is not a very popular commodity these days—among either Negroes or whites.

The incendiary words of SNCC leader H. Rap Brown, crackling from the television screens of America like verbal Molotov cocktails, cannot help but water the weeds of hatred and vengeance in the white community.

Stories of National Guard cruelties in Newark, or of the senseless killing of a 12-year-old Negro boy, fire bitterness and anger in the guts of million of Negroes.

The result is that none of us can be sure of our mental and emotional balance. We ponder, we probe, we analyze, we argue—but none of us really understands why the disorders come as they do, where they do, at the time they do.

It would be foolish to underestimate the racial element of the conflicts that have made this summer a grievous American tragedy. But it would also be shortsighted and dangerous to mistake what is fundamentally class conflict for race rioting.

One of the most intriguing stories of the Detroit upheaval was an Associated Press dispatch about interracial cooperation among the looters and thieves.

Some observers long ago sensed a growing alienation of impoverished Negroes from the so-called Negro middle class. There was this great mass of Negro Americans whose lives had barely been touched by the civil rights gains of the last two decades. Their diet was no longer the fatback and molasses of rural areas; it was the potato chips and grape soda of the cities. But this mass was still undereducated, undernourished, underemployed—and increasingly hopeless.

There is more and more evidence that the affluent Negro is as much a stranger, and perhaps an enemy, to him as is the white man.

Detroit would suggest that there are also thousands of poor whites who swelter in grubby tenements, resenting those who sit in air-conditioned comfort, eating like the royalty of other lands, watching color television.

So there is an element of revolt of the "have-nots" against the "haves" in this madness that sweeps from city to city.

No sane Americans of any race can argue with Johnson's assertion that the thieves, the looters, the snipers "must be dealt with forcefully, swiftly, certainly—under law."

But neither can any wise American reject his assertion that "we seek more than the uneasy calm of martial law. We seek peace based on one man's respect for another . . . We seek peace based on steady progress in meeting the needs of our people."

Only the blindest person would deny that the unmet needs are many. But the utterances and the inaction of this Congress suggest that man, in his lingering fallibility, still responds with angry reaction when the times call most for farsighted action.

We are a great nation. Providence has blessed us with too much material abundance for our society to fall hostage to those who are hungry and harassed. There is no excuse for widespread hunger in America today. And surely we have rescued from the deluge of time enough wisdom not to crash upon the old rocks of prejudice and hatred.

We must keep the faith that tomorrow holds a remedy for today's woes. Not because time heals all wounds, but because we have the ability and power both to maintain order and to right old wrongs—if we have the will.

KABC–TV Blackballs CAP

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 9, 1967

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial recently aired by KABC–TV, of Los Angeles, is correct in its facts, assumptions and conclusions:

WATER

Water—whether it comes from the Colorado River, the Pacific Northwest, or from desalination projects—is the lifeblood of Southern California.

The Central Arizona Projects threatens California's basic water suply. The Arizona project would divert Colorado River water to irrigate one million acres of Central Arizona—water now committed to Southern California.

Such projects violate the regional agreement on Colorado River water. Even so, Congress is giving serious consideration to legislation which would give Arizona the right to drain off water which belongs to California.

Whoever controls water supplies in the West controls the destiny of millions of people. Senator Carl Hayden's bill could change the future of Southern California—because it would give Arizona prior rights to available water.

Defeat of the Arizona plan is vital to every one of us. Write your Congressman and Senators Kuchel and Murphy. Make it clear that California's future depends on the defeat of Senator Hayden's bill.

Speech of Hon. W. M. Tuck, of Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 9, 1967

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday night, August 5, 1967, I had the privilege of attending the banquet at the annual meeting of the Virginia Association of Commonwealth's Attorneys at the Cavalier Hotel at Virginia Beach. I heard one of the finest speeches it has ever been my good fortune to hear.

The speech of the occasion was delivered by the Honorable W. M. Tuck, Member of the House of Representatives from the Fifth Congressional District of Virginia. He gave an outstanding presentation of the situation now confronting the people of America. In addition, he pointed out the pathways that have led to the deplorable crisis now facing our Nation. He placed the blame where it should be. He gave sound doctrine which, if followed. I am sure would place this Nation back on the right track. I subscribe to his message wholeheartedly.

Representative Tuck is one of the outstanding statesmen of America. He has spent almost all of his adult life rendering service to his home county, his State, and his Nation. He is admired and loved by the overwhelming majority of the people of Virginia. He served in the legislative halls of Virginia with distinction. He was one of the great Governors of the Commonwealth. Many crises arose during his occupancy of the governorship. He met every one of them with a firm hand and the wisdom of a Solomon. Representative Tuck has served in the House of Representatives with honor and distinction. Everyone here admires his ability, his graciousness, and his integrity.

Mr. Speaker, I commend to all the Members of this body the great speech that Representative Tuck made last Saturday night and which I am including along with my remarks. The speech is as follows:

Remarks of Congressman William M. Tuck, Democrat, of Virginia, at Annual Meeting of the Virginia Association of Commonwealth's Attorneys at Cavalier Hotel, Virginia Beach, Va., August 5, 1967

I am greatly pleased to be invited to visit and address the Virginia Association of Commonwealth's Attorneys. Although whenever I have appeared in criminal cases it has been on the side of the defense, nevertheless we do have a common interest, for the legal profession is the tie that binds us together. I am very proud to be included in such a fraternity. I will never forget the pride that came to me when I learned that I had passed the Virginia State Bar Examination and was lawfully entitled to hang out my shingle. That was many years ago. The intervening years have brought a myriad of social, governmental, political and economic changes.

The governmental changes have been the most numerous and radical among these, and as a result we are facing a national crime situation unprecedented in this country. The crime situation has gotten out of hand and unless we can stem the tide, we may find that our country is enveloped in anarchy. Someone recently said that it is safer to walk on the streets of Saigon than it is on the streets of Washington. The same situation now seems to obtain in many other principal cities of America.

During the last eight years, according to the Federal Bureau of Investigation, crime has been increasing at a rate six times faster than our population. Figures for the first three months of this year indicate that the number of major crimes committed during that period was 20 per cent higher than during the same period of 1966. This represents the largest increase during the nine years the FBI has kept records on crime trends.

Increases have been reported in all areas of crime, in all parts of the country, and in cities and towns of all sizes. The greatest increase was in crimes of violence, which were up 20 per cent. Included in these were murders, up 23 per cent; forcible rape, up 8 per cent; robbery, up 32 per cent, and aggravated assault, up 15 per cent. The overall increase in crime in cities of 100,000 or more was 20 per cent; in the suburbs, 22 per cent, and in rural areas, 16 per cent.

I cite these figures to indicate to you the gravity of the crime situation that now faces us and the urgency that something be done about it. You will be interested to know that the financial cost of crime is in excess of $27 billion per year. No method has been devised, nor scales adjusted, and none ever will be, by which to measure and weigh and value the tragic toll in human lives and the incalculable costs associated with fear and suspicion which mark urban life today.

The National Crime Commission states that the total amount of crime in the United States is several times that reflected by the FBI figures, which are based only on crimes reported to the police. A survey of three major cities conducted by the Commission indicated that from two to ten times as much crime occurs as is reported to the police.

The reason given the surveying teams as to why the crime was not reported is shocking. "The police could do nothing about it," was the most common explanation.

The sense of public helplessness reflected in this statement is one of the most serious aspects of the crime problem today, and it has its counterpart in the knowledge of law enforcement officers across the country that they lack essential support in their efforts to curb the spiralling wave of crime.

A report was prepared recently on police recruitment and retention difficulties in the District of Columbia, the site of our national capital and one of the worst crime spots in America. This report shows an increase in crime there of 39.8 per cent over the same months last year, with robberies for the period rising 97.3 per cent.

In this report it is pointed out that police patrolmen feel that they are exposed on the firing line, are left to their own resources, have no backing on the part of the District government, and are subject to physical assault. Moreover, they suspect that members of the city administration are encouraging frivilous or malicious action against them by repeatedly assuring the public how simple it is to prosecute or file damage suits against police officers.

The "atmosphere" referred to in this report, I fear, is to be found in many other cities of America. Both State and local police departments are finding it increasingly difficult to keep their police force fully staffed. A recent survey of 24 major cities revealed that only two of their police departments were of maximum strength.

Certain politicians and sociologists and so-called civil rights advocates seem to desire to place the blame for the racial riots now running rampant through the land on the law-abiding citizens of America for having permitted certain conditions to exist in the ghettos in the cities of the country. All sensible people would like to see full employment and would also do what is reasonable to improve the filthy conditions referred to. However, I would remind these misguided zealots of impracticability that there is little relationship, if any, between impoverished circumstances and criminal behavior. Evidence is overwhelming that poverty does not cause crime and that elimination of poverty will not prevent crime. On the contrary, the relationship between crime and material conditions appears to be exactly the other way around.

There has been less poverty in America in 1967 than in any previous year of our history, although one of the concomitants of this affluence is a mounting crime wave.

During the depression there was less crime in America than there is now. If the argument of these politicians and sociologists is correct, we would have had a genuine revolution all over the country in the depression years of the 1930's, and the present prosperous days of 1967 would be marked with unprecedented peace and tranquility.

The City of Detroit, scene of the worst riot which has ever occurred in America, has often been cited as having the most effective anti-poverty program in the nation. The wage conditions there as between the races is the same and probably exceeds the rate of any other city in America. The white and colored people in that city live side by side on the same streets. There is no segregation of any sort. Detroit is the only city in America that has two Negro members in the United States Congress.

No other city in the last ten years has had so much time and attention given to it by the Federal Government, and none has had so many hundreds of millions of federal dollars poured into it. Businessmen and the multitudinous unions have sought to improve the lot of the Negroes and the poor people.

I warned the American Congress in 1957 and again in 1964 that these so-called Civil Rights Bills would not ameliorate the racial tensions, but on the other hand would exacerbate the same. I cautioned against opening up Pandora's box, and I told the House of Representatives at the time that in passing this legislation they were undertaking like Haman of old to build a scaffold upon which to hang Mordecai, and reminded them that Mordecai was not hanged on that scaffold. Instead it was Haman who was hanged and Mordecai was present to witness the ceremony, and the last scene that Haman's eyes looked upon as he went down to his death was his enemy, Mordecai, luxurating in the luscious arms of Haman's paramour. The very conditions which I then predicted are taking place now, and these Northerners and Westerners who have been so zealous to improve conditions in the South now have their hands full looking out for themselves.

These riots are due largely to the senseless decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States, the actions of the Executive Department of this and several previous administrations, and legislation recently passed by the Congress of the United States. Congress also has its full share of responsibility, not for the laws it refused to pass, such as the anti-rat law, but the laws it did pass, such as the so-called Civil Rights Acts and others. The responsibility lies with the leadership of both our national parties. Both deserve to be rebuked for their shabby behavior in playing politics with this racial issue.

We can recognize the early beginning of the racial riots by considering the occurrences at Danville about four years ago. The crisis which arose in that peaceful and tranquil community where the races had lived in harmony for centuries was precipitated by lawless agitators from out of the State who came there for the sole purpose of fomenting discord and strife and to violate the laws of the Commonwealth of Virginia.

This public mischief and flaunting of the law could have been speedily suppressed by the local police but for the fact that agents of the Executive Department came from Washington to Danville and consorted and associated with and counseled these irresponsible elements in such a way as to seek to intimidate, to harass, and to impede local law enforcement agencies in the exercise of their powers and responsibilities. These malcontents succeeded in agitating the senseless minority of our Negroes to such an extent that demonstrations and violations of law were carried on for weeks.

The officers of the City of Danville, particularly the judge of the Corporation Court, the Commonwealth's attorney, the mayor of the city, and the chief of police, as well as the better element of both races, are to be commended for the sensible solutions they made of these problems despite the handicaps imposed by outsiders.

No government should surrender to the threat of the force of these demonstrators, rioters, and looters. The law should be enforced in such a manner that no city should have to cope with mobs gathered on the streets in violation of State and local laws and court injunctions.

Those who would disturb the peace and break our laws must be dealt with firmly and resolutely and in such fashion as to make them and all others like them know that lawlessness will not be tolerated in any locality in the United States of America. Instead of intimidating, harassing, and impeding our police officers, the government at all levels, local, State and national, should let these policemen know that they are expected to use whatever force is necessary to complete an arrest and to subjugate a criminal. At the same time, if help from the State or National Government is needed, the local authorities should be assured that it will be promptly forthcoming.

This nation was founded on the principle that observance of the law is the eternal safeguard of liberty. Definance of the law is the surest way to tyranny. Few laws are generally loved by all citizens, but they are to be respected and not resisted. A man may disagree with the law, but he may not disobey it. We must have a government of laws, not of men.

We have been repeatedly warned by history that every society which became lawless soon decayed. The first evidence of this decay appeared in the toleration of disobedience of laws and the judgment of the courts. There now seems to be existing in this country a planned course of lawlessness that has already gotten out of hand and which must surely lead ultimately to a complete surrender to lawlessness.

We must forthwith put an end to the practice of minority group leaders who go about telling the dissatisfied element that they should obey the laws they favor and violate the ones they do not like. These men are a danger to our society. We have too great a country to stand idly by and allow lawless and irresponsible men to encourage lawless and riotous conduct.

At least one of the central issues in the question of law enforcement is the relative impotence of our system resulting primarily from the recent Supreme Court decisions, particularly the *Miranda* v. *Arizona* ruling regarding confessions. Commenting on it, Quinn Tamm, Executive Director of the International Association of Chiefs of Police, said:

"We are gratified with President Johnson's vigorous interest in having the police fight crime. At the same time, however, we must eliminate the paradox. We cannot have one hand of government turning the key on the criminal while the other hand opens the back door for his escape from punishment."

The *Miranda* ruling, as you know, dictates that, immediately upon apprehension, all suspects must be informed of their right to remain silent and their right to legal counsel, at public expense if they are unable to provide it for themselves. These guidelines are derived from an interpretation of the Fifth Amendment's provision that no person shall be compelled to bear witness against himself.

One of the most horrendous features of the recent Supreme Court decisions is the fact that this court, under Warren, for the first time in American history, has established procedure for the trial and conduct of criminal cases in State courts. In other words, the effect of these decisions has been to divest all our State courts of their time-honored authority and powers. If this trend continues unabated, our whole system of jurisprudence will become federalized.

Because of this ruling, according to an article appearing in the current issue of Reader's Digest, a mother who confessed to killing her four-year-old son with a broom stick had to be released. And when she thanked the judge, he replied, "Don't thank me. Thank the United States Supreme Court. You killed the child and you ought to go to jail."

The Federal Government must be compelled to stop coddling lawbreakers. Some jurists have raised the question as to whether the Bill of Rights interpretations by the Supreme Court do not seriously affect the delicate balance between the rights of individuals and those of society. The rights of law-abiding citizens should take procedence over the rights of criminals. When a crime is committed, the question in law should be whether or not the accused is guilty and what punishment is merited and not a determination as to whether or not the criminal had a lawyer before he confessed.

The *Miranda* ruling has had the effect of shifting the emphasis in the investigation of guilt or innocence from the suspect to the police. My friend, the distinguished Judge Alexander Holtzoff of the United States District Court in Washington, recently remarked:

"I must say that I sometimes feel, when I am trying a criminal case, as though I am in a topsy-turvy world: I am not trying the accused, I am trying the policeman."

The Warren Court has lost sight of the rights of the public and the rights of the victims of these criminals. Its recent decisions would appear to be based on the theory that society needs little protection from criminals, but criminals need much protection from law enforcement officers.

All lawyers and students of government recognize the importance of maintaining rules of evidence to protect the true constitutional rights of every person accused of crime. I would certainly not advocate the abolishment of rules of evidence that would hamper a person charged with crime in making an adequate defense. We do not wish to have a police state fastened upon our country. The acquittal of the innocent is as important in the building of a law-abiding, peaceful and prosperous community as is the conviction of the criminal. Rules of evidence, however, are distasteful where they work in such a way as to bring about the acquittal of persons known to be guilty.

The purpose of the administration of justice is the quest for truth. And, in keeping with this, the test of the validity of confessions is whether or not they are voluntarily given. These criteria seem particularly applicable today.

There are no indications that our law-abiding citizens need further protection from the police, while there is every indication that they need considerably more protection from the lawless. The statistics which I recited make it all too clear that the need today is for stronger law enforcement and more concern about the rights of the law-abiding.

In his dissenting opinion concerning the *Miranda* ruling, Mr. Justice Harlan commented that the thrust of it is "to negate all pressures, to reinforce the nervous or ignorant suspect, and ultimately to discourage any confession at all. The aid, in short, is toward 'voluntariness' in a Utopian sense, or, to view it from a different angle, voluntariness with a vengeance."

Enlightening the ignorant, protecting the nervous, and supplying the indigent with free legal counsel are admirable goals, but I propose that they are not functions of the criminal law of a society which falls as far short of Utopia as does our own. As the situation now stands, these goals are being accomplished at the expense of police effectiveness and public safety.

The Administration has responded to the crime crisis with the Safe Streets and Crime Control Bill, which has been renamed the Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice Assistance Bill by the House Judiciary Committee. Both of these titles are a misnomer, for it will do neither.

This bill would make a considerable amount of federal money available to State and local organizations for a variety of purposes including improved police equipment, construction of better facilities, rehabilitation programs, police-community relations programs, and more research. But it is feared by many, including myself, that it constitutes the first step to federal control of our State and local police.

Thus I have grave doubts as to the wisdom of this approach. First of all, when considering the prospect of massive federal aid to State and local law enforcement, we would do well to bear in mind the following observation of Supreme Court Justice Robert H. Jackson in a 1942 decision: "It is hardly lack of due process for the Government to regulate what it subsidizes." This is an area in which we can run no risk of the possibility of any form of federal regulation, even under the guise of the setting of standards.

The emphasis of the Administration bill is on equipment and rehabilitation, on research and understanding. The most effective method the Federal Government could employ to assist in the suppression of crime would be to support the States and localities in their efforts to enforce the law and to desist from the past practices of hindering and impeding them.

The House of Representatives recently passed by an overwhelming majority the anti-riot bill, H.R. 421. I introduced and proposed similar legislation in both the 88th and 89th Congresses, but inasmuch as these agitators were then operating only in the South, the Congress at that time turned a deaf ear and refused even to consider my proposal.

The country vitally needs the provisions of this measure, and it will prove an effective instrument with which to put an end to the racial troubles now shaking the nation. It does not constitute a usurpation of the powers of the State, but simply makes it a federal offense to cross State lines for the purpose of violating the laws of the States and localities.

There is nothing strange and novel about this legislative approach. Since 1910, Congress has enacted a substantial number of criminal laws to free interstate commerce of corruptive influence. To name a few, the Mann Act, the Fugitive Felon Act, and the law to make it a federal offense to transport stolen automobiles in interstate commerce.

The House Committee on the Judiciary, in reporting H.R. 421, recognized that law enforcement is a local responsibility and made it clear that this bill in no way impedes or usurps local law enforcement, but rather will give it force and support. By assuring federal investigative and prosecutive jurisdiction over "out-of-state" inciters, local authorities should be substantially fortified in their efforts to keep the peace.

Without exception, I feel that States are capable and desirous of enforcing the law on a local basis. This can be accomplished if they are protected from the vicious outside influences which snub our laws and ignore our community mores, resulting in the chaos prevalent in many sections. Our safety and our liberty depend on the excellence of local and State law enforcement.

I have been engaged in the practice of law almost 50 years. I have from time to time actively participated in the trial of many cases, both civil and criminal. As a result, I can proudly commend Virginia on the high type of court officials with which we have been blessed. I have had the privilege of close association with the judges and Commonwealth's attorneys, as well as police officers, who likewise deserve, as they no doubt have, the appreciation of our citizens.

I have held public office for more than 40 years, during which I have sought to serve in the highest public interest. I am cognizant of the honors which have been conferred upon me and the trusts imposed. I have been associated in public life with many of you and with others who are not here, a number of whom have passed on into the great beyond.

Among Virginia's greatest blessings has been the leadership of the late Senator H. F. Byrd. He loved Virginia and every foot of her soil. The governmental philosophy which he embraced and espoused is appreciated and lingers in the breasts of an overwhelming majority of Virginia people. His philosophy and his public record demonstrate that he sought always to promote improvement and desirable changes in government, but when it came to fundamentals, he rightly believed that these never changed. He remained steadfast and unmovable in his firm support of basic principles. God forbid that Virginians will ever become so unmindful of our glorious past as to abandon the beliefs and governmental practices to which we have adhered throughout the years and which have brought our Commonwealth to its present state of eminence.

Virginia is the cradle of the Republic. She stands high in the sisterhood of States and her government is admired throughout the land. Our Chambers of Commerce and our Virginia Industrial Commission in their successful efforts to bring new industry to Virginia have learned that the type of government we have has served to attract these new industries.

I trust that Virginia will never abandon the sound philosophy which has guided her in the past. I hope that our people will insist upon continuing capable and worthy leaders in the forefront of our Virginia government. Our fiscal policies have brought us distinction. We must preserve our pay-as-you-go system and remain free from substantial bonded indebtedness.

I hope that Virginia will continue a public leadership which will fight to hold such powers and responsibilities as remain with the

States and localities and recapture the powers which have been unlawfully and unconstitutionally taken from the States by the National Government. This is essential for the preservation of good government at all levels.

If we are to preserve our form of government, our citizenship must take an active interest in public affairs.

In conclusion, there comes down to us an admonition in a beautiful passage from the literature of our Revolutionary period, the following words incorporated in that matchless instrumentality of freedom, the Virginia Bill of Rights:

"That no free government, or the blessings of liberty, can be preserved to any people but by a strict adherence to justice, moderation, temperance, frugality and virtue; and by a frequent recurrence to fundamental principles."

Liberals Fascism Showing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 9, 1967

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, actions many times belie words.

Can we talk of a "free society," yet at the same time dedicate ourselves to the destruction of individual freedom?

Is a liberal one who advocates the maximum freedom of an individual from compelling laws and government interferences? Or has the liberal developed to the point that he does not trust his fellowman to be free and so demands compulsory laws and dictatorial governmental control over the liberties of his fellow citizens.

If the liberal now demands control and regulation by an all-powerful central government, he cannot be liberal—his fascism is showing.

Mr. Speaker, I insert the article on the Civil Rights Commission from the August 8 Evening Star and an article on the civil riots bill of 1967, also from the August 8 Evening Star, to follow my remarks:

RIGHTS UNIT HITS U.S. EDUCATION OFFICE

(By John Mathews)

The U.S. Office of Education, accused by Southern congressmen of moving too fast in requiring school desegregation, was charged by the U.S. Civil Rights Commission today with moving too slowly.

Failure by the Office of Education to enforce its desegregation guidelines as written has resulted, the commisson said, in more children attending all-Negro schools in the 17 Southern and border states today than in 1954, when the Supreme Court outlawed racial segregation in schools.

More than 2.5 million Negro children or 75 percent of all Negro children in the 17 Southern and border states attend all-Negro schools. "The vast majority of Negro children in the South still are being denied the rights declared to be theirs by the Supreme Court's decision . . . and the Civil Rights Act of 1964," the commission said.

During a briefing yesterday, William L. Taylor, staff director for the six-member presidential commission, indirectly linked racial riots in cities with the slow pace of Southern school desegregation.

DISRESPECT FOR LAW

Educating another generation of children in inadequate segregated Southern schools as well as in de facto segregated Northern schools "will be building up the same kinds of alienation and frustration we are witnessing now," Taylor said. He added that failure to enforce the law regarding school desegregation "has some influence on the fact that there is disrespect for law" demonstrated in city riots.

The commission, headed by John A. Hannah, president of Michigan State University, said that the Office of Education through "substantial administrative dilution" had accepted many plans from Southern school districts calling for less desegregation than required in the controversial federal guidelines.

The guidelines have been bitterly attacked by Southern congressmen as an illegal administrative policy going beyond the congressional intent of Title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act. The most controversial section required that school districts with racially segregated schools during the 1965–66 school year to generally accomplish 15 percent pupil desegregation for the 1966–67 school year. The guidelines are unchanged for the school year beginning in September.

The commission also faulted the Office of Education for accepting freedom of choice plans in Southern school districts even though the plans produced virtually no desegregation of schools. Under freedom of choice Negro children volunteer to attend previously all-white schools.

ON-THE SPOT STUDIES

On-the-spot studies by commission staff members in 63 school districts in 14 states produced testimony in 6 school districts that shots had been fired at homes of Negroes who elected to send their children to formerly white schools. Threats of loss of job and eviction from residences were reported to be widespread.

The lax enforcement of the guidelines as written was due in part to understaffing of the Office of Education's Equal Educational Opportunities Program and inadequate collection of data from school districts, the commission said.

At the press briefing Taylor said it was "obvious" that there had been pressure on the Office of Education and congressional opposition to the guidelines. But, he added, the commission came to no conclusion as to whether this had led to abandoning the initial intent of enforcing the guidelines as written.

Several months ago enforcement of the guidelines was removed from the Office of Education by John Gardner, secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, and delegated to Peter Libassi, his special assistant for civil rights and director of the new HEW Office of Civil Rights.

Libassi yesterday issued a statement agreeing with the commission conclusion that enforcement of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act was both "heartening and discouraging." He added that careful consideration will be given to the commission recommendations.

The commission urged HEW to require for the coming school year compliance with the desegregation percentages of the guidelines, and for the school year beginning in September to bar freedom of choice plans, unless they result in substantial desegregation and there has been no harassment or intimidation of Negro parents and students.

The commission said Congress should enact legislation enabling a parent or child to bring a civil suit for damages and injunctive relief against anyone who harasses or intimidates him because of his race or enrollment in a public school. The attorney general should be authorized to sue on behalf of the parent or child, the commission recommended.

Noting an increase in the number of all-white private schools designed to avoid desegrated public schools, the commission said the secretary of the Treasury should ask the attorney general for an opinion as to whether such schools are entitled to a tax exempt status or to gifts that are tax deductible. The Internal Revenue Service last week granted tax exempt status to 42 such schools.

In its field investigations the commission also found that federal education funds were used to upgrade Negro schools, thus discouraging Negro parents from transferring their children to better quality white schools.

In its statistical section, the commission noted that in the 17 Southern and border states more than 75 percent of Negro children attend all Negro schools. In the 11 Southern states the figure is 83.1 percent and in the 6 border states, including Maryland and Virginia, the figure is 32.2 percent in all Negro schools. Using the scale of less than 100 percent Negro to indicate an integrated school can mean that the addition of one Negro, oriental or Indian child results in a school being listed as integrated.

If the scale of less than 95 percent Negro is used, nearly 83 percent of all Southern and border schools would be listed as segregated. In three border states, Kentucky, Delaware and West Virginia, more than 80 percent of Negro children go to schools that are less than 95 percent Negro. Maryland, however, shows only 40.5 percent of its Negro children go to schools that are 95 percent or less Negro. Virginia has the lowest border state figure, 20 percent.

JOHNSON GETS CHURCH BACKING ON RIGHTS BILL

(By Dana Bullen)

Passage of Johnson administration civil rights measures would help re-fuse conditions that contribute to riots, spokesmen for major religious faiths told Congress today.

Appearing before the Senate's subcommittee on constitutional rights, representatives of the U.C. Catholic Conference, the Union of American Hebrew Congregations and the National Council of Churches said in a joint statement:

"If we cannot achieve the just society, then all of us, both the oppressors and the oppressed, live as less than men and the whole fabric of civilization is in danger.

"The civil rights bill of 1967 is needed, not only to safeguard the rights of minority groups but to secure the balance and stability that comes only with the full realization of justice."

The subcommittee is holding hearings on administration measures to ban discrimination in housing, employment and jury selections, to extend the life of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights and to prescribe federal penalties for interfering with persons exercising their civil rights.

Similar proposals were approved by the House in the last Congress but died in the Senate.

Following presentation of the statement, Sen. Sam J. Ervin Jr., the subcommittee chairman, inquired repeatedly whether the open housing section bill would prevent people from "expressing any preference" about persons to whom they would like to sell or rent.

"Isn't there a total destruction of the right of the property owner to sell or rent as he pleases?" said Ervin.

"He's free to have his prejudices, but where housing is concerned, he's not free to have his prejudices determine who shall be the transferee of the property," said Marvin Braiterman, who represented the Union of American Hebrew Congregations.

"This is a method of removing an irrelevent criterion that has resulted in ghettos," Braiterman said.

In urging support for this year's measures, the spokesmen for the three broadly based religious groups said they were not urging support for new civil rights measures as a "reward" for riots or as a "panacea" for current urban problems.

"We should remove the ingredients that purveyors of disorder can use and manipulate among unfortunate victims of frustration and dispair," they said.

"The riots of 1967 . . . come out of ghettos and inner city slums, out of a sense of entrapment, inequality and injustice," the religious spokesmen said.

"This civil rights bill deals with some of the causes of those problems," they said.

Presenting the statement with Braiterman were Msgr. George G. Higgins, U.S. Catholic Conference, and Dr. Gayraud S. Wilmore Jr., National Council of Churches.

National Trail System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 9, 1967

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, the festering sores in our Nation's cities should bring this Congress to a recognition not only of the work we must do in our urban slums, but the advantage of protecting those wilderness areas as yet unspoiled by urban blight.

However, legislation is now languishing in committee which would establish a nationwide system of trails and preserve the country's beauty for hikers far from the maddening crowd.

An editorial from the Washintgon Post of August 7 well explains the need for this legislation, and under leave to extend my remarks, I include the article in the RECORD at this point:

NATIONAL TRAIL SYSTEM

Concern over the fate of the Administration's bill to create a Nationwide system of trails is mounting. Very little opposition was apparent when the House Interior Committee conducted hearings on the bill some months ago. But it has not yet emerged from the Committee. It would be most unfortunate if the bill should fail of enactment simply for want of a little steam behind it.

The immediate effect of the bill would be to set up a Nationwide System of Trails with four initial units. These would be the Appalachian Trail following mountain ridges and slopes from Maine to Georgia; the Continental Divide Trail in the Rocky Mountains from the Canadian border to the Mexican border; the Pacific Crest Trail through all the West Coast States; and the Potomac Heritage Trail, extending 825 miles from the mouth to the sources of the Potomac River. Other scenic trails of national significance could be later added to the system, and the development of shorter trails on public lands and adjacent to large cities would be encouraged.

We think the entire country has an interest in this bill as a means of promoting outdoor recreation. Of course, it is of vital interest to the Washington area because of the Potomac Heritage Trail that it would create and the Appalachian Trail that it would rescue. In the past the Appalachian Trail Conference and its 40 member clubs have rendered an enormous service by operating and maintaining this scenic pathway. Their efforts are no longer adequate, however, and Federal aid appears to be the only means of saving this great national asset.

Though most of the Appalachian Trail runs through parks and forests, some 800 miles of it traverses private land. In recent years some of this land has been converted into subdivisions, highways and other incompatible projects. Some parts of the trail have ceased to exist. The great advantage of a 2000-mile scenic walkway near the country's largest urban centers cannot be regained without governmental help.

The bill would permit the Secretary of the Interior (and in other cases the Secretary of Agriculture) to buy or lease right-of-way for trails within the System or to acquire easements when feasible. The power of eminent domain could be used as a last resort if necessary. Only by these means can the country's most famous wilderness trails be saved.

Fortunately, the Appalachian Trail Conference would continue to maintain the trail and the accommodations built to serve its users. The bill envisages a healthy cooperation among Federal, state and private groups to serve a public purpose. The cost of saving this trail and of extending and building similar trails in other parts of the country will not be great. But the benefits will be large in terms of healthful recreation and greater appreciation of our scenic and historic assets.

A "Fantastic" Episode

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 9, 1967

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, an editorial in the August 3 edition of the New York Post sheds light on Governor Rockefeller's reaction to Governor Romney's criticism of the President's response to the Detroit riots. The editorial follows:

A "FANTASTIC" EPISODE

Shortly after publicly blasting President Johnson this week for allegedly playing politics during the grim hours of the Detroit riots, Gov. Romney of Michigan called up Gov. Rockefeller of New York.

It is tempting to entertain rich fantasies about the long-distance discussion between the two Republicans, but excerpts from the transcript already published suggest that the truth may have been funnier than fiction.

Praising Romney's attack on the White House as "forthright, courageous and effective," Rockefelled declared enthusiastically:

"George, you've done a *fantastic* job under the most trying circumstances."

The italics are ours. We turned to Webster's New International Dictionary (Second Edition) for a definition of "fantastic":

"2. (a) Imaginary; unreal; irrational as, fantastic fears, arguments. (b) Conceived or having the appearance of being conceived by wild and unrestrained fancy; bizarre; grotesque; quaint; accentric, as fantastic costumes, music. (3) Characterized by extravagant fancy or imagination; whimsical; fanciful."

Perhaps the Governor of New York was generously sympathizing with the Governor of Michigan. But, perhaps Romney should call back for further clarification.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402, at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates Printing Office, that their addresses may be who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government correctly given in the RECORD.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20515

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Speaker: John W. McCormack

Abbitt, Watkins M., *Va*	
Abernethy, Thomas G., *Miss.*	6278 29th St.
Adair, E. Ross, *Ind*	4000 Mass. Ave.
Adams, Brock, *Wash*	
Addabbo, Joseph P., *N.Y*	
Albert, Carl, *Okla*	4614 Reno Rd.
Anderson, John B., *Ill*	
Anderson, William R., *Tenn.*	3006 P St.
Andrews, George W., *Ala*	
Andrews, Mark, *N. Dak*	
Annunzio, Frank, *Ill*	
Arends, Leslie C., *Ill*	4815 Dexter St.
Ashbrook, John M., *Ohio*	
Ashley, Thomas L., *Ohio*	
Ashmore, Robert T., *S.C*	
Aspinall, Wayne N., *Colo*	The Towers Apts., 4201 Cathedral Ave.
Ayres, William H., *Ohio*	
Baring, Walter S., *Nev*	
Barrett, William A., *Pa*	
Bates, William H., *Mass*	
Battin, James F., *Mont*	
Belcher, Page, *Okla*	
Bell, Alphonzo, *Calif*	
Bennett, Charles E., *Fla*	3421 Rusticway Lane, Falls Church, Va.
Berry, E. Y., *S. Dak*	118 Schotts Court NE.
Betts, Jackson E., *Ohio*	
Bevill, Tom, *Ala*	6224 N. 35th St., Arlington, Va.
Biester, Edward G., Jr., *Pa*	
Bingham, Jonathan B., *N.Y.*	
Blackburn, Benjamin B., *Ga.*	
Blanton, Ray, *Tenn*	
Blatnik, John A., *Minn*	
Boggs, Hale, *La*	
Boland, Edward P., *Mass*	
Bolling, Richard, *Mo*	307 Warrenton Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Bolton, Frances P. (Mrs.), *Ohio.*	2301 Wyo. Ave.
Bow, Frank T., *Ohio*	4301 Mass. Ave.
Brademas, John, *Ind*	
Brasco, Frank J., *N.Y*	
Bray, William G., *Ind*	
Brinkley, Jack, *Ga*	
Brock, W. E. (Bill), *Tenn*	
Brooks, Jack, *Tex*	
Broomfield, William S., *Mich.*	
Brotzman, Donald G., *Colo*	
Brown, Clarence J., Jr., *Ohio.*	
Brown, Garry, *Mich*	
Brown, George E., Jr., *Calif*	
Broyhill, James T., *N.C*	
Broyhill, Joel T., *Va*	
Buchanan, John, *Ala*	
Burke, J. Herbert, *Fla*	
Burke, James A., *Mass*	
Burleson, Omar, *Tex*	
Burton, Laurence J., *Utah*	
Burton, Phillip, *Calif*	
Bush, George, *Tex*	
Button, Daniel E., *N.Y*	
Byrne, James A., *Pa*	
Byrnes, John W., *Wis*	1215 25th St. S., Arlington, Va.
Cabell, Earle, *Tex*	
Cahill, William T., *N.J*	
Carey, Hugh L., *N.Y*	
Carter, Tim Lee, *Ky*	
Casey, Bob, *Tex*	
Cederberg, Elford A., *Mich*	
Celler, Emanuel, *N.Y*	The Mayflower
Chamberlain, Charles E., *Mich.*	
Clancy, Donald D., *Ohio*	
Clark, Frank M., *Pa*	220 C St. SE.
Clausen, Don H., *Calif*	
Clawson, Del, *Calif*	
Cleveland, James C., *N.H*	
Cohelan, Jeffery, *Calif*	1202 Longworth House Office Bldg.
Collier, Harold R., *Ill*	
Colmer, William M., *Miss*	
Conable, Barber B., Jr., *N.Y.*	
Conte, Silvio O., *Mass*	5619 Lamar Rd., Washington 16, D.C.
Conyers, John, Jr., *Mich*	
Corbett, Robert J., *Pa*	
Corman, James C., *Calif*	
Cowger, William O., *Ky*	
Cramer, William C., *Fla*	6215 Beachway Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Culver, John C., *Iowa*	
Cunningham, Glenn, *Nebr*	
Curtis, Thomas B., *Mo*	
Daddario, Emilio Q., *Conn*	
Daniels, Dominick V., *N.J*	
Davis, Glenn R., *Wis*	
Davis, John W., *Ga*	
Dawson, William L., *Ill*	
de la Garza, Eligio, *Tex*	
Delaney, James J., *N.Y*	
Dellenback, John R., *Oreg*	6903 Crail Dr., Bethesda, Md.
Denney, Robert V., *Nebr*	
Dent, John H., *Pa*	
Derwinski, Edward J., *Ill*	
Devine, Samuel L., *Ohio*	
Dickinson, William L., *Ala*	
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., *Mich*	
Dingell, John D., *Mich*	
Dole, Robert, *Kans*	6136 Beachway Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Donohue, Harold D., *Mass*	
Dorn, Wm. Jennings Bryan, *S.C.*	2030 Laburnum St., McLean, Va.
Dow, John G., *N.Y*	
Dowdy, John, *Tex*	
Downing, Thomas N., *Va*	
Dulski, Thaddeus J., *N.Y*	347 Cannon House Office Building
Duncan, John J., *Tenn*	
Dwyer, Florence P. (Mrs.), *N.J.*	
Eckhardt, Bob, *Tex*	
Edmondson, Ed, *Okla*	
Edwards, Don, *Calif*	9201 Fox Meadow La., Potomac, Md.,
Edwards, Edwin W., *La*	
Edwards, Jack, *Ala*	
Eilberg, Joshua, *Pa*	
Erlenborn, John N., *Ill*	
Esch, Marvin L., *Mich*	11754 Gainsborough Rd., Rockville, Md.
Eshleman, Edwin D., *Pa*	
Evans, Frank E., *Colo*	
Everett, Robert A., *Tenn*	
Evins, Joe L., *Tenn*	5044 Klingle St.
Fallon, George H., *Md*	
Farbstein, Leonard, *N.Y*	
Fascell, Dante B., *Fla*	
Feighan, Michael A., *Ohio*	
Findley, Paul, *Ill*	
Fino, Paul A., *N.Y*	
Fisher, O. C., *Tex*	Calvert-Woodley
Flood, Daniel J., *Pa*	The Congressional
Flynt, John J., Jr., *Ga*	
Foley, Thomas S., *Wash*	
Ford, Gerald R., *Mich*	514 Crown View Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Ford, William D., *Mich*	
Fountain, L. H., *N.C*	The Westchester
Fraser, Donald M., *Minn*	
Frelinghuysen, Peter H. B., *N.J.*	3014 N St.
Friedel, Samuel N., *Md*	
Fulton, James G., *Pa*	
Fulton, Richard, *Tenn*	
Fuqua, Don, *Fla*	
Galifianakis, Nick, *N.C*	
Gallagher, Cornelius E., *N.J.*	
Gardner, James C., *N.C*	
Garmatz, Edward A., *Md*	
Gathings, E. C., *Ark*	
Gettys, Tom S., *S.C*	
Giaimo, Robert N., *Conn*	
Gibbons, Sam, *Fla*	
Gilbert, Jacob H., *N.Y*	
Gonzalez, Henry B., *Tex*	200 C St. SE.
Goodell, Charles E., *N.Y*	3842 Macomb St.
Goodling, George A., *Pa*	
Gray, Kenneth J., *Ill*	
Green, Edith (Mrs.), *Oreg*	
Green, William J., *Pa*	
Griffiths, Martha W. (Mrs.), *Mich.*	
Gross, H. R., *Iowa*	
Grover, James R., Jr., *N.Y*	
Gubser, Charles S., *Calif*	
Gude, Gilbert, *Md*	
Gurney, Edward J., *Fla*	
Hagan, G. Elliott, *Ga*	
Haley, James A., *Fla*	
Hall, Durward G., *Mo*	
Halleck, Charles A., *Ind*	4926 Upton St.
Halpern, Seymour, *N.Y*	
Hamilton, Lee H., *Ind*	
Hammerschmidt, John Paul, *Ark.*	
Hanley, James M., *N.Y*	
Hanna, Richard T., *Calif*	
Hansen, George V., *Idaho*	
Hansen, Julia Butler (Mrs.), *Wash.*	
Hardy, Porter, Jr., *Va*	
Harrison, William Henry, *Wyo.*	
Harsha, William H., *Ohio*	
Harvey, James, *Mich*	
Hathaway, William D., *Maine.*	
Hawkins, Augustus F., *Calif.*	
Hays, Wayne L., *Ohio*	
Hébert, F. Edward, *La*	26 Cockrell St., Alexandria, Va.
Hechler, Ken, *W. Va*	
Heckler, Margaret M. (Mrs.), *Mass.*	
Helstoski, Henry, *N.J*	
Henderson, David N., *N.C*	
Herlong, A. S., Jr., *Fla*	
Hicks, Floyd V., *Wash*	
Holifield, Chet, *Calif*	
Holland, Elmer J., *Pa*	
Horton, Frank, *N.Y*	
Hosmer, Craig, *Calif*	
Howard, James J., *N.J*	
Hull, W. R., Jr., *Mo*	
Hungate, William L., *Mo*	
Hunt, John E., *N.J*	
Hutchinson, Edward, *Mich*	
Ichord, Richard (Dick), *Mo.*	
Irwin, Donald J., *Conn*	
Jacobs, Andrew, Jr., *Ind*	
Jarman, John, *Okla*	
Joelson, Charles S., *N.J*	
Johnson, Albert W., *Pa*	
Johnson, Harold T., *Calif*	
Jonas, Charles Raper, *N.C*	
Jones, Paul C., *Mo*	1111 Army-Navy Dr., Arlington, Va.
Jones, Robert E., *Ala*	
Jones, Walter B., *N.C*	
Karsten, Frank M., *Mo*	
Karth, Joseph E., *Minn*	
Kastenmeier, Robert W., *Wis.*	
Kazen, Abraham, Jr., *Tex*	
Kee, James, *W. Va*	5441 16th Ave., Hyattsville, Md.
Keith, Hastings, *Mass*	5906 Harwick Rd., Woodacres, Md.
Kelly, Edna F. (Mrs.), *N.Y*	
King, Carleton J., *N.Y*	
King, Cecil R., *Calif*	
Kirwan, Michael J., *Ohio*	
Kleppe, Thomas S., *N. Dak*	
Kluczynski, John C., *Ill*	
Kornegay, Horace R., *N.C*	
Kupferman, Theodore R., *N.Y.*	
Kuykendall, Dan, *Tenn*	
Kyl, John, *Iowa*	
Kyros, Peter N., *Maine*	
Laird, Melvin R., *Wis*	
Landrum, Phil M., *Ga*	
Langen, Odin, *Minn*	
Latta, Delbert L., *Ohio*	
Leggett, Robert L., *Calif*	
Lennon, Alton, *N.C*	
Lipscomb, Glenard P., *Calif.*	
Lloyd, Sherman P., *Utah*	
Long, Clarence D., *Md*	

Appendix

Remarks of the Honorable Joseph M. Montoya

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. E. S. JOHNNY WALKER

OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 10, 1967

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, a member of the New Mexico congressional delegation, the Honorable Senator Joseph M. Montoya, delivered the main address at the annual national convention of the Disabled American Veterans.

This address, in my opinion, should be given the widest circulation possible. It is an inspirational address and I hope my colleagues will read it and ponder the significance of these words.

The text of this speech follows:

I commend you for such a large and enthusiastic representation here at your National Convention. Through my many years of state and Federal Government I have worked very closely with many of your comrades, but this is the first time it has been my privilege to meet with you during a national convention.

I am encouraged by this wonderful attendance. It reflects an awareness of the acute need for veterans to be organized. It is an encouragement for all veterans—but even more—it is an indication of the deep concern you hold for our way of life and government. Your interest, devotion and enthusiasm to fight for our American Way did not diminish when you took off your uniforms. In fact, instead of waning in your support, this meeting is evidence that it continues to expand. Your activities throughout the years have benefited not only members of your organization—and all other veterans—but have enhanced the democratic principles of our nation. Your actions have helped build an America without precedent or peer—the world's greatest nation.

But, despite your efforts of the past—there is still a great task for you to accomplish. Your continued support for principles of freedom is in ever growing demand.

You and other veterans organizations have spear-headed a patriotic upsurge that is taking place all across our land. This is as it should be, for who besides those men who have defended this nation in time of peril are better qualified to imbue both young and old with the need for allegiance to our nation?

There are times when a legislator is invited to speak before an audience that has championed a worthy cause—but because of some stumbling blocks the legislators has been unable to accomplish the goals of the group. However—it is always a terrific pleasure to be able to appear before any group and tell them he has accomplished their desires. This is the position in which I find myself today.

I am happy to report to you that my proposals to broaden and expand rights and benefits of veterans and their dependents have met with success in both Houses of our Congress.

Just to name a few of these new provisions—we have provided that disability compensation will be awarded at wartime rates under all circumstances—we have made sure there are disability pensions for veterans and death pensions for widows and children of the present conflict. We have provided the $250 burial allowance to all veterans—regardless of when they served. We have provided rate increases for veterans, widows and children who are now receiving a pension under Public Law 86-211—for Spanish-American and prior war widows—and also increases in the housebound allowance. We have written in the presumption clause of permanent and total disability on attainment of age 65—we have made sure there is presumption of need for regular aid and attendanse for pensioners who are in nursing homes. We have changed marriage requirements for widows. We have allowed our new veterans from Viet-Nam to finish high school without using up their college benefits—and, of course, we have increased the allotment to our veterans taking education training.

There are other benefits—and I am most happy to see my proposals being accepted and enacted into law by your Congress.

You have championed these causes for a long time—and I know you share my happiness and pride over the fact that we have accomplished our goals.

This by no means signals the end of our efforts. As long as we have veterans—there must be new programs—new ideas—and revisions of existing statutes. Your continued vigilance—and willingness to see that the right laws are passed—will be needed long into our future.

I agree we have entered an era of cognizance for our veterans—a new era in which even the President has taken note of the needs of the American Veteran. It was a pleasant surprise to receive the message the President sent to Congress on January 31st—first of its kind in the history of our nation. Many Congressmen and Senators have long fought for veterans benefits—but President Johnson is the first man in the White House to send a message to Capitol Hill dealing specifically with needs of our veterans. It was indeed a pleasant change—and, I believe—an indication that henceforth it will be assured that the American veteran is due some special consideration.

With this much of the battle won—you, as members of the DAV—can attack other problems that are just as pressing—and most vital to our country.

For . . . to say that I am not disturbed over our world situation today would be an untruth. You will be called upon in the coming year for much devotion and action . . . in order to help preserve our freedom, and thereby the freedom of peace-loving nations all over the globe. I am grieved—as I know you are—that America's finest young men are once more required to brave the horrors of the battlefield for freedom's sake. I am saddened that the toll from the Viet-Nam conflict is mounting.

But, loss of American lives in Viet-Nam is not my only concern, nor perhaps even the *greatest* concern of this day. I have come to accept the fact that our nation has a self-imposed commitment to protect for others the freedom we so jealously cherish ourselves. And this commitment becomes more acute when aggressors attack a nation incapable of protecting its own freedom because of the overwhelming might and methods of the aggressor.

I believe our men in Viet-Nam are fighting—and yes, dying—for the freedom of many peoples; just as surely as Americans fell for liberty and human dignity in the trenches of the Meuse-Argonne or on the beach at Normandy—or the frozen hills of Korea.

What disturbs me most is that so many of our basic attitudes as Americans are now being questioned and challenged. As a people, in so many ways, our values seem to be different than they were only a decade ago. I am concerned, too, that these attitudes and values appear to be changing at a quickened pace.

I do not refer to passing fads of mini-skirts or the way some young men wear their hair. These are trivial "signs of the times," which have come and gone since you and I can remember. During my college days—some of my friends ate gold fish—but decided there were more important things after their spree with what they considered daring. Today's non-conformists are not the problem. I have faith in their abilities and knowledge to cope with the situation when their time comes to guide our nation. What I refer to is a problem among our adults—their attitudes and thinking. This withdrawal into themselves without concern for our future seems to be invading our everyday lives.

It is possible that these men and women have abandoned all sense of responsibility? Do not misunderstand. I welcome change. Change is as necessary for preservation of a nation as continuation of the race itself.

Adaptation is part of the continuing process of evolution. To cling to the past generates stagnation, and stagnation will eventually erase any nation from existence.

This is what we must prevent. New pacifist thinking promotes stagnation. It deplores any act that will emit an awareness of true living with goals for the future.

After the atomic explosions at Hiroshima and Nagasaki forever changed our concepts of waging war and preserving peace, we learned quickly there still existed a necessity for what we called, "limited war."

In Korea, and now in Viet-Nam, and to a lesser degree in Santo Domingo—we have found ourselves caught up in struggles of necessity. We find it possible to justify these limited wars on grounds of national policy and security.

Perhaps no justification is as compelling as the firm belief that by meeting Communist aggression and subversion boldly and openly, we can forestall and avert the spectre of total nuclear war.

If it had not been for the support of the great majority of patriotic and farsighted Americans—including the DAV and other veterans groups—America would not have been able to take steps to quell this spread of Communism.

If the new pacifist theory is allowed to take over America, Communist aggression will spread. It will spread throughout all of Asia. It will engulf the new states of Africa. The Middle East is not immune: nor is Europe. Should such an eventuality take place, we have doomed ourselves to the great global conflict of two ideologies engaged in a "to-the-death" struggle.

That is why I encourage you to continue your vigilance. That is why I urge you to expand your efforts to promote a new awareness smoldering in the minds of our young people and most of our adults as well.

Now is a time to promote patriotism. Now is a time to attack with renewed vigor apathy and outright rebellion against this country.

For this apathy—this outright rebellion—

is a serious matter that can cause our destruction.

As we have come to accept the concept of limited war, so are we gradually coming to a point where we are accepting reservations and limitations of an individual's patriotism—a patriotism we once held a prerequisite to citizenship.

There are those in America who now find they cannot—or at least are unwilling to—accept some of our nation's important policies.

There are those who agree it is necessary to fight—but they question who is to do this fighting. Far too many Americans have adopted the attitude of "let the other guy do it." This is especially true when it comes to fighting a limited war.

All of us will agree that our fighting men must have the finest in fighting material and supplies—though there are some in this nation who will not even pledge their allegiance to our gallant fighting men in Viet-Nam. What is most astonishing is there seems to be no agreement among those who are committed to the war to make sacrifices for our servicemen's benefit.

There is no agreement—even in Congress—as to what domestic programs should be curtailed, if this should become necessary—in order to carry on this struggle for freedom—and the destruction of Communist aggression. There seems to be a consensus going around—a new total support for our fighting men in Viet-Nam or any other limited war—*but* only so long as it doesn't affect us at home.

It is like a fiendish nightmare—in which we observe and shudder—but take no part ourselves.

But that nightmare is also staring us in the face from the other side—our own backyard. We now have among us—to our growing consternation and great peril of our nation and men in Viet-Nam—those who openly rebel at our national policy. The ways in which they express their disapproval give comfort and encouragement to our enemies. prolonging the war with their actions. I am shocked at the protest being voiced, and methods being used by some of these protestors. I am appalled by the spectacle of law breaking, burning of draft cards, desecration of the American flag, shouting down and reviling of our elected leaders and of drug-ridden withdrawal into stupor and squalor in the name of peace and love. I am convinced—as I always have been—that these things have no place in America.

I grant you that relatively few Americans—but a loud and clamorous few—have participated in anti-war demonstrations, protest marches and draft card burnings. But these few have captured a willing audience. They by no means have convinced loyal Americans—the vast majority of our people—that they are right. They have made many people withdraw from active support—they have made millions of people straddle the fence. It is a fence which seeks to divide, and evens threatens continuation of our nation.

I, for one, and I know the membership of the DAV will back this statement all the way—am ready to make any sacrifice here at home in order that our men will not be deprived of any of their needs in Viet-Nam. I believe we are not safe here at home until Communist aggression is halted—and it must be halted in Viet-Nam.

Because of this conviction—I pledge full support to our fighting men in Viet-Nam—for whatever they may need to carry on the war and assure them maximum safety while carrying out their task.

The basis for this unquestioned support for our fighting men in Viet-Nam stems from the fact that I am convinced the threat of Communism is real. It is real in Viet-Nam—it is a dark shadow in Thailand and Laos. It stands off our own shores in Castro's Cuba.

I have commented that I am concerned over our internal problems. But this concern is only because of the bigger picture. Communism eagerly awaits our apathy—our letting barriers down. If we fail in Viet-Nam—we shall surely have signed over our birthright to democracy. If those despoilers of patriotism have their way, opposition to the spread of Communism will be obliterated. It will be a welcome sign to war and destruction—or capitulation of our government to Communistic rule.

Yes—I am concerned that Communists continue to talk out of both sides of their mouth. They speak of peace—but their reference to peace has a different meaning than what the remainder of the world considers peace. They mean another Munich—peace through capitulation—peace by submitting to Communist rule.

Leonid Brezhnev, Secretary of the Soviet Communist Party, speaking on April 24th of this year to the Conference of Communist and Workers Parties of Europe said:

"The events in Viet-Nam remind us again of how vital is the task of strengthening the unity of the world communist movement . . . I can assure you, comrades, that we Soviet communists will continue to fulfill our international duty with regard to struggling Viet-Nam and render it the necessary help (meaning the Viet-Cong). It is well known that the socialist countries, including the Soviet Union, actively help fighting Viet-Nam (again meaning the Viet-Cong) with political, economic and military support. It could not be otherwise for imperialist aggression is taking place against a socialist country—the DRV." Those are the exact words of Brezhnev.

Mr. Brezhnev violently attacked the United States—branding this nation an aggressor. This in spite of the fact that 7,000 so-called volunteers from North Viet-Nam invade South Viet-Nam every month.

This, in spite of the fact that Mr. Brezhnev readily admitted military aid to invaders of South Viet-Nam.

Communism disbanded the Cominterm—in theory. In practice and words the revolution of the Bolsheviks continues throughout the world. Perhaps in a different form—a different guise—with smiles and pleasant words—with a suit and tie instead of military uniform—but still intent on world domination through subversion—and like Viet-Nam—active war if necessary.

Mr. Brezhnev did make one astute observation. He said—"The world socialist revolution is a complex process in the progress of which a stubborn struggle is developing, and difficulties arise at certain stages."

Yes, my friends, "difficulties arise at certain stages" . . . One of those major difficulties is the determination of the American people that Communism shall spread no further. That Communism will not take over and subjugate another free country.

Patriotic Americans, led by men like yourselves—will throw that necessary stumbling block in the path of Communist aggression. Even if we must resort to actions such as the one we are now taking in Viet-Nam.

I praise you for your firm support of this policy—which is our nation's policy in Viet-Nam. Vigilance must be a day-to-day affair, and the DAV can be proud of its role in keeping America prepared against an ideology that would destroy our way of life.

This vigilance and willingness of our nation to come to the aid of an oppressed and invaded country, has been one of the major deterrents to the spread of Communism throughout Asia and Europe.

We look to our future with hope. We know there are problems—here at home—and throughout the world. But if we stand firm in our beliefs and are ready to make sacrifices to assure continuance of our nation—then we shall win out. We have fought two wars that were supposed to end all wars. Still we must send our youth off to do further battle.

Your vigilance must include a continuing effort for a return to principles of patriotism that have made this nation endure. I have much faith in generations that will take over after we are gone. With men like yourselves who are devoted to this country—they will be brought up in proper fashion and assume their duties when their time comes. The battle for liberty is continuous . . . you began this battle a long time ago—I am confident you will continue the struggle.

I thank you.

A Definition of an American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 10, 1967

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, at the annual Congress of the Sons of the American Revolution, held in Columbus, Ohio, May 28, 1967, a number of outstanding speeches were given by the delegates. One of the most dramatic was presented by Thomas E. Martin, route 2, Anderson, S.C., who is a rising senior at Pendleton High School.

This young man spoke on "An American: What Is He?" His remarks indicate a deep insight into the important basic qualities which sustained the early founders of our Nation and have fortified our leaders since that time to help make this Nation the great citadel of democracy it is today.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the speech be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN AMERICAN: WHAT IS HE?

(By Thomas E. Martin)

An American is roughly 110–210 lbs. of pure grit, integrity, determination, daring, and foolishness; well seasoned with real horse-sense, a passion for liberty, progress, discovery, patriotism, and a keen sense of the Divine. He has been called the amalgam from the melting pot of the nations. The name fits him well.

His story, along with that of the other 200,000,000 of his fellows began with a $45,000 tea party in Boston Harbor. The spirit of this act was later translated into words at St. Johns Church in Richmond: "Give me liberty or give me death!" This phrased the American's passion for liberty, a passion which still possesses him. There were strange doings after that: A restless horseman with eyes trained on the tower of the old North Church. Two lights appeared in the window and he was off! An American's integrity and ingenuity: and those who know the story best say that Paul Revere did not ride alone that night. They say that with him there was the spirit of a great liberty-loving nation as yet unborn, but plain for anybody who had eyes to see were clumsy, good-natured, stubborn men wearing tri-cornered hats. They carried flint-lock rifles and a strange, proud flag, glorious with stars and stripes—each bore the cry of Patrick Henry in his heart. The next day the American story was marked with red, and the field at Lexington was spangled with the first blood spilled on behalf of liberty for Americans. From that day to this the story has been punctuated with blood, and wherever its country's blood has been spilled that flag with the broad stripes and bright stars has flown. It floated from the mast of the *Bon Homme Richard*, whose captain defiantly shouted from the jaws of defeat, "I have not yet begun to fight!" and snatched victory for determined Americans. This was one of the birth pangs of the tradition, defended by all true Americans from the battle with the *Serapis* to the Marne, to the Solomons, to Pork Chop Hill, to the steaming Mekong Delta: it is the right of men to be free; and the off-spring of the flag which proclaimed "Don't tread on me," still proudly warns the tyrant to beware.

The measure of the American is not expressed in prowess on the battle field alone. It lies in the hearts of the men that make up America and finds words in our freedoms of choice. Not satisfied with his conquest of the land, which he has made to grow more corn, cotton, and wheat and feeds more cattle, hogs, and chickens than any other land on earth, in order to give his people the highest standard of living of any people in the world, he has directed his inquisition into the depths of the sea and made her yield her knowledge and secrets for his pleasure and benefit; and he is now in the act of challenging the world of outer space to see what lies beyond the stars; and when he becomes the enfolder of those orbs, and all the pleasures and knowledge of everything in them, he shall not be filled and satisfied then. He will but level that lift to pass and continue beyond. Through scientific and medical experimentation, he has unlocked the mystery of the atom, of antibiotics; he has produced an artificial heart and kidney, and is knocking at the door of the riddle called cancer, so that his brother may be able to live longer in the land which God gave him.

This is not all. The American networks of public schools and institutions of higher learning testifies to the thirst for knowledge and a better education and way of life on the part of the American. However, the definition and description of the American do not end here. An American is one who realizes that without God his great nation would be nothing. No nation that has produced one George Truett or one Billy Graham is lacking in an awareness of God.

Here I stand, an American! I think God that I live in a land of opportunity, in a land of material progress, a land of scientific investigation, a land of medical achievement, a land of educational awareness; but, most of all, I thank God that I live in a land of free men—free to work, to learn, to explore, to achieve, to worship. An American is a man born to be free. I thank God—I am an American!

Exploiting the Negro

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEL CLAWSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 10, 1967

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, as the overheated emotions of this long hot summer subside and as we regard the problems which have so sorely tried and beset all of us, perhaps the time is now appropriate to regard these matters in the cooler light of reason. This morning's Washington Post contains a column by William S. White, which adopts such an approach. I commend it to the attention of my colleagues. The text follows:

EXPLOITING THE NEGRO—LEGITIMATE AIMS OVERLOOKED BY LEADERS

Hidden part of the iceberg of racial violence has nothing whatever to do with civil rights. There will be no solution until this ugly but powerful reality is fully grasped.

The extremist Negro leadership is exploiting Negro discontent, some of it justified and much of it fictitious and wholly trumped up—to destroy the lawful, bipartisan foreign policy of the United States against Communist aggression in general and specifically to force this Nation to abandon its commitment to the invaded people of South Vietnam.

This is the frightening core of it all and this terrible truth is eluding the more liberal politicians of both parties, who from the best motives are in turn wholly obscuring the real name of this game.

They are incessantly talking as though the crisis is purely domestic, and as though it can be cured solely by the panicky pouring out of countless additional billions for urban renewal and other desirable reforms.

That the three most implacable of the black power leaders—Stokely Carmichael, H. Rap Brown and Floyd McKissick—are simply revolutionaries is as plain as day itself. It was plain long before Carmichael went to Cuba to receive the warm salutes of Fidel Castro and to call upon American Negroes to take up arms "from New York to California, from Canada to Mexico."

In these grim and factual circumstances proposals for "Marshall Plans" for Negro citizens and vast, cloudy crash programs to buy off public disorder by Federal funds are nightmarishly ill-conceived. To say that more must be done to bring Negroes into full participation in American society is right and just. To say that this should be done in open panic under naked political and social blackmail, with rioters' pistols pointed publicly at the United States Government itself, is to accept a proposition indefensible in elementary public morality and bankrupt in simple fact.

For these disorders are occurring at a time when more is already being done at greater cost for an undeniably under-privileged minority than has been done in all the previous two centuries of the American experience. The conclusion that more and more money is the one true answer here is thus demonstrably wrong, however compassionate its motive.

It is a notion that misses every main actuality in this whole dreadful affair. It assumes that the great body of American Negroes is approaching a state of rebellion where the clear and self-evident fact is that nowhere has more than a tiny Negro minority been involved in riot and anarchy. It leads such public men as Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey and Sen. Robert F. Kennedy to speak in public as though the very founding stones of the Republic might crumble at any moment.

It rejects the testimony of the best possible authorities—the Governors and Mayors in areas of infection—that legitimate civil rights grievances have not been the operative causes of violence. It ignores the solemn word of a liberal Democratic Governor of New Jersey, Richard Hughes, that the horror in Newark was brought off by fewer than five per cent of its Negroes and that of this five per cent the majority had criminal records.

It ignores the consensus of the National Conference of Mayors that our tortured cities have been the work of men not at all interested in civil rights. It waves aside the sworn testimony of honorable police officials to similar effect.

This malady will never be cured until the firmest of action, entirely lawful but also entirely remorseless, is taken to put down Negro extremists. Only then can the genuine problems of racial disorder and racial unfairness be honestly and wisely met.

No rational society can continue to hide its eyes from patent truth and rational men, however opposed on principle to a war in Vietnam, can no longer condone or cooperate with a clear and present danger to the constitutional conduct, by elected officials, of the foreign policy of the United States.

Dewitt C. Greer Resigns as Head of Texas Highway Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 10, 1967

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, a distinguished public servant of my home State is retiring after 40 years of service to the people of Texas. Dewitt Greer has been in the Texas Highway Department since 1927, and has headed it as State highway engineer since 1940.

The magnificent highway system of Texas stands largely as a monument to the efforts of Dewitt Greer. His ability, dedication, and perseverance are principally responsible for our fine network of roads. His integrity and honor have made the Texas Highway Department one of the finest, most respected, and most effective in the Nation. His retirement comes as a loss to the people of Texas.

Three newspaper tributes to Mr. Greer have just appeared. These are "Monuments to Greer" and "Greer To Retire as Highway Chief," written by Richard Morehead, from the Dallas Morning News of August 2, and "Highway Engineer Resigns," written by Sam Wood, and published in the Austin American of the same date.

I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Dallas (Tex.) Morning News, Aug. 2, 1967]

MONUMENTS TO GREER

(By Richard M. Morehead)

AUSTIN.—Although we knew it was coming, the announcement of Dewitt Greer's forthcoming retirement brings genuine regret to all citizens who are interested in good government.

To a very large extent, this state's magnificent system of highways stands as a monument to the dedication, ability and integrity of this man.

In the words of show business, Dewitt Greer will be a hard act to follow, although his successor, J. C. Dingwall, is an engineer and administrator of proven great capacity.

Greer never accepted personal credit for the success of the Texas Highway Department.

"These are the men who made it great," Greer said of the department's 16,000 employes a few years ago. "In my opinion, ours is the finest single organization under any flag. Its esprit de corps is the highest in the nation."

Greer spoke the truth, too. While many Americans look down on public service, Greer and others like him make it respected and respectable. In many states, highway construction and maintenance has been scandalous. But it has not been in Texas since the early days of the department.

This may be a tribute to the Legislature's wisdom in creating an agency which has considerable autonomy, and is relatively removed from politics. The three highway commissioners are appointed by the governor, but the actual administration of the million-dollar-per-day spending program has been supervised by Dewitt Greer.

A diplomat who likes dealing with politicians as well as the public, Greer has staunchly and successfully defended his department against efforts to dilute its effectiveness.

This is shown repeatedly in his opposition to diversion of "road user" tax money to purposes other than building and maintaining highways.

As a result, Texas has about the lowest motor fuel tax in the nation as well as the most and the best highways.

Greer asserts that the School of Hard Knocks helped to shape his career as an effective administrator in dealing with politicians and other people.

He learned as "the greenest freshman at Texas A&M," Greer recalls, that one must substitute intelligence for muscle.

In those days, the Aggies had hazing, and young Greer volunteered for the menial tasks to keep upperclassmen from wearing out their paddles on him. Greer considers the experience character-building "as well as useful in dealing with the Legislature," and he graduated as one of the most loyal of the fighting Aggies.

As the first engineer of the State Parks Department, Greer once directed a crew of convict trusties in park improvement.

His first job as a highway engineer was turning the faucet on the rear of a steaming asphalt distributor, putting an all-weather coating on State Highway 11 in Camp County between Leesburg and Newsome.

"I wouldn't take a million dollars for them," Greer says of these experiences which some might view as harsh.

[From the Dallas (Tex.) Morning News, Aug. 2, 1967]

Greer To Retire as Highway Chief

(By Richard M. Morehead)

Austin.—Dewtt C. Greer, internationally known and respected head of the Texas Highway Department, will retire on Jan. 1, the Texas Highway Commission announced Tuesday.

In the surprise announcement, the commission said Greer's resignation was submitted to be effective last Monday, but at the request of the commission he consented to remain until the end of the year.

J. C. Dingwall, who directed building of the Dallas-Fort Worth turnpike, will succeed Greer.

Greer's retirement had been expected but the timing of his departure was not known until Tuesday. On Monday he was honored for 40 years of service in the highway department. He has been head of the department, with title of state highway engineer, since July, 1940.

Greer reached age 65, the department's age for retirement, on July 27.

"We have prevailed on Mr. Greer to retain his present position during the remainder of the calendar year," the 3-member Highway Commission said. 'We are acutely aware of the loss of his experience and knowledge of department affairs."

Its announcement added that Dingwall, Greer's chief assistant since 1958, had been instrumental in developing Texas' first freeway systems including the Dallas-Fort Worth turnpike.

On Sept. 26 friends of Greer and the Texas Highway Department will hold a celebration honoring the department's 50 years of operation. One feature will be presentation to Greer of funds contributed to endow a lectureship in his honor at the Texas A&M Civil Engineering Department, from which he received a degree in 1923.

The commission said Dingwall is "thoroughly versed in the administrative functions and policies of the department" and that under Greer a strong statewide staff has been organized.

Dingwall, 59, has been with the Texas Highway Department most of the time since 1928. He took leave during World War II to serve with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. And he spent four and a half years as engineer-manager of the Texas Turnpike Authority, supervising the financing, design and construction of the $58.5 million toll road.

The Gulf Freeway between Houston and Galveston also was supervised by Dingwall. The Highway Commission noted that these two Texas projects which Dingwall supervised have become prototypes for others in the United States.

In announcing Greer's impending retirement, the Highway Commission noted that the engineer has been a leader in legislative matters for the American Association of State Highway Officials which he once served as president.

Greer has visited many countries as an expert on highway building, and road builders from all over the world have come to Texas to study this state's 68,000-mile highway system.

Greer has received the nation's top awards for contributions to highway progress, Texas A&M's distinguished alumnus award, and an honorary doctor of laws degree from Texas Christian University.

Afterward, Greer worked briefly as an engineer for the city of Athens, served as the State Parks Board's first employe; and in 1927 he joined the Texas Highway Department. He worked seven years as engineer of the Tyler district before moving to Austin in 1936.

Leaving Post December 31: Highway Engineer Resigns

(By Sam Wood)

DeWitt C. Greer, world famous for his uncanny direction of one of the most efficient road building organizations—the Texas Highway Department—has submitted his resignation as state highway engineer, but at the request of the commission will remain in the department's top administrative post until Dec. 31, 1967.

Greer's resignation after 40 years of service with the highway department, including 27 years as state highway engineer, had been expected.

But a Senate concurrent resolution by Sen. Charles F. Herring of Travis County, passed March 6, expressed the Legislature's desire that Greer be allowed to remain at his post past the automatic retirement age of 65. Greer reached that milestone July 27.

Greer submitted his resignation effective July 31, the date upon which he was presented a 40-year service award by the commission.

The three-man commission announced Tuesday afternoon that J. C. Dingwall, now assistant state highway engineer, will be appointed state highway engineer on Jan. 1, 1968, to succeed Greer.

Legislation passed by the 59th Legislature makes it possible for Dingwall, who has been associated with the department since 1928 except for two brief periods, to succeed Greer. Under the previous statute the state highway engineer had to be a graduate engineer.

Dingwall, a graduate of SMU, in addition to his long experience with the department, served in World War II with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers; and for four years was engineer-manager of the Texas Turnpike Authority, supervising the financing, design and construction of the $58.5-million Dallas-Fort Worth Turnpike.

Greer, a 1923 civil engineer graduate of Texas A&M,, is noted for his dry humor, his ability to appease people and for his administrative ability.

He started his career with the highway department in 1927 at Tyler as assistant resident engineer. In 1929 he became district engineer in Tyler and in 1936 came to Austin as chief engineer of construction and design. Four years later, in 1940, he became state highway engineer.

Under his guidance Texas has become the recognized leader in state highway development.

Since Greer became engineer in 1940 the Texas highway system has grown from 20,359 miles to more than 67,300 miles. He has supervised the investment of more than $4 billion in the Texas highway system.

Greer has received numerous awards and honors for his unusual accomplishments in the highway field.

He is a member of the American Society of Civil Engineers; the Highway Research Board; Tau Beta Pi, honorary engineering fraternity; a past president of the American Association of State Highway Officials and a member of that organization's executive committee for 20 years.

He is a recipient of Texas A&M University's Distinguished Alumni Award. Texas Christian University bestowed an honorary doctor of laws degree on him in 1965.

In 1953 Greer received the George S. Bartlett Award for outstanding contributions to highway progress. This is considered the greatest honor that can be bestowed upon an American highway builder. He received the equally famous Thomas MacDonald Award in 1964.

In 1962 Greer was among the 10 top public works men of the year selected by Kiwanis International and the American Public Works Association.

Greer gained international reputation as official United States delegate to the International Roads Federation Conference in Oslo, Norway, in 1954; in Sydney, Australia, in 1961; and in Lima, Peru, in 1965.

A statement by Highway Commission Chairman Hal Woodward and Commissioners J. H. Kultgen of Waco and Herbert C. Petry Jr., Carrizo Springs, stated:

"Mr. Greer's long association with highway matters—particularly at the national level—makes it imperative that we have the benefit of his experience in the critical months ahead.

"This is a period of great change. Highways will play an important role in development of the new Department of Transportation. Highway programs to follow completion of the interstate highway system are being formulated. Legislation affecting every highway department and every highway program throughout the nation is being prepared for presentation to Congress.

"For many years Mr. Greer has taken a leading role in development of legislative matters for the American Association of State Highway Officials, an organization which he has served as president and which he now serves as a member of its executive and legislative committees.

"Mr. Greer has devoted his life to public service. As evidence of this dedication he has consented to serve until Dec. 31 to assure the continuity of leadership so essential in this critical period."

L. B. J. Spokesman?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 10, 1967

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from a prominent Virginia newspaper, the Roanoke Times, regarding the political activities of the Clerk of the House, Mr. Pat W. Jennings, is an interesting assessment of his activities:

L. B. J. Spokesman?

House Clerk W. Pat Jennings suddenly has emerged as a self-appointed political mischief-maker for the Johnson Administration.

The former Ninth District congressman told his long-time political supporters in the Virginia AFL–CIO that the blame for delays in employing federal troops to quell the Detroit riots rested squarely with Michigan's Republican Gov. George Romney. Thus the Virginia Democrat kept alive the absurd political debate over responsibility for allowing the rioting to remain out of control in its early stages.

Mr. Jennings might better stick to his new administrative duties in his patronage-laden Capitol Hill post, leaving to others the risky political game of blame-fixing in matters that are of no possible concern to the office of House clerk. For the most part, others have had the good sense to avoid prolonging the fruitless crossfire of charges and countercharges between Republicans and the White House that followed the inexcusable lag in restoring law and order in the Michigan city. In reviving the debate, Mr. Jennings has done the House of Representatives, the President and the nation a disservice.

Judicial Silliness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 10, 1967

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, there appeared in the August 3, 1967, issue of the State newspaper in Columbia, S.C., an editorial entitled "Judicial Silliness," which brought into sharp focus the extremes to which the courts are resorting in striking down any recognition of a supreme being in our school systems.

It appears that more and more this country is so concerned about the rights of the minority that the rights of the majority are being overrun in the process. Our Constitution provided for religious freedom and for this reason there appeared in it the words:

> Congress shall make no laws respecting an establishment of religion.

People in this country are free to pray or not pray. I think it is about time for us to think about the rights of our children or any group to express thanks to a supreme being if they wish, and for those who do not desire to participate then they are certainly free to exercise that right.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Judicial Silliness

The U.S. Court of Appeals in Chicago has ruled that the following "prayer" may not be recited by the kindergarten class at Ellwood Elementary school in De Kalb, Illinois:

"We thank you for the flowers so sweet,
We thank you for the food we eat.
We thank you for the birds that sing;
We thank you for everything."

It is difficult to determine just how this little verse could possibly offend any Catholic, Jew, Protestant, Moslem, Buddhist, Mohammedan, Confucian, or other. But somehow, the Court managed to arrive at an extremely pompous decision against it.

Judge Luther Swygert wrote: "The secular purposes of the verse were merely adjuctive and supplemental to its basic and primary purpose, which was a religious act of praising and thanking the Diety."

Clearly, there must have been something sinister going on at Ellwood Elementary if the kindergarten class was praising and thanking the Diety (not named) every day.

It only remains now to see how long it will take the courts to get around to banning the fourth verse of *The Star Spangled Banner*.

After describing America as "a *Heaven rescued land*," Francis Scott Key went on to write:

"Then conquer we must, when our cause it is just,
And this be our motto—'In God is our trust.' "

Little children oughtn't to sing such inflammatory, religious phrases in school—if we understand today's courts. American atheists might be outraged, not to mention the peaceniks who don't believe this country has any just causes anymore.

The steady process of secularization is speeding up, we see. And there's so much yet to do! *My Country 'Tis of Thee, America*, and *God Bless America* will have to be banned soon, if not burned.

While we're at it, too, we probably should take steps to prevent any further recitations of the Pledge of Allegiance which includes the damning phrase:

One nation, under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

To think that all such praising and thanking of the Diety has been going on all this time!

But now, thanks to our courts, we can change everything.

Even America.

Have We Overlooked the Importance of a Course in Civic Law for Youth?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 10, 1967

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, the Reverend Edward M. Foster, of the Immaculate Heart Church in Crosslake, Minn., has written a thoughtful and revealing article asking, "Have We Overlooked the Importance of a Course in Civic Law for Youth?"

Father Foster has done an excellent job in presenting an interesting approach to a neglected aspect of crime in America. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include his paper at this point in the Record in order that other Members of Congress may have the opportunity to review it:

Have We Overlooked the Importance of a Course in Civic Law for Youth?

(By Rev. Edward M. Foster)

President Johnson in his 1967 State of the Union message, delivered to a joint session of the House and Senate, reflected the feelings of responsible citizens when he said: "This Nation must make an all out effort to combat crime."

It was not necessary for the President to defend or explain the need for an "all out effort" to combat crime. Most people in the United States know someone—a relative, friend or neighbor who has been victimized by crime. According to "Uniform Crime Reports 1966," issued by J. E. Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation 2,780,000 were themselves the victims of crime in 1965.

Some might argue that in a nation of almost 200 million people that the 2,780,000 who were victimized represent only a small percentage of the country's population and that we should be thankful the crime rate is not any higher than it is. However, each person who has been victimized is a member of a family, and each family is a member of a community. As a consequence, millions of people, directly or indirectly, have a definite experience with crime. They know what it means to have a burglar in the neighborhood, creating for them an atmosphere of fear, suspicion, and uncertainty. Each year, thousands of happy homes are interrupted by the familiar ringing of the telephone. The Doctor is very kind and sympathetic, but *he* is the Coroner!

In the ensuing grief-stricken weeks and months, it becomes more and more apparent to the deceased's family that the "accidental" traffic death was in reality a crime arising out of criminal negligence or drunken driving. Perhaps crime means shocked disbelief—confused children under "house arrest" as their terrified parents try to protect them from the fate of a neighbor's little girl now in a psychiatric ward as a result of forcible rape. Not only young girls are the victims of physical violence. The F.B.I. reports show that the crime of aggravated assault was committed against more people in 1965 than the total population of a town the size of Grand Rapids, Michigan, a city of some 203,000 citizens.

Naturally, people are shocked and disturbed at such reports which tell of the prodigious amount of crime in an enlightened country. But how enlightened are we? When and how are we advised of the penalties and punishments that are enforceable when the law is violated?

The fact is that the average citizen is not educated about our laws. Unfortunately, Law, understood as a code of ethics, is a neglected subject. As a specific subject, understood in this context as a code of ethics, it is not generally included in the high school curriculum. Certainly in our public school system where the vast majority of our citizens receive a basic education, we do not teach in any systematic manner such fundamental standards of human conduct as those expressed in the Judeo Christian Commandments. We do not teach "honor your father or your mother; you shalt not kill; you shalt not commit adultery; you shalt not covet your neighbor's wife; you shalt not steal." It is unfortunate that we do not teach these standards because it is precisely the violations of these very standards that constitute the crime that we so ardently desire to eradicate from the national character.

Ironically we do not teach these standards because of our American respect for law. We so regard these specific standards as monopolized expressions of Judeo Christian morality—that we believe to teach them in our public schools would constitute a violation of the first amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

However, in every state of the Union, elected representatives of the people, legislators, formulate laws—laws which are only an extension and clarification of the Judeo Christian commendments of morality and which have for their explicit purpose the preservation, protection, welfare and safety of the public. There is not a state within the United States of America where the Executive Department of government in the person of the governor has not signed into law statutes dealing with murder, manslaughter, careless driving, drunkenness, adultery, bigamy, rape, theft, trespassing assault, aggravated assault, perjury, defamation of character—the observance of which is expected of civilized peoples everywhere.

Throughout the fifty states of the Union, judges representing the Judicial Department of government render to criminals punitive and rehabilitative sentences—sentences which elected law makers in state legislature have ratified.

Each sovereign state therefore has an existing body of laws, an established code of ethics which could be taught in every high school throughout the land.

Use the Judeo Christian commandments as guidelines of human conduct, but translate them in terms of civic law. For example, identify the fifth commandment, "you shall not kill" in terms of murder, suicide, assault, aggravated assault, criminal negligence, etc., the sixth commandment, "you shall not commit adultery" in terms of adultery, bigamy, incest, rape, forcible rape, etc., identify the seventh commandment "you shall not steal" in terms of theft, burglary, larceny, robbery forgery, embezzlement, etc. What a wonderful supplement this type of "Civic Law" would make to "Civics" already taught in our schools! Relate "Civics" to "Civic Law." Define personal responsibility, identify individual obligations in terms of law, and the course would be practical and more complete. Or even better, begin in the early grades, instructing the students in the law in a way meaningful to them at their particular stage of development. An entire series of units on law could be originated and presented from grade one through grade twelve.

Let every youth in the country know of the punishments and penalties that come with violations of law. Let him know that the verdict in court for assault can be a fine of $100 or 90 days imprisonment (Minnesota State Statute 609.22). Let him know, for example, that whoever is found guilty of aggravated assault may be sentenced to imprisonment for not more than ten years or to a payment of a fine of not more than $10,000 or both. (Minnesota State Statute 609.-225).

Let him know the cruel difference between a felony and a misdemeanor. He should know that commission of a felony bars him from employment in many positions of trust. This kind of knowledge may deter individuals from breaking the law. Let every student have an educated appreciation of the slogan: "Crime does not pay."

Let not the people be conscious of their rights and ignorant of their duties. Let them know that it is the duty of free men to respect and obey the laws. Laws that were enacted not by despots, not by dictators to restrict or restrain the freedom of the people, but by free men chosen from among the people. Men who enact laws to guard, defend and protect the freedom of the people—a responsible freedom fortified with just laws.

State Boards of Education, the legacy of "no formal morality," has gone far enough. Let future generations be the proud beneficiaries of the laws of the land. Let youth be taught in our schools to have a patriotic appreciation of the meaning of civil obedience and social order. Fortified with this knowledge—motivated and influenced by it—the whole nation would take on a refreshing new character.

Citizens would have a new respect for law—a wholesome regard for those who enforce the law and a legitimate contempt and a balanced concern for the punishment and rehabilitation of those who violate the law.

Proposed Marshall Aid Plan for Urban Areas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 10, 1967

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Monday, August 7, 1967, issue of the News and Courier contained an editorial entitled "Marshall Plan Talk," which makes an excellent point concerning the problems faced by our large urban areas.

The impetus of the editorial is directed toward the need in this country for a new outlook by those members of our society who have had painted for them a pie-in-the-sky philosophy. Many of our underprivileged have been constantly hearing about how they have been crucified by their more affluent fellow citizens, and the result has been a self-pity and restlessness which has helped support riots in various cities each summer. Those members of our society who have worked for and earned better homes and a better standard of living for their families have been harangued with a crucifying guilt complex.

While there are many areas in which efforts should be made to help those who wish to help themselves, we should hear more about such virtues as self-reliance, respect for authority, and appreciation for our heritage. Our urban areas are already receiving an estimated $10 billion in various forms of Federal aid, and I am convinced the serious problems faced in such heavily populated areas cannot be solved by money alone, but what is really needed is a new outlook and leadership directed toward encouraging an effort to improve one's self, one's environment, and one's will to rise above his circumstances. If such an attitude existed, new Federal housing, and private property, would not be turned into slums, as slums are made, not built.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARSHALL PLAN TALK

In saying that Americans must be willing to pay the price for a Marshall Aid Plan for impoverished urban and rural areas in their own country, Vice President Hubert Humphrey ignores economic and historical realities.

Some Americans fancy that all their government has to do to eliminate slums is to give poor people the funds now devoted to the war in Vietnam. We wish it were that easy.

In the first place, the phrase Marshall Plan is misleading. The plan devised by Secretary of State George C. Marshall in 1947 was not the type of relief operation proposed for U.S. slums, nor were European recipients of aid lacking in skills and enterprise.

The $11 billion given or loaned under the Marshall program was matched by $9 billion supplied by European governments. Much of the money went for food and coal needed while Europe's plants were getting back into operation.

At the end of World War II, Europe's production facilities were destroyed. The energy of Europeans, however, was abundant. The United States had only to help its wartime allies get back into business.

Germany, defeated and divided, produced an economic miracle. Today, as a result of free enterprise, planning, and production. West Germany is one of the richest nations in the world.

Britain, which erred in turning to socialism, wasted help given by the United States. The small countries of Europe also quickly recovered. Nations such as Norway, Denmark and Sweden were able to devise mixed economies. They have small, elite populations with no problem of educationally retarded citizens who are difficult to integrate into the work force.

The situation in American cities is markedly different. In these cities, industry is enormously productive. Today, however, industry requires an increasing degree of skill. Migrants from rural regions lack the skills to find first-class jobs.

Unlike European migrants from Spain, Portugal, Yugoslavia and Greece, who take the harder and less attractive jobs offered in German and French industry, American migrants are angry if they are offered something less than they believe is their due.

Thus the problem in the American slums is a problem of social attitude and discipline. Poorly educated migrants from backward areas of Europe are willing to work and to save for a better day in the future. Many American migrants to the big cities want instant prosperity. No Marshall Plan can provide immediate affluence.

What is really needed in the slums of America is a new outlook. Without a change in outlook, antipoverty funds will be wasted.

BUREAUCRATIC BUNGLE

The loss of confidence in Britain's National Coal Board as a result of a report on last autumn's disaster in Wales, which killed 116 children and 28 adults, is a blow for the Labor Government of the United Kingdom. The steel industry has just been nationalized. The public is bound to wonder whether its management will be any better than coal's.

Accidents happen, of course, in privately operated coal mines, and elsewhere in industry, but the investigation of the Welsh mishap has disclosed a degree of carelessness that we cannot believe would have gone unnoticed had not the government itself been the proprietor of the mines.

"Bungling ineptitude," "ignorance" and "fobbing off" are some of the critical phrases in the report of the investigating agency. In short, the disaster could have been prevented. Though heads may roll, the system still is suspect.

Nearly 3 Million on Uncle's Payroll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 10, 1967

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call to the attention of the House the fact that a half million more civilians are employed by the Federal Government now than when the Johnson administration took over in November of 1963. There was a very high increase in Federal employment between 1961 and that date, and to give some indication of its proportions, the number of State Department employees has doubled.

Now the Associated Press reports:

> The number of Federal civilian employees probably will pass the three million mark this month despite President Johnson's cost-cutting orders.

Would it be inappropriate to suggest that a principal administration answer to the employment problem has been to create Federal jobs, indirect as well as these direct ones, and to put much of our youth, coincidentally into uniform?

There certainly is a relationship between the increased number of Federal jobs and higher taxes, quite apart from the war in Vietnam. I would further suggest that the administration's cost-cutting efforts are shown to be humbug. I doubt that this will surprise our people.

By unanimous consent I introduce in the Record the Associated Press report as published in the New York Daily News of August 9:

> Nearly 3 Million on Uncle's Payroll
>
> Washington, August 8.—The number of federal civilian employes probably will pass 3 million this month despite President Johnson's cost-cutting orders.
>
> Executive branch employment totaled 2,980,156 in June, according to the Congressional committee on reduction of nonessential federal expenditures.
>
> Nearly 500,000 more civilians are employed now than when Johnson took office in November, 1963. This is the highest on record except for the period during and just after World War II.
>
> SEASONAL JOB RISE
>
> About half the increase over May, a total of 74,911 resulted from temporary summer jobs under the President's Youth Opportunity Program. There also were seasonal hiring rises at the Interior, Agriculture and Post Office departments.
>
> Administration officials concede there is little possibility of any significant job cutback even though Johnson has announced efforts to curtail spending by as much as $4 billion under the "cut, tax and borrow" program he sent Congress last week.
>
> Only a relatively small portion of federal spending is "controlable" by the Administration, and the President will not cut antipoverty programs, controllable or not.
>
> Summer jobs for slum dwellers, youth activities, work-training programs and other efforts to alleviate poverty are viewed officially as top-priority measures this summer because of racial tensions in the cities.
>
> The civilian payroll topped $20 billion in the fiscal year ended June 30, and Johnson, who took pride in announcing federal payroll cutbacks during his early months in office, apparently faces the prospect of still further growth in that federal establishment both in terms of civilian manpower and payroll dollars.

Maryland Governor Gives Clear Statement on Civil Rights and Rioting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROGERS C. B. MORTON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 10, 1967

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, on July 31 the Honorable Spiro T. Agnew, Governor of Maryland, issued a clear statement of the position he and other Maryland authorities have taken in regard to the outbreak of mass civil disorders which have plagued the Nation in recent months. Governor Agnew states without hesitation the first line of defense against such disorder is that manned by State and local authorities and they should not and cannot hesitate in their responsibility.

I commend his statement to my colleagues for their thoughtful consideration. In view of the back-and-forth trading of blame and name calling which has been the unfortunate lot of Congress recently, I feel Governor Agnew's forthright position should help clear the air.

> Governor Agnew Gives Clear Statement: Civil Rights and Rioting
>
> Our country is as much threatened by the lawless rioting in our streets as it is by our enemies abroad. In such a serious time, the people of a State are entitled to a clear and direct statement of their Governor's position. This is such a statement.
>
> In the first place, it is evident that there is ample cause for unrest in our cities. There is still discrimination and, in too many cases, there are deplorable slum conditions. Our Negro citizens have not received, and in many cases are not receiving, equal educational, job and housing opportunities. The gains recently made, while good, are not enough.
>
> I believe that responsible militants within the Negro leadership should use every means available to place legitimate pressure on those in authority to break the senseless and artificial barriers of racial discrimination. But legitimate pressure—the power of the vote—the power of organized political, economic and social action—does not give any person or group a license to commit crimes.
>
> Burning, looting, and sniping, even under the banner of civil rights, are still arson, larceny and murder. There are established penalties for such felonies, and we cannot change the punishment simply because the crime occurred during a riot. The laws must be consistently enforced to protect all our people. If an angry man burns his neighbor's house, or loots his neighbor's store, or guns his neighbor down, no reason for his anger will be enough of an excuse.
>
> In Maryland, rioting or inciting to riot, no matter what wrong is said to be the cause, will not be tolerated. There are proper ways to protest and they must be used. It shall now be the policy in this State to immediately arrest any person inciting to riot and to not allow that person to finish his vicious speech. All lawbreakers will be vigorously and promptly prosecuted.
>
> Acts of violence will not be later forgiven just because the criminal after a while adopts a more reasonable attitude. The violent cannot be allowed to sneak unnoticed from the war dance to the problem solving meeting. No, the problem solving conference must be reserved for those who shun lawlessness, who win their places at the conference table by leadership that builds rather than destroys.
>
> The problem-solving must be done by constructive militants such as the Wilkinses, Kings, Youngs and Randolphs—not by the Carmichaels, Joneses and Browns. But it should include the younger responsible leadership as well as older, more established leaders. Responsibility is the yardstick.
>
> It shall continue to be my firm policy to do everything possible to provide jobs, good housing and better educational opportunities for the poor and underprivileged, both Negro and white, in Maryland. I will meet with any responsible leaders to discuss the problems that confront us. I will not meet with those who engage in or urge riots and other criminal acts as weapons to obtain power.
>
> In conclusion, I commend the citizens of both races who have continued to conduct themselves with intelligent restraint in spite of great pressure. I share the sorrow of those who have suffered and who continue to suffer from the reckless acts of a few. For the confused and weak who seek to excuse, appease and rationalize for the criminals who threaten our society, I have only pity.

The Ugly Evidence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES V. SMITH

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 10, 1967

Mr. SMITH of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, Donald J. Morrison, copublisher of the Waurika News-Democrat, Waurika, Okla., describes himself as a country editor who is sensitive to all the evidences of irresponsibility in this country. In a letter, he told me:

> We need a jarring of national conscience, not a pricking. As a nation, we refuse to stay "tuned in" to significant issues and objectives and we are shedding, more and more, the responsibilities of citizenship.

At this point I would like to insert in the Congressional Record, Mr. Morrison's editorial of August 3, which carries a warning for us all:

> The Ugly Evidence
>
> It seemed strange, Sunday afternoon, to hear voices raised to God amid the blatant cacophony of "The Tube" that usually drums on our ears. The occasion was the day of prayer proclaimed by President Johnson to beseech divine guidance in calming the voices of anarchy in our land.
>
> There is reason, to be sure, for our nation to be on its knees. There are reasons besides Detroit, Newark, Los Angeles and other riot-stricken cities.
>
> There is also reason to question the sincerity of so many men who are seeking good will among men.
>
> Most of us want peace, and security, and possessions, and all the goodies—at little or no cost—and on our own terms.
>
> From the same electronic box that on Sunday showed congregation after congregation in prayer comes the most vivid evidence, hour after hour, day after day, of the shallowness of life within and beyond our borders.
>
> We are a nation possessed by our possessions—a nation enthralled by status symbols—a nation whose strength and substance is being drained by the idols of the twentieth century. To a great segment of our society, the far-from-magnificent obsessions are frills and thrills.
>
> Ours is still the best nation on earth, but we are going to have to wake up and work hard to keep it that way.
>
> Even with the benefit of history and tradition, which the free-thinking existentialists deplore, we are well on our way to outdoing the aberrations of fallen civilizations.
>
> Ours is a society that gives all kinds of license to irresponsible people to speak and act as they please, even treasonably—all in the name of individual rights, precious yet detrimentally defined by our highest court to protect the offenders of law at the expense of those who abide by the law.
>
> Ours is a society that makes millionaires out of the peddlers and portrayers of filth—on the screen, on TV, and in print—and wonders in all innocence what has happened to our sense of values.
>
> Ours is a society so caught up in a superficial existence that it falls at the feet of the creeps and, as just one example, aids and abets the large-scale advertising campaign

of the much-idolized "Beetles" to legalize "pot" (marijuana).

Ours is a society in which individual irresponsibility is festering and erupting in monstrous sores afflicting all levels and all branches of government.

There is some good news in our complex society, to be sure—much that goes unreported, because we demand and thrive on the sensational news. In any communications medium, there is far too much evidence of decay in our thinking and our behavior. But in no other medium as much as TV is there such a graphic and sickening playback, day by day, of life in our times—much of it exactly as the mixed-up American public wants it and makes it.

No more telltale symbol of the apathetic American attitude was even filmed, to our knowledge, than the ending of "The Ugly American," a movie of real substance. The U.S. ambassador to a fictitious country—an ambassador whose mistakes admittedly contributed to what could have been a nuclear holocaust—was about to describe on television what the responsibility of all Americans should be in understanding one another and other nations.

Mr. Average Apathetic American made a typical response, just when a statement of significance was about to be made. He turned off the set.

Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minn., Airports Commission Resolution 692

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK MacGREGOR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 10, 1967

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, throughout the Nation the increasing problem of aircraft noise is becoming more and more a major irritant to those living close to our major airports and to those living under the landing and take-off patterns.

Jet aircraft are becoming more common and are the greatest contributors to "noise pollution." I am sure that many Members of the Congress have received an increasing number of letters from constituents asking that something be done about this problem.

The Minneapolis-St. Paul Metropolitan Airports Commission recently passed a resolution calling on the Federal Government to assume the responsibility for seeking ways and means of correcting this situation. As one of the authors of the legislation endorsed by the commission, I warmly welcome the action of this truly outstanding public body.

MINNEAPOLIS-ST. PAUL METROPOLITAN AIRPORTS COMMISSION RESOLUTION 692

Whereas, The Minneapolis-Saint Paul Metropolitan Airports Commission, operators of the Minneapolis-Saint Paul International Airport—Wold-Chamberlain Field, pursuant to Minnesota Statutes, has a vital interest in urging a solution to the aircraft noise problem; and

Whereas, The noise created by the present jet aircraft is becoming an ever more serious problem and a solution of this problem is daily becoming more urgent; and

Whereas, The problem defies solution at the local governmental level and is properly a problem of national concern by virtue of Federal Statutes defining the airspace to be within the public domain and subject only to the jurisdiction of the Federal Government, and reserving to the Federal Government the establishment of standards for the certification of jet aircraft using such airspace;

Whereas, An orderly approach to the problem requires an extensive evaluation of the consequent effects created thereby, an analysis of the means by which aircraft noise annoyance can be reduced to acceptable levels, and the formulation and adoption of a comprehensive integrated program to solve the problem in the interest of the public; and

Whereas, The President of the United States, in his message on Transportation delivered to the United States Congress on March 2, 1966, took cognizance of the urgency of solving this problem; and

Whereas, At the present time no maximum standard of aircraft noise has been formulated or adopted by the Federal Government, and no agency or department possesses the authority to regulate aircraft noise;

Now, therefore, be it resolved, By the Minneapolis-Saint Paul Metropolitan Airports Commission, operators of Minneapolis-Saint Paul International Airport-Wold-Chamberlain Field, that:

1. This Commission hereby finds and determines that noise created by the operation of present jet aircraft is a problem of serious proportions beyond the control of the Minneapolis-Saint Paul Metropolitan Airports Commission as a local governmental unit;

2. The Government of the United States should accept Federal responsibility for the control and consequences of aircraft noise because of the congressional declaration that the airspace is public domain (Congress by such declaration has assumed the responsibility and duty to control in all respects the users of the airspace);

3. The President's Science Advisor, with the administrators of the Federal Aviation Administration, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, and the Secretary of Transportation should take steps toward the sound resolution of this problem by legislative recommendations to the Congress;

4. The Congress as quickly as practicable should consider and act upon the recommendations of the President or, in the alternative, on its own initiative confer upon the Federal Aviation Administration or other body or group, in its wisdom, the authority to establish and promulgate a maximum standard of aircraft noise in perceived noise decibels or other acknowledged standard and to vest the authority and power in the Federal Aviation Administration or other appropriate body, to enforce adherence to such standards, or take such other action as will result in effective discipline over the total problem;

5. The President's Science Advisor, the administrators of the Federal Aviation Administration, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, and the Secretary of Transportation take cognizance of the urgency of solving this situation and make provisions for receiving an expression of the views of representatives of national associations of organizations comprised of State, County or Municipal Governments;

6. This Commission is advised of and supports Bills presently before the Congress, in the Senate S707 and in the House HR3400, as legislative vehicles to meet in part at least the aircraft noise problem by establishing in the Federal Government through the Federal Aviation Administration the responsibility and with it authority to regulate the certification of aircraft on the basis of noise as well as safety standards.

Be it further resolved, That copies of this Resolution shall be forwarded to the U. S. Senators representing the State of Minnesota, the Congressmen constituting the Minnesota Congressional Delegation, the President's Science Advisor, the administrators of the Federal Aviation Administration, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, and this Secretary of Transportation, and that the Executive Director of the Minneapolis-Saint Paul Metropolitan Airports Commission inquire periodically as to any affirmative action or lack thereof on this matter so as to keep this Commission informed concerning the reactions of the recipients of this Resolution.

Adopted July 17, 1967.

Lessons Learned at Cambridge, Md.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MASTON O'NEAL

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 10, 1967

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, there are many lessons to be learned from tragic situations. One important example has been pointed out in an editorial appearing in the August 8 edition of the Thomasville, Ga., Times-Enterprise which I would like to share with my colleagues:

LESSONS TO BE LEARNED

A Cambridge, Md., Negro motel and restaurant owner, whose place of business was located in the path of flames started during the recent riot in that city, has committed suicide, because of despondency over his loss.

This Negro, said he had been burned out and put out of business by members of his own race, and all that he had worked for and accumulated, in an effort to be a good and successful American citizen had been wiped out, as a result of riots which followed inflammatory speeches by agitators in that city.

The man in question, of course, is not known in this section. But that he had been successful in acquiring property and owning and operating his own business, indicated he was a good solid American citizen, that he had worked hard and saved his money, that he took advantage of opportunities found only in America—to get ahead and become independent and self-reliant.

The example of this Negro citizen in trying to better his condition, is one which commends him to all who by their own energy, thrift and enterprise, seek to improve their lot and get ahead. Certainly his decision to end his life is not commendable but regrettable, and was as is reported due to the fact he had seen all his life's efforts disappear in smoke and flame in an instant.

His case brings to mind some of the words of Abraham Lincoln, who, in discussing problems of the individual is quoted as having said:

You cannot bring about prosperity, by discouraging thrift.

You cannot strengthen the weak by weakening the strong.

You cannot help the wage earner by pulling down the wage payer.

You cannot further the brotherhood of man by encouraging class hatred.

You cannot help the poor by discouraging the rich.

You cannot establish sound security by spending more than you earn.

You cannot build character and courage by taking away man's initiative and independence.

Added to these words are others by Lincoln, who said:

"Property is the fruit of labor; property is desirable; it is a positive good in the world. That some should be rich shows that others may become rich, and hence is just encouragement to industry and enterprise. Let not him who is houseless pull down the house of another, but let him work diligently and build one for himself, thus by example assuming that his own shall be safe from violence when built."

It would be well for those who seek to burn and destroy the property of others to study the words of Lincoln. The Cambridge, Md., Negro instead of seeking to destroy the house of another built one for himself, only to have it destroyed by others of his own race.

Exploiting the Negro

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OMAR BURLESON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 10, 1967

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, the following article by William S. White, writing in the Washington Post, is most timely and thought provoking. I commend its reading:

Exploiting the Negro: Legitimate Aims Overlooked by Leaders

(By William S. White)

The hidden part of the iceberg of racial violence has nothing whatever to do with civil rights. There will be no solution until this ugly but powerful reality is fully grasped.

The extremist Negro leadership is exploiting Negro discontent, some of it justified and much of it fictitious and wholly trumped up—to destroy the lawful, bipartisan foreign policy of the United States against Communist aggression in general and specifically to force this Nation to abandon its commitment to the invaded people of South Vietnam.

This is the frightening core of it all and this terrible truth is eluding the more liberal politicians of both parties, who from the best motives are in turn wholly obscuring the real name of this game.

They are incessantly talking as though the crisis is purely domestic, and as though it can be cured solely by the panicky pouring out of countless additional billions for urban renewal and other desirable reforms.

That the three most implacable of the black power leaders—Stokely Carmichael, H. Rap Brown and Floyd McKissick—are simply revolutionaries is as plain as day itself. It was plain long before Carmichael went to Cuba to receive the warm salutes of Fidel Castro and to call upon American Negroes to take up arms "from New York to California, from Canada to Mexico."

In these grim and factual circumstances proposals for "Marshall Plans" for Negro citizens and vast, cloudy crash programs to buy off public disorder by Federal funds are nightmarishly ill-conceived. To say that more must be done to bring Negroes into full participation in American society is right and just. To say that this should be done in open panic under naked political and social blackmail, with rioters' pistols pointed publicly at the United States Government itself, is to accept a proposition indefensible in elementary public morality and bankrupt in simple fact.

For these disorders are occurring at a time when more is already being done at greater cost for an undeniably under-privileged minority than has been done in all the previous two centuries of the American experience. The conclusion that more and more money is the one true answer here is thus demonstrably wrong, however compassionate its motive.

It is a notion that misses every main actuality in this whole dreadful affair. It assumes that the great body of American Negroes is approaching a state of rebellion where the clear and self-evident fact is that nowhere has more than a tiny Negro minority been involved in riot and anarchy. It leads such public men as Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey and Sen. Robert F. Kennedy to speak in public as though the very founding stones of the Republic might crumble at any moment.

It rejects the testimony of the best possible authorities—the Governors and Mayors in areas of infection—that legitimate civil rights grievances have not been the operative causes of violence. It ignores the solemn word of a liberal Democrat Governor of New Jersey, Richard Hughes, that the horror in Newark was brought off by fewer than five per cent of its Negroes and that of this five per cent the majority had criminal records.

It ignores the consensus of the National Conference of Mayors that our tortured cities have been the work of men not at all interested in civil rights. It waves aside the sworn testimony of honorable police officials to similar effect.

This malady will never be cured until the firmest of action, entirely lawful but also entirely remorseless, is taken to put down Negro extremists. Only then can the genuine problems of racial disorder and racial unfairness be honestly and wisely met.

No rational society can continue to hide its eyes from patent truth and rational men, however opposed on principle to a war in Vietnam, can no longer condone or cooperate with a clear and present danger to the constitutional conduct, by elected officials, of the foreign policy of the United States.

Rat Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 10, 1967

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, the Members of Congress have been criticized and ridiculed by the various press media, as well as some groups and organizations, for the rather expeditious refusal to consider the legislation recommended by the administration which would provide for $40 million to control rats in slum areas.

If anyone would carefully read the RECORD of the House of Representatives for July 20, they will find there are already in existence several programs for rat extermination. The Members of the House were right in their decision to reject the establishment of another bureau to handle a local problem. In this respect, I call my colleagues' attention to an editorial which appeared in the Washington Daily News, as follows:

The Capitol Miniriot

The Brooklyn and Harlem agitators, led by professional Negro "activist" Jesse Gray, chose the wrong place and the wrong tactics in staging their mini-riot in the halls of the U.S. Capitol. Capitol cops put them down with commendable promptness, arresting nine.

Ostensibly they were protesting the House action late last month in killing the $40 million Administration bill to subsidize rat control in slum areas. Thru clumsy, unfunny efforts to laugh off this measure, the majority of the House members present and voting made themselves look heartless and not very bright. Rats are a menace to health—even to life—and no American should have to live with them.

But rat control is primarily a local problem, if anything ever was. The House majority, tho callous in its treatment of the subject, was correct in concluding this was a problem for city hall—not a new Federal bureaucracy. And by its very ineptitude the House probably focused more attention on the problem than it would have if it routinely had passed the bill.

For instance, New York Gov. Nelson Rockefeller promptly announced his state would undertake its own $4.5 million-a-year rat-control program—which should have satisfied the New York agitators if this was their real interest. And a number of communities which hitherto had ignored the problem have begun special anti-rat programs—as they should have done long since. Any city government which can't mount such a basic health campaign ought to be turned out of office.

The New York firebrands, most of them from the district of Adam Clayton Powell (who never has come back from Bimini), apparently were more interested in making a highly publicized fuss than in making a case. Had they been seriously interested in rat control, they could have saved time and money and advanced the cause by volunteering their talents at city hall.

It is regrettable that the administration's only solution to a problem is to provide for another study, create a new commission, or to establish a Government agency with all its additional redtape and unnecessary administrative waste.

In A.D. 65, Petronius Arbiter during the government of Nero stated:

> We tend to meet any new situation by reorganizing and a wonderful method it can be for creating the illusion of progress while producing confusion, inefficiency and demoralization.

Neighborhood Action Crusade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS S. KLEPPE
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 10, 1967

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, as a cosponsor of the neighborhood action crusade, I call attention to this statement from the office of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BUSH] summarizing support which this proposal has received:

The Neighborhood Action Crusade proposed last week by four members of the House has picked up considerable support since its introduction.

Congressman George Bush (Tex.) said Wednesday that a total of 60 members of the House representing 26 different states and both political parties have joined in introducing the Joint Resolution authored by Bush and Congressman Goodell (NY), Cowger (Ky.), and Steiger (Wis.).

"In addition," Bush said, "the Neighborhood Action Crusade concept has received endorsements from the Houston Post, Mayor Kenneth A. Schmied of Louisville and Mayor B. F. Merritt, Jr. of Macon, Georgia."

The Houston Post said the proposal "properly identified a major weapon in the fight to bring an end to the death and destruction caused by such riots. For no amount of law enforcement can replace the voice of a concerned citizenry which has simply had enough." The editorial endorsement went on to say the idea "is a good one, and should be pursued."

In an article appearing in the Louisville Times, Mayor Schmied was quoted as saying that discussions and meetings on the matter started several weeks ago. He said he and County Judge Marlow W. Cook have talked with Congressman Cowger and "we are heartily behind this program."

Schmied said the city and county governments "heartily" endorse this kind of program. "I've always been a great believer in neighborhood projects. Using people from the neighborhoods gives a better insight into their problems. And people who do volunteer work more often give better results."

Bush received a telegram this week from the mayor of Macon describing the Neighborhood Action Crusade as "a must for any community." Mayor Merritt said in his telegram "We believe your idea of Neighborhood Action Crusade workable." Merritt and Schmied were among the 150 mayors urged to implement the program by the four authors.

Bush said evidence is "springing up all over the country that the concept of volunteers working in their own neighborhoods is workable and necessary to prevent disorder on a major scale. In Milwaukee further violence has been avoided by just this kind of effort. In Tampa, Pittsburgh and Wichita, volunteers have helped to quell violence. A nationwide crusade is growing and members of this Congress must continue to press for the inspiration of this nationwide program."

The Neighborhood Action Crusade is designed as a program for enlisting voluntary help in the poverty areas where riots are liable to break out. These volunteers would become a stabilizing influence to de-fuse the tensions that can lead to rioting.

The Joint Resolution calling for the establishment of the Neighborhood Action Crusade was introduced in the Senate Wednesday by Senator Hugh Scott (Pa.) Joining Scott were Senators Percy (Ill.), Morton (Ky.), and Tower (Tex.)

LIST OF HOUSE SPONSORS

Alabama: Dickinson (R).

Alaska: Pollock (R).

California: Pettis (R), Don H. Clausen (R), Mailliard (R).

Connecticut: Meskill (R).

Georgia: Blackburn (R).

Illinois: Arends (R), Rumsfeld (R), Railsback (R), Findley (R), Anderson (R).

Iowa: Denney (R), Mayne (R).

Kansas: Mize (R).

Maryland: Gude (R).

Massachusetts: Heckler (R), Morse (R), Conte (R), Boland (D), Keith (R).

Michigan: Ford (R), Brown (R), Ruppe (R).

Minnesota: Quie (R), MacGregor (R).

Montana: Battin (R).

North Carolina: Gardner (R).

New Hampshire: Cleveland (R).

North Dakota: Kleppe (R).

New Jersey: Frelinghuysen (R), Dwyer (R), Widnall (R).

New York: Goodell (R), Conable (R), Wydler (R), McEwen (R), Robinson (R), Grover (R), Smith (R), Halpern (R), Addabbo (D).

Ohio: Stanton (R), Latta (R), Taft (R), Feighan (D).

Oregon: Ullman (D), Dellenback (R).

Pennsylvania: Saylor (R), Biester (R), Eshleman (R), Johnson (R), Schneebeli (R).

Puerto Rico: Polanco-Abreu (D).

Tennessee: Kuykendall (R).

Texas: Bush (R), Price (R).

West Virginia: Hechler (D).

Wisconsin: Steiger (R), Laird (R).

Martin E. McCarthy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 10, 1967

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, one of the alltime great Democratic leaders in Massachusetts, Martin E. McCarthy, age 70, passed away on July 18, 1967.

Martin McCarthy was a close friend of many of the well-known political figures in Massachusetts during the past 50 years, going back to the days of the late Gov. James M. Curley; the late Gov. Charles F. Hurley; the late Gov. Maurice J. Tobin; and the late Gov. Paul A. Dever. He served in the ranks of the Democratic Party, working in the interest of a great U.S. Senator, the late beloved David I. Walsh of Clinton, Mass.

Martin E. McCarthy worked in the ranks of his chosen political party when it took courage to be a Democrat. He was one of those responsible for making Ward 18 of Boston a Democratic ward.

Our beloved Speaker of the House, the Honorable John W. McCormack, knew him as a loyal friend and supporter.

Back in 1958 when I was campaigning in a solid Republican district for Congress, he was one of those who was out in the huskings campaigning in my behalf. Martin was of the old school and could be affectionately referred to as one of the group that belonged to the "Last Hurrah." Martin had a deep-rooted love for politics. Coupled with this love was a concern for the plight of his fellowman. Martin could always be found in a congressional office pleading the case of some elderly person having a problem with social security or seeking to get some veteran into the hospital for needed medical care. Although I knew Martin for over 30 years, and he called on me on hundreds of occasions, never once did he ask for a favor for himself. No, Martin was always helping the other fellow.

Yes, Martin E. McCarthy, was of the old school of politics; working in the grassroots area, he kept a lively interest in government right up to the time of his passing. He was one of God's great noblemen. I know Martin, upon being welcomed at the pearly gates of heaven by St. Peter, will immediately start to point out to those he meets the great advantages of being a registered Democrat. May God bless him and keep him. Our prayers go out for his loving, loyal, and devoted widow, Emma, during this hour of sorrow.

Following is a copy of the news report which appeared in the Quincy Patriot Ledger, July 19, 1967:

Martin E. McCarthy of Sharon Dies, Democratic Leader

Sharon.—Martin E. McCarthy, 70, of 9 Lee Road died yesterday at the Norwood Hospital after a short illness.

He was a resident of Boston before moving to Sharon 19 years ago.

A retired inspector for the Boston Department of Public Utilities, he was a veteran of World War I in naval aviation.

He was a former chairman and member of the Sharon Democratic Town Committee, a former member of the Ward 18 Democratic City Commitee, Boston, and a member of Father McShane Council, Knights of Columbus and the Our Lady of Sorrows Holy Name Society.

Active in the state Democratic party, he was a political associate of Speaker of the House of Representatives, John W. McCormack, former attorney general Edward J. McCormack, Rep. James Burke, 11th Congressional District, and Probate judge, James Lawton.

He is survived by his wife, Mrs. Emma C. (Keenan) McCarthy, and was the brother of the late Mrs. Clara McCarthy O'Brien of Roslindale.

A solemn high mass of requiem will be celebrated Saturday at 10 a.m. in Our Lady of Sorrows Church.

Burial will be in the family lot in New Calvary Cemetery in Boston.

Visiting hours at the Joseph B. Keating Funeral Home, 46 South Main St., will be tomorrow and Friday from 2 to 5 and 7 to 10 p.m.

Poems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 10, 1967

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have the pleasure of commending to all people everywhere four poems written by the Honorable Edward T. Stodola. Mr. Stodola started to write poetry as a hobby in September 1966. Mr. Stodola's "War and Peace" has been published and copyrighted in the winter 1966–67, issue of the American Poet magazine, which is published by Prairie Books Press, Charleston, Ill. Other poems are pending in publication.

The other poems that follow are now scheduled for publication and copyright by the American Poet in Charleston, Ill. Reprinting of Mr. Stodola's poems in the Appendix is made with the permission of his publisher.

Mr. Stodola was born on a farm in Kewaunee County, Wis., not far from Green Bay. He now resides in Maryland. Teacher, lawyer, author, and a civil servant with a distinguished career of public service, Mr. Stodola at present is a trial examiner with the Civil Aeronautics Board in Washington, D.C. A student of Lincoln and a self-disciplined master of the English language, Mr. Stodola was a friend of and corresponded with the late Carl Sandburg.

Mr. Stodola's poems, beginning with "War and Peace," follow:

War and Peace

(By Edward T. Stodola)

Oh, the grandeur of peace
The utter immorality of war
If God has His own good purposes
Then why the terror of useless strife?

Perhaps many wars are noble
Flags, booming bands and pretty speeches
Appear to make all them so
Pray, say are all wars fine and dandy?

Stalwart sons are marching on to death
Millions of corpses strewn in filth and stench
Countless mothers silently weep and wonder
Were all our boys born to kill and die?

There must come the real brotherhood of man
A Merciful Providence must help us all
And stop the wickedness and wretchedness of war
Or will our Creator forsake us evermore?

Right is stronger than the might of war
Man's wisdom shall rise in the passing time
The real causes of war still wait to fall
Is the struggle for domination the focus of it all?

This world, this kind yet terrible world
Where angels of time had wrought merciless truths
Wars shall not end before there is a world union of man
Will the only uniform then be that of the civil policeman?

LOVE AND PEACE

(By Edward T. Stodola)

The sacred scriptures tell us
Of a time made for love
And a time made for hate
Of a time to kill and a time to die!

But the sacred scriptures also say
That he who takes up the sword
Shall surely perish by the sword
Yet, there may be a time for war!

But there is always, always a time for peace
And love is here, there and everywhere
Love is life and all life is love
Yes, love is mightier than the sword!

God and man and man and nature
The Master's glory is the life He gives
Let us fear God and nothing, nothing else
Yes, whom God would destroy He first makes mad!

DARKNESS

(By Edward T. Stodola)

As a very young child
I was afraid of darkness
My mother and father understood
If I awakened in the darkness of night
I was allowed to light a candle
It has often been said and written
That it is better to light a candle
Than to curse or fear the darkness

As a very, very young man
I began to like the darkness
The smell and the sounds of darkness
As darkness laid its kind mantle over me
I smelled the new mown hay at night

During darkness I would look at the stars
And wonder, and wonder and wonder
Each was very distant and glorious
Myriads of suns shinning upon other worlds

Alas, alas, a new darkness has come upon us
The darkness of strife, the darkness of total war
Dear God, our God, the Merciful Father of us all
Help us, aid us, allow all of us to survive.

A JOURNEY TO EXPO '67

(By Edward T. Stodola)

Good, we are now ready to see Canada again
O Canada, a country so close to our hearts
Our trip has begun with delight and anticipation
This is more like a short odyssey to Ogygia!

We love to fly, we love to fly
Flight brings us closer to the heavens
We leave from the airport Friendship
From Maryland, our own beloved Maryland!

All above us is the blue and cloudless sky
Below us are clouds pleasant as bowls of cream
The jet's whispering wind soothes us well
A drink and a lunch lands us in Montreal!

Montreal, Montreal, great cosmopolitan Montreal
Were he living, it would be one of O'Henry's favorite cities
But Montreal is much more than a great and generous city
It is the experience of one people, a whole country and all of Canada!

Now, to Expo '67: man, his environment and his progress
Its greatness lies in making the world one friendly people
It's more than its many, many magnificient pavilions and exhibits
Expo's basic theme is perhaps mankind's one last hope for survival!

Time To Face Facts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DON EDWARDS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 10, 1967

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, the reaction to the horrible outbreaks of violence and destruction in our cities this summer has been a tragedy in itself. It is a pathetic, negative response to pass unconstitutional and vague antiriot bills and to joke about the frightful, dangerous infestation of our central cities by rats. An excellent editorial appeared on August 4, 1967, in my home city's newspaper, the San Jose Mercury. The editors of the Mercury plead for a better, more far-sighted perspective, and quite rightly point out the alternative of further disaster.

The editorial follows:

TIME TO FACE FACTS

The tragedy of America's fourth consecutive "long, hot summer" is that nobody has been willing, so far, to face up to the grim facts that racial disturbances underline.

The American people, by and large, show no disposition to alter drastically their thinking, or their spending, in regard to the urban ghetto. This lack of appreciation is reflected in the Congress where members of the House and Senate continue to concern themselves with antiriot bills rather than the causes of riots.

It is tragic, indeed, that Congress has not come under intense and continuing criticism for this shortsightedness. It is presumptive evidence that the majority does not really understand or care to understand.

This obtuseness can have no outcome other than more and perhaps worse violence next year—and the year after that and the year after that.

For their part, the leaders of the so-called Black Power movement—if it can rightly be called a movement—show an equal obtuseness. It is far easier to incite a riot, to urge a ghetto be burned down, than it is to formulate precise demands that will meet the needs of the ghetto dwellers. It is easier, but it is self-defeating.

Calls for "urban guerrilla warfare" and threats against the President and Secretary of State avail nothing. There will be no "guerrilla warfare" in the true meaning of that word because geography and demography are against it.

The Negro "revolution" has to be a social and economic revolution because, like it or not, Americans black and white are Americans all. They share the same continent. They will sink or swim together.

It is time that leaders of both races realized this and began working together to achieve a better life for the disadvantaged of all colors, races and creeds.

The alternative is continuing violence and a bleeding of the creative talents of the nation. It is a waste that no one, black or white, can afford.

Resolution of the American Committee of California for Freedom of Enslaved Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 10, 1967

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on July 22, 1967, the American Committee of California for Freedom of Enslaved Nations composed of Armenian, Estonian, Hungarian, Latvian, Lithuanian, Polish, Romanian, and Ukrainian delegations, unanimously adopted a resolution requesting the President of the United States to bring before the United Nations the question of the liberation of enslaved nations and to ask the U.N. to request the Soviets to remove all control from these nations and return all prisoners from Siberia and slave-labor camps in the Soviet Union.

In additon, the committee resolved that the United Nations conduct free elections in these countries under its supervision.

I commend the text of the resolution to the attention of our colleagues, as follows:

JULY 23, 1967.

Hon. ABRAHAM J. MULTER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MULTER: We, as American Committee of California for Freedom of Enslaved Nations composed of Armenian, Estonian, Hungarian, Latvian, Lithuanian, Polish, Romanian and Ukrainian delegations respectfully submit the following Resolution:

Whereas, since 1918 the imperialistic and aggressive policies of Russian communism have resulted in the creation of a vast empire which poses a dire threat to the security of the United States and of all the free peoples of the world; and

Whereas, the Communist regime did not come to power in the enslaved nations by legal or democratic processes; and

Whereas, the Soviet Union took over the aforesaid countries by force of arms; and

Whereas, these submerged nations look to the United States, as the citadel of human freedom, for leadership in bringing about their liberation and independence and in restoring to them the enjoyment of their Christian, Jewish, or otheer religious freedoms, and of their individual liberties; and

Whereas, it is vital to the national security of the United States that the desire for liberty and independence on the part of the peoples of these conquered nations should be steadfastly kept alive; and

Whereas, there exists a strong and undivided world opinion to eliminate all remnants of imperialism and colonialism; and

Whereas, it seems to be a proven diversionary tactic that, while the Soviet Union is supplying arms and ammunition to the Arab and North Vietnamese armies we focus attention on the dreadful consequences of Russian presence in these nations: Now, therefore be it

Resolved, that we request the President of the United States to bring up the liberation question of the Enslaved Nations before the United Nations and ask the United Nations to request the Soviets—

(1) to withdraw all Soviet troops, agents, colonists, and controls from the aforesaid countries;

(2) to return all exiles and prisoners from Siberia, prisons and slave-labor camps in the Soviet Union; and be it further

Resolved, that the United Nations conduct free elections in these countries under its supervision and punish all Soviet Communists who are guilty of crimes against these nations.

Unanimously adopted. Los Angeles, Calif. July 22, 1967.

RICHARD D. WENEK,
Professor, President.
DR. EMIL ONAKA,
First Vice President.
Rev. L. KECSKEMETHY,
Second Vice President.

A Successful Partnership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 10, 1967

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, a recent Small Business Administration loan, called to my attention by Alvin Meyers, SBA's Los Angeles regional director, illustrates very well the innovative nature of small business and how programs of cooperation between Government and business is working out in practice.

The case that I am referring to is Gardner-Fulmer Lithograph of Buena Park, Calif. But more particularly I am referring to people—David Gray Gardner, 42-year-old president of the firm; Orbie Lee Fulmer, the firm's 43-year-old vice president, and their 30 hard working and devoted employees and the families of all of them.

This story has its beginning in 1962 when David Gray Gardner and Orbie Lee Fulmer, partners in a business that was not yet 3 years old, sought help from SBA's office in Los Angeles.

Their problem was typical of so many progressive, dynamic, growing small businesses. They had to raise a considerable sum to carry forward their expansion plans, or they would be doomed to skimping along on a hand-to-mouth basis.

The business of this small company is producing commercial lithography—brochures, catalogs, direct mail literature, books, house organs, price lists, and labels. Although the firm was then less than 3 years old it had obviously established a good reputation and demonstrated its capability. It had plenty of satisfied customers—sales were increasing steadily.

The firm also had as assets a nucleus of well-trained employees; morale was high; the owners were capable managers and were utilizing the services of a capable accounting firm.

Here, clearly, was a small firm that had all of the elements of success—all, that is except one—adequate working capital. But let the company president, David Gardner, tell the story in his own words:

> The principal problem facing us at that time was lack of growth capital. We were working close to absolute capacity with existing equipment, and while our earnings had been good, we had not been able to retain enough to finance the expansion that was needed.
>
> Banks were not interested in long-term financing, business loans were not available from insurance companies or savings and loan institutions, and private capital was either too costly or involved some loss of ownership.
>
> Equipment companies would finance purchases for three or four years with add-on interest after a down payment of 20 or 25 percent, but that did not provide any operating capital to handle the new business that the new equipment would make possible. Our accounting firm had assisted us in the study of our problem, and recommended that we apply to the Small Business Administration.

That is the way the president of this little company summed up the situation as it was in 1962. SBA quickly approved a 5-year loan of $80,000 which was used to finance the purchase of a new 25 by 38 two-color press.

David Gardner recalls now that this seemed a very bold step for the firm to be taking at that time. Indeed, some of his competitors were asking, "Do you really think there is that kind of business around?"

The business partners, David Gardner and Orbie Fulmer, knew that they were taking a big step, but it was a step forward toward their vision of a growing and progressive firm. They found also that SBA's financial backing gave them renewed assurance and confidence—new enthusiasm, impetus, and direction.

The two business partners say they are often asked about their experience with the Small Business Administration. They explain that to them working in partnership with an agency like SBA is a "good deal." And by "good deal," they mean it is "good for everybody—the business and the Government both benefit."

There can be no question that this loan worked out that way. In 5 years the firm's payroll has grown from 5 employees to 30. A growth of 25 new jobs with a side effect of support for 2 to 2.5 that number in service and support industries. This is the dynamic effect that is so important to the total economy. The firm's sales and profits have steadily increased. The company has a bright future and is doing so well that it recently instituted a profit sharing plan for its employees.

But the Federal Government has also benefited from this loan. The 30 employees and the owners all pay taxes, local, State, and Federal. The loan is being repaid to the Government with interest.

And that is not all. During 1966 this small firm made purchases of supplies amounting to many thousands of dollars. Many of these purchases were made in Buena Park. In addition this small firm in 1966 subcontracted many thousands of dollars of work. These expenditures alone now far exceed the firm's entire annual sales of 5 years ago.

For the owners of Gardner/Fulmer Lithograph and their employees, September 15, 1967, will be a big day. On that date they will pay off the last installment on the 5-year, $80,000 loan they obtained from SBA.

The partners in this small business consider the SBA loan was a sound investment in human resources, an expression of their Government's belief in progress and achievement, an example of enlightened Government at work.

And they firmly believe that the creative forces that are liberated through financial assistance provided by the Small Business Administration are an important factor in maintaining a dynamic economy.

A Restrained Admiral

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD J. IRWIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 13, 1967

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, during the Easter recess I went to Vietnam with several of my colleagues on the Armed Services Committee. On our way out to Southeast Asia we stopped in Honolulu and received our first briefing from Adm. Ulysses G. S. Sharp, Jr. His thoroughness, personal strength, and judicious care in talking with us was most impressive and encouraging. Today's New York Times devotes its "Man in the News" profile to Admiral Sharp and rightly notes the unusual qualities which make this man who is the commander of our forces in the Pacific area.

The New York Times profile follows:

A RESTRAINED ADMIRAL—ULYSSES GRANT SIMPSON SHARP, JR.

> WASHINGTON, August 9.—Few military men on earth have as much destructive power within their grasp as has Adm. Ulysses Simpson Grant Sharp Jr., commander of all United States forces in the Pacific area.
>
> From his beautifully situated headquarters high in the Hawaiian hills above Honolulu, he controls an armada of ships, planes and men that packs an almost incomprehensible wallop. It is a force that could blow a good-size piece of a small country like North Vietnam off the map. Yet the force has so far been used with restraint, and today Admiral Sharp journeyed to Capitol Hill to testify in the growing controversy that this restraint has produced.
>
> When the closed session was over, several Senators who have advocated tougher military action in Vietnam said their views had been bolstered by Admiral Sharp's testimony. The admiral himself refused to comment, a position that did not surprise those who have watched him carefully, balance his public views of the war with the views of President Johnson.
>
> Admiral Sharp's friends say that in private he is more "hawkish" than the Presi-

dent. But so judiciously has he kept his tongue that it is difficult to determine exactly where he varies.

He is described as a "great admirer" of air power, though most of his naval experience has been with ships other than aircraft carriers. But his use of air power against targets in North Vietnam is characterized by his associates as "cautious" and "judicious."

The officers who feed him details about targets proposed for bombardment undergo their own bombardment as Admiral Sharp hammers away with a flurry of questions—"Is that target necessary? What losses can we expect? What effect will it have on the war?"

The admiral is said to simpathize deeply with the political problems the war has created for President Johnson. In fact, during a news conference last April at the Pentagon he denounced persons who demonstrate against American involvement in the war in Vietnam and charged them with "damaging our over-all position."

Like many military men, he has a caustic word now and then for Washington bureaucrats. But those persons who work regularly with him say he never carps behind the backs of either the President or Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara.

"If you have described Admiral Sharp in a phrase," one of his friends said today, just call him 'a faithful servant.'"

The admiral also has another trait that military men find particularly appealing. He is almost imperturbable, whatever the crisis. The tighter the situation, they say, the quiter he grows and the quicker he moves.

If he has a temper, it never shows. Sometimes he may display a bit of irritation but only through a look or a curt word for a subordinate whose work has not met the admiral's standards.

They are very high standards. Admiral Sharp makes almost a fetish of preciseness and it is evident in the detailed thoroughness with which he goes about his job and issues orders and drafts reports.

Such thoroughness is achieved through long hard hours. The admiral arises each morning around 6 o'clock, calls his headquarters to determine if the night has gone quietly, then dresses and eats breakfast. Before heading for the office, he reads through the night file of messages, which has been specially delivered to him.

By eight he is in the office. He eats lunch at his desk so that he can get in an extra hour of work, then labors through the rest of the afternoon, finally heading for home around 6. With him he carries a briefcase full of homework.

The admiral is not overly fond of entertaining. But his position demands a considerable amount of it and several nights a week he and his wife, the former Patricia O'Connor, give formal dinners. They have two children—a daughter, Mrs. Russell P. Milham of Los Angeles, and a son, Lieut. Grand A. Sharp, U.S.N.

Hon. Wayne Fredericks Leaving Government Service

SPEECH

OF

HON. PETER H. B. FRELINGHUYSEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 9, 1967

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I should like to join my colleagues in paying tribute to Wayne Fredericks, and in expressing my regret that he is leaving Government service.

Those of us who have come to know Mr. Fredericks recognize him as a man of unusual qualifications for the job which he has been handling so well. He is acknowledged to be one of this country's experts in that great, but still somewhat mysterious, continent of Africa. Perhaps even more important, he has had the ability to share that knowledge with others, in an unpretentious but stimulating manner. As Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs, he has made many friends, and in the process he has aroused real interest in Africa, an area which promises to become increasingly important in the years ahead.

It is, therefore, with regret that many of us on Capitol Hill see Wayne Fredericks leave Washington. His shoes will be hard to fill. We wish him all good luck in the new job with the Ford Foundation.

Rats of Various Kinds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 10, 1967

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the attempted harassment of the House last Monday is of great concern to all of us. I deem it, therefore, of practical interest for Members to study an editorial which appeared in the Wednesday, August 9, edition of the Chicago Tribune. The editorial follows:

RATS OF VARIOUS KINDS

About the only thing the demonstrators from Harlem proved by their anti-rat-in at the Capitol Monday is that Congress needs better protection against invasion by unruly mobs. Capitol police had to use blackjacks to eject Jesse Gray, a professional rabble rouser from New York, and his delegation of 75 demonstrators shoving and shouting, "Rats cause riots."

Rats are indeed a menace which needs to be controlled, but before going into this we should point out that rats of the four-legged variety have been with us for thousands of years and have not until now, to our knowledge, caused murder, arson, and looting. So if rats are suddenly causing riots today, we must assume that they are two-legged rats, against whom Mr. Gray seems to have no complaints.

The demonstrators were protesting the failure of the House to take up Mr. Johnson's 40 million dollar rat control bill. It was not a love of rats which motivated the congressmen, despite the sarcastic comments of some supporters of the bill, but rather a feeling that the matter was a local responsibility and that federal grants-in-aid would not contribute to efficiency or economy in extermination. An official of the department of housing and urban development, which would have supervised the program, said that it would cost the taxpayers $6 to get rid of each rat.

If the responsibility is a local one, the obvious question arises what the cities are doing about it. In most instances, we are afraid, the answer is: Not very much. Most cities have ordinances like Chicago's, which states quite specifically that "every building or structure within the city shall be rat-stopped, freed of rats, and maintained in a rat-stopped and rat-free condition." Housing inspectors are charged with the duty of reporting violations to the building commissioner. Violators may be fined up to $200 a day for each day there are rats on their premises.

If the owner, agent, or occupant does not comply, the city may do the job and bill him for it. If he doesn't pay, a state statute authorizes the city to place on the property a lien "which shall be superior to all other existing liens" and, if it is not paid off within a year, to foreclose on the property. This means that the owner is ultimately responsible, as he should be.

The law is a good one, or would be if anybody paid any attention to it. Mayor Daley has tried to. Since November, 1965, city crews have plugged up more than 350,000 ratholes, have put out large quantities of poison, and have reported some progress. The trouble is that only about one-fifth of the property owners affected have paid up, and only a few of the delinquents have been taken to court. The 3 million dollar deficit to date has been made up partly by the city but mostly by a grant of more than 2 million dollars from the federal anti-poverty office.

If ordinances like Chicago's were adequately enforced, the fines and collections ought to offset most of the cost. It shouldn't take very many fines before the word got around, if prosecutions were given adequate publicity. Certainly cities should do all they can before the taxpayers at large are asked to pay at the rate of $6 a rat for the failure of slum landlords and slovenly tenants to comply with the law.

"Rhodesia Offers Help"—Address by the Honorable Strom Thurmond

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT W. WATSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 10, 1967

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, we are living in an age of paradoxes, and nowhere is this more apparent than in the official attitude of our State Department toward the Government of Rhodesia.

It seems that every possible rationalization has been used by our Government and the United Nations to justify the imposition of economic sanctions upon Rhodesia on the basis that this small nation constitutes a threat to world peace. The truth is that in an attempt to placate the noncommitted nations of the Afro-Asian bloc in the United Nations, our Government has been a party to these illegal and foolish sanctions.

Yet, how many of these nations support our position, just in principle alone, in the Vietnam war? If anything, most of them are highly critical of our role in trying to free South Vietnam from Communist aggression.

But, what about Rhodesia? How does this nation feel about American involvement in Vietnam?

This question was dramatically answered not long ago by our distinguished colleague in the Senate, the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND]. In an address on May 17, 1967, to the Peace With Rhodesia banquet held in Washington, Senator THURMOND revealed to the more than 500 persons attending that Rhodesia would be willing to send her soldiers to aid us in the

Vietnam fighting. Yes, despite our Government's willingness to bring about the downfall of a faithful ally by economic force, that ally stood ready to send her sons to fight alongside American boys in Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I include the address made by our colleague as part of my remarks:

Address by Senator Strom Thurmond, South Carolina, Before the American-Southern African Council Dinner, Hotel America, Washington, D.C., May 17, 1967

Everyone today is talking about "building bridges." Mostly they mean building bridges to the Soviet Union. We are told that, stone by stone, our bridge of friendship will arch out toward the Communists.

Now I don't think that any one has ever built an arch by starting from one side. In building such a bridge, we are building toward collapse.

Moreover, the planners of such a bridge have never revealed what tolls will be demanded in the event that it should be completed.

Nor do they seem to be making any provision for a draw span in the middle, in case we don't like what we find when we get to the other side.

I have called such structures "Bridges to Oblivion."

Now I think we all know what we mean when our policy planners talk about such a construction project. They mean a program of promoting, bit by bit, concessions and contacts with an enemy that has sworn to destroy us, and is at this very moment busily promoting revolutions against the West in Asia, Africa, and Latin America. They mean that, bit by bit, we will disarm ourselves, by unilateral decision, if necessary. We will cease to develop new weapons systems, phase out old ones, and refuse to put into production those we already have. They mean we will encourage so-called cultural contacts. They mean that we will applaud the Soviet ballet, while our young men are trapped by civilian policy decisions into a fruitless dance of death in Vietnam.

Another method of building bridges is to step up trade with the enemy. It is plain that in time of war, any kind of trade with the enemy must be considered strategic. There is no product or commodity that does not assist the economy of the enemy, strengthening it, relieving stresses and strains, allowing the enemy to allocate its resources to battle.

The Soviet Union, with its accomplices in the international communist conspiracy, is still our enemy. We are fighting a hot war with the proxies of the Soviet Union in Vietnam. Some 90 per cent of the material supporting North Vietnam today comes from the Soviet Union and its satellites. The Soviets could stop the war any time they wanted to by cutting off the supplies—particularly the oil—which they are sending to Vietnam.

But we are fighting in Vietnam because we are in a larger war with the Soviet Union all over the globe. It is a war that is fought on all fronts. One kind of front is the fictitious "war of national liberation," inspired and instigated from outside. The Soviets have organized and funded a special organization in Havana, the Tricontinental Congress, specifically for the purpose of centralizing the direction of such wars.

But there are other fronts too. One such front is propaganda. The Soviets aim to discredit us by every means. They organize peace groups, with carefully coordinated propaganda. They organize students, and use them for their own aims.

Another front is diplomacy. They seek to tie us down, and hamstring our actions by such instruments as the Consular Convention, and the Outer Space Treaty.

But the front I most want to talk about tonight is trade. The Soviets are most anxious to increase trade with us for two reasons. First, they want to copy our technology and obtain our quality tools and instruments. Second, they want to compromise our business interests; and, by the promise of a new field for profits, win our businessmen over to become advocates of peaceful co-existence. They hope to create a lobby within the U.S. itself to lower the American guard against Communist aims for world domination.

Unfortunately, our leaders, so confused by Soviet promises, unwittingly seem to be doing everything they can to assist the Communists in their program. At every opportunity, moves are made to lower the bars. Credits are extended. Loans are guaranteed. Most significantly, item after item is removed from the restricted list of strategic materials. Suddenly items such as computers, certain types of radar systems, precision scientific instruments, and technical data are no longer strategic. Thousands of revisions were made in the Commerce Department's Export Control list within the past month, and passed largely unnoticed in the Federal Register.

In the House of Representatives, the Administration is attempting to push through the FIAT auto deal, whereby thousands of dollars worth of American machine tools are being sold to the Soviet Union to equip an automobile factory being built there by FIAT. We are told that the factory cannot be used for anything else but making automobiles. We are told that American precision automatic lathes and screw machines, heat treating furnaces, stamping machines, and gear cutters can be used only to turn out FIAT automobiles. Obviously, all this machinery can be redistributed and retooled for other uses. It could be used in the planned complex to turn out light military vehicles for Vietnam. The Soviets don't need to put heavy tanks in Vietnam. Much of the military shipping now going through jungle trails is handled much more efficiently by bicycle.

I mention all these details to this audience tonight in order to remind you that all these actions, removing strategic goods from restricted lists, is accomplished through the mechanism of the Export Control Act of 1949. It is a curiosity that the very same Export Control Act, under which the Commerce Department, at the instigation of the Executive removes strategic goods from the control list, is the same authority which is being used to impose economic sanctions upon Rhodesia. The authorities are using the same discreation to take controls off the Communists, and encourage bridge buiding, as they are using to impose sanctions upon Rhodesia.

This is a manifest perversion of the Export Control Act. The Act authorizes controls for three purposes: 1. "national security," 2. "foreign policy," and 3. "short supply." The meaning of the first and last is self-explanatory. The meaning of the foreign policy classification was clarified by Congress in 1965 when a policy statement was added to the act specifying that the United States opposes restrictive trade practices, or boycotts by foreign countries against other countries friendly to the United States.

Nevertheless, on January 5, 1967, the President issued Executive Order No. 11322, calling for economic sanctions against the friendly country of Rhodesia, in contravention of the 1965 amendment. The importation of chrome, pig iron, sugar, tobacco, copper, meat and meat products, and hides, skins, and leathers, as well as dealings by U.S. nationals in such products originating in Rhodesia, was forbidden by summary edict.

Let me give you an example of the way this Executive Order has been interpreted. Last Spring, an American businessman, Robert L. Wyckoff, went to Rhodesia with the intention of buying such products as were not on the restricted list and importing them into the U.S. His motivation, if we may guess at it, was "building bridges." Only this time, he was building bridges toward a friendly nation, a defender of the West, a country that modeled its historic decision upon our own American Declaration of Independence.

Mr. Wyckoff purchased $5,000 worth of copper plaques. These plaques were manufactured in Rhodesia, but they were made from copper mined in Zambia and refined in Italy and Britain. Mr. Wyckoff personally investigated the copper inventory of the companies he dealt with to make sure that the shipping cases were stamped with the country of origin. The executive order issued by the President restricts only "copper . . . originating in Southern Rhodesia . . ., or products thereof." By "Southern Rhodesia," the President was referring to the country which the world knows simply as Rhodesia.

Mr. Wyckoff reports that on May 4, two men appeared at his door, without prior notice, one from the Treasury Department, and one from the Customs Department. They had a copy of a newspaper article reporting that he was importing articles manufactured in Rhodesia. The Treasury man stated that he had orders from Washington that all his imported goods were to be seized. They demanded his business records. They told him that if he attempted to sell such goods, even though they were not covered under the President's executive order, that there would be "trouble." Mr. Wyckoff was frightened, because he knows that under the President's arbitrary order, he might be jailed for as much as ten years.

Mr. Wyckoff says bitterly, and I quote, "In my mind, there is no doubt that the government will spare no expense or effort in order to convict those who assist that great anti-communist 'threat' to world peace, Rhodesia. If similar efforts were made to control those promoting our great peace-loving friends of Russia, one would feel better about it. I shall continue to help Rhodesia because Rhodesia is defending my country in the great struggle which will determine the future of my two children. By aiding Rhodesia, I am in service to my country." End quote.

Today I called the Treasury Department for an explanation of their actions in Mr. Wyckoff's case. Officials of the Foreign Assets Control Department were very patient in explaining their position. They thought the explanation was very simple. They admitted that Mr. Wyckoff was correct in his understanding that the President banned only Rhodesian copper and products made of Rhodesian copper. However, they said that Treasury officials were acting not under the President's Executive order, but under the Department's own "Rhodesian Transaction Regulations." They explained that the Treasury regulations "are broader in language" than the President's order. It was necessary, they said, to increase the scope of the restrictions in order to implement the President's order. They explained that they had no way of telling whether Mr. Wyckoff's copper plaques were made of Rhodesian copper or Zambian copper, so they interpreted the Presidential order to include all copper exports from Rhodesia just in case.

Ladies and Gentlemen, this is the way to bureaucratic tyranny. When underlings in the bureaucracy are free to broaden an Executive Order that is contrary to the sense of Congress in the first place, then there is no end to the harassment of private citizens engaging in private acts. The Treasury Department in this case is presuming that Mr. Wyckoff is guilty when they admit that they have no evidence at all.

Congress must and will put a stop to this distortion of executive power. The administration policy here is clear. We build bridges toward the Soviet Union, which intends to destroy us, but we build walls around Rhodesia, a devoted defender of the West. One and the same piece of legislation is being distorted at both ends to suit the aims of the Administration's policy planners. At each end, we see the plain meaning of the law twisted, hacked away at, undermined bit by bit, to suit the strange notions of the foreign policy the Executive is imposing upon our nation.

Nevertheless, I am happy to announce that bridges are being built between the U.S. and Rhodesia. But this time, they are being built from the other end. The Rhodesians today consider that they have won the battle of the sanctions. Not every sector of their economy is up to par, but in the main the balance of trade favors Rhodesia. Despite the UN sanctions, Rhodesia is trading with the world.

Meanwhile, Rhodesian chromite is on the banned list. So to make good on our policy of knifing our friends, the Administration has had to allow U.S. dollars to go abroad to the Soviet Union to import Communist chromite.

So bridges are being built to Rhodesia, and they are being built from both sides. The wonderful turnout at this dinner this evening is proof that many Americans are willing to indulge in "peaceful-coexistence" with Rhodesia. It shows that there may be some benefit in cultural exchanges after all. It may even be that by programs such as this we may cause Rhodesia to "mellow" and cease being the threat to world peace that Mr. Ambassador Goldberg keeps complaining about.

Rhodesia's problem, if we may try to guess at the strange workings of the minds of our policymakers, seems to be that Rhodesians are still too anti-Communist. Rhodesia wants the West to win. The American policy is No-win. All around the world, we have been anti-anti-Communist. Our policy of Communist containment has been less than successful. We have been far more successful at containing and demoralizing the anti-Communists.

I have one more item to report as evidence of Rhodesian spirit. On May 7, the Rhodesian Minister of Internal Affairs, Mr. William Harper, spoke to the Rhodesian Reserve Officers Association in Bulwayo.

Mr. Harper expressed his personal view that the Rhodesian Government would be willing to allow Rhodesians to volunteer to help the American effort in Vietnam. Telegram confirms definite offer of Rhodesia to help. Now, the men of the Rhodesian army and reserves are superior trained fighters. They have had experience with Communist guerrillas fighting hand to hand in Malaysia. More than that, they have the will to win. If the offer of the Rhodesian government is accepted by the U.S. and South Vietnam, it is believed that as many as 5,000 crack troops and officers would immediately make themselves available to go to Vietnam. There is nothing that Rhodesians would like better than to help the West win the war against world Communism.

I think that Rhodesia has solved many of its problems. Its independence is no more a matter of dispute by sensible observers. They are willing to open up lines of communication with Britain on any matter that will not jeopardize their independence. They would like to renew their relationship with Britain as trading partners, to the mutual advantage of both. They are hoping that the U.S. will return to a position that at least approaches neutrality, if not accepting the willing hand of friendship offered.

The question now stands with the United States: Do we want victory over world Communism? Are we so anxious to be friends with the Communists that we want to squelch a valuable friend from the Western tradition? Will the U.S. accept the Rhodesian volunteers? If we accept the Rhodesian volunteers, we should only do it if we have the will to win, as the Rhodesians have the will to win. Two years ago when the Rhodesians declared independence, everybody said that they couldn't win. They didn't reckon with the spirit of courage, patriotism, loyalty, and devotion that has typically animated Western man. The Rhodesians have it. That's why they are winning. That's why they want to help the West win in Vietnam. The United States has the power, the capability, the history to win. We must now demonstrate that we have the will to win, not only in Vietnam, but everywhere that Communism presents its challenge of world conquest. Ladies and Gentlemen, when we do, Rhodesia will be standing proudly by our side.

A Tribute to Astronauts Grissom, White, and Chaffee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. GURNEY
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 10, 1967

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, I have received a particularly impressive poem, dedicated to the memory of the three valiant astronauts who so tragically lost their lives early this year. It was written by John-Allen Seybold and Donald A. Seybold, who have taken a great interest in these three astronauts, as a tribute to the special place these men have earned in our history.

As Representative from the Fifth District of Florida, which includes the Kennedy Space Center, I felt particularly close to Astronauts Grissom, White, and Chaffee. This poem vividly illustrates the contribution that these great men made to our space program, and I would like to share it with my colleagues.

A PLACE TO STAND

(By John-Allen Seybold and Donald A. Seybold)

For an instant—
The valiant young have shown their courage.
They have demonstrated a spirit, a force,
Determined that the task shall be done—
A million moments of effort
May fail,
A million attempts
Without gains—
Amid throes,
Laments and refrains—
Yet, in another instant
Courage will prevail,
That one brilliant moment
When the valiant shall demand—
When in their finest hour,
They will affirm
I have a place to stand,
And I shall move the world.
This,—an adage
As ancient as the world itself
And still
As young and as grand—
That is all they have asked,
These valiant three.
Give me a place,
Let me contribute to the knowledge vast—
To contribute with honor
Toward the conquest in space
Of that waterless sea—
They have embraced their courage
Embraced too, their love.

Then these three,
These very valiant three of late
Have only asked the same,
Give us a place to stand
Within the frame
Of God's own estate—
Whereupon,—they stood
To be well counted
As they shall be—evermore—
Of these three,
These valiant who endeavored;
One has often said to us,
It is well worth the risk
In that sea
If life is lost,—yet, never,
Never in vain—
And said another
I have been there
I have walked in God's own yard,
And nothing
Has made me more aware
That I had found a place to stand
Where men and trouble
Are of small regard—
And the third of these valiant men so tall
Said,—I wish to move the world
Still, I must do it well
Or not at all.

That selfish infinite sea, their goal
Ever reaching—but conquerable
Yet, cruel and merciless,
A vacuumed swell
So determined to exact its toll—
But that seeming endless task
Has only spelled their courage for a time.
It has not abated their valor,
Not one whit.
Let them gain a running start
In the spirit of their souls
And they are joined
By an entourage
Of young men who demand with grit—
Give to us that place to stand!
Give to us the valiant goals!

For only then, I stand to courage
With pride and dignity—
And they each say, together—
Let not the hours that wound
Retard your faith,
But renew each moment soon,
That others,—those behind us
The many valiant young shall make
That move to valor
So that our souls may hear them say,
Give me a place to stand
Give me a heaven near
I strive to move the world
I yearn to hold God's hand.

Montgomery GI Dies in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE D. LONG
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 10, 1967

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Pfc. Lance D. Brunson, a young paratrooper from Maryland, was recently killed in action in Vietnam. I wish to commend the courage of this young man and to honor his memory by including the following article in the RECORD:

MONTGOMERY GI DIES IN VIETNAM—PFC. BRUNSON SERVED WITH 101ST AIRBORNE

GARRETT PARK, Md, Aug. 9.—Pfc. Lance D. Brunson, a Montgomery county paratrooper, was killed Sunday in Vietnam, exactly three weeks after he left the United States, the Defense Department reported yesterday.

Pfc. Brunson died of multiple wounds received on a combat mission, according to his stepfather, Chester B. Sobsey, of 10705 Montrose avenue, Garrett Park.

Pfc. Brunson, 20, was stationed in a weapons platoon with the 101st Airborne Division, the "Screaming Eagles." He left the United States for Vietnam July 16.

TRIPLE VOLUNTEER

Pfc. Brunson was a volunteer all the way, Mr. Sobsey said last night—he volunteered for the Army, for the paratroopers and for Vietnam.

"In his last letter he said there was no reason to be proud of him yet because he had not yet done his job," Mr. Sobsey recalled.

The young soldier enlisted in the Army two days after his graduation from Albert Einstein High School, Kensington, Md., in June, 1966.

BORN ON WEST COAST

He was born in Los Angeles and grew up in Las Vegas, Nev. The family moved to Maryland in 1959, after the election of Senator Cannon (D., Nev.), for whom Mr. Sobsey is executive secretary.

Pfc. Brunson is survived by his stepfather; his mother, Mrs. Mary Alice Sobsey; his grandmother, Mrs. Tina Truman; a sister, Barbre Alice Brunson; and two brothers, Stephen M. Sobsey and Robert L. Sobsey, all of Garrett Park.

A Confused Call for Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HASTINGS KEITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 10, 1967

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, recently there has been a great deal of publicity, most of it unfavorable, focused on the House of Representatives rejection of the resolution to consider the Rat Extermination Act of 1967.

My vote against the resolution was based on the conviction that rat eradication can best be handled at the local level, and that the existing Federal programs to provide financial assistance to fight rats do not require further proliferation.

No one, Mr. Speaker, ever denied that rats pose a serious problem to the health and economy of our Nation. Yet, there was a great hue and cry to the effect that Congress is impervious to the welfare of small children—that it spends millions to protect cows but spends nothing to protect babies.

Mr. Speaker, as the New Bedford Standard Times pointed out in an editorial of August 3, such claims are totally unjustified. I am pleased to bring to the attention of my colleagues what I consider to be a significant contribution to the rational consideration of the issue in its proper perspective. As the editorial so aptly points out, "sentiment has obscured reason" in the rat issue.

A Confused Call for Action

President Johnson's continuing effort to make the proposed federal rat control program a symbol of what Congress could do for urban harmony and peace is most regrettable.

The President is unfairly making a scapegoat of the House, which rejected the program. He is furnishing ammunition to riot inciters who need do no more than quote the President. And, unfortunately, the issue has, in reality, little or nothing to do with civil rights or civil disorder.

The administration's idea is to spend $40 million for eradicating rats, over a three-year period, with cities doubling U.S. grants the third year but contributing nothing up to then.

It is beyond contention that the rat population is substantial, that each year an undetermined number of children and adults are bitten, and that material damage from the rodents is extensive.

But the basis of the House majority's opposition was that the problem is one for the cities. And it has been so considered. It is noteworthy that, on the authority of Dr. Allan W. Donaldson, associate director of the U.S. Bureau of Disease Prevention and Environmental Control, the city that has been most successful is none other than Detroit, where rat bites were reduced from 123 in 1951 to 17 in 1965.

In this light, then, it is disturbing to review what the President has said within the past few days:

"If we can spend millions of dollars to protect cows from screw worms, why can't we spend a little more money to protect our children from rats?"

And, speaking to the nation after the Detroit madness, "A government that has spent millions to protect baby calves can surely afford the same concern for baby boys and girls."

Sentiment has obscured reason in this approach. Contagious disease among animals or humans, whether hookworm, hepatitis or cancer, is properly a challenge to the federal government. But there is no epidemic threat in this country from rats, says Dr. Donaldson.

Rats would not be a threat without accumulations of garbage and filth and property neglect, for which lazy or indifferent people and city governments share responsibility. It is at that level that Mr. Johnson should call for action, and not confuse the need for cleanliness with the causes of civil lawlessness.

You'll Pay for the Waste

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 10, 1967

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, the call by President Johnson for an income tax increase has not been greeted with enthusiasm in Iowa.

On Friday, August 4, an editorial in the Davenport Times-Democrat reflected the thinking of many Iowans.

It called for reduced domestic spending and elimination of waste. The editorial follows:

You'll Pay for the Waste

President Johnson linked a call for a 10 per cent surcharge on income tax Thursday with an announcement that American troop strength in Vietnam will be increased by 45,000 to 50,000.

The device here is so transparent it must be plain to all. He would have it appear the war is the reason for measures to avert a budget deficit which could surpass $28 billion.

It is one of the compelling reasons, of course. This nation is pouring $66 million a day into that effort.

The United States could finance a tremendously expensive war without such a surtax, though, if it were not for the financial waste which Mr. Johnson and the Congress permit to continue in the Federal government.

Pleas for greater fiscal responsibility are ignored.

Surveys reveal the cost of national defense has not risen as rapidly as that for non-defense purposes. Just how many hundred thousand employees have been added to the Federal payroll during the Johnson Administration cannot be stated accurately except when a computation is run on any given date because it has been a continually onward and upward process. One critic has suggested it probably "exceeds the population of Texas."

No one should question paying his share when the nation is at war. It is little enough by comparison with the sacrifices of men taken far from home to endure hardship, and possibly injury or death.

Everyone has a right, though, to demand an end to concurrent waste.

And President Johnson has no right to confuse one with the other in trying to justify a 10 per cent addition to your tax bill.

Nerve Gas: A First for Nasser

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 10, 1967

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, President Nasser's inhumanity to his fellow man, and to his brother Arab no less, was once again demonstrated by his use of lethal nerve gas against the Yemenite population.

The International Red Cross has confirmed the use of this gas and has reported that women, children, and livestock, as well as Yemenite troops, have fallen victim to Nasser's brutality.

I commend to the attention of our colleagues an article written by Ralph McGill, for the August 3, 1967, edition of the Washington Evening Star. The article concerns Nasser's atrocious acts and follows:

Nerve Gas: A First for Nasser

In Yemen President Nasser's love and compassion for his brother Arab is revealed by his army's use of lethal gas on villages and troops. Women, children, cattle and other livestock are among the victims.

The International Red Cross has confirmed the use of these gases. The United Nations has a report. The gas is being dropped in bombs. It is a mixture of phosgene and nerve gas. Phosgene was the gas which attained notoriety and condemnation in the First World War. The Germans initiated use of it against French and Canadian troops on the Ypres front, on April 22, 1915.

Nerve gas has been used in Yemen for the first time in the history of warfare. It is, as used in Yemen, mixed with phosgene. Nerve gas, either in liquid or spray form, is a killer. There is an injection of atropine which, if taken immediately after exposure will save the victim's life.

Adults, however, will find no comfort in news of the specific. Persons around 40 years old and above are not helped by the injection.

The U.A.R. reportedly had stockpiles of the gas bombs on the Sinai desert. There also are persisting stories that Israeli troops captured some of the bombs and at a moment regarded as propitious for the best propaganda and diplomatic results will release them for public view. This story of the capture of such gas bombs is, as aforesaid, not confirmed.

In Yemen it is confirmed. The International Red Cross has even exhumed some bodies. Samples of tissue and blood have been laboratory tested and evidence found of phosgene and nerve gas. There also have been signs of the occasional use of mustard gas.

Nasser has had 40,000 troops in Yemen for about two years. (The total was reduced to approximately 25,000 before the attack on Israel.) His enemies are the "royalists." They are, for the most part, tribesmen who have remained loyal to their king, who was displaced by a Nasser-supported coup. Despite the fact they are relatively untrained and possess few weapons, they have managed to stand off the Egyptian troops.

Now, however, they are probably near defeat. The first use of phosgene gas against them was in 1966.

In January 1967, the International Red Cross reported another gas attack, largely against villagers. This was nerve gas, the first use of it in history. Over 200 villagers, including women and children, and livestock were killed.

In May, shortly before mobilization against Israel, there was another attack.

Since that war ended, Nasser has stepped up use of gas. On July 4, 5 and 10, nerve gas was dumped on the Yemen villagers and on areas where the stubborn army was holding out. There understandably is growing panic and fear among the people who have for so long opposed Nasser's army.

There has been loud outcry because of the general use of napalm in recent warfare, including that in Vietnam. There was protest, even, against the use of defoliation sprays to kill leaves in jungle areas of heavy troops and arms concentration.

But Nasser's brutal use of lethal gas against civilians and troops—all fellow Arabs—has gone unprotested in and out of the United Nations. The silence is outrageous.

Just why the Russians, who are now the most influential power with Nasser, do not use their connection to halt use of gas also is a question. It does not redound to Soviet credit to be rebuilding Nasser's armed strength and not demanding he cease the ugly and barbaric use of gas in Yemen.

Key Job To Fill at State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER H. B. FRELINGHUYSEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 10, 1967

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, it is with regret that many Members of Congress learn that Wayne Fredericks, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs, is leaving Government service. Mr. Fredericks is a man of unusual qualifications and his absence will be felt in the State Department and here in Washington. I wish to insert an editorial from today's New York Times paying tribute to Wayne Fredericks.

The editorial is as follows:

KEY JOB TO FILL AT STATE

A Deputy Assistant Secretary for African Affairs does not rank high in the State Department bureaucracy, but J. Wayne Fredericks transformed that post into a key instrument of two-way education. He did much to educate leaders of the new Africa about America, but his greater contribution may have been the education of Americans about Africa's problems and prospects.

Mr. Fredericks was a tireless advocate of an active and distinctive American policy for a continent usually low on Washington's priority list. He thus helped overcome that "tremendous institutional inertial force" at State of which Adlai Stevenson warned President-elect Kennedy in 1960. He aroused an enduring interest in Africa on the part of intelligent young members of the Congress and many others in the community at large.

This dedicated man could carry on such a free-wheeling, many-faceted operation in part because he was not a career diplomat, beholden to the Foreign Service establishment. With his departure from Government, President Johnson and Secretary Rusk would be well advised to conclude that they can best fill the job by going outside the Foreign Service, as President Kennedy did when he appointed Mr. Fredericks in 1961.

Providing an Improved Promotion System for Medical and Dental Officers of the Armed Forces

SPEECH

OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 7, 1967

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 10242 which would provide for an improved promotion system for medical and dental officers of the Armed Forces. This legislation was a long time coming and is urgently needed, in my considered opinion.

By improving the promotional system the poor retention rate of physicians and dentists in the armed services will be improved. This, in turn, will provide for more experienced medical personnel, the end result being improved quality in medical care to our service men and women.

Unsatisfactory promotion opportunity has long been an important factor in our poor retention rate in the medical and dental officer corps. Physcans and dentists are highly trained and scarce commodities of personnel who have never had equal promotion opportunity in the armed services. They have always had to compete with other officers in the line for promotion when a vacancy occurred. This new legislation will eliminate the wasteful and unnecessary competition with line officers, and will create new promotional opportunities in the Medical and Dental Corps, especially for field grades.

The legislation would also grant much needed relief of the presently severe restriction in the number of authorized general or flag officer positions. As we well know, under existing regulations, we cannot expect to retain our senior colonels beyond the 20-year point unless there is a reasonable opportunity for further promotion.

I have introduced similar legislation which would assist in the elimination of this problem throughout the entire armed services which is entitled "selected extended tenure program." Coupled with this is the fact that the military is unable at present, to promote their experienced clinical specialists to general officer grade without removing them from their clinical position. What is required is authorized flag and general officer positions in our teaching hospitals and larger medical centers, so as to provide the incentive for highly qualified physicians to remain in the military service. The remaining step is to possibly increase and certainly compress specialty professional and proficiency pay.

Mr. Speaker, in summary, this legislation not only provides new career incentive through promotion and retention, but it would substantially enhance the prestige of highly qualified physicians and dentists in the armed services.

Parceling Out the Riot Blame

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 10, 1967

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the events of the last few weeks have demonstrated that there is a need for a reappraisal of the problems facing the cities of America. However, rather than a serious reappraisal, what we are experiencing is a frantic effort to place the blame for these tragic events on the President, Congress, Governors, mayors, and others.

I would commend to my colleagues a column written by Frank Getlein, and published in a recent issue of the Washington Star. It illustrates the futility of attempting to indict any one person or institution for riots and other ills of our society. The column follows:

PARCELING OUT THE RIOT BLAME
(By Frank Getlein)

The amazing things about the recent riots in our cities is how perfectly they bore out the direst forebodings of practically everyone. It isn't just that they didn't take anyone by surprise. Nothing takes anyone by surprise anymore. But beyond that, after the events—and even during them—the riots turned out to be the predictable result of what everyone on all sides of every question has been arguing all the time.

Take the gunnuts, pro and con, who are the easiest to identify with a simple, strong position. From the point of view of the antigunnuts, if only Congress had passed a firearms control law after the assassination of President Kennedy, as the anti-gunnuts urged at the time, the riots would never have taken place, since the only guns around would be in the hands of the police, a likely story.

The pro-gunnuts, by contrast, find that the riots prove their point that the worst thing Congress could do would be to pass a gun control law. When riots erupt, the law-abiding citizen is well-advised to have a shooting iron handy to protect his loved ones and his property. If shopowners and pedestrians had only had more guns of their own, the riots wouldn't have happened, another likely story.

Moving from the surface froth to the surges of the deep, we find the same interesting manifestation of simultaneous arrival at the same place from opposite starting points by moving in opposite directions.

One school holds that riots are the direct result of congressional inaction on administration proposals for expanding the poverty program. "If Sarge were only here," the thought goes, "these things wouldn't have happened." This seems to suppose that snipers and swipers are all subscribers to the Congressional Record and hit the streets whenever their favorite magazine reports bad news for ole Sarge. Possible, of course. There have been stranger literary tastes than the Record, although it's hard to think of one offhand.

On the other side of that particular street, the view is that the riots are obviously caused by a Supreme Court gone soft on the rights of criminals. Civil rights are civil riots. Tell potential rioters in advance that police will not be allowed to listen to their confessions, that they have to be provided with lawyers, that if convicted they can be released at once for any of a dozen constitutional reasons, and naturally they'll riot. Wouldn't you?

One of the most ingenious twists in the argument is the one that blames the riots on President Johnson for having aroused expectations he was totally unable to fulfill and not even especially interested in fulfilling. The implication here is that as long as the wretched and oppressed don't expect anything they don't give any trouble, so let's not disturb their despair. In the historical context of presidential promises, what is significant is that apparently for the first time in our political history a segment of the citizenry actually believed what a president said he would do for them and ran rioting when he didn't do it. Well, it's true that many Negroes have been deprived of a decent education, but surely they are not so totally deprived as to take a politician's word for his bond.

Equally comforting to those who hold it is the outside agitator theory of riots. The approach here is that young unemployed Negroes in any given community are perfectly happy, all the time singing and doing the cake-walk, until those rascally outsiders come inside from the cold and make things hot.

A particularly striking instance of the identity of opposites in riot theory is found in the role of the police. In Detroit, the police are blamed for not moving in immediately with hard hats and hard noses and no nonsense. If only firm action had been taken from the first, it is righteously pointed out, nothing at all would have happened. On the other hand, the police in Milwaukee did move swiftly to control the situation and what are they, for their pains? Honky-fascists, that's what; guilty of police brutality and premature tough-mindedness. It's not just that the police can't win; they can't even hope to stay even. No matter what they do, no matter whether a riot takes place or not, no matter whether people are killed or people are saved, the police are always wrong.

And so, for that matter, is everyone else. From some point of view or other, everyone—President, Congress, poverty workers, black power shouters, mayors, governors, National Guard, police, white men, black men, beggermen, thieves—everyone is responsible for the riots.

That's the beauty of it. What everyone is responsible for, nobody has to do anything about except sort out the blame onto all those other people. And that is what, in Congress, in committee, in state house and White House, in your house and my house, we are all engaged in doing.

Negro Fighter Pilot Hits Carmichael, Black Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HANSEN

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1967

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, the history of the United States is replete with the words and deeds of men who loved their country. The words of these patriots have been pertinent to their times, and I know of no recent public utterance more apt and moving than that of Col. Daniel James, Jr., an Air Force fighter pilot stationed in Vietnam, as quoted by William Tuohy, writing in the Los Angeles Times of August 9, and carried in the Washington Post August 10:

> If something is wrong with my country right now, then I'm willing to hold her hand for a while until she pulls out of it and gets right.

So said Colonel James.

Mr. Speaker, those words should be engraved on every American's heart. How much more powerful are the words of this distinguished American who is serving his country so well than the mouthings of black power advocate Stokely Carmichael who would tear this country apart, rather than build her up.

Mr. Speaker, something is wrong with our country right now, thanks, in part, to the Carmichaels and the Rap Browns. So let us join with Colonel James—and not only "hold her hand for a while until she pulls out of it and gets right"—but help her to "get right."

Mr. Tuohy's article on Colonel James follows. I commend it to all who love our country.

NEGRO FIGHTER PILOT HITS CARMICHAEL, BLACK POWER

(By William Tuohy)

DANANG, SOUTH VIETNAM, AUGUST 9.—"Stokely Carmichael is a big-mouth who is making a profession out of being a Negro, and he's got no damn business speaking for me," said the tall, impressive-looking Negro pilot. "This Black Power garbage is for the birds."

Col. Daniel James Jr., 47, carries his 230 pounds on a 6-foot, 4-inch frame covered by a distinctive black flying suit with silver colonel's eagles on the shoulders. There are command pilot's wings on his breast just above the name: "Chappie James."

Chappie James, the biggest fighter pilot in the Air Force, has become something of a legend in the air war in Vietnam. He flies an F-4 Phantom fighter and is vice wing commander of the 8th Tactical Fighter Wing based in Thailand. The commander is James's closest friend, Col. Robin Olds, the Air Force's top ace.

In Danang on a short visit, Col. James said in an interview, "These riots are the worst thing that could happen to the Negroes' cause. This could set the civil rights movement back 100 years. A lot of the fence-sitters are jumping off on the wrong side now."

Col. James emphasized that he did not speak for the white establishment.

"We're fighting to get laws passed to protect civil rights," James pointed out. "You've got to obey laws. You can't have a double standard."

James is especially critical of Stokely Carmichael, the former head of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee.

"I resent Stokely's setting himself up as spokesman for Negroes," he said. "This S.O.B. is leading too many kids astray. And when he advises Negro servicemen to come back and fight at home—that's sheer stupidity."

In case anyone should question his own credentials in the civil rights movement, James added, "Hell, I was in the original sit-in back in 1943."

He and nearly 100 other Negro Army Air Corps cadets refused to accept segregation at Selfridge Air Force Base in Michigan. They were all arrested and threatened with court-martial, but they held their ground and the charges later were dropped.

"What I really don't buy is that back-to-Africa stuff," James concluded. "I'm not an African immigrant. I'm an American with several generations behind me in my country.

"If something is wrong with my country right now, then I'm willing to hold her hand for a while until she pulls out of it and gets right."

Born in Pensacola, Fla., and a graduate of Tuskegee Institute, James now lives in Tucson, Ariz. He has two sons, one in Air Force ROTC at the University of Arizona, and a daughter who was formerly an airline stewardess.

A Push For ETV

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 9, 1967

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, as the sponsor of legislation establishing a private, nonprofit corporation to improve noncommercial, educational radio and television, I am pleased that support for public television is growing across the Nation.

As the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette noted in an editorial on July 1, National and State committees are being formed "to develop a public interest in educational television, chiefly among practitioners of the arts and civic leaders."

In my own home state of Pennsylvania, a committee on public television has begun a study of the possibility of a statewide public television network and a public television corporation.

The proposals by the Pennsylvania committee closely parallel the provisions of the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967 I have sponsored. Both recognize the importance of strong interconnections between local stations and the necessity of program and operational support from a private, nonprofit corporation.

The Pittsburgh Post-Gazette editorial asserts that "public television must fight for its independence and establish itself as a rival to commercial television." The Public Broadcasting Act of 1967 will help it do just that. In the hope that my colleagues will support this worthwhile legislation, I insert the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette editorial at this point in the RECORD, and commend its strong arguments for public television to their attention:

A PUSH FOR ETV

Creation of national and state committees for public television is good news for those who are fed up with the insipid fare provided by the commercial networks.

The federal committee, under the chairmanship of Thomas P. F. Hoving, director of the Metropolitan Museum of Art, will seek to develop a public interest in educational television, chiefly among practitioners of the arts and civic leaders.

In Pennsylvania, the Governor's Committee on Public Television, cochaired by Albert J. Nesbitt, of Philadelphia, and Joseph D. Hughes, of Pittsburgh, met this week to begin a study of the creation of a statewide public television network as soon as possible and to consider the desirability and feasibility of establishing a corporation for public television. The committee will complete its work before the end of this year and hopefully the seven ETV stations presently in operation in Pennsylvania will be interconnected soon thereafter.

The hope aroused that television will at last achieve maturity and fulfill its early promise as a fount of instruction and delight is inspiring. Unfortunately, the obstacles to the formation of a sophisticated, original and independent educational television network are formidable. Joseph Morgenstern, movie editor of Newsweek, describes a few of them in a recent issue of that magazine. Admitting that educational television has produced some superb documentaries and shows, he believes that it has acquired a reputation as an edifying bore. The infrequent successes of ETV are like so many plums stuck in a tasteless gray pudding.

But the real impasse is the timidity of local station managers who are afraid to offend influential members of their local board of directors, who are in turn frightened of community pressure groups. Mr. Morgenstern maintains that the people managing the pedestrian local outlets are fearful of reaching a wider audience or achieving excellence because they fear conflict with commercial television. He accuses all ETV viewers with complicity in the notion that whatever is edifying must necessarily be dull.

Mr. Morgenstern is not sanguine about the future of educational television. If it becomes too professionally competent it will meet with opposition from the commercial networks. If it dares explore unconventional intellectual themes its structure and financing will be reviewed by governmental authorities, who are notoriously combustible. The big challenge is to erect effective shields between sponsoring governments and the ETV networks so that their programing is not politically suspect.

Sometimes the only way out of a dilemma is straight through. Public television must fight for its independence and establish itself as a rival to commercial television. It must not cultivate an innocuous conformity but reflect every shade of opinion. It must, in short, express the diversity, even the chaos, of democracy itself.

The Southeast Asian Association for Regional Cooperation: An Important Event for the Pacific Community

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 10, 1967

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, a major step toward the development of the spirit of cooperation within the Pacific basin was taken this past weekend, although little noted in this country. In Bangkok, Thailand, representatives from the Governments of Indonesia, Malaysia, the Philippines, Singapore, and Thailand met for preliminary discussion of a proposed Southeast Asian Association for Regional Cooperation. The SEAARC is designed as an informal organization to assist in mutual assistance among these five developing nations. Exchange is hoped for on economic, technical, and cultural levels for the main part although other forms of interchange may arise from the association.

Two individual aspects of the SEAARC are of especial concern to those who seek peace in Southeast Asia. First, this is an organization of a completely regional nature. It is designed for the benefit of solely the five nations involved and has only those five nations as members—no outside interest group exists. All of the time, energy, and funds for the program were furnished by Asians. Second, the association will be totally free of any military or political commitment. The SEAARC is designed for multilateral assistance in the internal development of the nations involved and nothing more. The kind of internal economic and political stability that is hoped for through this plan is believed to be a much more important device for peace than any kind of treaty or alliance.

The SEAARC should be a source of great encouragement for all of us in the United States. The development of stability in that part of the world means much for our security as well. We have proposed and entered into many programs of this nature, but the SEAARC is significant in that we, nor any major power, are involved and that this plan is of an entirely peaceful nature. We can look to this program to make real progress toward its stated goals without becoming sidetracked in the political and military complications to which so many similar programs have fallen heir.

Truth in Lending: The Johnson Consumer Protection—Protection at Its Best

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. HOWARD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 10, 1967

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, we are approaching the threshold of realizing the long-sought-after goal of giving increased protection to American consumers.

I refer, of course, to the recent opening of hearings on truth-in-lending legislation by the House Banking Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs under the able leadership of Congresswoman LEONOR K. SULLIVAN, and to signs of growing endorsement by Members of this body for such legislation.

There is great interest in the current hearings. I am extremely hopeful that the controversy which may develop over certain features of this legislation will not be permitted to halt effective truth-in-lending legislation now that the Senate, after 7 years, has passed the credit disclosure bill, and after President Johnson has placed the moral authority of his administration behind it.

Approval of truth in lending will be a fine victory for the American consumer.

There is no question in my mind that truth-in-lending legislation is a practical necessity. The degree of need for such legislation has been demonstrated by evidence that many American consumers have an unclear notion of what they actually pay for in credit.

I am informed that a recent study of 800 families, published by the National Bureau of Economic Research, revealed that on the average, those who thought they were paying 8.3 percent in interest to their creditors, were actually paying 23.2 percent.

Truth-in-lending legislation will insure that the consumer knows the accurate cost of credit. It will make it possible for the shopper to compare credit costs and to "buy"the cheapest credit.

Moreover, the legislation will be of great benefit to the poor who are often the principal victims of unscrupulous lenders.

I do have certain reservations about the section of the bill prohibiting the garnishment of wages to pay for credit. This proviso could work against the consumer who might find his credit sources cut off if garnishment is prohibited.

But I am proud to support this breakthrough proposal as a cosponsor. I have nothing but admiration for the pioneering work that has been done in this area by former Senator Paul H. Douglas. I strongly compliment the Johnson administration and Senator WILLIAM PROXMIRE, both of whom have worked hard in winning Senate passage this year for the first bill on this subject.

My colleagues may be interested in knowing that the Senate's passage of truth in lending has won a very favorable reception in the press.

The Denver Post, in a July 13 editorial, commented that the Senate vote was a "welcome sign for the consumer." It added:

> The bill will give thinking consumers an opportunity to bargain effectively for credit the same way they now bargain for merchandise.

The July 13 Los Angeles Times, describing the truth-in-lending bill as "meritorious," commented that it will save consumers millions of dollars and protect families from excessive charges.

Newsday, of July 19, said that the truth-in-lending legislation is a "valuable protection for the millions of Americans who rely so heavily on credit to finance their purchases or to pay their bills."

Life magazine, of July 28, said:

> The House should pass truth in lending, a worthwhile piece of business regulation that will interfere only with those merchants who cloud the truth.

The Washington Star, on July 29, said truth in lending "should be welcomed by consumers, for it will help shed a bit more light on true interest costs."

The Chicago Daily News on July 17, said:

> The bill approved by the Senate should mark a long step toward acquainting the consumer with the true cost of the product he is buying—a cost often overlooked in the attraction of an easy-monthly-payment contract . . . We hope the House joins with the Senate in putting the law on the books.

Mr. Speaker, it is gratifying indeed to see this support for truth-in-lending legislation which, for 7 years, has been languishing in the Congress.

As far as I am concerned, passage of this legislation by the House cannot come too soon. I will happily cast my vote, when the time comes, for a practical, workable, and realistic Federal guarantee of truth in lending.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert in the Record editorials about truth in lending to which I referred earlier:

[From the Denver Post, July 13, 1967]

TRUTH IN LENDING: WELCOME VICTORY

The seven-year campaign by ex-Sen. Paul Douglas, D-Ill., and Sen. William Proxmire, D-Wis., for truth-in-lending legislation has succeeded in the Senate. It is a welcome sign for consumers.

The prospect in Washington is for favorable House action late this year and a quick signature by President Johnson, who has sought this kind of legislation since 1964.

If that happens, installment lenders will be required by federal law to furnish borrowers with full, accurate statements of interest and finance charges. Only two states not including Colorado) now require this type of disclosure).

What will it mean to the consumer? When he signs a note to buy a car or a television set he will be told how much he is being charged for credit. It will mean he has a better chance to decide intelligently where and how to borrow money.

Without a truth-in-lending law, about all the borrower knows is how much he is paying every month and how many months he must continue to pay. With a truth-in-lending law, he also will know the annual interest rate he is paying and the total amount of finance charges, stated in dollars and cents.

What will it mean to the lender? He will certainly have to be more frank with his customers and probably more competitive with his rivals. We do not believe for a moment, though, that the bill will "disrupt or destroy the system of extending credit," as one frantic lobbyist told Congress.

Senator Proxmire deserves credit for pressing on with a crusade that seemed to have litle hope early this year. Some observers said then the main battle would be fought in a Senate banking subcommittee, where bills sponsored by Senator Douglas had been buried so many times before. Proxmire got his bill through that subcommittee and then the full Banking Committee last month.

The unanimous Senate vote Wednesday was still surprising. It could not have been foreseen a few weeks ago.

One major amendment seems to have eased the way considerably. The amendment, accepted by Proxmire, gives a partial exemption to ordinary, short-term, revolving credit accounts.

Department stores and other lenders extending this short-term unsecured credit will not, under the bill, have to quote to customers an annual rate of interest—which they say they can't do anyway. But they will have to tell customers their monthly interest rate (usually 1.5 percent) and their monthly finance charges in dollars and cents.

We do not think the Proxmire bill was seriously hurt by this compromise. We do not think the major abuse of credit occurs in this type of account. And, anyway, the customer will still have a pretty clear idea of his credit costs.

We do not expect the Proxmire bill to cure all the ills of the credit industry. It will not make all borrowers prudent. Many will go right ahead borrowing up to the hilt, without thinking about interest rates, so long as they think they can meet all the monthly payments.

But the bill will give thinking consumers an opportunity to bargain effectively for credit in the same way they now bargain for merchandise. We think that's fair, and in the long run it's good for business, too.

[From the Los Angeles Times, July 13, 1967]

TRUTH-IN-LENDING BILL MERITORIOUS

A House subcommittee is preparing to give only consideration to a "truth-in-lending" bill which sailed through the Senate 92 to 0 Tuesday.

The Senate vote reflects the obvious fact that the measure has been substantially watered down from its original form. It is, nonetheless, a substantial step forward in a battle which has been going on for almost seven years.

Credit purchases are running more than $90 billion a year and the interest cost is estimated in excess of $12.5 billion.

The intent of the Senate measure is to provide consumers with an opportunity to compare credit plans and shop around for the best bargain.

It provides that finance charges must be disclosed to buyers in writing prior to a sales or loan transaction. For most consumer credit the loan costs would have to be itemized both in dollars and the approximate annual interest rate on the declining balance.

First mortgages on homes and "revolving" retail charge accounts are exempted. The building industry contended that disclosure of the full dollar cost of financing might discourage home buyers. Retailers insisted that it would be virtually impossible to show the true rate on revolving accounts.

But the program still covers consumer credit transactions such as home modernization and automobile and heavy appliance purchases. The Senate Banking Committee reported that its investigation had revealed that in some instances interest ran as high as 289% on used cars and 235% on television sets.

In backing the bill President Johnson emhasized that a consumer should not have to be an actuary or a mathematician to understand the rate of interest he was being required to pay.

Although the Senate version does not accomplish all that the initial sponsors of the bill sought, the compromise will save consumers millions of dollars and protect families from excessive charges.

[From Newsday, July 19, 1967]

TRUTH IN LENDING

The "Truth in Lending" bill was first introduced in Congress seven years ago by Sen. Paul H. Douglas (D-Ill.), who has since retired. At long last, under the sponsorship of Sen. William Proxmire (D-Wis.), and with the firm backing of the President, it has passed the Senate 92–0 and has been sent to the House. High time, and let's see affirmative action quickly.

Under the bill, merchants and loan agencies extending credit will, in all but a few cases, be required to disclose the total cash price of the article or service purchased, all service and financing charges, and the total amount to be paid, expressed in dollars and cents and as a simple annual interest rate percentage. Too many consumers have been gulled by inflated charges; too few have been able to figure out what they actually pay.

The bill therefore should be passed by the House and sent to the President at the earliest possible date. It is a valuable protection for the millions of Americans who rely so heavily on credit to finance their purchases or to pay their bills.

[From Life magazine, July 28, 1967]

A $123 TELEVISION SET WITH $297 INTEREST

In one way or another most Americans owe money. The debt may be in the form of a mortgage on their homes, a loan to cover Johnny's college education or, just as likely, the result of buying goods and services on time. All this borrowing has been a major force in fueling America's postwar boom. It has enabled families who would not ordinarily be able to do so to own their own cars and appliances. But few of these families know how much interest they are paying, and, tragically, the binge of borrowing has emboldened loan sharks and slippery salesmen to take advantage of an often too-trusting public.

To put a check on those who abuse the consumer credit system, the Senate recently passed the truth-in-lending bill, which would require merchants and lending institutions to inform their customers of the annual rate of interest they will be paying and also of the total amount of finanance charges. This little bit of information should permit Americans to make more intelligent decisions about what they buy and borrow and on what terms.

It is amazing how bad our arithmetic can be. A recent survey of 800 families showed that they estimated their finance charges to be 8.3%, whereas the average rate was actually 24%. Most people go astray because, faced with a dizzying array of carrying charges and compound interest rates, they take refuge in the seductively simple out of merely judging whether they can afford the monthly payments. A few years ago a Jersey City electrical worker bought a television set on monthly payments of $17.50 per month. By the time he got through paying for it two years later, he had paid $420 for a $123 set.

The truth-in-lending bill will in no way impinge on the right of lenders to set their own rates. The act will be of primary benefit to the poor, who are the ones credit sharks find easiest to gouge. It won't repeal unscrupulous salesmen, but it will crimp their style and help to generate a new credit-consciousness among shoppers. The House should pass truth-in-lending, a worthwhile piece of business regulation that will interfere only with those merchants who cloud the truth.

[From the Washington Star, July 29, 1967]

DISCLOSING INTEREST RATES

After a struggle lasting more than seven years, the Senate has approved by unanimous vote a "truth-in-lending" bill. This measure should be welcomed by consumers, for it will help shed a bit more light on true interest costs.

In order to get the bill passed, senators compromised on some points. The legislation exempts from disclosure the charges on first mortgages, for example, as well as annual rates on ordinary revolving credit accounts. But the final version still will make clear to borrowers the true annual percentage interest rate and the total finance charge in dollars and cents for many other types of loans.

The public should not feel ashamed of its inability to grasp this subject. It is complex. Even Chairman Martin of the Federal Reserve Board once complained that some credit charges were too complicated for him to figure out.

Consider a simple transaction like a $1,200 loan with a total finance charge of $6 per $100 or $72 per year. If the loan is repaid in a lump sum plus $72 at the end of the year, the interest rate is 6 percent. But if it's repaid in 12 monthly installments of $106, the interest rate is nearly double that, since the borrower doesn't have the use of the $1,200 for the full year.

It is this kind of riddle, confronting an uninformed public in daily transactions of our consumer economy, that has aroused concern of legislators. As Senator Proxmire of Wisconsin puts it, the Senate measure should save "millions of dollars in excessive charges and prevent millions of families from being saddled with excessive debt."

[From the Chicago (Ill.) News, July 17, 1967]

MORE HELP FOR CONSUMERS

In spite of its catchy nickname, the "truth-in-lending" bill was stalled for seven years in the Senate. It has now passed by a remarkable 92-to-0 vote, partly because Sen. William Proxmire (D-Wis.), who took over the bill's management after the defeat of its original sponsor, Sen. Paul Douglas (D-Ill.), was willing to make compromises Douglas was not.

The concessions by Proxmire do not, in

our opinion, weaken the bill unduly. They lie in an area where understanding was foggy and enforcement uncertain in any case. Bypassing this area achieves the main purpose of the bill, which is to give the consumer better protection against the gougers on the fringe of the legitimate credit business.

There has never been serious objection to this basic purpose, either in the Senate or in the responsible business community. It is merely good business to make sure that the buyer knows in advance how much interest he will pay on a loan and how much the carrying charge will add to the total bill when he buys on long-term credit.

The obstacles arose in trying to formulate a law to require that "true" interest rates be shown. This requirement, seemingly so simple, proved to be anything but that. So many different ways of figuring interest were paraded before the senators at hearings on the bill that at times it seemed arithmetic had abdicated as an exact science.

This year, the Treasury Department came up with a book of standardized tables to cover most credit transactions. With the help of these tables, the interest problem may be overcome, though it is bound to be confusing for a time to clerks and customers alike if the House concurs and the bill becomes law. To cite one of the simplest examples, a standard 6 per cent bank loan paid off in 12 installments on a declining balance will have to be restated as 11 percent "true" interest.

The Senate gave up on revolving credit accounts offered by many department stores and bank card plans, and exempted them from the "true interest" requirement. Also exempted were first mortgages, margin accounts with stockbrokers, and other commercial credit transactions.

In its final form, however, the bill approved by the Senate should mark a long step toward acquainting the consumer with the true cost of the product he is buying—a cost often overlooked in the attraction of an easy-monthly-payment contract.

Coupled with the credit-reform package passed this year by the Illinois Legislature, the federal measure promises better protection for the consumer than he has yet known. We hope the House joins with the Senate in putting the law on the books.

Lest We Get Too Smug

SPEECH

OF

HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1967

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, contrary to the thoughts of some Americans, senseless destruction is by no means confined to the ghetto. There are times when it occurs, and where it takes place, away from the underprivileged, that defy even rationalization. Does it make any sense for one of the highest per capita income counties in the country to experience the type of destruction to its parks described in a column by William A. Caldwell in the major suburban daily newspaper, the Record, of Bergen County, N.J.?

Just contemplate it. In white, middle-class, suburban America, plumbers equipment is used to rip out pipes and toilets in park restrooms, special tools are brought in to dismantle heavy equipment like bulldozers, drag races take place on public golf courses, lumber is dumped into ponds, equipment is stolen, even signs identifying trees and plants are slashed.

What do these people lack in terms of equal opportunity? In schools? In jobs? Perhaps we should ask, What do they lack in moral education directed toward their responsibilities within society? Is there really any answer? Or are we left, with Columnist Caldwell, to consider the young who "mugs nature herself under the cover of darkness" as a mystery, leaving us with nothing to do "but gasp a prayer."

There is a certain self-satisfied type of American who looks to the ghetto riots with a mixture of fear and disgust, and smugly believes that "it can't happen here"—meaning his own comfortable community or neighborhood. But it does happen "here." And how do we cope with society when "the parks are not safe in the parks anymore"?

The column by William A. Caldwell in the August 5, 1967, issue of the Record, of Hackensack, N.J., follows for all thoughtful Americans to consider:

THE ENEMY IN THE PARK

(By William A. Caldwell)

In a way that ought to but won't fascinate the President's select committee on what's bugging us this time, the violence in the suburbs this short, wet summer is more noteworthy than the violence in the ghettos.

Regardless of the midcity rioter's psychic anatomy, you know what he wants.

He wants equality. He wants respect. He wants not to be different or treated differently when he goes to ask for a house or a job or an education.

It doesn't matter whether you hold with William Golding in "Lord of the Flies" that humanity is innately and incurably evil or with Albert Camus in "The Plague" that it is innately and incurably noble. Violence in the slum states a demand. Give me liberty or give me six bottles of whisky, a color television set, and the studious attention of the United States Army.

The ghetto rioter serves an ultimatum. Receiving no response, he goes to war. He walks with kings. You have to grant to kings and rioters the virtue of clarity.

But I can't help wondering what a white boy, well brought up in the suburbs of wide lawns and strong family structures, has in mind when he wrecks a county park.

It seems to me that when James A. McFaul, executive director of the Bergen County Park Commission, described the other day the mean and mindless disfigurement of public parks he raised a question that goes to the heart of mankind's dreadful illness.

A rioter's anger can be understood, and so can his willingness to appease himself with an armload of booze and toasters and maybe an air-conditioner he'll never know how to install and operate.

He is a simple case of cause and effect. The rioter has a purpose, and the fact that it is an evil purpose need not be relevant. At the very least he's getting even with somebody for something.

This is lofty ethics indeed compared with the motivation of young people who spend their evenings destroying their own parks.

Look at Mr. McFaul's catalogue of destruction and defacement in parks which the people decreed so that the pressure of living crammed together might be relieved a little for us all, including the young:

Plumbers' equipment is lugged into the parks to rip out pipes and toilets in rest rooms.

Specialized tools are brought to disable heavy equipment like bulldozers.

Obscenities are written or painted on fences and buildings—of course.

Motorcycle riders drag race on the fairways and greens of the Overpeck Golf Course, which hasn't been opened to players yet, and our most precious resource has been riding bicycles through newly seeded greens.

Windows are broken, lumber is laboriously dragged to a pond and dumped in, surveyors' stakes are ripped up, equipment and materials are stolen, signs identifying trees and plants are slashed.

This is a protest against what? It is a demand for what? It is a statement of what hunger of grievance or wrath?

The questions are meant to be considered seriously, because it seems to me that until we understand what impels young people to desecrate themselves and their own household we shall not understand why young people become old people who make a mess of the world they must live in.

Again, the rioter in the ghetto is comprehensible. He knows what he's doing and why. Comprehensible is the gang of privileged suburbanites who so hate their world that they took a sledge-hammer to Pascack Hills High School. Likewise as respectable as a law in physics is the Klansman who mugs Catholics, the Wasp who mugs Jews, the white Christian who dynamites black churches. They are as natural and specific as a rattlesnake.

But in the presence of the black and bottomless mystery of the child who loathes woods and seedling grass and air and open space, who assaults with tools the environment which defines him and holds him in his shape, who mugs Nature herself under cover of darkness—in the presence of this mystery what can you do but gasp a prayer?

We have learned to deal at least inwardly with the sound of shots and shattered glass and running feet. But how shall we cope when the parks aren't safe in the parks anymore?

Coalition in the House

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD J. IRWIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 13, 1967

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, in today's New York Times Mr. John Herbers has contributed a very good news analysis on the Republican-Southern Democrat coalition. Acknowledged or not, the Republican bloc has found itself in the same camp with Southern Democrats in shaping some important legislation in the 90th Congress.

Mr. Herbers column follows:

COALITION IN THE HOUSES SOUTH'S DEMOCRATS VOTING WITH GOP DESPITE FORD'S REJECTING SUCH TACTICS

(By John Herbers)

WASHINGTON, Aug. 8.—Less than three months after Gerald R. Ford, the House Republican leader, publicly denounced the idea of a coalition with Southern Democrats, such a coalition has voted against the Administration Democrats on a number of important issues.

In fact, the coalition has been so effective, that the Democratic Study Group, composed of about 140 liberals, has published a memorandum documenting the damage that the coalition voting has done to eight or more Administration proposals.

Yesterday, the coalition succeeded in rewriting President Johnson's anticrime bill according to Republican specifications. Fifty-six Democrats from the 11 states, of the Old Confederacy joined an almost solid Republican bloc to give the states, rather than the Attorney General, chief control of grants under the bill and to write into the bill provisos that measures against riots and organized crime be given priority.

Last May 9, in a speech at Bowling Green University in Ohio, Mr. Ford said that he had developed a "Southern strategy" to avoid a renewal of the coalition of the Republican leadership and the Southern Democrats that existed before 1945.

"The strategy," he said, "is to drive Southern Democrats in the House in to the arms of the Administration, where they belong, on votes that will hurt them in their home Congressional districts."

The makeup of the House is 91 Democrats from 13 Southern and border states, 156 Democrats from 37 other states and 186 Republicans.

The Southerners, therefore, are in a position of influence on partisan issues if they decide to be independent of their party line, as they frequently do.

Asked today what had happened to his Southern strategy, Mr. Ford said it was exactly the same.

"The amendments which the House accepted yesterday were conceived and drafted by Republican members without any consultation with any Democrat. It was a Republican position through and through. If others voted for it, we can't help that."

Under the old coalition, he said, the Republican leadership and leaders of the Southern Democratic bloc consulted in advance on strategy and policy.

In the past, Mr. Ford contended, Southern Democrats have been elected by telling the voters that they do not need Republican Representatives because they, the Democrats, work hand in glove with them.

Today Mr. Ford said that on some issues, such as raising the debt ceiling, which the Republicans opposed 100 per cent many Southern Democrats voted with the Administration.

In the next year's elections, under Mr. Ford's strategy, the Republicans will go into Southern Congressional districts and try to tie the Democratic incumbents to President Johnson on as many votes as they can and take credit for the programs that the Southern Democrats supported in the coalition.

And it is from the South that the Republicans are hoping to pick up a sizable bloc of seats in 1968.

Whatever the merit of this strategy, the Republican leaders are exuding a confidence and independence that have not been seen for a long time on their side of the aisle. The party discipline has been excellent while the Administration Democrats have been in disarray.

The general mood of the House is one of frustration and unhappiness over the national criticism that has been directed at the present Congress, sometimes called the "negative 90th."

The malaise, however, has not penetrated the Republican leaders, who are happily looking forward to next year's elections. They need to gain 31 seats to control the House. And they are talking about winning the House even if the Republicans do not gain the Presidency.

Nor do the Republicans feel any need to seek out the Southern Democrats. Many of their policies, while designed for national consumption, happen to be ready made for Southern voters. It is the Southerners who have to come to them, as happened yesterday.

STERN LINE ON RIOTS

This summer, the Congressional Republican leaders have consistently taken a hard line on the riots. They have called for swift punishment of lawbreakers, protection of life and property and strengthening of law enforcement against disorder.

On social programs, they would strip the Federal agencies of many controls and invest this authority in the states and they would activate private enterprise rather than government in urban and other programs.

This kind of policy has been in the platforms of successful Southern politicians for years.

The question that remained with most observers was whether the Republican program, so appealing to Southerners, would appeal to the nation as a whole.

The War in Our Cities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 10, 1967

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks the Nation has witnessed a series of outbreaks which express the frustration and despair of the millions of Americans who do not participate in our society. Generations of neglect and injustice have produced a new "underclass" where traditional values and opportunities simply do not exist.

This situation was recently reviewed by a man who has served in two administrations, served with distinction, particularly in the areas of minority rights and urban poverty. I recommend this article to my fellow Members of the Congress, particularly to those who appear more interested in punishment than prevention.

The War in Our Cities—Its Causes—Cures

(Note.—Violence and rioting have made battlefields of America's city streets this Summer. Too few understand why. Too many suggest ridiculous remedies. Richard Goodwin of Brookline, a former special assistant to Presidents Kennedy and Johnson, is the exception. His speech last week before the Summer Institute for Adults at Brandeis University is truly an historic analysis of the strife. He also proposes avenues to civil peace and economic justice which ring with the New Frontier and Great Society aspirations others uttered, few knew were the brainchildren of ghostwriter Goodwin. The Globe here presents significant excerpts from his speech.)

(By Richard Goodwin)

Between the time this lecture was scheduled and tonight has come the shadow of a war whose immense portent for our nation, for its welfare and grandeur, dwarfs the American interest in the baffling and bloody struggle in Southeast Asia.

It is the war in our cities. It is the first large-scale racial conflict in American history. It is the bloody eruption of despair, hatred and yearning.

It is, or may be, if we are wise, the last great battle in the 200-year effort to form "a more perfect union."

Since I am a politician, although now retired, I share the political compulsion to affirm that violence and rioting are wrong, that order must be enforced; and those who shatter the law must be subjected to the rigors of justice, tempered, in this case, with a discriminating application of understanding and compassion.

Yet condemnation does not absolve us from the duty to understand; punishment is not prevention; nor does history offer much comfort to any who may thing grievance and despair can be subdued by force...

Being against violence is like being against sin. It is right; it is popular; and it is easy. However, it will not diminish evil, unless you also provide alternatives to the temptations and desires which drive men toward wrong.

If the beginning of wisdom is understanding; the condition of effective political solution is knowledge of the problem. What lays behind the present civil strife? What has caused the cities of America, in the year 1967, to dissolve into fury and chaos?

We know some things are not causes.

This has not been caused by some mysterious and special defect in Negro character. Few people have borne oppression and anguish with greater forbearance and patience . . . Men truly without hope or expectation do not revolt.

Only when the door to possibility opens to a sliver of light do men hurl themselves against it. If we can see this so clearly in Africa and Asia and Latin America—where long dormant populations have stirred to revolution—we should be able to understand it in our own country.

AGITATORS NOT TO BLAME

Nor has the violence been caused by a few "agitators" or irresponsible leaders. Agitation can help provoke violence, but such men flourish only because the soil is fertile, and they are usually swept along, sometimes to national notoriety, by people they do not control.

We must condemn any who preach violence, but we must not indulge ourselves in the comforting and dangerous illusion that silencing a few men will bring peace and security to our streets.

Nor is there violence because Negroes have decided they can achieve more by riots than by laws and work.

The riots are not carefully planed, purposeful demonstrations. They are wild, aimless, and accidental in immediate cause, if not in basic condition. Most of the participants expect little from their governments or from white society. That is one of the reasons they find themselves in the streets.

It would be heartening if the causes were so simple and lucid; swiftly understood and quickly dealt with.

The truth, however, is that they are rooted in the far more profound conditions or urban Negro life in mid-twentieth Century America. It is as if a lens were suddenly placed over the ghettos, bringing to a searing focus the converging rays of Negro poverty, rapid urbanization, modern technology and affluence and the state of the world.

We have had other waves of urban minorities. Their descendants are justly proud of their success in rising from poverty. There is much in their experience which should be instructive to the Negro. But none of them has had a 300-year history of American oppression.

None of them began their climb amidst the conditions and possibilities of modern America. And none of them were black.

Therefore it is not enough to say that Negroes should do as other minorities have done. They can't. Not for want of ability or effort. They live in a different world.

If we understand this, we can give more sympathetic understanding to the springs that feed the rising flood of violence.

INCENTIVE TO LEARN ERODED

First, of course, is poverty itself; not simply the lack of money, but a poverty which infects every institution of this society within a society.

Men cannot earn a decent wage. Sometimes they cannot find a job at all. They cannot, therefore, sustain a family, and those unable to meet a responsibility are often driven to deny it.

Thus, the Negro child is born not only into material poverty, but often amidst a poverty of a family life, deprived of important sustaining relationships.

As he grows older he is sent to overcrowded schools which do not teach, and where minimal order and discipline rather than learning is the principal objective.

As he grows older he discovers that his job opportunities are narrow and scarce. Negro unemployment is actually growing, the gap between Negro and white employment is widening, and the rate of joblessness among teen-age Negroes is astronomical.

Thus the incentive to learn is eroded because there seems little point to an education which is miserable in content and which leads nowhere. When he drops out, and often even if he finishes, the prophecy is fulfilled.

There is little opportunity to sustain life decently and little hope that hard work will bring rising income. And so the process starts again with his children.

This cycle, poverty breeding poverty, is immensely darkened by the conditions of the modern city.

In his own neighborhood, the ghetto dweller often returns every night to squalor, perhaps to overcrowded rooms, in a crumbling building without adequate heat or plumbing, and where the battle against filth is unending and unwinnable.

The boy or girl has no place to play and no contact with nature. They are jammed in with thousands of others who share their plight.

The resources which helped the rural Negro endure material misery—nature, open spaces, a sense of community, of fruitful contact with friends and relatives—are all denied him.

While the noise and filthy air, the crowded streets and continual press of other people, rub against nerves already raw.

Meanwhile all around him, only a few blocks away or on the screen of his television set, he can see that other world: The white world. It is the world of well-dressed children and neatly furnished homes, of private cars and well-kept lawns; all the marvels of affluent America.

It is not the simple facts of poverty, degrading as they are, which breed violence and hatred in many Negroes. It is, especially for the young man, the hopelessness of his own future and the savage contrast which is forced upon his consciousness.

Is there a solution for distress which springs from such multifarious sources? There is not one solution but many. All of them require a national determination to confront the problem, and a national willingness to devote the necessary resources.

There is no doubt that we can afford the effort. Were we to devote to poverty and the ghettoes the amounts we are now spending in Vietnam, we could begin a rapid transformation.

The return would be enormous, not only in human well-being and domestic tranquility, but in dollars and cents.

Our entire history is proof that the addition of new groups to the ranks of the educated and productive lifts the prosperity and standard of living of all. Each new group has been feared as a competitor. It has always proved an invaluable partner.

An investment now will be returned a hundred-fold by the millions who become part ofthe labor force and the consuming public. It is true, as President Kennedy said, the rising tide lifts all the boats.

Moreover we know how to begin. We are told that urban and racial problems are difficult, subtle, and complex. So they are. Experts and technicians bombard us with suggestions and solutions.

Yet the basic needs are clear, and there is no single right answer but rather there are many which will have an impact. The important thing is that we begin.

FIRST, we should add to our manifestos of law and order a manifesto of hope. The life of millions of people cannot be changed overnight.

We can, however, begin with immediate impact projects which will demonstrate our concern, ease some of the most urgent afflictions and, most importantly, restore to young people some feeling of hope about the future and some confidence that a better life is possible.

To the extent hope replaces despair, to that extent will our cities become more peaceful.

Possibilities for such projects are limited only by the imagination of national and local officials. Let me give a few examples.

Every part of the country has large park and recreation areas which could be devoted, in part, to Summer camps and to work and study projects for the city poor—giving them some contact with nature, relief from the oppressiveness of a city Summer, the chance to learn new skills and to sense new individual capacities.

It should also be possible, in a city like Boston, to recruit large numbers of volunteers from the intellectual and university community to spend part of each week in city schools, easing the shortages of teachers and infusing the system with new energy and imagination.

This would require a drastic shift in the traditional patterns of school administration, but would permit us to draw on a huge reservoir of unused talent. I have little doubt that such a volunteer program would meet with enormous response on the part of Boston's civic-minded university community. As it is, we let one of our greatest sources of talent lie idle.

There are many other projects which could have an immediate impact—from swimming pools to training and recreation programs. They can begin to change the attitudes which breed such destructive passion.

SHATTERING THE DOOM

Second, is to begin work on the more profound and difficult problems. Specific techniques may differ but the essential needs are clear:

It is for better schools and more teachers, for decent housing and medical treatment; for a humane welfare system, especially one which does not require a broken family as a condition of help; for training programs and for job opportunities.

It is basically to attack the entire doomed and dreary cycle of poverty at once as the only way to shatter it forever.

The air if full of programs for this purpose. They range from aid to education and incentives for private investment, to systems of family allowance and a negative income tax.

I do not pretend to assess the merits of particular proposals. However the harsh fact of the matter is that debate has only been a mask for our unwillingness to pass the laws and spend the money.

We can vote laws against violence and rejects programs to exterminate rats from the slums. We vote tens of billions to fight for freedom abroad and refuse the amounts needed to increase and enrich freedom at home.

As long as this is so, unrest will increase. When it changes, as it must change, the possibilities are endless, the way will be open and progress can be swift.

Third, we must make a coherent effort to create a sense of community among American Negroes.

This means we should no longer think simply in terms of building housing units and projects; but of creating real communities—places where a man can live and work and play, find necessary services, and meet with his friends; all within an area which is small enough to be comprehensive.

It will also mean permitting and encouraging Negroes to leave the ghettoes as other minorities have done. Integrated Negroes don't riot and rebel.

Moreover nothing is more critical than to create a sense of identification with the larger American community. That will be impossible as long as white society shuts its doors.

Fourth, we must devote serious study to the causes of racial hostility, to the springs of fear and hostility evoked by the color of a man's skin. The old song goes: You've got to be carefully taught to hate and fear.

Somehow millions of Americans are taught. If we can understand how this happens, we can begin to combine it.

It seems to me this will require specific changes in the education of white children—changes designed to combat intolerance and enlarge the belief in our common humanity. I am not talking about propaganda. For it is true that all men are equal and it is the job of education to carry the truth to the heart as well as the mind.

These are, in general and broad outline, some of the paths toward domestic tranquility and a more perfect union.

Few can be found who, in the abstract, will deny their necessity. Yet we are witnessing a strange and ominous surge of distrust and hostility between white and black America.

This is the most dangerous development of all. We cannot afford a darkening downward spiral of resentment breeding resentment, fear engendering fear, violence summoning suppression. That way lies disaster for both black and white Americans. . . .

There is work and prosperity for all in this abundant land. No man's well-being threatens another.

The ideals and purpose of this nation from its very beginning call upon us to assist the painful struggles of our fellow citizens and to help them enter the door of American opportunity.

In the most profound sense this is the only alternative if we are to preserve and strengthen the heart of this nation and the soul of our common humanity.

We are not enemies, but the common victims of the great wrong of racial injustice which has stained our history for 300 years.

I know it is often considered sentimental to talk about the deeper causes of violence. Yet that does not detract from the truth of those causes. Those who ignore them invite failure.

Neither are we served by those who ride the shifting winds of understandable popular resentment; by those who seek to persuade us that the policeman's club and the armored car are the answer to our problems.

They are leading us toward war; not a fight in foreign lands but one which will rip the fabric of American life itself.

If we ever needed moral leadership we need it now. The times demand men at every level of government who will tell us of our responsibilities as well as our rights, who pursue justice as well as tranquillity, who teach that our problems are difficult and complicated and that they will require effort and sacrifice.

We have such leaders and there will be more. For I believe it is those who reach for the noblest and most compassionate instincts of the American people—not those who feed nameless fears and aimless discontent—who touch the deepest energies of this country.

And at least if they lose, they do so nobly.

We must enforce the law and bring justice to the law breaker. But if this is all we do in the face of such huge despairs; if we pile up wealth and power while allowing millions to live in poverty, then we will truly become the oppressors our worst enemies say us to be.

I do not believe this will happen. For in every great test of the past, victory has finally gone to the forces of compassion and justice. That is the nature of Americans.

Upward Bound Project Working at Columbia University

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 24, 1967

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I have told the House before of the Upward Bound project called Operation Double Discovery being carried on by Columbia University in New York City. An excellent article by Frank McLoughlin appearing in the New York Sunday News on July 9 reaffirmed the contribution which Double Discovery is to previously destitute and often desperate young lives.

To sum up how much Upward Bound can mean to young people of poverty backgrounds, Mr. McLoughlin refers to the case of William Wright, a 17-year-old high school junior from Brooklyn, who entered Double Discovery last year:

> Before last summer I wasn't sure I would go to college—

William is quoted as saying—

> now I have only one question: Can you tell me a good law school?

Mr. Speaker, Mr. McLoughlin's article, which follows, gives further evidence of the vital role of Upward Bound in the war on poverty.

No Fun Summer for Them: Singular Prep School Shuns Sure Winners

(By Frank McLoughlin)

Perhaps the most exclusive "prep school" in the country has opened for its third year on the Columbia University campus. Its students, many of them from Brooklyn and Queens, aren't the sons and daughters of the nation's wealthiest or most powerful families and they won't be wearing clothes from Madison Ave. shops.

But, like the rich, it was their station in life, decided by an accident of birth, which earned them the privilege of admission to the "prep."

Actually a college cram course, the school is reserved for youngsters from families which have never had a son or daughter graduate from college; from neighborhoods that have never seen a college graduate.

The school isn't a year-round one—it lasts only eight summer weeks—and its name "Operation Double Discovery" doesn't have a rich heritage of American history behind it. But its idea is especially American.

NEVER CONSIDERED IT

Operation Daily Discovery is exploiting one of the nation's greatest untapped natural resources—the vast segment of our youth with the potential to graduate from college who have never even considered the possibility—let alone wanted it.

The eight-week course is an outgrowth of the City University's year-round progam to find high school students with potential, even if their marks are poor. The pupils, 1,100 of them at present, are sent to special classes at one school in each Thomas Jefferson, and in Queens, borough. In Brooklyn, they go to Jamaica High School.

The program attempts to do more than raise marks. Its hardest job is convincing the youngsters and their parents, that they can attend college. Then, it tries to make them want to go. Interviews, psychological tests, small classes, any tool available is used.

PERSUADED TO START

Three years ago, shortly after the program began, undergraduates at Columbia persuaded the Ivy League school to start a program to select a few of the 1,100 for more intense training at the Morningside campus.

There were 120 pupils in the first eight-week session, and this year there are 300. More unique, probably, than the program itself, is the method of selection.

"We don't pick sure winners to attend the summer session at Columbia," said Murray Bromberg, chairman of the English department at Jefferson and an associate director of the program. "We could have had kids we knew would do a tremendous job, but we made risky selections."

"We chose students who were real question marks and they have really surprised us. I don't know what the answer is, maybe it's just living the college life and associating with the counselors, students from Columbia and Barnard."

DO MUCH BETTER

Students at Double Discovery have done three or four times better, on the average, than other pupils in the program who have not had the opportunity of spending the summer at Columbia. More than 80% have passed regents in geometry and 70% in biology, compared to 20% of the larger group, said Bromberg.

The youngsters attend smaller classes, away from the pressure of exams, and their teachers are the best available, both from high school and colleges. They have a full range of extracurricular activities and make field trips to museums, concerts and other cultural activities. They sleep in Columbia dormitories.

Another incentive for students who might otherwise have to spend their summers working is a weekly stipend of $10. Some youths, who have returned for their second or third year, earn money by tutoring first-timers.

STRESSES CONTINUITY

One of the Columbia student directors of the program is Roger Lehecka, of 50-34 Broadway, Woodside. He sees the most important part of the program as its continuity.

"It has a tremendous effect on them," he said, "when they realize it's not just one fun summer. We have 120 back for the third year and 117 are here for the second time."

He pointed out that all will be interviewed by Columbia's admissions office before they go home, some to be accepted, others to learn how to face one of the more crucial moments of their young lives.

The real test of the program's success comes next spring when its first graduates apply for college. Many of them didn't even want to go to high school.

Typical is William Wright of 191 Sands St., Brooklyn. The 17-year-old Jefferson junior said: "Before last summer I wasn't sure I would go to college. Now I have only one question: Can you tell me a good law school?"

Clarence Belden Randall

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 9, 1967

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, Clarence Belden Randall, who died last Friday night at the age of 76, devoted a lifetime to the defense of private enterprise through his work in both Government and industry. He will long be remembered for the years he gave to business, and for his later contributions to Government under four Presidents.

After joining Inland Steel in 1925, and becoming president of that company in 1949, Mr. Randall was a leader in the steel industry's protest to the Government's seizure of the steel industry in 1952. Later, he was appointed by President Eisenhower to chair the President's Commission on Foreign Economic Policy. Under the Kennedy administration Mr. Randall continued his career in Government as Chairman of a special committee on the civil service pay scale. Recently he performed several special assignments for President Johnson.

It is with great sorrow that I note the passing of this great philanthropist, industrialist, civil servant, and author. His work for his country has been significant and ours is a better nation because of his contributions.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert into the RECORD two tributes to Clarence B. Randall, one which appeared in the New York Times on August 7, 1967, and one which was printed in the Washington Post on August 9, 1967, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Aug. 7, 1967]

CLARENCE B. RANDALL

The efforts of American industry to keep from being throttled by unreasonable government restraints would be more effective if all business executives had as lively a sense of civic responsibility as Clarence B. Randall. He never made the mistake of identifying resistance to Federal encroachment with a sterile negativism toward all exercises of public power to improve living standards and build a better world.

He came to national attention in 1952 when, as head of Inland Steel, he served as the articulate chief spokesman for industry in its successful fight against President Truman's strike seizure of the steel mills. But that battle was followed by a steadily increasing involvement in White House assignments to promote foreign aid and trade in the interest of a more peaceful and prosperous world. Far from damning all government officials as boobish bureaucrats, he headed a panel that called for higher salaries to compensate adequately those exercising the heavy responsibilities of top public office.

He defended freedom for the individual by demonstrating how much one free American could contribute to advancing the total welfare.

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 9, 1967]

CLARENCE BELDEN RANDALL

Clarence B. Randall, who died on Saturday in his 77th year, made his mark as an industrialist, a philanthropist and as chairman of important Presidential commissions on foreign economic policy and the compensation of Federal employes. Other gifted industrialists made valuable contributions to public policy, but Clarence Randall's later career was unique in that it involved a personal conversion. He came to Washington with a negative bias toward Government and emerged as a highly constructive critic, a principled conservative who recognized and appreciated excellence among civil servants.

Mr. Randall rose to national prominence in the 1952 dispute over Federal seizure of the steel mills when he discarded the efforts of the Inland Steel speech writers and turned his powerful oratory on the Truman Administration. When he came to head the Commission on Foreign Economic Policy in the early days of the Eisenhower Administration, it was feared that he would swell the ranks of the more narrow-minded industrialists who occupied high Government posts. But Mr. Randall soon proved himself an open-minded man of principle who placed the public interest above self-interest. He fought the protectionists in his own party, and while the Randall Commission broke no new ground, it was instrumental in securing the extension of the reciprocal trade agreements.

Clarence Randall, a powerful public speaker who never referred to notes, ran Government meetings with the iron hand of a top sergeant. Anyone who came late, irrespective of rank or status, was swiftly and furiously reprimanded. It was for this gruff candor and for his adherence to liberal economic principles which he expounded in several books that Clarence Randall will be remembered and admired.

Race Riots

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 10, 1967

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest tragedies of the recent rioting is that the cause of civil rights has been pushed back many years.

Jobs will now be more difficult to acquire because industry has been driven out. Housing will be more difficult to find because investors are terrified, and school integration will seriously suffer because whites will move to the suburbs in even more increasing numbers. The most serious effect is that the gap between black and white will widen considerably because many will associate civil rights with lawlessness.

I commend to the attention of our colleagues a WCBS–TV editorial broadcast presented on July 26 and 27, 1967, concerning this problem.

The text of the editorial follows:

RACE RIOTS

It seems to us that in recent years the notion has grown that rioting is a legitimate and constructive form of civil rights protest. According to this notion, a riot will cause "whitey" to become fearful of the energy of the ghettos and then he'll rush in with jobs, housing and schools.

The acceptance of this theory by a growing number of the poor accounts, in our opinion, for the devastation that erupted in our cities this week. We heard a version of it in Spanish Harlem this week. There, at least a few people have described the attitude as—well, the Negroes gain attention by rioting, so let's get some attention for the Puerto Ricans.

It is urgent now that everyone with an audience among the Negro poor impress upon them the truth. And the truth is that rioting does not advance civil rights, it is destroying the movement which had gained such constructive momentum in this country. Rioting does not provide jobs. It drives industry out. Rioting does not provide housing. It terrifies the investors who will build the housing. Rioting does not integrate the schools. It causes the whites to flee to the suburbs, there to be even more resistant to integration for the sake of their peace of mind.

The pressures caused by rioting are forcing the people of this nation to choose between two values that should not be opposed to each other. They are being forced to choose between civil rights and law and order. If this continues, it can only be an agonizing national tragedy, because, of course, law and order will prevail.

Those who are sincere about civil rights progress, who are sincere about helping the poor to a better share of America, should today be preaching that message in the troubled ghettos of our nation.

Those who preach riot, or who passively accept riot, are betraying the poor, and destroying the civil rights movement.

Fiscal Responsibility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 31, 1967

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I believe that the following article by Mr. Milton Friedman, of Newsweek magazine, on fiscal responsibility, will be of great interest to my colleagues and the readers of the RECORD:

FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY

For the twelve months ending June 30, 1967, the Federal government ran a deficit of about $10 billion. And this may be only a mild foretaste of things to come. On present projections, the current year's deficit is likely to be two or three times as large. What does fiscal responsibility call for in the face of these staggering deficits?

At first glance, the answer seems straightforward: restraint in spending and higher taxes. That is why there is a "Rising Consensus for a Tax Hike" (NEWSWEEK, July 24).

In my opinion, this is a shortsighted answer. The deficit in the Federal budget is only a symptom of a more deep-seated malady: the size of government spending.

When the Administration urges higher taxes, it points to Vietnam as the source of the deficit. That is a half-truth. Of course, if military spending were lower—and other spending the same—the deficit would be smaller. But civilian spending too has been rising rapidly—as the Administration proudly proclaims when it seeks to calm the liberal critics of its Vietnam policy. And this rise has been reinforced by growing spending by state and local governments.

All in all, we work from Jan. 1 to nearly the end of April to furnish the wherewithal for government spending, only then can we turn to providing for our private needs.

TAXES AND SPENDING

This situation would be dangerous to our liberty even if we were getting our money's worth from present government spending. But there is scarce a man so rash as to say that we are. Most of us regard high military spending as a necessary evil. But even many proponents of big government are having second thoughts about numerous civilian programs—from the agricultural subsidies of the New Deal to the zooming welfare measures of the Great Society. Time and again, extravagant promises have been made that this or that expensive program will solve this or that social problem. And time and again, the result is that both costs and problems multiply.

But what relevance does this have to taxes? If we adopt such programs, does not fiscal responsibility at least call for imposing taxes to pay for them? The answer is that postwar experience has demonstrated two things. First, that Congress will spend whatever the tax system will raise—plus a little (and recently, a lot) more. Second, that, surprising as it seems, it has proved difficult to get taxes down once they are raised. The special interests created by government spending have proved more potent than the general interest in tax reduction.

If taxes are raised in order to keep down the deficit, the result is likely to be a higher norm for government spending. Deficits will again mount and the process will be repeated.

If government spending can be restrained, growth in the economy will, at present tax rates, add enough to revenues in a few years to eliminate the deficit and even to permit tax reduction. This is a big if. But let taxes be raised and there is no if about it at all. The deficits can be temporary; higher taxes are almost certain to be permanent.

DEFICITS AND INFLATION

If we do not cut spending and do not raise taxes, will not the large interim deficits produce severe inflation?

Deficits have often been connected with inflation, but they need not be. Deficits were large in 1931 and 1932 when prices were falling drastically. There was a surplus in 1919–20 when prices were rising rapidly. Whether deficits produce inflation depends on how they are financed. If, as so often happens, they are financed by creating money, they unquestionably do produce inflationary pressure. If they are financed by borrowing from the public, at whatever interest rates are necessary, they may still exert some minor inflationary pressure. However, their major effect will be to make interest rates higher than they would otherwise be. A short spell of high interest rates is vastly to be preferred to a long spell of high taxes.

Those of us who believe that government has reached a size at which it threatens to become our master rather than our servant should therefore (1) oppose any tax increase; (2) press for expenditure cuts; (3) accept large deficits as the lesser of evils; (4) favor the financing of these deficits by borrowing from the public rather than by undue creation of money; and (5) urge the elimination of artificial ceilings on the rate of interest at which the government may borrow in order to foster this objective.

In the long view, that is the course of true fiscal responsibility.

War on Poverty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. M. G. (GENE) SNYDER

OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 10, 1967

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, today there is a constant plea for more and more funds to be poured into the war on poverty. However, the success of this war as a solution to the ills of poverty has been, to say the least, very questionable. The failure of this program is pointed out very poignantly in the following letter that I recently received from a constituent.

The letter follows:

CRESTWOOD, KY.,
August 7, 1967.

Hon. M. G. SNYDER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SNYDER: This letter is to voice my strenuous objection to a 10% surtax increase if any portion of these funds is to further the poor war folly. My view along this line stems from practical observation in the, to me, unquestionable lack of benefits from tax money applied in such direction after several personal dealings with job applicants referred to me by the local poverty war office.

I decided to try some of the unemployed listed by the local poverty war office early last year. None of the people hired through this office worked out at all. For documentation purposes, here are the results of the four most interesting failures obtained over a period of some 18 months. The subjects include one woman and three men (all adults with families) comprised of three negros and one white. Their work week was 44 hours with no Sunday work, vacations and paid holidays with earnings 50 to 65¢ per hour above minimum wages.

One of these became the first negro retail sales clerk in this county to my knowledge while working for me. He was well liked and accepted by fellow workers and customers for the short time he was here. He left abruptly with no warning, reason or forwarding address after a few weeks. Since then we have been repeatedly notified of potential unemployment benefit charges to us.

Another subject, after a few weeks of employment here, steadfastly refused to come to work Saturdays without listing to or from port some 30 degrees. After three warnings, we of course fired him. We did so with mild regrets since he was somewhat physically handicapped. The handicap resulted from earlier acquired gunshot wounds incurred from one of his girl friends or wife upon impregnating one or the other. We were never quite sure which was who. He too repeatedly appears on a notice of potential unemployment benefit charges.

We spent three weeks training our only poor war woman applicant in retail & clerical office duties and three months straightening out the mess she did or caused by not doing. She had to quit after a few weeks because the job made her nervous. We later learned she had confided the source of her nervousness in working to a mutual friend & I was told the employee became most upset in discovering her relief checks would be eliminated if she persisted in working. And yet her annual salary would have been above the amount stated by the government as living in a state of poverty. She now, I understand, has retired on a farm which she owns and is back on the dole. The poverty war office had told me, in sending her to apply for the job, that she was the best & smartest one they had listed. Since she is only one year older than I, I would say she appears to be somewhat more intelligent than I am because she appears to have it made. It would also seem that she is certainly smarter than some of our northeastern Senators who are inclined to further expand such portals of tax dollar idiocy.

The last & most recent subject left abruptly while I was on vacation several weeks ago. A quizzing of the employees on duty at the time revealed no stated reason of substance, no duress, no future plans, no better jobs, no nothing really and neither was he fired by any of my subordinates. In order to help him get off relief & get the job originally, I had even co-signed a small note to enable him to buy an auto for transportation to work. He felt riding a bus was beneath his dignity. Want to buy a 1953 Lincoln?

This concludes, and rightfully so I believe, my patience in trying to fulfill any obligation incumbent on my private enterprise to make such a social fiasco work.

As for the dour plight of large urban areas in providing jobs and services attending increasing numbers of people migrating there, I say this: No one makes them move there. No one makes them stay if conditions are so bad and no one makes them breed more of their own kind in numbers approaching animalistic propagation of the lowest vertebrate or invertebrate order. At the same time farm operations in this county have actually been shut down or reduced because of lack of workers. Or perhaps and more probably I should say for the lack of those who will work. I wonder how many people of this county have left out because the dole was good in some large city somewhere. And finally it seems, the numbers of such people are drying up the funds for such dubious purposes.

Because of all that is stated above I say to hell with a 10% or .1% surtax increase if any of it is to go to the perpetuation of such nonsensical and ineffectual programs dreamed up by the "excuse makers" portion of our government. It looks like good money thrown after bad to me. I have concluded that you cannot legislate either initiative or intelligence and definitely a necessity to work cannot be effected with the existing rewards for nonproductivity being as they are. Much less that they should be increased or even contemplated for increase.

Would that there were some way this letter could be put to use beyond the point of your merely being informed of my personal views on these matters.

Very truly yours,

J. D. Koontz.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the Congressional Record, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the Congressional Record, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the Record at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the Record should be processed through this office.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402, at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the Record.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Appendix

Prevention of Insurrection and Rebellion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 11, 1967

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, in recent years some news commentators, while purporting to report unbiased "news," have depicted normally peaceful southern communities as "citadels of hate and oppression."

This summer has again seen similar slanted and tasteless news productions which have similarly discredited the leaders and citizens of northern communities.

Mr. President, it is past time for the mass communications media to mature and help to prevent rather than to foment insurrection and rebellion. I ask unanimous consent that an excellent editorial on this subject, entitled "A Complaint from Newark," in the Columbia, S.C., Record, of August 9, 1967, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A COMPLAINT FROM NEWARK

There was nothing red-neckish about the Southern complaints. Nothing at all. There was the simple discomfiture, the smouldering anger, the righteous indignation over the reporting done by outsiders who would swarm down like starved locusts on any Southern community briefly beset by difficulties of racial transition.

Southerners would watch, appalled and disgusted as television and radio commentators (and some newspapermen) transformed their normally peaceful communities into "citadels of hate and oppression" peopled by "witless thugs."

Not that there weren't some Southern communities who were guilty. There were. But both the guilty and the guiltless were lumped together.

The obsession continues to this date. When the American Broadcasting System chose to televise Columbia's RSVP program as an example of what this community is doing for the American soldiers in Vietnam, the television network felt strangely compelled to report what was being done for the Negro community in Columbia.

Quite naturally, the story was quite incomplete—telling absolutely nothing about the remarkable Youth Step, Adult Step, Youth Opportunity Center, Head Start programs, central employment center and others.

Yet, the South is not now alone. Newark, New Jersey, and its editors now *know* what it's like to have a community misrepresented before the American people.

William R. Clark, editor of the *Newark News*, campaigned hard for Negro justice in his city. Yet, according to the July 29 issue of *Editor and Publisher*, he "deeply resented the decay, poverty and racial problem angles which, without counter-balancing facts, had been flashed across the nation, around the world. Although Newark's problems were intense, he intimated that there were also the problems of racial transition common to most older cities, especially in the Northeast. He thought, too, that television coverage of the Newark riot had tended toward being 'inflammatory.' "

Mort Pye, editor of the *Newark Star-Ledger*, agrees. "Interviewed in the paper's new building, Pye, too, expressed himself as being dismayed by the coverage given the riot. 'I'll tell you this, some of those outside comments on the situation here sort of shook my confidence in honest reporting. They showed a complete lack of understanding of our problems. Still, one thing I learned, is that when this kind of trouble hits other cities, think twice about jumping in with comment.' "

This newspaper has tried, earnestly, not only to think twice, but thrice . . . and once again . . . as the nation has confronted the Great Negro Passion of the 1960's. It has sought to be responsible and has tried to evoke responsibility from others.

Many a Southern community has been crucified, over the past decade, by flamboyant, sensational reporting—especially by television networks—without counter-balancing facts. Television news reporting, historically, stands where American print journalism did three or four decades ago. And for the preservation of stability in our society under law, it's got to mature in a hurry. For the sake of Newark and us all.

Free Elections in South Vietnam

SPEECH

OF

HON. JAMES G. O'HARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 10, 1967

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I am one of the signatories of the statement regarding the elections in Vietnam referred to yesterday by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] and several other speakers. I have joined in this statement because of the crucial importance of the forthcoming elections in South Vietnam. It is essential that these elections be conducted in a manner that demonstrates to the people of Vietnam and to the world that the leadership of South Vietnam has been freely chosen by the people and that the South Vietnamese Government is a people's government, not one imposed upon them by the United States or by anyone else.

The actions taken by the South Vietnamese Government leading up to the impending election were taken with the strong support of President Johnson. Throughout these events the unwavering support of this administration for a freely elected government in South Vietnam has been clear.

It is tragic that developments within the last several weeks have cast a cloud over the electoral process. It is my belief that the President is as concerned by these developments as any Member of the House. I am confident that the President will do all within his power to encourage the present Government to insure the integrity of the campaign and the election that follows. In this effort, the President will have my complete support.

The Riot Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 27, 1967

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Killeen Daily Herald for Monday July 31, 1967, carried an editorial on the President's Riot Commission which I feel is worthy of interest to each Member of this body. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include this editorial, as follows:

THE RIOT COMMISSION

President Johnson has given his newly-appointed Civil Disorders Commission exactly one year to study the causes of riots in the nation's cities, although an interim report will be made by next March 1.

The 11-member group headed by Illinois Gov. Otto Kerner is supposed to determine to what extent, if any, there has been planning and organization in any of the riots; why riots occur in some cities and not in others; how well equipped and trained are the local and state police, and the state guard units, to handle riots; and who took part in the riots—the rioters' ages, level of education, job history, origins and their roots, if any, in the community.

It is a national shame that it took the tragedy of Detroit to accomplish this. The action is long overdue.

In the President's own words, "Pillage, looting, murder and arson have nothing to do with civil rights." But the actions perpetrated by a minority of Negroes in Detroit—whether they were fanatics or criminals or hoodlums or simply desperate or thoughtless men—betray and make a mockery of everything their race has accomplished since Emancipation.

The violence they committed is a sin against their own people as wicked and inexcusable as anything that can be laid at the door of the white man.

The scenes reported from that city are similar to those that have taken place in other cities, but raised to a scale unknown before.

As usual, it was the innocent Negroes who suffered most. It was mostly their homes, their stores, their businesses that were smashed and ransacked and burned—in all-black areas as well as in supposedly model integrated neighborhoods.

Some white people, too, responded to the call to anarchy, joining with Negroes—not all of them poor and needy by any means—in co-operative looting of stores.

Here was integration with a vengeance. Here was equality on the most primitive level. Here was a mutual degrading descent to unreasoning animality when the restraining and civilizing presence of authority was temporarily removed.

Yet in other instances, Negroes formed armed guards to prevent other Negroes from attacking firemen who were attempting to save their homes.

To say that the nation will not tolerate another Detroit is to voice a truism. No government, whether benevolent or tyrannical, democratic or totalitarian, can permit attacks on itself by its own citizens. No community can permit its very existence to be threatened with anarchy and violence.

Insurrections must and shall be put down, wherever and whenever they occur, with whatever force is necessary. Those who participate in them, whatever their color, must be dealt with according to the full measure of the law.

It goes without saying that white America has the physical power to defeat black rebellion. To the extent that that power is required to be exercised, to that extent will it be exercised. To the degree that Negro extremists wish to test that power, to that degree will it respond.

But one thing the white community lacks is the ability to clamp a lid on civic chaos at its source. Only the Negro community can do that—the community of decent, law-abiding, hard-working Negroes who form the overwhelming majority and who are as horrified as anyone else by what has been happening in America's cities.

And to do that, they must begin rejecting the fanatics and troublemakers in their midst. They must cease shielding the sniper, or looking the other way as the firebomber goes about his mischief. They must refuse to play the game of cop-baiting and resist the impulse to get their share of the loot while the getting is good.

They must mass behind their responsible leaders, those whose assault on prejudice and injustice is constructive and nonviolent and whose aim is to bring about an era of cooperation and mutual respect between all Americans, not a bloody racial Armageddon.

Either they begin doing these things, and soon, or they will wake up to find themselves living in a police state, in which they will suffer most and for which they, not the rioters, will be ultimately responsible for they will have acquiesced in its creation.

These truths will become more and more evident to President Johnson's Civil Disorders Commission as it begins its investigation. Many of them are fully known to the millions of decent Negro and white citizens who read newspapers, watch television, and tune in radios.

Gathering facts into the causes of riots is fine, but unless steps are taken to prevent them we are no better off than before. It is doubtful, also, if this nation can afford to wait a year or more to begin closing the gap. A few more like Detroit, and we shall have made a long step toward returning to the Dark Ages.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402, at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

Appendix

Our Pioneer Heritage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED SCHWENGEL
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 14, 1967

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, this year the theme of the Iowa State fair is "Our Pioneer Heritage." One of the best known and well-attended State fairs in the United States, the Iowa State fair opens on Friday, August 18, and runs through Sunday, August 27.

An article which appeared in the Burlington Hawk-Eye on Wednesday, August 9, is devoted to the theme of this year's edition of the Iowa State fair.

"OUR PIONEER HERITAGE" THEME OF STATE FAIR

DES MOINES.—"Our Pioneer Heritage," the story of a state and of the men, women and circumstances making it, will be the 1967 theme of the Iowa State Fair Friday, Aug. 18, through Sunday, Aug. 27 in Des Moines.

The Iowa years from 1830 to 1865 were filled with strife, one culture receding, one triumphing.

There was hope, with settlers coming with their families, breaking plows, spinning wheels, livestock.

There was disaster with massacre, floods, drouth, epidemics, the small grave by the trail.

There was accomplishment with law, order, soddies and cabins, then the big, stark frame home; churches, schools, libraries, roads, overland transportation to the bigger world outside.

There was the push from the Mississippi toward the Missouri; dreams of a state that never could be, but a state with income and resources more munificent than dreams.

Iowa country in 1830, historians say, was a "political orphan," territorially abandoned when Missouri became a state in 1821 and on its own until spliced with Michigan Territory in 1834. That merger gave it two counties, De Buque and Demoine.

Possibly those 13 years were the happiest, a boundless space of sky and grass, a shining green or icy white landscape, clear, tree-hung rivers, wild flowers and game, a great silence in its splendid aloneness, before man of necessity had to trample, cut and slash, to cover the wandering paths with corn and potatoes, to crush the travois with trains.

Iowa had been a state in 1865 since late 1846. The population probably numbered under ¾ million, the 1860 census gave it 674,913.

It had survived Amelia Bloomer, her terrifying short skirt and ballooning bloomers; entertained Abraham Lincoln as land owner, speaker, lawyer; seen Abolitionist John Brown and his followers establish stations on the underground railway, known of preparations for the attack on Harpers Ferry, Va.

In the four years preceding 1865 nearly 80,000 had gone to the War Between the States, 13,000 never to return. A thousand Iowans had served in the earlier Mexican War.

HONEY WAR

The Honey War was the cold war of 1839. The entire Iowa militia, many in homespun garments, sometimes armed only with pitchforks, was mobilized, but no shots were fired.

The "conflict" followed an Iowa-Missouri boundary dispute, was chilled eventually when a Missourian chopped down three bee trees—and sweetening was hard to come by in those pioneer days—and Missouri tried to collect taxes, both outrages in the disputed area.

Death, tragedy and wide fear followed the Spirit Lake massacre of 1857. A marauding band of outlaw Sioux killed 32 settlers, took three women and a child captive, killing two, keeping two throughout the summer; burned a cabin, slaughtered cattle. The Sioux were not punished.

WOMEN'S BATTLES

Women fought their own battles in early years—Annie Wittenmyer for food sanitation and proper diet for the soldiers, later to obtain care for orphans of war dead; the known, including Mrs. Bloomer, and the unknown, for suffrage, almost winning over the legislature, only in the end forced to wait decades for full franchise; for temperance, educational opportunities, legal equality, racial justice.

For some of those years two of several famed Iowa chiefs led their people in diverse patterns, now are buried in the land they loved but could not hold.

Black Hawk, Sac warrior, fought his futile fight against the white, resisted loss of land along the Mississippi River in the war that bears his name. Keokuk, diplomat, orator, peace lover, best dressed man in his tribe, faced the inevitable in peace. The end of the struggle is told in two land purchases. Black Hawk along the Mississippi and western slope from the Sac and Fox and other tribes.

Iowa appears to have been publicized as an area name for the first time in 1836.

There was disagreement about the origin of the name; the name of its capital city always would raise a question. In that same year (Iowa was a part of Wisconsin Territory), the first bank and the first post offices were established and the Du Buque Visitor began publication.

Two years later Iowa became a good-sized territory, including a sizable slice of Minnesota and the east half of the Dakotas. It gained a governor, Robert Lucas, an economy-minded Virginian, Democrat, twice governor of Ohio. He came under presidential appointment, without campaign, contributions or controversy. Nobody apparently feared accepting $25,000 in federal benefits.

Political parties won, lost, were organized, disappeared, survived—Republican, Democratic, Free Soil, Abolitionist, Union, Liberty, Whig, all eager to come out on top.

In November, 1838, the legislature met in the territorial "capitol," Old Zion Methodist Church in Burlington.

The seat of government would move west by easy stages, eventually settling into the complex held together by the gold dome. That was the year James G. Edwards is said to have suggested "Hawkeyes" for Iowans; Black Hawk died; land offices were established and public lands sold, sometimes for $1.25 an acre; and Iowa's population totaled 22,859.

COMMON SCHOOLS

The Legislature in 1839 set up a system of "common schools." Dr. Isaac Gallard nine years earlier had established the first public school at Ahwipetuck near Keokuk, with McGuffey's Readers as an educational base.

The State University of Iowa, established in 1847, granted its first degree in June 1858, to a graduate who had studied "intellectual philosophy" among nine subjects offered by the seven-man faculty.

After several false starts Iowa was admitted as a free state to the union Dec. 28, 1846 (paired with Florida), the 29th star on the flag.

The previous year, after Congress had passed the admission act, U.S. Sen. Augustus Caesar Dodge (Dem., Ia.) had defined the state boundaries, just about what they now are, straight across the north and south, eratic with rivers on the east and west. The 56,290 square miles that it Iowa contains some of the world's most productive soil.

Before Iowa became a state the Whigs and Democrats had a hot political hassle in an effort to control the legislature because then it would elect two senators and three state supreme court justices. The Democrats elected the two senators, did all right with the justices who were held over due to an inter-party stalemate.

FIRST CHURCHES

Iowa Methodists built the first church, a log cabin at Dubuque. (A model of this small meeting house will be at the head of the Grand Concourse on the fairgrounds). Catholics, who held services in Dubuque, in 1833, built St. Raphael's Cathedral there in 1935. Presbyterians also preached there in 1833.

The first territorial survey was in 1837 and eigth years later the Sac and Fox, apart from some remaining on the reservation, left Iowa. Settlers poured across a restraining barrier to get their lands for homes. The last to leave, the Sioux, stayed until 1851.

CATTLE WARS

As in western cattle wars where cattle men resented sheep herders, the steamboat people resented the railroad bridges.

The Effie Action struck a pier of the $400,000 Mississippi River bridge at Davenport and caught fire. The owner sued the railroad for obstructing river traffic. Abraham Lincoln was the railroad attorney. Litigation followed and in another case the supreme court decided the railroads and bridges were here to stay.

The first passenger train on the Mississippi and Missouri ran from Davenport to Milton in 1855, a year later Iowa City was on the main line.

Post riders, stage coaches, covered wagons would give way to the steam cars as, although nobody knew it then, the trains a century later would read their future in the skies.

Within those 35 years a man died in an Ottumwa duel, 75 inches of rain fell within a 12-month period, Mormons made the heartbreaking trek across the state, some to succeed in their final goal, some to stay behind to break away from the early principles of their faith, to farm, to die. Forts were built, Atkinson, to protect Indians from their kind, five in northwest, with a small block house still standing, Des Moines, three in all.

Members of ethnic groups arrived, to found the Amanas, Pella, Spillville, later to be forever famous because of a man who made music; other Europeans arrived in numbers. Some of their bright promises failed, as the Icarians; some flourishing hamlets became ghost towns when the railroad bypassed them or industry failed.

Those 35 years are history, would take a history to tell. Some elements are depicted in the fair's Heritage Village, with its block house, Indian village, ambitious little museum of Iowa history, church and sodhouse.

THE PEOPLE

If this is not quite "in the beginning", it is the formal beginning of a state.

To it came storekeepers, bankers, farmers, promoters, cobblers, publisher, printers, teachers, camp followers, ministers and priests, remittance men, builders, millwrights, millers, doctors, lawyers, politicians, literate and illiterate, practical and visionary, content and adventuresome.

Each left something on the religious, educational, business life of the state, a little more on the ephmeral humanities, more for its future.

Negro Fighter Pilot Hits Carmichael, Black Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 14, 1967

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, after listening to the raft of irresponsible babble from the likes of Rap Brown and Stokely Carmichael, I think it is about time we start giving a little publicity to the more civil rights oriented Negro leaders. In particular, I am thinking of fighter pilot Daniel James who is currently serving his country as a colonel in the Vietnam war. "Chappie" James is one Negro who is not afraid to speak his mind about Stokely Carmichael and black power. In the following article, which appeared in the August 10 edition of the Washington Post, Colonel James makes it perfectly clear that Carmichael, when sounding off about the cause of the Negro in America, is really supporting no other cause but his own.

The article follows:

Negro Fighter Pilot Hits Carmichael, Black Power

(By William Tuohy)

Danang, South Vietnam, August 9.—"Stokely Carmichael is a big-mouth who is making a profession out of being a Negro, and he's got no damn business speaking for me," said the tall impressive-looking Negro pilot. "This Black Power garbage is for the birds."

Col. Daniel James, Jr., 47, carries his 230 pounds on a 6-foot, 4-inch frame covered by a distinctive black flying suit with silver colonel's eagles on the shoulders. There are command pilot's wings on his breast just above the name: "Chappie James."

Chappie James, the biggest fighter pilot in the Air Force, has become something of a legend in the air war in Vietnam. He flies an F–4 Phantom fighter and is vice wing commander in the 8th Tactical Fighter Wing based in Thailand. The commander is James' closest friend, Col. Robin Olds, the Air Force's top ace.

In Danang on a short visit, Col. James said in an interview, "These riots are the worst thing that could happen to the Negroes' cause. This could set the civil rights movement back 100 years. A lot of the fence-sitters are jumping off on the wrong side now."

Col. James emphasized that he did not speak for the white establishment.

"We're fighting to get laws passed to protect civil rights," James pointed out. "You've got to obey laws. You can't have a double standard."

James is especially critical of Stokely Carmichael, the former head of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee.

"I resent Stokely's setting himself up as a spokesman for Negroes," he said. "This S.O.B. is leading too many kids astray. And when he advises Negro servicemen to come back and fight at home—that's sheer stupidity."

In case anyone should question his own credentials in the civil rights movement, James added, "Hell, I was in the original sit-in back in 1943."

He and nearly 100 other Negro Army Air Corps cadets refused to accept segregation at Selfridge Air Force Base in Michigan. They were all arrested and threatened with court-martial, but they held their ground and the charges later were dropped.

"What I really don't buy is that back-to-Africa stuff," James concluded. "I'm not an African immigrant. I'm an American with several generations behind me in my country.

"If something is wrong with my country right now, then I'm willing to hold her hand for a while until she pulls out of it and gets right."

Born in Pensacola, Fla., and a graduate of Tuskegee Institute, James now lives in Tucson, Ariz. He has two sons, one in Air Force ROTC at the University of Arizona, and a daughter who was formerly an airline stewardess.

Problems of a Smalltown Newspaper Publisher

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. Y. BERRY
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 14, 1967

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, as a former member of the fourth estate, I have a special awareness of the many problems facing the smalltown newspaper publisher, particularly in his dealings with the many Federal agencies. A letter written by John Vickerman, of the Sioux Valley News, Canton, S. Dak., upon receipt of a request to publish a notice of a job opening from a Federal bureau, I believe expresses the views of every publisher succinctly. I urge my colleagues to read it so they, too, will know some of the problems and frustrations these publishers face. Mr. Vickerman's letter follows:

Problems of a Small Newspaper Publisher

This morning I received a notice of a job opening from your office, with a request that it be published "without cost to the government."

The federal government is about to raise my income taxes, my social security taxes, my medicare taxes, by mailing costs, and God only knows what else.

Job printing is an important part of my business. My principal competitor in the envelope-printing business is the federal government. The Post Office prints envelopes below cost, so while I lose customers I also pay to subsidize this competitor.

Every day my office is deluged with publicity handouts from every conceivable branch of the federal government. The purpose of these handouts is to convince the public, through this newspaper, that the government is all-wise and all-beneficient, that the current administration is wonderful, and that we citizens are getting the best of all possible deals.

I'm taxed to pay for this junk, the vast bulk of which is propaganda rather than news, and then I have to pay the garbageman to haul it away.

And then this morning your office comes along with an announcement which is nothing more than a classified advertisement, and I'm asked to run it without cost to the government. Well, I won't.

I'm not an extremist, or a John Bircher, or a member of any group dedicated to the violent overthrow of the U.S. government. I'm just a country newspaperman, trying to make a living, and I've had it up to here with taxes, handouts, self-serving publicity, government competition, and requests for free space.

We'll run your ad for five cents a word. That's what we charge our customers, most of whom watch their money more carefully than Uncle Sam watches his.

Meat Import Controls Need Further Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ED EDMONDSON
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 14, 1967

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker millions of pounds of beef are being imported from foreign countries, while our own cattlemen are not received a reasonable return on their investment. It does not make sense to import increasing shipments of beef from other countires at the expense of America's cattlemen and farmers, who contribute in many ways to the strength of the Nation.

I am inserting in the Record a resolution from the Oklahoma Cattlemen's Association, which I wholeheartedly support, calling for support of legislation introduced to amend the beef export law of 1964, and an end to this unjust situation.

I have also joined my colleague, the Honorable Wilbur Mills, of Arkansas, in introducing a bill indentical to his H.R. 9475, in an effort to improve existing import control legislation and provide a better break for our own cattle producers.

The text of the resolution adopted by the Oklahoma Cattlemen's Association follows:

Resolution

Whereas, the cattlemen of Oklahoma and of this nation recognize the price depressing affects of millions of pounds of beef being imported from foreign countries, particularly at a time when individuals producers are not receiving a reasonable return on their investments,

Therefore, be it resolved that the Oklahoma Cattlemen's Association in its quarterly board meeting on June 10, 1967, in Guymon, Oklahoma, reaffirm its support for legislation directed to amend the beef import law of 1964, based on the legislation that has been introduced during the Spring of 1967.

Adopted: June 10, 1967.

John R. Mayer, Guymon, Okla.; J. R. "Kuny" Ham, Pauls Valley, Okla.; Dan Dillingham, Enid, Okla.; Wray Finney, Fort Cobb, Okla.; Duty Rowe, Lawton, Okla.; W. R. Brannan, Marietta, Okla.; Wayne Rowe, Lawton, Okla.; Forrest Nelson, Norman, Okla.; Roy Schoeb, Cherokee, Okla.

J. K. Culbert, Guymon, Okla.; D. C. Fitzgerald, Jr., Ardmore, Okla.; A. P. Atkins, Guymon, Okla.; Glenn Easterwood, Fort Supply, Okla.; Byron Cook, Oklahoma City, Okla.; Leo Roberts, Ardmore, Okla.; Mike Turner, Ringling, Okla.; L. D. Watson, Oklahoma City, Okla.; Bob Mayer, Guymon, Okla.

L. W. Long, Jr., Rush Springs, Okla., J. K. Haley, Mountain View, Okla.; Bob Baumann, Lawton, Okla.; Perry J. Town, Arnett, Okla.; A. A. Engelman, Beaver, Okla.; Jim Romer, Guymon, Okla.; Henry C. Hitch, Sr., Guymon, Okla.; Ralph Gardner, Oklahoma City, Okla.; Ray Tucker, Finley, Okla.; Rick Ham, Elmore City, Okla.

The Big DOD Buildup—Part II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 14, 1967

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, members of the Armed Services Committees of the House and Senate, as well as the Appropriations Committees, experience great difficulty in gaining a proper perspective of the operations of the Department of Defense. Secretary McNamara, admittedly a brilliant man, presents statistics in such profusion that he sometimes obscures a basic issue in a mass of detail.

Fortunately, there are excellent writers for periodicals which deal with the armed services who explore the statistics and figures originating in the Pentagon in a scholarly fashion.

Louis Stockstill, the editor of the Journal of the Armed Forces, is one of these excellent reporters.

For a true picture of how rapidly the civilian employment in the Department of Defense has grown under Secretary McNamara's "efficiency," I recommend Mr. Stockstill's recent article entitled "The Big DOD Buildup—Part II," in the Journal of the Armed Forces.

The article follows:

THE BIG DOD BUILDUP—PART II

(By Louis Stockstill)

Top brass civilians within the Defense Department have mushroomed like an atomic cloud during the teneure of Secretary Robert S. McNamara.

In the six and one-half years he has been in office, the powerful Defense chief has added more than 200,000 civilians to the payroll and has almost tripled the number of "super grade"—GS–16, –17 and –18—positions in the defense establishment.

Civilian payroll costs within the Department currently are projected to be about $2.3-billion higher in fiscal '68 than they were in the final Eisenhower budget submitted to Congress when Secretary McNamara took office.

Salaries for the "super grades"—an elite force which has zoomed from 359 in fiscal '62 to 931 in fiscal '68—also have risen sharply. In pay grade GS–18, alone, the increase amounts to as much as $7,400 per year.

In addition to the three "super grades," the Defense Department, like other Government agencies, also has two other categories of top-paying jobs—"executive level" posts and "special positions" created by the Secretary.

Today, in the three categories, the Defense Department has one top-salaried position for each 800 permanent civilian employees.

By contrast, the military forces have approximately 2,600 uniformed personnel for each flag or general officer.

An earlier Journal survey (6 May) spotlighted the growth in the number of civilians who come under the "direct control" of Secretary McNamara. The article pointed out that when the Secretary first entered the Pentagon, he had about 1500 civilian employees in his own office and in DoD activities he controlled (apart from the individual Services), and that he has since expanded this number into a work force of 67,000. In addition, funds to pay some 7,000 other civilians are included in the FY '68 budget for DoD.

These 74,000 civilian employees include only those in the "DoD" portion of the budget. Civilian employees in the Army, Navy, Air Force and Marine Corps are budgeted separately.

Data on each group—DoD, Army, Navy, Air Force and Marine Corps—is not collected under these five headings, however, but is spread out in each category over a number of activities.

For example, the Navy civilian personnel budget figures are strung across 13 separate budget accounts. Those for DoD are covered in six accounts.

To provide a simplified picture of the civilian payroll throughout the Defense establishment, the Journal has collated the data as it applies to each of the Services and to DoD, proper. No such simplified presentation of the statistics is available to the House and Senate appropriation subcommittees which must approve or disapprove funds requested for the civilian payroll. These funds, for FY '68, add up to more than $8-billion, and cover 1.2-million permanent civilian employees as well as enormous numbers of temporary and part-time workers and foreign nationals employed overseas.

DEFENSE DEPARTMENT CIVILIAN PAYROLL,[1] FISCAL YEAR 1968

	Total civilian compensation	Number of permanent civilian positions	Increase in personnel since 1966
Department of Defense	$600,000,000	74,145	5,249
Army	2,900,000,000	429,289	59,071
Navy	2,300,000,000	386,689	49,601
Air Force	2,200,000,000	324,592	23,230
Marine Corps	113,000,000	21,654	3,899
Totql	8,100,000,000	1,236,369	141,050

[1] Does not include "civil" activities such as maintenance of cemeteries, administration of the Ryukyus, Panama Canal Zone activites, Army Civil Engineers, Soldier's Home or wildlife conservation, which account for an additional 50,000 employees earning $382,000,000.

For "overtime and holiday" pay, alone, DoD has budgeted $318-million for its civilian work force in the current fiscal year. The biggest portion of these funds ($165-million) will go to Navy workers. Army employees will get about $96-million of the overtime and holiday pay; $44-million is budgeted for the Air Force; $9.6-million will go to DoD employees and $3.2-million to employees of the Marine Corps.

In the overall Defense Department budget as it applies to civilian "personnel compensation," there are two main categories. One covers employees assigned to "military" activities; the other covers a much small number of employees who are assigned to "civil" activities such as administration of the Ryukyus, Panama Canal Zone activities, the Army Civil Engineer program, etc.

The detailed analysis given here is concerned solely with permanent civilian employees assigned to "military" programs in the FY '68 budget. All comparisons of fiscal 1968 data with earlier data are limited to the "civilian personnel compensation—military" budget accounts.

Employees who work in the immediate office of the Secretary of Defense, or in the offices of his Deputy, or the Assistant Secretaries of Defense, the JCS, the Defense Agencies, Defense RDT&E, etc.—all of whom are budgeted within the Defense Department, proper—are pulled together in this analysis and in the accompanying charts under the broad category of "DoD civilians."

Similarly, employees in the various Army activities are lumped under the single heading of "Army employees." The same applies to Navy employees, Air Force employees and Marine Corps employees.

Where "Defense-wide" employees are mentioned, all five groupings are covered: DoD, Army, Navy, AF and Marines.

This distinction is essential inasmuch as a high-ranking Defense Department official who was questioned on Capitol Hill about the earlier Journal article on "The Big DoD Build-Up" denied that the report was accurate. He said OSD does not have 67,000 civilian workers. He was correct only in the sense that he confined his disclaimer to OSD. However, OSD is merely the hub of the much larger DoD civilian payroll, which is separate and distinct from the payrolls of the Army, Navy, Air Force and Marine Corps. The Journal article was addressed to "DoD," not just "OSD."

Not only does Secretary McNamara personally control the 67,000 employees who fall within the DoD offices and the Defense Agencies, but, as this article already has noted, he controls an additional 7,000 civilian workers in the DoD research program and other DoD budget accounts.

Although vast numbers of the employees assigned to the DoD Agencies originally were transferred to DoD from the Services, overall civilian employment throughout the Defense establishment has been expanded rather than diminished.

When Secretary McNamara took office, he inherited from the Eisenhower Administration a total civilian work force of about 1,008,000 people—Defense-wide. Of these, only 327 were "super grade" employees. Another 359 fell into the "executive level" or "special position" groups at the top of the pay scale.

However, DoD employees constituted only a small fragment of the 1,008,000 total. They added up to 1492, plus 95 in the Advance Research Projects Agency and about 200 assigned to the military assistance program. At the time, DoD "super grade" employees numbered 105, plus 9 in ARPA. The other top-level DoD jobs numbered 52, plus 13 in ARPA.

Today, Defense-wide, the civilian work force totals more than 1,200,000, including 931 "super grade" employees and 612 other top-paying positions.

Of this number, 74,000 are assigned to DoD, including 294 in the super-grades and 113 in other executive-level or special-positions.

The figures disclose that DoD today has almost as many super-grade employees as existed Defense-wide when Secretary McNamara took office, and that the total number of civilian employees under his immediate control has mounted astronomically.

In clustering larger and larger numbers of civilians under his own control, Secretary McNamara has, at the same time, added heavier layers of civilian employees in each of the Services. Consolidation of former Service functions into "Defense Agency" functions did not result in reduced forces for the Services. In fact, the Armed Forces ended up with more civilians than they had to start with and with an overall total which is higher than the Defense-wide total in 1962.

Today, the Army, Navy, Air Force and Marine Corps have 1,162,224 permanent civilian employees. In 1962 they had 1,013,680. Numerically, the biggest increase has occurred in the Army; proportionately, the Marines have experienced the largest growth.

In round figures, in 1962, the Army had 353,000 civilians, the Navy 338,000, the Air Force 306,000 and the Marines 16,000. Today, the Army total is 429,000, the Navy 386,000, the Air Force 324,000 and the Marines 21,000.

In the super-grades in 1962, the four Services had 215 employees. Today, the number of employees in grades GS–16, –17 and –18 adds up to 637 (chart, page 32). In pay grade GS–16, alone, the Navy today has more employees than the number in all super-grades in all four Services six and one-half years ago.

The numbers are even more significant in light of two additional factors: (1) Pay for the super-grades today ranges—in round figures—from a low of $20,000 to a high of $26,000, and (2) the number of employees in the top grade—GS–18—has been almost doubled. Pay for a GS–18 in 1962 was $18,500 and the four Services had only 13 civilians in this grade at the time. Today, the Air Force has 9, the Navy 7 and the Army 6.

Growth in the GS–16 rating has been most marked, however. In 1962, the four Services employed only 150 civilians in this grade. Today, they have 548 GS–16 employees—or almost four times as many. The present pay range for this group is $20,075 to $25,435.

The big build-up of civilian employees within DoD and the Services is paralleled by publication of heftier and heftier Pentagon telephone directories. The earlier Journal article pointed out that the DoD yellow-page section of the directory (which lists mostly executive employees) covered three and one-half pages when Secretary McNamara took office, but had grown to 10½ pages with issuance of the "Spring 1967" telephone book.

The Directory is still growing. The new, "Summer 1967" issue is now off the press and the number of DoD yellow pages has again been expanded—by about 70 listings. Similarly, the total size of the "yellow" section (including all DoD and Service listings) increased from 124 pages in the "spring" 1967 issue to 158 pages in the "summer" 1967 issue.

In the six and one-half years he has been in office, Secretary McNamara has added 200,000 permanent civilian employees to the Defense-wide organization and has brought 74,000 of these employees under his direct control.

He has increased the number of DoD super-grade and executive positions from 179 to 407, and has similarly boosted the number of top-pay civilian posts in the four Services from 529 to more than 1,136.

Payroll costs for the overall civilian work force have mounted by about $2.3-billion.

AT THE TOP OF THE HEAP

More than 1500 employees are assigned to top civilian jobs within the Defense Department and the Departments of the Army, Navy and Air Force in the fiscal '68 budget.

Those occupying the senior civilian positions are employees in the so-called "super grades" (GS–16, GS–17 and GS–18); those in Executive Levels I through V; and choose in "special" positions created under Public Law 313.

The biggest group of top-salaried civilians is employed by the Navy. (See page 8.) Second place goes to civilian employees who are under the "direct control" of the Secretary of Defense.

Among the four Services, the Navy also is well out in front in all but one category of civilian employment, and is far ahead in the number of employees with GS–16 ratings. In the GS–16 group (top salary, $25,435), the Navy has more employees than the Army and Air Force, combined.

The Air Force holds a slight Service-lead in the GS–18 category, and outdistances the Army in all but the lowest of the high-paid groups.

The combined total of top civilian positions in DoD and the four Services adds up to 1,542 super- and super-super-grade jobs within an overall civilian work force of about 1,200,000. The statistics do not include civilians employed in "civil" DoD functions—such as the administration of the Ryukus—or the super-grade jobs held by such employees. The latter group are carried in separate accounts in the budget documents from civilian employees charged to the "military" programs of the Defense Department. If included in the overall total, the "civil" function civilians would boost total DoD employment and the total number of super-grade jobs.

Here is a complete picture of the top-paying civilian jobs budgeted for each of the Services in fiscal '68 (under "personnel compensation—military"), together with those under the "direct control" of Secretary of Defense McNamara:

	GS–16	GS–17	GS–18	Others [1]	Total
Department of Defense	179	78	37	113	407
Army	142	17	6	140	305
Navy	276	25	7	214	522
Air Force	130	23	9	144	306
Marine Corps	0	2	0	1	3
Total	727	145	59	612	1,543

[1] Includes Secretaries, Deputy and Under Secretaries, Assistant Secretaries, all executive level I through V employees and "special" positions created by Public Law 313.

More Rats in Bel Air Than Watts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEL CLAWSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 14, 1967

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, we are being told that it will be a form of antiriot insurance if the Congress will only authorize another Federal extermination effort in addition to the five we already have. In view of these attempts to relate "rats to riots," it was interesting to learn of Detroit's model antirodent program. A recent statement by Los Angeles County Supervisor Kenneth Hahn, Democrat, may also be surprising to proponents of a revived Rat Extermination Act of 1967. The statement published in the Daily Signal Huntington Park, Calif., August 8, follows:

"More Rats in Bel Air Than Watts"—Hahn

Because of good inspection by the County Health Department, there are fewer rats in Watts than in Beverly Hills or Bel Air, according to Supervisor Kenneth Hahn.

Only one rat bite was reported to the Health Department in the Watts area during the first six months of 1967, and that was in a classroom laboratory at Bret Harte Junior High School, 92nd and Hoover.

"The chief of the sanitation division in the South District of the County Health Department, Arthur Raya, informs me there is strict inspection of all stores, restaurants and other areas. In fact, Los Angeles County has the best health inspection in the United States," Hahn says.

He has asked the County Health Officer, Dr. G. A. Heidbreder, for a complete report of the entire County of Los Angeles.

"I do not think Congress should spend $40 million for rat control. This should be the full responsibility of the local health departments in the United States. This is one problem that does not need to be shifted to Washington. All that is needed is strict enforcement," Hahn said.

Father to Son on His Departure for Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 14, 1967

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. Speaker, I call to the attention of my colleagues the touching words of one of my constituents, a fine newspaperman, as he wrote an open letter to his son on the eve of the young man's departure for Vietnam. Many mothers and fathers have probably shared these sentiments but have found it hard to express them. Robert Fawcett of the Norristown Times Herald has succeeded.

First a Boy, Then a Man, Then a Soldier: All Wars Are Personal Things, but Some Become More Personal Than Others

(By Robert Fawcett)

(Editor's Note.—Tomorrow, another group of American young men will fly to South Vietnam to join the many thousands of troops already there. One of them will be the son of Robert Fawcett, executive editor of The Times Herald. On the eve of takeoff, the newsman, a veteran of World War II, has some things to tell his son. They are the things, it seems, which many mothers and fathers in similar situations want to say, but seldom find the right words.)

Dear Son: Tomorrow you literally fly out of the lives of your mother and me. On a jet's wings you head for a distant place with a name no longer strange to the American tongue—Vietnam.

I am only one of thousands of fathers who have gone through this agony. There are many sleepless nights ahead.

Though I am only one of many, I feel compelled to write you in this "open letter" fashion. The printer's ink in my blood perhaps?

More than most fathers, I suppose, I should have something of moment to say to you.

At my fingertips for years have been the informative advantages of the newspaper world . . . the columnists, the far-flung wire services, the observations of colleagues.

Still, what I have to say to you now, I know will have no persuasion among today's decision-makers. Worse still, this will not lessen the pangs of anxiety among the vast host of mothers and fathers who have no starred flags to put in their windows.

But it shocks me—even before you donned uniform—the "business-as-usual" complacency of us at home. This is the reason I write you in public print. Perhaps someone will be influenced.

You stand so tall and straight today, my son, I cannot but look at you with pride. Before my mind's eye pass rapid visions of you in the past . . .

. . . The night I came home, much too late, to find your mother fighting grimly against the pneumonia that wracked your thin frame

. . . The grin you wore when you were garbed as a resplendent toy soldier for a kindergarten playlet.

. . . Your willingness to accept the family uprootings that followed my new jobs . . . The look on your face when you displayed your catch of a 17-inch bass in Canada (travel expenses and all, that fish must have cost $20 an inch—it was worth it).

. . . Still echoing in my ears are the sobs I heard when your dog was killed by a car. You went off by yourself to cry, didn't you? I joined you, but I could do little more than put a hand on your shoulder. Comfort you, I could not.

. . . You grew up that night. Still a child, but overnight a man. I never heard you cry again. I felt something go out of my life that night.

Manly you have met responsibilities—some too great—without real complaint. Your last years in school . . . your introduction to the world of "making a living" . . . the rigors and cruelty of basic training . . . further military discipline and idiosyncracies.

And now . . . what?

The parades of 1918 are gone. The "all-out" of War II is non-existent. Your war is not popular, my son. There are relatively few, I fear, who whole-heartedly feel it is "right."

Tomorrow, when you board that screaming jet, I wish with all my heart I could convince you that your father, at least, feels that this strange "don't-win-but-don't-lose" war is right.

But we've been honest, you and I, and I cannot give you a lie even in farewell.

What are the answers to the questions you must be asking?

What is the explanation?

Contain Communism lest it spread? That is not enough reason to violate an age-old military tactic: Before you fight, choose advantageous ground.

Only this can I say to you. The war may not be "right," but as sure as there is a Divine Being who fixed this firmament in a galaxy, a "rightness" will come of it.

Radical, perhaps. Revolutionary, perhaps. But you, and thousands of others like you, will do this.

God bless you, son, and send you back.

Correct Jack Anderson Intentional Misrepresentation of Facts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN L. McMILLAN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 14, 1967

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I have been advised that Jack Anderson, who works with Drew Pearson, has printed in his syndicated column that Mr. George Hall worked with me for 4 months during 1943 and approximately 7 months in 1946.

Anderson further states in his column, which I understand has appeared in several newspapers, that no one knew of Mr. Hall and that he passed away in Marion, S.C., his hometown which is located in my congressional district, in 1938.

My administrative assistant, Major McGee, and Mr. Clayton Gasque, who is staff director with the District Committee, are both acquainted with Mr. Hall and knew of his part-time work with me here in my office on two occasions.

This information was given to a Washington Post reporter before Jack Anderson sent this unadulterated lie to the newspapers.

Mr. Hall was born in Marion, S.C., November 25, 1900, and on several occasions between 1939 and 1960, I assisted Mr. Hall in securing work with several private industries here in the city of Washington. I employed him to assist me on two occasions as a part-time worker in sending out material from my office. The exact dates were June 1943 until November of 1943 and June 1946 until February 1947.

Mr. Hall was admitted to the George Washington General Hospital for a hernia operation in 1957 and was again admitted to the George Washington Hospital for treatment in 1959 and suffered a heart attack in 1963.

Mr. Hall passed away at the roominghouse where he was making his home, 2700 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C., on August 8, 1966. He was buried at Washington National Cemetery, 4101 Suitland Road, Suitland, Md.

It is rather difficult to understand why any so-called newspaper columnist or reporter should want to originate and create a lie such as was presented in Jack Anderson's column, recently published in numerous newspapers.

Rats of Various Kinds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 14, 1967

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, last Monday the House was invaded by the Harlem "rat pack." What they proved, or tried to prove is still in doubt. But the unmistakable battle cry that was raised by that motley crew was that "rats cause riots." Although some people might not believe that there are alternatives to rate control legislation, an August 9 editorial in the Chicago Tribune shows what can be done to control this menace besides having the Federal Government go into the exterminating business. I include the article in the RECORD:

RATS OF VARIOUS KINDS

About the only thing the demonstrators from Harlem proved by their anti-rat-in at the Capitol Monday is that Congress needs better protection against invasion by unruly mobs. Capitol police had to use blackjacks to eject Jesse Gray, a professional rabble rouser from New York, and his delegation of 75 demonstrators shoving and shouting, "Rats cause riots."

Rats are indeed a menace which needs to be controlled, but before going into this we should point out that rats of the four-legged variety have been with us for thousands of years and have not until now, to our knowledge, caused murder, arson, and looting. So if rats are suddenly causing riots today, we must assume that they are two-legged rats, against whom Mr. Gray seems to have no complaints.

The demonstrators were protesting the failure of the House to take up Mr. Johnson's 40 million dollar rat control bill. It was not a love of rats which motivated the congressmen, despite the sarcastic comments of some supporters of the bill, but rather a feeling that the matter was a local responsibility and that federal grants-in-aid would not contribute to efficiency or economy in extermination. An official of the department of housing and urban development, which would have supervised the program, said that it would cost the taxpayers $6 to get rid of each rat.

If the responsibility is a local one, the obvious question arises what the cities are doing about it. In most instances, we are afraid, the answer is: Not very much. Most cities have ordinances like Chicago's, which states quite specifically that "every building or structure within the city shall be rat-stopped, freed of rats, and maintained in a rat-stopped and rat-free condition." Housing inspectors are charged with the duty of reporting violations to the building commissioner. Violators may be fined up to $200 a day for each day there are rats on their premises.

If the owner, agent, or occupant does not comply, the city may do the job and bill him for it. If he doesn't pay, a state statute authorizes the city to place on the property a lien "which shall be superior to all other existing liens" and, if it is not paid off within a year, to foreclose on the property. This means that the owner is ultimately responsible, as he should be.

The law is a good one, or would be if anybody paid any attention to it. Mayor Daley has tried to. Since November, 1965, city crews have plugged up more than 350,000 ratholes, have put out large quantities of poison, and have reported some progress. The trouble is that only about one-fifth of the property owners affected have paid up, and only a few of the delinquents have been taken to court. The 3 million dollar deficit to date has been made up partly by the city but mostly by a grant of more than 2 million dollars from the federal anti-poverty office.

If ordinances like Chicago's were adequately enforced, the fines and collections ought to offset most of the cost. It shouldn't take very many fines before the word got around, if prosecutions were given adequate publicity. Certainly cities should do all they can before the taxpayers at large are asked to pay at the rate of $6 a rat for the failure of slum landlords and slovenly tenants to comply with the law.

Romney Off Base Criticizing L. B. J.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. JOELSON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 14, 1967

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Boston Globe:

CONSTITUTION SPELLS OUT TROOP USE: ROMNEY OFF BASE CRITICIZING L. B. J.

(By Archibald Cox, Harvard's Samuel Williston professor of law and former U.S. Solicitor General)

President Johnson strengthened an important constitutional tradition when he predicated his dispatch of Federal troops to Detroit upon Gov. Romney's request for Federal assistance.

This week Attorney General Clark made the policy explicit by stating that Federal Troops would be available to suppress rioting and similar disorders only upon the express request of the governor or state Legislature accompanied by a representation that order cannot be restored with the forces otherwise available.

Both statements rightly assume that presidentail intervention to suppress local rioting must be under Article IV, Section 4, of the Constitution, which authorizes the United States to protect a state against domestic violence but only "upon request of its Legislature or of its governor if the Legislature cannot be convened."

When the purpose of rioting is to deny constitutional rights or prevent the execution of Federal laws or court decrees, the President has no alternative to acting without the state's request. The United States must be able to enforce its own laws regardless of the indifference or even active opposition of state officials.

When Pennsylvania farmers refused to pay the tax upon whisky under President Washington, Congress enacted a law authorizing use of the armed forces when unlawful obstruction or rebellion against the United States makes it impracticable to enforce Federal law by the ordinary course of judicial proceedings.

A post-Civil War statute authorizes the President to use the armed forces if necessary to suppress violence of an unlawful conspiracy, in any state, which deprives "any part or class of its people" of a constiutional right, provided that the sate authorities are unable or unwilling to give protection.

The use of this statute to protect civil rights demonstrators in Birmingham was seriously contemplated in 1964.

The same statute also authorizes armed intervention to suppress violence which "obstructs the execution of the laws of the United States or impedes the course of justice under those laws."

President Eisenhower looked chiefly to this source of authority for sending troops to Little Rock in 1957, as did President Kennedy in enforcing court decrees in Oxford, Mississippi, and, later, in Alabama.

But the case is different when the civil disturbance is not focused upon frustrating Federal law. Even then a President seeking to use Federal troops without a state request could invoke one of the above statutes by making a finding that the use of troops probably was necessary to protect government property, secure delivery of the mails, promote the movement of interstate commerce and execute one or more laws of the United States.

Since judicial review, if available, would be severely restricted, the consciences of the President and his Attorney General would be the only effective limit upon presidential authority.

Such use of troops, however, without a state request would be inconsistent with the basic consitutional distribution of power between the nation and the states.

The framers of the Constitution left the primary responsibility for preserving the peace and public order to the states, because they feared that a national police force, like a standing army, might easily become an instrument of oppression.

The danger to liberty remains undiminished. Size and distance would tend to make a national police force responsible for preserving local order into a remote and monolithic bureaucracy insensitive to human rights and unresponsive to community sentiment.

By making plain his unwillingness to intervene except upon request of a state which has exhausted its own resources, as contemplated by the Constitution, the President has strengthened local responsibility and local power.

The policy also lays a sound and practical foundation for Federal-state relations.

Ill-will, conflict and confusion would surely result from both state and Federal officials seeking to exercise concurrent but independent responsibility.

Imagine the acrimony if the President ordered troops into an area when the state officials believed they could control the situation.

Or suppose the mayor and governor publicly disagreed and both appealed to the President.

Charges of partisan politics—even actual political maneuvering—are probably unavoidable in a situation where the governor belongs to one political party and the President the other, but the temptations under the present policy are mild in comparison with the political consequences of vesting in a President the power to send troops into a state without the request of its governor.

A governor's request for Federal aid in quieting domestic violence should be regarded not as a confession of mistakes or incompetence but as a proper step in the constitutional administration of divided responsibility.

Labor's Call for Fairplay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 14, 1967

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, during hearings held last month before the Housing and Urban Affairs Subcommittee of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, one witness speaking for a part of the labor movement inveighed in rather colorful terms against the National Home Ownership Foundation Act, a bill which has 40 cosponsors from both parties in the Senate and 112 sponsors in the House of Representatives.

I am pleased to see that another respected voice of labor has seen fit to call for an end to intemperate attacks and a return to the time-honored principle of judging a proposal on its merits. Under unanimous consent I include the editorial from the July 28, 1967, Missouri Teamster, entitled "AFL–CIO Wrong in Attack on PERCY's Housing Plan," in the RECORD at this point:

AFL–CIO WRONG IN ATTACK ON PERCY'S HOUSING PLAN

(By Jake McCarthy)

The AFL–CIO seems determined to take itself out of the mainstream of American life. It lines up with "the system" at every turn, and hasn't taken on a good fight since the merger. It fawned on the McClellan Committee in return for protection, and when the Landrum-Griffin bill was being debated, its legislative representatives told its "friends" in Congress they were off the hook where labor was concerned.

Chief architect of this policy of conciliation on the political front—a policy designed to win friends and lose legislative battles—is one Andrew J. Biemiller. As if to prove the creeping inertia of American labor, and to confirm that the AFL–CIO is willing to save its marriage to the Democratic Party at any cost, Biemiller last week levelled a surprisingly intemperate blast at one of the most exciting and creative legislative proposals to be introduced in Congress in a long time.

In hearings before the Senate housing subcommittee, Biemiller referred to the national home ownership plan proposed by Republican Senator Charles H. Percy of Illinois as a "cruel hoax" against the low-income families it is designed to help.

Biemiller went on to declare that a home ownership program should be "drafted by people who understand the real problems that exist rather than presented as a Madison Avenue concept tailored to match a public relations image of the problem."

Along with others in the AFL–CIO hierarchy, Biemiller operates in the field of public relations images, and should know what he is talking about on that score, but that's about all. Because a study of the Percy bill and its plan to make home ownership available to low-income families reveals a highly workable approach to "real problems that exist.". One must conclude that the "hoax" is Biemiller's.

Under the Percy plan, non-profit or limited dividend corporations would be established in a community, for the purpose of securing financing through the federal government for low-cost housing. This "community organization" would be an alliance of low-income residents with business, labor, churches, educators and others. By this step alone, Percy's innovative approach would bring together elements in each community which have sidestepped their mutual responsibilities for too long.

The low-income homebuyer then takes part in the community organization's program to prepare himself for home ownership; buys his home, apartment or cooperative from the community organization; is helped by the federal government to pay the interest costs of his mortgage; repays his government aid later on if his income rises sufficiently; and may contribute his own labor as equity in his home.

As part of the home ownership program, the community organization would also provide access for the potential home buyer to basic adult education, training in job skills, assistance in finding productive employment, job counseling to ensure advancement, and family counseling on such subjects as insurance, taxes, home economics, maintenance and credit buying.

As an example of how the plan might work, a St. Louis group, including representatives of labor, business, church, education, and residents of a given neighborhood, would form a non-profit community organization and embark on a program to acquire shells and dilapidated housing in its neighborhood, for rehabilitation and sale to neighborhood families.

The organization then applies to the National Home Ownership Foundation for technical assistance in planning and developing its program, includinug the creation of the supporting educational and social services needed to prepare families for home ownership.

It then applies for a loan and exercises options on buildings to be rehabilitated, lets construction contracts to home builders, and produces the planned number of units for sale.

Residents of the area must be given first preference in buying or acquiring equity in the dwelling units, and families in the area shall have primary responsibility in recommending families for participation in the program. They must also receive first preference for job training and employment opportunities generated as a result of the program, and shall have the opportunity to contribute the value of their labor as equity in their dwellings.

The community organization would bridge the "credit gap" experienced by low-income families and provide interest payment assistance. The home owner's repayment schedule is based on his income and is adjusted upward as his income increases. And if he reaches middle income, his repayments go back into the original interest assistance fund to help other aspiring home owners.

The Percy plan provides a unique partnership between federal aid, the so-called "private sector," and low income families themselves, and it is hard to imagine why Biemillier and the AFL–CIO find fault with it.

As a matter of fact, Percy's plan embodies the "private sector initiative" concept that enabled the Teamsters locally to build the $20 million Council Plaza project for retired citizens. It is also the underlying concept of the new America 2000 Foundation, formed recently under local Teamster sponsorship, to help rebuild America's slums.

Senator Percy himself has admitted that his bill does not solve all of America's housing problems, and that it could benefit from certain refinements. Nor does he pretend that it would provide home ownership for all of America's poor.

But it is an interesting start, and deserves careful study within the labor movement before the unions of this country accept he AFL-CIO's rather incredible attack upon it.

Neighborhood Youth Corps Success Stories

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JIM WRIGHT
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 14, 1967

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the story of two young Texas women and how they have been able to begin building better lives for themselves and their children through the Neighborhood Youth Corps.

The two women, Mrs. Katherine Stacy and Mrs. Mary Lane, were both trapped in seemingly hopeless situations. Both had dropped out of high school; both were divorced and struggled to support their children; both knew that with their lack of education they could never be more than factory or cafeteria workers; and both were convinced that they did not have a chance in the world of making anything of themselves.

With the help of schooling and job-training from the Neighborhood Youth Corps, however, Mrs. Stacy and Mrs. Lane are now looking forward to bright futures as highly qualified, well-paid secretaries.

Their success in lifting themselves out of the bleakness of disadvantage is a fine tribute to their dedication and effort. It is also a great tribute to the vital work being done by the Neighborhood Youth Corps.

The heartwarming story of their achievement was described in a recent article written by Jack Moseley in the the Fort Worth Press. Under unanimous consent I include this article in the RECORD:

TAGGED A DROPOUT, SHE GETS A NEW CHANCE

(By Jack Moseley)

Katherine Stacy wanted "to make something of myself."

But she said she didn't think she was as good as everybody else.

"People called me a dropout, and it really hurt."

A carhop, she was convinced that the most she could ever be was a factory worker.

Mary Lane was a food server in a cafeteria. The young Negro had to quit school because of marriage and a new baby.

Recently, both girls graduated from the Neighborhood Youth Corps in record time. They are on the way to becoming well-paid secretaries with the federal government.

"When I got that certificate at graduation, I knew I was as good as anybody," said Katherine.

"Me too," echoed Mary.

This is the story of two of 136 people who were given a new chance at life by the War on Poverty program here. Some dropped out. Others entered the Job Corps training camps.

And some, like Katherine and Mary, stuck it out and finished.

Both girls were drawn into NYC through the Texas Employment Commission, where they went in January seeking better jobs.

"They had little faith in themselves, had difficulty expressing themselves," said Charles Dreyfus, head of NYC here.

Both—Mary with a 10th grade education, Katherine with a ninth—were assigned jobs as file clerks in the federal center.

"I didn't think I could do the work," recalled Mary.

"But everyone was wonderful to us," said Katherine, 20. "And I made more friends than I ever had before."

Before Katherine graduated, a federal employe brought her a new dictionary. "That meant more to me than anything. And they gave me a little party."

Mary's mother gave her a dictionary.

During the three months of training, the girls were paid $1.25 an hour. They attended classes in typing, health and personal habit improvement.

And they worked. NYC participants have put in more than 17,700 working hours for non-profit companies and arms of government.

Twelve graduated last week. One entered private industry. Eleven moved on to the Manpower Development Program and 30 months of intensive training for a career. That program is being conducted through Technical High School.

Mary and Katherine are studying math, English, typing and other subjects. Later, there will be shorthand and advanced secretarial science.

Both have children. Both are divorced.

"I know I can make it now," said Katherine. "And I know my son will stay in school and go to college."

What has happened to Katherine and Mary in three short months is not spectacular. Millions of girls will become secretaries.

But these two girls never thought they would have the chance.

The Feelings of the Taxpayers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. Y. BERRY
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 14, 1967

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, this letter is one of a number that are coming to me that express the feelings of the taxpayers with regard to wanton and reckless spending and wanton and reckless taxing. The letter follows:

THE FEELINGS OF THE TAXPAYERS

To get right to the point, if you people on Capitol Hill think this country has had riots, ill feelings toward politicians in general, and a slow year business-wise now, just wait till you raise income taxes on top of a Social Security tax increase. The tax schedule now in effect is already too high and should be lowered. This discrimination caused by the Great Society programs against those of us who work hard and long for the inflation-riddled paychecks we receive, in favor of the poor, lazy, ambition-less people of this country has got to stop. How about a program to provide aid for those in the $5,000 to $10,000 bracket? It's getting so now, that if the taxes are raised anymore our take-home pay won't even take us home.

Forget about Foreign Air Programs, how about a Domestic Aid Program, or better yet, how about reducing the national debt by using those funds. This country can't control criminals in the streets to make them safe after dark, but we're headed for the moon as fast as we can go. We're fighting a war in Viet-Nam as though we've forgotten how. You don't win a war by calling lulls in the fighting to enable the enemy to regroup and resupply themselves! Small farmers haven't a chance against the corporation farms, encouraged by the present Agricultural Department policies, but Congress wants to tax the little guy even further.

You must realize that after World War II was over, taxes imposed during that war were to be repealed, but they were not. Now our Great Society President wants you to impose still more taxes to finance this war. We, the citizen, know too well, that if this 10% tax goes into effect, one way or another the government will find some use for this tax money after the war, and we will still have to keep paying this through the nose for things this country does not need!

Protection of the Capitol

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK EDWARDS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 14, 1967

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, a week ago a large group of irresponsible demonstrators was able to make its way into the House gallery and to stage a public spectacle.

I believe it is essential that recurrence of the incident be prevented. With that objective I urge that a thorough study be conducted into the whole question of protection of the Capitol Grounds.

The study might be undertaken by existing committees of the two bodies or by some new committee or commission established for this purpose.

It should include the matter of movement of groups of persons across the grounds, their entry to the buildings, and security within the Chambers of the two bodies.

It should also include the manner in which the courts handle cases similar to that of last week in which eight persons were charged with disorderly conduct and released on bonds of only $10.

In this connection I insert an editorial from the Mobile Register, of August 10, at this point in the RECORD:

HOUSE DISORDER TREATED WITH ALARMING LENIENCE

How ironic that the Department of Justice and the District of Columbia Board of Commissioners should be urging Congress to pass a law against rioting or inciting to riot in the nation's capital almost at the moment that eight persons booked for disorderly conduct as participants in a wild demonstration in the public gallery of the House were being released on bonds of $10.

Immediately after adjournment of a routine session of the House, an estimated 95 persons, mostly from Harlem, turned the public gallery into a riotous scene of protest against the recent rejection of the Lyndon Johnson administration's $40 million so-called rat control bill.

That project, put into operation, would have had the potential for coming closer to being an urban boondoggle than an effective weapon against rats in cities. But both before and after the House cold-shouldered it, a drum-fire of propaganda emanating from Washington, D.C., has been designed to make the guillible believe that rats have fomented rioting.

When some politicians go after tax money to pour into ratholes, they can be reckless in the excuses they use in trying to get it, and, by our interpretations, this House-rejected $40 million rat bill provides a prime case in point.

The riotous disorder in the House gallery was precipitated more by political propaganda than by rats—and everybody knows it.

But the handling of this disgraceful disturbance carries the danger of being used by agitators and their puppets as a greater incentive for rioting than the political propaganda about rats.

In the first place, police arrested a mere eight of the approximately one hundred involved in the unlawful mass uprising in the House gallery.

Then, in an action equally if not more astounding, a court permitted these eight to go on their way under the trifling small appearance bonds of $10 each. Thus, by customary judicial procedure, if the eight fail to show up for trial their $10 bonds will be forefeited and that will end it.

This whole episode of dealing with the House gallery disorder can only be viewed as a breakdown in law enforcement in the District of Columbia, if viewed realistically.

Dealing with lawbreakers in the excessively lenient manner chosen in this flagrant case of mass contempt for law and order even in the U.S. Capitol itself is genuinely alarming. By the most charitable appraisal, it leaves the door wide open for more and worse disorders right in the seat of the national government on the assumption that offenders of this breed have what amounts to a special immunity from punishment.

The House Committee on the District of Columbia has a responsibility that cannot be fulfilled by either stalling or evasion. It should call for an explanation by the Capitol security officers as to why only eight of the approximately one hundred so-called demonstrators were arrested. And it should call on the judge who fixed the $10 bonds to explain why he treated the arrested handful with incredible lenience.

In addition, Congress should emphasize to the Capitol security force that in any future outbreak of mass disorder it will be expected to move swiftly to subdue the lawlessness and arrest the whole mob instead of a mere few members.

The American people should hold Congress strictly accountable if mobs are permitted to get away with rioting in the U.S. Capitol. The appalling breakdown in law enforcement in the case of the House gallery disorder is as sickening as it is frightening to Americans conscious of the vital necessity of saving this nation from anarchy.

Restoration of Good Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL E. BUTTON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 14, 1967

Mr. BUTTON. Mr. Speaker, while it is always easier to comment favorably about one's own community, occasionally it is necessary to bring to light unpleasant facts that exist. Such is the spirit in which I would like to insert in the RECORD a reference to certain political, economic, and social conditions in Albany County, N.Y., as recently described in some trenchant observations made by the Honorable Joseph C. Frangella, Republican county chairman of Albany County, in an address to his party's legislative candidates in Albany on July 8.

I direct the attention of my colleagues to these conditions because, though they were directly related to the election in 1966 of the first Republican Congressman to serve from Albany since 1920, they remain little known. Mr. Frangella, whom I have known for a number of years, is dedicated to the eradication of the noisome elements he describes and to the restoration of good government. It is worth noting that, as he points out, the Democratic leadership of Albany has absolutely no philosophic relationship to the national party whose banner they claim.

Under unanimous consent I include Mr. Frangella's speech in the appendix of the RECORD:

SPEECH DELIVERED TO REPUBLICAN COUNTY LEGISLATIVE CANDIDATES ON JULY 8, 1967, AT THE TEN EYCK MOTEL BY ALBANY COUNTY REPUBLICAN CHAIRMAN, JOSEPH C. FRANGELLA

Ladies and gentlemen, we are gathered here for the purpose of having a meeting of the minds and preparing to launch the Republican campaign for this year's election in Albany County. Although we are out of office at the county level, we do have the greatest of opportunities to turn a long history of defeats into victories. Our party, and you as candidates, has an abundance of issues. You, as candidates, and the party, also have the trend of the times all with you; because, although the rest of the United States is 1967—Albany County is 1897.

Albany County has a stagnant government which is over 50 years behind the times. Albany County is run like Tamany Hall ran New York City over 50 years ago. This county has a government by crony; it is an example of the spoils system at its worst; it has a government within a government; there isn't anything like it anywhere else in this state or nation. You can go to Schenectady, Syracuse, Cincinnati, or Sioux Falls and nowhere will you find such backwardness, secretiveness or obstructionism to progress as we have here in Albany County. Let's take a look at the record:

In Albany County who writes the county and city insurance and at what cost, is secret (can it be because some public official is involved?); county employment and advancement is mostly by political handpicking and people are illegally kept in positions all contrary to the merit system which was accepted in the rest of this country in the 1880's, sales to the county at huge profits have been exposed by the State Investigation Commission and the county bosses did everything in their power to stop the investigation and when the facts came out they ignored them and permitted Mr. Ryan, the then county purchasing agent, to resign, unscathed; profiteering through deals made in buying properties on which taxes were not paid was exposed by the State and one of the profiteers, Mr. Lynch, the then county clerk, was permitted to resign unscathed. Mr. Lynch is now the man to see for jobs in the city and county.

The board of supervisors is bossed by Mr. Clyne, who doesn't even have a vote, and the democratic majority votes en-masse—like a bunch of trained seals—on signals given by Mr. Clyne, the ringmaster without a vote.

We have county government by Clyne, Ryan, and Lynch.

Our county obstructs aid to poverty; it is backwards in mental health assistance; its budget is a mystery.

Its only justification is that the Barnes machine was worse. Ladies and gentlemen, Billy Barnes went out before I was born. But the reference to Mr. Barnes by the Albany County Democrats reveals their intellectual antiquity. Their thoughts and deeds are of the time of Mr. Barnes' rule—over 50 years ago. The problem is Clyne, Ryan, and Lynch—not Barnes. The character of your county government precedes the automobile and the airplane and it is intentionally kept that way by the thinking of Clyne, Ryan, and Lynch.

It is significant to observe that Clyne, Ryan and Lynch fight the Citizens Party of Cohoes at every turn. The Citizens defeated them and they have received nationwide recognition for their excellent work in government. The Democrats tried to block their every move for progress. Cohoes is an anathema because Cohoes stands for progress—and Clyne, Ryan and Lynch don't like that. They like to keep the clock turned back for the machine, and bossism and the spoils system.

The Albany County Democrats are not like the national Democrats or the State Democrats. Their political philosophy is as unlike that of John F. Kennedy as Night unto day. They have produced no one of importance in State or national politics because their training and thinking is inimical to all modern political thinking. The Albany County Democratic machine is a backward, outdated world unto itself. I accepted the position of Albany County Republican Chairman for the specific purpose of taking the challenge of bringing twentieth century government to Albany County. I am glad that you have joined with me in accepting that challenge. I ask you to work, and work, and work; to speak, talk, walk, write and bring the message to the people of this county. I ask you to join with me to make it crystal clear that the Republican Party and its candidates have cast off the shroud of defeat and blanket of complacency and that we are in this fight to win—and that we will win.

I can't believe that people of this county like the government they're getting, that being pot-holed streets and roads and uncollected trash. It is up to you to bring home the message that there is a better government available and that you can provide it. That is the key to victory. It is up to you. There is a lot at stake in this election, particularly in the contest for the county legislature where we have an excellent chance to change the entire complexion of county government. The board of supervisors is dead!

We can now put life in county government and move it out of the 1890's.

My door is open. I am here to help you. I will do all in my power to help. However, I expect you to dig in and do your part and I know you will.

Let's forget the past and bring Albany County back to life.

Excuses for Violence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE SKUBITZ
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 14, 1967

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, I insert the following editorial from the Arkansas City, Kans., Daily Traveler into the RECORD for the benefit of all—particularly for the benefit of those who have misinterpreted the recent action of the House in passing the antiriot bill. In no way was the antiriot bill a statement to the effect that Congress sees no social ills in this country. It was, however, a statement to mean that violence which threatens the lives and property of citizens of this society cannot be tolerated or excused. I commend to the attention of my colleagues the editorial views of the Arkansas City Daily Traveler, of July 21, as follows:

EXCUSES FOR VIOLENCE

Newark has been devastated by a riot that lasted four days, killed at least 24 persons, wounded 1,100, and resulted in the destruction of property valued at over $5 million. It was a bloody rebellion, a lawless rampage of looting, burning, an orgy of terror.

Now the theories on what made it all happen and the excuses for the lawlessness are being put forth on behalf of the mob by any number of experts. "Racists, brutal white cops and a mayor who refused to work with the poor, helpless, frustrated people," said one expert who is on the payroll of the antipoverty war. A hot, humid, summer also took its share of the blame, just as it has elsewhere. Complaints about housing, jobs, education were aired, and "police brutality" and an end to poverty were demanded as a cure to riots.

Any or all of these things might have been a cause of Negro discontent in the ghetto area of Newark. There can be no denying that the lack of good training for good jobs and the subsequent benefits of good housing and other material benefits which the good job provides is a source of great frustration for many Negro citizens.

But frustration, summer heat, unemployment have never been considered license for mob action which results in the death of law officers, innocent bystanders, and the looting and burning of the heart of a city. When we reach the point of condoning the acts of vandals and hoodlums because they might be frustrated, we will have condemned a lawful society to live and die by the laws of the jungle.

Governor Hughes called the rioting a "criminal insurrection," and that seems entirely appropriate. A small minority of the city's Negro population participated in the fighting, 3 or 4 percent, according to the mayor. These people were led and encouraged by outsiders who came to the city to take advantage of the volatile situation which existed there.

A Negro Olympic athlete, born and reared in the area of the Newark riot, visited his home town during and immediately following the rioting. He declared that the continuing burning, and sniping from the rooftops was the work of a small group of outside agitators, possibly 20 or 25 persons, who came to Newark for no other reason than to incite bloody insurrection.

Newark's agony and the report of the traveling agitators gave impetus to a bill before the House of Representatives in Washington Thursday which would make it a federal offense to cross a state line with the intent of starting a riot. The bill passed through the House by a 347 to 70 vote. Whether this bill can be effective or not is subject to question and many lawmakers who voted "no" felt it would do little good.

But the fact that the bill was passed reflect the growing concern of Congress and the general public. This law, of course, will not provide the complete solution. But it does represent society's effort to protect itself against a violent, radical element which has declared war against everything civilized society stands for.

Enthusiasm for Headstart Continues To Grow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE H. HAMILTON
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 14, 1967

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, Operation Headstart has established itself as the most successful and most popular of the community action programs in the Ninth Congressional District of Indiana.

Enthusiasm for the preschool program has grown as the program itself has continued to grow and it promises to continue to develop in efficiency and in its worth to the communities.

The acceptance of this educational experiment is demonstrated in the increasing number of newspaper accounts throughout the district. The articles attempt to assess the efficiency and the scope of these training projects. On the whole, they have been enthusiastic and complimentary. Mr. Speaker, I include the following account from the Columbus, Ind., Republic, the Seymour Daily Tribune, and the Orleans Progress Examiner:

[From the Republic, Columbus, Ind., July 18, 1967]

HEADSTART PROJECT ALREADY A SUCCESS

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—This is the first in a series of articles on the summer Head Start program in Bartholomew, Brown and Jackson counties. Today background information and philosophy will be given. Future articles, all prepared by the Community Action Program staff, will deal with programs designed and manned by local volunteers to help implement the project.)

We all like children. And, we all like to help make their lives easier, happier and more productive than our own. That's the spirit of Project Head Start.

The local summer Head Start project, under the asupices of the Community Action Program of Bartholomew, Brown and Jackson counties, has appealed to the hearts and minds of our communities and made the program unique, vibrant, and an unqualified success.

The program is designed to help disadvantaged children catch up to those more economically fortunate by improving their health, verbal skills, and ability to work and play with their peers before beginning school.

Mrs. Harold Higgins, president of the Tri-County board, puts it this way: "This is truly a community project. And all of us are gaining by giving these children special attention at an age when they are most impressionable. They are "our" children, and how they adjust to school and their later life affects us all."

Apparently, many in the communities of the three counties agree with Mrs. Higgins. "The number and quality of those volunteering their services for the benefit of the program has astounded everyone. So far we have put 90–100 volunteers to work and the phone hasn't stopped ringing!" says Robert Joplin, director of the tri-county program.

Approximately 40 persons spent a total of 400 hours going into the homes of prospective Head Start students to select those who would benefit most from the program. Other women are spending every morning for eight weeks assisting professional teachers in the classrooms. Women have volunteered to act as Hostesses when the Parent Organizations meet.

Teen-agers have offered to babysit at the same time so that the parents are free to go to these meetings. Others with special talents in the arts, for instance, have volunteered to present programs in the classrooms at the request of the teachers. The Bartholomew county public library has donated films to show to the children during Parent Organization meetings.

One hears much these days about "disadvantaged children." It is far more appropriate to speak of a disadvantaged society if that society is not able to nurture the skills and talents of all its citizens rather than merely the privileged segment. Project Head Start has been established to help prevent the fact of limited development from leaving a permanent mark on some of its children.

One of the first things that Project Head Start can do for disadvantaged children and the public is to help eradicate the notion that all children so classified (by means of family income, area of residence, etc.) are, in truth, disadvantaged. While it is true that most children from deprived backgrounds start to school behind those economically more fortunate, in such important skills as language, problem solving ability, and apparent desire to learn, this pattern is by no means uniform.

"A few years ago, it was suggested that the poor in our society were really 'invisible'—not because we refuse to see them," explains Robert Rouse, summer project director and principal of Booth-Setser school. "In the past two years, the members of the CAP boards have attempted to point out the problems to assure that we don't ignore poverty in our midst. Project Head Start is one attempt to attack the problem by giving children a better start in school, thus hoping to break the degenerating cycle which poverty creates."

Children raised in an environment where questions and communication are discouraged soon learn not to express their curiosity verbally. They therefore don't grow intellectually at the same rate as those children who are constantly encouraged to question and who are rewarded for their intellectual achievements.

Also, parents who have only experienced failure have a poor self-image, which is communicated to their children. Dropping out of school at the age of 16 becomes the norm, and repeating grades until this age is reached is expected. In order to break this cycle, Head Start attempts to improve the child's image of himself and to show that he can succeed in school. When adult, he should also fit into the mainstream of American society.

TYPICAL DAY IN HEADSTART CLASSROOM

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—This is the second in a series of articles about the summer's Headstart program in Bartholomew, Brown and Jackson counties. Head Start is designed to help disadvantaged children "catch up" and enter kindergarten or first grade at a level to compete with economically more fortunate classmates.)

A few children entering the Head Start program have had previous informal or formal play experience. For the majority, however, this is their first encounter with school. As such, it is a vitally important contact which may influence the child's reactions to all future education.

The program is carefully designed to give the children a good balance between individual and group activities, between intellectual and physical activities. An essential ingredient is a low teacher-student ratio. In our local program, some classrooms have as few as three children for every teacher or aide. There are no more than 16 students in any one classroom.

A typical day in a Head Start classroom:

9–9:15—Greeting by the teacher and a "good morning" song.

9:15–9:30—Music. Records are played in many classrooms, and children learn rhythms simultaneously by learning to skip, gallop, etc. to music.

9:30–10:30—Work-play period. During this hour, the children rotate through several activities such as playing house (to encourage role-playing and sociability); art activities (finger painting, making collages, playing with sack puppets, rubbings, crayon etchings); science (watching goldfish, gerbels, etc. which are in the room); and quiet activities (simple puzzles, peg boards, blocks, etc.)

10:30–10:40—Clean-up.

10:40–11—Snack and rest period.

11–11:30—Outside play (organized games as well as free play on the playground equipment).

11:30–11:45—Story time (usually read by the teacher and aides).

11:45–12:15—Lunch.

12:15–12:30—Clean-up.

The schedule is flexible, however, taking advantage of special programs designed by the teacher, and special situations in individual classrooms. Field trips to such places as Sap's bakery, the libraries, fire stations, drug stores, a game reserve and supermarkets are planned for many classrooms.

Professional people such as doctors and the county health nurses will speak to the children informally, allowing them to play with the stethoscopes, read a thermometer, etc., in a relaxed, positive atmosphere. A "science magic" program is being presented in the classrooms in Columbus.

In our 3-county area, there are 15 classrooms with 15 children in each. In addition to the professional teacher in each room, there is an aide who has first-hand knowledge of the environment from which the students are drawn, and several volunteers who work with the children for at least a week at a time. These volunteers help with art activities, assist at meal time, on the playground and on field trips.

"The Head Start program is a very exciting one," says Mrs. Judy Bricker, teacher at the State street school in Columbus. "I'm enjoying the close student-teacher relationship and the opportunity to influence these children. The conditions for their learning are ideal and they're so easily stimulated!"

The team of teachers at Crothersville, Misses Connie Keith and Sarah Land, have been especially effective at getting to know the community in which they work, and they too are finding the project challenging and provocative. "After this summer, routine teaching will probably seem dull," says Miss Land.

Choosing the 225 children who would benefit from the Head Start program was a time consuming and difficult task, accomplished with the aid of volunteers from the area.

Possible candidates' names were submitted by many sources—schools, churches, the welfare departments, doctors and individuals who knew of the program. Each of these families was visited and interviewed to find out if, indeed, the child was eligible. Then, forms with detailed information on the child and his home environment, as well as the volunteers' recommendations, were submitted to the county Boards for consideration and final selection of students.

At this point, teachers made second visitations to the homes to inform the parents of the child's acceptance into the program, and to get acquainted with the child and his family. Teachers did this before the program officially started and before they were receiving any pay.

Psychologists Help Headstart

(Editor's Note.—This is the third in a series of reports prepared by the staff of the local Community Action Program on the Head Start program.)

The summer Head Start program of Bartholomew, Brown and Jackson Counties is the only one in Southern Indiana to include a psychological services program.

Dr. Thomas Orr, Dr. David Elwood and Dr. Joanne Stiles, staff members of the Bartholmew County Mental Health clinic, are under contract with the Community Action Program to assist teachers in understanding and dealing with special behavioral problems they encounter in the Head Start program. These services are being provided at minimal cost to the program.

The psychologists will visit each classroom once a week to observe the classroom activity and to counsel with the teachers. Such problems as short attention span, lack of motivation, hyper-activity, and poor verbal communication skills are observed and the specialists will assist teachers in handling the children effectively.

Psychological services will have a continuing influence on the Head Start program. Psychological problems of disadvantaged children are clearly the result of inadequate or misguided learning experiences, and psychologists are helping the teachers to stimulate and recognize good responses on the part of the children while discouraging undesirable ones.

Another basic part of the Head Start program is the health services aspect. Many children participating in the program have not seen a doctor or dentist. They are asked to do so for two reasons: (1) To receive routine immunizations and examinations, and (2) to establish a relationship between the child's family and a doctor.

The short-term goal is to prepare the children for kindergarten or first grade. Children in poor health are absent from school frequently, putting them immediately at a disadvantage. Also, they may have chronic conditions which could be treated and cured if diagnosed in a early stage.

"Keeping in mind the traditions of this region as regards medical care and the strong doctor-patient relationship, the health program has been designed to encourage a personal relationship between these families and their "family doctor."

Parents of children in the program are asked to select a doctor, and all doctors in the area are informed of the requirements of the program. Once the examination and immunization program has begun, doctors submit their bills directly to the Community Action Program for payment. Some doctors and dentists have offered to set minimum fees or not to charge at all.

Before children visit the doctors, complete medical histories are collected by the county health nurses. They are also taking samples for urinalysis, giving vision and hearing tests, administering tuberculosis and hemoglobin tests, and making extensive notes for the doctors. "These nurses are invaluable to the doctors," explained Dr. Charles Rau, voluntary medical director. "When the children come to the doctors' offices, they have already been observed, and the doctors are alerted to potential problems."

Head Start students are asked to visit dentist for a complete examination, a set of X-rays and a fluoride treatment. These expenses also are paid by CAP. The children will be visited in their classrooms by Mrs. William Gripman, a dental hygienist, who will demonstrate correct care of teeth and answer the children's questions.

It is hoped that this added exposure to professional people will have a positive impression on the children. Parents will be encouraged to continue medical care for the whole family when the program is officially over at the end of the summer.

There is also a social services program supplementing the summer Head Start program.

The social workers from each county welfare deparment have visited each Head Start classroom, conferring with teachers on techniques of working with these children and their parents. They also informed the teachers of any general background information available on particular children that have been associated with the welfare departments in the past.

County welfare social workers will make home visitations on a selective basis and will act as a referral agency.

In addition, the department will be available for consultations with teachers, aides and staff on specific problems; and they will encourage parents to participate in the parents' organizations.

It is felt that this cooperation between the welfare departments of the three counties and the Head Start project will be mutually beneficial in dealing with the disadvantaged in communities.

Nutrition Program Vital Part of Headstart Work

(Editor's Note.—This is the fourth in a series of articles on the summer's Head Start program.)

NUTRITION PROGRAM

One of the most immediately rewarding facets of the summer Head Start project has been the nutrition program.

Mrs. Fred Brownson, a new resident of Columbus who had college training in dietetics, volunteered to design menus and solve the many mechanical details connected with providing the snacks and hot lunches each day.

Larry Jayne, an Indiana university student working with CAP this summer on a work-study program (IU pays 90 per cent of his salary and CAP pays 10 per cent) delivers the food to the 10 centers; and Bill Dunfee Chevrolet of Columbus has donated a station wagon for the eight weeks for use in making these deliveries.

In addition, local grocers have been extremely generous with discounts on food and supplies. Louden's Food Fair in Columbus is offering a substantial discount on all purchases of meat, produce and eggs. Columbus Wholesale is selling paper goods to the program at a discount; and the Don Marion produce stand in Seymour is discounting purchases of fresh fruits and vegetables. Most dairy and bread items are purchased locally by the cooks for each school center.

Each child participating in Head Start receives a mid-morning snack (juice or milk, crackers or cookies) as well as a well-balanced hot meal at noon. This meal, which contains a total of at least one-third of the child's daily nutritional needs, is composed of meat or eggs, fruit, vegetable, milk and bread and butter.

The cooks, who are experienced in cooking for children, have taken special interest in this program. Not only do they make the meals nutritional and tasty, but special care is taken to give the plates eye-appeal. As a result, the children are eating much more than first graders normally do. One little girl was reported to have taken four helpings of green beans the first day of classes.

Parents Need Involvement in Headstart Program

(Editor's Note.—This is the last in a series of articles prepared by the staff of the local Community Action program on the summer's Head Start program to help disadvantaged children in the year prior to their entering kindergarten or first grade.)

The summer Head Start project is attempting to involve the parents in as many ways as possible.

On a group basis, this is done by forming parents organizations at each of the 10 centers. The parents meet three times during the 8-week period.

"The basic purpose," according to Wes Bratcher, field director, "is to inform the parents of what their children are doing in the daily program." A movie showing a typical classroom day was shown at the initial meeting of the group. Teachers and staff were on hand to answer questions about the program.

At future meetings, parents will be encouraged to discuss their children with the teachers and other parents in informal meetings, and to develop ways in which parents can further help and understand the children at home. They will talk about mutual problems such as discipline.

Each center will appoint one representative to a policy advisory board which will be composed 50 per cent of parents and 50 per cent of public and private agencies concerned with the Head Start project. This board will provide communication between the professional community and the community to be served. It will also channel complaints and encourage the parents to participate more fully in the total Head Start program.

Many parents of children in the program also have volunteered to work as classroom aides and as hostesses for the parent organisation meetings.

Volunteers of all ages and inclinations can be utilized in the program. A list of those with special talents or hobbies is being developed now, and volunteers from Brown and Jackson counties are particularly needed. Such persons would be available to visit classrooms on request to expose children to areas in which the volunteers excel (examples: slides of trips, rock collection, folk music).

Anyone interested in participating in this way should call Mr. Bratcher, at the CAP office, 372-8407. Volunteers will be contacted by the classroom teachers, who will arrange programs at mutually convenient times.

Volunteers play an important role in the Head Start project. They give the children exposure to people of all ages and backgrounds. Also, they themselves benefit from giving of their energy and talents.

The fact that our local program has the support of young and old from a cross-section of society is a real tribute to the communities themselves. Because of this joint effort to eradicate the social problems among us, our lives—and the lives of the Head Start children—will be fuller.

[From the Seymour Daily Tribune, Seymour, Ind., July 27, 1967]

Eighty County Youngsters in "Catch-Up" Program

(By Carol Wait)

More than 80 disadvantaged children in Jackson County this summer became the youngest and happiest recruits in the battle against poverty as they attend learn-and-play Head Start classes.

Head Start is a program to help youngsters from low income families "catch up" so they enter kindergarten or first grade able to compete with their economically more fortunate classmates. It is conducted here by the Tri-County Community Action Program (CAP). Dr. Robert Rouse, principal of Booth-Setser School in Columbus, is director for the summer project involving 225 students in 15 classrooms in Jackson, Bartholomew and Brown counties.

Typical of the five centers located in Jackson County are the two at Seymour-Jackson school which draw youngsters from the area served by the Seymour Community schools.

The day's schedule is designed to give the children a good balance between individual and group and between intellectual and physical activities. An essential ingredient is a low teacher-student ratio and in each classroom the teacher is assisted by an aide and by one or more volunteers.

The three-and one-half hour daily program includes music and stories, outside play, and a classroom work-play period which might include art activities such as finger painting, making collages, playing with sack puppets, rubbings, crayon etchings; science observations and experiments and a quiet time. As they play, Head Starters are absorbing new experiences, learning to listen and to ask questions and receiving training in the basic skills for kindergarten.

Special experiences are provided through field trips and visitors. The local classes have gone on a nature walk conducted by A. J. Stiles in nearby Gaiser Park and have toured the library, fire station, airport and made homemade ice cream at a teacher's home. Also scheduled are a swimming trip to the Seymour pool and a visit to a farm.

Guests in the local classroom have been Mrs. Mildred Graves, children's librarian at the Seymour Public Library, who told a story, Police Chief Robert Gill and Stewart Hackman, who displayed his butterfly collection.

"Each child in the Seymour classes needs to be here," Miss Barbara Burns, one of two Seymour-Jackson teachers, stated. "It's amazing how much improvement the children have shown since the classes began in June."

Improvements in attention span, verbal skills and ability to work and play with their peers are apparent as the sessions continue.

Some, Miss Burns said, will be ready to enter the regular school kindergarten in the fall better prepared to benefit from the training offered. Others, she felt, would need a longer period, such as would be available in the proposed year 'round Head Start program now under consideration by the Tri-County board.

The county nurse has vistied the classrooms conducting hearing and vision and tuberculin testing and students are referred to the family doctor for examination and immunization and to a dentist for examination, X-rays and fluoride treatment, with the expenses, usually at a minimum rate, paid by the CAP.

Three times during the eight weeks of Head Start classes the parents of the students meet to discuss the children, their progress and any problems and many of the parents are assisting in the program either as classroom aides or as hosts for the parents' meetings.

The budget for the current Head Start program with $44,877 with 80 per cent provided by the federal government and the remaining 20 per cent from local sources in "in kind" contributions such as donations, classroom space, office space, volunteer work, etc.

Local workers in the Head Start program are: Teachers: Seymour—Miss Burns and Miss Barbara Fox; Crothersville—Miss Connie Kieth and Miss Sarah Land (jointly); Brownstown—Mrs. Robert G. Davis; Medora—Mary Lee.

Teacher Aides: Seymour—Mrs. Susan York and Mrs. Juanita Ruddick; Crothersville—Mrs. Carolyn Anthony; Brownstown—Mrs. Forest Stewart; and Medora—Mrs. Bruce Bevers and Mrs. Persinger.

Transportation: Seymour—Doyle Fulps and Mrs. Harold Brackemeyer, Crothersville—Marvin Sparrow; Medora—Mrs. Thomas Bevers; Brownstown—James Blevins and Mrs. Joseph Wayman.

Cooks: Seymour—Maude Heacock; Crothersville—Naomi Hall; Brownstown—Dorothy Hansome; Medora—Dixie Lee Bane.

[From the Progess Examiner, Orleans, Ind., July 20, 1967]

"Headstart" Progresses in Orleans

The Headstart Program in Orleans is now in its sixth week, with fourteen preschoolers enrolled under the guidance of Mrs. Beverly White.

To date, Mrs White reports the children have learned the basic colors, and they are now recognizing and learning numbers.

Every day the youngsters have art, craft, music, outdoor play and table manners, and on Fridays, swimming lessons are given.

Future plans include a visit to the dentist for an examination, and meeting with the children's parents.

Besides their every-day activities, the children have visited the Orleans Airport, the local police station, newspaper office, and the fire department.

Related to Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson's project, the Office of Economic Opportunity, the Headstart Program was first introduced in the Orleans Schools last summer. At that time, thirteen children were enrolled.

$3280 was allowed by the government for the Orleans program in 1966 and this year, the federal share was $4723, an increase of $1443. Comparing last year's budget with this year's, they each include a teacher's salary, a teacher's aid salary, supplies and games, breakfast, a mid-morning snack, medical exams and corrective work, and transportation. Added to the medical exams this year, is dental exams, each with a follow-up allowance. $5 is allowed for a medical check-up and $17 extra if an x-ray is needed, etc. The same amount is allowed for a dental examination and $14 extra if fillings are required. These amounts are based on per child.

Headstart children are selected from low-income bracket families, who could not afford kindergarten fees.

On June 14, Reverend Billy Graham endorsed the war on poverty and strongly commended the programs of the Office of Economic Opportunity. For the first time in seventeen years, he appeared in Washington, D.C. to express his support for a government program.

Graham addressed a bipartisan audience of 104 Congressmen and 48 business leaders who are members of OEO's Community Action Committee of the Business Leadership Advisory Council. He told them the poverty programs should not "be involved in partisan politics."

At one time, the Evangelist was not in favor of the anti-poverty program, but a few months ago, he began to study the subject of poverty in the Bible. He noted every passage in the Bible from Genesis to Revelation that had to do with our responsibility to the poor and found that it is one of the greatest teachings in the Scriptures.

In his message to the audience, he quoted a passage from the Bible on poverty, one of the laws that God laid down, not only for Israel, but for all nations and having equal validity with the 10 Commandments.

"If there be among you a poor man who is one of thy brethren, within any of thy gates in thy land, shall the Lord thy God giveth thee, thy shall not harden thy heart nor shut thy hand from thy poor brother. Thou shalt surely give him, and thine heart shall not be grieved."

In other words, you are not going to lose by giving "because for this thing the Lord thy God shall bless thee in all thy affairs and all that thou puttest thy hand to: For the poor shall never cease out of the land."

Graham had found 175 references similar to the one mentioned in the Scriptures.

His support of the OEO is based on first-hand knowledge. He visited Job Corps camps and other antipoverty projects, (Headstart), and one of the things that impressed him was that these programs are not give-away programs. He thought they were until he began to look into them.

In closing, Evanglist Graham said, "these programs are helping people help themselves. They're giving people an opportunity."

Mrs. White, a first-grade teacher in Orleans, has been able to compare a prescholar, who has not had Headstart with one who has, and in her opinion there is a noticeable difference in the two. The Headstarter knows what is expected of him and appears more at ease with others.

Hit the Enemy Where It Hurts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 14, 1967

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, after listening to the recent bipartisan attacks upon the administration's bombing policy, I am beginning to wonder if we ever intend to bring this costly and controversial war to a victorious conclusion. And, in the midst of such criticism, I am appalled that the President can, with a straight face, persist in his request for added troop strength, especially when our bombing tactics will afford them little more than minimal protection. The following editorial which appeared in the August 11 edition of the Chicago Tribune seems to suggest that in addition to the Vietcong, our heretofore ineffective bombing policy may be partially responsible for the steadily increasing number of American fatalities.

The editorial follows:

HIT THE ENEMY WHERE IT HURTS

Senators of both parties have called on the Johnson administration to drop all restrictions in bombing communist North Viet Nam before committing more American troops to the meat chopper of ground warfare. Sen. John C. Stennis, chairman of the Senate preparedness subcommittee, said that it was "unreasonable" to send 45,000 more men into the ground war, as the President plans, while air and sea warfare is under restriction.

The subcommittee's recommendation was made after Rep. Gerald R. Ford, House Republican leader, had voiced a similar demand. Mr. Ford said he saw "no justification" for sending another American soldier to Viet Nam until President Johnson removed restraints against attacks on a large number of key industrial and military installations in North Viet Nam.

The criticism of administration policy was especially sharp from members of Mr. Johnson's own party. Sen. Jackson of Washington said the communist port of Haiphong should no longer be considered off limits, and he asserted that the bombing campaign was "a long way" from making major port, petroleum storage, and electric power installations in North Viet Nam useless.

Sen. Cannon of Nevada stated that the administration was handicapping the military by its restrictions and consequently was delaying an end to the war. Sen. Symington of Missouri referred to the immunity extended by the administration to the principal communist air base at Phuc Yen, 15 miles from Hanoi.

The subcommittee submitted its views after testimony by Adm. U. S. Grant Sharp, commander of Pacific naval forces, that North Vietnamese military targets should be put on the eligible list. Adm. Sharp's views were in accord with those of the joint chiefs of staff, whose recommendations have been disapproved by Secretary of Defense McNamara and the White House.

It is elementary common sense to pursue a strategy of knocking the Communists out of the war by air and sea attack before sending in more ground forces as cannon fodder. The United States has already suffered more than 87,000 casualties, and the war is as far from decision as it was five years ago. The American people will not reconcile themselves to the sacrifice of their sons when the enemy is granted privileged sanctuaries.

Captured Arab Tells of Nasser's Murder Plans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 14, 1967

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, more examples of President Nasser's brutality have recently been exposed, this time by one of his own soldiers.

A captured Egyptian soldier told of a plan to destroy an entire Israeli village, murdering every man, woman, and child. The officers were to shoot any soldier who permitted one living soul to remain in the village.

The prisoner also disclosed that Egyptian soldiers returning from the battlefront were killed by their own men for fear of bringing the bad news of defeat to the people at home.

I commend to the attention of our colleagues an article which appeared in the August 4, 1967, issue of the Jewish Press, concerning these acts of brutality.

The article follows:

CAPTURED ARAB TELLS OF NASSER'S MURDER PLANS

A captured Egyptian soldier, who on July 2 participated in the violation of the cease fire shooting in the region of Kantara, has unreeled one of the most sinister stories to reach these shores.

The soldier, who belonged to an Egyptian commando battalion which crossed the Suez into Sinai in boats between June 30 and July 1, told of orders his group had been given as recently as last Tuesday.

The Egyptian high command had warned all men in their active front line battalions that they were not to be taken prisoner as they renewed their shelling of Israeli positions.

"We were told to fight and kill as many Israelis as we could with our last breath," the soldier is reported to have told Israeli intelligence officers.

"When our battle weary soldiers managed to straggle back across the Suez after the cease fire was announced," the soldier continued, "our battalion was ordered to fire on every man identifying himself as a soldier in the Egyptian forces. They didn't say it but we knew the high command did not want these men to return home to tell of our defeat. I remember how some of the men swam across the short span of water of the canal. As the men reached the beaches they were cut down by machine gun fire. It was a sight I shall never forget."

Although Israeli troops claim to have captured the soldier, he said he had deliberately permitted himself to be captured. He said he had enough of the orders he had been given.

"During the preparation period, before Israel began the attack," the soldier continued, "we were told that we were not to take any Israeli prisoners. They said we did not have enough food. Our officers said a dead Israeli was the best kind. The dead Israeli soldiers will stand as warnings to the others and they will throw up their hands and we will walk into Tel Aviv without firing a shot."

The soldier who said he had a brother and a cousin in Jordan in the Hashemite brigade (there were six Hashemite brigades) said they had been stationed on the West Bank under orders to destroy the village of Motza and to murder every man, woman and child in the village.

He said he had received a letter from his brother just before the war broke out, in which he said the men in his brother's battalion expressed disbelief at the order to murder every man, woman and child in the village. They argued with their commander that they would shoot only the men of the village and any women who bore arms. The men, the Egyptian soldier told intelligence men, were sickened at the thought of killing children. But, the officers said they, "would shoot any man who permitted one living soul to remain in the village."

The Egyptian further explained that they were told the attack would come at night. The men were told to wear light clothing so that they could move rapidly. They were told they could not carry rations, but that their assignment would be so quick they would be back to their own lines before breakfast. The plan was to blow up as much of the city as possible, and then have mop-up crews go through the houses systematically machine-gunning any living thing. "My brother even said his commander joked, 'even if you see a dog, shoot him, he may be an Israeli spy'."

The comments of the captured Egyptian soldier were verified by an Israeli commando, Haim Peled, who told reporters he had seen, with his own eyes, the Egyptians machine-guning their own men as they returned from the battlefront. The high command feared a revolt by Egyptians if word of the defeat got back to the civilian population. Captured orders from a Jordanian headquarters company on the West Bank verified every statement of the Egyptian soldier.

The soldier admitted many of the newer men who had just come into his outfit did not know the true facts of the Egyptian casualties.

"The young men brought in within the past few days say there is great jubilation at home because of our victory. They are shocked when we tell them, secretly, it was the Israelis who were victorious. One of the new ones turned in a comrade who explained the great disaster. That soldier was court marshalled for "lying." I have a family in Cairo. Before I crawled over to the Israeli side I left my credentials on the dead body of another comrade. Let my commander think I have been killed in battle. Some day I shall return from the dead to see my family. The poverty at home is very great. It was greatest before the war broke out. The captured Egyptian said he knew that thousands of Jews who lived in Cairo were put in prison, "Mostly for their own safety," he said.

"Many of them were wealthy. They are exporters mostly. Whole families are in jail and I have been told that a number are being shot. They have been accused of being spies. How many are left I do not know, but there cannot be too many. The officer who has been put in charge of the Jewish prisoners is a very mean man. He once had a command, but his men rebelled because of his cruelty and all of them were shot. They moved him to the job of taking care of the prisoners to prevent a similar incident."

Sources who have been able to get fragmentary reports out of Cairo, claim a great many Jewish civilian prisoners are still in the jails. They say some executions are going on but not as many as the soldier would want us to believe.

The International Red Cross has not been permitted to visit the prisoners in Cairo and fear that disease has caught many is prevalent.

"Many other soldiers would defect," the Egyptian soldier admitted, "But they have only sent men with families to the front. If a man defects the families are made to suffer. I hope Israel would take over all Egypt. The Jews have a good heart although they are ferocious fighters."

The soldier asked if he could serve in the Israeli army to help liberate his people. Israeli intelligence said he would be more helpful as a source of information. The prisoner has been extremely cooperative.

Outstanding Federal Court Officials Name Garnishment as Key to Worst Abuses in Consumer Credit, and Endorse Provision of H.R. 11601 To Abolish It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 14, 1967

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, the Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs of the House Committee on Banking and Currency is now conducting hearings on H.R. 11601, the Consumer Credit Protection Act, which contains many provisions dealing with consumer credit that were not included in S. 5, the truth-in-lending bill passed by the Senate on July 11.

One of those controversial additional provisions would prohibit the garnishment of workers' wages as a means of collecting debts on consumer credit transactions. The administration has not, as yet, taken an affirmative position on this provision—although I hope it will do so. The issue, we were told, is still under study and review by administration officials.

However, four outstanding officials of the U.S. courts, men with many years of experience as bankruptcy referees, told us Friday in our hearing that garnishment is generally the precipitating factor in personal bankruptcies, and they described it as a vicious practice used generally—not always, but generally—as a deliberate selling tool in loading down consumers with more debt than the vendors know the person can handle.

All of us on the subcommittee who heard the testimony of these men were appalled at the information they gave us. The referees were the Honorable Estes Snedecor, of Portland, Oreg., now in his 31st year of service in that position; the Honorable Elmore Whitehurst, of Dallas, Tex., former clerk of the House Judiciary Committee, and a referee for 10 years; the Honorable Clive W. Bare, of Knoxville, Tenn., who has also been serving for 10 years; and the Honorable James E. Moriarty, of Los Angeles, who has served as a referee for 4½ years.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the Members to read the statements of these court officials for an insight into the purposes of the antigarnishment provisions of H.R. 11601.

STATEMENT BY REFEREE ESTES SNEDECOR

Following, Mr. Speaker, is the testimony we received last Friday from Referee Snedecor of Portland:

STATEMENT OF ESTES SNEDECOR, REFEREE IN BANKRUPTCY, PORTLAND, OREG., BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON CONSUMER AFFAIRS OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY, FRIDAY, AUGUST 11, 1967, ON H.R. 11601 AND RELATED BILLS

My name is Estes Snedecor. I live in Portland, Oregon. After practicing law in Oregon for 26 years, I was appointed referee in bankruptcy in December 1936. This is my 31st year of service in that capacity. I am a member of the National Bankruptcy Conference, a past president of the National Conference of Referees in bankruptcy and am now serving on the Advisory Committee appointed by The Chief Justice of the Supreme Court to prepare uniform rules of procedure and practice in courts of bankruptcy.

I shall confine my testimony in favor of Title II of H.R. 11601 which seeks to prohibit the garnishment of wages or salary due any employee. The underlying causes of personal or consumer bankruptcies are: unemployment, over extension of credit, deficiency claims arising from repossessions of automobiles and appliances sold on contract, excessive interest rates and unusual medical and hospital bills, but the one overriding cause precipitating consumer bankruptcies is the garnishment or threat of garnishment of wages coupled with an unrealistic wage exemption. This is dramatically demonstrated by comparing the number of consumer bankruptcies in states permitting garnishment of wages with those prohibiting garnishment entirely or restricting it to only a small portion of wages.

To illustrate, in fiscal year 1966 California had 37,545 bankruptcies while New York, with a comparable population, had only 7,462 bankruptcies. Why should there be so many in California and so few in comparison in New York? It cannot be due to different economic conditions because less than 10% of these bankruptcies represent business failures. Over 90% of the bankrupts are individuals whose available income is in the form of a wage or salary, referred to as consumer bankrupts. In California garnishment up to 50% of wages is permitted but the debtor must apply to the court to obtain a release of this amount of his wages. There is no automatic exemption, whereas in New York 90% of wages is automatically exempt. Only 10% is subject to garnishment at any time. The unique feature of the New York law is that the garnishment is a continuing levy of 10% of the man's net wages until the creditor's judgment has been paid in full. However, only one execution and garnishment at a time may be in effect. If a second garnishment is served, it must wait until the first judgment is satisfied. In effect this law provides a simple and orderly method of satisfying old debts in instalments not exceeding 10% of the laborer's net earnings. A similar statute is in effect in New Jersey.

A more dramatic illustration of the difference in the number of bankruptcies between states of comparable populations is displayed in a total of 32,518 bankruptcies in Ohio and Illinois as compared to only 1,951 bankruptcies in Pennsylvania and Texas. This startling difference in the number of bankruptcies must be attributed to the fact that the first named states permit the garnishment of wages while no garnishment of wages whatsoever is permitted in Pennsylvania and Texas. Texas has gone so far as to include in its Constitution that "no current wages for personal service shall ever be subject to garnishment."

For the last 120 years Pennsylvania has prohibited the garnishment of wages of any laborer or the salary of any person in public or private employment. The legislative policy expressed by this law is: "The preservation to employees and their families of the fruits of mental or manual labor in order that their earnings may go to supply their daily needs without hindrance from their creditors."

Numerous other illustrations and comparisons could be made to indicate that the number of bankruptcies filed by debtors varies according to the harshness or the liberality of the wage exemption laws of the various states.

What disturbs me most is that garnishment affords these young people some justification for wiping out their debts in bankruptcy. Many of them come to me after court is over to say that they would have been able in time to pay their just bills if they had been given an opportunity, but repeated garnishments had prevented them from holding steady jobs. Our present laws are causing them to lose their sense of obligation. They become bitter and antagonistic toward some creditors who repossess their property and sue for deficiencies. They become discouraged after paying a long time on a small loan only to find that most of their payments have been consumed in annual interest at 36% on the first $300, 24% on the next $200 and 12% on the balance. Frequently, in answer to an advertisement to come in and consolidate their bills, they borrow, let us say, $1,000 on their furniture and automobile, without realizing that the interest alone will begin at $18 a month and will continue at a hopelessly diminishing rate.

Statistics will show that over the years the number of consumer bankrupts increased in about the same proportion as the rise in consumer debt. The record low in the number of bankruptcies occurred in fiscal year 1946 at the peak of world war II expenditures accompanied by rationing and credit restrictions. Only 10,000 bankruptcies were filed in that your while consumer debt amounted to only 6 billion dollars. Fiscal year 1966 produced 192,354 bankruptcies while consumer debt rose to 90 billion 650 million dollars.

In our expanded economy based almost entirely upon credit, consumers, no matter how improvident some may be, must be free to deal with their creditors in such a way as to meet their daily needs in the proper rearing of their children. *This*, they cannot do when one or two creditors insist upon being paid first by garnishing their wages.

Consumers throughout the nation should be given an equal opportunity of working their credit problems without being driven to desperation and bankruptcy through garnishment of wages.

STATEMENT BY REFEREE ELMORE WHITEHURST

Next, Mr. Speaker, I call attention to the short statement by Referee Whitehurst of Dallas, who advised us that the enactment of the provision of H.R. 11601 dealing with garnishment would result in his opinion, in an immediate and drastic reduction in the number of bankrutcy cases filed in the United States.

In our questioning, we developed this and other aspects of the testimony at length, and I hope when our hearings are printed, the Members will pay particular attention to the comments of Mr. Whitehurst and the other referees on this odious practice of garnishment which is a modern-day equivalent of debtors' prison.

Referee Whitehurst's statement was as follows:

STATEMENT OF ELMORE WHITEHURST, REFEREE IN BANRUPTCY, DALLAS, TEX., BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON CONSUMER AFFAIRS OF THE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, FRIDAY, AUGUST 11, 1967, H. R. 11601 AND RELATED BILLS

My name is Elmore Whitehurst. I am the full-time Referee in Bankruptcy for the Northern District of Texas, Dallas Division, with headquarters at Dallas, Texas. I have occupied this office for the past ten years.

For the record, my background is as follows: I graduated from Southern Methodist University with a B.A. Degree in Economics in June of 1927. The fall of the same year I was appointed by the late Hatton Sumners, then Representative in Congress from the Fifth District of Dallas, to be his secretary and served in that position for three years. In 1932 Mr. Sumners appointed me Clerk of the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives and I served in that position from 1932 until 1939 when I was appointed Assistant Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts. I served in that position until July 1, 1957, when I resigned to become Referee in Bankruptcy. I studied law in Washington and Texas and was admitted to the Bar of Texas in 1934 and to the Bar of the United States Supreme Court in 1938. I am a member of the Supreme Court Advisory Committee on Bankruptcy Rules, the National Bankruptcy Conference, Secretary-Treasurer of the National Conference of Referees in Bankruptcy, and Editor of the quarterly Journal of the Conference.

PROHIBITION OF GARNISHMENT OF WAGES

Title II of H. R. 11601, on Page 33, prohibits garnishment of wages or salary due an employee and attaches a criminal penalty for the violation of the Act.

In my opinion the enactment of this provision would result in an immediate and drastic reduction in the number of bankruptcy cases filed in the United States. It would not of course prohibit those who engage in "predatory extensions of credit" as that term is used in the bill, from pursuing their debtors and attempting to collect debts by harassment, or other direct means, or legal action outside the Bankruptcy Court.

Texas in its Constitution and Statutes has a prohibition against garnishment of current wages. The provisions of the Constitution and Statutes are as follows:

"CONSTITUTION OF THE STATE OF TEXAS, ARTICLE 16, SECTION 28

"SEC. 28. No current wages for personal service shall ever be subject to garnishment.

"VERNON'S TEXAS STATUTES ANNOTATED, ARTICLE 4099

"Article 4099. Current wages

"No current wages for personal service shall be subject to garnishment; and where it appears upon the trial that the garnishee is indebted to the defendant for such current wages, the garnishee shall nevertheless be discharged as to such indebtedness."

It is my considered judgment that it is the result of these prohibitions and not a mere coincidence that the Bankruptcy Courts in Texas have a far smaller number of wage earner cases than States of lesser populations which have severe garnishment statutes.

It has been, I believe, the finding of investigators who have studied the matter that garnishment of wages or the threat thereof triggers the filing of the great majority of no asset wage earner cases where the only object of the proceeding is to secure a discharge in bankruptcy.

The prohibition of garnishment of current wages has by no means put loan companies out of business in Texas. To the contrary, as far as I can observe there are as many loan companies operating in Dallas as in cities of comparable size in States which have garnishment statutes. But we do not have the flood of no asset wage earner bankruptcy cases which they have.

Rats Cause Riots?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEL CLAWSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 14, 1967

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, the publisher-editor of the Compton Post, Compton, Calif., Hank Watton, in a column of editorial comment, August 9, links administration requests for expensive Federal excursions into areas of local concern, such as rat control, to simultaneous requests for higher taxes. This is a connection which U.S. taxpayers may well choose to make for themselves in view of the increasing evidence discrediting rats as determinants in riots. Following are Mr. Watton's comments which I comment to my colleagues in the House:

A group took the floor of the House last Monday and caused a few problems. It was necessary for police to throw a few of them out. Their chant was, "Rats cause Riots."

What is odd is that there never was a mention of rats during past riots. It was only after the President brought up the subject, which later was turned down by Congress, that rats entered the riot arena. Are we then threatened with riots everytime the legislature turns down an appropriation. What would happen if taxpayers threatened riot everytime Congress passed a "giveaway" program? Persons must come to realize that when the Senate or House kills an appropriation it is not intended as a slap by any group . . . it's a case of a dry well. When there's only a gallon of water left, we must decide if we drink it, water the tomato plant in order to eat later or drink some and use some on the tomato. Already taxpayers are paying for more than they can afford. People must learn to do something for themselves. No one would deny legitimate aid to any person or family . . . aid for a time, not forever. California has just passed the largest tax bill in history. Likewise the county. And President Johnson wants to tax the tax we are paying. We call it surcharge. Tax by any other name would hurt as much.

A Common Tradition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 14, 1967

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, love of liberty knows no national boundaries. It is not confined to this country or any other. Liberty is at the very core of human society wherever it exists.

Many have tried to quench the flames of liberty in the past, and no doubt many more will try in the future. In Cuba, Fidel Castro has tried, and every day there is growing evidence of his failure as yet another plane load of Cubans flee from his tyranny.

Mr. Speaker, we in south Florida are fortunate to have in our midst so many thousands who have chosen freedom at a high cost to themselves. The Cuban exiles are in the vanguard of we in the United States who cherish liberty.

One of the most eminent of these refugees, Mr. Manuel J. Reyes, is now director of Latin American news for Miami's WTVJ television station. His leadership in the Cuban community has won him the admiration and respect not only of the exiles but of all the people of south Florida.

On July 4 this year, Mr. Reyes gave an outstanding speech on the tradition of liberty which is shared by the Cuban and American peoples. I commend his eloquent remarks to the attention of my colleagues:

In a day like today—Liberty Day—my first thought is for those in all latitudes who have died in the struggle for the conquest of liberty. For those imprisoned in political prisoners, or who suffer tyranny or oppression.

Their sacrifice will never be in vain. Thanks to them man's dignity will shine again with its best carats, there where they have been eclipsed.

With the utmost courtesy, I want to give my most sincere thanks to the National School of Cuban Teachers in exile and to its President, Dr. Rolando Espinosa, for having invited us to make the central speech in this act in which two countries, United States and Cuba are united in the best of their traditions.

And it is precisely the teaching class who has the responsibility of forming men and creating countries, those who sponsor this reunion today. With no false modesty, which in definitive in hyprocrisy, I confess that there are many Cubans much more able to face the responsibility which has been delegated to me by means of The Cuban Teachers in exile, but as we have never been and never will be remissible in an appointment regarding Cuba, invoking God's favor, we begin our speech.

Arquimides, the great ancient master, said: "Give me a level and I shall move the world."

This lever is Faith.

Without faith the human being becomes atheist and materialistic.

Without faith in liberty, there is no country.

Without faith at home, there is no family.

Without faith in our fellow beings, there is no friendship.

And prescisely tonight, we are gathered here in Miami, with a group of the highest American federal authorities in these areas, as well as with prominent American citizens and a group of Cuban exiles, without country, but with faith in liberty—to reaffirm before the world our traditional friendship between Cuba and United States.

As a paradox reflecting light and darkness, Cubans and Americans are sitting together today to talk about a date of great embossment for the dignity of the human being, they with the glow of having a free country . . . we, with a Cuba in darkness, obscured by the shadows of evil men, but with light in our forehead inherited from our ancestors, that will glow with its utmost brilliancy as long as our lives are dedicated to a supreme ideal: Cuba's liberty.

Bodies may die but the spirit of liberty survives, and has to survive in the conscience of our sons.

Because exile is rebellion, not cowardice.

Every exile's heart is a tortured eagle.

It is the country's liberty wanting to break its chains and fly high . . . very high.

Only those capable of being born twice in the same life can face exile. July 4th is a liberty date which changed the course of a nation and of humanity.

In 1776, fifty six American patriots proclaimed the liberty of the thirteen colonies and solemnly swore that they would not rest until they had achieved their liberty.

Maybe then those fifty six patriots were said to be utopic or dreamers. Who would believe possible that those thirteen colonies would be free from powerful England?

And there were apathetics, negligents, and pessimistics and traitors. There is no peak without slope.

There is no future without the dreamers of the present.

Because the future realities begin to comment on today's dreams.

On July 4, 1776 the world heard of the Declaration of Independence of the United States. As dozens of years went by, the apathetics, the negligents, the pessimistics and the traitors did not pass on to history. They became anonymous. It is the never-ending lesson of history that all read through time and space and very few learn.

Nevertheless, today, after two hundred years, this Declaration is the Monolitic base, the marble stone, where the marvelous structure of the first potency of the world stands.

Why? Because it encloses the soul of those fifty six patricians, who carried an ideal to hundreds and hundreds of consciences . . . And this ideal created a mystic, an unbreakable faith in liberty transmitted from father to son, as the right and fundamental duty of life.

And on behalf of this ideal there were imprisonments, battles, exile, executions, disgregated families and lost fortunes.

But the dedication of those who embraced the Declaration of Independence of the United States was so complete, so sincere, so unselfish, so full of faith, that its content of liberty became a reality.

Much more valuable is a grain of liberty than a mountain of injustice.

The Declaration of Independence of the United States, has not only served as a guide to its citizens, but it has also stimulated and inspired other men and other countries either in liberty or in oppression to follow its ideal.

Proof of all this is in the Congressional Record of the United States, official document of the United States Congress in Washington, where in February 16, 1966, Congressman Claude Pepper reproduced the Declaration of Liberty signed by 1500 Cubans in Key West on January 27, 1967, one year after it had been promulgated.

This Declaration, with the signature of prominent cubans in exile unites in itself not a group nor an organization but a mental state of opinion in order to obtain Cuba's liberty based in the principles of belief in God's existence, in the country, in the home and in the respect for the law as the first national truth.

Once more, United States and Cuba would unite their destiny in a Declaration of Independence or in a Declaration of Freedom.

And at this point we refer to the traditional friendship between our countries.

Many believe that friendship between Cuba and United States began during the Liberty Flights or maybe during the Spanish-American War.

Our friendship came long before that.

For the Cubans, May 19th is a date of great historic meaning. In this day in 1895, in Dos Rios, in Oriente province, there died under the bullets, he who was guide and propulsive brain of the second war of Cuba's independence, Jose Marti.

But in another May 19th, this time in 1850, a cuban of generous heart, General Narciso Lopez, landed in Cardenas, province of Matanzas, to try to liberate Cuba.

It was the first liberty cry that became a reality, in the mounting fight the cubans had to obtain their independence.

Some 500 men went with Lopez in this adventure to Cardenas . . . which for geographical reasons and as a curiosity of destiny is located several miles from Playa Giron.

Cardenas was taken over by Lopez's forces and there for the first time, free and sovereign, undulated the cuban flag, that of the solitary star. Together with Lopez landed a retired Colonel from the United States army, a West Point graduate. That American Colonel named Crittendem together with several retired United States soldiers, fought for Cuba's liberty or died while doing so. Days later, after the first alternative of the war was accomplished, Colonel Crittendem died together with Narciso Lopez, both killed by spanish troops.

There in cuban soil, sealed with cuban and american blood, a friendship arose which would grow stronger as time went by.

Later in 1895, the cuban patriots were again ready for their liberty war after 17 long years in exile. The permanent open wound which the exile carries in his soul can only be closed by the conquest of his faraway land. And it did not matter how much time passed, even though a year in exile is like 100 years of normal life.

The cuban patriots were set to conquer their liberty in 1895.

You all know that the american public opinion then, according to some newspapers from that date, was not moved to help the cubans in exile nor to free their country.

You all know of the sad disaster of the Fernandina, in Florida, where the United States government had to take action on account of spanish agents denouncements, who constantly watched Marti and confiscated the three ships that had been bought and equipped for the liberation war with great sacrifice. One of them was supposed to go to Costa Rica to get General Antonio Maceo, another would go to Dominican Republic to get General Maximo Gomez, and the third would go to Cuba with Jose Marti.

Nevertheless, people inside Cuba upraised in arms in the historic Baire, and thus started the second war for the independence of Cuba, while Marti, Gomez and Maceo made good their promise by landing in Playitas, for the reunion in the "La Mejorana" farm.

In May 19th, Jose Marti died in combat.

Once more the bonds of friendship between United States and Cuba became tighter with the editorial from "The Sun" newspaper in New York on May 23, 1895 which read:

"We have heard with grief the news of Jose Marti's death while in battle. Marti was a well known leader by the Cuban revolutionaries. We knew him well and deeply esteemed him. For a long period of time which dates back to twenty years ago, he collaborated in "The Sun", writing about all related to arts. His comments were always solid and intense, and his ideas and conclusions, original and brilliant. He was a man of temperament, of imagination, of faith and courage, one of those Spanish descendants whose birth and American instincts gave him the revolutionary heritage that the modern Spanish inherits. His heart warm and affectionate, his opinions, fiery and inspirated, he died like a man should, as he wanted to die, in the struggle for liberty and democracy. There are not many heroes like him in the world, and his grave in a battlefield, stands, even in an era of positivism and materialism, as one who gave everything for his beliefs without thinking in selfish returns. Honor to Jose Marti's memory, and peace to his generous and manly soul."

Up to here we have quoted several of the paragraphs from the editorial of "The Sun" newspaper in New York on May 23, 1895.

Benjamin Franklin once said: "My home is where liberty reigns." And Thomas Paine added: "My home is where there is no liberty."

Making these statements good, the people of the United States, backed by their government, began to worry on account of the tyranny imposed on Cuba, and about the unproportioned struggle which the Cuban liberators held against fresh and well trained Spanish troops.

A little after the Maine's explosion in Havana's Bay, before the beginning of the Spanish-American war, once more the traditional friendship between Cuba and United States renewed its vows, when on March 17, 1898 Senator Redfeld, Proctor in the Hemicycle of Washington's Cabinet, said after an unofficial trip to Cuba: "For me, the greatest appeal does not flow from the barbarous deed practiced by Weyler, nor from the loss of the Maine's armored ship, even though both incidents are terrible, but from the spectacle of seeing a million and a half of Cuba's total population fighting for their liberty in order to liberate themselves from the worst government I have ever heard of."

Up to here the pronouncements made by the Proctor Senator.

Once more there was proof that Cuba was not forgotten and thus began the Spanish-American War, in which the American forces joined the Cuban rebels, fighting together with them in the "Loma de San Juan", on the Caney, a part of the indomit province in the West side of Cuba.

Many Americans and Cubans died.

But the Pearl of the Antilles became free. American and Cuban blood fused in Cuban soil so that the solitary star would undulate free and sovereign, as it so happened on May 20, 1902.

Because of this, year after year, with the heart full of respect, appreciation and friendship, we Cubans get together in the old Miami cemetery on Memorial Day, to render tribute to those Teddy Roosevelt's "Rough Riders" who still live, and who though old, stand erect when they hear the bugle call as a reminder of all who died in Cuba and all those who year after year start their eternal journey. While in the cemetery's solitude we have often thought of those already dead for the liberty of Cuba and of those dead in exile. And for each one that dies in exile, our entrails move. Because exile develops people's entrails.

And how well do we understand that the exile's grave is a grave with no rest. Soil may fall upon the open grave, but for those who live, this grave will only be closed when the exile can rest in his faraway land.

And thus we arrive to the present days in which the friendship between Cuba and United States stands as never before.

Friendship based on mutual faith. United States has shown its faith in the Cuban exiles receiving and treating us like brothers.

The American people have opened their doors so that we may come to a land of liberty during the painful time of exile. They have opened their doors for work so that we may honestly support our families.

They have opened their hospitals so that we may cure our ailments. They have opened their schools, so that while we have been forced to abandon our beloved land, where all roots remain, we may feel welcome and needed.

We cannot forget that when one is alone, exile is hard. When a family is in exile they start again in Golgotha path.

In October 3, 1965, President Lyndon B. Johnson, officially stated, making unique history in the American Continent, that he would receive in United States almost half a million cubans. In front of the Statue of Liberty, in New York, he extended an invitation to all cubans who wanted to come to this nation.

From then on more than 70,000 cubans have arrived to this land of liberty. These cubans are like ambassadors of their country in exile. In eight and a half years they have made history by their good conduct, decency, honesty, with no rational index of criminality, with no juvenile delinquency, besides, contributing with the richness of the Cuban culture wherever they have arrived. Cubans are men of principles. Proof of this is the painful period they faced in the seventeen long years of exile in the past century from 78 to 95 and the one they now face from 59 to 67. Yesterday as today, we left for exile on account of our principles. And we will return only when those principles may be exercised freely. Let no one thing that the cubans are ungrateful because they carry constantly the love for their land in their soul. Those who do not hear the cries from their far away land have no exile's heart.

And exile will render its true fruits when the trees get back to their roots. When in the sacred soil of our land the disregarded families embrace themselves again. That is why the cuban in exile though with deep gratefulness for this nation, tries to maintain in his home an altar for his faraway land. The land lives in the exile's home, for the sap of the principal trunk will be lost if not infused in the minor trunk.

In the last eight and a half years cubans and Americans united, have made history showing the world what together they could do to assure a present for those fleeing oppression and tyranny.

Of course, we are humans and as humans we are subject to fatigue . . . to short pauses in the hard road of exile. Because exile without sacrifice is not exile.

The hard blows we have suffered make us talk this way! Giron was one of those blows. But we continued forward.

The October crisis, was another blow, for tyranny remained in Cuba, and yet we went forward.

Eight and a half years have gone by and we go forward, as liberty missionaries. While seven million of our brothers anxiously await for their redemption.

But how difficult it is for those not in exile to understand us. It is easy for the sight to get lost in the grassy plains when the eyes are not accustomed to the woods.

Nevertheless, we must go forward. Exile is example and inducement. It is as a warning lighting that enlightens the sleepy or lethargic consciences of those who were born and live in liberty. Never was the storm best announced than by the stroke of thunder. But as we said in the beginning of these words, without faith in our fellow beings there is no friendship. And we, United States and Cuba are friends, for we have faith in each other.

Together with the Cubans, thirteen million human beings have also fled, all throughout the world from materialism's oppression. Many of them are here, in this nation, source of democracy, and are spectators of this 4th of July in which United States celebrates the fundamental rights of a nation, liberty.

And in order that this liberty may be maintained throughout the world, Cubans and Americans are today fighting together again.

In the remote jungles in Vietnam, Cuban and American youth have united their efforts. Let us hear tonight the voice of one of those brave liberty fighters. With his twenty years of age he wrote to me from the battlefield in Vietnam:

"I am not sorry I came. Seeing the door closed for open war in Cuba, and the military service being an obligation, I have no objection at all. I feel it is our duty to place our effort in restricting the red invasion that only wants to convert Vietnam in another beach head for the hammer and the sickle.

"In this unfortunate country there are more Cubans than it seems, refugees, residents, citizens from all parts of Cuba. There are Cubans residing in Miami, New York, New Jersey, California, in fact from all parts of the United States . . . real Cubans fighting arm to arm next to young Americans, white, black, Chinese, from all races and religions . . . together as brothers . . . against the common enemy."

There is no better proof to ratify before the world the traditional friendship between Cuba ahd United States.

Friendship requires sacrifice . . . but having mutual faith, the day will come in which those sacrifices will culminate in the definite triumph of liberty.

There, in another part of the globe, in Southeast Asia . . . and here ninety miles from United States, in the heart of our America. . . . And we will achieve it . . . together as brothers against the common enemy.

Shelbyville, Tenn.: Walking Horse Capital of the World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 14, 1967

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the city of Shelbyville, Tenn., has become famous as the walking horse capital of the world.

Its internationally recognized Tennessee walking horse celebration is held annually and will be held August 25–September 2 this year.

At this great annual celebration visitors will see the champions—a great show—and enjoy warm southern hospitality—and I extend to all of my colleagues and others a welcome to this Tennessee celebration.

In this connection, the Nashville magazine, in its current issue, has an excellent article on Shelbyville and the development of the walking horse celebration.

Under unanimous consent I include this article in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The article follows:

THE HORSE THAT MADE A TOWN

At a point equidistant from the Great Lakes and the Gulf of Mexico, in the State of Tennessee, County of Bedford, is situated the little town of Shelbyville which normally contains a population of 15,000. In the past, Shelbyville was called the Pencil City of the World (because it manufactured more pencils than anywhere else in the world), but that time is past. Shelbyville is now known as the Walking Horse Capital of the World. Why the transition from pencils to horses? The change is a result of one man's flash of inspiration and the combined efforts of two generations of hard-working townspeople in producing, for the past twenty-nine years, an event that will double the population toward the end of this month—the Tennessee Walking Horse National Celebration.

Honored by the celebration are horses from all over the U.S. called Plantation or Tennessee Walking Horses, a breed that has been called "Nature's Rocking Chair." Selection and breeding from Thoroughbred and Arabian blood was responsible for their development in answer to the needs of the plantation owners of the South. Because the white-clothed owners of lush plantations had to inspect their domains by riding all day through the fields, with frequent stops to chat with the men about weather and crops, they needed strong horses with an easy ambling gait who could canter in a straight line between the rows of green tobacco and fluffy cotton. That easy ambling gait is now called a singlefoot or rack which gives the Plantation horse three gaits. In addition to convenience, the planters wanted a good looking, elegant, showy mount. The horse which was developed and is now honored yearly in Shelbyville is the Plantation Walker, better known as the Tennessee Walking Horse.

The highest honor of the celebration and, indeed, the purpose behind it, is the selection of the Grand Championship of all Walking Horses. Judges are not influenced by the original cost of a horse, or by the name of the trainer, so how can one champion be selected from all the magnificent looking horses with their clipped manes, pulled tails and competent riders? Three men are selected each year from the established directories of judges. Each judge is given a color—red, blue or green—and as they enter the ring, a colorful wheel is spun, so whatever color comes up, that man is called the referee. Each man then takes a separate area of the ring, and as he observes the horses and riders go through their routines, he marks or "ties" his card. Then the two judges compare cards, and if both have marked the same horse highest, the winner is announced. However, if they disagree, the referee's card is employed in the final decision. A weighted system is used in judging all the classes for the top ten in each class.

What do the judges, trainers, breeders and riders all agree on about a good Tennessee Walking Horse? It has rhythm, speed and action, and has a good disposition, temperament, is strong and game. Most important is that the horse can "hit the good lick," which has been called a brilliant, long-striding, natural running walk. The smoothness and the power which they display is a gift from the mounts of those early plantation owners who so often had to travel through mud as they traversed their grounds.

Each year since 1939, the Grand Championship has been awarded through inspiration of W. Henry Davis of Wartrace, Tennessee. Davis had been to a small town celebration where he got his idea, which was the beginning of the transition from Pencil City to Walking Horse Capital of the World. The local Lion's Club liked the idea, and the decision was made to have the first Tennessee Walking Horse Festival. The four businessmen who formed the first executive committee were looking ahead and thinking big. This year's president is Bill Tune, whose father, Clyde Tune, was one of the original foursome. Due to their efforts, the townspeople made the festival a civic project, and in the ensuing years it has grown to giant proportions. The first celebration opened for three nights August 25, 1939, with a $525 stake and twenty-seven classes. Former residents of Shelbyville had been invited to return, and one of the biggest events was a celebration in their honor. There was a big parade and floats, though these are no longer used. But the *Blue Ribbon*, a yearbook, is still published annually.

Tennessee Walking Horse National Celebration was an immediate success, and the proceeds from the sale of tickets and other revenue from the show was put back into the project, as has been the practice each year since. These funds are still the sole means of supporting the following year's celebration. For the first five years, it was a three-night show. In 1944 it began a four-night run, then expanded to five. By the twenty-sixth celebration it had reached the eight nights that it runs at present. Included in the changes and improvements since 1939 is a Junior World Championship, which has become a favorite with the spectators.

Work on the twenty-ninth Tennessee Walking Horse National Celebration, scheduled August 25 through September 2, began soon after the close of the 1966 festival, Bill Tune pointed out. A native of Shelbyville who is wed to a former Nashville girl, Tune commutes from his Shelbyville home to Nashville where he works with the Tennessee Industrial Development Commission. He also has a real estate and insurance interests in Shelbyville. Tall, amiable, with reddish hair and a ready grin, Tune reveals an ease about the festival that comes through his long association with its development. He serves without pay, as do the judges and the six other men on the committee that heads the show.

The whole population of Shelbyville seems to get into the act. They take pride in their assignments and play important roles in the smooth running program. Each year the Jaycee's handle the parking facilities. The gentleman who heads the arrangements for cleanup is only the second person to hold that post. Others, year after year open their homes to the visitors from as many as thirty states who descend on their town and cause it to swell to twice its size.

According to Tune, this year will be bigger and better than ever. There will be 1,500 or 1,600 entrees from thirty states, and the purse for all classes will be about $60,000. A total of $10,000 will be distributed in the Grand Championship class. In all, fifty classes will be viewed and judged. One hundred boxes have been added this year, plus 400 grandstand seats, bringing the capacity under the bright lights to 25,000.

The boxes have been sold out since early July, and everyone in boxes, seats or standing in the aisles will fall into silence as the lights go on for the traditional opening ceremonies August 25. Into the ring will step a pure white horse ridden by the rider of last year's champion, Betty Sain. Flags of the fifty states will fly in the breeze as the music begins for the *Star Spangled Banner*. The Tennessee Walking Horse National Celebration will have begun, and from that instant until September 3, the ring and grandstand areas will never be quiet.

Whatever enjoyment the celebration gives to everyone, there is an underlying purpose that boosts the spirits of this horse-loving community. Shelbyvillians know as they begin again their preparations for the next bigger and better show that through their love and hard work, the production and training of better Walking Horses has been stimulated and has, as a bonus, increased the value of show horses, which in turn elevates the economy of Shelbyville and of Tennessee.—Joy Ann Black.

I-H Expansion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1967

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the Morning News of San Leandro, Calif., carried an editorial on August 4 pertaining to the expansion of the International Harvester Co.'s activities in San Leandro.

This indicates the growth and development in San Leandro, a fine community that maintains a climate acceptable to both management and labor.

I congratulate both International Harvester and the city of San Leandro, and I thank the Morning News for recognizing the value of this operation to San Leandro.

The article follows:

I-H EXPANSION

Formal grand opening of the new International Harvester truck branch in San Leandro marks still another step forward in the ever-continuing industrial progress of the city.

The branch, located on Doolittle Drive, is more than twice the size of IH's former sales center in Washington Avenue, and reason for the expansion has been declared to have been the growth in volume of recreation vehicles and commercial trucks.

All of this is, obviously, to the advantage of International Harvester.

It is, however, also to the advanage of the City of San Leandro.

International Harvester chose San Leandro because it obviously saw the potential here. And San Leandro welcomed International Harvester because it, in turn, also saw a potential for the city's economy in the presence of this energetic, civic-minded firm.

The arrival of new business and new industry in San Leandro is always something to be desired.

But the expansion of a business, already well established in the community in more than one form, is an even greater pleasure because it signals not just that "we are glad to be here" . . . but that "we are glad to stay."

Objections Echoed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 14, 1967

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am including in today's RECORD a copy of a letter I received from the executive committee of the Natural Resources Council of Maine echoing my long-standing objections to the manner in which the Dickey-Lincoln School power project has been approached. I commend this letter to the attention of all those who are concerned about the fate of this project:

NATURAL RESOURCES
COUNCIL OF MAINE,
Augusta, Maine.

The Executive Committee of the Natural Resources Council has noted that following the deletion of funds for continued planning of the Dickey-Lincoln School power project on the St. John River, it has been stated by a number of sources that it is hoped that the Senate will restore the funds which were cut, and it is expected that in such case the House-Senate Conference Committee would approve the restoration.

Dickey, of course, is only the current version in a series of proposals to construct a huge dam on the St. John River. The earlier Rankin Rapids and Cross Rock proposals would have flooded the Allagash River as well. Dickey was less objectionable than these, because it would not do so. But it has not been established that any dam is either necessary or desirable.

Much of what is being said about this project appears to be based on the assumption that Maine people strongly favor it, but so far we have been unable to detect any substantial public support for the Dickey project within the state. On the contrary, it seems to us that there is a rising body of opinion which is opposed to flooding the upper St. John River valley.

To our knowledge, no public hearings have ever been held within the State of Maine on the Dickey project, either by the Department of the Interior or by the Army Corps of Engineers. We believe that the overwhelming vote last fall in favor of establishing the Allagash River as a wilderness area in perpetuity shows that the Maine public is strongly in favor of protecting our natural resources for the future. There has been no comparable indication that the public favors the Dickey project.

We do not propose to enter into the public power vs. private power aspects of this matter. Proponents of each point of view appear able to marshal impressive statistics to support their positions. Laymen not versed in electrical engineering lore find it difficult, if not impossible, to analyze these conflicting claims.

The discussion to date has been confined solely to the dollars and cents aspects of this project. Little if any attention has been paid to other factors which in our view deserve equal consideration. These factors include the destruction of irreplaceable natural resources, such as vast amounts of fish and game habitat, excellent canoeing waters, and of no slight concern the loss of a very substantial amount of prime timber-producing forestland. There has been no discussion of possible alternatives of resources development which would result in saving a major and irreplaceable resource for future generations rather than its destruction for a single purpose, and one at that which is the subject of vigorous debate on its merits.

We would like to know what, if any, attention has been given by the planners of this project to these important considerations and what attention is to be given them in the Senate. We strongly believe that these aspects of Dickey rank as highly as the dollars and cents questions and should not be ignored.

Until these matters have been thoroughly aired, we do not see how blanket support for the Dickey-Lincoln School project can possibly be justified.

Yours very truly,
CLINTON B. TOWNSEND,
President.

A Profile of the Bankrupt Wage Earner as Drawn by the Honorable Clive W. Bare, Referee in Bankruptcy, of Knoxville, Tenn., in Endorsing the Antigarnishment Provision of H.R. 11601

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 14, 1967

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, there has been wide press coverage of the hearing held by the Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs last Friday when we were privileged to hear from four outstanding referees in bankruptcy, who drew a direct relationship between the harshness of State garnishment laws and the number of personal or wage-earner bankruptcies in those States.

The Honorable Clive W. Bare, of Knoxville, Tenn., who, in 10 years, has handled more than 10,000 bankruptcy proceedings, gave us a picture of the kind of wage earners who go into bankruptcy as a desperate way out of their prison of debts, and the profile he drew will come as a surprise to many.

We are dealing, he told us, largely with blue-collar workers, with an average income of $60 a week and average indebtedness of $4,000.

I will let Mr. Bare's excellent and informative statement speak for itself, except to say that I cannot imagine any Member of Congress not wanting to join the sponsors of H.R. 11601 in outlawing garnishment as part of any truth-in-lending bill we pass. The bill, H.R. 11601, the Consumer Credit Protection Act, which I introduced in behalf of myself and five other members of the Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs, Representatives Gonzalez, Minish, Annunzio, Bingham, and Halpern, and which has been cosponsored by more than a score of other Members of the House, through the joint introduction of H.R. 11806 by Mr. Multer, does have such an antigarnishment provision in it.

Mr. Bare, and three other bankruptcy referees appearing with him before our subcommittee last Friday—Mr. Elmore Whitehurst, of Dallas, Mr. James E. Moriarty, of Los Angeles, and Mr. Estes Snedecor, of Portland, all endorsed this section of our bill.

Mr. Bare's prepared statement was as follows:

Statement of Clive W. Bare, Referee in Bankruptcy, Knoxville, Tenn., Before the Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs of the House Committee on Banking and Currency, Friday, August 11, 1967, on H.R. 11601 and Related Bills

Madam Chairman, I am Clive W. Bare, Referee in Bankruptcy for the Eastern District of Tennessee with headquarters at Knoxville. I have served as Referee for the past ten years and during that time have handled more than 10,000 bankruptcy proceedings.

Within the past few years Tennessee has achieved a rather dubious distinction. It has become one of the leading states in the filing of bankruptcy petitions. During the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, Tennessee with 10,295 new cases ranked fifth in total filings among the 50 states in this country. Only debtors residing in California, Illinois, Ohio, and Alabama filed more bankruptcy petitions than debtors residing in Tennessee. 90 per cent of all cases filed were employee-type bankruptcies as distinguished from business failures.

The principal reason for the large number of bankruptcy cases filed in Tennessee is that the garnishment of wages is permitted. Tennessee not only permits the garnishment of wages but its wage exemption statute is one of the lowest in the United States.

I believe the impact of wage garnishments on bankruptcy cases can best be illustrated by pointing out the vast difference in the number of filings in Tennessee and North Carolina. These states are similar in many respects—size, population, total income, and both have an agricultural and industrial economy. North Carolina, however, does not permit the garnishment of wages and in that state last year only 402 cases were filed. As heretofore mentioned, there were 10,295 new cases filed in Tennessee during the same period. Compare the number of filings in these two states and the effect of wage garnishments on bankruptcy becomes crystal clear.

A comparison of bankruptcy filings in Tennessee with some other states that prohibit the garnishment of wages also indicates the extent that wage garnishments play. During the last fiscal year filings in South Carolina totaled 155 cases; Florida, 1,514 cases; and Texas 1,103 cases.

In Tennessee prior to July 1, 1967, only $17 per week was exempt from wage garnishments to the head of a family. The statute also provided a weekly wage exemption of $2.50 for each dependent child. Thus, a married man with four children had a weekly wage exemption of $27.

Effective July 1, 1967, a new wage garnishment exemption statute became effective in Tennessee which provides an exemption to the head of a family of 50 per cent or $20 per week, whichever is greater, subject to a maximum total exemption of $50 per week. The $2.50 additional exemption for each dependent child was not changed. Thus, the head of a family with four dependent children earning $60 per week now has a total weekly wage exemption of $40. This figures out to a yearly exemption of $2,080 which is considerably below the so-called "poverty" level.

The garnishment of wages, in effect, makes the debtor's employer a collection agency for creditors. I am informed that more than 1000 garnishments per month are issued by the General Sessions Court in Knox County. I have also been informed that under the prior law it cost an employer an average of $7 in time and expense to answer a garnishment. If this figure is representative, then wage garnishments in Knox County alone have been costing employers some $84,000 per year. Under the exemption statute now in effect, this cost will probably increase as employers are required to submit substantially more information to the court issuing the garnishment than under the former statute. This information consists of a statement showing:

(1) Gross amount earned by the employee;

(2) Amount of Social Security and Withholding tax;

(3) Net amount due the debtor;

(4) A statement signed by the debtor

a) claiming as exempt wages in such amount as may be allowable;

b) stating that he is a resident of the State of Tennessee;

(c) stating that he is married and living with his spouse if such be the case;

d) stating the number of dependent children.

I understand that employers are quite concerned with the additional work involved in answering garnishments. Some employers are reported to be considering firing an employee if his wages are attached. This practice has been followed by many employers in the past. Some permit one or two garnishments without disciplinary measures but others will immediately discharge an employee when a garnishment is served.

My examination of bankrupts at first meetings of creditors disclose that between 60 and 70 percent of bankruptcy filings are the direct result of wage garnishments. Many individuals are being driven into bankruptcy who actually owe relatively small sums—but whose wages are under attachment. They are financially over extended but if given an opportunity to pay their debts could do so within a reasonable period of time. The triggering cause of bankruptcy is the wage garnishment.

I have often wondered whether companies seeking new locations prefer to locate in states where wage garnishments are not permitted. This seems logical as there can be no doubt but that garnishments are disrupting and costly both to the employer as well as to the employee.

I have often heard it said, principally by collection agencies, that creditors could not collect their debts unless wage garnishments are permitted. This premise is apparently not true in those states where wage garnishments are not permitted since their economic growth equals or exceeds that of Tennessee where wage garnishments are permitted. Nor do I believe it would be true if wage garnishments are prohibited by an Act of Congress. It would result, however, in a more judicious extension of credit. Clearly too much credit is being extended today and too many loans are being made not on the basis of the debtor's character, integrity, or ability to pay but solely because the lender or creditor knows that if debtors do not pay their wages can be attached.

My conclusion in this respect is fully supported by a survey made some years ago by the Chattanooga Retail Credit Men's Association in which they reviewed in detail some 200 bankruptcy cases. Their report indicates that only 8 per cent of the bankrupts covered in that survey had a good credit rating. 92 per cent had either a poor or fair rating. Yet credit was extended to those individuals to such an extent that bankruptcy resulted. One of their conclusions is as follows:

"Some tradesmen appear inclined to extend credit more on the strength of the fact that they can sue and garnishee than they would be, were it not possible to enforce payment in this manner."

If wage garnishments are prohibited, the inclination to over-sell or over-lend would not be so prevalent. I have observed hundreds of bankruptcy cases where five or ten loan companies hold hundreds of dollars of loans against the same household furniture which, if foreclosed upon, would have almost no value. These loans were made not on the debtor's ability to repay or the security which had been pledged but simply because the loan companies knew that the debtor's wages could be attached if he did not pay.

If consumers are not loaded down beyond their capacity to repay, they will have funds available to pay their legitimate debts. I firmly believe that the vast majority of bankrupts really want to pay their debts but, because of low sales resistance and garnishment statutes, they find themselves in an impossible situation and, once wage garnishments commence, their only hope is to seek relief from the Bankruptcy Court.

From my observation of individuals filing bankruptcy petitions in Knoxville, I believe the following reports a fairly accurate picture:

80% are men.
20% are women.
81% are married.
15% are divorced.
4% are single.
90% are blue collar workers.
15% have filed bankruptcy petitions before.
Median age—30.
Median education—10 grade.
Average income—$60 per week.
Average number of dependents—4.
Average indebtedness—$4,000.

The $60 average income of bankrupts indicates that it is the lower income group that is resorting to the Bankruptcy Court for relief, that it is this group generally whose wages are being attached. In other words, the individuals whose wages are being garnished are the very individuals whose total wages are required for the payment of necessary living expenses—food, clothing, shelter, and medical expenses.

In *An Analysis of Economic and Personal Factors Leading to Consumer Bankruptcy* prepared by the Bureau of Business and Economic Research of Michigan State University the following conclusion should be noted.

". . . of the bankrupts interviewed, 80 percent indicated that they had been threatened with garnishment. For many debtors, garnishment may mean short-term or long-term loss of income. Often the exemptions do not provide enough take-home pay to live on until the next pay check. Furthermore, if garnishment causes loss of employment, many debtors find it difficult to find new jobs. Faced with such bleak possibilities, debtors may find the threat of garnishment as frightening as actual garnishment. Of the bankrupts interviewed, 75 percent indicated that garnishment or threat of garnishment was the reason for their filing for bankruptcy. . . . There is little doubt that an individual in Michigan undergoes severe financial strain when garnished."

The proposed finding expressed in Sec. 202 of H.R. 11601 that garnishment of wages is frequently an essential element of predatory extensions of credit and that the resulting disruption of employment, production, and consumption constitutes a substantial burden upon interstate commerce is in my opinion fully justified. Remedial action should be taken.

Our Not-So-Private Lives: Surveillance and Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 14, 1967

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the amazing technological achievements which have been made in the last decade threaten to seriously invade one of our most basic and cherished rights—the right to privacy.

I commend to the attention of our colleagues an article which appeared in the spring issue of the Carnegie Quarterly concerning this matter.

The article follows:

OUR NOT-SO-PRIVATE LIVES: SURVEILLANCE AND FREEDOM

If someone gained access to your suit jacket, through the good offices of your cleaner, say, or a public check room, he could turn you into a walking radio within a matter of minutes. A microphone could be placed in one button of the jacket, a transmitter in a second, and a battery in a third, with conductive wire matching the seam thread to serve as an antenna.

Such a unit is only one of the many marvels of technology that now make it possible for those so inclined surreptitiously to hear what a man says and watch where he goes and what he does. Microphones the size of a sugar cube, suitable for installation in office or bedroom, are available for less than $10. There are cameras that can take good photographs from as far as a thousand yards, and a closed circuit television system the size of a cigarette pack that can send pictures from a wall socket where it might be hidden direct to the interested viewer's screen.

Modern-day surveillance, or spying, as some might put it, extends beyond the mere monitoring of an individual's words and actions. Mental tests, drugs, and emotion-measuring devices such as the lie detector provide for psychological surveillance as well. They can and do extract information about a person's innermost beliefs and attitudes—information which he might not know he is revealing, or might not wish to reveal, or might reveal without full awareness that he is exposing his private personality. The Constitution, incidentally, has attempted to protect citizens against having to divulge certain kinds of information—much of it, including attitudes toward religion, is of the sort we are dealing with here.

Finally, there is what might be called surveillance by data-processing. Computers make it easy for government, business, and other organizations to gather, save, and exchange more information about an individual than they could have (or would have wanted to, because of the difficulty of processing) only a few years ago. It is technologically possible that long before 1984, information about all important aspects of an individual's life could be collected on a running basis in master memory systems which would show at a glance how he did in nursery school and graduate school, the results of all the personality and aptitude tests he had taken over the years, how much he got paid for which job, his efficiency ratings, health record, and much more.

All of these developments, and others, make possible the almost total invasion of privacy—which is so intimately bound to freedom itself. While the framers of the Constitution clearly intended to establish the individual's inviolable right to a certain amount of privacy, neither legislation nor judicial interpretations have so far been able to cope effectively with the new problems posed by the new technology. For the right to privacy is not an absolute right; legitimate claims can be made for some surveillance under some conditions for some reasons. What has been lacking is a kind of Twentieth Century definition of what constitutes the proper balance between privacy and disclosure and suggestions as to how the balance might be achieved. These are the subjects of *Privacy and Freedom,* by Alan F. Westin, professor of Public Law and Government at Columbia University. The book will be published at the end of the summer by Atheneum Publishers ($10). Mr. Westin's study, which was made under the auspices of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York, was supported by a Carnegie grant to the Association.

FOUR FUNCTIONS OF PRIVACY

In the totalitarian state, the right of authorities to keep the activities of citizens and groups under close surveillance is assumed, while the regime itself operates in tight secrecy. In a democracy, the situation is nearly reversed.

"The democratic society relies on publicity as a control of government and privacy as a shield for group and individual life," writes Mr. Westin. (Even government, however, has the right and necessity to carry on some of its business in private.) The democratic emphasis on privacy springs from the fundamental belief of the democratic creed—in the uniqueness and sacredness of the individual. But as sociologist Robert Merton has pointed out, "Privacy is not merely a personal predilection; it is an important functional requirement for the effective operation of social structure." For the democratic social structure, Mr. Westin argues persuasively, privacy performs four very important functions.

The human being has a deep need for personal autonomy—the sense of having some control over his own life and, of course, mind; the knowledge that he is not dominated or manipulated wholly by others; the ability to choose when and what to disclose to others about himself. Psychologists have described a series of zones or regions of privacy leading to the "core self" which shields the individual's ultimate secrets. There are some hopes and fears that a person wants never to reveal to anyone. Only grave social need, says Mr. Westin, "can ever justify destruction of the privacy which guards the individual's ultimate autonomy." And the democratic society itself is strengthened when individuals have a sense of personal autonomy, since it produces traits that are desirable in citizens of a free state: independent thought, diversity of views, and nonconformity.

The second great function of privacy, Mr. Westin points out, is to provide for emotional release. In the course of any given day, everybody plays a succession of roles—"stern father, loving husband, car pool comedian, skilled lathe operator"—and everybody needs an occasional opportunity to lay the masks aside, to be "himself" as he feels at the moment. Privacy also furnishes the safety valve without which our social and public life might be even more disorderly and tempestuous than it is. All people, including janitors and statesmen, need at times to blow off to intimates without fear of being taken really seriously, let alone reported. They need to be able privately to vent their anger and frustration—even maliciously, slanderously, or profanely—in order to be able publicly to think and behave with reason, dispassion, and decorum.

Privacy also provides the opportunity for self-evaluation: for reflection, for intellectual and emotional integration, and for inspection of the conscience. Finally, it permits limited and protected communication.

"The greatest threat to civilized social life would be a situation in which each individual was utterly candid in his communications with others, saying exactly what he knew or felt at all times. The havoc done to interpersonal relations by children, saints, mental patients, and adult 'innocents' is legendary." Limited and protected communication leaves us free to maintain the psychological distance which seems appropriate to various relationships and situations; it also means that a man can share confidences with his intimates and professional or religious counselors.

Human beings need privacy, but they have similarly powerful needs for disclosure, for sharing, for companionship. Each individual is engaged in the continuous process of making adjustments between his changing needs for solitude and company, intimacy and general social intercourse, reserve and disclosure. "A free society," Mr. Westin writes, "leaves this choice to the individual, for this is the core of the 'right of individual privacy'—the right of the individual to decide for himself, with only extraordinary exceptions in the interests of society, when and on what terms his acts should be revealed to the general public."

Privacy performs the same basic functions for organizations that it does for individuals. It contributes to the achievement of organizational autonomy, releases the organization members from formal role compliance, provides internal evaluation to prepare policies, and protects the organization's limited communication with others. Privacy says Mr. Westin, is "not a luxury for organizational life; it is a vital lubricant of the organizational system in free societies."

A NEW GAME BY OLD RULES

By definition, all societies, whether primitive or modern, totalitarian or free, exert some sort of social control. Surveillance is one obvious means of doing so.

"Parents watch their children, supervisors watch employees, religious leaders watch the acts of their congregants, policemen watch the streets and other public places, and government agencies watch the citizens' performance of various legal obligations and prohibitions." Fair enough, Mr. Westin would say. A good deal of indirect surveillance (through the keeping of records, for example) is necessary to ensure that citizens pay their taxes and their parking tickets, and sometimes direct surveillance is required to maintain order. This has always been so. But the invention of the telephone, the camera, the lie detector, and the development of psychological tests have changed the playing of the game without a corresponding alternation in the rules of the game. What is at question is the current and proposed use of the new techniques.

Proponents of the no-holds-barred approach welcome the increasing sensitivity of surveillance devices as being protective of society and also, they say, of the individual himself. They reason that no accused person who is innocent should object to taking a lie detector test; that no one who is not plotting a crime should object to the fact that his telephone conversations are overheard by police; that no one who approves of proper personnel selection and placement should object to personality tests. They argue, as Mr. Westin says, that "the individual himself can now prove his innocence, virtues, or talents by 'science' and avoid the unjust assumptions frequently produced by 'fallible' conventional methods."

There are several arguments to be made against this plausible-sounding line of reasoning, perhaps the least important of which is that some of the surveillance devices are *not* scientifically perfect. Even if they were, the essential point is that the knowledge or fear of surveillance has a restrictive effect on human behavior, and not just on illegal behavior. It impairs many of the crucial functions that privacy performs—reduces personal autonomy, limits the opportunity for emotional release, lessens limited and protected communication. Who would ever put forward a tentative conclusion, "think out loud," make a heatedly damaging remark about the President, or, for that matter, make a declaration of love if he thought he was not only being overheard but that his words were being recorded?

The personality tests being widely used for purposes of personnel selection by government and business organizations invade the individual's very mind and heart, his ultimate "self." They inquire directly and indirectly into his attitudes and beliefs about religion, sex, and politics. People who object to this intrusion into hitherto protected realms consider it of small comfort that the purpose is not to find out specifically what they think on certain issues but to elicit a kind of psychological profile of themselves that can be measured against some "norm." Many individuals, Mr. Westin says, "do not want themselves to be sorted and judged according to standards that rest on the unexplained evaluations of professional psychologists in the employ of 'institutional' clients." Those who resist the tests say, in effect, to those in power: "If you make evaluative decisions openly, questioning me directly and justifying your decisions openly, I can fight out publicly your right to judge me in a certain way and American society will decide our conflicting claims. But if you invoke 'science' and 'expertise' and evaluate me through personality tests, the issue becomes masked. . . . Thus, where there are basic issues such as political ideology, religion, or race at stake, the selection process must be objective and public, and I assert my right of privacy to close my emotions, beliefs, and attitudes to the process of job evaluation in a free society."

KEEPING BIG BROTHER IN CHECK

Emotionally satisfying as it would be to take a decisive swipe at Big Brother, it would be unwise and unenforceable to grant all "private" acts total immunity from surveillance by device, Mr. Westin acknowledges. "The critical challenge now is to develop new public policies to protect privacy from unreasonable surveillance." What is needed is a rational weighing process with definite criteria by which claims for disclosure or surveillance can be gauged. He suggests five.

First, the seriousness of the need to conduct surveillance must be strongly established.

"Police want to solve crimes, corporations to control thefts, employers to select more successful employees, news media to tell the 'inside' story about leading persons and events, educators to identify personality problems in school children, behavioral scientists to observe real-life situations. But if all that need be done to win legal and social approval for surveillance is to indicate a social need and show that surveillance would help cope with it, there is no balancing at all, only a qualifying procedure for a license to invade privacy. Therefore, the need involved must be serious enough to overcome the very real risk of jeopardizing the public's confidence in its daily freedom from unreasonable invasions of privacy."

Second, there are often several methods available to accomplish a given social end. The burden of proof should be on those who seek authorization for surveillance to show that there are not alternative techniques available which do less violence to individual and organizational privacy. The need for bugging and wiretapping to control crime, for example, has not been publicly proved on any crime-by-crime type of analysis. Mr. Westin personally believes that the case probably could be made for use in crimes such as extortion and kidnapping, but it has not been made in a satisfactory or convincing way. As for personality testing, there has been no research under scientific control procedures indicating that personnel selected by such measures are more successful than those chosen by other means—on the basis of their past work records, interviews, aptitude and achievement tests, and the like. Furthermore, there is no evidence whatsoever that the many organizations which do not use such tests—RCA, Du Pont, Metropolitan Life Insurance among them—hire larger numbers of emotionally disturbed employees than those that do.

Third, the degree of reliability of the surveillance instrument must be taken into account. The personality test is simply too unreliable to justify use by governmental or private organizations, Mr. Westin says, particularly "given the fact that the questions used in many such tests intrude into otherwise protected areas of personal life and private beliefs, and that preserving attitudes of nonconfession to authorities is a high social goal in American society." And when devices which are not now reliable enough (lie detectors, for example) eventually are perfected, as seems likely, society must then face the question of whether the process should be permitted even if it is wholly scientific. At any rate, no device which is not proved reliable beyond a doubt should ever be used without the individual's freely given consent.

The problem of consent to invasion of privacy, the fourth consideration, is a complicated one. Is an individual's consent implied by the fact that he accepts a certain kind of job, or that he has permitted certain kinds of surveillance previously? School teachers, for example, are accustomed to having their classrooms visited by principals; does their consent to this long-standing practice imply consent to the use of loudspeaker boxes by which administrators can monitor a classroom without the knowledge of teacher or pupils? A particularly difficult case is presented when employers require privacy-invading tests as a condition of getting a job or a promotion. In certain areas, American law does not allow individuals to waive their rights when their bargaining power is inadequate; "yellow dog" contracts, for example, under which workers promise not to join a labor union as the price of getting a job, are prohibited. Mr. Westin says that the nature of consent must be "carefully examined in each instance to see how freely given or how coerced it is in the full context."

Finally, there must be the capacity for limitation and control on those occasions when surveillance will be employed without the knowledge or consent of the surveyed. When, and under what safeguards, may the devices be used?

RULES FOR SURVEILLANCE

Mr. Westin suggests four basic steps. Rules should be set limiting those who may carry out the surveillance (for example, police should not be permitted to use eavesdropping devices, Mr. Westin believes). Detailed regulations should be set for the scope, duration, and operation of the surveillance. Rules of scope would determine, for example, what questions could be asked and what questions could not be asked in personality tests; they would also specify the types of crime for which physical surveillance is permitted. The duration of surveillance should preferably be of short, renewable periods.

A general agency should be created to set the standards, supervise practices under the rules, investigate compliance, and hear complaints, Mr. Westin says. And having set the rule for the surveillance itself, rules governing disclosure and use of the information obtained must be formulated.

In order to achieve control of surveillance technology, action by the federal and state legislatures and by the courts will be necessary. Mr. Westin says that legislation should be considered to apply to the three kinds of surveillance: phychological, data, and physical. He also believes that the Supreme Court shows signs of being ready "to identify a comprehensive privacy right based on the Constitution." The sections of *Privacy and Freedom* discussing possible legislative statutes and judicial alternatives are required reading for those in a position to act on them. But most of us are not lawyers or legislators or jurists, and Mr. Westin reminds us pointedly that individual citizens and private organizations and the professions have extremely important roles to play in protecting privacy and freedom. The fight against subliminal advertising, he points out, was won "not by legislation or judicial intervention, but by the force of civic and public opinion." He is encouraged that the moral concern and consciousness of influential individuals and groups running the political spectrum from right to left has been aroused, and believes that the climate of public opinion may now be ready "to support effective organizational and legal action to safeguard privacy, if such action can be intelligently framed and effectively presented."

Mr. Westin invites the scientific community, whose efforts in this area have been largely directed to developing more effective instruments of serveillance, to devise more scientific countermeasures—scrambling devices and the like—by which privacy can be protected. Organizations can exercise self-restraint in their personnel and other policies on behalf of the values of privacy. And he believes that the "enforcement of professional ethical standards protecting privacy could accomplish a great deal," citing the current debate among psychologists over the use of personality tests as a healthy sign.

"American society now seems ready—for the first time in a century—to face the impact of science on privacy and to restore the equilibrium among privacy, disclosure, and surveillance that was, until the 1880's one of the greatest achievements of American law and liberty," Mr. Westin concludes. Perhaps we can lead the way. For the problem is not solely an American one.

"Sometimes in the name of Man and sometimes in that of Sociey, scientists throughout the West are at work to unlock man's mind through drug and brain-wave research. . . . Throughout the industrialized nations of the world, the computer networks grow, collecting their millions of bits of data, depositing the smallest details of the citizens' lives in the unforgetting and unforgiving memory units."

The technology is new. "But the choices are as old as man's history on the planet. Will the tools be used for man's liberation or his subjugation?"

Army Reserve Responds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 10, 1967

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, an Army Reserve unit, composed of Brooklyn and Queens, N.Y., men, has responded magnificently to a local medical emergency. In these days when we ask so much of our citizen-soldiers, it is a credit to them as human beings when they perform humanitarian tasks which are clearly far beyond their military call of duty.

This unit is the 766th Repair Parts Company which was on active duty recently at Camp Drum, N.Y. Many of its 128 members are my constituents.

The medical emergency arose when the camp hospital reported a serious shortage of blood. Available supplies not only were insufficient for expected needs during the army maneuvers underway, but local residents in the area near Camp Drum, who depend on the camp hospital in emergencies, would have been placed in jeopardy.

Capt. Ralph A. Vignola, a ranger and paratrooper, and commander of the 766th, considered the hospital's problem. He decided to call a meeting of his unit, which was still in its early stage of organization after its formation last year.

Before Captain Vignola could explain the whole problem to his men, they responded. Every single member of the unit volunteered to give blood immediately.

Mr. Speaker, as leader of a group of several hundred men yourself, you can understand the difficulty of getting large numbers of human beings to agree on any pattern of behavior. Imagine the situation when every member of such a large group not only agreed to do the same thing but volunteered before being asked.

I believe the example of the 766th is an inspiration not only for the Army Reserve units which it represents so well but also for every other organization in this country.

When unity comes, not from military discipline, not from a sheeplike conformity, but from free men who see a problem and solve it together, we can all be proud of them and what they represent.

Position Paper of Lt. Gen. William E. Hall, USAF, Retired

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 14, 1967

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a position paper prepared by Lt. Gen. William E. Hall. General Hall had a distinguished career in the Air Force, and his statement with respect to our fear of public opinion and his suggestion that we begin to pursue policies to promote our own national interests abroad is entitled to careful consideration by all who are concerned about the future of America.

I commend General Hall's position paper to all Members of Congress:

POSITION PAPER OF LT. GEN. WILLIAM E. HALL

"The surest way not to prevent war is to fear it," John Randolph told the House of Representatives in 1806.

Randolph's advice is as valid today as it was when the American nation was a bare 30 years old. Unfortunately, however, U.S. foreign policy since the end of the Second World War has been significantly influenced by the psychology of fear: fear of confrontation with the Russians, fear of confrontation with the Chinese; fear of domestic public opinion, and fear of our image abroad.

We have tiptoed in and around crises as if afraid of our own power. And when events have required us to make even a limited application of that power, we have acted hesitantly, almost fearfully, as if ashamed of doing what was necessary and justified in the light of our interests and obligations.

The last shot had scarcely been fired in Europe after the Nazi forces crumbled when we began to exhibit a fear of the Russians. At first, our concern was motivated mainly by a desire to get along. Then, when the Russians made it clear they were not interested in accommodation, we shrunk back for fear of provocation.

Consequently, Communist dictatorships were imposed on the countries of Eastern Europe in flagrant violation of international agreements to allow these nations to determine freely the political courses they chose to travel. We stood by in a paralysis of fear, despite the fact that we possessed the greatest military force in history, including a monopoly of the atomic bomb and an effective and proven delivery system.

The Korean War betrayed our fear of confrontation with both the Russians and Chinese, leading to a costly stalemate in that struggle. We had the capability to interdict the Chinese at the source of their strength and, at the same time, to deter the Russians from any direct intervention through our Strategic Air Arm. Again, we chose timidity, and salvaged what we could in negotiations.

The fear of domestic public opinion is less clear-cut but even more implausible. Who can forget the adulation heaped upon Gen. Douglas MacArthur at the time he was dismissed for his policy of "there is no substitute for victory?"

The public was equally approving of the firm stand taken during the Berlin Blockade by Gen. Lucius D. Clay, a stand that ran counter to much high-level pressure in the Pentagon and State Department for a softer policy. Clay persisted, however, and ultimately prevailed with President Truman. As a result, the Russians ended their blockade with a new respect for U.S. determination to make good on its commitments.

In a similar fashion, President Kennedy reached an apex of popular support for his bold response to Soviet Premier Khrushchev's dramatic gamble to turn Cuba into a serious strategic threat to American security. Recognizing that the U.S. meant business, the Russian ruler dismantled his offensive missiles and took them home.

Given responsible and positive leadership, the American people have never flinched nor faltered against those who would do them harm. Traditionally in times of crisis, they have kept their chins high and never broken rank.

As for our image abroad, we seem desperately determined to prove Leo Durocher's baseball dictum that "nice guys finish last." Few nations have succumbed to Uncle Sam's good-guy image. France's de Gaulle, despite our goodwill, good intentions, and millions of hard American dollars in aid, has been virtually disdainful in the prosecution of what he regards as France's self-interest. He has been singularly unconcerned about the image he has created in the U.S. and among his European neighbors. From the French viewpoint, his policies have been successful; indeed, other allies have begun to emulate him. They have been relatively unsympathetic, for example, about our balance of payment difficulties, and while gratitude is no basis on which to conduct a foreign policy, a little cooperation for those who have aided so massively in the past would not be too much to ask.

Isn't it time the U.S. begin to pursue policies to promote its own national interests, regardless of whether or not we inspire affection abroad? Great nations should seek only respect, not love. They need no other image so long as their motives are clear and their objectives are justifiable.

The fear psychology is especially crippling today. In our piecemeal conduct of the war in Vietnam, we have a glaring and disastrous example of a self-imposed restraint based upon the questionable fear of what "the other side" will do.

Thousands of lives are being lost and billions of tax dollars spent in a cruelly disappointing effort to dissuade a fourth-rate power to end its acts of aggression against a neighbor.

Inasmuch as the U.S. is irrevocably and justly committed to guaranteeing a free and independent South Vietnam, should we not proceed toward our goal in the most effective and least costly manner? Does it make sense to calculate every action against North Vietnam in fearful terms? Must we fear disapprobation of that elusive and mercurial element known as "world public opinion" in pursuit of aims we judge to be honorable and in our own interests?

My late wife, Marguerite Higgins, used to ask in her columns whether the opinion of the man in the streets of Calcutta was either informed enough or important enough to deflect us from our objectives. The question is still a good one, and it might well be broadened to include the men in Whitehall and the Quai d'Orsay, not to mention the Kremlin and Peking.

With great vision and the expenditure of vast sums of money, the U.S. has acquired a military capability which, properly and judiciously exploited, could be the greatest force for peace the world has known. If a serious and credible threat of using only a small fraction of that power were applied to North Vietnam, the war could be brought to a rapid and humane conclusion. This does not argue for leveling North Vietnam nor annihilating its people. It does argue for taking those measures which will end the Hanoi regime's capacity to continue its aggression.

We cannot, and should not, impose upon ourselves a standard of conduct in war that the enemy blithely ignores. Furthermore, sound policy dictates that we use our vastly superior air and sea power to advantage, not simply as incidental to a bleeding ground action. War is a test of will as well as of weapons, and we cannot afford to have our will questioned by our refusal to use those weapons best designed to achieve our ends.

Critics argue that such a course would precipitate a collision with Red China and Russia, lose support of the American people, and irreparably damage our image abroad.

There are four good reasons to dispute that argument:

(1) Relations between China and Russia and the former's domestic crisis are such as to preclude a serious military threat from the Red Chinese.

(2) The Soviet Union's vested interest in its political and economic status-quo is such as to minimize any interest in a major conflict in behalf of such an insignificant ally as North Vietnam.

(3) The American electorate will support any actions which would bring the expensive and frustrating Vietnam crisis to an honorable conclusion.

(4) Internationally, America through a clear, firm and productive course of action consistent with and in support of its international commitments, would once again be respected in the eyes of the world.

We must stop shrinking with fear from a wise and selective use of our immense force and resources. A common assumption today is that the Communists are playing a waiting game, hopeful that America's will and stamina will be undermined by frustration in the hard tasks ahead. In the last book she wrote before she died of a disease contracted while she was reporting the war in Vietnam, Marguerite took note of the highly vocal protests at home against the struggle in Southeast Asia. "But articulation is not representation in America either," she wrote, "and it is hard to believe that the people of this country would adopt a policy of scuttle and run."

She envisioned America swinging away from policies of an unhappy past of being "friendly to the neutrals, neutral to its enemies, and hostile to its friends." Let's abandon the psychology of fear and do that which is necessary and right.

Hoffa's Prison Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 14, 1967

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, a leading Chicago newspaper, the Chicago's American, in the August 11, 1967, edition, has an incredible story by one of its reporters, Sy Adelman, which indicates that a convicted felon, who should be serving his time like other prisoners in a Federal penitentiary, is being extended preferential treatment, apparently due to the intervention and through the help of a U.S. marshal, Joseph N. Tierney. It is nothing short of disgusting to read that Mr. James R. Hoffa, the leader of the Teamsters Union, is being driven to and from the Du Page County jail in Illinois to conferences in the Federal Building in Chicago by means of a 1967 air-conditioned Chrysler. The story goes on to indicate that Mr. Hoffa is dining on a specially ordered cuisine and holding conferences in a special chamber provided for his use, all of which is treatment most assuredly not afforded other Federal prisoners under similar circumstances. Mr. Speaker, I am addressing a letter to the chairman of the House Judiciary Committee requesting that his committee conduct an investigation of these most serious charges. We can have very little faith in the U.S. marshal's office or in the Federal prison system if favored and preferential treatment is going to be accorded to a convicted felon who should be serving his time like every other prisoner, but is being given special treatment because he was a former powerful labor leader.

Mr. Speaker, I enclose the text of Mr. Adelman's article in the Chicago's American of August 11, 1967:

HOFFA'S PRISON LIFE

(By Sy Adelman)

Tho he is a federal prisoner, Teamster President James R. Hoffa still seems to be living the good life.

At least he is during his frequent trips to Chicago's Federal building to prepare for new hearings Monday on his 1964 conviction on mail fraud charges.

United States Marshal Joseph N. Tierney insists that Hoffa, still a powerful labor leader, receives no special treatment.

But an investigation by Chicago's American shows that:

Hoffa is driven from the Du Page county jail, where he is being held, to the Federal building for conferences with his attorneys, in a 1967 air conditioned Chrysler.

Federal prisoners normally are transported from the Cook county jail to the Federal building in a prison van.

Hoffa confers with his four lawyers, his family, and friends in the conference room of the marshal's offices, which Tierney says is for use only "for conferences between me and my staff."

Other federal prisoners must talk to their attorneys and visitors in a special prisoner's section where the prisoners are separated from their callers by a wire partition.

During these conferences Hoffa is served fried chicken and huge roast beef sandwiches.

Recently a waiter from a catering service entered the conference room, while Hoffa was there, carrying a large package and a tablecloth. Other prisoners get lunch meat, pie, and coffee or tea.

DENIES SPECIAL FOOD

Tierney denied that Hoffa receives special food, but he was more vague about whether Hoffa uses his conference room.

Hoffa, who is serving an 8-year term in the federal prison at Lewisburg, Pa., for jury tampering, was brought here July 20 for the new hearings in his Chicago conviction.

At the request of Hoffa's attorneys, Judge Richard B. Austin ordered Tierney to make the facilities of the marshal's lockup available to the prisoner for conferences with his lawyers.

Asked whether Hoffa is using the conference room, Tierney replied:

"He is using the facilities of the marshal's lockup."

REPEATS HIS ANSWER

Asked whether other prisoners get to use the conference room, the marshal repeated:

"He is using the facilities of the marshal's lockup."

When questioned about whether he considers the conference room part of these facilities, Tierney again answered:

"He is using the facilities of the marshal's lockup."

During this conversation with Tierney, a reporter heard voices coming from the conference room and requested permission to look into the room. Tierney refused.

JAIL HERE CROWDED

Tierney said Hoffa and another defendant in the mail fraud case. Benjamin Dranow, who also is serving time on another conviction, are being housed in the Du Page county jail in Wheaton because the Cook county jail, where such prisoners ordinarily are held, is "overcrowded."

He said it is not unusual to keep his prisoners in the Du Page facilities.

Tierney said he has a list of about 15 persons who are authorized to see Hoffa when he is at the marshal's office. Hoffa makes the trip from Wheaton every Monday, Wednesday, and Friday.

ORDERED BY COURT

The hearings into the mail fraud conviction of Hoffa, Dranow, and five others were ordered by the United States Supreme court to determine whether some of the evidence may have been illegally obtained by wire tapping.

Hoffa and the other defendants were convicted of conspiring to divert 1.7 million dollars from the Teamsters pension fund.

Marine and GI Vietnam Victims

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 14, 1967

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Cpl. Albert F. Wright, Jr., and Pfc. R. Julian Davis, Jr., two Maryland servicemen, were recently killed in action in Vietnam. I wish to commend the courage of these young men and to honor their memory by including the following article in the RECORD:

MARINE AND GI VIET VICTIMS—MINE AND SHRAPNEL CAUSE STATE'S LATEST CASUALTIES

An Annapolis marine who had already received his orders to return to the United States and a Kent county soldier who had been in Vietnam only two months have been killed in action there, the Defense Department said yesterday.

The latest Maryland casualties were identified as Marine Cpl. Albert F. Wright, Jr., 22, of 103 Rosewood street, Annapolis; Army Pfc. R. Julian Davis, Jr., 20, of U.S. 213, Galena, Md.

Corporal Wright, whose specialty was handling explosives, was killed near An Hoa August 2 while he was working with a crew clearing a road of mines, the Defense Department reported.

WAS TO COME HOME

The corporal's father, Albert F. Wright, Sr., said his son had written in his last letter that he had received his orders to report to Camp Lejeune, N.C., and was expecting to come home this month.

Corporal Wright was assigned to an engineer battalion in the 5th Marine Regiment of the 1st Marine Division.

He enlisted immediately after his graduation from Bates High School in June, 1964, and had just completed the third year of his four-year enlistment.

Corporal Wright is survived by this father and two brothers, Bradley K. Wright, and Jonathan Wright, all of Annapolis.

SHRAPNEL FROM BOOBY TRAP

Pfc. Davis, who was assigned to the 25th Infantry Division, was mortally wounded Monday by shrapnel from a booby trap during a night patrol, the Defense Department said. He died in the 67th Evacuation Hospital.

A 1965 graduate of Galena High School, Pfc. Davis was drafted in January, 1967 after he had completed a course at an IBM Corporation school in Washington. He had been in Vietnam since June.

Pfc. Davis is survived by his parents, Mr. and Mrs. R. Julian Davis, Sr., of Galena; and two sisters, Mrs. Thomas Llewelyn, of Westminster, and Mrs. Paul Kesmodel, of Atlanta.

Bukhara Retains Traits of Eastern Past

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 14, 1967

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, one of the great illusions which Soviet Russian propaganda has created is the picture of the U.S.S.R. as a State comprised of "Russians," whereas the facts are that almost half the population within the present boundaries of the U.S.S.R. are non-Russian captives of Soviet colonialism.

An article in the Thursday, August 10, edition of the Chicago Tribune by Frank Starr, the newspaper's Moscow Bureau Chief, was obviously intended as a type of travelog but in an interesting fashion describes one of the non-Russian areas of the Soviet State. The article follows:

Bukhara Retains Traits of Eastern Past

(By Frank Starr)

Bukhara, U.S.S.R., Aug. 9.—Silk and spice bearing caravans no longer ply the Golden Road taking their bearing on a flare high in the great Kalyan minaret.

But the 153-foot minaret still stands, and traces of the Golden Road can be found, and Bukhara today still bears more characteristics of its eastern past than its soviet present.

The ancient Kalyan mosque is a warehouse for soviet motorcycles and bicycles altho it is being restored and officials say it will again be used for worship.

ONLY OPERATING MEDRESSAH

Nearby is the only operating medressah [a Moslem seminary] in the Soviet Union. It has 52 students and there are many 17-year-olds waiting to get in for the nine-year course.

The 18th century mosque used by the emirs who lived in the citadel of Bukhara is now a billiard hall.

The summer palace of the last emir, Said Alim Khan, who fled to Afghanistan when the revolution came to Bukhara in 1920, is a museum.

The graceful Arabic alphabet is seen only on a blackboard in the medressah. It was officially discarded in 1929 in favor of the Roman which in turn was abandoned in 1940 for the Cyrillic used to write Russian.

VEIL RARELY SEEN

Women no longer observe the Moslem custom of appearing in public only with their faces covered. The veil, or paranjeh, is rarely seen.

But the bazaar of Bukhara is as colorful as it must have been in the days of caravans. Tajik women still wear the pajama-like kuilak trousers and multihued scarf called a rumal.

Uzbek women still wear sack-like dresses of brilliant colors or, if they are older, black and white. The men don long robes and small white turbans. They wrap a brightly colored sash around their waists.

And the ancient greeting can be seen at every turn—right hand over the heart, a slight bow, and the words "salom aleikum" or "peace to you."

FIVE MOSQUES FUNCTION

Of the 60 old mosques here, five still function.

Bronzed Bukhara men enter barefoot, loosen one end of the turban cloth which then hangs to the shoulder, and stand silently or kneel, touching their foreheads to the floor.

Thus they pray facing Mecca, which from here is west, not east.

Across the square from Bukhara's only hotel for foreigners is a two-story color portrait of a smiling Lenin. But the usual party exhortations, which stand in huge red letters on building tops and on posters in Moscow are rare here.

MEDALS, BADGES RARE

In the afternoons, the men gather under the trees in the heart of the city, sit on low platforms covered with stained Oriental rugs, and drink green tea from unwashed cups at foot-high tables.

There are a few women with them. Their faces are uncovered and some wear western style clothes. The medals and party badges that adorn many Muscovite lapels are rare.

Children now swim in the few khauzes or water reservoirs that are left. These polluted pools used to provide drinking water for Bukhara. The soviet leaders replaced them with a high wooden water tower in 1929.

Today, even that tower is unused. But foreigners take the precaution of drinking bottled mineral water from the Caucasus mountains.

The historical monuments of Bukhara's periods of glory are shown with pride and those that are more than ruins are preserved with care.

The citadel, or ark, combining construction from the 1st to the 18th centuries, bears silent witness to the vast power of the emirs and their jealous sensitivity toward that power.

Wax figures are chained to the walls in the prison cells where ceilings are too low to allow a man to stand. The vermin pit, into which Emir Nasrullah threw two British envoys, Col. Charles Stoddart and Capt. Arthur Connolly in 1842, contains models of bleeding, bitten victims.

And there are paintings of the beheadings which took place on the flagstone square in front of the citadel as late as 1900.

The mausoleum of Ismail Samani, founder of the first of Bukhara's six dynasties, has been carefully restored and preserved. It stands alone on the edge of the city and is a gem of eastern architecture—nearly 1,000 years old.

EQUIVALENT OF SAINT

Because the founder of the Samanid dynasty was considered the equivalent of a saint, many Moslems were buried as near as possible to his mausoleum. Thus, only the dome could be seen when restoration began a few years ago.

Its excellent state of preservation is attributed to the mortar which the natives say is made of clay, camel's milk, and egg yolks. They add that this formula was used in only one other building in Bukhara, the Kalyan minaret.

The minaret, built in 1127, is Bukhara's landmark.

It was not only the tower from which the muezzin called the faithful to prayer. It served as a lighthouse guiding caravans across the desert to Bukhara; it was a watchtower against approaching enemies; and it served as the place from which criminals and enemies of the emir were dispatched. Thus it is sometimes called the Tower of Death.

Vietnam Elections

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 14, 1967

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, Prof. Julian R. Friedman, associate professor of political science, Maxwell Graduate School, Syracuse University, recently registered his views on the Vietnam elections and the urgency of deescalation. Professor Friedman is an old friend and former constituent whose views I highly value. I take this means to share his views with my congressional colleagues:

[From the Syracuse (N.Y.) Post-Standard, July 29, 1967]

Vietnam Election No War Solution

To the Editor of the Post-Standard:

Although the election game in South Vietnam has already produced a few startling episodes, it is unlikely under the present constraints to remove the major cause of the civil war, namely, the refusal by the South Vietnam Government sustained by the United States to admit into the political arena the National Liberation Front, its constituent bodies, and allied political groups.

Were the Front accorded this elementary right amidst democratic guarantees and with strict adherence to the Geneva Agreement and Declaration, its military effort is likely to cease. In this case, it will be no longer in need of assistance from North Vietnam. In turn, the Hanoi Government will then have no reason to extend military aid to the Front.

The cessation of such aid should satisfy the imperatives of the American authorities, thus eliminating the ostensible grounds for the assault on North Vietnam and the presence of American armed forces in the country. In this way the vicious cycle of escalation can be arrested and reversed.

It is a matter of the greatest urgency that the political impasses in South Vietnam be ended before the current escalation of means is phased into the escalation of ends. In 1963, the Vietnam war was for the United States a cheap war. It seemed to offer relatively high gains for a small outlay. Today it is an immensely expensive war for fundamentally the same gains, which now seem relatively small.

The more the United States increases its investments in its current commitments, the more it will inevitably be tempted to seek higher returns to justify its costs, which could very well mean extending the war in Asia.

Julian R. Friedman.

Belle Grove Dedication

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN O. MARSH, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 14, 1967

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, this past Sunday marked the dedication of one of the historic dwellings of Virginia, Belle Grove, near Middletown, Va., as a national trust property.

Belle Grove is a home steeped in the history of this Nation. Built in 1787, it is classic in its architectural design. Built by a Revolutionary officer, it figured prominantly in the early history of our country. Men of the North and South marched by it as opposing armies sought to control the Shenandoah Valley in the Civil War. In fact, "Belle Grove" was the headquarters to which Sheridan would ride during the Battle of Cedar Creek, which ride has been immortalized in poetry.

In 1964, Mr. Francis Welles Hunnewell of Wellesley, Mass., former secretary of the Harvard Corp., who had acquired the property in 1929, devised it to the National Trust for Historical Preservation.

On the occasion of the dedication of the trust property, which program was presided over by the Honorable Gordon Gray, chairman of the board of the National Trust for Historic Preservation, the dedication address was given by Dr. Edward P. Alexander.

The selection of Dr. Alexander was an outstanding one, by training and experience. An expert in the field of historic preservation, Dr. Alexander is chairman of the Virginia Historic Landmarks Commission, and vice president and director of the division of interpretation of Colonial Williamsburg.

Because his address sets out a criteria for historic preservation that has application far wider than just Belle Grove, in fact of State and National import, I would like to bring it to the attention of the other Members of the House, as follows:

Belle Grove Dedication

(By Edward P. Alexander, chairman, Virginia Historic Landmarks Commission Aug. 13, 1967)

About 1790, Major Isaac Hite came to this spot and began to build this stately Federal-style house. He was the son of Jost Hite, sturdy pioneer from Alsace, who as early as 1731 brought German families from Bethlehem, Pennsylvania, to people the Shenandoah Valley. Isaac was a graduate of the College of William and Mary and an early member of the new Greek letter society, Phi Beta Kappa. He had fought in the Revolutionary War, for two years as aide-de-camp to General Peter Gabriel Muhlenberg, and was present at the crucial battle of Yorktown.

In 1783 Major Hite was married to Nelly Conway Madison, the sister of James Madison—little Jemmy, his friends sometimes called him, who was soon to become the Father of the Constitution and later President of the United States. James Madison and his springtly bride Dolley Payne Madison later spent two weeks of their honeymoon visiting the Hites at Belle Grove.

Nelly Hite died in 1802 leaving a small son and daughter, and a year later the Major was married to Ann Turnstall Maury, by whom he had ten children. Ann was a member of the Huguenot families of Fontaine and Maury who gave Virginia its famed oceanographer, Mathew Fontaine Maury.

Belle Grove was a fine Virginia Valley farm. The Major owned more than 3,000 acres in Frederick County, kept his sawmill supplied with his own excellent timber, and, in addition to his large family, looked after 66 slaves.

About the beginning of the Civil War, the farm passed out of the Hite family and during that conflict was occupied in turn by Confederate and Union troops. In October 1864, General Jubal Early and his Confederate cavalry attacked at dawn Sheridan's force encamped around Belle Grove and won a preliminary victory. General Sheridan was in Winchester and when he heard the sound of firing set out on the ride celebrated in the well known poem. When he reached Belle Grove, he rallied the Union troops and scored a decisive victory.

A house associated with historic men and events and one that helps modern visitors recall the everyday life of another era is well worth saving. As Mr. Jefferson once put it, "A morsel of genuine history is a thing so rare as to be always valuable." History, then, is an important ingredient in constituting a landmark.

Of equal consequence, however, is the aesthetic element found in an outstanding example of architectural style. Belle Grove with its dressed limestone construction, rough hewn stone quoins, broad entrance porch with Doric columns, and four widely spaced chimneys is an imposing Federal or neoclassic building. Inside it contains distinguished architectural details—original floors of yellow pine, fine paneling and mantels in every room, and elaborately carved rams' heads on the drawing room pilasters. Little wonder that travelers as they passed on the turnpike used to turn to look at Belle Grove and that local citizens proudly considered it "the most splendid building west of the Blue Ridge."

Landmarks, however, should have more than historical importance or aesthetic beauty. They also should possess integrity. A high proportion of original work should survive, and it should be true to history, not prettied up or faked. Belle Grove owes much of its surviving authenticity to its last individual owner, Francis Welles Hunnewell, secretary of Harvard University and keen amateur botanist who acquired the charming old place in 1929 as a center for his field trips. He and his architect, Horace W. Peaslee of Washington, restored the structure with restraint and care. Mr. Hunnewell left the house and 100 acres to the National Trust for Historic Preservation so as to perpetuate its authentic condition and ensure for it an enlightened public use.

Belle Grove, then, is a model landmark—fortunate enough to combine history, architectural charm, and integrity of form. In 1960 the National Trust aided by the Old Dominion Foundation made a survey of Virginia landmarks that examined some 4,000 properties, and high on its list was Belle Grove, described as an outstanding building of statewide significance.

Today, Virginia is on the threshold of a great era for historic preservation. In 1966 the Legislature of the Commonwealth created a new state agency, the Virginia Historic Landmarks Commission. One chief duty of the Commission is to designate as Virginia landmarks the buildings, structures, and sites of historical, architectural, and archaeological importance that have statewide or national significance. The other purpose of the Commission is to forward preservation of these designated landmarks by coordinating the efforts of private individuals and institutions with those of local, state, and federal agencies. Mr. James W. Moody, Jr. is Executive Director of the Commission in Richmond and he and his staff are beginning the intensive survey of Virginia landmarks that will form the basis for all future work.

The Federal Government recently has increased its support of the preservation movement, and Congres in 1966 passed the Federal Historic Preservation Act. It grants up to 50 percent matching funds to states for the purpose of conducting comprehensive statewide surveys of landmarks and for their acquisition, preservation, and development. All state landmarks work must be coordinated with a comprehensive state outdoor recreation plan, and in Virginia, Senator FitzGerald Bemiss is Chairman of the Outdoor Recreation Commission and Mr. Elbert Cox its Executive Director.

The Federal Act also recognizes the key position of the National Trust as a catalyst for historic preservation and is making grants to the Trust for the expansion and acceleration of its preservation programs.

Thus the Commonwealth of Virginia, the Federal Government, and the National Trust for Historic Preservation are all joining hands to preserve and make wise use of our historical, architectural, and archaeological heritage. Belle Grove is only one superb example of the kind of landmark with which this triple effort concerns itself.

Under the new legislation the preservation movement in Virginia and in the nation is attaining maturity. Of paramount importance are the uses to which preserved buildings and sites are put. Not all landmarks can become house museums, for only a few have the broad appeals of a Belle Grove and are as fortunately situated near a major highway. More and more, preservationists must seek out adaptive uses for old places—uses that are in keeping with the structures themselves and will not harm them. Obviously, landmarks often can serve as residences, headquarters for clubs, conference centers, offices for profesional men, or in other ways that will preserve their exterior appearance. In cities and villages, whole historic districts may form mellow and pleasant areas for modern living where the individual buildings might not have enough historical and aesthetic importance to warrant their preservation. This is a case in which the value of the whole is greater than that of the sum of its parts. Alexandria, Fredericksburg, and Waterford offer a few Virginia examples of these historic districts.

Winston Churchill made a speech in New York during the Berlin airlift in which he said: "Our airlift has won us the hearts of the German people, gentlemen. I hope you won't be offended that I think it important to win the hearts of the German people seeing they did us so much wrong—but gentlemen, let us only remember so much of the past as will make us creative in the future."

This quotation applies most aptly to the preservation movement. We must weigh carefully the merits of the buildings, structures, and sites of the past. We cannot possibly save them all, because the present has its pressing and legitimate needs and demands. Mr. Jefferson was right when he once remarked that "The earth belongs always to the living generation." But careful research and expert evaluation of historic worth, aesthetic appeal, and structural integrity will help us choose the landmarks worth fighting for. In making our choices, we must beware both the fuddy-duddy antiquarian who wishes to save everything old and the callous real estate promoter who will bulldoze anything for a fast buck. In reaching our decisions we should ponder well Mr. Churchill's wise advice that we "only remember as much of the past as will make us creative in the future."

Publishers' Auxiliary Honors Paul Bruun

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANTE B. FASCELL
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 14, 1967

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, when Publishers' Auxiliary, a national publication, chooses to honor the editor of a local weekly newspaper, it is quite apparent that the editor can be no ordinary man.

Paul Bruun, editor-publisher of the Miami Beach Reporter, has been a prominent figure on the Miami Beach scene for the last 30 years and the impact of his columns and editorials have been felt by friend and foe alike. I recommend to my colleagues the following article from the August 12 edition of Publishers' Auxiliary which gives an excellent profile of Mr. Bruun:

Fights the World With Weekly

Miami Beach, Fla.—"When Paul Bruun is your friend you don't need anybody else, but when he is your enemy, watch out. . . ."

The six-feet-tall, 225-pound editor-publisher of the weekly 45,000-circulation Miami Beach Reporter and former columnist for the Miami Beach Sun is a man of apparent paradoxes—yet one who is widely read and often quoted.

"He is a severe critic, but a zealous reporter; a terrible adversary, yet a devoted friend; a man who enjoys raking press agents over the coals, but one who shows infinite patience and kindness with newcomers to the field of journalism."

A 59-year-old product of immigrant parents from Denmark, Bruun describes himself as "a country boy at heart."

Born in the virtually inconspicious community of Newcomerstown, Ohio, the versatile journalist was reared by an influential "God-fearing mother who fought the devil and his henchmen at every turn."

Reminisces Bruun: "My father couldn't have beer or wine in his own home and the cheap stogies he smoked, plus his smelly pipes, were the bane of my mother's existence."

It was little wonder that young Bruun strted out to "become a Methodist minister of the hellfire and brimstone school."

Drifting into the newspaper business while on his honeymoon in Miami Beach, the 29-year-old individualist took a job with the Tribune there, where he became star ad salesman, specializing in amusements.

Later a staff writer for the Miami Beach Sun, Bruun eventually earned the position of amusements editor and amusement advertising salesman, "remaining for 19 years and 50 weeks until . . . fired without being told why."

He began his column for the Sun—"Bruun over Miami"—strictly as an amusement venture, but gradually built it up into a "pillar of controversy" by discussing such diversified topics as pleas for charities, critical views on Miami's weekly entertainment, promotion of cultural activities and running commentary on "which stripper is feuding with which."

"For quite a number of years now I have campaigned for legalized gambling casinos for Miami Beach, for a Florida state lottery and for a national lottery," says the aggressive editor-publisher.

"Few people hate, with the hatred I have, the hoodlums, racketeers, crooks and parasites created by illegal activities in the gambling field."

Having a reputation for truthful, simple and untarnished reporting, Bruun is fiercely interested in politics and recalls with a bit of pride:

"I have been extremely lucky in picking political candidates"—even when it meant opposing the policy of the newspaper by which he was employed.

He comments, "In June, Miami Beach elected a mayor and one councilman who were in a run-off. The three daily papers endorsed Mayor Roosevelt and I endorsed his opponent, Jay Dermer. Dermer won."

Says the Florida publisher, with frankness, "I am a fanatic FOR Miami Beach and against the world if the world is against Miami Beach."

An avid reporter Bruun says he goes to great lengths to break a story but "protect my sources with the ferocity of a mother tiger.

"I once was cited for contempt of Grand Jury because I refused to reveal the source of an item I ran in 'Bruun over Miami.' Then Judge George Holt complimented me on my courage but found me guilty—fine $100."

He continues: "I am a rugged individualist campaigning for what I believe, not concerned with popular causes or popular candidates."

Presently publisher of Florida's largest weekly, editor-publisher Bruun claims no journalistic honors—"I am a loner, take tremendous pride in my work and revel in accomplishment."

Now in his sixth year with the weekly Reporter, the zealous newspaperman states bluntly:

"I am in the newspaper business primarily to make money, and anybody who says he isn't is either a damn liar or thinks he is in it because he has printer's ink in his veins."

The Enstrom F-28 Helicopter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP E. RUPPE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 14, 1967

Mr. RUPPE. Mr. Speaker, I doubt that many of our colleagues in this Chamber have ever heard of the Enstrom F-28 helicopter. Chances are you have seen it, however, if you were fortunate enough to attend Expo '67 in Montreal, Canada. It is the official helicopter there, and you may have even commented on its sleek lines and graceful appearance as it hovered overhead. If you are from Michigan, you have certainly heard of it since it has won the coveted title of Michigan Product of the Year.

The Enstrom story is an amazing one. In early 1966 Enstrom was a small research and development organization in Menominee, Mich. It made the transition to a manufacturing company, and by the end of January 1967 had four operating helicopters on the market. Enstrom is still a small company, but it is making its mark fast. As the president of the company, Jack Christensen, wrote me last week:

> Michigan's helicopter is superior to all others. . . . It's just that everyone doesn't know it—yet.

Frank Ogden is the pilot of the official Canadian centennial helicopter. From a hotel room in Winnipeg, Ogden wrote Christensen a letter conveying his impressions of the new Enstrom F-28 helicopter. Mr. Ogden confirms what other professional helicopter pilots have been saying since the first Enstrom F-28 appeared on the market. Mr. Ogden's letter is as follows:

WINNIPEG, CANADA,
July 16, 1967.

JACK CHRISTENSEN,
President,
R. J. Enstrom Corp.,
Menominee, Mich.

DEAR JACK: Just flew into Winnipeg for the Pan American Games. My 82nd stop in CF-CCP, Enstrom serial no. 8.

This is my 77th day of steady flying in this machine. No "down time" to date. No problems. Nice to be aboard such a dependable machine. During the last five days I have flown well over 1,000 miles over the most desolate sections of Northern Ontario. Most of the time solid bush without a landing spot of any kind. (The trees grow out over the water's edge around there). It was most reassuring to be in an Enstrom. I've never felt that safe in any other helicopter. The same feeling carried me over the provinces of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Quebec (including the remote Gaspe Peninsula) and Ontario. Prince Edward Island I also covered too, but the terrain there is more hospitable.

I have flown well over 500 people including Premiers, Cabinet Members, Government officials of all types, Municipal officials (40 Mayors in 11 days in the Province of Quebec alone as an example), beauty queens, centenarians (four so far—two 102 years old and two 100 years old), plus assistant journalists, TV cameramen, announcers, etc. Many remarked on the quietness and lack of vibration that had been so noticeable in other helicopters in which they had ridden previously. Almost everybody remarks on the "classy" appearance of the cabin.

I think I can safely say that *no other helicopter any where in the world* has had an extended shakedown cruise like I have given CF-CCP since I left your factory on May 1, 1967. And all this, remember, without the daily attention usually given all other helicopters by their mechanic (Air Engineers we call them in Canada). I do know that no other helicopter in this country would consider making such a trip without carrying an Air Engineer along and a carful of spare parts. I carried a screwdriver, a pair of pliers (to avoid burning my fingers when checking the oil dipstick), a can of Pledge (to clean the fuselage) and a bottle of Mirror Glaze for the windscreen. That, plus a couple of rags, my oil can and grease gun is it. I found I needed nothing else.

I have landed in very unusual locations. The easternmost section of Canada's mainland, as well as the southernmost point. On docks, sand bars, log booms, rooftops (I dedicated the new rooftop heliport of the Samsonite of Canadad Ltd. luggage factory in Stratford, Ontario on July 6th), front lawns, old folks' homes, military bases, etc., etc. The Enstrom handled beautifully under all circumstances.

When I complete the tour I will give you a more detailed report, but I want you to know—and tell the plant personnel—that they really built this one! And the design and engineering is most efficient. It handled thunderstorms, high winds (45 mph) and temperature changes (35° to 85°) without any problems.

It's a terrific bird!

Sincerely,

FRANK OGDEN.

Governor Kirk Confrontation With Rap Brown

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. GURNEY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 14, 1967

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, Wednesday night, August 9, 1967, Gov. Claude R. Kirk, of Florida, took the wind out of the sails of black power advocate H. Rap Brown. Brown was in Jacksonville, Fla., telling Negroes that they had the white people scared to death.

When he started talking about guns and violence, Governor Kirk strode from out of the darkness, calmly took the microphone from Brown, and deflated what was potentially a dangerous and tense situation.

The next day's headlines, both in Florida and nationally, told of Governor Kirk's bold confrontation with Brown.

By Thursday afternoon, everyone, it seemed, was applauding the Governor's courageous stand. Everyone that is, except elected Member of the Democrat Party.

They began sniping away at the Governor, for his so-called "welcome" of Brown to Florida.

One Member said the Governor was irresponsible, and that surely he was not speaking for the people of Florida. The people of Florida were not given much credit for intelligence by these critics. For the news stories and editorial comments reveal that the people of Florida were solidly behind their Governor in his confrontation with rabblerouser Brown. The shoe was on the other foot. It was the Democrat politicians who were not speaking for the people of Florida in their petty sniping at Governor Kirk.

In case there is any doubt on how this action by Governor Kirk was received in Florida, I commend to my colleagues the following press comments:

[From the Orlando (Fla.) Sentinel, Aug. 11, 1967]

THE LONE RANGER RIDES AGAIN

They laughed when Claude Kirk sat down at the piano but when he began to play . . .

Kirk has been confounding the conventional politicians since he was announced for governor last year by doing the unexpected unconventionally.

When he had an idea to help bring McDonnell Aircraft to Titusville, he jetted up to the company's St. Louis headquarters one evening for dinner.

To fight crime when his Democratic foes were reluctant to give him the tools, he appointed his own personal army of Wackenhut men and set about to finance the operation privately.

He flew into West Palm Beach at 2 o'clock one morning recently to check on trouble that was brewing there.

He personally directed Wackenhut agents by phone at 4 o'clock one morning to raid a suspected drug pusher's lair.

Thursday night he swatted hate peddler Rap Brown with love.

He is undiplomatic with his political foes.

He has heaped humiliation on the cabinet. While everything in Tallahassee, as in Washington, is supposed to be peaches and cream in public, Kirk has stared the Democratic cabinet officers in the eye and told them that they are inferior.

His is a personal type of government. He is an action governor. Nothing can happen in Florida unless Claude Kirk is there.

He is not a behind-the-lines general. He hand carries his orders to the front.

When the Florida Education Association holds its mass demonstration at the Tangerine Bowl in Orlando on Aug. 24, we would be disappointed if Claude Kirk doesn't ride in on a white stallion and a cloud of dust as "Hi yo, Silver" echoes through the stadium.

This personal approach to government is not only good newspaper copy, it is popular with the people.

Whereas the governor of another state might have received reports on Rap Brown from the sanctuary of his office, Kirk faced the lion in his den—to the approval of the overwhelming majority of Floridians.

Claude Kirk is obviously the kind of governor the people want, and Floridians are no different from people elsewhere.

Dwight Eisenhower was elected president after he promised to go to Korea.

Of such stuff leaders are made.

[From the Miami (Fla.) Herald, Aug. 13, 1967]

WASHINGTON STOPS LAUGHING

(By Peter Laine)

WASHINGTON.—In a city where publicity is the lifeblood for many inhabitants, grudging admiration is mounting for Gov. Claude Kirk.

Here he is one morning on the front page of the dominant Washington Post, a broad grin on his face as he lets the air out of racist Rap Brown in Jacksonville.

A few hours later the Brown incident—and Kirk—are the center of debate on the floor of the House. The Governor beams again from the afternoon Star.

The day before, his face decorated the Post in an account of a shouting match with the State Cabinet.

Wherever you turn there's Kirk—getting married, slashing budgets, huddling in hideaways, capturing conventions, warring with Democrats.

Few people in the Capital could have told you the name of any previous Florida Governor, or cared less.

Now it's getting so you hardly know what to expect when you pick up the paper—Kirk or LBJ.

Kirk jets in so often that one disgruntled Democrat said the Governor spends less time in his own Capitol in Tallahassee.

These visits never seem to produce any real news, anything of substance—though there's always an appearance of urgency about them.

Kirk is a hit and run phenomeon who promotes his own plays and moves on to the next scene before his opponents have rehearsed their parts. Even a pratfall is performed with a flourish.

Which is leading here to another assessment of the man: a realization that it is very dangerous to underestimate him.

A little more than a year ago, Kirk was a political joke, at best a perennial runner for a second place party. As soon as the primaries appeared to give the GOP a real chance, efforts were made to jerk out Kirk and send in a real ball carrier—something he hasn't forgotten.

A big laugh went up as soon as it leaked—or was leaked—that Kirk, hardly out of his inauguration top hat, was making plans connected with next year's national ticket. With characteristic modesty he once inquired here why everyone assumed these had to do with the vice presidency.

Now the convention has been landed for his home state and there he will be as host Governor with his impressive televison image in living color on the coast to coast network. Probably bouncing off satellites, too.

Here is a man in the new Republican mold with a shrewd knowledge of how to seize and exploit the areas that really worry people—crime, riots, taxes, spending, the frustrations of antiquated government and the insecurities of an increasingly complicated world.

Voters will go for someone with actions and answers. Kirk is always moving, never at a loss for words.

Florida has turned full cycle from the era of cracker politics and produced an entirely new breed of cat. The laughs around this town are dying down.

MERLIN ISN'T DEAD

(By Charles Kappes, editorial director, WGBS radio, Miami, Fla.)

Once upon a time there was wizard named Merlin who performed his tricks in the court of the good King Arthur of round-table renown.

It was believed that Merlin died in the 5th of 6th century the victim of either one of his own tricks, or a cold.

Now we know he still lives. He has to be living. He must be employed as a little voice giving ideas to Governor Kirk. Some of them may be questionable, but others are just plain great.

Take for instance Merlin's mutterings on Wednesday evening. In Jacksonville an evil gremlin, named Rap Brown, was making a speech, trying to stir up more of the trouble, he is famous for. He may have been trying to start a civil disorder. While the crowd wasn't too enthusiastic they might have become so.

Suddenly, there appeared as if out of no where, the flesh and soul of the Governor of Florida as if conjured up on cue. With a pleasant voice and demeanor, the Governor welcomed Mr. Brown, urged him to talk of anything but guns and trouble even cabbages and Kings, and then milled about with the crowd. Then he was gone along with the reporters and the crowds enthusiasm and Brown was left, his magic gone, his cool completely blown.

And so the evening ended. Less worrisome than it might have been and somewhat more interesting than it should have been.

So, it could just possibly be that Merlin is a dollar-a-year advisor to the Governor. Proof seems to have come from a cabinet official who didn't like the Governor's appearance in Jacksonville. Merlin, it seems, belongs to the GOP.

Still, partisanship aside, we kind of liked that trick.

ALL FORGIVEN CLAUDE, BABY

(By Charles Whited)

Thoughts While Waiting for the Light To Change:

The activities of Claude Kirk don't usually impress me.

I could care less about how he handles a yacht or his hobnobbing with the swells at California's Bohemian Club.

I'm skittish about his hiring the Wackenhut private police force. And during his clashes with the Legislature and the Cabinet, my sentiments are usually on the other side.

But when the governor of the State of Florida came grinning out of the darkness at Jacksonville, deftly took the microphone from Black Power firebrand H. Rap Brown and smoothly stole the hatemonger's thunder well . . .

I felt like saying, "Claude baby, all is forgiven."

The governor demonstrated with engaging elan that six battalions of motorcycle cops aren't the only way to meet the apostles of violence when they come snarling into town bent on kicking up trouble.

We also wield power by staying loose.

So. Mr. Brown, how about a nice glass of fresh Florida orange juice?

It's great for cooling a fellow off on a hot day.

[From the Miami (Fla.) Herald, Aug. 12, 1967]

A KIRK PLUS AND A MINUS

Some of Florida's Democratic polls puckered up with sour grapes when they attacked Gov. Kirk for his skillful handling of H. Rap Brown, the Negro racist he upstaged in Jacksonville.

Was this a dangerous gambit? It would have been had it failed. But it met the test of success. The Kirk finesse may have averted trouble. Brown would have attracted headlines, and perhaps serious ones, whether or not the governor of Florida had appeared at a black power rally.

Dade's congressional delegation is on firmer ground than some of the Democratic State Cabinet in calling the governor's hand on Interama. To charge, as he did, that Congressmen Pepper and Fascell dragged their feet on this project is partisan and uninformed.

Indeed, if partisanship is Gov. Kirk's approach on Interama then we fear for its success over the next few years. Events surely have proven that Interama is not a one-man job and it is not likely to be a one-governor job. For what Claude Kirk has taken over is not only a plot of ground but a sizable limb as well.

[From the Miami (Fla.) Herald, Aug. 11, 1967]

A WELL DONE FOR CLAUDE

When a man threatens to burn the country down, he must be treated with more than a shrug. Yet the ravings of Hubert L. (Rap) Brown, the Black Power generator, so tax credulity that authorities sometimes wonder how to handle him.

Gov. Claude Kirk had no doubts when Hubert showed up in Jacksonville to demonstrate his black magic. The governor popped in unexpectedly and stole the show. It was Brown who was non-plussed and his lame best was that the governor was playing politics and should have provided his own soap box.

This may not be the best way to handle the apostles of violence but Florida's unpredictable governor won the match in good style.

For once somebody put the rap on Rap.

[From the Titusville (Fla.) Star-Advocate, Aug. 10, 1967]

HOW IT LOOKS TO ME

(By Bill Lyerly)

This guy Claude Kirk never ceases to amaze me—and countless others.

Claude Kirk shook the very foundations of the state capitol when he became the first Republican in nearly 100 years to occupy the Florida governors mansion.

He has shaken the teeth out of Democrats. combating them on every turn. He has the cabinet so mad right now they could shake the teeth out of the governor, especially Secretary of State Tom Adams.

Last night Gov. Kirk shook the whole state, winning the admiration of whites and Negroes alike as he very calmly walked into a Black Power rally in Jacksonville and literally "stole the show" from BP advocate Rat Brown (or is it Rap Brown?).

When the governor left the rally there was organized resistance to Brown, crying "Go home! We don't need you!"

So, whether you're a Democrat or Republican, teacher or elderly taxpayer, doff your hats to the governor.

That was his "shining hour."

And believe me, he can sure use a couple.

Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice Assistance Act, 1967

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 14, 1967

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, in view of the interest of the general public in the Anticrime Act and the recently passed Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice Assistance Act, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD my newsletter on this subject.

The newsletter follows:

HOUSE OVERWHELMINGLY PASSES ACT TO ASSIST CITIES IN COMBATING CRIME, QUELLING RIOTS, AND MAINTAINING LAW AND ORDER

(Capitol comment by JOE L. EVINS, Member of Congress, Fourth District, Tennessee, August 14, 1967)

The House this week passed a second measure designed to assist local law enforcement agencies in combatting crime and violence. This latest action will provide Federal assistance in strengthening and building up local police departments and law enforcement agencies. Called the Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice Assistance Act, this measure provides that funds will be administered and allocated to local law enforcement agencies by the governors of the states.

The measure, recommended by President Jonhson in his State of the Union Message to the Congress, will provide $75 million for this fiscal year to assist in the training and equipment of local police departments and other law enforcement agencies.

The measure also provides that emphasis will be placed on riot control techniques and training. The bill earmarked $25 million in this fiscal year for this specific program.

"In the development of plans," the bill provides, "the highest priority shall be given to the detection, prevention and control of riots and violent civil disorders, and of organized crime."

The enactment of this bill came a week after enactment of a tough anti-riot act by the House, calling for a fine of $10,000 and a federal prison sentence of five years upon conviction of traveling across state lines to incite riots.

These measures form a pattern of Congressional action and reaction not only to this summer's riots and insurrections in some of our major cities but also to the increasing incidence of crime and lawlessness.

As enacted by the Congress, the measure will provide for grants based on population to local law enforcement agencies through state law enforcement planning agencies for training and purchase of equipment—and for a National Institute to train police officers. This institute will be patterned after the FBI Academy for police officers but will be independent and separate from the Academy. States must adopt comprehensive crime plans to become eligible for the grants.

This Anti-Crime Act and the previously passed Anti-Riot Act are now pending in the Senate.

Support of the National Court Assistance Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 14, 1967

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, John Fitzgerald Kennedy once said that justice delayed was justice denied and in keeping with that idea, Chief Justice G. Joseph Tauro of the Massachusetts superior court recently testified on the desirability of the National Court Assistance Act which would essentially modernize the State court systems. The problems of crowded dockets and administrative inefficiency are discussed frankly and reasonable solutions are proposed in Judge Tauro's consideration of Senator TYDING's legislation. I commend these remarks to those who are interested in judicial reform:

A PRESENTATION IN SUPPORT OF THE NATIONAL COURT ASSISTANCE ACT

(NOTE.—The following remarks formed a basis of the testimony given by Chief Justice G. Joseph Tauro, who appeared at the invitation of Senator Joseph Tydings before a hearing of the United States Senate Subcommittee on Improvemets in Judicial Machinery on April 18, 1967.)

For the past two years Senator Joseph Tydings of Maryland has filed legislation entitled the National Court Assistance Act. There are two main features of his proposal: First, the availability of federal funds and assistance to state and local courts for the purpose of modernizing and improving judicial administration; and second, the establishment of an Office of Judicial Assistance as a national clearing-house for up-to-date information on court management.

All of us concerned with effective judicial administration share Senator Tydings' awareness "of the flood of litigation that is engulfing our courts and compounding already serious problems of docket delay and congestion." This is a problem that is not confined to one area or limited section of the country. It truly is a national problem and demands national attention. I would hope that the judiciary and legal profession throughout the country will encourage and support the first forward step designed to formalize a comprehensive attack on what has been described as "lagging justice" in our courts.

I am aware that there is apprehension in some quarters that this bill might jeopardize the traditional independence of our state judicial systems. But I am confident that the authors of this bill intend no federal encroachment in this area. A fair and impartial reading of the entire proposal reveals no interference or threat to the independence of our state court systems. It would seem that the provisions in Sections 5 and 8 would satisfy the objections of those who insist this bill endangers our cherished principles of federalism. These sections specifically preclude any national supervision or control of the administration or organization of any state court and also prevent the initiation of any study or evaluation of a court without the prior approval of the chief judge of that court.

Although I consider these sections sufficient safeguards against possible federal interference, I see much merit in a suggested amendment to the proposal, which calls for the establishment of an Advisory Council on Judicial Assistance. The duty of this group would be to advise and consult with the Director of OJA with respect to matters involving programs and other functions arising out of the administration of the Act. In addition to allaying fears of federal interference, I think this board can make a positive contribution in guiding this new federal office based on its vast experience in this field.

I am particularly optimistic over the proposed composition of this board. There would be one member appointed from not less than three nominees of each of the following seven groups: The National Conference of Chief Judges; The National Conference of Trial Court Administrators; The National Conference of Court Administrative Officers; The Section on Judicial Administration of the American Bar Association; The National Conference of Metropolitan Judges; The North American Judges Association; and The National Conference of State Trial Judges. The diversification of this group is excellent, and they each share eminent qualifications and common interest and concern in judicial administration. They should provide invaluable experience and expertise to the programs of the Office of Judicial Assistance.

Furthermore, the involvement of members from these groups should enhance their interest and cooperation with OJA's objectives. In addition, the problems of conflicting or overlapping assignments between different organizations and of duplication of effort in a particular area of study could be minimized and even obviated by the participation and background offered to this office by these national organizations.

Both of these factors will provide a real benefit to this new office, and I feel the adoption of this amendment to the present bill should be encouraged.

There is a problem which should be considered and resolved in discussing the inclusion of state judges on an advisory committee of this type. There might be state constitutional or statutory limitations on judges' serving in this kind of dual capacity and under the authority of both state and federal governments. In fact, in my own state the possibility of such a restriction seems more real than illusory.

Nevertheless, I sincerely hope that all questions and doubts of federal interference and usurpation of state function will be discussed objectively and resolved so that this well-founded and much-needed legislation may be enacted. Of its many commendable features I would like to mention a few that I feel are especially attractive and benefical.

First of all, the availability of federal funds should greatly encourage the study and evaluation of court systems, some of which have remained unaltered for decades. Naturally, financial support is not the sole answer, but it could provide the "seed money" needed to plant programs of court reform. Perhaps modernization of our court system has proceeded slowly due to its association with an honorable profession which has an ancient affinity with precedent. Regardless of reasons and despite the notable advances of some states, I must agree with Senator Tydings that there has been no unified and comprehensive mobilization of effort on a national basis to attack lagging justice in our Nation's courts. I honestly feel that the enactment of this bill is essential to awaken concern and consideration of judicial problems and their potential solutions and to spur our courts to concerted action.

If this bill provided nothing else it would be worth its enactment just to focus national attention on our judicial branch of government, about which so many of our citizens are poorly informed and apathetic. This attitude breeds complacency and inspires legislative inaction, thereby impeding the forces of reform. I envision that the studies and recommendations fostered by this bill at the state and local level will help to overcome the public and legislative indifference to the needs of the judiciary. Although intangible, over the years ahead this educative effect could prove one of the most lasting and significant by-products of the proposal.

In a more direct and tangible way I think this bill will induce the rapid introduction into our court systems of the "hardware" and "software" offered by modern technology. In the former category would fall the use of data processing and computer equipment, and the latter would encompass progressive business methods and programs designed by professional management consultants. More and more I realize that well-trained and professional court administrators versed not only in the law and court procedures but in sound business management as well can be of significant help. For a variety of factors some judges are often reluctant to admit the need for the services of such personnel and their techniques. For purposes of efficiency and effective justice, both must soon be made an integral part of every court system. It is no longer possible for a judge to look upon his role in judicial administration as an auxiliary function of his office. In this modern and complex society, judicial administration in itself is a full-time responsibility which should not be imposed entirely on already overburdened judges. This bill should go far to bring about advances in this area.

In addition, one of the more beneficial aspects of this proposal seems to lie in the plan for a central clearing-house to gather and evaluate plans and programs tried in various courts throughout the country.

There have been several professional organizations that have served the field of judicial administration very well. Among others, the American Judicature Society and the American Bar Association's Section on Judicial Administration under the most able leadership of Justice Tom C. Clark have provided outstanding service.

Despite the excellent efforts of these groups, the long history of judicial reform is one of trial and error in the various jurisdictions. Unfortunately, there has never been one national organization or office which collected and evaluated information and pertinent data from all our courts on a continuous basis. Only in a limited and sometimes fortuitous way may we in Massachusetts learn of what is being tried in Illinois, for example, in the way of court reform or revision. What is being tried elsewhere, both with success and with failure, can be of tremendous benefit to other jurisdictions with similar problems. With a central evaluating office many of the pitfalls of the trial-and-error technique may be obviated.

Consequently, the concept of this national clearing-house designed to make available facts, figures and statistics, which could be of value and interest to many of our state courts, is especially intriguing. It could prevent the duplication of error, supply suggestions for reform not originally envisioned, provide ready solutions in instances where proven methods have been successfully adopted and incentives to expand limited improvements.

I look forward to this approach as a major contribution of the proposed legislation. Through such a source, we should be able to avoid the situation which exists today whereby many programs for court improvement, years after their local implementation, remain a matter of controversy and debate, if not mystery, elsewhere throughout the country.

I certainly hope that the Office for Judicial Assistance will place much importance on its role as an evaluator of the various studies and programs which it might sponsor or conduct. As an objective national observer of sundry state and local projects, this office is ideally qualified to provide meaningful comparative analysis, to issue unequivocal appraisals and to recommended specific proposals. Naturally, each state must decide for itself which suggestions or improvements, if any, are best suited for its own system, but to enable a state to better plot its own course, the national office should fully exercise its independent judgment and make known the product of its evaluation.

I personally believe that assistance in the way of recommendations and suggestions resulting from these evaluations by highly respected experts would go far toward overcoming the obstructions to court reform caused by local political factors or other parochial considerations.

Another outcome of this office could be the development of a highly trained and knowledgeable group of experts in the field of judicial administration. Hopefully, these personnel could make themselves available as consultants or advisors to those states which might request the benefit of this expertise. If this kind of cooperation and assistance would be forthcoming, it certainly should facilitate the implementation of improvements in judicial administration at the state and local levels of government.

Before closing discussion on the benefits to be accrued from this proposed bill, I wish to suggest the kind of project which I would hope the Office of Judicial Assistance would consider for early study and evaluation.

I believe there is the need for an in-depth survey of a state court system, which would include examination of all facets of its operation, organization, and procedure. I anticipate that the results or recommendations of such a study could serve as a pilot or master plan for other jurisdictions' adoption or adaptation, in whole or in part.

With the benefit of resources and talent available to the Office of Judicial Assistance it would seem a most appropriate office to undertake such a project. Perhaps it could enlist the cooperation of such groups as the American Bar Association, which several years ago approved a Model Judicial Article that several states have used as a guide to overhaul their judicial systems. I would think that far more benefits could eventually be expected from proposals offered as a result of a truly exhaustive and comprehensive survey sponsored by a governmental authority.

I realize that changes and improvements prompted by such a master plan will take years to evolve and as with all aspects of this Act, eventual success will greatly depend upon the acceptance and cooperation given this federal office by the various states. But a start must be made, and I feel this legislation and the funds it will provide along with the involvement of the federal government as an interested observer and invited participant in state court improvements will do much to promote real and substantial progress in this long neglected area.

Despite my enthusiasm for the bill as presently drafted there are, in my opinion, some other amendments which should be considered before the bill is enacted. As I earlier have indicated, I am not among the group who look upon this bill as a potential danger to the independence of our state courts. I am satisfied by the safeguards of Sections 5 and 8, but in fact, I question if they are too restrictive.

In both sections the presiding judge of the state court intended for study is given a virtual veto power over whether such a study or evaluation of his court may be made. It must be remembered that this court and its presiding judge quite often have the largest stakes in the status quo and that these same courts are frequently the very situs where change is often needed yet more often resisted.

I offer for consideration that the chief justice of the state's highest court be inserted as the necessary approving authority within a state for accepting grant applications instead of the chief judge of the court directly involved. As the highest judicial officer in the state, he is most often responsible for the over-all superintendence of all courts within his jurisdiction. Consequently, he should satisfy the valid check of requiring approbation by a judicial authority within the state court system to be studied before a grant will be authorized. Furthermore, by requiring the acquiescence of the chief justice of the highest court in a state, the risk would be lessened that a possibly far reaching and beneficial study would be scuttled due to the reluctance of a judge or court mose immediately affected by the change. It is true that an obstructionist can be found at all judicial levels, but in any event it would seem more likely that the chief justice of the highest state court would at least be more detached and objective in his decision.

I realize the practicalities involved in requiring the approval of the chief judge of the particular court intended for study, and I do not underestimate the disadvantages caused by not having his complete approval and cooperation. Nonetheless, I feel many excellent studies and recommendations can still come to light through the efforts of the organized bar, law school faculties and individual lawyers and judges.

Another general observation that I wish to make about this bill concerns the lack of any provision establishing a contact between the state's judiciary and the legislative and executive branches in furtherance of any court study. It would seem the basic reason for this is sound. The courts are most directly connected with the administration of justice, and I agree they should be the prime movers in resolving their problems. However, it must be remembered that courts are not the masters of their own houses. They have the responsibility for its successful operation but not always the authority to exercise it. Most often, significant and necessary changes in the judicial system cannot be accomplished without legislative and even executive consent.

In view of this inescapable fact, I feel that although this Act should not call for the approval of the legislative or executive arms to initiate study of a state court system, there should be incorporated into the bill some liaison with the other branches of government. Absent such an exchange, there is the distinct likelihood that many valuable studies could be permanently categorized as futile academic exercises since their chances for implementation would be weakened without the involvement or at least prior communication with the legislature and governor, whose aid will be eventually needed to enact any proposed changes.

Perhaps Section 4 would be a proper place to incorporate the requirement that a recipient of a grant in addition to submitting reports to the Director would also have to file progress reports to his own state legislature and governor. By including such a requirement in this Act, Congress will both emphasize and encourage not only the need for but also the importance of cooperation between all three branches of government if any changes or improvements in the court system are to come to fruition.

In conclusion, I reconfirm my opinion that this bill can provide real and substantive assistance to the states in promoting modern and effective methods in judicial administration. I would hope that if Congress sees the need for this bill, it would provide adequate funds for its successful operation. It must be remembered that highly professional people will be needed to staff and provide services to the Office of Judicial Assistance, and hopefully the salaries and stipends offered will be sufficient to attract the very best legal and administrative personnel.

I sincerely hope that this bill will receive the unified support of the bench, the bar and their related professional organizations. Much remains to be accomplished in the field of judicial administration, and this bill can provide the impetus for further significant achievements.

Firearms Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 14, 1967

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the recent rioting has tragically presented irrefutable evidence that firearms legislation is more urgently needed than ever.

No longer are we faced only with criminals and deranged individuals, which in itself should have been reason enough to enact gun control laws years ago, but we are now faced with the presence of snipers who buy their guns with no questions asked, and fire upon the police, fire department, National Guard, and U.S. Army.

I commend to the attention of our colleagues an editorial broadcast by WCBS–TV in New York on August 1, and 2, 1967, concerning the need for firearms legislation.

The text of the editorial follows:

In many of our editorials we have criticized the lack of adequate controls of firearms in New York State and the Nation. In New York State, and in many other states, any adult can buy a rifle with no questions asked. If you don't want to go to a store, then you can order through the mails. Given this situation, it is not surprising that guns are misused, by the unstable and the criminal. Instances of misuse occur frequently and cost lives, innocent lives.

Now we are faced with something much more ominous than criminal or crazed individuals armed with a weapon. Now we are faced with the presence of snipers during race riots, snipers that do battle with police forces, with the National Guard, with the United States Army on the streets of American cities.

The U.S. Attorney General testified last week, and I quote:

"This country has to act to control firearms. If Newark and Detroit don't demonstrate that, nothing can. Thousands of rounds were fired. If Government cannot control the movement of firearms, then it is inadequate."

Well, we didn't need a Newark or a Detroit to demonstrate to us the need for federal and state controls over firearms. Perhaps, though, the Congress and the New York State Legislature needed a Newark or a Detroit. Because these two bodies have been turning a deaf ear for years to police officials and others who have demanded better controls.

It's time the Congress and the Legislature began worrying about the threat and the presence of armed violence faced by millions of city dwellers, and spend less time worrying about the slight inconvenience gun controls might cause hunters and skeet shooters.

Training the Hard-Core Unemployed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 24, 1967

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, a common criticism of poverty empolyment training programs asserts that such programs do not affect the hard-core unemployed. However, Cleveland's program, funded under title V of the U.S. Economic Opportunity Act and administered by the Cuyahoga County Welfare Department, apparently has met with tremendous success.

Since the inception of the Cuyahoga County title V training program, over 60 of the men considered "unemployable" have found jobs. Their average pay scale is $6,500 per year. Their combined earnings will be $400,000 annually. 300 children will have more respect for their fathers and can raise their goals for the future.

Under leave granted, I insert the following article which appeared in the Plain Dealer, on May 1, 1967:

Thirty-one Unemployables Trained for Jobs

Federal antipoverty programs can help a lot of people, but the poor will tell you they sometimes fail to reach those who need help the most: the hard-core unemployed.

One antipoverty program that Cuyahoga County Welfare Director Eugene F. Burns says has reached Clevelands chronically unemployed will produce 31 trained power station operators. Eleven have already found jobs as a result of the federally financed job-training program.

The men are students at the West Side Institute of Technology at 9613 Denison Avenue S.W. The private institute took on the training task with funds provided under Title V of the U.S. Economic Opportunities Act.

Many of the trainees were former welfare clients who had not completed high school. Some had poor employment records. Nine had serious drinking problems. Seven had been convited of felonies.

An intensive social service program accompanied the job-training curriculum. According to institute directors, the program drew the men together and inspired self-confidence.

Before he joined the program, 25-year-old John McCall was a meatcutter who earned $50 to $100 a week. With a wife and six children to support, his weekly pay provided "just enough to survive."

As a boiler operator employed by the M. K. Darling Co., McCall, of 12121 Benham Avenue S.E. can now expect to earn $7,000 or $8,000 a year. The change in earnings has inspired a more hopeful attitude.

"I'm only 25," McCall explains. "I want to get some things while I can before I get too old."

Mrs. McCall looks forward to her own house. "It's just fine," she says. "It's wonderful."

Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice Assistance Act of 1967

SPEECH

OF

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 8, 1967

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5037) to assist State and local governments in reducing the incidence of crime, to increase the effectiveness, fairness, and coordination of law enforcement and criminal justice systems at all levels of government, and for other purposes.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I wish to express my continued support for H.R. 5037, the Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice Assistance Act of 1967, despite amendments from the floor which I feel have lessened the efficacy of this bill. We must take action against the serious problem of crime in the United States.

The President's Crime Commission found that 43 percent of a sampling of urban residents say they stay off the streets at night because of their fear of crime. Thirty-five percent say they do not speak to strangers any more because of their fear of crime. Twenty-one percent say they use cabs and cars at night because of their fear of crime. Twenty percent say they would like to move to another neighborhood because of their fear of crime.

Between 1960 and 1965, population increased by 8 percent in this country, yet, according to the FBI, crime went up 46 percent. Last year the net national loss due to property crimes alone was over a billion dollars, and only a quarter of the crimes reported were solved. Justice is not prevailing when crime is this profitable for criminals.

Of course, no amount of anticrime legislation is going to eliminate crime without a change in the attitudes which cause people to violate the law. If the inability to find jobs leads people to crime for a living, we must help them find jobs. If the few corrupt policemen serve to counteract the efforts of many times their number of honest officers, we must take more care in hiring. If too much idle time encourages crime, we must provide more recreational programs. If rat-infested tenements are accepted by Congress, and if anger at this acceptance engenders crime, we must try to eliminate the rats. Improve law enforcement and criminal justice will help to suppress crime, but we must cure the grave social ills of our society before we can except complete success.

Despite its limitations, H.R. 5037 is a realistic attempt to improve law enforcement and criminal justice. It is not a symbolic, emotional measure which duplicates existing legislation and accomplishes nothing new. This bill authorizes the appropriation of $75 million to be spent before June 30, 1968. The appropriations are divided under three titles.

Title I of this bill will allow the Attorney General to award grants to States upon his approval of comprehensive plans for the coordination and integration of existing programs of law enforcement and criminal justice.

Title II will authorize grants to States for innovations in the following areas:

First. Public protection, including the development, demonstration, and evaluation of methods, devices, equipment, and designs to increase safety from crime in streets, homes, and other public and private places;

Second. Equipment, including the development and acquisition of equipment designed to increase the effectiveness and improve the deployment of law enforcement and criminal justice personnel;

Third. The recruitment, education, and training of all types of law enforcement and criminal justice personnel;

Fourth. Management and organization, including the organization, administration, and coordination of law enforcement and criminal justice agencies and functions;

Fifth. Operations and facilities for increasing the capability and fairness of law enforcement and criminal justice, including the processing, disposition, and rehabilitation of offenders;

Sixth. Community relations, including public understanding of and cooperation with law enforcement and criminal justice agencies;

Seventh. Public education relating to crime prevention, including education programs in schools and community agencies; and

Eighth. Construction of buildings or other physical facilities which fulfill a significant innovative function.

Title III will "establish a National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice to encourage research, development, and training for improving law enforcement and criminal justice, to develop new or improved approaches, methods, techniques, equipment, and devices for the prevention and reduction of crime, and to establish and operate regional institutes for the training of State and local law enforcement personnel and for other purposes."

Planning is essential for efficient law enforcement—as it is for any complex undertaking. Often raw information exists on many facets of crime, yet it is not used by the police for achieving the maximum possible protection for the public. Patrolmen in cities should be distributed where and when they are most likely to be needed. Criminals must not be driven out of one municipality, only to take refuge in an adjoining jurisdiction. State, county, and city police must avoid duplication of efforts and facilities. Title I grants will be used for such planning to better protect our citizens.

I am sorry, however, that my colleagues have chosen to have title I and II grants channeled through State planning agencies rather than awarded directly to the local agencies involved. Most States are incapable of optimum coordination of law-enforcement efforts because of their limited experience in the field. Criminal enforcement has traditionally been within the domain of local government.

For instance, $380 million is spent annually for criminal justice in New York City, yet none of this comes from the State government. The bill originally reported, which allowed direct grants from the Attorney General, was explicitly endorsed by a number of experts, including a unanimous resolution of the National Sheriff's Association, the National League of Cities, and the International Conference of Police Associations. The statement from the latter reads in part:

> The International Conference of Police Associations representing over 200,000 local, county, and State law enforcement officers respectfully request that you oppose this amendment and let the police department make application and receive the moneys direct from the Federal Government.

Even perfect planning, however, will not overcome the fact that most of our policemen are using essentially the same tools and practices to fight crime as they were 50 years ago. Revolvers, billyclubs, and patrol wagons have generally been supplemented by very few innovations. This is the case despite a significant change in the problems faced by police today in an urban, mobile, sometimes rebellious society. This bill, however, follows up on the recommendation of the President's Crime Commission:

> It is essential that the new Justice Department program embody a major research component if it is not simply to perpetuate present failures in many areas.

Mr. Chairman, recently my colleagues and I attended an exhibit in the Rayburn Building which hinted at the potential uses of science by law-enforcement agencies. We saw closed circuit televisions for surveillance to supplement officers on the beat. We learned of new developments in infrared technology and fingerprinting which might aid the identification of objects and persons. There were many varieties of communications systems, computers, alarm systems, and devices which detect illegal telephone tapping. We even learned about research with nonlethal weapons—such as a dart gun which injects a fast-acting knockout dose of drugs into a suspect while causing no permanent damage. The further development and widespread use of these and other as yet unimagined aids to crime control will be greatly facilitated by the appropriations this bill authorizes.

But this bill will do far more than give police new hardware: the regional institutes it establishes will improve the quality of the police themselves through education and training. In almost every field we recognize the growing importance of education. College degrees are usually demanded for policymaking and many administrative positions in both business and government. In most other fields some type of technical training is requisite. Even barbers must undergo several month of special instruction. Yet our policemen, who literally carry the power of life and death on their belts and who often serve as the very symbol of government, seldom have college experience and more often than not begin their police service with no law-enforcement training at all. More than good intentions are necessary for excellence in any field of endeavor. Our policemen need more and better schooling. More training in the sensitive area of community relations should be understaken. Officers must go through intensive training in the difficult field of crowd control. They must learn when to act, how to act, and when not to act.

The broad nature of this bill will allow funds to be spent on the rehabilitation of a prisoner as well as on his rapid apprehension. By sending a criminal to prison we aim to protect society. Yet our system of criminal justice often hardens what would otherwise often be a repentant single offender into a professional criminal. More research in this field must be done, and more of what is already known in the universities must be applied in the prisons. This bill will allow funds to be used for such purposes.

So, Mr. Chairman, by passing this bill, the Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice Assistance Act of 1967, we will be taking a significant and realistic step toward reducing common crime—a problem which existed before and will exist after the present era of riots. This bill, if enacted, will help bring law enforcement into the atomic age by applying modern technology, sociology, and psychiatry to problems of law enforcement, criminal justice, and crime prevention. But I would still remind my colleagues that this act will not be fully effective unless it is followed up by an expanded program of legislation which seeks to eliminate the root causes of crime.

Blowup in the Cities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 14, 1967

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the recent violent disturbances in our cities have brought forth a torrent of analyses and suggestions for the future. Among the most honest, sensitive, and realistic of these was the lead editorial in the August 5 issue of the New Republic. I insert this now in the RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues:

BLOWUP IN THE CITIES

"It's not the 'agitators' who blow up. It's us, all over the place, the colored people who say it's too late for us to wait and wait when nothing comes anyway." That's a 24-year-old Bostonian talking. He doesn't have a job, though he has tried often enough to get one. He never finished high school. He belongs to no civil rights organization. He crossed no state line to get to the riot he joined. "Every black man knows he's not really wanted, just put up with, and given the salad while Whitey eats the turkey. So we're all one, by being black, that's why we get hot in the summer and try to break out, and break in, or something, even if we're in Iowa, like the papers say, it's all over the same. I'm just living here, and when I heard the police was doing what they was, I said to myself, they're sticking another knife into us, and if we try to defend ourselves they call us animals, so I'd better go fight. . . . I mean fight beside my brothers . . . so I just went there, and the action was going on, and that's how I got into it. There was lots of us there—must have been a thousand they said. And inside our people said 'good.' They didn't want the damage and the hurt, but they wanted to tell Whitey off, even if they couldn't do it themselves. Answers? I don't know. That's your job. You know what's needed, and you probably say it can't be done now, because there are other things that are wanting your money. Well, you go believe that; but don't expect us to, and don't be surprised when we don't."

So combat areas multiply as more and more Negroes pile into the cities, which more and more look like overcrowded prisons: in 1965, Watts; in 1966, Chicago, Cicero, Harlem; in 1967, Newark, Detroit, Minneapolis; Plainfield, New Jersey; Hartford, Conn.; Kansas City, Mo.; Waterloo, Iowa; Cambridge, Maryland. As of two years ago, a third of 20 million Negroes were living in 12 metropolitan areas in the North and West, and in each city the story is the same—"wait and wait when nothing comes anyway." We can now see that the mass protests of the early and middle sixties and the response of the Congress were only dimly relevant to the lives of most Negroes. The cities in which they are penned up are not theirs; their neighborhoods are sordid enclaves. They don't have jobs (the Negro unemployment rate has been averaging double that of the whites); they have rotten schools, rotten housing, poor sanitary facilities and public services; they are cheated, looked down on, and they blame the only one there is to blame—The Man who runs things. The Montgomery bus boycott in 1955; the lunch counter sit-ins of the early sixties; the march on Washington during the summer of '63; the two civil rights bills of '64 and '65 and the voting rights bill of '66 were all successes. But today they appear beside the point. They had an important symbolic meaning, particularly to an unsettled "moderate" white conscience; it was something for whites and Negroes to get together and attack the legal and most visible vestiges of the segregated society. But they weren't enough; they were barely a beginning. The rioting Negro today confronts American society with its own deep decay, far more serious than any deprivation of legal rights. Negro America is slum country—a foreign country not seen on TV, banished from white consciousness wherever possible. Its inhabitants are outsiders. The rage, the hatred that smoulders in the ghetto has yet to be adequately represented in the decisions of government on any level.

Terrifying as the looting, the shooting and the arson are, they could mean a gain for the nation if, as a result, white America were shocked into looking at itself, its cities, its neglect. If the Negro rebellion forced us to face our smugness and evasions, the violence of these past weeks would have served some constructive purpose. But no such reaction has been forthcoming. There has not been a word, for example, from the national leadership of the Republican Party that would suggest how complicit white America is in the rioting. From General Eisenhower down, these leaders have sought reassurance in fantasy—the fantasy that believes order is to be found at the end of a nightstick, that a few agitators are the cause of the discontent, that the remedy is to find them and punish them. They Republicans hint of conspiracy—not the white conspiracy to defraud and depress the ghetto people, but the conspiracy of "criminals." Senator Dirksen wants an investigation "to see if there is a touch of red" behind the riots. The Republican Leader in the House, Gerald Ford, "can't help but believe there is in the background some national plan." They do not grasp at all the fact that law and order are the consequence of domestic tranquility, not the other way 'round.

President Johnson has not been that foolish, but he and the spokesmen for the Democratic Party are nonetheless accomplices in this national crime of evasion. A commitment without cause to Vietnam has obsessed them; the ghetto has paid the price. Who, if not the President, should have made it his first order of business to require the nation to understand what Negroes endure, and go on from there to enlist the nation in a massive attack on squalor? Instead of first things first, it has been first things second or third or not at all. In June of this year, the President said he was "trying to do everything he can in cooperation with the cities, the counties, the states and the private employers to minimize the tensions that exist." Everything? Congress "promptly and generously" appropriated $75-million in special funds for summer programs for the cities. A few weeks later, the President was boasting to the Junior Chamber of Commerce that "our prosperity is second to none anywhere in the world." The Jaycees cheered; it seemed true to them.

Neither the fear of riots then nor the fact of riots now has shaken our complacency. Not one influential white politician has yet responded to the slogan "Black Power" with anything other than indignation and derision. All the demogogic skills of a Stokely Carmichael have been more than equalled by repeated allusions in the press and on platforms to "racism in reverse" and "black supremacists," as if the country were determined to confirm what Mr. Carmichael in *The New Republic* last year called "the American capacity for self-delusion." The most destructive element in the "Black Power" movement has been publicized; the best, the most hopeful, has been ignored. The worst element—and it does not lead to power but to impotence—is the cry for revenge. It is the shout of the head of SNCC in Cambridge, Maryland: "Burn this town down . . . when you tear down the white man, brother, you are hitting him in the money. Don't love him to death. Shoot him to death." But that is not black America speaking, and the cruelest irony is that the violence such talk triggers reduces not the white, but the poor Negro to ruin. "Burn this town down" is the shout of the angry, exalted young Brown Shirt, called by blood to smash the shops of "non-Aryans." It leads to madness.

What is encouraging about the still unformed Black Power movement, however, is the emergence of Negro awareness and responsibility, the determination to do things, not wait for others to do them, not accept the bought leadership with which ghettos have been saddled. An enlightened white leadership would encourage every sign of pride within the Negro community, foster every move for self-policing, self-help. For Black Power can mean jobs, businesses, homes, schools, neighborhoods and politicians which black Americans can claim for their own and in which they can take pride. When it gets above and beyond a shrill talkathon to practical politicial organization, Black Power could prove a blessing.

The collapse in meaningful communication between the two races will be hard to restore. Rioting, the head of the Urban League in Washington, D.C. said the other day, is just a "low form of communication by people who seek to get a response from a society that seems to be deaf to their needs." Up to now, the Negroes who have been consulted by "the power structure" were the civil rights leaders who are respectable middle class, and therefore (through no fault of their own) out of touch with the street leaders who say: Why don't people *ask* us, instead of *telling* us.

But White America will not be ready to communicate with the ghettos, and especially the young in the ghettos, until it regains its moral balance. Then we shall appreciate the absurdity, the barbarity of an economic system capable of creating entirely new technologies to place a man on the moon in a single decade and ordering its priorities to expend $40 billion to accomplish this feat, meanwhile finding itself unable to make available $40 million to begin reducing the rat population that plagues large cities. A military industrial system capable of producing and spending more than $2 million an hour prosecuting a little understood war in South Vietnam is the very system that responds to riots by putting forth a meaningless anti-riot act. Unless and until the American political system gets its priorities in perspective and puts at least the same resources, technologies and concern into a truly harmonious multi-racial society as it has put into landing a man on the moon or making Asia "safe for democracy," there will be no end to riots.

But judging by the past performance no such national commitment is likely—not until New York, Chicago or Los Angeles is brought to an indefinite standstill by a well-organized guerrilla action against the white establishment. If that happens, and it may be inevitable, there will be accusations, as there are now, of communist organizers at work, and the gap between white and black will widen further. But those whose eyes are open to realities will know that no political or economic ideology could have had the force to move people with such desperation as three centuries of dehumanization. The answer does not lie with the national guard or federal troops or anti-riot legislation or handouts, but in a national decision to emancipate the ghetto, and not by proclamation alone. Urban America needs a Marshall Plan, lavishly financed, planned and carried out by blacks and whites. The Negro wants white America to match his impatience, to become engaged. But white America is engaged elsewhere. It has yet to see that it is not American withdrawal from Vietnam that is dishoronable, but withdrawal from the struggle in our streets.

The Honorable James E. Moriarty, Referee in Bankruptcy for the Central District of California, Discusses Effect of Garnishment Laws on Personal Bankruptcies—Endorses Antigarnishment Provision of H.R. 11601

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 14, 1967

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, do honest merchants and lenders have to resort constantly to the practice of garnishment in order to collect debts? The evidence before the Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs of the House Committee on Banking and Currency is building to an overwhelming case against garnishment as being a device used primarily and principally by credit gyps to entice the unwary purchaser or borrower into going heavily into debt—as long as he is garnishable.

I submit as part of that evidence in support of the antigarnishment provision of the Consumer Credit Protection Act, H.R. 11601—which also contains strong "truth-in-lending" sections—the impressive and at the same time horrifying statement presented to us last Friday by the Honorable James E. Moriarity, referee in bankruptcy at Los Angeles, Calif., as follows:

Statement of James E. Moriarity, Referee in Bankruptcy, Los Angeles, Calif., Before the Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs of the House Committee on Banking and Currency, Friday, August 11, 1967, on H.R. 11601 and Related Bills

Madam Chairman, I am James E. Moriarity, Referee in Bankruptcy, serving the United States District Court for the Central District of California. I have been a Referee in Bankruptcy since January 21, 1963. Prior thereto I had devoted my entire legal career to the service of the Federal Government, serving in many legal capacities. My presence here today is to assist, as best I can, the Committee in its consideration of H.R. 11601, which is known as the "Consumer Credit Protection Act."

I would like to state at the outset that the position I hold does not permit me to make a policy recommendation for or against the pending legislation since this is solely within the jurisdiction of the Judicial Conference of the United States. However, I would like to relate to the Committee my experiences as a Referee as it is pertinent to the legislation under consideration.

In the four-and-one-half years that I have served as a Referee I have handled 8,210 bankruptcy matters. Of this number approximately 90%, or roughly 7,500, have been what may be referred to as straight bankruptcies filed by wage earners. It is my understanding that it is in this area that the Committee is most interested. It has been my experience that most persons seeking the protection of the Bankruptcy Act come before the Courts because of excessive medical bills, lack of employment, domestic discord, easy credit, and other factors. While it may sound strange, we had a very nasty experience several years ago in which certain debt consolidating firms, or pro raters, actually caused a number of persons to come to the Bankruptcy Court for aid. I am sure that each member of the Committee is well aware of the series of articles written by Miss Miriam Ottenberg, which appeared in the Washington Star within the last six months. This series of articles dealt with the vicious procedures used by many debt consolidating firms.

California, and particularly the Central District of California, which encompasses the metropolitan area of Los Angeles, has been referred to as the bankruptcy capital of the world. The figures support this dubious honor. But the figures do not tell the entire story. It has long been the practice of the State of California, dating back to the days immediately following WWI, that persons, particularly servicemen, were encouraged to come and settle in California and were given certain tax incentives on their residential property. This policy has continued to this day. With the conclusion of WWII many of our fighting men, having spent time in California either in training or in transit to the Pacific theatre of operations, found in California a way of life which they desired, and at the conclusion of World War II the influx of new residents reached its peak. This steady flow of persons has continued to this date. We have welcomed these people and they have made our State the most populous in the nation and they have contributed much to the industrial growth of California.

Many of our new citizens came to California without jobs and heavily in debt, so we inherited the problems that they thought they left behind. From personal experience I can state that I have presided at hearings on a Bankrupt's petition in which not one single California creditor was listed.

Of equal importance has been the relaxing of credit restrictions. Individual debt, not so long ago was discouraged and regarded with suspicion, is now encouraged. More than encouraged, debt today is merchandized as extensively and skillfully as any commodity, notwithstanding occasional pious reminder to "never borrow money needlessly". The communication media that touches a family's life constantly urges it to buy on "easy" terms, to open charge accounts with "nominal" monthly service charges,to get a new car at "bank" terms, travel now and pay later—whether the family can afford it or not.

Many researchers in the field of consumer credit have concluded that a person can become addicted to excessive credit buying just as one becomes addicted to alcohol, narcotics or gambling.

I would like to relate one very interesting experience which points up how easy it is to obtain credit. Shortly after I became a Referee in January 1963, I had a hearing on a Bankrupt's petition, The bankrupt was a Seaman 2/c stationed at the Long Beach Naval Shipyard. He listed approximately $2,000. in debts of which over $1,700. was owing to one of the better known department stores in Long Beach. During the course of the examination of the Bankrupt the Court inquired as to the nature of this indebtedness and was advised by the Bankrupt that between December 1 and December 15, 1962, he had purchased over $1,700 worth of merchandise to be sent to his relatives and friends back East as Christmas presents. While you might say that the gentleman had a little larceny in his heart, I think you might have some criticism of the department store for being so lax in their credit procedures.

As a Referee I do not like to see creditors sustain losses but I must conclude that in most cases the creditor has in many respects created the very problem from which his loss arose. Each of us are paying for these losses when we pay our monthly bills. The creditor merely adds to the normal price a sum sufficient to write-off these losses.

Reference is now made to some specific California Statutes which relates to the legislation before this Committee.

GARNISHMENTS

In the recent session of the State Legislature which has just completed its deliberations, several bills were introduced to tone down the effect of garnishment of wages. The fight for this legislation was led by freshmen members of the Assembly.

One bill, introduced by Assemblyman David Roberti, had for its purpose the prohibition against discharging an emyloyee due to the garnishment of wages. This bill passed the Assembly but was defeated on the floor of the Senate. Another bill, introduced by Assemblywoman Yvonne Brathwaite, passed the Assembly by one vote but was killed in the Senate Finance Committee. This latter bill originally provided for the exemption of one-half of "net earnings" or the first $100. whichever is greater. By amendment the term "net earnings" was deleted and the $100. limitation was reduced to $70. This bill would also have prohibited garnishment of wages before judgment.

I have talked with members of the Legislature and have been advised that opposition to these bills came from collection agencies, small jewelry shops and neighborhood furniture stores. There was no noticeable opposition from banks, doctors, small loan companies (one actually endorsed the amended bill which passed the Assembly) or department stores.

The current failure came after an Assembly Interim Judiciary Committee studied the subject and concluded:

"[A] revision of the law which will increase the debtor's protection by way of exemption and which will make that protection more modern and equal will be of benefit to both debtors and creditors. This conclusion reflects the underlying fact that neither debtor nor creditor benefits when the debtor is financially crippled. A more powerful exemption law will help keep the debtor from sinking further into a financial abyss and losing his job. At the same time it will protect the creditors to the extent that it allows the debtor to keep going and to avoid bankruptcy. Incidental credit grantors such as doctors, lawyers and small businessmen lose when a small loan company garnishes wages and causes the debtor to be fired or run for bankruptcy. A law with more exemption protection will encourage the commercial credit grantors to be more careful in choosing their credit risks. If the creditor will do this, he will reduce his bad debt losses. This induced care may result in some reduction of overall credit granted, but the reduction will probably be small and will be justified by the decrease in human misery caused by extreme credit problems. Finally, an exemption law can be tailored to encourage the debtor to find a program which will help him to find his way out of a bad financial situation and into a better one.

"The Judiciary Committee report made no specific proposals."

Also, a comprehensive study by George Brunn was published in the California Law Review, December 1965, Vol. 53, No. 5, page 1214. The Brunn Report included an anaylsis of Court records in San Francisco. There is attached to this statement an analysis of Civil Court Filings of the Los Angeles Municipal Court.

The effect of a garnishment can be devastating to a debtor. Most employers dislike garnishments because of the extra work and cost. As a matter of policy many employers will fire an employee after the second garnishment. Since California law permits multiple levies a worker could be fired within an eight-day period, the time necessary to cover two weekly pay periods. Not only does this challenge the ability of the worker to provide for the family needs, but a worker who has been fired because of garnishment can become a faceless person in the army of the unemployed. He may be a well-qualified machinist whose talents are in demand, but he is unemployable.

At a time when skilled employees are in great demand we must conclude that the exclusion of such a worker from our work force is a great waste of manpower.

CREDIT SALES

The State of California has enacted legislation that has for its purpose the protection of the debtor who must resort to credit buying or credit financing. In 1960 the Unruh Act (Civil Code 1801 et seq.) was passed by the legislature.

Perhaps the most important provision is Section 18 1812.5 which prohibits deficiency judgments resulting from repossession and sale of personal property. Section 1803.1, 1803.2, 1803.3, 1803.4, 1803.5, 1803.6 and 1803.7 contain provisions relating to "Truth in Sales."

AUTOMOBILES

In the purchase of automobiles the Rees-Levering Act (Civil Code 2981, et seq.) has given the purchaser certain protection. Unlike other credit sales, the buyer is liable for any deficiency resulting from a repossession and sale (cc. Section 2983.2). Such deficiencies frequently constitute a sizeable part of the debts listed by bankrupts.

SMALL LOANS

In the area of small loans (Financial Code Section 24000 et seq.) Sections 24411, 24412, 24413 and 24414, the "Truth in Lending" provisions give the borrower some protection. Section 24452, as amended, sets forth the maximum charges. It cannot be said that these provisions make the full disclosure that is sought by the provisions of H.R. 11601.

EXEMPTIONS

The exemptions granted under state law to a debtor are generally liberal and it has been the policy of our courts, both state and federal to give these exemption statutes a liberal interpretation and to avoid forfeiture of these rights if, at all, possible. Briefly, a debtor's property which is exempt from execution includes in part; a homestead (husband and wife) $15,000; deposits in qualified savings and loan associations $1,000; deposits in credit associations $1,500; one automobile of a value not in excess of $350; (This exemption has recently been increased to a value of $1,000 with an equity of $350); household furniture commensurate with the debtor's station in life; clothing and personal effects.

When we get to the exemption of wages we find that California appears to lag behind many of her sister states. Under Section 690.11 of the California Code of Civil Procedure the exemption for wages is one-half of the debtor's earnings. While there are provisions under Section 690.26 that enable the wage earner to claim the entire salary as exempt, the difficulty and cost is often a bar to such relief. Except for the rare case, fifty percent (50%) of the wage earner's salary is subject to garnishment, attachment or execution.

It was not until 1955 that one-half of the debtor's wages became automatically exempt. Prior thereto the debtor had to file an affidavit of exemption with the levying officer in order to obtain any exemption at all.

Because of the shortness of time I was unable to confer with a spokesman for the Commission on Uniform State Laws. Professor William Warren of the School of Law of the University of California at Los Angeles is active on a committee which is drafting a model uniform statute dealing with consumer credit. It is my understanding that the model statute will cover some of the problems included in H.R. 11601. Professor Warren is on vacation and perhaps when he returns I can provide the Committee with additional comments on this study.

DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED

I have delivered to the Committee the following documents:

1. Pertinent Section of the California Civil Code (Unruh Act) relating to Credit Sales.
2. The complete text of the Rees-Levering Act—California Automobile Sales Finance Act.
3. Pertinent Section of the California Financial Code relating to Small Loan Companies.
4. Pertinent Sections of the California Code of Civil Procedure relating to wage exemptions.
5. Pertinent Sections of the California Labor Code relating to assignment of wages.
6. Wage Garnishment in California: A Study and Recommendations—California Law Review Article by George Brunn.
7. Miscellaneous reports and papers relating to recent legislative efforts to liberalize the wage exemption.

Analysis of Civil Court Filings of Los Angeles Municipal Court

I. INTRODUCTION

Attachments by way of wage garnishments represent a large percentage of the problems brought to the offices of those assisting the indigent.

This and obviously related problems motivated a group to run a search of the Civil Court files of the Los Angeles Municipal Court (one of twenty-six Municipal Court Divisions in Los Angeles County) in relation to the nature of suits filed.

There was no preconceived idea as to what such a search might reveal; but, in part, it was thought that such a search would confirm in most respects the findings of a study by George Brunn, *"Wage Garnishment in California: A Study and Recommendations"*, December 1965 California Law Review, Vol. 53, No. 5, and would assist this Committee in consideration of AB 457.

II. COMPILATION OF CIVIL FILINGS

Cases filed in the Los Angeles Municipal Court (fiscal year July 1 to June 30) were:

	Total cases	*Percent*[1]
1963–64	95,577	82
1964–65	102,163	85
1965–66	107,616	84

[1] These percentages of cases were contractual in nature; the balance covers auto accidents, conversion of properties, unlawful detainer, mechanic liens, and related "wrongs". (Figures from Los Angeles Municipal Court Public Reports.)

During the corresponding period of time, the Los Angeles County Marshal's Office made attempts to levy on debtors, or persons holding debtor's funds as follows: 1963–64, 108,201 times; 1964–65, 114,972 times; 1965–66, 127,762 times.

These figures are maintained by the Marshal's Office, but whether such attempt to reach the debtor's fund were successful is not recorded for percentage determination.

III. RANDOM SAMPLING OF CIVIL FILE

The cases filed in the Los Angeles Municipal Court during the first quarter of 1965 indicated:

	Cases	*Percent*
Contract action	21,786	80.5
Torts (auto accident)	3,031	11.2
Unlawful detainer	1,266	4.5
Other		3.8
Total cases filed	27,080	100.0

(Above figures from Los Angeles Municipal Court Public records.)

A. The random sampling of this quarter[1] indicated that 84% of the cases *reviewed* were based on contractual obligations; and, of these, 78% were filed by assignees. This would indicate that of 21,786 cases filed, 17,050 were filed by assignees,[2] *or 63% of the total actions filed.*

B. The random sampling as to the amount involved in the lawsuit indicated that, in those actions based on contract, 36.5% were for less than $200.00 (Small Claims jurisdictional amount); therefore, 7,915 cases filed in this period were for less than $200.00 (approximately 30% of the "total" cases filed in the Municipal Court).

IV. DISPOSITION OF CIVIL FILE

The following statistics resulting from this random sampling of this period indicates the following *as applied to the contract actions:*

1. Answers to the complaint were filed in only 8 % (or 1,743) of the cases.
2. In 50.5% of the cases (or 11,002), judgment against the defendant was entered by default, entry being made by the Clerk of Court.
3. Of 21%of the writs that indicated a return on the levy of attachment or execution, 57% were on wages, 21% were on bank accounts, 18% were on personal property.

However, it is difficult to reconcile this small number in relation to the total handled by the Marshal's Department.

V. RELEASE OF ATTACHMENT

While a portion of the Code relative to the release of an attachment by the posting of a bond or other security is a possibility, no such release is recently a matter of record. Also, claims for exemptions from attachment are very infrequent.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

A. Eighty to 85% of the actions filed in the Municipal Court are of a contractual nature.

B. Of these contractual cases, 75% are filed by what is commonly known as collection agencies (⅔ of the total cases filed).

1. That in over one-half of these cases judgment was entered by default.
2. That in only 8% were the defendants able or willing to file an answer.

C. That 30% of the cases filed in the Los Angeles Municipal Court would be filed in the Small Claims Court, except that an assignee cannot sue in such court, nor will a writ of attachment be issued.

D. It is a fair conclusion that the results of the examination covered herein substantiates the article referred to by George Brunn of the San Francisco area.

Deterioration of Our Defense Structure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 14, 1967

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, another necessary warning of the deterioration of our defense structure was contained in an article from the August 14 edition of the Chicago Tribune, written by Walter Trohan, chief of that newspaper's Washington bureau. I believe Mr. Trohan's commentary deserves practical review and I insert it in the Record at this point:

United States Fiddled While Russia Built Planes

(By Walter Trohan)

Washington, August 13.—One of the most important military developments in our time—the decline in American military plant development and the stepping up of Soviet military aircraft—has gone virtually unnoticed in preoccupation over missiles.

The United States has phased out all of its medium B–47 bombers and retains an aging force of 600 B–52s and 80 B–58s. The air force had expected to replace obsolete strategic bombers with more modern counterparts, such as supersonic aircraft, but this country has not built an intercontinental bomber in six years.

---

[1] The random sample was taken for the months of February, March, April, 1965; based on a random numbers table. This particular period was taken because the grouping was convenient in location to working space. Two persons worked independently. One examined 215 cases, the other 265 cases; and, when these two studies were compared, the difference in results was minimal. From this, it was concluded that the samplings were representative of the whole, even though less than 2% of cases filed were reviewed. Further, a brief corresponding check of the same period for 1966 indicated that the results were in accord with what might result from a more extended study.

[2] Assignees for the most part are collection agencies.

Russia feared American intercontinental bombers more than it feared missiles. In 1961 the Reds maneuvered a shift in United States defense strategy. The late President Kennedy on the night of March 11, 1961, ordered a cut-off of super-bomber development, along with cutbacks in missiles.

Walt W. Rostow, then in the state department and now special assistant to President Johnson, played a major role in this decision. During a Rostow visit to Moscow late in 1960, Red leaders expressed doubt that American military men honestly supported disarmament and complained about the aggressive appearance of "first-strike" weapons or intercontinental bombers.

Rostow's report, on his return, is credited with having resulted in Kennedy's shift in defense strategy from a force capable of striking to a deterrent force for limited war. The decline in the American air force was further sped by the cost-effectiveness program of Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara and his whiz kids.

COST-EFFECTIVENESS PROGRAM HASN'T WORKED

The cost-effectiveness program hasn't worked out well in the TFX development of a medium fighter-bomber for the air force and the navy. The cost of the plane, which was to have been 2 million dollars each, is now estimated at 8 millions each and there is grave doubt that the plane can take off with a full load of fuel and bombs from the deck of aircraft carriers. This plane must be refueled so that it is not properly speaking an intercontinental bomber.

Meanwhile, the Russians have not been lagging in plane development. Observers have spotted six new types and some believe there are as many as nine in all classes of aircraft.

Currently, the Russians have the larger strategic bomber force in numbers and, if not, in performance. The Russians are ahead in numbers because they have retained their medium bombers comparable to the 1,000 B–47s which the United States scrapped. The Russians have 900 TU–16s and TU–22s in service.

REDS LENGTHENING RANGE OF SOME BOMBERS

The Reds do not currently have many planes comparable to our 600 B–52s. They have 110 M–4s, a four engine turboprop with a bomb capacity of 20,000 pounds. They also have 100 TU–95s, which have a range of 7,800 miles with a bomb load of 40,000 pounds. The Reds are developing refueling techniques to lengthen the range of the medium bombers and are reportedly developing supersonic bombers.

American airmen know that while the Russians are talking about the obsolescence of intercontinental bombers in modern war, they have always feared the striking power of the American strategic air command. From the organization and development plans of the Red air force, aviation strategists here are aware that Russia is not neglecting intercontinental bombers while we are.

To military experts it is obvious that under Russian strategy a bomber force is being developed to deliver strikes by medium and long range bombers, which can be followed and observed, after a first strike by Russian intercontinental ballistic missiles. The long range bombers would launch air to surface missiles from points beyond the range of anti-aircraft bombers in following up a missile strike.

The Lobbyists and Dickey Dam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER N. KYROS

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 14, 1967

Mr. KYROS. Mr. Speaker, it has now been 3 weeks since this House refused to appropriate final planning funds for the Dickey-Lincoln hydroelectric power project. During that time several Maine newspapers have expressed the understandable concern the people of our State share about the campaign of deliberate misinformation conducted by the private utility lobby against this greatly needed project of proven merit. Peter W. Cox, the managing editor of the Bath-Brunswick Times-Record, presented a thoughtful analysis of the tactics of this lobby in his column of August 3. I trust that the questions he has posed and the arguments he has raised will not be forgotten should this House have further opportunity to review the Dickey project.

I commend this perceptive column to the reading of my colleagues:

THE LOBBYISTS AND DICKEY DAM

(By Peter Cox)

Although the Dickey-Lincoln School Dam may be revived in the Senate, the defeat of it in the House of Representatives is a lesson in the power of the lobby. One need look no further than the Congressional Record of July 25 to see the private power arguments faithfully repeated by Congressmen.

Most fascinating was the decision by many, especially those from New England, not to be influenced by the study they had themselves requested.

When the House disapproved of Dickey the last time around, it did so on the stated grounds that the project needed more study. As a result, an independent study was authorized. When that report showed that Dickey was feasible and had a good cost-benefit ratio, the same ones who had demanded the study said, in effect, it was worthless.

There were some Congressmen who openly stated they were against public power but the more subtle arguments were the more revealing ones.

Congressman Giaimo of Connecticut made the amendment to cut Dickey out and he was the leader of the opposition. His basic arguments were that the independent study was erroneous, that Dickey would be inefficient, that private power is doing a good job of reducing electric rates in New England, that Dickey would result in a tax loss because it would not pay taxes, and that power from Dickey would be more expensive than private power.

One other Congressman picked up the expense item and to prove his point said that Dickey would not succeed because its power was so expensive the private utilities would not buy it.

This illustrates one of the ironies of the situation. Private utilities are allowed to buy public power and resell it to the consumer; the consumer gets his electricity cheaper and the private utility still makes a profit. This double benefit has been proven repeatedly in public power states.

In this case, however, it would not make any difference whether the private utilities bought the electricity. There are enough customers without them. But once Dickey was built, the attitude of the private utilities would very likely change anyway.

What comes out as the most objective view in the debate is that of Congressman Boland of Massachusetts, who previously opposed Dickey because of the lack of study, but now supports it, because of the study. He notes that the benefit to cost ratio is between $1.50 to $1.90 returned for every $1 invested.

If Dickey is indeed feasible and if the private utilities could still make a profit, why have they worked so hard to destroy it? The answer appears to be that a federal project of this size would keep constant pressure on them to reduce rates because it would show the taxpayers how much lower rates could be.

According to Maine's Congressman Hathaway, "The tangible proof of this is the fact that two years ago, in 1965, when the Dickey-Lincoln School project was before the House Committee on Public Works for the first time since the Electrical Coordinating Council of New England had been formed in 1947—this is a group of private utilities in New England—they came up with some innovations and what prompted this were the hearings indicating the possibility that the Dickey-Lincoln School project might be built."

This is the yardstick argument and it rings true. Congressman Kirwan of Ohio put it this way: "The reason the private power interests are fighting so hard in an effort to delete the project is that they do not want to have a yardstick in the area."

The sometimes irrational opposition of the New England utilities to Dickey has been an exercise in short term self-interest.

Despite attempts to frighten their stockholders with the veiled threat that public power is going to compete unfairly and so reduce stock values, the opposite has been shown elsewhere. Public power has a tendency to stimulate growth. And because private utilities may resell that power, they may also make a profit from it.

What the private utilities fear is anything that would break the comfortable monopoly which allows them to have their own way. The regulatory agencies, such as the Public Utilities Commission, cannot be as effective in keeping power rates down as can another project which demonstrates every day how much cheaper electricity can be produced.

The power lobby in Washington managed to defeat Dickey in the House not by sound argument or by marshalling the facts. They accomplished their feat by combining those who oppose public power in principle, those who want to economize in general, and those who could be influenced by pressure in their home states.

It is not only a sad commentary on the Congress that they should be so swayed but it is an equally sad commentary on the private utilities who want to "preserve a comfortable monopoly" in order to take advantage of their users by leaving them no alternative to paying the rates the company wants.

Earthly Management of Space

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1967

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the Times-Union, of Rochester, N.Y., on August 3, 1967, carried a story on its editorial page entitled "Earthly Management of Space," paying compliment to Mr. James Webb, the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

I am pleased to see this recognition given to Mr. Webb for his untiring efforts on behalf of NASA, and I am happy to insert it in the RECORD for all my colleagues to read:

EARTHY MANAGEMENT OF SPACE

(Excerpts from an article in the August, 1967, Fortune magazine)

The nation's civilian space program, the largest single technological undertaking in history, has come upon difficult times. In this tenth anniversary year of the first Soviet Sputnik, formidable critics are calling the $23-billion Apollo project to land a man on the moon before 1970 "a can of worms" and a "needless gamble."

And perhaps most basic, in view of suggestions of questionable management decisions and even gossip of scandal, Congress and the nation are asking: How well has the U.S. been served by the program's management, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and its boss, James Edwin Webb?

Despite the rancor and doubt of the moment, the evidence is persuasive that the nation has been well served indeed.

This is, for example, the view of Dr. T. Keith Glennan, NASA's first administrator and Webb's predecessor. Glennan had favored a much slower approach to a moon landing than the crash program ordered by President Kennedy in 1961, but he regards Webb's performance in carrying out the effort as "amazingly effective." Says Glennan: "In 1961, I would not have given him a Chinaman's chance to come this close to success."

This is not to suggest that the complaints about NASA are groundless. The fire that claimed the lives of three astronauts last January during ground testing of an Apollo command module was a byproduct of deporable negligence. Webb himself concedes that this neglect was caused, in part, by inadequate management feedback on conditions in the field.

The NASA shortcomings visible to date, however, are no worse than might be expected in an undertaking of such colossal magnitude and unprecedented complexity, in the view of management specialists. Says Simon Ramo, vice chairman of TRW Inc., who himself managed the crash program to provide the U.S. Air Force with a missile system in the 1950's:

"I defy anyone to define a system of management to land a man on the moon before 1970 that does not invite charges of incompetence sooner or later. It's a science Olympics in which you're supposed to do the 100-yard dash in three seconds. If you're not beaten by the Russians, you're beaten by accident, or you find you can't make such an arbitrary deadline anyway."

To try to overcome the odds, Webb, now 60 years old, has developed a managerial doctrine as extraordinary as the space mission itself. Essentially it is a bold extension of the systems-management principle first applied in the Pentagon for weapon development. This approach means that the Pentagon tries to relate design and procurement plans to the weapon system's maximum potential, to other weapon systems, to cost effectiveness, to foreseeable strategic situations, and to other special considerations.

In NASA's case, the "system" is usually an exotic research objective, like landing a package of instruments on Mars.

To master such massively complex and expensive problems, the agency has mobilized some 20,000 individual firms, more than 400,000 workers, and 200 colleges and universities in a combine of the most advanced resources of American civilization.

In 1961, President Kennedy committed the U.S. to "the goal, before this decade is out, of landing a man on the moon and returning him safely to earth."

The Kennedy moon-landing mandate confronted Webb with a sudden, comprehensive government-agency expansion without precedent in peacetime. NASA's budget jumped from just under $1 billion in fiscal 1961 to $3.7 billion in 1963, reaching a peak of $5.2 billion in 1965. The NASA payroll shot from 17,500 to 36,000 in five years, and contractor employes from 57,500 to a peak, in 1965, of 377,000.

A bewildering profusion of enormous contracts was spread around the aerospace industry. A worldwide flight-tracking network was also set up. Concurrently, Webb's political and administrative skill was taxed by repeated crises.

On top of all this, Webb has had to live precariously for years with the explosive potential—which finally erupted in the North American affair—involved in the sheer danger of manned space flight and the unprecedented quality standards that space flight imposes on NASA and its contractors.

How Jim Webb has survived six years in this kind of atmosphere is regarded as one of the true marvels of Washington. It has, of course, been helpful that Lyndon Johnson had originally pushed for Webb's appointment. But Webb's remarkable personality has also been an asset.

There is general agreement that he runs a tight agency. The Budget Bureau and most congressmen admire the exceptional tidiness of his annual budget. Aerospace executives, even in private, have a high regard for Webb and his unusual ability not only to pick good men for his staff but also to generate a degree of loyalty and dedication that is rare in government service.

Probably the main reason why Webb has not been swamped has been his deliberate policy to be ready and quick to change his management structure, personnel, and procedures.

Webb's concept of his job, in effect, is to adjust management procedures as often as necessary to keep up with the ever changing nature of NASA activities.

While concentrating on the moon landing as its immediate objective, NASA plans to build its longer-term operations around such unmanned probes as Voyager to study conditions on other planets, the development of nuclear engines for very distant manned flights, and its Apollo Applications program.

At the same time, Webb wants to undertake extensive earth "sensing" experiments to develop the use of satellites for such observations as surveying crop conditions, locating ore deposits and schools of fish.

If Jim Webb has his way, the space program will soon enter a phase of considerable commercial utilization, in addition to the advances it already has contributed to communication and weather forecasting. Also, the program he proposes, while less exotic than putting men in space for exploration, will preserve as much as possible of the new scientific and industrial capability and, most of all, the management structure that NASA has created.

Vietnamese Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 14, 1967

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, primary among the many reasons given by those supporting our involvement in Vietnam is to permit the people of South Vietnam to freely choose their government. Previously I have indicated my doubts as to the conduct of the presidential and senatorial campaigns which will presumably culminate in the September 3 election. I commend to the attention of my colleagues an excellent summary by Clayton Fritchey in the August 11 New York Post of the milieu in which the campaigns are being conducted.

The article referred to follows:

THE CAMPAIGN IN SAIGON

(By Clayton Fritchey)

WASHINGTON.—"We are in South Vietnam today," says President Johnson, "because we want to allow a little nation self-determination. We want them to be able to go and vote for the kind of leaders they want and select the type of government they want."

Johnson was saying in effect what Presidents Kennedy and Eisenhower had said before him, which is that the U.S. is not in Vietnam to take over the country, or the war, but to help the South Vietnamese help themselves.

To that end we have unflinchingly paid an ominous price in casualities and money to save the country, to try to stabilize it, and pave the way for an election to establish a democratic, representative government which the people would support and the army would fight for.

Since everyone agrees that the war cannot be won without the loyal support of the people of South Vietnam, the election scheduled for Sept. 3 could very well be the critical point in this long conflict. We know from sad experience that the people and the soldiers will not risk their lives for the present military government, dictatorially run by Generals Thieu and Ky. But the hope has been that all this would change once an honest election gave the people the exhilarating experience of self-government.

If, however, the military junta, in its determination to stay in power, keeps on rigging the election, it will not only have betrayed the Vietnamese, but the American people as well, for all of our sacrifices will then have been in vain.

President Johnson should long ago have warned Thieu and Ky and their fellow generals of what the public reaction in the U.S. will be if they persist in making a travesty of the election. Support for the war is already in jeopardy in the U.S. corruption of the electoral process could be the last straw. Dr. Phan Quang Dan, who is running for vice president on the civilian ticket of Phan Khac Suu, says, "The prestige of Vietnam depends on this election, and so does the American support of the war."

The Council of Republican Organizations is probably right in charging that the elections "may already have been rendered meaningless by the manipulations" of Thieu and Ky.

No anti-war candidates are allowed to run. The most popular general in the country (a former premier) has been exiled and ruled off the ballot. (Imagine Truman not permitting Gen. Eisenhower to return from Paris in 1952.) Campaign news in the press is censored by and for the junta. Radio and television likewise. The chief peace candidate, Au Troung Thang, is ruled out on charges of being a Communist and neutralist even though he served in Ky's own cabinet last year as Minister of Economics. The strong trades union ticket is banned on a flimsy technicality.

The rural areas, where most of the populace lives, have been kept in darkness about the election. All candidates for the Senate must run at large instead of, as in the U.S., from their home districts. The Constitution requires "all military personnel and civil servants" to take leave of absence before seeking office but Thieu and Ky are still running the country. The Thieu-Ky combine has unlimited funds at its disposal. The civilian tickets are allowed only $13,000 each.

Not content with having virtually wrapped up victory in advance, the junta now spreads the word that it is forming a "military affairs committee" which will continue to direct national policy no matter what the voters decree. Premier Ky also warns that if any opposition ticket should win by "trickery" he will overthrow it. Trickery apparently means not voting for them.

Despite the degradation of the election, there has not been a murmur of protest from the U.S. government. The truth is the Johnson Administration wants the generals to win so that our puppets will appear to have democratic sanction. The last thing the Administration wants is a civilian victory which might bring to power new leaders determined to run their country independently of the U.S.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Code of Laws of the United States

Title 44, Section 181. Congressional Record; arrangement, style, contents, and indexes.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the Congressional Record, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the Congressional Record semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

Title 44, Section 182b. Same; illustrations, maps, diagrams.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the Record without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the Congressional Record the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily Record as follows: the Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided,* That the makeup of the Record shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the Congressional Record, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorised to be inserted in the Record shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the Record issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the Record for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the Record of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the Record shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the Record style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the Record.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the Congressional Record any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent Record is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the Congressional Record the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the Congressional Record.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the Congressional Record shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the Official Reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the Official Reporters of the respective Houses.

The Official Reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the Official Reporters in the next issue of the Congressional Record, nor to Records printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the Congressional Record by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the Congressional Record which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402, at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided,* That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the Congressional Record, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the Record at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the Record should be processed through this office.

Appendix

The Growing Mystery of Communist China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 15, 1967

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "The Growing Mystery of Communist China," which appeared in the U.S. News & World Report for August 21, 1967. I believe Senators will find this analysis, such as it is, most interesting.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GROWING MYSTERY OF COMMUNIST CHINA

(Reported from Hong Kong and Tokyo)

Red China is emerging from a full year of turmoil—and the mystery surrounding that part of the world is growing steadily bigger.

China is a land that, in area, is one-third larger than the United States. Crowded within that area are nearly four times as many people as are in the U. S. China's population keeps exploding by more than 15 million each year. The time is not far off when the country will be struggling to support 1 billion Chinese.

Mao Tse-tung, 73, is striving to weld this teeming, under-developed land into a monolithic state, dedicated to world revolution.

This massive task, after 18 years of effort, seems to have turned out to be next to impossible to accomplish, even for a Communist dictator.

MAO'S STRUGGLE

In a year-long struggle, Mao has destroyed the original Communist Party apparatus, turned much of the country over to the Red Guard rioters, and fought for control over China's huge Army. All this he considered necessary to keep himself in power.

One day the stories coming from China had Mao down; next day he was up. After that came word he was out, then that he was in.

The fact is that Mao apparently has come through this struggle so far, but with his personal stature impaired.

Liu Shao-chi, Mao's main enemy, has been disgraced and repudiated. Yet Liu remains in office as President, apparently with more support than Mao dares confront head-on.

This story is far from over. The key to power in China today lies in control over the Army hierarchy—and Mao's battle with individual Army commanders is far from finished. If the struggle continues, China could be dismembered and reduced to regional "Red warlordism."

During the whole process, there have been gigantic purges of Army chiefs, Communist Party leaders and Government officials. The school system was torn apart for a time. State-owned industries in some areas were shaken from top to bottom. People were terrorized by gangs of marauding youths.

Mao's purges and his drive to have things his own way have brought about increasing resistance.

In nearly every city and Province, Communists are fighting Communists. Armed clashes have claimed thousands of lives. The party is in pieces, and administrative machinery is creaking. There is open revolt against established authority in some areas, near-secession in others.

IS MAO'S CHINA BREAKING UP?

Manchuria: Reports of chaos created by uprisings of anti-Maoist forces in Kirin and Heilungkiang Provinces, spreading southwest.

Inner Mongolia: Clashes between Mao's Red Guards and anti-Maoist forces that have received some support from Soviet Union.

Yangtze Valley: Major unrest in several Provinces, with continued bloodshed in Hupeh. Neighboring Szechwan Province considered main anti-Mao base in southwest.

South China: Scene of street violence in Canton, capital of Kwangtung Province. Serious railway disruptions.

Tibet: Virtually autonomous since overthrow of Red Guards by provincial military commander.

Sinkiang: Another virtually autonomous Province, with non-Chinese Central Asian tribes stirred up by Soviets.

IS IT CIVIL WAR?

The Chinese Army alone now holds the country together, but even the Army has now come to be regarded as "untrustworthy," its enforcement of martial law halfhearted and its loyalty to central command suspect.

Some outsiders say civil war is raging in China. Respected authorities on Chinese affairs insist not. Says one:

"There is no real civil war. What is happening has happened many times before in the course of Chinese history. It is war welling up from below. It is disintegration."

Yet, through it all, China has managed to press ahead with development of an H-bomb, and obviously is pushing toward development of a missile-delivery system. China's economy is still functioning. Exports have been kept up.

Large areas of the countryside, in a peasant economy, still are largely outside the ferment, and the huge peasant population goes its old way, producing and selling so that, with imports of wheat, the Chinese diet has been sustained.

Disintegration, in short, is far from complete.

Few experts on China admit to having a clear picture of the extent of the anti-Maoist movement. One authority reports.

"We are witnessing the end of a dynasty, and dynasties usually end messily and in much confusion."

A "SOFT" CHINA?

The root of all the trouble is easily identified, however.

In recent years, China has been going "soft," in Chairman Mao's view, slipping into capitalistic habits. The infection had become so deep by 1966 that drastic action was called for. Mao decreed a "cultural revolution" and started cleaning house.

Month after month, Mao's purges cut deeper and deeper into the leadership of the country. Youthful Red Guards were specially organized and turned loose to help Mao guide China back to "pure" Communist practice.

Still more sacrifices were demanded of an impoverished people, running directly counter to their dreams of better lives. Instead of more food, bicycles, radios, and watches, they foresaw more work for less pay.

The result of all this: opposition far and wide, from top to bottom of Chinese society.

Opposition has taken many forms. The bureaucrats who run China either willfully sit on their hands or have been frightened into inactivity. Premier Chou En-lai, a survivor of the purges, complained publicly that only six of 16 of his Vice Premiers were doing their work.

Industrial workers have been sabotaging production with strikes and go-slow tactics while demanding a better deal. Strikes have crippled the electricity and water supply of Shanghai, with the city itself being turned into a nightmare of street fighting between Maoist and anti-Maoist forces.

Red Guard shock troops, determined to establish Mao's new order, have been fighting pitched battles with peasants and workers from Heilungkiang in the Northeast to Yunnan in the Southwest. The tempo of these clashes is picking up. On August 9 a peasant rebellion was reported in Chekiang Province, opposite the Nationalists island of Taiwan.

Reports of just the past few days give evidence of Red Guards' battling in Canton, with many deaths resulting. The country's biggest oil fields were reported in "full rebellion." In Hupeh Province, 50 bloody "incidents" were reported in a week. A Red Guard newspaper told of attacks in Wuhan, where Mao supporters were killed with spears, pitchforks and axes.

Unruly Red Guards have themselves degenerated into not much more than bandits in the old Chinese style, terrorizing the countryside, looting, burning and killing.

The breakdown of law and order is so far advanced in some areas that authorities admit gloomily to "chaos" and "semianarchy."

Mao Tse-tung may be too strong to be toppled, but he in turn lacks real power to bring China back together. That is the assessment of most observers.

THE ARMY'S ROLE

The Army is the only effective force left in China. As a whole, it is beyond the control of what remains of the People's Government.

Military units are in direct or indirect control of all 28 administrative areas in China. But time and again Army forces refused to interfere in local rioting and disorders.

Most Army units have been garrisoned in the same places for 10 to 15 years. Close ties with local residents and officials have developed—and weakened the response of regional units to Peking's direction.

Army loyalties are qualified, and depend on the orders received. There has been reluctance, it is clear, to follow Mao's orders for the Army to join actively in the "cultural revolution."

Military commanders of several regions have in effect "withdrawn" from the current upheaval, showing allegiance neither to Mao in Peking nor to local rebels. Strategic Sinkiang Province and Tibet in particular have established a fair degree of autonomy. Others are on the same course.

In Wuhan, a major industrial center on the Yangtze River that is often called the crossroads of China, individual military commanders have been backing defiance of Peking's orders with force. On one occasion they imprisoned emissaries sent by Chairman Mao to restore order.

Peking radio reported on August 9 that twice in the past year anti-Mao officers had tried to seize control of the Red Chinese Air Force.

It is clear that Mao's loyal ally, Defense Minister Lin Piao, does not exert the control over the armed forces that Mao obviously once credited him with. Yet, authorities insist, the military is not spoiling for a civil war.

There is something else holding off civil war: an immense historic hunger for unity among the Chinese. Even Mao's most vigorous opponents have been of one mind—to avoid a breakup of China at all costs.

This desire for unity ties in with what observers call China's basic problem—a national feeling of inferiority.

The Chinese recognize that, for all their contributions to history, they were the last of the big nations to enter the twentieth century. They seem determined to spend the rest of this century trying to overcome that handicap.

Even if some government is able to get the country stabilized and turned to real industrial development, the pressures of population probably are to become inexorable. In that case, it will become time for Soviet Russia to worry. It is Russia, not the U.S., that authorities regard as the historic and natural rival of China in that part of the world.

Just where is China headed—not a generation from now, but in the next critical months?

The only agreement to be found among experts is that Mao's new revolution has been a disastrous failure. Yet no one has dared to oppose Mao publicly. Resistance remains, for the most part, disorganized and negative.

Says one veteran China-observer:

"This is a formless political wind that is blowing across China. In many ways there are no established sides once you get outside Peking itself."

CHINESE CHOICES

When the future is discussed, these three possibilities get the most attention:

1. A military take-over of China by regional Army commanders. There are no firm signs of such a conspiracy, and many doubt a nationwide cabal could be organized. Still, the Yangtze Valley has historically been a fulcrum used to move China, and opposition in Wuhan might prove contagious and spread to neighboring Provinces, which include the most powerful in China.

2. Another possibility is the gradual breakup of China into semiautonomous regions, ruled by military commanders as modern versions of the traditional warlords. Provincial loyalties have survived Communism, and regionalism has marked China's history. Yet the feeling among most outsiders is that the new forces of nationalism in China eventually will prove stronger than the old forces of dissolution.

3. A third, a "Chinese solution," is also suggested: nothing sudden or dramatic, no showdowns, just a slow drift back to stronger rule by Peking, and to stability. All this, the authorities insist, will come only after Mao dies or is incapable of ruling.

'RECIPE FOR "CAKE"

One specialist remarks: "Make a cake of all three possibilities and you may find yourself nearer the final answer."

For now, more disorder and near-anarchy are virtually certain, and a quick end to the troubles is unlikely. Incalculable damage has already been done. Development has been set back five or 10 years, possibly longer.

The problems—and the mystery—are far from solved in Red China.

Guide or Misguide: Archie Moore Points Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 15, 1967

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I have been an avid fan of Archie Moore's from the time I first began to follow boxing. And I am sure many of my colleagues would agree Archie Moore was one of the finest competitors and remains one of the most gracious gentlemen in the history of American sports. Last week when Archie spoke out publicly against riots and black nationalism, it was with an understandably deep sense of gratitude that I listened to what he had to say. In an editorial which appeared in the the August 8 edition of the San Diego Union, the former light heavyweight champion of the world tells his readers that one fights poverty by working, not by looting and destruction.

The editorial follows:

GUIDE OR MISGUIDE: ARCHIE MOORE POINTS WAY

(By Archie Moore)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Archie Moore, internationally known San Diegan and retired light heavyweight boxing champion of the world, told friends yesterday he feels that "everybody must take a stand in this time of internal crisis. A man who stands neutral stands for nothing." He then wrote the following statement and submitted it to The San Diego Union, which is printing it verbatim.)

The devil is at work in America, and it is up to us to drive him out. Snipers and looters, white or black, deserve no mercy. Those who would profit from their brother's misfortunes deserve no mercy, and those who would set fellow Americans upon each other deserve no mercy.

I'll fight the man who calls me an "Uncle Tom." I have broken bread with heads of state, chatted with presidents and traveled all over the world. I was born in a ghetto, but I refused to stay there. I am a Negro, and proud to be one. I am also an American, and I'm proud of that.

The young people of today think they have a hard lot. They should have been around in the '30s when I was coming up in St. Louis. We had no way to go, but a lot of us made it. I became light heavyweight champion of the world. A neighbor kid down the block, Clark Terry, became one of the most famous jazz musicians in the world. There were doctors, lawyers and chiefs who came out of that ghetto. One of the top policemen in St. Louis came from our neighborhood.

We made it because we had a goal, and we were willing to work for it. Don't talk to me of your "guaranteed national income." Any fool knows that this is insanity. Do we bring those who worked to get ahead down to the level of those who never gave a damn? The world owes nobody—black or white—a living. God helps the man who helps himself!

Now then, don't get the idea that I didn't grow up hating the injustices of this world. I am a staunch advocate of the Negro revolution for the good of mankind. I've seen almost unbelievable progress made in the last handful of years. Do we want to become wild beasts bent only on revenge, looting and killing and laying America bare? Hate is bait, bait for the simpleminded.

Sure, I despised the whites who cheated me, but I used that feeling to make me push on. If you listen to the professional rabblerousers, adhere to this idea of giving up everything you've gained in order to revenge yourself for the wrongs that were done to you in the past—then you'd better watch your neighbor, because he'll be looting your house next. Law and order is the only edge we have. No man is an island.

Granted, the Negro still has a long way to go to gain a fair shake with the white man in this country. But believe this: if we resort to lawlessness, the only thing we can hope for is civil war, untold bloodshed, and the end of our dreams.

We have to have a meeting of qualified men of both races. Mind you, I said qualified men, not some punk kid, ranting the catch phrases put in his mouth by some paid hate-monger. There are forces in the world today, forces bent upon the destruction of America, your America and mine. And while we're on the subject, do you doubt for a minute that communism, world communism, isn't waiting with bated breath for the black and white Americans to turn on each other full force? Do you want a chance for life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness in the land of your birth, or do you want no chance at all under the Red heel?

AFRICA'S A GREAT PLACE TO VISIT

There are members of the black community who call for a separate nation within America. Well, I do not intend to give up one square inch of America. I'm not going to be told I must live in a restricted area. Isn't that what we've all been fighting to overcome? And then there is the element that calls for a return to Africa.

For my part, Africa is a great place to visit, but I wouldn't want to live there. If the Irishmen want to go back to the Emerald Isle, let them. If the Slavs want to return to the Iron Curtain area, OK by me. But I'm not going to go to any part of Africa to live. I'm proud of ancestry, and of the country that spawned my forefathers, but I'm not giving up my country. I fought all my life to give my children what I'm able to give them today; a chance for development as citizens in the greatest country in the world.

I do not for a moment think that any truly responsible Negro wants anarchy. I don't think you'll find intelligent—no, let's rephrase that—mature Negroes running wild in the streets or sniping at total strangers. God made the white man as well as the black. True, we haven't acted as brothers in the past, but we are brothers. If we're to be so many Cains and Abels, that's our choice. We can't blame God for it.

TEACH THAT "ANY BOY CAN"

Something must be done to reach the Negroes and the whites in the ghettos of this country, and I propose to do something.

As a matter of plain fact, I have been doing something for the past several years. I have been running a program which I call the ABC—Any Boy Can. By teaching our youth, black, white, yellow and red, what dignity is, what self respect is, what honor is, I have been able to obliterate juvenile delinquency in several areas.

I would now expand my program, change scope. If any boy can, surely any man can. I want to take teams of qualified people, top men in their fields, to the troubled areas of our cities. I know that the people who participated in the recent riots, who are participating and who will participate, are misguided rather than mad.

If some bigot can misguide, then I can guide. I've spent too much of my life building what I've got to put it to torch just to satisfy some ancient hatred of a man who beat my granfather. Those men are long dead. Do we have to choke what could be a beautiful garden with weeds of hate? I say No! And I stand ready to start "Operation Gardener." I invite the respected Negro leaders of our country to join me.

Redressing the Balance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 15, 1967

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the August 9, 1967, edition of the State of Columbia, S.C., contains an editorial entitled "Redressing the Balance."

This editorial quite properly commends a recent decision of the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois wherein it was held that a State law requiring school boards to eliminate racial unbalance as unconstitutional. All too often recently the courts have been used as an instrument of social reform, and the decisions, particularly those affecting school systems, have been based on sociological considerations rather than legal principles. The decision in this case is a very refreshing one, and the State newspaper is to be congratulated for lending its support to uphold an obviously soundly based decision.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REDRESSING THE BALANCE

The Illinois Supreme Court has injected a note of reason into the debate over public school desegregation.

This issue, old hat in the South, is currently bedeviling Northern states where *de facto* segregation caused by housing patterns is under attack.

This creates, in the opinion of reformers, schools that are racially imbalanced—that is, there are too many Negroes or members of other minority groups compared to the number of whites. There are studies that purport to show that this situation produces inferior education.

So Massachusetts has passed a law banning racial imbalance in the schools. Washington, D.C., is under a sweeping federal court order to equalize educational opportunities between "poor and Negro" children and "affluent and white" children by eliminating neighborhood schools, integrating faculties and throwing out a system of separate classes for bright students and slow learners.

Other states are attacking the problem in different ways. Some are doing nothing.

The Illinois legislature got into the act by passing a law requiring school boards to eliminate racial imbalance. The Supreme Court of that state, however, struck the law down as being unconstitutional.

It held that the 14th Amendment does not require integration or elimination of racial imbalance unless the situation is a result of governmental action.

The Illinois statute, said the court, forces school boards to enter the field of racial classification for the first time.

"It is unfortunate that the battle for equal educational opportunity is being fought as a racial one. This tends to generate heat rather than light."

The court held that both the U.S. and the Illinois constitutions require that equal education programs be conducted without regard to race—that is, that they be color blind.

The court's majority held that the Illinois legislature had improperly approached the issue as a social problem rather than an educational problem.

The Illinois court's emphasis on education rather than sociology is refreshing. It is an emphasis that many federal courts have neglected in their pell-mell rush toward integration at any cost.

If quality education is run over and killed in the rush, who gains?

Castro Menace in Hemisphere

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. ROSS ADAIR

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 15, 1967

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, two recent editorials in the Elkhart Truth, Elkhart, Ind., deal with a matter of current deep concern. That is, recent developments in Cuba, and I include them herewith:

CASTRO MENACE IN HEMISPHERE

Fidel Castro casts a long and ominous shadow over Latin America.

Guerrilla activity in Latin countries, supported in most cases by the government of Cuban Premier Castro, is causing deep concern in Washington.

Castro will play host Friday to a conference of Latin American Communists. Its theme: "The duty of all revolutionaries is to make revolutions."

Venezuela has been a prime target of Red subversion in Latin America since Castro came to power in January, 1959. Although guerrilla activity in Venezuela is said to be under control, President Raul Leoni's government has not relaxed its counter-guerrilla operations.

Guatemala is said to be second only to Venezuela in the Communist "liberation" timetable, and perhaps in greater danger of a Red takeover than any other Latin nation.

Bolivia has had little success in combating a small guerrilla force presumably trained in Cuba.

The government of Colombia admits that a guerrilla movement supposedly crushed there last autumn has revived, and the government has taken counter measures.

Latin American revolutions traditionally have taken place in the capital cities.

Castro's current policy on the other hand calls for concentrating subversive activity in the countryside.

Unfortunately for the cause of freedom, Latin America is almost an ideal environment for guerrilla warfare by the Castroites. It is dominated by mountains and jungles. The interior of the South American continent is, in general, poor and sparsely populated.

Combating communism in Latin America requires a vigorous effort by all concerned to improve the living standards of the people. Too little has been done too slowly about that for many years.

But direct measures also are urgent to deal with the menace of Castro's export of arms and activists to neighboring countries.

Never has hemispheric unity and solidarity been more important than it is now to balk Castro's designs.

CUBA: 8½ YEARS LATER

After eight and a half years one begins to think that the Castro regime in Cuba is not so shaky as originally believed. Nor is it necessarily so personal a dictatorship. Castro himself said a year ago: "No one man is that important any more. The revolution has its own momentum."

Cuba's national holiday since the accession of Fidel Castro on Jan. 1, 1959 has been July 26. This is the anniversary of the revolt 14 years ago, in which a band of rebel youths with Castro at their head attacked the Moncado Barracks in Santiago de Cuba. Appropriately, the principal celebration of the holiday ths year will be held at Santiago.

The Castro "26 de Julio" or 26th of July movement words have become empty and the movement vestigial. But Cuba and Castro remain synonymous. Nobody can quite explain why.

One obvious answer is that Fidel has been able to get Soviet Communist bloc aid at the rate of about $2.6 million a day, about $1 million from the Soviet Union alone. Another is the fact that Cuban sugar—the all-important cash crop—is making a comeback.

But where is Cuba headed?

Rufo Lopez-Fresquet, who was minister of the treasury under Fidel for 14 months before defecting, writes: "Castro is not a real revolutionary . . . He has no cause. He has used different causes: the liberation of Cuba, the breaking of the feudal structure, Communism. But Castro is a rebel and he accepts no authority . . . He rebelled against Batista, against the Cuban community, against the U.S. He will rebel against Russia."

Right now Castro's cause seems to be exporting his revolution to Latin America. How will this goes down with his sponsor is questionable. One Soviet official in Havana is quoted as saying of Latin American revolutions, "We can't afford the one we've got."

Percy Housing Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 15, 1967

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the Philadelphia Inquirer, on August 14, published a special column by writer Charles Nicodemus concerning the impact of proposals by the distinguished junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. PERCY] in the field of housing legislation. I commend this timely article to the attention of the Senate, and ask that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Democrats Quietly Preempt Percy Slum Housing Measure

(By Charles Nicodemus)

Washington.—Senate Democrats have quietly put together a new Omnibus Housing Bill appropriating sizable chunks of Sen. Charles Percy's slum home ownership program. The bill, not yet made public, was drafted by the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), under the direction of Sen. John Sparkman (D., Ala.), chairman of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, which handles housing affairs.

Earlier, Housing Secretary Robert Weaver had indicated that the Administration this year would have no major housing bill—just a potpourri of minor "perfecting" amendments to existing legislation.

But with public attention now focused on the concept of home ownership due primarily to the Percy plan and other Senatorial proposals that followed it, Sparkman and Weaver decided a 1967 housing bill—dealing primarily with home ownership—was a "must."

Percy's plan calls for the creation of a private, non-profit national home ownership foundation that would sell up to $2 billion in Federally guaranteed bonds.

The proceeds would be loaned to local nonprofit groups that would buy and rehabilitate slum apartments, then sell the units to low income families—with low down payments and below-market, Government subsidized interest rates of 2½ to 3 percent.

Although details of the Sparkman-Weaver draft are officially still a closely guarded secret, details have begun to leak out during two days of closed-door consideration given the measure by Sparkman's Housing subcommittee.

In general, the bill is a mixture of home ownership programs submitted first by Percy and later by Sens. Walter Mondale (D., Minn.)—who, like Percy, is on the Housing subcommittee—and Joseph Clark (D., Pa.).

One section provides for Government subsidies of up to 3 percent for the purchase, by individual, low-income buyers, of new or rehabilitated single-family homes.

Also included would be subsidized interest rates for the purchase of cooperative or condominium apartments.

A second section provides for counseling on home-buying, credit handling and other aspects of home acquisition—a feature found both in Percy's program and a bill submitted later by Sen. Clark.

Another provision would revise the Federal Housing Administration 221-D-3 program under which nonprofit groups can buy and rehabilitate dilapidated dwelling with FHA-subsidized 3 percent mortgages, then rent them to low income families at reduced rates.

The revision would permit renters to buy their units, at reduced interest rates, thereby providing a plan closely resembling key elements of Percy program.

All of the home ownership section would also permit the use of "sweat equity"—where a prospective purchaser could contribute his time and labor to rehabilitation or maintenance—to further reduce his down payment.

Utilization of "sweat equity" was another innovation of the Percy plan.

Missing from the Sparkman-Weaver bill is Percy's national home ownership foundation. A new bureau in HUD would perform many of the functions Percy envisioned for the foundation.

When the bill was partially unveiled, other Republicans on the Banking and Currency Committee privately indicated that the wholesale use of Percy approaches and even Percy language was a substantial accomplishment for the Illinois freshman.

But Percy, who has so far declined to discuss the Sparkman-Weaver bill outside of committee, reportedly told his colleagues he intends to fight for inclusion of the foundation concept in the bill.

However, his effort, on the Democrat-controlled committee, is expected to be turned aside.

My Hometown: Compton, Calif.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEL CLAWSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 15, 1967

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, Compton, Calif. has had more than its share of attention recently from would-be sociologists. A welcome contrast was provided by a talk I heard given by Miss Pat Mount, a young lady who was born in Compton, and whose description of her hometown won first place in a competion sponsored by California realtors. Pat was our summer intern last year and so it gives me particular pleasure to include her fine talk at this point in the Appendix of the Record:

My Hometown: Compton, Calif.

"The first cry of a new-born baby in Chicago or Zamboango, in Amsterdam or Rangoon, has the same pitch and key. Each saying, I am; I have come through; I belong; I am part of the Family." In these words, Carl Sandburg began his prologue to the hundreds of pictures comprising the collection of the "Family of Man."

Obviously, I don't live in Chicago, or Zamboango, or Amsterdam, or even Rangoon. But I do live in a city whose citizens believe has a place in this history of man, is a part of this history.

Let me tell you about Compton, California. Let me show you Compton's Family Album. Like other cities, there are department stores, schools, churches, recreational facilities, and of course, people. The pictures recording the one hundred years of Compton's history are full of vitality and enthusiasm, showing both diversity and adversity, industry and frugality, ambition and achievement.

The original land area was part of the famous Rancho San Pedro, 75,000 acres granted by the Spanish crown to Juan Jose Dominguez in 1784. America entered the picture in 1866 when the northeast corner of the rancho, 4600 acres, was purchased for $1700. One could little imagine the energetic "Hub City" that would develop for such a small price.

In the late Fall of 1867, a small group of settlers led by Griffith Dickenson Compton arrived in their wagon trains and bought blocks of acreage from the original area and thus, the town had its start!

The early pictures of Compton offer nothing to startle or amaze historians. The first settlers worked long and hard under perilous conditions. The growth was slow at first, with a full generation passing before the population reached the 500 mark. But incorporation came in 1888 and a new stage began with the birth of the city.

The years from 1888 until today, 1967, have been full of growing pains. The changes that occurred can best be illustrated in economic terms. The treasurer of the city in 1888 received an annual salary of $60. Today he receives $7000. Some will call this progress, others will consider it inflation. But given whatever name, it illustrates the changes from the rather primitive settlement to the cosmopolitan metropolis we see today.

With its versatile location, Compton is truly qualified to be the "Hub City." Fifteen minutes from the ocean, two hours from the mountains and desert, Compton has the personality of both country and city. But looking further, one can see that Compton is also a hub of industry, of education, and perhaps most important, of understanding among men. Our eight square miles are full, statistically speaking. Our 85,000 residents make use of 29 elementary schools, six junior high schools, three senior high schools, as well as one junior college. We read books from three county libraries, attend services at more than 60 churches in the area, take part in the activities of over 100 clubs and organizations while finding employment in near 150 local industries.

There are many pictures I could show you, but some should be especially noted.

To the south of the city is Tartartown, or Compton Junior College, famous for such football players as Ken Washington, Hugh McElheney, and Bob Boyd. Established in 1927, it's one of the earliest junior colleges in the state. It is responsible for "Compton Concept," the idea of televised instruction in the classroom.

We can't overlook Ramsaur Stadium, home, until recently, of the famous Compton Invitational Trackmeet, hosting some of the world's greatest athletes.

Since 1923 flying enthusiasts have been able to take advantage of the Compton Airport. Let's look at some of the scenes recorded from the air. From this vantage point we can see symmetrical beauty in all hues of the rainbow. You can almost feel the slight wind from the nearness of the ocean.

Politically speaking, our city is quite sound. It took our local Republicans to elect Democratic Assemblyman Carley Porter, and it took our Democrats to return Republican Congressman Del Clawson to the House of Representatives in Washington.

Because of its racially mixed population, Compton is learning and maturing. Our background will provide the foundation which will meet our future needs.

We're reaching the last pages in our album, but future years will add more. Other cities will have common backgrounds, but the composite picture belongs only to Compton. With determination and perseverance Compton will continue to grow and prosper, as will the Family of Man.

Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 15, 1967

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the editorial page of the Columbia State is well known for the sound and informative features which it presents along with its editorials. On Wednesday, August 9, the State published two highly significant pieces.

The first is an editorial from the San Diego Union which points out that Soviet Premier Alexei Kosygin's own statements prove that the Soviet Union can stop the war in Vietnam whenever it wishes. It points out the fallacy of the "spirit of Glassboro." Let me quote one sentence:

> So far nobody has found any alternative to winning a war except military superiority used with professional judgment.

On the same page the State also presents an interesting column by the nationally known writer, James J. Kilpatrick, who relates his experiences at a military briefing at Pearl Harbor. Mr. Kilpatrick points out the artificial and unreal restraints which have been placed upon our military men and he does this in his inimitable and graphic manner.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial and article, "Soviet Key to Peace?" and "Evading Questions on Vietnam," from the August 9, 1967 edition of the State, Columbia, S.C., be printed in the Appendix to the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Soviet Key to Peace

The statement of Russian Premier Alexei Kosygin to President Johnson that Vietnam negotiations could begin if the United States of America unconditionally stopped bombing is of significance.

It is in fact another Russian acknowledgement that the Soviet Union has the power to dictate when North Vietnam should negotiate.

And it should lay to rest forever the fuzzy notion that is called the "Spirit of Glassboro." This is the euphoric, unilateral notion on the part of the United States that Russia is mellowing noticeably and wants peace.

The fact of the matter is, of course, that Russia has it within her grasp to establish peace in the world today.

If she stopped rearming the Arab nations in the Middle East, for example, there could be no possibility of hostilities in the immediate future.

If Russia stopped pouring weapons into North Vietnam, the Hanoi government would have capitulated long ago. Instead, the Soviet Union is escalating the war in Vietnam by shipping more and increasingly sophisticated weapons to the aggressors. It has an estimated 1,500 technicians in the country teaching the Viet Cong how to use them.

If Russia stopped propping up its sycophant Castro in Cuba with money and arms, the guerrilla subversion throughout Latin America would become a memory.

The "Spirit of Glassboro" does not exist in Vietnam. It does not exist in the Soviet Union. Only the United States is building a glass house on the foundation labeled Glassboro.

Actually, the "spirit" extends at least back to Oct. 6 and the President's now historic "building bridges" to Communism speech in New York.

Since then an estimated 450 items were removed from embargoed lists and can now be sent to Russia. Some are capable of being used for war immediately. Others are consumer goods that can release Russian industrial factories for war production.

Republican senators have pointed out we have licensed airborne communications equipment for sale to Russia while MIGS are in combat against us in Vietnam.

Incredibly, "legally" owned U.S. Liberty ships transport some estimated as high as 80 per cent of the total. These are ships the U.S. loaned to Russia during World War II.

Kosygin's statement is another reason why the United States should stop weaving its Vietnam "limited response" policy out of dream yarn. It is a time for cold hard facts, not enthusiasm.

The facts are that there is no visible detente with Russia. The war in Vietnam, a Communist probe of Western resolve, must be won.

And so far nobody has found any alternative to winning a war except military superiority used with professional judgment. This is what Russia is seeking to do through others while she dangles carrots at conference tables.

Evading Questions on Vietnam: Militarily Speaking, It May Go on Forever

(By James J. Kilpatrick)

Pearl Harbor, Hawaii.—So long as the present ground rules pertain in Vietnam, this war will drag along its indecisive way. Military speaking, it could go on forever. For all the encouraging words of General Westmoreland a few weeks ago, the condition is stalemate. Until some major change occurs, either in the ground rules or in the balance of forces, the U.S. will have to regard this miserable war as a permanent fact of life, like urban poverty or death on the highways.

These melancholy conclusions emerge from two weeks spent with officers and men who are intimately involved, at the highest levels of command, with the war in Vietnam. One is impressed first with their utter professionalism; second, with their utter frustration.

Doubtless there are some duds within the higher echelons of the U.S. Pacific command. No military organization is without them. But visiting correspondents have not encountered them here. Without exception, the officers have impressed us as men of total dedication to the service—strong men, keenly intelligent, well-informed. They answered our questions—most of them—candidly and responsively.

But we kept raising questions that drew exasive answers, unhapy answers, no answers at all. "Sorry, sir, that's a political matter." "I wish I could go into that but it's out of my area." Thus, as to targets in North Vietnam: "We have great freedom to strike," Pause. "Within a carefully selected list."

The question of surface to surface missiles came up. Why wouldn't it be possible, we inquired, to provide offshore missile platforms that could lob high explosives far-inland, at small cost and no risk? Uncomfortable silence. The question caromed around the green felt table. Well, ah, the use of such missiles is now prohibited; that is, it is not authorized; we have never, ah, asked for such authorization. And besides, such missiles are not very accurate; they have little penetration power; and, uh, we just do not know much about their capability. Long pause. And could we have the next slide, please.

Inevitably, the question came up of Haiphong. Somewhere between 60 to 90 per cent of the enemy's vital supplies, including all petroleum, flow through the port. In any conventional war, Haiphong would be a target of top priority. This would come first. But Haiphong is untouched and apparently untouchable. Yes, it could be destroyed by bombs; yes, it could be rendered unusable by mines; yes, it would be feasible—though tricky—to block the channel by sinking ships across it. But we are a little behind schedule in our briefings, gentlemen, and perhaps we could move along to other questions.

The enemy is making a travesty of our interdiction efforts in North Vietnam by running supplies and troops through Laos. On a handsome map board, 10 by 10 feet, the trails are marked with route numbers in the American fashion, as if they were primary highways. U.S. planes have not touched these trails since April.

How effective is the total allied effort in persuading North Vietnam that it cannot win? Oh, sir, one is told, the effort is bound to be effective. Current figures flash on viewing screens; the exhibits are abbreviated, computerized, couched in tidy ciphers—so many KIA, so many WIA, so many bridges hit in June, so many locomotives damaged in July. Eighty per cent of the electric power capacity of North Vietnam has been knocked out. Over the past 21 months, the enemy has lost 189,000 men.

But in this same period, the enemy has increased its force in South Vietnam, by infiltration and in-country recruitment, by 254,000 men. Net gain: 65,000 men. And this despite the enormous exertion of 731,000 South Vietnamese, 460,000 Americans, 47,000 Korean troops, and 8,000 others. There has been a "great increase" in the enemy's artillery capability. Anti-aircraft fire is "many times as severe as the ack-ack of World War II."

Yes, there are bright spots. The U.S. build-up of ports, roads, airfields, staggers the imagination. The ineffectual French, prior to Dien Bien Phu, had nothing like this. More South Vietnamese villages are secure. Problems of logistics and supply are diminishing. But as for winning? Really winning? Pause. Silence. Shifting of chairs. Clearing of throats. And next slide, please!

Voting Representation for the District of Columbia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 15, 1967

Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, the recent hearings by the full House Judiciary Committee revealed a great depth and unanimity of support for a constitutional amendment to permit the people of the District of Columbia to elect voting representatives to the House and Senate.

I am very pleased that two leading representatives of the Washington news media have endorsed not only the concept of representation, but the principle of full representation incorporated in the amendment I have proposed. I trust that the committee and the entire Congress will give full consideration to the arguments advanced in these two editorials, and include in the Record a statement from the Washington Post of July 25, and one broadcast over WWDC on July 27.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, July 25, 1967]

Representation in Congress

It is almost too much to believe that after all these years enthusiasm is building up in Congress to give the District of Columbia representation there. There is no more reason now than there was 50 or 100 years ago to let the people who live here have a voice in the Nation's legislature. Yet, the chances seem good that the House Judiciary Committee will report out a Constitutional amendment this year and there is even a glimmer of hope that it will pass both houses of Congress.

Such an occurrence would be a remarkable exercise of the power of logic and reasoning—no less welcome for being a little late. There never was a good reason for the Nation to have two classes of citizenship—one for those who live here and one for those who live elsewhere. The fundamental tenet of free government is that the governed have a voice in making the laws that rule them. The adoption by Congress of a Constitutional Amendment to give that right to the District's residents and its ratification by the states would be merely the long-delayed fulfillment of a right for which the Revolutionary War was fought.

One of the bottlenecks, of course, is how much representation the District's citizens should have. One proposal before the Judiciary Committee merely grants the right to representation and leaves to Congress the task of determining how much. Another guarantees one Representative and authorizes Congress to grant additional ones. A third gives the District two Senators and as many Representatives as its population merits.

Since this is a matter that requires a Constitutional Amendment, Congress ought to do the job right if it is going to do it at all. And doing it right requires that the District receive the same representation its population would entitle it to if it were a state, at least in the House. It makes no sense to leave the question of the number of Representatives to Congress which could then grant or withdraw representation depending on the whim of its members and could use this power as an additional club in District affairs. Nor does it make sense to grant the District one Representative when its present population entitles it to two; that would be the worst kind of malapportionment. The District had more residents than 11 sates in the last census and six of those states have two Representatives.

As a matter of logic and reason, of course, the District should also have full representation in the Senate. The historical argument that Senators represented state governments lost its validity with the 17th Amendment. Over a fifth of the Senators are now elected by populations smaller than that of the District. It may be too much to expect that Congress is ready to grant representation in the Senate now, given its reaction to the elemental concept of home rule.

It is not too much to demand full representation in the House now unless Congress lacks any sense of reason and justice.

[WWDC Editorial, July 27, 1967]

VOTING REPRESENTATION FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

This week wraps up public hearings by the House on congressional voting representation for D–C residents. As expected, not a single witness opposed the idea of so amending the Constitution. Rather, there was overwhelming support voiced by all of the community. The Judiciary Committee has only to make up its mind just how much representation the proposed amendment should provide.

Representative Charles Mathias of Maryland advocates going whole hog. . . . two Senators for D–C plus as many Representatives in the House as its population warrants. The President and others urge an immediate designation of a non-voting delegate to the House with details of future representation—when the amendment is adopted by the States—to be determined by Congress.

The question is: Just how much are the two Houses of Congress, and ultimately the 50 State legislatures, ready to approve. There is no justification for denying D–C residents voting representation. WWDC favors going whole hog as in the Mathias approach. But if that proves to be impossible, for whatever reason, the Administration proposal would be acceptable. After 167 years of unjustified denial, any step toward representation is welcome.

Thank you for your interest.

The Increased Minimum Wage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 15, 1967

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the National Federation of Independent Business, Inc., has recently conducted a survey in an attempt to evaluate the effect of increased minimum wage and extended coverage of the law.

This survey disclosed what many of us had good reason to believe—that the recently passed law contributes substantially to increased unemployment. Indications that this would be the case began immediately when this law when into effect. In almost every instance that has come to my attention those workers who are most adversely affected are those who fall in the category of marginal skills and are therefore least fitted to secure for themselves other employment. This has the double barreled effect, then, of necessarily increasing welfare payments.

The survey conducted by the National Federation of Independent Business, Inc., disclosed that this one law may cost as many as one-half million jobs this year. The application of minimum wage to agricultural employment has been particularly severe, but this segment of our economy was not included in the survey.

The survey was conducted among the membership of the federation which is made up of industrial and other nonfarming concerns.

The State-Record of Columbia, S.C., for Sunday, August 13, carried an article concerning the results of the survey. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the conclusion of these remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WAGE LAW COSTING JOBS, POLL SHOWS

A sampling of attitudes among some of the nation's independent businesses and industries indicates new federal wage laws according to one interpretation, may cost half a million jobs this year.

The National Federation of Independent Business Inc. which, as an organization, opposes most federal regulation of business polled its member on results of the wage law.

Surveys were taken in March, June, and July with increasing indications from the respondents that jobs were being discontinued as a result of the minimum wage.

The March survey was answered by 24,714 persons, with 22,857 answering in June and 6,737 at the end of last month.

Among those who responded in March, 12 per cent said they had decreased employment by an average of 3.6 persons with 17 per cent of them stating the wage law was the reason.

By projecting these figures as a cross-section of the small businesses throughout the nation, the Federation theorized that it represents an annual job attribution of 345,000 due to the wage law.

Similarly, in the second quarter, the 11 per cent who released an average of 3.9 persons each—with 21 per cent blaming the wage law—represent, according to the NFIB, an attrition of 423,000 jobs.

And finally, the report says, the July survey showed that 10.9 per cent of those responding had dropped jobs at an average of 4.1 each with 28 per cent blaming minimum wage. Projecting those figures to the whole business community the NFIB said it represented a job loss of 588,000 due to the minimum-wage law.

The new law raised the minimum hourly wage to $1, eventually to rise to $1.60. Others were raised directly to the $1.60 level.

The survey indicated those who have lost jobs in many cases have been youths and unskilled workers. Many businesses, according to the report, are now in the process of either planning or installing equipment which will further reduce employment of unskilled workers.

The impact has been greatest in the small cities and towns, the NFIB reported.

There's No Treason Without a War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SHERMAN LLOYD

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 15, 1967

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, many Americans are puzzled that many acts which seem to be treasonable on their face are not prosecuted as treason.

The Washington Evening Star of August 14, 1967, published a column written by Mr. David Lawrence, which discusses "treason" as defined by the Supreme Court of the United States.

I believe this analysis, based on a review of the cases, and other reearch, should have widespread distribution.

The column follows:

THERE'S NO TREASON WITHOUT A WAR

(By David Lawrence)

Many Americans have wondered why citizens who have declared their sympathy for the North Vietnam side of the war in public speeches or have openly sided with Castro or have urged Negroes in this country to commit acts of insurrection aren't guilty of treason. But the truth is that "treason," as defined by the Supreme Court of the United States, does not apply to such cases.

A study of the various decisions handed down by the high court reveals that for treason to be committed there has to be an overt act of actual aid to the "enemy," and the existence of an "enemy" is not legally recognized until after a declaration of war.

While Congress by resolution and by appropriations has authorized military forces of the United States to fight in Vietnam, there has been no "declaration of war" in a formal sense. The interpretations by the Supreme Court indicate that the wording of the Constitution itself in the provision specifying "treason" is inadequate and would seem to require amendment. The exact phraseology of the Constitution on treason is as follows:

"Treason against the United States shall consist only in levying war against them, or in adhering to their enemies, giving them aid and comfort. No person shall be convicted of treason unless on the testimony of two witnesses to the same overt act, or on confession in open court."

Many speeches or public statements have recently given the North Vietnamese, for instance, encouragement by conveying the impression that the people of the United States are opposed to their own government's policies, and that eventually the American forces will withdraw without achieving their objective.

This concept is certainly giving "aid and comfort" to an adversary and even preventing peace negotiations. But the Constitution, according to Supreme Court rulings, takes no account of psychological factors as an influence helpful to the enemy in making its policies.

The existing provision of the Constitution does not place any territorial limitation on where the crime of treason may be committed. So a traitorous speech made abroad by an American citizen might seem to some people to be punishable, but the Supreme

Court cases say that a speech alone is not punishable and that an "overt act" of aid to the enemy has to take place and be duly witnessed or confessed in open court.

In a compendium of digests and references to court decisions known as "Corpus Juris Secundum"—which is recognized by the legal profession as authoritative—the following explanation of treason is given:

"A mere conspiracy to overthrow the government, or an intention to commit treason, is not alone, without an overt act to carry out such traitorous intention, sufficient to complete the crime of treason. . . .

"The crime of treason consists of two elements, adherence to the enemy, and rendering him aid and comfort; and, in order to constitute treason, the aid and comfort given the enemy must be after the declaration of war between the countries. . . .

"Since both adherence and giving aid to the enemy are necessary, merely to favor or support the enemy is insufficient; a person intellectually or emotionally may favor the enemy and harbor sympathies or convictions disloyal to this country's policy or interest, but as long as he commits no act of aid and comfort to the enemy, there is no treason."

Every one of the foregoing interpretations is followed by a list of Supreme Court decisions bearing on each point. Treason has been defined by the courts as including "such acts as furnishing the enemy with arms, troops, supplies, information, shelter, or means of transportation." But, again, all this applies only "after the declaration of war between the countries."

While public opinion in America today certainly seems to be demanding punishment for those who have been giving any kind of "aid and comfort" to the enemy with or without any overt act, nothing can be done to punish dissenters unless a formal declaration of war is adopted. Also an amendment to the Constitution is necessary if an "overt act" of treason is to include any speech which incites other citizens to engage in disloyalty or disobedience of the laws of the United States.

Unfair to Chicago

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 15, 1967

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Chicago Tribune, in its editions of August 15, carried an excellent editorial which supports the position of many Members of Congress regarding the continued use of Washington National Airport by aircraft from the Midwest.

The Tribune, in its forthright editorial, has again performed a significant public service by adding the weight of its influential voice to the validity of this cause.

The Tribune editorial follows:

UNFAIR TO CHICAGO

The Illinois congressional delegation is aroused, and properly so, by revival of the proposal to bar from Washington's National airport all commercial flights originating more than 500 miles from the capital. If this plan is adopted, aircraft from Chicago and many other cities would have to use Dulles or Friendship airport, both much less convenient.

The purpose of the proposed limitation in flights to National is to reduce congestion at the field, which is now handling 10 million passengers a year. The congestion is not in the air, but in the terminal and parking facilities.

Rep. Roman C. Pucinski points out that only 14 per cent of all flights arriving at National originate outside the proposed 500-mile limit. Most of the congession at the field is caused by shuttle flights from the New York area. He has proposed that passengers using the shuttle services be handled at a building outside the main terminal. This remedy was used successfully at New York's La Guardia airport when it was threatened with a shutdown.

Rep. Pucinski argues that if any reduction in operations is necessary at National it should be apportioned among the air lines and the places they serve. A similar suggestion has been made by a civil aeronautics board examiner.

Most Washington burocrats have difficulty seeing anything west of the Allegheny mountains. This accounts for the arbitrary 500-mile limit proposed on flights to National. Chicagoans traveling to Washington have as much right to the convenience of National airport as the travelers from New York or Boston. The same applies to travelers from St. Louis, Milwaukee, Denver, Dallas, Tampa, and other cities.

Congressmen from all these cities should look out for the interests of their constituents, as the Illinois delegation is doing.

Meat and the Public Health

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 15, 1967

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch:

MEAT AND THE PUBLIC HEALTH

The dangers to health in some of the meat and meat products processed at plants that escape federal inspection are only now being brought to light from a Department of Agriculture investigation made five years ago. Approximately a fourth of the meat consumed in the United States is exempt by law from federal inspection because it was processed and sold within a single state. Even in states which have state meat inspection laws the USDA investigators found diseased animals being processed, meat products being contaminated, and failure to detect or control parasites that could be transmitted to man.

This state of affairs stems from the fact that the federal meat inspection laws presume conditions have not changed since 1906, the year of their enactment, when 30 miles was a good day's drive and Americans traveled neither as far nor in as large numbers as they do now. If meat sanitation were ever a matter of purely state concern it is no longer so, for millions of Americans every year eat meat and meat products in states other than their own and these commodities frequently cross state lines even when processed and sold in intrastate commerce.

It is some small measure of comfort that for the first time in seven years of effort to bring the federal meat inspection act up to date hearings are finally being held in the House on legislation proposed to extend federal standards to plants handling intrastate meat. Consumers should know that the opposition to this essential reform comes from the meat industry and the National Association of States Departments of Agriculture. Representative Neal Smith of Iowa and others who are standing with him for the consumer's protection, with the Johnson Administration's support, deserve a better hearing in Congress than they have got so far. Intrastate or interstate, state governments or federal, there is no valid excuse for permitting the marketing of unwholesome meat.

Voices From the Past

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 15, 1967

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, a recent issue of the White River Leader, Branson, Mo., included an editorial by Mr. Richard Jay. This article places the riots in our cities in proper prospective by citing the day-to-day events which have led to the riots.

I insert at this point in the Record the editorial and a letter from the Honorable Peter H. Rea, prosecuting attorney of Taney County, Mo.

FROM THE RECORD

(By Richard Jay)

The voices from the past skip, linger and fade as the city burns.

It would be good to hear those voices again so that America could ponder where we have been and the route we have taken. From days now past four voices emerge, fade and emerge again. Voices seeking to catch America's attention.

The first voice is that of the talented and articulate newsman who decided in those days what to show millions of watching Americans during the day on the national T.V. network news program. His voice, day after day introduced a scene in this City or that, where 10 or 20 juvenile delinquents crowded around listening to some young anti-social rabble rouser on a street corner tell how America should be burned for all the wrongs of the past.

The voice of the newsman, as he force feeds the rest of the population with day after miserable day of the same taut and intense faces—young militants shouting, "Burn, Baby, Burn!" Telling American colored people that the law is to be disobeyed and the great centers of population burned to the ground.

The newsman's voice and his selection of news created great national figures and made heroes out of the most irresponsible, criminal-like and thoughtless young hoodlums ever to burst full grown onto the National scene. In the past persons with such ideas would have been confined to the hospitals for the very mentally deranged and disturbed and newsmen would have been more thoughtful and considerate than to listen in on the insane diatribe of the sick and confused.

But listen in we did, and look in and observe, close up, with always the voice of the newsman to very nicely articulate that what you have just heard is the voice of the "News"; that this is what the great bulk of the colored people of America are saying.

Now, Mr. Newsman, the only justice might well be for you and your property to "Burn, Baby, Burn!"

The second voice, recalled from the days before Americans burned their own homes, is the voice of the very articulate, popular, young and powerful national liberal leader, whether he was Governor, Senator or President who sought in those days to insure his continued success at the polls by nailing down the block vote of America's colored. His voice is remembered in reference to the many speeches and major addresses made all over America in those days of the testing of local segregation laws.

His voice told the colored young people and all Americans that indeed there are some laws that need not be obeyed, which should be, in fact violated purposefully. He left it to his excited admirers many of whom were drop outs from the Nation's elementary schools, to decide which laws should be obeyed and which laws should be broken to bits and pieces.

His voice is the voice who urged the thousands to march on Washington interfering with the lawful process of an orderly working day for innocent millions; to sit in, stand in and pray in. To block our public buildings and "peacefully" break the laws of trespass and loitering.

Now the voice of the mob answers back to the young leader and calls out that the laws regarding murder, arson, looting and theft are also laws that need not be obeyed. That, in fact, just as the popular and liberal leaders led them to believe, these laws, like the others, may be broken with impunity. Indeed, if these laws are broken spectacularly enough, a cowed nation will open its treasure chest in reward out of fear, just as before the nation opened its heart out of sympathy and concern for the rights of man.

Now, for the aspiring politician who rode this crazy horse to power and who established his long loved dialogue with the militants of our land, let the sentence of the Nation be indeed "Burn, Baby, Burn."

The third voice is a chorus actually, but since the chorus speaks well together it sounds as though one mind controls the voice. A part of the chorus is the voice of the Communist leadership in Cuba, Moscow, China. His voice tells of a time of testing for America. He promises American cities will be burned and that race will lift up arms against race and that his loyal followers should move into the ghetto and the slums to take control of the thought and will of the poverty stricken and the minority groups and incite them to express their resentment with militant action.

Even as this man talks, rounding out the chorus is the answering echo from Washington and the liberal calling for peaceful co-existence; pointing to a new feeling of peace; pretending that summit meetings created understanding; calling for more trade with the East; seeking new ways to accommodate the tyrant. Back and forth the voices echoed. The voice of the Communist conspiracy who led the poor of American into bitterness and militant and active denunciation; the gentle voices of the present leadership and those that precede it in Washington, who profess to be altogether in doubt about the presence or effect of Communist activity.

For the Communist saboteur, active today in Latin America and the slums of America and for the "see no evil" leadership have a genuinely cauterizing meaning when we hear, "Burn, Baby, Burn!"

The fourth voice from the past is the wail of humanity who have lived during the fall of Governments, when freedom and liberty was lost and Law denied. From the very beinnings of history that voice calls to warn us if only we would listen, "A Government not able to protect its people from each other does not deserve to live, and will fall." The words come in a moan to point the way, "Freedom and liberty cannot live and will surely perish where the Law does not control man." Again the words come from the past: "Deny the Law only at the risk of loss of liberty: to deny the Law is to deny life for the Nation."

Unless some person can emerge with character, integrity and the wonderful ability to unite our people, the bell will toll for every city in our land and the voices of the past will indeed haunt us as we recall the selfishness deceit and stupidity practiced along the route to our humiliation.

The hope of this land may well be limited. The voice the future hears from this day and time best be the voice of a Nation at Prayer; fervently, devoutly, humbly and simply, "God Bless America, land that I love."

OFFICE OF THE PROSECUTING ATTORNEY,
Taney County, Mo., August 1, 1967.

Hon. DURWARD G. HALL,
Representative from Missouri,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HALL: I have your newsletter of July 28, 1968, in regard to the civil riots in our cities. Thank you for the stand you have taken in this regard, and particularly on the anti-riot legislation which was adopted by the House of Representatives. I, too, hope for quick Senate approval of this law. I cannot understand, however, how the Justice Department can accept the salary for performance of its duties when they will not see to it that the will of Congress is obeyed. The Justice Department, including the Solicitor General and the Attorney General as I understand the law, should be in there fighting on every case trying to uphold the constitutionality of any law passed by Congress. The other attorney representing the individual or the state or whatever, would be taking the position that the bill or the statute is unconstitutional. Unless the Justice Department carries out this burden Congress is left without an effective voice before the Courts of our land. This is an impossible situation, for the laws Congress passes should have a spokesman before the Court to uphold the constitutionality, particularly since Congress supposedly represents the will of the people.

I urge you to submit for consideration of the Congress legislation to curtail the blatant violation of tradition as we have seen by Ramsey Clark. Or, as an alternative, to provide for a House Counsel to represent the Congress of the United States and do the job which we taxpayers are paying the Attorney General to do.

Sincerely yours,

PETER H. REA,

Better Religious Life for the Mentally Retarded of Nebraska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT V. DENNEY

OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 15, 1967

Mr. DENNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring to the attention of my colleagues the necessary and noble efforts of the people of the State of Nebraska to provide a better religious life for our mentally retarded.

The Beatrice State Home for the mentally retarded is without suitable worship facilities. It is toward providing an all-faiths church building that a drive is now being directed.

Mr. Speaker, the Beatrice Kiwanis Club is sponsoring the drive as a work project. It is to be commended for its sincere community and State spirit in this endeavor. I hope that this drive will touch the conscience of our State for the benefit of our mentally retarded. Such an approach is within the best tradition of our State's attitude of solving her own problems on the local level. This is a self-help project worthy of both our reflection and praise, for its represents a response from the people to a need of the less fortunate.

The responsibility for the well-being of our mentally retarded is a statewide responsibility. An integral part of that well-being is a meaningful religious life. We cannot deny this to the mentally retarded.

Last week, August 6 to 12, was All Faiths Chapel Week in Nebraska. This was a first step for the chapel to become a reality for the mentally retarded. I am certain that it will not be the last.

Communism at Work Here?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. E. ROSS ADAIR

OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 15, 1967

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, many Americans have speculated as to the cause of the recent riots in so many of our cities. Mr. Henry E. Willis, in an editorial in the Steuben Republican, published at Angola, Ind., has some interesting thoughts in this connection. I am sure other Members will wish to read what he had to say and I include his editorial herewith:

COMMUNISM AT WORK HERE?

Racial riots again have shaken this nation to its foundation. On the heels of widespread death and destruction in Newark, another disastrous series of riots and destruction have occurred in Detroit.

This rioting and burning is not confined to the colored section of the city but has broken out throughout the entire city, causing many deaths and injuries and costing well over 100 million dollars.

What is causing these riots? True, there are many grievances, some real and some imagined, that have pestered the colored people. But in most cases they would not have erupted in this mass violence if they were not led. All too often this follows a very similar plan until now there can be no doubt but that it is fomented by some group.

This pattern is all too familiar to persons who have dealt closely with the Communists and their methods of operations in the past, both in this country and in other nations throughout the world. There should be no doubt that this encouragement to violence and destruction and law disobedience is directly fostered by Communists. They are masters of taking advantage of any incident and feeding it with fires of prejudice and unrest into a violent flame. Then, when they have the full scale riot going, they discreetly withdraw, leaving the innocent dupes who have been drawn into the fight to suffer the injuries and consequences.

There is no place for lawlessness in this nation. This feeling is also shared by the great majority of our good colored citizens who have a distaste for violence and lawlessness the same as anyone. But it is these few un-American, Communist oriented leaders who call the lower level of negro, the ones bent on destruction, and urge them to break the law and create death and destruction and the taking or destroying of personal property.

The time is long overdue for the people of the United States to call Communism what it really is, a foreign power aimed at the death and destruction of all American citizens, both colored and white who would oppose their views. In Russia such an uprising against the government could not happen because the leaders would have been killed long before they had any opportunity to act. Any voicing of opposition would have been dealt with not by concern and consideration, but by hard measures.

Rioting is only one step away from internal war against our own nation by its citizens. It cannot be dealt with softly. Law and order must be maintained and those who would live outside of the law, like other criminals, must suffer for their crimes.

Betty Furness Terrifies Us

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 15, 1967

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the August 12 edition of the Peoria Journal Star doubts the wisdom, or better yet the lack of it, behind L. B. J.'s appointment of Betty Furness as Special Assistant for Consumer Affairs. From the tone of the editorial, it seems as though our new Special Assistant is trying unsuccessfully to combine acting with economics. I know I would not borrow money from Betty Furness, would you?

The editorial follows:

BETTY FURNESS TERRIFIES US

Betty Furness, President Johnson's special assistant for consumer affairs, told a House committee this week that she has learned in the last three months to be careful about getting an automobile loan.

She said before she became aware of consumer problems and practices she would have bought a car "assuming I was paying interest around 6 per cent and that the man must be doing what was necessary when he wrote the extra language in."

"I would have signed at the bottom and I would have sent the payments in and I never would have known what the car really cost," she said. "If I could make such a mistake, having been a working woman 35 years, I am terrified to think what mistakes my daughter, who has never worked, might make today."

What "terrifies" us is Miss Furness.

Is the former television personality really buying her cars on time? Is she that broke? Or is she just "acting" like she is in order to make a point?

Before she took on her important assignment for the President did she honestly not know enough to read the small print on a contract? And did she really not pay any attention to interest rate?

If she was really that sloppy in the management of her own personal buying, how on earth can she help the rest of us?

We really shouldn't be faulting Miss Furness. The real problem is not her, but rather her appointment to such an important position in government. That is President Johnson's fault.

If he is really interested in protecting and enlightening the consumer and seeing some important laws put on the books in this regard, he should have found himself an assistant who already knew how to shop for a car loan.

Perhaps Some Benefits From the Disorder

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEL CLAWSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 15, 1967

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, the violence and rampant crime of the past months has been the occasion for national introspection, and far-ranging "stocktaking," and to that extent perhaps our society has wrested some benefits from the disorder. An excellent commentary came to my attention in the August 10 issue of the Herald American of Compton, Calif. I commend it to my colleagues.

The article by Mr. Warren Butler follows:

CURRENT COMMENT

(By Warren Butler)

Human disorder in our cities seems well matched with the disorder prevailing in our government with public finance completely out of control. We have stupidly thought that we could have both guns and butter, not only butter but also ice cream with topping on it, without working one bit harder. This in a way was what President Johnson in a timid way was apparently trying to tell us last week when he announced plans for a ten per cent income tax surcharge both on individuals and on corporations. And despite the huge tax increase that he asked President Johnson candidly admitted that even with the tax increase there will still be a huge government deficit.

What the President should have said is that the budget is completely out of control. We cannot have guns and butter too. At least in the sense that we are not willing to work hard enough to produce both.

GREATEST CRISIS

Announcements of the President regarding governmental financing and more troops for Vietnam actually confront the country with the greatest crisis of all time. And we have had one crisis after another for the last 38 years.

We have worked ourselves into an unprecedented position. We have made ourselves the greatest and most powerful nation not only of our times but in all history. When we sigh, as if in pain, the whole world shudders. But we have also kited our financing, both domestically and internationally, out to an extreme never before in history.

At the same time we have a great chorus, surprisingly including some of our leading so-called conservatives and conservative institutions, setting up a great national chant saying "Spend More! Spend More! Spend More! . . .

Even more alarming is the growing evidence of tired people in positions of responsibility in Washington. And, unfortunately, the man at the top is perhaps the most tired of all.

EXECUTIVE FATIGUE

Trying to do everything for everybody who ought to be doing it for themselves is not a relaxing job. After a while it can begin to produce a kind of numbness that not only dulls the judgment in decision-making but can grow positively dangerous. On the executive level they haven't been keeping what are familiarly described as union hours. Fatigue has set in!

But actually government has been doing things backward for a long time. Instead of giving people the incentive to do more and more things for themselves we have been trying to have government do the job for them. It is not within the power or the ability of government to do so.

About the only step in recent years that we have taken that made any sense was the tax cut which was designed to give businessmen the incentive to expand their plants, build new ones, replace obsolete and obsolescent machinery, introduce new jobs and thus provide more jobs. The results were remarkable.

But government stopped there. They went into trying to do more things for more people both in this country and abroad. Both the domestic and the international handout was the order of the day.

POLICY MAKES SLUMS

As a result taxes are depressing just about everything. We have gotten ourselves in a stew about cities and their slums. But we have overlooked the fact that tax policies are such as to discourage owners from fixing up their rental properties. They rather encourage them to allow their properties to deteriorate. The clammy hand of government is having about the same effect on everything else.

Taxes are the great depressant! It is to be fervently hoped that the dark picture which the President painted will awake the country. Congress needs to make a great reorganization of government, to cut out the monkey business at least until we can win the Vietnam war. And then we urgently need a rethinking of government theory so that government does not try to do everything for us but encourages us to do things for ourselves.

The 200,000,000 people who inhabit this country can do the job for themselves if our government will quit trying to do it for them and set up our tax and other policies in such a way as to encourage rather than to discourage the people from showing any initiative for themselves.

HELP CRIME PROBLEM

And it is my persistent belief that if we could give people the incentive to do the job for themselves in a proper manner the great crime problem would begin to subside. And our cities would find to their surprise that they probably have the ability to solve their own problems.

I am not advocating, of course, that we remove all regulation and restraint. Government has to continue to serve as a referee and to jail the cheaters in this life. But it's about time that we dropped the absurd theory that government can do everything for its citizens. It can't. But the citizens can do everything for themselves if government will but give them a chance and provide the incentive for them to do so.

The Public Television Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 15, 1967

Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, as the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce is currently considering the Public Television Act as passed by the other body, I think it is appropriate at this time to take note of the advances made in Maryland in the field of educational television.

For several years many talented and dedicated Marylanders have been working for the establishment of a statewide educational television network. In 1966 the Maryland General Assembly created the Maryland Educational Cultural Commission charged with the development, operation, and maintenance of an educational television network in the State. The commission recently received a Federal grant of $654,301 under the 1964 Facilities Act which recently expired. These funds, to be matched by State funds will serve for the construction of the intial television center at Owings Mills near Baltimore. With the passage of the Public Television Act more Federal funds would become available to the commission and other similar commissions across the country for further development of a meaningful, useful, and constructive ETV network.

Mr. Speaker, I include at this point in the RECORD an editorial from the Washington Evening Star which was brought to my attention by Mr. Ellery B. Woodworth, of the Maryland Educational Cultural Television Commission, which talks about the advantages and necessity of ETV in our country today.

MULTIPLYING THOSE TV CHOICES

"I think television should be the visual counterpart of the literary essay," E. B. White of the New Yorker once wrote. "It should be our Lyceum, our Chautauqua, our Minsky's, and our Camelot."

But in spite of its potential to be all these things and more, and in spite of the fact that Americans spend nearly a fourth of their waking hours viewing the medium, TV's promise remains unfulfilled. As Senator Scott of Pennsylvania remarks, much of commercial television programming meanders "from the mediocre to the moronic."

The action by the Senate last week expanding Federal grants for construction of educational TV stations and setting up a non-profit corporation to help distribute programs should offer a healthy corrective.

Senators have wisely added safeguards to protect the corporation from outside influence. Nine of its 15 board members would be appointed by the President—and subject to Senate confirmation. The remainder would be elected by the board itself. And the Senate has added language prohibiting interference by the government in programming.

That satisfies the doubts previously expressed in these columns about meddling by lawmakers in the program content of educational TV. Given a free hand, ETV also can operate without reference to the broadcasting rating systems and their obsession with numbers. The medium, in the words of Senator Prouty of Vermont, will multiply the choices given to viewers who want to be individuals rather than a mass audience.

The Senate bill deserves prompt and favorable attention by the House.

Poverty Breeds Hopelessness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL D. PERKINS
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 15, 1967

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, every Member of this body is very deeply concerned about the recent urban violence. We can and should expect that a variety of congressional efforts will be made to deal with all the factors which make it possible for the agitators to turn previously tranquil people into a mob. We will examine poverty, unemployment, poor health, and poor housing, as well as deliberate incitement to violence, as factors contributing to urban chaos.

Mr. Speaker, I have heard a great many of my colleagues rise to speak of these problems. For the most part they have spoken wisely. They have reminded us with compelling eloquence of the urgency of the problems America faces in her cities. I share their concern and I pledge to do my part in the rebuilding process.

But lest it is forgotten, Mr. Speaker, I want to remind my colleagues of the fact that poverty breeds hopelessness which is no less real than that found in the cities. Poor health and poor housing and joblessness are just as much of a burden on those in the hollows of America as they are to those who inhabit the urban areas. Furthermore, it is the hopelessness of rural poverty which forces migrations of many of the rural poor to American cities. These desperate souls then find themselves, unskilled and friendless, crowded among the urban poor. For these reasons we must direct our attention not only to the cities, but to the countryside. By helping the rural poor we replace hopelessness with hope in those regions, and we achieve a collateral reduction of new population pressures on the cities.

Fortunately, I can report that there is positive antipoverty action underway in the rural areas. The House Committee on Education and Labor only recently heard from Mr. G. Leslie Dawson, Kentucky commissioner of economic security, that approximately 2,000 unemployed fathers in eastern Kentucky have been helped toward new jobs.

Mr. Speaker the "happy pappy" program is but one of several highly successful projects which are part of the poverty effort. The Job Corps center at Camp Breckinridge is another. In fact, the Breckinridge Job Corps center is giving the type of training to young men which will make it unnecessary to institute programs for jobless husbands and fathers later on. That is what we mean by investing in people in an all-out effort to eliminate the causes of poverty. And that is why we must continue to wage this important struggle. We simply cannot afford—socially, economically, or morally—to give up on this important antipoverty combat.

Mr. Speaker, I cite another example, a moving example, of the results we can expect as we devote ourselves to helping America's poor. I am referring to the experience of a team led by Mrs. Mary Jane Dunn which visited families in the mountain hollows to suggest improved health conditions. As the Louisville, Ky., Courier-Journal reports:

> Among other things, they found an 11-year-old girl whose family thought she was retarded. A medical checkup found she was hard of hearing. With a hearing aid she has become a good student in school.

This is but one of a host of examples which illustrate the great and lasting good that can be done when Americans begin to reach out and help each other. It is also a poignant reminder of the existing need for such efforts. The Congress can take pride in the fact that it gave birth to such agencies as the Office of Economic Opportunity which are working closely with local people to help the poor out of sickness and poverty and into good health and productivity.

Mr. Speaker, I feel certain that my colleagues will be interested to read of the achievements of those good people in Kentucky who are in the thick of the fight to abolish poverty.

Objective Look at the Far East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN T. MYERS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 15, 1967

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Speaker, a distinguished newspaper publisher and personal friend of mine, George L. Carey, of Clinton, Ind., recently toured the Far East with the American Newspaper Studies Mission, Inc.

The tour took Mr. Carey to Japan, Korea, Taiwan, Hong Kong, South Vietnam, and Thailand. It was his third trip to the Far East in recent years. The last was 6 years ago.

His objective look at what the situation is in this troubled part of the world and personal observations about the war in Vietnam were of particular interest to me. I would like to share with you three of those articles related to the Vietnam struggle which I feel give us some important insight into the U.S. mission there and what the future holds for the people of South Vietnam.

As Mr. Carey states in the foreword to a collection of his newspaper articles, written during the trip, the impressions gained are purely personal but it is his hope that they may lead the reader to a little better understanding of what is going on there in that faraway land.

The articles referred to follow:

WE FIGHT FOR MEN'S MINDS IN VIETNAM STRUGGLE

SAIGON, VIETNAM.—There's none of the Taiwan plush about our military operations here in Vietnam. This is the real thing, with sincere men doing a job they don't like . . . and doing it well. We heard the story this morning at the First Infantry (The Big Red 1) headquarters at Di An, about 22 miles north of Saigon, in the heart of what is still Viet Cong territory and we liked what we heard.

I have wondered if we were trying for the same kind of military victory the French tried to achieve and failed or if we realized that this is a war for men's minds . . . the minds of little people who have never known anything but oppression in one form or another. I wondered if we knew that this was the war we had to win.

What we found is that our military leaders are keenly aware of this fact, that they have studied the successes . . . and the failures . . . of others confronted with the same kind of problem, that they are making progress and are confident of ultimate success.

It's not too difficult to tell when people are telling the truth and the officers who briefed us even admit that we made a sad mistake by pretending we were winning when we were losing a year or so ago, when we exaggerated our small successes and played down the progress being made by a tough and clever enemy.

It took us a while to realize that Col. Sam Glassmoyer and the other jovial officers who met us at the airport weren't just kidding when they warned us to be a little careful in Saigon.

"You don't have to worry too much," the colonel told us. "It's been almost a month since anyone was knifed in Saigon and about two weeks since a grenade was thrown or anyone was kidnapped, but be careful about mingling with crowds or getting down side streets."

But, if we thought the easy-going way they handled the danger was kidding, we lost the feeling when we headed for Di An this morning in an ancient Navy bus which didn't want to run . . . and finally didn't. Ahead of us was a jeep with a heavy calibre machie gun manned by a large and handsome colored boy. Beside the driver there was another soldier and two new automatic rifles. A similar jeep was behind us. There was no kidding about that.

The Vietnamese driver of our bus, who hadn't been told where he was going because he would have reported "sick," was obviously terrified when he realized where we were headed. He did everything he could to put the bus out of commission and finally did, leaving us stranded in a sort of no-man's-land not too far from the Di An base, to which some of us were transported in a small truck. I rode in the machine gun jeep.

We got none of those deeply-upholstered chair and colored slide briefings from Gen. James Hollingsworth and several other informal and friendly officers. They talked largely off the cuff, while we sat on folding chairs and they talked with obvious sincerity of how the course of the war has changed and the successes they think lie ahead.

We and our allies are fighting two wars in Vietnam where we have intervened in what is actually a revolution. We are fighting a war which we have largely won against hard core military units of the Viet Cong and North Vietnam regulars. Then we are fighting what they call a "resident war" against Viet Cong in the villages and operating as guerrillas.

In action against the hard core units we are simply saturating the enemy with fire power delivered from ground and air. General Hollingsworth made it clear that it was an expensive war but one designed to save the lives of our boys and at the same time get the job done.

At the present time the Viet Cong seem to be trying to avoid major engagements for we "clobber" them when they stand and fight. The general admitted that 65 per cent of his men were drafted and would a darned sight rather be at home, but he insisted that "these young men are the bravest, the smartest and the most courageous I have seen in 26 years of military service." If Americans are concerned about the record of our soldiers in Vietnam, they can forget it, he insisted.

There isn't space to go into details here but General Hollingsworth and his fellow officers told us of many instances where the Viet Cong have attacked in a ratio of 3 to 1 and been wiped out by our superior fire power. It was obvious that our military leaders consider that the "army-against-army" part of this war is just about won.

They are also making a lot of progress in the resident war, we were told. This is shown by the increasing number of former Viet Cong coming over to our side. These are the Chieu Hoi or defectors from the Viet Cong, known by the polite term of "ralliers," that is those who have decided to rally to the government side. We met one of them named Le Minh Chau, who hopes some day to join the American army.

Folks play rough in this part of the world and it was difficult to teach the Vietnamese . . . and our boys . . . to be nice to guys who had been shooting at them, but it's a way to win this war and it is being done.

If we are saturating the Viet Cong armies with fire power, we are no less gentle in the resident war. We found out that the Viet Cong were strongest where there were jungles they could fade into and maintain their bases. So we are methodically removing these jungle hideouts, with bulldozers, then piling up the trees and burning them. It is very discouraging to Viet Cong to have their headquarters bulldozed away and its working.

The average Vietnamese, we were assured, given a choice and a promise of security, will line up with the government. Most of the people are fed up with the broken promises and the terror of the Viet Cong.

We Meet the Youngsters Who Live With Death

Saigon, Vietnam—You can't help wondering what they are thinking about, those kids who may face death tomorrow. They look at you with serious eyes as they go about the important work of seeing that their weapons and their boats are in the finest possible condition.

They don't seem to pay too much attention to you and you feel a bit ashamed, as if you are a tourist where you have no business being. They don't even seem to kid a lot although when I did take a picture of one bronzed soldier, muchly tattooed, who was busily repairing a machine gun, he bowed low and with mock-solemnity, thanked me. "At least they'll know you're here now," his buddy quipped.

We saw them today at Nha Be, these youngsters who have one of the most dangerous jobs in the history of warfare. They are the Americans and Vietnamese who man the minesweepers trying to keep the shipping channels to Saigon open. They are the special target for the Viet Cong now. They have taken heavy losses and will continue to do so but they have a job to do and they will do it quietly and efficiently.

We had been told that we had lost two of the 12 mine-sweepers trying to keep the shipping channels open. Today a young officer told me we have lost three mine-sweepers sunk and four damaged, but the war goes on and figures change every day.

Last night our light sleepers were awakened by the sound of big guns about three miles from Saigon, softening up Viet Cong strong points just a few miles farther away. At night the northwestern skies are alight with star shells fired by our troops, for the war goes on night and day.

This morning we were somewhat surprised when Gen. William C. Westmoreland, MACV (pronounced "Mack V" and meaning "Military Assistance Command Vietnam") commander, took 45 minutes to tell us what this war is all about. We had expected no more than a formal greeting from the handsome, pleasant commander of our troops but he seemed to want us to hear the whole story.

General Westmoreland is as fine an orator as he is a military commander and he also feels that our war in Vietnam is very much misunderstood at home. He used several of what he called his "home-spun analogies" to make us understand this strangest of wars.

He compared Vietnam to a man who has a nice home but discovers that unknown to him termites have been eating away at the timbers. He is alarmed and calls in the members of his family. He gives them screwdrivers and puts them to work killing off the termites, one by one.

They are making fairly good progress when a bunch of bullies show up armed with crowbars. They have been in league with the termites and are all set to pry down the weakened timbers and make the house collapse. At that point the man is forced to call on his friends to try to hold off the bullies.

This, of course, is where we come in and General Westmoreland said we have done a good job of holding off the North Vietnam "bullies." Before long we shall be able to give more of our help to rooting out and killing the termites, which are the local Viet Cong guerrillas.

As we have been told before, this is a two-way war. It is two-way all the way. The ground forces are fighting two wars, with the regulars and with the guerrillas. The navy is also fighting two wars, one by offshore shelling and launching air strikes by sea and the other the operation we saw today at Nha Be, the big naval base south of here in the delta country.

General Westmoreland turned to another of his analogies to describe the ground fighting. He said we are like a boxer. With our right hand we must defend ourselves from injury and with the left we must keep the enemy off balance. Sometimes we can give a little more attention to one or the other but not for long.

Under no circumstances, he feels, should we ever "button up" which is a boxing term for going purely on the defensive. This, he feels, is what we would do if we adopted the enclave tactics some have suggested and merely held on to the seaports.

Hence, with our right hand, so to speak, we must keep and secure our bases while with the left, we must keep moving against the main troops of the enemy wherever and whenever we can find them. Many of these bases are in mountains and jungles. They are manned by highly-trained soldiers who know the terrain. They have elaborate fortifications and vast underground shelters. It is a hard, tough, bitter war

Our military leaders here hurry to the defense of our Vietnamese allies, known here as ARVN (Army of Vietnam). They think they have had a lot of criticism they did not deserve, it is true that they have a long way to go, they have been short on firepower and often on leadership, which is a rare commodity in these parts, but they have also made a very good record in many ways.

General Westmoreland cited us a number of fine recent achievements by our Vietnamese allies. He also pointed out that for three years the army was the only institution holding Vietnam together. Until we began giving them aid, they were fighting alone on all fronts. Even with a war going on they have been able to expand their operations by 50 percent.

The charge that Vietnam is letting us fight her war is false, we are constantly told. If the same proportion of Americans were in the army we would have 8½ million men under arms.

To tell you one-tenth of what we have been told in the past two days would take a dozen columns and it's no use to try but it should be noted that the relationship between officers and men out here is the best I have ever seen. There is no spit and polish and not too much of the "Sir" business. These men seem to agree that there is a job to be done and they are going to do it with as little formality and as much efficiency as possible.

Vietnam To Reap Benefits From Our War Spending

Honolulu, Hawaii.—There's one thing for sure when we finally save the skins of the South Vietnamese and pull out, we are going to leave them a lot better country than we found, when we decided to help them fight off the Viet Cong and North Vietnam.

We have spent nearly a billion dollars building modern harbors, airports, roads and railroads where there was virtually nothing before. Not all of these facilities can be put to peacetime use now; some probably never will be but the reorganized nation can benefit from many of them.

There was nothing particularly new in the briefings we were given here today by the military leaders who are masterminding the defense of our Pacific outposts but they confirmed and enlarged upon much that we have learned during the past few weeks. In a number of instances, pieces fell into place. We had been told, for instance, that many workers were being laid off in Vietnam, both native and American. This dovetailed in with what we were told today, which is that we now have adequate facilities for getting all the necessary supplies to our boys in Vietnam.

Not only are the shipping gluts and shortages of ammunition and supplies a thing of the past but we now have a 30-day supply on hand and can easily keep up with all demands. The big building spree is over. We are all set to handle a long war on just about any scale.

Although what we had been told and had seen in Vietnam was impressive, the illustrated briefings we were given here were even more impressive. They showed big photographs of huge ports and airfields which had sprouted from virtually nothing in a matter of months. The magnitude of the projects can be grasped from the fact that 2,500 acres of land have been reclaimed from rice paddies and swamps, by filling in, with fleets of earth moving equipment.

The same confidence that we found among our military people on the spot was again reflected in what we were told here. When the war will be over, none wants to prophesy, but of the outcome, they do not have the slightest doubt.

Like every military man we have talked to, the ones we have here in Hawaii share the same feeling that the suspension of bombing has been a mistake and to permanently suspend bombing targets in North Vietnam could only result in helping the communists prolong the war indefinitely. Not only do most of our military leaders not want to see bombing suspended, they want it extended to include the docks at Haiphong and other targets now denied them, where the communists must concentrate their supplies and where bombing could be most effective.

Increasingly they think, it is more difficult for the Viet Cong to get supplies, with us bombing away at his supply lines. They consider the vast propaganda campaign against our bombing as proof of its effectiveness. As matters now stand, they freely predict that the strength of the enemy in Vietnam will slowly decrease. They just as freely predict that we shall put in even more men than the 400,000 or so that we have there now.

Both Laos and Cambodia are providing sanctuary and supply infiltration routes for the communists, but just how thoroughly they are in sympathy with the Viet Cong is a hard thing to say. In some cases the governments of Laos and Cambodia have little control over wide areas of their territory and border lines are poorly defined.

Much of the eastern part of Laos is controlled by the communist rebels against the monarchy. The same is true of much of Cambodia and even parts of Thailand. The peasants in the hamlets are hesitant to align themselves with either side. This is one of the big problems we face in rooting the Viet Cong out of South Vietnam.

Again, and again, we were assured that we are on the road to success. It was pointed out that highways which were controlled by Viet Cong a few months ago may now be travelled in comparative safety. This is true. We rode over them. Villages held by Viet Cong a few weeks ago are now secure. This is true. We visited some of them.

Vast areas, not necessarily right around Saigon but elsewhere, are now almost free of rebels. The people are beginning to feel secure and business activity is resuming. The military campaign against the regular Viet Cong forces is going so well that 50 per cent of this year's government effort can be devoted to village pacification. We are freeing more of our own men for the tough job of "rooting out" the Viet Cong and as Marshall Ky said, "rooting in the government."

Having listened to thousands of words, looked at a great many things and done a lot of independent thinking, I cannot escape the feeling that the decline of the influence of the Viet Cong will begin to snowball one of these days, that the overwhelming might of our armed forces will take its toll and before we realize it, the war in Vietnam will just fade away.

There will be no formal surrender, for there has been no formal war. North Vietnam has never openly admitted she supports the Viet Cong or has troops there. Neither has Red China, or Russia. It isn't the oriental way, but above all things, the orientals want to be on the winning side of a war.

In the meantime, we have the fuzzy thinking of a Senator Robert Kennedy and a Senator Fulbright to contend with. We have the foolish pacifism of thousands of our citizens to contend with. They may be able to bring about what the Viet Cong has failed to do . . . hand the United States its first defeat.

Budgeting: Blunders or Baloney?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 15, 1967

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the August 12 edition of the Peoria Journal Star relates perfectly my sentiments with regard to the U.S. budget and its annual error-ridden computation. For the 31st time in 37 years, the Federal Government looks like a shoo-in candidate for the Diamond Jim Brady "last of the big spenders" award.

The editorial follows:

Budgeting: Blunders or Baloney?

Somehow, with all the astounding computers and electronic brains available, the U.S. government in recent years always seems to make a mistake on its budget.

It estimates spending to be so much—and outgo always turns out to be quite a bit more than anticipated. Granted there are unexpected situations happening—but wasn't there always? And can't these in some way—especially with the astounding computers which can do the work of a thousand men in the flash of an eyelid—be provided for?

In the fiscal year which ended June 30, the secretary of the treasury has finally ascertained that the government had a deficit of almost $10 billion. Almost $10 billion in the red—because spending wasn't accurately forecast.

What's the problem? Is it political, wherein the party in power doesn't want to admit how much it is going to spend? Is it pure blundering in which rough guesses replace scientific bookkeeping processes?

The deficit for the just completed year is the second largest since World War II, and the 31st such deficit (31st error in anticipating outgo) in the past 37 years.

And why is spending always underestimated? If they're just making mistakes, why doesn't it happen at least half the time, that we come out with a surplus?

It is no wonder there is a growing distrust of spending programs in Washington.

Much Meat in United States Is Not Inspected

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 15, 1967

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following:

Much Meat in United States Is Not Inspected—Dying, Diseased Animals Are Slaughtered, Wind Up on Dinner Tables

(By David A. Meeker)

Washington, July 29.—That good, red meat on American dinner tables may not be good and it may be red only by virtue of chemicals. It may even have come from a four-D animal—one that was dead, dying, diseased or disabled when taken to the slaughterhouse.

Most housewives are under the impression that all the meat they buy has been slaughtered and processed under the eyes of federal inspectors, but congressional hearings have brought out that more than 20,000,000 animals were slaughtered for food last year with no Department of Agriculture inspection. Much of this meat went to the dinner table with no inspection at all.

After Upton Sinclair's "The Jungle" was published in 1906, a national uproar resulted in enactment of the Meat Inspection Act, which provided for federal inspection of meat moving in interstate commerce. Under that law, amended only once since enactment, the Department of Agriculture's 4000 inspectors provide some assurance that meat shipped from state to state is wholesome.

In the case of meat slaughtered, processed and sold within a state, no federal inspections are made. Twenty-six states have laws providing for mandatory inspection of slaughter and processing. Thirteen states provide for voluntary inspection and two states have limited regulations on meat packing.

Missouri is one of nine states that do not inspect meat, but a mandatory meat inspection law is to go into effect in Missouri Oct. 13. Illinois has a mandatory inspection law. The new Missouri statute was enacted by the recent session of the Legislature.

Missouri has 258 plants that slaughter or process meats outside of federal inspections. In 1962, federal inspectors visited some of them and filed confidential memorandums with the Department of Agriculture.

The previously unpublished reports have been obtained by the Post-Dispatch. They alarm and nauseate the reader.

In one plant, an inspector reported, "skins, snouts and the like intended for use in franks, bologna and imitation meat food products had visible hair, hair roots, scurf and dirt in quantity."

Another inspector reported, "Meat observed hanging in cooler contaminated with dirt and enteric material associated with killing floor. A badly bruised hindquarter observed along with edible meat in a boning area. This meat did not appear to be edible as human food."

Most of the reports said the plants had no inspection of animals before or after slaughter, as required in federally regulated plants to prevent diseased animals getting on the market. In many of the plants, inspectors found chemicals being mixed with meat to give it color and prevent deterioration, steps not permitted under federal regulations.

Some plants were found to be of high quality, one was called "an exemplary operation." But the bulk of the reports categorized the plants inspected as ranging from "unsatisfactory" to "deplorable" and "very filthy."

In Illinois, which has mandatory state inspection for intrastate meat, the inspectors found conditions ranging from very good to very poor and concluded that "a great deal of time and effort will still be needed to get a system of inspection in the State of Illinois that will in any way compare with the federal system."

After visiting a plant in the St. Louis area on the East Side, an inspector reported, "A carcass observed on the pork-cutting table displayed an enlarged lymph gland typical of that of acute tuberculosis. Thus diseased meat is not being suitably eliminated from the meat source." Illinois has 965 plants outside federal regulation.

A proposed Wholesome Meat Act of 1967 is being considered by the livestock and feed grains subcommittee of the House Committee on Agriculture. The version of the bill supported by the Administration would end exemptions granted to some meat shipped in interstate commerce and would tighten standards. It would provide for aid to states to carry on inspection programs. Cost of the bill is estimated at $4,650,000.

A rival bill would extend federal inspections to all meat-packing and processing plants covered by the Taft-Hartley law, providing federal inspection for most of the intrastate operations not now regulated.

Opposition to the legislation springs from Southern congressmen who oppose extension of federal authority and from the powerful meat lobby.

Proponents of the bill say that state inspection has proved inadequate, primarily because many states refuse to appropriate sufficient funds for adequate personnel.

In Missouri, the General Assembly appropriated $285,400 for inspection. This and about $80,000 in fees paid by packers would provide a director, 10 full-time veterinarians and the equivalent of 40 full-time inspectors.

United States Department of Agriculture officials question whether the staff is adequate. They doubt that the legislation is specific enough to insure good meat inspection in Missouri. Regulations authorized by the statute have not been established by the Missouri Department of Agriculture. If they are strong, it will be start on improving intrastate meat standards.

Indicted Pair on Poverty War Payroll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 15, 1967

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an Associated Press article from Houston, Tex. The article follows:

INDICTED PAIR ON POVERTY WAR PAYROLL

HOUSTON.—Two of the five former Texas Southern University students indicted for murder and assault to murder after May 16-17 disorder on the campus have been hired by Houston's war on poverty organization, the Houston Post said.

In a story written for its Saturday editions the newspaper quoted an unnamed official of the Harris County Community Action Association as saying that Trazawell Franklin, Jr., 20, and Floyd Nichols, 25, were hired for summer work after their indictments were returned.

Nichols reportedly has received $1.40 an hour and Franklin $1.75 an hour for work in parks and playgrounds with poor children.

The newspaper reported that Francis Williams, HCAA executive director, said he did not know of the two working for his organization.

The Post said the deputy director and the personnel director of the HCCAA and Bob Kercheville, a spokesman for five-state regional OEO headquarters in Austin, all refused comment on the matter.

Criminal Repeaters Give Clue to Way To Deal With Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 15, 1967

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, there is mounting concern across the Nation over rising crime rates and lawlessness in general. Last week the House of Representatives passed legislation aimed at helping States and communities improve their methods of law enforcement.

The Wichita, Kans., Eagle in an editorial published August 11, 1967, pointed to the need of dealing "adequately with offenders" and cited FBI studies relating to criminal repeaters. The editorial states:

> We'd better take a close look at our system of justice. It seems designed to encourage repeaters.

Under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I call attention to all of my colleagues in the House this timely editorial. We are alarmed over lawlessness and crime, and the recent FBI report gives cause for further deliberation and action by all those responsible for meaningful law enforcement and rehabilitation.

The editorial follows:

CRIMINAL REPEATERS GIVE CLUE TO WAY TO DEAL WITH PROBLEM

Crime statistics have become like traffic statistics. They are so bad, and so increasingly bad, that the nation regularly looks them over, screams for a moment, then ignores them with a feeling of futility.

It's time to look them over again, for the Federal Bureau of Investigation has released its annual analysis of the nation's crime. We could simply scream about the 11 per cent increase in serious crime in 1966, as compared with 1965. Or we could let off our annual bellow about teen-age criminals, because of statistics showing a great increase in criminal involvement of people 18 and under.

Instead, we would rather look at a couple of segments in the FBI report that, while discouraging, are encouraging, for they show that the country has a couple of handles for getting hold of the crime problem. These segments are that showing the high rate of criminal repeaters, and that showing the low average of serious criminal cases solved by arrest.

The FBI studied records of 41,733 persons, arrested in 1966, who had previous criminal records. On an average, their records dated back to 10 years, involving six arrests, three convictions and two imprisonments apiece. Juvenile crime made its usual frightening increase in 1966. But the FBI points out that only five out of 100 young persons were involved in crime in 1966.

We might go a long way toward solving our crime problem if we dealt adequately with offenders. Repeaters were found in large numbers among those who had had every kind of treatment—parole, probation, acquittal, even those from "half-way houses" of rehabilitation. Before the public decides rehabilitation is useless, however, we'd better take a close look at our system of justice. It seems designed to encourage repeaters. Justice is neither swift nor sure. If an offender is convicted, he is sent to a prison in which he has little or no chance of rehabilitation. When he gets out, society is apt to shun him, keep him from working in productive jobs, and therefore encourage him to return to crime—in which he has probably had a graduate course from fellow convicts in prison.

During 1966, our law enforcement agencies solved an average of only 24 per cent of the serious crimes brought to their attention, an eight per cent decline over the previous year. Police methods are better than a decade ago, but more police are needed. Last year, the number of police employes increased, for the first time since 1960, but only a little. In face of increasing population, increasing crime, and increasing demands for traffic control and other non-criminal activities, the police are increasingly outnumbered. And police pay is scarcely designed to get and keep the best men.

If we could have enough well-trained, seasoned police to apprehend criminals, if we could capture and deal with the hard core "career" criminals, we would be a long way toward solving our shameful crime problem.

It would cost too much? Last year, there were 6,500 people murdered. They paid the ultimate cost to crime—their lives. Goods worth $600-million were stolen in robberies, burglaries and larcenies. We didn't want to throw a lot of statistics at you, but a few are irresistible: In 1966 there were 36 arrests for criminal offenses (excepting traffic) for each 1,000 Americans. Crime increased 13 per cent in the suburbs, 10 per cent in large cities, 10 per cent in rural areas. Since 1960, the crime increase has outstripped the population growth by nearly 7 to 1.

No society can live with so much lawlessness.

A Great Sailor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 15, 1967

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

[From the Army, Navy and Air Force Journal, July 29, 1967]

A GREAT SAILOR

(By Louis Stockstill)

David L. McoDnald was not quite 18 when he entered the U.S. Naval Academy, and had not yet celebrated his 22nd birthday when he departed with his new commission for duty as a junior officer aboard the battleship Mississippi in June 1928.

Next week—on 1 August—as he approaches his 61st birthday and the anniversary of his 43rd year in Naval uniform, he returns to

Annapolis to relinquish the highest post a Naval officer can hold.

In the long span of years from midshipman to retirement as Chief of Naval Operations, Admiral McDonald has watched the decimated fleet of the post-WWI period expand and grow into the two-ocean Navy of WWII, and steam into an eventual position of world dominance on the seas, moving ever closer to the nuclear fleet of the future.

For the last four of those years, he has stood at the helm and guided the Navy through the tides of dynamic change. He has worked indefatigably not only to improve ships and weapons and to revamp and strengthen organizational and management functions, but to develop enlightened personnel policies.

As a young officer, David McDonald learned the hard way about some of the Navy's "people" problems. He served in the grades of Ensign and Lt(jg) for more than eight years and was a Lieutenant for another 5½. By 1946, after 18 years' service and as a result of the speedier promotions of WWII, he was a captain, earning princely basic pay of $357 per month. He had to wait 11 years and 7 months for his next promotion.

The sacrifices he made along the way, both for himself and for his family, are all too apparent. So, too, is the obvious fact that he was guided by the challenge of career service, rather than any promise or prospect of financial reward.

Once he had reached the top, however, he did not forget about those still making the long, arduous climb. As CNO, he saw to it that the Navy made renewed efforts to improve both the challenges and the rewards of career service. Creation of the highly effective Alford Task Force and its probing study of ways and means to retain more career Navy men, is but one example of the concern he felt for people.

His successful fight to prevent reduction of the carrier force was no more important in many ways than his equally successful efforts in winning hazardous duty pay for flight deck personnel.

But there can be no realistic summary of his achievements as CNO, just as there can be no capsulized version of the other 30 years he spent in uniform. That would take a book. And even then it might not tell all of the little things that made him—in the words of the President—"a great sailor."

Along with the Navy and the other Services, we salute him. "Well done," Admiral.

Chicago's New Symbol of Its Cultural Strength

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 15, 1967

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, August 15 marks an historic date in Chicago.

This is the day that Mayor Daley and a group of distinguished leaders in the arts and sciences, as well as the entire population of Chicago, participates in the unveiling of a new Chicago landmark—a 50-foot high sculpture created by Pablo Picasso.

The Chicago Sun-Times, in an excellent editorial which appeared in its editions of August 15, has captured the real meaning and the real spirit of this historic breakthrough on the cultural front for the people of Chicago.

Pablo Picasso created this unusual modernistic sculpture as a gift to the people of Chicago.

This 162-ton steel work of art in Chicago will now take its place along with other historic landmarks of the world such as the Eifel Tower in Paris, the Mermaid in Copenhagen, the Golden Gate Bridge in San Francisco, the Empire State Building in New York, and many others.

There will, of course, be those who will not agree with the presence of this unusual Picasso creation in the Civic Center of Chicago. As free citizens, it is their pirvilege to disagree and even disavow, but I believe Mayor Daley deserves the highest commendation for permitting and sharing in this historic cultural breakthrough for the city of Chicago.

The fact that Mayor Daley has shared in this venture again demonstrates the depth of his great dedication to his beloved Chicago, not only as the mighty industrial center of the world, not only as an inspiring commercial center, not only as the busiest transportation hub of the world, not only as the seat of the finest institutions of learning in the world, not only as an inspiring medical center, but now Chicago becomes—with the addition of this huge Picasso—a new horizon for those who would deal in the field of art and culture.

The thrilling Sun-Times editorial which so significantly grasps the spirit of Chicago on this historic day of unveiling follows:

THE UNVEILING

The Chicago Picasso is unveiled today and for the first time can be seen in full view in its permanent architectural environment. Looking at a work of art 50 feet high is a visual experience quite unlike an impression of it obtained from a photograph.

Whether Chicagoans will be able to see the great sculpture "like it is," after it has been tried and condemned in absentia by a kangaroo court of self-appointed art critics, remains to be seen. The verban smog which has shrouded it more effectively than the canvas screen while it was under construction, nevertheless, is showing signs of dispersing.

To those familiar with art, the controversy over the Chicago Picasso must seem like a late-late show on TV—the same story, the same cast of characters with the same leading man, filmed more than 50 years ago. The battle over Picasso and modern art has long been fought and won and become art history with which some of our citizens seem to be just catching up. Picasso himself must be the most surprised individual to find his art controversial today. It should make the old maestro feel young again.

Picasso's works are enshrined in museums throughout the world. Art collectors vie with each other for the possession of an example from his hand. If any controversy remains about Picasso today, it is limited to the auction room where his works bring the highest prices ever paid for the art of a living artist.

Were the Chicago Picasso merely a new acquisition by a private collector, there undoubtedly would be little controversy. (Some like Picasso and some don't.) But a colossal Picasso in Chicago's front yard makes it an event which promises to change the cultural climate of the city.

Chicago, hitherto, has never quite managed to keep her artists at home. Once they mature they leave for where the action is—usually New York or the West Coast. While an instant Renaissance cannot be expected to result from a single example of new and challenging art, the presence of a Picasso in the Civic Center Plaza does serve as an official sign of welcome to new and stimulating creative effort. Above all, this new public monument will stand as a symbol of freedom of expression.

The sculpture's lyrical lines are a blithe contrast to the geometric discipline of the architecture in the area. They express a sense of freedom more truly than any classical lady in a marble nightgown upon a pedestal.

New times demand new images to express them. Picasso with his radar-like perception has been among the first to sense this strange new world in which we find ourselves. He has put in 65 years of prodigious labor to create a new vocabulary necessary to express it. The new world which Picasso expresses is, naturally, not the pretty little calendar world of our grandfather's time.

A non-static vision is required to make a picture of our new world and also to see it. Unaware of this, some spectators of contemporary art are, not surprisingly, baffled by what they see and moved to anger by their frustration. They think somebody is putting something over on them, which, of course, at the same time, absolves them on any effort to adjust their own vision. It is reassuring in our ever-changing age to know that c-a-t spells cat, or to recognize the animal in a reasonable likeness of it. But artists like Picasso go far beyond this primary stage of education.

Simple vision can make out the face of a lady in the Chicago Picasso. Its significance, however, is not that elementary. If it is the face of a lady, it is more enigmatic than the smile of Mona Lisa or the face of the Sphinx, and may, in time, become as familiar as both.

Unquestionably, it is already a milestone in Chicago's cultural landscape, and should be a conversation piece for generations to come.

Running Backward

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LIONEL VAN DEERLIN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 15, 1967

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, the El Cajon, Calif., Daily Californian, an independent newspaper circulating in my district, last week carried a perceptive editorial about the likely political consequences of the negative actions dictated by the so-called conservative coalition in this session of Congress.

The editorial follows:

RUN BACKWARD AND LOSE A RACE

Conservative Republicans in Congress are blindly undermining whatever slender chance the GOP presidential nominee will have next year of replacing Lyndon B. Johnson.

By aligning themselves repeatedly with Southern Democrats on key votes, especially in the House, the Republicans are furnishing President Johnson with a perfect scapegoat. He will have as much fun—and probably as much success—castigating the 90th Congress as Harry Truman did the "do-nothing" 80th in the 1948 campaign.

The House Republican leadership, not noted for political astuteness, apparently has forgotten the principal lesson of the 1960 campaign: That for a Republican to win the presidency he must take an increasingly larger share of the city vote. Richard Nixon proved conclusively that a bad showing in the cities is fatal to presidential ambition.

Yet the conservative Republicans in Congress have ignored the requisites. They have teamed up with Southern Democrats to defeat programs aimed primarily at solving the problems that afflict major urban centers. They have renewed the old obstructionist alliance which accounts for a long list of Republican election failures in the past 30 years. They have further tarnished the reputation of their party by consorting with narrow-minded and selfish men in a mean display of political irresponsibility.

It is odd the Republican conservatives cannot see that they are being used. The Southern Democrats with whom they bargain lose nothing. They preserve their privileged positions in the legislative hierarchy because they are Democrats and because the Democrats win vital elections. They can frustrate their own party's program, with GOP help, and never suffer in the slightest. Their positions are secure and to them that is all that matters.

Republicans are the losers. They cannot operate successfully from a regional base as do the Southern Democrats; they must operate from a national base or not at all. Yet their legislative tactics frequently reveal a strange unawareness of the requirements for gaining national power. They shun responsibility for presenting solutions to national problems and consider their work done when they have, for whatever reasons, sabotaged a program offered by the Democratic administration.

This is playing with political fire. Lyndon Johnson isn't going to let the Republican conservatives or the American people forget who gutted his program for urban improvement. And it would be sheer stupidity for the Republicans to assume they can draw up another of those "blame LBJ for the riots" statements and make it stick. The voters will look at the record to find out who they should blame.

The Southern Democrats do not make dependable allies for a party which is trying to curry national favor to win a presidential election. They may be able to throw the support of the South to the GOP presidential candidate if he's conservative enough, but of what value is that? Both Nixon and Barry Goldwater carried the South but they didn't win the elections.

Legislative indifference will exact a heavy price from the Republicans during next year's campaign. They will be cast in their old familiar role as obstructionists and men with rear-view vision. They'll have to defend their alliance with the Southern Democrats and that will be difficult to do. Voters will want to know what alternatives the House Republicans proposed and they will be obliged to answer, "Very few."

There may be some truth to Everett Dirksen's assertion that Lyndon Johnson and the Democrats are defeating themselves. But if that can be said about the Democrats, it can also be said in double measure about the Republicans.

Rising Solid Wastes Called U.S. Threat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ED REINECKE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 14, 1967

Mr. REINECKE. Mr. Speaker, a recent issue of the Christian Science Monitor carried a report of an address by the Nation's Surgeon General, Dr. William H. Stewart, on the serious problems of solid waste disposal.

The problems facing this Nation in the matter of solid waste disposal are mostly technological. It is time that we took a serious look at the problem, and began to find some scientific solutions. This problem, like that of water conservation, air pollution, urban congestion, and law enforcement, can be easily solved technologically. We should move ahead disregarding the political chaos created by conflicting interest.

Here follows the article:

Rising Solid Wastes Called U.S. Threat

(By Neal Stanford)

Washington.—"Rubbish," was one term applied to a recent speech by the country's Surgeon General, Dr. William H. Stewart.

"Garbage," was another.

Both were accurate, and not derogatory.

For rubbish, garbage, junk, trash, refuse of any and every kind was the subject of Dr. Stewart's opening remarks to a conference he had called here in the capital on the overall topic of "solid wastes."

It didn't take him five minutes to make clear to his audience what a threat to the country's health, economy, society, progress this ever-expanding mountain of refuse, garbage, junk, and the like actually is.

Every day, according to the Surgeon General, the country's urban communities produce 800 million pounds of solid wastes. That means some 165 million tons of solid waste a year. And by 1980, with the population increases and constant increase in waste per person per day, that will come to 260 million tons a year!

This avalanche or glacier of waste that is spreading over the countryside threatens to overwhelm and destroy large areas, much as Mt. Vesuvius wiped out Pompeii centuries ago.

This just can't go on, was the subject of Dr. Stewart's remarks, and ways must be devised to take care of the "megatons of wastes generated by the processes of modern living." He charged that "waste collection and disposal methods have not basically changed for a quarter of a century, while the size of the problem has magnified enormously."

According to his figures the United States today is spending nearly $3 billion a year to collect and dispose of refuse and other solid wastes. But it is doing it about as it did 30 years ago. Incineration, landfill, composting, salvage, and reclamation are still the methods used to get rid of solid wastes.

But, according to Dr. Stewart, if this is the age of science and technology, as everyone says it is, then "science and technology must develop better disposal methods," and they must be given "high priority" for this task.

The purpose of this gathering and the reason for the hope Dr. Stewart expressed that something will be done, rest on the possibilities written into the Solid Waste Disposal Act of 1965. "This, for the first time," said the Surgeon General, "gives us specific mechanisms" for attacking this problem.

The only trouble with the solid-waste disposal program, suggested the Surgeon General, was that it was having to operate on a $12 million budget.

New York City Commissioner of Sanitation Samuel J. Kearing has said of his city's solid-waste disposal problems, "We could take the NASA (National Aeronautics and Space Administration) approach, putting all our technological knowledge into a crash program." "But then you are talking about a billion-dollar program instead of the $100 million we need to put into working machinery."

Finance in Two Wars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. GOODELL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 15, 1967

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following article from the Journal of Commerce, New York, August 2, 1967, entitled "Finance in Two Wars":

Finance in Two Wars

It is customary for those who console themselves with the thought that the rising Vietnam War costs are not yet as impressive as were those of the Korean conflict to cite the fact that the Vietnam War outlays have not yet reached 10 per cent of the gross national product, as compared with 14 per cent of a much smaller GNP in the 1950–52 Korean period. This is cited as some justification for the fact that swollen domestic expense can continue without any war-induced reduction, butter can be supplied as plentifully as guns and there is nothing to worry about.

There has been, we believe, too little stress upon the radically different conditions that prevail during this war as compared with the Korean period. What stands out most painfully by way of difference is the fact that the $33 billion rise in defense spending in the 1950–52 period was financed out of increased government revenues, whereas the $24 billion rise in Vietnam expense in the two years following the 1965 escalation—now being further increased not only by enemy action but by tragic accidents such as that which befell the carrier Forrestal—has been more than half financed by increased debt.

There are other points of great dissimilarity in these two war periods, and in a recent economic letter the Central National Bank of Cleveland has done a public service in pointing some of them out.

In the Korean period various measures raised corporate tax liabilities by 50 per cent, personal tax liabilities by nearly 30 per cent and total government revenues by over 32 per cent. Curbs were placed upon installment and mortgage credit. There were wage and price controls, then as now somewhat unsophisticated and not applied with any vigor.

Two other factors then operated to ease the burden upon financial markets which today are being felt so keenly. When the Korean War came, the federal budget was in a substantial surplus instead of in the monumental deficit position of today. And, most important of all, nondefense federal spending was held in check and in the second quarter of 1952 was actually lower than in the second quarter of 1950. Federal debt at the end of June, 1952, was not up by some $14 billion, with more to come, but was up only $1.8 billion from June, 1950, in spite of the rise of $33 billion in spending. There were more guns and less butter.

With fiscal policy working in high gear, monetary policy then had less of a burden than it does now and while interest rates firmed, they did not go to anything like the current levels as indicated not only by bank lending rates but by rates of return obtainable in the short- and long-term bond markets. Three-month Treasury bills rose in yield from 1.2 to 1.7 per cent and high grade corporate bonds from 2.8 to 3.2 per cent—not to yields above 6 per cent which have once again since last year threatened transfer of funds from savings institutions to the bond market. The small increase in rates in 1950–

52 was the more surprising because it was in 1951 that the accord between the Federal Reserve and the Treasury ended the system of "pegging" of the government bond market.

When fighting began in Korea the period of war-born shortages of goods which marked World War II was fresh in the public mind and the wave of private spending which ensued not only eliminated slack left over from the 1948–49 recession but pushed consumer expenditures up by an annual rate of 30 per cent, consumer prices up by 10 per cent and wholesale prices still more. Use of manufacturing facilities went from 87 to 95 per cent and unemployment fell from 5 to 4 per cent. These developments, not yet paralleled in the current war, were the target of aggressive fiscal policy.

Today fiscal policy as well as monetary policy is highly expansionary and only now is the administration getting around to the idea that something ought to be done about tightening it by a tax rise which may come at the wrong time, but which may be adopted in desperation because of the rise in interest rates which has been mainly produced by the prospect of heavy Treasury financing on top of record-breaking private long-term capital issues.

The Korean War, in brief, was soundly financed; the current one has not been. The Korean conflict brought to money market squeezes or crunches; this one has. In the Korean period there was no now-you-see-it-and-now-you-don't administration policy, although at the time the administration then in power was criticized for some of its controls. There was no problem of killing off housing through the mortgage market, for interest rates did not go high enough.

The Central National Bank of Cleveland's analysis, by its economist, C. W. Walton, draws some mild lessons from its own comparisons of the periods of the two wars. One is that, while it is hard to trim nondefense government spending, with so much of it determined by prior legislation, it can be done. The other is that since taxes and spending are two blades of the fiscal scissors, one obviously can't work without the other, which means that more reliance must be placed on fiscal policy and less on monetary measures. These lessons, hopefully, the administration will learn before the Vietnam spending exceeds the like outlays of the Korean period.

Authorizing the Secretary of Commerce To Provide for the Collection, Compilation, Critical Evaluation, Publication, and Sale of Standard Reference Data

SPEECH

OF

HON. CHARLES A. MOSHER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 14, 1967

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 6279) to provide for the collection, compilation, critical evaluation, publication, and sale of standard reference data.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MOSHER].

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge support for H.R. 6279, the standard reference data bill, although I do welcome the amendment to be offered by Congressmen FULTON and PELLY which will close the open-end authorization now written into the bill.

Some question has been raised concerning the attitude of industry concerning this legislation. Therefore, I want to report that recently I had the privilege of participating in meetings of the Industrial Research Institute, a group composed of the research directors of practically all the great industrial corporations of this country, as well as many smaller concerns.

I can personally testify that those leading industrial research scientists are fully in support of H.R. 6279. Their support was indicated in a special bulletin sent to all their membership in June of this year. Their bulletin recognized that the National Bureau of Standards has already made a good start in developing a national standard reference data system, but it was their strong opinion that the full potential of that program could not be realized unless legislation of the type we are discussing today is approved by the Congress. They placed a strong emphasis on the importance of the program as an aid to the more efficient operation of industrial research, with great savings resulting, but a program too large for any agency in the private sector to accomplish.

Those top industrial scientists completely agreed that this is a proper and necessary function for the Bureau of Standards. It is, in fact, imperative in our national interest.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DADDARIO] has stated that this already is an ongoing program within the National Bureau of Standards. The purpose of H.R. 6279 is to make the program more efficient.

It will facilitate the means by which standard reference data can receive the widest distribution to our businesses, universities, Government agencies, and other people that require this data in their everyday work, and, at the same time, it will make it possible for the Government to get back a portion of its investment in this data.

Every year, about 1 million research papers are published in over 35,000 technical journals. About half the research papers contain unevaluated data. Some of this data consists of numbers which describe the important properties of materials, for example; melting point, density, strength, boiling point, electrical properties and so forth. These numbers are used by scientists in research projects and by engineers in design and production work. The success or failure of their efforts may hinge on the accuracy and reliability of reference data.

During the hearings on the bill last year, the committee consulted with representatives of universities, industry, professional societies, and nonprofit research institutes concerning the merits of the bill. No one has denied that a comprehensive program to collect, evaluate, and disseminate standard reference data is of the utmost importance for the efficient conduct of our national research and development effort. Nor has anyone shown that the task could be done cheaper or more efficiently by an organization other than the National Bureau of Standards.

In fact, the testimony indicated that a private organization could not undertake a program of this magnitude because of the scope and cost of the program, nor could another Federal agency undertake this program without harming its primary mission responsibilities.

The National Bureau of Standards has been active in both materials research and the publication of reference data for many years. Under the provisions of H.R. 6279, the Bureau will coordinate, stimulate, and support the expansion of existing organizations already producing reference data. Through central coordination, duplication of effort would be avoided. At the same time, the Bureau will be made aware of any gaps in our storehouse of reference data. Perhaps most important, through the use of panels of outside experts, the Bureau will assure that the reference data produced will meet standards of quality, and that all the data would be critically evaluated by specialists in the various fields.

Mr. Chairman, the standard reference data system will not solve the entire scientific information program we face today. But it will solve an important part of the problem. This country spends billions of dollars each year, in both public and private funds, for the performance of research and development. A great deal of this R. & D. requires reliable data on the properties of materials. Does it make sense to have highly trained, highly paid scientists and engineers spend hours or days of their time wading through mountains of paper looking for a number? Technical manpower is a national resource we cannot afford to squander or to use inefficiently. Duplication of effort must be eliminated. Our scientists and engineers should be able to pick up a book and easily find the number they want. They should be able to use that number with confidence. The right number at the right time can save many times over the cost of having to determine the number experimentally.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOSHER. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. PELLY. I cannot recollect that it has been emphasized that industry, according to the testimony given our committee, will benefit to the tune of about 100 to 1 for every dollar that the Government invests in this program, and I think it is a proper function for Government to perform this type of work in order to help our American industry.

Mr. MOSHER. The gentleman knows that it is impossible to estimate fully what those benefits will be, but they are tremendous, of course.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOSHER. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank the gentleman from Ohio for having given us in detail the information that he has obtained from his personal participation at such a meeting. It is in keeping with his competence and high capability, as demonstrated during the course of these hearings, where he was the senior member on the minority side. He worked with the committee without any partisan objectives, and the legislation is good legislation, I believe, in great part because of his own unselfish and capable contribution.

Mr. MOSHER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HALL].

Mr. HALL. I appreciate the gentleman yielding. I simply wished to ask my esteemed colleague, with whom I came to Congress some 7 years ago, in view of his statement about this international organization——

Mr. MOSHER. It is not an international organization. It is an American industrial research organization. These are all Americans.

Mr. HALL. I took it from hearing your opening statement that you are a member of that organization.

Mr. MOSHER. No; they invited me to participate in their discussion of this subject.

Mr. HALL. The gentleman is not a member of that organization or any association to which it might belong, and does not have any personal interest in it?

Mr. MOSHER. That is correct. They invited me there to obtain information about the thinking of Congress on this subject.

Mr. HALL. I am sure the gentleman informed them, and I compliment them on the 100-to-1 benefits that they may reap therefrom. I thank the gentleman.

AFL-CIO Poll Shows Solid Support for President Johnson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 15, 1967

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, I have evidence here that union members today would vote overwhelmingly for President Johnson's reelection against any potential Republican candidate.

This is the finding of a poll conducted by the AFL-CIO. The results of this poll are explained in a recent article by Alexander E. Barkan, director of the AFL-CIO Committee on Political Education.

Mr. Barkan demonstrates that the majority of members support the President's policies in Vietnam and believe that he is doing a good job in the White House.

The union members go down the line with the President's domestic program and his economic policies. All in all they have given Lyndon B. Johnson a resounding—and deserved—vote of confidence.

Under unanimous consent I insert this informative article from the AFL-CIO Federationist in the RECORD:

THE UNION MEMBER: PROFILE AND ATTITUDES

Union members today would vote overwhelmingly for President Johnson's reelection against any potential Republican candidate. They support the President's legislative achievements and endorse the legislative goals of the AFL-CIO and the President. Yet there is some uncertainty and unease among unionists, notably concerning jobs and economic security, some areas of civil rights and Viet Nam, though the vast majority of union members support the President's conduct of the war there.

These are among the major general findings of a survey taken among union members by professional pollster John Kraft. Those interviewed did not know the poll was just of union members or who sponsored the poll.

Behind these generalities are a host of specifics that point up the attitudes of union members toward their unions and their government in the mid-1960s.

The scientific accuracy of the poll is above question. It was conducted among a cross-section of 1,700 union members representing 12 separate international unions—industrial, craft and service. An accurate age, sex, regional and racial sampling was involved.

Though 1,700 may appear to be a small figure among an overall AFL-CIO membership of some 13.5 million, in the world opinion polling it is actually a large sampling, far more generous than most. Major national polls—Harris, Gallup and others—normally rely on a sampling of only between 2,000 and 4,000 in forecasting the outcome of presidential elections among a potential vote of more than 110 million.

The Kraft survey was commissioned by the AFL-CIO Committee on Political Education. Its findings reflect the feelings and opinions of members as of January 1967, when the poll was conducted.

From the survey, this general profile emerged of the trade union member today:

32 percent of union families are in the $5,000 to $7,500 a year income range (figures embrace total family income of the union member, thus including in many cases the working wife of a member and/or working offspring);

46 percent are in the $7,500 to $15,000 a year income range;

25 percent of union members are less than 30 years old;

Nearly 50 percent are less than 40 years old;

Nearly 50 percent of all members now live in suburbs;

Nearly 75 percent of members under 40 live in suburbs;

About 20 percent of union members are women;

About 13 percent of union members are Negro and 4 percent are Mexican, Oriental or other minority;

25 percent of present members have belonged to their union for 5 years or less;

54 percent have belonged to their union for 10 years or more;

58 percent identify themselves as Democrats, 16 percent as Republicans, 17 percent as independents and 9 percent are not sure.

HOW MEMBERS WOULD VOTE

The Kraft poll revealed that, as of January 1967, union members would have voted for President Johnson's reelection overwhelmingly against any of the prominently-mentioned potential Republican candidates. Since January represented a low ebb in the President's popularity with the public at large and since recent public opinion polls show a sharp upturn in his popularity, inevitably this would reflect an even higher standing for the President among union members than the following figures show:

[In percent]

	Total	Age group		
		Under 30	30-49	50 and over
Johnson	55	55	53	55
Nixon	22	25	21	21
Not sure	15	12	18	14
Neither	8	8	8	10
Johnson	46	42	43	51
Romney	30	47	29	25
Not sure	19	10	25	17
Neither	5	1	3	7
Johnson	60	57	62	59
Reagan	16	23	16	13
Not sure	17	15	16	20
Neither	7	5	6	8
Johnson	55	58	55	55
Rockefeller	20	27	18	19
Not sure	18	8	21	17
Neither	7	7	6	9

When union members were asked their choice for President, they declared themselves emphatically for the reelection of Lyndon Johnson against any GOP contender. For example, the President would defeat former Vice-President Richard Nixon 55-22, Michigan Governor George Romney 46-30, California Governor Ronald Reagan 60-16 and New York Governor Nelson Rockefeller 55-20.

It should be kept in mind the Kraft poll was conducted in January, when the President's popularity as reflected in national polls generally was lower than today. The Louis Harris poll in January showed only 43 percent who gave the President a good job rating. By June, it had soared to 58 percent. Any increase in his popularity among the public-at-large inevitably would be accompanied by a like, or greater, increase in his standing among union members. In the January findings of the Kraft poll, among only one group of unionists did the President trail any potential GOP opponent. Union members under 30 at that time favored Governor Romney over LBJ, 47-42.

When members were asked how they voted in the presidential election of 1964, they responded Johnson over former Senator Barry Goldwater by 60-12. Asked how they would vote today if the same two were paired, members declared 56-16 for Johnson, a remarkably slight slippage given the President's length of time in office and the momentous events of his tenure.

The President's popularity as a candidate is mirrored in the widespread acceptance of his legislative achievements and goals, most of which are supported by the AFL-CIO.

Members were queried on the major national issues of recent years as to their degree of support or opposition. From medicare to pollution control, they backed by huge margins the achievements and aims of the Administration and projected improvements in most progressive programs already on the books.

For example, when asked if medicare coverage should be expanded, 74 percent responded "yes." Asked if they supported federal efforts toward water pollution control, 94 percent said "yes" and 91 percent were for air pollution control programs. On expanding the scope of workmen's compensation, 76 percent said "yes." Ninety-one percent backed truth-in-packaging legislation and a like percentage supported truth-in-lending.

There were lower, but still substantial, percentages of support for expanded federal aid to education, 67 percent, and a minimum wage increase, 71 percent.

Support for repeal of Taft-Hartley Section 14(b) was 2-1 among members, with 54 percent agreeing 14(b) should be repealed, 23 percent disagreeing and 23 percent not sure. Support for repeal was strongest where awareness of the "right-to-work" issue was highest. In states where an open shop law prevails, and in states where it has been a live issue, union members overwhelmingly reject it and want 14(b) repealed.

The strongest support for AFL–CIO positions on almost all major issues occurred among women members.

Interestingly, a mild division between younger and older members crops up in the degree of support evidenced for certain issues. More recent prominent issues—like air and water pollution control and consumer legislation—achieve a slightly higher degree of support among younger than among older members. Conversely, issues that dwelled in Congress for years—issues with roots in the 1930s, 40s and 50s—garner higher support among older than among younger members. Medicare, for example, gets 75 percent support from members in their 40s and 78 percent from members 50 and over, while it gets 70 percent support from members under 30, many of whom apparently view it as a problem that won't crop up for them until far down the road.

Despite their clear approval of President Johnson's performance and program, union members—like other Americans—do not view contemporary America as Elysium. They've got problems and in their minds the problems are big ones.

Members polled were asked this question: "What are the big problems on your mind—the things that bother you and should be getting attention?" The issues clearly uppermost in their minds were those involving jobs and economic security, the war in Viet Nam and civil rights.

Fifty-three percent of all members listed economic problems ranging from the cost of living and taxes to the employment picture and wages. Forty-two percent listed the war in Viet Nam, with the largest percentage of these supporting the President's policies there. More than 33 percent listed civil rights as a major issue. While most members supported civil rights progress in voting and public accommodations, support for open housing was slightly below the 50 percent point.

Beyond these, concern about many other issues reflected the members' special individual problems. For example, one of the biggest problems for members in their 40s and early 50s turned out to be education. It is they, after all, who have children in the schools and nearing, or at, college age.

Members were asked what problems the President should wrestle with and which ones are in the province of congressmen and senators. The weight of responsibility for action on almost all major issues, in the eyes of members, falls on the shoulders of the President. The White House, in their view, is where the action is.

Finally, in terms of issues, Kraft found that suburban living naturally has directed members' attention to suburban problems, often in higher priority than national issues. Members in the suburbs share their neighbors' concern about local tax assessments, zoning, sewage and garbage disposal, street repairs, transportation and school bond issues. It is not that they change from liberal Jekylls to conservative Hydes the moment they cross the city line into the suburbs; it is that in many cases their roster of interests is shuffled and becomes more locally-oriented.

HOW THE PRESS DISTORTED THE POLL

Before being released, the Kraft poll was the subject of a spate of newspaper stories—most of them completely distorted.

On the basis only of hearsay, The Wall Street Journal ran a lengthy article on the poll last month. One press service picked up, and provided wider distribution for, the Journal piece. In an article crowded with distortions and inaccuracies, some of the worst of them were these:

The Journal claimed the poll showed: "Labor's traditional legislative goals are far out of line with union members' main interests. . . . The AFL–CIO's No. 1 goal in this session of Congress—boosting social security payments—draws more boos than cheers. . . ."

The fact it: The poll reflected overwhelming support among union members for AFL–CIO legislative positions with the single exception of open occupancy housing. Further, social security per se was not included as a question in the poll. Medicare was, and members' support for expanded medicare was 74 percent.

The Journal claimed: "A surprisingly high proportion of rank-and-filers won't readily admit they belong to a union." They "owned up to being union members only when pressed. . . ."

The fact is: Sixty-four percent of members quickly identified themselves as such when asked to name their associations from a list of various church, civic, social and job-related organizations. The rest, when asked if they were members of a union, answered affirmatively without hesitation. The loaded phrases in the Journal article, "won't readily admit" and "owned up," make it appear many members view their membership as something sinister and to be hidden at all costs. This was not the case.

The Journal claimed: "The poll's political findings were stunning. . . ." It quoted "one incredulous union man" as saying, "It showed almost anyone could beat Lyndon Johnson in 1968, even (Illinois Republican Senator) Charles Percy."

The fact is: President Johnson was an overwhelming favorite for reelection among union members when pitted in the poll against the most prominently-mentioned potential Republican candidates, Michigan Governor George Romney, former Vice-President Richard Nixon, California Governor Ronald Reagan and New York Governor Nelson Rockefeller, Senator Percy's name did not even figure in the poll.

HOW MEMBERS VIEW THE ISSUES

Following is the degree of union member support, expressed in percentages, on some of the major issues of today:

[In percent]

	Total	Age group		
		Under 30	30 to 49	50 and over
Expanding medicare:				
Agree	74	70	75	78
Disagree	13	15	14	9
Not sure	13	15	11	13
Water pollution control:				
Agree	94	98	94	91
Disagree	2	------	3	3
Not sure	4	2	3	6
Truth in lending:				
Agree	91	93	91	88
Disagree	4	4	5	4
Not sure	5	3	4	8
Repeal sec. 14(b):				
Agree	54	55	55	53
Disagree	23	25	24	20
Not sure	23	20	21	27
Air pollution control:				
Agree	91	95	89	89
Disagree	4	3	6	4
Not sure	5	2	5	7
Improved workmen's compensation:				
Agree	76	77	78	73
Disagree	11	15	10	8
Not sure	13	8	12	19
Truth in packaging:				
Agree	91	92	93	89
Disagree	3	2	3	3
Not sure	6	6	4	8
Higher minimum wage:				
Agree	71	72	73	67
Disagree	21	23	20	20
Not sure	8	5	7	13
Federal aid to education:				
Agree	67	71	70	61
Disagree	20	19	21	21
Not sure	13	10	9	18
Open Housing:				
Agree	43	48	41	39
Disagree	46	48	48	43
Not sure	11	4	11	18

In his polling, Kraft found most union members—64 percent of them—quickly referred to their membership when asked to list affiliations with various public, private, church or job-related organizations. All of those sampled answered affirmatively when asked directly if they are union members.

Yet though their status as members is clearly in the forefront of their consciousness, this is no guarantee of member participation. Nor does it assure that the member is always listening when the union speaks. These facts became apparent when Kraft asked a related question about attendance of meetings and attention paid to union publications.

The poll revealed that about 20 percent of members reported attending almost every local union meeting—a surprisingly high figure—and that an additional 14 percent attend "quite frequently." However, some 36 percent attend "rarely." Members under 30 years of age rate highest in regular attendance, while this age group also has the largest percentage attending meetings only rarely.

Some 63 percent of all members answered that they read their union publications "a lot." The highest readership was among members 50 years and older, 77 percent of whom answered they pay a lot of attention to their union publications. (Four percent reported they receive no union publication, which suggests a problem in union administration or the age-old problem of keeping mailing lists up-to-date.)

The entire area of communications emerged as one of the most interesting sections of the poll. For, though members by and large read their union journals, they appear to rely generally on television, daily papers and magazines—in that order—as their most trusted sources of information.

Forty-seven percent responded that TV is their most reliable source (small wonder—the poll found that 58 percent of members spend 10 or more hours per week in front of the tube); 31 percent look to the daily newspapers and about 9 percent to weekly news magazines. Radio ran a poor fourth; only 6 percent of members consider it the most reliable information source.

Despite the overwhelming competition of the mass media, however, it was clear that a fair portion of members still look to union sources as helpful, reliable providers of information. From a list of sources of information, only President Johnson, a leading nightly network TV newscaster and a major weekly news magazine came before AFL–CIO President George Meany as the "most helpful source for information." Considered in context, this is an excellent showing. The regularity of national exposure for the President, a nightly network broadcaster and a news magazine obviously far exceeds the exposure President Meany achieves on a national platform. Of those who named President Meany, 78 percent did so because he "represents my interests, levels with me, tries to solve problems." This was a far higher percentage of identity of interest between the persons polled and the information source selected than any other listed source achieved.

The Kraft poll on the whole is encouraging. It indicates that the policy positions adopted by the AFL–CIO convention accurately reflect the feelings of union membership, with the single exception of open occupancy housing. This has 43 percent overall support and 48 percent support among members under 30.

Yet there are warning signals. Where support appears least strong generally is among younger members and more and more the trade union movement is becoming a younger movement.

While two-thirds of members over 30, for example, said they pay a lot of attention to their union publications, only half of those under 30 do.

Though members under 30 were more emphatic in believing their union should take a stand on important issues, they responded generally in lower percentages in supporting their union's positions.

Though a higher percentage of young members reported they attend union meetings "nearby always," a higher percentage of them also answered they "never" attend.

On some basic union positions in support of oldline, though still crucial, matters it is the younger members whose support is softest. (This problem, it should be pointed out, is not unique to the labor movement. Throughout all groups in society today, it is the younger members who are most restive.)

It is the younger members who are both less informed and less concerned with these issues. The tribulations of 30 years ago are remote from a young member's experience. The Depression is a moment of history and the issues it spawned are tangential to his own life or unrelated to his problems. To younger members, Franklin D. Roosevelt, who was a live inspiration to many of us, is but a name in the history books and his great achievements a matter for the archives.

The 1960s and their unique problems are what is right now to the younger member and the problems of yesteryear seem to bear little if any relationship to the problems he sees today and tomorrow.

As with the younger member, so with the suburban member. There is no minimizing the impact of local issues on the life of a suburbanite. In his mind, the issues are deeply important and, in fact, they are. They involve his welfare as intimately as most of the larger national issues. They involve his home, his money, his child's education, his security, his recreation. In effect, we compete with these problems when we attempt to capture the member's attention and these are problems which from a national level are hard to articulate and even harder to engage.

It indicates that for many members we have not yet succeeded in showing that national issues have as great an impact on their daily lives and welfare as local ones.

WHAT MEMBERS SEE AS PROBLEMS

The Kraft poll asked union members this question: "What are the big problems on your mind—the things that bother you and should be getting attention?"

The three big issues on their minds and how they feel about them follow. The figure in bold face represents the percentage of those polled who mentioned the issue. Percentages under it represent those who felt the listed aspects of the overall issue was most important.

[In percent]

	Total	Age group		
		Under 30	30 to 49	50 and over
Economic	**53**	61	55	44
High cost of living	------	20	13	8
Taxes	------	13	28	21
Unemployment	------	13	3	5
Wages, salaries	------	10	5	4
Working conditions	------	2	1	1
Other	------	3	5	5
Vietnam	**42**	56	37	33
President doing best he can	------	20	13	11
Escalate war	------	13	9	5
End war, make peace	------	8	6	8
Escalate or get out	------	5	2	2
National unity, patriotism	------	5	1	1
Stop (lessen) foreign aid	------	3	5	5
All other foreign affairs	------	2	1	1
Civil rights and law enforcement	**33**	49	20	30
Open housing	------	10	3	3
Juvenile delinquency	------	7	6	3
Back civil rights progress	------	7	3	8
More police protection	------	7	2	5
Crime rate	------	7	1	7
Highway safety	------	2	1	1
Auto safety	------	------	1	8
All other civil rights and law enforcement	------	8	3	------

In all, the problems faced are far easier to define than to deal with and the Kraft poll projects more questions than answers.

For example, in terms of labor's political efforts, is there a way to channel the suburban member's natural interest in local affairs and candidates to constructive action in the COPE program, which is geared primarily to national issues and candidates? Can COPE organize in the suburbs first around local issues? Can it then branch out to involve suburban members in national issues and behind COPE-endorsed national candidates? We now have pilot projects seeking ways to reach and involve members in the suburbs.

Most importantly, can the labor movement in its political and all other aspects keep the commitment and loyalty of its younger members, who make up an ever larger part of the movement? There is evidence that most of them enter with commitment. Some international unions are making efforts now through new-member programs to fan the commitment and keep it burning. A COPE program with building trades apprentices in attempting to interest them in labor's political activities and to involve them in the political life of their communities. Is there more we can do?

These and other questions suggest themselves as a result of the Kraft poll's findings. The final question is: Can we find the answers?

Speaking for COPE, I say we must and we will.

The Spirit of '67

SPEECH

OF

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 7, 1967

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, a privately sponsored exhibition is currently underway in my district. It is entitled "The Spirit of '67" and it illustrates, largely through the words of John F. Kennedy, recent advances in communications, industry, international relations, and space. Thousands of New Yorkers have seen this exhibit and I commend it to my colleagues. The ensuing statement evokes its aims and purposes.

THE SPIRIT OF '67

Over 190 years ago, men like Franklin, Washington, Adams and Jefferson, with pen and sword, brought a new nation into existence. Theirs was the "Spirit of 76," an exciting time, a time for moving ahead and boldly facing new dangers. It was a time when the American Spirit was molded. Today, we are again moving through exciting times. Again we move ahead, facing the dangers before us. It is a time when the American Spirit, so strongly forged nearly 200 years ago, is being tested and found worthy of the challenge before us. This is the Spirit of 67.

Now, more than at any other time in American history, we are undergoing vast changes in industry, education, science, international relations and communications. Today we "explore the stars, conquer the deserts, and encourage the arts and commerce."

A tall order, yes, but one which the American people can meet and match. It is the American Spirit—the Spirit of 67—that the Franklin Society salutes, both through this article and with the most dramatic exhibition ever held in Franklin Society's history.

Just as the Declaration of Independence was the voice of the Spirit of 76, so might the Inaugural Address of the late President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, delivered in 1961, be considered a testament of our times. This historic document sets forth clearly and concisely, the aims and goals of America today—an America beset by challenges and given opportunities for greatness never before experienced by any people.

The text of the Kennedy Inaugural Address has been taken as the guide to this special exhibition, an exhibition every school child—every American—should visit.

How have we as Americans met the challenge of the Sixties? In science, education, international relations, space, medicine, business, industry, in fact, in every field, the challenge of the Sixties is met and matched by an appropriate display of will, inventiveness and energy that demonstrates the American character. The American Spirit of 67 is a fitting answer to President Kennedy's statement in his Inaugural Address: "Ask not what your country can do for you—ask what you can do for your country."

At Franklin Society, progress in the Sixties in medicine, industry, communications, international relations and space is vividly shown through photographic murals, models and exhibits.

In medicine, you will learn how the Laser beam, the "light knife," operates. The Laser beam permits surgery that cauterizes the wound as it cuts, preventing loss of blood and spread of contamination from disease growth. In industry, you will learn how atoms can be made to work for peace.

When you enter 217 Broadway, you will find suspended from the ceiling, a scale model of Intelsat, the communications satellite, which more than any previous scientific development has brought us closer to the rest of the world. Current events that happen anywhere in the world can now be seen on your television screen moments after they have taken place.

President Kennedy called the United Nations an "instrument of peace," where we could help develop "a new world of law, where the strong are just and the weak secure and the peace preserved."

Another interesting display in the exhibition will show the United Nations, how it functions in trying to provide a better world for all through keeping the peace and encouraging economic development throughout the world. You will see how the United Nations is striving to bring "new life to arid lands" and what it is doing to help the world's less fortunate children.

One of the most important programs of the Sixties is that of space, and America's space program is told with exciting models, displays and pictures, including color photographs of the space astronauts. Through the cooperation of NASA and the U.S. Treasury, there will be on display a model of the Mercury space craft.

The story of the "Spirit of 67" shows how as a nation, we are forging ahead in science, industry, medicine and international relations to provide a "more fruitful life for all mankind."

This exhibit pays homage to that great revolutionary spirit of America which blazes on to new frontiers in its quest for a better world.

Correction of Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 15, 1967

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, in the August 8 RECORD, I included a newspaper account in memory of Lance Cpl. Charles G. Butler, Jr., who was killed in Vietnam. In that account there were three mistakes which I wish to correct at this time. Lance Corporal Butler was in the service for 13 months, and not 6 as stated. He died on August 1, not August 3; and, he graduated from Springbrook High School in June 1965, not in 1966.

SNCC in Havana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 15, 1967

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, Stokely Carmichael's trip to Cuba was an inevitable development in the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee's change from a group of peaceful individuals dedicated to the cause of civil rights to a group of violent hatists greatly responsible for the tragic events of the past few weeks.

SNCC's alliance with Cuba did not have its beginning with Carmichael's visit, but rather goes back to at least 1964.

I commend to the attention of our colleagues an article written by Rowland Evans and Robert Novak for the August 3, 1967, edition of the Washington Post concerning SNCC's relationship with Cuba.

The article follows:

SNCC IN HAVANA

The sudden appearance of Stokely Carmichael in Havana, rubbing elbows with Fidel Castro and the hemisphere's Communist guerrilla leaders, is an inevitable development in the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee's long evolution.

Sentimental white liberals who have consistently blinked away the worst about SNCC now attribute its alliance with Castro to deep disillusionment over Vietnam and civil rights. In fact, however, covert links between SNCC and Havana stretch back at least to 1964.

The flamboyant Carmichael is merely the outward manifestation of the SNCC Cuban alliance, not its cause. The principal responsibility for moving SNCC violently to the left must go to two men who, unlike Carmichael, seldom appear on television or the front page.

One is James Forman, who today holds no formal office in SNCC but is still believed to be its most important internal force. When SNCC was spawned in the Southern sit-in movement in February, 1960, by idealistic Negro college students, Forman was already a hardened radical and an associate of Negro terrorist Robert Williams (who fled to Cuba to escape Federal prosecution).

The other man is even less familiar to the public than Forman. He is Jack Minnis, a white intellectual radical who, as an instructor at Tulane University in 1961, was a leader in pro-Castro activities in the New Orleans area. With Forman in absolute control of the SNCC apparatus, Minnis was named to its central committee and given command of its research operation. Despite SNCC's current blacks-only policy, Minnis still wields backstage influence.

By the time of the Mississippi Summer Project in 1964, SNCC's admiration for Castroism was apparent. SNCC workers were distributing Castroite propaganda and material printed in Cuba by exile Williams advocating guerrilla warfare by American Negroes and describing how Molotov cocktails could be used in American cities.

The clearest revelation of SNCC's link with Havana, however, did not come until 1966 when SNCC leader Julian Bond was barred from his seat in the Georgia Legislature. His case was being ably handled by white lawyer Charles Morgan of the Atlanta office of the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU). Morgan is a civil libertarian but no radical.

Suddenly a new face appeared: Victor Rabinowitz, a Manhattan lawyer long associated with far left causes and a leader in the National Lawyers Guild and the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee, organizations specializing in defending Communists. Rabinowitz served as legal counsel in the United States for the Castro government and had intimate contacts in Havana.

Forman insisted that Rabinowitz supplant Morgan as Bond's attorney. In accordance with standard ACLU practice of deferring to other attorneys, Morgan stepped aside.

At about the same time, SNCC's treasury—empty since the disaffection of white liberal contributors—suddently began to fill again. It is believed by many close to SNCC that the new money came from Cuba.

Although there is no documentary evidence to support this suspicion, it makes sense. At precisely this time in 1966, Castro abandoned his Moscow-ordered policy of cooperating only with the regular Communist parties throughout the Hemisphere. He declared he would support, with arms and money, *any* revolutionary movements Communist or not. In the United States, SNCC would qualify for such help.

Nor has there been much doubt lately about SNCC's revolutionary nature. After this year's Negro riots at Jackson (Miss.) State College, Mississippi SNCC leaders met secretly to discuss plans for more effective "guerrilla warfare" in the future. In recent weeks, there has been serious discussion inside SNCC about how to limit destruction to white property in future rioting and avoid destroying Negro property.

Outsiders who know SNCC best disagree in assessing the seriousness of such plans. Some believe SNCC has played a part in most of the major riots; others believe SNCC is far too disorganized for that. But effective or not, there is no longer any doubt that SNCC today is Fidel Castro's arm in the United States.

Tyranny in Greece

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 15, 1967

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, a little more than a hundred days ago an event took place which carries a great deal of significance for the United States and the world. The democratic Government of Greece was overthrown and replaced with a government which has proved itself to be of a most dictatorial and tyrannical nature. This is a government which has gone so far as to dictate proper dress, proper religious practice, and proper speech to its people. It has denied its citizens all of the civil liberties which we in this country hold dear. The people of Greece are finding themselves enmeshed in a fast developing police state of the first class.

After studying the information available on the new government, we, as citizens of the United States, can only feel indignation and shock at its actions and policies. Such indignation and shock is, I feel, accurately reflected in two documents which I have recently received. The first is a petition to the President signed by over a hundred members of the faculty of the University of Wisconsin. The second is a resolution passed unanimously by the Democratic Party Convention of Wisconsin on June 10, 1967.

Both documents request that we withdraw military aid from the present Government of Greece. I must wholeheartedly agree with that sentiment. As the symbol of freedom and democracy for the rest of the world, it seems incongruous for us to supply to this military dictatorship the arms and machinery with which the fruits of democracy will be denied to the people of Greece.

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN,
Madison, Wis., May 25, 1967.

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President of the United States,
Washington, D.C.:

We, the undersigned, believe that the reestablishment of democratic government in Greece is dependent in large degree on the position of the Government of the United States. This position should explicitly state and demonstrate our disapproval of military dictatorship as the form of government there. Specifically, we urge the President to.

1) Withhold U.S. aid until such time as democracy is re-established in Greece. Military juntas are often quick with promises of democratic processes. Our aid should not be given until the promises are fulfilled.

2) Publicly condemn the military dictatorship in Greece.

(Signed by over 100 University of Wisconsin faculty.)

WISCONSIN DEMOCRATIC CONVENTION,
La Crosse, Wis., June 10, 1967.

RESOLUTION

Whereas, the military junta which has recently overthrown constitutional government in Greece is dictatorial and anti-democratic, and

Whereas, this military takeover is incompatible with the democratic precept of self-determination, and

Whereas, the re-establishment of a government which permits the Greek people self-determination may be largely dependent on the position of the government of the United States.

Be it resolved that the Democratic Party of Wisconsin urges that United States aid, particularly military aid, be withheld from Greece until such time as a popular government is re-established there.

I Accuse

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 15, 1967

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial was written by, and appeared in the newspaper of, my good friend Tom O'Connor. Tom is the editor of the Allendale County Citizen of Allendale, S.C.

In this editorial, entitled "I Accuse," he very correctly points out that the news media must take a large share of the blame for the riots American cities have recently been faced with. I certainly agree with him, and I hope that those responsible for news coverage will have the opportunity to read and learn from this editorial.

I ACCUSE

In any analysis of where the blame for the riots in our cities should be placed, the American press, and that phrase includes all news media, must face up to the fact that it is just about as guilty as any.

I accuse news editors of television, magazines, newspapers and radio, of shirking a clear responsibility, when they lend credence to charges and counter charges voiced by so-called leaders, without seeking to authenticate the accusations.

I accuse news reporters of being guilty of "making names for themselves" by deliberately building up, through unwise publicity, minor incidents and minor personalities.

I accuse the news media of irresponsibility for giving wide publicty to matters, such as meetings and propaganda of extremist groups, and the mouthings of rabid rabble rousers, in the interests only of sensationalism.

I accuse the American news media of immaturity, of careless reporting and of withholding from the general public knowledge to which it is privy, and which it uses only to its own advantage, in order to "get there with the mostest" ahead of the competition.

The mere fact that reporters, news cameras, television crews, and others who must set up their equipment in advantageous spots ahead of time, have been in the very center of these matters would indicate that they had prior knowledge which was not fully shared with the public or with public authority.

No Carmichael, no Brown, no King, no Powell, has yet proved worthy of the publicity handed out hour by hour by the news media.

The American press has put itself on a diet of blood, guts and disaster in preference to decency, respect for the intelligence of its audience, and concern for the general welfare.

TOM O'CONNOR.

Authorizing the Secretary of Commerce To Provide for the Collection, Compilation, Critical Evaluation, Publication, and Sale of Standard Reference Data

SPEECH

OF

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 14, 1967

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 6279) to provide for the collection, compilation, critical evaluation, publication, and sale of standard reference data.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Chairman, the amendment which has been offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON] has been placed before us for our consideration. However, I would like to refer the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union back to a meeting which we held on this legislation in the full committee, when the able gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY] raised this particular question which is now pending before us in the form of an amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

I told him at that time I agreed with him and I would support this efforts on the matter when we arrived on the floor of the House, and I do so today in the form of this amendment which has been recommended by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, and which I understand the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY] supports.

But the fact that it has added a $1.86 million limitation for this year I believe is an important point to comment on because we are talking about an amount of money which this House has already approved because of action previously taken by the Committee on Appropriations.

I bring this up because I believe it is important for us to recognize that we already have taken into consideration that this is a year when expenditures for new programs ought to be kept down. The Committee on Appropriations has already met that requirement. This is the amount they have supported.

Mr. Chairman, I therefore have no objection to this amendment.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DADDARIO. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank the gentleman for his comments and his generous statement. Might I say the amendment puts into effect the minority views not of one person, but likewise the views of some eight of us, and there has been discussion back and forth between Mr. PELLY, Mr. GURNEY, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. WINN, Mr. PETTIS, Mr. LUKENS, Mr. HUNT, and myself. I want to compliment each of them for their work on this program.

I again thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. DADDARIO. The gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. Chairman, has listed a whole series of names, and they have, in fact, been listed in the report, so that it is a matter of record, but I do believe the gentleman from Washington, because of his leadership on this subject, is deserving of special comment.

Mr. VANDER JAGT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DADDARIO. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. VANDER JAGT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Connecticut for accepting the amendment. In my opinion, since we are already doing this work to the tune of $1.86 million, this legislation will make it possible to do the job even better for no additional cost. It also opens up the machinery where we can practically recoup the cost from industry and business for the money that they are saving as a result of this.

Mr. Chairman, I enthusiastically support this legislation with the amendments added.

Mr. DADDARIO. The gentleman from Michigan and I are in complete agreement.

Text of Reply by the Honorable Dean Rusk, Secretary of State, to Questions Submitted by Daniel Viklund, Dagens Nyheter, Stockholm

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 15, 1967

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on July 1, 1967, Secretary of State Dean Rusk was interviewed by Daniel Viklund, of the Stockholm newspaper, Dagens Nyheter.

Secretary Rusk replied to 12 questions concerning the situation in Southeast Asia.

I commend the text of his replies to the attention of our colleagues as follows:

TEXT OF REPLIES BY THE HONORABLE DEAN RUSK, SECRETARY OF STATE, TO QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY DANIEL VIKLUND, DAGENS NYHETER, STOCKHOLM

1. Which were the decisive reasons for the original U.S. decision to intervene militarily in Viet-Nam, and do you think that those reasons have in any way been affected by later developments, in terms of direct American interests, locally in Southeast Asia, or internationally?

The simplest way to answer this question is to remind you that we had a promise to keep. Since the Geneva Conference of 1954 and the SEATO agreement of the same year, three American Presidents have pledged that the United States will help South Viet-Nam defend itself against Communist aggression. We have undertaken similar pledges for the mutual defense of the NATO area. We believe that it is important to the prospects for peace that it be fully understood that, on such matters, we mean what we say.

We had hoped that the defense of South Viet-Nam would not require the participation of United States military forces in combat operations. For more than six years the South Vietnamese managed to withstand an unrelenting and extremely efficient political and military aggression. By the spring of 1965, however, the armed agents of Hanoi in the South were being massively supplemented by regularly constituted units of the North Vietnamese army in virtually open armed attack against South Viet-Nam. At that point, only the military support of South Viet-Nam's friends could save it from conquest. That is why our troops, along with 45,000 Koreans and thousands of Australians, New Zealanders, Filipinos and Thais, are in South Viet-Nam.

As for our interests in Southeast Asia, we have declared them on many occasions. As late as August 1964 our Congress, with only two dissenting votes in the entire Congress, declared that "The United States regards as vital to its national interest and to world peace the maintenance of international peace and security in southeast Asia." We do not see how a durable peace can be achieved unless all nations, large and small, have a chance to live in safety and in peace. This applies quite specifically to those countries with whom we have undertaken mutual defense alliances.

2. What is your opinion of the view, frequently voiced in Europe, that both North Viet-Nam and NLF (Viet Cong) hold independent positions on the issues of the war, not necessarily always the same?

It is curious, if true, that this view should gain currency in Europe with its sophistication and experience regarding Communist fronts. Neither the history of the origin of the NLF nor intelligence based on Communist statements, NLF documents and prisoner interrogations support this view. A concerted effort has of course been made, particularly abroad, by Hanoi to create the illusion that the NLF is an independent organization, but this does not convince many South Vietnamese—nor many knowledgeable foreign observers, for that matter. If you examine with care Hanoi's programs and those issued by the NLF, you will agree, I am sure, that there is no substantial difference in what they are proposing to do to Sout Viet-Nam. Tactics on occasion demand differences in emphasis, particularly for foreign consumption. But Hanoi's control of the NLF has been amply demonstrated over the years. Were this not so, the NLF has had many chances to demonstrate it and has not done so.

3. What is your assessment of the military situation in Viet-Nam, as of today, and do you think that there is any possibility of any U.S. troop withdrawals within the next six months?

You will recall the address of General Westmoreland to the Congress on April 28, in which he compared the situation today with what it was some time ago. Although no one foresees any United States troop withdrawals within the next six months, the United States is confident that the efforts by South Viet-Nam and its allies will continue to bring improvement, although there may be ups and downs. The important point to bear in mind is that the military and nonmilitary developments are inextricably intertwined in South Viet-Nam, even more than elsewhere, so that the most significant indicators of military success may be found not in battle reports and casualty statistics but in the evidence that the country is moving forward, creating political institutions, holding village and hamlet elections, improving communications and stabilizing the economy. You are aware of the many proposals which we and others have made for a deescalation of the violence in Viet-Nam. We have offered to put on the table a schedule of withdrawal of United States forces if North Viet-Nam would do the same.

4. If the Viet-Nam war should continue for a long time, how seriously do you judge the risk that it might lead to a direct confrontation between the U.S. and Russia or China?

It is prudent always to keep such possibilities in mind. Our objective in Viet-Nam remains limited to forestalling the aggression from the North, and our military response remains a measured one calculated to reach this goal. We have repeatedly made it clear that our ends do not include the destruction of the North Vietnamese Government, or the occupation of the country. In any event, while the common defense requires in some instances the taking of risks, we believe that there is a far greater risk in shirking responsibility and allowing aggression to go unchallenged.

5. Do you think that the American air bases in Thailand will increase or reduce the risk that that country might be drawn in, and that the war will spread?

Let me make it clear, first of all, that there are no American bases in Thailand. The Royal Thai Government, recognizing the common danger, allows us to use jointly with its forces certain of its defense facilities. That Thailand itself is on the Communist timetable for the new kind of warfare the Communists dub "wars of national liberation" is sufficiently documented. Peking has said this, publicly and often. But the Thais are not waiting passivly for the blow to fall. They are actively cooperating today in the defense of Southeast Asia. In addition to making their facilities available to us in Thailand, they have sent air and naval training units to South Viet-Nam, and they are presently training and equipping an augmented battalion of ground troops to join the Koreans, Australians, New Zealanders and Americans who are fighting side-by-side with the South Vietnamese troops to defend the country.

6. In retrospect, do you think that there was, at any time, a reasonable chance to end the fighting on conditions acceptable to all parties involved, and, if so, why was an agreement impossible?

We thought such an opportunity had come with the Accords on Laos in 1962. At that conference we accepted the nominee of the Communist side as the Prime Minister for Laos, as well as a coalition government worked out among the so-called "Three Factions." President Kennedy was bitterly disappointed with the results of those Accords. Hanoi refused (a) to withdraw its forces from Laos, (b) to cease using Laos as an infiltration route into South Viet-Nam, (c) to permit the coalition government to exercise authority in the Communist held areas of Laos, and (d) to permit the International Control Commission to exercise its functions in those same areas. All of these were specifically required by the Accords themselves. Performance and good faith of the Agreements of 1962 would have represented a giant step toward peace throughout Southeast Asia. Since then we have not seen any indication that Hanoi is prepared to stop its effort to seize South Viet-Nam by force. Were they to do so, peace could come very fast.

7. Which are the main reasons for the American refusal to recognize NLF (Viet Cong) as an independent representative for a part of the population of South Viet-Nam?

The NLF does not say that it represents a *part* of the people of South Viet-Nam, but rather that it is the *sole* legitimate representative of *all* these people. The Catholics, Buddhists, Cao Dai, Hoa Hao, Montagnards, ethnic Cambodians, all making up an overwhelming majority of the people of South Viet-Nam, reject this pretension of the NLF. Obviously, we cannot "recognize" the NLF on their terms. Nevertheless, as President Johnson has said, "The Viet Cong would have no difficulty in being represented and having their views presented if Hanoi for a moment decides she wants to cease aggression."

8. What measures would you consider necessary to protect the civilian population of South Viet-Nam, following the withdrawal of American troops within six months of a peaceful solution, as visualized by the President?

It is too early to discuss this in any meaningful detail. Perhaps a final a final settlement would include some type of continuing international assistance. We believe, however, that once North Viet-Nam withdraws its leadership, its troops and its supplies, the Republic of Viet-Nam will be able to make further progress in assuring economic and social betterment for the South Vietnamese people and to handle any insurgency situation which might persist or arise subsequently. As you know, the South Vietnamese have offered full amnesty and reconciliation to the South Vietnamese who are now assisting Hanoi.

9. Is your willingness to negotiate with North Viet-Nam unchanged in spite of the escalation of the bombing of the North, and what would you say are now the minimum American conditions for negotiations?

I find it very curious that the word "escalation" seems to be reserved for actions taken by the United States and its allies and is not applied to actions taken by North Viet-Nam. For example, for almost a year North Vietnamese mines have been placed in the Saigon River approaches to Saigon harbor. Viet Cong and North Vietnamese forces today are using Cambodian territory. Has the *Dagens Nyheter* called either of these "escalation?" I would suggest that if we picked up North Vietnamese mines in the Saigon River and simply took them home to their point of origin, namely Haiphong, that there would be a great outcry about "escalation." As for our conditions for negotiations, we have none. We have stated many times that we are ready to negotiate at once without conditions. Since the other side has imposed conditions, such as stopping the bombing, we have said we will negotiate about the conditions themselves. As for the shape of a final settlement, our views have been set forth many times in such summaries as our Fourteen Points and our reminder of the 28 proposals made by ourselves and others which Hanoi has rejected. Fundamentally, we believe that the Geneva Agreements of 1954 and 1962 are an adequate basis for peace in Southeast Asia. But no one has been able to produce anyone from the other side with whom to talk—either without conditions or about conditions.

10. How do you assess the possibilities to win the population of South Viet-Nam for a government friendly to the United States, and which elements of the pacification and democratization program appear to you most essential in that context?

It is not a question of winning the South Vietnamese people's support for a government friendly to the United States, but of relieving them of the burden of North Vietnamese aggression and subversive insurgency. Security is the element basic to pacification, and with security the broad program of revolutionary development can accelerate its forward movement. The remarkable progress being made in the direction of a constitutional government augurs well for the future, if security can be maintained. Our basic interest is that the South Vietnamese people have a chance to decide for themselves what kind of government they want and what their international orientation should be.

11. If free elections, including some form of de facto NLF participation, were held in South Viet-Nam now, how big a part of the voters do you think would back the present government, and NLF, respectively?

If Hanoi were to abandon its attempt to take over South Viet-Nam, it is conceivable that those indigenous elements who have cooperated with the Front would wish to participate in politics in some way. Their right to do so would appear to be present in the Doan Ket or National Reconciliation program. How many votes they might get would depend on many factors, such as whether these persons integrated with other political groupings, what support these groupings might have in various areas of the country, and so on. However, a recent poll undertaken independently in South Viet-Nam by CBS News shows clearly that the South Vietnamese people do not want communism and/or a government dominated by the NLF.

12. Do you think that Sweden could contribute in any way to establish contacts leading to a peaceful solution of the Viet-Nam conflict?

We have frequently stated that we welcome the efforts of any country which would advance the course of peace. But I would be less than frank if I did not add two points: we see no sign that Hanoi is willing to move to an honorable settlement, and we do not believe that the prospects for such a settlement are enhanced by proposals which ask us to stop half the war while the other side continues unabated its half of the war. Suppose that the United States were to say that we would negotiate only if the other side stopped all of the violence in South Viet-Nam while we continued to bomb the north. Everyone would say that we were crazy. When the other side makes exactly the same proposal in reverse, why do many people say that their proposal is reasonable and ought to be accepted?

Support for the "Kaiulani" Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 15, 1967

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, last month 10 Members of the House joined with me in introducing a resolution to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to guarantee certain loans made to the National Maritime Historical Society for the purpose of restoring and returning to the United States, the last surviving American square-rigged merchant ship, the *Kaiulani*. The loan would be repaid by admissions to the vessel which, when restoration is completed, is to be berthed on the Washington waterfront as a nonprofit maritime museum and as a monument to the American merchant marine.

The interest of the Philippine people in this project can be seen from the fact that the introduction of this resolution received publicity in all of the Manila papers.

A letter typical of the many received expressing support for this legislation and urging early action on it, came from Mr. Porfirio U. Sevilla, president of P.I.-U.S. Factors Corp., which I am placing in the Appendix because I know it will be of interest to all of the Members:

P.I.-U.S. FACTORS CORP.,
Manila, Philippines, August 7, 1967.

Hon. EDWARD A. GARMATZ,
U.S. Congress,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Last August 1st, on the front page of all newspapers here in Manila, there appeared an item stating whereby you introduced a Resolution in Congress calling for US$500,000 guaranteed loan to refit the last American built square-rigged merchant ship, donated by the people of the Philippines to the United States.

Congressman, your Resolution, supported by your Democratic colleagues and several Republicans is most heartening, considering the endless good will between your people and my people!

Sir, I do wish my Government and people were in a position to raise these funds, but you, Sir, and the American people will appreciate that my Government is one of the outstanding creditors of the United States, and that is why we offered to you the "Kaiulani" . . . to reciprocate your kindness in some small measure.

Congressman, at this juncture, I believe that the friends of the Philippines in the United States, such as the Rockefellers, the Fords, the Firestones, and others, will be glad to undertake this project in a similar vein that your Resolution calls for through their respective foundations.

Because today, the discovery of a Spanish galleon, supposed to be one of the first merchant ships plying between Mexico and the Philippines sunk during the early trading days . . . the relics of this vessel are highly treasured for historical value and worth millions of dollars to the Governments of Mexico, Spain and the Philippines.

Congressman, how much more is the value of the merchant ship, "Kaiulani", to be displayed as a dockside museum on the Potomac?

As a Filipino who spent his boyhood days in the United States, trained and educated in the American way of life, I am heartily endorsing your Resolution.

I am also proud to note that President Lyndon B. Johnson, in appointing Attorney Alan D. Hutchison, President, National Maritime Historical Society, as Special Envoy to receive the "Kaiulani" from the Philippine President, that such gesture of good will will go a long way in insuring the traditional Philippine-American friendship.

With assurances of my best wishes and kind regards to you, Sir, I am, believe me
Sincerely,

PORFIRIO U. SEVILLA,
President.

Pittsburgh FHA Office Helps Preserve Inner City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 14, 1967

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, one of the less obvious factors in the decay of our inner cities until recently has been the reluctance of the FHA to insure mortgages for homes in what they considered to be poor risk neighborhoods.

I am pleased that the FHA has altered its policy, and is now emphasizing the good credit rating of prospective borrowers rather than the economic soundness of the neighborhood in which the property to be mortgaged is located.

This shift in policy, will, I predict, help preserve well-established neighborhoods in our inner cities by encouraging homeowners to improve their houses, and by making it possible for would be homeowners to find mortgage money for their purchases.

The new FHA directives are being enthusiastically executed in my home city of Pittsburgh by Mr. Philip O'Connell, the FHA's regional director. The Pittsburgh FHA office under Mr. O'Connell's guidance has always been a forward-looking unit, and the new directive will increase its ability to promote homeownership and home improvement.

In an interview published in the Pittsburgh Press of August 6, 1967, Mr. O'Connell outlined the potential in the new directive.

He noted that the new policy will make mortgage financing available to "creditworthy individuals who are the innocent victims of their surroundings, such as where riots occur." I hope that this observation is not missed in other cities faced with unrest due to housing problems.

In the hope that Mr. O'Connell's enlightened treatment of FHA's enlightened directive can be repeated in cities across the Nation, I insert the Pittsburgh Press article on Mr. O'Connell at this point in the RECORD:

FHA EASES POOR-RISK LOAN POLICY—RIOT-THREATENED AREAS GET CHANCE FOR IMPROVEMENT

Strife in the streets of other towns could be a blessing in disguise for Pittsburghers seeking to own or rehabitate their own homes in areas Uncle Sam once thought of as poor mortgage risks.

While looking for ways to help riot-torn cities elsewhere, the Federal Government has realized that it has a potential plus factor—Federal Housing Administration (FHA) insurance aid—in cities such as Pittsburgh.

It was once almost a blanket FHA decree that a house had to meet an "economic soundness" criteria before mortgage money would be risked.

Now the Federal men will forget the neighborhood and look at each home on a case-by-case basis.

The determining factor, according to Philip O'Connell, regional FHA director for Pittsburgh, is the good credit rating of the borrower.

Mr. O'Connell said older city areas, and he pointed to the Hill District and North Side, have normally been looked at by his office with a great deal of hesitancy. No longer will this be the case, he said.

But he cautioned prospective home buyers or present property owners in city areas showing signs of blight, the easing, of restrictions does not mean "we will insure mortgages for deteriorated homes unless the building is basically sound and a firm contract with a reliable builder has been negotiated for repair of the property."

FHA's mortgage insurance activities in older areas will not be confined to urban renewal projects or limited to one or two programs, he said.

PERMITS REFINANCING

By substituting the "acceptable risk" determination for "economic soundness," insured mortgage financing is now available to credit-worthy individuals who are the innocent victims of their surroundings, such as where riots occur.

The new policy will also permit owners to refinance their mortgage payments in order to renovate their homes.

Providing the total amount needed is not greater than the value of the property after rehabilitation, FHA will back mortgages up to $15,000 at 97 per cent of the agency's appraised valuation.

Mortgage insurance is open for homes which are owner-occupied or have absentee-landlords.

However, the absentee-landlord cannot get "as good a deal" on his mortgage as the owner living in the dwelling. FHA will back an absentee's mortgage up to about 82 per cent.

Mr. O'Connell is hopeful that the policy change will stimulate home rehabilitation and give more low-income families an opportunity to become home-owners.

The Washington directive makes clear the Government's backing of property owners who want to rebuild in areas racked by riots.

The changes make it possible for responsible citizens to rebuild in an area and to form a stable nucleus of home owners.

Actually, the amendments date from last November when the "economic soundness" requirement was relaxed if the house was in an area where rioting had occurred or was threatened.

While the Government has waived its restrictions on older neighborhoods, it still maintains its policy of forbidding FHA-backed mortgages in areas subject to flooding or subsidence, areas adversely affected by airports and areas in transition from residential to commercial or industrial usage.

More Action on Drug Addiction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 15, 1967

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, in the Baltimore area, Group W television station WJZ-TV is carrying out a Breakthrough project to alert the public to urban problems. I would like to place in the Record an editorial, "More Action on Drug Addiction," presented by WJZ-TV as a part of the project:

More Action on Drug Addiction

The WJZ-TV *Breakthrough* project, now involved in a study of crime, must inevitably branch out into a concern over drug addiction. Some authorities estimate that as much as 30 per cent of the crimes against property are committed by dope addicts seeking money to pay underworld agents for drugs. Dope addiction is thus a personal tragedy and a social menace that deserves more public attention than it is getting.

Through news coverage, editorials, and yesterday on the "Contact" program, WJZ-TV has called attention to a unique effort by a private physician to curb addiction. Dr. Emmett Davis treats heroin addicts with a drug called methadone—in effect the substitution of a harmless addiction for a harmful one. Combining this with a self-help organization of addicts called "Man-Alive," he seems to have had unusual success. The same treatment has been widely tested in New York.

Meanwhile, on the public front, the Maryland Department of Mental Hygiene has asked for funds to tackle the drug problem through a new outpatient clinic, a new specialized institution and through broadened treatment in penal institutions.

We welcome the State's expanded drug program. In our opinion, however, there is too much of a void between the State's long-range approach to the problem and the immediate grass roots work of Dr. Davis. Some medical people are cautious about the methadone treatment because its long-term success is not yet proven. But what alternative is there in Baltimore at the present time?

We urge the State to work toward its well-conceived long-range plans. At the same time, we believe there should be more City and State involvement in methadone research through clinics or grants to private physicians. Perhaps there is a risk, but there is also a risk to every citizen so long as drug addiction and the crimes resulting from it continue to plague a whole society.

Address by Hon. Lester L. Wolff at the International Air Cadet Exchange Dinner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES J. DELANEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 15, 1967

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, our colleague, and a distinguished member of the New York congressional delegation, the Honorable Lester L. Wolff, delivered an excellent address on August 8 at the International Air Cadet Exchange dinner here in Washington.

Directing his remarks primarily to 138 cadets of the Civil Air Patrol from 17 countries, the gentleman from New York expressed some cogent thoughts on a number of benefits gained through international exchange of young people bound by a common interest.

To those who might take the airplane for granted, Lester Wolff reminded these future leaders of the great contributions air transport has and is making to international understanding, national defense, trade and commerce, and humanitarian endeavors. As for the future, he observed:

> It used to be that the sky was the limit. We have demonstrated that the sky is not the limit. But rather it is only the beginning.

For the benefit of the Members, and other readers of the Congressional Record, I include the text of his speech at this point:

Speech by Congressman Lester L. Wolff at International Air Cadet Exchange Dinner, Washington, D.C., August 8, 1967

General Wilcox, Colonel Breeskin, honored guests, ladies and gentlemen, it is always a pleasure to be introduced by Barnee Breeskin, a good friend and an officer in the Civil Air Patrol. Barnee deserves special mention tonight for his hard work and devotion to this valuable exchange program. Over the years Barnee has done an outstanding job and the CAP may be justly proud to have so fine a representative. Barnee, I know you work closely with the Vice President on CAP matters. Mr. Humphrey has an active interest in the CAP and the air cadet exchange.

In fact it was just two years ago that I attended a similar dinner at which the Vice President held the rostrum I now hold. Our thanks should go tonight also to Mercedes Benz, Inc., of North America for making this dinner possible.

As some of you realize, I have a particular affinity for the CAP and the IACE. As a former major and squadron commander in the CAP and now an honorary member of CAP I assure you all of my continuing support for this fine program.

Because of my interest I was pleased when General Wilcox was recently appointed the new national commander of CAP. We are fortunate to have such an outstanding gentleman and excellent airman at the helm. I have no doubt that under his fine leadership the CAP and the IACE will continue to grow and expand their contribution to aviation and international understanding.

While it is an honor to have here this evening, representatives of the 17 countries participating in the exchange program, and the leadership of the Civil Air Patrol—I trust these gentlemen will understand if I address myself to our special guests—the 138 cadets from the aero clubs of the participating nations.

I hope you have enjoyed your visit to the United States. I also hope, most sincerely, that you have learned a bit about our country, our people, and our deep interest in international cooperation. Your visit, and the visit of our young CAP members, to your countries, is an important example of the valuable international understanding, that can be developed through exchanges in areas of mutual interest. It is the responsibility of all young people, in all nations, to build such understanding—in the interests of cooperation and peace. We must recognize the growing interdependence of the world and the need for mutual understanding. You people, because of the leadership you enjoy in your respective countries, are especially suited to this task. And, I am sure you will do all you can to meet your responsibility.

During your visit to the United States you have witnessed our country in the midst of difficult days of decision. The unrest in our cities is the burden of our freedom. Such disturbances would never be permitted in a totalitarian society. We must not condone such violence, for burning, looting, and sniping are truly arson, larceny, and murder.

But, I call our trouble to your attention for several reasons. Ours is not a perfect order. Despite our great strength, despite our freedom, unprecedented in the history of mankind, despite all the things that make the United States the great nation it is—we too have problems: we too are struggling for better days.

But in that struggle—in our own cities and in Vietnam—we practice self-control. For nations, like individuals, must be moderate and reasonable. Only through the practice of collective self-control can we build.

The United States is in Vietnam to build, to preserve that nation, to work toward a better day for the people of that embattled country. I spoke a minute ago about self-control. Our policy in Vietnam is the best example I can think of. We could, if we wanted so empty a victory, destroy Vietnam—in a matter of minutes. But our aim is not destroy—it is to build. To that end we practice the controlled use of power.

The very strength of the United States demands moderation. It is interesting that our annual increase alone in our GNP is greater than the total GNP of that strong industrial nation, France.

Rather than use our massive power—a power that could destroy the entire world in minutes—indiscriminately, we use that power to build a better world. There are some in these United States, that would have us stop helping others. To them, and to you, I say—in our interdependent world no nation is an island unto itself. With the help of the United States, with help of your strong countries—we can all work together to eliminate man's enemies, hunger and disease and poverty and war. We will all benefit by working together.

In this regard, and especially because you are the future leaders of your countries, I would like very much to hear from each of you personally about your observations and comments after visiting the United States. Vice President Humphrey extended a similar invitation two years ago to your predecessors and I believe it was a great idea. I would like to know what you found, that impressed you. I would like to know what you found that distressed you. I would like to hear general observations and particular comments. If you will be so kind to write to me: Lester L. Wolff, Member of Congress, Washington, D.C., I will call your letters and comments to the attention of my colleagues in Congress and see that those observations are inserted in the Record of our Congress, so they may be part of our history.

I know, without doubt, that some of you will be military leaders in the generation now on the rise. Some of you will be political leaders. All of you will have the opportunity to foster international goodwill and understanding and, for my part, I pledge to help you in that effort.

You have had the opportunity to meet many of our leaders, besides visiting our people throughout the United States.

The International Air Cadet exchange program is a privilege and pleasure afforded to you in the interests of world peace and cooperation. With the privilege goes the responsibility to share with the people of your countries, and especially your aero clubs, your experiences and knowledge gained while in the United States. By carrying out that responsibility, as I am sure you will, you can offer an important and positive step in the direction of international understanding.

Permit me to turn for a few short moments to the specific mutual concern that brings us together—civil aviation and the advancement of civilian aviation programs throughout the world.

In our Congress, I am on the committee concerned with developments in space. Many of our airplanes are built in the part of New York that I represent. I am aware of developments in aviation and I am aware of the developments that will come about through aviation.

It is through high-speed air travel that international exchange programs are possible. It is through high-speed and low cost air travel that the world is becoming increasingly interdependent and truly closer together. The 20th century has been built on the wings of flight and the future will be written by developments in the air.

Air technology has the awful capacity to wage war. But more important are the wide range of constructive applications. Air technology makes possible rapid shipments of food and supplies to areas hit by natural disaster, as recently happened in earthquakes in Turkey. It makes possible easier travel and thus facilitates international understanding. Air technology itself has spawned a great and powerful industry in aviation itself.

If we dedicate ourselves to the constructive applications of technology the future is very bright indeed. I would urge each and every one of you young people to strive to develop civilian aviation in your country with an eye toward the wide range of uses open to us. The use of short take off and landing aircraft, the advent of the supersonic transports, the decreasing cost of air travel and air cargo shipments all merit our deepest attention—because hopefully this is the direction that aviation will advance through.

At the same time we must never minimize the importance of aviation in defense. Our own Civil Air Patrol, as you know, is an auxiliary of the United States Air Force. A solid defense system is built today on a strong air force and many of you, I trust, will go on to careers in your own air forces. That is a vital and most honorable profession. General Wilcox is an outstanding example of a man who has dedicated his life to his country and the development of our air capacity for both defense and civilian purposes. If you could take the lead from a man like this, and the many similar men in your countries, the world can look forward to a secure and prosperous future.

For centuries man aspired to fly. In this century flight became a reality. It used to be that the sky was the limit. We have demonstrated that the sky is not the limit. But rather it is only the beginning. It is up to your generation, each and every one of you, to reach to the stars and beyond. You have the knowledge and ability. I also believe you have the dedication.

Some of the things we strive for are far away. The ideals we must maintain, the same ideals I charge you to aspire to, are of a better world of a different day. To quote for a moment in closing. Our reach must exceed our grasp, gentlemen. Otherwise what's a heaven for. We can grasp the physical heavens through technology—we must reach for the ideal heaven.

Together we face the problems of the world. Together we can surmount those problems. We are human; we are part of an imperfect world. But with time and with devotion, with hard work and with perseverance—someday the dreams of mankind will be realities.

The International Air Cadet Exchange is an important step in the future of which I speak. I congratulate you for being selected. I congratulate the sponsors of this fine program and I wish you godspeed while returning to your homes.

CWV MacArthur Post Holds Operation Appreciation for Wounded Veterans of Vietnam War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERVEY G. MACHEN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 15, 1967

Mr. MACHEN. Mr. Speaker, there is no more honorable and useful program than one designed to express the gratitude and admiration of the American people for those who have sacrificed life, limb, or at the least, some of the best of their years, in the defense of our country. Operation Appreciation, which was held at the West Lanham Hills Volunteer Fire Department, July 26, 1967, has let wounded veterans know in a very real way that the American people both understand the significance of their dedication and sacrifice, and give them their heartfelt praise. It is my deep belief that this is the type of demonstration that ought to be made in every section of the country.

I attended this function and met some of the young men who have fought so valiantly and nobly in the defense of our Nation, and let me assure you that there is no higher honor. I only regret that it was not possible to meet more of these fine men.

It is with this thought in mind and in tribute to this dedication that I insert the following material to be printed in the RECORD:

[From the Prince Georges County News, Aug. 3, 1967]

THE MARINES LANDED, THIS TIME FOR FUN

(By Phyllis O'Neil)

There was a party and what a party.

Fifty attractive women marines chatted across tables, hostesses scurried about checking on last minute details inside West Lanham Hills firehouse, and others waited outside for the guests.

The Carrolltones drum and bugle corps signaled harmoniously that the guests had arrived. Indeed they had, three bus loads of them 120 wounded marines, veterans of Vietnam now patients at the Bethesda Naval Hospital.

Out of the buses they came, some on crutches, some carried on stretchers, some with bandages, but all smiling. These wounded men were going to a party and they were ready.

Invited dignitaries, among the 400 persons who attended, welcomed the men and eventually everyone made their way to the room at the top of the firehouse. The fire company's Dalmatian dog greeted the men as they entered. The hall—although sparsely decorated—lacked nothing for a great party.

The deafening strains of the rock 'n roll, "The Unknown Kind" of Seabrook, prompted gyrations and a sense of rythm in practically everyone. Almost instantly the sporatic dancing gave way to a packed floor. Those on crutches, in casts or those confined to chairs kept the beat.

There was not end to the food or drink. Nor was there an end to the smiles.

As the pulsating beat grew, the honored guest arrived—Lt. Gen. Lewis Walt, until recently commander of all marines in Vietnam; "Big Lew" as some of the men called him, the man with the sparkling pale blue eyes and the infectious broad grin.

The party was the baby of the Douglas MacArthur Post Catholic War Veterans of America called "Operation Appreciation." The party was the 27th event arranged by the Catholic War Veterans Operation Appreciation program in the past 13½ months for Vietnam Veterans at Bethesda Naval Hospital.

James E. Merna of New Carrollton, chairman of the party, decided after awhile that it was time for speeches. The tempo had caught on and everyone was swinging. Quiet finally was obtained by yelling "attention" in the microphone.

Reps. Hervey G. Machen and Charles Mc. Mathias and State Sen. Fred L. Wineland began the praise for the marines. Rep. Clarence D. Long, Baltimore County Democrat, and Mrs. Long arrived a little late, they had just come from visiting their son at Walter Reed Army Hospital, where he is a patient after being wounded in Vietnam.

Rep. Long began his emotion packed address by saying, "I'm proud that you men believe in fighting for America."

He continued, "If we get out of Vietnam, our troubles will be just beginning." The men approved with thunderous applause.

We would rather fight 12,000 miles away than on the shores of the continental United States, Long remarked. With this, the marines cheered, whistled, applauded and gave the "thumbs-up."

Then Gen. Walt, the marines' marine, stepped to the mike. There was no mistake that he was the man of the hour. It was obvious that every man there would have risked his life again for his country and for "Big Lew." Mrs. Walt stood by the general's side as he welcomed his men, for he had commanded most of the 120 men in battles near the demilitarized zone.

The general began: "It's great to see you again. We are continuing to win the war—we are making headway every day and night."

Gen. Walt offered special praise for "the unsung heroes on the battlefield," the medical corpmen. Walt said he had pinned more than 15,000 purple hearts on the men in Vietnam and he heard over and over, "If Doc hadn't been there, I wouldn't be here now." As the cheers went up, a medical corpsman stood nearby with a broad smile and a nod of approval. Gen. Walt said the job "has got to be done" and that he would like to go back. He said the men in Vietnam must have the patience and the backing of those at home.

As the general and his wife stepped from the stage, a chant began—"We Want Walt—We want Walt."

"Big Lew" continued with praise for the Seabees. "God Bless them," he said. "I pinned 72 purple hearts on them in a single day."

James F. McCarthy, post commander, presented the general with a certificate of recognition—"For the love of his country, leadership and dedication." He also was presented an honorary life membership in the post.

The music and festivities continued and a large cake waited for the cutting. The red, white and blue decorations fit the occasion. Large red rosettes bordered the cake and standing in each was a tiny American flag.

Prince Georges County Commissioner Francis J. Aluisi, his voice with noticeable feeling, said, 'I feel grateful that there are still people who recognize the efforts of our men who fight and give their lives for the ways of our government. People like Jim Merna who have the guts to recognize the same deserve a lot of credit."

His reference was to James Merna, chairman of the Operation Appreciation party.

Posters on the walls clearly summed up the celebration. "Thanks Vietnam Vets for a job well done."

[From the Washington Star, July 27, 1967]

VIETNAM CASUALTIES—MARINES TASTE HOSPITALITY

(By John Gregory)

They came to the party by bus last night—nearly 120 Marines—on stretchers, crutches, in wheelchairs.

The Bethesda Naval Hospital patients, all Vietnam casualties, were greeted at the West Lanham Hills, Md., firehouse by a drum and bugle band, area members of Congress and—women.

At first, it was just another party. Outside, there were the handshakes and brief how-do-you-do encounters with the girls, the 50 women Marines recruited as hostesses for the four-hour affair, sponsored by the Landover Hills chapter of the Catholic War Veterans.

The Marines were helped upstairs—one's leg cast breaking a window as he was lifted around a corner.

GENERAL WALT ON SCENE

At the top of the stairs were the drinks, a rock 'n roll band and Lt. Gen. Lewis Walt, the man just back from Vietnam who had commanded most of the 120 men in battles near the demilitarized zone.

The mingling began, while patients described their maneuvers in combat to the ladies over the sound of the band.

Walt signed autographs on napkins or any other paper scraps that the men could find. Marines on crutches danced while those on stretchers frugged with their hands.

The music stopped and the speeches began. Applause and thumbs-up approval from the audience followed praise for the Marines by Maryland Reps. Hervey G. Machen, Democrat, Charles Mathias, a Republican, and Clarence D. Long, a Baltimore Democrat.

"I'm proud that you men believe in fighting for America," said Long, whose son is a patient at Walter Reed Army Medical Center for wounds suffered as an Army paratrooper in Vietnam.

There were cheers and whistles for other speakers, and thumbs-up for the brewery which supplied the evening's refreshments.

But the loudest applause went to Walt, who left the Vietnam command in June to become director of personnel at Marine Corps Headquarters.

"We're making headway in Vietnam every day," he said. "As long as we have the patience and backing here at home, there is no reason why we can't win."

He left the stage to the chant, "We want Walt," and one Marine broke into tears.

The music and festivities continued.

A 20-year-old corporal from Falls Church, restricted from the dance floor by the cast on his leg said: "I'm going over there (Vietnam) again the first chance I get. I'm not serving much purpose by being in a hospital.

"Some of the men in the hospital are a little bitter and discouraged," said the corporal, John R. Lucas of 2821 Mankin Walk. "These are the ones who have lost their legs or don't have many vistors at Bethesda."

Gen. Walt said he could not detect any discouragement last night. "The spirit of these patients is tremendous, just as it is over there in Vietnam."

Over here, in the fire station. 120 Marine shook to the beat of the music as if they were in full agreement.

[From the Prince Georges Post, Aug. 3, 1967]

WOUNDED VIETNAM MARINES FETED AT GAY PARTY GIVEN BY CWV POST HERE

(By John Radowich)

Hospitality and friendship—PG County style—were the happy orders of the day Wednesday when the Douglas MacArthur Catholic War Veterans Post of Landover Hills and local residents welcomed three busloads of wounded Vietnam Marines to a carefree and swinging party at the West Lanham Hills fire department hall.

Jim Merna, of New Carrollton, who heads the Post's unique "Operation Appreciation" program, acted as the master of ceremonies for this latest outing for the Marines hospitalized at the Bethesda Naval Hospital. The patients, many of whom came on stretchers, in wheel-chairs and on crutches, are all Vietnam casualties. They were greeted by the New Carrolltones' drum and bugle corps, members of Congress, Mayor Jack King and members of the New Carrollton City Council, firemen, CWV Post members, and women. The women were wives of Post members, 50 women Marines from the Henderson Hall Marine headquarters and two Vietnamese ladies, dressed in native Ao-Dai costumes. The two Saigon-born women were Nhu Bang and Hong Swong, who work for the State Department teaching government officials the Vietnamese language before tours of duty in the embattled country.

The four-hour affair was a gay event, even though poignant reminders of the war were at hand. Lt. Gen. Lewis Walt, just back from Vietnam, who had led most of the 120 men in battles near the demilitarized zone, told the gathering that "We're making steady headway in Vietnam every day. All we need is patience and backing here at home and there's no reason why we can't win". Gen. Walt, who returned to the U.S. in June to head Marine Corps personnel activities and is rumored to be the next Marine Corps Commandant, revealed that Viet Cong captives concede they know they can't win the conflict; know they can't stand up to the Marines in the I Corps. When Gen. Walt mentioned that he had pinned 15,000 Purple Heart medals in Vietnam, one Marine broke into tears.

Brief talks were made by the three Congressmen present, Hervey Machen, Charles Mathias, and Clarence D. Long, who revealed that his son is a patient at Walter Reed Army Medical Center for wounds suffered as an Army paratrooper. The Congressmen, along with State Senator Fred Wineland and County Commissioner Francis Aluisi praised the Marines, PG County Sheriff William Kersey made Gen. Walt an honorary deputy sheriff and the wounded men cheered and whistled all the speakers and showed by their sustained applause that Gen. Walt is their particular hero. Gen. Walt autographed casts, programs, and napkins for the Marines. Wounded Marine Joseph W. Halsey, from Elkton, hobbled around the room, proudly showing his buddies the General's autograph on his leg cast.

Marine George Blander, from San Diego, Calif., had his left leg in a cast. Next to the autographed line, "From a sexy blond to a sexy cast", written by a woman Marine in attendance as a hostess, Gen. Walt had written his name. Mr. Blander vowed to save the cast for his children to see.

Jim McCarthy, Post commander, made Gen. Walt a life member of the MacArthur Post. The General clapped McCarthy, a former Marine, on the back and took him to meet Mrs. Walt. Sgts. Bobbie Lane and Anthony Minutolo, restricted from the dance floor by the casts on the legs and arms, kept time on the sidelines to the beat of the "Unknowns" combo from Lanham.

One of the busses, containing most of the men confined to litters and stretchers, got lost and ended up in New Carrollton. West Lanham Hills fire department officials led by Howard S. Umphlet and Fred Hornung, drove to the bus in a pick-up truck and convoyed it to the firehouse where the other wounded Marines and guests were waiting. A "thumbs-up" salute was given by many to the more seriously-wounded men as they were carried up to the second floor hall at the firehouse, with one's leg cast breaking a window as he was carried up the stairs.

Mayor Jack King and Councilmen Art Bush, John Burgess, Bill Rawlinson, and Jerry Byrnes moved about the hall, talking to many of the men, and helping the busy hostesses keep the Marines supplied with food and refreshments, as the festivities continued.

A writer from the Marine Leatherneck national magazine was taking notes for a feature story, as Marines in pajamas and bathrobes, with neck braces, with arm casts and with eye patches, danced versions of the Bug-a-loo and the Ching-a-ling with women Marines, dressed for the most part in mini-skirts and mini-shifts.

The Leathernecks magazine writer looked about and marveled: "I've talked to a half-dozen of these young men and each one of them wants to get out of the hospital and go back to Vietnam. With that kind of spirit, is there any doubt as to the eventual outcome in Vietnam?"

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402, at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H–112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

Poverty Workers Attack Underlying Causes of Rioting, "Cool" Potential Outbreaks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 25, 1967

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the Milwaukee Journal has editorially addressed itself to an important matter—the alleged riot participation of workers in the war on poverty. The editorial quotes Mayor Harold Tollefson, of Tacoma, Wash., who is also past president of the National League of Cities:

> The antipoverty program in city after city has been responsible for just the opposite of that, he said. It has attacked some of the most basic social ills in the community which breed impatience and antagonism. It has provided the vehicle for the peaceful expression of this impatience.

A recent front-page story in the New York Times sounded a similar theme. it said:

> While congressional critics focus on complaints that poverty workers have fomented disorder, the Office of Economic Opportunity has accumlated a far greater number of unsolicited accolades for the "cooling" operations of poverty workers in riotous and threatening situations.

The Times story goes on to cite specific examples from different cities which support the view that antipoverty programs and antipoverty workers are important forces for community peace. I commend these two timely articles to the attention of my colleagues, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Aug. 10, 1967]

POVERTY AGENCY PRAISED ON RIOTS—TELLS OF ACCOLADES IN PRESS FOR PEACEKEEPING ROLE

(By Joseph A. Loftus)

WASHINGTON, August 9.—While Congressional crictics focus on complaints that poverty workers have fomented disorders, the Office of Economic Opportunity has accumulated a far greater number of unsolicited accolades for the "cooling" operations of poverty workers in riotous and threatening situations.

The police arrested more than 6,700 persons in the recent disorders in 28 cities. Of these, seven were paid poverty workers. The community action agencies in those cities employ 12,000 persons, and an even greater number are employed by delegate agencies using Federal poverty funds.

These are figures of the poverty agency. They do not conflict with any evidence produced in Congressional hearings. The agency has evidently convinced at least two Republicans on the key House Education and Labor Committee that reports of the involvement of poverty workers have been overdrawn.

The poverty agency said that in no case did the arrest charge exceed a misdemeanor, and that there had been no convictions so far.

The poverty agency reported the seven arrest cases and their internal disposition as follows:

Buffalo—One VISTA volunteer resigned.

Newark—Suspension of one employe ordered by the poverty agency.

Waterbury—One VISTA volunteer suspended by local action.

Hartford—A college student working on a summer program was arrested. Internal disposition deferred until disposition of civil case.

Cincinnati—Two professional workers arrested, disposition awaiting disposition of civil case.

Wichita—One summer program worker arrested; disposition not reported.

Jersey City—The city did not experience a riot, but in a single incident two poverty workers were arrested and convicted. They were ordered dismissed from the program. If these were counted, the arrest total would be nine.

Also left out of the arrest count were four youths picked up with 19 others by the police in New York after a looting raid on July 27. The four were described as poverty workers.

The agency said that one worked for the New York City Youth Board, which is not funded by the poverty agency. The others are minors who are enrolled in the neighborhood Youth Corps at $45 a week. The agency counts them as "recipients" of the poverty program rather than "poverty workers." They have been demoted from their supervisory positions pending disposition of their civil cases.

The poverty agency said that evidence of peace-keeping operations, culled from local newspapers, more than offset the few negative examples that received Congressional attention and newspaper headlines.

Some examples:

Providence—Mayor Joseph A. Doorley Jr., addressing Progress for Providence Volunteers: "As far as I'm concerned, there is no telling how bad this might have been if it hadn't been for you guys."

Minneapolis—The police, quoted in a local newspaper, said that 15 or 20 summer poverty program workers had gone into the streets during the disorders and were "a key factor" in limiting the violence.

Grand Rapids—The press, quoting a police officer, said that a group of young Negroes connected with the poverty program "are doing a beautiful job (during the disturbances), and we sure appreciate it."

Youngstown—A police captain, Carmen Bruno, referring to the police cadets, who are financed by the poverty agency, said:

"They calm down a hothead spoiling for a fight or mingle in a crowd urging excited youngsters to go home." (Quoted in the Vindicator).

Representative John R. Dellenback, Republican of Oregon, told Mr. Shriver in a hearing on July 31: "I spent three or four hours last Friday night on the streets of one of our major cities, walking with some of your people, and I was completely favorably impressed by the manner in which these people . . . were making a real effort to stop trouble and not to create it."

Representative Charles S. Goodell, of upstate New York, a Republican principal in poverty legislation, said: "Poverty workers generally have helped defuse riots."

[From the Milwaukee Journal, Aug. 8, 1967]

POVERTY WAR AND RIOTS

The war on poverty has survived many attacks in its three controversial years, but the latest round may prove to be the most damaging. Officials in several cities have attempted to link local poverty agencies with racial disorder and dissension. Newark's mayor and the city manager of Rochester, N.Y., have accused antipoverty personnel of stirring disturbances. A Nashville police captain declared that an antipoverty teaching project was teaching racial hatred. The accusations are denied by the office of economic opportunity (OEO).

It is surprising that the allegations have not been more numerous. The poverty effort involves the poor, the jobless, the hopeless, the frustrated—the very ones most likely to become involved in racial disturbances. If an occasional antipoverty program participant were not found among the thousands involved in the disorders, it would be a sign that the program was not reaching those it should.

Yet, of 19 cities where riots have erupted, OEO has identified only three rioters as having any connection with the agency. And no one knows how many disturbances antipoverty personnel have prevented. A potential outbreak in Chicago was "cooled" recently by members of two youth gangs involved in an antipoverty project.

The past president of the National League of Cities, Mayor Tollefson of Tacoma has warned against making the war on poverty a scapegoat for racial turmoil. "The antipoverty program in city after city has been responsible for just the opposite of that" he said. "It has attacked some of the most basic social ills in the community which breed impatience and antagonism. It has provided the vehicle for the peaceful expression of this impatience."

Federal regulations ban the use of antipoverty funds for political or unlawful purposes. These regulations should, of course, be enforced. But a few scattered accusations of violation, even if they can be documented, are no justification for reducing the antipoverty efforts. The racial disturbances only emphasize how important these efforts are.

Increased Use of Dulles Airport Urged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 16, 1967

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Dulles, Not National," published in the Washington Post of August 14, 1967.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DULLES, NOT NATIONAL

The proposal put forward by Trans-World Airlines for reducing the congestion at National Airport is one that the CAB should explore in depth. TWA suggests that each airline be required to assign to Dulles or Friendship 25 per cent of its flights involving cities less than 225 miles away, 50 per cent of the flights of 225 to 650 miles, 66⅔ per cent of flights of 650 to 900 miles, and all flights of more than 900 miles.

The idea has the advantage of forcing from National some of the feeder traffic from small cities, particularly in the South, as well as some of the longer flights. It also has the advantage of mollifying some Congressmen who are more worried about retaining the use of National for themselves and their constituents than they are about solving the problems of congestion, noise and pollution that National creates.

But the proposal is only a temporary solution. The growth of air traffic is so great that, although TWA's formula would move 22 per cent of the present operations out of National, the airport would be just as crowded in less than three years as it is now. In that time, TWA assumes, National will be rebuilt so it can handle more passengers.

The details of the plan, unfortunately, are designed to appeal primarily to the Congressmen who have complained the most. For example, it would move out of National none of the nonstop flights serving Atlanta and only about a third of those serving Chicago while moving about half of those to and from Boston. The complaining Congressmen, of course, are those who fly regularly from Chicago and Atlanta.

The simple fact is that Dulles, not National, ought to be this city's major airport. It will become that in time. Its passenger traffic was up almost 27 per cent in the first six months of this year while National's was up 14 per cent.

The CAB can go ahead and take the steps needed to shift the emphasis from National to Dulles. It can use the formula TWA proposes, reduce the mileage zones, eliminate more longer flights into National, and establish a permanent pattern of air traffic. It will have to do that sometime; it ought to do it now.

Capitalists Encourage Red Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 16, 1967

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, every taxpayer and parent should know of the American Assembly, which in mid-January announced plans to do business with the Communist countries including Soviet Russia. Their aims were furthered by passage of the controversial Soviet Consular Treaty.

According to Freedom Press, in addition to Cyrus S. Eaton, Jr., and Gov. Nelson Rockefeller, the following are also among participants of the Thirty-First American Assembly desiring to do business with the godless enemy while our boys die in Vietnam:

AMONG PARTICIPANTS IN 31ST AMERICAN ASSEMBLY URGING RED TRADE

George V. Allen, Director, Foreign Service Institute, Department of State.

Frank Altschul, Vice President, Council on Foreign Relations, New York.

Nils Anderson, Jr., President, Devevoise-Anderson Co., New York.

Paul B. Anderson, Consultant on Eastern Europe to The Executive Council of the Episcopal Church and N.C.C., New York.

F. K. Arthur, Jr., Publisher, Monterey *Peninsula Herald*, California.

R. W. Askanase, Chairman, Dunhill International, Inc., Houston.

Emile Benoit, Professor of International Business, Columbia University.

Meyer Bernstein, International Affairs Director, United Steelworkers of America, Washington, D.C.

Thomas C. Bostic, President, Cascade Broadcasting Co., Yakima, Washington.

Lawrence Broadwell, Harriman Scholar, Columbia University.

R. V. Burks, Professor of History, Wayne State University.

Robert F. Byrnes, Director, International Affairs Center, Indiana University.

John C. Campbell, Council on Foreign Relations, New York.

Jeffery Cohelan, Representative from California, Congress of the United States.

Guy Coriden, Deputy Director, Office of European Programs, Bureau of Educational & Cultural Affairs, Department of State.

Alexander Dallin, Adlai E. Stevenson Professor of International Relations, Columbia University.

Richard T. Davies, Assistant Director (Soviet Union and Eastern Europe) U.S. Information Agency.

Vera Micheles Dean, Professor of International Development, New York University.

Rev. William H. Dickinson, Highland Park Methodist Church, Dallas.

Dudley P. Digges, *The Sun*, Baltimore.

Walter Dowling, Director General, The Atlantic Institute, Paris.

John B. Fisher, Consultant to Congress, Washington, D.C.

Julius Fleischmann, Chairman, Fleischmann Foundation, Cincinnati.

Walter Friedenberg, Scripps-Howard Newspaper Alliance, Washington, D.C.

A. R. Gale, President, International Business Development Co., Cleveland.

Richard N. Gardner, Henry L. Moses Professor of Law and International Organization, Columbia University.

George Garvy, Economic Adviser, Federal Reserve Bank, New York.

Stanley T. Gordon, International Affairs Program, The Ford Foundation, New York.

James Gould, Foreign Area Fellowship Program, New York.

David L. Guyer, Vice President, Institute of International Education, New York.

W. Averell Harriman, United States Ambassador at Large.

Milan Herzog, Vice President, Encyclopaedia Britannica, Educational Corporation, Chicago.

Paul M. Herzog, President, Salzburg Seminar in American Studies, Austria.

George W. Hoffman, Professor of Geography, University of Texas.

Norman O. Houston, Chairman, Golden State Mutual Life Insurance Co., Los Angeles.

James Kagen, Harriman Scholar, Columbia University.

Stephen D. Kertesz, Professor of Government, Notre Dame University.

William R. Kintner, Deputy Director, Foreign Policy Research Institute, Philadelphia.

Allan B. Kline, Western Springs, Illinois.

Josef Korbel, Dean, Graduate School of Internatioanl Studies, University of Denver.

Tom Lilley, Director, Export-Import Bank of Washington.

G. A. Lincoln, Colonel, USA, Chairman, Department of Social Sciences, United States Military Academy, West Point.

Raymond E. Lisle, Director, Eastern European Affairs, Department of State.

K. L. London, Director, Institute for Sino-Soviet Studies, The George Washington University.

Richard B. Lynch, Rear Admiral USN, Chief, European Division, Plans and Policy, Joint Staff, Department of Defense.

Edwin A. Malloy, President, Fred F. French Investing Co., New York.

Philip Mosley, Professor of International Relations, Columbia University.

Zygmunt Nagorski, Foreign Policy Association, New York.

I. A. Oehler, President, The American Welding & Manufacturing Co., Warren, Ohio.

Christopher H. Phillips, President, U.S. Council, International Chamber of Commerce, New York.

Frederick A. Praeger, Publisher, New York.

John Richardson, Jr., President, Free Europe, Inc., New York.

Scovel Richardson, Judge, United States Customs Court, New York.

James Q. Riordan, President, Mobil Oil Corporation International, New York.

Hugh J. Rosellini, Judge, Supreme Court, State of Washington, Olympia.

Alvin Rubinstein, Professor of Political Science, University of Pennsylvania.

Howland H. Sargeant, President, Radio Liberty Committee, New York.

Albert J. Schmidt, Chairman, Department of History, University of Bridgeport.

Harry Schwartz, Editorial Board, The New York Times.

Marshall D. Shulman, Professor of International Politics, Fletcher School of Law & Diplomacy, Tufts University.

Sister Mary Grace, C.S.C., President, St. Mary's College.

J. E. Slater, Program Officer in Charge of International Relations, The Ford Foundation.

Philip Sporn, Chairman, Systems Development Committee, American Electric Power Co., New York.

Irving Stone, Author, Beverly Hills.

Shepard Stone, Advisor on International Activities, The Ford Foundation.

Theodore C. Streibert, Executive Secretary, Citizens Committee for Higher Education in New Jersey, Princeton.

Theodore L. Thau, Executive Secretary, Committee on Export Policy, U.S. Department of Commerce.

Kenneth W. Thompson, Vice President, The Rockefeller Foundation, New York.

Edward Vernoff, Harriman Scholar, Columbia University.

A. G. Ward, Admiral, USN, United States Representative, Military Committee, North Atlantic Treaty Organization, Washington, D.C.

Watson W. Wise, W. W. Wise Drilling Co., Tyler, Texas.

Aid in Fighting Urban Blight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 16, 1967

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, the complex problems confronting urban America can only be solved by the coordinated effort of Federal, State, and local government and the private sector of the economy. I am proud to report that the financial institutions and business firms of Cleveland realize the necessity of their participation in improving the housing situation in our city.

Upon leave granted, I insert the editorial from the Cleveland Plain Dealer of August 10, 1967:

WELCOME AID IN FIGHT ON BLIGHT

The fight against urban blight has gained powerful allies in Cleveland.

All within a period of 48 hours, a group of important financial institutions and a group of other and equally important business firms have committed themselves separately to the idea that their resources, too, are needed in the battle to save deteriorating parts of the city.

To this end, each group has revolving loan funds to be administered on a nonprofit basis.

The banks—Central National, Cleveland Trust, National City, Society National and Union Commerce—have jointly and initially pledged their talents and more than $250,000 in cash to an effort which at first will concentrate on buying and rehabilitating Hough area apartment properties.

Later the project will be expanded to include construction of new housing in line with the areawide renewal program.

The banks see their venture as one benefiting more than the properties acquired and improved. Their estimate that it will provide reassurance for neighboring homeowners and stimulate individual residents' efforts to fight decay is certainly one based on a sound appraisal.

The banks' enlightened view obviously is shared by the six business firms—Clevite Corp., East Ohio Gas Co., E. F. Hauserman Co., Midland-Ross Corp., Republic Steel Corp., and Warner & Swasey Co.—which two days ago committed $150,000 to the task of rehabilitating deteriorating neighborhoods.

This revolving fund is broad enough in scope to include both residential and commercial property. It is flexible enough to guarantee home improvement loans for individuals as well as provide seed money for projects undertaken by organized groups. Also, the fund itself may conduct demonstration renovation projects.

Primary target for use of the six businesses' fund will be the Mount Pleasant area. In time it aims to make its help available to Glenville and other areas in need of relief and rescue.

In terms of dollars, the initial commitments of the two revolving funds to the enormous task of community rebuilding are modest.

They represent, however, a substantial expression of confidence in the future of the city and its people.

What the People Want

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DELBERT L. LATTA
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 16, 1967

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, Mr. David Lawrence has written a column entitled "What the People Want," and it appears in the August 21 issue of U.S. News & World Report. I believe the Members should take the time to read this article and for their convenience, I am inserting it with these remarks.

The article follows:

WHAT THE PEOPLE WANT

(By David Lawrence)

The American people are dissatisfied today about many of the things the Government is doing or failing to do. They are writing to the members of the House of Representatives and the Senate an unusually large number of letters reflecting discontent.

What are the people saying? What do they want?

The people are tired of the state of fear and uneasiness which has enveloped them. Extremists in our midst, both whites and Negroes, have resorted to a process of intimidation and blackmail—euphemistically called "protests" and "demonstrations."

The people want the agencies of the Government, particularly the courts, to recognize the difference between "freedom of speech" and incitement to riot. Especially do they want to see more courage shown in high places in dealing with disorders.

The people are tired of the outbursts of violence—the killing and wounding of citizens across the land, the sniping and looting, the setting of fires which damage or destroy homes and places of business. Yet all this is, in effect, being condoned as the natural result of the failure to clean up slums in urban areas. Living conditions should, of course, be improved, but the people don't believe that criminals and disturbers of the peace should go unpunished.

The people are tired of reading what the Stokely Carmichaels say, whether in Cuba or in rallies in this country, as they openly preach rebellion. The people want to see such persons prosecuted. If existing laws are inadequate, the people want Congress to strengthen the statutes. Most of all they want to see the laws vigorously enforced.

The people are tired of political legerdemain. They are fed up with attempts to buy votes by giving public funds to politically motivated officials to distribute. They want, moreover, a better accounting of what is done with the tax revenues derived from their earnings. They want to know why Congress has not exercised a closer check on all Government spending.

The people are tired of seeing big deficits piled up year after year, as they are told that "deficit spending" can go on indefinitely and that confidence in the future of the dollar will still be preserved.

The people are tired of the floundering policies of the Administration in handling the Vietnam war. They are being told that military men who want to fight to win aren't being allowed to use maximum power to shorten the war. The people want their Government to employ in war every effective strategy, including the bombing of all enemy bases and supply lines as well as the blockading of all ports at which ships land war supplies for the armies of our adversaries.

The people are tired of reading that their money has been used to make loans to various governments to help them buy arms, and that now the same regimes which received such aid are turning away from the United States and lining up frequently with the Communist side in the U.N.

The people are tired of being told that the big deficits are due solely to the Vietnam war and that the country can also afford domestic spending on an unprecedented scale. Billions of dollars are being poured into many projects which could be deferred or at least managed more efficiently.

The people are complaining about the mail service. Business correspondence of importance is often delayed, and this causes financial loss. Despite the introduction of air mail, the delivery systems have been bogged down by poor management. Yet postage rates for letters are about to be increased.

The people do not like the rise in the cost of living. They cannot readily discern what increases in price are really necessary and what strikes for higher wages are merely the result of selfishness and the organized pressure of ambitious labor-union officials. They want the Government to face up courageously to the need for wage-and-price controls if voluntary restraints are not imposed. It is obvious that much could be accomplished if the influence of the Government were conscientiously applied and politics subordinated.

The people want a peaceful society, a decent society, a society in which a fair deal for everybody transcends political deals in the use of governmental power at the federal, State and local levels.

The people are not going to tire of writing to their elected representatives and telling them that persons in public office have a responsibility not just to factions and blocs, but to all segments of our society.

For—as has been said again and again—"you can fool all the people some of the time, and some of the people all the time, but you cannot fool all the people all of the time." The people are voicing their protests and will continue to do so. In a short time they will be expressing themselves at the polls. Citizens want above all else to be presented with a ballot on which the candidates of both parties are persons who possess courage, integrity and a conscience that overrides the temptations of self-serving politics.

Archie Moore—American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. RARICK
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 16, 1967

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, I know nothing of Archie Moore except, that from his remarks he loves his country and wants to praise, not destroy it.

I do not even know whether or not he is on the Federal payroll. I hope not—because his program will work if voluntarily done, individual to individual, without politics, fanfare, or taxpayers' money. We cannot do too much to help our youth—the strength, the future of the United States.

Under unanimous consent I follow my remarks with a story by Archie Moore, which appeared in the August 8 San Diego Union:

GUIDE OR MISGUIDE—ARCHIE MOORE POINTS WAY

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Archie Moore, internationally known San Diegoan and retired light heavyweight boxing champion of the world, told friends yesterday he feels that "everybody must take a stand in this time of internal crisis. A man who stands neutral stands for nothing." He then wrote the following statement and submitted it to The San Diego Union, which is printing it verbatim.)

(By Archie Moore)

The devil is at work in America, and it is up to us to drive him out. Snipers and looters, white or black, deserve no mercy. Those who would profit from their brother's misfortunes deserve no mercy, and those who would set fellow Americans upon each other deserve no mercy.

I'll fight the man who calls me an "Uncle Tom." I have broken bread with heads of state, chatted with presidents and traveled all over the world. I was born in a ghetto, but I refused to stay there. I am a Negro, and proud to be one. I am also an American, and I'm proud of that.

The young people of today think they have a hard lot. They should have been around in the '30s when I was coming up in St. Louis. We had no way to go, but a lot of us made it. I became light heavyweight champion of the world. A neighbor kid down the block, Clark Terry, became one of the most famous jazz musicians in the world. There were doctors, lawyers and chiefs who came out of that ghetto. One of the top policemen in St. Louis came from our neighborhood.

We made it because we had a goal, and we were willing to work for it. Don't talk to me of your "guaranteed national income." Any fool knows that this is insanity. Do we bring those who worked to get ahead down to the level of those who never gave a damn? The world owes nobody—black or white—a living. God helps the man who helps himself!

Now then, don't get the idea that I didn't grow up hating the injustices of this world. I am a staunch advocate of the Negro revolution for the good of mankind. I've seen almost unbelievable progress made in the last handful of years. Do we want to become wild beasts bent only on revenge, looting and killing and laying America bare? Hate is bait, bait for the simple-minded.

Sure, I despised the whites who cheated me, but I used that feeling to make me push on. If you listen to the professional rabble-rousers, adhere to this idea of giving up everything you've gained in order to revenge yourself for the wrongs that were done to you in the past—then you'd better watch your neighbor, because he'll be looting your house next. Law and order is the only edge we have. No man is an island.

Granted, the Negro still has a long way to go to gain a fair shake with the white man in this country. But believe this: if we resort to lawlessness, the only thing we can hope for is civil war, untold bloodshed, and the end of our dreams.

We have to have a meeting of qualified men of both races. Mind you, I said qualified men, not some punk kid, ranting the catch phrases put in his mouth by some paid hate-monger. There are forces in the world today, forces bent upon the destruction of America, your America and mine. And while we're on the subject, do you doubt for a minute that communism, world communism, isn't waiting with bated breath for the black and white Americans to turn on each other full force? Do you want a chance for life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness in the land of your birth, or do you want no chance at all under the Red heel?

AFRICA'S A GREAT PLACE TO VISIT

There are members of the black community who call for a separate nation within America. Well, I do not intend to give up one square inch of America. I'm not going to be told I must live in a restricted area. Isn't that what we've all been fighting to overcome? And then there is the element that calls for a return to Africa.

For my part, Africa is a great place to visit, but I wouldn't want to live there. If the Irishmen want to go back to the Emerald Isle, let them. If the Slavs want to return to the Iron Curtain area, OK by me. But I'm not going to go to any part of Africa to live. I'm proud of ancestry, and of the country that spawned my forefathers, but I'm not giving up my country. I fought all my life to give my children what I'm able to give them today; a chance for development as citizens in the greatest country in the world.

I do not for a moment think that any truly responsible Negro wants anarchy. I don't think you'll find intelligent—no, let's rephrase that—mature Negroes running wild in the streets or sniping at total strangers. God made the white man as well as the black. True, we haven't acted as brothers in the past, but we are brothers. If we're to be so many Cains and Abels, that's our choice. We can't blame God for it.

TEACH THAT "ANY BOY CAN"

Something must be done to reach the Negroes and the whites in the ghettos of this country, and I propose to do something.

As a matter of plain fact, I have been doing something for the past several years. I have been running a program which I call the ABC—Any Boy Can. By teaching our youth, black, white, yellow and red, what dignity is, what self respect is, what honor is, I have been able to obliterate juvenile delinquency in several areas.

I would now expand my program, change scope. If any boy can, surely any man can. I want to take teams of qualified people, top men in their fields, to the troubled areas of our cities. I know that the people who participated in the recent riots, who are participating and who will participate, are misguided rather than mad.

If some bigot can misguide, then I can guide. I've spent too much of my life building what I've got to put it to torch just to satisfy some ancient hatred of a man who beat my grandfather. Those men are long dead. Do we have to choke what could be a beautiful garden with weeds of hate? I say NO! And I stand ready to start "Operation Gardener." I invite the respected Negro leaders of our country to join me.

Our Maligned National Guard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 16, 1967

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, on Monday of this week I commented on the floor of the House about the hasty and ill-advised report of the President's Commission on Civil Disorders on the participation of the National Guard in recent riots.

With further reference to the position I took at that time I would like to call the attention of the House to a feature article in the Detroit News, Sunday, August 13, 1967.

The article, entitled "Our Maligned National Guard," was written by Edwin G. Pipp, Detroit News reporter, who is a lieutenant colonel in the Michigan Air National Guard and a combat-qualified jet reconnaissance pilot. He became a guardsman in 1940 and served as a bomber pilot in Europe during World War II.

The article follows:

(By Edwin G. Pipp)

They were with Washington when he crossed the Delaware.

During the Civil War they fought for both the Union Army and the Confederate Army.

They died in the trenches during World War I, on Pacific islands and European streets during World War II, and in the rice paddies of Korea.

They helped keep the peace during the Berlin crisis and were ready for quick action when Communist rockets were discovered on Cuba.

More recently they helped stop riots in Newark and Detroit.

This is the National Guard which despite its long service to the United States is the most misunderstood military organization in recent history.

Some people think of guardsmen as strikebreakers. Others describe them as "weekend soldiers." More recently the guard has been called a haven for draft dodgers.

The fact is that the guard has served honorably to keep the peace during violent labor strikes, helped stricken areas hit by hurricanes and floods, quelled riots and in almost every war fought side by side with the regular Army and, more recently, the Air Force.

Confusion comes because of the guard's mixed responsibilities and because its members are primarily civilians.

The National Guard has two missions and two commanders-in-chief.

Today every state has an Army and Air National Guard. Their first commander is the governor. He can use them as he sees fit to maintain order within the state.

In a national emergency their other commander, the President of the United States, can call them to duty to become part of the nation's regular military establishment.

In the last two decades this second mission has become more important than the first.

Guard units were first organized to protect their communities. They came into being before the American Revolution and were known as the militia, organized to protect communities from Indians and thieves.

During the Revolutionary War they were dubbed "Minutemen," for their swift action when danger threatened.

It was the militia that Paul Revere summoned to arms on his midnight ride. At that time there was little or no pay and every man furnished his own arms, transportation and often meals.

This militia formed a major part of the army that fought for America's independence.

After the war of Independence it was the militia, again on a volunteer basis, that was the main military force of the new nation that could not afford its own army and did not want an army that might assume control of the government.

The name "National Guard" began to replace "militia" in 1824. On the occasion of the farewell visit of the Marquis de Lafayette that year, New York's militia adopted the name "7th Regiment National Guard of New York" in honor of the National Guard Lafayette had led during the French Revolution.

As the need for a force to protect communities diminished, the guard became part of community activities with influential citizens forming and outfitting their own units.

In the Mexican War of 1848 these regiments volunteered for service by being sworn in en masse as "U.S. Volunteers" to serve as the President directed.

During the Civil War the guard units remained loyal to their own states and at times were in battle against each other.

Up to this time the National Guard was loosely knit and often poorly trained. However, 216,225 guardsmen served in the Spanish-American War and 170,000 in the Mexican Border Campaign.

In 1903 federal legislation provided funds and a detail of regular Army officers to serve as instructors for the state forces.

Federal support and supervision has proved profitable during both World Wars and in Korea where National Guard troops fought in some of the biggest battles.

Today the Army Guard's strength is nearly 421,000 men and officers. The air arm is another 80,000. Federal budget for the combined operation is $901 million.

It is estimated that this is only a third of the cost that would be required if a similar force were on continuous active duty.

The overall guard operation is directed by the National Guard Bureau in the Pentagon. This force of nearly 100 officers and men on full-time duty, plus more than 200 civilians, coordinates the regular Army and Air Force with the state forces.

Each state has an adjutant general, plus a small staff, to direct operations within the state. Maj. Gen. Clarence C. Schnipke is the Michigan adjutant general. His assistant for air is Brig. Gen. John A. Johnston. His Army assistant is Brig. Gen. Carson R. Neifert.

On full-time duty are a total of 1,035 persons who maintain 45 armories or air guard facilities around the state. These are guardsmen who receive pay at a civilian rate, rather than military, for the jobs they perform.

The Michigan guard has 12,000 members with 2,000 of these in the air arm.

The guardsmen leave civilian life usually one weekend a month and for 15 days in summer for scheduled training.

During this time their pay equals that of a regular of similar rank. A guardsman does not receive any of the regular Army side benefits, such as hospitalization, post exchange and quarters.

Average pay for guardsmen on riot duty was less than $10 a day.

They do receive uniforms and other personal equipment for use during their training period.

Recently there have been charges that the guard is a home for draft dodgers. Every guard unit has long waiting lists of men seeking to join, and some of draft age have joined the guard to escape years of active duty service. But in doing so they take on a six-year obligation, and failure to meet guard requirements means immediate drafting into regular service.

Men without prior service going into the guard now must spend a minimum of four months on active duty, with six months often the case. They first get six weeks of general military training. The remaining time is spent learning their specific job. Often this is done at regular service schools.

What about the guardsmen with prior military service, or those old enough so the draft can't touch them? Why do they continue in service?

This question puzzles military historians as evidenced by the quotation from the book, "The Modern Army and Air National Guard":

"As one military historian puts it: 'To layman and military professional alike, the pleasure derived by the guardsman from hard and unrequited labor does not make sense.' This historian quotes another eminent military writer who says that the volunteer spirit 'defiles logic,' and he draws the conclusion that only guardsmen can understand the guard."

The guard is a 100 percent volunteer organization. Its members range from business executives to production workers and clerks.

Training of some ground and air units has been accelerated in the last two years to provide a force that can be mobilized and committed to action in a matter of day or hours. Earlier plans called for months of training after a unit was called to duty.

One unit of the Michigan Air National Guard—the 191st Tactical Reconnaissance Group at Detroit Metropolitan Airport—is an example.

Within the past two years it has been brought to full strength and sufficient funds authorized so that its members can receive more than the normal amount of training. Equipment is on the base and its men trained for a quick move any place in the world on only a few hours notice.

All of its men and officers are required to give the same performance as the regulars. Pilots must fly the same number of hours and perform the same training missions as regular Air Force fliers with the same duty.

Most of this is accomplished during the guardsman's time away from his civilian job.

Once a year, without notice, a regular Air Force team of as many as 40 men, report at the base to check on the ability of the unit to perform. If they fail in any area, a report is written, another no-notice inspection comes and the improvement noted.

The Michigan unit has not yet failed one of these Operational Readiness Inspections.

Ground units earmarked for quick action get similar tests.

This is the national side of the National Guard picture.

Guardsmen also must be ready for state duty.

The recent Detroit riot is an example of units being called to duty by both state and federal governments.

During the first day of rioting Gov. Romney called the Michigan 46th Infantry Division to duty. Then he requested help from federal troops.

President Johnson sent paratroopers to Detroit and at the same time federalized all Michigan guardsmen, including the Air National Guard. This took the guard out of state control and put it under the regular Army officer commanding the military forces in Detroit.

The Air Guard, which had spent all its time training for aerial photographic missions, had 850 men on Detroit riot duty.

The Army guard, which has been criticized for some of its riot actions, also was fighting a war in which it had little or no prior training.

In addition, the guardsmen were handicapped in using what training they had received because they were assigned to the Detroit Police Department and split up into small groups rather than operating as units.

This year the Michigan budget for the guard was $2.7 million. Pay for the riot duty increased it $450,000. In addition, the federal government will pay guardsmen another $850,000 for their active duty.

There is continuing criticism that guard officers are politically controlled and this effects the organization's effectiveness. Politics does play a part in the National Guard, just as it did in the formation of the militia and the appointment of its commanders.

Top guard officials in all states are appointed by the governor. But before they can assume command they must be approved by a board of regular Army or Air Force officvers. They won't pass this board unless they have proper military experience for the job.

State officials have resisted all attempts to abolish the Air National Guard. They argue that it is a trained force the state can use and a national asset in time of emergency.

Because of the worldwide commitments of the Air Force, coupled with the Vietnam War, it is no secret that the tactical units of the guard are the nation's reserve. As Pentagon officials often point out: the regular establishment is spread too thin.

And the regulars would like to see the ground guard on active duty. Vietnam is the first major conflict in which guard units have not taken a part.

But the political repercussions of calling up the guard, plus the need for a strong reserve force at home has kept the guard from being called.

Now the city riots of this summer have given the guard a new mission, and a more compelling reason for keeping them off active duty with the regulars.

Beloved Oklahoman Josh Lee Is Mourned by the Nation

SPEECH

OF

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 14, 1967

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, the entire Nation mourns the passing of one of Oklahoma's most eloquent and beloved statesmen, the Honorable Josh Lee.

Both in the House of Representatives and in the Senate, and also as an able member of the Civil Aeronautics Board, Josh Lee commanded attention and won respect as a dedicated public servant and leader.

One of the finest public speakers of this century, Josh Lee was a master of gentle humor and effective rhetoric. He was also one of the Democratic Party's most articulate spokesmen during the New Deal period which brought many legislative gains to the people.

Josh Lee will be mourned by many Americans who admired him and respected him as a fine public servant.

I will mourn him, Mr. Speaker, as a good friend and able champion of our State, who made a significant contribution to good government in his lifetime. My deepest sympathy goes to his family in their hour of grief.

Big Jolt for ADC Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 16, 1967

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

[From the Plain Dealer, Aug. 15, 1967]

BIG JOLT FOR ADC PROGRAM

A shakeup of earthquake magnitude is rumbling toward welfare families on ADC (aid to families with dependent children).

This earthquake is being built into the 1967 social security amendments by the House Ways and Means Committee.

Under the guidance of the chairman, Rep. Wilbur D. Mills, D-Ark., something new is being added: Compulsion.

If the bill is passed as now written, every state would have to—

Size up every ADC family to see if its adults and out-of-school youth are employable.

Offer work experience and training to ADC employables.

Set up day care facilities for children, freeing mothers for work or work training.

Act to place neglected children in foster homes.

Offer family planning—birth control—service to mothers.

Let the earners keep the first $30 per month earned plus one-third of everything else earned without deducting from the welfare check—up to the point where they rise above the poverty mark.

Track down deserting fathers and start a program to reduce illegitimacy.

Compulsion would also bear down on the ADC family members. They would have to participate, accept work or work training, and cooperate on all the rest of the state's program. Otherwise—no welfare checks.

Compulsion is a horror word in the vocabularies of most welfare professionals.

But most welfare professionals would gladly approve the Mills bill if welfare recipients were not told to shape up or starve.

The Mills bill draws a great deal of its justification from the excellent and successful program of work experience and training demonstrated here in Cuyahoga County.

Under Title V of the Economic Opportunity Act, led by Eugene Burns, county welfare director, heads of welfare families have been given schooling, work tryouts, training, job guidance, child day care, job placement and casework help and encouragement just as the Mills bill plots it.

Burns' testimony in Washington, and that of his associate, Stephen Minter, showed how 1,100 welfare adults at a time can be helped into independence or a long way toward it.

This Title V program didn't need compulsion. It managed with something just short of it: persuasion and available services which really solve the welfare parent's problems.

Many states will need the compulsion applying to them. Otherwise, they will not set up the facilities or go into the full casework approach contemplated in the bill. The states can stand it.

But the threat of dropping a family off the rolls is too harsh. Most of the victims of this punishment are children. Life on ADC is harsh enough without adding the fear of starvation.

Thurgood Marshall—Ignorance Is Bliss

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. RARICK
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 16, 1967

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the rubber-stamp approval of Thurgood Marshall to the Supreme Court by the liberal apparatus contributes one additional vote to the revolutionary judicial arm of our Government which continues its public image of being anti everything American.

We can expect Marshall's contribution to be in the Warren style—without law. They cannot find the law; it is hidden in the law books.

One more appointed judge with one more vote, but millions of Americans will suffer this day forward because of a loyalty to party and philosophy confirmation.

I insert the report which appeared in the Commercial Appeal on August 13, 1967, of Prof. Alfred Avins, professor of law at MSU, at this point in the Record:

The Supreme Court: Marshall's Base Is Shaky

(By Alfred Avins)

The hearings on the nomination of Thurgood Marshall to be a justice of the United States Supreme Court have now drawn to a close. If they have proved nothing else, they have proved that if ignorance is a qualification for being a justice of the United States Supreme Court, then Marshall is the best qualified nominee in the history of the United States.

First, under questioning by Senators McClellan of Arkansas and Ervin of North Carolina, Marshall, instead of answering questions about his philosophy of the Fifth Amendment virtually took the Fifth Amendment and refused to answer. He said that he might have to decide on some of these points as a justice. Of course, these senators pointed out that this theory applied to all parts of the Constitution, which meant that Marshall could refuse to answer anything which had any contemporary relevance. This is in fact what his position was. The wall of silence precluded inquiry into his constitutional philosophy.

But Senator Thurmond's questioning was so telling that it nettled the Times and Washington Post, both liberal beacons, into unrestrained fury. Thurmond reasoned that learning was an important qualification for the highest court. Most lawyers have a general practice, and cannot be expected to have an expert knowledge of any area of the law.

However, between the time of Marshall's admission to the bar in 1933 and his appointment, as a Federal judge in 1961, he was engaged almost exclusively as NAACP counsel in arguing cases under the 13th, 14th and 15th Amendments, which pertain to Negro rights.

Having specialized in these areas to the exclusion of everything else, it was reasoned that if Marshall did not know the law in the areas of his specialty, he could hardly be expected to know much of any other branches of the law, or have the intellectual capacity to learn it.

Hence, some elementary history of these amendments was prepared, and Thurmond read 50 of these to Marshall. Within the hearing of this commentator, Marshall had to reply that he did not know the answers to almost all of them. The questions were more simple than an examination this writer gave last spring in the same area to a group of second and third year law students, all or whom passed.

The nadir came when Marshall's argument in Katzenbach v. Morgan was quoted to him. He had said: "I don't believe I remember a single one of the cases that interpreted the Fourteenth Amendment from Slaughterhouse through Plessy v. Ferguson that have had anything to say about the Chinese in San Francisco. To the contrary, this court says over and over again what the purpose of the equal protection clause was for—to protect the newly freed slaves."

Marshall was asked whether he still agreed with this statement and he said that he did. In fact, the very first case interpreting the Equal Protection Clause was Yick Wo v. Hopkins, an 1886 case about the right of Chinese in San Francisco to operate laundries.

This is a leading case known to law students as soon as they complete a course in Constitutional Law, and it is unbelievable that the solicitor-general of the United States who has specialized in the 14th Amendment for his whole life as a lawyer should never have heard of it. That a Supreme Court nominee should not have heard of this case (not to mention several other Chinese laundry cases) is incredible.

Nevertheless, the liberal senators dutifully read prepared statements saying that they were satisfied with Marshall's qualifications and would vote for his confirmation. The New York Times editorialized that the questioning was a "farce," but the only farce will be a rubber-stamp confirmation which adds ignorance to the highest court of the land.

Farm Prices Collapse—Costs Move Up

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS S. KLEPPE
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 16, 1967

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, the further collapse of wheat and other grain prices this week calls for immediate, positive steps by the administration to strengthen agricultural income. I have prepared the following remarks on this subject for release tomorrow:

Washington, D.C.—Rep. Tom Kleppe (R.-N.D.) today accused the Johnson Administration of "looking the other way while the bottom drops out of the U.S. grain market."

"The long, downward slide in farm prices, which began nearly a year ago, hit disaster levels this week with a further wide open break in the wheat and feed grain markets," Kleppe said.

"Hard spring wheat produced in North Dakota and other Northern Plains states is down nearly 30 cents a bushel from a year ago. Kansas City wheat is off 40 cents. Chicago wheat is down about 45 cents from last August. Corn is off 30 cents, which means that Midwestern farmers will market their 1967 record-breaking crop at less than a dollar a bushel. Soybeans, which brought $3.81 a bushel in Chicago a year ago, are now bringing $2.76—more than a dollar down.

"Meanwhile, farm operating costs reach new peaks every month. They will jump further when the 3 per cent railroad freight increases become effective August 19. You would have to go back to the 1930's to find a comparable cost-price squeeze.

"The Administration appears to be so preoccupied with the war in Vietnam and the riots in the cities that it doesn't seem to know, much less care, about what is happening to the agricultural economy. I strongly urge both the President and his Secretary of Agriculture to exercise immediately the administrative authority they already have to:

1. "Freeze completely present stocks of wheat, feed grains and other storable commodities in CCC inventory and at the same time increase the resale price on these holdings from the present 115% of the loan to at least 135%, plus carrying charges.

2. "Step up lagging shipments of grain to needy countries under the 'Food for Peace' program. Wheat and flour exports from the United States dropped from 859 million bushels in the 1965–66 crop year to 733 million in the crop year ending last June 30. Since July 1, wheat and flour exports totaled only 69 million bushels against 102 million for the same 1966 period. Wheat sales for foreign currencies under P.L. 480 are running nearly 50% under a year ago.

3. "Increase the government loan rate on storable farm commodities by 12½ per cent which would be in line with the proposed inflation 'catch up' raise for Social Security recipients.

"These steps would reverse the disastrous drop in farm prices overnight. They would do infinitely more to increase grain prices than the proposed Administration 'stockpiling' bill now before the House Agriculture Committee. This measure has the fatal defect of permitting the government to dump its acquired stocks back into the market at the first faint sign of higher prices.

"There is one thing farmers can do for themselves. They can refuse to sell their grains at prevailing firesale prices. They can utilize the farm storage loan program to the maximum extent. This I hope and believe they will do."

The 90th Congress Tarnished by Vote Against Rat Control Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 16, 1967

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, the recent defeat of President Johnson's rat control legislation has cast an unhealthy pale over the 90th Congress. Rarely have we seen an outpouring of sentiment against a single congressional action as we have seen over this vote.

Some, undoubtedly, grounded their negative votes on substantive objections. For example, it was argued that rats were exclusively a matter of local concern and thus there was no rationale for Federal intervention. Others argued that Congress could not afford $40 million for another domestic program because of our rising national expenditures. These Members I prefer to view as merely being misguided and misinformed.

However, I have no tolerance nor any excuses for those who coupled their negative vote with jokes. To those, rats were a very funny issue. But to me and quite evidently to millions of Americans, these jokes were, at best, bad taste and at worse, very sick.

A recent editorial so cogently put the issue in perspective:

The jokes added insult to injury. And in the meantime, the rats still are among us—not only in the reservoir of the slums but in the suburbs and on the farms. The matter should and will come up again. But next time, please, without the comedy.

Should any doubt the reaction of the American people to this issue, I call their attention to four sample editorials. Read the Kansas City Star, the News American, the Detroit News, and Cleveland Plain Dealer and read them carefully—perhaps it is not as funny as some imagined.

At this time I insert these editorials in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

[From the Kansas City (Kans.) Star, Aug. 1, 1967]

Nothing Funny About Rats in Slums

It can be debated, we suppose, whether the administration's 40-million-dollar rat control bill was in the best possible form. But is shouldn't have been debated with the snickering ridicule that some members of the House of Representatives employed to defeat the measure. Rats aren't funny. Rats are ugly. In the slums, rats are a particularly ugly reality. They bite babies, chew up food and spread disease.

On the floor of the House there was much talk of a "civil rats bill," the purchase of "federal cats" and the establishment of a "high commissioner of rats." Most of the laughing stopped when Rep. Martha W. Griffiths (D-Mich.) said that "rats are a living cargo of death and you think it's funny. . . ."

But the House went on to defeat a resolution that would have let the measure come up for formal debate and action. The President, and others, have asked that the matter be reconsidered.

Apparently there were legitimate grounds for questioning the bill as it stood. Some objected that rat control should not be an isolated project; that it ought to have been considered as part of other federal block grants for health, or be included in poverty legislation, or that it was too restrictive, or that it was too much money or not enough money, or that it was a local responsibility.

The net result was enough dissenting votes—for various reasons—to put the bill down. But the jokes added insult to injury. And in the meantime, the rats still are among us—not only in the reservoir of the slums but in the suburbs and on the farms. The matter should and will come up again. But next time, please, without the comedy.

[From the Plain Dealer, Aug. 2, 1967]

Cities Must Step up Rat War

Whatever the final result of renewed efforts to get rat control legislation through Congress, Cleveland and many other cities now should be working on their own to expand whatever modest eradication and education programs they have in operation.

The problem of what to do about the growing rat menace to health and property cannot be laughed off in urban areas as it was laughed off recently in the U.S. House of Representatives.

Until the national legislators become sober about this deadly serious matter, as they someday must, the cities will have to go it alone in stepping up the pace of the rat war. Local agencies must do their inadequate best where federal assistance has been denied.

Aware of this reality, the state government of New York this week pledged $4.5 million a year beginning immediately for a total war on rats. More than half of the annual outlays will go to New York City. At such time as federal rat control aid becomes available, the state plans to reduce its spending to the extent of federal funds received.

The action by New York's governor and legislative leaders from both political parties to commit such a generous amount of state resources to city wars on rats is laudable. The action recognizes that the cities cannot do an effective job without strong financial help, and that Congress has been remiss in its duty to assist.

In Cleveland, a pilot rat extermination program begun last October in the Hough area has shown some good results. The work was supported by the Rotary Club of Cleveland which provided $4,300 worth of supplies and equipment.

Now the 20 workers of the city's Bureau of Neighborhood Conservation have carried the battle into other neighborhoods with a $100,000 budget lift from the Public Health and Welfare Department.

What is going on and what has gone on here in the war on rats still represents only a small effort.

Focus on Cleveland's rat problem was brought about by a U.S. Public Health Service survey in 1961–62. That survey found rat infestation in all 33 city wards and set rat damage to property alone at $4 million a year.

Recent House of Representatives action to the contrary, there is nothing humorous in these figures. Cleveland and other cities needed the great help offered by the $40 million rat control program which the representatives on July 20 so laughingly refused to call up even for consideration.

Until that needed help is forthcoming, either through reconsideration of the defeated House measure, through adoption of a Senate housing bill containing a section on rat control or through a Senate amendment to the House-passed antiriot bill, the local efforts must be continued and expanded.

[From the Detroit (Mich.) News, Aug. 8, 1967]

Congress and the Rats: A Report on Ohio Study

Congress had an almost hilarious day in voting down a rat control bill. There were jibes at the Great Society, which wanted to exterminate rats in slums.

New York's Gov. Rockefeller, who assuredly was not behind the door when brains and common sense were passed out, has now announced New York State will have rat extermination. Gov. Rockefeller knows that it is not funny to slum residents to have their babies or their sick and feeble bitten and disfigured by rats, or to become sick from diseases rats bring.

If the Congress had not been so amused about the very idea of bothering about rat control, it would have looked into the report of the hearings held by the U.S. Commission on April 7, at Cleveland.

There was an investigation of the slum housing—with the usual reports. City inspectors admitted the housing was substandard, unfit for human occupation, but they were short of inspectors, the laws were lax, and so on.

The next witness, Clyde F. Fehn, sanitary engineer with the U.S. Public Health Center, was sworn. His experience covered, he said, 24 years.

Fehn was asked whether, in 1961, the U.S. Public Health Department had been asked by the City Council of Cleveland and the Ohio Department of Health to make a study of rat problems and associated refuse conditions in Cleveland.

His answer was yes. He was asked if the study had been made and if it had been under his supervision. His answers were in the affirmative.

Fehn was handed the report. He identified it. He was asked to summarize its findings.

"We found," he said, "that of 25,000 premises inspected, there were about 7,500 of these with rats on the premises. About 14,000 of these 25,000 had refuse storage deficiencies. We found that there were many residents who did not put garbage in the garbage can and just threw it into the yard, giving food to rats. We found that many of the citizens had lumber, debris and junk in the yards which would provide a home for rats . . . In other words . . . there were a lot of rats."

Fehn was then asked if photographs had been made. They had been made and were shown. The pictures showed very bad conditions. Garbage was not being adequately collected. Many business houses had too few cans. There were pictures showing places where rats were coming into homes.

"We know," said the witness, "there are hundreds, even thousands, of houses that have rats in them. In this day and age I think that is terrible . . ."

Fehn testified that a survey made again in 1966 showed there had been "a very serious deterioration in human behavioral patterns and attitudes. Drastic action is going to have to be made to reverse these," he said.

Fehn recommended larger containers instead of small, battered, uncovered cans, twice a week refuse collection, twice a week garbage collection, and funds for an attack on rats and for educational instruction about rats.

He was followed by Witness William F. Murphy, head of Cleveland's Food and Drug Administration. He said the city council had not adopted the twice-a-week pickup service. He testified that perhaps 60 or 70 rat bites of children had been reported . . . many go unreported.

He was asked about diseases caused by rats.

"There are many diseases," he said, "rabies, trichnosis, various food poisoning bacteria, rat-bite fever, plague, cholera—it is almost limitless . . ."

There was more testimony.

It does not make for humorous reading. But the Congress was amused by the rat extermination bill and killed it. Presumably it did not wish to pamper people.

[From the News American, Aug. 7, 1967]

White House Says Congress May Reconsider Rat Bill

(By Catherine Mackin)

WASHINGTON, Aug. 7.—The rat extermination act, which the House recently killed in a controversial debate, probably will be reconsidered and enacted into law next month, White House officials said today.

The White House is focusing its hopes on the Senate where comparatively little opposition is expected. In the Senate, the $20 million rat proposal will be handled as only one of many amendments in the Administration's big $2.5 billion housing bill, rather than as a separate bill which was the case in the House.

To get the rat proposal through the Administration also is counting on a change of heart among some congressmen. The White House now feels that enough House votes to make the difference can be counted.

The Administration's strategy for success revolves around a House-Senate conference on the overall housing bill. Conferences are standard procedure for working out differences between House and Senate versions of the same law.

If all goes according to plan, Senate Democrats will propose in conference that the rat proposal be kept in the 1967 Omnibus Housing Amendments and the House conferees will accept their proposal.

Technicaly, House members could instruct their conferees to forbid inclusion of the rat measure but such action is not now anticipated.

The Administration's new strategy, it is believed, involves considerable less gamble than the first one tried. There is some risk of criticism for "rewarding rioters." But, if congressional mail is any measure, not even this will happen. Mail is running in favor of the rat extermination proposal.

Chastened by its crushing, even shocking, House defeat the first time around, the White House freely admits its poor judgment.

Along with some House members, the Administration thought it a good idea to remove the rat proposal from the enormously complex housing bill and send it to the floor as a separate bill. As such, the rat bill became one of few new bills offered this year by the President.

The reasoning invoved was related to summer unrest in the big cities. The bill's passage would have given President Johnson something to hold out as still another effort he was making to help poor, underprivileged ghetto inhabitants.

Not only did the strategy backfire, it backfired with a big bang. The House discussion—technically, the House only debated whether it would rebate the rat bill—was cutting and sarcastic and filled with cynical "jokes" about having "a high commissioner of rats" and "rat patronage."

The House action, which occurred just after the Newark riot and right before Detroit erupted, made nationwide headlines.

To the surprise of some congressmen, their mail now is showing considerable sympathy among voters of all colors for exterminating rats wherever they might be but, especially, in ghettos.

He Goes Where the Action Is

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. E. (BILL) BROCK

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 16, 1967

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, a hometown friend of mine, Tom Sturdivant, is a sergeant serving his second tour in Vietnam. He has an excellent record in the Army, reflected in a number of impressive medals and commendations. A courageous American, his attitude is best summed up in his own words. When asked why he volunteered for 2½ years of hazardous duty in Vietnam, Sergeant Sturdivant replied, "I know I can serve my country better over there."

Mr. Speaker, believing Sergeant Sturdivant's career to be an inspiration to all of us, I insert an article by Mr. Gene Roberts in the August 9 Chattanooga Times, entitled "He Goes Where the Action Is," in the Appendix of the RECORD:

HE GOES WHERE THE ACTION IS

(By Gene Roberts)

Sgt. Tom Sturdivant is a career soldier, a native Chattanoogan, the winner of a chest full of medals including the Air Medal, Bronze Star and Purple Heart, and an immediately likable man.

He is taking 30 days off from the war in Vietnam owing to a death in his family. Although the circumstances are tragic, the rest is well-earned. In December, Sgt. Sturdivant will have completed a second year of duty in Vietnam. He volunteered for both tours and he plans to volunteer for an additional six months at the end of this one.

"I guess that's about enough time over there," he said, "I don't want to press my luck too far."

Sgt. Sturdivant is a master jumper, a parachutist with 236 jumps to his credit. He was the third man out the airplane door last Feb. 22 when American paratroopers made their first combat jump in 15 years.

His unit parachuted to positions near the Cambodian border to cut off an enemy force. "Gen. (John R.) Deane was the first man out the door. Col. (Robert) Sigholtz was next, and I followed him," the sergeant told me proudly.

The sergeant's assignment in Vietnam is that of a forward observer. His job is to call in artillery strikes on enemy positions. Before he left Vietnam the last week in July he had become the chief forward observer for the 173rd Airborne Brigade, a job which keeps him at Gen. Deane's side much of the time.

Obviously being at Gen. Deane's side is not a safe assignment, but it is perhaps not so hazardous as accompanying infantry units on search and destroy operations which Sgt. Sturdivant did for a year and a half. He still flies helicopter missions to spot the enemy; he has in fact more than 100 aerial sorties over hostile territory to his credit.

Most of his time in Vietnam has been spent on the ground, however, and he takes great satisfaction in the fact that no company he has served with has been ambushed. "The forward observer," he said, should be able to spot likely ambush sites and feel them out with artillery before the infantry goes through. A couple of artillery shells don't cost much, and they can save a lot of lives. Don't many come out of those ambushes."

His most harrowing moment in Vietnam was finding himself in a cave with a Viet Cong who was preparing to throw a grenade at him. His M-16 rifle was faster than the enemy's pitch in that instance, but later he wasn't so lucky. An unseen V.C. lobbed a grenade into his position and the explosion sent metal fragments into his hand, wrist and leg. He has a stiff finger to remind him of the incident.

Why does a man volunteer for such dangerous duty? "I've got a real important job, one I like, and I know I can serve my country better over there," he told me, adding: "Besides, over here I'd just be an instructor, and I'm not cut out for teaching."

Sgt. Sturdivant is a 36-year-old bachelor, the oldest of 14 children of Mr. and Mrs. Ralph Sturdivant of 3008 Basham Street. He went into the Army in 1951 shortly after his graduation from Howard High. He served in Korea during the fighting there, and has had four tours of duty in Germany.

Gene Hunt, Rep. Bill Brock's district assistant, brought Sgt. Sturdivant to my attention when he told me of a letter the Congressman had received from the Chattanooga paratrooper's battalion commander describing him as "one of the finest soldiers I have ever commanded."

Sgt. Sturdivant said he met Mr. Brock several years ago in Washington and stops by to see him every time he is there, even corresponds occasionally from Vietnam. Apparently his commander learned of the friendship and decided to write the Congressman in addition to recommending Sgt. Sturdivant's most recent decoration, the Bronze Star.

Another honor for the sergeant is reportedly still pending: A recommendation for an officer's commission stemming from a battlefield action in which he took over for a wounded lieutenant. He doesn't expect it to go through, however. "They just don't give out them promotions like they used to."

Sgt. Sturdivant has a "poor impression" of the Viet Cong's fighting ability, but he realizes they are effective at their specialty of hit-and-run attacks. "They won't fight," he said. "You can look for them night and day and you won't find them. But as soon as you sit down and get off guard, there they are."

"They (Viet Cong) know where we are 24 hours of the day," he continued, "Old men, little children, even women spot us for them. The hard-core V.C. are tough. They don't give up. They're fed propaganda that we're going to mutiliate them and kill them if they're captured. The local V.C. are different. They'll surrender if it looks like they're going to get killed."

He is angered at the V.C. most of all, perhaps, for their use of children. He said a 12-year-old boy once threw a grenade into a restaurant where he and other soldiers were eating. Luckily, everyone managed to find cover before the explosion.

On another occasion, he said, a young preteen walked into a group of his comrades resting in a village. The boy had a folded cloth in his hand. It concealed a grenade which the youngster exploded, killing himself and two GI's.

Sgt. Sturdivant believes in the rightness of the American mission in Vietnam, but he is frustrated by the lack of visible success. "We keep taking the same hills and jungle over and over again. We're not getting anywhere. The V.C. aren't getting anywhere. We're just killing each other. And I can tell you there's a lot being killed on both sides."

Come 1971, Sgt. Sturdivant plans to give up Army life and find himself a civilian job. He wants more time to see his family and practice his hobbies of tennis and golf. He has won two service championships in tennis, and scores in the low 80's in golf.

His father will also retire in the next several years, and Sgt. Sturdivant is saving money to help toward a family home investment. "They've had to move twice because of freeways and things—from 23rd street to W. 50th to Basham—and now the railroad relocation is going to require them to move again." He said these things without a trace of bitterness. That's more than anyone has a right to expect even from a devoutly religious man who sings tenor in the choir for frontline chapel services. That's Sgt. Tom Sturdivant, and Chattanooga and America can be proud of him.

Suggested Rat Drive Futile, Expert Says

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROGERS C. B. MORTON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 16, 1967

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives has been the object of a great deal of criticism for its failure to adopt a rule for the consideration of H.R. 11000, the rat extermination bill.

Rats are a serious problem and should be eliminated by concerted effort of all concerned with the management of our environment. Many of us question the value of creating a new Federal program for rat control, when we already have several existing programs through which funds for this purpose are available.

Mr. Speaker, the Los Angeles Times carried an article on August 9 which raises serious doubt about the effectiveness of the proposed rat legislation.

I commend this article to the attention of my colleagues in this body:

SUGGESTED RAT DRIVE FUTILE, EXPERT SAYS

SAN FRANCISCO.—A rat extermination program such as Congress recently refused to fund wouldn't work anyway, says Dr. Leo Kartman, the nation's chief federal investigator of rats and wild rodents.

Kartman's section of the U.S. Public Health Service San Francisco facility traps and examines rats and their parasites. San Francisco has been national headquarters for rat surveillance since bubonic plague—transmitted by rat fleas—entered the United States at West Coast ports many years ago.

"Rat control should be part of a real, long-term community health program," Dr. Kartman said Tuesday. The program should cut or eliminate the rats' food supply and deny them places to live, he said.

"It may be easier to get simple rat control programs funded, but in my opinion such programs will not succeed," Kartman said.

After trapping and poisoning programs,

rats will simply multiply again to the limits of their food and nesting site supplies, Kartman explained.

Discard Riots

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 16, 1967

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, many excuses and explanations are being fed to the American people as to why the riots, looting, and bloodshed have occurred in our cities.

Seldom is it even suggested that so-called civil rights legislation and promoted race mixing—not poverty—is the cause.

Unless our people through their elected leaders stop this forced amalgamation the result can but be either a society of semislavery under so-called social laws, or a race war—in either event, neither can benefit America.

I trust our colleagues will read a letter recently received from Bishop C. Fain Kyle of Box 1366, Richmond, Calif., who as a Negro presents his views on the created race problem.

I also include a news release from the August 15 Washington, D.C., Evening Star:

DISCARD,
Richmond, Calif., August 11, 1697.

HON. JOHN R. RARICK,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SIR: Where there is no vision, the people perish! Your Negro writer was one of those able to foresee from the very beginning that these civil-rights agitators posing as crusaders would eventually and inevitably provoke a general frightening race war in this country through their hatred, bigotry and defiance manifested through these nonsensical demonstrations.

Said foresight resulted in the establishing of the above-named anti-demonstration organization which was chartered by the State of California on November 19, 1963.

In our first press release, we issued the following statement: "There is no doubt but what there are in existence certain evils and inequities that need to be dealt with, but open rebellion on the part of any people is certainly not the answer and should not be tolerated in America, where we have constitutional government, and where it is every citizens constitutional right to seek redress in the courts of the land if he has been dealt with unfairly, or exposed to lawless violence."

Perhaps you can help to arrange for your humble servant to be invited to appear and testify before one of the congressional committees so that the American people can be thoroughly informed by hearing from an American-born Nego who is a very definite part of that 97 percent of the Negro population in this country which now and always have been opposed to demonstrations, riots, insurrection and anarchy.

For the consideration which shall be given to this letter, please accept my sincere thanks in advance.

Respectfully,

BISHOP C. FAIN KYLE.

RICHMOND, CALIF.—Bishop C. Fain Kyle is Executive Director, Dedicated Independent Society Committee Against Racial Demonstrations, Inc., Presiding Bishop, Conservative Christian Churches of America, Inc., National Chairman, Christian Conservative Party, Inc., President, Conservative Broadcasting Corporation, Inc., and State Chairman, California Recall Committee, Inc.

Each one of the above named Nonprofit Corporations recently went on record charging Dr. Martin Luther King as being directly or indirectly responsible for the chaos, anarchy, insurrection and rebellion brought about through agitation, demonstrations and rioting throughout the United States in recent years, months, weeks and days.

This includes the Selma and Montgomery mess, shame and murders in Alabama, the Americus, Georgia, debacle and murder, riots, injuries, arson and murders in the State of Mississippi, lawlessness in Chicago, Springfield, Massachusetts, and the fair city of Los Angeles, where the nation witnessed the greatest catastrophe of its kind in history take place in Watts.

King was severely criticized, condemned and censured by all of these organizations for being the inspiration or instigator directly or indirectly of all these sordid affairs. King was further condemned for his hypocrisy in posing as a non-violent leader and Christian Minister, when in reality just about every move of King has inevitably resulted in both violence, bloodshed and murder.

The organizations further censured and condemned King for his noticeable failure or refusal to go or even send word to Los Angeles ordering the rioters in Watts to cease and desist from all violence and lawlessness which King knew to be wrong, both morally and legally.

Furthermore, these organizations took note of the fact that instead of King trying to do something, anything to bring a halt to the recent Los Angeles war in Watts which has brought shame upon our nation, that King left the country for a sort of vacation speaking engagement in Jamaica, West Indies, during the time the lawlessness in Watts was at its peak.

According to the five organizations which authorized Bishop Kyle to issue this news release, the whole world should now be aware that King is a false, hypocritical wolf in sheeps clothing, who, knowingly or unknowingly, is being used by the Communists to provoke a general frightening "race war" in this country that could very well result in the destruction of America.

During the past several years, Bishop C. Fain Kyle has repeatedly warned and sought to alert the American people (both Negro and White) that King is the most dangerous man in the world today, that such disasters as the one that recently struck Los Angeles are inevitable under his kind of leadership, and that in due time the entire nation will become locked in a hopeless, devastating "race war" unless King, who has openly defied Municipal, County, State and Federal Court edicts and injunctions, and gotten away with it—is shorn of his power and imprisoned for his criminal acts and deeds for defying the courts of the land.

Standards

SPEECH

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 10, 1967

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the able gentlemen who have given us such an illuminating discussion of the lumber standard problem in the Department of Commerce.

It is clear that this matter, technical as it is, is simply another link in the chain that the Department of Commerce has been wrapping around the hands of business and industry.

The Department was established to aid and assist business in serving the public interest. Its voluntary industrial standards program was intended to do just that. Yet here we have an example of the Department hampering, not helping, an industry.

This is not just a matter affecting the lumber business. It is far greater than that.

It is a matter of government abandoning its responsibility and putting roadblocks in the way of progress.

American industry is the envy of the world. It is able to produce economically and efficiently because it follows a system of voluntary manufacturing standards. If a lumber standard were to be enacted into law, as the Department's panel has urged, why not legislate all manufacturing standards?

How many standards would that mean? I do not know, but it must be thousands or tens of thousands. I do not think for a moment that my constituents sent me to the Congress to legislate standards. Nor do I think that the voters who sent every other Member here intended that they should act as engineering technicians to enact mandatory industrial standards.

We have a newly appointed Secretary of Commerce who appears to be an able and dedicated man, and I sincerely hope he will reject the findings of his panel; withdraw the existing lumber standard which all investigators, as we have been told, have found not to be in the public interest, and establish the new standard that has been so carefully developed by the industry.

Then we can get on with the task of rebuilding America with a new, improved, and better building product.

James P. Baxter and Portland's Heritage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER N. KYROS

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 16, 1967

Mr. KYROS. Mr. Speaker, Maine is blessed with a proud heritage. From the Lady Pepperell House in Kittery to the blockhouse in Fort Kent, our State is graced with many sites of historical, architectural, and cultural interest. Mr. Earle G. Shettleworth, Jr., has been recalling the heritage of our largest city in a Portland Evening Express series entitled "Portland's Heritage." This commendable series has reflected Mr. Shettleworth's deep commitment to historical preservation and his keen awareness of Portland's past. I am sure that the people of Portland have found his articles revealing and rewarding.

In his article of August 14, Mr. Shettleworth reviewed the lasting contribution made to Portland by James P. Baxter. This portrait of one of the city's most distinguished benefactors illustrates the impact a dedicated public servant can have on his environment. The initiative and imagination shown by Baxter should serve as an inspiration to us all. I commend this valuable article to the attention of my colleagues:

JAMES P. BAXTER SPARKED PARK SYSTEM

(By E. G. Shettleworth, Jr.)

Portland possesses a fine park system today chiefly because of the foresight and effort of one man, Mayor James P. Baxter. Although the city owned parks before his administration and has acquired more since, along with various recreational facilities, it was Baxter who had a master plan created for park development and set Portland on the course to fulfill it.

In 1836 the city made its first attempt at establishing pleasure areas for its citizens by laying out drives on the Eastern and Western Promenades.

The first park, Lincoln, came in 1866 as a result of the Great Fire that year. Bordered by Congress, Franklin, Federal and Pearl Streets, it had been the site of many crowded wooden structures which the city did not want rebuilt because of the fire hazard they would make.

Free of buildings, the new park was looked upon as a firebreak which would help stop any future conflagrations from sweeping across the peninsula.

For more than a decade, no other park was founded. Then on Sept. 25, 1879, Portland received a portion of Deering's Oaks from the the Deering Heirs.

The next acquisition was Fort Allen Park in 1890. However, from that 4.55 acre plot of land to Tukey's Bridge almost all of the property was held by private owners and was liable to be developed with houses.

Now James P. Baxter entered the scene. Baxter was a successful businessman, who turned his energies to civic improvements and historical pursuits. These included the gift of the Portland Public Library building and the writing of carefully researched works on early settlers George Cleeve and Christopher Levett.

When he was elected mayor of Portland in 1893, he immediately embarked upon creating a park system for the city.

He tackled the problem of the privately-owned land on the Eastern Promenade by having a plan made of the area showing how the property was distributed.

With this evidence, he publicized the fact that most of it was in private hands which surprised many who had thought that it was the city's.

The land owners were interviewed and after several months of persistent efforts, a number of them agreed to sell their holdings at terms favorable to Portland. One large piece of land was paid for in small annual installments.

Baxter also labored to save the Western Promenade. When he became mayor, a few dwellings had already been erected at the foot of the northwesterly slope of the hill and in a short time the rest of the land would have been covered.

Again citizens thought that the area already belonged to Portland. In the city council, a measure to purchase it failed but the mayor later triumphed by exchanging a piece of city property for it with the Brown Estate.

Baxter sought to enlarge Deering's Oaks, too. During his six terms in City Hall, he was able to get the city to add much to the park.

With all these accomplishments, he still felt his work was not finished until there was a boulevard around Back Cove. Although the idea was not original with him, he became its chief exponent.

In 1896 his administration commissioned the Olmstead brothers of Boston to draw a plan of the highway. Then he began to negotiate for land and secure funds from the city to purchase it.

At this point he was attacked for trying to buy property and sell it to Portland at a profit. Despite this and other unfair accusations, he continued to fight for the boulevard.

His strong stand once lost him his seat as mayor. However, he was reelected and in his inaugural address of 1904, he reported,

"On Sept. 24, 1903, the City Council took the first step toward . . . construction of a boulevard around Back Cove substantially on the lines laid down in the report of Olmstead, Olmstead and Eliot in 1896 . . . A small appropriation made each year will soon complete an attractive driveaway, which may be made an important part of our park system and open for improvement an extensive tract of land most desirable for residence."

The last line reflects the practical as well as aesthetic considerations of Baxter's projects. His ideas were carried out with sound economic planning and an eye to making various areas desirable for development which would benefit the city in taxes.

In 1905, during his last term as mayor, Baxter published a booklet on Portland's parks, outlining what progress had been made and what remained to be done.

Included with this were three detailed maps which reveal the great amount of thought that he put into the matter. Both the Eastern and Western Promenades were shown as tree-lined drives. Sections of the Eastern Promenade were set aside for a baseball field, a play field and a children's playground.

In the booklet Baxter mentioned the need for more playgrounds and suggested creating small parks within the city at such points as the foot of Center St., the junction of York and Pleasant Streets and the junction of Free and Congress Streets.

The same year that he published the booklet, he took practically all of Portland's government to Boston at his own expenses to let them see what parks and scenic drivers could do for a city.

Since James Braxter left the mayor's office, the projects that he started have been completed and some of his suggestions have become realities. In fact, Portland's park system has gone beyond his expectations to include such features as swimming pools and a golf course.

Yet as one walks through Deering's Oaks or gazes at an unobstructed view from one of the promenades, he should pause a moment to remember that had it not been for the action of one man, the beauty might not have been there to enjoy.

The Kee Report—Foster Grandparents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES KEE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 16, 1967

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include last week's public service television and radio newscast, "The Kee Report."

The subject discussed in this report is the foster grandparents program. The report follows:

This is Jim Kee—bringing you the Kee Report.

One of the most urgent social problems of our times is how to provide proper care for handicapped children.

In the past few years, a great deal of attention has been focused on one phase of this problem—the need to provide better educational opportunities for impoverished children. With the aid of Federal funds, local school boards are now in a position to give substantially more help to the teaching corps in poor areas. The goal of this program is to provide more compensation for underpaid teachers, better teaching aids and better classrooms wherever possible.

But providing better schooling for poor youngsters is only part of the problem. There are untold thousands of American children who embark on life's journey with a far greater handicap than the lack of adequate schooling. There are the children who must live in foster homes because their parents are dead or lack the means to support them. We all know what it means for a child to grow up without knowing the joys and comforts of home life.

Yet the child with a severe physical handicap is quite often even worse off than the orphan. He may need daily care in an institution. Because of his handicap he may be unable to run or play outdoor games. Perhaps the most unfortunate of all are the mentally retarded.

In former times, the great burden of caring for these unfortunates rested upon our religious institutions. They are still carrying much of the load but now the Government is also providing financial help.

The good people who run these institutions know that the homeless child needs something more than food, shelter and clothing. That extra someting is love and a sense of belonging.

To meet this need, a novel program was started two years ago by the Office of Economic Opportunity. This is known as the Foster Grandparents plan. Elderly people are employed at a nominal wage to visit youngsters confined to institutions. These foster grandparents work four or five hours a day, five days a week, helping the children in their games and studies.

No one knew just how this plan would work. According to the men and women who operate these foster homes, it has been a real help. The plan got underway with an appropriation of $2,700,000. It was given a try-out in twenty-two cities. Later, the plan was expanded to include thirty eight new projects.

One writer on social problems said this plan has helped two classes of people. First, it has helped those children who are classed as unfortunate, abandoned, neglected, abused or helpless. And this program has also helped the elderly retired people over sixty five, who have signed to act as foster grandparents. Besides the additional income, it gives them the satisfaction of working in a very worthwhile project.

One of the worst afflictions a child can suffer is loneliness. The foster grandparents plan is helping to provide a cure for many homeless children.

Thank you for listening.

Maurice H. Thatcher—A Tribute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM O. COWGER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 16, 1967

Mr. COWGER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention of the House to the fact that yesterday, August 15, 1967, was the 97th milestone in the long span of life of a distinguished and most effective and highly regarded Member of this body, as Representative from the former Louisville district of Kentucky, made up of the city and Jefferson County, Maurice Hudson Thatcher.

His service here covered five terms—1923–33. He was author of much meritorious and important legislation for the benefit of his district, the State of Kentucky, the Panama Canal enterprise and its employees, the Isthmus of Panama; and, indeed, for our Nation and the world at large.

Before his congressional tenure, Mr. Thatcher had made notable records in various public capacities—see biographical sketch herewith which is shortly to appear in a national biographical volume.

He served during the years 1910–11, 1912, and 1913 as a member of the Isthmian Canal Commission and civil Governor of the Canal Zone; and in these posts rendered excellent services, for which he was warmly commended by Secretary of War Garrison and the President of Panama, Dr. Belisario Porras, and by the press, and otherwise.

There are yet serving in the House but few of his old colleagues—yet he is well known and highly regarded in current congressional circles.

For his fine achievements of public benefit, including his work as a member of the House Committee on Appropriations throughout his congresional service, and his successful activities in behalf of the canal, its employees and the Isthmus, he was signally honored by the Congress in writing into the 1962 appropriation act for the Panama Canal legislation naming the new and splendid $20 million bridge across the canal, at its Pacific entrance, in his honor by the official designation of the Thatcher Ferry Bridge, dedicated October 12, 1962. It was on the site of the Thatcher Ferry, established years before under legislation enacted in Congress, of which he was the author.

Mr. Thatcher is the only surviving member of the Isthmian Canal Commission, which had supervision of the construction of the canal.

In the midst of a very active life he has found time to write a considerable body of highly regarded poems, some of which have appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and various neswpapers and magazines in Panama and the United States. For years he has written Christmas messages, in poetic form; and I now include herewith a typical poem, illustrative of his philosophy of life, sent to his friends at Chirstmas 1965.

Mr. Thatcher is yet of "sound mind and disposing memory," and is yet most active in his labors as a conservationist and publicist. Largely because of these considerations he has remained domiciled in Washington, D.C., though he remains a legal resident of his home city of Louisville.

I am sure that all those currently serving in the Senate and House will be glad to join me in extending to former Congressman Thatcher the assurances of our respect and esteem, and in the wish that he may be long spared to continue his useful and fruitful endeavors.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF MAURICE H. THATCHER

Maurice H. Thatcher was born in Chicago, Illinois, where—at the time August 15, 1870—his parents (John Christophers Thatcher and Mary Tyler Graves Thatcher) were in temporary residence. He was reared in Western Kentucky, on Green River, in Butler County; and received his education in the public and private schools of the State. He was elected to the Office of Clerk of the Butler Circuit Court after attaining his majority. He began the study of law while thus serving. Later in Frankfort, the State Capital, he continued his law studies and in 1898 was, by the Kentucky Court of Appeals, licensed to practice.

During the period 1898–1900 he served as Assistant Attorney General of the State; removed to Louisville in 1900, and there entered upon the private practice of his profession. In 1901 he was appointed Assistant United States District Attorney for the Western District of Kentucky, serving until 1906; then returned to private practice in Louisville. He held the office of State Inspector and Examiner for Kentucky, 1908–1910, when he resigned the post to accept appointment by President Taft, April 12, 1910, as member of the Isthmian Canal Commission, which had supervision of the construction of the Panama Canal; and in that capacity and as Head of the Civil Administration—Civil Governor—of the Canal Zone, he served during the years 1910–11–12–13.

On May 4, 1910, just before sailing for Panama, he married Anne Bell Chinn, daughter of Franklin Chinn, attorney, of Frankfort, Kentucky; and the first marital home of the Thatchers was Ancon, in the Canal Zone,

In the fall of 1913, after leaving the Isthmus, Mr. Thatcher returned to private practice in Louisville; and also served as member of the Board of Public Safety for Louisville (1918–1919); and as Department Counsel for the City (1919–1923). In November 1922 he was elected to Congress for the Louisville District, and reelected four times, thus serving five terms (1923–1933).

In Congress Representative Thatcher was the author of much beneficial legislation for his District, his States, and the Canal Zone and Isthmus of Panama. As to the Canal Zone, (including the Panama Canal), and the Isthmus, in Congress he was the author of Acts—for the establishment of a free ferry across the Canal, Pacific entrance, and the construction—West side—of a connecting Canal Zone road; both road and ferry officially named for him, and constituting links in the Inter-American Highway system; and for the establishment, maintenance, and operation of the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory (under the supervision of the Gorgas Memorial Institute of Tropical and Preventive Medicine), dedicated to research touching the cause and prevention of tropical disease, both human and veterinary. For many years, following his retirement from Congress, he has served (gratuitously) as Vice President, General Counsel, member of the Executive Committee and Board of Directors of the Institute.

In Congress Mr. Thatcher was the author of various Acts of conservational and public welfare character—much of it of both local and national value, namely, the Acts—providing for the establishment of the Mammoth Cave National Park; the permanent improvement and maintenance of the Lincoln Birthplace Farm near Hodgenville, Kentucky—now designated as the Abraham Lincoln National Historical Site, and administered by the National Park Service; the construction of the George Rogers Clark Memorial Bridge across the Ohio River at Louisville; and Kentucky's Bridge Construction System—the bridge legislation being of pioneer character, simplifying fiscal procedures with ultimate freedom from tolls. In addition—while in Congress—he obtained enactments and appropriations for the construction of much needed Federal buildings: a post-office-custom house and a Coast Guard station for Louisville; several hospitals including one for veterans at Lexington, Kentucky. Also legislation and appropriations for the Nation's schools for the blind; legislation with respect to kidnapping in the District of Columbia; an Act for the relief and betterment of the storekeep-gaugers, the "under dogs" of the Treasury Department. He effectively supported appropriations for Ohio River improvement; and was largely instrumental in the conversion of Camp Knox into the great military establishment of Fort Knox, with the Nation's gold reserves under its protective care.

While a member of Congress he procured the naming of a battle cruiser "Louisville," for his home city; and at Bremerton Navy Yard, Puget Sound, on September 1, 1930, he delivered the launching address, Mrs. Thatcher acting as hostess for the occasion.

Thruout his congressional tenure Mr. Thatcher served as a member of the House Appropriations Committee.

He was appointed by the Speaker to represent the House of Representatives: on certain occasions: in June 1929 at the celebration of the founding of the city of New Bern, North Carolina; and also in the fall of 1929 at the celebration—from Pittsburgh to Cairo—of the completion of the canalization (9-foot stage) of the Ohio River. In 1930 he was appointed by President Hoover as a member of the special mission named to attend, at Caracas, the formal presentation of the statue of Henry Clay to Venezuela, in December of that year. He attended all these functions and participated therein.

Since his retirement from Congress Mr. Thatcher has practiced law in Washington, D.C., and has continued his labors in behalf of the Panama Canal and its employees, and the Isthmus of Panama. Thus—among other things—he has substantially aided in bringing about the enactment of legislation for the benefit of the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory; and also for annuities and benefits for the builders and operators of the Panama Canal—both civilians of the United States and aliens. In 1931 he organized the Eastern National Park-to-Park Highway Association, and has served ever since as its President. He has done effective service in behalf of the National Park and Parkway systems. For years he has served as a member and Vice President of the Mammoth Cave National Park Association. He is a member of the Louisville and American Bar Associations.

Mr. Thatcher has served faithfully and well the cause of Pan Americanism. He holds orders and decorations from several Latin American governments—including that of Panama. He is the only surviving member of the Isthmian Canal Commission. In consideration of his Isthmian and congressional services and his record of achievements, the Congress—by unanimous action of the two Houses—officially named the new twenty million dollar bridge across the Canal, Pacific entrances, the Thatcher Ferry Bridge (on the site of the Thatcher Ferry which it supersedes) in his honor. The bridge was dedicated October 12, 1962, and is free.

He is well known and active in fraternal and patriotic societies. He is a descendant of Elder William Brewster, of Pilgrim-Mayflower fame, and is a member and Past President of the Society of Mayflower Descendants in the District of Columbia; and a member and former Counsellor General, and now the Honorary Life Counsellor General, of the Eternal Society of Mayflower Descendants. In addition he is a member of the Sons of the American Revolution, Kentucky Society; member and Past and Honorary Life President of the Panama Canal Society of Washington, D.C.; Honorary Life member of the Isthmian Historical Society; member and Surety of the Baronial Order of Magna Charta; member and Councellor of the Military Order of the Crusaders; and member of the National Society of Americans of Royal Descent. In September 1963 he organized at Plymouth, Massachusetts, the Elder William Brewster Society, and was elected as its President-Treasurer, and is yet thus serving;

and is engaged in conducting a campaign for funds with which to erect a tangible and appropriate memorial in honor of this Pilgrim leader. Mr. Thatcher is also a 33d degree Scottish Rite Mason, and affiliates with the Kentucky Consistory.

In the midst of a long and very active life, Mr. Thatcher has found time to write a considerable body of poetry, and various articles dealing with historic and patriotic subjects; also travelogues; many of all these have appeared in newspapers, magazines, and the Congressional Record.

Mr. and Mrs. Thatcher saw much of the world together, having travelled thru Latin-American lands, islands of the Caribbean, the Far East, including Hawaii, Guam, the Philippines, China and Japan; Europe and the Near East, including South East Europe, Turkey, Greece, Egypt, the Holy Land, and Syria; also the various sections of the United States, including the principal National Parks and Sites.

The marriage of Mr. and Mrs. Thatcher, after more than fifty years of companionship, was terminated (without issue) by her death October 10, 1960. Mrs. Thatcher was a very popular hostess, and was of the greatest assistance to her husband in his public career. She was a descendant of Esther Ball and her husband Raleigh Chinn, of Virginia. Esther was also the half sister of Mary Ball who, as the wife of Augustine Washington, was the mother of George Washington. Mrs. Thatcher served as President of the Kentucky Society and the Panama Canal Auxiliary, both of Washington, D.C.

The city of Louisville remains the legal home of Mr. Thatcher; and the city of Washington his domicile, with 1801 16th St., N.W., his residence address, and his office in the Investment Building.

OUR BEST

The Years go by more swiftly than of Yore,
When Youth was prone to dally on Life's shore
As if this Mortal Round would never cease,
And Good might nought deny us of her Store.

Where are the Stars we long have sought to see?
And where the Selves we ever hoped to be?
Where are the dreamed-of rare and precious Goals?
And where our Passports for Eternity?

Yet, when the Light shall wane within the West,
May we not count Ourselves as something blest,
If, on the Whole, in Justice we can say,
Our All, tho Little, was and is—Our Best?

Existing Federal Expenditures and Programs for Rat Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DELBERT L. LATTA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 16, 1967

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, the whole story is not being told concerning the Federal Government's present involvement in rat control programs, the availability of Federal funds for use by the States and cities under existing programs, and the actual expenditures and grants being made therefor.

From reading some of the stories being written these days, one could easily be led to believe that the Federal taxpayers' money has been doing absolutely nothing for rat control in this country and as a consequence, another new program is actually needed. Of course, nothing could be further from the truth.

Believing that it is time to let the facts be known, I have decided to release detailed information as to what each Federal department or agency is actually expending or is authorized to expend on pest and rat control programs. Not one, two, or three, but nine different departments or agencies are now expending such funds. Here are their expenditures for fiscal year 1967:

Department of Agriculture	$649, 266
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare	426, 927
Office of Economic Opportunity	2, 373, 671
General Services Administration	200, 000
Department of Commerce	10, 380
Department of Housing and Urban Development	282, 000
Department of Defense	11, 800, 000
Department of the Interior	64, 248

Expenditures already made in fiscal year 1968—which began July 1:

Department of Labor	$300, 000
Office of Economic Opportunity	757, 024

All of these departments and agencies do not make outright grants to the cities to help them with their particular local problems, but many of them are authorized to do so. The Office of Economic Opportunity—a creature of the Johnson administration—is authorized to and is making grants to cities for rat control. In fact, the Office of Economic Opportunity points this out for our city officials on page 442 of its "Catalog of Federal Assistance Programs." As noted above, it expended $2,373,671 in fiscal year 1967. The Johnson administration could have expended several millions more from OEO funds for this purpose as over $250 million of its total $1,612,500,000 1967 budget were in unallocated funds. Naturally, the question is why were not more OEO funds allocated by the administration for this purpose during fiscal year 1967?

The Department of Labor has just funded a rat control program under existing legislation for the District of Columbia in the amount of $300,000. This money came from its manpower development and training fund. The moneys in this fund are disbursed at the direction of the administration, and the Congress appropriated $390 million to it for fiscal year 1967. Why were not more manpower development and training funds allocated by the administration for this purpose during fiscal year 1967? Certainly more of these funds can be used for rat control programs in fiscal year 1968 should the administration desire to do so. The House has approved an expenditure of $394 million for fiscal year 1968 for manpower development and training.

The Department of Housing and Urban Development, the same Department wherein the President desired to start another new program, has acknowledged that it is authorized to expend funds for rat control under the new Model Cities Act, and that it expects requests from cities for the same. The House has already voted $225 million for the model cities program for fiscal year 1968. This same department acknowledges the expenditure of Federal funds for rat control in urban renewal projects, concentrated code enforcement projects, demolition grant projects, in the management and operation of federally assisted low-rent housing projects, and so forth.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare even has a training program in rat control techniques for local and State sanitarians at Atlanta, Ga., in addition to a research center in San Francisco.

Contrary to what some may have been led to believe, the Department of Agriculture aids our cities in many ways in rodent control through its county agents, home economists, extension service, publications, and so forth.

One program passed by the Congress just last October 17 authorizes the Public Health Service to make grants to the States and cities to carry out comprehensive health service programs. This program carries an appropriation of $125 million for grant purposes. California, $500,000; Pennsylvania, $145,000; South Carolina, $105,000; Washington State, $20,000; and New Jersey and the cities of St. Louis, $130,000; and Kansas City, Mo., $6,000, have already applied for Federal grants for rat control under this act totaling $906,000. Applications from other cities and States are expected. A $140 million request to operate this new program for fiscal year 1968 has already been reported out of committee and is awaiting action by the House. In requesting the legislation to carry out this comprehensive health service program, the President said:

> Our purpose must be to help redirect and reform fragmented programs which encourage inefficiency and confusion and fail to meet the total health needs of our citizens.

Notwithstanding what the President said about redirecting and reforming fragmented programs under the Public Health Service, the President urged the passage of still another program under another Department—Housing and Urban Development. According to the testimony of the Honorable Robert C. Weaver, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, before the Banking and Currency Committee, "such a program could cost as much as $6 per capita."

The House finally said "no" to creating still another program but in so doing was not saying "no" to all the existing rat control programs. It merely said, "Mr. President, you have the programs and the money at your disposal for rat control. Now use them instead of asking for more."

The House will certainly pass the increased authorization for the comprehensive health service program under the Public Health Service when it comes before the House within the next several days. This may not please those constantly interested in enlarging the Federal bureaucracy, but the proper agency—the Public Health Service—will have more money at its disposal to grant to the cities and States to kill rats.

With expenditures being made by nine separate Federal departments and agencies and all these programs available for rat control, I was amazed that anyone could take the position that we must be for the creation of still another new rat control program in order to be for any other type pest control programs, including the continuation of necessary basic research. Such a position is so ridiculous that it is, under ordinary circumstances, not deserving of comment. However, since the farmers' blackbird problem was singled out for attack, permit me to state that I was pleased to support a request for a slight increase in the funding of the Department of the Interior's blackbird research program. The Department had proposed that a research lab be established and that it be staffed by not less than 10 research specialists. My testimony was in support of this basic research only and not for a program to kill individual farmers' blackbirds as a couple of writers have indicated. The Department has estimated the annual damage done to crops by blackbirds to be $58 million. One newspaper erroneously reported the cost of the program to be $58 million and then failed to mention the request was for basic research only.

American Farm Bureau Federation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 16, 1967

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Charles B. Shuman, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, was recently interviewed by Dean Manion, of the Manion Forum, of South Bend, Ind., on free enterprise and liberty in American agriculture.

I think that our colleagues may well be interested in his presentation and, therefore, include the interview following my remarks:

The Vicious Cycles Subsidies and Crop Controls Hurt Both Farmers and Consumers

(By Charles B. Shuman)

Dean Manion. With me here at the microphone today is the man I like to call the Freedom Fighter of American agriculture, the distinguished Charles B. Shuman, of Illinois, who, as practically everybody knows, is the President of the great American Farm Bureau Federation. For the past 13 years he has led the Federation's long continued battle for a free market for American farm products, and for the restoration of freedom to the American farmer in the management and operation of his farm.

Whether we all realize it or not this is an objective in which every patriotic American has a vital vested interest, and our guest here today is the best qualified man in the country to tell us about it. Mr. Shuman, welcome back to the Manion Forum.

Mr. Shuman. Thank you, Dean. I'm glad to be with you again.

Dean Manion. I have seen you quoted recently, and I would like to hear you say it here: tell us the relationship, in your judgment, between inflation and crop controls.

Mr. Shuman. Actually, there is both a little cause and effect relationship. In the first place, inflation hurts farmers the same as it does consumers and citizens generally, and we're having a big dose of it. But at the same time, one of the causes of inflation has been the very costly government farm program.

I believe that most of the people recognize that inflation is due to government policies—the spending of more money by the Federal Government than it takes in. And certainly government programs in agriculture have been very costly and have contributed to the extent of from three to five billion dollars a year in the fire that caused the inflation—the deficit spending.

There's another relationship too, and that is that the farmers themselves have been caught up by increased cost of farming. Their costs go up with inflation. They are hard-pressed to know how they could get out of the trap that they're caught in with government payments. In other words, the farmer gets used to accepting and using the payments that come from the government. So it's a vicious cycle that we're trapped in. Government programs and inflation together—and they are almost interrelated—are not really doing the farmer much good and they're hurting the consumer, too.

Dean Manion. Who wants crop controls?

Mr. Shuman. There are several general groups that want government farm programs and controls. One of the most obvious, of course, is the payroller, the bureaucrat, the fellow that has the job of administering the government program.

Dean Manion. How many bureaucrats like that are there now in proportion to the number of farmers?

Mr. Shuman. The U.S. Department of Agriculture has eighty thousand employees engaged in operating crop control and subsidy type programs in agriculture. They're in every agricultural county in the United States. Their jobs consist of doing the paper work, the red tape, of issuing regulations, and of supervising the farmer, watching to see that he doesn't plant too much or do something else that's against the rules.

So this big group wants continuation of government programs because they're afraid that they might not have jobs if they were ended. A second group, unfortunately, is some of the largest business enterprises in this country. They have become accustomed or adjusted to the fact that the government has been in the business of buying up crops and holding them off the market.

They've adjusted their business to the place they depend upon the government to warehouse—the government granary, the storehouse. They also believe that government control programs keep prices of farm products relatively low—and so you have great grain enterprises, milling enterprises, and the cotton textile industry generally, that favor these things.

I guess the third group would be these dedicated folks who believe that government should control everything and everybody. They don't want to see farm controls and subsidy programs ended, because it ends this attempt to move in and socialize a major segment of American business and industry.

Dean Manion. Mr. Shuman, do crop controls have a tendency to keep the price of food low, and, consequently, would the removal of crop control tend to cause the price of food to be further inflated?

Mr. Shuman. I don't think so. Of course, we've had these government controls and interventions and manipulations of price so long, it's difficult to know what the reaction would be on the open market. However, there are some pretty good indications that the removal of government farm programs and controls would not increase the price of food to the consumer.

The major cause of high food prices is inflation—the government policies which have really been directed towards making money cheap or the prices of things that we buy high—while farmers have sometimes received the blame. Efforts of the Administration during the last year and a half have tended to put the blame on farmers for high prices. Both the Secretary of Agriculture and the President were guilty of depressing farm prices; their excuse was to get lower prices for consumers. The real results of this action didn't show up in any reduction in prices to consumers.

CONSUMERS AND FARMERS WOULD BENEFIT

Therefore, my conclusion would be that the removal of government control programs would not make any material difference in the price to consumers. Actually the consumer pays the tax cost for the control programs and for the subsidies. So, if you ended government control programs there would be a reduction in the tax cost to consumers. In figuring the price of food under these control programs, the consumer must add to what he pays to the grocery store the amount of his tax dollar that's going to pay the subsidies, and these subsidies are a considerable item. So my conclusion is that the farmer and the consumer both would be better off if the control and subsidy programs ended. We would not have this tremendous and wasteful subsidy that shows up in tax bills.

Dean Manion. Mr. Shuman, recently the newspapers have revealed that payments to farmers for not farming—corporate farmers and other large farmers—have amounted to hundreds of thousands of dollars per person. What about this?

Mr. Shuman. Actually, this tells what every farmer has known for some time—that government programs and subsidies to farmers are helping the bigboys far more than they help the small farmer. This is a fact that would help the consumers and taxpayers and voters decide that the government programs in agriculture are not doing what they were intended to do. They were supposed to help the family farmer compete in this day of bigness.

When we saw these reports come out, some of us, I'm sure, were startled by the fact that six large farm operations in California averaged over a million dollars a year payments from the Federal treasury. This suggests that there be limitations on payments, but our approach is that the whole concept of a government managed agriculture and subsidies paid for not producing food and fibre, in a period when we're supposed to have starvation in the world, are not justified; that what we need to do is not to prolong these schemes by arguing over whether or not there's a limitation in payments, but to get rid of them as quickly as possible.

We are supporting a bill in the Congress which would eliminate the feed grain and the wheat control and subsidy plan immediately. We hope that we will have some support from consumers who are alarmed at this tendency ot put some of the huge corporate farms and other large operations on the Federal payroll for these large subsidy payments.

Dean Manion. Now this whole farm program was aimed at the small farmer, to help him. How many of the small farmers voluntarily participate in the crop control programs?

Mr. Shuman. As best that we can figure out, less than half of the small farmers are operating within the government programs. More than half of them refuse to have anything to do with these government farm programs when it's a voluntary program. When it's compulsory, of course they have to go along.

On the other hand, of the large operators, almost all of them are signed up, because these huge payments make it very attractive to them. To the small farmer, the payments are relatively insignificant. He doesn't have the flexibility to make the changes, to get the extra land to offset the cuts.

Dean Manion. Due largely to your efforts, and the efforts of others, I think that only a small portion of farm production is under the compulsory program. Is that right?

ONLY ONE-THIRD UNDER CONTROLS

Mr. Shuman. This is correct. The present Administration has been doing everything they can to bring other segments of agriculture under government control and subsidy plans, but they haven't succeeded. Only about one-third of total agricultural production in the United States is involved in government programs. This is another reason why I'm so confident that ending these programs would probably not at all increase the price of food in the supermarket, and at the same time, would let farmers adjust their production to the needs of the market and make a better income.

We're fortunate that this one-third was all that came under, because we've had the opportunity to see what would happen where the free market operates as it has for all of the livestock production and most of the fruit and vegetable production, and one of the great crops in this country, soy beans. Most of the sickness, most of the trouble, all of the surplus that we have been plagued with are located in the one-third that's been under the government control programs.

Dean MANION. Mr. Shuman, in your judgment, what is the relationship of this crop control program to the obligation that we seem to have to feed the hungry people all over the world?

Mr. SHUMAN. It's quite obvious, of course, that if we're going to need increased production to feed hungry people, it's almost insanity to continue regulating and controlling production in this country. We have insisted that the needs of the hungry people of the world ought to be reflected in the market. We're suggesting that if we help them, let them decide what they want to buy in our market, and then let the needs reflect in the market price.

This would be a far more efficient way than incentives that free men have to gain by their production.

Dean MANION. Where price is rigidly controlled below the cost of production, the tendency is, I think you said once, to engage in subsistence farming exclusively, and there is no capital built up for the rainy day. Is that true?

Mr. SHUMAN. That is what many observers have noted about the agriculture of many of the countries that are not producing enough food for their own people. When they have price controls, a price-ceiling imposed by the government, the farmer tends to hang on to his little tract of land and to produce for his family and his relatives who gather around him. But he uses his extra time to work in other occupations which will reward him better for his time. The result is that they reduce and strangle food production by trying to produce only for their own needs.

Dean MANION. Mr. Shuman, I heard you say that this business of price control is a cause for the hunger in many parts of the world. In India, for instance.

Mr. SHUMAN. That is certainly correct, in my view. If you look around the world to find the places where people are hungry, you almost invariably find that these same countries have adequate natural resources to produce all the food that the people need. India, for instance, could produce enough food to feed all of its millions of people and have an exportable surplus—if they used the resources that they have, the land and the water and the manpower and everything else in a way which would get the maximum production.

This causes you then to try to find out why they don't get production in a country that's rich with soil and mineral and other resources like India. The only conclusions that you can come up with is that India has devoted itself to a system of government management of agriculture and of an economy that's copied very much after the Soviet system. This management reduces incentives that come when you have free production on the parts of farmers.

Dean MANION. Our thanks to you, Mr. Shuman, and to the American Farm Bureau Federation for what you are doing for the restoration of free enterprise and freedom in American agriculture.

Veterans' Pension and Readjustment Act of 1967

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 16, 1967

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to wholeheartedly support the veterans' legislation before us, which has been agreed upon by a House and Senate conference committee.

This bill provides an average overall cost-of-living increase of 5.4 percent for all veterans, their widows and children who receive pensions under Public Law 86–211. There is a considerably greater increase for widows and widows with children in the lowest income categories, and they will receive around 8.5 percent more.

The bill also provides certain wartime benefits that were not previously available for veterans who served in the Armed Forces on or after August 5, 1964. There are increased educational allowances for veterans receiving training under Public Law 89–358, and there are changes in laws concerning guaranteed and direct loans for veterans of World War II and later wars.

EFFECT OF SOCIAL SECURITY INCREASES ON PENSIONS

Veterans' pensions are based on income limits, and increased social security payments may mean reduction in pension or possible removal from the pension rolls. Last year the Congress passed legislation providing that income changes during the year would not affect pensions until the beginning of the next year. This was to give Congress time to coordinate veterans' pension legislation with social security increase measures.

The bill before us contains no provisions for deduction of any social security increases when annual income is computed for pension purposes, or for dependency and indemnity compensation. However, the chairman of the House Committee on Veterans Affairs has assured all Members that when work is completed by the Congress on increased social security payments, his committee expects to take immediate action to make appropriate adjustments in the veterans' pension program.

Following is a brief summary of the bill:

PENSION PROVISIONS

Amounts of pension increase are outlined in the charts which appear below. Present rates are printed in *italics* and enclosed in brackets, and new proposed rates are printed in roman.

Veteran, no dependents [1] [2]

Annual income other than pension		Monthly pension
More than—	But equal to or less than—	
	$600	$104 [*$100*]
$600	1,200	79 [*75*]
1,200	1,800	45 [*45*]

[1] Pension reduced to $30 after second full month of hospitalization or domiciliary care by the VA.

[2] Applicable rate increased by $100 per month for veterans who are patients in nursing homes or so helpless or blind as to require the regular aid and attendance of another person, or by $40 [*$35*] when veteran is permanently housebound because of severe physical disability.

Veteran, with dependents [1]

Annual income other than pension		Monthly pension		
More than—	But equal to or less than—	Veteran and one dependent	Veteran and two dependents	Veteran and three or more dependents
	$1,000	$109 [*$105*]	$114 [*$110*]	$119 [*$115*]
$1,000	2,000	84 [*80*]	84 [*80*]	84 [*80*]
2,000	3,000	50 [*48*]	50 [*48*]	50 [*48*]

[1] Applicable rate increased by $100 per month for veterans who are patients in nursing homes or so helpless or blind as to require the regular aid and attendance of another person, or by $40 [*$35*] when veteran is permanently housebound because of severe physical disability.

Widow, no child [1]

Annual income other than pension		Monthly pension
More than—	But equal to or less than—	
	$600	$70 [*$67*]
$600	1,200	51 [*48*]
1,200	1,800	29 [*27*]

[1] Payment to widow increased by $50 a month when she is so disabled as to require the regular aid and attendance of another person or is a patient in a nursing home.

Widow, one child [1] [2]

Annual income other than pension		Monthly pension
More than—	But equal to or less than—	
	$1,000	$86 [*$80*]
$1,000	2,000	67 [*64*]
2,000	3,000	45 [*45*]

[1] Plus $16 [*$15*] for each additional child.

[2] Payment to widow increased by $50 a month when she is so disabled as to require the regular aid and attendance of another person or is a patient in a nursing home.

No widow, one or more children

Annual income equal to or less than (earned income excluded)—	Monthly pension
$1,800	$40 [*$38*] for one child and $16 [*$15*] for each additional child.

PENSION INCREASES FOR VETERANS AND WIDOWS OF SPANISH-AMERICAN WAR AND PRIOR WARS

Widows of the Spanish-American War, Civil War and Indian Wars who have been receiving a pension of $65 a month will receive a basic pension payment of $70 a month and will be eligible to receive an additional $50 a month if a patient in a nursing home or if in need of the regular aid and attendance of another person.

Directs the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to pay aid and attendance veteran pensioners of Spanish-American War and Indian Wars under provisions of Public Law 86-211, as amended, where it would result in their receiving a higher pension payment. These veterans, if they have not elected to receive under provisions of Public Law 86-211, currently receive $135.45 monthly, but would be eligible to receive as much as $209, (in a case where the veteran's wife is still living and he has income other than pension of $1,000 a year or less) upon enactment of this bill.

SPECIAL PROVISIONS FOR VETERANS AND WIDOWS WITH SEVERE DISABILITIES

Veterans who continue to receive pension payments under laws effective on or before June 30, 1960, because of failure to elect to receive pension under laws effective after that date, and who are housebound because of the severity of their disabilities but unable to qualify for the aid and attendance allowance, will receive pension in the amount of $100 a month. These veterans now receive $78.75 a month if on the pension rolls 10 or more years or if 65 years of age, or older, or $66.15 if under age 65 or on pension rolls less than 10 years.

Widows of veterans of *all wars* will be eligible to receive a monthly allowance of $50, in addition to pension otherwise payable, if a patient in a nursing home or if in need of the regular aid and attendance of another person.

Veterans of *all wars*, previously eligible to receive aid and attendance allowance only upon a showing that they were helpless or blind or so near helpless or blind as to require the regular aid and attendance of another person, will be presumed to be in need of regular aid and attendance if a patient in a public or private nursing home. This presumption also applies to widows in determining their eligibility to receive aid and attendance allowance discussed in paragraph immediately preceding.

Veterans who have attained the age of 65 years will be presumed to be totally and permanently disabled. These veterans must now be determined by VA to have a 10-percent disability.

The special allowance paid in addition to pension otherwise payable to veterans who are housebound because of the severity of their disabilities and who are receiving pension payment under provisions of law effective on and after July 1, 1960 (Public Law 86-211, as amended) is increased from $35 to $40 a month.

Will permit the furnishing of therapeutic or rehabilitative devices, medical equipment and supplies (except medicine), when medically indicated, to veterans receiving pension based on the need for regular aid and attendance.

Requires the furnishing of drugs and medication to aid and attendance pensioners receiving payments of pension under provisions of law in effect on or before June 30, 1960.

MISCELLANEOUS PENSION PROVISIONS

A widow or wife of a deceased veteran will be permitted to exclude amounts paid for the last illness and burial of a child of the veteran, when computing annual income for pension purposes. A widow will be permitted to exclude expenses of the veteran's last illness which she paid prior to his death.

Eligibility for pension extended to veterans with service on or after August 5, 1964, and their widows and children, on the same basis as is now available to veterans of World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict.

Liberalizes marriage requirements for a widow of a veteran to receive pension. Present law requires that the widow be married to the veteran prior to certain specified dates applicable to each war period; or for 5 or more years; or for any period of time if a child was born of the marriage. This amendment would change the 5-year requirement to 1 year, and would clarify the provision relative to a child born to the parties to the marriage.

ADDITIONAL BENEFITS FOR VETERANS ENTERING SERVICE DURING THE VIETNAM CONFLICT

Provides certain wartime benefits not previously granted to veterans who serve the Armed Forces beginning on or after August 5, 1964, and ending on a date to be determined by Presidential proclamation or concurrent resolution of the Congress, as follows:

(1) Disability compensation rates and dependency allowances for service-connected disabled veterans payable at the full wartime rate under all circumstances. Present law provides for payment of the wartime rate only when disability is incurred in line of duty "as a direct result of armed conflict" or "while engaged in extrahazardous service including such service under conditions simulating war," and if this condition is not met the rate is payable at 80 percent of the wartime rate.

(2) Eligibility extended for non-service-connected pension for veterans, their widows and children on the same basis as is presently available to veterans of World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict and their widows and children.

(3) Eligibility for payment of a burial allowance of $250 to survivors of deceased veterans.

(4) Extension of the presumption of service-connection of psychoses developing within 2 years following discharge, thus providing service-connected status for medical and hospital treatment.

(5) Miscellaneous medical benefits such as authorizing payments to State home for care provided veterans of this period and use of contract private beds in a Commonwealth or a Possession for non-service-connected conditions. The same type of care provided under contract in the Veterans' Memorial Hospital, Manila, Republic of the Philippines.

Provides for the following additional wartime benefit for veterans with service in the Armed Forces after January 31, 1955:

Authorizes an allowance of $1,600 toward purchase of an automobile for veterans who, as a direct result of the performance of military duty, have lost or lost the use of one or both feet, one or both hands, or who have suffered permanent impairment of vision in both eyes as defined in the law.

MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS APPLICABLE TO VETERANS OF WORLD WAR I, WORLD WAR II, THE KOREAN CONFLICT, OR SERVICE AFTER JANUARY 31, 1955

Permits payment of $47 per month statutory award for wartime service-connected disabled veterans suffering certain anatomical losses for *each* such anatomical loss, as specified in the law.

Requires the furnishing of drugs and medication to all aid and attendance pensioners and to service-connected disabled veterans receiving aid and attendance allowance for their service-connected disability but who are in need of drugs and medicine for treatment of a non-service-connected condition.

Permits the furnishing of a flag to eligible survivors of service men who died while in the service, after May 27, 1941, but his remains were lost at sea, or for some other reason not recovered.

PROVISIONS RELATED TO VETERANS' AND WAR ORPHANS' EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Increases educational allowance payable to veterans receiving benefits under provisions of the Veterans' Readjustment Benefits Act of 1966 (Public Law 89-358) as indicated in the table printed below. Present allowances are printed in *italics* and enclosed in brackets [ ], and proposed new allowances are printed in roman.

Type of program	No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	Each dependent above two
Institutional:				
Full time	$130 [*$100*]	$155 [*$125*]	$175 [*$150*]	$10.00
Three-quarter time	95 [*75*]	115 [*95*]	135 [*115*]	7.00
Half-time	60 [*50*]	75 [*65*]	85 [*75*]	5.00
Cooperative [1]	105 [*80*]	125 [*100*]	145 [*120*]	7.00

[1] Full-time institutional training, with training in business or industrial establishment supplemental thereto or farm cooperative training.

The rate for persons on active duty or those pursuing a program of education on less than half-time basis is computed at the rate of established charges for tuition and fees which the educational institution requires of nonveteran students enrolled in the same program or $130 [*$100*] per month for a full-time course, whichever is the lesser.

Permit full educational benefits to be paid to "educationally disadvantaged" veterans so that they may complete high school without losing eligibility for college training. Time spent in pursuit of a high school course are not to be charged against the veteran's basic period of entitlement.

Provides for on-the-job, farm cooperative, and flight training for veterans pursuing an educational program as a result of eligibility accruing to them as a result of service in the Armed Forces beginning on or after February 1, 1955. Flight training is provided veterans who have valid private pilot licenses or equivalent in flight training hours and who meet medical requirements for a commercial pilot's license. Educational allowance computed at 90 percent of established charges for tuition and fees for nonveterans enrolled in the same flight training course, with $130 per month to equal 1 month of training eligibility.

On-job trainees will receive for the first 6 months: No dependents, $80; one dependent, $90; two or more dependents, $100. Payments are reduced in each succeeding 6-month period.

Permits payment of an annual fee to educational institutions, based on peak enrollment (in October), of veterans pursuing a course under provisions of Public Law 89-358, as amended.

Amends the War Orphans Educational Assistance Act by increasing the period of time during which training may be taken. Present law permits training between ages 18 and 23. This bill would extend the 23-year limit to 26.

PROVISIONS RELATED TO HOUSING

Extends over-all delimiting date for entitlement of World War II veterans to a guaranteed direct loan or business loan from July 25, 1965, to July 25, 1970.

The Administrator may increase maximum allowable direct-housing loan from $17,500 to $25,000 in areas where he finds cost levels so require.

International Thought Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 16, 1967

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the granting of monopolistic advantage to communication concerns and the use of programing with the so-called fairness doctrine way be best understood by a special report in the August 15 Washington Evening Star.

Why not an international educational communication system financed by the U.S. tax dollars and channeled by Eugene V. Rostow who disapproves of U.S. national sovereignty? An international thought control center. A fairness doctrine extension.

UNITED STATES REVIEWING COMMUNICATIONS POLICY

(By Garnett D. Horner)

President Johnson has started a comprehensive review looking toward formulation of a new national communications policy.

The review could favor merger of American companies in the international communications field. And Johnson urges the Soviet Union to join the international telecommunications satellite system.

The desirability of merging the international activities of such companies as International Telephone & Telegraph, Radio Corp. of America and the Communications Satellite Corp. is one of the matters to be examined by a task force of key government officials set up by the president.

MESSAGE TO CONGRESS

The task force also will look into such questions as how soon a domestic communications satellite system might be economically feasible.

Johnson outlined his thinking on some key aspects of communications policy and the need for formulating a new national policy for the space age in a special message to Congress late yesterday.

Unlike most presidential messages to Congress, it did not ask for any legislation.

REAFFIRMS SUPPORT

He reaffirmed American support of the development of a global system of communications satellites to make modern communications available to all nations.

Specifically, he said the United States supports continuation of the International Telecommunications Consortium (Intelsat), formed in 1964, which now has 58 nations as members. Each member contributes to the expense of the system and shares in its revenues according to their use of it. Comsat, the U.S. representative, is the consortium manager.

The 1964 Intelsat agreement is subject to renegotiation in 1969.

Johnson urged the Soviet Union and Eastern European nations to join Intelsat eventually linking the Soviet domestic communications satellite system with the international system.

Discussing proposals for possible merger of the several American-owned international communications companies, the President said, "There is a legitimate question as to whether the present division of ownership continues to be in the public interest."

He said critics argue that communications rates are regulated so that price competition does not exist, and divided ownership means maintaining expensive duplicating facilities which increase operating costs and result in higher rates.

In considering the possibility of a domestic communications satellite system, Johnson said any such system should be supervised by Intelsat to assure compability of systems design, position in orbit, assignment of frequencies and other technical considerations.

The President said the task force he named will "examine our entire international communications posture." He asked for a final report within one year, with interim reports in the meantime.

Eugene V. Rostow, undersecretary of state for political affairs, was named chairman of the task force. Its numbers include high officials of several other government agencies interested in the problem.

International Drum Corps Week: September 2–9

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 16, 1967

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, once again it is my pleasant task to remind my colleagues, as I have in past years, of the fact that September 2–9 is International Drum Corps Week. I am especially happy this year to draw attention to this worthy occasion because of the motto for 1967: "Pageantry and Patriotism—Youth on Parade." The accent on youth is noteworthy because few activities that I can think of offer such a unique service to all people through youth and few activities offer youth so much in pleasure and actual accomplishment.

To those who are intimately involved, there is the thrill of performing and the gratification and feeling of accomplishment for a job well done. It allows an opportunity for these young people to perfect their talents and to keep fit. It is also a wonderful educational experience for our youth to learn more about the flag and their national heritage while enjoying and joining in a productive activity.

For those who stand aside and watch, there is the thrill of the march and the excitement of a parade. Everyone enjoys the stirring atmosphere of a patriotic celebration. A well-trained marching corps is an inspiring sight and a joy to watch as it skillfully executes its maneuvers.

What better way to promote juvenile decency than through an activity that accomplishes so many pleasing results: skill, education, physical fitness, musical talents, and most of all fun and enjoyment for those watching and listening and for those participating.

For Milwaukee—the home of the world famous Fourth of July Circus Parade—I salute a great American tradition during International Drum Corps Week.

The American Syndrome

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ODIN LANGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 16, 1967

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, we hear much about the Federal Government's efforts to fight a war and still carry on business as usual at home. Many of us feel that we are overextending our resources. Bruce Biossat, of the Newspaper Enterprise Association, took a look at this problem in a recent column that appeared in the Washington Daily News.

It is interesting reading, and I commend it to my colleagues:

BLAME GOES TO THE AMERICAN SYNDROME

(By Bruce Biossat)

Some veteran observers here are presently faulting President Johnson not only for trying to do too much on too many fronts but for trying to persuade the American people that everything is possible at once.

He is specifically charged with not establishing needed priorities as among the Vietnam war, the racial struggle and anti-poverty effort, foreign aid, and so on.

The complaint ought to be lodged not against Mr. Johnson alone but against what might be termed the American syndrome.

For the fact is that no president nor any other kind of leader has ever spoken forcefully for a system of priorities in this country, with or without emergency situations.

This was true even in the obvious extremity of World War II. In 1943, a furore went up when it was disclosed that Franklin D. Roosevelt was considering drastic cuts in civilian output. The plan was buried. Scholars now say wartime civilian production was kept at an amazingly high level.

It is the ingrained habit of U.S. leadership, across the board, to assume that in rich America everything can be done and therefore no really harsh priorities need be set.

More than this, our leaders have for decades tended consistently to exaggerate the prospect, to enlarge the promise almost without limit. The outlook in war is painted bright, the economy is found encouraging, major legislative proposals are offered as final solutions rather than as patches on problems.

Almost no influential elements in U.S. society are exempt from the spell of the American syndrome. Liberals who want to make it a sin peculiar to Mr. Johnson should review their own history.

For more than three decades they or their earlier counterparts have been trying to invest particular pieces of legislation with the special magic of the "ultimate solution".

A perfect example is the area redevelopment program, a scattershot, only partly effective assault on the problems of "distressed areas." In the late 1950's, its loud exponents portrayed it as a virtually sure means of lifting the curse of distress.

Americans are an impatient people. Being rich in resource, they learned long ago that, for the most part, they did not have to be patient. From this history arose the notion that they would not be patient, that they want only the optimistic word and cannot take bad news.

In sector after sector of U.S. life, the idea hardened: Americans must be promised the world tomorrow if they are to get thru today.

But as gigantism has increasingly afflicted the nation's life, the gap has widened steadily between overstated promise and the glacial pace of real change.

A terrible irony it is, that rising numbers of U.S. Negroes should begin urgently imitating the impatience of established white society at a turn in history when the gap between easy promise and real hope has become so huge.

This country may be over-extended, trying to do more than it should or can. But if President Johnson is guilty of veiling that fact, he is hardly different from critics who propose laying out hundreds of billions to remake U.S. cities in quick, sweeping strokes—with no genuine attention to how it can be achieved or paid for. They are caught up in the syndrome they attack.

Magazine Article Angers Residents of Plymouth, Mich.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARVIN L. ESCH
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 16, 1967

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, I was distressed and shocked to read in the August 8 edition of Look Magazine that Plymouth, Mich., was a center of illegal drug activity. Citizens of this outstanding residential community in Michigan's Second District were astounded and angered by this outrageous and false claim. Plymouth is a fine community and has no significant drug or crime problem.

What was behind the unfounded charge that Plymouth is a dope center? Veteran newspaperman W. W. Edgar, of the Plymouth Mail & Observer, conducted a thorough investigation. Far from being a widespread community problem, Edgar discovered that the "drug problem" involved only one small firm—and there it centered around a small bookkeeping discrepancy which was quickly corrected to the satisfaction of the Food and Drug Administration.

Plymouth's reputation was slurred in a national publication. I want to take this opportunity to set the record straight and include Mr. Edgar's article, which appeared in the August 13 Plymouth Mail & Observer to be printed at this point in the RECORD:

OUR PLYMOUTH A DOPE CENTER? WELL, HARDLY

(By W. W. Edgar)

A single sentence in the Look Magazine edition of August 8 referring to Plymouth as a center of the drug problem in the nation shocked area residents, brought stormy denials from the law enforcement officers and, upon investigation, proved to be nothing more than an unusual set of circumstances that made a mountan of a molehill.

The Look article entitled, "Drugs, The Mounting Menace of Abuse" was written by Roland H. Berg, and in it he declared, in part:

"An epidemic of drug abuse is sweeping the nation. The contagion, centered on college campuses, also infects high-school students and adults in our cities, suburbs and small towns. No one is immune . . .

"Drugs no longer are a slum problem . . .

"Serious drug problems sweep through white America: Junction City, Kans.; Pagedale, Mo.; Woodford, Va.; Plymouth, Mich.—places with apple-pie smells and wind-snapped flags. . . ."

This was the sole reference to Plymouth in the lengthy article but the charge of being a "dope center" brought quick and pointed denials from the city and township authorities.

City Police Chief Robert Corrington called it "muck-raking that has given Plymouth an unwarranted black-eye. If no city had a bigger dope or drug problem than Plymouth, it would be a damn clean country."

Public Safety Director Paul Albright of Plymouth Township was aghast with disbelief when shown the article.

In view of these reactions how could such an article come to be written?

The Mail & Observer immediately contacted all parties and agencies concerned. Here are the facts:

The author, reached at his office at Look Magazine, revealed that the source of his information was the March 1 Newletter distributed by the Food and Drug Administration, which stated:

"On February 1, 1967 Deputy U.S. Marshals, accompanied by Michigan State Police and BDAC agents executed a court order for seizure of controlled drugs from Plymouth Laboratories in Plymouth, Michigan.

"This seizure was made after an accountability investigation of the firm's distribution records revealed numerous violations of the record-keeping requirements of the Drug Abuse Control Amendment.

"Simultaneous with the seizure, which amounted to approximately 7.5 million dose units of controlled drugs, the Michigan Board of Pharmacy revoked the firm's drug license.

"The accountability investigation of Plymouth Laboratories was prompted after agents, who had arranged for purchase of some two million anphetamines during an under cover investigations, determined that the drugs were coming from the Plymouth Laboratories."

The author then referred any further questioning to the regional office of the Drug Abuse Commission.

At this agency, Donald Schnettler, one of the men in charge of the Detroit office, stated that there was little information available and suggested that contact be made with Jack Trumbauer, assistant U.S. district attorney, inasmuch as it was a civil case.

Trumbauer pointed out that a consent decree had been obtained in Federal Court with Plymouth Laboratories regarding the records. He further stated that the case did not originate in Michigan, but emanated from the eastern region of Philadelphia and New Jersey where a warrant had been issued for a Paul J. Raisig, a licensed dealer, who had been charged with illegal traffic in drugs.

Raisig, a native of Kalamazoo, was arrested during the investigation at Plymouth Laboratories and according to the U.S. attorney the case is still pending.

U.S. Marshal Orville H. Trotter, of Detroit, offered the further information that on March 9, 1967 a consent decree was issued in Federal Court ordering the return of the medicines to the Plymouth Laboratories. He stated that the Food & Drug investigators apparently had found a very small deficiency in the medicines and they were returned to be reworked.

The U.S. Marshal emphasized that this was not a criminal action, and if there had been any suspicion of illegal drug traffic, the medicines would not have been returned.

Rubin Losh, present owner who took over control of Plymouth Laboratories several years ago, readily admitted that there had been a slight discrepancy in the records that were quickly corrected—and his license was reinstated. He also admitted doing business with Paul Raisig for a long time.

"Raisig is a licensed dealer," he said, "and I have been doing business with him for a long time. I have no way of telling whether he makes illegal sales, and I am surprised that such a reference would be made toward the City of Plymouth."

And so the mountain became a molehill.

Farm Bureau Companies Pay Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED SCHWENGEL
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 16, 1967

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, because of the recent unfair attacks on the Farm Bureau and its members, I would like to call the attention of the House to an article written by the highly respected farm editor of the Des Moines Register concerning the business aspects of Farm Bureau-affiliated companies:

IOWA FARM BUREAU PAID OVER $1 MILLION IN TAXES

(By Don Muhm)

The Iowa Farm Bureau Federation, which says it "has nothing to hide" as far as tax matters are concerned, paid at least $1,150,000 in state and federal taxes through its business-affiliated companies in 1966.

"We welcome any investigation into our tax matters," stated J. Merrill Anderson, Newton farmer and state Farm Bureau president now completing his second, two-year term in that office.

"We have lived by and have abided by state and federal laws," he said.

The tax status of state Farm Bureau units, such as the Iowa organization which has 113,000 members, as well as the parent American Farm Bureau Federation, has been under fire.

MAIN ATTACKER

Source of the attack is Representative Joseph Resnick (Dem., N.Y.), a member of the House Committee on Agriculture and chairman of that committee's subcommittee on rural development.

Resnick has called for an investigation by the Internal Revenue Service of the Farm Bureau's tax status. His charges have put new focus on the structure of the Farm Bureau, which nationally is the largest general farm organization with 1.7 million members.

Iowa Farm Bureau leaders feel that Resnick's blanket charges are erroneous, and that they have created confusion concerning the organization and its affiliated companies.

They point out that the Farm Bureau as an organization is tax-exempt, but that its affiliated companies are taxed like any other comparable business concerns.

"The Farm Bureau is not in the insurance business," said Iowa President Anderson. "It did help start insurance companies which are separate corporations organized under the same laws as other Iowa-based insurance companies.

"These companies were formed by the Farm Bureau to serve its members."

Anderson reported that the Farm Bureau Life Insurance Co. operates under the same tax laws as does every other life insurance stock company in Iowa.

"And this company pays taxes like every other company," Anderson added.

PAID $776,000

In 1966, Farm Bureau Life paid $776,000 in federal and state taxes, according to Anderson. This company had $750 million in force at the end of last year in the states (Iowa, Minnesota and Nebraska) in which it operates.

The Farm Bureau Mutual Insurance Co., which deals in casualty, fire and hail coverage, paid taxes of $338,000 last year. This money was largely premium tax since operating losses for casualty companies were high in 1966 and the Farm Bureau concern did not pay any federal income tax for the 1966 year.

Anderson said that the Farm Bureau-affiliated FS Services, Inc., of Bloomington, Ill., also pays taxes the same as any other farm supply concern. This company sells fertilizer feed and other farm items largely to farmers in Iowa, Illinois and Wisconsin.

Taxes of $36,000 were paid last year for the Farm Bureau state office building and related facilities in downtown Des Moines. Most of this tax money related to property taxation, Anderson said.

ON ONLY PART

Taxes are paid on only that part of a Farm Bureau office or related facility that is used for non-organizational purposes, such as insurance or farm supply business operations.

"If half of an office is used for non-organization purposes," said Anderson, "then that half of the Farm Bureau office, its equipment and facilities, is taxed like any other business place."

The Polk County Farm Bureau office was mentioned in a suit filed last week in District Court here. The Greater Des Moines Chamber of Commerce claimed, in the suit, that it is entitled to the same tax-exempt status granted to the Farm Bureau.

Farm Bureau officials pointed out later, however, that $740 will be paid in property taxes this year on the Polk County Farm Bureau building located at 1200 E. Euclid ave.

The $740 in taxes relates to that portion of this building used for other than Polk County Farm Bureau purposes.

"The tax-exempt aspect of the Farm Bureau relates only to the organization itself, and not to its non-organization activities," Anderson said.

The Farm Bureau president, Anderson, is also president of two of the Farm Bureau's affiliated insurance companies which operate in Iowa, Minnesota and Nebraska. All of the corporations share in paying his salary, which is not made public.

Berkshire Festival Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 16, 1967

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues a special day in my district in Massachusetts. Gov. John A. Volpe has proclaimed August 17 as Berkshire Festival Day throughout Massachusetts. The Boston Symphony Orchestra's concerts at the Tanglewood Music Festival in Lenox, Mass., have long been a highlight of the summer season in Berkshire County, and it is fitting that they will be featured on August 17.

At 7:30 in the evening, Erich Leinsdorf will conduct a gala concert by the Boston Symphony Orchestra as part of a program to benefit the Berkshire Music Center. The concert will be televised live by the National Broadcasting Co. I have always thought that the Boston Symphony Orchestra was one of the most outstanding in the country, and I feel that it is appropriate that their music should be brought to the whole country on Berkshire Festival Day.

I am further pleased to announce in this connection that Monday evening, August 21, Arthur Fiedler will conduct the Boston Pops Orchestra in a special concert at Expo 67 in Montreal. This program will highlight Massachusetts Day at Expo 67.

Realistic Riot Prevention Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY L. PETTIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 16, 1967

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, every American is concerned about conditions in city slums and other disadvantaged communities. Few are able to take a view that is both realistic and courageous. In my opinion, the editors of the San Bernardino Evening Telegram have effectively done this.

In the following editorial, "Program for Jobs in the Slums," a root problem is frankly identified and constructively treated:

PROGRAMS FOR JOBS IN THE SLUMS

There have been plenty of calls for "instant hiring" of slum dwellers. The constant theme of Negro leaders—and of many white public officials—is that lack of jobs is basic to unrest in the big cities.

Instant hiring by private employers has not happened nor will it happen unless the jobless have skills. Private firms cannot hire unqualified help.

"What's needed to close the gap on an immediate basis is some sort of government program for creating work," says a Philadelphia businessman.

Well, why not? There could be a double purpose in such programs. One would be to give the unemployed something to do. The other would be to improve living conditions in the slums.

There is no doubt that the final abolishment of poverty must rest on long-range programs, which produce steady, though unspectacular results. During the last few years, the majority of Negroes have been moving ahead both in employment and education. The average level of income among non-white families, though still well below that of whites, has been rising more swiftly than that of whites.

But within the broad framework of Negro improvement, there have been some striking disparities. As of June 1967, government statistics showed that the unemployment rate among non-white men had declined to 4.6 per cent. However, among non-white youths—those in their late teens—the unemployment rate nationally was an appalling 26 percent.

This is exactly the element that has taken the lead in the city riots. Most of them are school dropouts, and have no job training. In a technological society, they are unemployable and will remain so unless their condition is changed.

A government program could offer them work in the slums; cleaning, painting, repair work of all kinds, rat eradication—you name it. Whatever housing ill exists anywhere, the slums have a sample.

Hopefully, such programs would get the youths in the working habit, and encourage them to move on to training programs. At the same time, the ghetos—which are now depressing enough to make any human being hostile—would be brightened.

Training programs now exist in the War on Poverty organization. Possibly, utilization of the job training could be tied into the works program, and made a requirement. In that case, expansion of the training setup might be necessary.

Further, the able-bodied on welfare could be removed from the rolls and required to work, thus reducing expenditures in that field somewhat.

Finally, a public works program would draw a sharp line between those willing to work and those who use lack of jobs only as an excuse for protest. The good and the bad need to be labeled.

There are indications that the administration would be receptive to a works program if there were some strong hints from the public. How to get the message through to Congress is a tougher problem, for Congress is in a dour mood where money is concerned.

Yet, this is the kind of investment that could pay long-range dividends. It offers an opportunity for progressive congressmen to formulate a realistic venture.

On Rioting—We Can Tear Down, but Can We Build Up?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 16, 1967

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, today while we are discussing and voting on another piece of legislation aimed at improving the civil rights of all Americans, it seems particularly timely to call to the attention of my colleagues an outstanding editorial in a leading Negro publication which takes a commendable attitude regarding Negro rights and responsibilities.

This outstanding editorial by Clarence J. Irving, editor of the San Diego Voice, deserves thoughtful consideration. Personally, I applaud the reasonable and responsible tone of Mr. Irving's comments and believe they will contribute much to improvements in community relations between Negroes and others.

I include the editorial as a portion of my remarks:

ON RIOTING—WE CAN TEAR DOWN, BUT CAN WE BUILD UP?

"We Shall Tear Down" ought to be the new title of a Negro national anthem replacing "We Shall Overcome." In the U.S. ghetto today, destruction is the by-word. It must happen for sure, because the revolution is too far gone to turn around.

However, looking into the future, we ask, after the Molotov cocktails, fires and looting, will the Negro be free and able to create anything of value on his own?

There are grave doubts about our constructive ability—it's a little more difficult to build up than to break down. And thus far in this country our greatest achievements are in singing, dancing, and making love. Also, we have been able to yell quite loudly about our problems—about the white man having his foot on our neck. Also, we have been great speech makers. For example at the national black power conference of last week in Newark, some main goals reportedly include:

"—Negro controlled financial institutions supported by bonds to provide for neighborhood credit unions and housing and business loans," and

"—Selective buying to fore job upgrading and a nation-wide 'buy-black' move."

The words sound fine, but it's a fact that in business, economics, money, that is with "green power," the black man just isn't ready. It's a fact that all of the speeches in the world are just hot air without the economic power that the man wields who controls our politicians, our jobs—our very lives.

It's a fact that gaining economic power has been a goal for the Negro since Booker T. Washington's Negro Business League of the early 1900's—the colored man's Chamber of Commerce—which tried to make the Negro a force in the business world—and failed.

Black nationalists like Marcus Garvey, before Stokeley Carmichael even thought about being born, wanted Negroes to own stores and factories, to get closer to green power. Garvey himself set an example by running an all-Negro steamship company, the ill-fated Black Star Line, which failed to the tune of more than $500,000.00 after four years.

Today there is the NEIU, the Negro Economic and Industrial Union—with ex-footballer Jim Brown at the helm, trying again to do what countless other black business groups have before failed.

Uncle Sam has tried hard to help us. The Wall Street Journal reported last week that Sam has lost more than $10 million in defaulted Small Business loans to brothers.

The facts—aside from glittering speeches and goals—are saddening. Although there are individual rich blacks—they have made it by and large in fields like show business and personal services, or in areas where he had little or no competition, and a tremendous edge—beauty culture, insurance and real estate, for example.

But we have no beautiful skyscrapers, no hotels (we take them over when dilapitated), no department stores, no factories hiring more than ten people, no buses, no electric or gas companies.

The black conference also called for a separate nation here in the U.S. for black people. This, of course, is possible, but right off the bat, such a nation would be in sad shape because the black man has never been able to compete with the white man economically.

Aside from equal rights—money makes this world go 'round, and thoughtful Negroes must be prepared to fill the void created by the destruction of the Revolution.

Last week in San Diego several businesses were closed on Imperial Avenue after having windows broken the week before. This week the convenient branch of the Gas and Electric company moved its location.

New businesses, which could hire more of us, are frightened of setting up in our neighborhood. We not only need the jobs that these businesses could offer, but we need their services. It costs to take a bus downtown. And if you drive, it costs for gas and parking.

The Negro must come out the loser when he destroys, at random, that which could help him, and that which he is unable or unwilling to replace.

I'm reminded of a child who gets a thrill out of being able to dismantle his toy to see how it's made, but then cannot begin to put it together again.

Negroes must begin to take more lessons and more responsibility in economics. This cannot be done as quickly as breaking a window. But it's just as important. And in the meantime, maybe some windows ought not to be broken, until we know how to make glass.

"From 'Hear' and There"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 16, 1967

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Dolton-South Holland Shopper is a publication specializing in advertising and shopping news and does not as a general rule take an editorial position. However, in its August 10 edition Editor Harold Pals, in his personal "Here and There" column produced a frank and thought provoking commentary on the riots which have been afflicting the country. In placing this commentary in the RECORD I wish to point out that it is the voice of grassroots thinking, vigorously expressing the concern of the writer with the conditions the Nation has faced in recent months. The article is timely and, as I pointed out, frank and thought provoking. Since it is the type of commentary that should stimulate honest discussion, I urge that it be thoughtfully read by the Members.

The article follows:

FROM "HEAR" AND THERE

(By Harold Pals)

It is a mystery to me indeed why the President of the United States should have to appoint a special commission to investigate the causes of the riots and mob violence which have swept our land like wildfire in recent weeks. Either he is blind to certain facts or he does not care to face them.

It seems to me that the answers to the causes of riots are not only readily available but that they are verily flying in our face. Anyone who reads a daily newspaper or watches a T.V. newscast cannot possibly avoid recognizing them.

To begin with, we know that during the past several years there has been a general breakdown of morals and one demonstration after another of disrespect for authority and law and order. This breakdown has been encouraged greatly by a number of decisions handed down by the U.S. Supreme Court. We have commented frequently on this matter wondering how men who wear the black robes of justice can possibly see their way clear to set the guilty free in the name of "personal rights".

Just one example of such incredible decisions concerns a Brooklyn man, Jose Suarez by name, who confessed to stabbing his common law wife and five children to death last year, but was set free because of the Supreme Court ruling barring confessions as evidence unless a suspect is previously advised of his right to counsel. Even the judge, Justice Michael Kern of the Brooklyn Supreme Court who had to release him considered the whole business revolting for he said: "This is a very sad thing. It is repulsive and makes one's blood run cold . . . to let a thing like this out on the street."

Can you believe it? If you think I am exaggerating the matter, I have the news articles in my file and will be glad to show them to anyone. Imagine, a man stabs six people to death and goes free on a Supreme Court technicality!

In view of such evidence, my friends, do we need a special commission to investigate the cause of riot and mob violence?

Secondly, our government has permitted "black power" leaders to criss-cross our country preaching hate, anarchy and bloodshed. H. Rap Brown, who succeeded Stokley Carmichael as head of the so called Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee told negroes in Washington last week to "get you some guns" and "burn this town down." Does that sound like nonviolence to you?

About a month ago, Stokely Carmichael in a speech to college students said: "To hell with the laws of the United States. And, in Havana recently, he said that urban guerrillas were being organized for a "fight to the death." And he further declared that they will move first to kill President Johnson, Secretary of State Rusk, and Secretary of Defense McNamara. Now, if this is not treason, I don't know the meaning of the word.

If our government permits Carmichael to return to the United States, some of the officials may have to pay for that folly with their life.

It is high time, no, past high time that our government calls a halt to these anarchists and treason lovers. They are a great moving force behind all the rioting and violence and the seed they have sown is now bringing a multiplied harvest. In view of such evidence, my friends, do we need a special commission to investigate the *cause* of riot and mob violence?

Thirdly, the Chicago Tribune in an editorial dated August 2, reminded us of some of the statements which government leaders have made during the past few years. For example, in a speech to college students on August 3, 1965, President Johnson told them, "I am proud to salute you as fellow revolutionaries. . . . we want change. . . . I hope you will go out into the hinterland and rouse the masses and blow the bugles and tell them the hour has arrived and their day is here." Looks like they took your advice, Lyndon!

Also, one year ago in a night message to Congress, the President in an attempt to sew up the vote of the racial minority forever joined the chant and dramatically shouted, "We shall overcome."

But, Vice President Humphrey has done his share also. In a speech in New Orleans on July 18, 1966, he declared: "If I had to live in the slums I think you would have more trouble than you have had already because I've got enough spark left in me to lead a mighty good revolt." I wonder if these words came to mind again as the Vice President heard the news of Newark and Detroit being burned to cinders?

Add to this the contribution of our U.S. Senator who wears his hair like a California Hippie these days, Senator Robert F. Kennedy. On August 17, 1965, he said, "There is no point in telling negroes to obey the law. To many negroes the law is the enemy." What or when should negroes obey, Bobby?

And, finally, add the advice of the late President John F. Kennedy who once shouted to a group of negroes, "If you do not get your way, you will have to take to the streets." And, they did!

In view of this evidence, do we need a special commission to investigate the cause of riots and mob violence?

No, a thousand times no. We do not need a special commission to investigate the *cause* of riots and mob violence. We are up to our necks in evidence. How can they possibly ignore all of it? The Supreme Court under Chief Justice Earl Warren, our government leaders who in the name of free speech permit anarchists and treason lovers to preach on every street corner, and who themselves make remarks which incite to riot. . . . they are responsible for this monster which practices the works of perdition. But, our government leaders will not recognize this. Rather, they call for more money for more aid and welfare and poverty programs. We already have a list of such programs as long as both your arms and although we have discovered that many people who have been taken from the slums and put in high-rise apartments still dump their garbage in the hall or out of the window, the cry of the President and Vice President is more, more aid.

No, we do not need more welfare programs. What we need is some old-fashioned justice once again, the kind that calls sin sin and does not make excuses for lawbreakers. The kind that begins in the home by giving Johnny a whack on the britches when he misbehaves instead of psychoanalyzing him to see what we might have done wrong to make him act that way. The simple kind of old-fashioned justice which most of us learned at our mother's knee should extend into every area of life. It says that wrongdoing must be punished and it fits the punishment to the misdemeanor.

In this connection, we congratulate Mayor Daley for his forthright statements concerning possible rights in Chicago. He said that the National Guard is under a standing alert and that thousands of militia can be on the streets within an hour. "There will be no substitute cartridges and no ammunition that won't be live," he declared. And he adds, "I declare that law, order, and justice will prevail in our city. . . ." Significant also is the fact that Cook County Sheriff Joe Woods said that his men would "stop rioters dead" and he emphasized the word "dead".

The Preamble to the United States Constitution reads: "We the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this constitution for the United States of America."

That term "insure domestic tranquility" should be haunting every government leader today in view of what has transpired. The American people will not permit lady justice to be cloistered in the corner forever by our leaders. If they do not take sterner measures to insure the domestic tranquility of law abiding citizens, both Negro and white, the time will come when the citizens will be forced to take these measures themselves in order to preserve property and their very lives. We are pledged to preserve our Republic!

View From Space

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 27, 1967

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, recently a poll was taken by Louis Harris on public support of our space program and I must say the results were discouraging in view of the fact that enthusiasm and approval of our national space program is declining. The significant conclusion drawn from the poll is that those who favor and support the national space program are the young people of our country and we must depend on them to keep national support for our goals alive.

In light of the results of the Harris poll and its warning, it was very disheartening to read in the Chicago Tribune that an educator of our young minds was voicing his disapproval of the space programs to his students. I wish to insert in the Record the following article from the Chicago Tribune written by a Capt. Phillips Iden, of the Chicago Police Department. In these few paragraphs, Captain Iden has presented a thought-provoking argument in support of the space program; and its message cannot be repeated too many times.

VIEW FROM SPACE

Chicago, July 10.—It was disheartening to read in today's Voice of the People an educator's disapproval of the space program. This man, responsible for molding the minds of our future generations, would have us stick our heads in the sands of ignorance.

Now for the first time in history we can observe our planet earth from outer space. From there we can survey the possibilities of feeding and distributing our exploding populations from resources of land and sea. We can take inventory of mineral deposits for future needs.

Thru our telecommunications we can reach a better understanding with our distant neighbors and promote peace. Peace alone can provide the proper climate for feeding the hungry, adequate housing, education, and conditions that do not breed crime.

As we now see our planet from a distant perspective, we begin to see ourselves from beyond a narrow, subjective viewpoint. Too long have we looked from the inner selfish viewpont, prolonging the agonies of wars, famines, ignorance, and poverty.

These problems will not be solved by diverting money appropriated for space research and knowledge. Money in itself cannot create understanding, food, living space, or knowledge. Money spent in the pursuit of knowledge thru space exploration may provide all these needs.

Despite dissenters, man will continue to seek out the wonders of the universe at all costs. The billions we spend now in the conquest of ignorance will be repaid with interest when we cross the new horizons of enlightenment and enter our brilliant future.

Capt. Phillips Iden.

The Unversity of California's Education Abroad Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 16, 1967

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I have long been acquainted with the "Education Abroad" program of the University of California. It is undoubtedly one of the most complete and the most successful among many similar programs. I feel that the university deserves recognition for its efforts and have asked Mr. Keith Sours, a summer intern and a recent Berkeley graduate, to provide a synopsis of the program in order to provide an opportunity for the Members of Congress to become acquainted with it:

THE EDUCATION ABROAD PROGRAM

(By Keith Sours)

The University of California is beginning the sixth year of operating the Education Abroad Program with an enrollment of 340 students in the following centers: Hong Kong; Tokyo, Japan; Bogota, Colombia; Birmingham, Edinburgh, and Sussex in the United Kingdom; Bordeaux, France; Goettingen, Germany; Padua, Italy; Delphi, Greece; and Madrid, Spain. It is open to all qualified students from the nine campuses of the University for either graduate or undergraduate studies. Future plans include centers to open for the academic year 1968–69 in both Beirut, Lebanon and Jerusalem, Israel. These centers were to have opened with 16 students in September of this year, but had to be delayed as a result of the events of this summer. In addition, a special program for Spanish Language instructors will open in September of 1968 in Mexico.

Students are selected on the basis of academic achievement, personal interview and (where necessary) language proficiency. Most centers are open to students of any academic major and students may choose their course of study so that they make normal progress toward their degree. Some centers are for specific area studies or for certain majors, such as language in Mexico and drama in Delphi.

An interesting feature of the UC Program is that the directors in the various countries are professors who take the opportunity (usually two years) to continue their own studies and are chosen not only on their qualification, but on their interests in the specific area. In addition, the Hong Kong center includes a joint effort by the Chinese and the Americans to improve the teaching and administration of the Hong Kong University. Two faculty members from UC act as deaprtment heads, usually in new fields that need strengthening. This year there are two profesors; one acting as Graduate Dean of the Department of Psychology, the other is continuing as head of the Mathematics Department.

The financing is handled in much the same way as it is on the home campus. The students pay the same fees as they do at home. In addition, they pay their transportation and their housing. However, with the many scholarships and grants made available and the comparatively low cost of living, the cost of the year abroad is approximately the same as a normal school year.

The financing of the Hong Kong center is, however, unique. Support for this program comes from a grant by the Bureau of Education and Cultural Affairs of the State Department which provides the transportation cost for one American professor. The University of California pays for the other professor and the Chinese provide their housing. In addition, scholarships are available for 4 graduate students to act as assistants to Chinese professors and for 5 undergraduate travel grants. The Department of State provides 3 additional stipends for junior faculty members from Hong Kong to do PhD work at UC, while California waives fees.

The distinctive feature of the program is the emphasis placed upon cooperation between the two universities and upon the full academic and cultural integration of the students into the life of the foreign university community. They live as do the students of the host university, attend the same classes, share the same professors, and take part in their social and cultural activities.

By way of illustration of the format of the program, I turn to the Italian Study Center where I spent the academic year 1965–66. We were a group of 22 students from three different campuses and included students whose interest ranged from Art to Political Science.

As with the other programs, the year began early with a six-week, intensive language-culture course with local professors. This gives the students a chance to break the language barrier before the local students arrive. All of our group had two years of the language behind us; but the intensive use and study was invaluable.

When the University of Padua opened, we all had Italian roommates in dormitories and took our meals in the student cafeterias. Our classes were Italian classes, chosen on the same basis as we would have at home. We had special study sections set up by Padua University for the Americans to supplement the regular courses. These were also in Italian and often with the same professors. We were subject not only to Italian exam requirements, but to special requirements of this supplementary sections. The academic life was rigorous, but rewarding. Seldom were we treated special and never were we given less difficult assignments because of our speical status.

The social-cultural life was of our own making. There was no formal effort made by UC to force us into the Italian community. We made friends and handled our social life much as we would have at home, but always with a view to the traditions and mores that differed from our own. As problem arose, the student was expected to handle them to his own ability.

Travel was, of course, very important. We either traveled in groups or individually, whichever suited us best. We were not restricted by UC in any way except to provide a basic itinerary in case we needed to be contacted. The director encouraged us to travel to the limits our pocketbooks would allow us.

The University of California deserves praise for the quality and thoroughness of the Education Abroad Program. It is attempting to build relationships with foreign universities that will open all their resources to American faculty and students and, at the same time, opening the doors of UC in reciprocation. This comes at a time when real communication between countries is so crucial to complete world understanding.

Mr. Speaker, the University of California has demonstrated what the possibilities are for successful reciprocation in international studies. The field is, however, still wide open and the void cannot be adequately filled by our universities alone. Both Government and business must follow the example of the University of California in providing Americans with the tools needed in foreign relations, language and area studies. Preeminence in the field of international affairs demands this of us.

I direct the attention of my colleagues to H.R. 3548 which I introduced in both the 89th and 90th Congresses along with Senator CLAIBORNE PELL. In light of our responsibilities in international affairs, I call for immediate consideration of this bill. The advantages of a governmental response to the needs of international education as outlined in the bill are exemplified by the results of the UC Hong Kong program. One can hardly deny that it is an investment of high, long-term gain.

I emphasize, Mr. Speaker, the fact that there is pending legislation to accomplish needed Federal involvement. I refer not only to H.R. 3548, but to the International Education Act which we passed in 1966 but have yet to finance. I suggest to my colleagues that it is time we direct our immediate attention to the needs of education in international affairs.

The Justice (?) Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LARRY WINN, JR.

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 16, 1967

Mr. WINN. Mr. Speaker, in a recent editorial, the Kansas City Call chided the Department of Justice for allowing their officials to make statements concerning the urban riots which predicted more to come. In this editorial they point out that predictions of this sort from Government officials are as irresponsible as statements made by Stokely Carmichael and Rap Brown.

I want to associate myself with the remarks of the Call and wish to insert them here for my colleagues' perusal:

IRRESPONSIBILITY IN HIGH PLACES

> Stokely Carmichael and "Rap" Brown have been severely criticized by both white and Negro citizens for the irresponsible statements that they have made during this country's racial upheaval. That criticism has been just.
>
> Now come persons in high places—as high as the U.S. Department of Justice itself—who are making statements just as irresponsible as those of Carmichael and Brown.
>
> We were shocked to read in a UPI release this week that "High Justice Department officials viewed the current quiet in the nation's cities as merely a lull before another storm of rioting."
>
> Cities throughout the country, torn by violence and disorder for 23 days, were notably calm over the last week-end and into the middle of this week. For this condition, the Justice Department and the nation should be giving thanks rather than predicting that the rioting soon would break out again.
>
> Law-enforcement officials need to stay on their guard and to be prepared for anything that might happen but we feel that it is most out of place and unbecoming for an official of the Justice Department to suggest publicly that another wave of racial violence is in the offing.
>
> Such a statement is akin to the numerous rumors which have been floating around many of our large cities during the last two weeks—rumors that trouble was going to break out on such and such a day. Kansas City has had its share of rumors but, thank God, we have had no outbreak of any consequence, false reports in a national magazine and an erroneous statement over a wire service and a national radio network notwithstanding.
>
> The official (or officials) who suggested that the current quiet is just the "lull before another storm" should be severely reprimanded. His identity was not disclosed but he should be ferreted out and harshly dealt with. Suggesting riots and putting ideas into immature minds is almost as bad as actually starting one.

Archie Moore: "Success Was a Way To Fight Back"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED REINECKE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 16, 1967

Mr. REINECKE. Mr. Speaker, Archie Moore, internationally known Californian and retired light-heavyweight boxing champion of the world, told friends recently that he feels—

> Everybody must take a stand in this time of internal crisis. A man who stands neutral stands for nothing.

He has written an excellent statement which appeared in the San Diego Union newspaper of Tuesday, August 8, 1967. It deserves the attention of the House:

> The devil is at work in America, and it is up to us to drive him out. Snipers and looters, white or black, deserve no mercy. Those who would profit from their brother's misfortunes deserve no mercy, and those who would set fellow Americans upon each other deserve no mercy.
>
> I'll fight the man who calls me an "Uncle Tom." I have broken bread with heads of state, chatted with presidents and traveled all over the world. I was born in a ghetto, but I refused to stay there. I am a Negro, and proud to be one. I am also an American, and I'm proud of that.
>
> The young people of today think they have a hard lot. They should have been around in the '30s when I was coming up in St. Louis. We had no way to go, but a lot of us made it. I became light heavyweight champion of the world. A neighbor kid down the block, Clark Terry, became one of the most famous jazz musicians in the world. There were doctors, lawyers and chiefs who came out of that ghetto. One of the top policemen in St. Louis came from our neighborhood.
>
> We made it because we had a goal, and we were willing to work for it. Don't talk to me of your "guaranteed national income." Any fool knows that this is insanity. Do we bring those who worked to get ahead down to the level of those who never gave a damn? The world owes nobody—black or white—a living. God helps the man who help himself!
>
> Now then, don't get the idea that I didn't grow up hating the injustices of this world. I am a staunch advocate of the Negro revolution for the good of mankind. I've seen almost unbelievable progress made in the last handful of years. Do we want to become wild beasts bent only on revenge, looting and killing and laying America bare? Hate is bait, bait for the simple-minded.
>
> Sure, I despised the whites who cheated me, but I used that feeling to make me push on. If you listen to the professional rabble-rousers, adhere to this idea of giving up everything you've gained in order to revenge yourself for the wrongs that were done to you in the past—then you'd better watch your neighbor, because he'll be looting your house next. Law and order is the only edge we have. No man is an island.
>
> Granted, the Negro still has a long way to go to gain a fair shake with the white man in this country. But believe this: if we resort to lawlessness, the only thing we can hope for is civil war, untold bloodshed, and the end of our dreams.
>
> We have to have a meeting of qualified men of both races. Mind you, I said qualified men, not some punk kid, ranting the catch phrases put in his mouth by some paid hate-monger. There are forces in the world today, forces bent upon the destruction of America, your America and mine. And while we're on the subject, do you doubt for a minute that communism, world communism, is'nt waiting with bated breath for the black and white Americans to turn on each other full force? Do you want a chance for life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness in the land of your birth, or do you want no chance at all under the Red heel?

AFRICA'S A GREAT PLACE TO VISIT

> There are members of the black community who call for a separate nation within America. Well, I do not intend to give up one square inch of America. I'm not going to be told I must live in a restricted area. Isn't that what we've all been fighting to overcome? And then there is the element that calls for a return to Africa.
>
> For my part, Africa is a great place to visit, but I wouldn't want to live there. If the Irishmen want to go back to the Emerald Isle, let them. If the Slavs want to return to the Iron Curtain area, OK by me. But I'm not going to go to any part of Africa to live. I'm proud of ancestry, and of the country that spawned my forefathers, but I'm not giving up my country. I fought all my life to give my children what I'm able to give

them today; a chance for development as citizens in the greatest country in the world.

I do not for a moment think that any truly responsible Negro wants anarchy. I don't think you'll find intelligent—no, let's rephrase that—mature Negroes running wild in the streets or sniping at total strangers. God made the white man as well as the black. True, we haven't acted as brothers in the past, but we are brothers. If we're to be so many Cains and Abels, that's our choice. We can't blame God for it.

TEACH THAT ANY BOY CAN

Something must be done to reach the Negroes and the whites in the ghettos of this country, and I propose to do something.

As a matter of plain fact, I have been doing something for the past several years. I have been running a program which I call the ABC—Any Boy Can. By teaching our youth, black, white, yellow and red, what dignity is, what self respect is, what honor is, I have been able to obliterate juvenile delinquency in several areas.

I would now expand my program, change scope. If any boy can, surely any man can. I want to take teams of qualified people, top men in their fields, to the troubled areas of our cities. I know that the people who participated in the recent riots, who are participating and who will participate, are misguided rather than mad.

If some bigot can misguide, then I can guide. I've spent too much of my life building what I've got to put it to torch just to satisfy some ancient hatred of a man who beat my grandfather. Those men are long dead. Do we have to choke what could be a beautiful garden with weeds of hate? I say no! And I stand ready to start "Operation Gardener." I invite the respected Negro leaders of our country to join me.

Rabbi Shmidman Sees Israel Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. HOWARD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 16, 1967

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, recently a prominent New Jersey clergyman, Rabbi Morris A. Shmidman, spiritual leader of the Orthodox Congregation Sons of Israel in Asbury Park, visited Israel and recorded his reactions to the changes that have taken place since the recent war with the Arab States. Although this was his third trip to the Holy Land he noted that the experience was as new to him as his very first trip due to the amazing growth the tiny State of Israel has made in the last few years.

As Rabbi Shmidman toured the old city of Jerusalem, he noted:

> There was no exultation, no victory celebrations. The price was too high. Everyone knew someone who died in the war.

On one occasion Rabbi Shmidman observed the opening of a kindergarten for children of indigent Shepardic Jews, refugees from Yemen, Iran, and Morocco, who were expelled by Moslem governments in 1949. This school was made possible through the generosity of the Asbury Park-Shore Area Jewish community.

The Asbury Park Sunday Press carried Rabbi Shmidman's recollections of his recent visit on August 13, 1967, and I wish to insert it in the RECORD at this point:

RABBI SHMIDMAN SEES ISRAEL AGAIN

ASBURY PARK.—"I never believed that in my lifetime I would be at the Wailing Wall," says Rabbi Morris A. Shmidman, recalling his trip to Israel last month.

The spiritual leader of the Orthodox Congregation Sons of Israel here visited the Wall four times during his two-week stay in Israel last month.

The Wailing Wall, all that remains of the ancient Temple of Solomon, is one of the holiest of Jewish religious shrines. For 19 years while in the hands of Jordanian officials, Jews were not admitted to the area in Old Jerusalem.

Thousands of others apparently shared Rabbi Shmidman's belief. The rabbi says that's apparently what accounted for the outpouring of 200,000 Jews who visited the Wall the first day Old Jerusalem came under Israeli control after the six-day June war.

"Even the irreligious streamed toward the Wailing Wall, expressing their belief in miracles," Rabbi Shmidman said.

The Shore rabbi's first visit to the Wall was as a "messenger."

He carried with him a scroll signed by several hundred persons who attended a "bon voyage" party for him and his wife at the Hillel School in Wanamassa. Tradition permits a person who is unable to make a pilgrimage to the Wailing Wall to send a messenger.

The scroll entrusted to Rabbi Shmidman was placed in one of the many crevices in the Wall, also a traditional practice.

He visited Hebron which for more than 100 years, he said, had also been denied to Jews even though the Tomb of the Patriarchs is there—the graves of Abraham, Sarah, Isaac, Rebecca, Jacob, Leah and Joseph. Hebron, like Old Jerusalem, had been in Jordanian territory.

This was his third visit to Israel. "But it was like my first. I saw a vastly new state of Israel," he said, referring to the amazing growth of the 19-year-old nation.

Being there so soon after Israel's third war with her Arab neighbors in less than two decades, Rabbi Shmidman observed that the "mood of the land was far from one of rejoicing.

"There was no exultation, no victory celebrations. The price was too high. Everyone knew someone who died in the war.

"There is no sense of being a conqueror; there is more a sense of grief that peace and security had to be established at the price of human life."

Rabbi Shmidman said he also was made aware of the nation's "pride in its own accomplishments, pride in the knowledge the people did it on their own, and that their future and destiny will be shaped by themselves."

He reported a "sense of gratitude to the United States, to American Jews, to World Jewry for the speed of their response."

Here, Rabbi Shmidman was referring to the outpouring of financial aid from people to the Israel Emergency Fund and to the support given by the American government in the United Nations.

However, he added, "Israel does not believe the U.N. can guarantee peace." He said the people there accept as a "fact of life that regardless of what kind of peace agreements are signed Israel must forever remain armed.

"But," he continued, "there is no animosity, no hatred toward the Arabs."

It was reported last week that Arab shopkeepers and other businessmen closed for one day to protest the unification of the old and new sections of Jerusalem by Israel.

But during Rabbi Shmidman's visit he recalled seeing a sign written in Hebrew on an Arab restaurant in Old Jerusalem saying, "Peace Restaurant in the Unified Jerusalem."

Rabbi Shmidman said there is virtually no physical evidence of the recent war in Israel. About the only signs were the damage from shelling in Mea Sherarim, the ultra-orthodox Jewish quarter adjacent to the Mandelbaum Gate, which formerly separated the Jordan and Israel sectors of Jerusalem. "The war was more evident in the faces and attitudes of the people."

"They don't have the nervous energy to take much more."

He brought back part of the fin of a bomb dropped by an Arab plane. The souvenir was marked with the name of a manufacturer in Troy, N.Y.

Another high light of his visit was observing the creation of a kindergarten for children of Sephardic Jews under the auspices of the Asbury Park-Shore area Jewish community.

Sephardic Jews comes from such countries as Yemen, Persia, Morocco, and are among the indigent, having been thrown out of their homelands by the Moslem governments there following U.N. creation of the state of Israel.

Riots: An Exercise in Futility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON FUQUA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 16, 1967

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, Gene Matthews, of Starke, Fla., is universally recognized as one of the most outstanding weekly newspaper publishers in America.

His Bradford County Telegraph is a widely read and quoted publication, and an editorial of August 3, 1967, was particularly thought provoking.

I am, therefore, having this editorial reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and recommend it for reading to my colleagues:

RIOTS: AN EXERCISE IN FUTILITY

As might be expected, everyone blames everyone else for the disgraceful and inexcusable riots that have racked Newark, Detroit, and other large Eastern cities during this memorable summer of 1967.

Democrats blame Republicans, Republicans blame Democrats, the Mayor of Detroit blames Congress, the Governor of Michigan blames the President, and some thinking people on both sides are beginning to blame the news media for their sensational and sometimes irresponsible coverage of such incidents.

Congress has set the wheels of investigation in motion to try and determine the cause of the riots—a task which will likely prove as ineffectual and inconclusive as most other congressional investigations.

In much that has been written and spoken on the subject, there seems to be an underlying theme that the riots, though reprehensible, are simply the result of desperation and frustration expressed by a race that has been downtrodden for years. This note was unmistakable in the closing comment of Chet Huntley on a news telecast when he said the rioters were in effect, saying. ". . . Whitey, it may take this to make you recognize the problem."

We don't buy this line of hogwash which is being used in an obvious attempt to partially excuse acts of criminal violence.

In all the millions of words that have been written on the subject of the riots, their cause and effect, not the first line has been used to point out that the Negro does not have exclusive access to all sub-standard housing, unemployment and-or job discrimination, and other abuses in the country. Does it ever occur to these "ends justify the means" writers and spokesmen that there might be a few members of other races in the nation that are also born into, live through, and die under conditions just as deplorable as those that handicap segments of the Negro race? We have no doubt that every depressed Negro could be matched with a so-called "pore white" whose lot is equally as frustrating, and gets a lot less attention. Why aren't they rioting in the streets?

The answer is that they don't have the Stokely Carmichaels and the Rap Browns who are allowed to go about the country shouting treason, mayhem, and inciting to riot without fear of punishment or imprisonment.

It is undoubtedly true that these men have been built into national figures and threats to the nation's safety by overzealous reporting by press, radio, and television of their every move, and treasonous remark. They could never have risen to such prominence without the free publicity which is lavished upon them without regard to their real importance.

Many of the very acts that are decried and denounced by press, radio, and television are the work of men whom the news media must share responsibility for building up into their present positions of power.

In an editorial in its current issue, Life magazine points out the basic need for distinguishing between the riots and the goal of Negro advance toward full participation in American life—economic, political, and social.

Life wisely comments that those who say the only answer to the riots is to do more for the Negroes are only inviting further violence. "The threat of arson is not the way to sell the American people on social justice," the Life editorial continues. "A man who loots, who burns, who shoots at police from a rooftop is committing a criminal act. Society puts its very foundation in jeopardy when its officials ignore their duty to stop such crimes or to punish those who commit them."

Another writer has pointed out that American Negroes already have a higher standard of living than many people—probably a majority of people—throughout the world. They also have—or at least a vast majority of them have—finally obtained access to opportunities for self-betterment.

True, it might take years to realize the goals obtainable by application of these opportunities through peaceful channels—but they can never be obtained through riots and other criminal acts of violence.

Retired Age Curtain?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 15, 1967

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Desplaines Valley News, an independent publication serving the southwest suburban area of Cook County, Ill., in its issue of August 10, carried a very stimulating and thought provoking editorial by its editor, Harry Sklenar. In view of the fundamental importance of the subject he discussed, I insert his commentary in the Record at this point:

RETIRED AGE CURTAIN?

Everyone worries about the loss of human dignity behind the Iron Curtain, or about the loss of human dignity of war prisoners, but seldom do they worry about the loss of human dignity behind the age barrier or curtain of age 45, 50 and 65.

Everyone seems to think that they would enjoy living in a world which demands a minimum of effort with guaranteed security and a pension for doing as little or nothing as possible.

Retirees that have reached this state find that the castles of retirement are often but dismal dungeons, for human dignity, recognition and ability are often forced to the sidelines as the iron age curtain bangs down to bar all further effort to serve society.

It is a sad commentary of our society that so much emphasis is given programs for preschool tots, the youths in school, the teenagers, the youths without jobs, the drop-out, and recreational programs for the youth groups, but no program or planned attention to the retired person who finds that he is forced by law to sit on the sidelines, yet well and willing to contribute something more useful to society.

No one seems to bother with the complaints of the retired, for all interest seems turned to youth projects and other community endeavors.

The various unions place high regard on their "retirement benefits," but seldom take an iota of interest in the worker following retirement age.

What of those persons whose establishment went out of business prior to their reaching retirement age? Seldom is a job opportunity provided for that age gap between 45 and 65. What does this person or group do when the axe falls?

Retired persons questioned by this writer tell of aimless wandering about, searching here and everywhere for something to occupy their free time, or even to find someone with time to talk or listen.

Too often their married children have been too busy taking care of their own families to bother with the oldsters, or quite frequently shoving them in the attic, basement, or rear room or on the streets to make their own way.

You will find many such persons in the rooming houses along Archer road and Archer avenue, or living alone in private rooms within residential homes.

Several oldsters with tears in their eyes tell of the practice of tavern owners insisting on their drinking while frequenting the establishments or be tossed outdoors, since the tavern cannot survive on "vagrants," "loiterers," or other designations applied to the oldsters.

Industries design beautiful pension plans, but none has gone ahead to see what the retiree does after he receives the allotment.

One retired person tells us that he gives the tavern owner his entire allotment check so he can have a place to frequent besides his lonely sleeping room.

Some within the golden age group are fortunate in having their cottages to putter away their time, but the majority do not. They live alone, and in some cases are abandoned by their own children and relatives.

This writer can cite several instances where a retiree passed away and it was several days before his absence was missed, or the odor became so strong that entrance to the living quarters was necessary.

Sure they possessed social security. Sure they had union or industrial retirement benefits monthly. But what they needed most was someone who cared, who stopped and chatted and listened.

In an attempt to enrich the lives of the discarded retired persons, thereby enriching the community life level of the entire community, this writer is offering the use of the Community Center from 1:30 p.m. until 6 p.m. daily, and on some days later, depending on demand, for any retired group of four or more persons.

The center is currently undergoing major washroom and electrical repairs, but retired persons can still come, chat, play cards, listen to the ball games on the radio, or just watch the workmen work. If locked, inquire next door at news office.

We sought no government grant. We offer no forced recreational program. We only seek to find out just what retired persons wish.

Retired St. Joseph's parish Pastor Emeritus Rev. J. Fuerst (also "forced to retire") has gladly accepted the responsibility of acting as spiritual counselor for the group.

At least we are attempting to do something constructive for what is believed to be a forgotten segment of people, the retirees. Let no one now say that no attempt has been made to reach this group.

—HARRY SKLENAR.

Toward Peace in the Middle East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 16, 1967

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday, August 10, there appeared in the New York Times a fine and encouraging example of the constructive role which private citizens and organizations can play in support of American foreign policy. I refer to an advertisement in the Times by a new organization called Americans for Permanent Peace in the Middle East Organizing Committee.

The statement reflects the combination of idealism and pragmatism which characterizes the activities of so many private American organizations interested in foreign affairs.

I commend the committee and its founding members, Mr. Meshulam Riklis, Mr. Clarence Moore, Mr. James Michener, Mr. Paul O'Dwyer, Mr. Victor Ratner, and Mr. Herbert Rickman, for the concrete steps they are taking to protect American interests in the Middle East by working for a reasonable and durable peace.

I am sure that my colleagues, regardless of their own views on the subject will be interested in the attached statement:

ALL QUIET IN THE MIDDLE EAST

(NOTE.—There are many different ways of being quiet. One of them is found in "the eye of a hurricane." Everything gets very still . . . as the tremendous destructive forces of the storm are gaining momentum. This is what the "quiet" in the Middle East today can be—unless the United States does what it should and must do to protect its own interests, the interests of the Arabs, the Israelis, and the Free World.)

Here are the Facts:

1. Russia continues to re-arm the Arabs, already investing an estimated additional $2 billion in heavy-destruction weapons for their Arab satellites—on top of the original $3 billion investment in war goods, which the Arabs squandered in their 6-day defeat.

2. Russian warships are now stationed in Alexandria and Suez. They came for "a week's visit" but the Russians have openly anounced they will now remain there "permanently," with more Russian warships to come.

3. That the Russians were defeated in the 6-day war is not a fact. The Arabs were defeated—and this has immeasurably strengthened Russia's hold on them, as well as her overall position in the Middle East.

For the Arabs, at the moment, are stripped of virtually all their independence from Russian designs in the region.

4. This is why the Russians have for all practical purposes now taken over control of the Egyptian and Syrian armed forces; the planning and direction of their industrial mobilization.

What else would the 8,000 Russian "technicians" in these countries, today, be doing?

5. With such Russian support, the Arabs continue to proclaim openly that they are now preparing for the next round of war with Israel.

6. The belligerent Arab leaders also continue their malicious anti-American campaigns; accusing the United States of imperialism, of fostering aggression, even of perfidious "Pearl Harbor" tactics against the Arab nations.

7. But while the Arabs are still determined to wipe Israel out of existence, if they can, this is not Russia's goal. Her large investments in the Arabs are not for the purpose of liquidating Israel, but for the larger purpose of liquidating the American presence in the Middle East. If Israel falls by the wayside, in the process, that's too bad . . . Russia believes she now has the chance to replace American policies, interests and influences—and is ready to do just that, however long it takes!

WHAT CAN THE UNITED STATES DO ABOUT THIS?

Only the United States can protect the interests of the United States. For, if America does not act to halt the use of aggressive militarism, who will?

To do so, we must counter Soviet belligerency, direct or indirect, with a strong and reasonable program for peace in the Middle East.

Surely it is both our national and international responsibility, not only to speak for peace, but to take actions for peace. It is up to us, the United States, to prevent the Middle East from continuing to be a pawn in the Cold War.

President Johnson, in his speech of June 19th, called clearly and boldly for what we, and the world, need most in the Middle East: "a durable peace." We believe the time is overdue for our government to put firm deeds behind these firm words; to act for peace, not just to talk of peace; and that the need is urgent.

This Committee is now being formed for the purpose of upholding the best traditions of the American inheritance, and the American purpose, by mobilizing public opinion with a view of strengthening our President and his Administration in our country's demands for peace, stability and social progress in the Middle East—which can only be achieved by firmness, not by force.

We are therefore for:

1. Full United States pressure to foster constructive plans for economic and social development of the area as a whole.

For example: Large-scale desalinization programs (such as recently proposed by former Pres. Eisenhower) will provide both very badly neeed water and very badly needed employment. These are typical of the technical encouragement and assistance America can and should support.

Simultaneous economic support from the West and East should be welcomed—but never as a screen for military penetration and adventurism.

2. The displaced Palestinians should be aided in a cooperative effort undertaken for their social and economic benefits, regardless of political borders.

3. International waterways and national oil interests must be protected by establishing a climate of cooperative co-existence: among holders and users of the waterways, between oil producers and oil consumers.

4. Not least in importance is the establishment of an adequate international control of arms-shipments into the area.

5. But none of these can be achieved unless the United States takes the leader's role in firmly demanding—and uses all its weight and influence to achieve—the long-sought cessation of continuing hostilities of the Arab nations against Israel (their fellow member in the UN); while also insisting that Israel manifest, in some positive way, its avowed willingness for peace; assuring both sides of full protection for their legitimate necessities, and security of their peoples.

In asking for these things, we are not pro-Israel or pro-Arab—but both.

Above all we seek an enlightened role of active leadership for the United States. One way or the other, we must protect our vital national interests in the Middle East, which we could never afford to surrender. Which is better; to use firmness now or risk the dangers and costs of having to use force later?

We appeal to all those who see the facts of the Middle East as we do, and prefer to use firmness now to the use of force later to bring about "a durable peace" in this region of such inescapable importance to the vital interests of our country.

Join with us to carry out this urgent campaign, on all levels, through every means of public enlightenment.

A Marine's Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 16, 1967

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, while in Vietnam last December, I had the privilege of visiting Lt. Gen. Lewis Walt, then commanding general of the U.S. forces in the I Corps area of Vietnam, and was tremendously impressed with his understanding of the nature of the conflict. General Walt knows that no military victory through the use of air power over North Vietnam is possible and that the principal and most difficult problem facing the South Vietnamese and the U.S. forces in South Vietnam remains the guerrilla in the villages and the pervasive Vietcong "infrastructure."

Recently, I was proud to have General Walt on my weekly radio program, where he again spoke vividly of the complex and difficult nature of the conflict.

I insert herewith an excellent column about General Walt by Marquis Childs from the Washington Post of August 11:

A MARINES' MARINE WITH HOPEFUL IDEA

(By Marquis Childs)

The President, the Vice President, members of Congress and audiences large and small around the country have been listening hopefully to a new version of Vietnam. It comes from a solid, thickset general who is a Marines' Marine. Lt. Gen. Lew Walt is an evangelist for his conviction that cooperation with the South Vietnamese in pacifying the countryside can succeed. In his simple, direct way he argues the case that it is only by working closely on a basis of complete equality with the Vietnamese that control of the countryside can be wrester from the Vietcong.

The Walt line is music to the ears of those in the top echelon in Washington who have been reading gloomy reports of a stalemated war of indefinite duration. For Walt it is not a line but a passionate belief growing out of his two years as Marine commander in I Corps, consisting of the five northern provinces in South Vietnam. That experience, he insists, refutes all the sterotypes of the South Vietnamese military—that they will not fight, that their officers are never, or hardly ever in the thick of battle, that they maltreat and rob the villagers.

Walt had a close working partnership with Maj. Gen. Hoang Xuan Lam, commanding general of South Vietnamese forces in I Corps. They cooperated both in main-force assault on North Vietnamese positions in the Demilitarized Zone and in pacification. Walt says the South Vietnamese lost a lot of senior commanders.

The heart of his story, however, is pacification and the imperative need to win the support of the people in the villages. It was on this that Walt and General Lam concentrated a large part of their effort. When Walt left Danang in June, 14 South Vietnamese battalions out of 29 were working entirely on pacification.

He built up Combined Action Teams made up of a squad of American Marines and South Vietnamese Popular Forces, part-time soldiers, together with a Navy medical officer. The teams go into a village and stay there for six months or longer. Their first task is to grub out the Vietcong. Then they proceed to help establish security in the village behind village chiefs with whom trust and confidence have been established over weeks and months. Many Marines are being taught Vietnamese and others pick up enough to get along with the villagers.

Walt is proud that of 1100 Marines who were in the pacification program 62 per cent asked to have their tour of duty extended. Seventy-five CAT platoons are in the villages, with 114 more programmed. He describes with the same enthusiasm the Kit Carson Teams consisting of two U.S. Marines and two Vietnamese marines that go into the toughest areas to root out VCs.

Give them something to fight for. Walt says this over and over in his enthusiasm. He directed the reactivation of a coal mine, and a power plant is to be built that will use the coal from the mine. It will supply power for lighting to a considerable part of the coastal strip in the north where the peasants have never had electricity.

In late February Walt talked for three hours one evening with Bernard Fall, the distinguished writer on Southeast Asia. Fall took copious notes and, as Walt recalls it, he said at the end of the enthusiastic presentation of the village operation, "You know, this may be it, this may be the answer." The next day Fall was shot down by sniper fire along with a Marine photographer near Hue.

It is costly in lives, Walt doesn't deny this. But he claims a kill ratio over the Vietcong of 21 to 1. More important, he says the rate of VC defectors has been going steadily up, with defectors helped to find useful and constructive work in marked contrast to reports of the lack of any consideration for those in other areas in Vietnam who have been persuaded to abandon the VC and come over to the side of the South.

Questions are bound to occur when one has heard this evangelist expound his faith. Could the same approach be applied in areas such as the Mekong Delta where the VC seem dug in deeper? Why isn't the Walt approach employed elsewhere in the South? Walt, now Deputy Chief of Staff for Manpower, confines himself entirely to his own experience and he is completely loyal to his commander in Vietnam, Gen. William C. Westmoreland.

But the impression grows here that Westmoreland is fighting a conventional war while increasingly the enemy resorts to guerrilla tactics. And a conventional war of search and destroy, giving the Vietnamese little reason for hope, cannot be won in a time span of years.

Milwaukee's Excellent Vocational, Technical, and Adult Schools Provide Model for the Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 25, 1967

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, in the last of an excellent series of 10 articles on vocational education, Cynthia Parsons, education editor of the Christian Science Monitor, describes the outstanding program of the Milwaukee Vocational, Technical, and Adult Schools.

This Milwaukee institution is, as the article reports, "considered by most educational authorities the finest of its kind in the world." As such, it provides a model for the nation of what can be done in providing workers with up-to-date skills.

An extensive program of vocational education can undoubtedly make an important contribution to the elimination of riots and the underlying frustration and alienation. As the article's foreword states:

> The majority of those responsible for the wanton destruction in the riots that have swept American cities this summer are said to be youths without jobs or the skills necessary to get jobs. The vast Milwaukee Vocational, Technical, and Adult Schools system believes it has a partial answer. It offers thousands of courses and superb facilities to those who left or did not finish school.

But it is clear also that vocational education alone it not the answer. As the article also points out, Negro vocational school graduates take longer to get their first job, are less successful in finding a job in their trade or in being accepted into apprenticeship programs, and receive lower earnings than white graduates with the same skills and training.

Because the article contains much that is of general interest, I include it hereafter:

TRAINING: ONE ANSWER TO RIOTS

(By Cynthia Parsons)

MILWAUKEE.—Two weeks ago the Negro community in Milwaukee exploded in frustration. It was a small riot, as riots this summer in the United States are sadly measured, but it was no surprise to anyone. As a University of Wisconsin administrator explained:

"We all knew it would come. The Negroes have been frustrated, and the attitude on the part of some of the white community has been a kind of perverse pride about the poor way Negroes have been treated."

The American Institute for Research has made the most comprehensive study to date of vocational education in the United States, comparing results for the years 1953, 1958, and 1962. Regarding Negroes, the institute made the following generalizations for the nation as a whole:

Negro graduates of vocational curriculums take about twice as long to get their first job as white graduates.

EARNINGS COMPARED

More Negro than white graduates stated that no job was available for them in the trade studied.

A very high percentage of Negroes reported that they were not accepted into apprenticeship programs, even when their school records were comparable to those of white classmates.

Negro graduates reported less job-placement help from school sources than did white graduates.

The present earnings (as of 1965, when the study was completed) of Negro vocational graduates are substantially less than those of white vocational graduates.

When the students were asked to rate their former schools and the vocational education they had received there, the Negroes were as high in their praise as the white graduates. That is, with the one exception of help in job placement.

MAJOR PROBLEM

Perhaps no vocation educator in the United States is more aware of the frustrations experienced by skilled Negro vocational school graduates than Dr. George A. Parkinson, director of the Milwaukee Vocational, Technical, and Adult Schools. This sprawling educational complex is considered by most educational authorities the finest of its kind in the world, and is unquestionably the largest.

"This problem is too big to sweep under the rug," said Dr. Parkinson in a recent interview. "Milwaukee is getting hundreds of immigrants from the South who haven't enough education to attend our regular schools. And the schools have ignored their real needs.

"In this country we've been training the elite," he continued. "We glorify the route from kindergarten through post-doctoral fellowships. The money and emphasis are wrong. Eighty percent of the tax money raised for post-high-school education is used for the 20 percent who go to college.

AGE NOT A FACTOR

"And only 20 percent of public tax money goes to the 80 percent who want to learn an employable skill."

Since 1912, the Milwaukee Vocational, Technical, and Adult Schools have been offering skill training to those who left or did not finish high school. No one is considered too old or too poorly prepared to enter this complex of schools.

And Dr. Parkinson feels strongly that the general public must change its thinking about what a vocational school is and does. He cites the following as the generally held belief:

"Vocational education is half-trained teachers babysitting with juvenile delinquents."

It's quite possible that some of the students in Dr. Parkinson's schools might be considered juvenile delinquents, but certainly not while they are in school.

Special teachers are in charge of the academic courses for illiterate pupils and those most severely in need of remedial reading. These students (whose ages range from 16 to 80) require very special attention. A long period of academic frustration precedes their entrance into the adult school, and their teachers must be sensitive to what will help them help themselves.

EQUIPMENT PROVIDED

Dr. Parkinson says that the strength of his school is its very fine faculty.

"If you're going to teach a trade," he explains, "then you need someone who knows the trade. You take the man who knows his trade and then you teach him how to teach."

Another part of Milwaukee's strength is its very fine equipment and facilities. Milwaukee Vocational Technical is made up of several schools and several buildings.

The institution offers 1,800 courses to more than 35,000 students. This outstanding school has 10,000 more students than the University of California at Berkeley, and 9,000 more than the University of Wisconsin at Madison. To get at the problem of assuring jobs for both white and Negro graduates of the vocational and technical programs, Dr. Parkinson makes use of 51 advisory committees. Management and labor sit down with the teachers to discuss programs, changing technology, up-to-date equipment, and the problems of employment for the student who wants to enter the working world as a semiskilled laborer.

STUDIES COMBINED

The Milwaukee Vocational, Technical, and Adult Schools' 132 programs include one which combines printing and graphic arts. Prior to 1965, printing and graphic arts were separate programs. In each, Dr. Parkinson confessed, the effect was teaching for obsolescence. Officials from printing unions and from publishing houses were asked to review the courses.

With the director of that division, they worked out an entirely new offering combining some knowledge of computer-driven machinery, graphic display, mechanical skill in press maintenance, and direct printing techniques. Today, students who want to do magazine layout, enter printing-apprentice programs, advance toward journeyman status, or move into any one of a dozen different printing occupations, take a broad range of courses from specialists in the related fields.

TECHNOLOGY CHANGES

Art students headed for a career in advertising must take some work in the printing department. What they create on their drawing boards they must set in type, even handling the photo process, and carry through to the pulling of their own proofs.

This crossing of skill and discipline lines is essential if today's vocational students are to be prepared for tomorrow's jobs.

As Dr. Parkinson remarks, "It is not easy to keep up with technological changes, and we review 200 to 250 courses every year."

Since printing and publishing students must know some mathematics, the flunk-out rate among the less academically inclined students used to be very high. Good at printing, patient with detail, skillful at layout and design, these students could not pass the required math course, and so flunked out. The school decided to change the course.

The new course covers all the necessary math in a programed text through which the students move at their own pace. A student with a question may go immediately to a teacher; the new combination of self-study and tutoring has completly altered the mathematical competence of the printing students.

As at most of the better vocational schools I have visited in preparing this series, Milwaukee Vocational Technical requires faculty members to make up their own teaching materials. Very few good texts are available which take into account vocational students' special academic needs, or which are easily adapted to team teaching.

TEXTS PREPARED

The Milwaukee Institute of Technology, which grants a two-year associate degree, is a part of this vast school. The teachers of these highly technical programs have had to design their own courses too. The electronics students, for example, must cover college algebra through differential equations. The members of the Milwaukee faculty have put together their own programed text, relating the mathematics to the laboratory work.

As I walked endless corridors to visit the departments of this five-schools-in-one—watching and talking with students of every age busy learning new skills—one thing became acutely clear. That was the tremendous gap between what the general public-school system offers its students, and what is available in only a handful of schools across the United States.

NEGLECT SEEN

The Milwaukee Vocational, Technical, and Adult Schools are not set up to meet the needs of students attending Milwaukee's public schools. In fact, before a student may take advantage of one of the 1,800 courses, he must be calssified as a "failure" by the regular schools.

At the beginning of this series of 10 articles on vocational education, I stated that "schooling for skills is in trouble." Since the series began on June 13, more than 20 cities have been racked by riots, looting, burning, killing, and wanton destruction.

Bands of youths without jobs or the skills necessary to get jobs have been identified as the majority of those who harm and destroy. These are the neglected students. These are the ones who have been pushed out of school, who have not been offered occupational schooling.

And while sociologists grapple with the problem of what to do with these young adults, the course is clear for the schools—to offer the best of vocational and technical education to at least seven of every 10 students in school. Vocational education must be a part of every school system's offerings.

Not only is the dignity of man at stake, but so is the integrity of those who now pay only lip service to education for every American to meet every individual need.

Indonesian Labor Leader Speaks Out on Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 16, 1967

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, Indonesia's successful suppression of an attempted Communist takeover of its government has been called "the greatest setback ever given the Chinese Communists." Now, the president of the Indonesian Christian Workers' Union advocates that Indonesia withdraw recognition of Hanoi and establish relations with Saigon instead.

The President of the Indonesian trade union, Darius Marpaung, made this statement as he was interviewed on the AFL-CIO public service program, "Labor News Conference," over the Mutual Broadcasting System. Interviewed with Mr. Marpaung was Harry Goldberg, who has had long experience in Indonesia.

Because we are all vitally interested in the future of Indonesia, I place a transcript of the program in the RECORD, as follows:

LABOR NEWS CONFERENCE, AUGUST 8, 1967

Subject: "Indonesia May Support South Vietnam."

Guests: Darius Marpaung, President, Indonesian Christian Workers' Union; Harry Goldberg, AFL-CIO International Representative.

Panel: Richard Dudman, Washington correspondent, St. Louis Post-Dispatch; Harry Conn, Editor, Press Associates, Incorporated.

Moderator: Harry W. Flannery.

FLANNERY. Welcome to another edition of Labor News Conference, a public affairs program brought to you by the AFL-CIO. Labor News Conference brings together labor representatives and ranking members of the press. Today we have two guests: Darius Marpaung, president of the Indonesian Christian Workers' Union, and Harry Goldberg, an AFL-CIO Inlternational Representative.

At the invitation of Mr. Tran Quoc Buu, president of the Confederation of Vietnamese Trade Unions, Mr. Marpaung recently visited South Vietnam, where he met with government and labor leaders. Upon his return, Mr. Marpaung reported his findings of the situation there, especially as they apply to Asian trade unionists and Indonesia's government, to Foreign Minister Adam Malik and other top Indonesian officials. Here to question him about his visit to South Vietnam and the reports he made, are Richard Dudman, a Washington correspondent for the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, and Harry Conn, editor of Press Associates, Incorporated. Your moderator, Harry W. Flannery.

And now, Mr. Dudman, I believe you have the first question?

DUDMAN. Mr. Marpaung, what brings you to Washington? Is there something particular you hope to accomplish by this visit?

MARPAUNG. Yes, Mr. Dudman, I have the privilege of being invited by the State Department to visit the United States and the American people, including labor leaders and some members of Congress and the government. What I would like to achieve during my visit here in the States is primarily to improve the relationship between Indonesia and the United States.

Secondly, in practical terms, I am seeking to convince my colleagues, my friends in the labor movement to be sympathetic with our problems and needs in Indonesia. We wish to build real democratic unions to be really meaningful in serving our members.

CONN. Mr. Marpaung, your country is of considerable size and of influence in Southeast Asia. Could you very briefly spell out its population in comparison with other Asian countries?

MARPAUNG. Yes, Mr. Conn. Our country is the fifth biggest country in the world as far as population is concerned. We have 100 million people scattered in 3,000 islands. There are about 300 different ethnic groups, but we can get along together. We have different languages and dialects, but we have our own national language. About 85 percent of our people are Muslims, 10 percent of Christians and about 5 percent Buddhist or Hindu.

CONN. How strong is the trade union movement in Indonesia?

MARPAUNG. The Communist dominated trade union or SOBSI was dominant, but democratic trade unionism has emerged in the last 20 months.

FLANNERY. What is SOBSI?

MARPAUNG. SOBSI was the Indonesian trade union central that was controlled by the Communists. We ousted this organization on the 14th of October in 1965.

Altogether there are 10 federations now in the Joint Secretariat of our Indonesian trade union federation: several Muslim trade unions; several national trade unions; one socialist trade union—which is actually not socialist in the European sense; a Catholic trade union and a Christian trade union. I am president of the Indonesian Christian trade union.

DUDMAN. There is a continuing dispute, Mr. Marpaung, in the rest of the world as to what relationship there was between the American efforts in Vietnam and the violent, anti-Communist upheaval in Indonesia in which, I suppose, 300,000 people were killed and the Communists were pretty well cleaned out. What is your view of this? Was there a relationship between the two?

MARPAUNG. Well, I will tell you that we have been a victim of brain-washing by the Communists for many, many years. In the past they have fooled us and have misled us to such an extent that in our relationship with several other countries, we leaned towards the Communist line and along that line we made serious mistakes. We came to understand that South Vietnam is not a worthwhile country but North Vietnam is. So along that line we established a full diplomatic relationship with North Vietnam—we established an embassy there. As a result, the Consulate General of South Vietnam, which existed I think 5 years ago, has withdrawn and naturally we had to withdraw our Consulate General from South Vietnam. But I will tell you that on my recent visit, I came to understand that we have been really fooled by the Communists because . . .

FLANNERY. Your recent visit to South Vietnam?

MARPAUNG. Yes, I visited South Vietnam at the invitation of Mr. Tran Quoc Buu. I then saw with my own eyes and heard with my own ears, and as a result, I believe the relationship with South Vietnam has to be improved. I have decided to inform my people and my government, to inform political leaders in my country frankly, openly and squarely what I have seen and heard there in that country.

The Communists in our country, before the coup d'etat, used to tell us that South Vietnam is just a puppet of America, the United States, and the Viet Cong is a patriotic movement, a National Liberation Front, a national movement. I found that was wrong. It is not true.

In the past, we welcomed the Viet Cong when they came to our country before the coup d'etat and we gave facilities to the National Liberation Front. When I came back to Indonesia and told my government, the Minister of Foreign Affairs, the Speaker of the House and many other political leaders, what I had learned, they did not believe what they heard because this is new thinking.

DUDMAN. I take it that your finding is that the Viet Cong is not a legitimate, popularly based nationalistic movement. Is that correct?

MARPAUNG. No. It is purely a Communist terrorist organization and the National Liberation Front is purely a political arm of the Lao Dong—the Communist Party of North Vietnam. There is no doubt about it.

DUDMAN. Why have they been so successful if they don't have a popular base?

MARPAUNG. That is what the Communists are trying to set up. In the case of national liberation, they have managed to convince some people that they are not a part of the Communist Party. They say they are a nationalistic movement and they have been successful in having some of the South Vietnamese leaders in their front, but I found out that none actually has a national standing. In cases where they don't control a certain country, the Communists work along the line of a kind of national front. In our case, for instance, they were able to form what they called a national front. I think that if this kind of idea works in Indonesia, it can also work in other countries and especially in the case of South Vietnam because, of course, there is a war and it is very easy to arouse sentiments.

GOLDBERG. May I make a short comment on one of Mr. Dudman's previous questions which was not quite answered directly by Mr. Marpaung. If I understood you, Mr. Dudman, you asked whether the events in Vietnam had an influence upon what took place after October 1st in the attack against the Communists in Indonesia.

I think that there is no statistical or documentary evidence that proves the connection. However, there is not the slightest doubt in my mind that there was a basic general influence of the one situation on the other.

You would be entitled to say to me: "Well, then, on what basis do you express this opinion? How do you know?"

My answer would be that my opinion is based upon personal conversations. I was in Indonesia recently and talked with elements high up in the present regime. On such occasions, you get expressions of opinion and it is curious that amongst the military—the generals—with whom I was in contact when I was in Indonesia, I heard it said—and I put it down in some of my reports—"We are very glad that the Americans are in Vietnam. We have an example there, a definite stand against an attempt of the Communists to take over. We saw this in the light of our own experience with the PKI, the Communist Party of Indonesia. The attempted coup d'etat, pushed and encouraged from behind the scenes by Communist China, encouraged us to proceed."

Dudman. Of course the generals who conducted that purge were saving their own lives, too, and that is why I asked the question. It had occurred to me that maybe this was explainable quite apart from the American position in Vietnam.

Goldberg. Well, Mr. Dudman, there is no doubt about the fact that the generals saved their own lives. Remember, of the general staff of eight which the Communists tried to kill off, they killed six. And naturally if the Communists had been successful, they would have killed the other two and many more. Sure, the generals were trying to save their lives, but I think it would be bad to lose sight of the broader aspects. There was not only the question of their losing their lives, but the question of a Communist-takeover of Indonesia against which they reacted and against which they reacted quite successfully and I for one, certainly, and I think a lot of others, say, "Well, thank God for that."

Conn. Mr. Marpaung, as a result of the anti-Communist upheaval in your country and as a result of your visit to Vietnam, what do you feel is the general movement of policy vis-a-vis recognition of Saigon and to withdraw recognition, perhaps, from Hanoi?

Marpaung. I think it will take time, really, to re-establish, to restore our relations with South Vietnam.

Flannery. Do you recognize both North and South Vietnam?

Marpaung. Yes. I say no, we had a Consulate General in Saigon five years ago.

Conn. But he has been withdrawn.

Marpaung. He has been withdrawn because, as I say, we had been brainwashed. Finally we established an embassy in Saigon and, of course, the South Vietnamese people considered this a kind of discrimination, which I can really understand. So then they withdrew. Aotually we have never broken our relationship with South Vietnam.

Flannery. Do you foresee breaking relationships with North Vietnam?

Marpaung. To be frank about it, I have mentioned several times during my press conferences in Indonesia that it is high time for us even to reconsider breaking off relationships with North Vietnam, because North Vietnam is actually doing the same things as China is doing. As you know, not only the state parliaments of Indonesia have passed many, many resolutions to break off relationships with Peking, but also the national parliament has passed a resolution to break off relationships with Peking. We argue that we should say the same words to North Vietnam.

Dudman. If you are successful and Indonesia follows that path, do you foresee a time when Indonesia might be willing to send troops to assist South Vietnam?

Marpaung. I don't think we need to send them. After all, we have many problems in our country. Also, I believe that the war will be ended and with victory for the democratic powers.

Dudman. What is your time schedule in your own thinking? I would be interested in your view as an Asian of what the task ahead is in South Vietnam.

Marpaung. It is a very difficult question to answer. I think it would take a prophet or an angel to answer that. However, I believe the democratic forces of Asia can make clear their view on how to establish peace in Southeast Asia in relation to Vietnam. I think it can play a constructive and important role. That is why actually I urge my government to re-establish relationships with South Vietnam, because we would then be able to play a more positive and constructive role to really bring about peace. I think that all Asian countries should establish their relationships—normal diplomatic relationships with South Vietnam. There are so many of them who have not done so.

Conn. President Johnson apparently thinks that troops as well as good will are necessary. And he seems to believe that a great number of additional Asian troops will have to be called before this thing can be brought to a conclusion. But you don't think that Indonesia has them available?

Goldberg. May I make a comment on that. I think that this is far from being a practical question for Indonesia, certainly at present. My own feeling is that even if there is a change in sympathetic attitude in Indonesia, vis a vis South Vietnam, that this wouldn't happen at all.

But let me add this factual comment. At the present time, the Indonesian government officially still has a policy of not having relations with South Vietnam, but still maintains its relations with Hanoi. This was announced officially by Foreign Minister Adam Malik even after he had seen Marpaung.

Nevertheless, let me say, in spite of the fact that Indonesia has maintained its position, the efforts of Marpaung have been important and encouraging, because there is a certain degree of ferment and questioning now going on. It will take time and the ideological, psychologic ferment that is going on is good and has a certain promise for the future. I am reasonably optimistic about it.

However, even if they get to the point where they may even withdraw from Hanoi, because they do feel very strongly about Communist China and they might re-establish relations with Saigon, that in itself will take a bit of time and a bit of doing. If it happens it will have an enormous psychologic effect.

Conn. Mr. Marpaung, in the last two minutes can we direct some questions back to Indonesia itself. Since the upheaval and the movement into power of General Suharto, how much basic freedom, how much free trade unionism do you have in the country in contrast to the previous regime?

Marpaung. We have absolute freedom now. For the first time I think in our history we really have absolute freedom—freedom of association, freedom of speech, freedom of the press—we can really print anything in our newspaper now, and, of course, I include news that really has something to contribute to our welfare.

Conn. The fact that you have a military man as the head of the government, what does this really mean to the people?

Marpaung. Well, you had, for instance, General Eisenhower as the head of your government, but that doesn't mean—well, we like Suharto to be there. He has democratic approval.

Conn. Was he elected to the post?

Marpaung. Well, the Peoples Consultative Congress elected him in March.

Flannery. You are a member of the Peoples Congress?

Marpaung. Yes, I am a member of the Peoples Consultative Congress, yes. We like him very much and we like him to be there.

Flannery. And are there free elections soon?

Marpaung. Yes, we hope to have elections maybe in the course of next year. You know we are really establishing a real democracy in our country and that is why we think general elections should be held.

Conn. As a trade unionist, I know you are particularly concerned about basic economic reforms, including land reform. Has the government instituted any such reforms?

Marpaung. Yes we have had land reform already. Besides that, I will tell you that our present government is endeavoring very hard to concentrate on the social, economic life of our people and several basic steps have been taken. First of all, we have an austerity policy; secondly, a new investment law has been introduced. It has encouraged people from everywhere to invest their money; and thirdly, we have established a relationship with many, many countries, especially the Western countries, which can help us in our basic needs.

Flannery. Thank you, gentlemen. Today's guests on Labor News Conference were Darius Marpaung, president of the Indonesian Christian Workers' Union of Indonesia, and Harry Goldberg, an International Representative for the AFL–CIO. Representing the press were Harry Conn, editor of Press Associates, Incorporated, and Richard Dudman, a Washington correspondent for the St. Louis Post-Dispatch. This is your moderator, Harry W. Flannery, inviting you to listen again next week. Labor News Conference is a public affairs production of the AFL–CIO, produced in cooperation with the Mutual Radio Network.

Space Travel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 27, 1967

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Jim Maloney, of the Houston Post, wrote an article on Monday, July 24, 1967, recapitulating a speech which the Honorable Bob Casey, of Houston, made to a small group of college and university professors. Mr. Casey's remarks hit at the key problem plaguing our space program—the support of the general public, which is slowly declining. The man on the street must be told of the benefits of the program in language he can understand. We have to cross the barrier which has been created by the lack of communication between our scientists and the general public. I wish to include the article by Mr. Maloney in hopes that Mr. Casey's remarks will enlighten even more educators and scientists than the few he addressed in Houston.

SPACE TRAVEL

(By Jim Maloney)

Bob Casey came to town to talk candidly last week with a small group of college and university professors here from throughout the country.

The Houston congressman's message was simple and direct—the manned space flight program's public and congressional support "is beginning to taper off." And, he said, "you had better start some just plain old fashion politicking."

Casey, who resigned a spot on the House Science and Astronautics Committee to gain one on the more influential appropriations committee, is a man who should know. His record of getting elected to public office certainly qualifies him as one who should know the public mind. And his association with his congressional colleagues equally qualifies him to know their thinking.

His audience consisted of 50 professors from 20 states brought to the University of Houston at NASA's expense for a 10-week seminar. Their purpose is to attend lectures on such subjects as advanced communications techniques, Apollo check-out functions, information systems, spacecraft environment control systems, advanced computer techniques and space physics.

Casey explained that for the manned space flight program to retain its support, "the man on the street will have to be told in language he understands" of the benefits of the program.

He urged the professors to let their congressmen know how they feel about the space program being financially supported at a high level. Many of the congressmen need to be reminded of the benefits from the space program, Casey said.

Real, tangible space "spinoff"—here and now—is difficult to explain to the man on the street in language he understands, you think as you sit in the cool comfort of the university auditorium.

But the congressman is right as rain, as the man on the street in East Texas says, so you are grateful that you remember a handout that a PR man left with you not long ago. The handout seemed interesting at the time, but there just didn't seem to be a use for it at the moment.

The release that the PR man left with you didn't mention benefits from space, or space "spinoff," but that's what the release was about.

And it was about space spinoff dealt with in uniquely American way—government-financed developments, refined and improved on by private financing then used to return benefits we all feel indirectly.

And it dealt with a benefit from space exploration that the man on the street has already become so used to that he accepts it now, probably without even realizing that it is space spinoff, or that his tax dollars helped make it possible.

The release was from the International Business Machines Corporation—better known as IBM. It said that high-speed, volume transmission of business data by satellite has been demonstrated in recently completed tests.

This was the first full-scale test extending by satellite a commercial high speed network that uses regular telephone company switching. Signals were relayed by Early Bird satellite in orbit 22,300 miles above the Atlantic Ocean.

Early Bird is the satellite that let the man on the street sit in his living room, beer in hand, and see the European fights of a fellow who used to be called Clay, and the compelling grandeur of the last rites of Churchill.

This satellite is owned by Intelsat, a national consortium, or partnership. Comsat, an American corporation, manages the activities of Intelsat.

IBM, at its own expense and just to show that it could be done, used the satellite to send regular business data at the rate of several thousand characters a minute from points in this country to Paris.

Speeds of trans-Atlantic voice transmissions are from 150 to 250 characters a second.

"The tests demonstrated that a reel of magnetic tape, the high speed input/output medium for most computer systems, could be transmitted internationally in 30 minutes compared to the six to eight hours normally required," the IBM release said.

"The tests included direct transmission from one computer to another, as well as from magnetic tape unit to magnetic tape unit," the release went on.

IBM had shown in October, 1962, using another communications satellite—Telstar—that business data could be beamed from space.

Both Telstar and Early Bird are privately financed satellites.

The first communications satellites, however, such as relay, were developed by NASA, which still handles the launching of the privately financed communications satellites and probably always will.

So what does all this have to do with space spinoff? A lot.

You can be sure that if IBM and other companies find faster and faster methods of conducting their business and the business of their customers, cost of conducting this business will become cheaper and more efficient. Competition will likewise see to it that the cheaper, faster methods make for less expensive consumer products or more efficient consumer services—such as continent-to-continent television or business data transmission.

Space engineers now talk of the time when, instead of unmanned communications satellites, manned orbiting stations will be handling most space-to-ground and ground-to-space communications.

The wonders of Early Bird, and IBM's seemingly rapid data transmission, will seem like crude oddities in a few years. Be sure of this.

Be sure of it, that is, if the space program continues to get the financial support that is needed for advancement.

And that, in a few hundred words, is what Congressman Casey was saying.

Meals for Millions, Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 16, 1967

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, for years I have been very interested in the various private organizations dedicated to helping feed the far too many undernourished people of the world. One such organization, which I think is doing a most effective job, is Meals for Millions, Inc.

Meals for Millions helps people in agriculturally backward nations to help themselves in increasing their food production. By providing specialized training, technical assistance, organizational and marketing know-how to these people, it is performing a great service to the world.

Unfortunately, though established in 1946, the organization is not well known. Being nonprofit and nonendowed, it depends upon donations from interested citizens concerned with helping others less fortunate to reach a better standard of living in order to maintain as well as extend its sphere of operation.

Mr. Speaker, I have prepared a summary of the program of this worthwhile organization, and I am hopeful the Members of both Houses will take the time to acquaint themselves with Meals for Millions. I promise it will be time well spent.

When Meals for Millions began operating, its goal was to send multipurpose foods to countries throughout the world in order to meet hunger emergencies. After close observation of the results of such a program, the directors have decided to conduct a long-range program in which they assist developing countries in producing and distributing their own high-protein food on a self-sustaining basis. It operates in only a few areas which need help urgently. It shows the people of these countries how to create, process, and distribute the food, using their own raw materials, their own capital and manpower. It discourages interested governments from directly subsidizing the installation of the food-processing plants, while local investment is encouraged.

The method of processing employed often utilizes byproducts from the processing of oilseeds—materials usually discarded or fed only to animals. This is fortified inexpensively with essential vitamins and minerals and becomes a food supplement which provides vital nutrients missing from the normal diet of most people in underdeveloped regions. Meals for Millions presently is investigating the possibility of utilizing other potential resources such as fish meal. When such a supplement can be added to traditional foods without affecting taste or texture, the problem of changing lifelong food habits is practically eliminated.

Meals for Millions also initiates a widespread educational program to obtain the assistance of civic, educational, medical, and religious leaders within a community where it hopes to set up operations, in order to encourage the use of the multipurpose foods in schools, hospitals, and orphanages as well as through normal commercial market channels.

The foundation also provides the specialized training, technical assistance, organizational and marketing know-how so that people in hunger areas can replace their declining economic cycle with a positive one by using modern technology and developing indigenous resources.

Following are the steps Meals for Millions go through before establishing a program in an area:

First. It conducts an on-the-spot feasibility study by sending experts and short-term consultants to the area. A practical analysis is made of all aspects of local production, including local investment and consumption potential.

Second. In the precommercial phase, a proposal, consisting of a limited scale manufacturing and pilot plant designed to achieve production with limited capital investment, is made to a local investment group. If local investment cannot be stimulated sufficiently to provide working capital and other soft currency requirements, then the foundation takes no further action in that locale.

Third. It conducts a realistic program of education on two fronts:

First. In its pilot plant, laboratory and classroom in Santa Monica, Calif., it conducts a school for prospective plant managers. Experts from American businesses and universities patricipate in specialized technical training, management and marketing courses for those who will ultimately operate the food industries when they return to their respective countries.

Second. Mass education in each project area is imperative and an essential part of market development. Feeding programs for school and preschool children demonstrate how the multipurpose food can be adapted to the normal diet.

Meals for Millions is always careful to adapt programs to local conditions. The product varies from a basic high protein product in powder form to its incorporation into traditional foods such as noodles. Thus, the need for popular education varies with the product form.

Some current examples of the successful programs initiated by Meals for Millions are:

First. Northeast Brazil and Talca, Chile—preschool children receive flavorful high-protein soy beverages dispensed from colorful bicycle-propelled "Good Humor" type carts.

Second. Aganda, East Africa—Cooperating with Africa Basic Foods, Inc., to develop a local soy milk production plant which will replace the undependable supply of cow's milk.

Third. Iran: A Meals for Millions team has just completed a study indicating the feasibility for local production of a soy-based, multipurpose food to fortify flour for bread, a staple which constitutes 60 percent of the Iranian diet.

Fourth. Daule, Ecuador: "Sharecroppers have become shareholders" by financing the majority of a fortified noodle industry, organized with assistance from the foundation. They acquire stock in the corporation by small payments. Also, Meals for Millions is helping them form 11 cooperatives to buy land for farms.

Fifth. Chile: People in the country areas that are protein deficient eat what they call "harine tostada." It is a toasted blend of wheat and sugar, lacking any amount of protein value. It presents a primary opportunity for an economic use of fishmeal. The foundation has offered to build a pilot plant for producing a protein supplement of sunflower seed, soy and fishmeal. When this is added to harina tostads, it acquires food value and tastes good.

I believe that private organizations such as Meals for Millions, Inc., are an important facet of the overall effort of the United States to help alleviate the world hunger crisis. Programs such as theirs, that aim not merely at short-range goals, but seek out the root of the problem and start from there, are not only vitally important but desperately needed and should be generously supported by all Americans concerned about the plight of hungry people all around the world; people who are suffering because they lack adequate and nutritional food.

Archbishop Cousins Delivers Outstanding Speech on the Churches' Role in Social Reform

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 25, 1967

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, following the riots which struck Milwaukee recently, the Most Reverend William E. Cousins, archbishop of Milwaukee, delivered a notable speech reaffirming the crucial role of the churches and of Christians as individuals in shaping a just society.

Part of what Archbishop Cousins said is relevant mostly to Milwaukee, since he did not hesitate to come to grips with specifics of the local situation. In so doing he made an outstanding contribution to social progress in Milwaukee.

But much of this excellent statement will be of interest generally because Archbishop Cousins has expressed himself with balanced wisdom and insight on issues of common concern through this country.

Therefore, I include an editorial from the Milwaukee Sentinel summarizing and commenting on Archibshop Cousin's speech, followed by an abridgement of the speech text:

[From the Milwaukee (Minn.) Sentinel, Aug. 8, 1967]

A CALL TO ACTION—CHURCHES HAVE VITAL ROLES

The statement by Archbishop William E. Cousins was an appeal to the conscience, not just of the archdiocese of which he is the spiritual leader but to all citizens. It was a forceful call to action, filling the need for leadership that avoids the twin pitfalls of reckless impetuosity and lethargy.

It might have been easier for Archbishop Cousins to have remained silent and thus earned the gratitude of those who would have the church remain aloof from community strife. Or, having chosen to speak out, he might have avoided conflict by uttering only platitudes. Instead, he addressed himself to the underlying causes of the tragic disorders and offered a program of social justice that might uproot those causes and bridge the gap that separates the races.

The archbishop made clear from the outset his conviction that the Catholic church, as all churches, is, as he put it, an "essential and vital factor in community life." For, as he said, our society, our government and its basic philosophy are based on fundamental religious concepts. The religious principles which have guided our nation are embedded, the archbishop reminded us, in the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, the Bill of Rights and the Emancipation Proclamation.

"It is the sacred duty of the faithful, the priests and the religious of our time and of our archdiocese," Archbishop Cousins said, "to root out of their hearts and to free their communities of any prejudice that would make men anti-Jewish, anti-Negro, anti-Mexican or anti-anything-else that would render them anti-Christian in practice." It was appropriate that the archbishop quoted from a 1958 official statement of the American bishops:

"The heart of the race question is moral and religious. It concerns the rights of man and of attitudes toward our fellow man. If our attitude is governed by the great Christian law of love of neighbor and respect for his rights, then we can work out harmoniously the techniques for making legal, educational, economic and social justice.

This is a call to action, not merely on the spiritual front but to assault the evils of hate and discrimination by political, social and economic reform. In endorsing this view of church obligation. Archbishop Cousins made it clear that the place of the Catholic clergy is not only in the pulpit but in the front lines in the eternal struggle for equality and justice—even in the picket lines, the demonstrations where, the archbishop said, "these priests and sisters point up by their unusual action the abject conditions of stark poverty and despair that affect so many of our Negro citizens."

The place for the clergy also is, he said, in the struggle for equal employment and for open housing and other rights too often denied members of minority groups. Recognizing the limitations of legislation (". . . law cannot substitute for God's grace, and . . . a man who closes his mind to Divine inspiration will not be changed by human legislation") the archbishop nevertheless notes the place that law can have in bringing about the correction of inequities.

The church cannot, he said, refuse to take an active part in promoting legislation, such as that which would guarantee the right of all persons to live in homes of their choosing. Milwaukee's common council, which has stubbornly demonstrated its lack of moral leadership by repeatedly refusing to adopt a local open housing ordinance: Please note.

Even within the Catholic church, it will take more than a declaration by Archbishop Cousins to lead our community out of the valleys of injustice and violence. But the Catholic church, through the archbishop, has offered its invaluable help and has shown the way.

COMMUNITY IN CRISIS AND THE CHRISTIAN CONSCIENCE

We have known the horrors and fears and anxieties of something that many believed "could not happen here." Unfortunately, it happened. And we must face the inevitable fact.

Wanton destruction, arson, potential-murder can never be condoned. They are offenses against the law of God and the law we rely upon to protect us all. Yet, through them we have been dramatically made aware of conditions we might have ignored, of problems we might have continued to disregard. An uneasy truce does not change conditions, nor does apparent peace mean that our problems are solved. It would be a tragedy if any one of us failed to realize the seriousness of the situation; unforgivable if anyone failed in his duty to examine thoroughly his own conscience.

In the confused and confusing thinking of today, we have the charge made, on the part of some, that the Church's interest in community affairs is interference—that anything outside of the sanctuary is none of its business. From another group comes the question: "Why doesn't the Church speak out on issues that are of common concern?" "Why does it remain silent when men are crying for guidance and direction?" We find these conflicting views in most areas of social action, but especially in the area of race relations.

As a Catholic Bishop, I am convinced that the Church is an essential and a vital factor in community life. I would like to feel that I reflect the thinking of the 699,000 Catholics who live in the 10 counties comprising the Archdiocese of Milwaukee. Though I address myself to all men of good will, in this particular matter I speak to you, my Catholic listeners, who share with me the same baptism, who receive the same Sacraments, and who are pledged with me to profess the teachings of Christ in word and work.

Let me remind you that you are also citizens. You are represented in every level of society. Your general interests are interests shared by your neighbors and by your friends. You have a stake in community welfare and well-being, because you want the best for yourselves and for your families. If you are to be faithful to the directives of Christ, you cannot disregard nor be indifferent to your personal responsibility to live in harmony and charity with every segment of the society of which you are part.

The Church, therefore, best serves its members and the community as a whole by standing ready to direct its resources and its spiritual influence to the good of all. This pledge of service I make freely and confidently as an assurance to all with whom we work for the common good.

We do not, however, stand alone. In recent years there have been many occasions when Christian Churches and Jewish Synagogues cooperated in community life. By common consent, religious leaders can and do meet in areas of common concern, especially those in which justice, charity, and moral values are involved. A general religious approach is not something revolutionary in American life in spite of those who would have us think otherwise. One has only to read the Declaration of Independence, the Preamble, and Bill of Rights of the Constitution, the Emancipation Proclamation to recognize the deep, reverent, religious beliefs of their authors. Our very laws have reflected the religious principles by which our forefathers lived and for which, in many instances, they died.

It is significant that Vatican Council II sought to bring the Church into modern focus by emphasizing again the value of the individual as possessing an immortal soul made to God's image. It insisted upon the inalienable right of all men to life, liberty of conscience, and pursuit of eternal happiness. It deplored in no uncertain term conflicts within the human family. And it spoke out against the soul-shattering poverty and the consequences of that poverty in the lives of so many millions.

Pope John XXII and Pope Paul VI invited Christians and non-Christians, men of good will everywhere, to work together in honoring God and serving their fellow men in the eradication of injustice and discrimination. Those who claim that the Church has not spoken, or has not spoken clearly, in matters of discrimination, racial or otherwise, have not read carefully the Council's decrees.

To make more local the same decrees, permit me to say that it is the sacred duty of the faithful, the priests, and the religious of our time and of our Archdiocese to root out of their hearts and to free their communities of any prejudice that would make men anti-Jewish, anti-Negro, anti-Mexican, or anti-anything else that would render them anti-Christian in practice.

During Milwaukee's first Conference on Religion and Race we pledged as Catholics a constructive and continuing effort to bring about racial equality. We were convinced then as we are now that the practice of charity and justice must be a way of life.

Among the most important in the fulfillment of that promise are the 40 priests, the 80 sisters, and the 20 lay people specifically assigned to the 11 parishes that serve the central city. I address you directly, because you are close to the scene and because your closeness leads to a more ready understanding of existing conditions. Your shared experience affords a sound basis for progressive, productive planning. You can cooperate with all religious groups and agencies in the area in securing health and welfare benefits for all. You can work as a responsible *unit*, thus avoiding duplication of effort.

A head-on meeting of one of our problems is in the field of education. Each of the 11 parishes mentioned supports its own school. In no case has integration evoked violent reaction. Forty-eight per cent of the total registration is non-white. Many of you, our most competent sisters, have requested assignment to Core schools; all of you are personally involved in meeting the challenge of the inner city. It must be your job to use to their full potential your personal talents.

Some of our Negro children are from backgrounds and environments that make adjustment to urban living and education difficult. You who serve them can do much in the field of fundamental and correctional reading. You can explore more fully the idea of ungraded classrooms. You can think in terms of the child as a "whole" being rather than as just a student.

Bitterness and resentments are sometimes carried from the home to the school. Your religious convictions and your dedication to religious ideals should be enough to make religion a sustaining and an encouraging force in the lives of those with whom you come in contact.

Certain required educational standards must be met and maintained. We cannot reduce commendable standards to the lowest common denominator. But even as we give full opportunity to the average student, we must recognize the equally important task of working harder with the slow learner.

All our parochial schools are Christ-centered. We must help our children to meet life with the best Christian incentives. A child's relations with God and neighbor develop into the adult art of living.

Turning our attention from the schools, we call again to the attention of all the definite, unequivocal teaching of the Church in regard to charity toward our neighbor regardless of color. At the same time, I want to make it crystal clear that the Church cannot be the only interested party in humane, racial relations.

There are important roles to be played by municipal, county, and state governments. Federal aid necessary to progressive municipal programs must be forthcoming. Responsible, responsive, and broadly representative leadership is needed on all fronts.

As is true in any controversial issue, feelings run high, and deeply-rooted prejudices handicap our best efforts. But intelligent men and women make a mockery of our intelligence, if reason and love cannot triumph over fear and hate. In his encyclical, "Mater et Magistra", Pope John said: "One of the characteristic features of our age is the growing interdependence of men in society. This coming together of men makes all of us more sensitive to one another. And as long as human rights and human freedoms are being grossly violated anywhere, we realize more and more clearly that this is somehow an attack upon the integrity of each one of us."

Since I cannot speak with authority for community leaders in other fields, permit me again to talk of the Church.

There are some who are convinced that the Church is indifferent to the plight and needs of our Negro brethren. There are some whose cynicism suggests that the Church does not dare to take a stand, because its more affluent white membership would withdraw financial support. It is, therefore, of interest to know that the American Bishops have made three distinct official statements in this matter, speaking out explicitly and offering moral and practical guides to the faithful. Let us quote from their statement of 1958:

"In the Providence of God there are among us millions of fellow citizens of the Negro race. We owe to these fellow citizens, who have contributed so largely to the development of our country and for whose welfare history imposes on us a special obligation of justice, to see that they have in fact the rights which are given to them in our constitution.

"This means not only political equality but also fair economic and educational opportunities, a just share in public welfare projects, good housing without exploitation, and a full chance for the social advancement of their race . . . There are many facets to the problem. There are issues of law, of history, of economics and of sociology. There are issues of law, of history, of economics and of sociology. There are questions of procedure and technique. But it is time, in our prayerful judgment, to come to the heart of the problem.

"The heart of the race question is moral and religious. It concerns the rights of man and of attitude towards our fellow man. If our attitude is governed by the great Christian law of love of neighbor and respect for his rights, then we can work out harmoniously the techniques for making legal, educational, economic and social adjustments.

"But if our hearts are poisoned by hatred and even by indifference, then our nation faces a grave, internal crisis . . . To work for the elimination of injustice amid passions and misunderstandings will not be easy. It will take courage. But quiet and persevering courage has always been the mark of a true follower of Christ.

"We urge that concrete plans in this field be based on prudence. Prudence aids us to use the proper means to secure our aim. The problems we inherit today are rooted in centuries of customs and cultural patterns. When we are confronted with complex and far-reaching evils, it is not a sign of weakness to distinguish among remedies and forms.

"We deplore a gradualism that is merely a cloak for inaction; but we equally deplore rash impetuosity that would sacrifice the achievements of decades in ill-timed and ill-considered ventures."

Surely the Church has spoken, at length and emphatically. It remains for us to practice what is preached.

It must seem to many that our task is so extensive as to be almost hopeless. Recurring frustrations make us wonder if anything worthwhile is being accomplished. We are so often faced with criticism and reminded of our failures so frequently that it takes spiritual incentive to continue on. It is good to know that God never tries us beyond our strength.

Still, there are rewarding moments that compensate for fruitless hours.

We have proven that things can be done, if we have the courage to try. We cannot smugly rest on our laurels, but neither are we justified in joining the prophets of gloom, "who grieve as those who have no hope". Inaction based on fear of failure is just as unproductive as inaction founded on indifference. In either case nothing is done, and the continuing irritation in the community body develops into cancer.

A possible remedy for our ills that cannot be disregarded involves legislation. I know that law cannot substitute for God's grace, and I realize that a man who closes his mind to Divine inspiration will not be changed by human legislation. Law, however, can and does benefit society, and respect for the law is basic to orderly living. The Negro could have remained a slave, a mere chattel, were it not for the Emancipation Proclamation. He would still have been denied the right to equal education and the right to vote, without the Supreme Court ruling of 1954 and the specific legislation of 1964.

In other crucial areas, such as, equal employment and open housing, the rights of the Negro and all minority groups must be recognized and firmly secured for all time to come. If good legislation can bring about the correction of inequities, we are in no position to refuse to take an active part in promoting such legislation.

We have already said that all Catholics, priests, sisters, and laity, must take an active and intelligent part in the promotion of Christ's teachings. We are all part of the apostolic mission of the Church. Therefore, in the field of racial relations we should not be surprised to find priests and religious joining with our lay brothers and sisters in the fight for equal rights for all.

There are many, Catholics and no-Catholics, who are violently opposed to priests and sisters in demonstrations. "Why don't they stay at home and attend to their religious duties?" But, what if the priest or sister in question thinks that taking part in a demonstration is, under certain circumstances, a religious duty? Can we presume to sit in judgment and accuse every such demonstrator of insincerity or unworthy motivation? Can we say arbitrarily that such a one is acting contrary to conscience, consequently is guilty of sin? "Let him who is without sin cast the first stone."

These priests and sisters (and lay people, as well) are not always prudent or even helpful to the cause to which they are dedicated. In their zeal they can be seriously involved in undesirable consequences. This can certainly be true of participation in unsupervised or unorganized demonstrations or in demonstrations of doubtful sponsorship.

Still they are not violating the law of God or the law of man in their vigorous support of the Negro. If they believe in their hearts they are doing what is compatible with the teaching of our Faith, are they necessarily wrong, because there are those who think they are? Picketing of itself, under proper conditions, is not opposed by police authorities. Unions have used this device for generations. Housewives have protested high prices by picketing stores. Students have picketed for almost any reason on college campuses. Must the Church then prohibit what is permitted by law, because some observers make such a demand?

One fact must stand out. These priests and sisters point up by ther unusual action the abject conditions of stark poverty and despair that affect so many of our Negro citizens. They see themselves as lending support to the efforts of those fighting for equal rights. They are members of the Church witnessing the interest of the Church in alleviating human sufferings. They are *not* the *cause* of unrest; they are *not* responsible for *existing* conditions. If they were to withdraw completely from the scene, our minority and racial problems would still be with us. A swinging red light at a railroad crossing doesn't *create* the danger; it simply calls it to our attention.

To Catholics, lay and religious, in every section of our city, to Catholics, lay and religious, in all of our 10 counties that make up our Diocese, I make this fervent appeal:

Calmly and reasonably examine your conscience as to your personal beliefs and attitude in the field of racial relations and civil rights.,

Do everything within your power, in your home, at work, at school, among your neighbors, to clear away prejudice and misunderstanding. Be a Christian.

Recognizing that we are dealing with a complex, controversial, and emotion-generating problem, dedicate yourselves to the task of seeking valid answers for your own guidance.

To all others in our community we repeat our assurance that the Church is interested, willing, and anxious to cooperate with all members of our community in promoting God's kingdom and the essential dignity of all men—in the growth of a city where justice in all fields, and honest regard for the rights of all our neighbors will be the foundations for a lasting civic peace.

This can be done only when everyone recognizes that rights imply obligations. Rights cannot be gained nor retained by trampling upon, or being indifferent to, the rights of others.

Why U.S. Worker's Output Is Greater

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 15, 1967

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Melchior Palyi is an internationally renowned economist whose column is featured in the Chicago Tribune. His view on the subject of the productivity of U.S. workers, which appeared in the August 16 edition of that newspaper, is especially interesting. Therefore, I insert his commentary in the RECORD at this point:

WHY U.S. WORKERS' OUTPUT IS GREATER

(By Dr. Melchior Palyi)

Your columnist knows little more about shoes than that they serve an important utilitarian purpose and, incidentally, for "beautification" as well. They may be used, also, as status symbols. South African Bantus buy the most expensive shoes they can afford and frequently carry them around on a string.

What prompts me to write about shoes has nothing to do with status symbols. It has to do with something I came across casually—an aspect of the American industrial success which is hardly ever mentioned. It may not apply to all American manufacturing but there is reason to assume that the factors which give a branch of our shoe industry a special position in the world are present in many other fields as well.

The occasion was a meeting of leading shoe manufacturers from some 10 foreign countries, ranging from Canada to Japan and from Sweden to South Africa. They are licensees of an American manufacturer who owns and keeps developing the patents on the separation and tanning of pigskin to produce the raw material used in the production of casual shoes known by the trademark "Hush Puppies." Wolverine World Wide, Inc., is the firm in Rockford, Mich., that has developed this technique and supplies the specially prepared pigskin to licensed manufacturers abroad.

EXTERNALLY, THE SAME

The foreign licensees, visiting the Rockford plant, made a surprising discovery. Externally, the American plant is no different from the one in Germany, England, or elsewhere. All licensees use the same kind of machines—some of those in Rockford are imported from Germany—to make a basically identical product out of the identical pigskin. But one thing was very different. The visitors discovered that the American worker works appreciably faster than his foreign counterpart.

In the Rockford plant, the average day's output for each worker is 18 to 20 pairs of the simplest kind of "Hush Puppies." With the same type of equipment and the same raw material, the average Japanese worker's daily output is 10 pairs. The German, British and Canadians get their production up to the range of 13 to 15 pairs.

So it goes among leading industrial countries.

On the basis of daily output, the American worker appears to work 33 per cent to 100 per cent more efficiently than his counterpart in other countries.

AMERICANS DON'T FIGHT IT

Why this remarkable difference in work-intensity? The German manufacturer who attended the meeting ventured to offer an explanation. It is all, he said, a matter of labor psychology. The American considers his job simply as a job to be done in cooperation with the management, as a matter of course, while the European worker's mind is saturated with class struggle ideologies. He regards management as his enemy and he makes no more productive effort than is absolutely mandatory.

There may be something else at stake. Faced with the choice between greater effort and more income on the one hand, as against a more leisurely pace at somewhat lower remuneration, the American still is inclined to give preference to the higher income. This ambition is one of his outstanding characterstics. It helps accelerate the wheels of progress.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402, at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided,* That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Appendix

"Slovenia Yesterday, Today, and Tomorrow"—A Book Banned by the Government of Yugoslavia

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. LAUSCHE

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 17, 1967

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, on June 19, 1967, the Central Government of Yugoslavia prohibited the importation and circulation in Yugoslavia of the book entitled "Slovenija—Vceraj, Danes in Jutri"—"Slovenia Yesterday, Today, and Tomorrow"—written by Cyril A. Zebot, professor of economics at Georgetown University, Washington, D.C. The book was published in Klagenfurt, Austria, by the St. Hermagoras Society, the oldest Slovenian publishing house in the world.

Mr. Zebot has presented me with his analysis as to how and why this book was banned. It is a thought-provoking article.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Zebot's article, "Slovenia—Yesterday, Today, and Tomorrow': A book That Was Banned," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"SLOVENIA—YESTERDAY, TODAY AND TOMORMORROW": A BOOK THAT WAS BANNED

(By Cyril A. Zebot)

After having for twenty years offically ignored what foreign authors, especially those of Yugoslav origin, have critically written about Yugoslavia, the Communist regime in Belgrade finally broke this political silence.

On May 10 of this year, the Zagreb (Crotia) weekly Vjesnik U Srijedu published a page-long story about an alleged "Diversion at Night" in the School of Philosophy at the University of Ljubljana (Slovenia) ascribing the still-unrevealed slogans secretly painted on the internal walls of the School to the influence of my writings in war-away America.

On June 16, the semi-official Ljubljana daily DELO published a surprise announcement of my new book "Slovenia—Yesterday, Today and Tomorrow" and warned its readers against it.

THE LJUBLJANA ANNOUNCEMENT OF THE BELGRADE BAN

On June 22, DELO carried the following additional piece of publicity concerning my book:

"The Pamphlet 'Slovenia—Yesterday, Today and Tomorrow' Prohibited from Being Imported.

"Concerning the announcement of the publication of the white-guard pamphlet 'Slovenia—Yesterday, Today and Tomorrow', published in Celovec (Klagenfurt) by the emigree Cyril Zebot and intended for circulation in SR Slovenia, the Office of Information of the Executive Council (Government of SR Slovenia), in response to inquiries by various citizens, issues the following clarification:

"The said pamphlet is apparently in the nature of hostile propaganda and is directed against our constitutional, social, and political system. Because of this the appropriate federal authorities have prohibited the importation and circulation of this pamphlet in our country on the basis of articles 52 and 72 of the law on the press and other media of information. Import or propagation of this banned pamphlet is punishable not only according to the provisions of the law on the press and other media of information but also according to the Code of criminal law."

THE OFFICIAL TEXT OF THE BAN

It is worthwhile noticing that the above announcment in DELO was a doctored version of the offical text of the ban of the book as it appeared in the Sluzbeni List (Official Gazette) of SFR Yugoslavia, No. 27, of June 21, 1967, Item 412:

"On the basis of Article 72, in connection with Article 52, of the Law on the Press and other Media of Information, the Federal Secretary for Internal Affairs renders the following:

"Decision prohibiting the bringing into the country and distributing there the book entitled 'Slovenia—Yesterday, Today and Tomorrow.'

"It is prohibited to bring into Yugoslavia and to distribute there the book entitled 'Slovenija Vceraj, Danes in Jutri' ('Slovenia Yesterday, Today and Tomorrow') by the author Ciril Zebot, printed by 'Druzba sv. Mohorja' (St. Mohor Society) in Celovec (Klagenfurt).

"RADOVAN STOJACIC,

"Federal Secretary for Internal Affairs."

The comparison of the two texts reveals that the announcement in DELO not only changed *"the book* . . . by the *author* Ciril Zebot" into *"the white-guard pamphlet* . . . by the *emigree* Ciril Zebot" but also *added* to the threatened punitive sanctions against the circulation of the book "the *code of criminal law*". Furthermore the Ljubljana announcement conveniently substituted the impersonal "appropriate federal authorities" for the "Federal Secretary of Internal Affairs, Radovan Stojacic (s)" as the author of the ban.

THE BOOK'S SEVEN PROPOSITIONS

Only dictatorial regimes, isolated from the people they rule, ban and persecute public expression of opinions with which they do not agree. Yet, the government of Yugoslavia has recently been tolerating limited sale in Yugoslavia of some Western publications. Why then has the regime in Belgrade risked damaging its reputation for liberalization precisely in the case of the book "Slovenia—Yesterday, Today and Tomorrow"? It could only be because the originators of the ban feared some, to them particularly undesirable influence the book could have on its Slovenian readers.

Since a book usually influences its readers by the cogency of its factual and analytical content, it may be useful to summarize briefly the seven main propositions that are developed in "Slovenia—Yesterday, Today and Tomorrow":

1) The book finds, explains and supports the fact of *evolution of the social system* in Slovenia and Yugoslavia and discards as unimportant all talk about violent or utopian "solution" of the national and other basic problems of Yugoslavia.

2) The book is pacific and realistic even in relation to the *preliminary question of the fratricidal violence in Slovenia during World War II* about which differences of conviction among the Slovenes appeared to be insurmountable. The book reveals and strongly favors the widespread tendency in Slovenia toward national reconciliation and suggests the restoration of posthumous honor to all the fallen victims of the wartime tragedy as a first step. A further proposal is made in the book that a special commission of independent historians, free of all government pressure and political responsibility for its impartial findings, ascertain the true facts of that tragedy.

3) The book is wide open and understanding toward the concepts and application of *"social self-government"* and *"socialist democracy"* which differentiate the Communist regime of Yugoslavia from that of other Communist ruled countries. The book recognizes that this distinction of the Yugoslav regime has facilitated the development of a broader and faster liberalization and endowed the ongoing social evolution with a flexible framework of continuity. The book's criticism centers on the *fundamental political exclusivism* that still blocks all effective political pluralism and restricts even the scope of non-political "self-management" within narrow limits of deep subordination to the "leading role" of the League of Communists.

Yet even in relation to this key point the book seeks an evolutionary solution in the *separation of the League of Communists from the Socialist Alliance*. As far as I know, neither Djilas nor Mihajlov have proposed democratization by such an unobtrusive process of uninterrupted constitutional continuity. It is my feeling that one of the most valid insights gained from the study of current conditions in Slovenia is that growing insistence on the emancipation of the Socialist Alliance is that key which may open the evolutionary door toward an effective political dualism.

4) The book is benevolently *objective toward the economic reform of 1965*. Criticism of its shortcomings is entirely constructive and even of practical usefulness.

Beyond this, the book stresses and illuminates the *need for a Slovenian economic policy* to develop and strengthen the specific potentialities of the Slovenian economy as a well-advanced, diversified and integrated whole thus lifting it to the level of Western Europe. (For twenty years the centralist government in Belgrade, by fiscal and other means, was holding back the rate of progress of the Slovenian economy in the detrimental expectation that the southern republics would catch up with it.) This is also the only way to stop the protracted exodus of Slovenian experts and young skilled workers in search of better work and higher pay in the countries of Western Europe. Now we read that this necessity has been recognized and stressed also by the new head of the government of Slovenia, Stane Kavcic (DELO, June 17).

5) *The state of religion and church in Slovenia* is examined in the book from the viewpoint of universally accepted human rights that include unmolested freedom of religious practice without fear of political or economic reprisals, and from the viewpoint of the spiritual and pastoral mission of the church (the Catholic Church in Slovenia is celebrating its 1200-anniversary this year) which encompasses the entire human condition but does not include direct political action as a form of ecclesiastical activity. Last year's

agreement between the Holy See and the Federal government of Yugoslavia is evaluated in the book according to its achievements and shortcomings in relation to the above two criteria.

SLOVENIA AND YUGOSLAVIA

6) The book maintains its consistent evolutionary orientation also regarding the *national political question of Slovenia in relation to Yugoslavia*. Starting from the uncontroversial historical fact of an autochthonous Slovenian culture and a distinct nationality, the book recalls and develops the principle of Slovenian national sovereignty which the Slovenes had proclaimed as early as 1848.

The book explores practical possibilities for the realization of Slovenia's sovereignty through a *confederal reorganization of Yugoslavia* by means of contractual agreement among its constituent republics. In clear contrast with the empty talk about "destroying Yugoslavia" the book explores current and future chances for a speedier development toward both contractual confederation and its democratization. The book characterizes the objective of Slovenian national sovereignity in the evolutionary dynamics of history as the "need for national affirmation by means of its own government in equal relations with other national governments and with evolving possibilities for contractual rearrangements of inter-national relations according to changing conditions for inter-national cooperation".

Equal representation of each republic in, and increased legislative power of, the revived Chamber of Nationalities in the federal framework represent a first major step toward a confederal realignment of Yugoslavia as a contractual union of its six republics. With this constitutional change the incipient confederal reorganization of Yugoslavia is already ahead of its development toward political democracy, which is still being stubbornly resisted by the political monopoly of the League of Communists. In a confederal framework the Republic of Slovenia will be in a position to evolve its own political dualism even while other republics may not as yet be ready for theirs.

In this evolutionary context, the book reveals how totally obsolete has become the concept of *a priori* "Yugoslavism" which was derived from the inaccurate assumption of an imaginary single Yugoslav nationality (of several ethnic "names" or "strains") as an artificial basis for a unitarian Yugoslav sovereignity embodied in the Belgrade centralism which has caused so much damage and, if persisted in, would ennervate any kind of Yugoslavia.

It now appears that the 120 year-old objective of Slovenian national sovereignity, has prevailed also in government circles in Ljubljana. Under the label of "socialist Sloveniandom" (slovenstvo), this objective has been expounded in the April issue of the journal Teorija in Praksa (Vol. IV, 1967, No. 4) by Ernest Petric, a member of the new government of the Republic of Slovenia.

7) In its last chapter the book examines *some neglected* yet important *requisites of world peace*. The remaining stateless peoples in Europe and elsewhere must reach the same national sovereignty which is already being enjoyed by a great majority of the peoples of the world as the fundamental instrument of their distinct national existence and progress. Modern history has shown beyond doubt that peaceful international cooperation presupposes basic political independence of all national communities. By the same token, Communist regimes will have to renounce the international violence they are still fomenting under the Khrushchevian label of "wars of national liberation". In a world of equally sovereign nations in various forms of contractual cooperation with others to their mutually-recognized common advantage, Communist governments will loose the seedbeds for international violence as, under the pressure of growing social pluralism in their own countries, they already have had to give up the extremes of Stalinist lawlessness in the internal affairs of the states under their control.

WHY THE BOOK WAS BANNED?

Such is the undistorted core of the book that the Belgrade government has singled out for its official ban with accompanying threats of punishment under its political thought control law.

Why did they do it? Given the content of the book, one rational answer suggests itself. The diehard political monopolists and Yugo-centralists within the ruling League of Communists fear that the influence of the book will be a powerful boost to the twin evolution that is on the move, particularly in the Republic of Slovenia, which borders on Western Europe: Evolution toward *contractual sovereignity of the republic* and *its political democratization*. Since the fall of Aleksander Rankovic it has become clear to a great majority of people in Slovenia that this twofold evolution cannot be stopped or reversed; it can now only be hindered in its pace.

It is the difference between *promoting* and *hindering* the unavoidable evolution that explains why the book "Slovenia—Yesterday, Today and Tomorrow" has been banned.

OEO Education in Massacre

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1967

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, our taxes are used for many questionable purposes—but to pay to indoctrinate children by reenacting a slave massacre of whites 136 years ago must be branded as classic of the exemplary control of the establishment over our tax money.

Ready to raise your income taxes to pay for the training of your own children's executioner?

Better yet, why not teach the massacre students just what happened to old Nat Turner following the massacre—it might well prove to be a good deterrent.

I insert the story as it appeared in the Washington Post for August 17 following my remarks:

NASHVILLE, TENN., August 16.—A dozen small Negro children, attending classes at the controversial Liberation School, today acted out the slaughter of white plantation owners in the Nat Turner slave rebellion of more than a century ago.

An instructor gave the spellbound children her version of the bloody 1831 uprising, and how the slaves hackled to death 55 whites before the revolt was put down.

Fred Brooks, 20, the school's director and former Nashville chairman of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, insisted today that the school was simply teaching Negro history, adding:

"If that history teaches them, the youngsters, to hate white people, that's the white people's problem."

KICKED OUT OF CHAPEL

The school was kicked out of an Episcopal Chapel and the grounds of a hospital in the last few days after Police Capt. John Sorace told a congressional committee that the children were being taught to "hate whitey." The school has been supported by funds from the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Antipoverty funds for the school were suspended pending investigation by the Metropolitan Action Committee, which handles local antipoverty money, and the OEO.

Today Nancy Woodruff held classes for the younger students, most of them less than 8 years old, in a park in a predominantly Negro neighborhood.

Mr. Woodruff told the children how slaves were forced to eat scraps from their owners' tables and wear rags for clothing.

"They were so unhappy, they decided they were not going to do this any more, that they would just fight." Turner, she said, had a vision in which God told him to go to Jerusalem, a town in Southampton County, Va., and free the slaves.

"What did the slaves not have to fight with?" she asked the children.

"Weapons," one of them replied.

"That's right," said Mrs. Woodruff. "They didn't have guns and knives, but they had hatchets."

MEANING OF "MASSACRE"

She asked the children if they knew the meaning of the word "massacre." None replied.

"They went in and took all the weapons and killed the white people," she explained.

During a recess, Mrs. Woodruff asked, "Who wants to be Nat Turner?" Several volunteered, and one boy was chosen for a reenactment of the slave revolt, in the same spirit as youngsters play cops and robbers, cowboys and Indians and similar games.

"Who's going to be the white people?" asked a little girl, and some Negro children were chosen for that role, too.

The little "Turner" stealthily crept up on his "victim," pounced on him, and crept away with the "freed slaves" to the next objective.

"We had many slave revolts," Mrs. Woodruff told the children, "but Nat Turner's was probably the best." She said many revolts were suppressed because of "Uncle Toms and tattletales."

Failure of Department of Justice To Prosecute Insurrectionists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 17, 1967

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, several weeks ago I called upon the Justice Department to apply the full force of the law to the Carmichaels and others of his type as a major step toward halting the destruction of our cities by these insurrectionists.

This country has been extremely naive and unaware of the attitude of lawlessness which prevails in some quarters. Top figures in this administration have condoned and even encouraged disobedience of laws. Federal money is in the hands of organizations and in the hands of people who openly encourage and participate in civil disorder.

What this country needs is a demonstration by the responsible officials that they are no longer going to tolerate those who call for the burning of our cities and urge our young people to dodge the draft.

Are we living in a time when it is wrong to discourage violence and wrong to punish those who urge others to refuse to serve in the defense of their country?

Mr. President, an excellent editorial on this subject, entitled "Justice Department Failure," appeared in the Saturday, August 12, 1967, issue of the News and Courier newspaper in Charleston, S.C. It called attention to the dramatic floor speech in the House by the Honorable L. Mendel Rivers, Representative of the First District in South Carolina and able chairman of the House Armed Services Committee.

Representative Rivers' remarks and the editorial centered on the failure of the Justice Department to prosecute insurrectionists and those who counsel draft dodging. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the News and Courier, Charleston, S.C., Aug. 12, 1967]

Justice Department Failure

Exposure of the failure of the U.S. Dept. of Justice to prosecute insurrectionists and those who counsel draft-dodging has been needed for some time. The American people have reason to be thankful to U.S. Rep. L. Mendel Rivers for drawing up an indictment Aug. 8 in a powerful speech on the floor of the House.

Rep. Rivers charges the Justice Department with "timidity and irresponsibility." He said that decision-making officials in the department are "ignoring their responsibility to society and to the American people in order not to offend certain minority groups."

Mr. Rivers supported his charges with a detailed analysis of testimony given before a congressional committee by Fred M. Vinson Jr., assistant attorney general in the Criminal Division. The congressman cited section 12 of the Selective Service Act, which provides criminal penalties for anyone "who knowingly counsels, aids or abets another to refuse or to evade registration or service in the armed forces." He also cited Mr. Vinson's admission, under questioning, that the Justice Department has not charged anyone under this provision, though Stokely Carmichael and others repeatedly have urged young Americans not to serve their country.

Mr. Vinson said the department takes the position that "general statements made to a general audience would be exceedingly difficult to prosecute." This may be true, but the fact remains that the department has made no effort to win a conviction. Mr. Vinson also said he had no suggestion for changing the law so that prosecution could be made easier.

Rep. Rivers rightly concluded, in our judgment, that "the Department of Justice would rather second guess the Supreme Court than fulfill its responsibility to the nation."

Congressman Rivers, in drawing up his indictment of the Justice Department, took the precaution of providing a supporting statement from an outstanding legal authority, Dean Joseph O'Meara of the Notre Dame University Law School.

Referring to those who counsel lawbreaking, Dean O'Meara declared:

"They should be prosecuted, and there is no excuse for not doing so."

Dean O'Meara provided a lengthy analysis of court decisions, justifying action against Stokely Carmichael and others of that ilk.

Mr. Rivers has performed another public service in producing this indictment of the Justice Department under Atty. Gen. Ramsey Clark. It is a do-nothing' department when it comes to dealing with those who promote draft-dodging and advocate burning down America.

J. R. "Red" Wright, Retired Federal Marshal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JIM WRIGHT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1967

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I am including an article about a very fine friend of mine, J. R. "Red" Wright, retired Federal marshal.

Red is an institution in Texas. Undoubtedly he is one of the most popular law enforcement officials in a State noted for its colorful lawmen.

The article was written by Martha Hand and appeared in the Fort Worth Star-Telegram on August 10. Because of its general interest and the inspirational character of the marshal's eventful life, I recommend it to the reading of my colleagues.

The article follows:

Ex-Officer Recalls Illustrious Career

(By Martha Hand)

Arlington.—J. R. (Red) Wright, dean of U.S. marshals, lives in quiet retirement on a 160-acre ranch a few miles north of Six Flags Over Texas.

The colorful Wright sat beneath a cool grape arbor beside his Echo Hills rock ranch-house recently and recalled his 47 years as a lawman.

He began with a bit of philosophy.

"You can't coddle criminals the way the Supreme Court today insists they be handled," drawled Wright.

"They are like children. They need rules of conduct carefully spelled out for them and, like children, they need to know that those rules will be strictly enforced.

"When I think of wishy-washy enforcement, including that of parents, I am reminded of my wonderful mother who left no doubt that she meant what she said."

Wright shifted his 6-foot-2 frame and continued.

"When I was a little kid, a peddler with a wondrous wagon of general merchandise came by our farm near here ever so often and my mother traded chickens for things we needed. This peddler had a long blue wire with a hook on the end and he'd reach out and catch a chicken and have it in the wire coop on the back of his wagon in one great sweeping motion. I thought this was great and I decided to be a chicken catcher.

"I made a blue wire catcher just like his and I started catching chickens. My mother warned me not to catch another. She said she hated thieves and especially chicken thieves. She said she'd hang me if I caught another.

"But, I didn't believe her. Next day she caught me catching one of her chickens. She hung me to a pear tree and when she cut me down I loved her more than ever—but I sure hated thieves and chickens and pears."

Wright, brother of County Commissioner C. H. (Punch) Wright, is one of Tarrant County's best known figures.

He has spent 78 of his 79 years as a resident of Arlington.

Undoubtedly Wright was the only 200-gun marshal in the nation. He still has the collection.

Yet in all his 47 years as a lawman, he never killed anyone. And he never lost a prisoner.

Wright became a peace officer at 19 when, as Arlington's city marshal, he strapped on a .45-caliber thumb buster, made sure the shooting iron showed, and started pounding the city's wooden sidewalks.

When he was 11, Wright's father died, leaving a wife, two sons, two daughters, and two farms to work. One farm was "gumbo" black land. The other sand.

When it rained too hard to work the sandy land, Red—he had dropped his given name of James Robert—worked in the cotton bin selection seed for planting.

He was born in Dickens County, but when he was a year old, the family moved to Arlington to farm.

He grew tall, rawboned, strong, patient, and on the farm developed the quiet courage which made him famous.

Wright pointed a big freckled hand from beneath the grape arbor to a postoak which almost concealed the only thief Red has ever admired.

The thief is a squirrel he calls Old Chip.

"Sometimes when he brings his friends and shows them how to snitch feed from that bird feeded, I call him Sargent Shriver because he's so good at helping them get something for nothing."

Then Wright led the way inside the rock house he helped build.

The rooms were covered with pictures of his friends—the late Amon Carter; President Franklin D. Roosevelt, who first appointed him U.S. marshal in 1933; President Harry S. Truman; Congressman Jim Wright; Jim Farley; Tom Mix, the cowboy star; Sen. Tom Connally; Morris Sheppard, former Vice President John Nance Garner; Paul Waggoner; W. T. Waggoner, and many famous early-day ranchers, judges, lawmen, and district attorneys.

Dallas homicide capt. Will Fritz is one of his favorite lawmen and friends.

He bent his carrot-topped head (which refuses to turn white) over an old brass badge. Dated 1911, it was used at a convention in Handley of city marshals and chiefs of police of Texas. Wright was marshal of Arlington.

In 1914 he and the former Miss Clairette L. Smith were married. They had one son, James, now a Fort Worth lawyer. His wife died in 1957.

Wright was elected sheriff of Tarrant County in 1928 and on Aug. 1, 1933, resigned to become U.S. marshal. He credits Amon Carter with helping him get the appointment.

He served under three presidents, Roosevelt, Truman, and Eisenhower, before retiring in 1954. In April 1964 he was appointed federal jury commissioner for the Fort Worth district, but two years later retired to his beloved "Echo Hills" home which sets on a bluff overlooking a verdant valley on Red Wright Road.

As sheriff and marshal, Wright handled some of the nation's most notorious criminals.

He chased Pretty Boy Floyd. He searched for Clyde Barrow and Bonnie Parker, who killed his deputy, Malcolm Davis, in West Dallas.

Wright and Arlington Police Chief Ott Cribbs went looking for desperado Raymond Hamilton at his uncle's farm near here one night but found a black bear tied in the front yard and Hamilton gone.

He has a gun and saddle that once belonged to Pancho Villa.

More than once Wright found himself looking down the barrel of the gun of a tough criminal. He captured each and every one—sometimes it took force but he never used a gun.

Wright believes the death penalty keeps criminals from "going too far."

"They aren't afraid of jail—I handled one man who was given three different life sentences, and as far as I know he is out now."

Lawmen in today's civil rights era have it rougher than he did, he says. But he had no modern communications such as car radios.

He captured many a whiskey still.

"I did a lot of my work crawling through underbrush," Wright laughs.

Although he neither drinks nor gambles, Wright is opposed to prohibition and to law prohibiting horse racing. He favors serving liquor by the drink.

"You can't legislate morals. And you might as well get taxes on liquor and racing. As it is, racing taxes all goes outside the state."

A few years back, a man Wright put in Alcatraz sent word to him through an ex-convict that he planned to get him.

"I sent him my picture. Wouldn't want him to kill the wrong man," drawled Wright.

The case, he likes to talk about most involved an $80,000 robbery of the U.S. mail in Fort Worth and subsequent slaying of three members of the gang who turned up in the Trinity River.

And his favorite yellowed news cartoon shows him with a trio of prisoners being turned down by a warden at Huntsville because the prison was overcrowded. The cartoon first appeared in a New York newspaper, later in the Star-Telegram.

Wright spends most of his time tending beautiful flower gardens and growing corn and peas. Despite his impending 80th birthday, he is strong in body and memory.

His mother would have had to admit he turned out well. But just to keep himself humble, on the wall with all the mementoes of a storybook life hangs a slogan:

"If you're so dang smart, why ain't you rich?"

Taxpayer Must Pick Up the Tab

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1967

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Newton Kansan, which provides an illuminating reaction to the voluminous "Catalog of Federal Assistance Programs" just produced and distributed by the Office of Economic Opportunity throughout the Nation. The editorial follows:

TAXPAYER MUST PICK UP THE TAB

The other day we got a book in the mail. It weighs 3 pounds 3 ounces, is 1½ inches thick, 10¼ inches long and 7⅞ inches wide. It's title?

"Catalog of Federal Assistance Programs."

And a sub-title explains that it is "a description of the federal government's domestic programs to assist the American people in furthering their social and economic progress."

The cover also informed us that it was "produced by the Office of Economic Opportunity Executive Office of the President."

The book explains the nature and purpose of the programs, specifies major eligibility requirements, tells where to apply, and lists printed materials available. It also contains an introduction, instructions on how to use the catalog, a master index and an alphabetical subject index.

It contains 701 pages.

A total of 459 programs are described.

Some of these programs are well-known to the public, such as the services available to veterans of the armed services, agricultural aid programs and Social Security.

Others like the program for "Strengthening Developing Institutions" are seldom heard of.

We suppose the catalog fills some sort of a need.

And we know it cost the taxpayers a lot of money.

Penalties for Inciting Riots

SPEECH

OF

HON. HERVEY G. MACHEN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 19, 1967

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 421) to amend title 18 of the United States Code to prohibit travel or use of any facility in interstate or foreign commerce with intent to incite a riot or other violent civil disturbance, and for other purposes.

Mr. MACHEN. Mr. Chairman, I speak as a Member who supported the antiriot bill and the administration's proposal to aid law-enforcement agencies. As I spoke out then, I cannot in good conscience remain silent now.

We meet in a time of tragedy and crisis. Having experienced the rioting and widespread destruction which occurred in the past few months, the Nation now finds the seeds of bitterness sown in many quarters as rancor and race hatred attack the body politic.

We have been asked to consider a measure providing stiff penalties for those who would interfere with individuals attempting to exercise their constitutional rights in eight specific fields. The bill provides for a maximum penalty of $10,000 or imprisonment for 10 years, or both, and if death results, an indefinite prison term or life.

The areas protected are voting and activities relevant to the exercise of that right; enrolling in or attending public schools and colleges; participation in obtaining service from or receiving benefit from governmental activities administered by the Federal, State, or local government; employment and using the services, advantages, or membership in any labor organization; areas pertinent to jury duty; the use of vehicles, terminals, or facilities of common carriers; participation in or enjoying the benefits of programs or activities receiving Federal financial assistance; and public accommodations.

These are not new fields of protection but a forceful reiteration of rights long recognized as basic. This bill merely adds "teeth" to laws that Congress, in its wisdom, has already seen fit to pass.

Mr. Chairman, the Members of this House can debate any of the fine points of this bill, but let us recognize that there is a definite need to let the public know that we are consistent in the application of the principles of individual liberty. As we stand on record for the protection of the individual from rioters and looters, let us also stand up for his protection from purveyors of violence. Let us aid in the provision of security and safety for individuals engaging in these specific activities.

In the light of the past treatment of individuals attempting to exercise their legitimate rights and the impending threat of social dissolution in this country, who would deny that the need for legislation exists? Can the House afford to apply the principle of Federal guarantees for the protection of the individual in the one instance and refuse to provide them in the other? I think not. Let us discuss this measure thoroughly, make any amendments necessary, and pass it with all due speed.

Thank you.

Rats Can Be Controlled

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1967

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, possibly any rat problem could be greatly relieved if local and city authorities were freely permitted to enforce the housing and sanitation codes of their communities. But then again, such strict enforcement might see eviction of tenants from the cities which would be bad politics.

Anyway, the local Washington Post for August 15 carried a report on what can be done to control rats. The recommendations are certain not to be accepted or followed because they dare suggest the residents do something for themselves—work.

I insert the Post article in the RECORD:

HOW TO GUARD AGAINST RATS

What does Washington need to control its rat problem?

Experts in the field feel that, at the outset, it needs a (1) a program to provide for intensive poisoning of rodents, (2) an educational program for both landlords and tenants who violate housing and sanitation codes, (3) stricter enforcement against dumping garbage in Washington, (4) better policing of all commercial establishments selling food, and (5) a Sanitation Division with better equipment and men who take care not to handle garbage containers carelessly.

Residents can take these steps on their own:

Buy only metal garbage cans and make certain the lids fit tight. If possible, buy metal stands to keep them six inches off the ground.

Keep garbage out of trash cans and vice-versa.

Keep kitchens, hallways, stairs and alleys free of litter.

Keep doors shut and have broken windows repaired promptly.

Tell children not to topple garbage cans.

Keep dog houses and pet cages clean. Yards and alleys should be kept free of bones.

If rats or rat burrows are seen, tenants should notify their landlords and the Housing Division. The number is 629–4635. Private homeowners must call a commercial exterminator.

Poor persons may secure free rat poison from the Health Department at either 3246 P st. nw., or at a Health Department clinic at Delaware Avenue and I Street sw.

"Bridge of War"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1967

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, Gary Klingsporn is a young lad of 15 and a student at Monett High School. In June of this year he was the Missouri entry in the sectional contest for the Knights of Pythias. He serves by appointment of his principal on the seventh district of Missouri, youth advisory council.

Last year, following a memorial service for a Monett pilot, who was shot down and killed over Vietnam, he wrote a paper entitled "Bridge of War," which was later published in the Monett and Springfield, Mo., papers. Under unanimous consent I insert his comments at this point in the Congressional Record:

Bridge of War

A young American stands alone, gazing out across the vast and lonely countryside, at the beginning of another day. A day during which he will once again be subjected to the horrors of war; a day whose end he may never witness.

He ponders briefly upon what fate has brought him to this place, thousands of miles from home and his loved ones. As he does so, his heart begins to beat rapidly, a lump chokes at him in his throat, and a gnawing sickness eats at his heart and soul.

As the sun tops the distant horizon with hope, he begins to pray, "Heavenly Father, strengthen me that I may fulfill my duties on this day. Be Thou my protector and guardian in peril, and my comfort and hope in life. If Thy will requires my life on this day, let it be so, and strengthen my soul in steadfast faith unto the end. Bless all people who continue upon the earth, that they may find and come unto the true knowledge of Thee. Protect those who wage this war in defense of freedom, under Thy banners. Finally, bless my many loved ones who remain so far from me, as well as the people of the world with the hope of everlasting life. Above all, may Thy will be done, in Jesus' name I ask it, Amen."

His meditation over, this young soldier sets out with his company into a deep Viet Nam Jungle Highland, wondering if he will ever return alive.

Whether it be a foot soldier at the base of DaNang, Duc Co, or Thai Bi, or an air force pilot based at DaNang in Thailand, or in Guam, whether it be a navy pilot from the ranks of the 7th fleet, all have one thing in common . . . they march stealthily into battle at the rise of sun, wondering if this will be the day they are carried off cold at set of sun!

War is a horrible thing and in Viet Nam, death comes in hundreds of ways. It could be in an unexpected ambush, in outright battle engagement, or in a flaming aircraft plunging to earth. But regardless of the way, in each instance before death, there is time for one to think; sometimes very little time, sometimes hours.

We cannot comprehend how awful it must be in those last few moments before death, as the flaming aircraft plunges earthward. What goes on in the pilot's mind as it occurs? What does one think as he faces guns of the enemy? Time to think, and what is thought, represents the pattern of the individual's life.

There are those who die in angry struggles with conscience and soul, fighting to live, afraid of death. Their life patterns have been hollow and sad, for they knew no joys of the everlasting, of hope, or of faith. They knew only of this world.

Then there are those who die in complete peace, with no hopeless struggles or angry thoughts. Their life patterns have been rich and full of the joys of faith, hope, and love. These die with the love of God in their hearts, and go to live with Him in eternity. For they, and all their loved ones, death is joyful as well as sad, for death to them is merely the crossing of one last bridge of life into Heaven.

All who die in the Viet Nam war will receive the highest tribute of our land, for they have died, not in vain, but for those oppressed, that we might be free. For those who die with God in their hearts, honor will be raised not only on earth, but honor and rejoicing in Heaven as well.

Today, 30 Americans will die in Viet Nam. Let us pray that they will die in honor and peace, knowing that they are crossing, to eternal life, that bridge finished by the greatest soldier who ever fought; and who died violently for those oppressed, that all men may be free . . . . that men could . . . . go in peace!

Parasites or Americans?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1967

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, in the field of agriculture, unless parasites are eliminated, crop failures result.

If this country is to survive, is it not about time we start an eradication campaign to rid our shores of those who see a greener pasture on the other side of the fence?—Iron Curtain if you prefer.

The following address was delivered by Lt. Col. Oliver D. Coble, U.S. Army, retired, chaplain at a memorial service honoring members of 818–819–820 military police companies killed in action or died of wounds. The service was held in the Military Park Amphitheater, Gettysburg, Pa. The address follows:

Parasites or Americans?

Friends of America! There are few assemblies where his salutation might be more sincerely given.

There is no question as to your loyalty or love of Country! Your presence is an indisputable evidence of your devotion to our great Nation. You are here of your own choice to pay tribute to those who have sacrificed, served and died for their County . . . your Country and mine!

Thank God we still have those who are not motivated by petty, selffish or mercinary interests. I would bet my life that there is not a single flag burner or draft dodger in this group!

Somewhere in my files is a copy of a letter written by a Tank Commander to his Superior Officer. He had lost a hand in battle and was sent back to England for hospitalization. Somehow, he escaped and made his way across the Channel and was picked up at Cherbourg. He wrote a letter to his Commanding Officer. . . . It was my task to check its contents or censor it. In it he begged his Commanding Officer—"Pull your rank! Sure I only have one hand, I didn't use it any way. I am just as able without it!"

Thank God there are those who put the interests of their country first!

It is gratifying to know that I speak to Americans. Those who have America in their hearts. I shall not stoop to mention by name those who would deal a mortal blow to our Beloved Land . . . Burn our Flag; tear up their draft cards; slur; slander; malign; and destroy what we hold dear!

These parasites are not Americans!

I am proud of America. . . . Those who have served and those who now serve! God grant them a sustaining faith!

We are proud of America! The poet has put it beautifully:

"O beautiful for spacious skies—For amber waves of grain
For purple mountain Majesties—above the fruited plain
America, America, God shed His grace on Thee
And crown thy good with Brotherhood, from sea to shining sea."
"O beautiful for Pilgrim feet—Whose stern impassioned stress—A thorofare for freedom beat,
Across the Wilderness—
America, America, mend thine every flaw! Conform
Thy Soul in self control—Thy liberty in Law
"O beautiful for Patriot dream—that sees beyond the years
Thine alabaster cities gleam—undimned by human tears
America, America, God shed His grace on Thee. And crown thy good with Brotherhood, from sea to shining sea."

Yes, let us remember. . . . There is much to remember!

When one approaches the Rockies, they present an awesome spectacle; fifty or more miles away; but once you gain the foothills, the mountains are often hidden from view.

When confronted by a national crisis, the good and the beautiful are often over-shadowed by irrational acts of irresponsible people! But these unfortunate few who would desecrate our flag, tear up their draft cards, interfere with our National Defense, are but a pitiful minority!

The vast majority are loyal and true to America! It would be sad indeed if we did not remember those who live and serve; or the one million who have died; or the one million three hundred thousand who have been wounded—to establish and protect this our beloved Land!

David, the Shepherd lad—and later King of Israel—could well speak for us:

"If I forget Thee O Jerusalem, let my right hand forget her cunning. . . .

"If I do not remember Thee, let my tongue cleave to the roof of my mouth, if I prefer not Jerusalem to my chief joy!"

A great American, once said: "Ask not what your country can give to you. . . . rather, what you can give to your Country!"

Each of us here are in debt to this great land! Millions upon millions have left their native land and came here in order to gain a new and better life! We have that life. . . . Let us cherish it. . . . Let us remember those who have made it possible!

Freedom of speech has been one of our most cherished possessions; but in the hands of irresponsibles, it can become a dagger pressed to the heart of our Land!

It was never intended to slur—slander—or malign our Nation either in Peace—or in time of War! Nor was it intended to be a devise to shield the Communist or Anarchist!

Freedom has been our undying glory! Shall it also be our inevitable shroud? The grave of all our cherished liberties?

This is a serious hour! We stand at the "Cross Roads of Destiny"!

Once we had the respect of other Nations and other people! Our enemies increase—our friends decrease!

Once we had a heritage which we could pass on to our posterity with a sense of pride!

Now . . . We are fearful of tomorrow!

"Yet not by night, but my spirit, saith the Lord God!" Evil shall not triumph—the

Soldiers of God go marching on! Tomorrow can and shall be a more glorious day!

May I in conclusion quote the words of a great Christian leader, Francis of Assisi (Saint):

"Lord, make me an instrument of Thy peace; where there is hatred let me sow love; where there is injury, pardon; where there is doubt, faith; where there is despair, hope; where there is darkness, light; and where there is sadness, joy.

"O Divine Master, grant that I may not so much seek to be consoled as to console; to be understood as to understand; to be loved, as to love; for it is in the dying that we receive; it is in the pardoning that we are pardoned; and it is in dying that we are born to eternal life."

Legislation To Assist Hospitals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1967

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation which I believe will provide assistance to hospitals in their attempts to decrease administrative costs enabling a reduction in medical and hospital care for patients.

Our hospitals would like to join together to pool their resources and scarce personnel; make maximum use of equipment and plant; and avoid expensive duplication of materials and services. In many communities this has already been done. A group of nonprofit hospitals have created a single entity to perform activities that the member hospitals have been doing by themselves, such as laundry, purchasing, recordkeeping, or diagnostic laboratory services. However, adverse consequences have resulted to these organizations because of inability to obtain a tax exempt status under section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code.

When a tax exempt hospital performs these functions for itself, there is no tax problem. When a hospital performs these services for other hospitals, or joins with other institutions to create a joint venture, unfortunately, tax exemption is denied to the entity conducting the joint activity.

A tax exemption is necessary to enable the receipt of grants from charitable foundations and gifts from individuals. Neither would be willing to donate without assurance of tax deductibility for the gift. Second, accounting practice sometimes shows income, subject to tax, as a "paper profit" when, for example, loans are amortized more rapidly than the depreciation of the plant or equipment they have financed. Third, without the appropriate Federal exemption, in many States the organization would be denied exempt status under State law and would be faced with real estate, sales, and income taxes.

The proposed amendment would add a new subsection to the Internal Revenue Code, section 501(c)(18). It would give statutory recognition of the exempt status of joint, group or cooperative organizations created by nonprofit hospitals, as if the organization's activities were conducted by the member hospitals individually. Personnel of the joint venture would also enjoy the same benefits as accrue to employees of nonprofit hospitals.

This amendment would not reduce the Treasury's actual revenue, and would encourage hospitals to do collectively and at a reduced cost, some of the activities they now perform individually.

I urge my colleagues to support the enactment of this measure in view of the rapidly increasing expenses of our medicare program and in an attempt to aid the hospitals in their endeavors to reduce these costs for our citizens.

National Federation of Independent Business Has No Position on Oil Depletion Allowance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE BUSH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1967

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, on February 1, Representative HERBERT TENZER, my distinguished colleague from New York, submitted for the RECORD a statement and a letter in support of H.R. 3803, his bill to reduce the oil depletion allowance from 27½ percent to 20 percent at the rate of 2½ percent annually over a 3-year period. They appeared in the RECORD on February 9.

The letter, dated February 3, and written by Mr. Ed Wimmer, public relations director of the National Federation of Independent Business, purports to place his organization in support of H.R. 3803.

At this point, I must respectfully correct this misconception and state that the National Federation of Independent Business has, in fact, no position on the subject of oil depletion allowance.

I quote from a letter dated August 11, 1967, to me from the federation's president, Mr. C. Wilson Harder, of Hillsborough, Calif.:

> Recently there has been a great amount of correspondence with regard to the stand of the National Federation on the oil depletion allowance.
>
> With reference to your recent letter, the Federation has never taken an official position on this subject.
>
> As you know, it is a firm policy of the Federation that no stand can be taken on any issue until the same has been submitted to our entire nationwide membership for their individual Mandate ballot vote. The oil depletion allowance issue has never been submitted to vote, therefore we have no position.
>
> We can appreciate your great interest in the issue, and we would appreciate anything you might do to make the Federation's position known to the members of Congress.

This excerpt speaks for itself and I hope it will serve to indicate the true position of the National Federation of Independent Business with respect to the oil depletion allowance issue.

A Salute to an Outstanding American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL D. PERKINS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1967

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, on this past Tuesday the Committee on Education and Labor favorably reported H.R. 12257, a bill to amend the Vocational Rehabilitation Act. As was the case in subcommitee, the full committee reported the bill unanimoulsy. It seems to be almost a tradition in the House for according the programs carried on under the Vocational Rehabilitation Act not only unanimous but enthusiastic support. You will recall that legislation in 1965 providing for a major revision of the act was reported from subcommittee and the full committee by unanimous vote. The bill received a warm reception in the House and on final passage, I do not recall one dissenting vote.

Why is this the case? How is it that the Congress is able time and time again to expand and strengthen the vocational rehibilitation program without controversy and without dissenting voices? Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that it is due in large part to the manner in which Mary Switzer, former Commissioner of Vocational Rehabilitation, has administered the program through the years.

On legislation matters, she has been an articulate and pursuasive advocate for administration after administration. As a member of the executive branch, shouldering major program responsibilities, she has been more than cooperative with the committee and subcommittees, both with regard to new proposals and to the administration of existing programs. More importantly, Mr. Speaker, she has been a dedicated and hard-working friend of the clientele she serves. Through her imaginative and untiring efforts, she has effectively translated the acts of Congress into meaningful and efficient programs to rehabilitate thousands and thousansd of physically and mentally handicapped American.

Also on last Tuesday, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare announced a major realinement of the Federal welfare, rehabilitation, and social service programs. A new agency, the Social and Rehabilitation Service, is being established in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to carry out functions and programs presently scattered in four agencies within the Department.

Mary Switzer has been selected as the Administrator of the new agency. Mr. Speaker, a better choice could not be made. I want therefore to join with other Members of the House, with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and his associates, and with the many Americans who have benefited from the Vocational Rehabilitation Service programs, in paying tribute to Mary Switzer and in expressing sincere congratulations to her on this appointment.

Commenting on the reorganization, Secretary Gardner said:

> The new Agency will join under a single leadership both our income support programs for needy Americans and the social service and rehabilitation programs that many families and individuals need.

Not only will the programs be under a single leadership, but they will be under the expert and sensitive leadership of a truly great American.

Mr. Speaker, the Members of the Congress can feel confident that the programs and services in which we are so interested will be strengthened under the guiding hand of Mary Switzer. So too can the aged and the handicapped and the other needy Americans for whom these programs are intended be optimistic about the future.

Beat the Devil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY C. SCHADEBERG
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 17, 1967

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, I had the occasion on July 16, 1967, to worship with the congregation of the Calvary Methodist Church in Arlington, Va. The pastor of the church, the Reverend Mr. Bernard S. Via, Jr., delivered a very thought-provoking message entitled, "Beat the Devil" in which he put his finger on one of the basic causes of the breakdown in law and order in our present-day society. His message, although a very personal message, bespeaks of the cure for society's ills. I urge my colleagues in the House to read his message as a means of better understanding why legislative action in many areas, though necessary to ease the social pains caused by our failures are not and indeed cannot be the cure for our social pains. The sermon follows:

BEAT THE DEVIL

(Scripture: I Peter 5:6–11. Text: "Be sober, be watchful. Your adversary the devil prowls around like a roaring lion, seeking some one to devour." I Peter 5:8.)

In the opinion of several of my brighter friends, I suffer from a theological deficiency. The source of this distress is that I join the host of people who almost unconsciously accept theological dualism. On the basis of what we have observed we sense not just one supreme God, but we have found two spiritual forces, one righteous, the other evil. Loosely speaking one is called God and the other the devil. For responsibility's sake I try to keep the devil shorn of his horns and forked tail, but the loss of these appendages make him no less a matter of human experience.

GOOD AND EVIL ARE ALIVE

It is the Christian understanding of God that He is a personal God. That is, righteousness has a personality. Righteousness has the capacity to possess people. In accumulation, it reinforces itself and expands. It acts not so much like an abstract principle as it does a spiritual organism. But the same things may be said of evil. It too has a personality with the capacity for superimposing itself upon individuals and their communities. Evil, too, in accumulation reinforces itself and expands.

Frequently now, one observes a situation or an individual so depraived that it is not adequate to say that the affliction is merely the "absence of good." On the contrary, it is the presence of something positively wrong and sinister in its being.

Now the Christian must be very careful about his understanding of evil. We cannot eliminate the devil by redefining him. The peculiar way of our discipleship seems understandable when seen in terms of its gigantic conflict. We have accepted the struggle to raise the banners of decency, hope, righteousness and faith over all the powerful, entrenched forces that would tear them down.

An order for this day is given in our text found in the First Epistle of Peter, "Be sober, be watchful. Your adversary the devil prowls around like a roaring lion, seeking someone to devour." (I Peter 5:8)

Reinforced by this descriptive text we can launch the topic, *Beat the Devil,* with considerable enthusiasm. The New Testament promoted the idea that discipleship is a matter of being a christian soldier. The enemies of God are such that, discipline, decisive, aggressive action is essential. We must not be afraid to identify the enemy and to attack!

ABOLITION NOT ACCOMMODATION

But times have changed. The devil has become fairly respectable. He often looks decent—and when times are uncertain, the way something looks may be the primary criteria for judgment.

The Christian is out to abolish evil, not to accommodate himself to it! If the devil's demise is not a practical undertaking for today; it is at least a *necessary* one. If anyone is suggesting truce, we had better get the bugles blowing, for we're called to beat the devil!

NO CLOSER THAN NECESSARY

Initial strategy in our fray with evil calls for four elementary disciplines. First, if we would beat the devil, we must not let him get too close. He is exceedingly potent in close combat. We must not let over confidence in our own righteousness lure us into unnecessary jeopardy.

When I was a small boy it was our privilege to have a grandmother making her home with us. Occasionally I would climb into her lap for a story. One of my favorites concerned a pioneer family on the American frontier. The wilderness that surrounded their earth floor cabin, was filled with wild animals, some of the ferocious. Because of this, one day when the parents left the home they instructed the children to remain inside with the door and windows closed. Then came the exciting part of grandmother's story. After the parents had gone, a wolfe who was as hungry as he was large descended upon the little house. He peered in the window and saw the children. He scratched on the door and before long he was digging to tunnel underneath. The oldest child assumed command. Hurriedly he instructed that pots of water be heated in the fireplace. Just as the wolfe got his head fully underneath the door into the cabin, the children poured the scalding water over his head! Of course, you can imagine what happened. (Perhaps this was the beginning of bald headed wolves!)

The old fashioned way said don't let the wolfe in. Don't let the devil come any closer than absolutely necessary to send him on his way.

The "new morality," which usually seems to be "no morality," by contrast says, let him in and let's see if we can tame him! This new way is like the story of Little Red Riding Hood where the wolfe is allowed to gobble up grandmother (and everything she stands for) and then jumps into bed to await his next victim.

Our perspective is usually better from a distance, our ideals are brighter. In combat with evil it is good to have slugging room. Elementary Christian strategy demands that we not invite evil to close personal combat if we can fight him on any other battle ground.

EVIL CAN'T TAKE ITS OWN MEDICINE

In the second place, the Christian must learn to *make fun of the devil*. Now this is quite different from having fun with the devil. And it is certainly different from thinking that evil is funny. But the Christian cannot afford to loose his sense of humor. Evil has a way of withering under the warmth of a righteous life that is enjoying itself.

Sir Thomas More, who has come alive for our day as *A Man for All Seasons* said, "The devil . . . that prowde spirite . . . cannot endoure to be mocked."

Legend has it that Martin Luther threw an ink bottle at the devil. It must not have been effective for later he wrote, "The best way to drive out the devil, if he will not yield to texts of Scripture, is to jeer and flount him, for he cannot bear scorn."

A SENSE OF HUMOR IS BASIC

A personal victory over evil is often won when a person has learned to *play* the fool, without *being* the fool. In the third place it is an essential part of the Christian strategy to have a sense of humor. The capacity to enjoy life is a prerequisite for a sense of humor. John Wesley said, "Sour godliness is the devil's religion."

Human beings have not only the *desire* to be foolish, but also the *need* to be foolish. Occasionally our emotions need to over flow in a ridiculous way. So we play practical jokes, shout and jump in the stadium bleachers, and we act the clown. All of this can be a part of the joy of living. But some people do not know how to be foolish without being naughty! Evil always tries to use our natural inclinations to establish a beach-head.

The Christian believes that life is good. Being good it holds a great deal of satisfaction, in short, it contains an abundance of fun. A person can enjoy life without escaping from it. Some people do not seem to know this. But the Christian believes that reality is not only endurable, it is also worth consuming.

The rise in the sale of escape mechanism is a serious danger signal. It is an indication that many of our people are forgetting how to live. This is a basic and cruel sort of defeat. The sale is too great for alcohol and tranquilizers; stimulants and depressents; the illicit and the grotesque; too great in the United States for us to deceive ourselves into thinking that we are making a real success of living in America. As a result, because of the personal and unmet needs of our people, America is again an urgent mission field!

To turn the tide, to beat the devil, this elementary strategy must be applied, we must learn to play the fool without being the fool.

PERSONAL INTEGRITY AND DISCIPLINE ARE IMPERATIVE

Finally, the most obvious council of all. If we are out to beat the devil, we must not let any one talk us out of our backbone.

The devil launches his attack along the nerve centers, he musters force against those qualities that help us to stand up straight as people of dignity and principle.

Unlike traditional Christian evangelism the devil does not seek an all out conversion. I do not know of anyone outside of fiction who "sold out" to evil all at once. For evil is satisfied with an occasional compromise, and an undefined morality. The devil is pleased with an openness to all sides where there is the possibility that one will become suspicious of the old truth and fascinated with new lies.

C. S. Lewis in *The Screwtape Letters* has a senior devil, Screwtape, giving advice on how to be an effective demon to a junior devil named Wormwood. One of Screwtape's complaints was, "We work under a cruel handicap, everything must be twisted before it can be of any use to us." Indeed, evil has become proficient in this technique as a matter of survival. The devil changes the labels on things making positive identification difficult, if not impossible. A bottle of arsenic ought to be labeled "poison" in bold letters and embellished with crossed bones and skull as a warning to those who may not take the time to read. If this label is changed to "essence of peppermint" the appearance of danger has been diminished while the probability of disaster has been greatly increased. The weaker the label, the more dangerous the poison.

Our new day with its so called new morality seems incapable of conclusive ethical decisions. So mass media is being used to change the labels on some old poisons by advertisers and others who want a hearing or a reading. With Puritanism discredited and piety being made synonymous with hypocrisy it is easy to convince that: gambling is not so bad . . . divorce can be an adequate way of life . . . free sex has its advantages . . . and compromised honesty is the fruit of cleverness. . . .

If we have been drinking from any bottles where the labels have been recently changed, where the truth has been twisted for the sake of sales or circulation, then we had better brace up our backbones!

After William James had seen Guido Reni's famous painting in the Louvre of the arch angel Michael with his foot on Satan's throat, he is reported to have said, "The world is all the richer for having a devil in it, so long as we keep our foot upon his neck."

Even underfoot he is too close for comfort, but if the proximity is unavoidable the position is correct.

All of this is only the basic training for a long fight, but the Christian soldier takes the high ground when he doesn't let evil come any closer than can be helped, when he can make fun of the devil, when he can learn to *play* the fool without *being* the fool, and when his backbone is intack, his uprightness is unimpaired and his ethical judgments are unpolluted.

"Be sober, be watchful. Your adversary the devil prowls around like a roaring lion, seeking someone to devour."

Elco Corp. Wins President's "E" Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1967

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. Speaker, an electronics manufacturing firm in Montgomery County, Pa., the Elco Corp., of Willow Grove, has been conducting an ambitious program to sell and manufacture its products abroad. Recently the firm received an "E" award from President Johnson in recognition of its "excellence in exporting."

I think my colleagues would be interested in learning what one relatively small but growing company has accomplished in opening up international markets.

Elco manufactures electronic connectors used in computers and other business machines. It first began seeking export markets 8 years ago. Today foreign sales account for 12 percent of the company's $30 million annual sales.

Benjamin Fox, president of Elco, personally visited several foreign countries in 1959 in an initial bid for export business. By 1961 Elco products were being assembled in England, Denmark, and Australia and, in addition, they were being sold to representatives in Japan and France.

By 1964 Elco had set up manufacturing operations in England, Denmark, France, Germany, Australia, and Japan. In 1965 Elco entered a joint venture to manufacture in Canada.

Elco has developed customer relations abroad by taking part in international trade exhibitions and holding seminars in foreign countries.

We in Montgomery County are proud of Elco's efforts, which have furthered the national policy of increased exports. We are proud that Elco's accomplishments have been recognized by the Federal Government with the presentation of the President's "E" award.

Food Stamp Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BROCK ADAMS

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1967

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago the House passed legislation which would authorize appropriations to continue the food stamp program. The Senate previously had passed similar legislation. However, the two versions differed as to the length of time the program would be extended. The House bill called for 1 year and the Senate for 3. I understand that the House-Senate conferees have met on two occasions, but have been unable to reach an agreement.

I would like to urge the conferees to agree to an extension of the program for an additional 3-year period—the same length of time authorized by the original legislation enacted in 1964. I am convinced that a 1-year limitation is unnecessarily restrictive and would prevent the Department of Agriculture and the participating States from undertaking the necessary forward planning which is essential to maintain an effective and prudently administered food stamp program.

The report of my colleagues on this bill had nothing but praise for the manner in which this program has been administered. The Department of Agriculture is to be congratulated for living up to the commitment made to the Congress in 1964 to gradually and carefully expand the program. The 3-year appropriation authority enacted in 1964 has contributed substantially to this solid record of achievement.

The successful implementation of a program of this nature requiring the cooperation of local, State, and Federal governmental bodies cannot be accomplished overnight. State and local governments have major responsibilities for administering this program. They are solely responsible for determining who is eligible to participate, and for the actual issuance of food coupons. In order for them to provide for orderly and well-thought-out expansion, it is essential that they have adequate time to provide the necessary financing, the training of personnel, and the preparation of facilities. If the States have reasonable assurance that the program will be continued, they can proceed, as they have been since 1964, with careful and orderly planning.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that a 3-year extension should be enacted. However, in view of the fact that we are already in the second month of the fiscal year, I would be willing to settle for a 2-year extension so that the Department and the States could begin to make definite plans for expansion in the current fiscal year. The Department has had many requests to expend the program into new areas. However, under the circumstances, it is not in a position to respond because of the uncertainty surrounding the program's future.

Approximately one-third of the Nation's counties do not have a food assistance program. In all these areas there are people in the richest Nation of the world who need more food. I urge a speedy resolution of the differences which are holding up final action on this important piece of legislation. I would hope the conferees would see fit to extend the program for 3 years. If such an agreement cannot be obtained quickly, then I urge a compromise extending the program for at least 2 more years.

Social Research Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1967

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. taxpayers are now financing a mass classroom facility for social research. Only the experimenting will be with human beings, not guinea pigs.

I insert the report which appeared in the February 11, 1967, New York Times in the RECORD:

NEW SCHOOL BUYS OLD LANE'S STORE

The New School for Social Research has purchased the former Lane department store at Fifth Avenue and 14th Street for classroom use.

The school, which will retain its main building at 66 West 12th Street, paid a reported $4.5-million for the land and the three-story building that has been vacant since late 1965.

Apart from acknowledging that "it's going to be a classroom facility," the school declined to comment yesterday on the use of the building, pending study. Built in 1951, the structure has 138,000 square feet of floor space.

A Federal loan of "more than $1-million" helped to defray the purchase price, a school spokesman said. He added that the United States Office of Education had made a grant of more than $600,000 for renovating the building.

The 31,000-square-foot site was purchased from Bernard Freeman, a realty investory, for $2,250,000. The site covers the east blockfront on Fifth Avenue between 13th and 14th Streets.

The building's long-term lease, held by the McCrory Corporation, was acquired for more than $2-million, it was reliably reported. The transaction was completed Jan. 24.

The Lane store was closed because of continuing unprofitability. The former Lane chain, now Love's, is owned by Klein's Department Stores, Inc., which is controlled by McCrory.

Commencement Address of Prof. Gaston Pelletier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN G. DOW
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 17, 1967

Mr. DOW. Mr. Speaker, I invite your attention to a commencement address that is not bound by idolatry of established routine. It is one that presumes much that is hopeful in the new generation. It is an address delivered by Prof. Gaston Pelletier of the English Department, Agricultural and Technical College, Delhi, N.Y., at the commencement exercises of that college on June 11, 1967. Except for omitting some introductory observations within Professor Pelletier's address, I offer it in its entirety for the Record, as follows:

Mending the Old Order

It is often a necessity to war with precedent. Too often, the old way, the old road, the old rule simply will not do. It is often a compulsion then, felt not solely but especially by those individuals from a newer order, from a newer tradition, from, let us say, a newer generation, to establish precedent rather than glorify it; to innovate rather than imitate; to lead rather than follow; to be in the process of becoming rather than merely having "arrived"; to act and react rather than ponder passively.

And these compulsions upset the existing older order. They cause antagonism and breaches of faith. They are considered revolutionary, yet they are but part of an evolutionary process.

Moreover, these upsetting compulsions often freeze dialogue between one order and another, between one generation and another, between the implacable "establishment", now on the uneasy defensive, and the reactionary young and new, now disconcertingly on the offensive and very much on the move. It is often the parent order's first reaction either to ignore summarily or to put down patently the voice of its own child now clamoring to speak for itself. The obvious tragedy is the misunderstanding that results, not because the new voice is unreasonable, but because the old one won't keep quiet long enough to listen.

Before the parent order becomes too quick to slap the wrist or spank the flank of its mischievous child, before the parent order puts into a corner its parading and protesting child whose name is the new or current generation, it should perhaps be reminded of its own role in some recent history, much of which might well be the cause of that child's embarrassing and irascible behavior.

The old order, older generation might be reminded of some of its more notable achievements in this our own century. Out of the backdrop of the First World War (which some myopic soul called the war to end all wars), there is the infamy of World War II, there is the infamy of the Korean "conflict," and there is the infamy of the very real and very close but undeclared-declared insanity of World War III.

The older generation should be reminded of its role in such places as Nagasaki and Hiroshima, Budapest, The Bay of Pigs, Dachau and Auschwitz. It should be reminded of its role in creating the "healthy climate" and "atmosphere of brotherhood" that lead to man's humanity to man in the case of a certain six million Jews, and more recently in our own country, of such diverse people as Medgar Evers, Mrs. Liuzzo, or John F. Kennedy.

It should be reminded of its contribution to the speedy solution of such problems as nuclear disarmament, racial and religious intolerance, pollution, over-population, disease, famine, and poverty. Perhaps the older generation should not seek too much flattery for its having beautified the globe with such dubious embellishments as the Iron Curtain, the Bamboo Curtain, or its sturdy, well-built wall in Berlin.

I catalogue these contributions to 20th century life, not to embarrass the old nor to intimidate the young, not to suggest that those of older generations bury their heads in shame, nor certainly, to provide the young with grist for their mills of protest and rebellion. I catalogue these realities because they are part of the fabric of 20th century life, the fabric into which you graduates must soon weave yourselves. If the cloth you inherit from my generation or from that which preceded mine, is soiled and tattered, spotted and blooded, mangled and torn, so be it. You must learn to accept the cloth as it is. You must learn to live with fact, not fiction; with reality, not illusion. Merely to shout "J'Accuse" at an older generation because the cloth it has left you is in disrepair, is contribute nothing useful. It is to do nothing but weaken whatever strands of connective thread are left between generations. You must learn, rather, to stitch and to sew. To shout execrations and invectives: is nothing. But to want to mend the cloth: is everything.

We live in an age where rapid rockets invade almost daily the virginal outer spaces, in an age where science is becoming king, technology its loving queen, the computer their sputtering progeny, and man, their push-button vassal and serf. We live in an age where radioactivity may soon become our soul-brother, an age where such people as Bob Dylan, The Supremes, The Mammas and the Poppas, and Playboy's Hugh Hefner are currently writing a new Third Testament. We live in an age of fire where monks and pacifists torch themselves to death, where bunkers become ovens and villages are napalmed out of existence, an age which must wonder how close to hell it really is.

We live in an age which is slowly humanizing the machine but dehumanizing man, ignoring God but exalting jerks, an age tolerating the topless, defying the beats and hippies, living by the pseudo-ethics of a new "immorality," an age unfortunately forgetful of what happened to the Roman Empire or to Sodom and Gomorrah.

Ours is an age characterized by certain pessimists, and I suppose by realists as well, as an age of confusion, uncertainty, anger, chaos, protest, unrest, violence, turbulence, suffering, prejudice, alienation, anguish and despair, an age where "absurd is the word", "don't get involved" the motto, and "do unto others before they do unto you" the unwritten eleventh commandment.

We live in an age where a mahoganied Cyclops stares at us nightly with its one bloodshot mangled eye, its monstrous voice growling the virtues of little old wine-makers, white knights, and jolly green giants, those heroes of a new 20th century mythology. We live in an age where phenomenal wealth is more than balanced off by abject indigence, where a cornucopia is more than balanced off by an empty cupboard, where those who live well are too often ignorant of those who do well if they live at all, an age where bitter hatred and contempt too often exist between black and white, atheist and theist, Arab and Jew, low-brow and snob, and sadly, even between parent and child.

But more importantly, we live in an age of choice, of decision, an age where men of the old order, together with men of new and future generations may soon have to decide whether they wish to burn themselves at the stake of nuclear warfare, thereby atomizing civilization, or whether they wish to unify their strength, their imagination, their spirit, their vitality, certainly their reason, and to borrow Churchill's phrase, their very blood, sweat and tears, to the making and remaking of a civilization, of a social order, of a mankind that is not savage, not primitive, not barbaric, but is one that is deeply and truly, one-hundred percent human.

The last one-third of this century belongs in large measure to you young people. It is yours to claim, yours to impoverish, yours to perfect. The quality, and I daresay even the quantity of mankind will be determined by the quality and quantity of your thought, your action, your judgment.

Mankind's future, whether bright or bleak, depends at least to a degree upon what you decide to do with the seed of learning planted in you at this institution. You can neglect that seed, or you can nurture it. Mankind's destiny lies in a crystal ball held largely by you, a ball which will surely fall and shatter if you abdicate your responsibilities by refusing to gaze full face into it. And you can be in no condition to gaze into it to face either present or future realities if you chose to travel the current escapist routes of sniffing glue, smoking banana skins, getting hooked on pot or hashish, or taking psychedelic trips a-go-go.

The fabric of life you are inheriting is hardly a clean, wholesome and untattered one. Its edges are frayed interchangeably by boiling hot then frigid cold wars, its interior design marred by revolutions and counter-revolutions. Rather than a pure and peaceful white, its color is a shocking blood-red. But despite the shoddy condition of this cloth, despite your justifiable tendency to point the accusing finger, I implore you to accept the following mandates:

Go forth and be forever known as that generation that not only accepts, but also adjusts sanely to its mutilated legacies; go forth and be forever known as that generation that is indeed a belligerent one, but is one that bears its arms against intolerance, against suffering, and against ignorance. Go forth and be forever known as that generation that indeed feels the need to kill but rather kills disease, kills poverty, kills hunger, kills prejudice.

Go forth and be forever known as that generation that exalts not jerks and kicks, but God and human reason, that knows all the repulsive four-letter words of its day, but prefers to focus on the learning of such vocabulary as peace, integrity, justice, character, honor, and on such phrases as faith in God, dignity of the human person, and love of man.

Be that generation that resists vehemently any power structure that consciously or unconsciously tries to crush your originality, stifle your imagination, suffocate your spirit, or choke your creativity, whether in thought, art, or science.

Go forth and immortalize yourselves by refusing categorically to let man annihilate himself.

Perhaps the best counsel possible is to suggest that you echo the following affirmation by American Nobel Prize-winner, William Faulkner.

"I decline to accept the end of man. It is easy enough to say that man is immortal simply because he will endure; that when the last ding-dong of doom has clanged and faded from the worthless rock hanging tideless in the last red and dying evening, that even then there will still be one more sound: that of his puny inexhaustible voice, still talking. I refuse to accept this. I believe that man will not merely endure: he will prevail. He is immortal, not because he alone among creatures has an inexhaustible voice, but because he has a soul, a spirit capable of compassion and sacrifice and endurance."

Two years ago, at another time but in this very place, a voice sang to you graduates during three magnificent lectures on William Golding.

The voice was that of poet-professor Luke Zilles.

It is only fitting that so as it was *his* voice that welcomed you to campus life in the September of your college careers, so too should it be *his* voice that bids you farewell in its final moments. My message to you is contained in the concluding lines of one of his poems. I leave you to consider their value, and to consider whatever is implied for you, for me, indeed for all of us, especially in the final line.

"I who have lost myself in quest of me,
A man amid the magnitude of Man,
A drop of blood into the sea of blood,
Return to me, the least minority.

And yet, . . . the me, though lost, is found
In Man as Men, the enlargement of the Me.
That ample drop of blood that falls, erects
A coronet of rubies on itself.
Within the majesty of the Immense,
Where booms the heart of Time enormously.

Beyond all this, . . . the stars crown love,
Love that increases men, enlarges me.
Permit this cricket his Magnificat:
Love alone shall magnify my life."

Preservation of the Alligator

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1967

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, it is with much pleasure that I rise to associate myself with the remarks of my colleague, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Fascell], and to serve as a cosponsor of his bill to provide protection to the American alligator, which was introduced on July 26, 1967. Similar legislation was also introduced on July 26, 1967, by our colleague, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Willis].

I consider myself quite fortunate to have enjoyed, on numerous occasions, the scenic and biological splendors which are combined in Mr. Fascell's district, especially in Everglades National Park. The people of his district, the Nation, and Members of this body should be deeply appreciative of the tireless stewardship he has displayed with regard to the natural resources of southern Florida.

The bill which we introduce today affords all our colleagues the opportunity to participate in saving from extinction a most unusual animal whose history extends back 200 million years. Having survived the tumultuous heavings and sinkings of the earth's crust and its watery envelope; the extreme vagaries of global climatic pulses; and the depredations of predators in its ecological milieu, the alligator now faces extinction at the hand of man.

As has been pointed out, the alligator is subject to a two-pronged attack from civilization. The swampland habitat which is home to these huge reptiles is being ruthlessly torn from existence—drained, bulldozed, and subdivided, farmed, or developed industrially. Then, as the range is reduced and survivors are crowded together, poachers can conduct their butchery with greater ease.

I have recently visited Everglades National Park and talked at length with the personnel, including Superintendent Allin, about both major threats to the gators—poachers and Army Engineers. It is sickening to think that extensive poaching operations can be carried out within the boundaries of an area designated by the Congress to receive the highest degree of protection of its natural resources—a national park. So grossly outnumbered are the men whose duty it is to protect the wildlife, and I include both Federal and State rangers, that protection on the ground is virtually impossible. The hide hunters make use of every available scheme and device to pursue their hateful work. Aircraft, airboats, and radios are all used to advantage to capture the alligaters and avoid pursuit.

Given this inability to protect such a vast expanse with additional rangers or wardens, there remains only a single attainable means of effectively cutting the flow of alligator hides in the channels of commerce. That method is the one proposed in this bill. By amending the provisions of the old Lacey Act we may lessen the market for the hides. As this in turn would reduce the return which the poachers could hope to realize, we could expect a significant drop in the number of animals taken for their skin.

Mr. Speaker, I would stress to my colleagues that the second threat to the American alligator, and indeed to all the splendid variety of life forms in the Everglades, is not so simple of solution. Those who prey upon these wild creatures by destroying or radically altering the environment, hide behind a mask of "progress," or "public service."

Mr. Speaker, the Corps of Engineers has over the past few years insured a high degree of accuracy to the predictions of all and sundry prophets of wildlife doom. Yet, despite validating the protestations of their critics, they continue to dig, damage, and destroy.

A case in point is the canal III project just east of the Everglades Park. Here these "engineers" were about to allow the intrusion of salt water far inland of the current fresh water—saline water interface. Such an intrusion would not only endanger local water supplies but wreck havoc among the biota of the park itself. The alligator for instance requires a fresh water environment. It was only the sheer outrage and voluble complaints of conservationists that prevented this from being an accomplished fact at this time. There is now a plan to modify the project somewhat in an effort to guard against salt water intrusion. I must confess to my colleagues that I maintain some serious reservations as to the efficacy of the modifications. I hope I will not be placed in the position of saying, "I told you so," at some later date.

The corps affects a most curious defense at times—and its arsenal of defensive mechanisms is great—that of piously stating that they do only what they are directed by Congress to do. To this there is an element of truth, and it is here that this body can make its second contribution to the preservation of the alligator specifically, and vast numbers and kinds of wildlife generally. We must tell these people what to do. What we tell them must be that which takes full cognizance of the need to preserve and protect our diminishing natural environment and its inhabitants.

I urge my colleagues, therefore, to support these efforts—the United States Code amendment and careful inspection of corps projects—to stay the closing jaws of extinction which now threaten the alligator and his wildlife brethren.

Soap Box Derby

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE E. MILLER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1967

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, we are all familiar with the Soap Box Derby championship which is held each year in Akron, Ohio. Most of us, however, are more familiar with the soap box derbies which are held in our local communities as preliminary competition to the national championship.

These soap box derbies are fine examples of the type of activity which this country needs. They promote a keen spirit of competition among the participating youth. Derby participants work long and hard preparing for their races and this is a great learning device.

Furthermore, activities such as this are the real answer to much of our civil disturbances. We can take heart in knowing that this is done without the Federal subsidies which some advocate as the only solution to riots and other unrest.

In Lancaster, Ohio, we are very proud of our local derby. As the result of hard work by many dedicated people, the Lancaster Soap Box Derby has contributed much to the youth in our area.

One of my constituents, Mrs. Ralph E. Cochran, recently expressed her views on the Lancaster derby in a letter to the derby's director. I am in complete agreement with Mrs. Cochran's views.

Her letter follows:

Lancaster, Ohio.

Mr. Jack Friend,
Derby Director, Lancaster Soap Box Derby,
Lancaster, Ohio.

Dear Mr. Friend: As the mother of a contestant in the 1967 Lancaster Soap Box Derby, I want to express my thanks to you and to all of the other people who have made our local Derby second only to Akron's.

Although my son lost in his first run down the track, the lesson he learned about being a good loser was worth as much as would have been his being a champion. This is one of the things that makes the Soap Box Derby so outstanding among the world's great youth activities.

Both my husband and I cannot get over the dedication and hard work of so many in your organization. The Lancaster Derby has the only return lift in the world and the only Derby museum. We understand that we also have a racer storage building that is considered the best of any local Derby's in the country.

All in all, I cannot say enough for the Soap Box Derby and for the many fine people who have given themselves so generously for the betterment of our children. Congratulations!

Sincerely yours,

MRS. RALPH E. COCHRAN.

Operation Morale

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY L. PETTIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1967

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, the greatness of America and the fullness of its life are attributable to a large extent to the imagination and initiative of her people. Individual Americans, acting on an original dream or idea have created and developed facilities and services that enrich our lives and enhance our Nation.

Lee Estes, a retired Air Force photographer-journalist, is currently giving birth to a new kind of newspaper designed to meet needs and interests peculiar to men in the Armed Forces. Mr. Estes is not having an easy time with his new project, but he is working indefatigably to do a job for our boys overseas. I think that his unique national tabloid, by compiling hometown news from communities throughout the United States, offers a much appreciated service to our men.

His story is told in the San Bernardino Sun. I submit it as a source of genuine inspiration.

NEWS FROM THE HOMEFRONT: TINY PAPER SCORES BIG HIT WITH GI'S

(By David L. Otis)

In an era when large metropolitan newspapers fold with alarming regularity, The Stateside News, a national tabloid distributed among American military forces in Vietnam continues to print—but its future is a shaky one.

The newspaper's home is in Apple Valley, and publisher Lee Estes, a retired Air Force photographer-journalist, says circulation has topped 5,000.

"In the past two weeks I have received subscription requests from 43 military units," Estes says with some distress. "One outfit ordered 25,000 copies. It's just getting two big for one man to handle."

Estes, who mailed out the paper's third edition this week, is the one-man show—from publisher to circulation manager to advertising salesman.

I got the idea for the paper during my two tours of duty in Vietnam as a military correspondent," Estes recalled. We'd be out in the battle zones and the soldiers would come up and ask us what news we had heard from back home."

Estes began by ordering three of the largest newspapers from every state in the union. Scanning the 150 papers, he chose the most interesting local news to fill the 50 separate state columns in the tabloid.

His project has found support from the journalism world. Several newspapers, including the Idaho Statesman, Hawaii Star Bulletin, Seattle Times, Cleveland Plain Dealer and the Newport News (Va.); Times-Herald and Daily Press volunteered monthly columns. Playboy Magazine donated the Playmate of the Month free. Milton Caniff drew greetings from his comic strip hero, Steve Canyon.

The first edition of the Stateside News found its way into battle-torn Southeast Asia last February. But while U.S. servicemen gave the paper rave reviews, the tabloid almost immediately ran into financial problems back home.

While Apple Valley-Victorville area businessmen have kept the newspaper alive by taking out small ads, Estes found few national advertisers sympathetic to his cause.

"I wrote 184 letters to national advertising firms," Estes says, "and only one company, a beer manufacturer, showed any interest."

Estes even tried running free full page advertisements, hoping to lure steady support from national accounts. "Few companies even answered my letters," the publisher recalled.

But while advertisers have proven scarce, encouragement has materialized from many camps.

George Christian, presidential press secretary, wrote to say that copies of the Stateside News have been passed on to President Johnson.

Senate Minority Leader Everett M. Dirksen of Illinois wrote words of encouragement for the fledging tabloid.

And the requests for the free newspaper come daily from outfits in Vietnam.

Estes said he sent the May issue of his paper to 20 units in Vietnam. The biggest bundle went to the aircraft carrier USS *Kittyhawk*. Five hundred copies were sent to U.S. bases in Thailand. "The guys on the carriers write and tell me that when they're through reading The News, they pass the copies on to the destroyers and tankers," he said.

The newspaper apparently has made an impact on the soldiers in Vietnam. One young Marine wrote that he was the 20th person to read the same copy of the paper. A chief petty officer called from San Diego on his return from Vietnam to congratulate Estes on the paper.

A woman in Apple Valley arrives at the newspaper office for each issue. She won't tell Estes her name, but did tell the publisher that she sends The News to her husband who is a prisoner in North Vietnam.

A Pittsburg man called Estes to ask him to send a copy of the paper to his son. It seems a friend in Pittsburg had told him about the paper. The friend's son also was fighting in Vietnam.

Most of the letters Estes receives from servicemen thank him for his interest. They tell him his newspaper boosts the troops' morale. As Lt. Gen. John A. Heintges, deputy commander of the U.S. military forces in Vietnam wrote, "The Stateside News brings a touch of home to the troops, and is appreciated."

Estes says his policy is simple. "The Stateside News does not carry any stories of violence, politics or the Vietnam War. We print just the local news, so when the kids come back home, they won't be a stranger to their state."

What of the future? Estes admits that he needs help. He says he now must turn to the nation—clubs, church groups, Boy Scouts, anyone who has a desire to bring comfort to our soldiers in Vietnam.

Estes talks of the possibility of putting out the newspaper twice monthly. And government loans to small business also are available.

But the publisher, who runs as much as $300 in the red on every issue, is working one day at a time. His operating costs are high ("I spend about $100 a month on telephone bills alone") and he gets no reduced mailing rates, although local Rep. Jerry L. Pettis, R-San Bernardino County has looked into mailing regulations for him.

"I'll just keep pounding the pavement, looking for advertisers," Estes says. And if he doesn't find any? "There'll be an edition next month anyway."

Protected Privilege To Riot

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1967

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, Congress has now reinflamed the anti-American movement of turning class against class to greater unrest by dignifying their activity under color of law.

Riots are now not only made profitable—they can be instigated with a document of Congress intimidating all local and State officers against taking preventive action until too late.

Law once could be compared to a faithful wife—she was always beside a man and dependable. But the so-called civil rights laws of 1967 is promiscuous—her fidelity and virtue cannot even be evaluated or understood by those who passed the bill. A real shady lady.

Mr. Speaker, I ask to include the editorial from the August 8 New Orleans Times Picayune following my remarks. Some day spokesmen of the people will listen to the cries of frustration from the people and not a few pressure groups and do-gooders. The people want preventive protection against open instigators of further violence. The Civil Rights Act of 1967 does not give it—the voters will need seek further for relief.

OPEN INCITEMENT TO RIOT

Within and without the country the cries of extremist Negro "leaders" for riot, burning, bloodshed in the United States grow more open. With or without tie-ins with communism, and to a considerable extent without regard or compassion for who it is that may be maimed, killed, ruined, the inciters throw volatile fuel on the flames of violence, or on coals they hope or believe are smoldering. The record, incomplete as it doubtless is, calls for a clear, direct answer to the question of whether this is protected "free speech."

In the context of the riots that have occurred, ranging from minor rampages to disasters, such as to represent a flowing, possibly unpredictable sequence of events, most laymen must find it difficult to believe that law and jurisprudence have so snarled affairs or become so ensnarled that the law-abiding have no recourse except to detect the verbal incendiary in the act of personally lighting and tossing a Molotov cocktail.

It is impossible to look on this situation as a hypothesis, something that might occur in the future, something whose advocacy is merely abstract or "unpopular," as the fetish phrase goes. If this is not the "crowded theater" of analogy; if "fire" is not being cried, and cried not merely as an indirect way through false alarm to bring about needless injury or death, but in a direct, literal fashion that minces no words, disguises no intent—that, too, is impossible to comprehend. As the cliche goes, this is condition—not theory.

For the past four months there has been particular interest in the vocal activities, national and international, of Stokely Carmichael. The Justice Department says some 1,000 letters have been "answered" as to laws that may be applicable. It is only recently his utterances abroad began to take on the pro-Castro, pro-Communist, anti-United States tinge. As far as can be told from excerpts from the Justice Department responses, it has not made up its mind in four months that it can optimistically prosecute him, or obtain a conviction, under any federal law. As far as constitutional questions are concerned. the responses may be considered in terms of state laws as well.

Letters are not mentioned in dispatches that may have questioned the inflammatory remarks of such persons as H. Rap Brown, Lincoln Lynch, A. Z. Young, LeRoi Jones, Floyd B. McKissick, on national and local scenes. Maryland state action has been instituted against Brown and two others (one white) in connection with July 25 rioting and burning at Cambridge. As to Carmichael, the State Department's movements to restrict and possibly take up his passport represent, to most people, mere slaps on the wrist.

A San Francisco Chronicle correspondent quoted him as saying at Havana Aug. 1 (among other things): "We are moving into urban guerrilla warfare in the U.S. . . . We have no alternative but to use aggressive armed violence in order to own the land, houses and stores inside our communities, and to control the politics of those communities . . . Our enemy is white America—the people of Vietnam are our brothers in a common struggle . . . We are not waiting for them to kill us. We will move to kill them first—or rather, we are working toward that goal."

A few other quotes (excerpts):

H. Rap Brown, at Cambridge, July 24: "Black folks built America and if America don't come around we're going to burn America down." (It was four hours later that Cambridge's riot broke out.)

Lincoln Lynch, at Franklinton, La., July 24: ". . . If those rednecks at Bogalusa won't hire you, don't picket their stores any more, run them out of your neighborhood. Many of you are going to be asked to kill for freedom—and you'd better be ready to kill."

A. Z. Young, at Franklinton, July 24: "They talk about Watts and burning—everything will burn in the state of Louisiana—burn, burn, burn."

LeRoi Jones, at Newark, N.J., July 22: "Newark's rioting was a rebellion against the forces of oppression, brutality and legalized evil . . . We will govern ourselves—or no one will govern Newark."

Floyd B. McKissick (same date and place): "People have a constitutional right to revolt or use violence if they are victims of intolerable conditions."

Amid the kaleidoscope of assumptions, charges, half-truths, blame-laying questions that now flashes concerning the riots, this facet right now is distinctive: "Does the U.S. law-abiding public have preventive protection, or does it not, against open instigators of further violence?" If so, we want it; if not, we must seek it.

The So-Called Antirat Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM V. ROTH, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1967

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of discussion about the refusal of the House on July 20 to consider a rat eradication bill providing $20 million a year to Housing and Urban Development for 2 years.

I share the concern about rat control, but passage of that particular bill would have been, in my judgment, a travesty. It was an inferior imitation of any worthwhile legislation that we may be able to pass. Concerning the merits of the President's rat bill, the Federal Government's chief investigator of rats and wild rodents, Dr. Leo Kartman, said:

> A rat extermination program such as Congress recently refused to fund would not work anyway. Rat control should be part of a real, long-term community health program.

There is presently some $448 million available for such things as rat and rodent extermination programs through the Department of the Interior; Health, Education, and Welfare; the Office of Economic Opportunity; and the Agriculture Department. To have set up still another $20 million a year program under yet another Department, Housing and Urban Development, we would have allowed money to leak off in redtape and unnecessary administrative waste.

The Congress balked at adding HUD to the other agencies already competing for rat control money, and those who criticize our refusal to allow that, while their hearts may be in the right place, either have not closely examined the President's poorly conceived rat bill or are purposely raising a totally false and specious issue.

This controversy was recently summed up by a leading liberal spokesman, Daniel P. Moynihan, former Assistant Secretary of Labor under Presidents Kennedy and Johnson, who himself grew up in a New York City slum, when he said in the Washington Post:

> The President seems to be doing nothing. Worse, he is denying it. Talk about the rat bill is meaningless. The rat bill is nothing.

It is time, it seems to me, for some people to stop talking nonsense on this important issue. A proliferation of programs is no help, in fact it would be a hinderance. With three existing Federal programs for urban rat control and another for rural areas, it is no real solution to add still another. That is one of the problems with Great Society solutions.

Instead of getting to the heart of the problem, the administration sent over a worthless imitation of legislaion, having a fancy slogan, the antirat bill, and big Madison Avenue treatment.

The Congress saw the bill was meaningless, even detrimental, and refused to hear it. Any meaningful legislation would probably have cut back urban rat control money from two of three existing programs and put enough money into a single workable program to do the job. Furthermore, legislation in this area should consider, along with rats, disease carriers of all types, such as cockroaches, mosquitoes, and other things.

In my judgment, if we had passed the so-called rat bill, we would have succeeded only in further compounding the frustrations of the poor people caught in the middle.

The fact that a totally false issue has been raised concerning the rat bill is summed up effectively by Congressman Henry Reuss, a Democratic Representative from the city of Milwaukee, who served on the subcommittee that considered the bill, when he said:

> I am all for exterminating rats, but just last year the Congress was at great pains to take some 10 or a dozen public health programs, including programs in the environmental field, and to put them together into one program so as to move forward greater flexibility in Federal-State-local relations. It was a remarkable piece of legislation in the Public Health Service. The President signed it last October. Under the act, which gives localities freedom to choose the things they want to concentrate on, at least seven States are now coming in with excellent vector rat control programs. But here, having done all that, what do we do but come in with another tiny specific program, very costly to administer. It gets HUD into the health business, it confuses the local health departments who have been dealing uniformly with the Public Health Service of HEW, it is going to result in shopping around, whether you get rat-control money from HEW or whether you get it from HUD.
>
> Worse, it is terribly inflexible. Take the Milwaukee health commissioner, with whom I discussed this matter. He has programs going on all sorts of vectors, mosquito control, pigeons, rats, cockroaches, and several other things. Here we are picking out one of those and saying, this is it, and if you have to starve the rest of your program, that is too bad. So, because I do not offer this in a destructive spirit, I am asking, why do you not in the administration forthwith go before the House Interstate Commerce Committee, which is taking up amendments to the Public Health Act next week, and add another $20 million to their $62.5 million annual authorization, and you do not even have to have a rat-control measure there because it is already there?

Another point that needs to be made is that the control of rats and other disease-carrying rodents, is primarily a problem that can be met only through local action, with help, if needed, from the Federal funds which are available. Rat control experts agree that the only way to eliminate rats in urban areas is to starve them out. These experts have said that city garbage is the primary food source for rats, and that rats could be starved out in most urban areas in 6 months if the cities adequately cleaned up garbage, if food distributing agencies watched their practices, and if private citizens would take care to store garbage in sealed containers.

As for Delaware, neither at the time the rat bill came to the House nor to this date, have I received any official requests concerning rat control programs or the availability of rat control money.

A Statement of Law and Order

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1967

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, the Iowa Department of the American Legion recently held its 49th annual convention at Davenport, Iowa.

The convention delegates approved the following statement on law and order:

> A STATEMENT OF LAW AND ORDER BY THE IOWA DEPARTMENT OF THE AMERICAN LEGION
>
> For nearly half a century the American Legion has committed itself to uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States of America; to maintenance of law and order; to combat the autocracy of both the classes and the masses; to make right the master of might; to promote peace and good will on earth. These and other noble prin-

ciples are incorporated in the preamble to the constitution of the American Legion. Today we look back with horror and revulsion on a series of riots and burnings, of pillage and plunder by hoodlums, psychotics and criminals in cities large and small throughout this great and beautiful and bounteous land. Nothing like this succession of outbreaks, with their violent and utter and inhuman disregard of law and order has been, until now, known in this great country.

The American Legion, Iowa Department, calls upon officials, state and federal, to deal with this monstrous tragedy. We beseech a non-partisan approach to a solution of the underlying causes. We offer full support to the Presidential Commission appointed to investigate the origin of the recent disorders in our cities. We strongly urge the adoption of measures to prevent such awful disasters in the future. We urge speedy trial and punishment of criminals convicted of participation in such crimes. We urge that the F.B.I. and all other appropriate investigatory agencies be authorized and directed to investigate basic causes, and to uncover anything of a conspiratorial nature involved.

Finally, we urge that stern and realistic measures be taken now, with every means in the power of local, state and federal governments, to abort future similar threats in their incipiency.

We suggest that such preparedness include adequate training of required forces, police, national guard and federal troops, with adequate equipment and adequate authority. And we demand that such units be permitted and directed to use their power as field commanders must do against a foreign enemy.

Let the word go forth and now that the vicious tactics of the lawless will never again under whatever guise or for whatever cause be permitted to wreak havoc and inflict irreparable damage, suffering and despair upon American communities; that every practicable means of prevention can and will be used to that end. This can be the beginning of the restoration of law and order, of the peace and tranquillity every loyal American desires and is entitled to enjoy.

Air Force Pilots Like F–111

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JIM WRIGHT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1967

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, three of the supersonic F–111's are being used by the Tactical Air Command in pilot training at Nellis Air Force Base in Nevada. Probably within a few months these revolutionary new planes will be flying in Southeast Asia.

Jerry Flemmons, of the Fort Worth Star Telegram, recently interviewed the Air Force pilots involved in this exercise, known as Operation Harvest Reaper.

The pilots are very enthusiastic about this revolutionary new swept-wing aircraft.

Gen. R. G. Taylor describes it as "a great airplane."

Col. James Randall stated that it "exceeds expectations."

Col. Robert Mead calls it "a fine bird," and Col. Charles Reed speaks of its numerous advancements in the state of aerial warfare as "a complete challenge."

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am including the article by Jerry Flemmons, which appeared in the Fort Worth Star Telegram on August 15:

"SUPER-BIRD" GOING TO WAR SOON—AF PILOTS EAGER TO TEST F111 IN BATTLE

(By Jerry Flemmons)

NELLIS AIR FORCE BASE, NEV.—The F111 is a super battle bird, the greatest thing with wings since angels.

It is the "Cadillac of the Air."

It flies high and low, fast and slow, throws a power punch tougher than five World War II heavy bombers and sniffs out targets like a thirsty vampire.

The F111 and its internal organs are a "radical effective departure" from any contemporary aircraft. The supersonic plane is "the shape of things to come."

Air Force pilots—who should have been asked earlier—are saying these things about the Fort Worth-built F111. They like the plane. It exceeds expectations, they agree.

All of which causes one to ponder the last five exhausting, often infuriating, years in which the swing-wing aircraft was treated like a sweatshop orphan, flogged with angry words and pushed around like a shuffleboard puck from political whim to political fancy.

The doers, pilots who will use the plane, have the F111 here, hardly a silver dollar's throw from Las Vegas' gaudy neon-nylon gambling and entertainment strip.

In the words of one pilot, the F111 is "having its legs flown off."

"We're flying in the morning, we're flying in the afternoon and sitting in the cockpit when its on the ground. We want to learn about this aircraft," he added.

Nellis Air Force Base is a Tactical Air Command headquarters, home of TAC Command Center—"Central authoritative agency for deployment of fighters worldwide." It is the only such center in the continental United States.

The base's principal runway stretches north and south before a bar, red-clay mountain. Fronting the runway is a wooden building, out of which operates the 4520th Combat Crew Training Unit.

Presently the unit incorporates the abilities of about 20 students and seven instructor pilots.

This is Harvest Reaper.

The code name, or project designation, will carry the F111 to war, which means Vietnam since Vietnam is the only war the United States has at the moment.

"Of course, it will be used in Southeast Asia," one 4520th member said. "You don't build a $5 million aircraft to fly over the Nevada desert."

Harvest Reaper, however, officially is a closed subject. Ask, and the reactions are uniformly similar. Officers assume a bland military expression, toe the ground in abstract gesture.

Eyes turn to the blue Nevada sky or to the reptilian-backed scraggy mountains which ring the Las Vegas basin. The officer searches for the right words. Eventually, he finds them: "No comment."

"No comment" is a fine, standardized, all-purpose retort full of security preservation and non-information. Military officialdom is no-commenting itself into hoarseness.

What it means, though, is that the F111 is going to war. Soon. Probably within six months.

One clue to the Air Force's anxiety to place the new aircraft in battle is the fact that the pilot training program was scheduled to begin in September when first production models of the F111A—Air Force version of the plane—emerge from General Dynamics-Fort Worth.

Instead, pilots began the familiarization procedure last month, leaving General Dynamics to rush through replacement parts and ground support equipment.

When plane No. 31—the first assembly line model—is delivered to Nellis in September, Harvest Reaper will become the 4480th Tactical Fighter Wing, a 250-man unit whose ultimate strength will be as many as 72 F111's.

And, by Jan. 1, 1968, or thereabouts, the F111 will be flying in Vietnam.

The first F111 arrived here July 17, without prior public announcement or fanfare. Still, word moved around the base that the already-famous plane was due in. Children, wives and off-duty airmen swarmed to the field to see the aircraft.

"It wasn't an arrival, it was a welcoming."

That was George Davis, a General Dynamics-Fort Worth executive, speaking. He and a GD crew are watching the training with a cautious eye.

Davis, who shoulders the heavy title of executive assistant to the vice president in charge of the General Dynamics F–111 program, admits his company is maintaining a special vigil over the swing-wing aircraft ("closer than normal"), presumably because of the controversy that still rages around the plane.

Davis, a test pilot for 12 years, has flown his pet plane and knows the project from blueprint to finished product.

"The F111 is a highly versatile plane—this is an overworked word—but it really is readily adaptable," he said. "It has a good fuel and good load capacity, high speed, good systems, can navigate well plus deliver a heavy weapons load.

"One F111 can put more bombs on target than any other contemporary airplane," he added.

The F111 is a needle-nosed, crew-of-two with cockpit-loaded mysterious black boxes capable of directing the fighter anywhere in the world in one day, carrying nuclear or conventional weapons.

Its terrain radar scanning devices and automatic pilot capabilities lock in on any target in any kind of weather. Sweptback wings ("Like the ears of a racing greyhound") allow speeds up to Mach 2.5—about 1,750 miles per hour.

The Air Force doesn't think of it as an airplane: It is a weapons system.

The Department of Defense has ordered 493 of the planes, 331 of which are for TAC. Remainder will go to the Navy, Strategic Air Command, the Royal Australian Air Force and the British Royal Air Force.

Pilots are undergoing the transition from conventional jet to the super F111. ("We take off and land and fly in between.") Here, there is no bombing—yet—nor is there an attempt to reach the maximum flight speed.

TAC pilots work within a "tight envelope" of the plane's capability. Still, they test and suggest improvements within the restrictions imposed upon them.

What they think is important, perhaps more so than the political and high brass faction which has warred over the F111 since its conception—five years ago.

Capt. John D. Phillips is an experienced pilot. He first flew the F111 at Edwards Air Force Base in California, later came to Fort Worth to continue training. He was one of four pilots who flew two F111's to Paris in June for an air show.

"The weapons system is the most advanced I have seen," he says. "Unbelievable.

"It is far advanced over anything else we have got. It is no longer necessary for a pilot even to see the terrain or the target. He can make a hit by using the terrain following radar.

"This (the F111) is the forerunner of all other aircraft to come," he added.

Gen. R. G. Taylor is commander of the USAF Tactical Weapon Center. He has flown the F111. "It's a great airplane, a smooth airplane," he claims.

He particularly likes the plane's slow approach speeds and landing techniques.

Col. James. E. P. Randall, an 18-year Air Force veteran, is director of operations for the F111 project. He flew P51s in Korea and the F105 in Vietnam. He has 109½ hours in the F111.

"It is an easy airplane, a smooth airplane. The plane is more than I expected, particularly the radar systems. The radar systems exceeded all expectations," he said.

The auto-pilot-radar-scanning system is a little unnerving at first, he said. "It's hard enough for a pilot to trust himself to fly a plane, let alone a little black box."

Col. Charles Reed, director of the F111 project at Nellis, called the plane "real new and different, a complete challenge to pilots."

Capt. John Shatz, the project maintenance officer, praised the plane's easy maintenance capabilities. "It is engineered and designed well. Maintenance was well thought out. The craft is easier to work with than the F105. Everything on the F111 is tailored to fit."

Col. Bobby Mead is the wing commander. He is a Vietnam combat veteran.

"It's easy to fly," he says.

"There are a lot of gauges which make it look hard but the gauges are easy to go through and control. A pilot can go in blind and still do a good job, good or bad weather.

"One of the biggest problems is to get used to that guy in the seat next to you."

(The F111 has lateral seating with the aircraft commander on the left; the second man is navigator, systems operator and backup pilot.)

For those who fly it in battle, this is the picture of the F111.

The super battle bird is going to war, to put the claims of its maker and its fliers to the ultimate test, despite the no-commenting of officials.

Painted a natty two-tone green and tan camouflage, packed with computerized innards and holding the confidence of the men who will fly it, the F111 is going to war.

That's war by Jan. 1, 1968.

Happy New Year, F111.

Bureaucracy Out of Control?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WENDELL WYATT

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1967

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, the problem of a burgeoning Federal bureaucracy is both urgent and important. The many Federal programs are in danger of choking to death from the very glut of Government employees hired to administer them.

This problem was brought home recently in an editorial in the Portland Oregon Journal. I believe it deserves the attention of every Member of Congress, and I present it here for their perusal.

The editorial follows:

BUREAUCRACY OUT OF CONTROL?

Who runs our government?

The question is one of mounting concern around the nation as a disturbing answer begins to come into focus.

To a growing degree it is not elected officials who operate the governmental machinery, but the hired hands entrenched in a bulky bureaucracy.

Especially this is true of the federal government, but it is also a growing problem in some state governments.

Washington observers have warned in recent years that there are three potent parties and that the most powerful is the Bureaucratic party, because it runs government regardless of whether Republicans or Democrats are technically in control.

This is not to discredit the career administrator. But the system tends to develop autonomy from elective control and drifts farther and farther from direct response to public will.

The Capitol Hill newspaper, Roll Call, contends also that Congress is slipping in its role in the check and balance system. The newspaper questions that Congress really controls the purse because the money it appropriates is spent by bureaucratic agencies.

"Elected by no one and effectively responsible to no one," Roll Call says, "it (bureaucracy) has become a challenge to democratic values which few have come to understand."

Editor David Lawrence of the U.S. News and World Report contends that the federal government has become involved "in nearly every facet of American life," and has grown so large that it is beyond the ability of any president and his cabinet to control.

Lawrence calls for a 20-member presidential council in addition to the cabinet. Moreover, he would name a general manager for each department with salaries of around $100,000 to attract top executive talent.

Roll Call suggests that Congress should modernize its operation with computerized data analysis and more and better trained staffs so that congressional "knowledge and understanding (can become) equal to that of those who have often usurped its role."

One example of success in this approach can be seen in the Oregon Legislature, whose stable of talented fiscal experts provides alternative recommendations to executive budget proposals, contributing to the economy and efficiency of state government.

Perhaps a renewed and intensified effort along the lines of the Hoover Commission should be undertaken to develop specific recommendations for improving the governmental structure.

Certainly, it would be better to make an attempt to save government of, by and for the people than to surrender it to the army of bureaucrats they employ.

Let's Hit Enemy Supply Sources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1967

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

MCNAMARA PULLS PUNCHES: LET'S HIT ENEMY SUPPLY SOURCES

Not even the computers programmed by Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara could possibly make sense out of his response to congressional pleas to use our air and sea power effectively over North Vietnam.

The congressional criticism offered by Rep. Gerald Ford, Republican of Michigan, and a group of senators is highly pertinent. It demands an honest response and action.

Why, the critics ask, does the United States of America still refuse to bomb three fourths of North Vietnam's petroleum storage? Why does the forbidden target list include one third of the power plants; 60 per cent of the key transportation facilities; all seaport installations, and most repair shops? And why haven't two thirds of the outright army and navy facilities never been blasted?

By some incomprehensible logic, the defense secretary insists that pulling our punches in Vietnam saves American lives. Object of the war, he adds, is not to invade, but to curb the flow of supplies from the North.

Says Mr. McNamara, "This requires that the air attacks be directed primarily against the military lines of communication. They are."

Don't most of the supplies in the increasingly sophisticated war flow through the port of Haiphong or a rail line from China? Yet most rail, and port facilities, canals and locks are not to be bombed, says the Pentagon.

Mr. McNamara also knows well that once supplies leave Hanoi they travel routes in Laos, Thailand and Cambodia that are not accessible to bombing.

It would be interesting to hear him explain to a rescued American shot down by a MIG how the sparing of northern airfields saves lives. It also would be interesting to hear specifics on why one fourth of the petroleum supplies are bombed, while three fourths are not and are intact.

Mr. McNamara is correct in asserting that the United States does not plan an invasion of North Vietnam, but he means a land invasion. We already have invaded the North's air space, but still do not fight a proper air war.

It is, of course, high time that the Pentagon and Administration applied its touted "cost effectiveness" formula to the war in Vietnam. A bomb dropped on a military target does not cost a penny more than one that lands on an empty forest.

The cheapest and most effective way to destroy supplies is not when they are scattered over thousands of miles, but when they are stored or made in the North.

And the "cost effective" way to win the war is through best use of our military strength against valid targets according to the best professional judgment of Army, Air Force, Navy and Marine Corps commanders. This is true cost effectiveness.

And it might even save the cost of some travel to Washington where the commanders frequently fly to beg permission to win a war.

U.S. Forest Service Job Corps Conservation Centers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1967

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, an article on the Job Corps conservation center in the August 14, 1967, issue of U.S. News & World Report adds another to the objective and positive appraisals of this important effort in youth rehabilitation and training.

"Life in the Job Corps: What a Camp Is Like," captures in a short space the problems and achievements of a typical U.S. Forest Service Job Corps conservation center as set against the goals Congress envisioned for this worthy program.

My colleagues who have conservation centers in their own States are well aware of the fine work that is being done by Job Corps conservation center personnel and Job Corpsmen. For those among us who have had no contact with these camps, I heartily recommend a visit to partake of a great experience at first hand.

Under unanimous consent I include the article in the RECORD:

Life in Job Corps: What a Camp Is Like

(Note.—Now the Job Corps—considered an advanced experiment in "social engineering"—is trying some old-fashioned ideas. One finding: A little discipline helps trainees a lot. Another: Instilling a healthy attitude toward work is more important than job training. A visit to a North Carolina camp shows how it all works.)

Camp Schenck, N.C.—This little Job Corps camp in the hills of North Carolina, far from riot-torn cities, may have some lessons for the nation.

Trainees who arrive here have an average education level of about the third grade. Many cannot use a ruler. Some do not know the alphabet. Among the "high-school graduates," none has tested recently above the sixth-grade level.

Many are Negroes from city slums. Others are white youths from rural slums. Many were headed for lives of futility, unemployment, relief, and maybe crime.

Those who stick with the training at Camp Schenck acquire enough skill to get a beginner's job. Far more important, as camp officials see it, they learn to work, keep clean, and take orders.

JUST SERVED TIME

Listen to Beverly Taylor, education instructor, describe the boys:

"These boys have had no one who would listen to them. They just served time in school; sat in the corner with nobody paying any attention.

"One of them recently told me: 'When others weer learning to read, I was learning to use a knife.'

"If you will listen, they will talk and learn. The first thing I try to get across to them is that here they are not competing with anyone but themselves."

The camp's education program stresses basic reading and arithmetic.

Then trainees are taught to apply their skills in practical ways—filling out job-application forms; applications for credit and for opening bank accounts; deposit and withdrawal slips for savings and checking accounts; checks and stub forms; income tax forms; and other paper work.

About nine out of 10 trainees, whose average age is 17½ years, have never driven a car. So driver education also is offered, since many jobs now require the use of a car or truck.

HOW TO LIVE

A major problem is teaching trainees to live with others. This sometimes takes months. A big hazard during this period is homesickness, especially among those from the city, and they are in the majority.

Robert Brown, a resident dormitory worker who lives with the boys, said:

"We try to keep a neat dormitory. The men take pride in it. There is a trophy for the cleanest dormitory and we have won it often.

"But I do not overstress this. Many of the boys are used to just dropping things, leaving them where they fall. We are looking for improvement, not a sudden, miraculous, overnight change."

On the other hand, limits are enforced. One lesson officials at Camp Schenck say they have learned is that discipline is vital.

Originally, they report, treatment of trainees was too lax. The staff was told to treat the boys with kid gloves or they would quit. Now discipline at Camp Schenck and other Job Corps camps has been tightened.

Said Wayne McKinney, and education instructor:

"These men want discipline and need discipline. For example, when they left on one vacation period, we said that when they came back there would be no more smoking in classrooms. We feared a big rebellion. Instead, I did not hear one complaint."

HOW TO WORK

A course called "The World of Work" is the most important part of the Camp Schenck program, in some officials' view.

This course is designed to change work attitudes and give practical instruction in finding and keeping a job.

Camp officials are convinced, by experience, that specific job training is less important than motivating youths to work. Pat Thomas, the director of Camp Schenck, put it this way:

"The main thing we try to accomplish is a change in attitude. Most employers are not interested in the skills we can teach. They say: 'Send us a boy with good work habits and the ability to get along with other workers, and we will train him.' "

As a result, more stress now is being put on teaching trainees to get out of bed and get to work on time; to wear proper safety equipment; to carry out the orders of the supervisor; to take responsibility, often for the first time in their lives.

Each youth's performance is rated daily and promotion depends on performance. Pay is raised with each promotion, from a base level of $30 a month, up through a series of $5 raises, to a maximum of $50 a month. Trainees also get room, board, and clothing.

Otis Shipman, a work supervisor who was a first sergeant in the Army, said the Job Corps' new methods are producing results. He added:

"Army recruits act like they are doing a big favor by serving their country. High-school kids think they know it all. You can't tell them anything.

"But these Job Corps men have gone through it. They have been knocked around and beaten down. They know they are not prepared to make it on the outside and that this camp is a real opportunity for them.

"I have had absolutely no trouble with these men. They are here to learn and they want to learn. The main thing we try to instill in them is confidence in themselves."

The Job Corpsman who finishes training at Camp Schenck has learned to be a beginning carpenter, mason, auto mechanic, heavy-equipment operator, cook, janitor or hospital orderly.

The camp's graduates, whose training may take anywhere from nine months to two years, come out usually skilled enough to be aides or helpers. They are ready to go into a commercial kitchen as cook's helpers, for example, rather than as chefs.

They are prepared to be first-class filling-station attendants, not qualified auto mechanics.

About one out of every three goes on to an urban Job Corps center for more intensive job training.

Camp Schenck officials try to keep in touch with graduates. Director Thomas reported that "of 208 men who left the camp in the last 18 months, we have been able to place 76 in various jobs ourselves.

"Most of the others went to urban Job Corps centers, entered military service, found jobs in their home towns, or re-entered school."

Many of the Camp Schenck enrollees had tried before to join the armed forces but had failed tests. After being taught reading and math, they often try again, and qualify.

TOWNSPEOPLE'S VERDICT

What do people in the towns near Camp Schenck think of the Job Corpsmen?

Said Richard Wynne, executive editor of the "Citizen-Times," of Asheville, 30 miles away:

"When it was announced that Job Corps camps were to be built in western North Carolina, there was a lot of uproar about it. Most people were frankly worried, and looked for something to happen. So far it hasn't."

Asheville's chief of police, J. C. Hall, added:

"I have not had one complaint about the Job Corps from townspeople. A few of the boys, not used to liquor, have been taken into custody. But none has been arrested for any crime here."

In Brevard, a smaller community closer to Camp Schenck, there was one minor incident blamed on Job Corpsmen. It turned out later that a few youths from another town were to blame.

The Job Corps has won friends in Brevard. The town has a local theater group and corpsmen have helped design and build sets for its plays, and participate in the cast.

Also, corpsmen have helped fight forest fires. Recently trainees saved a home from a fire and the grateful owner invited 50 to a picnic supper.

COSTS, AND PROBLEMS

Because it is a typical Job Corps operation, Camp Schenck has all the problems that have plagued the parent Job Corps.

Costs to taxpayers, for example, come to about $4,700 a year per trainee at Camp Schenck. This excites many people, including members of Congress, who know that $4,700 a year is more than the most expensive prep schools charge to educate wealthy youths. It is two to three times as much as the average family pays to keep a son or daughter in college.

Camp Schenck administrators give this explanation: The Job Corps expense per man reflects a full year—12 months, rather than a nine-month school year. Too few colleges charge students the total cost of their educations. Also, about $1,500 of the Job Corps' cost per man goes for material, supplies, and equipment used on work projects. This came to a total of $300,000 last year, but the capital improvements made by the corpsmen—they are restoring old structures in the Pisgah National Forest and building new visitors' facilities—have been appraised at $550,000.

Of the personal expenses for each youth, estimated at $3,000 a year, medical and dental care is a big item. One of the main reasons is that 85 per cent of the trainees have never seen a dentist before coming to Schenck, and extensive dental repairs are routine, costing around $2,000 a month at this one Job Corps center.

Contributing to cost problems is high turnover among trainees. Camp Schenck used to lose 50 per cent of its trainees before they finished their training. That's been cut to 13 per cent.

Officials are worried, too, about the rising percentage of Negroes among trainees, because they are afraid the camp will be virtually segregated—almost all Negro—if the current trend continues.

Better buildings, and more education instructors, also are needed.

Monkey Research

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1967

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, it is not surprising that the Federal Government is headed for a huge budget deficit. Many of us have repeatedly expressed deep concern about the ever-increasing spending by the Federal Government for a variety of nondefense programs.

Financial realities cannot be ignored so it is not surprising either that Congress is now being asked to increase taxes to help meet the budget deficit.

While there is no question but that expenses of the Federal Government must be paid for at the same time the executive branch should exercise every reasonable restraint to curb undue expenditures of tax moneys. Unfortunately, needed restraints are not always exercised.

Recently the National Science Foundation listed various research grants made by the Foundation. One of the grants amounting to $13,500 was for a program entitled "Social Behavior of Old World Monkeys in the Caribbean." Since it was hard to see why Government funds should be expended for such purposes I wrote to the Director of the National Science Foundation expressing my position on the grant. Obviously, an item such as this does not have a large impact on the overall budget, but it does symbolize, I believe, certain prevailing attitudes about Federal spending. The response I received from the Director of the National Science Foundation does little to alleviate my concern about using tax money for such grants.

Since I believe Members of the House will be interested in seeing the correspondence on this matter, under leave to extend my remarks I submit the two letters for inclusion at this point in the Record:

July 26, 1967.

Mr. Leland J. Haworth,
Director, National Science Foundation,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Haworth: It is my understanding that a grant in the amount of $13,500 has recently been made by the National Science Foundation for a project to study the "Social Behavior of Old World Monkeys in the Caribbean."

Because of the high level of Federal expenditures and the prospects for continued high deficit spending the current Federal fiscal situation is a matter of concern. In fact, as you know, the President has called for increased taxes in the form of a surcharge on income taxes.

In view of the current budgetary situation, it would not appear to me that we should incur further Federal spending for a project calling for a study of the "Social Behavior of Old World Monkeys in the Caribbean."

While it is difficult to see the merits of expending tax money for such a study even under favorable budgetary circumstances, it is to me inconceivable why such a project is funded at this time.

Though the amount of funding involved in this particular instance is not large in relation to the overall Federal budget, it is all-too obvious that every item in the Federal budget is important to the total spending picture.

It is my hope that henceforth greater care will be exercised with regard to expenditures of taxpayers' money.

Sincerely yours,
Glenard P. Lipscomb,
Member of Congress.

National Science Foundation,
Washington, D.C., August 14, 1967.

Hon. Glenard P. Lipscomb,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Lipscomb: This is in reply to your letter of July 26 objecting to the National Science Foundation grant for a study of primate social patterns in the Caribbean, to be conducted by Donald S. Sade of the Department of Anthropology of Northwestern University. Representative Roudebush has also written to me objecting to the Foundation's support of this project, and I'm glad to send you a similar report.

The Congress, as well as the Executive Branch, has called for increased research activity in the social sciences in the hope that our ability to deal with social problems can be advanced to match the pace of achievement in the physical and biological sciences. With this in mind, the social sciences have received special stimulus from the Foundation in the past several years, and in our fiscal year 1968 budget request now pending before the Congress I have proposed an increase of 25% in the level of research support, over fiscal year 1967. Dr. Sade's study of social behavior in rhesus monkeys—a study that obviously is not feasible on human populations—is among those that support this increased effort to better understand problems of human social behavior.

In carrying out the Foundation's mission to support basic research, it is essential that we continue to undertake the study of fields which—even though they may not have any immediately obvious application—offer promise of advancing our knowledge and improving man's ability to adapt successfully to his material and social environment. We consider that research which may foster better understanding of humans is directly and immediately relevant to the Foundation's responsibilities. The need to explore a wide range of approaches to achieving that understanding is evident as we examine our problems, both international and domestic.

Sincerely yours,
Leland J. Haworth,
Director.

Class War—Communist Objective

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 17, 1967

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, yesterday's meeting of so-called poverty leaders should remind all Americans that the Red objective remains class war. The Communist movement has successfully exploited many black people to serve as shock troops. The united front movement now appeals for the poor downtrodden whites to give the appearance of a class war. The poor against the rich.

Thanks to our Supreme Court and its antipeople decisions, the Anne Bradens and like revolutionists are tolerated to plant and nurture their seeds of class hate.

Mr. Speaker, I insert the report on the National Student Association from the August 16 Washington Daily News following my remarks. These would be good organizations to see how much OEO money they receive in the interest of the poverty revolution.

New Theory at NSA Conference: Role Sought for the "Poor Whites"

(By Michael Bernstein)

North and South poverty leaders yesterday urged Americans—mainly the young ones—to get into poor, white neighborhoods and teach people that they and ghetto Negroes are fighting the same battle.

As Mike James of JOIN, Community Union Project, Chicago put it: "Whites and Negroes are exploited by the same ogre: capitalism."

He complained to National Student Association delegates meeting at the University of Maryland, that "The press plays up the racial, not the class aspects of the riots."

Mr. James said poor whites and Negroes actually have at least two things in common: a hostility toward the police and the system.

"As one poor white woman in Chicago told me," he said, " 'I may not like Negroes, but if they came up here fightin' cops, we'd have to help the Negroes.' "

Mr. James, who admitted he has no love for policemen in general, warned that the "pent-up hatred" against the law and the government could lead to traditional white-Negro social riots.

He urged all students to get involved with helping poor white to relate to poor blacks so they might form a coalition some day to better themselves.

Another speaker, Mrs. Anne Braden of the Southern Conference Education Fund in Louisville, Ky., who like Mr. James, is white, agreed poor whites will have to organize if they are going to help themselves. "This can't be handled from the top down," she said. "It is silly to talk about a black-white coalition now," she added, "because no one is working to organize the white people."

NEW WAVE

She claimed there is a new "wave of repression" in the South to keep poor people down. Part of this, she said, was last week's arrest of Al and Margaret McSurely in Pikeville County, Ky., on charges of possessing Communist books and papers.

The couple, both former United Planning Organization workers now helping the poor in Appalachia, were arrested under a law which the U.S. Supreme Court threw out in 1956, she claimed. The McSurelys were charged only because they were helping the poor fight for their rights, she contended.

Mrs. Braden urged the students to write to the Kentucky Governor Edward Breathitt to to protest the arrests.

"BEAUTIFUL" SIDE

Lawrence Guyot, Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party, brought frequent applause from the audience in a short speech in which he said "there's one beautiful thing about the riots: for once it's been made clear to everybody—blacks and whites—who in the hell the enemy is. The only function of institutions in this country is self-preservation."

He said the only institution which should be abolished, though, is the House Un-American Activities Committee.

Later Mr. Jones said he would add the government to that list and Mr. Guyot grinned broadly and said he'd go along with that.

Representative Bob Wilson, of California, Addresses Jewish War Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 17, 1967

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of the Congress an address of great significance delivered by our able and beloved colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. Bob Wilson] before the 72d Annual Convention of the Jewish War Veterans, now in session in Washington.

Congressman Wilson notes in his forthright speech that he has asked the Department of Justice to examine evidence to determine if the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee—SNCC—should be required to register under the Foreign Agents Registration Act as an agency of the Arabs, Communist Cuba, China, Russia, or whoever else SNCC may represent. The Congressman has taken notice of admission by SNCC officials that anti-Jewish propaganda material disseminated by SNCC is being obtained from the Arab Embassies in Washington.

I am delighted that our colleague

called public attention to this disturbing and apalling revelation and I am in complete agreement with him that we have enough domestic racial strife without allowing foreign embassies to spread additional agitation throughout our country.

I am also in complete agreement with the gentleman from California's analysis that SNCC is following an old Marxist and Nazi technique of trying to turn race against race, religion against religion, in an effort to divide and conquer. I totally share the gentleman's conviction that it is dangerous to the national security of the United States to continue training in this country of Arab military officers who represent governments friendly to communism.

I am submitting for inclusion in the RECORD at this point the text of Congressman WILSON's very important address. I heartily compliment the gentleman for his courageous, timely, and enlightening speech and urge all our colleagues to read it.

The address follows:

REMARKS OF REPRESENTATIVE BOB WILSON, OF CALIFORNIA, BEFORE THE 72D ANNUAL NATIONAL CONVENTION OF THE JEWISH WAR VETERANS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, WASHINGTON, D.C.

I am extremely pleased to meet with and greet this important convention of Americans of Jewish faith from throughout the nation. It is my understanding that the Jewish War Veterans organization is actually the nation's oldest active war veterans' group, founded by patriotic survivors of the Civil War. Your present membership covers the span from World War One to Viet Nam.

As a member of the House Committee on Armed Services, I have long been aware that Americans of Jewish faith have served our nation during her wars in numbers exceeding the numerical proportion that might be indicated by the percentage of Jewish citizens in our general population. It is also my honor to salute an organization whose ranks include the worthy holders of decorations ranging from the Congressional Medal of Honor through the other awards that America bestows upon her most loyal sons.

I have heard with great interest of your concern over the urgent need for the United States Government to deal with threats to our security created by two extremist movements—Black Power fanaticism and Arab Power extremism.

Some evidence has emerged to indicate that these two movements, both of which exploit religious and racial emotions, are beginning to collaborate.

Some weeks ago, I informed the Department of Defense of my conviction that any nations collaborating with Communism, especially the Arab states that severed relations with America and vilified us, forfeited any right to have their military personnel trained in the United States. I am pursuing this problem because of the unrelenting Arab involvement with the Soviet Union and anti-American policies. It is with dismay that I observe that the Administration is still allowing Arab military officers and technicians to have access to classified weapons and technical manuals of our armed forces. These men serve governments who support the Russians, the Chinese Communists, the Viet Cong, and the North Vietnamese.

You can then understand my consternation to learn that Ralph Featherstone, program director of the so-called Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, known as "SNCC", has admitted that SNCC obtained anti-Jewish and anti-Israel propaganda material from Arab embassies in Washington. It is very possible that some of this vile propaganda came from embassies of Arab States whose military officers are still enjoying the hospitality of American taxpayers of all faiths.

The new anti-semitic line of SNCC has followed a worldwide rise in Communist anti-semitism. Moscow set the pattern for vengence after the armed forces of Israel defeated the Arabs who were acting, by proxy, for their Communists allies. Anti-Jewish propaganda erupted in Russia, Poland, Yugoslavia, and elsewhere. The Communists sought to continue efforts to penerate the Moslem world by singling out the Jews as scapegoats.

In this context, we notice the participation of Stokely Carmichael, a notorious SNCC leader, in the recent Havana, Cuba, conference of elements seeking to promote chaos and Communism in the Western hemisphere. Just as Russia exploited Arab emotions in instigating war in the Middle East, the leftists of SNCC are seeking to introduce anti-semitism into the racial war they are trying to start in the United States.

The un-American passions of anti-semitism would be added by SNCC to the cauldron of the "hate whitey" fanaticism that SNCC is stirring up. We cannot allow this cauldron to boil over.

SNCC is following the world Communist technique of turning race against race, religion against religion, group against group. It is the old Marxist and Nazi technique of divide and conquer.

Since SNCC has admitted acting as a propaganda conduit for Arab embassies, I see great wisdom in your suggestion that SNCC be required to register under the Foreign Agents Registration Act. Accordingly, I am asking the United States Department of Justice to examine all available evidence to determine if SNCC can be required to register as an agency of the Arabs, Communist Cuba, China, Russia, or whoever else they may represent.

The F.B.I. should be instructed to maintain the closest surveillance on this group which advocates prejudice, violence, and subversion. SNCC would sabotage everything Americans of all races and creeds have tried to do to perfect our society and improve the lot of all our citizens.

Another proposal that I am making, in view of the psychotic ravings of SNCC leaders, is that persons like SNCC Chairman Rap Brown be committed for mental observation. When a person calls himself "non-violent" and simultaneously urges his followers to "burn America down" and obtain guns for a paranoid racial war, we can reasonably doubt his sanity.

There is also the legal question of whether Brown is mentally capable of defending himself in the trial he faces in the State of Maryland on charges of instigating widespread arson in Cambridge, Md. To make this determination, he should be admitted at once to a Maryland state hospital for the insane or to a Federal mental facility to determine his degree of sanity. Brown is presently free on bond, creating a situation of danger to himself and to the general public.

The same concept applies to other SNCC leaders who claim to be fighting prejudice but actually are reviving Nazi-style anti-semitism, the most terrible manifestation of racism of modern times. Any "rights" worker demonstrates symptoms of a split personality when he agitates against other groups on racial and religious lines, whipping up prejudice and hate.

Not only will this have the salubrious effect of protecting sick individuals and the community in which they live, but it would allow the public to recognize the distorted thinking of Black Power fanatics for what it is—a outpouring of sick ranting and raving, fed from the hate springs of foreign political ideologies.

Let us turn to a foreign manifestation of extremism symbolic of the anti-American prejudices being spread in the wake of the recent Middle Eastern war. The Washington Post has reported this week from Karachi, Pakistan, that Pakistani newspapers said that government's political circles were "shocked" at the appointment of a person they described as "the senior vice-president of the well-known Jewish international concern of Coca-Cola" to be the new American Ambassador to Pakistan. The gentleman attacked is Benjamin Oehlert, Jr., who happens to be a Protestant. But the Pakistanis nevertheless characterized Mr. Oehlert as a Jew, as if there should be some scandal if an American of Jewish faith were, indeed, assigned to Pakistan.

Pakistan meanwhile denounced American relations with Israel and sided with the pro-Communist Arab forces that sought to destroy the State of Israel, a pro-western republic.

I would remind Pakistan that Americans of all faiths pay the taxes to finance the huge aid programs we have extended to Pakistan. We also notice that the Pakistan International Airlines is granted all courtesies by Peking and transports Communist Chinese personnel to the Arab world and Africa. Indeed, Pakistan allied herself with Communist China against India. Pakistan continues to serve as a funnel for the channeling of Peking propaganda to the Middle East, especially Cairo, and points in Africa.

Although human slavery still exists in Pakistan, Karachi has indicated sympathy for the Black Power revolution in America.

I think the time has come to re-examine our aid program to Pakistan. Also, new military supply arrangements must be re-evaluated at once.

Pakistani military officers are trained in the United States. What is to stop them from going from here to Communist China or even to Hanoi to pass on the techniques and military data they acquire in U.S. Army training facilities?

The whole question of training military officers from any nation that colloborates with Communism was wisely raised by your convention. I wish to assure you that I will not relax in my own efforts to remove such personnel from our installations. Some are even trained as jet pilots, at the expense of hundreds of thousands of dollars.

It is ridiculous to lavish our secrets an officers of nations that do not share our devotion to freedom and find themselves more sympathetic to our enemies.

I might add that if any nation is entitled to training assistance and the sale of military supplies it is the State of Israel which stood single-handed against the Communist-equipped and Communist-trained Arab onslaught.

It is an honor for me to address your convention and to commend your objective of continuing to fight as civilians for the freedom you fought for on so many battlefields.

Welfare, or Politics?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1967

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, two generations ago the welfare programs were conceived and dedicated to the American principle of helping our less fortunate rehabilitate and improve themselves so they could become productive, working, taxpaying citizens.

Over the two generations we have but educated another generation that they can live off the builders and have more free time for political action.

Now Congress is under attack for trying to limit the number of illegitimate children being nurtured and raised on the tax roll.

And to top it all, the civil rights bill of 1967 under A(7) could even protect the civil rights of the welfare recipient and the welfare recipient rights organizer—they now have a legal protection in their dole which is far more than the taxpayer, businessman and laborer to protect his civil rights.

Mr. Speaker, I insert the column of William Steif from the August 16 Washington Daily News following my comments.

Gardner Hits Hill Action: 7.6 Million on Welfare in United States

(By William Steif)

Secretary John W. Gardner of the Health, Education and Welfare department has sharply criticized a key congressional committee's plan to limit the number of children receiving payments under the nation's biggest welfare program.

The plan to curtail the aid to families with Dependent Children program is included in the administration's social security bill on which debate was scheduled to begin today in the house. The House Ways and Means Committee changed the Administration's welfare proposals before sending the bill to the House.

Under the House committee's plan, Mr. Gardner said, "the Federal Government would be foreclosed from sharing in the support of children whose condition is precisely the same as that of children already being assisted . . . I do not believe that children should have to pay for the shortcomings of the society into which they are born."

Mr. Gardner said he would urge the Senate to delete a provision putting a ceiling on the number of children aided.

Of the 7.6 million Americans aided under Federal-state welfare programs, 4.9 million—900,000 mothers and four million children—this year are getting AFDC payments. The total of AFDC recipients has been rising by 200,000 a year, according to the House group, and its bill would clamp a lid on this year's total.

In a speech to welfare officials, Mr. Gardner also criticized the Ways and Means Committee for killing an Administration recommendation that would force the states to pay full minimum "need" to welfare recipients, as defined by each state. He said the states' definitions of need are "far from prodigal" and urged the Senate reinstate this provision.

Mr. Gardner also was cool to a selection of the committee's bill which would force some welfare recipients to take work—training to qualify for assistance. He said HEW would administer this section—if it becomes law—to "ensure protection of the rights of the individual." He said "rigid formulas inflexibly applied" don't work in welfare cases.

The committee changed the Administration's bill to:

Emphasize training and jobs, especially for AFDC Mothers; the House group wants to commit nearly $1 billion yearly to day care, training and other social services designed to get families off welfare rolls, and also seeks to make training mandatory for most welfare recipients by mid-1969.

Offer welfare recipients an incentive by permitting them to keep the first $30 they earn monthly and a third of all further earnings while they are still on welfare rolls.

Stress establishing paternity to maintain child support so that fathers of illegitimate children could be compelled to help support them.

Expand foster care by raising Federal participation from an average $32 a month to $100 and by loosening Federal restrictions. Open the possibility of landlords, grocers, and others collecting debts run by welfare recipients. Welfare administrators would be empowered to divert part of a recipient's welfare "income" to creditors.

Provide emergency aid for 30 days to crisis-stricken families.

Establishing a Vietnam Action Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WENDELL WYATT

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1967

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, the tragedy of our Government engaged in what is apparently a no-end war in Southeast Asia is foremost ir. the thoughts of all in Congress and the Nation.

This tragedy is doubled if our efforts and sacrifices go for naught. Without a massive, adequate pacification program, incorporating a reconstruction and civic improvement program in Southeast Asia, these vast material and manpower resources we have invested in the future of Vietnam may be in vain.

A constituent of mine in Oregon's First District has proposed a plan for a Vietnam Civic Action Corps which I feel has great merit, and would do much to strengthen the gains freedom has made against communism in Southeast Asia.

The author of this proposal, George D. Dysart, is a member of the national board of the American Veterans Committee, and is a friend of mine, and an interested, constructive citizen. I herewith present his proposal for your consideration. I feel it merits serious thought and early implementation.

The proposal follows:

Gentlemen: I urge AVC to propose that the United States establish immediately a Viet Nam Civic Action Corps for a massive reconstruction and civic improvement program in Viet Nam. The Corps would be civilian and would operate similarly to the Peace Corps. Without letting up on our military effort in Viet Nam it would constitute a government-conducted centralized effort of similar magnitude to wage "the other war", the winning of which is just as essential to our objectives in Viet Nam as winning the military war. The Government should conduct a vigorous campaign to recruit civilians with the appropriate skills to serve in the Corps. It would offer those who sincerely question the righteousness of our military action there an opportunity to contribute to the constructive rebuilding of the country. (I don't propose we include the commie-oriented or Leary-eyed lunatic element. Apart from the fact that they wouldn't want to have anything to do with anything constructive, Viet Nam has enough troubles without our inflicting them on that country.)

I realize that large numbers of our men in uniform are directly engaged in civilian aid and construction—both on their own time and as part of their duties. I'm sure the extent of that effort is unappreciated both in this country and abroad. I don't propose we let up on those activities. But, perhaps partly because it is a military effort, its genuine contribution is not as publicized and as accepted by world opinion as it should be. I think a separate (but coordinated) civilian Civic Action Corps could undertake activities and win acceptance and admiration that the military effort will never be able to.

I recommend that the Corps be separate from the Peace Corps and that the latter not be used in this effort. The Peace Corps has built its own enviable reputation and is widely accepted in many countries that disagree with our Viet Nam policy. It is begging the question to argue whether their disagreement is justified or is head-in-the-sand thinking. The fact is that many of these countries of people would look less favorably or even hostilely on the Peace Corps if it were an instrument of our Viet Nam effort. We should not jeopardize the Peace Corps' success by exposing it to that risk.

Because the Civic Action Corps would operate in a combat area and be exposed to hostile military and terrorist action, I believe that its members should receive the full health, hospitalization, disability compensation and assistance, and death and dependents benefits that military servicemen receive for Viet Nam service.

The Corps should be open to both men and women. It should include engineers, construction crafts, medical and public health, teachers, agricultural specialists, fiscal and management experts, and countless other skills. It should undertake both public works-type programs (water systems, schools, health clinics, etc.) and individual aid (agricultural yield improvement, home improvement, business or industry techniques, vocational training, etc.). It should be given the necessary materials, supplies and equipment to do its job. An appropriate share of shipping capacity should be allocated to it in recognition of its co-equal importance with our military effort in winning the Viet Nam war.

Very truly yours,

George D. Dysart,

National Board Member, American Veteran's Committee.

Two Indicted in Rioting Lose Poverty Jobs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 15, 1967

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I inserted in the Record an Associated Press story out of Houston which stated that two Texas Southern University students, who were under indictment for murder, had been employed by OEC. Another article, from the August 6 issue of the Houston Post has been called to my attention. It is there stated that the two involved have been dismissed. In fairness to all concerned, I include in my remarks the Houston Post story. It follows:

[From the Houston Post, Aug. 6, 1967]

Two Indicted in Rioting Lose Poverty Jobs

The former Texas Southern University students indicted for murder and assault to murder in the May 16–17 rioting at the school have been fired from their jobs with the Harris County Community Action Association.

"I understand that the two gentlemen in question have been dismissed," a spokesman for the Office of Economic Opportunity in Washington said Saturday.

Trazawell Franklin Jr, 20, and Floyd Nichols, 25, were hired by the HCCAA after the riot to work as recreational aides in park and playground activities and to encourage poor youngsters to take advantage of the Summer Go program.

One was hired in late June and the other early July, an HOCAA official said Friday.

The spokesman at Washington said OEO hiring restrictions apply only to persons convicted of felonies.

Middle East Resolution Adopted by the American Legion, Department of Texas, at 49th Annual Department Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 16, 1967

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, from July 27 to 30, 1967, the American Legion, Department of Texas, held its 49th annual department convention in Dallas, Tex.

On July 29, the Legion adopted a Middle East resolution which, among other things, urges the President of the United States, using all resources at his command, to attempt to bring about direct Israel-Arab negotiations.

I commend the text of the resolution to the attention of our colleagues as follows:

American Legion, Department of Texas, Resolution

Whereas, a stable and durable peace in the Middle East is a matter of prime national interest to the United States; and

Whereas, the many unresolved Arab-Israeli differences are a continuing threat to the peace and well-being of the area and, for various strategic and historic reasons, to the entire world; and

Whereas, the first step toward a just and meaningful settlement of those differences must be taken by the parties concerned, using such third party or international assistance as they may wish: Now, therefore be it

Resolved by the American Legion, Department of Texas, in convention assembled in Dallas, Texas, July 28–30, 1967, that the American Legion urges the President of the United States, using all the resources at his command, to attempt to bring about direct Arab-Israeli negotiations; and be it further

Resolved that pending the outcome of such negotiations it should be the policy of the United States—

(1) To uphold the national and international rights of all nations of the Middle East, including Israel's right to existence with recognized and secure boundaries, and its right to free maritime passage through the Suez Canal and the Gulf of Aqaba;

(2) To extend a commensurate share of assistance to the Arab refugees;

(3) To offer to meet with all concerned nations for the development of an equitable, long-range solution of the Middle East refugee problem; and

(4) To continue efforts to secure multilateral agreements for reasonable limitations on arms shipments to the nations of the Middle East; and be it further

Resolved that if the Arab leaders refuse to enter into negotiations with the Israelis, the United States should lift its embargo on arms shipments to Israel immediately upon finding that any Arab country or any combination of such countries has secured from the Soviet Union or elsewhere a level or kind of weapons beyond that which it possessed prior to the onset of hostilities in June 1967.

Insurance Difficult To Get in the Cities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER L. WOLFF
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 17, 1967

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, there is a growing problem of securing adequate insurance coverage in our urban areas. As a result of the riots in our cities insurance companies are charging prohibitive rates or refusing to write insurance at all.

The inability to get adequate insurance means a business can be ruined overnight. The insurance problem could thus precipitate an even greater economic problem. Yesterday I alluded to this problem in congratulating the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] for his bill, S. 1484.

An article by Drew Pearson in the August 18, Jewish Press, discusses this problem and points directly at the growing difficulty of securing adequate insurance. I commend this article to my colleagues' attention and wish to insert it in the RECORD at this point:

Riot Backlash

(By Drew Pearson)

Dozens of merchants whose stores have been destroyed or damaged in race riots have complained to their Congressmen that the insurance companies are balking at paying off damage claims.

The damage from riots this summer has been so staggering that the claims could almost bankrupt some insurance companies. As a result they are claiming that the riots really amounted to "insurrection." There happens to be a clause in most insurance policies making them invalid in case of insurrection.

The merchants have also encountered other delays and excuses. Even before the Newark and Detroit riots, insurance companies raised their rates on the ghetto property until the premiums were prohibitively high.

The National Liquor Stores Association learned from a survey that one third of their members either have partial insurance or no insurance at all because of the high-risk rates. Many have been forced to pay more than double the previous U.S. rates for limited insurance from Lloyds of London.

Not only riots but the crime increase has contributed to the insurance headache. One Washington, D.C., liquor dealer, who had paid out $70,000 in insurance premiums over the years without filing a single claim, had his insurance summarily cancelled after a single holdup. Another, who was already paying the top rates, got an extra $1,500 added to his bill following a break-in.

Some merchants unable to afford insurance, have now been wiped out. Most of the others, so far, have been unable to collect. Legislation has now been introduced, however, to shift the burden to the taxpayers and let the federal government help underwrite insurance on slum property.

(NOTE.—The insurance companies paid off $40 million in claims following the 1965 Watts riots. But fire insurance rates there immediately shot up 500 percent, and insurance has become virtually unobtainable for theft and vandalism.)

Steelworkers' President I. W. Abel Endorses Consumer Credit Protection Act in Testimony Before Consumer Affairs Subcommittee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 16, 1967

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, it was my great privilege and pleasure this morning to preside at a hearing of the Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs of the House Committee on Banking and Currency where International President I. W. Abel of the United Steelworkers of America gave one of the best statements we have heard in 2 weeks of hearings on the need for legislation such as H.R. 11601, the Consumer Credit Protection Act.

Mr. Abel is not only an outstanding labor leader—head of one of the largest and most highly respected unions in the Nation—but he is also a public-spirited citizen who gives generously of his time and energy to issues of importance to all Americans and to his country. In the tradition of the late Philip Murray, founder of the steelworkers' union more than 30 years ago, Mr. Abel has served in numerous assignments at the request of his country's leadership, and is now a member of the President's Commission on Civil Disorders.

As a member of that Commission, he has had opportunity to learn at firsthand some of the causes of unrest leading to despair and violence in this country, and sees a direct relationship between the recent rioting in some parts of this country and what can only be called predatory credit practices.

PREDATORY CREDIT PRACTICES ENCOURAGE "VIOLENT MILITANT"

Mr. Abel put it this way:

> As was pointed out to this committee by Sargent Shriver, director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, "It is the low-income consumer who is most likely to fall prey to the unscruplous merchant or lender, because it is the low-income consumer who is undereducated, who needs the credit, and who must hunt for the bargain with the low down-payment". It is little wonder, then, that pent-up resentment in the ghettos can become the fertile ground for the violent militant.

I am pleased to say that the steelworkers' president endorsed not only the thrust and concept of H.R. 11601 but most of its provisions and details. He called for an end to the use of garnishment as the major tool of the unscrupulous seller or lender in consummating his transaction. Mr. Abel also supported a broad list of other reforms in the consumer credit field in addition to the required disclosure of finance charges relating to extension of credit.

Mr. Abel's excellent statement follows:

Statement of I. W. Abel, President, United Steelworkers of America, Before the Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs, House Banking and Currency Committee, on Truth in Lending

My name is I. W. Abel, I am President of the United Steelworkers of America which is an organization comprising over a million and a quarter working people. I appear before you to support the principle, incorporated in H.R. 11601, that all finance charges, involved in consumer credit, be converted to the common denominator of an annual percentage rate and be disclosed to the consumer.

At long last the issue of truth-in-lending is before a House committee. For more than seven years, this legislation was trapped in the Senate Banking and Currency Committee without any glimmer of hope that it would reach the floor of the Senate for a vote. It was during those years that the heroic efforts of Senator Paul Douglas kept the legislation alive. The American consumer owes a great debt of gratitude to this man for his crusading spirit to protect the average working man from misleading and, at times, unscrupulous credit practices in the market place.

The hard work and persistence of this committee will, I hope, be instrumental in correcting some unneeded compromises made in the Senate-passed bill and in contributing some new concepts of its own to the original bill.

During the last few years there has been a growing grass-roots concern about and awareness of the plight of the consumer. As a matter of public policy, the old adage "Let the buyer beware" has been rejected by the American people. Congress, for the most part, has reacted favorably to this demand for legislative action. A consumer-oriented Congress has gradually expanded the areas of its scrutiny where the safety of the consumer was at stake. It has also taken some steps when his economic interests were involved. Consumer credit vitally affects the economic well-being of every American family. Statistics presented to your committee indicate the phenomenal growth of consumer credit from $56 billion, just six years ago, to a current rate in 1966 of $95 billion. The interest charges are over $12½ billion.

Proper use of credit is, of course, an important factor contributing to the economic growth of the economy. However, the consumer cannot make a wise decision in the use of credit unless he has sufficient knowledge about the credit transaction. The consumer has the right to know the true cost of borrowing, just as he has the right to know the price of any other commodity he purchases. Furthermore, as was pointed out to this committee by Sargent Shriver, Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, "It is the low-income consumer who is most likely to fall prey to the unscrupulous merchant or lender, because it is the low-income consumer who is undereducated, who need the credit, and who must hunt for the bargain with the low down-payment". It is little wonder, then, that pent-up resentment in the ghettos can become the fertile ground for the violent militant.

The truth-in-lending legislation, therefore, would provide both information and protection. The key tool is the provision which requires that there be a full disclosure both in *dollar terms* and in *annual percentage rates* of the cost of credit which is extended in making a purchase or obtaining a loan. When credit transactions are reduced to a common denominator in terms of an annual percentage rate, then there can be an adequate comparison between the various forms of credit which are offered. Furthermore, the consumer will be in a position to determine whether he can afford the credit. This, I think, is very important. The consumer should, at least, be given the information so that he can make that choice for himself.

I emphasize this factor of "ability to pay" because it has been the experience of saving and loan associations in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, that the primary cause of default for many homeowners has been the overburdening monthly payment obligations on other consumer debts and loans. These borrowers admit getting into financial difficulty without knowing it. When they came to a realization that they could not keep up their payments, they lost not only the articles which they purchased on time, but their homes as well.

The unwary consumer is too often misled by the sale with the low down-payment and the low monthly rate. He is usually not aware that the final price of his purchase may well be beyond his means.

The small loan companies, by failing to disclose the annual interest charge, or by misrepresenting the charges to be only six percent, are able to extract from the consumer rates which vary from thirty-five percent up to one hundred or two hundred percent.

Four years ago this month, the Senate Subcommittee on Banking and Currency went to Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. A number of steelworkers testified before that committee. One of them, a president of a local union with many years of seniority in a U.S. Steel plant, was a good credit risk. Yet on a loan of $152 he paid an interest rate of over seventy one percent. He was completely unaware of the charge and could have obtained the same amount at a local bank for much less interest.

There is no need for me to enumerate the various methods of subterfuge used by small loan companies and finance institutions to hide the true annual rate of interest. This committee is by now fully aware of them. As a matter of fact, nearly every member of this committee has introduced a rate disclosure bill. Let me, however, address myself to some areas of controversy.

(1) *Revolving credit plans.*

There is absolutely no reason why the open-end or revolving credit plans should be exempt from coverage of the annual disclosure requirement. Claims have been made by retail associations that the rate can not be translated into annual percentage terms. These claims have been refuted by reliable experts.

Most department stores charge 1½ percent per month on the unpaid balance. This equals eighteen percent a year and the stores should be required to make such a disclosure. The family which is counting its pennies can ill afford to have its income sifted away at rates of eighteen percent a year.

Despite arguments to the contrary, the so-called "free ride" period does not really represent free use of credit. During those periods, the lack of credit charge is reflected in a higher price of the article. Hence, the credit should not be measured from the date of the purchase, but from the date the service charge actually begins. H.R. 11601 rejects the spurious argument of the retailers that revolving credit charges cannot be calculated on an annual basis. We agree.

The bill introduced by Congresswoman Sullivan rectifies the compromise which the Senate (S-5) made on this issue by requiring *annual percentage* disclosure of all charges incurred in these plans. I can concur, surprisingly enough, in the statement of the American Bankers Association that this category of credit should not be exempt from the same requirements which apply to other creditors. According to the A.B.A., a single, nondiscriminatory system of time disclosure should be uniformly applied to all creditors and all type of credit.

The competition which the banks are offering through bank credit cards could be beneficial to the consumer. If we are interested in giving the consumer a real opportunity, then there is every reason why we should encourage wholesome competition among these creditors.

Furthermore, the Senate's version could become an escape hatch whereby installment or closed-end credit plans could be converted into revolving credit plans and thereby escape annual disclosure.

The "installment open-end credit plan" wherein the creditor retains a security interest in the property purchased and the borrower does not pay more than sixty percent of the unpaid balance within one year is arbitrarily designed to exempt other open-end or revolving credit plans. We oppose such exemptions and, hence, the need for the above mentioned definition.

(2) *Finance charges.*

We strongly urge that H.R. 11601, which includes credit health and/or life insurance premiums within the definition of a finance charge, be approved. The Senate bill excludes these premiums even though, in most cases, they are incident to the extension of credit. The use of this insurance, in many cases, is a subterfuge for raising the true cost of the loan to the borrower. By quoting a lower interest charge and then requiring the borrower, as a condition for receipt of the loan, to purchase a credit life insurance, the creditor, in reality, may be charging a very high rate of interest.

Moreover, there is growing evidence of a tie-in between the small loan companies and credit life insurance. In testimony before the Senate Antitrust Subcommittee evidence was given that banks, finance companies, and other consumer-loan institutions require their borrowers to take out certain insurance policies for which they are getting kickbacks from the insurers. In such cases, the creditor accepts the highest bid rather than the lowest for this type of insurance because he can receive the difference in a kickback.

In many cases credit companies set up their own insurance companies. In an article which appeared in the *New Republic*, James Ridgeway discloses that the CIT Finance Corporation through a wholly-owned subsidiary, the North American Company, insures its credit life insurance policies where in there was a gross profit of fifty percent in premiums or $6.8 million in 1965. And this profit is on top of the rate that is already being charged for the loan. (I should like at this point in my testimony to submit two articles for the record dealing with this subject).

(3) *Small installment transactions.*

Unfortunately, the Senate bill exempts from coverage installment sales and loan transactions in which the finance charge is less than $10. The reason for this exclusion defies explanation. In a bill which is admittedly designed to afford the consumer protection, the proponents for this drop-out from coverage claim that the interest rate is so high that, and I quote from the testimony of the Federal Reserve Board, "[The creditors] may be understandably reluctant to disclose a high annual percentage rate, and might instead simply discontinue this type of credit." Well, all I can say is that the consumer himself might well decide to discontinue this type of purchase if he knew what the true charges were. It is that right which we are trying to provide by this legislation.

We are also concerned that a single unit of purchase might be subdivided into parts in order to come under the $10 finance charge loophole. The purchase, for instance, of a $50 chair with a $5 finance charge at the end of the month amounts to a 120 percent annual rate.

The exclusion of these transactions would, of course, have a real adverse impact upon the low-income wage earner who needs the protection of this bill the most.

(4) *Garnishment.*

Madam Chairman, a federal anti-garnishment law is long overdue. You are well aware of the vicious repercussions of garnishments. Many employers, rather than undertake the costly procedure to garnishee wages, will discharge the worker. Or the worker, driven by the threat of discharge or loss of reputation, will seek out other loan companies to pay off the original loan. Eventually, many of them end up in the hands of the "loan sharks."

Garnishment increases the security of the creditor thereby making them willing to extend credit to borrowers that they otherwise might not accommodate. The protection, which the creditor thus obtains, makes him most eager to entice the wage earner into his tender trap.

Stripped of this privilege the lenders will be more cautious in their extension of credit. The labor movement has consistently opposed the garnishment of wages. It is reminiscent of the days when workers were thrown in jail until such time as they would pay their debts. Now, instead of seizing his person, they seize his wages and, in many cases, his job.

Last year the Wall Street Journal carried an article indicating that at the Inland Steel plan in East Chicago, Indiana, each pay period the company makes deductions from about 2,000 production employees—all of whom are members of our union. Inland annually pays out more than $500,000 in withheld wages to creditors.

Even the editorial page of the Journal remarks that: "In their own interest lenders could stand a stronger dash of self-restraint. By paying a little less attention to boosting their business and a little more to borrower's actual ability to repay, they not only would protect their own solvency but possibly head off new restrictive legislation."

I understand that Inland Steel has written to Congressman Annunzio expressing their concern that these garnishments not only are a heavy financial burden to the company but that "this repayment device may well lead to the extension of credit to wage earners in situations where credit more reasonably might be withheld."

A recent study conducted by the Labor Department "How Garnisheed Workers Fare Under Arbitration," which appeared in the May issue of the *Monthly Labor Review*, mentions that a worker's going into debt, like any other off-duty conduct, generally should be of no concern to the employer. However, if defaulted debts are subject to garnishment, then arbitrators tend to treat this the same as off-duty misconduct and uphold the right of the employer to discharge the worker.

In many states the labor movement is trying to get the state legislatures to pass laws to prevent discharge due to garnishment. Where there is an organized plant the discharge is subject to the grievance procedure and arbitrary discharge is prevented. But what about the many unorganized low-income workers who are most subject to the blandishments of easy-money advertisement. What recourse do they have where there is no union to protect them. At the very least, there should be a federal law prohibiting the discharge of employees because of garnishment.

In some cases the tenacious lender pursues the employer into another state jurisdiction where there may be more liberal garnishment laws. One steel corporation has actively pushed a bill in Congress to prevent the courts of the District of Columbia from issuing a garnishment decree which is not consistent with the state law in which the worker resides and draws his income. For instance, the state of Pennslyvania prevents garnishment but it is of no avail to the worker if the District of Columbia courts can attach his wages.

Strong testimony was given to you by a group of referees in bankruptcy wherein they attest to the fact that in those states where there is no garnishment there is a drastic reduction in the number of personal bankruptcy cases. According to Mr. Elmore Whitehurst, Texas, "It is my considered judgment that it is the result of these prohibitions and not a mere coincidence that the bankruptcy courts in Texas have a far less number of wage earner cases than states of lesser population which nave severe garnishment statutes."

Furthermore, there is no evidence that a prohibition of garnishment of current wages has by any means put loan companies out of business. It has not happened in Pennsylvania. It will not happen elsewhere.

The experience of many of our state labor federations at the state legislatures indicate that a federal law is necessary. In some states there is absolutely no protection. In others, there are various degrees of protection. Only three states (Texas, Florida and Pennsylvania) have a total prohibition. It is now time to have a uniform federal prohibition. I, therefore, urge that this committee retain the anti-garnishment provision of H.R. 11601.

ENFORCEMENT

H.R. 11601 is stronger than the Senate bill in that it provides more than "self-enforcement." Administrative enforcement of the Act by the Federal Reserve Board through cease and desist orders are a necessary complement to the right of an aggrieved individual to bring civil suit where information has not been properly provided. We note that the Board is reluctant to assume this responsibility, although it recognizes that "self-enforcement is probably less effective, however, in the field of advertising."

USURY

The question as to what should be the maximum ceiling for interest charges is quite a different one from whether there should be a ceiling. We agree that usurious rates should be proscribed. We are not in a position, however, to advise this committee what that rate should be. The various types of credit situations should be reviewed by this committee. The relationship of an interest rate to the all-inconclusive finance charge must be made. But we support the idea that all charges which are incident to the loan should also be included in any calculation of a ceiling. Otherwise, we are fearful that a low-interest ceiling will be compensated by high finance charges. Certainly, the question of the rate could be an area of investigation by the proposed National Commission on Consumer Finance. The salutary effect of a disclosure bill will, we hope, create an atmosphere of competition among creditors which would help to drive down interest charges.

CONCLUSION

Madam Chairman, we know that effective lobbying by financial institutions has prevented an earlier enactment of a truth-in-lending bill. However, in the process the American people have been educated about the issue. There is now both a need and a demand for this legislation. A national consensus has evolved. Your committee, we hope, will give legislative expression to that consensus. The United Steelworkers of America appreciates the opportunity to appear before you in order to add its voice to that consensus.

INLAND STEEL CO.,
August 3, 1967.

Hon. FRANK ANNUNZIO,
House of Representatives, Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs, Committee on Banking and Currency, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ANNUNZIO: Mr. Joseph L. Block, Chairman of Inland Steel Company, has asked me to reply to your letter of July 29, 1967, concerned with H.R. 11601, the proposed Consumer Credit Protection Act, of which you are a cosponsor in the House of Representatives. You were good enough to enclose a copy of the proposed legislation along with a summary of it.

The provisions of the proposed bill which have a direct relationship to our operation are those requiring full disclosure of credit terms and prohibiting the garnishment of wages. We are in favor of both of these provisions in the bill.

While we are aware that it may be contended that full disclosure of credit terms may often fall on deaf ears, we believe that many wage earners for the first time will learn the full extent of the cost to them of credit extended and conesquently may be less inclined to assume additional credit obligations that they cannot reasonably carry. Certainly full disclosure of credit terms can do no harm to the buying public. Probably we cannot assess the full advantage of disclosure until we have experienced it in practice.

Wage garnishments constitute a heavy and costly administrative burden for this Company. In fact in your above-mentioned letter you referred to certain statistics about Inland that appeared in a *Wall Street Journal* article of last year. For your information we do not pursue a policy of discharging employees on account of garnishment actions or even in the case of repeated or excessive garnishments. Quite apart from the administrative burden that garnishments impose on any large-size company, we believe that this repayment device may well lead to the extension of credit to wage earners in situations where credit more reasonably might be withheld and in fact serves to enhance the credit problems to which many employees find themselves subject.

Perhaps also should be added the observation that garnishment actions constitute an undue burden for our courts which are already severely taxed by other kinds of litigation.

We hope the foregoing comments may be helpful to you in your consideration of the proposed legislation.

Needless to say we are grateful to you for your thoughtful letter in soliciting such observations as we might care to make.

Sincerely yours,
GEORGE A. RANNEY,
Vice President and General Counsel.

A Frank Talk With the President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK E. EVANS
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 17, 1967

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, early in July, President Johnson invited a reporter from Der Stern, a leading magazine in Germany, to spend a few hours with him at the LBJ Ranch in Texas.

As a result of this visit the reporter, Henri Nannen, has written an interesting and timely article. It includes material about the President's meeting with Kosygin at Glassboro and our country's relationship with West Germany.

There is no question but that with Der Stern's wide circulation, this article will clear up many of the misconceptions held by Europeans about the present administration. Moreover, I think I can well commend it as timely reading matter for my colleagues and other Americans.

So it is for this purpose that I insert excerpts from the article in the RECORD:

A FRANK TALK WITH THE PRESIDENT

(By Henri Nannen)

The invitation had arrived some weeks ago, but the date was fixed so suddenly that there was hardly time to pack. Chancellor Kiesinger had been compelled to cancel his visit to Washington. This had been scheduled for July 8, a Saturday. The call came early Friday. President Johnson, I was told, had flown to Texas to spend the weekend at his ranch, and would be happy to see me the next morning. The LUFTHANSA plane took off from Hamburg at 1:45 p.m. It landed in New York at 5:15 p.m. At Kennedy airport we changed to an Eastern Airlines plane. My fellow reporter, Theo Sommer of Diet Zeit came along with me, and in New York we were joined by Stern reporter Bob Lebeck with his cameras. At 11 p.m. at San Antonio the air hits us like a hot towel. The thermometer registers 103. In Germany it is now 5 a.m.

Next morning at eight, George Christian, White House spokesman, waits for us in front of the El Tropicano Hotel. It is an hour and a half drive from San Antonio to the LBJ ranch.

* * * * *

Johnson has on dusty brown shoes, brown slacks, over it an olive-colored bush jacket, short sleeved, with the top two buttons open, showing a chest of grey hairs. He takes off the light beige colored balloon cap and the sun glasses, we go to meet each other, a big and freckled hand is proffered in a firm and cordial grip. What words does one use when suddenly facing the most powerful man in the Western world? That we are happy and grateful for the invitation, Mr. President, because we have not forgotten that you came to see us in one of our darkest hours, back then when the Berlin wall was erected "Yes," Johnson replied, lost in thought, "those were trying times."

He shakes hands with my fellow newsmen Theo Sommer and Bob Lebeck, then he walks ahead. "Let's sit down outside," he suggests. "There is shade here, and a bit of breeze." We agree. "Then pick up a chair, gentlemen."—

We quickly say hello to Mrs. Johnson, who is wearing summer slacks of pink shantung, with a maroon silk blouse, sun goggles and a motoring cap.

She takes off her goggles and cap, her smile is much more feminine and cordial than it often seems in photographs, and she looks younger—not at all like a grandmother. "Now I better leave you alone, gentlemen," she says and promises to send out something to drink.

* * * * *

Farmer Johnson tells us that he has just finished getting in the hay. Eight thousand bales of hay he stacked in his barns—for the cattle and for the game on his ranch. Each year, he sells 50 to 75 calves from his heard of breeding cattle. Now, he is planning to reduce the herd to 175 or fewer. "More I cannot handle alone." This is big-scale farmer Johnson talking. He talks about real estate prices, which have risen to $450 per acre (Johnson bought his ranch and house in 1952 for $20,000. He put another $12,000 into the house at the time).

Gradually the talks veers around to politics. He fully appreciates the reasons why Chancellor Kiesinger had to suddenly call off his trip to Washington. So you have some financial problems of your own. All of us have such household problems. Who doesn't? I'm looking forward to seeing the Chancellor at some other date.

* * * * *

Quickly he gets around to his favorite topic—Glassboro. He feels that his summit meeting with Kosygin has been by far the most important encounter during his time in office, perhaps the most important East-West encounter since the war. It is always a good thing to be face to face with your opposite number. That is how to get to know the other fellow, to understand his way of talking, to understand better what he means.

The Soviet Premier with whom he talked a total of ten hours struck him like an American businessman—cool, precise, purposeful. He might have been the boss of A.T. & T., largest of American corporations and one of the biggest in the world.

When Johnson talks about Kosygin, he cannot hide his respect. The Russian is what in America is known as an eye watcher, a man who looks you constantly in the eyes when talking. Johnson did likewise. Kosygin sat in an easy chair on Johnson's right. A small table stood between them. The Russian interpreter, Victor Sukhodrov, translated simulatenously. Kosygin kept his eyes on the President as if they were radar beams, as if he wanted to read what went on behind that forehead. When he wanted a gulp of coffee, his hand probed over the table, felt for the cup, but his eyes never left the President; only then did his hands grasp the cup and he drank from it. In the same way Johnson's big hand searched for the glass of water; the conversation never broke off for an instant, and the eyes never strayed away.

Was Johnson really a farmer, the Russian wanted to know. Did he own the land down there in Texas, and did he grow his own corn and his own wheat? Well, in this way he had found the right man. Only the day before, the President had eaten fried liver with corn on the cob, okra and peas out of his own garden.

They swapped experiences. Kosygin's mother died when he was four. Lyndon Johnson worked on the road between Johnson City and San Antonio. "That's the road over which you came this morning," he pointed out to me. "They're still working on it, but then, it wasn't as wide." The Soviet Premier had to go to work in a textile factory as a young boy; during the war, he had been in besieged Leningrad, and for twelve years, he was one of Stalin's deputies. He did not know much about agriculture, but he showed great interest. What about the Colorado River in Texas? Were there much fish in it? Did the river drive electric power plants? Johnson told about the six dams on the lower Colorado river which had been built during the time he was in the Senate. Kosygin was one of those many people who could not stand the frantic pace of New York. He preferred the country side. The President invited him to go anywhere he wished on the Saturday between the two summit meetings, anywhere in the U.S., he would be cordially welcome at his ranch. Later, the Russian remarked that he would like to see the Niagara Falls, because of the magnificent natural scenery, of course, and perhaps a little because of the turbines in the Niagara power plant. After all, the Russians had put in a bid to supply American power plants. In power plants their experience was more extensive.

They talked about their families and their wives. Kosygin was accompanied by his daughter; his wife had died two months before. Lyndon remarked what a fine thing it was to gather energy at home, with wife and daughters. And now he was a grandfather, that was his supreme bliss.

This touched things off. All we can do is to see that our grandchildren will live in a better world, the President said. "To whom are you saying this?" the Russian asked. "I have been a grandfather for nineteen years. You've been one only a few days." Kosygin's hair was not as grey as in photographs. The President commented on it and said that he himself was a bit greyer. The Russian countered that since he was four years older, the color of one's hair was unimportant.

What they visualized as the world of their grandchildren was highly similar. Adjustment, mutual understanding, ability to talk things over. Only the methods seemed different. "You are for war, we are for peace," Kosygin said, not without an edge to his voice.

Lyndon Johnson had risen early at 4:30 a.m. that Friday morning. He had gone through his papers, had briefed himself on everything, and felt that he had never been so well prepared for a discussion; he felt in the pink, his blood pressure that morning was 120 over 78, and he was extremely calm. When the Russian mentioned that America was for war—which he did several times in the first two hours—Lyndon Johnson was able to look at him unruffled, secretly count to ten, and answer that he was convinced that the Russians were for peace, the people as well as its leaders. While he did not know the Russian people as well as he would like (a hint perhaps of the unspoken invitation?), but what nation desired war? His own people, LBJ stressed, he knew full well. He had traveled up and down America, had talked with people and shaken their hands. And Americans, this much he was certain of, desired peace earnestly. There would not so soon be anybody who yearned for peace as much as he, Lyndon Baines Johnson, who in his youth worked with paving blocks and shined shoes.

* * * * *

Just like with children of a large family it is with nations. The Soviet Union and the United States are the two big brothers and sisters in the family, who had to give an example to the others.

Johnson hoped that the Russian had understood his meaning. Of course, there were families in which there was sometimes a big fight. But there is no problem that cannot be solved when the desire was there.

Kosygin seemed to listen carefully. As the time went on, Johnson found him to be more and more accessible, but a man who knew exactly what he wanted. It was no Khrushchev who banged the table with his shoe, who simply dispatched missiles to Cuba on a hunch—but if he should do so, he would not be the one to withdraw them so promptly.

Herein lay the value of such a summit meeting, that one partner learned what to think of the other. What might Kosygin be thinking of LBJ? "If he believed only one-half of what he had read about me," the President said with a laugh, "he wouldn't really be able to sit down in the same room with me." How could it be different with Kosygin?

Kosygin did not seem to him to be stubborn, at any rate not malicious. He was intelligent, definite, precise, open-minded and evidently an attentive talker and listener. When reporters asked permission to run a few lengths of film, Johnson agreed, and so did the Russian. So we can tell the press at once that Lyndon Johnson and Alexey Kosygin achieved agreement on this first item.

Why should not the President and the Premier and all the others convert the billions that must be spent on bombs and armor into bread and butter for the hungry people of the world? Would it not be better to spread peace and happiness? How could they face their people and history if they could not put an end to fear and terror on earth!

This is the way it should be, they both agreed. But the method was what caused opinions to differ. And the Russian, always similing the skeptical smile of an American businessman, looked upon things from his own viewpoint—that the United States was waging war in order to foist upon the world the American way of happiness and life, but the Russians wanted peace, without prior qualifications.

without prior qualifications? Had not the Russians been the cause of many of these qualifying conditions? Did not the Communist North Vietnamese penetrate into South Vietnam? Did not the Communist Chinese wave the threat of the atom bomb? Did not the Germans under Moscow's orders erect the Berlin wall? After all, not he, Lyndon Johnson, had forged military alliances like NATO, SEATO, CENTO. He had signed the treaty for the peaceful use of outer space, and the Consular Treaty with the Soviet Union, the Civil Air Transport Agreement, and the Cultural Exchange Agreement. And now, the treaty on non-proliferation of nuclear weapons was coming along, and it was his hope, too, that agreement could be reached on a mutual renunciation of an anti-missile system, thereby bring the arms race to an end. Despite the war in Vietnam, Russia and the United States had signed more agreements during his term as President than ever before.

The two found no easy solutions. Neither one or the other promised anything. Kosygin did not sell his North-Vietnamese down the river, and Lyndon Johnson not the South-Vietnamese. And to say that Kosygin had betrayed the Arabs is just as untrue as to say that Johnson had sacrificed the Israelis to his desire for détente, or the Germans.

In any event, the Glassboro conference had been a good thing. "And if it only proved to the world that Kosygin and Johnson could talk with each other, without one or the other losing either his nerves or his shirt."

* * * * *

Somewhere along the way the word "Israel" was mentioned. I asked whether the United States insisted on Israel withdrawing from the occupied areas, without a guarantee that the hostile moves of the Arabs would not be repeated tomorrow. No, of course not. It would be like depriving a feverish person of medicine that kept the fever down; the thermometer would quickly rise to 102; a little more than that brings on prompt death.

* * * * *

With a sweeping gesture he says, "Come, I'll drive you around the ranch a bit."

* * * * *

Occasionally he slows down when he warms up to a conversation. His foot hits the brake, his hand comes to rest on my arm, he pats my thigh, as if to stress his words. All this is without nervous excitment, more like a schoolmaster, interested, and without any diplomatic reserve. To me he seems like a man who means what he says and says what he means.

* * * * *

People were always saying that America was neglecting Europe because it was too deeply involved in Asia. Yes, he said, even the Germans had voiced such complaints. And he, so he said, had spent three Christmases with German Chancellors. And when he had withdrawn 35,000 men and 96 aircraft, in order to replace them soon by the rotation system with new brigades, he had negotiated for months about it and had asked the advice of John McCloy, as expert on German conditions. And now he had to learn from the newspapers that the Bundeswehr is to be reduced by 60,000. Nobody, he said, had informed him about this in advance.

* * * * *

I asked whether he would not be forced in any case to withdraw troops from Europe if the war in Vietnam developed further?

Absolutely no. The United States, with a population of 200 million, had unlimited reserves, he said. And the United States knew what it meant to be a faithful ally.

For that matter people were constantly telling him that the situation in Europe was not favorable to the United States. What then? He couldn't understand that, he said. De Gaulle, for instance, is said to have indicated that he could hamstring NATO. He had called upon the United States to evacuate its bases by a certain time. Nobody would have believed that NATO could manage to accomplish its move by the date fixed, and everybody was sure that it would cost the United States a billion dollars. But the move was accomplished ahead of time and the cost was only a fraction, and at the final count the score was 1 : 14—De Gaulle was backed up by one country, America by fourteen.

* * * * *

At the mid-day meal in the ranch house, the whole family was present. Sitting around the oval mahogany table were Ladybird, Marie Fehmer the secretary. Ladybird's secretary wearing Bermuda shorts, Press secretary George Christian, Jim Jones, a young assistant, and we three—Theo Sommer, Bob Lebeck, and I.

* * * * *

While we eat and talk, a tape recorder is playing "A riverderci Roma" as background music.

When Luci arrives—she had to first take care of the baby that had been just awakened ("it sleeps through the night, and seldom cries, really"), the President rises and helps his daughter into a chair. He asks if she wouldn't like to eat something different, and Ladybird enumerates what there is in the house. It's like things are at home with us, and with you, there is nothing official, nothing artificial, it is a weekend with the Johnsons, but everything is in its place. Ladybird sees to that. Her eyes are everywhere, where something is needed. She runs things like a conductor from a podium, using a push on the bell, and instructions in a low voice to the two dark-skinned mammies who served us.

We say "Thank you" and take leave. The President gives us a couple of colored snapshots of his visit to Luci in the hospital; one of them is used as the cover picture on this issue of STERN. And then he writes in book called The President's Country, which contains a brief account of the history of this part of the country, in which Lyndon Johnson's grandmother still had to barricade herself against the howling Comanche Indians. "To Henri Nannen, with pleasant recollections of your visit, Lyndon B. Johnson, July 8, 1967."

The next morning at 7 a.m. our airplane takes off. The flight will take a total of 14 hours, including stops. Heat, humidity, then a cool day in Hamburg. When we get off, Theo Sommer says, "But we saw nothing of the United States. Only the President."

Then we both say it as of one mind: "But he *is* the United States."

The "Why's" of Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. CORMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1967

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, retiring Adm. David L. McDonald, Australia's Chief of Naval Operations, on the recent occasion of the annual Coral Sea celebration, made some remarks in which he reassesses the meaning of the Vietnam conflict. He has expressed the "why's" of this conflict more accurately and succinctly than anything I have read.

It is noteworthy that the admiral represents an allied country—a country whose commitment to the preservation of the freedom of the South Vietnamese is as great as ours.

I commend the admiral's remarks to my colleagues:

IS VIETNAM WAR "A QUARREL IN A FAR-AWAY COUNTRY?"

(NOTE.—Remarks delivered by retiring Adm. David L. McDonald, Australia's Chief of Naval Operations, on the occasion of the annual Coral Sea Celebration. It is the assessment of a veteran military man of the meaning of Vietnam.)

In many countries today, a number of people ask the question, "Why Vietnam?" There are many possible answers to that question, but I think perhaps the best is another question, and that is, "Where else, if not Vietnam?"

Perhaps some people in this room may remember the following words: "How horrible . . . it is that we should be digging trenches and trying on gas masks here, because of a quarrel in a far-away country between people of whom we know nothing."

Those words were spoken in 1938 by the Prime Minister of England, Sir Neville Chamberlain, who in that same year returned from Munich with the promise of "Peace in our time." But only a little more than a year later, the most terrible war in history broke out in Poland—another land of which England knew almost nothing.

Sir Neville was in many ways a brilliant man, who had achieved the highest position of leadership in one of the world's greatest countries. And yet today we know that his attempts to avoid the horrors of war were tragically ineffective. The question is, why? What caused his almost tireless search for peace to lead only to battles for places with names like Narvik, and Dunkirk, and Tobruk?

I think it is only fair to say that Sir Neville Chamberlain was an accurate mirror of his times, reflecting the ideas and opinions of the people he represented. And so I do not think it is fair to judge him as anything more, or less, than a symbol of the age in which he lived. With that in mind, let's look at the mistakes that caused the vision of peace to be so short-lived in 1938.

First, I think, was the unquestioning assumption that the negotiators of the other side were men of integrity, whose desires for peace were as sincere as those of Sir Neville Chamberlain and the English people. And thus no real attempt was made to develop strong safeguards against the possibility that deliberate deception and falsehood might be practiced in the name of negotiation.

Another mistake was what might be called an overly developed sense of fair play—a belief that if we just didn't do anything that might offend the other fellow, he would behave responsibly. And so claimed injustices were accepted at face value, and new aggressions were repeatedly tolerated in the name of correcting those injustices.

And I think the third mistake was a continuing willingness to believe that an aggressor's assurances could be trusted as evidence of his intentions. In 1936, this mistake was made in connection with the Rhineland. In 1938, Austria and the Sudetenland. In 1939, all of Czechoslovakia. Each was given up in the hope that, by doing so, it would mean "Peace in our time." But instead, each of these actions led, step-by-step to the frontiers of Poland, to Sept 1, 1939—and to war in our time.

How much better would it have been if, in the Rhineland of 1936, the free nations of the world had said, "This we will not allow," and backed those words with their full resolve? And if that had been done, how many men and women who died in the years 1939 to 1945 would be alive today?

Our predecessors were asked a question, and it was this: "Where are you willing to make a stand for man's freedom?" They answered it by saying, "Not in the Rhineland," "Not in Austria." "Not in Czechoslovakia." "But we will stand in Poland."

Our generation is being asked that same question again today, and we have already answered it many times. We have answered it by saying: "We will stand in Korea." "In Malaysia." And now, "In Vietnam."

Whatever the future may bring, we cannot avoid that question. All we can change is the name of our answer. And that is why I answer the people who ask, "Why Vietnam?" with another question, "Where else, if not Vietnam?"

Every free man and woman in the world today can be thankful that neither Australia nor the United States is willing to sacrifice the ideals of freedom for the expedient of their own comfort and safety. As long as we have the will to stick it out—not only in Vietnam, but wherever freedom is challenged—I don't think the world will ever have to re-live days such as those of 1938. Or more important, of 1939 to 1945. And I think that may be the most priceless gift we can give to our chilldren.

L. B. J. Misleads Public

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HANSEN

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1967

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, the people of the United States are becoming increasingly concerned over the extravagant spending spree on which this country has long been embarked. More and more they are aware of the fact that it is their money—not the money of the Federal Government—that is being squandered with wanton disregard for prudence. More and more they are calling for a halt to the reckless fiscal policies of the Johnson administration which tosses money around as though it were going out of style. More and more they realize that if the current trend is not reversed, or at least slowed down, perhaps it will.

An excellent editorial appeared in the August 4 edition of the Caldwell News-Tribune which, very succinctly, sums up the feeling of a vast majority of Americans.

Mr. Speaker, the editorial follows:

L. B. J. Misleads Public

It is outrageous.

That's our opinion of the 10 per cent income tax increase that President Johnson is trying to unload on the American taxpayers.

As we suspected earlier, LBJ is attributing the need for such a tax to our war effort in Vietnam. He's doing this because he knows that the American people support him in the effort to win in Vietnam. Since the people stand behind him on this subject, he's praying that he can appeal to our patriotism to dig deep and pay up.

We expect if things begin to look bad for the tax increase in Congress, LBJ will put on an unhappy face and—in his most sincere and apologetic manner—will appeal to the public via network TV. And we imagine his appeal would be, "Don't let the fighting men down."

This is pure bunk.

The reason the President is asking for the tax increase is because he did not heed the voice of the people after the last election.

When the Democratic majority in Congress was trimmed by the electorate, LBJ refused to hear the pleas for economy. Blindly and without regard for the wishes of the American people, he went right on proposing greater and greater domestic spending projects.

Amid the clamor for "guns, not butter," LBJ was not big enough to back down on his "Great Society" program. And so we wound up spending billions for both "guns and butter."

This reckless spending finally has caught up with the President.

Who pays for his irresponsibility? The American taxpayer.

We admit that drastic steps must be taken at once. But not the steps LBJ has called for.

It is our hope that the responsible members of Congress will awaken to the need for one of the nation's most drastic economy drives.

We don't mean the false economy measures the Administration has enacted within the past year or so. Twice LBJ has called for a freeze in government employment. Each time the number of federal employes has risen noticeably.

We mean severe cuts in domestic spending—not only in the War on Poverty but in all areas of our government.

We've continually complained about the way much of the War on Poverty funds are wasted. But this is just one of many federal government agencies that exists for the sole purpose of giving away money.

Take the Department of Housing and Urban Development, for instance.

The HUD weekly news summary shows that $70,198,198 was spent in outright grants in one week's time last month. Multiply this by 52 weeks and you come up with a possible annual expenditure of $3,650,306,296. On top of this is a heavy administrative cost. After all, it takes a lot of money for the government to hire those who determine in which direction the money shall be thrown.

If every domestic agency within federal government were to reduce its total budget by 5 per cent, we'd bet there would be no need for an income tax boost.

We call upon Congress to strike down this 10 per cent request.

We believe our federal government must be made to cease its reckless spending. We urge all Idaho citizens to make their feelings known to their Congressmen: Reps. James McClure and George Hansen and Sens. Frank Church and Len Jordan.

It is time for a return to responsible government.

Increase in Crime Must Be Stopped

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 14, 1967

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I was greatly impressed with a recent editorial in the Bristol, Tenn.-Va., Herald Courier on the continuing increase in our crime rate, and I call it to the attention of my colleagues and the readers of the RECORD by inserting it in the Appendix for their ready information:

Increase in Crime Must Be Checked

Another depressing report on crime in America has been released by the Federal Bureau of Investigation and it should cause concern among all citizens.

According to J. Edgar Hoover's annual crime breakdown, serious crime jumped a staggering 11 per cent in 1966 over 1965 and, since 1960, serious crimes have risen 62 per cent.

To drive the point home, at least for non-criminals, is the fact that since 1960, the risk of being a victim of serious crime has risen 48 per cent.

Of particular concern is the tragic increase in juvenile crime with a seven per cent rise in 1966 in the number of juveniles arrested over 1965.

As the FBI's Hoover bluntly says, all forms of crimes rose substantially in 1966 and, indeed, have been on an upward spiral since the '60's began.

This is doubly tragic because the 1960's was foreseen as the decade of dramatic advancement—and indeed, to a large degree it has been.

But with a greater awareness of social problems, the advent of "Great Society" reforms, and a political determination to rid the country of many of its ills something apparently has gone amiss.

It's tragic because the innocent, the law abiding, the peaceful man is now more victim to sudden, fierce violence than ever before—and our police departments are less able to cope with it.

The crime report, while spelling out the grim details of lawlessness, also says that the number of serious crimes solved by law enforcement agencies in 1966, alone, was a substantial eight per cent below 1965.

It's tragic because the good works of a generation or a decade can be seriously damaged through the violent and senseless death of a valuable individual or destroyed when wanton violence goes unchecked, as in Detroit.

Crime will undoubtedly continue to increase so long as lawless summer explosions in the big cities, which are becoming an annual experience, are justified and excused as rightful expressions of "dissent."

It's tragic because now, in the complexity of the nuclear age, when America needs to exert peaceful influence in the world arena, other nations view the U.S. as a country unable to control its own people.

Indeed, the recent racial uprisings in this country have delivered a stinging blow to American prestige abroad and provided rich fodder for the propaganda of our enemies. Even our allies question if America is a peaceful leader when we can't control our people at home.

It's tragic because America is a great land—the greatest experiment in freedom in history—and it does work. But every serious crime chips away a little more at the very foundations of this system: That every man should have a freedom of choice and a freedom of decision.

This staggering increase in crime, which didn't happen overnight, can't be expected to be curbed overnight.

It obviously has been fostered by a general relaxation in moral standards and a wider acceptance of often muddled voices of dissension.

To combat it, indeed, to check it the guilty, in all crimes, must be dealt with more harshly; certain powers must be restored to the police agencies; and the nation, as a whole, must begin to show a more genuine concern with the caliber of individuals who enforce the law.

And as a first immediate step those who would take to the streets to loot and burn and kill, must be made to pay the price for their lawlessness.

By their actions, they motivate the petty criminal to increase his activity and, tragically, often enlarge the scope of his devious work.

The summer must be made safe again, and then we can attack the other seasons and reasons of crime. If we don't do these things, and now, law and order may soon become the voice of dissent.

Madison, Wis., Mayor Endorses Neighborhood Action Crusade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1967

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to place in the Congressional Record a letter from a friend, Otto Festge, mayor of Madison, Wis., to Congressman William Steiger, of Wisconsin. Mayor Festge comments favorably on a proposal, the Neighborhood Action Crusade, that has been offered by several of our colleagues, Congressmen George Bush, William Cowger, Charles Goodell, and William Steiger. The Neighborhood Action Crusade is a plan to respond in part to the crises in our cities. Mayor Festge draws upon his own experience as the chief executive of Wisconsin's capital city in initiating several of the ideas implicit in our colleagues' proposals. While it may be too early to discuss the effectiveness of the Neighborhood Action Crusade, the mayor's letter is a useful and affirmative comment on his own action in Madison, which is in my district, and on this proposal.

Mr. Speaker, any proposal that offers a constructive approach toward assisting our cities is most welcome, and I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues the letter from Mayor Festge to Congressman William Steiger:

Madison, Wis.,
August 8, 1967.

Hon. William Steiger,
U.S. Congressman,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Steiger: I am pleased to support the resolution introduced by yourself and Congressmen Bush, Cowger, and Goodell. In this resolution you call for a Neighborhood Action Crusade.

I believe that the City of Madison has had such a program for sometime and is working diligently to modify it to recognize any imperfection that may exist.

Let me point out that the City of Madison in 1963 adopted an open housing ordinance which includes all dwellings in the City of Madison except owner occupied single family dwellings and owner occupied houses of four units or less. We have an Equal Opportunities Commission which has been extremely successful in dealing with complaints that have been brought to its attention. The Commission also has engaged in an educational program to inform people of our City about the ordinance and through this educational program has attempted to influence the attitudes of our people. In this area again it has been very successful. Today we have Negro families living in each of the 22 wards of this City.

I would say that we have made a great deal of progress in the past three years; however, I would not say that we have completely erased racial bias. This goal is yet to be attained.

Madison has always had several very effective neighborhood organizations. The Lake Wingra Community Council, for example, together with the Madison Housing Authority and the Common Council, has sponsored a moderate incoming housing development which will provide housing for people in this income bracket who experience difficulty in finding adequate facilities. Other neighborhood organizations have been in existence for varying periods of time and with varying degrees of success. I do believe it is generally recognized in this City that neighborhood organizations can and do serve a very useful purpose to enunciate the problems that may exist in a given neighborhood, to bring the neighborhood together for a discussion about the proposed solutions, and finally to lend support to the implementation of these solutions.

The Mayor's Citizens Advisory Committee is attempting to set up a coordinating body so that the efforts of the individual neighborhood councils could be further strengthened through an over all City unit.

Therefore, I am pleased that you have sponsored a resolution in the Congress of the United States endorsing such a program as we have attempted to implement in Madison.

Sincerely yours,

Otto Festge,
Mayor.

Elections: Fair or Foul

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1967

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues are aware, I am going to South Vietnam to observe the upcoming elections there. As the editorial in today's New York Times so well put it:

> Washington's duty, now that it has certified the legitimacy of the vote, is to make sure that the reality bears some reasonable resemblance to the promise.

It is fulfillment of this responsibility and a realization of the importance of the elections that prompt me to go to Vietnam.

The editorial from the New York Times that I quoted points with clarity and consciseness to the situation in Vietnam as the elections approach. I commend it to my colleagues' attention:

Elections: Fair or Foul?

The United States has now committed its prestige and good faith to underwriting the relative fairness of the Vietnamese elections. Yesterday President Johnson said that, while the campaign is not "without blemish," the elections of Sept. 3 will be an important, meaningful step toward the development of a truly representative government. In Saigon, Ambassador Bunker said: "I feel that the campaigning and the election activities are proceeding fairly and freely."

These cap a long line of statements by American officials, all intended to provide assurance that—after due allowance for the upset of war and the absence of democratic tradition in Vietnam—the voting will be valid. Americans, having invested so much blood and money in safeguarding Vietnam's right to self-determination, will now watch with extra intentness the fulfillment of those assurances.

Every observer who is willing to speak frankly says that the General Thieu-Marshal Ky ticket is unbeatable. In itself, this would not prove that the elections are rigged. Mr. Johnson was unbeatable in 1964. So was General Eisenhower in 1952 and 1956. What has caused grave reserve about the Vietnam balloting, however has been the deluge of charges of harassment by the civilian candidates and they way the military slate has used its official powers to further its own campaign.

Both General Thieu and Marshal Ky are on record—under Washington pressure—with pledges to honor the electoral victors, "whoever wins." But statements keep coming from military sources that only the generals are qualified to govern. Such statements merely reinforce the skepticism over the elections in both the United States and South Vietnam. Washington's duty, now that it has certified the legitimacy of the vote, is to make sure that the reality bears some reasonable resemblance to the promise.

The duty of the Vietnamese is even greater. The civilian candidates should stick it out although they were ten days late in starting their camaigns. The junta must resist the temptation to use chicanery and duress to win a campaign that it is most unlikely to lose in any circumstances.

The Fireman Is Your Friend

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 16, 1967

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, one of the most shocking aspects of the recent riots was the fact that the fireman was the target of bullets and dangerous missiles.

It is almost unbelievable that firemen, who save countless homes and lives at great risk to their own lives, should be victims of even the most angry and violent rioter.

Occurrences like these force me to believe that most of the rioters were never thinking of civil rights and better living conditions when they were destroying entire blocks of our cities.

The Uniformed Fireman's Association is presently spending $15,000 toward a campaign which simply says, "The Fireman Is Your Friend."

It certainly seems incredible that a campaign of this sort should ever be necessary.

I commend to the attention of our colleagues the text of a WCBS radio editorial which was broadcast in New York on August 9 and 10, 1967, as follows:

So it has come to this: the firemen of New York City, in efforts to protect themselves from angry mobs, snipers, and brick throwers, have embarked on an advertising campaign.

To convince people that it's wrong to interfere with fire engines; that it's wrong to throw things at firemen on their way to or at a fire; that it's wrong to turn in false alarms, the ads, the handbills, the radio appeals have a simple message: "The Fireman is Your Friend." Fifteen thousand dollars is being spent by the Uniformed Firemen's Association in this campaign . . . hopefully a type of life insurance policy in a business that already has more than its share of hazards built in.

For a long time, some residents of the ghetto have considered the policeman as the enemy, deservedly or not. But the fireman, no. He was a helper who braved flame and smoke to save homes and people; who offered and not infrequently lost his own life in doing his job.

Now, this idea of the fireman as a folk-hero of ghettos seems to have changed—drastically. Firemen have been the targets of rifle bullets, bricks, bottles, and cans. In New York City, ten firemen have been hospitalized because of such incidents.

In the South Bronx, firemen had to put chicken wire around their equipment as a barrier against attack.

In Plainfield, a fire station was the target of a sustained guerrilla-type attack—the station ridled with bullets. Out in California, a fire department is training its men in the use of shotguns to defend themselves. In Newark and Detroit and other cities, similar stories: firemen killed and wounded, not by impersonal smoke and flame but by people bent on destruction.

And why? Is it because the fireman is a symbol of authority? Perhaps. Someone has said that the recent riots indicate a drive within the ghetto to destroy itself, to rip away and break away and burn away its tragic surroundings. Whatever the reasons, it is difficult to believe antipathy for the firemen has any basis in reason.

We hope the current "The Fireman is Your Friend" campaign succeeds. It should not have been necessary in the first place. The fact that it was is a sad commentary on the scope of our common trouble in this terrible summer of 1967.

Penalties for Interference With Civil Rights

SPEECH

OF

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 16, 1967

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2516) to prescribe penalties for certain acts of violence or intimidation, and for other purposes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Chairman, the courts and law enforcement officers can only do their duty in enforcing the law as it is written. It is our duty here in Congress, the lawmakers, to provide our public officers with proper guidelines in order that they may adequately protect the civil rights of all our citizens.

The Civil Rights Act of 1967 establishes a Federal law protecting the civil rights guaranteed in our Constitution. This is most fitting since the acts covered in this legislation protect an individual's Federal civil rights, and is not confined to any one State's laws.

I am sure all my colleagues remember the Civil Rights Act of 1966 which passed this body last year. During debate on that legislation, I took the floor to implore my fellow Americans in this distinguished body to join with me in passage of that bill. I stated then, as I do now, that this act deals with important gaps which recent civil rights legislation did not fill. This 1967 Civil Rights Act is nothing new to us. We debated its merits last year, and passed it.

This year's bill, as last year's, describes with great specificity the conduct which is prohibited. It prohibits violence and threats of violence in connection with voting, attending schools, enjoying the benefits of Federal or State programs and programs using Federal funds, employment, jury service, common carrier transportation, and public accommodations.

For most of our citizens, the above activities are everyday occurrences taken for granted. Would not it be a shock for anyone of us, entering a polling place, to be told that we could not vote? What indignation and humiliation we would feel! Yet this type of occurrence happens daily in many parts of our country and, to large numbers of our citizens. It is up to us to see that these acts do not continue, or if they do happen, that the wrongdoer be brought to account for his unlawful and unconstitutional deeds.

I wish to emphasize that it is the responsibility of the Federal Government to insure the security of all Americans. This means both the security to freely exercise their federally protected civil rights, and the security of being safe from violence in their homes and on the streets.

And, with regard to safety guarantees other than in one's own home, this legislation has the great merit of assuring prosecution of anyone who interfers with a fireman's or policeman's duty to restore order in the streets. It is incumbent upon this body to protect the safety of these brave men who, in fulfilling their duty, have recently risked their lives, not only in the combat of natural disasters, but in trying to restore civil order as well.

Four weeks ago, this body passed an antiriot bill, empowering Federal authorities to deal with interstate threats of violence. That measure is intended to secure law and order in this country. This is a necessary requirement, if our society is to be able to function. Today we have the opportunity to pass a bill which will provide Federal penalties for interference with the exercise of federally guaranteed civil rights. This action is a necessary and natural partner to the antiriot legislation. It simply seeks to protect the Negro and other minority groups seeking to practice the human rights guaranteed by the laws and by our Constitution. One cannot be upheld without the other. Without civil rights, we have totalitarism; without law and order, we have anarchy. Neither can be condoned in our Nation.

What the People Want

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 27, 1967

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial by Mr. David Lawrence of the U.S. News & World Report is a superb summation of why the people of our country are so discontented about what is happening all over the United States. The volume of mail which I have been receiving from my constituency adequately verifies the statements Mr. Lawrence makes.

I insert the following article in the RECORD because Mr. Lawrence presents the "peoples' case" much better than I possibly could.

WHAT THE PEOPLE WANT

(By David Lawrence)

The American people are dissatisfied today about many of the things the Government is doing or failing to do. They are writing to the members of the House of Representatives and the Senate an unusually large number of letters reflecting discontent.

What are the people saying? What do they want?

The people are tired of the state of fear and uneasiness which has enveloped them. Extremists in our midst, both whites and Negroes, have resorted to a process of intimidation and blackmail—euphemistically called "protests" and "demonstrations."

The people want the agencies of the Government, particularly the courts, to recognize the difference between "freedom of speech" and incitement to riot. Especially do they want to see more courage shown in high places in dealing with disorders.

The people are tired of the outbursts of violence—the killing and wounding of citizens across the land, the sniping and looting, the setting of fires which damage or destroy homes and places of business. Yet all this is, in effect, being condoned as the natural result of the failure to clean up slums in urban areas. Living conditions should, of course, be improved, but the people don't believe that criminals and disturbers of the peace should go unpunished.

The people are tired of reading what the Stokely Carmichaels say, whether in Cuba or in rallies in this country, as they openly preach rebellion. The people want to see such persons prosecuted. If existing laws are inadequate, the people want Congress to strengthen the statutes. Most of all they want to see the laws vigorously enforced.

The people are tired of political legerdemain. They are fed up with attempts to buy votes by giving public funds to politically motivated officials to distribute. They want, moreover, a better accounting of what is done with the tax revenues derived from their earnings. They want to know why Congress has not exercised a closer check on all Government spending.

The people are tired of seeing big deficits piled up year after year, as they are told that "deficit spending" can go on indefinitely and that confidence in the future of the dollar will still be preserved.

The people are tired of the floundering policies of the Administration in handling the Vietnam war. They are being told that military men who want to fight to win aren't being allowed to use maximum power to shorten the war. The people want their Government to employ in war every effective strategy, including the bombing of all enemy bases and supply lines as well as the blockading of all ports at which ships land war supplies for the armies of our adversaries.

The people are tired of reading that their money has been used to make loans to various governments to help them buy arms, and that now the same regimes which received such aid are turning away from the United States and lining up frequently with the Communist side in the U.N.

The people are tired of being told that the big deficits are due solely to the Vietnam war and that the country can also afford domestic spending on an unprecedented scale. Billions of dollars are being poured into many projects which could be deferred or at least managed more efficiently.

The people are complaining about the mail service. Business correspondence of importance is often delayed, and this causes financial loss. Despite the introduction of air mail, the delivery systems have been bogged down by poor management. Yet postage rates for letters are about to be increased.

The people do not like the rise in the cost of living. They cannot readily discern what increases in price are really necessary and what strikes for higher wages are merely the result of selfishness and the organized pressure of ambitious labor-union officials. They want the Government to face up courageously to the need for wage-and-price controls if voluntary restraints are not imposed. It is obvious that much could be accomplished if the influence of the Government were conscientiously applied and politics subordinated.

The people want a peaceful society, a decent society, a society in which a fair deal for everybody transcends political deals in the use of governmental power at the federal, State and local levels.

The people are not going to tire of writing to their elected representatives and telling them that persons in public office have a responsibility not just to factions and blocs, but to all segments of our society.

For—as has been said again and again—"you can fool all the people some of the time, and some of the people all the time, but you cannot fool all the people all of the time." The people are voicing their protests and will continue to do so. In a short time they will be expressing themselves at the polls. Citizens want above all else to be presented with a ballot on which the candidates of both parties are persons who possess courage, integrity and a conscience that overrides the temptations of self-serving politics.

Red Image of Broken Promises

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1967

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, Jerry Sanchez, formerly of Castro's Communist dream states, tells us that Cuba under communism is a wonderful place to be from.

A one time supporter of Castro, Sanchez is today in the United States and earning his place in a free society.

Among his nightmares were memories of a labor union run by Castro, which abolished overtime and fixed wages, used conscript labor to fill in farm shortages, land reforms where tenant farmers would be given land of their own from the land barons, inflation, bad living and working conditions, required attendance at political rallies, and secret police. In the United States today some still sleep and would call his nightmares progress.

Everything—but individual liberty.

Mr. Speaker, I include Mr. Sanchez's story, which appeared in the August 17 the Machinist, following my remarks in the RECORD:

REFUGEE MEMBER REPORTS ON CUBA

Cuba under red dictator Fidel Castro is one thing to Jerry Sanchez—a place to get out of.

Now a member of IAM Local 785, Burbank, Calif., working the graveyard shift at Menasco Mfg. Co., Sanchez explained to Gil Padilla, representative, that workers in Cuba have everything but a paradise.

They have a union, run by the government, that abolished overtime. They have fixed wages.

They have to work one day a week, unpaid, in the cane fields—no matter what their occupation.

They have inflation, bad living and working conditions, required attendance at political rallies and secret police.

For Jerry Sanchez, 36, former supporter and fellow student with the bearded one, Cuba is a place of broken promises.

"Ninety per cent of the people were for Castro, and the liberty he promised," he declared. "Now those and more are against him."

Castro told the factory workers before the 1959 revolution they would not only earn higher wages but would get 25 per cent of the profits. Tenant farmers would get land of their own.

By mid-1962 Sanchez went underground. He, along with 38 men, women and children, commandeered a boat that landed them in Mexico's Yucatan Peninsula.

Today he is well on his way to becoming a member of the American democratic system. He attends Pierce College and works at night. He and his wife, Senia, have two sons, three and two years old. They were born in the land of the free. Their father has had to earn his place here.

Rats

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. O'HARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1967

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, most of us were shocked, I think, by the cynical humor with which a few of our colleagues attacked the proposed Rat Extermination Act.

But this cynicism was not the most shocking aspect of the House's refusal to consider that legislation. Far more shocking was our failure to face up to a serious problem. And none of us can deny that rats are a serious problem.

There may be as many as 100 million rats in the United States. New York City alone has 8 million rats. Rats cause nearly $1 billion in damage each year. They spread disease and frequently attack people—particularly children.

During the recent riots in Detroit, an article appeared in the Detroit Free Press which dramatically illustrated the rat problem. The article was titled "Rat Plague Poses Threat to Health."

Even while rioting was still underway, the Free Press found that:

> Observers in some parts of the city said rats already are scurring over the cooling rubble of many buildings. Finding no food there, the rats are expected to move into residential areas. With the rats will come a variety of disease germs, including rabies and typhoid.

Mr. Speaker, so that our colleagues may read the Free Press' description of the serious dimension of the rat problem, I insert the article at this point in the RECORD:

RAT PLAGUE POSES THREAT TO HEALTH

(By Boyce Rensberger)

Rats fleeing riot-devastated areas of the city are expected to pose a major health threat requiring a massive extermination program, city health officials said Tuesday.

Extra stores of rat poison and equipment are being gathered for the time when affected areas are quite enough to allow Health Department workers to enter safely.

"We're expecting a pretty serious rat problem and mapping out a major program of poison baiting and gassing to combat it," said Harry Boyle, the Detroit Health Department's director of sanitary engineering.

Because many of the destroyed buildings were havens for rats, health officials believe the fires drove them out to infest neighboring homes. Looted grocery stores with quantities of spoiling food are expected to be a major harboring place.

Boyle expressed concern that the curtailment of garbage collections in the city could increase food supplies for rapidly multiplying rat populations.

Observers in some parts of the city said rats already are scurrying over the cooling rubble of many buildings. Finding no food there, the rats are expected to move into residential areas. With the rats will come a variety of disease germs, including rabies and typhoid.

Boyle said his men were preparing huge quantities of rat poison and running into difficulties in getting enough raw materials.

The Health Department uses a variety of commercial and specially-mixed poisons and gases, each designed for a particular use determined by the area, types of buildings and proximity of people.

Boyle said inspectors and workers will enter the riot-torn areas as soon as police officials will permit them.

The extermination program will begin on the periphery of the affected areas and work its way toward the center. This will be done to avoid driving rats father out of the areas.

City Health Commissioner John Hanlon said that if rat control crews were not able to begin work soon a more serious problem could develop.

"If we can get in soon, we can head off most of the problem," Hanlon said. "We're going to try to prevent problems from developing."

Temple Isaiah Dialog on Human Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. REES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1967

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, in recognition of the work that members of the clergy are doing to heal the racial and religious wounds of our Nation, I would like to call the attention of the Members of this body to a meeting to be held this Sunday, August 20, in my district.

At that meeting at Temple Isaiah, members of the different racial and religious communities of Los Angeles will open a dialog aimed at improving human relations. They will also hear a major address by one of the Nation's most illustrious Protestant preachers, Dr. Howard Thurman.

In 1965, in India, Dr. Thurman met Mahatma Ghandi and, after a long talk with him, Dr. Thurman's resolve to help eliminate the tensions and barriers that divide men was reinforced. As a result, in 1943 he left his influential posts as dean of the chapel and professor of systematic theology at Howard University to go to San Francisco where he became one of the founders of the interdenominational Fellowship Church. Today, that church continues to maintain a membership that is open to members of all races and all religions.

In 1953, Dr. Thurman, the grandson of a slave, took leave from his San Francisco church to become the first Negro dean of the chapel at Boston University. Later that year, Life magazine named him one of the 12 great preachers of the century.

Dr. Thurman is a theologian, poet, and mystic, and the author of 16 books including "Inward Journey," "Disciplines of the Spirit," "Jesus and the Disinherited," and "Luminous Darkness."

On display at the meeting at Temple Isaiah will be "Fredom Now," an enormous wood carving by Robert W. Ames, which depicts the history of the Negro people and has been on an exhibition tour throughout the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to call attention to the admirable work in bettering human relations of Rev. James Hargett of the Church of Christian Fellowship—United Church of Christ—and of Rabbi Albert Lewis of Temple Isaiah, who are cochairmen of the meeting.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the membership of this honorable body to join me in extending greetings to Dr. Thurman, Rev. Hargett, Rabbi Lewis, and to all those who will be attending the meeting at Temple Isaiah. They and members of the cloth of all denominations throughout the United States of America deserve the commendation and respect of all of us for their dedication to the cause of the brotherhood of all men.

Bath Beach Antipoverty Program Makes Great Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 16, 1967

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to report that the Bath Beach antipoverty program, which operates in my district, is making great progress.

With the help of civic organizations in the area, progress has been made in such projects as tutoring programs for children, job training programs for teenagers, and information center services.

Future plans include an adult educational program and an extension of the teenage programs.

I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following news release issued by the Bath Beach antipoverty program on August 8, 1967:

As of July 12, 1967 the Bath Beach Anti-Poverty Program has been operating from its store front location at 8634 18th Avenue, Brooklyn, New York.

Without the cooperation of many community organizations such as the Bensonhurst West Community Council, P.T.A.'s, civic associations, etc. this program could never have become a reality, Great progress has been made so far in the following projects.

1. Tutoring program in reading and math now in operation servicing children from age 6 to 13.
2. Recreation program in operation with arts and crafts scheduled daily. Trip made to Palisades Amusement Park. Others planned include the Planetarium. Prospect Park, Brooklyn Museum, Yankee Stadium, and bus trips to Hyde Park and Kennedy Airport.
3. Job training program for teenagers 16–21, starting at $1.50 per hour during training, after which placement in a union shop.
4. Information Center services aiding those who need help with Medicaid, etc.

Future plans include extension of Teen Age Program and an Adult Education Program to teach reading and writing as well as discussions and lectures on Consumer and Credit buying, nutrition, mental health, etc. We are presently in the process of applying for additional funding so that this most beneficial community program can be extended into a 12 month operation.

The theme of the Bath Beach Anti-Poverty Center is "self-help." The center is open from 9:00 A.M. to 5:00 P.M. weekdays. For information call Mr. Harper, Executive Director, 232–1001 and 232–1002.

Public Rights Undermined by New Copyright Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1967

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a resolution adopted by a group of leading editors regarding section 105 of the copyright bill, H.R. 2512, approved by the House on April 11, 1967.

This resolution deserves careful consideration.

The resolution referred to follows:

PUBLIC RIGHTS UNDERMINED BY NEW COPYRIGHT BILL

We the undersigned vigorously object to the phrasing of Section 105 of the copyright bill now before the Senate and approved by the House on April 11th. If enacted into law, this provision would open wide the door to copyright restrictions on a vast amount of knowledge amassed at public expense. It would increase, not decrease, present abuses of the Copyright Act by government contractors, government agencies, government employees, and commercial book publishers.

Avowedly, Section 105 is designed to continue the present law's prohibition of copyrighting of "any work of the United States Government". But its definition of such works is so narrow as to sanction extensive copyrighting by virtually all contractors of the government and practically all public servants.

Defining a "work of the United States Government" as merely "a work prepared by an officer or employee of the United States Government as part of his official duties" does not provide suitable protection of the public interest. This definition is inadequate because it does not take into account the following considerations:

Billions in tax funds are expended annually on research by government contractors. Information derived from this research belongs in the public domain unless it must remain classified for legitimate national security reasons. Since such research is commissioned and financed in behalf of the public it rightfully belongs to the public and should not be transformed into private property that can be discarded, suppressed, or commercialized at private caprice.

Many ostensibly private contractors are actually creatures of the government. We refer to such organizations as the Rand Corporation, the Institute for Defense Analyses, the Mitre Corporation, the Aerospace Corporation, and the scores of non-profit groups spawned by federal agencies. These institutions are for all practical purposes auxiliaries of the government.

Many private firms engaged in government research are so completely dependent on public funds that they are little more than publicly subsidized enterprises. We see no reason why the knowledge they obtain at public expense should be treated like their private property.

If the phraseology of Section 105 is as narrowly interpreted by the Copyright Office as Section 8 of the existing law has been, prohibition of copyrighting could be limited merely to the relatively few persons on the federal payroll whose job descriptions specify duties requiring the preparation of press releases and official publications.

The fact of the matter is that, as the American Newspaper Publishers Association has pointed out in its objections to the phrasing of Section 105, "a great number of government officers and employees, including administrative assistants, research workers, lawyers, economists, and others on a professional level, devote substantial amounts of time and efforts to the prepartion of . . . material [that] might not be held to be within the scope of their official duties or employment."

Except for annual reports, most government information activities are not required by law. Holding press conferences, delivering speeches, granting interviews are discretionary acts that are not subject to officially prescribed duties. Section 105 could permit these acts to attain a privileged personal status.

Section 105 would encourage less and less availability of authoritative informational material from the government. At the present time although $18 billion in public funds is devoted to research and development and approximately $600 million is expended on all types of government printing only about $6 million is allocated for copies of publications legally available to the public via purchase from the Superintendent of Documents. This situation would be substantially worsened by Section 105. The propaganda advantages of commercial publication (with or without disclosure of governmental participation) would be given preferential treatment.

The chief purchasers of the government-financed materials that would be transformed into private property would be governmental entities—government agencies (often the very same agencies that provide the funds for the preparation of the materials), libraries, schools, and similar institutions. In consequence the expenses of these public institutions would rise and inevitably result in the need for increased funds in order to enable them to obtain access to the aforesaid materials at what is equivalent to a double cost to the public.

In our opinion, Section 105 of the bill now before the Senate is contrary to the purpose of Section 8 of Article 1 of the Constitution. The latter expressly states that "The Congress shall have power . . . to promote the progress of science and the useful arts by securing for limited times to authors and inventors the exclusive right to their respective writings and discoveries." Governmental contractors and public servants engaged in undertakings funded by tax monies can hardly be considered authors entitled to the monopoly rights authorized by the Constitution and past copyright laws. Indeed Section 105 is compatible with the basic purpose of the present bill: protection of private property rights in order "to insure that authors receive the encouragement they need to create and the remuneration they fairly deserve for their creation."

Section 105 is also contrary to the Constitution's First Amendment, which expressly forbids enactment of legislation infringing upon freedom of the press. Such freedom would be substantially curtailed if Congress grants to government contractors and public servants the right to control and restrict knowledge amassed at public expense.

Anyone who has the legal right to copyright has the legal right to censor. The Copyright Office admitted as much when it recommended that government agencies be given the right to copyright publications that "must be controlled to prevent distortion in a dangerous manner." In justifying copyright restrictions on a score of official military histories General C. G. Dodge stated: "The works were copyrighted . . . to prevent quoting of material out of context." Another Army officer has explained that copyrighting has been employed in order to prevent "sensationalizing." These are disturbing admissions. Any attempt to control the manner and extent to which government information can be quoted by the press or by the public is censorship.

Moreover, Section 105 is contrary to the recently enacted Freedom of Information Law. Since copyrights are available only to works previously unavailable to the public a premium is placed on the ability to prevent disclosure of their contents prior to registration. As a result public access to government financed undertakings would be delayed until such time as publication is considered expedient or advantageous. Registration in itself is no guarantee of public availability. Copyright procedures merely require that two copies of a work (typed, processed or printed) be filed with the Library of Congress and the latter is not even required to retain these copies for public examination.

Section 105 would in addition hamper and restrict the use of government-financed knowledge in all the innumerable ways sanctioned by the new copyright legislation for periods as long as 75 years.

In view of the above considerations the undersigned herewith urge the Senate to include in Section 105 the following definition: "A publication of the United States Government is a work that is a product of (a) activities financed by funds received from the United States Government; and/or (b) functions of an officer or employee of the United States Government."

The right of private contractors and public servants to copyright that which is genuinely private is not at issue in this connection—except in the sense that this essential right is bound to be greatly vitiated if a clear line isn't drawn between that which is private and that which rightfully belongs to the nation.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402, at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

Harvard Law Prof. Vern Countryman Endorses Federal Garnishment Law as Part of Consumer Credit Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 17, 1967

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, among our witnesses in the Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs of the Committee on Banking and Currency this morning on H.R. 11601, the Consumer Credit Protection Act, which also includes truth-in-lending provisions, was an outstanding scholar in the field of bankruptcy law, Prof. Vern Countryman, of the Harvard University Law School.

Professor Countryman testified on only one title of H.R. 11601, title II, which would ban wage garnishment as a device for enabling unscrupulous credit merchants to overload low-income wage earners with more credit than they can possible handle without losing part or all of their wages—and eventually their jobs—because of employer annoyance and expense in connection with the garnishment process.

Confining his testimony to this one title of the bill, Professor Countryman provided us with valuable insight into the relationship of harsh State garnishment laws and the prevalence of personal bankruptcies in those States. He called for severe limitations on the use of this device to deprive a worker's family of the money needed for day-to-day living.

For those who wonder whether an antigarnishment provision belongs in a consumer credit bill dealing primarily with disclosure of finance charges in connection with extensions of credit—truth in lending—I am taking this opportunity to call attention to the reasoned and documented statement made to our subcommittee by an outstanding member of the legal profession, as follows:

STATEMENT OF VERN COUNTRYMAN, PROFESSOR OF LAW AT HARVARD LAW SCHOOL, BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON CONSUMER AFFAIRS, OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY, ON H.R. 11601, THE CONSUMER CREDIT PROTECTION ACT, AUGUST 16, 1967

My name is Vern Countryman. I am Professor of Law at Harvard Law School. I have been teaching the law of creditors' rights and bankruptcy since 1946, save for a four-year period, 1955–1959, when I practiced law in Washington, D.C.

I do not appear here to testify on all aspects of H.R. 11601. I am not an expert on consumer credit—a subject I have just begun to study. I have gotten only far enough in my efforts to know that reliable information on the subject is scarce and that there is a real need for the sort of investigation which Title III of H.R. 11601 would authorize.

I appear to testify in general support of Title II of H.R. 11601, which would prohibit the garnishment of wages, although I have several suggestions to make for changes in the proposal.

The problem with which Title II would deal is a nationwide one because nearly all states permit wage garnishment. Some limit the remedy to creditors who have first reduced their claims to judgment, but most permit the creditor to garnishee the employer when suit is initiated. In some states a separate levy is required each payday; in others, the initial levy is a continuing one until the creditor's judgment is paid.

All states exempt some portion of the debtor's wages from garnishment, but the exemptions vary drastically. In some states they are expressed in dollar amounts and they range from $350 for married debtors and $200 for single debtors in Alaska to $50 for all debtors in Rhode Island. In other states they are expressed in percentages and range from 50% in Arizona to 100% in Florida, Pennsylvania and Texas. Most exemption to the many debtors whose employers can be served with garnishment process outside the state of the debtor's residence.

The best and most recent survey of this bewildering pattern of state wage garnishment laws is an article by Mr. George Brunn, published in volume 53 of the California Law Review in 1965. I have a copy of that article with me and would be happy to submit it to the Committee if you would care to have it.

The consequences of wage garnishment are principally three:

(1) If garnishment of the employer is effected outside the state of the debtor's residence, he may find his wages shut off entirely. If it is effected in the state of his residence, he may find himself left to support his family on $50 a month in Rhode Island, $67.50 a month in Kentucky, $20 a week in New Hampshire, or half of his $75 a week wage in Arizona, or 50% of his wage or $25, whichever is less, in Vermont.

(2) Without regard to the amount of the exemption, the debtor may find himself unemployed. Many employers do not take kindly to the extra bookkeeping required by garnishment levies, particularly if they are repeated. Labor unions have been largely ineffective in protecting their members against such employer retaliation although some collective bargaining contracts give the employee one or two free garnishments before discharge.

(3) To save his job and support his family, the debtor may be driven to resort to bankruptcy in many cases where he would not otherwise do so in order to dissolve the garnishment levy or prevent threatened levies. As the number of non-business bankruptcies has increased more than twenty-fold, from 8,500 to almost 176,000, between 1946 and 1966, this is a matter of some consequence to the federal bankruptcy courts.

Precise information on the relationship of wage garnishment to bankruptcy is, of course, not available. But there is enough evidence to support a recent statement of the Bureau of Labor Standards that "There seems to be a direct connection between the number of garnishments and the number of personal bankruptcies." *Debt Pooling and Garnishment in Relation to Consumer Indebtedness,* Fact Sheet No. 4-F (1966).

Mr. Brunn, in his California Law Review article, made a study of the 10 states with the highest and the 10 states with the lowest per capita personal bankruptcy rates in 1962. The results are so interesting that I reproduce them here.

Personal bankruptcies

[Per 100,000 population]

Alabama	279
Oregon	200
Tennessee	184
Maine	153
Georgia	149
Arizona	147
California	145
Illinois	134
Ohio	132
Colorado	131
North Carolina	1
Texas	2
South Carolina	3
Pennsylvania	4
Maryland	5
Florida	7
Delaware	10
South Dakota	11
New Jersey	11
Alaska	13

Of the states with the lowest personal bankruptcy filings, Florida, Pennsylvania and Texas had a 100% wage exemption, North Carolina, South Carolina and South Dakota authorized exemptions up to 100% if needed to support the debtor's family, New Jersey had a 90% exemption, and Alaska exempted $350 for married and $200 for single debtors. Maryland exempted only 75% in some counties and $100 in others, but wage garnishments were little used there because of the necessity of a separate levy every payday.

Of the states with the highest personal bankruptcy filings:

Alabama had a 75% exemption.

Oregon exempted $175.

Tennessee exempted $17 per week for the head of a family plus $2.50 per week for each dependent under 16, and $12 per week for debtors who were not heads of families.

Maine allowed garnishment of not to exceed $30 per month but provided that at least $10 should be exempt.

Georgia exempted $3 per day plus 50% of the excess.

Arizona had a 50% exemption.

California exempted 50% but authorized more, up to 100%, if needed to support the debtor's family and if the creditor's claim was not for necessaries.

Ohio exempted 80% of the first $300 per month and 60% of the balance (with a minimum of $150), and $100 for debtors who were not heads of families.

Colorado exempted 70% for heads of families and 35% for others.

Illinois had the highest exemption in this group—85% or $45 per week, whichever was more, with a maximum of $200 per week. But the Illinois experience is instructive further. Until a 1961 amendment to its law, its exemption was only $45 per week. Between 1961 and 1964 Mr. Brunn found that personal bankruptcies in Illinois *declined* 9% while they were increasing 18% nationally. [And I find that they have *declined* another 4% in Illinois from 1964 to 1966 while they have increased another 2% nationally.]

Mr. Brunn also studied the experience of Iowa, which moved in the opposite direction in 1957 by abolishing its 100% wage exemption and substituting $35 per week plus $3 per dependent. Since 1957 personal bankruptcies have multiplied 3.6 times in Iowa while multiplying 2.8 times nationally.

It may be said that these figures alone do not prove that wage garnishment is a contributing cause of bankruptcy. It may merely be a series of remarkable coincidences. Or it may be that the financial difficulties which led to garnishment would have led to bankruptcy had there been no garnishment.

But we need not only rely on the figures alone. Last week you heard the testimony of three able and experienced Referees in Bankruptcy from states where wage garnishment is heavily employed (Oregon, Tennessee and California). They were unanimously of the view that wage garnishments caused bankruptcy filings by many debtors who would not otherwise have filed.

That view is supported also by studies of personal bankruptcies in which the bankrupts were interviewed. In one such study, involving 84 bankrupts in Michigan, 75% indicated that garnishment or the threat of garnishment was the reason for their filing in bankruptcy. Dolphin, *An Analysis of Economic and Personal Factors Leading to Consumer Bankruptcy* (1965), p. 18. In another study in Illinois in which 73 bankrupts were interviewed, 35 said that threat of garnishment or fear of job loss was what caused them to go into bankruptcy. Stabler, *The Experience of Bankruptcy* (1966), p. 7. Other similar studies which did not include personal interviews with the bankrupts reveal:

Out of 300 cases in Seattle, 69 debtors had suffered one garnishment in the four months preceding bankruptcy, 14 more had experienced two garnishments in that period, and 4 had been garnished 3 or more times. Brosky, *A Study of Personal Bankruptcy in the Seattle Metropolitan Area* (1965), p. 39.

Interviews with bankruptcy attorneys in Utah revealed their opinion that most personal bankrupts have either had their wages garnished or have been threatened with garnishment. Misbach, *Personal Bankruptcy in the United States and Utah* (1964), 33.

To this I would like to add my own opinion, based on discussions with many Referees in Bankruptcy and bankruptcy attorneys, and on the examination of the files in hundreds of bankruptcy cases, that wage garnishment, either actual or threatened, is a precipitating cause in a very substantial number of the personal bankruptcy cases.

I have previously estimated, based on my studies of the official bankruptcy statistics published by the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, that over a billion dollars in creditors claims per year is being discharged in bankruptcy cases and more than 90% of these cases are personal bankruptcies. Countryman, *The Bankruptcy Boom*, 77 Harv. L. Rev. 1452 (1964). A more recent analysis of the statistics has persuaded me that my prior estimate was far too low and that the amount of creditors claims discharged is now approaching two billion dollars per year.

This figure may not reflect serious damage to the bankers, loan companies and finance companies whose losses probably do not exceed one-half of one percent of loans outstanding, nor to the installment seller operating on a 100 percent markup who breaks even whenever he loses only one-half of his claim. After all, they can shift half of their relatively small loss to the federal fisc when they make out their tax returns. But there are other small volume, low margin creditors for whom the bankruptcy of a debtor is a painful blow.

Moreover, bankruptcy is a catastrophe for the debtor. As one observer has said, "Although uninformed people may minimize the gravity of the consumer bankruptcy problem by saying that only one-tenth of one per cent of the population goes bankrupt, there is a qualitative dimension in human distress that is understated by such statistics." Myers, *Non-Business Bankruptcies*, in Proceedings of Tenth Annual Conference, Council on Consumer Information, page 9. I would agree, and would add that the studies referred to above, and others, indicate that the typical bankrupt has three or four dependents, so that the human distress is felt not merely by the 176,000 personal bankrupts, but by families whose members number from 700,000 to 800,000.

My conclusions about the relationship of wage garnishments to bankruptcy lead me to my first suggested change in H.R. 11601. I would suggest that the finding in Section 201 of the bill be not confined to the effect of wage garnishment on interstate commerce, but that it take account also of the effect of wage garnishment on the federal bankruptcy system. It is ludicrous, unseemly and uneconomic to have most of the states providing creditors with a remedy for collection and the federal bankruptcy system providing debtors with a countervailing remedy to undo what state law has allowed the creditor to do. It is well within the power of Congress to do directly what it now authorizes indirectly and to relieve the federal bankruptcy system of the burden of cases where bankruptcy petitions are filed only to avoid garnishment.

Second, I would suggest that the term "wages" in the Title of Title II and in Section 201 is probably too restrictive, and that the same is true of "wages or salary" in Section 202(a). The compensation of many of those you would want to protect from garnishment is derived, wholly or in part, from commissions and bonuses. I would suggest, instead, that the reference in the Title and in Section 201 be changed from "wages" to "personal earnings" and that in Section 202(a), the operative Section "earnings in the form of wages, salary, commission or bonus as compensation for personal service" be substituted for "wages or salary due an employee." I would delete the second reference to "employee" in Section 202(a) because of experience with the wage priority under Section 64a(2) of the Bankruptcy Act where it three times became necessary to amend the original language, "wages due to workmen, clerks, or servants," once by adding "traveling or city salesmen," again by adding "on a salary or a commission basis, whole or parttime," and finally by adding "whether or not they are independent contractors . . . with or without a drawing account." If this suggestion were followed in its entirety, Section 202(a) might read:

"No person may attach or garnish or by any similar legal or equitable process or order stop or divert the payment of earnings in the form of wages, salary, commission or bonus as compensation for personal service."

Third, I doubt the necessity of prohibiting garnishment of all earnings, regardless of size. I see no necessity for immunizing all the income of entertainers, corporate executives, etc. whose incomes approach or run into six figures.

I realize the difficulty of fixing a limit. One recent proposal suggests a poverty-level limit of $3,600, which I regard as much too low. Karlen, *Exemptions from Execution*, 22 Bus. Law. 1167, 1171 (1967). The present working draft of the Uniform Consumer Credit Code, a project of the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws which is not yet in final form, would put the limit at $100 per week for debtors with dependents and $65 per week for others [and would limit the protection to consumer credit claims]. This seems too low to me also, but I have attached to my statement a copy of the pertinent sections of the present draft of the Code so that the Committee can examine them.

The studies of personal bankruptcies to which I have previously referred indicate that the typical bankrupt has an income of about $5,000 per year. I would take that figure as an indication that the protection against garnishment should extend considerably higher.

Figures compiled by John A. Gorman, Associate Chief, National Income Division, Office of Business Economics, U.S. Department of Commerce, and reported in the *Wall Street Journal*, May 31, 1967, p. 1, column 6, show the following average family incomes:

1949	$3,860	($3,945)
1952	4,570	(4,747)
1955	5,000	(5,275)
1958	5,670	(5,839)
1961	6,220	(6,360)
1964	7,325	
1965	7,780	
1966	8,300	

(I have been in touch with Mr. Gorman and he advises me that because of a revision in national income accounts the figures for earlier years should be revised as I have indicated in parenthesis.)

I should suppose that protection against garnishment should also extend well beyond the income of the average family. It therefore seems to me that a figure in the neighborhood of about $15,000, translated into $285 per week, would be appropriate.

Mr. Gorman's figures illustrate another problem, however. That is a problem of obsolescence, since laws like these tend not to get periodic revision—the Connecticut exemption law still saves to a debtor ten bushels of Indian corn. Obsoletness accounts for the inadequacy of many of the state wage exemption laws which employ dollar amounts. But the percentage exemption laws produce excessive exemptions for large income debtors and inadequate ones for small income debtors, regardless of the percentage used.

The present working draft of the Uniform Consumer Credit Code would solve this problem by using dollar amounts and authorizing an administrator to change them whenever there is a change of 10% or more in the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics Consumer Price Index for Urban Wage earners and Clerical Workers. Under H.R. 11601 the same function might well be assigned to the Federal Reserve Board.

An alternative method of handling this problem would be to tie the exemption to a legislatively-fixed figure which does seem to receive periodic revision—the amount of earnings subject to tax under Section 209 of the Social Security Act. Currently, that figure is $6,000, although H.R. 5710, as reported out by the House Committee on Ways and Means, would raise the figure to $7,600. An exemption in H.R. 11601 for twice the amount of earnings taxed under the Social Security Act would come very close to the $15,000 exemption I have suggested.

Fourth, and finally, if you go no further than to protect wages from garnishment, you may not accomplish much. In many states the creditor still will be able to reach the debtor's income by taking an advance assignment of future wages at the time of extending credit. And since employers find wage assignments as annoying as garnishments, there will be the same jeopardy to the debtor's job. Again the debtor will be driven into bankruptcy—this time to get the debt discharged so as to free his post-bankruptcy earnings from the lien of the wage assignment. Mr. Justice Fortas, while still a law student, made an exhausitive study of the use of wage assignments in Chicago. Fortas, *Wage Assignments in Chicago—State Street Furniture Co. v. Armour* & Co., 42 Yale L. J. 526(1933). That was followed in 1935 by a statute limiting assignable wages to 25%, and limiting the effectiveness of the assignment to three years. Later reports indicated that the situation was not much improved [see Satter, *Wage Assignments and Garnishment Cited as Major Cause of Bankruptcy in Illinois*, 15 Per. Fin. L. Q. Rep. 50 (1961)], and in 1961, when Illinois liberalized its exemption from garnishment, it also amended the Wage Assignment Law to limit assignable wages to 15%. As previously indicated, the rate of personal bankruptcies in Illinois has consistently declined since 1961. A few states have by statute prohibited such wage assignments and others, like Illinois, limit the amount of wages assignable and the period of time the assignment may cover [See Annotations, 137 A.L.R. 738(1942); 37 A.L.R. 872(1925)], but in many states they are valid and enforceable in the courts. Hence, to complete the job, I would suggest a new subsection (b) of Section 202 reading:

"No person shall take any assignment of the future earnings of another in the form of wages, salary, commission or bonus as compensation for personal service, and all such assignments shall be void and unenforceable."

If the Committee were to adopt my suggestion of a limit on earnings protected from garnishment, and considered a similar limit appropriate for wage assignments, the new subsection (b) might read:

"No person shall take any assignment of the future earnings of another in the form of wages, salary, commission or bonus as compensation for personal service save for the amount in excess of $285 per week, and no such assignment shall be valid and enforceable save for such excess."

If either of these proposals were adopted, present subsection (b) of Section 202 should be redesignated subsection (c) and amended to cover violations of either subsection (a) or subsection (b).

In conclusion let me anticipate that there will doubtless be testimony that the abolition or restriction of wage garnishments and assignments will bring ruin to the institution of consumer credit. Any witness taking this position should be invited to explain data presented to a California legislative committee by the Associated Credit Bureaus of California, and summarized by Mr. Brunn at pages 1239–1243 of volume 53 of the *California Law Review*, which indicates that installment credit thrives as well in Alabama where 75% of wages are exempt from execution, in California where as a practical matter only 50% is exempt, and in Colorado which exempts 70% for heads of families and 35% for single persons, as it does in Texas and New Jersey with 100% exemptions, or in New York with a 90% exemption, or in North Carolina which exempts up to 100% where needed for support of the debtor's family.

Congress Is Forward Looking—Congress Is Reactionary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 18, 1967

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an editorial entitled "Come Again?" published in the Richmond, Va., News Leader of recent date.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

COME AGAIN?

"The Congress has done many positive and forward-looking things in recent years to meet [the cities'] needs." Detroit Mayor Jerome Cavanagh, August 23, 1966.

"Congress is reactionary, indifferent, sometimes completely negative." Detroit Mayor Jerome Cavanagh, July 30, 1967.

ASEAN

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 10, 1967

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, last week I commented on the significance of a new regional organization in Southeast Asia called the Southeast Asian Association for Regional Cooperation. The official name taken by the member nations during the first meeting last week in Bangkok is the Association of Southeast Asian Nations—ASEAN.

The formation of the ASEAN marks an important step in the growing trend toward mutual assistance in that area. The expansion of this spirit will lead to a time when the United States and all major powers will no longer be called upon for support and defense. Southeast Asia contains more than enough resources for a potential position of influence in world affairs. Through programs like ASEAN they can be developed to their fullest extent and still belong solely to the regional nations.

I would like to introduce to the Congressional Record an editorial from the Washington Post which further elaborates on the importance of the new association:

ASIAN REGIONAL EFFORT

The impulse toward seeing and solving problems in the regional terms is making itself increasingly felt in Asia. The centrifugal pull of nationalism still overpowers the centripetal haul of regionalism; indeed, Asian nationalism's capacity to mobilize popular energies and enthusiasms, for good or ill, is striking in both Communist and non-Communist countries. And non-Communist Asia is far from creating regional institutions as strong as, for instance, the European Economic Community or the Alliance for Progress.

Yet there is discernible in Asia a developing feeling that traditional historical patterns must be either strengthened or supplanted, as the case may be, in order to forge regional ties of relevance today. The latest sign is the formation of the Association of South East Asian Nations. Composed of Thailand, the Philippines, Indonesia, Malaysia and Singapore, "ASEAN" joins a company which already includes the geographically wider Asian and Pacific Council and the functional Asian Development Bank, among otehrs. ASEAN's aims are chiefly economic. Its first step, beyond its own birth, will be to study measures for cooperation in tourism, fisheries and trade.

It is gratifying to see Indonesia taking part; ASEAN's standing committee will be located in Djakarta. Under Sukarno, Indonesia followed an adventurist foreign policy which brought it into collision with the neighbors, particularly Malaysia, which it is now conciliating. Its present goals are more modest, realistic and pacific. One hopes that South Vietnam and Cambodia will soon join. For the essential aspect of a regional organization is that it be geographically comprehensive, not a club. It is perhaps worth noting that nothing in ASEAN's charter precludes eventual membership by a Communist country.

For the United States, the appeal of ASEAN and organizations like it is the prospect that eventually their members will be able to stand on their own. This country's role in Asia is not to batten and stay forever but to equip its friends to do without it, some day.

Honorary Degrees Awarded by Baylor University, Waco, Tex., to Tom Lea and Carl Hertzog, Outstanding Texas Men of Letters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 18, 1967

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, outstanding in the field of literature and of art in Texas are two men whose names are known throughout the United States: Tom Lea, author and artist, and Carl Hertzog, publisher and book designer. Recently these two men were recognized by Baylor University, in Waco, Tex., for their outstanding contributions to literature of the Southwest by the award of honorary doctorates.

These two figures who have given such glory to their State and to their Nation are richly deserving of honor, and I commend Baylor University highly on its choice of these recipients of honorary degrees. The impressive record of their achievements was reproduced in the Baylor Line, the university's magazine, of May and June 1967, and inspired me with renewed respect for these two great Americans and great Texans.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the biographical sketches of these two great men be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the sketches were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Lea and Hertzog were awarded honorary Doctor of Literature degrees in recognition (in the words of President McCall) "of their major contributions to the culture of Texas and the Southwest."

Lea, a versatile writer, painter, muralist, illustrator, and historian, is the author of several outstanding books on Southwestern subjects, including "The Brave Bulls," which has won two best-novel awards and was also made into a successful motion picture; "The King Ranch," a two-volume work on the fabulous Texas cattle kingdom with the author's illustrations; and "The Wonderful Country," and adventure story and prose poem which was also made into a movie. He served as a World War II correspondent for Life Magazine and not only wrote notable war accounts but executed a number of wartime paintings which now hang in the Pentagon.

In 1946 Life commissioned him to illustrate the historical development of the cattle industry. His eleven oil paintings done in that series are now in the Dallas Museum of Fine Arts. His portrait of the late House Speaker Sam Rayburn of Texas now ornaments the new Rayburn House Office Building in Washington.

Hertzog, born in France because his father, a concert violinist happened to be studying there at the time, is a fervid Southwesterner by adoption, having lived in El Paso for the past 44 years. He has designed, printed, or published more than 150 books, many of which have won awards for their artistry and superior quality. Since 1948 he has been on the faculty of Texas Western College (now a branch of the University of Texas), where he has taught widely heralded courses in art, journalism, advertising, design, and typography. He founded and is now the director of the Texas Western Press.

Conference Report on S. 16

SPEECH

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1967

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I join in commending the great chairman of the Veterans Committee, Mr. TEAGUE, and all the members of the Veterans Committee of both political parties on the colossal service they have rendered to the veterans of this Nation, their widows and dependents.

As a distinguished and dedicated member of that committee, Mr. DORN, said in the debate this bill truly is a milestone for the American veteran and his dependent. Our Nation never can do too much for the men and women who have served her in the time of war. As is well known by my constituents and by my colleagues, that is the legislative credo from which I never depart.

As the last veteran of the war with Spain in the Congress of the United States I am moved by emotion by the inclusion of the widows of our comrades in that war of long, long ago.

The monthly pension of these widows will be raised from $65 to $70 and where there is need of regular aid and attendance an additional $50. There are not many widows of the Spanish-American War and they will not be with us long. I am grateful to my colleagues for voting them an increase, small in amount though it may be, yet meaning so much in their struggle to keep body and soul together on a pittance, and I am hopeful that perhaps next year the minimum pension for these fine and deserving women can be raised to $100 a month.

Mr. Speaker, I could not close my remarks on this subject without tribute and congratulations to the officers and the membership of the United Spanish War Veterans and of the Auxiliary. Their legislative spokesmen year after year have presented the case of the widows to the Veterans Committees with peaceful clarity and with the eloquence that comes only when words come from the heart.

Social Breakdown

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 18, 1967

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Columbia, S.C., State is a newspaper which keeps a close eye on the trend of society today. Two recent editorials have pointed out the breakdown in morals and the crass materialism which is evident in our Nation.

The first editorial, entitled "A Lust for Loot," point out that in the recent riots the looters were driven not by hunger or deprivation, but by greed. In the breakdown of social order, what was revealed was not anguish but the criminal instinct which lies repressed in the heart of man.

But it is not only in situations of violence that we see the collapse of moral values. In another editorial, entitled "Responsibility of Youth," the State points out that the reckless pursuit of pleasure was evident in all levels of society.

I quote one paragraph from this excellent editorial:

> When we deplore this, as we have before, it is not out of prudish unawareness of the times or blindness to the force of passion. It is in the knowledge of the history of the human family, a knowledge which includes the futility and the tragedy of such uninhibited foolhardiness, with its tendency to create general insecurity.

I ask unanimous consent that the two editorials be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A LUST FOR LOOT

Some time ago, a nine-year-old boy of our acquaintance declared solemnly, with that special wisdom children have: "The Americans are trying to lock themselves in the broom closet because they're afraid the Russians will come and lock them in the broom closet."

Looking at the ruins of Newark and Detroit, we wonder if perhaps the child wasn't right. Simple "materialism" is America's broom closet. And, to judge by events of the day, we can't seem to lock ourselves in fast enough.

Rioters seen looting shops last month were not carrying off loaves of bread or any other necessity of life (as in the novel, *Les Miserables*) No, they carried off TV sets, cases of liquor, fine suits, and so on—in many instances to waiting *cars*.

Crass materialism governed the hour. Civil rights, or anything remotely having to do with civil rights, had been forgotten.

Some Negroes said they resented "whitey's" materialism; they wanted to cut themselves in for a "share" of life's luxuries.

But minorities—ethnic, religious, or political—depend for their safety and their very survival upon the rule of law. No minority can claim to be immune from the ordinary means of law enforcement, and still derive benefit from the law's protection. Luxuries can't simply be picked up and carried off.

Resentment, as the late Richard Weaver pointed out, may well prove the dynamite which will finally wreck Western society. Demogogic appeals to vague resentments accomplish almost nothing toward improving the real condition of American colored folk.

Patient work is required, and most of that work must be done by Negroes themselves.

It does no good to cultivate a sense of materialistic greed. The Russians have already taken that course, throwing aside all other human and spiritual values and locking themselves into one vast, dark broom closet. Their society is one of producers and consumers, merely.

Negro-white relationships throughout America may be strained at the moment; probably they are.

But let's not burn down everything in sight for the sake of a case of beer. And, above all, let's not destroy our Constitution and our Bill of Rights and every other cherished part of this nation's heritage for the sake of creature comforts and status symbols.

RESPONSIBILITY OF YOUTH

Complaints are many, and warranted, that we are recklessly and unfairly passing on to our successors a mammoth and burdensome public debt.

But segments of the generation consisting of today's young men and women in the late-'teens and early-twenties might well be asked what sort of heritage they may be preparing for their successors—and, indeed, for themselves in their own maturity.

A group of New York doctors have published further documentation of the familiar fact of increasing sexual promiscuity. Their reports appear in the New York State Journal of Medicine.

The erstwhile respectably high percentage of virgins among brides has markedly declined, with a corresponding increase in the number of men who have had sexual experience before marriage. And now, one of every 18 babies is born out of wedlock.

The doctors have re-enforced the many evidences of the new looseness and have concluded, as have others, that youth is undergoing a revolution in its attitudes towards sex, life and proper behavior.

When we deplore this, as we have before, it is not out of prudish unawareness of the times or blindness to the force of passion. It is in the knowledge of the history of the human family, a knowledge which includes the futility and tragedy of such uninhibited foolhardiness, with its tendency to create general insecurity.

It is popular to blame parents for the unbridled youth of the era, and they are not without guilt to be sure. But at the age of indulgence the young people who are the subject of the doctors' report should be taking on an obligation of their own in this matter—in their own behealf and behalf of those they will present to this world.

As things are going now, the consequences will be worse than the monetary debt they will inherit. Enlightened youth is not without its own responsibility for today and tomorrow.

Prof. David Caplovitz, Author of "The Poor Pay More," Urges Strengthening Amendments to Consumer Credit Bill, H.R. 11601

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 16, 1967

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, Dr. David Caplovitz, associate professor of sociology at Columbia University, a student of the problems of those who live in poverty, has given to the dictionary of familiar expressions the title of his widely read book, "The Poor Pay More." In that book, and in television programs based on the book, we have seen much documentation of the uneven treatment of the poor in the purchase of goods and in the extension of credit.

The Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs of the House Committee on Banking and Currency was most fortunate in having Dr. Caplovitz as a witness this morning on H.R. 11601, the Consumer Credit Protection Act, and I strongly urge those Members of Congress genuinely interested in effective truth-in-lending legislation, and in legislation to help the poor combat the enticements of predatory merchants of debt, to read his testimony.

Dr. Caplovitz told us not only that the poor are the most likely victims of abuses arising from consumer credit but they are "particularly prone to exploitation by unscrupulous credit merchants who now operate with virtual immunity as a result of loopholes in current legislation and the absence of enforcement machinery."

As far as H.R. 11601 goes in trying to close these loopholes—and it goes very far indeed—Dr. Caplovitz urges us to go further and include a "cooling off" period on credit sales, and also to do away with the holder-in-due-course doctrine which relieves the finance company holding the contract from any responsibility for any defenses the consumer may have against the original seller. This is a provision of the Massachusetts law about which we have received much favorable testimony.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include as part of my remarks the provocative testimony delivered this morning before the Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs of the House Committee on Banking and Currency by Dr. Caplovitz, on H.R. 11601, as follows:

Testimony of David Caplovitz, Associate Professor of Sociology, Columbia University, Before the House of Representatives Consumer Affairs Subcommittee of the House Banking and Currency Committee, in Connection With H.R. 11601, the Consumer Credit Protection Act, and Related Bills, August 16, 1967

I am most grateful for this opportunity to testify before the House Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs on the proposed "Consumer Credit Protection Act." I commend the Committee for doing its utmost to increase the protection of consumers in credit transactions. Such protection is long overdue and the need for it has never been greater.

Several generations ago, Americans had a negative attitude toward debt. The person in debt was viewed as somewhat less than an upstanding citizen. This is, of course, no longer true. Consumer credit has become the fuel of our so-called affluent society. Americans in *all* walks of life see nothing wrong with buying now and paying later. The growth of consumer credit since World War II has been extraordinary, far outstripping the growth in population. In 1945, the amount outstanding *installment* debt was 2.5 billion dollars; in 1955, it climbed to 29 billion and by 1965, it had soared to 66 billion. Today installment debt stands at 74 billion.

The phenomenal growth of installment credit has brought in its wake a sharp rise in deceptive and fraudulent marketing practices. Insofar as market transactions depended on cash, sellers had less opportunity and incentive to employ deception and fraud. The consumer who could afford to pay cash for an automobile or an expensive appliance was probably more deliberate and sophisticated in his shopping behavior and there was no point in trying to convince the person without cash to make an expensive purchase. All this changed with the advent of installment credit. Whether or not the consumer can afford the purchase has become largely irrelevant. Once the contract is signed, the seller can count on the law to enforce his right to payment. Appropriate changes in the laws governing consumer credit have lagged far behind the growth of our credit economy. The signed contract is treated as sacrosanct in courts of law and the fraudulent techniques used to obtain the consumer's signature, so difficult to prove in court, are largely ignored. It is a sad fact that the laws in most states are now heavily biased in favor of the creditor; his rights are much better protected than those of the debtor.

My own research on the consumer problems of the poor has convinced me that the poor, more than any other group in society, are victims of abuses arising from consumer credit. They are particularly prone to exploitation by unscrupulous credit merchants who can now operate with virtual immunity as a result of loopholes in current legislation and the absence of enforcement machinery. The poor, more than any other group, are apt to be misled by the false promises of the credit salesman, by the "bait ads" that appear in the mass media, and by the misrepresentation of price and quality of high-pressure salesmen. It is not uncommon for the poor consumer to be sold reconditioned merchandise that is misrepresented as new, and yet this obviously fraudulent practice is almost never punished by our law enforcement agencies. Should the poor consumer protest the fraud by withholding payments, he soon discovers that his wages are being garnisheed and by that time he has great difficulty protecting his job, let alone his legal rights in the transaction.

I cannot stress too strongly the need for government to do everything in its power to stamp out consumer fraud and exploitation. The need is particularly great today when our cities are being torn asunder by ghetto riots. Last year, when I testified before another congressional subcommittee, I suggested that resentment against consumer exploitation was one of the many grievances that find expression in riots. I am even more convinced of this today. Numerous newspaper accounts have quoted ghetto residents as rationalizing the looting on the grounds that they have been victimized and robbed by the merchants for many years.

The common thief is severely sanctioned when apprehended, but the credit merchants who abuse the law to bilk the unsuspecting consumer run little risk of punishment. Untold millions of dollars are stolen each year from consumers by disreputable used car dealers, home repair firms, vacuum cleaner firms and many other types of firms. But instead of being met with criminal sanctions, the perpetrators of this kind of thievery more often than not become wealthy men respected in their communities. How can we expect the disadvantaged to learn respect for the law when those in positions of responsibility do not themselves respect the law? And how can we expect the disadvantaged to obey the law when we do not enforce the law for their protection? I believe the time has come when society can no longer tolerate a dual system of law, one set of laws for the disadvantaged and another set for those in respected positions of responsibility.

It is in the light of these observations about the compelling need for consumer protection that I shall comment on the proposed legislation. I wholeheartedly endorse the provision for full disclosure of credit costs in terms of a true annual rate. The arguments for this reform are so cogent and are so well known that I need not repeat them. I should only add that I particularly approve of the provision to include the cost of insurance that the debtor is required to buy as part of the cerdit cost. From the vantage point of the consumer, this is part of the price he must pay for credit and it makes little sense to exclude it from the calculation of that cost. Moreover, it may well have the additional advantage of bringing down the exorbitant charges that are now being made for this type of insurance. I feel less strongly about the provision to fix a ceiling on credit charges. With full disclosure of cost, perhaps the market mechanism will be sufficient to keep credit charges at reasonable rates.

I am in complete agreement with the provision to abolish confessions of judgment. The confession of judgment assumes that the transaction was scrupulously carried out and that the debtor has no defenses for defaulting on payments. Needless to say, this is not always the case. My own research has shown that many debtors stop payments when they believe they have been cheated. Since fraud is not uncommon in credit transactions, the debtor should not be deprived of his day in court.

Perhaps the most controversial feature of the proposed act is Title II which would abolish wage garnishments. I share the Committee's view that this remedy of the creditor is frequently abused and often results in severe hardships for the debtor, particularly when he loses his job because of the garnishment. Studies have shown that some of the "hard-core" unemployed are in fact unemployable because they have garnishment records. Not only does garnishment impose a burden upon the debtor, but also it is quite costly for the employer as well. I see little point in making America's employers into collection agents for the creditor. Nor, for that matter, should the courts have as much of that responsibility as they now have. Studies have shown that many of the minor courts in various states do little more than collection work, and in some states the minor judiciaries make their living from the fees charged on the debts collected. Doing away with garnishment might well make the more unscrupulous creditors more hesitant in foisting heavy debt burdens on the consumer.

But all this notwithstanding, I am not yet convinced that doing away with garnishment is either feasible at this time or would have the desired effects even if it were possible to pass such a law. For example, garnishment is not permitted in Pennsylvania and yet credit merchants are thriving in that state and consumer fraud is just as prevalent there as elsewhere. The creditors in Pennsylvania do not hesitate to attach both personal and real property and sheriff's sales of furniture and even homes are quite common. To lose one's home because of a consumer debt is certainly as harsh a consequence as losing one's job.

Although eliminating garnishment is probably a desirable long-run objective, I would urge the Committee to consider a more modest proposal now, the adoption of a stronger version of the New York State law which prohibits employers from firing employees because of garnishments. The New York law now applies only to the first garnishment, but there is no reason why such a law should not cover two or even three garnishments. Moreover, if the abolishment of garnishment is not yet feasible, attention should also be given to the amount of income that is exempt from garnishment. Many states have harsh garnishment laws, while some states permit garnishment on only a smal percentage of income. (It should be noted that personal bankruptcy rates are higher where garnishment laws are harsh.)

Although problems may arise in trying to abolish garnishments now, there is hardly any justification for wage assignments which circumvent the courts entirely. I would strongly recomend that the Act do away with wage assignments which are now permitted in a number of states.

If I may, I should now like to call attention to some aspects of the consumer credit problem that are not covered in the proposed legislation. One of the major abuses in the legal procedure leading up to garnishment has to do with inadequate service of process. All too frequently the debtor has no idea that he is being sued until his employer informs him of the garnishment, for the simple reason that he was never properly notified. In some jurisdictions—New York, for example—improper service, known as "sewer service", is quite common. Needless to say, failure to notify the defendant of the law suit is a fundamental violation of our whole legal structure, and yet this happens all too often. Many suggestions have been made about correcting this abuse; one is to have process served by registered mail. I am not sure what the best solution is, but I would suggest that the Committee look into this problem.

As you know, the State of Massachusetts has recently passed a very progressive consumer credit law and there are two provisions of that law that I would strongly urge be adopted in the proposed legislation. One attempts to control the frequent abuses that occur in door-to-door selling by introducing a cooling-off period. In Massachusetts the consumer is given 24 hours in which to rescind the contract in direct selling. In England, the comparable law provides for a 72-hour cooling-off period. I believe that a "cooling-off" period in direct selling would go some way toward reducing the abuses associated with this method of selling. The second feature of the Massachusetts law that I think should be adopted in this Act has to do with the assignment of contracts to third parties. Under the "holder in due course" clause, these third parties are not responsible for any defenses the consumer may have against the original seller. According to the law, they are entitled to payment—whatever the fraud involved in the transaction. As a result, many finance companies do not hesitate to buy the contracts of unscrupulous merchants who employ deception to obtain the consumer's signature on the contract. These fly-by-night credit merchants could not long survive without the finance companies that buy their paper. Thus, one way of controlling fraud and increasing the protection of the consumer would be to do away with the holder-in-due-course doctrine and make the assignee also responsible for the transaction. This may have the beneficiary effect of making the finance companies behave in a more responsible fashion.

As I noted earlier, our society can no longer afford to condone the crass exploitation of consumers that is now so prevalent. If consumer fraud is to be done away with, it is essential that there be strong enforcement machinery and that the perpetrators of such fraud be confronted with criminal sanctions. This is not the case today. The Attorney Generals of some 23 states now have Consumer Fraud Bureaus modelled after the one set up in New York by Attorney General Lefkowitz. But for all his investigation of consumer complaints and his efforts to negotiaate them, the Attorney General of New York does not have the power to prosecute the perpetrators of fraud. To my knowledge, not a single businessman in New York has been put in jail for cheating his customers. Until strong enforcement machinery is instituted, I see little hope of making much headway in eliminating fraud. One of the merits of the proposed law is that it does provide for criminal penalties for violations. I would like to suggest that these penalties be strengthened and made to cover even more offenses. In this connection, I would also like to suggest that the responsibility for enforcement of the various provisions of the Act be placed in the hands of the U.S. Attorneys' offices rather than in the central office of the United States Attorney General. The U.S. attorneys are much closer to the local scene in which the violations occur and they should not have to wait for authority from the Attorney General to act.

In closing, I again commend the Committee for attempting to come to grips with one of the major problems confronting America today.

A Tale of Two Message Carriers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 18, 1967

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Tale of Two Message Carriers," published in the Chicago Tribune of recent date.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TALE OF TWO MESSAGE CARRIERS

A strange contrast exists in recent moves of two federal organizations, both ostensibly acting "in the public interest."

One federal agency, the Federal Communications Commission, has ordered the American Telephone and Telegraph company to reduce its long distance rates. To the dismay of the more than 3 million A.T. & T. stockholders, the market value of their investment dropped several billion dollars as a result of the FCC action.

At the same time another agency, the Post Office department, is asking for a 20 per cent boost in its first class rate on letters.

In less than 35 years the government-operated postal service has increased by 150 per cent the rate on letters—from 2 cents to the present 5 cents—and another increase from 5 cents to 6 cents is in the works. The rate on the old "penny" postcard, which held at 1 cent for 80 years until 1952, would also be boosted to 6 cents.

In the same 35-year period long distance rates of the privately operated telephone company have been reduced by as much as 70 per cent.

For example, a three-minute day time station-to-station call from Chicago to Los Angeles in 1932 cost $6.25, with an overtime charge of 12 a minute after the first three minutes. Today the same call can be made for $1.80, with an overtime charge of 45 cents a minute.

A comparison of first class mail rates for years when significant changes were made since 1932 and the cost of a typical long distance telephone call (Day rate, Chicago to Los Angeles) follows:

	3-minute	1st class mail	
	phone call	Letter (cents)	Post card (cents)
1932	$6.25	2	1
1933	6.25	3	1
1952	2.25	3	2
1958	2.20	4	3
1963	1.95	5	4
1967	1.80	[1] 6	[1] 6

[1] Proposed.

The cost of mailing a letter is the same day or night; but not for making a long distance call. The night rate for a Chicago to Los Angeles call is 90 cents for the first three minutes and 25 cents for each additional minute.

In the light of this record, it hardly seems appropriate for the government to be lecturing a private communications system on the advisability of holding down rates.

Social Security Amendments of 1967

SPEECH

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1967

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 12080) to amend the Social Security Act to provide an increase in benefits under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system, to provide benefits for additional categories of individuals, to improve the public assistance program and programs relating to the welfare and health of children, and for other purposes.

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Chairman, I can think of no more important social legislation this year than the bill we are now considering. I wish to commend the members of the Committee on Ways and Means, and especially its very able chairman [Mr. MILLS], for bringing before us a reasonable and effective piece of legislation. I am happy to speak in support of this bill.

Sometimes I wonder if we realize the full significance of our social security system. Sometimes I wonder if we take it too much for granted. It is not obtrusive; it does not loudly demand attention at every turn. In fact, its operations are as quiet as the drop of a letter into a mailbox. Nevertheless, the nearly silent passage of more than 23 million checks into more than 23 million mailboxes every month is one of the most significant and profound sounds in America today. That tiny sound, multiplied 23 million times a month, testifies to the fact that social security has become—in a short 32 years—one of the basic factors in the economic life of the Nation. Social security is the fundamental economic support in the lives of millions of Americans. But, while fundamental, in too many instances it is not as adequate as it should be. And that is one of the reasons I am glad to lend my support to the bill now before us. It will provide an essential increase in benefits for every American now on the rolls—every one of them will receive at least 12.5 percent more.

I am certain that all of us are well aware of the pressing need for an increase in benefit levels. The case is too obvious for argument. Social security benefits are virtually the sole reliance of half of the almost 23.8 million beneficiaries and certainly the major source of support for just about all of them. The level of these benefits therefore determines how well the retired, the widows, the orphans, and the disabled get along.

The indisputable fact is that millions of social security beneficiaries are being left behind, as our national economy produces greater and greater abundance. Millions who now rely on social security for their support have been unable to enjoy the marvelous advances made by the world's most productive and prolific economy. They have had to live in the midst of ever-increasing abundance without sharing in that abundance. They have had to get along on less and less while their friends and neighbors have been enjoying more and more. In too many instances, they have been forced to live in a state of poverty.

To be able to live at a base subsistence level today, an individual must have an income of $125 a month, while a couple must have $154 a month. Yet the average social security benefits paid today are only $84 a month for retired workers, $142 a month for retired couples, and $74 a month for elderly widows.

The plain and unforgettable fact is that 5.2 million elderly Americans live below the minimum poverty level—and, of these, 4.3 million are social security beneficiaries.

Thus a meaningful increase in benefits is essential to the economic well-being of those presently receiving benefits. And such an increase, now, will help to insure the adequacy of social security when millions of Americans begin receiving payments—and relying on those payments—in the years ahead.

I wish to commend the committee for giving us the possibility of moving our social security system another step toward the adequacy it must have to fulfill its purpose today. We cannot, I believe, overlook our responsibility in this task. The dictates of both good sense and good conscience require us to support this increase in benefit payments.

I would like to comment on another aspect of the bill before us today. When the social security program was enacted in 1935, it provided a wage base of $3,000 which, in those days, was sufficient to cover 95 percent of all taxable earnings. From time to time over the years, the base has been raised, but it has not kept pace with rising incomes in recent years.

If the base were to remain at $6,600 a year, by 1974 only 67 percent of those working in covered employment will have all their earnings covered.

Yet we must remember that social security—in addition to providing disability, survivor's, and health insurance protection—is the Nation's basic retirement protection system. We must, therefore, make it possible for more workers to become eligible for benefits that are more closely related to their full earnings.

The wage base could be described as the backbone of our social security system. There can be no substantial doubt that the base must be raised.

The bill takes us a step in the right direction, by providing an increase to $7,600 a year. With the increase, we will be able to provide improved protection not only for those soon to come on the rolls but for all younger workers who will draw benefits in the decades ahead.

A shortcoming in this bill is that it does not raise the wage base to the level proposed by the President. He asked for a base of $10,800 a year, an average of $900 a month income. I am certain we will arrive at this base in the years immediately before us. I would like to see it accomplished now. As I have said, the base is the system's backbone: not only does it affect a worker's contributions to the system; it also plays a determining role in setting the level of benefits he will get from the system.

When we recall that social security is no longer just a retirement system, when we recall that today it protects 87 out of 100 workers against the risk of disability, and 95 out of 100 mothers and their children against the hazard of the family breadwinner's early death—and when we add to it the great system of medicare—I believe we cannot escape the conclusion that the backbone of such an all-embracing and all-important insurance system must be strong enough to fulfill our needs for today and tomorrow.

In short, I would like to see more of this Nation's people and payroll become eligible to participate in our basic insurance system.

In one respect, I am disappointed that the bill on which the distinguished committee worked so hard did not provide for greater benefit increases in line with those which were proposed in my own social security bill. The legislation which I introduced calling for raising minimum benefits from the present $44 to $90 per month. In addition, I also proposed an average overall increase of 50 percent in benefit payments.

Two additional features important to the long-range development of social security contained in my bill and omitted by the committee were the provisions for an automatic adjustment of benefits to meet changes in the cost of living, and for benefits to be financed partly out of general tax revenues. The adequacy of the social security program in the past has been seriously weakened because the benefits have remained more or less stationary, while the cost of living has risen. Under my bill the benefits granted by Congress would continue to keep abreast of inflationary trends, rather than merely make up for what has been lost.

My bill provides a formula whereby equal amounts will, for the first time, be contributed out of general revenues beginning in fiscal year 1969. By 1977, general revenues would finance 35 percent of the social security system. Attempting to meet all of the social security costs by means of a payroll tax would be regressive taxation and put a disproportionate burden on those we are trying to help most, and those least able to meet such a burden. Financing cost in part from general revenues would represent progressive taxation, and would take advantage of the broadly based graduated individual and corporate tax structure and place more of the burden on those best able to pay.

While the committee's bill does not go as far as I would wish in raising benefits, and it does not contain the automatic increase and general financing provisions which I feel are vital to the growth of the social security system, it is nevertheless an important move in the right direction. I will, however, continue to do all I can until those who depend upon social security as a primary source of income are guaranteed the minimum necessities of a decent life.

The most important element to keep before us is the enormous social and human good that comes from providing an adequate standard of living through the social security program, rather than supplementing deficient payments with relief and welfare subsidies. The measure we are now considering is a bill which will help secure this goal and behind which both parties may unite.

J. Edgar Hoover—Public Protector

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 18, 1967

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover is one of the most esteemed public officials of our generation. Every good American is thankful that for 50 years he has given outstanding service to the Justice Department and in particular for his unparalleled career with the FBI. It would be pointless for me to go on at length extolling the merits of this great citizen. An editorial entitled, "Public Protector," published in the Columbia State, one of South Carolina's leading newspapers, is a fine summary of the debt which we owe to Mr. Hoover.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PUBLIC PROTECTOR

FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover has marked his 50th anniversary with the Justice Department. He was hired as a law clerk in the Alien Enemy Registration Section in 1917.

On May 10, 1924, Attorney General Harlan Fiske Stone designated Hoover acting director of the Bureau of Investigation. Today, at age 72, the burly, indefatigable lawman can look back upon service to the government under seven presidents and 15 attorneys general.

He has been called a dictator and a nuisance, mostly by dictators like Al Capone and nuisances like Gus Hall. His sanity has been questioned—by *The Worker*, official organ of the American Communist Party. He has survived run-ins with Martin Luther King and Bobby Kennedy.

Through it all, Hoover has simply gone on working, every day of every week of every year. In 1964, by executive order, President Johnson waived his mandatory retirement.

Recently, quoting Thomas Jefferson, Hoover roundly declared: "The flames kindled on the 4th of July, 1776, have spread over too much of the globe to be extinguished by the feeble engines of despotism; on the contrary, they will consume these engines and all who work them."

It has been Hoover's never-ending task to wage war against despotic engines, whether associated with drugs, bootleg booze, counterfeit money, or the international Communist conspiracy.

We would like to think that Director Hoover could go on serving the nation, and the cause of man's freedom, indefinitely. But time will overtake him, as it must every man. Before it does, Congress should insure that his successor be a man equally dedicated to no-nonsense law enforcement and unyielding opposition to Communism.

There long has been pending legislation calling for Congressional approval of the next Director of the FBI. Knowing of the propensity of contemporary Presidents to play politics with high appointments, we hope that such confirmation will be required.

Skeptics may point out that, despite requirement for Senate confirmation, some sorry attorneys general have been inflicted upon the nation in recent years. Nevertheless, the members of Congress, as direct representatives of the people, should have some voice in approving the next Director of the FBI.

In our view, the man who holds that job is more important to the nation's protection than his nominal superior—the attorney general of the United States. Hoover certainly has been.

End Delay on Noise Abatement Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT TENZER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 16, 1967

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, since coming to the Congress in January 1965, I have advocated congressional action on aircraft noise abatement. In February 1966, the President recognized the national importance of this problem in his transportation message to Congress, and appointed a White House Task Force on Aircraft Noise Abatement.

During the second session of the 89th Congress the administration sent to the Congress a noise abatement bill, authorizing the Secretary of Transportation to establish maximum aircraft noise levels to be used in certifying aircraft under the Federal Aviation Act. I have sponsored a measure which incorporates this provision and also provides financial assistance for modifications to aircraft and airports to reduce jet noise—H.R. 1398.

On July 11, 1967, I called on the Secretary of Transportation, Alan S. Boyd, to issue administrative regulations implementing the essential provisions of the administration noise abatement bill—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, July 11, 1967, A3467.

Under unanimous consent I place the text of my letter to Secretary Boyd in the RECORD at this point:

JULY 11, 1967.

Hon. ALAN S. BOYD,
Secretary of Transportation,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Two weeks ago the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of NY struck down a Hempstead Town noise abatement ordinance as unconstitutional. Federal Judge John F. Dooling held in effect that jet noise was not only a national problem but a federal responsibility. He held that aircraft noise limitations must come from a federal agency.

On February, 1966 in his Transportation message to Congress, President Johnson recognized jet noise as a national problem. In response to my letter to the President of August 30, 1965, the President appointed a White House Task Force on Aircraft Noise headed by his Science Advisor Dr. Donald F. Hornig "to frame an action program to attack this problem". In his letter to me of June 5th, Dr. Hornig stated that passage of the pending noise abatement bill was "critically important."

The Administration noise abatement bill has been co-sponsored by more than 20 Members of the House and while my bill goes much further, I believe the basic provisions authorizing the setting of noise standards can be implemented by administrative regulation. Section 307 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 provides this authority to limit the use of navigable airspace "for the protection of persons and property on the ground."

In short, the outlook for passage of the noise abatement bill is bleak and we cannot wait any longer to take the necessary action to alleviate the ever increasing problem of jet noise. I urge you to take administrative steps now to establish noise standards.

Sincerely,

HERBERT TENZER,
Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I have today received a response from the Secretary of Transportation which I want to call to the attention of my colleagues and which I include at this point in the RECORD:

THE SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION,
Washington, D.C., August 16, 1967.

Hon. HERBERT TENZER,
Member of Congress,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. TENZER: Thank you for your letter of July 10, 1967, reviewing the current status of the aircraft noise problem and urging the Department to act to control aircraft noise under Section 307 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958.

We would, of course, prefer to attack the problem of aircraft noise through rules for the certification of aircraft and aircraft equipment. We have been actively engaged in seeking meaningful international noise standards for aircraft equipment in close cooperation with the British and French Governments.

In the event, however, that Congress does not grant certification authority for noise abatement purposes, the Department of Transportation can establish operating rules under Section 307 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958. Although I feel that such action is a poor substitute for certification authority because it does not include many of the incentives for quiet operation which can be built into certification rules, the Department of Transportation will take whatever action is possible and practicable within existing authority and technology.

Sincerely,

ALAN S. BOYD.

Mr. Speaker, because of the delay in holding hearings on the pending noise abatement legislation, we are losing valuable time in the battle against the menace of jet noise.

I will continue to urge the Secretary of Transportation to take immediate administrative action to curb aircraft noise by issuing proposed operating rules under section 307(c) of the Federal Aviation Act. But that is not enough. The Secretary is handicapped by the delay in scheduling congressional hearings. Without legislation, the Secretary can only issue operating rules. He cannot enforce those rules with the strong measures proposed by the pending legislation.

I urge my colleagues in the House to review the exchange of correspondence relating to noise abatement regulations and to express their views, to the end that steps may be taken to assure appropriate congressional consideration of the pending legislation.

The era of sonic boom has arrived—but we have not yet been able to find the answer to reducing jet noise. We must accelerate our efforts at both the administrative and legislative levels of government if we are to be successful in ridding the atmosphere of the annoying pollutant of jet noise.

Yesterday in Washington, culture became the latest victim of the jet noise menace. Secretary of the Interior Stuart Udall announced that his Department may be obliged to terminate summer concerts because of interference by jet noise.

Another Weekly Newspaper Added to Bruce Sagan Chain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 10, 1967

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent, I am extending my remarks to include a news article from the Publisher's Auxiliary announcing the addition of another newspaper to the Bruce Sagan chain. Mr. Sagan, who is one of my most distinguished constituents, is the head of the largest chain of weekly newspapers in the Nation. The article from the Publishers Auxiliary follows:

ANOTHER WEEKLY NEWSPAPER ADDED TO BRUCE SAGAN CHAIN

NEWPORT BEACH, CALIF.—The 10,768-circulation weekly Newporter here has been purchased by Bruce Sagan, publisher of San Diego and Chicago weeklies, from the Newport Publishing Co.

Roy McCann will continue as editor and publisher.

Sagan, who has been cited as "Publisher of the Year" by the National Assn. of Weeklies, owns the San Diego (Calif.) Independent, the Southwest Press and a chain of midwest weeklies.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402, at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

Appendix

We Must Not Turn Our Backs on the Cities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK BROOKS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 21, 1967

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, this summer of dreadful violence will long be remembered by the American people.

It will be remembered as the time when bottles and bricks were met by troops and tanks on our city streets.

It will be remembered as the time when entire neighborhoods were put to flame and held under siege by rooftop snipers.

It will be remembered for the hundreds of people killed and injured; the neighborhoods looted and destroyed; and for the senseless anarchy which, for a few frightening days, seemed to be in control.

Such a summer must never happen in America again. Law and order must—and will—be preserved. Rioters must not be let off lightly.

But while this summer will be a chilling memory for most Americans, it remains a grim reality for many others.

The chief victims of these riots are those who live in the riot-torn areas. Because of the madness of a few, they are left homeless and hungry, in despair and with an uncertain future.

In each of our riot-torn cities, the pieces are being put back together. But what was burned and uprooted in minutes will not be so easily restored. And the greater tragedy growing out of the summer riots are the thousands of innocent victims who watched helplessly as their homes and businesses were destroyed.

Americans are right to be shocked and angry about the dreadful events of this summer. But we must not turn our backs on those who were most injured by the lawless mobs. Nor, may I add, can we permit the riots to deter us from our commitment to programs that will aid the urban poor.

There are some in Congress and elsewhere who are trying to use the ill will generated by the riots as a wedge to destroy badly needed urban programs proposed by President Johnson.

But if the lessons of this summer taught us nothing else, we should have learned that such hatred and bitterness can only lead to more tragedy.

Americans, in their fairness, know that the just demands of Negro Americans for full rights and full opportunity remain as valid as they ever were.

And we know, also, that the sins committed by a few cannot be charged against an overwhelming majority who are innocent.

The President and Congress can—and do—provide the leadership and resources to help meet the problems of the city. But we cannot solve them—only the cities themselves can do that.

As President Johnson said recently:

> These problems demand the best that an enlightened nation can plan, and the most that an affluent nation can afford.

And as the President noted, there are currently 23 programs pending before Congress to help the urban poor.

The Congress does not have to wait for fresh blueprints to rebuild our cities. This plan already exists in the form of the President's proposals now awaiting action.

All told, President Johnson and Congress have worked together to enact 35 major proposals to aid our cities. This is a promising start—but it is only a start.

We cannot halt or retreat from programs still in their infancy. Nor can we refuse to act on many of the President's new proposals that add a further dimension to the overall help being received in urban America.

We need the model cities program, rent supplements, the rat control bill, the poverty bill, the Teacher Corps, increases in social security, housing for the elderly, Safe Streets and Crime Control Act, and urban research.

These new programs are not peripheral to the problems we face—they aim at the heart of many of the social ills that cause unrest and bitterness in city slums.

But these programs are not enough. Equally important is the determination by every city official, every civic and business leader, to dedicate themselves to righting old wrongs in the urban slums and to begin working year round—not just during the summer—to bring our poor into the mainstream of American life.

President Johnson warned us more than 2 years ago:

> The problems of the city are problems of housing and education. They involve increasing employment and ending poverty . . . they are, in large measure, the problems of American society itself. They call for a generosity of vision, a breadth of approach, a magnitude of effort which we have not yet brought to bear on the American city.

How we—all of us—respond to the President's words may well determine our future growth and greatness as a people. The ghetto is there—winter and summer. It has been there for many generations. Its people have been oppressed but patient.

But they are patient no longer. We must share their impatience to rid our society of injustice and neglect, of blight and misery, of hopelessness and despair.

And when these purposes are accomplished, I believe all Americans will breathe more deeply the fresh air of a brighter future.

The Port of Haiphong, North Vietnam's Greatest Military Asset

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 21, 1967

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Block the Channel," relating to the Port of Haiphong, North Vietnam, published in the Chicago Tribune, of August 19, 1967. The editor of the Tribune is W. D. Maxwell.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BLOCK THE CHANNEL

The great port of Haiphong in the Red river delta is generally reckoned as North Viet Nam greatest military asset. Thru it flows unmolested annually, by the Pentagon's own estimate, a billion dollars' worth of guns, missiles, rockets, planes, petroleum, and other warmaking material from the Soviet Union and the east European communist bloc.

Without this mighty array of military hardware—10 times the amount obtained from Red China—North Viet Nam could scarcely stay in the war. Yet the port of Haiphong remains open, untouched by American military might, for fear of a direct confrontation with the U.S.S.R. thru an attack on Russian shipping that clogs the port.

Gen. Earle G. Wheeler, chairman of the joint chiefs of staff, told the Senate Wednesday that, while a valuable target, Haiphong remains off limits because it provides an opportunity for "incidents" that could expand the war role of other communist nations. Thus there is no naval blockade of the north, no bombing of the port, no mining of its sea approaches, and no effort to capture Haiphong by an amphibious landing.

If these methods of closing the port carry too much risk for the Johnson administration, there are other, equally effective, more "peaceful" ways, suggested by the American Security council.

Sinking one or two cement-laden ships in Haiphong's vital sea channel would block the port to all oceangoing vessels, the council said in its latest analysis of developments affecting national security. So would destruction of the few dredges needed to keep the channel open and free of silt, as proposed by the Tribune on this page Feb. 19, 1966.

Haiphong can be reached from the sea only by a single dredged channel five miles long and 100 to 200 feet wide. Constant dredging is required to keep it free of silt. Thus, the council's "Washington Report," pointed out, the channel can be effectively blocked by scuttling one or two ships.

This would entail supplying the proper ships to the South Viet Nam navy, convoying them into blocking positions, and defending the ships and crews against the enemy's naval, air, and shore artillery attack.

The result, said the council, would neutralize Haiphong harbor, shorten the war, and halt the delivery of Soviet weapons that are being used to kill thousands of American service men. The council strongly recommended that the Haiphong channel be obstructed as quickly as possible.

As we said on these pages in February, 1966, when we outlined the vulnerability of the Haiphong channel dredges to aerial bombardment: "Haven't we some commitment to the hundreds of young Americans who have died and to their comrades who are sent into battle with one hand tied behind their backs? It is Korea all over again. It is not that we can't win, but that we refuse to win."

That appraisal is more than ever valid now that American casualties exceed 91,000, with 12,487 dead in combat.

State Aide Volunteers To Fight in Vietnam But Respects Right of Those Who Disagree

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 21, 1967

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, we hear a lot today about draft card burners, peaceniks, and even those who would leave this country rather than serve in its Armed Forces. That is why it is particularly gratifying to learn of a young man who has given up an excellent job with a promising future in order to go back in the Marines and fight in Vietnam.

This man is Bill Huggett, who, up until a few weeks ago was administrative aide to State Senator Dick Fincher of Miami, Fla. Huggett, who graduated from the University of Florida Law School in 1966 and worked for two Federal district court judges until his assignment with Fincher, had already served 6 years in the Marine Reserve. He did not have to go back.

Mr. Speaker, this dedication to one's country is truly heartwarming and I commend to my colleagues the following news article from the Miami Herald about this fine young man:

Fincher Aide Quits Post for Vietnam

(By John McDermott)

Tallahassee.—Bill Huggett quit the Battle of Tallahassee Wednesday to volunteer for front line action with the Marines in the real war in Vietnam.

The Miami attorney said that going to war for his country, is "my duty and my responsibility."

Huggett, 27, announced his decision to his boss, Sen. Dick Fincher. Then he went to Rep. Carey Matthews, who is commanding officer of the Marine Reserves in Miami, to be sworn in.

Asked how he felt about youths who demonstrate against military service or who use every possible device to avoid serving, Huggett said:

"In this country, everybody has a right to disagree. It is regrettable that these individuals so often make such a violent display and leave an ugly impression of America with other countries.

"I respect their rights to disagree and I hope they respect my right to go off and fight."

Huggett's action was described by Fincher as "giving me goose bumps—it is so patriotic."

The Marine-to-be grinned as he told of drawing opposition from two sources.

"My girl friend isn't very happy about it and my mother doesn't want me to go," he said. "But I guess that is an understandable reaction for women."

Huggett didn't have to go to war. He already had completed his required service, six years in the Marine Reserve. But he has never been to war and he feels that must be a part of his life.

Poverty War Aids Black Power Hate School

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. E. (BILL) BROCK

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 21, 1967

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, recently, evidence concerning a black power hate school operating in Nashville, Tenn., with the help of poverty program funds and equipment was presented to a congressional committee by Capt. John Sorace, of the Nashville police.

In return for his cooperation with the committee, Captain Sorace's truthfulness was questioned by Senator Edward Kennedy, whose brother-in-law, as it would happen, is in charge of the war on poverty.

When the matter was examined more closely, it developed that Captain Sorace's testimony had been correct.

The details of this timely and revealing episode in the history of the scandal-ridden war on poverty are recounted in a column by Washington journalist Richard Wilson, which originally appeared in the August 11 issue of the Washington Star.

Another aspect of the hate school itself is exposed in a dispatch published by the Nashville Banner on August 16 and describing an actual class of the school. Among the student activities, as astounding as it may seem, was a reenacted massacre of white planters during a slave uprising of the colonial period.

I insert these two important items in the Appendix to the Record:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, Aug. 11, 1967]

Teddy Kennedy Proves Embarrassingly Wrong

(By Richard Wilson)

The Kennedy brothers and brother-in-law have gotten themselves on the side of the poor, but it has led to some strange contradictions particularly so far as Teddy is concerned.

One cannot help but reflect that if the late Senator Joseph R. McCarthy had been caught so flagrantly wrong in a congressional inquiry as has been Sen. Edward M. Kennedy, D-Mass., there would have been no end to the lamentations and outcries of foul play.

The Kennedys are apparently immune to this kind of treatment from the journalistic and intellectual community because their motives are deemed to be pure.

But it remains the fact that Teddy Kennedy was embarrassingly wrong when he impugned the testimony and motives of a metropolitan police captain from Nashville, Tenn., named John Sorace.

Capt. Sorace informed the Eastland committee considering a federal anti-riot bill that a Nashville firebrand named Fred Brooks organized a "liberation school" to teach Negroes how to hate whites with the help of funds of a Nashville poverty program.

Sorace spoke of Brooks being on the poverty program payroll, where his name was although he had not yet been paid and might technically be considered as not on an operative payroll. Teddy Kennedy rose in righteous indignation to defend the record of the poverty program headed by his brother-in-law, Sargent Shriver.

The poverty program, proclaimed Teddy, was implicated in "an extremely unfortunate way, and many of us believe that the poverty program is more related really to the problems of riots in different parts of the country than the current legislation (anti-riot) we are holding hearings on."

So that "truth might catch up with fancy," Kennedy summoned a telegram from the Rev. J. Paschall Davis, chairman of the Nashville Metropolitan Action Commission, ringingly denying that Brooks was on the poverty program payroll. The Mr. Davis then testified that his commission had incurred no expenses for the student summer project that involved the liberation school.

With great satisfaction Kennedy announced that Sorace's testimony had been "controverted" and added, "I am just hopeful that the truth can catch up with what is falsehood."

Brooks, 20, did his part by telling an interviewer from the Nashville Tennessean that Sorace "is a racist and should be killed," which was duly published under the headline, " 'Kill Sorace,' Brooks Says."

But, upon arriving back home in Nashville, Mr. Davis quickly found it necessary to correct himself in a long telegram to Senator William Eastland, D-Miss. He had discovered that in fact the commission financed by Sargent Shriver's poverty program had indeed agreed to pay rentals to house teachers and aides for the liberation school and furnish supplies.

It was not true that the commission had incurred no expenses for the student summer program. It appeared furthermore that Mr. Davis' statement that Fred Brooks was not on the payroll, that his application "has not yet been acted upon," was a charitable interpretation.

So there was no longer any doubt that poverty funds were involved in Brooks' project. It was a school to teach hatred of whites, and Teddy Kennedy had clouded up the facts out of his emotional belief that poverty is the primary cause of revolutionary activity by 20-year-old extremists.

Eastland's comment with respect to Sorace's testimony was, "We have substantiated what he said."

This is not the first indication that the poverty program gave a helping hand to the riot and hatred inciters. There is evidence of it in Newark, Cincinnati, Buffalo and other cities, and it is little credit to Teddy Kennedy that he would try to create a contrary impression.

His smug satisfaction that he had blown out of the water a false charge and had thus brought discredit upon the Eastland committee was another reflection of his righteous, but mistaken, emotions.

It reflects also the fuzzy state of mind of so many people who will not direct their attention to the specific criminal acts which have been committed in the riots, but wish to meander off into the sociological thickets and blame society in general and all of its members individually for conditions they had no part in creating.

[From the Nashville (Tenn.) Banner, Aug. 16, 1967]

"Liberation" Class Students Enact Slaughter of Plantation Owners

(By Duren Cheek)

A dozen young Negroes attending classes in the controversial "liberation school" today acted out the slaughter of white plantation owners in a slave rebellion led by Nat Turner over a century ago.

The school—booted from an Episcopal chapel and a hospital ground in the past few days—moved its operations to a park in a mainly Negro neighborhood. A Metro park patrolman watched the proceedings from a distance but made no attempt to interfere.

MRS. WOODRUFF

The class for the younger students, most of them under 8 years old, was conducted by Mrs. Nancy Woodruff, wife of the Rev. James Woodruff.

Woodruff's church, St. Anselm's Episcopal Chapel, is the delegate agency for the North Nashville Summer Project of which the liberation school is a part.

Anti-poverty funds approved for the program have been suspended pending action by the Metropolitan Action Commission Thursday night and an investigation by the Office of Economic Opportunity.

The school came under fire in Washington last week when police Capt. John Sorace testified that the children were being taught racial hatred.

Mrs. Woodruff conducted the class under the shade of a tree as the children, obviously inhibited by the presence of white newsmen, sat on three park benches. A blackboard was leaned against the tree.

FRED BROOKS

After giving the children her version of the Turner-led rebellion, Mrs. Woodruff turned the class over to Black Power Advocate Fred Brooks, chairman of the local chapter of the Student Non-violent coordinating committee. He suggested that the children act out the revolt.

A boy clad in a white shirt and blue jeans agreed to play the part of Turner with two companions. Other members of the class split up to portray white slave owners and salves.

As the youngsters playing Turner squirmed beneath a picnic table and started crawling across the grass, he asked Mrs. Woodruff, "Where are the weapons?"

"Just pretend you have weapons," she replied.

The smiling children stalked one group pretending to be asleep on the lawn. "Kill the whites. Free the slaves," exclaimed Brooks.

Prior to the skit, Mrs. Woodruff said slaves were forced to eat scraps from the white man's table and wear rags for clothing.

They were so unhappy, she said, "They decided they were not going to do this anymore, that they would just fight."

She said Turner had a vision in which God told him to go to Jerusalem, a town in Southampton County, Va., and free the slaves.

"What did the slaves not have to fight with?" she quizzed.

"Weapons," one of the children shot back.

"That's right," she said. "They didn't have guns and knives but they had hatchets."

She asked the children if they knew the meaning of the word massacre. When no one replied, she said the slaves led by Turner went to the home of Turner's owner and killed all the white people there.

They went on to other plantations doing the same thing and ultimately freed about 350 slaves, she said.

"We had many slave revolts," she said, "but Nat Turner's was probably the best."

Many uprisings, she said, were doomed to failure because of "Uncle Toms" and "tattle tales."

Brooks told newsmen prior to the class that attendance was smaller than usual because the presence of patrol cars in the Negro neighborhoods "intimidated some from coming."

He said the classes would continue in the park, with or without anti-poverty funds and "whether the white people downtown like it or not."

A group of older students attended class in a nearby picnic shelter.

Orange County, Calif.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 21, 1967

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, Orange County, Calif., which is part of my congressional district, has been the target of some national magazines for being the center of conservatism, and the articles usually indicate that the legislators from that district are irresponsible extremists.

Since I was elected to Congress in 1952, Orange County has grown from 220,000 to 1,300,000 in population, placing an extremely heavy burden upon the people of that district to meet the expanding needs for schools, highways, flood control, water, and public parks. These needs have been met by the governing body of that county in a most successful manner. They have not waited for Uncle Sam to take care of them, but have bonded themselves and taxed themselves to meet these needs as they continue.

Eighty-five thousand people still continue to come to Orange County every month. They apparently like the conditions, the climate, and the atmosphere of that county and, regardless of their previous political affiliations, considerably more than half of them register Republican. So they must not be afraid of the "goblins and kooks."

The national magazines who thrust their spears into Orange County end up by admitting this. In other words, "in their hearts they know we are right," and they just cannot stand it.

Mr. Speaker, I include with my remarks an article written by Russell Kirk in the August 22, 1967, issue of National Review, in which he pays high tribute to two of Orange County's great institutions, Disneyland, and Knott's Berry Farm and Ghost Town. These are two of the most fantastic centers of entertainment in the United States, both conceived and produced by conservative Republicans, who are far more progressive than any of the so-called liberals.

The article follows. I urge its reading.

"Conservatism is enjoyment," Walter Bagehot wrote a century ago. It is of some significance that America's two principal fun-fairs are situated cheek by jowl in the heart of Goldwater-Reagan territory, and that both are the creations of conservative gentlemen of imagination.

I refer to Disneyland and to Knott's Berry Farm and Ghost Town, in Orange County, California. Don't let anyone tell you that these are mere commercial enterprises. Charming fancy built them, and any visitor's spirits are lifted up by a few hours (or better still, some days) spent in these enchanted realms, more fantastic than the stately pleasure-dome by Kubla Khan decreed. Make you a pilgrimage thither, true-blue conservative, and take with you all your rising generation.

As Mr. Ray Bradbury often tells his audiences don't be ashamed of loving Disneyland: it is lovable. The late Walt Disney, a staunch Republican and champion of tastes traditional, evoked such a world as even Prospero could not fashion. Disneyland's delights have been described too often, and are too numerous, for me to catalog them here. But my especial darling is the newest Disney satrapy, "New Orleans" *cum* "Pirates of the Caribbean."

Above ground, in this complex, is a maze of Vieux Carré lanes and courtyards. (If the Federal Bureau of Roads, great Vandal, has its way in Louisiana, soon Disney's ingenious reproductions will be more satisfactory than anything left in the original New Orleans.) These are lined with delectable shops, restaurants, and shows. Below ground is the most splendid and thrilling ride in all the world—the cruise by boat among the Pirates of the Caribbean. Words fail me, gentle reader, when I aspire to give some account of the fearful joys of this expedition: the cannonades of the buccaneers volleying and thundering, Panama and Caracas sacked and burnt before one's eyes. We drift on and on among these scenes of carnage and sanguinary merriment, protected from the combatants by a mantle of invisibility.

Before long, I trust, Disneyland will open its tremendous Haunted House, which stands hard by New Orleans, in handsome green grounds—but which as yet does not admit mortal visitants. Whenever I make my way to Disneyland, I poke my nose through the wrought-iron gates of the Haunted House's precincts, like a boy at a candy-shop window. Comrade Khrushchev, repelled by a heartless capitalist regime from this Garden of Earthly Delights, knows too well the lifelong pang which anyone must suffer who comes so close to the Terrestrial Paradise—and, after being weighed in the balance, is found unworthy to enter.

Mr. Walter Knott's Berry Farm and Ghost Town, developed over forty-seven years by a farmer who began with a few thousands dying boysenberry bushes, in some ways is even more fun than Disneyland. For one thing, admission is free, and one can spend a whole day there without sacrificing a penny—if one can resist the odors from Mrs. Knott's kitchens, and the enticements of the innumerable shops, various as the booths of Vanity Fair but a great deal more uplifting. There are even bookshops, where one encounters the chief works of all literary champions of freedom, justice and order.

The Ghost Town—consisting in part of genuine old buildings transported from deserted mining sites, and in part of marvelous reproductions of the type—is one sprawling expanse of the jolly picturesque, from the jail (with a talking prisoner who knows amazing things about *you*) to the saloons, complete with dancing girls and bumpers of boysenberry juice. The mountain-railway ride through the Calico Mine never cloys.

At Knott's, the newest splendor is the full-scale reproduction of Independence Hall, Philadelphia, perfect in every detail: a work pious in the old Roman sense. Here, in the handsome chamber where the Continental Congress met, one actually hears the authors of the Declaration of Independence at their debates. (Today's Congress taxes Mr. Knott heavily for having been patriotically presumptuous enough to erect Independence Hall in California; so there is a modest admission fee, but it's worth it just to hear John Adams in the accents of 1776.)

You understand, I'm sure, that these Gardens of Delights cannot be captured in a single day. If you and yours stay overnight, or for several nights, I earnestly recommend that you put up at the Mission Inn, in Riverside, an easy drive distant. Aside from being spacious and comfortable, with good food, the Mission Inn is the most fantastic and curious and labyrinthine hostelry in these United States, or perhaps in the universe. (Rates are modest enough.) It seems ageless. Cloister after cloister, gallery above gallery, Spanish chapels, catacombs, audience-chambers, halls of art, splashing fountains, battlements, gigantic clocks with moving figures, enigmatic statues, topless towers—why, at the Mission Inn (which never was a mission, but began as a frontier stage-stop) your offspring will be swallowed up in wonder.

No liberal ever will be half so inventive as Walt Disney, or Walter Knott, or the family which, over generations, piled rococo grotesque upon baroque ingenuity at the Mission Inn. One might as well expect Sir John Falstaff to apply for Medicare, as to ask a liberal to think of anything funny or fantastic. Get your utopia now: go West, young man, and learn to rejoice with Tory and Old Whig. There'll be no fun when, in John Betjeman's lines, surging millions cry from communal canteens, "No right! No wrong! All's perfect, everywhere!"

Archie Moore Speaks Against Hate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 21, 1967

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in a recent issue of the San Diego Times and in the Washington Star of August 20, 1967, by permission of the San Diego Times, appeared a statement written by the former light heavyweight champion of the world, Archie Moore.

The statement of Mr. Archie Moore is logical, profound, and is one of ringing Americanism and should appeal to all sound thinking persons, without regard to color, race, or creed. The statement of Mr. Archie Moore should be as widely publicized as possible.

In my remarks, I include the article that appeared in the Washington Star of August 20, 1967.

ARCHIE MOORE SPEAKS AGAINST HATE

(By Archie Moore)

The devil is at work in America, and it is up to us to drive him out. Snipers and looters, white or black, deserve no mercy. Those who would profit from their brother's misfortunes deserve no mercy, and those who would set fellow Americans upon each other deserve no mercy.

I'll fight the man who calls me an "Uncle Tom." I have broken bread with heads of state, chatted with presidents and traveled all over the world. I was born in a ghetto, but I refused to stay there. I am a Negro, and proud to be one. I am also an American, and am proud of that.

The young people of today think they have a hard lot. They should have been around in the '30s when I was coming up in St. Louis. We had no way to go, but a lot of us made it. I became light heavyweight champion of the world. A neighbor kid down the block, Clark Terry, became one of the most famous jazz musicians in the world. There were doctors, lawyers and chiefs who came out of that ghetto. One of the top policemen in St. Louis came from our neighborhood.

BAIT FOR SIMPLE-MINDED

We made it because we had a goal, and we were willing to work for it. Don't talk to me of your "guaranteed national income." Any fool knows that this is insanity. Do we bring those who worked to get ahead down to the level of those who never gave a damn? The world owes nobody—black or white—a living. God helps the man who helps himself!

Now then, don't get the idea that I didn't grow up hating the injustices of this world. I am a staunch advocate of the Negro revolution for the good of mankind. I've seen almost unbelievable progress made in the last handful of years. Do we want to become wild beasts bent only on revenge, looting and killing and laying America bare? Hate is bait, for the simple-minded.

Sure, I despised the whites who cheated me, but I used that feeling to make me push on. If you listen to the professional rabble-rousers, adhere to this idea of giving up everything you've gained in order to revenge yourself for the wrongs that were done to you in the past—then you'd better watch your neighbor, because he'll be looting your house next. Law and order is the only edge we have. No man is an island.

Granted, the Negro still has a long to way to go to gain a fair shake with the white man in this country. But believe this: If we resort to lawlessness, the only thing we can hope for is civil war, untold bloodshed, and the end of our dreams.

We have to have a meeting of qualified men of both races. Mind you, I said qualified men, not some punk kid, ranting the catch phrases put in his mouth by some paid hate-monger. There are forces in the world today, forces bent upon the destruction of America, your America and mine. And while we're on the subject, do you doubt for a minute that communism, world communism, isn't waiting with bated breath for the black and white Americans to turn on each other full force? Do you want a chance for life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness in the land of your birth, or do you want no chance at all under the Red heel?

NOT ONE SQUARE INCH

There are members of the black community who call for a separate nation within America. Well, I do not intend to give up one square inch of America. I'm not going to be told I must live in a restricted area. Isn't that what we've all been fighting to overcome? And then there is the element that calls for a return to Africa.

For my part, Africa is a great place to visit, but I wouldn't want to live there. If the Irishmen want to go back to the Emerald Isle, let them. If the Slavs want to return to the Iron Curtain area, OK by me. But I'm not going to go to any part of Africa to live. I'm proud of ancestry, and of the country that spawned my forefathers, but I'm not giving up my country. I fought all my life to give my children what I'm able to give them today; a chance for development as citizens in the greatest country in the world.

I do not for a moment think that any truly responsible Negro wants anarchy. I don't think you'll find intelligent—no, let's rephrase that—mature Negroes running wild in the streets or sniping at total strangers. God made the white man as well as the black. True, we haven't acted as brothers in the past, but we are brothers. If we're to be so many Cains and Abels, that's our choice. We can't blame God for it.

Something must be done to reach the Negroes and the whites in the ghettos of this country, and I propose to do something.

"ANY BOY CAN"

As a matter of plain fact, I have been doing something for the past several years. I have been running a program which I call the ABC—Any Boy Can. By teaching our youth, black, white, yellow and red, what dignity is, what self respect is, what honor is, I have been able to obliterate juvenile delinquency in several areas.

I would now expand my program, change scope. If any boy can, surely any man can. I want to take teams of qualified people, top men in their fields, to the troubled areas of our cities. I know that the people who participated in the recent riots, who are participating and who will participate, are misguided rather than mad.

If some bigot can misguide, then I can guide. I've spent too much of my life building what I've got to put it to torch just to satisfy some ancient hatred of a man who beat my grandfather. Those men are long dead. Do we have to choke what could be a beautiful garden with weeds of hate? I say NO! And I stand ready to start "Operation Gardener." I invite the respected Negro leaders of our country to join me.

Social Security Amendments of 1967

SPEECH
OF
HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 17, 1967

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 12080) to amend the Social Security Act to provide an increase in benefits under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system, to provide benefits for additional categories of individuals, to improve the public assistance program and programs relating to the welfare and health of children, and for other purposes.

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Chairman, it is vital to the Nation's welfare that the social security bill, H.R. 12080, be amended before final passage to avoid the evil effects of the restrictive welfare provisions which the bill contained.

Unless changed, not only will several millions of our needy citizens lose Federal welfare support, but States finding themselves encouraged to adopt even more restrictive legislation will further tighten their policies, thereby adding more people to welfare rolls and increasing the tensions in already troubled cities.

Basically, Congress is reflecting the wave of negative thinking toward public welfare that is too often characteristic of social issues these days. Most people, it seems, prefer to believe that people on welfare are deficient in personal qualities needed to make themselves self-sufficient, that they are lazy and immoral, and have only themselves to blame for their condition. It is loosely asserted that while jobs go begging, these "lazy and immoral" people linger on relief rolls. Few of us stop to question what kind of jobs go begging and who are the people so unfortunate to be on the starvation standards of our relief rolls.

First, we should understand just who the people are who make up the 7.3 million Americans on welfare. According to a recent U.S. Department of Labor publication, these are:

Aged 63 or over, with a median age of 72, 2.1 million.

Blind or otherwise severely handicapped, 700,000.

Children whose parents cannot support them, 3.5 million.

The remaining 1 million are the parents of these children, mostly mothers, and about 150,000 fathers.

Unless we provide some custody for the children, and education and training for the mothers, we should not expect the mothers to leave their homes and children, if at all, to obtain jobs, too often the most menial ones available.

Of the 150,000 fathers, all but 50,000 are incapacitated. So we are actually talking about between 50,000 to no more than 100,000 persons capable of being trained for employment.

We must also understand that most poor people, or about 78 percent of the poor, get no welfare assistance at all, and are equally entitled to welfare or jobs, neither of which we are now providing. It is ironic that we talk of providing jobs for those on relief when we do not furnish enough jobs even for those not on relief but who qualify.

Despite public misinformation, relief standards do not encourage chiseling, laziness, or immorality. Most States do not meet their own standards in fixing benefits. For example, the maximum benefit to families with dependent children in January 1965 was less than the States' own minimum needs standards in over half the States.

The average monthly cash payments for those on public welfare was as follows:

Old-age assistance	$66.83
Blind, etc	86.10
Disabled	71.76
AFDC per person	35.63
General assistance	37.93

Attacks on welfare almost invariably concentrate on the symptoms of family desertion, neglected children, and illegitimacy. Such a welfare recipient becomes ipso facto immoral and unsuitable in the minds of most people, regardless of the rights of the needy child to receive legal assistance and protection. Public officials who do not hesitate to vote billions in subsidies to corporate interests feel politically safe if they satisfy their often misunderstanding constituents that they have voted against a welfare subsidy to immoral behavior, meaning, of course, the few highly publicized cases of unmarried couples in AFDC homes.

Instead of adopting a sound welfare policy, this Congress so far is moving toward the "good old days" of the poor law, the woodshed, and institutional care. A few years ago this country, including Federal officials, were shocked by the action of local officials in Newburgh, N.Y., who instituted a plan of limited assistance, rigid work requirements, and a prohibition against assistance to mothers bearing illegitimate children. Action of the House would make the Newburgh revolt against humanity a national policy.

There is but one sound approach for those who really want to reduce public welfare costs and caseloads: We must prevent the need that makes people seek public welfare in the first place. This means providing better jobs, better schools and health, and better community facilities for all.

It means improving our social insurance system to prevent predictable economic want, and not to harass and punish innocent persons as H.R. 12080 does. It means ending discriminatory practices that deprive millions of our citizens of equal rights to employment, housing, and education.

But on the way to achieving these essential objectives, this Congress can stop now the drive to deprive citizens of their basic rights and opportunities.

Let's Give the Thieu-Ky Ticket a Chance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SHERMAN LLOYD

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 21, 1967

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, we are subjected to a great deal of information indicating that the pending elections in Vietnam are rigged and controlled in such manner that they are totally lacking in credibility and that such a situation is further evidence that we should reconsider our decision in South Vietnam.

It is, therefore, encouraging to see an editorial such as the one issued in the Washington Sunday Star for August 20, 1967, which I submit here for broader distribution in the interests of balance.

The editorial follows:

LET'S GIVE THE THIEU-KY TICKET A CHANCE

The most unfavorably prejudged election in modern times is scheduled to be held in South Vietnam two weeks from today. It will be a minor miracle if it comes off even reasonably well.

This is so because of the calculated effort that is being made, in advance of the event, to pin a fraud tag on the balloting. There are various reasons and different motivations for this preelection smear campaign. But there can be only one end result—a discrediting of the election outcome and, perhaps designedly so, a weakening of the commitment by the United States to assist the South Vietnamese in their struggle against the Communists and the Viet Cong.

The detractors were in full cry in the United States Senate on August 11. Senator Robert F. Kennedy said there is "mounting and distressing evidence" that the Vietnamese presidential elections will not be freely and fairly conducted. If anything of this sort happens, said Senator Pastore, the United States should plan to get out of Vietnam. Senators Javits and Symington spoke up in similar vein.

When General Nguyen Van Thieu, head of the Vietnamese military government, urged Congress to send observers to watch the voting, our legislators threw up their hands in horror. Senators Mansfield and Dirksen would have none of it. Senator Kennedy said that sending observers was no "answer to the mounting evidence that the forthcoming elections in South Vietname already may have become fraudulent." He did not say what this "mounting evidence" consists of. Why bother? Sniping is easier than producing evidence.

It is difficult to understand this performance in our own Senate. Perhaps it can be attributed to a general sense of frustration and a disenchantment with President Johnson's conduct of the war. But this surely is no excuse for prejudgments which can only make it tougher for our side and which could help the enemy.

The probable motives of the Vietnamese civilian presidential candidates are less obscure. For in all probability they are going to lose the election, and they will be responsible for their own defeat.

The Thieu-Ky ticket probably would win the election in any circumstances. But its triumph was virtually assured when their civilian rivals fielded 10 teams of candidates, an act of political stupidity which was bound to divide the civilian vote to the benefit of the junta ticket. There were attempts to persuade some of the civilian hopefuls to step aside so the stronger candidates among them might fare better against the generals. This failed because each of the civilians insisted that he was the best of the lot. Consequently, facing defeat, the civilians, rather than confess an error of judgment, which no self-respecting Vietnamese politician would dream of doing, seem intent now upon discrediting the honesty of the election to explain their impending defeat.

What are some of their complaints? One is that Generals Thieu and Ky have not been willing to make campaign appearances with them. But when has a probable election winner been willing to help his losing opponent draw crowds? Another nitpicking gripe concerns a foul-up in flying 10 civilian candidates to a scheduled rally in the city of Quangtri. The pilot said the crosswind was too strong for a landing at Quangtri, and he put down at the small town of Dongha, some miles away. Finding no welcoming committee on hand, the candidates flew off in a huff, despite the fact that a convoy was on the way to take them to Quangtri. There is no proof that Generals Thieu and Ky connived in this, and our Ambassador in Saigon, Ellsworth Bunker, does not believe they did.

Perhaps the most substantial complaint has been made by Tran Van Huong, a leading civilian candidate. He has accused the Saigon military government of launching a "widespread campaign of intimidation" against his supporters. Huong, a former premier, told reporters that "ordinary peasants have told us about this, but they will not dare to admit it to you because they are terrified."

On the other side of the ledger, this appears: One of Huong's campaign managers told reporters he was "puzzled" by his candidate's statement. "Objectively speaking," said Doan Van Truong, a high school teacher, "there has been no government pressure or intimidation here at all." Truong heads a 42-man Huong campaign organization in Phongdinh province. He added that some incidents may have occurred in remote hamlets, but so far "I haven't heard of any."

Is this part of Senator Kennedy's "mounting and distressing evidence" of election fraud? If the New Yorker knows of anything more distressing, he ought to lay it on the line or stop talking in harmful generalities.

President Johnson, in our view, has also done his bit to help muddy the September 3 election waters.

On August 13 Clark Clifford, who, with General Maxwell Taylor, had gone to Saigon as representatives of the President, said they had delivered to General Thieu and Ky a stiff warning from the President against rigging the election. Any rigging, they quoted Johnson as saying, would be calculated to alienate the people of the United States. A few days later the President was said to be cautioning against raising "impossible standards" for the Vietnamese candidates to meet. Finally, on August 18, two days ago, it was disclosed that Johnson had warned South Vietnam's military leaders early in July that a fair and honest election next month is absolutely essential to continued American support of the South Vietnamese struggle for independence.

This sounds like Bobby Kennedy, though it probably was intended to show that President Johnson was in there pitching for a clean election long before Bobby got in his licks. In any event, unless Johnson really thinks the election is being rigged, his has not been a particularly helpful performance.

We think it would be a good thing if grown-ups with no axes of their own to grind would view the coming election in some perspective.

Let's keep several points in mind. A few months ago, despite pessimistic predictions and murderous obstruction by the Viet Cong, the South Vietnamese did elect a constituent assembly to draft a new constitution. The doubting Thomases were saying that the military would never accept a meaningful constitution. But a constitution was drafted.

and it was accepted. It is also worth remembering that Premier Ky, although many "observers" said it couldn't be done, crushed the Buddhist rioting inspired by the notorious Thich Tri Quang—the same Tri Quang who is threatening to lead his mobs into the streets once more if the generals win on September 3.

This is a record which should inspire some degree of confidence. Election "irregularities," as we should have learned long ago in our own country, are not an attribute peculiar to the Vietnamese. So why not suspend judgment and give the Thieu-Ky ticket a chance to show whether it can win because it is preferred by the South Vietnamese? If the election should be vitiated by fraud, we will know that soon enough.

Archie Moore Says Lawlessness No Answer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DELBERT L. LATTA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 21, 1967

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, Archie Moore, the retired light heavyweight boxing champion of the world, has spoken out against lawlessness in this country in a letter to the San Diego, Calif., Union. I believe his statement is one of the best I have read on this subject in recent weeks.

His statement follows:

LAWLESSNESS NO ANSWER: ARCHIE MOORE SPEAKS AGAINST HATE

(By Archie Moore)

(NOTE.—A little over 10 days ago the sports editor of the San Diego (Calif.) Union received a statement with the query, "What do you think of this?" The statement and query were from Archie Moore, retired light heavyweight boxing champion of the world. The sports editor liked the statement. So did Editor Herbert G. Klein and it appeared on Page 1 of the San Diego Union. In granting The Star reprint permission, Klein said that reader reaction in San Diego was amazing. "And," he added "if anyone wants to know, Archie Moore wrote the statement himself.")

The devil is at work in America, and it is up to us to drive him out. Snipers and looters, white or black, deserve no mercy. Those who would profit from their brother's misfortunes deserve no mercy, and those who would set fellow Americans upon each other deserve no mercy.

I'll fight the man who calls me an Uncle Tom. I have broken bread with heads of state, chatted with presidents and traveled all over the world. I was born in a ghetto, but I refused to stay there. I am a Negro, and proud to be one. I am also an American, and am proud of that.

The young people of today think they have a hard lot. They should have been around in the '30s when I was coming up in St. Louis. We had no way to go, but a lot of us made it. I became light heavyweight champion of the world. A neighbor kid down the block, Clark Terry, became one of the most famous jazz musicians in the world. There were doctors, lawyers and chiefs who came out of that ghetto. One of the top policemen in St. Louis come from our neighborhood.

BAIT FOR SIMPLE MINDED

We made it because we had a goal, and we were willing to work for it. Don't talk to me of your "guaranteed national income." Any fool knows that this is insanity. Do we bring those who worked to get ahead down to the level of those who never gave a damn? The world owes nobody—black or white—a living. God helps the man who helps himself!

Now then, don't get the idea that I didn't grow up hating the injustices of this world. I am a staunch advocate of the Negro revolution for the good of mankind. I've seen almost unbelievable progress made in the last handful of years. Do we want to become wild beasts bent only on revenge, looting and killing and laying America bare? Hate is bait, bait for the simple-minded.

Sure, I despised the whites who cheated me, but I used that feeling to make me push on. If you listen to the professional rabble-rousers, adhere to this idea of giving up everything you've gained in order to revenge yourself for the wrongs that were done to you in the past—then you'd better watch your neighbor, because he'll be looting your house next. Law and order is the only edge we have. No man is an island.

Granted, the Negro still has a long way to go to gain a fair shake with the white man in this country. But believe this: If we resort to lawlessness, the only thing we can hope for is civil war, untold bloodshed, and the end of our dreams.

We have to have a meeting of qualified men of both races. Mind you, I said qualified men, not some punk kid, ranting the catch phrases put in his mouth by some paid hate-monger. There are forces in the world today, forces bent upon the destruction of America, your America and mine. And while we're on the subject, do you doubt for a minute that communism, world communism, isn't waiting with bated breath for the black and white Americans to turn on each other full force? Do you want a chance for life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness in the land of your birth, or do you want no chance at all under the Red heel?

NOT 1 SQUARE INCH

There are members of the black community who call for a separate nation within America. Well, I do not intend to give up one square inch of America. I'm not going to be told I must live in a restricted area. Isn't that what we've all been fighting to overcome? And then there is the element that calls for a return to Africa.

For my part, Africa is a great place to visit, but I wouldn't want to live there. If the Irishmen want to go back to the Emerald Isle, let them. If the Slavs want to return to the Iron Curtain area, OK by me. But I'm not going to go to any part of Africa to live. I'm proud of ancestry, and of the country that spawned my forefathers, but I'm not giving up my country. I fought all my life to give my children what I'm able to give them today; a chance for development as citizens in the greatest country in the world.

I do not for a moment think that any truly responsible Negro wants anarchy. I don't think you'll find intelligent—no, let's rephrase that—mature Negroes running wild in the streets or sniping at total strangers. God made the white man as well as the black. True, we haven't acted as brothers in the past, but we are brothers. If we're to be so many Cains and Abels, that's our choice. We can't blame God for it.

Something must be done to reach the Negroes and the whites in the ghettos of this country, and I propose to do something.

ANY BOY CAN

As a matter of plain fact, I have been doing something for the past several years. I have been running a program which I call the ABC—Any Boy Can. By teaching our youth, black, white, yellow and red, what dignity is, what self respect is, what honor is, I have been able to obliterate juvenile delinquency in several areas.

I would now expand my program, change scope. If any boy can, surely any man can. I want to take teams of qualified people, top men in their fields, to the troubled areas of our cities. I know that the people who participated in the recent riots, who are participating and who will participate, are misguided rather than mad.

If some bigot can misguide, then I can guide. I've spent too much of my life building what I've got to put it to torch just to satisfy some ancient hatred of a man who beat my grandfather. Those men are long dead. Do we have to choke what could be a beautiful garden with weeds of hate? I say no! And I stand ready to start "Operation Gardener." I invite the respected Negro leaders of our country to join me.

The Individual Must Look at Himself: Radio Station WXLW Editorial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 21, 1967

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, as the following editorial by Robert D. Enoch, broadcast over station WXLW in Indianapolis, points out so clearly, much of the world and even in our country the dream and drive to be greater than we are has been lost. But as Mr. Enoch says, it does not take dollars for an individual to appraise himself. The full text of the editorial follows:

WXLW EDITORIAL, AUGUST 5, 1967

(By Robert D. Enoch)

Dr. William James, a brilliant psychologist, philosopher and lecturer, told students at Stanford University, in 1906, "The world is only beginning to see that the wealth of a nation consists more than anything else in the number of superior men that it harbors."

This was a wise man's appraisal of our world at the turn of the century. With that same century more than half gone, with the evolution of man and nations during those same years many tragic developments have occurred. Man as an individual has compromised his personal dreams, dedications and disciplines. He has accepted without continuing and constant resistance, being pushed into the colorless world of group identity and mediocrity. The superior man to which Dr. James referred was motivated by a sincere, deeply felt urge to find meaning to life—relevance, significance and usefulness. The individual of quality lifted his head above the drab, humdrum world about him to see the horizons fitting his abilities. His imagination and dreams played with the future possibilities, as he bent his back and will to the immediate tasks that would make those dreams come true.

There is nothing wrong with a man who is struggling to be greater than he is. But today in the world—yes—and tragically in America, we have lost too much of the dream and the drive to be greater than we are. We have sacrificed that dream and the individual cost of dedication to superiority for colorless mediocrity in group categories.

We as a nation are spending ourselves into chaos trying to do with dollars that which can only be done from within the individual. It does not take dollars for an individual to look into a mirror each morning for one minute of personal appraisal. It does not take dollars for that individual to have a heart to heart talk with the reflected image—and say, look friend, who are you? What are you doing here? Where must you go from here? What can you do today that will make you greater for having done it? Does greatness mean greater in spirit, mind and body or does it mean something less. It does not take dollars to get the answers to these questions. It takes only objective honesty.

The whole world—not just a few—live today in ghettos of colorless mediocrity, because they deny their own individual dream and dedication to the task of being greater today than they are.

A sense of values is totally personal and is not to be averaged or measured by ratios common to all humanities. We choose between truth and falsehood, fact and opinion, the real and the phony, the beautiful and the tawdry. These are but a few of the stepping stones to a sense of values.

What are your values worth to you? At the point where compromise colors your decision and determination there is the measure of your sense of values.

So—what does all this mean? Is it worth saying all? Yes, of course it is. If only one man in a high place of responsibility—or one man caught in a tawdry mire of nothingness will catch the spark of a new understanding of himself, then this will not have been wasted. But it depends on the individual—and nothing more. It is the difference between that which is constructive in our nation today and that which is destructive. It is the difference between a government of laws, supported by superior men and a government in the throes of anarchy, supported by group identified masses in conflict who have lost the dream of individuality.

Remember the words of Dr. William James "the wealth of a nation consists more than anything else in the number of superior men than it harbors." This was and must be again—America's greatest asset. This must be our task today—each of us as an individual—and we must begin by having our own serious discussion with that chap reflected in our mirror.

Kick Out Carmichael

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 21, 1967

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

[From the San Diego Union, Aug. 5, 1967]

KICK OUT CARMICHAEL

Incomprehensible is the word for the Administration's pussyfooting over the case of Stokely Carmichael, who is openly advocating overthrow of the United States of America from Communist Cuba.

Here is a man who has preached racism, hate and anarchy in the United States. Police officials have testified that riots have come in his wake.

Here is a man who defied the laws of his nation to travel to Communist nations.

Here is a man who appears with the chief exponent of communism in our hemisphere, Fidel Castro, to stoke subversion throughout the Americas.

Here is a man who advocates guerrilla warfare in the United States from the platform in Cuba; who verbally desecrates the honor of his nation abroad, and says of the nation in which he holds citizenship, "We are ready to destroy it from the inside."

And what does the Administration, for all intents, propose to do? Revoke his passport! It would be like asking Benedict Arnold to apologize.

Stokely Carmichael should first be deprived of his U.S. citizenship. If present laws are not adequate, Congress should pass new ones. If the U.S. Supreme Court opposes them, Congress should propose a constitutional amendment that would take care of all of the Stokely Carmichaels.

Then Carmichael should be deported to the West Indies from whence he came. If then he chose to live in Communist Cuba—excellent.

This would better punishment than a life sentence in a prison of a freedom-loving nation.

Riot Warnings Went Unheeded

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. E. (BILL) BROCK
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 21, 1967

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, a recent article by syndicated columnist David Lawrence has documented the fact that the Federal Government was warned, well in advance, of the blueprint of violence and destruction which has now been unleashed in major cities throughout America.

Tragically, the administration refused to listen to these warnings before the holocaust of looting, burning, and killing had already broken out.

In light of the significance of this material, and the lesson to be learned here, I am inserting it in the Appendix to the RECORD:

WASHINGTON IGNORED WARNING OF RIOTS 2 YEARS IN ADVANCE

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON.—The American people will have to decide in next year's presidential and congressional elections whether the Democratic Party has fulfilled its responsibility under law to maintain order in the country. Evidence is piling up that the administration as well as members of Congress were aware at least two years ago of the methods and planning which set in motion "demonstrations" that lead to violence.

Many people have forgotten what was printed two years ago as the cities where riots would occur were named in advance. Also the presence of Communists inside some of the organizations that sponsor "demonstrations" was noted in the press.

On April 27, 1965, for instance, Representative William L. Dickinson, Republican of Alabama, accused several civil rights leaders of links with the Communists or "Communist-front" groups, and complained that he had been denied access to information in the files of the Federal Bureau of Investigation about certain Negro leaders.

PRIOR KNOWLEDGE

Mr. Dickinson disclosed that more than a year before violence broke out in Selma, Ala., the United States Army had been fully informed about prospective disturbances and had issued instructions directing the 101st Airborne Division to develop a contingency plan for a possible "civil disturbance beyond the capability of local authority to handle." As early as 1963 officials in Selma were tipped off about a "demonstration" "of unheard-of proportions" to be held in October of that year, and individuals involved were named. It was averted then and postponed but, after the Selma disorders and the "march" to Montgomery had taken place, Mr. Dickinson asked in vain for a congressional investigation to see whether "this Communist front and these degenerate acts have been financed by your and my tax dollars."

In the spring of 1965, the U.S. Community Relations Service had labeled eleven cities as danger spots and sites of potential racial conflict. The cities designated were: Los Angeles, Oakland, Chicago, Detroit, Rochester, Boston, Gary, Cleveland, Philadelphia, Newark and New York.

There had been riots in 1964 in New York City, Philadelphia, Rochester, Jersey City, Paterson and Elizabeth, N.J., and Chicago suburbs—all of which began in a similar way. Some speeches were made in Congress denouncing the riots, and the usual charge of police "brutality" were voiced. A boom in arms sales was noted.

In the Los Angeles riot of August 1965, there were 36 persons killed. The injured numbered 895, including 93 peace officers, 45 firemen, 10 National Guardsmen and 747 civilians. More than a thousand buildings were burned, 209 of which were demolished. Fire damage alone was estimated at $175 million, with looting and vandalism adding many additional millions of dollars of damage.

Even after this heavy toll, neither Congress nor the Executive branch of the Government moved to inquire into the causes of the riots and the exact way in which they were provoked. The usual answer heard was that these were "spontaneous," but many members of Congress since have pointed to evidence that Communist agitators play a significant part in developing bitter feelings and instigating disturbances as crowds gather in the streets in connection with any protest "marches" or "demonstrations."

WASTED EFFORT

A grand jury in Cleveland reported just a year ago that the riots in that city were "organized and exploited" by a small group of "trained and disciplined professionals" and that they were aided by some individuals who "are either members or officers in the Communist Party." The grand jury, which was headed by Louis B. Seltzer, formerly editor of the Cleveland Press, spent seven days taking testimony from 40 witnesses. The report was discussed in Congress, but no action to avert similar disturbances has been taken.

Coincident with the riot era, many reforms and improvements have been instituted. Unfortunately, the leaders of protests are not content with what has been done or the progress made, but insist upon public "demonstrations" which are taken advantage of by malcontents.

What Could Israelis Teach Vietnamese?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 21, 1967

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article, entitled "What Could Israelis Teach Vietnamese?" from the San Deigo, Calif., Union of August 13, 1967:

WHAT COULD ISRAELIS TEACH VIETNAMESE?

(By Col. Irving Salomon)

(NOTE.—The author, a retired Chicago industrialist now living in San Diego, was a United States representative to the United Nations during the Eisenhower administration and served as a U.N. undersecretary.)

Some people attempt to contrast the Israeli success with the protracted conflict in Vietnam. In terms of terrain, objectives, ideology and local politics, obviously, many elements are not comparable. There are some that are. Israeli's victory last June was rooted in military foresight, excellent planning, superior army intelligence, dedication and esprit de corps.

Do these provide some basis for comparison? Is South Vietnam imbued with the same triumph of spirit and moral commitment as was Israel—fighting for its life and thus had to win?

Are the South Vietnamese as certain that their cause is right as were the Israelis?

Is there anything comparable to the Israeli pilots sleeping in their cockpits for five straight days and nights (for instant takeoff and to avoid being caught on the ground, as were the Arabs)?

What about the South Vietnamese officers? Do they remain in the rear as did the Egyptian officers, who issued their commands at safe distances? One of the reasons for Israel's success was that both commissioned and non-commissioned officers went ahead of their men, never commanded from the rear. This is evidenced by the fact that of the 700 Israelis who died and of thousands who were wounded, a noteworthy percentage was officers.

Enough for comparative references concerning Vietnam operations.

Here are a few other points, not commonly known, concerning the Mideast war, which were gathered from conversations with Clete Roberts, a Los Angeles TV newsman, and others who were on the ground during the conflict and since.

Unlike Egypt, the Jordanians were great fighters and King Hussein was with his troops. Unfortunately, Hussein fell into two traps set by Egyptian President Gamal Abdel Nasser. One, he signed the defense pact rather than accept the non-belligerency offer of Israel. Two, he was told by Nasser, after his air force was destroyed, that Egypt had control of the air and that it was safe to bring the Jordanian troops out of well-prepared defensive positions and to attack. Thus, King Hussein exposed his troops to strong attacks by Israeli forces and he lost 15,000 men.

Israel's civilian radio and news service issued situation reports a few hours after each event. The Arab central command, knowing of the Arab's habitual exaggerations, used the Israeli news service to obtain correct information of the war.

Three-quarters of the Israelis from 18 to 55 were called up; the women, children and older men voluntarily worked long hours to fill their places. Maintenance of essential services and the continuity of supplies became the major civilian task.

For example, with most postmen gone, children took over the post office. With nearly all trucks mobilized, and supplies to shops interrupted, housewives with a few old private cars transported bread from the bakeries, eggs from the farms, flour, etc., to the grocery stores. There was no hoarding of food.

In addition, the people gave unstintingly financially. With relatively few wealthy people, Israel collected $85 million from its citizens.

In fleeing, the Syrians left behind their army plans, which were captured by the Israelis. These outlined attacks to take place on May 28: Syria seizing Haifa, Jordan taking Israeli Jerusalem, and the Egyptians capturing Tel Aviv. Poison gas was to be used, if necessary, and of course the Russian armament, including their new offensive weapons.

Incidentally, it is now known that captured Soviet equipment consisted of some brand new devices, which have been made available for U.S. study. U.S. transport planes have picked up three of the captured MIG–21s for study. These are said to be more advanced than American fighter planes and are beginning to challenge U.S. pilots in Vietnam.

One of the biggest prizes for U.S. study was the SAM ground-to-air missiles, which were captured intact with computers, guidance and fueling systems. Their study will yield valuable information about Soviet weaponry, which may enable our ordnance experts to find ways and means to jam the guidance instructions. There was considerable other new military equipment, of which we have no counterpart, and, which Russia had not yet shipped to North Vietnam. So, the Israeli war will not only provide the U.S. with knowledge of Russia's new military potential, but also will create a greater U.S. awareness of Russia's formidable, inventive talent in weaponry.

There has been considerable discussion about the city of Jerusalem and its holy shrines. The Jordanians shelled the Israeli section of Jerusalem from their Old City, causing considerable civilian casualties, including scores who were killed.

On the other hand, Israeli maneuvers to counterattack on the Jordan side were lifted because of instructions to spare the holy places, almost all of which escaped undamaged. Thus, Israeli planes were not used in the Old City, which resulted in fierce hand-to-hand fighting and sniping, with heavy Israeli losses. This fact, together with capturing the greatest religious shrine of Judaism for 2,000 years, accounts for Israel's determination to keep all of Jerusalem. There also is the point that for 19 years Jordan denied Israel access to it, contrary to the U.N. decision.

For its part, Israel immediately recognized that Jerusalem was the Holy City for Christians and Moslems alike, and hastened to assure the Moslems of unrestricted ingress and egress, protection of revered properties and, of course, religious freedom.

It is reported that the question of the refugees is high on agenda for discussion. Israel is very conscious of this problem, now accentuated by the increased number of refugees, many located in the new territories which it controls. Israel is discussing funds that will provide for Arab employment in agriculture, crafts and industry.

Also, if the Arab rulers refuse to talk peace, Israel wants to begin on its own to prove that it can normalize the lives of its new Arab population. There is some discussion of constituting autonomous provinces for the Arab refugees under Israel, like Switzerland's cantons. The refugee problem will receive top priority, not only as a humanitarian act but, it is hoped, also to bring forth peace with Arab neighbors.

What about the Soviet Union? This time the new equipment supplied Egypt and its Arab Allies was being supported with Russian instructors. The Arabs do not know how to use the technical equipment used in today's warfare. The Russians know this; but they also know that they can drive the Arabs to the brink of war (but cannot prevent them from going over the brink). Russia will arm the Arabs to the hilt again and encourage them to go into battle. This is a part of the Soviet Union's plan to move into the Mideast and displace Britain and the United States, at any cost.

Castro's Spectacular Flop?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 21, 1967

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, an illuminating article on the recent Havana Conference by Francis L. McCarthy, UPI Latin American editor, indicates that Castro's latest Communist gathering was pretty much of a failure.

Mr. McCarthy notes that Moscow's disapproval of the conference was obvious and that the Soviet delegation almost walked out on several occasions.

In July of this year, the Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs, chaired by that outstanding and distinguished gentleman from Alabama, ARMISTEAD I. SELDEN, and, of which I am a member, issued a report on Communist activities in Latin America, 1967. The report, in commenting on the upcoming conference forecast that Castro might well feel that his position was strong enough to call his own revolutionary tune from Havana rather than rely primarily on the Soviet Union.

Events at the conference suggest this was what happened. Time will tell whether in widening the split in the international Communist world he ruptured the hemispheric Communist ranks as well.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. McCarthy's article was featured in the Times of the Americas on August 16, 1967, and I know it will be of interest to my colleagues.

The article follows:

LATEST FIDEL SPECTACULAR PLAYS TO MANY EMPTY SEATS: HAVANA CONFERENCE GIVEN SILENT TREATMENT BY REDS

(By Francis L. McCarthy)

The evidence indicates Cuban Premier Fidel Castro's latest communist spectacular was pretty much of a practical flop.

It delighted the communist world what with its denunciations of "Yankee imperialism" and two TV-type panel shows put on for delegates featuring self-styled U.S. "CIA agents." But at the same time it not only was an attendance fizzle but left most Latin American communists hopelessly confused as to their future course of action.

INCESSANT BICKERING

Almost as many newsmen—153—as delegates—164—attended the 11-day Latin American Solidarity Organization (LASO) conference. The meeting ended 48 hours behind schedule because of incessant bickering behind closed doors between rival factions.

Up to 800 delegates, observers and guests were predicted before the conference, but they failed to materialize. Less than half that number showed up, and Castro had to count the newsmen to make up that total.

Castro called the LASO conference to put over his new "third front" position—the theory that it takes activists in the field and not theoreticians in the cities to foment revoluion. The Soviets stood pat on their current line of "shifting positions to meet shifting conditions" and "peaceful coexistence."

CASTRO UPSTAGED

Castro invited U.S. black power advocate Stokely Carmichael to attend LASO and the result subordinated the Cuban premier to a secondary role in conference proceedings throughout. Castro got expected anti-U.S. propaganda mileage out of Carmichael, but the Trinidad-born Negro's fulminations were too far out for even the communists to stomach.

Moscow's disapproval of Castro's handling of LASO could hardly have been more pronounced. Pravda, Izvestia and Tass, the principal Soviet news media, gave LASO largely silent treatment. The presence of Carmichael in Havana was not even mentioned in the Soviet press.

The French Communist daily "L'Humanite" attacked LASO as "a small grouping of leftists (engaged in) violent anti-communist and anti-Soviet declarations."

EDITORIAL HOSTILITY

The same line of editorial hostility toward LASO was followed by the Communist press of eastern Europe. This French leftist weekly, "L'Express" editorially bemoaned the fact in dispatches from Havana that "great revolutionary hours" of the past were exhausted there "in dogmatic discussions."

Some of the hemisphere's largest Communist parties, those of Argentina, Brazil, and Venezuela, were not represented at Havana. Rump groups of those parties following the Castro line were present.

Conference newsmen reported "bitter wrangling" in the Havana closed-door sessions, with "Le Monde" of Paris reporting "violent controversy."

Le Monde said as a matter of fact that the pro-Soviet delegations at Havana considered a walkout on "several occasions" and noted that the closing days of the conference were marked by "increasing nervousness . . . and the prospect of a spectacular rupture" in hemisphere communist ranks.

All in all, LASO can be said not only to have widened the split in the international communist world but, quite possibly, to have perpetuated it in Latin America.

Statement of Hon. Lee H. Hamilton on Veterans' Pension and Readjustment Act of 1967

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 21, 1967

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to join with my colleagues in the Congress to help pass Veterans' Pension and Readjustment Act of 1967. This bill is a proper step to help all veterans and their families.

The bill provides an average overall cost-of-living rate increase of 5.4 percent for all veterans, their widows and children currently receiving pensions under Public Law 86-211, as amended. A substantial increase of 8.5 percent is granted to widows and widows with children in the lowest income categories.

Other sections of this legislation extend wartime benefits to those veterans who have served in the Armed Forces since August 5, 1964. There are also increased educational allowances for veterans receiving training under Public Law 89-358. Finally, there are changes in the laws governing guaranteed and direct loans for veterans of World War II and later wars.

What follows is a thorough summary of the bill prepared by the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs:

BENEFITS UNDER VETERANS' PENSION AND READJUSTMENT ACT OF 1967

PENSION PROVISIONS

Amounts of pension increase are outlined in the charts which appear below. Present rates are enclosed in parenthesis ( ), and new proposed rates are printed in roman.

VETERAN, NO DEPENDENTS[1][2]

Annual income other than pension: More than—	Annual income other than pension: But equal to or less than—	Monthly pension
	$600	$104 ($100)
$600	1,200	79 (75)
1,200	1,800	45 (43)

[1] Pension reduced to $30 after second full month of hospitalization or domiciliary care by the VA.

[2] Applicable rate increased by $100 per month for veterans who are patients in nursing homes or so helpless or blind as to require the regular aid and attendance of another person, or by $40 ($350) when veteran is permanently housebound because of severe physical disability.

VETERAN, WITH DEPENDENTS[1]

Annual income other than pension: More than—	Annual income other than pension: But equal to or less than—	Monthly pension: Veteran and one dependent	Monthly pension: Veteran and two dependents	Monthly pension: Veteran and three or more dependents
	$1,000	$109 ($105)	$114 ($110)	$119 ($115)
$1,000	2,000	84 (80)	84 (80)	84 (80)
2,000	3,000	50 (48)	50 (48)	50 (48)

[1] Applicable rate increased by $100 per month for veterans who are patients in nursing homes or so helpless or blind as to require the regular aid and attendance of another person, or by $40 ($35) when veteran is permanently housebound because of severe physical disability.

WIDOW, NO CHILD[1]

Annual income other than pension: More than—	Annual income other than pension: But equal to or less than—	Monthly pension
	$600	$70 ($64)
$600	1,200	51 (48)
1,200	1,800	29 (27)

[1] Payment to widow increased by $50 a month when she is so disabled as to require the regular aid and attendance of another person or is a patient in a nursing home.

WIDOW, ONE CHILD[1][2]

Annual income other than pension: More than—	Annual income other than pension: But equal to or less than—	Monthly pension
	$1,000	$86 ($80)
$1,000	2,000	67 (64)
2,000	3,000	45 (43)

[1] Plus $16 ($15) for each additional child.

[2] Payment to widow increased by $50 a month when she is so disabled as to require the regular aid and attendance of another person or is a patient in a nursing home.

NO WIDOW, ONE OR MORE CHILDREN

Annual income equal to or less than (earned income excluded)	Monthly pension
$1,800	$40 ($38) for one child and $16 ($15) for each additional child.

Pension increases for veterans and widows of Spanish-American War and prior wars

Widows of the Spanish-American War, Civil War and Indian Wars who have been receiving a pension of $65 a month will receive a basic pension payment of $70 a month and will be eligible to receive an additional $50 a month if a patient in a nursing home or if in need of the regular aid and attendance of another person.

Direct the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to pay aid and attendance veteran pensioners of Spanish-American War and Indian Wars under provisions of Public Law 86-211, as amended, where it would result in their receiving a higher pension payment. These veterans, if they have not elected to receive under provisions of Public Law 86-211, currently receive $135.45 monthly, but will be eligible to receive as much as $209 (in a case where the veteran's wife is still living and he has income other than pension of $1,000 a year or less).

Special provisions for veterans and widows with severe disabilities

Veterans who continue to receive pension payments under laws effective on or before June 30, 1960, because of failure to elect to receive pension under laws effective after that date, and who are housebound because of the severity of their disabilities but unable to qualify for the aid and attendance allowance, will receive pension in the amount of $100 a month. These veterans now receive $78.75 a month if on the pension rolls 10 or more years or if 65 years of age or older, or $66.15 if under age 65 or on pension rolls less than 10 years.

Widows of veterans of *all wars* will be eligible to receive a monthly allowance of $50, in addition to pension otherwise payable, if a patient in a nursing home or if in need of the regular aid and attendance of another person.

Veterans of *all wars*, now eligible to receive aid and attendance allowance only upon a showing that they were helpless or blind or so near helpless or blind as to require the regular aid and attendance of another person, will be presumed to be in need of regular aid and attendance if a patient in a public or private nursing home. This presumption also applies to widows in determining their eligibility to receive aid and attendance allowance discussed in paragraph immediately preceding.

Veterans who have attained the age of 65 years will be presumed to be totally and permanently disabled. These veterans must now be determined by VA to have a 10-percent disability.

The special allowance paid in addition to pension otherwise payable to veterans who are housebound because of the severity of their disabilities and who are receiving pension payment under provisions of law effective on and after July 1, 1960 (Public Law 86-211, as amended) is increased from $35 to $40 a month.

Permits the furnishing of therapeutic or rehabilitative devices, medical equipment and supplies (except medicine), when medically indicated, to veterans receiving pension based on the need for regular aid and attendance.

Requires the furnishing of drugs and medication to aid and attendance pensioners receiving payments of pension under provisions of law in effect on or before June 30, 1960.

Miscellaneous pension provisions

A widow or wife of a deceased veteran will be permitted to exclude amounts paid for the last illness and burial of a child of the veteran, when computing annual income for pension purposes. A widow will be permitted to exclude expenses of the veteran's last illness which she paid prior to his death.

Eligibility for pension is extended to veterans with service on or after August 5, 1964, and their widows and children, on the same basis as is now available to veterans of World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict.

Liberalizes marriage requirements for a widow of a veteran to receive pension. Present law requires that the widow be married to the veteran prior to certain specified dates applicable to each war period; *or* for 5 or more years; *or* for any period of time if a child was born of the marriage. This amendment changes the 5-year alternative requirement to 1 year, and clarifies the provision relative to a child born to the parties to the marriage.

ADDITIONAL BENEFITS FOR VETERANS ENTERING SERVICE DURING THE VIETNAM CONFLICT

Provides certain wartime benefits not previously granted to veterans who serve the Armed Forces beginning on or after August 5, 1964, and ending on a date to be determined by Presidential proclamation or concurrent resolution of the Congress, as follows:

(1) Disability compensation rates and dependency allowances for service-connected disabled veterans payable at the full wartime rate under all circumstances. Present law provides for payment of the wartime rate only when disability is incurred in line of duty "as a direct result of armed conflict" or "while engaged in extrahazardous service including such service under conditions simulating war," and if this condition is not met the rate is payable at 80 percent of the wartime rate.

(2) Eligibility extended for non-service-connected pension for veterans, their widows and children on the same basis as is presently available to veterans of World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict and their widows and children.

(3) Eligibility for payment of a burial allowance of $250 to survivors of deceased veterans.

(4) Extension of the presumption of service-connection of psychoses developing within 2 years following discharge, thus providing service-connected status for medical and hospital treatment.

(5) Miscellaneous medical benefits such as authorizing payments to State home for care provided veterans of this period and use of contract private beds in a Commonwealth or a Possession for non-service-connected conditions. The same type of care provided under contract in the Veterans' Memorial Hospital, Manila, Republic of the Philippines.

Provides for the following additional wartime benefit for veterans with service in the Armed Forces after January 31, 1955:

Authorizes an allowance of $1,600 toward purchase of an automobile for veterans who, as a direct result of the performance of military duty, have lost or lost the use of one or both feet, one or both hands, or who have suffered permanent impairment of vision in both eyes as defined in the law.

MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS APPLICABLE TO VETERANS OF WORLD WAR I, WORLD WAR II, THE KOREAN CONFLICT, OR SERVICE AFTER JANUARY 31, 1955

Permits payment of $47 per month statutory award for wartime service-connected disabled veterans suffering certain anatomical losses for *each* such anatomical loss, as specified in the law.

Requires the furnishing of drugs and medication to all aid and attendance pensioners and to service-connected disabled veterans receiving aid and attendance allowance for their service-connected disability but who are in need of drugs and medicine for treatment of a non-service-connected condition.

Permits the furnishing of a flag to eligible survivors of service men who died while in the service, after May 27, 1941, but his remains were lost at sea, or for some other reason not recovered.

PROVISIONS RELATED TO VETERANS' AND WAR ORPHANS' EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Increases educational allowance payable to veterans receiving benefits under provisions of the Veterans' Readjustment Benefits Act of 1966 (Public Law 89–358) as indicated in the table printed below. Present allowances are enclosed in parentheses and proposed new allowances are printed in roman.

Type of program	No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	Each dependent above two
Institutional:				
Full time	$130 ($100)	$155 ($125)	$175 ($150)	$10.00
Three-quarter time	95 (75)	115 (95)	135 (115)	7.00
Half-time	60 (50)	75 (65)	85 (75)	5.00
Cooperative [1]	105 (80)	125 (100)	145 (120)	7.00

[1] Full-time institutional training, with training in business or industrial establishment supplemental thereto or farm cooperative training.

The rate for persons on active duty or those pursuing a program of education on less than half-time basis is computed at a rate of established charges for tuition and fees which the educational institution requires of nonveteran students enrolled in the same program or $130 [*$100*] per month for a full-time course, whichever is the lesser.

Permit full educational benefits to be paid to "educationally disadvantaged" veterans so that they may complete high school without losing eligibility for college training. Time spent in pursuit of a high school course are not to be charged against the veteran's basic period of entitlement.

Provides for on-the-job, farm cooperative, and flight training for veterans pursuing an educational program as a result of eligibility accruing to them because of service in the Armed Forces beginning on or after February 1, 1955. Flight training is provided veterans who have valid private pilot licenses or equivalent in flight training hours and who meet medical requirements for a commercial pilot's license. Educational allowance computed at 90 percent of established charges for tuition and fees for nonveterans enrolled in the same flight training course, with $130 per month to equal 1 month of training eligibility.

On-job trainees will receive for the first 6 months: No dependents, $80; one dependent, $90; two or more dependents, $100. Payments are reduced in each succeeding 6-month period, up to and including the fourth such 6-month period.

Permits payment of an annual fee to educational institutions, based on peak enrollment, of veterans pursuing a course under provisions of Public Law 89–358, as amended.

Amends the War Orphans Educational Assistance Act by increasing the period of time during which training may be taken. Present law permits training between ages 18 and 23. This bill extends the 23-year limit to 26.

PROVISIONS RELATED TO HOUSING

Extends over-all delimiting date for entitlement of World War II veterans to a guaranteed direct loan or business loan from July 25, 1965, to July 25, 1970.

The Administrator may increase maximum allowable direct-housing loan from $17,500 to $25,000 in areas where he finds cost levels so require.

Food Stamp Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 21, 1967

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I wish to add my voice to those who have been calling for prompt action on S. 953, legislation which would extend the food stamp program.

This bill passed both Houses several weeks ago by substantial margins. However, the conferees have been unable to agree on a satisfactory resolution on the differences between the two versions. Thus, it now is far past the beginning of the new fiscal year, and this major program to help people improve their diets cannot move forward until final action is taken by the Congress. I think it imperative that we move quickly to enact this bill.

If I understand the situation correctly, the major disagreement involves the period of time over which the program will be extended. The House version provides for a 1-year extension, the Senate version for 3 years.

I wish to express my support for a 3-year bill. As I have followed the progress of this program and the debate on this legislation I have been impressed with the prudent and careful operation of the food stamp program since it was started. The House Agriculture Committee, in its April 12 report, commended the care with which the program has been organized and administered. I have heard many reports from my own district praising the program and the manner in which it is administered by local, State, and Federal agencies. The Department of Agriculture is to be commended for a job well done.

I do not understand, therefore, why it should be considered necessary by some to limit this program to 1 additional year. The food stamp program is not an experimental program. It went through a 3-year period of testing as a pilot program and has not completed a 3-year period under the Food Stamp Act of 1964.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard a lot recently about hunger in Mississippi and other States and about the need for effective programs to combat this problem. Within the framework of the basic legislation the food stamp program has recently been modified to make it an even more effective means of combating hunger and alleviating hunger wherever it exists throughout our country. Thus, we are now considering a program for which the major objective is helping people eat better, and yet, by delaying action on this legislation, we are preventing its expansion to areas where it is needed.

In addition, the successful implementation of a program of this type requires the cooperation of governmental agencies at all levels. State and local governments have major responsibility for the operation of the program at the local level, and they must have adequate time to provide the necessary financing, secure adequate facilities, and train personnel. By forcing the States to operate under the uncertainty of a year-to-year appropriation authorization, we endanger their ability to do the job expected of them. If the States have reasonable assurance that the program will be continued, they can proceed with careful and orderly planning, as they have done since 1964.

We must complete action on this bill without further delay. As I have indicated, I believe a second 3-year authorization is needed. However, I am prepared to support a 2-year extension if that is the only way we can avoid further delay.

Mr. Speaker, time is of the essence. I fervently hope that we will have the opportunity to complete floor action on this bill and send it to the President in the very near future.

"When This Country Falls to Communism, Where Can We Go?"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 21, 1967

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, last week I received a letter from Mrs. Guy Swift, of Garden Grove, Orange County, Calif., which sets out one of the finest examples to be followed by true American patriots. Mrs. Swift is a German immigrant, having suffered the terrors of naziism, and she is completely dedicated to the freedom provided under our constitutional form of government. She cannot understand why native-born Americans cannot see the perils of communism developing within this country. She rejoices that she had a place to come in order to escape the treachery of communism and naziism, and rightly asks, "When this country falls to communism where can we go?"

I do not believe this letter can be read without shedding a tear, and I urge that all Americans read the letter of this great immigrant and follow her example.

The letter follows:

GARDEN GROVE, CALIF.

DEAR SIR: I'm a new citizen of this country, and my family and I living in Orange County for 2½ years now, and I thought I would write you a letter.

I like to tell you that it is a shame that we have not a President like you. When we came to Orange County from Venice we did not know anybody here, but you have my husband's and my vote also my neighbors—I will see to that. I just finished the book, The Fearful Master. It took me a long time to read it because after reading several pages I'll get nauseous and had to put the book down. I remember the case of Mr. Albert Verbrughe well, it made headlines in all European papers.

Sir, I simply cannot understand it. This is such a great country one had to live some place else, to know, how can the people be so stupid, it seems to be a shame to pay all the taxes for schools when so many people are so ignorant.

Sir, I don't know what your stand is on us trading with the Communists. My husband and I think it's terrible. Our boys are getting killed by Russian bullets in Viet Nam, and our Government trading. So we took it upon ourself to see if we could get a petition signed, and see if this could be stopped. And what I found out complete shocked me. Russia would be thrilled to hear what conservative Orange County has to say. Some people didn't even know we were trading; other said we should; some haven't given it any thought; while still others had to think about it. Some even thought all Communists weren't our enemy, and how else could we make friends, as you could buy friends. Sir, if it weren't for innocent people who would suffer, I would say they deserve Communism. I would get so disgusted with people for being so stupid, and not knowing what's going on. Just from talking to them, you know, they don't read anything besides Dear Abby, and the Liberty Bell just got cracked in vain. Sir, the people of the Iron Country used to look to America for freedom when they get the chance to escape but if this trend keeps up, where will they go. There is no place left.

I had a man come up to me on the street thanking me for doing what I'm doing and praising me. I don't want praise, but it gives me courage again. It is no fun doing it but I take my babies, ages 3 and 2, and knock on everybody's door for a country that has been good to me, and I hate to see something happen to it.

Sir, the people still talk and ask me about those horrible Nazis (and there were), and how the German people could fall for Hitler, and I try to tell them that there is no difference between a Nazi and a Communist; that WW II is over, but the latter still here and they look at me like I was crazy.

I grew up in Nazi Germany and I know, and I think the same thing happen over there. By the time the German people woke up, it was too late to speak up, and the whole country was a disaster.

Sir, for the life of me, I cannot understand our Government condemning Rhodesia. The only thing those people want is the same America wanted in 1776. At least it's not biting the hands who has been feeding it, like India, the biggest receiver, and denouncing the United States. I was reading in the paper that you plan to go to Rhodesia soon, and money being collected for your trip. Sir, I don't have any money right now. My children (have) been in the hospital but I have Blue Chip Stamps book. I been saving for a clothes hamper. I will gladly send them. One is worth about 3 dollars, I understand.

Why is President Johnson giving the Panama Canal away? It seems to me, the American taxpayer should have something to say about this. Those people will turn around and probably give it to Russia or Cuba. After reading The Fearful Master, it may was not such a bad idea U Thant giving in to Nasser and pulling out of the Suez Canal the UN troops. Poor Israel may never have made it.

Sir, I think I took up enough of your time. Thank you for reading my letter. If your stand is for trading with the Communist, I just like to let you know I'm not doing this out of malice, because I still think if Russia don't have enough wheat to feed their Army, a hungry Army cannot fight, and from what I found out in the last couple of days, if they ever decided to harvest in the States, it won't be hard work because the crop is almost ripe.

Sincerely,

MRS. GUY SWIFT.

Oh, one more thing!

In case of a riot, whom should we call for protection? It used to be the police but, according to our Supreme Court, the poor policeman can only fire after he is shot dead. That word, Police Brutality, how nauseous. I'm glad they thought of something new. It's the rats now. There wouldn't be no rats, if they clean up after themselves. What is the policeman supposed to do when he sees a looter putting a Color TV in a 1967 Cadillac? Take down the license number and give it to Martin Luther King or Stokely Carmichael? If my husband was picked up for drinking (drunken) driving, I would say GOOD, let him sleep it off in jail, rather (than) being a menace on the highway. But I would not burn a country down I did not build. Since the police can't book them for a simple thing like murder or arson, maybe they should watch until they throw a match away and get them for littering and the judge thinks he is an earnest citizen and jails them. If a country would treat me as bad as they claim, maybe they should immigrate to a better place, like Russia. Of course, they could not burn or loot. Russia does not tolerate things like that, and I imagine they would have to work. I don't think they like freeloaders either—more so, if he drives a Cadillac, and is on Relief. We couldn't even afford to put the gas in one, and my poor husband works all the time. From what I have seen, white people bending over backwards to be nice, but they (are) not satisfied. How about doing something for themselves for a change? I agree with you—Blackmail.

Calif. had to bring in people from Mexico to harvest the crop. I saw no volunteer from Watts. Every year the people in Orange County plow strawberries under because of not enough help.

Sir, when WW II ended I was 10 years old. We didn't have nothing to eat, so my parents put me with people who had a farm. For six years from 5 in the morning until 10 or 11 at night, I worked for nothing, but I had food, and I felt lucky because many people didn't have that much. I did not grow up feeling that my ex-country owed me something. I think there are hungry people in America—they may be on a Diet.

I'm only here four years, my English is not too good yet. I taught myself to read and write, so please overlook the mistakes.

I did not intend this to be a book.

This Land of Ours

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 21, 1967

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, the Greyhound Corp. has published a significant patriotism brochure entitled "This Land of Ours," which is available to schoolchildren across the Nation, to civic organizations, and to private individuals. The free booklet is a notable effort to instill into American youth a knowledge of and a respect for our national heritage.

Encompassing the principles and traditions of our Nation's foundation, "Patriotism" is defined in this booklet as follows:

Proud of the heritage that has been carved out of history and passed along for you to nourish and to protect.

Alert to any hint of either aggression or subversion that threatens to wrest or wear away your rights and those of others.

Trusting in the faith that gave our founding fathers the strength and the wisdom to forge this land of ours.

Resolute in your refusal to compromise your fundamental freedoms for some fleeting promise or some easy answer.

Informed on the meaningful issues of the day, that you might exercise your precious voting rights with discretion.

Outraged at any injustice that dilutes the basic concept of the dignity and equality of all men.

Truthful in your relationships with others, for truth is the cornerstone of democracy; without it, the structure will crumble.

Involved in your government at all levels, making your voice heard on the vital issues that will shape America's destiny.

Sacrificing when sacrifice is called for, sure in the knowledge that the good of the nation far transcends any individual wants.

Moral in all your deeds and judgments, for without morality any triumph is a hollow, meaningless thing.

The Greyhound Corp. deserves recognition for this fine effort to promote responsible citizenship in these troubled times.

Is God Morally Intolerable?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JERRY L. PETTIS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 21, 1967

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, the decay and confusion that characterize so many of our social and moral traditions are distressing to discerning men and women because they realize that behind these changes is a crumbling or even a lost faith in God.

Dr. Wilbert Alexander, professor of theology at Andrews University in Michigan, delivered the baccalaureate sermon for the summer graduating class at Columbia Union College here in Washington.

In his address, entitled "The Post-Christian Christian," Dr. Alexander suggests a constructive role for Christians in this increasingly godless age. His concise, penetrating insights were stimulating to me and are, in my opinion, worthy of consideration by the people of America.

The Post-Christian Christian

(A baccalaureate sermon by Wilber Alexander, professor of theology, Andrews University)

At high noon on May 4 of this year forty men and a few women and children gathered together to celebrate Ascension Day, to remember the day of Christ's glorification. To one end of a long kite cord they attached some gas-inflated balloons, and to the other end of the cord they fastened a weirdly constructed paper and cardboard effigy of Christ. At the stroke of twelve the group began a sardonic space-age-like countdown beginning at the number one-hundred. As the count reached one, the shouting rose in pitch; and with a raucous cry of "Zero" and "Blast-Off" the group loosed the balloons, and the crude "Christ" began to rise. A curious bystander was unable to get the significance of the burlesque celebration at all until he heard one of the men say as the balloons ascended, "Ye men of Galilee, why do you stand looking into heaven? This Jesus who was taken up from you into heaven will come in the same way as you saw him go into heaven."

According to the report given in the news media covering the grotesque event, there were no militant atheists in the group, no members of the "Red guard," no hippies on an LSD kick. The incident took place on the campus of a well-known seminary and was conducted by seminary students.

It is no longer necessary to make generalizations from an extreme example of anti-Christian reaction to the Christion ethic and way of life in order to reflect the negative attitude of the western world towards Christianity. It is possible to select enough evidence at random ease to draw a conclusion the world has been drawing for a number of centuries, a conclusion that the church is fearfully beginning to admit: We are living in a post-Christian age!

It is being said, if somewhat reluctantly, that 1967 graduates from Christian colleges will be moving out from cloistered campuses and sheltering homes into a non-Christian world. According to some critics this is really no way to speak to a group of bright, idealistic, young hopefuls. Increasingly so each year commencement speakers are urged to refrain from telling graduating classes that the world is a "mess" or that they are a "mess" and certainly not that the two "messes" deserve each other and must now get on the best they can. The fact is that the alert graduating senior today already senses that most of the world about him lives practically and precisely as though there were no God, as though Christianity no longer offered any living options or imperatives.

The most serious question facing the graduate of a Christian college, or any college, both for himself and the world he will soon attempt to influence, is the question Jesus Christ raised, "When the Son of Man comes will He find faith in the earth?"

At this point in human history when the world is so needful of a faith of almost any kind, and at the point when Christian faith appears to be so expendable, the natural and correlate questions which a concerned graduate must ask and help answer are: "How has our world, our 'Christian nation,' come by its post-Christian thinking and living?" and "What is the role of the post-Christian Christian to be just now?"

From what we can discover in the history of thought which projects the present situation, it appears that by a slow, subtle, secularization process man has moved from a strong theistic faith to a strong nihilistic non-faith.

There was a time when man believed in the existence of an Eternal rational order from which he could deduce or receive ongoing directions toward truth and values for his world. With a firm belief in God and the Scriptures man had a context for a total world view in which he might integrate and relate all areas of his life and knowledge toward meaningful living. But during an age of irrational rationalism and humanistic scientism "modern man" let go of a theological world view and began to live out of his own subjective self. Man has become the measure of all things. The finite has taken over the infinite.

Under the influence of empiricism and scientism a practical atheism and agnosticism developed so that in this post-Christian era post-Christian men are saying: 1) God is intellectually superfluous; 2) God is emotionally dispensable; 3) God is morally intolerable.

These pronouncements are intended to say intellectually that while no one has disproved the "God hypothesis," it is dying "the death of a thousand qualifications," and further that the God hypothesis is irrelevant for the practical business of living; to say that emotionally man is discovering that he no longer needs a heavenly bosom or a father figure; for he is well able to live without a metaphysical prop, since he has discovered a chemical prop or a people prop for his "peace that passets understanding;" to say indignantly that a God who allows or causes Vietnam and leukemia is morally intolerable.

The secular man who has rejected the "God hypothesis" and who has moved beyond the Christian ethic is left to himself and is now a practicing "existentialist." In its simplest form existentialism is seen in the playboyism of America, in the loyal subjects of the "kingdom of kicks" who look for life in the raw—not in the hunger and hurt of a sick world but in the fold-out playmate of the month with a staple through her navel. In its extreme form existentialism is seen in the nihilistic philosophy of the hippy who sees himself as an accidental collocation of atoms living out the idiocy between his birth and death.

So it is that secular men in secular cities are living out their days without God and without hope in the world. What is the role of the post-Christian Christian to be?

First he needs to repent. He needs to acknowledge that he has become affected and infected by the secular world. He needs to listen to his own paradoxology, "My hope is built on less and less." He must experience God not as Ground of Being but as Personal God confronting personal man. He must believe in and respond to Christ not only as the model "Man for Others" but as He is fully revealed in Scripture to be man's Saviour. He must see the Holy Spirit not as a "Ghost" or a theology of the unmanageable but as the Spirit of God who is here to teach, guide, strengthen, and use in the work God is doing in His world.

Second the post-Christian Christian needs to come to grips with his own "isms"—his pharisaical legalism, his scientific obscurantism, his pietistic provincialism and isolationism, his conspicuous absenteeism from the ghetto and the university alike.

Third the post-Christian Christian needs to take most seriously the challenge of Camus:

"What the world expects of Christians is that Christians should speak out loud and clear, and that they should voice their condemnations in such a way that never a doubt, never the slightest doubt could rise in the heart of the simplest man. They should get away from abstraction and confront the bloodstained face history has taken on today. The group we need is a group of men resolved to speak out clearly and to pay up personally. We are still waiting. . . ."

At Dartmouth college there is a mural which Orozco daubed on the walls of Baker library in a single night. Lying on a gigantic delivery table is a colossal mother skeleton. The delivery table is made up of great books, tremendous tomes. The attending obstetrician is a skeleton clothed in an academic gown with appropriate mortarboard. He has just delivered a tiny skeleton which he holds in his hands with meticulous care. The little skeleton wears a mortarboard too. In the foreground are glass domed jars, each containing a tiny skeleton with his mortarboard—stillborn ideas, students delivered from the mother skeleton, the university. In the background are several figures in cap and gown, representing the educational institutions of the world; and behind them in flaming red are the fires of a world consumed by greed, revolution, and war. At first it seems as if the painter is making a cynical thrust at education, an education that yielded big heads full of cold brains, but this mural was intended to be an agonized plea for a creative, constructive, consecrated use of knowledge.

There is always the gnawing fear in the heart of a parent, teacher, or friend that under these mortarboards there are potential skeletons with lifeless, dry bone lives and skulls full of cold, unconcerned brains. Fear, lest these hopeful young scholars go from ivy halls only to become part of a flabby, soft, adjusted, satisfied, confused, decadent and dying post-Christian society. Fear that they will never be fully committed to Christ, never know the depths of life in the Spirit; fear that they never will be crucified for Christ's sake. Fear that they will never give a positive answer to the question of Christ, "Will the Son of Man find faith? . . ."

So it is that at commencement times we cannot resist making a final plea for this creative, constructive and consecrated use of knowledge. In this meaningful moment of consecration those here who love you call you to a mature, growing discontent with the post-Christian thought and life about you—to a thoughtful indignation where needed. They call you to an awareness of the crippling weaknesses within your church and yourself, to an involvement in ever seeking a possible better rather than in being content with an actual worse. You are challenged to a ready recognition and rejection of that which is not worthy of you and to a wholehearted post-Christian Christian devotion and witness.

Advice From the Sage of Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 21, 1967

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, the citizens of our great common country, regardless of race, creed, color, religion, or previous condition of servitude, are vitally concerned about what is going on in this country in this matter of racial riots, which has reached the proportion of anarchy. There are sharp divisions of opinion as to the cause and the cure therefor. Unfortunately, a considerable proportion of the division is brought about by political considerations. This, of course, is particularly true among public officials here in the Nation's Capital.

My attention has been called to an article which appeared in the Fauquier Democrat, a highly respected newspaper in Virginia, written by one who is now disassociated with politics and one who, because of his former service in this body for some 36 years, is eminently qualified to objectively approach this subject. I refer to the former chairman of the House Rules Committee, a man of substantial wisdom, of unexcelled patriotism, and dedication to our great common country, "Judge" Howard W. Smith. Judge Smith, from his ancestral home in Broad Run, Va., has evaluated the situation and reduced his analysis of the problem and the answer thereto in a letter he sent to the Fauquier Democrat.

In view of the high regard in which Judge Smith is held in this body, the stature that he enjoys as an elder statesman throughout the country, I am exercising the privilege of having the article inserted in the RECORD so that it will rereive wider circulation and, I hope, will be seriously considered not only by the Congress but by the President and other people in the higher echelons of Government.

The article follows:

JUDGE SMITH WRITES: WHAT TO DO IN "A DANGEROUS TIME IN THE LIFE OF OUR NATION"

(By Howard W. Smith)

BROAD RUN, VA.—Having been a Member of the Congress in 18 consecutive terms, beginning with the year 1930, in the early stages of the Great Depression which so drastically changed our whole system of democratic government, I have been a close observer for more than a third of a century of every branch of our democratic system of government.

I have participated in much of the revolutionary changes that have overtaken us. I have noted with dismay and anguish the surrender to the inordinate demands of minority groups in the country, yielding to their demands and too often encouraging their growth and power by actions or inactions in times of stress.

In a way, all of it has been a part of worldwide unrest and period of revolutionary spirit that has pervaded the human race throughout a period of such great advancement in science, in economic growth, and education that we all feel puzzled at what might be the underlying reasons and the remedies for the situation that exists, both at home and abroad—a situation in which we have taken a part that has appeared to some of us entirely beyond our government functions as a nation in connection with our foreign affairs and our domestic difficulties.

I fear that we have now reached a dangerous time in the life of our nation where we are faced with an incipient revolution in our own homeland that takes on a spirit of anarchy that must be dealt with firmly, patiently, and with all the joint and combined wisdom that we can command.

It seems to me that all of us in America ought to be willing to realize that we are all in it together, that we will accomplish nothing by trying to shift the responsibility from one political party to another, and from one segment of the country to another, but should devote our efforts to meeting the situation as it exists today.

Many of us remember the pronouncement of Winston Churchill when in the hour of Britain's greatest peril and danger, he took charge as Prime Minister, and in his first public statement said in effect, "If we use the present precious hours to quarrel with the past, we may lose the future."

It seems to me that those words are particularly appropriate to the present crisis in America. The future success or failure of any political party, or any political officeholder, fades into insignificance beside the crisis that has been brought upon us by whatever causes or deficiencies we may have had in our differing views about how this situation should have been handled.

If there ever was a time when we should forget past differences and fix our minds upon the solution of a problem that is becoming more serious daily, this is that time.

We are confronted with an unprecedented phenomenon, something that is new, different, dangerous and distressing in our system of democratic government. But as one who has no official responsibility, seeks no public office at the hands of the voters, no axe to grind—political or otherwise—and only a superficial knowledge of what is going on, it seems to me that I am eminently qualified to offer some sage, useful suggestions.

1) Stop passing the political buck. Postpone the election campaign until 1968. This is 1967 and a lot of things are going to happen between now and the election of 1968.

2) Persuade the television system of the country to cease giving the militant scalawags, revolutionaries, demagogues, and traitors equal time—and sometimes more—than the President of the United States or any other important public official.

Any militant Negro revolutionists of the type of the Rap Browns and the Carmichaels know that if he can pick up some vicious language with which to denounce his country and urge the overthrow of it by force, and yells into the mouth of the television camera his intention to induce his people to burn their cities and overthrow their government by force and violence, he can have every television station in the country eager to display his ugly, contorted features, and his vicious, traitorous and criminal denunciations. Cut them off from their television appearances and you have cut them off from their greatest source of doing mischief.

3) Gas bombs and Molotov cocktails are homemade weapons by which the great conflagrations, that have taken place in the cities, are set off. They are made, designed and used purely for criminal purposes. If we do not have a law against them, pass one quick and enforce it. Fix severe penalties for anyone who makes, possesses or uses these incendiary weapons.

4) The sneaky sniper who conceal themselves on the rooftops and shoot indiscriminately into the streets during these upheavals should be shot on sight and, if captured, should be prosecuted for murder or attempted murder, and held for trial without bail.

5) Make use of the information in the secret files of the F.B.I. I believe that many people in public life have knowledge of some of the information that the F.B.I. has obtained by various methods concerning subversives, concerning the Negro revolution so to speak, and the connection between them and the Communists.

That information should be at least in the hands of people in the government who could use it to advantage in determining what is back of the Negro revolution.

Few people will believe that these riots and burnings and disturbances are organized by the local Negroes themselves. They are not characteristic of the American Negro. There is too much planning, too much concerted action to be spontaneous.

And where is the money coming from to support these revolutionists? We should know so that we would be in a better position to form a judgment about where the trouble lies.

6) Stop trying to find excuses for criminals who participate in the mob violence that seek to burn, destroy, and loot the cities of our land, and deal with them for what they are. Enforce existing laws, instead of shedding crocodile tears for the lawless.

Start using the laws already on the books. Section 2385 of Title 18 of the U.C. Criminal Code would be a good place to start. That law makes it a felony with long terms of prison for any person who advocates or urges others to attempt the destruction of any unit of government, national, state or local, by force or violence.

A Dangerous Answer to U.S. Riot Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 21, 1967

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an outstanding column from the August 13, 1967, issue of the Sioux Falls, S. Dak., Argus-Leader, which, in my judgment, is most thought provoking.

The column is written by Fred Christopherson, for many years editor of South Dakota's largest daily newspaper, a man whose sage columns have molded thought in the Middle West for a quarter of a century. This column should be read by every Member of Congress, by every employee in the executive department, and by the public across the Nation.

The article follows:

A DANGEROUS ANSWER TO U.S. RIOT PROBLEM

"Today's Chuckle" is a delightful bit of nonsense that appears regularly on page one of the Argus-Leader. One day last week, however, its theme was neither humorous nor nonsensical. It was instead a capsule of penetrating philosophy in a few lines.

Here it is: "Why bother to climb the ladder of success? Wait awhile and the government will probably build you an escalator."

With perhaps a wry sense of the fitness of things, the news editor placed close to it an Associated Press dispatch from Washington about a frenzied demand for an immediate appropriation of $1,000,000,000 in federal funds to be spent in the riot areas of American cities.

The sponsors of the proposal were Sens. Abraham A. Ribicoff, Democrat of Connecticut, and Charley H. Percy, Republican of Illinois.

The billion dollars, they insisted, should be made available at once so that President Johnson could distribute it to the primary places where Negro tension has developed.

Ribicoff and Percy said nothing about climbing a ladder. And perhaps they weren't thinking about an escalator. But the author of the "Today's Chuckle" placed in proper proportion the significance of their proposal.

DON'T BLAME OTHERS

Well worthy of thought was the gist of a letter in Time Magazine last week. The author was Winnie May Boston of St. Louis, a Negro widow. She discussed the rioting and destruction in the Negro section where she lives.

"The truth is," she wrote, "I don't have anything to fear from the white folks but the colored boy hoodlums in my neighborhood scare me to death. You might as well be living in the Congo. The white folks in neighborhood stores where you get a little credit have moved and are moving away and property is not kept up and is ruined. I have to say we Negroes did it all. We destroyed a fine neighborhood that others built. We got to quit blaming others and depending on the government and expecting miracles overnight and now we got to work ourselves up. It's up to us and it's going to take time."

THE WRONG CONCEPT

Another potent contribution to thought on the subject was a Washington dispatch in the Des Moines Register written by Richard Wilson, an able and experienced observer of the national scene.

"If the hysteria-prone advocates of multibillion dollar programs to rebuild America's cities will stop screaming long enough," he said, "they can learn much from some simple facts which are now being disclosed in Congress. Nothing being disclosed would give the slightest color to the concept that billions spent for new housing, for rat control, for guaranteed annual incomes, for new schools or for aid to dependent children would prevent revolutionary agitation leading to rioting . . . Violence and hate are fanned by extremists whose chief concern is a political, economic and social revolution."

U.S. DOLLARS FOMENT HATE

It was revealed explicitly last week that federal funds had been employed in a Nashville, Tenn., educational venture where Negro children were being taught to hate the whites.

The charge was at first denied by the Rev. J. Parschall Davis, chairman of the Nashville poverty program. But the evidence of the federal expenditure was direct and specific. So he supplemented his first statement of denial—a step he couldn't avoid taking if he wanted to get away from a charge of perjury. Yes, he finally told the McClellan committee in Washington, poverty funds were utilized to assist in the financing of the hate school.

It would be well to await the findings of the McClellan committee. Sen. Karl Mundt of South Dakota is a member of it. The committee already has made progress and seemingly is not blinded as are so many other agencies in Washington when this subject is being discussed.

LOSING THEIR COOL

What is disturbing in the reaction of some persons in Washington, such as that indicated in the proposal by Sens. Ribicoff and Percy, is the fear that Washington has lost its cool in the excitement of the moment. In the process it is doing precisely what it shouldn't do. It is proposing steps that are in effect a reward for the looters, the arsonists and the murderers.

If we are to have order—a fundamental requirement in a civilized society—we must penalize those who flout the law. If we fail to do so, we invite disorder, rioting and contempt for the government.

There are in Washington, one must hope, enough persons who can retain their heads when many about them are losing theirs.

Archie Moore Speaks Against Hate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 21, 1967

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I was very pleased to read in the Sunday Star, Washington, D.C., a very patriotic and moving article by retired boxing champion Archie Moore, who says lawlessness means bloodshed, not progress, for our Negro citizens. Today I would like to salute Archie Moore by placing his story in the RECORD. I am proud to be his fellow American. The story follows:

ARCHIE MOORE SPEAKS AGAINST HATE

(By Archie Moore)

The devil is at work in America, and it is up to us to drive him out. Snipers and looters, white or black, deserve no mercy. Those who would profit from their brother's misfortunes deserve no mercy, and those who would set fellow Americans upon each other deserve no mercy.

I'll fight the man who calls me an Uncle Tom. I have broken bread with heads of state, chatted with presidents and traveled all over the world. I was born in a ghetto, but I refused to stay there. I am a Negro, and proud to be one. I am also an American, and am proud of that.

The young people of today think they have a hard lot. They should have been around in the '30s when I was coming up in St. Louis. We had no way to go, but a lot of us made it. I became light heavyweight champion of the world. A neighbor kid down the block, Clark Terry, became one of the most famous jazz musicians in the world. There were doctors, lawyers and chiefs who came out of that ghetto. One of the top policemen in St. Louis came from our neighborhood.

BAIT FOR SIMPLE-MINDED

We made it because we had a goal, and we were willing to work for it. Don't talk to me of your "guaranteed national income." Any fool knows that this is insanity. Do we bring those who worked to get ahead down to the level of those who never gave a damn? The world owes nobody—black or white—a living. God helps the man who helps himself!

Now then, don't get the idea that I didn't grow up hating the injustices of this world. I am a staunch advocate of the Negro revolution for the good of mankind. I've seen almost unbelievable progress made in the last handful of years. Do we want to become wild beasts bent only on revenge, looting and killing and laying America bare? Hate is bait, bait for the simple-minded.

Sure, I despised the whites who cheated me, but I used that feeling to make me push on. If you listen to the professional rabblerousers, adhere to this idea of giving up everything you've gained in order to revenge yourself for the wrongs that were done to you in the past—then you'd better watch your neighbor, because he'll be looting your house next. Law and order is the only edge we have. No man is an island.

Granted, the Negro still has a long way to go to gain a fair shake with the white man in this country. But believe this: If we resort to lawlessness, the only thing we can hope for is civil war, untold bloodshed, and the end of our dreams.

We have to have a meeting of qualified men of both races. Mind you, I said qualified men, not some punk kid, ranting the catch phrases put in his mouth by some paid hate-monger. There are forces in the world today, forces bent upon the destruction of America, your America and mine. And while we're on the subject, do you doubt for a minute that communism, world communism, isn't waiting with bated breath for the black and white Americans to turn on each other full force? Do you want a chance for life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness in the land of your birth, or do you want no chance at all under the Red heel?

NOT ONE SQUARE INCH

There are members of the black community who call for a separate nation within America. Well, I do not intend to give up one square inch of America. I'm not going to be told I must live in a restricted area. Isn't that what we've all been fighting to overcome? And then there is the element that calls for a return to Africa.

For my part, Africa is a great place to visit, but I wouldn't want to live there. If the Irishmen want to go back to the Emerald Isle, let them. If the Slavs want to return to the Iron Curtain area, OK by me. But I'm not going to go to any part of Africa to live. I'm proud of my ancestry, and of the country that spawned my forefathers, but I'm not giving up my country. I fought all my life to give my children what I'm able to give them today; a chance for development as citizens in the greatest country in the world.

I do not for a moment think that any truly responsible Negro wants anarchy. I don't think you'll find intelligent—no, let's rephrase that—mature Negroes running wild in the streets or sniping at total strangers. God made the white man as well as the black. True, we haven't acted as brothers in the past, but we are brothers. If we're to be so many Cains and Abels, that's our choice. We can't blame God for it.

Something must be done to reach the Negroes and the whites in the ghettos of this country, and I propose to do something.

"ANY BOY CAN"

As a matter of plain fact, I have been doing something for the past several years. I have been running a program which I call the ABC—Any Boy Can. By teaching our youth, black, white, yellow and red, what dignity is, what self respect is, what honor is, I have been able to obliterate juvenile delinquency in several areas.

I would now expand my program, change scope. If any boy can, surely any man can. I want to take teams of qualified people, top men in their fields, to the troubled areas of our cities. I know that the people who participated in the recent riots, who are participating and who will participate, are misguided rather than mad.

If some bigot can misguide, then I can guide. I've spent too much of my life building what I've got to put it to the torch just to satisfy some ancient hatred of a man who beat my grandfather. Those men are long dead. Do we have to choke what could be a beautiful garden with weeds of hate? I say NO! And I stand ready to start "Operation Gardener." I invite the respected Negro leaders of our country to join me.

Problems in Perspective

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 21, 1967

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Aug. 21, 1967]

PROBLEMS IN PERSPECTIVE

In this time of troubles it's easy to get the picture of America badly out of whack. Manifestly, much of the world is seeing a distorted image, but some Americans are also exaggerating the ills.

Don't misunderstand us; we aren't trying to minimize anything. For all we can certainly tell, both the racial crisis and the war in Vietnam may be developing, as is occasionally argued, into national disasters. It seems entirely possible, too, that the makings of an economic breakdown may lie in the incredibly loose financial policies of the present Government.

And a large part of such pessimism as there is, we think, stems from a feeling that the problems appear at once insoluble and unnecessary.

We have never believed, for example, that the agitators, criminals and black racists responsible for the riots represent anything but a tiny fraction of the Negro community. Most Negroes would have been willing, and we hope still are, to deal with their difficulties in peace and order, especially in a country where public opinion and public policy are on their side.

Merely to cite those facts already begins to restore a bit of the perspective: The riots prove how much havoc a few evil men can wreak; they do not define the temperament of a whole group. That the law and the people generally favor the improvement of Negro conditions gives the lie to the vicious propaganda that the U.S. is a nation where the majority is bent on repression of the minorities.

Similar comments can be made about Vietnam. Probably many Americans, maybe most, fervently wish that two and a half years ago the Administration had decided against, instead of for, a large-scale commitment of American forces to a land war in Asia. In that event South Vietnam presumably would have been lost, but the U.S. would not be in this predicament of beng bled in a seemingly unwinnable war. It is a predicament which must be causing a great deal of contentment in Moscow and Peking.

We suspect that more Americans would be doves today if they did not assume that the consequences of withdrawal would be worse than the admitted agonies of involvement. Even today, as America's casualties begin to exceed South Vietnam's, more people must be wondering if the price is not becoming exorbitant.

Yet it is simply not true, though much of the world and some of the dissenters at home are determined to believe it, that the U.S. is in Vietnam for some sadistic purpose of repressing a small Asian land. One of the tragic ironies in the whole mess is that the U.S. went in with the best of intentions, to try to save millions of Asians from communism and check the territorial ambitions of Red China. It is significant that the U.S. has the support of most of the nations in the area, Asian and non-Asian alike.

In any case, and remote as it seems now, the war will end, somehow. Officials in Saigon may talk of its possibly dragging on for decades, but we don't think the American people will stand for that. Not this war, with its heavy burden of sorrow and its small prospect of gain for the national interest.

The problems of race, poverty and war inevitably interact on each other economically, causing severe strains in the Federal budget and elsewhere. It is hard to be even faintly optimistic about that, since it seems only too possible that the nation is in for years of uncontrollable deficits and inflation, despite constantly rising taxes.

In the meantime, however, the great bulk of the population continues to live normally, busy at their jobs or taking or thinking of vacations, involved in family and local matters. They are prosperous and in many ways it is still the good life. While they naturally don't like the violence in the slums and in Vietnam, most Americans are as yet not directly affected by it, and find it feasible to go on as though the disorders did not exist.

We do not necessarily dispute Senator Fulbright's contention that the Great Society has become a sick society; at least, there is plenty of sickness in it and in time it may get worse. All we say is that there are also grounds for confidence, for which reason it is premature to decree the end of the American dream.

So it isn't playing Pollyanna to try to put the problems in perspective. On the contrary, it is essential if they are to be understood and if intelligent efforts are to be made toward a better future.

On 4-Year Terms for the JCS

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 21, 1967

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to bring to the attention of my colleagues a very forthright and lucid article which appeared in the Navy magazine, June 1967, in support of a statutory term of 4 years for the members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

I might note the article was written while the bill was on the President's desk. It has since been signed into law.

The Navy magazine editorial follows:

ON 4-YEAR TERMS FOR THE JCS

The passage of legislation by Congress to make mandatory the appointment of service members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff for four-year terms properly belongs in the "striking-a-blow-for-freedom" class. It is eminently sensible and logical. One of the chiefs, the Commandant of the U.S. Marine Corps, is already appointed for four years. It is an action long overdue. The fact that even the powerful Carl Vinson, when he was Chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, could not get such a bill through Congress because of heavy White House and Pentagon opposition, speaks well for the generalship of L. Mendel Rivers, his successor and the man largely responsible for getting the job done.

Designed to promote fuller and freer testimony on the part of the Joint Chiefs when they appear before congressional committees, the legislation is the first substantial action to upgrade the prestige and self-respect of the nation's top military officers since the Department of Defense was created 20 years ago.

Pentagon opponents of four-year terms—they want to continue the present two-year tours for the Army and Air Force Chiefs of Staff and the Chief of Naval Operations—say that the congressional rationale for the change is a reflection upon these officers. Presumably they mean an adverse reflection. If this is so, it is unfortunate. But these opponents can hardly argue that the Chiefs today feel free—within security limitations—to testify fully and with complete frankness. Anyone who has ever read a transcript of a hearing at which a Chief testified is struck by instances of evasiveness, of carefully phrased responses which make more difficult the uncovering of situations embarrassing to his civilian superiors, of the use of euphemisms.

Many Congressmen recognize the restraints and restrictions the Chiefs must operate under when they appear as Pentagon witnesses and, accordingly, are often charitable. But Congress has a duty to perform and it feels that by extending the tour to four years it will encourage the Chiefs to speak up and speak out. This very possibility—that they would speak more frankly—is undoubtedly at the root of White House and Defense Department opposition. It is no accident that the Commandant of the Marine Corps has a reputation for giving the most informative, least ambiguous testimony. The House Armed Services Committee's report to the House of Representatives made a strong case. It declared:

"Members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff must be free to express their independent judgments on all military matters. They should not be unnecessarily concerned about whether or not they will be reappointed.

"The security of the United States depends to a large extent upon the quality of judgment rendered by its top military advisers. If these military advisers are appointed to terms of office less than the normal four-year term contemplated by law, and must conform in all respects to the views of the civilians appointed over them in order to earn reappointment, then it is obvious that the professional judgments required of them may well be compromised.

"The Congress cannot legislate wisely if members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff merely repeat back to the Congress that which they feel is agreeable to the administration in power. There can be little doubt that under the prevailing tendency to appoint afficers to the Joint Chiefs of Staff for two years, with the knowledge that a further reappointment for two years will follow if the individual echoes the policies of his civilian superiors, tends to produce a form of compliance in national security matters that leaves much to be desired."

The principal argument against the four-year term is that it would restrict the President in choosing his top military personnel. This is invalid. The President, under the new legislation as under the old law, may remove any Chief at any time, for good reason or none at all. (As a practical matter, however, a President would be unlikely to remove a Chief without good cause, but might very well decline to reappoint him for some minor policy or personality clash.)

As for precedent, in addition to the Commandant of the Marine Corps, the Bureau chiefs of the Navy, the Judge Advocates General of the Air Force and Navy and the Army branch chiefs are appointed for a term of four years, by law.

The new legislation excludes the Chairman of the JCS, who, in reality if not by law, is the chief military adviser to the President and Secretary of Defense. His term would continue to be for two years, with reappointment for an additional term. In time of war declared by Congress, all members of the JCS could be reappointed by the President without limit. And so that no current member of the JCS would be affected, the legislation would not become effective until Jan. 1, 1969.

At the time of this writing the President has not yet signed the bill authorizing $21 billion in defense appropriations wherein the

JCS provision which he opposes was placed. But we think he will not veto the measure. With a nagging war in Viet Nam and a threat of hostilities in the Middle East, he needs all the friends he can get on Capitol Hill. Another fight he doesn't need. If he should veto, we would urge a vote to override. A great deal is at stake—for Congress and for the American people.

"Shoot To Kill" Favored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OTTO E. PASSMAN
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 21, 1967

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

[From the Monroe Morning World, Monroe, La., July 30, 1967]

"SHOOT TO KILL" FAVORED

If there has been a change in President Johnson's attitude toward Negro leaders who have yelled violently, "We will burn America," and have made a good start toward doing it, the change can be labelled "too little and too late." It came too late to prevent a $1 billion property loss in Detroit. It was "too little" to give federalized National Guardsmen and federal troops the kind of freedom they need in putting an end to a situation that has disgraced this nation before the eyes of the world and before its own people.

When the President finally called out federal troops, he issued an order for "minimum" action to stop the riots. You can't stop a rebellion with "minimum action." As long as the rioters and agitators know there will be minimum action, they will keep pushing.

Thousands upon thousands of our citizens in the South, as well as throughout the nation, including members of the clergy, have expressed views similar to those announced by Major General Ervin C. Hostetler, commanding the Ohio National Guard, and Democratic Senator Robert C. Byrd of West Virginia. That sentiment is: "Shoot to kill!"

General Hostetler told his men, as they were alerted for action, that if they were sent against Negro rioters in Ohio cities they were to shoot and shoot to kill.

Senator Byrd said the tragic riots must be stopped "by force." He said every looter should be shot down with bullets aimed to kill. "It is time," he said emphatically, "to end this stuff about don't shoot until you are shot at."

Until the Detroit sabotage started reaching for the reported $1 billion damage mark, there were reports that city police and National Guards were ordered to take a "creampuff" approach against the rioters. They were told not to shoot until they were fired upon and there were even reports that some of them were sent into the fire-scourged areas without arms for fear they might "resort to unnecessary shooting."

One reliable commentator said:

"It is time for pussyfooting governors to stop sending National Guardsmen against shooting mobs with no ammunition or only blank ammunition, for the Guardsmen. Both have happened in the past two years—since the Watts riot in Los Angeles two years ago set off a chain of riots which repeatedly have developed into revolution and rebellion, and thus into anarchy—with all of it built on murder, arson and brazen, bullet-backed defiance of law and order and of constitutional government."

We say that sending men without ammunition or with blank ammunition against armed mobs is an outrage of the century, equalled only by that perpetrated by the Negro rioters.

It has been pointed out that some white people have participated in the riots with the Negroes and this has been cited as a sign that white people are supporting this sort of lawlessness. Certainly a majority of the Negroes were not involved either. When lawlessness is openly permitted by a government, as it has been permitted in this outbreak of unresisted rebellion, there will always be lawless elements of whatever color to take advantage of the chance to kill, pillage and burn. This is no evidence of sympathy but simply is the spirit of a beast which will attack when its adversary is helpless. White people who join the rioters should face the same "shoot to kill" bullets.

Some commentators have had the audacity to condone these outrages on the contention that the "government promised them many things and didn't come through with the promises." No government ever gave any people one-tenth as much as the United States government has given the Negroes of this country. There is no such thing as appeasing the rabble-rousers who make their living by arousing members of their race to intense pitches of excitement.

In the Kennedy-Johnson years, some $25 billion of tax money, mostly contributed by white people, has been poured into various types of anti-poverty programs, and now we have arson, murder, mob looting and anarchy.

Despite what Senator Robert F. Kennedy, D. N.Y., suddenly an advocate of free enterprise, called 30 years of failure of our American welfare programs, American Negroes are the most prosperous group of non-whites in the world. They enjoy the highest per capita income of all non-white groups. In fact, the average American Negro has an income that make salaries in Russia seem paltry indeed and that are far ahead of average white income in most of the countries of the world.

In the Detroit debacle, Governor Romney pattered around with high-sounding phrases about "you can replace property but not human lives," while Detroit burned and policemen and firemen engaged in their duties, as well as Negro criminals, died or were wounded.

For a good part of the time, Romney was about as useful as was Nero, who fiddled while Rome burned. After "fiddling" around until the nation's greatest manufacturing city had suffered tremendous losses and people had been subject to terrorism worse than war between nations, the Michigan Governor, with his eye always on the Negro vote, got up as much nerve as a dying jellyfish and sent in the National Guard—but not to shoot, only to be shot at. Finally, he called for federal troops and President Johnson responded by sending in the troops with orders to use "minimum force."

Nobody stops a robber or a looter with minimum force. If a robber were breaking into a home at night and the owner used "minimum force" and did not shoot until the intruder had been given a chance to shoot first, his chances of coming out alive would be mighty small. That was just about the chance the Chief Executive seemed to want to give the troops he sent in.

From the first, however, we felt that the "Screaming Eagles," tough, trained paratroopers, 40 percent of them with war experience in Vietnam, wouldn't wait long after the first shot was fired before "protecting" themselves.

After Romney chose not to allow the National Guard to do much shooting and after he had "passed the buck" to President Johnson, about two hours passed before the order was issued, and another eight hours elapsed before they moved inside the city limits and more time passed before they were in action. The delay must have been in accord with Washington orders. It was accompanied by what we regard as the despicable "minimum force" order, which could not be interpreted as doing anything but adding to the danger the paratroopers must undergo.

Another outrage in the prodigiously outrageous failure of the federal government to quell an open revolt in this country is the fact that a civilian was put in charge of the paratroopers sent in to quell the riot. Cyrus R. Vance, former deputy defense secretary, who is on the scene as Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara's special assistant, said that while Lieutenant General John L. Throckmorton is in charge of the paratroopers as the military leader, "ultimate responsibility for his actions resides in me."

This indicates that President Johnson is again endangering the lives of our military men by putting a civilian over a military commander, as he has done in Vietnam, where McNamara is in charge. This is an indication that he is not so much interested in putting a stop to the riots as in merely taming them down enough so the people of this country won't be too much aroused.

Community Resources Pool

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN G. DOW
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday August 21, 1967

Mr. DOW. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call your attention to an exciting educational experiment which has been going on up near my home in Rockland County, N.Y. Nine years ago, through private initiative, the community resources program was begun in the South Orangetown school district. This is a Saturday morning extracurricular program which brings together interested students and local professionals from such diverse fields as oceanography, architecture, city planning, photography, and music. Exposure to the active professionals in the various fields has captured the imagination of these young people and enriched their education substantially. The value of the community resources program was officially recognized about 4 years ago when both the district school board and New York State's education department began contributing financial support. As a matter of fact, I have appeared as a speaker on this program and found it most stimulating.

The success of this unique educational program in Rockland County, N.Y., has attracted nationwide interest and was the subject of a recent article in the Christian Science Monitor which I hereby commend to the attention of our colleagues. The article follows:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Aug. 12, 1967]

WHERE EXPERTS DO THE TEACHING

(By Zorah K. Buchtmann)

BLAUVELT, N.Y.—Many students today may lose sight of the realities of life outside school in their necessary concentration on grades and other academic requirements. But in a unique educational program in New York State, attracting nationwide attention, students can gain practical insight and experience in fields ranging from art to zoology in addition to their regular studies.

Recent research by New York State's Education Department concluded that student participation in the program, known as the

Community Resources Pool, has a definite effect on attitudes toward various professions, and career choices as well.

This past semester, some 200 students from 5th through 12th grades in Rockland County's South Orangetown School District, spent Saturday mornings at the district high school. Included in their extracurricular explorations were such diverse subjects as development of original musical themes with composer Herbert Haufrecht (some student works from this group will be published next fall); an examination of modern police techniques and theory in seminars and field trips conducted by local police sergeant Robert Crable, who recently earned a college degree in police science; and an introduction to techniques of oil painting by artist Ken Nishi.

According to Charlotte Bordwell, program director, "Students are exposed to professionals in various fields, instead of the usual professional teachers. In groups of no more than 15, they develop an informal, personal relationship with men and women earning a living in these fields, and really learn the daily details involved. We're more pragmatic than scholastic, and there are no requirements for admission, academic or otherwise. Student interest is the main consideration."

Student interest has demonstrably been captured and consistently maintained. In each of the seven years of the program's existence, the anticipated 10 percent of student population has attended, managing to duck conflicting family activities and to forgo sleeping late. Up to 15 different courses are offered for 10 Saturdays each semester.

The program began nine years ago in cooperation with the Rockland Foundation, a locally organized, nonprofit cultural center.

A Rockland resident before publication of her "Feminine Mystique," Betty Friedan sought greater challenge for her son than she believed available in his public school curriculum at the time. Through the foundation, she worked out an informal organization, open to students throughout the county, who met casually at the homes or studios of their instructors. As interest and enrollments increased, Mrs. Friedan saw that a larger administrative body could better handle the growing volume of detail. She persuaded members of the South Orangetown PTA Council to cosponsor the seminars, enabling them to be held in a district school.

Every child of eligible age, in the district, whether or not attending public school, was and still is able to attend.

Subject coordinators from the community in each of five disciplines—art, music, language arts, humanities, and science—developed seminar ideas, and found leaders from among local professionals to conduct them. Early financial support came as an educational grant from the New World Foundation in Chicago. In 1963, the New York State Education Department allocated research funds for this "pilot project in educational enrichment," and the district school board authorized inclusion of seminar funds in the annual school budget.

The school district assumed full responsibility for continuing the classes in 1965, and Mrs. Bordwell was named director in December of that year. She plans each year's classes in cooperation with subject coordinators selected from among district teachers.

Students in past seminars produced a movie, published a "nonsense" book, cut records at a recording studio, and, in one high-school group a few years back, came up with an original discovery concerning chlorophyll subsequently published in scientific journals.

They have worked with oceanographers, seismologists, biochemists, botanists, psychologists, politicians, historians, mathematicians, architects, sculptors, city planners, fabric designers, cartoonists, artists, writers, editors, musicians. Last fall, students were taught by Pulitzer Prize-winning photographer Nat Fein.

From the outset, the program has avoided the uncertainties of a strictly volunteer operation. All leaders and coordinators are paid a nominal sum for their time and services. Student attendance is voluntary, with no credit given for courses. Because of the lack of pressure and competition for grades, there is a relaxed atmosphere in the Saturday classes which the students relish.

"If you make a mistake, it's all right here," said one.

Mrs. Bordwell notes, "These studies don't replace subjects in the regular curriculum, but augment them. Here we can branch out into discussions of interest and value for which there is no time in the regular schedule."

Mrs. Bordwell receives frequent requests for information from all over the country, and many visitors have watched classes in progress. One of these, David Mallery, representing the National Association of Independent Schools, described his observations of the seminars in a small booklet, "A Community-School Venture—Top Professionals Work With School Students."

According to Mrs. Bordwell, "All of us in South Orangetown would be happy to see our Community Resources Pool duplicated throughout the country. We want to share our excitement and pride in an educational program which is thoroughly practical and realistic, at the same time encouraging creativity and independent thinking, with the enthusiastic support of the entire community."

Poverty Program on the Local Level

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ODIN LANGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 21, 1967

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, in view of the many discrepancies that have been called to the attention of this House relative to the poverty program, a letter received in my office from a businessman in my home town of Kennedy, Minn., should be of further interest to my colleagues. The letter is included at this point in the RECORD:

KENNEDY FARM SUPPLY CO.,
Kennedy, Minn.

HON. ODIN LANGEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

CONGRESSMAN LANGEN: I have read of the awful confusion and waste of the larger projects of the Poverty Program.

However, recently an incident happened here that if multiplied often enough could make a pretty revolting story.

For the past couple of years I have employed a high school student here in the plumbing and heating business. He was just getting good enough to be of value to me. We had him under Federal Wage and Hour. Then along came one of these poverty boys saying that another town could not use all the money being showered on it from Washington and could Kennedy possibly use it up.

Well, we don't have much here in Kennedy that existing city employees can't handle. But now we have my former employee around town trying to look employed and I am short on help. Who wants to work these days?

This makes me feel real good about paying my income taxes.

Yours truly,

BERYL BRACEWELL.

The Postal Hikes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 21, 1967

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of discussion here in Congress about the postal department. There has been equally as much discussion among the taxpayers and postal users on the pending postal rate increase proposals. I have stated repeatedly that a "lean, efficient operation in this department would not necessitate a rate increase."

Mr. O. B. Augustson, editor of a daily newspaper in Willmar, Minn., and a man whose opinions and judgment I hold in high esteem, has presented some new light on this problem. Therefore, I am inserting in the RECORD his editorial of August 9, 1967, as printed in the Willmar West Central Daily Tribune:

THE POSTAL HIKE

The postal authorities at Washington are in the midst of proposals to again hike postal rates. This seems to be a common practice in this department and it is up, up, up during recent years. Presume this is due to the usual increases in costs of operation just like in private business. One must be fair in this judgment. Employes must have wages and salaries commensurate with the rest of the economy.

Yet at times one has noted difficulties in some areas of postal service. There have been complaints from the public on tardy service even in this day of air transit. This perhaps has led to some private concerns getting into the parcel delivery business. The complaints have reached such proportions that some even advocate turning over the service into private hands. That of course is unthinkable—then one would perhaps see some real high rates when a monopoly would be granted. Would make present government rates look like charity.

As far as deficits are concerned we have departed from the original function of the postal department. It was founded as a real public service and never instituted as a money making enterprise. In fact it was accepted as good sense even to subsidize the postal service thru congressional appropriations to take care of any deficit.

The proposed hikes on first class mail is understandable. This class has first call and priority. It is still a bargain to be able to send a letter anywhere in the U.S. for 5 cents and an air mail letter for 8 cents. So we do not think there will be much complaint about hikes to 6c and 10c in first class letter postage. Also true as to post cards.

However there are proposals effecting second class rates. This will hit the newspapers real hard, small dailies and weeklies particularly, the size of newspapers which are having the toughest struggle to keep in business. The postal department has been continually raising those rates during the past decade and the department keeps on just as if the newspapers had nothing that would entitle them to more consideration. One would wager that as to the small dailies and weeklies in our nation they are not usually the best paying enterprises in a town nor the publishers among the rich class. If it were not for love of the profession they would not be in it. Or remain in these times of far more lucrative enterprises.

Many smaller newspapers have heavy enough sledding now without any increases in their delivery costs. Meanwhile other media that compete with the press such as radio and television have no comparable costs so that one could say that the postal service is playing right into the hands of these other media who could shout with joy as additional postal burdens are thrown upon their competitor—the press!

By the way—how often does government realize or appreciate the free service given said government. Just imagine all the news about government that a newspaper prints, all the publicity releases from all departments of government—they depend on the press more than the other media for bringing all this information to the public. Probably as the government raises postal rates the newspapers ought to charge for running all this free publicity. What a bill the government would get from the newspapers—it would be worth a thousand times more than the postage money the government gets. But all this free publicity of course is taken for granted. In this respect newspapers could almost be classed as suckers and figure they've been taken to the cleaners.

Newspapers are still the main and most thorough contact with the homes of the nation. People still look to the newspapers for the best and most complete overall dispensation of information. That being true should not government seek, as it used to do, to hold down costs of newspapers so that every home can afford to have one. That used to be the principle, the sound one, but guess government is getting to be a money grabber like all enterprises. Wonder too if the congressmen and the politicans who look for a lot of free space in the press during campaigns and while in office—remember this when they are tempted to vote for postal rate increases. Someone should remind them.

There are less and less papers in the country as they find the going tough. Is that what the country wants? Newspapers were originally established as the profession of the Fourth Estate, a co-worker with government and a necessary adjunct to government for public enlightenment and an informed citzenry. Has this been forgotten too?

The Congress had better take a second look at this proposed hike in second class rates effecting newspapers—they could be killing the goose that lays the golden eggs in this democracy. And in closing one could voice this added comment—that while it is proposed to hike rates on newspapers there is a counter proposal to cut rates on junk mail circulars. Figure that one out for discrimination.

Hon. Joshua Bryan Lee

SPEECH

OF

HON. PAGE BELCHER

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 14, 1967

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, the death of Joshua Bryan Lee comes as a great shock to all of us who have had the privilege through the years to know him.

The Honorable Josh Lee was a Member of the House of Representatives during the 74th Congress, and of the U.S. Senate during the 76th, 77th, and 78th Congresses. He was an able Representative and Senator, and had the respect and love of his colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

Josh was a man of stalwart character, high integrity, and strong convictions. He had the courage of his convictions and would fight for what he thought was right. Yet, he was always kind and courteous and accorded those who disagreed with him the right of their convictions. He was never narrowminded or petty. Throughout his lifetime he has been devoted to the service of his community, State, and Nation.

There will never be another such man as the Honorable Josh Lee. I am proud that he was an Oklahoman, and I am proud to have called him friend—he indeed will be missed. I extend my deep and heartfelt sympathy to his dear wife and family.

Demographic Collision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS G. MORRIS

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 21, 1967

Mr. MORRIS of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, an editorial appeared in the Washington Post on Sunday, August 13, on a timely and important subject, that of proper planning to achieve balance between land and people for the year 2000. The editorial cites Secretary of Agriculture Freeman's speech to the National League of Cities in Boston, August 1, as pointing the way toward a national policy in this regard.

The editorial says the speech "contains what may well prove to be, in the long reach of our national evolution, the wisest words yet spoken on our current national malaise."

Because the subject is of such vital importance to the entire Nation, I am inserting the editorial in the RECORD.

The text is as follows:

DEMOGRAPHIC COLLISION

A little-noticed speech by Secretary Freeman the other day to the National League of Cities contains what may well prove to be, in the long reach of our national evolution, the wisest words yet spoken on our current malaise. Mr. Freeman sees the violence of recent weeks as a collision of man with his environment. Its origin runs back at least 50 years when millions of young men in rural America were uprooted by World War I. They began what Mr. Freeman calls "the 50-year march to the cities" which has now produced so much misery, disillusionment and violence.

While this great migration has been taking place the country has given far too little thought to it. Nearly 600,000 persons a year have been flowing into the cities, most of them displaced from the countryside, as Secretary Freeman acknowledges, by the revolution in agricultural technology. They have gone to the cities in search of a better life, but what they have usually found has been poverty, slums and only the dregs of urban living. In a very real sense they are refugees from a rapidly changing economy.

The result is that 70 per cent of our people are jammed into 1 per cent of our land—the 1 per cent that is largely covered by macadam, houses, factories and places of business. Many have found jobs but largely of the low-income varieties because the newcomers usually lack the skills that most industrial employment requires. So the glamor of the city that once lured them fades into the sodden dulliness of ghettos, smog and social decay.

For some years the country has been vaguely aware of this demographic revolution but has done very little about it. Further concentration of people has seemed inevitable. But what will happen if this trend is allowed to run its course until the turn of the century when the country will have another 100 million persons to house and to absorb into its social structure? Will they, too, be crowded into our five vast strip cities?

It is this prospect of "an airless, waterless, joyless—and perhaps hopeless—existence" in a metamegalopolis of the year 2000 that frightens Secretary Freeman. And so he has pointedly raised the basic question: "Should we try to check the accelerated movement of people from country to city?"

Six members of the Cabinet are sponsoring a symposium designed to bring together "the best minds in the world" to discuss this problem in Washington next December. As for Mr. Freeman, he has already committed himself to pursuit of an urban-rural balance that will save the cities from destroying themselves. He is not of course recommending that the rural refugees be sent back to the farm where they have been displaced by machinery. But he does see a brighter future for these rootless millions in towns and small cities where industrial jobs can be provided without the high costs, the congestion and the social overheating that have become so common in the large cities.

The Secretary suggests giving "a high investment priority to building up opportunity in rural America" and points to what some small cities have accomplished. But the chief significance of his speech does not lie in any specific recommendations. Rather, it is to be found in his impressive call for a change of direction. It is not necessary for this rich, resourceful and powerful country to strangle itself in its own congestion. The warning signals that have been sounded in one large city after another should set the whole country to thinking about ways and means of getting off this collision course with our environment.

There's Bound To Be a Change

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 21, 1967

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

[From the San Diego (Calif.) Union, Aug. 13, 1967]

ONE OF THESE DAYS: THERE'S BOUND TO BE A CHANGE

One of these days the good people of the United States of America will be heard and heeded.

One of these days, not too distant, they will show in unmistakable terms that they are fed up with the slurs at home and abroad which question our honorable national intentions and goals.

One of these days they will tire of supporting petty tyrants who insult our nation, our flag and our honor with impunity—indeed are often rewarded for their attacks.

One of these days Americans will tire of the sedition that too often passes for free speech in our nation, especially on our campuses.

One of these days the point of tolerance will be passed on the street where criminality and anarchy too often erupt in the name of freedom of assembly.

One of these days no self respecting American, and he is in the majority, will stand for the insults to God through the attacks on religion that occur daily, or through the emergence of cults of pseudo religion that need the crutch of dope.

One of these days good Americans will scorn the thought that there is virtue in radical behavior for the sake of being an oddball, or that there is virtue in ordinary dirt.

One of these days good Americans will show segments of the publishing industry that filthy treatises and smut have no place in the American way of life.

One of these days Americans will stand up in favor of capitalism which has given them individually and collectively the best life that any human has known since life began.

One of these days Americans will insist that national resources be husbanded and meted out efficiently, not squandered on unmitigated futile sociological slop and sentimental hogwash.

One of these days Americans will tire of the fact they cannot even believe what their top officials in Washington say.

One of these days they will insist that crime be punished as crime should be, so it is safe to walk the streets anywhere at any time of day or night.

One of these days Americans will insist that our defenses be so strong that no possible question can be raised about their adequacy.

One of these days Americans will insist that while American men are dying in Vietnam, the nation should follow a policy of winning that war as rapidly as possible.

One of these days Americans will demand that if they are paying the piper they also shall call the tune; that their hard-earned dollars should not support generations of welfare or people who can work and will not.

One of these days, in short, Americans will insist that we stop drifting mentally and morally and that we return to the principles that have made the United States of America strong. It will not be an uncertain trumpet.

One of these days had better come soon because any one of these days may be much later than we believe for preserving the America we love.

One of these days . . .

Statement of Mayor Theodore R. McKeldin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 21, 1967

Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, for many years the State of Maryland has been favored with outstanding political leadership. Although many men and women have earned applause in public service, none has been more distinguished, more effective, or more personally beloved than Theodore Roosevelt McKeldin.

Twice Governor of Maryland and twice mayor of Baltimore, Theodore R. McKeldin has attained a unique position as a national party leader, as an advocate of enlightened public policies, and as a catalyst for progress. Fully committed to sense and humanity in government, Mayor McKeldin has based his entire career on the principle that "a public official must do what is right and must speak out against all forms of injustice." His record has set the highest standards not only for Republicans, but for all who aspire to true political service.

Mayor McKeldin's recent statement, announcing his decision not to run for reelection this fall, marks an important chapter in this important career. I would like to call his remarks to the attention of the entire Congress.

Mayor McKeldin's statement follows:

MCKELDIN STATES REASON: TIME FOR CHANGE PROMPTS STEPPING ASIDE CAMPAIGN

(By Theodore R. McKeldin, Mayor)

There is nothing I would rather be than Mayor of Baltimore. I love the opportunity of service to nearly a million neighbors. I love the challenge, excitement, variety and scope of the job; the close and meaningful contact with people of many races, religions and occupations. I love the joining of hands and the meeting of minds. There is no place of employment I would prefer to City Hall, Baltimore, Maryland.

Indeed, I have had a long and fruitful political life. In a state which is heavily Democratic, I as a Republican have been fortunate enough to have been selected by the people to be Mayor twice and Governor twice. However, once again, I must make a decision to run for elective office. I have in the past deliberated considerably before each campaign, both because I am a Republican in a Democratic state and because it has always been my practice to face the times realistically.

In appraising the present situation, I have considered many factors and I am basing the decision I have made upon a myriad of reasons. But fundamentally, my decision is based upon one of the ironies of life. I started my political career by defeating one of the ablest, most knowledgeable Mayors in Baltimore's history, Howard Jackson. I, who as compared to him at the time knew little of municipal government, won the election because Mayor Jackson had been in public office so long that he finally encountered the seemingly ever-present desire of people for something new and different. Indeed, it did become—as we stressed in our campaigning—"time for a change."

Ironically, it appears that this very thing it now occurring on the political scene of today's Baltimore. I have been in political life for many years and in office for sixteen. During that time, I have learned much and sharpened many skills in the leadership of government. These skills I believe I still very much retain. But it is one of the contingencies of holding public office that to serve the people one must first be elected.

I have throughout my political life and certainly even more so in my last four years as Mayor made many decisions, advocated many policies and promoted many programs which I knew to be politically unpopular. But I did these things because I was convinced they were necessary and just. For example, I have always supported tax programs if they were directed at improving needed services or inaugurating vital programs, and I have always fought for equal rights for everyone, because I cannot tolerate injustice and certainly not those injustices which government can correct.

In this recent year alone, both taxes and equal rights have become topics of controversy and, at times, of deep division. I do not begrudge that these policies I have championed have caused segments of our City to voice disagreement. Despite this development, I still firmly believe that a public official must do what is right and must speak out against all forms of injustice. So while I consider my administration to have been productive and progressive, these issues I have just cited and others do not appear to have made my administration popular. The combination of issues and the apparent desire for a change thus convince me that this would be a most difficult time to conduct a campaign.

I do not shrink from political battle. I do not bemoan the rigors of campaigning. Indeed, I welcome them. But my political sense tells me that the people of Baltimore may have now once again reached that time when they want to change. I feel no sense of chagrin, for I am proud of the many causes I have fought for and the many programs and policies I have undertaken in this administration and throughout my public career.

However, I do not need the ballot box to tell me what years of political experience tell me—and that is, that it seems to me the people of Baltimore may want a change and I do not wish to stand in the way of such sentiment. I therefor am not a candidate for Mayor. However, my interests throughout most of my life have been in public service. Indeed, I have devoted the very purpose of my career to serving the people of Baltimore City and the State of Maryland.

I hope that I will be able to continue serving the people of this City and this State wherever, whenever and in whatever capacity I may be needed.

Is It Too Late?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 21, 1967

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, in a recent editorial which appeared in the Wall Street Journal, the racial problem was carefully analyzed. The editorial explained what mistakes were made in the past, and suggests new ideas for the future.

No matter what is done, however, we must all realize that the situation will not miraculously change overnight.

I commend to the attention of our colleagues the August 1, 1967 editorial, as follows:

IS IT TOO LATE?

Many well-meaning people are still saying the answer is to destroy the ghetto—not by the torch but with massive new urban renewal programs. We fear that dreams of such pat solutions will accomplish little and may make matters worse.

Destroy the ghetto? Federal, state and local governments have been trying to do it for years. At the same time a lot of Negroes have managed on their own to move to the suburbs from the slums that supposedly imprison them.

Yet the public programs, demonstrably and in a number of places, actually aggravate the slum conditions. In some cases poor people are evicted in the name of urban renewal without sufficient provision being made for their relocation at rents they can pay. In others, the new public housing structures themselves deteriorate into new slums.

Those who demand overnight solutions retort that the failures so far only prove that far too little has been done. But before the nation embarks on a grandiose crash program, it ought at least to take a realistic look at the complexity of what it is trying to deal with.

The complexity could be said to begin with a simple statistic. More than five million Negroes, mostly from the rural South, have migrated to the Northern cities in the past 15 years or so. For economic and other reasons they gravitate to the slums. This, plus the rapid natural population increase among Negroes, helps keep the slums teeming despite the exodus of many to the suburbs.

It is no offense to these new arrivals to observe that often they lack the learning, the skills, the general background to make their way in a competitive modern economy; it's simply a fact and it applies also to whites of similar background. Studies show, for example, that sometimes Negro children can scarcely communicate with their teachers because the children speak a dialect in which words and sentence structures do not mean the same things as in ordinary English.

In those circumstances the requisite kind of cultural assimilation is bound to take years, maybe a generation or more, no matter how much is done. Even if the slums could be physically destroyed in short order and replaced with attractive housing, it obviously could not improve the lot of those Negroes (and whites) who are presently unequipped to earn a decent living. The slums, therefore, would reemerge. The trouble with instant solutions is precisely that they overlook the human factor.

Now, into a situation already vexed by the huge migration, enter the civil rights leaders. They—including those who preached and still preach nonviolence—have been putting forth at least three doctrines that greatly complicate the search for solutions.

They insist, despite the evidence, that poor Negroes late from the rural South can in fact have almost immediately the economic well being achieved by the American middle class by dint of long years of hard work. Thus they build false hopes leading to disillusionment.

They imply, moreover, that conferring that well-being is somehow a Negro right. It's an idea that not only goes strongly against the American grain; it is also impossible of fulfillment. The most munificent of governments cannot bestow prosperity on people not yet ready to maintain it. Therein, we think, lies the fallacy in the various proposals for a Government-provided guaranteed annual wage.

The advocates of nonviolence, finally, nonetheless advocate civil disodbedience. However worthy that tenet traditionally, in today's confused conditions it can sow the seeds of violence. After all, if it is permissible to break the law in Mississippi, why not in Michigan?

On top of all that come the fanatical black racists, peddlers of hatred who incite to riot and claim they want to see the fall of the United States. Nothing suggests that the vast majority of Negroes want any truck with that line, but if it ever caught on generally, it would kill any hopes for the future. For any realistic hopes must be based on good will and not on bitterness verging on insanity—or communism.

If the Negroes do eschew the extremists among them, we believe there are solid grounds for hope for the future, despite the grimness of the present. The best portent is simply the enormous progress, out of the bleakest of histories, that so many Negroes have made. The nation doesn't hear enough about it, but the Negro middle and upper classes are steadily growing, college graduates are becoming more numerous, income is rising.

The experience of the successful Negroes is relevant to the current chaos. They didn't get there by rioting, arson and murder, nor by a smothering Federal subsidization, nor by promises of instant uplift. They got there the way millions of other Americans did, by wanting and working for a better life for themselves and their children.

That is the theme the civil rights leaders ought to be stressing. At the same time they should really get to work among their own people in an effort to prepare the unready for taking part in the society, instead of directly or indirectly encouraging them to violence. The forthright statement of Roy Wilkins and others last week, condemning the violence, could be a start.

Is it too late? We don't think so, but it is late enough. The begining of hope must be an end to this simple-minded business of viewing a complex congeries of problems as though it were a single one susceptible to prompt correction.

Halt the Bombing of North Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 21, 1967

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, we do not yet know what repercussions will result from the loss of two U.S. aircraft over China today. We do know that these losses and the ensuing dangers were the inevitable results of the escalation of the bombing of North Vietnam.

I suggest we halt the bombing of North Vietnam. I believe the military advantage gained by the destruction of targets close to the China-North Vietnam border is insignificant when compared to the military threat of Chinese entry into the Vietnam war. I believe a total suspension of the bombing may open the way to a settlement of this tragic conflict.

The Minneapolis Tribune has been a supporter of the administration's policy in Vietnam. Last week it changed this policy and opposed the escalation of the bombing. At this point I insert the Tribune's editorial in the Congressional Record:

Dangerous Escalation of the Bombing

The extension of U.S. bombing targets almost to the border of China is a dangerous escalation of the Vietnam War. Previous experience suggests that a stepped-up air war in the north will do little to bring Hanoi to the peace table, and may likely make a political settlement more distant. But even more important, bombing targets only 10 miles from the Chinese border—the approximate distance from downtown Minneapolis to downtown St. Paul—raises the specter of possible war with China, the world's most populous nation.

In the past, this newspaper has generally supported both the goals and the policies of the United States—and the Johnson administration—in the conduct of this war. However, in recent months we have become increasingly skeptical of some aspects of administration policy, particularly bombing the north. On Feb. 10, for example, we suggested—as have U Thant and many other world leaders—a suspension of the bombing as an invitation for North Vietnam to talk peace. Instead, the administration renewed the bombing promptly after the short truce of the Lunar new year. Again, on April 25, we said our support of U.S. involvement did not commit us to support the kind of aerial escalation then being made.

Now the United States has embarked on a new round of escalation by intensifying attacks in urban areas and by sending planes to points less than two minutes—jet time—from China's border. This new escalation may be President Johnson's reaction to unfavorable public opinion polls and to irresponsible proposals from certain Republican hawks, such as Rep. Gerald Ford. Whatever prompted it, we believe this new escalation is unwise—in terms of our national interest and the cause of peace.

Reluctant as we are to criticize the President's handling of the war, escalation of the bombing in such a dangerous way makes us wonder whether the administration is in a rut and needs some fresh thinking about our entire Asian policy.

While we supported this month's decision to send more troops to Vietnam, provided those troops are used in combative rather than supportive roles, we believe the time has come for the United States to call a halt to its dangerous air game in the Hanoi-Haiphong delta area and north of there to the Chinese border. Bombing in this region (north of the 19th or 20th parallels) should be suspended, rather than increased. Failure to suspend this bombing may at best prolong the war, and at worst may lead the United States and China into a far more disastrous conflict.

Social Security Amendments of 1967

SPEECH

OF

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1967

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 12080) to amend the Social Security Act to provide an increase in benefits under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system, to provide benefits for additional categories of individuals, to improve the public assistance program and programs relating to the welfare and health of children, and for other purposes.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Chairman, I have always been a strong advocate of the extension and liberalization of social security to provide security and care for our elder citizens and I shall continue to be one in the future. In this light I would like to address myself to reservations I have on certain aspects of the Social Security Amendments. Because this bill does increase social security benefits, makes some improvements in medicare, and provides Federal assistance for the training of social workers I will vote for it. However, I cannot pass over some of the more disturbing aspects of this legislation which have come to my attention.

While social security benefits will be increased, the increase is only a token one, nowhere near the needs of the elderly of our country. Unfortunately, over the years benefits from social security have not kept pace with the increasing cost of living. While in the 1950's benefit increases raised benefits to a greater extent than was required to offset the rise in the cost of living that followed, this is no longer the case and this increase will not even equal the present cost of living let alone provide for a further rise in the cost of living. The increase of only $6 a month for those receiving the minimum payment will give the elderly little solace in these days of increasing prices. The price index for the elderly is even higher than that for the general public which further lessens the effect of this increase. In this the most affluent country in the world how can we expect a person to live on $600 a year? Neither this 12½ percent increase or the President's proposed 20 percent increase would be enough. Only a 50-percent increase would come close to meeting the needs of our elder citizens.

I am also disturbed at the deletion of the President's proposal setting a minimum payment regardless of contributions for anyone paying for a period of 25 years or more. This was proposed in response to a person's being penalized in the early years of social security, who while paying a substantial portion of his earnings gets few benefits today because of a much higher standard of living.

The sections dealing with aid for dependent children are especially irritating to me. I do not feel freezing the proportion of children on ADC rolls at last January's percentage for each State will achieve its stated purpose of cutting down on illegitimacy. The cause of illegitimacy runs much deeper than our welfare system. If an attack is to be made on illegitimacy it must be a responsible one, dealing with poverty, lack of job training, and inferior housing so prevalent in the slums of our cities. It just is not fair to penalize children for the errors of their parents. It only breeds bitterness and resentment. We also should not penalize the individual State who must either take on the extra burden of making additional payments or cut back their payments as the proportion of children on welfare increases.

I fear that the sections dealing with ADC are in part a reaction to the riots which have plagued our country this summer. The rationale, which I do not accept, is that by making it more difficult for a person to live on welfare he will be forced to get a job which will keep him off the streets and lessen his discontent. This presupposes that: First, jobs are available; and second, that these people have the training and education for such jobs. The fact is that jobs are not available in the private sector for those with such little training and education and the community work and training programs required by the bill are likely to be simply make work. Added to this is the fact that a great number of people on welfare are unemployable. This section far from alleviating the causes of the discontent which leads to riots will only increase it.

Lastly I am disappointed by the limitations on the Federal contributions to State medicaid programs. Instead of discouraging liberal programs which States like New York have instituted, extending benefits to those who need them most, they should be encouraged. This title will only place the burden on already financially overburdened States to assume the portion of the costs which no longer will be available from the Federal Government or force these States to cut back their programs. I do not think this is just or financially sound.

In support of the bill, however, let me make a few observations on medicare. I am pleased to say that the fears of some concerning medicare have proven to be totally unfounded. There has been no run on hospitals. Medical standards have not been lowered. And most importantly, a measure of security has been afforded for our elder citizens in the payment of medical bills which cut so deeply into their savings. Our job, though, is far from over. Coverage under medicare must be expanded to include drugs of the elderly who are not in hospitals.

In conclusion, let me reiterate that the increase in social security benefits is a long awaited, if too small, stride forward which I hope will be followed by further expansion and liberalization in the years to come.

Results of Questionnaire on Major Issues, Eighth Congressional District of Indiana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROGER H. ZION

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 21, 1967

Mr. ZION. Mr. Speaker, I recently circulated over 150,000 questionnaires to the residents of Indiana's Eighth Congressional District, inviting them to express their opinions on some of the vital issues of the day. Nearly 15,000 of these folks took the opportunity to return this questionnaire for my consideration. In addition, many of these people wrote thoughtful letters which further expanded their views on these topics.

I am now submitting, for inclusion in the RECORD, a tabulation of the results of this questionnaire. I hope that this information will be helpful and informative for my colleagues in the Congress.

The tabulation follows:

COMPLETE FINAL TABULATION OF CONGRESSMAN ZION'S QUESTIONNAIRE

	Percent		
	Yes	No	Undecided
1. Should Congress enact the President's proposal to increase taxes to help offset the budget deficit?	24	69	7
2. Do you favor a withdrawal of U.S. troops from Vietnam?	37	48	15
3. Do you think the poverty program has been effective in eliminating the cause of poverty?	7	85	8
4. Should Congress approve funds for development of a multibillion-dollar antimissile defense system?	35	38	27
5. Do you believe that spending for domestic programs should be reduced as a means of holding the line on the national debt?	67	25	8
6. Do you favor lowering the vote age for Federal elections to 18?	46	50	4
7. Do you favor a direct popular vote for President?	79	15	6
8. Do you favor tax credits for businesses which would train young people in useful occupations as proposed by my Human Investment Act legislation?	62	26	12
9. Do you believe the earning limit of those drawing social security benefits should be removed?	51	44	5
10. Should the United States be obligated militarily in any conflict in the Middle East?	12	74	14
11. Do you feel we should expand trade with the Soviet Union and other Communist nations who supply aid to North Vietnam?	7	83	10
12. Do you believe Federal tax revenues should be shared with the States?	64	23	13
13. Should Congress permit tax credits for some portion of college tuition costs?	60	33	7
14. Should the Federal Government restrict the sale of firearms?	44	49	7

Food Stamp Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LIONEL VAN DEERLIN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 21, 1967

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues the serious delay in final action on S. 953—the food stamp bill.

This bill has been in conference for several weeks, but there has been no action to resolve the House-Senate differences. The point at issue is the length of the extension. The House bill calls for a single-year extension—through June 30, 1968. The Senate bill calls for a 3-year extension.

I urge my colleagues on the House conference committee to accept the Senate version, or, at the very minimum, a 2-year extension. An extension beyond June 30, 1968, is necessary so that both the Department of Agriculture and the States can move forward with this program.

The uncertainty now created by the delay in Congress and the added uncertainties which would be created under a 1-year extension will impede the very thing the House is seeking—an efficient, well-administered program, that meets the need for dietary improvements among the poor.

Uncertainty—the inability to plan ahead for reasonable periods—is the source of inefficiency. State agencies cannot submit plans to their legislatures far enough in advance to provide the administrative budgets they need to insure proper program supervision.

Counties and cities who have been waiting in line to get the program are reluctant to invest the money and staff time needed to inaugurate the program when they have no guarantee that it will continue beyond next June.

States and counties which are now participating are reluctant to spend funds and staff time to improve their operations or to reach more eligible people. They want assurances that food stamps will be available after next June.

I should like to emphasize that I agree with my colleagues on the House Agriculture Committee about the need for a periodic review of this program, and the results of its operation. However, the record during the past 3 years of operations under the Food Stamp Act of 1964 has not raised any basic questions as to the method, prudence, or propriety of Federal, State, and local administration. Therefore, I am convinced that the committee can continue effectively to carry out its fundamental responsibilities without jeopardizing orderly program expansion.

The level of expansion would, of course, continue to be governed by annual appropriations.

Therefore, I hope the conferees will move promptly toward final action on this bill. I hope they will find it possible to agree on a 3-year extension. If this is not possible, I would urge an extension of at least 2 years.

"Notebook"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1967

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the very able publisher of the Morning News in San Leandro, Calif., Mr. Abe Kofman, writes a column called "Notebook."

It gives me great pleasure to insert in the Record his column for August 4, 1967, pertaining to Bill Romwall, a great fellow and good friend.

Bill Romwall has served the business interests of the East Bay well. He has always been extremely interested in the community in which he lives and in advancing it to make it a better place in which to live.

The article is as follows:

Notebook

(By Abe Kofman)

Bill Romwall . . . a name perhaps better known to all Southern Alameda County men and women . . . than people who are supposed to be more important. I say "supposed" only because no one is more important to this area and community than is Bill Romwall. Lived in San Leandro during the Cherry Days . . . and the Fourth of July Celebrations . . . when horses were in their prime during parades . . . when San Leandro started to forge ahead in both housing projects and the very necessary industrial additions that came to San Leandro. Bill was a gib-wig in Eastshore Neighbors . . . a group of dedicated people who had one major interest . . . the building up of San Leandro.

Bill was also a V.I.P. at Lincoln Engigneering Company . . . a firm located in Berkeley . . . As of last month came time for Bill . . . because of Company regulations . . . to say goodbye to Lincoln because of retirement age. This writer is acquainted with the retirement age for Lincoln . . . for us we're happy this has taken place . . . now Romwall will be with The Morning News.

Perhaps the best way to pay credit to this great guy is to print articles that found their way into my possession. First one is dated July 19 . . . addressed to Mr. G. W. Romwall . . . "Dear Bill: It certainly does not seem possible that the time has arrived for you to start doing the things that you probably have always wanted to do . . . but never seemed to have found the time to accomplish. This 65th birthday seems to catch up with all of us much faster than anticipated when we were in our 20's. Your association with Lincoln Engineering Co. of California has been very pleasant from my standpoint personally. It is always gratifying to have an associate with the company whom we know is forever doing everything within his power to help the business succeed. There are times in every employee's life when he, I am sure, doubts the sincerity of management and the company . . . but I have always felt that we enjoyed your loyalty and sincerity. Many times management must make decisions that are not accepted and understood by some of the employees . . . as it is a difficult task in this day and age to operate any business profitably . . . and unless it is operated profitably, we don't have employees. We have always felt that regardless of these decisions . . . you have had an understanding of our problems. While we hate to see you go . . . we know that you will be able to enjoy some of the luxuries of coffee in bed and knowing you won't have to make that 8:00 a.m. bell at the office. We wish you well and good health for many years in the future. Kindnest personal regards . . . L. L. Meikle, President."

Bill was also recipient of a telegram from Lincoln's St. Louis Office . . . from Jack O'Donnell, the Sales Manager. Was sent to Spengers during a "surprise" retirement testimonial dinner in Bill's honor. Expressed Lincoln's thanks for his 22 years of excellent service. The two messages were read at said "retirement dinner." Because of the high esteem in which Romwall was held at his place of business . . . he was toasted with heaps of praise during the dinner by his fellow employees . . . something this writer is sure Bill deserved.

Bill is vacationing right now . . . will be back "on the job" after August 7th . . . taking his place with members of this newspaper editorial staff. Tells me "praise from my fellow workers was made doubly precious with the knowledge that I will be moving directly into another career . . . that of reporting for the Kofman newspapers on a full time basis." All of us are happy to have Romwall with us . . . confident his contribution will be appreciated by the entire family of The Morning News subscribers. He's the optimistic sort of a guy . . . concludes his message with . . . "Perhaps we'll have a second retirement dinner about 22 years from now . . . when I'm too old to carry on." Bill ole fellow . . . we're never goin' to get too old!

International Drum Corps Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 21, 1967

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, ever since the very beginning of our life as a nation, the colorful spectacle of a drum and bugle corps on parade has symbolized the spirit of freedom which has marked the birth and growth of America. Over the years, drum and bugle parades have inspired the hearts of many of our citizens with a devotion to liberty and pride in the United States of America.

This year, during the week of September 2–9, International Drum Corps Week will be celebrated across the Nation and in Canada. I am proud to call attention to the young people—numbering over 1 million—who participate in this pageantry.

In these disquieting times, when some of our young people are turning to violence and delinquency, it is most encouraging to see so many engaged in this wholesome activity. The drum and bugle corps, whose motto is "Pageantry and Patriotism—Youth on Parade," is doing a great service to this Nation by building the qualities of good citizenship and leadership which are so important to the survival and health of a democracy.

The sight of a drum and bugle corps on parade never fails to bring to mind the many courageous Americans who have gallantly served this country and its ideals, as well as those who are doing so today. America's drum and bugle corps, by virtue of its patriotic, wholesome, character-building activities, merits our admiration and respect. International Drum Corps Week brings this important activity to the attention of the American people, and I hope all Americans will support its continued growth in the future. I am proud to join many of my colleagues in Congress on this occasion in saluting the drum and bugle corps during International Drum Corps Week.

Where Is World Opinion?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 21, 1967

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the International Red Cross recently confirmed that Egypt had used poison gas to murder Yemen civilians, yet not a word has been said against this atrocity in the United Nations.

I commend to the attention of our colleagues an editorial which appeared in the August 3, 1967 edition of the Wall Street Journal concerning this matter.

The editorial follows:

Where Is World Opinion?

The International Red Cross has confirmed that Egypt has slaughtered Yemeni civilians with poison gas. The ephemeral force known as world opinion predictably has rendered its moral judgment with deafening silence.

Three years ago, by contrast, world opinion boiled in outrage when U.S. commanders used non-lethal tear gas to disperse Vietcong guerrillas firing from behind a shield of civilians.

There is no reason to be surprised, for no inconsistency is involved. World opinion comprises chiefly the editorials of Europe's left-wing political press and the posturing of the United Nations' fuzzy-minded neutralists. It can thus be counted on to be consistently anti-American.

Somehow, though, this lesson hasn't penetrated the minds of those Americans who continue to argue that U.S. foreign policy should be designed to get good reviews from world opinion. The next time those arguments come up, it will pay to remember the corpses Red Cross doctors examined in Yemen.

They are a gruesome reminder that what passes for world opinion is an essentially hypocritical force that should never sway the United States from following its own best judgment.

Where To Cut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 21, 1967

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the public is obviously incensed at the prospect of a 10-percent income tax surcharge which has been demanded from the Congress by the President. This morning's Chicago Tribune offers some practical suggestions as to where reductions can be made in Federal spending which could well make the request unnecessary. In view of the helpful nature of this editorial, I am placing it in the RECORD, hopefully that it will undergo proper scrutiny, especially by the Defense Department:

WHERE TO CUT

President Johnson, in asking Congress the other day to impose a 10 per cent income tax surcharge, sought to mollify the irritated taxpayer with soothing remarks about his efforts to hold down expenditures, particularly those of the military.

The President's tax message said he had directed Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara, a "pacesetter" in government efficiency and economy, to make a "searching review" of all defense spending and to "cut costs wherever possible."

"Any organization that has so greatly expanded in so short a time," Mr. Johnson declared, "is bound to have some areas in which further economies can be achieved or less essential expenditures stretched out."

Altho, Mr. Johnson did not so specify, a leading target for the economy ax is the civilian empire with which Secretary McNamara has surrounded himself. The Journal of the Armed Forces reported that civilian employment in the department of defense has grown to enormous proportions in the six and one-half years McNamara has been in office.

The number of permanent civilian positions in the 1968 fiscal defense budget stands at 1,236,369, an increase of more than 200,000 since the last Eisenhower budget was presented to Congress. In that time, McNamara has almost tripled the number of high-paying civilian jobs and added 2.3 billion dollars to the civilian payroll, which stands at 8.1 billion dollars in the 1968 budget.

Adding 200,000 jobs and more than 2 billion dollars to the civilian payroll is a remarkable accomplishment for a cabinet officer who had been held out to his peers by the President as a model in efficient and economical business management.

Civilian jobs on McNamara's personal staff also have mushroomed. They totaled about 1,500 when he first entered the Pentagon. In the 1968 budget there are 74,145 of them, enough to fill out five divisions of troops, and 7,000 more than in the preceding year.

If numbers alone counted, McNamara could also round up several armies, fleets, and air forces from the other 1,162,224 permanent civilian employes employed directly by the army, navy, air force, and marine corps. Nor does this huge "military" payroll cover those engaged in such "civil" activities as administering the Panama Canal Zone, maintaining cemeteries, etc. They number 50,000 and their pay is 382 million dollars.

In every area of the McNamara civilian empire there have been increases, but none so striking as that of the top three "supergrades," where salaries range from $20,000 to $28,000. McNamara boosted their number from 359 in fiscal 1962 to 931 in fiscal 1968.

That amounts to 800 civilian spear carriers for every top salaried McNamara civilian. Not even the military can come close. By contrast, as the Journal pointed out, there are 2,600 uniformed personnel for each general or admiral. It pays to be a McNamara civilian.

Legislation To Eliminate Juvenile Delinquency Is Imperatively Urgent

SPEECH
OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 21, 1967

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, the recent revelations, by the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the testimony of other authorities, concerning the accelerating crime rate in this country is most alarming and the particular statistics showing the steady growth in juvenile delinquency throughout the Nation is nearly frightening to the average citizen.

The Congress and the country have, I believe, a high obligation to extend every effort and resource in trying to decrease the general crime rate and especially reduce the most disturbing advance in juvenile delinquency. In response to this obligation and in fulfillment of this wholesome objective, the esteemed and industrious chairman and dedicated members of the House Education and Labor Committee have approved a bill designed to strengthen the operations of the Nation's juvenile courts and project programs of constructive and enlightening help to potentially delinquent youngsters.

In a prudently realistic approach and with conviction that substantial research in delinquency causes is already underway, with some of the results available, the committee has recommended that more money and concentration should be directed toward strengthening existing rehabilitation programs and improving the operations and services of youth detention centers. With additional prudence, although questioned by some, the committee has recommended a limited authorization, to 1 year, of $25 million, with the understanding that the Congress will review the results and the effectiveness of the program at the end of the year for continued legislative action.

Mr. Speaker, this country is unfortunately faced today with many critical and complex problems, solutions to which seem to remain tragically unclear. However, there is one thing of which we may be certain; the youth of this country is our greatest asset for the future. This bill, H.R. 12120, represents a sound step forward in meeting our obligation to help our troubled youth to become tomorrow's stable, responsible citizens. I most earnestly hope this House will soon be granted the opportunity to consider H.R. 12120 and I further earnestly hope it will be granted resounding approval in the national interest.

Exempted Magazines Doubt IRS Has Right To Tax Them

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 21, 1967

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, Boy Scouts from all over the world convened this month at the 12th World Jamboree of Scouts in Farragut State Park in Idaho. As the father of a son who has enjoyed and profited greatly from the Scouting movement, I certainly pay the highest tribute to the Boy Scouts who help to turn out real men and outstanding citizens, as every Member of this body will agree.

It is unfortunate, therefore, that there are those who would put roadblocks in the way of Scouting and its many good deeds. I have always labored under the impression that doing something to hinder Scouting would be a little like being against God, mother, and country. Evidently I have been somewhat naive in this impression, although it does not lessen my desire to help Scouting one bit. Nevertheless, not too long ago, here in the Nation's Capitol, a witness appearing at a hearing of the Internal Revenue Service had some startling things to say regarding the Scouts.

Mr. Speaker, at this point, I would like to insert in the RECORD a news story by United Press International which appeared in the Thursday, July 20, issue of the Washington Evening Star. I have eliminated the name of the individual who made the comments about the Boy Scouts of America. I did this because I do not want to criticize this individual as much as I want to call attention to the real culprit—the group which seeks to hinder the work of the Boy Scouts and of other voluntary organizations in this country. I am talking about the Internal Revenue Service.

The article follows:

EXEMPTED MAGAZINES DOUBT IRS HAS RIGHT TO TAX THEM

Attorneys for the National Geographic Society and other tax-exempt magazine publishers have told the Internal Revenue Service it has no right to tax their profits on advertising revenue.

"Let the Congress act on this matter," Washington attorney Arthur B. Hanson said at an IRS hearing yesterday on a proposed ruling to impose levies on income from activities "unrelated" to purposes for which organizations were granted their exemptions.

But a private magazine publisher . . . insisted the tax agency could act without Congress rewriting a 1950 law on the unrelated income.

. . . who puts out magazines on municipal, educational, and engineering matters, pointed specifically to "Boy's Life," the magazine of the Boy Scouts of America, as one periodical that should lose its exemption.

"This could well be the Boy Scouts 'good deed' of the year for 1967," . . . testified.

He quoted from a "Boy's Life" report that its advertising helps young boys "in the development of brand preference and the ability to buy sensibly." then he commented:

"I am hopeful that . . . the leaders of the Boy Scouts of America will voluntarily conclude that it is more important to teach respect for the taxpaying process than to teach the development of brand preference."

Hanson's challenge of IRS jurisdiction was supported by Kenneth H. Liles, an attorney representing the American Trucking Associations, Inc., which publishes Transport Topics each week.

Further opposition, in the second of three days of hearings, came from spokesmen for the New England Journal of Medicine and the Journal of Bone Joint Surgery.

As many of you in this body know, the IRS held hearings on proposed regulations to impose taxes on so-called unrelated income from advertising in the publications of various tax-exempt organizations, including Boys Life, the magazine of the Boy Scouts of America. As I have said, my criticism is leveled not at the man who made these statements, but at the IRS which seeks to establish such a tax without congressional action.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that if such so-called unrelated income should be taxed that this be done only after appropriate hearings before the respected Committee on Ways and Means and after this House, and Congress as a whole, has acted on new legislation.

Personally, I support the legislation introduced by colleagues on both sides of the aisle which would make it absolutely clear to the IRS that magazines published by tax-exempt organizations are tax exempt. If it takes passage of such legislation to make it clear to the IRS that Congress writes tax laws, then I urge Congress to take appropriate action.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend Congressmen JOEL T. BROYHILL, Republican of Virginia; JAMES F. BATTIN, Republican of Montana; JOHN C. WATTS, Democrat of Kentucky; THOMAS B. CURTIS, Republican of Missouri; and TIM LEE CARTER, Republican of Kentucky, who have introduced the needed legislation to prevent the hindering of the work of such outstanding organizations as the Boy Scouts of America. I also want to commend my colleague, the Congressman from Missouri, Dr. DURWARD G. HALL, for his earlier remarks exposing the efforts of IRS to tax the Boy Scouts magazine and other such publications.

Soviets Lead World in Shipping Buildup

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED REINECKE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 21, 1967

Mr. REINECKE. Mr. Speaker, the present administration seems unable to grasp the seriousness of the problems facing the merchant marine industry in this Nation. For more than 2 years the Nation has been anxiously awaiting the announcement of a new maritime policy by the President. So far no policy has been announced by the White House.

The new Secretary of Transportation has taken an arrogant attitude toward the plight of the martime industry. He seems only intent on building up his empire. He clearly does not care about finding solutions to maritime problems.

What does it take to wake up the administration? Must we sink every ship? Must this Nation's international shipping and its merchant fleet fall to absolute zero before the White House does something?

The administration says it is for jobs. But it fails to propose any new ideas for training merchant seamen. And so ships sail without adequate crews. The administration says it is for building industry. Yet the Transportation Secretary proposes exporting jobs and industry by building American-flag ships in foreign shipyards.

Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, this recent report by Paul Wohl in the August 19, 1967, issue of the Christian Science Monitor will help to wake up the White House, before it is too late. It gives hard facts about the remarkable growth and vigor of the Soviet merchant fleet.

SOVIETS LEAD WORLD IN SHIPPING BUILDUP

(By Paul Wohl)

Merchant shipping is the Soviet Union's bridge to the world. Its unprecedented expansion increases the Kremlin's bargaining power in world affairs.

During the Middle East crisis, Western interests asked themselves anxiously whether the Soviets could not pick up all or part of the oil which the Arab states refused to ship to the West.

At that time Soviet tanker tonnage already was more than half as large as that of the United States (2.726 million gross tons as compared to 4.568 million gross tons as of June, 1966).

There was the possibility that the Soviets might charter tanker tonnage under Liberian or Norwegian registry (the largest tanker tonnage in the world). But the Soviet Union, for various reasons, was not ready for such an undertaking.

YOUNG AND SPEEDY

Soviet shipping is engaged in a more solid enterprise. Its increase during the past five years has been extraordinary (from 5.5 to 9.5 million deadweight tons), faster even than that of Japan. In the next five years the Soviets expect to expand their Merchant Marine from its present 9.5 to 15 or 17 million deadweight tons.

The Soviet Merchant Marine is one of the youngest in the world. Four-fifths of its vessels were built in the past 10 years; two-thirds have a speed of more than 14 knots.

In the past, most Soviet merchantmen were built abroad. Now Soviet yards produce 40 percent of the new tonnage. Only 10 percent comes from capitalist countries. The balance is built in Poland, East Germany, Yugoslavia, Romania, and Bulgaria. The Soviets supply navigation instruments and radio equipment.

For Western shipyards, which banked on Soviet orders in years of recession, this is a severe blow.

The Soviets operate 29 shipping lines servicing ports in 38 countries, Minister of the Merchant Marine Victor G. Bakayev told the Moscow weekly, New Times, in June.

In March, it was reported that every third day a Soviet cargo ship called at an Algerian port. At least 100 Soviet vessels, usually fully loaded, constantly ply the West African route. On the return voyage from Africa, Soviet diesel ships now frequently are chartered by West European firms.

There is a Soviet-French, a Soviet-Japanese, a Soviet-Indian and, since February, even a Soviet-Spanish line. There also are lines run jointly with British, West German, Dutch and Belgian firms.

While in the past the Soviets concentrated on small, sturdy freighters, they now build larger ships of various types. Among them: 15,000-deadweight-ton cargo liners with 13,000-horsepower steam turbines capable of making 19 knots and with a cruising range, without refueling, of more than 12,000 miles.

Another standard-type vessel turned out by Soviet yards is a 7,500-ton cargo ship for service in the Arctic. These ships, which can make 15 knots, are said to be capable of negotiating the northern seaway around Siberia without icebreaker support.

In tankers, too, the Soviets are going in for bigger vessels. Today the average Soviet tanker has little more than half the average capacity of a United States tanker. But the Leningrad shipyards now are turning out so-called Sonya-type tankers of 45,000 deadweight tons, which ranks among the larger ships of their class. Yugoslavia is building 18,000-ton tankers, and Poland, 16,000-ton tankers, for the Soviet Union.

BIG ANNUAL INCREASE

From Italian and Japanese shipyards the Soviets are getting refrigerator vessels.

There are few passenger ships.

The Soviet merchant fleet, which increased by 435 percent since 1950 (compared with a 93 percent increase for the rest of the world), now adds every year more than a million gross tons to its present tonnage.

(The gross ton is the traditional measurement of merchant vessels; it is more complex than the deadweight ton, because it takes in the size of the hold. Shipping tonnage in gross tons is usually smaller than the same tonnage expressed in deadweight tons. Thus, total United States tonnage as of June, 1966, amounted to some 27 million deadweight tons, or 20 million gross tons.)

In 1958, the Soviets had 730 merchant vessels. By the end of this year they are expected to have 1,700 vessels. A recent inquiry in the shipyards of the capitalist world indicates that capitalist tonnage will increase between 1966 and 1970 by 20 to 25 percent. In the same period the Soviet Merchant Marine is expected to increase by 50 percent.

Coastwise shipping is much less important than in the past. Today, nine-tenths of the Soviet Union's shipping capacity is engaged in international trade, but part of Soviet exports still is moved by foreign carriers.

HALF MOVED BY SEA

According to a statement by Mr. Bakayev in Paris last April, the volume of Soviet goods carried by foreign merchant vessels last year was equal to four times the total Soviet maritime traffic in 1958.

More than half of Soviet foreign trade now moves by sea (in 1965, nearly 92 million tons out of 174 million tons; the corresponding figures for 1960 were 44 million tons by sea and 49 million tons by rail; the total in 1960 was 99 million tons).

The Soviets have very little maritime trade with the United States, but trade with Latin America is increasing. Between 8 and 10 million tons of Soviet goods are moved to Cuba every year. The long Cuban route and the even longer route to Vietnam are a big burden for Soviet merchant ships.

In order to cope with these distances, the Soviets seek to speed up their turnover. The Soviet monthly Morskoi Flot (Maritime Fleet) says the daily turnover in Soviet-bloc ports is larger than in Western ports.

HUGE PROFITS LISTED

According to Mr. Bakayev, Soviet merchant shipping has become a profitable enterprise, especially since the introduction of "Libermanism" (a system whereby profit should be the main test of the efficiency of an enterprise), as it is called in the West. Thus the Latvian shipping line operating mainly from Riga is supposed to have increased its turnover in overseas traffic by 11.5 percent since last July and its profits by 26.6 percent.

Altogether, writes Mr. Bakayev in Pravda of Aug. 1, the Soviet merchant fleet has brought in several hundred million rubles of profit in recent years.

In order to speed up operations, computer techniques have been introduced. At present there is one computer center in Leningrad and another one in the Merchant Marine Ministry in Moscow.

Reading Mr. Bakayev, one must assume that Soviet captains are accomplished mathematicians. While mathematics always has been a Russian strong point, one wonders how Soviet shipping will make out with the amount of paper work in store for it under the proposed system of automation.

But progress continues. New ports have sprung up (they also are under the Ministry of Merchant Marine). Thus the port of Ilyichevak near Odessa already surpasses Odessa in freight turnover. In the Far East the Soviets hope to expand and radically modernize the port of Nakhodka with the help of the Japanese. Other new ports are being built along the northern sea route.

SOVIETS JOIN GROUPS

Merchant shipping is one line of Soviet economic activity which unfolds under the eyes of the West. There can be no "iron curtain" in international shipping. Thus the Soviets have joined several of the international shipping conferences through which private shipping companies seek to regulate freight rates.

The Soviet Union belongs to almost all international maritime conventions and its vessels have participated in numerous rescue operations. Last year the Soviets say they saved 109 sailors of Greek, Danish, Japanese, Swedish and Norwegian origin.

Soviet seamen, who only five years ago frequently made a sloppy appearance, now are fairly well dressed and their ships usually look freshly painted and clean.

The emergence of the Soviets as the world's sixth biggest maritime power, ranking behind the United States, the British Commonwealth, Norway, Liberia, Japan and Greece (in this order), is an entirely new departure and, apparently, only a beginning.

While Soviet merchant tonnage is expected to increase by 50 percent in the current five-year-plan period, it aims to expand its traffic by 80 percent.

Economy Snaps Back, Foils Bearish Critics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 21, 1967

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, Hobart Rowen, a perceptive writer on economic affairs, discussed the economy and the President's request for increased tax revenue in editions of the Washington Post for August 20, 1967. The column usefully ties together in clear fashion the disparate views in respect to the economy. Under unanimous consent I place it in the Appendix of the Record:

Economy Snaps Back, Foils Bearish Critics

(By Hobart Rowen)

Things are perking up again, and the pessimists about the economy have had to beat a hasty retreat. Some of them had confidently predicted that we'd be in a recession by now.

But with economic activity on the up-tick, the Gloomy Gus contingent has been reduced to saying: "It's true that things are brighter, but that doesn't mean we're in for a big boom."

We will have to wait to see whether the economy develops that extra edge of exuberance associated with excessive demand. It may not, especially if the President's deflationary program—composed of tax increases and spending cuts—gets through Congress.

But the more important point is that the economy, despite the wars in Vietnam and the cities at home, has come smartly through a period of readjustment. Once again, consumers are in the stores—buying instead of looking—and corporate profits, which had edged down early in the year, have turned up again.

Throughout the whole period that the Gloomy Guses were crying "recession," the over-all unemployment level never exceeded 4 per cent. The latest figure is 3.9 per cent.

Economic council chairman Gardner Ackley and his associates proved to be much better forecasters than those alarmists who saw disaster ahead. It is true that Ackley & Co. did not expect 1967 to get off to as slow a start as it did. But to their credit, they recommended stimulative actions earlier this year when they were necessary.

The latest Federal Reserve Board production index, for July, is almost as high as the level of a year ago, although still down from the December peak. Personal income in both June and July increased briskly.

This adds up, as Ackley says, to evidence of an economy that is once again "buoyant." Even a critic like economist Pierre Rinfret concedes that a recovery has taken place, and that Gross National Product in the 4th quarter of this year will be running at a rate of $805 billion.

That implies an advance in the July-September period, and again in the October-December quarter of a boom-style $15 billion for each three months.

All of the foregoing might be just an exercise in finger-pointing at those who haven't yet had the good grace to say they were wrong, were it not for the painful fact that these same misguided worriers now insist that higher taxes will end the "incipient boomlet."

Better, says the New York Times editorially, to cut expenditures for the space program, agriculture, and other nonmilitary endeavors. Thus, the New York Times joins hands with some members of the Joint Economic Committee—and others who need a refresher course in basic economics—who fail to see that cutting spending is just as deflationary as raising taxes.

The Times can't have it both ways. If it fears that boosted taxes would cut short the "boomlet," it should have the same concern about reduced spending.

Another strange argument put forward against raising taxes is that the Government has such a big debt to carry that borrowing another $7.4 billion (the amount to be brought into the Treasury in fiscal 1968 by higher taxes) wouldn't matter much.

ECONOMIC IMPACT

Tell that to the housing industry and municipalities whose tongues were hanging out last year for a couple of hundred million dollars that they couldn't borrow!

It would be just dandy if the Times could have its way, and the Vietnam escalation ended. That would reorder the Nation's priorities, and we wouldn't be in the present budgetary bind.

But that is just wishful thinking at the moment. Critics must be realistic, even when it hurts. For example, it would be nice to have tax reform, as Congressman Henry Reuss suggests. But Congress isn't going to pass a reform bill at this session. And tax reform bills, anyway, rarely yield revenue: what is gained from plugged loopholes is generally distributed elsewhere.

Nor is it realistic to think that Congress will cut spending by significant amounts—not in wasteful areas like space and certainly not in unnecessary subsidies for the water, transportation, and agriculture lobby interests.

Unless the Nation is ready to accept a 7 and 8 per cent interest rate structure, it thus must acknowledge the unhappy need for higher taxes. Fighting a war on borrowed money alone means that the price of money will have to go up. And higher interest rates hit the economy in an uneven way..

Among other things, higher interest rates put a crimp in the construction industry. And let's face it, the construction industry is one of the main sources of jobs for unskilled and less-skilled Negro labor.

The festering problems of the cities, already reflecting the Nation's preoccupation with the Vietnam war, would be worsened if we try to pay for all of its costs by cutting other spending or letting interest rates soar.

Newport, Tenn., Plain Talk Editorializes on Our Nuclear Edge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 21, 1967

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert in the Appendix of the Record the following editorial from the August 17, 1967, Newport, Tenn., Plain Talk, which I am sure will be of interest to my colleagues and the readers of the Record.

I think we will also agree that we cannot permit a nuclear gap to exist, and I hope we will take all the necessary action to prevent such an occurrence.

The editorial referred to follows:

Our Nuclear Edge

Of growing concern to a number of legislators in Congress is the prospect of a change in the nuclear balance between the United States and Russia. A recent report by the American Security Council to the House Armed Service Committee is the cause of some of it.

The implications of the report are grave and if it's an accurate projection of the future trend the United States is on the way to losing its once-great nuclear weapons edge over the Soviet Union. By 1971, says the report, "a massive megatonnage gap will have developed."

The report blames civilian leaders in the Pentagon, notably Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara, for a slowdown in U.S. nuclear weapons progress. The U.S.S.R. is reportedly well ahead of the United States in two vital categories—anti-missile defense and orbital bomb capacity.

The report indicts civilian leaders in charging them with discounting chances of a Russian attack, with believing that Russia desires to live in peaceful co-existence.

Whether or not estimates of Russia's intensions are accurate, it would be folly to allow a nuclear weapons gap to develop. Such a gap was alleged in the 1960 presidential election campaign—and it later turned out no gap had, after all, existed. If a gap is indeed developing today, Congress must take the necessary action, even at considerable cost to reverse the trend.

India's Progress With Self-Help Programs—Rebuttal to Foreign Affairs Committee Minority Views on India and United States Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD M. FRASER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 21, 1967

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, in the recent committee report on the Foreign Assistance Act of 1967, H.R. 12048, a minority of the foreign affairs committee was highly critical of the policies of India, a major recipient of U.S. aid funds. I would like to use this opportunity to comment on some of their criticisms. I believe that India has made progress on a number of fronts.

First, there is the question of food production.

In the fall of 1965, the Indian Government announced, on its own and not as a result of "pressuring" from the outside, that increased agriculture production would be given top priority in its development plans and that a whole new strategy would be pursued. This strategy relies very heavily on providing modern inputs like fertilizer, new seeds, and water plus the assurance of attractive prices to the food producers to enable them to use these modern inputs at a profit. The rapid introduction of these new inputs would not be possible without the groundwork that has been laid over the past 15 years through demonstration, extension and information programs to acquaint the Indian farmer with new techniques.

Even though only 2 years has passed since the beginning of the agricultural revolution in India, significant progress has been accomplished. Outlays for agriculture and community development account for about 18 percent of total development outlays in 1966–67, compared with 14 percent in 1965–66 and an average of less than 13 percent in the first 4 years of the third plan.

Indian fertilizer consumption has also expanding very rapidly. India's import bill for fertilizer has increased from $65 million in 1965 to an estimated $300 million this year. Domestic production of fertilizer is also increasing from about 375,000 tons in 1964–65 to a target of almost 600,000 tons in 1966–67.

There are other new programs which have been started. The Indian Government has a target of sowing 15 million acres with new high yielding varieties of seed during the current crop year and 32 million by the end of 1971.

New programs have been started to survey the water resources of Northern India, and to bring about more effective utilization of available water in support of intensive agriculture rather than as drought relief. By 1971 acreage under irrigation is expected to reach 111 million acres or about one-third of all of India's cultivated farmland. New credit regulations have been promulgated to extend credit to farmers on the basis of production rather than on the basis of fixed assets.

Recent reports on the Indian crop year which ended April 1967 give evidence that price incentives, fertilizers and new seeds may be taking hold. The rice production in South Indian States not affected by the second drought exceeded the alltime high, and wheat production in the important "bread basket" states of Punjab and Uttar Pradesh also exceeded the previous record levels of 1964–65.

There is every reason to think that, given continuation of these new programs, normal monsoons and given a continuation of assistance programs from the United States and others, that India can become self-sufficient in food by the mid-1970's.

A second criticism contained in the minority report dealt with the question of rat control and the religious beliefs of the people relating to cows.

There have been many stories on loss of grain because of rats and cows. The Indian Government is well aware of the rat problem and sponsored a Rodent Symposium in December 1966. Subsequently, a center for research and training in this area has been set up by the Government. On the basis of experiments carried out at this center, methods and pesticides to control rats and insects have been developed and are being extensively used in India. During 1967–68 nearly four times more money is being budgeted for state government rat control programs.

Many of the cows in India are indispensable to the rural economy where their primary use is for power for such farm operations as irrigation, threshing and transportation. They are also a source of fuel and fertilizer and of milk and dairy products. The number of cows milked each year averages close to 100 million. There are also large numbers of old and unproductive cattle. An organized effort is being made to herd unproductive cows into forests or other segregated areas where they can be worshiped without so costly a drain on Indian food resources.

A third criticism in the minority report dealt with the problems of population growth.

For the purpose of continuing the population growth within manageable proportions, the Indians set a goal of reducing the birth rate from the present 41 per thousand per annum to 25, within a decade.

Family planning is a state subject under the constitution and therefore the implementation of the program rests with the state governments. However, in effect, 96 to 97 percent of the expenditure on the family planning program is met by the central government. For 1966–67 over $19 million was provided and for 1967–68, $41 million has been provided in the budget for family planning. The latter figure is higher than the total family planning expenditure during the entire third 5-year plan period.

Fourth, is the question of India's foreign policy.

Indian foreign policy during the recent Middle East crisis reflects her past support of President Nasser in the United Nations and in the Arab world. India's desire to maintain a position of influence in the Afro-Asian camp has played a key role in her support of Nasser. Nevertheless, not all Indians agreed with Mrs. Gandhi and as is to be expected in a democracy, lively debate about India's real interest in the Middle East took place within India. Despite the strong support given the United Arab Republic by Prime Minister Gandhi, she has explicitly dissociated India's position from Arab avowals to accomplish Israel's destruction. India has supported Israel's right to existence.

Thus, it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that our foreign aid program in India is accomplishing its aims. India is the largest free nation in the developing world. It deserves the support and encouragment of the democracy whose traditions and wealth put it in the most favorable position to lend assistance—the United States of America. Congress will reflect the overwhelming sentiment of the American people in continuing our aid to India.

The Carroll County Farm Museum

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 21, 1967

Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, for many Americans, born and raised in cities, a visit to a present-day farm is like a trip into a different world. For all of us, including modern farmers, a chance to observe the agricultural methods of the past is a rare and valuable opportunity, both educational and enjoyable.

Just such an opportunity is now available in Westminster, Md., in the midst of beautiful Carroll County, just a short drive from Washington and Baltimore. The Carroll County Farm Museum, already a very popular attraction, offers us excellent displays of all of the buildings, equipment, and furnishings of a typical 19th-century farm. On selected days, the farm museum also features demonstrations of various crafts, performed by individuals who have preserved and mastered the now-vanishing practical arts which the pioneers relied on.

The success of the farm museum is a tribute to the perception and energies of countless citizens of Carroll County, who had the vision and imagination to convert the "Old Folks Home" into this museum of agricultural history, and who contributed both the antiques which now grace the museum, and the many hours required to restore the property and its fascinating displays.

I would encourage my colleagues and their constituents and friends to visit this unique and intriguing museum at the first opportunity, and would like to include in the RECORD the following description of it by Maryland's own Anne Christmas which appeared in the travel section of the New York Times of August 13, 1967:

A NEW MARYLAND MUSEUM DOWN ON THE FARM

(By Anne Christmas)

WESTMINSTER, MD.—A 19th-century farm filled with relics of a nearly forgotten era is the setting for the Carroll County Farm Museum, one of Maryland's newest tourist attractions.

The story of how the museum came into being is an interesting one. Some years ago, residents of Westminster noted that subdivisions were encroaching rapidly around a beautiful 142-acre tract of county-owned land within the city limits. This last bit of farmland inside Westminster was known as "The Old Folks Home," and, when its inhabitants dwindled to six, the facility was phased out.

This left the place unoccupied, and an immediate target for real-estate developers. They envisioned an extension of the attractive communities already flanking the property's boundaries.

The Carroll County Commission named a Citizens Committee to establish a farm museum to preserve some memories of the area's rich agricultural heritage—"just in case a generation might grow up without being able to recognize a plow, or even a cow," as one of the group commented.

BANK BARN

The buildings of "The Old Folks Home" were well suited to the project. The key structure was a bank barn, which ranks among Maryland's best examples of early 19th-century construction. A series of rooms—they are built along one side of the barn to serve as a dormitory—was ideal for small exhibits of farm crafts, such as spinning, butterchurning, weaving, chair-caning and baking.

The main house, somewhat dreary and in need of refurbishing when the museum's board of governors inherited it in 1965, nonetheless was stoutly built with classically simple lines. Its 30 rooms underwent a major overhaul last year.

Most of the rooms of this typical farm dwelling are now open to the public for the first time. Many a Maryland attic was raided and many a long hour was spent by antiques buffs in acquiring furniture suitable for the house.

QUAINT KITCHEN

The Citizens Committee is particularly pleased with the results it has produced in setting up a quaint old kitchen. Items there include fireplace implements, a dough box, a hutch cupboard and ladderback chairs.

A child's bedroom has a four-poster walnut bed and a complete set of 19th-century doll furniture. Two other bedrooms, the customary "summer kitchen" and a bake-oven room recently were furnished with suitable antiques and opened for inspection by visitors.

Most of the land in surrounding Carroll County is used for growing corn, wheat and hay, with beef and dairy cattle as important byproducts. In keeping with local custom, the farm museum's acreage has been planted in grass, along with demonstration crops of wheat, corn, tobacco, buckwheat and broomcorn.

Before its formal opening last summer, the museum received some 1,000 articles from 200 individuals and organizations. Now that the farm is open regularly each weekend and holidays, many more people have become interested in contributing antiques and farm memorabilia.

One of its treasures is a wagon that was one of the first to deliver mail in Carroll County, where rural free delivery was begun in 1899. Also in the barn area are early reapers, threshing machines, furrow and shovel plows, harnesses, oxen-yokes and carriages.

Implements for shoeing horses, making brooms, quilting, woodworking and the like also are on view every weekend throughout the season, which ends Oct. 31. Visiting hours are noon until 7 P.M. during August, and from noon to 5 P.M. in September and October. Admission is 75 cents for adults and 25 cents for children between 12 and 18 years old.

CRAFT DAYS

In addition, on "craft days" experts in many of these nearly forgotten arts are on hand to show how the pioneers performed these tasks. Dates for such demonstrations are next Saturday, when the accent will be on threshing and tobacco harvesting; Sept. 7–10, when the Mason-Dixon Steam Society holds its annual show, and Oct. 14, when "Fall Harvest Day" will attract thousands of visitors to enjoy Maryland's spectacular autumn foliage, as well as the farm operations.

Westminster is only 35 miles from Baltimore, and can be reached by taking the Baltimore Beltway (Interstate 695) west to the Pikesville-Reistertown exit and then U.S. 140. The highway goes through some glorious open land, including Green Spring Valley, Maryland's most beautiful fox-hunting country.

The village of Glyndon, only a mile or two east for Reistertown on U.S. 140, is the home of the Maryland Hunt Cup each April. Many enthusiasts of timber racing make a special trip there to view the tremendous fences on the course, which is regarded as one of the most difficult steeplechase tests in the world.

Corn Price Drop—What It Means

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 21, 1967

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, the following is an editorial which appeared in the August 13 issue of the Council Bluffs Nonpareil. It points out what a 30-cent drop in the price of corn means to the people in a single county. Multiply this by the hundreds of counties in the Midwest. The effect on the people is disastrous.

I think the article is very thought-provoking and deserves the attention of the Members of the House:

IT WILL MEAN $5.1 MILLION LESS

"Okay", says the city guy. "So the price of corn is down. What do I care? What does it mean to me?"

Maybe this is right. Maybe so few people live and work on farms any more that the price received for farm products is of little interest. So let's put the whole situation in a different light to try to draw attention to what is a very real problem.

Pottawattamie County is expected to produce about 17 million bushels of corn in 1967. The price of corn when the new harvest starts, about 60 days from now, is certain to be 30 cents below the level of last year. That means that the corn crop will be worth $5.1 million less than if last year's prices had prevailed.

Farmers are accustomed to being pushed around so although there will be some grumbling and criticism, little will be heard about it. But what if the same kind of income drop were to be sustained by our wage-earners. What if 5,100 of the salaried men of this county were to be notified that they were going to receive $1,000 each less this year than last for the same amount of work?

Would this raise the roof? You bet it would. These 5,100 wage-earners would represent about 25 per cent of the families in this county and this kind of income reduction would mean consternation.

Or to spread the drop in income even farther, if 10,200 workers were to have their earnings reduced by $500 per year each, the resulting decline in economic activity in this county would be the same as the projected decrease in corn prices. Would this be worth a lot of comment? You know it would; in fact we might have some riots of our own right here.

Why then should the farmer have to take this kind of cut in earnings without squawking? He shouldn't. He ought to raise cain and keep raising it until something is done. As far as we are concerned, he has a lot more to complain about than most of the people who are keeping the country in a state of pandemonium right now.

Crash Regimentation?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 15, 1967

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, I believe my colleagues will enjoy and appreciate an editorial entitled "Crash Regimentation?" which appeared recently in the Des Plaines Valley News.

The editorial follows:

[From the Desplaines Valley News, July 27, 1967]

CRASH REGIMENTATION?

No one seems to be paying attention to all the latest crash legislation (regimentation?) imposed on us by Congress lately.

The stock market goes down. "Crash" investigations and profit margins are hastily imposed by Federal Bureaus. It goes up and "crash" inflation practices and scrutiny is ordered by FTC.

Two giant firms attempt to merge. "Crash" rulings are ordered to halt the practice.

Rail workers go on strike. Nothing happens until they do, then "Crash" rulings are passed prohibiting this practice.

Two planes crash. Congress hurriedly orders a "Crash" investigation on the incident. It does this after every such plane crash.

An attorney writes a book about auto safety. Congress hurriedly holds hearings to investigate and make rulings. Another author writes about the effects of chemical insect control, so to the rescue comes a Federal Bureau with a crash program.

Conditions in large cities cause riots. So crash rulings are sought to forbid such practices.

College students take to LSD, so national legislation is asked to end that practice.

Cigarette smoking is connected with cancer somehow. So a Federal Bureau orders warnings on all packages (sales continue to climb) and now seeks to have equal time with each commercial on that product.

The population increases. Bureaus hurriedly pass out information pamphlets and birth control pills.

A fist fight occurs in Africa. Suddenly huge U.S. transport planes appear over that place. Israel forces damage all of the Arabian tanks rolling to invade their borders. Somehow a U.S. communications ship "happens" to be there (to protect citizens that have been evacuated earlier naturally) and is damaged.

Teachers strike and national rulings are sought to halt the practice. Truckers strike, so more rulings are sought.

Note that in each incident or case, the "crash" legislation had been imposed following the act rather than trying to find out just what had caused the incident.

It's just like firemen seeking to outlaw fires without seeking their causes. If an evil must build up to the point that a disaster occurs, the method has been to outlaw the fire rather than seek its cause.

The threads of federal regimentation are like those of a spider web. The fly cannot see the web until snagged and removed from society.

"Crash" legislation leaves no time for careful thought, analysis or deliberation. It calls for dictatorship (do this or else laws) hastily imposed.

Many will argue that "crash" legislation has accomplished some good. Perhaps it has, but at what price in dictatorship? And has it cured the problem or its causes?

Note that our apathy toward the disaster lies dormant until the cancer occurs, causing awareness and fear; so federal laws are asked and the causes of the disaster still remain in need of treatment.

Currently, a "crash" extra six percent federal income surtax is sought besides all those taxes imposed by the state legislature effective August 1.

Praise for Percy Housing Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT TAFT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 8, 1967

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, recently the Cincinnati Enquirer commented editorially on a bill introduced in the Senate by my friend from Illinois, Senator CHARLES H. PERCY, and cosponsored in the House by me. I commend the editorial to the attention of all.

[From the Cincinnati Enquirer, Aug. 13, 1967]

WHY OVERLOOK THE PERCY PLAN?

Administration supporters in Congress are engaged in a flurry of activity to step up the flow of Federal aid to the nation's big cities—and in particular to its low-income inhabitants. None, however, has given more than passing attention to the most ingenious formula of its kind to find its way into the legislative hopper in many years.

One reason may be that its author is Sen. Charles H. Percy (R., Ill.), who has performed the remarkable feat of enlisting every Senate Republican as a cosponsor.

Another may be that, unlike most legislative proposals in the field, the Percy plan leans almost exclusively upon private enterprise rather than government.

What Senator Percy is advocating, specifically, is the establishment of a National Home Ownership Foundation to provide millions of low-income Americans with the resources to buy their own homes as an alternative to being herded into public housing projects.

Briefly put, the National Home Ownership Foundation would raise as much as $2 billion in private capital through the sale of guaranteed debentures. That capital would then be loaned to nonprofit associations to build or restore homes that could be sold at not more than $12,500 on long-term loans at 3% interest. The taxpayers' share would be limited to subsidizing the 3% interest subsidy.

The benefits of the Percy program are obvious.

For one thing, it represents the only formula through which many low-income families can ever approach home ownership with the sense of pride and responsibility that generally accompanies it. Moving into a public housing project, by way of contrast, often commits such a large share of a low-income family's income that home ownership simply vanishes forever as a realizable goal.

For another, what Senator Percy proposes could be a prime factor in reclaiming substandard neighborhoods and making them habitable again.

Richard Cloward of Columbia University's School of Social Work cited some statistics in an appearance before the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions not long ago that create some serious doubts about the scope of existing Federal housing programs.

"Since the public housing program was legislated in 1933," Mr. Cloward notes, "some 600,000 low-income housing units have been built, but in the last 15 years urban renewal and highway construction alone have demolished 700,000 low-rental units. If we add to this figure the low-rental housing destroyed by various Federal mortgage and tax-abatement programs . . . it is estimated that probably one million low-income units have been destroyed in this 15-year period.

"In the same period, urban renewal has built at the most 100,000 new units. So, in a little more than three decades the net loss in low-income housing is probably about 250,000 units. . . . The same story has been repeated all over the nation: urban renewals that demolish low-income housing and new highways that run through the ghetto have compressed people further and further into fewer and fewer and worse and worse buildings."

I twould take some expert exploration to determine precisely the extent to which Senator Percy's National Home Ownership Foundation could reverse the trends of the last three decades. But it seems a creative contribution to one of the nation's basic problems and deserves, as a result, considerably more attention than it has received to date.

Conference Report on S. 16

SPEECH

OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1967

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I most earnestly urge and hope that the House will speedily and overwhelmingly approve this conference report now before us on S. 16, which provides a more equitable and realistic extension of benefits to all our war veterans and their families.

This conference report represents a just compromise agreement of our persistent congressional efforts to enact reasonable legislation to justly liberalize pension benefits for older veterans and simultaneously extend the full range of our traditional wartime benefits to veterans of current military service.

In substance, Mr. Speaker, this conference bill will provide an average 5 percent greatly needed cost-of-living increase in pension benefits for veterans and their survivors of all wars; authorize full wartime benefits for Vietnam era veterans regardless of where they have served; increase subsistence allowances for veterans in college; initiate urgently-required job training programs, and extend the Veterans' Administration home loan guarantee program for World War II veterans for 3 years. There are several other provisions designed to improve and balance our veterans benefits program that have already been fully and carefully explained by the distinguished chairman of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee and that need no further recitation.

Mr. Speaker, in accord with the advocation of myself and a great many other Members of the House, I am gratified for the pledge inherent in this bill and emphasized by our esteemed committee chairman that action will be taken in the immediate future, in avoidance of some past confusion and misunderstanding, to insure that any increases we may grant in social security payments will not deprive veterans and their widows and their families of any of the benefits authorized in this conference report.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps there has never been a more opportune time in our history for this Nation and this Congress to demonstrate consciousness of the moral obligation we have and the patriotic concern we feel toward our veterans and their families. Let us, then, recognize this opportunity and promptly approve this bill in the national interest.

Abba Eban Sums Up 5-Week Mideast Debate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 21, 1967

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on July 21, 1967, Israel's Foreign Minister, Abba Eban, presented his final speech before the General Assembly of the United Nations on the present crisis in the Middle East.

While the Arabs are presently being rearmed and are threatening to bring war once again to the Middle East, Abba Eban continued to stress Israel's wish for a just and lasting peace.

I commend to the attention of our colleagues the full text of Foreign Minister Abba Eban's speech which appeared in the July 27, 1967, issue of the American Examiner.

The text follows:

ABBA EBAN SUMS UP 5-WEEK MIDEAST DEBATE

NOT AN ACT OF ABDICATION

Israel leaves the General Assembly with strengthened resolve to work for the attainment of a just and durable peace. The Assembly has had many moments of tension and even of vehemence. But there is no reason to regard the result as one of paralysis. The rejection of unjust and intemperate charges against a Member State is not an act of abdication; it is an act of considered judgment.

Despite the intense and powerful pressure brought to bear upon it, the General Assembly has declined to violate justice or to betray truth. Thus, it has refused to mirepresent Israel's fight for survival as "aggression." A majority of its Members have seen the recent hostilities, in the long and sombre context of the events which preceded them. Nineteen years of implacable hostility reached a climax in May 1967, when a small State found itself encircled, besieged, blockaded and openly menaced with destruction.

Nothing in contemporary history is comparable with the intense and virulent belligerency which has best Israel in the first two decades of its independence. No other State in our time has been required to live on such a slender margin of security or in the shadow of such a constant threat. When the noose was tightened around its neck two months ago, Israel's lonely resistence became the only alternative to a disaster which would have weighed intolerably upon the conscience of mankind. For if the openly avowed plan of Israel's extinction had succeeded, there would have been nothing practical for the United Nations now to discuss. Israel has in fact been denounced here by its adversaries for having energetically refused to die. The solid majority votes, first in the Security Council and then in the General Assembly, against the charge of Israeli aggression, bear witness to the inherent sense of justice and truth which has swept across world opinion and found its echoes in this hall.

TWO PROBLEMS

The central theme discussed at this session has been the relationship between two problems: the withdrawal of forces and the establishment of peace. The Soviet Union, the Arab States and those closely associated with them, have sought to establish a separation between these two concepts. Nearly all other Members of the General Assembly declined to endorse this separation. They saw the two issues as integrally and inseparably linked. They understood the dangers of restoring the situation which had given rise to active hotilities. For there would have been no Middle Eastern crisis had not Israel's right to peace, to security, to sovereignty, to economic development and to maritime freedom been forcibly denied and aggressively attacked. It is impossible to eliminate the symptoms of the Middle Eastern tension while leaving its basic causes intact.

That is the central lesson of this Assembly for Middle Eastern States. The lesson is plain: Member States which maintain a doctrine and practice of war against another Member State cannot receive from the United Nations the help and consideration which they could otherwise expect.

PRINCIPAL OF PEACE REJECTED

The General Assembly session has ended as it has for one reason alone: that Arab States and other refuse to tolerate any resolution which speaks seriously of peace. That is the only reason why no resolution of a substantive character could be adopted. If the Arab States accept the principles of peace, there can be not only resolutions, but, what is more important, solutions.

There have been many efforts in recent years to maintain a minimal tranquillity, even within the context of Arab belligerency. We co-operated with those efforts right up to May 1967. It is now evident that such efforts cannot long succeed. There is no method of avoiding a constant brooding tension, with constant danger of explosion, unless one condition is fulfilled. The condition is that all Middle Eastern States render, each to the other, the full rights which States possess under the Charter to which we are all signatories.

U.N. CHARTER

Under the Charter, Israel's neighbours owe it the full recognition of its independence and statehood. Under the Charter, all Israel's neighbours are committed to refrain from the use of threat or use force against that Statehood and that independence. Under the Charter, all Arab States are bound to regard Israel as a State endowed with sovereignty equal to their own. Under the Charter, they are pledged to practice tolerance and live together with Israel as good neighbours, and to harmonize their efforts with Israel's for the maintenance of international peace and security.

These are the principles of the Charter. These are the accepted principles of internation coexistence and of regional security. These are the principles which govern the American hemispheric system and other systems of peaceful regional security and cooperation.

Can anyone imagine that if Israel's neighbours had guided their relations with Israel by these principles we should be faced today with a crisis which still afflicts the Middle East and darkens the world? The strict application of Charter relationship between sovereign States is the beginning and the end of international wisdom in the Middle East. The replacement of the doctrine and practice of war by the doctrine and practice of peace is the central issue. I repeat: the replacement of the doctrine and practice of war by the doctrine and practice of peace is the central issue. It cannot be evaded. It cannot be sidetracked.

PEACE INSTEAD OF BELLIGERENCY

If it faced and solved, all other problems fall into place. For if there is peace instead of belligerency, such problems as the determination of agreed frontiers, the disengagement of forces, abstention from the threat of constant violence, and the normal use of international waterways all find their solution through the processes of peaceful settlement which the Charter prescribes. It is impressive to notice and to record how great a body of opinion exists in favour of attempting not a return to insecurity, nor a temporary palliative, but a radical and permanent remedy.

TIME HAS COME

Once the Arab States acknowledge to Israel those rights which all other Member States acknowledge to each other, the foundations of a peaceful Middle East will become firmly laid. The time has come—indeed, it is long overdue—to adapt the Arab-Israeli relationship to the accepted rules of international conduct amongst sovereign States. Many delegations have understood and affirmed that Israel's neighbours cannot at one and the same time deny its sovereignty, threaten its existence and refuse its basic rights to peace and security while demanding that Israel respect their sovereignty, their existence and their rights. The key to the Middle Eastern future therefore lies in the principle of reciprocity. Those who respect Israel's sovereign interests and rights will encounter from Israel a reciprocal respect of their rights and their interests.

It remains for me to discuss the application of these principles to the tasks which lie ahead. The cease-fire has been instituted. It must be meticulously observed. Agreed arrangements for its supervision are in force. But the cease-fire is, of course, an interim situation. It should be replaced as soon as possible by an agreed and viable peace ensuring security for all States. Peace should be negotiated freely between the parties in accordance with the procedures of pacific settlement prescribed in our Charter.

ISRAEL STANDS READY

Israel stands ready to negotiate a peace settlement with Egypt, with Jordan, with Syria and with Lebanon. In such negotiations all parties are free to present and examine any proposals in an effort to reach mutual agreement.

In addition to the issues, which lie within the responsibility of Middle Eastern States, there are universal religious interests which demand satisfaction and respect and which should be settled in consultation with those directly concerned. It is our hope and our policy that universal spiritual concerns in the Holy City will find agreed expression.

The war of 1948 and the subsequent belligerency have created and perpetuated humanitarion problems whose solution, as experience shows, can, only be achieved in the context of normal inter-State relations. Hundreds of thousands of people—Arabs and Jews—have been affected by the population movements generated by two decades of war, belligerency and hostility. The lesson of experience is clear. The conditions necessary to transform homeless refugees into productive members of society can reach full expression only if there is peace. A situation in which States are arrayed and embattled against each other; in which the violent destruction of one State is the avowed policy of others; in which an armaments race consumes scarce economic resources; in which refugees are envisaged by certain Governments as a spearhead for the destruction of a sovereign State—such a situation is not one in which Government and international agencies can successfully undertake enterprises of resettlement. Indeed, the clearest of lesson of experience after twenty tormented years is that nothing in Arab-Israel relations is soluble without peace, while everything is soluble with it.

While the main responsibility falls on sovereign States within our region, States outside the Middle East, especially the most powerful amongst them, can do much to affect our destiny for good or for ill. They can affect it for good by respecting the policy of non-intervention; by making an equal distribution of their friendship; by avoiding any identification with hostility; by giving no indulgence to belligerency; and by concerting their action with the States of our region for the promotion of peace and welfare.

UNIVERSAL HUMAN DESTINY

It was, after all, in the Middle East in ancient times that the idea of a universal human destiny was expressed with incomparable force. It is there, more than anywhere else, that the need is compelling for a new atmosphere of relations on the international plane. Such new relationships are urgently needed for the highest human ends. There should be in the Middle East no belligerents, no victors or vanquished, but only the vision of peoples who have suffered greatly through the errors and illusions of those who have rejected peace as though it were an alien and forbidden word, to be banished from the international vocabulary. For the sake of countless people in the Middle East for whom there is no answer but peace, the world community should continue to set its face against the tensions and rancours of the past two decades. It is in our region that statemanship now faces its heaviest challenge and its brightest opportunity. To meet the challenge and to fulfill the opportunity will require the utmost dedication of our hearts and minds.

Soviet Diplomacy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 21, 1967

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, as is the case in any undertaking of such vast proportions, the U.S.

foreign aid program has suffered its share of abuse over the years, and inevitably many mistakes have been made during the course of our expenditures abroad. Nevertheless, an examination of the history of the last two decades shows an impressive list of accomplishments which have resulted from our international involvement.

West Berlin, Greece, and Korea mark major victories against Russian attempts at forced communization. Out of 44 countries in which there have been Communist attempts at takeovers, only six have actually turned Communist. This is a remarkable record. Overall, in view of what the world would look like today if we had pursued a policy of contented isolationism, I think we must clude that our investment has been very worthwhile.

I am including for the Record an article from Time magazine on Russian foreign policy since World War II which I commend to the attention of all those who are interested in the foreign aid program. It documents clearly the many beneficial effects that U.S. military and monetary assistance abroad has had.

The Uneven Record of Soviet Diplomacy

In the past two decades, Soviet foreign policy has proved consistently costly, dangerous and in large measure ineffectual. After World War II, the Soviet Union scored tremendous gains, principally the Communization of Eastern Europe accomplished by the Red army. In due course, the West was compelled to acknowledge these gains and stop thinking about "rolling back" Communism. On the other hand, Moscow's grip on its satellites grew dramatically weaker. And beyond its original World War II conquests, Moscow won virtually nothing in the way of further Communist takeovers, with the sole exception of Cuba. Quite apart from Communism, Russia has achieved far less than it has often been credited with in the more conventional, big-power style of spreading influence, particularly in the "third world," where its potential had once seemed so menacing.

In almost every direct postwar confrontation with the West, Moscow backed off or down. Major milestones:

Iran. When Stalin refused to withdraw Soviet troops from the country's northern tier after World War II, U.S. and British pressure, backed by the West's monopoly on nuclear arms, forced their unconditional evacuation in 1946.

Greece & Turkey. Both nations faced takeover in 1947—Greece from a savage struggle with Communist guerrillas, Turkey from Russian pressure to annex its northeastern territories and thereby force joint sovereignty over the strategic Bosporus and Dardanelles. The Truman Doctrine was chiefly responsible for thwarting Moscow's goals in both countries.

Berlin. Moscow did its best to squeeze the Allies (U.S., Britain, France) out of West Berlin with the blockade in 1948–49. Truman's characteristically spunky reply was the airlift, and another Soviet defeat. Again in 1959, after Nikita Krushchev launched his rocket-rattling "breakthrough" policy, the Russians began threatening to sign a separate peace treaty with East Germany, thereby isolating and possibly dooming West Berlin. The threat to Berlin, repeated in 1960 and 1962, was defused by U.S. troop reinforcements. The building of the Wall in 1961 to choke off the flow of escapees was tacit admission of failure.

Korea. Stalin thought that the southern half of the divided country—a scant 120 miles from Japan—was ripe for plucking in 1950. Truman's decision to intervene, with United Nations support, frustrated that attempt. While Korea was no victory for the U.S., the stalemate that resulted prevented the Russians from achieving their original objective.

Cuba. In the cold war's tautest showdown, John F. Kennedy forced Khrushchev's hand by demanding the removal of Soviet missiles from the Caribbean. Faced with the alternative of nuclear war, Khrushchev caved in.

Viet Nam. Though the U.S. is deeply and painfully embroiled in Viet Nam, the Southeast Asian war has yielded scant prospect of benefit for Moscow either. Kosygin and Communist Boss Leonid Brezhnev, reversing Khrushchev's policy of noninvolvement in Southeast Asia, began aiding Hanoi early in 1965, when a Viet Cong victory seemed imminent. Large-scale U.S. intervention thwarted their hopes of a quick, cheap victory and exposed Russia to the charge that it will retreat from its involvement in any war of national liberation if the stakes get too high.

Russia can take some comfort from the divisions inside the Western Alliance and some victories in minor skirmishes, such as the U.S. backdown on the U.N. payments issue. But perhaps the prime Soviet accomplishment in recent years is that, compared to the buccaneering days of Stalin, Russia has become respectable as a world power. At home it has shown a measure of liberalization, and a pragmatic concern with prosperity that tends to discourage foreign adventure. Abroad, it has shown discretion in staving off any major, nuclear East-West conflict. The 1966 Tashkent Declaration, in which Russia acted as mediator between warring India and Pakistan, symbolized this new Soviet international respectability. But Moscow has had great difficulty in translating this image into concrete influence, partly because it seems basically divided as to its ultimate aims. Is it to be a conventional big power with global responsibilities and trade interests, more or less unhampered by the old Marxist goal of world revolution? Or is it to compete with Peking in the expensive and increasingly futile business of spreading disorder and rebellion?

Russian leaders are torn between the two policies. As a result, Russia has made scant headway along either course. Certainly, the Soviet's client states have grown increasingly skeptical of Moscow's interest in their cherished "wars of liberation." By contrast, the overwhelming U.S. commitment to South Viet Nam has persuaded many nations in Asia and elsewhere that Washington is willing to support its commitments to the end.

Sixteenth Amendment Used as Weapon Against Sierra Club

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ED REINECKE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 21, 1967

Mr. REINECKE. Mr. Speaker, CBS Radio, through its Los Angeles station KNX, has made some clear statements concerning the plight of the Sierra Club in its battle with the Internal Revenue Service. The IRS revoked its tax exemption as an educational institution, largely because it opposed the Department of the Interior proposal to build two dams on the Grand Canyon.

Mr. Robert P. Sutton discusses this issue in his radio editorial of July 25, 1967. He is vice president of CBS Radio.

The Thirty Word Weapon

Thirty words written in 1913 have now become a federal weapon to silence citizen groups. These 30 words are the 16th Amendment that created Federal income tax.

In the millions of words that followed the first 30, Washington recognized that some groups operate in the public interest. It was agreed that their income should not be taxed. These are religious, charitable, scientific, literary, and educational organizations. They are not supposed to devote a "substantial" amount of their efforts to propaganda or lobbying. Apparently, it is all right to be "educational" but you can't spend a lot of time "propagandizing."

You can immediately see that the law is subject to a wide range of interpretation. What is "substantial" and what is not? What is the difference between "educating" and "propagandizing" or "lobbying"? These would be difficult questions for most people. However, they are not hard for the Internal Revenue Service as you shall see.

A few years ago, the Department of the Interior decided to build two dams in the Grand Canyon. They would have destroyed much of the primitive grandeur of that natural wonder. As usual, the Sierra Club stood up to fight for preservation of the Canyon.

We say, "as usual," because the Sierra Club is the leading conservationist group in America. It has been for years. Supported by many distinguished citizens, it has waged a constant battle to save America's God-given treasures. It does this by using the public media to tell the story of conservation. It has enlighted all of us about the glories of our natural heritage. And, at least for now, the battle it led to save the Grand Canyon, has been won.

The Sierra Club's reward for this has been two-fold. First, it has gained the gratitude of millions of Americans. Second, it has had its tax exemption revoked by the Internal Revenue Service.

By doing this, the federal government has frightened away much financial support for the Club. It has cut in half what money the Club does get to fight bureaucrats who either don't know or don't care about conservation.

Although the Club has been operating for years, Washington didn't move against it until the administration lost the Grand Canyon fight. The government might respond to this by trotting out Section 501 of the Internal Revenue Code. But, that will not answer the important questions here, such as: Why are legal technicalities being used against the Sierra Club after all these years? Why only the Sierra Club—why not the many other technical violators of the law? What is the exact definition of the words, "substantial," "educational," and, "propaganda" as used in the law?

Washington may be technically correct—and there is some doubt about this—but, if it is, this is a classic case of being right for the wrong reason. KNX urges you to write to your Congressman today. Demand that the tax-exempt status of the Sierra Club be restored.

Constructive Proposals of the GOP Governors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 21, 1967

Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, one of the most thoughtful and constructive statements on urban problems offered during the past several weeks is the statement by the policy committee of the Republican Governors Association.

At the invitation of Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller, of New York, chairman of the policy committee, this group met in New York City on August 10. Their purpose, in their own words, was "to determine a positive course of State action commensurate with the staggering dimensions of the problem."

The Governors' statement emphasized that—

> The states must do their part in providing the creative leadership to achieve the solutions to today's urban crisis. This solution must be based on a new kind and degree of cooperative action between the various levels of government and the private sector . . . Merely pouring more money into outmoded programs will not do the job. We seek new ways to tap the creative and constructive forces in society.

Their recommendations, embracing many fields of policy, are based on a candid examination of the facts and an open-minded review of alternatives. Such initiative and commitment are extremely promising, and illustrate the intelligence and imagination which each of these noted chief executives has brought to the service of his own State and the Nation.

I am particularly pleased that the Governor of Maryland, Spiro T. Agnew, is an active member of this committee, and participated in the drafting of this statement in New York. In addition to Governors Rockefeller and Agnew, the committee also includes Govs. Nils A. Boe, of South Dakota; John H. Chaffee, of Rhode Island; John A. Love, of Colorado; George Romney, of Michigan; Raymond P. Shafer, of Pennsylvania; and John A. Volpe, of Massachusetts.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of the Congress the comments by three leading newspapers on the statement offered by these eight distinguished Republicans.

Following are editorials from the New York Times of August 11, the Washington Post of August 12, and the Christian Science Monitor of August 14:

[From the New York Times, Aug. 11, 1967]

The Governors Speak Up

The Republican Governors have offered the nation a constructive and enlightened response to the recent rioting. Although they recognize that prompt and firm law enforcement is essential in putting down disorders, they also see clearly that police measures are not enough.

The rioting in the core areas of so many American cities does not develop among people who are simply poor or temporarily down on their luck. Those who resort to violence are so brutalized by failures and frustration that they have abondoned faith in normal social processes and turned to the jungle rule of seize and despoil. Society has to turn them around, moving them out of the dead-end streets of violence and back to the main road. It is necessary, as the Governors' statement declares, that "all shall have a stake in the potential and promise of America."

The action plan set forth by the Governors contains many useful, specific suggestions for transforming the physical environment of the slums, increasing job opportunities, creating "community schools" and tailoring educational programs to the distinctive needs of the impoverished and disoriented.

Many of these recommendations draw upon experience gained in the Federal antipoverty effort and in programs already under way in New York and other states. But with remedial measures, as with the deployment of police, the important consideration is not that the ideas and techniques be new but that they be put into effect on a sufficient scale and in a wise, timely fashion.

Many states may not be eager to adopt this action plan fully, since its implementation would be costly, and the states, like the Federal Government, find their budgets strained. But the price of inaction is higher still. The cost of arson, loss of life and loss of confidence in a riot-torn city goes beyond dollars into the fabric of the community. The Republican Governors have provided leadership that the G.O.P. members of Congress, the Democratic majority and the Johnson Administration could all heed.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Aug. 12, 1967]

Good Intentions

The eight Governors who attempted to work out an antiriot program for the states were handicapped by the fact that all were Republicans. The group was brought togetther by Gov. Nelson Rockefeller of New York, chairman of the policy committee of the Republican Governors Association. Political overtones in such a gathering were unavoidable. The meeting could have been far more influential if Governors of both parties had participated and if partisan advantage had been entirely forgotten in a broad movement for elimination of violence in the cities.

Within its limitations, however, the conference in New York acted responsibly and constructively. Its recommendations range broadly from prompt law enforcement when disturbances begin to amelioration of social conditions out of which riots grow. The Governors recognize that poor enforcement of housing codes and laws relating to health, sanitation, gambling and narcotics have encouraged disrespect for law in general. They seem to accept, without equivocation, the necessity of a larger state role in improving life in the ghettos.

Though much of the statement deals with generalities, it recognizes that the states no less than the cities and the Federal Government and the people themselves have been laggard in dealing with the underlying problems. This is a net gain. No doubt the proposed Urban Action Center to advise state administrations in working out urban programs will prove helpful. The important question is whether the Governors will now go home and translate their fine words and intentions into action.

Will these men who have spoken out for "comprehensive developments" in slum areas and tax incentives for industries that provide jobs in underprivileged neighborhoods now sponsor the necessary state laws and raise taxes to finance the state's larger role? The good intentions have brought applause, but something far more tangible will have to be forthcoming if the states are to meet their responsibilities in this difficult period.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Aug. 1, 1967]

Strong GOP Slum-Program

The winning combination in meeting the racial problem in the United States is ideas and determination. Neither alone is enough.

Fortunately, both ideas and determination characterized the meeting of eight Republican governors in New York at the invitation of Gov. Nelson Rockefeller. Not only did the meeting endorse a list of some 60 suggestions for tackling ghetto problems, but it also voiced a strong Republican Party commitment to carrying these ideas out.

Sensibly the idea check list dealt with each of the two main aspects of the present racial situation—how to deal with riots and how to root out the conditions which cause them. A particularly good suggestion for handling riots is the proposal for interlocking emergency arrangements between the police and fire departments of neighboring towns and areas. This would permit a swifter concentration of more powerful law-enforcement teams. The program also rightly laid heavy stress on far better training and more efficient deployment of National Guard units.

But the governors' suggestions for measures to eradicate the causes of riots were even more impressive. Indeed, their check list probably covered more ground, and included more striking ideas than any other single program hitherto introduced. Its strength and excellence lie in the fact that it is not a bulldozer program focusing on only one or two fronts but is adapted to tackle problems at several dozen different individual points. Best of all, it zeroes in on the most crucial point of all: giving the disadvantaged "an opportunity to achieve a stake in our society through the investment of their own aspirations and energy."

The Republican program bears down very strongly on tax incentives for business in slum areas, school programs adapted to slum-children's needs, means for helping working mothers, special programs for those moving from rural to urban areas, and, of course, both better housing in poor areas and the right of all citizens to live where their financial position enables them to live.

This is a forward-looking, strong program. But even it will not be enough, unless it is reinforced by one further indispensable ingredient. This is the encouragement of on-the-spot leadership by the slum-dwellers themselves. One minor program put through by local initiative, hard work and enthusiasm, can do more for a run-down, racially tense neighborhood than a far more ambitious program run from the outside and shoe-horned into the people's lives. But we do not think that it is overstating the case to say that if local initiative can be linked to the new GOP program, the combination can work wonders.

Michigan House of Representatives Asks Congress To Reinstate Funds for Lamprey Control Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 21, 1967

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the Appendix of the RECORD House Resolution No. 234 adopted by the House of Representatives of the State of Michigan on July 11, 1967.

This resolution memorializes Congress to reinstate the money deleted from the appropriation for the lamprey control program.

The resolution follows:

H. RES. 234

Resolution memorializing Congress to reinstate the money deleted from the appropriation for the lamprey control program

Whereas, The reestablishment of lake trout in Lake Superior, the increase in abundance of whitefish in Lake Michigan, the recovery of the steelhead, and the exciting success of our coho salmon introduction can all be attributed to the progress made in sea lamprey control in Lake Michigan, Superior and Huron; and

Whereas, A cut of $100,000.00 in the United States contribution to the Great Lakes Fishery Commission has been recommended by the House Sub-Committee on Appropriations, which, if approved, means a reduction of $45,000.00 in the Canadian contribution, making a total reduction of $145,000.00; and

Whereas, Last year, extension of the control program to Lake Huron which both countries share was welcomed by Canada and brought immediate support from the Canadian Government after a 1963 reduction in the United States appropriation required concentration in Lake Superior and Lake Michigan and places an obligation upon the United States Section to continue operations on Lake Huron and make whatever reductions are necessary to meet the cut in the United States Program; now therefore be it

Resolved by the house of representatives, That its members by these presents respectfully urges the United States Congress to restore the money that was deleted from the appropriation for the Lamprey control program so that this program so essential to a large segment of both Canada and United States may be continued in all its vigor; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the presiding officers of the United States Senate and the House of Representatives and to each member of the Michigan delegation to Congress.

Adopted by the House July 11, 1967.

T. Thos. Thatcher,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

The Silent Church Behind the Iron Curtain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 21, 1967

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, we have heard many stirring statements on the floor of this House in connection with the plight of the world.

Recently, the Right Reverend Monsignor John Balkunas, president of the Conference of Americans of Central and Eastern European Descent addressed the Catholic War Veterans of Queens County, N.Y., in connection with the observation of Captive Nations Week.

He discussed the plight of the church in Communist-dominated lands. I have rarely seen a more thorough, more articulate, more knowledgeable discourse on this subject, and I offer it here for the interest and guidance of my colleagues:

The Silent Church Behind the Iron Curtain

We have gathered here as free citizens of the United States of America to mark the 9th annual observance of Captive Nations Week. This week is Captive Nations Week, during which Americans from all walks of life will commemorate it in nationwide manifestations, rallies, ceremonies and other public gatherings.

These observances are legally provided for by Public Law 86–90, enacted by the U.S. Congress in July, 1959. They are destined to serve as a powerful moral symbol underscoring the fact that Americans will never forget or abandon the captive nations or accommodate themselves to their permanent enslavement.

In observing this signal event we must view the problem of the captive nations in its totality, and we must not lose the sight of the fact that all captive nations deserve a fair and equal treatment on our part. When we speak of the captive nations, we obviously think of 22 captive nations enumerated in Public Law 86–80, namely: Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Czechoslovakia, Ukraine, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Romania, East Germany, Bulgaria, mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan and North Vietnam.

Since this law was enacted, Cuba, our very neighbor, has become another captive nation.

I wish to dedicate my talk today to the plight of the Silent Church Behind the Iron Curtain, and to bring to fore the suffering endured by our brothers in Christ under the ruthless and godless communist regimes in Central and Eastern Europe.

Much has happened in the world since the passage of the Captive Nations Week Resolution in 1959. We had the Ecumenical Council (Vatican II) in 1962–1965, at which observers of the Russian Orthodox Church were invited to sit in and witness the proceedings of the greatest Catholic council ever gathered in history. In pursuance of the "dialogue" with the Communist governments, we have seen Soviet President Nicholas Podgorny come to the Holy Father to talk on the possibility of "improving relations" between the Soviet Union and the Vatican. Toward this end also, Msgr. Agostino Casaroli, a Vatican expert on Communist affairs, travelled to Poland and other Communist-run countries. Finally, a few weeks ago the United States was the host to Soviet Premier Alexei Kosygin, who met President Johnson for a new Summit conference at Glassboro, N.J. There are many among us who believe that the Cold War is over, and that these meetings and visitations *per se* have removed or, at least, eased international tensions and conflicts.

But to us, who are interested in the countries of origin of our forefathers, and also in the plight of our Church, the most important question remains unanswered.

Are these contacts and visitations by Communist leaders here and to the Vatican helping our Church behind the Iron Curtain? Do our brothers and sisters feel free to worship God and educate their children according to Christian principles and teaching?

A cursory survey of the plight of the Silent Church behind the Iron Curtain gives a bleak and depressing picture that certainly challenges the claim of our era to humanism and peaceful coexistence.

Albania: In Albania the 170,000 Catholics suffered a cruel fate, as the entire Catholic hierarchy was either killed or imprisoned. The Catholic Church ceased to exist in that country. The Orthodox Church and the Moslem religion are still tolerated, although all church policies are dictated by the Communist Party.

Bulgaria: The religious persecution in Bulgaria was limited to the Protestant and Catholic communities, as both groups are regarded as West-oriented. The Roman Catholic hierarchy is virtually destroyed, as is the Apostolic Exarchate for the Bulgarians of the Eastern Rite. The Jews and Moslems are also persecuted and harassed. The Bulgarian Orthodox Church is tolerated, but their leaders must accommodate themselves to the regime and follow its policies and directives.

Czechoslovakia: From 1948 to 1952 religion in Czechoslovakia was persecuted openly by the Communist government. A number of Catholic bishops, including Joseph Cardinal Beran, was arrested and sent to jail. In 1964 Archbishop Beran was released and allowed to return to Rome, but the Catholic Church has been under the systematic attack; religious instruction for children is eliminated, and the Church is perennially attacked by the Communist-sponsored "Society for the Propagation of Political And Scientific Knowledge," an arm of the Communist Party. Other denominations are also submitted to a tight control of the government.

Estonia: The Estonian Evangelical Lutheran Church has been subordinated to the Communist Party which rules and controls the activities of the ministers in all details. Acts of public worship, church weddings, funeral services and baptismal ceremonies have been replaced with atheistic rituals. Anti-religious education is steadily pressed and the church itself is burdened with heavy taxation.

Hungary: Depending on the international situation the Kadar regime either intensifies the anti-religious policies or relaxes them, guided by hints and directives from Moscow. In 1964 an agreement was signed by the Vatican and Hungary, which somewhat improved the religious situation. But in 1965 a series of arrests of Catholic priests was reported in the *L'Osservatore Romano*. Many of the priests were sentenced for a "conspiracy" case, others for holding seminars and open discussions with the youth.

Latvia: The Roman Catholic Church in Latvia has been destroyed as an organization, with many Catholic priests arrested, tried and sentenced to hard labor. The head of the Latvian Evangelical Church is a Communist nominee. The Lutheran Church and the Orthodox Church were also destroyed. All church ceremonies had been replaced with Communist rituals. There is no religious instruction, and the church, that is the Evangelical Lutheran Church, is subjected to heavy taxation and other rules of the Communist Party.

Lithuania: Since Lithuania is one of the foremost Catholic Countries in Eastern Europe, one of the prime targets of the Communist regime is to eradicate Catholicism. Officially, the Roman Catholic Church in Lithuania exists, but by its systematic attacks the regime has reduced it to a skeleton organization. Out of 14 Lithuanian Catholic Bishops only one has remained in the country, and out of 1,546 priests, only 741 were left. Religious teaching to children is punishable by law; the clergy and religion are under constant attacks; all religious private schools, kindergartens, orphanages, hospitals and charitable organizations have been confiscated. Sometimes the Communists trumpet the "existence of religious freedom," and they allow a few Lithuanian churchmen to attend the Ecumenical Council in Rome and also to consecrate a new Catholic Bishop, Most Rev. Joseph Labukas. But the antireligious policy is the order of the day for the Communist regime in Lithuania.

Poland: The Catholic Church in Poland, especially after the 1956 revolt, has been tolerated and subject to a sort of "coexistence" with the Communist regime. But the campaign against the Catholic Church is relentless and systemic, which includes arrests of priests, tax prosecutions and land confiscations; the training of new priests is being hindred and a number of seminaries has been closed. Stefan Cardinal Wyszynski has been barred from travelling to the United States in 1966, and a number of American Catholic Bishops were denied Polish visas to come to Poland for the observance of the millenium of Christianity in Poland.

Look at *Romania:* the first victim of the Communist rule was the Orthodox Church, which was purged of all bishops who were replaced with "elected popular prelates." The Catholic Church of the Byzantine Rite was subjected to a savage destruction and its faithful were forced to join the Orthodox

Church. The Roman Catholic Church is allowed to exist, but its activities are completely paralyzed. By any standards, religion in Romania has been reduced to a twilight existence.

Now, *Ukraine*: But perhaps one of the most brutal and inhuman acts against the Catholic Church was the destruction of the Ukrainian Catholic Church of the Byzantine Rite in Ukraine in 1945–46. There were about 5,000,000 Ukrainian Catholics in Western Ukraine, and as soon as the Soviet troops reoccupied all of the Ukrainian lands, Moscow moved to mercilessly liquidate Catholicism in Ukraine. Although the Soviet government professes "freedom of coexistence" for its citizens and the principle of "separation of the church from the state," it savagely meddled in the Catholic Church in Ukraine. In March, 1946, the Soviet government, actively supported by the Russian Orthodox Patriarchate, headed by Patriarch Alexei, dispersed the entire Ukrainian Catholic hierarchy and destroyed the church organization as such. Of all 11 Ukrainian Catholic bishops, arrested at that time, only Metropolitan Joseph Slipy survived. He was released in 1963, reportedly upon direct intervention by the late Pope John XXII; he was made a cardinal and resides now in Rome. At the time of the Communist assault there were 5 million Ukrainian Catholics, 1 Archbishop-Metropolitan, 10 bishops, 5 dioceses, 2 areas of Apostolic Administration, 2,950 diocesan priests, 520 monastic priests, 1,090 nuns, 540 seminarians, 3,040 parishes, 4,440 churches and chapels, 127 monasteries, 1 theological academy and 5 ecclesiastical seminaries. In addition, the Catholic Church in Ukraine possessed a great number of cultural centers; primary and secondary schools, institutes, printing press; scientific, religious and educational organizations; libraries, welfare and aid associations, orphanages, student, youth and women's associations and the like. All were destroyed by the official act of the Soviet government.

A faked "synod" was then called in Lviv, at which three apostate priests were nominated bishops of the Russian Orthodox Church. The group promptly "abolished" the Union of Brest (1596) and subordinated over 5,000,000 Ukrainian Catholics, against their will, to the Russian Orthodox Church. This brutal destruction was deplored at the time by Pope Pius XII in his encyclical *Orientales Omnes Ecclesias* (Dec. 23, 1945), and later in *Orientales Ecclesias* (Dec. 15, 1952). For all intent and purposes, there is no legal Catholic Church in Ukraine. But there are hundreds of thousands of Catholics who secretly profess their traditional faith. The Communist press in Ukraine frequently reports arrests, trials and deportations of "religious fanatics." In 1965 a trial was held in Lviv, Western Ukraine, at which 20 persons were tried for practicing "underground religion." In 1966 another trial was held in the city of Zhytomyr, where a man and a woman were sentenced to three years of hard labor for giving religious instruction to children. Last year, in 1966, the Soviet government sponsored extensive celebration in commemoration of the 20th anniversary of the "liquidation" of the Ukrainian Catholic Church. Fortunately, there are 14 Ukrainian Rite Sees throughout the free world—the United States, Canada, South America, Australia and Western Europe—where the Ukrainian Rite Catholic traditions and Liturgy are preserved.

White Russia: In 1916 White Russia had 3,024 Orthodox priests, and in 1965 only 150 are still surviving. In 1916 there were 917 Catholic priests and only 25 are left today. Especially large scale persecutions took place in 1958. The only Catholic seminary in White Russia was closed in 1953. Soon the White Russians will have no clergy.

Other Captives: Our roster of the captive nations would not be complete without mentioning our brothers—Serbians, Croatians, Slovaks and Slovenes—who also suffer national, religious and cultural persecution at the hands of Communist masters.

As we have seen, the Silent Church behind the Iron Curtain is suffering incessant Communist persecution. Communist attacks vary from country to country, and they are conducted quietly and systematically by means of harassment and covert persecution.

People are said to have a right to agitate against religion. However, priests and ministers do not have a civil right to defend themselves against such attacks. Communist run atheistic clubs and conduct atheistic instruction in labor unions, youth organizations and in schools. Meanwhile, priests and ministers who conduct religious instruction are liable to be sent to Siberia without even a judicial hearing.

Other anti-religious tactics of the Communists include the undermining of the people's faith in baptism and matrimony, and the discrediting of Christian burial by priests of ministers.

This is the religious situation behind the Iron Curtain.

The observance of Captive Nations Week affords us this opportunity to make the plight of the captive nations known to our fellow American citizens, and our government as well.

Those of our officials who receive Communist leader should know what they are doing to their own people.

Is it, then, moral and practical to "build bridges of understanding" with these Communist governments which so ruthlessly persecute our brothers and sisters in Central and Eastern Europe?

We do not think so.

As we begin the observance of Captive Nations Week we must make everything in our power to help these captive nations in their struggle for national and religious freedom, for freedom and independence. Above all, we must let them know that we do not forget them.

Our government is waging a gallant struggle in Viet Nam in order to prevent the Communists to enslave South Viet Nam. We wholeheartedly support our President, because it is the only way to save Southeast Asia from Communism.

But we urge our President not to forget these Communists who are killing our fighting men in Viet Nam are also jailers and persecutors of the captive nations in Central and Eastern Europe.

Let us hope that this basic truth is imparted to those who are responsible for shaping our foreign policy with respect to the communist empire.

And we, free citizens of this great country, must continue to educate our people in the importance of the captive nations.

We must rededicate ourselves to the cause of universal freedom.

We must learn the eternal axiom: peace without freedom is illusory, and life without freedom is meaningless.

Let us pray for peace—for just peace to all nations!

The Anticrime Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH M. McDADE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 21, 1967

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, the Christian Science Monitor is certainly one of the most respected newspapers in the world. In a recent issue of the Monitor, editorial note was taken of the amendment to the crime bill proposed by my distinguished colleague from New Jersey [Mr. CAHILL].

We are all vitally concerned over the crime picture in America. The growth of crime and violence in our streets must be met by the most intelligent means at our disposal. The amendment offered by my distinguished colleague will do much to strengthen the crime bill, by focusing the responsibility where the responsibility must lie.

I join with the Christian Science Monitor in commending the gentleman from New Jersey. We are fortunate to have the benefit of his expertise on so significant a matter.

Mr. Speaker, I append to these remarks the editorial comment of the Monitor:

THE ANTICRIME BILL

Some newspaper accounts would make it appear that House Republicans have greatly weakened President Johnson's anticrime bill. But this is not so. It remains basically in accord with the recommendations of the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice. The House passed a strong bill and, in at least one crucial respect, a better bill than the administration had proposed.

The amendment introduced by Rep. William T. Cahill (R) of New Jersey gives to the state governments the key role in administering the federal grants, and properly so. The administration bill without the Cahill amendment would have given the Attorney General of the United States sweeping administrative control in an area long reserved to state and local government. It would have set the stage for the possible development of a national police force. The Cahill amendment erases that danger and encourages the states to assume their proper responsibilities in the war on crime.

Many states have yet to undertake comprehensive planning or to establish statewide anticrime commissions. This amendment should spur their efforts to do so and to acquire competent staff and the necessary expertise.

Integral state participation and over-all state coordination are greatly needed if the fight against crime is to succeed. Under the measure as amended federal aid goes to states in block grants and with few strings attached. It could strengthen federal-state cooperation to solve a problem which is at the same time local, statewide, and national in scope.

The amendment to encourage antiriot training is understandable at this time. Better police training in riot control is a must. It would be unfortunate, however, if the priority given this phase of police training were to mean any lessening of emphasis on broad programs of planning, education, and research. While it is necessary to attack the symptoms, it is even more important to strengthen crime prevention by equipping the police to assess and deal more effectively with the underlying causes of crime.

The House has passed a good bill. May the Senate now do the same.

Strange Lessons for Johnny

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 21, 1967

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, strange and subtle ways are employed by the subversives who advocate various ideologies. A good example of this is very convincingly developed in a revealing article written by Mike Engleman, an editorial writer for the Dallas Morning News. This article should be read by every American. It is for that reason that I include it under leave to extend my remarks. The article follows:

STRANGE LESSONS FOR JOHNNY

(By Mike Engleman)

Did your 15-year-old attend vacation church school this summer? If he did, it might be a good idea to sit down with him and find out just exactly what he learned. For if your church followed the curriculum offered by a New York outfit that calls itself "Friendship Press," and if little Johnny paid attention in class, by now he may be confused.

Mission: The Christian's Calling is a packet of two books designed as a course of study for junior high school "early teens" in vacation church school, Sunday school or Sunday night fellowship groups. It has found its way into several churches of the Dallas area.

The apparent theme of the two books is worthy enough. The books say to the youngster: "It is the duty of Christians from all faiths to put their belief into action in the world." There's certainly nothing new about this teaching.

But running through the two books are several strange subtleties that must make Johnny, who is impressionable at age 15, question the wisdom of his parents.

If Johnny has been taught to obey the law and the police, he must wonder after reading one of the books, *Called to Be,* why the brutal police deserve any respect. *Called to Be* mentions police at least five times, and in each instance they are the "bad guys."

Listen as the book describes those first days after Christ's crucifixion in news story style: "Governor Pilate today asked the FBI to keep the disciples of Jesus under close surveillance. It is feared that the 11 might seek to continue his [sic] seditious activities . . ."

Or in relating the duty of the Christian in these modern days, here's one instance of how the book pictures police and the law: "Numerous Christians are being arrested during these days for challenging customs and laws they hold to be wrong. Many have been attacked by fire hoses and police dogs . . ."

The books tell a horrible story of 23 peace marchers' maltreatment by police, claiming to be quoting directly from a "news report." In the guidebook for the adult that will be teaching the class, it is revealed that the story comes not from a reliable news source at all, but instead from "an actual account printed in a civil-rights magazine . . .".

The story graphically relates how the "Walk-for-Peace" marchers are arrested. "Jack stopped, and a plainclothesman put his hand on Jack's arm saying, 'You're under arrest get in the bus.' Jack sat down in noncooperation and said, 'I have nothing against you personally but I cannot co-operate with this arrest.' The officer . . . said, 'Bring the electric prodder over here.' "

After telling how the prodder was used on Michele's (a girl) "legs and thighs," the author of *Called to Be,* Theodore A. Braun, writes: "Police brutality is a problem in all parts of our country—South and North, East and West—especially toward minority groups."

Then Braun asks, "Does a person ever have the right to put his own conscience above the law? What if he believes a law to be wrong? Should he in all cases obey that law, or can he refuse to obey, accepting the consequences, being obedient to a higher (and in his own mind, better) law?"

What will be a 15-year-old's answer to these carefully posed questions?

Braun guarantees the student's answer with his story about Christ in the temple after first asking another question: "Is it true that 'angry young men' such as Jesus are not tolerated by society very long—they are either tamed, ostracized or crucified?"

After describing Christ's acts in ridding the temple of the money changers and animal salesmen "like a bull let loose in a china shop," Braun puts forth these questions:

"How do you react to the story of the temple cleansing? Should Jesus have first written a letter to the superintendent of the temple grounds or to the editor of the city newspaper? Should he have picketed the temple merchants, conducted a temple sit-in or organized a march on the temple? Or do you agree with his taking the matter into his own hands and acting as he did?"

The remainder of this section admonishes Johnny to "help overturn all the tables that need turning in the sacrosanct temples of society. Is there a need for revolution in your own community?"

What will a child make out of this call to revolution?

How will he react to the totally black picture painted of police and the law? Will he believe all police are animals?

Will he accept Braun's word that Christ was a "revolutionary"?

Will he understand that Christ had the power to overturn kings, to reorganize government and society, but did not use it? From what he reads in this book, can he be expected to see that Christ could have been a social reformer or a Martin Luther King, but was not? Does he know that Christ could have ended the endless brutality of the Roman Empire, but chose not to?

Can little Johnny be expected to understand that Christ was most interested in another kind of kingdom, that He offered not salvation from earthly poverty and strife, but eternal peace in a life after death?

The foregoing has been just a taste of *Mission: The Christian's Calling* and the Friendship Press. But it should be enough of a warning to Johnny's parents that they should examine the teaching materials being used in their church.

Friendship Press publishes a great number of teaching materials for churches and is a rather popular source of literature for some Protestant denominations.

Listed discretely on the last page of Friendship Press' catalogue is the publishing house's address: 475 Riverside Drive, New York. Oddly enough, the same address is carried on the literature of another Protestant organization—the National Council of Churches.

The Job Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERVEY G. MACHEN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 15, 1967

Mr. MACHEN. Mr. Speaker, I am sure you are all aware that the Office of Economic Opportunity and its poverty programs are on "trial," and that some of the most spirited debate centers around the Job Corps. The House Committee on Education and Labor, sitting as a subcommittee, has concluded hearings on the entire program and it is presently awaiting the consideration of the full committee.

The proceedings of the subcommittee should be of interest to the entire House. Job Corps today is an increasingly sophisticated effort to salvage talent and productivity and it is a beacon of hope to those whom society would otherwise have left behind.

Job Corps has come a long way since the time when there was trouble keeping order in some of the program's training centers. The list of the program's accomplishments is too long to be enumerated here but a recent article by Mr. Robert Walters in the Washington Star, July 30, 1967, touches upon a number of issues pertinent to the consideration of its support.

He points out that the cost per enrollee per year is $6,700 for fiscal 1968, or less than one-half of the $15,000 some people have suggested. This investment is repaid within the first 18 months of an average graduate's employment. The one-third of its enrollees, who are functional illiterates because the public schools have failed to reach them, are taught to read.

Mr. Speaker, it is my belief that today's Job Corps program is characterized by orderly and swift progress. The majority of its graduates are now responsible citizens holding good jobs. They are not candidates for the relief rolls, inactivity, or rioting in the streets. This program offers a sound, responsible, and progressive approach to the eventual cutting of the ranks of the unemployed, and the making of new and productive citizens.

As Mr. Walters points out, OEO and Job Corps have learned and changed quite a lot. They both merit our support.

I insert the article by Mr. Walters to be reprinted below:

[From the Sunday Star, July 30, 1967]

THE WAR ON POVERTY FACING BATTLES IN CONGRESS

(By Robert Walters)

Federal antipoverty officials return to Capitol Hill this week to defend their already beleaguered program on the grounds that the country must intensify—not cut back—its efforts to aid the poor if future big-city riots are to be avoided.

"There were riots long before there was an Office of Economic Opportunity, there have been riots this year in cities where there was no antipoverty program," a top OEO official said last week.

"Most importantly," he added "in cities were a viable antipoverty program has been operating, there either has been no rioting or the project has been valuable in preventing additional trouble."

But the antipoverty agency, which had more than its share of congressional critics long before the current wave of civil disorder, already has been accused by some House members of allowing its projects and personnel to be used in promoting disturbances.

SOUTHERN OPPOSITION

OEO officials are confident they can disprove such allegations, most of which have been voiced by Southern congressmen who have opposed the antipoverty program for one reason or another ever since it was established by President Johnson three years ago.

They are considerably less sanguine about their success in surviving an attack from another quarter—Rep. Edith Green, D-Ore., ranking Democrat on the House Education and Labor Committee.

It is before that committee that OEO Director R. Sargent Shriver and his top aides will appear this week to press for acceptance of the Johnson administration's request of $2.06 billion to finance the program during the current fiscal year. This is the crucial first step in a long and tricky road through Congress for the program.

Mrs. Green has become a force to be reckoned with in the wake of her success in sharply modifying the school aid bill on the House floor earlier this year. She succeeded where Republicans failed in efforts to write state controls into the bill.

PREDICTS CHANGES

Throughout a series of appearances by Shriver and other pro-OEO witnesses last month, Mrs. Green was critical of the antipoverty program. At one point she offered this determined prediction:

"There are going to be changes in the poverty program. I don't think anyone here expects that this bill is going to come out of here without major amendments to it."

She has consistently called for a program that is "responsive to local needs and to local authority" but has not disclosed, thus far, the specific changes she will propose.

Much of the congresswomen's criticism has been centered on the Job Corps, for which OEO is seeking $295 million in fiscal 1968. The program receiverd $308 million in fiscal 1966 and $211 million during the just-concluded fiscal year.

The Job Corps currently is training 41,000 previously unemployable young persons in job skills at 123 urban and conservation centers throughout the country.

Mrs. Green has argued that Job Corps costs are far too high, and that the program can be run more efficiently by vocational educators in local school systems.

FIGHT TO FINISH

But William P. Kelly, in charge of the Job Corps, has marshalled an imposing collection of facts and figures in an effort to rebuff the congresswoman's allegations.

At the same time, Shriver has lined up diverse organizational support, ranging from labor and civil rights groups to the U.S. Jaycees and the General Electric Co., behind the Job Corps.

Rep. Carl Perkins, D-Ky., chairman of the Education and Labor Committee who lost the bitter floor fight with Mrs. Green during debate on the education bill, also has pledged a fight to the finish.

"I shall fight to the last hearing, the last motion and the last hour of debate and conference to preserve a centralized and coordinated assault upon the root causes of poverty," Perkins said last month in a speech at the University of Maryland.

He will need all the support he can muster because Mrs. Green will have not only the support of southern congressmen but also many House Republicans when she finally makes her move.

OVERHAUL PROGRAM

Kelly, in an intertview last week, repeatedly emphasized: "It's a new Job Corps. It's different from the one that existed a year ago."

Kelly, whose reputation as a non-nonsense administrator was built while climbing from the bottom of the Civil Service ladder to the Presidential appointment he now holds, has overhauled what once was a stumbling program, according to many observers.

In the program's early days, there was a constant stream of reports of violence. In Kalamazoo, Mich., a fight broke out at a school dance involving students and corpsmen. It triggered an all-night riot that swept the town and required 60 policemen to restore order.

At Camp Breckenridge, Ky., a fight among trainees erupted into a three-hour-long free-for-all that ended only when federal marshals and state troopers were called in.

"That was true years ago, but no longer," said Kelly. "This year the riots are in the cities, not in the Job Corps camps. Many of those who might have been rioting in the streets are now responsible citizens with good-paying jobs as a result of their training."

To prove his point, Kelly has a bulging file of letters of commendation from police chiefs, sheriffs, chamber of commerce presidents, newspaper editors and governors from across the country. Many of them, from cities which once experienced trouble with neighboring Job Corps camps, now contain only praise.

Replying to Mrs. Green's suggestion that the program be administered by the public schools, Kelly said: "This isn't just vocational education. It's a comprehensive program of human renewal."

As an example, he displayed a pair of before-and-after photographs of a young man who had an entire set of front teeth replaced—while receiving Job Corps training.

Pointing to the toothless "before" photo, Kelly asked "How far is he going to get in a job interview looking like that, no matter what his skills are?

How much confidence can he have in himself in that condition? Are the public schools going to help with a problem like that?"

He talked of 200,000 immunizations against diphtheria and typhoid, as well as a variety of other medical and dental services averaging $300 a year for each Job Corpsman.

"Thirty percent of our youngsters can't read or write. How are you going to teach him to repair a carburetor when he can't read a 7th grade textbook?" asked Kelly. "These people came to us for help because the public schools failed to provide what was needed. To send them back there is to send them out on the streets."

Mrs. Green has argued however, that Job Corps costs are too great and "indefensible at this time. Some alternative must be found." She cited costs of $13,000 to $15,000 a year for each trainee at the former Tongue Point Naval Station in Astoria, Ore., and said similar expenses were incurred elsewhere.

Ironically, the Tongue Point Job Corps Center in Mrs. Green's home state, was changed from a men's to a women's installation by OEO officials to please the congresswoman, who last year argued strongly for increased feminine participation in the program.

Kelly said Mrs. Green's figures were accurate at one time but now are outdated. During the 1967 fiscal year the average cost of training a corpsman was $6,950, and OEO officials hope to reduce that to $6,700 this year, he said.

One item hotly disputed by the opposing forces is a series of surveys taken by Louis Harris & Associates to measure attitudes among Job Corps enrollees and graduates.

Mrs. Green and the Republicans point to survey results which show that only 10 percent of the Job Corps graduates now employed found their jobs through the OEO program.

Kelly, however, quotes the survey as saying "even for corpsmen who stay less than 90 days, contact with the Job Corps is a meaningful experience."

He also cited a survey taken by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, long opposed to the antipoverty program, which showed that 70 to 80 percent of the employers of Job Corps graduate described work habits, skills and training as "satisfactory to excellent."

A NEW SPIRIT

In addition to the benefits received after leaving the Job Corps camps, enrollees are making significant contributions while undergoing training, said Kelly. "There's a new spirit here. People are proud to be involved in the Job Corps," he added.

"In Clinton, Iowa, Job Corps girls went to work filling sand bags to hold back the flooding waters of the Mississippi River; in Michigan, Corpsmen have been working as therapy aides in a state home, when tornadoes hit the Midwest earlier this year, our youngsters were among the first digging through the rubble looking for survivors," Kelly said.

Efforts such as those have picked up some unexpected support for the Job Corps and the poverty program in general during recent months. Among the converts was Rep. Catherine May, R-Wash., a political conservative and a long-time critic of Great Society programs who last year voted to kill the administration's antipoverty legislation.

"The Job Corps has its problems, certainly—and every effort must be made to solve those problems, toward the end that the Job Corps can accomplish its important mission. But despite these problems, the achievements of the Job Corps have been impressive," Mrs. May said at a recent Job Corps Center dedication.

Social Security Amendments of 1967

SPEECH

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1967

The House in Committee on the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 12080) to amend the Social Security Act to provide an increase in benefits under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system, to provide benefits for additional categories of individuals, to improve the public assistance program and programs relating to the welfare and health of children, and for other purposes.

Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, this is one of the most important bills to come before this Congress. Its social security provisions directly affect at least 23.7 million beneficiaries, and almost every employed citizen. Its other titles make extensive changes in Federal-State-local systems of medical assistance, public welfare, and social services, and thus will have great impact on both the jurisdictions which administer these programs and the Americans who must depend on them for subsistence and essential help.

An increase in social security benefits is long overdue. During the past few years, the real value of these benefits has been severely eroded by inflation and repeated increases in the cost of living. As I have stated before, every month of delay in raising benefits brings added difficulty, and in many cases real hardships, to the millions of retired men and women who rely on these payments for their day-to-day support.

The increases in this bill, averaging 12½ percent, have been carefully calculated by the Ways and Means Committee as the largest increases permissible without either disturbing the actuarial soundness of the trust fund or imposing punitive burdens of taxation on those presently employed. Although payment levels are still low, especially for those receiving minimum or near-minimum benefits, this total of $2.9 billion in additional benefits in 1968 alone will be extremely helpful to our retired citizens.

I regret that the committee did not see fit to implement one important recommendation which I and many of my colleagues have made for some time. This is the establishment of automatic cost-of-living adjustments in benefits to keep their purchasing power stable in the face of inflation. This step continues to gain support throughout the Nation, and I trust that it will be considered again in the near future.

I also regret that the committee approved only a token increase in the ceiling on outside earnings by social security beneficiaries. Especially since benefits remain quite low, I am convinced that it is appropriate and important to remove this ceiling, to encourage continued work by all those who are able and willing to hold full- or part-time jobs past the age of 65. By removing this restrictive ceiling, we would be aiding and encouraging our senior citizens to remain fully engaged in productive activities. We would also be giving the Nation and their communities the full benefit of their talents and experience.

While the social security provisions of this bill understandably have received the greatest attention from the public at large, the other titles of H.R. 12080 are equally important, and in fact, far more controversial.

There is general agreement that the entire structure of our public welfare programs needs review and reform. Concern has intensified not only because these programs are increasingly expensive, but above all because there is more and more evidence that the great investment made in the present programs is essentially unproductive. In fact, far from bringing constructive results, our present public welfare system actually has destructive consequences, harmful both to aid recipients and to society as a whole.

Essentially the public welfare system is intended to assist those who, for reasons beyond their own control, cannot support themselves—the very old, the very young, the disabled, and those who lack even the most rudimentary skills needed for employment. The goals of the system, in theory, are to help the States provide essential support for such persons, and at the same time to offer them the social services which can help them to become more independent, self-respecting, tax-paying members of society.

But we have fallen far short of these goals, and in fact may have lost sight of them entirely. In too many States, public welfare payments are far below even the minimum subsistence levels established by the States themselves. In too many States, social services are totally inadequate, and offer no help or incentives for individuals to "get off the dole". Rather than promoting the growth of strong families, the welfare system too often produces broken homes. Rather than aiding communities, it too often leads to shattered neighborhoods. Rather than encouraging independence and initiative, the system actually promotes dependence, strangles individual effort and, above all, erodes human dignity.

Mr. Chairman, while there is growing agreement on the need for change, there is not yet consensus on the directions of reform. Many proposals have been made, ranging from revisions within the present system to the substitution of entirely new programs such as the guaranteed annual income or family allowances. Important suggestions have been advanced by many groups, including the President's Advisory Council on Public Welfare in its landmark report of June 1966. Great support has been expressed to me for advances in social services such those encompassed by the legislation generally known as the Fogarty bill. Many Members of this body have also proposed new steps to expand job training and basic education, revamp poverty programs, and develop neighborhood centers to serve the complex needs of low-income areas.

A recent study by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has shown us statistically the dimensions of the problem. According to this analysis, of the 7.3 million Americans on Federally-aided welfare, the vast majority—all except perhaps 50,000—are dependent and may not be able to reach economic self-sufficiency under the best of circumstances. Of these 7.3 million people, about 2.1 million, mostly women, are 65 or over; 700,000 are either blind or severely handicapped; 3.5 million are children receiving AFDC because their parents cannot provide for them. The remaining 1 million are the parents of those children, including about 900,000 mothers and 150,000 fathers. Of this last group, most lack sufficient education, while most of the mothers have young children to tend at home, and all but perhaps 50,000 of the fathers are incapacitated and unable to hold jobs.

While these statistics are illuminating, we do not need data to see the social and human costs of perpetuating present programs. The need for change—thoughtful, and compassionate change—is obvious in our urban slums, in areas of rural poverty, in the empty lives and despairing faces of the poor, and in the frustrations experienced by the many public servants who are attempting to respond to human need and remedy the failures of our society.

H.R. 12080, as reported by the Ways and Means Committee, does make major changes in our welfare programs, especially in the program of aid to families with dependent children—AFDC. These proposed changes are primarily directed at stabilizing Federal costs, improving social services, strengthening family life, and encouraging job training for aid recipients over 16. Some of the new proposals, such as expanded child welfare efforts and increased aid for training of social workers, are generally regarded as constructive. Others, such as the imposition of a ceiling on Federal AFDC payments, are considered in many quarters to be regressive and punitive.

In bulk, these amendments impose many new responsibilities and requirements on the States, requirements which will become prerequisites for certain categories of Federal assistance in 1969. In many cases, particularly where States and cities have already assumed substantial burdens and provided extensive aid, these changes will increase State and local cost. In all cases they will require additional personnel, the development of new and expanded programs such as counseling and day care, and close coordination with present efforts such as most of the antipoverty programs.

The House has had less than 2 weeks to consider the committee's proposals, and in this short time has not been able to make a full assessment of their impact nationally or in individual cities and States.

Most important, we have debated these proposals under a closed rule, which prohibits amendments to the bill. There are, of course, arguments for and against this procedure, traditionally applied to bills reported by this committee. On the one hand, legislation of such magnitude and complexity obviously cannot be written on the House floor. On the other hand, the closed rule effectively denies most Members any opportunity to advance their own proposals, to evaluate alternatives, or even to express their positions through votes on individual sections of the bill.

There is sound reason for a closed rule on tax legislation. But the welfare programs are linked with the Social Security Act in the statutes only by historical accident, because both programs were initially enacted in an omnibus bill 30 years ago. Now, just as we have come to see the dangers of relying indefinitely on the works of a previous generation, we should see the need to open this entire area for full discussion and debate. Failure to do so means that we are not only abdicating our responsibilities as individual Representatives, but also surrendering initiative to the other body.

I trust that we shall have an opportunity very soon to give the entire field of public welfare the open, complete consideration which the subject and the times demand.

To Serve and To Protect: Motto of Los Angeles Policemen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED REINECKE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 21, 1967

Mr. REINECKE. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Robert P. Sutton, vice president of CBS Radio and general manager of KNX Radio in Los Angeles, has well defined the problems facing the Los Angeles police force.

His radio editorials of July 26 and 27, 1967, are well worth the attention of the House:

TO SERVE AND PROTECT

(Part I)

If it hasn't happened to you, it probably doesn't seem too important. Unfortunately, the number of people who have become victims of criminals is growing bigger every day.

The latest report from State Attorney General Thomas Lynch underscores the situation. Felonies in California jumped by 18.2%

in the first 3 months of this year over 1966. Experts predict that our crime rate will double by 1975.

Clearly, crime in California is becoming a critical problem. The solutions to the causes of crime are—at best—long-range affairs. They are not going to protect any of us from a criminal today. Until this long-range solutions do take hold, there is a tactical battle against the criminal that must be waged right now and right here.

The soldiers in this battle are the police. However, while the army of law-breakers gets bigger, the corps of police gets smaller. Nowhere is this more evident than in Los Angeles.

With luck, we graduate 480 new officers from the police academy every year. But, each year we lose 500 officers through retirement and resignations. In addition, the population of Los Angeles goes up by approximately 50,000 every year. We need a minimum of 100 additional officers to serve and protect these new people. In short, our Police Department is going down at the rate of 120 men per year while the number of criminals continues to climb.

To get the full picture, let's compare Los Angeles with San Francisco, Chicago, and New York. Let's see how many policemen each city has per square mile and how many people have to be protected by each police officer.

San Francisco has 41 officers for every square mile. It has one policeman for every 370 citizens. In Chicago, its 48 officers per square mile and 346 citizens per policeman. In New York, it's 103 officers per square mile and 240 citizens per policeman. In Los Angeles it is 11 officers per square mile and 477 citizens per policeman. The Los Angeles Police Officer must protect vastly more area and a great many more people than the police officer in any other major city in America.

The figures illustrate the point dramatically: Los Angeles desperately needs more police officers. The Los Angeles Police Department is smaller today than it was at the time of the 1965 Watts Riots.

Our police have just been given a 5% salary raise. But, more money is not—by itself—the answer. Too many policemen are retiring early or simply quiting. Too few young men are signing up for police work. Tomorrow KNX will tell you some of the reasons why. We will also make some suggestions on how each one of us can personally help reverse the trend.

TO SERVE AND PROTECT

(Part II)

Yesterday we told you about the problem of recruiting officers for the Los Angeles Police Department. While crime is increasing, our police force gets smaller every year. Today we have fewer policemen per capita than any major city in America.

Civic problems are often approached with massive doses of money in an attempt to get an instant solution. In the case of the police, more money helps but it does not solve the problem. It does not—of iteslf—attract new recruits. It does not—of itself—prevent early retirement and resignations. The problem has many facets. Some are rarely talked about—not even by the policemen themselves. Today, KNX will talk about some of these aspects of the problem.

One of them is the inability to ever completely relax. The police are visual personification of organized society. They represent the social order as the majority of people want it to be. This makes the police the target of criminal elements. It also makes them the focal point for protestors, rioters, and rebels. After being the brunt of hatred for venom for awhile, police morale begins to suffer. The will to do a hard and dirty job is sapped. Early retirement and resignation looks better and better all the time.

Another is the question of dedication. To be a good policeman requires dedication. It requires a willingness to walk in dark places—to do the best job possible in the face of harassment and violence. Money cannot buy this dedication.

In addition, there is the dual attitude of the general public. When you get a speeding ticket, the police are the darn fuzz. When you get roughed up in a protest march, they are brutal monsters. But, at 3 a.m. when things go bump in the night, you want these brutal fuzz there . . . You want them to defend you at whatever the cost. After all isn't that what they're paid for?

Finally, policemen are people. They don't want a job that doesn't have the visible support and the respect of the public they are serving and protecting.

KNX says that there is only one way we are going to recruit and retain the policemen we need. That is for all law abiding citizens to stand up and be counted. We must give our police our solid and open support.

Learn, Baby, Learn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 21, 1967

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, the annual summer commencement address at Wisconsin State University in Stevens Point, Wis., was delivered on August 5, 1967, by a regent of the university, Mrs. Robert Williams of Stevens Point.

Mr. Speaker, Mary Williams has some very interesting and pertinent comments to make on the current situation that is facing our country. Under unanimous consent, I ask that Mrs. Williams' commencement address entitled "Learn, Baby, Learn," be inserted in the RECORD at this point:

The commencement address referred to follows:

(Commencement address by Mrs. Robert Williams, 59th annual summer commencement at Wisconsin State University—Stevens Point, August 5, 1967)

LEARN, BABY, LEARN

President Haferbecker, Dean Yambert, Honored Guests, and Honored Graduates. It is my distinct privilege to speak to you who receive your degrees from Wisconsin State University-Stevens Point today. A privilege because as individuals you embody characteristics we most admire and characteristics our society most urgently requires.

You have completed your work in a summer session. This could signify that you have your own work-study program: Work or teach 10 months, study two months. You may be upgrading your education to increase your potential; you may have a dependent family, and this degree represents sacrifice by all of them.

Even more than the fuzzy cheeked June graduates, summer school graduates at Wisconsin State Universities represent discipline and motivation. You undoubtedly have missed hours of suntanning and beach parties; days of summer travel with the family or the gang; you have unquestionably missed weeks of sleep.

It is small consolation to note that educators wish they could stem the tide of high school graduates who immediately rush to attend college—to wait until the young people have learned the perspective, motivation and organization so many of you take for granted.

Indeed, students do need a desire for self-improvement, a regard for achievement, an understanding of goals and the efforts to reach them.

Yet, our human society needs these same attributes even more desperately!

Today, at last, the trend in research efforts and educational emphasis is turning away from science and technology and toward the social sciences. We could split the neutron, eliminate polio, employ the laser. But, in the summer of 1967 we cannot stop the sniper fire on Third Street in Milwaukee.

Amidst this affluent and so civilized society we encounter violence, hostility and futility. Not only in the city masses and among the very poor; but also in the young and not-so-young running away to join the 100,000 Hippies in California; yes, among those gathered for honest protest or criminal disorder at Madison, Platteville, Oshkosh, Whitewater, Lake Geneva, the corner of Main and Division or in front of the Post Office right here in Stevens Point.

Then there is Newark, Detroit, Milwaukee.

Indeed, that is "something else," as the freshman would say. That is a national scandal—a tragedy.

Too many times this last week I have heard honorable, responsible citizens say, "Thank God, we don't live in Newark, Detroit, Milwaukee, in any of those big ugly cities."

I reply, "Open your eyes, your ears, and your hearts. What happens there, happens here. What destroys human aspirations there, destroys it here. What blocks improvement of social conditions there, blocks it here."

Our isolation from the world of nations died in 1941.

Our isolation from the world around us never lived.

We are inseparable, held together by copper wires and TV tubes, by an economic technostructure, by an all-pervasive government, by a complex, fast changing social environment—if not as we might hope to be held together, by a feeling of brotherhood and shared dreams.

Anthropologists tell us that human societies are unable to concern themselves with moral values unless the source and continued supply of food is plentiful.

Yet, in our nation today, there is generally too much food and too little successful coping with moral issues.

True, some still suffer physical want, but too many face other obstacles to a commitment to moral values and goals of social conduct.

We are aware of many who wander without clear goals; many out of touch with any heritage; many who see themselves alienated from all about them and see only hypocrisy and cynicism around them.

No, we here cannot be isolated from midtown Detroit, or Third Street, Milwaukee.

But those who live there, they see themselves as isolated from you and me—the privileged many.

This sense of futility and moral emptiness effectively reduces our storehouse of potential leadership. There is an erosive quality present in this kind of despair which decreases all energy and drive. The application of individual talent, the imaginative use of experience and wisdom, the desire to serve and work with purpose declines when confronted with aimlessness, drift and confusion.

Hence, a pollution of our human resources!

How to explain this lack of individual and group commitment?

Many simply—over-simply, perhaps—refer to our "sick" society. Psychologists argue that man may be a creature who must avoid competing loyalties, assuming that man cannot function under uncertainty and conflict. Therefore, modern society causes disintegration with its specialization, its rapid change, its high mobility, and its weakening of traditional institutions such as church and family.

We frequently hear criticisms of the impersonality which has grown out of the increasing bigness of our systems. Teachers see fewer opportunities to shape the educational process; citizens are frustrated in attempts to change or modify policy in Big Government. Business men succumb to the pushing, shoving and conformity on the corporate organizational ladder.

They all conclude that schools, government, business are not sincerely concerned with social problems and people's needs.

Our young people—perhaps, even some of you—rich in a wealth of knowledge, nevertheless may feel locked out of the social and political establishment. Discontented with the past and present, you may feel as if you have neither position nor power in the social structure.

One could go on and on with reasonable explanations for the plague of despair and futility upon so many.

But let us not credit textbook explanations alone for the lack of a common moral system. Other psychological studies show that certain values are widely accepted.

Constitutional and legal rights, human dignity, individual freedom.

The quality of human life *is* of primary concern to many.

Individual achievement *is* possible regardless of social and economic status.

Despair and confusion is felt among the deprived but not universally, and *it is* present among the affluent.

Slum living does cause a cycle of poverty, isolation and prolonged ignorance, but social problems such as violence, alcoholism and crime are not confined to the slums.

Studies have shown that when human beings live together, they often assume a shared standard of conduct. These standards are learned and the nature of the learned process depends on what is available to be learned. The learner's ability and motivation and the strength and frequency of reinforcement influence the process.

First, let us consider what is available to be learned:

We are really super people when it comes to emphasizing our most superficial and frivolous aspects and minimizing or disguising our most profound and cherished beliefs.

We have been so zealous in our separation of church and state that we have depreciated all ethical codes and idealistic human conduct.

We have been so energetic in dissociating from our Puritan traditions that we have elevated Hugh Heffner to a social high priest—and raised the cult of self indulging and bunny-watching to a national pastime.

We have become so confused regarding sincere protest that we defend hooliganism and suppress adverse criticism when we really want to curb hoodlums.

We have become so conscious-stricken about slum conditions and the Negro dilemma, that we deprecate the hard-working business man, laborer and farmer who is providing us with an example of excellence and achievement.

We have become so absorbed in the prolonging of life that we appear unchallenged by what human lives can accomplish and their imprint on world history. Our stress is usually on quantity—rarely on quality.

One of my choices for an all-time low in TV advertising is the current "Feel like a healthy animal—eat Glutz's breakfast cereal." To infer that good health of and by itself is a virtue rather than a singular blessing is contrary to the experiences of history. We may *be* the most healthy nation in the world, but we may not improve human relationships. And to encourage people to feel like animals even in supercillious advertising is the exact opposite of what we teach our children, it ignores centuries of human evolution, human reason, loyalty, sensitivity, and creativity.

The diversity in standards and values available to be learned is mountainous.

Secondly, let us look at the learners' ability to acquire a common belief in a set of values. According to sociologists "ignorance is not bliss." Individuals without knowledge, skills, or native intelligence lack the power to organize and understand events and ideas they encounter. They cannot reason from effects to causes, and rational thought is difficult for them. A simple, stable culture does not hold so many conflicts for them, but in our constantly changing society, values are incoherent and contradictory. Hence, our educationally disadvantaged citizens are least able to operate within social patterns.

In addition there are emotional factors which interfere with the learning process. One does not learn values and standards as one does facts. Living, working, and talking with others in varying circumstances and contexts and over a period of time are the steps in acquiring standards. Anxiety, resentment, a sense of personal inadequacy all reduce the individual's ability to interact with his fellows and to learn from such experiences. Anxiety may, also, warp perception and distort the values one sees. A lack of self-appreciation and sense of worth may isolate individuals so they do not even approach the full learning experience.

In the slum situation where ghettos exist, social workers report it is more of a problem to get the ghetto out of the man than the man out of the ghetto. The pattern of lack of confidence and faith in one's ability has to be overcome. Emotional factors may be intensified for those who live in deprived circumstances.

Thirdly, let us see what opportunities for reinforcement of a set of rules for conduct the learner has: One has his lesson reinforced by example, by actual participation, by trial and error.

If a young girl or boy has problems in interacting, in becoming part of a group, she or he will have a learning experience cut off from them. They may accept ideas they don't really believe in order to participate. Then the act of participating will reinforce the ideas. They may then see other codes of conduct as being senseless or deceitful.

The masses of people everywhere decrease person-to-person contacts. The individual feels he is making no impact, that his identity is threatened. The lonely crowd, so to speak.

The Hippie wave offers freedom and leisure for the individual to be himself. Hippie belief in true pacifism and the brotherhood of man is compelling. But the turning in on oneself through drugs and the absorption in self-exploration is yet another strain on our total capacity for leadership and energy to solve society's problems. Self indulgence is no training for life saving.

Evidently the Existentialist philosophy has many unknowing advocates. The existentialist does not believe God exists. He has one clear theme: to know himself, to develop himself and to explore experience in relation to himself. He does not see himself in a historical perspective accepting the wisdom of past generations. And he does not feel compelled to accomplish anything with his life or to make a contribution for posterity.

What moral values are being learned by example? Again—confused and contradictory. Our cities have been victims of an unfortunate exodus. The citizens best prepared in education and understanding to deal with cities' problems live in suburbs. Builders of factories, owners of stores, teachers in metropolitan schools, bank executives and office managers leave the places of work, they leave problems they know and could help solve, to live elsewhere. They don't participate; they don't live as examples. Who is left in the cities? The ones least prepared in skills or stamina to cope with the tasks.

John Weiss, Professor of History, Wayne State University in Detroit says he thinks walls should be again built around the cities—not to keep the barbarians out as in medieval days—but to keep the people who are needed in—so that the powerful cannot be divorced from the consequences of their acts.

I began my remarks minutes ago by telling you, sincerely, that it was my privilege to be here because of certain characteristics you hold—discipline—motivation—a high standard of conduct.

I said that society urgently needs those characteristics.

Society needs you!

For I have talked much of the learning process, the learner, the learned—of what is available to be learned; the learner's ability to acquire a comon belief in a set of values through learning; the opportunities for the learner to reinforce that the set of values.

There is a frenetic scream in our streets this summer. It cries in a hundred thousand voices—"Burn, Baby, Burn!"

Your answer equally forceful and determined must be: "Learn, Baby, Learn!" And let me help you do so!"

Because I believe with many that the deep radium to this nation's big city cancer is education.

Education of the impoverished and disadvantaged.

Education of the Negro.

Education of the rest of us to recognize this cancer and a dedication to do something about it.

I am no teary-eyed super-liberal who wants to forgive the fire-bomb throwing criminal in our city streets and try to "educate him" to our ways.

He is just that, a criminal, and he must be treated with the justice a criminal deserves.

But he was a person before he became a criminal.

His children are not born criminals.

We must work to prevent that small person, and small persons yet unborn from becoming of despair and futility.

Society does need you—probably as never before—to help in this endeavor.

You are today's—tomorrow's leaders.

You have entered the golden eight per cent—the eight per cent of this nation's people who hold a college degree.

You live in a world where knowledge is power—and you already know more than most of us.

You live in a world where job is status, and any job you seek in teaching or in business or in government will automatically give you status.

Many of you will be teaching next month. (I am told by President Haferbecker that a much larger percentage than in the June graduation class.) The need for you is great; the opportunity immense.

Big business is *finally* increasing its contributions to the social success and its emphasis on public service.

Let your business know you care and want to help.

Labor unions are training members to help with social problems and are finally offering scholarships to black and white, young and old.

Let your labor unions know you care and want to help.

The church is finally becoming involved in the daily experience of men and the actual facts of human life.

Let your church know you care and want to help.

Colleges and universities are finally trying to prepare students to live with purpose wherever they may find themselves.

Let your college know you care and want to help.

Be no party to the "thank God I don't live there . . . ." attitude.

There will be much serious thought in the next years as to what must be done to make this nation, its cities, more livable—to give its people more living. Be a part of that thinking. Communicate your knowledge. And when there is studied, constructive action—*act!*

You have had a fine education in a respected education system. You do have immense capability to learn more—to teach more.

To all—the poor, the not-so-poor, the uneducated, the somewhat educated—the colored, the bigot—the powerful, the weak—please say

"Learn, Baby, Learn!—And let me help you!"

The Situation in Hong Kong

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 10, 1967

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, a great deal of legitimate concern has been raised over Red China's intent in the recent riots in Hong Kong. There is no doubt that the People's Republic was and still is behind a great deal of the unfortunate tragedy which has erupted on the bustling streets of the British crown colony.

Are we witnessing the end of China's tolerance of the profitable city? It is important to remember, and I have made the point in the past, that Hong Kong is a definite economic and financial asset to the People's Republic and as long as it remains so it is doubtful that a serious attempt to significantly change the present circumstances will be made.

This, however, does not preclude harassment of British and local Hong Kong authorities, even at the scale of the present incidents. Because Hong Kong is such an integral and important part of the Pacific community, I felt an analysis of the present circumstances existing in the crown colony should be made. The immediate past riots and the present incidents should be viewed within the perspective I will attempt to put forth.

Many consider Hong Kong to be the most significant of the remaining British crown colonies. Part of the land of Hong Kong, including the city of Hong Kong, was ceded to Britain "in perpetuity" by the Manchus in the 19th century. The majority of the land, however, remains in British control through a lease which expires in 1997. What will happen past that time is, as are many aspects of Hong Kong today, uncertain.

Paramount military and civil authority in Hong Kong is vested in an appointed British Governor representing the Crown. The Governor receives guidance from the Colonial and Foreign Offices at London. An Executive Council and a Legislative Council further aid the Governor in the formulation of policy and laws; both of these bodies are appointed. The Urban Council is the only governing body in the colony which includes elected members. But elections still fail to elicit a serious response from Hong Kong citizens; in late 1966, only 9 to 14 percent of the eligible voters had registered. The Urban Council, whose influence was extremely limited to begin with, thus has very little bargaining power with the colonial administration. As a result, Hong Kong is controlled—almost exclusively—by the British Government.

At present Hong Kong's economy appears to be relatively healthy. In 1964, a tremendous boom took place. In 1965, however, a serious recession ensued. Since that time Hong Kong has enjoyed gradual expansion and in many areas now rests at a position comparable to that of the prerecession period. The recent riots have had a slight effect on the economy, which I will discuss later. Most sectors of the economy now appear to be leveling off. Internal business is still sluggish, but trade is adequate, though the rate of growth slipped in 1966.

Accurate speculation as to the future state of Hong Kong's economy is extremely difficult. This results from many factors. First, Hong Kong depends mainly on external trade for the development of economic prosperity. External trade, however, is subject to many whimsical forces: world political climate; economic conditions among the nations with whom Hong Kong trades; the fluctuations in the world market. Further, industry in the colony has failed to respond to various attempts at diversification. It continues presently to function well through sales of fairly basic products to a limited number of countries. Both the narrowness of product emphasis and market are exceptionally susceptible to the above-mentioned unstable factors. Third, Hong Kong has little, if any, long range planning system. The colony has managed thus far on the basis of a year to year macroeconomic policy. Hong Kong is thus ill prepared for any substantial economic change in the future—such as the imminent entrance of Great Britain into the Common Market and the subsequent loss of preferential treatment—and has little direction in its economy. These three factors afford the analyst inconsiderable foundation for speculation.

The most critical problems facing Hong Kong today are social. Housing is a key area of concern. There exists a tremendous shortage of adequate living facilities, with the number of squatters reported in excess of 550,000 in 1966. Various government agencies are working toward a solution of the problem, but are hindered by a chronic inability to raise funds. The private building industry, still struggling toward a stable position, is of little assistance. This is not to say that nothing has been done. The mark IV program, for example, has successfully relocated 85,000 people. Much more must be accomplished, however.

Health continues to be a problem in Hong Kong. There is a serious shortage of hospitals. The number of deaths from cholera and typhus in 1966 increased from the previous year, although major epidemics were avoided. Again shortage of funds obstructs the alleviation of the problem.

The most striking social problem in Hong Kong recently has been labor. Although wages have risen steadily in the past few years, and have risen more rapidly than has the cost of living, the number of man-days lost through labor-management disputes continues to increase and is seen as one of the major causes of the recent rioting.

The civil tranquility that Hong Kong enjoyed for early a decade—with the exception of minor disturbances in 1966—was shattered early this year by a series of demonstrations and riots. The riots allegedly evolved from a number of labor disputes, the rioting having begun in an artificial flower factory involved in a labor disagreement. From the beginning, however, it was obvious that the riots were Communist-inspired. The mobs brandished copies of the writings of Mao-Tse-tung; posters of the Chinese Communist leader were plastered on walls; and slogans such as, "the imperialists are bullying us and must be dealt with severely," were chanted. The strikes emanated, it was believed, from genuine economic grievances, but the spirit of the mobs was definitely accentuated by the cultural revolution going on in the CPR. The riots were, at first loud and disorderly, but serious injury or damage did not ensue.

I must interject here a comment on Communist incitement of riots in general. Any kind of social disturbance within a Western-oriented nation is clearly in the best interest of the Communist movement. In Southeast Asia, the Chinese Communists are most happy to see riots or demonstrations break out. When social eruptions do occur, the Communists will lend what assistance they can toward making them more severe. We must bear this fact in mind as we analyze the recent rioting in Hong Kong. The role assumed by the Communists was substantial, but they were not necessarily responsible for the actual beginning of the disturbances.

On the 13th of May, Peking became officially involved in the disturbances in Hong Kong. The New China News Agency called for redress of police brutality against demonstrators in the British colony. The flames of insurrection were fanned by the local Communist newspapers, led by the publication Wen Wei Pao. On May 14, through more formal channels, Peking confronted the British authorities with a series of demands, including the immediate and unconditional release of all those arrested in the disturbances, official apologies to the pro-Communists, and the punishment of police officials whom the Communists accused of resorting to excessive measures for the control of the mobs.

A great deal of speculation surrounded the Peking involvement. Many believed that Peking had entered the picture reluctantly, perhaps wanting only to voice support of pro-Communist forces in any attempt to overthrow the barbaric capitalist—in this light, of course, Red China had a special, cultural commitment. Further, due to the great disruption faced by the CPR as a result of the cultural revolution, Peking may have viewed the Hong Kong riots as an internally unifying issue. At the same time, it was clear that the stability of Hong

Kong was of great importance to the CPR as a market for her exports; trade between the British colony and the mainland totals approximately $700 million yearly, with the CPR maintaining a favorable balance of trade of nearly 98 percent. Thus Hong Kong represents a valuable source of hard currency for the Communists and would represent a substantial financial setback if lost.

As the first series of riots subsided in late May, the position of Peking became abundantly clear: They were willing to accept an easy, quick, and inexpensive victory, but did not view the issue worthy of great economic or diplomatic expense. Peking did not find it in its best interest to assume a major role in the harassment of British authorities and remained satisfied to support the effort with nothing more than verbal reassurance. Peking's reluctance to lend substantial support to the insurrection in Hong Kong must be seen as an important factor in the failure of the riots to have any serious effect on the colony.

Another significant factor contributing to the failure of the insurrection was the inability of the Communist agitators to gain solid following among the Hong Kong citizens. Not only was relatively little assistance subscribed from the masses, but prominent Hong Kong leftists were also unwilling to substantially further the cause. They had too much at stake in their personal affairs to take part in such a questionable undertaking.

The admirable position taken by the British Government, especially the stature of Gov. David Trench, and his administrators, was, by far, the most important element in the Communists' failure. Restraint and firmness characterized the British attitude. The mobs were carefully watched and violence was quickly quelled, yet the police took exceptional care not to injure anyone or incite the crowd in any way toward extremes. Governor Trench worked diligently to bring the disturbance under control, yet he rigidly refused to comply with the unreasonable demands of the Communists.

The first wave of violence did not conclude without some derogatory effects. The financial climate of the colony was noticeably less lively. Capital flowing into the colony diminished by an estimated 25 to 50 percent. The stock market was forced to close for a number of days and when it reopened near the end of May prices were down 10 percent. Bank activities were slowed considerably. These and other developments demonstrated a great loss of confidence in the stability of Hong Kong. Further, they may well lead to a serious business recession.

On June 8, a second series of riots began. Once again, the riots began over a labor dispute, and, once again, after a brief delay, Peking became involved. At first, Peking's attitude appeared to be considerably different. The Washington Post, on June 14, reported:

> Communist China called on the Chinese . . . to mobilize themselves into a "mighty revolutionary army" in order to "smash the decadent and moribund reactionary rule of British imperialism in Hong Kong."

This was a much more rigid, anti-British stand than the CPR had taken before and it was accompanied by an official ban on sales of fresh meat, poultry, and seafood normally imported daily from the mainland. Shipments of fresh water were also put under embargo. Although these bans were not wholeheartedly honored by the Red Chinese, the respective food supplies were considerably affected and Peking's posture was clearly defined.

As the riots unfold, however, it becomes evident that China is willing to harass the Hong Kong and British authorities solely on a diplomatic level. Token financial support has reportedly been given to some of the pro-Communist demonstrators in the Crown colony, but Peking has done little else to aggravate the disorder. At the same time, violence, which has been more evident in this series of riots—though still on a minor scale—has been met by greater activity on the part of the Hong Kong authorities. Many more arrests and other precautionary measures have been taken and the Government does not intend to relent. These two factors afford observers of the situation confidence that Hong Kong will remain in British control—that stability will be maintained.

The rioting, now subsiding in Hong Kong, gives members of the Pacific community no reason for panic. The British plan to stand firmly behind their colony. Neither the citizens of Hong Kong, nor Peking are willing to support a revolutionary movement. Demonstrations may continue sporadically, designed for the inconvenience of the British authorities, and reflecting desires of the people for certain social reforms, but Hong Kong still represents one of Peking's major sources for hard currency exchange, and as long as Hong Kong remains profitable it is doubtful that the CPR will make a more concerted effort than the one reflected by the recent riots.

How Long?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE L. HAYS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 21, 1967

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a poem by Miss Marty Hale, of Wintersville, Ohio:

HOW LONG?

(By Marty Hale, The Old Spinner, July 23, 1967)

Somehow I do not care to go
To concerts, or a movie show—
I see a lad with smoking gun,
Which spoils my ordinary fun;
I can't enjoy a cut of meat,
For wondering what they have to eat;
I cannot be serene and calm,
While our boys die in Viet Nam.
How many wars must time release
Before the world can live in peace?
Has such return to savagry
Ever made any nation free?
How can we go our usual way
Of strikes, and lay-offs every day,
While our boys wade through swamps and mire,
And sleep at night while under fire?

Have we grown careless here at home
And take for granted how they roam
To foreign lands to keep us free?
Sometimes I wonder—Just HOW free;
Wake up, Americans! Count the hours,
And get behind these boys of our's.
Do something special . . . Don't just dream . . .
(And, God, Take care of one Marine.)

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402, at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

Appendix

Tornadoes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY ROBERTS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 22, 1967

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, those of us who live in the Western part of the United States have always been concerned with cyclones and tornadoes. This has been the subject of study by interested individuals as well as scientists throughout the country.

Recently a magazine published a conclusion drawn by a layman who had been studying tornadoes for some 50 years.

In view of the interest on this subject in our part of the country, I am attaching the following statement by Roy F. Hall of McKinney, Tex.:

TORNADOES

Observation, research and experimentation accomplished in the last 30 years point, significantly, to the avoidless conclusion that a tornado is thermal in its creation and electrical in its execution. It appears that a tornado is composed of atmospheric molecules, acted upon by electrical forces which move the particles as an electrical field, in the direction of the force of that field.

A tornado originates at or above the cloud line, where it appears a huge generator is created when two clouds of opposite polarity are forcibly merged, or when a single cloud whose separate areas of positive and negative charges are merged by the fall of heavy rain, hail or overriding by heavy dry air of a cold front. This great generator, by the introduction of ions, energizes the affected molecules of atmosphere, causing them to move in the electrical field, possibly in proportion to the electrical strength of the field, or possibly at or above the molecular diffusion velocity of nitrogen, the higher gas. The paths of all the molecules, and their single direction within the vortex is the direction of the electrical forces in the field—counterclockwise in the northern hemisphere.

As single atoms do not usually exist in the atmosphere, almost all atmospherical molecules consist of two or more atoms in close combination, and these, undisturbed, are poor conductors of electrical forces. But any agency that introduces charged atoms into the air can increase its conductivity to a high degree. An electrical bombardment, possibly by dust particles, minute drops of moisture, and so on, ionizes the air molecules which, due to their newly-acquired positive charges, are then accelerated in the strong electrical field surrounding the embyronic vortex. This, it seems, is the inception, the creation of the tornado.

But further; the particles, ionized, are electrically charged and carrying minute charges of electricity in their passage through gas not yet ionized creates further electric fields, causing the newly-charged molecules to be deflected by the electric field and to take a new motion and a new path. As the molecules are deflected the local air density changes from diffusion to an ionized discharge of the molecules; which now move unrestricted in the direction of the force of the magnetic field. With a free path, which tends to increase the velocity and energy of the molecules, the electrical conductivity of the molecules alters the magnetic field and thus inducts unionized molecules and moving them in the direction of the field induces a high velocity in the vortex. This is repeated endlessly as the vortex moves downward due to the force of gravity, for, due to the high condensation of atmosphericam molecules within the vortex, the tornado funnel is heavier than the surrounding air.

With its rotational velocity of over 1600 fps the tornado funnel seemingly should disintegrate due to centrifugal laws. It, however, holds its initial diameter from its inception to its final withdrawal into the cloud base. Bernoulli's law may account for a fraction of this cohesiveness, but only a fraction. It appears that the tornado's design and spin is due totally to an electrical field, which accelerates the ionized air molecules in the direction of the force of the magnetic field at velocities not yet determined.

As force laws between ions and atoms are almost unknown, the velocity of the ionized molecule in its free path in the tornado funnel remains unknown. If, therefore, it is correct that the ionized molecules are deflected from collision and diffusion courses into the circular free path in the electrical field, do they partake of the velocity of the fast nitrogen atoms, or are they accelerated to even higher velocity by the force of the electrical field? The last appears the true situation.

SUMMARY

A tornado is created when a cloud or clouds of opposite polarity are merged by air currents. This "merging" must be north-south or a large fraction thereof so that the approaching polarities, due to the earth's rotation, meet slightly off center. Held close by opposite polarities a vortex of high potential is created. Ionized particles within the vortex are deflected from diffusion paths to a new course in the direction of the magnetic field, moving in that field with no centrifugal force and no lateral pressure.

ROY F. HALL.

Representative Widnall—Nemesis of Urban Renewal, Champion of Poor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM T. CAHILL
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 21, 1967

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, Representative WILLIAM B. WIDNALL, of the Seventh District of New Jersey, is a modern-day example of the truth of the Biblical quotation:

> A Prophet is not without honor, except in his own country.

To those of us who serve with him, BILL WIDNALL is an able, thoughtful, and effective legislator and a trusted friend. To the Seventh District of New Jersey, his talents and leadership are recognized by the citizenry regardless of political affiliation as demonstrated by the tremendous pluralities with which he is elected every 2 years to the House of Representatives. The State of New Jersey knows Representative WIDNALL as the dean of the Republican congressional delegation and as a forceful advocate for fair and adequate housing for all citizens of our country. While he is well known, therefore, in his own district and State, he is definitely recognized as a "prophet with honor" in the State of Ohio.

Mr. Speaker, I was delighted to read the Sunday issue of the Cleveland Plain Dealer and to observe the full-page eulogy of our colleague and friend, Representative WILLIAM B. WIDNALL. The article in question describes in detail why BILL WIDNALL is such an effective and forceful Representative of the State of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to insert in the RECORD the article from the Plain Dealer, under date of Sunday, August 20, 1967, entitled "Representative WIDNALL: Wily Old GOP Battler Is Nemesis of Urban Renewal, Champion of Poor," by Sanford Watzman, of the Washington Plain Dealer bureau:

REPRESENTATIVE WIDNALL: WILY OLD GOP BATTLER IS NEMESIS OF UBRAN RENEWAL, CHAMPION OF POOR

(By Sanford Waltzman)

WASHINGTON.—The fight announcer, introducing Rep. William B. Widnall, whose opponents have included Mayor Ralph S. Locher and federal urban renewal officials, would say:

"And in this corner, from Saddle River, N.J., one of the champion producers in the House of Representatives (though a member of the GOP minority), wearing the conservative trunks (though he has outpaced the Great Society in some bouts) . . .

"Elected by the rich (but a fighter for the poor), representative of a white suburban New York district (though he speaks for Negroes in big-city ghettoes) . . .

"Force-feeder of housing legislation to the Democratic administration (which admits having grown stronger on the Widnall diet), winner of many a congressional battle (though he's quiet and studious, not an orator or a wheeler-dealer) . . .

"In this corner, nemesis of the urban renewal program in Cleveland and elsewhere, still in there at 61, after having been elected to Congress 10 times . . .

"That Episcopalian lawyer of English-Danish descent, that old pro who voted for Herbert Hoover, then twice for FDR, finally getting excited and training for politics under his hero, Wendell Wilkie . . .

"In this corner—Bill Widnall."

The crowd would cheer. Some of those getting hoarse would be fans you could hardly expect to be sharing the same row of seats, such as:

The conservative Americans for Constitutional Action, on the right wing (who credit Widnall with voting correctly two out of three times) and the NAACP on the liberal side—to cite two examples.

"And in this other corner," the fight announcer would resume . . .

Most frequently its Secretary Robert C. Weaver of the Department of Housing and

Urban Development. They always fight an unorthodox fight with no knockouts.

What usually happens is that Weaver climbs through the ropes of the House Banking and Currency Committee, which is the big ring for most housing legislation and where Widnall is the ranking Republican member.

Weaver jabs first with a new Great Society program. Widnall blocks it and counterpunches with an amendment. Then they clinch. By the time they pull out of it, Weaver has scored with a program but Widnall has inserted an amendment.

Here are some famous Widnall-Weaver bouts:

Model cities—Widnall wrote a report to the House after losing round one in committee:

"We are told that (this program) would help the poor and disadvantaged in our restless cities. For the past 17 years we have been told that slum clearance and urban renewal would do likewise. Now we are told by Secretary Weaver himself that urban renewal has never lived up to its promise.

"My efforts for the past several years to change this deplorable situation have been met with the statement by HUD that urban renewal cannot be tampered with for fear of losing flexibility. Flexibility for what?

"Do they mean the kind of flexibility that has constructed luxury high-rise apartments and promoted downtown commercial renewal at the expense of low- and moderate-income citizens left behind in the ghettos? Do they mean the kind of flexibility that has fostered the explosive situations in city after city that we face this summer (1966)?"

Democrats and Republicans on the floor agreed to what has become known as "The Widnall Amendment"—a requirement that future residential renewal projects include a substantial number of units for persons of low and moderate income.

When observers commented on the spectacle of a Republican dragging the administration forward in its war against poverty, Weaver replied he had been headed in the direction of the amendment anyway, though he preferred to have unfettered discretion to grant or deny applications from cities.

Weaver and Widnall are headed for a return bout. Widnall charges that Weaver has translated "substantial" into 20% and that Weaver has inserted an "or" in the low-and-moderate-income proviso, to give more weight to the "moderate" element.

Rent supplements—all the controversy about this program has obscured the fact that it too has a Widnall amendment, and everyone agrees that this part of the program is working just fine.

Weaver acknowledges it has come into much wider use than the rent supplements themselves, though he was skeptical at first.

The Widnall feature is the "rent certificate"—also known as leased public housing. It allows authorities, in lieu of building new housing projects, to lease some space in existing buildings, with the government paying part of the rent.

Advantages are that private property remains on the tax duplicate, rehabilitation is encouraged, constructions costs and delays are avoided and units are available immediately in many cities with long public housing waiting lists.

Rehabilitation loans—Widnall pioneered in 1964 with a program of low-interest loans for persons who wanted to fix up their houses. He got the law to say that, before demolition is authorized, rehabilitation must be shown to be impractical. The administration added grants for the poor in 1965.

Instant compensation—where property is condemned for urban renewal, the owner now is paid 75% of the appraised value immediately—pending court action and to assist in relocation. This Widnall proviso has since been extended to freeway cases.

Relocation counseling—Widnall demanded assurances in 1964 that no one would be driven out of a renewal area until officials could guarantee new living quarters—not later, but now; not by filing a report, but by making a field investigation for substitute housing. The principle was ensconced in law, but Widnall says he is not satisfied it is being enforced.

Elderly and college housing—Widnall amendments to the 1965 Housing Act are credited with saving these two programs from being throttled by the tight money market. The administration was saying that, because of high interest rates, direct loans should be abandoned in favor of loan guarantees.

Widnall insisted on loans with a 3% interest maximum—and he won. His argument to cost-conscious GOP colleagues was that it was worth subsidizing interest payments on loans because otherwise a grant program would eventually be necessary.

His victory helped set the stage for the administration's rent supplement projects, which have been concentrated in the elderly housing area.

Other bouts—The record shows Widnall wielded a big glove that rammed through legislation on veterans housing (qualifying them for certain FHA benefits), on preservation of historic sites, on mass transit inside cities (he corralled the GOP votes) and on setting up an Asian development bank.

What accounts for this friendly, relaxed battler winning so many decisions, since the odds always appear to be against him as he tips the scales with so few GOP votes?

"You have to understand," says a Democrat who has fought Widnall and also joined him, "that we regard him as an expert in his field and one who plays it straight. We know he works hard and we know he represents no one but himself."

This friend and foe adds: "We Democrats can't help noticing how often he pulls his party with him. On the other hand, the Republicans can count on his organizational loyalty and they feel that to be with him when possible is to be constructive."

Evidently, Mayor Locher of Cleveland was not fully aware of Widnall's standing. Locher scoffed at a hearing before Sen. Abraham Ribicoff, D-Conn., that Widnall was a "false" and not a "fairminded" critic of urban renewal in Cleveland.

Ribicoff shot back at his fellow Democrat: "I have found him (Widnall) to be one of the fairest, one of the most perceptive, thoughtful and decent human beings that I know."

"I don't dispute that," Locher replied lamely.

"The Cleveland situation," Widnall told the House in February, "is an ugly reminder of what happens when commercial renewal is pushed at the expense of low- and moderate-priced housing. Mayor Locher's smooth talk last year about a balanced program seems very shallow in the light of Cleveland's failures."

"If I seem to be picking on Cleveland time and again," says Widnall, "it's only as an example of what's been wrong with urban renewal over the years. It's been a planners' paradise, changing the face of a number of cities by demolition, building a lot of beautiful new buildings, but not helping the poor as Congress originally intended.

"Urban renewal has been bogged down in politics and tied in with special interests—downtown department stores and newspapers that get big ads from them, the big banks and the Democratic dynasties in the city halls.

"We've got to show concern for the poor because poverty is the source of all the unrest today."

So speaks a man who, in the 1964 election, was able to make two speeches for Barry Goldwater. Those who see inconsistency in such things are those who must label politicians to understand them, Widnall says. He adds that no label applies to him.

He is married, has two children and three grandchildren.

Bureaucratic Frustration

Washington.—The senior Republican member of the House Banking Committee complained yesterday the model cities program has been delayed for nearly a year.

Rep. William B. Widnall, R–N.J., said President Johnson and Housing Secretary Robert C. Weaver should be required to explain why none of the 193 cities which have applied for inclusion in the program has yet been selected.

"High hopes are frustrated by bureaucratic delay and indecision," Widnall said, adding that planning funds are available as soon as the cities are selected and "President Johnson knows that Congress is going to approve a substantial amount for model cities this year."

Giveaway at Panama: More Appeasement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 22, 1967

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, a 2-year series of secret negotations between this country and Panama has produced a set of three proposed new treaties between the two governments. Ratification of these would short-circuit U.S. sovereignty over the Canal Zone.

There can be little doubt as to the participation of Castroite-Communists in the rioting in Panama in early 1964. During these riots, Americans were killed, our flag was trampled underfoot and burned, and property damage reached astronomical proportions. Then the Panamian Government suddenly broke diplomatic negotations with the United States—until we pledged to renegotiate the 1903 treaties under which we built, then maintained, and defended the Canal.

An interesting editorial appeared in the July 30, 1967, edition of the North Baton Rouge Journal, an outstanding pro-American suburban weekly, edited and published by Mr. Louis Jenkins.

Mr. Speaker, I insert this editorial following my remarks:

Canal Zone Treaty of 1903 Should Not Be Nullified

The United States Senate will soon vote on whether to ratify a set of three treaties designed to end American sovereignty over the Panama Canal Zone.

The treaties, negotiated in secret over a two-year period, would nullify the Canal Zone Treaty of 1903 which granted the United States the right to use the 533 square mile Canal Zone in perpetuity. The original treaty also gave the U.S. exclusive police and judicial control over the Zone.

In return, our government agreed to build and operate the canal, to guarantee the independence of Panama, to pay an initial charge of $10 million and to rent the Zone for what now amounts to almost $2 million a year.

The first of the three treaties would turn the Canal Zone and the canal itself over to Panama. The second would limit the use of American military forces to a few small areas in the Zone. And the third would grant the United States the right to build another canal, also in Panama, that would link the Pacific Ocean with the Carribean.

There are many possible objections to the new treaties. First of all, the Treaty of 1903, as it now stands, is more than just another international treaty. It is a legally binding business agreement between the Republic of Panama and the United States.

We have upheld our part of the bargain to the letter. Twice we have voluntarily raised our yearly rental fees and on other occasions have acceded to questionable Panamanian demands.

Reliable sources report that the total U.S. contribution to the economy of Panama exceeds $90 million a year. With a gross national product of only about $500 million, little Panama is enjoying tremendous profit from a canal that it did not build and has not maintained or protected.

Furthermore, the strategic importance of continued American control of the Panama Canal is immeasurable. It is a vital link between our East and West coasts. In time of war, it serves as an indispensible route for the deployment of American men and military equipment.

Control of international waterways and shipping lanes has been a stated objective of the Soviet Communists for several decades. Through their alliances with Egypt they now have a stranglehold on the Suez Canal. And now they are anxious to seize the Canal Zone, which they call the "jugular vein of hemispheric defense."

Communist influence in Panama is extensive. In fact, the new treaties negotiated by the Johnson Administration came as a direct result of the Communist-inspired and led riots in Panama during January 1964.

The riots began after a group of American high school students raised an American flag over their school in the Canal Zone without raising a Panamanian flag at the same time. This minor incident was all the Communists needed to start a full-scale insurrection.

Four American soldiers were killed in the rioting and property damage totaling in the millions of dollars was done to American-owned buildings, automobiles and homes.

President Chiari of Panama then suddenly broke off diplomatic relations with the United States and said relations would not be resumed until we would negotiate a new canal treaty.

Chiari admitted the mobs involved in the riots were infiltrated with Castroites and Communists, but this did not alter his demands.

Instead of being angered by the destruction of Americans' property in Panama and condemning this attempt to use mob violence to influence our international policies, President Johnson soon agreed to open negotiations and resume diplomatic relations.

Let's Hit Enemy Supply Sources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 22, 1967

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

[From the San Diego (Calif.) Union, Aug. 14, 1967]

McNAMARA PULLS PUNCHES: LET'S HIT ENEMY SUPPLY SOURCES

Not even the computers programmed by Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara could possibly make sense out of his response to congressional pleas to use our air and sea power effectively over North Vietnam.

The congressional criticism offered by Rep. Gerald Ford, Republican of Michigan, and a group of senators is highly pertinent. It demands an honest response and action.

Why, the critics ask, does the United States of America still refuse to bomb three fourths of North Vietnam's petroleum storage? Why does the forbidden target list include one third of the power plants; 60 per cent of the key transportation facilities; all seaport installations, and most repair shops? And why haven't two thirds of the outright army and navy facilities never been blasted?

By some incomprehensible logic, the defense secretary insists that pulling our punches in Vietnam saves American lives. Object of the war, he adds, is not to invade, but to curb the flow of supplies from the North.

Says Mr. McNamara, "This requires that the air attacks be directed primarily against the military lines of communication. They are."

Don't most of the supplies in the increasingly sophisticated war flow through the port of Haiphong or a rail line from China? Yet most rail, and port facilities, canals and locks are not to be bombed, says the Pentagon.

Mr. McNamara also knows well that once supplies leave Hanoi they travel routes in Laos, Thailand and Cambodia that are not accessible to bombing.

It would be interesting to hear him explain to a rescued American shot down by a MIG how the sparing of northern airfields saves lives. It also would be interesting to hear specifics on why one fourth of the petroleum supplies are bombed, while three fourths are not and are intact.

Mr. McNamara is correct in asserting that the United States does not plan an invasion of North Vietnam, but he means a land invasion. We already have invaded the North's air space, but still do not fight a proper air war.

It is, of course, high time that the Pentagon and Administration applied its touted "cost effectiveness" formula to the war in Vietnam. A bomb dropped on a military target does not cost a penny more than one that lands on an empty forest.

The cheapest and most effective way to destroy supplies is not when they are scattered over thousands of miles, but when they are stored or made in the North.

And the "cost effective" way to win the war is through best use of our military strength against valid targets according to the best professional judgment of Army, Air Force, Navy and Marine Corps commanders. This is true cost effectiveness.

And it might even save the cost of some travel to Washington where the commanders frequently fly to beg permission to win a war.

Taxpayers Educational Association, Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE BUSH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 22, 1967

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention that the Taxpayers Educational Association, Inc., headquartered in Austin, Tex., is circulating a petition concerning the President's proposed surtax. The resolved clause of the petition states:

> Therefore, we urge the Ways and Means Committee and members of the Congress to reject any proposal to increase taxes, until absolute assurance is given that non-essential domestic spending, of the type herein mentioned, will be eliminated from the federal budget.

At the request of Mr. Joseph E. Bacon, executive director of the association, on behalf of Mr. Gene O. Parker, president of the association, and because I am the only Texas House Member on the Committee on Ways and Means, I think it only fair to report the desires of this group to the full House, meeting in session today.

Editorial Approval of Republican Pronouncements on Foreign Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. GOODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 22, 1967

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, the Buffalo Evening News is one of our country's best newspapers, and one which is read throughout New York State. Its editorial staff is independent, extremely well informed and thoughtful in its appraisal of public issues. I was therefore particularly pleased with two recent editorials which have appeared in the News with reference to Republican pronouncements. The first editorial appeared on August 16, 1967, commending the Republican coordinating committee's report on foreign aid. The second editorial appeared on August 19, 1967, and commended the House Republican task force paper on NATO. I am especially pleased about the latter commendation because this paper was produced by the task force on Western alliances created by the Republican planning and research committee of the House, which I have the privilege of leading. The task force chairman, Congressman PAUL FINDLEY, has done a superb job in developing position papers and placing in perspective our present programs with reference to our allies in Europe and Latin America. I submit these two editorials for the reading of my colleagues, as follows:

SENSE ON FOREIGN AID

In a report just adopted as party policy by the Republican Coordinating Committee, a national GOP task force makes a lot of sense on foreign aid.

We especially like the pertinent but reasonable line the report draws on aid to countries consistently hostile to American interests:

"While not making aid conditional upon support for our foreign policy," it says, "aid should not ordinarily be forthcoming to (a) those nations whose heads of state (like Nasser) engage in continual intemperate abuse of the United States or (b) those nations which give military aid to our enemies in Vietnam or which engage in military aggression, or (c) those nations, which, in contravention of international law, harass American citizens engaged in commerce, or confiscate American-owned property without fair compensation."

Notice that this statement does not make the mistake of saying never, under any circumstances, give aid to our hecklers abroad. But while recognizing that there may be exceptions, it simply takes the proper stance that we shouldn't be giving aid and comfort to those who consistently help our enemies, or who rattle swords or engage in aggression. The statement even goes on to disavow any intent, "like Robespierre, Hitler or Stalin" to insist upon support of U.S. foreign policy in all its aspects. "We are dealing with independent nations," it wisely warns, "and a measure of demonstrated independence from us in certain matters is often a political necessity for their leaders."

The GOP task force, headed by a former ambassador to Mexico, Robert C. Hill, calls for other basic foreign-aid reforms, but it clearly and properly emphasizes the long history of Republican support for "sensible" forms of foreign aid, geared to these five purposes: (1) promotion of peace, security and stability abroad in our own national interest; (2) promotion of prosperity abroad as an aid to prosperity at home; (3) narrowing of the dangerous gulf between "haves" and "have nots"; (4) demonstration that the free world can give a better life than communism, and (5) spread of co-operation and friendly partnership among freedom-loving nations.

In that spirit, the report laments erosion of domestic support for foreign aid owing to waste, misuse and too many downright failures. Then it goes on to spell out such sensible principles as: "No aid should be extended without commensurate self-help effort on the part of those aided" (including efforts to check runaway population growth), "special care should be taken to avoid aid being used to bolster corrupt and self-perpetuating oligarchies," and "more emphasis should be placed on projects that will visibly reach the masses of people."

On all these points, the GOP statement shuns the provincial viewpoint of so many of foreign-aid's carping critics in Congress, and accentuates instead the constructive national-interest viewpoint of those experienced in conducting the Eisenhower era foreign policy. It is a position paper that could well comprise the foreign-aid plank in the 1968 Republican platform.

End NATO Standstill

A group of 15 House Republicans has staked out a constructive party role in calling on the Johnson administration for a reappraisal of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization in conjunction with America's allies.

In marking out a party viewpoint, the House panel has shown an initiative closely paralleling the theme of enlightened commitment to the principles of collective security, enunciated in the upper house by New York's Senator Javits.

While justifiably critical of the administration's "paucity" of official thought and action to check drift in the NATO alliance, the House group accentuates the positive in its specific proposals for a recasting of the Atlantic Council responsive to changing European conditions.

Realistically, the panel does not foresee any impending crisis in 1969, when member nations can exercise their option to withdraw from the alliance. Nevertheless, it expresses the concern of knowledgeable observers about a deepening malaise and signs of discord that have failed to prompt any commensurate revitalizing initiative at high levels.

What such initiative will require in the view of the GOP committee, is the creation of a NATO strategy council that can end the present standstill on such problems as the predominance of U.S. military power, the credibility of U.S. nuclear defense guarantees, and differences within the Alliance on bridge-building with the East.

The thrust of this appeal is its recognition of the need for providing a political-economic equivalent in the 1970s of the military foundation created originally in the early 1950s for the security of Europe.

America's continuing role in Europe requires now a U.S. determination to promote a broader-guage alliance, one that can assure its allies a more active role in determining Atlantic defense policy, the easing of East-West tensions, and an interallied strategy on disarmament and the security of Central Europe. The alternative as the committee warns, is a continuing decay in an alliance beset with official posturing, and de Gaullist-inspired isolationism. An administration preoccupied with Vietnam needs prompting by the opposition party.

Need Spending Slash Before Tax Increase

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 22, 1967

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, with the propaganda drums of the administration building up their pitch for the President's tax package, a column in this morning's Chicago Tribune, by the renowned correspondent Henry Hazlitt, merits special attention. I especially direct the attention of the Members to this article since later this week we will be voting on the 1967 Foreign Aid bill, which will give the House an excellent opportunity to achieve practical slashes in spending. The article follows:

Need Spending Slash Before Tax Increase

(By Henry Hazlitt)

If Federal spending were slashed heroically—as it should be—there would be no need for the 10 billion-dollar-a-year tax increase that the President demands.

In every respect Mr. Johnson's message made grim reading. It revealed that the government no longer knows how to estimate in advance what it will spend or what it will get. Only seven months ago the President estimated that the deficit in the current fiscal year would be 8.1 billions. Now he tells us it may be 23.6 billions. In January, 1966, he estimated the 1967 fiscal year deficit at 1.8 billions. It turned out to be 9.9 billions.

What is shocking is that the President even now fails to suggest a single real cut in expenditures. He pays repeated lip service to "restraint." He "pledges" that he will make "every possible expenditure reduction"—but he can't think of anything specific. He bluntly refuses to give up, reduce, or postpone even one of his extravagant Great Society "programs that have been begun . . . in the last three and one-half years."

He contends that most of the expenditure programs are "uncontrollable" anyway because the payments "are definitely fixed by law." This alibi ignores the fact that these payments can be reduced or repealed by other laws. The President also forgets that he originally recommended most of the "earlier commitments" which, he now pleads, tie his hands.

He rightly blames Congress for sometimes increasing even his own profligate spending recommendations. But he has never even asked, as have other Presidents, for the item veto.

STILL LEAVES DEFICIT

Even with the whopping tax increase, the President's proposals are fiscally irresponsible. His tax increases, he says, would raise 7.4 billions in fiscal 1968. But even on his own estimates this would still leave a 15 or 18-billion dollar deficit.

This deficit he calls "manageable," whatever that may mean. It would be in fact the biggest deficit in 28 years. And it would be obviously and ominously inflationary. Under present conditions nothing can prevent further inflation but a balanced budget.

To balance the budget with his present spending program the President would have to propose tax increases to raise in fiscal 1968, not 7.4 billions but 22 to 25 billions. He knows that an attempt to impose such a staggering increase would send the economy into a tailspin. So the situation flatly refutes his own repeated contention that the taxpayers can "afford" to pay simultaneously for the Viet Nam war and all his present and proposed welfare and handout programs on top of it.

ASK FOR CUT

The duty of Congress is unpalatable but unmistakable. Before it grants a dollar of tax increase it should petition the President to cut from 15 to 28 billions from his annual expenditures.

This may seem startling, but it is certainly not impossible. We have only to recall that total cash spending now estimated for 1968 would exceed that in the last full Eisenhower year, 1960, by 86 billions while nondefense expenditures alone would exceed those of 1960 by 51 billions.

Congress would have to do much more than recommend this total spending cut. It would have to itemize just where it should be made—just which programs should be postponed, which curtailed, and which eliminated entirely.

An unpleasant duty. But what is the alternative? It is to go along with the present profligate spending program, to impose Mr. Johnson's inadequate and unsettling tax increase, and deliberately to run a deficit between 15 and 18 billions. This would bring a further inflation that, to use Mr. Johnson's own words, "would rob the poor, the elderly, the millions with fixed incomes."

Better Means of Advancement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM STEED

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 22, 1967

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago Mrs. LaDonna Harris, wife of the distinguished junior Senator from Oklahoma and a recognized leader herself in Indian affairs, made an eloquent statement on the Office of Economic Opportunity program in Oklahoma. She appeared before an Education and Labor Subcommittee of the House.

The Oklahoma Journal, daily newspaper in Oklahoma City, commented editorially on her remarks August 1, urging a constructive approach to the problems of minorities. The Oklahoma Journal's article follows:

Better Means of Advancement

While a small segment of one minority race sought to redress its grievances with riot and disorder a quiet voice spoke for another minority people in America in the halls of Congress, appealing to the reason and compassion of the country's leaders.

LaDonna Harris, speaking before the Committee on Education and Labor in the House of Representatives, on behalf of the American Indian, urged support for the programs sponsored by the Office of Economic Opportunity, pronouncing her strong conviction that the O.E.O. must be continued as a separate agency of the government and endorsing the provisions and the increased funds contained in the authorization bill before the committee, H.R. 8311.

To our way of thinking, this must be more nearly the proper course in these troublesome times.

Mrs. Harris, wife of Oklahoma's junior senator, who was recently named to a vital committee to try and figure some way out of the riot dilemma, made a dramatic and lucid appeal, based on fact and reason, for the continuation of programs she believes are providing the answers to so many of the problems facing her people.

Mrs. Harris' presentation was a long and studied assessment of changing conditions in America which are bringing about the need for action in previously untrodden provinces.

While acknowledging "nobody is altogether certain of how to accomplish the goal of human resource development," she pointed out that those connected with the O.E.O. program in Oklahoma are trying "and mostly succeeding."

Mrs. Harris' most persuasive pleas on behalf of O.E.O. in our opinion, were those that dealt with people and programs she had observed personally.

She told of some young people she had seen in Altus, Oklahoma, "who had caught a glimpse of a whole new world of opportunity when they were exposed briefly to campus life at Southwestern State College through the auspices of the Community Action Program.

"I think of their neat appearance," she said, "and their hopeful eyes and their change of attitude toward themselves and other people."

"When I think of the Work and Training Program," she continued, "and the Neighborhood Youth Corps, I think of the beautiful young Indian high school girl in McLoud, Oklahoma, who had been a severe disciplinary problem, but who has, now, for the first time, begun to see what she was meant to be and can become.

"When I think of the Legal Services Program, I think of a lady in Oklahoma City, who for the first time, now sees the law and those who administer it as possible friends, rather than enemies.

"When I think of the Headstart Program, I think of 'Project Magic,' an activity in my hometown of Lawton, Oklahoma, and I see children with a sparkle in their eyes for the first time in their lives because they were brought together with older people, under the Foster Grandparent Program, people who formerly had felt useless and unwanted. I think of a particular pair, a child starved for love, who for the first time now is beginning to talk, and an older person, who now has someone to whom to give his love.

"When I think of the adult training program, I think of an 80-year-old Negro woman in Lawton, who is learning to read and write. She said, 'It seems like I had just been waiting to die; there was nothing for me to do. Now, for the first time, I feel like a real human being.'"

Mrs. Harris concluded her appeal to the committee by saying, "From all over American people have written me asking, 'When can I do?' That is a terribly difficult question to answer, and we must make it easier. But one way, I always say, is to support the programs of O.E.O. and their funding. Another is to become personally involved in them."

One thing may be safely said, we believe, is that this beats riot, incendiarism and pillage as the means for advancement of a people.

U.S. Policy Antiwhite

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 22, 1967

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, something is wrong when the United States of America, predominantly Caucasian, is consistently against white people—not only in this country but around the world.

I include the UPI releases from the August 15 Washington Evening Star following my comments:

[From the Evening Star, Washington, D.C., Aug. 15, 1967]

MOBUTU GIVES MERCENARIES 10 DAYS TO QUIT

KINSHASA, THE CONGO.—The official Congolese radio today said President Joseph Mobutu gave white mercenaries holding the town of Bukavu 10 days to surrender "or face spectacular punishment."

The ultimatum was unlikely to be heeded by the 160 mercenaries, who reportedly fear they would be murdered by the Congolese army if they give up their weapons.

Mobutu's warning came one day after Congolese rioters sacked the Belgian Embassy in Kinshasa, the capital, attacked two Americans and stoned the U.S. Embassy.

A jet airliner jammed with whites arrived in Brussels from Kinshasa today and an exodus of more alarmed whites was expected.

The plane carried 173 passengers, a capacity load, on the first flight out of Kinshasa since yesterday's rioting signaled an approaching end to 80 years of Belgian influence in the embattled nation.

A phase-out of Belgium's $90 million annual aid to its former colony would leave the United States, currently contributing $50 million a year, as the mainstay of the tottering Congolese economy.

In Washington, the State Department said the rioters yesterday threw rocks through the windows of the American Embassy but stressed that the outburst appeared directed mostly against the Belgians.

State Department spokesman said two Americans who lived next door to the Belgian Embassy, U.S. Air Force M. Sgt. Homer L. Paulhus and his wife, were beaten by rampaging Congolese who invaded their apartment. Neither was reported seriously hurt.

"After today we have no illusions about our role in the Congo," a high Belgian government official in Brussels said after the estimated 2,000 rioters had set fire to the embassy's furniture and files and toppled a statue of Belgium's King Albert, the nation's hero of World War I.

The statue outside the Congolese parliament had survived seven years of often-violent independence turmoil during which more than 400 Belgians have been murdered. The rioters quickly covered the fallen monument with black cloth.

The 2,000 youthful Congolese were members of Mobutu's Popular Revolutionary Movement, the Congo's only legal political party, and were protesting the capture of the Congo town of Bukavu last week by white mercenary-led Katangese rebels.

JOHNSON FIRM ON HELPING CONGOLESE

The Johnson administration is determined to help the Congolese government through its latest crisis, despite the stoning of the U.S. Embassy in Kinshasa, the Congo capital, and mob violence against two Americans.

President Johnson made this clear yesterday to President Gregoire Kayibanda of Rwanda, a Congolese neighbor, at a meeting of the two chiefs of state, U.S. officials said.

The United States is providing logistical help for Congolese President Joseph Mobutu's forces seeking to quell a mercenary-led rebellion against the current regime. Mobutu intervened yesterday to help disperse the mob in Kinshasa.

Following his meeting with Johnson, Kayibanda said he was "ready to mobilize the whole population" of Rwanda to repulse the Congolese rebel forces if they should cross the border into his country. He predicted the mercenaries would be defeated.

Russia's Role in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THEODORE R. KUPFERMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 22, 1967

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Jesuit magazine, America, in its issue of July 29, 1967, has a thought-provoking article by my constituent, Christopher Emmet, entitled "Russia's Role in Vietman: Myths and Realities Behind Our Hope for an American-Soviet Detente."

On June 1, 1967, I called to the attention of my colleagues the fact that the United States had lost the initiative to the Russians who could stimulate an Arab attack on Israel while we were bogged down in a debilitating conflict in Vietnam. See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 1, at page H6484.

In my opinion, it proved, among other things, that the so-called "domino theory" was wrong, and only an amazing Israeli victory bailed us out of this situation.

Mr. Emmet presents another view of the situation well worth reading. His article follows:

RUSSIA'S ROLE IN VIETNAM—MYTHS AND REALITIES BEHIND OUR HOPE FOR AN AMERICAN-SOVIET DETENTE

(By Christopher Emmet)

Soviet Premier Alexsei Kosygin's attack in the United Nations, linking American "imperialism" in Vietnam with the Arab-Israeli war, was strictly propaganda, yet there are many real links between the two crises. One such link (which, incidentally, directly refutes Kosygin's propaganda thesis) is the fact that the United States was perhaps overcautious in the Near East precisely because it was so deeply involved in Vietnam.

As James Reston wrote in the July 12 New York Times, in a column entitled "The Echoes of Isolationism": "The greater the sacrifices in Vietnam, the faster this opposition to intervention grows. The Administration itself felt the power of this opposition in the Middle East crisis, and reacted, accordingly, with great caution. Moreover, this caution proved to be popular in the country . . . The hard facts, however, remain. The need for 'strengthening the peace forces in the world' was never greater than now."

All this is true, but the cause may lie not in Vietnam itself but in the failure of the Administration and most of the press to explain the real meaning of the war to the American people. During the last two years, while the influence and prestige of Red China reeled under a series of blows, Soviet military aid was steadily increased, not only to Hanoi but to Nasser and Syria. Yet the Administration, most academic experts and most of the press continued to attribute Soviet policy mainly to its fear of losing influence to Red China, rather than to any expansionist aims of its own.

Again, the Soviet rearming of the Arabs since their defeat, like the continued Soviet support (if not instigation) of the violent Arab attacks against Israel and the United States at the UN, has been rationalized and explained away by attributing it to Soviet fear of losing popularity among the Arabs because Russia did not intervene directly in the war.

The most obvious explanation has been ignored—that the Soviets are simply continuing a policy in which they have invested immense wealth and arms for ten years, a policy of making the most irresponsible Arab leaders dependent on them, encouraging Arab dreams of aggression against Israel, and thereby turning the Arabs against the West. Also ignored has been the fact that the Arab economies are so limited that it is possible for the Soviets to supply enough economic as well as military aid to maintain the Arab economies on a minimal basis and keep their Arab friends in power.

It is also forgotten that the most gifted of Arab leaders, Gamal Abdul Nasser, was originally an Egyptian nationalist who sought to rebuild Egypt and recall the past glories of the Pharaohs, just as Mussolini sought to revive the glories of Rome in Italy. Nasser's turn toward so-called Arab nationalism and his attempt to use their hatred of Israel as a means to unite Arabs behind him only followed the granting of important Soviet military aid in 1956. Thus the Soviets alone made possible the Arab world's fixation on the liquidation of Israel; and having failed, the Arab elements still in control are more dependent on the Soviets than ever—while Israel becomes more isolated than ever, now that France has deserted her.

The real Achilles heel of our Vietnam policy, in terms of public understanding and support, is not that it is, in a sense, a "no win" policy but that it is a "no enemy" policy. The Administration has been diligent in finding excuses and rationales for Soviet aid to Hanoi, and in avoiding the admission that there may be both a Russian and a Communist motive for keeping the United States bogged down there.

Because the Johnson Administration conceals this Soviet Communist motivation, or possible motivation, the costs of the Vietnam war seem out of proportion to its importance. It lacks the meaning and the dignity of being part of a confrontation with Soviet as well Chinese expansionism. It becomes an isolated mess in the eyes of much of the public, instead of being part of a world-wide pattern.

Secretary Rusk has tried hard to bridge this gap by his analogy between Vietnam and the situation in the 1930's, when small countries fell one by one because the free world did not resist in time. But, though valid, Secretary Rusk's plea has partly failed because his enemy is the abstraction "aggression," not a flesh and blood Red China or Soviet Russia.

The answer to this Vietnam dilemma was provided by Reston himself in two earlier columns, July 7 and July 9, in which he summarized some of the facts that indicate both Communist motives and traditional Russian motives for aggressive Soviet policies in the Near East and elsewhere. The truth is that our main enemy may not be the madness of Red China or the stubborness of Ho Chi Minh, but the calculated long-range policy of the Kremlin. The need is to think globally, as the Kremlin has done since Lenin's apocryphal remark that the road to Paris went via Peking. Yet to do this conflicts with the natural and ever growing trend toward specialization, both within our government and outside it.

It could be damaging for President Johnson to crudely announce such a conclusion, but there is no chance of that because all the President's personal instincts and political interests point in the opposite direction. That is why he has tried so hard to maintain the illusion about an approaching American-Soviet *détente*, an illusion which has threatened to reach the proportions of a myth, in Europe if not here. The strength of this myth alone explains the sensational defense cuts just announced in West Germany, the most exposed country in Europe. Why should the hard pressed U.S. or German taxpayer maintain his present burdens or invite even greater ones if, for instance, a Non-Proliferation Treaty may be just around the corner and might open a new era in U.S.-Soviet relations, as the President implies?

It is right to seek real agreements with the Soviets that promote peace, but wrong to advertise and anticipate such agreements in advance, or exaggerate the importance of those already reached. It is perfectly possible to sell the American people and a *dual* policy of seeking realistic negotiations with the Soviets, on the one hand, and of publicizing a frank appraisal of their record and aims on the other. Recognition of the Soviet desire and long-range planning to move into the existing Near Eastern vacuum, as well as into a hoped-for vacuum in Southeast Asia, does *not* conflict with the belief that they want to avoid a direct military confrontation with the United States. It simply means that they are willing to face some risks, or at least the appearance of risks, in such a confrontation, in their effort to fill the vacuum.

We must remember, too, that the progressive erosion of the Western Alliance—as illustrated by de Gaulle's policy in the Near East, by the threatened British financial paralysis as a result of oil boycotts, Suez and Hong Kong, and by the new German defense cuts—means that the Soviets have a right to hope for *an even more tempting vacuum in Europe*. Therefore, the opportunities for them must seem tremendous and worth some risks.

The Soviet desire to weaken the United States and to break up the Western Alliance is inspired by fear, as well as by a reasonable hope of expanding its influence into the vacuum. But the fear is not of German militarism or U.S. imperialism, as they profess, but involves what Jefferson called "the contagion of liberty." They fear the effect of the very existence of our freedom on their people. The immense difficulties that all Communist governments have faced in stabilizing their power after making the necessary minimal concession to their people, have nowhere been solved—least of all in Yugoslavia or Poland, where they have been trying the longest. De-escalating Communist control in the economic as well as the political sphere may prove even more difficult than de-escalation in Vietnam.

That is why an explosive revolutionary potential, based on possible economic failure plus political paralysis, revolt or collapse, may exist in all Communist countries, not just in East Germany and Red China, where it is obvious. And just as the Communist hopes would tend to make them exaggerate the American costs in Vietnam, so their fears may make them exaggerate the political danger in the example and the power of attraction of a free, prosperous Western Europe, backed by a free United States. The need for a Berlin Wall probably exists, to some degree, throughout the Communist world.

Thus the Soviets are probably moved toward an aggressive expansionism both by their hopes and by their fears. If so, President Johnson's policy of exaggerating both the degree and the hope of *détente* with the Soviets is counterproductive—not only by making the American people less willing to tighten their belts, but by reducing the apparent risks of the Kremlin's expansionist policies, and thus weakening the influence of any relative "doves" in the Kremlin.

President Johnson's motives in keeping alive the hopes for a non-existent *détente* are both powerful and honorable. From the domestic point of view, and in his role as leader of the Democratic party, he has a duty as well as a selfish interest in trying to counteract the revolt against Vietnam by so many influential liberal Democrats, for that revolt is a threat to the war effort in Vietnam as well as to his party's success next year. Moreover, by reducing the extent of this revolt and division among Democrats and liberals, and by consoling them with the hope of "bridges toward the East," he reduces the danger of having to yield to pressure from the "hawk" element in the United States toward undertaking risky ventures to end the war quickly.

President Johnson also has a legitimate foreign policy motive in stressing hopes for *détente*. By so doing, he has decreased the difficulties of the British Labor government in going along with us in Asia, as well as decreased the opposition against the United States in the Near East within the United Nations. That this last point has some importance is shown by the defeat of most of the Soviet UN maneuvers against Israel, not to speak of the U.S. interest in keeping the door open for a future strengthening of UN peacekeeping operations in Vietnam or the Near East, if Soviet and Red Chinese objections can ever be overcome.

Nevertheless, the main argument advanced in favor of the President's "dovelike" tones and obscurantist attitude toward the real Soviet objectives is the hope that this helps the Soviet "doves." As a matter of fact, this tone and policy is more likely to tempt the Soviet "hawks," for the reasons cited.

Above all, the President must speak more frankly about Soviet policy if he is to get adequate Congressional support to continue limited war in Vietnam and maintain the sacrifices needed to prevent the collapse of NATO or anarchy in the Near East. How can the President hope to get even the minimum necessary increase in defense and foreign aid funds to maintain U.S. (not to speak of British) troops, in Europe, or to relieve what may become a fateful flight of capital from Hong Kong, without a fundamental appeal explaining the necessity for us to win, or at least survive, the still existing Cold War before we can hope to find real peace?

[Christopher Emmet is a trustee of Freedom House and moderator of the Foreign Affairs Round Table of Station WEVD, New York.]

The Temptation To Overpolice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 22, 1967

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Aug. 22, 1967]

The Temptation To Overpolice

In a number of areas, Washington is getting increasingly zealous about trying to protect the consumer. Even, sometimes, when it is highly doubtful that he needs protection at all.

And even then, the Government goes about trying to protect people in strange ways. Take, for instance, that law Congress passed earlier this year requiring passenger steamship companies to insert in their advertisements information on a vessel's safety features. This is in addition to the law's requirement that passengers be given such safety data in promotional literature and at the time of booking passage.

What has resulted is the addition to ads for cruises of paragraphs headed, "Safety Information," stating that Ship X "conforms to International Safety Standards for new ships developed in 1960," or that Ship Y "substantially" meets standards set in 1948. All of which will merely confuse consumers.

Or take the "truth-in-lending" issue now before Congress. Most lenders already provide consumers with clear information on credit charges, and there already are laws on the books applying to lenders who defraud and deceive. And the Senate has passed a bill designed to compel sellers of goods and lenders of money to inform customers of the true cost of credit purchases or loans.

But before a House committee is a similar bill containing a gimmick the Senate version does not have. The House bill would provide not only that the customer be advised in writing of the cost of his planned credit transaction but would require that details of such costs be put into all advertising as well.

The question is, how much is this going to help the consumer? The answer, plainly, is not much. Faced with the problem of inserting lengthy explanations of credit terms in print, radio or television advertising—thus increasing his costs—the businessman is either going to curtail his advertising or omit all prices in credit ads. The consumer then would be getting less product information than he is now.

These are simply instances of the tendency of Government to succumb to the temptation to overpolice. And one sure result of such moves is to add to the cost of policing and hence to the cost of Government as more and more Federal policemen are needed. Which may lead a good many consumers to wonder when Washington is going to discover that they are taxpayers too.

H. E. Suderman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 22, 1967

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, one of the pioneer agricultural and financial leaders of the State of Kansas, Herman E. Suderman, of Newton, passed away recently. Mr. Suderman came to Kansas with a group of Mennonite pioneers from Russia who brought with them the Red Turkey wheat. They also brought agricultural know-how which helped Kansas become one of the leading wheat States in the Nation.

We owe a great debt to men such as Herman Suderman, who worked long and hard in behalf of his family, his community, and our Nation. He was a man of initiative and integrity. Mrs. Shriver and I join in extending our heartfelt sympathy to Mr. Suderman's family.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following editorial from the Newton Kansan, which ably describes the lasting contributions made by Mr. Suderman. The editorial follows:

H. E. SUDERMAN

Herman E. Suderman, who died over the weekend, was one of those hardy Mennonite pioneers who came to this area from Russia during the last century and who have contributed so much to its life.

This is the group that brought the Red Turkey wheat to Kansas and helped make it one of the top winter wheat states in the nation over the years.

And the group also brought with them other agricultural methods and the qualities of frugality and hard work that has built for this area a sound economy from which all of us have been able to prosper.

Mr. Suderman took an extremely active part in the financial affairs of the community until the last few years, and still remained chairman of the board of the Midland National Bank, retaining his interest in its affairs. He also was active in other community affairs and in church work.

Communities are fortunate when they have civic leaders such as Mr. Suderman who take interest in community affairs and who provide leadership and who give valuable advice in helping to solve the problems that come about from time to time.

It is these same people who also provide the leadership when it is needed to help the community progress into a larger and more prosperous situation.

And while successors appear for these early leaders in the community, we must remember that it was their work that helped put the community into the status from which it could grow and prosper. This usually is the hardest job of all.

In 7 Years

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT V. DENNEY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 22, 1967

Mr. DENNEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert for the information of my colleagues a thought-provoking editorial which appeared in the Omaha World-Herald 2 weeks ago.

The editorial follows:

IN 7 YEARS

Some people say that Dwight Eisenhower shouldn't talk so much. And write so much. He is of another time, they say, and his words about crime, respect for law, the trend of foreign affairs are not relevant to the problems of 1967.

We disagree. For a man who is supposed to have trouble communicating, he communicates very well. This may be because Mr. Eisenhower has no credibility gap to bridge and because he is so obviously a man of good will. People trust him, and the same cannot be said about some of the men who are in active charge of the country's affairs.

Moreover, Mr. Eisenhower does not speak out of a distant time. It merely seems that way. Men and women who were in their early twenties when Mr. Eisenhower went out of office in January, 1961, are in their late twenties today. They are hardly old people, not even by hippie reckoning.

But what a change there has been. The summer of 1960 was only seven years ago. The "New Frontier" and "The Great Society" were yet to be born. And what was life like then? U.S. News & World Report offers a few reminders in its current issue:

Race riots were absent.
Street crime was moderate.
Schools were calm.

There was no war in which the United States was actively involved. In Vietnam, the United States had 773 military advisers, not one of whom was a casualty. The money cost of Vietnam was "300 million dollars as a maximum."

In 1960, the alliances of the United States were strong. Neither NATO nor SEATO was dormant or disintegrating.

The leadership of the United States in world affairs was accepted.

We shall not pretend that all was well in 1960. Castro had turned Cuba Red, and Mr. Eisenhower's Administration had not stopped him. We had strikes, inflation, civil rights protests and misery in the slums.

But when all allowances are made for the troubles of 1960, the state of the country as Mr. Eisenhower prepared to leave it to a new Administration was by comparison serene.

The changes that have been made in seven years were not the changes most of us had hoped for or thought likely. And perhaps the changes of the next seven years are not predictable either.

But it seems to us that in the decision-making ahead, we would do well to listen to all the sound counsel we can get, whether it comes from the younger, newer problem-solvers or the older, experienced problem-solvers, among whom Mr. Eisenhower is conspicuous.

America's Clouded Dream

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 22, 1967

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I know all of us have been thinking about the things which have been taking place in various parts of the country. It is good to know that other people are thinking of these problems seriously. The Reverend Malcolm Nygren, pastor of the First Presbyterian Church of Champaign, in a sermon of some days ago, really hit the nail on the head as to where America is going and what is wrong. I append it herewith in order that my colleagues may have renewed thought and consideration from a source for which I have considerable respect.

The sermon follows:

AMERICA'S CLOUDED DREAM

(Sermon by Malcolm Nygren, Aug. 13, 1967)

Thirty-five years ago, in 1932, the country was sunk in one of the most serious economic depressions it has known. Poverty—the deep poverty of actual hunger—was widespread. Millions were out of work, millions more working short weeks in half-idle factories for pay checks too small to support them. Farm prices had fallen to an impoverishing level. Insurance companies and banks found themselves faced with more foreclosures than they could handle, no market for the properties they foreclosed, and the imminent prospect of bankruptcy themselves. Franklin Roosevelt said with much justice that one third of the nation—one third!—was ill-fed, ill-clothed and ill-housed.

If you had predicted rioting in the streets that year, murder and arson as hungry mobs looted stores for food, the prediction would not have been unreasonable. Yet there was no rioting. There was despair, there was a revolt at the polls from which the Republican party has not yet recovered, but there was no rioting.

If you had set yourself up as a prophet that year you could have made a more startling prediction. You could have said that a time would come when the nation had vast public housing projects, an intricate system of welfare payments to the unemployed, to families of dependent children and to the aged. It would be a time when school and colleges were open to minority groups, when a Negro would be elected to the Senate by a white constituency and others would serve on the President's cabinet and the Supreme Court. It would not be a nation without inequity, but a nation vastly different from that in 1932. And in that year, you might have said, there would be rioting in the streets, robbery, murder and arson. Stores would be looted, but not for bread. The chosen loot would be liquor, television sets and jewelry in that order.

You could have predicted it if you had known, but no one would have believed you.

Perhaps you read a recent press release from the Federal Bureau of Investigation, detailing statistics for major crimes in the period from 1960 to 1966. Major crimes—not petty larceny or traffic violations—major crimes increased by a stunning 48% in those six years. You don't need to be a mathematician to know where that kind of runaway gain will take you shortly. But other statistics are even more alarming. The percentage of unsolved crimes rose. There was a smaller proportion of arrests, and even smaller share of convictions. That would be encouraging if it meant that we were protecting the rights of the innocent more effectively. But the report had one more unsettling statistic. Of those acquitted for major crimes, 83% are subsequently arrested for another major crime! All but a fraction are released only to continue their depredations. A legal system could hardly work more poorly than that.

The old saw has it that crime does not pay. Doesn't it? If you commit a major crime in this country today, the probability is that you will not be arrested. If you are arrested, you will probably not be convicted. If you are convicted, you will probably not be imprisoned for very long. There is only one group for whom crime does not pay. It does not pay for the victims of crime.

The first duty of a government to govern: to protect its citizenry from crime and disorder. There are many things a government can do for its citizens. It can educate them, provide for their medical care, build highways and regulate commerce. But none of these things avail unless the government performs its basic duty. Our government does not. This frightening anarchy is accelerating. Law and order are breaking down. The American Dream is turning into a nightmare. Where are we going? Is this the end of a civilization? Other great cultures have broken down and fallen. There is a smell of death and decay about the land today.

Through much of the country there is a silent fear that the signs of decline, disturbing as they are, are only symptoms of a deeper sickness. The thought is not often spoken openly. It is so frightening that we would rather not acknowledge it. Yet it is there. James Reston spoke for many people in a syndicated article in the New York Times this week:

"A nation is in trouble when its people feel helpless to deal with their major problems and do not know what to trust. . . . there must be faith . . . and this is what we do not have—neither faith in our common purposes, not in our old religious and philosophical institutions, nor in our present policies, nor in the men who are making or administering them." A nation is in trouble. There must be faitih—and this is what we do not have!"

This is a gloomy view of the way things are. It takes courage to face up to a world like this. Yet it is no more pessimistic a picture than the one frankly faced by the Bible. The Bible is a kind of survival manual for times like these. The third chapter of second Timothy includes a long list of signs of spiritual and material decay. The chapter is so appropriate to our time that it might be reprinted without altering as a newspaper editorial. The chapter is a picture of the roots of decay in a culture.

The letter writes of men who are "lovers of pleasure rather than lovers of God." I am no enemy of pleasure. God made us to laugh and sing as well as work, and it is a poor religion that doesn't know that. God made us to live in a world that he repeatedly said was good, and He gave us this world to enjoy.

But it is one thing to enjoy God's gifts and quite another to let the gifts take God's place as our master. When we choose pleasure rather than God we are Guilty of the ugliest kind of idolatry. We worship our own senses, dedicate everything to the stimulation of our nerve-endings and the titillation of our mind. That's what the letter to Timothy is writing about: a pleasure-sated, joy-worshiping world.

Pamela Hansford Johnson is a novelist of note in England. She is also the wife of English physicist and novelist C. P. Snow. She has written a non-fiction book released this Spring that deserves to be read by thinking people. The book is called "On Iniquity." The book is not interesting because it is well-written (it rambles in a disorderly fashion) nor because of its major premise, which quite probably is wrong. It is interesting because it was written in a state of profound shock. It shows the agony of a well-bred, very liberal minded Englishwoman who has encountered something that shook all her convictions, all her beliefs.

Miss Johnson had been commissioned by an English newspaper to attend the trial and write about the most revolting and sensational crime of recent history in England. It was called in the newspapers the Moors Murder Case. A young man and woman, Ian Brady and Myra Hindley, had abducted and killed several children, burying their bodies on the moors. Before killing the children they had subjected them to tortures so bestial and perverted that their nature has never been made public. They recorded the agonies of their victims with photographs and tape recordings. The pictures and recordings were so inhuman that the few people who witnessed them have said only that they can't talk about them and wish that they had never had the experience.

Yet it was not the horror of the crimes that disturbed Pamela Hansford Johnson. It was something else. As she attended the trial a frightening realization dawned on her. It was that these two—Brady and Hindley—were not insane. By no stretch of the term that makes any sense could they be dismissed as mad. They knew what they were doing, they knew what they had done. They were able at the trial to maintain calm, and to lie with intelligence and perseverance throughout. That was the ultimate horror for her: that sane people could inflict such cruelty just for the pleasure of it.

Miss Hansford wrote of ". . . the catchphrases of excuse for anti-social behavior. I did it for a joke. It was a bit of a giggle. (English slang.) I was bored."

The writer goes on to speak of people who live with "affectlessness"—with no concern for the affects of their actions. They are people who live only to satisfy the anger, the desire, the boredom of the moment. Affectlessness is tolerated today, she says, even encouraged. Then she makes the telling remark,

"When anything goes, everything goes."

Everything is going. It is going whenever people act without thinking of the affects of their acts. The hippy drop-out, the burglar, the rioter who burns the street where he lives, the people who join in political choruses forgetting the future—all live affectlessly. It is only possible to be that way when we think that we are accountable to no one but ourselves. When people lose the sense of standing under the judgment of God, affects don't matter. Then anything goes, and before long, everything goes. That is the price of loving our own pleasures rather than God.

The letter of Timothy speaks also of people "holding the form of religion while denying the power of it." It uses the phrase, "counterfeit faith".

There are two ways of holding the form of religion powerlessly, not one. One way is well-known, and often decried. Agnostics have made a stereotype of the figure of the hypocrite worshiper, the person deeply involved in the rituals and public acts of worship, but not concerned about anything else. He loves elaborate liturgy, is concerned that the ancient prayers be said, the creeds affirmed, that the offering come after the sermon and the Gloria after the Psalm. The type has been caricatured in novels and attacked in sermons.

That temptation still remains, but it has gone out of date. New generations have new ways of denying their God, as well as new technologies and arts. Worship is one of the forms faith creates, but it is not the only one. Faith also creates an ethic. In the Christian faith it produces the ideals of brotherhood, peace and self-sacrifice. Today it is this form that we are greatly tempted to keep without the power behind it.

The Quaker philosopher Elton Trueblod saw this trend in Western life twenty years ago. He then described our culture as being a "cut-flower" society. That is, a society which adopts the ethical flowering of Christian faith, but cuts it off from its roots. A large part of the population, he wrote, believe in the Christian way of life, but not Christ; in the men as brothers, but not God as Father; in responsible living, but with no One to whom they are responsible. They are educated people, amiable, virtuous, filled with social zeal. But their life is a cut flower, plucked from its roots.

Cut flowers last for awhile, and for a time they look as good as when they were growing. The first days it seems as though the roots were not needed at all, that you're better off without their encumbrance. But the flower withers. That's what is happening now. In spite of all our high ideals, our noble social consciousness, the brown edges are beginning to appear. The ugliness is showing through. The leaves are curling, and the sickly sights of decay are evident.

Most tragic of all is the fact that the cut flowers, even when they are fading, are still described as all the flower that matters. That's what the letter means by "counterfeit faith". The greatest sadness of our time is the impotence of the churches in a time of spiritual crisis. In all too many cases the churches are still hawking cut flowers, and neglecting the living plant.

These are times when the forms of religion are not only not enough, but when they will themselves soon wither if they are not rooted in faith. Worship and ethics are the splendid flowering of Christian faith. A faith that does not produce them is no faith at all. (By their fruits you shall know them, our Lord said.) But neither worship nor ethics can survive without the faith in the living God that creates them in the first place.

There is a hopeful note in all this, however. We need not love pleasure more than God. We need not live without the roots of ethics of worship, the faith that gives them life. The letter to Timothy has this kind of optimism. It speaks of the things by which "the man of God may be complete, equipped for every good work." You can be that complete when you are able, says the letter, "to stand by the truths you have learned."

It is easy today to go with the crowd, barking like dogs in the street after every new idea. There are times when the most difficult and important duty of Christians is to stand by the truth they know, to endure against everyone who would persuade them to abandon it. This is not a time for new creeds and moralities, but for holding fast to the ones we know. It is not a time to adjust our beliefs to fit the unbelief of the age, to deify pleasure and surrender the power of religion for its forms. It is a time to stand by the truths we have learned.

That means that we must look for some word from outside. That's what the letter means when it says that Scripture is "inspired by God and profitable." There are no trustworthy authorities here. The words that come to us from one another and from our leaders hold no hope. The only word that can carry us through is a word from God. This is the time when we must know that word—and know God.

Is there any hope for America? Who knows? Perhaps we have already gone too far in this suicidal course to be turned back. I know that if He chooses, God can get along without the United States. He managed to do without Rome, and before that, with a long list of buried empires. The trouble is that the United States can't get along without God.

But there is hope for Americans, and whatever hope the country has is part of the hope of its citizens. We can enjoy life without letting our desire for new pleasures and experiences become God. We can hold on to the faith that makes our ethics honest and enduring, and saves our worship from being a beautiful fraud. We can stand by the truths that we have learned. We can. If we will.

So that leaves it up to you. What will it be? The form of religion without its power, the gratification of desire without reverence? Or life, life both pleasurable and responsible, with the living God?

How will you answer that question? When you decide that, you will have decided how much hope there is, for yourself, and for all of us.

Vietnam Election

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 22, 1967

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago, the opening of the electoral campaign in Vietnam brought on another attack of worry—not to say jitters—about our program and purposes in Southeast Asia. The fever flared up first in our press and then, inevitably, amongst ourselves.

Now this, Mr. Speaker, is understandable enough. We all know that these elections were and are a matter of considerable and legitimate concern to us. But now the fever has fallen somewhat. In the face of outside aggression and domestic harassment, the Vietnamese are going ahead with their elections. This, I think, is as good a time as any to ask ourselves whether our reactions—as expressed in the press and in this body—are not a matter of considerable and legitimate concern to the Vietnamese.

None of us knows, of course, how the Vietnamese will pass this great test. We are only dimly aware of how important it may be for their future. But we also are in a time of testing, Mr. Speaker, and it behooves us—for it is a matter of some importance to our future—to ask ourselves how we are facing up.

Must we not admit, in all honesty, that our first reactions were wildly exaggerated and ill-informed? The ball game had barely started before we heard cries of "foul." There were charges of rigging, of pressure, of dishonest practices. And these charges were quite enough—there was no need of evidence and none was presented—to convict the Government of South Vietnam.

So for a few days we wallowed in gloom and doom and presented a sorry spectacle to our allies in Southeast Asia.

A distinguished Washington newspaper, on the basis of a single, minor—and by all accounts unintentional—mishap, quickly predicted the elections would be a farce. Several of our distinguished colleagues went so far as to suggest, doubtless to the great glee of the hawks in Hanoi, that if elections in this devastated, divided and underdeveloped country were run less honestly or efficiently, than, say, in Massachusetts, or in Brooklyn, or in Cook County, Ill., then we—the greatest power on earth—should simply renege on our promises, abandon our commitments, break faith with the young men who have given their lives so that South Vietnam might be saved from aggression and a measure of stability and hope might be brought to the new nations emerging on the periphery of Communist China.

Mr. Speaker, gentlemen, I suggest that this sort of thing is unworthy of us. It is unworthy of our great press to serve us up such doubt. It is unworthy of us to swallow it and make the world wonder—when world peace depends on it—about our constancy and our resolve.

Floyd E. Fawver To Receive the John Campanius Holm Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 22, 1967

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, on August 31, 1967, Mr. Floyd E. Fawver, of Seligman, Mo., will receive the John Campanius Holm Award, for his outstanding record as a volunteer weather observer. The award will be presented by the Environmental Science Services Administration of the Department of Commerce, in recognition of a long period of unstinting public service as the cooperative weather observer at Seligman, Mo.

I insert at this point in the Record the citation from the Department of Commerce, and I congratulate Mr. Fawver on this outstanding recognition:

> Washington.—Floyd E. Fawver of Seligman, Mo., has been selected to receive the John Campanius Holm Award for his outstanding record as a volunteer weather observer, Dr. Robert M. White, Administrator of the Environmental Science Services Administration (ESSA), Department of Commerce, announced today.
>
> John Campanius Holm Awards, created in 1959 by ESSA's Weather Bureau, are made annually to honor volunteer observers for outstanding accomplishment in the field of meteorological observations. The award is named for a Lutheran minister who is the first person known to take systematic weather observations in the United States. The Reverend John Campanius Holm took daily observations near the present site of Wilmington, Del., in 1644 and 1645.
>
> Fawver, 75, a Phi Beta Kappa graduate of the University of Missouri in 1916, has been the mayor of Seligman several times and presently operates a hardware and lumber supply company. He became the official observer at Seligman in 1921.
>
> Fawver's citation, signed by Dr. White, reads "for a long period of unstinting public service as the cooperative weather observer at Seligman, Missouri."
>
> The Weather Bureau has over 12,000 volunteer observers throughout the United States who make and record daily weather observations. The information they gather is processed and published by the Environmental Data Service, another component of ESSA, and is invaluable in recording the nation's climate.

A Real American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. HARSHA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 22, 1967

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, no American who loves his country can look at his Fatherland these days without feelings of sadness and apprehension. Growing anxiety about a rapid increase in crime of all kinds, inter-racial hostility and violence, a common uncertainty about spiritual and social values, the crumbling of elemental relationships and the destruction of American communities—these things, Mr. Speaker, inflict on thoughtful citizens everywhere pain that is both poignant and deep—for behind the degeneration of our social and civic patterns is a breakdown of individual responsibility and initiative.

It is easy, Mr. Speaker, to suspect that Americans generally, are losing their basic goodness and character, their kindness and consideration. But I wish to say that while many Americans are troubled, they are also awakening to the need for old-fashioned neighborliness and action—voluntary action that comes not from legislation nor from the spending of Federal dollars, but from a thankful heart and a compassion for humankind.

Carey Alexander Fleming personifies this kind of action. Known to thousands of friends and neighbors as "Pop" Fleming, Carey, now 74 years old, spends all his time and energy working for that which is good in America. Mr. Fleming loves his country because he knows it. He has been a part of the American dream and has been involved in the struggle that has made that dream come true.

Born in Cincinnati on April 26, 1893, Carey later moved with his family to West Union, Ohio. He now resides on Garrison Road, Route 2, Bethel, Ohio. One of eight children, he quickly learned the necessity and satisfaction of hard work. After completing the eighth grade, he met and married Lenora Alice Vincent. He and Lenora provided a happy and wholesome home for six children.

Soon after the birth of his second son, World War I was declared. Allied shipping was being decimated by German U-boats and the very existence of free nations was at stake. Carey answered the call of our Nation to serve in its hour of need. He joined the Navy to help suppress the threat that confronted America. At the close of World War I, after serving in the Atlantic, Fleming was discharged with the rank of engineer 2d class. Returning to his wife and two small sons, Carey worked tirelessly for the well-being of his growing family. Rearing six children and educating them through the depression years was not easy, but Fleming instilled in each of them a sense of true values and a love and pride for his country. Two of his sons served in World War II, a son-in-law served in the Korean war and four grandsons serve in Vietnam.

Pop Fleming's service to his country

and his fellow man did not stop with his honorable discharge from the U.S. Navy. He interested himself in veterans affairs and founded numerous VFW posts throughout southwestern Ohio. Pop has instilled in these Veterans organizations the motivation to promote the American way of life by extending a helping hand to his fellow man.

He has held every position of leadership in many of these posts and was once Council Commander for Clermont County. Presently, he is service office for the 4th District of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Since his retirement nine years ago, "Pop" Fleming has greatly increased his service to Veterans and their organizations. He is a familiar and welcome visitor at many Posts where he does whatever needs doing, whether it be getting the books up to date or planning a meeting or special event. He frequently assists the Veteran Service Officer of Clermont County, Mr. James Griffith, in providing help and assistance to soldiers and sailors.

Perhaps the real Carey Fleming is best known through countless acts of kindness to neighbors and veterans who are ill or incapacitated. He is among the first to comfort the widow of a U.S. serviceman killed in action. Even when in poor health himself, he has kept himself busy providing transportation and other assistance for those needing medical care and help. He recently secured a wheelchair for a friend who could not afford to rent one and is a regular visitor at Veterans Administration and other hospitals where veterans are being treated. Anyone, young or old, is free to call on this one-man welfare and assistance program for help.

The words of the late President Kennedy aptly describe Mr. Fleming's philosophy of life, "Ask not what your country can do for you—ask what you can do for your country."

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to honor "Pop" Fleming before my distinguished colleagues and to present him to the people of America with the hope that he may inspire others as he has me. He is indeed a real American and I am honored to call him my friend.

Oil Depletion Allowance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY A. TAYLOR

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 22, 1967

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, it is my belief that the oil and gas depletion allowance is unreasonably high and should be drastically reduced or eliminated before the American people are required to carry an increased tax burden.

For the past 41 years, the depletion allowance, which permits oil well developers to forget about taxes on the first 27½ percent of their gross income from oil and gas receipts, has enabled the Nation's large oil companies to amass fantastic fortunes while providing the Treasury with much less revenue than that derived from other American corporations.

I am not a geologist and lack sufficient knowledge of the Nation's estimated subterranean petroleum reserves to accurately calculate how large, if at all, the depletion allowance should be.

However, the allowance has been in effect since 1926 and, I am happy to observe, oil reserves do not appear depleted.

From all I can observe, the industry has continued to enjoy a phenomenal tax break while the average citizen has been required to pick up a disproportionate share of the tab for every war and every new program that come along.

I am informed that the present depletion allowance represents an annual loss to the Treasury of about $1¼ billion. This would not pay for the Vietnam war, but it would help. Moreover, it would shift more of the tax burden where it should be.

The oil companies can afford to pay a larger share of taxes and I believe the loophole by which they escape fulfillment of their responsibilities should be promptly closed. I cannot in good conscience vote for an increase in income taxes until this inequity is removed and until unnecessary Federal spending is eliminated.

Walter E. Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. GOODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 22, 1967

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Post-Journal, Jamestown, N.Y., August 15, 1967, concerning Walter E. Washington, a former resident of my congressional district, who has been named to a special advisory panel on insurance in riot-affected areas by the President's National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders.

The editorial follows:

FORMER LOCAL MAN IN RIOT STUDY

The people of the Jamestown area may be pardoned for taking considerable pride at this time in the recognition given a former Jamestown resident, Walter E. Washington, in his selection as a member of a special advisory panel on insurance in riot affected areas. The appointment was made by the President's Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders. His selection was announced in Monday's Post-Journal.

Mr. Washington's leadership qualifications drew attention here when he attended Jamestown High School. He was named manager of the school football team and was a popular member of the track team. He was graduated with the Class of 1933. We believe he was the first Negro to be named manager of the football team at JHS.

That he is well qualified to serve on the new panel in connection with the study of riots and civil disorders is indicated by the recognition he has received in housing affairs. He had served as executive director of the National Capital Housing Authority, a government agency he had joined in 1941. As a nationally known authority on housing, Mr. Washington was chosen by Mayor John Lindsay of New York City as chairman of the New York City Housing Authority, a position he now holds.

Over the years the people of the Jamestown area have had reason to feel pride in achievements of many men and women who have grown up among us. We believe all the people of our community are especially gratified at the recognition of the standing of a Jamestown Negro in these times of disturbance. Such recognition gives further credence to the faith this community holds in the Negroes of this area and the strong feeling of friendship and confidence among all our people.

We congratulate the President's Commission on the selection of a highly competent man of fine personal character.

Stop Playing Politics With Vietnam War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 22, 1967

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, one of Michigan's great newspapers, the Detroit News, published an editorial in its edition for Sunday, August 20, 1967, which I feel would be of interest to many of my colleagues. Pursuant to permission granted, I place the text of this editorial in the Appendix of the RECORD:

STOP PLAYING POLITICS WITH VIETNAM WAR!

It is time to stop playing politics with the war in Vietnam.

In that war over 500,000 young Americans are committed to action. More than 12,000 of them have died. Already billions of dollars have been spent.

Our enemy indicates that the price of peace is Communist "participation" in the government of South Vietnam. All the world knows that, in Communist dialectics, "participation" means complete control, brutal punishment of all those who ever opposed communism and use of the conquered area as a base for new conquests.

The United States refused to pay this price in 1954, in 1961 and again in 1963. Rightly, we refuse to pay it today. As long as the North Vietnamese maintain their flat insistence that we surrender and get out as a prelude to peace discussions, we have no alternative but to continue and, if necessary, increase our military effort. Painful as it is, that is the nature of war.

Yet this country echoes with the talk of politicians preaching that there is some easy, bloodless and cheap way "out"—some trick excuse that will let us disengage while still pretending that those who died did not do so for nothing.

For example, there is Gov. Romney arraying himself as a peace candidate with a misty premise that we should "de-Americanize" the effort and let the South Vietnamese essentially take over a war that they and we together have so far been unable to win.

From the unquenchable Senator Robert Kennedy we hear the newly-inflated theory that, because the people we support are not quite honest enough, we should wash our hands of the whole affair unless the Ky regime conducts a wartime election that is a model of democracy. This is strange talk from the third generation heir to a political dynasty built on the idea that election chicanery is just good Irish fun.

And from Senator J. William Fulbright, who has held his Arkansas seat by careful adherence to the Arkansas line of keeping Negroes in their place, comes an amazing second to Martin Luther King's idea that costly American entanglements abroad must be blamed for the riot-spawning poverty in our slums at home.

Even President Johnson, whose dedication to victory we support, must be faulted for his political preachment that it really won't cost too much to prevail, that we can afford success in Vietnam and everything else too.

The Detroit News believes we are at war. We believe this war will end when North Vietnam realizes that Washington is not Paris, that soldiers fighting in Vietnam will not be sold out by lack of support at home.

The Detroit News believes that the self-serving political statements of ambitious candidates, eager journalists and restless critics serve mainly to encourage our enemy and prolong the fighting.

We believe there should be an American moratorium on the sly innuendoes about our allies, on slurs on the character of our military leadership and on cheap attempts to capitalize upon suffering in the name of intellectual dissent and political debate. Let the public critics of the war answer this question: What do their statements do to our soldiers or for our cause?

The Detroit News says: Politics as usual, and business as usual, must stop until this war is over.

A Voice From the Judicial Jungle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 22, 1967

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, a Pennsylvania jurist has spoken out clearly for constitutional government in calling for Congress to have veto power over the runaway Supreme Court.

State Supreme Court Justice Michael A. Musmanno says that the United States should not have the doctrine of "one judge, one law." He calls upon Congress to take steps to "outgeneral the fifth column and restore faith in the people."

Mr. Speaker, I believe Justice Musmanno's remarks will be of interest to my colleagues and I insert the following release by the Chicago Tribune Press Service:

JUDGE URGES VETO OVER HIGH COURT

WASHINGTON.—A Pennsylvania Supreme Court justice today said Congress should have veto power over 5 to 4 Supreme Court decision concerning national security.

"The power of the Supreme Court to declare unconstitutional laws enacted by Congress does not appear in the constitution," said Justice Michael A. Musmanno, "We have heard much of the doctrines of one person, one vote, but we should not have the doctrine of one judge, one law for the United States."

Musmanno, who testified at a hearing of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, was critical of the high court for its recent ruling in the Keyishian case that a state cannot bar a person from teaching in public schools because he is a communist. The court split 5 to 4 on the decision.

Rep. Edwin Willis, D-La., chairman of the committee, said he agreed with the theory but believed such action much require a constitutional amendment.

Musmanno said Congress should have the same right to overrule a Supreme Court decision in a national security case, if the split were 5 to 4, as it does to override a presidential veto, when a two-thirds vote is required.

The Pennsylvania jurist testified in support of amendments to strengthen the Internal Security Act and give more power to the Subversive Activities Control Board. He said Communists have been able to "turn the 5th Amendment into a fifth column marching against the security of the nation."

He urged Congress to "take whatever steps are required to outgeneral the fifth column and restore faith in the people that our government has the required brain power and resourcefulness to defeat the circumvention of the Communists and those who purpose it is to overthrow our government."

Musmanno said "it has become almost a vogue" among some people to "treat with scorn those who see a serious threat to the security of our nation in the machinations, plottings, propaganda, and tumult engineered by the Communist party."

War Error Fatal to Maryland Soldier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 22, 1967

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Pfc. Randy L. Taylor, a young soldier from Maryland, was recently killed in Vietnam. I wish to commend the courage of this young man and to honor his memory by including the following article in the RECORD:

WAR ERROR FATAL TO STATE SOLDIER—UPPER MARLBORO GI KILLED BY OWN TROOPS

UPPER MARLBORO, MD., August 21.—A 20-year-old soldier from Upper Marlboro, Pfc. Randy L. Taylor, was mistakenly shot to death by his own troops in Vietnam, the Defense Department reported today.

Private Taylor was part of a search-and-destroy mission and was returning from a patrol last Thursday when mistaken for the enemy, his stepmother, Mrs. James R. Taylor, said last night.

Mrs. Taylor said her son had been in Vietnam for over a year and that he was a frequent correspondent. She recounted one letter, which she said the Pentagon is investigating. It was dated July 4 but received August 10.

In it, she said, her son told of seeing his name printed on a casualty list in a newspaper in Vietnam.

"I'll never forget it. I know it by heart," Mrs. Taylor said, recalling the letter. "In black and white he saw his own name on a casualty list—Randy Lee Taylor, killed in action."

Mrs. Taylor said her son had attended Crosslands High School in Temple Hills, Prince Georges county.

He arrived in Vietnam July 29, 1966 and had been home for 45 days last spring on emergency leave granted so that he might visit with his stepmother when she was ill.

In addition to his stepmother, Private Taylor is survived by his father, a stepbrother, John D. Fisher, and a stepsister, Joan K. Fisher, all of the 8200 block Eagle Drive, Upper Marlboro.

Crisis Coverage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 22, 1967

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, all of us rely on the newspapers of the Nation to know what is happening in these historymaking days. Naturally we expect the press to carry all the relevant facts in their stories. As the AFL–CIO News points out in an editorial in its most recent issue, the mass media—which includes not only the papers, but the news magazines, radio and television these days—usually ignores a statement of the basic issues in labor disputes.

A free press is an indispensible means to an informed democracy, but every now and then we must be reminded that with every right there goes a corresponding responsibility. It is in this spirit, Mr. Speaker, that I include this editorial in the RECORD:

"CRISIS" COVERAGE

In the past few months the mass media—newspapers, magazines, radio and television—have shortchanged their vast audiences in their coverage of labor disputes.

They have virtually ignored a number of vitally important disputes and strikes while reacting with an almost hysterical tone to others.

The basic issues in the disputes—a fair share for the workers of industry's rich harvest of profits, the removal of wage inequities, protection for workers against rising living costs—have been either brushed aside or buried deep in a mass of not-very-perceptive reporting.

For 13 long weeks the workers in major rubber plants were on strike to secure economic justice that could not be won at the bargaining table because of the companies' hard-nosed refusal to concede the workers' needs. This dispute went virtually unreported and unnoticed until settlements were finally arrived at.

Workers in the non-ferrous mines and mills have been on strike for two weeks, forced onto the picket lines by a rigid company position on key issues of wages and cost-of-living clauses. There has been nary a line or a film clip on this dispute involving copper, zinc, lead, etc.

The struggle by the farm workers to organize in the Texas fields finally penetrated the media when a Senate committee went down into the Rio Grande Valley to hear firsthand of the strikebreaking activities of the Texas Rangers and the beatings and jailings of strikers.

There are other disputes scattered across the country—strikes to establish the simple fact of union recognition, of combatting sweatshop wages and inhuman working conditions. These go basically unreported except in the labor press.

In the year-long rail shopcrafts dispute, the media took real note only when the railroads—intent on forcing congressional action on compulsory arbitration—in effect refused to bargain. When frustrated rail workers finally struck in a last effort to win wages comparable to those paid for similarly skilled workers in non-rail operations, the hysteria point was reached.

Strikes that had been long ignored or glossed over suddenly won notice in the media as part of the "labor crisis," and "strike roundup" stories flourished to support the crisis contention.

The on-deadline reporting shed neither light nor understanding on the issues involved—many of them complex and having their roots in problems of prior bargaining and contracts.

Trade unionists do not go on strike lightly. They bear the economic brunt of the battle. They exercise the strike weapon—the right to refuse to work under conditions not acceptable to them—as a last resort.

In the struggle to win a fair share of the wealth they have helped produce they are entitled to a full hearing in the mass media, to in-depth reporting, not a sweeping attack on unions for allegedly endangering the public interest when at most what is involved is the public convenience.

The public interest in the rubber strike, in the copper strike, in the shopcrafts dispute is in peaceful, good-faith labor-management relations that result in justice and equity for the workers.

Food Stamp Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 3, 1967

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of the House the need for prompt action on the pending Food Stamp Act, S. 953.

The House and the Senate passed different versions of this bill several weeks ago. The House passed a 1-year extension and the Senate a 3-year extension of the 1964 act. Thus far, the conferees have been unable to resolve this difference and agree on a final version. This deadlock has made it impossible for the Department of Agriculture, in cooperation with the States, to plan for further expansion of this program for the current fiscal year even though we are now well into the second month of fiscal year 1968.

When the House considered the original legislation in June, the future of this worthwhile program was in doubt. Through the legislative skill of the able chairman of the Commitee on Agriculture [Mr. POAGE] we were able to successfully authorize the extension of the food stamp program. Further delay will place the entire program in jeopardy once again.

This program for our needy citizens involves long-range planning and contractural arrangements with the States. State and local organizations must make careful commitments and plan well in advance of actual operation of the program.

Periodic review of the Food Stamp Act is a desirable and necessary feature of this important legislation. However, in view of the leadtime necessary for adequate planning, it would seem that review every 2 or 3 years would satisfy our legislative responsiblity for program control. It would also provide a stable commitment to the States and localities which participate.

I urge the conferees to resolve their differences so that the food stamp program can continue to reach those of our citizens who are in need of additional food.

Local Youth Aid Program Proves a Boon to Area

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1967

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the Office of Economic Opportunity has long recognized that one of the fundamental causes of unrest and violence in our society is a lack of productive and meaningful jobs. One of the OEO's most popular and successful programs, the Neighborhood Youth Corps, provided enrollees with modern and competent job training and excellent job placements.

In cooperation with the Department of Labor, the OEO has organized several fine job-training projects across the Nation for Neighborhood Youth Corps enrolleees.

I would like to take this opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to include in the RECORD, an article from the July 31 issue of the San Leandro Morning News in Alameda County, Calif., which offers some hopeful and reassuring insight into the OEO's Neighborhood Youth Corps program:

LOCAL YOUTH AID PROGRAM PROVES A BOON TO AREA

Placement of the first 11 graduates of the U.S. Neighborhood Youth Corps project sponsored by the Alameda County Central Labor Council, AFL–CIO, under a precedent-setting approach to job training was announced by J. W. Gaines, project director.

Gaines pointed out that the 11 are "early graduates" of the 52-week, $1,589,800 federally-financed program.

"When the normal training cycle is completed," Gaines said, "we expect to help almost all of the 410 youths enrolled in our program find useful full-time jobs at decent pay and, thus, make room for more in the program."

Gaines, a veteran unionist and former deputy juvenile and adult probation officer who administers the program for the Central Labor Council under U.S. Labor Department guidelines, praised the employers who made jobs available to the 11 young people.

"We are confident that the program's graduates will prove themselves capable employees," Gaines said.

Two of the youths found their own jobs as welders. Employment for the other nine was secured through the efforts of Fred Payne, the project's placement supervisor.

Payne placed three youths in trainee positions with the Pacific Gas and Electric Co., one as a gardener at Oak Knoll Naval Hospital, four as burners with a scrap firm, and the other, a girl, as a clerk-typist with the Pacific Telephone and Telegraph Co.

"All 11 of these young people," Payne emphasized, "are proving themselves to be well-qualified workers. They're earning a reputation for our program, and we hope this fact will help us find jobs for the others as they complete their training."

The union-sponsored youth training program has attracted nationwide attention because the Oakland metropolitan area has one of the highest minority group youth unemployment rates in the nation and because the program is a unique one in a number of respects.

The Alameda County Central Labor Council in 1965 became the first local labor organization in the United States to sponsor a federal War on Poverty program.

The present project, an outgrowth of the earlier one, was the first approved under a new Experimental and Developmental Program of the Neighborhood Youth Corps.

Youths are first enrolled in work experience projects, most of them landscaping, demolition and light construction tasks for charitable and local government agencies.

When the youths prove themselves punctual, regular in attendance and capable of following instructions and safety regulations on the work experience projects, they are promoted into one of four job training courses—welding, carpentry, auto repair and, for girls, office machines and procedures.

The Labor Council project was one of the first anti-poverty programs to employ a full-time placement expert and also has on its staff three counselors and remedial education specialists.

Ninety per cent of the youths are school dropouts with no previous job experience or training.

Some Brighter Perspective on the News

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HASTINGS KEITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 22, 1967

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, a quick perusal of the front-page news on any given day will almost certainly give the reader a sense of increasing gloom and discouragement with the world situation. Racial outbreaks in cities across the Nation, mountain casualties and no end in sight in Vietnam, and the sad plight of homeless Arab refugees dominate headlines and lead stories. It is little wonder that the concerned American becomes overwhelmed with the pessimistic side of life and loses his perspective on reality.

Last week, New York Times correspondent Harry Schwartz took advantage of four gloriously hot and sunny days at Martha's Vineyard Island to regain that perspective and reexamine the world scene. Martha's Vineyard, a favorite spot for relaxation and fun of many prominent writers, artists, statesmen and others, is renowned for its magical effect on gloomy outlooks. I am pleased to bring Mr. Schwartz' column to the attention of all my colleagues who find themselves forgetting that we as a Nation have blessings to count, despite the gloom and doom emanating from the daily newspapers.

The article follows:

SOME BRIGHTER PERSPECTIVE ON THE NEWS

(By Harry Schwartz)

MARTHA'S VINEYARD, MASS., August 17.—The big news on this lovely island is that the sun has been out, hot and strong, for four consecutive days.

Nobody knows if the wettest summer weather in memory here is finally over, or has merely taken a brief vacation. In any case the golfers, the swimmers, the tennis players, the sailing enthusiasts and the sluggards who merely want to get a good sunburn while reading a murder mystery on the beach have all been frantically taking advantage of every golden minute.

IT'S BETTER IN THE SUN

In the resultant euphoria, news of such calamities as the latest racial outbreak in Syracuse or the flood in Alaska doesn't have the same impact that earlier disasters had last month while it was raining here and in Manhattan.

It may be evidence of sun-stroke, but confession must be made that on this island this week the thought occurs that perhaps the nation has been paying too much attention to the prophets of gloom and doom and taking too little time to count its blessings.

One suddenly wonders, for example, if President de Gaulle isn't right in his reported belief that the United States is the only superpower in the world today, and that all other nations, including Russia and China, are minor powers by comparison.

What other nation, after all, is rich and strong enough to fight a major war 10,000 miles away, while feeling so little pain at home? People who have sons fighting in Vietnam or whose boys have been killed or wounded there know that a war is going on. But where are the shortages, the rationing and the inflation that historically have been the normal sacrifices extorted by wars from their participants' home fronts?

SELECTIVE REPORTING

The Soviet and the Chinese press have been exultantly telling their readers these past weeks all the gory details of the Negro riots in Detroit and elsewhere. But they have carefully kept silent about the fact that the average American Negro lives appreciably better than the average Russian and almost infinitely better than the average Chinese. It is the contrast with this super-affluence of most white Americans that makes Negroes here understandably bitter about their lot, but neither Pravda nor the Peking Peoples Daily mentions that.

It is now a decade since Nikita Khrushchev began boasting to all the world that Russia would soon catch up economically with the United States and then pass it, Mr. Khrushchev is now a disgraced politician living in comfortable obscurity. Meanwhile, the United States is still producing at least twice as much as the Soviet Union annually, though it has about 35 million fewer people among whom to spread its goods and services.

At times something approaching despair seems to seize this country's Communist opponents as they watch the United States getting richer and more powerful, and as they see their cherished hopes of political gain in the world arena go up in smoke. From the destruction of the Indonesian Communist party three years ago to Israel's recent stunning triumph over Egypt, Syria and Jordan, it has been the friends of the United States who have more often than not come out on top of tense world situations.

The mood produced by these events is perhaps best mirrored in human terms by the record of prominent defections. Within the past year the West has received from the Communist world the daughter of Joseph Stalin, China's outstanding musician, the chief Hungarian diplomat in the United States, and Czechoslovakia's top novelist. There is no corresponding flow in the opposite direction and even Stokely Carmichael presumably plans to return to the United States rather than stay in Havana indefinitely.

ON THE BRIGHT SIDE

No doubt the rain will come again to Martha's Vineyard. There will be more race riots and the casualty figures from Vietnam will rise above the exceptionally low figures announced for last week. But a look at the bright side of things helps to correct perspectives distorted by the bad news featured on front pages day after day.

America's problem is not poverty or weakness, but the correct utilization of its enormous wealth and power, both of which are the envy of all the nation's detractors abroad. The United States has both guns and butter today, more than any other nation has ever had in history. What it needs is the wit to use these resources according to wiser priorities than those which have governed in the recent past.

Support for the Public Television Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 22, 1967

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, last month the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce held extensive hearings on the Public Television Act. A bill has been reported to the House and I hope it will be scheduled for early action.

As Maryland is embarking on an ambitious program of educational television, with extensive instructional television in the classrooms, I sponsored a bill on the subject and include in the Appendix my statement before the committee:

SUPPORT FOR THE PUBLIC TELEVISION ACT

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee: It is a pleasure to appear before you today in support of HR 6736, introduced by the Chairman and HR 7748 which I introduced on March 23, 1967.

It is my understanding that this Committee is considering the Chairman's bill. As the sponsor of similar legislation, I wish to state my unqualified endorsement of the provisions of HR 6736 as well as my endorsement for the amended version of the Public Television Act, S. 1160, which passed the Senate on May 17. I find the differences between these two measures to be small and I stand ready to support either version on the floor of the House.

Mr. Chairman, I am prompted to appear here this morning by a general concern for the continued and expanded development of educational television throughout the United States, and by a specific interest in our own educational television facilities which are now being developed in Maryland.

Since 1952 when the Federal Communications Commission began reserving channels for non-commercial educational use, educational television in the United States has grown to a 127 stations broadcasting this spring. It is my understanding that 62 additional ETV stations are expected to be on the air by 1968, and that another 34 are in the planning stages.

Among the 62 scheduled for inaugural broadcasts in 1968 or early 1969, is the first station of the Maryland Educational-Cultural Broadcasting Commission—the first of seven Maryland stations which will, by 1970 or 71, provide a completely interconnected statewide network of UHF transmitters capable of bringing educational television programs to every community in my state. Such statewide systems have already begun operating in Alabama, Georgia, Hawaii, Maine, Nebraska, and South Carolina. Additional ones are in the planning stages for Mississippi and Vermont. But these state-wide, and state supported facilities are recent in their development and comprise only a handful of the more than 100 stations I just mentioned.

If we look carefully at the vast majority of ETV stations now operating in the United States, if we analize their history and struggle for growth, we must conclude that the entire educational television enterprise has faced, conquered, or been crippled by problems of financing. Traditionally, financial support for educational television systems has been derived from a vast variety of sources which, except in selected instances, have been singly or collectively unequal to the opportunity which educational television can provide.

Accepting the relatively recent efforts at full fledged state support of educational television stations, traditional sources of funding have been local systems and boards of education, colleges, and universities, community support through periodic fund raising activities, and the beneficence of established foundations. Since the early days of ETV, the Ford Foundation has given more than a $120 million. Since 1965 it has made available to community stations funds so far totaling $80 million. The Ford Foundation grant alone during fiscal year 1965–66 approximated $3.5 million, or almost as much money as is contemplated in the initial one year authorization of the pending legislation.

These efforts have all come in recognition of the fact that, in establishing the rules for non-commercial, non-governmental educational television, we created, here in the United States, the only broadcasting system in the world without any visible means of support. These efforts to support it by hard pressed schools and colleges, by interested and dedicated citizens, and by our great foundations have been noble but they have been insufficient. They have been insufficient to permit educational television to realize its potentiality for our citizens, and they have been insufficient to permit normal growth, or in some instances survival.

Mr. Chairman, it was for these reasons that the National Association of Educational Broadcasters convened its first Washington Conference On The Financing of Educational Television Stations in December 1964. It was for these reasons that the Carnegie Corporation sponsored its now famous Commission on Educational Television. It was for these reasons that the Ford Foundation came forth one year ago with its recommendations for the future financing of ETV. It is for these reasons that you, Mr. Chairman and I, and many of our colleagues in this body and the other body have sponsored legislation to breathe life into the recommendations of the Carnegie Commission and provide a stable future for ETV in the United States.

This is not the federal government's first venture into assistance in ETV financing. The Educational Television Facilities Act of 1962 authorized $32 million over a five year period for federal matching grants for new ETV stations and for the expansion of existing station facilities. This authorization has now expired but is my understanding that, prior to the expiration date, the entire appropriated amount had been expended in grants to more than a 140 applicants.

My own State of Maryland was one of the last recipients of matching money under this program. Mr. Chairman, I think it is fair to suggest that, without the possibility of federal assistance under that Act, Maryland would not now be looking forward to the first broadcast of its ETV network. In fact, Mr. Chairman, the Maryland plan might well serve as an illustration of the importance of the pending bill to the future growth of ETV anywhere.

The Maryland plan is as bold as any conceived. It envisions the construction of a state-wide production center and seven transmitters geographically separated but electronically joined in a network capable of bringing the programs of the Maryland Educational-Cultural Broadcasting Commission into every community in our State.

The Maryland plan has required the appropriation of more than $2 million by the Maryland legislature for initial construction and operating expenses. It has required federal participation through a matching grant of $654,301 under the Facilities Act mentioned earlier. These monies will be sufficient only to place the production center and first transmitter on the air. Additional money will be required to construct the six additional transmitter facilities. The 1962 Act having expired, Maryland looks to favorable action on the pending bill in which Title I provides for an additional authorization of $10,500,000, for facilities next year and such sums as may be necessary for the succeeding four years.

When fully operational, the attention of those responsible for operating the Maryland network will turn from a concern with construction to a concern for content—a concern for programming.

As a public facility, supported in a large measure by the taxes of Maryland citizens, our ETV system will seek to provide a balance of program material to meet some of the needs of each of the many social, economic, and cultural groups within our society. Here we begin to touch on one of the fundamental differences between commercial television and ETV. The former seeks the largest possible audience for every program. The Maryland Educational Television network will also seek the largest possible audience but not for each individual program. Our facilities will seek an ever greater audience by programming to meet a variety of interests over a longer time span. In other words, during a given week the Maryland Educational Television network will be bringing to its viewers the kind of program variety which assures that within that time span there will have been something of interest to every citizen, whatever his background.

To accomplish this, the Maryland Educational Television network must look to existing sources of program material and to its own responsibilities for local production and the coverage of local affairs. Here the Maryland network will face the most persistent problem to plague ETV since its inception—the cost of program production.

I am sure that I need not emphasize these costs to any member of this Committee. All of us who have stood for elective office are too familiar with staggering charges associated with filming or taping five minute talks by the candidate, one minute political announcements, and the thirty-second spot.

In planning its program and budgeting its costs, the Maryland ETV network will be like many others throughout the United States. Our facilities will be responsible for providing instructional television for the school system of our State, and a variety of programming for adult audiences in the area of public affairs, cultural activity, and special education.

In the report which formed the basis for the President's recommendation and for the legislation now pending, the Carnegie Commission repeatedly stressed the importance of the vigorous and independent local station, well equipped and immediately responsive to the needs of the local community which it serves. The Facilities Act of 1962 helped to provide hardware and the extension of the provisions of that Act in Title I of the pending bill promise a continuation of this support. What has never been provided before is the kind of assistance now envisioned under Title II of this bill—substantial assistance to local stations and to national production facilities for the development of program material.

Television is only a tool. All the elaborate and expensive electronic equipment is only a means of bringing information, experience, education, culture, and entertainment to the viewer. To invest substantial sums in the technology and a few pennies in the content is to miss the point entirely. The "soft ware" must be at least as good as the hardware if educational television is to make its appropriate contribution to our society.

The Carnegie Commission on Educational Television reached the conclusion that "a well financed, well directed educational television system, substantially larger and far more pervasive and effective than that which now exists in the United States, must be brought into being if the full means of the American public are to be served". This was the central conclusion of the Commission and it was upon this conclusion that the Commission based its recommendation for the establishment of the Corporation for Public Television which is now proposed in Title II of this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, if I may be excused the parochial references, I believe that the general plan for the development of the Maryland ETV network may be useful as an illustration of the relationship between the recommendations of the Carnegie Commission, the provisions of this legislation, and the promise inherent in joining exciting and imaginative programming with sufficient and consistent support.

Maryland has determined to create and foster the growth of the kind of vigorous, independent, and well equipped ETV facility which the Carnegie Commission and the President recommended and toward which the provisions of this legislation are directed. In accordance with other recommendations of the Carnegie Commission, and with the general consensus of all who think and plan for the future of educational television in the United States, the Maryland system will be interconnected to provide coverage throughout the state and will be prepared to join in whatever regional or national systems of interconnection may be developed, through the efforts of the proposed Corporation for Public Television provided in Title II.

In its report to the people the Carnegie Commission emphasizes the need for a firm pedestal of dependable financial support for educational television combined with additional and diverse sources of funds for specific activities and programming purposes. Maryland has embarked on this course. We have determined that our ETV facilities will have the financial foundation of appropriation by the legislature from general funds.

The Maryland Law has also provided for the establishment of an independent commisison to own and operate the facilities with the authority to receive grants, gifts, and donations from all sources to meet additional network expenses. Through this arrangement, Maryland will draw on the interest and involvement inherent in the allocation of both public and private funds.

Among the most ingenious and productive developments in our system of government has been the growth of a tradition of federal assistance to state and local projects in which our citizens have already made substantial investment of public and private money. What is proposed in Title II of the pending bill is another unique arrangement for the appropriate and careful channeling of federal assistance to a project which is already receiving substantial pubic and private support not only in Maryand but in nearly every state of the Union.

What is promised by Title II is the realization of the potential which educational television possesses to serve the general welfare.

What the Carnegie Commission and the President recommended and what all of us who are sponsoring these bills are seeking is a new freedom for the American people—a freedom for the artists, the technician, the journalist, the scholars, the public servants to create, inovate and be heard through the medium of educational television. What we seek is to free that medium from the constraint of inadequate funds in order to provide our citizens the freedom to learn, to be informed, and to be entertained through a wider choice or programs than can ever be made available under entirely commercial auspices.

Mr. Chairman, on behalf of myself as a sponsor of H.R. 7748, on behalf of the people of Maryland who have chosen to build a network, and behalf of the increased measure of opportunity and freedom for every American to choose what he shall learn, what he shall see, and what he shall hear, I urge this Committee to act favorably on the pending bill.

Federal Program Evaluation: U.S. Chamber of Commerce Endorses H.R. 69

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 21, 1967

Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, the need for a thorough, objective review of Federal operations is being recognized by more and more students of governmental affairs.

One such statement appeared in "Here's the Issue," the report of the Legislative Department of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce for August 11. Summarizing several proposals for evaluation of present Federal activities, the report concluded that:

> The need for evaluating the effectiveness of programs and in assigning priorities between them is made increasingly imperative by the ominous evidences that we must as a Nation assign priorities in our national goals.

As the original sponsor of legislation—H.R. 69—to create a new, 14-member, Hoover-type commission, I am very pleased that the chamber in this article reiterated its support for this proposal. Such a survey of executive branch organization has great intrinsic merits. It could also serve, as the essay notes, as the foundation for a searching review of national priorities, as recommended in the bill—H.R. 10520—sponsored by the distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee [Mr. MILLS].

I would like to call this summary to the attention of the Congress, and urge the Government Operations Committee to hold hearings on H.R. 69 and other legislation on this subject without delay. The statement follows:

FEDERAL PROGRAM EVALUATION

Sentiment is building up in Congress for the establishment of some form of National Commission to look into the organization and operation of the Executive Branch.

Bills that have been introduced in both Houses of Congress fall into one of two broad types.

Some would set up a Hoover-type Commission to study and make recommendations on such problems as duplication and lack of coordination.

Others are designed to achieve a more basic purpose by delving into the problem of "program evaluation." Are the programs doing the job? Are results commensurate with costs? And most important: What priority should one program have as compared with another?

PERSPECTIVE

Useful background perspective on the proposals is offered by three recent comments:

The first comes from Representative Mahon (D-Tex.), during the post-mortem in the House on the riots in Detroit and other cities.

On July 31, obviously incensed by the charge that one of the basic causes lay in Congressional inaction on programs designed to improve slum conditions, Mahon, Chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, delivered a stinging rebuke to such critics. He said:

One would think from many of the statements in the press that the Congress has done virtually nothing for the poor in the past and is doing little or nothing now. Let us inform the American people on this issue, my colleagues.

He pointed out that the fiscal year 1968 budget contemplates expenditures of $25.6 billion for "benefits and services which aid the poor"—and that as recently as 1960 the comparable figure was only about one-third as high.

"For housing and community development," said Mr. Mahon, "as it is classified in the President's 1968 budget, the estimate for 1968 is $3 billion. That is five times what it was in fiscal 1960."

Mr. Mahon cited some of the other appropriations already approved this year by the House of Representatives:

$750 million for urban renewal. (More than $100 million has been provided in grants for Detroit alone since 1960).

$237 million for demonstration cities.

$40 million for urban planning grants.

$275 million for public housing.

$175 million for mass transportation.

$75 million for open-space land grants.

$165 million for water and sewer grants.

$75 million for the Office of Economic Opportunity summer programs.

$394 million to provide for 280,000 trainees under the Manpower Development and Training Act.

$4,000 million in grants to States for public assistance.

$235 million to States for maternal and child welfare.

$53 million for education of the handicapped.

$1,400 million for medical research and training.

$1,600 million to help disadvantaged secure a better education.

$311 million for vocational rehabilitation to help the disadvantaged.

$400 million for school lunches and milk.

$300 million for food stamp programs and other food distribution programs.

$150 million for loans and grants for rural water and waste disposal systems.

$400 million for low-income rural housing loans.

$500 million for farmers' loans.

This is a rather staggering list. It does not include other major programs, such as the War on Poverty still pending, as well as a multitude of other programs in other areas.

Additional perspective can be gained from a statement made by Senator Abraham Ribicoff (D-Conn.) during the extensive hearings held by his Subcommittee on Executive Reorganization which has been looking closely at our urban problems and the ability of Federal programs to meet them:

We have learned that we cannot place all our faith in single programs that may—or may not—add up to an urban policy. It is absolutely indefensible that seven different Federal agencies should be operating 140 different programs and projects in a city like Oakland, Calif.—and that doesn't even include welfare.

You don't have to be a political scientist to know that this situation is bound to result in bureaucratic entanglements, redtape, inefficiency, and financial and human waste.

You don't have to be a political scientist to understand that so many fragmented programs, many with conflicting goals and strategies, prevent us from looking at the city as it really is. . . . This task of coordination and a unified view has been sadly ignored in our headlong rush to adopt bigger and newer programs.

A third quotation rounds out the picture: On August 3, President Johnson said:

Without a tax increase and tight expenditure control, the deficit could exceed $28 billion. And that does not include an estimated $700 million higher cost of interest on the public debt that such a deficit would involve.

A deficit of that size poses a clear and present danger to America's security and economic health.

This, then, is the over-all picture that emerges:

Hundreds and hundreds of Federal programs, many hastily enacted; some working at cross purposes.

Pressures for more and more new programs and expansion of existing programs.

A request for an increase in taxes—that will still not meet expenditures.

THE HOOVER-TYPE COMMISSION

Bills calling for the establishment of a "Commission" to look into the organization and operations of the Executive Branch have been introduced in both Houses during the current session.

Minority Leader Gerald Ford (R-Mich.) and other representatives have proposed legislation in the House (H.R. 3130) and Senators James Pearson (R-Kansas) and Ribicoff, each with a number of cosponsors, have introduced such bills in the Senate.

All of the House bills are similar and follow provisions of the legislation which set up the Second Hoover commission—with one important exception. The bill setting up the Second Hoover Commission had no provisions governing the political affiliations of Commission members.

Under each of the House bills, the Commission would include 14 members:

Six Presidential appointees—two Governors, two Members of the Executive Branch, and two from private life.

Four appointed by the Speaker of the House—two Congressmen and two private citizens.

Four appointed by the Senate President pro tempore—two Senators and two private citizens.

The elected officials (Governors, Senators and Congressmen) are to be selected in equal numbers from the two major political parties. The bills are silent regarding the political affiliations of the private citizens.

The bill introduced by Senator Pearson (S. 47) is also similar to the Second Hoover Commission Act. It provides, however, for a 10-man Commission and limits the Presidential appointments to two from private life. Other appointments would be made on a bipartisan basis as provided in the other bills.

Under all of these bills, the "Commission," like the Hoover Commissions, would be acting on behalf and be responsible to Congress.

The principal thrust of Commission action would be to conduct an appraisal of the existing Executive Branch organizations with the prime objective of reducing expenditures through consolidation and elimination of services, activities and functions found to be duplicative or unnecessary.

Specifically mentioned are activities relating to urban affairs, natural resources and transportation.

The bills also charge the Commission with recommending means to improve liaison, communications and the exchange of information between the Executive and Legislative branches and between the Federal Government and State and local governments.

The Ribicoff Bill. (S. 2116). The Ribicoff bill approach is quite different. It would establish the Commission "to assist the President in the discharge of his Constitutional responsibilities."

In deference to this concept, the bill grants the President the authority to select all nine members of the Commission and to designate the Chairman and Vice Chairman. It includes ho provisions on the political affiliation of those selected, does not require the inclusion of Members of Congress, and provides for the submission of reports to the President as well as to the Congress.

In some respects, the Ribicoff bill is broader than the other pending bills on the subject. For instance, it charges the Commission with assessing the future goals of our country and to review our problems, resources, and capabilities.

In other respects, the Ribicoff Commission would be more limited. It would not, for example, be expected to make recommendations regarding functions and activities of the Executive Branch, because there is no provision comparable to Section I of the House bills which call for "defining responsibilities of officials, functions, services and activities of departments, bureaus and other instrumentalities of the Executive Branch."

OBVIOUS NEED

In testimony before Senator Ribicoff's Subcommittee on June 28, Budget Director Charles L. Schultze discounted the value of such a Commission. He said:

"The answers to our current organizational dilemma are . . . not to to be found in the reports of the two Hoover Commissions and the President's Committee on Administrative Management. The Hoover Commission solution of "placing related functions cheek-by-jowl" so that "the overlaps can be eliminated, and, of even greater importance coordinated policies can be developed" is not workable when you must combine major-purpose programs such as health, education, manpower training, and housing in alleviating the social and economic ills of a specific metropolitan area, city or neighborhood.

"Our basic task is twofold: (1) to devise techniques and systems to make voluntary cooperation work smoothly among different agencies and levels of government; and (2) to change attitudes so that each Federal Department is not a fiefdom to itself, surrounded by moats and ditches, but a part of one Government, in which responsibilities are shared, not divided up."

Few people would dispute Mr. Schultze's argument that a major challenge facing Federal Administrators today is the elimination of inter-department rivalries and empire-building.

At the same time, there is considerable evidence that in such areas as education, and training there is much over-lap and duplication.

The Catalog of Federal Assistance Programs, put out by the Office of Economic Opportunity contains information on 458 separate Federal Assistance programs. These programs have mushroomed both in number and in size in the past few years. It is time, say proponents of the commission study, to take a good overall look at their administration and organizational structure.

The Hoover Commission reports obviously did not solve all the Governmental organizational problems of the early Fifties.

But its penetrating survey focused attention on the monumental waste, extravagances and excesses of a sprawling bureaucracy of some 1900 Federal agencies which existed in 1952. Altogether, its Task Forces submitted recommendations estimated to save some $10 billion annually out of a total Administrative budget of slightly over $61 billion. Perhaps more importantly, however, the Commission offered many recommendations to strengthen the economic, social and governmental structure then existing.

Some of these recommendations were rejected; others were never implemented. Its most severe critics—and there were many—admit, however, that the work of the Commission brought about much-needed reform and that the net effect has been salutary for all American citizens.

The huge growth in the Federal government in the decade and one-half since the Second Hoover Commission study makes the establishment of a similar Commission imperative. The National Chamber, on the recommendations of its Government Operations and Expenditures Committee, has voiced strong support for legislation calling for a bi-partisan Commission patterned after the Second Hoover Commission.

PROGRAM EVALUATION AND PRIORITIES

Going beyond the duplication and lack of coordination among existing programs are other problems. Their satisfactory solution is not only more important—but more difficult.

Just as an individual's wants and desires are insatiable, so also Society's wants and desires are insatiable.

There are increasing evidences that we are fast approaching—if we have not, in fact, already reached—a position where we as a Nation, and the lawmakers as our representatives, must make some hard choices.

All of us, perhaps, succumb to the very human desire to translate bland assurances that "we can afford anything we need" into a belief that we can afford anything we want. There is a difference.

The Nation has always had to make choices, but there is now disturbing evidence—such as the President's tax message—that we as a Nation must increasingly do so. As an aid in making these choices, we need to sharpen our abilities and our tools for dealing with:

1. The problem of evaluating the effectiveness of programs.
2. The problem of assigning priorities between programs.
3. The problem of assigning priorities between our major goals.

Program effectiveness. Although it is popular in some Government and academic circles to ridicule the "profit" system, one of its greatest virtues is that the market mechanism imposes a continuing and relentless measurement on the programs of private industry.

Few Government programs have such a measuring rod.

The Government is attempting through a new planning-programming-budgeting system—called PPBS—to move toward a more businesslike system of cost analysis.

The fiscal 1968 budget is the first drafted under this concept, although the Department of Defense has been using the concept since 1962.

In an interview with *Nation's Business* Budget Director Schultze explained how the system is intended to correct some of the past deficiencies:

In the past, too much of our budgeting has been by organizational categories—within a department, it's been by bureaus, subbureaus—or by the kinds of things we buy—equipment versus construction versus salaries.

The purpose of the Defense Department is not simply to buy airplanes, or to operate an army; rather, it is to provide national security, and within that are such aspects as strategic and retaliatory forces, continental defense, ground forces, airlift and sealift. So Secretary McNamara reshaped his budge to fit these over-all goals. . . .

The second problem is to get continuing in-depth analysis of agency objectives and the most efficient means of achieving them.

Instead of a crash effort one month before the budget is due, you need to examine the effectiveness of programs year around.

The third problem with the old kind of budgeting is that it seldom offered alternatives. Very often the only choice was Yes or No.

With PPBS, we look at the objective, the ways of attaining it, the advantages and disadvantages of each alternative, both in terms of lowest cost and highest effectiveness. That is why, by the way, a lot of these analyses are called "cost-effectiveness" studies.

The PPBS program is a step in the right direction, but even its strongest supporters admit that it is many years away from eliminating the inherent tendency of proponents and administrators of government programs to overestimate the benefits and minimize the costs.

Priorities Between Programs. Because, at present, Congress has either great difficulty or great unwillingness in determining the true effectiveness of existing Federal programs, it finds it difficult to choose between proposals. The frequent solution is to approve several of them.

Sen. William Proxmire (D-Wis.) explained some of the practical problems in this way:

Often new programs come under attack because they have not been in existence long enough to build up a group of beneficiaries who will fight tooth and nail to see that benefits continue to flow their way. Yet older programs which may well be outmoded . . . continue on because of empire building in the executive branch and the efforts of a select group of program beneficiaries.

A system of priorities would be of immense help to the Congress in determining how much should be appropriated in a given fiscal year and for what purposes.

We tend now to look at more than a dozen individual appropriations bills, each of which may have its own set of priorities, but it is extremely difficult to take a balanced look at the whole picture.

For example, I serve on five subcommittees of the Senate Appropriations Committee. These subcommittees are where the real work is done. This means that I really have little to do with deliberations on seven other appropriations bills. . . .

What I'm saying . . . is that a system of priorities could help us immeasurably in seeing each segment of the Federal budget in a more significant over-all context.

Priorities Between Major Goals. The need for evaluating the effectiveness of programs and in assigning priorities between them is made increasingly imperative by the ominous evidences that we must as a Nation assign priorities in our national goals.

One of our great decisions on priorities involves public vs. private expenditures.

Rep. Wilbur Mills (D-Ark.), chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, declared a few months ago in a public speech:

Stable economic growth is produced by a long-range program of periodic tax reduction. Attention has frequently been called to the growth in our tax system's revenue productivity which accompanies the growth of the economy.

There will always be competition for this potential increment in revenues between those who would spend and those who would reduce taxes. (Emphasis added.)

The problem, said Representative Mills is that "the future ramifications of spending" for some of these existing and proposed programs may limit this area of choice.

He declared:

If the Congress itself is not going to make a restudy and a reevaluation of programs as to their cost-benefit ratio and determine their priority of demand on public funds as I have thought should be the case in order to establish the degree of expenditure control which I think is needed, then I am beginning to think in terms of the establishment of another Presidential commission to make a study of Government programs and report to the Congress.

On June 5, Congressman Mills introduced H.R. 10520, and similar bills have been introduced by Senator Proxmire, and others.

Congressman Mills evidently had second thoughts about a "Presidential" Commission, because the bill he introduced provides for a 12-member Commission with four appointments each by the President, the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House.

The legislation provides that the Commission would:

. . . make a full and complete study and evaluation of existing Federal programs and activities (old and new) and of projected expansions of such programs and activities for the purpose of determining, in the light of the fundamental needs of the Nation and its vital objectives—

(1) the effectiveness of each such program or activity in terms of its present and projected costs;

(2) whether such program or activity should be continued, and, if so, the level at which it should be continued, and

(3) in the allocation of Federal funds, the relative priority which should be assigned to such program or activity.

CHAMBER ENDORSES PROPOSAL

Data regarding the Mills proposal was presented to the National Chamber's Board of Directors at its June 30, 1967 meeting. Relying upon existing Chamber policy that "there must be continuous and critical review of all Government activities and spending authorizations, by Congress, the Executive Branch, and the people," the Board authorized Chamber support of the establishment of a bipartisan Commission to evaluate Federal programs and make recommendations for priorities in the allocation of Federal funds.

The present need for such evaluations and recommendations would seem, in fact, to demand general approval and support of the proposal.

Captive Congressmen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 22, 1967

Mr. DERWINSKI: Mr. Speaker, I insert in the Record at this point an editorial which appeared in the Washington Post on July 10, 1967, which has previously appeared in the Record, with a most effective rebuttal by the Hairenik Weekly of Boston, Mass. The editorial in the Hairenik Weekly speaks for itself with great elegance.

The editorials follow:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, July 10, 1967]

CAPTIVE CONGRESSMEN

Captive Nations Week is almost upon us, and so it's time to pine again for Idel-Ural, Turkestan, White Ruthenia and—don't forget—good old Cossackia. These pseudo-states and others of better historical repute are listed in Congress' Captive Nations Resolution as having lost their "national independence" to the wicked Communists. "The people of the United States share with them their aspirations for the recovery of their freedom and independence," in case you didn't know.

The fanciful cold-war rhetoric was issued by Congress in 1959 in a surge by hysterical anti-communism. Or rather, it was issued by ethnic manipulator Lev Dobriansky, father of the Captive Nations idea, and foisted by him upon a Congress sensitive to the presumed sentiments of Americans from now-Communist lands. Actually, many of these Americans, if not most of them, are insulted by being treated as hyphenated citizens. The annual Captive Nations charade might better be called Captive Congressmen Week.

Its aspect of ethnic discrimination is particularly offensive. For, it turns out, Russia is not among the Captive Nations. The reason for this strange omission is that Mr. Dobriansky's heart belongs to his ancestors' native Ukraine, and Ukrainian nationalism is nothing if not anti-Russian. This is, in our view, precisely the kind of old-country ethnic backbiting that has no place in a gambit designed to influence American policy.

To those who do not share faith that Captive Nations Week will crack the Kremlin, Mr. Dobriansky has prepared an insidious rebuttal. "High on the priority list in Red psychopolitical warfare," he has written, "is the downgrading and eventual elimination of Captive Nations Week." The technique of attributing criticism to foreign manipulation is, unfortunately, typical.

To his credit, President Johnson has shown some embarrassment over the Resolution, which "authorizes and requests" him to proclaim Captive Nations Week annually. He has avoided specifying which countries are Captive Nations and has stressed instead American support for the "just aspirations" of peoples everywhere. Clearly, Mr. Johnson rejects the Resolution's tenet that "Communist imperialism makes a mockery of the idea of peaceful coexistence." He believes, as most Americans do, that all available openings to East-West peace and stability should be explored."

[From the Hairenik Weekly, Boston, Mass.]

The Washington Post: A Captive Organ

Intellectual matters—such as a problem faced by 119,000,000 human beings—ought to receive intellectual attention, but the Washington Post (see its editorial of July 10, reprinted elsewhere in this organ) feels that these matters can be best handled on the cartoon page; for the offending editorial is really not an editorial; it is a cartoon in the worst possible taste calculated to destroy an issue by the application of the great American belly-laugh.

As the memorable British cartoonist, it has tied a crazy little beat-up can over the austere pate of Gladstone, and has shown him as Happy Hooligan—as the Lord Blimps laugh and laugh.

In this instance, the Post has tied cans over the heads of 88 members of the United States House of Representatives, including the distinguished Speaker and the equally distinguished Minority Leader, and has caricatured not only their motivations in expressing their warm support of the common cause of the Captive Nations of the Soviet, but has in effect cavalierly scorned the sacred aspirations to be as free (as the Washington Post is free) of 119,000,000 non-Russians who, today, in a classic syndrome of colonialism, are dominated by a minority of 96,000,000, the Russians of the Soviet Union.

The Post's inference of course is completely untenable—and dangerous. If as it is says Mr. McCormack, Mr. Ford, Mr. Flood and Mr. Derwinski, acted as "captives" to vote-get the support of Americans descended from Captive Nations stock, may we then conclude that our Congress acts simply out of the quest for the vote, that there no longer are ideals and issues before Congress, that Washington is simply a filthy pot of seething cynicism?

For instance, are we to conclude that those Congressmen who have through the years stoutly supported the Negro cause have done this not because there are legitimate issues involved, but with the Negro vote as the sole objective?

The question really is, of course, who is the captive? Is it the Congressman who supports the captive cause, or the Post, which tries in every conceivable way to laugh it out of existence?

The editorial in question of course is not of a nature which nourishes careful study. It is, as we have said, a cartoon, not an editorial befitting a great American newspaper; and in viewing that cartoon, we are quickly led to believe that it betrays a slavishness which discloses the full extent of the captivity of the Post editor.

The reader will note that the central theme of the editorial is that there is something awful, and perhaps foreboding, in that the listing of Captive Nations does not include "Russia" and this, says the writer, "is an aspect of ethnic discrimination".

Now, when we think of "ethnic discrimination" we think of the Russians up there in the Kremlin who have practically authored the phrase. If it is "ethnic discrimination" that is bothering the Post, then it ought to editorialize against the terrible discriminations against the nationalities and religions of the Soviet Union; for of course (and read Prof. Pipes of Harvard on this), the nationalities of the Soviet Union are simply the modern serfs of Peter's days.

Let us here draw a simile. To list Russia as a Captive Nation would be to have listed England with India, Uganda, Kenya, etc., etc., among the territories of the British Empire which were candidates for decolonialization! That is, in this business, one is either a captive or a captor and, in this instance, Moscow is the colonialist, Armenia, Ukraine, yes, Idel-Ural, Cassakia and White Ruthenia, which by the way turns out to be the great nation of Byelorussia, that is White Russia, the nationhood of which has been recognized by both the Soviet and the nations of the world to the extent that it maintains a "delegation" at the United Nations), and the rest of the Russian Soviet occupied world are the captives. It is as simple as that. You can't in this instance list Russia as a captive nation because Russia is the captor.

Behind all this is the traditional Great Russian imperialism which the Communists have simply adopted and perfected—and achieved. We think the Post is quite aware of this, and we think it is more than aware of the preeminent position the Russians of the imperium have arrogated to themselves in the structure and affairs of the Soviet Union. Even Stalin himself, who was quite an authority on authoritarianism, found himself called upon to say the following:

"Great power chauvinism in our country is increasing daily and hourly . . . Great Power chauvinism, the rankest kind of nationalism, which strives to obliterate all that is not Russian, to gather together into the hands of the Russians the threads of administration and to crush everything that is not Russian."

There is today in the United States (and of course in Soviet Russia) important elements who feel that the establishment of Soviet Russia as the "great nation it deserves to be" will be a logical step towards the establishment of "world peace". It will of course be a step toward the permanent captivity of the once-free nations of the Empire, but this doesn't seem to bother the Post in the least. The Post is all the way a captive of the "great power" mentality, and this miasmatic state of mind simply and gratuitously submerges the destinies of millions of people and sublimates the conquests of Russia.

As for the Post's charge that the leaders of Captive Nations Week utilize a "technique of attributing criticism (of Captive Nations Week) to foreign manipulation", we point out that as late as the recent Glassboro confrontation, Mr. Kosygin is known to have accosted President Johnson, asking if the latter intended to "complicate U.S.-Soviet relations by issuing a Captive Nations Proclamation."

If this isn't "foreign manipulation" we've never seen foreign manipulation; and it is incredible to relate that the Post apparently is unaware that since 1959 the Soviet Government has directed an intensive worldwide propaganda effort against the Captive Nations cause, for there is no doubt in the least that the Achilles-heel of the Soviet is its captive world—and the Kremlin knows this.

This is America, however, and the Post is entitled to its opinion, and we would give our life to protect the Post's right to its opinion. But we are not at all sure that the Post feels likewise in respect to our right to have and to express an opinion contrary to its opinion. Nevertheless, we invite the Post to exercise its American privelege and duty by reprinting this counterview, as we have freely reprinted its view.

Until the Post does precisely that, we will have every right to believe that the sentiments of the distinguished members of the House are closer to expressing the views of the American people than those of the Washington Post.

Arcadia Chamber of Commerce, General Policy on Education Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 22, 1967

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, the board of directors of the Arcadia, Calif., Chamber of Commerce, located in the congressional district it is my privilege to represent, recently approved a statement outlining the chamber's general policy on education legislation.

In its statement the Arcadia Chamber of Commerce Board of Directors expressed its views concerning the need to retain local control over education.

Because I know this is a subject of interest to many people, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit a copy of this statement for inclusion in the Record, as follows:

Arcadia Chamber of Commerce, General Policy on Education Legislation

The General Policy of the Arcadia Chamber of Commerce on Education Legislation is in opposition to legislation, whether city, county, state or Federal, that would deprive local school districts of their right of control or hamper their administration in providing educational opportunities for people under their jurisdiction.

1. FINANCIAL SOURCES AND EXPENDITURES

A. Taxation is necessary to meet the needs of education. Tax money spent for educational purposes, however, must be spent wisely, prudently, and in a manner by which the whole process of education is benefited.

B. In the public schools (kindergarten through junior college) the Arcadia Chamber of Commerce supports the following financial policies:

(1) It is recognized that property owners cannot continue to carry such a large share of the costs of supporting education. Other avenues of taxation and support should be explored.

(2) The use of government funds at any level is strongly opposed if that government could thereby dictate policy decisions and/or educational processes to the local school districts.

(3) Continuing effort should be made to achieve maximum effective use of all educational buildings and facilities.

(4) The policy on pupil transportation should be reviewed to determine the advisability of having such transportation operated on a self-supporting basis.

(5) At all levels above high school, stricter rules should be enacted governing legal residency.

C. With regard to higher education, the Arcadia Chamber of Commerce supports the following financial policies:

(1) Students should pay reasonable tuition at all schools above the junior college level.

Out-of-state students should be required to carry a higher proportional share of these expenses.

(2) Where needed, students should be encouraged to finance college costs by scholarships, part-time employment, or use of loan funds. Adequacy of available scholarships and loan funds should be ensured.

(3) Postgraduate students should pay their proportionate share of costs of the continued education.

(4) As with public schools, the use of government funds at any level is strongly opposed if that government could thereby dictate policy decisions and/or educational processes.

(5) As with public schools, it is recommended that continuing efforts be made to achieve maximum effective use of all educational buildings and facilities.

2. EDUCATION OPPORTUNITIES

A. We believe that the opportunity for education, particularly higher education, is an important privilege rather than a right. Opportunities for education should be available to all regardless of sex, race, color or religious beliefs.

B. We strongly believe that the breadth and depth of educational opportunities are extremely important and will largely determine the ultimate development of this country. An equally important facet of education, however, is the motivation of the student to take advantage of all educational opportunities available within his capabilities.

c. We recommend that greater opportunities should be offered in the vocational fields for those students that have these aptitudes. We realize that a number of students have greater aptitudes in these fields than in the fields covered by academic college and university training.

3. TENURE AND SECURITY EMPLOYMENT

A. To adequately staff our schools at all levels below university postgraduate, we recommend that teachers, instructors, lecturers and professors be primarily selected and retained on their ability to teach. Scholastic achievement, research ability, writing and publications and other extra curricular activities may be important, but they should be considered only of secondary importance to teaching ability.

B. We recommend an adequate salary policy at all levels of education to aid in securing and retaining competent teachers.

C. To improve overall teaching quality in our schools, a more effective method must be developed to identify and replace incompetent or substandard teachers. Tenure policies should be revised to achieve these goals.

4. TEXTBOOKS, EQUIPMENT AND TEACHING PROCEDURES

A. We are opposed to dictatorial policies of any government with regard to the use of textbooks. We believe that textbooks should be selected to meet the needs of the local district and chosen on their contents to qualify as the best suited material. Lists of textbooks reviewed and recommended by the state should be made available to assist local districts. Their selection, however, should be on an optional basis.

B. Equipment selection, whether purchased by district funds or subsidized funds, should be made by the district for utilization in the schools as the need is proven.

C. We resist any outside influences, dogmatic in nature and not benefiting the learning process which would tend to impose teaching procedures upon any district.

Approved by the Arcadia Chamber of Commerce Board of Directors July 27, 1967.

Attest:

SHERRELL WATSON,
Manager.
JAMES A. HARVEY,
President.

Wisconsin Couple Saves Youth From Drowning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP E. RUPPE
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 22, 1967

Mr. RUPPE. Mr. Speaker, all too frequently we read in the papers and hear on radio and television about instances of mugging, robbery, and murder that take place in plain view of citizens who refuse to lift a finger to assist the victim. One sometimes wonders if old-fashioned heroism is a thing of the past.

The following article that appeared in the Menominee Herald-Leader of Menominee, Mich., does not involve a crime. However, it does involve an act of heroism—a young man who put his life on the line to save a fellow citizen. It involves a married couple who had the training and commonsense necessary to save the life of a young boy. This is, indeed, a refreshing story, and I commend it to the attention of my colleagues.

The article follows:

BUEGES RESCUE DROWNING YOUTH

An Allouez, Wis. couple, both natives of Menominee, were credited today with saving the life of a Washington Island youth Saturday while on a tour of the island.

Mr. and Mrs. Michael Buege were summoned to the scene when they heard a cry for help from a companion of Bradley Hanson, a seventh grade student, who was trying to swim to shore from a pier.

Hanson was barely afloat when the Bueges reached the water. Michael Buege removed his shirt, shoes and glasses and swam to where Hanson was near drowning. Buege, a strong swimmer, pulled the youth to shore where Mrs. Buege applied artificial respiration.

Mr. and Mrs. Buege are 1957 graduates of Menominee High School and she received her artificial respiration training in a high school lifesaving class.

Buege is the son of Mr. and Mrs. Austin Buege, 3112 17th St., and his wife is the former Miss Carol Jean Schmitt, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Walter Schmitt, 2000 16th Ave.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402, at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

Appendix

Mrs. Ethel Halcrow Cooley, Minot, N. Dak., a Writer for 50 Years

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILTON R. YOUNG

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 23, 1967

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, all of us realize the concern young people have as to what opportunities the future holds in store for them. This has always been true. Throughout my span of years—and I think this has been true of everyone—there have been times when there seemed to be little opportunity for young people.

An article entitled "Active In News Media Almost 50 Years, Minoter Began Writing As E. H. Cooley," written by Dorothy Hager, and published in the Minot, N. Dak. Daily News of August 12, 1967, gives a most interesting account of a lady I have known for more than a quarter of a century. She excelled in many fields of endeavor under the most difficult circumstances.

Her life story, from a young girl on up, spans some of the most difficult years during this century and I know it will be an inspiration for many young people today. This remarkable woman, Mrs. Ethel Halcrow Cooley, seemed to reach her greatest heights when the going was the toughest.

Mr. President, because I think this story is so interesting and should be so encouraging for many people to read, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ACTIVE IN NEWS MEDIA ALMOST 50 YEARS, MINOTER BEGAN WRITING AS E. H. COOLEY

(By Dorothy Hager)

For years Mrs. Ethel Halcrow Cooley wrote farm stories under the byline of E. H. Cooley because the Grand Forks Herald felt farmers wouldn't pay as much attention to the stories if a woman wrote them.

They did heed the articles, and because of those stories Mrs. Cooley is credited with providing the impetus that started the sugar beet industry in the Red River Valley and causing the formation of the state Seed Control Board.

Those are just two of many achievements in the life of a woman who, at 79, is president of Minot Broadcasting Co. and who reports daily to her office at KLPM Radio.

The youngest of 11 children of Mr. and Mrs. John Halcrow, Mrs. Cooley was reared on a Bowesmont farm where she obtained the background that enabled her to be farm editor.

A tomboy, she "was always out with the horses," and until she went away to Drayton High School, never attended a full school term. She would quit in the spring to help with the field work, and wouldn't get back to school until after classes had started in the fall.

In 1906, the year Mrs. Cooley graduated from high school, her father died, and she was on her own as far as furthering her education was concerned. She was determined to get her degree, and taught school long enough to get money to enroll at the University of North Dakota, Grand Forks, in 1908.

While she was a freshman she won the state women's speed skating championship. The same year an accident interrupted her education. She was playing basketball and a fall that left her unconscious 36 hours caused severe headaches. Because of the headaches Mrs. Cooley returned to teaching for two years, then went back to college.

In 1914 she graduated from UND with an A. B. Degree in English and a lifetime teachers certificate, and at the same time graduated from Wesley College, at Grand Forks, where she had taken a course in expression, or elocution.

After returning to college following her accident Mrs. Cooley had found a new way to finance her education—giving dramatic readings with a group of Wesley College musicians in the winter and teaching painting during the summer.

During her senior year Mrs. Cooley took part in a pageant on the Northwest, giving a reading in the Hidatsa language. "That was the language of Sakakawea . . . and I learned the Sakakawea Soliloquy very painstakingly, syllable by syllable."

So well did she learn it that when some Indians overheard her practicing one of them said, "That squaw, she Hidasta."

While she was busy with the pageant Mrs. Cooley didn't have time to give programs. To get enough money to finish school she mortgaged her horse for $75, then, worried about losing it, arranged with Wesley College to give three more programs at $25 each.

"I took the money down and paid off the note, but I'd forgotten the interest. I paid the interest but that meant I didn't have enough money for carfare, so I walked the mile and a half to the University for the week, and for lunch just had soup and crackers," Mrs. Cooley laughed.

After graduation she taught expression at Wesley College, then worked in the UND Extension Division for 2½ years. Her job included arranging statewide concert tours and setting up speaking engagements.

It was while arranging publicity for one of the artists that she met her husband, J. B. Cooley. She took a handwritten news release to the Grand Forks Herald, asked Mr. Cooley to run it in the paper and he shouted at her for not having typed it.

He later apologized and the next time the energetic young woman brought in an item he invited her out for ice cream. She refused.

Later, however, when the Herald's society editor went on vacation in 1916, her future husband asked her to fill in.

Her copy was due at midnight and she said, "Mr. Cooley thought it wouldn't do at all for me to be out at that time of night alone so he took a coffee break and walked me home and that's the way it started."

By 1917, when Mr. Cooley entered the service during Warld War I, they were engaged. The Minot woman looked reminiscently at her engagement ring and said, "He inherited the diamonds from his great-grandmother in a large broach . . . he had them put in a princess setting."

They were married May 12, 1917, and while her husband was in service, Mrs. Cooley continued her job with the university. In 1919 Mr. Cooley was stationed at a camp in Iowa, where he was to be mustered out, and she joined him there. While awaiting his discharge, Mrs. Cooley gave dramatic readings for the troops, including the Sakakawea Soliloquy.

They returned to Grand Forks and Mr. Cooley again joined the Grand Forks paper where he became managing editor. In 1921 Julius Bacon, general manager of the paper, decided to start a farm page.

Mrs. Cooley related that he sent a male reporter to the fair to interview a hog breeder. The reporter, a city boy, asked the man how often he milked his Duroc-Jerseys, and that error sent him back to the office to throw in his hat. That afternoon Mrs. Cooley became farm editor.

One of the problems Mrs. Cooley tackled through her work was that of better quality seed potato production in the state.

At that time, in addition to her newspaper work, the energetic woman was serving as state chairman of the Independent Voters Association Women, and when their candidate, George Shafer, was elected governor, he came to Mrs. Cooley's home to thank her.

In his gratitude he offered her "a half of my kingdom." Mrs. Cooley asked, instead, for a state seed department.

On his suggestion, she and an agronomist drafted a bill, which was passed by the legislature. Mrs. Cooley said modestly that three years after the state seed department was established, North Dakota, which had ranked 11th among the northern seed growing states, became number one.

She also sponsored the legislation for the North Dakota Poultry Improvement Board.

Another program Mrs. Cooley espoused through her work was the growing of sugar beets. Bacon felt diversification of crops was necessary and backed Mrs. Cooley in this project.

Her articles attracted the interest of a Grand Forks area farmer who planted five acres of sugar beets, the first to be grown in the Red River Valley.

Mrs. Cooley reported the results: "His sugar beets not only went 12 tons to the acre, which was quite phenomenal, but they also had the highest sugar content of any sugar beets in the United States."

As a result of his experiment other farmers began trying the new crop, and the Red River Valley sugar beet industry was born.

Mr. Cooley had become one of the owners of the Herald, and when the paper was sold he purchased Radio Station KLPM. The first station in Minot, it was less than a year old when they took over its operation in July 1930.

Radio was in its infancy in those days, and they had no guidelines to follow, but Mrs. Cooley said, "We didn't know enough to be scared. We were making it a news station—news and good music," she added.

Even after moving to Minot Mrs. Cooley continued her farm writing. Bacon had taken over a paper in Watertown, S.D., and she wrote for his paper, as well as for the Herald, in addition to having her hand in at the radio station.

Drouth was damaging to North Dakota in the early 1930s and the time came when money was so tight in the Minot area the Cooleys had a problem keeping their station going.

To remedy the situation they moved to

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Watertown where, from 1933 to 1936, both worked for the paper and sent money back to Minot to keep the station running.

After returning to Minot Mrs. Cooley continued writing farm stories for the Grand Forks and Watertown papers until the 1940s.

While she had always had a hand in the operation of the radio station, Mrs. Cooley began devoting a great deal of time to it after 1946. One of the activities she handles today, as she has for the past 27 years, is that of doing interviews at the fair,

In 1958, after her husband's death, Mrs. Cooley took over as president of Minot Broadcasting Co.

Work and family did not occupy all Mrs. Cooley's time, and for many years she has been prominent in the Republican party on local, state and national levels. From 1948 to 1961 she served as national Republican committeewoman, and she estimated she and her husband had easily spent $50,000 for the party.

Women have a definite role in politics, she stated positively, adding that "Women have even more to lose than men by bad government. Taxation that comes from bad government is something they should pay the greatest attention to because it influences their home, the future of their children and the welfare of their nation."

Mrs. Cooley's children are Mrs. W. O. S. (Madeline) Sutherland, Austin, Tex., and Mrs. Joseph S. (Dorothy) Massee, Minneapolis. Another daughter, Mary Beth, was killed in a 1951 car accident.

As she reviewed her many activities Mrs. Cooley attempted to explain why, at the age of 79, she doesn't retire for a well-earned rest.

She showed her contentment with her busy life and its variety of activities by asking simply, "Well, what more fun is there than what I've been doing?"

Texas Workers Endorse L. B. J. Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK BROOKS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 23, 1967

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, the working people of Texas and their leadership, who feel keenly the need for social progress legislation, have unanimously endorsed the successful efforts of the administration of President Lyndon B. Johnson to make this a nation of opportunity and equality for all and urge expanded support for him.

The Texas AFL–CIO, assembled in convention August 4, 1967, in Fort Worth, Tex., unanimously passed a resolution attesting to their endorsement of the vitally needed domestic social reform legislation which has been enacted by the Democratic 89th and 90th Congress during President Johnson's administration and urged organized labor to expand its efforts to restore to the President the liberal congressional majorities needed to continue his program.

The resolution has been referred to president George Meany and secretary-treasurer William F. Schnitzler, American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organization, for action in its convention in December 1967.

Text of the resolution, signed by H. S. Hank Brown, president, and Roy R. Evans, secretary-treasurer, Texas AFL–CIO, follows:

RESOLUTION

Whereas, The administration of President Lyndon B. Johnson passed Legislation resulting in much-needed social reform on the domestic scene; and,

Whereas, The slowdown in social progress legislation the past year resulted from the introduction of reactionary forces in the Congress in the 1966 elections rather than from a weakening of President Johnson's commitment; and,

Whereas, An expanded effort on the part of organized labor's political forces could restore to the President the liberal majorities in Congress he needs for continuation of his program; therefore, be it

Resolved That the Texas AFL–CIO Convention continue to support President Johnson and his efforts to make this a nation of opportunity and equality for all.

Adopted Unanimously by Texas AFL–CIO, in Convention assembled, this 4th day of August, 1967, Fort Worth, Texas.

Witness Our Hands this 4th day of August, 1967.

H. S. HANK BROWN, *President.*
ROY R. EVANS, *Secretary-Treasurer.*

Referred to President George Meany and Secretary-Treasurer William F. Schnitzler, American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, for action in Convention, December 1967.

The 50th Anniversary, the 78th Division—Training—Army Reserve, New Jersey's "Lighting Division"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 23, 1967

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, it is with great pride that New Jersey commemorates, today, the 50th anniversary of the heroic 78th Division—Training—or "Lighting Division" as it is popularly known.

Fifty years ago, on August 23, 1917, the famed 78th was organized at Camp Dix, N.J., and became the first division to leave there for France, where it landed in May 1918. Gallant as "doughboys" in World War I and "GI's" in the Second World War, the men of the 78th fought in some of the fiercest battles of those wars. In peacetime the division has earned an outstanding record of service in the U.S. Army Reserve. Today, it is New Jersey's only Army Reserve division.

Today I am honored to commemorate the officers and men, both past and present, whose heroism and dedication have made the Lightning Division the fine outfit that it is today.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two recent articles on the 78th. The first is entitled "The Golden Jubilee of the 78th Division," and was written by Maj. Gen. John G. Cassidy, of Nutley, N.J., commanding general of the 78th. It was published in the July issue of New Jersey Business. The second article, entitled "Jersey Born, Jersey Bred," was written by Maj. Carmine P. Giordano, information officer of the 78th.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GOLDEN JUBILEE OF THE 78TH DIVISION

(By Maj. Gen. John G. Cassidy, commander, 78th Division, Training)

The history of the 78th Division (Training)—informally known as the Jersey "Lightning Division"—in both World Wars and in active Reserve status since 1946 is a record of heroic achievements, missions accomplished and outstanding service to the United States of America.

War, as such, is opposed to American principles and ideals; nevertheless, in times of emergency New Jersey citizens have turned from peaceful pursuits to undertake the protection of their country with steadfast determination. This was the situation in 1917 when the 78th Division was first organized, again in 1942 when it was reactivated and once more in 1946 when it became a part of the United States Army's Reserve component.

I joined the 78th Division in 1929 as an enlisted man with the 310th Regiment; the 78th has been my life since then, except for a period in World War II when I served with another outstanding division. Every day of my association with the "Lightning Division" has been a cherished, never-to-be-forgotten memory.

This year the 78th Division (Training) is celebrating its Golden Jubilee. And during those past 50 momentous years the division has reaped plentiful battlefield honors for heroism in some of the fiercest actions of World War I and World War II and also, since 1946, when it was reactivated as an Army Reserve Division, has received innumerable honors and awards.

For example, in 1966 the division was awarded 81 Secretary of the Army Superior Training Unit Citations—the highest number ever given to a United States Reserve division.

It has been my privilege to have commanded this outstanding division since July, 1964 and service with the "Lightning" men has been an exceptional honor. Compilation of the history of a combat and reserve unit is a daring task; too great a part of this type of unit's past lies buried with the men who made it. For the deeds of one man on an unnamed hill or the actions of a squad fighting for an isolated farmhouse are often the turning points of a battle . . . and in the confusion of war, these actions are frequently unrecorded.

Certainly the history of the 78th Division is one of proud accomplishments, and I sincerely hope that the following pages will remind you of the greatness to which civilian soldiers can rise as a team, of the good fellowship many of the readers have had and of the pride which you developed in making the "Lightning Division" the famous unit that it is today.

JERSEY BORN, JERSEY BRED

(By Maj. Carmine P. Giordano, 78th Division (Training) information officer)

CAMP KILMER.—The 78th Division (Training), under the command of Maj. Gen. John G. Cassidy, of Nutley, that fought with honor in two world wars and is now an Army Reserve unit headquartered here, celebrates its Golden Jubilee on Wednesday, August 23.

To cap the events marking the 50th Anniversary of the proud division, the 1,200-member 78th Division Veterans Association will convene for a celebration at Fort Dix from August 25 to 27.

The division recently announced plans to locate a museum near the division's headquarters and, in the future, the 78th will obtain a permanent building at Fort Dix to house mementos of its long and glorious history.

The 78th was organized on August 23, 1917, at Camp Dix. Originally, its members were all from New Jersey, and the division—which eventually included soldiers from all parts of the nation—has continued to be identified with the Garden State.

The first division to be organized at Camp Dix in World War I, the 78th was also the first to leave the post for France. Constant, vigorous training under rigid discipline through one of the coldest winters on record made the 78th ready for battle when it landed overseas in May 1918.

The 78th was anxious to get into action, but it had to go through weeks of training with the First British Army behind the Arras front. The instruction ended September 14, when the division moved up and relieved the Second and Fifth divisions, taking over the Limey sector from Xammes to Juiney, near Thiaucourt.

The members of the 78th were to hold the line and keep the enemy engaged, but not to advance except locally. The chief object of the division there was shown September 26, the day the Allies started their drive in the Argonne. The 78th gave every sign of starting another bid offensive to distract the Germans from the threat in the Argonne.

The 78th was relieved on October 3 and sent on a forced march to the Argonne. It soon was known that the division was assigned to crack the nut which held Grandpre intact. The unit relieved the 79th Division and took over the line facing Grandpre October 15. Action began the next day. The division attached the enemy holding Champignuelles, the Bois des Loges, and Grandpre.

The soldiers faced one of the greatest concentrations of artillery that the Germans ever massed behind their lines. The earth rocked under the shock of a tremendous barrage as the 78th moved forward. Men fell on every side, but always moved forward.

An example of the spirit of the 78th was shown by a No. 1 machine-gunner. As he was hit, he called out: "No. 1, fall out!" and rolled away from his gun While No. 2 took his place, No. 1 rolled against a tree, lighted a cigarette, called out: "Give 'em hell, boys!" and died.

The 78th's "doughboys" got revenge on the enemy machine-gunners. They mopped up the gun crews and assaulted the Germans in the enemy trenches. Their own artillery, which had rejoined the division after serving the St. Mihiel sector, sought out the German artillery crews with salvo after salvo.

Gen. John J. Pershing inspected the division during the battle, and he found it facing its big job, the men keyed-up and everyone in a fighting mood. He left satisfied.

In serving as the "point of the wedge" for the final offensive of World War I, the division not only satisfied General Pershing, but all the forces that kept the Germans checkmated.

The division was demobilized on June 9, 1919, and was reconstituted as the 78th Division on June 24, 1921, in the Organized Reserves.

Redesignated the 78th Infantry Division on July 11, 1941, the unit was ordered into active military service on August 15, 1942, at Camp Butler, N.C. After first serving as a training division, the 78th participated in Second Army maneuvers in Tennessee during January 1944. In April, the division was moved to Camp Pickett, Va., for additional training.

The 78th entered combat December 11 to 13 near Roetgen, Germany. After withstanding the German winter offensive, the 78th advanced through Kesternich in January, 1945, capturing the Schwammenauel Dam and reservoir intact in February, as well as 1,500-ton ammunition dump near Flamersheim.

After elements of the 78th seized five bridges over the Ahr River, the unit joined the 9th Armored Division in a race to the Rhine River. A unit of the 78th was among the first to cross the Rhine over the Ramagen bridge—one of the key actions of the war.

During early April, the division participated in the attack on the Ruhr pocket, taking 50,000 prisoners of war and liberating 300,000 slave laborers. V–E Day found the 78th in the vicinity of Marbury, Germany. After some elements of the division had returned to the United States, the 78th was inactivated in Europe on May 22.

When the war ended, the 78th again had left its mark on American military history. The World War II honor roll for the 78th includes: 1 Medal of Honor, 9 Distinguished Service Crosses, 599 Silver Stars, 26 Legion of Merit Medals, 3,909 Bronze Stars, 5,453 Purple Hearts, 1 Distinguished Service Medal and 97 foreign decorations.

The division was activated in the Organized Reserves on Nov. 1, 1946, at Newark, N.J., and was redesignated and reorganized as HHC 78th Div. (Tng) on May 1, 1959.

The 78th, New Jersey's only Army Reserve Division, now has 3,200 members commanded by Maj. Gen. John G. Cassidy. He is continuing the division's tradition of excellence.

Last March, the 78th was presented 81 Secretary of the Army Supervisor Unit Awards for 1966, the most ever given a U.S. Army Reserve Division.

General Cassidy, named commander in 1964, follows a line of distinguished leaders. They are: Maj. Gen. James McRae, World War I; Maj. Gen. F. P. Parker, Jr., 1942–1946; Brig. Gen. Ernest H. Hawkwood, 1946–1953; Maj. Gen. H. Norman Schwarzkopf, 1953–1957; Maj. Gen. Henry G. Nulton, 1957–1960, and Maj. Gen. H. Russell Morss, Jr., 1960–1964.

At Camp Kilmer with General Cassidy of Nutley, are Brig. Gen. H. J. Rockafeller of Manasquan, and Col. David B. Kelly of South Amboy, assistant division commanders.

Regimental commanders for the division's six regiments are: Col. Howard A. Louderback of Trenton, commander of the 309th, Fourth Monmouth; Lt. Col. James L. Filler of Clifton, commander of the 310th, Lodi; Col. Joseph K. Wright of Upper Montclair, commander of the 311th, Morris Township; Col. Walter Lakusta of Lebanon, commander of the 312th, Kearney, Col. James S. Benson of Clifton, commander of the 78th, Nixon; and Maj. Carl Marggraff of Oradell, commandant of Special Troops at Camp Kilmer.

In the event of a general mobilization of the Army Reserve, the 78th would assume operational duties at a training center similar to Fort Dix.

Three of the division's regiments conduct basic combat training. The other two conduct combat support training and advanced individual training. Other units of the division are based in Trenton, Northfield, Runnemede, Camden and Caven Point.

Through five decades, the 78th has served with the distinction of its name—"lightning."

According to an historical account, the division's shoulder patch—a lightning bolt emblazoned on a field of bright red—brought the unit its bold nickname.

It seems that French generals, who respected the 78th's prowess in combat, said the patch was appropriate because the division "struck like a bolt of lightning leaving the battlefield red with blood."

OEO: The Quiet Revolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 23, 1967

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the quiet revolution is becoming far too noisy and is waking up American taxpayers who just can not adapt themselves to paying for a revolution to attack themselves.

I insert the Associated Press report of August 19 at this point in the RECORD:

TWO STATES OPEN FIRE: POVERTY WORKERS' CONDUCT ASSAILED

The Office of Economic Opportunity has come under new fire from two states—West Virginia and Kentucky—for the conduct of antipoverty workers.

West Virginia Gov. Hulett C. Smith said last night that federal authorities had agreed to a thorough investigation of alleged immoral and improper conduct by Appalachian Volunteers in his state.

And Kentucky Gov. Edward T. Breathitt announced that OEO will end its support of the Appalachian Volunteers program in his state by Sept. 1.

In Charleston, W. Va., Gov. Smith told a hurriedly called press conference that federal authorities will begin an "immediate and thorough investigation" starting Monday of alleged conduct by antipoverty volunteers.

He said "appropriate steps are going to be taken immediately to correct the situation" which he outlined in a letter to OEO director R. Sargent Shriver Aug. 14.

Smith made the announcement after meeting with a team of OEO officials.

The governor cited in the letter to Shriver a list of charges made against numerous individuals working in the Appalachian Volunteers program, which operates in conjunction with Volunteers in Service to America.

COMMUNIST LITERATURE FOUND

While VISTA is directly responsible to OEO, the Appalachian Volunteers program is a summer project under OEO contract with an organization located in Bristol, Tenn.

Among other things, Smith sent to Shriver what he said was evidence showing "immoral conduct" on the part of several VISTA-AV workers.

Smith said his complaints were against about 95 Appalachian volunteers sent to West Virginia, who are leaving the state next month at the end of the summer program.

Smith said he probably would not approve a similar VISTA–AV program in West Virginia next summer. He said OEO had not lived up to its guarantees that the workers would conduct themselves with propriety.

One of the incidents involved an AV staff member and two other antipoverty workers, not connected with VISTA, who have been arrested on sedition charges at Pikeville, Ky. The Pike County commonwealth's attorney said raids on the homes of Mr. and Mrs. Alan McSurley and Joseph Mulloy turned up Communist literature.

Gov. Breathitt, responding to a movement spurred by the Pike County case, announced yesterday that OEO will withdraw financial support of Appalachian Volunteers in Kentucky by Sept. 1.

The incidents and charges cited by Smith also included:

An all-night party on July 22 at Barcock State Park which allegedly involved a group of AV and VISTA personnel. Smith said the group destroyed park property, interfered with the exit and entrance of other park guests, tampered with automobiles and were "generally disturbing the peace."

Charges of immoral conduct by several volunteers in Wyoming County, which Smith said "seriously weakened" the effectiveness of the program.

Participation by five VISTA-AV workers from Raleigh County in a peaceful anti-Vietnam war protest on the lawn of the State Capitol. Smith said the workers drove a "clearly marked U.S. government car" to the demonstration.

Charges from State Sen. Carl E. Gainer that the Volunteers called for dismissal of several Nicholas County officials and school personnel.

Charges that they are teaching "ideas that are communistic."

Smith said he was assured when he renewed the contract that volunteers would be

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

more carefully screened to recruit persons of "greater maturity and judgment." He said several persons protested at the time because of "immorality, uncleanliness, unconventionality and personal obnoxiousness" by AV workers last summer.

NASHVILLE EVICTION SOUGHT

In Nashville, Tenn., the owners of a downtown building went to court in an effort to evict Nashville's embattled antipoverty agency from its eight-floor offices, and to collect $1,407 in back rent.

A hearing on the suit has been set in General Sessions Court Thursday.

William Davis, director of the Metropolitan Action Commission—the poverty agency—was not available immediately for comment.

MAC and the city administration have feuded periodically since the agency was founded. The antipoverty agency has come under renewed fire since Nashville Police Capt. John Sorace told Senate investigators two weeks ago that antipoverty funds were financing the controversial Liberation School, which he said taught young Negroes to hate whites.

Giantism in U.S. Industry Continues To Grow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 23, 1967

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the disturbing trend toward giantism and concentration of economic power in American industry continues. One of the notable developments in this area is the increasing use the Nation's larger corporations are making of conglomerate mergers to expand their holdings. Between 1950 and 1965, the share of total manufacturing assets held by 200 of the largest firms in the United States rose from 46.9 percent to 55.4 percent, the Washington Star reports, in an article by William Reddig, Jr. More than 45 percent of these assets were owned by the top 100 companies in the United States.

I include this perceptive article of Mr. Reddig in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The article follows:

[From the Sunday Star, Aug. 20, 1967]

ANTITRUST ENTERING "NEW ERA" OF BATTLING CONGLOMERATES—P. & G.-CLOROX CASE PROVIDES BASE FOR LAUNCHING MERGER SUITS

(By William M. Reddig, Jr.)

The federal government's modern-day trust busters, feeling that they have neutralized old monopoly moves, are preparing to meet new ones.

They are armed with the Supreme Court's landmark antitrust decision this year blocking the conglomerate merger of Procter & Gamble and the Clorox Chemical Co.

If the rules of law set down in this case can be made to fit other proposed mergers of conglomerates—companies with diverse lines of business under a single name and controlling management—it may bring a "new era" of antitrust actions and a slowdown for this merger method. For here is where the key antitrust agencies, the Justice Department and the Federal Trade Commission, have been hesitant to move because the legal territory has been uncharted.

FTC Commissioner Philip Elman told the American Bar Association at its meeting this month, "Clorox tells us what the right questions are that we must ask in examining a conglomerate merger—and this is a significant step forward in making the law effective in regard to such mergers."

MANY WAYS BLOCKED

The need for a regulatory approach on conglomerates is also reflected in an 88-page study of antitrust actions over the last 16 years just released by Willard F. Mueller, director of the FTC's Bureau of Economics.

Mueller finds that antitrust regulators have halted horizontal and vertical mergers which Justice and the FTC feel would be anticompetitive. A horizontal merger is one between competitors and a vertical merger is one with a supplier or a customer.

But he also says that, paradoxically, there has been a tremendous growth in the nation's top 200 companies, which often expand these days over the conglomerate route. During 1948–65 they made 2,692 acquisitions with assets of $21.5 billion.

Between 1950 and 1965, the share of total manufacturing assets held by the 200 largest firms in the United States rose from 46.9 percent to 55.4 percent. The top 100 companies have 45.4 percent of the assets. This "superconcentration" was accomplished as the economy broadened and the number of U.S. manufacturing firms increased by about 55,000 during the period.

VIEW DISPUTES GALBRAITH

Mueller, expressing his own opinion, thinks that an extension of present antitrust activity, rather than a reworking of the Sherman and Clayton antitrust acts, "may well result in an erosion of their position," and put a brake on bulging conglomerates.

He bases his thesis on past actions, in contrast to the recent claim of economist John Kenneth Galbraith that present antitrust policy is a "charade," designed "not to prevent exploitation of the public" but "to persuade people in general and American liberals in particular that the market is still extant." Galbraith feels the trust-busters mainly go after small companies engaged in horizontal mergers.

Mueller reports that the Federal Trade Commission and the Department of Justice have filed 205 merger complaints in the last 16 years, most of them against large firms. He makes his analysis over the period 1951–67, for in 1950 the Celler-Kefauver amendments tightened up Section 7 of the Clayton Antitrust Act under which most merger complaints have been entered.

A total of 11 of these cases made their way to the Supreme Court. The government has won them all.

AIM AT LARGE FIRMS

The FTC economist says that 70 percent of the complaints for manufacturing firms merging were filed against the 500 largest companies, each of which had assets of $100 million or more in 1966. Over half of the challenged mergers involved a horizontal relationship, 27 percent had to do with vertical mergers and the rest for conglomerate mergers.

Mueller believes that the deterrent effect of these prosecutions has been large, that businessmen and their antitrust lawyers watch them closely and make business decisions accordingly.

While horizontal mergers in 1951–54 involved 40 percent of the assets of large acquisitions, in 1966 the rate had fallen to 8 percent. Antitrust actions in the field were buttressed by the Supreme Court's Brown Shoe Co. decision of 1962 which found a violation when the combined market shares of the merging companies amounted to as little as 5 percent.

Mueller also finds a fall-off in vertical mergers. Mergers by what is called "market extension" in the dairying and food retailing field also have been slowed.

CONCENTRATION NEUTRALIZED

The result is a neutralizing effect, the economist finds, with no marked increase in concentration for manufacturing firms as a whole over the 16-year period. However, he discovered concentration in the consumer good industries went up, while it declined for producer goods companies.

Mueller says the Procter & Gamble-Clorox case, although limited in its scope because the products of the firms are not too unalike, "may have an important impact on the future course of the current merger movement in the consumer goods industries."

How then can a businessman know that his planned conglomerate merger is believed illegal under current antitrust law?

Elman, although noting the narrow scope of the Clorox case, laid down this general thesis to the nation's lawyers:

"Where a conglomerate merger is shown to alter the structure of the market of the acquired firm, by diminishing potential competition or by raising barriers to entry, such a change in market structure may justify a finding that the likelihood of anticompetitive behavior in that market has been substantially increased."

This seems to imply that economic studies are going to have a lot to do with whether the FTC finds a would-be conglomerate is trying to knock out all opposition, but also declares that the commission is not going to flinch from acting in this murky and complicated field.

Another Red Hoax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 23, 1967

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, as we know, the State Department continues to cooperate with the Communist propaganda line that the Soviet-imposed dictatorships of Eastern Europe are "mellowing." We have been exposed to barrages of this type of propaganda regarding Rumania. The noted international columnist, Dumitru Danielopol, who is a former Rumanian diplomat, has a special insight into the problems of that country ,and exposes this hoax in an article which appeared in the August 5, 1967, edition of the Elgin, Ill., Daily Courier-News.

The article follows:

INTERNATIONAL SCENE: ANOTHER RED HOAX

(By Dumitru Danielopol)

WASHINGTON.—Are we going to swallow another Communist hoax?

The police shake-up in Romania is being called by some Western observers as a step towards liberalization in that country.

In a speech accusing the security police of having developed "independent power beyond the control of the party," Red Boss Nicolae Ceausescu announced a major change.

He put the security police under a new Council of State Security of the Communist Party, which will supervise its activities.

"No citizen can be arrested," Ceausescu said, "without a proper case against him. . . . No activist or party member can be arrested without the approval of the party organs."

He called on the security system "to respect the legitimate right of citizens to voice criticism of government errors."

It sounds fine. Correspondents in Bucharest call this "the most significant development in recent years." Some conclude this means "wider guarantees to the citizenry."

Exile leaders and students of Communists laws scoff at such optimism.

They point out that every Communist constitution guarantees a wide range of rights and freedoms to its citizenry, but such rights and liberties exist only on paper. They are seldom implemented.

Jurist in Washington point out that the statement that no citizen can be arrested "without a proper case against him," leaves a wide loophole. Who pays what "a proper case" involves?

Technically the right to criticize government errors has always existed, they add.

Critics of the regime have unvariably found to their sorrow that they were severely prosecuted for any such criticism under the pretext that they were endangering "the security of the state."

Jurists stress that police shake-ups have been a feature in every Communist regime, from Jagoda to Beria in the USSR to Rankovic in Yugoslavia. No police "reform" has yet done anything to bring real freedom.

Even in Tito's Yugoslavia, so much ballyhooed for its alleged "liberalization," Mihajlo Mhiajlov is in prison simply because he attempted to print an opposition magazine—a right guaranteed by the Yugoslav Constitution. He, too, was accused of endangering the security of the State.

The real significance of the Romanian shake-up is a consolidation in power of Ceausecu's regime. It eliminates potential police opposition to his leadership.

The key is the rule which forbids the arrest without approval of party organs of "any party member." This insures that the police can never threaten Ceausescu and his regime.

With the police under his control, Ceausescu has now total power similar to that of Stalin.

"What difference does it make to the man in the street that the police is autonomous or under Party control?" said Constantine Visoianu, chairman of the exile Romania National Committee.

"The police is not there to protect the citizen, it is there to maintain the Party in power. As long as a citizen can be arrested and proescuted under the guise of "endangering the security of the state" he has no protection."

VISTA Volunteer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 23, 1967

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the House to an article that appeared in the Long Beach, Calif., Independent-Press-Telegram, on July 9, concerning the work of Mrs. Lillie Cooper, a VISTA volunteer from Orange, Calif.

Mrs. Cooper's story shows not only the success of VISTA's operations, but also that opportunities exist for older citizens to remain useful contributors to the welfare of their society. All that needs to be done is to make them aware of these opportunities and encourage them to utilize their capabilities in this manner, as Mrs. Cooper has done. The article follows:

A GRANDMOTHER FINDS NEW JOY IN LIFE—AS A VISTA VOLUNTEER

(By Betty Murphy)

One might think that a 68-year-old mother of nine children and grandmother of 20, who worked as a fashion consultant, dress fitter and sewing teacher for more than 30 years after her husband's death in 1932, would want to retire and relax for the rest of her years.

Not Mrs. Lillie Cooper. She tried retiring in 1963 and ended up keeping house for two daughters and two teen-age granddaughters in Costa Mesa. Two years later, she suddenly announced to her daughters: "I've a surprise for you—I've jointed VISTA."

Her decision didn't come about entirely because she was bored with cleaning the house, mowing the lawn and tending the gardens. "I like to keep house and I love my family," she says. "But I wanted to do something else, and not dress fitting. After working so many years with beautiful women and their expensive dresses, you wonder if there is anything else in the world besides clothes."

Mrs. Cooper had applied to the Peace Corps before she heard about VISTA (Volunteers in Service to America), but when she took her physical examination she was informed that she had a bad heart. Doubting this report, she consulted another doctor who said her heart was as sound as a 16-year-old's. The first doctor later informed her that his electro-cardiograph machine had been broken at the time of her exam, but by then she had decided to join VISTA instead of the Peace Corps.

In January 1966, following six weeks' training at the University of Oregon, Mrs. Cooper was assigned by the Northwest New Mexico Economic Opportunity Council to San Rafael, N.M., a community of about 900 Spanish-Americans 70 miles from Albuquerque. She arrived with pneumonia and was hospitalized for six days, but didn't let that, or the fact that she didn't speak a word of Spanish, deter her from her VISTA service.

When she got out of the hospital, she found a small vacant house on the San Rafael highway, the only sizable thoroughfare in the town. However, it had been unoccupied for so long that the window frames had warped, causing the glass panes to break, and the wind blew in drifts of sand in every room. Some were dunes several feet high. Mrs. Cooper's house cleaning days weren't over, after all.

She almost wished she was back in Costa Mesa after she and some helpful neighbors finished digging the sand out and found that the filthy floor was warped to a peak in the middle and the whole house dipped to one side. However, she decided "to lean with it" and scoured the house three times, found irregular-shaped glass panes for the warped windows and an old phone booth for a stall shower. "I spent one of the happiest years of my life in that house," she now maintains.

Some of her work in San Rafael was in community action—assisting in neighborhood improvement projects. She also tutored children, taught mothers home economy and created more work with her needle. Despite having given up her sewing career, she taught practically the whole town how to sew. She organized knitting and crocheting classes for many of the women and older girls, and even taught young boys how to sew buttons, mend shirts and darn socks.

Even though some of the residents didn't speak any English and Mrs. Cooper never learned very much Spanish, she didn't have any problems in communication. One of her most frequent visitors was going deaf and only spoke Spanish—"and we got along just fine," said Mrs. Cooper.

Mrs. Cooper, now serving her second year with VISTA in Wilcox, Ariz., left many friends in San Rafael and hopes someday to return and live the rest of her life there. The townspeople echo this wish. Six teenage boys in particular made sure she wouldn't forget them by crocheting her a magnificent afghan blanket for Christmas. They spent months on the job and would frequently work on squares while visiting Mrs. Cooper, pretending that the cover was "a gift for grandmother."

Mrs. Cooper was more fortunate with her living quarters in Wilcox than in San Rafael. Two days after she arrived on Feb. 9, she located an immaculate little white house eight blocks from the day care center where she is assigned by the Arizona Migrant Opportunity Program (MOP). All she had to do was plant grass, and a few flower gardens, build a birdbath and a rock and broken bottle garden, and decorate the three-room house with New Mexican treasures.

She walks the eight blocks every weekday to the day care center, where she looks after a group of about twenty 2- and 3-year-olds. Two of the three aides she works with and many of the children are Spanish-American and speak little English. Again, Mrs. Cooper has no problem communicating with them. "Where children are involved, you don't need a common language," she explains.

Her needle is getting plenty of work in Wilcox, too. She made 28 bibs for her day care babies out of an old shower curtain, and is finishing more than 100 sheets for their cribs. She also makes dresses for "the little girls who need them the most," and plans to teach a group of aides and migrant mothers how to sew.

"Sewing has been too much a part of my life not to use it," she says. She first learned to sew in her native Amarillo, Tex., from her mother, an expert seamstress who made clothes for her nine children. When she moved to Kingsville, Ont., with her Canadian husband, John Cooper, she made clothes for her nine children. Her husband died shortly after the birth of her youngest daughter and they both started school at the same time—the daughter in kindergarten and Mrs. Cooper in the Academy Sapho, a French dress designing school across the border in Detroit. She graduated in 1939 and moved the family to Detroit where she taught sewing and worked as a style consultant and fitter in fashion salons. She also sewed for several California dress shops before she "retired" four years ago.

Toward a Healthier Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. E. (BILL) BROCK

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 23, 1967

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, the August 7 issue of Newsweek magazine contained a most instructive article on fiscal responsibility and the Nation's economy by Milton Friedman. Because of recent administration proposals—notably the 10-percent surtax on income—which would have serious, and in the opinion of many experts, detrimental effect on the economy, I feel that this article is particularly valuable and timely, and include it in the Appendix of the RECORD:

FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY

For the twelve months ending June 30, 1967, the Federal government ran a deficit of about $10 billion. And this may be only a mild foretaste of things to come. On present projections, the current year's deficit is likely to be two or three times as large. What does fiscal responsibility call for in the face of these staggering deficits?

At first glance, the answer seems straightforward: restraint in spending and higher taxes. That is why there is a "Rising Consensus for a Tax Hike" (NEWSWEEK, July 24).

In my opinion, this is a shortsighted

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

answer: The deficit in the Federal budget is only a symptom of a more deep-seated malady: the size of government spending.

When the Administration urges higher taxes, it points to Vietnam as the source of the deficit. That is a half-truth. Of course, if military spending were lower—and other spending the same—the deficit would be smaller. But civilian spending too has been rising rapidly—as the Administration proudly proclaims when it seeks to calm the liberal critics of its Vietnam policy. And this rise has been reinforced by growing spending by state and local governments.

All in all, we work from Jan. 1 to nearly the end of April to furnish the wherewithal for government spending; only then can we turn to providing for our private needs.

TAXES AND SPENDING

This situation would be dangerous to our liberty even if we were getting our money's worth from present government spending. But there is scarce a man so rash as to say that we are. Most of us regard high military spending as a necessary evil. But even many proponents of big government are having second thoughts about numerous civilian programs—from the agricultural subsidies of the New Deal to the zooming welfare measures of the Great Society. Time and again, extravagant promises have been made that this or that expensive program will solve this or that social problem. And time and again, the result is that both costs and problems multiply.

But what relevance does this have to taxes? If we adopt such programs, does not fiscal responsibility at least call for imposing taxes to pay for them? The answer is that postwar experience has demonstrated two things. First, that Congress will spend whatever the tax system will raise—plus a little (and recently, a lot) more. Second, that, surprising as it seems, it has proved difficult to get taxes down once they are raised. The special interests created by government spending have proved more potent than the general interest in tax reduction.

If taxes are raised in order to keep down the deficit, the result is likely to be a higher norm for government spending. Deficits will again mount and the process will be repeated.

If government spending can be restrained, growth in the economy will, at present tax rates, add enough to revenues in a few years to eliminate the deficit and even to permit tax reduction. This is a big if. But let taxes be raised and there is no if about it at all. The deficits can be temporary; higher taxes are almost certain to be permanent.

DEFICITS AND INFLATION

If we do not cut spending and do not raise taxes, will not the large interim deficits produce severe inflation?

Deficits have often been connected with inflation, but they need not be. Deficits were large in 1931 and 1932 when prices were falling drastically. There was a surplus in 1919–20 when prices were rising rapidly. Whether deficits produce inflation depends on how they are financed. If, as so often happens, they are financed by creating money, they unquestionably do produce inflationary pressure. If they are financed by borrowing from the public, at whatever interest rates are necessary, they may still exert some minor inflationary pressure. However, their major effect will be to make interest rates higher than they would otherwise be. A short spell of high interest rates is vastly to be preferred to a long spell of high taxes.

Those of us who believe that government has reached a size at which it threatens to become our master rather than our servant should therefore (1) oppose any tax increase; (2) press for expenditure cuts; (3) accept large deficits as the lesser of evils; (4) favor the financing of these deficits by borrowing from the public rather than by undue creation of money; and (5) urge the elimination of artificial ceilings on the rate of interest at which the government may borrow in order to foster this objective.

In the long view, that is the course of true fiscal responsibility.

Nobody Paid My Way—I Worked Because I Wanted an Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES RAPER JONAS
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 23, 1967

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I include an article that appeared in the August 4 issue of the Richmond County Journal, a newspaper published in Rockingham, N.C., in the district which I have the honor of representing here in Congress. This article discloses how a young Negro boy of poor but respectable and Christian parentage, without money, scholarship, loan, or other outside help, worked his way through college and made good in his chosen field of activity.

This young Negro boy is now Maj. Booker T. McManus, and recently he came back to Richmond County to visit relatives and friends. It was while he was there on that visit that he was interviewed by a reporter of the Richmond County Journal. The story of how Maj. Booker T. McManus pulled himself up by his own bootstraps should be an inspiration to the youth of our country, white as well as Negro, and I am pleased to include that story as a part of my remarks. I wish to invite attention particularly to Major McManus' words of advice to the youth of our land as contained in the closing paragraph of the attached article. The article follows:

NOBODY PAID MY WAY, I WORKED BECAUSE I WANTED AN EDUCATION

(By Reese Dutton)

A 1950 Capitol Highway High School graduate from Hamlet came home this week to visit after a 17-year absence, a trip around the world, with a gleam in his eye that lets you know that he is on his way to the pinnacle of success.

He is Major Booker T. McManus of the U.S. Army from where he has earned the rank of major from 2nd lieutenant in 12 short years after graduating from the Virginia State College in Petersburg, Va.

Major McManus who has numerous family connections in the area, including his sister, Zulee M. Samuels (a professional dressmaker) of Hunter Circle in Rockingham, said in an interview that he was still in love with the sand around Rockingham and Hamlet and that it was basically the same grit that he ran errands in for his late father and learned to work—the secret of being able to get somewhere in the world.

The major proudly speaks of his family and the sacrifice they made in his climb to his professional status and shows extraordinary devotion for his mother, Mrs. Janie B. McManus (who is 67-years young) of Hamlet, and his five brothers and two sisters that have made it quite well in their respective professions.

Major McManus was reluctant to discuss the family background but his sister, Zulee, chimed in and said, "there is only one in the family that smokes, we were raised by the 'Golden Rule' and the highest of morals—sure we are proud of our heritage . . . it is not a tradition but the only way of life and not one of those rules would we care to change."

Lending a voice to the McManus family faith, the major said, "our father was the Rev. B. F. McManus, a Missionary Baptist preacher that lived and walked by the gospel he preached, and died by the truth in the Holy Bible that has inspired us all down through the years."

The towering, six-feet-four soldier, went on to say that he had deep religious convictions that the service of his country, or his surroundings, have been unable to change. "When a boy or girl comes home from any branch of the service and uses his past experiences as an alibi to his trifleness and excessive indulgence of one's sensual desires, they are simply using it as a crutch or fig leaf garment which clearly exposes their intent from within which could date back to childhood environment and not from the habitat from whence they came," the major said boastfully.

The 35-year-old major worked his way through college where his wife now teaches and where they make their home with two children in Petersburg. He has a trained baritone voice that is detectable in his speech that began as a student in the junior choir at his church in Hamlet and echoed around the world in service choruses.

He has been in and out of school in the Army since his graduation from Virginia to France via Korea and has had honors bestowed upon him for performances while in command of various units around the world that include personal salutations from generals to heads of state.

He wears the Army Commendation Medal, the Senior Parachutist Badge (over 60 jumps), and is presently being recommended for the Legion of Merit Award.

Where is he going from here? Back to school as a Quartermaster instructor for supply depot personnel around the world.

He had a few parting words for the youth of today that have apparently become so restless and despondent. They were spoken by the major as follows: "Select a goal worthy to work toward, develop a self fit to live with, select and practice a Christian faith sufficient to live and die by, a philosophy of life that's meaningful, and last but certainly not least—don't become a puppet to the vocals."

Seventy Percent of Our People Crowded Into 1 Percent of the Land: Demographic Collision of Man and Environment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 23, 1967

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, one of the most obvious needs of our time is to slow the outmigration of population from small towns and rural areas to our already overcrowded and congested big cities.

In this connection the Washington Post in an editorial on August 13 last outlined the dangers of the "Demographic Collision"—the conflict between man in the city and his environment.

The editorial commends a speech made by Secretary Orville Freeman of the Department of Agriculture who has been preaching the gospel of rural and smalltown development from coast to coast.

Because of the interest of my colleagues and the American people generally in this most important subject, I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be reprinted in the Appendix of the Record, along with a commentary by Eric Wentworth in the same issue of the Washington Post on the relationship of rural and urban problems.

The articles follow:

Demographic Collision

A little-noticed speech by Secretary Freeman the other day to the National League of Cities contains what may well prove to be, in the long reach of our national evolution, the wisest words yet spoken on our current malaise. Mr. Freeman sees the violence of recent weeks as a collision of man with his environment. Its origin runs back at least 50 years when millions of young men in rural America were uprooted by World War I. They began what Mr. Freeman calls "the 50-year march to the cities" which has now produced so much misery, disillusionment and violence.

While this great migration has been taking place the country has given far too little thought to it. Nearly 600,000 persons a year have been flowing into the cities, most of them displaced from the countryside, as Secretary Freeman acknowledges, by the revolution in agricultural technology. They have gone to the cities in search of a better life, but what they have usually found has been poverty, slums and only the dregs of urban living. In a very real sense they are refugees from a rapidly changing economy.

The result is that 70 per cent of our people are jammed into 1 per cent of our land—the 1 per cent that is largely covered by macadam, houses, factories and places of business. Many have found jobs but largely of the low-income varieties because the newcomers usually lack the skills that most industrial employment requires. So the glamor of the city that once lured them fades into the sodden dullness of ghettos, smog and social decay.

For some years the country has been vaguely aware of this demographic revolution but has done very little about it. Further concentration of people has seemed inevitable. But what will happen if this trend is allowed to run its course until the turn of the century when the country will have another 100 million persons to house and to absorb into its social structure? Will they, too, be crowded into our five vast strip cities?

It is this prospect of "an airless, waterless, joyless—and perhaps hopeless—existence" in a metamegalopolis of the year 2000 that frightens Secretary Freeman. And so he has pointedly raised the basic question: "Should we try to check the accelerated movement of people from country to city?"

Six members of the Cabinet are sponsoring a symposium designed to bring together "the best minds in the world" to discuss this problem in Washington next December. As for Mr. Freeman, he has already committed himself to pursuit of an urban-rural balance that will save the cities from destroying themselves. He is not of course recommending that the rural refugees be sent back to the farm where they have been displaced by machinery. But he does see a brighter future for the rootless millions in towns and small cities where industrial jobs can be provided without the high costs, the congestion and the social overheating that have become so common in the large cities.

The Secretary suggests giving "a high investment priority to building up opportunity in rural America" and points to what some small cities have accomplished. But the chief significance of his speech does not lie in any specific recommendations. Rather, it is to be found in his impressive call for a change of direction. It is not necessary for this rich, resourceful and powerful country to strangle itself in its own congestion. The warning signals that have been sounded in one large city after another should set the whole country to thinking about ways and means of getting off this collision course with our environment.

Freeman Concocts a Cure: Agriculture Secretary Links City Problems With Those of Country Cousins

(By Eric Wentworth)

Among the physicians prescribing salves, ointments, lotions or pills to ease America's outbreak of angry urban sores is Orville L. Freeman, the irrepressible Secretary of Agriculture.

Freeman, by the nature of his job, is a specialist and seeks equal billing for his specialty in whatever treatments are undertaken.

"The ills of the city," he argues in the wake of violence in Newark, Detroit and other urban areas, "can never be cured in the city alone. It will take action in both rural America and the cities."

The Freeman diagnosis takes note of two linked problems which he describes, in jargon befitting a medical professional, as "rural depopulation and urban impaction."

He says that between 500,000 and 600,000 people are quitting the countryside each year and moving to the cities. They add to the burdens on municipal services and many incur new burdens and frustrations of their own.

To Freeman, it's "a tragic waste of human lives and of land" that more than seven of every ten Americans are jammed onto only one per cent of the Nation's real estate.

The country-to-city migration has been going on for decades, and the results are visible not only in crowded urban slums but in countless rural communities that are gradually becoming ghost towns with stores boarded up and grass growing through neglected sidewalks.

Probably the main cause is lack of opportunity in the countryside, both for those who can find no jobs and those for whom the available jobs prove unrewarding.

Not only the rural poor, many of them Southern Negroes, are moving to the cities; better-off young people, potential community leaders, also join the parade in quest of greater challenge.

Farming's technological revolution, which the Federal Government has helped foster, is forcing millions off the land. For example, cotton pickers and other machines have slashed the need for harvest labor on Mississippi Delta farms from 750,000 man-days to 95,000 man-days in a mere six years, Freeman reports. (Production cutbacks to work down a huge cotton surplus presumably figure here, too.)

The President's National Advisory Commission on Food and Fiber recently reckoned that only one farm boy in ten can hope to become a commercial farmer. The Commission added that no matter how much food the Nation's farms are called on to produce, farm labor needs will decline by another one third by 1980.

Meanwhile, rural America is lagging on other fronts: roads, schools, housing, health care.

While much has been written about the plights of Indians, Mississippi's hungry sharecroppers and Appalachia's jobless ex-coal miners, rarely if ever do the afflictions of rural America approach the drama of recent ghetto violence. But there are real problems nevertheless.

The National Farmers Organization staged a milk strike earlier this year to call attention to the dairy farmers' profit pinch.

In June, a band of Spanish-Americans raided a county courthouse in northern New Mexico. Those who peered behind the incident glimpsed sorry living conditions in that area's remote mountain hamlets.

Though Freeman repeatedly calls attention to the needs of country folk—and sometimes is criticized for failing to do more for them—rural America has relatively few champions in Washington and is gradually losing whatever political clout it once enjoyed on Capitol Hill.

A study by Congressional Quarterly showed 212 "rural" (by one definition) House seats out of a total of 435 in the 1961–62 Congress, trimmed by redistricting to 203 seats in the Congress that followed. Continuing shrinkage is in the cards.

The human tide flowing into the cities cannot be reversed, but if Freeman has his way it can at least be slowed.

His prescription for urban sickness involves a "national policy of urban-rural balance." It's vague concept at best, but Freeman uses it to stress the links between depressing conditions in the countryside and the frustrating and at times traumatic results when millions of ex-rural dwellers "pile up" in crowded cities.

He has announced, to promote this idea, a December symposium of planners, sociologists, economists and other experts in Washington as "a first infant step toward charting a national course for our people and their land."

To be sure, rural problems have been studied and restudied over the years. Development plans have been drawn and redrawn.

Washington has managed to produce (by one count) 197 programs that promise aid to rural areas. And yet, funding falls far short of needs.

While there have been "rural renaissance" success stories in some communities where local leaders pitch in and have a knack for Federal "grantsmanship," there have also been confusion and disappointment elsewhere when hoped-for Government dollars weren't forthcoming.

The Freeman prescription calls for setting a higher national priority on Government investments in rural areas, to improve public services and facilities, to help create more jobs and generally to make the countryside a more inviting alternative to city life.

National Aeronautics and Space Administration Appropriation Bill, 1968

SPEECH

OF

HON. BOB ECKHARDT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 22, 1967

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 12474) making appropriations for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes.

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York to cut the NASA budget by an additional $100 million. Adoption of such an amendment would deal our space program a wound from which it would be hard to recover.

As a matter of fact, the reduction of the NASA authorization by the Appropriations Committee is a matter of regret to me, but all our actions in this Congress are affected by the long shadow of Vietnam. Our Committee on Science and Astronautics made an extremely careful review of all of the projects in the Nation's space program during the authorization hearings held over a period of many weeks, beginning in February of the current session of Congress. Three standing

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

subcommittees of the Science and Astronautics Committee met simultaneously virtually every day of the week during that period. In my opinion, our committee extensively pruned the space agency's budget request, but with discernment.

The Appropriations Committee was, I think, not quite so discerning. But I am satisfied that it has done an honest job with respect to the bill before the House today, and I intend to vote for that bill, however reluctantly.

Reluctantly because I fear that a reduction of a half-billion dollars in NASA's budget for this fiscal year will ultimately result in a loss of momentum in the Nation's space program, and may even jeopardize America's supremacy in space exploration. I would remind the Members of the House that it took America 10 years to develop our present capability whereby we can now make claim to leadership in space in many fields.

I am satisfied that in the long view of history the American space effort will prove to be one of the most significant undertakings of our generation. Fiscal year 1968 may be remembered as the nadir in this important program's course of development.

I look hopefully to the time when the long shadow of Vietnam is lifted, permitting a reversal of the current trend in the funding of America's space program, so that NASA's activities may again move on apace.

Tshombe Return to Congo Would Be Travesty of Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 23, 1967

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, columnist Michael Ward, in an article which appeared in the August 10 edition of the La Grange Park, Ill., Suburban Life, very effectively discussed the kidnaping of former Premier Moise Tshombe.

The article follows:

Tshombe Return to Congo Would Be Travesty of Law

(By Michael Ward)

It would be a travesty of justice and a mockery of international law if Algeria hands over former Premier Moise Tshombe to the Congolese government and certain death.

Tshombe, one of Africa's most stable leaders, was preparing the Congo for national elections in October, 1965, when he was thrown out of office by President Kasavuba. This action was followed by a coup by Gen. Mogutu, the present Congolese ruler.

Tshombe sought and received asylum in Spain. Mobutu had a military court sentence him to death in absentia last March. The charges were high treason, subversive propaganda, inciting and organizing rebellion and recruiting foreign mercenaries to be used against Mobutu.

Reliable sources have stated that the court, which reached the death sentence in a matter of minutes, was comprised of Mobutu's relatives.

On June 30, Tshombe was aboard a chartered British jet bound for Palma de Majorca when armed kidnappers diverted the aircraft to Algeria.

The Algerian government has aided and abetted this act of piracy and kidnapping by imprisoning Tshombe against his will. The Congolese government has asked Algeria to extradite the former Premier.

Algeria has said that it will do so although, at this writing, Tshombe is still being held by the Algerian government, which has no extradition treaty or diplomatic relations with the Congo.

A Chicago lawyer, Luis Kutner, who is representing Tshombe in this case, does not think his client will be extradited.

"Unless Algeria says to the world that it is lawless," he said, "Tshombe will not, in my opinion, be turned over to Congolese authorities."

To prevent such a move, Kutner has filed a petition of world habeas corpus before the United Nations Commission on Human Rights and with the U.N. High Commissioner for Refugees.

Kutner, the originator of the world habeas corpus procedure and long involved in the struggle for the rule of law to prevail in international disputes, pointed out that his petition already has the support of 65 chief justices and leading bar associations throughout the world.

"Even the Russians have not objected to it," he said.

Although Algeria has given no reason for its illegal action, Kutner believes Tshombe is being used as a bargaining power in international politics.

"Israeli advisers have been working in the Congo for years," he declared. "It appears that Algeria, which supported Nasser in the recent Israeli-Arab conflict, wants the Congo to turn against Israel."

Tshombe has been a good friend of the West and the type of leader Africa needs; he wants to build up his country, not tear it down as too many African leaders are already doing.

If Algeria and the Congo get away with this outrage, then no citizen of any nation can be sure of traveling in safety.

Poverty: A Cause or Effect

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 23, 1967

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, a different view on poverty is advanced by a special analysis from the Freedom magazine for July–August, which I insert for our colleagues to review, as follows:

Fighting Poverty Sensibly

Everyone knows that poverty abounds in the slum areas of our great cities. And everyone should know that slum conditions provide the breeding ground for instigators of violent insurrection. If the slums could be transformed into affluent neighborhoods with everyone working productively, troublemakers who parade under the banner of "nonviolence" would have to become self-supporting.

Why not take a look at some of the factors which *produce* poverty? Who lives in slums? Those whose incomes (usually welfare) preclude their living anywhere else. Why are they on welfare? Because many of them are "marginal" workers who exceed the number of "marginal jobs" available. Why have the number of "marginal jobs" not kept pace with the number of workers in the labor market? Because the decline in overall American purchasing power has decreased the demand for consumer goods and services. Stiffer competition among business firms forces lowered costs of operation.

Why has overall American purchasing power declined? Because more than a third of the average family income now goes for taxes at all levels of government. The money paid out in taxes cannot also be spent for goods and services. When consumer buying slacks off, production follows the pattern and employment must suffer also. Thus it can be seen that taxation is the natural enemy of a prosperous private economy, and must be held in check to cover only the essential functions of governing.

For the purpose of this discussion, let's give the federal government the benefit of the doubt and assume it wants to eliminate poverty in the slums. Can lavish outlays of "federal money" do what is desired? Even when portions of such money are directed to "job-creating" programs? The answer is an unequivocal no, because the millions of dollars of "federal money" can only consist of money that has been taxed away from *job-creating* purchasing power that had existed prior to the tax-bite. Artificial creation of jobs through political manipulation and subsidization by the taxpayers is literally worthless because the tax-drain on the general public lessens the market for goods produced by workers in the artificially-created jobs.

The "liberal," who cannot (or refuses to) see the relationship between cause and effect and thinks only in terms of immediacies, accuses the "conservative" of having no answers to "social problems." In view of the basic premises which have been stated here, our "answer" to *any* social problem would be to remove the self-gaining art of politics from the natural science of economics as thoroughly and quickly as possible. Once this sacred cow is removed from the tracks, the prosperity train can resume its forward journey to the lasting benefit of every American regardless of race or national origin. The *degree* of prosperity enjoyed by each individual would be dependent upon many factors including ambition and training; but the overall economic environment will be vastly improved for all when the politicians and ivory-tower theorists are forced to stop their damaging intervention into matters that are outside their areas of competency.

Time To Stop Being Nicey-Nice About Riots

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 23, 1967

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, considerable attention has been extended the subject of riots in our various news media, and while much thought has been centered on the causes and cures of these riots, little has been done to point up the distress these riots have visited upon an innocent party, the general public.

James J. Kilpatrick has written an interesting article on this aspect and it appears in the August 22 issue of the Evening Star. Because of the article's timely nature, I am inserting it into the Congressional Record and directing it to the attention of my colleagues. The article follows:

Time To Stop Being "Nicey-Nice" About Riots

The thought occurs, and can no longer be repressed, that it's time for some of us who write for a living to stop writing so nicey-nice about this summer's riots and the Negro leadership. This is a summer of outrage, scored for kettle drums of violence; but such as our sense of genteel restraint that most of us have been playing our typewriters pianissimo. We have settled for murmuring my-my and oh-oh, and they certainly do have grievances, don't they.

Well, nuts. There comes a time when the law-abiding majority of this country, imperfect as it is, ought to put a hard question to large elements of the Negro community: When in the name of God are you people going to shape up?

One is tempted to exempt from the thrust of that question many thousands of Negro citizens who have played no active part in the recent violence and indeed have been victims of it. They can't be left out. Who has given santuary to the Negro snipers? Fellow Negroes. They share in the guilt.

What's the matter with the Negro leadership? Since the first torch was put to Newark, one has waited—and waited in vain—for some high-level expression of shame, apology, contrition. Non est. Perhaps nothing was to be expected from H. Rap Brown; his theme is "Get you some guns and burn this town down." The sullen Stokely Carmichael yearns "to kill the whites first." But what of Roy Wilkins, Whitney Young, the Rev. Martin Luther King? They are full of excuses, and in King's case, something more. It's all the fault, says the reverend doctor, of "the policy-makers of white society." He proposes massive strikes and sit-ins to "dislocate" the cities without actually destroying them. He will do this "lovingly."

At every hand, the cry goes up for crash spending programs in the slums. Michigan's Rep. John Conyers wants $30 billion a year. Most of the money would go toward jobs and housing. The New Republic magazine tells us what kind of jobs—not merely jobs for "black waiters, dishwashers and busboys, but jobs that will restore Negro self-respect."

What's wrong with being a waiter, a dishwasher, or a busboy, if one qualifies for the work? Hundreds of thousands of white men and women perform these humble but essential labors. What's the matter with a teen-ager's starting as a bootblack? It's an honest trade—but Washington barbers are desperate for bootblacks. No colored boys apply.

And what of "jobs that will restore Negro self-respect"? From one end of the country to the other, employers increasingly are searching for Negroes as sales clerks, bank tellers, draftsmen, technicians. They may not be overcome with altruism; it may be only the Equal Employment Opportunities Commission breathing down their necks. But the jobs are there. Where are qualified Negro applicants to fill them?

The excuse is that the "ghetto schools" are so bad, and the Negro teen-agers so "insufficently motivated," that they drop out. It's a feeble excuse. Many a middle-aged American looks at some of these "ghetto schools" and is dimly reminded of the elementary schools of his own unfar nonage. Others recall the pot-stove schoolhouses of the country. The opportunity for an education lies within them. What's asked of the Negro? Ambition. Hard work.

But it is said that the typical Negro has no reason for ambition. He is ground down by three centuries of oppression; he supposes that society owes him back pay at time and a half for 300 years. It won't wash. The typical Negro under discussion isn't 300 years old; he's maybe 15 to 19 years old, and he's living in a generation that is light-years removed from the 17th Century. He has more than most other minorities have had: A fighting chance in a prosperous land.

The cry is that "ghetto housing" is so bad. Okay. Some of it is awful. Some of it is not. But there are twice as many poor whites as poor blacks; the poor colored neighborhoods of Watts and Detroit have their counterparts—and their rats—in poor white neighborhoods across the land. The blunt truth is that self-help could cure at least a part of the ills. If some of Jesse Gray's complainers would spend more time with a dollar rake or a 50-cent broom, and less time with a two-dollar pint of gin, maybe a sense of mutual respect would start to grow. Heresy, one supposes, to say such things. But they need to be said.

An Editorial Directed to President Lyndon B. Johnson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL C. JONES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 23, 1967

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I have requested permission to have printed in the Appendix, copy of "An Editorial to President Lyndon B. Johnson," written by Jack Stapleton, Jr., publisher of the Daily Dunklin Democrat, which also publishes a weekend edition, known as the Missouri Weekly, one of the most widely quoted rural newspapers in Missouri, believing that this editorial expresses so well what I believe to be the thinking of a majority of the people in this 10th District of Missouri. It is my understanding that a copy of this editorial is being furnished the President by one of our Senators, and it is my fervent hope that the President will at least be permitted to know what many of the people in this Nation are thinking today, as so well expressed by Mr. Stapleton.

I realize, Mr. Speaker, that the President does not have the time to read all of the articles that are mailed to the White House, but at times I am inclined to believe that some of his advisers and secretaries try to insulate and isolate the President from the views of the public, to the extent he may be misinformed on occasions.

I cannot help but recall, Mr. Speaker, on one of those rare opportunities that I had to talk with the President, a year ago last February, when the members of the Missouri delegation were guests on the President's plane on a visit with President Truman at Independence, Mo., I remarked that no one had been able to explain to my satisfaction why we observed so many sanctuaries in North Vietnam which were off limits to our bombers. I was surprised then when I was informed in no uncertain terms that "there are no sanctuaries." And I well remember when about 6 months later our bombers began making strikes at what had previously been off limits, and from time to time the ban has been further lifted.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with the general philosophy of Mr. Stapleton's letter to the President, and would like to know that someone in authority, either the President himself, or one of his trusted advisers, has at least considered some of these suggestions set forth in the following editorial:

AN EDITORIAL TO PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON

HON. LYNDON BAINES JOHNSON,
President, United States of America,
White House, 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: First of all, let us both acknowledge that it is presumptuous for a small-city newspaper editorial to outline for you any degree of conduct this nation should be following in waging a war in a remote Southeast Asian nation known as South Vietnam. Our sources of information, while some are the same, are varied, and you have access to much more classified information than do our offices. You are, therefore, much better informed about the military strength of the enemy, our own field army capabilities, our firepower and other critical points than are we.

Acknowledging this, however, let us start with some very basic points about a war that has now been in progress since 1960, and has actively engaged a large number of our armed forces for the past three years.

1. Point No. 1 is the recognition that the United States is in Vietnam not to protect any costly investments, for we have few save for dead American heroes; we are not in Vietnam to protect colonial interests, as were the French, nor are we seeking additional land, as were the Chinese before the French. We have established a political and military beach-head in Vietnam to stem communist aggression, committed both by North Vietnam and by communist irregulars in South Vietnam. We believe citizens in Southeast Asia deserve as much protection from communist aggression as do the peoples of Europe, although most Americans are more firmly committed to the latter principle than the former.

2. In addition to seeking freedom for the South Vietnamese, and a resultant establishment of a free government in Saigon, we are committed, along with our military troops there, to finding a suitable and satisfactory peace solution to a nation that has been tormetned and divided for too long. The entire force of the U.S. government now stands behind the principle that a just and honorable peace is not only desirable, but essential, and should be concluded at the earliest possible moment.

With these two principles established, let us examine, briefly, some of the facts in Vietnam that affect these principles at the moment.

First, we are not winning the war in South Vietnam at the moment; perhaps we have never been militarily ahead of the communists and most certainly we have never been politically ahead of the National Liberation Front, the Viet Cong.

Secondly, despite the continued escalation of troops and military equipment, we face the danger of being bogged down to a point that some military experts believe the war may last for 10 years or more. Quite frankly, we do not share this view, simply for the reason we do not believe Americans will support a 10-year war in a nation such as South Vietnam.

Thirdly, the national pulse at the moment seems to beat stronger for air escalation in North Vietnam, while a weaker pulse beats for withdrawal, immediate ending of bombing in the north, and several other lesser valid proposals for peace. At the moment, the strategy has been to bomb military areas in the north that generally are removed from high population areas; this plan has drawn fine from a good many Americans many of whom do not believe we are fighting to the best of our ability and a smaller number of whom believe we are playing footsy with the communists in the North despite a 50 per cent increase in casualties in the last year.

It has taken all of this to bring us to our proposal to you, the leader of the free world.

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

For we propose a change in the present U.S. policy embodying these points:

1. A recognition that we must win in South Vietnam, having already committed the lives of 15,000 Americans and signed agreements to defend those who feel the heel of transgressors.

2. A recognition that the present policy, while perhaps producing a victory in 10 years, will not end the war within the foreseeable future without a change in the thinking of the leaders in Hanoi, who believe they are winning the war and over a period of time will sap the strength of the world's greatest military power.

3. A recognition that the U.S. is the greatest military power in the world and should not be hampered by restrictions which serve to hamper this power and decrease the effectiveness of our armed forces.

We, therefore, propose that the government of the United States, in an effort to preserve the freedom of those who have been violated and reduce American casualties to the lowest possible point, begin a pursuit of the war that has for its sole purpose total victory in the shortest period of time, utilizing every weapon in the American arsenal that is capable of defeating the enemy.

We are not suggesting that this full commitment of the American arsenal be undertaken immediately. First of all, the change in policy should be transmitted to the enemy by all possible means, with the knowledge that Ho Chi Minh and those around him fully comprehend the change in policy.

Then, we propose that the United States begin a step-by-step escalation of the war that includes not only major ground force movements against the enemy in the north but a full-scale, round-the-clock bombing of all, and we repeat all, strategic areas in North Vietnam, without regard to consequences.

This would be done, as noted above, on a step-by-step basis, so that the enemy would be fully aware of what was being planned and what was to be executed.

This step-by-step escalation would be accompanied by our nation's full honor to halt these military activities at any point at which Hanoi agrees to go to the peace table, but with the warning that our nation will not be blackmailed into accepting armistices or truces that are not valid and meaningful.

So that there will be no misunderstanding of what we are proposing, let us outline in a general way the type of step-by-step escalation of the war against the enemy that we suggest. The initial phase might well be a removal of several heretofore off-limit targets in North Vietnam, targets that have not been hit as yet because of the potential repercussions, military or political or diplomatic. A second phase might well be bombing ports of entry into North Vietnam which would, in effect, seal off the north from aid from both communist China and communist Russia, neither of whom will seek to conclude a peace in Vietnam as long as we pursue our present policies which serve to commit more than one-half million Americans in a small, isolated nation.

So that we will not be further misunderstood, let us state that if the above-mentioned steps do not bring the enemy to the peace table, then more overt military action should be undertaken. Certainly, at least one consideration should be a declaration of war against North Vietnam and an invasion of that country across the DMZ.

The peaceniks would call this proposal war-like.

They are right, in at least one sense.

We are committed to war in Vietnam at this moment, and Americans are dying at this moment, under a policy that we believe will never win the war. Are these Americans to be sacrificed to a policy that has one eye toward winning and one eye toward containment?

The peaceniks want us to stop military operations to bring the enemy to the peace table. This does not work; it only permits the enemy to renew his strength and his material.

We want the U.S. to fight a war it is committted to fight in the best possible manner and in a manner in which we are capable. We believe a step-by-step escalation of the war will convince Ho Chi Minh that we are not about to abandon the principle of freedom in Vietnam and that he has no course, if he wishes to save his nation, but the one leading him to the peace table.

The step-by-step escalation permits the enemy to say at any time: We are ready to talk peace with you. It also gives him the reason for doing so.

We believe this is the only way to convince men hardened by war that we mean to win in Vietnam and establish the principle of self-determination.

Whether the war is won or lost depends, in great measure, upon you, Mr. President, and the policies you pursue in the months ahead. We respectfully suggest your consideration of this proposal, acknowledging that it holds both danger and the need for refinement. But we believe the principle to be sound; we believe it offers an answer to the war in Vietnam that is worthy of your consideration and, hopefully, your adoption.

We apologize for the length of this editorial; we recognize it is too long to meet journalistic standards of brevity. But it is short in comparison to the ultimate time we will spend fighting in Vietnam under the policies now being pursued.

Respectfully submitted.

The Editors,
Missouri Weekly/The Daily Dunklin Democrat.

Attack on Public Assistance Marked by Distortions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. McFALL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 23, 1967

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks it has become more and more apparent that a concerted political attack is being mounted throughout the Nation, aimed at long-needed improvements to the public assistance program which have been established by Democratic Congresses and Democratic administrations.

Evidence of this effort crystallized on the floor of the House last week during consideration of the Social Security Amendments of 1967.

When an article in the U.S. News & World Report issue of June 17 came to my attention, shortly before the social security bill was due for consideration by the House, I felt it was necessary to request comment from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare concerning certain statements and statistics used by the magazine in a blanket denunciation of the public assistance program.

I contacted Under Secretary Wilbur J. Cohen, requesting that a complete study of the article be conducted and that I be provided with detailed information in an effort to correct misstatements which were presented by the magazine.

I have now received a response from Under Secretary Cohen, together with a report prepared by the Department on the statistics, examples, and the success-failure standard used in the article entitled "After 30 Years—Relief a Failure?"

Following is Under Secretary Cohen's letter to me of August 17, and the analysis which I had requested:

Under Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare,
Washington, D.C., August 17, 1967.

Hon. John J. McFall,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. McFall: In your letter of July 18, 1967, you requested that a study be conducted of the U.S. News & World Report article of July 17, entitled "After 30 Years—Relief a Failure?"

In response to your request, an analysis of this article has been prepared. This analysis, which I am enclosing, will provide you with the detailed information you desire.

If there should be any additional information you want, please do not hesitate to request it.

Sincerely yours,

Wilbur J. Cohen,
Under Secretary.

A Response to Data Used in "After 30 Years—Relief a Failure?" U.S. News & World Report, July 17, 1967

This report will examine the statistics, the examples, and the success—failure standard used in the article entitled "After 30 Years—Relief a Failure?" More representative and more meaningful data will be presented.

STATISTICS

Serious questions can be raised about the validity or meaningfulness of the statistics used in this article. In most cases these statistics present only part of the relevant information. For example, many observers believe that the difference between the number of public assistance recipients in any two given years is not very meaningful unless differences in the total population between these two years is also considered. Therefore, this type of complete statistic, and other types, will be presented and compared to the following statistics from the article.

(1) The article states that 1 million more people are receiving relief now than received relief in 1936. If the statistics in the article are related to the sizes of the civilian population in these years, (128 million in 1936, 196 million in 1967), then a fuller comparison is available; 5.7 percent of the population received relief in 1936, whereas 4.2 percent receive relief in 1967.

Comparisons are questionable, however, because some of the "relief" programs operating in 1936 no longer exist, and some of the current programs were not established then, or were just getting started. If various income maintenance programs of the depression are included in the comparison (WPA, CCC, FERA, PWA, NYA, REA and the Farm Security Administration programs) at the end of 1936 some 17.4 million persons, almost 14 percent of the civilian population—were receiving public aid.

(2) The article states, and depicts in a chart, that the people on relief have increased 50 percent in the last ten years, from 5,500,000 in 1957 to 8,250,000 in 1967. These figures are both inaccurate and misleading.

The 1957 figure of 5,500,000 included general assistance *cases*, whereas the 1967 figure of 8,250,000 included general assistance *recipients*. The 1957 figure that is comparable to the 1967 figure, a figure based on general assistance recipients, is 6,100,000. The increase in the number of recipients between

1957 and 1967 is, therefore, 35 percent, not 50 percent.

These figures ignore the 15 percent increase that occurred in the civilian population between 1957 and 1967. Taking this into account, the increase in relation to population was only 20 percent.

(3) The article states that relief costs have increased by 119 percent between 1957 and 1967, from $3.1 billion to $6.8 billion. These figures are not adjusted to make allowance for increases in the cost of living index during this period, nor are they related to the growth of the Gross National Product in these years. If the "relief costs" the authors cite are calculated as percentages of the GNPs of these years ($441 billion in 1957, $764 billion in 1967), public assistance and general assistance costs were 7/10 of 1 percent (.7 percent) in 1957, and 9/10 of 1 percent (.9 percent) in 1967.

(4) The article states that "welfare workers are hazy in talking about the size of the relief checks." The fact is that data on welfare payments are issued monthly by the Bureau of Family Services, Welfare Administration, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and are published each month in *Welfare in Review*.

The most recent data, for March 1967, indicates that average payments in AFDC range from $9.30 per recipient in Mississippi to $54.70 per recipient in New Jersey. The national average was $36.85 per month, per recipient, or *$1.21 per day per child*. Payments in New York are among the highest ($54.60 was the average payment per recipient in March) but are still far below the amount needed to support a family at or above the poverty line. Other national average welfare payments per recipients for March 1967 were as follows: OAA, $68.15; AB, $86.95; APTD, $76.05; and GA, $37.15.

(5) The article, apparently in reference to AFDC, states that "instead of temporary aid, relief has become a permanent way of life for millions. Second and third generations of families now live on relief." The average time a family receives AFDC is two years if there is no wage earning parent at home, nine months if a wage earning parent is at home but is unemployed (22 States include the unemployed in their AFDC programs).

EXAMPLES

The authors were just as selective in their choice of examples as they were in their use of statistics. In most cases, the examples used to illustrate existing conditions are unrepresentative of the total system or situation under consideration. The analyses of the following examples are illustrative:

(1) The article suggests that it is possible for relief families to receive $6,000 or $7,000 a year in public assistance payments. A more representative statement, and a more probable situation is this: a 1965 study showed that the average annual income for AFDC families (including earnings and all other income) was *$1,800* a year. Public assistance payments have not been substantially increased since then: in March 1965 the average monthly payment to an AFDC family was $143.76, in March 1967 this average payment was $152.75.

(2) As an example of the inequities in the American system a comparison between public assistance benefits and social security benefits is presented. A retired couple receiving social security benefits of $2,447 or $3,311 a year is compared with an AFDC family of eight receiving $4,713 or $5,000 a year in public assistance benefits.

Two facts about these examples must be noted: (1) the AFDC family is four times the size of the social security family, and twice the size of the average AFDC family, (2) the AFDC family lives in New York, the State with the second highest average AFDC payments. In short, both the size and the residence of the AFDC family—and therefore the benefits described—are extremely unrepresentative of the AFDC program.

A more representative example of AFDC benefits could have been derived from either: (1) the 1965 study showing the average AFDC family annual income from all sources to be $1,800, or (2) current statistics showing the average family AFDC payment to be $152.75 a month. An unrepresentative example from the other extreme, using October 1966 statistics, would show that in Mississippi the maximum *annual* amount a two person AFDC family could receive was $300, the maximum annual amount an eight person family could receive was $1,080.

(3) Finally, as an example of the "racket" welfare has become the authors cite "an investigation by a Senate committee in 1962 (which) showed that two-thirds of all welfare cases in Washington, D.C., the Nation's capital, were getting aid under false pretenses." This D.C. report promoted a nationwide study in 1963, the results of which the authors chose not to present.

The findings of this study were that for all AFDC cases nationwide, about 5.4 percent were ineligible. Furthermore, agency errors in determining eligibility was the major factor. Less than two percent revealed evidence of willful deceit. Ineligibility was highest in States with extremely restrictive and complex eligibility requirements and insufficient staff. Under a quality control system established after the study, ineligibility has been further reduced to about two percent.

SUCCESS-FAILURE STANDARD

Relief or public assistance is judged in this article solely on the basis of how little it costs and how few persons it helps. A successful program, by the authors' standards, would be one in which the number of recipients and the costs have decreased over the years. Absolute success would be reached when a welfare program no longer existed. Failure, on the other hand, is attributed to a program that has not decreased in size and cost; extreme failure to a program that has increased over the years.

Considerations of financial costs and numbers of recipients are important to all program evaluation; they are not, however, sufficient in and of themselves. For example, few people would call public assistance a success if it decreased its costs and recipients by simply eliminating Aid to the Blind and Old Age Assistance payments. Cost and coverage statistics must, of course, be related to measurements of the need for a program. No such relationship is attempted by the authors and therein lies the weakness of their success-failure standard. The standard is applied without concern for or consideration of the number of persons living in poverty and the extent to which a need for public assistance exists.

Rural America Poses Challenging Opportunity to Urban America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 23, 1967

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association and its affiliated rural cooperatives, as all Members of Congress know, are immensely effective agencies for the improvement of life in rural America.

The rural cooperatives have brought electric power and light and modern telephone service to many rural areas throughout the United States. They also support a wide range of programs for comprehensive community development. They are concerned with the problems of our small towns as well as with the problems of rural communities. They are guided by the principle that progress in rural America is essential and closely related to progress in urban America.

A forceful and timely expression of this broad rural outlook is given in a recent statement by the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association. Addressed to the cities and published in metropolitan newspapers, this statement explains what rural America can do to help our overgrown cities solve their problems. As the association emphasizes, major and fundamental help can be realized by the cities through a diversion of population made possible by the creation of more job opportunities in the countryside. In the process, all America will realize great benefits.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association merits our congratulations and commendation on the statesmanlike work it is performing in this cause. Under unanimous consent I insert the association's challenging message to Urban America in the Appendix of the Record because of its interest to my colleagues and the people of America.

The statement follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Aug. 20, 1967]

Crisis in Our Cities: What Rural America Can Do About It

Since its early days, our nation has periodically faced a crisis in its cities.

And, since the early days, the root cause has been the same . . . people flocking to the cities in search of something better . . . people leaving areas of little opportunity in search of fulfillment for themselves and their children.

In earlier times, the people came from overseas. Nearly all of them came from the land which no longer provided them with a living.

Today the people who fill our cities in search of a better life . . . nearly 600,000 of them a year . . . come from our own countryside, nearly all of them from the land which no longer offers them a living.

The fact is, as Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman and other informed government officials have noted, that 70% of our nation's population is crowded into one percent of our land . . . many of them crowded into space covered by brick and mortar and macadam, over-laden with smog-filled air . . . treeless, flowerless, hopeless.

They are the victims of a quiet revolution in agriculture which no longer needs the labor of large numbers of human beings to produce the vast quantities of food and fiber we provide for the world. They are today's landless immigrants who formed our city ghettoes and slums of generations past.

The people of rural America, and America's rural electrics, believe this view of the past and of the present contains the seeds of our future . . . a brighter, more productive future for the people of the cities and the people in the rural areas.

We believe it is time we use one of our nation's greatest assets . . . our uncrowded countryside . . . to help solve the problem which concerns us all.

Rural America boasts more than space. It has fresh air and sun and sky and water. It has room for kids to run barefoot through grass covered with early morning dew, hills covered with clean snow for sleds and skis, fields for people and dogs to romp in.

And it has more.

In the towns and villages of rural America there are uncrowded streets and sidewalks.

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

There is electric power and transportation. There are good roads to bring the products of hard-working people to the great market places.

What rural America lacks are job opportunities. Of the nearly 14 million new jobs created in our country in the past 15 years, few were created in rural areas. Yet polls say half our population would like to live and work in rural areas.

We believe that unless we bend our efforts to the development of rural America, we will fail to solve the problems of our cities. Unless we stem the tide of migration from the country to the city that puts more and more people into less and less space, we will have ignored our greatest asset in meeting one of our gravest problems.

We must start now to develop job opportunities, adequate hospitals and medical facilities, better schools and theaters and libraries, better water and sewer systems, and improved public services and facilities for industry in our rural areas. With them, rural America *can* meet the job hunger of its own people. It *can* provide the space and living room city people so desperately seek.

The nation's rural electrics view with optimism the efforts of our nation's leaders to restore the balance between rural and urban America. We pledge our support and the continuation of our unstinting effort. We invite the participation and cooperation of all people concerned about the future of our country, regardless of where they live.

There is ,after all, only one nation, and we are all part of it.

The Pressure of Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 23, 1967

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, station WBBM–TV, channel 2, in Chicago has acquired a well-deserved reputation for objective, effective editoralizing. In an editorial broadcast on Wednesday, August 16, its editorial director, Mr. Carter Davidson, commented on the newest developments in the war in Vietnam. I believe that more effective bombing of North Vietnamese military targets is in order and hope that the President would finally permit the Air Force to render inoperative all North Vietnamese military airfields.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the Record I include this most timely and objective editorial from station WBBM–TV:

The Pressure of Vietnam

Both the complexion and the size of the war in Vietnam have changed in the past few days.

Our bombers are now zeroing in on targets that have heretofore been off limits, including some military installations in North Vietnam that are only ten miles or so from the borders of Red China.

The reaction to this stepped-up attack in this country has been a mixture of anguish and applause. Moreover, the mixture of reaction has wiped out political party lines.

Our own two Illinois Senators, for example, are divided, although both are Republican.

Senator Dirksen said the raids to within seconds of Red Chinese air space were necessary, and he did not think they were dangerous. Senator Percy took the opposite view and warned that the raids could provoke Red China into turning Vietnam into another Korea.

Our own view of the bombing of North Vietnamese military targets near the Chinese border is that it is a calculated risk, and that it was time we took that risk.

Our bombing of North Vietnamese military targets until now has been on a highly selective basis. The bombing has been costly and devastating, but it has not effectively arrested the flow of fresh Communist troops into South Vietnam, according to highest Pentagon estimates which have been published.

A number of highly placed observers, in fact, have said that the regime in Hanoi, North Vietnam's capital, has elected to prosecute its aggression against South Vietnam simply because our bombing has been so feather-light as to indicate an American weakness.

If the object of our policy is to negotiate an end of the war in Vietnam, without prolonging the fighting and adding to the casualty lists, then it seems clear that we can negotiate only from a position of strength, rather than from a position of real or imagined weakness.

We believe the stepped-up bombing raids even to the doorstep of Red China, are an indication of such strength.

There are hopes that, after the South Vietnamese election in September, the regime that comes to power will seek to bring North Vietnam to the bargaining table, decorating its invitation with an end to the bombing.

That can be effective only if we quit bombing as a step to peace, not as an admission of weakness.

It is unfortunate that such a step to peace has to be debated in this country as a political issue that has split both parties.

South Africa Study Backfires

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 23, 1967

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, perhaps the lot of the members of the United Nations Organization would improve if they followed South Africa's example instead of attacking her with hot air and spurious unsupportable charges.

That is the trouble with a little knowledge—it can go a long way the wrong way.

I insert William Fulton's "Report From the U.N.," from the Chicago Tribune for August 17, in the Record following my remarks:

Study Made on South Africa Misfires

(By William Fulton)

New York, August 16.—Sometimes an official document of the United Nations backfires, and so it is with the current report on the police force maintained by the republic of South Africa. The original intent was to prove that South Africa is a "police state," but the facts proved just the opposite.

The latest study, prepared by Abdulrahim Farah of Somalia on behalf of the U.N. special committee dealing with apartheid, showed a total police strength of 30,068 keeping the peace in a population of 17,075,000 spread over 471,00 square miles. By way of contrast the New York police force numbers 27,900 in a city population of 8 million.

Farah's excursion into South Africa's policing aimed at the republic's apartheid [race separation] policy, but the shot misfired. His figures show nearly as many nonwhite police officers—13,769—as there are whites—14,292. The remainder of the force comprises administrative and labor help.

The report coincided with another study on the strength of the South African permanent military establishment. These reports are steps by the fiery black African diplomats to goad the U.N. into attacking the republic and bringing it to its knees.

Battle planners for the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace hatched the idea of a U.N. conquest of South Africa two years ago. The so-called peace organization published a 170-page book which outlined the international army, air force, and navy required for a successful invasion.

FIGURE ON GROUND FORCE OF 93,000

Carnegie military experts reckoned on 93,000 ground troops with air and sea support. The United States would foot a third of the bill.

Returning to the police state allegations, the U.N. commission on human rights adopted a resolution March 6 "to investigate charges of torture and ill-treatment of prisoners, detainees, or persons in police custody in South Africa." The commission set up a working group of experts—so called despite the fact there was not a single criminologist among them.

This part sprang into being altho representatives of the International Red Cross society had just visited places of detention thruout the republic. They roamed in perfect freedom thru the institutions and talked extensively to prisoners. The investigation turned up only minor irregularities which the government hastened to correct.

Ambassador M. I. Botha, chief of the South African delegation to the U.N., protested in vain to Secretary General U Thant over the creation of the working group. He called the new inquiry "a flagrant interference in the internal affairs of a sovereign state member of the U.N."

INSISTS GOVERNMENT HAS NOTHING TO HIDE

"The South African government has nothing to hide in respect of the administration of its prison system and the treatment of prisoners, no matter for what crime they may have been legally convicted," Botha stated.

Botha called attention to the Red Cross inquiry. He said:

"The fact that this wealth of material, issued under the most impeccable auspices, has thruout been freely available to all who have an interest in such matters, which would include the commission, makes it all the more incomprehensible that the commission would nevertheless see fit to launch this unwarranted attack on the republic of South Africa and, incidentally, also to burden the organization's already grievously loaded budget with additional heavy expenditures which are both fruitless and unnecessary and quite mischievous."

Nevertheless, the experts are going ahead. Unable to gain entry into the republic, they are holding sessions and hearing witnesses in various capitals while living high off the hog in luxury hotels.

Letters From Job Corps Girls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 23, 1967

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to relate to my colleagues some of the comments and impressions of the girls from Santa Clara, Santa Cruz, San Benito, and Monterey Counties in California who are in the women's Job Corp training program. The WICS project director, Mrs. Henry Kappelhof, received these observations in letters from the girls while they were in the training program.

The WICS program, Mr. Speaker, as these letters show, does have a terrific impact on these young women and gives them hope and inspiration of a more productive future. I feel that once the girls begin training in a Job Corps training center they start life anew—that their past is dead and they have the opportunity to build a new life.

The poverty program will soon come before the House, I hope that we will not fail these young people in their quest for self-betterment.

The letters follow:

"Moses Lake, Wash.

"Dear Mrs. Kapplehof: I'm sorry I stayed so long without writing to you but I thought I would wait and see how I would like it here, it's really nice. Like you once said though, there are always a few bad apples to ruin things and here there are a few bad apples. Otherwise everything is real nice. The teachers and the Resident Advisers are all very nice. Today, they took us to Grand Coulee Dam. I'm sending you this picture of the Dam. I've never seen anything so pretty as the lakes in Washington. A week from today I will be graduating from orientation and then I will no longer be an enrollee. I will then be a Corpswoman. I hope that as you read this letter that you are in the best of health. As for myself I am just fine. I better be closing now. Here's hoping that you take care of yourself and hoping that you aren't working too hard."

The next letter is from a girl from Los Gatos (an all Caucasian community) from a broken home. She married to escape problems not of her making and found that she was in a situation much worse than she was trying to escape from. By age 18, she was married, divorced, had several miscarriages and a CYA record. Oh, such despair when she came to see us, a drop out, untrained, a record, no one would give her a chance, so worried about how she was going to be able to support herself.

"Cleveland, Ohio.

"Dear Mrs Kappelhof: Thank you, thank you and all the people who made Job Corps possible for me. I love it here, I have never been happier in my whole life. I am taking Lab Technician (medical). Enclosed you'll find a photo of myself and a few friends. I will write again soon. Take care of yourself. We are all getting ready for a Christmas dance.

"Love always,"

(Would you believe 3 of 4 of her friends in the photo are Negro girls!)

"St. Louis, Mo.

"Dear Mrs. Kappelhof: You asked how things are here, well it is a lot better than what you described it as. I took a picture of the outside of this place and you can see how big it is.

"The people are wonderful specially if you want someone to talk to.

"The profession I am taking up is Child Care professional. In February, 12 children will come to the center and we will be their teachers. I am looking forward to it.

"We went to the Boys Job Corps to a dance and it really was a swinger.

"Please write soon,"

The next letter is from a girl who is also a product of not only a broken home, but one in which the mother rejects her, wants absolutely nothing to do with her and could care less about where she is or what she is doing.

"Excelsior Springs.

"Dear Mrs Kapplehof: How are you? fine I hope and this finds you in the best of health. I'm doing fine and everything is going well. I really enjoyed Christmas here and had a nice time. Thank you so much for the gift you gave us, we really enjoyed it very much. We didn't have a white Christmas but it sure started snowing today, it started snowing today and hasn't stopped yet. It is supposed to snow until tomorrow afternoon with 3–4 inches deep.

"I want to thank you so much for getting me into the J. C. At first, like all the other girls who first got here I didn't like it and wanted to go home but decided if I was going to make anything of myself I'd stick it out. Most of the girls when they got here were homesick and now I'm glad I did decided to stay because I like it very much. I enjoy my classes more now than I did in my regular school. I am taking up Graphic Arts its real interesting and I like the teachers. In my vocation I am required to take math for 1 hour a day. We also take (required) Home & Family, Health, Charm, they change us around in these classes, we only have Charm once a week, the other two are once a day maybe for 1 or 2 hours. You go to your vocation for 4 hours in the morning and the rest of your classes are in the afternoon. In 8 or 9 weeks I go (I hope) out on OJT (On the Job Corps Training). The teacher says I work hard and catch on fast which she says helps a lot. My first paycheck was a whole 96¢, my second paycheck was $14.37. Mary and I have a room together, just the two of us in here so it is not really too bad and its just enough room for us and its easy to keep clean. We have a real sweet R.A. (Resident Advisor) she gets along with everybody kids around with us but she also is stern when she says something she means it and the girls respect her for that. We can go to her with any problem we have. Well I can't think of much else to say right now at the moment so bye for now and take care of yourself. A lot more girls are going to need you before this year and the years to come are over.

"Yours very truly,

"P.S.—I owe so much to you and Mrs. Phillips that I don't know how I could repay you both for your kindness maybe someday I can repay you both but I don't know how to go about it. Maybe in the future I can somehow. If I can you tell me and I'll try my best to fulfill your request."

This girl came to the states from Hawaii, to try to get a better job, she was doing live-in babysitting since she was 13 years old. She found out that without more education and job training she was at a dead end. She is from Monterey County.

"Albuquerque.

"Dear Mrs. Kappelhof: To begin with here's hoping and praying that this letter finds you in the very best of health.

"Ever since I've been here I've loved the Job Corps and still feel very highly of the wonderful opportunity this is.

"I'm taking business courses as well as General Education. I feel that I'm doing real good work and making the best of what's offered to me.

"I'm sharing a room with just one girl and she is sweet. She is helpful when it comes to our cleaning day. I have a wonderful R.A. and she is cute and little too. She's the prettiest R.A. in the center.

"We had so many exciting events taken place here, and it shall always be remembered, cause of such thrill and excitement it brought. I was hostess for Vice President Humphrey and I got to take pictures with him. Also, our Dedication was a very nice tiring one.

"Right now I have a couple of my girl friends in here chatting away while I'm writing this letter. Its after curfew and at 11:00 we have bedcheck.

"So I'll close for now, so I can do my shorthand homework. May God Bless you and Thank you for helping me get into the Job Corps.

"Aloha,"

I really hesitated about sharing this next letter and then decided that if you are to get a picture of the kind of impact we (WICS) have upon the girls I must include this one also. I have personally seen this girl 3 times and perhaps talked to her on the phone the same number of times. She is from a rural community.

"Omaha.

"Dear Mrs. Kappelhof: This lines to say hello, hoping God will fulfill all your wishes for the coming holidays as well as all the holidays to come.

"I'm sorry I haven't written sooner, Mrs. Kappelhof. I would like to tell you that I think you're the greatest person in the world. I mean this from the bottom of my heart. I think you're nothing less than an angel. No, not only cause you've helped me in such a great way, but because you will have helped so many others.

"That's why I can say I love you, Mrs. Kappelhof, for being my friend, and for being the friend of the world.

"Well this place is really a nice place. There are lots of things to do. I went skating last Sunday oh and I fell a million times. It was a lot of fun. We have all sorts of things to do and Fridays or Saturdays they take us to a town about 48 miles from Omaha to a Boys Job Corps Center, and we go bowling or dancing. There are a lot of things to do.

"I try to study harder than ever before. I work until I fall asleep, and my teachers say I'm learning very fast. Oh, but I try because I want to learn everything I can. Then maybe someday I too, will be helping girls such as you. Not that I could ever be as nice and wonderful a person (thought I'd like to try)

"God Bless you,"

This next letter is from one of the sweetest Negro girls I have ever met. She told me that her life took a "Newmeaning" from the very minute she applied for the Job Corps, she is one of 13, the family has a long history on welfare.

"Poland Springs.

"Dear Mrs. Kappelhof: Just a short note to thank you for everything, for the wonderful night at the YWCA and for taking me to breakfast. I was so scared and you made me feel so good.

"The center is just like you said it would be. Not perfect but almost. I love it here and I am going to work hard. I want to be good at something.

"Oh, Mrs. Kappelhof, my counsellor told me that you told them that I can dance and they asked me to be on a program. I hope I won't be nervous.

"Thank you for everything. I love you,
Always,"

This letter is from a girl whose mother and father have been in prison several times, each of their children have been in trouble with the law time and time again, including the writer of this letter:

"Clinton, Iowa.

"Dear Mrs. Kappelhof: Writing these few lines to say hello and hoping when this letter of my reaches your most gentle hands that you will be feeling better. I am doing just fine at the Center thanks to you and the people who made it possible for me to be here. Well Mrs. Kappelhof, I would like to thank you for the gift it was sure kind of you.

"Over at the Job Corps it is a real gift for getting this education. I am taking up cosmetology. I sure am learning a lot and also I am getting a chance to get my G.E.D. test in a few more months. I never thought I would ever get a chance to get what I want

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

out of life and I have so many people to thank for this.

"It's work, but there is lots of fun, too, which is real nice.

"P.S.—These 4 months at Job Corps really truly, I learned a lot."

What a pleasant surprise in January when this girl visited me while on her annual leave. Gone was the high ratted hair do, the harsh makeup. In fact, it was hard to imagine that this soft gentle girl was the same young lady. She spoke to a group of girls who were meeting with me to discuss their center assignment. How I wish that I had a tape recorder to really do justice to the tone of her voice as she related how well the Center "took care of the girls and all their needs".

FROM THE CENTER DIRECTORS

This first communication is about the girl who wrote the second letter of this group. Donna has been chosen to be a part of the Job Corps YWCA program and is being transferred to Buffalo, New York. Cleveland Center is proud that Donna has received this evidence of growth and progress she will arrive in Buffalo 7/13 to receive her training.

When Terry entered the Job Corps she had been out of school for quite some time, she had many emotional problems which prevented her from functioning in our public schools, she entered Job Corps January 31, 1967.

Terry has transferred to Poland Spring, Maine so that she could complete her training in Floristry. I feel that she has great potential in this field and encouraged her to take advantage of all Job Corps Training opportunities.

She was deeply committed to the Floristry and Graphic Arts programs and when they were discontinued here we referred her to the Poland Spring Center where they were still being offered. This young lady has been the ideal Corpswomen and we regret that we could not provide her with the training in which she was interested.

These letters are but a sampling of the many I am receiving. I tried to select them from girls who come from the different parts of the Central Coast area, from East Palo Alto, in San Mateo County, in the north and in the south San Benito County, Monterey, Santa Cruz as well as Santa Clara Counties.

The gifts the girls made reference to were made possible by a special contribution from members of the Santa Clara County Council of Catholic Women and the Church Women United. The gift enclosure cards stated that the gifts were from the San Jose WICS, they were sent to girls who were not coming home for Christmas. To many this was the only gift from "home" they received.

How would you like to be a recipient of some of these letters? Some of these girls are desperately in need of a pen pal. They are lonesome and homesick for their community some never receive mail of any kind. How wonderful if some of you would adopt a girl and remember her on birthdays and holidays! Call our office at 292-0965 if you are interested.

The girls are always in need of luggage.

Thailand: A Dynamic and Constructive Pacific Neighbor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 23, 1967

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, Thailand is one of the most active initiators and supporters of regional cooperation in Southeast Asia. As a result, Thailand is playing an important part in such organizations as ECAFE, ASPAC, ASA, the Colombo Plan, the Asian Development Bank, and the recently founded ASEAN. Bangkok often serves as the host city for the annual meetings of these groups and, in fact, was the city in which the ASEAN was organized a few weeks ago. This kind of regional "spirit" is of critical importance to the development of strength and stability in Southeast Asia and Thailand should be commended for her efforts in regional cooperation. It would be well worth our while to take a closer look at this dynamic and constructive nation.

Since the revolution of 1932, which overthrew the last of the absolute Kings, Thailand has been a constitutional monarchy with the King as Chief of State, a Prime Minister as head of the Government, a Cabinet, a Parliament, and an independent judiciary. The present Chief of State, King Bhumibol Adulyadej ascended to the throne in 1946; Field Marshal Thanom Kittikachorn, the Prime Minister, took office in 1963.

As is common to many developing nations in Southeast Asia, Thailand faces some problems in the Government. Although the problems are real, it is important that we view them in the perspective of a nation struggling to create a viable constitutional system upon the basis of a heritage of eastern monarchalism. There can be no sure guide to success in this endeavor. Only diligence and patience can overcome the historically based obstacles.

The most fundamental of Thailand's political problems and the one to which the most energy has been devoted is the development of a constitution suited to its traditions and to its present needs. The military, especially the army, has had a predominant role throughout most of this period, which has been marked by several coups and attempted coups. The most recent was in 1957. In 1958, a bloodless "revolution" carried out by the ruling military group abrogated the constitution then in effect and replaced it with an interim constitution which gave extraordinary powers to the Prime Minister and to the executive branch. At that same time Parliament was dissolved and replaced by a 240-member appointed Constituent Assembly. This body was given the dual responsibilities of serving as an interim legislative body and of drafting a new constitution. Today, the Constituent Assembly is still working on the drafting of the new constitution. Prime Minister Thanom had indicated that it would be ready on January 1, of this year, and that general elections would be held within 180 days thereafter. Although the Assembly failed for many reasons to meet this deadline, we can expect that the new constitution will be promulgated shortly. Meanwhile, order is being maintained and progress is being made under the interim constitution.

A second problem confronting the present administration is the threat of Communist subversion in the Northeast. The U.S. State Department reports:

> It is clear that the Communists are making a major effort there.

Steps are being taken to preclude any serious problem of insurrection and the presence of U.S. military forces in the Northeast provides the Thai people in the area a measure of security.

Thailand's role in foreign affairs is unique in the history of Southeast Asia. It was the only country to avoid colonization by the Western imperialists. The wisdom of the Thai Kings during the 18th and 19th centuries—maintaining domestic tranquility, while demonstrating great diplomatic skill with foreign powers—kept Thailand independent. Shortly after World War II the Thais developed close relations with the United States.

Thailand today stands as one of the most rigid resistors of Communist domination in Southeast Asia. The Thais have gone so far as to align themselves firmly behind the U.S. efforts in Vietnam, having pledged a small military force to assist in the fighting. As she has been since 1949, we may conclude that Thailand will remain a solid force against Communist aggression and a supporter of programs designed to produce stability in the region.

The Thai economy is a bright point in the scheme of Southeast Asian development. Although the Thai economy operates as a free enterprise system, the Government plays a significant role in its direction. Through careful supervision of export-import relationships, refusal to indulge in excessive deficit financing, and regard for inflationary pressures, the administration has achieved an extremely stable economy. Thailand's balance of payments is only slightly less than favorable—with foreign reserves to cover well over 1 year's total imports—and the currency is one of the most stable in Southeast Asia. This economic stability, of course, is attractive to foreign investors, as well as providing an extremely healthy atmosphere for domestic industry.

The Thai economy combines stability with a tremendous rate of growth. The annual rate of growth since 1960 has been 7 percent; it was 9 percent in 1966 and expansion has continued during the first few months of this year. Much of this can be directly attributed to the first 6-year plan which came to a successful conclusion in 1966—the original targets of the plan being achieved by the end of 1965. Most of the growth emanated from the industrial sector. In 1964 and 1965, the annual growth rate of manufacturing was 14 percent, electricity and water supply 19 percent, and trade and commerce 10 percent.

Despite the growth of industry, agriculture remains the foundation of the Thai economy. Eighty percent of the population depend upon agriculture for their income and 80 percent of those depend upon rice. The rate of growth in this sector has been disturbingly low in recent years—only 2 percent in the 1965-66 period. Yet, the labor force has not shifted substantially to other sectors. Rice, which once composed 60 percent of the total export figure is now only 33 percent. Per capita income has increased steadily for Thailand as a whole, yet those in agriculture have enjoyed only a small share of the growth.

Aware of this disparity and the detrimental effect that it could have on the economy in the long run, the Government plans to gear the second 6-year plan toward broad basing economic growth. A greater share of the labor force must enter the industrial sector—at present 20 percent of the population produce 75 percent of the gross national product. This will call for a great deal of training to enable the Thai people to fill the various needs of industry and to update agricultural plans. The second 6-year plan presents a more sophisticated challenge to the administration, but their unqualified success in the first plan, affords them much confidence.

At present two outside developments affect the Thai economy in a very favorable manner. First, there is the war in Vietnam. Thailand is now an important base for American efforts. Behind the American military, with its vast civil engineering capacity, flows much aid and many development projects of a nonmilitary nature. Most of this assistance is directed toward Thailand's northeast region which has always been an area of little production. Money and skill are now available for roads, dams, and schools. Further rapid expansion of consumer spending has resulted from American personnel, especially toward Western-style goods. In turn, this has given a boost to domestic industry.

The second factor, and again one that is a source of despair for many in other parts of the world while benefiting Thailand, is the failure of major rice producing nations to get their grain to market. Thailand, the world's largest exporter of rice before the shortage, is enjoying a great expansion of income from the resulting increased world market price. Although only a short-run phenomenon, the rice shortage will provide more funds for the development projects the government plans for the future, among other things, by making the balance of payments more favorable.

The social conditions in Thailand appear quiet at present, and the administration is taking steps to maintain this tranquillity. The population of Thailand is 32 million with a comfortable population density. Housing shortages create a problem only in the Bankok area and a housing development program is at work to alleviate the shortage. The provision of birth control education, now available from private groups, is being discussed for all Thai citizens as an attempt to keep the 3-percent annual population increase from expanding and creating the widespread problem found in many Southeast Asian nations.

Educational and health facilities present the most serious social problems. Over 100,000 children reach school age each year. For many, even the 4-year period of compulsory education is unavailable, and the inadequacies of the system increase for the higher levels of education. The Government is making steady progress in this field aware that education is of critical importance to long-range development. Educational facilities were expanded on all levels in 1966, and large appropriations have been made in the second 6-year plan for further growth—both in quantity and quality of education. The establishment of private schools will also be of assistance in the alleviation of this problem.

The shortage of health facilities is most grave in the rural areas. The national budget set aside B544.8 million—about $27 million—for the Ministry of Public Health for this year. Other assistance has been provided by charitable agencies and by American forces in the northeast section. These programs are still inadequate, however. The Government apparently recognizes the importance of these facilities and the prospects for serious progress are good.

As do many of the members of the Pacific community, Thailand suffers from the pains of development. This very proud, nationalistic state faces a number of social and economic problems. But, Mr. Speaker, Thailand is working diligently to overcome these handicaps and to assume a responsible role in world affairs. We can look to the Thai economy to continue to grow at the rapid pace of the past few years and to the Thai Government to continue their resistance to communism and to support cooperation among the independent states of Southeast Asia. Thailand is a valuable friend of freedom and cooperation in the Pacific community.

The Path to Vietnam: Bill Bundy Speaks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 23, 1967

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, in a speech of August 15, before the national convention of the National Student Association, the Honorable William P. Bundy, Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs, reviewed the history of American involvement in Vietnam.

His address, "The Path to Vietnam: A Lesson in Involvement," is an excellent survey of U.S. policy, past and present, toward Southeast Asia, the Indochina Peninsula, and most particularly, Vietnam.

Mr. Bundy isolates 10 major American foreign policy decisions in that region, going back to 1945. He traces the continuity of policy through four administrations, and describes the origins of the American commitment.

Because of its conciseness and clarity, I recommend that Mr. Bundy's address be read by my colleagues and all Americans concerned about U.S. policy in Vietnam.

ADDRESS BY HON. WILLIAM P. BUNDY, ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE FOR EAST ASIAN AND PACIFIC AFFAIRS, BEFORE THE NATIONAL STUDENT ASSOCIATION, UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND, COLLEGE PARK, MD., AUGUST 15, 1967

You have asked me to speak this morning on the topic: "The Path to Viet-Nam: A Lesson in Involvement." I welcome this opportunity to review the whole history of United States actions with respect to Viet-Nam—speaking personally as to the period up to 1961, during which I had no policy responsibility, and of course necessarily more officially for the period since January of 1961.

Quite apart from the enormous present importance of South Viet-Nam and our actions there, I have often reflected—as one who was tempted to become a professional historian—that the story of Viet-Nam, of Southeast Asia, and of American policy there forms an extraordinarily broad case history involving almost all the major problems that have affected the world as a whole in the past 25 years. For the strands of the Viet-Nam history include the characteristics of French colonial control compared to colonial control elsewhere, the end of the colonial period, the inter-relation and competition of nationalism and Communism, our relation to the Soviet Union and Communist China and their relationships with each other, our relation to the European colonial power—France, and—at least since 1954—the relation of Viet-Nam to the wider question of national independence and self-determination in Southeast Asia and indeed throughout Asia.

The Viet-Nam story is above all a product of Vietnamese aspirations and decisions. In the early period, French decisions were crucial. But I am sure you want me to focus on the American policy role, how and why we became involved, and how we reached the present position. This should not be a purely historical discussion, of course, and I know that you have natural and valid concerns that focus particularly on the decisions of the last two years and on the decisions that confront us now and in the future. So I shall touch briefly on these, fully expecting that your questions will be quite largely in this area.

"THE PATH TO VIETNAM"

For our mutual convenience in analysis, I have tried to isolate 10 major American decisions, going back to 1945. It is not for me to defend, or necessarily to justify, policy decisions taken before 1961, but it is essential to examine them if one is to understand the present position.

I

Our first decisions affecting Viet-Nam were in 1945. President Roosevelt deeply believed that French colonial control in Indochina should not be restored, and this attitude led us, in the closing months of the war against militarist Japan, to adopt what French have always considered an obstructive attitude toward their return. Separately, we briefly gave modest assistance to Ho Chi Minh as an asset against the Japanese. This story, like so much else in the whole record, is best told in Robert Shaplen's thoughtful "The Lost Revolution."

II

Second, when the French had returned, we stood aside. In the critical year 1946, and over the next 3–4 years, the French first made the Fontainebleau Agreement and then broke it so that major conflict started. It has often been argued, by Shaplen among others, that we could have exerted greater pressure, perhaps even effective pressure, on the French to go through with the Fontainebleau Agreement and to set Viet-Nam on the path to early independence. The failure to exert such pressure may thus be construed as a negative policy decision on our part.

I myself am skeptical that we could conceivably have affected the unfortunate course that the French followed in this period. If it is argued that our overwhelming Marshall Plan aid to France should have given us leverage, then it must be pointed out at the same time that the Marshall Plan became operative only early in 1948 and that by then the die was largely cast. Moreover, I doubt very much if the proud and bruised French nation would have responded even if we had tried to act to end the colonial era, as we did to a major extent with the Dutch in Indonesia.

In a very real sense, the tragedy of Viet-Nam derives from the fall of France in 1940 and all the understandable emotions aroused by that event among French leaders, including notably de Gaulle himself. Restored control in Indochina was a badge, however mistaken, for a France that meant to be once

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

again a world power. Although it may be argued that we should at least have tried, I doubt if this deep French attitude could have been shaken by anything we did or said, and least of all by anything said or done in connection with the wise and right policy of helping France to get back on her feet.

III

The third period of American decision began in 1950, just before our involvement in the defense of Korea against Soviet-inspired aggression. The Communists had just taken control in China and entered into the 1950 alliance with the Soviet Union. Communism did then appear to our policy makers as something approaching a monolith, and we came to see the French stand in Indochina as part of a global attempt to repel Communist military adventures. In essence, we acted on two lines of policy between 1950 and 1954—on the one hand, economic and growing military assistance to the French, on the other hand steady urging that the French proceed rapidly to grant real independence to Indochina, both for its own sake and as the best means of preventing Communist control.

Here it has been argued that we did too much assisting or at least too little urging. I find myself sympathetic to this point of view, as indeed it was expressed at the time by such wise men as Edmund Gullion, who served in Viet-Nam and much later became our distinguished Ambassador in the Congo from 1961 to 1963.

Yet, again, I am not sure whether a different United States policy in this period could have brought about the desired result of a France first successfully waging a costly and bloody war to defend Viet-Nam and then granting it independence. Again, French attitudes and actions had deep roots in the still shaky situation of France, and in the combination of a valid concern for the Communist threat and a desire to maintain a major French presence and hold in Indochina. Even if the French had acted wisely in every respect in this period, they might have been able to achieve nothing more than a division of the country into Communist and non-Communist areas. The vital difference might have been that valid non-Communist nationalism in Viet-Nam would have had a chance to stand on its feet and develop respected leaders before 1954, and if this had happened the whole later story might have unfolded in a very different way.

As it was, the spring of 1954 brought French defeat, in spirit if not in military terms, and left non-Communist nationalism in Viet-Nam almost bankrupt.

IV

The period of the Geneva Conference is the fourth period of American decision. That is a complex story, well told from a relatively detached viewpoint by Anthony Eden, now Lord Avon, in his memoirs.

We played a critical backstage role at Geneva. We maintained the possibility of military intervention, which many observers at the time believe played a crucial part in inducing the Soviets and the Communist Chinese alike to urge Hanoi to settle for a temporary division of Viet-Nam at the 17th parallel and for an independent Cambodia and Laos. And we began to lay the groundwork for SEATO, as part of the effort to show strength and to convince Communist China that it would not have a free hand in Southeast Asia.

Yet we were unwilling to participate fully in the framing of the Geneva Accords, apparently because our policy makers did not wish to associate themselves in any way with a loss of territory to Communist control. So the Geneva Accords were framed largely between Hanoi, Communist China and the Soviet Union on the one side and the French, who were under the urgent time pressure of their domestic politics on the other. In the end, we confined ourselves to saying two things:

(*a*) That we would view any aggression in violation of the Accords with grave concern and as seriously threatening international peace and security.

(*b*) That we took the same position on the reunification of Viet-Nam that we took in other "nations now divided against their will"—meaning, then and now, Germany and Korea—and that we would continue to seek unity through free elections supervised by the United Nations. In effect, we thus interpreted the election provision as providing for a free determination by the people of Viet-Nam as to whether they wished reunification and in that sense endorsed it consistently with the similar positions we had taken in Germany and Korea.

All sorts of things could be said about our decisions in that period. Some are of the view that we should have taken military action and tried to nail down at least a clear military division of Viet-Nam, or even to defeat Ho; I myself think that by the spring of 1954 that course would have been untenable.

It may also be argued—and I do not know the contemporary factors—that, involved as we already were by preceding decisions, we should have participated forthrightly in the making of the Accords and lent our weight to them from the outset, declaring right then that we meant to stand—with the French if possible, but alone if necessary—in supporting non-Communist nationalism in South Viet-Nam. We would then have acted as we had done for non-Communist nationalism in Korea, although without its being necessary or desirable for us to put continuing forces on the ground as we had to do in the face of the conventional threat to Korea.

At any rate, in July 1954 a new national entity came into being in South Viet-Nam with what appeared at the time to be extraordinarily small chances of survival. At the very end, the French, with a degree of American pressure, installed the staunchly nationalist Diem as Prime Minister, hardly thinking that he would survive and looking rather to a short period in which the French could exit with some semblance of grace and let nature take its course.

V

The fifth set of American decisions came in this setting, and indeed overlapped the period of the Geneva Conference. The first aspect of these decisions was our leading role in the formation of the SEATO Treaty, signed at Manila in September of 1954 and ratified by our Senate in February, 1955, by a vote of 82–1. In the SEATO Treaty, South Viet-Nam and its territory were specifically included as a "protoool state", and the signatories specifically accepted the obligation, if asked by the Government of South Viet-Nam, to take action in response to armed attack against South Viet-Nam and to consult on appropriate measures if South Viet-Nam were subjected to subversive actions. The Geneva Accords had of course already expressly forbidden aggressive acts from either half of Viet-Nam against the other half, but there had been no obligation for action by the Geneva patricipating nations. SEATO created a new and serious obligation extending to South Viet-Nam and aimed more widely at the security of the Southeast Asian signatories and the successor states of Indochina.

The second aspect of our decisions at this period was an evolving one. In late 1954 President Eisenhower committed us to furnish economic support for the new regime, in which Diem was already showing himself tougher and more able than anyone had supposed possible. And in early 1955, without any formal statement, we began to take over the job of military assistance to South Viet-Nam, acting within the numerical and equipment limitations stated in the Geneva Accords for foreign military aid.

In short, in the 1954–55 period, we moved into a major supporting role and undertook a major treaty commitment involving South Viet-Nam.

These decisions, I repeat, are not mine to defend. In the mood of the period, still deeply affected by a not unjustified view of monolithic Communism, they were accepted with very wide support in the United States, as the vote and the debate in the Senate abundantly proved. And the Senate documents prove conclusively that there was full understanding of the grave implications of the SEATO obligations, particularly as they related to aggression by means of armed attack.

The important point about these decisions—and a point fervently debated within the Administration at the time, according to many participants—is that they reflected a policy not merely toward Viet-Nam but toward the whole of Southeast Asia. In essence, the underlying basic issue was felt, and I think rightly, to be whether the United States should involve itself much more directly in the security of Southeast Asia and the preservation of the largely new nations that had come into being there since World War II.

There could not be the kind of clear-cut policy for Southeast Asia that had by then evolved in Northeast Asia, where we had entered into mutual security treaties individually with Japan, Korea, and the Republic of China. Some of the Southeast Asian countries wished no association with an outside power; others—Malaya, Singapore, and the northern areas of Borneo, which were not then independent, continued to rely on the British and the Commonwealth. So the directly affected area in which policy could operate comprised only Thailand, the Philippines, and the non-Communist successor states of Indochina—South Viet-Nam, Laos, and Cambodia.

Yet it was felt at the time that unless the United States participated in a major way in preserving the independence and security of these nations, they would be subject to progressive pressures by the parallel efforts of North Vietnam and Communist China.

The judgment that this threat of aggression was real and valid was the first basis of the policy adopted. Two other judgments that lay behind the policy were:

(*a*) That a successful takeover by North Viet-Nam or Communist China of any of the directly affected nations would not only be serious in itself, but would drastically weaken and in a short time destroy the capacity of the other nations of Southeast Asia, whatever their international postures, to maintain their own independence.

(*b*) That, while we ourselves had no wish for a special position in Southeast Asia, the transfer of the area, or large parts of it, to Communist control achieved by subversion and aggression would mean a major addition to the power status of hostile and aggressive Communist Chinese and North Vietnamese regimes. It was believed that such a situation would not only doom the peoples of the area to conditions of domination and virtual servitude over an indefinite period, but would create the very kind of aggressive domination of much of Asia that we had already fought the militarist leaders of Japan to prevent. It was widely and deeply believed that such a situation was profoundly contrary to our national interests.

But there was still a third supporting judgment that, like the others, ran through the calculations of the period. This was that the largely new nations of Southeast Asia were in fact valid national entities and that, while their progress might be halting and imperfect both politically and economically, this progress was worth backing. To put it another way, there was a constructive vision of the kind of Southeast Asia that could evolve, and a sense that this constructive purpose was worth pursuing as a matter of our own ideals, as a matter of our national interest, and as a realistic hope of the possibilities of progress if external aggression and subversion could be held at bay.

These I believe to have been the bedrock reasons for the position we took in Viet-Nam and Southeast Asia at this time. They were overlaid by what may appear to have been emotional factors in our attitude toward Communism in China and Asia. But the degree of support that this major policy undertaking received at the time went far beyond those who held these emotions. And this is why I for one believe that the bedrock reasons I have given were the true and decisive ones.

So the United States became deeply involved in the security of Southeast Asia and, wherever it was welcomed, in the effort to achieve economic progress as well. And the undertaking to support South Viet-Nam economically and militarily and through the Protocol to the SEATO Treaty must be seen as a part of the wide view that the choice was between fairly deep involvement in Southeast Asia, or standing aside in the face of an estimate that to do so would cause Communist Chinese and North Vietnamese power and domination to flow throughout the area.

VI

The unfolding of this policy between 1954 and 1961 is a tangled and difficult story. Mistakes, even serious mistakes, were undoubtedly made then and later. Some of these, many believe, were in our economic and particularly in our military assistance policies in Viet-Nam, and it has been argued—to be persuasively—that we should have at least tried harder to counter the growing authoritarian trends of the Diem regime in the political sphere.

What was not a mistake—but the logical corollary of the basic policy—was the handling of the provision in the Geneva Accords that called for free elections in 1956. It has been argued that this provision, which was certainly badly drafted, called for a single nationwide election, with reunification assumed. Our interpretation—that what was meant was in effect a plebiscite as to whether reunification was desired—has strong support in reason and the recollections of Geneva participants. What cannot be disputed is that the determination was to be free; the word appears three times in the article of the Accords.

Much hindsight nonsense has been written about what took place in 1956 on this issue, and if any of you are planning a thesis subject, I commend to you the examination of the *contemporary* sources and discussion. You will, I think, find clear confirmation that by 1956 two propositions were accepted—first, that South Viet-Nam, contrary to most expectations in 1954, was standing on its own feet and had demonstrated that the makings of a valid non-Communist nationalism existed there, and, second, that North Viet-Nam—which had gone through a period of harsh repression in 1955 and 1956 in which Bernard Fall estimates that nearly 50,000 political opponents were killed outright—would not conceivably have permitted any supervision or any determination that could remotely have been called free.

In the face of these facts, Diem refused to go through with the elections, and we supported him in that refusal. Incidentally, I am told that we urged that he put the monkey on Hanoi's back and force them to refuse supervision or free conditions—as they would surely have done. Diem proudly rejected this advice, which did not change what would have happened, but did leave the elements of a propaganda argument that still rages. It is, I repeat, hindsight nonsense, and I would only quote two contemporary statements—one by the then junior Senator from Massachusetts, John F. Kennedy, the other by Professor Hans Morgenthau.

Kennedy categorically rejected "an election obviously stacked and subverted in advance, urged upon us by those who have already broken their own pledges under the agreement they now seek to enforce."

And Morgenthau referred to the tremendous change between 1954 and 1956 and the "miracle" of what had been accomplished in South Viet-Nam. He went on to say that the conditions for free elections did not exist in either North or South Viet-Nam and concluded:

"Actually, the provision for free elections which would solve ultimately the problem of Viet-Nam was a device to hide the incompatibility of the Communist and Western positions, neither of which can admit the domination of all of Viet-Nam by the other side. It was a device to disguise the fact that the line of military demarcation was bound to be a line of political division as well."

Unfortunately, the promise of South Viet-Nam in 1956 was not realized in the next five years. In the face of Diem's policies, discontent grew—much as it grew in the same period in Korea under Rhee. As in Korea, that discontent might well have led to an internal revolution in a more or less traditional Asian manner. This is not what happened. Despite all that romantics like Lacouture may say, what happened was that Hanoi moved in, from at least 1959 onward (Bernard Fall would say from 1957), and provided a cutting edge of direction, trained men from the North, and supplies that transformed internal discontent into a massive subversive effort guided and supported from the outside in crucial ways.

The realistic view, then and later, has been well summarized by Roger Hilsman in his recent book (with which, incidentally, I have serious factual differences on the period after 1963). Hilsman puts it thus (page 471 of his book):

"Vietnam, in truth, was in the midst of two struggles, not one. The guerrilla warfare was not a spontaneous revolution, as Communist propaganda would have it, but a contrived deliberate campaign directed and managed from Hanoi. But Vietnam was also in the throes of a true revolution, a social and nationalistic revolution very much akin to the 'new nationalisms' that pervaded both the Congo crisis and Indonesia's confrontation with Malaysia. Even while the struggle went on against the Viet Cong, power was in the process of passing from the French-educated mandarin class to representatives of the new nationalism, the Buddhists, the students, and the 'young Turks' in the military. . . ."

VII

This, then, was the situation as it confronted the Kennedy Administration in January of 1961. All this is history. Reasonable men can and do differ about what was done. But those who believe that serious mistakes were made, or even that the basic policy was wrong, cannot escape the fact that by 1961 we were, as a practical matter, deeply engaged in Southeast Asia and specifically in the preservation of the independence of South Viet-Nam.

President Kennedy came to office with a subversive effort against South Viet-Nam well under way, and with the situation in Laos deteriorating rapidly. And for a time the decisions on Laos overshadowed Viet-Nam, although of course the two were always intimately related.

In Laos, President Kennedy in the spring of 1961 rejected the idea of strong military action in favor of seeking a settlement that would install a neutralist government under Souvanna Phouma—a solution uniquely appropriate to Laos. Under Governor Harriman's astute handling, the negotiations finally led to the Geneva Accords of 1962 for Laos, and the process—a point not adequately noticed—led the United States to a much more explicit and affirmative endorsement of the Geneva Accords of 1954, a position we have since consistently maintained as the best basis for peace in Viet-Nam.

In Viet-Nam, the situation at first appeared less critical, and the initial actions of the Kennedy Administration were confined to an increase in our military aid and a small increase of a few hundred men in our military training personnel—a breach—it may be argued—to this extent of the limits of the Geneva Accords, but fully justified in response to the scale of North Vietnamese violation of the basic non-interference provisions.

Although the details somewhat obscured the broad pattern, I think any fair historian of the future must conclude that as early as the spring of 1961 President Kennedy had in effect taken a seventh United States policy decision—that we would continue to be deeply engaged in Southeast Asia, in South Viet-Nam, and under new ground rules in Laos as well.

This was *not*—despite the hindsight straw man recently erected by Professor Galbraith—because President Kennedy believed at all in a monolithic Communism. Professor Galbraith forgets a good deal, and notably the Vienna meeting of June 1961 in which President Kennedy set out deliberately to work with the Soviet Union for the Laos settlement—even as at the very same time he dispatched Vice President Johnson to visit Viet-Nam and Thailand and in effect to reaffirm our courses of action there. The total pattern of United States policy toward Communist countries under both President Johnson and President Kennedy belies the Galbraith thesis.

No, neither President Kennedy nor any senior policy-maker, then or later, believed the Soviet Union was still united with Communist China and North Viet-Nam in a single sweeping Communist threat to the world. But President Kennedy did believe two other things that had, and still have, a vital bearing on our policy.

First, he believed that a weakening in our basic resolve to help in Southeast Asia would tend to encourage separate Soviet pressures in other areas.

James Reston has stated, on the basis of contemporary conversations with the President, that this concern specifically related to Khrushchev's aggressive designs on Berlin, which were pushed hard all through 1961 and not laid to rest till after the Cuban missile crisis of 1962. At any rate, President Kennedy clearly did believe that failure to keep the high degree of commitment we had in Viet-Nam and Southeast Asia had a bearing on the validity of our commitments elsewhere. As Theodore Sorensen has summarized it (page 641 of "Kennedy"), "This nation's commitment (in South Viet-Nam in January, 1961) . . . was not one that President Kennedy felt he could abandon without undesirable consequences throughout Asia and the world."

Secondly, President Kennedy believed that the Communist Chinese were a major threat to dominate Southeast Asia, and specifically that a United States "withdrawal in the case of Viet-Nam and the case of Thailand might mean a collapse in the entire area." (Press Conference of June 14, 1962.) Indeed, President Kennedy in one statement expressely supported the "domino theory." (TV appearance, September 9, 1963.)

My own view, based on participation and subsequent discussion with others, is that the underlying view of the relation between Viet-Nam and the threat to Southeast Asia was clear and strongly believed throughout the top levels of the Kennedy Administration. We knew, as we have always known, that the action against South Viet-Nam reflected deeply held ambitions by Hanoi to unify Viet-Nam under Communist control, and that Hanoi needed and wanted only Chinese

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

aid to this end and wished to be its own master. And we knew, as again we always have, that North Viet-Nam would resist any Communist Chinese trespassing on areas it controlled. But these two propositions were not then, as they are not now, inconsistent with the belief that the aggressive ambitions of Communist China and North Viet-Nam—largely North Vietnamese in old Indochina, overlapping in Thailand, Chinese in the rest of Southeast Asia—would surely feed on each other. In the eyes of the rest of Southeast Asia, certainly, they were part of a common and parallel threat.

So, in effect, the policy of 1954–61 was reaffirmed in the early months of 1961 by the Kennedy Administration. Let me say right here I do not mean to make this a personal analysis of President Kennedy, nor to imply any view whatever as to what he might or might not have done had he lived beyond November of 1963. But some untrue things have been said about the 1961 period, and I believe the record totally supports the account of policy, and the reasons for it, that I have given.

VIII

We then come to the eighth period of decision—the fall of 1961. By then, the "guerrilla aggression" (Hilsman's phrase) had assumed truly serious proportions, and morale in South Viet-Nam had been shaken. It seemed highly doubtful that without major additional United States actions the North Vietnamese threat could be stemmed.

President Kennedy took the decision to raise the ante, through a system of advisers, pilots, and supporting military personnel that rose gradually to the level of 25,000 in the next three years.

I do not think it is appropriate for me to go into the detail of the discussions that accompanied this decision. Fairly full, but still incomplete, accounts have been given in various of the books on the period. What can be seen, without going into such detail, is that the course of action that was chosen, considered and rejected, at least for the time being, the direct introduction of ground combat troops or the bombing of North Viet-Nam, although there was no doubt even then—as Hilsman again makes clear—that the bombing of North Viet-Nam could have been sustained under any reasonable legal view in the face of what North Viet-Nam was doing. Rather, the course of action which was adopted rightly stressed that the South Vietnamese role must remain crucial and primary.

In effect, it was decided that the United States would take those additional actions that appeared clearly required to meet the situation, not knowing for sure whether these actions would in fact prove to be adequate, trying—despite the obvious and always recognized effect of momentum and inertia—not to cross the bridge of still further action, and hoping strongly that what was being undertaken would prove sufficient.

IX

This was the policy followed from early 1962 right up to February of 1965. Within this period, however, political deterioration in South Viet-Nam compelled, in the fall of 1963, decisions that I think must be counted as the ninth critical point of United States policy-making. It was decided at that time that, while the United States would do everything necessary to support the war, it would no longer adhere to its posture of all-out support of the Diem regime unless that regime made sweeping changes in its method of operation. The record of this period has been described by Robert Shaplen and now by Hilsman. Undoubtedly, our new posture contributed to the overthrow of Diem in November, 1963.

I do not myself think that we could in the end have done otherwise, but the important historical point is that our actions tended to deepen our involvement in South Viet-Nam and our commitment to the evolution of non-Communist nationalism, always foreseen to be difficult—that would follow the overthrow of Diem.

Unfortunately, the fall of Diem—while it had overwhelming popular support in South Viet-Nam—failed to produce an effective new government. For a year and a half, South Viet-Nam wallowed in political confusion, and power finally passed, with the agreement of civilian political leaders, to the Thieu-Ky, military-led government of June 1965.

This political confusion was disheartening, but it was not surprising. For South Viet-Nam had never been trained by the French to govern itself, and above all it was faced with steadily rising North Vietnamese and Viet Cong terrorist and military action. Intensification of that action began almost at once after the overthrow of Diem and demonstrated, if it needed demonstrating, that the struggle was not over Diem—despite Communist claims and honest liberal qualms—but was an attempt to destroy non-Communist nationalism of any sort in South Viet-Nam.

In early 1964, President Johnson expressly reaffirmed all the essential elements of the Kennedy Administration policies, publicly, through every action, and through firm internal directives. It is simply not true to say that there was any change in policy in this period toward greater military emphasis, much less major new military actions. Further actions were not excluded—as they had not been in 1954 or 1961—but President Johnson's firm object right up to February 1965 was to make the policy adopted in late 1961 work if it could possibly be done, including the fullest possible emphasis on pacification and the whole political and civilian aspect.

The summer of 1964 did bring a new phase, though not a change in policy. The situation was continuing to decline, and North Viet-Nam may have been emboldened by the trend. Certainly, infiltration was rising steadily, and as we now know more clearly, began to include substantial numbers of native North Vietnamese. But, more dramatically, American naval ships on patrol in the Gulf of Tonkin were attacked, and there were two responding United States attacks on North Vietnamese naval bases.

This led President Johnson to seek, and the Congress to approve overwhelmingly on August 7, 1964, a resolution—drafted in collaboration with Congressional leaders—that not only approved such retaliatory attacks but added that:

"The United States regards as vital to its national interest and to world peace the maintenance of international peace and security in Southeast Asia. Consonant with the Constitution of the United States and the Charter of the United Nations and in accordance with its obligtaions under the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty, the United States is, therefore, prepared, as the President determines, to take all necessary steps, including the use of armed force, to assist any member or protocol state of the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty requesting assistance in defense of its freedom."

X

So things stood through the election period. But as 1964 drew to a close, the situation was moving steadily downward in every respect, both military and political. A review of policy was undertaken, analyzing three basic choices: to continue the existing policy with every improvement that could be devised within its limits, to take new and major military measures, while adhering to the same basic objectives that had been followed all along, or to move toward withdrawal.

From late November onward, these choices were intensively examined, even as the military threat grew, the political confusion in Saigon deepened, and all the indicators recorded increasingly shaky morale and confidence not only in South Viet-Nam but throughout the deeply concerned countries of Southeast Asia. By late January, it was the clear judgment of all those concerned with policy and familiar with the situation that the first choice was rapidly becoming no choice at all—and not, to use the phrase of one commentator, a "constructive alternative." To "muddle through" (that commentator's phrase) was almost certainly to muddle out and to accept that South Viet-Nam would be turned over to Communist control achieved through externally backed subversion and aggression.

This was a straight practical judgment. It ran against the grain of every desire of the President and his advisers. But I myself am sure it was a right judgment—accepted at the time by most sophisticated observers and, in the light of reflective examination, now accepted I believe by virtually everyone who knows the situation at all at first hand.

There were, in short, only two choices—to move toward withdrawal or to do a lot more, both for its military impact and, at the outset, to prevent a collapse of South Vietnamese morale and will to continue.

And, as the deliberations continued within the Administration, the matter was brought to a head by a series of sharp attacks on American installations in particular. These attacks were serious in themselves, but above all they confirmed the over-all analysis that North Viet-Nam was supremely confident and was moving for the kill. And, as they thus moved, it seemed clear that they would in fact succeed and perhaps in a matter of months.

Let me pause here to clear up another current historical inaccuracy. The basis for the successive decisions—in February to start bombing, in March to introduce small numbers of combat forces, and in July to move to major United States combat forces—was as I have stated it. It depended on an over-all view of the situation, and on an over-all view that what had been going on for years was for all practical purposes aggression—and indeed this term dates from late 1961 or early 1962 in the statements of senior Administration spokesmen.

But there is a separate point whether, as has sometimes been asserted, it was the United States alone which unilaterally changed the character of the war in the direction of a conventional conflict. It is alleged that Hanoi was adhering to a tacit agreement that, so long as we did not bomb North Viet-Nam, Hanoi would not send in its regulars, at least in units.

Multiple and conclusive evidence which became available from the spring of 1965 onward seems to me to refute these contentions. As has been repeatedly made public over the past two years, we know that one North Vietnamese regiment entered South Viet-Nam by December 1964, and we know that several other regiments entered in the spring of 1965 on timetables of infiltration that can only have reflected command decisions taken in Hanoi prior to the beginning of the bombing.

From the standpoint of the basis for U.S. decisions, this evidence simply reinforces the February picture that Hanoi was moving for the kill. Native North Vietnamese, alone or in regular units, were in themselves no more and no less aggressive than the earlier native South Vietnamese who had gone North and become North Vietnamese nationals. The point is that *Hanoi*—as we suspected then and later proved—had taken major steps to raise the level of the war before the bombing began.

As to any tacit agreement, these facts alone seem to disprove that there ever was one. Moreover, students of North Vietnamese behavior, and especially of the recent major captured North Vietnamese documents, would in any event find such an allegation hard to credit. Is it not far more reasonable to conclude that Hanoi preferred to conceal its hand, but was prepared at all times to put in whatever was necessary to bring about military victory—and that the regular units were simply a part of that policy, introduced after they had run out of native Southerners and wanted to maintain and step up the pressure?

But this historical point is less important than the fundamental elements of the situation as it stood at the time. On the one hand, all of what I have earlier described as the bedrock elements still remained—a strong Chinese Communist and North Vietnamese threat to Southeast Asia, a crucial link between the defense of South Viet-Nam and the realization of that threat, and the validity of non-Communist nationalism, whatever its imperfections, in South Viet-Nam and in the other nations of Southeast Asia.

Moreover, the wider implications for our commitments elsewhere appeared no less valid than they had ever been. Viet-Nam still constituted a major, perhaps even a decisive, test case of whether the Communist strategy of "wars of national liberation," or "people's wars" could be met and countered even in the extraordinarily difficult circumstances of South Viet-Nam. Then as now, it has been I think rightly judged that a success for Hanoi in South Viet-Nam could only encourage the use of this technique by Hanoi, and over time by the Communist Chinese, and might well have the effect of drawing the Soviets into competition with Peking and Hanoi and away from the otherwise promising trends that have developed in Soviet policy in the past 10 years.

Finally, it was judged from the outset that stronger action by us in Viet-Nam would not operate to bring the Soviet Union and Communist China closer together, and that the possibility of major Chinese Communist intervention could be kept to a minimum, so long as we made it clear at all times, both by word and deed, that our objective was confined solely to freeing South Viet-Nam from external interference, and that we did not threaten Communist China but rather looked to the ultimate hope of what the Manila Declaration, of last fall, called "reconcilation and peace throughout Asia."

On the other hand, it was recognized from the outset that the taking of these new major military measures involved heavy costs and hazards. The South Vietnamese still had to play the crucial role in military security and above all in political and economic development and stability. A greater American role was bound to complicate South Vietnamese evolution. It was bound to increase the scale of the war and to cost significantly in lives and very heavily in resources. Even though the casualties and damage of the war remain far below what was suffered in Korea, war is never anything but ugly and brutal.

The balance was struck, after the most careful deliberation, in favor of the course that has since been followed. The key elements in the policy were stated in President Johnson's Baltimore speech of April 1965, and the major combat force commitment was explained in the President's statement of July 28, 1965. These have been the cornerstones of policy, and they have been elaborated and explained repeatedly and at length by all senior Administration spokesmen.

In essence:

(*a*) Our objective remained solely that of protecting the independence of South Viet-Nam from external interference and force. We declined, and still decline, to threaten the regime in North Viet-Nam itself, or the territory and regime of Communist China.

(*b*) We indicated in April of 1965 that we were prepared for discussions or negotiations without condition, and we have relentlessly pursued our own efforts to enter into meaningful discussions as well as following up on a host of peace initiatives by others. Unfortunately Hanoi has clung firmly to the objective of insuring a Communist takeover of South Viet-Nam, and has refused to enter into any fruitful discussions. Indeed, Hanoi has rejected any discussions whatever, initially unless its basic objective was accepted in advance through the so-called "third point," more recently unless we agreed to a complete cessation of the bombing without any responsive action on their part. Hanoi's philosophy toward negotiation has now become authoritatively available, particularly in the section on "fighting while negotiating" in the captured remarks of one of the North Vietnamese leaders, Comrade Vinh.

(*c*) We continued to place every possible emphasis on the crucial non-military aspects of the conflict, greatly strengthening our own contribution to the essentially South Vietnamese task of restoring stability and control in the countryside and working for the welfare of the people.

(*d*) Militarily, our actions were directed to proving to North Viet-Nam that its effort to take over the South by military force must fail, and to extending and enlarging the areas in which the vital business of bringing real security and peace to the countryside could go forward with all the strength we could hope to give it. The total effort in the South remained primary, even as the bombing of military targets in the North was carried on—initially to demonstrate resolve, but always and basically to make Hanoi's infiltration far more difficult and costly and to prevent levels of new men and equipment that could only, in the arithmetic of guerrilla warfare, multiply many times over, for each addition from North Vietnam, the requirement for forces in the South.

(*e*) We encouraged the South Vietnamese in their own resolve to move to a constitutional basis of government, a process set under way formally by Prime Minister Ky in January of 1966 and followed since that time in the face of all the difficulties and dangers of attempting to create such a basis in a country without political experience and ravaged by terrorism and by guerrilla and conventional military action.

(*f*) We encouraged the South Vietnamese at the same time to proceed on the track that has now become reconciliation, the holding out to members of the Viet Cong of the possibility of re-entering the political life of their country under peaceful conditions. In essence, we seek and would accept a fair determination of the will of the people of South Viet-Nam along the lines well summarized by Abassador Goldberg's Chicago speech of May 12, 1967.

These were the South Vietnamese aspects of our policy. But then, as previously, the policy was seen in the wider context of the future of Southeast Asia. So it was that President Johnson lent our strong support in April of 1965 to the development of regional cooperation and of economic projects created through Asian initiative. By this vital element in our policy, we made clear again that our underlying objective was to do what we could to assist in the constructive task of bringing about a Southeast Asia of cooperative and independent nations, whatever their international postures might be.

We had a security job to do in Viet-Nam, and were joined over time by five other area nations in supplying military forces to do that job. And we are assisting Thailand against a concerted Chinese Communist and North Vietnamese effort at external subversion—an effort begun, to keep the record straight, as early as 1962 and clearly and definitively by December 1964, before our major decisions in Viet-Nam. Our SEATO and ANZUS undertakings remain firm.

But we looked beyond these, and we must still look beyond these, to the whole question of the future of Southeast Asia, and to the role that we can play in assisting the nations of the area to consolidate their national independence and to improve the welfare of their people.

SUMMARY

This, then, is a bare-bones account of "The Path to Viet-Nam." Even within its own terms, it may omit what others would include. And, long as it may seem, it is still incomplete in two respects that it would take far too much time to cover.

First, it is plainly inadequate to focus solely on our policies toward .Viet-Nam or even toward Southeast Asia as a whole. Those policies are intimately related to the rest of Asia, to the implications of Asian developments for other areas and in the last analysis for our own national security, and to our central world purpose—the creation of an international order of independent states.

Secondly, I have tried to isolate what I consider to have been the major policy decisions. Obviously, policy is not just a matter of single decisions, however fully considered. A vast number of lesser policy decisions have accompanied these basic ones, and the way in which a basic policy is carried out in the end affects its substance. I have not tried to cover, for example, decisions on the balance of effort within South Viet-Nam, decisions on particular negotiating proposals, decisions on the pace and nature of the bombing of North Viet-Nam, or the subtle and difficult problem, over the years, of United States influence toward political progress in the South. I know full well that these are areas in which many of you undoubtedly hold strong views. I welcome discussion of them.

"THE LESSON IN INVOLVEMENT"

What, then, is "the lesson in involvement"?

Is it that we have been trapped into a difficult situation by a series of lesser decisions taken with no clear view of their implications?

Is it that we should never have become engaged in Southeast Asia?

Is it that we should never have attempted to support South Viet-Nam?

Is it that, having supported South Viet-Nam in certain respects (including a treaty), and having become deeply engaged in Southeast Asia, we should nonetheless have decided—or should now decide—to limit the actions we take, or even to withdraw entirely?

The first question seems to me both separate and difficult. At some point in the history I have recited we became committed, deliberately and by formal constitutional process, to the support of the freedom of South Viet-Nam from external interference. That commitment included a strong treaty obligation, and that is a clear part of the story. But what is perhaps more to the point is that great powers must face two central points:

(*a*) As Irving Kristol has pointed out in his recent article in *Foreign Affairs*, the very definition of a great power is that not only its actions but the cases in which it declines to act have major consequences. At every stage in the Viet-Nam story, it has seemed clear to the leaders of this country that not to act would have the gravest effects. This is the way that successive choices have appeared to four successive Presidents.

(*b*) The second point that a great power cannot escape is that its actions in themselves affect the stakes. When great powers commit themselves—by treaty and by a total course of conduct extending over many years—an element of reliance comes into being, both within the area and within other areas in which commitments have also been undertaken.

Yet, all this being said, I do not think one can conclude that because we said or did A, we must necessarily say or do B—in an old phrase of Bismarck's. So I, for one, do not believe that the "lesson in involvement" is that we are the prisoners of history.

Rather, I think we should be focusing on the second, third, and fourth questions I have listed above.

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

These are big questions, and if I have tried to do anything today it is to stress that the matter has really been looked at for at least the last 13 years in this kind of larger framework. The policies followed today are, as they must be, the policies of this Administration. No one can say whether another administration would have done the same. What can be said is that the underlying viewpoint and analysis of factors have been largely similar throughout the last 13 years, if not longer.

This does not prove, of course, that this analysis has been correct. The United States has no divine dispensation from error, and the most that your leaders, at any time, can do is to exert the best human judgment and moral sense of which they are capable. I for one am convinced that this has been done at all stages.

In essence, the question is not capable of geometric proof. Like all policy, it is a judgment. Our bet with history has been that Southeast Asia does matter, that the independence of South Viet-Nam crucially affects Southeast Asia, and that non-Communist nationalism in Southeast Asia and in Viet-Nam has in it the seeds of a peaceful, progressive, and stable area that can take its place in a world at peace.

Other factors enter in, as I have tried to summarize, and despite their variations from time to time remain of major general importance. But it is primarily from the standpoint of Southeast Asia that I would like to close my remarks today. How do the bets I have described look today?

Southeast Asia surely matters more than ever. A region which may have held as few as 30 million inhabitants in 1800—and which is carried under the heading of "peripheral areas" in some textbooks on East Asia—now holds more than 250 million people, more than Latin America and almost as much as the population of Western Europe. The resources of this area are large, and its people—while not yet capable of the kind of dramatic progress we have seen in the northern parts of Asia—have great talent, intelligence, and industry. Its geographical location—while it should not be in the path of great power collisions—is crucial for trade routes, and in other respects.

From the standpoint of our own security, and the kind of world in which we wish to live, I believe we must continue to be deeply concerned to do what we can to keep Southeast Asia from falling under external domination and aggression that would contribute to such domination. And I believe also that we have a wider concern in doing what we can, and as we are wanted, to assist sound programs on an individual country or regional basis, and to improve the welfare of the peoples of the area. And I do not think that you can do the latter unless the former is achieved.

The second part of our bet is that the independence of South Viet-Nam critically affects Southeast Asia. South Viet-Nam and its 15 million people are important in themselves, but they assume an additional importance if the judgment is accepted that a success for aggression there would drastically weaken the situation in Southeast Asia and indeed beyond. That judgment cannot be defended solely by reference to the dynamics of major aggressive powers and their prospective victims in the past. I myself believe that those parallels have validity, but the question is always what Justice Holmes called "concrete cases." In this concrete case, I think the underlying judgment has been valid, and remains valid today.

None of us can say categorically that the Communist Chinese would in due course move—if opportunity offered—to dominate wide areas of Southeast Asia through pressure and subversion. But that is what the Chinese and their maps say, and their Communist doctrine appears to add vital additional emphasis. It is what they are doing in Thailand today, and through local Communist allies in Burma, Cambodia, Malaysia, and Singapore. And it is what they would like to do in Indonesia again.

Surely Adlai Stevenson was right that the threat of Communist China is not so fanciful that it should not serve as a valid assumption of policy. And we can be more categorical that Hanoi intends to dominate at least the successor states of Indochina, and would move rapidly to this end if it were to get practical control of South Viet-Nam.

Perhaps the hardest point for some to grasp is the psychological impact of a development such as the fall of South Viet-Nam in this setting. As to Hanoi and Peking, judgment and past experience point to the conclusion that it would greatly encourage them to push further. As to the threatened nations, the view of their leaders is a matter of record. All over Southeast Asia, whatever the posture of the individual nation, the great body of responsible opinion—and I invite you to check this against any firsthand account—accepts the judgment stated only the other day by the independent and non-aligned Prime Minister of Singapore, Mr. Lee Kuan Yew:

> "I feel the fate of Asia—South and Southeast Asia—will be decided in the next few years by what happens out in Viet-Nam."

I could multiply that quotation ten times over in public statements, and ten times more in private statements. As Drew Middleton of the *Times* reported last June after a trip in the area:

> "Despite some misgivings, non-Communist leaders from Tokyo to Tehran largely support United States policies in South and Southeast Asia."

This does not mean that every nation accepts our choice of military actions. Some would have us do more, some less. But it does lead to the clear conclusion that our own view accords with the deep sense in Southeast Asia, and indeed elsewhere in Asia, that the struggle in South Viet-Nam is crucial to the independence and continued ability to work for its people of each and every nation for a wide area.

Lastly, there is the question whether a new Southeast Asia is in fact being built and can be developed. On this point, surely the developments of the last five years, and particularly the last two years, have been vastly encouraging. Where Indonesia in 1965 was drifting rapidly to Communist control and practical alignment with Peking, it now stands on a staunchly nationalist basis, abandoning the threat to its neighbors and seeking to work out the chaotic economic problems left by Sukarno—with the multilateral help of ourselves and others. Regional cooperation within Southeast Asia, and among Asian nations as a whole, has taken great and historic strides. And it is the widely accepted view in the area—which I share—that these developments would have been far less likely if we had not acted as we did in 1965, and if Communist force had thus taken over in South Viet-Nam.

So all over Southeast Asia there is today a sense of confidence—to which Drew Middleton again testified from his trip. Time has been bought, and used. But that confidence is not solid or secure for the future. It would surely be disrupted if we were, in President Johnson's words, to permit a Communist takeover in South Viet-Nam either through withdrawal or "under the cloak of a meaningless agreement." If, on the contrary we proceed on our present course—with measured military actions and with every possible non-military measure, and searching always for an avenue to peace—the prospectts for a peaceful and secure Southeast Asia now appear brighter than they have been at any time since the nations of the area were established on an independent basis.

In short, I think the stakes are very grave indeed. The costs are large, and it is clear that we must steel our national capacity and resolve to continue in a tough struggle and still do those things that we must do to meet our problems at home. I find it impossible to believe that we do not have the national capacity and resolve to do both.

The New Manpower Grab

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 23, 1967

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, once again, the Johnson administration is seeking congressional authority to expand the activities of the U.S. Employment Service under the guise of escalating the alleged unconditional war on poverty. The legislative vehicle which would make USES the principal manpower agency of the Nation is H.R. 11280. This is the new manpower grab.

Ostensibly, this bill would give USES a new charter which would "provide a more comprehensive and definitive statement by Congress" of the role that the Service is to play in dealing with the Nation's employment and manpower problems. In plainer terms, it would give approval to USES efforts to take over the entire employment placement industry now handled more than adequately by private enterprise.

Mr. Speaker, you will recall that a similar bid for power by the Employment Service died with the adjournment of the 89th Congress. The objectives of this bill are the same as those of last year's bill, although they have been buried amidst flowery and flowing language. The proposals appear to be but slight modifications of activities already approved and the logical extension thereof. The extension of powers provided for are couched in moderate terms and contain no extreme language which might alert and fan opposition.

But careful study reveals that the employment service bill of 1967, as this bill is entitled, is nothing more than a cleverly written attempt by USES to pull the wool over the eyes of Congress. The true intent of the bill is the eventual takeover of all employment functions of this Nation, all under the guise of assisting the unemployed and disadvantaged.

The March 1967 issue of the American Legion Magazine contained a brief statement I prepared regarding the purported need for a USES charter. Although written before the introduction of H.R. 11280, the article is appropriate to this legislation and to the prevailing policies of the Department of Labor regarding their so-called need for comprehensive manpower services.

Mr. Speaker, I insert this article in the RECORD so that every Member of this Congress will be made aware of the latest efforts of the administration to make additional inroads in another area of private enterprise:

A "new charter" for the United States Employment Service is the polite description of an ambitious power grab that, if successful, would make this agency "the manpower agency" of the nation. This is the goal established some years ago by its former director, Louis Levine. It is a goal toward which USES has been working in countless quiet maneuvers. It is the goal it sought to legitimatize through the Clark-Holland Bill, which fortunately failed of enactment in the closing days of the 89th Congress.

The USES received its present charter in the dark days of the great depression. It was given the task of finding jobs for the unemployed. This is still its primary responsibility, but USES has shortchanged the unemployed in order to extend its activities into services to employers, professional people and those who simply wish to change their jobs. It has sought to have industries assign their personnel functions to the employment services of the various states. It has tried to take over the placement services of our colleges and universities. It has offered testing and counseling services in high schools. In short, its efforts are directed toward a day when any American workingman or woman who seeks a new job will be required to go to the government employment agency. Every American businessman who seek new employees will have to hire them through that agency. Total control of hiring and firing in America by any agency would be a serious blow to our free enterprise system, yet this is the ultimate goal of those who advocate the "new charter" for USES.

The problem of unemployment today is serious enough to absorb all of the energy and all of the talent USES can muster. Men and women with skill are in great demand today. They need no federal manpower agency. But those who remain unemployed have great need for assistance. A recent survey in Ohio indicates that of 114,000 persons remaining unemployed, 99,000 are virtually unemployable because of educational deficiences, lack of training and work experience. Fifty percent are under 25 years of age, with their adult life time still ahead of them. Similar conditions are found in all states. It is a bleak prospect, indeed, unless the federal agency assigned this responsibility renders assistance in training, and in placing these people. Its present "charter" gives the USES responsibility and ample authority to help the unemployed find work. It has responsibility under the Manpower Development and Training Act to train the unemployed. There is no requirement for broader authority or additional legislation. USES should concentrate on the job.

Unless you, as an American citizen, ask your Congressman and Senator to take steps to block the government's mammoth manpower grab, you may well find that your most basic freedom—the right to decide your own life career for yourself—will soon be the real battlefield victim of the war on poverty.

Funding ETV and Radio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVID PRYOR

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 23, 1967

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend to the attention of my colleagues an editorial that appeared in the Arkansas Democrat on July 7, 1967. This editorial highlights the importance attached by the editors of this leading Arkansas newspaper to the production of top-quality educational television and radio programs and their advocacy of public support of such undertakings. Under leave granted to extend my remarks I include this recent editorial:

FUNDING ETV AND RADIO

The administration's Public Broadcasting Act of 1967 has passed the Senate. Included in the act is $10.5 million for grants to states to support educational television and radio. In addition $9 million is appropriated for starting an independent and nonprofit Corporation of Public Broadcasting which will make quality programs available to ETV and radio facilities.

Although the appropriation for grants to TV and radio is a pittance—roughly what the networks pay yearly for a dozen in their star stable—the signs are encouraging that Congress may eventually face the real and difficult issue in the arts, primary government subsidy to the arts. So far congressmen in the main have been reticent to approve large subsidies for artistic projects which have no measurable, practical value.

Despite the boom in building cultural centers, the fact of a real cultural explosion in America remains to be proven. Someone has to pick up the tab for America's cultural life and apparently it won't be the general public, unless support is given in the form of taxes.

Educational TV and radio, often the only release from the tyranny of bad taste, must be able to compete to some degree with the commercial networks in the quality and manner of their presentations; otherwise the young will continue to be drawn to the splashy, empty fare which often clogs the airways, following an avalanche of overstated advertisement. To do this, educational television and radio need more than a minimal budget. In the past it has not been basically the subjects or ideas of educational TV which have left something to be desired, but rather the frequent impression that the productions fell short of their intensions because of minimal funds and personnel.

Comments on the Social Security Amendments of 1967, as Passed by the House

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 21, 1967

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I find that the position taken by the Bristol, Tenn., Herald-Courier on the Social Security Amendments for 1967, which we passed last Thursday, is a sound and insightful appraisal of the measure.

So that these comments will be available to all my colleagues, I insert this editorial in the Appendix of the RECORD:

NEW WELFARE BILL IS LONG OVERDUE

The vote of 413 to 3 by the House of Representatives for a harsh, new line on welfare recipients reflects the mood of the nation. It gives notice that taxpayers are no longer going to stand for making handouts a way of life in this country.

As Chairman Wilbur D. Mills of the Ways and Means Committee, which wrote the bill, said, "We are rough in this bill—we intend to be—but we do not intend to be inhuman."

Mills was referring to the changes the committee made aimed at forcing off the welfare rolls and into gainful employment as many persons as are trainable and employable. They must take work training and seek employment hereafter, instead of living on the dole.

The core change involves aid to families with dependent children, which has doubled in 10 years. Almost five million mothers and their children are now beneficiaries. They are largely concentrated in the urban Negro population of the north.

As Mills said, the committee does not intend to be inhuman. Savings in the year 1972, five years hence for persons trained who become self-sufficient would be $130 million. That is only 7 per cent of the estimated 1972 cost of the program, without changes of $1.837 billion. Presumably, the rest would be unemployable.

In addition, the bill estimates costs in 1972 of $470 million for day care for children of mothers required to work, and $225 million for work training. Thus, $695 million would be spent to enable beneficiaries to earn $130 million. But a break would begin in the present self-feeding system. And; if the bill works as intended, the earnings may be more.

Briefly, the bill denies relief to parents or children over 16 who are deemed qualified to work, or can be trained for work, and who refuse either work or training. They will have to join the rest of the work force instead of living on its earnings.

The best part of the reform is that the reliefers will be the gainers in the long run.

Avoiding Blackouts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1967

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, ever since the massive northeast power failure of November 1965, there has been widespread concern in this country about the reliability of the network of utilities that supplies our electricity. This concern was heightened early last June when a somewhat smaller failure cut off power to 13 million people in parts of New Jersey, Maryland, Delaware, and my own State of Pennsylvania.

Last month, the Federal Power Commission released its long-awaited report on the "Prevention of Power Failures," which contains recommendations based on an 18-month study of our vital electric utility system.

The report is a long one, but its recommendations are so important to assuring the reliability of electric power service in this country, that I urge my colleagues to read an editorial summarizing the report's major points which appeared in the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette of August 8, 1967.

The editorial follows:

AVOIDING BLACKOUTS

With the formal issuance of its report on the "prevention of power failures," the Federal Power Commission has taken another step in its effort to reduce the dangers and inconveniences resulting from the cutoff of electric service. A few weeks ago, on the commission's recommendation, federal legislation was introduced to require electric utilities to get together and plan safe, reliable regional power systems and to authorize the FPC to set forth criteria for the safe operation of power systems.

Now the FPC has released a comprehensive

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

report which contains additional recommendations aimed at avoiding crippling power failures. Some 20 major power failures have occurred in various parts of the country since November, 1965, when a massive blackout in the northeast led the FPC to undertake its just completed study. The report, based on this 18-month study, proposes, among other things, that federal, state and local governments establish requirements for emergency power sources and see that they are met. It points out, for example, that only 22 states have taken adequate steps to supply emergency power for essential services and that less than half of the nation's hospitals have adequate emergency power.

A major key to the prevention of blackouts, the FPC said, is the installation of stronger interconnections between power systems. To provide reliable power, the nation's power industry, according to the commission, needs to spend $8 billion on high voltage lines between now and 1975. This is an outlay of about $3 billion more than is being planned. Yet, as FPC Chairman Lee C. White observed, reliability must have priority over economy," even if this means increased costs to consumers. A rise in costs, however, is not necessarily required, since better interconnections could bring economies for the industry.

In any event, steps must be taken to assure the public of the reliability of the electric power on which so many life-saving services depend. If industry cooperation, based on federal criteria, does not provide an adequate guarantee against breakdowns, then the government will have to be given broader power than that envisaged in the pending legislation.

American Public Opinion and the Vietnam War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 23, 1967

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news article, datelined Paris, which appeared in today's Albany, N.Y., Times-Union. It sets forth the views of the renowned journalist, Kingsbury Smith, European director and chief foreign writer for the Hearst newspapers, concerning the position of the United States in Vietnam. The news article is titled: "U.S. Facing Test of Patience in Vietnam." Mr. Smith clearly states that American public opinion may be the worst enemy the United States has in these very crucial days of the Vietnam crisis. Historically, Americans have always sought a quick and efficient solution to problems—both economic and political.

I commend to my colleagues Mr. Smith's very searching analysis of the Vietnam problem.

The article follows:

UNITED STATES FACING TEST OF PATIENCE IN VIET WAR

(By Kingsbury Smith)

PARIS.—America is now facing its greatest test of patience in the Vietnam war.

If the American people have the stamina to support President Johnson's Vietnam policy for another 16 months, there is a good chance a peace settlement can be achieved that will save South Vietnam and Southeast Asia from Communist domination, and prove a great victory for the free world.

If the American will breaks and public opinion turns strongly against the President's present policy, one of the following two possibilities is likely to develop within the next year:

1. A desperate effort by President Johnson to force the Hanoi regime to its knees by large-scale escalation of military pressure against North Vietnam, including a land invasion, with the risk of precipitating Chinese intervention and a war with Red China.

2. A compromise peace settlement that could win the President reelection in 1968 but would pave the way for eventual Communist control of South Vietnam and Southeast Asia.

The will of the American people to stick it out is now showing signs of weakening to the point of where one of the aforementioned alternatives may become a strong possibility.

If public opinion turns strongly against the President's present policy, he is not likely to continue it unchanged.

Such are the views I have heard expressed in recent days in pro-American political and diplomatic circles in Paris. Little hope is held in these circles that Hanoi will respond favorably to new peace overtures which President Johnson is reportedly planning to make after the South Vietnamese elections are held early in September.

Diplomatic advices from Hanoi, Moscow and Peking indicate the Communists are counting on the American will to break and either force President Johnson to acquiesce to a compromise settlement that will assure them of eventual domination of South Vietnam or lead to his defeat in 1968 by a Republican candidate committed to pulling America out of the Vietnam conflict.

Diplomatic dispatches from Hanoi state that the North Vietnamese regime and the Viet Cong leadership have been greatly encouraged by reports of the President's declining popularity in public opinion polls, and especially dwindling support for his Vietnam policy.

Ho Chi Minh is said to be more confident than ever that if the Communists hold out for another 18 months, President Johnson will be defeated in 1968 and America will pull out of Vietnam shortly thereafter.

Constitution Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARVIN L. ESCH

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 23, 1967

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, in just a month our Nation will celebrate Constitution Week. In this time of national crises, both here at home and throughout the world, it is well that we stop to reflect on the wonderful and flexible Government which our Constitution guarantees to us. Although our Constitution was framed nearly 200 years ago when we were a small, isolated, and rural Nation, it still serves us well as we have assumed the role of world leadership and have become a large and urban society.

Our Nation faces great challenges in the decade ahead—can we meet the needs of our domestic situation without sacrificing our international leadership—can we turn into constructive channels the energies of our alienated youth and minority groups—can we break the circle of poverty which binds so many of our people into hopeless and unproductive lives—can we encourage our free enterprise system to take increasing leadership in the solutions of our national problems? Clearly these are the significant questions which must be decided in the light of our Constitution's pledge of freedom and justice for all.

The Detroit Board of Commerce is taking leadership in its efforts to encourage community consideration of the problems facing our Nation and the responsibilities of citizens to participate in the constitutional process of solving them. It has already begun to prepare for Constitution Week and to encourage businesses and community organizations in the Detroit area to participate in it. As Edwin O. George, chairman of the Constitution Week Committee said, Constitution Week is a time to show our patriotism proudly, to highlight our yearround commitment to upholding our liberty under law.

Mr. Speaker, the Detroit program for Constitution Week is an excellent one and I encourage cities around the Nation to follow their fine example.

I include the following two articles from the Greater Detroit Board of Commerce weekly newspaper, Detroiter:

YOU CAN HELP MAKE CONSTITUTION WEEK MEANINGFUL

Never before have justice, domestic tranquility, and concern for the general welfare been of greater significance to us. This nation was founded to ensure freedom of choice, of opportunity, under law and order for all citizens. But freedom is not static; it is a way of life, and it demands our constant vigilance in exercising our unalienable rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Constitution Week has been proclaimed for September 17–23 by the President of the United States and the Governor of the State of Michigan to focus attention on our rights and responsibilities as citizens. The United States Constitution sets the legal basis for our government. The preservation of that government, however, requires the continuing exercise of our responsibilities as citizens. Only to the extent that we determine to preserve our liberty under law will our nation remain free.

I urge all citizens to join in making Constitution Week a time of rededication to American patriotism and a meaningful celebration of our liberty under law.

You can help by being well informed and encouraging your family and friends to become active, informed citizens. Display Constitution Week posters in offices and plants, at meetings, in schools and public buildings. Order the booklets of "Our Constitution" and distribute them to employes and associates. The reproductions of our Charters of Liberty are the visual reminders of the ideas on which this nation is founded; why not send them to friends with a note inviting them to join you in a rededication to personal initiative and responsibility.

A number of business and industrial firms are developing window displays for Constitution Week and including articles or editorial viewpoints in their company magazines and newsletters. Plan now to be sure your company is one of them. As practitioners of free enterprise, businessmen would do well to speak out on principles of economic freedom inherent in our Constitution in their radio and newspaper advertising during Constitution Week. This is a fine opportunity to have your advertising carry a message for freedom.

September 17–23 is a most appropriate time for associations, clubs, and civic groups to invite a speaker for a Constitution Week meeting. Ask your organization's program chairman now to schedule such a program.

This nation was formed and prospered based on morality under God; in attending religious services together on Sunday, September 17, families might particularly rededicate themselves to strengthening family life.

Libraries are full of books about the formation of our country; how long is it since you've read about the exciting events when men were building the foundation of our freedom? Schools will find Constitution Week an appropriate time for study projects on American history and citizenship. Why not take time to discuss the rights and responsibilities of freedom at home with your children, too?

Let's show our patriotism proudly. Let's commit ourselves anew to the American ideals of freedom and justice. Let's celebrate Constitution Week as the highlight of our year-around commitment to upholding our liberty under law.

CONSTITUTION WEEK—COMMITTEE PROMOTES LAW AND ORDER IN COMMUNITY PROGRAM

"Protect Your Liberty Under Law—Know Your U.S. Constitution" is the theme of Constitution Week materials available for use during September 17–23, 1967. Flyers showing the poster and carrying information on booklets and reproduction of the U.S. Constitution, Bill of Rights, and Declaration of Independence which can be ordered went out to business and civic organizations, government bodies and educational institutions, cultural and community groups this week.

Constitution Week General Chairman Edwin O. George, president of Detroit Edison Co., is head of the program being spearheaded through your Board of Commerce.

Members of the Constitution Week Executive Committee directing dissemination of materials and working with various community groups on activities are Ray Okonski, president of Michigan-Dynamics, Inc., in charge of Business and Industry Liaison; Dale I. Sellers, senior vice president of the Bank of the Commonwealth, in charge of Community Programs; Edward L. Cushman, executive vice president of Wayne State University, working with Educational Institutions; Thomas R. Reid, director of Civic and Governmental Affairs for Ford Motor Company, in charge of Government Liaison; Mrs. Mary Ball, executive secretary of the Community Cultural Council, head of Civic Liaison; and Henry D. Brown, director of the Detroit Historical Museum, in charge of Cultural Programs.

The Constitution Week poster and promotional flyer on materials available has been developed under the direction of John S. Pingel, president of Ross Roy, Inc., as head of Promotion. George L. Lahodny, vice president of Sales for The Detroit Edison Company, is serving as Chairman of the Constitution Week Banquet to be held on Thursday, September 21 at the Statler-Hilton Hotel. Chairman of Finance is Frank Couzens, Jr., senior vice president of Manufacturers National Bank of Detroit.

Constitution Week is proclaimed each year by the President of the United States to commemorate the formation and signing of the United States Constitution on September 17, 1787.

Social Security Amendments of 1967

SPEECH

OF

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1967

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 12080) to amend the Social Security Act to provide an increase in benefits under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system, to provide benefits for additional categories of individuals, to improve the public assistance program and programs relating to the welfare and health of children, and for other purposes.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, on April 5, 1935, the Ways and Means Committee report called for "a comprehensive and constructive attack on insecurity." On April 19, after 20 hours of debate under a wide-open rule, the House passed the most sweeping social legislation in history. The Social Security Act was signed into law by President Roosevelt on August 15, 1935.

The legislation we are considering today is a logical and long-needed reaffirmation of our national commitment to mount "a constructive comprehensive and constructive attack on insecurity." Today, there are over 23 million elderly and disabled people, widows, and orphans receiving social security benefits. This is more than three times the number eligible in 1935. In my own State of New Jersey, a total of 758,661 people received $61.6 million in benefits during calendar year 1966. In Hudson and Union Counties alone, $11.4 million in social security benefits was paid to 137,442 citizens. The impact of the changes we are considering today will not be small in New Jersey.

This bill grants an across-the-board 12½-percent increase in benefits for all persons currently on the social security rolls. The proposed increase in old-age benefits will lift the increasingly pressing burden of rising costs from those who are least able to sustain the increases—our elderly citizens. In addition, this legislation would increase the special payments for certain people over 72 years of age who have not been enrolled long enough in the social security program to qualify for the regular cash benefits. I might add here that I have introduced a bill to rectify an inequity that will remain in the law, in that those receiving private pensions remain eligible for this type of pension payment but those receiving some type of governmental pension do not. My bill would afford governmental pensioners equal opportunities for this pension.

In the area of medicare and medicaid, the 1967 amendments strengthen the administration of the program while at the same time improving the efficiency and speeding services to eligible individuals and families.

H.R. 12080 will reform many of the outdated and inefficient provisions dealing with aid to families with dependent children. Emphasis will be placed on work training, employment counseling and job opportunities. Income incentives will be established to encourage members of these families to get and hold a job.

The child welfare and child health sections of the act will be augmented by increased funds as well as consolidation of separate earmarked authorizations in the programs for the health of children and their mothers. More personnel with higher qualifications will be authorized in order to better cope with the increasingly complex situations arising in the child health and welfare area.

Mr. Chairman, in 1957, Health, Education, and Welfare Secretary Marion B. Folsom said:

> (I)n the years ahead . . . the prevention of poverty will become less and less a question of economic capacity. It will be more and more a matter of planning and organizing to do the job.

The amendments we are considering today will implement the long-recognized and pressing changes in the social security setup. By these amendments we will be better able and better organized "to do the job."

As the then 4-term Congressman JOHN W. MCCORMACK said in 1935:

> We cannot legislate today to adequately meet the conditions that might exist in 1970, but at least we can lay the foundation today so that those of 1970 and later will be able to more easily meet the problems that might confront them.

We must have courage equal to our predecessors of 1935 who expertly laid the groundwork of the social security system. We now have the benefit of hindsight to recognize the need for these extensive changes and to meet the challenges wrought by 32 years of dramatic social and economic change in America.

President Johnson, in calling for these omnibus revisions in the social security laws, has faced squarely our responsibility to provide a means to a life of dignity and a sense of security for our senior citizens and for those of our people who have been left without means to carry on a productive life.

I rise in support of the social security amendments as reported by the committee. Although in some cases the increases are minimal, they will, nevertheless, serve to upgrade the social security system and they represent a continuation of our attack on poverty and insecurity in the United States.

CSM High-Protein Food: U.S. Industry Contributes to War on Hunger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 21, 1967

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, as the House begins consideration of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1967, it is a fitting time to review one of the true success stories of our foreign aid.

It is the story of CSM, a high-protein blended food which is now combating malnutrition in children all over the globe as part of our Nation's war on hunger.

CSM is particularly notable because it is the result of cooperation between American industry and the Agency for International Development in the interests of starving boys and girls.

When specifications were established the corn millers produced without cost to the Government, samples of the product for worldwide testing.

In May 1966, half a ton of CSM donated by the millers was airlifted without charge by Air India to Bombay for testing in a child feeding program.

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

I am proud to say that a key firm in this effort was Krause Milling Co. of Milwaukee, which is located in my district.

The first purchase of CSM was made in September 1966. Since then 277 million pounds have been purchased to combat hunger and malnutrition in children in less-developed lands.

This case history, it seems to me, is an outstanding example of men working intelligently and far-sightedly for others, to their own ultimate benefit.

From talking to some of the men in the private sector who were responsible for the development of CSM, I know that they were motivated to make their investment of capital as much by a deep concern for starving peoples, as by the prospects of future sales.

They were willing to make an investment in the future. So must we. For that is what foreign aid is: an investment in the future.

Impressed by this success in our aid programs, I have asked the President to cite in some special way those men, both in and out of government, who have been responsible for this milestone in the war on hunger. The White House has informed me that the matter at present is under consideration.

In order to provide my colleagues with further information on CSM and other examples of industry cooperation in the war on hunger, I am including, at this point in the RECORD, a copy of a report on the subject which was specially requested from AID officials:

INDUSTRY COOPERATION IN WAR ON HUNGER PROGRAM

American trade associations and private business have been most helpful in contributing their talents to achieve Agency for International Development's War on Hunger efforts. Assistance from the private sector has been of particular value in the development of high-protein blended foods designed primarily to combat malnutrition in children.

For example, the American Corn Millers Federation, the Soybean Council of America and the Dry Milk Institute, and a number of individual private firms worked closely with Government (AID, USDA and NIH) in the development of CSM. This high-protein blended food is 68% gelatinized cornmeal, 25% soy flour, 5% nonfat dry milk and 2% vitamin and mineral premixes. It has a minimum protein content of 20 percent and contains the essential elements for growth of children. In the development of this product, private firms produced samples of different formulations, and ran stability and protein efficiency tests. Vitamin and mineral manufacturers contributed generously of their know how and research facilities in the development of premixes which would best meet nutritive requirements and yet assure product stability.

When specifications were established the corn millers produced without cost to the Government, samples of the product for world-wide testing. In May, 1966, half a ton of CSM donated by the millers was airlifted without charge by Air India to Bombay for acceptability testing in a child feeding program. The first purchase of CSM was made in September 1966. Since then 277 million pounds have been purchased to combat hunger and malnutrition in children in less developed countries.

The American Medical Association in a recent article in *Today's Health* made this evaluation of the product: "CSM–Mix is one of the newest weapons in the Food for Peace Program's efforts to combat malnutrition. . . . CSM is a powder which, since it has been precooked, can be prepared for consumption by merely adding it to boiling water for one minute."

The Mennonite Central Committee in a recent report on a refugee feeding program in Vietnam stated: "Almost without exception CSM is liked by children." Weight gain was noted in infants eating the product.

The processors also provided expertise and contributed samples for testing another high-protein food which is a blend of rolled wheat (80%) and soy flour (20%). Approximately 150 million pounds of this product will be available for donation programs in the current fiscal year.

The Millers National Federation, Bulgur Associates and individual millers have contributed generously of their time and resources in the development of a high-protein flour which is 70 percent straight flour and 30 percent refractionated shorts high in protein and vitamins. The protein in this product runs about 30 percent higher than in straight flour and the protein is of higher nutritive value. The millers estimate that the cost will be less than that of regular bread flour. Also the trade associations and individual millers have cooperated in the development of two blended foods one with a bulgur flour base, the other with a gelatinized flour base. Both blends contain refractioned millfeed or shorts and soy flour and are comparable to CSM in nutritive value. The millers are now providing samples of both the high protein flour and the blended food for overseas testing.

Industry has also been most helpful in the development of better packaging for Food for Freedom commodities. Trade associations representing the paper bag manufacturers, the corn millers and other processors provided much of the expertise in working with Government technicians in the development of an insect resistant multiwall paper bag. After development of specifications by Government and industry groups this bag was tested in USDA's Savannah, Georgia, laboratory and in a trial shipment of cornmeal to Brazil two years ago. Industry food and packaging experts, as well as USDA and AID entomologists, participated in checking the results of the highly successful shipment to Brazil. In view of the negligible infestation noted in unbroken bags, this insect resistant packaging has been used exclusively for shipments of CSM.

The trade association of the textile bag manufacturers, the floor and corn millers, have been cooperating with Government technicians in the development of a cotton bag which, according to tests recently completed at USDA's Savannah laboratory, is highly resistant to insect infestation. Consideration is now being given to the use of this bag in Food for Freedom program shipments.

Veterans' Pension and Readjustment Assistance Act of 1967

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN P. HAMMERSCHMIDT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1967

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, it was good to see the House unanimously adopt the conference report on the Veterans' Pension and Readjustment Assistance Act of 1967. I hope the Senate will act on this report in the near future.

As a member of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee I am well aware of the hard work that our committee has expended on this important legislation. The bill, as agreed to by the House, will provide an increase in benefits for the 2 million veterans, widows, and orphans covered by the act. In addition to the general increase in benefits, disabled veterans and widows will be eligible for additional compensation.

As a result of the changes made in the law by the passage of this act, veterans will receive more liberal allowances for education. They will also find it easier to obtain the assistance they need in financing new homes in high-cost areas. Furthermore, World War II veterans will be able to obtain VA home loans until July 25, 1970, instead of July 25, 1967, as the current law states.

Thanks to this legislation our veterans of the Vietnam conflict will be treated equitably. They will have benefits which are just and which are comparable to benefits paid other veterans.

There is one important failure in the bill as agreed to by the conference. This bill does not make provisions that allow recipients of veterans' benefits to receive increased social security benefits without reducing their veterans' benefits.

Inflation has reduced the value of benefits paid by social security and the Veterans' Administration. The House has recognized this problem and has taken steps to combat the problem by increasing benefits in both areas.

The Members of the House of Representatives are very concerned about this problem. This was illustrated by the deliberation of the conferees. An amendment was proposed to the legislation which might have eliminated this inequity but further study indicated the amendment would have hurt more people than it helped.

The conference committee decided to act on the total bill without solving this problem after they were given assurances by both Houses that further action would be taken to keep veterans from losing benefits as a result of the increase in social security.

Now, it is gratifying to know that the honorable chairman of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee has told this body that he will schedule hearings shortly after the Labor Day recess. He has assured all of us that our committee and the House will work toward a solution. We must all be sure that no veteran loses his benefits because of the recent change in the social security benefits.

I appreciate the attitude of the chairman and I look forward to working with other members of the Veterans' Affairs Committee in seeing that our veterans' interests and benefits are protected.

Social Security Amendments of 1967

SPEECH

OF

HON. MARGARET M. HECKLER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1967

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 12080) to amend the Social Security Act to provide an increase in benefits under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system, to provide benefits for additional categories of individuals, to improve the public assistance program and programs relating to the welfare and health of children, and for other purposes.

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, at long last we are considering our obligations in social security legislation—long promised to our senior citizens. Elder Americans were promised benefit increases as of July first of this year. This date passed, and it appeared until recently, that the House Ways and Means Committee might not agree on permanent changes in the social security program for several more months. For this reason, I joined with many other of my colleagues in introducing, on July 20, legislation calling for an immediate increase in retirement benefits retroactive to January 1, 1967, which would give our senior citizens a lump-sum payment from the existing surplus in the social security fund.

Changes in the existing law are long overdue. Rising prices have increased the hardships of those living on fixed incomes. Inflationary trends have eroded their purchasing power, and they have little chance to increase their buying power or catch up with the rising costs of living.

Above all, our elder Americans deserve the opportunity to live in dignity, therefore, I am pleased that the Ways and Means Committee agreed to a 12½-percent increase in benefits for offsetting the rapidly rising costs of living. I only wish that this increase, or part of it, had been made retroactive—if not to January 1, 1967, at least to July 1, 1967.

There are several other areas for improvement in the retirement system that were not contained in the bill reported by the committee. Under this bill, senior citizens may now earn $1,680 per year or $140 a month without losing any benefits. I feel that this provision is inadequate for those who now receive minimum, or near minimum benefits. In many cases, their total income including benefits and earnings fall below the President's defined $3,000 poverty level.

These are two remedies which would significantly improve the lot of those in the lower benefit categories. First, we should remove or significantly raise the ceiling on outside earnings by social security beneficiaries. As the bill stands, there is only a token increase in the earnings ceiling—certainly not enough to assist senior citizens who wish to remain productive in our society. Second, the bill should have established an automatic cost-of-living increase applicable to the benefit schedule. This measure would keep the beneficiaries purchasing power stable during inflationary periods, and would enable the senior citizens to maintain his well-earned dignity instead of periodically begging Congress for increases to offset inflationary trends.

Mr. Chairman, while I feel that the Ways and Means Committee has done a laudable job, I hope that the other body further improves this most important piece of legislation. Certainly much remains to be done.

Lleras' First Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 23, 1967

Mr. MORSE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, a year ago, it was my privilege to attend the inauguration of the new President of Colombia, Dr. Carlos Lleras Restrepo. In the August 18 edition of the Christian Science Monitor there appears a balanced, constructive analysis of President Lleras' first year in office, written by Sara H. Feininger. I include it, for the attention of my colleagues, in the RECORD:

LLERAS' FIRST YEAR

(By Sara H. Feininger)

MEDELLÍN, COLOMBIA.—After almost a year in office, Colombian President Carlos Lleras Restrepo has won general respect as a dedicated leader with an ambitious reform program for the country. How successful his program will be in bringing about the basic changes needed, however, is still a matter of public debate.

Dr. Lleras Restrepo brought to the Colombian presidency a well-defined set of objectives, which he began to put into effect immediately after his inauguration last August. On the international front, these were to broaden Colombia's commercial and political ties with Eastern Europe and build a position of leadership for Colombia within the Latin-American community, thereby weaning the country away from its previously almost exclusive orientation toward the United States. The new independence would be used to develop what Dr. Lleras Restrepo has called "positive nationalism." Domestically, Dr. Lleras Restrepo set out to increase the effective power of his own office while establishing closer ties with the people. Most important, he planned to control the economy in new ways that would solve the worsening balance of payments and inflation problem.

When President Lleras Restrepo took office, observers here predicted two major obstacles to his programs. One was the pressure groups, including the university students whose destructive strikes and demonstrations forced his predecessor, Guillermo Valencia, to declare the country in a "state of seige." Dr. Lleras Restrepo has clashed several times with the students, and so far has come out on top.

Recently, when students at Bogota's National University went on strike to protest a general raise in bus fares, Dr. Lleras Restrepo moved in soldiers and tanks to stop demonstrators from pillaging the university buildings. Actions like this have brought protests from some quarters, but have established the President's reputation as a man who will not be pushed around by anyone.

In the other predicted problem area, the Colombian National Congress, the President has also surprised observers by his political successes. For years the congress, paralyzed by factionalism and a rule requiring a two-thirds majority for most legislation, has been a severe handicap to government action. Dr. Lleras Restrepo has managed to push through congression reforms allowing a simple majority for the passage of important economic legislation, and has also obtained congressional approval for greater presidential powers in key areas. Evidently an astute politician, Dr. Lleras Restrepo has gathered support from dissident factions of his own Liberal Party by such moves as appointing radical leader Alfonso Lopez Michelson to an important committee on Colombian foreign policy.

Dr. Lleras Restrepo has thus succeeded where difficulties were forecast, and has laid strong groundwork in all the major areas of his program. During his administration, Colombia has made trade agreements with Poland and Russia. At the recent heimsphere summit meeting, Colombia took the lead in promoting the Latin-American common market. At home, Dr. Lleras Restrepo has kept in close contact with the people through his "chats" over national radio and television, and by his frequent visits to various areas of the country.

Dr. Lleras Restrepo's major problem, so far, seems to be his economic program. A sweeping "economic statute," issued in March to reorient the economy, has proved vague and cumbersome. Businessmen complain that the elaborate new controls on imports and prices are suffocating them in paperwork, and add that foreign investment has been discouraged for the same reasons.

Ironically, what may turn out to be Dr. Lleras Restrepo's greatest problem in the long run springs from his very success in most areas. Having stimulated new hopes for reform in Colombia, he must now deal with an undercurrent of doubt whether any government within the present system can really make or impose the sacrifices necessary for substantial change in the country. If such a competent and energetic president as he is not able to make significant progress on these basic problems, it is felt, then there is no reason to hope his successors might.

Colombia's young intelligentsia has for the past several years maintained an attitude of cynicism toward the established governing group. Although they respect Dr. Lleras Restrepo as an able politician, many of them doubt his "sincerity." They did not vote for him—or anyone—in the past elections, and many would not vote for him today. Compounding this hostility toward the government is the recent increase of the guerrilla movement in southern Colombia, which may indicate a sharper loss of faith in some quarters.

The fact is that Colombia's most pressing problems, such as the population explosion and the country's dependence on coffee exports in a declining world market, do not lend themselves to quick solution under any form of government. President Lleras Restrepo is aware of this dilemma. His solution is to communicate these problems to the country and initiate government efforts to ease them. Whether the efforts can keep pace with the hopes President Lleras Restrepo has awoken in the people is the question now facing Colombia.

The Summer Riots: Analysis Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD D. McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1967

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, August 13, Mr. Jack Gould of the New York Times provided a thoughtful and incisive analysis of the circumstances surrounding calls in this Chamber and in the other body for an investigation of the role of television in reporting this summer's riots in Detroit, Newark, Cambridge, Md., and other cities.

As a former newsman myself, I could not help but agree with Mr. Gould's hope that Congress "would not conduct an investigation of a mirror because of the disquieting images that it beholds."

Mr. Speaker, I insert the full text of Mr. Gould's article to be printed at this point in the Record:

The Summer Riots: Analysis Needed

(By Jack Gould)

The immediacy and forceful impact of television has been a subject of controversy during the summer riots. Was the home screen an instrument of dangerous contagion? Was the visual example of disorder in one city an instant stimulus to its imitation in other communities? Was time on the air accorded to H. Rap Brown and Stokely Carmichael a contributing factor in escalating the gunplay and violence?

The sheer nature of radio and television unquestionably raises problems not shared in like degree by the print media. In underprivileged areas the picture tube and loudspeaker are the chief sources of information. In the dismalness of the ghetto, the TV set stands as the most important escape from the oppressive realities of the enervating environment. The traditional essentials of life may be in a lamentable state of repair, but one way or another, the viewer receiver is somehow kept working. Wherever there is social or economic isolation, be it the shut-in, the remote rural family or the ghetto inhabitant, the record clearly shows an exceptionally strong dependency on TV.

The emotional involvement that is part of the process of intensive television watching similarly is unique with the home screen. Reading the remarks of Mr. Brown or Mr. Carmichael can hardly be compared with seeing them in action and watching the gestures and intonations of speech that punctuate and dramatize their imprecations. And so it is with the combat of riot: the still photograph or column of type can convey shock but not the urgency and reality of darting figures on the move, the sound of rifle fire, the wail of sirens or sustained brutality in the raw.

Central to a consideration of television's role in the domestic crisis is the recognition that speedy communication is a fact of modern life, that the almost instantaneous display of the devastation of such an industrial center as Detroit is not something that can be bottled up or made to go away by legislative restraint or noble-sounding codes. If television's performance on the rioting has been mixed, both the good and disappointing aspects of the coverage reflect problems that existed before the racial difficulties.

Journalistically, television cannot operate with a blindfold. If Detroit and Newark are under disheartening civil siege the truth will out on the home screen. Socially, it is far better for the country to be aware rather than not told that within the structure of the civil rights movements there are militant individuals transcending the bounds of reasonable protest. For the handful of extremists responding to such calls for disorder it is not to be overlooked that the majority of Negroes were as appalled by what they saw on the screen as white viewers.

It has been argued that the mere presence of TV cameras or radio microphones invites exhibitionism on the part of a mob, and that early coverage of a disturbance magnifies its subsequent proportions. No one will deny that over the years some TV producers and directors, eager for visual activity, have catered to such impulses. The conduct of TV in the Watts riot admittedly was highly questionable. But this summer, under difficult physical circumstances, there has been far more restraint, such as the use of unmarked cars for camera crews, putting caps over camera lenses if misleading antics were obvious, and, in some cases, the delay of news bulletins to minimize alarm.

If it is part of television's job to report the stresses of society under forbidding internal strains, it would seem in equal measure the responsibility of the medium to question more seriously whether existing formats might not be restudied.

The front pages of national television are the evening newscasts of Walter Cronkite, David Brinkley and Chet Huntley, and Peter Jennings. Within an hour's time, minus commercials, they presume to cover the day's events the world over. Unfortunately, global affairs do not always fit into a TV format. There are days of heavy news and light news, yet the evening newscasts lack the elasticity to deal with such fluctuations.

One inherent drawback of TV in covering domestic riots or, for that matter, the war in Vietnam, is the pressure of time which leads to oversimplification of serious developments and places an extra premium on visual action per se. Putting Mr. Brown on the air, for instance, has been a journalistic necessity, but in many of the accounts of his speech in Cambridge, Md., there was almost no detail on who the man was and the apparent dimensions of his influence. In short, a new figure abruptly emerged on the home screen, but he was not put in any kind of perspective.

It is not a question of TV's inability to do so. After a Presidential address, for example, there is no hesitancy in showing reporters merely sitting in a studio and calmly analyzing the main implications of the speech. More of the same reflecting analytical reporting is needed in the regular evening newscasts.

A handful of members of the House of Representatives reportedly threatens to probe television's behavior during the riots. The reality they overlook is that in all probability TV was the medium which made them aware of the severity of conditions on the home front. In any number of documentaries prior to the disturbances, TV had enabled the set owner to be an eye-witness to the misery of the ghettos, but all the warnings of explosions went blithely unheeded.

Whatever the room for improvement in TV coverage and other media, the home screen served an essentially constructive purpose in showing the riots quickly. The policy has focused attention on the causes of the disturbances; more information, be it disturbing or reassuring, is the first step toward elimination of riots. Congress, one would hope, would not conduct an examination of a mirror because of the disquieting images that it beholds.

Editorial Support for 4-H for Washington by the WMAL Stations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 23, 1967

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be sponsor of H.R. 12035, a bill to extend 4-H activities to the District of Columbia. Companion measures have been introduced by Representatives McMillan, Zwach, and Nelsen in the House and in the Senate by Senator Mondale, for himself and Senators Cooper, Hatfield, Robert F. Kennedy, McGovern, Montoya, and Tydings.

Recently the Evening Star stations, WMAL radio and television, endorsed this plan in two editorials. Under unanimous consent I include these editorials at this point in the Appendix:

[An editorial broadcast by WMAL,
Aug. 6, 1967]

Four-H for Washington

We salute the hundreds of teenagers who are cleaning up Washington's filthy streets and alleys. We have only praise for Pride, Inc., the Labor Department-funded project that this week put nearly a thousand teenagers to work almost overnight. There may be those who say cleaning up filthy streets and alleys "lacks dignity." We believe such a meaningful community service demands respect. Pride, Inc. is well named.

This project is funded, however, for only five weeks. These hundreds of young people and others like them must continue to improve their communities and themselves, even when in school. Several Congressmen have introduced bills proposing an exciting solution. These bills would include the District in the 50-year-old national 4-H program. "4-H" stands for development of head, heart, hand and health. Tomorrow we will discuss what 4-H is and what the 4-H program can do for the young people of Washington.

[An editorial broadcast by WMAL,
Aug. 6, 1967]

Four-H for Washington

Congress should include Washington in the national 4-H program. 4-H will help ambitious young people, such as those now cleaning the city's streets and alleys in the Pride, Inc. project, to continue learning and doing. A national 4-H official says that, if Congress includes Washington, 25.000 District young people could be reached the first year. They would range in age from nine to nineteen.

Several Congressmen have introduced bills to include the District in the 50-year-old 4-H program. Though 4-H was founded for rural young people, programs now operate successfully in many cities. Some 40 projects have been planned to develop the heads, hearts, hands and health of young people of the inner city. Boys learn skills such as mechanics, electronics, woodworking, photography and landscaping. Projects for girls include sewing, child-care and cooking.

We urge Congress to pass legislation extending 4-H to Washington before the summer ends.

Statement of George Meany on President's Tax Proposals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB H. GILBERT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 23, 1967

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert in the Record the testimony of Mr. George Meany, president of the American Federation of Labor and CIO, on the President's tax proposals. I believe that Mr. Meany's statement before the Ways and Means Committee today will be of interest to my colleagues in the House.

Statement of George Meany, President, American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, to the House Ways and Means Committee on the President's Tax Proposals, August 23, 1967

Mr. Chairman, my name is George Meany. I am President of the AFL-CIO and I am appearing here on behalf of that organization.

At the outset, I would like to summarize our views on these issues.

We are fully in accord with the President's concept that a temporary war tax is needed. It is our view that the American public generally—not just the armed forces—should share the sacrifice involved in the war in Vietnam. Moreover, we believe that increased tax revenue is needed—in view of the large prospective budget deficit and problems of financing that deficit—to lessen the danger of tight money and very high interest rates, which would depress the socially important home-building industry and related industries.

However, we are firmly opposed to the Administration's major recommendations of how to increase taxes. It is our conviction that equality of sacrifice should be based on ability to sacrifice. The required temporary tax increase must be fair and equitable.

Certainly some sectors of our economy can afford far more in tax increases than others. But the Administration's proposals recognize the principle of ability to pay only to a minor degree.

We believe that the temporary surtax rate on corporations should be at least twice as great as on individuals. Low-income taxpayers should be exempt from any surtax and the temporary tax increase on other income groups should be based on ability to pay. We recommend some degree of taxation of excluded income; those large sums that are not now subject to taxation, such as interest on state and local bonds, the excluded half of capital gains and depletion allowances. Moreover, we urge you to give careful consideration to a substantial increase in the maximum tax rate of 25 percent on capital gains from the sale of property.

In our opinion, Mr. Chairman, the war tax you are now considering must be fully keyed to ability to pay.

We are aware that some people have suggested cutting or halting vital domestic programs as an alternative to a temporary tax increase. If we put into effect, such suggestions could be disastrous and we unalterably oppose them.

We are convinced that America can meet the nation's obligations in Vietnam, while making progress towards solving its domestic problems. Forward strides on the homefront are essential to the preservation of our free society. America has the human and material resources to achieve both an honorable settlement of the war in Vietnam and a strengthened social order at home.

A TEMPORARY TAX INCREASE IS NEEDED

This nation, Mr. Chairman, could easily finance a greatly expanded domestic program, within the present tax structure, were it not for the war in Vietnam. It is the added cost of men and material for that war which makes a temporary tax increase necessary.

Such tax increase is a war tax—necessitated by the sharp rise, within the past two years, in the size of our armed forces and in military expenditures. This tax rise envisions a degree of sacrifice by the American public, not only our fighting men.

A tax increase in a war period is not strange to the American people. Although no American hails a tax increase on his income, we have willingly paid increased taxes for the defense of freedom in eariler years. I have confidence in the good-sense of the American people to believe that we will do so again, at present.

The need for a temporary tax increase rests on sound economic, as well as moral grounds. National defense expenditures have risen $20.5 billion between fiscal year 1965 and the year that ended June 30, 1967. They are rising at present. In this fiscal year, defense spending is expected to rise another $5 to $9 billion and perhaps more.

Mainly as a result of these rising military expenditures—coupled with the effects on tax revenue of the recent economic slowdown, due to last year's tight money—the budget deficit is increasing. The administrative budget deficit in fiscal year 1967 was about $10 billion—substantially greater than the modest deficits of the previous two years. Now, this deficit looks like it is rising to $20 to $25 billion or more in the year ending June 30, 1968.

It is not the existence of a budget deficit which troubles us, Mr. Chairman. With remaining problems of unemployment and under-employment, the federal government should be placing somewhat greater amounts of money into the economy's spending stream than it takes out.

It is the size and sharp rise of the deficit—and the financing of a large deficit under foreseeable conditions—that does trouble us. I believe it troubles most members of the Congress, as well.

In fact, anticipation of the government's financing of a large deficit has already affected the money market and interest rates. Many corporations have floated new bond issues in recent months, in an attempt to beat the expected tightening of the money supply and very high interest rates. In the process, interest rates have been rising. The average mortgage rate on FHA insured new homes rose to 6.4 percent in June, for example. The rate on triple-A corporate bonds, in mid-July, was nearly 5.6 percent—higher than last September, when money was very tight.

Mr. Chairman, I am no expert in these matters. However, I see many signs of the economy moving up moderately and, hopefully, the pace will be picking up a bit in the months ahead. One does not have to be an expert to know that rising economic activities mean some increase in private borrowing, as businesses finance the expansion.

If the financing of the government's large deficit, in the coming year, is super-imposed on this situation, money will probably tighten and interest rates will rise to new heights.

We saw the effects of the Federal Reserve Board's tight money and high interest rate policies last year. Home building went into a deep recession, despite the need for a sharp increase in new and rehabilitated housing. Related industries, such as lumber and furniture, went into a slump.

Tight money and very high interest rates, in the year ahead, will probably achieve similar results again. The social goal of more and better housing would be thrown for a loss. The economic pick-up would be unbalanced, with one sector of the economy depressed. Countless numbers of people would pay the price for such development—consumers, small businesses, farmers, state and local governments that need to borrow money, as well as workers in affected industries.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, we believe that a tax increase is needed to reduce the amount of the government's deficit that will have to be financed in the money market.

We do not agree, at all, with the proposition that the tax increase is required to prevent a classical inflation in the next several months with shortages of goods, manpower, plants and machines. Manufacturing industries are now operating at about 85 percent of their capacity, the workweek has been cut down in the past year, there is remaining unemployment and under-employment. Moreover, the labor force is expanding rapidly and new plants and machines are being installed. It would take a very sharp and continuing boost of business activity—much sharper than expected—to reach such inflationary shortages in the next several months.

If a tax increase is adopted, the over-all pace of the economic upturn will probably be slightly slower than otherwise. However, the economic advance would be more balanced and it would be more widely shared among the various industries.

The dangers of tight money, very high interest rates and an unbalanced economic advance are real and tangible. A tax increase is needed to reduce these dangers and to provide our armed forces in Vietnam with as much of the best equipment they need to achieve an honorable settlement of the conflict.

THE SURTAX RATE ON CORPORATIONS SHOULD BE SUBSTANTIALLY GREATER THAN ON INDIVIDUALS

The record cleary indicates, Mr. Chairman, that the surtax rate on corporations should be much greater than on individuals. There is no justification for applying the same surtax rate on both corporations and families, as the Administration proposes.

Only within the past several months, Congress restored, at the Administration's request, the 7 percent tax credit on business investment in new equipment. This early restoration was also more lavish than the original credit.

The restored 7 percent tax credit is worth about $2 billion to corporations over a full year. It is the equivalent of a $2 billion tax cut on corporate income.

However, this special action to reduce corporate taxes was not accompanied by any action, whatsoever, to reduce taxes on American families.

We are fully aware, Mr. Chairman, of the talk about declining profits and a profit squeeze. Corporate profits did decline a bit towards the end of last year and in early 1967, as business activity levelled off. However, the decline was small and it was from very great heights. In addition, profits are rising again, with the economic pick-up.

Let us look at the record of rising incomes for various groups in the economy between 1960 and the first half of 1967:

Corporate profits after payment of taxes skyrocketed 74½ percent.

Dividend payments to stockholders soared almost 69½ percent.

Total wage and salary payments to all employees in the entire economy increased only 54 percent—reflecting increased employment as well as the wage and salary gains of individual workers.

Total after-tax personal income in the entire economy rose merely 53 percent.

Weekly after-tax take-home pay of a factory worker, with three dependents increased only 24 percent—and, in terms of buying power, merely 11 percent.

That is the record of the past 6½ years, Mr. Chairman, even after accounting for the temporary and small profit decline of the recent past. Profits have skyrocketed—moving up, far out of line with workers' wages. In addition, corporations received a special tax cut only a few months ago.

In light of this clear record, we urge the Committee to recommend a surtax rate on corporations at least twice as great as on individuals. A 6 percent surtax on individuals should be accompanied by a 12 or 15 percent surtax on corporate tax liabilities. Or an 8 percent surtax rate on individuals should be coupled with a 16 or 20 percent rate on corporations. The surtax rate on corporations should be at least 20 percent if the surtax rate on personal income is 10 percent.

Over a full year, such surtax rates on corporate tax liabilities would raise the following approximate amounts:

Surtax rate on corporations:	*Approximate additional revenue*
12 percent	$4,000,000,000
15 percent	5,000,000,000
16 percent	5,300,000,000
20 percent	6,600,000,000

THE SURTAX ON INDIVIDUAL INCOME SHOULD BE FULLY BASED ON ABILITY TO PAY

The Administration has proposed a flat 10 percent surcharge on the total tax liabilities of all personal income taxpayers with taxable incomes above $2,000 for joint re-

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

turns and $1,000 for single individual returns. In effect, this means no surcharge on a family of four with a gross income of $5,000 or less, but the application of the same 10 percent surtax rate on the total tax liabilities of all such families whose incomes are $5,001 and more.

This proposal recognizes ability to pay to a degree—by exempting lower-income taxpayers from the surtax. However, this proposal is unfair and inequitable to middle- and moderate-income taxpayers.

For example, under the Administration's proposal, a family of four with a taxable income of $1,999—gross income of about $4,990—would pay its regular tax of $290. It would pay no surcharge. Another family of four with a taxable income of $2,001—gross income of slightly over $5,000—would be required to pay its regular tax of slightly over $290 plus the 10 percent surtax, or $29. For the extra $2 of taxable income, it would be required to pay $29 in additional taxes. This is clearly unfair.

Moreover, this proposal also fails to give sufficient recognition to the ability to pay principle as one moves up the income scale. Families with incomes of $6,000 or $10,000 would pay the same 10 percent surcharge on their total tax liabilities as families with incomes of over a million dollars.

In addition, the proposal also fails to recognize that the after-tax weekly take-home pay of most groups of wage and salary earners has increased only slightly in the past two years. The weekly take-home pay of the average factory worker, with three dependents, was $100.39 in June—only 62 cents per week greater than in June 1966 and $3.40 per week above June 1965.

Simple application of the 10 percent surtax rate to the total tax liabilities of all four-person families with gross incomes above $5,000 would wash out this average factory worker's gain in weekly take-home pay during the past year and one-quarter of his take-home pay improvement over the past two years. A somewhat similar situation would apply to most large groups of wage and salary earners.

So, Mr. Chairman, we reiterate our belief that the surtax on individuals must be based fully on ability to pay.

Therefore we recommend the following proposal, which we urge you to adopt:

Each family filing a joint return would subtract $300 from its tax liability and apply the surtax rate to the remainder. Therefore, lower-income families—such as four-person families with gross incomes below $5,000—would be exempt from the surcharge. A family with a tax liability of $301, would apply the surtax rate to $1 instead of to the full $301 amount. Another family, with a liability of $700 would apply the surtax rate to $400.

Each single individual taxpayer would similarly deduct $150 from his tax liability before applying the surtax. The effect would be similar to what I have just described for families filing joint returns.

All taxpayers, except those with low-incomes, would pay the same surtax rate. However, with the deduction of $300 for joint returns and $150 for single individual taxpayers, the burden of the surtax would be much more equitably based on ability to pay.

Let us take the example of an 8 percent surtax on a family of four. At a gross income of $5,000 or less, there would be no surcharge. At $6,000, the surcharge would be $12 or 2.6 percent of the regular tax liability. At $10,000, the surcharge would be $65 or 5.8 percent of the regular tax. The surcharge would reach 7.2 percent of the tax liability, or $229, at $20,000 of gross income.

SURCHARGE ON FAMILY OF 4

Gross income	Present tax	8 percent surtax after $300 deduction from tax liability	Surcharge as percent of present tax
$5,000	$290	0	0
6,000	450	$12	2.6
10,000	1,114	65	5.8
15,000	2,062	141	6.8
20,000	3,160	229	7.2

Note.—See apps. I, II, and III for detail.

If this much fairer and more equitable method of applying a temporary surtax on personal income is adopted, the following approximate amounts of money could be raised over a full year:

Surtax rate:	*Approximate additional revenue*
6 percent	$2,800,000,000
8 percent	3,900,000,000
10 percent	4,900,000,000

We urge you to adopt this method of raising additional revenue from the individual income tax, combined with a corporate surtax rate that is at least twice as great as the rate on personal incomes.

THE ABILITY-TO-PAY PRINCIPLE REQUIRES TAXATION OF EXCLUDED INCOME

Tax loopholes of special privilege for wealthy families and corporations are numerous and notorious.

In 1964, for example, 482 tax returns reported adjusted gross incomes of $1 million or more—after excluding interest from state and local bonds, half of capital gains and so on. Yet, 19 of these millionaires paid no tax at all on their 1964 incomes—not one cent.

Personal capital gains from the sale of stock, real estate and other property are in the neighborhood of $20 to $24 billion per year in recent years. However, only half of these profits are even listed as income, subject to taxation. The top tax rate on personal capital gains is very special—it is 25 percent. In addition, the story is closely similar for the approximately $7 to $8 billion of capital gains of corporations.

Double depreciation write-offs of new buildings are wonderful if you are lucky enough to be a real estate investor—or an outrage, if you are an average citizen. These tax-free cash-returns add up to great fortunes. After the major write-offs are taken, in seven or eight years, the building is sold and the top tax rate on the profit is 25 percent. Yet this is not the end. The new owner of the used building writes off the price he paid for it at one-and one-half times the average rate. The process goes on and on and the public pays the price in inflated land costs, high rents and lost revenue to the federal government.

Fortune magazine once described a typical real estate situation, involving a Manhattan skyscraper. On a $2½ million investment, the happy investor made $3.3 million in after-tax profit after only five years.

In his book on federal taxes, Philip Stern reports the following developments in 1960:

"Eight New York real estate corporations amassed a total of $18,766,200 in cash available for distribution to their shareholders. They paid not one penny of income tax.

"When this $18,766,200 was distributed, few of their shareholders paid even a penny of income tax on it.

"Despite this cash accumulation of nearly $19 million, these eight companies were able to report to Internal Revenue losses, for tax purposes, totalling $3,186,269."

I shall not go on with any more of such details, Mr. Chairman. You are considering a temporary war tax. This is not the time for structural tax reform, with detailed consideration of each loophole. In this connection, we were glad to learn that the Administration intends to present its proposals on tax loopholes later this year.

However, Mr. Chairman, we believe that this is the right time—when you are considering a war tax—to include some degree of federal taxation on the great amounts of cash-returns that are now excluded from income reported for tax purposes.

Major categories of such excluded income are: half of capital gains, income from tax exempt state and local bonds, and depletion allowances. These excluded categories of income add up to something like $13 to $14 billion for individuals and families and to about $9 to $10 billion for corporations. To permit such huge categories of income to go untaxed while the government is imposing a special war tax, would be utterly unfair and inequitable.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, we suggest that once a figure is determined for the surtax rate, that a tax of that exact figure be imposed on excluded income in these three categories, after a generous deduction.

On the personal income side, we propose that the taxpayer list his income from these three categories, deduct a generous $10,000 and apply the same tax rate as the surtax on the remainder, if any.

With a deduction of $10,000 per tax return, moderate-income taxpayers would be exempted from the tax excluded income. Moreover, the tax rate would be much lower than the regular tax rates. Yet a significant portion of excluded income would be subjected to some taxation and additional federal revenue would be raised at a time when it is needed.

On the corporate side, we recommend a similar listing of those categories of excluded income, a very generous deduction of $25,000 and application of the same tax rate as the surtax to the remainder.

The deduction of as much as $25,000 would exclude small corporations, and most medium-sized corporations, as well, from this tax. However, it would subject the excluded income of wealthier corporations to a low tax rate—much lower than the 48 percent on reported income. At least part of the revenue potential of excluded income would be tapped.

This proposal seems to us to be simple, clear and direct. It is not structural reform of the detailed problems in our tax system. But it would raise additional revenue, as part of a war tax, by applying a degree of taxation to the large sums that are now excluded from the income tax.

On personal income, such taxation, at a 6 percent rate, could raise approximately $350 million. An 8 percent rate could raise about $475 million and a 10 percent rate, something in the neighborhood of $600 million.

As for corporate income, a 12 percent tax rate on excluded income, along these lines, could bring about $800 million of additional revenue and a 20 percent rate, approximately $1.3 billion.

Approximate revenue potential of taxing excluded income

Personal income tax:	
6 percent	$350,000,000
8 percent	475,000,000
10 percent	600,000,000
Corporate income tax:	
12 percent	$800,000,000
15 percent	975,000,000
16 percent	1,100,000,000
20 percent	1,300,000,000

These estimates, Mr. Chairman, are not precise. However, they roughly indicate the substantial amount of revenue that could be raised by placing a small tax, after a generous deduction, on these categories of excluded income. It seems to us that taxation of excluded income should be an integral part of a temporary war tax, if it is to be fair and equitable.

In addition, Mr. Chairman, we urge you to give careful consideration to a substantial increase in the 25 percent maximum tax rate on capital gains. This special rate is unfair—particularly when the Congress is adopting a temporary tax increase to raise additional federal revenue to help finance a war.

In conclusion, let me repeat, we are firmly convinced that a temporary war tax is needed. Such tax increase, however, must be fully keyed to the principle of ability to pay.

I have tried, Mr. Chairman, to give you, as briefly and carefully as I can, a number of fair and equitable methods to achieve the President's objective of raising additional revenue. These alternatives to the Administration's proposals are also practical and sound. They would raise from about $8 billion to approximately $13.4 billion of additional federal revenue over the course of a year (See Appendices IV, V and VI for detail).

We urge you to give these AFL-CIO recommendations your careful consideration during the Committee's deliberations in the coming weeks.

APPENDIX I.—AFL-CIO PROPOSAL, 6-PERCENT SURTAX, FAMILY OF 4

[Income from wages and salaries]

Gross income	Present tax[1]	AFL-CIO proposal[2]	Surtax as percent of present tax
$3,000	------	---	---
4,000	$140	---	---
5,000	290	---	---
6,000	450	$9	2.0
7,000	596	18	3.0
8,000	772	28	3.6
9,000	943	39	4.1
10,000	1,114	49	4.4
11,000	1,285	59	4.6
12,000	1,468	70	4.8
15,000	2,062	106	5.1
18,000	2,710	145	5.4
20,000	3,160	172	5.4
25,000	4,412	247	5.6
30,000	5,876	335	5.7
40,000	9,332	542	5.8

[1] In addition to $2,400 in personal exemptions, family is assumed to have personal deductions of $600 or 10 percent of gross income, whichever is larger.

[2] AFL-CIO proposal calculated as 6 percent of present tax after subtraction of $300 from present tax.

APPENDIX II.—AFL-CIO PROPOSAL, 8-PERCENT SURTAX, FAMILY OF 4

[Income from wages and salaries]

Gross income	Present tax[1]	AFL-CIO proposal[2]	Surtax as percent of present tax
$3,000	------------	------------	------------
4,000	$140	------------	------------
5,000	290	------------	------------
6,000	450	$12	2.6
7,000	596	24	4.0
8,000	772	38	4.9
9,000	943	51	5.4
10,000	1,114	65	5.8
11,000	1,285	79	6.1
12,000	1,468	93	6.3
15,000	2,062	141	6.8
18,000	2,710	193	7.1
20,000	3,160	229	7.2
25,000	4,412	329	7.4
30,000	5,876	446	7.6
40,000	9,332	723	7.7

[1] In addition to $2,400 in personal exemptions, family is assumed to have personal deductions of $600 or 10 percent of gross income, whichever is larger.

[2] AFL-CIO proposal calculated as 8 percent of present tax after subtraction of $300 from present tax.

APPENDIX III.—AFL-CIO PROPOSAL, 10-PERCENT SURTAX, FAMILY OF 4

[Income from wages and salaries]

Gross income	Present tax[1]	AFL-CIO surtax proposal[2]	Proposed surtax as percent of present tax
$3,000	------	---	---
4,000	$140	---	---
5,000	290	---	---
6,000	450	$15	3.3
7,000	596	30	5.0
8,000	772	47	6.1
9,000	943	64	6.8
10,000	1,114	81	7.3
11,000	1,285	99	7.7
12,000	1,468	117	8.0
15,000	2,062	176	8.5
18,000	2,710	241	8.9
20,000	3,160	286	9.1
25,000	4,412	411	9.3
30,000	5,876	558	9.5
40,000	9,332	903	9.7

[1] In addition to $2,400 in personal exemptions, family is assumed to have personal deductions of $600 or 10 percent of gross income, whichever is larger.

[2] AFL-CIO proposal calculated as 10 percent of present tax after subtraction of $300 from present tax.

APPENDIX IV

Approximate amount of additional revenue—alternative A

Tax	*Additional revenue*
Individual income tax:	
6 percent surtax (AFL-CIO proposal)	$2,800,000,000
Corporate income tax:	
12 percent surtax	4,000,000,000
15 percent surtax	5,000,000,000
Excluded income:	
6 percent on personal income	350,000,000
12 percent corporate income	800,000,000
15 percent corporate income	975,000,000

Total—About $8 billion–$9.1 billion.

APPENDIX V

Approximate amount of additional revenue—Alternative B

Tax	*Additional revenue*
Individual income tax:	
8 percent surtax (AFL-CIO proposal)	$3,900,000,000
Corporate income tax:	
16 percent surtax	5,300,000,000
20 percent surtax	6,600,000,000
Excluded income:	
8 percent on personal income	475,000,000
16 percent on corporate income	1,100,000,000
20 percent on corporate income	1,300,000,000

Total—About $10.8 billion—$12.3 billion.

APPENDIX VI

Approximate amount of additional revenue—Alternative C

Tax	*Additional revenue*
Individual income tax:	
10-percent surtax (AFL-CIO proposal)	4,900,000,000
Corporate income tax:	
20-percent surtax	6,600,000,000
Excluded income:	
10 percent on personal income	600,000,000
20 percent on corporate income	1,300,000,000

Total—About $13.4 billion.

Credit Card for Rats

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. EDWARD ROUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 23, 1967

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, I am including in the RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues an essay written by Mr. Mark Van Voorhis, an intern in my office. Mr. Van Voorhis is a student at Indiana University. He has proven himself to be an unusually astute scholar. He has been a very enthusiastic and dedicated worker in my office during these summer months. I predict a successful career for this young man.

The essay follows:

A CREDIT CARD FOR RATS

Recent action taken by Members of the House of Representatives against the Rat Extermination Bill has proven itself to be a regrettable decision. Regrettable, because tonight, throughout our nation, 38 men, women, and children will fall victim to the bite of a rat. Regrettable, because every year business and the public lose nearly 1 billion dollars in destruction of property, contamination of produce, and food loss consumed by this menace. Day after day, our urban areas are infested by these carriers of disease and filth whose homes are the sewer lines and the open garbage pits; and worst of all, in the homes of those people who live in our extremely populated urban cities.

By a vote of 207–176 the members of this House shunned a bill that would alleviate one of the major problems in our urban slums; that of the rat. To the astonishment of many, the opposition to the bill refused to even listen to sound reasoning. They refused to debate the issue.

From the response of the general public and news media it clearly appears that a mistake was made and an injustice war done to those individuals living in constant fear of rats. The issue is no longer a laughing spectacle, it can no longer be scoffed at, joked about, or shoved aside as the Republicans have tended to do so far. Facts and figures are before us. Action must be taken!

Do those voting against consideration of this bill feel it is the job of the Federal Government to give the rat a credit card to live on as it pleases? It costs the American citizen $10 apiece for each rat that is allowed to live. It eats 40 lbs. of food in one year. Add that to the cost in food contamination and property damage multiplied by an estimated 100 million of these rodents and you have a yearly loss of 1 billion dollars. Can we afford this annual loss every year and let it pass as a local problem? The answer is no!

A pest that destroys our food, cripples, maims and bites nearly 14,000 people a year is a menace to our well-being and serves no useful purpose. As a spreader of filth and pestilence, 20,000 cases of rat-associated disease occur in the United States every year. The plague is not a thing of the past. The Department of the Interior fights a daily battle to keep this silent mass murderer in check in our Western States. Plague is a disease caused by a small flea carried on the oily, grimy, hairs of the rat. Releasing nearly ½ million hairs over our food supplies the chances for plague are enhanced. Are we to wait until a small child is found crushed

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

between the bars of its crib trying to escape from a pack of hungry rats or an epidemic spreads before we realize that this is a serious and urgent problem? The answer, once again is no!

Presently, the Department of the Interior spends $26,000 a year for rat control. Approximately enough to pay two technicians. Is this the type of program needed to eradicate a rodent whom Mr. Walter W. Dykstra of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service says is being born at a rate of 40 every second or 3,456,000 a day?

Only with an effective program of eliminating places for rats to enter, gather food and nest, can a program be outlined to destroy the menace. The secret to control is natural mortality. H.R. 11000 would have been a start in the right direction.

Let's eliminate the death and injury. Let's eliminate the fear of ghetto families toward this greedy menace. Let's begin at once to eliminate the rat. It has been proven in the past that the Federal Government can work with state and local governments to solve and answer such current problems. But only by working together can a threat of this proportion be solved.

We must begin here, in the Capitol of the United States, in the House of Representatives, to do what should have been done long ago. We must not deny peace of mind and a healthier home to those who are knocking at our door for help. We must not deny these people the same chance as we have for a better life. It is essential that we take immediate action to eliminate this blight in urban areas and put an end to this serious problem. Let's begin now to eliminate the rat!

Indianapolis Firm Makes Inner City Playgrounds Possible

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 23, 1967

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, one of the most pressing needs of inner city children in the summertime is for a place to run and play.

Fortunately, for youngsters living in neighborhoods on the near southside of Indianapolis, the Lilly pharmaceutical firm recognized that need. What's more, the company did something about it.

Lilly officials last month asked a local planning agency what could be done in the community to contribute to neighborhood improvement, particularly in providing vitally needed recreational programs for youngsters.

The result: Within a few days, two playgrounds adjoining company property were opened. Recreation directors were provided. Lights were installed. Facilities were added. The necessary money was provided by the company. Volunteer social agencies assumed the responsibility of managing the areas.

Today, scores of children are playing ball and other games who otherwise would have no choice but to resort to streets and alleys.

This cooperative approach of business and private and public agencies has been noted in editorials appearing on the WFBM television station as well as the Indianapolis Star & News.

Because of the favorable impact of this program locally and its potential for application in other cities, I place the text of the three editorials at this point in the RECORD:

[From the WFBM Stations]

INNERCITY PLAYGROUNDS

Happiness, for thousands of innercity children, is a place to play. Park West, the new pocket-sized park at Blake and North just east of the Indiana University Medical Center—was opened last week. Its Wild West Playground equipment and above-ground swimming-pool have already proved so popular that children are having to swim in shifts.

Maximum use has been made of every inch of this small area, which belongs to the university and will someday be the site of a university building. In the meantime the land is being utilized in the best possible way. The project was only possible because of the cooperation of university officials, the Metropolitan Park Department and neighborhood civic groups.

Expanded play facilities to meet neighborhood needs on the South side of town were also announced last week. Two playgrounds adjoining the Kentucky Avenue and McCarty Street plants of Eli Lilly and Company are being enlarged and improved, as the result of consultation between company officials and the Community Service Council.

The Council, which has stressed recreational services in the inner city in its long-range program, provided the expertise. Lilly's and the Lilly Endowment are providing funds for capital improvements, needed equipment and staff salaries. Leadership and supervision will come from two settlement houses, Southwest Social Center and Fletcher Place.

We are delighted by these two examples of unprecedented cooperation between public and private agencies, industrial and commercial establishments and neighborhoods, to meet a community need. Since other parts of the city lack playgrounds, we hope similar cooperative efforts will be ignited from these examples.

We feel that Indiana University and Eli Lilly and Company have displayed an exciting concept of responsibility to their neighborhoods. Both have acted as community institutions, prepared to share their know-how and resources with the people who live near the campus or the plant. This concept has tremendous implications for the future of our city.

[From the Indianapolis Sunday Star, July 30, 1967]

TO MEET PLAY NEEDS

An unusual collaborative arrangement is bringing the money of an industrial corporation and a related foundation together with the talents and time of two social service agencies to provide additional playground facilities and programs in two near Southside neighborhoods.

The playgrounds are near the Kentucky Avenue and McCarty Street plants of Eli Lilly & Co., which is providing money to improve the grounds. The Lilly Foundation is financing equipment and program operation. Indianapolis Settlements Inc., and Fletcher Place Community Center will provide the planning and direction. The deal was worked out through the Community Service Council.

Private industry and private voluntary agencies are here combining their forces to deal with a community problem.

The need for more playground facilities and recreational programs is common throughout the inner city. This exemplary arrangement will alleviate the need in a couple of places.

Perhaps it may inspire other firms and agencies to join hands in similar efforts.

[From the Indianapolis News, Aug. 1, 1967]

PLACES TO PLAY

A combination of effort by public agencies and industry is bringing some needed recreation places to downtown Indianapolis.

Park West is the latest playground to be dedicated by the city. The ceremony took place Saturday as wide-eyed children clambered over the new equipment and splashed in an above-ground swimming pool, the only one of its kind in the city.

Park West came about because of the cooperation of Indiana University and the Metropolitan Park Department. University officials donated the land for the park and playground and the Parks Department had it properly equipped. A Lockfield Gardens mothers' committee is assisting trained personnel in supervising the youngsters.

Two other playgrounds will help downtown children enjoy outdoor fun the rest of the summer and in many summers hereafter. These are on land provided by Eli Lilly & Co., which also is financing the improvement. The Lilly Foundation has bought the equipment and will pay for the operation.

Collaborating in this program are Indianapolis Settlements, Inc., and the Fletcher Place Community Center, which will provide supervision and planning. The program came about when Lilly asked the Community Service Council how it could contribute to neighborhood improvement. The latter agency then worked out the arrangements.

Places to play during hot summer days are important to youngsters who otherwise would resort to streets and alleys as playgrounds. The combined effort displayed here shows these needs have been met in three areas.

New Chairman Confirmed for Equal Employment Opportunity Commission

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 15, 1967

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to note that the nomination of Clifford L. Alexander, Jr., by President Johnson, to be Chairman of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, was confirmed by the Senate on August 2, 1967. Mr. Alexander has long been a friend of mine and, based on this association, I can attest to his excellent qualifications for this important responsibility. He has served the President extremely well as a White House assistant since 1964, and this experience should be invaluable to the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

Mr. Alexander takes the reins of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission at a crucial time. The Commission has been in existence just 2 years. During this time, it has had considerable difficulty securing an adequate staff to handle a far greater workload than originally anticipated. It appears that finally these problems are being resolved, and that the Commission is ready to make a meaningful contribution to the elimination of discrimination in hiring practices. As the Washington Post editorial of July 27, 1967, points out, Mr. Alexander has a great opportunity to guide this Commission into the forefront of civil rights progress.

One major difficulty faced by the Commission to date has been the weak enforcement powers contained in the original legislation. Now pending before Congress is a proposal to strengthen these enforcement powers by giving the Commission cease and desist order powers. S. 1308, introduced by Senators Clark and Javits, has already been reported favorably by a Senate Labor Subcommittee. An identical version to H.R. 680, H.R. 10065, passed the House overwhelmingly last year. Because I believe that the machinery contained in this legislation could well serve as a model in the fair housing area. I offered such an amendment to the omnibus Civil Rights Act of 1966 and was gratified when the House of Representatives accepted this amendment. I am also pleased that the housing provision of the omnibus civil rights bill of 1967 contains the same enforcement provisions in its title on fair housing, indicating full acceptance of this concept by the administration.

I urge the Congress to act favorably on this equal employment opportunity legislation so that Clifford Alexander and the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission are enabled to meet the expectations of the minority communities of the United States.

At this point in the Record, I include several newspaper articles which attest to the overwhelmingly favorable response to the appointment of Mr. Alexander from all quarters:

[From the Amsterdam (N.Y.) News, July 8, 1967]

Roy Wilkins Lauds L. B. J. on Alexander

In a telegram to President Johnson following appointment of Clifford L. Alexander as chairman of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, NAACP Executive Director Roy Wilkins said: "There has been a kind of tradition that entrusting the leadership of an agency enforcing civil rights to a Negro may be indiscreet.

"This tradition has now been struck a timely blow. My associates in the NAACP join me in renewing our pledge of vigorous and critical support of the EEOC as it moves ahead under Chairman Alexander."

Mr. Wilkins also commented that "the new chairman brings with him youth, dedication and intelligence as well as invaluable experience as a member of your personal staff."

[From the Amsterdam (N.Y.) News, July 8, 1967]

Two Native Sons

Two New Yorkers have recently moved into positions of great responsibility and challenge. We are sure each is capable of doing justice to his new job, both of which are in the field of equal rights.

In Washington, Clifford L. Alexander, Jr., has been named by President Johnson as the new chairman of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. His job, subject to Senate confirmation, will be to head a Federal agency in charge of ending job discrimination in industry and labor.

In New York, Robert J. Mangum has been named by Governor Rockefeller as the new chairman of the State Commission For Human Rights. He takes over an almost new agency, one that has been revised after growing complaints over the work of the old agency. With emphasis on enforcement and broader powers in the chairmanship, the lingering criticism of SCHR may now die down.

Mr. Alexander and Mr. Mangum, both native sons, will bring dedication and intelligence to their new responsibilities. We are certain that EEOC and SCHR will both benefit from their being at the helm.

[From Jet magazine, July 13, 1967]

Clifford Alexander, President's New Bias Fighter

President Lyndon B. Johnson's newest job bias buster is a sleek, handsome ex-Harlemite who boasts degrees from Ivy League schools (Harvard and Yale), a White House counsel and top Negro member of the inner circle. Apprised of his nomination as the $27,500-a-year chairman of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) in Washington, D.C., Clifford Alexander, Jr., quipped: "It's another challenge in my life." Alexander, 33, is a banker's son.

As the top-ranking Negro on the President's staff, Alexander, a legal counsel and civil rights advisor, quietly furnished the expertise and firsthand knowledge to pave the way for human relations advances. Aides recall how he took off-the-record assignments, such as informing Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. on statistics of the Vietnam war, to offset his (King's) widely reported (but inaccurate) figures. Alexander was a back-up man in framing executive orders and campaigns aimed at upgrading Negroes in government.

Alexander, the first Negro named to head the $6.5 million, 281-staff anti-bias group, matches his Harvard honor record, his Yale Law School background and a medley of hard-hitting legal posts with mounting discrimination in industry and labor unions. "The President has faith in me," said Alexander. "And I'll do the job."

Modest and slow to anger, Alexander's poised countenance often is taken as a sign of meekness. Friends regard the young scholar as competent and able not only in the world of law and politics but also in administration.

[From the Washington Post, July 25, 1967]

Their Journey Marked by Many Miles

(By Dorothy McCardle)

It's a long way from Harlem to the White House, but Mr. and Mrs. Clifford L. Alexander Jr. have made it in style.

Today both are helping other Negroes take similar journeys.

"The final gesture toward racial peace will have to come from the private sector," says Alexander.

Cliff Alexander's efforts are through the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, of which he is the new chairman. His wife is working as a member of the District of Columbia Board of Higher Education, which is setting up the new Federal City College. She has also helped organize an integrated nursery school.

Both agree that Government efforts such as these cannot alone achieve truly equal opportunity, and that the right to vote is not enough, either.

He thinks that the current epidemic of racial unrest could be ended within a decade if the American people could suddenly see the "irrelevancy of color" in their relations with Negroes.

Alexander blames "the age of the tube" for triggering violence among Negroes.

"The opulence of American life shown on television makes for increased frustration and outbursts of discontent among Negroes," he said. "TV has opened my people's eyes to the discrepancies in American life as nothing else could do.

"A few far-seeing industries are offering job programs to Negroes which provide courses in good grooming, mathematics, speech, sewing, cooking as well as job skills."

All industry, he says, will have to do this eventually, if "this generation of Negroes is to catch up with the rest of the Nation."

The Alexanders live with their two young children in a newly restored, three-story brick house on C Street behind the Capitol. It has every modern convenience with central air-conditioning. Tastefully furnished, the home's walls reflect talents of Mrs. Alexander, an artist in several media.

As President Johnson's former Deputy Special Counsel, Cliff Alexander and his wife are frequent guests at White House social functions.

At home in his own neighborhood, Alexander keeps in touch with his people's problems virtually in his own back yard. Near him is a playground where he shoots basketballs with teen-age players. Most know him only as a fine athlete, not as the friend and aide of the President.

The Alexanders grew up together in Harlem. He is 33, four years older than she. They went through the same neighborhood schools, and then he went off to Harvard where he graduated cum laude and got his law degree at Yale. She went to Radcliffe to major in architectural sciences.

Both have known first-hand the prejudice against their race, but Washington has less, they say.

"Washington has welcomed us," Alexander says.

"Unless, of course, we wanted to buy a house in Virginia or Maryland or if I wanted to go to lunch at the Metropolitan Club or play golf at the nearby country clubs. Then I don't think I would be welcome."

The Alexanders have two children, Elizabeth, 5, and Mark, 3.

[From the Washington Post, July 27, 1967]

Opportunity

The Senate Labor Committee is scheduled today to consider the nomination of Clifford L. Alexander Jr., to serve as chairman of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. Presumably the Committee will conclude that he ought to have the job. He has exceptional qualifications for it in terms of character and experience; and it seems highly appropriate that the chairmanship should be filled at this time by a Negro with genuine fervor for the Commission's purposes. Mr. Alexander has had training for the tasks ahead of him as executive director of Harlem Youth Opportunities Unlimited in New York. And his more recent service as an aide to President Johnson has undoubtedly given him some knowledge of how to get things done in Washington.

The EEOC has not been conspicuously successful to date. But it has done a good deal of essential preparatory spade work in the development of technical assistance programs which can help employers to change basic hiring and promotion policies so as to enhance opportunities for Negroes. Equality of opportunity can be a reality only through training which enables workers to overcome handicaps and disadvantages of birth and background. The EEOC must do much more than a policing job; it must do an affirmative promotion job. This will demand of its chairman much more than the charm and persuasiveness Mr. Alexander has already demonstrated. It will demand drive and toughness. We hope he will bring these qualities to the opportunity ahead of him.

Biography of Clifford L. Alexander, Jr.

On June 27, 1967, President Johnson announced his attention to nominate Mr. Clifford L. Alexander, Jr., to be Chairman of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission succeeding Stephen N. Shulman, whose term expired July 1, 1967.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION OF MR. ALEXANDER

Present position

Deputy Special Counsel to the President, The White House.

Education

A.B., Harvard University, Cum Laude, 1955.

LL.B., Yale Law School, 1958.

Previous experience

Successively Deputy Special Assistant, Associate Special Counsel, and Deputy Special Counsel to the President, 1964 to present.

Foreign Affairs Officer, National Security Council, 1963–1964.

Private Law Practice, New York City, 1963.

Program and Executive Director, Harlem Youth Opportunities Unlimited, 1962–1963.

Executive Director of the Manhattanville Hamilton Grange Neighborhood Conservation Project, 1961–1962.

Assistant Director Attorney for New York County, 1959–1961.

Born September 21, 1933, New York City. Married in 1959 to Adele Logan. Two children. Home: 247 G Street SW., Washington, D.C.

First Marshal of class, Harvard University.

President, local chapter, Phi Delta Phi, International legal fraternity while at Yale Law School.

Contributor, *The Newcomers—Negroes and Puerto Ricans in a Changing Metropolis* (by Oscar Handlin).

Military data

United States Army, 1958–1959.

Senate Joint Memorial 9 of the Oregon Legislative Assembly—1967 Regular Session

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. DELLENBACK

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 23, 1967

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker, since the inception of Oregon's statehood, and up to the present time, fishing has ranked as a major natural resource industry in the State of Oregon.

Cititzens of both the Oregon coast and the interior of the State have become genuinely alarmed over the foreign threats both to this major resource and to the effects on the economy of the State of foreign exploitation of this resource.

It is against this background of concern that I enter in the Record a copy of Oregon State Senate Joint Memorial 9 recently adopted by both houses of the Oregon Legislature:

SENATE JOINT MEMORIAL 9

To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled, the Secretary of the Interior and the President of the United States:

We, your memorialists, the Fifty-fourth Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent as follows:

Whereas the importance and nutritional value of fish and shellfish in the world (fish protein concentrate) and the American diet are becoming increasingly more important as a protein resource; and

Whereas our federal agencies involved have found on three occasions since 1953–54 that our domestic trawl fish industry was being hurt or injured by importations, and yet executive administrative action has not been forthcoming to provide this needed protection; and

Whereas the United States domestic fishery production has decreased and diminished consistently since 1954 to the point of having dropped in world production from second place to fifth place (1964) with Norway overtaking the United States in 1966; and

Whereas the domestic fishing industry, having been severely criticized for not having upgraded itself, has found so doing impossible as long as any and all foreign nations can so conveniently ship fishery products into the United States; and

Whereas the United States production of these species in 1966 was only 19.2 percent of the total United States supply and that from imports was 80.8 percent (U.S.D.I. Bureau of Commercial Fisheries Annual Summary, "Packaged Fishery Products—1966," C.F.S. No. 4343); and

Whereas foreign fishing on our coasts and importations are one and the same problem, and are destroying the domestic trawl industry; and

Whereas the processing plants of Oregon are limiting the landings of otter trawled seafoods due to the heavy and steadily increasing imports of similar species; now, therefore,

Be It Resolved by the Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon: (1) The Congress of the United States is memorialized to take appropriate action to ensure and provide a sound and healthy domestic trawl fishery through quota protection on such imported products.

(2) A copy of this memorial shall be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of the Interior and to each member of the Oregon Congressional Delegation.

CECIL L. EDWARDS,
Secretary of Senate.
E. D. "DOBBS" POTTS,
President of Senate.
F. F. MONTGOMERY,
Speaker of House.

Fewer Women Inmates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 23, 1967

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, one of the serious problems facing American society today is that of crime and criminal rehabilitation. It was reassuring for me to read recently that the Office of Economic Opportunity has been credited with considerable progress in reducing the number of inmates at the Massachusetts State Correctional Institution for Women. I was reassured but not surprised. We know that poverty breeds crime and violence. Because the OEO is successfully attacking poverty in this Nation, by orderly and peaceful means, it has also greatly assisted the battle against crime and lawlessness. Mr. Speaker, I believe the OEO and its dynamic director, Sargent Shriver, should be highly commended for their significant efforts toward achieving a just and orderly America.

I include in the Record a brief article from the July 31 issue of the Christian Science Monitor mentioning the OEO's progress in this field:

FEWER WOMEN INMATES

BOSTON.—The number of inmates at the state correctional institution for women has dropped, but those still in the institution were described by the superintendent as "younger, better educated, and in for more serious offenses."

In a radio interview (WBZ), Mrs. Betty Cole Smith said the drop in inmate population from 250 to 135 was due in part to "the poverty programs out of the Office of Economic Opportunity" and to a change in the public's attitude toward prison inmates.

Mrs. Smith said about 150 women from the community go to the institution each week as volunteer workers. She said they have learned that the inmates "are not dangerous criminals and don't have horns."

"Greater permissiveness, lack of control as far as the home is concerned," was given by Mrs. Smith as the reason for the increased seriousness of the offenses committed.

The Democratic Party and Its Democratic President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT TENZER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 16, 1967

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, the role of dissent within political parties in America is fundamental to the preservation of the two-party system. It is a well known fact that the Democratic party is a party of diverse views—yet one which traditionally has been able to unite behind the common goals of prosperity and equality for all.

In this sense dissent is not inconsistent with party unity. Dissent is carried on withi nthe party, within the general framework of party ideals and goals. When we disagree with the party, we do so not in the sense of disagreeing with the broad ideals and approach but with the particular method employed at that point in time. The Democratic party and the Nation have a great President. He has guided into law one of the most progressive and forward looking platforms in history. He has brought the Federal Government into a creative partnership with States and local governments in an effort to meet human needs in education, health, housing and the war against poverty.

During the 90th Congress we have debated some of the most frustrating and difficult problems in the history of our Nation. The Vietnam war continues to escalate, riots have broken out in ghettos in cities across the country and a huge budget deficit must be met by the administration.

On the majority side of the political aisle many have found it expedient to criticize and protest without proposing alternatives. Some have looked at the results of public opinion polls and have decided that the best course to follow is that which places them in a position of having differed with the President. It is each Member's right to do that, but it is his duty to recognize that it is not enough to differ with the President purely for the sake of doing so.

The loyal opposition has found it easy to protest and criticize. They, too, have offered no alternatives—no new constructive suggestions to deal with the complex problems facing our Nation. They offer no leadership.

We, the majority party, must provide

that leadership and must remain a united party.

Let me make it quite clear that the brand of party unity which I support is not that which means blind and unreasoned adherence to the formal policy dictates of the administration. Party unity is a subtle concept which, in its most fundamental aspect, means an acceptance of the broadly conceived ideology of the political party. It means working within the framework of the party to effect those changes which are essential to the progressive development of our society. To disagree on any specific issue or set of issues is not to disassociate oneself from his party. The party is strong because it allows such dissent and and will be stronger in the future by encouraging the expression of individual opinon.

I have cast my vote in this Chamber a number of times against the administration stand. This year, I voted to cut the NASA and Public Works appropriations. I voted against the appropriation for development of a supersonic transport. And I am now engaged in efforts to defeat the proposed 10-percent tax surcharge unless and until we place a tax on loophole income and reach those who avoid their contribution to the Nation's obligations through various tax loopholes.

Notwithstanding the fact that I have differed with the President on these issues, I beileve that he is qualified, as no other man is, to be this Nation's Chief Executive. His record is one of excellence, it is unparalleled in our Nation's history. He has completed in 4 years the work begun by three of his Democratic predecessors spanning over 30 years. He is the leader of our party and we, as members of the Democratic Party, can be proud to have him as our leader.

I urge my colleagues in the Democratic Party to review the record of our President—the record of our party—and the meaning of party unity. Let the people know that we are and will continue to be united in the true sense of that word. We will be stronger as a party and the people of the United States will receive the benefits from our strength.

Let the Democratic Party go "from strength to strength."

Editorial Expresses Feeling of Frustration by Many Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 23, 1967

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, Harry Yockey, veteran editor of the Daily Reporter in Dover, Ohio, is one of the most gentle men I know, but he has a special talent for expressing indignation in language that everyone can understand and appreciate. One of his hard-hitting editorials recently summed up the anger, frustration, and apprehensions of many of his readers, and several were moved to clip and forward it to me. Though not everyone will agree with everything Mr. Yockey has to say, I think it is well worth reading as an expression of how millions of Americans are reacting to the events of recent weeks and months. Perhaps it is an indication that the real revolution in this country is going to come from fed-up and disgusted middle-class Americans in hundreds of communities across the land who have come to the conclusion that it is time for a change in Washington.

The article follows:

EDITOR'S COMMENT

(By Harry Yockey)

America has had enough of senseless life taking and wide spread property destruction in the name of civil rights.

America has had enough of the loud-mouthed, brazen exhorters who incite blind followers to shoot, burn and loot.

America has had enough of H. Rap Brown, who said "We'll burn the country down, honkies (whites) and all."

America has had enough of Stokely Carmichael, who was quoted from Havana as saying we applied war tactics of the guerrillas in Newark and we're preparing groups of urban guerrillas for our defense in cities."

America has had enough of Adam Clayton Powell, who yells from his Bimini retreat that "riots are a necessary phase of the black revolution" and that there will be other upheavals unless Negroes are nominated to Congress "by September."

America has had enough of those who demand that they receive, scot-free, housing and other common necessities which others earn through hard work.

America has had enough of the unqualified and their commands for equal employment simply because of color.

America has had enough of the politicians including President Johnson, who try to make hay by placing the blame for the uncontrolled rioting and burning on each other.

America has had enough of national legislators who apparently would rather vote millions in tax money for "disaster relief" than incur the wrath of some voters and enact laws that, in no uncertain terms, will curb racists.

America has had enough of the congressional reticence in approving a gun control law aimed at preventing the "guerrillas" from arming themselves so they can wage a civil rights rooftop war on policemen, firemen, innocent citizens or anyone else they decide to snipe at.

America has had enough of youths, old enough for military service, who race through streets hurling firebombs and rocks while a half million others are fighting a war in Vietnam.

Yet, America has had enough. But just the mere saying that enough's enough isn't enough.

It is time for every American, who loves his country, to give sober thought to today's conditions and to weigh how he might help correct them.

It is time to recognize that the vast majority of Negroes are honest, conscientious, hard-working, respectable citizens who ask only an equal chance in the land of plenty and who want no part of the lawlessness that's putting the nation to shame.

It is time for the Republican and Democratic parties to declare a moratorium on their political bickering and work in complete harmony to bring the United States out of the civil rights chaos.

It is time for the Johnson administration, all senators and all representatives in Washington to stop the flow of foreign aid to unappreciative countries, and especially those in league with the communists, and channel the money into an allout effort to alleviate suffering and misery in the United States.

It is time for Congress to put a halter on the U.S. Supreme Court, whose rulings have aided the country's criminal element and fostered a freedom to pillage and kill at will.

It is time for stringent laws that provide imprisonment for any and all who have been taking advantage of free speech to encourage utter destruction and defiance of the government.

It is time for an understanding that taxpayers' dollars will not be used to replace buildings wrecked or destroyed as were those in Detroit and thereby, in effect, rewarding the rioters.

It is time for the enactment and enforcement of laws which compel penny-pinching landlords to keep housing properties in respectable condition and limit occupancy to a sensible number.

It is time to acknowledge the Communist party as an enemy and, even if constitutional changes are necessary, deport every Red to a country of his choice.

It is time to forego dilly-dallying and direct the full manpower of the Federal Bureau of Investigation into an intensive trackdown of those who organize, engineer and participate in wanton rioting.

It is time to open the doors of all educational institutions to Negroes and give them an equal chance to seek and absorb the knowledge to which they are entitled and which they must have to fulfill their roles as good countrymen.

It is time for every city and every hamlet to do something about undesirable housing for poor whites and Negroes, and to encourage private capital to join in investing in America's future.

It is time to rid the welfare rolls of loafers and leeches and sterilize women who don't care who fathers their children as long as taxpayers see to their care.

It is time for the nation to wake up to the truth that it has 2 wars on its hands, one in Vietnam and one in America; that one must be fought with bullets and the other with laws and humanitarianism.

Yes, it is time, and no community regardless of size, is in a position to say "it can't happen here." All are vulnerable.

Communities must work together, or separately, to eradicate undesirable conditions, no matter their nature, recognizing that the big cities now are in trouble because, from the time they were small, nobody cared enough to insist upon day-to-day housecleaning.

Communities must recognize that prejudices and petty jealousies are deterrents which slow or stop progress and kindle resentments that become fuel for destructive elements.

Communities must show appreciation for those citizens who volunteer many hours of their time in unrewarding public service designed to foster betterment, instead of accusing them of ulterior motives, such as self-gain.

Communities must be wary of those who would deny low-income families or senior citizens a better lot in life for fear it may take a few pennies off their income.

Communities must not be swayed by those who, because they didn't think of it first, throw "they're-trying-to-run-us" rocks in the path of possible improvements.

Communities must be alert to possibilities of anticipation in all federal programs for which money has been allocated, right or wrong, and which will go to those with enough desire that they formulate plans and made application for grants.

Communities must take a renewed interest in their law enforcement agencies, making certain they are adequately staffed, properly trained and fully equipped for any emergency involving life and property.

Communities must not be lackadaisical as they read of terror elsewhere because not just one segment but all of America is facing a rebellion that has been brewing many scores of years as a large part of the population looked down its collective nose at those it was keeping under foot.

The time for talking is past. The times demand action, the kind of action that will eradicate the spoilers, establish equal rights on a sound and sensible plateau and bring harmony to a nation that has grown and prospered on a foundation established on life, liberty and happiness.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Code of Laws of the United States

Title 44, Section 181. Congressional Record; arrangement, style, contents, and indexes.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the Congressional Record, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the Congressional Record semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

Title 44, Section 182b. Same; illustrations, maps, diagrams.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the Record without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the Congressional Record the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily Record as follows: the Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided,* That the makeup of the Record shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the Congressional Record, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the Record shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will case will a speech be printed in the Record of unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the Record issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the Record for 1 day. In no the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the Record shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the Record style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the Record.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the Congressional Record any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent Record is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the Congressional Record the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the Congressional Record.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the Congressional Record shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the Official Reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the Official Reporters of the respective Houses.

The Official Reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the Official Reporters in the next issue of the Congressional Record, nor to Records printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the Congressional Record by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the Congressional Record which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402, at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided,* That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Appendix

Former U.S. Senator Homer E. Capehart Named National Chairman of USO Drive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 24, 1967

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, the State of Indiana lost the voice of one of its finest sons ever to sit in the U.S. Senate when Senator Homer Capehart was defeated for reelection in 1962. He has been sorely missed by all those who knew him, and were proud to count him among their friends.

It is totally in keeping with the devotion to public service that this man always had that he should remain busy and active in business, patriotic, political, and civic affairs since he left the Senate. Now, another position of great responsibility has been given to him, by his being named national chairman of the United Service Organization fundraising drive.

The USO could not have picked a finer American for the job, and those of us who are privileged to know him are confident he will render to the USO the same outstanding and selfless service he gave to his State and to his country when he was a Member of the Senate.

The following article from the August 4, 1967, Indianapolis Star, gives the details of Senator Capehart's appointment:

CAPEHART MADE CHAIRMAN OF NATIONAL USO DRIVE

Former United States Senator Homer E. Capehart (R-Ind.) yesterday was named national chairman of the United Service Organization funding-raising drive which includes an Indiana quota of $201,375 from United Fund or Community Chest drives.

The announcement was made yesterday by retired United States Air Force Gen. Emmett (Rosy) O'Donnell Jr., national president of the USO, at a luncheon in the Indiana National Bank. Representatives of business, industry, labor unions, clergy, and military and government agencies attended.

O'Donnell stressed the USO is strictly an expression of civilian concern for the man and woman in uniform. He declared.

"Many of these young 18 and 19-year-olds are away from home for the first time in their lives. In Vietnam, they've been tossed into a dirty war, vicious war, a meat-grinder, and they need whatever we can offer to make their lives more comfortable."

He said United States forces in Vietnam have increased from 800 in 1963 to 500,000 at the present time, necessitating more help from the USO.

He said civilian participation in USO campaigns should be increased "because of the worry for the welfare of our men fighting in a war, not declared and apparently with no victory in sight according to the ground rules."

He pointed out that USO receives no money from the government and relies mostly on contributions from Community Chest or United Fund drives in local communities.

Russell W. McDermott of Indianapolis, regional chairman of a four-state area including Indiana, Illinois, Michigan and Ohio, said increased efforts will be made this year to collect USO funds from Indiana towns and cities that have no Community Chest or United Fund programs.

He also said that of Indiana's 420 banks, about 200 banks have not made any contributions.

"It isn't because they have refused to do so, they just haven't been asked since they are not tied in with any local fund-raising project," McDermott said.

Gen. O'Donnell paid tribute to Capehart, who served as an Army private in World War I, as a highly regarded, loyal and patriotic American.

Capehart quipped:

"The people of Indiana retired me three years ago and I've been on vacation. Gen. O'Donnell is about the only man who could talk me back to going to work."

Conservation Overused, Misunderstood Word

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON H. CLAUSEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 24, 1967

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, much of the controversy surrounding the proposals for establishment of a Redwood National Park in my First Congressional District of California is generated by a misunderstanding of the differences between the terms "preservation" and "conservation."

Interpretation of these often-used terms are as various as the people interested in the outdoors. Richard Alden Knight, writing in the June 12 edition of the Hartford, Conn., Courant, has interpreted the terms as succinctly as anyone in my experience and has applied them to the proposals for a Redwood Park.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I place in the RECORD the attached article written by Mr. Knight. It is my hope to continue to provide my colleagues with information that I think helps tell the redwood story. I hope all Members will read its contents because I sincerely believe it will help to clarify what I am attempting to accomplish in my Redwood-to-the-Sea conservation package.

The article follows:

CONSERVATION OVERUSED, MISUNDERSTOOD WORD

(By Richard Alden Knight)

Perhaps the most overused (and easily the most misunderstood; word in our everyday language is the term "conservation". It has been applied to a multitude of outlets, not all of them apt and proper. Far too often, it is used in the same breath as the word "preservation" . . . this in itself not correct. Conservation is the logical and continuing use of a resource, a use designed to further the resource while harvesting its potential within its limits.

The term "preservation" is reactionary, dedicated to the premise that all should remain, forever and a day, as it is today. Such thinking went out with the last of the great buggywhip factories, but unfortunately, its very existence today in legislative proposals is due to the lamentable fact that our elected representatives (and their petitioning constituents) do not do their homework before they act. Impulsive reasoning and emotion have no place in hard, logical fact. To preserve in many cases means to waste, to allow a resource to grow fallow and useless.

Preservation can be (and should be) applied to our endangered species of wildlife. Conservation has assured over the years that other species remain in a status quo (or far better) position. This has shown to be the case in the whitetail deer populations across the nation . . . it also applies in excellent part to our forests and our inland fish populations. It does not apply, in any degree, to a resource that is damaged and in dire need of upgrading. Here you could mention air and water pollution, estuary controls, seashore areas and defiled mountains where strip mines have left their ugly scars.

DENIES TREE THEORY

There is a move afoot these days to "save" the redwood, that stately tree that grows on our Pacific coastlines. Attributing lumber interests with crass greed and lack of public interest, the Save The Trees factions are agitating for tremendous land parcel grabs of existing growths, saying that unless the trees are saved, there will be no more. This is not true.

The Sequoia sempervirens or redwood has been falsely attributed to be a slow-growing species when in fact it is one of the fastest growing trees in existence. Second growth redwoods can reach a height of 90 per cent of their old growth neighbors in less than a century. Unlike most of the conifers, the redwood has the capacity to reproduce itself from a stump, shooting forth vigorous sprouts to grow within weeks after cutting. Yet let this same tree die from old age and its sprouting capacity dies with it.

"If we lose the redwood in America, we could never replace them." Not True! Even if all the redwood forests in America died tomorrow, the trees can be found on five continents of the world. They are thriving in Algeria, Brazil, Burma, France, Mexico, Spain, Switzerland and Uruguay. New Zealand, by far the best suited of all areas for their growth, has a 64-year-old plantation near Rotarua hitting heights of 140 feet with diameters of three feet. A 23-year-old plantation in Wales, here in the fog and damp, is 75 feet high today. A similar 84-year-old plantation is now 111 feet high.

CONFUSE REDWOOD, SEQUOIA

There is a habit afoot today to confuse the redwood with the giant sequoia. Actually, the word sequoia is a generic term applied to two species, the above-named redwood and the Sequoia gigantea, the giant sequoia. The latter is native to the middle slopes of the Sierra Nevada of California while the redwood is confined to the Pacific Coast, within reach of the ocean fogs from Monterey

County north to the Oregon line. Their foliage is strikingly different . . . the redwood having needlelike leaves while the sequoia has scale-like leaves.

Let's return to the two words in contrast here, conservation and preservation. It would seem that there is room for both in the case of the big trees, but not to the extent now being touted by the tree-savers. To allow a resource, and the big trees are one whether we will consider them as such or not, to lie fallow, to waste itself of a lifetime and fall to the ground unused of old age is nothing more than sheer mismanagement.

To conserve this resource, to section-cut it and insure its continuation through the ages, here lies the reasoning behind conservation.

SEES POOR REASONING

I would be the first to say that the existing Ntaional Parks containing both of these huge trees should be held to antiquity. To stand in the presence of these giants is to feel close to your Creator. To see the massive trunks rearing off into the sky so high that your neck grows stiff just to see their tops . . . this is a glimpse back into history. But to say, in the same breath, that we should never cut them, that we should let them stand as they are . . . this is poor reasoning.

The timber interests are often classed as the villian in the piece and, at one time, such casting was more than correct. Our forefathers, driven by greed and considerable lack of foresight, looted the land of its first growth trees and left acres and miles of nothing. They made no effort to insure the future and, in doing this, deprived a sequence of coming generations of the sight of a tree bigger than your wrist. To these same thieves, we can attribute much of our past and present erosion problems.

Today, the picture is not the same. I feel that the timber companies can and will preserve the trees to the extent that they will manage the use of them intelligently. They have done this all over the nation. To say that they will not is to deprive them of their right to innocence. Let's not confuse preservation with conservation . . . the end result is total waste.

De Gaulle Uses State Department Agency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 24, 1967

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, President de Gaulle's meddling into the affairs of the Canadian Government professing to seek liberation of those of French ancestry should shock none of our policymakers.

This divide into minorities by race, creek, color, and national origin has been the policy of the United Nations and our lition of national sovereignty is the intellectual label for this type of revolution. A tearing down of patriotism for one's geographical country—the turning of minority against minority to undermine constitutional government.

Note the correlation of De Gaulle's program in Quebec to the program of our country in the Congo, Rhodesia, and South Africa.

Revolution is the overthrow of government—be it by force of arms; sinister ideas or by divisive practices.

It has come time to start defending governments rather than appealing ideas and news promoted, self-styled, front leaders.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert the UPI news release for August 23, 1967, concerning De Gaulle's announcement on Quebec:

DE GAULLE PLANS QUEBEC "LIBERATION" AID—MAJOR MOVE ANNOUNCED IN THREE FIELDS

PARIS.—President Charles de Gaulle today announced a massive program of technical, cultural and economic cooperation with Quebec to help the French-speaking Canadian province achieve its "liberation."

The De Gaulle announcement was made by Information Minister Georges Gorse after a three-hour cabinet meeting under De Gaulle.

Gorse told newsmen France's present ties with Quebec will be "considerably stepped up" in the technical, cultural and economic fields.

The French announcement came only 24 hours after Canadian Prime Minister Lester Pearson, speaking in Ottawa, again rejected De Gaulle's intrusion into internal Canadian affairs.

De Gaulle touched off the current France-Canada difficulties during a visit to Canada in July when he concluded a speech to Quebec residents with the slogan "Vive le Quebec Libre"—Long Live Free Quebec.

Pearson rebuked him publicly and De Gaulle cut short his visit and returned to France. Since then he has voiced support several times for the French-speaking Canadians who would like to secede from English-speaking Canada.

Speaking at Banff, Alberta, Canadian Ambassador to France Jules Leger warned yesterday that establishment of close relations between France and Quebec would lead to new frictions between Ottawa and the Franch-speaking province.

In Ottawa, Pearson told the Anglican Synod, "We will repudiate interference in our affairs by those who may mistakenly believe that we are not Canadians so much as Canadian Frenchmen, or Canadian Americans, or Canadian Englishmen, or Canadian something else."

Percy E. Batchelor Selected To Receive the John Campanius Holm Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAGE BELCHER

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 24, 1967

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted, I insert in the RECORD the following release by the U.S. Department of Commerce Weather Bureau, giving the John Campanius Holm Award to my dear friend Percy E. Batchelor, of Jefferson, Okla., for his outstanding record as a volunteer weather observer.

The release follows:

JOHN CAMPANIUS HOLM AWARD

WASHINGTON.—Percy E. Batchelor of Jefferson, Okla., has been selected to receive the John Campanius Holm Award for his outstanding record as a volunteer weather observer, Dr. Robert M. White, Administrator of the Environmental Science Services Administration (ESSA), Department of Commerce announced today.

John Campanius Holm Awards, created in 1959 by ESSA's Weather Bureau, are made annually to honor volunteer observers for outstanding accomplishment in the field of meteorological observations. The award is named for a Lutheran minister who is the first person known to take systematic weather observations in the United States. The Reverend John Campanius Holm took daily observations near the present site of Wilmington, Del., in 1644 and 1645.

Batchelor has been the official observer at Jefferson since 1945. His observations have been remarkably complete even during periods of high water when Jefferson and his own home were inundated. On one occasion his rainfall observation was taken from a boat.

During severe weather and tornado "watches" he actively participates as the city's Director of Civil Defense and has complemented his regular climatological observations with observed details on severe storms.

Batchelor's citation, signed by Dr. White, reads "for continuing excellence and devotion to his duties as the volunteer weather observer at Jefferson, Oklahoma."

The Weather Bureau has over 12,000 volunteer observers throughout the United States who make and record daily weather observations. The information they gather is processed and published by the Environmental Data Service, another component of ESSA, and is invaluable in recording the nation's climate.

Tulsa World Editorial Puts Rights in Perspective

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 22, 1967

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, responsible newspapers of the Nation play an important and vital role in building respect for law and order and for due process of law in the pursuit of rights and correction of grievances. A fine example of editorial leadership in this press role is provided in the Tulsa World of August 20, 1967.

I would like to have that editorial appear in the RECORD:

NO RIGHT TO RIOT

"Our country was founded on the right to revolt. The Revolutionary War was a rebellion against authority—and don't forget the Boston Tea Party!"

So goes the defense these days—the defense of rioting and looting, the burning of cities and the whole pattern of challenging and tearing down legal shall-nots. The arguments is that all of us have a right to riot against a law or restriction we consider oppressive. Isn't that what freedom is all about?

The words have a plausible ring, but it's a false argument, shot full of holes. It may give rioters a warm sense of righteousness that blots out any twinges of conscience, but they're kidding themselves.

In the first place, what is a "legal" right? Prof. Sidney Hook, Chairman of Philosophy Department of New York University's graduate school, notes that a legal right is a claim or demand to something that the Government stands ready to enforce.

Thus, if the right to destroy authority were a constitutional or legal right, the Government would be obliged to enforce the act of overthrowing itself. That's ridiculous on its face. There can be no such legal right.

Well, then, how about the moral right—the one that justified the farmers at Concord and the rebels at the Boston Tea Party?

Here it is important to remember the American colonists lived in a society that lacked the basic freedoms we take for granted. They had no representation to protest honest grievances; there was no orderly procedure to correct the wrongs that pressed down on them. Orders were handed down from sources beyond their reach—there was nothing they could do about them.

Contrast the civil rights struggle today. Can anyone say that Negroes and other minorities have no representation in Washington or in State capitols? Can even the most ardent champion of equal rights deny that great progress has been made in the last 20 years? He may be impatient for more, but he cannot honestly argue he has been neglected, much less unrepresented.

The right of free speech and assembly is not the same as the "right" to riot, for that crosses the point where the other fellow has equal rights. A Boston Tea Party could not be justified today—even in the name of Black Power.

Tight Money Failed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 3, 1967

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, a special study by the Department of Commerce released yesterday should lay to rest forever the persistent myth that tight money and high interest rates are effective in controlling inflation and in slowing an overheated economy. As I have said many times in the House, tight money and high interest rates fuel the fires of inflation while doing irreparable damage to the Nation's consumers, individuals living on fixed incomes, farmers, small businessmen, and the housing and lumber industries.

Business editor Hobart Rowen of the Washington Post and the financial pages of the New York Times are to be commended for the excellent press coverage they have given to this important study. Their articles are reprinted below.

As these business writers emphasize, only 121 of 4,418 major companies responding to the Commerce Department survey cut back their investment plans last year because of money market conditions. This miniature percentage is in sharp contrast to the "shock effect" the report describes for tight money on housing. A reduction in corporate fixed capital outlays of 0.7 percent due to financial conditions compared dramatically with the $2½ billion or 10 percent reduction in expenditures for residential construction last year.

With the economic indicators consistently pointing upward once again, and with the long-term interest rates close to or exceeding last year's peaks, the ingredients for another financial crisis are present in our economy. The Congress, the administration, and the Federal Reserve Board should give careful attention to this timely study by the Commerce Department in formulating a monetary and fiscal program for balanced economic growth.

The articles follow:

FEW OUTLAYS CUT BY TIGHT MONEY—GOVERNMENT SURVEYS PLANT INVESTMENT OF LAST YEAR

WASHINGTON, August 22.—Only 121 companies out of 4,418 replying to a new Government survey cut back their investment last year because of tight money, the Commerce Department disclosed today.

The survey, begun in March this year, was aimed at filling what today's report called a "striking gap in our basic knowledge about the effects of monetary policy."

What the survey found was that the effects of last year's severe credit squeeze on business investment in plant and equipment and in inventories was "quite small in almost any perspective." This is in contrast to what the report called the "shock effect" of tight money on housing.

The report was contained in the department's "survey of current business" in a long article by Prof. Irwin Friend and Prof. Jean Crockett of the University of Pennsylvania and Henry Chavell of the department's office of business economics.

Where investment was cut back last year, the survey found, by far the most important reason was delays in delivery of equipment or in construction. Of the 4,418 companies replying to the survey, about one-quarter revised their investment plans "appreciably" in 1966. And, of these, more increased their planned outlays than reduced them.

The report said the impact of last year's tight money would be a little greater on 1967 investments than on 1966 investments. It estimated that investment this year would be about $1-billion less than it otherwise would have been because of the credit squeeze last year. But this amounts to a reduction of only 1.3 per cent, the report said.

Contrary to some earlier beliefs, the survey found that the proportion of companies citing financial market factors in reduced investment was about the same for large and small companies, ranging from 5 to 6 per cent of the reporting companies.

UTILITIES' SITUATION

However, the smaller companies that said they were affected cut back their investment by a greater amount, proportionately, than the larger concerns.

The report said, "Utilities mentioned financial market developments as a factor responsible for reducing planned capital outlays relatively much more frequently than did manufacturing and all other industries covered."

The authors not only found that the impact of tight money was "quite small" on investment but also found a "significant lag between monetary action and any appreciable effect on business investment."

The effect of tight money on investment in inventories was a little greater than on fixed investment, the survey found. Last year's rise in inventories was cut by an estimated $500-million because of credit conditions, according to the report, or "a little less than 4 per cent of the $13.7-billion invested in nonfarm inventories last year."

CONCLUSION OF COMMERCE DEPARTMENT STUDY: BUSINESS BOOM BARELY DENTED BY THE CREDIT SQUEEZE OF 1966

(By Hobart Rowen)

Last year's severe credit squeeze—one of the worst in a half century—made only a minor dent in business' plant expansion boom.

This conclusion is the principal finding of a special Commerce Department study released yesterday.

The relatively light impact of tight money on fixed capital outlays—for plant expansion and inventories—contrasts sharply with the clear effect on investment in housing.

"BITE" ON HOUSING

In 1966, tight money put a $2.5 billion "bite" into the housing industry, equivalent to a 10 per cent slash in residential construction.

But business investments in fixed capital and in inventories in 1966 were each only about $500 million lower than they would have been in the absence of the money squeeze, the Commerce report said. The total outlay reached $75 billion.

Impact this year will be a reduction of only about $1 billion in expenditures for plant and equipment, and about another $500 million in inventories.

For fixed capital outlays that amounts to a reduction of only 0.7 per cent for 1966 and 1.3 per cent for 1967.

The study was prepared by Professors Irwin Friend and Jean Crockett of the University of Pennsylvania, and Henry Shavell of the Commerce Department, based on questionnaires mailed to 8876 business firms. The Securities and Exchange Commission cooperated with Commerce on the survey.

The report comments that economists have generally assumed that restrictive money measures have their biggest impact on the demand for different types of investment goods.

From the replies of 4418 firms, the authors concluded that the impact is small, except in housing. Until the publication of this survey, there had been no such data available to guide economic policymakers.

"These estimated effects of monetary policy in 1966 on business investment in 1966 and 1967 seem quite small in almost any perspective," the study said.

It noted that not only was tight money relatively ineffective in cutting short the investment boom, but whatever impact did result involved a large time lag.

Almost no effects were visible until the third quarter of 1966—more than six months after basic tight money decisions were made. Lags were shorter, and the impact more severe for smaller firms.

The study acknowledges that only the direct effects of tight money on investment were assessed, and that if indirect effects of financial market condition were included, the figures would be increased somewhat.

But even if the $500 million figure for 1966 impact on fixed investment were subject to a 50 per cent error, "the total impact is obviously a very small fraction of aggregate plant and equipment expenditures."

PLANS CHANGED

All told, about one in four firms responding to the Commerce-SEC questionnaire said that their actual 1966 plants and equipment spending had changed appreciably from their plans at the outset.

But increases out-ran decreases by a 6 to 4 ratio, with changed sales outlook the most important factor among those increasing their outlays, and delays in deliveries accounting for about half of the cases where there were reductions.

Observations of the Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROGERS C. B. MORTON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 24, 1967

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, in these troubled Vietnam war days, many American people continue to look to the Congress for leadership in the task of facing up to the ever-mounting crisis in Southeast Asia.

All too often it seems we find it difficult to reconsider our convictions and admit we have been wrong. This is not an easy thing to do. However, if we are truly to represent the people who have delegated to us vast authority, I believe we must have the courage to maintain an open mind on the great problems which face our Nation.

I call to the attention of my colleagues an editorial which appears in the August 28, 1967, issue of The Nation magazine:

A Senator Speaks His Mind

Sen. Thruston Morton, Republican of Kentucky, could be said to come as close to deserving the title of "Mr. Republican" as anyone since the late Sen. Robert A. Taft, who inspired it. It is not only that he occupies, politically, a position close to the center of the party's "mainstream" but also that over the years he has served his party skillfully and well. Republicans, from all sections and of all persuasions, have a high respect for Mr. Morton, and with reason.

It is highly significant when a man of the Senator's stature and influence publicly announces that he has changed his position on a crucial issue. He did so, not by inches but by a mile—or perhaps the measure should be in light years. It oocurred, not in a private interview or at a press conference but on television's *Opinion: Washington* (WTTG), and just to show that there could be no mistake about it, he repeated his statements the next evening to Martin Agronsky on C.B.S. national TV.

Senator Morton, who until now has been an outspoken supporter of the bombing of North Vietnam, said that he "thought they'd be brought to the table in a few months if we did that, but I was wrong and I'll admit it. . . ." This he followed up by declaring: "I think the tools we're working with and the tactics we're using today are outworn and are not working," and continued that we were "painting ourselves into a corner" by following a policy of escalation.

It is a rare and refreshing experience to hear a national political figure stand up and admit that he has been wrong. It has happened very seldom within our experience. The last memorable example was provided by President Kennedy, following the Bay of Pigs fiasco which he handled with characteristic frankness and aplomb, but under the circumstances he had no choice; the facts were there for all to see and to bemoan. Mr. Morton had a choice, and with rare courage and honesty made the right one by obeying his conscience. One might hope that his example would be followed by those currently in power. If they need an excuse for turning away from their disastrous course in Vietnam, the forthcoming election on September 3, which promises to be a farce, could provide one. But Johnson and Rusk, judged by past performances, lack Senator Morton's integrity.

The Senator eloquently and forcefully espoused an "honorable disengagement." We agree with him, and would go further and say that immediate disengagement is the only honorable course now left to us. The Senator is convinced that Vietnam will be "a burning, compelling issue, the *big* issue in the 1968 election." Asked if the Republican candidate in 1968 should be a peace candidate, he replied: "Well, to paraphrase '64, let's give a choice, not an echo, and we've got a war candidate in the White House today, so I'd say the Republican candidate should be a peace candidate. . . ." In his view, the political leader who presents a program of honorable disengagement "is going to get elected President of the U.S." It would be exciting to see the Senator give it a try.

Northwest 2000: Coming to Terms With the Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 24, 1967

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, an imaginative program has been developed in the Pacific Northwest called Northwest 2000, which, it is hoped, will offer the people the opportunity to come to terms with the future. This project has the vast capability of being negotiable in other regions of the country through an exchange of ideas and information with knowledgeable people throughout the country and the world who are interested in developmental work and processes. This project was developed by James H. Cowles, Jr., of Bellevue, Wash., and I am inserting a résumé of Northwest 2000 to be printed in the Record.

The summary follows:

What Is Northwest 2000?

Northwest 2000 is an imaginative concept which offers an opportunity for the people of the Pacific Northwest to rapidly come to terms with the future. In a crisis ridden world no other regional area has the exciting potential for leadership which is found in this area. Recent events at home and abroad bear testimony to the feeling that time is running out unless fresh insights and innovative solutions are found to deal with the mounting problems.

Northwest 2000 has been created to stimulate the regional development of the Pacific Northwest. To maintain a position in the competitive and fast changing world it is necessary to stir up minds, to unlock imaginative ideas and to create receptivity to the unusual and the unexpected. An organization designed to dredge up ideas, develop them, and get them placed in the hands of those with the capability to take action might result in some exciting developments.

Regional development, at best, is an inexact science. It is true that there is growing interest in community and regional planning but available evidence shows that there are only isolated cases where this work is being carried on with some measure of success. It is necessary to develop an integrated over-view of a region for sound regional development on the broad basis which is required.

Northwest 200 has not been designed to compete with existing agencies nor to duplicate the work of others, but rather to complement and correlate what is already going on. It is planned to develop a perspective of a regional nature that will accelerate the decision-making process involved in the determination of goals and the establishment of priorities. For it is only possible to take sound action when one knows where he is going and why.

Northwest 2000 is concerned wih Alaska, Western Canada, and the four Northwestern States of Montana, Idaho, Washington, and Oregon. This is a broad area and the task not small, but in effect, here lies the greatest underdeveloped nation in the world in terms of resources as well as potential. The Columbia River and the great forests do not stop at the border. The salt water and the clean atmosphere are common assets. Brainpower, ideas, and capital are readily exchanged in such an area. The various segments of this region will be interlocked in the future. This is what Northwest 2000 is all about.

The perspective of Northwest 2000 is truly regional in nature with an eye on the 21st Century. There is a present widespread interest in planning of all types and descriptions. There is a proliferation of projections relating to all aspects of our lives. Electronics are providing new tools with which to divine the future and a hierarchy of "future planners" is coming into being in government and business. Out of the computers a seemingly endless flood of information, facts, and statistics pour onto the desks of management and planners. But what does it all mean in reference to the growth and development of the Pacific Northwest if there are no underlying principles and goals upon which decisions can be made that are understandable to the people?

It is not the business of Northwest 2000 to become an oracle or a prophet. It will be the business of Northwest 2000 to raise the sights of leadership, to encourage better utilization of human resources, and to suggest alternatives as to how effective and orderly development can be accomplished. It may be in the form of new economic opportunities, a fresh insight into the use of the land area, an expansion of the research base, innovations in education, or simply the encouragement of a new symphony orchestra or community theater group. Northwest 2000 can become a catalyst for development of the total community.

The work will be conducted privately through a non-profit, tax-exempt organization, already in existence, in the hope that a desirable objectivity can be attained through an independent organization rather than one dependent on government or vested in an industry. Most associations, unions, and study groups are not set up to be objective.

The original financing of the project has been arranged so that Northwest 2000 can get off the ground. It seems logical that local foundation support through a small grant program is feasible to consider if the business and government leadership will lend moral support to the venture. There is an obvious potential for income from publications, consultation, and information services. Northwest 2000 will be a small organization with a compact staff and limited overhead. Bureaucracy does not lend itself to this work.

It is anticipated that a profile of the Pacific Northwest will be created. Work has already started on this phase. A number of studies will be generated to be accomplished by outside agencies although much of the formal study work has been accomplished or is in process in the various states, and provinces. A seminar program will be etablished to maximize an exchange of ideas on a continuing basis. A regional magazine has been conceived to be published by an independent group working closely with Northwest 2000.

A surprising number of development ideas have been uncovered during the preliminary plannnig for Northwest 2000 and these will be disseminated to individuals and groups with capability for taking action. One of the real functions of Northwest 2000 will be to act as a development clearing house and intelligence center.

In summary, Northwest 2000 is an experimental people—oriented concept working through a small staff to stimulate the development of the Pacific Northwest along orderly lines. It is not a one shot research effort to be culminated in a bulky study, but rather a "living" program re-acting to the challenges of the times on a continuing basis. It will maximize efforts to accelerate decisions and coalesce the efforts of the many capable individuals and groups dedicated to the growth and development of this great area without destroying the magnificent natural and social environment which is, today, the region's greatest strength.

Invasion of Privacy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT N. C. NIX

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 24, 1967

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, a recent article appearing in the Philadelphia Bulletin demonstrates the success one man can have in bringing this Nation to an awareness of a much-overlooked problem—the continuing threats to individual privacy inherent in many technological advances.

Our distinguished colleague from New Jersey, the Honorable CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER, has served with dedication as chairman of the Special Subcommittee on Invasion of Privacy of the Government Operations Committee. His subcommittee has brought onto the American scene a climate of continuing and increasing concern for the dangers to individual privacy posed by such technological innovations as the proposed National Data Center.

Chairman GALLAGHER and his subcommittee have contributed to our appreciation of the freedoms we now enjoy and his work will inspire us to protect these rights in the face of continuing buffeting from the winds of technological and scientific change.

I submit the article by John G. McCullough for the RECORD:

THE LOWDOWN ON EVERYMAN: WHO IS TO WATCH U.S. DATA CENTER?

(By John G. McCullough)

Picture this:

An intense young man wearing a scientist's smock with the letters U.S. SDC above the breast pocket is at a desk in a vast room. Rows of electronic computers are all around him. The room is still. Its air, sound and light are controlled, antiseptic.

A series of numbers flash on a screen. Our intense young man leans forward and quickly taps a series of buttons atop a box-like device. A light blinks on one of the computers. There is a soft whirring noise. Through a slit-like opening in the young man's desk a long sheet of paper emerges. It is covered with words, figures and symbols.

"John Doe," our intense young man reads, "is 42, lives at 1234 Maple av., Anytown. Married, two children and frequently argues (loudly) with his wife. Did badly in spelling in grade school and finished next to last in his 109-member high school class.

"Owes $900 on a two-year-old car and is usually two months behind in his mortgage payments. During military service lost a boot (combat, left) and was held overnight by Armed Services Police for intoxication in Baltimore.

"Degree in business administration. Low averages in all subjects. Employed as salesman at $11,800 a year. Family expenses will exceed this by $123.68 in current year.

DOES NOT TRUST POLITICIANS

The long sheet of paper tells the intense young man a great deal more about John Doe. John, for example, still bites his fingernails. He keeps an up-to-date passport although he has never traveled outside the country. He has gotten five traffic tickets for ignoring a stop sign near his home. He once announced well along in a cocktail party that he had never met a politician he trusted.

The sheet of paper even tells the young man in the smock that John Doe's house is in need of a new roof and that Mrs. Doe has credit accounts in six department stores and specialty shops.

Are the intense young man and John Doe something out of an Orwellian fantasy? Is it possible for someone to push a button and lay bare the personal and family secrets of millions of Americans? Could closely guarded business details of corporations be disgorged by computers willing, in effect, to tell all to anyone?

There are many, including members of Congress, lawyers and computer experts who insist there is a real danger that the Federal Government might well develop a proposed Statistical Data Center into what could be a "monstrous Big Brother" or a "prying electronic octopus."

A GUARDIAN OF PRIVACY

Congressman Cornelius E. Gallagher, a New Jersey Democrat who heads a special U. S. House Subcommittee on Invasion of Privacy, has for the past year conductd hearings into the Johnson Administration's plan to centralize and coordinate all of the data securing and retrieval functions now scattered among scores of U. S. agencies.

Gallagher is not against the idea of centralizing such functions in the interest of economy and efficiency. But he wants to make certain that the amount of information fed into the computerized center is carefully regulated. Even more, he wants to be sure that there are regulations to spell out in detail just what data can be taken out and who is eligible to get this information.

The data trail left by all Americans is astounding. Consider the personal information involved in selective service or military records or a civilian security clearance. Social Security and income tax forms hold a wealth of personal data, but so do the papers involved in government-aided housing, educational programs and even something as routine as a passport.

The federal census, which started out as a head count for the setting of congressional districts, has developed into a massive survey of socio-economic mores. There were as many as 165 questions in the 1960 census and they had to be answered under penalty of fines or imprisonment.

Gallagher, an attorney, is afraid the proposed national data center would "turn our society into a transparent world." And his fear is echoed by Vance Packard, the author, who thinks the thing to worry about is not the power-hungry official so much as "the relentless bureaucrat obsessed with efficiency."

A CONVENIENT FILE NUMBER

Gallagher and others fear that every bit of information available now—and in the future—from hundreds of governmental sources would be pulled together and fed into computers for storage under the individual's Social Security number. And Gallagher likes to point out that a computer "neither forgives nor forgets" and doesn't care at all who asks it questions.

The idea of a centralized data bank emerged in 1966 from a Presidential panel headed by Dr. Carl Kaysen, Dr. Kaysen, a native of Philadelphia who was graduated from Overbrook High School and the University of Pennsylvania, now heads the Institute for Advanced Studies at Princeton.

"We wouldn't dream," says Dr. Kaysen, "of feeding in any information such as how many drinks a man takes, what his wife says about him or anything that might be found in personal files."

He emphasized, too, that the purpose of the new center would not be to pull together dossiers on individuals, but to make available to those who need it, the economic and social data vital in government planning.

There are 21 major federal units now spending about $122 million a year gathering statistics on the country and its people. Much of this involves costly duplication. In addition, the statistics on housing, employment and even the census itself have been shown to be faulty.

Those who question the idea of centralizing all data on a push button basis insist that the best way to prevent an electronic invasion of privacy is to keep the information scattered throughout many governmental agencies just the way it is now.

BUDGET BUREAU WANTS FACTS

Proponents of the center argue, however, that if the data is brought together in one place with adequate safeguards it will actually be easier to protect.

Thus, the debate continues. At the American Bar Association meeting in Hawaii last week, Congressman Gallagher repeated his warning of "computerized snooping" while a spokesman for the Bureau of the Budget insisted the whole idea is to "give us the facts so we can do something about the pressing problems such as poverty and education."

It may be that most of the data now available but scattered will be brought together and stored in electronic memory drums. It is also likely, however, that our intense young man in the scientist's smock will have to be watched—perhaps by a special "watchdog" computer to make certain that he doesn't release the wrong information.

Steve A. Alford, Jr., Trustee, Kiwanis International

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 24, 1967

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to call attention to a distinguished citizen of the Sixth District of Louisiana who has been recognized by one of the great service organizations in the world. He is Steve A. Alford, Jr., of Baton Rouge, who was recently reelected a trustee of Kiwanis International at its 52d annual convention in Houston.

Mr. Alford began his second 2-year term as a Kiwanis International trustee on August 1 of this year—a term which I know will be as productive as his first 2 years as a leader of this group of more than 270,000 men in more than 5,200 clubs all over the globe.

The Capital City Kiwanis Club, in which Mr. Alford has rendered invaluable service to his local community, was recently awarded first place in the 1966 Kiwanis International achievement program's silver section, composed of clubs with membership from 71 to 100. Kiwanis—and other voluntary groups—do outstanding work in our Nation in promoting free enterprise and the basic constitutional philosophy which has made this country the greatest the world has ever known.

Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD at this point a summary of Mr. Alford's qualifications for this high post:

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

INTERNATIONAL TRUSTEE STEVE A. ALFORD, JR., BATON ROUGE, LA., QUALIFICATIONS IN KIWANIS EXPERIENCE

Positions in Club

Past: President, Vice-President, Secretary, Director.

Positions in district

Past: Lieutenant Governor, Governor, Chairman of several committees. Host Chairman, District Convention.

Positions in Kiwanis International

Present: Trustee, Chairman, Board Committee on Administration and Structure. Member, Board Committees on Laws and Policies; Program Development.

Past: Trustee since 1965. Member, Board Committees on Extension; Laws and Policies; Publications and Advertising. Chairman, International Committees on Inter-Club Relations and Fellowship; Kiwanis Education, Fellowship and Inter-Club Relations.

How long a Kiwanian? 15 years. Perfect attendance since joining.

Of what Kiwanis Club first a member? Baton Rouge, Louisiana.

QUALIFICATIONS IN GENERAL

Business or Profession: Attorney. Age: 47.

Education: B.A., University of Southwestern Louisiana, Lafayette, Louisiana, LL.B., Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, Louisiana.

Personality, Ability, etc.: Consistently congenial; always friendly; excellent ability as a speaker. Alert with ability to think objectively on all occasions and in all situations.

Positions in or service to

City: Served on several occasions over the years as Acting City Judge.

State: Presently serves as Attorney for Louisiana State Department of Public Safety.

Trade or Professional Organizations: Member, Baton Rouge, Louisiana and American Bar Associations. Member, National Legal Fraternity.

Civic, Philanthropic and other organizations: Deacon, Grace Baptist Church of Baton Rouge. Served as Secretary, Baton Rouge YMCA; Past Master of his Masonic Lodge. Member, Scottish Rite and Shrine.

In what specific ways and for what specific reasons could he add strength to and be of service on the International Board of Trustees: His demonstration of his ability to contribute to the International Board was evident these past two years. His interest and enthusiasm as well as honest dedication should not be questioned after his performance with the various assignments given to him as a Trustee for 1965–66 and 1966–67.

General Facts: Married to the former Kate Peatross of Morgan City, Louisiana. They have two sons and a daughter. Their older son, Steve, Jr., just returned home from a four year tour of duty in the U. S. Navy and is presently enrolled in L.S.U. Their other son is enrolled in Louisiana College, Pineville, Louisiana, and their daughter is a Junior in High School.

A Strong Case for Believing in the Good Intentions of All Concerned in the Vietnamese Elections

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. BARRETT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 24, 1967

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, an excellent article by White House correspondent Marianne Means set the record straight on the Vietnam elections.

Miss Means writes that Ambassador Ellsworth Bunker is convinced that Premier Ky and his followers are "not attempting to interfere with free elections in South Vietnam."

She says that Ambasador Bunker has pointed out:

> To assure free elections, the South Vietnamese Government has lifted press censorship, imposed its own version of the Hatch Act forbidding government and miltary employees to electioneer, warned province leaders not to engage in politics, complied with legal requirements to provide campaign funds, propaganda, and TV and radio time, and transportation, and invited members of the United Nations and U.S. Congress to come and observe the process.

The result of these actions, she writes, is that administration officials accept Ambassador Bunker's evaluation, "which is that small mistakes—if indeed they are not more imagined than factual—are more likely to be the fault of administrative inefficiency than malice.

Miss Means' article is important reading for all Americans concerned with the honesty and integrity of the forthcoming Vietnamese elections. I insert it in the RECORD:

[From the Baltimore (Md.) News American, Aug. 17, 1967]

A CLEAN BILL FOR THE JUNTA

(By Marianne Means)

U.S. Ambassador Ellsworth Bunker has secretly cabled the White House his conviction the Saigon military junta is not attempting to interfere with free elections in South Vietnam.

Bunker's lengthy, calm evaluation of the situation directly contradicts the contentions of a small group of U.S. senators, who complained last week the election in South Vietnam is a fraud and unfair to civilian candidates who oppose the incumbent generals Thieu and Ky.

Bunker is a 71-year-old career diplomat who happens to be a Republican and who presided over the similarly ticklish elections following the revolt in the Dominican Republic last year. The White House sought his views after the senators set off an alarm that could drastically undermine the President's support on Vietnam, which is already dwindling in the public opinion polls.

Bunker declared that in his opinion the charges made by the civilian candidates against the military regime, upon which the U.S. senators based their own attack, were self-serving, unwarranted, predicated upon rumor and suspicion, and—ironically—unfair to the ruling junta.

The protesting band of senators went so far as to urge the U.S. to withdraw its troops if the election is not conducted in a democratic fashion. Leader of the group was Sen. Robert Kennedy, and most of the senators were Vietnam doves who oppose the conduct of the war in any event and who are up for re-election next year.

Some critics noted unkindly that Sen. Kennedy was setting up a standard of perfection for the South Vietnamese election that had not prevailed in the 1960 presidential election, when Republicans charged his late brother was elected by illegal vote tampering in Illinois and Texas.

The Senators were, in fact, judging the election process in Vietnam by guidelines more rigid than those in the U.S. and older countries. And they made no allowance for the fact that South Vietnam is in the midst of a war, must cope with Vietcong intimidation in the countryside, and has neither democratic tradition nor experience.

The senators accepted as absolute truth protests by seven of the 11 presidential candidates that the military regime refused them adequate campaign help and would not allow the election to be a fair test of national preference.

The senators apparently forgot that even in the U.S. similar statements by opposition candidates seeking to undercut the natural advantage of an incumbent would be designed to serve their own interests.

The administration has been concerned all along that the elections have both the reality and appearance of being free, and has stressed this continuously to Vietnamese officials. But top-level officials here are inclined to accept Bunker's evaluation, which is that small mistakes—if indeed they are not more imagined than factual—are more likely to be the fault of administrative inefficiency than malice.

Bunker pointed out that to assure free elections the South Vietnamese government had lifted press censorship, imposed its own version of the Hatch Act forbidding government and military employes to electioneer, warned province leaders not to engage in politics, complied with legal requirements to provide campaign funds, propaganda, TV and radio time, and transportation, and invited members of the United Nations and U.S. Congress to come and observe the process.

Bunker also noted:

The civilian candidates complained that Big Minh and Au Truong Thanh had been rejected as candidates, but the action was taken by the elected assembly, not Thieu or Ky. (Gen. Minh, who presided over the 1963 coup that ousted the Diem regime, is still popular but lives in exile in Thailand. Thanh, an economist, had filed as a "peace candidate" but was suspected of being a Communist.)

They complained that Thieu and Ky did not resign their positions to run for office, but in no other country does an incumbent leader resign his job to seek re-election. And they complained Marshal Ky threatened to pull a coup if a civilian won, but he has repeatedly denied it.

Advice to Farmers Is Cheap

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT DOLE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 24, 1967

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, recent evidence of unrest throughout the Nation's farm areas is stark testimony to the seriousness of the economic plight facing countless farmers.

Reduced farm income, the devastating inflation sweeping the land, and this administration's refusal to take steps to bolster sagging agricultural income all contribute to the frustration besetting our producers of food and fiber.

It is becoming increasingly apparent farmers have decided to fight to survive. Some are advocating withholding action. In this connection, I submit a timely editorial from the Kansas City Times of August 22, 1967, and I include it in the RECORD at this point:

ADVICE TO WHEAT FARMERS IS A HAZARDOUS VENTURE

There's an element of risk, we think, in the campaign being waged by Orville L. Freeman, secretary of agriculture, and others urging farmers to withhold the marketing of grains. The National Farmers Union and the president of the Nebraska Wheat Growers association are making the same plea.

We do not presume to say that farmers

should be selling their wheat or any other grain, or for that matter, that they should be holding onto it. We do suggest that it is a ticklish area in which to be giving advice, at least to the extent of appealing to all farmers. Too much can happen that cannot be predicted.

No doubt about it, grain prices now are down in the face of large crops. Also, in the farm price support program farmers have an adequate mechanism for delayed marketing.

The grain now going to market is wheat. Farmers can get a government loan on their wheat at a national average of $1.25 a bushel. If the price of wheat should rise later in the year, they could redeem their loan and take advantage of the higher price. If the price drops, the government takes title to the wheat. The price support loan system has contributed to more orderly marketing of wheat and it does give farmers a chance to benefit in higher prices later in the season, if they actually exist.

Last year, the highest prices on wheat were those prevailing in the summer months after harvest. Prices began to weaken in September and gradually worked lower through the winter. Those farmers who sold early were lucky—or wise. Even this year, when the start was on a lower base, the highest prices were at the early part of the harvest.

Certainly it is possible, but not a certainty, that prices may rise later this year. Prices in Kansas City are above the loan rate. Thus if we assume that the loan stands as a price floor, it also is possible that prices could yet go down.

Wheat that is put in storage becomes available for marketing at a later date. Some farmers still have grain from their 1966 harvest. It might be assumed that had they sold last summer prices would have weakened somewhat, although demand was high. On the other hand, had all the 1966 supply been sold, it would not be adding to the record crop being produced this year.

In deciding whether to sell or hold onto wheat, farmers must use their best judgment from all the data available as it relates to their personal business situations. Their decisions, in the aggregate, will prevail. Even with the best of intentions, efforts definitely designed to influence farmers one way or the other could be embarrassing should they prove wrong.

The Law and the Land Under the Sea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 24, 1967

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, the enthusiastic romance with the promise and potentials of the "wet frontier" of the world's oceans has continued through the last few years, unabated. On a more practical plane, Government agencies have cautiously extended their activities, sensing a possible explosion of funding for mission-oriented projects. Most impressively, private industry has committed substantial resources toward engineering and scientific projects for meaningful intrusions into the underseas envioronments. All this has appropriately engendered rising concern over the status of the law of the sea and how, given the underdeveloped condition of this facet of jurisprudence, orderly and effective development and exploitation of the envisioned potentials can be realized.

Viewpoints of concern include our own early observations before the Oceanography Subcommittee over a year ago, when we likened the prevailing lawless conditions in the "wet frontier" to the situation in the early "west frontier." The rule of the six-gun prevailed. The violence of possession gained, being nine points of the law, we were provided with a bloody chapter in our development. To reconstruct that history in the sea in an international scramble for possession and protection would not be appealing. However, to see in this dilemma the necessity for cooperation and mutual assent to some developing rules does not in our judgment dictate an immediate turning to the United Nations, as some have suggested, as the sole forum for an answer. Our attention, as has that of other thoughtful and concerned persons has been drawn to the proposal, most recently expounded by the able Senator from Idaho, Senator CHURCH. We choose to look upon the Senator's suggestion as an invitation for a broad dialog on the problem.

In the hopes of encouraging a continuance of investigation and suggestion, we have set down some thoughts which, in our judgment, question the wisdom of a hasty turn to the United Nations at this juncture in the emerging situation under seas. This is not to say that some role cannot in the early stages be assumed by the United Nations. Nor is it to deny that ultimately, that role may wisely be expanded.

Pragmatically, it strikes us that the more productive approach would be in limited stages, closely associated with practical problems as they occur, and the gradual working out of problems of cooperation within a framework of internationally binding law.

During the period in which modern international law evolved, the bed of the sea and its subsoil were technologically inaccessible. As a result, no specific doctrine was developed as to ownership and exploitation of submerged areas. Whether the exercise of sovereignty over the territorial seas and contiguous zones included a like or lesser control of the subsoil and seabed was not a matter of practical or legal importance.

Unilateral action regarding sponges and pearls—in areas called fisheries—represented the initial attempt to control areas of seabed. In English jurisprudence, the isolated incidents of litigation and subsoil rights were brought by the Crown as a result of the extension of mine shafts beneath territorial seas.

Nonetheless, two general principles have evolved which could be applied. One is the Roman doctrine of res communis, or common to all. This has provided the basis for the generally accepted doctrine of freedom of the seas. Institutions of this doctrine would prevent any establishment of national sovereignty. The second doctrine, is that of res nullius, or belonging to none. Such a doctrine would permit the acquisition and extension of sovereignty into such areas as were not already occupied. The two doctrines, of course, are incompatible.

It has been only recently, when modern technology has made it feasible and profitable to drill oil wells into the subsoil, and when projections of future interrelated demands for energy, water, and minerals from the sea have been established, that the importance of ownership of the seabed and subsoil has become fully recognized.

In 1945, President Harry Truman issued a landmark proclamation in which he expressed the view that—

> The exercise of jurisdiction over the natural resources of the subsoil and seabed of the Continental Shelf by the contiguous Nation is reasonable and just.

And proclaimed further:

> The Government of the United States regards the natural resources of the subsoil and seabed of the Continental Shelf beneath the high seas but contiguous to the coasts of the United States as appertaining to the United States (and) subject to its jurisdiction and control.

This, however, could be explained as a domestic matter in the historic sense. Soon, however, in light of the new technological capabilities, it became necessary to extend the width of territorial waters and the establish contiguous zones, formerly regarded as high seas areas.

As a result, the Convention on the Continental Shelf attempted to establish a method for national control over the seabed and subsoil of the Continental Shelf, so that sovereignty over the superjacent waters would not be extended. Unfortunately, the Convention adopted a double standard for establishing the limits within which the coastal state may exercise "sovereign rights for the purpose of exploring and exploiting" the Continental Shelf. The first article of the Convention provides that—

> The term "continental shelf" is used as referring (a) to the seabed and subsoil of the submarine areas adjacent to the coast but outside the area of the territorial sea, to a depth of 200 meters or, beyond that limit, to where the depth of the superjacent waters admits of the exploitation of the natural resources of the said areas; (b) to the seabed and subsoil of similar submarine areas adjacent to the coasts of islands.

And the second article then declares that—

> 1. The coastal State exercises over the continental shelf sovereign rights for the purpose of exploring it and exploiting its natural resources.
>
> 2. The rights referred to in paragraph one of this article are exclusive in the sense that if the coastal State does not explore the continental shelf or exploit it natural resources, no one may undertake these activities, or make a claim to the continental shelf, without the express consent of the coastal State.
>
> 3. The rights of the coastal State over the continental shelf do not depend on occupation, effective or national or on any express proclamation.

The implications of this doctrine present numerous problems in international law of the sea. What remains unclear is the outer boundary of this exclusive area. What if the seabed has deep trenches in it? Does the coastal jurisdiction revive farther at sea? Under part (a) of article I, cannot one state just keep going, out into the sea up to the point where another state makes a similar claim? And then, where are we left? Furthermore, what about the area beyond the coastal state's jurisdiction, what regime rules here? Does res nullius

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

or res communis apply? It would seem that in reality, the only limit is that which is measured by the criterion of exploitability.

There is a growing concern that somewhere in the near future a few oceanographic powers will be able to occupy and thus appropriate all the deep ocean mineral areas that could be developed for some time.

Recently, President Johnson called attention to these dangers in his remarks at the commissioning of the new research ship *Oceanographer*:

> Under no circumstances, must we ever allow the prospect of rich harvest and mineral wealth to create a new form of colonial competition among the maritime nations. We must be careful to avoid a race to grab and to hold the lands under the high seas. We must ensure that the deep and the ocean bottoms are, and remain, the legacy of all human beings.

Clearly, we are now faced with some fundamental decisions about rights and uses of the lands beneath the sea. Pressures for making the decisions are mounting daily.

In a paper prepared for the American Bar Association National Institute on Maritime Resources, Mr. Frances T. Christy, Jr., outlined the criteria for the establishment of a useful regime over the sea. In part, he stated:

> In considering the alternative regimes, the basic objective is to arrive at that regime that will be viable over the long-run and that will encourage the economically efficient, peaceful, and orderly exploitation of the minerals of the sea floor. Its success will be measured against three criteria. First, it must permit economically efficient operations. Second it must be acceptable to a sufficient number of nations both in the long and the short run. And third, it must be feasible.

In the United States, the Commission to Study the Organization of Peace, in its 17th report, dated May 1966, presented its arguments for the proposal that—

> With respect to the bed of the high seas beyond the continental shelf and to outer space, which are outside the jurisdiction of any state, we urge the General Assembly to declare the title of the international community and to establish appropriate administrative arrangements.

With the United Nations owning and licensing for exploitation the sea floor minerals, the income would naturally flow into the U.N.

And, on February 15, 1967, Senator FRANK CHURCH proposed that—

> By conferring title on the United Nations to mineral resources on the ocean floor beyond the Continental Shelf, under an international agreement regulating their development, we might not only remove a coming cause of international friction, but also endow the United Nations with a source for substantial revenue in the future.

On the surface, we suppose, this may seem to be a most logical, necessary, and simple proposition. But a more than cursory look at the implications of such a move would reveal some of the numerous problems which arise.

The U.N. would have to acquire jurisdiction over resources on and under the sea floor in order to permit it to grant and protect exclusive rights of entrepreneurship and to withhold areas from exploration and development perhaps for the use of missile ranges and such. Would allocations be made to nations or to individual developers? In addition it would have to have the power to tax or extract rent or royalty payments for the use of the resources. It would also have to be granted the ability to utilize or distribute these revenues in an acceptable manner and boundaries for its own jurisdiction would have to be established. Probably some scheme would have to be enforced whereby the interest of the adjacent coastal states would be recognized and perhaps they would split royalties with the U.N. Some equitable method for doing so would have to be found. Perhaps the closer the exploitation to the shore of the state, the greater its share of the royalties. Some form of a bidding mechanism would be necessary to insure efficient and fair allocation of the rights of exploitability.

Many other controls would have to be established. Definite time limits for performance of the required exploration and exploitation would be necessary, as would some form of inspection to insure that the requirements of the lease were being upheld, that maximum care was being taken to insure that the marine environment was not being damaged, and that the resources were being used efficiently.

Administratively, the placing of jurisdiction over the sea in the hands of a group such as the United Nations poses numerous other problems. Initially, we must ask, where a qualified staff would be found. How could they determine the size of a possible lease, the duration or terms of renewal, the royalties or taxes which should be applied, the method of awarding concessions to competing groups, the amount and nature of control of production and prices, and effectively establish and enforce the controls and requirements previously enumerated as well as those yet unnamed, except on an extremely arbitrary basis? With a questionable degree of urgency, should we not be sure that we are on solid ground before committing ourselves to a position we might later regret?

It has been pointed out that a great deal of money is required for deep sea mineral exploration, but even more will be necessary for production. Only a few very large companies, and a few national governments have the necessary risk capital readily available. Of the 135 national states in the world, 109 border on the sea, but the governments likely to be involved in undersea operations of this nature number no more than a dozen if we take into consideration the factors of financial capacity, maritime experience and undersea technology. But, these are the very same nations with important military and strategic interests in the sea. In the past they have not found it necessary or expedient to ask permission from the United Nations to carry out their undersea operations. In the future, it is doubtful that they are going to find it necessary or desirable to ask the U.N. for permission to carry out their mineral explorations.

Furthermore, these are the very same nations which have veto powers in the Security Council and extraordinary bargaining powers in the General Assembly.

Then again, it is rather inconceivable that nations large or small would concede taxes and royalty rights, previously under their own jurisdiction to a nonsovereign agency for the granting of a right which it only obtained power to grant because these nations elected to create such a device. The United Nations' primary function is that of a mediator, not a sovereign. Nor would many nations be ready to accept a proposal which would permit emplacement of foreign controlled structures near their coasts. Many coastal nations would undoubtedly have to yield rights previously asserted. The United States, for example, has granted a phosphate lease some 40 miles from the coast of California in 240 to 4,000 feet of water.

Furthermore, even despite inspection controls, many states would naturally be apprehensive about positioning structures, under foreign control, near their shores, because of potential interference with navigation, fishing, recreation, submarine pipelines and cables, and military exercises. Such structures would be potential bases for covert espionage and military purposes, as well as potential producers of pollutants which would eventually reach the adjacent shores.

We readily doubt that we are at an appropriate stage in ocean development for the establishment of detailed rules and principles for allocating and regulating the use of the ocean. Our view of the future is rather dimly perceived. There are an infinite number of varied possibilities in the field of adapting the ocean to human benefit. While we can hope to prepare for dealing with a variety of possibilities, and attempt to make extremely flexible, tentative, resolutions for anticipated problems, we cannot be nearly as optimistic if we seek to definitively resolve problems now which are hard to define except in the most general of terms. Can we effectively formulate rules for the exploration and exploitation of resources before we know what and where these resources are? Thus allocation of sovereignty to an international community should be considered a bit premature at this time.

Our present knowledge of the future of drilling and production technology is similarly limited. We really have very little knowledge of what the state of such machinery, and the problems they could conceivably present in the near future are or what their course of development would be. Due to this unpredictable technological timetable and in the name of efficiency, and to avoid unnecessary restraints on efficient equipment should we not wait until we are more familiar with technology before adopting treaty principles?

As far as the need for providing a source of income for the United Nations is concerned, a number of points should be made. If the world powers, whose assent would be a prerequisite to a plan to turn the ocean floor over to the U.N., desired to support that organization wholeheartedly, they certainly could do so without resorting to the sea at this stage in time. Certainly a restructuring of the General Assembly would be a necessary requirement before the major powers would agree to permit it to dispose of large amounts of money obtained independent of their control, but in realty, at their expense. Current political realities make this a necessnty.

Certainly, the U.N. presently has enough administrative problems with which to deal. It can ill afford additional burdens at this point. It has recently become all too evident that the U.N. has a long way to go in its maturation process. Doubts must be raised to the U.N. plan with respect to two of the three listed criteria: acceptability and feasibility.

The rather dramatic and immediate demonstration of how more effective international and regional programs can play in the exploitation of the ocean bed can be seen in the arrangements now being worked out for the extrication of gas from under the North Sea.

By the multilateral determination of the interested countries along general principles offshore ownership of the gas and other mineral deposits under the North Sea have been extended along a median in that body of water. The median lies between two masses of land and is supplemented by unilateral agreements on the actual division line of arc segments coming from sovereign coasts. Because of this, understandings are emerging which make a peaceful, productive and equitable solution to the North Sea problem appear eminent.

The thrust of our argument questioned whether having this matter within the jurisdiction of the United Nations would have unscrambled this situation in anywhere near the time frame than this more practical handling was able to, nor could we predict that United Nations handling would have provided any more equity than that which was worked out on a regional basis.

There are broad ramifications that can make a very definite contribution to the emerging patterns of the body of law relating to the resources of the sea where competing national interests impinge one upon the other. The North Sea experience suggests positive ramifications.

A large portion of the law will have to come into being based upon practical experiences similar to that resulting from the North Sea situation where the benefits of cooperation easily outweigh the benefits which may accrue from an antagonistic and aggressive posture.

The world's existing mineral laws, operating above the sea have evolved in an orderly manner from centuries of struggle with problems far less complex than these. Together with a maturation of the U.N., we ought to look toward a maturation of the law of the sea, before burdening it with additional, and perhaps naive codes. It would be wise to let the scientists precede the lawyers in this field. Case law seems far more practical than codes prefabricated in an unknowledgeable vacuum.

The issues are highly complex, the political dangers great, and the economic consequences potentially enormous. A great degree of caution is vitally necessary.

Sedition by Mail, Courtesy Earl Warren

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 24, 1967

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the use of the U.S. mail to promote sedition and violence has again shocked the American people.

The cause of all this humbug always returns to the same man or men—Earl Warren and his unelected teammates of the Federal judiciary.

American boys have died and will die, citizens are victimized and private property destroyed—all because of the anticonstitutional babbles of a few extremists on the Federal bench who have all but abolished the legal right of the American people to defend their national sovereignty.

The American people are tired of this so-called liberal bunk and are demanding the reestablishment of constitutional government with law and order in our country.

The national parties show no leadership in preserving our people or our country—the Congress, the voice and protector of the people, must act and act now to right the judicial wrongs.

It is better that a few or all the professional political jurists on the Federal bench be removed than the defense of our Republic be hamstrung by a secessionist Supreme Court.

Mr. Speaker, I insert an AP release of August 23, 1967, in the RECORD following my remarks:

NEGRO IN PEKING SENDS VIOLENCE PLEA BY MAIL

A publication by a fugitive American Negro in Red China which advocates violence in U.S. cities and advises Negro GIs to "eliminate" their white comrades in Vietnam has been carried in the U.S. mail.

The 12-page folder, stating it is published in Peking by Robert F. Williams, contains in the latest edition available here tips for clogging sewer lines and highways, burning public facilities and smashing windows without getting caught.

It also urges that American Negroes refuse to fight in Vietnam, but it says those who are "trapped into" serving should "throw monkey wrench into those murderous operations."

Further, it says: "They should eliminate as many of their real enemies as they can at the front so that these racists will not be able to return home and intensify the brutalization and extermination of black people to the extent that they are currently exterminating the Vietnamese people."

Postal, Customs and Justice Department officials say their power to police the import of foreign propaganda has been sharply restricted in recent years by Supreme Court decisions dealing with the 1st Amendment's guarantees of freedom of speech and press.

A customs spokesman said propaganda is barred at the ports of entry only if it is treasonable or advocates overthrow of the government or assassination of the President.

Williams, one of the first of the Negro militants, fled to Cuba 6 years ago to dodge a charge of kidnaping during a racial disturbance in Monroe, N.C.

In Havana, the bearded, 42-year-old Negro became a propagandist. He is said to have forged Fidel Castro's link with U.S. Negro militants and founded the violence-prone Revolutionary Action Movement.

About two years ago Williams moved from Havana to Red China.

Social Security Amendments of 1967

SPEECH
OF

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 17; 1967

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 12080) to amend the Social Security Act to provide an increase in benefits under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system, to provide benefits for additional categories of individuals, to improve the public assistance program and programs relating to the welfare and health of children, and for other purposes.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, the parliamentary situation we are working under requires that we either vote for or against the social security amendments in their entirety. I am supporting the social security bill, therefore, because it generally increases the levels of benefits paid to our citizens. I believe that I have a responsibility to my constituents, however, to clearly state my position on specific sections of this bill.

The primary objective of the Social Security Act is to assure for all our elder citizens a retirement of dignity and self-respect. The social security legislation before us today proposes an across-the-board monthly increase in benefits of 12½ percent with the minimum monthly payment being increased from $44 to $50 for a single person. I commend the distinguished members of the Committee on Ways and Means for the long hours they have spent considering this legislation, though I am deeply disappointed in the size of the increase proposed by the committee. I believe it is totally inadequate. It will not get the job done.

Earlier this session, I introduced legislation calling for a 50-percent across-the-board increase in benefits with a minimum monthly payment of $100 to a single person. I believe this 50-percent increase is necessary.

President Johnson in his congressional message on older Americans, called for a 20-percent across-the-board increase with a minimum monthly payment of $70 to a single person. I regret that the committee did not at least support the President's recommendation.

If we are to assure our elder citizens a life free from pressing financial needs, then we must do more than worry about actuarial balance. We must seek out new sources of funds. If the funds collected under the social security system are not adequate, then we have an obligation to provide the financing through general tax revenues as proposed in my social security proposal. As public servants, we all have obligations to the people we represent. No obligation, in my judgment, holds a higher priority than that of providing adequate retirement benefits for our elder citizens.

I was pleased to see the committee's amendment liberalizing the earnings limitation for retired citizens. I believe it is vitally important that we encourage our citizens to lead active lives in retirement. The measure as reported, raises from $1,500 to $1,680, the amount a person may earn without having his social security benefits withheld. I had proposed a base increase to $1,800 but believe the committee measure is a substantial move in the right direction, for it raises the amount a person may earn in 1 month, and still get full benefits, from $125 to $140. The amount to which the $1 benefit to $2 earning reduction would apply, ranges from $1,680 to $2,880 a year as compared to $1,500 to $2,700 as provided in current law.

I was particularly pleased to see that the committee extended benefits to disabled widows and widowers of covered deceased workers. This new provision will set benefits first payable at age 50 on a graduated basis starting at 50 percent of primary insurance amounts and rising to 82½ percent at age 62. An estimated 65,000 disabled widows and widowers will be eligible for benefits when this provision is enacted.

I had hoped that the committee would raise the benefit level paid all widows, disabled or not, at age 62 to 100 percent or the same as the deceased husband's retirement level. I had proposed such an amendment earlier in the year.

Workers disabled at a young age continue to be a concern. I support the Committee's expanded bill which adds flexibility to the current law. The new provision allows a worker who becomes disabled before the age of 31 to qualify for disability insurance if he worked in one-half of the quarters between the time he was 21 and the time he was disabled, with a minimum of six quarters of coverage. Approximately 100,000 people—disabled workers and their dependents—will receive benefits estimated at $70 million under this provision in 1968.

During the past 10 years, social security benefits have increased approximately 27 percent. During the same period, cost of living has increased approximately 14 percent. It is obvious from these statistics that over half of the social security increases simply went to cover rising living costs. I believe it is essential to tie social security benefits to cost of living. I regret that the committee did not include this important new provision as part of its bill.

AID TO DEPENDENT CHILDREN

I view with serious reservation, the committee-backed restriction placed on States regarding aid to families with dependent children where a parent is absent from the home. By freezing State aid to families with dependent children at the January 1967 percentage ratio of dependent children to the total children under 21 in the State, we are placing a heavy social and financial burden on the individual State governments. And in those States that refuse to accept this burden, very great hardship will result for these children who bear no responsibility for their impoverished situation.

The effects of this provision on a State like New York becomes of grave concern in view of studies like the one recently published by Mr. Jonathan Lindley, of the Economic Development Administration. This study indicated that the migration of our Nation's poor to our urban centers will continue for at least another 10 years. It is possible that this freeze on AFDC funds will work a real hardship on dependent children living in large urban States. I hope that this will not happen, but if it does that the Congress will move quickly to correct this situation.

The members of the committee apparently feel that the substantial increase in the number of children on the AFDC roles is caused by family breakups, illegitimacy, and a lack of emphasis on employment. This is, in part, probably true and to the extent that it is, I applaud the committee's efforts to expand State welfare programs by providing employment counseling, job training, day care services for working mothers, and family planning.

I view with particular enthusiasm the provision establishing an emergency assistance program for dependent children and their families. Federal funds would be available to States under this program on a 50–50 basis for cash payments and on a 75-percent Federal to 25-percent State and local basis for services. Assistance is limited to a 30-day period with no more than one 30-day period in a year. Program coverage includes not only cash payments, but payments to purchase items needed immediately by the family such as living accomodations, medical care, and a variety of related services. I believe we should study the results of this program carefully in the year ahead to see if additional benefits and legislative authority are needed to effectively carry out this emergency assistance program.

In the past, no provisions existed in Federal law through which States could provide an earnings exemption for aid to dependent children families. Under this bill, the first $30 of earned family income plus one-third of earnings above this amount would be retained by the family. In my judgment, this provision is sound, for it provides those members of a family who can work with an incentive to seek employment.

MEDICARE

Medicare legislation was incorporated into the social security system in 1965. This was a landmark piece of social legislation for it expanded retirement benefits to include medical assistance. One of the most far reaching and progressive provisions of the Medicare Act was title XIX, known as medicaid. This provision was aimed at encouraging the individual States to establish a medical assistance program for needy citizens regardless of age. New York State has been a pioneer in this field. The State has moved with vision to provide a responsible medical program for its needy.

The new income restrictions placed on eligibility for the medicaid program are a tragedy. Many working persons who are unable to meet the high cost of medical expenses, many of them now productive members of society, may have to go on welfare in order to receive medical assistance. The new income restrictions will not penalize welfare recipients, but will penalize the self-supporting worker. It is ironic that these new income restrictions are being imposed because the New York program has been too successful. It has been estimated that it will cost New York State over $40 million to maintain the same level of service it now provides under medicaid.

I vigorously oppose this amendment to the Medicare Act as being shortsighted and not attuned to the need of our poor population.

Earlier this year, I proposed legislation extending the medicare program to cover disabled individuals aged 60 or over now under the social security and railroad retirement systems. President Johnson proposed a similar measure. I regret that the Committee on Ways and Means has not moved to extend medical protection to these disabled Americans. The setting up of an Advisory Council to study this question will be of little comfort to those disabled citizens in immediate need of medical assistance. I hope that the Advisory Council will ultimately work as a positive force in securing passage of medical coverage for our disabled citizens and not as just another bureaucratic plot designed to delay consideration of this issue.

I support the committee's amendment extending the number of days of hospitalization which can be covered under medicare in one spell of illness from 90 to 120 days. This provision requires, however, that the patient pay a coinsurance amount of $20 a day or approximately half of the cost of these 30 additional days. We all know that the burden of hospital costs grows heavier with the length and usually related seriousness of an illness. I draw attention specifically, to the supplementary comments of committee member THOMAS CURTIS. Representative CURTIS points out:

> The real health problems lie in the area of financing catastrophic health costs, which can bankrupt even high affluent families.

I urge that the committee and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, give careful study to the need for and problems faced in adopting medicare provisions aimed at assisting elder citizens who experience such catastrophic illnesses.

The committee also adopted a third method of paying for physicians services under the supplementary medical insurance program. Presently, a doctor must accept a patient on assignment and thus accepts the fee scale used by Medicare, or secondly, a patient must pay the doctor and then submit a receipted bill to medicare for payment. This latter method has worked a hardship on many older Americans who could not afford to pay the doctor and then wait 3 months for medicare reimbursement, often at a lower fee rate than that charged by the doctor. The new pay method will allow the physicians to submit an itemized bill to medicare for payment. Payment would be made to the physician if the bill is not more than reasonable in charge, other-

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

wise, it will be made to the patient. This at least eases the hardship on many older citizens. If a physician is unwilling to submit a bill through medicare, the patient is allowed to submit the itemized bill. In my judgement, this new method will provide flexibility in physician payment. It will not, however, erase one of the basic problems of this supplementary medical insurance program, that is the substantial difference in the fees charged patients by physicians and the allowable fee reimbursement under medicare. The elder citizens are still caught in the middle. I urge that careful study be given the problem of reaching a more closely alined medicare-physician fee schedule. This problem should be given top priority.

There are many types of health care which have not been incorporated into the medicare program. For instances, the cost of drugs, dental care, and glasses and eye care weigh heavily on many poor elderly Americans. I command the Committee on Ways and Means for requiring the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, to study the question of adding to the services now covered under the supplementary medical insurance program and by requiring him to report to the Congress before January 1, 1969. Again, I urge that the next year be used by the Secretary to find effective ways of incorporating these basic health services into the medicare program.

Bringing the Space Program Down to Earth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 24, 1967

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, the September issue of Air Force Space Digest, the publication of the Air Force Association, carries a perceptive article on "Bringing the Space Program Down to Earth," by the magazine's senior editor for science and education, William Leavitt.

Mr. Leavitt's work has earned him high praise among aviation editors on occasions past, and his new article is a succinct and interesting summary of what has happened in the 10 years since the Russian launching of sputnik galvanized the world into technological action.

His account points to some of the problems which were present among us this past week as we analyzed the fiscal pace at which NASA's work must continue, and it affords some lessons for the future. I include it in the RECORD for all our colleagues:

BRINGING THE SPACE PROGRAM DOWN TO EARTH

Next month marks the tenth anniversary of the "Technological Pearl Harbor" that was Sputnik. Anniversaries are a traditional time for stocktaking, for recalling past glories, regretting past errors, and looking ahead with hope to the future.

Where have we been and what have we accomplished in space since those shattering days of national embarrassment, heated congressional investigations, editorial outcries, and universal recrimination, when the Russians seemed ten feet tall and storming at our technological gates?

We have traveled far and accomplished much, at great cost in time, talent, and money. We have demonstrated our national ability to get under way a large-scale space program, manned and unmanned. We have built, largely on the foundation of the military missile program, a huge government/industry complex, employing hundreds of thousands of people. In a decade this complex has not only built the hardware to orbit men and unmanned weather, communications, reconnaissance, and scientific-observation satellites, but has also brought us to the verge of man's first truly extraterrestrial exploration, a landing on the moon.

There can be little doubt that we have to a great degree redeemed our national pledge, secured with treasure and talent, to wipe out the mortification of Sputnik. No nation has accomplished so much in so short a time.

Yet, there is a growing sense of public disquiet about the whole affair. In the face of war in Southeast Asia, against the background of civil strife at home, and in the aftermath of the shocking Apollo disaster of January 1967, the faceless but vocal "man in the street" is expressing increasing doubts about the worth of the enormous investment that has gone into building the nation's space capability. This public mood finds expression in Congress. Critical and budget-minded legislators have hacked away at space funding, attacked the competence of space planners, and generally questioned the priority of the space program, a singular irony to those observers who can recall the days, not so very long ago, when space was a sacred cow on Capitol Hill.

Why the doubt? Why the collapse of enthusiasm? No one can say for sure, but it is not enough to suggest merely that the public is so fickle that it cannot sustain support for what continues to be an important endeavor with major implications for the whole of mankind. Nor is it enough to say that people are too worried about Vietnam and Detroit to care anymore about our space effort.

There is something deeper, and it has to do with how the US space program has from the start been presented to the American people—as a giant and continuing spectacular, rather than as an effort worthy of standing on its own merits as a three-pronged endeavor serving the national security in a troubled world, the national economy in an increasingly technological era, and world science in a time when men, as never before, are searching the unknown for ultimate answers to questions involving the very nature and origin of life and of our planet and universe. These are the ideas and concepts that should be permeating the public mind, that should be taught in the public schools, not only in the affluent suburbs but also in the ghettoes, and should fill the air on radio and television.

In the large, we have failed to make this presentation, and as a consequence we face the irony of great achievement in space that is poorly understood and weakly supported by the very public that has to pay the bills and stands to benefit so importantly—whether from employment, enhanced national security, improved weather forecasting and communications, or last, but not necessarily least, a deeper understanding of the universe we live in.

This failure has its roots in our own national misconceptions about technology itself.

For too long, we have viewed technology as a kind of shortcut to material achievement, almost as an end in itself, and with scarcely any attention at all to the range of complex side effects, positive and negative, that technology leaves in its wake. Up to a point this approach has been fruitful and has most certainly contributed to our position as the most powerful and affluent power on earth. But it is a view which no longer warrants, in itself, great investments of money and time and people. Every important technological investment, whether it be to build massive road networks or school buildings or ships to the moon, has enormous social and economic implications for virtually every member of society, implications that need to be examined and sorted out in advance. Somehow, this obvious truth continues to elude us. We continue to operate on a business-as-usual basis, using the ancient tools of salesmanship and hoopla to push forward, when the time seems ripe and the short-run benefits in clear sight, programs that ought to be examined in long-range terms and in relation to each other.

Which brings us back to the space program and why it presently lives in daily fiscal peril and in a shadow of public disenchantment. The tragedy is that the drumbeat of press-agentry that accompanied the opening of the American space show after Sputnik has never quite been replaced, as it should have been, by thoughtful exposition of the intrinsic worthwhileness of space technology as a broad-fronted national advance.

From the start, we have been caught up with slogans: "space for peace" . . . "man in space" . . . "national prestige" . . . "the American image abroad" . . . and all the rest. Our space planners have had to operate in a goldfish bowl of extravagant publicity, and for the most part, the glamorous aspects of the space program have been advanced and funded at the expense of the more important, socially useful, portions of the program. With all due respect to the courage of the astronauts, we have overly concentrated on their exploits and undervalued the duller and more esoteric unmanned working satellites which in the long run may do much more to help solve earthbound problems, ranging from air pollution to strategic reconnaissance and control of the arms race, than any grand manned rendezvous in the sky.

The space program has finally begun to pay the price for the frothiness of its publicity. Adult Americans not associated economically or emotionally with the space program have adopted attitudes about the program ranging from boredom to irritation. They find the space program somehow irrelevant to their daily lives, and in some cases even consider it an unnecessary and cruel drain on resources that they believe might be better devoted to social and economic enterprises closer to their daily lives.

More and more people, and they are not all in the slums, have this attitude toward the space program. The sum of their indifference and anger is enough to create serious damage not only to the program itself but also to the benefits that they and the rest of the public could derive from the program.

But is the space program irrelevant to societal advance, and if it is not, how can those who do believe in it help restore its public acceptance?

That the program is relevant—witness enormous contributions to mundane problems that have already been made by the weather satellites and the rest—should be clear. And those have not been the only positive effects. Even more important is the fact that we can credit the space revolution with helping set off the salutary examination of the quality of American education, a critique that started in the affluent suburbs and has now spread to the poverty-stricken inner cities. Families everywhere in America, using different battle cries, are saying the same thing: that they want their children to be prepared for useful lives and intellectual expansion in a space-age world.

How to restore public confidence and acceptance of the space program is the dilemma. In the face of the headlines that crowd space off the front pages, even getting the attention of the public becomes a formidable task. Yet the job has to be accomplished if the space program is to survive as something

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

beyond grudging fulfillment of a pledge made by a remembered President to land an American on the moon by the end of the current decade.

It is possible to make some suggestions as to how the problem might be attacked. With the wisdom of hindsight, we can at least be sure of what we ought not to do. We can scrap the Madison Avenue approach, and we can think of planning our future space program in ways that do not put the cart before the horse, a sad example being the decision of 1961 to concentrate heavily on a moon landing in advance of development of long-term, manned orbital capabilities for scientific and military purposes.

We can husband our resources by looking carefully at the question of whether we need two expensive and competitive manned orbital laboratories, one run by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and one run for the Defense Department by the Air Force (see Col. Richard C. Henry's perceptive article, "Needed—One—and Only One—National Manned Orbital Laboratory Program" in the August 1967 issue of Air Force/Space Digest).

We can increase the funding and sharpen the planning of the unmanned working satellites that have only begun to revolutionize communications, weather observation, and scientific observation. We can begin to look seriously at the potential of aerospace systems analysis and engineering in the solution of nonspace and nonmilitary public problems, with an emphasis on building into these techniques the social, economic, and political factors, the flesh-and-blood considerations that were not so relevant when the problem was merely to develop working ballistic missiles or the first manned and unmanned spacecraft. And we can begin to put to work in our schools, suburban and urban, many of the space-age training techniques that have been a beneficial by-product of the technological age we live in.

All of these approaches—and they are but a sampling—suggest a basic reevaluation of the true value of space technology to our society and a new approach to communicating this worth to society—all of society. Space technology has already cost too much in time and treasure to go down the drain now as a TV spectacular that has slipped in its ratings. We can excuse the past and its errors on the grounds of inexperience, but now that a decade has passed and a history of great achievement has been written, we will have only ourselves to blame if the chapters yet to be recorded are scrubby and thin.

Space technology is remote in many ways from man's daily experience. Yet, at the same time, it is closer to his soul and mind than any other human venture. In that it involves man's emancipation from the bounds of earth, in that it has allowed him through the eyes of cameras and the reports of astronauts to look back upon his own world, it advances our understanding of our commonality as travelers together on this spaceship, Earth. In that it has provided new ways to communicate, to foresee natural disaster, to watch from space potential aggressors, it has made life a little safer than it was before. These are only beginnings, the products, for the most part, of even less than a decade. The world will never be the same again. And it could even be better, if the knowledge and new in-sights that emerge from space technology can steadily be put to work for the public benefit. These are not benefits that should be packaged and sold like so much soap.

All this is not to suggest that space technology needs to or deserves to be advanced at the expense of other necessary programs. It is rather to suggest that space technology should be acknowledged and defended as a continuing, worthwhile, and socially useful national endeavor, justifiable in terms of its enhancement of man's knowledge, its expansion of his outlook, and its demonstrable improvement of his daily life.

In many ways space technology, as we have practiced it in the past decade, represents the best and the worst of the American style. It has grown like Topsy, and an incredible collection of feats previously undreamed of have been achieved. At the same time, there have been false starts, wasted motion, wrong emphases, too much of the wrong kind of publicity, and not enough attention to the long-range goal of well-founded public understanding of the potential for human betterment through space technology and its allied arts.

Yet, in the main, the effort has been worthwhile and will be even more so. There is more than a passing connection between the earthbound problems of war and peace, progress and poverty, and the achievements of space technology. As Dr. Charles Frankel, the Columbia University philosopher who is now a State Department official, has remarked: ". . . It is a grave mistake to dismiss science as useless in solving moral and political problems. Objective knowledge of the conditions and consequences of our personal desires or our social institutions does help us to realize the actual nature of the ends we choose to pursue; and in this way we can frequently come to choose our ends and ideals more intelligently. . . . One can . . . take an apocalyptic attitude and assume that the unfamiliar world that is emerging is also going to be unrecognizable, whether for the better or for the worse But human traits like envy, malice, and egoism are likely to remain no matter what moral medicines the druggist of the future has on his shelves. And once the initial thrill wears off, most honeymooners are probably going to prefer the moon overhead rather than underfoot. But if utopia is not around the corner, neither is it inevitable that our powers are unequal to the problems that are appearing. In an age whose problems are almost all signs of mounting human powers, this would be a strange moral to draw. Man is now making his own stars and setting his own impress on the solar system. If these stars are as yet minuscule and only a very little way out in space, they still represent something of an achievement for a creature who is built rather close to the ground."

COPE for Tax Rise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 24, 1967

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the powerful AFL–CIO, financed by the hard-earned dollars of American workingmen, has now endorsed an increase in taxes.

As in many of its recent endorsements, the workingman might well ask who his organization speaks for—that is, the laboring man or big brother government. Is it a political arm to help its dues payers, or has it become a mere rubber-stamp for national politicans to be used against the membership?

Strange behavior—to blame the tax increase on Vietnam police action. Echoes like a parroting of the national administration line using fear tactics of the extremist fringe to hide behind. One might question what poll the AFL–CIO used to mirror the thinking of its membership. Or are they too undemocratic to trust their members to arrive at their own decisions?

It staggers one's mentality to imagine all the organized union men in America favoring a larger deduction from their paycheck.

Mr. Speaker, I insert an article from the Washington Evening Star for August 23 in the RECORD following my remarks:

MEANY ENDORSES TAX RISE FOR WAR

(By Lee M. Cohn)

AFL–CIO President George Meany endorsed tax increases today but urged Congress to hit corporations and wealthy individuals much harder than President Johnson recommends.

Meany said corporations should pay at least double the surtax rate on individuals, and some kinds of exempt income should be taxed.

"A temporary war tax is needed" to protect the economy against high interest rates and to "share the sacrifice" of the Vietnam conflict, Meany said in testimony before the House Ways and Means Committee.

But he complained that Johnson's proposal of 10 percent surtaxes on individuals and corporations fails to recognize adequately the principle that "equality of sacrifice should be based on ability to sacrifice."

Corporate profits have "skyrocketed . . . far out of line woth workers' wages," Meany said, and corporations received the equivalent of a $2 billion tax cut earlier this year when Congress reinstated the investment tax credit.

To be fair he said, Congress should make the corporate surtax rate at least twice as large as the rate levied on individuals.

If the individual surtax is 6 percent, he said, the corporate rate should be 12 or 15 percent. If Congress levies a 10 percent surtax on individuals, he said, the corporate rate should be at least 20 percent.

Meany also recommended exemptions from the individual surtax aimed mainly at helping midle-income taxpayers.

Under Johnson's plan, individuals in the two lowest tax brackets—with taxable income up to $2,000 on joint returns or $1,000 on single returns—would be exempt. All others would calculate their taxes at present rates and then add 10 percent for the first full year of the surtax.

Meany proposed instead a flat reduction—$300 on joint returns and $150 on single returns—in the amount of tax on which the surtax would be levied.

A married couple owing $700 of regular taxes, for example, would pay in addition a surtax on $400—or an extra $40 if the surtax rate were 10 percent.

The effect of this plan would be to raise taxes proportionately more on higher incomes.

For a family of four with standard deductions and gross wage income of $6,000, the tax now is $450. Johnson's 10 percent surtax proposal would raise the tax by $45. Meany's $300 reduction plan, with a 10 percent surtax on the remainder, would raise the tax by $15 or 3.3 percent of the present tax.

At $15,000 income, the family now pays $2,602. Johnson would increase this by 10 percent, or $206. Meany would raise the tax by $176, or 8.5 percent.

Johnson's plan would raise taxes by a flat 10 percent, regardless of income above the bottom-brackets exemption. Percentage increases under the Meany plan would rise with incomes, from 3.3 percent of the present tax at $6,000 of income to 9.7 percent at $40,000 and even closer to the theoretical 10 percent at higher incomes.

Meany said his version of a 10 percent individual surtax would raise $4.9 billion of revenue in a full year, compared with the administration's estimate of $6.9 billion for its plan.

A 20 percent corporation surtax would

raise $6.6 billion, Meany said, compared with $3 billion for the administration's 10 percent plan.

Iowa Unit of American Legion Urges Restoration of Law and Order

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 24, 1967

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, the Iowa Department of the American Legion at its 49th Annual Convention issued the following statement concerning the recent rioting in our cities. I must concur with the conclusion of the editor of the Elk Horn-Kimballton Review who, after printing the statement, concluded with a simple but fitting "Amen." The statement of the Iowa Department of the American Legion places this whole matter in proper perspective, and I commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

A STATEMENT OF LAW AND ORDER

For nearly half a century the American Legion has committed itself to uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States of America; to the maintenance of law and order; to combat the autocracy of both the classes and the masses; to make right the master of might, to promote peace and good will on earth. These and other noble principles are incorporated in the preamble to the American Legion. Today we look back with horror and revulsion on a series of riots and burnings, of pillage and plunder by hoodlums, psychotics and criminals in cities large and small throughout this great and beautiful and bounteous land. Nothing like this succession of outbreaks, with their utter and inhuman disregard of law and order has been, until now, known in this great country.

The American Legion, Iowa Department, calls upon officials, state and federal, to deal with this monstrous tragedy. We bessech a non-partisan approach to a solution of the underlying causes. We offer full support to the Presidential Commission appointed to investigate the origin of the recent disorders in our cities. We strongly urge the adoption of measures to prevent such awful disasters in the future. We urge speedy trial and punishment of criminals convicted of participation in such crimes. We urge that the F.B.I. and all other appropriate investigatory agencies be authorized and directed to investigate basic causes, and to uncover anything of a conspiratorial nature involved.

Finally, we urge that stern and realistic measures be taken now, with every means in the power of local, state and federal governments, to abort future threats in their incipiency.

We suggest that such preparedness include adequate equipment and adequate authority. And we demand that such units be permitted and directed to use their power as field commanders must do against a foreign enemy.

Let the word go forth and know that the vicious tactics of the lawless will never again under whatever guise or for whatever cause be permitted to wreck havoc and inflict irreparable damage, suffering and despair upon American communities; that every practicable means of prevention can and will be used to that end. This can be the beginning of the restoration of law and order, of the peace and tranquillity every loyal American desires and is entitled to enjoy.

Ed's. Note: Amen!

EDA's Second Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 21, 1967

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, August 26 marks the second anniversary of the establishment of the Economic Development Administration, a Federal agency within the U.S. Department of Commerce. It was officially created under the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, passed by Congress and signed into law by the President on August 26 of that year.

The primary function assigned to EDA is the long-range economic development of areas of substantial unemployment, underemployment, and low family incomes. In order to create new employment opportunities, the agency seeks to help and to encourage the development of new facilities and resources in such areas, as well as expansion of existing facilities. It does so by providing public works grants and loans, loans for industrial or commercial enterprises, working capital loan guarantees, technical planning, and so forth.

Included within EDA's scope of authority and functions is the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965, a special program to assist in the development of the economically depressed Appalachian area encompassing parts of 11 States, which I supported when it came up before the Congress.

The EDA is also authorized to provide assistance to areas which may face unemployment because of the closing down of military and naval installations, of which we have a number in eastern Connecticut. I might add that this latter provision was one of the major reasons which prompted me to support the Public Works and Economic Development Act when it came up for consideration in Congress.

One of the major projects on which I worked diligently for some time and which was approved by the EDA was a loan of $4,192,500 to the Knox Glass Co.'s new glass container plant in Dayville, Conn. The total cost of this project was $6,500,000, but it was the EDA loan which made possible its realization. The plant comprises an area of over a half million square feet of manufacturing and warehouse space. It should be noted that as a result of this project and the loan which made it possible, over 500 direct jobs had been created and another 200 jobs were saved.

Today there hangs high over the entrance to this plant a sign which reads "Help Wanted." An extensive training program was undertaken to train personnel for the plant. One of the most recent acts of EDA was to provide the last disbursement under its loan to Knox Glass for the completion of a new electric furnace for the manufacture of greenware. This will now enable the Knox plant in Dayville to manufacture flint—white—amber, and green glass containers for a more diversified market. It also means additional employment for more families in eastern Connecticut.

It is projects such as these which help prevent economic dislocations and hardships in the event military installations are closed down. But most important, it is projects of this sort which make possible economic diversification and self-containment so that a given area or region is not subject to becoming dependent on governmental or defense-type work which are not often a factor for economic stability.

In its short span of 2 years of existence the Economic Development Administration has chalked up some very fine achievements. The one I cited above in the case of Knox Glass in my district is only one such instance. There are many more in various parts of the Nation, including others in Connecticut.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to congratulate the Economic Development Administration and the very capable people who head up this agency, who guide it, and who have worked so hard over these past 2 years. They work quietly, without much fanfare, but they have achieved good results. They deserve recognition on this second anniversary of the EDA for a job well done.

Chula Vista Desalting Plant Is Dedicated

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LIONEL VAN DEERLIN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 24, 1967

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, last April 20, the House passed legislation authorizing a $57.2 million Federal contribution for the futuristic desalination and powerplant to be constructed on manmade Bolsa Island off the coast of Huntington Beach, Calif. The bill subsequently was signed into law, and plans for building this huge facility, which eventually would produce 150 million gallons of fresh water a day, are well underway.

Before this plant can function, however, the new and promising technology of desalination must take some great strides forward. I am proud that much of the preparatory work for the Bolsa Island project is taking place in my own district of Chula Vista, Calif.

Last Saturday, Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall came from Washington to dedicate a key component of the Chula Vista desalination complex, the $8 million Clair Engle Desalting Plant. I was honored to serve as master of ceremonies on this memorable occasion.

The Engle plant, and an adjacent research module, will be the sole source of much of the data required for the successful completion of the Bolsa Island project.

As Secretary Udall stated at the dedication ceremony:

> The most significant "crop" of the Engle plant will not be fresh water—although 1

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

millions a day will be furnished—but technology.

I hope my district can continue to show the way in advancing this vital new technology which promises to go far in alleviating the water shortages that now afflict so many parts of the world.

So that our colleagues may be further advised, I am inserting at this point in the RECORD a front-page article about the dedication of the Clair Engle plant which appeared in the August 20 editions of the San Diego Union:

SOUTH BAY DESALTING PLANT DEDICATED

(By Tim Shepard)

The $8 million Clair Engle Desalting Plant was opened yesterday, marking what speakers described as a milestone in the technological conquest of the sea as a means of solving the water problems of the arid world.

An explosive blast of steam heralded a gush of 100 per cent pure water at the South Bay plant seconds after Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall and Rep. Lionel Van Deerlin, D-San Diego, opened a valve at the plant.

Dedication of the 1-million-gallon-a-day facility gives the San Diego area the leading role in the world's efforts to convert salt water economically, Van Deerlin said.

OFFICIALS ATTEND

Twice as efficient as any seawater desalting plant now in operation, the jointly sponsored and funded plant was dedicated in ceremonies attended by federal, state and local officials and representatives of industry.

Those at the ceremonies adjacent to the San Diego Gas & Electric Company's South Bay Station included Daniel McCorquodale, mayor of Chula Vista; Mayor Curran; Joseph Sinnott, president of the San Diego Gas & Electric Co.; and William Gianelli, director of the state Department of Water Resources. Van Deerlin was master of ceremonies.

"A glass of water is neither Democratic nor Republican and political differences are unimportant when we face the task of providing water for city, factory and farm," said Udall.

BIPARTISAN SUPPORT

The secretary noted that it took bipartisan support and the cooperation of the communities, the state and the federal government and private enterprise to locate the plant here. The facility and a larger desalting plant module will determine the design of the Bolsa Island Nuclear Power and Desalting Plant at Huntington Beach. The Engle plant was built by Aqua-Chem Inc. of Waukesha, Wis.

"The Bolsa Island project involves construction of a 43-acre man-made island half a mile offshore from Huntington Beach," Udall said.

The Bolsa Island project will have two large nuclear reactors which will produce 1.8 million kilowatts of electricity and 150 million gallons of desalted water a day.

Gianelli noted that California has appropriated more funds over the years toward the support of desalinization studies than all the other states combined.

"As we are all aware, the burgeoning population and the expansion of industry in California have taxed the water supplies that are available in the southern part of the state," said Gianelli.

Sinnott, whose company provided the site free of charge, described how gas company engineers devised a method of modifying a steam generating unit to enable it to supply low-cost steam for the test facility.

"This facility demonstrates what can be accomplished when industry and government combine their efforts and resources to work toward a common goal," he said.

Udall described the $8 million federal investment in the test site as "seed money."

"The most important crop isn't even the 2.5 million gallons of water per day that the Engle plant and the test module will produce by next spring," he said. "Valuable as this water will be, a matter of far greater importance is the engineering data that will be developed here. Our crop is new technology."

Udall added that he felt a possible solution to peace in the Middle East would be water. He said President Johnson has strongly considered the recommendation of foreign aid funds to help develop desalinization plants in the Middle East if the Arab nations and Israel agree to a co-operative effort.

"We can see the possibility of very large plants to make the deserts bloom," he said.

Udall also mentioned that studies are being made toward a 1 billion gallon per day joint-sponsored desalinization plant at the head of the Gulf of California to supply the future needs of the Mexican states of Sonora and Baja California and Southwest Arizona and Imperial Valley in California.

It's Time To Teach Self-Help

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 24, 1967

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of the Members of this House a recent article by James Kilpatrick in Newsday. May I suggest that those of my colleagues who have not read it do so now, and that those who have read it only once read it again.

In letter after letter from my district, I have seen these same sentiments expressed in a multiplicity of prose. May I suggest, in line with Mr. Kilpatrick's thoughts, that the fault does not entirely lie with the press, the "social deprivation" pablum they print and the coddling they urge. Does the fault not really lie with those politicians who vote for programs they know are wrong and who stir up aspirations they know can be realized only with hard work? I hope to yet see the day when some of my distinguished colleagues have the public courage of their private convictions and repeat words like James Kilpatrick's on the floor of this House.

The article follows:

IT'S TIME TO TEACH SELF-HELP

(By James Kilpatrick)

WASHINGTON.—The thought occurs, and can no longer be repressed, that it's time for some of us who write for a living to stop writing so nicey-nice about this summer's riots and the Negro leadership. This is a summer of outrage, scored for kettle drums of violence; but such is our sense of genteel restraint that most of us have been playing our typewriters, pianissimo. We have settled for murmuring my-my and oh-oh, and they certainly do have grievances, don't they.

Well, nuts. There comes a time when the law-abiding majority of this country, imperfect as it is, ought to put a hard question to large elements of the Negro community: When in the name of God are you people going to shape up? One is tempted to exempt from the thrust of that question many thousands of Negro citizens who have played no active part in the recent violence and indeed have been victims of it. They can't be left out. Who has given sanctuary to the Negro snipers? Fellow Negroes. They share in the guilt.

What's the matter with the Negro leadership? Since the first torch was put to Newark, one has waited—and waited in vain—for some high-level expression of shame, apology, contrition. Non est. Perhaps nothing was to be expected from H. Rap Brown; his theme is: "Get you some guns and burn this town down." The sullen Stokely Carmichael yearns "to kill the whites first." But what of Roy Wilkins, Whitney Young, Martin Luther King? They are full of excuses, and in King's case, something more. It's all the fault, he says, of "the policymakers of white society." He proposes strikes and sit-ins to "dislocate" the cities without actually destroying them. He will do this "lovingly."

At every hand, the cry goes up for crash spending programs in the slums. Most of the money would go toward jobs and housing. The New Republic tells us what kind of jobs—not merely jobs for "black waiters, dishwashers and busboys, but jobs that will restore Negro self-respect."

What's wrong with being a waiter, a dishwasher, or a busboy, if one qualifies for the work? Hundreds of thousands of white men and women perform these humble but essential labors. What's the matter with a teenager's starting as a bootblack? It's an honest trade.

And what of "jobs that will restore Negro self-respect"? Employers increasingly are searching for Negroes as sales clerks, bank tellers, draftsmen, technicians. They may not be overcome with altruism; it may be only the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission breathing down their necks. But the jobs are there. Where are qualified Negro applicants to fill them?

The excuse is that the "ghetto schools" are so bad, and the Negro teenagers so "insufficiently motivated," that they drop out. It's a feeble excuse. Many a middle-aged American looks at some of these "ghetto schools" and is dimly reminded of the elementary schools of his own unfar nonage. The opportunity for an education lies within them. What's asked of the Negro? Ambition. Hard work.

The cry is that "ghetto housing" is so bad. Okay. Some of it is awful. Some of it is not. But there are twice as many poor whites as poor blacks; the poor colored neighborhoods of Watts and Detroit have their counterparts—and their rats—in poor white neighborhoods across the land. The blunt truth is that selp-help could cure at least a part of the ills. If some of Jesse Gray's complainers would spend more time with a dollar rake or a 50-cent broom, and less time with a $2 pint of gin, maybe a sense of mutual respect would start to grow. Heresy, one supposes, to say such things. But they need to be said.

Oklahoma Mourns Loss of Artist Jerome Tiger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 22, 1967

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, Oklahoma and the Nation suffered a tragic loss last week when Jerome Tiger, one of our outstanding Indian artists, lost his life in an accident at age 26.

Jerome grew up in Eufaula, Okla., and chose to live and work in Muskogee, Okla., only a short distance away. There, in a spectacular 5-year career, he developed his own traditional Indian style which brought him many honors.

It was my good fortune 4 years ago to have Jerome Tiger among the exhibitors at a special Washington showing of Indian art from Oklahoma's Second Congressional District, and his work was highly praised here. Four Jerome Tiger works are on the walls of our Washington office, and they invariably attract attention and favorable comment from our visitors.

Phil Harris, one of Oklahoma's best known columnists, was a close friend and patron of Jerome Tiger's. In the Muskogee Daily Phoenix of August 20, 1967, Mr. Harris wrote a wonderful tribute to the young Indian artist.

I would like to have that tribute appear in the Record:

JEROME TIGER: ART METEOR, THEN MEMORY

(By Phil Harris)

Jerome Tiger was a meteor that flashed across the art world for five short years, dazzling and captivating with his genius, and leaving in his wake a wealth of great beauty of his own creation.

Yesterday he was a shy, taciturn Creek-Seminole Indian youth, not yet 21 and without formal art training, asking Miss Nettie Wheeler if she thought he had any future as an artist.

Today he is a memory, dead at 26 from an accidental gunshot wound.

In between, in museums and in private collections across the nation, are paintings in the traditional Indian art style whose delicate lines and expressiveness of contour, exquisite color and flawless workmanship distinctly mark them Tiger as much as his signature.

At the time of his tragic death last Sunday morning at Eufaula not a single Jerome Tiger painting remained to be sold; his last painting, completed too late for planned entry in the 1967 Gallup, New Mexico, Inter-Tribal Indian Ceremonial art show, being purchased by an Arkansas couple for $400.

His last major show award was the grand award for the best painting in show at the just-closed 1967 All American Indian Days at Sheridan, Wyoming, with a painting titled "The Victors."

His name will be engraved on a trophy there, offered this year for the first time and to be awarded annually for the best of show, a trophy that can now never be Tiger's. It must be won three times before it becomes the permanent possession of an artist.

First place in the woodlands division this year at Sheridan was won by Solomon McCombs of Washington, D.C., with second place in that division going to Fred Beaver of Ardmore.

Both artists are natives of Eufaula, where Tiger also spend his early boyhood years, returning to his people there whenever he was tired or troubled for new strength and inspiration.

Still to be seen when Alice Marriott's new book on the Kiowas is published by Macmillan are 16 drawings by Tiger illustrating each chapter. The drawings alone should insure success of the book.

Tiger was selected by the author to do the illustrations after seeing his drawings for Charles Stewart Turci's "The Lighthorse" in the Winter 1966–1967 issue of Oklahoma Today. The publisher had only to see examples of Tiger's work to agree with the author.

Unfinished but almost complete in Tiger's studio when death struck is a six-foot clay statue of an Indian stick ball player, his first venture into that art medium, described by those who have seen it as magnificent, and distinctly Tiger.

It is almost certain to be completed, possibly by a fellow Indian artist, cast in bronze and sold. It is to be hoped it will remain in Oklahoma.

Jerome Tiger in his brief career not only reached great heights in art, but by his devotion to traditional Indian art pointed the way for other young Indian artists who may follow.

The meteor that was Jerome Tiger has flashed across the sky and faded, but few who came in contact with the artist and his work will soon forget the Creek-Seminole Indian boy from Muskogee.

Lumber Standards Should Be Voluntary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 3, 1967

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, the American softwood lumber standard needs to be revised. At the present time, the standard is widely recognized as being technically inadequate. Progress and technological change can only come about when technical standards are kept up to the latest state of the art.

The lumber industry has been working with the Department of Commerce in an attempt to arrive at an acceptable revision of the standard. The problem of revising the lumber standard, however, has been so difficult that several years have gone by with no solution in sight even today.

Last month, a special advisory panel to the Secretary of Commerce recommended that Secretary Trowbridge seek a legislative solution to this problem rather than to use his executive authority. I am strongly opposed to legislating standards of this type and then imposing them upon industry. There are other alternatives, based on joint efforts and voluntary cooperation. A result achieved through voluntary cooperation is always more easily accepted than a decision brought about through coercion.

Therefore, I was pleased at the news that Secretary Trowbridge has decided to exercise the powers that have been delegated to him by the Congress, and that he will seek an executive solution to the lumber standard problem rather than a mandatory legislative solution. The hard task of developing a suitable standard still lies ahead, but at least we are on the right track, which is the voluntary, cooperative track. I know that many other Members will join with me in applauding this decision by Secretary Trowbridge, and with permission I insert his announcement in the Record:

SECRETARY TROWBRIDGE ANNOUNCES ACTION ON LUMBER STANDARDS

Secretary of Commerce Alexander B. Trowbridge announced today that he plans an executive, not a legislative, solution to the problem of achieving a satisfactory revision of the country's softwood lumber standard.

The Secretary refused for the present to accept the first of two recommendations of a three-man Federal panel which on June 19 heard witnesses on whether the current standard should be withdrawn and whether the Secretary should recommend legislation to the Congress for a mandatory lumber standard.

The panel recommended that since the lumber industry was unable to agree voluntarily under the Department's procedures requiring general concurrence of affected interests, the Secretary should recommend authorizing legislation to the Congress, but should not withdraw the standard pending legislation.

Secretary Trowbridge said that many Senators and Congressmen who had expressed their views favored an executive solution rather than a legislative one. He said further: "It is time for forthright action to bring the lumber standards controversy to a conclusion. A solution by agreement among the affected interests is apparently not possible under our procedures. In this situation, we should not let all the progress toward sound national standards and effective enforcement and inspection become blocked either by an effective veto of a minority of interests or dominated by a few regional interests. For the good of the entire country, we should have a truly national standard. Lumber now has a national market and is used all over the country in the homes we buy and in construction. Home buyers usually do not know what lumber goes into their homes or where it comes from. And they have a right to expect a standard that local building code officials and inspectors can use to ensure uniformity of performance in construction. We all are entitled to a better engineered product from a progressive industry."

He added, "While we cannot issue a *mandatory* standard without Congressional authorization, we can meet our responsibility and the country's needs by recommending a national voluntary lumber standard. We have the authority to develop and publish such standards in cooperation with industry and Government agencies. We intend to use this authority to publish a lumber standard, working with the most representative body in existence, the American Lumber Standards Committee, as well as other interested parties. We intend to act through an appropriate public process to develop and recommend this national standard. I am asking the new Office of Standards Review in the Department under the Assistant Secretary for Science and Technology to assume the responsibility for developing such a standard, working closely with the American Lumber Standards Committee and the National Bureau of Standards. Under this solution, we do not have to resubmit the recommended voluntary standard to an industry vote because it will be developed by a public process similar to rule-making."

Secretary Trowbridge stated that the following steps would be taken:

1. The American Lumber Standards Committee, a committee appointed by the Secretary of Commerce and representative of producers, distributors and consumers of lumber as well as others, will be given the opportunity to give advice on the kind of a standard the Secretary should publish.
2. Based on these recommendations and other relevant information and discussions, the Department will propose a standard and publish it in the Federal Register for public comment, at which time, if need be, evidentiary hearings will be commenced to explore in depth the implications of the proposed standard and to get the best possible technical information on the feasibility of performance standards which are not in the standard which was recently not accepted.
3. The Department then will publish its standard and at that time will withdraw the existing standard. The Department's work will also be in cooperation with other Federal agencies, and they will be invited to participate in the public process. Industry, of course, will be under no legal obligation to follow the standard published.

The Secretary also applauded the recent inquiry by the Federal Trade Commission into abuses of grademarking and inspection of lumber and offered the Department's cooperation to the Commission in whatever

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

action is necessary to correct these abuses which have too long been hidden from public view. He said that the American Lumber Standards Committee has done a fine job within its authority and resources, and we support it, but that more protection to the public may be necessary.

Secretary Trowbridge concluded by reflecting that the lumber standards matter is one of the most complex problems the Department has faced from the time Herbert Hoover was Secretary of Commerce. He called on the industry to participate in the process and added his conviction that members of the Congress would support this kind of responsible executive action. "Although legislation ultimately may be necessary," he said, "we are confident that our action is the best way at present to reach a solution as promptly as possible in the total national interest."

We Are Buying Russian

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 24, 1967

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the obvious conclusion of the trade boycotts against the ally of the American people, Rhodesia, is now to do business with Communist Russia.

The cutting off of trade with Rhodesia finds our industry fulfilling all chromite needs from Russia—a volume estimated at 350,000 tons. With chromite valued at $250 a ton this would constitute more than $87 million being turned over to the enemy.

Who hates the Rhodesians this much? What has Britain or the United Nations done for the American people to justify the economic mess?

Mr. Speaker, I insert the release of August 20 from the New York Times in the Record following my remarks:

WE ARE BUYING RUSSIAN

Anyone buying a frying pan or a knife or just about anything of stainless steel made in the United States this year is buying high-grade chromite which was probably supplied to this country by the Russians.

Much of the platinum that ends up in American-made jewelry or in this country's factories originated in the Soviet Union. And last week it was revealed that now even titanium, that rare and light mineral which makes the fuselage of a supersonic aircraft, is an item import from Russia.

In both the United States and the Soviet Union, small chinks have appeared in what was once an iron curtain of trade restrictions. Trade between the two countries is still minute, but surprising changes of attitude toward this trade have come from the Soviet side: metals which are still on the "strategic" list of banned exports for American producers appear in the list of materials which the Soviet Union is willing to sell to the West.

Commercial instincts, it seems, have supplanted political inhibitions in the Kremlin, if not yet in Washington.

The most spectacular example is that of high-grade chromite, used primarily in the production of stainless steel. The United States produces no chromite. Until Jan. 7 of this year the bulk of this country's chromite supplies came from Rhodesia. In response to the United Nations' sanctions against the white-supremacy Rhodesian regime, U.S. imports were redirected and this year the Soviet Union became by far the largest supplier of chromite for American producers of stainless steel. The volume of chromite imports from Russia this year will probably amount to over 350,000 tons.

Titanium is a more special case. Extremely light in weight but of high strength, this metal is in great demand for structural parts of high speed aircraft and space vehicles. It is also tough in resistance to corrosion. Virtually unique among the major metallic ores, titanium has almost no consumer uses—it is of value exclusively to military and space industries. American production has not equaled a suddenly increased demand in recent years, and the Russians are now willing—and have the surplus—to fill the gap.

The amounts remain small, for over 90 per cent, of United States needs are met by domestic production. But United States officials estimated this year's titanium imports from the Soviet Union to be between 2,000 and 3,000 tons even with a 25 per cent ad valorem duty which the Russians must pay, the price to U.S. distributors is less than the titanium bought from Japan.

A Long and Sober Think on Vietnam—II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THEODORE R. KUPFERMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1967

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, in the Congressional Record of July 26, at page A3764, I detailed a number of comments by respected voices in the community concerning our misguided involvement in the conflict in Vietnam, which continues to devour our young men and to waste our substance.

The heading of my remarks was entitled "A Long and Sober Think on Vietnam," and I now bring before this body an editorial from another newspaper, the Long Islander, entitled "Who Has Democracy?" which continues to express the same thought.

The editorial follows:

WHO HAS DEMOCRACY?

The up-coming South Vietnam elections seem no more democrtaic than our own Administrations' conduct of the Vietnamese war. Neither government is the least bit interested in what its citizens or their representatives think. We are shocked and dismayed at the actions of the military junta in South Vietnam. We could use some of the same indignation here at home.

The only recognition of the Johnson Administration has ever taken of the deep doubts of its citizens and their duly elected Senators is to voice mealy-mouthed and totally unrealistic peace conference appeals on the one hand while constantly escalating the war on the other. The escalation is always done without consultation with anyone but the military, and always comes directly after a lying statement that the generals will not be given what they ask for. We seem to be falling into the hands of a military junta here in the United States.

No justification is ever made for the steady escalation. Although it has gained us absolutely nothing, it has been pressed to the very rim of risk. We do not want holocaust, and yet the Johnson Administration invites it every day. We are supposedly a peaceful people, and yet our Administration is the only one which continues to fight a war oblivious to all world opinion, and which is completely unwilling to submit its problems to any kind of mediation, in spite of the fact that it piously insists that all other governments involved in altercations should do just that.

Further, although it has won no victories, nor diminished in any way the determination or damaging power of the enemy, this Administration goes right on fighting the wrong kind of war the wrong kind of way. The only thing it has succeeded in doing is to make the South Vietnamese Army lose complete interest in the whole proceedings, and to make the Vietnamese people resentful in a hopeless, resigned way.

How much longer do we have to put up with this junta-headed stupidity? We elected Johnson on the basis that he would not involve us further than we were already involved in '64. Since we were given this clear choice, we made it outstandingly clear what we wanted. Yet Johnson has run counter to the people's expressed will ever since his election. And he has done so without consultation with our elected representatives, and without consideration of our opinions, doubts or convictions.

How many more thousands of sons and husbands must we loose needlessly before we make him listen? How much closer do we have to come to World War III? We can put him out of office in 1968, but at the rate Johnson is going, we'll probably be in the midst of holocaust by then. Better we should make him listen now. But how? How do you reach a military junta? How do you rein it in, control it? The ordinary citizens of South Vietnam are not the only ones who lack democracy.

Dick Mansfield: "Pied Piper of Safety in Washington"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERVEY G. MACHEN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 15, 1967

Mr. MACHEN. Mr. Speaker, every native Washingtonian under 40 knows of him—his name is as familiar to area schoolchildren as President Johnson's—he is aptly called the "Pied Piper of Safety" in the Nation's Capital—he is Inspector Richard H. "Dick" Mansfield, director of the Washington Star's Safety program.

Every year Inspector Mansfield, 76, talks to 50,000 schoolchildren about safety. He enchants them with his lightning quick cartoons, his clever twists of humor, his bold Irish laughter. His austere, booming voice and his uniform of an honorary police inspector command their respect. He changes the mood of his "chalk talks" from howling laughter to utmost seriousness. He gets the kids to shout and sing his songs, wear his buttons, and join the Safety Carefuliers, his club for careful children. The result is a lesson in safety thoroughly understood and long remembered by children in a populous, heavily trafficked city.

Inspector Mansfield delivers his "chalk talks" with the entertainment skill of a vaudeville performer, the artistry of a newspaper cartoonist, the authority of a police official—all of which he has been.

In his early years, Mansfield saw Al Jolson sing and dance and attributes his own calling to show business to the veteran star. Then his talent in art lead him to free lessons. Between the two careers—his father chose for him—and Mansfield started work as an apprentice machinist at 56 cents a day. When he lost the job in the 1907 money panic, Mansfield put together a cartoonist act and got himself hired. Soon he was booked in Baltimore, Philadelphia, and all the Atlantic points.

In 1911 he left the stage at the urging of his best girl and joined the Washington Police Department—exchanging his $75 a week salary for a $74 a month salary and a wife. In 1921 his cartooning talents were spotted by the old Washington Times and he was hired as a newspaper cartoonist. Never having felt secure in newspaper work despite the schooling the Times put him through, Mansfield soon resigned and returned to the police force. It was that year that tragedy lead Mansfield to form his first safety program. He answered an accident call on his motorcycle one afternoon. A blond, curly-haired 6-year-old boy lay sprawled in the street—run down by an automobile. During the night the child died. Mansfield vowed then that he would do something for child safety.

He gave his first "chalk talk" that next day to the dead child's classmates, illustrating in cartoons and words how the accident could have been avoided had the boy followed some elementary safety rules. From then on Mansfield gave safety "chalk talks" whenever his schedule permitted. When he was made captain of his police precinct he made the "chalk talks" a standard part of the curriculum of the 31 elementary schools there. At the end of his 10 years as captain not one single child was killed going to and from school in that precinct.

In 1943 tragedy again hit Richard Mansfield when a heart attack forced him to retire from the police force. It was then that Benjamin McKelway, former editor of the Evening Star, asked Mansfield to head the Star's school safety program. And the District of Columbia Commissioners conferred on Mansfield the title of honorary police inspector and the privilege of wearing a police uniform.

Now in his 25th year with the Star—Mansfield has won numerous awards for his work—as well as the heartfelt thanks of the community he has served so well.

Medal of Honor for West Virginian

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KEN HECHLER

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 24, 1967

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join with my colleagues in honoring a native son of West Virginia, who has brought great honor to his Nation by his gallantary in action. Born on Christmas Day 25 years ago, in West Columbia, W. Va., Staff Sergeant Stewart grew up in Mason County and spent most of his life in the bustling Ohio River Valley where his surviving relatives still live. He was killed in action in Vietnam on May 18. The Medal of Honor was awarded to him posthumously.

The sons of West Virginia have always been in the forefront of every conflict in defense of their Nation. Staff Sergeant Stewart has won the highest award for valor which the nation can present, and he typifies the heroism which has always characterized men in combat from our Mountain State.

It was a particular honor for me to join with U.S. Senators JENNINGS RANDOLPH, of West Virginia, and FRANK LAUSCHE, of Ohio, as well as my colleagues in the House, Hon. JACK BRINKLEY, of Georgia, and CLARENCE MILLER, of Ohio, at the ceremony honoring the late Staff Sergeant Stewart.

Wasteful Programs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OTTO E. PASSMAN

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 24, 1967

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

BERNARD & GRUNNING,
New Orleans, La., August 19, 1967.

Hon. OTTO PASSMAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PASSMAN: The other day a matter was brought to my attention, which I am taking the liberty of calling to your attention.

Recently the Urbanization Program for Rural Youth brought 34 teenagers from upstate Louisiana to Xavier University where they spent four to six weeks.

Then they were given an airplane trip to Chicago, all 34 of them, with 7 chaperons which cost the tax payers approximately $1700.00. They were returned to New Orleans by train at a cost of approximately $1100.00. Add to this the meals, lodging, etc. for several weeks plus pay for the chaperons or instructors and the estimated cost would be somewhere between $25,000.00 to $30,000.00.

Multiply this by probably one hundred or five hundred similar procedures throughout the United States and the cost to the tax payer will probably run between $3,000,000.00 and $15,000,000.00.

It seems to me that such excursions for these children will result in making them unhappy with their lots in the country and they will continue to be unhappy until more tax payers' money is spent on them. Approximately $1,000.00 is being spent on each child which is more than a tax payer in ordinary circumstances can afford to spend on a vacation for his own children because of the heavy burden of income tax which he has to bear to support such unnecessary and probably injurious programs.

It is very unfair to make a tax payer contribute to elaborate vacations for other peoples' children when he cannot afford such vacations for his own.

And now, we hear that Mr. Johnson wants additional taxes from us to continue or increase such goings on.

If such wasteful programs as this would be discontinued there would be no need for people who work for a living to pay such high taxes as we pay.

Please let me know if you are in favor of raising our taxes in order to continue this waste of money and other similar programs, or in favor of discontinuing such programs and other wasteful ways of spending the tax payers' money.

Very respectfully yours,
LOUIS J. BERNARD.

Learn by Our Errors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 24, 1967

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to bring to the attention of my colleagues a thoughtful editorial that appeared in the Newport Daily News, of Newport, R.I. The editorial, "Learn by Our Errors," follows:

LEARN BY OUR ERRORS

The most obvious commentary on last week's 22nd anniversary of the death of Nazi Germany, is that we simply changed one monstrous tyranny for another, that we were not smart enough to prevent communism from moving into the power vacuum left by the expiration of naziism in Eastern Europe. That terrible oversight created a new totalitarianism that holds captive twice the number of those whom Hitler had dominated. The results of that mistake are the cause of the world division today.

Then, after we halted the new Communist aggression in the Far East, we made the mistake of permitting the Chinese "volunteers" to snatch the victory our men and their allies had fashioned in Korea. Had we denied the Chinese sanctuary in Manchuria, their first massive aggression would have blown up in their faces, and we would not today be enmeshed in Vietnam.

Again in Indochina, the third mistake was the division of Vietnam so that the North Vietnamese Communists were able, first to carve a path through Laos and Cambodia, and then to attack South Vietnam. A divided nation, with communism in one half, whether in Germany, Korea or Vietnam, has been an invitation to aggression.

The lesson of all these divisions is that what we won on the battlefield, we lost at the conference table. Those who today cry that President Johnson makes impossible conditions for peace in Vietnam are not remembering these lessons. This time, the President wants to make sure that the American and allied lives lost on the battlefield are not thrown away at the peace conference.

Unless we are in such a strong position that we can demand independence for South Vietnam, free of aggression, we will have fought this war in vain. That is not an "impossible condition" as the critics of the Johnson policy insist, it is what we are fighting for.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Thursday, August 24, 1967

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Senate passed bills on Inter-American Development Bank and to continue appropriations.

House passed Foreign Assistance Act Amendments.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S 12153–S 12191

Bills Introduced: Three bills were introduced, as follows: S. 2343–2345. **Page S 12154**

Bill Reported: Report was made as follows: S. 222, to insure that all public buildings shall be constructed so as to be reasonably accessible to the physically handicapped, with amendments (S. Rept. 538). **Page S 12154**

Authority To Report: Committee on Public Works was authorized to file report on S. 1467, authorizing funds for highway safety and beautification programs, until midnight Thursday, August 24, following adjournment of Senate. **Page S 12207**

Inter-American Development Bank: Committee on Foreign Relations was discharged from further consideration of H.R. 9547, authorizing U.S. to increase by $900 million resources of the Fund for Special Operations of the Inter-American Development Bank, and the bill was then passed, by 65 yeas to 21 nays, in the form of S. 1688 (with the amendment adopted by committee to S. 1688). Motion to reconsider passage of the bill was tabled. Prior to these actions Senate rejected, by 38 yeas to 41 nays, Lausche amendment (to committee amendment) to S. 1688, to reduce from $900 million to $750 million the authorized increase in fund resources.

Senate insisted on its amendment to H.R. 9547, asked for conference with House, and appointed as conferees Senators Fulbright, Sparkman, Mansfield, Hickenlooper, and Aiken.

S. 1688 was then indefinitely postponed.

Pages S 12191–S 12193, S 12197–S 12202

Continuing Appropriations: H.J. Res. 804, continuing appropriations for fiscal year 1968 through September 30, 1967, was passed without amendment, clearing bill for the White House. **Page S 12207**

Confirmations: The following nominations were confirmed: Three civilian, including that of Townsend Hoopes, of Virginia, to be Under Secretary of the Air Force; and numerous postmaster nominations.

Pages S 12210–S 12211

Nominations: Numerous Army nominations were received. **Pages S 12209–S 12210**

Record Votes: Two record votes were taken today.

Pages S 12198, S 12202

Program for Friday: Senate met at noon and adjourned at 4:19 p.m. until noon Friday, August 25, when conference report on H.R. 10738, defense appropriations, will be considered as soon as the House has acted thereon. If S. 1467, highway beautification, is reported today it will be eligible for consideration on Friday.

Pages S 12207, S 12209

Committee Meetings

(*Committees not listed did not meet*)

APPROPRIATIONS—INDEPENDENT OFFICES

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee met in executive session to mark up H.R. 9960, fiscal 1968 appropriations for independent offices, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development, but did not conclude action thereon, and will meet again tomorrow.

APPROPRIATIONS—D.C.

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee continued its hearings on H.R. 8569, fiscal 1968 appropriations for the District of Columbia, receiving testimony from Chief Judge Morris Miller, D.C. Juvenile Court; Deputy Chief John F. Ryan, Commander of the Youth Division, Metropolitan Police Department; Miss Winifred G. Thompson, Director, Department of Public Welfare, and other officials of the D.C. government.

NOMINATIONS

Committee on Commerce: Committee held hearings on the nominations of Dr. John F. Kincaid, of Missouri, to be Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Science and Technology, and Joseph W. Bartlett, of Massachusetts, to be General Counsel of the Department of Commerce. The nominees were present to testify and answer questions on their own behalf.

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Appendix

Gallantry in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK BRINKLEY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 24, 1967

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, today I was witness to an example of the gallantry and intrepidity in action of our forces in Vietnam as the Secretary of the Army presented, posthumously, to S. Sgt. Jimmy G. Stewart the Medal of Honor. To his widow, Mrs. Gertrand H. Stewart, 1833 Gardiner Drive, Columbus, Ga., and his family this is a tangible expression of this Nation's appreciation for his service and recognition of his supreme sacrifice. As a member of the 1st Cavalry Division, Airmobile, which had its origination at Fort Benning, Ga., Sergeant Stewart demonstrated loyalty and determination beyond that required of any soldier.

Officially representing the Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces, the Secretary of the Army in his remarks this morning expressed the gratitude and pride of our Nation in Staff Sergeant Stewart:

REMARKS BY SECRETARY OF THE ARMY STANLEY R. RESOR, POSTHUMOUS AWARD OF MEDAL OF HONOR, TO S. SGT. JIMMY G. STEWART, THURSDAY, AUGUST 24, 1967

Mrs. Stewart, Mrs. Stitt, Distinguished Guests: I am honored today to represent the President of the United States in bestowing the Medal of Honor upon an American soldier who gave his life heroically for his country. Staff Sergeant Jimmy G. Stewart, whom we honor today, was one of those rare individuals, so completely devoted to duty, that he willingly laid down his own life so that others might live.

In November 1963, Staff Sergeant Stewart joined the 11th Air Assault Division. This was the test division which tested and proved the airmobile concept which has played such an important part in the Army's operations in Vietnam.

Sergeant Stewart stayed on with the division when, in July 1965, it was reconstituted as the 1st Cavalry Division, Airmobile. In August 1965, he deployed with the division to Vietnam, and served with it until his untimely death.

The 1st Cavalry Division deployed directly to the 2nd Corps Area in Vietnam at a time when the enemy was threatening to split South Vietnam along the Pleiku-Ankhe-Qui Nhon axis. At the time of the division's arrival in Vietnam, nearly half of the population of the 2nd Corps Area was under Viet Cong domination. Today 89% of that population is under control of South Vietnam and its Allies. In August 1965 70% of the rice land in the 2nd Corps Area was under Viet Cong control. Today 95% of the rice land is under control of the government of South Vietnam. Two years ago none of the important highways could be used unless a major military effort was launched to open one, for a limited number of days for a specific purpose. Today 90% of the important roads are open. Two years ago almost none of the railroads were in operation. Today 53% of railroads, or 226 miles, are repaired and in use.

The progress which has been made in the 2nd Corps Area in the last two years is in large part due to the outstanding performance of the division of which Staff Sergeant Stewart was a member. It reflects the sacrifice and devotion of the many fine Americans who have served in this division throughout this period. In time of war sacrifice and service are not equal. The progress which has been made in the 2nd Corps Area reflects particularly the extra sacrifice and extra service which have been displayed by those unusual individuals who, under the extraordinary demands of combat, have responded with unusual qualities of leadership and self-sacrifice. Sergeant Stewart was one of these.

His selfless acts of courage are an example from which we may all draw inspiration and courage. His heroism has earned him a rightful place among our Nation's most honored soldiers. It is indeed fitting, therefore, that we should recognize his extraordinary courage and devotion to duty by bestowing upon him posthumously the Nation's highest award for valor.

Cooperation Is Key to Meeting Hygrade Shutdown Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 24, 1967

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, it is a sad day in the life of a community and all of its people when a major industry is forced by changing circumstances to close its operations in that community.

Such was the case in Indianapolis last year when it was decided that the venerable Hygrade Foods Corp. packing plant could no longer operate in view of changes in livestock procurement.

What could have been a personal disaster for the 2,000 employees who would have been out of work was averted by the foresight, planning and cooperation of the firm, the Indiana State Employment Service and the U.S. Employment Service personnel of the Department of Labor.

The full campaign of placement, retraining, basic education, counseling, job development, and relocation assistance has reduced the number active applications in the Employment Service files to 375. Many of the former employees also were able to find better paying jobs as a result of the assistance.

This story of a shutdown that was not a disaster, told in the June issue of the Employment Service Review, follows:

OPERATION HYGRADE: THE ANATOMY OF A SHUTDOWN

(By George G. Vaughan and Keith Collins)[1]

"The company has exhausted every possibility in its efforts to continue this operation, but changes that have taken place in livestock procurement and the meatpacking industry no longer make it commercially feasible to maintain the large Indianapolis plant."

To the 2,000 employees of the Indianapolis plant of the Hygrade Food Products Corp., this announcement last year came as a shock. Disbelief was felt throughout the city where the meatpacking plant had operated continuously since Samuel Kingan founded the business 104 years before.

In contrast to the public expression of alarm shown by all segments of the South Bend community at the time of the Studebaker shutdown in 1963, there seemed to be a feeling of apathy in Indianapolis after the initial surprise. Community response was tempered by the city's low rate of unemployment which was only about 2 percent, an awareness that many employers had unfilled job openings and were hiring, and the fact that the layoff was to occur some 3 months after the announcement of the closing. The impact of a 2,000 layoff in an area where 440,000 were employed was not as devastating a blow as was the sudden idleness of 6,000 workers in South Bend's 90,000 labor force, even though the distress of the individual worker was no less.

Staff members of the Indiana State Employment Service recognized the seriousness of the situation and within minutes after the public announcement were in contact with local Hygrade officials. The first of many meetings between company, union, and Employment Service representatives was arranged and held 2 days later at the ES administrative office. Present were company representatives from the home office in Detroit and Indianapolis, officials of both the International and Local No. 17 of the United Packing House Workers, and administrative and local office Employment Service personnel. Company and union representatives agreed that the Employment Service should be responsible for assisting Hygrade workers in finding other employment. Both approved of a leaflet prepared by the ES to give workers information they would need in their switch to new work.

Actions taken between that initial meeting on May 25 and the plant closing on August 21 were team efforts, with the union, the company, and the Employment Service all participating to the fullest extent.

One of the first decisions was that a full-service branch office would be established at the Hygrade plant as soon as possible to take work registrations and make referrals to training and jobs. The responsibility for this operation was assigned to the Industrial and Service office. I&S did not have all the manpower needed, so additional staff were drawn from other Indianapolis offices.

EXPERIENCED INTERVIEWERS

Care was taken to select experienced personnel. ES officials felt that interviewers should not depend upon the self-application

---

[1] *George G. Vaughn is Indianapolis Area Manager and Keith Collins is Assistant Chief Indiana State Employment Service.*

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

process but should take complete applications in order to get full work histories of each employee. Many had little education, about 200 were illiterate, and their average age was 45. Interviewers were instructed to discuss fully the prospects of securing new employment, to explore the need for training, and, above all, to make each one understand that the Employment Service would do everything possible to help him in securing new employment.

The company turned over three adjoining rooms for use as the ES office and installed additional telephones. The office was opened on June 7. By the end of the week, staff were taking applications at the rate of more than 100 per day. Judged by the old time factor standard, this was not a good record, but allowing time for the interviewers and the workers to talk was extremely important to them and to the ES. Many of the employees did not seem to comprehend that they were losing their jobs. They were not ready to make decisions, but the fact that someone was willing to discuss their future seemed to help.

During the first 3 weeks, when the bulk of the applications were handled, the branch was staffed with a supervisor, 10 experienced interviewers, and a counselor to discuss possible training courses. As volume declined the staff was reduced. Some applications were taken each day until the plant closed. Some 200 of the employees did not register until after the actual closing on August 21. This was partly because it had been expected that some 300 workers would be retained for a warehouse operation. This has not developed, but in January 1967 about 100 persons were still employed in the dry sausage operations.

A breakdown of the 1,542 work registrations taken before the plant closed is shown in the table above.

The union strongly backed the idea of vocational training. As the table shows, 579 of the individuals registering indicated they would consider training. Interest was expressed in more than 30 vocational areas. A request was made for additional MDTA funds. A special allocation of funds was made available to cover 300 training slots in 19 different vocational areas. The course included basic education, provided through a special grant under title II of the Economic Opportunity Act.

All of the 579 applicants who indicated an interest in training were interviewed again, but only 203 accepted referral to training. To date, 39 have completed their courses and are employed (30 are in training-related jobs). There are still 115 in training. Seventy-three of the trainees had basic education according to the individual need as well as the vocational training. Most of those who dropped out of MDTA classes did so to accept full-time employment.

Prior to the closing of the plant, the company and the union agreed to allow 25 workers to request a reduction from 40 to 20 hours of work weekly so they might enroll in training while still employed. This permitted them to complete a good portion of the training with little loss of income before their ultimate layoff.

Placement activities began on June 14. Copies of all orders in the Indianapolis area offices were made available to the branch office. Many employers called the Hygrade company and were referred to the placement interviewers. The company agreed that any worker called by the ES office for an interview or to apply for a job could do so without loss of pay for the time he was off work if the Hygrade personnel office was informed beforehand. Even so, the acceptance of referrals to other jobs was slow during the first 6 or 8 weeks.

Every effort was made to see that the best possible job openings were made available to the Hygrade workers. Positive recruitment was provided at the branch office for both local and out-of-area firms. Placement representatives in the downtown Industrial and Service and Commercial and Professional offices spent most of their time developing job openings specifically for Hygrade people. At the suggestion of the State Director, administrative office analysts made a complete study of the jobs in the Hygrade plant to relate their characteristics to jobs in other industrial areas.

	Total	Male	Female
Age:			
21 to 44 years	732	645	87
45 to 65 years	810	652	158
Education:			
8 grades or fewer	679	578	101
Some high school	495	411	84
High school graduation	368	308	60
Veterans	232	231	1
Minority group	573	548	25
Willing to relocate	251	231	40
Interested in training	579	505	74

A REMEDY IS SOUGHT

When reports came to the local office from prospective employers that Hygrade people failed to face reality, preferred to ignore their imminent job loss, and refused referrals to training or to new jobs, a remedy was sought to counteract and change these attitudes. Some Hygrade workers appeared unwilling to accept offers of employment paying less than they had been receiving. Some conveyed the impression that employers in the community owed them jobs. The appearance and manners of others were much less than desirable, several employers commented.

To be of more service to the large number of individuals involved, the Employment Service section started group counseling sessions in the union hall. The similarity of the problems seemed suitable for the application of group dynamics in discussions led by trained counselors who could assist the individuals to better understand their problems and to plan possible courses of action. Many were older persons, members of minority groups, with limited education. Some possessed no work skill other than the ability to dismember a beef carcass. Most had no recent experience in seeking employment.

"Group feelings" were developed. Counselors and participants wore self-adhesive tags bearing their first names. The counselors removed their suit coats, and (when not leading the discussion) sat in the "circle" of applicants. Two role-playing skits were used by the counselors, one emphasizing mistakes in the job search interview and the other showing effective approach and self-presentation. These were followed by a discussion period. Pictorial cards were displayed and employed as visual aids to encourage group response. A total of 434 persons attended the 3-week sessions in groups ranging from 6 to 33.

Of the group counseling, the Hygrade Industrial Relations Director said, "The project was very helpful from a practical sense and gave our employees a definite psychological lift."

The chief steward of the local union wrote, "Our older workers came to grips with reality. This was a job that could only have been done by trained people; it was beyond our ability." He added, "You have earned the respect and friendship of 2,000 members and their families."

The Hygrade workers proved to be strongly attached to the local area. Recruitment efforts by outside employers were unsuccessful, although the jobs offered and the pay rates were comparable to Hygrade's. In fact, Hygrade had 90 jobs at plants in other localities where the workers could have exercised "bumping rights" under terms of their union contract. Only five did so, and all returned to the Indianapolis area in less than 2 weeks. Although 250 workers originally indicated they would move, they later changed their minds. Many owned their own homes. Others had spouses employed locally. Some were willing to accept less pay to remain in the Indianapolis area.

Despite all problems, more than 1,000 workers had been given selection interviews by the time the plant closed. There had been 672 referrals resulting in 139 placements. About 200 workers had found jobs for themselves.

PLACEMENTS ARE VARIED

The placements covered many industries and a variety of vocational areas. Probably, the most unusual placement was of a 45-year-old man who had been employed as a meatcutter for 16 years. The interviewer discovered that he spoke Spanish fluently and had had 2 years of college. A job was developed through the efforts of one of the staff with an agency of the Federal Government needing an employee with this background. He was accepted on the job at a salary of $9,200 per annum and began work August 1, 1966.

Six months after the plant closed, there were only 375 active applications in the ES files. Many of the applicants were in the older age group and had the least education. Almost all had been offered one or more referrals to available jobs, but for some reason had refused the referral or the offer of employment. The Indiana State Employment Service had made 1,418 referrals of Hygrade workers and completed 452 placements. Another 115 were currently enrolled in MDTA classes.

While the Hygrade project is not finished, the results so far demonstrate that labor, management, and government can cooperate completely in situations such as this. Several times considerable tension developed between union and management during negotiations, but both continued to cooperate with the Indiana State Employment Service toward the common goal of finding employment for the workers.

If Vietnam Escalator Works, Why Did the Edsel Go Down?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 24, 1967

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, while reading this morning's Washington Post I came across a column by Art Buchwald which I believe my colleagues will find entertaining and, hopefully, educational as well.

The article follows:

IF VIETNAM ESCALATOR WORKS, WHY DID THE EDSEL GO DOWN?

(By Art Buchwald)

We were sitting around discussing the war in Vietnam the other night when somebody remembered that our Secretary of Defense, Robert McNamara, used to work for the Ford Company.

Then somebody else said, "I wonder what would have happened if Ford continued making the Edsel motor car?"

This is what we decided could have happened:

The year the Edsel came out a high-level conference was called. The vice president in charge of sales made his report. "Sir, we might as well face it. The Edsel is a bomb. We can't sell enough of them to pay for one advertising spot on the Ed Sullivan show. I think we ought to take our losses and get out."

"Wait a minute," a board member said, "If the Edsel falls, the Ford might fall, then the Mercury, and then finally the Continental. Psychologically this would be the greatest victory General Motors could possibly achieve, and our prestige in the motor industry would be impaired forever. We've got too much at stake for us to stop the Edsel now."

"I disagree with you, sir. I think we made a mistake and should admit it."

"Balderdash. The solution is to pour in more men and money. Surely, with all our resources we can make the Edsel a big success, and we will show General Motors once and for all that if Ford makes a commitment to a car it will keep it."

"What's your plan, sir?"

"Let's send in our top engineers and develop the best car money can buy."

A year later the high-level group stared glumly at the sales figures. "Sir, as you can see, we only sold 43 cars this year. The people just won't buy the Edsel. It's not their kind of car. Let's get out before it's too late."

"We can't just get out. We've got 50,000 workers committed to making a successful car and we'd be the laughing stock of the world if we quit now. The problem seems to be with the Edsel management team. Let's change the management, send in another 75,000 workers, add an additional $30 million, and we're bound to have a winner on our hands."

A year later the same group met to hear the news that only 23 Edsels had been sold. But one of the top-flight executives, who had just returned from a visit to the Edsel factory, was optimistic.

"It may take more time than we thought," he said, "but progress is being made. We have to concentrate harder on the customers to win them over before we'll see any results on the sales charts. Our industrial intelligence division says that General Motors is hurting badly and that with each new Edsel coming off the production line, their morale is sinking to a new low. This is no time to let up. I propose we pour in another 125,000 workers and $50 million additional funds. GM must be made to realize that their hard-sell tactics won't pay off."

Three years later, with 550,000 workers on the production line and a billion dollars invested in the car, only one Edsel was sold—to the Smithsonian Institution.

"What do we do now?" someone asked.

"I think we should stop making Fords, Mercurys, Thunderbirds and Continentals and put all our resources into the Edsel. Our engineers say that all they need is 250,000 more workers and another billion dollars, and they'll have General Motors on their knees."

To Philip Randolph

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 24, 1967

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, the renowned author, James T. Farrell, has composed a moving poem to A. Philip Randolph. It is a tribute which I urge all of my colleagues to read and enjoy:

To PHILIP RANDOLPH

(By James T. Farrell)

Philip Randolph, this is a poem to you.
For I write to tell you now,
In affection and in comradeship,
That I think, I believe
That in your life, and with your life
Your name has grown into syllables of imperishable honor.
When we all shall be no more,
It is a time to be
That we are forced to think for, fight for, work for,
The signature of high honor
Will belong to you, your name, the memory of you.

II

A. Philip Randolph
He walked our American cities,
He saw, he knew our American earth,
He walked, he saw, as proud as the proudest man
He lived long years,
Years given for the greatest aim
That we can hold as ours, our own.
Long years given to struggle
For the liberation of mankind.

III

A man tall, but not too tall
For his purity of dignity
A man of character
With greatness that can grow across the years
That yet must come,
And must be won.
A man not fully recognized
In his living years.
But, and but again,
How could greatness
When he was living
What is yet to be?

IV

There were a few, they knew him
For what he was,
A man whose end dictated a life made brave,
A courageous, walking vision
Flesh and blood, dreams and faith
Compounded into the uncorrupted vision
Of what men can be,
And what men should be.

V

He was tall
And even his dignity
Was a proud kindness
And honor of the soul.
A. Philip Randolph, a leader of his people,
Whose manly cleanliness of spirit
Has become an example
Of the future he pursues
A man who walked the corridors of history
In the natural simplicity of his courage,
And his faith that Justice
For black and white and all
Is new in the greatness
Of its envy of what must be.

VI

He is a comrade.
He is a comrade of yesterday,
And he is a comrade of today,
And he is a comrade of tomorrow.

VII

Phil, I salute you.
My hand,
The affection of my heart
The judgment of my mind
And solidarity
In dedication to the goal of goals,
We have marched,
We marched to do our share
For the day, the time
Of the solidarity of the centuries.

The Tonkin Gulf Resolution, and "The American Purpose"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 24, 1967

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, several days ago I joined with a number of other Republican colleagues, under the leadership of the able gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY], in introducing a resolution calling for a review by the appropriate committees of Congress of the so-called Tonkin Gulf Resolution of 1964—which has recently become the focal point for both public and congressional reconsideration of how we got into war in Vietnam in the first place, what we are fighting for there, and how might we eventually get out.

That resolution has attracted some attention, although not so much as it might have if hearings had not gotten underway in the other body, in its Foreign Relations Committee, looking into the broader questions of whether or not the President has committed this Nation to conflict in Vietnam without sufficient legal authority for doing so.

Those hearings have kicked off a most interesting constitutional debate which I do feel is a useful thing—though there are surely those who may feel otherwise including, quite possibly, the President, himself. I feel they are useful—as hearings on the Findley resolution would also be here on the House side—in that there is great uneasiness about our situation in Vietnam, and great uncertainty concerning our purposes there; an uneasiness and uncertainty that pervades the country, despite all the President's efforts, and has contributed to an uncomfortably querulous mood among our constituents and even among ourselves.

That mood—and its corollary, a new form of isolationism full, I believe, of potential hazard on its own—has rather obviously been present here these past few days as this House has been debating the annual foreign aid authorization bill of which not much may be felt before the night is over. It is an understandable mood, considering our experience in Vietnam and our failure to develop any sort of consensus as to how we might break out of our present dilemma there; but it is also a mood that belies the kind of world we must live on in, whether we like it or not.

In any event, Mr. Speaker, I feel it would be useful to go back to the beginnings of our Vietnamese experience—insofar as they were ever formalized—to see if, out of doing so, we could not develop a better understanding of our objectives, changing them somewhat if they now seem wrong, and, more importantly, also to see if this kind of review produce for us all—as for the President who needs it badly—some better unification of our national will than we now enjoy.

On Wednesday of this week, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] presented what I felt to be a most penetrating and useful statement to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the other body—a statement that I believe has already appeared on the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Without here repeating his line of reasoning, he suggested that there has been something less than a full compliance with constitutional procedures with respect to our gradual involvement in Vietnam and stated that, because of this—

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

The great issue of Vietnam—in all its vexing complexity—has never been placed on the great anvil of democracy where major policy decisions have traditionally been hammered out.

I fully agree—and I further concur that it is not too late to try to do this, even now. At the same time, some of my other colleagues have, quite properly, asked me what did we hope to gain from this sort of a review, starting with that Tonkin Gulf Resolution, as the "beginnings" of Vietnam. I have attempted to answer them as best I could, but by coincidence I have now seen some possibly even better answers presented by the distinguished former editor of the Christian Science Monitor, Erwin D. Canham, in his column in that paper on August 22 and—under leave to do so—I now include that column, entitled "The American Purpose," for the consideration of my colleagues:

The American Purpose

(By Erwin D. Canhan)

A dispute over powers and policies between President Johnson and the United States Senate will do little good just now. It will not help to bring peace in Vietnam. But it should be possible to redefine American policies in terms on which most of Congress would agree, and which would help toward a peaceful settlement.

There is no question that the Tonkin Gulf Resolution has been stretched far beyond the intent of Congress. Indeed, it has been used to defend policies which the administration itself would never have dreamed feasible a couple of years ago. Secretary Rusk stated in my hearing a few months ago that if anybody has told him earlier that we would have been bombing North Vietnam as we were then doing, he would have regarded it as an inconceivable risk. The chance of bringing in Communist China would have been much too great. Today the bombing is far more venturesome.

INTENT STUDIED

The literal terms of the Tonkon Gulf Resolution would permit almost anything. "All necessary measures to repel any armed attack" is a phrase which much of the Senate may reget, but there it is. The intent is something else again. The Senate undoubtedly had in mind steps to resist or prevent further Chinese Communist attacks on American warships. Sen. J. W. Fulbright, who vigorously fought on behalf of the resolution in the Senate, says he would have opposed it had he known it would be used to justify the sending of American ground troops to South Vietnam in the following year.

Now the President challenges the Senate to repeal the resolution. It probably shouldn't do exactly that. But it could bring its intentions up to date. And in so doing it might clear the air for the effort to promote peace negotiations which many hope can follow the Vietnam elections.

AIM CLARIFIED

A point the Senate might make clear is that the United States does not seek to destroy the government of North Vietnam. The sole American purpose is to prevent North Vietnamese interference in the affairs of South Vietnam. Moscow in particular wishes clear reassurance on this point. North Vietnam is a member of the Communist brotherhood. It is being attacked by the world's most powerful military force. The credibility of Communist solidarity would be at stake if Moscow ever seemed to abandon Hanoi.

Second, the Senate might affirm American intention to withdraw from the Asian mainland just as soon as the protection of South Vietnam is assured. This may be a little hard to make persuasive in the face of the fantastic investments in bases and military headquarters the United States continues to make in Vietnam. But the American taxpayers would be the first to write off their investment if it got them out of the open-ended involvement now prevailing. Withdrawal might take several years, but the commitment would be the main thing.

U.N. ROLE SEEN

Third, the Senate might also clarify American willingness to return to the Geneva Agreement terms, and envisage a free decision by the Vietnamese on ultimate unification.

Fourth, the Senate might express the desire to see peace in Southeast Asia guaranteed in future by the United Nations, and by Asian powers themselves, with the United States taking a less dominant role.

Many of these points are in executive rather than legislative prerogative. Therefore the new Senate resolution should be coordinated with a presidential statement of policy. Such a joint document could deeply impress world opinion. It could facilitate peace negotiations. It could bring together hawks and doves in terms of ultimate objectives.

There is deep concern in the United States over Vietnam, and a certain amount of bitterness, but there is less fundamental difference over the long-run purposes of American policy than appears. Many of these could be resolved in terms of a major peace offensive by the United States.

Remarks by Secretary of the Army Stanley R. Resor, Posthumous Award of Medal of Honor to S. Sgt. Jimmy G. Stewart, August 24, 1967

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE E. MILLER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 24, 1967

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I joint with my colleagues, the gentlemen from West Virginia [Mr. HECHLER] and Georgia [Mr. BRINKLEY] in paying tribute to Sgt. Jimmy G. Stewart, and to his widow and family. It is men like Sergeant Stewart who, through their supreme sacrifice, make this world a better place in which to live.

It was a humbling experience to attend the ceremony in which the Medal of Honor was awarded posthumously to Sergeant Stewart. His sacrifice is a mandate to us to give our best to bring peace to the world. If we succeed, then Sergeant Stewart will not have died in vain.

I am privileged to submit the remarks made by the Secretary of the Army, Stanley R. Resor, at the ceremony this morning:

Mrs. Stewart, Mrs. Stitt, Distinguished Guests, I am honored today to represent the President of the United States in bestowing the Medal of Honor upon an American soldier who gave his life heroically for his country. Staff Sergeant Jimmy G. Stewart, whom we honor today, was one of those rare individuals, so completely devoted to duty, that he willingly laid down his own life so that others might live.

In November 1963, Staff Sergeant Stewart joined the 11th Air Assault Division. This was the test division which tested and proved the airmobile concept which has played such an important part in the Army's operations in Vietnam.

Sergeant Stewart stayed on with the division when, in July 1965, it was reconstituted as the 1st Cavalry Division, Airmobile. In August 1965, he deployed with the division to Vietnam, and served with it until his untimely death.

The 1st Cavalry Division deployed directly to the 2nd Corps Area in Vietnam at a time when the enemy was threatening to split South Vietnam along the Pleiku-Ankhe-Qui Nhon axis. At the time of the division's arrival in Vietnam, nearly half of the population of the 2nd Corps Area was under Viet Cong domination. Today 89% of that population is under control of South Vietnam and its Allies. In August 1965 70% of the rice land in the 2nd Corps Area was under Viet Cong control. Today 95% of the rice land is under control of the government of South Vietnam. Two years ago none of the important highways could be used unless a major military effort was launched to open one, for a limited number of days for a specific purpose. Today 90% of the important roads are open. Two years ago almost none of the railroads were in operation. Today 53% of railroads, or 226 miles, are repaired and in use.

The progress which has been made in the 2nd Corps Area in the last two years is in large part due to the outstanding performance of the division of which Staff Sergeant Stewart was a member. It reflects the sacrifice and devotion of the many fine Americans who have served in this division throughout this period. In time of war sacrifice and service are not equal. The progress which has been made in the 2nd Corps Area reflects particularly the extra sacrifice and extra service which have been displayed by those unusual individuals who, under the extraordinary demands of combat, have responded with unusual qualities of leadership and self-sacrifice. Sergeant Stewart was one of these.

His selfless acts of courage are an example from which we may all draw inspiration and courage. His heroism has earned him a rightful place among our Nation's most honored soldiers. It is indeed fitting, therefore, that we should recognize his extrordinary courage and devotion to duty by bestowing upon him posthumously the Nation's highest award for valor.

Tribute to the Holt Adoption Agency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. DELLENBACK

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 24, 1967

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker, as we all know, the Korean conflict had many far-reaching results. There were a number of marriages between American servicemen and Korean women which resulted, and America has been strengthened by the resulting infusion of this blood from a hearty and courageous people.

Another lesser known, or at least lesser talked about, result was the unfortunate fact that a number of children were born of unwed Korean mothers, fathered by members of our American Armed Forces. Shortly after the cessation of hostilities in Korea, two citizens of my State of Oregon, Harry and Bertha Holt, deeply troubled about these children, began a campaign almost singlehandedly to seek the adoption of as many as possible of these children by American parents. The redtape that needed to be cut was voluminous and the road was long, but Harry and Bertha Holt struggled and persuaded and cajoled and fought their way through the problems and succeeded in a remarkable degree.

Today some 3,900 of these children have been adopted; 3,481 have been adopted in U.S. homes, five in other countries, 301 by U.S. military personnel and 193 in Korean homes as a direct result of the self-sacrificing work of Harry and Bertha Holt. Afflicted with heart trouble, Harry Holt literally gave his life in this work. Upon his death, Bertha Holt picked up the load, and, gathering around her a group of interested and concerned and dedicated individuals, have gone forward with the work of the Holt Adoption Agency. This work is at present headed up by Rev. Jack Adams, himself the son of former Presbyterian missionaries to Korea and a tremendously able and dedicated man.

I rise today, Mr. Speaker, to call the attention of the Congress to this one additional problem which faces America. It is a problem of particular heartbreak because in many Asian countries the child belongs to the father, not the mother, and lacking a father, has no family, no one authorized to register his birth. Such a child is, therefore, often denied the rights of schooling and later of access to normal employment. Such an Amerasian child often becomes in many ways a stateles person, a special kind of orphan, condemned to anger and bitterness at his lot and prey to the temptation to run in the company of others like him, anything but a productive member of society. Often these children are individuals of real ability and talent, with potential for at least normal and wholesome personality development and with the possibility of making real contributions to society.

I commend today, Mr. Speaker, the work of Harry and Bertha Holt—the same Bertha Holt, incidentally, who was last year chosen as the American Mother of the Year—of the Reverend Adams and those who have gone before him, and of others like these individuals who are deeply concerned about this basic problem and who have given so much of themselves in the little publicized but critically important task.

L. B. J.'s Forecast of War Proving Correct

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JIM WRIGHT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 24, 1967

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of my colleagues to an article by Raymond Coffey, which makes it clear that General Westmoreland and his staff do not consider the Vietnamese conflict a stalemate, but rather are firm in their belief that the tide has turned against the enemy.

Mr. Coffey states in his article that the latest American military command report indicates that the enemy is suffering such severe physical losses that "North Vietnamese troops are beginning to show signs of lagging morale and discipline."

Mr. Coffey summarizes the following encouraging points of the command report. First, Vietcong guerilla strength has been overestimated. Second, enemy losses—from combat deaths and wounds, desertions, malaria, other sicknesses, defections, and other causes—are now running in excess of 15,000 per month. Third, recruitment of Vietcong in the South has fallen off somewhere between 3,000 and 5,500 per month from their previous level of 7,000 monthly. Fourth, the desertion rate among northern troops being infiltrated through Laos has risen significantly.

Statements from captured enemy infiltrators make it evident that a large percentage of those sent south never reach their destination due to U.S. air strikes and artillery, desertion, malaria, and other disabling illnesses. There is also general unwillingness to be sent south to the war. Moreover, the numerical attrition in Vietcong ranks is starkly demonstrated by solid information that the Vietcong now are actively recruiting women and very young boys.

As reported by Mr. Coffey, this battlefront report compiled from frontline information belies those administration critics who insist a military stalemate has been reached from whch we must extricate ourselves at all costs. North Vietnam, though so far willing to pay the heavy price of aggression, must soon begin to realize that the allied nations are firm in their resolve to keep South Vietnam free. Enemy losses, like those reported, will soon become insuperable.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Coffey's informative article be inserted in the RECORD.

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer, Aug. 22, 1967]

RED MORALE, RECRUITING SAG, WESTMORELAND'S G-2 REPORTS

(By Raymond R. Coffey)

SAIGON.—Vietcong recruiting has fallen off sharply and for the first time North Vietnamese troops are beginning to show signs of lagging morale and discipline, according to the American Military Command's latest intelligence review.

"We believe we have recently overestimated" Vietcong guerilla strength, a top-ranking U.S. source said.

The latest intelligence summary presented to Gen. William C. Westmoreland, according to the source, also makes these major—and generally optimistic—points:

Enemy losses—from combat deaths and wounds, desertions, malaria, other sicknesses, defections and other causes—are now running in excess of 15,000 per month. This has been the situation since first of the year, meaning that the enemy this year has already lost well over 100,000 men.

Recruitment of Vietcong within South Vietnam has fallen off to somewhere between 3000 and 5500 per month. It had been running at a level of about 7000 a month.

Infiltration of enemy troops from North Vietnam is continuing at about the same level—between 6000 and 7000 men per month. However, there is evidence, according to the source, that the desertion rate among Northern troops being infiltrated through Laos has risen significantly.

The over-all judgment of Westmoreland's intelligence analysts, the source said, is that "the enemy has reached a critical point" in the war where he is soon going to be forced to a "momentous decision" about how to go on from here and how long he can afford to take the losses he is taking.

All this, it should be noted, adds up to a considerably more optimistic view of the war than many people here have. Making the intelligence summary available at this time perhaps reflects the continuing dismay among Westmoreland and his staff at the fact that many people here consider the war to be in something of a stalemate—which has become a dirty word at Westmoreland's headquarters

However, ranking U.S. sources insist there is solid evidence for the estimates.

They cite, for example, interrogation reports of captured North Vietnamese soldiers, who they say now are beginning to "realize that they are being sent South to die."

In one case they cite a captured enemy who said that out of the group of 250 men who started South in his infiltration group, only 30 made it to the battlefronts in the South—the rest falling victim along the way to U.S. air strikes and artillery, desertion, malaria and other disabling illnesses.

Another enemy captured on July 20 said that morale was exceedingly low in his unit and that 70 percent of the men were draftees who did not want to come South to the war.

Another indication that the enemy is hurting, according to the sources, is solid information that the Vietcong now are actively recruiting women and very young boys.

One of the things left unexplained in all the optimism is this:

If Vietcong recruitment and North Vietnamese infiltration over the last six months have averaged no more than 12,500 per month—as the new estimates indicate—then why has total enemy strength remained at around 297,000 men despite all the losses being taken?

"There is every evidence" that the pressure being applied by American troops and air raids and by Vietnamese and Allied forces is beginning to take its toll, the high-ranking source—who insisted on anonymity—said. What there is not yet, however—and this is the key factor—is any apparent indication that the enemy is not willing to go on paying the price.

On Obscenity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. G. ELLIOTT HAGAN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 24, 1967

Mr. HAGAN. Mr. Speaker, the Screven County News, one of the weekly newspapers in my hometown of Sylvania, Ga., recently published an editorial concerning obscenity.

I would like to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a copy of this article that so well describes the situation we find today as smut fills the airways and the bookstands of our country.

The article follows:

[From the Screven County (Ga.) News, July 20, 1967]

ON OBSCENITY

If we were to print in this space in the next issue of this paper the words to some of the songs which blare out over the radio these days, we'd pretty certainly get a bundle of subscription cancellations in the next mail.

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

This is not to say that we think even a small percentage of our readers could be called either prudes or puritans. On the contrary, we think our subscribers are good-citizen parents who expect a family newspaper to be sensible about the language it uses in print. The same is true of all newspapers worthy of the name. The masthead of a newspaper carries the name of the editor and publisher, and he is aware that off-color or obscene material in print is going to bring not only pointed letters to the editor but even more pointed cancellations of subscriptions and advertising.

But have you sat down and really listened to the words of some of the songs and ballads on the radio these days? You should. Your teenagers do. And don't bother asking any teenager to repeat some of the words to you. They'd be too embarrassed to do so.

A few days ago the president of one network of 13 AM and FM stations ordered his stations to refuse to play records which "either innocently or intentionally offend public morals, dignity or taste."

There are, he said, rock records that "glorify dope addiction, homosexuality in general. Some absolutely make permissible, if not encourage, fornication and all varieties of things that would have been called immoral 20 years ago."

Then, in an advertisement in the trade publications, he said: "We've had all we can stand of the record industry's glorifying marijuana, LSD and fornication."

In the future, he said, his stations would refuse any new record release "unless it is accompanied by a valid lyric sheet."

That, it seems to us, might be a good idea for parents, too. No record comes into the house unless the dealer supplies with it a "valid lyric sheet." That's when the objectionable music trade will end—when the music publisher, the manufacturer, and the dealer, including retailers, have to put the salacious lyrics in writing.

The Supreme Court of the United States hasn't found anything it considers in violation of obscenity laws for so long that our magazine stands, bookstalls, and record shops are amuck with smut. But with a little effort, and only a little, we can shut it off the airways.

The 70th Anniversary of Black Horse Troops

SPEECH

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 23, 1967

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on August 19 of this year, all over this land of ours, graduates, friends, and admirers of the Culver Military Academy of Culver, Ind., celebrated the 70th anniversary of the Black Horse Troop of that world-famous school.

I am indebted to Constantine N. Kangles, distinguished lawyer and master in chancery in Chicago, who is a vice president of the Culver Military Academy Father's Association and whose son, Nicholas, has been a Culver cadet since last summer, for the following information:

First. The troop is the last cavalry unit on any campus in this Nation. The Black Horse Troop has participated in Presidential inaugurals by parading in Washington along with West Point and by parading in Washington along with U.S. service academies. The troop is, as such, not only well known throughout this Nation, but in many foreign countries as well.

Second. August 19 marked the retirement of a distinguished military officer, Gen. Delmar Spivey, a superintendent of the academy, being indeed a fitting climax to a most illustrious career. General Spivey, concluding 11 years at Culver as its superintendent, was a World War II bomber pilot, and headed the Air Universities War College.

Third. Commencement exercises of the Culver summer schools were held August 19, where some 1,700 or more students participated.

Mr. Speaker, I am extending my remarks to include interesting excerpts from an article by Ridgely Hunt in the Chicago Sunday Tribune of July 18, 1965, as follows:

THE NEW CULVER: SCHOLARSHIP, SABERS, AND FANS IN THE HAT

(By Ridgely Hunt)

Down amid the cornfields of central Indiana lies Culver Military academy, which is at once a country club, a basic training camp, a preparatory school, and a foster home for 874 of the nicest kids who ever lived. Because it costs $3,000 a year to send a boy to Culver—plus another $500 if he joints the cavalry troop—most of the cadets come from wealthy homes. On Mothers' weekend, when parents descend on the campus from all over the midwest, the parking lots are jammed with Continentals and Imperials. Even so, 20 per cent of the students receive scholarships, so the school encompasses poor as well as rich.

But rich or poor, the Culver cadets shine with a sort of adolescent splendor. Their backs are straight, their heads erect, their gaze unwavering. When they speak, they look you manfully in the eye, maintaining a decent respect but refusing to be overwhelmed by superior age or wisdom. Their discourse is peppered with "sir's" and heavily larded with school boy humor.

On parade they crackle with military precision. The guidons dip and snap erect, and 1,700 white-duck legs scissor back and forth together. As the cadet officers march to their posts, their sabers clank softly. Then with a rattle of orders and a crash of drums, the whole corps swings past in review, faces stern, plumes waving in the spring time breeze. You would never suspect, to look at these stiff-backed youths, that inside their high shakos a few have rigged battery-operated fans to cool their heads.

Culver cadets regard the military life with emotions ranging from ardor to irreverence. "Four years is enough," says one regimental staff officer in explaining his choice of a civilian college. This year only one graduate is going on to West Point and one to the Air Force academy. Three are going to Yale, two to Harvard, five to Stanford, and 11 to Northwestern, the most popular choice. There were 209 in the class.

"A lot of people like me just don't like the military," says a 16-year-old third classman, or sophomore.

And a 14-year-old fourth classman, his voice still unchanged, states flatly, "I think it's a farce."

For most of its 75 years Culver was a rigidly militaristic school, tho it has long ranked among the best. Many parents, having botched the job of rearing their sons, sent them to "get some sense pounded into their heads." Plebes sat at attention during meals, perched on the front edges of their chairs, and they were obliged to polish the upper classmen's boots. After four years of this rigorous environment, many entered the world at the age of 18 with a Prussian bearing and with commissions as second lieutenants in the United States army.

Military schools have traditionally been regarded as genteel correctional institutions for the sons of the rich, and this reputation continues to haunt and to injure Culver. In a recent Dr. Kildare television program, an irate father advised his knife-wielding son that he had better repent lest he be sent to a military school. "And there," says a Culver official bleakly, "went 25 years of public relations down the drain."

Little of the old militarism remains at Culver. R.O.T.C. instruction has been cut to two class periods a week plus drill on Thursday afternoons and Saturday mornings if the weather is nice. "During the winter months," says Steven R. Patterson, a second-classman from Los Angeles, "the military system almost goes completely underground" The cadets always wear uniforms, even while traveling between school and home at vacation time and they march to church three times a week, but mostly they move about the campus singly or in bunches as they would at any school.

"I've tried to indoctrinate our boys with the idea that you can play soldier all day long and never learn a darned thing," says Maj. Gen. Delmar T. Spivey, a retired air force officer who heads the academy. This is a remarkable belief for a West Point graduate who has completed a distinguished military career, but General Spivey [pronounced Spy Vee] is a remarkable man. He still remembers with distaste the military school graduates whom he knew at West Point and whose unbending militarism exceeded all requirements. "We called them tin soldiers," says General Spivey. "Why, you could hardly talk to them.

"The military system serves a useful purpos here," he says, "but it's not paramount. It teaches a boy respect for constituted authority. It teaches him the principles of morality and the pride of belonging to a unit. It's a convenient way to reward the boys for achievement." Culver offers a variety of chevrons, stripes, insignia, and badges that denote rank as well as athletic or academic honors.

"And the military serves a very useful administrative purpose," says General Spivey. "The boys control their own actions 24 hours a day." By forming ranks and marching out the door, the cadets can empty the dining hall in a third the time it would require if they shoved thru in a mob. Cadet officers maintain order in the dormitories—called barracks at Culver—thus freeing faculty members from routine police chores that they must perform at non-military prep schools.

"And it doesn't take very much of the boys' time," says General Spivey. "I don't know what they would be doing if they weren't doing this."

Most students agree. "I get all the time I need for studying," says Patterson.

"Heck, I get all the time I can stand," adds Miles B. Kehoe, 16, of Whittier, Cal.

Like most of his faculty, General Spivey devotes his energies less to sabers and shakos than to scholarship and morals. "I have a strong feeling that parental control and the amount of time that parents spend with their kids have declined more and more because of the type of society in which we live," says General Spivey. "I regret this deeply, but it's a fact of life. We farm our children out to teachers and playground supervisors and baby-sitters. Most of our parents are deeply concerned for their youngsters, and most would like to have them at home. But they send their sons here because of a desire for them to have a better education than they could get at home and because they want to take them away from the distractions of their communities. I usually sum up those distractions as wine, women, and automobiles."

While he speaks in his paneled office, a gun barks down by the lake, and a bugle sounds retreat. Over the years the general has stood a thousand retreats, saluting the colors as they fluttered downward in the twilight. He has flown military aircraft since 1928—everything from the fabric-covered DH's to advanced jet fighters. He was shot down over Germany and culminated his imprisonment with a secret mission that might have shortened the war. Now, while the last bugle notes die away, he talks of more immediate matters, his soft voice still touched with the drawl of his boyhood on a South Carolina farm.

"I have a feeling that people don't have a real, deep purpose in life and that they're just running helter-skelter, trying to find something, they don't know what. Youngsters want leadership. They want guidance and direction. They want a purpose in life. I feel this is absolutely true."

Part of that direction comes from the regular army personnel who run Culver's R.O.T.C. program: four officers and four noncoms, all of them as straight and polished as bayonets. Under army instruction the cadets master such subjects as leadership, first aid, army history, and map reading. They learn marksmanship wtih .22 rifles and study the anatomy of such venerable weapons as the M1 rifle and the .30 calibre light machine gun, which are no longer much used in the army but where are almost the only arms available for R.O.T.C. units. They carry M1 rifles on parade but don't shoot them. If they complete Culver's four years of military training, the cadets may receive credit for some college R.O.T.C. work, but they no longer graduate with commissions.

* * * * *

The cadets live their most glamorous moments on the parade grounds, and when the Black Horse troop canters down the road, 150 youths in boots and spurs with banners flying, the earth trembles beneath their hoofbeats. But the deeper excitement comes in the classrooms when their instructors lead them in assaults on the battlements of knowledge. Teachers like Arthur G. Hughes, chairman of the English department, prick them with questions, stirring them up until their minds ignite and their ideas ricochet among the desks.

"Well, how about our world at Culver? Would we drive Thoreau out? Would there be no chance for him at all? Yes, Vance, go ahead."

"Well, Thoreau spent most of his time saying what he wanted to do rather than talking about what other people wanted to do, and I know most of my years here I've had to do what everyone else wanted."

"Unhuh. Yes, Coplan?"

"Well, if a person wanted to do what Thoreau did, he could just sit around and think."

"But Thoreau did more than that," Hughes insists. "He did till his own fields and build his own house and feed himself. He hired himself out as a surveyor."

"He could do theatrics," another cadet suggests. "He could join the philosophy club or the liberal club." A mild burst of laughter sweeps the room. Hughes, who once ran an education program for the United Automobile Workers union, is faculty adviser to the Liberal club.

The next afternoon Hughes yields his seat to Ralph E. Dittman, 17, the regimental commander, or highest-ranking cadet in the academy. Dittman is a phenomenon—a scholar, an athlete, a leader, admired by students and faculty, he's everything a father has ever sought in a son. Sergeant Major Sprouse calls him the roughest line backer in the state. His teachers call him brilliant. Tho his father is an air force colonel, Dittman will enter Harvard next fall and intends to study medicine. Now he lectures Hughes' class about Yeats' poetry, a subject on which he has written a 50-page honors paper, stressing the effects of mysticism and Irish mythology on the poet's work. After a 45-minute display of restrained erudition, he winds up with a reading of "Sailing to Byzantium." The next day he would help the varsity baseball team to victory, and the day after that he would lead the corps of cadets thru a full-dress review.

Not all Culver cadets are Dittmans.

"I had a new boy this year who was the biggest marshmallow I ever saw," says Channing Mitzell, a history instructor who also serves as counselor to battery B of the academy's artillery unit. "He couldn't tie his tie. He was so sensitive that if you raised your voice to him, he cried. He had a speech impediment. He couldn't drill, couldn't get his left foot out at the same time that everyone else did, and he cried because he couldn't.

"His mother came and stayed at the inn for the first two weeks of school." Culver runs an inn and a motel on the campus for parents and other visitors. "She used to sneak into the barracks without my knowing and make his bed for him. She bought him a snap-on tie so he wouldn't have to tie his own. Finally I told her that I was having enough problems with her son and she was making them worse. So she went away.

"I put two of my best boys to work with this kid, teaching him to drill, and they did it in private so he wouldn't be embarrassed. I got the hall officer to work with him and teach him to tie his tie. Then the hall officer asked if he could try to help this kid with his speech, and I said, 'Sure, go ahead.'

"This boy came in one day at the end of the first semester and said, 'Mr. Mitzell, I'd like to show you something.' I said, 'What's that?' And he said, 'Red radishes.' That's all he said. 'Red radishes.' I said, 'My God, I don't believe it!' His speech impediment was just about gone.

"He wanted to go home at first. He came in here and begged me to send him home." But Mitzell persuaded him to stay and fight, and the boy won.

* * * * *

"A lot of guys never wanted to come here," says one cadet. "Their parents just sent them." Yet Culver will not knowingly accept an unwilling student and does its best to keep him out.

* * * * *

Inevitably, a few who enter cannot stay. Some cannot adjust to prep school discipline; some go AWOL; some cheat. One boy was dismissed last spring because his ungovernable temper led him into repeated insolence toward his teachers and cadet officers. Another departed speedily after he threatened to beat up an instructor. A third ended his Culver career by gambling. These malefactors typically repent their sins, and most receive second and third chances to reform. Dismissal comes only as a last resort and usually fills the faculty with sorrow. The lost sheep represents a failure.

* * * * *

Most cadets disapprove of such offenses as cheating and stealing. They live by an honor code, which some of them take more seriously than others but it is the basic law of their private society, and they do not like to see it violated.

* * * * *

To the great majority who stick it out Culver offers a world of riches for mind and body: an enormous gymnasium with a swimming pool; a library fit for a small college; an auditorium with all the equipment of the professional stage and an Ivy league drama professor to show them how to use it; and a dining hall managed by a major restaurant chain. The food is of the type euphemistically described as "plain but hearty"; i.e., boiled frankfurters for lunch, meatloaf for supper.

* * * * *

Within a single afternoon a cadet may be exposed both to the horsemanship instruction of Col. Gerald C. Graham, a former aide to General MacArthur, and to the literary tutelage of John M. Hartley, a Briton with a dry sense of humor and a splendid, Victorian mustache. "Does the meaning of any other word elude you?" Hartley asks. "Shards? What are shards? Shards are broken pieces of pottery. The kind of thing you throw out when it's broken and that the archeologist will be delighted to dig up and give to a museum." Humor is an important weapon in the prep school teacher's armory. With it he can quell a classroom disorder or drive home a bit of information. One instructor, as he draws a large circle on the board, ritualistically chants, "Swing and sway with Cassius Clay," or for variety, "Swing and sway with Chaplain Bray." The boys think it's hilarious.

* * * * *

And always there is the control exerted by the cadet officers, the youths who have earned the right to bear a saber [about $28 at the academy store] and an assortment of chevrons on their arms. All cadets enter the academy as privates and receive $450 worth of identical uniforms, which are specially made so that they can be lengthened in sleeve and leg as the cadets grow. Most new boys are too fat, however, so that as the year progresses, coats and blouses are more often nipped in than expanded.

Promotions in rank come mostly in the junior, or second-class, year when cadets reach such positions as battalion staff sergeant or company first sergeant. They usually enjoy this first taste of authority. "Last year was the best," says First-Classman Benner, looking back to his first major promotion. "Last year was sheer exuberance. I've learned a lot since then." Benner, who was graduated last month as a cadet first lieutenant, had felt the first heavy touch of responsibility.

* * * * *

Pride comes in many ways to the Culver cadets as it does to all prep school boys. It comes, first of all, in the simple act of survival in this world where their fathers cannot extricate them from trouble and where their mothers cannot comfort them. It comes in winning honors and promotions or in converting a detested enemy into a close friend. It comes in the time of glory on the soccer field or in the act II reprise of a production of "Brigadoon." And especially it comes in the realization that, as they have outgrown boyhood, they have become men. And pretty good men at that.

Margaret Mary Mangan: Justice Is a Lady

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 24, 1967

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, Justice Margaret Mary Mangan graces the New York State Supreme Court bench with charm and distinction. She is a wonderful constituent of mine who has made a great contribution not only to the judiciary but to her community to which she has also devoted her talents.

The New York Sunday News of August 13, 1967, carried a profile of Justice Mangan written by May Okon, which I believe will be of interest to my colleagues. It follows:

JUSTICE IS A LADY

(by May Okon)

New York State Supreme Court Judge Margaret Mary Mangan has freckles, reddish-blonde hair piled atop her head and a beguiling gift of gab that owes much to the Blarney stone.

"That's why I became a lawyer in the first place—" she grinned, "I wasn't good at spelling, I wasn't good at mathematics . . . but I had a big mouth, so I figured law was my field."

The second woman to sit on the state's high court bench—she was preceded by Birdie Amsterdam—Judge Mangan made news recently when she ruled that a man on relief can't collect alimony from his estranged wife even if she is working and he is unemployable. "A husband who looks to his wife for support is placed in an unnatural relationship," said Judge Mangan in dismissing the case. "Traditionally, the husband is the breadwinner and provides for the family."

At the root of this decision by the slender, vivacious justice, who has never married and cheerfully admits to being 60, is her firm belief in the inequality of the sexes, in the natural supremacy of man. "You can't go against nature," she said, "and I believe in keeping man in the dominant role.

"I think I'm the happiest judge on the bench," she said. "I think it's a great privilege for me . . . a gal from the other side of the tracks. I got some awfully good breaks along the line. First, I had a wonderful mother and father. They both came here from County Kerry, Ireland, when they were in their 20s. I was an only child, and my parents sacrificed for me. Dad worked at the Metropolitan Museum of Art, and when the museum opened the Cloisters in Fort Tryon Park he became the curator there. He was a good man . . . kind, gentle, and he loved beauty. He was a quiet man. My mother was the vocal one—she made with all the jokes. She was the one who saved the pennies so I could go to school. My father was the one who'd empty his pockets for anyone who was down on his luck.

"It was my father's father who first got me interested in law. He was a lawyer in Ireland and a great friend of Parnell's. When my grandfather came to visit us he would stay only a little while because he hated the New York climate, and then he would rush off to California. But I guess the stories he told impressed me, though my mother used to say, 'Don't listen to the Mangans, they're all liars.' She was a Sullivan.

"At Blessed Sacrament High School, where I was frowned upon because I was a tomboy, the nuns looked askance at my going into law, which they considered a man's world. When I think about it today, I guess I studied law primarily to do good . . . but it's not easy. When you're young you have ideals and like to think of yourself as doing good in a big way, but as the years pass you learn that the only good you can do is in a small area around you."

After attending New York University, the College of the City of New York and Brooklyn Law School, she was admitted to the bar in 1932. In the seven-page dossier of Judge Mangan's career, which lists her legal, political, civic and community activities (also her honors, endorsements and awards, of which there are many), beneath the heading, Practice of Law, is written: "For several years maintained own offices at 17 E. 42d St., New York City, trying cases in all local, state and federal courts. General law assistant to the Justices of the Supreme Court of the State of New York for the First Judicial Department until appointed Justice of the Municipal Court, Seventh District, Manhattan, by Mayor Robert F. Wagner, on May 21, 1956; as a candidate of the Democratic, Liberal and Republican parties, elected as Justice of the Municipal Court Nov. 6, 1956, to serve 10-year term.

"Appointed June 4, 1958, by Gov. Averell Harriman to the City Court of the City of New York; as a candidate of the Democratic, Liberal and Republican parties, elected as a Justice of the City Court on Nov. 4, 1958, to serve a 10-year term."

She was elected to the New York Supreme Court in 1962 (for a 14-year term).

"Our Supreme Court is the busiest court in the world," she said. "We handle all kinds of actions—matrimonial, trusts, the dissolution of corporations—litigations often involving tremendous sums of money. I've just been in a blockbuster session, handling 60 hard-core cases in two months. We have to keep moving the jam-packed calendar, and it's hard work.

"The public thinks a judge's life is glamorous, like on Perry Mason," she smiled. "But we go till 5 o'clock, hold conferences on cases other than the one we're working on, conduct hearings . . . and then there's always paper work, paper work . . . I'm shelpping papers all the time.

"You know, each case involves giving the jury a short course in law. It all requires a great deal of patience. One man gets on the stand, butter wouldn't melt in his mouth, then the other side gets on the stand and butter wouldn't melt in *his* mouth. Truth is very illusive, but after a while you develop an antenna for it.

"I don't think there's a valid answer to whether a man or a woman makes a better judge. I don't think brains have any sex. But women approach things differently than men. A man tends to be objective, a woman is more subjective. A woman has more more patience, more understanding, and she thinks in terms of the humanities.

"A woman judge can't be too nice, however, because niceness is often construed as weakness. But by the same token, she can't order a man around, and this is as it should be—our relation to men is that we complement each other. They can't do things we do, and we can't do things they can.

"A woman has one advantage in law, whether she's an attorney trying a case or sitting on the bench—everyone in the court will remember her because she's a woman.

"Where can I go from here? I suppose I could go to the Appellate Division—a woman is due there. I think it should go to Birdie Amsterdam. I don't know how she feels about it, but for me the trial work is so much more interesting than all the paper work required of judges in the Appellate Division.

"I prefer being involved with people . . . I'm a people person," she smiled.

The Negroe's Hopes Are a War Casualty

SPEECH

OF

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1967

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, I am including in the RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues an article by Walter Lippmann in the Washington Post of August 20, 1967, entitled "The Negro's Hopes Are a War Casualty."

The problems of America's Negroes cannot be solved by treating them separately as another people. Nor can there be a pro-Negro enterprise financed by unilateral white sacrifices. Instead, there must be an attempt to uplift the entire community, white and Negro, through the enlarged quest for the Great Society. This must be an endeavor supported by both whites and Negroes in an inspired, total effort.

But now this effort cannot have the impetus and total commitment of America, for the American people are engaged in a Vietnam war "with half a million men fighting in Asia, nobody really cares, or can care about, what life is like in a Detroit slum."

Mr. Speaker, with unanimous consent, I insert this article in the RECORD:

THE NEGRO'S HOPES ARE A WAR CASUALTY—GREAT SOCIETY THAT MIGHT HAVE LIFTED HIM OUT OF GHETTO HAS BEEN RELEGATED BY VIETNAM

(By Walter Lippmann)

However much the Negro riots this summer have demonstrated our failure to make our racial policy work, the American people are quite unable to turn around and adopt a radically different policy. The American predicament is unique.

All the known "solutions" which have been applied elsewhere to racial conflicts are foreclosed. There is no alternative to continuing to work for as much peace and harmony as possible on American territory between the Negroes and the whites.

The races cannot separate. There can be no exodus of the Negroes to a land of their own. They cannot go elsewhere. They cannot separate on American territory by some form of apartheid as in South Africa. The Negroes will not tolerate and the whites will not attempt to enforce the brutality of a racial separation.

The Negroes cannot seize, let us say, Mississippi and secede from the United States in order to establish a country of their own. The suggestion is unthinkable. There is nothing left for us all but to go on living together, trying to make the relationship as decent and tolerable as possible.

AN UNACCEPTABLE GAP

The American belief in the gradual harmonization of the races is no doubt optimistic and idealistic when it is seen in the light of the ugly realities. But it is the only general vision of the future that, given American geography and history, Americans can allow themselves. Any other course means incessant smoldering violence and hatred.

The critical difficulty is that all serious efforts to advance toward racial harmony take a long time to achieve results and they are very costly. The grievances and complaints of the young Negroes are, however, immediate and urgent. They will not wait for their grandchildren to enjoy the solutions of their problems.

This is the ominous gap in which the riots are kindled. The older generation of Negro and white leaders has learned to accept the gap. It has learned to live on promises, on small tokens and samples, of better things to come. For the present, these older and more patient Negroes are not listened to by the new generation.

The core of the problem is how to create a new generation of Negro leaders whom the young Negroes will follow and with whom the white establishment in American society can live and work. For the irreconcilables like Stokely Carmichael, who consider themselves at war with the white majority, there is no future except in jail or in exile. For in any test of strength and violence, they would certainly be crushed, and if they insist on putting the matter to the test, they have no prospect whatsoever of prevailing.

The power of the white community is so overwhelmingly superior that the security of the blacks lies, in the last analysis, in the determination of the whites not to let the conflict go to extreme limits. The disparity in strength is such that it is absurd for Stokely Carmichael to think of a race war.

A GENERAL UPLIFTING

The question is whether and how the white community can be induced to pay the costs, financially and also human, of the reform and reconstruction which might at last as-

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

suage the grievances of the Negroes. My own view is a tough-minded one.

As long as the advance of the Negro is presented as a form of white philanthropy—the white majority making sacrifices to uplift the Negro minority—nothing on the scale needed will be practical politics. The uplifting of the Negro cannot be accomplished as a pro-Negro enterprise. Large communities of men are not that generous and unselfish.

The advance of the Negro must be part of a much greater and more general effort to uplift the whole community, carrying the Negro minority with it in the enterprise. In the current jargon, we can uplift the Negro only in the process of creating the Great Society.

We can do little for the Negro if we do not absorb his grievances in the greater needs of the whole community. Unless the whites have a vital interest in their own advancement, in making the cities livable, they will respond reluctantly to the costs of helping the Negro minority.

This comes down to saying that the racial problem is manageable, I do not say soluble, in situations which come about only now and then, not often, in the life of a nation. There must be an overwhelming desire and intention among the active people to reform and reconstruct their own social order. The hope of the Negro people is to participate in such a general movement. There is, in my view, no hope for them as a separate minority who are to be accorded separate and special measures of relief and uplift.

CONTRADICTING COMMITMENTS

A general movement of reform and reconstruction can exist only if its objectives are the main preoccupation of the great masses of the Nation. In 1964, it was conceivable, indeed possible, that the Great Society would become the main American preoccupation for a generation to come. It has not been the American preoccupation ever since President Johnson decided that he had to wage war in Asia.

For it is impossible to expect a people to be preoccupied at one and the same time with two diametrically opposite and contradicting commitments: with a war on the other side of the world and with the rebuilding of their own society at home.

Once the President chose to believe that he had to prevail in a war of attrition on the Asian mainland, the Great Society lost its momentum and its soul and became nothing more than a complex series of political handouts to the poor. The hope of Negro participation in the creation of a new American social order was lost.

President Johnson keeps on saying that the United States is big enough and rich enough to pay for the war in Vietnam and at the same time for the Great Society at home. More than anything else, this reveals Lyndon Johnson's lack of knowledge of war and his lack of wisdom in dealing with it. His willingness to believe that a democracy can have two overwhelming preoccupations at the same time is the mark of an amateur.

It is the view of a man who does not realize, because he has never himself felt it, the absorbing preoccupation of war. He does not understand that when the issues are life and death, victory and defeat, everything else becomes pale and irrelevant and unimportant. Some of the measures for the Great Society are still on the White House list of desirable legislation. But with half a million men fighting in Asia, nobody really cares, or can care about, what life is like in a Detroit slum.

AN EXCUSE FOR REACTION

Moreover, the people who do not feel the need for reform or do not believe that there is justice and reason in the claims of the Great Society now have a legitimate reason for stopping the reforms and even reversing them.

President Johnson is much mistaken if he thinks that because he has adopted the Goldwater war policy, the Goldwater faction will support the Great Society. Nor can he convince the predominant and bewildered majority of our people that the 90th Congress is wicked because it puts the war ahead of everything else.

In a word, therefore, the Negro grievances cannot be assuaged by a policy of white philanthropy, of white sacrifices to uplift the Negro. The only way forward is to make the advance of the Negro a part of the general effort to solve the problems and deal with the needs of our great urban centers.

But this undertaking, though it is a noble and inspiring one, is possible only if it becomes the main preoccupation of the whole Nation. And that is impossible while the Nation is distracted and preoccupied by a foreign war it does not understand and does not believe in.

The Barrier Zone Idea: "Worth Talking About"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 24, 1967

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, with increasing concern over the excessive military costs and possibility of failure of American policy in Vietnam, this month has pretty much become the how-to-solve-our-problems-in-Vietnam month, as Member after Member in this Congress has risen to suggest his or her pet theory about what we ought to be doing now.

Some of those ideas get shot down about as fast as they are put up—which is understandable under the circumstances—while others receive favorable attention from some quarters though not from others. And the debate goes on and on, which is as it should be for our present dilemma is an untenable one to almost everyone.

For at least a year, now, I personally have been interested in promoting consideration of a defensive barrier zone below the "DMZ" separating North from South Vietnam. To some, particularly those of a military bent, this has suggested a "maginot line" approach and one which, considering what happened to the original maginot line, they reject out of hand.

However, I have been pleased to note that this idea has gradually been picking up support in other quarters, especially the support of the distinguished majority leader in the other body. And, now, I am further pleased to note that this idea has been brought to the attention of the editors of the Wall Street Journal, who commented upon it with some approval as being, certainly, worth talking about—as I have always believed it was. That comment entitled "Worth Talking About," as carried in the Journal's issue for August 15, is now set forth for the consideration of my colleagues, as follows:

WORTH TALKING ABOUT

President Johnson's announcement of another round of troop increases for Vietnam predictably has provoked another round of the nearly meaningless statements that pass for debate between hawks and doves. It's too bad, for there are a couple of more specific issues currently worth talking about.

The hawks, like Representative Ford and Senator Stennis, want more bombing of North Vietnam. And apparently the Administration has approved some of the additional targets they suggested.

Yet by now it should be clear that despite air power's important supporting role, any real success in Vietnam will be won on the ground. It would be entirely responsible for some hawk to ask why, if Vietnam is as important as the Administration says, General Westmoreland doesn't get all the additional troops he requests rather than a third of them. But it does not strike us as responsible to suggest that the big problem is too little bombing, that more air power could bring cheap and painless victory.

The doves and even some hawks have criticized the Vietnamese election campaign. This criticism is valid to a large extent, though, it tends to overlook that the problem is not merely the fault of the junta, that its civilian opposition scarcely seems more reasonable.

Other dovish comments have hardly been helpful. Senator Fulbright and Senator Robert Kennedy draw self-serving relationships between Vietnam and racial riots. Senator Mansfield and Senator Cooper talk about reducing the bombing and turning the problem over to the United Nations. Considering the UN's Middle East fiasco, that is grasping a frail straw indeed.

Senator Mansfield, however, does raise one of the points we think could be constructively discussed. He suggests a defensive barrier below the demilitarized zone separating North and South Vietnam. Defensive works have already been built over part of the line, and while some military leaders are apparently cool toward the idea of a full-scale barrier, it has a ring of plausibility.

Particularly so since the word "stalemate" has been cropping up so often lately as a description of the war. Some accounts suggest it is a stalemate in the sense that our units have made no important progress in suppressing guerrillas. Maybe so, but it is simply not true that things are no better than when our units started ashore in 1965; the Vietcong were very close to victory then.

Indeed, it is possible to read the increasing intervention of the North Vietnamese regular army as a reaction to our success against the Vietcong. What most military analysts mean when they talk of "stalemate" probably is this: North Vietnam has several divisions poised just north of the DMZ; we do not know when they may start south again; and we can do nothing about them. Senator Mansfield's barrier makes sense as one attempt to break that kind of stalemate.

Sure, military doctrine condemns Maginot Lines, but that doctrine never contemplated a limited war in which the army is—in our view entirely sensibly—restrained from the approved answer of an invasion to destroy the threatening force. Sure, the barrier would be expensive, but something of the sort seems necessary anyway to the Korea-type solution the Administration hopes for. Sure, it would take troops to man, but would it take fewer troops to defend the same line without the barrier? In short, Senator Mansfield deserves more than the perfunctory answers his proposal has drawn so far.

A second question worth weighing has received even less attention. This is the long-standing issue of a joint command. The number-one problem in the war today is the Vietnamese army, and every analysis puts the blame on bad leadership. At present the U.S. command can only request that inef-

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

fective commanders be removed, and it seems hesitant to press such requests.

A joint command would in effect give General Westmoreland the power to fire incompetent South Vietnamese commanders. There was a joint command in the Korean War. The army keeps saying all will be well if the Vietnamese respond as the Koreans did, so it seems fair to ask why the methods used in Korea are not used in Vietnam.

The answer, again somewhat perfunctory, has been that in this political war we must protect any shred of South Vietnamese sovereignty. We suspect, though, that the degree of "Americanization" that makes any real difference has long since been past. Perhaps it's a good time to reconsider whether the cost of establishing a joint command really outweighs the cost of not doing so.

It may be the U.S. has got into an untenable position in Vietnam; certainly we don't contend a defensive barrier or a joint command would solve all of the problems. Indeed, lacking the edification of a thorough public discussion, we cannot be entirely sure we favor either. We only wish our national leaders would provide that edification instead of more bombing vs. less bombing and other stale reruns.

The hawks, the doves and the Administration would all serve the nation better if they cut back the talk about nonexistent instant solutions, and started focusing on smaller things that conceivably could make a difference.

Poverty of What?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 24, 1967

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, in these days when so much is said about poverty, it is appropriate to know just what we are talking about. An excellent article in this month's Freeman puts the whole matter in its proper perspective. There is a poverty in America today but, unfortunately, it is not most acutely represented in money or a standard of living but rather in our poverty of moral principle as compared to those who had the vision and strength to found and build this great Nation.

When one thinks of the courage and faith of our forefathers and then contemplates so many of their woe-begotten progeny, destitute and helpless—waiting for a handout from Washington to accomplish mere trifles compared to the superhuman job our forefathers did in conquering the wilderness, gaining our freedom and building this great Nation—we get a better idea of just how deep our poverty runs.

POVERTY OF WHAT?

(By Donna Thompson)

Newspapers and magazines have been filled with articles about the war on poverty. But it seems that these analysts think of poverty only in terms of money income. The government is trying to provide income of a certain amount in the belief that, with material poverty obliterated, the individual can have all the good things in life and live happily ever after.

The popular impression seems to be that the individual cannot amount to anything in the world if he is poor financially. Apparently it has been forgotten that the great of the world have climbed to the heights from hovels, half-starved, perhaps, but undeterred from the things they desired.

That is where our modern thinking stumbles. The dictionary defines poverty as "a quality or state of being poor, any deficiency in what constitutes richness. Poor—as poverty of soil or ideas. Poverty, a stronger word than poor, is the state of being in need." In need of what? Money, yes. But not money alone. We need a war on poverty of moral principle, poverty of character, poverty of ideas, poverty of ambition, poverty of courage, and poverty of determination.

I have been reading the life of Hans Christian Andersen. His father was a cobbler. His mother washed clothes in the river to help make a living. He was poor in this world's goods, hungry and cold, poorly dressed, and uneducated. But rich, very rich in ideas, in dreams, in courage, determination, and faith in God. Poor clothes and hunger could be endured as he reached to become a great novelist, playwright, and spinner of fairy tales that have delighted children around the world.

Abraham Lincoln, reading by firelight and candlelight, with ill-fitting clothes and no formal education, asked nothing of any man. He wanted a chance and made it for himself.

The pages of history reveal great actors, writers, lawyers, artists, ministers, politicians—the list is endless. They were poor. They were hungry. But they achieved because they were rich in many ways.

THE NATURE OF GROWTH

We need to change our viewpoint. It is well to clean up the slums. It is well to try to find work for people who will work. It is a wonderful thing to provide an education for people who want it. But let us not mislead ourselves. Those who are poor in worldy goods will not be stopped if they are rich in character, moral fiber, courage, and ambition. They will develop the talent God has given them and nothing will stop them.

I do not mean that everyone has the divine spark of greatness. But any individual can help himself become a responsible, desirable citizen—not rich, but with enough—honest and law-abiding if he so desires. Look at the leaders in your own community, many of whom from poor beginnings have risen above their surroundings. And among your neighbors are many others who live in smaller houses and work for what they have—not abundance, but enough—who go to church and send their children to school, whose pride will not permit them to ask for help and, if offered, will push the offer away with the answer, "Let me do it. I can do it for myself. I don't need any help."

I once know a boy who was working his way through college. He had no money, but he was determined to go on to medical school.

"Medical schools cost a lot of money," I said. "I don't see how you can do it financially."

I'll never forget the way he looked at me or what he said.

"I've wanted to be a doctor since I was a little boy. The old country doctor in our town used to take me with him on his calls in his horse and buggy. And I'm going through medical school and become a doctor if I have to live on a sack of peanuts a day."

He became a very successful surgeon. He had started poor in money, but rich in dreams and determination. He would not be stopped.

Even the Great Master himself was so poor that he told his friends, "The Son of Man hath not where to lay his head." But his words have endured for two thousand years, his life an example of wealth of spirit, of courage, of character. Each can achieve the goal that is set for him—if he is rich in those spiritual qualities which defy the bonds of materialism. In the soul and mind of man lies the richness of his life. Not what he wears or where he lives, but he lives and what he is.

THE DESIRE TO LEARN

In the War on Poverty, the word education is mingled with that of material advantage. Formal education is of great value moneywise. It is also the key that will unlock many doors. But education may be acquired without going to college. The dictionary defines education as " the impartation or acquisition of knowledge, skill, or the development of character as by study or discipline. Education is the general and formal word for schooling, especially in an institution of learning. But knowledge, that which is gained and preserved by knowing, enlightenment, learning, is the sum of information conserved by civilization. To learn is to gain knowledge or understanding by study."

And you can study by candlelight, as did Lincoln, or by a glowing electric light. You can study and learn on the street, in the field, in the factory, anywhere, if there is desire and will. The world of learning, of knowledge, is open to those who want it.

Poverty in a sense is a physical and material condition to be overcome; but men also must fight the war on poverty of spirit, poverty of ambition and determination and courage, the poverty of our minds. "Knowledge is power." It is time men stopped thinking only in terms of financial and material poverty and began to fight this poverty of the soul. If the latter is conquered, the other will take care of itself.

The Big Department of Defense Buildup

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 23, 1967

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, for some time I have been concerned about the growth of the civilian work force within the Defense Department. I raised questions about it during hearings on the fiscal 1968 Defense Department appropriations bill. And I have expressed the belief that Congress may find it necessary to place some curbs on the massive buildup of civilian employees in the Defense Establishment.

Recently, the authoritative Journal of the Armed Forces reported that more than 200,000 permanent civilian employees have been added to the Defense Department payroll in the past 6½ years, and that the number of "supergrade" and executive positions has been almost tripled.

In the August 26 issue of the Journal, an editorial further illuminates the situation by quoting Assistant Secretary of Defense Robert N. Anthony's estimate of the "savings" the Department has made through its "civilization" program. Secretary Anthony's documentation of the "savings" was furnished to the Appropriations Committee is response to questions I asked during this year's hearings. But, as Journal Editor Louis R. Stockstill notes, the Defense Department reply creates more questions than it answers.

I believe Congress will want to probe this matter in greater depth in the next session, and I urge Members of the House to read both the Journal article, "The Big Department of Defense Buildup—Part II" which appeared in the Appendix of the RECORD—page A4087—on August 14, and the current editorial from the August 26 issue of the Journal of the Armed Forces. The editorial follows:

CHEAPER BY THE DOZEN

(By Louis Stockstill)

It's about time some Congressional committee took a long and careful look at the Defense Department civilian build-up.

As we have pointed out in recent reports, more than 200,000 permanent civilian workers have been added to the DoD payroll since Secretary of Defense McNamara took office, and civilian payroll costs have mounted $2.3-billion.

The largest part of the increase, DoD claims, results from the demands of the Vietnam war. Part of the increase stems from the so-called DoD "civilianization" program, designed to convert thousands of military billets into civil service jobs.

When questioned about the civilian growth within the Defense Department, Assistant Secretary of Defense Robert N. Anthony told the House Appropriations Committee that DoD will save $122-million in FY '68 through the conversion of 78,322 jobs. He said it costs $1,567 less for each civilian than for the military man he replaces.

How did he arrive at this figure? Well, he said the cost "per man-year" for a civilian is $5,681; multiplied by 78,322 positions this totals $444.9-million. The cost "per man-year" for a military billet is $5,528; multiplied by 78,322 positions, this totals $433-million. But, he said, you have to add the military "tail" (the training and support associated with the military "which a civilian does not have") of $74.6-million. This boosts the military total to $507.6-million including $423.5 million in pay and allowances and $84.1-million for support costs such as "training, medical care, dependents education, transportation, command and administration support, security investigations, moving and facilities support, etc."

And then, he added, you have to crank-in $60.1-million for "retirement liability" for the military group, for a total cost of $567.7-million for the 78,322 positions. Thus a savings of $122.8-million, since the civilian replacements will cost only $444.9-million.

We doubt if that explanation would satisfy any members of the Congress who has time to read and ponder it. Surely it would raise at least a few questions.

Are we to assume that the civilians require no "security investigation" for which the military man is being charged? Don't dependents of overseas civilians receive the same education as those of military families? Are there no command and administration support costs for civilian employees? Doesn't the Government pay part of their health-care insurance costs? Aren't there some fairly liberal transportation and moving allowances for civilian employees of the Government?

And what about retirement costs? Secretary Anthony testified that appropriations for the Armed Forces do not include "the present value" of the "retirement cost" of the individual, "whereas the cost of a civilian does include an approximation of the present value of his retirement costs."

Hmmmmm. Interesting. But we wonder why, then, the Federal civilian employee's retirement fund currently is $50-billion in debt. If it's all funded and accounted for and tied up in a neat little package, someone has been doing pretty sloppy bookkeeping.

And we also wonder how Secretary Anthony arrived at the $5,681 "per man-year" cost of the individual civilian worker.

As a spot check, we examined the pay of the 2700 permanent civilian employees in the OSD Family Housing Office. The average pay of this group (not counting the top-salaried officials) is more than $6,000. And then we took a look at the Office of Civil Defense. The 849 permanent employees of that office earn an average of more than $12,000 each. And then we glanced at the budget account for "RDT&E, Defense Agencies," where the 981 permanent employees earn average salaries of more than $8,500.

Admittedly, we don't know much about "man-years" and "tails" and things like that, and it may be that Mr. Anthony has a solid case, and that we're only confusing the issue. But if so, we would like to see a better explanation and some answers to some of the questions which seem so obvious, if only on the surface.

We trust that Congress will do some further probing.

September Calendar of the National Gallery of Art

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 8, 1967

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to call the attention of Congress and the American people to the usual fine calendar of events for the National Gallery of Art for the month of September.

The lectures, films, tours, and special exhibits of the National Gallery continually enrich the cultural life of our Nation's Capital. They include a wide variety of activities and areas of artistic endeavor and really provide something for every taste and interest:

NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART, SEPTEMBER 1967

Continuing exhibitions: 15th and 16th Century European Drawings. Central Gallery. Through September 24.

Ginevra de'Benci by Leonardo da Vinci. New acquisition. Lobby B.

Recent publications: Catalogue. 15th and 16th Century European Drawings. 64 pages, 8" x 9⅛", with foreword by A. Hyatt Mayor, 50 illustrations. $2.00 postpaid.

Catalogue. Paintings from the Samuel H. Kress Collection; Italian Schools, XIII–XV Century by Fern Rusk Shapley. (First volume of a 3-volume complete catalogue.) 451 illustrations including 17 color plates, 12" x 9¼". $25.00 postpaid.

Christmas card catalogue, 1967: Available upon request, free of charge, with black-and-white illustrations and descriptions of 48 Christmas cards and notefolders reproduced from paintings, sculptures, and prints in the Gallery Collection.

Acoustiguide: A new recorded 45-minute tour of the National Gallery with the Director. A small, portable unit may be rented for 50¢ for one, 75¢ for two persons.

LecTour: A radio lecture device is installed in 28 exhibition galleries. Talks last about 15 minutes in each gallery. A small receiving set may be rented for 25¢.

Concerts: The National Gallery of Art concerts resume on September 24 at 8:00 p.m. in the East Garden Court.

Starting September 5, the Gallery returns to its September-through-March schedule: 10 a.m. to 5 p.m. on week days and on Sundays from 2 p.m. to 10 p.m. The caferteria will be open on weekdays from 11 a.m. to 4 p.m. and on Sundays from 4 p.m. to 7 p.m. Admission is free to the Gallery and to all programs scheduled.

MONDAY, AUGUST 28, THROUGH SUNDAY, SEPTEMBER 3

Painting of the Week: Koerbecke. *The Ascension* (Samuel H. Kress Collection), Gallery 35A, Tuesday through Saturday 12:00 and 2:00, Sunday 3:30 and 6:00.

Tour: Introduction to the Collection. Rotunda, Monday 11:00 and 3:00, Tuesday through Saturday 11:00, 1:00, 3:00, Sunday 2:30 and 5:00.

Film: The Cabinet of Dr. Caligari, Lecture Hall, Sunday 4:00 and 7:00.

MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 4, THROUGH SUNDAY, SEPTEMBER 10

Film: The Cabinet of Dr. Caligari, Lecture Hall, Monday 4:00 and 7:00.

Painting of the Week: Beccafumi. *The Holy Family with Angels* (Samuel H. Kress Collection), Gallery 15, Tuesday through Saturday 12:00 and 2:00, Sunday 3:30 and 6:00.

Tour of the Week: Still Life and Reality. Rotunda, Tuesday through Saturday 1:00, Sunday 2:30.

Tour: Introduction to the Collection. Rotunda, Tuesday through Saturday 1:00, and 3:00, Monday 1:00, Sunday 5:00.

Sunday Lecture; 15th and 16th Century European Drawings. Guest Speaker: Winslow Ames, Author, Lecture Hall 4:00.

All concerts, with intermission talks by members of the National Gallery Staff, are broadcast by Station WGMS–AM (570) and FM (103.5).

MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 11, THROUGH SUNDAY, SEPTEMBER 17

Painting of the Week: Delacroix, *The Arab Tax* (The Chester Dale Fund), Gallery 83, Tuesday through Saturday 12:00 and 2:00, Sunday 3:30 and 6:00.

Tour of the Week: The Exhibition of 15th and 16th Century European Drawings, Central Lobby, Tuesday through Saturday 1:00, Sunday 2:30.

Tour: Introduction to the Collection. Rotunda, Monday through Saturday 11:00 and 3:00, Sunday 5:00.

Sunday Lecture: Canaletto. Guest Speaker: Jacob Kainen, Consultant on Prints and Drawings, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C., Lecture Hall 4:00.

MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 18, THROUGH SUNDAY, SEPTEMBER 24

Painting of the Week: Redon. *Saint Sebastian* (Chester Dale Collection), Gallery 84, Tuesday through Saturday 12:00 and 2:00, Sunday 3:30 and 6:00.

Tour of the Week: Some Correlates to 15th and 16th Century European Drawings. Rotunda, Tuesday through Saturday 1:00, Sunday 2:30.

Tour: Introduction to the Collection. Rotunda, Monday through Saturday 11:00 and 3:00, Sunday 5:00.

Sunday Lecture: Painting in Mid America from the 1830's to the 1930's. Guest Speaker: Thomas S. Tibbs, Director, Des Moines Art Center, Des Moines, Lecture Hall 4:00.

Sunday Concert: National Gallery Orchestra, Richard Bales, *Conductor,* East Garden Court 8:00.

Inquiries concerning the Gallery's educational services should be addressed to the Educational Office or telephoned to 737–4215, Ext. 272.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H–112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20510

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey

Aiken, George D., *Vt*	
Allott, Gordon, *Colo*	
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.*	6 Wesley Circle
Baker, Howard H., Jr., *Tenn.*	
Bartlett, E. L., *Alaska*	
Bayh, Birch E., *Ind*	
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*	
Bible, Alan, *Nev*	
Boggs, J. Caleb, *Del*	
Brewster, Daniel B., *Md*	
Brooke, Edward W., *Mass*	
Burdick, Quentin N., *N. Dak.*	
Byrd, Harry F., Jr., *Va*	
Byrd, Robert C., *W. Va*	
Cannon, Howard W., *Nev*	
Carlson, Frank, *Kans*	Sheraton-Park
Case, Clifford P., *N.J*	
Church, Frank, *Idaho*	
Clark, Joseph S., *Pa*	
Cooper, John Sherman, *Ky*	
Cotton, Norris, *N.H*	
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr*	
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill*	
Dodd, Thomas J., *Conn*	
Dominick, Peter H., *Colo*	
Eastland, James O., *Miss*	
Ellender, Allen J., *La*	
Ervin, Sam J., Jr., *N.C*	
Fannin, Paul J., *Ariz*	
Fong, Hiram L., *Hawaii*	5519 Uppingham St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Fulbright, J. W., *Ark*	
Griffin, Robert P., *Mich*	
Gore, Albert, *Tenn*	
Gruening, Ernest, *Alaska*	
Hansen, Clifford P., *Wyo*	
Harris, Fred R., *Okla*	
Hart, Philip A., *Mich*	
Hartke, Vance, *Ind*	
Hatfield, Mark, *Oreg*	
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz*	
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa*	5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala*	
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla*	Sheraton-Park
Hollings, Ernest F., *S.C*	
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr*	
Inouye, Daniel K., *Hawaii*	
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash*	
Javits, Jacob K., *N.Y*	
Jordan, B. Everett, *N.C*	
Jordan, Len B., *Idaho*	
Kennedy, Edward M., *Mass*	
Kennedy, Robert F., *N.Y*	
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif*	
Lausche, Frank J., *Ohio*	
Long, Edward V., *Mo*	
Long, Russell B., *La*	
McCarthy, Eugene J., *Minn.*	5916 Bradley Blvd., Bethesda, Md.
McClellan, John L., *Ark*	
McGee, Gale W., *Wyo*	
McGovern, George, *S. Dak*	
McIntyre, Thomas J., *N.H*	
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.*	The Shoreham
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont*	
Metcalf, Lee, *Mont*	453 First St. SE.
Miller, Jack R., *Iowa*	5417 Kirkwood Dr., Bethesda, Md.
Mondale, Walter F., *Minn*	
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*	
Montoya, Joseph M., *N. Mex.*	
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg*	
Morton, Thruston B., *Ky*	
Moss, Frank E., *Utah*	
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak*	122 Schotts Court NE.
Murphy, George, *Calif*	
Muskie, Edmund S., *Maine*	
Nelson, Gaylord, *Wis*	
Pastore, John O., *R.I*	
Pearson, James B., *Kans*	
Pell, Claiborne, *R.I*	3425 Prospect St.
Percy, Charles H., *Ill*	
Prouty, Winston L., *Vt*	
Proxmire, William, *Wis*	
Randolph, Jennings, *W.Va*	4608 Reservoir Rd.
Ribicoff, Abraham A., *Conn*	
Russell, Richard B., *Ga*	
Scott, Hugh, *Pa*	
Smathers, George A., *Fla*	
Smith, Margaret Chase (Mrs.), *Maine.*	
Sparkman, John, *Ala*	4928 Indian Lane
Spong, William B., Jr., *Va*	
Stennis, John, *Miss*	
Symington, Stuart, *Mo*	
Talmadge, Herman E., *Ga*	
Thurmond, Strom, *S.C*	
Tower, John G., *Tex*	
Tydings, Joseph D., *Md*	
Williams, Harrison A., Jr., *N.J.*	
Williams, John J., *Del*	
Yarborough, Ralph, *Tex*	
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak*	Quebec House So.
Young, Stephen M., *Ohio*	

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Francis R. Valeo.
Sergeant at Arms—Robert G. Dunphy.
Chief Clerk—Darrell St. Claire.
Secretary for the Majority—J. S. Kimmitt.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences

Messrs. Anderson (chairman), Russell, Magnuson, Symington, Stennis, Young of Ohio, Dodd, Cannon, Holland, Mondale, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Hickenlooper, Curtis, Jordan of Idaho, Brooke, and Percy.

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Holland, Eastland, Talmadge, Jordan of North Carolina, McGovern, Montoya, Mondale, Byrd of Virginia, Hollings, Aiken, Young of North Dakota, Boggs, Miller, and Hatfield.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell, Ellender, Hill, McClellan, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Pastore, Monroney, Bible, Byrd of West Virginia, McGee, Mansfield, Bartlett, Proxmire, Yarborough, Young of North Dakota, Mundt, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Kuchel, Hruska, Allott, Cotton, Case, and Javits.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell (chairman), Stennis, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Cannon, Byrd of West Virginia, Young of Ohio, Inouye, McIntyre, Brewster, Byrd of Virginia, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Thurmond, Miller, Tower, Pearson, and Dominick.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Sparkman (chairman), Proxmire, Williams of New Jersey, Muskie, Long of Missouri, McIntyre, Mondale, McGee, Spong, Bennett, Tower, Hickenlooper, Brooke, and Percy.

Committee on Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Lausche, Bartlett, Hartke, Hart, Cannon, Brewster, Long of Louisiana, Moss, Hollings, Cotton, Morton, Scott, Prouty, Pearson, and Griffin.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Bible (chairman), Morse, Kennedy of New York, Tydings, Spong, Prouty, Dominick, and Morton.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Long of Louisiana (chairman), Smathers, Anderson, Gore, Talmadge, McCarthy, Hartke, Fulbright, Ribicoff, Metcalf, Harris, Williams of Delaware, Carlson, Bennett, Curtis, Morton, and Dirksen.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Sparkman, Mansfield, Morse, Gore, Lausche, Church, Symington, Dodd, Clark, Pell, McCarthy, Hickenlooper, Aiken, Carlson, Williams of Delaware, Mundt, Case, and Cooper.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Ervin, Gruening, Muskie, Ribicoff, Harris, Kennedy of New York, Metcalf, Montoya, Mundt, Curtis, Javits, Hansen, and Baker.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Jackson (chairman), Anderson, Bible, Church, Gruening, Moss, Burdick, Hayden, McGovern, Nelson, Metcalf, Kuchel, Allott, Jordan of Idaho, Fannin, Hansen, and Hatfield.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Eastland (chairman), McClellan, Ervin, Dodd, Hart, Long of Missouri, Kennedy of Massachusetts, Bayh, Burdick, Tydings, Smathers, Dirksen, Hruska, Fong, Scott, and Thurmond.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), Morse, Yarborough, Clark, Randolph, Williams of New Jersey, Pell, Kennedy of Massachusetts, Nelson, Kennedy of New York, Javits, Prouty, Dominick, Murphy, Fannin, and Griffin.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Monroney (chairman), Yarborough, Randolph, McGee, Brewster, Hartke, Burdick, Hollings, Carlson, Fong, Boggs, and Fannin.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Randolph (chairman), Young of Ohio, Muskie, Gruening, Jordan of North Carolina, Inouye, Bayh, Montoya, Tydings, Spong, Cooper, Fong, Boggs, Murphy, Jordan of Idaho, and Baker.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Jordan of North Carolina (chairman), Hayden, Cannon, Pell, Clark, Byrd of West Virginia, Curtis, Cooper, and Scott.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D.C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 4852 Hutchins Pl.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.
Mr. Justice Brennan, of New Jersey, 3037 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Stewart, of Ohio, 5136 Palisade Lane.
Mr. Justice White, of Colorado, 2209 Hampshire Rd., McLean, Va.
Mr. Justice Fortas, of Tennessee, 3210 R St.
(Vacancy.)

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—John F. Davis, 4704 River Rd.
Deputy Clerk—Edmund P. Cullinan, 4823 Reservoir Rd.
Deputy Clerk—Michael Rodak, 6311 Joslyn Pl., Cheverly, Md.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Rd.
Reporter—Henry Putzel, Jr., 3703 33d St.
Librarian—H. C. Hallam, Jr., 10927 Pleasant Acres Dr., Adelphi, Md.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS
JUSTICES ASSIGNED
TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Fortas. Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Connecticut, New York, Vermont.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Brennan. Delaware, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, West Virginia.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Alabama, Canal Zone, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, Texas.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Stewart. Kentucky, Michigan, Ohio, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: ——— ———. Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice White. Arkansas, Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Alaska, Arizona, California, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Washington, Guam, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice White. Colorado, Kansas, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Utah, Wyoming.

Appendix

Kilmer Job Corps Center

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1967

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, a remarkable thing happened in the Kilmer Job Corps Center in my district during the recent wave of urban riots.

This Job Corps center with 1,700 enrollees at Edison, N.J., lies in the middle of an area which has had several serious disturbances within the last 6 weeks.

I checked to see what took place at Kilmer during the riots.

The worst that happened was that six boys without passes slipped across the road to buy ice cream cones.

Not one disturbance took place at Kilmer.

Not one of these men, themselves once steeped in the ways of the ghetto streets, slipped out of Kilmer to join the street warfare either in nearby cities or in any other city.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, during those tragic—and tragically tempting days to some—at least 20 more boys than otherwise normal returned from leave to take their stand in Kilmer on the side of law, order, decency, and self-fulfillment.

These boys are persons of standing and distinction and I congratulate them and their staff.

I also call your attention to the fact that this successful center is operated by the Federal Electric Corporation, the worldwide service affiliate of ITT, for the Office of Economic Opportunity.

I do not pretend to be smart enough or wise enough to offer a panacea for the recent upheavals which have marred our land. I am concerned about them, as is every other Member of this body.

But I do know that the experiences of the Kilmer Job Corps Center offer many valuable lessons for eradicating the effects of slum life on slum youth—and for giving them the opportunity for self-advancement, which is the gist of the American dream.

In my remarks to the House on February 9, 1967, I stated that what Kilmer has accomplished cannot be measured by training and job-placements alone.

The context in which I then equated Kilmer was that we are at war against the effects of the slum.

We are at war—

I said—

> against the antisocial feelings of the slum, the scoffing of authority, the hatred of the police, the hostility toward society, the destruction of property, the contempt of educational institutions, the flaunting of life and limb.

The peacefulness at Kilmer during the riot period—a period 5 months after my remarks—demonstrates that on one flank at least we indeed are winning a major battle against the effects of the slum.

We have taken boys off the streets from all parts of American cities and made men of them, men who choose to side with the forces of decency.

In the midst of what seems a losing fight, we are winning a major battle.

Why do we always have to say, Learn from our failures? I say let us also learn from our successes such as the one we are experiencing at Kilmer.

Is not one key to take these boys, many of whom spent their lives running around corners from the police—to take these boys off the street and place them in a character building environment?

Let me point out some of the social adjustment programs at Kilmer which accounted for the constructive stance of the Corpsmen during the riots:

First, and perhaps most important, group living has replaced gang life. One out of every 10 Corpsmen is a member of a Lead Corpsman program—that is the name, "Lead Corpsman"—in which his status and prestige arise because he practices socially acceptable behavior—for which he has been trained. His positive behavior serves as a model for other Corpsmen. These Lead Corpsmen, "Big Brothers" to all arriving Corpsmen, also man Courtesy Patrols—that is their name, "Courtesy Patrols"—which have had a marked effect in reducing community incidents, once high, to a minimum.

Kilmer is also the scene of one of the most unusual Explorer Boy Scout programs in the country. More than 350 Corpsmen have gone through this program, many to take Scout leadership posts in their home communities after they leave the Center. One unit, Post 402, is the only one in the Nation to have the designation, "Community Service." Under the sponsorship of the Salvation Army, this Post went into the public housing area of New Brunswick, told the boys there, "Follow in our footsteps," and organized a troop of boys 11 to 13 years old. "Be like us, not like them," they urged, contrasting their own behavior to that of existing street gangs and pool hall groups, this despite the fact that these boys, now matured by Kilmer, were once themselves members of street gangs and pool hall groups.

There are other boys at Kilmer who have organized a project to prevent school dropouts. The amazing thing about the members of this group is that they are all former dropouts themselves. Each regrets dropping out of school, but takes justifiable pride in his current achievements at Kilmer. The members of this group have been going to public schools to encourage potential dropouts to continue with their studies. Their message to those who would follow the way of the streets is "Shape up, man; you're facing trouble."

Mr. Speaker, if anyone in my district needs someone to donate blood, fix tops, solicit for a community drive, paint a church or rehabilitate a park, the chances are that a Kilmer corpsman will be the first to respond. In fact, few, if any, high school or college student bodies can match the outstanding record of Kilmer corpsmen in community help and activities.

These boys—and the manner in which they have responded to character-building programs—bear out the contention I also made on the floor here on February 9, 5 months prior to the July riots, that "there will be few Kilmer boys who will be found among the rioters of the future."

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues will also be pleased to know that more men have enlisted in the armed services from Kilmer than from any other single community in my congressional district. Almost 300 Kilmer boys are in our Armed Forces. Unfortunately, two already have died in Vietnam.

Why is this so?

Listen to the enthusiastic words of Sgt. Joseph Jandura, in charge of the U.S. Army recruitment office in New Brunswick, who alone has processed some 74 enlisted men from Kilmer.

> I am a great supporter of Kilmer. These fellows enlist to further their training and to fulfill their commitment to their country. When we get a recruit trained at Kilmer, we get a man.
>
> Kilmer has more than paid its way in terms of preparing men to serve their country. Ask me.

Mr. Speaker, we are talking of spending millions and millions of dollars for welfare and for rehabilitation of the slums. But here we have a wonderfully successful experience with the merits of taking people out of the slums for training, and qualifying them to take advantage of the wonderful opportunities that exist here.

I salute the men. I salute the staff. If ever there was a group which merits our deepest respect and appreciation; if ever we have funded a program that has proved its worth; and if ever there was a program on whose experience we can chart positive steps for the future, it is the Job Corps. It is the one program which offers the most hope to the youth in the ghetto.

Popular Vote Presidency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1967

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the electoral college remains under attack by the many foes of constitutional government and those who, in their zeal for reform, never take the time to read Madison's notes or understand the reasons for the college.

In all probability the pushers only contemplate a two-party program, or possibly they fear the popular support of George Wallace.

Yet, the project for a direct vote does hold inviting objectives. Abolition of the electoral college would erase the balance of power held by some minorities in large electoral vote States. Nationwide their bloc vote would be of little significance.

On the other hand, with a third party candidate or a fourth party candidate, the President could still be elected by less than a majority of the popular vote.

Mr. Speaker, I here insert in the RECORD an article from the Washington Evening Star for August 23, 1967.

DIRECT ELECTION OF PRESIDENT GETS SUPPORT

Sen. Edward V. Long, D-Mo., and a spokesman for the United Auto Workers Union today urged approval of a constitutional amendment to provide for direct election of the president and vice president.

In separate statements submitted to the Senate subcommittee on constitutional amendments, both Long and Stephen I. Schlossberg, UAW general counsel, supported abolition of the present electoral college system for selecting the nation's top executives.

"If the majority of Americans vote for one candidate, then that candidtte should be the winner," said Long. "The reform I am supporting should have been made 100 years ago."

PRESENT SYSTEM

Under the present system, the president and vice president are chosen indirectly, with voters casting their ballots for electors who in turn are expected to cast ballots for the candidates who receive a plurality of a state's vote.

Schlossberg and Long criticized the present method of casting all of a state's electoral votes for the winning candidate and discarding votes cast for his opponent.

Under certain circumstances, Schlossberg said, such a procedure could allow a minority candidate to win the national election.

Long, a co-sponsor of the proposed amendment, said also that establishment of direct elections would give each citizens' vote equal weight and would strengthen the two-party system in present "one-party" states.

"The present system," Long said, "causes campaign firepower to be first concentrated on the states, the ones with the most electoral votes." He said direct election will provide an incentive for presidential candidates and their parties to work harder in each state.

The statements submitted by Long and Schlossberg join a number of other endorsements for direct presidential election that have been presented to the subcommittee since it began hearings on the proposed amendment last spring.

For an amendment to become part of the Constitution, it must be approved by two-thirds of each of Congress and then ratified by legislatures in three-fourths of the states.

Congressman Wyman Reports to the People of the First District of New Hampshire on Our Dilemma in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1967

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, uppermost in everyone's mind and heart these trying days is our dilemma in Vietnam. I seek to speak frankly to you about Vietnam.

Senator FULBRIGHT told the American Bar Association in Honolulu:

> The United States lacks the moral and psychological capacity to fight both the Vietnamese war and its own urban ills.

He also commented:

> We are truly fighting a two-front war and doing badly in both.

The other night in the Cabinet Room of the White House, President Johnson met with a group of Congressmen, including myself, in a question-and-answer period on Vietnam. At this meeting, he said he would love to negotiate but there was just nobody who would negotiate.

This is true. Of course, the Communists will not negotiate. It is not to their advantage to negotiate. We are being bled white in Vietnam, and they know it. Until they are hurting real badly, the prospect of negotiation is remote.

Those who urge cessation of bombing and unilateral withdrawal are, for all practical purposes, urging outright surrender. Such a step without an agreement would be followed by horrible U.S. losses, wholesale murder of the South Vietnamese and a virtual reduction of U.S. international prestige—if there is any left—to absolute zero.

There are some hard realities of our dilemma in South Vietnam. These are—

First. We cannot pull out on the South Vietnamese, on our own soldiers, our dead and wounded, wholly aside from the domino theory argument.

Second. Even if we are successful and obtain a military victory so that South Vietnam is freed from aggression and left with merely a sporadic guerrilla mopup, the hard fact is that we cannot guarantee that peace will be maintained, even with a U.S. housekeeping force. Nor can we guarantee that there will ever be economic stability in this manifestly unstable oriental nation.

Third. A military victory appears to be impossible to attain in Vietnam without a vastly greater offensive commitment than has been made to date. This will cost more billions, would involve more men and planes and would risk or even invite military confrontations with Red China and perhaps the U.S.S.R.

Fourth. Should Red China get into the military situation in Vietnam and should it send hordes of Red Chinese across the border, the plight of American troops in Vietnam will be desperate, for ground warfare cannot avail against such offensive numbers. There are not enough bullets, nor in all probability can the supply train be maintained. This was proven in North Korea. Should this happen, the United States will be faced with the awful decision of whether to retreat ignominiously or use atomic weapons.

In the meantime, our losses in Vietnam are staggering, the cost is dangerously overheating the U.S. economy, and the raiding of our reserves in the United States has so gravely reduced our capability to defend against any other aggression that the national security is impaired to an extent that would shock and alarm all Americans if they were told the full truth. Into this tiny, faraway country we have poured essential elements of our best combat divisions, our best planes, our best pilots, and untold billions of money and property. The quicksand of Vietnam has absorbed all this and greedily seeks more.

We ought never to have engaged in a land war in this area. Every military man recommended against this, but the Johnson administration has us so deeply involved and committed without even a declaration of war that the levels now exceed Korea.

The man on the street wants us to win or get out. Unfortunately, winning is not all that easy, as can be seen from merely a review of the above realities. Getting out could be done, but before we got through without an agreement, it could look like Dunkirk. This would be tragic and, in the long run, would more certainly expose us to eventual wholesale nuclear attack than anything else we could do.

I hold personal convictions as to what ought to be done in Vietnam, but I am neither a military strategist nor an armchair general. My own son, now 16, will shortly be eligible to serve. Sons of friends throughout New Hampshire are having their turn facing death 10,000 miles away right now. The very least we owe to them, it seems to me, is to do everything of which we are capable to defend them against those who try to kill them in combat in Vietnam. This we are not doing, as a matter of Johnson administration policy in the current stalemate. In such a policy is found both tragedy and dilemma. While most of us try to be Americans ahead of political party in meeting such grave challenges, this becomes difficult when an administration policy of stalemate is so closely derived from political considerations. Civilian control over the military is constitutionally cherished, yet once we are in a military engagement, which is the situation in Vietnam, civilian control should not become civilian restraint of military victory, which is the case at this hour.

But one basic fact of life about Vietnam can safely be asserted at this writing. This is that we cannot afford to continue with a stalemate in Vietnam. If we do, there will be little left at home in

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

the way of reserves or money. Such a gradual erosion of our national defensive and offensive capability is, of course, a common objective of the Communist bloc, whether the U.S.S.R. or Red China. In truth, the policy of stalemate in Vietnam seriously imperils every man, woman, and child in the United States of America, for every day it is allowed to continue there is less and less remaining to protect us in the United States.

I voted for the Tonkin resolution in August of 1964, but in so doing the thought never occurred to me that the executive branch would ever commit this Nation to any military engagement lacking a policy to win. I would not have voted for such a resolution had I known it would be used as a vehicle for justification for the dangerous situation of stalemate that prevails at this hour.

Principles of Charity and Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1967

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, the House has just concluded its consideration of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1967, and the versions of the bill are soon to be reconciled in conference committee. Congress took a much closer look at the program and the overall philosophy behind the program this year, much, I believe, to the benefit of the program and the much-beleaguered American taxpayer.

The September issue of the New Age magazine begins with an editorial which puts into perspective the guiding principles of our American heritage of sharing our knowledge and assistance with other nations.

The editorial was written by Raymond W. Miller, a Californian. His writing has special relevance in light of our recent consideration of the foreign aid bill. Under unanimous consent I include the editorial in the Record:

Sir, Will You Contribute?

(By Raymond W. Miller)

A few weeks ago, while walking on the sidewalk of a busy metropolitan street, I was accosted by a smiling, neat-appearing boy of about sixteen who asked: "Sir, will you contribute?" He held a quart can before me and shook it to let me hear the tinkle of coins. He offered no explanation as to what the contribution would help, nor did his can bear any valid evidence of it. There was only the shaking of the container and the question. Being in a hurry, I shook my head and walked on. The lad immediately shook the can before the next pedestrian and repeated: "Sir, will you contribute?"

As I walked along, my memories took me to Lucknow, India, where professional beggers lie in wait for strangers and travelers. I remembered, too, the streets in Pusan, Korea, during the low ebb of the war in 1951, when Seoul had fallen and it was nip and tuck whether the allies could hold the nation from a complete overrun. Everywhere then were beggers shaking their shawls for a dropping of coins.

The wish for something for nothing might be a perfectly human weakness, but self-respecting people do not indulge it save in extreme need or peril. "Sir, will you contribute?" is a polished American approach to the ancient profession of begging from someone who seems to have something to share. From time immemorial it has been practiced in probably every corner of the world, but seeing a nice-appearing boy on a busy American street plying the trade set me to thinking about some of the trends in our society.

Charity is one of the noblest traits of man and most of us probably agree that, truly, it is more blessed to give than to receive. A practical evaluation of our times, however, proves that needed alms are often dissipated by planned begging that seeks something for nothing. Every pastor or custodian of church offerings or fraternal funds knows of the conniving and indolent, who try to get to the feed trough via this route. As death and estate notices appear in the press, how many human leeches descend upon the survivors with similar requests: "Sir or Madam, will you contribute?" How many requests are received by foundations and trust funds for grants for "make-work" projects which will have little or no lasting benefits to society?

A generation ago, America had county "poorhouses," with an unsavory stigma attached to the poor souls who existed there. Many a handicapped person or one who became a pauper through misfortune simply did not apply to county supervisors for admission to these places because of personal pride. Thinking Americans saw the system cried for change, and one after another legislative enactment was put on the statute books to make it possible for the worthy indigent to retain his self-respect and lead a family life. These laws received the support of the voters of America and the use of tax dollars to help fill the needs of the poor became a part of our economic and political life. It is unfortunate that, in many instances, can-shakers gain access to the government treasury through bills passed by legislators looking for votes.

America is a land of community and group effort to aid the needy. Many hundreds of millions of dollars are voluntarily contributed each year to reputable relief and charitable organizations which do a needed and worthwhile job. Likewise, however, millions are given unwittingly to professional can-shakers. No people on earth are as open-handed and as weepy-hearted as our citizens and each year the coffers of really big, organized tear-jerkers get bigger and bigger.

The young man who shook the can in my face was starting on a career that may bring him money at the expense of the needy, or he may be on the road to becoming a modern Sir Lancelot, doing good where good is needed—even to sharing a dry crust with the hungry.

I continued my walk and contemplation and came to the conclusion that there is a duty incumbent upon those who give to make sure that the gift will help fill a real need, and that charity, except in cases of immediate, extreme distress, is best when used to help others to help themselves, rather than keeping them endlessly in charity lines by a dole without work. Some social workers with "client" poor tend to keep a backlog of needy for many reasons, not the least of which is that they do not want to run out of "clients."

Some of the finest welfare organizations accept money and old goods to help the needy and the handicapped rebuild and refurbish material things for reseale while they rehabilitate themselves and their spirits at the same time. Some help other by educational loans to be repaid to funds for similar use by others, thereby creating a human chain with a good-deed program. Yet another furnishes starter seeds and livestock to a farmer, who will repay in kind from his own produce to help another along the way to self-reliance. There are many ways to help—but the practice of something for nothing is not morally uplifting to the giver, the receiver, nor the community. Most of us need a lift during a lifetime—sometimes money—sometimes advice—but whatever the gift, its value is more lasting if the recipient repays in like or in service either to the giver or someone else.

People the world over are subject to the same built-in laws of behavior. Something for nothing, invariably breeds contempt for the giver and has a deteriorating effect on the receiver. There is a story of an old Greek philosopher who, upon being told a certain person hated him, asked: "I wonder why he should feel so? I have never given him anything."

Church have learned this the hard way. With the best of religious and philanthropic reasons, millions were spent on foreign aid long before governments ever entered this phase of affairs. Some church leaders took literally the injunction, "Freed the hungry," and witnessed a generation of "rice Christians" turning on their benefactors in fury when the going got rough. Other churchmen thought in terms of helping people to help themselves and in such areas there is a long history of adherence to the faith and friendship for the missionary. Our Point 4 program of foreign aid, as originally enunciated by President Harry S. Truman in 1949, was based upon this concept but it soon became almost inundated by a widespread give-away philosophy.

The unfortunate effect of this change in policy was summed up for me in 1959 and again in 1967 by the Right Reverend L. G. Ligutti. In my opinion, this wise churchman takes the pulse of the world and interprets its beat as effectively as any person I know. He said, and I concur:

"Much American surplus food is being distributed in Spain. It's a great work of charity, but I am afraid it is creating in Spain, as elsewhere, a whole group of paupers, and that such result (unwittingly created) is actually harmful to any nation because it debases human personality. A way must be found to give food and clothing to people as a reward for work done. Except in cases of disaster or extreme urgent need, a handout is not a sign of Christian love. We ruin characters when we fill stomachs. I have been told by very responsible people that United States government regulations demand handouts. On the other hand, Congressmen I have talked with insist that such was and is not the intent of the law. It is my earnest conviction that if we cannot figure out a way of distributing surplus food abroad (or at home) without creating a race of paupers, it is better to dump the food in the ocean. 'Them is strong words'—but 'them is my sentiments.' "[1]

Dr. Alexander Nunn, a prominent Methodist layman of the Alabama-West Florida Conference, said an an article which appeared in *The Methodist Christian Advocate* on April 4, 1967:

"I am concerned about Methodism—and again, the American church in its broadest sense—when some of us seem to have swallowed the projected new doctrine that every individual should have a guaranted minimum income for life, regardless of whether he or she ever works."

That the concern these two great and good friends have expressed has long been with us can be seen from this writting of the Spanish rabbi and philosopher, Maimonides, who lived from 1135 to 1204:

"Anticipate charity by preventing poverty; assist the reduced fellowman, either by a considerable gift, or a sum of money, or by teaching him a trade, or by putting him in the way of business, so that he may earn an honest livelihood, and not be forced to the dreadful alternative of holding out his hand for charity. This is the highest step and the summit of charity's golden ladder."[2]

---

[1] From "Can Capitalism Compete?," by Raymond W. Miller. Published by Ronald Press, New York, New York, 1959.

---

[2] From Maimonides' "Charity's Eight Degrees," as quoted in Bartlett's "Familiar Quotations," Garden City Publishing Co., New York, reprinted 1944.

Determined Parents Put Four Through College

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1967

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include the following article from the August 20 edition of the Sunday Star at this point in the RECORD. It tells the story of Mr. and Mrs. Asa L. Brock, the National Urban League's Negro family of the year, and demonstrates what can be accomplished by old-fashioned hard work.

If the Brocks can send four girls to college after starting their family on a salary of $60 a month, I am sure that under today's far better and ever improving conditions, a good many others could do equally as well, let alone exterminate a few rats.

NEGRO FAMILY OF YEAR—DETERMINED PARENTS PUT FOUR THROUGH COLLEGE

PORTLAND, OREG.—A Negro family whose life has been a successful struggle for education will be honored today as the National Urban League's family of the year.

The presentation to Mr. and Mrs. Asa L. Brock of Portland will be made by William J. Trent Jr. of New York City, general chairman of the Urban League conference which opens tonight.

It is an annual award, made to Negro parents who have overcome obstacles and achieved success in raising a family through hard work and determination.

Among the Brocks' obstacles was lack of money, and among their successes was sending their four daughters to college.

While Mrs. Brock sewed and canned—"I canned everything in sight"—and took care of the children, Brock got extra jobs on his days off between runs on the Union Pacific Railroad as a dining car waiter. He was making $60 a month when they started their family in 1925.

Was it hard driving himself all these years? He reflected a moment, then said, "It had to be done. Money was awfully scarce."

The Brocks started early exposing their children to what they saw as the proper life. They took them to the art museum, took bus rides into the suburbs where they could picnic beside a farm and look at the animals, stood in line to get cheap seats at movies they thought the children would enjoy.

Mrs. Brock said many friends thought it odd that they scrimped and saved to make sure their children went to college. But, she added, "It was what we wanted to do. We felt it should be done."

Brock, still working for the Union Pacific after 43 years, is now on a run to Seattle that gets him home each night. He doesn't talk about retiring, says "I'm feeling good."

He also doesn't talk about his age. His hair is grey but his step is brisk, and he finds time—now that he no longer works on his days between runs—to go fishing with his grandchildren.

THREE DAUGHTERS TEACHING

Their daughters are Mrs. Earl C. Johnson, Portland, mother of twin boys, now back in college for a degree in speech therapy; Mrs. Walter Jourdan, mother of three sons, teaching sixth grade mathematics in La Puenta, Calif.; Mrs. Clarence Pruitt, mother of three boys, a kindergarten teacher in Portland; and Mrs. Beverly Hillard, mother of one son, teaching in a Portland elementary school.

What do they see in the future for Negro children?

"Better opportunities," Brock says. But Mrs. Brock adds, "Taking advantage of opportunities starts within the home. Sometimes children rise above their home environment, but mostly it has to start there."

The Courageous Customs Bureau

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1967

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, for over a century the twin ports of Long Beach and Los Angeles, in southern California, have not had a customshouse. During these years these two ports have grown to be amongst the highest density seaborne traffic centers of the entire globe.

Rightly and properly the U.S. Bureau of Customs decided it was time to put its customshouse there, instead of in congested downtown Los Angeles many miles away. It had a beautiful building constructed and was ready to move in this month. But it was beleaguered by a provincial group of Los Angeles downtowners who did not want the move to be made. This group enlisted the aid of several Congressmen. Together they badgered the Commissioner of Customs and his aids unmercifully. When all else failed the downtown group went to court seeking an injunction to prevent the move. They properly got thrown out of court as they should have been. Undoubtedly the judge, as have other fair minded people, concluded that a customs house belongs at a port, not many miles inland just because some selfish interests demand it.

The Bureau of Customs deserves great credit for standing up against this pressure and political heat and sticking to its decision to do the logical and sane thing—namely, to move to the new multi-million-dollar customshouse at the harbor. Powerful forces were brought to bear on Customs, but the dedicated public servants there had the courage to stand up against them. This does great credit to the Commissioner of Customs, his superiors in the Department, and those who work for him. The taxpayers can be reassured that in this instance their true interests were served by men of great strength and moral fortitude as well as wisdom.

The rightful move to the harbor is now being made. The public good is being served. Hats off to the Customs Bureau.

Federal Registrars for Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1967

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the suggestion of our Government that voting observers be sent into Vietnam is a far departure from the image that we are not interfering in that country's internal affairs and that our mission is limited to assistance.

The sanctity of this ballot is now to be supervised by the U.S. State Department. This sounds similar to the illiterate Voting Rights Act used as an excuse to suspend the people's constitution in our Southern States in order to put Federal spies in the voting booth.

If we cannot trust the South Vietnamese to conduct their own elections, how can we trust them to lead their sons into battle against the common enemy, Godless communism?

Or, can our no-win, soft-on-communism now be extended to the ballot box—we don't want the anti-Communists to win the election.

Mr. Speaker, I include an article from the August 23d Washington Daily News following my remarks:

UNITED STATES WEIGHS SENDING VOTE OBSERVERS

President Johnson, who has already warned the Saigon government against any election rigging, is considering sending a team of observers to South Vietnam for the presidential balloting next month.

The President's plans came to light shortly after it was disclosed that South Vietnamese Premier Nguyen Cao Ky had written Congress a letter defending his miliary regime's handling of the election campaign.

The letter, dated Aug. 21 and addressed to speaker John W. McCormack (D-Mass.) and Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey as President of the Senate, plainly was in response to charges by some congressmen that the Sept. 3 presidential balloting might be fraudulent.

SMARTING

Marshal Ky, smarting from earlier complaints in Congress about the election campaign, had invited U.S. legislators to come to Saigon to see for themselves, but the Senate leadership rejected the idea.

He asked that his letter yesterday be conveyed to all members of Congress Mr. McCormack ordered it inserted into the Congressional Record, and House Democratic leader Carl Albert, (D.-Okla.), urged all members to read it.

"The defense of freedom in Vietnam requires more than our joint efforts at war," wrote Marshal Ky. "It involves first and foremost our mutual commitment to the achievement of democracy and social justice. Should we stray from that basic commitment or should you misconstrue our purposes, our alliance would indeed be in jeopardy."

Marshal Ky is a vice presidential candidate on a ticket headed by Lt. Gen. Nguyen Van Thieu, now chief of state in the military government that rules the country. He said his government would "readily accept" the verdict of the voters Sept. 3.

H. H. H. BACKING

Meanwhile Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey said here yesterday that President Johnson is following the "safest way, the surest way" to bring the Vietnam war to an end without bringing other countries into the conflict.

He defended the Administration's war goals in response to questions after he addressed 45 legislators from 28 states attending a meeting of Democratic state legislative leaders sponsored by the Democratic National Committee.

Nation Dies as Anarchy Rules

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1967

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

[From the San Diego Union, Aug. 20, 1967]

"THERE LIVES NO GREATER FIEND"—NATION DIES AS ANARCHY RULES

This is the anatomy of an anarchy.

Once upon a time there was a nation that was the mightiest on earth.

It had the highest refinements of individual liberties, the most food and luxuries, the best education and the strongest weapons. Opportunities for its people were unlimited, although some problems existed.

It came to pass that this Utopia of the 20th Century had a conscience as well as gold and mead. In the jargon of its time, it thus began a total systems attack on the problem.

It allowed people to say they did not have to obey the law if they did not like it—indeed disobey jurists seeking to enforce the law.

Violence breeds violence and the pestilence of anarchy spreads upon the land.

Its highest practitioners could be found among those on the campuses of the highest educational institutions. Preachments of socialism and anarchy and sedition became the mode and were tolerated. The calls for self destruction were financed by tithes upon all the people.

Then it came to pass that politicians saw fertile valleys in what they had thought was barren land. They promised to pay the rent. They promised to pay the indolent wages. They told the lazy they were unfortunate victims of the more well-to-do. They told the stupid it was education's fault they could not learn.

The promising politicians promised even more. And they used the tithes to support schools for hatred of the type they were promising to eliminate. Nay, they did not even chide the disciples of hate and division who travelled far to revile their native land.

Lo, the officials fanned the flames of anarchy and sowed further seeds of violence by allowing excessive handiwork of hoodlums to continue far too long.

So it came to pass that fire scorched the earth and the buildings of the cities, hurting most of those the nation earnestly sought to help. Behold, the promising politicians wrung their hands and promised more although they could not fulfill the goals already set. They further studied the problem which has been reviewed since Cain slew Abel.

Like the fungus it is, anarchy now is beginning to threaten the seeds of its own nativity. As Sophocles, the wise, once said:

"There lives no greater fiend than anarchy;
"She ruins states, turns houses out of doors,
"Breaks up in rout the embattled soldiery."

We have seen the fiend attacking our state, growing bolder with each unpunished success. And once upon a time it will come to pass that the state itself will be endangered and the soldiery will be routed if we do not come to our senses.

For as another wise man, Edmund Burke, once said: "By gnawing through a dike, even a rat may drown a nation." There now are packs of them at the dikes.

Unscrambling the Poverty Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1967

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, soon Congress will be faced with the task of amending the poverty program. In addition, many urban programs are pending before the congressional committee.

Recently the Christian Science Monitor editorialized on the work of Congress in this area. The editorial points to the challenge confronting Congress and the administration, as follows:

UNSCRAMBLING THE POVERTY PROGRAM

When faced with a complicated problem a thoughtful man first sits down and tries to think it out. He gets as many facts as he can, sorts out the fundamental from the superficial, outlines his priorities and then decides how, when, and where to tackle the question. This is the right way to meet a major challenge. And it is just as valid for the Administration in Washington, as it faces the tremendous social crisis in American cities, as it is for an individual citizen workng out his own personal problems.

Perhaps never before in American history has there been a greater feeling of confusion, of drift and cross-purpose over any crisis than there is over today's urban racial issue. While recognizing the need for quick action, we doubt if any action taken in the present mood of confusion will be effective.

During the three or more years of the Great Society's lifetime, a flood of new measures has poured forth from Washington. While sincerely motivated, these multitudinous measures have left the country bewildered. The average citizen feels that a great deal has been done but that very little has been accomplished. And his bewilderment is only increased when the President, as he did Friday, notes that there are some "15 or 20" urban bills pending before Congress. Hearing this we are all impelled to ask: are that many bills necessary, how many are duplicative, which ones seek to do too much, which ones will fall far short? In short, word that there are a dozen and a half or so bills before Congress on city problems does not automatically reassure us. Nor, for example, does the knowledge that there are now two-dozen housing bills pending, and that each is caught up in all kinds of political crosscurrents.

What is desperately needed today is decisive national leadership, which will help define and clarify the urban social crisis. The various threads of this crisis need to be drawn into a few easily understandable strands which can then be subjected to all-out treatment. Popular pressure for action can never be brought effectively to bear when only a few experts can be expected to keep in mind the multifarious programs now on the books and which are all in different states and stages of implementation.

We do not ignore the fact that the problem is many-sided and complicated. We do not deny that it must be attacked on more than one front. But we do believe very strongly that the first requisite for effective action must be to rid the poverty program of the stifling clouds of confusion which today greatly lessen its effectiveness. This will be achieved only by a determined White House effort to simplify the poverty program and concentrate national effort at a few key points.

Rat Sterilization Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. GOODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1967

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, debate in this Chamber over the past weeks since the defeat of the rule on H.R. 11000, the administration's rat extermination bill, has unfortunately missed one essential point. National debate over the merits of such legislation has also missed the same point: Simple rat eradication programs are not a comprehensive answer to reduction of the menace posed by rats.

It is an unfortunate fact of life that rats reproduce as fast as we exterminate them. If an eradication program was 80 percent successful in a given area, studies have shown that without other preventive measures, the entire area would be repopulated with rats within a year after completion of the program. Such eradication programs as we now observe rarely approach even 80 percent effectiveness, and that compilcates conditions seriously, in that 10 females and 2 males can produce 3,000 young within a year. False hope so generated produces further urban frustration.

A recent statement from my Governor, Nelson A. Rockefeller, of New York, holds real promise for meaningful rat population control. The Governor has instructed an agency of our State government to proceed immediately with a scientifically sound research proposal to develop a workable rat sterilization program.

I submit that the development of chemosterilants is one of the more encouraging attempts at rat eradication. Further, I am encouraged by the fact that a State government has proposed a comprehensive program to provide significant relief from the menace of rats.

I commend Governor Rockefeller's statement and program proposal to the attention of my colleagues:

RAT STERILIZATION PROGRAM

Governor Rockefeller announced today the initiation by the New York State Department of Health of a program of rat sterilization for New York State to supplement existing methods of rat control.

This move is part of the Administration's objective of mobilizing the best scientific talent to meet today's problems.

The Governor said, "the approaches to the problem of rat control have shown very little advance since the Middle Ages. All existing programs, based on rat extermination, have proved inadequate. A recent scientific breakthrough now gives us an opportunity of developing a two-phased attack on the very serious problem of rat infestation, particularly in the urban areas. Thanks to scientific research we now have a potential method, both inexpensive and safe, for rendering infertile a very high percentage of the rat population in urban centers."

The Governor announced that Dr. Sheldon Segal, Director of the Bio-medical Division of the Population Council and Dr. Harry W. Rudel, the Division's Associate Director, brought to his attention experiments on inhibiting the fertility of both female and male rats using the compound mestranol.

According to Dr. Segal, $500 worth of this compound, used in ordinary rat bait, will sterilize a million rats for three years.

The Governor announced that Dr. Hollis S. Ingraham, Commissioner of the New York State Department of Health, will initiate a program, in cooperation with Dr. Segal and Dr. Rudel, to conduct field trials, under controlled conditions, in rat infested areas in New York City and elsewhere. The field trials will include measures to destroy rat harbourage and to clean up sources of rat food, since no type of poison or anti-fertility agent can be fully successful by itself. In the meantime, the State will continue with its rat extermination program using conventional methods.

On July 31, the Governor announced a $4.5 million emergency rat control program for the State. As a result of this announcement, Doctors Segal and Rudel informed the Governor of the work on rat sterilization.

The Governor added, "the problem of rat destruction of food crops is enormous not only in the United States but throughout the world." Also present at today's news conference was Dr. Clifton R. Wharton, Acting Director of the Agricultural Development Council, who noted, for example, that food grain losses in India, due to rats, are twice as large as the total United States' shipment of food grain to India.

RAT CONTROL THROUGH ANTIFERTILITY AGENTS

The control of rat population through the use of anti-fertility agents has been a most intriguing possibility since the discovery of these substances. Initial experiments with the compounds were somewhat disappointing because of dosage and baiting problems.

Recently however, Rudel and his co-workers using mestranol (ethinyl estradiol 3-methyl ether) reported inhibition of fertility in laboratory reared rats fed, for a period of 10 days, a bait containing extremely minute quantities of the compound. If these results can be duplicated in wild rats mestranol will offer a most effective new weapon for controlling one of man's oldest and most implaceable enemies.

The potential of mestranol as a rat control agent is such that it merits careful study and further evaluation under both laboratory and field conditions. Accordingly a three-phase study will be conducted.

Phase I.—Will consist primarily of further laboratory evaluation of bait acceptance, species tolerance or resistance, frequency of feeding and dosage of anti-fertility substance required. Study protocol will be developed in consultation with Drs. Rudel and Segal and staff.

Phase II.—Will consist of a pilot study made in a carefully selected environment evaluating under field conditions results obtained in Phase I or by others. This phase might not be required if the laboratory tests are adequate in scope and the results clear cut.

Phase III.—Since final analysis of anti-fertility effect must of necessity be made under field conditions, Phase III will be an adequately controlled, large-scale study undertaken in a carefully selected urban and/or rural area.

A. Objectives

Study and evaluate the effectiveness of anti-fertility agents such as mestranol, in controlling rat population as an adjunct to existing rat eradication techniques.

B. Procedure—Phase I

Laboratory evaluation of anti-fertility agents and bait acceptance.

1. Review existing reports and field studies on use of anti-fertility agents for the control of rat populations.
2. Select agent or agents to be used for field trials; determine dosage and frequency of feeding of anti-fertility agent.
3. Determine bait formulations and acceptance.
4. Evaluate results.

C. Procedure—Phase II—Pilot field study

1. Study and evaluate literature.
2. Select a study area or areas of sufficient size to provide meaningful data. The study areas should have adequate rat populations and be isolated to prevent in-migration and out-migration. Possible places might be (a) an island in New York City or Upstate New York; (b) open dumps located in isolated areas; (c) selected urban areas as in New York City, Yonkers, New Rochelle, Albany, Rochester or Buffalo.
3. Determine existing rat populations in the study areas. Measurement techniques would include (a) trappings; (b) food consumption; (c) tracking; (d) fecal dropping counts.
4. Distribute anti-fertility agent or agents in accordance with a previously determined plan of action. Evaluate bait acceptance, dosage and frequency of feeding.
5. Periodically determine rat populations in test and control areas.
6. Sample and study rat populations, both male and female, for evidences of inhibition of reproduction.
7. Evaluate results.

D. Procedure—Phase III

Full scale field study.

1. Study and evaluate literature.
2. Select study areas, both urban and rural, with rat populations sufficient to provide meaningful results. Possible urban places might be selected areas in New York City, Yonkers, New Rochelle, Albany, Rochester or Buffalo.
3. Determine existing rat populations in the study areas. Measurement techniques would include (a) trapping, (b) food consumption, (c) tracking, (d) dropping counts.
4. Distribute anti-fertility agent or agents in accordance with a previously determined plan of action, and compare relative effectiveness of controlling rat populations with conventional rat control techniques with use of anti-fertility agents along or combined with conventional ratacidal substances.
5. Periodically determine rat populations in test and control areas.
6. Sample and study rat populations, both male and female, for evidences of inhibition of reproduction.
7. Evaluate results.

E. Budget for rat population control studies

Phase I:

Laboratory evaluation of anti-fertility levels required for rat species to be controlled; determination of optimal doses and bait acceptance.

A. Duration, 3 to 12 months.
B. Estimated Cost, $2000 to $6000.
Phase II—Pilot field study:
A. Duration—2 to 5 years:
B. Estimated cost—first year:

1. Preparation of study area including construction of rat barriers	$100,000
2. Staff	88,240
3. Equipment:	
Vehicles (3)	12,000
Office equipment	5,000
Lab and field equipment	10,000
4. Maintenance and operation:	
Bait, crating portage	$15,000
5. Travel, including out-of-state	15,000
6. Miscellaneous	15,000
Total	260,240

Phase III—Field study:

Estimated annual cost is essentially the same as for Phase II, except for site preparations, office equipment and possibly motor vehicles.

1. Staff	$88,240
2. Equipment	5,000
3. Maintenance and operation	15,000
4. Travel, including out-of-state	15,000
5. Miscellaneous	15,000
Total	138,240

Who Won?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 28, 1967

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government increasingly is invading the field of private enterprise and setting up competition for the free enterprise effort.

An article on this theme appeared in the August 29, 1967, issue of the Wall Street Journal, pointing out how the Rural Electrification Administration had extended a loan of $22 million to 13 co-ops for the purpose of building a $30 million electric generating plant.

As the article points out, the plant was opposed by private utilities on the grounds that this facility would duplicate existing facilities and, therefore, prove a disadvantage to the consumers of electricity.

Mr. Speaker, I think this article graphically illustrates how the Rural Electrification Administration indulges in abusive use of 2 percent money to promote electrical facilities that are not needed and must be paid for by the taxpayer. It is interesting to note that the article concerned is entitled "Who Won" and most appropriately—in tune with the spirit of the article—the following words could be added to that title: "The Taxpayer Lost."

I insert this article into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and I commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

WHO WON?

For a while there, it appeared that a couple of investor-owned electric companies in Colorado had stopped a Federally financed invasion of their service areas dead in its tracks. But appearances can be deceptive, especially where Federal money is involved.

In the Colorado case, there was a lot of it involved. About $22 million, in fact, loaned by the Rural Electrification Administration to 13 co-ops forming the Colorado-Ute Electric Association to build a $30 million electric generating plant.

That plant was opposed by Public Service Co. of Colorado and Utah Light & Power Co., which contended that the Colorado-Ute facilities would duplicate, and hence, compete with, their own facilities and that the 13 co-ops in effect would be raiding their customers.

Early last year the Colorado Supreme Court ruled that the co-ops' Colorado-Ute plant was illegal and ordered it demolished. However, the court granted the co-ops a stay to see if some other solution could be worked out.

To be sure, it would have been a big waste of materials and money—mostly the public's money—if the co-ops' new $30 million plant had been torn down. And it wasn't. Like the heroine in "The Perils of Pauline," the co-op plant emerged unscathed.

And how was this feat managed? One explanation is that the REA itself used certain persuasive arguments in talks with the opposing private utilities. For instance, Barron's observes that "like many Western utilities, Public Service must do business with another Federal agency, the Bureau of Reclamation, and Uncle Sam can apply plenty of heat." The bureau not only is a power producer in its own right but also controls a lot of Western water power sources.

However it was engineered, an agreement has been reached under which the co-ops' Colorado-Ute plant will be in operation after all. The co-ops have agreed, as the needs of its members increase, to buy a certain amount of electricity from Public Service Co. of Colorado. That utility in turn agrees to buy the co-ops' surplus power for six years beginning in 1968. After that the Reclamation Bureau gets first call on any surplus.

Plainly this is not going to satisfy either the expansion-minded, REA-financed co-ops or the private companies whose territory has been infringed on. If the battle is over—temporarily, at least—who won?

Well, that $30 million REA-financed plant, which never should have been built in the first place, now is very much in business. If any supportable conclusion can be drawn, it is that unless Government-financed enterprises are blocked at the blueprint stage, their mighty momentum carries them on. And on.

Psychedelic Defenders of America?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1967

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, the extent of "hippy" influence within the younger generation of Americans and what it portends for the America that lies around the corner of the future, is a profound problem. It is a matter of increasing concern to those of the present generation who must depend on the next generation to protect it in the golden years of seniority. Compared with the youth of the Soviet Union, as an example, can they do it? Will they?

In this connection I commend the letter of Arnold Apple of Potomac, Md., to the attention of concerned citizens. It appeared in the Washington Star of August 26, 1967.

The letter follows:

POTOMAC, MD.

LERNER AND THE HIPPIES

SIR: I would like to comment on Max Lerner's column, "Hippies Reveal a Values Revolution."

Mr. Lerner is obviously more learned than I, and certainly handles his words and ideas in a much more sophisticated manner. Nevertheless, he reveals an unsophisticated knowledge of the world we live in, not only today, but for generations to come.

He is abominably weak on history; especially on the history of civilizations. The revolution he speaks of has always been in the minds of dreamers. The fact that a small minority has had the courage to bring it in the open does not make it a revolution in any sense.

I am sure that Mr. Lerner is aware that civilizations are created and maintained by brutal realists, and not dreamers; and that if a revolution of the type he writes of were to actually take place, it would be the end of Western Civilization as we know it.

Our society and our country were not built by nonachievers. It was built by the efforts of men who, when the varnish was removed, proved to be the biggest band of cut-throats, thieves and pirates the world has ever known. I assure you, Mr. Lerner, this country did not achieve greatness and power because of any flower throwing . . . although the fuzzy thinking of the flower throwers may well toss this country down the drain.

I would like to bring in the words of my father-in-law, a first generation American, who literally brought himself and his family up by brute force. When faced with a problem of human behavior that went against the grain of all logic, he would simply state: "It is not the nature of man."

I would point out to Mr. Lerner that steel, without tempering, is practically worthless. Preceding generations have always had a "tempering medium," whether a national involvement in war, recession or depression, which taught discipline and self-control. This sheltered generation has had no tempering, and may well be as worthless as untempered steel.

We have sheltered them, coddled them, and protected them from every unpleasantness that might have strengthened their character and moral fibre. We have produced (I hope with exceptions in large numbers) a generation that will not be able to maintain the forward impetus of this country, but will stall it completely, if not put it into reverse.

ARNOLD APPLE.

Answer to Rebuttal on Minority Views Regarding U.S. Aid to India

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1967

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, on August 21, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRASER] took issue with the minority views on the Foreign Assistance Act of 1967. His rebuttal centered around the group's views on the problems of India, particularly the issue of sacred animal life and agricultural production.

As a coauthor of those minority views, I feel it is necessary to correct several statements which the gentleman made regarding our section on U.S. aid to India.

The first issue is India's food production.

The point which our minority views made was a simple one—that there are enough calories in India today if she would only tap her resources at hand. India must reexamine her reverence for the life of animals or there is little hope for her to stave off starvation of untold millions of her people.

Recently, Indian scholars have said that the ancient writing have been misinterpreted and that present-day reverence is not based upon the scriptures, but upon custom and tradition. We believe that India should take a long, hard look at the historic sources of her current situation. That was the thrust of our main argument.

In particular reference to the gentleman's statements, however, there is much open to doubt. He states:

> Even though only 2 years has passed since the beginning of the agricultural revolution in India, significant progress has been accomplished.

Let us look at the facts. I do not know where the figure of 2 years was secured, but it is not easily reconciled with an article in the current issue of the Hindu Weekly Review, an Indian publication, dated August 21, 1967. The article quotes the President of India, Dr. Hussain, saying:

> We are, it seems to me, poised for a major breakthrough in the matter of agricultural production . . . In ten years or perhaps even in five, I am sure we shall see our country as the center of a great economic change.

It is very interesting that in the President's remarks, ostensibly aimed at revealing agricultural progress, President Hussain turns instead to a recitation of industrial progress. However, his phrases, despite the political optimism, seem to clearly refute the statement that great strides have been made over the past 2 years. We may well be on the brink of a breakthrough in India, we may be able to help with fertilizer and new seeds and water in the next decade, but these are not programs geared to the immediate problem of widespread starvation.

The second point is more important. Reference was made to the minority position on the problem of rat control and sacredness of cows and other animal life. The gentleman from Minnesota said the Government is aware of the problem and is conducting research and training centers. Again, this is an excellent example of where a thrilling announcement has been made, but there is little evidence of action. Let us look at the facts.

On January 4, 1967, the Washington Post carried an article which points up the seriousness of the problem. It is entitled "India's Revered Rat, Gobble U.S. Grain," and concludes that there are probably five rats for each of India's roughly 500 million inhabitants. Most of these rodents live out their lives unharmed in order to avoid offending the Hindu god of good luck, Ganesh, who reportedly rides on a rat's back. Further, the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, in its report of 1966 states:

> The losses in stored rice caused by rodents consist of losses in weight, losses in quality and other losses from gnawing on bags, structures, lead pipes, electrical wires, etc. If rat population equals human population, as has sometimes been suggested, and if one rat consumes about 9 kilograms of grains per year, the annual loss in quantity alone in a country with a human population of 50 million would be 450,000 tons.

This loss figure when applied to India, therefore, would be multiplied ten-fold, or a total of 4.5 million tons if we use

FAO's conservative one-to-one ratio. If the Post's five-to-one ratio, as developed by a West German research team in India, is used, that figure escalates rapidly to an impressive 22.5 million tons consumed annually by rats.

The Washington Post article goes on to name other pests in India which live a good life, quite undisturbed for the most part. Among these are bandicoots, which resemble cat-sized rats, and do immense damage to crops at the same time that they are a threat to infants. Wild birds, crows, roaming dogs and monkeys add to the damage, and the national bird, the peacock, has become a major pest.

Pesticide control was also mentioned.

But what does the U.S. Department of Agriculture have to say about these programs in India. Their publication Agriculture in India says:

> The use of chemical insecticides and fungicides is retarded in India by economic and religious considerations. The low yields for most crops make the use of chemicals economically prohibitive and the vast majority of Indians are Hindu, part of whose philosophy, ahimsa, prohibits the killing of any animal life. Therefore, plant protection measures directed toward the destruction of insect and animal life have two formidable deterrents to overcome before widespread progress can be made.

Most importantly, however, were the statements which the gentleman made about the cows in India. The statement said the cattle were indispensable to the rural economy and are used for milking and draught purposes. Let us look at the facts.

A firsthand observer of the Indian cattle situation is Dr. O. R. Whyte, of the Asian regional office of the FAO. In a recent article published in the Far Eastern Economic Review, Dr. Whyte details all phases of the cattle issue. He explains:

> People use the pat phrase, "the cattle wealth of India." In reality, we are faced with the paradoxical situation in which, in a country with a quarter of the world's cattle population, there are not sufficient strong male animals to cultivate the land, nor sufficient productive females to produce the milk so urgently needed to correct chronic malnutrition in the vulnerable sections of the community—children and pregnant and nursing mothers."

Dr. Whyte goes on to say:

> The surplus cattle population is growing like the human population at the rate of 2% *per annum*, and its maintenance in an unproductive state is an important cause of rural indebtedness and consequent lack of progress.

He continues:

> The cattle poverty of India is revealed in the accompanying table—a deficiency of at least 25 million strong males to cultivate the land, and 55 million cows to produce milk more economically than is possible from the buffalo, which as present produces 80% or more of the milk in India. As the *Indian Dairyman* pointed out earlier this year, the buffalo has too many idle, unproductive years in its life cycle to give an economic return on the investment in feeding. As soon as possible, it must be replaced by the cross-bred European-indigenous cow in those parts of India to which this superior animal is adapted.

The table which Dr. Whyte referred to gives a detailed analysis of the cattle population of India:

The Cattle Balance Sheet

	Million
Total bovine population, 1961 census	225
Buffaloes	45
Cattle, male and female	180
Males (50 percent, there being no slaughter)	90
Males, percentage strong enough for work (cultivation and draught), not more than 50 percent	45
Males required as bullocks to cultivate 350 million acres of land at one pair per 10 acres (excluding those needed for draught which are decreasing with the growth of motor transport)	70
Females, 50 percent of total	90
Females (cows) with a sufficient potential milk production for use in a dairy industry, not more than 10 percent	9
Females needed to provide 6 oz. (one-sixth of a litre) per head of human population per day (i.e. 80 million litres per day, from cows giving 2,000 litres per lactation (all-India average at present 250 litres per lactation)	64

Further information is obtained from the March 1967 issue of the magazine, Natural History:

> It must be admitted that the Indian dairy industry is among the least efficient in the world. In India, the average annual yield of whole milk per cow has been reported at 413 pounds, as compared with an average of over 5,000 pounds in Europe and the United States. Furthermore, of the 79.4 million cows maintained in 1961, only 20.1 million were milk producers. Among the 47.2 million cows over three years old, 27.2 million were dry and/or not calved. If we go on to accept the proposition that India can make no profit from the negligible slaughter of its enormous cattle supply, we have completed the case for the great cattle bungle. Hence the conclusion of a 1959 Ford Foundation report on India's food problem:
>
> "There is widespread recognition, not only among animal husbandry officials, but among citizens generally, that India's cattle population is far in excess of the available supplies of fodder and feed . . . At least one third, and probably as much as one half, of the Indian cattle population may be regarded as surplus in relation to feed supply."
>
> This view is endorsed by government agronomists, and the Indian Ministry of Information insists that "the large animal population is more a liability than an asset in view of our limited land resources."

Dr. Raymond Miller, a close observer of Indian affairs, in a detailed report, comments on the use of the cows for work:

> Also lumbering along through the streets were countless oxcarts carrying supplies from the docks to the city. There were propelled by bullock power, not by now power as used in Germany, Austria and in other countries where the cow has become a beast of burden. I have never seen a cow in India being worked as a draft animal, nor have my associates who have been there . . . The bullocks that provide the power for the plows are strong. They are hungry, tired and often have open sores under their yokes. The cows, on the other hand, often lead a much easier life—at least they have more time to scrounge for food because they are not hooked to plows, water pumps nor carts.

These facts clearly refute the gentleman's statements.

What this means in terms of the American foreign aid program is that the United States is blindly continuing to aid a country which must make a more vigorous effort to help itself. India must reexamine her traditions and the sources of her present food problem. This is not the time for blind optimism and use of statistics which, in addition to being false, only mislead supporters of our present policy into believing progress is being made. We are talking about a tragedy affecting the largest democracy in the world. We are talking about the dire need for the United States to insist that the Indian Government make drastic changes. We must use our assistance to India as a lever for speeding these changes. That is the point of the minority views, and it is a view which is firmly established and supported by the best authorities in this matter. It is also supported by the facts, not wishful thinking, on what we hope the situation might be.

Illinois Assembly Resolution for Tax Relief for Higher Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1967

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that every Member of Congress is familiar with the everincreasing cost of a college education. Because of the rising costs, many parents have elected to send their college-bound youngsters to the less costly State-supported universities; and, because of this understandable parental inclination, public and private institutions alike have suffered, the former from over-enrollment, the latter from underenrollment.

The following resolution, petitioning the Congress to enact tax relief legislation for those financing a college education, was drafted by the 75th General Assembly of the State of Illinois and I include in the RECORD at this point:

H.J. RES. 48

A resolution by the 75th General Assembly, House of Representatives, State of Illinois

(House Joint Resolution 48, offered by Messrs. Katz, Warman, Pierce, Mrs. Chapman, Messrs. Merlo, and Mann)

Whereas, the rising costs of attending a college or university has placed a tremendous financial burden upon the parent or guardian who is financing a student through college or upon the student who must work in order to obtain a college education; and

Whereas, if Congress enacted legislation amending the Federal tax laws to provide a tax relief for students or those supporting students, the financial burden accompanying the students attendance at an institution of higher education would be considerably reduced; and

Whereas, the advantages to the State as a result of such a tax relief would greatly exceed that of easing only the taxpayers financial burden, for legislation of this type would allow more students to attend private institutions, thereby increasing the funds available to these institutions to continue to advance their educational purposes, and the increase in attendance in private universities would necessarily reduce overcrowding of State supported universities and reduce the State's financial responsibility to these institutions; and

Whereas, It is of primary interest and concern to the State to make private institutions more accessible by allowing a tax relief to students or those financing students, because the increase in attendance at private schools would not only make available more class room and dormitory space in the State supported schools for those who do not desire or cannot afford to go elsewhere, but would also allow the State institutions to expand and improve their other facilities; and

Whereas, The Federal tax laws, which now give favorable treatment to a taxpayer who makes a contribution towards socially important activities, such as charitable contributions and contributions to educational institutions, have no provisions for favorable treatment for the contribution of a parent who provides for the education of his own child which contribution is as socially important to our society and the State as the contribution of the parent who provides for the education of someone else through his contribution to the educational institution; therefore, be it

Resolved, By the House of Representatives of the Seventy-fifth General Assembly of the State of Illinois, the Senate concurring herein, that the General Assembly respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to enact legislation amending the Federal tax laws in order to provide a tax relief to the student or those financing the student for the expenses of receiving an education at an institution of higher education; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of State forward a copy of this resolution to every member of Congress of the United States from the State of Illinois.

Adopted by the House, June 20, 1967.

— —
Speaker of the House.
FREDRIC B. SELCKI,
Clerk of the House.

Concurred in by the Senate, June 28, 1967.

SAMUEL H. SHAPIRO,
President of the Senate.
EDWARD E. FERNANDES,
Secretary of the Senate.

Vietnam: Its Effect on the Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN G. DOW
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 28, 1967

Mr. DOW. Mr. Speaker, in his address on August 11, 1967, before the Commonwealth Club of California at the Sheraton Palace Hotel in San Francisco, Marriner S. Eccles, board chairman of Utah Construction & Mining Co., and former Federal Reserve Board Chairman under Presidents Roosevelt and Truman, strongly urged withdrawal from Vietnam.

Following his address, in answer to a question about the possible collapse of our economy if the war were to end, Eccles replied:

> For us to admit that we have to fight a war killing tens of thousands of Vietnamese as well as our own boys in order to have prosperity in our country seems to me to be an admission of incompetency.

The San Francisco Chronicle commenting on Eccles' talk said:

> He encountered a surprisingly enthusiastic capacity audience.

The San Francisco Examiner reported:

> He struck out with surprising vehemence against U.S. involvement in Vietnam. Even more surprising was the warmth with which the group of professional and businessmen received his remarks.

These follow below:

VIETNAM: ITS EFFECT ON THE NATION

The Kosygin visit to this country has given us all cause to seriously think about the Soviet Union, our relationship to it, and the relationship of both of us to the greater and more compelling world problems. Upon the solution of these problems hangs the survival of both the United States and Russia, and perhaps the world. As Senator Fulbright so aptly stated: "America is showing signs of that arrogance of power which has afflicted, weakened, and in some cases destroyed great nations in the past." Never before has there been such valid reason for the fears that beset us. Never before has there been reason to feel that the human race was speeding along the road to possible oblivion.

The most important issue before the country today is our involvement in Vietnam. It affects every facet of our lives and our relationship to the rest of the world. Are the sacrifices imposed justified by the stakes of war? What are the reasons and justification, if any, for our involvement in Vietnam?

For the past twenty years our government has believed that communism intends to conquer the world—by force, if persuasion does not succeed—and that it is the duty of the United States to save the world from that fate. The American picture of aggressive communism is unreal.

The President believes that aggressive monolithic groups are making war in South Veitnam. Under the Truman Doctrine of Containment, communism has continued to spread. It has advanced through revolutions rather than by military aggression. But while communism has been advancing, the power of Russia over the communist world has been waning. It is evident that communism is not a monolithic world power. Russia has its differences with the Yugoslavs. The Chinese and Russians have conflicts of national interest which override communism. The threat of a united communist world does not exist. National rivalries divide the communist states as well as democracies.

It is apparent that communist countries are as intensely nationalist as others. They crave independence and resent interference. They will fight against domination—from whatever source: either capitalist or other communist country.

The Administration believes that the war in Vietnam is being made solely by communist intervention from without. This does not explain the tenacity of the Viet Cong. They are not Russians, Chinese or North Vietnamese communists; they are South Vietnamese. They are fighting for national liberation and unity of South Vietnam: the causes for which others, including Americans, have fought.

We see every rebellion as the result of a deep plot out of Moscow or Peking, when it usually is the result of crushing poverty, hunger and intolerable living conditions. The aim of revolution, no matter what ideology, is to achieve the values of self-determination, economic security, racial equality and freedom. Let us not forget that while our road was not via communism, we did, as a nation, emerge from revolution.

We might as well face it: there may be more communist countries in the world. But we need not panic at this. Communist nations vary widely; each has a different version of communist theory to fit its own problems. The more of these countries there are, the greater their diversity.

Communism is only part of a broad movement: the rising of desperate people in Asia, Africa, and Latin America. We crush insurrection in one place, only to find a revolution—whether communist, socialist or nationalist—springing up somewhere else. With military bases around the world and ships in every ocean, a revolution takes place in Cuba, 90 miles off our shore.

How can we reconcile what we are doing to the South Vietnamese under the guise of saving them from communism? We have destroyed vast areas of their country. We have killed, wounded or burned more than one million children, as well as countless parents, brothers, husbands and sons. The family has been smashed. We can only guess at the terrible long-range social effects that will result from our actions. No wonder the great majority of the people do not consider us their savior, but hate us and want us to get out of their country.

Despite this, the United States military has increasingly taken over the war. In 1965 one American was killed for eight South Vietnamese; in 1966, one for two; and to date in 1967, one for one. U.S. casualties through 1966 were over 8,000 killed and almost 38,000 wounded. Projected for 1967 alone, based on actual figures for the first six months: 11,190 killed; 64,264 wounded, making a projected total to the end of this year of 19,344 killed and 102,002 wounded. We have lost 832 planes as well as hundreds of helicopters.

Based on the following reports by McNamara it is apparent we are making little progress after three years of fighting and cannot win a decisive victory:

1964—"McNamara told Congress that the U.S. hopes to withdraw most of its troops from Vietnam before the end of 1965."

In 1965—He said, "It will be a long war."

In October, 1966—He said, "I see no reason to expect any significant increase in the level of the tempo of operations in South Vietnam."

Communist strength in South Vietnam has increased from 120,000 in January, 1965, to an estimated 298,000 at present. However, North Vietnam has committed only one-fifth of their regular army. Based on the estimate that guerillas must be outnumbered four to one, the communists have more than matched the American buildup to 476,000 now. It is no wonder that General Westmoreland claims he needs five additional U.S. divisions: more than 200,000 men.

Tuesday the press reported General Van Thieu said: "We have not enough Allied soldiers which we need to win the war. We need a big amount of troops to be everywhere, to do many jobs at the same time." At this time the President might reconsider his September, 1964, statement: "We don't want our American boys to do the fighting for Asian boys. We don't want to get involved . . . and get tied down in a land war in Asia."

During the past two years Russia has added to the enemy arsenal in South Vietnam rockets, artillery, heavy mortars, automatic infantry weapons and flames throwers, while in North Vietnam she has supplied fighters planes and antiaircraft guns. She is reported to be supplying 75% of all military supplies and has said she will continue to furnish all military aid necessary. The Chinese are furnishing part of the small arms, clothing and food, and have said they will assist North Vietnam with troops whenever requested to do so. Both countries have indicated they would enter the war, if necessary, to keep the North Vietnamese and the Viet Cong from being defeated. It is quite apparent that neither Russia or China are willing for the United States to achieve a victory over the communists and to establish a powerful military base on the mainland of Asia.

If Russia were conducting daily bombing raids against an American ally, as we are doing against a Russian ally, it is inconceivable that we would limit ourselves to providing only military equipment, as they are doing.

What is the effect of our policy on the nation? The Vietnam War is responsible for the most serious economic, financial and political problems in this country. It is responsible for the huge federal deficit which, without a tax increase, could run to more than $25 billion. In order to curb the resulting inflationary pressures the government has proposed a 10% surtax on individuals and corporations, which, if enacted, would reduce the deficit, on an annual basis, between $9 and $10 billion.

This war is directly causing a substantial increase in the deficiency in our international balance of payments, which is already serious, as we are by far the world's largest short-term debtor, now owing nearly $26 billion. It is reducing our free gold to meet these obligations to less than $2 billion.

It is creating inflationary pressures in nearly every field—increased costs of living, going up about 3% per year—a great shortage of skilled workers—increasing strikes and exhorbitant demands by union labor—and higher interest rates, in all categories, due to the heavy demand for credit.

The costs of war do not end with the cessation of hostilities. Excluding the Vietnam War, at the end of 1965 we had approximately 20,600,000 veterans. Total veterans' benefits paid to the end of 1965 were $134 billion; by the end of this year it is estimated they will be $147 billion. In 1966 we were spending in excess of $6 billion per year for veterans' benefits, and the Korean War alone is costing more than $700 million a year. The annual operating expense of the Veterans' Administration hospitals has now passed the billion mark.

I believe Russia is glad to see us bogged down in Vietnam, diverting multi-billions of our resources and millions of our manpower, while she is rapidly gaining in the nuclear arms race. While the U.S. lags in its nuclear defense, the Soviets are rushing ahead. It is believed today's nuclear balance has already shifted to Russia.

At a time when defense against missile attack is still in the talking stage in this country, the Soviet Union is racing ahead with unprecedented speed.

Of even greater concern to us at this time is China's rapid growth in the development of nuclear weapons. It is now estimated that between 1972 and 1975 China will be a first-class nuclear power with a full arsenal of H–bombs and war heads. ICBM will be in production with an intercontinental range of 6,000 miles. This would hit most of the world; the northern stretches of the U.S., Los Angeles, San Francisco, Chicago and Detroit would be particularly vulnerable. Meanwhile, we are spending over $2 billion a month on Vietnam instead of being prepared to cope with the rapidly growing atomic strength of Russia and China.

Our foreign aid since World War II has been $128 billion—$91 billion in economic aid and $37 billion in military aid—with dubious results in many instances. The United States is pledged to defend 43 countries under specific treaties and agreements. In addition, a commitment to stop aggression covers all the countries in the Middle East, and any country where the U.S. has a military base is promised support.

While we've been spending tens of billions abroad, our cities are exploding in violent protest as a result of our injustice, and neglect, and failure to meet unfulfilled promises of the "Great Society." Our total estimated Vietnam and foreign aid budget this year is $30 billion; whereas, the Great Society budget is approximately 40% of that amount—$12.5 billion—which is half of what we spend in Vietnam alone.

Senator Percy says: "If we continue to spend $66 million a day trying to save the 16 million people of South Vietnam while leaving the plight of 20 million urban poor in our own country unresolved—then I think we have our priorities terribly confused."

Public and congressional reaction relative to our world-wide involvement, especially in Vietnam, is forcing the administration to reconsider its role as world policeman.

The horrible Vietnam debacle, tragic as it is, may yet be a blessing in disguise if it forces us to recognize our staggering failures at home. Runaway crime, delinquency, the riots in our cities, loss of respect for law and order, and the rebellion of frustrated youth—all spring in part from this. No wonder Russia had this to say about the United States: "Only in mockery can the word 'free' be applied to a society which cannot provide tolerable living conditions and democratic rights to a considerable part of its population."

It is tragic that the most powerful country in the world, with 6 percent of its population and producing 40 percent of its wealth, should have lost the respect of most of the world. The world, with few exceptions, would like us to leave Vietnam. The continued confidence and good relations with Japan, our greatest asset in Asia, is dependent upon our getting out of Vietnam. The same is true with all the Western European governments and our friends in Latin America. We cannot survive, no matter how powerful we are, in a world without friends.

With these disastrous effects on the Nation to continue our ruthless pursuit in Vietnam is madness. To withdraw is sanity. The consequences of withdrawing cannot possibly be as disastrous for this Nation as pursuing our present course. The greatest service we could render the Vietnamese is to withdraw from their country, leaving them to negotiate a conclusion to the war, which is their right.

There is something intrinsically wrong with the idea that the United States should participate in negotiations to decide the future of Vietnam. We are an outside power, which is true also of China and the Soviet Union. To have the future of Vietnam decided by outside powers is a violation of self-determination. Whatever negotiations go on should be among the Vietnamese themselves—each group negotiating from its own position of strength, uninfluenced by outside powers.

If the U.S. insists on negotiating, it should be with Russia and China, as the sinews of war are being furnished by these countries, without which the war would collapse. In any case, the United States cannot negotiate strength for any future segment of government in South Vietnam. The presence of the United States can only distort the true balance of forces, and only a settlement which represents this balance can bring about a stable government.

No one seems to be able to show in what way a communist Vietnam would be bad. Under Ho Chi Minh, Vietnam would be quite as likely to enforce its independence as has Tito in Yugoslavia, Rumania, and other Russian satellites. Ho Chi Minh is unquestionably the choice of the Vietnames people, both North and South. Both President Kennedy and Eisenhower have stated that had the election called for under the Geneva Treaty been held in 1956, Ho Chi Minh was so popular he would have won by a large majority. While Ho Chi Minh is a communist, he is not Russian, he is not Chinese, he is Vietnamese—and Russian, Chinese and Vietnamese communism may differ widely. It is even possible that our best interests would be served by having Ho Chi Minh's communist regime as a buffer against the Chinese communists.

History does not show that a nation that liquidates a bad venture suffers from loss of prestige. Proud, powerful England surrendered to the thirteen American colonies and did not suffer for it. More recently, France moved out voluntarily from Algeria and Indochina. Today she has more world prestige than ever before. Russia pulled her missiles out of Cuba; her prestige has not suffered.

Hans Morgenthau has written: "Is it really a boon to the prestige of the most powerful nation on earth to be bogged down in a war which it is neither able to win nor can afford to lose? This is the real issue which is presented by the argument of prestige." We should be less interested in saving face and more interested in saving lives. It is possibly not easy for a proud nation to admit it has blundered, but throughout history great men and nations have gained stature by so doing.

Getting out of Vietnam will enable us to re-establish a friendly relationship with Russia and thereby bring about a balance of power in the world, which would tend to deter any aggressive policy on the part of China. So long as we are in Vietnam, Russia and China consider us their enemy. Kosygin made this crystal clear in his statement before the United Nations and in his conference with Johnson at Glassboro.

We should also recognize China diplomatically and open our doors to trade and travel and help bring her into the United Nations. We should no longer ignore one-fourth of the world's population as though it did not exist.

In conclusion: What can we expect from the stricken Vietnamese nation but hatred, deep and abiding? Their farms and villages have been laid waste, their families scattered to the winds. Their husbands and sons are dead, maimed or missing. And children, orphans and grotesquely burned, have been seen running through the rubble in packs.

We can never blot out the deed which stands as a testimony of man's inhumanity to man. Nor can we really make amends for the enormity of our crime against these people, who know us not, but whom we have chosen to save from communism.

But we can try. We can make a beginning. And, in conscience, how can that beginning be less than immediate withdrawal of our evil presence, because that is what it has proved to be in the lives of the Vietnamese. And we can humbly, with vigor, and never ceasing, do everything in the power of a rich and repentant nation to heal, and rebuild, and reassure.

The Vietnamese will never forget us, and it is to be hoped that we will never forget the Vietnamese. Because it is this Vietnam tragedy which has shown us ourselves as others see us: a nation to be feared instead of loved, flushed with pride and sure of omnipotence. An arrogant nation, not qualified to handle power wisely.

While the hour is late, it is not yet impossible to turn the page. Men and nations have made new beginnings before. And out of defeat, there has often come victory—and what a victory it could be for this nation, so bountifully endowed—to reverse its image, make itself loved and admired and revered, so that it could stand forth before the emerging peoples around the globe, as an example of what they might wish to become.

But the road is long—and we must win much forgiveness. So let us begin.

The Fight To Save the Panama Canal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 28, 1967

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, since the remarkable journalistic performance of the Chicago Tribune in obtaining and publishing the texts of three proposed treaties relative to the Panama Canal, there has been a steady growth of opposition throughout the Nation to the projected surrender of U.S. rights, power or authority over the Canal Zone territory and canal.

Despite the extensive and thorough coverage of the subject in the columns of the Chicago Tribune for a period of weeks, I have yet to see any other large paper in the mass news media that has covered the exposure of these secretly devised treaties.

Even with a major press blackout of this vital subject, the word has continued to spread by means of patriotic journals and other publications, one of which is Human Events of Washington, D.C. A news story in a recent issue of that paper giving the present status of the fight to save the Panama Canal follows:

THE FIGHT TO SAVE PANAMA

Hope that Congress can block surrender of the strategic Panama Canal waterway has been buoyed by the belief that the House of Representatives may exert authority over some areas of the Administration's three controversial Canal treaties.

Under the proposed pacts, the United States would virtually relinquish all rights over the Canal Zone to the unstable and leftist-infiltrated government of Panama. All property not needed for the Canal's operation and now owned by the United States would be given outright to the Panamanians, with the remainder coming under the sole authority of a joint U.S.-Panama administrative body.

Diplomatic and military experts say surrender of U.S. territory to the Panamanians would be a disaster, but the treaties—despite the vigorous battle against their adoption by such senators as Strom Thurmond—could well be ratified by the overwhelmingly liberal Senate.

Moreover, expected opposition from Sen. Everett Dirksen, the GOP's Senate leader, has rapidly melted and other Republicans are expected to defer to former President Eisenhower's endorsement of the treaties. Whether two-thirds of the Senate can be persuaded into ratifying this surrender of U.S. sovereignty is still in doubt, however, and readers are asked to keep urging their senators to oppose the Panama giveaway.

Yet even if the treaties pass the Senate, there is now a distinct possibility that at least one of them can be effectively stopped in the House. While the Constitution empowers only the Senate to ratify treaties, legal experts believe the House can prevent the treaties' execution through its powers to dispose of territory belonging to the United States.

The House foreign affairs subcommittee on Latin American relations states it clearly has a right to a voice in the treaties' implementation, a position that is known to be held by even some high State Department authorities. Article 4, Section 3, clause 2 of the Constitution provides:

"The Congress shall have power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting territory or other property of the United States; and nothing in the Constitution shall be so construed as to prejudice any claims of the United States, or of any particular state."

Supporting the theme that the House must have a voice in the treaties, Rep. Durward G. Hall remarked that Duncan has established a "concrete case for showing that the House of Representatives must adopt enabling legislation before the United States cedes all sovereignty of the Panama Canal Zone to the Republic of Panama."

Hall pointed out that there is a clear precedent for the House to take an active role. To implement the 1955 treaty with Panama that conveyed $24 million worth of real estate to the Panamanian government, the House had to pass enabling legislation which was not approved until Aug. 30, 1957. In that instance, said Hall, "the Eisenhower Administration realized that this land conveyance could not be constitutionally consummated until the House of Representatives passed the necessary enabling legislation.

"The Constitution and the aforementioned precedents establish, beyond doubt, the course of action in regard to the currently proposed Panama Canal Zone Treaty; there must be House action and approval before the Administration gives away the assets of the United States and of the American people."

Hence the belief that the House will demand its rightful role in dealing with the treaties. One hundred and fifty House members are already on record against the package, with the respected Selden Latin American affairs subcommittee having drafted a sense-of-Congress resolution also in opposition.

Thus there is the prediction that even if the Senate decides to approve the LBJ "giveaway" treaties, the House will simply refuse to enact any enabling legislation transferring American-owned territory in Panama to the local government.

Another Forceful L. B. J. Educational Initiative

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 28, 1967

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, on August 25, President Johnson issued a proclamation urging all Americans to launch a "stay in school" campaign.

This is just one more in a long series of President Johnson's initiatives dedicated to the improvement of education and educational opportunity in this country.

We sometimes lose sight of the fact that it was the Johnson administration which brought to a fruitful conclusion the 20-year fight to begin Federal aid to primary and secondary schools.

We sometimes lose sight of the more than two dozen educational bills which have become law under the Johnson-Humphrey administration, and which have transformed education horizons in the United States.

We sometimes lose sight of the fact that millions of poor schoolchildren have gotten a new lease on education with Federal help; that thousands of students are now attending college because of the work-study program under the Economic Opportunity Act; that adults are getting basic literacy training; that colleges and universities have received millions in Federal aid for the building of new classrooms and laboratories and other structures.

That is why the President's "stay in school" campaign is not an isolated gesture. It is part of the continuing effort of the one man who has done more for American education than any President in American history.

I take pleasure in inserting into the RECORD the "stay in school" proclamation of the President issued on August 25.

It reminds us of where we have gone, and how much further we have to go. It is an eloquent testament to an administration which will go down in history as the education administration of all time.

STAY IN SCHOOL

(A proclamation by the President of the United States of America)

Education through high school is now within the reach of every American boy and girl. It is essential to our nation's welfare—and to theirs—that they grasp it.

This Nation could neither prosper nor endure without trained, productive men and women. For this reason, we have begun a massive campaign to extend the blessings of education to the children of the poor, to increase opportunities for vocational training, to help the physically handicapped, and to bring higher education within the grasp of more and more of our young people.

A high school diploma is not a sure pass to a successful life, but it vastly increases a young adult's chances for employment and economic independence.

Those who seek employment without training or preparation will knock upon many closed doors. This year, more than 900,000 of our youth will not return to their high school classrooms to complete their secondary education.

For their sake and for ours, it is urgent that they, and others who are tempted to leave school, be persuaded to continue their education.

Citizens in communities across the Nation can help to combat the high school dropout problem—and they are. We have succeeded in reducing the percentage of dropouts among high school age youngsters from 25 percent in 1960 to 18 percent last year. But we must do more.

To emphasize the importance of this task, I, Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States of America, do proclaim a national "Stay in School" campaign.

I call upon the American people to make this campaign successful. I ask the citizens of every community to take an active part in furthering the improvement of American education. I urge that the total resources of all communities be brought to bear upon the educational needs of every young person. I propose that we translate into reality our fond hope that, in this Nation, no young man or woman shall reject, or be rejected by, our most essential institution.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this twenty-fifth day of August in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and sixty-seven, and of the Independence of the United States of America the one hundred and ninety-second.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

Lt. Gov. Albert Brewer Dedicates ETV Station

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BILL NICHOLS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1967

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, in recent months, there has been a great deal of discussion concerning the merits of educational television. On August 5, Alabama dedicated her seventh educational television station, which will bring coverage to 92 percent of the people of Alabama. In Montgomery, a new recording studio has been completed. An eighth station is now being built in Texasville, and a ninth is planned for the Demopolis area. The addition of these stations will give 100-percent coverage to all Alabamians. These are a few of the many signs of the continued growth and progress of America's first and finest State educational television system.

The Alabama Educational Television Network is unique in more ways than one. It is the first television network in the Nation to provide a regular program of driver education. All that stations are connected by a 1,000-mile microwave system that provides instantaneous location of failures in the equipment. It is also, the largest totally owned and simultaneously broadcasting ETV system in the United States.

The State of Alabama annually appropriates around $1,000,000 to the Alabama Educational Television Commission for the operation of this system. The program is adminstered by Mr. Raymond D. Hurlbert, who has proved to be an effective and efficient leader.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I insert for the RECORD an article from the Tri-Cities Daily which tells more of the progress of the Alabama television network:

> RUSSELLVILLE.—Lt. Governor Albert Brewer was the keynote speaker for the dedication of the state's educational television station here Friday night.
>
> Dedication ceremonies for WFIQ, Channel 36, located in Colbert County at Crooked Oak were held at Russellville High School. The state's network is now available to more than 85 per cent of the state's population, and when Channel 36 joins the network in September, ETV will be available to more than 92 per cent of all Alabamians.
>
> WFIQ will bring ETV to all of Lauderdale, Colbert, Lawrence, Franklin, Marion and Winston counties. Several other counties will receive ETV due to the new transmitter.
>
> Commenting on the growth of ETV in Alabama, Brewer said, "Today with the present addition of this station, the seventh unit in the State network, we remain in the forefront with not only the first State ETV network, but with the largest totally owned and simultaneously broadcasting ETV system in the U.S. Furthermore, it can be taken as a high compliment to our State's ETV pioneering that many states are now patterning their systems after Alabama's extensive and exemplary operation.
>
> "The cultural and educational opportunities afforded our adult citizens through this new media are as encouraging as they are fantastic. Never before has it been possible, through such technically and skillfully prepared and psychologically sound presentations, to bridge the gap between our many educational and cultural levels of public needs and appropriations."
>
> Dr. James R. Swendenburg, president of the Alabama Educational Television Commission, presided at the meeting. Public officials from the area served by Channel 36 also attended the banquet.

Congressional Ethics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1967

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, may I commend you for appointing such an outstanding Committee on Standards of Official Conduct. It was my honor to appear before this committee at its first public hearing. The following is my statement to the committee:

> It has been my privilege in hundreds of addresses throughout this Nation to defend the integrity, morality and ethics of the Congress. The conduct and ethical standards of Congress, as a whole, will compare favorably with any parilamentary body in the world or in the history of the world. No legislative body in the world or government officials anywhere are more generally respected or have higher moral and ethical standards than the United States Congress and the United States officials here in Washington. The only government officials and legislative bodies approaching the United States in moral and ethical conduct are those countries associated with England and the nations of northern Europe.
>
> The Congress has had an illustrious history. The history of Congress began with the Continental Congress. That Congress unanimously elected George Washington Commander-in-Chief and we eventually won our independence. Had it made any other decision, I do not believe this Nation would have won its independence. That Congress created an army, a navy and a marine corps. Congress called for a Constitutional Convention out of which emanated the greatest document in world history. Congress called for a Bill of Rights which was adopted.
>
> The Congress has made mistakes. The Congress has been both justly and unjustly criticized throughout the years, but it has remained the people's institution, directly responsible to the people, reflecting their hopes and aspirations. Congress has developed, both branches, into the greatest deliberative bodies in all the history of the world.
>
> Recently Congress has come under severe attack largely because of the misconduct of a few of its members. This is an age of advertising and public relations when modern news media make news available almost instantly to almost every individual citizen throughout the country; therefore, a comparatively few and spectacular incidents have created for Congress an improper image. Reliable polls indicate that a majority of the American people believe the members of the Congress are lacking in ethical standards and that a large percentage of the American people believe that members of Congress are dishonest.
>
> The United States is the leader of the free world. Should its Congress lose prestige—fairly or unfairly—it will affect the cause of freedom throughout the world. We are operating in a glass arena, with the world looking on.
>
> Frankly, our image is not good. By the same means this bad image was created, we can create a good image, reassure the American people and reassure those who believe in parliamentary representation the world over. We can no longer delay reform.
>
> The House of Representatives, elected every two years, is the most direct representation the American people have. Members of the House of Representatives are quite often the only real contact the sovereign American citizen has with the agencies and departments of the Federal Government. We have an obligation to represent those people "to the best of our ability." In order to best represent them and keep their confidence, the time has come for us to formulate and enforce high ethical standards for our own membership. Congress is already disciplined. We have many rules and regulations in existence now covering the conduct and activities of members of the Congress, but we need to discipline ourselves still further and adopt a code of ethics and conduct for both members and candidates.
>
> I recommend that the Committee very seriously consider the creation of a permanent Committe on Ethics similar to those of the American Bar Association. This Committee could receive any complaint, under oath, of any American citizen or group of citizens against any Member of Congress or any employee. This is nothing radically new. Wild public charges can be made against Members of Congress now. This would merely be an orderly and regulated way to bring complaints against the Members. Already under the Constitution any citizen has the right to petition Congress on any grievance. I believe the time has now arrived when we should create a permanent standing Committee on Ethics to perform this duty.
>
> All Members of Congress should be required to file a detailed financial statement annually with the Committee on Ethics. This statement should show all assets and liabilities of both the Member and his wife and should include all outside income, gifts and honorariums in excess of $100, including automobiles and receipts from testimonial dinners. It should also include payments from the Federal government such as soil bank payments, price supports, office rent, and reserve pay, etc.
>
> I would urge the Committee to recommend that the same standards of conduct and ethics apply to candidates for the House as for Members of the House. A candidate for the House, who is not an incumbent, should be required to file with the Clerk of the House a complete financial statement for himself, his spouse and dependent children. This financial statement should include assets and liabilities, including all income, gifts, honorariums, etc., together with the names and addresses of the source, whether an individual or organization, for the one-year period prior to his becoming a candidate for the House.
>
> We should consider regulations which would prohibit nepotism. I would recommend that the Committee carefully consider legislation that would prohibit any public official from employing or recommending for employment any member of his immediate family or any close relative for employment in the government in any department in which he is serving or over which he exercises jurisdiction or control. I make this recommendation realizing fully that some immediate members of the family have performed magnificently and rendered a great service to our Country. I can think of Mrs. John Nance Garner and Mrs. Harry S. Truman as examples of devoted, dedicated public servants. However, we have had members of the House who have flagrantly violated this privilege and employed members of their family who did not even reside in the United States and who did no work.
>
> I have every confidence in the membership of this Committee. I commend and thank

you for serving on this Committee in addition to your other committees and countless duties. The American people are grateful to you. Each of you in both parties is a warm personal friend with whom I have served for many years. It has been a privilege to serve with most of you for 19 years. I know you cherish, love and respect this House. I know that your only concern is to see this House preserved and its image protected. I commend you and pledge you my complete cooperation in restoring the image of this House as the people's very own institution.

I further pledge you my cooperation and support in your efforts to create a code of ethics and a standard of conduct for the membership of the House.

Rat Extermination Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD RUMSFELD
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 28, 1967

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, a great deal of press comment followed the refusal of the House of Representatives to take up the Rat Extermination Act. Regrettably, all aspects of the issue were not fully discussed. The comments of two of our colleagues on this bill merit the attention of all who are concerned with this problem.

Representative THOMAS B. CURTIS, of Missouri, commented on the issue in the following letter which was his response to inquiries on his vote:

AUGUST 7, 1967.

While I agree that the joking manner in which this bill was discussed on the Floor does the House of Representative no credit, I find that the press coverage and political demagoguery over this issue to be equally, if not more, deplorable. Leaving aside the less-than-responsible statements about this bill on the floor, there are very good reasons for the defeat of this bill. One of the best criticisms of this program is contained in the supplemental views of Representative Henry Reuss accompanying the Committee Report (a copy of which I have enclosed for your colleagues who seldom find the time to read committee reports).

Congressman Reuss can hardly be accused of being against helping cities or ghetto areas, and he finds the rat-control problem to be a serious one requiring active measures to combat the danger to our urban communities. Yet he points out in his views just how this bill will *hurt* the urban health effort, not improve it. Setting up a special program on rats would "fragment and askew the local public health agency's program for attacking all carriers of communicable diseases." Congessman Reuss, in testimony before the Committee, used the example of Milwaukee to illustrate this point effectively. Yet this received *no coverage whatsoever* by the press. Why is the press so willing to print the political baloney thrown out by the Administration, and ignore any rational, reflective arguments against this particular bill.

I thought that the rat problem is one which needs attention, but I refused to vote for a measure which had received such inadequate study and what study there was reveals it will hinder efforts to meet the problem. Also, there are presently at least four existing federal programs in rat control which spend at least $2,830,000 on eliminating rats. There may be good arguments for extending these programs or modifying them to make them work, but why do we need another program, with a different agency handling the matter? It seems to me, as it seemed to many of my colleagues on Banking and Currency, that this was merely a bill designed to get HUD some more authority at the expense of agencies already working in the area, most particularly at the expense of the Public Health Service. There have been no press mention of these other programs—the public has been given the impression that the Congress has ignored the rat problem competely. The facts show the contrary.

Then there is the matter of the cost-effectiveness of the proposed program. Secretary Weaver, in his testimony before the Committee (Hearings before Housing Subcommittee on H.R. 8068, page 39), estimated the cost of the program at $6 per capita. It appeared to me that we could get better results from working through existing programs and agencies rather than adding more bureaucratice overhead costs.

One way in which this could be done under existing authority is through the Code Enforcement Program. HUD is authorized at present to spend $750 million on urban renewal and code enforcement. Of that amount, HUD has allocated only $56 million for code enforcement—they could do a lot more, but they have made enforcement of building, safety and health codes a low-priority item. If they needed more money to step up code enforcement, they could have asked for it and probably could have gotten it. Republicans on the Housing Subcommittee were responsible for getting health code enforcement in the urban renewal program—a Republican proposal to require 20% of renewal funds to go to code enforcement was defeated by the majority party in 1965). The code enforcement approach utilizes existing agencies and standards (which are required under every city's "workable program" for urban renewal aid) and has the advantage of including low-interest loans to slum dwelling owners to eliminate health hazards (such as rats) and keep the building in a healthful state. This approach gives the "slumlord" a financial interest in maintaining a rat-free environment—such loans are unavailable in the Administration's rat bill. But nobody in the Administration and the press discusses this alternative—if you voted against the bill, it meant to the reporters that you supported the idea of rats biting children. What kind of mischief does this create in the ghettos already willing to believe the worst of their fellow human beings? And what further mischief does it create by distracting attention from designing programs carefully which might alleviate the problems, including rats.

* * * * *

The majority report of the Banking and Currency Committee contained another outstanding example of a "responsible approach," this time from a Democratic city administration. Note on page 5–6 of the Report the statistics on the Detroit rat extermination program. Last year, according to the figures presented at the Hearings (page 77), ratbite cases in Detroit were reduced from 123 in 1951 to 17 in 1965, rat infested buildings were reduced from 9.2% of the buildings checked to 0.4% in 1966. Milwaukee also has a strong rat control program—rat infestations have been reduced 90% in the last 15 years. And yet we have the sorry spectacle of the President equating on national television the failure of the rat bill with the Detroit riots—at the same time, Secretary Weaver is graphically showing that Detroit needs federal rat control money less than any other city. Routinely, these facts are never widely publicized—if the news reporting media will not read committee reports, they certainly won't take time to look at the printed hearings.

Governor Rockefeller's program provides "twice as much for rat-control in New York as the federal bill proposed." Thus, because the bill failed, New York will have a better program—on the other hand, if the federal government were handing out the anti-rat money, would New York even have developed this plan? Would other cities develop programs such as Detroit has had for years? No, they would limit their efforts to that which can be funded with federal money; they would, as Congressman Reuss pointed out, skew their anti-pest activities toward rats, even though rats may not be the major pest problem in a particular city.

The points I have tried to make here may not be irrefutable—I would never claim that there are not good arguments on both sides of any proposed legislation. But they are sound, sensible reasons to believe that the Administration's rat bill may not be the best approach to the problem, a problem which I am concerned about and which I think needs attention. Secretary Weaver was the only witness in the two weeks of hearings who testified on the rat provisions of the Administration's comprehensive bill—the director of the Public Health Service and other interested agencies did not appear. I believe that Congressman Reuss' approach or the code enforcement approach are eminently more sound than the bill which was defeated, and I—and I am sure many others who voted against H.R. 11000—would have supported wholeheartedly a reasonable attack on the rat problem based on these ideas.

I am sick and tired of this simplistic, naive demagoguery—this equation of voting against the rat bill with supporting suffering in the ghettos. I didn't think the issue was funny on the Floor, and I have little respect for those who thought this was a matter for laughing. But I don't think the reporting of these issues which has been confined to attacking the misplaced humor is funny either. I have equally little respect for those who have neither the time nor the energy to consider the Committee Report, the Hearings and the responsible views of those who voted against the bill, but who will scream to the heavens about Congress' lack of concern for the problem. Are we going to operate on the basis of a serious study and discussion of the problems and careful, reasonable selection of the best way to solve them, or are we reduced to either voting for whatever the Administration sends down or "voting for rats" or "voting against helping the poor"?

On August 9, 1967, WBBM–TV, Chicago, Ill., editorially criticized opposition to the bill. An opposing point of view of Representative EDWARD J. DERWINSKI, of Illinois, was broadcast on August 11, as follows:

The rat bill, which very properly was rejected by the House, has received extraordinary press attention; but, unfortunately, a minimum of effective review of its defects.

It is charged that Congress is completely indifferent to problems caused by rats and nothing is being done to control this menace.

There are existing federal programs under the comprehensive Public Health Services Act, established in November, 1966, which provides over 100 million dollars in grants to states and cities to control diseases such as carried by rats—and they have been implemented in seven states. All Illinois Republicans supported this bill.

Other federal departments or agencies have rat control programs, which means that this proposed rat control measure was unnecessary and actually would have hindered the administration of existing programs. Chicago has received over 2 million dollars for a pilot program under existing laws.

Congressman Reuss, a Milwaukee Democrat, proposed that we add 20 million dollars to that program instead of establishing an unnecessary, costly, conflicting new bureaucracy.

He charged that the proposed bill would have established a costly program which would have confused local health departments and would have interfered with the flexibility of the Milwaukee health program.

Incidentally, by admission of committee witnesses, the rat bill would have served only 2½ per cent of our population. Thus, it would have been a typical great society "pie in the sky" program with promises far exceeding results.

The House action accidentally coincided with the peak of summer rioting which produced the charge that defeat of this measure contributed to the riots.

Both Milwaukee and Detroit, which suffered from riots have effective rat control programs which clearly disproves the charge that the rejection of the rat bill had anything to do with riots in those cities.

A program to eradicate rats must involve cleaning up garbage in our cities, improving garbage disposal, and maintaining effective housing standards.

Extermination of rats can be accomplished at the community level in coordination with functioning agencies, coupled with improved housing and sanitary habits in neighborhoods, and a new bureaucratic program would have strangled existing progress.

Future Unlimited: Alabama ETV

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BUCHANAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1967

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, all Alabamians have reason to be proud of the excellent achievement of Alabama educational telecasting under the competent leadership of Mr. Raymond Hurlbert, of Birmingham. The Alabama ETV network was the first in the Nation and continues to be the largest educational television network wholly owned by a State. Still expanding, within 1 month Alabama ETV will be available to 92 percent of the people of Alabama.

In a recent editorial, the Birmingham News pointed up the unique contribution which Alabama ETV is making to the lives of the people of our State. It is included herewith, in the hope that this meritorious example will be a benefit to other States, as follows:

OUR SCHOLARLY AIRWAYS

In the last few years a new term—educational television—has crept into our language. In Alabama we accept the term almost as a matter of fact, for it was this state which pioneered educational telecasting and today has the largest inter-connected ETV network in the world.

Friday will mark still another expansion of the Alabama network with the dedication in Colbert County of the state's seventh ETV transmitting station, located at Crooked Oak between Florince and Russellville.

The new station, WFIQ, will bring ETV to all of Lauderdale, Colbert, Lawrence, Franklin, Marion and Winston counties, and portions of Lamar, Fayette, Walker, Morgan and Limestone. Already, ETV is available to more than 85 per cent of the state's population. When WFIQ gets on the airways in September, serving better than 375,000 persons, more than 92 percent of all Alabamians will be within reach of the network.

As Alabama ETV has expanded, the quality of its programming has improved. A typical day last week included programs on aviation, pottery, a teenage discussion of LSD and other drugs, medical facts for the aged, reading, variety entertainment, and a production of T. W. Robertson's play "Society." There was even a half-hour slanted entirely to the homemaker: How to prepare veal parmigiana, Hawaiian fruit salad and baked carrots using spices from Mexico and Hawaii.

In addition to its programs of general interest, instructional television has its impact in the classroom. During the school year, instructional "telecourses" occupy the airways from sign-on time at 8 in the morning until 2:30 in the afternoon, with programs designed for every grade level. More than 376,000 pupils in Alabama regularly view ETV. Teacher education is still another facet of the programming.

"Future Unlimited" is the slogan of a recent brochure put out by the Alabama ETV Network. The booklet calls attention to some of the new advances looming ahead, including color transmission, live interconnection with National Educational Television, and the possibility of satellite television.

In terms of audience ratings, ETV can never hope to compete with *Bonanza* or *Batman*. But in the specialized job that it attempts to do, Alabama ETV stands in the highest national rankings. Events such as Friday's dedication will help keep it there.

A Program for Better Law Enforcement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1967

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, the Police Conference of New York has recently proposed a 10-point program to assist police departments in their law-enforcement efforts. I think the proposals are excellent, particularly in light of the recent riots and violence in many of our urban centers. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the text of the proposed program:

A PROGRAM FOR BETTER LAW ENFORCEMENT

In communications to Senators Kennedy and Javits, Governor Rockefeller, leaders of the State legislature and congressional representatives, the police conference of New York, Inc. with statewide headquarters in Albany, New York, representing over 50,000 policemen, called for an immediate, intensive program of crime control by the Federal and State governments.

In emphasizing the need for swift action to insure law and order, Al Sgaglione, president of the police conference, stated: "It is a long road ahead before we wipe out the root—causes of the riot epidemic plaguing our country. In the meantime, law-abiding citizens are living in constant fear. It is the obligation of our Federal and State governments to insure the lives and properties of the citizens living in 'tension areas'."

In answer to the many charges of police indecision in the recent riots, Sgaglione blamed political leaders who hesitated in ordering police to enforce the law. "The law must be enforced swiftly and firmly if we are to protect the people," he stated. "Looting must be treated as naked burglary; throwing a Molotov cocktail—as arson, and sniping as attempted murder—otherwise our system of law and order is in grave danger of collapse" also commented Mr. Sgaglione.

In addition to urging the immediate Senate passage of President Johnson's crime control bill recently passed by the House, the police conference called for a 10-point program:

(1) Boosting of minimum salary scales in New York State for police.

"There are many municipalities in our State where police earn as little as $3,500 per year" Sgaglione stated. "How can they attract even mediocre talent at that price?"

(2) Special training for police in riot control tactics.

(3) Strict Federal and State gun-control legislation, especially in the interstate traffic of firearms.

(4) Legislation to make it a Federal crime to cross State lines in order to incite or participate in a riot.

(5) Federal and State aid to local municipalities to expand understaffed police forces and to provide modern equipment.

(6) Extension of police jurisdiction allowing any policeman to make an arrest anywhere in the State where a serious crime is being committed. This would also allow mutual assistance of men and equipment by neighboring police forces.

(7) To permit wire-tapping under strict judicial supervision where a conspiracy to incite a riot is suspected, or the public safety is endangered.

(8) Additional judges for the criminal courts to hear cases without the present delays and to make quick, firm decisions.

(9) Representation by rank-and-file police on regional crime study commissions. Scaglione pointed out that of all the National and regional crime study groups, the police who come in face-to-face contact with the troubled areas are conspicuously absent from these groups.

(10) Review by the Supreme Court of their recent rulings regarding confessions which have "hampered effective police work".

Soviet Seapower—Titan Unbound

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MAILLIARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1967

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, since Russia lacks a long history as a seafaring nation, many are prone to discount her seaward thrust of recent years. However, the fact is that since the end of World War II, the Soviet Union has transformed what was formerly a coastal defense force into a "blue water" offensive fleet by an accelerated buildup of all elements of national sea power—Navy, merchant marine, and fisheries.

The intensity of the current Soviet maritime effort clearly demonstrates a very real appreciation of the concept of sea power and the geographical, political and economic mobility which such power affords a nation possessing it.

The true purpose of this Soviet buildup at sea may not now be apparent. However, it should not be lightly discounted, since the fate of American shipping and that of our allies may well be determined by how effectively we interpret these Russian moves.

The methodical manner in which the Russian bear is moving into the ocean lanes of world commerce also has a direct bearing upon the debate in recent years concerning the lack of Federal leadership in our own maritime efforts. It is particularly significant when considering that in his state of the Union message of January 1965, the President said that he would "recommend a new policy for our merchant marine." More than two and a half years have passed since that Presidential statement was made, and we in the Congress are still waiting for submission of this "new" maritime policy. Meanwhile, our position in the world maritime community has continued to degenerate at an ever-accelerating rate.

On other occasions, I have inserted material of special merit in the RECORD reporting upon this growing and potential threat posed by the methodical buildup by the Soviet Union of its seapower. The following two articles, "Titan Unbound—I," and "Titan Unbound—II," by Raymond Moley, which appeared in Newsweek on July 24 and August 7, respectively, are in my opinion of merit and worthy of commending to the attention of my colleagues.

The articles follow:

[From Newsweek, July 24, 1967]

TITAN UNBOUND—I

(By Raymond Moley)

The traditional concept of Russia, which still lingers in the minds of American statesmen, is a great intercontinental land mass with a population of multiracial strains, sinister and inscrutable, ever crowding upon its neighbors, but locked in by its lack of warm-water exists to the world outside. A titan, stirring uneasily within and suspicious of Western influence. It was so when Peter the Great gingerly surveyed Western ways. But through two centuries until the revolution it contented itself with harassing its neighbors, making alliances in Europe and breaking them when its rulers chose.

When attacked, as in 1812, Russia permitted such aggressors to perish in its vastnesses and cold. And even in our century, when it was racked by internal convulsions, Western eyes, except those of the most perceptive, looked on with passive indifference.

Then, when the cold war started in the late 1940s, we and our Western allies came to be alarmed by Soviet demonstrations of scientific progress and military might. We conceived the threat to be directed against Western Europe, Japan and the United States on land and in space and through subversion by Communist propaganda.

Our reaction has been to match the Soviet's military potential and by massive foreign aid to anticipate Soviet influence in needy countries.

We cannot deny the danger in such projections of power and influence nor the need for countermeasures.

THE STRATEGY OF SEAPOWER

What we see superficially are Soviet policies to exacerbate centers of conflict over the world, to make grand gestures in space, to rattle missiles and to poison world opinion by propaganda glorifying Russian scientific progress and vilifying the West as imperial and colonial.

But beyond those diversionary tactics is a major design rooted in the Kremlin's comprehension of seapower, a key to breaking out of landlocked isolation. Soviet strategists have been literate people. They have read in history that ever since Rome overcame Carthage, despite Hannibal's genius, the nations that have been dominant have been powerful on the sea, commercially and militarily. Nothing in our day has changed that.

Seapower is a nation's ability to project its identity into the seven seas—its commercial potential in peace; in war, its fighting ships. To employ to its advantage its capacity to use the seas—a navy, merchant ships, shipyards, seaports, a fishing industry and marine science and engineering.

Sometime before the death of Stalin fourteen years ago, the strategists in the Kremlin decided upon seapower as a national policy. Once made, that policy became binding upon all of Stalin's successors.

In creating long-term policy, a totalitarian police state has certain advantages over free or, if you will, democratic states. For it has continuity in its self-perpetuating oligarchy undisturbed by popular influences. Here, Presidents and Congresses make not policies but expedients as political tides change.

INTERNATIONAL PURPOSES

Since commercial intercourse is the basis of seapower, major wars must be avoided. At first, at least, the building of a navy is designed for defense and the possible destruction of an enemy's commerce. The Kaiser, who sought seapower, made the mistake of building a navy for offense against the British Navy and failed in the test.

Soviet strategy has considered that. In addition to building defensive naval forces, the U.S.S.R. has concentrated on accumulating a vast merchant fleet with all the auxiliary facilities. Soviet programs have been models of efficiency and determination, directed to political, military, economic and scientific ends.

The earlier ships were built for purely domestic needs. But now ships are being launched for a complex of international purposes.

V. G. Bakayev, Soviet Minister of Sea Transport, has emphasized the economic value of the program, especially to acquire for the Soviet more and more foreign currency. But he added that by "participating in the foreign-trade shipments between many countries of the world, the Soviet sailors contribute to the expansion of the international ties with the U.S.S.R." The role played in international economic relations creates, as another Russian put it, "a new alignment of forces" in the world.

Russian maritime policy is well designed to achieve supremacy at sea in relatively few years. In another piece I shall supply the details of this new phase of the cold war.

[From Newsweek, Aug. 7, 1967]

TITAN UNBOUND—II

(By Raymond Moley)

In a piece two weeks ago I noted that a major, probably the major, long-term policy of the Soviet Union is to stay out of a great war, and, by developing a massive sea potential, to break out of its traditional landlocked isolation. That policy, created even before the death of Stalin fourteen years ago, has been binding upon all Russian leaders since. Some five-year economic plans have fallen short. But naval strength and seagoing commerce have even outpaced their original objectives.

At the end of World War II the Soviet merchant fleet was insignificant. When Stalin died in 1953 his government's 500 ships aggregated 1.5 million gross registered tons. Then maritime policy accelerated, and in five years an 80 per cent increase was made. That brought Russia into twelfth place among maritime nations. A seven-year plan began in 1959, and the fleet expanded to 7,290,000 gross tons, with 1,437 ships.

The economic potential of a merchant marine is measured not only in the number of units and total tonnage but in age. A technological revolution is a swift destroyer. Here the Russians, building from little, have a great competitive advantage. In 1964, 48 per cent of their dry-cargo ships and 63 per cent of their tankers were less than four years old. Only 22 per cent of the total were more than nineteen years old.

AMERICA, THE OBSOLETE

The Soviet design to penetrate into all sorts of nations is shown by the great suitability of their fleet. They have technically advanced ships in trade with the industrialized West, shallow-draft vessels necessary for the ports of North Vietnam and for the most primitive ports of small or underdeveloped countries, supertankers to carry oil to African states and Asia and sophisticated vessels for paramilitary support. Her trawlers are everywhere, as are survey and research vessels. More than a hundred times a month Soviet ships have been furrowing the Suez Canal. The Soviet Minister of Sea Transport has said that ships flying the hammer and sickle call at 600 ports in 91 countries, only thirteen of which are Communist and 51 of which are underdeveloped. Russia's many shipyards have worked long hours. The U.S.S.R. has also patronized the shipyards of Finland, Yugoslavia, East and West Germany, Japan, Italy, Poland, Sweden, Holland, Britain, Denmark—a good customer paying billions in cash and meticulously abiding by contracts.

The American active merchant marine is overwhelmingly obsolete—70 per cent of World War II vintage. To meet our needs in Vietnam, decayed relics are hauled out from the rusty reserves. They break down and are towed into port. These ships are the stigmata of our maritime sickness. The building program, which the Maritime Administration describes as proceeding "at a deliberate [snail's] pace," is 100 ships behind schedule. A baker's dozen are delivered annually. Last year 109 of the reserve fleet were turned into scrap. There is a great tanker and bulk carrier fleet built for American owners and sailing under many flags, and some serve in the war in Vietnam. But their contribution to American employment is mainly a bonanza to admiralty lawyers.

MONUMENTAL CHALLENGE

The Maritime Administration's figures on deliveries of new merchant ships are most significant. The U.S.S.R. added 100 new vessels in 1966 and in addition received 55 transfers from satellite countries. The U.S.A. added thirteen. Robert L. Nichols, in "A Survey of Russian Shipping," derived from Russian sources, notes that in a single year the Russians added more new ships than the U.S.A. built in five years. Only 386 ships have been built for the U.S. flag since 1947. But even more important so far as the future is concerned is the fact that as of May 1966 the Soviet had 581 ships under construction or on order.

"Jane's Fighting Ships, 1966–67" makes particular reference to the Soviet Union's 2,000 merchant ships aggregating 9.5 million gross tons as an adjunct of naval strength. Her naval forces are now deployed on a worldwide scale. Her merchant fleet is "twice as big numerically and four times the size in capacity as it was only a decade ago, and is now the sixth largest in the world . . . the time has now come when [Russia] can exploit the oceans to the full."

The U.S.S.R. seeks not only monetary returns but the multiplication of influence everywhere. Landlocked isolation is gone forever. Seapower is a reality and, to Americans, a monumental challenge.

Is DOD Becoming Overcivilianized?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1967

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the civilianization of the Department of Defense has proceeded to greater lengths under its present Secretary. Seems like the matter should be looked into as called for by the following editorial appearing in Armed Forces Journal on August 26:

CHEAPER BY THE DOZEN

(By Louis Stockstill)

It's about time some Congressional committee took a long and careful look at the Defense Department civilian build-up.

As we have pointed out in recent reports, more than 200,000 permanent civilian workers have been added to the DoD payroll since Secretary of Defense McNamara took office, and civilian payroll costs have mounted $2.3-billion.

The largest part of the increase, DoD claims, results from the demands of the Vietnam war. Part of the increase stems from the so-called DoD "civilianization" program, designed to convert thousands of military billets into civil service jobs.

When questioned about the civilian growth within the Defense Department, Assistant Secretary of Defense Robert N. Anthony told the House Appropriations Committee that DoD will save $122-million in FY '68 through the conversion of 78,322 jobs. He said it costs $1,567 less for each civilian than for the military man he replaces.

How did he arrive at this figure? Well, he said the cost "per man-year" for a civilian is $5,681; multiplied by 78,322 positions, this totals $444.9 million. The cost "per man-year" for a military billet is $5,528; multiplied by 78,322 positions, this totals $433-million. But, he said, you have to add the military "tail" (the training and support associated with the military "which a civilian does not have") of $74.6-million. This boosts the military total to $507.6-million including $423.5-million in pay and allowances and $84.1-million for support costs such as "training, medical care, dependents education, transportation, command and administration support, security investigations, moving and facilities support, etc."

And then, he added, you have to crank-in $60.1-million for "retirement liability" for the military group, for a total cost of $567.7-million for the 78,322 positions. Thus, a savings of $122.8-million, since the civilian replacements will cost only $444.9-million.

We doubt if that explanation would satisfy any member of the Congress who has time to read and ponder it. Surely it would raise at least a few questions.

Are we to assume that the civilians require no "security investigation" for which the military man is being charged? Don't dependents of overseas civilians receive the same education as those of military families? Are there no command and administration support costs for civilian employees? Doesn't the Government pay part of their health-care insurance costs? Aren't there some fairly liberal transportation and moving allowances for civilian employees of the Government?

And what about retirement costs? Secretary Anthony testified that appropriations for the Armed Forces do no include "the present value" of the "retirement cost" of the individual, "whereas the cost of a civilian does include an approximation of the present value of his retirement costs."

Hmmmmm. Interesting. But we wonder why, then, the Federal civilian employee's retirement fund currently is $50-billion in debt. If it's all funded and accounted for and tied up in a neat little package, someone has been doing pretty sloppy bookkeeping.

And we also wonder how Secretary Anthony arrived at the $5,681 "per man-year" cost of the individual civilian worker.

As a spot check, we examined the pay of the 2700 permanent civilian employees in the OSD Family Housing Office. The average pay of this group (not counting the top-salaried officials) is more than $6,000. And then we took a look at the Office of Civil Defense. The 849 permanent employees of that office earn an average of more than $12,000 each. And then we glanced at the budget account for "RDT&E, Defense Agencies," where the 981 permanent employees earn average salaries of more than $8,500.

Admittedly, we don't know much about "man-years" and "tails" and things like that, and it may be that Mr. Anthony has a solid case, and that we're only confusing the issue But if so, we would like to see a better explanation and some answers to some of the questions which seem so obvious, if only on the surface.

We trust that Congress will do some further probing.

The Urban Coalition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER L. WOLFF
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 28, 1967

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, last week the Urban Coalition held an emergency meeting here in Washington. The problems these outstanding citizens discussed and gave appropriate attention to are some of the most fundamental concerns of our society. Our urban ills demand our highest priorities, for the health of our Nation is dependent on the health of our citizens.

The Right Reverend John E. Hines, presiding bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church of America, gave an interesting and provocative talk to the Urban Coalition last Thursday. Bishop Hines clearly delineated certain of our basic problems and offered some possible solution to those problems. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the text of Bishop Hines' speech so that my colleagues may be aware of his interesting and important comments:

EMERGENCY CONVOCATION: THE URBAN COALITION

(Statement by the Right Reverend John E. Hines, Presiding Bishop, the Protestant Episcopal Church of America, Washington, D.C., August 24, 1967)

Mr. Chairman, Members of this Convocation: It is with genuine reluctance that I attempt to speak as a representative of the "religious community" to the critical and, I believe, decisive issues made painfully unforgettable in the shock and horror and loss of a rioting people in the cities of this land. I am reluctant because no one person can speak for the so-called religious sector or community—a description which, incidentally, I cannot defend. I am reluctant because the image of the Churches, at least in the years past, too often has been one of a moral and spiritual bastion from which, from time to time, have been issued divine directives and ethical judgments to which men and women have been called to conform or run the risk of being irretrievably lost. While this is a caricature of the churches and will be recognized as such by people of a broad understanding, like all caricatures, there is enough truth showing to prove a point. And that point is not reassuring.

I am reluctant because mere human beings seem entitled to convincing answers to the dilemmas and frustrations and agonies of people imprisoned by desperate circumstances from a channel for God's might intervention in His world of men, in justice, love and reconciliation—which channel historically the churches have claimed to be—and I am reluctant because we of the churches have demonstrated that we do not have the answers, at least not in the form of discernible specifics, to alleviate the basic hopelessness, the despair of becoming, the powerlessness, and the loss of human dignity which are clearly the root of the Negro's rebellious protestations and subsequent violence.

No, I am afraid that we have unwittingly demonstrated that we are part of the problem inasmuch as the sickness of our society is our sickness also. And our brokenness, highlighted by our fears for our own survival, our institutional status, our insularity from the suffering and hostility of other members of the human family, betrays the fact that, far from being equipped to exercise the role of the physician to the illness of mankind, we should be sensitive to the biblical injunction, "Physician, heal thyself!"

Let us be honest and acknowledge that we are here primarily because we have been shocked and bewildered by the horror that is Watts and Newark and Detroit and Milwaukee and New Haven and other urban centers of a nation whose forefathers fought for the right of self-determination, for the rights and dignity of every human being, for freedom under law, for deliverance from discrimination and for a dream which for nearly two centuries now has been a torch to which the oppressed and shackled could look up in hope. We are here because violence has rudely shattered our complacency about something basic that we had taken for granted.

Let us be clear that lawlessness and violence are frightfully destructive and are not to be condoned as such. But let us be equally aware that men can become prisoners of the law unjustly, for the process of law which is abused into an instrument of oppression by insensitive men of power, thus rigidly prohibiting the rightful process of change which could bring healing to the body sores and spiritual cancers that affect mankind, soon faces the rude awakening, namely, that desperate and despairing human beings will revolt against the tyrannous character of such law, inasmuch as they have no other recourse open to them by which their wrongs may be redressed. The beneficiaries of order and domestic tranquillity must understand this, indeed must learn to deal sympathetically and constructively with it without hypocrisy or illusion or pretense, and to respond to the violence of frustrated hopelessness. For the application of increased restrictive power only is to compound the root causes of alienation, abandon the responsible role of reconciliation and destroy the God-given bonds of relatedness by which men belong to each other inseparably and irrevocably.

Secretary General U Thant has said, "The truth, the central stupendous truth about developed countries today is that they can have—in anything but the shortest run—the kind and scale of resources they decide to have. . . . It is no longer resources that limit decisions. It is the decision that makes the resources. This is the fundamental revolutionary change—perhaps the most revolutionary mankind has ever known." I believe those words are accurate. I believe their truth places a moral question of unprecedented dimensions before the conscience of America. It is no longer a question of whether we shall do a few good things for the victims of a kind of givenness composed of powerlessness and poverty and hunger and rats and illiteracy and unemployment and second-class citizenship and hopelessness so deep it can find expression only through riots and destruction. The question now is: Shall we mobilize our capacity for wiping these shameful conditions off the face of this nation and this planet or shall we choose other priorities? For the first time in history we are called to leadership and responsibility in the possession of the capacity to eliminate the basic conditions themselves.

On December 7th, 1966, the General Assembly of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A. adopted the following resolution:

"Whereas, we recognize that millions of persons are living without access to an equitable share of our nation's abundance in terms of adequate housing, education and job training employment, as well as health and medical services; and

Whereas billions of dollars of our nation's economic resources and a concentration of manpower resources are required to establish full equality of opportunity; and

Whereas our present set of national economic priorities of defense, space exploration and the production of super-sonic air transport must not be allowed to impede the achievement of social justice for people; therefore be it,

Resolved, that we, the General Assembly of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A., call upon the President and the Congress of the United States to use our nation's economic resources so as to give the highest priority to programs designed to provide for full equality of opportunity.

We need the kind of government programs which reflect a massive change in national priorities and we need the kind of funding that will prevent those programs from being empty promises only. The executive and the legislative branches of our government has a clear responsibility. But unless the private sector similarly changes its own priorities, the task will not be accomplished. Recognition of ghetto community organizations as legitimate agents of the poor, guaranteed annual income for all citizens, costly motivational and training programs for the unemployed and the underemployed, location of manufacturing plants where the jobs are needed, upward mobility for our Negro brethren—all these are overdue. The religious institutions are now beginning to awake to their obligation to invest the large sums in their care according to the prime criterion of responsibility to the total community and all its citizens.

It would be refreshing if this Convocation facing its responsibility seriously as I know it will, would be emphatic and unequivocal about the right of the power, and to an effective voice in decisions that affect their destiny. The more we permit the dilution of the principle of maximum feasible participation: even in a gathering such as this or, more importantly, in legislation designed to aid the poverty-ridden sector of this country, the less credible we appear to men and women struggling with their misery—and the less likely we are to build our part of a bridge between our alienation. The basic dignity of man demands of us a new style of operation in which we confess our lack of answers and acknowledge our lack of right to prescribe what is good for our brothers! For the best of well-intentioned programs is doomed to failure of it does not from the outset involve those whom it would benefit!

But—as the World Council of Churches Report on the Church and Society reminds us:

"Violence is very much a reality in our world both the overt use of force to oppress and the invisible violence perpertrated upon people who . . . still are the victims of repression and unjust social systems. Therefore the question often emerges today, whether the violence that sheds blood in planned revolutions may not be a lesser evil than the violence which, though bloodless, condemns whole populations to perennial despair."

Someone has suggested that the tremendous job that stands before us depends almost entirely upon two factors: men and money. His point, in part, is that enormous numbers of people must be recruited to do a tremendous variety of jobs simultaneously. And there can be no doubt about that! What is less distinguishable is that any amount of money can make the decisivs difference! What Detroit . . . for example . . . seems to be telling us is that poverty is more a state of mind than material want. This is what the great prophets of the Bible also said!

What makes poor people poor (most of whom are also black) as Mr. Roy Wilkins has reminded us, is "a kind of anguished culture that is almost impossible for people outside to comprehend." To which the Editor of "Commonweal" adds: The anguished culture refers to the fact that vast numbers of black Americans, and particularly their dynamic nucleus, the youth, feel no sense of identity with this nation. . . . Their sights were encouraged to broaden with the Supreme Court decision on school integration thirteen years ago . . . but the realization of identity has not accelerated apace. Perhaps they are earning more money. Perhaps more of them have jobs. Perhaps a few are training for skilled posts. But they don't really belong in the White Man's society, and that is what hurts infinitely more than whatever solace is offered by their material improvement." What is being said is that no antipoverty program will work unless, and until poverty itself is re-defined, and ministered to, in human rather than material terms alone.

Meat Inspection Standards Must Be Strengthened in the Public Interest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1967

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, the evidence developed during recent hearings by the House Agriculture Committee on H.R. 12144, to expand Federal meat inspection standards, emphasizes the urgency for stringent new safeguards for the protection of the public, and particularly for the protection of the poor and lower income families, against the sale and use of contaminated meat for human consumption.

While it appears, from the information available, that the committee's proposal does represent some strengthening of the Agriculture Department's authority to control processed meat producers, it also appears that the proposal leaves practically untouched the commercial animal slaughtering houses which sell meat within State borders.

It is authoritatively revealed that about 25 percent of the country's commercially processed meat producers and some 15 percent of the commercially slaughtered animals—19 million head a year—are not now covered by Federal inspection standards because they travel only in intrastate commerce. It is significant to note that only 25 of our 50 States presently require State meat inspection and Agriculture experts have testified that virtually none of the State regulations match the Federal standards of meat inspection to insure that the animals are not dead, dying or decayed before they are slaughtered.

Mr. Speaker, while no legislator has any desire to interfere with, or unduly intrude upon, the fair and legitimate service operations of any segment of industry in this country, we, nevertheless, do have the obligation to reasonably protect the health and safety of our citizens, and very especially the poorer citizens and families, against the poisonous selfishness of the unscrupulous few.

From all the authoritative information and testimony available, it quite clearly appears that, in the very serious public interest, the great majority of slaughterhouses must be subjected to Federal inspection standards and I would urge my colleagues to focus their most conscientious legislative attention upon this problem and its urgency when the subject comes before the House in the near future.

Fairchild Hiller's C-123 Has Important Role in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1967

Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, as concern for the situation of the United States in Vietnam continues we very often do not have the opportunity to familiarize ourselves with the "inside" operations and maneuvers which compose the day-to-day life of war itself.

In an article which appeared in the Aviation Week and Space Technology magazine, Mr. Cecil Brownlow gives an interesting and detailed account of the importance of the airlift to the survival and success of ground operations. Mr. Brownlow devotes particular attention to the C-123, an aircraft developed by the Fairchild Hiller Aircraft Division located in nearby Hagerstown, Md. I wish to commend and congratulate Fairchild Hiller for the valuable contribution which it has made to the military and industrial development of the United States.

Mr. Brownlow's article follows:

VIET GROUND EFFORT KEYED TO AIRLIFT BASE

(By Cecil Brownlow)

TAN SON NHUT, VIETNAM.—Airlift provides the baseline of survival and success for the allied ground forces struggling in the morass of the half-light war in South Vietnam.

"This war would come to a screeching halt without airlift," Air Force Brig. Gen. William C. Moore, Jr., commander of the 834th Air Div. here, recently told Aviation Week & Space Technology. Other top air and ground commanders in South Vietnam agree.

Airlift as a whole has provided the capability of overflying Viet Cong ambushes and supporting isolated or besieged units. It has directly supported major allied ground actions such as the recent sweeps through war zones "C" and "D" near Saigon, two areas that had remained under firm Communist control for more than 20 years.

Army helicopters moving troops directly into action from their staging areas and provide some logistics backup as well. Responsibility for bulk movements, however, including emergency resupply, rests primarily with the 834th Div., with its fleet of Fairchild C-123s and recently inherited de Havilland of Canada C-7A Caribous plus a complement of Lockheed C-130 turboprop transports sent here on a rotational basis. Work of the 834th is augmented by the six Caribous of the Royal Australian Air Force here plus the transport wing of the Vietnamese Air Force equipped with Douglas C–47s.

In a war such as this, where there are no front lines per se and where there are no absolutely secure areas as such, the requirement for airlift is self-evident. The relative paucity of it was a major factor behind France's loss of Vietnam and the remainder of its holdings in Indo China in the early 1950s. At present, only about 31% of South Vietnam's railroad network is open in any form for use by the allies. Most of this is available during daylight hours only and subject to frequent Viet Cong sabotage and harassment. The same holds true for the country's highway and road net, although the situation here has improved somewhat in recent months.

To accomplish its task, the 834th depends upon a normal aircraft completement of:

Four C–123 squadrons of the 315th Air Commando Wing stationed at Bien Hoa. A fifth C–123 unit of the 315th, the 12th Air Commando Sqdn., is used for "Ranch Hand" defoliation and "Trail Dust" crop-destruction missions.

Six C–7A Caribou squadrons of the 483rd Troop Carrier Wing headquartered at Cam Ranh Bay. Under terms of an earlier Pentagon agreement, the Army on Jan. 1 reluctantly turned over the C–7s to the Air Force. The transfer engendered bitterness here on the part of some Army commanders, who regarded the move as a USAF power grab. Previously, they also had had the Caribous at their direct beck and call, and they feared the transfer might mean a reduction in the amount of support available to them.

Some Air Force officials, in turn, privately charged the Army with deliberately running the aircraft to the maximum and pushing them well beyond their normal overhaul times prior to the transfer in hopes that the C–7 support effort would take an at-least-initial dip under USAF control. Gen. Moore and his commanders, however, are determined to see that the C–7 utilization rate goes up rather than down, and initial results indicate that this is being accomplished.

Forty-four C–130s from the 315th Air Div. in Tachikawa, Japan, that rotate into South Vietnam on a temporary-duty basis. Normal period for a C–130 and its crew here at any one time is 10–14 days, according to Gen. Moore. C–130 models seeing service here include the A, B and E.

In addition, the 834th also has under its command the 2nd Aerial Port Group, which is responsible for the loading, off-loading and manifesting of troops and cargo.

The aircraft of the 834th serve some 200 "airfields" in South Vietnam as well as others in Thailand, the major staging area for USAF aircraft striking North Vietnam. The number of airfields fluctuates upward or downward depending upon the movements and requirements of the ground troops. Capabilities of the fields range from dual 10,000-ft. concrete runways to hastily-slashed-out 1,000-ft. red-dust strips of dirt or laterite. The latter are in the majority. Of the 197 "fields" being served by the 834th in a recent month, only 10 possessed any night-lighting capabilities whatsoever.

Many must be reached by flying low-level, hazardous courses between hill lines from which the Viet Cong often snipe at an aircraft during its approach and departure. Since USAF transports began operating here on a regular basis in the early 1960s, they have been struck well over 500 times by Viet Cong ground fire.

This figure, however, includes hits taken by "Ranch Hand" and "Trail Dust" aircraft, which provide particularly-tempting targets to the Communist snipers because of the low speeds and altitudes at which they must fly. To minimize the Viet Cong propaganda charge that the aircraft are engaged in "bacteriological warfare," the Air Force also often alerts the population of an area well before the spray aircraft arrives so that they can evacuate if they desire. Unfortunately, the notice also serves to alert the Viet Cong gunners.

The C–130, capable of carrying payloads up to 30,000 lb., currently is moving the bulk of the cargo being airlifted in South Vietnam. For routine operations, the C–130 is restricted to air strips and bases having runways with a minimum length of 3,000 ft. On an emergency basis, however, the aircraft have operated into strips with lengths ranging down to 1,900 ft., including runways hastily laid out among the trees of abandoned French-owned rubber plantations.

The C–123Bs normally are restricted to runways having a length of at least 1,900 ft., but this ruling also is stretched on occasion when the resupply need is urgent. Maximum payload of the B model is 10,000 lb., and is used extensively here in the support of remote Army Special Forces camps.

The Caribous, with a 5,000-lb. payload capability, are used primarily to service the smaller strips with runway lengths of 2,000 ft. or less. Normal minimum runway length for the C–7A is about 1,200 ft., but, again, this can be lowered to 1,000 ft. and below if the tactical situation demands. In a recent month under USAF control, the Caribous flew cargo and passengers into 162 of the 197 fields being utilized by the 834th.

The smaller airfields used by the C–130 and C–123 have been divided into three categories. Type One includes three different configurations, all with a minimum width of 40 ft.—a 2,000-ft.-long dirt runway, a 1,900-ft. laterite strip and a pierced-steel-planking (PSP) unit with a length of 1,600 ft. All three have been used by the C–123.

DIRT RUNWAYS

Type Two includes dirt runways with a length of 2,300 ft. or 1,900-ft.-long PSP units. Minimum width for both is 50 ft. These runways can be used by the C–130 as well as the C–123.

Type Three consists of runways 3,000 ft. in length composed of either PEP or laterite or 2,500 ft. of packed dirt. Minimum width is 60 ft. Type Three is used routinely by the C–130 and the C–123.

Here's how the operational figures for the three aircraft types of the 834th totaled out in one recent and comparatively light month:

C–130—8,221 sorties in 6,102 flying hours carrying a total payload of 46,093 tons, 96,921 passengers and 34,463 tons of cargo.

C–123—8,048 sorties in 5,066 flying hours carrying a total payload of 22,574 tons. 70,886 passengers and 14,068 tons of cargo.

C–7A—12,451 sorties in 7,545 flying hours carrying a total payload of 17,269 tons, 82,239 passengers and 7,400 tons of cargo.

C–123K VERSION

The capabilities and utilization of the C–123 will be improved markedly with the full introduction of the 76 modified K versions of the aircraft scheduled for this theater. The first of these aircraft, with an augmenting General Electric J85–17 turbine engine positioned outboard of each of the standard reciprocating powerplants, recently arrived in South Vietnam (AW&ST May 1, p. 57). The J85–17s have a maximum thrust of 2,850 lb. each.

The K version will boost the C–123's payload capability by 3,400 lb. and permit it to operate from substantially-smaller strips than those now utilized, according to 834th officials here. The B model, as an example, requires approximately 7,000 ft. from the beginning of a takeoff roll to reach an altitude of 450 ft. the C–123K can be at this altitude after only 1,200 ft.

Aside from permitting the aircraft to operate from smaller fields, the improved climb capabilitiy also will help the aircraft to climb beyond the range of the Viet Cong snipers who often hide off the thresholds of runways to take pot shots at incoming and departing aircraft.

834TH WORKLOAD

The workload of the 834th generally has kept pace with the step-by-step buildup or escalation of the U.S. effort and forces in South Vietnam. In January, 1966, the division transported a total of 107,250 tons, including cargo, mail and passengers (see table, p. 89). The cargo/mail figure stood at 80,696 tons as compared with the 14,394 tons brought into the country by the Military Airlift Command (MAC). For December, the total tonnage for the division stood at 179,260 and, for January, with the Caribous operating under USAF control, at 185,003.

The cargo represented by these figures is diverse to say the least, ranging from urgently-required ammunition to livestock on the hoof for units of the Army of the Republic of Vietnam.

While the 834th operates under the direct control of the 7th Air Force here, the employment of its aircraft is determined by the Military Assistance Command, Vietnam (MACV), the top U.S. military headquarters in South Vietnam. The MACV-established mission priorities for the 834th are:

Priority 1—Unplanned movement of troops into combat.

Priority 2—Unplanned movement of cargo into combat.

Priority 3—Materiel or troops essential to the success of an operational mission.

Priority 4—Equipment without which the success of a mission might be impaired.

Priority 5—Administrative troop movements.

Priority 6—Routine resupply.

Priority 7—Training flights.

PREPLANNED MISSIONS

Priority 4, 5, 6 and 7 missions normally are preplanned from one to several days before they are to be flown. Priority 1, 2 and 3 missions, on the other hand, generally are assigned on a near-immediate basis, and, to obtain the necessary aircraft to conduct these, preplanned flights often have to be diverted or canceled. For the top three priorities, an emergency airlift request net recently was established to short-circuit the normal, sometimes cumbersome, calls for aid from the ground forces.

Under emergency net procedures, a request initiated at the battalion level is transmitted to the divisional tactical air control party and to the field force (corps) headquarters simultaneously. If approved at these levels, it goes to the responsible direct air support center (DASC) responsible for the area. The DASC then funnels the request into the MACV combat operations center. At the same time, the 834th's airlift control center (ACC) is alerted so that it can begin to round up the necessary aircraft and crews and be prepared for the mission if MACV gives a final approval. Normal time required from the initiation of the request until the first aircraft are airborne is 3 hr.

In the past, the ACC was not formally notified of a pending mission until after it had received MACV approval. On occasion, with each unit up the chain of command weighing and approving the proposal before passing it along, as many as 22 hr. were consumed before the ACC received any notification. It then had to search for the crews and aircraft to fulfill the requirement.

In one recent move, the 834th was called upon by MACV to transport a 2,800-man brigade plus 4.5 million lb. of equipment and supplies in support of a major operation within five days. The designated landing strip was 3,000-ft. runway at Kontum in the central highlands area of South Vietnam. After receipt of the order, Gen. Moore promised that it would be accomplished in not more than 72 hr. Actual time required to complete the move from the time it was initiated was 47hr. 35 min.

Using 12 C–130s during the daylight hours and 6–8 at night because of the limited facilities at Kontum, the mission was accomplished in 198 sorties for an average of one every 13 min.

A temporary lighting system was strung along the runway for the night operations, and a mobile Army ground control approach (GCA) system was moved in to monitor the flights during periods of marginal weather.

While the majority of supplies flown are into existing air strips, some are paradropped to the more remote units. The relatively new precision low-altitude drop system (PLADS) and the low-altitude parachute ejection system (LAPES) (AW&ST Mar. 28, 1965, p. 92) also have been used here on an experimental basis in recent months. Developed at USAF's Tactical Air Warfare Center at Eglin AFB, Fla., the accuracy and reliability of PLADS and LAPES do not yet have the full confidence of the Army commanders here. Once this is overcome, however, the 834th plans to make greater use of the two delivery techniques.

The 834th as such was formed on Oct. 15 as a successor to the former 315th Air Commando Group, a subordinate unit to the 315th Air Div. in Japan. The distance between Japan and the Army user in South Vietnam, however, made the command and control system somewhat cumbersome and the response times to unexpected requirements sometimes overly long.

This was particularly true in view of the U.S. buildup. The group's strength also had grown to the point where the divisional designation was appropriate.

The aerial port operations, also formerly supervised from Japan, now have been placed under the control of the 834th, "and we've already seen improvements," according to officials here. Sub-units of the 2nd Aerial Port Group include the 8th Aerial Port Sqdn. at Tan Son Nhut, the 14th at Cam Ranh Bay and the 15th at DaNang as well as mobile teams for the forward operating strips.

MAC/834TH AIR DIVISION WORKLOAD—VIETNAM

Month (1966)	Cargo/mail		Passengers		Total (tons)	
	MAC	834th	MAC	834th	MAC	834th
January	14,394	80,696	34,252	221,280	18,505	107,250
February	9,109	81,964	40,057	275,232	13,916	114,992
March	13,479	93,464	37,965	252,206	18,035	123,727
April	15,139	105,800	49,295	346,103	21,054	147,333
May	16,893	110,267	70,349	409,847	25,332	159,448
June	14,130	102,988	66,393	374,312	22,097	147,905
July	14,437	111,003	67,812	397,350	22,574	158,685
August	15,899	110,372	84,800	441,941	26,069	163,405
September	16,888	113,126	82,499	446,829	26,788	166,746
October	25,442	110,628	86,890	452,407	35,869	164,918
November	28,325	135,835	83,021	483,513	38,287	193,856
December	30,494	127,438	105,355	431,835	43,137	179,260
Total	214,620	1,283,581	808,688	4,532,855	311,663	1,827,525

Navy Flyer Dies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1967

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Lt. Comdr. Fred H. Gates II, a naval aviator, was recently killed while he was en route to Vietnam. I wish to commend the courage of this pilot, and to honor his memory, by including the following article in the RECORD:

FRED H. GATES, NAVY FLIER, OFF VIET

CENTREVILLE, MD.—Funeral services for Lt. Cmdr. Fred Horatio Gates 2d, a Naval aviator for the last twelve years, will be held at 3 P.M. Sunday at St. Paul's Episcopal Church here.

Commander Gates, 35, was operations officer of Attack Squadron 25, operating from the U.S.S. Coral Sea in the South China Sea en route to Vietnam.

He was killed Saturday after his propeller-driven airplane developed engine trouble during a landing approach. Commander Gates went down with the airplane after ditching it about a quarter mile astern of the aircraft carrier.

A native of Wilmington, Del., he was a graduate of the United States Naval Academy. He received his aviator's wings at the United States Naval Air Station, Pensacola, Fla., in 1955.

A specialist in anti-submarine warfare, Commander Gates had served aboard the U.S.S. Tarawa, Randolph, Lake Champlain and Essex before joining the Coral Sea. He flew patrol and reconnaissance missions during the Bay of Pigs invasion and the Cuban missile crisis.

Commander Gates held a master's degree in naval ordnance and electronic engineering from the United States Naval Post-graduate School, Monterey, Cal.

Survivors include his wife, the former Sandra Perry, of Rockland, Maine; two daughters, Stephani Leigh and Terri Elizabeth Gates; two sons, Paul Douglass and Courtney MacLeod Gates; a sister, Mrs. Sally-Louise Herzer, of San Diego, Cal., and his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Fred Carleton Gates, of Centreville.

Resolutions Adopted by the New York State Young Democrats

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1967

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, at their recent convention, the New York State Young Democrats adopted a number of resolutions covering a wide range of important public issues in New York State. It is a remarkable document, both in scope and content, and it is an excellent example of this fine organization's deep concern for the welfare of the State of New York. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the text of the resolutions:

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY THE NEW YORK YOUNG DEMOCRATS AT CONVENTION, JUNE 25, 1967

Whereas, the New York State Young Democrats recognize that if they are to be an effective organization and representative of the youth of this State, through their state organization, they must take positions on issues of vital public interest.

Whereas, and in view of the foregoing, our Committee has discussed divers aspects of various legislation and items of public and political interest to the community,

Now, therefore, be it resolved, that the New York State Democrats recommend to the Constitutional Convention of the State of New York that the voting age be reduced to 18 years of age.

Be it further resolved, that we support mandating free tuition in all state, city and county colleges and universities.

Be it further resolved, that the present scholarship programs be increased in number and amount of award.

Be it further resolved, that the prohibition against the use of the said scholarships in other states be removed; provided, the institutions do not discriminate because of race, color or creed.

Be it further. resolved, that the "Forever Wild" provisions of the Constitution be retained, with the addition of a proviso to allow the use of some land to provide greater accessability to these regions, without violating their basic nature as forest and wildlife preserves.

Be it further resolved, that the New York State Young Democrats support legislation for greater home rule and further memorialize the New York State Constitutional Convention to enlarge the powers of local government.

Be it further resolved, that the Constitutional Convention adopt a new re-written constitution in simplified form and oppose piece-meal amendment thereto.

Be it further resolved, that a permanent non-partisan commission be established to redraw state legislature districts, at least every ten years, based on the latest federal census.

Be it further resolved, that local governments be required to adhere to the "one man—one vote" principal in the apportionment and districting of their representative bodies.

Be it further resolved, that the New York State Young Democrats support legislation for the liberalization of abortion laws.

Be it further resolved, that the New York State Young Democrats continue to support legislation favoring open housing.

Be it further resolved, that the New York State Young Democrats shall seek to encourage and support the inclusion and enfranchisement of teenagers and Teen Democratic Clubs in its organizations and in its member clubs

Be it further resolved, that the New York State Young Democrats support a transportation program which emphasizes the unification of a state-wide and regional system of transportation based on the development of high-speed, inter-city and inter-regional mass transit rather than the highway.

Be it further resolved, the New York State Young Democrats support legislative reform to encompass the publication of a daily journal of proceedings, similar to the Congressional Record; the enactment of a strong Code of Ethics, prohibiting representation by legislators or people employed by the State, before State Courts, Agencies or Departments, involving claims or suits, by or against the State; the revision of the present Standing Committee system by reducing the number thereof and the establishment of a more orderly method for the assignment of bills to the appropriate committee.

Be it further resolved, that wiretapping and eavesdropping be prohibited, except by Order of the Court and when the national security is at stake.

Be it further resolved, that the New York State Young Democrats support legislation clasisfying the sale or possession for the purpose of sale of hallucinogenic drugs a felony.

Be it further resolved, that the punishment for the sale or distribution of narcotic or hallucinogenic drugs, especially involving our youth, be of such a nature so as to deter such sales.

Be it further resolved, that the present separation of the Surrogates' Court and the Court of Claims be maintained and that they remain entities unto themselves.

Be it further resolved, that a State-wide Civil and a State-wide Criminal Court be established.

Be it further resolved, that Justices of the Peace Courts and other County Courts be eliminated and a District Court system be established in lieu thereof.

Be it further resolved, that funding and fiscal affairs of the entire court system be made the direct responsibility of the State.

Respectfully submitted.

WILLIAM J. GARRY,
Chairman of Resolutions Committee.

Statement by Charles Benton in Support of Public Broadcasting Act of 1967

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES J. HOWARD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 28, 1967

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, a most interesting statement by Mr. Charles Benton in support of the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967 will be of interest to my colleagues. Mr. Benton speaks from a fund of experience in the audio-visual field. His background in business and his present task as president of the Fund for Media Research, which is engaged in an extensive study of the needs and problems of educational television, made him an eminently qualified witness on this important measure.

I found his comments and suggestions most helpful and I include them in my remarks in the RECORD at this point:

STATEMENT OF CHARLES BENTON, PRESIDENT, FUND FOR MEDIA RESEARCH, LINCOLNWOOD, ILL., ON PUBLIC BROADCASTING ACT OF 1967

Mr. Chairman, I am grateful for this opportunity to testify on the Public Broadcasting Act. My remarks are based on experience in private business in the development and production of educational films as former president of the Encyclopaedia Britannica Educational Corporation and of Encyclopaedia Britannica Films.

Today I appear in my capacity as President of the Fund for Media Research, a private non-profit foundation engaged in a study of the status and needs of instruction, as served by television, in 16 major cities.

The Fund is conducting this study on behalf of the Research Council of the Great Cities Program for School Improvement. The membership of the Council includes 16 major metropolitan school districts involving around 4 million youngsters, or roughly 10 per cent of the total school population in the United States.

My comments are based on direct knowledge of the uses of modern audio-visual techniques in improving classroom instruction.

I would like to express my full support for the goals of the legislation now before this committee. A sound program of public television can be a force for improving the quality of all television, and indirectly the advancement of education.

My comments today concern one specific section of this bill, Title III, which authorizes a study of instructional television which may cost as much as $500,000. While the idea of a Government-supported study is good, I am concerned that Congress makes the purposes quite clear, so that the result can be as authoritative and useful as the Carnegie Commission report.

I believe the study proposed by Title III can be extremely useful—*if* it is expected to provide the Congress, the educational community, and private business with clear answers they need to aid in the most productive development of instructional television.

But to get any such answers, we must first ask the right questions. I think that the Committee might find it impractical—as did Senator Pastore's subcommittee in the Senate—to rewrite section 302. Yet either through language in the bill itself or through a clear statement in the committee report, the Congress should state what it feels the character of these questions should be.

In my view, quite aside from the important topics given as examples in section 302, dealing with content of the study, there are some vital matters the study plan should consider essential. I respectfully ask if the six examples in section 302 indicate how the study should tie directly to our most pressing educational needs.

H.R. 10408, confirming H.R. 6736 as adopted by the Senate, omits this description of content. When witnesses suggested changing in its phrasing, Senator Pastore said that details should be left to the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare.

It was prudent of the Senate to delete that section. It would be desirable to make clear, possibly in your report to the Congress, your realistic and practical intent in authorizing Title III, in three respects. The points I submit all apply to urgent, un-met needs of disadvantaged children in our inner cities.

If taken into account, they would also serve large numbers of other students in public and private schools throughout the nation.

It is not absolutely certain that the Title III study will put the most pressing needs of pupils and teachers first, nor that it will come to grips with city problems that Dr. Conant has called "social dynamite."

No matter what else this study does, if it were not to examine inner city requirements it will be remiss. Now, to three factors that deserve emphasis:

First, what is instructional television? What does it do? The Title III research should *start with basic needs of education.* Among the conditions we are seeing on our study of instructional TV in the big cities is the high turnover of pupils and teachers. In some schools, well over 100 per cent of children move in and out per year. Thousands speak not English, but a dialect or only a foreign language. In language ability, thousands enter the first grade a year behind the norm, and by the sixth grade are as many as four years behind. Arithmetic skills show the same dismal pattern.

There is the absence of motivation with more than half of all students dropping out along the line before high school graduation in some large cities. More than 6,000 teachers in New York City alone were newly hired last year. Most have no inner city teaching experience, and the teacher preparation program for such teachers is almost nonexistent.

We are seeing how television can mitigate these enormous problems. Chicago has devised clusters of schools linked by closed circuits. They are financed under Title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Much of the pupil turnover is within a neighborhood cluster. When a child moves to another school with the same television teachers, there is less dislocation.

In Detroit, one new child—now in her fourth school that same year—was unreachable by any teacher until she saw the TV screen and exclaimed, "There's my teacher!"

Many superintendents have told me that a major advantage from television is inservice teacher training. We are seeing school systems where telecast series provide the framework for updating what is taught, and how it is taught, particularly in the sciences and with math concepts still new to the teachers, who were raised on the "old math." In some cities television series on Human Relations, aimed primarily at the teacher, have provided a useful stimulus for the frank discussion of problems in this area.

However, too often television offerings are mere supplements. We find them largely incidental decoration, remote from what schools must do. As one superintendent put it, "TV hasn't in any way done anything but supplement the traditional."

Seldom do we find enough programs for children at markedly different levels of achievement, designed for their individual aptitudes, interests, and problems. The potentially powerful tool of television can offer the good teacher a wide repertory to draw upon, as her students require.

In order to meet the special instructional needs of the inner city, the school *broad*cast efforts of the community station are not sufficient. The big city schools also need their own *narrow*cast facilities—CCTV, 2500 Mc.—to handle their own critical requirements.

Second, what national policies can encourage better ITV programming for improving learning? The Title II study should *explore ways the Federal Government can encourage private risk investment.*

Surely, the best professional resources of the educational publishing and audio-visual industries ought to be available, producing materials that educators can draw upon. Even though the need is evident, there is no market. Why? Risks are costly and they must be balanced against a chance for reasonable profits.

ITV was born with foundation money as an experiment, but the experiment is over. ITV is now a reality in American education that needs competitive quality programming. Educators should be able to select for their schools' needs from competitive courses. I neither under-estimate the problems nor know the answer in school television. But one can be found that will protect the public interest and will advance instructional results.

Third, the country needs to learn more than "whether Federal aid for instructional media is proper and what form it should take." The Title III study should *estimate the scale of financing necessary to use instructional television well,* much as the Carnegie Commission did in projecting public television costs.

To duck this question would be to risk drifting into multi-million dollar expenditures in taxpayers' money on half measures not worth buying.

Let me amplify each point briefly and suggest that in the long run Title III can be as important as any authorization the Congress has ever made to strengthen education in this nation.

First, the new media can be centrally constructive instead of on the "enrichment" fringes. While instructional television is not now generally making a major contribution to better teaching and learning, virtually all of the administrators and curriculum people we are talking to in the big cities agree that its potential is enormous.

Further, they seem to appreciate the uncommon work being done by resourceful instructional television supervisors and staff who cope, often superbly, with insufficient time, people, and money. What they have in abundance are courage, energy, and fine working relationships. To date, however, most Boards of Education and key administrators have not assigned high priority commitments to the electronic agents of change.

The Carnegie Commission observed that "instructional television has never been truly integrated into the educational process," that—like educational radio and films—it has been "put to incidental and occasional uses as ancillary material."

There are isolated contrasts. In May, I visited American Samoa with a group of big-city school superintendents. There we saw television instruction at the heart of an entire school system. How much greater the potential should be in the 50 States.

Both John Goodlad of UCLA and Father John Culkin of Fordham University remind us that this year's high school graduate has, on an average, had 12,000 hours of classroom instruction, but has watched 15,000 hours of television.

Without neglecting logistics, the Title III study should recognize the "electronic upbringing" of the generation now at school, whose members have watched television since they were weaned. The flow of signals is as normal to them as air and water. It is unfortunate that nobody knows how our educational system can mobilize the full power of this medium for better teaching and learning of today's "television generation."

My second suggestion is to attract private competitive investment. The incomparable wealth of vivid material being developed by the foremost textbook publishers and educational film producers is rarely used on—or in conjunction with—school television.

As a former producer of films which school systems buy widely, I know that very few of our films were being telecast. There is something wrong when teachers use printed descriptions and line drawings of cell division when their students could see through microphotography this life process itself; when at the flick of a switch they can watch distant lands and peoples, or the reenactment of memorable statesmen and great events from the past.

School and community stations assembling lessons find it easier to restrict content to what is at hand. They lack time and money to cull from film libraries and and graphics collections, and to arrange for clearances. There isn't any visible market for the education industries, even for excerpts of their products over television.

More and more companies have been entering the education field. None that I know of is making any serious investment in instructional television programming, where their professional resources could be invaluable. The uncertainties on copyright further inhibit risk capital as well as the maximal use of existing visual materials. Title III presents an opportunity to lay the groundwork for the solution of this impasse.

Lastly, the scale of resources—in money, personnel, facilities, and time—needed to get really substantial benefits from the new media must be anticipated. The Carnegie Commission deferred examination of instructional television, recommending the study proposed in Title III. It reported that there is as yet no basis for making cost estimates in the manner projected for public television.

Congress should consider requesting that the Title III study seek cost criteria in terms of instructional effectiveness, to find out what kind of money will be necessary to meet the priority needs of students and teachers. Unless we learn this, money spent meagerly could be largely wasted because we would get little for it.

In our inner-city slums, we are finding that even record-high per-pupil expenditures bring poor results, unless there are resources enough to accomplish the relevant tasks. It is the same principle as the critical mass required to set a chain reaction into motion.

There are times when we need to remind ourselves of what we already know. At the risk of belaboring the obvious, in the phrase "instructional television" the more important word is "instructional." The ultimate in engineering design cannot make up for poor teaching.

The Title III study must regard advancing technology as a means, never an end. Television and other electronic media are still a new set of instruments. At their best, they are simply tools. The technological factors ought never be permitted to eclipse our concentration on primary goals. And the most important of these are the better teaching and learning for all the children in our fast changing society.

An Answer to SNCC

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 24, 1967

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, in this long and difficult summer, the frequency and intensity of the violence which surrounds us has caused us great despair. The riots, the crime, the war, and the awesome responsibility of correcting injustices and establishing equality have taken their toll on our energies. In this climate, one more unfortunate incident may go unnoticed, but I, for one, was shocked by the stand taken recently by the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee.

The Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee came out strongly against so-called Jewish atrocities perpetrated on the Arabs in the recent Middle East war.

SNCC, which began its career a few short years ago, as an idealistic group of young people, has rapidly dispelled the "nonviolent" appellation in its title and moved into the front ranks of the extremist organizations. I find myself deeply saddened that a group which patently seeks to raise its people above discrimination should, in turn, invoke the oldest discrimination known to man, antisemitism.

Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD at this point, the statement of Mr. Morris B. Abram, president of the American Jewish Committee, in answer to this attack:

STATEMENT OF MORRIS B. ABRAM, PRESIDENT OF THE AMERICAN JEWISH COMMITTEE, REPLYING TO SNCC NEWSLETTER—AUGUST 15, 1967

Anti-Semitism is anti-Semitism whether it comes from the Ku Klux Klan or from extremist Negro groups, "Snick" included. We must remember, however, that "Snick" is no more representative of American Negroes or the civil rights movement than the Ku Klux Klan is of white America. It is tragic that "Snick" has now adopted the oldest and most pernicious form of prejudice, namely anti-Semitism.

Anti-Semitism has the historic quality of destroying whoever or whatever touches it, whether it be Nazi Germany or Czarist Russia. It is also particularly devastating that "Snick" should have adopted a program of extremist Arabs and Soviet anti-Semites who are at this time advancing the same arguments as "Snick" did in its newsletter. The obvious purpose of the Soviet Union and its Arab allies is to divide and weaken the United States in its search for a just and honorable peace in the Middle East.

Americans will not be divided by the Arabs, Soviets or "Snick".

Governor Dempsey of Connecticut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1967

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, the State of Connecticut is justly proud of its Governor, the Honorable John N. Dempsey. He is a hardworking, understanding, and amiable individual, well-loved by the people and highly respected by all who are privileged to know him personally.

Recently, the Hartford Times, one of the great newspapers of our State, published a feature article on Governor Dempsey in its issue of August 24, 1967. It is written by Robert Conrad and presents a very fine profile study of Connecticut's first citizen. I am pleased to insert this article in the RECORD:

DEMPSEYS IN MIDST OF SUCCESS

(By Robert Conrad)

John N. Dempsey went into seclusion this week for a vacation from his job as Governor of Connecticut.

He didn't say where he was going, or for how long. At his last session with newsmen before leaving the capitol, Dempsey gave the impression that he didn't really care—he just wanted to get away for a while.

The last month had been especially strenuous, emotionally, for family man Dempsey.

He had experienced the joy of seeing his 26-year-old son, Edward, ordained as a priest in the Roman Catholic Church.

He had played the traditional role of father of the bride as Margaret, 20, walked down the middle aisle and out of the family circle.

He had mourned the death of his mother, Ellen Luby Dempsey, who with her husband brought Dempsey to this country from his village birthplace in Ireland when the boy was 10.

LONG HARD YEAR

The governor was tired, too, from a year that had been one of the hardest since he entered public life as a councilman in Putnam at 21.

Now 52, Dempsey was feeling the effects of a year marked by Democratic in-fighting and a few swipes at his performance as governor. Even so, he was at a political peak and apparently firmly entrenched in a job he could have as long as the Dempsey magic at the polls held up.

He was "Man O' War," in the words of State and National Chairman John M. Bailey. Dempsey had become, through the use of a smile and a handshake, the party's ticket to happy days in Hartford.

But although Dempsey was in the midst of giddy Democratic success, and a chief reason for it, the governor was confiding to newsmen more frequently lately that the office could be "the loneliest room in the state" at times.

Politically, the action shifted this year to the General Assembly, where a new breed of Democratic cats busied itself in a struggle with the party's old guard. ("Our dinosaurs," one of the up-and-coming party wheels said.)

The Republicans, and sometimes even Dempsey, were only looking in.

In the final days, Dempsey was smacked down with a surprisingly one-sided overriding of his veto of a bill involving one of his favorite subjects of morality—gambling.

INCREASING PRESSURES

When the General Assembly packed up and departed from the capitol, Dempsey was left with a bushel basket full of appointments to make. He was hemmed in by the pressure of time (one committee needled him about failing to fill its ranks, when he actually had nearly two months to act) and news media demands that he avoid putting "hacks" in high places.

By the middle of last week, Dempsey was ready for a break from the demands at the Capitol and the executive residence.

The governor works hard, incidentally, to keep his family shielded from the public life he must lead. Unlike others in high state posts, he has no family pictures or mementos in his office.

The routine at the State Capitol follows a regular pattern in the off-legislature months. His aides say Dempsey puts in more time being governor than many of his predecessors.

Dempsey arrives at the capitol each morning at about 9:10 or 9:30, riding up front in the Ford state police cruiser with one of his drivers, Lt. Charles Rust or Trooper Percy Salley.

He unbuckles his seat belt, sheds his dark glasses and takes the elevator to the second floor office in the capitol's west wing. The staff has his mail sorted for him and Dempsey goes through it before summoning his aides to a daily meeting.

MEETING THE PRESS

Newsmen are next on the schedule. Dempsey started holding press conferences every day soon after taking office. They go on regardless of who may be waiting in the outer offices or what meetings may be on tap.

The mornings are usually cluttered up by appointments with visiting dignitaries, publicity stunt promoters, citizens who have convinced the staff they should see him, or state officials.

The governor tries to get caught up by noon or 12:30. If he goes out for lunch, it is usually to one of a half dozen downtown restaurants. It is also like him to prefer downing some crackers with milk at his desk.

Afternoons are taken up with conferences and visits by legislators, party leaders, commissioners and others high in government. These are the policy sessions and the work meetings which produce the next day's news handouts and speeches.

A high-level Democrat says Dempsey contributes his share of ideas at these sessions, but is often talked around to one of the inner circle's preferences on policy.

The press conference is warmly informal in its conversation and usually limited to prepared releases in the news it produces. One of the ground rules during the General Assembly is that Dempsey won't discuss pending legislation. He turns most questions about happenings in state government away with the explanation that such-and-such commissioner would have the answer.

RIGHT TO OPINION

A typical question about Republican activities might be, "Governor, Mr. Hausman (GOP Chairman Howard E. Hausman) says your road program will hurt the small towns. Have you any comment?"

The Dempsey reply is almost guaranteed to be, "Mr. Hausmann has a right to his opinion."

Newsmen who have been covering Dempsey since he became governor say he tends to be gunshy on direct answers because he was candid once or twice too often in the early days.

Dempsey's liking for people is genuine—not a political pose. He has a gift for instant friendship. He can put total strangers at ease quickly with his "How are ya? Good to see ya" greeting.

He is at his best winging it with kids, or in casual confrontations with the surprised public on street corners and eating places.

When the federal Interstate Commerce Commission reached its landmark decision last year that the merging New York Central and Pennsylvania Railroads would have to include the New Haven Railroad, newsmen and top state officials made a bee line for the governor's office.

WITH THE BOYS

Dempsey had the same news, too. But where was he when reporters came for his reaction? Out in the corridor by his office talking to a visiting group of Cub Scouts.

"You do the best you can," Dempsey often half mutters to himself. A motto on his desk may be the inspiration for his thought. It reads:

"Always do right. This will gratify some people and astonish the rest."—Mark Twain.

Titan Unbound: The Soviet Strategy of Sea Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1967

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, during times such as these when storm-tossed waves of the present are high and treacherous, demanding expert navigation to minimize damage to the ship of state, we may fail to hear hurricane warnings indicating the direction from which a far greater danger threatens. With the problems of the cities keeping us busy and tense on the homefront, and the war in Vietnam occupying our minds and emotions almost to the exclusion of lesser so-called wars of liberation elsewhere, we tend to forget certain of the causative undercurrents of historic upheaval. The gigantic buildup of the Soviet merchant marine which, except in my committee and in some trade journals, has had scant publicity, may, in the long run, prove to be more menacing to the security of the United States and the survival of our open society than some of the more pretentious Soviet missile rattling going on today.

Mr. Speaker, Prof. Raymond Moley has written a commentary entitled "Titan Unbound," published in two parts, July 24 and August 7, in Newsweek magazine on the Soviet strategy of seapower.

As you well know, Mr. Speaker, Professor Moley is no Johnny-come-lately or superficial observer in the field of world affairs. He organized and headed President Roosevelt's famous brain trust; and he was the President's personal envoy to the Economic Conference in London in 1933. He was chairman of the department of government at Barnard College, and professor of public law at Columbia University. He is the author of some 17 books, including the recently published "First New Deal." His perceptive analysis of long-range Russian strategy as a monumental challenge to the United States is worthy of careful perusal.

Mr. Speaker, I insert Professor Moley's two, short but scholarly, columns in the RECORD immediately following these remarks:

TITAN UNBOUND—I

(By Raymond Moley)

The traditional concept of Russia, which still lingers in the minds of American statesmen, is a great inter-continental land mass with a population of multiracial strains, sinister and inscrutable, ever crowding upon its neighbors, but locked in by its lack of warm-water exits to the world outside. A titan, stirring uneasily within and suspicious of Western influence. It was so when Peter the Great gingerly surveyed Western ways. But through two centuries until the revolution it contented itself with harrassing its neighbors, making alliances in Europe and breaking them when its rulers chose.

When attacked, as in 1812, Russia permitted such aggressors to perish in its vastnesses and cold. And even in our century, when it was racked by internal convulsions, Western eyes, except those of the most perceptive, looked on with passive indifference.

Then, when the cold war started in the late 1940's, we and our Western allies came to be alarmed by Soviet demonstrations of scientific progress and military might. We conceived the threat to be directed against Western Europe, Japan and the United States on land and in space and through subversion by Communist propaganda.

Our reaction has been to match the Soviet's military potential and by massive foreign aid to anticipate Soviet influence in needy countries.

We cannot deny the danger in such projections of power and influence nor the need for countermeasures.

THE STRATEGY OF SEAPOWER

What we see superficially are Soviet policies to exacerbate centers of conflict over the world, to make grand gestures in space, to rattle missiles and to poison world opinion by propaganda glorifying Russian scientific progress and vilifying the West as imperial and colonial.

But beyond those diversionary tactics is a major design rooted in the Kremlin's comprehension of seapower, a key to breaking out of landlocked isolation. Soviet strategists have been literate people. They have read in history that ever since Rome overcame Carthage, despite Hannibal's genius, the nations that have been dominant have been powerful on the sea, commercially and militarily. Nothing in our day has changed that.

Seapower is a nation's ability to project its identity into the seven seas—its commercial potential in peace; in war, its fighting ships. To employ to its advantage its capacity to use the seas—a navy, merchant ships, shipyards, seaports, a fishing industry and marine science and engineering.

Sometime before the death of Stalin fourteen years ago, the strategists in the Kremlim decided upon seapower as a national policy. Once made, that policy became binding upon all of Stalin's successors.

In creating long-term policy, a totalitarian police state has certain advantages over free or, if you will, democratic states. For it has continuity in its self-perpetuating oligarchy undisturbed by popular influences. Here, Presidents and Congresses make not policies but expedients as political tides change.

INTERNATIONAL PURPOSES

Since commercial intercourse is the basis of seapower, major wars must be avoided. At first, at least, the building of a navy is designed for defense and the possible destruction of an enemy's commerce. The Kaiser, who sought seapower, made the mistake of building a navy for offense against the British Navy and failed in the test.

Soviet strategy has considered that. In addition to building defensive naval forces, the U.S.S.R. has concentrated on accumulating a vast merchant fleet with all the auxiliary facilities. Soviet programs have been models of efficiency and determination, directed to political, military, economic and scientific ends.

The earlier ships were built for purely domestic needs. But now ships are being launched for a complex of international purposes.

V. G. Bakayev, Soviet Minister of Sea Transport, has emphasized the economic value of the program, especially to acquire for the Soviet more and more foreign currency. But he added that by "participating in the foreign-trade shipments between many countries of the world, the Soviet sailors contribute to the expansion of the international ties with the U.S.S.R." The role played in international economic relations creates, as another Russian put it, "a new alignment of forces" in the world.

Russian maritime policy is well designed to achieve supremacy at sea in relatively few years. In another piece I shall supply the details of this new phase of the cold war.

TITAN UNBOUND—II

(By Raymond Moley)

In a piece two weeks ago I noted that a major, probably the major, long-term policy of the Soviet Union is to stay out of a great war, and, by developing a massive sea potential, to break out of its traditional landlocked isolation. That policy, created even before the death of Stalin fourteen years ago, has been binding upon all Russian leaders since. Some five-year economic plans have fallen short. But naval strength and seagoing commerce have even outpaced their original objectives.

At the end of World War II the Soviet merchant fleet was insignificant. When Stalin died in 1953 his government's 500 ships aggregated 1.5 million gross registered tons. Then maritime policy accelerated, and in five years an 80 per cent increase was made. That brought Russia into twelfth place among maritime nations. A seven-year plan began in 1959, and the fleet expanded to 7,290,000 gross tons, with 1,437 ships.

The economic potential of a merchant marine is measured not only in the number of units and total tonnage but in age. A technological revolution is a swift destroyer. Here the Russians, building from little, have a great competitive advantage. In 1964, 48 per cent of their dry-cargo ships and 63 per cent of their tankers were less than four years old. Only 22 per cent of the total were more than nineteen years old.

AMERICA, THE OBSOLETE

The Soviet design to penetrate into all sorts of nations is shown by the great suitability of their fleet. They have technically advanced ships in trade with the industrialized West, shallow-draft vessels necessary for the ports of North Vietnam and for the most primitive ports of small or underdeveloped countries, supertankers to carry out to African states and Asia and sophisticated vessels for paramilitary support. Her trawlers are everywhere, as are survey and research vessels. More than a hundred times a month Soviet ships have been furrowing the Suez Canal. The Soviet Minister of Sea Transport has said that ships flying the hammer and sickle call at 600 ports in 91 countries, only thirteen of which are Communist and 51 of which are underdeveloped. Russia's many shipyards have worked long hours. The U.S.S.R. has also patronized the shipyards of Finland, Yugoslavia, East and West Germany, Japan, Italy, Poland, Sweden, Holland, Britain, Denmark—a good customer paying billions in cash and meticulously abiding by contracts.

The American active merchant marine is overwhelmingly obsolete—70 per cent of World War II vintage. To meet our needs in Vietnam, decayed relics are hauled out from the rusty reserves. They break down and are towed into port. These ships are the stigmata of our maritime sickness. The building program, which the Maritime Administration describes as proceeding "at a deliberate [snail's] pace," is 100 ships behind schedule. A baker's dozen are delivered annually. Last year 109 of the reserve fleet were turned into scrap. There is a great tanker and bulk carrier fleet built for American owners and sailing under many flags, and some serve in the war in Vietnam. But their contribution to American employment is mainly a bonanza to admiralty lawyers.

MONUMENTAL CHALLENGE

The Maritime Administration's figures on deliveries of new merchant ships are most significant. The U.S.S.R. added 100 new vessels in 1966 and in addition received 55 transfers from satellite countries. The U.S.A. added thirteen. Robert L. Nichols, in "A Survey of Russian Shipping," derived from Russian sources, notes that in a single year the Russians added more new ships than the U.S.A. built in five years. Only 386 ships have been built for the U.S. flag since 1947. But even more important so far as the future is concerned is the fact that as of May 1966 the Soviet had 581 ships under construction or on order.

"Jane's Fighting Ships, 1966–1967" makes particular reference to the Soviet Union's 2,000 merchant ships aggregating 9.5 million gross tons as an adjunct of naval strength. Her naval forces are now deployed on a worldwide scale. Her merchant fleet is "twice as big numerically and four times the size in capacity as it was only a decade ago, and is now the sixth largest in the world . . . the time has now come when [Russia] can exploit the oceans to the full."

The U.S.S.R. seeks not only monetary returns but the multiplication of influence everywhere. Landlocked isolation is gone forever. Seapower is a reality and, to Americans, a monumental challenge.

Public Broadcasting Act: A Choice for the Public

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. RONAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 24, 1967

Mr. RONAN. Mr. Speaker, whether the television viewer elects to watch a baseball game on a commercial channel or listen to a Russian language expert on a noncommercial channel is a personal choice. But every viewer should have the opportunity to make a choice.

One in every three Americans lives outside the range of a noncommercial or educational TV station. Hampered by personnel and equipment shortages, few educational stations can offer the variety of creative programing they would like.

For these reasons I suport the Public Broadcasting Act about to come before the House.

The bill provides Federal grants to help educational TV stations build or enlarge their broadcast capability. This program, first authorized by the Congress in 1962, has been responsible for new stations or stronger stations in many communities. The bill expands the program slightly and includes, for the first time, equipment grants to educational radio.

To help local educational TV and radio stations offer a greater variety of cultural and public affairs programs, the bill provides support for additional staff and program production, for a national broadcasting library and for an interconnection system that will enable national distribution to local stations.

This legislation is needed. It has public support. It is endorsed by the major commercial networks. I urge my colleagues to give it favorable consideration.

Doesn't Anybody Need Me?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 24, 1967

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, it is often said that there now exists a gap of understanding and trust between the younger and the older generation. My district includes the University of California, at Berkeley, where one student coined the famous phrase, "You can't trust anybody over 30." This, of course, is nonsense. It would be likewise as foolish for us to say that anyone under 30 is not worthy of trust. But many of the younger generation seem to put faith in these words.

I have always felt it very important to talk with younger people, both for the purpose of listening to their ideas, and learning from them, as well as being heard myself. Though we might disagree, the imperative factor is that both listen and understand the other.

This is complicated by a world changing so rapidly that often the very language we use to communicate between generations becomes meaningless or takes on opposite meanings, but one generation must be able to understand the other in order to avoid some of the previous trials and errors.

Mr. Speaker, this gap between generations has been well expressed in a recent Advance-Star article by Dr. Leon Lessinger. I call this article to the attention of my colleagues and include it in the RECORD. Personally, I agree with the final conclusions that Dr. Lessinger draws:

[From the Advance-Star (Burlingame), Aug. 13, 1967]

DOESN'T ANYBODY NEED ME?

(What's behind the apparently widening gap between teenagers and their parents? Dr. Leon Lessinger, who came to San Mateo Union High School District as its superintendent three years ago, spared no adult feelings when he tackled the subject recently. Following is the bulk of his lecture delivered from the pulpit of United Church of Christ, San Mateo, where he appeared as guest speaker.—The Editor).

(By Dr. Leon Lessinger)

"Dad," a teen-ager writes, "how come me and you are always on the outs? Is it something I do or something I am? Doesn't anyone need me?'

Right now, Dad isn't answering very clearly, although he's aware of a growing wall between himself and his youngsters. There is a generation gap, a growing sense of misunderstanding and lack of communication between youth and their elders.

Today's youth are something rather new to the nation. Ever since the second world war—and certainly during the last decade—schools have been struggling to adapt themselves to different types of students than they had seen before.

Nor should this seem particularly strange. The present students have grown up in a unique time and in singularly affluent circumstances. They have known only material prosperity and do not remember prohibition, the stock market crash, the depression, the CCC, President Franklin Delano Roosevelt or even Jimmy Doolittle.

Their war is Vietnam; their world is clouded by nuclear proliferation, an ill-defined Cold War, amazing technological advances, urban decay, rioting youth and a bombardment of sights and sounds via readily available communications media which staggers belief.

Moreover, the present students have been raised differently. By comparison with the past, their parents have been permissive; their families have been on the move, and many (children) come from broken families. Their relationships with their parents and their peers bear the impact of psychology and psychiatry.

They have been influenced by the increased freedom of expression in the public schools and the increased freedom from taboos and restraints of the press, the movies and television. They have been encouraged and permitted to form their own sub-cultures, and the resultant gap between these sub-cultures and The Culture has grown ever larger.

The most striking result of this phenomena has been the rejection of many youth of the values, experience and advice of adults—and the misunderstanding of youth by adults who have grown unable and unwilling to establish a meaningful dialogue with them.

As one college freshman wrote recently, "our morals, or lack of morals, show our increasing conviction that there is nothing absolute or dependable in this world, that nothing is real and no purpose is valid unless we make it so and believe in it. There is no God, or if there is, the code that people attribute to him is only an invention of man. There is no country in itself worthy of patriotism, unless its ideals coincide with what we personally feel is just."

Many of our youth are turning inward—inward to that "inner reality." Many youth talk about "turning on" "and tuning out," about exploring that far-out frontier of inner space.

Even the place of youth in our modern society is undefined. The transition from youth to adulthood is unclear. Up to the modern period, every society has had its rites of passage—its ceremonies and rituals through which youth must go in order to become adults.

We don't know (now) when to end childhood and become adults, and this has had grave consequences for us as a society.

Instead we have a "no-man's land" of quasi-children and semi-adults. Those who dwell in this land have the names with which we are all familiar: subteens, teens, adolescents, teeny-boppers and hippies. And there are many more.

Everywhere the word is change! Change in business, in clothes, in morals, in science, in religion and in education. The change is abrasive, anxiety-arousing, relentless and persuasive.

With this change there is an undermining of authority. Established authorities are losing their persuasiveness and perhaps even their relevance. The questioning of authority is widespread with attacks on the "establishment" and the frequent question, "Can we trust anybody over 30?"

In a changing society, identity is no longer conferred: it must be discovered or created. The question "Who am I?" is constantly asked. The youth subculture, which once sought to submerge its identity in an eagerness to become adult, now asserts its identity in protest against adult culture.

Against the onslaught of change, many leaders and writers are counselling a doctrine which calls for the abandoning of our heritage and our traditions. I find that little thought is ever given by these "prophets" to the consequences of such advice.

To me, this theme is the essence of irresponsibility. Rather than abandon much of our culture, our judgments and our civilization in seeking new paths, we need to rediscover this culture and civilization. We need a massive quest for a serviceable past. We need to turn outward with renewed sensitivity and energy, not turn away into a philosophy of escape.

The most significant action we can take is to provide an opportunity for every boy and girl to do honest work through valued service. Much of the present behavior of youth and adults can be truthfully described as irresponsible. A great deal of the cause of this irresponsibility stems from the failure of adult society to demand, to use and to value the honest labor and service of our youth.

We have eradicated the burden of child labor, but we have removed youth too far from the strengthening fires of work and service alongside adults who need youth to rediscover the usable past and share the necesssary energy to face an uncertain future.

The experience of work and service requires involvement. Those who require, organize or serve in such a program are advised to be responsible adults. Our youth need models—living standards to emulate. Many of our youth have rarely talked with or been around a responsible adult.

Every boy and girl living in our free dynamic society must be given opportunities to pioneer, to contribute a fair share to the building and developing of our land while he is young. The counsel of delay, of the pot at the end of the formal-education, degree-strewn rainbow, will not do.

So many of our youth are bored, restless, wellfed, and eager to "do something." We have no place for them in our towns and cities. Even the drive-ins are becoming off-limits, and the police are getting very adept at stopping drag races.

Shall the sole alternative for "kicks" be the exploration of the inner frontier?

Those who would set up opportunities for youth to serve would be well advised to study the Outward Bound program. At a time when there is so much attention given to the psychedelic set, the hippies, and the fake excitement of the Halloween fringes of our society, it would be a veritable breath of fresh air to watch a group of real adventurers on a different sort of "trip" that requires, demands and rewards discipline, skill and courage.

I believe the following statements about youth are true. If this is so, it suggests a dramatic change in the way we are now using and training youth in our society.

1. Youth can be trusted.
2. Youth want to know the world that surrounds them.
3. Knowing the world and its human agents (adults) is good for youth.
4. Working with responsible adults in a serving, participating relationship leads to growth and responsible behavior for youth.
5. Youth enjoys good teamwork, friendship and a place to belong.
6. Youth is tough and able to "take it."
7. Youth wants to feel important, to be needed and to be useful.
8. Youth does not now feel important, needed or useful.
9. Youth would rather work than be idle.
10. Youth prefers meaningful, socially valued work to meaningless, make-work.
11. Youth likes to be publicly appreciated.
12. Youth prefers active responsibility to passive dependency most of the time.
13. Youth would rather be interested than bored.
14. Youth needs adventure.

"Dad," a teen-ager writes, "how come me and you are always on the outs? Is it something I do or something I am? Doesn't anyone need me?"

Dad better have an answer soon. We need the young people badly. There isn't any alternative.

Pittsburgh Shows Way in War on Poverty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 23, 1967

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, in the wake of the riots in many of our cities this summer, there have been charges that Federal war on poverty funds have been used to foment unrest in the slums. I do not believe these charges, Mr. Speaker, but I do believe that the war on poverty will not succeed until the poor everywhere are given opportunities to articulate their needs and do something about them.

In my home city of Pittsburgh, where the war on poverty has repeatedly been described as a "model for the Nation," the basic aims of the community action program are to first, encourage the city's poor to voice their grievances; and, second, provide them with the means to translate protest into constructive action.

In a column released on Wednesday, August 23, 1967, columnist Charles Bartlett accurately and perceptively analyzed the purposes of Pittsburgh's community action program and concluded:

> Agitation for social change is unquestionably being stirred in Pittsburgh with federal money. The agitation supplies the people in the slums with what every human being requires, a chance to be hopeful about the future. If this be treason, Congress can make the most of it.

I urge my colleagues, particularly those who feel that Federal funds are being used to foment unrest in our urban slums, to read Bartlett's sensitive summary of Pittsburgh's antipoverty efforts. The column follows:

NEWS FOCUS

(By Charles Bartlett)

PITTSBURGH, PA.—The lively pace of the attack on poverty in this city is a persuasive answer to complaints in Congress that federal money is being spent to stimulate militancy in the slums.

The crucial aim of Pittsburgh's highly successful community action program is to encourage the slum poor to make their complaints audible. Federal money is used to channel the aggressiveness of the black militants into constructive, effective protests that stop short of violence.

Thus the Mayor's Committee on Human Resources furnishes experts who guide and advise protests that lead in some cases to marches on City Hall. Neighborhood branches of the Mayor's Committee give summer employment to young black power advocates with police records and encourage them to march at the head of protest parades.

This is not a restful way to wage the war against poverty. Thus encouraged, the spirit of protest runs high and Mayor Joseph Barr has to move fast to stay ahead of it. Militants employed for the summer with OEO funds talked of burning down the city's slums during one recent visit to his office. He has even been faced with a new political challenge aganist the Democratic city organization.

If Pittsburgh should erupt into riots, the men who run its poverty programs will have much to explain to critics like Sen. John McClellan (D.-Ark.) who find it hard to understand why militants should partake of the fruits of the anti-poverty war chest.

But the crucial task, as David Hill, Director of the Mayor's Committee, sees it, is to focus public attention on slum complaints so that the whole city will be aroused by them. By giving support and direction and hope to the militants, Pittsburgh intends to avoid paying the price of their frustrations. So far it has worked.

Hill, himself a Negro who emerged from the slums, plays a uniquely free hand because the Mayor's Committee is dominated by 12 board members who vote as representatives of the poor. The Mayor is a member but he is frequently out-voted.

However there is one thing Hill knows he cannot do and that is to act as a restraint upon the slum protests. Attempts in this direction will cause the poor to dismiss him as another "necktie nigger" and the Committee as a part of "whitey's" establishment. He and his staff can guide and sharpen the protests but they can't tell the poor to stop pushing.

In hiring militants, Hill considers a reasonable risk to be a man with some sense of values and an understanding of the larger problems. He does not harbor any illusions that he is buying their loyalty or changing their point of view. He is merely offering jobs and a legitimate challenge for their grievances.

A major gamble by the North side branch of the Mayor's Committee has paid off this summer. Hiring 150 youngsters with highly dubious backgrounds, the directors found that those with the longest police records and most aggressive attitudes have tended in the clutch to show the most leadership and responsibility.

A group of these "trouble-makers" led an adamant demonstration against the City Health Department in July. Many including the Mayor were apprehensive that it would explode into serious trouble. But the kids walked 20 blocks on a hot day without even a surly outcry.

A more significant instance of backing militant protest with community action funds has been the assistance furnished by the Mayor's Committee to a crusade against slum housing that is widely known in Pittsburgh as CASH.

This is a "war" on slum lords and the activity by CASH, including preparations for a city-wide rent strike, have wrung impressive concessions from the Board of Realtors and confronted the Pittsburgh public with the issue of slum housing.

The Mayor's Committee allocates funds to pay the staff which guides CASH. It is actually run by the slum residents themselves and they have inspired some of Pittsburgh's finest clergymen to take aggressive roles in their behalf.

Agitation for social change is unquestionably being stirred in Pittsburgh with federal money. The agitation supplies the people in the slums with what every human being requires, a chance to be hopeful about the future. If this be treason, Congress can make the most of it.

Taking the Kink Out of Rats

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. RHODES
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 3, 1967

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, in light of the highly controversial subject of riots and rat control, I wish to insert in the RECORD the following article, "Hamelin City Ends Menace," which appeared in the Washington Daily News of August 1, 1967. I believe it will be of interest to my colleagues.

The article follows:

TAKING THE KINK OUT OF RATS: HAMELIN CITY ENDS MENACE

(By Dan Thomasson)

If rats cause riots, Detroit should have been as serene as Hamelin after the Pied Piper marched through.

The Motor City had a $1.8 million rat extermination project that has been heralded as a model for the rest of the nation.

President Johnson has implied the failure of Congress to pass his $20 million anti-rat measure last week could be partially to blame for the wave of civil unrest that has hit the country.

The House Banking and Currency Committee, however, in its report on the Administration rat-control bill cited Detroit's success with rats and said:

"The proposed bill could, with adequate local support, lead to comparable benefits throughout our nation."

Detroit, the Committee report said, launched a "starve out, clean out, build out, kill out" of rats which had:

Drastically reduced the incidence of rat bites. (Only 17 cases reported in 1965).

Practically eliminated the incidence of rat-transmitted disease such as Weil's disease. (There were no cases in 1966.)

Cut sharply the number of buildings infested with rats.

"Other benefits due to the reduction of the Detroit rat population include a direct savings of millions of dollars of damage to buildings, goods and other merchandise," the Committee said.

In addition to its model rat program, Detroit also has been praised by Congress for its outstanding anti-poverty program, which also apparently failed to stave off one of the worst riots in the nation's history.

The United States and Communist China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 28, 1967

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to further develop Chinese language and culture programs in our colleges and universities at both the undergraduate and graduate level, to initiate the study of Chinese at the secondary school level, and to increase the number and effectiveness of Chinese language and area centers in this country.

Historically, China has always been of great potential if not real importance. Its vast size, burgeoning population, and untapped resources, coupled with a propensity to retain the characteristics of a medieval state have justly earned China the title of the "sleeping giant." However, the giant is no longer sleeping, but is a force in being on the international scene which can no longer be ignored. This fact has been dramatically punctuated by the awareness that Communist China is not only building a nuclear bomb stockpile, but is also well on its way to completing a workable missile system for delivering these bombs. The time is long overdue for facing realistically the enormous significance of China as a major factor in world politics.

The emergence of Mainland China as a nuclear power and primary force in international affairs offers the United States, perhaps more than any other nation, a range of complex problems which will grow in magnitude over the coming years. However, these complexities can be reduced to their simplest terms in the rather obvious proposition that armed conflict, especially a nuclear exchange offers the least satisfactory solution to any conflicts of national interest. Correlatively, more satisfactory and stable alternatives must be sought and implemented, yet no one can predict at this moment with certainty what form these alternatives will take.

Certainly in the coming years the United States must reexamine in depth the questions of diplomatic recognition of Mainland China, and its membership in the United Nations. Closely bound to these problems are the possibilities of establishing trade relations, the development of tourism, cultural exchange, and, in fact, the whole spectrum of normal international relationships which, hopefully, will provide for the lessening of tensions and the peaceful solutions to the differences between the two nations.

The examination of these problems, and the possible eventual development of social, political, and economic relationships can best be achieved through the efforts of an informed citizenry, and specialists trained in the language, culture, history, and other academic disciplines of the Chinese people. This will not automatically guarantee satisfactory solutions to the many problems which we will face in our relationships with the Chinese in the future. However, in the absence of developing such understanding and expertise, it is hard to imagine how we can establish and implement those policy decisions which are in the best national interest.

One of the most effective means of interpreting and understanding the behavior of another ethnic group is through the comprehension of its language. This is true for cultures with common roots such as those of the Western World, but it is even more meaningful for cultures which do not spring from the same origin. In the case of Chinese the comprehension of the language provides an insight into the whole Chinese mentality, for in many ways that language mirrors Chinese thought.

This was brilliantly illustrated in a recent article by a British journalist, Dennis Bloodworth, writing in the New York Times. He points out that the Chinese language deals in concrete forms, which prevent the proper expression of abstract concepts. The ideograms are absorbed passively and spontaneously by the eye, as opposed to Western script where the reader is drawn along by a closely reasoned logical argument. The Chinese language is thus considered as not a language of ideas or of rational debate.

One of the problems Bloodworth sees with Chinese is not so much its lack of preciseness, but its ambiguity. It is almost completely lacking the plural form, an active or passive voice, a definite article, or grammar as understood in English.

Even though ambiguous, written Chinese has the tremendous advantage that it can be read and understood by people who pronounce the names of the symbols entirely differently. Vietnamese was written with Chinese characters for centuries, the Japanese still use about 2,000 basic Chinese characters, and the Koreans some 1,200, even though when spoken neither of these languages resembles Chinese. All of the characters are recognizable throughout China, even though one dialect may be totally unintelligible to someone from another part of the country.

Bloodworth describes the Chinese mind as:

> Stereotyped as Chinese decor, clad as it is in stiff cliches of prejudice and tradition. The neat pun, the symbol, the apt classical quotation are all part of a mental system of push-button tuning that tempts a Chinese to avoid bothering with the finer adjustments of original thought. His language delights him with its economy of idiom, and he would rather be concisely ambiguous than long-windedly lucid.

He states that:

> Too often the responses of the Chinese are narrow and mechanical. For centuries they learned the classics by rote, repeated improving slogans parrot-fashion, memorized words rather than remembered their wisdom. More recently, Red Guards expressed their revolutionary Communist zeal by scribbling and shouting endlessly the same fag-end phrases from the "Thought of Mao Tse-Tung" and showed their atavistic obsession with symbolism by smothering their cities in red flags and red tags, by demanding that the red lights on traffic signals signify "go" and not "stop," and even by discussing how to rearrange the world so that East would always be to the left.

The British journalist concludes by saying that:

> The Chinese confuse by seeming to clarify, for the more we try to tidy nature up, the more we obscure it. They are, in their neat suburban fashion, the enemies of the windy and shapeless open spaces of free inquiry in which alone truths can sometimes be found, if not truth itself.

Before World War II, the study of Chinese history, culture, and politics was initiated in the United States at a few leading universities and encouraged by the support of organizations such as the American Council of Learned Societies. The impact of the war in the Pacific focused sudden attention in the United States on the strategic importance of the countries of Eastern Asia, and was a tremendous stimulus to the realization of the need for knowledge of that area. The Army specialized training programs set up at a number of universities and the special training schools for several branches of the military produced a group of young Americans who possessed an excellent knowledge of Chinese, Japanese, and other Asian languages. A large proportion of our current scholarship and Government expertise in this field is the result of this accelerated wartime education.

Since World War II, Asian studies have been maintained through foundation support and, most of all, through Government grants given under the National Defense Education Act for centers of Far Eastern studies, student fellowships, and the like. However, there are still only some 80 colleges in the country that have a Chinese program of any sort.

The development of the Chinese language and area approach has, unfortunately, not found universal acceptance in an academic system which does not always appreciate the interrelations of various disciplines. We are training specialists for immediate needs, but our broader understanding of the cultural diversity of human history has not yet been fully realized. It is vital that we look on our own tradition, not only from within but also from without, and deal with the problems of human development through a multicultural approach. The intellectual as well as the political tasks which fall upon the United States in its New World role demand a widening of our educational horizons that has to effect the education in middle and high schools, as well as those of the specialists. Some of the problems rest with the educators themselves, who, in many cases, still insist that Western civilization should be a predominant if not the sole factor in undergraduate education and who are opposed to programs on non-Western cultures.

The need for trained specialists and the support given to specialized training has enabled a very small number of institutions to move ahead. Fortunately, there has been the student interest itself that has pushed the development in some cases over the reluctance of professional educators. With the possible exception of some west coast institutions, it has been the continuing students interest which has maintained the initiative, but the obstacles are still significant. A large program of financial support that reaches beyond the few bigger name universities in the field will have a crucial impact on broadening our educational philosophy and will give the young Americans of today a further understanding of the world in which they live.

My bill is intended to remedy many of these shortcomings through the implementation of programs which may be summarized as follows:

First. In spite of the increased pressure and complexities of international events and the increased awareness of the roles of the universities and colleges, there still exists a deficiency in numbers and competence in U.S. personnel, although additional resources are available. There must be an enlargement in the number of persons with Chinese language and area competence. To accomplish this graduate level, fellowship programs need to be continued and expanded. There is also the need for more postdoctoral fellowship opportunities, and for more imaginative approaches to the training of able and committed undergraduates.

Second. Continued and expanded support of individual and group research projects by the Government is essential in order to keep abreast of all kinds of demands for new knowledge. This research should not be confined to projects geared only to problem solving or to increasing knowledge of contemporary society. There is valid reason for supporting long-range basic research of specific topics, for it is in this area that the most significant intellectual breakthroughs in our understanding of the Chinese mentality and culture will come.

Third. Continuing support must be given to existing Chinese graduate language and area programs until they have become accepted as a permanent and normal part of a university's total educational program. The universities must also do their part by matching the efforts of the Government, and showing greater evidence of their commitment. There has been some tendency on the part of foundations and those administering NDEA legislation to award fellowship grants to the select few large centers that are already well endowed. With the bigger centers getting bigger, the discrepancy grows and a situation exists where the alienation of the specialists from the broader educational development creates a serious gap that is hurting both the outlook of the specialists and that of the general public and has aggravated present tensions. A better distribution of advanced education among educational institutions in the United States would be wholesome for some of the larger centers as well as raising the national level of instruction.

Fourth. Interinstitutional cooperation is necessary to develop and share scarce resources. Government grants can help stimulate joint planning by universities and assist them in developing joint programs, such as the already established intensive summer Chinese language program, or the Interuniversity Language Center at Tapei. These grants will also aid in enlarging American university contacts with training and research institutions in the Chinese geographic area through faculty exchange and through arrangements for collaboration with scholars in this area on research projects.

Fifth. Many colleges are committing themselves fully to including Chinese studies as an integral part of their educational programs. However, they need assistance in strengthening faculty competence, and to make limited resources go further by cooperating when feasible with other institutions, sharing faculty and library resources, developing joint programs, such as oversea study, and by taking advantage of the experience and resources of nearby universities. Government grants can continue to seek to stimulate and assist various kinds of cooperative approaches to faculty development and curricular revision by groups of colleges; cooperation between universities and colleges, especially in mobilizing scarce resources for Chinese language and area studies; faculty development and curricular experimentation; and the preparation of teaching materials.

Sixth. The undergraduate field is regarded as the crucial area for development. Graduate interest has moved ahead of undergraduate development, and it has been discovered that many graduate students who want to specialize in the field lack the preparation for an advanced study program. It is, therefore, necessary not only to broaden the educational preparation of our college youth in all fields, but also to lay the foundation for the professional course work of studies leading to the M.A. and Ph. D. degrees in Chinese specialization. It has been the experience of some graduate and research institutes that while they have had considerable success in attracting a number of highly qualified graduate students who will make their contributions, they have also found it necessary to move into the undergraduate field in order to provide the necessary foundations for this graduate work. To overcome these difficulties, the institutes would be greatly aided in their efforts to improve and enlarge what are regarded as essential undergraduate development if Federal legislation and funds supported this cause.

Seventh. It is anticipated that on a selective and pilot project basis support will be given for the development of Chinese language teaching on the secondary school level. The earlier a student is exposed to a foreign language the more efficient the learning process becomes, and the opportunity for acquiring a pronunciation approaching that of the native speaker is greatly enhanced. By offering Chinese language instruction, the secondary school students with the interest, motivation, and aptitude for such instruction will be able to develop their skills without having to wait until they reach the undergraduate or graduate levels. These projects must be so constructed that they will reach the greatest possible number of students, including those attending the smaller or rural schools. In many instances this may be accomplished through imaginative and cooperative programs coordinated by State and local education authorities.

Eighth. One of the most promising new areas in which my bill will offer assistance is the provision for including the study of Chinese culture in the curriculums of secondary schools and at the undergraduate level in our colleges and universities: It is very important to the United States that as many as possible of our students, and as early as possible, come to appreciate and understand the position of China in the world today. Studying such a vastly different culture will also give them, by means of contrast, a valuable insight into the traditions of their own country. Understanding China and the Chinese mentality is probably best achieved through study of the language, however this requires students with special aptitude and motivation for learning a complex written and spoken language. The incorporation of Chinese studies, other than linguistics, into world history or other general education courses, or offering special courses which include Chinese history, geography, economics, philosophy, and civilization, at the high school and freshman-sophmore level, may achieve similar results for a great number of students.

It is not very encouraging to realize that our educational system is training the young men and women who will fall heir to the responsibility of creating and implementing national policies regarding China, with only the most meager knowledge of the vast and complex land. It is necessary not only to provide as many experts and specialists as possible in Chinese affairs, but also that our population as a whole is adequately aware of the size and nature of the Chinese nation and its enormous potential for both good and evil. As a Nation we can create and achieve those policies which will best serve our goals regarding China by developing an informed population from whom we may draw the necessary leadership and talent.

The support and encouragement of the establishment of general education courses in Chinese cultural studies will help eliminate the current inadequacy in the curriculums of our educational system. In addition, it is hoped that other disciplines will be encouraged to include consideration of China as an integral part of their programs. Thus, in such courses as comparative literature and government, the traditional purely Western orientation could be enlarged to include the study of corresponding Chinese endeavors.

An indication of our lack of knowledge and understanding of Chinese events, the rate at which conditions are changing, and the urgency for dealing with the expanding problems, may be seen in the current happenings in Hong Kong and the chaos within China itself. Seasoned China-watchers had expected the usual tough statements to continue but thought real belligerency would not come for years. This forecast has changed completely and the riots in Hong Kong and the near civil war conditions in China provide significant indications of the changes that are taking place.

Certainly, if Communist China is willing to sacrifice Hong Kong as an intelligence and banking center and as a source of significant amounts of foreign exchange, then it would be willing to engage in any mischief in the whole of Southeast Asia and beyond. It may be that Communist China has decided to stir up much more serious trouble in such areas as Burma, Malaysia, and Singapore. There is always the dreaded possibility that she may intervene with troops in the Vietnam conflict in order to direct the maximum attention away from the mushrooming internal strife and colossal failures of her domestic programs.

However, the spasms which many consider symptomatic of a "dynasty in decline," have in no way deterred the ultimate Chinese threat to our security, which is the development of China's nuclear arsenal and missile delivery system. Despite the withdrawal of Soviet technical assistance as early as 1960, the Communist Chinese have made tremendously rapid strides in the development of both weapons and rockets which have greatly surpassed previous strategic estimates. They have moved well ahead of the French in nuclear weapon development, and in 2½ years have successfully tested a multimegaton device. The French have held many more tests over a 7-year period and have not yet tested a true thermonuclear device or achieved a megaton-size yield.

Further evidence of the crucial need for facing the realities of Red China's existence, and developing workable policies regarding it, are seen in the recent report of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy concerning the impact of Chinese Communist nuclear weapons development on our national security. It observes that Chinese progress has been "more rapid and surprisingly more effective than had been expected or indeed predicted." The committee's report states the belief that Red China will be able to develop a thermonuclear warhead in the ICBM weight class with a yield in the megaton range by about 1970, and can have an ICBM system ready for deployment in early 1970's. The report also claims that the Chinese are now able to design a low-yield fission warhead which could be adapted to a missile, and with a few tests they could probably design an improved fission weapon for medium-range ballistic missile or bomber delivery. At the present time the Chinese have a few hundred short-range jet bombers and a few longer range bombers. In addition, they are believed to be interested in the development of submarines equipped with suitable moderately long-range missiles. The committee concludes by noting that—

> Perhaps most significant for the United States is the fact that a low order of magnitude attack could possibly be launched by the Chinese Communists against the United States by the early 1970's, and that at present we do not have an effective anti-ballistic-missile system which could repel such a suicidal—for the Chinese—but nevertheless possible strike.

It was for these reasons that the joint committee felt that the assessment it had made should be brought before the American public in order to state clearly where we stand in relation to this emerging threat to our national security.

Mr. Speaker, it may be that the means to achieve national survival will be found in the construction of an antimissile defense system. However, such a system, at best, will only continue the present status quo in United States-Chinese relations, and still leaves unanswered the ultimate problem of creating a world in which a country of such far-reaching importance may enter into the community of nations. At worst, an antimissile defense will theoretically reduce by a certain percentage the great numbers who will die in a nuclear attack. But assuming survivors on both sides after such an exchange the question of international relationships will still remain unresolved. Building the intellectual background necessary for achieving the most desirable policies in our future relations with Communist China is a logical corollary of any military-defense approach to the problem. Hopefully, this might, in the long run, also produce international relationships and understandings which would eliminate the need for any future use of force.

I believe that the cost to accomplish the purposes of my bill is very modest in terms of our overall national expenditures, and yet the dividends which it may pay are in many ways, as great as those resulting from the billions spent in other programs which seek to insure our national survival. I do not presume, however, that this bill offers a panacea for the enormous problems which the Nation faces in its future relations with mainland China. Nevertheless, alternatives to nuclear holocaust must be found if the earth is to continue to support human life, and this legislation at least moves us down the path to finding these more desirable alternatives.

Our resources are finite and on the basis of priorities, Communist China with a 12,000-mile border, containing one-quarter of the world's population and rapidly becoming a nuclear power, commands our immediate attention. In future years other problems may become paramount, but for the moment we must establish some form of lasting rapport with Communist China which will permit the mutual existence of both countries.

Statement by Andrew J. Biemiller, Director, Department of Legislation, AFL–CIO, Before the Senate Education Subcommittee on Labor and Public Welfare in Support of S. 1125, the Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1967, August 14, 1967

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1967

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, Andrew J. Biemiller, former Member of Congress from Wisconsin and now director of the AFL–CIO department of legislation, testified on August 14, 1967, before the Education Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. Biemiller testified in support of S. 1125, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1967.

I find particularly significant in Mr. Biemiller's testimony his criticism of the drastic changes made in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act by some of the amendments adopted by the House earlier this year.

The text of his testimony follows:

STATEMENT BY ANDREW J. BIEMILLER, DIRECTOR, DEPARTMENT OF LEGISLATION, BEFORE THE EDUCATION SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE, IN SUPPORT OF S. 1125, THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION AMENDMENTS OF 1967, AUGUST 14, 1967

The American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations is pleased to have this opportunity to meet with this committee and to pay testimony to the wisdom and vision with which it has shaped a series of educational programs that have brought significant benefits to the millons of American children and young people.

We are here today to discuss the various amendments to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 included in S. 1125, "The Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1967." We are proud of the part which the AFL–CIO played in shaping that act and in helping to secure its passage.

AN IMPRESSIVE SUCCESS STORY

Throughout the nation, programs funded by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act are bringing new educational opportunities to the children who need them the most, the children from low income families who must have excellence in education if they are to brake out of the poverty cycle which has entrapped their families, in many cases for several generations. This legislation has placed libraries in schools which were previously devoid of all books other than the most essential textbooks—and many of these were out-dated. It has encouraged promising innovations in teaching methods. And it has strengthened the support available for long needed educational research.

Experience has shown that there is need for improvement and expansion of the original legislation, but this should in no way detract from the fact that the Elementary and Secondary Education Act so far constitutes an impressive success story and that it is one of the most important legislative achievements of Congress in recent years. We are firmly convinced that the great breakthrough in the education field accomplished by the 89th Congress has received overwhelming support from the American people.

The importance of this breakthrough can best be measured by the fact that federal aid for education had been a subject of debate in America for more than a century prior to the enactment of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. Invariably proposals became bogged down in controversy over possible dangers to local control of education and over the question of aid to nonpublic schools. In congress, proposals which proved acceptable in one house proved unacceptable in the other.

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act was a carefully formulated piece of legislation which for the first time provided a way out of the years of impasse. Federal aid for elementary and secondary education is today a working reality and it is working under a structure which experience demonstrates endangers neither local control of education nor the separation of church and state.

Some members of Congress and even some conservative members of the education establishment have proposed to alter substantially the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. They would do it on the basis of impulsive and hastily put together formulas for block grants to the states which could destroy the entire balance that made it possible to resolve the conflicting demands upon federal aid. We urge the Senate to resist these pressures. They are pressures which place the entire federal aid program in serious jeopardy.

The Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1967 contained in S. 1125 build upon the successful programs which are already under way and we pledge our support to the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare in holding fast to this approach.

Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the largest in terms of its authorization, places federal funds where they are most needed, in the hands of local school districts that are dealing with the educational needs of disadvantaged children. To replace this program with one of block grants of federal aid to the states would dissipate the effect of federal aid and would correspondingly diminish the educational opportunities of those low income children who need help the most. It would, to say the least, be a peculiar response to the dangerous wave of unrest which has swept across the nation to blunt the effect of a major program that can help to eliminate the causes of that unrest. We would strongly urge that Title I be continued in ts present form and that the funds available under that Title be substantially increased.

Title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act provides funds to develop innovative programs. Compared to Title I, Title III provides only a modest amount of money, but it is money that is having effect of great significance throughout America's schools. It has become increasingly apparent that American education in its organization, its teaching methods, and in its materials has been primarily oriented with the needs of middle class children. These methods have failed to make contact with the children of the urban ghettos. There is abundant evidence that disadvantaged children can learn, but that if they are to learn, they will need to be taught in new ways. It is not enough to do the old things a little bit better or a little bit more.

Title III has provided the encouragement for educational innovation which is one of the great national needs. It has made possible a cooperative effort between local school districts, state departments of education, the federal government, and leading educators in seeking out the very best in creative educational experimentation. The program has made it possible for school systems to explore new kinds of schools such as educational parks, supplemental learning centers and community schools. It has brought the rapid developments of educational technology within the realistic reach of local school systems. It has encouraged cooperative programs between elementary and secondary schools and college and universities. Innovations are commonplace today which would have been regarded as beyond practical possibility before the enactment of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

DESTRUCTION IS THREATENED

Amendments passed by the House of Representatives threaten to destroy the very fabric of which these successes have been made. By giving total responsibility for Title III programs to the state departments of education which in many cases are ill-prepared to assume those responsibilities, the House amendments would in effect cancel out a program which is making a major contribution to the improvements of American education.

The AFL–CIO strongly urges this subcommittee to reject the block grant approach to Title III of the Act as adopted by the House. Title III programs, conceived and carried out under the Act, have been imaginative and innovative. More such programs—not less—should be started. We are fearful that the amendment adopted by the House runs contrary to this purpose. A full block grant to the states, we believe, will only discourage the development of new exemplary educational programs that would otherwise serve as models for regular school programs.

Title I–D of S. 1125 provides a new program under Title V of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. The new program would provide federal funds for the support of statewide long-range educational planning. We believe that this proposal identifies an important educational need. In a sense Congress has helped to create that need by the very actions which it has undertaken to improve the educational opportunities for our nation's children and young people. After years of stalemate on the issue of federal aid to education, Congress began to meet the problem by passing legislation designed to meet specific and identifiable needs.

The National Defense Education Act, as first passed, recognized a special national interest in the quality of teaching in science, mathematics and foreign languages. As other national interests in specific subjects were identified, these subjects were added by amendments to the original Act. Public Law 874 recognized the impact of federally affected areas and provided federal assistance for the operation of schools in these areas. P. L. 815, dealing with the same type of problems, provided federal funds for school construction.

Provisions of the Civil Rights Act provide federal assistance to schools attempting to eliminate segregation and its related problems. Many of the provisions of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 bear upon educational needs. Special legislation has been enacted to improve educational opportunities available to handicapped children. The Vocational Education Act of 1963 provides substantial federal support in a field of major educational importance. We could go on at length extending the list, because recent

Congresses have been extraordinarily productive in the field of educational legislation, thanks in great part to your very constructive work, Mr. Chairman, ably assisted by your colleagues.

CONGRESS MADE WISE DECISION WITH CATEGORICAL APPROACH

We believe that in adopting this categorical approach, Congress made a wise decision. Yet in so doing Congress created a new need. If school systems are to make the best possible use of the funds available to them under this wide variety of programs, they must undertake far more comprehensive planning than any in which they have previously engaged. They must systematically identify their needs, organize them into a coherent pattern, and relate them to all of the available funds under existing federal programs.

The addition of federal funds for educational planning will do much to help meet this growing need. The proposed amendment involves a small expenditure which will make possible the best use of the very substantial expenditure which the federal government is now making in the field of education. The AFL–CIO urges this subcommittee to support this proposal for comprehensive educational planning.

Among the amendments adopted by the House of Representatives is one which would prevent the Department of Health, Education and Welfare from holding up approval of new applications from school districts which are not in compliance with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act until these districts have been through the entire funds termination process. We emphatically support the present provisions of the law as opposed to this House amendment which would encourage and in effect subsidize continued definance of the law by recalcitrant segregationist-minded school districts. The most recent report of the United States Civil Rights Commission reveals that thirteen years after the Supreme Court decision of 1954 and three years after the enactment of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, 75% of the Negro children in Southern and border states still attend all-Negro schools. This should be persuasive evidence that the Department of Health, Education and Welfare has not been overly zealous in enforcing Title VI of the Civil Rights Act. The Senate should by all means reject the House-adopted Fountain amendment and permit HEW to continue operating under the provisions enacted in 1966.

Title II of S. 1125 deals with Amendments to the Vocational Education Act of 1963, especially the establishment of a $30,000,000 program of grants for the purpose of stimulating innovative programs in vocational education. This proposal is being considered by the House in a separate bill, H.R. 8525, and we have filed with the House a statement of strong support for the proposals.

We are not especially concerned whether this program be enacted as a part of S. 1125 or, as in the House, in separate legislation. We do however urge its adoption in one form or the other.

To conclude, we believe that S. 1125 continues and extends the important gains which have been made in elementary and secondary education. At its spring meeting in February of this year, the AFL–CIO Executive Council declared in a statement on "Education and the Federal Government:"

"The laws which have by now been enacted have contributed significantly to improving educational opportunity and toward achieving the goal of providing quality education for every child, wherever he may live and whatever his family background. From pre-kindergarten programs through graduate schools and adult education programs, the federal government has assumed responsibility for sharing in the costs of education."

For the vital role which this committee has played in bringing these things to pass, we express our deepest gratitude.

Thank you.

Marriner S. Eccles Speaks on "Vietnam: Its Effect on the Nation"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1967

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Marriner S. Eccles, chairman of the board of the Utah Construction & Mining Co., and former Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board spoke before the Commonwealth Club of California in San Francisco on the subject of "Vietnam: Its Effect on the Nation."

His analysis of U.S. policy regarding Vietnam, the results and ramifications of that policy are indeed thoughtful and certainly worthy of consideration by all Members of the Congress.

The speech follows:

VIETNAM: ITS EFFECT ON THE NATION

(By Marriner S. Eccles at the Commonwealth Club of California, San Francisco, Calif., Aug. 11, 1967)

The Kosygin visit to this country has given us all cause to seriously think about the Soviet Union, our relationship to it, and the relationship of both of us to the greater and more compelling world problems. Upon the solution of these problems hangs the survival of both the United States and Russia, and perhaps the world. As Senator Fulbright so aptly stated: "America is showing signs of that arrogance of power which has afflicted, weakened, and in some cases destroyed great nations in the past." Never before has there been such valid reason for the fears that beset us. Never before has there been reason to feel that the human race was speeding along the road to possible oblivion.

The most important issue before the country today is our involvement in Vietnam. It affects every facet of our lives and our relationship to the rest of the world. Are the sacrifices imposed justified by the stakes of war? What are the reasons and justification, if any, for our involvement in Vietnam?

For the past twenty years our government has believed that communism intends to conquer the world—by force, if persuasion does not succeed—and that it is the duty of the United States to save the world from that fate. The American picture of aggressive communism is unreal.

The President believes that aggressive monolithic groups are making war in South Vietnam. Under the Truman Doctrine of Containment, communism has continued to spread. It has advanced through revolutions rather than by military aggression. But while communism has been advancing, the power of Russia over the communist world has been waning. It is evident that communism is not a monolithic world power. Russia has its differences with the Yugoslavs. The Chinese and Russians have conflicts of national interest which override communism. The threat of a united communist world does not exist. National rivalries divide the communist states as well as democracies.

It is apparent that communist countries are as intensely nationalist as others. They crave independence and resent interference. They will fight against domination—from whatever source: either capitalist or other communist country.

The Administration believes that the war in Vietnam is being made solely by communist intervention from without. This does not explain the tenacity of the Viet Cong. They are not Russians, Chinese or North Vietnamese communists; they are South Vietnamese. They are fighting for national liberation and unity of South Vietnam: the causes for which others, including Americans, have fought.

We see every rebellion as the result of a deep plot out of Moscow or Peking, when it usually is the result of crushing poverty, hunger and intolerable living conditions. The aim of revolution, no matter what ideology, is to achieve the values of self-determination, economic security, racial equality and freedom. Let us not forget that while our road was not via communism, we did, as a nation, emerge from revolution.

We might as well face it: there may be more communist countries in the world. But we need not panic at this. Communist nations vary widely; each has a different version of communist theory to fit its own problems. The more of these countries there are, the greater their diversity.

Communism is only part of a broad movement: the rising of desperate people in Asia, Africa, and Latin America. We crush insurrection in one place, only to find a revolution—whether communist, socialist or nationalist—springing up somewhere else. With military bases around the world and ships in every ocean, a revolution takes place in Cuba, 90 miles off our shore.

How can we reconcile what we are doing to the South Vietnamese under the guise of saving them from communism? We have destroyed vast areas of their country. We have killed, wounded or burned more than one million children, as well as countless parents, brothers, husbands and sons. The family has been smashed. We can only guess at the terrible long-range social effects that will result from our actions. No wonder the great majority of the people do not consider us their savior, but hate us and want us to get out of their country.

Despite this, the United States military has increasingly taken over the war. In 1965 one American was killed for eight South Vietnamese; in 1966, one for two; and to date in 1967, one for one. U.S. casualties through 1966 were over 8,000 killed and almost 38,000 wounded. Projected for 1967 alone, based on actual figures for the first six months: 11,190 killed; 64,264 wounded, making a projected total to the end of this year of 19,344 killed and 102,002 wounded. We have lost 832 planes as well as hundreds of helicopters.

Based on the following reports by McNamara it is apparent we are making little progress after three years of fighting and cannot win a decisive victory:

1964—"McNamara told Congress that the U.S. hopes to withdraw most of its troops from Vietnam before the end of 1965."

In 1965—he said, "It will be a long war."

In October, 1966—He said, "I see no reason to expect any significant increase in the level of the tempo of operations in South Vietnam."

Communist strength in South Vietnam has increased from 120,000 in January, 1965, to an estimated 298,000 at present. However, North Vietnam has committed only one-fifth of their regular army. Based on the estimate that guerrillas must be outnumbered four to one, the communists have more than matched the American buildup to 476,000 now. It is no wonder that General Westmoreland claims he needs five additional U.S. divisions: more than 200,000 men.

Tuesday the press reported General Van Thieu said: "We have not enough Allied soldiers which we need to win the war. We need a big amount of troops to be everywhere, to do many jobs at the same time." At this time the President might reconsider his

September, 1964, statement: "We don't want our American boys to do the fighting for Asian boys. We don't want to get involved . . . and get tied down in a land war in Asia."

During the past two years Russia has added to the enemy arsenal in South Vietnam rockets, artillery, heavy mortars, automatic infantry weapons and flame throwers, while in North Vietnam she has supplied fighter planes and antiaircraft guns. She is reported to be supplying 75% of all military supplies and has said she will continue to furnish all military aid necessary. The Chinese are furnishing part of the small arms, clothing and food, and have said they will assist North Vietnam with troops whenever requested to do so. Both countries have indicated they would enter the war, if necessary, to keep the North Vietnamese and the Viet Cong from being defeated. It is quite apparent that neither Russia or China are willing for the United States to achieve a victory over the communists and to establish a powerful military base on the mainland of Asia.

If Russia were conducting daily bombing raids against an American ally, as we are doing against a Russian ally, it is inconceivable that we would limit ourselves to providing only military equipment, as they are doing.

What is the effect of our policy on the nation? The Vietnam War is responsible for the most serious economic, financial and political problems in this country. It is responsible for the huge federal deficit which, without a tax increase, could run to more than $25 billion. In order to curb the resulting inflationary pressures the government has proposed a 10% surtax on individuals and corporations, which, if enacted, would reduce the deficit, on an annual basis, between $9 and $10 billion.

This war is directly causing a substantial increase in the deficiency in our international balance of payments, which is already serious, as we are by far the world's largest short-term debtor, now owing nearly $26 billion. It is reducing our free gold to meet these obligations to less than $2 billion.

It is creating inflationary pressures in nearly every field—increased costs of living, going up at about 3% per year—a great shortage of skilled workers—increasing strikes and exhorbitant demands by union labor—and higher interest rates, in all categories, due to the heavy demand for credit.

The costs of war do not end with the cessation of hostilities. Excluding the Vietnam War, at the end of 1965 we had approximately 20,600,000 veterans. Total veterans' benefits paid to the end of 1965 were $134 billion; by the end of this year it is estimated they will be $147 billion. In 1966 we were spending in excess of $6 billion per year for veterans' benefits, and the Korean War alone is costing more than $700 million a year. The annual operating expense of the Veterans' Administration hospitals has now passed the billion mark. In addition, during 1965 the land and construction costs of medical facilities was $1,418,000. Veterans costs will grow rapidly as long as the war lasts, and will continue for decades. The ultimate astronomical expense is difficult to conceive. In the financial sense, a war is never over.

The real tragedy is not financial, it is the useless suffering of the millions of our people whose sons, husbands and brothers are drawn into this useless conflict unwillingly and are killed and maimed for life—*not* in defense of their country—but because of our incompetent and ill-advised leadership.

I believe Russia is glad to see us bogged down in Vietnam, diverting multi-billions of our resources and millions of our manpower, while she is rapidly gaining in the nuclear arms race. While the U.S. lags in its nuclear defense, the Soviets are rushing ahead. It is believed today's nuclear balance has already shifted to Russia.

At a time when defense against missile attack is still in the talking stage in this country, the Soviet Union is racing ahead with unprecedented speed.

Of even greater concern to us at this time is China's rapid growth in the development of nuclear weapons. It is now estimated that between 1972 and 1975 China will be a first-class nuclear power with a full arsenal of H-bombs and war heads. ICBM will be in production with an intercontinental range of 6,000 miles. This would hit most of the world; the northern stretches of the U.S., Los Angeles, San Francisco, Chicago and Detroit would be particularly vulnerable. Meanwhile, we are spending over $2 billion a month on Vietnam instead of being prepared to cope with the rapidly growing atomic strength of Russia and China.

Our foreign aid since World War II has been $128 billion—$91 billion in economic aid and $37 billion in military aid—with dubious results in many instances. The United States has pledged to defend 43 countries under specific treaties and agreements. In addition, a commitment to stop aggression covers all the countries in the Middle East, and any country where the U.S. has a military base is promised support.

While we've been spending tens of billions abroad, our cities are exploding in violent protest as a result of our injustice, our neglect, and failure to meet unfulfilled promises of the "Great Society." Our total estimated Vietnam and foreign aid budget this year is $30 billion; whereas, the Great Society budget is approximately 40% of that amount—$12.5 billion—which is half of what we spend in Vietnam alone.

Senator Percy says: "If we continue to spend $66 million a day trying to save the 16 million people of South Vietnam while leaving the plight of 20 million urban poor in our own country unresolved—then I think we have our priorities terribly confused."

Public and Congressional reaction relative to our world-wide involvement, especially in Vietnam, is forcing the Administration to reconsider its role as world policeman.

The horrible Vietnam debacle, tragic as it is, may yet be a blessing in disguise if it forces us to recognize our staggering failures at home. Runaway crime, delinquency, the riots in our cities, loss of respect for law and order, and the rebellion of frustrated youth—all spring in part from this. No wonder Russia had this to say about the U.S.: "Only in mockery can the word 'free' be applied to a society which cannot provide tolerable living conditions and democratic rights to a considerable part of its population."

It is tragic that the most powerful country in the world, with 6% of its population and producing 40% of its wealth, should have lost the respect of most of the world. The world, with few exceptions, would like us to leave Vietnam. The continued confidence and good relation with Japan, our greatest asset in Asia, is dependent upon our getting out of Vietnam. The same is true with all the Western European governments and our friends in Latin America. We cannot survive, no matter how powerful we are, in a world without friends.

With these disastrous effects on the nation to continue our ruthless pursuit in Vietnam is madness. To withdraw is sanity. The consequences of withdrawing cannot possibly be as disastrous for this nation as pursuing our present course. The greatest service we could render the Vietnamese is to withdraw from their country, leaving them to negotiate a conclusion to the war, which is their right.

There is something intrinsically wrong with the idea that the United States should participate in negotiations to decide the future of Vietnam. We are an outside power, which is true also of China and the Soviet Union. To have the future of Vietnam decided by outside powers is a violation of self-determination. Whatever negotiations go on should be among the Vietnamese themselves—each group negotiating from its own position of strength, uninfluenced by outside powers.

If the U.S. insists on negotiating, it should be with Russia and China, as the sinews of war are being furnished by these countries, without which the war would collapse. In any case, the United States cannot negotiate strength for any future segment of government in South Vietnam. The presence of the United States can only distort the true balance of forces, and only a settlement which represents this balance can bring about a stable government.

No one seems to be able to show in what way a communist Vietnam would be bad. Under Ho Chi Minh, Vietnam would be quite as likely to enforce its independence as has Tito in Yugoslavia, Rumania, and other Russian satellites. Ho Chi Minh is unquestionably the choice of the Vietnamese people, both North and South. Both President Kennedy and Eisenhower have stated that had the election called for under the Geneva Treaty been held in 1956, Ho Chi Minh was so popular he would have won by a large majority. While Ho Chi Minh is a communist, he is not Russian, he is not Chinese, he is Vietnamese—and Russian, Chinese and Vietnamese communism may differ widely. It is even possible that our best interests would be served by having Ho Chi Minh's communist regime as a buffer against the Chinese communists.

History does not show that a nation that liquidates a bad venture suffers from loss of prestige. Proud, powerful England surrended to the thirteen American colonies and did not suffer for it. More recently, France moved out voluntarily from Algeria and Indochina. Today she has more world prestige than ever before. Russia pulled her missiles out of Cuba; her prestige has not suffered.

Hans Morgenthau has written: "Is it really a boon to the prestige of the most powerful nation on earth to be bogged down in a war which it is neither able to win nor can afford to lose? This is the real issue which is presented by the argument of prestige." We should be less interested in saving face and more interested in saving lives. It is possibly not easy for a proud nation to admit it has blundered, but throughout history great men and nations have gained stature by so doing.

Getting out of Vietnam will enable us to re-establish a friendly relationship with Russia and thereby bring about a balance of power in the world, which would tend to deter any aggressive policy on the part of China. So long as we are in Vietnam, Russia and China consider us their enemy. Kosygin made this crystal clear in his statement before the United Nations and in his conference with Johnson at Glassboro.

We should also recognize China diplomatically and open our doors to trade and travel and help bring her into the United Nations. We should no longer ignore one-fourth of the world's population as though it did not exist.

In conclusion: What can we expect from the stricken Vietnamese nation but hatred, deep and abiding? Their farms and villages have been laid waste, their families scattered to the winds. Their husbands and sons are dead, maimed or missing. And children, orphaned and grotesquely burned, have been seen running through the ruble in packs.

We can never blot out the deed which stands as a testimony of man's inhumanity to man. Nor can we really make amends for the enormity of our crime against these people, who know us not, but whom we have chosen to save from communism.

But we can try. We can make a beginning. And, in conscience, how can that beginning be less than immediate withdrawal of our evil presence, because that is what it has proved to be in the lives of the Vietnamese. And we can humbly, with vigor, and never ceasing, do everything in the power of a rich and repentant nation to heal, and rebuild, and reassure.

The Vietnamese will never forget us, and it is to be hoped that we will never forget the Vietnamese. Because it is this Vietnam tragedy which has shown us ourselves as others see us: a nation to be feared instead of loved, flushed with pride and sure of omnipotence. An arrogant nation, not qualified to handle power wisely.

While the hour is late, it is not yet impossible to turn the page. Men and nations have new beginnings before. And out of defeat, there has often come victory—and what a victory it could be for this nation, so bountifully endowed—to reverse its image, make itself loved and admired and revered, so that it could stand forth before the emerging peoples around the globe, as an example of what they might wish to become.

But the road is long—and we must win much forgiveness. So let us begin.

(I am indebted to Arnold Toynbee and Howard Zinn for the assistance I received from reading their excellent articles.)

FAA Must Act To End Threat of Midair Collisions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1967

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, the airline crash on July 19, which claimed the lives of 82 persons, including John T. McNaughton, the newly designated Secretary of the Navy, is a sad reminder to all of us of the constant threat of midair collisions and the problem of air safety in general.

With the steady increase of air traffic, the threat of midair catastrophes looms increasingly over us. Last year alone the Federal Aviation Agency reported close to 500 near collisions in the air. We may assume that the number of near collisions was really much higher due to the reluctance of many pilots to report situations for which they might have been held responsible. Also last year, there were a total of 25 midair collisions. Thus far in 1967 there have been 14, three involving commercial carriers.

On the ground it is evident that airport congestion has reached crisis level. For instance, more than 300,000 takeoffs and landings occur every year at National Airport near Washington. This means that an average of 876 airplanes enter or leave the airport every day, which averages out at one every minute and one-half, 24 hours a day.

The situation in my home county of Queens, in New York City, is not much better. John F. Kennedy International and La Guardia Airports, both in Queens, handle a heavy volume of international, transcontinental, intermediate, and local commercial air traffic, as well as considerable general aviation and military traffic.

Low-flying aircraft in this residential area create the constant nuisance of ear-shattering noise for the thousands upon thousands of people on the ground. There is a persistent threat to the lives and property of residents and passengers. The midair collision of two commercial airplanes over Brooklyn in December 1960, in which 134 people died, 128 passengers and six people on the ground, was a tragic fulfillment of that threat.

Over the years the FAA has done an outstanding job in furthering air safety, but it has been evident for some time that we must review and redouble our commitment to safety in the skies and on the ground. We must do this at once, before the threat of disaster becomes a routine of tragedy.

I urge the FAA carefully to analyze approach patterns for our great metropolitan airports and to suggest alternates. I ask that ways of reducing air terminal congestion be found, and that the FAA pursue the speedy development and installation of anticollision devices on all aircraft, commercial and private.

I also urge the immediate installation of radar and control towers at airports now without such facilities.

Mr. Speaker, increased air safety must not wait any longer. The Federal Aviation Administration must pursue this goal assiduously. We must leave no stone unturned in our effort to assure the well-being of all our citizens.

Arthur Altmeyer Says Social Security Program Must Go Further

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 22, 1967

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including an article from the Madison Capitol Times about "Mr. Social Security," Arthur J. Altmeyer. This great man, 32 years ago, worked closely with President Roosevelt in shaping the social security law. His vision is worthy of recognition.

MR. SOCIAL SECURITY'S BABY IS A HEALTHY 32

(By Whitney Gould)

The Social Security system, once reviled as "creeping socialism" and "a cruel hoax," celebrates its 32nd birthday today, having become as much a part of American life as the supermarket.

One of the chief architects and first administrator of this vast program of social insurance, Arthur J. Altmeyer, is a gentle, silver-haired man of 75 who wears bow ties and steel-rimmed glasses and now makes his home just outside Madison, in Middleton.

"The criticism now is not about what was done back in 1935," says Altmeyer, who was an appointee of President Franklin D. Roosevelt to the Federal Social Security Board, an ex-assistant secretary of Labor and a commissioner of the Social Security Administration. "The trouble is that the program still hasn't gone as far as it should."

Altmeyer recalls that Roosevelt termed the program "a cornerstone in a structure which is being built but is by no means complete."

"The system," which encompassed contributory insurance against the hazards of old age and unemployment, public assistance for the disabled, and social services for vocational rehabilitation, would have expanded into the health insurance field had World War II not intervened.

Military expenditures also cut back on FDR's public works programs, which aimed at training youth in job skills.

The obvious parallel with the war in Vietnam, and its toll on domestic programs, has Altmeyer concerned.

"But I'm optimistic enough to think we won't make the same mistake twice. We can't backtrack," he says.

Altmeyer views the House-approved antiriot bill with a certain sadness.

"Disorder grows out of basic human problems," he observes. "We can't solve the problems just by attacking the few who engaged in rioting. That's like trying to cure a wasting disease by rubbing on a little skin lotion."

Altmeyer and his wife returned to the Madison area last year, after living in Washington for two years. He still acts as an occasional consultant for governments in the Near East and Latin America who are establishing their own social security systems, and he jets off to New York now and then, to serve as chief appeals officer for the International Ladies Garment Workers Union's (ILGWU) pension plan.

One of those rare types who combines a sensitivity to human needs with a pragmatic capability for coming up with workable solutions, Altmeyer worked under the late labor economist John R. Commons at the University of Wisconsin. He administered Gov. Philip LaFollette's unemployment relief program in the 1930s.

Altmeyer's convictions on social welfare run deep.

"Some people can't comprehend," he says, "that in a complex industrial society like ours, there are individuals who do not have the opportunity to be self-sufficient. The government has an affirmative responsibility to protect the individual against hazards that occur to him through no fault of his own."

Halting the Nuclear Plague

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 24, 1967

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, there can be no doubt that one of the major problems confronting the world today is the threat of nuclear war. There can also be no doubt that the more countries that have a nuclear potential, the greater are the chances that nuclear warfare will occur. Who could predict what would have happened had nuclear arms been available to the protagonists of the Middle East crisis?

Such obvious examples clearly indicate the importance of a workable nonprolifteration treaty, and the longer a treaty of this type remains unsigned the greater the danger that new countries will develop enough potential to be able, themselves, to lead the way to nuclear war.

The draft treaty worked out by the United States and Russia is not a perfect one. It does not guarantee that nuclear arms will not eventually get into the hands of every country in the world. It does not prevent those countries with the potential from developing and using nuclear weapons. Nevertheless, I submit that this treaty is one of the great events of modern history. It marks an acceptance on the part of two major powers of responsibility not only for their own actions, but also for the consequences to other nations of these actions. It represents a triumph of reason, in the face of deep and vital differences.

I heartily concur in the views of the

editor of the Washington Post, of August 25, and include his remarks, which follow, in the RECORD:

HALTING THE NUCLEAR PLAGUE

The presentation of a draft treaty to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons is unquestionably a major diplomatic achievement for the Soviet Union and the United States. The two countries must now turn their mutual boon into a general global benefit by filling in the blank inspection section and by securing the agreement of other nations to the completed document.

The prospect of a nuclear-free world disappeared, of course, in the mushroom cloud over Hiroshima. Given postwar tensions, it was perhaps inevitable that other nations moved to claim the protection and prestige they imagined nuclear capacity to confer. With the expansion of the nuclear club, however, came a growing fright that there were too many nuclear powers and that sooner or later there would come a terrible, final war. This is the chief impulse behind the great-power efforts to halt nuclear spread.

The draft treaty satisfies that impulse as well as the national interests of the United States and Soviet Union allow. It is not—it could not be—a perfect document. But, we are convinced, it offers the world a larger measure of security and a broader promise of peace than does the unchecked spread of nuclear arms.

To be sure, it is easy for the nuclear powers to preach nuclear abstinence for others while not practicing it themselves; they already have the weaponry, the peaceful nuclear potential and the status which they are asking the others to forgo.

But the incentives open to nonnuclear countries are very considerable. Not only can they spare themselves the expense of national bomb programs and the skewing of their economic development. They also have President Johnson's pledge to "make available nuclear explosive services for peaceful purposes on a nondiscriminatory basis," at nominal cost. The Soviet government ought to make a similar public pledge. It is the treaty's "intention" that no country foreswearing bombs will thereby lose economic advantage. (Since most peaceful uses of atomic energy do not involve explosions, all countries will be free to explore them.)

The critical issue is security guarantees, which are not mentioned by the draft. Unfortunately the Soviet and American governments are a long way from agreeing to protect nonnuclear signers from nuclear blackmail, even though they both realize that no country could abandon the right of self-protection without a firm guarantee.

American officials point to President Johnson's unelaborated pledge of 1964: "The nations that do not seek national nuclear weapons can be sure that if they need our strong support against some threat of nuclear blackmail, then they will have it." Although this pledge is not among the State Department's recent listing of "United States Defense Commitments and Assurances," other countries would be mistaken to conclude that it is without meaning. The record of United States' involvement in the world underlies the President's words. The whole purpose of postwar American policy has been to create conditions in which local conflicts can be peacefully resolved and, beyond that, to stand behind victimized lands. It must be considered, too, that a given country's signing of the treaty would harden the United States' inclination to go to its aid.

To the American people and doubtless to the Soviet people too, it is comforting that their governments have moved toward a diplomatic agreement at a time of great tension over Vietnam. Now that the draft treaty is on the table, world public opinion can, hopefully, propel it along. Vision, patience and trust will be required from all countries, big and small, to make the treaty a reality.

Air Transportation Safety

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 7, 1967

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to call the attention of the Congress and the American people to the excellent outline on air safety sent to me by an outstanding Pittsburgh businessman, Mr. R. W. Mallick. A vice president of the Joseph Horne Co., Associated Dry Goods, Mr. Mallick has flown private aircraft for many years. This long flight experience and his constant civic interest in air safety make his thoughtful suggestions and recommendations valuable to those of us in Congress and in the Federal agencies concerned over air transportation safety. I am glad to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Mr. R. W. Mallick's recent letter and the editorial from the Pittsburgh Post Gazette of August 19, 1967:

JOSEPH HORNE CO.,
Pittsburgh, Aug. 22, 1967.

Hon. JAMES G. FULTON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FULTON: I am sending to you a copy of an editorial that appeared in the Pittsburgh Post Gazette on Saturday, August 19, 1967, captioned "Air Safety Procedures Neglected". I thought you might be interested in reading it as it points a finger at both the F.A.A. and Congress.

As I mentioned in previous letters, I had mentally debated the thought of pursuing the matter any further. However, each day I see more evidence of the gravity of the situation, so I am compelled to belabor the matter further.

Mr. James Ridgeway's comment echoes what I have said repeatedly, i.e., that the F.A.A. is not doing all it can with the facilities and authority it has at its disposal. What is most discouraging is that there is no evidence of an effort on the part of F.A.A. to acknowledge the suggestions to it. Certainly, if there is no merit to them and the persons or organizations making the suggestions were convinced of it, the issue could be closed. Nevertheless, there are volumes of correspondence on the subject, from responsible sources, and it continues to remain unanswered.

It is fully appreciated that the problem is not a simple one, and that there are no ready-made, overall solutions. But it will never be solved with the present "head in the sand" attitude. It is far better to do something and risk a failure than *do nothing* in hopes that the problem will cure itself. Apparently, the confusion and complexity is so great that a "wait and see" attitude exists.

To anyone who wishes to delve into the history, he will find that the following suggestions have been submitted. Some involve much time and expenditures to implement, others only a change of attitude and a will to do. I will enumerate several that could start the ball rolling.

1. Immediately provide for *voluntary* controlled visual flight procedures at all low altitudes for cross country flights as previously suggested. Last week I flew from Pittsburgh to Coudersport on a VFR flight plan. Visibility limits were legal for VFR but marginal. I departed Pittsburgh on a special VFR clearance. When I cleared the control zone, I radioed Cleveland Center to advise of my flight route and altitude which was 5,500 feet MSL. The controller asked if I had transponder or DME. When advised negative, he told me he could not give me radar service at that altitude. Yet, 5,500 feet is higher than permissible I.F.R. altitudes. I continued to monitor the radio frequency and know that the controller was not busy.

2. *Discourage* rather than *encourage* more instrument ratings for pilots until such time as the air traffic control can handle more instrument flight plans. The system cannot handle the volume of such potential traffic now.

3. Accelerate a program of new secondary airports in busy areas to handle private, executive, and feeder line and similar aircraft to reduce the load on metropolitan airports. This would not only improve air safety, but would tend to relieve ground transportation congestion. For example, the Pittsburgh area needs a new airport in the northeastern district of Allegheny County or western Westmoreland County to relieve the loads on Greater Pittsburgh and Allegheny County airports. An adequate airport of such type can be built today for the price equivalent of *one* mile of four-lane expressway for each runway required. Most such secondary airports would be more than adequate with two runways.

4. Establish a program whereby non-essential pleasure flying and student training, usually done in the vicinity of airports, be conducted away from the traffic areas of major airports. The secondary airport program suggested above could do much to bring this about.

5. Relocate all military air operations from busy metropolitan areas. There are plenty of military airports that are now inactive to provide bases for military operations.

6. Recently FAA announced intentions of controlling VFR flights above 18,000 feet. This is fine, except the problem is between the ground and 10,000 feet. A check of the records will reveal that the collisions or near misses have all been at low altitudes. To fly above 10,000 feet requires oxygen equipped or pressurized aircraft which represents a very small percentage of registered aircraft. Let's get to the "scene of the crime."

7. Of great importance is the need to quit looking at the problem as one being associated with the commercial airlines. The commercial airlines represent only about 2% of the registered aircraft in the country. Also, it is the most sophisticated aircraft, operated by highly qualified pilots, under strict procedures. Yet, they become involved in mid-air collisions because of the system under which they must operate. The other 98% of the aircraft and pilots have the same right to air safety as do the airlines. We do not make special rules or enact special vehicle codes or build special highways for buses, and we should not attempt to give preferential treatment to airlines. We must improve air safety for *all* aircraft, and only then will the solution to the problem be forthcoming.

My apology for another long epistle, but I hope it will serve to stimulate someone to get the F.A.A. to *do something* other than take a defensive position. Actually, the F.A.A. is a fine organization of capable people, faced with an overwhelming problem. They need *help* not *hell*. They will learn that many people will help when they come out of their shell and quit behaving as though the problems and solutions were their exclusive prerogatives.

It is my understanding that Congressional hearings are planned to explore this all-important matter. If so I respectfully suggest that the above seven points be covered in the hearings. Perhaps in that way their merits can be determined.

My appreciation of your patience and cooperation.

Sincerely yours.

R. W. MALLICK,
Vice President, Properties.

[From the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, Aug. 19, 1967]

AIR SAFETY PROCEDURES NEGLECTED

The public is justified in questioning federal procedures to insure air safety when there have been five major plane accidents so far this year and a number of smaller ones. The latest was the crash of two single-engined craft as they simultaneously approached the same runway in New Hampshire recently.

There are 547 airports in this country served by airlines; 285 have no control towers and 434 lack radar which would provide a means of keeping planes at a safe distance. There wasn't any radar at Asheville, N. C., where 82 persons were killed recently.

According to James Ridgeway in the August 5 New Republic, the Federal Aviation Administration, part of the Department of Transportation, is at the root of the problem. The FAA is understaffed and isn't given the money to implement technological advances. Its chief, an ex-Air Force general, William F. McKee, scarcely makes the best of what the FAA has, Ridgeway says.

He cites, for instance, the number of safety requirements that don't apply to air taxis (chartered planes for hire): no requirements for co-pilots, radar, emergency evacuation, or weighing of baggage. McKee has said the government must not place too heavy an economic burden on small operations lest they fail.

When the FAA's budget request was cut this year from $75 million to $65 million, the argument in Congress was that since the money was being poorly spent and the amount inadequate to meet the airport crisis, it might as well be trimmed.

Such a view not only contradicts logic but renounces responsibility. There should be no doubt in anyone's mind that airports serving airliners should be equipped with radar and that height-finding equipment to avoid mid-air collisions, which military planes have used since the Korean War, should be placed in all commercial planes. Crashes in the vicinity of airports can be reduced. The tragedy is that not enough attention is being given to the matter.

Two Connecticut Editors Look at Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1967

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, in view of the current discussions in the Halls of Congress, in the press, and other public forums regarding the war in Vietnam and the U.S. position there and in Southeast Asia in general, I desire to call attention to two recent editorials published in Connecticut newspapers on the subject. I believe both of these have much to add to the discussion and to the clarification of our position.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Time For Reconsideration," published in the August 11, 1967, issue of the Catholic Transcript, and another editorial entitled "Shaky Foundation For a Democracy," from the August 14, 1967, issue of the Hartford Times. Both newspapers are published in Hartford, Conn.

Mr. Speaker, these two editorials are balanced and rational evaluations of the Vietnam problem. They are not the views of political radicals, but rather the result of serious and profound thinking and much soul searching. I know that all of us in the Congress are deeply concerned over this situation, and for this reason I commend the views of the two editors to all my celleagues.

The editorials follow:

[From the Hartford (Conn.) Catholic Transcript, Aug. 11, 1967]

A TIME FOR RECONSIDERATION

There were reports last week that President Johnson was considering a change of policy on Vietnam. It was hinted that new means of securing peace were under study. A flicker of hope relieved the gloomy mood of thoughful Americans. But it was very brief, squelched by the announcement that the number of American troops in Vietnam was to be substantially increased. This is not a change of policy, and scathing experience indicates that it means nothing in the way of advance toward peace. It is gradually and painfully being realized that what the United States has set out to do in Vietnam simply cannot be done. But this realization has not yet come home to the makers of American policy.

We have undertaken to inflict decisive defeat on the Vietcong and their North Vietnamese allies. This effort is costing us more and more lives, billions upon billions of dollars, the ability to make a massive attack on our domestic problems and especially those of the rotting, riot-prone cities, the respect and trust of other nations, and any advantage in our critical confrontation with the major Communist powers—the Soviet Union today and China tomorrow. Despite this exorbitant cost. which even the rich United States cannot afford to bear, we are not winning the war in Vietnam. The best that we are achieving is stalemate. Knowledgeable observers on the scene assert that just to maintain stalemate may require a continuation or increase of our present outlay for decades or generations, without any progress toward the issue we seek. The better part of valor is still discretion, and it is high time that discretion ruled.

It is apparent also that we are making no progress in our endeavor to transform South Vietnam into a unified, viable, and responsible democratic society. The people are said to be more and more disengaged and disaffected. The pacification program is ineffective. The South Vietnamese armed forces count for less and less, largely because of the absence of conviction and the presence of wretched leadership. Corruption and profiteering run wild. Reform of ancient, demoralizing abuses is at a standstill. There is little expectation that the coming elections will make much difference. War and terror rage through the land, bringing death and devastation but no prospect of genuine, durable improvement. If military victory were possible, and it seems ever less so, the condition and the outlook would remain the same.

In the face of all this, the one supposedly clinching argument for our continuing on our present fruitless course is that, for both moral and practical reasons, we cannot knuckle under to the Communists. The argument is seriously flawed. For one thing, a necessary condition of a just war is the possibility of winning, which seems incapable of fulfillment in this instance. Again, the notion of a holy war against Communism has been discredited and should be abandoned. So, too, with the notion that the United States can and must police the globe. Doubtless our pragmatic interests would be served by a repulse of Communist aggression, but we are not succeeding in that, and while we are mired and bled in an enterprise which has the stench of futility about it, the Communist powers suffer no such crippling attrition. There is, of course, turmoil within China, but whatever gain that might have meant to the West has been largely dissipated by our entrapment in Vietnam. That, on balance, our involvement in Vietnam is actually a help rather than a hindrance to Communism certainly knocks out the supposedly clinching argument.

It is profoundly discouraging to learn, from events, that American policy is not being reconsidered. There should be a rising volume of opinion in favor of radical reappraisal and sensible action. The fact that some humiliation would inevitably be entailed should not deter us. Pride is always a poor counsellor. The pages of history are strewn with the bones of nations betrayed by it.

[From the Hartford (Conn.) Times, Aug. 14, 1967]

SHAKY FOUNDATION FOR A DEMOCRACY

Less than three weeks from now, the first "free" election will be held in South Vietnam. How free it is and what it will decide are open questions.

The strongest contenders are the highest-ranking members of the present military government. Their opposition is split into ten factions backing different tickets. From the news accounts, it seems that the military government, if it is not putting obstacles in the way of the civilian candidates, is at least withholding the cooperation required by South Vietnamese law. The candidates are entitled to protection, transportation and other services from the present government. It is clear that they are not getting those services.

Several senators and members of Congress in the United States have charged that the election is being rigged by the Ky government. Marshal Ky of course denies that, suggesting that the congressmen go to Vietnam and have a look for themselves. The suggestion has already been turned down, for if congressional observers went to Vietnam their presence might be mistaken for advance approval of the results of the election.

The campaign, as it has been run so far, seems like a poor basis for a truly free election. And the election, as far as we can estimate now, seems likely to be a shaky foundation for a truly democratic government.

The implications of the election extend far beyond South Vietnam. First and most important is its effect on American policy. Our purposes in Vietnam, as presidents from Eisenhower to Johnson have said repeatedly, are to deter the advance of Communism and to guarantee a free, democratic, representative government to the people of South Vietnam. An unfair election would destroy the second of those purposes.

The voices of those who call for a reappraisal of our position in Southeast Asia and especially in Vietnam are growing in number and volume. The Johnson administration must give them more attention and be able to supply arguments against the objections they raise to the investment of more American lives and money in what seems to many to be a pointless war. If the election is unconvincing, if it does not appear to be an expression of the will of a free and informed people, the American presence in Vietnam will have its underpinnings cut away.

So far, Mr. Johnson's spokesmen have defended the way the campaign is being run. They are not convincing, however. If the United States interferes to make the campaign more fair and more enlightening to the Vietnamese people, we shall run the risk of being charged with meddling in the domestic affairs of a foreign country. But if there is no such attempt to guarantee a respectable election, the Johnson administration may be forced to reconsider the American commitment.

Monday, August 28, 1967

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Senate passed bills on highway beautification and rural financing.

Senate committee approved independent offices appropriations.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S 12290–S 12362

Bills Introduced: Four bills and five resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 2350–2353; S.J. Res. 107–108; S. Con. Res. 41–42; and S. Res. 161. **Page S 12297**

Bills Reported: Reports were made as follows:

S. 1477, to provide that the National Advisory Committee on Agricultural Research shall meet annually and at such other times as are deemed necessary (S. Rept. 543);

S. 1564, authorizing Secretary of Agriculture to convert the national tobacco marketing quota into a national acreage allotment (S. Rept. 544);

H.R. 547, authorizing sale of the Pleasanton Plant Materials Center in Alameda County, Calif., and providing for establishment of a more suitable location for the replacement therefor (S. Rept. 545);

S. 974, authorizing conveyance of certain land to the city of Glendale, Ariz., with amendments (S. Rept. 546); and

S. 1568, to amend the Federal Farm Loan Act with regard to restrictions on eligibility for loans by Federal land banks, with amendments (S. Rept. 547). **Page S 12297**

Foreign Aid: Senate disagreed to House amendments to S. 1872, proposed Foreign Assistance Act of 1967, asked for conference with House, and appointed as conferees Senators Fulbright, Sparkman, Mansfield, Morse, Gore, Lausche, Church, Hickenlooper, Aiken, Carlson, and Williams of Delaware. **Pages S 12290–S 12296**

Farm Loans: Senate passed with committee amendments (in the nature of a substitute for the bill) S. 1504, to facilitate financing of rural community centers and other facilities under the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act. Motion to reconsider this action was tabled. **Pages S 12321–S 12325**

Highway Beautification: Senate passed with committee amendments S. 1467, authorizing funds for highway safety and beautification programs (motion to reconsider tabled). **Pages S 12362–S 12370**

Walt Disney Medal: Senate made its unfinished business S.J. Res. 93, providing for the issuance of a gold medal to the widow of the late Walt Disney in recognition of his outstanding contributions to the U.S. and to the world. **Page S 12375**

Legislative Program: Majority leader announced that following disposition of S.J. Res. 93, Walt Disney medal, Senate will consider, not necessarily in the order given, S. 1035, protection of civilian Government employees in their constitutional rights; S. 2171, amendments to Subversive Control Act; nomination of Thurgood Marshall, of New York, to be an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court; H.R. 9960, independent offices appropriations; and unobjected-to items of legislation coming out of committees in the meantime.

On Monday, September 11, when Senate returns from its Labor Day adjournment, it will consider Treaty of Amity and Economic Relations with Thailand. On Tuesday, September 12, Senate will consider conference report on H.R. 10738, defense appropriations; S. 1985, flood insurance; S. 510, corporate equity ownership of securities; H.R. 12257, vocational rehabilitation, as well as possibly the omnibus housing bill, and other matters, including military construction. **Pages S 12375–S 12376**

Treaty Reported: Treaty of Amity and Economic Relations between U.S. and Thailand, signed at Bangkok on May 29, 1966 (Ex. P, 66th Cong., 2d sess.) (reported under prior authorization on August 26) (Ex. Rept. 14).

Agreement was entered into that when vote is taken on resolution of ratification of this treaty at 2 p.m. Monday, September 11, it will be by yeas and nays. **Pages S 12296, S 12370–S 12374**

Program for Tuesday: Senate met at noon and adjourned at 3:11 p.m. until 11 a.m. Tuesday, August 29, when it will consider S.J. Res. 93, Walt Disney medal, to be followed by other items listed in first paragraph of legislative program set out above. **Pages S 12374, S 12376**

Appendix

American System of Free Enterprise and Opportunity—Address by Dr. William Stuart McBirnie

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
Hon. EVERETT McKINLEY DIRKSEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 29, 1967

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on June 27, 1967, Dr. William Stuart McBirnie, a noted clergyman, author, radio commentator, and world traveler, addressed the Fox College assembly of students, faculty, and guests in Chicago, Ill. He made an exceptionally fine talk on our American system of free enterprise and opportunity. I ask unanimous consent that his address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

YOUR TWO CHOICES IN THE ART OF LIVING

(By Dr. William Stuart McBirnie, clergyman, director of the leadership training center, news analyst, radio commentator, author, and world traveler)

I believe very strongly in the modern American business college, because we are creating a generation of people who are college trained and yet, unfortunately, much of our college education today tends to be not a liberal education, but an education in liberation!

Much of our trouble in modern American education is traceable to the pernicious philosophy of a man named John Dewey, the father of progressive education. John Dewey was a socialist, a very active socialist, who dedicated his life to the spreading of socialist philosophy. He did it through the means of what he called progressive education, which was a nice term for the philosophy of socialism in education. People accept progressive education who might throw up a wall of resistance against socialism. But progressive is a good word, and education is a fine word; and put the two of them together and they're a kind of Madison Avenue advertising technique to describe socialism in action.

The point of progressive education—the education in liberalism—the education in socialism—is essentially the idea that we do not teach students lessons, we do not teach them facts and history and techniques and approaches; but, rather, we teach the student himself. The student is the center, rather than the lesson. This sounds very intriguing. I have a Doctor's degree in the field of education, so I can speak on this from the professional vantage point when I say that the student-centered lesson is the idea that the student himself is the main thing. This is now very intriguing because every one of us wants to be thought of as the center of things. But, unfortunately, the emphasis on teaching the student instead of teaching lessons, or facts, or techniques results in giving the student the idea that everything should be related to him. This is simply another way of giving credence to the idea of selfishness. We do not exist as an end in ourselves. *We exist because we have been given a mission and a purpose in life, and we have meaning only when we relate to those purposes and meanings which life has.* I don't want to be philosophical, but I do want you to understand the fallacy of progressive education.

Among the other philosophies that progressive education professes to its students and those who sponsor it is that the purpose of education is to get the student to adjust to what they call his peer group; namely, that the main function of education is to teach one to get along in society. Yet a careful look at history will reveal that in no instance has any one ever accomplished anything very worthwhile by merely adjusting. Life's rewards, the rewards of satisfaction and the material rewards and the rewards of a job well done, go to those who do not adjust, who refused to adjust.

I'm not speaking of the beatniks who are apparently refusing to adjust to society or the demonstrators who walk the streets with placards on their shoulders, advocating that we get out of Viet Nam or some other silly thing. They're not actually rebelling against society. They're the most conformist individuals in our society, because they all dress more or less alike. You notice they have the same kind of beards, and the same sandals and the same kind of sloppy uniform which says that they do not have personal identity. They desperately want to find some group with which to identify. It may be that the group itself is rebellious and thus they are able to adjust to a group and to rebel en masse, both at the same time. But the left-winger, the demonstrator, the beatnik type that we see making a disgraceful scene in America today, is above all else a conformist; it's just that he has chosen to conform to the wrong group. He has submerged his own identity by identifying with a larger group. He is the end product of this philosophy of progressive education that says the purpose of education is to get a child to adjust to his peer group, not to stick his head higher than the rest, not to have ambition, not to achieve, not to become something more than the rest around him, not to encourage competitive life, but, rather to adjust. Progressive education, therefore, defines its educational principles in terms of how well the individual adjusts to society.

America was not made great by adjustment—it was made great by individuals who took a good, careful look at what was going on around them and who decided to be better and to make things better. Ambition is not the hallmark of the progressive educationist. The teacher who believes in progressive education does not teach the young person to achieve, to excel, to adopt a high goal even beyond his reach and strive mightily for it; but he, instead, teaches him to adjust, to accept the inevitable, to fit in as a cog in a machine.

The United States of America was once the greatest exporter of ideas the world has ever known. We created and exported the idea of individual dignity, personal responsibility and freedom. We created the idea of government that tried to meet the needs of individuals of, by and for the people. We even had the sound idea that people who were taxed should be represented, and determine the amount of the tax.

Today it is mighty hard to find any ideas that America has exported. We have turned to importing instead. From the bazaars of Asia Minor in the middle east we bought the idea that an honest man is probably a fool. From our most mortal enemy, Communist Russia we have bought the idea of a strong government for a weak people.

We desperately need the type of trained and disciplined youth who will "reverse the trend" and help us return to basic essentials and the "good" life.

Those of you who have come to a college such as this need not worry about progressive education, because in a college such as this you are trained by the techniques that you learn to become a worthwhile individual on your own. There is no one to subsidize you, there is no one to help you. You are on your own. This, I think, is the glory of America—that the American knows how to stand on his own feet, to accept responsibility for his choices.

I want to come very swiftly to one of the most valuable insights that I have ever come across in living in a competitive society; namely, that the whole of the American dream, the whole of the capitalist society could be summed up in one simple phrase, that we learn to accept under capitalism, free enterprise, the free market ecoonomy, the emphasis upon individualism, the consequences of our choices. This sounds trite and perhaps overly simple; but it is not. For instance, a young person in his teen years makes a choice about what he's going to do with the money that he earns. He may say, "Well, I'm going to spend it and have as good a time as I can afford," so, therefore, he will have made a cohice, the conseqeunces of which he will have to abide by as time passes. On the other hand, suppose he decides that while he will spend some of his money upon himself, part of his money will be set aside for his education. Part of it will be set aside that he may become a possessor of what we call capital. He will accumulate, not much at first; but, after awhile though, by self-sacrifice, by the choice that he makes, to go without, to perhaps say "no" when the crowd wants him to say "yes" and go along, he will gradually acquire what we call capital; and that capital is himself.

We ought to understand this: capital is yourself crystalized in a spendable form. It is part of your skill, part of your time, part of your self-discipline. It is your personality put into a form that can be exchanged for value. After that capital is accumulated, it may be that one will then have enough to invest in better education; education is also a form of capital, because education is something that no one can ever take away from you—you can never unlearn something that you have genuinely learned. After a time, you accumulate learning; and then that additional capital again brought about by self-discipline, by the choices that you've made, then that capital, invested in a business, in stocks or in some profitable enterprise, will in time bring happy results or consequences. Now, of course, in the American system you must run the risk that you will make some bad choices—you will make some bad judgments.

But if you make all of your judgments bad, that is to say, if you never save, if you never get an education, if you just let today take care of itself, you will end up as a wage earner. And you will abide by the consequences of your choices. Capitalism is simply the economic result of abiding by the consequences of your choices. When you're young, you invest in an education, you invest in a program of self-discipline, you invest in a program of savings. After a while, because of the wonderful opportunities of the American system, the consequences of those choices will result in profit, in a better way of life, a higher standard of living, and in a certain amount of security. Thus, abiding by the consequences of your choices in the capitalistic system will almost always in the end result in helpfulness, and in security, and in happiness for you. But, on the other hand, so is the capitalistic system that if you make bad choices, you will also have to abide by the consequences of those choices. You can throw your money away or drink it away, and you can refuse to discipline yourself. And the end product is poverty, or at least a standard of living so low that life will be unsatisfying to you. So capitalism in the philosophical sense is the willingness to abide by the consequences of your choices.

There's an old Spanish proverb that says, "Take what you want and pay for it." The principle that is illustrated is this: you can make your investments in this fashion: if you want to choose a good thing, you must pay for it now and enjoy it later. Those two choices are before you. If you want an education, that's a good thing; you must therefore pay for it now, but you'll enjoy the fruits of it the rest of your life. On the other hand, if you would prefer to loaf now, that's a bad choice; you can enjoy it today; yet you will pay for it the rest of your life. "Take what you want and pay for it." This, you see, is what is possible under the American system—the possibility of success and the possibility of failure. But those of us who believe in the American way of life, in capitalism, in free enterprise, have chosen to make our choices for good things now, to pay for them now, and enjoy them later—to abide by the consequences of our choices. I suggest to you today that the American way of life is the best way of life there is for it gives the broadest scope of freedom and the greatest opportunity for self-development of all other systems on the face of the earth.

Therefore, you as a student of this college should begin now to think in terms of capitalism; for those thoughts will pay off in a life that is more satisfying.

Now, I want to come to a matter that perhaps will appeal to you directly. Looking back upon my own student days, I recall that one of the big problems I faced, and I suspect one that every student in this college faces today, is the problem of finding out who you are. Now, if someone were to ask you who you are, you would, of course, reply, "I'm John Jones" or "I am Mary Smith"; but that doesn't tell us a thing, and it furthermore doesn't tell you anything. Let's come now to grips with something on a very personal level—who are you? You see, the search for identity is perhaps the greatest problem that young people have. After all, they have come out of a home, they have largely been consumers. But life does not, ladies and gentlemen, reward the consumer. Life rewards the producer. Every American can be divided into one of two classes—either he is a producer or he is a consumer. Now, as long as you are a student, you are primarily a consumer.

And here is the answer to a problem that has bemused many of us in the field of education, and that is: for some reason or other many times the best students do not make the greatest successes in life. We have an old saying in the field of theology, which is where I've had most of my education, though I've done a lot in Education as well, and that is that a lot of the preachers who went to seminary with me, who were outstanding, A-plus students, somehow ended up on the scrap heap, never amounted to very much, didn't achieve very great success in the ministry, and people began to say, "Why?" "What happened?" "They were tremendous students." "Why weren't they successful?" They were chosen, perhaps, sometimes in the school yearbook as the most likely to succeed. Yet, when the history of their lives was written, behold, they didn't succeed at all. Why? Why—because as students, as children, they have learned primarily to be consumers—consumers of food, consumers of affection, consumers of pleasures and consumers of education. And that's necessary and good. After all we couldn't start a baby out as a producer of anything but noise and dampness, for awhile; but anyway, after a time we expect babies to grow up and the process of maturation—maturing—is the process of switching over from being a consumer primarily to being a producer primarily. That is one of the most valid and valuable insights that any young person can have in his educational career—to come to realize that merely being a good consumer does not make him a success in life.

Now, therefore, you have to make a moral decision, a choice right here to abide by the consequences of a choice and that choice is this: are you going to become a producer or are you going to remain primarily a consumer. Life in the long run may give a bare living to the consumer, that is the person who is primarily a consumer. All people are partially producers and partially consumers, but I'm talking now about the successes in life, the people who are successful are never primarily consumers. They are primarily producers. Now, under the socialist system production is not as much encouraged or rewarded as is consumption. Notice the philosophy of Karl Marx, "To each according to his needs; from each according to his ability." But you see there production and consumption are not really related to each other. A person is given help from the government in a socialist system by reason of his need, not by reason of his production. And that's just the opposite to the American way of life which says the greatest rewards should go to the greatest producers. Today you have a moral choice to make. "Will I from this moment," you must ask yourself, "become a producer primarily in order that later on I may also become a consumer, or that I may partially consume things as I go along. Is the main orientation of my life to be that of a producer?" When a person becomes a producer primarily he then becomes successful because life, and the American way, and the capitalist system have a way of rewarding the producer—and the more you produce the more the reward.

It's as simple as a mathematical formula. On the other hand, the whole of socialism whether it be the kind of socialism they call Marxist-Leninism in the Soviet Union, or the kind of socialism they have in Britain called Fabian socialism, or the kind of socialism that we're beginning to get in America, unfortunately, the gradualist socialism that we have here—they all tend to reward not the producers but those who are primarily consumers. But the great fallacy of this is that in the long run it is the producers who have to support the consumers. And that is what is wrong with socialism. Then why not make up your mind today that you going to be primarily a producer, that you're going to outproduce other people around you. If you're going to be a secretary, you're going to turn out more letters and better letters. If you're going to be a business executive, you're going to make more decisions, wiser decisions. You're going to take your work home with you at night and you're going to study when the rest of the gang in the office is primarily having a big time at the local tavern.

You are going to be boning up on the latest developments and the newest inventions, and the greatest new inovations in your field of business so that tomorrow morning when you go back to work you can produce a higher level, a higher quality, and a higher quantity of work than your fellow workers. Then simply stand by and watch yourself progress to the top, because that is the way you go in the American system.

Now, I began a moment ago by saying that you need to find out who you are. How do you find out who you are? You find out your self-identity by the things to which you belong. Now what do you belong to? You see if you belong merely to the enjoyment of consumption you don't have much of an identity, you're a lump. You're a consumer. You're a grownup, mature in years but not mature in judgment. Therefore, you are consumer oriented and you have not become anything but simply a mouth or a mind that drinks things in. The question is, "How do you find identity?" You find identity by becoming a producer, by adding more to your environment than you take away from it; and then life has a peculiar way of coming around and rewarding you when you become a producer beyond your fellows.

But there are others things that are far more important than just production. You are not a production machine. You're a human being made in the image of God. And so, therefore, there are other aspects of your identity which grow. For instance, if you were to ask me, "Who are you?" I would say, "W. S. McBirnie". That wouldn't tell you anything. I would have to go on and say I'm the pastor of the United Community Church in Glendale which is a large non-denominational church in Glendale filled with people who are attempting to try to become today the church of the future so that we may survive this century and make Christianity living and valid, and vibrant, and vital to people. So, I draw part of my identity because I belong to the United Community Church and indeed to Christianity in general. In other words, I draw part of my identity from the fact that I belong to God with all my heart. Then, also, if you would ask me who I am I would say that I'm the speaker on the Voice of Americanism, a radio program, a news analysis program, that has a point of view to help everything American, to help everything that has to do with freedom, to help preserve our freedoms and traditions, and the great ideas of Constitutionalism, capitalism, free enterprise, the free-market economy, individual responsibility, and patriotism.

I draw a very great deal of my personal sense of identity from identifying with that cause called Americanism. And, therefore, were you to ask who I am, I would say I'm the speaker on the Voice of Americanism and I'm a worker in the field of helping to preserve the best of America's traditions; because I'm grateful to America, I'm grateful to the free enterprise economy, and I'm grateful to our American way of life, and I resent it being damaged by such things as socialism and progressive education and appeasement in foreign policy. So, therefore, I draw identity from belonging to that cause. I draw identity from belonging to people that I love. I draw identity from belonging to institutions and causes bigger than myself. But the sum total of the things to which I belong gives me that sense of identity, "I know who I am," but the average young person today doesn't. Now, this isn't something to blame him for, it's something to help him with; because if you don't know who you are, you can become 40 years of age and still by not knowing who you are, have an aimless, purposeless existence and wander from job to job and from relationship to relationship and always be pursued by a vague sense of unhappiness because somehow you've never fitted in.

You've never, as they put it, belonged, and that means that you do not have a personal sense of identity. You don't know who you are, you don't know where you're going and, therefore, you're not going anywhere because life is a merry-go-round. You go round and round in a circle and get off about where you got on. Go down to the restaurant in the lower part of this building that I noticed as I came by this morning. I saw a group of people in there eating, and at just that quick a glance I could tell that the vast majority of people in that restaurant were not people with a purpose in life. They had no great dedication; they didn't belong to anything very worthwhile, and as a result they have no real sense of identity. They are primarily consumers and they produce only enough to keep body and soul together and to keep life bearable, but they are not orientated to a goal. They do not have a journey. They're not on their way. They do not have a sense of purpose. They do not have a sense of identity. They do not know who they are. And yet I come up here to this large room filled with people and I think that already you have begun to formulate certain goals and ambitions and aims. I hope that I might give some sense of sharpening to the decisions that you make to put the emphasis today upon two important principles: One, that you face life with the awareness that in the American system that person profits most who realizes that life consists of abiding by the consequences of his choices.

Every man in the penitentiary today has to face the fact that he is now reaping the consequences of his choices. Every millionaire is reaping the consequences of his choices. Every man who's successful is reaping the consequences of his choices. Now, whether for good or for ill, that's what life is all about, and life is one series of choices after another and that is what you must do. Among the choices that you ought to make very quickly, very early in life is to decide who you are—and you find out who you are by the things and the people to whom you belong. Do you belong to God? I hope you do. You'll never really find a sense of purpose and mission in life unless that is the first loyalty, the ultimate loyalty of your life. If you belong to God you know who you are because you know His plan and purpose for your life. You ought to belong to America. You ought to belong to the American system. You ought to belong to the free enterprise system. You ought to personally find your identity from these great things and institutions to which you belong.

Now you belong to Fox College. It is really a moment of inspiration to be here at Fox College, a college that I strongly recommend to my nationwide listening audience; because there are some unique features about this college of business, which I believe should be reflected in every college of business in the nation and which are personified here.

And so ladies and gentlemen here today, thank you for letting me come and share with you these two principles because I regard them as among the most important insights that anyone at your time of life can have. And if you find them you will never again be the same. Good-bye and God bless you!

Anti-Semitism in the Black Power Movement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 29, 1967

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I deplore, along with all other civil rights supporters, the vicious, stupid anti-Semitic attack made recently by SNCC in its newsletter.

The following editorial broadcast by radio station WCBS in New York on August 16 and 17, accurately characterizes the newsletter for what it really is.

The editorial follows:

WCBS RADIO SCORES BLACK POWER GROUP'S ANTI-JEWISH STAND

With more bravado than good sense, the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee has added anti-Semitism to the philosophy of black power it outspokenly favors. The Negro organization, in its bimonthly newsletter, has atacked the concept of a Jewish homeland in Israel and accused Israelis of committing atrocities against Arabs. The essence of the newsletter's charge is that Zionism conquered the Arabs by massacre; that in 1956 Israeli soldiers lined up Arab victims and shot them down in cold blood. This, said the newsletter, was "the Gaza Strip, Palestine, not Dachau, Germany."

In openly taking up the cause of the Arabs, the committee, which contrary to its name advocates violence, marshals no evidence to support its allegations and engages in historical research of doubtful value. The newsletter goes on to mix fact freely with fiction, dealing in half-truth and innuendo. It makes much of the fact that the United States has given material support to Israel, failing to point out that similar aid has gone to Arab states. It points out that dark-skinned Jews from the Middle East and North Africa are often treated as second-class citizens by white European Jews; it neglects to mention, however, that the problem posed by Eastern Jews is of tremendous concern to Israel and that attempts are being made to heal the rift. The committee's analysis is crude but clever. Like all caricature or propaganda it sees what it wants to see; its purpose is to make a case. And the case it has made, apparently to its own satisfaction, is that the Jews are oppressors and the Arabs the oppressed.

Perhaps it is unnecessary to suggest that no thinking person would be taken in by the committee's essay. The history of a Jewish homeland in Israel is a complex one and like most histories shows no single people or group of peoples as pure and unsullied and others as villains. Certainly the committee's attack violates principles of reason and good tatse. It does nothing to redeem the organization from the blind alley of reverse racialism into which it has so disastrously fallen, and which more than anything else is calculated to stir up fresh ethnic discord in our troubled nation.

What the People Want

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 29, 1967

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "What the People Want," written by David Lawrence, and published in the U.S. News & World Report of August 21, 1967.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT THE PEOPLE WANT

(By David Lawrence)

The American people are dissatisfied today about many of the things the Government is doing or failing to do. They are writing to the members of the House of Representatives and the Senate an unusually large number of letters reflecting discontent.

What are the people saying? What do they want?

The people are tired of the state of fear and uneasiness which has enveloped them. Extremists in our midst, both whites and Negroes, have resorted to a process of intimidation and blackmail—euphemistically called "protests" and "demonstrations."

The people want the agencies of the Government, particularly the courts, to recognize the difference between "freedom of speech" and incitement to riot. Especially do they want to see more courage shown in high places in dealing with disorders.

The people are tired of the outbursts of violence—the killing and wounding of citizens across the land, the sniping and looting, the setting of fires which damage or destroy homes and places of business. Yet all this is, in effect, being condoned as the natural result of the failure to clean up slums in urban areas. Living conditions should, of course, be improved, but the people don't believe that criminals and disturbers of the peace should go unpunished.

The people are tired of reading what the Stokely Carmichaels say, whether in Cuba or in rallies in this country, as they openly preach rebellion. The people want to see such persons prosecuted. If existing laws are inadequate, the people want Congress to strengthen the statutes. Most of all they want to see the laws vigorously enforced.

The people are tired of political legerdemain. They are fed up with attempts to buy votes by giving public funds to politically motivated officials to distribute. They want, moreover, a better accounting of what is done with the tax revenues derived from their earnings. They want to know why Congress has not exercised a closer check on all Government spending.

The people are tired of seeing big deficits piled up year after year, as they are told that "deficit spending" can go on indefinitely and that confidence in the future of the dollar will still be preserved.

The people are tired of the floundering policies of the Administration in handling the Vietnam war. They are being told that military men who want to fight to win aren't being allowed to use maximum power to shorten the war. The people want their Government to employ in war every effective strategy, including the bombing of all enemy bases and supply lines as well as the blockading of all ports at which ships land war supplies for the armies of our adversaries.

The people are tired of reading that their money has been used to make loans to various governments to help them buy arms, and that now the same regimes which received such aid are turning away from the United States and lining up frequently with the Communist side in the U.N.

The people are tired of being told that the big deficits are due solely to the Vietnam war and that the country can also afford domestic spending on an unprecedented scale. Billions of dollars are being poured into many projects which could be deferred or at least managed more efficiently.

The people are complaining about the mail service. Business correspondence of importance is often delayed. and this causes financial loss. Despite the introduction of air mail, the delivery systems have been bogged down by poor management. Yet postage rates for letters are about to be increased.

The people do not like the rise in the cost of living. They cannot readily discern what increases in price are really necessary and what strikes for higher wages are merely the result of selfness and the organized pressure of ambitious labor-union officials. They want the Government to face up courageously to the need for wage-and-price controls if voluntary restraints are not imposed. It is obvious that much could be accomplished if the influence of the Government were conscientiously applied and politics subordinated.

The people want a peaceful society, a decent society, a society in which a fair deal for everybody transcends political deals in the use of governmental power at the federal, State and local levels.

The people are not going to tire of writing to their elected representatives and telling them that persons in public office have a responsibility not just to factions and blocs, but to all segments of our society.

For—as has been said again and again—"you can fool all the people some of the time, and some of the people all the time, but you cannot fool all the people all of the time." The people are voicing their protests and will continue to do so. In a short time they will be expressing themselves at the polls. Citizens want above all else to be presented with a ballot on which the candidates of both parties are persons who possess courage, integrity and a conscience that overrides the temptations of self-serving politics.

Call for Democratic Action in South Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 28, 1967

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, perhaps the foremost of the many rationalizations given for U.S. presence in South Vietnam is to help create a situation in which all the citizens of that area have an opportunity to elect a government of their own choice and to build representative institutions.

Recently a number of Americans, well known in their fields, representing a broad spectrum of opinion, have signed a statement pointing to recent events which have cast grave doubt concerning the conduct of the campaign as well as the pending presidential and congressional elections in South Vietnam.

Emphasizing the fact that "this principle unites us: the South Vietnamese people should decide the political future of South Vietnam," the signers of the Call for Democratic Action in South Vietnam "ask that our Government: first balance its actions in South Vietnam so as to make possible free and fair competition among all of the political forces; and, second, press the Saigon government for strict enforcement of the letter and spirit of the new Constitution.

I commend to the attention of my colleagues this statement, underscoring as it does the concern that these elections reflect to as great an extent as possible the desires of the South Vietnamese, as well as emphasizing the necessity for the development of representative institutions:

Call for Democratic Action in South Vietnam

We call upon American civic, trade union, business, educational, religious, minorities and civil rights leadership, and all others who have worked for the fullest realization of American democracy, to join in a constructive effort to aid the people of South Vietnam in developing representative institutions and political freedom.

We are all committed to the goal of negotiating a political settlement to end the fighting. Although we differ on what steps we would have our government take to facilitate negotiations, this principle unites us: the South Vietnamese people should decide the political future of South Vietnam. We cannot qualify this principle in Vietnam with *ifs* and *buts*: we cannot consent to the notion that the Vietnamese people must forego the "luxury" of democracy until the Vietcong is defeated, or until the United States withdraws its troops, or until the shooting is over, or until something else happens. One of the factors contributing to the tragic situation in Vietnam today has been the subordination of democracy to other considerations. We believe that the growth of representative institutions and a climate of political freedom is necessary to a lasting and satisfactory peace.

Recent events have brought South Vietnam and America to yet another time of choice. Fresh evidence that elements of a democratic society still exist in South Vietnam has appeared in the determination of civilian groups to challenge the political power of the military junta, both in the recent struggle for enactment of the new Constitution and in the current struggle for its enforcement in the election campaign. It is encouraging to note the certification of candidates capable of presenting a challenge to the junta ticket. On the other hand, two prominent candidates for the presidency have been decertified, as have several slates running in the senatorial race—including the slate of the 400,000 member General Confederation of Vietnamese Workers. Moreover, a general atmosphere of harassment and intimidation is being maintained by the present government.

Regardless of the different assessments it is possible to make of this complex situation, we as Americans have a responsibility to do what we can to support and encourage a choice leading to a more representative government.

Our first step is clear: we must bring every pressure to bear for free elections. We therefore ask that our government:

(1) balance its actions in South Vietnam so as to make possible free and fair competition among all of the political forces, and in particular, end actions which politically strengthen the junta at the expense of other forces;

(2) press the Saigon government for strict enforcement of the letter and spirit of the new Constitution, stressing especially the need to (a) free political prisoners, (b) guarantee freedom of speech and the press, (c) end all harassment of electoral candidates, and (d) prevent economic and physical intimidation of the voters, particularly in the rural areas.

Our second step should be to greatly increase support and interchange between American organizations and individuals and their Vietnamese counterparts. Some forms this might take include:

(1) exchanging delegations with Vietnamese voluntary organizations;

(2) exploring areas of mutual cooperation in such fields as education, social service work, union organization, and agrarian reform;

(3) encouraging the American press in South Vietnam to give the same full coverage to political affairs currently extended to the military effort.

We are motivated by a concern for the freedom and independence of the Vietnamese people, not by the policies of any particular government. Our purpose is to encourage democratic development, not to proclaim it where it does not exist.

A program of this sort ought to have begun long ago; the approach of the Vietnam election makes it more urgent. But the task of building democracy in Vietnam extends beyond September. We are not so naive as to believe that a country whose political life has been stifled by war, terrorism and corruption can give rise to flourishing democratic institutions overnight. But neither can we accept the difficult conditions in Vietnam as an excuse for inaction.

A beginning must be made—now. We must work for free elections. But we must look beyond the elections—whose character and outcome are very uncertain. Surely no one associated with the struggles for racial, political and economic justice at home can be indifferent to these values in South Vietnam. With so many factors weighting Vietnamese political affairs in favor of the junta, we have a continuing and inescapable moral responsibility to foster the emergence of popular, representative institutions.

Call for Democratic Action in South Vietnam—List of Signers

(Organizational affiliation given for purpose of identification only.)

A. Doak Barnett, Columbia University.
Philip Baum, American Jewish Congress.
Daniel Bell, Columbia University.
Rev. John C. Bennett, Union Theological Seminary.
Roy Bennett, Journalist.
Emile Benoit, Columbia University.
Rev. Robert Bilheimer, National Council of Churches.
LeRoy Bowman.
Rabbi Balfour Brickner, Union of American Hebrew Congregations.
Jack Cluck, Lawyer.
Randolph Compton, Investment Banker.
Charles Cogen, American Federation of Teachers, AFL–CIO.
Lewis Coser, Brandeis University.
Moshe Decter, Jewish Minorities Research.
Leslie Dunbar, Field Foundation.
John K. Fairbank, Harvard University.
Vernon L. Ferwerda, United World Federalists.
Roger Fisher, Harvard Law School.
Harry Fleischman, American Jewish Committee.
James D. Fowler, U.S. Youth Council.
John Kenneth Galbraith, Former Ambassador to India.
Robert W. Gilmore, Center for War/Peace Studies.
Nathan Glazer, University of California, Berkeley.
Nicholas T. Goncharoff.
Ernest A. Gross, Former Ambassador to the UN.
Rev. Herschel Halbert, Protestant Episcopal Church.
Rabbi Abraham J. Seschel, Jewish Theological Seminary of America.
Rt. Rev. Msgr. George Higgins, U.S. Catholic Conference.
Norman Hill, Industrial Union Department, AFL–CIO.
Rabbi Richard G. Hirsch, Union of American Hebrew Congregations.
Sidney Hook, New York University.
Richard Hudson, WAR/PEACE REPORT.
David Hunter, Stern Family Fund.
Herman Kahn, Hudson Institute.
Tom Kahn, League for Industrial Democracy.
Amrom H. Katz, The RAND Corporation.
Clark Kerr, University Professor.
Philip M. Klutznick, Former Ambassador to the UN.
Myron Kolatch, The NEW LEADER.
Betty Goetz Lall, Cornell University.
Arthur Larson, Rule of Law Research Center, Duke University.
Seymour Martin Lipset, University of California, Berkeley.
Lenore Marshall, Author.
Will Maslow, American Jewish Congress.
Hans Morgenthau, University of Chicago.
Ayreh Neier, New York Civil Liberties Union
John Oliver Nelson, Fellowship of Reconciliation.
John Nuveen, Investment Banker.
Harold L. Oram, Harold L. Oram, Inc.
Guy J. Pauker, The RAND Corporation.
Jonh DeJ. Pemberton, American Civil Liberties Union.
Robert Pickus, World Without War Council of the U.S.
Norman Podhoretz, COMMENTARY.
Lucian W. Pye, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
A. Philip Randolph, Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters, AFL–CIO.
Joseph Rauh, Jr., Lawyer.
Edwin O. Reischauer, Former Ambassador to Japan.

Victor Reuther, United Automobile Workers, AFL–CIO.

David Reisman, Harvard University.

Bayard Rustin, A. Philip Randolph Institute.

Philip J. Scharper, Sheed & Ward, Inc.

Dore Schary, Playwright.

Orville Schell, Lawyer.

Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., Historian.

Paul Seabury, University of California, Berkeley.

Clarence Senior, Brooklyn College.

Albert Shanker, United Federation of Teachers, AFL–CIO.

Leon Shull, Americans for Democratic Action.

Mulford Q. Sibley, University of Minnesota.

Earl P. Stevenson, Banker.

Harold Taylor, Educator, author.

Mary N. Temple National Committee for a SANE Nuclear Policy.

Norman Thomas.

Albert Vorspan, Union of American Hebrew Congregations.

Jerome B. Wiesner, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Addendum.—Stringfellow Barr, Historian; D. G. Brennan, Hudson Institute; Alexander Eckstein, University of Michigan; Alan Geyer, United Church of Christ; Rev. Dana McLean Greeley, Unitarian Universalist Association; Rev. Donald Harrington, Community Church of New York; Irving Howe, Dissent Magazine; Rev. David R. Hunter, National Council of Churches; Bishop John Wesley Lord, Methodist Church; Ralph H. Patton, Insurance Executive; Louis H. Pollak, Yale Law School; William Stern, The Workmen's Circle; Carl F. Stover, National Institute of Public Affairs; Lyle Tatum, Farmers and World Affairs; Jerry Voorhis, Cooperative League of the U.S.A.; Herman Will, Jr., Methodist Church and Raymond E. Wilson, Friends Committee on National Legislation.

Congress Is Taking Right Road on Riots

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 29, 1967

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, in a column published yesterday in the Philadelphia Inquirer, the distinguished columnist Roscoe Drummond points out that Congress, contrary to some expectations, is taking a compassionate, not a punitive, approach to the causes of the recent and tragic riots. I am pleased with Mr. Drummond's references to the constructive role being played by Republicans in this connection.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Drummond's column be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

CONGRESS IS TAKING RIGHT ROAD ON RIOTS

(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—The riots are not producing the predicted punitive mood in Congress. On legislation which bears directly on the urban slum problems the effect is the opposite. This is good. It does not mean that Congress is going to reward violence. It does mean that there is growing, not lessening, support for measures to deal with causes of the violence.

The prospects of the whole antipoverty program, which has been in trouble for months, are visibly improved.

There is new Republican support for the Administration's rent supplement bill.

The Teacher Corps program, greatly needed to provide more and better-trained teachers in slum schools, is being revived.

The first effect of the riots was to harden the attitude in Congress. This mood is changing—among both Democrats and Republicans. President Johnson helped by warning that, while we should not appease the violent few, we should not punish the vast majority of Negro poor who want no part of violence.

Among the Republicans who have done much to help change the mood are Reps. Charles E. Goodell of New York and Albert H. Quie of Minnesota. They strongly warned Congress against allowing "anti-Negro sentiment to develop from the rioting."

"We must not," they have been saying, "allow the tremendous effort being made by the great majority of Negroes in these tragic communities to be overshadowed and forgotten because of a few irresponsible militants. Only then can we get on with the task of providing opportunity for a fuller life for all our citizens."

This is the view which is now beginning to prevail in Congress.

It is prevailing with respect to the antipoverty program. The partisans on both sides are giving ground and the outlook is increasingly favorable.

At first the Republicans wanted to abolish the central direction of the war on poverty by the Office of Economic Opportunity and distribute the programs among the oldline Federal agencies.

But most of the witnesses before the recent House hearings advised against this course and of the 64 who were asked their views about abolishing OEO only one favored its elimination.

At first the Democrats tended to take an unyielding attitude toward any other changes which the Republicans wanted to provide greater local and private-sector participation. Now both sides are negotiating for an agreed measure in committee, a constructive process whch was never possible under the high-handed, cavalier chairmanship of Adam Clayton Powell.

Credit for the bipartisan approach goes to Powell's successor as chairman of the Education committee, Rep. Carl D. Perkins of Kentucky, and to Rep. Sam M. Gibbons of Florida, and on the Republican side to Reps. Quie and Goodell.

It is this same bipartisan give-and-take which recently rescued the Teacher Corps from oblivion—but it still needs more money if it is to begin to do its job.

The Administration wanted a Teacher Corps run from Washington. The Republicans wanted Teacher Corps funds and projects controlled locally. This time the GOP leaders got more of what they wanted than the Administration, but the Senate appropriation was woefully inadequate—$18 million (nearly twice that much is needed)—and the House failed to appropriate anything. Since the bill reflects GOP views, the Republicans ought to find a way to give the Teacher Corps adequate funding because the need for slum-school teachers is so acute.

All of this shows how two-party government can work: Legitimate compromise and action vs. no compromise and stalemate.

Ballot for Peace in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN G. DOW

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 29, 1967

Mr. DOW. Mr. Speaker, recently I was one of a panel of four speakers, including our outstanding colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Kupferman], who addressed an ad hoc forum on the subject of Vietnam.

This occurred on a Saturday afternoon, August 26 last, at Ocean Beach, N.Y., a resort on Fire Island, where a great many New York City people have summer homes.

The meeting represented no group intending to advance a particular theory. It was open to the public and consisted of the public. Two of the four speakers represented a position favoring a continuation of the present course in Vietnam or an escalation thereof. Two, including myself, favored deescalation and steps toward a peaceful settlement.

My purpose in mentioning all this to you, Mr. Speaker, is to reveal the impressive and significant vote expressing the views of the audience by written ballot at the end of the meeting: 257 votes were cast in favor of deescalation or withdrawal of U.S. troops; 27 votes were cast for escalation or support of the present U.S. policy in Vietnam.

Summer Breeze

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 29, 1967

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, one of the crucial needs of the central city is the encouragement of youth to continue their education. I want to call attention to a program in Indianapolis, Ind., which is an exemplary attempt to preserve the potential of disadvantaged youth.

The program is called Summer Breeze and was begun in 1966. "Summer Breeze No. 2" was conducted this year. The program was designed and is directed by Father Robert J. Dunn, S.J., of Brebeuf Preparatory School in Indianapolis.

To give additional information to Members of Congress, I ask unanimous consent to have two news stories about "Summer Breeze" printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Indianapolis (Ind.) News,
July 18, 1967]

IT'S A "SUMMER BREEZE" FOR CENTER TOWNSHIP YOUTHS

While the thoughts of most boys 12 or 14 years old run to a summer of fun and freedom 39 disadvantaged youths from Center Township became a part of "Summer Breeze."

This program was designed by the Rev. Robert J. Dunn, a faculty member at Brebeuf Preparatory School, to encourage its participants to remain in school.

The program is in its second summer of operation. Many of the boys have returned for a second summer and two members of last year's program won scholarships to attend Brebeuf. Furthermore, all the boys in the first program returned to their schools last fall.

Absentees are rare and the only dropouts resulted from health reasons and the desire to attend summer camp on the part of one pupil.

"Summer Breeze" is not a regular school. The pupils are not tested or graded on their progress. Father Dunn defends this system by saying, "Last year I was more interested in academics, this year I am interested in stimulating the pupils."

Father Dunn is aided by five instructors and eight high school pupil volunteers, all of whom share the pupils' enthusiasm about the program. Classes are taught in English, art, mathematics and science.

The volunteers assist in classroom work and conduct special sessions for the slower pupils. Because of the small number of instructors, Father Dunn feels that the volunteers are an important asset to the program.

All is not work in the seven-week experiment, however. There is a weekly excursion to the Broad Ripple Park swimming pool and an hour of physical education activity each day. Drama programs and field trips also have been planned.

"Summer Breeze" depends on contributions from citizens but help comes from other sources also. St. Thomas Aquinas supplies the bus for various outings and Brebeuf contributes facilities.

[From the Indianapolis (Ind.) Star, June 12, 1967]

Brebeuf "Summer Breeze" Will Get Started Today

Brebeuf Preparatory School today will start its second Summer Breeze program, with 50 boys from the Indianapolis inner-city participating.

The free five-days-a-week program, taught by five Jesuits and two lay instructors with the assistance of several Brebeuf pupils, is a racially integrated program for boys with high learning potential.

Those taking the course were recommended by the Indianapolis public schools, settlement houses and inner-city agencies.

The program is financed by voluntary contributions and the Rev. Robert J. Dunne, S.J., its director, said its purpose is to "stimulate economically disadvantage boys with a liking for learning." The boys range from 11 to 13 years old.

The "Summer Breeze" program is run simultaneously with Brebeuf's summer school, in which 250 boys are enrolled.

Charles McC. Mathias, Sr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROGERS C. B. MORTON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 29, 1967

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, the death of Charles McC. Mathias, Sr., is a personal loss to those of us who knew him. More than that, the loss to his community is infinite.

Here was a man who gave of himself that his community and his world would be a better place to live. Truly he was a citizen in the highest sense of the word.

The Frederick Post has eulogized Mr. Mathias, and I insert the editorial at this point in the RECORD:

Charles McC. Mathias, Sr.

Frederick County has lost one of its most distinguished citizens with the death on Tuesday of Charles McC. Mathias Sr.

Active in all phases of community life, Mr. Mathias was especially interested in the care and education of disadvantaged children. His interest was manifested with service for 35 years as president of the Children's Aid Society, and also as chairman of the executive committee of the Maryland School for the Deaf.

His distinguished record of service also encompassed nearly every field of community endeavor, and he was a loyal and devout member of All Saints' Episcopal Church.

Mr. Mathias was noted for his serenity and composure under all circumstances. His outstanding characteristic was his ability to see both sides of a question, and bring opposing parties to a common meeting ground. Because of this, his counsel was widely sought.

He was known as a diplomat for his tactfulness, and even when on the losing side of an argument, he managed to put across his point. His motives were always honest, and his integrity was never questioned.

His legacy to society include that of a distinguished family which has also made its contribution to both the community and the nation.

Because of his attributes and activities, Mr. Mathias was one of the best known citizens of Frederick. In all of his activities, he was conscientious and devoted, and was one who could be counted on to assist in the lead for civic betterment.

Status of Cardinal Joseph Mindszenty, Primate of the Hungarian Roman Catholic Church

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 29, 1967

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today we are reminded of one of the gravest outstanding issues in Eastern Europe, as far as religious freedom is concerned. I am referring to the continued enforced presence of Cardinal Mindszenty as a political refugee at the American Embassy in in Budapest which now had lasted almost 11 years.

How can we think about trade expansion, most favored nation clauses, cultural exchanges, and technical information releases with a Communist country that fails even to conform to the minimum of international standard, the respecting of the highest church officials of its people? How can one speak of liberalization and religious freedom when the one archbishopric is unfilled, the other is filled by a man who is gravely ill and is over 75 years of age, and the third one is kept from fulfilling his ecclesiastical functions—I mean Cardinal Mindszenty—by an illegal sentence that would not hold up even in a present Hungarian Communist court?

Mr. Speaker, it is with admiration that we salute the cardinal who has the physical and moral courage to stay in virtual isolation for 11 years after a prison sentence of 10 years rather than to abandon his faithful and compromise the basic rights of the church. I hope that our administration will concentrate on this case in order to promote an equitable solution of the same.

The Truth-in-Lending Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 29, 1967

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the 90th Congress, I hope, is going to enact into law a truth-in-lending bill. Those who have studied it have long known the need for this legislation because of the refusal of those who extend credit to perform the simple act of disclosing the true cost of that credit.

In the 90th Congress I have joined with 30 of our colleagues in sponsoring this legislation.

The following column concerning this matter appeared in the August 21, 1967, edition of the Washington Evening Star.

I commend it to the attention of our colleagues:

Consumers Grow More Popular in Congress

There is no rarer phenomenon in the Senate or House than the passage of a controversial bill by a unanimous vote. It has happened only once this year, and the measure's unexpected success shows once again how invaluable the states can be in acting as a laboratory for the federal government.

The legislation in question is the suddenly prominent truth-in-lending bill which is now being argued in the House, but which recently passed the Senate by the astounding vote of 92 to 0, although a powerful opposition had been able to defeat previous efforts for six consecutive years. What happened?

First of all, both President Johnson and former Senator Paul Douglas deserves some of the credit. In a message to Congress, Johnson said, "I recommend enactment of legislation requiring all lenders of credit to disclose to borrowers in advance the actual amount of their commitment and the annual rate of interest they will be required to pay . . . The antiquated legal doctrine 'Let the buyer beware' should be superseded by the doctrine 'Let the seller make full disclosure.' "

Paul Douglas devoted some of the best years of his life to generating public interest in the bill and educating consumers to demand "the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth" about the charges they are asked to pay when buying on time or taking out a loan.

This year his work was ably carried on in the Senate Banking Committee by Sen. William Proxmire, D-Wis., but a careful examination of the critical hearings discloses the introduction of new evidence which did much to break down the long resistance to the bill.

In other years the lenders' lobby had been able to convince a majority of the Senate that the pioneering legislation, desirable as it sounded, was not practical, was so complex as to impose intolerable hardships on creditors, and would even cause some businesses to collapse.

In 1966, however, Massachusetts passed a truth-in-lending bill of its own; so when Proxmire opened the Senate hearings in Washington this year he promptly invited various Massachusetts officials, along with merchants and bankers, to testify on their actual experience under the new law.

Their testimony was a revelation; it annihilated the theoretical objections which had seemed so formidable in the past. The head of the state's Consumers Council said, "Arguments opposing truth-in-lending which seemed valid to many economists at one time have now been proven to be completely unacceptable." The credit manager of one firm testified that sales had gone up rather than down after the law became effective.

Backers of the federal bill contend that half the consumers presently have no idea how much interest they are being charged, especially on installment buying and small loans. A Massachusetts merchant said consumers at first were slow to take advantage of the new law, but now they are "shopping for credit rates."

This bears out the contention of Rep. Leonor K. Sullivan, D.-Mo., whose House Consumers Subcommittee is currently holding hearings on the Senate bill. Mrs. Sullivan, who is trying to put more teeth in the measure, says, "There is a price for money as there is for a coffeepot. If we force lenders to say what they are really charging for money, we hope consumers will go out and comparison shop."

The AFL-CIO reports on a study which showed that on loans of $500 or less the informed borrower paid interest of only 12 percent, while the uninformed paid 37 percent. An executive for a large auto manufacturer told a Senate committee: "The variety and complexity of finance and insurance arrangements and the charges for them are such as to almost defy comprehension. It is impossible for the average buyer to appraise the rates offered."

Consumer credit is now one of the nation's biggest businesses. Short term debt alone totalled $95 billion last year, and the credit charge on it came to $13 billion. This is more than the U.S. government paid in interest on a national debt of $330 billion.

The outlook in the House is for safe passage of the Senate bill; it would not be too surprising if it adopted some of Mrs. Sullivan's proposals for toughening the measure. For the moment, consumers are very popular in Congress. They are getting more prominent all the time.

Air Force Chief Lauds Van Nuys, Calif., Air Guard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ED REINECKE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 29, 1967

Mr. REINECKE. Mr. Speaker, the Chief of Staff of the U.S. Air Force, Gen. J. P. McConnell, has commended the 146th Military Airlift Wing, California Air National Guard, Van Nuys, for their unprecedented contributions to the Vietnam airlift. Joining General McConnell in the commendation was the adjutant general of California, Maj. Gen. Glenn C. Ames.

In a letter to the California National Guard commander, General McConnell said:

> I wish to extend my appreciation to all members of your airlift units who have so unselfishly given of their time and effort to alleviate the many problems encountered as a result of accelerated airlift requirements generated by events in Southeast Asia.
>
> The Air Force is especially proud of the manner in which the Air National Guard airlift units have responded to the many exceptional demands which have been placed upon them. Without mobilization of the Air National Guard—

General McConnell said—

> airlift units have made available aircraft, active duty aircrews and support personnel deployment to Vietnam and for many other tasks.

General McConnell's letter to General Ames, continued:

> The overall contribution made by these units is unprecedented. I cannot overemphasize the importance of this ready force of volunteer personnel who continue to serve the Air Force and our Nation in time of need. When the airlift units of the Air National Guard are again called upon to assist the Active Establishment, I am fully confident that they will be as "ready and able" as they have always been.

Mr. Speaker, this recognition of the work of the 146th Military Airlift Wing in Van Nuys by the Chief of Staff of the Air Force is unprecedented. But so is their accomplishment. It merits unique recognition.

The readiness of this unit sets an outstanding example for National Guard units throughout the Nation. During the first 6 months of this year the wing has completed more than 125 overwater missions; 43 flights directly into Southeast Asia and Vietnam. More than 1,510,550 pounds of cargo airlifted; 2,250,000 miles flown and 355,852 passenger miles logged. And there have been no accidents during this period. This was accomplished solely by the part-time duty of Air Guardsmen. To accomplish this with active duty servicemen would have required 1,300 full-time, 5-day-a-week Air Force personnel.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with General McConnell in commending Brig. Gen. Raymond J. Kopecky, commander of the 146th, and his men for this outstanding job.

California's Attorney General Tom Lynch Points the Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 29, 1967

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, Attorney General Thomas C. Lynch, in a dramatic address to the Western States Democratic Conference last Friday, August 25, heralded the leadership of the Democratic Party and President Johnson in Washington and also pointed up the do-nothing negativism of the Republican Party around the Nation, including that of our own Governor Reagan in California.

Tom Lynch is a natural leader and should be the natural candidate to carry the flag of President Johnson with the California delegation to the Democratic Convention next year.

A portion of Attorney General Lynch's speech is as follows:

> In an affluent society, we cannot ignore the poor. Nor in our war on poverty can we ignore the special needs of the ever-growing affluent middle class. In attempting to provide new outlets for youth, we cannot ignore the problems of our older citizens. In seeking to affirm the civil rights and liberties of all our citizens, we cannot ignore the challenge of the lawless and the lawbreakers who respect no one's rights or liberties. In attempting to pay for needed programs, we cannot forget the burdens imposed on taxpayers.
>
> The years of the Johnson Administration have seen uniquely farsighted and sweeping programs launched to deal with all these problems.
>
> If modern poverty as a government problem was discovered by Senators John Kennedy and Hubert Humphrey in the 1960 West Virginia Primary, it has certainly been named, claimed and explored by President Lyndon Johnson.
>
> Yet today—in the wake of bloody riots and civil distress—we hear Republican governors demanding that President Johnson mount a massive attack on urban poverty.
>
> I would only recommend that these governors—these new voices—first talk to their own congressmen.
>
> Republicans in Congress have spent the past four years hacking away at the President's poverty proposals. The Ninetieth Congress has reached a new high—or low—in this regard.
>
> While tragedy stalks our nation's cities, the Republicans of the Ninetieth Congress have slashed at programs to restore health to our cities by removing the blight of poverty . . . slashed at programs to erase the stain of disease and ignorance . . . slashed at programs to alleviate the tragedy of unemployment and slum housing.
>
> With almost incredible frivolity, they rejected the President's request for funds to fight the plague of rats in our urban slums. (Incidentally, I don't think we have yet heard the last of that *milestone* vote.)
>
> How can we expect children born in the 1960's to grow into responsible citizens if they have been raised in the medieval terror of rats? In a nation which is sending men to the moon, in a nation where air conditioning, and color television, and automated kitchens are becoming necessities for millions of Americans, how can we expect children to respect a government which will not protect them from rats? No man can honestly rationalize such a question.
>
> The Republican governors demand action for our cities, and every year since 1964, the Republican congressmen have cut away at President Johnson's proposals for building better cities. The President's request this year for $662 million for the Model Cities Program has already been cut to about one-third the requested figure.
>
> In so many important areas, in housing and in medical care, in education . . . in social security . . . in mental health . . . in civil rights . . . in minimum wages . . . in manpower training . . in urban affairs . . . in mass transportation . . . in recreation and in consumer protection—the President's proposals have faced and are facing stiff Republican opposition in Washington, while the Republicans in the states and cities are demanding action in these very same areas.
>
> This summer has seen these same Republican governors decry the crises in our cities. Yet two years ago, Lyndon Johnson created the new federal Department of Housing and Urban Development over the massive opposition of Republican congressmen.
>
> As a member of the President's Crime Commission, as Attorney General, and as a former District Attorney, I am most familiar with the Administration's approach to the problems of crime, law enforcement and criminal justice—certainly among the most sensitive of national urban problems. I am proud to have played a part in mapping the first truly national strategy against crime.
>
> Yet I have already seen the Republicans in the House turn this critical effort into a political football, sinking serious consideration of police needs in a morass of old political shibboleths.
>
> Similarly, I have seen Republicans in Washington block all attempts at controlling the deadly proliferation of mail order firearms and the equally dangerous traffic in

heavy military weapons—a traffic which has become a national scandal.

This national Republican attitude toward crime is consonant with their behavior in other vital areas. It involves a belated response to crises featuring a tidal wave of oratory and frantic alarums and excursions. It involves a sense of urgency which is apparently energized only by virtual disaster.

This record of Democratic action and Republican resistance, however, is not an instant ticket to victory in 1968, on either the state or federal levels.

As they say in Sacramento, you're only as good as your last picture. None of these programs have achieved immediate success. None were intended to. In fact, in the face of many of these programs, the United States has been torn by rioting and terror-ridden with civil disturbances.

The way is open for the type of non-program which has served the Republican party so well in the past. A P. T. Barnum style with platitudes and slogans; a fraudulent general-store approach to economics; a philosophy toward social and human problems which is as irrelevant—but also as palatable—as the homilies of Ma Perkins or Mary Worth; a portrayal of government—as practiced by Democrats—as some sort of arcane and probably "black" art; a special appeal to the home-owning, boat-owning, mortgage-owing, comfortable and insecure middle class voter—all of these elements wrapped in a flag and carried by a handsome man who proclaims his distance from politics.

Such an appeal will be hard to overcome in 1968. It will not be overcome by relying on such tired chestnuts as the right wing, or the inexperience of our opponents, or the Republican failures of other years. It will not be overcome by futilely decrying and criticizing the opposition. It will not be overcome by dependence on the empty cliches of past campaigns. It will be overcome by the thorough and positive presentation of the unparalleled record of legislation which has been created by President Lyndon Johnson. It will be overcome by presenting candidates on all levels who answer—really answer—America's problems in this same spirit.

We must seek to assure the American people of our ability to better control the massive forces which are driving modern America.

We must neither ignore nor dispute the alarm and concern which has spread across our nation. We must not attempt to gloss the uglier truths about our nation *circa* 1968. We must not rely on old formulas of success which ignore the new social structures.

We must emphasize our past successes and offer new proposals. We must demand that our Republican opponents base their campaigns on the harsh realities, and realistic responses. We cannot allow them to respond to realities with wistful dreams of an untroubled past and a simpler future.

We cannot allow the Republican Party to conduct its typical campaign of dealing with new problems by complaining about them. The White House, the Congress, the State Capitols are not wailing walls. Government today demands action, not accusations; compassion, not complaints.

We must insist on a campaign which will embody the "candid and universal" debate which Woodrow Wilson saw as the saving virtue of our nation. In doing this, we must ourselves insist on candor and reason. We must ourselves refrain from substituting rhetoric for reason and platitudes for problems.

We must strive to create political campaigns which are healthy for America—which will not play on either hidden or open prejudices; which will not seek to sit one group against another; which will not allow candidates to cloak intolerance with an attitude of self-righteousness, to conceal indifference with the banner of economy, to heighten fears with inflamed demands for public safety, to inflate pettiness into public spirit.

The temper of the nation is such that we cannot afford the posturing and the demagoguery which has been tolerated in other years. Campaigns of deceit, of division, of vilification could be a national tragedy.

Our party faces a most difficult election. In California, we've had several recently. And, I note, in the other Western states, a few Republicans have been getting elected. Hopefully, recent defeats will have prepared us for this election.

We have a national administration with an unparalleled record of programs dealing with the problems which beset us. In President Lyndon Johnson and Vice President Hubert Humphrey, we have national leaders who have proven their greatness, their understanding, and their feeling for all Americans. This we must successfully present to the American people.

We must respond to the challenges of our times in a manner which is understood, accepted, and supported by the American people.

I am certain we will.

Thank you.

Time To Stop Being "Nicey-Nice" About Riots

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. G. ELLIOTT HAGAN
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 23, 1967

Mr. HAGAN. Mr. Speaker, columnist James J. Kilpatrick hit the nail on the head in the Washington Star of August 22.

I believe his article, "Time To Stop Being 'Nicey-Nice' About Riots," says what most Americans today are thinking.

The article follows:

The thought occurs, and can no longer be repressed, that it's time for some of us who write for a living to stop writing so nicey-nice about this summer's riots and the Negro leadership. This is a summer of outrage, scored for kettle drums of violence; but such is our sense of genteel restraint that most of us have been playing our typewriter pianissimo. We have settled for murmuring my-my and oh-oh, and they certainly do have grievances, don't they.

Well, nuts. There comes a time when the law-abiding majority of this country, imperfect as it is, ought to put a hard question to large elements of the Negro community: When in the name of God are you people going to shape up?

One is tempted to exempt from the thrust of that question many thousands of Negro citizens who have played no active part in the recent violence and indeed have been victims of it. They can't be left out. Who has given sanctuary to the Negro snipers? Fellow Negroes. They share in the guilt.

What's the matter with the Negro leadership? Since the first torch was put to Newark, one has waited—and waited in vain—for some high-level expression of shame, apology, contrition. Non est. Perhaps nothing was to be expected from H. Rap Brown; his theme is "Get you some guns and burn this town down." The sullen Stokely Carmichael yearns "to kill the whites first." But what of Roy Wilkins, Whitney Young, the Rev. Martin Luther King? They are full of excuses, and in King's case, something more. It's all the fault, says the reverend doctor, of "the policy-makers of white society." He proposes massive strikes and sit-ins to "dislocate" the cities without actually destroying them. He will do this "lovingly."

At every hand, the cry goes up for crash spending programs in the slums. Michigan's Rep. John Conyers wants $30 billion a year. Most of the money would go toward jobs and housing. The New Republic magazine tells us what kind of jobs—not merely jobs for "black waiters, dishwashers and busboys, but jobs that will restore Negro self-respect."

What's wrong with being a waiter, a dishwasher, or a busboy, if one qualifies for the work? Hundreds of thousands of white men and women perform these humble but essential labors. What's the matter with a teenager's starting as a bootblack? It's an honest trade—but Washington barbers are desperate for bootblacks. No colored boys apply.

Ad what of "jobs that will restore Negro self-respect"? From one end of the country to the other, employers increasingly are searching for Negroes as sales clerks, bank tellers, draftsmen, technicians. They may not be overcome with altruism; it may be only the Equal Employment Opportunities Commission breathing down their necks. But the jobs are there. Where are qualified Negro applicants to fill them?

The excuse is that the "ghetto schools" are so bad, and the Negro teen-agers so "insufficiently motivated," that they drop out. It's a feeble excuse. Many a middle-aged American looks at some of these "ghetto schools" and is dimly reminded of the elementary schools of his own unfar nonage, Others recall the pot-stove schoolhouses of the country. The opportunity for an education lies within them. What's asked of the Negro? Ambition. Hard work.

But it is said that the typical Negro has no reason for ambition. He is ground down by three centuries of oppression; he supposes that society owes him back pay at time and a half for 300 years. It won't wash. The typical Negro under discussion isn't 300 years old; he's maybe 15 to 19 years old, and he's living in a generation that is light-years removed from the 17th Century. He has more than most other minorities have had: A fighting chance in a prosperous land.

The cry is that "ghetto housing" is so bad. Okay. Some of it is awful. Some of it is not. But there are twice as many poor whites as poor blacks; the poor colored neighborhoods of Watts and Detroit have their counterparts—and their rats—in poor white neighborhoods across the land. The blunt truth is that self-help could cure at least a part of the ills. If some of Jesse Gray's complainers would spend more time with a dollar rake or a 50-cent broom, and less time with a two-dollar pint of gin, maybe a sense of mutual respect would start to grow. Heresy, one supposes, to say such things. But they need to be said.

President's Tax Message

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES B. UTT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 29, 1967

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, the Ways and Means Committee is holding extensive hearings on the President's tax message. There have been many statements, pro and con. Most of these statements are directed at spending restraint as a prerequisite to any tax increase. One statement that appealed to me most was the statement by William Jackman, president of the Investor's League, Inc. He cut through the underbrush and went directly to the point.

In order that his statement may receive wider attention, I insert his statement in the RECORD following my remarks:

Statement on President's Tax Increase Proposals Before the House Committee on Ways and Means

(By William Jackman, president, Investors, League, Inc., August 25, 1967)

My name is William Jackman. I am President of the Investors League, a non-profit, non-partisan organization of thousands of individual investors from every state in the nation with offices at 84 Fifth Avenue, New York, New York.

Mr. Chairman and distinguished members of your Committee, I wish to thank you for the privilege of presenting to you our views on the President's proposals to increase corporate and individual income taxes now before you for consideration.

The President asks for an individual and corporate income tax surcharge of 10% starting on October 1, 1967 for individuals and July 1, 1967 for corporations. These surcharges would be "temporary" and expire in June 1969. He also asks for an extension of automobile and telephone excise taxes.

The principal reasons given by the Administration for these recommendations are to head off inflation and soaring interest rates.

The proceeds of $7.4 billions presumably would be used to reduce the 1968 federal budget deficit now estimated at $29 billions (instead of the $8 billions estimated at the beginning of the year).

PROPOSALS WOULD BE INEFFECTIVE

Gentlemen, it is our opinion, that these tax increases are unnecessary at this time and would prove ineffective. The only way to put our government's financial house in order would be to drastically curtail non-defense federal spending programs and to defer other ones now under consideration.

Every businessman knows that high taxes, just like high wages, are inflationary. They represent costs of doing business, and these increased costs, when they exceed increased production, must be passed along in higher prices to the consumer.

As regards higher interest rates, excessive government debt competes for the people's savings and naturally forces up interest rates. This is exactly what has been happening in recent years. In the long run, interest rates are controlled by the laws of supply and demand, and not by government fiat.

CUT FEDERAL SPENDING

Since 1960 the U.S. population has grown by *only 10%*. In the same period, the personnel comprising the civilian bureaucracy of the Federal government has grown by *25%;* the cost of government payrolls, including military, has grown by *75%;* the total of all government spending has grown *by 83%;* non-defense expendtiures of the Federal government are up *97%*.

It is obvious that the only sensible step toward curbing inflation and huge deficits, is to cut federal spending.

There is a bill, S. 538, passed by the Senate in May, now pending before the House. It provides for creation of a Joint Committee on the Budget. It should be passed.

A NEW COMMISSION NEEDED

A more fundamental, additional approach to expenditure control is envisioned in a proposal by the distinguished Chairman of this Committee, Congressman Wilbur D. Mills. His bill, H.R. 10520 would create a 12-member bipartisan Government Program Evaluation Commission, its members drawn from private life, to examine all Federal program and activities, old, new and projected, and assign priorities among them. The yardstick would be "the fundamental needs and vital objectives of the Nation". The Commission would ask of each program: What is its effectiveness in terms of present and future costs? Should it be continued? If so, at what level of funding? A companion Senate bill, S. 2032, has been introduced by Sen. William Proxmire (D-Wis.), Chairman of the Joint Economic Committee. He calls the idea "a fresh look" at government expenditures needed to instruct Congress and the President as to how much should be appropriated in a given fiscal year for each Federal activity.

The rationale of expenditure control was outlined by Rep. Mills in a speech in late May, before he introduced H.R. 10520. Among his points: After taxes were reduced in 1964, it appeared that the rate of Federal spending had moderated.

But in September 1965, the spending rate rose quickly and this year, if certain contingencies occur, the Nation is faced with the prospect of a possible fiscal year 1968 budget deficit of nearly $30 billion—the largest since World War II. Though urgent defense costs account for part of the spending rise, non-defense costs also have risen and this is where controls must be applied. First-year costs of a new program are only part of the story; of more concern is what future costs will be—5, 10 even 15 years ahead. As these rise, they can impose a "straitjacket" on tax policy and endanger the desired goal of spending controls coupled with "regular, frequent and significant reductions in tax rates" which will free the private economy to help solve problems "which many people are urging that the Government solve directly". Therefore, priorities must be set on non-defense programs.

EXCISE TAX REVISION

The Administration proposals to extend excise taxes on automobiles and telephone services are likewise inflationary. The F.C.C. is trying to reduce telephone rates. Why not let the "temporary" Korean War excise taxes expire? The same thing applies to automobile excise taxes. Threatened strikes and other factors are going to force up automobile prices. Continuation of the excise tax will force prices even higher.

If there is to be an excise tax, which might be a saving grace if applied fairly, it should be at a very low rate applied equally to all industry at the manufacturer's level, with the possible exception of food and drug industries.

The President estimates that "extension" of scheduled reductions in telephone and automobile excise taxes would provide additional Federal revenues of $300 millions for fiscal 1968 and over $2 billions in 1969. The $2 billion figure for 1969 seems to be a highly questionable estimate.

A SOURCE OF NEW REVENUES

It would be much more simple to collect such additional revenues by a simple tax reduction. This could be done promptly by enacting H.R. 8146, a bill introduced on April 6, 1967 by Congressman James B. Utt. This bill provides for a 50% reduction in the maximum tax rate on long-term capital gains, from 25% to 12½%. Dependable surveys indicate that if this bill were enacted, the Treasury would receive nearly $700 million more than under present rates. If these surveys were updated, they would indicate that the Treasury's increased revenues from this source would be even greater.

TIMING WRONG

The timing of the President's tax increase proposal seems all wrong. We can as yet see no indication of a big business boom. Ask the steel and auto boys. These are basic industries. Labor uncertainties in the near future are alarming to these industries and could well result in a slump, certainly not a boom.

CONSIDER THE STOCKHOLDER

Under the President's proposals, the individual who is a stockholder will be hit double since a 10% surcharge on the present 48% corporate rate will raise that rate to 52.8% or more than it was before the reduction of the old 52% rate. The individual will then bear the bite on any dividend distributions.

Because so much of personal income is in the lower tax brackets, a relatively small but constant increase in each of the percentages in the several graduated brackets, say by 2 percentage points, might well produce more tax revenue than the higher-sounding 10% surcharge.

Because inflation is best checked by a tax that reduces consumer income and that bears least heavily upon income likely to be invested, the flat increase in the scale of rates would seem more appropriate economically than the 10% surcharge at this time.

There is talk of making tax surcharges larger for corporations than for individuals. Just remember that, tax-wise, there is no such thing as a "corporation". "Corporations" are only millions of people pooling their invested savings together. The corporate income tax is one of the Treasury's major sources of income. They are paid only out of *profits* at a rate of 48%.

The remaining earnings distributed to individual stockholders are then taxed at rates from 14% to 70%. It is obvious that if the Treasury wants more income, they should go all out to encourage business expansion and creation of even *greater* profits. Whenever government attacks profits, it is simply attacking itself. As Senator William Proxmire crisply summarizes, "the crux of my opposition to the President's 10% surtax proposal is that it is dead certain to retard this nation's economic growth".

Gentlemen, our entire Federal tax system must be overhauled. It has become a hodgepodge mess. Its policies must be established and controlled by Congress, and not by the executive branch or its bureaus who are only presumed to enforce our laws and *not* to make them.

In your tax thinking, gentlemen, just remember that there are over 24,000,000 American investor-shareowners whose savings provide the jobs for our workers in industry and produce under our free-enterprise profit system, the goods and services that have given this nation the highest standard of living in this world. And remember one other thing. This system is called "Capitalism". Karl Marx, in his "Communist Manifesto", stated that the surest way to destroy Capitalism was to impose a heavy progressive income tax and an ever higher inheritance tax. We have already gone too far down this road.

Gentlemen, I thank you.

Counter-Deterrence and the ABM

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 29, 1967

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, that trenchant observer of the American scene, Will Rogers, once observed that in the field of disarmament Americans had a tendency to scrap battleships while their opponents tore up blueprints. Something of this American tendency of an almost extremist good will is in evidence today with reference to the question of anti-ballistic-missile defense. We talk and talk in the hope that we can persuade the Soviet Union to dismantle its present anti-ballistic-missile system and to refrain from going ahead with further missile defenses. The Soviets stall in the negotiations while continuing to build and deploy their ABM's.

SOVIET CAPABILITIES AND INTENTIONS

The recent study prepared by a special subcommittee of the National Strategy Committee of the American Security Council entitled "The Changing Strategic Military Balance: U.S.A. versus U.S.S.R." has stated that—

> The preponderance of evidence points to the conclusion that the Soviet Union is succeeding in its massive drive toward strategic military superiority . . . (and that) the year 1967 falls in a crossover period with the U.S.S.R. estimates ranging between 16,000 and 37,000 (deliverable) megatons, to equal or exceed the U.S. estimated range of between 8,000 and 29,000 (deliverable) megatons.

This study, with its graphic documentation of the Soviet thrust for military-technological superiority, has received, and continues to receive, widespread attention from leading editors and authorities in both the daily and the periodical press. The New York Times, for example, in a front-page story on July 12, 1967, stated that—

> *The Defense Department did not directly contradict the study's findings,* but argued that deliverable megatonnage was not an accurate indicator of "true military capability."

It has been argued in some quarters in the West, however, that Soviet capabilities as illustrated by the Soviet deployment of an ABM system need not be a cause for alarm, since Soviet intentions are peaceful and the cold war is, in fact, over.

But are the Soviet leaders mellowing? Unfortunately, the most recent evidence would appear to indicate that storm flags are flying in the Kremlin. Some storm signals are:

First. The official pronouncement of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union issued June 25, 1967, in a summary of 50 years of bolshevism. It stated that "the domination of imperialism on the world scene has ended" because of the growth of Soviet military power. The statement also singled out the United States as the "main enemy" of the national liberation warfare movement and charged the State of Israel with aggression.

Second. Appointing—for the first time since Beria's execution in 1953—the Soviet secret police chief a member of the ruling Politburo. This is Yuri Andropov, whose promotion was announced June 22, 1967. Since the KGB—the Soviet secret police—have vast responsibilities for waging unconventional warfare around the world, it would appear that giving Andropov such power indicates stepped-up cold war operations.

Third. Writing in the official Soviet Armed Forces newspaper, Red Star, on June 3, 1967, Bulgarian Minister of Defense, General of the Army Dobri Dzhurov, said:

> The Soviet Union has always been and *will continue to be the main political and material base of the world revolutionary process.* (Emphasis added.)

The general also went on to say that—

> The Soviet Union constitutes the main support of fighting Vietnam.

Fourth. Soviet escalation of the Vietnam war is another example of the Soviet's true intentions. Soviet shipping going into North Vietnamese ports has shown a marked increase this year over 1966. As of June 1967 the rate was 18 per month, with an additional two to five Soviet satellite ships per month. Indicative of this escalation is the Moscow Radio broadcast of July 28 which stated that Soviet ships "leave Odessa practically every day with cargoes for Vietnam."

Fifth. The recent hard line in the Soviet press which continually attacks Israel, "Zionism," and the United States. In reporting this trend from Moscow, the Washington Post of August 8, 1967, stated that the press campaign was one which "to some senior diplomats here recalls the worst days of the cold war."

These indicators of increasingly "stormy cold war weather" indicate that Soviet strategists understand quite well that revolutionary agitation and propaganda, "peace marchers" in London and New York, guerrillas in Africa and Latin America, are techniques of conflict on a par with guided missiles and nuclear submarines. But does it follow that these same Soviet strategists are unaware of the possibilities for nuclear blackmail of the West in the event that they attain strategic military-technological superiority? Indeed, one may well ask whether the present U.S. limitations on air strikes against military targets in North Vietnam result from the steady accretion of Soviet military-technological power.

CHINESE COMMUNIST NUCLEAR WEAPONS DEVELOPMENT

Even if it were possible to disregard the evidence of the Soviet deployment of an ABM system or systems and the counter-deterrence which this poses to the announced U.S. policy of deterrence, it would be still more difficult to close our minds to the ominous developments in China.

The Chinese Communists exploded their first H-bomb on June 17, 1967. It was apparently a sophisticated implosion type in the two-to-seven megaton range. The complicated electronic triggering and measuring devices that would appear to have been required, in this and other nuclear tests, would be of great assistance to the Chinese in building an intercontinental missile. Since the Chinese progress in nuclear weapons development has been faster and more effective than had been anticipated by Western sources, it may be that they will also develop a nuclear ICBM delivery capability sooner than the mid-1970's, which is the time phase previously estimated by Western sources. Moreover, the Chinese now possess the design capability for a multimegaton thermonuclear weapon which can be delivered by aircraft.

The possibilities of the Chinese Communists exercising nuclear blackmail against Southeast Asia countries, Japan, or, indeed, against the United States are underscored in a report released August 3, 1967, by the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy. The committee said:

> We believe that the Chinese will continue to place a high priority on thermonuclear weapons development. With continued testing we believe they will be able to develop a thermonuclear warhead in the ICBM weight class with a yield in the megaton range by about 1970. We believe that the Chinese can have an ICBM system ready for deployment in the early 1970's. On the basis of our present knowledge, we believe that the Chinese probably will achieve an operational ICBM capability before 1972. Conceivably, it could be ready as early as 1970-1971.

The Joint Committee then went on to sound a warning about the direct threat to U.S. national security posed by Chinese Communist nuclear weapons developments by pointing out that—

> Most significant for the United States is the fact that a low order of magnitude attack could possibly be launched by the Chinese Communists against the United States by the early 1970's. At present we do not have an effective anti-ballistic-missile system which could repel such a suicidal (for the Chinese) but nevertheless possible strike.

THE STABILIZING VALUE OF A U.S. ABM SYSTEM

In the final analysis, the value of a system of deterrence is that which the enemy believes about it. If the Soviets believe that the U.S. deterent offensive force can be neutralizd by their ABM systems to a point at which the Soviet warmaking capability will sustain only an acceptable level of damage—and, of course, their acceptable level may be much higher than ours—then they have achieved a counter-deterrence posture which may lead them to risk—at a given crisis in international relations—a nuclear war.

Equally, if at some future point the Chinese Communists should believe—in the absence of a U.S. ABM system—that there is somewhat more of a "suicidal" element for the United States than for them in a nuclear war, they might, in a given confrontation, launch a surprise nuclear attack on America.

The evidence of the post-World War II period suggests that it has been the stabilizing factor of U.S. military-technological power which has prevented a general war. Today, under the impact of both the Soviet and Chinese Communist military-technological thrust, that stability appears to be threatened. Would the production and deployment of a U.S. ABM system—perhaps even on a crash basis as a clear demonstration of credibility—have a definite stabilizing value on world politics? That it might well do so is indicated by the thoughtful and carefully measured words of the Senate Appropriations Committee. In reporting on the Defense Department appropriation bill for fiscal 1968—August 4, 1967—the committee said:

> It is the view of the Committee that the deployment of the Nike-X antiballistic missile system should be initiated immediately, and the Committee urges the executive branch of the Government to take action accordingly.

Bureaucratic Arrogance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAN KUYKENDALL

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 29, 1967

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Speaker, the latest chapter in the agonizing ITT–ABC merger saga demonstrates the human element of peevishness, arrogance and irresponsibility of governmental bureaucracy.

It is interesting to note that the Justice Department has gone into the court of appeals with its case to be based not on antitrust but on a request for remanding the proposed merger back to the FCC. It is pretty obvious that the strategy is one of delaying any decision beyond the December 31 deadline when the merger agreement expires.

By that time, the Department of Justice is hoping that the parties will be tired of legal harrassment and call off the deal. If there was ever a more disgrace display of bureaucratic arrogance over the past quarter of a century, one cannot recall it to mind.

Even the manner in which the announcement was made was a nose-thumbing gesture. The Justice Department could have waited until after the Pacific Coast Stock Exchange was closed before announcing it would continue its fight against the merger.

The Government agency might argue that the closing times of stock markets are not its concern, but whoever was responsible for deciding the timing obviously took the New York market into account because the bombshell was fused to go off after the eastern close.

After the announcement, ABC stock went down on the pacific coast exchange as though someone had pulled the plug, as indeed they had, and many investors went with it. The stock plummeted 16¼ points, one of the sharpest declines in the history of the exchange in the 50 minutes of trading that were left.

The Justice Department had waited so long before announcing its opposition to the merger that most people thought it had given up. In fact, on the day of the announcement—Thursday, July 20—ABC rose 6½ points to 102 on the New York Stock Exchange amid rumors that the Attorney General would approve the merger.

The Justice Department should have made the decision earlier and let its position be known on a Friday night after all of the exchanges had closed. This would have given investors time to digest the news. While this might not have prevented selling, it is reasonable to assume trading would have been more orderly given the cooling off period.

As it was, there was not enough time even for investors on the New York Stock Exchange to appraise the situation. There was such a pile-up of sell orders on Friday morning that the exchange had to delay the ABC opening until 12:50 p.m. The stock closed that day at 80⅛, off 21⅞.

What started as an inter-governmental squabble is having wide repercussions. ABC has been given a bolo punch. The ABC stockholder is taking a beating, too, but if the merger is thwarted the real loser will be the American public.

Educational Scholarships

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL D. PERKINS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 29, 1967

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, every young American who is qualified should have the opportunity to obtain a college education, whether or not his parents can afford it. It is therefore very good news indeed that the number of scholarships awarded by the AFL–CIO and AFL–CIO unions have been increasing.

A report on this development appears in the AFL–CIO News and under unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, I include the article in the RECORD, as follows:

HUNDREDS AIDED: UNION SCHOLARSHIPS OPEN COLLEGE DOORS

Scholarship aid to help young men and women meet the expenses of college educations is being awarded by an increasing number of AFL–CIO affiliates.

Most of the awards at the international union level are earmarked for the sons and daughters of members, but the Intl. Brotherhood of Electrical Workers has presented scholarships to help four young journeyman members study for degrees in the field of electrical engineering.

Winners of awards of $2,500 a year for four years, good at any accredited engineering school of the winner's choice, were:

James L. Harrison, Local 779, Columbus, Ga.; Douglas E. Hefner, Local 32, Lima, O.; Robert L. Jack, Local 332, San Jose, Calif., and Davis M. Shackleton, Local 1547, Anchorage, Alaska.

The National Maritime Union has awarded scholarships worth $2,500 a year for the four college years to nine children of members. The winners were selected by an independent panel of educators under the chairmanship of Dr. John T. Dunlop of Harvard University on the basis of competition administered for the union by the Educational Testing Service. Chosen were:

Ernesto Bachiller, New York, son of Ernesto Bachiller, who sails as a chief cook; Jose DeJesus, New York, whose father, Jose, is a merchant seaman; Otto F. McNab, Arabi, La., son of Robert O. McNab, a seaman; Candice L. Connor, New Orleans, daughter of James J. Connor, a seaman; Cheryl Margaret Francis, New Orleans, daughter of Albert Felix Francis, Jr., a seaman.

Also, John Chaiken, Springfield, Mass., whose father, Arthur Chaiken, is a fireman-watertender; Christine L. Compston, Portland, Me., daughter of William T. Compston, a baker on passenger vessels; Sandra Gayle Daws, Port Arthur, Tex., whose stepfather, Ben C. Gann, Jr., is a seaman, and Helene M. Bolden, Bryn Mawr, Pa., daughter of Edgar Bolden, a fireman-watertender.

AWARDS BY SEAFARERS

The children of five members of the Seafarers have been picked by a committee of prominent educators for awards totaling $6,000 for the four years of college. They are:

Bronwyn M. Adams, daughter of Edgar Adams, Jr., Bayou Vista, La.; Anthony J. Calister, son of Raymond Calister, Brooklyn, N.Y.; Lisa Ann Cresci, granddaughter and dependent of Peter Gonzales, Jamaica, N.Y.; Philip E. Shrimpton, son of Jack (Aussie) Shrimpton, Lexington, Ky., and George S. Thurmer, son of George B. Thurmer, Oliver Springs, Tenn.

Twelve four-year scholarships worth $1,000 a year for four years have been awarded by the Machinists to 11 children of members and one member. The winners were picked by a committee of educators from among 1,400 applications which were limited by the union to the children of members and members themselves under 35 years of age.

The member-winner is George Callender, Jr., 23, of Ocean Springs, Miss., who belongs to IAM Local 1133 at the Ingalls Shipbuilding Corp., Pascagoula. He will attend Jackson County College, Gautier, Miss., and continue working at Ingalls.

The remaining winners:

Daniel Bauwens, Omaha, Neb., son of Bernard H. Bauwens of Local 1826; Clifford Butzin, Peru, Ind., son of Otto Butzin, Local 2069; Joan DiGiacobbe, Wilmington, Del., daughter of Attilio DiGiacobbe, Local 1284; Thomas P. Foley, Jr., Dover, N.H., son of Thomas Foley, Local 634; Patricia C. Hannigan, Balboa, C.Z., daughter of Joseph Hannigan, Local 699.

MORE WINNERS NAMED

Also, Stephanie Hernandez, Citrus Heights, Calif., daughter of Mike Hernandez, Local 1209; David S. Kemper, Vancouver, Wash., son of Eugene Kemper, Local 1374; Susan Mathes, Green Bay, Wis., daughter of Robert Mathews, Local 501; Barbara E. Richardson, Wichita, Kan., daughter of Lloyd Richardson, Local 733; David Snizek, Chicopee, Mass., son of Chester Snizek, Local 1746, and Leonore Uebelher, Alexandria, Va., daughter of Rudolph Uebelher, Local 1759.

The Glass Bottle Blowers, whose scholarship fund is supported chiefly by voluntary contributions from members, have presented awards to two children of members—Linda M. Skuse, Milpitas, Calif., daughter of Arthur R. Skuse, Local 262; and Randolph Shrider, Glenford, O., whose father, Walter Shrider, is employed by the Central Silica Co., a sand-producing firm.

Edward L. Wheatley Scholarships of $500 for each of four years of college study have been awarded yb the Operative Potters to three children of members selected on the basis of regional competitive examinations. The scholarships honor the union's international president.

The winners are Thomas P. Gallagher, Trenton, N.J., son of Thomas P. Gallagher; Kathleen Ann Wilson, Tiffin, O., daughter of Recording Sec. Harold Wilson of Local 7, and Peggy Thyra Harding, El Sobrante, Calif., daughter of Leroy C. Harding.

Do-Gooders and Bleeding Hearts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN N. ERLENBORN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 29, 1967

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Speaker, since the riots marred this summer of 1967, we have had many analyses of their causes, their effects, and their cures. One such analysis appeared in the Lisle Graphic, Lisle, Ill., and was written by Mrs. Terry Figg. It appears below:

[From the Graphic, Aug. 2, 1967]

DO GOODERS AND BLEEDING HEARTS

(By Terry Figg)

One can only view with disbelief the incredible sight of some of our nation's finest cities being ravaged by rioters engaged in week long orgies.

The "do gooders" and "bleeding hearts"

have crawled rapidly out of our nation's woodwork to defend the rioters and looters by placing the burden of their lawless acts on the nation as a whole. They claim we must accede to the sociological blackmail demanded by extremists as their price for a cease-fire.

Those mainly condemned to wear the hair shirt by the latter day prophets are the great middle-class. The middle classers' meaculpas must be said for the horrendous crime of working themselves out of the poor category into tax oblivion.

Many in our nation have become sickened with the do gooder's admonishments that unless we guarantee an annual income and subsidize rent payments to these anarchists, we will continue to see our country turned into a blazing inferno.

This is no longer a battle over civil rights. Instead it has reverted to the age-old battle of the "have nots" wanting to be given what the "haves" broke their backs to get.

This current problem is not unique. Back in the days of M. Cicero, over 2,000 years ago, it is written that the roman rulers guaranteed life, liberty and the constant pursuit of happiness to the proletariat, from birth to death.

In Cicero's time the middle class was taxed out of existence to pay for the never ending demands of the masses. Sound familiar? Shades of the Great Society!

Perhaps the disaster that is facing the American middle class is deserved. For the most part we have become too complacent. We work, pay our taxes, discipline our progeny and make excuses for the odd balls who do not or can not conform to societies rules.

This leaves us little time to organize into loud mouth, self pitying groups, crying to all who will listen that we are not being given everything that we believe we are entitled to.

Many of today's middle class were depression kids. They had little to eat and almost no recreation provided for them. They managed to survive this ordeal primarily because sympathy was not allowed to rear its troublesome head.

They were sent off to school wearing second-hand or patched garments with parental warnings not to think of dropping out. When they left school, they worked hard, sacrificed much and rose from their individual ghettos to a better life.

Personal ambition is the key word in this dilemma. The man who is willing to give a little more than his pay check calls for will be recognized eventually and rewarded, no matter what his race, color, or creed happens to be.

Conversely, the man who is content with being poor will remain so. This is a fact of life, and even the constant intravenous feedings of pork barrel funds into the distended veins of the poverty program has not been able to cure the age old disease of poverty.

All the Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1967

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, excellence in new areas is to be admired and congratulated. Recently the Westbury, Long Island, N.Y., Senior League Baseball All-Stars, of my congressional district, demonstrated true excellence. The 15 boys on the team from Westbury have won the 1967 Senior League World Championship. They deserve to be congratulated and feted for their achievements in baseball and as responsible young men.

An editorial in the Westbury Times, of August 24, 1967, paid appropriate tribute to the Westbury baseball team, and under leave to extend my remarks I wish to include it in the RECORD as follows:

> ALL THE WAY
>
> They did it! They went all the way!
>
> Fifteen boys, ranging in age from fourteen to sixteen, and wearing the colors of the Westbury Senior League All-Stars, are the 1967 Senior League World Champions.
>
> Their victory was a tremendous demonstration of competitiveness and teamwork; it was a difficult challenge met and conquered.
>
> Just as important as the fact that the boys played as champions is that they bore themselves in the same manner—serving as ideal ambassadors of suburban Long Island amidst teams representing all corners of the United States and four foreign lands.
>
> Westbury will not soon forget its "year of the champions"; it is an equal certainty that the All-Stars themselves will forever remember the experience with pride and pleasure.
>
> And that's just the way it should be!

Exemption of Ambulance Service From the Wage and Hour Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT V. DENNEY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 29, 1967

Mr. DENNEY. Mr. Speaker, on March 13, 1967, I introduced H.R. 7067 which provides for an exemption for ambulance drivers from the wage and hour law. Since then, several other Members have introduced a companion bill or similar legislation.

As I have remarked before, the passage of a wage and hour law is good, but giving it blanket application to so many segments of the economy can be destructive.

On August 15, 1967, in an interview with the Associated Press in Nebraska, Mr. Marty Miller, president of the Eastern Nebraska Ambulance Service, declares that there are certain areas of my State now without ambulance service. He contends it is due to the 1966 Amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act passed by the 89th Congress.

Of special note is this observation of Mr. Miller:

> We have to pay a man $1.40 an hour if he's just sitting there waiting for the phone to ring.

This is what I mean when I refer to "blanket coverage" of a law. Obviously, ambulance drivers in New York, Philadelphia, or Chicago do not sit idly by the hour waiting for the telephone to ring. They have the necessary work that requires services and they should be paid the minimum or above wage.

But in sparsely populated areas of a State like Nebraska, ambulance service might be required only once or twice a week. Some of these drivers might never make a call in 30 days.

No employer in business of this type can afford the minimum wage. And those who can now must hike their charges out of reason for the general public. This further adds to the inflation problem in the United States.

My bill is now before the General Subcommittee on Labor of the House Committee on Education and Labor. I urge that members of this committee read the interview with Mr. Miller and I am sure after doing so they will agree with me that corrective legislation is necessary.

All areas of the Nation, whether it be New York or Craig, Nebr., are entitled to ambulance service. Let us not have laws on the books that destroy business in the small towns of this country.

Further, I hope the subcommittee will hold hearings on my bill as soon as possible.

The news story of which I make reference appeared in the Omaha World-Herald of August 15, 1967, I include it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD following my remarks:

> "SOME AREAS HURTING"—AMBULANCE MAN SAYS $1.40 HOUR STALLING SERVICE
>
> LINCOLN.—An official of a private ambulance company Monday warned there are some areas of the state without ambulance service.
>
> Marty Miller, president of the Eastern Nebraska Ambulance Service, said the situation is bad in the eastern half of the state but "there's practically no ambulance service available to any one in certain areas out west."
>
> The cause of it all, contends Mr. Miller, is the Federal Wage and Hour Law Congress passed early this year.
>
> The law hiked the minimum wage to $1.40 an hour but what really hurt, Mr. Miller said, was the law's new interpretation of what "work" is.
>
> A mortuary or ambulance service employe used to be exempt under the Federal Wage and Hour Law, Mr. Miller said, if he spent less than 20 per cent of his time actively working.
>
> Now, Mr. Miller says: "We have to pay a man $1.40 an hour if he's just sitting there waiting for the phone to ring." In some of these small towns where a mortician may get one call in two weeks, that makes running an ambulance pretty expensive, he added.
>
> OUTRAGED
>
> "Of course the people are outraged," Mr. Miller said. "They used to have ambulance calls for about three dollars each. Now they range from 20 dollars to 30 dollars plus mileage in some instances."
>
> A rule of thumb has developed for the business, the private ambulance service owner said. "Generally a town of under 80 thousand can't support a private ambulance company—even if the company charges 25 dollars a call."
>
> When the local mortician goes out of the business, the county or city has to subsidize an ambulance service, he said.
>
> Volunteer fire departments in some communities refuse to have anything to do with an ambulance service, he said.
>
> One instance, Mr. Miller said, is in Central City where the Fire Department is volunteer. You can't blame them, he explained, it costs volunteer firemen money every time they have to leave their business or jobs for a call.
>
> HE'S IT
>
> Merrick County has hired one man to operate an ambulance out of Central City. "He's it," Mr. Miller said. "There's no attendant, if it's a call where another man is needed, you just hope there's some one around to help at the accident scene."
>
> And farther west, for instance, around the Broken Bow area, Mr. Miller said the mor-

tician has been talking of getting out of the ambulance business. "He has covered up to around one hundred miles from Broken Bow. He'll leave a huge void in that area if he leaves," Mr. Miller added.

"I don't know what the solution is to the problem out west," Mr. Miller said.

"No private firm can afford to run an ambulance in sparsely populated country and the fire departments and rescue squad will not go out into the rural country outside its own fire district. People are paying taxes for a rescue unit to be there and if it is on a call outside the district when something happens, the taxpayers would have a right to holler," he said.

Solving Urban Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE BUSH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 29, 1967

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, as the vice chairman of the Republican National Committee's Task Force on Job Opportunities, I would like to commend to the House the following editorial from the Sunday, August 27, edition of the Boston Sunday Globe.

I was privileged to submit the task force report mentioned in the article to the Republican Coordinating Committee and feel the entire House membership should have the benefit of these objective comments.

I should also like to commend the chairman of our task force, Prof. Don Paarlberg. He is almost singlehandedly responsible for this creative approach.

The editorial follows:

ONE STONE, TWO BIRDS

In 1960, just under 70 percent of the American people were living in increasing degrees of discomfort in cities, crowded into one percent of the nation's land area. The percentage increases annually. By the year 2000, more than 80 percent of the population will be concentrated in the great metropolitan areas, most of them crammed into five super cities.

"By generating an urban crush they create a problem in the cities to which they go and, by depopulating the countryside, they create a problem in the rural areas from which the come."

So states a brochure just released by a *Republican National Committee* task force on job opportunities and welfare. The brochure describes the Repulican Party's answer to twin problems which are not quite so easily solved as the brochure makes it appear, but it also suggests solutions which are worthy of the most serious consideration.

The late Henry Ford, who sometimes surprised his severest critics by rising above the laissez-faire philosophy of his industrial contemporaries in the early decades of the century, at one time urged a kind of urban-rural mode of living in which industry, to the extent permitted by its assembly line and other techniques, would be decentralized.

Workers would live near the small plants in which they were employed, far removed from the big cities. Each of them would have his own garden plot, a cow, a pig, some chickens. They would enjoy a degree of freedom from the regimentation and other discomforts which are accepted as inevitable in large cities, and they would sacrifice none of the conveniences.

So at any rate went Ford's thinking, and it is neither here nor there that he did nothing effective to make it a reality. It is his plan, more or less, which now occupies the attention of the Republican National Committee's task force.

It notes that the urban population increased by 28 million in 10 years largely because rural living was becoming increasingly unattractive, incomes were dwindling and job and education opportunities were grossly inadequate. The President's Manpower Report of 1967 discloses that rural unemployment, despite the flight from farms, is almost twice the rate in urban centers. One-third of farm families have incomes below the absolute poverty level of $3000. A majority of farm children are educated only to the eighth grade level.

The mechanization of agriculture and the concentration of larger and larger farms in fewer and fewer (and largely corporate) hands has complicated the problem immeasurably, costing the rural community $12 billion a year as measured in its investment in the upbringing of its migrating teenagers.

The Republican Task Force, with its eyes not exactly closed to the political hay which might be harvested, asserts that the cost per year "is several times the total of all subsidies provided to agriculture." It asserts that "farm programs designed by the Democratic Party have continually sought parity of prices as an objective, when they should have sought parity of opportunity; for 30 years, the programs have been commodity-oriented when they should have bene people-oriented."

That is what the task force says its program is—people-oriented—and, if this is so and it can be brought off and made to work, there will be no niggling criticism of the brochure's partisan flavor.

The program would encourage the location of industrial plants in rural areas by providing "realistic economic incentives" through local, state and Federal tax policies and by building "better roads, better schools and better public utilities in those areas."

It would channel defense and Federal supply contracts to the rural areas, change the focus of the Vocational Education Act of 1963 to increase the number of rural vocational-technical schools and provide rural communities with the same kind of employment services as are now offered urban workers.

There may be some quarrelling with the details of the task force's program. If so, it can be amended, added to, subtracted from or even junked. But there cannot be much quarrel with the philosophy behind it. It has the ring of academe and, sure enough, it is largely the product of an academician, Prof. Don Paarlberg of the Agricultural Economics Department of Purdue University.

"We confront an agricultural revolution which creates problems and opportunities in some ways similar to those of the industrial revolution," Prof. Paarlberg states. "There is no reason to accept, unquestioned, the social and economic consequences. Some balance must be sought between the rural and urban sectors. We are not the helpless objects of blind economic forces. We are capable of helping to shape the institutions which in turn help shape us."

Thus, the plan and the philosophy on paper. The difficulty (and the proof) will be in transferring it to reality.

Stopgap Measure Not Enough

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 29, 1967

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, many of us in Congress believe that the American dairy industry is so vital to the health of agriculture and to our human health that it deserves greater protection than a mere changeable regulation.

There are at least 195 of us who feel this way and have indicated our desire for a law to regulate the flow of dairy imports by introducing a dairy import control bill in this session. Many of the leading dairy marketing groups feel this way also.

I am enclosing an editorial from the August issue of the Land O'Lakes News expressing their point of view in regard to this matter. The Land O'Lakes Creameries is the world's largest farm dairy cooperative and had its origin in the Sixth Congressional District of Minnesota.

The editorial follows:

STOP-GAP MEASURE NOT ENOUGH

The cover page of this issue has a chart showing in milk equivalent the steady increase in imports both under and outside quotas since 1953. It vividly portrays the great increase, the explosion, in imports in 1965 and 1966. (Not shown is the fact that the first half of 1967 was at a rate of 4.3 billion pounds.)

On page 3 is the announcement of the quotas set by the President. Land O'Lakes thanks the President for his action at this time.

However, we believe that the quotas set under Section 22 are nothing more than a stop-gap and will not give the diary farmer permanent protection from foreign imports. We believe that only through legislation by Congress such as the "Dairy Import Act of 1967" can the dairy farmer be protected from foreign imports for more than a year at a time.

Since 1953 foreign dairy products have evaded attempts to control them under Section 22. Recent history shows how weak this method is. In spite of the fact that imports were coming in at record levels in 1966 and early 1967 the President did not ask for a Tariff Commission investigation until April 7, 1967. He did not act until June 30, 1967. During this entire period a virtual flood of products evading quotas entered the country, even though the President could have proclaimed emergency import restrictions under Section 22, and held hearings later. Land O'Lakes Creameries, through the National Milk Producers Federation, had called attention of Washington officials to the great influx of imported dairy products on many occasions, at the same time pointing out the downward pressure being brought on paying prices for milk to producers by the flood of imports.

There developed a tremendous pressure from dairymen, senators, and congressmen for the President to act. It is doubtful that any action would have been taken had not this pressure been applied.

In testimony given before the Tariff Commission on May 15, Secretary Freeman said, "Prompt remedial action is critically needed. I believe that Section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as amended, provides the best means to obtain that remedy. It is a flexible instrument created to achieve equity and fairness in international trade. With it we can prevent excesses and the hardships which follow, and we can relax or eliminate restraints when sensible and in the interest of all parties concerned."

We do not agree with Secretary Freeman in this regard, in that Section 22 is too subject to political manipulations and pressures. Even though the gates on imports can be closed under Section 22 they can also be opened at any time.

Land O'Lakes believes that the "Dairy Import Act of 1967" should be passed so that the American dairy farmer's market will be protected permanently and not be subject to the political expediency of the moment. It is just as easy and probably easier to open the flood gates again and let more imports enter.

It is noteworthy that the agency that is required by law to advise the President didn't see the urgency of the situation and made a recommendation equivalent to the increased amount coming in at the 1966 rate. This rate could be accepted another time.

There is no doubt that pressure is going to be applied that the quotas be raised, not only now but in the future.

Land O'Lakes urges that you contact your senator and congressman asking them to support the "Dairy Import Act of 1967." It is only through legislation that the future of the American dairy products market can be protected. It is just as urgent now that the "Import Act of 1967" be passed as it was before the President's proclamation. We must look to the long time program and not just to the stop-gap measure of the present.

Pat Brown Speaks on the Urban Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LIONEL VAN DEERLIN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 29, 1967

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, the problems of our cities are concerning the Nation as never before.

Former Gov. Edmund G. Pat Brown, of California, who has been a great Democratic leader in alleviating urban distress, gave an important speech on this subject last Saturday in Los Angeles.

Governor Brown's remarks, as delivered at the Western States Democratic Conference, follow:

Today let me speak of the crisis in our cities.

In truth, there is not one crisis but four: a crisis of law and order, a crisis of poverty, deprivation and unemployment, a crisis of physical growth and deterioration—housing, pollution, transportation, and a crisis of community—the disintegration of the social fabric that made our cities a melting pot of cultures, races and languages. Today the melting pot is disintegrating. Our cities are failing. The nation is wracked by doubts. Our people are confused and divided. Fear and frustration permeate government and our institutions.

As we meet here today to make political plans for 1968 let us remind ourselves of these crises.

For it is the Democratic Party—and the Democratic Party alone—which has effectively dealt with economic and social crisis in this nation.

Once again, it is our party, and our leaders, who must go to the people with the plans, the ideas and the philosophy to resolve the problems of our cities. We are the party of the people. We are the party of the cities. And we are the party of action.

Let me discuss briefly the four crises of our cities, as I see them.

First, law and order. Whatever the grievance of any of our people, be they black or white, the preservation of law and order is the first business of democracy.

To be safe from crime and violence, to be able to walk unafraid on a city street night or day, to be assured swift and even-handed justice—these are fundamentals of the constitutional government under which this nation has grown strong and prosperous.

The vast majority of the Negroes of this nation agree with that principle. They reject the violent appeals of the Rap Browns and the Stokely Carmichaels. They are the principal victims of crime. It is their homes which are destroyed by the flames of riot.

We shall not and we cannot tolerate anarchy.

But all that being said, let us mark well the words of President Johnson:

"It would compound the tragedy," he said, "if we should settle for order that is imposed by the muzzle of a gun.

"In America, we seek more than the uneasy calm of martial law. We seek peace based on one man's respect for another man—and upon mutual respect for law. We seek a public order that is built on steady progress, in meeting the needs of all of our people."

It is clear that we have not met the needs of all of our people.

And this is the crisis of poverty in our cities.

You have read the statistics. You have seen the face of poverty. You have heard the voices of despair, and anger, and hate from the ghettoes.

The face of poverty is grinding unemployment—up to 35 percent in many of the hard core ghetto areas.

The face of poverty is disease and sickness—four times as much heart disease, six times as much arthritis and rheumatism.

Sixty percent of the children never see a dentist, fifty percent never see a doctor. If you are black and if you are poor the chance that you will die before the age of 34 is four times greater than if you are white and affluent.

The face of poverty is hunger and want—a maximum of 32 cents a meal per person each day, and a dollar and forty cents left over for rent, clothing and other needs.

Hand in miserable hand with poverty is the crisis of physical growth and deterioration in our cities.

Slums erode the very heart of every city in the nation. Some four million families—20 or 30 million Americans—live in homes which "violate decency."

They are homes of unspeakable filth and decay. Dreary, unlit, broken, ridden with vermin and rats, they breed the anger expressed last week by a recently returned Negro Vietnam veteran.

"I couldn't even get a job driving a cab," he said. "The lowest job in the world and I couldn't even get that. Over there in Vietnam I was considered a man. Now I'm nothing but a lousy dog.

"I'm not saying it's good to burn down another man's home but if that's what it takes to do it, I say burn it down."

The schools are little better than the housing. Clean, yes, but failures, producing illiterate dropouts or only slightly better than illiterate graduates.

The McCone Commission survey of Los Angeles schools exposed the dreary record here. A dozen other surveys in every major city in the nation found the same conditions. The fact is, the next generation of ghetto poor will be no more prepared for our society than this generation if we do not act now, decisively and meaningful to end the disaster in our schools.

Air pollution, water pollution, crime, traffic and transportation failures . . . the list is long and familiar to all of you. It needs no more verification than a ride through the streets to see for yourself the conditions which the sociologists have studied to death.

And all of this—the breakdown of law and order, the poverty, the physical decay have produced a crisis of community which is the ultimate and most dangerous end product of the deadly dynamics of modern urbanization.

Writing 200 years ago De Tocqueville clearly saw the fate of people without community:

"Each of them living apart is a stranger to the fate of all the rest—his children and his private friends constitute to him the whole of mankind; as for the rest of his fellow citizens, he is close to them, but he sees them not; he touches them but he feels them not . . . he may be said at any rate to have lost his country."

The brilliant Negro novelist Ralph Ellison wrote compellingly of the Negro as "the invisible man" in our society.

Today we *see* the Negro but his invisibility is of a new order. White America has turned him off and tuned him out. The Gallup poll only last month found that 76 percent of white Americans thought "Negroes are treated the same as whites" and only one in one hundred thought they are being treated "badly."

My friends, I do not think I overstate the case when I say that the survival of this nation is dependent on our ability to change those figures.

We cannot live separate and unequal. We cannot live separately, apartheid is unthinkable. We must all together bring about a new community of common interest and mutual goals.

In this task, we, the Democratic Party, have a vital role.

For we must articulate the needs of our society and formulate the programs to meet those needs.

More importantly, we must convince our fellow Americans, many of whom have turned their backs on our cities and their inhabitants, that the Great Society, the New Frontier and the New Deal are the instruments of progress upon which we can and shall build the New Society and New Community.

For the vision of Franklin Delano Roosevelt and his New Deal brought us the economic and social reforms which today are the bulwarks of American society.

The vision of John Fitzgerald Kennedy and his New Frontier reinforced those bulwarks with new programs that got this nation moving again after eight years of stagnation.

And the vision of Lyndon Baines Johnson and his Great Society gave this nation a new thrust, innovation and leadership which produced the greatest roll call of legislative accomplishments in the history of our country.

That the Democratic Party is the party of leadership, the party of action and the party of all the people is clear.

The Republican Party has rejected the cities and its people.

The Republican Party has rejected the Negroes, the poor and the concept that government is an instrument for solving problems.

In combination with the ultra-conservatives of the South it has voted against every program designed to meet the crises of our cities.

Against a bill to eliminate the plague of rats in our cities.

Against federal aid to education to bring equality of educational opportunity to all of our children.

Against civil rights.

Against decent housing.

Against bills to combat pollution, disease and transportation breakdowns.

No! No! and No! That is the party of Reagan, Romney and Nixon. Like sleepwalkers, their eyes closed, their minds in a dream world, they float on clouds of hope, hoping some how all the problems will go away and saying all the time, No! No! and No!

The question today is whether America too is asleep, sleep-walking away from the bitter realities of our cities and their people.

If they are, we must awaken them. And awaking them we must again convince them of the ability of our nation and its people to solve its problems in the best interest of all.

Of one thing I am convinced, the Reagan-Romney-Nixon sleepwalking team will be happy to keep everyone asleep.

It will be their strategy—as it was in 1966—to speak loudly and say nothing.

Once again, it will be the role and responsibility of the Democratic Party—as it historically has been—to lead the great debate on the future of this nation.

To present the facts.

To present the record.

To present the solutions.

And that debate will test the ancient principles of democratic society, principles that go back 2,000 years, that are rooted in the Judaeo-Christian beliefs in brotherhood, principles that tested this nation a hundred years ago.

Of that crisis Lincoln said:

"No personal significance or insignificance can spare one or another of us. The fiery trial through which we pass will light us down, in honor or dishonor, to the last generation . . . We shall nobly save or meanly lose the last, best hope on earth."

Let the debate begin here and now. We are ready.

Let us take to the people our story, our beliefs, our programs. I have faith that in this new crisis—the crisis of our cities—the people will listen, and listening, they will awaken and they will act.

Vietnam Hero Returns to Naalehu

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 29, 1967

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, a story being reported in many American communities happened recently in the most southernmost community in the United States—the return to his hometown of a military hero on leave from war.

In this instance, the welcome home was to Maj. Frank Sasaki, and the hometown was the orchid- and palm-fringed community of Naalehu, located on the southernmost tip of the island of Hawaii, in the 50th State.

The Naalehu News, a monthly publication of the Hutchinson Sugar Co., reported the event in its July issue, and described the heroism of Major Sasaki in aerial action over Vietnam which resulted in his recent promotion and the award of Major Sasaki's second Distinguished Flying Cross and two Oak Leaf Clusters to his Air Medal.

The historic isle of Hawaii is justly proud of its fighting men, and Major Sasaki follows in the tradition of another Naalehuan, his brother, Hideo Sasaki, who has the distinction of being awarded more military decorations than any other local man. "Champ" Sasaki returned home from service in World War II decorated with the Silver Star, Bronze Star, Presidential Citation and Good Conduct pins, Infantry Combat Badge, European Theater service pin, and the Purple Heart.

In order that my colleagues in Congress may acquaint themselves with another intrepid soldier from this small community on the Big Isle, I submit for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the article, "Naalehuan Home from Vietnam," from the July 1967 issue of the Naalehu News:

NAALEHUAN HOME FROM VIETNAM

Major Frank Sasaki, recently promoted, has returned to Naalehu to visit with his family after completing his tour of duty in Vietnam.

In addition to receiving his promotion to Major before leaving Vietnam, he was awarded his second Distinguished Flying Cross and two Oak Leaf Clusters to his air medal.

His citation for receiving the second DFC is as follows: For heroism while participating in aerial flight evidenced by voluntary actions above and beyond the call of duty: Captain Sasaki distinguished himself by heroic actions on 26 March 1967 while serving as pilot of an armed UH–1C helicopter assigned to the 114th Assault Helicopter Company. He had been called to provide support for three helicopters and crews that had been shot down twenty kilometers southeast of Vinh Long. Among those shot down was his battalion commander, Colonel Jack Dempsey, who was killed when he gallantly attempted the rescue of the first two helicopters' crewmen. During the day he conducted attacks on enemy held positions, flying through hostile fire in order to support and protect the downed crews which were about one hundred meters from the enemy stronghold. He continued his unrelenting attacks, even after his aircraft had been hit by enemy fire, until he had expended his ordnance. That evening his fireteam was scrambled to return to the area of the downed helicopters. It was learned that one pilot was still alive but due to intense sniper fire the evacuation helicopter was unable to reach the survivor. Captain Sasaki volunteered his gunship for the rescue and descended through the darkness and ground fog to where the pilot was located. Through his superior flying skill and sound judgment he was able to rescue the pilot and return him to Vinh Long for medical treatment. His actions were in keeping with the highest traditions of the military service and reflects great credit upon himself, his unit and the United States Army.

Major Sasaki while in Naalehu will visit with his mother, Mrs. Rin Sasaki, his brother Hideo, and sisters Mrs. Maragaret Yamamoto Mrs. Terue Sumida, and Mrs. Lillian Aratani.

After his stay in Naalehu, Major Sasaki will be reassigned on the Mainland.

Stop the Bombing in North Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 29, 1967

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent, I am extending my remarks to include two editorials from the Minneapolis Star. Each editorial expresses concern over U.S. bombing in North Vietnam which has resulted in flights over Chinese territory and the loss of two U.S. planes.

I have never believed that the bombing of North Vietnam would shorten the war or bring the combatants to the negotiating table. Since the bombing began, the war has deepened and North Vietnamese resistance has intensified.

I believe this new direction in our bombing policy is based on the same faulty rationalization which resulted in our earlier decision to bomb in the North. These new raids are unlikely to bring the North Vietnamese to the conference table, and secondly, the provide China with a legitimate reason to intervene if she desires to do so.

Once again I must urge that we stop our bombing of North Vietnam. Some of my concerns are expressed in these editorials and at this point, I wish to insert them in the RECORD, as follows:

DANGEROUS TURN IN WAR

The war in Vietnam is moving in a frightening direction.

Domestic American political considerations and pressures from hawkish military quarters appear to have gained the upper hand in the White House.

The Star's editors, recognizing the need for an American presence to shore up political stability in Southeast Asia, have generally supported the administration's conduct of the war in Vietnam. As recently as Aug. 5, we supported the dispatch of perhaps 50,000 more U.S. *combat* troops to the area.

But as long ago as last December we criticized the escalating air war over North Vietnam, and on Aug. 3 an editorial in this space argued that after all military considerations are weighed, "it is in this country's best interests and in the best interest of the war effort to suspend the bombing indefinitely." (In order to bring closer the day when meaningful negotiations can be expected.)

Now U.S. bombers, with White House approval, are carrying the air war to within 10 miles of Red China. Apparently President Johnson, with the shadow of the 1968 election looming ever larger, has capitulated to the political and military hawks and is gambling that the new bombing will bring that "quick decision" which past bombing has failed to produce.

It is hard to say whether it was the loud cries of Democratic or Republican hawks which triggered Mr. Johnson's latest decision; probably the latter. But if the machiavelian ploy described by Evans and Novak in their column today *does* describe Republican strategy, then such Republicans are guilty of political recklessness which rivals the recklessness of the President's new bombing policy.

China's political schisms have given non-Communist Asia a badly needed breathing space. But nothing could better bring Peking's warring factions back together than American bombing on—and all-too-potentially across—China's own borders.

Nor could Russia and other Red bloc nations which have parted company with Peking fail to rally behind even the deeply disliked Maoist regime if it is attacked by the United States.

To sum up: Bombing of North Vietnam has not produced military dividends to balance its political costs. It rallies North Vietnamese behind the government in Hanoi and stiffens Hanoi's back against negotiations. Bombing on the Chinese border shares all the disabilities of the earlier bombing and runs the additional, pointless risk of spreading the war on the Asian mainland.

It ought to be stopped.

NEXT: AIR WAR OVER CHINA?

A jet fighter-bomber, traveling up to 1,500 miles an hour, cannot make an abrupt, right-angle turn once it has dropped a load of bombs on a target. At that speed, a turn can take far more than the 10 miles between the railroad yard at Langson, in North Vietnam, and the Chinese border.

If this kind of raid is continued, aerial encroachment over China is almost unavoidable. Dogfights, involving American and Chinese planes, become a strong possibility, as does the "hot pursuit" of Communist planes and the bombing of airfields within China.

All these are events that could logically follow the decision to move the bombing of North Vietnam closer to the Chinese border in the hunt for more "lucrative" targets.

It is folly to base this policy on the belief that the Peking regime is so absorbed with its internal problems that it will not be provoked into war. As Mao Tse-tung and his clique appear to be losing their grip on many parts of China, they may come to look on a war as the only means of unifying the country and rekindling the revolutionary fervor that led to establishment of their regime.

The bombing of North Vietnam has never been as effective as its advocates claimed in halting the movement of men and supplies to the South. A stepup in the pace of that bombing, one that carries the war to China's doorstep, can lead only to a dangerous widening of the conflict.

Lawrence, Mass.: The Shoe Industry Capital of New England

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 29, 1967

Mr. MORSE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, a recent report by the New England Footwear Association, compiled in cooperation with the Massachusetts Department of Labor, states that the city of Lawrence, Mass., is now the shoe industry leader in the six-State New England area. The city's 10 or 11 shops employ nearly 3,000 workers who manufacture $43.3 million worth of shoes annually. Lawrence leads the next largest employer, Haverhill, by 200 workers and outproduces the city of Lynn by $11.1 million.

It is extremely heartening, Mr. Speaker, to see this growth and vigor in an industry that has been hard set by many catastrophic difficulties, not the least of which is the young competition from imported shoes produced by low-wage labor. I know from personal contact with many of the shoe manufacturers in Lawrence that the industry is doing its very best to operate in the most economic, efficient, and competitive manner possible. As the above report shows, this effort by the shoe plants in Lawrence has raised the city into first place in the New England industry.

Mr. Speaker, the fine city of Lawrence forms an important part of the Fifth Massachusetts Congressional District which I have the honor to represent in the Congress, and it has been my pleasure over the years to know and work with the fine people in the Lawrence shoe industry. I am sure that they are gratified with this recognition of the city's importance in the New England scene. At the same time, I am certain that they will agree, as will my other friends in the Massachusetts shoe industry, that much remains to be done to insure the continued viability and strength of this very important segment of our domestic economy.

I include at this point in the RECORD, an article from the Lawrence Eagle-Tribune dated August 18, 1967, which discusses the above report in more detail.

LAWRENCE BECOMES LEADER IN SHOE INDUSTRY

(By Andrew Coburn)

Her history is textiles and her future points toward electronics, but according to a 1965 preliminary report just released she has become the surprise leader of the New England shoe world.

That leader is Lawrence.

Haverhill is shoe queen of the women's world, Boston the biggest paymaster in shoe wages, Marlboro the site of the oldest shoe company in the state, Brockton the state's center for the production of men's shoes, but Lawrence leads them all in the number of workers and the value of products.

The report comes from the Boston-based New England Footwear Association. The figures are backed by the Massachusetts Dept. of Labor.

THREE THOUSAND SHOE WORKERS

According to the figures, Lawrence employs nearly 3,000 workers who manufacture $43.3 million worth of shoes.

Lawrence has some 200 more shoeworkers than Haverhill, 400 more than Boston and 900 more than Brockton.

Lynn has over 20 shops, but Lawrence's 10 or 11 outproduced them by $11.1 million.

Lawrence outproduces Boston by about $1.4 million, Haverhill by some $12.6 million, and Brockton by $14.1 million.

Gradually, almost imperceptibly, this city has become a shoe power, which is startling to many because residents here have always considered neighboring Haverhill as *the* shoe city. The best bedlasters, sidelasters, fancy stitchers: they were in Haverhill.

But some 15 years ago Haverhill and other big shoe communities were going through a crisis from which they never fully recovered. Many shoemen crept into New Hampshire, ran South or went West.

The major reason, claimed the shoemen, was unions.

Unions, they said, with their constant demands for higher wages and fringe benefits, were sucking the shops dry.

Labor in Massachusetts, they said, was not only too dear and demanding but somewhat scarce with the expansion of the electronics industry in the area.

"Nonsense!" said union officials who called the deserting shoemen names and blamed foreign imports (and sometimes Communist conspiracies) for the declining shoe industry not only in Massachusetts but all over the nation.

MOVE INTO LAWRENCE

At any rate, it was during this same period that out-of-town shoemen began renting chunks of floor space in Lawrence's mill mausoleums left behind by the textile tycoons who also left a huge labor supply that was looking for work.

So began Lawrence's rise in the New England shoe world which isn't the world it once was.

Shoe manufacturers in the city say that the rise is due mainly to the fact that shoe shops here, except for two, are non-union.

A spokesman for the New England Footwear Association agrees that this is a major factor.

Anthony Frasca, a national representative with the local union here, says that Lawrence shoe manufacturers are riding high "because they are getting away with a little exploitation of our people."

He says that highly skilled shoe workers here can demand and receive union wages but that the bulk of the labor force—female, unskilled and semi-skilled—receives little more than the federal minimum ($1.40 and hour.)

He says that the shops remaining in Haverhill are practically all union and are prospering.

Lawrence shoemen claim they are paying good wages to their workers and that the lack of union interferences has enabled them to install modern machinery and to initiate other labor-saving measures that benefit both worker and employer.

At the same time neither shoemen nor union officials are optimistic about the shoe industry as a whole.

They blame foreign imports for the decline, and both concede that the shoe industry no longer attracts workers the way it once did. Gleaming clean electronic plants get the big draw, they say.

Says Union Representative Frasca: "It's a serious situation for all shoe firms—both union and non-union."

In the meantime, Lawrence has become the New England leader in an industry that isn't what it used to be.

Happiness May Be a White Pill, but the FTC Is Doubtful

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 29, 1967

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, all of us who have watched television have been regularly perturbed and sometimes amused by the extravagant claims made by some of the commercials. Now we learn that at least some of these messages will be toned down, by order of the Federal Trade Commission.

Sidney Margolius, who is one of the most interesting and perceptive commentators on consumer affairs, wrote about this FTC move in his recent column in the AFL–CIO news.

Mr. Speaker, I insert Mr. Margolius' column to be printed in the RECORD:

HOW TO BUY: HAPPINESS MAY BE A WHITE PILL BUT THE FTC IS SORT OF DOUBTFULL

(By Sidney Margolius)

You are about to lose some of your most exciting, suspenseful TV commercials, like the one showing the woman who beats up her kid, husband and neighbors because somebody slammed a door. Then she swallows a brand-name aspirin tablet and loves everybody again. Happiness in a little white pill.

You no longer even may get to see diagrams of your interior plumbing showing how a brand-name aspirin speeds through your pipes while old slow-pokey crawls along.

The Federal Trade Commission, with due deliberation, has just said what we've been telling you for years. You might as well buy the 15-cent private-brand aspirins offered by co-ops, department stores and many drug stores, instead of paying 69 cents to $1.39 and even more for advertised brands, sometimes with a few secondary ingredients added.

Now the FTC is about to propose a rule, if the brand-name aspirin packages can't convince it otherwise. It will bar claims of effectiveness or safety which contradict or exceed statements on the label. Sometimes the aspirin advertisers make claims on TV which they don't dare make on their package labels.

What ran the aspirin packagers afoul of the FTC is the lengths they have been going to in advertising uses for aspirin. Aspirin is merely a mild pain-reliever. But the ads have suggested, or hinted broadly, that aspirin and related compounds should be taken for "irritability," "jittery nerves" and "tension."

Other "objectionable" claims for analgesics (pain relievers) noted by the FDA include such conditions as influenza, lumbago, migraine, neuritis, sciatica, sleeplessness and tension headaches. The FDA feels that such conditions cannot be diagnosed by a layman and are too serious to risk treatment without a doctor's care.

The FTC and Bristol-Meyers Co., manufacturers of Bufferin, currently are in dispute over Bufferin's claims for its possible usefulnes for arthritis as shown in a medical study.

The FTC previously had complained about Bufferin's insistent assertions that its additional ingredient (an antacid) prevented stomach upsets. FTC-sponsored research found that there was no significant difference in frequency of stomach upset between the two ordinary aspirin brands in the test and Bufferin.

All that Bufferin has over aspirin, for its much higher price, is the added antacid. If you really suffer stomach upset when taking aspirin, all you need do is take it with a pinch of a common antacid like soda bicarb or magnesium sulfate, and presto! you're buffered. Or drink a full glass of water when taking aspirin to help guard against upset. Or private brands of buffered aspirin are available at half the price.

Products like Anacin and Excedrin, which have "a combination of ingredients your doctor recommends," cost about twice as much as ordinary brand-name aspirin, and actually 10 times the price of private-brand aspirin. Such combination products are usually about two-thirds aspirin plus an additional pain-reliever like phenacetin, plus a little caffeine.

More new variations of aspirin are appearing on the market. These include new time-released aspirins like Measurin. Norgesic, Stendin and Relay. The FDA has questioned the claims made by these products on the grounds that the clinical investigation reports on which the claims were based were incomplete or otherwise faulty. (Some of the people reported by an outside clinical investigator as receiving Stendin during the clinical trials actually were deceased, the FDA said.)

Another new pain reliever advertised in the women's magazines is Vanquish, with two of everything: "two pain relievers . . . plus two buffering agents . . . plus the fifth ingredient." But the ads do not say what any of the ingredients are, a notable instance of "advertising by omission" that characterizes such medicine advertising.

A related case of aspirin-phenacetin-caffeine combined with another ingredient and sold under a brand name is Coriciden, a widely-used decongestant pill. The other ingredient is an antihistamine. While the antihistamine is a genuine medical ingredient often prescribed by doctors, the price under the advertised name is $1.53 for 24 tablets.

Pharmacists can buy a comparable product under the generic name of chlorpheniramine maleate with APC for $5 per 1000 tablets, or a half-cent apiece. Thus the actual wholesale value is about 12 cents for 24 tablets. At retail, comparable private-brand combinations of antihistamine, aspirin, phenacetin and caffeine sell for as little as $1.50 per 100 tablets.

As we used to say in the old days, don't take any wooden nickels.

Rhodesian Government Pushes Apartheid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 29, 1967

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the regime of Premier Ian Smith in Rhodesia is continuing to move in an alarming direction. At the present time they are pushing for a residential protection bill which is, in effect, another form of apartheid. I think this provides another reason for us to continue our sanctions against the Rhodesian Government and support Great Britain in her effort to end Smith's unilateral declaration of independence. I include the following article from the Christian Science Monitor in the Record:

RACIAL-OUSTER BILL PUSHED IN RHODESIA

SALISBURY, RHODESIA.—Premier Ian Smith's government is pressing on with a controversial bill that would enable whites to force colored (mixed race) and Asian families out of their homes in predominantly white neighborhoods.

There has been intense oppositon, both inside and outside the ruling Rhodesian Front Party, to the law. Delay in presenting the bill to Parliament since it was first announced three months ago has led to speculation that the government might be having second thoughts.

But Local Government Minister Mark Partridge quashed these suggestions when he told Parliament Aug. 22 that the draft legislation now was before the Cabinet.

At a meeting of party supporters, Internal Affairs Minister William Harper promised that the new law would "have some teeth in it."

The meeting was also told that a survey confirmed that properties in one Salisbury suburb had fallen in value as a result of the "infiltration" of Indians into the area.

The new legislation, called the property owners (resdential protection) bill, would make it possible to evict colored and Asian families living in white neighborhoods on payment of compensation if a sufficient number of whites petition for this to be done.

Critics of the bill have described it as the "thin edge of the apartheid [racial segregation] wedge."

Latest figures show there are about 14,000 colored people and 8,000 Asians in Rhodesia, compared with nearly 250,000 whites.

National Safety Council Backs Gun Control Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 29, 1967

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to report that the National Safety Council has joined in the attack on our lax firearms control laws and urged the adoption of legislation to keep firearms from the immature, the irresponsible, and the incompetent.

I have been urging stricter firearms control for many years and in the 90th Congress I have sponsored H.R. 5463, a sensible and fair approach to the problem. I believe the 90th Congress is moving toward adoption of stricter gun control legislation and I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following statement released by the National Safety Council on August 23, 1967:

NATIONAL SAFETY COUNCIL BACKS GUN CONTROL LEGISLATION

CHICAGO, ILL.—The National Safety Council will actively support at all levels of government legislation that woud prevent the purchase and control the use of firearms by "immature, irresponsible and untrained persons," a Council spokesman said here today.

The Council also said it would urge government, especially state government, together with interested groups and individuals, to develop a uniform procedure for identifying, reporting and summarizing firearm accidents.

"More than 2,500 people will die this year because of firearm accidents, and many of these could be prevented with effective legislation and enforcement," Howard Pyle, president of the National Safety Council said. "This might mean that states will have to enact legislation that would require registration of firearms, licensing of owners, and reporting of all firearm transactions."

Pyle proposed four legislative goals for reducing firearm accidents. Legislators might require:

A minimum age for the purchase and ownership of firearms, with considerations within each state taken into account in arriving at an age figure.

A minimum age for gun use, recognizing hunting, range-firing and supervised youth activities existing within various states.

Mental and physical competence of would-be gun owners or users, with ownership and used denied to anyone with a history of mental incomeptence, alcoholism, narcotics addiction or firearm accidents.

Technical competence to handle firearms safely, with proof instruction or experience commensurate with the type of firearm and its intended use required.

Pyle also stressed the importance of backing-up legislation with meaningful data relating to non-fatal accidents. "The absence of a reliable system for collecting and analyzing firearm accident data limits evaluation of accident-prevention programs," he said.

Pyle further emphasized the importance of individual responsibility for safe keeping and proper use of guns. "Legislation can provide some degree of control, but only the individual gun owner can provide the follow-up safety measures so vital to a solid solution to the problem," Pyle said.

More than half of the accidental firearm deaths each year occur in the home—many while cleaning or playing with guns—the Council president pointed out. He attributed most of the others to recreatonal activities such as hunting.

The Council will continue to assist in educational efforts which will further the implementaton of firearms safety programs," Pyle said.

"In general, the Council's gun-control recommendations parallel those it makes for controlling the use of motor vehicles, which are similarly dangerous in the hands of unqualified or irresponsible persons," he added.

Col. Tench Tilghman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROGERS C. B. MORTON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 29, 1967

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, not everyone knows that Maryland has her own "Paul Revere." Col. Tench Tilghman, aide-de-camp to Gen. George Washington during the Revolutionary War, is one of the heroic figures of this period of our history. Colonel Tilghman is well known throughout the State of Maryland for his ride from Yorktown to Philadelphia with the news of the victory of the Colonial Army at Yorktown.

Mr. Vincent Godfrey Burns, poet laureate of Maryland, has written an epic poem about this great Revolutionary War hero. I have requested that Mr. Burn's poem be inserted at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

MARYLAND'S REVOLUTIONARY HERO

(An epic poem by Vincent Godfrey Burns)

1

The battle's over—the great work done—
The bloody war against Britain's won—
The commander selects a favorite son
For a task demanding great loyalty—
"Cornwallis is taken—our land is free!"

2

A little cash and a change of suit—
A sandwich, some grog and a piece of fruit—
A stand at attention and a snappy salute—
He's prepared for any adversity—
"Cornwallis is taken—our land is free!"

3

So Tilghman reports for his dangerous ride—
His bearing's serene, untouched by pride,
Knowing God and freedom are on his side—
He faces the journey fearlessly—
"Cornwallis is taken—our land is free!"

4

A deep breath like wine has made him heady—
His sword is sheathed and his holsters steady—
His pommel lamp and his pistols ready—
(The October woods are a sight to see!)
"Cornwallis is taken—our land is free!"

5

A wave of farewell and he's on his way—
His horse, then the boat and across the bay—
For a hazardous venture by night, by day—
With news that would echo from sea to sea—
"Cornwallis is taken—our land is free!"

6

A man of courage and daring and force,
A race with time on a rugged course,
A rider flying from horse to horse—
Well fit for bearing good news was he—
"Cornwallis is taken—our land is free!"

7

Over the hills and over the streams—
Along the bay where the moonlight gleams—
Bearing a bundle of human dreams—
The word of a nation's destiny—
"Cornwallis is taken—our land is free!"

8

Chestertown, Millington, Sassafras—
Avoiding the swamps and the black morass—
Dover and Wilmington, all must pass—
If his journey's to end victoriously—
"Cornwallis is taken—our land is free!"

9

What were his thoughts as he sped along?
Hungry and tired—though his faith was strong—
Deep in his heart he hummed a song—
The glorious song of our liberty—
"Cornwallis is taken—our land is free!"

10

He thought of his sweetheart as he passed her home—
(Oh she was sweet as the honeycomb!)
But he had a task and he must not roam—
For Old Glory hung on his fidelity—
"Cornwallis is taken—our land is free!"

11

Pictures of Valley Forge flashed thru his mind—
Men bleeding and dying and broken and blind—
Giving their all for the sake of mankind—
Breaking the bondage of slavery—
"Cornwallis is taken—our land is free!"

12

At Upland his horse fell down to his knees,
Its whinney of pain was a weakening wheeze—
He died right there 'neath the sycamore trees—
Tilghman crawled from his saddle wearily—
"Cornwallis is taken—our land is free!"

13

When his courage faltered he bowed and prayed,
Asking the Lord for his strength and aid,
That he might fare forward undismayed
And meet every danger triumphantly—
"Cornwallis is taken—our land is free!"

14

Thru hamlets dark with the dead of night—
Over darkling trails in the pale moonlight—
Determined that nothing delay his flight,
Knowing the goal was the world to be—
"Cornwallis is taken—our land is free!"

15

The heat of the day, the chill of the frost—
But little he reckoned what might be lost—
Real patriots never do count the cost—
He rode all the way with Eternity—
"Cornwallis is taken—our land is free!"

16

A wide, wide river and a turbulent flow—
And the only ferry so frail, so slow—
Yet over that river he needs must go—
Heading north, ever north relentlessly—
"Cornwallis is taken—our land is free!"

17

Voices repeated it o'er and o'er—
Neighbors shouted from door to door
The words that will echo forevermore—
The turning point of our history—
"Cornwallis is taken—our land is free!"

18

Imagine the furor, the terror, the pain,
Which over in London would soon maintain,
When the news of this victory fell like rain—
What a surprise for His Majesty!
"Cornwallis is taken—our land is free!"

19

Thru the streets of the sleeping town
The rhythm of hoof-beats clattering down,
Tolling the knell of the English Crown—
And a nation delivered from tyranny—
"Cornwallis is taken—our land is free!"

20

A pounded door and a cheery shout—
A sleepy voice of suspicion and doubt—
A watchman's demands "What's this all about?"
And a tired rider who called with glee
"Cornwallis is taken—our land is free!"

21

The watchman took up the vibrant cry
And it echoed across the midnight sky
From house to house as he went by—
This was the day they had longed to see—
"Cornwallis is taken—our land is free!"

22

The city went wild with jubilation
And this was the cause of that celebration—
A battle won and a brand-new nation—
Born of men's blood and high bravery—
"Cornwallis is taken—our land is free!"

23

Loud rang the bells on the autumn air
To publish the glad news everywhere,
As the men of the Congress gathered there,
To give thanks to God for his constancy—
"Cornwallis is taken—our land is free!"

24

We will remember that thrilling deed—
In the hour of peril and mortal need—
Maryland's hero on a flying steed
With the glorious news of victory—
"Cornwallis is taken—our land is free!"

Peace Corps Volunteer Physician Reports on Health Center in Ethiopia

SPEECH
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 28, 1967

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the African Subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I am happy to report on the successful operation of the Gondar Public Health College and Training Center in Ethiopia.

I am extending my remarks to include the following letter from Thomas A. Dine of the Peace Corps with a report on the work in Ethiopia by Dr. William B. Mitchell, a Peace Corps volunteer physician:

PEACE CORPS,
Washington, D.C., July 26, 1967.

Hon. BARRATT O'HARA,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Africa, Committee on Foreign Affairs, House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: You will recall that on February 23, 1967, I accompanied Mr. David Berlew, Director of the Peace Corps program in Ethiopia, to your office to discuss recent progress in African developments.

At that time you requested information dealing with the Gondar Public Health College and Training Center in Gondar, Ethiopia. I am pleased to report to you that the program is a success, and that the college is a first-rate institution for training health workers who will in many ways be better adapted than medical graduates for the rural health services of this important region in Africa.

Teams composed of a health officer, a community nurse, and a sanitarian are being prepared to staff rural health centers. Their training emphasizes simple management of prevalent diseases and common medical emergencies, the approaches and techniques of preventive medicine, mass methods, control of environmental hazards, skills necessary to obtain community cooperation, and health education of the public.

The following information and attached article, supplied to me by Mr. Berlew, and Dr. William B. Mitchell, Peace Corps physician at the College, are for your perusal, which you, perhaps, could insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

With every best wish,
Sincerely,

THOMAS A. DINE,
Congressional Liaison.

REPORT FROM DR. WILLIAM B. MITCHELL, PEACE CORPS VOLUNTEER PHYSICIAN, GONDAR PUBLIC HEALTH COLLEGE, GONDAR, ETHIOPIA

The Gondar Public Health College and Training Center was begun in 1954, under joint AID IEG/WHO sponsorship with the goal of training definitive health workers for the provincial needs of Ethiopia. The realistic evaluation of the problems show that: 1. basic health services are practically non-existent; 2. physicians, as such, are not only expensive, and time consuming to train, but are unwilling to work in the field; 3. the major job to be done—more than 90% of the medical and public health needs—did not require the skills of a fully-trained physician. It was decided that in order to train personnel for this intermediate position as specifically to work in the field, a training facility must be developed which did not expose the rurally oriented Ethiopian to the embellishments of city life. Thus the semi-rural and relatively crude physical setting of the Gondar Public Health College in the calculated privation of the associated training health centers.

The personnel which would make up the health team to approach this need were:

Health Officers: "leaders" of the health team requires knowledge of public health, preventive medicine, health education, clinical diagnosis and treatment—geared to an atmosphere of practically no supervision, advice, or material support other than necessary drugs. This is a 12th grade graduate and the course is 4 years—a BS degree. The first two years are basic arts & sciences with the exception of a course in physical diagnosis during the scond year. Beginning in the summer between the 2nd and 3rd year, the student begins clinical training in the hospital wards, out-patient department, and the field. It reserves about ⅓ of his time for lectures, both clinical and basic.

The 4th year is spent as a "intern" with about ⅔ of his time in the field under able public health advisors and the remaining ⅓ in the hospital taking moderate responsibility for patients under intensive clinical supervision. There is no training in major surgical technique.

When these students graduate they are well qualified to go to a "health center" which may or may not to be on a passable road, has no electricity or telephone, and may or may not have other health workers in the same area. His responsibilities are to census and map the village indicating occupation, sex, latrines, water supply, etc., run a daily clinic—where he will see diseases ranging from typhus to gunshot wounds and burns in a number of patients ranging from 50 to 75 per day. He must make correct diagnosis and institute proper treatment. Further diseases of epidemologic importance he must be prepared to recognize without delay and program and institute an appropriate plan of epidemic control. Whether it be mass DDT dusting, mass vaccination, or careful control of water supply and excreted disposal.

For those preventable diseases which are encountered so frequently—he must be prepared to recognize both cause and disease and direct measures to alleviate both—including intensive levels of health education. The level of his clinical ability have been carefully tailored to the conditions under which he must work. And those diagnoses that do not require elaborate laboratory or X-ray facilities, he is intensely trained—and probably has much more skill in using his senses than the average physician.

In summary, he is trained to do about 75% of the clinical and diagnosis work of the physician sacrificing unusual or difficult to diagnose diseases which have no epidemiological importance and usually no cure, and is also highly adapted to the specific diseases epidemological and public health needs of an underdeveloped provincial center.

Community nurses: The community nurse is trained to be an assistant to the health officer to do home visits on recently sick persons or on those with long-term treatment programs. They do basic midwifery, and most importantly, health education in preventive medicine, prenatal and maternal and child care. She is also a great help in the health center assisting in patient care and conducting classes on health education.

The training begins at the 10th grade and lasts three years. The training begins with basic college type courses in arts & sciences as well as basic professional courses in the first year. She also begins her first year on the hospital ward in general cleaning and basic nursing care. Her second year is about ⅓ time in clinical and field experience with emphasis on a complete range of nursing responsibilities in field work in course supervision. The remaining ½ of the time in class lectures and general arts and on professional subjects. The third year she is "intern" spending ½ of her year in the training health centers taking responsibility for her field in health center tasks, with periodic (1 to 2 times per week) supervision. The other ½ of the time she is in the hospital responsible for the ward and midwifery situations. With still moderately intense supervision.

In the course of her training the community nurse develops the ability to carry off most of the hospital and health center nursing tasks while still retaining a remarkable ease of relationship with the women of the community. She accepts this relationship without much question, and soon develops a strong sense of dedication with the community. Without which her job would be largely teaching without much tangible sign of progress over a short period of time.

Sanitarians: The sanitarian is trained to be an engineer. He will be expected to build brick buildings, develop water supplies, and disposal facilities ranging from single buildings to large buildings in provinces. He is a 10th grade graduate and his course is 3 years. The first year is a combination of basic arts & sciences along with other exercises to help develop manual dexterity. This latter aspect is a tremendous breakthru here in Ethiopia. For the average person has very poor ability and no desire to produce quality work with his hands. This training consists of assembling and disassembling of pumps, faucets, latrines, mechanisms, as well as cutting and threading pipes, making stone and cheka walls, etc.

During his second year his time is spent in the field under fairly close supervision. He continues to carry an academic load, however, both in professional and general subjects.

During the third year, most of his time is spent in the field—mostly at the training health centers—where he works with one to two other students on projects on community support. Then he must plan his project submitting it to a board of supervisors for criticism. Following which, he will carry out the project to completion with periodic supervision. This latter step may include procuring materials, supervision of daily labor, and many other practical day-to-day problems. Upon graduation, this same list of tasks will be his responsibility.

This approach to problems of Ethiopia's basic health services should appropriate but the Health College suffers from the same high percentage of poorly motivated students and students who are changing goals, as in other colleges. This stems in part from the tendency of any student in a struggling economy to take advantage of any training opportunity before considering at length the moral and legal obligations they are assuming. But also with anticipation of spending their lives in isolated areas with impossible work loads. The latter problem should improve as the general economy of the country improves.

Many of the health officers want to go to medical school. But the percentage of those who ultimately complete the course will be small enough to not deplete the ranks of the health officers severely. If they do finish, they should make a good qualified provincial medical officer. Many of the community nurses marry and have families. But the attraction of good wages seem to prevail in most of their work. In general, the majority seem to marry health officers and lead a health center life.

The long range problems for all classes will conceivably be greatest with respect with relationships to their counterparts who have a more advanced degree of education to do essentially the same job. These will be M.D.s with Public Health degrees, Public Health nurses, and sanitary engineers. I don't think that anyone can accurately project the way in which the transition will occur, but we do know that there are going to be many years of pushing back the frontiers of medicine and that the highly trained persons are going to be unwilling enough to work in the bush that the bulk of the responsibility in these areas will still be carried by our presently trained workers.

Strong Support for OEO

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 29, 1967

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to call the attention of my colleagues to a very fine letter which I received from Mr. Walker L. Cisler, chairman of the board of the Detroit Edison Co. It is encouraging to hear of such strong support for the work of the Office of Economic Opportunity from members of our business community.

The letter follows:

THE DETROIT EDISON CO.,
Detroit, Mich., August 25, 1967.

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD,
Member, House Education and Labor Committee, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FORD: I am writing to you of my deep concern for the Economic Opportunity Act of 1967 and related appropriation requests now being considered in the Congress.

It has been my valued privilege to have served for the past two years as Chairman of the Business Leadership Advisory Council for the Office of Economic Opportunity. This group of key executives of many leading corporations from all sections of the United States consults with and advises the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, Sargent Shriver, and participates actively in the planning and evaluation of the programs of that office.

As business and community leaders deeply concerned with the causes and effects of poverty in our society and as citizens who have been privileged to assist those directly responsible for the work of O.E.O., we know full well of the many problems which must be faced and overcome if meaningful progress is to be made. I and other members of the Council have personally visited and seen firsthand the work of many of the organizations and establishments associated with the endeavors of the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Our approval of the beginning which has been made and our confidence in the organization and the leadership to which this great task has been assigned is well expressed in a resolution adopted at our recent meeting on May 10 in Washington, D.C., at which time we also met with President Johnson to tell him of our support for the Poverty Program.

Introduced by Mr. R. H. Carter, President of the Fostoria Corporation, the following resolution had the unanimous support of Council members.

"Whereas, the Business Leadership Advisory Council, which includes members of both political parties, reaffirms its support for the programs of the Office of Economic Opportunity, which the Council believes are being effectively administered in the interests of our country, and,

"Whereas, the Council believes that the success of the O.E.O. programs has been made possible by its organization as a central command post in the War on Poverty which enables it to coordinate a broad spectrum of programs that represent many needs and touch many age levels with strong thrust of purpose, be it

"Resolved, that the Council be on record that it believes the Office of Economic Opportunity should remain as presently structured, retaining the overall administrative responsibility of the scope of the entire Poverty Program, and that dispersal of its programs with divided responsibility would seriously deter the impact of the total campaign that is now the charge and responsibility of the Office of Economic Opportunity."

This position has been further endorsed by a number of chief executives of major corporations in a statement which will appear in the September Nation's Business. A reprint is enclosed for your information.

As with all citizens, I have been deeply concerned with recent unfortunate events in many of our cities, including my own City of Detroit. Many of our Detroit Edison employes were closely involved in maintaining and restoring service in the riot areas, with support and protection of civil and military personnel. I have personally gone into these areas and have talked with many who are involved at all levels of our community. As a member of the Mayor's "New Detroit" Committee, I have a deep and continuing concern for those endeavors which willl contribute to the well-being of our people and our community. It has been a significant part of my daily life.

During the riots and following, I find only good work being done by those involved in programs here developed and supported by the Office of Economic Opportunity. Many were working actively to contain the disorder and to keep others from participating. Considering the short time these programs have been under way, I believe the present and potential benefits are clearly evident. This good work must be continued and strengthened if we are to resolve the crucial matters facing us today. Time cannot be lost.

The recommendations made to the Congress by the Administration redefine and strengthen those areas of the War on Poverty which experience has proven most effective. It merits your full support and I commend it to you most highly.

With all good wishes,
Sincerely,
WALTER L. CISLER.

Pitch for Lottery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER L. WOLFF
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 28, 1967

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I would like to include in the RECORD at this point an article which appeared in Newsday, August 18, 1967, exposing the base level of the New York lottery sales pitch.

In order to increase sales the entire campaign will now openly exploit citizens to lure them into buying a lottery ticket.

It is a sad travesty upon the American scene when we have to stoop to this type of activity to pay the rapidly increasing cost of education. I wish those who criticized my vote against the sale of lottery tickets in federally chartered banks will have a chance to read this excellent article. The article follows:

GREED, NOT NEED, IS AIM OF NEW PITCH FOR LOTTERY

(By Linda Charlton)

New York—State lottery officials, faced with sales figures that have gone from bad to worse, have decided that the way to make New Yorkers buy more of their $1 product is not to tell them that it's good for them.

As a result of this fresh insight, the lottery's advertising on billboards will place more stress on what the purchase of a $1 ticket can do for the purchaser—make him rich, maybe—than what the purchaser can do for state aid to education. Plugs for the lottery will also be printed on paper matchbook covers for the first time in an effort to bolster sagging ticket sales, lottery officials said.

The basic philosophy behind the advertising campaign so far was explained by Frank Otwell, spokesman for the state tax commission, before the first tickets went on sale: "We're trying to keep the idea that the main reason for the lottery is to help education and also appeal to the basic greed in people that would make them want to win," Otwell said at the end of May. June's ticket sales amounted to $6,400,000 and July's, to $4,100,000, both far below the state's prediction of about $12,000,000 monthly. Now, according to a spokesman for the lottery's advertising agency, the sales pitch will be more to the point. "The way to sell lottery tickets," the spokesman for Fuller & Smith & Ross was quoted as saying, "is by appealing to people's greed."

The new, hopefully improved, billboard-and-matchbook campaign will get under way within the next two weeks, the agency spokesman said. Lottery officials are also hoping that the downward sales curve will take a turn for the better as a result of the publicity surrounding the winners and how much they have won. Also being investigated is possible expansion of lottery advertising and sales outlets. Federal laws prohibit the advertising of lotteries in newspapers that are sent through the mails and on radio and television.

Bonneville Power Administration Observes 30 Years of Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH GREEN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 29, 1967

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, located in my district is the Bonneville Dam—one of the many dams in the Columbia River system which has produced low-cost electric power over the last 30 years. Thirty years ago on August 20, Franklin D. Roosevelt signed into law the Bonneville Power Act, which made possible the development in the Northwest of 21 hydroelectric dams, and an interstate grid of electric powerlines which not only supplies power to the States of the Pacific Northwest, but which also will be supplying power over the intertie to America's Southwest.

The story of the Bonneville Power Act over the last 30 years has been one of service and progress, and I include in the RECORD at this point a recent newspaper account of the impressive history of the Bonneville Power Administration and its partnership in progress for the Pacific Northwest, as follows:

[From the Portland (Oreg.) Oregonian, Aug. 21, 1967]

BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION OBSERVES 30 YEARS OF SERVICE

(By James Magmer)

To tell the story of the changes the Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) has made in the Pacific Northwest during the last 30 years takes "before and after" pictures.

BPA is the government merchant who has strung 10,000 miles of high voltage transmission lines from steel towers through the Pacific Northwest to carry and sell electricity from 21 federal dams on the Columbia River and its tributaries to 119 public and private utility companies and 29 electroprocess industries.

BPA was 30 years old Sunday.

To tell the story of these 30 years takes figures and statistics, too, but to make the story vivid, you would have to see pictures of the rivers, cities, homes, farms and industries in the Pacific Northwest as they were, Aug. 20, 1937, when President Franklin D. Roosevelt signed the act which created BPA.

Then you would have to see pictures of these same rivers, cities, homes, farms and industries as they are today.

Take the rivers first, the Columbia and its tributaries. In 1937, there were only two federal dams, Bonneville and Grand Coulee. Today there are 21. And eight more are under construction.

BPA didn't build the dams, the Army Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation did this job, but chances are the dams would not have been built, if BPA hadn't been there with the know-how to carry the electricity generated by the power plants at these dams and sell it to customers hundreds of miles away.

These dams though, have changed the picture of the Pacific Northwest. They've established a system of flood control to protect the cities and farm lands. They've made the rivers more navigable. They provide irrigation, and have turned desert lands into rich farming lands. They provide a water supply for cities and industries, pollution control, recreation.

In changing the face of the Pacific Northwest, BPA, the Army Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation have operated together a unit called the Columbia River Federal Power System.

BPA's role in this operation was to build a transmission system to carry the electricity from the dams and sell it to customers. To accomplish this mission, BPA built one of the nation's largest networks of long distance, high voltage transmission lines.

BPA now has nearly 10,000 circuit miles of high voltage lines and 273 substations. Stretched end to end these lines are long enough to encircle the 48 contiguous states.

Half of the circuit miles are operated at 230,000 volts and BPA is building the largest 500,000 volt transmission line in the United States that will, when completed, tie the Northwest with the Southwest together in a great electrical cooperative.

This network of transmission lines is called a grid; it connects at more than 100 locations with 14 other lesser transmission systems. In addition to scheduling and dispatching power from 21 federal dams with a capacity of 6.7 million kilowatts, BPA wheels or exchanges over its grid about 2.7 million kilowatts for non-federal utilities.

In all, BPA supplies about 50 per cent of the power generated in the region and has about 80 per cent of the region's capacity to transmit electricity at high voltage.

It serves Washington, Oregon, Idaho, and the part of Montana that lies west of the Continental Divide, plus small adjacent portions of California, Nevada, Utah and Wyoming, an area of 290,000 square miles with a population of 5.5 million.

All these figures and statistics add up to a picture of transmission lines strung between steel towers that run over farmlands, mountains, cross desert stretches and cut through forests to bring electric power from dams to homes, farms and industry.

In 1935, homes in the Pacific Northwest lagged behind many other parts of the country in their use of electricity. Today they are leaders in electrical living. In 1935 there were 700,000 homes in the Pacific Northwest with electricity; today there are 1.9 million. The cost per kilowatt hour in 1935 was 3.5 cents; today it is 1.1 cents.

The picture here is the modern housewife using electricity for cooking, refrigeration, washing, drying and ironing her clothes, lighting and heating her home with her fingertips and a minimum of attention.

SERVICE SCARCE

Only 28 per cent of the farms in the Pacific Northwest in 1935 had electricity. The farmer who had electricity to pump water, light his home, and do some of the farm chores was rare.

Today the average of farmers in the Pacific Northwest who have electricity is 97.8 per cent. Farmers are using electricity to pump water for their homes, as well as for the livestock; for milking; grinding feed, sawing wood, filling, silos, and for innumerable other chores.

In addition to selling power wholesale to public and private utilities who in turn market it to homeowners and farmers, BPA sells electricity directly to 29 large electroprocess industries, such as aluminum reduction plants.

Many of these electroprocess plants located in the Pacific Northwest to get power from the dams as they were completed. The Aluminum Company of America, for example, became BPA's first industrial customer shortly after Bonneville Dam began producing power. Alcoa built its plant at Vancouver because electric power was available.

EARNINGS HUGE

More than 13,000 persons worked in these 29 plants in 1966. They earned over $103 million. It is estimated that for every person employed at these plants a livelihood is furnished indirectly to two other persons in allied or service industries.

By 1967 approximately 3 out of every 10 pounds of primary aluminum produced in the United States came from Northwest plants. Besides aluminum, the products produced by the electroprocess plants include silicon carbide, ferro-nickel, ferro-silicon, calcium carbide, and ferro-manganese.

In its 30 years, BPA has shown that the basic principle of the Bonneville Act President Roosevelt enunciated in a speech given at Portland, Sept. 22, 1932, would work. President Roosevelt said:

"The power issue when vigorously handled in the public interest means abundant and cheaper, current for American industry, reduced rates and increased use to millions of urban and rural homes, and preservation of our water resources in coordination with flood control, reclamation and irrigation."

Public Health Work-Study Project, Springfield, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 29, 1967

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw the attention of the House to an event of some significance which occurred in Springfield, Mass., just a few days ago. On Sunday, August 27, 16 young people were graduated from a 27-month pilot public health training program, conducted in Springfield. This program, Mr. Speaker, created and funded by the Office of Economic Opportunity, was and is a tremendous example of the creativity and imagination which is possible in dealing with the problems of the underprivileged at the community level. As Senator KENNEDY and I said in a telegram to Miss Mary Killeen, R.N., the very able directress of the program:

> This work-study project . . . shows the feasibility of recruiting trainees from underprivileged groups and preparing them through special educational approaches and with individualized attention, for subprofessional careers that are potentially useful in providing health services traditionally the function of professionals.

There can be no question, Mr. Speaker, that the Office of Economic Opportunity is to be complimented, and complimented highly, for the vision it showed in the conception of the project, for the wisdom it showed in pursuing, in funding the project, and for the foresight it showed in selecting Miss Killeen to direct this new program.

To give the House a real taste of what this project has meant to the community of Springfield; to the State of Massachusetts and, quite possibly; to the entire Nation, I insert into the RECORD an article by Mr. J. M. Bradley, which appeared in the Springfield Union of Monday, August 28.

I hope that my fellow Members will read the article and discover the very real significance of this project—a project piloted in Springfield, Mass.

The article follows:

MODEL PUBLIC HEALTH PROJECT GRADUATES 16

(By J. M. Bradley)

Sixteen young persons graduated Sunday from the Health Department's nationally recognized Public Health Assistants Program and were applauded by city, state and national officials on completion of the 27-month pilot training project.

In ceremonies at Municipal Hospital auditorium, the city residents and their families heard testimony from Sargent Shriver, director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, who wired his congratulations and said, "Acting as a catalyst, this pilot project has become a model for community action showing the entire nation what the cooperation of civic minded citizens and highly motivated youths can accomplish."

FIRST IN COUNTRY

The first such project for the training of public health technicians in the country, the program was the original idea of former Health Commissioner Dr. Lowell Bellin, who returned to the city Sunday to address the first graduating class.

The young people, mostly 19 and 20 years old, came from underprivileged families and would not have received higher education were it not for the program. Said one graduate Sunday, "We were given a second chance in life."

Funded by OEO, the $150,000 program has received wide national and international attention due to the crises in the recruiting of public health staffs. Messages of congratulations were received from Gov. John A. Volpe, U.S. Sen. Edward W. Brooke, U.S. Sen. Edward M. Kennedy, U.S. Rep. Edward P. Boland, Mayor Charles V. Ryan, Jr., Senate President Maurice Donahue, and OEO community action program Director Theodore M. Berry.

PRESENTED CERTIFICATES

The graduates were presented public health assistant certificates by Acting Health Commissioner Dr. John C. Ayres. A touching note occurred when 4-year-old Alice Cenell Maddox accepted a posthumous certificate for her sister, Gloria, who was killed this summer in an automobile accident.

Robert Jerald Wineberg represented the graduates in accepting the certificates. He said the program has proven that given the opportunity, young adults can successfully work in the community in a practical way, and thanked those responsible for giving the eight young women and eight young men that opportunity.

Receiving certificates were: Scott C. Barton, Geraldine D. Brown, Linda F. Chisholm, Alexander Dawidjan, Murdock A. Douglas, Craig A. Givens, Patricia M. Huntington, Carolyn D. Johnson, Patricia A. LaBranche, Victor F. Lopez, Francis A. Maratea, Kathryn A. McGowan, Lauren E. Stachelek, Marion A. Streeter, Robert J. Wineberg, and Janice M. Wojtowicz.

The program is coordinated by Miss Mary Killeen, RN., who originally drafted the antipoverty proposal with Dr. Bellin for submission to OEO. Miss Killeen said her journey "up the down staircase" with the youth would not have been possible without the complete backing of parents.

Dr. Bellin described the growing pains of the project and cited the invaluable contribution of Holyoke Community College which collaborated with the Health Department in the work-study project. Former Dean John J. Mazeika, and present Dean Victor Thomas were applauded for their help.

Ten of the 16 students recently received their associate arts degrees from the college upon completion of credits for the past two-years study in a special public health curriculum. Other enrollees will graduate shortly.

GRANTS TOTAL $10,000

Miss Killeen said with the help of the local Horace Smith Fund and federal Education Opportunity Grants from the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, totaling $10,000, six of the graduates will enter the University of Massachusetts School of Public Health next month. Three positions in the Civil Service pay plan have been established for program graduates who will work for the Health Department.

Of the others one is now working with the state air pollution office, one will work at Wesson Maternity Hospital blood bank, one will become a Job Corps counselor for the YWCA and the remaining three will continue their studies at Holyoke Community College.

Dr. Bellin partially explained OEO's interest in the program when he said the federal agency felt if Springfield's pilot project could succeed, the new positions created would open up thousands of jobs for other people throughout the country. Shriver said the program is "an excellent example of what OEO is trying to do in the U. S."

To Be Sure of the Safety of the Peaceful Atom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 29, 1967

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, if you will look on page 86 of the U.S. News & World Report for August 7, you will note the locations of the nuclear powerplants in operation, being built, and planned. Application of a few population figures will disclose that at least half of the Nation's total population will be within easy reach of at least one of these stations.

Unfortunately, the general assumption is that atomic plants must be situated sufficiently far from centers of population to prevent radiation damage in the event of an accident. The following paragraph appeared in a New York Times editorial last May 14:

Too many catastrophies have occurred after the most solemn assurances that they were impossible—from the sinking of the unsinkable Titanic to the recent Apollo tragedy—to justify rushing approval of anything so potentially hazardous as a nuclear plant in the heart of a city of eight million people.

Is New York or any other city safe from fallout merely because the plant is situated a few miles outside the center of population? Do city lines or State lines stay off the horrible consequences of radioactivity that may waft at random according to the whims of air currents? Apparently America has been lulled into accepting such theory, but Congress cannot, in conscience, permit fables of this nature to persist if, indeed, there is even a scintilla of the danger that the Atomic Energy Commission itself has admitted is present in a reactor.

In 1957, the AEC estimated that a single accident could cost 3,400 lives, injure 43,000, and cause property damage of $7 billion. Is it not about time that these figures be updated, in view of the fact that today's reactors are 10 and more times the size of the models about which the AEC reckoned a decade ago? The answers can be made available if Congress will approve House Joint Resolution 599, which I introduced on June 1 to create a Federal Committee on Nuclear Development to review and reevaluate the existing civilian nuclear program of the United States.

Congress needs to know whether the AEC is pushing ahead too fast at too great a risk. If no danger is involved, then it is time to find out why insurance companies will not allow the homeowner to buy a single dollar's worth of protection against damage that might come from an atomic powerplant.

Parenthetically, might I suggest to my colleagues who have labored under the illusion that the premiums on their homes are an investment against the disaster that would come if an accident should take place at that atomic plant way out in the country and visit radioactive material upon your dwelling: go home tonight and get out your policies. When you find the exclusion clause that may be written in relatively small lettering, then come back here and join me in demanding to find out why we are allowing this wild dash into possible disaster. Yes, the Price-Anderson Act provides, primarily at the expense of the taxpaying public, a pot of $560 million to take care of such experiences, but that amount would not go very far among a million or more claimants. At least you would not have any local hospital bill, for the hospitals—like your home and the one next door—would be uninhabitable.

The delegations from the Middle Atlantic States should be particularly interested in the U.S. News map, for it shows that, if the Federal Government is indeed subsidizing disaster, our area is being subjected to such a proliferation of plants that not a single dwelling between Buffalo and Washington or Pittsburgh and New York City would be outside the danger zone. The finger of latent imperilment also points ominously at New England, the Great Lakes States, and at California.

But we are concerned about the safety of every State, every community, every citizen, just as we share the grief of those families in the far-away Rockies where too many miners have been exposed to lethal dosages of radiation in the perilous pace set by the AEC solely to meet its own schedule for producing the fuel necessary to serve the power reactors they are foisting upon an unsuspecting populace. Despite the abnormally high toll of uranium miners, there has apparently been no cutback in the AEC program, and Congress must assume the responsibility of determining once and for all why this inhuman policy is permitted to persist.

In this connection I should like to insert at the conclusion of my remarks a column by John Herling in the June 8 Washington Daily News and an article by Thomas O'Toole in the July 27 issue of the Washington Post. I also insert the full text of an address by the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER] at the American Nuclear Society banquet in San Diego on June 13.

I call attention to the distinguished gentleman's endorsement of House Joint Resolution 599, and urge our colleagues to join in support of a probe into a program that may affect the safety, just as it affects the pocketbook, of every American.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News, June 8, 1967]

DEATH IN URANIUM

(By John Herling)

Suffering in silence is no good if you want action.

Not until 150 factory girls were burned to death in the Triangle Shirt Waist fire in New York City more than 50 years ago did the state begin to pass protective factory legislation. The lamentations, the remorse, the bitter self-reproaches did not make the dead live, but they struck down the obstructionists.

Today uranium miners are dying of cancer at ten times the rate in normal occupations. Over a decade tens of thousands of uranium miners have breathed harmful amounts of radioactive material. True, this takes place some distance from the metropolitan areas. But uranium death in states like Utah, Colorado, New Mexico, Arizona and Wyoming is just as criminal as violence in the streets.

The Public Health Service reports this rapid climb in the incidence of lung cancer among the miners from an odorless gas called radon. Of 3415 miners who worked in uranium mines for more than two years, 63 were found by the Health Service to be suffering from lung cancer. Based on the degree of exposure, within the next 20 or 30 years between 200 and 1000 of the men examined will die of this slow death caused by radon.

Now these men won't go all in a group. They will die alone. There will be no jumping from windows, no photographers to catch the bodies as they fall—but they will be dying from criminal neglect just as surely as those tragic Triangle Shirt Waist girls.

Thus far only one state, Colorado—where most deaths have occurred—recognizes lung cancer in miners as an occupational disease and pays compensation to families. The industry takes her man and the wife gets the money. Some exchange!

For years, men like Leo Goodman of the AFL–CIO Industrial Union Department have been shouting warnings against the danger of radiation hazards. Bearers of bad news, from Cassandra down, have never been popular. Slowly a union here, a union there has joined in the warning. But there has been no orchestration of indignation, no concentrated drive to save these miners.

Now Labor Secretary Wirtz, fed up with the tardy movements of the Federal Radiation Council, the Atomic Energy Commission and the Defense Department, has moved to exercise his powers under the Walsh-Healy Act. He has issued an order withholding government contracts from mine owners who fail to install machinery to freshen air underground to a safe working level. The opposition is giving him a hard time.

Academic experts—hired out as consultants to private companies—pooh-pooh the Wirtz position that death from cancer in the uranium mines can be prevented at some extra exepnse. To those who say that his standard of safety is too strict and will close down a mine, he replies: "The controlling question will remain of whether a looser standard will close down a man."

To those who protested that the statistical evidence is incomplete as to just how many have died or will die from lung cancer clearly attributable to radium exposure in the uranium mines, he says: "the controlling reply will be that some undeniably have."

"If the point is made that there is always some human cost of industrial advance, or even of normal commerce, the answer is that none of it can be condoned. That the ground troops, working men and women, paid with their lives for the industrial revolution is no proper precedent for the technological revolution."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, July 27, 1967]

URANIUM MINE LEVEL OF EXPOSURE DECRIED

(By Thomas O'Toole)

The Committee for Environmental Information, a non-profit organization founded to foster debate on scientific policy, told Congress yesterday that the new radiation exposure level recommended for U.S. uranium mines is unsafe.

"Any miner exposed to the new standard for eight to 33 years," the Committee's Dr. Malcolm Peterson told the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, "many have double the risk of dying of lung cancer than he would in some other occupation. Out of every 2000 miners exposed under the new standard, we can expect 10 to die of lung cancer—twice the number expected in a similar group in the general population."

Dr. Peterson was objecting to a recent recommendation by the Federal Radiation Council that uranium miners be exposed to no more than one "working level" of radiation in their time on the job.

As defined by the Atomic Energy Commission, one "working level" is the amount of alpha radiation (the source in underground uranium mines) equal to about 650,000 million electron volts—the same number of alpha rays generated by a small particle accelerator in operation.

The decision by the Federal Radiation Council to set one working level as the level of radiation a miner must not exceed in his lifetime came after two years of study by the Council staff and 17 years of study by the Public Health Service. Its recommendation of one working level was made over the objections of the U.S. Department of Labor, which wanted to set a limit of three-tenths of a working level.

In past years, the radiation exposure to uranium miners went as high as seven "working levels," a condition most health experts believe led to an estimated 115 deaths from lung cancer in a mining population that was never higher than 5600.

This is a lung cancer rate almost ten times that expected in the general population.

At last count, the uranium miners were being exposed to about 1.7 "working levels" of radiation. To get that down to the one working level recommended by the Federal Radiation Council, Dr. Peterson said yesterday, will cost about $4 million—for the filters and fans to improve mine ventilation, for protective masks for the miners and for better radiation monitors in the mines as warning devices.

"Control measures could reduce the working level to three-tenths" of the level suggested, Dr. Peterson said. "This would cut the exposure to a level at which only miners working 28 years or longer would receive a doubling dose"—one strong enough to double the risk of lung cancer.

"We would like to suggest," Dr. Peterson said, "that this Committee (Joint Committee on Atomic Energy) ask for the figures it will cost to lower the risk. How much in dollars and cents does it take to outweigh health?"

The Committee for Environmental Information—for whom Dr. Peterson spoke yesterday—is a Nation-wide group of 1000 scientists and civic leaders based in St. Louis. Formerly known as the Committee for Nuclear Information, it takes no strong stands on science policies but pushes for full disclosure of scientific facts.

Text of Remarks by Congressman Craig Hosmer at American Nuclear Society Banquet, San Diego, Calif., June 13, 1967

I am happy the ANS picked my State for its meeting this year—and particularly the San Diego area because such important progress has centered here during the past weeks:

A giant nuclear desalting plant in which San Diego Gas and Electric is a major participant has passed the planning and authorization stages and will become a reality of meaningful scope in the peaceful application of nuclear resources.

Also, nearby General Atomics appears to have survived its tribulations as the advanced converter pioneer in the form of significantly trouble-free full-power runs at the Peach Bottom HTGR.

I mention these two companies specifically due to their geographical proximity. Indeed, the entire United States nuclear effort in all its ramifications and you, and all the people in it, deserve commendation. During these past two short decades since the peaceful atom was unwrapped, American free enterprise in partnership with federal government enterprise has racked up an astounding unparalleled record of progress and accomplishment.

Of course, at American Nuclear Society meetings things like that are likely to be said. One of our critics, Congressman John Saylor from deep in the Pennsylvania coal country, charges that we are something like the man in front of the mirror who mutters "how handsome I am." He has introduced H.J. Res. 599 creating "a Federal Committee on Nuclear Development to Review and Reevaluate the Existing Civilian Nuclear Programs of the United States." His resolution would bar from membership on the Committee any member of the AEC or the Joint Committee—and apparently anyone else likely to be predisposed. Personally I am strongly supporting the Resolution. If the Committee does its job, it can only confirm what we have been telling ourselves all along.

You are familiar with that splendid record and I do not intend tonight to belabor the statistics on new nuclear generating plants, or enumerate proliferating isotopic applications, or call the roll of peacetime nuclear heroes and so on. We are not about to relax on our laurels, anyway. I believe a better thing to do is to make a brief assessment of where we are in relation to the future, quickly identify the players in our game and then get into some speculation as to the roles government and industry are likely to play in the future, for they may be different than in the past.

WHERE WE ARE

So, to the first question: Where are we? This is something that really cannot be answered quantitatively or in much of any way except by order of magnitude comparison. That comparison, as I see it, pegs us at around the early Model T era both in technology and as to the peaceful atom's sociological acceptance and consequences. We have a long way yet to go and a vastly larger industry is in the making. The role of government, on the other hand, logically should diminish—but as a practical matter at a slower rate than some would like to see.

WHO THE PLAYERS ARE

This is apparent when one reviews the cast of characters on the nuclear stage representing industry, government and the academic community:

Industry: This is the free enterprise element who wants to make a buck. And that is a very good goal. It has made America the greatest economic force in the world's history. It works just as well with the atom as it does with any other industry. The vast numbers of megabucks involved in getting the nuclear industry underway with the speed it is exhibiting were just not within the sole capacity of free, private enterprise to provide. It was necessary for government enterprise to come up with supplemental support which directly and indirectly runs in excess of a billion dollars a year. I suspect this government enterprise was inspired less by a clear view of the peaceful possibilities of the atom than it was by a tacit acknowledgment of a kind of national guilt complex arising from its initial military use. Spearheading swift civilian developments probably can be classified in the category of an atonement.

Continued large research and development costs to round out the national nuclear power capability in the form of advance converters and breeders makes continued substantial government participation in these areas mandatory for another 15 years or more. Of course factors like the impact of many civilian developments on military weaponry and security, safety, licensing, and regulation and other responsibilities will keep government in the picture indefinitely. However, not necessarily with money or control comparable to the present. Industry should be given as much opportunity as possible to permit economic forces to determine its future without regard to unreasonable government interference. An example of what I consider unreasonable interference is the recent AEC decision to put gas centrifuge technology under wraps on the theory this will delay nuclear weapons proliferation. If IAEA inspection is good enough to police plutonium, it ought to be good enough to police U235. Efforts to uninvent the wheel only make the AEC look silly.

Universities: Universities as operators of AEC facilities have performed a splendid service which I hope will continue. They have played an even larger and more vital role in the production of Ph D's. This will continue both by outright grants of various types and by a wide spectrum of research contracts. In contrast, I believe the so-called scientific community, as such, with its great public prestige and imperial command on federal dollars is due for a somewhat harsh awakening which I will discuss a little later.

Government: Government participation in civilian atomic affairs has been unique and extra-ordinary not just because of the depth of involvement legislated by the Atomic Energy Act, or because of vast public appropriations, or the extent to which international atomic activities have been fostered or the rigid adherence by both Democratic and Republican Administrations to an unswerving Atoms-for-Peace philosophy. Rather, it has been so because of the unflagging strength and zeal with which both the Atomic Energy Commission and the Congress, as represented by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, first, have pursued their responsibilities, *AND*, second, have, shall we say euphemistically, cooperated with each other, or say realistically, competed with each other.

The net result is that—with exceptions of course—vacuums which might otherwise have arisen as to in government participation in civilian nuclear enterprise have been rather quickly filled by one or the other of these authorities.

Now it is alleged by some that AEC is passing through a menopause of spirit and purpose. That the objective of the 1946 Atomic Energy Act—the development of weapons—and the purposes of the 1954 Act—the development of peaceful uses—have been achieved and that the Commission should fade away and let the market place take over. To that let me say we have reached the millennium neither in weaponry nor unassisted civilian applications. AEC still has plenty of pep and nuclear sex appeal. Right now it is even taking some anti-monopoly birth control pills in the form of a comprehensive study of competition in the industry. More power to it. One or two companies dominating the field interested only in marketing bread and butter types reactors can tend to squelch innovation and progress. This situation has a parallel in the development of jet aircraft engines. Standard piston engine suppliers made regular and progressive refinements of their products. But the radically innovative jet engine emerged from other sources. Competition prevents monopoly and it fosters innovation. AEC's enterprise in going ahead with this study will serve the nation well.

We also hear allegations that the Joint Committee is a monolithic structure, akin almost to the Kremlin, hell-bent on self perpetuation and on ruling the nuclear affairs of this country by fear and intimidation. None of this do I deny. But, by way of confession and avoidance, I make my own allegation that the Committee has been instrumental in pushing many of the accomplishments which have permitted both industry and our national defense to reach their present stage of development. In the future as in the past the Committee will seek to insure United States preeminence across the entire spectrum of nuclear excellence.

Some people have asked me if all this will change drastically in the event the 1968 elections put a Republican in the White House to control AEC appointments and/or shift the JCAE majority and its chairmanship from Democratic to Republican. Based on the experience of the 1954 election and my own notions I would answer that changes there would be, but I doubt if they would be cataclysmic. For one thing, conditions underlying the cooperatively competitive relationship between the Commission and the Committee are extraneous to political circumstances. For another thing, both the Commission's operational programs and the Committee's legislative plans are rather long range in nature and essentially responsive to environmental conditions other than the political climate.

Therefore, whose political star shines brightest over Washington after November 1968 is likely to influence the pace and dimension of changes already underway rather than to alter precipitously their direction and nature.

FUTURE ROLE OF GOVERNMENT, INDUSTRY, AND OTHERS

In any event these changes will affect the relative roles of government and industry and others in the future. They must be reckoned with by all of us and in the remaining time I want to touch lightly on a few of them.

The scientists

First let us take inventory on the nuclear physicists, chemists and any other disciplines to which by any stretch of the imagination the adjective "nuclear" could be applied. Once the wraps were taken off the Manhattan Project and Los Alamos, Hanford, Oak Ridge and other names became romantic fantasies, the American public engaged in a great love affair with science and scientists. The latter were figuratively ensconced in a "Temple of the Living Gods," located immediately adjacent to the Federal Treasury with only swinging doors between. Time and the high cost of accelerators and other basic research tools have altered circumstances considerably.

A greater public appreciation has developed of the need to encourage and support engineers to put to public use the knowledge gained by scientists. Where previously congressmen and senators worried mostly about the proper allocation of public support for basic research between the various disciplines, now they worry about the allocation between basic research and practical developments for public use. It is safe to say that the "easy money" days for scientists are slipping into history.

The Government laboratories

It is also safe to predict that a searching examination of what already is known as the "government laboratory problem" is in the offing. Within the AEC itself the issue is how many and what kind of laboratories it should operate. Without being specific, I think the answer will be "less", not "more." Also within the AEC is the broader issue of the logic or illogic of its budgetary and management responsibility for large and expensive basic research programs which are loosely atomic related but might more appropriately come within the province of some agency more fundamentally oriented toward basic science only. I have in mind here the high energy accelerators as well as the possibility of revising and enlarging the charter of something like the National Science Foundation to encompass their operation.

Laboratories operated by the Defense Department and many other government agencies are part of this total picture as well as the nongovernmental laboratories and universities with which extensive research contracts are maintained. Because the "in-house" laboratory problem is government-wide and because it is pressing, I think the AEC and the JCAE well might take an initiative in solving it in order both to set a government-wide example and to prevent AEC, if it fails to take early action, from being swept into some generalized scheme of reform which may not particularly fit its needs.

AEC peripheral activities

Somewhat akin to the laboratory problem, because it does involve research as well as development, is the issue of how much AEC should continue to promote peacetime civilian nuclear applications in such fields as medicine, biology, food preservation and similar activities. Those who sternly predict that once government gets into any kind of business "it never gets out" must be amazed to see how swiftly and voluntarily AEC relinquishes its isotope production activities the moment private operators can supply the market. The activities from which the AEC might recede I am talking about at this particular moment, however, fall into a different category than isotopes.

In medicine, biology and like areas we do not find a large involvement of private enterprise. The traditional responsibility has been one of government at some level, universities, research foundations and so forth. So the question really is, should the AEC be financing and managing the efforts because they are nuclear related, or should the AEC be urging those who traditionally have operated in an area to assume its nuclear related aspects as quickly as possible? I favor the second alternative.

In food processing and other applications of ionizing radiation by private industry the question boils down to the rate of progress you want to make as a matter of national policy. Perhaps we have tended to overestimate the economic and prestige rewards from moving here at forced draft rather than at a pace determined and financed by industry itself.

By way of contrast, space nuclear power has just one customer, the government, so private enterprise in this area is limited to the prime and subcontractor role. The questions government has not satisfactorily answered respecting it are simply what do we want to put in space and when. Space auxiliary nuclear power is another matter. The rapid penetration of industry into the ocean environment which makes similar power demands, brings government and industry back into partnership on this one.

Raw materials

Having just taken you quickly from outer space to under the oceans, I'd now like to take you to inner space for a moment—into the uranium mines from which the nuclear industry gets its basic raw material. These have been much in the headlines recently and the Joint Committee still is in the midst of extensive hearings on the uranium miner lung cancer problem. In the 1950's the national interest dictated discovery and production of vast quantities of uranium ore. The AEC dutifully and very successfully established a program of prizes and incentives which accomplished the objective. It has done a reasonably good job since of withdrawal in favor of private industry as the prime force sponsoring additional exploration and production. However, from the recent request of the Colorado Springs Operations Office for money to spend on large scale geological surveys, ore benefication research and the like, I gather that the spirit of bureaucratic empire building is not entirely dead within the AEC. Resurgent activity in the mining and milling industry leads me to believe, however, that it will be able to supply the new surge of yellow-cake demand even if Colorado Springs does not get all the money it asked for.

In its past efforts to spur uranium production the Commission logically and wisely refrained from attempting to nationalize the mining industry or regulate the mines. That was recognized as an area of state jurisdiction and responsibility. On that basis it was left to the states. Yet the Joint Committee and the Commission because they did so, have been subjected to the severe criticism that they have been neglectful in the matter of radon daughter induced lung cancer amongst the uranium miners. As pitiful as these cases are, it seems to me that we adopted a national philosophy of weaving the emerging nuclear industry into our existing political, economic and social fabric as normally as possible and therefore, that Labor Secretary Willard Wirtz's hasty move to put the government into the mines by way of Walsh-Healey Act regulation is not wise.

His regulation, according to testimony, is impractical and unenforcible. Instrumentation does not exist by which the required .3 working level radon concentrations can be monitored. Already the regulation has had to be amended to cure defects in the definition of the .3 level and to avoid closing down all our mines.

Standards and specifications

I believe the basic fault in this instance, if it can be pinpointed at all, is a lack of proper standards to guide the states in establishing their safety regulations.

In 1959 the Joint Committee attempted to create machinery to provide such safety guides for exposure to radiation. It gave statutory recognition to the Federal Radiation Council to assure their orderly, comprehensive and scientifically sound treatment. The Council was set up to permit inputs from all the executive agencies having talents and responsibilities in the field—AEC, HEW, Labor and others.

The first major radiation problem the Joint Committee recognized and handed FRC in 1961 was the development of protection action guides covering radioactive fallout. At the time, you will recall, atmospheric weapons tests were creating hot spots. In this case we got the FRC to come through, but it wasnt' easy.

We had to call hearings in both 1962 and 1963 to keep things moving. We also wrote a lot of letters and finally got the protection guides in 1964.

As soon as these were out FRC work was directed toward radiation exposure of uranium miners. I have no doubt that its staff worked hard to come up with the needed guides, but it was obvious the progress was too slow. Again the Joint Committee jumped in to move things along. As soon as we scheduled hearings, the next meeting of the Council was moved up to complete action on the guides beforehand. This was fine. But then things blew apart. FRC met on May 4th and there was a split decision. The object was to get together again and make one. But. somebody lost the script. The Secretary of Labor overreacted, bolted and put out his proposed regulation. This pre-empted FRC action and, even more seriously, the proposed order by Labor was garbled in a number of technical aspects.

In summary the way we laid things out when we passed the statute setting up the FRC broke down and something has to be done about it. What should be done? Abolish the FRC and reorganize the executive to handle these problems? Strengthen the FRC to take care of this job? Or what?

I don't have the answers—only the questions. But I do know, as you know, that not only safety in the mines, but safety throughout the nuclear industry as well as public safety depends on getting them. And further, that the entire matter of standards and specifications in the broad sense is critical to the growth and development of the nuclear power industry. They are needed by the purchasers of reactors. They are needed by the manufacturers and by their suppliers. They are needed in order to avoid a breakdown of the licensing and regulation process in the face of the avalanche of new nuclear power plant orders.

Milton Shaw deserves great credit for zeroing in on this particular problem and working with all concerned to come up with some of the answers.

Advanced converters and breeders

Mention of Shaw's name, of course, brings up the bitter issue of the best way to go about developing breeder reactors—a program in which private enterprise and government enterprise find themselves in ambigous, uneasy, but necessary partnership. Milt wants to go the component development route. Industry wants a comprehensive approach, on the theory its objective is not building components, but whole reactors. When listening to Shaw I find myself favoring his approach and when listening to industry I favor its approach. I like to feel that this is not because I am whishy-washy but because I believe that the magnitude of the job—and the resources both government and industry eventually will devote to it—will permit both approaches.

Nor do I wish, by this emphasis on the breeders, to imply any belief that advance converters are in danger of disappearing from the mix of nuclear power systems this nation and the world eventually will end up with. It long has been the custom of a few key members of the Joint Committee to meet informally with both government and industry representatives to exchange views on specific major problems. We have listened individually to lots of discussion, estimates and speculation from burner, advance converter and breeder proponents. We have heard lots about sodium, steam, gas and other coolants. I think the time is reasonably close when we should bring them all together at a formal hearing and get a better fix on when and in what proportion these various type of reactors can be expected to capture their markets.

Controlled thermonuclear reactors

I believe, in evaluating these remarks, we cannot neglect the very real possibility that controlled thermonuclear reactors may be in the picture, too. The Joint Committee actively supports the program and regularly endorses an ever increasing budget. Progress in understanding and suppressing plasma instabilities is excellent. It would be reckless to expect a quick breakthrough in CTR. But it would be even more reckless to expect none at all. When it comes I am certain industry will move swiftly to exploit it.

Plowshare

Since some of you probably think I am pretty far out on the fringes talking about controlled fusion and since my time is about exhausted, to conclude I will just switch to another area many believe is on the fringes but I do not. It is Plowshare. Recently EG&G's Herb Grier, wearing his hat as President of CER Geonuclear Corporation, explained why his company, Continental Oil and Reynolds Electric are pouring substantial sums not only into the Gasbuggy Project to liberate natural gas locked in hard shale, but to set themselves up in the general nuclear rock crushing business on a permanent basis.

Where else, asks Grier can you buy TNT for 30 cents a ton? And, how else can you stuff kilotons of it underground through an eight-inch hole?

Considering the locked up reserves of natural gas alone, Grier estimates that in five to ten years there will be 1,000 shots a year and a total of 30,000 shots is needed in the United States alone. This is a lot of business. I hope the enterprises amongst you will not let CER get it all.

But that is only one area of Plowshare application. It's techniques should be applicable to oil as well as natural gas recovery. As of this week the AEC has a team in Pennsylvania looking into the use of Plowshare to create vast underground storage cavities for natural gas imported into that state from elsewhere.

Our old friend Norman Hilberry of Argonne Laboratory went to Arizona to retire but instead he is developing a scheme to use Plowshare to solve that state's critical water shortage. He would use underground nuclear explosives to deveolp giant catch basins to retain the State's rainfall, 98% of which is otherwise lost to evaporation.

Then there is the intriguing idea Plowshare heat sinks. Where there is a potential thermal pollution from a new power plant, before its construction, a Plowshare underground cavity could be blasted which would "cool down" while the plant is built. Then the excess btu's from cooling might be dumped in the cavity as an alternative to thermal pollution or dissipation from towers. Some people think the heat sink idea might even be practical for systems of central heating in winter and cooling in summer for entire cities. I close with these far-out thoughts mostly to underscore my estimate that our atomic industry today really is still in the Model T era and that great opportunities and great rewards lie ahead for anyone with enterprise.

Burton B. Roberts, Chief Assistant District Attorney, Bronx, N.Y., Speaks Out for Gun Controls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1967

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, it is past time for Congress to act upon gun control legislation. The Washington Post, in a timely editorial on August 28, quotes Bronx Chief Assistant District Attorney Burton B. Roberts, whose office recently made major arrests in connection with a private arsenal. The editorial follows:

A MATTER OF CONVENIENCE

The Chief Assistant District Attorney of the Bronz, N.Y., said a few sensible, astringent words the other day for the benefit of gun enthusiasts. "It is time," said Burton B. Roberts, "we stopped worrying about sportsmen and started worrying about the great majority of the public." Mr. Roberts' words were spoken at a press conference in connection with the discovery by New York police of a private arsenal including a submachine gun, rifles, shotguns and 250,000 rounds of ammunition; four men were charged with an assassination plot.

The interest of the public in this situation is an interest of life and death. The ease with which criminals and irresponsibles can obtain guns in the United States entails a dreadful toll in human suffering. Some 18,000 human beings were shot to death in this county during the past year. Many of those shootings could have been avoided by sensible regulations governing the purchase and possession of firearms.

The interest of sportsmen is an interest of convenience. No one suggests that they should not be allowed to go into the woods in appropriate seasons and enjoy themselves in the slaughter of birds and beasts. No one suggests that they should not collect as many firearms as they please. No one suggests that they should be deprived of the pleasures of target shooting. No one suggests that, if they choose to run the risks involved, they should be denied the satisfaction of keeping guns around their homes for self-protection.

Sportsmen are simply asked to undergo a moderate inconvenience for the sake of the general welfare. Under the Administration's gun bill, they would be required to make their firearms purchases from a licensed dealer in the state where they live—and thus to forego the convenience of ordering guns by mail. They would be required to identify themselves when purchasing a gun in such a way as to enable the police to determine that they are law-abiding adults. The hardship involved in this would be as severe as that involved in obtaining a license to keep a dog or in obtaining a license to hunt or fish.

It is hard to believe that American sportsmen would put their convenience ahead of the public safety in this matter. Perhaps those who presume to speak for them do not genuinely represent the views of their constitutents. It is time for them to realize, in any case, that the American public is not going to submit much longer to senseless danger for the mere sake of avoiding a minor inconvenience to an intransigent minority. Self-interest as well as sportsmanship suggests a reasonable accommodation to the general welfare.

Vietnam Policy Change Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 29, 1967

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the Minneapolis Tribune, in a recent editorial, traces the expansion of the U.S. air war in Vietnam. They question the strategic necessity and usefulness of U.S. bombing raids near the Chinese border.

I believe the military advantage gained by our air raids near the Chinese border is insignificant compared to the threat of Chinese entry into the war. Further, this does not appear to be a policy which will shorten the war: Our increasing military action yields only an increasing threat to world peace.

Our continued expansion of military activity in Vietnam has another perhaps equally serious consequence. Our present economic resources for foreign assistance are being rapidly consumed by this war effort. These resources would be put to better use in other areas of our foreign assistance program such as self-help projects in technical and agricultural development. Our goal in foreign assistance is to provide the impetus for self-sustaining growth in the developing nations. Our energies and resources must be skillfully directed toward this end.

This article is further evidence of growing public concern over our actions in Vietnam. I suggest that we consider the alternative they present, the cessation of bombing in North Vietnam. I believe this policy change would develop into an effective tool for peace.

The editorial referred to follows:

WHY VIETNAM POLICY SHOULD BE CHANGED

Last week's expansion of the air war in Vietnam was a step in escalation which we believe was more dangerous as a provocation to China than it was justifiable on even strictly military grounds.

The attacks on targets 10 miles from the Chinese border were apparently carried out with great precision by highly experienced pilots, and it is argued that such attacks did not pose a threat to China and were strategically necessary. If the destruction of those highway and railroad bridges was of overriding importance, then perhaps the risk could be justified. But experience shows that bombing alone will not stop the flow of supplies and that the Hanoi government is not likely to be persuaded by such methods to enter into peace negotiations. And while this country may assert that attacks near China are not a threat to that country, who is to say what Peking's attitude will be?

Air warfare in North Vietnam has also brought the United States a long distance away from its original goals. The principle of American assistance was described by President Eisenhower in a letter to the South Vietnamese government in October 1954: ". . . developing and maintaining a strong, viable state, capable of resisting attempted subversion or aggression through military means." The same intent was expressed in other ways on many occasions by Presidents Kennedy and Johnson.

During the 13 years that followed, Americans came to recognize that the conflict was not "conventional" by traditional military standards. The public showed adaptability to the "flexible response" concept which President Kennedy promoted in the military establishment in the early 1960s.

It is true that dissent grew as the war ground on, particularly as the U.S. role changed from advisory to principal combatant in 1965. But even before then, in September 1963, President Kennedy expressed concern that "Americans will get impatient and say, because they don't like events in Southeast Asia or they don't like the government in Saigon, that we should withdraw." Public support of administration policy was even then tempered with frustration over the lack of conclusive results.

But frustration has caused a turn of events in quit a different direction than withdrawal.

The Tonkin Gulf attacks in August 1964 on U.S. destroyers prompted the first American air strikes in the north—limited at that point to retaliation against North Vietnamese torpedo boats and support facilities. Six months later, in response to Vietcong attacks on U.S. bases, the Secretary of Defense announced the initiation of "joint retaliatory attacks" on barracks and staging areas in North Vietnam.

Thus the bombing in the north began: with great restraint at first, but on a scale which this year ascended to include the Hanoi-Haiphong area and now the border near China.

U.S. involvement seems no longer based simply upon helping the Saigon government to "resist subversion and aggression." It has grown from limited retaliation above the north-south boundary line (the 17th parellel) into a campaign of increased devastation in North Vietnam.

We believe this is a policy which will not shorten the war; which exposes the United States to charges of aggression; and which needlessly raises the threat of confrontation with Communist China.

But a pronounced change in that policy—for example a cessation of all bombing above the 19th parallel—might well provide a basis for moving toward some kind of reasonable settlement. Pleas for this kind of approach have come from many directions: in vituperative terms from North Vietnam and its allies, but also from responsible U.S. and foreign critics, and from some South Vietnemese political leaders as well.

There is much to be gained and little to be lost by such a change in policy. It should be tried.

Philadelphia School Reform

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 29, 1967

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, I would like to offer for the RECORD a story which appeared in the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin, August 15, by Paul F. Levy, and editorials in both that newspaper and the Philadelphia Inquirer which followed.

There is little a Congressman can add except, perhaps, a touch of his own pride in his community and those of its leaders who are steering it along a progressive direction.

The material referred to follows:

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Evening Bulletin Aug. 15, 1967]

FEDERAL STUDY FINDS "DRAMATIC REFORM" IN SCHOOLS HERE—PHILADELPHIA LEADS BIG CITIES, REPORT SAYS

(By Paul F. Levy)

WASHINGTON.—The Philadelphia school system was described today in a federal study of urban education as being in the midst of "the most dramatic revolution in a city school system in the post-war period."

Lavishing praise on the school reform movement of the past several years and the leadership of former Mayor Richardson Dilworth as president of the Board of Education, the study reports:

"Today, the Philadelphia school system is moving rapidly towards major improvements."

"That so much has been accomplished in so short a time, is a remarkable feat for a school board whose heritage had been one of the most backward large-city school systems in the country."

TWO YEARS OF RESEARCH

The organizational changes that have taken place in the Philadelphia system, the study adds, "are more widespread and far-reaching than have been experienced in any large school system in the country."

The still unpublished 310-page report was prepared for the Federal Office of Education by three New York educators after two years of research into the school systems in Philadelphia and five other large cities.

Entitled, "investigation of fiscally independent and dependent city school districts," the study also examines the school systems of Baltimore, Chicago, Detroit, New York and St. Louis.

SHORT PERIOD OF REFORM

Recognizing the short period of reform in the Philadelphia school system, the report explains: "Though the extent of actual change thus far has been relatively limited, the nature of the accomplished change, however, is highly significant.

"By moving outside the community for new and needed expertise, by seeking out and providing mechanisms for encouraging community involvement and by pioneering in long-range planning and evaluation, the Philadelphia board has set the stage for changes yet to come."

Despite the praise, the study, completed June 30, recognizes a number of areas where improvement is still seriously needed.

DE FACTO SEGREGATION

They include:

De facto segregation: While recognizing improvements, and the problems inherent in big cities today, the study notes:

"Philadelphia schools were hardly pioneers in pressing for integrated education. As late as 1953, Philadelphia schools were segregated . . . following residential patterns in all northern cities, the school system remained de facto segregated as it still is today."

The teacher's union: Pointing out that Philadelphia has had a teacher's union since 1965, and that like all teacher's unions it has been primarily concerned with salaries and conditions of employment, the study adds:

"In New York City and Philadelphia, the union contract tends to contribute to a lack of flexibility in educational policy . . . thus far, the role of (all the teachers') unions is one of limiting flexibility and stifling innovation (and) as contracts become more extensive, this trend will probably be intensified."

SIX-YEAR BUILDING PLAN

School reorganization: Recognizing that "little has been done in any of the cities" to change the pattern of elementary, junior and senior high schools to make them more comprehensive, the study says of Philadelphia:

"Philadelphia has a six-year building program (1967–72) which is geared toward a 7-4-4 pattern of grade organization . . . the four-year high school is referred to as 'comperhensive,' but no particular budgeting of programming has been developed to indicate how the four-year comprehensive high school will differ from the three-year high school, except for the addition of the ninth grade."

Educational parks: Discussion of educational parks, where elementary, junior and senior high schools are grouped in a campus arrangement, are under discussion almost everywhere, but actually in the planning stage in Philadelphia and New York, the study notes, adding:

NO PARKS FORESEEN

"Philadelphia is planning a study for three proposed parks; administrators interviewed conceded that there would probably be no parks built."

The study, by Marilyn Gittell, of the City University of New York; T. Edward Hollander, of the Bernard M. Baruch School of Business and Public Administration of CCNY, and William S. Vincent, of the Institute of Administrative Research at Columbia University's Teachers College, skips the usual criteria for such analysis (per pupil cost, pupil-teacher ratio) for an analysis of new methods and willingness of the school systems to change in the light of modern problems.

"The forces that contributed to the decline of the public school systems are the same in all large urban systems," the study explained.

PROCESS OF CHANGE

"What differentiates Philadelphia from other large cities is not the need for reform, but the fact that reform seems to be taking place.

"More important in some respects than the change itself is the process of change."

The three authors review in detail the sorry history of Philadelphia's educational past; its unwillingness to spend money, its conservative outlook, its political and financial dependence on the Republican and Democratic parties.

Over the years, the report charges "little was done beyond the routine minimum operation of the school system.

"As a result of inadequate spending and insulation from the community, and political control, the Philadelphia public school system in the 1960s was among the poorest urban systems in the country."

TAX POWER TRANSFER

The study dates the "renaissance" of the Philadelphia school system from July 31, 1963, when the State Legislature, over opposition from the existing school board, the teacher's union, City Council and the mayor, transferred school taxing power from the state to the city.

"The law set in motion," the three educators say, "a series of changes that altered radically the distribution of power within the system and set the potential for widespread school reform."

The civil rights movement, the study says, played a "significant role" in bringing about the changes, "initially by pointing to the overcrowded conditions in the Philadelphia schools and subsequently by joining with other groups to achieve school reform."

OVERCROWDED CLASSES

The study adds:

"Although parents of school children may not have been aware of the poor quality of instruction or the inbred bureaucracy that administered Philadelphia's school system, they could not fail to notice the overcrowded classes and deteriorated buildings in which their children received their education.

"And if the inadequacies of the school plant escaped notice of white parents in outlying areas of the city, they did not escape the notice of civil rights leaders who saw in the severely overcrowded ghetto schools a major effect of de facto segregation."

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Evening Bulletin, Aug. 16, 1967]

PRAISE FOR THE SCHOOLS

The praise given Philadelphia's public school system in a U.S. Office of Education report is, as welcome as it is, chiefly a recognition of the determination of the city's school officials—and its people—to right the wrongs of years of neglect.

The credit for what the federal study describes as the renaissance in the public schools can, to a degree unmatched in other cities, be shared by the people. It was the city's voters who, organizing at neighborhood levels, crusaded effectively for the adoption of a "home rule" school charter, pressured for changes in the taxing system and who have supported ballot questions to help the School Board with its admittedly massive financial burden.

This strong community support for quality education is especially notable since a high proportion of the city's young people attend other than public schools. Worthy of note, too, is the fact that the people have indicated a gretaer willingness to bear the cost of providing a good education than their elected representatives and political leaders have shown in seeking needed taxing measures.

Throughout the federal study, two years in preparation, was commendation for the organizational and structural innovations undertaken in the public schools here under the direction of Richardson Dilworth, president of the Board of Education.

There is also, however, a realistic acknowledgement that much needs to be done and that there are faults and weaknesses still present in the system. Thus, the praise can be compared with that given a runner at the start of a race—a race that is certain to be a long, tiring and challenging one.

This acknowledgement for effort should provide Philadelphians with a realization that their public schools are, as the report states, "moving rapidly toward major improvements." Hopefully, too, it will give school officials added support in their quest for the local, state and federal funds that are necessary now and will be necessary for years to come to continue the "dramatic revolution" now underway in Philadelphia public schools.

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Inquirer, Aug. 17, 1967]

PROGRESS IN OUR PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Philadelphia's public school problems are broad in scope and difficult to solve. There will be no easy, overnight solutions. But progress is being made.

It is encouraging and gratifying that this progress has been recognized and applauded in a report compiled by a team of experts for the U.S. Office of Education. After making a two-year comparative survey of public school systems in six of the Nation's largest cities, the study group concluded that changes for the better in Philadelphia are "more widespread and far-reaching than have been experienced in any large school system in the country."

The praise is tempered with reminders that much remains to be done and that recent improvements in public education here were preceded by years of stagnation and neglect. Well-deserved credit is given to the new Board of Education, under the leadership of Richardson Dilworth, that took office less than two years ago.

"That reform has come to the Philadelphia schools is clear, and that it is directly identified with Mr. Richardson Dilworth, the new board chairman, and his perception of his role as a change agent, is clearer still," the report said.

There is no cause for complacency. The survey team was critical as well as laudatory. It emphasized that progress, though commendable, is just beginning. Goals are in sight, not attained.

They cannot be reached without adequate financial backing. The report should provide timely reading for members of the State Legislature and City Council as the Board of Education's revenue package moves toward adoption and implementation.

Who Cares About the Consumer?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT TENZER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 24, 1967

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, there are many items of legislation coming before the Congress which do not affect each of us personally and directly.

But each of us is a consumer and we are vitally interested in being protected in making our purchases.

Miss Betty Furness, special assistant to the President on consumer affairs, has made an important speech on this subject. I commend it to my colleagues and include it in the RECORD:

WHO CARES ABOUT THE CONSUMER?

I am glad to be in Los Angeles and to meet with so many consumers from our Western States and Guam. I looked forward to this event for many reasons, but chiefly because:

I like to think of myself as a forward-looking Democrat who doesn't leave all the action to my fellow Democrats:

I speak as the consumer's representative in Government, which means that I speak as *your* representative, because we are all consumers:

And most importantly, I am an American interested in the future of all Americans and the best possible way to insure that future.

On all counts, I am fortunate to be here, because it gives me a chance to get to know you, to let you know what I am doing in Washington, and to ask for your help in getting it done.

I know I will have your strong support. Many of you have been active on the consumer front in your own states, forming your own consumer organizations.

You also have consumer and fraud protection agencies in the offices of some of your Attorneys General.

But what I would really like to see is strong consumer representation—a Consumer Counsel—at the official state level, the way you once had here in California under the leadership of Governor Brown.

Too bad that office has now lost its punch.

But the consumers of this country have not lost theirs.

They are gaining in strength, and today I want to talk about this consumer strength, which means that I want to talk about people—about the housewife and the businessman, the farmer and the factory worker, the teenager and the senior citizen—about you and me and our friends and families. For there isn't a single person who isn't a consumer.

A child playing with a toy is a consumer. A motorist buying gas is a consumer. So is the housewife in a department store and the elderly man at a drug counter.

We are consumers from the time we turn off our alarm clocks in the morning until we turn off the lights at night, and then we are consumers of sheets and pillows and blankets and beds.

And so, when I say that I speak on behalf of the consumer, I speak on behalf of 200 million Americans who buy, eat, wear or use something every day of their lives.

Never before have they made the Government so conscious of their existence as consumers.

Never before has Congress passed so many consumer bills in so short a time—or has had so many consumer bills to consider.

Now what has happened to bring all this about?

Obviously, a great deal has happened. We can't say that the consumer has been discovered, because Federal action to protect him is not new—it's been going on for nearly a hundred years. And occasionally his presence has been felt.

During the Depression, some of you may recall, President Roosevelt established a Consumer Advisory Board to help revive the economy. There also was consumer representation in the war-time Office of Price Stabilization.

So we can't say that the consumer is a recent discovery, but we *can* say that he has been rediscovered, and that what is new is the representation he now has at the topmost levels of government.

Before President Johnson appointed a Special Assistant for Consmer Affairs and established the President's Committee on Consumer Interests, with a new Consumer Advisory Council, the consumer, as such, was still pretty much of a lightweight in Government.

He had been well represented, of course, as a businessman, a farmer, a lawyer, doctor, and so on but as a consumer he had had to take a back seat.

The longer he sat there the more disgruntled he became. And his wife who did far more buying than he did, was an even more dissatisfied customer.

As President Johnson observed in his Message to Congress in 1964:

"The American housewife—the major American consumer—cannot help but feel confused, and too often unheard, as she seeks the best value for the hard-earned dollar she spends."

And he pledged to come to her aid and the aid of all consumers with new legislation and new administrative actions.

What developed was a mutual effort on the part of Government, enlightened business leadership and consumer organizations to assure that the best practices of the American marketplace became the common practice.

The effort gained momentum. It also gained passage of much-needed legislation. The 89th Congress passed:

The Truth-in-Packaging Act which tells the buyer exactly what's in the package, how much it weighs and who made it;

The Child Protection Act which safeguards our youngsters against death or injury from dangerous toys.

The Traffic and Highway Safety Act to cut down on our heavy death tolls;

An additional insurance protection for the millions of Americans who place their savings on deposit.

Actually, there was not a single piece of domestic legislation that did not benefit the consumer.

Medicare was a "must" for our elderly consumers.

The anti-poverty program helps the poor and underprivileged with bread-and-butter problems and gives them hope for a better life.

The overall impact of the new Department of Housing and Urban Development and, more recently, the new Department of Transportation, is far-reaching and obvious.

And laws to reduce air and water pollution are promoting everybody's health and welfare. Just last month the Senate unanimously passed a bill proposed by President Johnson to further reduce air pollution. And efforts are being made by Democratic Congressmen to give us cleaner water, to provide a better environment for all of us.

In short, every domestic program is, in a very real sense, directed toward the consumer. We have been very fortunate in having strong domestic programs that have brought us unprecedented benefits.

As a Nation, our standard of living has never been higher.

In less than four years, we have seen these gains:

Over 6 million more Americans are at work. And they have better jobs and better paying jobs than ever before.

Wage and salary payments are up 33 percent.

Real per capita income after taxes has increased 17 percent, a gain larger than in the preceding 8 years.

The net financial wealth of American families has risen $150 billion.

Four million people have moved out of the poverty income group.

With all these gains some people might say, what's the consumer got to complain about? The answer is that prosperity has brought a whole new set of problems. For most Americans, they are the problems of abundance, and they are very real.

Sweeping changes in merchandising, in distribution and in selling have changed our shopping patterns and our buying habits. Technological progress is affecting the homes we buy, the appliances we use, foods we eat and the medicines we take. Drug counters display "remedies" for everything from "nervous indigestion" to "tired blood." What is "tired blood," anyway?

Countless new products, and new forms of old ones, vie for our attention and our dollar. On the market is the widest range of quality goods ever offered for sale in this country. Which do we choose? Which is the best buy for our money?

Fortunately, American business has responded to many of our problems with its usual flair and ingenuity. Private enterprise does its job remarkably well! But in some areas there is room for improvement—for protection against unsafe products and misleading information—the deceitful practices of the few that can undermine the honesty of the many.

In some areas, things are not always what they seem to be.

Many people—particularly elderly couples—are attracted to advertisements offering inexpensive retirement homesites. The interstate mail order sales of such land runs into many millions of dollars each year. Most buyers get what they pay for, but too often, our senior citizens find they have wasted much of their life savings on a useless piece of desert or swampland.

This is a cruel hoax.

But even worse is the sale of worthless medical devices.

Some artificial eyes have resulted in serious infection. Useless heating and vibrating machines have caused the ill to squander their money and delay pursuit of effective treatment. X-ray machines, which could have been properly safeguarded at little cost, have emitted excessive doses of radiation. And defective nails and screws for bone repair have required repeated operations to correct the damage.

We have today no accurate records of medical device failures, no legislation to insure the effectiveness of these devices before they are sold and used. In some states, toilet valves must meet as many as five different standards before they are installed, but artificial heart valves require no standards whatsoever.

And standards seem to be lacking in some of our clinical laboratories, at our meat counters, in clothing and household furnishings, and in some of our electric appliances and cooking utensils.

Most clinical laboratories give us accurate and outstanding services. But some don't. Studies show that one out of every four diagnostic tests conducted by clinical laboratories may be wrong. This means that we could be treated for a disease we don't have or, worse yet, not treated for a disease we do have.

Must we wait for another disaster—such as the patent medicine scandal of the thirties or a thalidomide tragedy before we pass effective laws?

Consider the meat we buy: Each of us eats on the average of 165 pounds a year. We assume that all of it has been inspected, but has it really? Nearly 15 percent of the fresh meat supply and almost 25 percent of processed meat products—millions of tons of meat—are not subjected to the high standards of our Federal inspection program because the meat does not enter into interstate commerce. While some of this meat is inspected under State and local programs, most of it receives no inspection at all. Is the average housewife aware of this when she buys some "ground round" or a roast for her family? I doubt it.

And I doubt that we always know what we are buying when we buy clothes, or baby blankets, or drapes or upholstery fabrics. With all the apparent regulations, we still may wind up with a fire-trap. Unhappily many people do. Every three hours one person dies because a dress, shirt or robe went up in flames.

In addition, powermowers, washing machines, power tools and cooking utensils cause over 400,000 accidents a year. Do we know where the hazards lie? Do we know what precautions to take?

The list of things that are not always what they seem to be also includes fraudulent activity in pension welfare plans, certain inequities in mutual funds, and of course, consumer credit.

Nearly everybody buys on credit.

Outstanding consumer credit today totals $95 billion, of which $75 billion is installment plan credit.

Credit has become a way of life in this country, and many of us would be hard-pressed without it. Ask any young couple just getting started in a new home. Ask any family struck by serious illness or other financial setbacks. Ask yourselves. Would you have been able to afford that new car or that new heating unit for your house if you hadn't been able to spread your payments over a period of time?

Credit is a convenience, and we all have learned to use it. Unfortunately some of us are not using it as wisely as we should. Here are two prize examples:

A man bought a record player for $123.88. He was given a coupon book which called for 24 monthly payments of $17.50. The rate turned out to be 229 percent a year—or more than twice the cost of the record player.

A housewife bought a $300.00 sofa from a door-to-door salesman. She was told payments would be $12 every two weeks for two years. The salesman didn't mention the finance charge of $324 and the annual rate of 107 percent.

Not surprising that the interest costs on consumer credit alone amounted to nearly $13 billion last year!

But we don't have to be mathematicians to people are unaware of their share in it. They don't know how much they are actually paying for that television set, or that electric mixer or the family car they bought on credit. And the reason they don't know is because charges often are stated in confusing or misleading terms. They would have to be advanced mathmeticians to figure it out.

But we don't have to be mathmeticians to figure out what to do about it. Our course of action should be very clear.

From a consumer's standpoint, we must build a world in which things actually are what they seem to be or what they are claimed to be.

We can go a long way toward accomplishing this if Congress will pass the legislative proposals submitted by President Johnson in his Consumer Message this year.

We need Congressional action to give us what the President has proposed:

Greater safeguards against fraudulent land deals and dangerous and unreliable medical devices.

Stronger programs for meat inspection within each state;

Establishment of a National Commission on Product Safety;

Prevention of gas pipeline failures and the kind of electric power blackouts we had in New York and New England in 1965, and again in Philadelphia this year;

Additional safeguards for mutual fund investors.

As you know, the Senate has acted favorably on three other Administration proposals.

It voted to establish a National Fire Research and Safety Program in an effort to cut the high death toll and property losses from fires.

It unanimously passed amendments to strengthen the Flammable Fabrics Act and give us added protection against unreasonable risks.

It also passed unanimously—by a vote of 92 to 0—the President's Truth-in-Lending proposal. This was a great victory, for the consumer. Final passage of the bill will provide him with the actual dollars and cents cost of installment buying. It will enable him to shop more wisely for credit. We can only hope that the House will take similar action soon.

But we can get that action only if the people of this country let their Congressmen know they want it. The job can't be done in Washington alone. It will require total effort. And every one here today who goes home and writes to his Congressmen in favor of Truth-in-Lending and gets his family and friends to write will help to bring this legislation closer to passage.

I am very aware that many of you have studied legislation and have taken action through Operation Support Programs in California, Colorado, Washington and other western states.

Already, the work of all your women's groups, speakers, conferences and state-wide committees has had its effect., So do not stop now. Every voter should make his voice heard.

After all, the legislative proposals submitted by the President comprise the most ambitious and most comprehensive consumer's program a President has ever presented to Congress. For this reason, our efforts to help him get it passed should also be vast and comprehensive.

And the first thing we must do is see to it that the American people know about the program and what's in it. We must start a vigorous grass-roots campaign to let everybody know that the legislation the President wants—and which you and I and so many other Americans want—is legislation that will insure the economic well-being and safety of all of us.

And we must make it very clear that all this interest in the consumer is not in the interest of any special group. It is in the interest of families as well as individuals, of farm people as well as city people, of factory workers as well as professional people.

It is in everybody's interest, and so it is in the American interest.

That does not mean that we should not take pride in what has been done thus far. I have today mentioned only a few of the great achievements of President Johnson's Administration, and these achievements have gained for us millions of satisfied customers.

But we probably all prefer the dreams of the future to the history of the past. And that is why we are here. We are here to make some of those dreams come true in 1968.

A big step forward would be if you began right now to let the people know which Party really has their interests at heart. Which Party really cares about the consumer.

Would it be the Republican Party which, in its 1964 Platform pledged "an end to power-grabbing regulatory actions . . . and the ceaseless pressing by the White House, the Food and Drug Administration and Federal Trade Commission to dominate consumer decisions in the market-place," meaning, of course, *let the consumer beware?* Or would it be the Democratic Party which, in both its 1960 and 1964 Platforms, pledged effective Government representation and protection for consumers? And is helping them get it?

Which Party has the most satisfied customers?

An Active Citizenry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1967

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, the crisis in our cities demand the attention and devoted efforts of all our citizens. I am pleased that the Great Neck North Democratic Committee, Great Neck, N.Y., in my congressional district, has taken an active interest in our urban problems.

As I have said previously on the floor of the House, it is necessary for us to reexamine our imperatives and work toward alleviation of the oppressive conditions in our urban ghettos. Progress in this struggle for decency requires reason and rejects violence. These important points are articulated in a recent resolution passed by the Great Neck North Democratic Committee. Because of the quality and importance of this resolution, I wish to include it in the Record under leave to extend my remarks:

Whereas, riots, killing, arson and looting have erupted in recent days in the cities across our Nation; and

Whereas, there is a sizable segment of our citizenry still subjected to grave inequalities and gross indignities; and

Whereas, the democratic principles of this Nation must demonstrate that justice and equality go hand in hand with law and order and that all men are to be equal before the law and the society which creates the law,

Now, therefore, the Great Neck North Democratic Committee does:

1. Resolve, that written protests be sent to Congress for its irresponsible acts in rejecting needed socio-economic legislation aimed at aiding our impoverished ghetto areas, as exemplified by the defeat of the Rat Bill, while at the same time voting to appropriate tens of millions of dollars to construct an unneeded fish aquarium, peanut laboratory and other such insipid projects in a time when human needs are so wanting.

2. Resolve, that this membership organize a standing committee to detail steps to rally public support for the immediate implementation of such worthy programs as slum clearance, urban renewal, and job guarantees to have the highest priority, and to be financed not only by public funds and public agencies, appropriated and established for that single purpose, but also by creating tax and other incentives for those members of private industry who will commit their money and resources to such ends.

3. Resolve that violence, murder, mayhem and anarchy, no matter what the ostensible cause, be unequivocably repudiated and rejected as repugnant to this Nation's ideals, principals and desires; and that, the responsible Negro leadership of Martin Luther King, Jr., A. Philip Randolph, Roy Wilkins and Whitney M. Young, Jr. be praised for their affirmance that ". . there is no injustice which justifies . . . destruction. . . ."

4. Further resolve, that the A.M.E. Zion Church's resolution, with its more than one million members, condemning the concept of Black Power be endorsed.

5. Further resolve, that the reckless, hysterical and anarchial words, acts and misleadership of the Black Power advocates H. Rap Brown, Stokely Carmichael, Adam Clayton Powell, and Floyd B. McKisseck, all of whom encouraged the recent race riots which reflected a complete disregard for the rights of this Nation's people, be strongly condemned.

Dr. Harry L. Arnold Retires After 46 Years of Medical Practice in Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 29, 1967

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, the August 14, 1967, issue of the Honolulu Star-Bulletin carried the news that one of the founding partners of Honolulu's famed Straub Clinic, Dr. Harry L. Arnold, would retire at the age of 80 following 46 years of active practice in Hawaii.

In an engaging interview with Dr. Arnold on the eve of his retirement, Star-Bulletin Reporter Tomi Knaefler elicited from this distinguished physician his observations on a wide range of subjects. Her article reflects the many talents of this longtime leader in the island medical profession, and I know that my colleagues will read of his contributions to his profession and to his adopted State with tremendous interest and appreciation.

Dr. Arnold was born in Owosso, Mich., and graduated from the University of Michigan Medical School. He had intended to make his career that of an Army doctor, however, after serving in Hawaii in 1919, he decided to resign his commission and join the Straub Clinic in Honolulu. Dr. Arnold recalled that in the early days of the clinic, there were five doctors seeing 100 patients a day, whereas today there are 50 clinic doctors with well over 1,000 patients seen daily.

Since the early 1920's, Dr. Arnold has served as president of the Honolulu County Medical Society, the Territorial—now Hawaii—Medical Association, chief of medicine and chief of staff at Queen's Hospital, and he is now serving as the president of Leahi Hospital's board of trustees for the 20th consecutive year. This energetic octogenarian has also rendered service on numerous committees in the Island State. Dr. Arnold has authored several articles and textbook chapters, principally in the field of thoracic surgery, and his book on Hawaii plantlife is scheduled to be reprinted soon.

It is good to know that Dr. Arnold will continue his association at Straub Clinic as a consultant in internal medicine. He commented, however, that much of his new-found leisure will be spent in the enjoyable pursuits of orchid culture, woodwork, and reading.

I know that all those who know and admire Dr. Arnold will join me in expressing aloha and best wishes to him and to his wife, Meda, during these meaningful retirement years.

It is a pleasure to insert in the Congressional Record at this point the article, "Dr. Arnold Retires at 80," which appeared in the August 14, 1967, issue of the Honolulu Star-Bulletin:

AT STRAUB CLINIC 46 YEARS: DR. ARNOLD RETIRES AT 80

(By Tomi Knaefler)

Dr. Harry L. Arnold, one of the founding partners of the Straub Clinic, retired from 46 years of active practice today, a day after his 80th birthday.

He will, however, continue his association with the clinic as a consultant in internal medicine.

"And that's a laugh," he said in an interview on the eve of his retirement. "That bunch of kids (young Straub doctors) won't need to consult me for anything. Those kids make me feel like the hen that sat on duck eggs and then watched with amazement as the ducklings walked into the water."

Dr. Arnold was born in Owosso, Michigan and was graduated from the University of Michigan Medical School. He was "literally in horse and buggy practice" in the tiny hamlet of Henderson for five years before receiving a commission in the Army.

He said, " I had every intention of making the Army my career" when he was stationed in Hawaii in 1919, but he resigned two years later to join the clinic because "here was the chance to practice medicine the way I wanted to—no obstetrics and no kids, just internal medicine."

Back in those days, he recalled, the clinic had five doctors and it was "a big day when we had 100 patients. Now, there are 50 clinic doctors and they see well over 1,000 patients daily."

The tall, lean physician has long been a leader in the Island medical profession. He served as president of the Honolulu County Medical Society in 1928, head of the Territorial (now Hawaii) Medical Association a decade later, chief of medicine at Queen's Hospital in 1939 and chief of staff in 1954, both of which he retained until 1957.

He was elected to Leahi Hospital's Board of Trustees in 1931 and is now serving as its president for the 20th consecutive year.

He was also an active member of numerous committees, and as if all that weren't enough, he authored several articles.

His principal writings are three chapters in a textbook on thoracic surgery by the late Dr. George Straub, founder of the clinic, and his authoritative "Poisonous Plants of Hawaii," written in 1942 and scheduled to be reprinted soon by Charles E. Tuttle Company.

"Funny thing about that book," Dr. Arnold related, "we sold more of it in Florida than here because just about all the plants memtioned also grow there."

Plants, particularly orchids, woodwork and reading are what will occupy his retirement years, which he welcomes, rather than dreads.

He said, "I've been trying to retire for years, but one thing or another has come up. I've been retiring by degrees and now I plan to do what comes naturally. I won't do anything that I don't want to."

He has flowered three noteworthy varieties of orchids. His woodwork has included prize-winning dishes, bowls and other objects and in recent years, he has been specializing in bracelets of laminated tropical woods. All this he does at 2039 Lanihuli Drive, which has been his home for 40 years.

During the interview, he pulled out a string of the bracelets and offered his guests to "pick your choice. Take them for you and your children. That's what I make them for—to give away."

He said of his 80th birthday, "It's a queer thing. I don't feel like an old man—except I get short of breath and I can't lift things like I used to.

"I was thinking the other day that I ought to trade in my 13-year-old car, and then I thought: 'Why, . . . I'll probably never need a new car now.' "

He looked around his book-lined study and noted: "If I came to Honolulu for the first time now, I wouldn't want to stay because of all the concrete. It burns me up to hear them say that the concrete is progress. A city is a place to live and if something you do doesn't make it a better place to live, then, that's not progress."

The solution, he believes, is to "do away with the visitors bureau. Stop urging people to come here. There's got to be a limit. But, that's silly, no one will listen. Pollution of the water and air comes from people and it's not going to help to keep building highways."

He feels "all that concrete today makes this a less desirable place to live for me."

He loooks back at his 56 years of practice and notes "the most satisfying parts were being able to practice medicine the way it ought to be at the clinic and the many wonderful patients. I still run into an occasional guy on the street who thanks me for treating him for typhoid or one of those diseases we don't have today."

Dr. Arnold is the son, brother and father of physicians. His son, Harry L. Arnold Jr., is also a physician and the veteran editor of the Hawaii Medical Journal.

His other child is Mrs. Robert S. (Sally) Lowrey of Honolulu. "I'm proud indeed of both of them—each in their own way," he said.

Dr. Arnold, who still puffs away on cigarettes, was asked whether his son didn't get after him to quit smoking. He said "he knows better. Mind you, I'm sure smoking does have something to do with the cause of lung cancer, but if it hasn't gotten me after 60 years of smoking."

Asking whether he wished to impart some advice to youngsters today, he said: "I don't think I'm sufficiently endowed with wisdom to tell them what to do and what not to be, except, get your hair cut."

He sees the essence of medicine as "caring for the sick, regardless. And no one should have to have a doctor he doesn't like. It's not fair to him or to the doctor."

He said "I have one more ordeal before I can retire for good. I have to go down (to the clinic) and say goodbye to all of them today."

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: the Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided,* That the makeup of the RECORD shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the Official Reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the Official Reporters of the respective Houses.

The Official Reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the Official Reporters in the next issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, nor to RECORDS printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Appendix

Democratic Party Working Toward Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM R. ANDERSON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 30, 1967

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I think too little is known about what President Johnson and the Democratic Party have done and are doing for the good of our country.

At Los Angeles last week, Postmaster General Lawrence F. O'Brien really set the record straight.

I include the Postmaster General's speech in the RECORD so that others may know who is working for progress in this country:

DEMOCRATIC PARTY WORKING TOWARD PROGRESS

We meet here this week-end to lay the groundwork for the 1968 campaign. At this conference, in my view, we are tooling up for full production. From here forward, we must go on the offensive, we must spell out the issues, we must place our record before our fellow Americans and urge them to compare it with the empty record of the Republican Party.

As an old campaigner, I am delighted to join you at the start of the 1968 campaign. Certainly, I know the President considers this meeting of great importance to the Democratic Party, to the people of the Western States, and to the nation.

As I left Washington, the President asked me, as his personal representative, to give you this message: "The smoke of domestic and foreign violence is thick and blinding," he said. "Men of little vision panic, men of little knowledge of the crises of the past feel lost, men of little courage feel threatened. When panic, aimlessness, and fear are in control, a nation is in danger of acting in ways foreign to its spirit and its history." And the President added, "I call upon every Democratic leader to show our people the difference between easy but negative solutions to the nation's problems and the meaningful actions and programs of our party. I call upon every Democrat for the kind of leadership and support that made it possible for Franklin Roosevelt, Harry Truman and John F. Kennedy to meet, and to overcome, the crises that darkened *their* days."

So, my friends, it is a pleasure to meet with Democrats from 13 states here tonight, but that is not why I travelled 3,000 miles.

It is a pleasure to bring you the President's greetings, but that is not why I travelled 3,000 miles.

I flew across the continent for one reason and one reason only.

I want to present you with an indictment. I would rather not do this. I would rather have talked in polite and accepted terms. I would rather have kept my gloves on.

I resisted. But the time is too critical, the days too dangerous, the forces of political propaganda too powerful to permit anything but candid talk.

It has nothing to do with individuals.

It concerns rather a Party and policy.

That Party is the Republican Party. That policy consists of a muddy mixture of irresponsibility and a do-nothing program.

Why do I feel compelled to issue this indictment? For the simple reason that during the last seven years we have seen in stark contrast the record of the Democratic Party and the empty record of the Republican Party.

The record of the Democratic Party was expressed in the greatest surge of progressive legislation in any seven year period in our history.

Under the leadership of President Johnson, the 89th Congress alone produced more legislation designed to meet the overriding, too long neglected, issues of the day than any Congress in our history.

Let's take a look at some of the landmarks of these amazing seven great years:

Medicare . . . Nuclear Test Ban . . . Elementary and Secondary Education . . . Higher Education . . . Peace Corps . . . Alliance for Progress . . . The Department of Transportation, the Department of-Housing and Urban Affairs . . . Minimum Wage . . . Voting Rights . . . Social Security increases . . . Veterans benefits . . . Truth in Packaging . . . Model Cities . . . Rent Supplements . . . Imaginative measures that increased our national income by over $260 billion, a fifty per cent increase in seven years, the greatest record of economic advance in our history.

In all, during the 89th Congress alone, no less than 200 major measures were enacted.

During the last seven years, in fact, all of the New Frontier program and 85% of the Democratic Platform of 1964 have been translated from hope and aspiration, into law and into solid accomplishments.

The record of the seven great Democratic years is clear.

And, the seven long years of Republican obstruction is equally clear.

My friends, I've lived with the passage of these laws. As the personal emissary of two Presidents with the Congress. I was in the middle of the battle. I saw the kind of opposition the Republicans generated. I walked through their mine fields, I climbed over or ran around their roadblocks. I saw our outstanding Democratic leaders of the Congress guide legislation designed for all the people through the gauntlet of Republican obstructionists who were more interested in special interests than the national interest.

Our Democratic effort was to build.

The oppposition's record, their consistent record, was to delay, to denounce, to destroy.

Millions of older Americans saw their meager savings wiped out during the long years that Republicans preferred catering to national lobbyists instead of responding to the real human need for medical care for the aged.

While 90% of Democrats in the Congress were supporting increased funds for education, build programs to reduce unemployment, to find ways to combat man's ancient enemies of sickness, poverty, and ignorance, 90% of the Republicans in the Congress were voting against these measures.

The Republican Party in power is impotent; the Republican Party out of power is the party of knee-jerk opposition.

The irresponsibility of the Republican Party is not confined to frustrating measures needed at home. They strive to confuse the people about our response to aggression abroad.

Every day we hear of a new Republican policy toward Vietnam. One day a Republican spokesman seeks to bomb everything that moves in North Vietnam; the next day another spokesman says we are bombing too much.

It is our task to remind the American people, again and again, of the true nature of the President's policy in Vietnam. For in Vietnam, and throughout the world, the Democratic policy is one of seeking peace with honor, of assuring that we *solve* conflicts not hide behind a temporary, patchwork truce. We will never back down on our commitment to prove that aggression does not pay, a commitment that has had much to do with holding the line in Laos, and in the Communist disaster in strategic Indonesia.

President Johnson, my friends, is a man of peace. Like Lincoln, he finds war a cause for deep sorrow. For those who earnestly hope to see the war end quickly, he has asked me to repeat to you hat *any* indication of a willingness to talk about peace, move toward peace, lower the scale of violence, as a signal of a desire to negotiate, will find an equal response on our side. The President agrees with all, whether they be "dissenting Democrats" or consenting Republicans, that meaningful peace negotiations should begin in Vietnam. But, loving peace can be one sided, while making peace requires both sides to come together. We are willing. We want peace. The sooner the better. So far our adversary does not want peace. *That* may be a cruel fact of life, but it is the crux of the problem.

Turning to domestic matters, the Republican Eyewash Committee tried recently to play partisan politics with the nation's urban and racial crisis.

The Republicans clearly seek to make crime pay—in political terms.

But when it comes to action, when it comes to supporting the President's initiative in the Safe Streets and Crime Control Bill, the Republican Party shows its true colors: it takes action that would make this vitally needed legislation largely inoperative.

The President has made it clear that there is no American right to loot, to burn, to kill. He has made it plain that peaceful Civil Rights to commit crimes will not be tolerated. Adding to the Law Enforcement Assistance Act and the National Crime Commission passed by the 89th Congress, the President many months ago proposed the most extensive anti-crime legislation in our history.

And he has taken action to provide National Guard units throughout the country with training specifically designed to control riots, and such training has already commenced.

Thus, the first priority is a quick end to violence.

It is at this point that Republican and Democratic policies diverge sharply. It is truly a source of wonder how many Republicans think passing laws against riots will make them go away. They want to cure this dangerous domestic crisis by treating the symptoms and avoiding the causes.

Actually, when I say avoiding the causes, I am understating the case. For the record shows beyond a shadow of doubt that the Republican policy has been to frustrate, to oppose, to hinder every major effort my this Administration to remove the social combustibles on which riot and dissaffection breed.

There can be no more severe indictment of the Republican Party.

Last January we heard a Republican "State of the Union Address" that used the theme "Solutions for the Seventies." But have they, in fact, given us any solutions?

Republican policy may be designed to produce solutions for the 1870's or the 1770's, but it has nothing whatsoever to offer for the problems of our day.

Republican bankruptcy, Republican callousness, Republican indifference to the needs of human beings, Republican lack of concern were never more in evidence than in action against the President's plan to help cities and local communities exterminate the rats that make so many lives a living hell. My friends, once again 90% of House Republicans lined up to deny that proposal.

Not only did these men vote down the proposal—they found it very funny. Certainly, government effort to wipe out rats is funny to those who live in sanitized surroundings. But for the man in the slums, who sees no way out, it is yet another spark that feeds the fire of his frustration.

A child bitten by a rat is tragic. The refusal to take action against this vile scourge is cruel and incredible.

In contrast to Republican irresponsibility, opposition, blindness, and indifference, the Democratic program has been designed to meet the needs of all segments and sections of our country. The Democratic program recognizes that we have an unfinished agenda both in cities and suburbs, for the small businessman and the farmer, the student and the senior citizen.

No group, no race, no area has a monopoly on Democratic concern—because the Democratic Party and Democratic programs are designed for all the people.

I want you to consider for a moment what seven years of Democratic leadership has meant to an American workers who lives in the suburbs; the man who pays his taxes, supports his church and community activities, hopes to send his children to college, seeks to take care of his aging parents, tries to save some money, and strives to pay off the mortgage.

We have been concerned about the plight of minorities *and* the needs of the majority, because we are the party that truly *represents* all of America.

Our efforts have been aimed at every area of our life where there are problems that must be solved—problems in the ghettos, problems in our urban complexes, problems affecting those who live in suburbs, problems affecting those who live on farms.

No group has been neglected by our programs.

But, in my view, we have failed in one area, we have neglected one task—we have failed to remind everyone equally of the enormous gains *all* have shared as a result of seven years of Democratic administrations.

Sometimes this failure is the result of using old ways of looking at those we represent. For example, we are making a serious error if we look at union members as if they were living back in the 1930's. Today the Party that forgets that about 50 per cent of union families are in the $7,500 to $15,000 range does so at its peril.

We have not sufficiently reminded the majority of Americans of how they have gained in ways vital to them and their children.

First. *Prosperity*. The suburban American, and all Americans, have a common stake in continued prosperity. When the Republican Administration was coming to an end, the nation was burdened by its third Republican recession. Our growth rate was the lowest in the free world—a mere 2.5 per cent. Since then we have entered the greatest boom in history. A four-person family of a salaried professional or managerial worker gained $1,100 added purchasing power in 1966 alone. With this increase that family could:

Reshingle the roof and buy a color television set and an automatic washer, or

Keep a son or daughter at a State college or university for a year, or

Buy a recent year popular-priced sedan as a second car.

Second. *Medical Care*. The American who lives in the suburbs is usually a highly responsible citizen. He pays his own way. Too often in the past the cost of his parents' medical expenses wiped him out, or strapped him for years. Over Republican opposition, the Democratic Party succeeded in getting legislation aimed at cleaning the tarnish of crushing medical bills from what should be the golden years.

Third. *Education*. The majority of Americans want their children to reach full potential through higher education. Because of Democratic programs and in spite of overwhelming Republican opposition, for the first time in our history, through the Higher Education Act of 1965, scholarships and loans and work opportunities and facilities, will be available for one million young Americans every year who otherwise could not go to college.

Fourth. *Crime in our Streets*. In addition to programs designed to eradicate the causes of crime, the President proposed the most extensive anti-crime legislation in our history. All citizens concerned with living in a safe, secure neighborhood should be told again and again of the President's initiative in the Safe Streets and Crime Control Bill and of the overwhelming Republican opposition.

Read what the Washington Post said about the President's Anti-Crime program and the Republican effort to sabotage it: "If the Republicans are out to make crime and violence a campaign issue in 1968, they are going to have to do much better than they did in the House of Representatives on the Federal anti-crime bill. In one day of action on the floor, the Republicans teamed with States' rights Democrats to mangle that bill almost beyond belief. Instead of strengthening it, as Republican leaders are claiming, the House changed the bill in such a way that it can no longer be considered an effective instrument to help local police to fight crime in the streets."

And let me tell you that the Republican gutting of this legislation is only temporary—we don't intend to let them get away with it!

We have brought about so many other programs that will help every American family—measures to control air and water pollution, to add sufficient parks and recreation facilities near urban centers to take care of 20 million more people, to protect consumers, and to break the bottlenecks that make commuting a nightmare for millions of Americans.

My friends, these are some of the issues that directly affect the worker in the city who lives nearby, the American whose numbers increase each year, and who is apt to leave old party loyalties behind when he moves to the suburbs.

Well, we don't want to rely on old party loyalties. Furthermore, we don't need to! The Democratic Party is the Party that succeeded in overcoming Republican opposition and brought into being these historic programs of direct benefit to the vast majority of Americans.

If we don't get the message across, if we don't let these people know how much Democratic programs have helped them, then we will not have their votes—and we will *deserve* to lose them.

This is one of the great tasks that face us as Party leaders.

Get the word out to your communities. Talk about issues that concern your friends and associates.

We have a great record.

We have a great program.

But leadership, accomplishment, and aspiration are *not* enough.

We must also inform, and explain. And more important, we must organize, and we must organize ourselves to attack, when necessary.

I am too familiar with political organization to claim that it can account for more than a small percentage of the overall result. Our leadership and the candidates themselves must carry the major share of the campaign burden. But let us not forget for one moment that a small percentage can be the decisive percentage when the votes are counted. When elections are close, as they have been, and as they can be again, organization can make the difference between victory or near miss.

We have many difficult months ahead of us. The only prediction that I can make with certainty is that the Republican Party will continue to criticize, will continue to oppose.

But though I do not believe that the American people will turn the future of this nation over to the party with the empty record, we cannot merely sit back and rely on our record to win elections for Democrats. Many fine Democrats with good records were defeated last November. So past Democratic accomplishment and proven Republican incompetence are not enough.

For the Republicans have a secret weapon. That weapon is nothing less than Democratic disunity and internal strife. In all candor, we simply cannot afford, and the country cannot afford, the luxury of internal strife. Is there any Democrat in California or in the other 12 States in this Western Conference who is individually more important than the Democratic Party or its programs? Is there any Democrat among us who has the right to pursue a course based only on his individual ambitions and to the detriment of the party? This has occurred at times in the past and it is occurring now in some States.

Our leaders are dedicated. They can and will march shoulder to shoulder in party unity. But I am seriously concerned about those who are so selfishly motivated that they would destroy what we have accomplished, that they would see our unfinished agenda go down the drain.

I can tell you that Lyndon Johnson, Hubert Humphrey, Robert Kennedy and our other national leaders will stand together in 1968. But what about our leadership on the local level?

What I am asking of you is no less than the kind of cooperation that existed between John F. Kennedy and Lyndon B. Johnson.

You know that in the best American tradition the two men fought valiantly for the Democratic Presidential nomination. When the decision was made right here in Los Angeles, neither man permitted the past to cloud his judgment. John F. Kennedy wanted the most able man he could find for his Vice President. That's why he picked Lyndon B. Johnson. He knew the problems we faced were too vast, the course of human life too uncertain to have anyone but the very best in the Vice President's chair.

My friends, the sense of mutual responsibility, the ability to forget past differences, paid dividends for our country in those terrible days of November, 1963. The result was continuity of leadership, and continuity in the constructuve work of the Democratic Party.

That continuity began with cooperation right here in 1960. Let us restore and strengthen that spirit—that spirit of Los Angeles—and we will again assure continuity in the great unfinished tasks that face our country.

In the final analysis, you—the Democratic leaders in every state—must lead the way to victory in 1968.

My friends, the decision is in your hands.

We Want Jobs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES H. PERCY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 30, 1967

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, we all recognize that the first need in every urban area is greater employment opportunities.

In Chicago, we are extremely fortunate to have the Committee for Economic and Cultural Development of Chicago working in this area. This committee, established by Mayor Daley and under the able chairmanship of David Kennedy, chairman of the board of the Continental Illinois Bank and Trust Co., began its work in 1963 and has, in the last 2 years, helped to bring about the creation of 14,000 new jobs in the inner city.

In order to inform Senators of the fine work the committee has done for the city of Chicago and its residents, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement, issued recently by the committee, which describes their efforts in some detail.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WE WANT JOBS

From Cambridge, Maryland, to Cairo, Illinois, city officials have been forced to take a long, hard look at their spiraling unemployment statistics. For some cities procrastination resulted in anarchy. But in Chicago, painstaking groundwork begun in 1963 by the Mayor's Committee for Economic and Cultural Development paid off this summer.

Figures released today by Paul Zimmerer, Executive Director of the Committee, show that the work of the Committee's staff has resulted in the creation of 14,000 manufacturing jobs in the inner city between 1964 and 1966. (The work of the Committee was initiated by a $125,000 grant from the U.S. Department of Commerce in 1963.)

"The economy of the inner city has been definitely turned around," said Zimmerer. "Confidence in the area has been established and the $240,000 grant just received from the Department of Commerce's Economic Development Administration will hopefully increase that confidence. For the first time in years, we are adding jobs and filling them from the ranks of the formerly unemployed."

The report, covering the area approximately between Lake Street and 79th Street, and Lake Michigan and Cicero Avenue, showed that manufacturing employment moved from a low of 171,522 jobs in 1964 to 187,176 in 1966—a gain of 8.4 percent.

"Between 1961 through 1964, the inner city lost over 26,000 jobs because industry, seeking expansion, was moving westward to the suburbs," explained Zimmerer. "But, in the last two years, we've regained 55 percent of that loss by making it possible and *profitable* for industry to remain within the city. As far as I know, Chicago's inner core area is the only one in the United States making such a dramatic economic comeback."

The report also noted that over 11,000 of the new jobs were added in 1966 making the area's comeback even more impressive.

"It's clear to us now that this is not just a temporary change," said Zimmerer, who added that the Committee's task in getting companies to stay or relocate within the city has become easier because "they're becoming increasingly aware of the advantages of expansion in the inner city."

The increase in employment, according to the report has been felt throughout the inner core area, but more impressive strides have been made in Lawndale, Garfield Park, and the Near West Side. Lawndale and Garfield Park increased manufacturing employment by 13.0 percent over 1964 and the Near West Side increased by 10.2 percent.

"Chicago's improvement programs are beginning to pay off," concludes Zimmerer. "The inner city has become more desirable to industry and industry, in turn, is providing employment for local residents."

Making the Point Well

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 10, 1967

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my fellow Members of Congress an editorial which appeared in the Fullerton, Calif., News Tribune on July 25.

I believe that it speaks eloquently of the very root of our urban problem, the needs of Negro farmhands from the South who have migrated to the North for housing, educational facilities, and job training, which are not now being met.

I wish to commend the News Tribune for its wisdom and foresight in recognizing this growing problem of our cities and calling it to the attention of its readers. If more people realized the extent of the problem, then we might be able to do something about it. I believe the News Tribune to have made a large contribution in this direction. The editorial follows:

"TOKENS" WON'T FILL THE BILL

Each time you punch a button on a self-service elevator, think of Newark, or Cleveland, or Buffalo, or any other American city afflicted with race riots.

The pushbutton elevator is a symbol of this age of mechanization which is one root of the trouble.

More pertinent to this discussion is the mechanical cotton-picker which has displaced hand labor all over the South. These workers were Negro, which tends to confuse the issue with civil rights.

These Negro farmhands, finding themselves unwanted in an area which had been their homeland for two centuries, formed a caravan to the promised land in northern industrial cities. More than two million of them have come North in a two-year period.

This is a historic migration, resembling that of the first half of the last century when famine and political discontent brought poverty-stricken millions from Europe to the United States. These eventually were absorbed into the polyglot American family, but they had one great advantage over the 20th century's Negro migrants. The country still was young and in need of strong backs to build the railroads, mine the coal and lift the heavy burdens in developing industry.

Now a virtual revolution in mechanization has left muscle in short demand and muscle is about all these displaced farmhands have to offer.

The labor market has been distorted further by a political obsession that real wages can be raised by passing a law. Elevator operation, to choose only one item among hundreds, is a chore which can be performed by the aged, the young, the physically handicapped. But as minimum wages are forced up there comes a time when it is cheaper to mechanize than to pay operators. Thousands of jobs thus have been eliminated.

Similarly multitudes of odd jobs for teenagers have been eliminated. Formerly these youngsters at least might have earned spending money and made connections leading to better jobs; but their labors often are not considered worth the required minimum wages and they are left to congregate in idleness.

The basic fault lies in the failure of officialdom to recognize and prepare for the huge problems of this migration, in housing, educational facilities, job training. This still isn't being recognized. Despite the statements of civil rights leaders, Negro and white, this is not a situation which basically involves civil rights. A few swimming pools and parks, a few token Negroes appointed to high office won't fill the bill. It is a situation which eventually must be recognized on a national scale.

The affair in Newark properly was termed open rebellion which must, of course be put down with whatever force is necessary. But then a similar effort must be made to house, educate and train these refugees.

We have, it seems to us, a great deal of nerve presuming to protect freedom everywhere in the world when we can't maintain order in our own back yard.

Death of Herman Keto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. McCARTHY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 30, 1967

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, the newspaper column "Woodland Echoes," by Herman Keto, has long been a feature in the Minnesota press. In his writings, Mr. Keto reflected his knowledge of nature and his love of the beauty and rhythm of nature. Mr. Keto, a friend of mine for 20 years, died recently, and I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of his last column, a rich description of the coming of the fall season in northern Minnesota, which appeared in the Mesabi Daily, Virginia, Minn. It was also a kind of preparation of the spirit for the death he seemed to anticipate.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WOODLAND ECHOES

SUMMER IS ON THE WANE; AUTUMN, BEST OF SEASONS

The summer is waning, for one can sense it all around—the deeper blue of the skies, a bit of nip in the air and all of Nature's plants having passed the climax of colors and the flowers fading as they close to build their seed. From now on in until the last of the leaves flutter to the ground, and maybe even for some weeks following, comes the most beautiful time of the year in these parts. As the poet sang: "Each age is a time that is passing, or one that is coming to birth." The glamor of summer will die, but a more glorious autumn is being conceived.

Most natives in these parts seem to rate a Northern Minnesota autumn as the finest of our four seasons. Each, of course, has its peculiar charms, but autumn gives one the most satisfying feeling.

The seasons, it seems logical, begin with spring, with its aura of awakening. Then follows the summer when nature bursts in full life bloom, when all the wild children, plants and animals, grow and flower toward maturity.

Now comes the fall. The climax of nature has come, with its flame of yellow orange and red bursting throughout the land. Gone are the softer colors of summer's flora, to be replaced by the blaze of autumn.

The season reaches its climax of color and fades. The plants and grasses wither and leaves of the foliates fall as the autumn prepares for the white shroud of winter, the graveyard of the cycling of seasons.

In other ways, too, the autumn here has its charms, besides its excitement of brilliant colors. Gone are the bugs and insects which harass us in the warmth of spring and summer. Gone are the searing rays of the sun at apex. Days are not too warm, and nights not too chill.

Gone, too, are the pounding thunder and wind storms which rake the lands and waters during the hottest days and weeks of the summer. The winds have gentled and there are less extremes of weather. Mostly it is nice.

Old Man Moon at this time has reached his "harvest" place in the skies, low down on the horizons and bigger than ever at his rising and sinking full.

Now are the harvests to be taken up by both man and beast. . . . The bounties of summer's growth are gathered. This, too, provides one with a pleasing sense of shoring up some security and expressing a thanks-giving. Anyone who has planted seeds in the spring, cared for the growth that sprang from them, watched the precise magic of developing fruit and harvested the crop and stashed it away for the winter's use, can truly appreciate the wonders of autumn.

The pelts of fur-bearing animals reach their prime of development in the fall as well. The brown cottontail rabbit will soon turn white. His mortal enemy, the weasel or ermine, also will turn from brown to white, better to stalk his prey.

This is the season, too, which is best for fishing, for now is when the big folks of the streams and lakes will be enticed to lure.

From now through September and some years in October if the chill is delayed, is the best time for a canoe trip. In years past in our single days when school and other civic affairs were not confining, we hied out on fall canoe trips up north. They proved most enchanting and inspiring. Game and fish were in the prime. The north lakes were places of virgin solitude. There were no intruders about. The weather was more dependable. The sunsets, although shorter, blazed more deeply red. The snap in the air quickened the senses. The ripe smells of autumn were everywhere.

Septembers sometimes can be surprisingly warm. I remember one of them years ago, perhaps 20 or more, when Ham, his brother Bucko and I spent some days on Lac La Croix, camping on the eastern shore of Lady Boot Bay, where a stretch of sand and tall timber provided an ideal tenting site with a beautiful view.

The nights we spent there, following prowlings each day all over the huge lake probing for lake trout, northern pike and walleyes, were so warm we slept outside without blankets. Each day was bright and warm and soft breezes from the south laved the lake each night. It was perhaps the most idyllic camping weather I have ever experienced. Some day, or year, it could happen again.

Another beautiful fall time was shortly after World War II, when Ham, Henry Koski and I spent some time on Kekakabic Lake. It was October then, and a brisk, cold west wind kicked up the waters days and through the nights. Mornings there was ice along protected shorelines. We beat it out before we'd planned to, for fear of being iced in. Despite the cold, it was a memorable trip, too, providing an exciting time as contrasted to the relaxing time we'd had on La Croix.

The falls here are bountiful in their provisions, not only for the larders of us Homos and wildfolk, but for the senses. The season affords one of the best time of year to do some serious thinking and mulling outdoors. There is something significant and paralleling about the nature of fall with our lives as we live them through. The fall of our life spells the time of greatest rewards for the effort and the ripening of our endeavors. Like the leaves who have done their bit and glowed for a time in glory, we too will wither (gracefully I hope, as leaves mostly do) and go into the shrine of our winter's limbo.

Make the most of it, friends, this autumn. It may be a year later than you think. Get out and enjoy this best of seasons. There's good fishing to be done. There's good camping to enjoy. Hiking? It's the best time of year for it. Even picking spuds has its allures. Get moving. You're still alive, you know.

Philadelphia Inquirer Praises Urban Insurance Panel Appointed by President Johnson and Headed by Governor Hughes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. HOWARD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 30, 1967

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, the Philadelphia Inquirer, of August 25, said that the urban advisory insurance panel appointed by President Johnson to study insurance problems in riot threatened or riot damaged areas, "should help to produce some badly needed long-range solutions."

We in New Jersey have long been aware of the problems of urban property insurance, and we are proud that our own Governor, the Honorable Richard J. Hughes, has been chosen to head the panel in its important undertakings.

Such a panel will inevitably give us not only a better understanding of insurance needs in the cities, but also of the total social and business problems of the cities.

The panel in its search to accommodate private insurance needs and the public interest will, I am sure, bring new ideas to an area which has been too little explored in the past.

We are hopeful that this panel under the able leadership of Governor Hughes will provide us with long-term solutions which may help prevent riots, as well as protect those business and property owners who are the innocent victims of riots.

I compliment the President on having chosen Governor Hughes for this important task, and I insert into the RECORD the editorial, "A Presidential Panel on Insurance," from the August 25 edition of the Philadelphia Inquirer:

A PRESIDENTIAL PANEL ON INSURANCE

President Johnson's appointment of an advisory board to study problems of property insurance, in areas damaged or threatened by riots, should help to produce some badly needed long-range solutions.

With New Jersey's Governor Richard J. Hughes as chairman, and former Governor William W. Scranton, of Pennsylvania, as vice chairman, the prospects for an effective inquiry are excellent.

Private insurance companies, which have a great deal at stake in this investigation, no doubt will cooperate fully with the advisory board in search for practical answers to the troublesome matter of keeping insurance costs down in high-risk neighborhoods. Solving the problems within a framework of private enterprise, if possible, is far preferable to intrusion of the Federal Government into the property insurance business on a massive scale.

Law enforcement is an aspect deserving major consideration. The way to avert property damage is not to seal off riot areas and let them burn. Restoring order quickly and firmly is essential—or, better still, employ preventive measures to stop riots before they start.

The urgent, short-range side of the insurance problem should not be overlooked, either. Steps should be taken to protect the public against arbitrary cancellation of property insurance policies without adequate notice or sufficient reason.

Queens County, N.Y., Program for Brain Injured Children

SPEECH

OF

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1967

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, throughout the Nation, groups of dedicated people are planning and carrying out more programs each year for the benefit of children with various handicaps.

The plight of the brain injured child is one of the most poignant to face us, and the job of guiding him and helping him to assume his place in society is difficult and demanding.

In my home County of Queens, N.Y., the Queens chapter of the New York Association for Brain Injured Children is carrying out an effective program which offers hope in place of despair, to brain injured boys and girls and their families.

I am sure that many of our colleagues are as concerned over the needs of the brain injured child as I and my Queens neighbors are. For its value in guiding local groups in other parts of the Nation, anxious to establish similar projects, I offer a recent statement issued by the Queens chapter outlining some of its achievements and its plans:

Saul Spindel, President of the Queens Chapter of the New York Association for Brain Injured Children has announced a broad program for expanding the chapter's activities and educational classes during the coming fall and winter season.

The Queens Chapter is located at 64–33 215 Street, Bayside, New York. It is an organization dedicated to meet the needs of the minimally brain injured child.

In addition to advocating Public Educational, Medical and Social Programs for these children, the Queens Chapter also sponsors numerous service activities for them. These include the Pathfinder School, an early childhood center for the brain injured child; Play Therapy Programs, Teen Age Programs, Music Lessons, a Boy Scout and and Cub Scout Program and boys Athletic Groups.

The chapter also sponsors parent and community education programs.

These services have as their goal the encouragement of maximum self-sufficiency for the children so that some day they will be able to take their places in society.

"Our Queens Chapter," Mr. Spindel said, "represents over 600 local families. One of our major present problems is the lack of adequate facilities to house these new programs. We urgently need space in which to conduct our Pathfinder School as well as space for our numerous service and community programs."

The Pathfinder School, sponsored by the Queens Chapter, is an early childhood program for children aged 4 to 6. Classes meet weekday mornings and small groups of youngsters are taught in a preschool program specially designed to provide them with a foundation for their future educational needs. The program is fully licensed by the New York City Department of Health and served approximately 30 children last season.

The Queens Chapter's Play Therapy Program is oriented to help boys and girls aged 6 to 12 in their social and academic adjustment. Last year the group, which meets Saturday mornings, serviced over 25 children.

The teenage program is designed to provide a strong social relationship between young boys and girls aged 13 to 18. The program meets on Saturday afternoons. It serviced over 10 children last season.

The boys' athletic group is pointed toward helping boys who need special assistance with motor activities. The aim of the program is to teach boys, aged 8 to 13, how to play the games their peers engage in so that these children will be able to play with other boys in their neighborhood. The groups meet on Saturdays and on weekday afternoons, after school.

Music lessons are provided for over 30 children, in order to give them the opportunity to learn to play an instrument of their choice. The program, which employs special teaching methods designed to deal with the learning problems these children possess, also helps the children academically by improving their reading skills. Lessons are given at the teachers' studios.

A Boy Scout and Cub Scout program has been initiated to give brain injured youngsters all the advantages scouting has to offer. The troops meet on Tuesday evenings and 25 boys are presently enrolled.

Mr. Spindel also pointed out that the Queens Chapter of NYABIC, in addition to expanding all of its services this fall, plans to form a "Tween Age" program for boys and girls aged 12 to 13. A day camp program for the summer of 1968 will also be launched.

Red China Steps in Where Uncle Sam Missed the Boat in Africa

SPEECH

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1967

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, rail transportation, if not completely transcontinental at least serving large areas and a number of countries, will contribute very much to the growth of Africa as it did to the Western States of our own country. As is well known to my colleagues interested in Africa, I long have advocated the construction of a railroad linking Zambia and Tanzania.

Unfortunately, a World Bank study was unfavorable to the project, which on the other hand was declared definitely viable by an Anglo-Canadian team. All this has led to another situation where our country may be missing the boat as far as Africa is concerned.

The article from the August 12, 1967, issue of the Economist, of London, would indicate that Red China is seeking to take full advantage of what would seem to me the unpardonable procrastination if not blindness of the United States.

The article from the Economist, of London, follows:

CHINA'S GOLD-TIPPED WAND HOVERS OVER EASTERN AFRICA

It is almost ten years since the proposal to build a railway linking the Rhodesian and east African systems was test mooted; the passing of time has produced little more than vast increases in the envisaged capital expenditure. Now, at long last, there are indications that the expensive dream may be granted with China as fairy godmother.

Last year Tanzania's then minister of commerce, Sheikh Abdulrahman Babu, uncharacteristically observed that Rhodesia's unilateral declaration of independence had not been without its silver lining for Tanzania. As Zambia severed its links to the south, it has turned more and more to Tanzania in the north for its trade outlets. Already a £16 million oil pipeline is under construction and some thousand trucks are operating on the Great North Road, better known as the "Hell Run," carrying fuel south and copper north. And the arguments in favour of a rail link have become stronger and stronger.

When Zambia's president, Mr. Kenneth Kaunda, returned from a state visit to China in June he announced that Peking had offered to construct the rail link and finance it to the extent of £100 million. While this offer went little further than a previous one to President Nyerere in 1965, the attitude of both Zambia and Tanzania towards the idea of China doing the job has changed. Both originally favoured a western consortium and tentative feelers were put out to Britain, America and West Germany. But all three countries fell back on the 1964 World Bank report which condemned the project as unviable and urged Mr. Kaunda and Mr. Nyerere to concentrate on improved road links. Russia was also approached before the matter was finally put to Peking.

China, which specializes in long-term interest-free loans to "revolutionary" African countries, leapt at the chance. A survey team swiftly followed although their report, in Swahili and Chinese, turned out to be little help. Simultaneously, an Anglo-Canadian team was carrying out a study. This, contrary to the World Bank report, concluded that the project was indeed viable.

The Anglo-Canadian report is officially still secret but apparently it places the total capital cost at £126.3 million, plus a further £11.6 million for 10 more deepwater berths at Dar es Salaam to cope with an estimated additional two and a half million tons of cargo if the rail link is built by the early 1970s. Using this tonnage figure, the report predicts a surplus over operating costs of £11.4 million in 1971, and £18.5 million in 1981. This estimate is based on the belief that operational costs on the rail link in 1971 will be .83d per ton mile against 1.14d on the Rhodesian railway system. The team rejected the labour intensive construction method that the Chinese are thought to favour, stating it would put three years on the estimated construction period of four to five years.

With Peking in the field, the western attitude has shown a cautious change but there remain two distinct schools of thought. The first says that China cannot be allowed to win such a prestigious project; the second, which appears to have the most support, believes that China should be allowed to go ahead for it would tie up a great amount of its foreign aid budget in a single project. Apparently the two African governments are themselves somewhat in the dark about the Chinese offer and a team headed by the Tanzanian finance minister, Mr. Amir Jamal, and his Zambian counterpart, Mr. Arthur Wina, are expected to fly to Peking later this month.

The sort of questions they will want answered (for apparently the Chinese offer is not a detailed one) is whether the loan is interest-free, when the first repayments fall due, over what period will they be spread and in what form the loan will be made. They will also want to know what the Chinese proposals on the labour force are and how many experts they themselves would bring in, what the source of material and equipment would be and what construction period is envisaged.

For China the railway would be a valuable if expensive prize. It is the third biggest project in independent Africa (beaten only by the Aswan and Volta River dams) and would greatly strengthen the Chinese position in Tanzania—probably their most important one in Africa—while giving them a foothold in Zambia. President Kaunda until recently was definitely cool towards Peking's overtures and is even reported to have refused to allow the Chinese survey team to cross into Zambia. Certainly its report dealt only with the Tanzanian side of the link and was made at the invitation of the Tanzanian government only. Mr. Nyerere sees the rail link as the key that will unlock considerable agricultural and mineral wealth in the southern part of his country. This at present cannot be tapped because of poor communications. A survey has ascertained there is at least 300 million tons of coal to the south of the area through which the railways would pass as well as 45 million tons of iron ore.

Britain and America are currently complaining that they had not been formally asked to undertake the project. But this is a red herring; any interest today is in large part attributable to China's offer. The point is that both the Tanzanian and Zambian governments are determined to see the railways built and there is a growing feeling that China will get the job. The next stage is the design and the Tanzanians would like to see this started by the end of the year.

The Anticrime Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 30, 1967

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, recently the House passed an anticrime bill. The House acted to insure State control of funds spent under the provisions of the bill.

In my opinion, the House acted correctly, thereby insuring continued local control of law enforcement.

The action of the House has been applauded by radio station WHO in Des Moines. I include an editorial broadcast by WHO radio-TV during the week of August 23 to 28, 1967, at this point in the RECORD:

THE ANTICRIME BILL

In passing it's anti-crime bill, the House of Representatives changed the Administration bill to bring effective control into the hands of state officials, rather than the United States Attorney-General. Backers of the Administration bill were not happy about the change. One of them, Congressman Emanuel Celler, was particularly harsh in his criticism. He said the states don't have the experts to deal with the crime problem. In fact, he said that for more than 100 years there has been "an utter lack of interest on the part of state authorities with respect to law enforcement."

Perhaps that's the big problem, why the fight against crime has been so ineffective up to now; the cities have been going their own separate way in fighting a war that needs to be co-ordinated on a state level. If the states don't have enough crime experts they should get them; if they've been disinterested, it's time they get interested. State direction of its crime program makes far more sense than having each city work directly with the U.S. Attorney-General.

Educational Television

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 30, 1967

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, 5 years ago this Congress considered and passed the Educational Television Facilities Act, now Public Law 87-447. This act provided the first essential step of Federal financial assistance to help construct new educational television stations and to improve existing stations. No one today questions its merits or value, although, at the time of its consideration, this support was quite controversial.

Under the support authorized by this legislation, 101 new educational television stations have been established. Yet, 200 to 300 such television stations are needed if the all-important media of noncommercial television is to be made available for every citizen in this country.

Moreover, existing stations need more staff and more funds if they are to achieve their potential of providing many and diversified educational and informational programs for the American public's viewing appetite.

Our agenda for action in this field is quite clear and very soon this body will be given a chance to forward the broad media of noncommercial television and radio in this country.

The Public Broadcasting Act of 1967 affords all of us a chance to build on the previous support for facilities with slight variations.

First, for the first time, educational radio will be eligible grantee for support under title I of the Public Broadcasting Act. Second, the Corporation for Public Broadcasting is an invaluable mechanism to provide additional programs of higher quality than now exists to the network of noncommercial stations throughout the country. Third, the legislation authorizes a study of the whole scope and range of instructional television which is making a significant impact on the young students in our Nation's classrooms on levels from elementary and secondary schools to colleges and universities.

The concept of public broadcasting is an important one and it deserves the support of the House. The President has pointed out that the medium can "not only instruct, but inspire and uplift our people."

The legislation provides the means to accomplish this instruction and inspiration. By providing a nonprofit, non-Federal Corporation for Public Broadcasting to strengthen the programing of local stations so that diversity is not stifled, the potential of public broadcasting can be utilized for the benefit of all citizens of this country.

I support this legislative proposal.

Dr. Peter Carl Goldmark, Electronic Genius

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD J. IRWIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 24, 1967

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, I am sure you and my other colleagues in the House read in the New York Times, of August 28, about a revolutionary electronic device for the playback of motion pictures or other visual material through an ordinary television set.

This device stems from the genius of one of my constituents, Dr. Peter Carl Goldmark, of Stamford, Conn., who is president of the Columbia Broadcasting System laboratories, also located in Stamford.

Dr. Goldmark fathered this playback device for more than 5 years while he supervised and directed a team that reached upward of 30 scientists at the CBS laboratories.

But remarkable though this playback device seemingly will become particularly in the worlds of education and entertainment, I think it should be noted that it is not the first tremendous scientific achievement of Dr. Goldmark and his team of scientists.

The New York Times on August 28 also published a highly interesting profile on Dr. Peter Carl Goldmark, which I would like at this time to enter in the RECORD:

DR. PETER CARL GOLDMARK, CBS RESEARCH CHIEF

Dr. Peter Carl Goldmark, who spearheaded the development of the Columbia Broadcasting System's device for playing back movies, taped programs or even the pages of a book through a standard television set, is a rugged scientific individualist in an industry noted for executive diffidence. His stern inquiring mind's grasp of electronic physics resulted in his perfection of the 33⅓ r.p.m. recording disk that made possible long-playing music in the home. His earlier adventures into color television rattled the citadel of the Radio Corporation of America as it had not been shaken before or since.

But his onslaught was to prove a distinctively bitter experience in the annals of electronics.

He won a governmental endorsement of his color system, which would have required abandonment of a regular black-and-white program in order to present a show in color. Subsequently he lost out to the indefatigable chairman of R.C.A., David Sarnoff, who rushed through a system enabling owners of black-and-white and color sets to see the same program in monochrome or tinted hues, the system in use today.

A MAN OF MANY HATS

As president and director of research for the C.B.S. Laboratories in Stamford, Conn., Dr. Goldmark combines the assorted functions of inventor, corporate big wheel, civic activist and accomplished cellist.

By day he may be tied up by budgetary matters or locked in esoteric research on everything from the nuances of advanced recording to retrieving pictures from lunar probes; by night he may lend his paternal presence to a laboratory soft ball game or lecture a local parent-teachers chapter on the meaning of the mass media. * * * This is partly because his division of C.B.S. is engaged in highly classified military undertakings and partly because he is not plagued by uncertainty as to when or if he wants to speak.

His agility as a corporate strategist is not unappreciated, however. When C.B.S. Laboratories needed more room some years ago, it chanced to locate its headquarters in Stamford, a proverbial stone's throw from his home.

Dr. Goldmark was born in Budapest in Dec. 2, 1906, attended the University of Berlin and earned his bachelor and doctorate degrees in physics from the University of Vienna.

After a brief stay as a physicist with Pye Radio, Ltd., in England he came to the United States in 1933, became a naturalized citizen four years later, and cast his professional lot with the burgeoning Columbia Broadcasting System. From chief engineer of a virtually nonexistent TV department in 1936 he steadily rose to the presidency of the C.B.S. Laboratories.

It was Dr. Goldmark's relish of good music, reflected in chamber recitals in his home and proficiency on the piano as well as the cello, that intensified his interest in improved reproduction of sound. In 1948 he developed that 33⅓ r.p.m. record that allowed extended playing time and improved fidelity over the old disks that turned at 78 revolutions per minute.

The electronic ramifications of space and defense needs have occupied much of Dr. Goldmark's attention in the last few years. The technology utilized in the playback device for the home derives in part from the dividends of extensive military research, he said yesterday.

Dr. Goldmark lives quietly in the back country section of Stamford with his wife, the former Diane Davis. The announcement of the playback device culminated more than five years of work by a team that reached upward of 30 specialists at the C.B.S. Laboratories.

"It's been a long struggle to work it out and now there is a natural excitement," he said.

The Public Broadcasting Act

SPEECH

OF

HON. RAY BLANTON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 24, 1967

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, the enormous impact of the broadcasting media on the lives of each one of us cannot be underrated. We are kept informed by them, we are entertained by them, we are sometimes annoyed by them. They stimulate our thinking. They provoke our comment. We cannot ignore them. Television and radio have evolved into the most influential method of communication of our time. Still the potential of this vast industry is only on the verge of being explored. I refer to noncommercial educational broadcasting which, because of grave financial restrictions, has remained in its developmental stage far too long—gaining only inches when it should have been making great strides ahead. In instances were a noncommercial service has been professionally tested it has proved its worth beyond expectation. In my own State of Tennessee, educational television has had great impact on the culture of our people—both in terms of formal instruction and in terms of the broader aspects of noncommercial broadcasting—adult education and the enrichment of family and community life. The Public Broadcasting Act will aid my State in its development of a network of educational communications dedicated to the public good.

Until we have a fully operational educational broadcasting service throughout the United States our communications system will not be complete. Educational broadcasting, if it is ever to realize its great capacity for public service, needs the endorsement of the 90th Congress through swift passage of the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967.

Cpl. Michael E. Jones, Overlea, Md., Killed in Action in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 30, 1967

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Cpl. Michael E. Jones, a young marine from Maryland, was recently killed in action in Vietnam. I wish to commend the courage of this young man and to honor his memory by including the following article in the RECORD:

OVERLEA MARINE KILLED IN ACTION—CORPORAL JONES WAS IN HIS 11TH MONTH OF VIET DUTY

A 20-year old Marine corporal from Overlea who was in his eleventh month of Vietnam duty has been killed in action, the Defense Department reported yesterday.

Cpl. Michael E. Jones, son of Mr. and Mrs. Frank B. Jones, of 501 Elmwood road, was killed last Thursday while on his thirteenth combat patrol.

The Defense Department telegram to his parents said that Corporal Jones died after he was hit by shrapnel from a mortar while on patrol in the Quang Tri area near the demilitarized zone.

Mr. Jones said his son had been scheduled to be sent to Okinawa after the combat tour during which he was killed, and then to come home by November.

A senior infantry squad leader, the young marine would have been in Vietnam a year next month. He had served two and one half years of a four-year enlistment.

TO COME HOME SOON

His father served 22 months in Burma during World War II as a medic in the famed Merrill's Marauders and was wounded twice, he said, once by a bullet in the leg and once by shrapnel in the back.

Mr. Jones said he and his wife received a letter from their son two days before he was killed. In it he told them his unit "really had been catching it."

"We fought the same kind of war," Mr. Jones said. "You can't see anybody until they jump up."

Corporal Jones was a 1964 graduate of Overlea Senior High School, where he was a member of the cross-country team.

Besides his parents, he is survived by a sister, Sharon Jones, and a brother, Kirk Jones.

Zambia Plagued by Computer's Error

SPEECH

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1967

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, when the foreign aid bill was under discussion in Committee of the Whole, I suggested that a study of the feasibility of the computer system in the operation of AID's activities should precede the positive instruction to the President to install such a system. This, it seemed to me, would have been the course of prudence, both because of the high cost of a computer, the rent of which runs as high as $160,000 a month, and the questioned infallibility of the computer system.

I am extending my remarks to include a special dispatch to the reliable New York Times that relates the unhappy experience of that African country with a breakdown in computer programing which left that nation completely without official trade figures and the data required to check her balance-of-payments position.

The dispatch follows:

ZAMBIA COMPUTER PROGRAM COMES UP WITH AN ERROR

LUSAKA, ZAMBIA, August 12.—A breakdown in computer programing has left Zambia without any official trade figures this year with which to gauge the progress of her sanctions campaign against Rhodesia or check her balance-of payments position.

Informed sources here say the mistakes, which resulted in two sets of figures being added instead of subtracted, have resulted in figures for 1967 being scrapped and doubt being thrown on last year's figures.

A new staff has now been recruited and the whole import-export statistical program has been restarted.

No figures are expected to be available before the end of the year.

Zambia normally publishes import-export figures monthly to enable Government departments to arrange administrative controls in the program to cut off Rhodesian trade and also as a guide to the balance-of-payments position.

In a recent report, Zambia's Auditor General said he was "extremely perturbed" by the situation prevailing in the data-processing unit at the core of the Government's accounting system.

Tribute to George R. Hammond, a Man Who Has Put "Safety First"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GILBERT GUDE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 30, 1967

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, a familiar sight on school crossing corners in the Washington area and throughout the Nation are the boys and girls of the school safety patrol. Most of us never stop to think just how these youngsters receive their training for the valuable work they perform. In the Washington area, the majority of the training is done at school safety patrol officers' training camps.

On Tuesday, September 5, the man behind these safety patrol camps, Mr. George R. Hammond, of the District of Columbia division, American Automobile Association, will be honored for his 25 years as director of the camps.

The school safety patrol program in the District of Columbia got underway in 1926 as a result of the tragic previous year in which 19 schoolage children were killed in traffic accidents, focusing considerable public attention on the problem. In March of that year, the first safety patrol was installed at the Grant School in Northwest Washington. Credited with starting the first patrol here is Miss Elsie Green, then a teacher at the Grant School. She will be present to help honor Mr. Hammond next Tuesday.

Of major significance have been the combined efforts of the police, school officials, and the AAA to establish the annual summer training program for school safety patrol members. During the month of June, nine day camps for District of Columbia patrols are held at various school playgrounds throughout the city. More than 400 youngster attend these day camps annually. Maryland youngsters attend camp at Benson, Md., while Virgina youngsters attend Camp Charles H. Grimm at Kilmarnock, Va. More than 1,100 children attended resident camps this year in July and August.

George Hammond's work at directing these camps the past 25 years is not going unrecognized. As one example of the tributes paid, some 175 testimonial letters from his friends in the fields of education, enforcement, and safety have been collected from officials throughout the United States. Metropolitan Police Chief John B. Layton said:

> The Metropolitan Police Department is deeply grateful for the service you have rendered in providing for the protection of our school children. We recognize your contribution to this record through the School Safety Patrol program. It has also become apparent in recent years that a need exists for a better understanding between law enforcement officers and people in the community. In my judgment, contacts between school children and officers assigned to duty as School Safety Patrol Police Coordinators serves as an excellent way for bringing about this understanding. I extend my sincere congratulations upon your completion of 25 years of loyal and dedicated service in directing the camp program.

The U.S. Congress has called on automobile manufacturers, highway engineers, State and local officials to give increased attention to this very important subject of traffic safety. Let us not overlook, right here in our own community, one of the most effective safety programs in the Nation, jointly sponsored by the public and parochial schools, the police officials, and the AAA.

Mr. Speaker, I too would like to extend my congratulations to George Hammond. Mr. George, as he is affectionately known by our school patrol members, has performed a valuable service to the cause of traffic safety in the Washington area. Since the patrol was started, there has not been one child killed in traffic at a crossing where safety patrols were on duty. This is indeed quite an achievement, and we should be grateful for his dedicated service throughout this past quarter of a century. We are all indebted to him for putting "safety first."

Truth in the Marketplace

SPEECH

OF

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1967

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, August 28, my colleague from New York [Mr. Halpern] and I, who are members of the House Subcommittee on Consumers Affairs, conducted an informal hearing in New York City on H.R. 11601, the Consumer Credit Protection Act, and related truth-in-lending bills, which are pending before our subcommittee. We heard a number of excellent statements on the merits of H.R. 11601, as well as moving personal stories of statements on the merits of those who have been deceived and defrauded by misleading and incomprehensible consumer credit transactions. I plan to put some of the most helpful statements in the Record in order to further inform my colleagues on the need for this legislation.

Yesterday, the New York Times declared its support for major provisions of H.R. 11601, introduced by the Consumer Affairs Subcommittee's most able chairman, the gentlewoman from Missouri, Mrs. Leonor Sullivan, as against S. 5 which recently passed the Senate. The Times correctly pointed out that the Senate bill's gravest inadequacy is its failure to cover all revolving charge accounts, and that the Sullivan bill, of which I am proud to be a cosponsor, remedies that defect. I insert the editorial herewith:

Truth in the Marketplace

The truth-in-lending bill already passed by the Senate needs strengthening in the House if it is to provide adequate protection for ordinary families. As Senator Robert F. Kennedy, City Council President O'Connor and other witnesses told the House Consumer Affairs subcommittee here yesterday, those in the low-income brackets are the principal victims of high-interest rates charged for personal loans and installment purchases. These consumers are often unaware of how much they are actually paying for so-called easy credit.

The bill, in the form approved by the Senate, would require sellers and lenders to state the true interest in terms both of annual rates—as distinguished from monthly or quarterly rates—and of actual dollars. The sale of automobiles and other large items such as furniture and refrigerators would be included, as well as personal loans and second mortgages on real estate.

The big defect in the bill is the failure to cover revolving charge accounts. Department stores persuaded the Senate Banking Committee that it would be burdensome and misleading to state the credit charge on these accounts, usually 1.5 per cent a month, at the annual rate of 18 per cent.

Representative Leonor K. Sullivan, Missouri Democrat, who is chairman of the subcommittee, is urging restoration of this provision in the bill. Since revolving charge accounts are the fastest-growing form of consumer credit, it is important that families become fully aware of the cost of handling such purchases.

A Federal ban on the garnishment of wages would also protect unwary buyers. This device for collecting money is principally used by high-pressure, easy-credit outfits which prey upon the gullibility of low-income consumers. It has no more place in the modern business scene than a debtor's prison.

President Johnson's Truth-in-Lending Bill Receives Strong Support in the Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. HOWARD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 30, 1967

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, the House will soon have the chance to strike a strong blow for the American consumer by supporting the truth-in-lending bill, which has already been overwhelmingly adopted by the Senate.

The Truth-in-Lending Act of 1967 is one of the keystones of President Johnson's consumer protection program.

It would require lending institutions and retailers to disclose information on interest payments on loans and extensions of credit.

The impact of the bill on the buying public will be immense, according to Under Secretary of the Treasury, Joseph Barr.

Secretary Barr testified recently that consumers must pay $13 billion in interest on personal debts. Yet, many are misled—especially the poor—on rates of interest they must pay.

The Johnson truth-in-lending bill would eliminate a good deal of consumer confusion, and provide the American shopper and buyer with the information he needs to make his credit choices wisely.

I insert in the Record a recent editorial in the Andeson, S.C., Independent, which fully supports the President's truth-in-lending proposal:

[From the Anderson (S.C.) Independent, Aug. 22, 1967]

Congress Has Good Opportunity To Give Consumers Fair Shake

A House subcommittee on consumer affairs has been holding hearings on the Johnson administration's "truth in lending" bill, and an administration witness, Under Secretary of the Treasury Joseph W. Barr, testified the other day that the American consumer debt, excluding mortgages, totaled $95 billion last year.

Interest charges on that sum, he declared, amounted to $13 billion. "That," he added, in the understatement of the of the month, "is a large sum,"

By coincidence, it is almost exactly the sum that the U.S. government pays in annual interest charges on its current $330 billion debt.

Obviously, the U.S. government is a better credit risk than any American citizen, however well-fixed he may be. But when the average citizen is paying more than three times as much for credit, and in not unusual cases three times as much, something would seem to be askew.

Nevertheless, the purpose of the "truth in lending" measure is not so much to reduce the cost of consumer credit as it is merely to let people know what that credit costs them.

Then, of course, genuine competition might take over and the American consumer should be able, as President Johnson's advisor on consumer affairs, Betty Furness, put it, to "shop for credit as wisely as he has been able to shop for merchandise."

The outlook for "truth in lending" legislation is better this year than it has ever been since former Sen. Paul Douglas of Illinois began his at first lonely fight for it. The Senate, by an overwhelming 92–0 vote early in July, passed a version worked out by Wisconsin Democratic Sen. William B. Proxmire, who took up the struggle where Senator Douglas left off.

A stronger bill has been introduced in the House by Rep. Leonor K. Sullivan (D-Mo.), chairman of the House Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs.

Where Senator Proxmire had been willing to omit coverage of ordinary revolving credit accounts, which are usually expressed in terms of monthly interest charges, Mrs. Sullivan would not only include them but insist that they be expressed by annual rates.

Some retail spokesmen argue that to do so is impossible. Former Senator Douglas, an economist by profession, replies that that's "hair-splitting"; 1½ per cent a month is 18 per cent a year and "why shouldn't a housewife know" that that's what her credit is costing her?

The Sullivan bill, unlike Senator Proxmire's, would also include credit charges under $10. That may seem that a picayune sum, but it isn't to the poor, who, as Mr. Douglas pointed out in his testimony to the House subcommittee, must necessarily buy in small quantities and upon whom usurious interest charges weigh most heavily.

The legislation should also have a salutory effect on the price level which, if present predictions are borne out, will have a tendency to rise toward the end of the year.

Congress seldom gets such an opportunity to strike a blow for the consumers, most of whom are also taxpayers and voters, and the opportunity ought not to be passed up.

Drum and Bugle Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. SCHEUER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 30, 1967

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure and pride that I join in the salute to the drum and bugle corps. The rich, meaningful role this organization plays in the lives of American youth merits the recognition they receive during International Drum Corps Week. The patriotism so proudly displayed before the world is in the finest American tradition. The activities engaged in, constructively channeling the exuberant energies of our youth, is an example for all to see.

As a Representative from the Bronx, N.Y., it is personally gratifying to me to notice the energetic participation of Bronxites in the organization. This includes national chairman, Harvey Berish, along with so many young people.

I wish the corps an enjoyable and fruitful Drum Corps Week. I hope that they meet continued success as they symbolize the great American heritage and echo its resounding calls.

Dissent and Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN O. MARSH, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1967

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, when the Nebraska Centennial Commission sponsored a George Norris Day observance at McCook, Nebr., on July 11, 1967, the principal speaker was the Honorable J. L. Robertson, Vice Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

Because I think Mr. Robertson placed in excellent perspective in that address the relationship of the right of dissent, which we cherish, to the ultimate protection of our national security in the face of a persistent and resourceful attack by totalitarian techniques of infiltration and subversion, I believe the House would have interest in a portion of this address, which I include herewith under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix:

DISSENT AND DEMOCRACY

It is fitting in Nebraska's Centennial Year that we should join to honor one of its great men, for it was iron-strong men and women who, in the short period covered by the lives of my father and myself, transformed Nebraska from a wild frontier, where only the Indians bothered the herds of buffalo that roamed its prairies, into a land of sophistication and plenty. Today, throughout the nation, Nebraska is known as the Beef State, because of the quality and quantity of its cattle. It is recognized, at least in fiancial circles, as the locus of the best known home town in America, Broken Bow. But its worldwide place in the sun is attributable to the superior men and women it has nurtured. History books are full of the contributions they have made, in war and peace, in all the arts and sciences, and especially in the fields of literature, law, and political science. The towering figure whom thoughtful historians credit with the greatest contributions of all is the one Franklin Roosevelt aptly referred to, in Chaucerian terms, as "the very perfect, gentle knight of American Progressive ideals". He is the one we honor here today—Senator George W. Norris of Nebraska.

Fifty years ago this year, the Senator was at a low point of his political career. At the height of his powers, he had taken an unpopular stand. Together with eleven other United States Senators, he had successfully filibustered against President Wilson's request for power to arm American merchant ships. Tremendous abuse was heaped upon his head. He was called a traitor and was denounced all over his country.

George Norris responded in a manner that was characteristic. He wrote to the Governor of Nebraska requesting a special election to give the people the opportunity to recall him from the Senate if they so desired. Senator Norris wrote:

"I have no desire to represent the people of Nebraska, either in the United States Senate or elsewhere, if my official conduct is contrary to their wishes . . ." [1]

The Senator packed his bag and came back to Lincoln to meet his constituents face to face. Friends warned him that he might be mobbed. His reception in Lincoln was remarkably cool. There was no mob, but neither were there many well-wishers. The newspapers ignored him, with the exception of a solitary reporter who took it upon himself to get the Senator's side of the story, promising to publish it in full.

The public meeting the Senator had arranged in the City Auditorium was attended by an overflow crowd, but George Norris, chairing his own meeting and confronting that mass of people alone, had no way of knowing whether they had come to listen to him or to mob him. He stood for a moment as an ominous silence came over the packed hall. Then he began.

"I have come home to tell you the truth," he said. And then, with complete frankness, he described the reasons for his action. When he had finished, the crowd gave him a standing ovation. There was no recall election. And although Norris was one of only a half dozen Senators to vote, a few weeks later, against the declaration of war, he won renomination and re-election to the Senate the following year.

George Norris never regretted his futile battle to keep the United States out of the first World War. On the contrary, he and many others came to believe that history had vindicated his position. He lived to hear one of his severest critics, Senator James A. Reed of Missouri, describe the minority vote against the war as "the most superb act of courage this century has witnessed."

Many Americans have been inspired by the courage of Senator Norris. The individual who takes an unpopular stand always hopes that history will vindicate him, and the example of George W. Norris has been cited time and again as a dramatic demonstration that it is possible for men in public life to stand by their principles, maintain their integrity and still succeed.

We are today engaged in another war—undeclared, but nevertheless real. The reasons for this war remain unclear in the minds of many good Americans. Vociferous dissenters abound. No doubt many of these, perhaps including some of the present members of the United States Senate, look back at Senator Norris and that beleaguered minority who opposed our entry into World War I and find inspiration for their own present conduct. Indeed, some have gone even further into the past and have thought to find justification for opposition to the President over the war in the actions of an even more universally known and revered American—Abraham Lincoln.

Is this valid?

Let us go back and first take a look at the position of Lincoln in the Mexican War, since it bears some striking similarities to Norris' position in World War I.

Recently a synthetic quotation was created from disconnected phrases and sentences uttered by Lincoln in an effort to make it appear that Congressman Abe Lincoln of Illinois was a more caustic critic of the Mexican War than are some of President Johnson's present day critics of the war in Asia.

Lincoln, to be sure, did disagree with President Polk about the necessity of the war and the way in which it was begun. But the fact is that he held his tongue for over a year after the war was begun. He explained why in these words:

"When the war began, it was my opinion that all those who, because of knowing too little, or because of knowing too much, could not conscientiously approve the conduct of the President, in the beginning of it, should nevertheless, as good citizens and patriots, remain silent on that point, at least till the war should be ended . . . and I adhered to it, and acted upon it, until since I took my seat here; and I think I should still adhere to it, were it not that the President and his friends will not allow it to be so." [2]

Lincoln explained that he was forced to depart from this course of silence only because a vote was being forced on resolutions which required him to state his position. Lincoln later noted that even though his party had generally held the view that the war had been begun unconstitutionally and unnecessarily, once it became the cause of the country, he and his fellow Whigs, with few exceptions, had supported the war with their votes, their money, their services, and their blood. He cited approvingly the position of General Zachary Taylor, saying:

". . . as a citizen, and particularly as a soldier, it is sufficient for him to know that his country is at war with a foreign nation, to do all in his power to bring it to a speedy and honorable termination by the most vigorous and energetic operations, without enquiring about its justice or anything else connected with it." [3]

Abraham Lincoln came to have reason to wish for that kind of support from his fellow Americans when the duty fell upon him of leading the bitter struggle to preserve the Union. This being a civil war, he found behind his own lines a dangerously large number of critics, obstructionists, and sympathizers with the rebellious South. Lincoln found it necessary to do far more than cast aspersions on the patriotism of those who through word and deed obstructed the successful prosecution of the war. He suspended the writ of *habeas corpus* and, in an action which exemplified his difficulty, placed under arrest one of the prominent leaders of the opposition, a man named Vallandigham. Lincoln justified the arrest, saying:

". . . he who dissuades one man from volunteering or induces one soldier to desert, weakens the Union cause as much as he who kills a Union soldier in battle." [4]

He went on to say:

"Must I shoot a . . . soldier boy who deserts, while I must not touch a hair of a wily agitator who induces him to desert? This is none the less injurious when effected by getting a father, or brother, or friend, into a public meeting, and there working upon his feelings, till he is persuaded to write to the soldier boy, that he is fighting in a bad cause, for a wicked administration of a contemptible government, too weak to arrest and punish him if he shall desert. I think that in such a case, to silence the agitator, and save the boy, is not only constitutional, but, withal, a great mercy." [5]

History has vindicated Lincoln, not the dissenter Vallandigham.

And this is a point that must be remembered by those who are enamored of the drama of dissent. Vallandigham may have been a man of courage and integrity. I do not know his character. But in the cold light of history he was on the wrong side—not merely the losing side, but the *wrong* side. No matter how much courage he displayed or how much sacrifice he made in his efforts to obstruct the Union cause, history will never vindicate him.

George Norris did not oppose American entry into World War I for the sake of op-

---

Footnotes at end of speech.

posing. He studied the facts carefully and concluded that the German ambitions did not constitute a threat to the security of the United States. It was his reasoned judgment that there was no justification for shedding American blood to defeat the Kaiser. He was subsequently vindicated, because in retrospect it appeared that his judgment had been correct, although the crucial test of his position—a German victory in the war—was, of course, avoided.

We must also note that Norris, like Lincoln in 1846, did not go on opposing the war and harassing the President in his conduct of it once the die was cast. On the contrary, once the war had become the cause of the country, he gave it his full support. He voted against the declaration of war on Germany, but he voted for the declaration of war against the allies of Germany—Austria-Hungary, Turkey, and Bulgaria. He fully supported with his vote the powers and appropriations required to bring about the successful conclusion of the conflict. When an amendment was offered in the Senate to prevent transportation of soldiers to the European front without their consent, Norris denounced it as an unjustifiable interference with the powers of the Commander-in-Chief. He told all who inquired that the war "is now my war as much as it is the war of our General Staff". He, himself, volunteered for service in the Marine Corps at the age of fifty-seven, and refrained from pursuing the matter only upon being informed that, because of his age, he would not be permitted to serve in France.

Norris avoided all further discussion of the causes of the war once we were in it. Like Lincoln, he thought it best to remain silent, but he did not insist that others follow his example. He thought Robert M. LaFollette, for instance, was unwise in attacking our entry into the war after we were in it, but the situation was obviously not as dangerous as it had been during the Civil War, and he saw no reason why LaFollette, or anyone else, should be deprived of the right to state his opinions.

Norris never changed his view about World War I, but he took a very different position with respect to the Second World War. Here again he analyzed the war in terms of the danger to the United States, and he reached the conclusion that the Axis powers represented a genuine threat to American security. He therefore supported our entry into the war. Had he clung blindly to the role of dissenter, we would have to say today that he erred, for history has not vindicated those who opposed and obstructed our battle to save the world from Hitler, any more than it has vindicated Vallandigham.

But George Norris displayed sagacity as well as integrity. He was not stopped by his horror of war and bloodshed, because he had an even greater horror of seeing the world engulfed by a new barbarism, of seeing liberty crushed under the iron heel of the Nazis. He pointed out the menace of the totalitarian philosophy, saying:

"Have the unreasonable, the murderous desires of dictators like Hitler and Mussolini, as well as those of Japan, affected the mentality of humanity? Are we drifting in a direction where the theories of these men, who would obtain power by murder and robbery and destruction, gradually are gaining control of the hearts of men?" [6]

He observed that the world was confronted with a new and dangerous philosophy of government—the theory that "any government has the right to conquer any other government or any other people if it has the power to do so". The threat was very different from that which confronted the nation in 1917. "At that time," he said, "there was still honor among nations and men, even though they were enemies upon the battlefield. The enslavement of peoples was not then at stake. There was no likelihood that the life of our nation, as well as that of every other democracy in the world, would be endangered, no matter what the outcome of the war might be . . . However, in this war," he continued, "we are confronted with an enemy whose ambitions are known to the world and that means the destruction of every democracy in the world." [7]

George W. Norris was willing to see war come that the kind of society which permitted men of integrity to thrive might survive.

And that is precisely the challenge that confronts us today.

---

[1] Alfred Lief, "Democracy's Norris", pp. 2, 3.

[2] "Collected Works of Abraham Lincoln", Rutgers University Press, Vol. I, p. 432.

[3] *Ibid*, p. 515.

[4] "Collected Works", Vol. VI, p. 264.

[5] *Ibid*. pp. 266–7.

[6] Leif, *op. cit*. 527.

[7] Norman L. Zucker, "George W. Norris, Gentle Knight of American Democracy", pp. 134–5.

The Challenge of Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BILL NICHOLS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 30, 1967

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, much has been said on the floor of this House and written in the newspapers about the cause of the recent riots in our country. There has been substantial evidence and reliable testimony presented to indicate that although the Communist Party may not have started the riots, the Communists were there to take advantage of the disorders.

Recently, one of my constituents wrote a very fine letter to the editor of the Montgomery Advertiser. In his letter, Mr. George Blackmon of Prattville, Ala., has pointed out many of the fears that our people have over the continued growth of Communism, both here and abroad.

Mr. Speaker, I include Mr. Blackmon's letter in the RECORD:

THE CHALLENGE OF COMMUNISM

PRATTVILLE, ALA.

To the EDITOR, the ADVERTISER:

Have the communists really changed their strategy so that we can be assured free trade with communist countries will keep our food and equipment from being used against American boys in Vietnam? Or are the following just loosely spoken words with no meaning?

"Communism and capitalism can not live side by side. One must go.

"We can win by revolution; playing race against race, class against class and nation against nation.

"We will not have to fight for our prime objective, the United States of America; it will fall into our hands like an overripe plum.

"Your children will live under communism.

"We will bury you.

"Our programs must be diversified to cope with different countries, people and cultures throughout the world.

"We can not expect to win with free elections. We must win through appointments of well trained and organized communists in high places in government, in labor unions and in key jobs in industry. In order to gain these we must work underground. We can not be identified.

"Give us one generation of your children from kindergarten through high school and we will change your competitive and free enterprise system to a centralized communist state.

"We will sit on the side lines and play nation against nation.

"Law and order must be completely broken down before communism can be organized.

"We have learned from history that infiltration is probably the surest and sweetest death for a capitalist country, but it can only be brought on by government spending."

Can we afford to ignore the above threats and statements? Can we be lulled into a state of mind to believe higher taxes will stop inflation, when all it really does is put more money into the hands of Washington bureaucrats to spend and waste as they see fit.

Can we afford to pay taxes to promote and finance collective farms to compete with the private independent farmer, or have our independent farms confiscated and turned into collective farms?

Can we afford to lure people off the farms to the big cities and create ghettoes by giving them big welfare checks?

Can we as a Christian nation, continue morally or financially to keep paying bonuses to unwed mothers to have more children to place on our welfare rolls? Can we afford to make it more attractive for people to get on one of our welfare programs, than to work?

Can we afford to spend billions on so called antipoverty programs while at the same time and place millions of jobs are going unfilled?

Can we be blackmailed into spending one hundred billion dollars for public housing to be kept up by the taxpayers, for able-bodied people who have only to say, "I never had a chance?"

America, the greatest nation on earth owes more than the balance of the entire world; yet we are still dishing out billions to friends and enemies alike. How much longer can this last? Where have we headed and how much higher can our national debt go before international bankers will lose confidence in our dollar and our economy will collapse? Uruguay is an example. In 15 years of their welfare state their currency has dropped in value 97 per cent and wages are climbing at the rate of 60 per cent a year. This entire calamity grew from government spending.

Can we afford to lower or practically abolish tariffs on imports and guarantee the businesses hurt will be subsidized and the workers guaranteed their salary by the federal government? This is a chance for thousands of businesses to fold up and millions added to our federal payroll.

Can we afford to give the Panama Canal away and build another at a cost of billions?

How long before the Washington bureaucrats will stop using the South for a scapegoat to get their unconstitutional laws rammed through Congress as well as their huge give away appropriation demands met?

How much longer are we going to keep our local law enforcement officers handcuffed while our cities are being burned and looted and crime is at an all time high? I think the communists have scored one of their biggest gains by the rioting, looting and burning going on in different cities throughout the nation. The sole purpose of it all is to force insurance companies to cancel millions of policies or put in a strict anti-riot clause. It would be impossible for private enterprise to afford the risk of their investment with out insurance. It will also be impossible to get even a home financed, let alone rental property for either business or residential use. Any thinking person can see this is a well organized plot or it would not have such wide spread operations. Most of our cities are being threatened with burnings. These are not idle threats as many cities are already in flames; forcing us into this catastrophe.

We have already surrendered our children to appointed HEW officials we have never heard of, to pick their schools, teachers, studies, associates, friends and playmates. Now are we going to continue to spend and live in luxury at their expense, or have we already sold them into slavery? Remember this is our childrens future we are molding and their money we are spending, not ours.

GEORGE BLACKMON.

The Israel Victory and Arab-Russian Doubletalk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THEODORE R. KUPFERMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 30, 1967

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, in statements so egregious that they could not be taken seriously, the heads of two sovereign states, bent on the extermination of democracy in the Middle East, accused Israel of Nazi methods.

They were joined by the Premier of the Soviet Union, who undoubtedly knew better, but preferred to spout invective propaganda.

So that the record might be clear, I am pleased to bring to the attention of my colleagues a careful analysis of the facts in the bulletin of the Antidefamation League of B'nai B'rith of September 1967. In an article by Sid Goldberg, entitled "The Grand Mufti and His Friends," the history of collaboration between Arab leaders and Nazis is detailed.

The article follows:

THE GRAND MUFTI AND HIS FRIENDS

(By Sid Goldberg)

(NOTE.—Mr. Goldberg is editor of the North American Newspaper Alliance, a major newspaper syndicate.)

On June 20 President Nureddin El-Atassi of Syria told the United Nations General Assembly that "The Arab people is indeed being subjected today to an operation of extermination surpassing in dimensions what the Nazis did."

The day before, Premier Aleksei N. Kosygin of the Soviet Union told the same group that Israel's behavior "brings to mind the heinous crimes perpetrated by the Fascists during World War II."

Radio Cairo compared Israeli administrators in Gaza to "Nazi Gauleiters." Other Arab and Soviet propaganda mills referred to the "Hitlerite death merchants" of Israel, to "Moshe Dayan's storm troopers," and to what they charged were "Zionist plans for genocide."

The irony, of course, is that thousands of Israelis are the sole survivors of families that vanished in the Nazi furnaces. But doubly ironic is the fact that the Soviet and Arab accusers of Israel stand guilty of their own charges.

It was Soviet Russia that signed a nonaggression pact with Nazi Germany in 1939, a pact which was ultimately broken by Germany, not Russia. Some of the other communist countries which accused Israel of "walking the Hitlerite path" also know that route very well. Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, Albania and Slovakia not only were allies of Nazi Germany in World War II but had native Nazi movements that vied in viciousness with the German.

What is less known is the record of the Arabs in World War II. President El-Atassi told the General Assembly, "the Arabs fought in both world wars and contributed to the liberation of Europe from Nazism and to the realization of allied victory."

The fact is that Syria, Egypt, Saudi Arabia and Lebanon did not declare war on Germany until February, 1945, when the war was little more than a mopping-up operation by the allies. The Arab declarations of war were made in late February because attendance at the forth-coming San Francisco conference, setting up the United Nations, required a declaration of war on Germany no later than March 1.

The only Arab state that played any military role in the war was Transjordan, which declared war on Germany as early as 1939. Transjordan was totally dependent on British grants for its existence, and its army, the Arab Legion, was in effect a part of the British Army, under British officers.

Iraq declared war on Germany in 1943 after it was clear the Nazis were losing. Before that, pro-Nazi sentiment was powerful in Baghdad, and a Nazi puppet government was installed there in 1941 under Rashid Ali, who went so far as to declare war on Britain. Rashid Ali received congratulations from Arab leaders in Egypt (including King Farouk), Lebanon, and Syria. The latter permitted German bombers and transports to land on its fields while the Nazi regime lasted in Baghdad.

The whole temper of the Arab world before and during World War II was neutralist at best, pro-Nazi at worst. When Italian troops in August, 1940 invaded Egyptian territory, Egypt did not consider this a cause for war. The fighting was left to the British. Even General Erwin Rommel's invasion of Egypt, in May, 1941, couldn't nudge the Egyptians into a declaration of war. And so strong was the pro-Nazi sentiment in Egypt that when Premier Ahmed Maher did declare war—on February 24, 1945—he was assassinated while reading the Royal Decree.

Arab fighting during World War II was on the side of the Nazis. Several thousand Arab volunteers were mobilized into Nazi units by the Grand Mufti of Jerusalem, Hitler's man in the Middle East. The Mufti (Haj Amin El-Husseini), who operated out of Berlin from 1941 to 1945, organized his pro-Nazi Arabs into sabotage squads, espionage cells and a fighting unit called the Arab Legion.

The Mufti also helped organize the Moslems of Bosnia and other Balkan areas into special SS Units called "The Black Legions." He praised them as the "cream of Islam" and they were dispatched to the Eastern front in the Caucasus to stir Soviet Moslems into an anti-Communist crusade. Some 3,000 of these Mufti troops were held prisoners of war as late as 1946 in Camp Opelika, Alabama.

The Grand Mufti was among the most popular Arab leaders before, during and after the war. So effective was his hate-sputtering oratory that few if any Arab leaders dared oppose him. As spiritual and political leader of the Palestine Arabs he had learned to hate Jews in the '20's and '30's as their numbers increased in the land of Zion.

Now 71 and last reported—in March of this year—to be in Old Jerusalem, the Mufti had been Hitler's chief advisor on Arab affairs and the friend and confidante of Adolf Eichmann.

Gideon Hausner, chief prosecutor at the Eichmann trial in Israel, established that "the Mufti asked Gestapo Chief Heinrich Himmler to provide him, after the war, when he planned to enter Jerusalem at the head of the axis troops, with a 'special adviser' from Eichmann's department to help him solve the Jewish question in the same way as it had been done in the axis countries. Eichmann offered the job to his assistant, Dieter Wisliceny."

The Grand Mufti spread his anti-Jewish venom throughout the war over radio Berlin. He praised the Germans for "knowing how to get rid of Jews." He urged his Arab listeners to "kill the Jews wherever you find them." He gave the number of Jews "still to be dealt with" (in 1944) as 11 million, representing the Jewish populations of America, Russia and other countries beyond Hitler's reach.

All this would signify no more than the ravings of one madman—except that the Mufti was returned to his role after the war as leader of the Palestine question. He directed policy from a lavish and fortified home in Cairo and, as one of the Arab delegates to the United Nations in 1947 said, "the Mufti is the irrefutable leader of the Holy Land Arabs."

To this day none of the Arab leaders has repudiated the Grand Mufti, or his pro-Nazi assistants who worked with him in Berlin during the war.

Nor is this tolerance of a Nazi in their midst surprising. Egypt, the chief victim of the "Hitlerite" Israelis, has given sanctuary to hundreds of former Nazis, among them up to 100 of Hitler's rocket and missile experts.

Also in Egypt, according to the latest information from the Anti-Defamation League, are the following:

Colonel Naam Al-Nashar, formerly Leopold Gleim, who was head of German security in Poland. He arrived in Egypt in 1955 and organized the Egyptian security service along Nazi lines.

Lt. Col. Ben Sala, formerly Bernard Bender, a storm trooper still on the Polish list of war criminals. He is head of the Jewish Department of the Egyptian security service.

Hassan Soliman, formerly Heinrich Sellmann, wanted by West Germany for crimes committed while he was Gestapo chief in Ulm. He now holds a senior position in the Secret Police in Cairo.

Col. Ahim Fahumi, formerly Dr. Heinrich Willermann, wanted by West Germany for sterilization experiments he conducted in several Nazi concentration camps. He now runs the Egyptian political prison at Samara, near Alexandria.

Louis Al-Haj, formerly Louis Heiden, director of a Nazi press agency in Berlin. He is now an adviser to President Nasser and it was he who prepared a pocket-sized Arabic translation of *Mein Kampf* for Egyptian officers.

Ibraham Mustafa, formerly Joachim Daemling, wanted by West Germany for crimes committed in Dusseldorf while a storm trooper there. He is an adviser to the Cairo police on concentration camps.

Ali Mohammed, formerly George Brunner, one of Eichmann's assistants, in charge of deportation of Jews from Greece. He now works in the Egyptian propaganda industry.

The list goes on and on. The Arabs, by raising a "Nazi issue", convict only themselves

In World War II, 1,300,000 Jews were in uniform in the Allied Armies. In Palestine, 85,800 Jewish men and 50,400 Jewish women volunteered for war service; 27,028 Palestine Jews served with the British forces in various Middle East, North African and European fronts, many in the most hazardous missions.

What made a mockery of the United Nations "debate" was that the Communists and Arabs well know their respective roles in World War II. Their statements in the General Assembly would have made Joseph Goebbels proud. Dr. Goebbels, incidentally was royally welcomed in Cairo on the eve of the war.

Paul Bedford: 1875–1967

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 30, 1967

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month one of the most distinguished men in my congressional district passed away at the age of 92, the Honorable Paul Bedford.

The Wilkes-Barre Times Leader Evening News in its edition of August 17, 1967, said editorially:

> Essentially, his was a life of service. Aside from his profession, as well as education, banking and business interests, he served his community and country in many capacities when a man of his vast private interests might have begged off. But that would not have been Paul Bedford, the dedicated public official in peace and war. He loved the America of his forebears and demonstrated it on so many occasions when he shared his time and talents as duty called.

Having known well Paul Bedford for the many years that I did, I heartily concur in these sentiments.

Those who are and have been associated with Princeton University, his alma mater, will remember him kindly for the enormous contributions he made during his lifetime to that distinguished university.

And all of us in Wilkes-Barre and vicinity will remember him with equal affection for his contributions to a better life for all of the citizens in that area.

As part of my remarks today, Mr. Speaker, I include a news article of August 16, 1967, as well as an editorial of August 17 on the death of Attorney Bedford which appeared in the Wilkes-Barre Times Leader Evening News.

The aforementioned articles follow:

ATTORNEY PAUL BEDFORD, 92, IS CLAIMED BY DEATH

Attorney Paul Bedford, 92, of 96 West South Street, Wilkes-Barre, died this afternoon at 1 in Mercy Hospital where he was admitted June 30 as a medical patient. He had been ill since June 15, when he was stricken while attending the 70th anniversary reunion of his class at Princeton University. He was a patient at the University of Pennsylvania Hospital, Philadelphia, prior to being transferred to Mercy Hospital.

Attorney Bedford was widely known as a corporation lawyer, banker and benefactor. He was chief counsel for the Delaware & Hudson Railroad, succeeding his father, George Bedford, who filled that position from 1883 until his retirement in 1913, and the Vulcan Iron Works, Wilkes-Barre.

He recently retired as chief counsel and board member of the D & H and also ended a long tenure as chief counsel of the Miners National Bank of Wilkes-Barre where he was senior member of the board.

Among his many gifts to the community, church, and colleges, are the athletic field for intramural sports and a new building for the music department at Princeton. He also assisted his wife, the late Gertrude Vaughn Bedford, in the operation of the Wheel Chair Club, Inc., now a world wide organization in charge of the Kiwanis Club of Wilkes-Barre.

LAW DEGREE IN 1899

Born June 24, 1875 in Wilkes-Barre, he was educated at the Harry Hillman Academy, Wilkes-Barre, and was graduated from Princeton in 1897. He received his law degree in 1899 at the University of Pennsylvania Law School. He was admitted to the Luzerne County Bar July 14, 1900 and immediately began his law practice with his father in the Miners National Bank building, Wilkes-Barre.

The law firm of Bedford, Jones, McGuigan and Waller was one of the most famous corporation law firms of the day. Attorney Bedford was senior member of the firm now known as Bedford, Waller, Griffith, Darling, and Mitchell. He became assistant district attorney of Luzerne County in 1913 and in 1921 was elected President of the Board of Assessment for Revision of Taxes in Luzerne County.

During World War I he was assistant solicitor of the United States Railroad Administration, a Four-Minute Man in the Liberty Loan and Red Cross campaigns and a member of the Legal Advisory Board.

Atty. Bedford was honored as a life trustee of the Mercy Hospital, First Presbyterian Church, Osterhout Library, all of Wilkes-Barre and served as president of the Home for the Friendless Children and a board member of the Pennsylvania Association for the Blind.

He became a member of the board of trustees of Princeton University in 1930 and served on the athletic council and motivated the program for the establishment of a music appreciation course at the institution of higher learning.

On the occasion of his 80th birthday, Friends of Music at Princeton University honored him with a concert on the campus.

DONATED ATHLETIC FIELD

He donated the athletic field bearing his name for use in intramural sports by Princeton students "To give every student who is unable to play on varsity teams a chance for healthful recreation." He also was chairman of the music committee of the board of trustees.

He held the distinction of having served as chairman of the Commencement Committee at Princeton University for more than a decade and served on the Graduate Council since 1921. He was a former president and secretary-treasurer of the Princeton Alumni Association and a member of the Nassau and Elm Clubs and the Princeton clubs of Philadelphia and Northeastern Pennsylvania.

He was also affiliated with the Bankers Club of New York City, the Westmoreland Club, Wilkes-Barre; Scranton Club, Scranton; Zeta Psi Fraternity; American Bar Association, Pennsylvania Bar Association and the Law and Library Association of Luzerne County.

He often times described himself as "a native-born Democrat" and served as a member of the Democratic State Committee and the finance committee of the National Democratic organization. In his later years, he preferred to give his support "to men and issues, not parties and platforms," and became an independent.

Upon the death of Mayor Daniel Hart of Wilkes-Barre, Atty. Bedford was assured the appointment to complete the unexpired term of the city's famed playwright mayor but declined the offer. He has previously directed the Community "War" Chest at a time described "as one of the most difficult periods in the history of the organization" and was credited with restoring it to a stable unit. The organization was a combination of the Community Welfare Federation and the National Ward Fund which he consolidated in the 1943 campaign.

A member of an outstanding family residing in the Wyoming Valley and Luzerne County regions for more than a century and a half, Atty. Bedford was recognized as one of the leading lawyers and financiers of his generation. He was a descendant of Jacob Bedford. * * *

DISTINGUISHED NATIVE SON, PAUL BEDFORD: 1875–1967

Although Paul Bedford's life had run its full course at 92, it will be particularly difficult for his native Wilkes-Barre and his beloved alma mater, Princeton University, to bid farewell to so distinguished a native son in the one instance and to so loyal an alumnus in the other.

In New York and Philadelphia, in towns big and small, in the legal profesion where he was a towering figure for 67 years, in banking and railroad circles, he will be missed, for he was nationally known.

Above all, his vacant chair will revive memories for associates and other intimates who knew him as the genial host or guest, as the occasion might be, in his leisure moments when he was such a delightful companion.

He was indeed a complete life and extended into so many fields it is difficult to cover them adequately.

A man, whose roots were deep in the soil of colonial America, in his person the glorious past of the country was linked with its promising future. For 70 of his adult years, he made a substantial contribution to its betterment.

Essentially, his was a life of service. Aside from his profession, as well as education, banking and business interests, he served his community and country in many capacities when a man of his vast private interests might have begged off. But that would not have been Paul Bedford, the dedicated public official in peace and war. He loved the America of his forebears and demonstrated it on so many occasions when he shared his time and talents as duty called.

Athough he was a "native-born Democrat" by his own words and served his party in the Commonwealth and nationally, he was an independent in politics, more or less, in his later years, always putting the public welfare before personal considerations and party.

His benefactions to his home town and to Princeton were so extensive that he easily qualified for the accolade of philanthropist. The public, through the Community Welfare Federation, predecessor of the United Fund, was deeply indebted to him for leadership when it came upon difficult days. He also shared his wife's interests in the internationally known Wheelchair Club she founded and played a leading role in it behind the scenes.

There is far more to be told about Paul Bedford, as the files of this newspaper and the official records will testify. At Princeton, for example, he held a dozen offices, and his activities could fill a book in themselves.

So long as there is a Wilkes-Barre, a Princeton University or even a world, the names of Paul and Gertrude Vaughn Bedford will be remembered with respect and gratitude. Even though death has come inevitably to both, they will live on in their good works and achievements, as well as in the hearts of uncounted thousands.

Election Observers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK BROOKS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 30, 1967

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, recently there has been an outbreak of charges and rash statements by individuals decrying the forthcoming elections in Vietnam. While these purveyors of vague allegations have no basis of expertise other than their own self-proclaimed infallibility in all fields of national policy, they do receive an unusual coverage in the media.

In order to remove this confusion and to insure a valid evalution of the fairness and effectiveness of the election process in South Vietnam, President Johnson has dispatched a bipartisan committee to observe and to make their report to the American people. This delegation of outstanding Americans from all walks of life will contribute substantially to setting the record clear as to the true facts of this important election.

An editorial, which expresses the reaction of most Americans, appeared in the August 25 edition of the Beaumont Enterprise, a distinguished newspaper published in southeast Texas.

So that my colleagues can read this editorial comment, the complete text follows:

Election Observers

It is inevitable that some candidate or group of candidates in the South Vietnam election will brand as interference President Johnson's dispatch of a delegation of Americans to observe the campaign and balloting.

It is certain, too, that the more severe critics of the administration's war policies will cook up some reason for voicing objection.

We believe, however, that the White House decision was in the public interest, perhaps also in the interest of the Vietnamese.

Most Americans will feel that the presence of a score or more outstanding citizens in South Vietnam at this time will contribute to public enlightenment in this country on a matter that is of vital importance both to the future of the Vietnamese and to the future military and political policies of the United States in Southeast Asia.

Moreover, most Americans must believe that the presence of the observers could be instrumental in making the election reasonably clean and its outcome acceptable to all parties.

President Johnson is to be commended for selecting a delegation of such collective high caliber, and for the way his choices cross political and other lines.

This variety makes for confidence in the group's efforts.

Cardinal Joseph Mindszenty Celebrated His 75th Birthday at the U.S. Embassy in Budapest

SPEECH

OF

HON. JAMES J. DELANEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 24, 1967

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have this opportunity to join my colleagues in paying tribute to Joseph Cardinal Mindszenty, the heroic Hungarian martyr to the cause of religious liberty.

As one of history's great religious leaders, the cardinal always has been outspoken in defense of individual freedom. He opposed the anti-Semitic excesses of the Nazis and fought valiantly against the tyrannical measures of the Communist puppet regime of his own country. For his devotion to justice and liberty, this man of God was ignominiously arrested, tried on unfounded charges, and sentenced to prison for life. There he remained in torment for 7 years until rescued by the heroic Hungarian freedom fighters in 1956. He was immediately given asylum by the American legation where he has remained ever since, and just recently celebrated his 75th birthday.

Cardinal Mindszenty is not only revered and honored by the Hungarian people, but symbolizes the world man's resolute belief in the ultimate supremacy of the spiritual life over gross materialism. He is an inspiration to all of us and will continue to be to generations not yet born.

I share the hope of people throughout the world that the Communist regime of Hungary will soon find the courage to set this holy man free, so that he may once again walk in dignity among his people.

The Agony of War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN O. MARSH, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1967

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, there is a side of the war that we frequently fail to see and often is not reported in press accounts. This side of the war portrays the Vietcong and their indiscriminate terrorist attacks where the victims are innocent bystanders caught up in these acts of violence. An Associated Press story, which appeared today in the Northern Virginia Daily, of Strasburg, Va., points up, in a dramatic but heartrending way, the agony and suffering the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese Army inflict on those who happen to be in their way.

This story of the suffering of a 7-year-old boy portrays graphically the reason why we are in Vietnam. I do not recall having seen this story in other papers, and I think it is unfortunate that it may not have been carried in many major metropolitan newspapers, because it gives a picture of the war that is too often neglected. For that reason, I bring it to the attention of the House.

The Agony of War: A Brave Little Boy Tried Not To Cry, but Pain Was Too Much

Can Tho, Vietnam.—His tiny chest throbbed with pain from the shell fragments that tore into his body. His eyes were filled with all the agonies of war.

He was a brave little boy. He did not cry, at least not aloud, not at first, when one of the wounds in his back began to hemorrhage. His lips trembled, his eyes quivered and he whimpered softly.

Then the pain and fear became more than a boy of 7 could contain, even with his wounded grandmother, her own face pocked with superficial shrapnel wounds, at his side. And so finally, he screamed.

His mother could not come to him. She lay wounded in the same hospital in a bed only a few feet away. She seemed to recognize her son's voice when he cried out. She turned on her side and looked at him forlornly across the aisle of the hospital ward.

The boy, his mother and her mother were the victims early Sunday of a Viet Cong mortar shelling of Can Tho that left 46 persons dead and 222 wounded.

The South Vietnamese provincial hospital in this Mekong delta city 80 miles southwest of Saigon was filled with men, women and children wounded in the attack. There were perhaps 100 persons jammed into the main ward. With the wounded were their families who remained at their side, as is the custom of the Vietnamese.

Outside, American medics loaded some patients into ambulances for evacuation to other hospitals where they could receive specialized treatment.

A crowd gathered around one middle-aged woman on a stretcher. Her arms and legs moved erratically. Her facial muscles twitched. Her eyes made a jerking movement.

She had suffered a compressed skull fracture in the Viet Cong shelling that poured more than 100 rounds of fire at several areas in this city of 118,000 persons.

"Let's tie her feet together because she's having a convulsion," shouted one American medic as the men hoisted the stretcher. She would be transferred to a hospital that had a resident neurosurgical specialist.

After the shelling, which lasted about 10 minutes, the wounded began to pour into the hospital. Some were carried in on stretchers by their relatives; several children with superficial shrapnel wounds walked in with their parents.

"It was a mess," said Betty Stahl, 26, of Chisholm, Minn., an American civilian nurse working at the hospital under the auspices of the U.S. Agency for International Development.

Miss Stahl said 163 persons were brought in during the night and more later in the morning.

"They were all over the floor," she said. "We didn't have beds to put them in." She estimated that perhaps 60 to 65 per cent of the wounded were women and children.

The Tortoise and the Jet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GILBERT GUDE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 30, 1967

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, a plan to develop the island of Aldabra, a natural laboratory of biology in the Indian Ocean, for use by the United States and British Air Forces for jet and other military uses brings about a confrontation and possible conflict between two great fields of science: military science and its related technology, and biological science, specifically the study of ecology and evolution.

To me, both of these sciences are necessary to the survival of modern man. Free man has not yet found a means to survive without military science.

The need for the maintenance and development of biological science is less dramatic, but just as essential. Indeed, biological science contributes much to the supporting knowledge of military science as well as to some of the so-called glamour sciences of today. For example, the need for biological research and knowledge in support of space exploration is well known.

The island of Aldabra is a small coral atoll near Africa and Madagascar which has an importance to the natural sciences far exceeding its physical size. The 30 species of plant and animal life unique to Aldabra, as well as the rare giant land tortoise which resides there, attest to its value as an area where studies of genetics and evolution could be invaluable. The erection of military facilities would forever destroy Aldabra's scientific research potential. Military science could well have a Pyrrhic victory if it impoverished the scientific world by invading this small Pacific island.

The Smithsonian Institution and the National Academy of Science, as well as other national and international science organizations, are to be commended for their opposition to such a military invasion of Aldabra.

To this end, I would like to bring to the attention of the House an editorial, "The Tortoise and the Jet," which appeared in Science, a journal of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, on July 21, 1967:

THE TORTOISE AND THE JET

(By Deal Wolfle)

The tortoise beat the hare. Can it also beat the jet? The racetrack is Aldabra, an uplifted coral atoll in the Indian Ocean, 260 miles northwest of Madagascar and 400 miles east of Africa. The tortoise is the giant land tortoise, and Aldabra is its only remaining home in the Indian Ocean. The jets are of the United States and British air forces, which want to develop Aldabra for military use.

Obscure and almost uninhabited, Aldabra has a rich and unique ecosystem. It is the breeding place of the frigate bird for the entire Indian Ocean, and home of the last colony of flightless birds in the Indian Ocean. Of its 22 species of land birds, 12 species or subspecies are found nowhere else. About a quarter of its species of invertebrates are believed to be found only on the island. Aldabra is a major breeding place of the increasingly rare edible green turtle and the hawksbill turtle. Of some 175 species of higher plants known on the island, 18 or more are unique. When still undisturbed, such islands provide ideal opportunities to study evolutionary processes. Aldabra is the ecologically richer of the last two nearly undisturbed uplifted coral atolls in the world. Raymond Fosberg, of the National Academy of Sciences staff, calls the island "scientifically, the most important area of its size remaining in that part of the world." The Royal Society is sending an expedition there in August and would like to establish a small, permanent research station.

With support from the National Academy of Sciences, the Smithsonian Institution, and several international organizations, the Royal Society has proposed that Aldabra be totally preserved for scientific investigations, and in May it so recommended to the British Secretary of State for Defence. The air forces, however, need an airfield in that region and consider other islands much less satisfactory. The Secretary promised to consider the Royal Society recommendation and said that, if the decision is made to go ahead with military development, "our object . . . would be to make sure that changes in the ecosystem of the island are kept to a minimum."

But it is doubtful that there can be dual use. The atoll is too small. Road, harbor, causeway, and other construction would bring major physical alterations and connect the now separated islands of the atoll. The larger birds would be a hazard to aircraft, and some species would probably have to be exterminated. The home of the giant land tortoise is precisely the best part of the island for airfield construction. The suggestion that the airfield be surrounded by a wall seems unsatisfactory. A wall could exclude the tortoise, the flightless birds, and some other animals, but could not contain their imported enemies. Nor is temporary development and use a satisfactory compromise; once a species is destroyed, or an environment drastically invaded, there is no return to the original state. The current program to study with little remains of native Hawaiian plant and animal life is evidence of the need to study island ecologies before invasion brings ecological chaos.

Will the jet replace the tortoise on Aldabra? Perhaps. Military needs rightfully have high priority, and man has powerful weapons. He can win over tortoises, passenger pigeons, the blue whale, the Great Auk, the Moa, and other animals, and he can win most easily in the fragile ecology of a small island. The decision between the tortoise and the jet will be a governmental and a political one. The jet can win, but the more virgin areas we destroy, the more we impoverish our natural heritage. British and American government councils must weigh this fact in deciding whether to build on Aldabra or elsewhere.

Hawaii Lauded for Its Aloha Spirit by Recent Visitors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 30, 1967

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, the American Bar Association has just concluded its 90th annual convention in Hawaii, and it has been estimated that some 14,000 lawyers, judges, and their families enjoyed the incomparable beauty of the Island State while attending the many functions in connection with the convention. I had the privilege of participating in this convention, which brought the largest group of visitors to the 50th State.

In addition to the influx of convention visitors, Hawaii has also seen an increasing number of servicemen coming to Hawaii from Vietnam for rest and recreation leave. In its year of growth, the R. & R. program in Hawaii has developed from one flight a week in August of 1966, to a high of 42 flights a month during May and June of this year. As of August 3, 288 flights have been processed with an average of 158 men per flight. Approximately 70 percent of the men on each flight are joined by their dependents from the mainland, and to date over 31,000 wives have come to Hawaii. In addition, many children, parents, and relatives have been coming to Hawaii to meet the servicemen during their R. & R.

I mentiond these figures, Mr. Speaker, merely to emphasize that despite the increasing number of visitors to Hawaii, there has been no diminishing of the spirit of aloha on the part of the people of Hawaii.

This friendly hospitality by the special name of "aloha" which pervades the Hawaiian Islands continue to bring warm responses from those who come in contact with it. In this regard, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues two letters to the editor of the Honolulu Advertiser from recent ABA and R. & R. visitors to Hawaii, as they appeared in the August 21, 1967, issue of the Advertiser:

ABA LAWYER ON ALOHA

As a recent visitor to the American Bar Association convention in Honolulu, I want to express my appreciation for the uniform courtesy with which we were received.

I regularly attend the American Bar conventions which are held all over the United States. I do not think I have ever attended one anywhere where the hotel employes, taxi drivers, store clerks, and other persons with whom a conventioneer normally comes in contact gave such an impression of hospitality.

We had the feeling that Hawaii was glad to see us.

WALTER D. HANSON,
Oklahoma City, Okla.

HOW WAS R. & R.?

My husband and I recently spent a week on your beautiful island. We were there during one of my husband's "rest and recuperation" periods and were overwhelmed by the kindness of the people there.

Besides the very generous monetary benefits given to servicemen and their families, we were made to feel truly welcome everywhere we went. We shall long remember our stay in the 50th State and the kindness of its people.

Lt. & Mrs. LARRY M. TUCKER.

For Rent Supplements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 16, 1967

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago, I spoke in the House in favor of the rent supplement program. Because of the importance of this program in curing the blight of substandard housing, which is unquestionably one of the major causes of intercity tension. I insert the following editorial from the Cleveland Press of August 25, 1967, and urge Members of the House to reconsider and act favorably on this essential Federal program:

FOR RENT SUPPLEMENTS

Happily, reports of the collapse of the federal rent supplements program were premature. Two encouraging developments, one in Cleveland, make the outlook brighter:

In Cleveland the Catholic Diocese has launched a five-million-dollar housing rehabilitation project in the Hough Area, and has received an initial federal rent supplement allocation of $67,200 that will help pay rent on the first 66 units to be improved.

In Washington the Senate's potent minority leader, Everett Dirksen, as well as 10 other GOP senators have shifted from opposition to support of legislation which would expand the important program.

This should go far in overturning the House vote in May which turned down the Administration's request for an expansion to $72,000,000 a year from the present inadequate $32,000,000.

Better housing of course, is no panacea for the problems of the very poor. It will not in itself raise incomes or provide better education. Yet, as survey after survey has shown, substandard housing is a major reason for discontent in the ghettos. And, despite all the public and private programs of the past 30 years, bad housing of the poor remains a mammoth national problem.

The rent supplement plan, approved by Congress for the first time in 1965, is only one of several approaches in attacking substandard housing. But it has special merit.

Key idea behind rent supplements is that they will stimulate private construction of decent housing for poor people much faster than can be done through public housing. They seem to be doing that.

The rent supplement tenant, who must qualify for public housing, starts out by paying one-fourth of his income for rent but then doesn't have to move as in public housing when his income goes up. He simply pays a greater share of the rent and the government pays less.

Subsidized housing long has been and remains an essential in seeking to improve the lot of the poor. The still new idea of federal rent supplements seems to be a desirable alternative in this field.

The Real Price of War: Alienation of Younger Generation Counts for More Than Dollars and Diplomacy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DON EDWARDS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 30, 1967

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, many of us have expressed concern about the tremendous and burdensome cost of the war in Vietnam, in terms of our national economics and resources and our international role. The following comment from Joseph Kraft, appearing in the Washington Post on August 27, 1967, shows us the most serious and long-ranging cost of this tragedy—the alienation of young people today, young people whose ideals and energy are being destroyed by a war which, as Kraft points out, is regarded as an "utter absurdity."

I urge my colleagues attention to this penetrating editorial, which follows below:

THE REAL PRICE OF WAR: ALIENATION OF YOUNGER GENERATION COUNTS FOR MORE THAN DOLLARS AND DIPLOMACY

(By Joseph Kraft)

EN ROUTE TO SAIGON.—Returning once more to Vietnam, I find myself brooding on one of the strangest features of this strangest of wars—its cost.

By a curious quirk, the costs that have loomed largest—the costs in international safety and in national resources—have turned out to be relatively minimal. Conversely, the cost that is proving truly burdensome—the cost of turning off the best part of our younger generation—is so unfamiliar as to be almost impossible to grasp.

Consider, for a start, the diplomatic cost. The great danger at all times has seemed to be that the fighting in Vietnam would wind up to a direct confrontation with China or Russia.

But the coming apart of Maoism has sharply reduced the prospects of effective Chinese entry. Rivalry with China inside the bloc has turned the Soviet Union against anything that would mean victory for the Asian Communists.

To be sure, Washington's traditional allies in Western Europe have almost no sympathy for the American effort in Vietnam. But as long as the Russians are not making a fuss, the Europeans are prepared to swallow their doubts. And thus diplomatically, the Vietnamese war costs the United States a pittance.

The dent in national resources is not much greater. As an absolute number, the $25 billion spent annually on the war looks astronomical. But it is only a tiny fraction of the gross national product and less than half the expected gain in GNP for this year. Certainly the war has not made anybody poorer. Indeed, unless the money now being spent on Vietnam were voted for other Federal projects, the absence of the war would probably mean the onset of a recession.

As a portion of the Federal budget, the war expenses bulk large. Since the wave of race troubles, it has seemed to many that money spent on the war is money taken away from Great Society programs for improving life in the Negro ghettos. But personally, I do not believe it.

Except for the overwhelmingly liberal Congress which resulted from the freak election of 1964, the temper on Capitol Hill has consistently gone against heavy new spending for Negroes. Had there been no Vietnamese war, had there been a Federal surplus this year, it would surely not have been voted for new Federal programs, still less for a Marshall Plan to help the Negro community. The surplus would have been distributed back to the states, or perhaps even to individuals in the form of another tax cut.

No doubt the Vietnamese war has made it easier for Congress to deny funds to Great Society projects. The present conflict, like past conflicts, has promoted a kind of jingoistic know-nothingism which finds expression in a drive for all-out war at the expense of anything which is humane.

But here begins the realm of social costs. And in this realm the jingoistic surge—a phenomenon so often met and mastered in the past—is small beer. The big social cost arises from the impact of the war on the younger generation, on those below 30.

This generation is the first generation of the Affluent Society, the first generation in history which has seen millions of its members brought up without fear of economic privation or immediate external threat. It was bound to make things hot for those of us who are older—bound, in particular, to be skeptical about many of the arrangements accepted in the name of economic and national security.

But on top of that there has come the Vietnamese war. And my clear conviction, after extensive visits to campuses across the country, is that the best elements among the best students at the best schools are bitterly opposed to the war, that they regard it as an utter absurdity, a betrayal of the American ideal by corrupt and frightened men.

The result is that a very large percentage of the younger generation is contracting out. Whether as hippies or pacifists or new radicals or synical academic draft-dodgers, they have turned away from productive participation in the work of the Nation.

The cost of this turning away cannot be measured. But as an advanced society, the United States is peculiarly dependent on the contributions of its most sophisticated people, on what Prof. Galbraith has called the educational and scientific establishment. Thus I go out to Vietnam feeling that the cost of the war—the cost of turning off the younger generation—is staggering, and that we will still be paying it years after the ugly little war is only a bad memory.

Travel at Home

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD T. HANNA
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 10, 1967

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to a resolution adopted at the 1967 annual meeting, Western Governors' Conference, June 28, 1967, concerning travel-recreation research and the 1970 national census.

I believe this to be an important area that should be fully explored because the encouragement of foreign travel in the United States, as well as domestic travel, could contribute enormously in alleviating our balance-of-payments dilemma.

I have often shown my interest in the development of this profitable aspect of world trade and have introduced a bill, H.R. 439, to amend the International Travel Act of 1961, in order to promote travel in the United States. I would like to commend the Western Governors' Conference for recognizing this need of our country.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY 1967 ANNUAL MEETING, WESTERN GOVERNORS' CONFERENCE, JUNE 28, 1967, WEST YELLOWSTONE, MONT.

V. TRAVEL RESEARCH

Whereas, There is a need for adequate and uniform research on the dimensions of the travel-recreation industry; and

Whereas, The Bureau of the Census will undertake a national census in 1970 to gather valuable information about the nation; and

Whereas, The Western Governors' Travel Council has asked that significant questions about travel and recreation be included in the Census;

Now, therefore, be it resolved, That the Western Governors' Conference petition the Bureau of the Census to include a number of pertinent questions about travel and recreation in the 1970 Census; and

Be it further resolved, That the Western Governors' Travel Council and other travel-related organizations of the western states submit recommended questions to the Bureau of the Census for this study.

President Johnson's Vietnam Election Endeavors Receiving Strong Support From the Nation's Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 30, 1967

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, national editorial opinion is giving continued strong support to President Johnson's efforts to encourage free, democratic elections in Vietnam.

The President has asked a highly respected and representative group of American leaders to visit Vietnam during the election campaign. I was pleased to see that among this group was the distinguished Governor of my State of New Jersey, the exceptionally able Richard Hughes.

In addition, the President has rightfully cautioned us on applying wholly American standards to institutions or events in other nations.

South Vietnam is valiantly struggling to maintain its independence, while at the same time trying to carry out free elections which will select a representative national government. This is a feat which even large nations might find difficult, let alone a small beseiged nation like South Vietnam.

We have no evidence of large-scale election fraud in South Vietnam; but we do have evidence to the contrary that the campaign is almost as open and as uninhibited as a free-wheeling American political campaign. Let us not confuse campaign rhetoric with charges of fraud.

President Johnson is absolutely right when he says that this is a time for American perseverance on the military side, continued efforts on the negotiating side, and patience and understanding on the electoral side.

I insert in the RECORD two forceful editorials from the Independent Anderson of South Carolina and the Baltimore News-American which commend the President on his efforts to encourage the new democracy being born in South Vietnam:

[From the Independent, Anderson (S.C.), Aug. 23, 1967]

THE BIRTH OF A NATION IS NOT EASY—WE NEED RECALL SOME U.S. HISTORY

Taking note publicly for the first time of the criticisms of the forthcoming election in South Vietnam, President Johnson drew a parallel between it and the struggle for independence in this country 200 years ago.

In particular, he was answering Senators Robert F. Kennedy and Jacob K. Javits of New York, loudest in their cries of "foul" before the election is even held.

But what he had to say is a needed lesson in history for all Americans.

"We Americans should understand the pain of that process (of fighting for freedom). For our nation was not born easily. There were times in the years of the 18th century when it seemed as if we might not be born at all.

"During the hard days of fighting for our independence, some would not fight at all. Some people would not pay taxes; some states would not meet their levies of men and money; some men were so devoted to colonial power that they fled abroad.

"But there were—and we thank God for this—enough brave men to bear the burden; there were enough dedicated men to endure year after year of war and suffering; and there were allies who stood with us in the darkest hours, and we prevailed. After 13 years of war and political strife we prevailed.

"Given that background, we ought not to be astonished that this struggle in Vietnam continues. We ought not to be astonished that the nation, racked by a war of insurgency and beset by its neighbors to the north, has not already emerged, full-blown, as a perfect model of two-party democracy."

What South Vietnamese have politically is considerable. They elected their own representatives to a Constituent Assembly; that Assembly wrote a democratic constitution; local elections were held in the villages where security permitted; a national campaign for president and vice-president is on the way; the members of a new Senate will be chosen at the same time and members of a House of Representatives the following month.

Instead of criticizing, Congress should hail these accomplishments and cheer the people of South Vietnam on their way to representative self-government.

[From the News American, Aug. 23, 1967]

ELECTION JITTERS

Those who have expressed anxiety about the prospective fairness of South Vietnam's election may now, paradoxically, be more apprehensive than ever. This is because of increasing indications that the election is indeed fair, in fact more so than almost anyone would have expected. This confounds those critics of the election whose true purpose is not the establishment of a valid electoral process, but undermining of American policy in Vietnam.

Speaking at a lively turn-out at the city of Nha Trang, candidate Tran Van Huong, a former premier and bitter opponent of incumbent Premier Nguyen Cao Ky, is quoted as saying: "I believe the local government authorities did all they could to make this rally a success." He is thus informing the world that agencies of a government he is seeking to unseat have exerted their authority on his behalf and placed their facilities at his disposal.

Such actions would be remarkable in a country enjoying a peaceful atmosphere and long Democratic tradition. South Vietnam has neither and it is, in fact, astonishing that an election is being held there at all. Yet these aspects of the forthcoming contest seem to have been ignored by those critics, in Congress and elsewhere, who have indulged in solemn and ill-informed carping about "unfairness," etc.

This can only mean that the South Vietnamese elections have been seized by those critics as one more peg on which to hang their true intent—unilateral American withdrawal from South Vietnam, regardless of commitments and consequences. They are grasping at any issue to accomplish this. They would, in fact, be delighted if the South Vietnamese election proved to be a travesty, and are undoubtedly chagrined at the obvious indications that it will not.

Bridges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 30, 1967

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, an assistance program to buy the materials to build a dam or to develop an industry is more than money.

In a small developing nation, such a program can foster the hope of a better economy. It means that with hard work a nation can assure a better standard of living and better health to its people.

It can lead the way to a stable political and social climate able to withstand the forces of aggression and destruction from without and within.

And when two nations work together in this way, it can help to bridge the gap of fear and distrust between them.

While not in any way perfect, our foreign aid programs have done these things.

When we as a nation, well able to afford such assistance, turn our back, we destroy these hopes and these bridges. We make it more likely that the developing nations will turn to other nations and other systems to see their hopes accomplished.

These matters deserve our deep and serious consideration.

The Washington Post, on August 26, referred to the legislation passed by this House as the "Foreign Aid Nightmare," much in need of being repaired by the conference committee.

Mr. Speaker, the editorial had an important message, and I call it to the attention of our colleagues by inserting it in the RECORD at this point:

FOREIGN AID NIGHTMARE

A nightmare seized the House in its discussion—one shrinks from the word deliberation—on the foreign aid bill. Grown men acted like adolescents spiting an erstwhile girl friend. Otherwise responsible Congressmen allowed themselves to be guided by escapism and frustration. The effect of 1400 pages of House testimony on the bill evaporated in an atmosphere of partnership, phony economy and cheap demagoguery. As the evening wore on, tides of fatigue and caprice swept the national interest out to sea.

The resulting bill authorizing a sum of $2.8 billion only sketches the outlines of the wreckage. The Senate had voted only $2.6 billion, and the appropriations hurdle remains to come. For the first time in the history of postwar foreign aid, the authorization is under $3 billion—at a moment when the Nation's capacity to give has never been greater. The House passed the bill by a margin of only eight votes. Had a handful of Congressmen changed their minds, there would have been no foreign-aid program at all.

How vain for the United States to claim to be a great power, with global interests, responsibilities or commitments, as you will, if the Congress cannot muster the maturity to give unequivocal support to foreign aid! How irrelevant is any tug of war between Executive and legislative branches over foreign policy control in the light of the Senate's and House's performance on this bill!

Consider development loans, repayable on easy terms in dollars; they are the basic instrument for helping the economies of poor countries to support their own needs. The Administration asked $774 million, the Senate voted $500 million and the House, not to be outdone in narrowness, cut that back to $450 million. Vital programs in Turkey, Korea, India and Pakistan will be hurt most. Adding salt to the wound, the House confirmed the Senate's earlier folly in doubling the service charge on the so-called grace period of these loans.

Alliance for Progress programs were voted only $578 million (the Senate figure), against a request of $643 million. This was done in a year when President Johnson, clearly bespeaking the intent of Congress, gave Latin America an urgent push along the self-help road. By its parsimony, the Congress not only undercuts American hemispheric leadership but virtually invites Latins to listen to local guerrillas or Communists overseas.

Technical assistance funds were sliced from $243 to $210 million (the Senate figure), despite evidence that these funds are perhaps the most effective stimulus to local growth. One result will be to end AID programs in Africa. A warmer welcome to chaos and despair, in a whole continent, could scarcely be imagined.

It was in the policy amendments, however, that the House shamed itself most. Without having the foggiest notion of what it was about, the House eliminated the President's entire authority to sell arms on credit; it did this even while retaining the vehicles by which that authority is exercised, including the controversial Pentagon revolving fund. We favor tighter congressional oversight in arms sales, but the President should not be stripped of all authority to act.

The House also reimposed tariff discrimination on Poland because of its arms sales to Hanoi—an ineffective gesture destroying an important "bridge" to Eastern Europe. It also forbade training military personnel from countries with which the United States has no diplomatic relations—a ban that would prevent this country from keeping a hand in with certain Arab countries.

It will probably take several days to sort out all the damage the House did in its 15-hour, 50-amendment ramble. Much of the damage, unfortunately, is beyond the repair of the Senate-House conference. What can be saved there must be saved. Meanwhile, the country owes itself a deep look at its own heart to see how it has come to this pass.

South Vietnam Needs a National Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD J. IRWIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 24, 1967

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, in the midst of much criticism in this country over the prospective elections in South Vietnam, one of Connecticut's newspapers, the Hartford Courant, has come forth with an excellent editorial which lends some needed perspective on what should and can be expected from a country wracked by war and wanting in years of democratic experience.

Vietnam has made an important political step in formulating a constitution and in running elections. This beginning should not be belitted by a people who pride their own past struggles in founding a democratic nation and who have so much at stake in Vietnam. As the editorial suggests, Americans should wish the new Government of Vietnam well rather than smirk at the results from our sophistication 6,000 miles away. The Hartford Courant editorial of August 29 follows:

SOUTH VIETNAM NEEDS A NATIONAL GOVERNMENT

All the anguished cries about irregularities in Sunday's upcoming Vietnam election seem to be aimed at the incumbent military slate of General Nguyen Van Thieu and Premier Nguyen Cao Ky. They've got most of the government and military establishment of a million people working for them, ostensibly out on official visits. The 10 rival civilian slates have been electioneering largely on this issue, instead of presenting any concrete programs of their own.

It might be well for Americans to take a closer look at this nation and its first open election before they start judging it in American terms. Here is a country that has been wracked by war, religious differences, corruption, and a dizzying succession of inept governments over the years. Its voters are mostly illiterate peasants who need party symbols to cast their ballots. There is little or no sense of national purpose in the thousands of hamlets, even those under Saigon's control. Anyone who expected a politically sophisticated campaign based on our codes to come out of this background is naive.

The Thieu-Ky ticket is believed the odds-on favorite, even by those who discount charges of poll-rigging. They are well known; they have been in the spotlight over the last two years of military government. They undoubtedly have used their offices as springboards for their candidacies—and this charge, it might be noted, is not unknown in American policies. General Thieu is predicting 40 per cent of the vote, and Ky things they'll get a majority. And, no matter what happens, you can be sure of one result: a loud wail of fraud from all the losers the morning after. That is par for the course in any of these new republics that have given the people the vote.

But what must not be lost sight of is that a national election is being held, one that has at least excited the Vietnamese people into thinking nationally. It also has seemed significant enough to the Vietcong that they have been doing their best to terrify the South Vietnamese from taking part. A Senatorial slate as well as a Presidential slate is running, and the Senatorial candidates are generally high-caliber men. All the candidates are risking Vietcong assassination by seeking seats in the new government.

It is a cinch that South Vietnam must have a national government if this nation is to honor its commitment there. If the new national government, to be formed after an election for House seats in October, can engender a sense of national purpose, it will have achieved a long step. It will face a host of problems—corruption, security, land ownership, education, production—and they are not easy or quick to solve. Americans, even those who despise our Vietnam policy and generals per se, would do far better to wish the government well as at least a crude expression of the people's will than to smirk at the results from their sophistication 6,000 miles away.

Memorial for Congressman Herman Toll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 29, 1967

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is with a deep sense of personal loss that I rise to pay tribute to our late colleague, Herman Toll. Although I only had the privilege of serving with him for one term, Herman Toll symbolizes to me the vitality and vision of his party and the people of Philadelphia who elected him to four successive terms in Congress.

Reviewing the career of Congressman Toll recalls to my mind the years when my own father was the Democratic leader of Philadelphia and the leader of our city's congressional delegation here in Washington. Although young at the time, I recall vividly the high opinion my father held of Herman Toll and the many instances in which they collaborated on legislation of value to their city and its people.

Such admiration is not difficult to understand. Herman Toll worked hard and long for his people and his district. To this fact I can testify personally. Since his retirement from Congress, I have represented part of his old Fourth District in Philadelphia. Time and again residents of that area have told me that, if I were to serve them as effectively as Congressman Toll, I would more than meet my responsibility as their Congressman.

His service, then, has been a model for me as it was an indispensable source of aid and support to my father.

Equally as valuable was his own work here in Washington. Intelligent, literate, and progressive, he was in the vanguard of legislators concerned about the problems of our cities. Through his service on the Judiciary Committee, he helped to shape the national conscience toward concern for civil rights, and the preservation of constitutional safeguards for all our citizens.

Although we shall no longer have the benefit of his hard work and good counsel, his spirit remains with us today. His efforts in behalf of his people are continued by the dedication of his wife, Rose, who has succeeded him as the Democratic Party's leader in his area. And here in this Chamber, his colleagues from the city of Philadelphia, myself included, will never cease to benefit from his example.

In conclusion, on behalf of myself and my family, I want to express my deepest sympathy to Herman Toll's wife and family. He was a credit to his district, his city, and his country.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402, at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H–112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

Office Address: Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20510

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey

Aiken, George D., *Vt*	
Allott, Gordon, *Colo*	
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.*	6 Wesley Circle
Baker, Howard H., Jr., *Tenn.*	
Bartlett, E. L., *Alaska*	
Bayh, Birch E., *Ind*	
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*	
Bible, Alan, *Nev*	
Boggs, J. Caleb, *Del*	
Brewster, Daniel B., *Md*	
Brooke, Edward W., *Mass*	
Burdick, Quentin N., *N. Dak.*	
Byrd, Harry F., Jr., *Va*	
Byrd, Robert C., *W. Va*	
Cannon, Howard W., *Nev*	
Carlson, Frank, *Kans*	Sheraton-Park
Case, Clifford P., *N.J*	
Church, Frank, *Idaho*	
Clark, Joseph S., *Pa*	
Cooper, John Sherman, *Ky*	
Cotton, Norris, *N.H*	
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr*	
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill*	
Dodd, Thomas J., *Conn*	
Dominick, Peter H., *Colo*	
Eastland, James O., *Miss*	
Ellender, Allen J., *La*	
Ervin, Sam J., Jr., *N.C*	
Fannin, Paul J., *Ariz*	
Fong, Hiram L., *Hawaii*	5519 Uppingham St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Fulbright, J. W., *Ark*	
Griffin, Robert P., *Mich*	
Gore, Albert, *Tenn*	
Gruening, Ernest, *Alaska*	
Hansen, Clifford P., *Wyo*	
Harris, Fred R., *Okla*	
Hart, Philip A., *Mich*	
Hartke, Vance, *Ind*	
Hatfield, Mark, *Oreg*	
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz*	
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa*	5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala*	
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla*	Sheraton-Park
Hollings, Ernest F., *S.C*	
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr*	
Inouye, Daniel K., *Hawaii*	
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash*	
Javits, Jacob K., *N.Y*	
Jordan, B. Everett, *N.C*	
Jordan, Len B., *Idaho*	
Kennedy, Edward M., *Mass*	
Kennedy, Robert F., *N.Y*	
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif*	
Lausche, Frank J., *Ohio*	
Long, Edward V., *Mo*	
Long, Russell B., *La*	
McCarthy, Eugene J., *Minn.*	5916 Bradley Blvd., Bethesda, Md.
McClellan, John L., *Ark*	
McGee, Gale W., *Wyo*	
McGovern, George, *S. Dak*	
McIntyre, Thomas J., *N.H*	
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.*	The Shoreham
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont*	
Metcalf, Lee, *Mont*	453 First St. SE.
Miller, Jack R., *Iowa*	5417 Kirkwood Dr., Bethesda, Md.
Mondale, Walter F., *Minn*	
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*	
Montoya, Joseph M., *N. Mex.*	
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg*	
Morton, Thruston B., *Ky*	
Moss, Frank E., *Utah*	
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak*	122 Schotts Court NE.
Murphy, George, *Calif*	
Muskie, Edmund S., *Maine*	
Nelson, Gaylord, *Wis*	
Pastore, John O., *R.I*	
Pearson, James B., *Kans*	
Pell, Claiborne, *R.I*	3425 Prospect St.
Percy, Charles H., *Ill*	
Prouty, Winston L., *Vt*	
Proxmire, William, *Wis*	
Randolph, Jennings, *W.Va*	4608 Reservoir Rd.
Ribicoff, Abraham A., *Conn*	
Russell, Richard B., *Ga*	
Scott, Hugh, *Pa*	
Smathers, George A., *Fla*	
Smith, Margaret Chase (Mrs.), *Maine.*	
Sparkman, John, *Ala*	4928 Indian Lane
Spong, William B., Jr., *Va*	
Stennis, John, *Miss*	
Symington, Stuart, *Mo*	
Talmadge, Herman E., *Ga*	
Thurmond, Strom, *S.C*	
Tower, John G., *Tex*	
Tydings, Joseph D., *Md*	
Williams, Harrison A., Jr., *N.J.*	
Williams, John J., *Del*	
Yarborough, Ralph, *Tex*	
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak*	Quebec House So.
Young, Stephen M., *Ohio*	

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Francis R. Valeo.
Sergeant at Arms—Robert G. Dunphy.
Chief Clerk—Darrell St. Claire.
Secretary for the Majority—J. S. Kimmitt.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences

Messrs. Anderson (chairman), Russell, Magnuson, Symington, Stennis, Young of Ohio, Dodd, Cannon, Holland, Mondale, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Hickenlooper, Curtis, Jordan of Idaho, Brooke, and Percy.

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Holland, Eastland, Talmadge, Jordan of North Carolina, McGovern, Montoya, Mondale, Byrd of Virginia, Hollings, Aiken, Young of North Dakota, Boggs, Miller, and Hatfield.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell, Ellender, Hill, McClellan, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Pastore, Monroney, Bible, Byrd of West Virginia, McGee, Mansfield, Bartlett, Proxmire, Yarborough, Young of North Dakota, Mundt, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Kuchel, Hruska, Allott, Cotton, Case, and Javits.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell (chairman), Stennis, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Cannon, Byrd of West Virginia, Young of Ohio, Inouye, McIntyre, Brewster, Byrd of Virginia, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Thurmond, Miller, Tower, Pearson, and Dominick.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Sparkman (chairman), Proxmire, Williams of New Jersey, Muskie, Long of Missouri, McIntyre, Mondale, McGee, Spong, Bennett, Tower, Hickenlooper, Brooke, and Percy.

Committee on Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Lausche, Bartlett, Hartke, Hart, Cannon, Brewster, Long of Louisiana, Moss, Hollings, Cotton, Morton, Scott, Prouty, Pearson, and Griffin.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Bible (chairman), Morse, Kennedy of New York, Tydings, Spong, Prouty, Dominick, and Morton.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Long of Louisiana (chairman), Smathers, Anderson, Gore, Talmadge, McCarthy, Hartke, Fulbright, Ribicoff, Metcalf, Harris, Williams of Delaware, Carlson, Bennett, Curtis, Morton, and Dirksen.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Sparkman, Mansfield, Morse, Gore, Lausche, Church, Symington, Dodd, Clark, Pell, McCarthy, Hickenlooper, Aiken, Carlson, Williams of Delaware, Mundt, Case, and Cooper.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Ervin, Gruening, Muskie, Ribicoff, Harris, Kennedy of New York, Metcalf, Montoya, Mundt, Curtis, Javits, Hansen, and Baker.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Jackson (chairman), Anderson, Bible, Church, Gruening, Moss, Burdick, Hayden, McGovern, Nelson, Metcalf, Kuchel, Allott, Jordan of Idaho, Fannin, Hansen, and Hatfield.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Eastland (chairman), McClellan, Ervin, Dodd, Hart, Long of Missouri, Kennedy of Massachusetts, Bayh, Burdick, Tydings, Smathers, Dirksen, Hruska, Fong, Scott, and Thurmond.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), Morse, Yarborough, Clark, Randolph, Williams of New Jersey, Pell, Kennedy of Massachusetts, Nelson, Kennedy of New York, Javits, Prouty, Dominick, Murphy, Fannin, and Griffin.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Monroney (chairman), Yarborough, Randolph, McGee, Brewster, Hartke, Burdick, Hollings, Carlson, Fong, Boggs, and Fannin.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Randolph (chairman), Young of Ohio, Muskie, Gruening, Jordan of North Carolina, Inouye, Bayh, Montoya, Tydings, Spong, Cooper, Fong, Boggs, Murphy, Jordan of Idaho, and Baker.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Jordan of North Carolina (chairman), Hayden, Cannon, Pell, Clark, Byrd of West Virginia, Curtis, Cooper, and Scott.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D.C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 4852 Hutchins Pl.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.
Mr. Justice Brennan, of New Jersey, 3037 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Stewart, of Ohio, 5136 Palisade Lane.
Mr. Justice White, of Colorado, 2209 Hampshire Rd., McLean, Va.
Mr. Justice Fortas, of Tennessee, 3210 R St.
(Vacancy.)

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—John F. Davis, 4704 River Rd.
Deputy Clerk—Edmund P. Cullinan, 4823 Reservoir Rd.
Deputy Clerk—Michael Rodak, 6311 Joslyn Pl., Cheverly, Md.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Rd.
Reporter—Henry Putzel, Jr., 3703 33d St.
Librarian—H. C. Hallam, Jr., 10927 Pleasant Acres Dr., Adelphi, Md.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS
JUSTICES ASSIGNED
TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Fortas. Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Connecticut, New York, Vermont.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Brennan. Delaware, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, West Virginia.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Alabama, Canal Zone, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, Texas.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Stewart. Kentucky, Michigan, Ohio, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: ——— ———. Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice White. Arkansas, Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Alaska, Arizona, California, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Washington, Guam, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice White. Colorado, Kansas, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Utah, Wyoming.

Appendix

Summer Opportunity Centers—Address by Vice President Humphrey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER F. MONDALE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 31, 1967

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I invite the attention of the Senate to the remarks of Vice President HUMPHREY before the American Federation of Teachers on August 24.

The Vice President called for the establishment of summer opportunity centers in our schools during the summer months to provide slum children the chance to become real participating members of our society. He emphasized that we must make social and economic opportunity a reality for all.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of the Vice President's speech.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, AMERICAN FEDERATION OF TEACHERS, AUGUST 24, 1967

Thank you, President Cogen, and my good friend, your Legislative Representative, Carl Megel. I should pay a special note of tribute to the fine delegation from Minnesota—the MFT. And particularly Ed Bolstad, the President of our Minnesota Federation of Teachers.

And I don't want to leave out my friend here, Herrick Roth, and the others from Colorado.

First I want to congratulate the AFT, on its remarkable progress—not only progress in terms of membership—I think there were 103 new Locals this past year; but particularly on your progress as outlined in the remarkable and inspiring address of your President Charles Cogen.

I not only read the address, but one of my very capable staff assistants, whose brother works closely with the Minnesota Federation of Teachers, brother of Roger Peterson, my staff assistant, Neal Peterson, took the time to go through that speech.

It is more than a speech. It is a paper. It is a remarkable document that outlined for me what I considered to be the philosophy of education needed for America, and it tells, in good rhetoric and solid substance, the achievement and the accomplishments as well as the long term goals of the American Federation of Teachers and the goals for educators in the United States of America.

The point is not that every line is one with which you must agree but more importantly that here is a thinker, a man of ideas; a man deeply concerned with the educational process in our nation, and much more concerned, may I say with the substance as well as the process and the purpose of education.

I want you, President Cogen, to know that I have looked upon your remarks and your dissertation on the educational philosophy and the educational program as a standard by which we will measure our conduct in government, and, indeed, in the educational system.

I come to discuss with you some thoughts of mine on educational matters.

PUBLIC OFFICIALS SHOULD BE TEACHERS

I come to you today not only as your Vice President but I come to you, also as a teacher. You see, I happen to believe that a man in public life ought to be a teacher all of his life. When I served in the Senate for some 16 years, I tried in my way to teach, to think ahead, and all too often for the happiness of some, to think out loud. That way you get a chance for other people to tell you how wrong you are.

If you just think silently you are apt to convince yourself and no one really gets a chance to tell you that you are on the wrong course. But I do believe that every public officeholder should be and ought in a sense be required to be a teacher, speaking to the public; working with his associates; hopefully coming forth with some creative thought.

Today I am going to stand in the role of a teacher, and I'm going to prevail on you as a teacher to give you some candid thoughts about the expanding responsibility of American educators in a rapidly changing American society.

And I would also like to mention a word or two about the responsibility of American society to the American educator, and both to our clients, so to speak, the youth of the land.

WE SHOULD BE SELF-CRITICAL

We are prone, as Americans, to always be self-critical. That is a good sign. The famous Swedish sociologist, Gunnar Myrdal, an old friend of mine once said, "If you really want to find out what is wrong with America you don't have to spend too many years in research. Just ask somebody. They will tell you." And we are very good at that. And if he won't tell you, why somebody will tell you. They will hire people to tell you.

And that is a sign of health. Only the strong can be self-analytical self-critical. It is the weak; the uncertain; the fearful that are always right who never admit—at least publicly—that there could be any doubt at all.

It is the person of maturity; it is the person of responsibility and of strength that can admit that possibly he is in error, or that his judgment may have not been what it should be. Therefore, we look upon ourselves, in a sense of self-criticism, and from that criticism seek remedies to build.

Let's see where we are today in education.

AMERICAN EDUCATION TODAY

It has given motivation to some, and alienation to others. The educational opportunities open to Americans today, through your efforts, and through the efforts of the American Labor Movement that has been a champion of education throughout history, are literally unprecedented. Ninety-three per cent of the teenagers have had secondary education, compared to *seven* per cent at the turn of the century.

In just the last twenty years, the percentage of American high school graduates who go on to college and to the professional schools has doubled, from twenty-five to fifty per cent. Last year there were six million of your high school graduates that were in college, and a million of them were there because of federal scholarships or loans.

HIGH LEVEL OF EDUCATION IS IMPORTANT

A high level of education, because of your steadfast position, and others like you, has become an intrical, inseparable feature of American society today. It reflects, and is reflected in our unprecedented prosperity.

I do not think our country could possibly be what it is on the economic front today without our school system and without the dedication, and many times the sacrifice, of teachers.

This dedication is reflected in our position of world leadership in the sciences and in our national power. It enables us both to integrate and to cope with rapid technological development.

EDUCATION NECESSARY TO MODERN SOCIETY

From the individual American's point of view, education in addition to the cultural environment that it affords, has become the credential which enables him to participate fully in our society. A high school diploma or a college diploma is the ticket which entitles a young American to opportunity. It is the coupon which makes him eligible to earn a decent living.

Now, our society insists on that credential, and it should. Therefore, it is not surprising to me, or to you, that in those same slums and ghettoes where frustration and hopelessness and joblessness and despair and bitterness have recently contributed to riots and violence, two-thirds of the unemployed ghetto residents have never finished high school. Even those who have completed a few years of school test much lower than their grade levels.

And this is only to say, in polite language, that separate but equal was only separate.

The average Job Corps recruit, most of them school dropouts as you know, has completed nine grades of school. But he reads at a fifth grade level, *if* he reads at all.

EDUCATION IS NOT REACHING SOME

I noted just yesterday the average earned wage of the Job Corps recruit before he came in—only five per cent ever had a job by the way—and those that had a job, their average hourly wage was 71 cents.

After they left the Job Corps, and 90,000 have now graduated, 70 percent of them received jobs in private industry, 20 percent went back to school; 10 percent into the military service, the average rate of pay is $1.91 per hour.

JOB CORP PAYS FOR ITSELF

So, when I hear people complain that it costs a great deal of money to have the Job Corps. I like to remind them that if a man earns a minimum of $1.91 on the average to start, the Government of the United States, and the state and local governments will be able to take enough from each one of those hourly paychecks so that in due time the cost of that educational or training experience will be amortized.

The result of educational deficiencies, and there are educational deficiencies, the result is unemployment, at least this is one result, and underemployment at a rate in our American slums and ghettoes up to 35 per cent.

JOBLESSNESS DUE TO UNEMPLOYMENT

Complex economic and social factors, of course, contribute to this grim situation. But

I am certain that there is one factor more than any other which dooms a man to joblessness today, and that is insufficient education and training.

Now we are not just giving young people, nor should we have as our purpose transmitting just information. You can buy that in a world almanac. But what we are trying to do is to transmit to people an existence in living. We are trying to make life more meaningful. That is the ultimate purpose of education.

America today has reached an acute crisis in the historic progress towards economic and social democracy. One-seventh of our population, and I had originally in my remarks here one-sixth, but I am happy to tell you that the povery group in the American society in the last few years has somewhat diminished, live below the poverty line, and are excluded.

EDUCATION REDUCES GAP BETWEEN RICH AND POOR

That one-seventh do not want to be excluded. They want to be included. And they want to be sure that their children will be included.

I think one of the most remarkable addresses delivered by the President of the United States was at Howard University some two years ago, when he asked the American people whether or not we were going to have one America and one citizenship or whether we were going to have two Americas; whether we were going to have the America of the majority, the affluent majority, and the America of the poor; or whether we were going to have an America in which all Americans could feel that they were a part of this great community, that they were included in, and that hope could come to reality.

Now this nation has to make an historic choice, either make social and economic opportunity for all a reality, or watch the gap between the rich and the poor, between the employed and the unemployed, between the sheltered and the unsheltered, between the educated and the uneducated, grow ever wider, until it threatens our national growth, health, and well-being.

And if that gap does continue to expand, America will be at war with itself, and be in such a state of crisis that all of our hopes and aspirations will be lost.

Many of today's participants in this great American society are already too old to acquire what you would term a full educational credential. They are not going to go back to high school or grade school. They are of another generation. Therefore, they need temporary passes, so to speak, new skills; job training—and that is a very, very difficult assignment.

NEED FOR MOTIVATION, TRAINING, AND SKILL

They need, in other words, the kind of a program that offers them an opportunity for a diploma—not a diploma from your high school or your college, but in a sense a program of motivation; of training; of skill that gives them the key to opportunity to make something out of their lives.

There are a large number of these people, and we would not have to be talking about them today if our system thus far had been successful. There are twelve and a half million who have been passed by in America. That is a large number. And over fifty per cent of that twelve and a half million are under eighteen years of age. Many of them will be amongst the almost one million school dropouts this year.

We have to ask ourselves, and we ought to ask the school board, are the students dropping out, or has the school left them? There is possibly an interplay here. And there will be, if we continue at the rate of school dropouts in this decade, eight million who will fall by the wayside in our school system. Eight million who ought to have a rich educational experience.

Now it is these poor children who present the great challenge to the entire nation, and, indeed, to the American educational establishment today. These are the ones that we need to concentrate our attention upon.

PROVIDING FOR THOSE WHO HAVE TOO LITTLE

You know, Franklin Roosevelt said one time what I believe to be the guiding philosophy for this country in its present effort, and I can only paraphrase here, but he said, "It is not the purpose of government to help those more who already have too much. It is the duty of government to help provide enough for those people who already have too little."

In other words, our efforts need to be, in a sense, targeted on those who have been left by the side of the road, that are not fully involved in what you and I are seeking to do in our life.

EQUAL OPPORTUNITY MEANS AVAILABILITY OF JOBS

Can we bring this group into the large, prosperous American society with full educational credentials?—which is just another way of saving, can we bring them into the pattern of opportunity?

If there is one word that I feel that ought to characterize our efforts these days; it is the word "opportunity."

I spent a long time in public life fighting for what we call equal opportunity, I have spent a great deal of time in the field of civil rights, trying to get a fair employment practices law. But I ask you, what good does it do to have non-discrimination in employment, number one, if there are no jobs? And what good does it do to have non-discrimination in employment if you are not employable?

The legal rights are not enough.

And this is where the educator comes in. Here is where we come in. We have to help equip the individual so that he can have these legal rights mean something in his life—not just a theory of law, but a way of life itself. This is the challenge which requires the maximum use of every educational resource that we can bring to bear on the whole spectrum of educational needs.

Training—training—training in everything from personal hygiene and basic skills to highly specialized research on social problems.

REACHING OUT FOR DISADVANTAGED

And it also means something else. It means reaching out. It is not good enough just to open up the schools. It is not good enough just to say you are going to have job training. Ladies and gentlemen, I can tell you from this platform today that we have job training positions open in America today fully funded by the federal government, unused—unfilled.

I spend almost every hour of my life working on these matters. Let me put it this way: In a community in which there may be two thousand job training positions, where we seek to open up job training for two thousand hard core unemployed, half of them go empty.

Why?

Because we have opened up job training but that is not enough. People that have been rejected for a century—some of them, or their families, are not going to believe that the gates of opportunity are open, just because you say they are. You have to reach out and find them, and I have said to government officials and private individuals, if we are half as ingenious in finding ways to extend the hand of friendship and fellowship and hopefulness to others as we were in denying them that hand of fellowship, we will make a lot of progress.

WE MUST BEGIN AT 18 MONTHS

Yes, what I am talking about means reaching out to children's children whose backgrounds of cultural degradation and economic poverty provide no motivation for them. It means reaching them young enough to counteract the lifelong mental stigma of poverty and rejection, of prejudice and discrimination, which begins to be acquired at about eighteen months of age, not eighteen years but eighteen months.

It means making education more than initiation rite to fraternity, or a lodge—an initiation rite required for entrance into the prosperous society of the majority.

EDUCATION A BRIDGE FROM POVERTY TO PROSPERITY

It means making education a bridge with one end that is firmly planted in the culture of prosperity, and it means making that bridge strong enough to be worth crossing; and it means helping people to cross that bridge, and to find a new life.

I think it is fair to say that we have made a remarkable start towards building that bridge, and here are some of its parts.

FEDERAL PROGRAMS HELP BUILD THE BRIDGE

Project Headstart—Project Headstart has already prepared two million pre-schoolers for what we hope will be a successful contribution to the educational experience. I think it needs to be a year-around, continuing program; and you know it.

Through Project Headstart, we cannot only help the lives of little ones; help make their lives better, but we find the parent; we reach back into the community; we follow the child back to the source of the trouble; and if we have any sense of decency at all we will do something about the conditions that exist in that area of trouble.

ACHIEVING FEDERAL AID A LONG STRUGGLE

Now the Elementary and Secondary Education Act is designed specifically to enable children from deprived backgrounds to benefit fully from regular schools. It is already operating in 17,500 school districts. It is already effective in the lives of eight and a half million people.

You know, we take all this for granted. It did not come easy. The first bill I voted on when I came to Washington in 1949, was to aid education.

We passed it in the Senate, and they killed it in the House. Two years later we passed it in the House, and they killed it in the Senate. It was a sort of suicide tennis game—homicide, I suppose I should say. Each year you had to determine who was going to kill it. You killed it either on the basis of race, religion, or region.

Whatever you may think about some of the things that may have been done, or should be done, I think that one of the greatest contributions to the welfare of this nation accomplished in the last four years under the leadership of the man who is President of the United States, is the passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act—no small accomplishment.

And two billion dollars goes into that program this year.

Oh, I heard somebody say, "That is not very much." But it is two billion dollars more than you had four years ago.

This is a very hard generation to satisfy—for sixteen years I stood side by side with people on this platform and fought for Federal Aid to Education; introduced the Federal Aid to Education bill.

PROJECT UPWARD BOUND

Let's take a look at another project, Project Upward Bound, a Headstart Program for prospective college students.

I have been visiting these young people. The program does not make many headlines. These are the young folks that have potential for something great, and something bad. These are the kinds that could go wrong, or could go to higher achievement.

I have been in college after college across this country and I want to tell you something—unless somebody stands up you would never know they were there; and I always hope somebody will, because then at least they know you are in town.

We have today thousands, 32,000 young Americans in Project Upward Bound, in over 200 colleges across this land—32,000 young people that are being found; 32,000 that are going on to college; 32,000 whose lives are going to mean something.

I wish it were three hundred thousand, but it is 32,000 more than you had two and a half or three years ago.

BUILDING AFT TOOK TIME

You did not get your good collective bargaining agreement all at once. You did not build the AFT that way. I was around building the AFT 27 years ago, and it wasn't anything like this, I'll tell you that. It takes a lot of doing, and it takes more than just dues paid.

And there is the President's Council on Youth Opportunity. I happen to be Chairman of that. I like my work. That program has sponsored summer enrichment programs in cities throughout the country; and we have the finest program that we have ever had. It is not good enough, but it is better than it was last year; three times better than it was the year before; and the year before that there was not any. So I have been in this from the beginning.

SUMMER EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM

We have a massive summer employment program this year. We found jobs under this program for a million, two hundred thousand needy youth. For the first time, we have cut into the teenage unemployment. Despite the fact that there were five hundred thousand more teenagers in the labor market, we have reduced the number of teenage unemployed. For the first time!

I know we have not done it well enough, but we have done it a whole lot better than our critics, because they did not do anything.

We are now embarking on what we call a nationwide back-to-school-stay-in-school campaign, designed to combat the dropout problem.

These are unprecedented programs, and you have cooperated with them. We work with your people.

The program is designed to catch as many of the disadvantaged young people as possible right now, wherever they are in their education; and to enable them to gain as much as possible from their remaining years of school. We just refuse to sign off anyone. We think that there is hope in every one of these young people, and it is our job to reach out to them.

FEDERAL PROGRAMS SUPPLEMENT LOCAL PROGRAMS

These programs are designed to supplement creative programs undertaken at the local level. They are over and above the regular education program. They are the sort of thing that this document, this remarkable address that I spoke of, incorporated in its thinking. And they are designed to give you, the dedicated professional teacher, the tools that you need to extend the challenge, the excitement, the pleasure, and the benefits of a good education to every American child.

AFT—FOR GOOD EDUCATION FOR ALL

I want the public to know that is what the American Federation of Teachers stands for—a good, wholesome, enriched education for every American child regardless of what it may cost the American public.

Various teachers federations have been prominent in the news lately because of your organizing and collective bargaining efforts. Well, let me just say a word about that.

First of all, there is nothing wrong with it. It is part of the American scene.

AFT COLLECTIVE BARGAINING TO IMPROVE EDUCATION

Collective bargaining, is, after all a process to achieve more than just higher salaries for teachers, even though higher salaries are needed if you are going to have teachers.

Teachers in this great organization are bargaining for the improvement not only of salaries, but the quality of education. I know what the teachers from my state are fighting for. I have been with some of them for years. What you ought to do is what you ought to do whether people like it or not. They may come around a little bit later and like it. You cannot tell.

COLLECTIVE BARGAINING TO DO AN EFFECTIVE JOB

In reference to your work, teachers are really bargaining for the rights and the tools to do effectively what is the overall job of public education, to transmit history to our youth, and to inspire creative thinking about the future, of our society, so that society and civilization can continue.

You can find a lot of this kind of philosophy in what John Dewey used to write, but you do not even need to read John Dewey. You know that you cannot really motivate young people with teachers that are not motivated.

You know you cannot really bring an enriched educational experience to young people today unless you have the facilities; the tools; the books—all of the teaching methods and machines and apparatus that is required to make education what it ought to be in the last third of the 20th Century. That is what you are fighting for. And I regret that this story does not seem to get to the people.

Every time I read about my friends of the AFT, it appears to the public that you seem to be fighting is just for yourselves.

Well, let the Vice-President of the United States, put it on the record that had not some of our teachers stood up and fought for what they believed was right, the educational system of this country would not be half what it is today. (Applause)

TEACHER POWER

I read a great deal these days about student power. There has never been any lack of it as long as I remember. I can remember it back a few years. I am not sure that it always holds in one direction, but there is plenty of power.

What you really need is a little teacher power.

Who knows better—who knows better what ought to go on in a classroom?

Who knows better about young people than those who work with them and live with them?

Who knows better about the kind of teaching tools that work?

Who knows better what the purpose of education is than a trained teacher?

Well, what I am talking about is what the Federal Government is trying to help you do in some of these programs; trying to make these all-important educational credentials available to the poor youngster.

AFT'S MORE EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS PROGRAM

And these federal programs are and must be supported by a vast number of local and private interests. I think the AFT's Effective Schools Plan is outstanding amongst these splendid local and private efforts that can help our educational system.

Mark my words, this massive effort we are speaking of will pay dividends long before many other investments. But even if you have to wait a few years, it is too long when it is counted in lives wasted because of inadequate education.

At this time of acute crisis—and it is a crisis—we have to ask ourselves, are we doing as much as we can right now with what we have, to concentrate our existing educational resources on the needs of the poor child in America?

The answer is, "No"—we can do much more.

I believe that the obvious place to start is in extending our educational programs right through the summer months.

SUMMER PROGRAM IN SCHOOLS

I do not mean for you to work for nothing.

Well, teachers are entitled to be paid for the services they perform. So, when I speak of a full year's school program I do not mean that you are paid for nine months and you contribute three to the Community Chest; and I do not mean that the 12-month program was exactly the same as it was when you started in September.

You have programs that are related to needs and seasons. The 12-month school year has been adopted tentatively in some communities under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, and it works; and in the context of our present needs the nine-month school year is an unacceptable anachronism. It is as out-of-date as a kerosene lamp in a public utility.

It was related to the harvest season. Only six percent of the population is rural now, living on farms. A century ago the school year lasted 78 days. Now it averages 162 days. I think it is time to add another ninety days. At least in those neighborhoods where the school offers the only wholesome, positive influence in the bleak and poverty-ridden lives of thousands of American youngsters.

What right do you have to padlock a school playground; to close a swimming pool; to close off the auditorium when it is owned and paid for by the public?

I could give you another tip. There is more school vandalism on closed schools than there is on open schools. Disadvantaged children, you know, are disadvtanged all year; not just for nine months. They don't have a rich daddy and mama, or even a semi-prosperous one that can send them off to summer camp or make it nice and pleasant out at the country club, or in a comfortable suburban area. They need your help all year, and not all year except during the worst months, the hot, explosive summer months.

SUMMER OPPORTUNITY CENTERS

Now don't misunderstand me. I am not talking about correctional summer schools, designed to punish and prod those who did not do their homework during the year. And I am not talking about merely an extension of the regular classroom activties. I am talking about something much more than simply an extension of the regular classroom activities.

I am talking about turning our schools into summer enrichment centers; opportunity centers for the development of human resources.

Summer is a time of growth. It is a time when plants and flowers and shrubbery grow. It is the period of life, and it should be a time of experimentation for expanding the experiences of the individual child.

It should provide special opportunities in art; in music; in drama; opportunities for exploration; for reading; for developing individual capacities. It should be a time for camping; for trips; for new horizons.

It should be a time for learning, to even swim; for games and playing.

Does this sound like the summers that you remember from your childhood?

I think some of us remember that. This is close to what I mean.

If people say, "What is your target?"—something like you have experienced.

But keep in mind that the slum child of today does not look forward to this kind of a summer, and he does not remember it, nor do his parents, because they never had it. He looks forward to three months of days on the hot pavement; three months of standing around on the corner; three months of nights in a stifling rat-infested apartment or tenement. Three months of idleness; impatience, and frustration.

AMERICANS SHOULD VISIT SLUMS

And if the people of this country do not know it, let them go and see their own country. If you want to do something in your town that will help it, when you go back, go to the mayor or one of the city officials and say, "Let's us organize a little tour through the slums, and let's get everybody in this town to go take a look at it."

I don't think the American people are calloused and sinful. They just don't know. We have people talking all the time about China, and Asia, and Africa, and they haven't even been across the tracks in their own home town.

And some of my friends here from Minnesota, you know I used to say that very thing when I was Mayor of Minneapolis. I'd go down in the south of Minneapolis and speak to a young people's group, and they would want to talk about China.

I'd say, "That's good; let's talk about China." I did not know very much about it, so I could talk a great deal about it. We'd talk about China. I'd say, "How many of you have been on the other side of Holecombe Boulevard?"—which was in the other direction, about a mile and a half; mighty few had. I'd have a group of a hundred youngsters, and one hand would go up.

I would say, "You are trying to talk about China, which is 8000 miles away, and you haven't even been visiting a part of your city which is a mile and a half away. Why don't you go up and find out what they are doing?"

OUR BEST SCHOOLS SHOULD BE IN THE SLUMS

Isn't it a fact, that the best schools, with the highest paid teachers, with the most up-to-date audio-visual machines, finest equipment, are generally to be found in the newest areas of the city, where the well-to-do people live? Where they have the extra-curricular activities; the orchestra; and where they have all sorts of student activities; and where they buy the band instruments; and where they have school concerts?

And where are the worst schools?

The best schools in America ought to be where the people need them the most. That is the way you make progress. That is the way you get on top of this.

SLUM CHILDREN NEED NEW EXPERIENCE

This boy or girl's experience that I talked about, this slum child, his opportunities for experimentation and explorations, they are not happy. They are not art and music. They are limited to the vices of the street. They are not camping.

His experiences, too, remember, may well include a run-in with the law.

Summer Opportunity Centers—that is what I want to call our schools. I think after that nine months period is over of regular schooling, we ought to change the sign and say Youth Opportunity Center; put it right up there. Let the kids know that we care.

They should provide a comprehensive package of experiences, especially designed to meet the needs of these disadvantaged children; to bring them up; to help them see the other part of the life that this nation lives.

Let me give you some ideas of what is available in this great Summer Opportunity Program. I have been into more slum areas in America in the last year than I think almost any public official in this country because I travel around this country. I have been in forty-two of the fifty states; and I go into the backwash areas.

I have been out to see and not just hear about these.

SUMMER OPPORTUNITY PROGRAM

Here is what these young people could have in these Enrichment or Opportunity Centers—remedial courses for those who need them in English and other fields, the mastery of which is a prerequisite for success in regular schooling in other subjects.

They could have cultural programs; museums tours; and trips designed to broaden cultural horizons. There could be emphasis on jobs preparation which would include visits to factories; talks with union leaders; business leaders; and other contacts designed to present realistic but interesting employment horizons.

I know of one program where they have taken hard core kids and put them out on this big earthmoving equipment, and the first thing that a kid asks when he sees these great machines is, "How much do you make?"

LEARNING FOR HIGHER PAY

And when the driver says he gets six dollars an hour, or eight dollars an hour, or five dollars an hour, or whatever the pay is, the kid says, "Gee, I sure like that!"

And if you have your program worked out right, the fellow that is driving that piece of equipment says "Well, I'll tell you what; if you get back to school they can get you in a program; we can put you on one of these machines, and we can teach you how to operate one of these machines. And if you can get a good reference from your teacher, we can get you a job on one of these machines."

The teacher is the enemy at that point. That kid needs that teacher like he needs his mother. He knows the only way he is going to get the six dollars an hour, five, or four, or whatever the wage is, if the teacher says the boy has done well. So the teacher becomes an ally instead of an enemy. This works; I have seen it work.

But you have got to bring this child in contact with reality, not just talk theory. He most likely is not going on to Harvard. He possibly is going to try to get enough experience and training, and hopefully a high school diploma, because he has been told he needs it in order to get some place, and he wants to come in contact with the life that is going to be his.

These Opportunity Centers should permit contact with local civic leaders; political leaders; welfare administrative and indeed police authorities, designed to give participants a sense of how their communities operate.

And they can have science discovery centers; shop courses; home economics work; work study programs for adults, which enable them to earn a living while gaining experience. And some camping for every child; special camps for those in need of special attention.

The organized sports program: Do you know what I am talking about?

What we are trying to do is this; this is not theory. We are working at it. I worked on it yesterday. I worked at it last night. I have contacted across this country over a hundred of the top mayors of the hundred largest cities, working with business, labor, and church leaders and teachers to get this Youth Opportunity Program going.

Oh, we've had some wonderful experiences. In Chicago, last year, a group of Chicago students participated in a work study program designed to raise the level of their opportunities and initiative. They manufactured and marketed their own handicraft, products; aid their own way, with advice and assistance from the local business community and schools.

Some 200 New Orleans' children from Spanish-speaking background underwent an intensive six-week course in English, using everything from puppets to modern electranic equipment. And they improved their language capability immeasurably. They also studied American political institutions, and their Spanish cultural heritage.

NEED TO TEACH NEGRO HISTORY

You know, I read in the paper the other day that some of the advocates of Black Power said that we ought to teach Negro history in the schools. You ought to teach that; that is a part of the history of America. We ought to know about it. You do not need to get that kind of advice from so-called power movements. That is not necessary. We ought to be teaching labor history in our schools.

Most people are wage earners. They ought to know what the labor movement has meant too. Frankly, a lot of the young people joining the labor movement do not know what it means. All they know is it means the initiation fee and dues. They do not know how this labor movement was built. They do not know the sacrifices of the early leaders, of the trouble they had to go through, and indeed may I say of the brutal beatings that many of them had to take.

They need to know this history.

Well now, these are just a couple of examples. So there are lots of things we can do.

One of the reasons that the summer is so desirable for all of this—space is more available; the weather is better for field trips; there is a warm and informal relationship between the teacher and pupil; and what's more important is you're trying to fail somebody. You are trying to edge them along. Then I know the inevitable question—what will it cost?

Well, there are two ways of analyzing. What will it cost if you do not do it? That is one way.

And what will it cost?

WE CAN USE SCHOOLS IN SUMMER

Well, it is not prohibitive. The estimates I have seen, and we are making full evaluation of that, and will be able to report to you more accurately by this December, is about $40.00 per child.

I have been around, and I want to say that I used to tell some of my friends back home when they were a little angry because we had to raise the tax a little bit to get our school system a little better I'd say, "Now look, my dear friends, you spend enough up at the club drinking those martinis, protesting what I am trying to do, to pay for your share of that plan."

I don't like to be misunderstood. Many of you know I often speak of my father. He was my best teacher. My daddy never ever told me what time to go to bed. He never lectured me on that. He just was the best getterupper in the county. I never told the folks that they shouldn't be up to the club. I just said, "Fellows, if you can spend all that time grousing, griping, and planning how you're going to kill it off, go ahead and have your martinis, but get ready to back the kids because we're going to put the program through. You're going to have to pay for it."

That is what you have to tell the people.

The cost of such programs are modest. The equipment does not need to be large. The schools are there. The school buses are there, and if they're not ask your local bus company to help. Ask and it shall be given. Seek and ye shall find.

I go around the City of Washington. When we asked to put in playgrounds. They did not have any lights in these playgrounds a year ago. We had 132, and 18 were illuminated. We have 137 now, and 122 are illuminated. We did it.

And if you need some extra buses call the National Guard. They can provide buses, too. I've got it cleared with them.

The libraries are there. The laboratories are there. The museums are there. The gymnasiums are there. And we are opening up National Guard armories for young people today for use as gymnasiums; we use their equipment.

The Fire Department in Chicago opened the Navy Pier facility, and they had 7,000 kids a year into the Navy Pier gymnasium. It was sitting there idle. There is a lot of equipment around.

We have camps, one right out here at Camp Roosevelt.

Camp Roosevelt, the oldest Boy Scout Camp in this area. They were going to close it up. We kept it open. We raised the ninety thousand dollars it took to rehabilitate that Camp. We raised it, and we are putting into that Camp 1700 kids that have never been to camp in their life.

Right now as I speak to you one of the great big camps out near Watts, Camp Roberts, is being opened for thousands of kids from the Watts Area.

It can be done if you want to do it. But you can roll over and die, too. I tell you I let other people talk about dying conditions; I am for living conditions. (Applause.)

LET THE PUBLIC KNOW WHAT AFT STANDS FOR

I appeal to you to go home to your respective communities and let people know what this organization stands for, because what you stand for is what your country stands for.

You stand for opportunity. You stand for the enrichment of our society. You stand for helping those who need help. You stand for giving people the opportunity to gain self-respect, human dignity.

That is what educators are all about. That is what the AFT is about. That is what the Labor Movement is about.

I have been proud to be associated with the Labor Movement.

When I look back over the history of the United States, who was the first to champion the cost of public education—American Labor. (Applause)

AMERICAN LABOR FOR BETTER EDUCATION

Who was the first to come to the Congress of the United States and back aid to education—American Labor.

Who was the first that said if you want to have good teachers, you are going to have to treat them as professionals and pay them as professionals—American Labor.

Who was the first to say that if you really want a good educational system you have to provide a good educational environment, meaning the total facilities—American Labor.

So we're on the same ball team. Occasionally, once in awhile, we may have somebody in the bleachers that doesn't think so; but we are.

And I want to congratulate this illustrious President of yours. I want to thank each and every one of you for your work in behalf of a better America.

I want to thank you for what you are trying to do to give every person a chance.

As Thomas Wolff, that old depression poet put it, give every man his chance; his right to live; his right to work; his right to be himself.

To every man, his chance to become whatever his manhood or his vision can make of him.

To every man his chance—this is the promise of America.

Thank you very much.

Politics: An Honorable Calling, an Editorial in the South Bend, Ind., Tribune

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1967

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that all Members of Congress will read with interest the following excellent editorial from the August 12, 1967, issue of the South Bend, Ind., Tribune concerning careers in politics.

The editorial entitled "An Honorable Calling," follows:

AN HONORABLE CALLING

We felt deeply disturbed—and perhaps a bit guilty—to learn recently that a survey of 400 students at 16 colleges across the country showed the students hold a low opinion of American politics and those who practice it.

The Gilbert Youth Research Report, which made the survey, said 77 per cent of the students believe the average politician is short on integrity and is influenced most of the time by pressure groups. Only 23 per cent of the students were willing to admit affiliation with either of the major political parties.

Most of these students, we suspect, would vehemently deny it if anybody accused them of holding prejudices against a creed or a race. It has been our experience that American youth hold far fewer such prejudices than their elders, fortunately for us all.

Yet this survey, if it is at all accurate, indicts these same youth as being prejudiced against politicians, although there is no more reason to distrust a man whose calling is politics than to distrust a man whose skin color or creed happens to differ from one's own.

The reason we felt a twinge of guilt along with concern is that the mass media may be partly to blame for youthful distrust of politics. It is the job of the media to focus on the shortcoming of politics—indeed, it is one of the safeguards of a free society—but it may be that we give too little account of the responsible politician, who far outnumbers his unethical colleagues.

There are unethical politicians, men "on the take," just as there are in any calling that involves human beings.

We believe, however, that the kind of integrity and courage that John F. Kennedy cited in his "Profiles in Courage" is more typical of American politicians at every level of government than the faults of the legislator who accepts favors from lobbyists or the influence peddler who occasionally gets unmasked.

Politics is an honorable calling and an essential one in the United States. Without it, our system of government would not work.

And though that system has faults, it remains the best yet tried—thanks to the honorable men who make it work.

Dr. Robert H. Montgomery Honored by Southwest Texas State College at San Marcos, Tex.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 31, 1967

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, Dr. Robert H. Montgomery, a graduate of Southwest Texas State College, was generally regarded as the most distinguished alumnus of that college until Lyndon Baines Johnson rose to the leadership of the Senate, then the leadership of his party, and then of the Nation. Now President Lyndon Baines Johnson and Dr. Robert H. Montgomery, distinguished economist and author of a number of books and studies of economics, are generally regarded as the two outstanding living graduates of Southwest Texas State College at San Marcos, Tex.

"Dr. Bob," as he is affectionately known to his former students at the University of Texas, where for decades he was a distinguished professor of economics, was my economics professor at the University of Texas. I sat at his feet in courses of economics and profited by his wisdom, his keenness, and his incisive teaching which stimulated thought. His questioning manner stimulated thought. His were not dry lectures. He left the class with a baffling question at the end of each class period. Economics still presents baffling questions to this day, and sometimes they seem to grow more baffling with the years. I join with the ex-students of Southwestern State and of the University of Texas in honoring my old economics professor "Dr. Bob," one of the most distinguished college economics professors in Texas for two generations.

The ceremonies held at San Marcos on Saturday August 26, 1967, were described by Alicia Helton, staff writer for the Austin American Statesman, in the Sunday, August 27, 1967, issue of the Austin American Statesman. I ask unanimous consent that this description, under the caption "Adviser to Presidents: University of Texas Professor Honored at Graduation," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADVISER TO PRESIDENTS: UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS PROFESSOR HONORED AT GRADUATION

(By Alicia Helton)

SAN MARCOS.—College professor, stump speaker, adviser to presidents and generals—Dr. Robert H. Montgomery was honored Saturday at Southwest Texas State College summer commencement exercises.

The man who has excited and inspired his listeners in University of Texas economics classrooms and across the nation for four decades was named distinguished alumnus of the SWT Alumni Association before more than 450 graduates and an audience that packed the college gym.

Another outstanding SWT-ex, President Lyndon Johnson, when serving as Vice President, inserted this comment, in the Congressional Record after hearing Dr. Montgomery speak:

"This speech impressed me more than anything I have ever heard or seen with the immediate necessity for effective cooperation of all peoples and nations of the world if we are to survive in the Atomic Age."

Thus accustomed to high praise, his black academic robes trailing over white shoes and his Menard County grin crinkling his suntan, Dr. Montgomery quietly accepted the award from Fenner Roth, alumni president.

In his own words, Dr. Montgomery was born a son of the Depression in 1893, "tenth in an unbroken biennial succession of 12 children," in Blanco County.

His first 20 years, he has said, were spent working cattle and picking cotton in Menard County and reading "all four of the books in West Texas."

He loved to argue political economy, though he had never heard the term, "with anyone who would lay his six-shooter on the ground and talk sense."

"Trying to acquire the rudiments of a reasonably adequate education despite the usual collegiate interference," he pitched in for two years at Southwest Texas between high school graduation in 1911 and the clash of World War I.

Following his tour as combat aviator with the US Army Air Force—"to make the world safe for the democrats"—Dr. Montgomery received his BA degree from the University of Kansas, his MA from UT and his PhD from the Robert Brookings Graduate School of Economics and Government in Washington, D.C.

He is now professor emeritus of economics at UT.

Through the decades, Dr. Montgomery has preached, questioned, expounded and exalted his many views of a world with no boundaries, of peoples bound inexorably together by the gadgets of the Atomic Age.

And from the soap box and podium to behind the desk, he has labored with stern idealism toward the one alternative of world cooperation and peace.

Sprinkled throughout his UT teaching tenure and in addition to his stints as guest professor at colleges across the nation, he worked with the US Agriculture, State, Treasury and Commerce Departments and the Federal Trade Commission, the Interstate Commerce Commission, the National Resources Planning Board and the Federal Planning Division.

During World War II, as chief of economic objectives for the Board of Economic Warfare, he was responsible for directing the research of a large staff of experts in determining bombing objectives in Europe and the Far East.

When he heard that Hiroshima had been obliterated by the atomic bomb, Dr. Montgomery made his since much-quoted statement:

"Since there will be no more war, or only one, I shall resign.

"We now have our choice. We can have millennium or Armageddon."

He did not speak Saturday morning—offered no comment on how Vietnam or race riots or hippies are affecting the progress of the world toward one of these two ends.

But he received swelling congratulatory applause from a body of SWT students and alumni proud to be able to honor him.

Neighborhood Schools or Guinea Pig Experiments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1967

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, we have for some time now heard the rumblings of many muddleheads who would abolish forever our basic American system of neighborhood schools.

These revolutionists would use in place of these schools their own guinea pig social experiments involving innocent little children.

An interesting and thought-provoking editorial appeared in the August 24, 1967, Chicago Tribune. I insert it following my remarks:

RACIAL MIXING PLANS IN CHICAGO SCHOOLS

Abandonment of the neighborhood school policy in favor of a system of racial quotas maintained by busing Negro pupils to distant schools has been proposed to the Chicago board of education by Supt. James F. Redmond.

The recommendations are the result of a five month study financed by the United States office of education. The study was undertaken after the same federal office made a report criticizing pupil and teacher segregation in the Chicago schools. With billions of federal dollars available for distribution to local schools, it is to be expected that local administrators will seek to please the federal bureaucrats.

The official doctrine in Washington is that the only way to give equal educational opportunity to Negro children is to mix them with white children. Supt. Redmond adopts this theory, although his report concedes that nothing much can be done about segregation in those schools which already are 100 per cent Negro. The busing of pupils would be undertaken to keep a school from becoming 100 per cent Negro, which has happened to scores of schools in recent years. To protect receiving schools, the quota of bused pupils would be limited to 15 per cent in elementary schools and 25 per cent in high schools.

The theory behind this program, according to the report, is that it would "anchor" white families in the city and thus help to stabilize Chicago as an interracial city. The plan might have the opposite of its intended effect. There is no assurance, either, that Negro pupils transported long distances to predominantly white schools would gain any educational advantages thereby. To many it might be an uncomfortable if not harrowing daily experience.

Negroes already make up a majority of the pupils in the schools here. At best, the Redmond busing and quota system could affect only a small minority. The main hope for better education for most of the Negro pupils is to improve their schools.

Fortunately, the Redmond report recognizes this in a section urging the assignment of more experienced teachers to inner city schools. Former School Supt. Benjamin C. Willis made a mild proposal in this direction a few years ago, and the teachers union promptly threatened to go on strike. The Redmond report noted that any change in the present teacher transfer policy would require changes in the collective bargaining agreement with the union.

THE TRIBUNE has often urged that extra pay be given to teachers working in difficult schools. This plan, too, is anathema to the teachers union.

In addition to the racial quota and busing proposals, the Redmond report offers long range plans for huge educational parks on 8 or 10 peninsulas in Lake Michigan. The report also suggests "magnet" schools offering specialized programs and high grade teachers. These would be so attractive that families might be attracted back to the city from the suburbs. New York and several other cities have such schools, and they are widely praised.

Many things might be done to improve Chicago's schools. We fear, however, that nothing much will be done so long as all the authorities are obsessed by the notion that improvement of Negro education requires racial mixing.

The Late Dr. John L. Taylor

SPEECH

OF

HON. ROGERS C. B. MORTON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 30, 1967

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, over the years there have been many fine men who have served the Congress of the United States with great distinction. Among these, Dr. John L. Taylor to me, was outstanding.

Jack Taylor exemplified beyond measure a man dedicated to the well-being of those served by the legislation on which he worked so diligently as a consultant to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. His judgment was never clouded by partisanship nor could he be persuaded to accept a special interest. Jack was truly an objective adviser to the Congress.

It was my privilege through association with him to learn from him in a small measure of his wisdom. As an institution, the Congress of the United States has been enhanced by his service. As members of a great committee we have lost in his passing a dear and personal friend.

Fire Warning—Federal, State Wardens Call Threat to Forests Worst Ever This Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1967

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, today the Western States are fighting a war on many fronts—a war against forest fires. Several hundred forest fires are raging—many uncontrolled—and valuable property, homes, timber, wildlife, natural beauty, forage, and watershed cover are going up in smoke. We will be lucky if we do not lose human lives as we have in situation like this frequently in the past.

Both strong forest and rural fire programs are needed to stop the losses of lives and millions of dollars worth of property in our rural areas which occur throughout the Nation every year.

A recent lead article in the Wall Street Journal describes the situation very clearly. I urge each of you to read it and I include it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Aug. 22, 1967]

FIRE WARNING: FEDERAL, STATE WARDENS CALL THREAT TO FORESTS WORST EVER THIS YEAR—SPRING RAINS NOURISHED FUEL FOR AUGUST FLAMES—FIRES FOUGHT WITH COSTLY GEAR—CARELESSNESS STILL A PROBLEM

(By Norman Sklarewitz)

LOS ANGELES.—You can't blame Smokey the Bear. For 20 years now he has been begging campers and highway travelers to douse cooking fires and snuff out cigaret butts.

Plenty of people heed Smokey's warnings, but not enough. The number of costly forest and brush fires keeps increasing, especially in the West, and this year threatens to become the worst ever.

Last year was bad enough. U.S. national forests had 11,245 fires, compared with 9,366 the year before. The fires in 1966 burned off 332,921 acres, way up from the previous year's 75,765 acres. On all state, Federal and private lands, there were 122,500 forest or brush fires last year, and they burned more than 4.5 million acres.

LIGHTNING STRIKES

Human carelessness is believed to cause anywhere from 40% to 80% of the nation's forest and brush fires, although it was lightning from a slow-moving storm that opened the Pacific Northwest's "fire season" this month. As the storm moved across Oregon and Washington, lightning set about 400 fires. In Montana and Idaho it set 150 more. A few days later, lightning started 30 fires on California forest lands.

Hundreds of fires, mostly touched off by lightning, were still burning in the West yesterday after a weekend described by forest service officials as the worst this year. The Montana headquarters of the forest service reported 164 fires that started on Sunday alone in its five-state region (Eastern Washington, Northern Idaho, Montana and parts of North and South Dakota). "Smoke jumpers," or firefighting parachutists, were battling blazes in the Salmon River region of Idaho yesterday.

In Oregon, logging operations on 10 million acres of state-protected forest lands were ordered shut down because of fire danger. In California, state fire officials said more than 100 man-caused fires burned 7,000 acres of brush and grass lands over the weekend.

The increasing seriousness of the fire threat to the nation's reserves of timber and grass lands is spurring forestry agencies to sharpen fire-fighting techniques, tighten fire-law enforcement and invest in specialized new equipment. More World War II surplus bombers are dropping fire-retarding chemicals on big blazes. People who are believed to have started fires are getting into more trouble with the law.

A SINGER IS SUED

Pending now in the U.S. district court in Los Angeles is a suit brought by the Government against Johnny Cash, a country-music singer. The Government charges that Mr. Cash accidentally started a fire in June 1965 that burned 508 acres in the Los Padres National Forest in southern California; Mr. Cash and two co-defendants, the Government says, were driving a camper that did not have adequate devices to prevent sparks and glowing substances from being discharged in the exhaust. The Government seeks to collect $125,000 from Mr. Cash to pay for the lost timber and the cost of putting out the fire. Mr. Cash denies starting the fire.

The new equipment being used to fight forest fires is expensive. Los Angeles County in March bought a $350,000 turbine-powered Bell helicopter that can carry nine firemen with portable gear to practically any spot in the 2,171 square miles under county jurisdiction. The helicopter can lug a 365-gallon tank of water or chemical solution. The county also uses a smaller chopper that carries a 100-gallon tank.

The county maintains several dozen helipads spotted strategically throughout its area, each with a 10,000-gallon water cistern. To help move firemen and their gear across rugged terrain, the county recently bought a $5,000 tracked vehicle called a Spryte from its builder, Thiokol Chemical Corp., Logan, Utah. County fire department trucks have been equipped with small, submersible pumps to tap the water in swimming pools for use in fire fighting.

MISSION FOR THE FLYING FORTRESS

The U.S. Forest Service contracts with some two dozen aerial fire fighting companies, most of them equipped with surplus bombers or fighter-bombers that carry fire retarding chemicals. Rates range from $300 an hour of flying time for a single-engine tanker to $530 an hour for a four-engine B–17, known in World War II as the Flying Fortress.

Aerial Applications, one such private company, flies six Grumman torpedo bombers, each carrying 600 gallons of fire retardant, from Salt Lake City. "If we can hit a new blaze or a small secondary fire fast enough, we're about 100% effective," says John Streeter, president of the company.

California forestry officials are building more "fuel breaks" through areas likely to be set afire. These breaks are bands from 200 feet to 500 feet wide in which existing woody vegetation is cut and replaced with low-growing vegetation such as grass or clover. Fires in such vegetation are much easier to ignite—but also much easier to control—than fires feeding on heavier fuels such as timber. Properly timed, a back fire set deliberately in a break can deny an advancing forest fire both fuel and oxygen.

The wide fuel breaks are considered more effective than narrow fire breaks, or lanes cleared in brush and timber country to provide access to otherwise located fires. In strong winds, these lanes offer no impediment to a fast-moving blaze.

An unusually rainy spring this year, oddly enough, is blamed for intensifying the fire hazard that now eixsts in many places. Rains nourished an unusual growth of grass and underbrush. Now that it is hot and dry in these places, the growth just becomes more fuel for any fire. "Grass which normally is maybe eight inches high this time of year is up ot your waist now," says Ronald E. Smith, who is in charge of fire control in Oregon.

State foresters in Oregon rate the situation "extremely dangerous," the worst in 12 years. Washington is in much the same shape. In the Spokane area, there has been no measurable amount of rain for more than six weeks, and at least one small fire a day has occurred. So far, fire-fighting crews have managed to extinguish the fires before they could become serious. But Bernard Murphy, who works in the Deer Park fire warden's office near Spokane, says: "With the weather like it is, there's a chance that one of them will get away from us."

THE PROBLEM: PEOPLE

While lightning and downed power lines cause many wildfires, people get the biggest chunk of blame. "People are still our greatest problem," says Keith Klinger, chief of the Los Angeles County fire department. Studies by the U.S. Forestry Service in California show that only 1,045 fires out of 7,556 last year were started by lightning. People started the rest, for the most part accidentally.

Campers and other outdoors-lovers are only partly to blame, says Norman Farrell, a forest service official in San Francisco. He says that home builders, construction workers, utility company crews and others working in newly developed suburbs start many fires with vehicles and electrically driven equipment.

Owners of summer cottages also increase the dangers of fire. Many leave dry brush, leaves and pine needles around their buildings, or use wooden shingles on their roofs to maintain a rustic look.

TOO DANGEROUS FOR INSURERS

Many insurance companies won't write policies on houses in Southern California's dry brush country. "The danger of someone throwing a cigaret from a car window in these areas is just too great," says a spokesman for Farmers Insurance Group.

The insurers' caution is traceable to a brush fire that swept Los Angeles' plush Bel Air and Brentwood sections last November. It lasted two days, destroyed more than 500 buildings, and burned off 6,000 acres of land. Property losses were about $24 million.

A similar fire "could definitely happen again," says fire chief Klinger. All that is needed, he says, is a spell of extremely dry weather coupled with an onslaught of hot, high winds called Santa Anas, which blow in from the desert.

International Drum Corps Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES R. GROVER, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1967

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Speaker, we are all familiar with the rapidly increasing numbers of such events as "Flag Day," "American Education Week," "Be Kind to Animals Week," "Drive Safe Week," "Teacher Recognition Day," ad infinitum. Regrettably, but understandably, many of us have grown so overtired with this surfeit of commemorative days and weeks that we accord them only indifferent attention at best, and do not pause to consider the worthy causes and groups which they honor.

In particular I would hope that we would accord "International Drum Corps Week"—September 2–9—honoring the more than 1 million persons actively engaged in drum corps activity, the notice and support it deserves.

Especially in these troubled times, drum and bugle corps serve a useful purpose. Their inspiring performances remind us of our brave young men who have fought and who fight today to defend freedom. Further, by providing a healthy outlet for youthful energies, the activity helps fight a major problem—juvenile delinquency. And perhaps not the least of their accomplishments, they are wonderfully entertaining, as I can attest from having the privilege of hearing a group from my own district, Babylon's "Islanders."

I, therefore, congratulate the drum and bugle corps around the country on their valuable contribution and urge that you support—as I do—"International Drum Corps Week."

Worthy Friend, Deadly Enemy: The Korean Soldier in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY P. SMITH III

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1967

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, sometimes in our preoccupation with the problems in Vietnam, we feel that we are alone and friendless and we wonder whether the game is worth the candle.

As an antidote for these national feelings of loneliness, and as a reminder of the results of a determination to stand fast for freedom and justice, I am happy to set forth, so that all may read, an article by Larry L. Lubenow in the September 1967 issue of the Elks magazine, entitled "Worthy Friend, Deadly Enemy: The Korean Soldier in Vietnam." The article follows:

WORTHY FRIEND, DEADLY ENEMY: THE KOREAN SOLDIER IN VIETNAM

(By Larry R. Lubenow)

Americans who remember the Korean soldier, vintage 1950–1953, wouldn't believe their eyes if they visited the Korean fighting man stationed in Vietnam's Central Highlands today.

It is understandably hard for an American, who 16 years ago saw the ill-equipped and poorly trained Korean Army fold under the Communist invasion, to imagine that those who serve so proudly in Vietnam could even be of the same nationality.

The Republic of Korea soldier, or ROK as he is known, is bigger, stronger, better trained, and just plain better in every respect than those who came before him. This is especially true when speaking about his personal pride, discipline, and commitment to his present mission.

The Korean combat contribution to the Allied effort in Vietnam consists of two crack infantry divisions and one marine brigade.

The first to arrive, the Capitol Division, is known in Vietnam as the "Tiger" Division. The nickname stems not only from the tiger's head they wear on their left sleeves but also from their fierce combat spirit and determination.

As one U.S. combat veteran of the Korean War put it, "These fellows are downright anxious to mix it up with Charlie. In fact, they're unhappy as hell when they don't get into a fire fight."

The Tiger Division's accomplishments since their arrival in October 1965 more than prove they rightfully deserve their symbol and name. Since they rushed off the landing craft onto the beaches at Qui Nhon they have soundly defeated the Viet Cong in every engagement and have eased significantly the threat of Red military action in a 600-square-mile area stretching from the key port city west along strategic National Route 19 to the An Khe pass. They also have been credited by American officials with helping to push ahead the Vietnamese government's pacification program in lower Binh Dinh Province, a key area in the eyes of all who know and understand the importance of the Highlands.

The second Korean Division, the "White Horse," arrived in September and already has given the Viet Cong a taste of their combat ability. Well-remembered by American Korean vets, the unit earned its name in blood at White Horse Mountain, where they were credited with the defeat of a Chinese Communist Division.

The Korean officer in Vietnam sees his nation's commitment as much more than a simple act of military assistance. If some Americans have forgotten what happened on the 25th of June 1950, the Korean soldier certainly hasn't. He feels deeply that without President Truman's decision to commit U.S. might, and the effect of his decision had to force the United Nations into action, the Republic of Korea might not exist today.

This feeling of national and personal commitment to a "cause" probably goes far toward explaining the ROK's willingness and extreme zeal for the fight. The Korean sees his role as one of proving that his nation can stand on its own two feet. For the first time in his nation's modern history, he is able to *offer*, not *request*, assistance.

Because of this feeling, every action, large or small, places the honor and pride of the Korean nation on the line.

The similarities between the situations which both the Korean and Vietnamese people have faced are striking. Both nations have been divided by international agreement and a confrontation with Communism—Korea at the 38th parallel, and Vietnam at the 17th.

The Korean army's home environment also has had much to do to condition its psychologically to its Vietnam commitment. Since 1954 they have had the task of manning the Korean Demilitarized Zone, eyeball to eyeball with an enemy they could see but couldn't touch—an enemy who often raided their territory, killing both Korean and American defenders. Vietnam has provided them a chance to do what they can't do at home. Fight Communism!

Trained and equipped by the American army, the Korean soldier is without a doubt "one of our most important products." Roughly 75 percent of the men who make up this force volunteered in order to fight in Vietnam.

While some Americans have criticized our military assistance and advisory efforts in Korea, the investment has been a good one. American commanders are proud to soldier alongside of their Korean comrades.

The Korean soldier in Vietnam has, without a doubt, proven himself as a worthy friend of freedom and a deadly enemy of the Communists. In addition, he has reminded us all that honor and pride are still entities of which nations are made.

Making Matters Worse

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ALBERT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1967

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Madill Record for August 24, 1967. It seems to me that this editorial, published in a small county seat town in the heart of America, demonstrates real insight into the growing problems of American cities. I commend it to the attention of my colleagues.

The editorial follows:

[From the Madill Record, Aug. 24, 1967]

MAKING MATTERS WORSE

Nobody doubts the need for doing something about the problems of big cities.

Increasing concentration of population in small areas has already brought about a dangerous situation. Racial problems, housing problems, transportation problems, school problems—these and many others are becoming worse all the time.

Civic and political leaders are casting about wildly for solutions for the many problems. They are floundering in a sea of contradictory plans and ideas, most of which miss the heart of the problem by a country mile.

Basic cause of the plight of our cities lies in the fact that so many persons have left the farms and small communities and flocked to the metropolitan areas, in the vain hope of finding jobs and big pay checks.

They scarcely could be blamed for leaving the farms, after mechanization and questionable governmental controls had drastically reduced the need for farm labor.

The fact remains that workers in tremendous numbers have concentrated in the big cities.

It would seem that the obvious solution to the problem would be to provide inducement for workers to leave the cities and return to the less densely populated areas.

That does not mean that they should be returned to engage in subsistence farming—or to starve or go on welfare.

Rather, it means that industries should be established in the smaller communities.

And it means a new kind of thinking in regard to the establishment of industries.

In making a survey for the establishment of a new industry in the past, one of the first considerations was a head-count of available trained workmen, if consideration were given to a small community in the first place.

The trained personnel was not available, of course, simply because jobs were not available.

As a result, the factory was located in a big city, a recruitment program was begun, and more workers were enticed from the small communities to the metropolitan area. Problems of the big city were multiplied, as were the problems of the small communities.

Would it not be much more logical to choose the industrial sites on other considerations, and then recruit workmen to move to the vicinity of the new factory? Wouldn't it be better to induce workmen to move away from the metropolitan areas?

That would help solve the problems of our big cities, and at the same time, help solve the problems of our smaller communities.

Deliberate steps to reverse the flow of families from the country to the cities would be of definite advantage to the entire nation.

Remarks of Vice President Humphrey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH Y. RESNICK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1967

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, last week, under the very trying circumstances of a critical illness in his family, Vice President Humphrey made a telephone address to those assembled at the Western States Democratic Conference in Los Angeles.

It is not altogether a partisan message. For the Vice President, who is doing an outstanding job for his country, knows full well that the goals of peace, equality, and opportunity transcend party lines.

It is for this reason that I include the Vice President's remarks in the Appendix of the Record:

ADDRESS BY VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY

I want to put my message in the terminology of four words—Confidence—Communication—Coordination and Commitment. Now let me say a few words first of all about confidence.

You can't win if you don't believe you can win. You can talk yourself into defeat and you can in a sense really lift yourself into victory. It just depends upon what you want to do.

Now I have been accused many times in Washington and elsewhere of being a perenial and congenital optimist and I plead guilty. One of the reasons that I try to be an optimist is that there are so many pessimists around, particularly in Washington. They're specialists in that field and most of them are Republicans. And I have never believed that we ought to crowd over into their jurisdiction. I believe in people honoring professional competence. And Republicans are absolutely the most professionaly competent pessimists in the world. They can make a young man feel old over night and as Adlai Stevenson said, "Democrats can make an old man feel young." So that is the difference.

Now, we ought to know that the attack is on. Republicans do not wait for a campaign to start about a month before the election. They started this compaign of 1968 when they convened in Washington after the election of 1966. They tasted a little of the wine of victory in 1966 and they would like to have a lost weekend with it. So I suggest that we recognize what we are facing and what we are called upon to deal with. The opening guns of the 1968 campaign are on and it is almost like guerrilla action. They shoot from behind the bushes, they lay in ambush for you and they wait to see what mistakes we make, if any. But more importantly, they wait for defection. And I repeat, for the defectors.

Now, my fellow Democrats, I want to tell you right now you can really convince the Republicans that they can win if we talk enough about their victories and if we talk enough about what they are saying. I think what we ought to do is to have confidence in our leadership; confidence, above all, in our program, and get on with the job of knowing that we have been doing the right thing.

I have an abiding faith in the American people. I think they're going to make the right decision in 1968. The American people know that government is serious business. They know that and they want people who have the intellectual integrity, the character and stamina to take a position and stand by it. They are not nearly as concerned with images as they are with reality. They are not nearly as concerned, may I say, with whether or not you look like the all-American boy or whether or not you really are thinking about all the Americans all the time and working for all of the Americans all of the time. So I call upon you to have the confidence in our Party, confidence in our leadership.

That brings me to the second part of my message.—Communication.

Communication is absolutely essential these days and, of course, with modern media you ought to be able to communicate.

We have the most creative and effective record of political accomplishment in our history these past seven years. Starting out in 1961 with John Kennedy, and continuing on with Lyndon Johnson, we Democrats have been busy passing progressive programs, initiating policies, breaking new grounds in terms of our social and economic betterment. We have been able to achieve the greatest legislative record in the history of this country. And I think it's time we Democrats got out and talked about it. Communicate—people forget. There is a lot of noise these days and people forget your message. Medicare, aid to elementary, secondary and higher education, civil rights and voting rights, War on Poverty—all of these matters . . . they did not come by accident. They came by hard work. Model cities, urban renewal, everything that you can think of in terms of the improvement of our programs of social welfare . . . we had to fight for these things. What are we talking about here? This administration is committed to the proposition that every American is entitled to have a chance in life. President Johnson and Vice President Hubert Humphrey are committed to the proposition that American freedom should carry with it opportunity . . . the opportunity to be somebody, the opportunity to make something of your life, the opportunity to make the best of your life, and that's why we have poured ourselves into the programs of health, education, and resource development. This is why this government of yours has done more in the field of education in the last five years than the government of the United States has been able to do since the beginning of this republic. Now, that is a program of accomplishment and I think we have to communicate.

The Republicans oppose these programs. You know, a real news flash today would be for some Democrat just to stand up and say that on most of the programs that have been adopted, 90% of the Republicans in Congress have voted no and 90% of the Democrats have voted yes. So, when you see an old person that has benefitted from Medicare, you might not only ask them how the Medicare program is working, but you might even ask them, "Who do you think passed it?" "And who do you think was opposed to it?" They may not know because we haven't told them. And now's the time to tell them.

This record does not, in other words, speak for itself. We have to speak up for it and we have to do a better job of communicating not only the record of accomplishments but, also, the goals and objectives of the Democratic Party as we move into the 1970's.

People are not so much interested in what you have done as in what you plan on doing.

What's the philosophy of this Party?

Well, Franklin Roosevelt, bless his memory, in those final departing words of his, said, "Let us move forward with a strong and an active faith."

That ought to be the message of inspiration for every Democrat and every good citizen of this country. This whole concept of moving forward has been characteristic of our Party. John Kennedy said, "Let's get this country moving again. Let's begin." And Lyndon Johnson said, "Let's keep this country moving. Let's continue." This is a forward looking, outward reaching party and we are unafraid of the issues of tomorrow. We don't see problems and difficulties, we see opportunities and challenges and that's the faith that motivates us.

The third message that I have for you is, beside confidence and communication, is coordination. And that's why you're having this conference.

You simply must coordinate the enormous energies of our political structure. Coordination also means subordinating personal differences and personal ambitions to the common cause and good of the country and the goal of progressive and effective government. Coordination means forgoing the luxury of personal hatreds and revenge. It also means that you work together. It means cooperation for the common interest. Ben Franklin put it right on the line about 200 years ago when he said, "We must all hang together or we'll assuredly all hang separately."

And, my fellow Democrats, I have some other words for you.

Next year there is going to be a national ticket and President Johnson will be at the head of that ticket and on every Democratic ballot and every precinct in America. The Democratic family is going to win together or it's not going to win at all. We're going to have a joint victory or we're going to have separate political funerals without too many flowers. In other words, don't poison the soup that you're going to have to eat, don't put poison in the well from whence you're going to dip your cup. If you, if Democrats can, if Democrats feel they must be critical in order to prove they're independent, I suggest that they be critical of the opposition. There's plenty, plenty to work on.

Coordination also means intelligent analysis, planning and operations which are designed to harness the various strengths and abilities that are everywhere waiting to be put to work. Your meeting is a splendid early step to ensure that kind of communication and coordination.

I'm pleased, also, that you are spending some time on the nitty-gritty, the nuts and bolts of politics, the practicalities of it. We're all issue oriented and we ought to be. We're deeply concerned with the whys and the objectives and the goals of progressive government and we must be. But, my dear friends, to carry forward progressive government you have to be in power. We must win and that's what we're discussing. And if you really want social progress in this country, you better take a good look at the list of candidates' potentials that offer you that opportunity. I think when you do, you'll find you have a good going team right now. This isn't the time just for going separate paths. This is the time to work together.

My fourth and final message to you is commitment. Commitment. National commitment, personal commitment, party commitment, commitment to build a better America, commitment to our cities, commitment to our needy and our deprived, and commitment to the world. This world needs the American commitment as never before and the needy of this country of ours need our national commitment as never before.

I travel up and down this country. I've been in 46 States since I've been Vice President and I will be in all of them in a very few months. And I go not only to the luxury hotels, but I go to the back alleys of the slums as I was only yesterday in Washington, D.C., where I went out with the young boys who were on a special project of rat extermination and the filth in the garbage and the dirt of the back alleys of our slums.

I happen to be one that believes that you must have a strong and active faith. I believe that you must have commitments. This is no time for that summer soldier and sunshine patriot. This is a time for Democrats to stand up and be counted and to rally around the President and the leader of their Party. When the going gets tough and the opposition senses the possibility of an upset, this is the time to stand up and to be counted and to fight back. This is the difference between a great people and a weak people; a great Party and a weak Party.

Your President is bearing unbelievable burdens these days and responsibilities. I hear a great deal of criticism about our President in many areas of life. I hear criticism—foreign policy, domestic policy.

Let me just say a word about foreign policy. We signed more forward looking agreements that blend themselves to the ultimate cause of peace since Lyndon Johnson has been President than for many, many decades. With our relationships with the Soviet Union alone, only recently we put on the table for consideration the new Non-Proliferation Treaty on Nuclear Weapons in cooperation with the Soviet Union. The Consular Treaty which stood untouched and no one dared to even move it for years is a fact now. Civil air agreement is a fact. The Cultural Agreement is a fact. The Space Treaty is a fact. So when I hear that we seem to do not too well in foreign relations, I say the record says to the contrary.

The Alliance for Progress is working. Your President has just expanded that Alliance by a new commitment made at Punta Del Este. The Dominican Republic is free—elections were held. Latin America is moving ahead economically and politically. Europe is strong, independent and the United States of America still is the shield of protection. This hasn't been done by accident—it has taken careful, personal, effective diplomacy. And I do not think we ought to let our President stand alone to bear these awful burdens without the united support of his own Party and of his own people. He deserves that.

Let me just say something about Southeast Asia. I know this is the most sorrowful part of our national life.

I spoke the other day to the Democratic State Legislative leaders. I want to say to you what I said to them. I could not support the policy if I thought it were wrong. I could not go out talking to people, mothers and fathers, supporting a national position, doing it openly, actively, a position that required the lives of our sons if I thought it were wrong. Every man has his weaknesses but one of mine, I trust, is not to be a hypocrite. And I am not so politically ambitious that I would want to see my country do something that is wrong and knowingly wrong and yet to speak up for it.

To put it in the affirmative, we are in Southeast Asia not just because of South Vietnam, we are there for the cause of world peace and order. We're there for our own purposes as well and I have travelled in that area, much more than many of the critics, and I have been to all of the countries of free Asia and I have talked with their leaders. And isn't it interesting that not one of them, not one, suggested that we withdraw. No one. Some have a different point of view of certain tactics but not one suggests that we withdraw.

To the contrary, they tell us that our presence there is their hope for freedom. It is their hope for independence. And there have been some great victories. Indonesia today stands proud and free and independent. The sixth largest nation in the world. The leaders of that country know full well that our presence in Southeast Asia has given them that chance. They have delivered on their chance.

The leader of Singapore, the Prime Minister who surely has been no particularly outspoken friend of the United States, said that "America's presence in Asia buys time for Asians to be free." The Southeast Asian Association of Free Nations is a fact. War between Malaysia and Indonesia is over. Korea is beginning to come into its own and have a tremendous economic breakthrough. Things are happening that are good and it is because this Nation, even though it's been costly and painful, and it's required great sacrifice, kept its commitment. We have been tested once again, in Asia this time, as we used to be in Europe, and we have met that test.

Our commitment is the very keystone of the arch of world peace and world security and the credibility of the American commitment is the shield of protection not only for the American people but for people all over the world—in Asia, in Europe, in Latin America.

We are trying to build a world of peace. And that's why we have committed ourselves to the United Nations and that's why today we are trying to find a way to stop the proliferation of nuclear weapons. This is why today your Government stands committed and ready for disarmament to save the peoples of the world from this terrible costs of weaponry. This is why your government today is ready to go to the conference table immediately to bring peace to Southeast Asia. Until that day comes, though, Americans owe it to themselves, owe it to their honor and owe it to the cause of peace and justice in this world to keep the faith and to keep the commitments. To do less would be to prove us unworthy of trust and confidence.

I have spoken of this many, many times and I ask you to think about it, to remember that leadership gives you no privilege. Leadership is not a luxury, it is a burden. Leadership is not a cloak of comfort, it is a robe of responsibility. And remember that a great nation must prove its greatness by trial and sacrifice. It must prove it at home and abroad.

Fellow Democrats, I want you to be the idealists that you have always been. The ideal of America—one nation. The ideal of an America with one citizenship, opportunity for all. I long for the day when we will never again speak of Ghettos, when we will never again speak of Americans as Negro or White but just speak of them as Americans. I long for the day when every boy and girl of Mexican ancestry can have a chance like everyone else. And believe me, we're working for it.

This is the liberal program—this is the progressive program. This is the program of the future. We're thinking about the tomorrows. The best way to do something about the tomorrows is to be proud of your work, to look at your record. And might I ask you to be proud of your President, speak up for your Party, stand up and be counted for what you believe in, to really submerge your little personal and private ambitions and feelings and to remember that this is a great country that has a great destiny.

We have a message to tell the American people and I am waiting to tell that message from the political platform. I welcome the opportunity of Republican opposition. I long to see them stand up in what I call a free and open debate. We'll take care of them.

The American people are not going to turn their backs on responsible leadership. They didn't do it in 1948 when Harry Truman was under much more criticism than Lyndon Johnson. So let's spend our efforts out here in the West to give the kind of get up and go that this part of the country is known for.

Thank you very much.

National Drum Corps Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 31, 1967

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to call special attention to the 3 million people throughout the United States and Canada who devote a great deal of their spare time to drum and bugle corps activities. The week of September 2 through 9 has been designated as National Drum Corps Week in recognition of those who participate in the colorful and entertaining drum and bugle corps activities. One fine example is the Greater Norristown Junior Drum and Bugle Corps in my congressional district.

Many an American history student will recall the memorable part the drum and bugle corps have played in our heritage. The American Revolution began as the drummer, William Dinman, beat the call "To Arms on Lexington Common." During World War I, drum signals continued to be prescribed in our military manuals. The drum corps continue to offer their participants enjoyment and an invaluable opportunity for character growth.

To qualify for one of today's units, our young people must be willing to acquire a keen sense of duty and responsibility, both to themselves and others. They must learn the importance of cooperation, self-discipline, and reliability—qualities which are badly needed in a country with a rising rate of juvenile crime. Our young people in the drum corps are taught fair play, the rules of sportmanship, and how to follow orders. Their participation in these units provides them with valuable training and experience in developing disciplined minds and bodies essential for future leadership in our country.

It seems appropriate during the National Drum Corps Week to give special praise to the millions who add color and spirited music to our parades and public events and who add enthusiasm and public spirit to our Nation.

Britain and the Enemy: Hand in Hand?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. RARICK
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 31, 1967

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, now that terrorists are waging guerrilla warfare within friendly, anti-Communist Rhodesia, it is interesting to note that the origin of the majority of terrorist weapons and equipment is from behind the Iron Curtain.

Britain, we must assume, views this action favorably because that nation has been at odds with the free Rhodesian Government since its unilateral declaration of independence in November 1965.

Mr. Speaker, there is a strange and appalling parallel here. The Communists supply terrorists working to subvert and overthrow a pro-Western country. Meanwhile Britain supplies North Vietnam with more than 60 percent of its material, while North Vietnamese troops and guerrillas battle to crush and enslave another anti-Communist country—South Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, I believe two articles appearing in the Rhodesia Commentary of August 14, 1967, will be of interest to my colleagues and I hereby insert them following my remarks:

TERRORISTS AND SABOTEURS ARE IN WAITING

Large numbers of trained terrorists and saboteurs are gathered in camps to the north of Rhodesia and, as their training had a purpose, it must be expected that they would attempt to implement it.

Asking for an extension of the State of Emergency, the Minister of Justice and Law and Order paid tribute to the efficiency of the security forces and assistance given by the public.

COMMUNIST BACKING

The equipment and weapons recovered from terrorist groups have been manufactured in several countries, but by far the majority emanate from Russia or Communist China, leaving little doubt of the extensive Communist backing received by the Rhodesian-expatriate African racialists, particularly in their terrorist campaign. There have been instances where these weapons have been used.

"Our enemies have not given up the fight", said Mr. Lardner-Burke. "They will resort to anything, no matter how low or reprehensible, in an effort to overcome us. Whilst the main threat at present is external, there are also some enemies in our midst."

(Parliament agreed to an extension, without a division.)

CONTROL OF TRANSPORT

In recent months terrorists have made use of certain types of road vehicles into Rhodesia from Zambia.

In order to ensure that this loophole is plugged, Government has published regulations controlling enclosed transport vehicles traveling from the North. The regulations provide that such vehicles will not be cleared in Salisbury or other points of destination in Rhodesia until after their cargoes have been fully inspected.

With co-operation from the transport operators and the public, a considerable degree of control will be achieved on Rhodesia's northern borders.

UNITED STATES SHOULD IMPOSE SANCTIONS ON UNITED KINGDOM

The part that Britain is playing over Vietnam should be brought home to the Americans, said Mr. J. A. Newington, the R.F. member for Hillcrest, Bulawayo, speaking in the Budget debate.

"Sixty per cent of all shipping going into Vietnam is British," he said. "While thousands of American GI's die, Britain reaps the bloody profit".

Saying that America should impose sanctions on Britain, Mr. Newington wondered how reverse sanctions would work.

South Bend, Ind., Man Is Now Successful Proprietor Thanks to Small Business Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BRADEMAS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 31, 1967

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, on July 1, speaking at the Democratic Governors conference in St. Louis, President Johnson reasserted his faith that Americans, working together, will provide jobs for disadvantaged persons. The President stated:

> Earlier this week, I visited a center in Philadelphia where I was the next logical American step after protest.

It was a center for disadvantaged citizens. The leaders of that center had protested—with full justice—a lack of job opportunities for Negroes. The business community listened—and made more opportunities available. But then the protesters found that there were not enough men and women with skills to fill the jobs that opened up.

Their response should inspire us all with deep pride—and faith in our future. They did not react in bitter frustration against the dead past. They set their eyes to the future. They rolled up their sleeves, and they built a place where Americans who might have lived out lives without hope could be trained, and made more productive, contributing members of our society.

Your Government helped to provide funds for that center—and there is no investment of which I am prouder. Business is contributing as well—and some labor and foundations and city government.

That can happen all over America. And it will—if we work to make it happen.

HELP FOR DISADVANTAGED

The Small Business Administration is an agency of the Federal Government that is working closely in cooperation with various national, State, and local agencies and groups to help disadvantaged persons acquire a business of their own.

I know no better way for Americans to fight poverty and assist disadvantaged persons to achieve dignity and stature than by making it possible for them to be successful small businessmen.

It is for that reason that I should like to recount briefly the story of one disadvantaged person in my home city of South Bend, Ind., and explain how the Small Business Administration, through its Indianapolis regional office, helped him become the proprietor of his own small business.

James E. Williams held a variety of jobs with the Studebaker Co. in South Bend until 1963, when the plant was shut down. He was but one of a large number of men and women who found themselves without a means of livelihood when that unfortunate shutdown occurred.

But Mr. Williams' predicament was particularly acute since he was a Negro with a limited education. In the fierce competition for jobs, he was at a particular disadvantage. But he was not idle. To provide a meager living for his family, he set up a home workshop where he repaired automobiles, and also worked part time at a service station. He also obtained employment with the city street department.

NEEDS $9,000 LOAN

In 1965, Mr. Williams had an opportunity to become the operator of his own filling station. But he would require $9,000 to purchase inventory and for working capital. This he did not have.

Mr. Williams applied to SBA for a loan. SBA was convinced that Mr. Williams was a hard worker and that he could make a success of the filling station. A $9,000 economic opportunity loan was made.

Mr. Williams now is the proprietor of his own small business. His filling station is making a nice profit and he is repaying the loan. He has one full-time employee and four who work part time.

Many South Bend residents have learned that they can depend upon James E. Williams' service. That is why Jim's Six Point Shell Service at 1224 East Corby Street is a prosperous enterprise.

Secretary Freeman's Leadership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN G. DOW

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1967

Mr. DOW. Mr. Speaker, in recent days, I have become increasingly disturbed by the efforts of those whose apparent objective is to discredit the Secretary of Agriculture and the President in the earnest endeavor they have made to help the American farmer. While I know that some depression has occurred for dairymen, I am surprised that ostensible spokesmen for our grain farmers should be so critical.

These critics are the same ones who supported the tired, do-nothing policies of the Benson regime—policies that caused farm income to steadily slide for 8 solid years while we built the most devastating surplus in history—policies that started the great mass movement of families from the farm to the city.

As a result of these policies, by 1960 overproduction had robbed the farmer not only of prestige, but had cost him dearly in dollars. By the close of that year, we had a stockpile of 1.4 billion bushels of wheat and 85 million tons of feed grains, and net farm income had plummeted $2.4 billion in just 8 short years.

In 1961, a new team, managed by two great Presidents and coached by the Secretary of Agriculture, has been largely responsible for the development, enactment and success of five major pieces of farm legislation, the elimination of surpluses, and a substantial improvement in farm income and farm living standards.

From the 1960 level of $11.7 billion, net farm income jumped to $16.4 billion in 1966—the second highest mark in history—and gross farm income at $49.5 billion and net income per farm at $5,049 set an all-time record.

The voices I hear today crying for the hide of Orville Freeman bear an eerie resemblance to those of the little men who since 1961 have cried "get the Government out of agriculture," and "let farmers go it alone so that farm prices can be set in the marketplace by the law of supply and demand."

Now that this administration has eliminated the surpluses their policies built, farmers this year are operating in what is essentially a supply-demand situation.

Under our voluntary farm programs, wheat and feed grain producers in 1967 were provided an opportunity to increase production by a prudent amount—an amount sufficient to provide for safe, adequate reserves without creating a surplus.

Farm production has increased this year—thanks not only to unusual growing weather all over the country but to the fact that we have witnessed once again the tremendous impact the technological revolution is having on American agricultural production.

Certainly farmers can ill afford lower prices and reduced income in the face of an ever-present cost-price squeeze.

But to point the finger and scream "surplus" in the face of current supply levels is to cry "wolf" when there is no wolf.

And it would appear to me that this kind of carping and sniping badly serves the farmers' cause.

I think the cause is better served by such sober, responsible evaluations and appraisals as I found this week in Secretary Freeman's "Agriculture 1967—A Situation Report."

In the course of this report, the Secretary made these important observations of the current agricultural picture:

> It is impossible to predict, with absolute accuracy, what the weather will do around the world, or how much of any one commodity our competitors in world trade will produce in any one crop year. Yet our export business is a major outlet for U.S. farm commodities and the quantities needed are basic in making farm program policy decisions.
>
> In 1966, after increased domestic wheat acreage had been announced for 1967, new information from the Soviet Union and Australia indicated bumper harvests. Despite a record global wheat crop, our commercial wheat exports reached a record 450 million bushels in 1966–67 and overall exports were over 742 million bushels, continuing the high levels of the past few years.
>
> After consulting wheat farmers and others through informal hearings on 1968 wheat acreage levels, all evidence pointed to the need for a cutback in acreage to maintain a satisfactory relationship between production and needs. And the allotment for 1968 was set at 59.3 million acres, about 9 million acres less than for 1967. The actual 1968 outturn, of course, remains subject to weather factors.
>
> No overall surplus of wheat resulted from the 1967 crop. The sharp drop in wheat prices in the summer of 1967 from a year earlier was not justified on the basis of 1967 production and prospective demand for wheat.
>
> Unfortunately, too much wheat loaded into marketing channels at harvest resulted in temporary glut that pushed prices down.
>
> This illustrates the changed marketing situation farmers face in the new era. With surpluses gone, yearly production will be keyed to needs for the entire marketing year. This means larger supplies available from the current crop than when production was being held in check to work off the surplus. Government stocks no longer provide the stabilizing market force they did when there was a market shortfall from yearly production that had to be made up from the surplus. Now, virtually all of the needs in commercial channels are coming from free stocks.
>
> This new challenge to farmers requires more active orderly marketing. It requires restraint on the part of farmers in the quantities of a commodity moving into the market at any one time. The price-support program helps in the holding process. With a reseal program for on-the-farm and warehouse storage, farmers can hold on to their products and make the market work for them, rather than against them. Price supports and payments strengthen their holding power also. Direct and diversion payments in many of the basics make it possible for them to compete in world markets and, at the same time, maintain their income.
>
> The fall of 1967 brought feed grain and soybean producers face to face with the same marketing problem wheat farmers con-

> fronted. But patient and hard-nosed marketing by farmers can avoid sharp harvest time price dips. Temporary market supplies can push prices down just as much as if there really were surpluses.
>
> The course of feed grain production in 1967 brings out the problems and difficulties in matching production with needs. In the fall of 1966, it was apparent that the surplus era for feed grains was ended and acreage needed to be increased.
>
> After long study by people both inside and outside the Department of Agriculture, the 1967 feed grain program was fashioned to bring about a reasonable increase. Following the first indications of spring plantings in March, many who felt production would be too low pressed for an increase. We stuck by the original decision, and what happened? The first report of production, as of July 1, indicated a corn crop of 4,580,000,000 bushels. Weather conditions were favorable and the next report showed an increase of nearly 150 million bushels to 4,651,000,000 bushels.
>
> When the effort is to bring production in on a supply target, relatively slight weather variations can mean a plus or minus three bushels per acre. So slight a variation could mean a difference in the range of 400 million bushels in the total crop. It isn't always possible to hit the supply target exactly. It's important that farmers understand this and help in the decision-making process so that our judgments are as accurate as possible. After the fact is too late.
>
> The newness of the New Era Programs is another factor that bothers farmers. Newness means uncertainty, which is always unpleasant. Under the old programs, the loan rate, in effect, set the market price. This was certain and comfortable. Now the market is jumpy, although above the support rate. This newness of the programs also relates to another problem. Farmers instinctively separate their program payments from market returns.
>
> But wheat certificate payments and corn price-support payments are as much a part of the per-bushel return to farmers as are the market prices. Many farmers tend to forget that they receive a rather substantial payment for every bushel of wheat.
>
> The program is designed to allow wheat to move in the market at the world competitive price while the participating farmer gets the parity price for his share of wheat used as domestic food. For 1967 this works out to about 47 cents per bushel on all the production on participating farms. For 1966, the combination of the market price and wheat certificate payment brought the wheat price average on participants' farms to $2.22 per bushel. The same principle is true for corn and for the 1966 crop the average value came to $1.40 per bushel, including an average price-support payment of 11 cents per bushel.
>
> We're working hard to make these programs better. But they have already been effective in raising farm income. Compared to 1960, receipts in 1966 were up $500 million in wheat, and up $2.1 billion in feed grains.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest that Republican Congressmen from the grain belt might better serve their rural constituents by abandoning hyperbole and adopting the reasoned, responsible approach of the Secretary of Agriculture. As a Representative of an eastern farm region, where we have to pay the price of grain raised in the West, I cannot endorse the idea that growers of grain are suffering as some of their representatives would imply.

The President has said of Mr. Freeman:

> Orville Freeman is one of the most dedicated and conscientious public servants in this country. His work in behalf of farmers' income—and of better living conditions throughout rural America—is known, or should be known, to every enlightened man and woman in this country. He has been a tower of strength for rural Americans, for the consuming public generally, and for two Presidents.

Economic Development Administration Marks Second Anniversary With Record of Achievements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1967

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago, the Economic Development Administration celebrated its second birthday. I have been actively interested in this program since its first was envisioned during hearings held before the Public Works Committee, of which I am a member. As we mark the second anniversary of this Federal agency, designed to stimulate economic growth and development of our communities, I think the record of achievement speaks for itself. I would like to single out for special mention, two projects in California which have benefited from the Economic Development Administration program which, in turn, will result in long-term employment for hundreds of people.

First of all, I would like to call to your attention the Box Canyon Dam. On the 20th of July of this year, a construction contract, totaling $7,818,054, was awarded to Vinnell Corp. for the construction of this dam and reservoir in Siskiyou County near Mount Shasta.

The award of the contract culminates negotiations and application consideration extending over a period of approximately 2 years. The future dam has the enthusiastic support of the citizens of all northern California, and the project will result in a solid underpinning for the economy of a part of California which has been distressed for many years and plagued with a high rate of unemployment and low-median income.

The dam is expected to create employment for approximately 400 persons, and will be the nucleus for a recreation-tourist complex in addition to the control and conservation of water streams in the area.

A significant and unique facet of the project is the recognition it has generated of the importance of orderly economic growth through elimination of slum areas and the creation of employment opportunities for all segments of the population. As an immediate outgrowth of the project, the board of supervisors of Siskiyou County and chairman of Siskiyou County Flood Control and Water Conservation District have agreed to implement a broad range of urgently needed and forward looking projects. Included will be an employment plan to assure employment of low income and minority group individuals during the construction phase of the project and during the life of the project itself; to institute training programs for persons heretofore unable to find employment for lack of training; and to initiate a program of countywide housing to assist low-income and minority groups.

This all has been achieved through the combined efforts of the Federal Government, State of California, and local government. The Economic Development Administration of the Department of Commerce provided a total grant in the amount of $4,618,500. The State, through its Davis-Grunsky program, put up $4,532,000.

Officials of all three levels of government are pleased with the cooperative attitude and constructive approach in facing a problem and finding a solution. I believe that here is an outstanding example of what can be done through cooperative action.

Similar cooperation between the Federal Government, represented by the Economic Development Administration, the State of California, and local government can be found in the other project which I would like to mention to you today, that is the South Tahoe Public Utility District sewer export works which is a major step in preserving the purity and beauty of Lake Tahoe.

Lake Tahoe, one of the clearest and most pure lakes in the world, has been threatened because of the ever-increasing presence of man. In 1962, the summertime peak population at this most popular resort was about 132,000 people. In just 4 years this increased to about 180,000 people and it is estimated that by the end of the century it will approach the 600,000 mark.

To meet this influx of people, steps must be taken to provide adequate sewer facilities if we are to prevent pollution of this beautiful body of water. Through the cooperative efforts of Federal, State, and local government we have achieved a major step forward.

The South Tahoe Public Utility District is the agency which is responsible for sewer collection and disposal of sewage. Like all other districts, South Tahoe's chief difficulty in maintaining adequate facilities to ensure the purity of the lake has been financial. The assessed valuation, from which the bonding limit is derived, does not reflect the increasing volumes of people who use the district's facilities. From 1961 to 1965 assessed valuation increased almost 75 percent, but sewage volume increased more than 200 percent.

The cost of expanding the facilities to export the sewer effluent out of the Tahoe basin—the only reasonable solution to the problem—amounted to about $8,680,000. Bonding itself to the maximum, the district still was $5,360,000 short. The deficiency had to come from State and Federal sources. More than 60 percent of the funds were provided under the Economic Development Administration program. An EDA grant of $3,253,000 to South Tahoe Public Utility District was the largest single grant ever made by any Federal agency for a water pollution control project and it was one of the largest made by EDA for any purpose during 1966.

It is my pleasure to report that the grant has made it possible for us to achieve major successes in halting the threat of pollution at the south end of Lake Tahoe.

At the same time, this grant will mean hundreds of new, permanent jobs for the people of El Dorado County and the city of South Lake Tahoe.

I cite these two projects to show that the goals for which Congress enacted the legislation in 1965 are being achieved.

Brave New World for Republicans?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE BUSH
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 31, 1967

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, I rise to direct the attention of my colleagues to excerpts from a thoughtful and highly perceptive column by the distinguished Marquis Childs, entitled "Brave New World for Republicans?" It appeared in the Washington Post, August 28.

In particular, I direct attention to the paragraph which reads:

> Often moderate and progressive Republicans are deeply disheartened when the powers that be, Republican and Democratic, join to force an issue beyond hope of modification or improvement.

In my judgment, Mr. Childs has pinpointed a cause of the widespread frustration which seems to be the mood of America. It seems likely that all Americans, not only moderate and progressive Republicans, are deeply disheartened when the powers that be engage in political "gimmickery" which precludes the elected representatives of the people from fully discharging their obligation.

We not only should, but we must, mobilize the best possible ideas and concepts in facing the problems of contemporary America. To do less, for whatever reason, is a breach of faith with the people whom we are elected to serve.

The article referred to follows:

BRAVE NEW WORLD FOR REPUBLICANS?

(By Marquis Childs)

Since that day in January when Sen. Everett McKinley Dirksen and Rep. Gerald Ford struck a bold posture for a brave new Republican world in their own State of the Union message, a great many things have happened. For the Democrats in Congress and the Johnson Administration, most of them have been bad. This follows on the political maxim that the party in power gets blamed for everything that goes wrong and correspondingly takes credit for everything from a bumper wheat crop to a short blackfly season on the good side.

The clarion call from Ev and Gerry was for an opposition party that was to be more than just opposition. With 47 new seats in the House and distinguished new faces in the Senate, the Republicans were to be constructive and forward looking.

No more opposition just to oppose. Above all, Ford said later, the Republicans would not ally themselves with their old comrades, the Southern Democrats, in the kind of naysaying coalition that over the years frustrated and delayed so much social legislation.

As the days run out, with the wrangle of the final weeks of the session looming beyond the September recess, an objective audit on Republican forward-looking independence is hard to come by. Both on foreign policy and Vietnam and on the domestic programs, there are Republicans trying hard to come up with alternatives.

Six House Republicans joined Rep. Bradford Morse of Massachusetts in proposing a limited and phased de-escalation of bombing in Vietnam. This was the thrust of the proposal of Sen. John Sherman Cooper and others of his party in the Senate.

Reps. Charles E. Goodell and Albert H. Quie are sponsors of a substitute for the Administration's poverty program that they call Opportunity Crusade. Incorporated in a bill of 100 printed pages, the crusade would revamp the entire poverty program, putting more stress on the participation of private enterprise and turning most of the separate programs over to other agencies. The sponsors insist that, far from cutting back, they favor expanding outstanding successes like Head Start for small children and carrying it on in Follow Through.

Conscientious men like Goodell cannot be dismissed as wreckers. Many Republicans—and many Democrats—are dead set against the poverty program. They may succeed in wrecking or even abolishing it when it finally comes to a vote in early October. But if this happens, it will be as much the fault of conservative Democrats, paying back the Office of Economic Opportunity and the Negro for the riots, as of Republicans on the right.

This is the squeeze in both parties. Except for those rare times when a President elected by a landslide sweeps a large majority of his party into power—1964 was such a year—the intramural fighting on both sides of the fense makes forward movement extremely difficult.

While it may be merely parallelism, as the moderate Republicans say, the fact is that on vote after vote a majority of the House GOP went down the aisle with the Southern Democrats. The Democratic National Committee pours out the statistics—70 percent of Republicans opposed to the food stamp plan, 85 percent against a raise in the minimum wage, 93 percent against rent supplements.

Often moderate and progressive Republicans are deeply disheartened when the powers that be, Republican and Democratic, join to force an issue beyond hope of modification or improvement.

The famous rat bill, which got only 21 Republican votes in the House, is another case in point. As Goodell noted, a liberal Democrat, Henry Reuss of Wisconsin, pointed out that the $40 million measure was a gimmick to put another agency with a high administrative overhead into the rat-exterminating business when the Public Health Service already is coordinating a series of antirat programs.

Does it really matter, the cynic will ask, whether the Republican minority establishes a stance of independence with constructive alternatives? The answer is probably "No" as the level of discontent in the country constantly rises. "Turn the rascals out" is an old and tried formula, and it may work again

World Food Needs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL E. BUTTON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 31, 1967

Mr. BUTTON. Mr. Speaker, in these times when the problem of the sufficiency of our world food supply is so critical, it is interesting to note that Hayden, Stone Inc., on June 16, 1967, sponsored an important forum on world food sufficiency.

In an effort to stimulate the interest of world investors in the world food needs, Hayden, Stone Inc. asked the Secretary of Agriculture, Orville L. Freeman, to speak on this challenge to the American business and financial interests. Responses from the investment community came from Mr. Patrick James, vice president of the Chase Manhattan Bank, and Mr. Robert Price, executive vice president of the Dreyfus Corp.

I am pleased to include in the RECORD Secretary Freeman's remarks:

WORLD FOOD NEEDS

(By Hon. Orville L. Freeman, Secretary of Agriculture)

I am impressed with the leadership that Hayden, Stone has shown in selecting this topic as the focus for our discussion today.

With the dramatic Middle East crisis, we have all had our eyes focused on the headlines. We have been more than normally conscious of the basic question of war or peace in the world. If that terrible day of total war should come, it would come not because we or the Soviet Union arbitrarily took the frightful final step. It would come because other nations, smaller nations, with their frustrated needs and aspirations brought us into it. I have asked myself: What can we do to prevent this? What can we do to stop World War III before it starts?

The President has stated again and again that his every-waking thought is "How can we accomplish both a stable world and a world at peace?" Obviously, there is no simple answer to that question, no easy blueprint, no button that anyone can push.

But we must hope.

Individually and collectively, mankind is restless and desires betterment. If everyone in the world believes that he can better himself, we might be sure that the peaceful world we want is possible.

Frankly, I think we would have to conclude that many, too many, are losing hope. If someone asked me, "What is the single biggest reason for such frustrated hope?", I might say, it's things as simple as transistor radios, because they have helped bring on a tremendous wave of rising expectations. Every thatched hut, every adobe village around the world, has these little radios; poor people have learned that there are other people living better. There poor people have aspirations, but in many cases few prospects of realizing them. This is another way of saying that there is a pitifully large gap around the world between the "haves" and "have-nots", the hopeful and the hopeless.

A gap has always existed, and perhaps that gap was worse in other times than it is in ours. But it has never been focused in such sharp relief, nor was it so widespread.

The economic gap and the recent war are closely connected. We might properly concentrate our attention on that gap.

There are 900,000,000 people in the so-called rich countries of the world. That includes Europe and the North American continent, Oceana, Japan and the U.S.S.R. There are two-and-a-half billion people in the poor countries, including mainland China. In the rich countries, the average income per person is $1,700 a year. In the poor countries, it is $110 a year, 1/15th as much. Of course, the gap between the richest and the poorest is very much greater. United States per capita income in 1960 was $2,300 and in India it was $70—which means that the average American is 33 times richer than the average Indian.

With these figures fresh in our minds, we focus sharply on the topic to which we direct our attention today—food and population.

By the year 1980 there will be at least one billion more people to feed around the world.

most in the developing countries. In addition, any progress that is made in increasing per capita income is going to result in rising pressures for more food, because the elasticity of demand for food in these countries is indeed very great.

It isn't commonly known that these countries have not done so poorly in agricultural development. Their rate of increase is only slightly less than ours. But their population and income growth have caused food demand to exceed food production increases.

The dangers implicit in this were well expressed centuries ago by the Roman philosopher, Seneca—"A hungry people listens not to reason, nor care for justice, nor is bent by prayer." That is applicable today.

If we look to the Old Testament, Isaiah, in the 8th Chapter, 21st Verse said, "And they shall pass through the land hard pressed and hungry; and in their hunger they shall become mad with rage, and shall curse their king and their God. . . ."

And so it has come to pass. In the past decade only one of the twenty-seven rich nations has suffered a major war on its own territory, and yet 32 out of the 38 poorest nations have known war on their home grounds.

Obviously, for both moral and practical reasons, closing the gap is an imperative both for us and for the poor nations. The sons of the rich and the sons of the poor alike are hostages of world hunger.

Can world hunger be prevented? All of us here have decisions to make which could help.

If we could put to work in the less developed countries the agricultural know-how that we have in the United States—where we have experienced the greatest productive marvel in the history of mankind—then every human being today, and the billion more in the year 2000, could have an adequate and nutritious diet.

But how do we go about exporting modern knowhow? How do we apply it to the lands which have not known modern agricultural techniques and inputs?

First, I might mention what we shouldn't do. We shouldn't start out trying to feed the world ourselves. It is true that for some time to come, the developed countries could produce enough to provide an adequate and relatively nutritious diet to the peoples of the world.

But could we distribute it? That would be an extremely difficult task. Just the logistics of having enough storage, rail and ocean transportation, loading and unloading facilities, and a distribution system are staggering. If we are willing to invest enough, we might have the know-how to accomplish it.

What it would take in terms of international politics is another question. I have never talked to a chief of state anywhere around the world who is willing to become dependent upon this country or any of the so-called more developed countries for the sustenance of his people. If we assumed, however, that a country was willing to become dependent upon us, and if we mobilized all our know-how, production and distribution to satisfy its needs, conceivably it could be done.

But even then, it would be the wrong thing to do because very quickly the less developed countries would become dependent upon us, and two serious problems would arise. They would relax their agricultural effort. They would fall short of making the necessary investment of both talent and resources. To put it rather crudely, the Finance Minister wouldn't give the Agricultural Minister much money and there would be, consequently, very little agricultural development. And, the food price structure would be destroyed, taking with it the inducement for local producers to apply modern techniques and inputs to raise production.

And if this doubly adverse effect occurred—and I'm quite confident it would—the developed countries would have the ability to produce enough to feed the rest of the world for only a very limited period. At some later date the world would literally run out of food. Long before that happened, I think we would have had our Armageddon. There could not be much hope. The outbursts that we have witnessed in the last decade around the world would grow in intensity until that last and ultimate horror of atomic war would overwhelm us.

I will be a little dogmatic and say that, in the absence of agricultural development, there won't be any economic development. The sine qua non of economic development is agricultural development. This is the number one economic prerequisite. This country, and the great developed countries of the world, have gotten to the stage of real economic progress only when they have developed a healthy, viable agriculture. That is the base on which progress rests.

So, too, we can see the crucial role of the private sector in every successful agricultural development example. This is obviously true of the great American agricultural complex.

The job of world agricultural development cannot, in my judgment, be done without the private sector of our economy exporting more of our agricultural know-how. It is a tough job. It is more difficult to build a strong agricultural economy than it is to accomplish industrial developments of various kinds.

There have been a lot of analogies drawn between industrial and agricultural development. But they are fundamentally different. In the first place, agricultural development depends on millions of individual enterprises in any one nation rather than a few industrial combines. The close supervision which is prevalent in factories is lacking on farms, and agriculture is subject to largely uncontrollable environmental and biological forces. It must be custom tailored to each country, or to each region within a country, and often to each farm.

We ought to face the fact that to move from a thin subsistence to a healthy commercial agriculture is a tough, exacting process. It is a complex task to get new discoveries down to the farmers, as the county agents and businessmen in this country do. It means fair pricing for farm products. It means credit at reasonable rates to farmers. It means transportation to move products.

It means processing and marketing. It means fertilizer plants and the availability of many other inputs. It means educational and cooperative institutions. The key to this is in the private agribusiness sector.

You can have all the inputs; but putting them together, understanding the targets, organizing and administering to achieve a goal—these are the key elements; the most limiting elements, the ones that somehow or other we have got to attract if we are going to bring hope to people and put knowhow and capital to work where needed.

The time has come, the challenge is there. There is real opportunity for investment consistent with the responsibility that any corporate leader has to his stockholders to make a fair and reasonable profit. And, in the process of making a profitable investment, a corporation can create hope and enthusiasm which are so important if we are to build a peaceful world and avoid the ultimate horror.

The areas of investment opportunity are great because the potential demand for farm inputs is tremendous. In magnitude, the potential is really enormous, challenging and exciting.

In our country, farmers purchase $12.5 billion worth of inputs from the non-farm sector. American farmers cultivate 300 million acres and spend $42 per year per acre on supplies from the non-farm sector.

Even nations with very small holdings, such as Japan and Taiwan, with average farms of only about three acres, absorb a huge volume of inputs. As a matter of fact, spending per acre in Japan is greater than in the United States.

Last year, American farmers spent $600 million for improved seeds. Move that for a moment to India, Pakistan, Indonesia and other countries in terms of the magnitude of demand for improved seed.

Another component of demand is fertilizer. Today the world uses about 7,000,000 tons of plant nutrients. By 1980, it will need to use about 47,000,000 tons. Let us say that $150 buys a ton of nutrient. The prospective market could well expand from the present $1,000,000,000 a year to at least $7,000,000,000 a year. This is only 15 years away.

I could cite equally promising markets for other inputs. Chemicals, machines and implements, and a complex of other products from pumps to refrigeration equipment will be in demand. It is a challenge to every innovative, imaginative, creative business leader to meet this demand and in the process to make a fair profit.

Your government looks favorably upon private investment in the developing countries. Without going into great detail, this government is ready to offer credit, various kinds of risk insurance and political guarantees and technical and financial information to companies investing in these countries. We have been trying in a number of ways to reach leaders in the agribusiness investment communities to ask them, "Can you tell us specifically what the government can do further to lend you a helping hand?"

With other countries, our policies have become firm. The whole thrust of Public Law 480, "Food for Freedom—Food for Peace" is that in meeting the needs of hungry people through our food shipments, we ask the recipients to apply sound self-help principles to their own food production. We are *requiring* countries which have lagged and refused to invest in their agriculture to change their policies.

Many have responded. India is a good example. There has been almost a 180 degree turnaround in India. Agriculture is her number one topic. When they start cutting the budget because of financial pressures, agriculture is the one that is protected from cuts as they seek to move ahead.

This is reflected in other less developed countries. "Profit" has become a respectable word around the world. The free enterprise privately-owned business operations are outscoring, outcompeting, outdoing socialist enterprises on every front around the world. It is interesting to observe that even in the Soviet Union the word "profit" is becoming acceptable.

In country after country—Mexico, Israel, Costa Rica, Taiwan, Thailand, South Korea, Ivory Coast, Brazil and several others in Latin America—governments have taken and are taking steps to establish favorable investment climates. Tax preferences or exemptions, import privileges, guaranties on capital repatriation—in short a variety of laws—testify to their recognition that they need and are prepared to support investment and the management skills which come along with it.

I don't mean to overstate this picture. I do not mean to imply that prejudice has ceased and everywhere around the world there is agreement that foreign capital is indispensable or that investment laws will be carried out in the letter and the spirit of the law.

Economic development is a complex matter that is obviously not accomplished by flat. But a great deal of progress has been made in the most recent years. Agriculture is beginning to assume its proper leading role. It is simply too important a matter to be deterred by blind prejudices.

Finally the stage is set. I would repeat by saying that soon you will explore this carefully and thoroughly. The influence of business and financial people is very significant. The effect that you could have—when you decide to follow up some of the suggestions resulting from our gathering here today, and others that you know about—can be very important.

For a host of political, traditional, ideological and cultural reasons, agriculture doesn't rate very high on the prestige totem pole. The result has been that agriculture has been progressively ignored and the phantom of industrial development and the symbolism of prestige that goes with it have tended to downgrade agriculture. But today there is a change of attitude, a recognition of the farmer's importance, a recognition here and around the world. In the six years that I have been in Washington there has been a sharp reversal. That turnaround has been in part the recognition of agriculture's contribution to the progress we have enjoyed in this country.

Government has been involved in our agricultural miracle, but private enterprise has played the key and critical part in it. While the extension agent has been out in the boondocks, the salesman has traveled right along with him. As I have put it facetiously on occasion, when you get the salesman out there selling and the extension agent out there keeping him honest, you have a combination that can't be beat.

Our government has never gone in for producing farm production inputs. Our government has never gone in for processing or distribution. But our government has sponsored research, although today private industry is doing more agricultural research than public agencies. Likewise, government has organized education and credit systems and yet today the private sector is involved in both.

And our government has established a pricing arrangement that stimulates producers to maintain a reasonable working relationship in a free market between supply and demand. Blessed as we are with an enormous capacity to overproduce, we have had to learn by pragmatic trial and error how to do this.

We are now in a world where the need is so great that it is intolerable to have unmet needs and unused capacity. We must bring those two together. In the process of doing so, we have to keep our eye on the target. That is to export technical know-how and management techniques. We will export food for humanitarian purposes, food for nutrition purposes, food for capital, but not food to suffocate agricultural development and self-help.

Agricultural development will be accomplished only with a combination of capital, scientific and technical know-how, and equally and more important in my judgment, management. Creative leadership is always in short supply and is always hard to find, but it is the essence of a good business operation. This is what we need most.

Most of you here today counsel people on how to invest money. I think you do so as much as anything on your evaluation of the capacity and leadership of the people that will carry forward an enterprise. This is the key reason above all others why the private sector must be deeply involved in this challenge that lies right before us.

I close my remarks here today with a quotation from one of the truly great men of the world. I refer to Saint Paul. Paul said in his letter to James, Chapter I, Verse 22, "But be ye doers of the word, and not hearers only, deceiving your own selves. For if any be a hearer of the word, and not a doer, he is like unto a man beholding his natural face in a glass: For he beholdeth himself and goeth his way, and straightway forgetteth what manner of man he was. But whoso looketh into the perfect law of liberty, and continueth therein, he being not a forgetful hearer, but a doer of the word, this man shall be blessed in his deed."

In this room are assembled doers, and we are engaged in giving mankind freedom from hunger and pestilence and woe. There is nothing more important in the world.

Guide or Misguide

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 31, 1967

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, It was most refreshing and encouraging to read these words written by an outstanding member of the Negro race, Mr. Archie Moore, retired light heavyweight boxing champion. I was so impressed by his thoughts and comments, that I felt compelled to call the attention of all of the Members of the House of Representatives to Mr. Moore's most eloquent and moving plea, as it appeared in the August 8, 1967, issue of the San Diego Union:

Guide or Misguide—Archie Moore Points Way

(Editor's Note.—Archie Moore, internationally known San Diegan and retired light heavyweight boxing champion of the world, told friends yesterday he feels that "everybody must take a stand in this time of internal crisis. A man who stands neutral stands for nothing." He then wrote the following statement and submitted it to The San Diego Union, which is printing it verbatim.)

(By Archie Moore)

The devil is at work in America, and it is up to us to drive him out. Snipers and looters, white or black, deserve no mercy. Those who would profit from their brother's misfortunes deserve no mercy, and those who would set fellow Americans upon each other deserve no mercy.

I'll fight the man who calls me an "Uncle Tom." I have broken bread with heads of state, chatted with presidents and traveled all over the world. I was born in a ghetto, but I refused to stay there. I am a Negro, and proud to be one. I am also an American, and I'm proud of that.

The young people of today think they have a hard lot. They should have been around in the '30s when I was coming up in St. Louis. We had no way to go, but a lot of us made it. I became light heavyweight champion of the world. A neighbor kid down the block, Clark Terry, became one of the most famous jazz musicians in the world. There were doctors, lawyers and chiefs who came out of that ghetto. One of the top policemen in St. Louis came from our neighborhood.

We made it because we had a goal, and we were willing to work for it. Don't talk to me of your "guaranteed national income." Any fool knows that this is insanity. Do we bring those who worked to get ahead down to the level of those who never gave a damn? The world owes nobody—black or white—a living. God helps the man who helps himself!

Now then, don't get the idea that I didn't grow up hating the injustices of this world. I am a staunch advocate of the Negro revolution for the good of mankind. I've seen almost unbelievable progress made in the last handful of years. Do we want to become wild beasts bent only on revenge, looting and killing and laying America bare? Hate is bait, bait for the simple-minded.

Sure, I despised the whites who cheated me, but I used that feeling to make me push on. If you listen to the professional rabble-rousers, adhere to this idea of giving up everything you've gained in order to revenge yourself for the wrongs that were done to you in the past—then you'd better watch your neighbor, because he'll be looting your house next. Law and order is the only edge we have. No man is an island.

Granted, the Negro still has a long way to go to gain a fair shake with the white man in this country. But believe this: if we resort to lawlessness, the only thing we can hope for is civil war, untold bloodshed, and the end of our dreams.

We have to have a meeting of qualified men of both races. Mind you, I said qualified men, not some punk kid, ranting the catch phrases put in his mouth by some paid hatemonger. There are forces in the world today, forces bent upon the destruction of America, your America and mine. And while we're on the subject, do you doubt for a minute that communism, world communism, isn't waiting with bated breath for the black and white Americans to turn on each other full force? Do you want a chance for life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness in the land of your birth, or do you want no chance at all under the Red heel?

AFRICA'S A GREAT PLACE TO VISIT

There are members of the black community who call for a separate nation within America. Well, I do not intend to give up one square inch of America. I'm not going to be told I must live in a restricted area. Isn't that what we've all been fighting to overcome? And then there is the element that calls for a return to Africa.

For my part, Africa is a great place to visit, but I wouldn't want to live there. If the Irishmen want to go back to the Emerald Isle, let them. If the Slavs want to return to the Iron Curtain area, OK by me. But I'm not going to go to any part of Africa to live. I'm proud of ancestry, and of the country that spawned by forefathers, but I'm not giving up my country. I fought all my life to give my children what I'm able to give them today; a chance for development as citizens in the greatest country in the world.

I do not for a moment think that any truly responsible Negro wants anarchy. I don't think you'll find intelligent—no, let's rephrase that—mature Negroes running wild in the streets or sniping at total strangers. God made the white man as well as the black. True, we haven't acted as brothers in the past, but we are brothers. If we're to be so many Cains and Abels, that's our choice. We can't blame God for it.

TEACH THAT "ANY BOY CAN"

Something must be done to reach the Negroes and the whites in the ghettos of this country, and I propose to do something.

As a matter of plain fact, I have been doing something for the past several years. I have been running a program which I call the ABC—Any Boy Can. By teaching our youth, black, white, yellow and red, what dignity is, what self respect is, what honor is, I have been able to obliterate juvenile delinquency in several areas.

I would now expand my program, change scope. If any boy can, surely any man can. I want to take teams of qualified people, top men in their fields, to the troubled areas of our cities. I know that the people who participated in the recent riots, who are participating and who will participate, are misguided rather than mad.

If some bigot can misguide, then I can guide. I've spent too much of my life building what I've got to put it to torch just to satisfy some ancient hatred of a man who beat my grandfather. Those men are long dead. Do we have to choke what could be a beautiful garden with weeds of hate? I say NO! And I stand ready to start "Operation Gardener." I invite the respected Negro leaders of our country to join me.

Address of Senator Frank Moss, Before the Western States Democratic Conference in Los Angeles, August 26, 1967

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BRADEMAS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 31, 1967

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have the opportunity to call to the attention of my colleagues a most timely and appropriate speech by Senator FRANK MOSS, of Utah, before the Western States Democratic conference in Los Angeles on August 26, 1967.

The address follows:

We meet tonight at a time of national pain and crisis. On all sides, our beloved country is beset with problems—with war, taxes, strikes, riots, population explosions, drugs, campus unrest, conflict between generations, invasion of privacy, and crime.

And we Democrats are getting blamed for all of them—for all of them, and the hippies too.

In fact, if we were living in China today, and were following the old Chinese custom of labeling the years, we probably would be calling 1967 "The year of our great agony."

There are few men of good will who do not feel shaken. What is happening challenges the basic Democratic processes upon which American civilization is built.

It questions the effectiveness of our institutions—public and private, spiritual and secular, labor and business—to rise to the needs of the people.

It calls up for scrutiny the human and social value of the economic progress the country has made in the last ten years.

It makes it very clear that all Americans—black or white, rich or poor—must reaffirm their willingness to be responsible citizens.

And it indicates that whatever we have done to banish hopelessness and open the doors of opportunity and improve life for the poorest of us—it is not enough—not nearly enough.

Events of 1967 constitute a clear call to all of us—to those who hold public trust, to those in business, to labor, to individual, dedicated citizens everywhere—to pitch in and help make democracy work for all so that the great American dream of equality and fraternity will not go down the drain, but will be preserved and strengthened.

TRIAL IN AMERICA

But if you think that this time of firey trial in America has brought forth any real suggestions for solutions from our Republican friends, you are pipe dreaming. It has only swelled the eternal Republican Chorus of "We can do it better." When it comes to the question of "how" the chorus is as silent as it has ever been.

It is easy to stand here and say that violence and rioting are wrong, and that we must enforce order and make our streets safe and bring to swift justice all who shatter the law.

Being *against* violence is like being against sin. To a public official, it is worth a thousand votes any day, and the Republicans know it.

But it is something else to try to *demolish* sin. You can't do this unless you know what causes it. And after you know what causes it you must provide alternatives to the conditions which drive men to evil.

The Democratic administration and the majority of the Democrats in Congress have been trying for sometime to get at the causes of some of our troubles. It would be cruel deception to stand here and tell you we have all of the answers. Part of the agony of our times is that the solutions to our problems are tough to find, and hard to put into operation. But we are aware that our cities are rotting at the core, and that our urban ghettos are fertile ground for violence and crime. And we have proposed some remedies—some minimal remedies.

What help have we had from our Republican friends who are talking so long and so loud? We have found that they are just as much against sin—after it is discovered—as anybody else, but when it comes to doing anything to prevent it, they shuffle into that Republican sidestep which they do so well.

VOTES IN THE HOUSE

Consider the votes of Republicans in the House of Representatives on the minimal first steps we Democrats proposed to remove some of the blight which has settled on the nation's cities.

84 percent of the House Republicans voted against the Model Cities Program.

90 percent voted to recommit the Urban Mass Transit Act.

94 percent voted against passage of the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

85 percent of House Republicans voted to delay the effective date of the Minimum Wage Law for one year.

98 percent of the Republicans voted to recommit relocation assistance to the urban poor.

93 percent of the Republicans voted against rent supplements.

84 percent voted against the Civil Rights Act of 1966 and 85 percent against the Civil Rights Act of 1965.

And, finally, 87 percent voted against the Rat Extermination Act of 1967.

If I wanted to be unkind—and I certainly would never want to be unkind to a Republican—I might suggest that our Republican friends are trying very hard to make this the "Year of the Rat."

Gerald Ford, the Republican's Minority Leader, told us not long ago, with a straight face, that the Republicans voted against the Rat Extermination Bill because it could "at best serve only 2½ percent of the people, and only a little better than one-half of one percent of the nation's 18,000 communities."

By his own calculation, this means that the Rat Control Program would have served only five million people.

Does Mr. Ford mean that the Republicans only vote for programs which serve more than 5 million?

Only 300,000 people died from cancer last year. Does this mean that we should stop spending federal money to find the causes and cure of cancer?

Only 53,000 Americans died in highway accidents in 1966. Does this mean that we should not put into operation our new highway safety regulations?

COLD-BLOODED NONSENSE

Mr. Ford was talking nonsense and he knew it—cold-blooded nonsense which helped perpetuate a mini-riot in the House of Representatives a few days later.

There have been other brands of nonsense this summer from the Republican side. Surely they have been spawned by this long, hot summer—this "summer of our discontent" as the news media like to label it. I was amazed to read in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the other day that:

"Betty Furness terrifies us."

Now, I know President Johnson's new special assistant for Consumer Affairs quite well. She conducted a most successful audience participation show for me during my campaign in 1964, and she recently married Les Midgley, who is a native of Utah and the brother of my Administrative Assistant.

So I read further about Betty. It seems that Congressman Robert H. Michel, a Republican of Illinois, is "terrified" of her because she admits that some of the information made available to her since she took her new job has made her more careful about getting an automobile loan.

Congressman Michel asks darkly:

"Would you borrow money from Betty Furness?" Pretty, charming, intelligent Betty Furness. It must be the summer heat, Congressman.

If the Republicans have been floundering on riots and rats—and Betty Furness—consider their plight on Vietnam.

For months, they have generally supported President Johnson, taking the hard military line. About once a week, Gerald Ford, the House Republican leader rises up to say:

"Let's rain more bombs on North Vietnam."

Now along comes Governor George Romney, one of their leading candidates for the Presidential nomination, with a plan to make the Republican the "Peace Party of 1968."

THE RIGHT COURSE

But since Governor Romney has said several times in the past that he felt President Johnson was pursuing the right course, he is having some difficulties in making his case for peace stick.

First of all, he doesn't say whether the Republican Party would achieve peace through military conquest, or whether the party has found some way out, which they haven't revealed yet.

Next, he declares that he thinks it is unrealistic to think that bombing North Vietnam will ever bring negotiations, but then hurries to say that he is not recommending that the bombing be stopped. And that he agrees with Gerald Ford anyway.

Furthermore, Governor Romney advises that the only way to end the war is to "demonstrate" that we can "destroy the military infrastructure of North Vietnam," that is destroy the guerrilla infrastructure. But he doesn't say how we should "demonstrate" this, or even better, how we should do it. I am sure our military leaders in the field would like to know.

But finally, Governor Romney does say something with which I think perhaps President Johnson, and many others here in the audience would fully agree—and that is that it is a "tragedy that we ever got into Vietnam."

I am telling no secrets when I say that no one is happy with the situation in Vietnam today. It is draining 2 billion dollars each month from our resources—resources we need to rebuild our bleeding cities and wipe out poverty here at home and is killing hundreds of young American men a month and wounding many more. I am sure that President Johnson and Defense Secretary McNamara and Secretary of State Rusk want, far more fervently than either you or I, to bring the war to an end. But they insist that we do it with honor—that we keep our commitment to the South Vietnamese—that we assure the people of this small, underdeveloped nation the opportunity to choose the type of government under which they will live. The President and his advisors are trying hard to bring North Vietnam to the conference table by bombing. If bombing will not work, they must find some other means of persuasion. But find it they will. You and I know that—you and I know that this agony will pass.

THE 1968 PLATFORM?

Some of the Republicans may think they are going to succeed in making the American people believe that they—and they alone—can bring peace to Vietnam and end our riots here at home. But if I should be asked to suggest a Republican platform for 1968 it would run something like this:

End the war in Vietnam—but don't ask us how.

Bring peace to the world—but we haven't even a twig for the dove.

Make our streets safe—but where do you start?

Stop the riots—but don't depend on us to do it.

And, if by chance the Republicans should tell you that a Democrat can't even be elected rat catcher in 1968—don't believe it.

I am reminded of the story of the politician who woke up one morning to find a large obituary in the newspaper announcing his death.

He was nonplussed, to put it mildly, and immediately got the local editor on the phone.

"Bill," he said, "Your story is in error, I'm right here on the phone."

The editor didn't say anything for a moment, and then came back hesitantly with: "Where are you calling from?"

Well, I want to tell all the editors, and all the Republicans, and all of the people, that the Democratic party is very much here—and it is working in the here and now.

We have a program for the future of America and we have the resources—human and material—to match our problems and match them we will.

We have brought the United States to the greatest peak of prosperity in its history—Democratic prosperity. Our gross national product will run at the rate of $805 billion in the fourth quarter of this year. Any sag which was apparent in the economy the first of this year has gone. And unemployment is again down below the four percent point.

AMERICA WILL DO IT

So America has the money to do the things which must be done to meet the crises which face us. We can take the strain out of the fabric of American life—and we will do it.

But the federal government cannot—and should not—be asked to do it alone.

Whose fault is it when thirteen people are crowded into two rooms of a slum ghetto?

Whose fault is it when a willing and able-bodied man cannot find work, simply because his skin is the wrong color?

Whose fault is it when a young man drops out of school to join a gang of juvenile delinquents?

Whose fault is it when small children go to school in clothes that are not warm enough and with a breakfast that is too scant?

The answer is that it is the fault of each and every one of us—of America as a whole.

Whose fault is it when an infectious wave of mindless violence sweeps a city?

Whose fault is it when looters and snipers roam our streets at night?

Whose fault is it when our police departments are understaffed and our policemen ill-trained?

Whose fault is it when justice is not meted out swiftly and surely to those who break the law?

It is the fault of all of us—and it will require the efforts of all of us to do something about it—the efforts of every one of the fifty states, of each of our counties and cities and towns, of private enterprise, of labor, of our churches and our schools, of our police departments and our courts, of our civic groups and our philanthropic groups, of our mothers and fathers at our family hearths, and of men and women of good will everywhere.

YEAR OF OPPORTUNITY

I say that 1967 is not "the year of our great agony," but "the year of our great opportunity."

Over 100 years ago men like Washington and Franklin and Adams and Jefferson founded a new nation. The times were dangerous. The stakes were high. It took men with courage and heart. But the spirit of '76 prevailed, and the dream of a free and independent nation, in which all men were equal, became a reality.

Today, America faces a new test in a new time. The American dream has been challenged. There is a question as to whether free and equal people can live together in happiness and harmony. I think we can. I call upon America to produce the spirit of '67—a spirit akin to that which founded our country almost 200 years ago. I call upon all our people to show that courage and heart and wisdom and will are not dead in America, and that the American dream is still the hope of the world. And I call upon our great Democratic party to continue its leadership in seeking political and human solutions to the problems of our time. As we have done before, we will again prove our right to lead!

Robert King High: Dedicated American, Mayor of Miami, Fla.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1967

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, Robert King High, the fighting, red-haired mayor of Miami, died yesterday. At 43 he had apparently regained his health after a previous heart attack suffered some 4 years ago. Mayor High's death is a tragic loss to the people of Miami, the State of Florida, and to the country. He was a dedicated public servant, always in the mainstream of public life. Small in stature, big in heart and courage, he was the little man's hero.

In politics he took on all the giants. Elected first in 1957 as mayor, he immediately started out as a crimebuster, taking on the political consequences of all the powerful gamblers. He took on utility companies and forced them to lower their rates. He fought with the powerful Florida East Coast Railroad. The "powerful" were the "special interest" groups that ganged up against the "little man," and the mayor as their champion always waged courageous fights.

He was the standard bearer for the Democratic Party in the last gubernatorial election. He was a staunch Democrat; always active in local, State and National Democratic affairs. He was one of the first high-ranking public officials in Florida to publicly announce his support of Senator Jack Kennedy prior to the Democratic Convention at which Senator Kennedy became the presidential nominee. He became a vigorous and active supporter of President Johnson in the last presidential race.

Robert High loved politics; the hard work, the challenge, the excitement, the accomplishments and the defeats all, were part of the fabric of his life.

His interests ranged far beyond purely domestic politics. He learned to speak Spanish. He became extremely well-known throughout South America, where he traveled extensively, spoke frequently, and otherwise became as Mayor of Miami, America's ambassador of good will. He was a favorite of Miami's large Latin population, and Mayor High spent a great amount of time and effort in bridging the gap of understanding, not only between the diverse groups that existed in his community but also between North and South America.

His loss is a tragic one to the thousands who knew him and worked with him. I join all our citizens in extending our deepest sympathy and regret to his lovely wife, Faith, their children, and the rest of his family.

The Ninth New Jersey District Voters Speak Out

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1967

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, recently I sent out my annual questionnaire, "The Ninth District Voters' Voice in Congress," to the 149,000 households in the Ninth Congressional District of New Jersey, which I have the honor to represent in Congress. I have sought the opinions of my constituents on the vital issues which we, as Congressmen, face and must resolve in the best interests of our Nation and our constituents. I am extremely gratified that 28,408 people—actually representing families—in my congressional district have taken the time to return their questionnaires, providing me with a cross section of their opinions and views. It indicates their concern on the domestic and international issues of the day.

Now that the careful tabulation and analysis has been completed, I intend to have it circulated within my district so that my constituents may be apprised of the results. This compilation was an effort that required many college volunteers, in addition to my staff members. I wish to assure my constituents that their responses are of great value to me in making determinations and voting on the issues.

The subject of Vietnam has been given most considerate thought. In analyzing the present responses and comparing them with those of the past 2 years, I find that there is no significant change in the desire of my constituents on how to end this conflict: 80.7 percent advocate a greater effort and emphasis on diplomatic and peace initiatives in cooperation with other parties to secure an early termination of the conflict; 14.7 percent opposed this approach. Thus, a majority of my constituents feel as I do on this problem. I have advocated this method for some time.

In spite of the many demonstrations which have taken place in the United States in favor of getting out of Vietnam, the responses from my district indicate an opposition to this idea by a 56.3 percent to 34.9 percent ratio, with 8.8 percent undecided.

Fifty-nine and seven-tenths percent of my constituents feel that we should continue the bombing of North Vietnam, while 35.4 percent approve of the cessation of such bombing; 4.9 percent are undecided.

I have asked my constituents what other alternatives they suggest as a change in our policy to bring about an early and honorable termination. Of those answering this question, a lesser number than those answering question number 1, 34.1 percent stated that they desired no change in the present policy and 65.9 percent suggested other methods of concluding the war. The suggestions ran from "let the military run the war," "a concentration of military effort for achieving victory," to "allow the United Nations to resolve the matter," or "total withdrawal."

The fact that no radically new departures were suggested seems to indicate, to a degree, some frustration regarding the length of the conflict. Both the so-called "doves" and "hawks"—if this terminology is proper—have indicated a sincere desire to end the conflict and reestablish peace, except through different approaches.

One subject that has attracted much attention has been the question of President Johnson's efforts to increase trade and cultural relations with Eastern Europe. Fifty-three and nine-tenths percent of the responses indicated approval of such a program, with 35.1 percent dissenting and 11 percent undecided. These figures indicate an increase of 3 percent in favor as compared to last year's result. This slight change in attitude with respect to this proposal, perhaps reflects more positively this year because of the recent Johnson-Kosygin talks held at Glassboro, N.J., arranged by our Governor, the Honorable Richard J. Hughes. In addition, Mr. Speaker, I feel that my constituents feel that the proposed trade, in nonstrategic goods, and cultural exchange programs, as an alternative to armed conflict, is in the long run a more valid approach to establish a lasting world peace.

President Johnson's proposal for a surtax could command only a 25.6 percent approval while 65.2 percent disapproved; 9.2 percent were undecided. As an alternative to this my constituents expressed a suggestion to cut some of the existing domestic programs: 20.6 percent want the antipoverty program cut; 17.9 percent do not desire aid to cities; 11.8 percent want cuts in the public works program and the same number showed a desire to reduce expenditures in our space program; 10.9 percent indicated cuts in other fields such as foreign aid, defense and military spending and Federal spending in general.

The problems of our senior citizens were reflected in he answers to the questions concerning social security benefits: 67.2 percent endorsed an immediate social security increase with 25.1 percent were undecided. Flexible payments to meet the increases in cost of living were approved by 70.8 percent to 21.4 percent; 7.8 percent gave no opinion. Another social security question on the abolision of the dollar limitation of earning capacity was endorsed by 67 percent of those who replied and disapproved by 20.8 percent; 12.2 percent were undecided on this approval.

Another question which drew much favorable attention was one on combating crime by aiding local law enforcement officials through Federal grants to improve their police departments, courts, and correctional institutions. This showed a 77.2 percent approval; 14.9 percent disapproval and only 7.9 percent undecided. Legislation to this effect was passed by the House. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have played a role in this legislation with the introduction of a bill similar to the one approved by the House. I also cosponsored legislation which would increase the financial grants by $30 million to States and local autohrities for this purpose. This was incorporated in the measure passed by the House.

Finally, but not the least important topic on which my constituents were polled, was the suggested legislation to permit income tax deductions for parents of children attending college. I have also introduced legislation on this subject which is presently pending in the Ways and Means Committee. The results show an overwhelming 71.6 percent in accord, 23.4 percent disapproving, and a mere 5 percent undecided.

As I previously stated, the results of this poll will be sent to all of my constituents. I am very grateful for their participation because their answers reflect the time and effort they gave to the questionnaire. The results serve as a guide and an indication of their thoughts and opinions. I shall continue to respect their judgment when voting on the issues, and, as always, take into account the results before arriving at my decisions on any legislative matters.

With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I include at this point the complete tabulation of the 22 questions covered in my 1967 questionnaire, showing the vote by totals and percentages:

THE 9TH NEW JERSEY DISTRICT VOTERS' VOICE IN CONGRESS

Question	Total response	Approve		Disapprove		Undecided	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
FOREIGN AFFAIRS—VIETNAM							
Do you approve or disapprove of—							
1. A greater effort and emphasis on diplomatic and peace initiaties in cooperation with other parties in order to secure an early termination of the conflict	27,085	21,841	80.7	4,003	14.7	1,241	4.6
2. An unconditional cessation of the bombing of North Vietnam	27,526	9,763	35.4	16,441	59.7	1,322	4.9
3. A cessation of the bombing of North Vietnam only if Hanoi agrees to take some reciprocal measures	25,535	16,205	63.0	7,448	29.1	1,882	7.9
4. Deescalation of our military effort in South Vietnam with a gradual withdrawal of our troops	26,742	9,327	34.9	15,049	56.3	2,366	8.8
5. Further extension of the bombing to include other military targets in Hanoi and Haiphong	26,812	15,802	58.9	8,886	33.1	2,124	8.0
6. What do you suggest as a change of policy to bring about an end to the conflict?	24,043	------	----	------	----	------	----
No change. Pursue present policy since it is adequate	------	8,281	34.1	------	----	------	----
Other—Let military run war, all-out fight, let U.N. resolve problem, pull out completely, etc	------	15,762	65.9	------	----	------	----
DOMESTIC AFFAIRS							
Do you approve or disapprove of—							
7. Immediate social security increases to bring benefits in line with the cost of living	27,563	18,562	67.3	7,160	25.1	1,841	7.6
8. Flexible payments which would increase automatically with cost-of-living increases	26,543	18,811	70.8	5,686	21.4	2,046	7.8
9. Abolish the dollar limitation of earning capacity for people employed while receiving social security benefits	27,328	18,326	67.0	7,442	27.2	1,560	5.8
10. Help offset the proposed budget deficit with a 6-percent (surtax) tax increase	26,414	6,761	25.6	17,241	65.2	2,412	9.2
11. A cutback in the following existing programs in lieu of the surtax proposal	50,500	------	----	------	----	------	---
Health	------	2,481	4.9	------	----	------	---
Antipoverty	------	11,446	20.6	------	----	------	---
Education	------	2,082	4.1	------	----	------	---
Space	------	9,962	11.8	------	----	------	---
Aid to cities	------	9,045	17.9	------	----	------	---
Public works	------	5,961	11.8	------	----	------	---
Other—Foreign aid, defense and military spending, Federal spending	------	9,523	10.9	------	----	------	---
12. A return of a portion of Federal revenues to States to be used as the States desire	27,263	14,457	53.0	9,641	35.3	3,165	11.7
13. Enactment of a law to provide for full disclosure by public officials of all their financial interests in any corporation, business enterprise, or institution through an annual financial statement	27,413	22,723	82.9	3,241	11.8	1,448	5.3
14. The establishment of a strict code of ethics to include rigorous conflict of interest provisions	26,969	22,966	85.1	2,083	7.7	1,921	7.2
15. Safe Streets and Crime Control Act of 1967 to provide matching Federal funds to States and municipalities to improve their police departments, courts, and correctional institutions	27,570	21,287	77.2	4,121	14.9	2,162	7.9
16. Federal matching funds for the treatment and rehabilitation of narcotics addicts and users	27,256	17,364	63.7	7,010	25.7	2,882	10.6
17. President Johnson's efforts to build bridges to Eastern Europe through increased trade and cultural exchange	27,457	14,803	53.9	9,646	35.1	3,008	11.0
18. In general, do you approve of the antipoverty programs (Headstart, Job Corps, Neighborhood Youth Corps, VISTA)	27,534	12,609	45.8	12,284	44.6	2,641	9.6
19. Legislation restricting the sale and possession of concealable firearms	27,533	21,010	76.3	5,681	20.6	842	3.1
20. The outlawing of wiretapping, both public and private, except where the national security is at stake	27,163	15,882	58.4	9,123	33.5	2,153	8.1
21. Antistrike legislation for public service employees	27,691	17,961	64.8	7,307	26.4	2,423	8.8
22. Income tax deductions for parents of children attending college	27,649	19,806	71.6	6,451	23.4	1,362	5.0

Foreign Assistance Act of 1967

SPEECH

OF

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 24, 1967

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 12048) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I will not add my name to the list of those who intend to vote in favor of this bill.

My reasons for this opposition are varied and many, but I will say that perhaps my overriding reason can be summed with these words: I will not vote in favor of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1967, Mr. Chairman, because, in my heart, I know that what we should be debating and voting upon today is a Domestic Assistance Act of 1967—and beyond 1967.

In capsule form, Mr. Chairman, this Foreign Assistance Act is not presently commensurate with our national priorities.

We are turned around. This administration would have us blindly follow a path leading to a bottomless pit. Is there an end in sight in Vietnam? The message ought indeed to be clear enough. President Johnson has just consented to General Westmoreland's most recent request for additional deployment of American boys in that civil war—45,000 more troops will be provided by this country in 1968.

The massive cost of our involvement in Southeast Asia hardly needs elaboration. We are presently expending more than $2 billion a month—almost $30 billion a year. What was initially a minor commitment of around 600 technicians has become a major and brutal commitment of over 500,000 American soldiers. And there is no end in sight.

A further sign that this sacrifice shall continue is the administration's recent request for a tax increase. Americans are to dip into their pockets once again to finance U.S. involvement in a civil war 7,000 miles away. I assure you that citizens across the breadth of this land are today fast becoming more conscious of national priorities. And I would say that this growing consciousness about national priorities is broadly based; that is to say, the middle-income sector is developing a wariness similar to that of the vast majority of our poor.

For how long will our citizens be asked to prop up an oppressive and highly unpopular military government in Vietnam? I suspect as the stark reality begins to set in—so to speak—administration policymakers will become increasingly under scrutiny by the American public. National priorities will, indeed, become the focal point for debate.

Will our citizens continue to sit and observe as we vote down one domestic program after another? Will it be amusing to them as their elected legislators laughingly refuse even to debate the merits of legislation aimed at eliminating the rats from our slums and other areas? As the torch is put to one American city after another, will not our citizenry wonder about national priorities? As citizens—all of them American citizens—confront one another in the streets in what appears to be a lineup of "haves" versus "have-nots," will they not one day see the futility and tragedy of it all and seek to divert funds from a war most of them readily admit they fail to understand, and demand, instead, a massive domestic program at home?

These, then, are some thoughts which cross my mind as I listen to the debate taking place here today. I was impressed at the way Senator PERCY, of Illinois, expressed himself on this subject when he said:

> If we continue to spend $66 million a day trying to save the 16 million people of Vietnam while leaving the plight of 20 million urban poor in our own country unresolved—then I think we have our priorities terribly confused.

I fully agree with Senator PERCY's analysis. I am opposed to our involvement in the Vietnam war. Until we extract ourselves from that bloody conflict and begin to channel funds toward the proper priorities, any expenditure abroad will receive a long, hard, critical review from where I stand. Such is the case with this Foreign Assistance Act of 1968.

I readily admit that it was neither an easy nor a clear-cut decision for me to arrive at regarding this bill. Over the months, I have researched this subject carefully and extensively. In all fairness, I submit that the act encompasses some good, positive features—features which reflect an understanding of the methods we must use and approach we must take if our foreign assistance program is to bear positive results, both for this Nation as well as for the recipients of our aid.

However, despite these good features, I perceive the bill as more damaging and detrimental to our national interests than beneficial and constructive.

I realize there are some who will gasp in disbelief at my remarks and respond that this bill, as amended, would authorize a total foreign aid program of only about $2.8 billion for fiscal year 1968; also, that this is but a very modest change from last year's total; that, indeed, the current administration request has been trimmed to proper and prudent dimensions.

How, it will be asked, can one refuse the infusion of a paltry $2.8 billion in aid to the struggling, less-developed countries of the globe, in view of our massive $30 billion a year expenditure to one side of a civil war in Southeast Asia?

The answer is that as long as we remain entangled in Vietnam to the extent that we are, and 30 million Americans face a life of poverty, I must voice my opposition to further expenditures abroad—particularly when those expenditures reflect, in large part, the same mistakes of foreign policy which precipitated our involvement in Vietnam.

It is plain that the war in Vietnam feeds upon our Great Society resources. We are now faced with a 10-percent increase in taxes; taxes that are made necessary by our adventurism in Southeast Asia. Actually, it is difficult to assess who suffers more from the hostilities, our own citizens or those of Vietnam. In relation to this point, I would like to direct the attention of my colleagues, Mr. Chairman, to the similar views expressed by Mr. Hobart Rowen in a recent issue of the Washington Post:

GUNS NOT BUTTER: L. B. J. TAX POLICY STRESSES THE SHIFT

(By Hobart Rowen)

Belatedly, the Johnson Administration is confessing that even the rich American society cannot have unlimited amounts of guns and butter. Its request for a $7.4 billion, 10 per cent tax surcharge is an admission that this much money, at least, must be diverted from vacations and color TV sets to buying guns, helicopters and ammunition for the shooting war in Vietnam.

But the impact is even deeper than that, and Budget Director Charles L. Schultze yesterday drew a clear blueprint—somewhat unintentionally—of the shift from butter into guns.

His figures show that mountains of dollars have been poured into Vietnam in the past three years—and only pitifully small amounts into troubled U.S. cities and for social needs.

For example, in response to questions by Chairman Wilbur Mills (D-Ark.) of the House Ways and Means Committee, Schultze estimated that of a $44 billion increase in the projected fiscal 1968 budget compared with fiscal 1965, $29.7 billion has gone to defense, all but $3.8 billion of which was for Vietnam.

Measure that $26 billion increase for Vietnam against increases in the following items:

For the anti-poverty program—$1.6 billion

For the public housing—$600 million

For other low-cost housing—$600 million

For secondary and elementary education—$1.4 billion

For public assistance—$1.4 billion

Schultze's tally showed that lumping all poverty, housing, education, and welfare programs together, the increase in spending amounted to only $6.2 billion in the three-year period.

One Administration rebuttal to this line of argument is sure to be that additional billions are poured into socially desirable programs through trust fund operations.

But that cannot conceal the fact that at a moment of great national crisis, the Johnson Administration finds itself limited on what it can spend at home by the billions of dollars it has committed the nation to spend in Southeast Asia.

But we are not yet at the end of the cycle. As Schultze and Treasury Secretary Henry H. Fowler made clear, the President's "program of fiscal responsibility" in meeting the costs of the Vietnam war contemplates not only the tax increase, but further sizable reductions in non-military spending.

Thus, Schultze boasted that if we realize $1.5 billion in civilian expenditure reductions in fiscal 1968, non-Vietnam spending will constitute only 14 per cent of the Nation's total output, compared with 16 per cent in fiscal 1964, and 16.5 per cent during the Eisenhower Administration.

So the Great Society becomes a not-so-great society. Not only is there no consideration being given to a Marshal Plan for the cities, as proclaimed by Vice President Humphrey, but even existing programs are being whittled back.

And if the Administration and Congress should try to limit the size of the fiscal 1968 deficit to $14 billion—the lower end of the range that Secretary Fowler yesterday said is tolerable—there would have to be cutbacks deeper than that $1.5 billion mentioned by Schultze.

Revenues, with the surtax, are now estimated at $122.5 billion and expenditures at a potential $143.5 billion—prior to the Presi-

> dent's commitment to restrain, cut and control.
>
> That's a gap of $21 billion—and if the $14 billion figure isn't in the Administration's propaganda just to make Congress feel a bit less sick, that target would require reductions of $7 billion somewhere.
>
> Or, it will require more sales of "participation certificates" for a cosmetic touch-up of the deficit.
>
> In any event, the Administration finally did face up to the need of putting a tax-revenue bill before Congress. It helps show dramatically how deep and costly is our involvement in Southeast Asia, which Fowler said offers "no clear prospect of any early ending."
>
> But do we have the whole story, even on statistics?
>
> For example, the cost of 45,000 additional troops in Vietnam is put at from "zero to $4 billion." But cleverly, this is a net figure, which includes offsetting savings that Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara has been ordered to find.
>
> One wonders, therefore, whether the real figure for the additional troop cost is not the $5 to $6 billion predicted earlier by Sen. John Stennis (D-Miss.) and so vigorously denied by the Administration.

I do not intend, however, to discuss or analyze at this particular time, the capacity, nor the will, of our citizens to support this war effort. The important and more immediate point for our consideration is that we are financing an illegal and unjust involvement in a civil war to the tune of almost $30 billion a year. And we continue this policy at a time when our people and cities are faced with the wrath and torch of urban slumdwellers, and smolder with rebellion, and increasing societal disruption.

In view of the obvious need for expensive and expansive social engineering in our own Nation, I reiterate to you that I cannot and will not, at this time, support additional expenditures abroad. We cannot at once afford to involve ourselves in the bloody, protracted conflict in Vietnam, a renewed and massive effort to alleviate the desperate conditions of our poor at home, and foreign assistance.

To me, the priorities are clear. Assistance to our own people is first; foreign assistance is next, and expenditures for war in Vietnam should not have been on our list in the first place—because it is, our domestic programs suffer; and, as long as our domestic programs suffer, I stand in opposition to these foreign expenditures. I suppose this is a roundabout way of expressing a dissatisfaction with the war. Perhaps it is.

Others are expressing similar views. I find myself in complete agreement with the distinguished chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the Honorable WILLIAM J. FULBRIGHT, who stated recently:

> Administration officials tell us that we can indeed afford both Vietnam and the Great Society, and they produce impressive statistics of the gross national product to prove it. The statistics show financial capacity but they do not show moral and psychological capacity. They do not show how a President preoccupied with bombing missions over North and South Vietnam can provide strong and consistent leadership for the renewal of our cities. They do not show how a Congress burdened with war costs and war measures, with emergency briefings and an endless series of dramatic appeals, with anxious constituents and a mounting anxiety of their own, can tend to the workaday business of studying social problems and legislating programs to meet them. Nor do the statistics tell how an anxious and puzzled people, bombarded by press and television with the bad news of American deaths in Vietnam, the "good news" of enemy deaths—and with vividly horrifying pictures to illustrate them—can be expected to support neighborhood anti-poverty projects and national programs for urban renewal, employment and education. Anxiety about war does not breed compassion for one's neighbors; nor do constant reminders of the cheapness of life abroad strengthen our faith in its sanctity at home. In these ways the war in Vietnam is poisoning and brutalizing our domestic life. Psychological incompatibility has proven to be more controlling than financial feasibility; and the Great Society has become a sick society.

Mr. Chairman, we are presently witnesses to a social vomiting in the streets of America, from a sickness festering for too long in the bowels of our society. And, it was bound to evidence itself. I say this, because we have never sought an answer or treatment for this sickness; instead, we coated it over with stop-gap or temporary measures.

We are painfully aware now, that this social sickness affects all of us. No one is free from it—certainly, we cannot hide from the truth any longer; for it confronts us on our own terms, in our own neighborhoods, on our own streets.

Our domestic problems await proper solutions. The solutions demand vast and immediate expenditures, as well as basic social reorientation.

Consequently, we must reassess our national commitments and priorities and bring them into proper focus and balance. The conflict in Vietnam must be settled so that we may be better equipped—morally and financially—to get at first things first. Until that time, I will not support expenditures for Vietnam—neither will I presently lend my support to foreign assistance.

The plain and irrepressible truth is we cannot afford the entire package. Someone will be shortchanged in the process—in this case it would be the American public; and it is my view that they deserve more than an open-ended Asian war and a short-sighted, deflated war on domestic poverty.

But what of the bill itself? As I stated earlier in my remarks, it encompasses both good and bad features.

First, I am pleased to note that the initial administration request was reduced in committee from $3,226,420,000 to $3,158,919,000. Those members responsible for the reductions deserve our admiration.

However, my opposition to this Foreign Assistance Act goes much deeper than fiscal concern alone. I have strong reservations about the thrusts and objectives of our entire foreign assistance program. Where does the aid go, and for what purposes? What type of assistance is it—economic or military? What about the self-help aspects of this aid? Are we doing all we can to discourage regional arms races?

Before I begin to elaborate on these subjects, I want to commend the distinguished members of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs for including in the bill, section 304, which calls for U.S. initiative in strengthening arrangements for standby forces to be used for United Nations peacekeeping purposes. This section represents a progressive and farsighted understanding of the work that can be carried out by that world organization in preserving the peace. This amendment to the bill reflects the general provisions of the more than 60 bills, including my own, which have been introduced this session on this subject.

Much of my dissatisfaction with our foreign assistance program stems from my strong dislike for those provisions which allow for military grants and sales. In my opinion, this arms policy has not served our long-range national interests.

In the eyes of much of the world, the United States seems more intent on furnishing swords than plowshares. During the past 17 years, we have bestowed on foreign governments $8 billion in military vehicles and weapons, $7 billion in aircraft, $5 billion in ammunition, $2 billion in ships, $2 billion in communications equipment, $1.5 billion in missiles, and $3 billion in other supplies. Services granted in the form of base construction, training, repair, and spare parts amounted to an additional $8 billion, for a staggering total of $37 billion dispensed abroad since 1950.

The armaments which these sums represent are no less staggering: 4,385 F–84 fighters; 2,812 F–86 fighters; 3,292 aircraft trainers; 20,279 tanks; 75,995 trailers; 150,552 2½-ton trucks; 1,362,000 carbines; 2,106,000 rifles; 72,777 machineguns; 29,716 mortars; 30,340 missiles.

And that is not all, Mr. Chairman. As if to augment these massive gifts of arms, the Defense Department is now engaged in a mushrooming sales campaign. Direct sales to foreign governments already exceed $16 billion, while Pentagon officials anticipate orders worth another $15 billion in the next decade.

Rather than to outline here a broad, general picture of the military arms policy we are following, I will discuss, instead, a good case in point—our military assistance program to Latin America.

I was impressed by an excellent review of U.S. Government operations in Latin America by the Honorable ALLEN J. ELLENDER, Senator from Louisiana. These views are contained in Senate document No. 18, 90th Congress. I offer for your perusal the conclusions of Senator ELLENDER:

> 1. I again recommend an immediate reduction in the overall emphasis we are placing on military assistance. In my view, we are working at cross-purposes when we seek to bring about economic integration and cooperation on the one hand, and assist and encourage neighboring nations to increase their military strength on the other.
>
> I question many of our high ranking officers stationed throughout Latin America as to what they believe to be their primary role and the function of their assignment. There was a singular lack of any real understanding and agreement as to what they were actually to do in behalf of our Government. Some stated that their presence was to limit the influence of other governments, such as France or Russia. Others stated that they were there to assist with internal security. I recommend that immediate steps be taken to explicitly define the role of our military assistance programs on a country-by-country basis. If this role is indeed to assist in internal security operations, I would have

fewer objections, but I doubt that this can be shown in a majority of cases.

2. As a furtherance of the internal security justification, it would seem to me that better results could be obtained by recruiting civilian police officers to aid in this work. In any event, no single feature of our foreign policy so tarnishes the image of the United States as does the presence of large numbers of military personnel parading around the streets of foreign cities in uniform. I recommend that in those few cases where a military assistance program is actually in the best interest of our Government, our officers and men be directed to make their military presence in the country as unobstrusive as possible and be instructed to wear civilian attire when going before the public.

3. I questioned all of our representatives abroad and could not find any who admitted that a military buildup was in progress in any part of South or Central America. However, the fact remains that we sold jet fighter planes to Argentina on the basis of "modernizing" the Argentine Air Force. In response, Chile has purchased jet fighters from Britain, and the Chilean Foreign Minister has been quoted as saying, "This is the start of an arms race in this area."

As will be seen in my country report on Chile, this nation can ill afford to divert any of its resources from economic development, which has already suffered greatly because of the lack of attention to agricultural development, although it has one of the greatest agricultural potentials of any country to the south of us.

The fact remains that whether an arms race is in the making or not, our military presence in these countries tends to create fear and suspicion among neighbors. Except for scattered guerrilla activities, all of Latin America is now at peace, but if we encourage the creation of large military establishments, the question will naturally be asked, "Against whom is this military might to be directed?" Since jet fighter planes and tanks are of questionable value in maintaining internal security, good neighbors might conclude that the purchase of these armaments is for use against them, and they will naturally be constrained to increase their own defense structure. Therefore, I recommend that the activities of our military assistance advisory group be curtailed and the large number of high ranking officers we are maintaining abroad be returned home as soon as possible.

The following table indicates the authorized strength for fiscal year 1967 of military and civilian personnel, including locals attached to military group staffs throughout Latin America.

U.S. MILITARY GROUPS—LATIN AMERICA—FISCAL YEAR 1967 MANPOWER AUTHORIZATIONS

Country	Officers	Enlisted	U.S. civilians	Locals	Total
Argentina	38	25	2	9	74
Bolivia	26	23	2	10	61
Brazil	51	52	13	49	165
Chile	27	21	1	8	57
Colombia	33	28	1	6	68
Costa Rica	4	7	------	2	13
Dominican Republic	35	24	------	3	62
Ecuador	30	39	------	9	78
El Salvador	13	12	------	3	28
Guatemala	15	15	------	4	34
Honduras	9	12	------	3	24
Nicaragua	11	12	------	2	25
Panama	3	2	------	1	6
Paraguay	13	12	------	4	29
Peru	35	34	1	5	75
Uruguay	15	12	1	7	35
Venezuela	42	39	1	2	84
Total	400	369	22	127	918

We have heard discussed here today, the constant flow of large and sophisticated military hardware to the nations of Latin America. And, we are told that this weaponry is to be utilized to assist in the defense of the hemisphere, and to quell local insurgencies—or, as we hear more often, to deal with Communist agitators. Allow me to elaborate on this last point for a moment, because, in my opinion, it presents us with one of our greatest obstacles to success in dealing with the peoples of Latin America and, for that matter, the world.

It is indeed a tragic thing to say, but in my judgment, we seem to be furthering the cause of those enemies we profess to obstruct. In too many instances, these Communist agitators who are beaten back into the bushes, largely with American weaponry, are legitimate and well-intentioned nationalists. Frustration with corrupt and unconstitutional governments that make a mockery of progressive reform as outlined in the Alliance for Progress, is what generally causes these guerrillas to take to the hills; then, ironically, our weapons help keep them there. This further intensifies their frustration, and they do indeed take on ideological philosophies which run counter to ours. In effect, then, we assist in backing these nationalist movements into an ideological corner, where they must look outside their local sphere for guidance and assistance. And, I hasten to add, they generally find willing allies. Is this in our interest? I think not.

Success in Latin America lies in fundamental socio-economic and political reform—not to say, revolution. It will not be easy, if it is at all possible, in our lifetime. It will demand nothing less than a massive infusion of human and financial resources—both local and external. The continued diversion of caiptal from reform outlays to military expenditures is, with few exceptions, a useless waste. It is a luxury that less-developed countries can ill afford.

There has been a cutback in this military assistance as a result of voting here today; for this, I am encouraged. More American dollars should be diverted from military assistance to economic reform; if we can realize this soon enough, we might possibly be saved the expense of more Vietnams. I believe that what we are a witness to, and victims of, in Vietnam—and it would do us well to learn our lesson—is a failure to move with the tide of revolutionary reform presently sweeping the less-developed world. We should realize that, at times, we will find ourselves in the awkward and painful position of discovering that what might constitute a "friendly" government in our American eyes, is an oppressive, unrepresentative, antireform government in the eyes of the local peoples.

We found ourselves in that awkward and painful position in 1954 in Vietnam. Unfortunately we chose to back the forces representing the status quo, rather than the popular forces for change. Now we see that all the military might we have introduced is not powerful enough to reverse the intense desire for this change.

The lesson? Sincere alliance with the aspirations and desires of the people who seek reform will, in most cases, bring us much more in the way of positive returns, than all of the military might we funnel into the capitols of the world to maintain an unjust status quo.

In Latin America, we have the opportunity to prevent an arms race from escalating and getting out of hand. One of the greatest statesmen to emerge from Latin America has outlined the situation clearly and eloquently. I direct your attention to the remarks of Eduardo Frei Montalva, the President of Chile:

> The armaments race also conspires against the strengthening of the Alliance. The annual expenditure of the Latin American countries on armaments has reached $1.5 billion. Yet the average yearly sum made available by the United States to Latin America in the period 1961–65 was $1.1 billion. The two figures clearly show that present arms purchases seriously undermine the objectives of the Alliance. A Latin American country in 1965 had, in proportion to population, approximately the same number of men under arms as the United States. India, with twice the population of Latin America and having had two armed conflicts in recent years, has fewer soldiers than Latin America.
>
> Nobody can possibly suppose that these weapons and armies are going to deter an aggressor from outside Latin America. Equally, the assertion that to stop subversion these countries must purchase fifty-ton tanks, supersonic aircraft and battleships defies belief. The armaments race encourages distrust and nationalism and these in turn are among the chief enemies of integration. It also diverts important resources which should be utilized to satisfy the urgent need for economic and social development. It is therefore essential that a decision be taken at the highest levels of the Alliance to establish a quantitative limitation on arms purchases.

Mr. Chairman, I feel it essential that the entire U.S. policy of selling and granting arms abroad be investigated thoroughly by Congress. In his connection, I offer for insertion, an editorial from the July 23, 1967, edition of the New York Times. It is my belief that the editors have summed up the situation and probable consequences of our present policy, exceedingly well:

Feeding the Arms Race

> Some members of Congress are beginning to ask searching questions about America's government-sponsored, booming international arms business. It's about time. A series of events in recent years has cast serious doubt on some of the basic assumptions that underlie the arms aid and sales programs. In a number of situations, it is clear that the decision to sell or give American arms has done more harm than good to the interests of the United States.
>
> In a series of articles on the arms business, Neil Sheehan reported in The Times last week that this country has given away or sold $46.3 billion worth of arms in the last seventeen years. Weapons sales in the last fiscal year totaled $1.5 billion and the Defense Department's supersalesman of arms, Henry J. Kuss Jr., says he intends to boost that figure to $2 billion a year for the next eight years.
>
> Administration spokesmen argue that arms sales and aid have helped to strengthen free world defenses against Communist aggression. They point out that 89 per cent of recent arms sales have gone to members of the NATO alliance. In most cases, such sales unquestionably have given American allies more and better arms for their money because of superior American research and the efficiency of mass production. But these advantages have been bought at a price that is becoming increasingly dear for the alliance and the world.
>
> Aggressive sales tactics have provoked growing resentment among European countries who fear the political consequences of overdependence on the United States for arms and the economic implications of in-

> creasing American superiority in the technologies associated with arms development. Instead of bowing meekly to the American drive for dominance in the arms field, the Europeans have entered the international arms competition with determined vigor, further aggravating the worldwide arms race.
>
> The United States is also shipping increasing amounts of weapons to the developing nations—1.2-billion dollars' worth in the last five years—in the name of "mutual security." This is an area of the arms business particularly open to question. Sometimes arms aid is justified in terms of political expedience, for the purchase of political influence. More often than not, such influence proves to have been an illusion, as when Pakistan cast her lot with Red China against India; or, in the case of the Soviet Union, when Jakarta's generals used Russian arms to suppress a Communist uprising.
>
> Certainly some arms sales and aid will continue to be prudent where proved friends are seriously threatened and for as long as the Soviet Union refuses to cooperate in curbing arms races, as in the Middle East.
>
> But the search for alternatives, such as arms limitation and the development of effective United Nations peace-keeping forces, must be pressed with vigor and imagination. To continue to peddle arms with the reckless enthusiasm that has characterized American policy in the recent past is to settle for a solution to the problem of international insecurity that is demonstrably self-defeating.

Before I conclude my remarks, Mr. Chairman, I do want to praise another aspect of our foreign assistance program which, hopefully, reflects a major and basic shift in our policies.

As we are all aware, last year the Foreign Affairs Committee called upon the Agency for International Development to refocus their programs. The committee urged that AID seek through its programs to involve people of the developing world in the development process. This amendment has become known as title IX.

I urge all Members of the Committee to review thoroughly a report released by the Agency for International Development on May 10, 1967, entitled "Report to the Congress on the Implementation of Title IX."

In my opinion, the implementation of title IX would go a long way toward solving many of our problems regarding our entire foreign policy. I say this, because title IX seeks to face up to the fact that it is both prudent and wise to expect, and, in fact, to encourage change in the less developed world. Moreover, there is implicit in the philosophy of title IX, the understanding that this change would, in many cases, originate and be directed from below—that is from the grassroots public, if you will—rather than from the top, which, in too many cases, places the tools, direction, and orientation of change in the hands of the wrong persons.

I assure you, this does not necessarily mean that the United States will do a turnabout, and systematically roam around the world seeking out revolutions to lead, but I will tell you one thing that it does mean: we will seldom find ourselves flying in the face of popular movements. Yes, it is true, at times we may indeed be lending at least moral support to wars of national liberation. Horrendous, some will say. Traitorous, will come the cry from other corners. But I do not look upon this proposition as such. Why such a hue and cry every time mention is made of these manifestations? What is a "war of national liberation"? Is such a war or societal disruption ipso facto counter to our national interests? I believe too many people have done their utmost to lead us to this belief—and, if these souls remain as inflexible as they have evidenced in the past, they are leading us down a blind and dark alley.

I say that these persons are the ones who have painted us into a corner with their "brush-fire," "anticommunism" foreign policy. Theirs is a policy of defeat, for it flies in the face of reality. It is a foreign policy that is more conscious of pragmatism and expediency, than to human interests and progress for all the world's peoples. It is for the most part, negative, and does not thrust forward to meet the challenges of the future.

This foreign policy fails to adequately recognize the positive good about America. It forgets our own revolution which inspired a whole continent—nay, a whole world, to national liberation. It forgets that democracy originates with the people themselves, and cannot be of the same quality if it is imposed or directed from above. It forgets that the destiny of people is best determined and guided by the people themselves. And, perhaps most important of all, it forgets that the best hope lies in the American faith that people left alone to handle their own lives will do a decent and good job of it.

Am I advocating that we withdraw from the field of international relations? Not at all. On the contrary, I am asking for broader and more extensive participation in world affairs; albeit, an active and flexible alliance with a broader cross section of the people, as well as some basic reorientation of our national interests.

I have seen some good changes over the past few years. I wait for more. I wait especially, for one of our biggest blunders to date to end: involvement in the Vietnamese civil war. Vietnam tests the very essence of our society—I speak not of our strength, but of our sense of justice. Justice could end the war for us, force alone will not.

Mr. Chairman, we have a war of our own to win—the domestic war on poverty. Let us escalate this war.

Let us negotiate a peaceful end to the bloody conflict in Southeast Asia, so that we might divert those billions of dollars to solving our own problems.

I am confident that the good will of our people is such that they would encourage our participation in the awesome task of uplifting the conditions and lives of other peoples less fortunate than themselves.

Because of the war, and because of the need for further changes in our foreign assistance programs, I will not vote in favor of this bill.

A True Negro Leader Speaks Out

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL G. ROGERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 31, 1967

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, recently the Fort Lauderdale News reprinted a story from the San Diego Union, written by Archie Moore. In an accompanying editorial, the News said of this boxing champion:

> Archie emerges as the sorely needed constructive leader America must have to answer the vexing racial problems that have torn this Nation into savage bands of destructionists. Archie has issued his challenge. Let it be heard, the torch taken up and carried forward by all who are truly interested in themselves, the welfare of their race and the future of this country.

I insert the article by Archie Moore to be printed in the RECORD. As editorial writer Harvey Call has said, this is a positive approach to a most serious problem. It is a program that can be backed by all those who have, like Moore himself, succeeded to fulfill the American dream. And it can lead to more meaningful efforts by those in Government and all men of good will who seek answers to the problems of today.

SUCCESS: A WAY OUT FOR NEGRO

> (NOTE.—Archie Moore is a 53-year-old Negro. He's a fighter. He retired as the light heavyweight champion of the world after 228 fights. He's still a fighter. His gloves now are patience, his opponent is failure. Moore shows that success is a way to fight back. In this article, reprinted from the San Diego Union, Moore takes a stand on the nation's racial upheaval and tells what he, as just one person, is doing about it.)
>
> (By Archie Moore)
>
> The devil is at work in America, and it is up to us to drive him out. Snipers and looters, White or Black, deserve no mercy. Those who would profit from their brother's misfortunes deserve no mercy, and those who would set fellow Americans upon each other deserve no mercy.
>
> I'll fight the man who calls me an "Uncle Tom." I have broken bread with heads of state, chatted with presidents and traveled all over the world. I was born in a ghetto, but I refused to stay there. I am a Negro, and proud to be one. I am also an American, and I'm proud of that.
>
> The young people of today think they have a hard lot. They should have been around in the '30s when I was coming up in St. Louis. We had no way to go, but a lot of us made it. I became light heavyweight champion of the world. A neighbor kid down the block, Clark Terry, became one of the most famous jazz musicians in the world. There were doctors, lawyers and chiefs who came out of that ghetto. One of the top policemen in St. Louis came from our neighborhood.
>
> We made it because we had a goal, and we were willing to work for it. Don't talk to me of your "guaranteed national income." Any fool knows that this is insanity. Do we bring those who worked to get ahead down to the level of those who never gave a damn? The world owes nobody—Black or White—a living. God helps the man who helps himself!

HE HATED INJUSTICES, TOO

> Now then, don't get the idea that I didn't grow up hating the injustices of this world.

I am a staunch advocate of the Negro revolution for the good of mankind. I've seen almost unbelievable progress made in the last handful of years. Do we want to become wild beasts bent only on revenge, looting and killing and laying America bare? Hate is bait, bait for the simple-minded.

Sure, I despised the Whites who cheated me, but I used that feeling to make me push on. If you listen to the professional rabble-rousers, adhere to this idea of giving up everything you've gained in order to revenge yourself for the wrongs that were done to you in the past—then you'd better watch your neighbor, because he'll be looting your house next. Law and order is the only edge we have. No man is an island.

Granted, the Negro still has a long way to go to gain a fair shake with the White man in this country. But believe this: if we resort to lawlessness, the only thing we can hope for is civil war, untold bloodshed, and the end of our dreams.

We have to have a meeting of qualified men of both races. Mind you, I said qualified men, not some punk kid, ranting the catch phrases put in his mouth by some paid hate-monger. There are forces in the world today, forces bent upon the destruction of America, your America and mine. And while we're on the subject, do you doubt for a minute that communism, world communism, isn't waiting with bated breath for the Black and White Americans to turn on each other full force?

AFRICA: A NICE PLACE TO VISIT

There are members of the Black community who call for a separate nation within America. Well, I do not intend to give up one square inch of America. I'm not going to be told I must live in a restricted area. Isn't that what we've all been fighting to overcome? And then there is the element that calls for a return to Africa.

For my part, Africa is a great place to visit, but I wouldn't want to live there. If the Irishmen want to go back to the Emerald Isle, let them. If the Slavs want to return to the Iron Curtain area, OK by me. But I'm not going to go to any part of Africa to live. I'm proud of my ancestry, and of the country that spawned my forefathers, but I'm not giving up my country. I fought all my life to give my children what I'm able to give them today; a chance for development as citizens in the greatest country in the world.

I do not for a moment think that any truly responsible Negro wants anarchy. I don't think you'll find intelligent—no, let's rephrase that—mature Negroes running wild in the streets or sniping at total strangers. God made the White man as well as the Black. True we haven't acted as brothers in the past, but we are brothers. If we're to be so many Cains and Abels, that's our choice. We can't blame God for it.

TEACHES THAT "ANY BOY CAN"

Something must be done to reach the Negroes and the Whites in the ghettos of this country, and I propose to do something.

As a matter of plain fact, I have been doing something for the past several years. I have been running a program which I call the ABC—Any Boy Can. By teaching our youth, Black, White, Yellow and Red, what dignity is, what self respect is, what honor is, I have been able to obliterate juvenile delinquency in several areas.

I would now expand my program, change scope. If any boy can, surely any man can. I want to take teams of qualified people, top men in their fields, to the troubled areas of our cities. I know that the people who participated in the recent riots, who are participating and who will participate, are misguided rather than mad.

If some bigot can misguide, then I can guide. I've spent too much of my life building what I've got to put it to torch just to satisfy some ancient hatred of a man who beat my grandfather. Those men are long dead. Do we have to choke what could be a beautiful garden with weeds of hate? I say NO! And I stand ready to start "Operation Gardener." I invite the respected Negro leaders of our country to join me.

They Were Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1967

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, five people, four of whom were children, were killed recently in a tragic accident on a California freeway.

Many others were injured and remain in the hospital for treatment.

It happened when a flatbed truck transporting 58 youngsters and seven counselors overturned after swerving onto a 40-foot-wide dirt divider.

The group was returning from a regular outing planned by the South Berkeley Branch YMCA and the victims were all from Berkeley, which is in my congressional district.

Mr. Speaker, aside from the question which is raised about why a flatbed truck carrying 65 people was on the highway in the first place, there is a tragedy pointed out by the Morning News, published in Alameda County, Calif., in its editorial on Monday, August 7:

> Adding to the sickening feeling of learning of these deaths was the shocking attitude of several persons in our area commenting on the accident. The attitude was reflected in an oft-repeated question: "What were they, a bunch of colored kids!"
>
> It is a sick society which insists on bringing racial implications into a tragedy such as this, the question as phrased and spoken clearly hinting that it was not such a great tragedy as if the children had all been Caucasian.

Mr. Speaker, my heart goes out to the families of those who did not survive the accident and of those who remain in the hospital because of injuries. As any unnecessary loss of human life is, this is heartbreaking. And I deeply regret that any racial overtones could be brought into a situation like this.

Mr. Speaker, I want to call this editorial to the attention of my colleagues by inserting it in the RECORD at this point:

THEY WERE CHILDREN

The tragedy of the horrible accident on the Nimitz Freeway Friday in which several children were killed is readily apparent.

Violent death is always tragic. Multiple violent death more tragic . . . and multiple violent death of children even more.

The first call which this newspaper received concerning the accident indicated that this was a San Leandro group of youngsters returning home from camp.

However, this was immediately subject to extreme doubt, because no San Leandro group of which we are aware transports children to and from camp on a flatbed truck. This is not necessarily to imply criticism of this mode of transportation, merely a statement of fact as it relates to San Leandro groups.

However, while there was the normal sense of relief in the awareness that they were not San Leandro children, the tragedy was none the less overpowering.

And its full impact was yet to be felt.

Adding to the sickening feeling of learning of these deaths was the shocking attitude of several persons in our area commenting on the accident. The attitude was reflected in an oft-repeated question: "What were they, a bunch of colored kids!"

It is a sick society which insists on bringing racial implications into a tragedy such as this, the question as phrased and spoken clearly hinting that it was not such a great tragedy as if the children had all been Caucasian.

These young, destroyed bodies are not to be branded Colored Child, White Child, Oriental Child.

They were children. And they are dead. And that is tragic.

And so is the condition of our society when it brings itself to bring other issues into a situation where they clearly do not belong.

Mrs. Ethel H. Hayes, Volunteer Weather Observer of Wilmington, Ohio, Receives Holm Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1967

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following item concerning the selection of my constituent, Mrs. Ethel H. Hayes, as a recipient of the John Campanius Holm Award for her outstanding record as a volunteer weather observer. I am very pleased that she has been so honored:

JOHN CAMPANIUS HOLM AWARD

WASHINGTON.—Mrs. Ethel H. Hayes of Wilmington, Ohio, has been selected to receive the John Campanius Holm Award for her outstanding record as a volunteer weather observer, Dr. Robert M. White, Administrator of the Environmental Science Services Administration (ESSA), Department of Commerce, announced today.

John Campanius Holm Awards, created in 1959 by ESSA's Weather Bureau, are made annually to honor volunteer observers for outstanding accomplishments in the field of meteorological observations. The award is named for a Lutheran minister who is the first person known to make systematic weather observations in the United States. The Reverend John Campanius Holm took daily observations near the present site of Wilmington, Del., in 1644 and 1645.

Mrs. Hayes continues the record of observations taken at Wilmington begun by her husband, the late Erskine R. Hayes, in 1917. She has been the official observer since 1935. Her radio weather reports are well known throughout the area and she also serves as a rainfall reporter for Weather Bureau hydrologists.

Mrs. Hayes' citation, signed by Dr. White, reads "for long and exceptional service to her community and nation while serving as the weather observer at Wilmington, Ohio."

The Weather Bureau has over 12,000 volunteer observers throughout the United States who made and record daily weather observations. The information they gather is processed and published by the Environmental Data Service, another component of ESSA, and is invaluable in recording the nation's climate.

Mrs. Hayes lives at 581 West Locust Street in Wilmington.

Adequate Funding for the Demonstration Cities Program Is Essential in the National Interest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1967

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, whatever varying reflections we may have upon and about the tragic violence and destruction that has recently been occurring in so many cities throughout the country, I think it is universally and unmistakeably clear that the underlying causes of such tragedy ought to be and must be corrected at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. Speaker, the vehicle through which this correction can be most surely and effectively carried out are the appropriation bills containing aid to the cities of this country that are now pending before the Congress.

In the past several weeks these appropriation bills have taken on increasingly vast significance to the unity of this country and our people and they further represent the measure of our response toward curing a disease that is tearing away the very foundations of our civilized society.

Very truly if these appropriation bills are reduced to the point of practical obliteration or elimination of urban programs, most of our cities will be left, as the poor feel themselves to be now, without any hope of help in a vital task that is obviously beyond their individual capacities.

If major reductions are made and permitted to stand, in these particular bills, it might well become one of the greatest imprudences of modern history because such action would undoubtedly generate new and higher despair and frustration.

That is why the appropriation bill for the model cities program is currently so vital to the needs of the poor and the welfare and security of all our people.

Let me remind you that when this Congress passed the original model cities bill, it was making practically an inherently binding promise not just to a comparatively few and restrictively selected cities, that might come to be afflicted with riots and property destruction, but to all those numerous cities qualified for assistance on the basic grounds of low-income population, adequate housing shortages, and associated standards.

At the present time, hundreds of such cities all over the country have invested much time and overtime of community officials and expert volunteers, together with community money, to apply for this assistance, and this includes my own home city of Worcester, Mass., which has a nationally recognized reputation for community cooperation, dedication, and efficiency and accomplishment in planning, projection, and fulfillment of development programs. If this Congress is now to refuse adequate appropriations and funding for the fundamentally qualified city applicants for this particular Federal help, it will be tantamount to a contradiction and betrayal of the words and promises that were enacted into law less than a year ago.

Mr. Speaker, it is my earnest hope and exhortation that promptly upon our return here from this coming holiday, the Congress will direct its most conscientious attention to the agonizing problems affecting our cities and approve appropriations to permit my community—and all other qualified communities—to participate in the demonstration cities program that is so wisely designed to grant all of our citizens, of whatever race or color or circumstance, the opportunity to rightfully share in our national heritage and to enable this country to truly fulfill its destiny of leadership in a world at peace.

Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. HOWARD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 16, 1967

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, public attention has been sharply focused on the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee recently. Daily, evidence is mounting to prove that this organization is neither student oriented nor nonviolent in nature.

The latest proof that SNCC is losing touch with its constituency and defying the basic principles of brotherhood and goodwill which were embodied in its 1960 constitution, was a statement in its bimonthly newsletter, published on August 14. This statement consisted of a general indictment of Jews and accused the State of Israel of unspeakable atrocities against the Arabs in the recent 6-day Middle East war. SNCC alleged that Israelis committed the very crimes Nazis were accused of committing during World War II.

These false, vile denunciations of Jews parallel statements by the White Citizens Council, the Ku Klux Klan, and the American Nazi Party. There surely is no doubt in anyone's mind that SNCC, in adopting strong racial supremicist doctrines and preaching anarchy, anti-Semitism, and insurrection, has dug its own grave.

Stokely Carmichael and H. Rap Brown, and their Marxist-Maoist dogma have alienated every decent person in the Negro and white community. What a far cry this 1967 version of SNCC is from the group started in 1960, dedicated to, "racial integration, brotherly love, and nonviolent protest." It is a distinct change from the period of activity in the summer of 1963 and 1964 when SNCC workers put their lives in jeopardy trying to ameliorate conditions which negated the American promise for so many Negroes. Who cannot recall the period of mourning following the tragic deaths of James Chaney, Andrew Goodman, and Michael Schwerner—the latter two being of the Jewish faith, incidentally—who had their young lives snuffed out by those who preached racist doctrines similar to those now attributed to the leaders of SNCC.

There are no longer any students at the helm of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, only professional agitators intent upon inciting riots and preaching "burn, baby, burn." The coordination is now between SNCC and other racial supremist groups not between a principled service organization and the American community.

In the same August 14 publication, SNCC printed an ad saying:

> Help, help, we're sinking fast.

Mr. Speaker, that about summarizes the direction of the Carmichaels, the Browns, and the Featherstones. With each day, SNCC is discovering new lows.

Indicative of public displeasure and disgust is the lack of financial support forthcoming from those sources which first helped them in 1960. So desperate is SNCC that it is now appealing to Arab sympathizers and pro-Communist sources. Carmichael's trips to Havana and Hanoi point up the desperation. Isn't it strange that SNCC finds itself supporting the very countries in which slavery is a national institution? Where free speech is unknown? Where inhuman punishments are still meted out by the courts so that a man convicted of stealing must have his hand cut off.

SNCC speaks for nothing more than a miniscule, infinitiesimal percentage of the Negro population in this country. It has been condemned by every major Negro group. Our history shows that "nothing" groups quickly vanish from the scene, terminated by an adverse reaction from the general public. SNCC will not be different.

This is a time of great frustration across our Nation and it is necessary for all of us to exert more understanding, patience and compassion to our neighbors. We can and we will meet the great challenge of seemingly unsolvable problems through the present framework of our Constitution and democratic institutions, and through the maintenance of law and order.

When Stokely Carmichael told the Havana Conference of Latin States: "I hope to see the United States destroyed—I believe I will see it destroyed," he was talking about all America, white and Negro. He was not talking about resolving new ways to treat our urban ills, better ways to educate our children, improved opportunities for the impoverished, he was delivering a tirade against everything American and Western. His very presence at the Havana conference confirmed that he supports everything anti-American and anti-Western.

Some may thing this is an unusual alliance, this assemblage of extremist groups of the right and of the left, racists, anarchists, and international communists, but it is really a natural alliance. Their methods may vary but their goals are the same—complete control of our destiny.

Unions Stifle Right To Dissent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 15, 1967

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include an article I recently prepared, entitled "Unions Stifle Right To Dissent." The article follows:

UNIONS STIFLE RIGHT TO DISSENT

Virtually overlooked was a recent Supreme Court decision that very likely has set the stage for renewed pressure on the courts to decide—once and for all time—the constitutionality of the compulsory union shop.

On the same day it was deciding one case after another in favor of the individual's right of dissent, the nation's "court of last resort" decided in a 5-4 decision that a union had the right to legally fine members for crossing its picket lines during strikes.

The decision, in the Allis-Chalmers vs. United Auto Workers case, gives further ammunition to the union bosses' advocacy of total union solidarity at the expense of the liberty of individual employes and dramatically underscores the absolute necessity of providing rank-and-file workers with the protection of "right to work" laws outlawing compulsory union membership.

The decision flies in the face of union claims that the union shop proviso of Taft-Hartley requires nothing more than payment of dues and assessments and does not even require membership!

Coming during an era of deep concern over the civil liberties and individual rights of our citizens, it is shocking to have the highest court in the land take the position that a particular class of citizens—the workingman—has less freedom than the rest of the country.

It was a sad day for those who believe in individual rights, and raises some interesting questions as to how the "establishment" press could overlook the decision and why those "liberals" who most vehemently espouse the "right of dissent" have never taken a stand against the arbitrary action of unions in depriving a worker of his individual rights.

The National Right to Work Committee expects the decision to have two immediate effects. First, there will be stepped-up pressure in Congress and in state legislatures for passage of "right-to-work" laws banning all forms of compulsory union membership.

There are 31 states now that permit labor unions to deny a job to anyone who doesn't join a union within a specified time, usually 30 or 60 days. As a matter-of-fact, a petition campaign begins Aug. 1 in Oklahoma, aiming for a public referendum in the Oklahoma primary next year. And only a week or two ago the formation of a Californians for "right to work" group was announced with a long-range objective of outlawing compulsory unionism in that state.

But over and above the battles in the state legislatures and possibly even on the floor of Congress is the likelihood, in the very near future, of a worker-instigated suit challenging the constitutionality of the compulsory union shop on the grounds that he is being deprived of individual freedoms guaranteed under the First, Fifth, and perhaps Ninth Amendments.

In the 1961 Street case the union (IAM) openly admitted in court that it used compulsory dues for political purposes. Justice Hugo Black said, in his opinion, "There can be no doubt that the Federally sanctioned union shop contract here, as it actually works, takes a part of the earnings of some men and turns it over to others, who spend a substantial part of the funds so received in efforts to thwart the political, economic and ideological hopes of those whose money has been forced from them under authority of law."

That was six years ago and while the courts ordered the union to refund to the protesting workers all compulsory dues money and to exempt them from the compulsory union shop provisions, the decision applied only to this case. The courts refused to come to grips with the basic issue—the constitutionality of the compulsory union shop.

Isn't it obvious that the compulsory union shop imposes upon many unwilling rank-and-file workers political and ideological conformity and deprives them of their civil rights? Isn't it time that this nation guarantee the workingman the same freedom of association, thought, speech and political action that the court has ruled is guaranteed to all other citizens?

International Drum Corps Week September 2–9

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB H. GILBERT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 29, 1967

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, the week of September 2–9 will be celebrated throughout the Nation in honor of the more than 1 million persons actively engaged in drum and bugle corps activities. Drum Corps Week will be commemorated with competitions, concerts, colorful parades, and other activities.

As a youth activity, the drum corps offer an opportunity for our young to engage in an exciting and challenging project of music, action, and sportsmanship. The corps provide character growth, discipline, personal reliability, and pride in accomplishment to youngsters.

They add entertainment to charitable affairs, perform at hospitals, and cheer up patients. It would be difficult to imagine a parade or public event without the spirited pagentry and stirring music these groups contribute.

I am especially proud of drum corps activities in my 22d District of the Bronx, N.Y. Many of us have had the pleasure of hearing the Midshipmen, the Kingsmen, and the Mother Butler High School Girls Corps at official events in the Bronx, including the stirring pagentry of our annual Memorial Day parade. We are fortunate to have as a resident of the Bronx, Mr. Harvey N. Berish, a noted educator and youth worker who is the national chairman of International Drum Corps Week.

Mr. Speaker, at a time when we are witnessing turmoil in our cities, and as we strive to give our young people the educational and recreational activities they urgently need, the drum and bugle corps is playing an important role. Through their exemplary motto of "Pagentry and Patriotism" they are working to combat delinquency and to give our youth a productive channel for their energies—and one which is both exciting and educational.

I congratulate the drum and bugle corps for their fine work and wish them success in future achievements.

No Time To Weaken National Guard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1967

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, the recent riots have served to underscore once again the importance and need for a well equipped and trained National Guard program. In light of this, the Defense Department's decision to reduce the Michigan National Guard by 717 men can only be viewed with the deepest concern. Governor Romney has called such a move "totally unacceptable" and has recommended instead that the Michigan Guard be increased by 1,700 men. The Governor's position has elicited strong support and I insert at this point in the RECORD editorials appearing in the Jackson Citizen Patriot on Thursday, August 24, and the State Journal, of Lansing, on the same date, as I know this is a matter which will be of interest to my colleagues from other States who may be faced with similar situations.

The editorials follow:

[From the Lansing (Mich.) State Journal, Aug. 24, 1967]

NO TIME TO WEAKEN THE NATIONAL GUARD

There are solid grounds for Gov. Romney's opposition to a federal plan to reduce the strength of the Michigan National Guard under present conditions and we urge that his protests be heeded by officials in Washington.

In a letter to the chief of the National Guard Bureau, the governor listed what we regard as urgent reasons the Michigan Guard should not be reduced by 717 men and why it should instead be increased by 1,700 men to bring its unit strength to 12,000.

The federal plan to which Romney properly objects is to reduce the Michigan National Guard over a three-year period from 10,317 to 9,600 men.

Romney's assertion that this proposal is wrong for the present time appears to us to be a statement of the obvious. It is fully supported by conditions during the riots in Detroit in which it was necessary to call in federal troops to assist National Guardsmen and other state and local law enforcement agencies.

"Experience in Watts, Newark and Detroit convinces me that a force of 12,000 Army National Guard with the command, control and support elements required to conduct sustained operations in two urban areas is the minimum requirement for the State of Michigan," the governor said in his letter to Washington.

"We must accept the realities of the wholly new situation facing our metropolitan and manufacturing areas.

"For a strong responsive force to back up local law enforcement, the National Guard of the several states must be kept at such strength as to assure the capability of each governor to fulfill his constitutional responsibility of the protection of the state."

At the time the federal plan for reduction of the National Guard was first conceived conditions may have seemed to warrant such a move.

But, unfortunately, subsequent experiences in Michigan and some other states have clearly established the necessity for strong National Guard forces to assist the normal law enforcement agencies in protecting the public from the rioting, killing, looting and arson, which, if uncontrolled, would result in anarchy in which the lives and property of all would be imperiled.

In the light of these conditions this is clearly not the time to weaken any of the agencies that may have to be called upon to cope with rioting snipers, looters and arsonists.

Instead, it is the time to be thinking—and acting—in terms of providing greater protection for the public.

[From the Jackson (Mich.) Citizen Patriot, Aug. 24, 1967]

AN INCREDIBLE DECISION

The Pentagon has now reached the incredible decision Michigan has too many men in its National Guard, so another reorganization is being pushed.

This one would lop off 717 persons, including 90 highly qualified officers, plus much of the top echelon.

Gov. Romney is protesting, pointing out that while present National Guard authorized strength is between 10,000 and 11,000, including the Air National Guard, the state needs a minimum of 12,000 men under a divisional command.

The reorganization would take away the divisional designation, therefore its command staff and some supporting units in addition to the 717 men. The state would then be allocated an infantry brigade (in place of the 46th Division), an engineer group and a field artillery group of two battalions each, plus four separate battalions and two separate companies.

Thus fragmentized, there would be no over-all command within the state in the event all were needed for emergency duty.

It would preclude the use of the Guard in two cities beset by riots at the same time, for example, and in the recent Detroit situation would have resulted in an impossible command structure.

This newest effort in the years-long process of reducing the Guard to impotency is even more unusual in view of our large Army commitments overseas, with more slated for the war in Vietnam, plus our domestic turmoil.

Romney calls the new plan "totally unacceptable." It would be more fitting to call it totally unbelievable.

Invasion of Poland: 1939–67

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 15, 1967

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, 28 years ago tonight, the world stood on the brink of a terrible war—a war that was begun with the invasion of Poland by the Nazi Armies on September 1, 1939.

This invasion was brought about by the infamous Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact—a treaty which has become well known to all those who have felt the oppressive weight of tyrants.

The world has other cares today, many of them great and awesome in their ability to rain incalculable destruction upon the heads of all men. Although the Molotov-Ribbentrop perfidy is now history, it is history which should remind us constantly of the need to be on our guard. Because our strength is great, we must never suffer the delusion that there are not other men and other nations who would challenge it willingly, if given the opportunity.

Our position in Vietnam is difficult and enormously complex. But if we yield and withdraw without firm guarantees, we will reap the whirlwind. Everyone who really knows the trustworthiness of tyrants and dictators knows this. Southeast Asia will relentlessly fall beneath the weight of the Red Chinese advances. We must help the South Vietnamese to stem this inevitable invasion before it has an opportunity to develop. Let Poland, and the terrible havoc wreaked on Poland, serve as a warning to all free nations who believe they can have any faith in the promises of conquerors.

African Students in United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 21, 1967

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in the summer of 1965 the Subcommittee on Africa of the Committee on Foreign Affairs conducted a series of interesting hearings on African Students and Study Programs in the United States. On August 15, 1965, its report and hearings were published, and included in the report were seven recommendations.

To Gordon Radley, resident of the Second Congressional District of Illinois and a student at Amherst, working in my office as a summer intern, I assigned the mission of ascertaining to what extent the seven recommendations of our subcommittee had been implemented in the approximate 2 years since the publication of the report.

I am extending my remarks to include the full text of the letter of July 20, 1967, from Assistant Secretary of State, Macomber replying to the questions of Mr. Radley:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington.

HON. BARRATT O'HARA,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Africa,
Committee on Foreign Affairs,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Recently, Mr. Gordon Radley, of your office, called concerning recommendations which were made by the Subcommittee on Africa relating to the African Students Study Program. Mr. Radley's inquiry was with regard to implementation of these recommendations during the past year. We would like to make the following comments:

1. Concerning the Subcommittee's first recommendation that AID and State attempt to achieve a more cohesive and coordinated process in the selection of African students for training in the U.S., there has been considerable progress. During 1966 and 1967 AID and State have worked out an agreement which delineates the fields of study which each agency intends to further in the awarding of scholarships. AID will limit its scholarship offerings to the social and economic development fields, while State will concentrate on the humanities and the social sciences, not specifically related to development. As part of this agreement, AID has assumed the responsibility of funding renewal grants for 102 African students in the social and economic development fields who had been studying under State sponsorship previously.

2. The Subcommittee's second recommendation deals with the need for the study and evaluation of African student exchanges. The State Department is indeed conscious of the need for evaluative studies of this nature. The posts in Africa have been urged to keep in touch with returning students and to report developments to the Department regularly. No formal studies have been undertaken by the Department in this regard, however. Both AID and USIA may be able to report on this recommendation.

3. The Subcommittee's third recommendation reflects the opinion that American educational assistance to Africa may best be achieved through the assistance in the form of improved educational techniques, through the assignment of specially qualified teachers and the granting of a limited number of scholarships to Africans in Universities in their own countries. AID has played the primary role in carrying out this recommendation. State in FY 1967, however, had awarded grants to nearly 40 American professionals for teaching in African institutions. Through the nature of its legislative authority, the Department cannot provide scholarships for study in non-American universities and schools, but AID is on the verge of launching a program for encouraging African students to study in Africa.

4. As far as the Subcommittee's fourth recommendation concerning non-sponsored students, AID again has the primary role. Because of budgetary limitations, the Department has not been able to continue its support of the Phelps-Stokes Fund for emergency financial assistance to non-sponsored students, but the Department is still continuing to support orientation programs for selected non-sponsored students and in other ways is continuing to urge private organizations such as the Institute of International Education and the African American Institute to assist these students in academic and vocational counselling. AID should be asked to report on Project SCOOP and its International Development Fellowship Program.

5. In regard to the Subcommittee's fifth recommendation on students from the territories of southern Africa, State and AID have a shared responsibility. Their respective programs are in touch with similar assistance projects of the United Nations and European nations. Both participated actively in an international conference convoked by the African American Institute and Syracuse University in April 1967, which specifically aimed at coordinating efforts in this field, particularly in helping to find meaningful employment for graduating students in the independent countries of Africa until they can take up their rightful places in their homelands.

6. The Subcommittee's recommendation for an International Center in Washington, D.C. to serve as a "central clearing house" for organizations concerned with African students has not been implemented. The Department's liaison with the International Institute of International Education and its branch office in Washington, and the African American Institute and its Washington office, however, has been exceptionally close. In most respects, other than serving as actual hostels for African students, these organiza-

tions represent the sort of central clearing house operation which the Subcommittee had in mind.

7. The Department of Health, Education and Welfare has the responsibility for implementing Section 102(b)(6) of the Fulbright-Hays Act. As mentioned in Ambassador MacArthur's letter to you of August 11, 1966, the Department of Health, Education and Welfare is energetically providing assistance to U.S. students and faculty for field research in Africa. On several occasions, also, African scholars have been brought to the United States to assist in curriculum development projects promoting African studies in American institutions.

I am taking the liberty of forwarding a copy of this communication to Dr. Robert VanDuyn, Chief of the Educational Division of the Office of Institutional Development in the Bureau for Africa of the Agency for International Development with a request that they submit a separate report on the progress which has been made in carrying out the recommendations contained in your Subcommittee's report.

The Department continues to appreciate the helpfulness of the Subcommittee's report. If I can ever be of any further assistance, please do not hesitate to call upon me.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM B. MACOMBER, Jr.,
Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations.

Joseph F. Little

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 29, 1967

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, at the request of Sister M. Angelica Little, of the Depaul Institute school for the sensory handicapped in Pittsburgh, Pa., I would like to place in the RECORD, the comments and tributes paid to Joseph F. Little. Mr. Little served the American people in the tradition of this fine family and in the spirit of public service which has long been a heritage of our great Nation. It is a pleasure to call the attention of Congress and the American people to the compiled biography of Joseph F. Little:

NO LIFE IS NOBLER THAN ONE SPENT FOR THE BETTERMENT OF MANKIND

Many tributes to Joseph F. Little, 67, who was striken with a fatal heart attack in his Denver law office April 26, have appeared in Colorado newspapers, honoring him as a distinguished attorney, a great civic and political leader, a "man of many facets." It seems good to the present writer to "let his light shine before men."

"Joe Little was indeed an unusual man," writes Richard K. Ayers, a well-known Denver journalist, in his "Looking Ahead" column. "The privilege of knowing him and working with him will live forever in our hearts; he will be missed for his friendly counsel, valued advice, and sincere work: a man highly devoted to his family and friends, tireless in working for things he believed right and proper, difficult to convince but usually correct in his evaluations, and dedicated to correction of considered injustices. . . . Though best known for his highly successful business ventures, his remarkable knowledge of mining and its legal ramifications, and his capabilities in politics, he contained many facets not so readily seen nor observed by most people."

BIOGRAPHY

Joseph F. Little was born on October 26, 1899 in Ebensburg, Pa., into a family that numbered many distinguished attorneys and several jurists. His father, Peter J. Little, was a well-known lawyer, historian, and engineer, serving as attorney for the Pennsylvania Coal and Coke and other large coal corporations in the State. Joe was graduated from Georgetown University and the University of Colorado Law School. He was admitted to the Colorado bar in 1929.

On June 20, 1929, he married Jane Cottrell, the daughter of founder George Cottrell of the Cottrell Clothing Company. Little was the Cottrell firm's board chairman at the time of his death.

Little was Denver County Democratic chairman from 1934 until 1940 and served as State Democratic chairman from 1948 until 1954. He was mayor of the city of Cherry Hills Village from 1945 until 1955.

He held many offices, including state master in the Knights of Columbus, and was the founder of the St. Peter Claver School in Denver for underprivileged Negro children.

He was a member of the Denver, Colorado, and American Bar Associations; the American Legion, the Elks, and the Kiwanis Club.

Little was a trustee of Brandeis and Georgetown Universities and a director of Regis College. He was also a past president of the Downtown Denver Improvement Association, a former trustee of Loretto Heights College, and a past chairman of the Colorado Natural Resources Commission.

He had served as a director of the Colorado Cattlemen's Association and was a former chairman of the trustees of the American Metal Mining Owners.

Survivors, in addition to his widow, include three daughters: Mrs. Bernard O'Kane of Arvada; Mrs. C. G. Starbuck, Denver, and Mrs. Michael P. Reardon, Phoenix, Ariz., and a son, David Little, of Denver.

Six sisters also survive: Mrs. Jack McLaughlin, Denver; Mrs. Ferdinand Shields, Ebensburg, Pa.; Mrs. David Solomon, Gettysburg, Pa.; Mrs. Steven Ceo, Wheeling, W. Va.; and Mrs. Carl Brown and Sister Mary Angelica, both of Pittsburgh, Pa. A brother, Peter J. Little, Denver, also survives, in addition to 17 grandchildren.

COMMUNITY LEADER

Says Richard Ayers: "Joe achieved great respect for his leadership in the business community. His service to the Downtown Denver Improvement Association and other community endeavors brought him a lot of work and sound accomplishment." Two large plaques were awarded him: one "in grateful recognition of his outstanding services" to the city of Denver, the other awarded by the State Central Committee "for long and loyal service to the Democratic party."

A dedicated Catholic churchman, he had many charities and benevolences to his credit and served institutions and fraternal orders with distinction." And "Looking Ahead" adds: "We are comforted in the knowledge that the things Joe stood for, the things he accomplished, have made this state of Colorado and each of us better for having had him as a friend and associate."

"A magnificent Democrat, a great Coloradoan, unselfish of his time and energy; one of our most respected leaders," wrote President Ryan of Regis College. And Leonard Carlin, president of the Denver Catholic Lawyer's Guild: "Mr. Little's efforts at the inception to assist in organizing the Guild will always be remembered. He was an ardent and devoted sponsor and contributor. His outstanding reputation as an attorney, civic leader, and Catholic layman was a great credit to our organization and to the community."

Archbishop Vehr called Joseph Little a splendid Christian gentleman, admired by all. Protestants, Catholics, Jews alike, paid tribute to his warm human fellowship, his vitality and enthusiasm, "always quick with ideas." Joe had a great love of the West and Western scenery. He delighted with the fresh wonder of a child in her snow-capped peaks and red, rock-ribbed mountains—the "purple mountain majesty" Katherine Lee Bates glimpsed, as, looking out the window of her room in the Broadmoor Hotel at Colorado Springs, she was inspired to write her immortal song, "America the Beautiful."

MINING INTERESTS

"Almost everyone who encountered Joe Little learned of his vast fund of knowledge in the mining industry and its relationship to Colorado's past as well as his hopes for its future. It is hard to conceive that one man could have compiled such a fund of information and such sound understanding of the economics of mining in the 40 years he practiced law in Colorado.

"Possibly not so many knew of his activity in the mining publishing business. A few years ago along with some associates he bought the *last great mining weekly newspaper* in the nation—The Mining Record. While serving as its president, he wrote some provocative editorials and engaged in a lot of challenging speculation on the future of metal mining. His ideas may not be completely in accord with much current thinking—but it seems highly probable he is closer to the right than most authorities prevailing today," writes Mr. Ayers.

The Mining Record itself is our best source of information here. "Metal miners lost a friend and champion with the unexpected death of Joseph F. Little. . . . Few persons other than the close circle of friends knew that Mr. Little was a major stockholder in the Mining Record Company, publisher of this newspaper, and that he made up the deficit that often occurred these past few years."

Even more important, Mr. Little wrote the editorials, pointing up the fallacies in the policy of the United States Government towards gold and silver, and that while our stock of precious metals is deteriorating rapidly, the Government has made no effort towards increasing the production. . . .

"Mr. Little had mining interests, and was well versed in mining law. He handled a lot of litigation for small metal miners and we have a suspicion that for much of this he was promised payment when 'the prices go up and I open my mine again.' (This paragraph and the above one, beginning with "Metal miners . . ." are printed in bold face type.)

MAYOR OF CHERRY HILLS

The Village Crier in its May 15 issue features a large handsome picture of Mr. Little alongside the city's Memorial Resolutions. We quote from them briefly:

"Mr. Little served with distinction and loyalty as the Mayor of Cherry Hills Village continuously from its incorporation as a town in 1945 for a period of ten years, contributing indispensably to the organization of the town and to the deliberations and decisions of the Board of Trustees serving with him. His keen and active interest in the town, its affairs, his wide business and political knowledge and experience and his sound judgment, all were of great value to the functioning of the Village. He was a "beloved friend, universally respected and admired, whose good influence in the world will continue and always live in the hearts and minds of all who knew him."

Perhaps the best memorial is to be found in the editorial column of the Littleton Independent for May 4. It gives a specific example of Joe's championship of sorry causes long before the Civil Rights movement. It is entitled—

STATE CHAIRMAN

"In the late 40's we first became associated with Joe Little while he was serving as Colorado state chairman of the Democratic party. Who can forget how he teamed up with the late George Rock, then Colorado's Democratic national committeeman, and others, to revitalize the Democratic party in this state. Many have forgotten how this force eventually succeeded in taking over the entire state house except for one office. . . .

"Little had already served the party in Colorado, particularly in Denver, in various positions of leadership, including the Denver chairmanship. He was acknowledged as a sound political leader and dedicated worker. Respected by both parties, his ability was sought after by many who aspired to office."

And the publisher of the *Denver Post:* "Joe was a distinguished attorney and an expert in mining law. But his primary interest lay in politics, and that's where I first met him. He was introduced to me by 'Big Ed' Johnson, then returning for his second term as the U.S. Senator from Colorado.

"Joe employed our firm to handle the advertising and public relations for the Democratic party. That was the year Harry Truman ran for President and was on the short-end of 15 to 1 odds that he wouldn't make it. . . . Truman carried Colorado—the whole State ticket won, 'Big Ed' amassing the largest vote of all.

"Joe was not a slambang, fist-thumping chairman. He operated quietly and efficiently, seldom raising his voice, and firmly held the throttle. He knew exactly where the political winds were heading, and could smell trouble a mile away.

"Joe knew politics from the ground up. His whole philosophy was: save everything for the precincts, gear everything to the precincts, spend your money in the precincts. To him, political advertising was secondary. 'Oh, I know that newspapers supply the publicity and influence public opinion. But elections are won and lost in the precincts!' So, when Joe ran the political ship, nearly all signals and telephone calls were directed to the district captains, the precinct committeemen and the judges at the polls. . ."

JOE LITTLE'S MEMORIAL

"We have followed Mr. Little's career for over forty years, and one of his little known efforts seems to be his best memorial. That was his move in behalf of Negroes long before 'brotherhood' became a fashionable word.

"Having married Jane Cottrell, he in time became chairman of Cottrell's, the large 16th Street men's clothing store. Some years after that, a survey made on Mayor Quigg Newton's order revealed that Negroes were unable to find work as clerks in the big city stores.

"One department store employed twelve Negro janitors, all with college degrees. One even had an M.A. But when the Negroes applied for maintenance work they told the personnel director, "I just got a grammar school education, suh." Otherwise they would not have been hired.

"Mr. Little thought this was wrong. He went to Sebastian Owens at the Urban League about 1949 and told him he wanted a capable Negro man to sell suits and coats to his high-class trade. The man was found, he made good, and the ice was broken. Perhaps we should say 'cracked,' for it was ten or fifteen years before another store dared hire Negroes to sell a pair of stockings or a package of fertilizer. They could, in those days, handle food and babies but not merchandise.

"As time went on, Mr. Little's clerk saved enough money to make a down payment on a home. He asked his boss for advice, and Mr. Little introduced him to a 17th Street friend who got him the money at a 'white man's rate of interest.'

"This little human drama began almost two decades ago. It is the sort of thing we like to remember a man by."

The best part of a good man's life, says the poet William Wordsworth, is, perhaps, "his little unremembered acts of kindness and of love."

For the past several years Joe began every day of his life with a visit to the neighboring Church for morning Mass, knowing that "the night cometh when no man can work." He was ready when the summons came. In the words of the Psalmist, printed on his memorial cards:

"Precious in the sight of the Lord is the death of His faithful ones."

Death of a Great Masonic Leader

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 23, 1967

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the New Age magazine for August 1967 contains a most interesting account of the life and work of one of the Nation's great Masonic leaders. He was the illustrious Frank Howard Thompson, Sovereign Grand Inspector General in Florida, who died April 29, 1967. I know that all members of the Masonic fraternity will consider it a privilege to read this account of his life and contributions.

The article follows:

FRANK HOWARD THOMPSON, 33°

Illustrious Frank H. Thompson, 33°, Sovereign Grand Inspector General in Florida and Second Grand Equerry of The Supreme Council, suddenly passed away on April 29, 1967, at Lakeland, Florida. He was 79.

Every position that he was called to he filled with benefit to the Fraternity and credit to himself, and in his death the Craft in general loses one who will be missed for many years, while the Brethren in particular lose a most pleasant gentleman who walked among them for half of a century as a Brother and a man.

Born at Jefferson, Georgia, on October 23, 1887, he was educated in the public schools in Florida. He served as mayor of Lakeland; president of Mine and Mill Supply Co.; operated the Frank H. Thompson Insurance Agency; director of Florida National Bank at Lakeland; and was chairman of Local Selective Service Board, Lakeland, during World War II.

Illustrious Thompson was a Past Master of Lakeland Lodge No. 91, F. & A. M., at Lakeland; honorary member of 24 Florida Lodges; Past Grand Master of the Grand Lodge of Florida, and a member of the Tampa Scottish Rite Bodies. He had the distinction of serving as Venerable Master, Tampa Lodge of Perfection; Wise Master, Tampa Chapter Rose Croix; and Master of Kadosh, Tampa Consistory. He was honored with the rank and decoration of Knight Commander of the Court of Honour in 1919. Coroneted an Inspector General Honorary of the Thirty-third Degree in 1923 and appointed Deputy of The Supreme Council in the Orient of Florida in 1952. Brother Thompson was Crowned an Active Member on October 21, 1955. He had been a member of the Committees on Visitations, Domestic and Foreign; Nominations; Obituaries; Benevolence and Fraternal Assistance; he also had served as Grand Herald, Grand Standard Bearer, and Second Grand Equerry.

Brother Thompson had been a life member of Tampa Consistory Scottish Rite Bodies, and he was an honorary member of the Mobile, Alabama, Scottish Rite Bodies and the New Orleans Grand Consistory Scottish Rite. In the York Rite his affiliation included Lakeland Chapter No. 20, R.A.M.—High Priest 1917, 1918; Lakeland Council No. 11, R. & S.M.—Illustrious Master 1919, Grand Master 1926; and Lakeland Commandery No. 21, K.T.—Eminent Commander 1919.

Other memberships included Morocco and Egypt Temples, A.A. O.N.M.S.; Indiana Priory No. 8, K.Y.C.H.; Tampa Court No. 89, R.O.J.; Palm Chapter No. 26, O.E.S.; Selama Grotto, M.O.V.P.E.R.; Royal Order of Scotland; Indiana College Societatis Rosicrucianae in Civitatibus Floderates; and Miami Chapter No. 2351, National Sojourners, Inc. A past Ill. Sovereign of Florida Conclave No. 16, Brother Thompson organized Florida Conclave No. 16, served as Lieutenant General for Florida, was appointed Grand Orator of the Imperial Council of Pennsylvania, and served in all appointive and elective offices of the Grand Imperial Council of Pennsylvania, reigning as Most Illustrious Grand Sovereign in 1926.

Brother Thompson also served as Grand Master of the Order of DeMolay in 1955.

Funeral services were conducted at the First Methodist Church in Lakeland on May 1. The Grand Lodge of Florida conducted the graveside services.

He is survived by his widow Mrs. Nell Thompson.

So he lived and when at last he came to die, to pass through nature to eternity.

He gave his honors to the world again,
His blessed part to heaven, and slept in peace.

To his widow we extend our heartfelt sympathy.

Statement of Principles, Goals, and Commitments—Emergency Convocation: The Urban Coalition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1967

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, it is of great significance that an "urban coalition" of labor, business, civil rights, and civic leaders has responded promptly to the task of rebuilding our cities. Those who say that we should not "reward" those Americans whose despair has broken into riot might as well say that we should not reward a symptom by prescribing medicine for the disease.

On August 23, 1967, the Emergency Convocation of the Urban Coalition unanimously adopted a statement of goals, principles and commitments which I commend to the attention of my colleagues.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES, GOALS, AND COMMITMENTS—EMERGENCY CONVOCATION: THE URBAN COALITION

We are experiencing our third summer of widespread civil disorder. In 1965, it was Harlem, and the disaster of Watts. In 1966, it was the Hough area of Cleveland, Omaha, Atlanta, Dayton, San Francisco and 24 other cities. This summer, Newark and Detroit were only the most tragic of 80 explosions of violence in the streets.

Confronted by these catastrophic events, we, as representatives of business, labor, religion, civil rights, and local government, have joined in this Convocation to create a sense of national urgency on the need for positive action for all the people of our cities.

We are united in the following convictions:

We believe the tangible effects of the urban riots in terms of death, injury, and property damage, horrifying though they are, less to be feared than the intangible damage to men's minds.

We believe it is the government's duty to maintain law and order.

We believe that our thoughts and actions should be directed to the deep-rooted and historic problems of the cities.

We believe that we, as a nation, must clearly and positively demonstrate our belief that justice, social progress, and equality of opportunity are rights of every citizen.

We believe the American people and the Congress must reorder national priorities, with a commitment of resources equal to the magnitude of the problems we face. The crisis requires a new dimension of effort in both the public and private sectors, working together to provide jobs, housing, education, and the other needs of our cities.

We believe the Congress must move without delay on urban programs. The country can wait no longer for measures that have too long been denied the people of the cities and the nation as a whole—additional civil rights legislation, adequately funded model cities, anti-poverty, housing education, and job-training programs, and a host of others.

We believe the private sector of America must directly and vigorously involve itself in the crisis of the cities by a commitment to investment, job-training, and hiring, and all that is necessary to the full enjoyment of the free enterprise system—and also to its survival.

We believe the sickness of the cities, including civic disorder within them, is the responsibility of the whole of America. Therefore, it is the responsibility of every American to join in the creation of a new political, social, economic, and moral climate that will make possible the breaking of the vicious cycle of the ghetto. Efforts must be made to insure the broadest possible opportunity for all citizens and groups, including those in the ghetto, to participate fully in shaping and directing the society of which they are a part.

This Convocation calls upon the nation to end once and for all the shame of poverty amid general affluence. Government and business must accept responsibility to provide all Americans with opportunity to earn an adequate income. Private industry must greatly accelerate its efforts to recruit, train, and hire the hard-core unemployed. When the private sector is unable to provide employment to those who are both able and willing to work, then in a free society the government must of necessity assume the responsibility and act as the employer of last resort or must assure adequate income levels for those who are unable to work.

EMERGENCY WORK PROGRAMS

The Convocation calls upon the Federal Government to develop an emergency work program to provide jobs and new training opportunities for the unemployed and underemployed consistent with the following principles:

The Federal Government must enlist the cooperation of government at all levels and of private industry to assure that meaningful, productive work is available to everyone willing and able to work.

To create socially useful jobs, the emergency work program should concentrate on the huge backlog of employment needs in parks, streets, slums, countryside, schools, colleges, libraries and hospitals. To this end an emergency work program should be initiated and should have as its first goal putting at least one million of the presently unemployed into productive work at the earliest possible moment.

The program must provide meaningful jobs—not dead-end, make work projects—so that the employment experience gained adds to the capabilities and broadens the opportunities of the employees to become productive members of the permanent work force of our nation.

Basic education, training and counseling must be an integral part of the program to assure extended opportunities for upward job mobility and to improve employee productivity. Funds for training, education, and counseling should be made available to private industry as well as to public and private nonprofit agencies.

Funds for employment should be made available to local and state governments, nonprofit institutions, and Federal agencies able to demonstrate their ability to use labor productively without reducing existing levels of employment or undercutting existing labor standards or wages which prevail for comparable work or services in the area but are not less than the Federal minimum wage.

Such a program should seek to qualify new employees to become part of the regular work force and that normal performance standards are met.

The operation of the program should be keyed to specific localized unemployment problems and focused initially on those areas where the need is most apparent.

PRIVATE EMPLOYMENT, ASSISTANCE AND INVESTMENT

All representatives of the private sector in this Urban Coalition decisively commit themselves to assist the deprived among us to achieve full participation in the economy as self-supporting citizens. We pledge full-scale private endeavor through creative job-training and employment, managerial assistance, and basic investment in all phases of urban development.

The alternatives to a massive and concerted drive by the private sector are clear. They include the burden of wasted human and physical potential, the deterioration of the healthy environment basic to the successful operation of any business, and the dangers of permanent alienation from our society of millions of citizens.

We propose to initiate an all-out attack on the unemployment problem through the following steps:

In cooperation with government, to move systematically and directly into the ghettos and barrios to seek out the unemployed and underemployed and enlist them in basic and positive private training and employment programs. We will re-evaluate our current testing procedures and employment standards so as to modify or eliminate those practices and requirements that unnecessarily bar many persons from gainful employment by business or access to union membership.

To create a closer relationship between private employers and public training and emergency employment programs to widen career opportunities for our disadvantaged citizens. To this end, we will proceed immediately to promote "Earn and Learn Centers" in depressed urban areas that might well be the joint venture of business, labor and local government.

To develop new training and related programs to facilitate the early entry of underqualified persons into industrial and commercial employment.

To develop large-scale programs to motivate the young to continue their education. Working closely with educators, we will redouble our efforts to provide part-time employment, training, and other incentives for young men and women. We also pledge our active support to making quality education readily accessible to deprived as well as advantaged young people.

To expand on-the-job training programs to enhance the career advancement prospects of all employees, with particular emphasis on those who now must work at the lowest level of job classifications because of educational and skill deficiencies.

We pledge to mobilize the managerial resources and experience of the private sector in every way possible. We will expand part-time and full-time assistance to small business development. We will strive to help residents of these areas both to raise their level of managerial know-how and to obtain private and public investment funds for development. We will work more closely with public agencies to assist in the management of public projects. We will encourage more leaders in the private sector to get directly and personally involved in urban problems so that they may gain a deeper understanding of these problems and be of greater assistance.

We pledge our best efforts to develop means by which major private investment may be attracted to the renovation of deteriorating neighborhoods in our cities. We will explore and encourage governmental incentives to expedite private investment. We will develop new methods of combining investment and managerial assistance so that the residents may achieve a leadership position in the development of their areas.

HOUSING, RECONSTRUCTION, AND EDUCATION

This Convocation calls upon the nation to take bold and immediate action to fulfill the national need to provide "a decent home and suitable living environment for every American family" with guarantees of equal access to all housing, new and existing. The Urban Coalition shall, as its next order of business, address itself to the development of a broad program of urban reconstruction and advocacy of appropriate public and private action to move toward these objectives, including the goal of rehabilitation and construction of at least a million housing units for lower-income families anually.

This Convocation calls upon the nation to create educational programs that will equip all young Americans for full and productive participation in our society to the full potential of their abilities. This will require concentrated compensatory programs to equalize opportunities for achievement. Early childhood education must be made universal. Work and study programs must be greatly expanded to enlist those young people who now drop out of school. Financial barriers that now deny to youngsters from low-income families the opportunity for higher education must be eliminated. Current programs must be increased sufficiently to wipe out adult illiteracy within five years.

This Convocation calls upon local government, business, labor, religions, and civil rights groups to create counterpart local coalitions where they do not exist to support and supplement this declaration of principles.

This Convocation calls upon all Americans to apply the same determination to these programs that they have to past emergencies. We are confident that, given this commitment, our society has the ingenuity to allocate its resources and devise the techniques necessary to rebuild cities and still meet our other national obligations without impairing our financial integrity. Out of past emergencies, we have drawn strength and progress. Out of the present urban crisis we can build cities that are places, not of disorder and despair, but of hope and opportunity. The task we set for ourselves will not be easy, but the needs are massive and urgent, and the hour is late. We pledge ourselves to this goal for as long as it takes to accomplish it. We ask the help of the Congress and the Nation.

(NOTE.—This statement was unanimously adopted by members of the Steering Committee and their representatives at a meeting Wednesday, August 23, 1967. Mr. Roy Ash and Mr. Theodore Schlesinger were unable to attend or to be represented.)

International Drum Corps Week, September 2–9, 1967

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 15, 1967

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, this Saturday, September 2, marks the beginning of International Drum Corps Week. It will be celebrated in all 50 States and Canada with parades, concerts, competitions, and civic and social events paying tribute to the thousands of young people who are members of these corps.

Last year, and again at the start of the 90th Congress, I introduced a resolution in this House to allow certain drum and bugle corps units selected by the President to travel abroad as goodwill ambassadors under the provisions of the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act.

My own district in Chicago is the home of the Cavaliers—a drum and bugle corps that has often won recognition as the best unit in the United States. Recently, in Boston, Mass., the Cavaliers once again were singled out for the national championship award.

In my travels throughout our country, I have met hundreds of young people who devote long hours each week to perfecting their precision and to demonstrating the spectacular effectiveness of teamwork. They have youth and zest and a keen appreciation of what they are doing for themselves, their schools and their communities. We are proud of them.

On the eve of this week which pays public tribute to these youngsters and the parents and communities which encourage them, I believe it is proper that the Congress take full notice of these activities. In an age of rising delinquency, crime rates, tension and civil strife, it is reassuring to remember all that is right with America.

Mr. Speaker, following is the language of House Resolution 85, my resolution in behalf of drum and bugle corps units. I would like to call it to the attention of my colleagues for I believe it expresses the sincere enthusiasm and support we all feel for these outstanding young people:

Whereas drum and bugle corps units are a typically American institution; and

Whereas drum and bugle corps units are sponsored by schools, various veterans' groups and other patriotic organizations throughout the United States and accurately reflect American life and institutions; and

Whereas the boys and girls who are members of drum and bugle corps units are the flower of American youth: Patriotic, enthusiastic, physically fit, highly motivated, and well trained and disciplined with a respect for law and order; and

Whereas drum and bugle corps units provide excellent entertainment which would be well received in foreign countries; and

Whereas the boys and girls who are members of drum and bugle corps units would serve effectively as United States ambassadors of good will on a people-to-people basis: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that the President should include drum and bugle corps units among those groups sent to foreign countries (including the countries of Eastern Europe) under the provisions of the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961 (the Fulbright-Hays Act): It is further

Resolved, That each year the champion drum and bugle corps unit selected at the annual convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars and the champion drum and bugle corps unit selected at the annual convention of the American Legion shall be sent as ambassadors of good will to appropriate nations to be designated by the Department of State, with the time for such trip to be arranged with the mutual consent of the winning drum and bugle corps and the agency sponsoring such a trip: It is further

Resolved, That such funds as may be necessary are hereby authorized to be expended by the Department of State to pay for all travel and lodging for the respective drum and bugle corps units sent on such good will missions.

Worker Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1967

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, according to a recent radio interview with Walter G. Davis, director of the AFL–CIO Department of Education, "worker education in the United States is growing in scope, size, and effectiveness."

I commend the AFL–CIO for its efforts in this field. It is through such educational programs that the worker, trained in yesterday's schools, can share in today's advances and participate more actively in collective bargaining, union management, and even community action programs.

Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of our colleagues to this important adult education program by inserting in the RECORD, at this point, a news release from the AFL–CIO on August 16:

LABOR NEWS CONFERENCE

Worker education in the United States is growing in scope, size and effectiveness, an AFL–CIO spokesman reported today in a network radio interview.

"We have seen real changes of community attitudes" and "activation of programs as a result—a direct result—of labor education in the community," Walter G. Davis, director of the AFL–CIO's Department of Education, noted on Labor News Conference.

Davis said that during 1967, unionists will study subjects ranging from shop steward training and collective bargaining to "how to be more active in community action projects," at more than 150 union-sponsored schools and institutes, most of them held on university campuses. Enrollment this year is expected to top 15,000.

Subjects taught at the union schools are "designed to improve the skills and abilities of these people with respect to the manner in which they represent the members of their organizations," Davis said, noting that they "spread through the whole area of concern of the labor movement."

He pointed out that many of the students represent their unions in collective bargaining sessions. There has been a "step-up in the education of management people," with executives brushing-up on new processes, economic trends and developments and other subjects, he said.

"We think that our people must keep abreast or a step ahead of their counterparts in industry in the areas they deal in," he emphasized.

Davis said that while the labor schools are conducted for trade unionists, "there is really no restriction" that would bar employer representatives from the sessions. "We are quite objective," he said, and "we aren't saying anything that we wouldn't want management to hear." He said that university faculty members often attend the courses and sometimes serve as instructors when union staff people aren't available.

Reporters questioning Davis on Labor News Conference, aired Tuesdays at 7:35 p.m. EDT on the Mutual Radio Network, were Murray Seeger, economic correspondent for Newsweek magazine, and Lee Cohn, business and financial reporter for the Washington Evening Star.

Commentator Applauds State Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1967

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, one of the Nation's most knowledgeable commentators, Howard K. Smith, has written an excellent article praising the work of the State Department.

Frustrated critics often find the State Department a convenient whipping boy.

The State Department cannot measure its successes in statistics. Its programs may not show instantaneous results in our fluid world. Yet it is interesting to note that the popularity of the State Department during President Truman's presidency was at its lowest at the moment of its greatest accomplishments—such as the Marshall plan and NATO.

The State Department under Dean Rusk is effectively performing its critical function of recommending policies to the President to meet both long- and short-term problems confronting us.

Its central goal of promoting peace through regional cooperation is producing heartening results in Asia and Latin America. Through Secretary Rusk's open forum policy, State Department junior officers are being encouraged to submit new ideas for policy.

I wholeheartedly endorse Mr. Smith's views on the State Department and under unanimous consent I insert his article in the RECORD for the perusal of my colleagues:

[From the Boston Globe, Aug. 27, 1967]

STATE DEPARTMENT BLOODY, BATTERED

(By Howard K. Smith)

If there is anything more battered and bloodied than a President in the midst of an unpopular war, it is the State Department in the midst of any time. Something kind ought to be said about it now and then, not to soothe the pain, but because there are kind things to say.

Probably the Department's basic problem is that it deals with Power.

In our permissive time, four-letter words are gaining acceptance. But the five-letter word, Power, is still a dirty word to most Americans. There is a feeling that it is like sin: you can choose to do it, or not to do it, depending on your strength of character.

The truth has not been widely grasped that we have no choice: we have to use Power.

It would be truer to say that the State Department has the function of threatening or promising Power—which is one definition of Diplomacy.

The Power itself resides in the White House and the Department of Defense. Thus the State Department is in fact required to throw its weight around without having much weight to throw.

Its problem is compounded by the fact that it is the only department of government which has no statistics to measure progress the way Sec. Wirtz can with unemployment statistics or Sec. McNamara can with almost anything.

Statecraft is a football game with no clear termination time. An act that seems foolish today can turn out to look wise a year from now—and foolish five years from then. It is hard to say when the results are all in.

Furthermore the Department is precluded from defending itself by the fact that it deals with over 100 sovereign nations about whom it cannot say harsh truths that might explain away many of its own problems. The State Department is thus the ideal target for political freebooters who abound not only in Congress but in the press and in academe.

Undoubtedly the stock criticisms are true: it is probably overstaffed in some places, pushes too much paper and is often dilatory. Possibly some kind of Hoover committee ought to study it for a few years and make recommendations.

But the old caution must be kept in mind; reforming the administration of this department is, as it defenders say, a little like performing an appendectomy on a man permanently carrying pianos.

However, reforms would probably not much improve its central function of working out policies to recommend to the President, and seeing they are carried out.

It has actually done this work amazingly well at a time when the established powers—Western Europe—have all abdicated, at a time when a new aggressive ideology is on the move, and at a time when multitudes of peoples with no qualifications for being sovereign have become sovereign. The world has been not merely fluid, it has been ragging with riptides.

It is now widely agreed that it accomplished marvels in the Truman period with the Truman Doctrine, the Marshall Plan, NATO and Point Four. It is hard to recall that, while that was going on, Truman's Gallup Poll rating shrank to half what Johnson's is, and Acheson became an almost unspeakable name.

What is not widely realized is the fact that the Department is still fertile and creative. While critics say it should stop being a fire department and work out long-range policies, that is exactly what it has been doing.

Its central plan is regional cooperation and integration. That process did not exist in Asia two years ago, but now it is moving ahead. It is moving more rapidly in Latin America and less so in Africa.

What critics fail to take into account is that long-rnage policies are by definition long range: No sudden glossy triumphs are likely. Still, the marked change of mood in Southeast Asia in the past two years is something to brag about.

There is one outrageous point to add: Mr. Rusk is a good Secretary of State. He handles Congressional committees more skillfully than any predecessor I have seen or read about.

He has launched a program called "Open Forum" by which any idea for policy from the lowliest officer in the Department can reach him for his personal attention. The criticism that he does not come down hard on an option, when advising the President, is invalid; when you serve a strong President who likes his options left open, that is the way to do it.

When policy is set, with his advice, he becomes hard enough. If he did not, he would be a badly whipped man about this time in his career.

More Than an Exit From Poverty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 29, 1967

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished Under Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Mr. Wilbur J. Cohen, spoke last Saturday, August 26, in my home State of Michigan at the sesquicentennial conference of the University of Michigan's School of Social Work. In a widely ranging address, Mr. Cohen detailed the progress our people are making—with help from the administration's programs—in their efforts to eliminate poverty in this country.

Since 1965, in just 2 short years, 4.4 million more Americans have escaped from poverty. Today, about 27.5 million Americans are still living in poverty, but they make up only 15 percent of our population. And as Mr. Cohen told the social work conference:

> By 1970, we can cut the proportion to 10 percent and in the following decade we can eliminate poverty.

This is phenomonal progress, the result of exciting, new approaches to ages-old problems. In welfare, we are placing greater emphasis on education and training as a way out of the poverty trap. In health, we are turning to welfare and social security as a way of making medical care more widely available. In education, we are paying greater attention to the economic, social, and health factors that are an integral part of the learning process.

As Mr. Cohen said in his speech:

> We are not just seeking *exits* from poverty, despair, disease, ignorance and other social wastelands, but *access roads* to positive enjoyment of good health, education, meaningful employment and economic security.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the Under Secretary for his address and insert it in the RECORD so that my colleagues also may read it:

MORE THAN AN EXIT FROM POVERTY

(By Wilbur J. Cohen)

America has been a fortunate Nation. Natural resources, combined with a highly developed technology and the determination of the people have brought about luxuries and a way of life for most Americans that years ago could have been the privilege of only the very rich.

An extended period of unprecedented prosperity has raised family incomes to new highs. The majority of people who can and want to work are employed. Educational attainment has steadily increased. Record numbers of students are enrolled in colleges and universities. Americans are spending more for, and hopefully getting, better health care. But despite these advances about 30 million people live in poverty. The paradox of this poverty in the midst of plenty troubles the American conscience. And I think that it is a sign of maturity that Americans have realized that we cannot be content or complacent while a vast number of citizens do not share in the gains enjoyed by the majority. Thus, we have made a commitment to do something about poverty—abolish it—not just ameliorate it.

We have witnessed in recent years a remarkable transformation in social awareness and social thought in the United States. We have seen in the last three years more revolutionary changes in attitudes on fundamental issues than occurred in the previous century. Medicare, Federal Aid to Education, the Civil Rights Bill, and the War on Poverty are the outgrowth of the significant changes that have taken place in the American conscience. What has been started in the past few years has a tremendous significance for our society, our families and for the future.

There are a number of reasons for the shifts in attitudes, but I think that one of the most important is the growing concern and new awareness of the importance of the individual. New attitudes toward human dignity and the importance of the quality of the individual's life are emerging. There are determined efforts to strengthen and enhance the quality of life by reducing poverty, raising educational levels, improving health and general welfare.

This has been an unprecedented period of receptivity to social innovations and policies—a period of accelerated, intensive innovation. Far reaching social legislation has been enacted reflecting the American people's desire for equality, opportunity and justice.

We are trying out many new ideas and new methods:

An all out attack on poverty has begun.

Community action programs involving the poor, themselves, have been inaugurated.

A successful beginning has been made through the "Head Start" program to give deprived youngsters a better start in life.

Legal services have been inaugurated for the poor.

The National Teachers Corps was started to bring new teachers and new skills into the central cities.

The Appalachian Regional Development Act was designed to restore a geographical area that had lagged behind the rest of the Nation in terms of economic development.

Aid was provided for elementary and secondary education in thousands of school districts with high concentrations of low income families.

New community mental health centers have been established.

Major improvements have been made in the vocational rehabilitation programs.

Through Medicare, millions of aged Americans are now getting the medical care they need but could not afford in the past.

A rent supplement program to enable low and moderate income families to obtain better housing was started.

The Job Corps and Neighborhood Youth Corps to train youth were established.

A work-study program to enable youth to continue in college was started.

An adult literacy program to wipe out illiteracy was created.

A policy of making family planning services available to all who desire them was initiated.

A Model Cities program was established to try out a comprehensive approach to human problems—involving jobs, education, health facilities, and housing.

A Medicaid program was launched in cooperation with the States to enable not only the needy aged but every child and youth under age 21 whose parents have insufficient income to obtain high quality medical services.

These programs—and many others I could cite—are underway now. They offer exciting new possibilities for tackling difficult and persistent problems. But we know that much more needs to be done.

ADDITIONAL STEPS

The drive to assure every American the good life continues. The momentum has not slackened. This year President Johnson recommended to the Congress that many existing programs be expanded and strengthened, that bold, new programs be developed, and that all resources, public and private be brought to bear on the persistent problems of poverty. He recommended:

A substantial increase in social security benefits.

The extension of Medicare to disabled beneficiaries.

Improvements in public assistance to require States to pay their full standard of need and keep the pricing of the standard up-to-date.

The expansion of child welfare services.

The extension of maternal and child health services.

Increased funds for vocational rehabilitation.

Strengthening Head Start and preserving its opportunities in a Follow Through program.

The establishment of more neighborhood health and welfare centers.

A concentrated employment program using all public and private resources to improve employment opportunities.

A rat extermination program.

These and a number of the President's other recommendations to improve health and education are designed to strike at the very roots of poverty.

REDUCTION OF POVERTY

Since 1960 Federal funds for assisting the poor have increased 2½ times—from $9.9 billion to $25.6 billion. In fiscal 1968, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare alone will be spending $16.6 billion on programs for the poor.

The combination of programs to improve health, education and welfare and a prospering economy with high levels of employment, have helped bring about partial victory in the war on poverty and has encouraged us that if the effort continues we can abolish poverty.

Since 1930 the extent of poverty has declined from over 40 percent of the population to 15 percent. By 1970, we can cut the proportion to 10 percent and in the following decade we can eliminate poverty.

In 1965 there were 31.9 million people living in poverty. By 1966 the number was reduced to 29.7 million. The number today is about 27.5 million.

STRATEGY AGAINST POVERTY

If the War on Poverty is to be won, however, both short-range and long-range tactics will have to be deployed. It will involve providing job opportunities, job preparation, adequate income maintenance programs and availability of health services. Two years ago in a historic speech at Howard University, President Johnson said:

"Thus it is not enough to just open the gates of opportunity. All our citizens must have the ability to walk through those gates.

"We want to go beyond opportunity to achievement."

We must make breakthroughs on every front: education, housing, health, jobs and job training, transportation, income maintenance, and social services. We must deal with the whole wide range of human needs if people are going to walk through that door of opportunity.

For some of the poor—those who are not able to work—the aged and the disabled, for example, we must make improvements in our social security and public assistance programs. They must be assured the right to live at a level of human decency and dignity.

For those who are unskilled and unschooled, we must help them become educated, trained, and self-sufficient. For those who are unemployed or underemployed, we must provide job retraining, to upgrade their skills and assure improved job opportunities.

There are programs underway now that are directed to the needs of these groups. By building on them and strengthening them and developing new programs to meet new problems, the gains that have already been made against poverty can be multiplied.

Yes, in the past few years much has been accomplished. Doors of opportunity have been opened through which many have walked. Yet for reasons too numerous to list, reasons such as geographical or social inaccessibility, lack of knowledge, distrust or suspicions bred from experiences, many others were unable to walk through these doors. And bitterness comes to the surface when opportunity is so near yet so far.

There must be more than just opportunity. Some people must be helped to take advantage of these opportunities. Much hard work remains to be done if we are to break the stubborn heritage of poverty that perpetuates itself from generation to generation.

WHO ARE THE POOR?

But who are the poor? Whom are we talking about? Based on the Social Security Poverty Index:

Twelve and one-half million (43%) are children under age 18.

Another 1½ million are young adults, 19 to 21 years old.

Five million aged persons are living in poverty.

And if the same relationships hold as for 1965, about 8¾ million persons were counted poor even though the head of the family was employed full time all year.

All told the persons in poverty make up about 11 million households, or 1 out of 8 families of 2 or more and 2 out of 5 one person families.

Although the present focus of attention is on the Negro poor who live in city ghettos, the poor are spread throughout the land and they are not of one color. In 1964, for example, over half of the poor lived in non-metropolitan areas. One out of 8 lived on a farm. But some of the worst pockets of poverty are in those parts of the central cities where living costs are highest and where resources for aiding the poor are inadequate. As compared with surrounding suburbs, central cities of our metropolitan areas have disproportionate numbers of the aged poor and of children in poor families. For example, within the central cities, 17 percent of the total population is poor. Twenty-seven percent of the aged are living in poverty, and 66 percent of the individuals living in nonwhite families headed by a woman are poor.

In metropolitan areas there are 10 million poor persons in the central cities, while 6 million live in the surrounding suburbs. It is more likely that the head of a family living in the city will be out of the labor force than the family head living in the suburbs. If he is working, the chances are greater that we will have a low-skilled, low-paid job.

Nor is the poverty problem a color problem. Poverty in the central cities is not restricted to the non-white population. Overall the white poor outnumber the Negro poor in the cities as well as the suburbs.

While we cannot view the new figures on poverty with any complacency, there has been considerable progress, although more for some groups than others. The sharpest declines, however, have been among families with a young, white male worker. Increasingly the poverty roster is becoming hard core groups: the aged, families headed by a woman and the disabled.

Poverty has many causes, but we all know that the immediate problem is money—not enough of it. One of the problems is how do you get more money into the hands of the poor: How much money would it take to raise poverty stricken people above the level of want and despair? Today it would take about $11⅓ billion to raise their incomes to a level where they could buy the basic goods needed for a decent level of living. This is about 1.5 percent of the GNP. About $2.5 billion could bring all the aged out of poverty.

Granted that you cannot solve all the problems of poverty with money alone, a regular income is a prerequisite for good life. Continued economic growth and concerted efforts to improve education, training, health, housing and opportunities which promote self-help and motivate those who are dependent now to achieve independence, will significantly improve the status of many younger people. But these factors cannot be relied upon to improve the status of those groups who cannot work and who make up a sizeable proportion of the poor. Here the only remedy is an immediate improvement in their cash income. Thus, it is imperative that we make improvements in the social security program and public assistance.

IMPROVEMENTS IN SOCIAL SECURITY

What is the biggest anti-poverty program we have in this country? The Social Security program, of course.

Social security is one of the most effective programs that we have developed to prevent poverty in this country. Although the objective of social security is much broader than just preventing poverty, its actual and potential contribution to the war on poverty is often overlooked.

About 8 million people today are kept out of poverty by their social security benefits. About 5.7 million of them are aged 65 and over. Less than one-fourth of the retired aged have enough income, other than social security, to keep them above the very low poverty line of $1,500 for a single person and $1,900 for a couple. However, 6.2 million aged persons plus another 2.3 million younger beneficiaries are poor despite their social security benefits.

While the total number of the poor have been reduced from 39 million in 1959 to 27.5 million in 1967, the number of aged poor has remained almost unchanged. Aged persons are the most poverty-stricken age group in the Nation. In 1965, for example, 30 percent of them were poor as compared with 16 percent for all other age groups.

H.R. 12080, passed by the House of Representatives on August 15, would result in additional social security cash benefit payments of $3.2 billion in 1968—an overall increase in benefits of 14½ percent. All the people receiving benefits would get an increase of at least 12½ percent, with a minimum benefit of $50. These increases would help to bring 800,000 people out of poverty.

President Johnson has recommended to the Congress that social security benefits be increased at least 15 percent, with a minimum benefit of $70. The President's proposal would result in an additional cash benefit payment of $4.5 billion—an overall increase of 20 percent. No other measure now being seriously considered would so quickly and so surely cut down the size of the poverty rolls. The Administration's proposal in one single stroke would raise the incomes of 2.1 million social security beneficiaries and their dependents—1.6 million of the aged—above the poverty line. Passage of the Administration's social security proposals would bring the number of persons in poverty in the U.S. down to 25 million in 1968—a drop of nearly 14 million persons since 1959.

In addition, the workers who have not yet retired and those present beneficiaries would be assured that their income will be retained at a reasonably adequate level in retirement—that old-age, disability, or death will not mean that they or their dependents will automatically be assigned to the poverty rolls.

The President also recommended extension of Medicare to disabled social security beneficiaries. The House bill does not include this provision. But the disabled are in pretty much the same position as the aged. Most of them are dependent on their social security benefits for their income. They have high medical bills and little private health insurance. Their economic situation would be considerably improved if they had Medicare protection.

By continuing to improve the social security program we could eventually assure all the aged, disabled and widowed mothers and children a life free from want.

SOCIAL AND REHABILITATIVE SERVICES

The President's proposals to increase social security benefits would significantly reduce the number of persons who required public assistance. The social security program has already demonstrated its effectiveness in reducing the proportion of old-age assistance recipients. Both the number of old-age assistance recipients and their proportion in this population group has declined remarkably since 1950. In that year 23 percent of the 65 and over group—2.8 million received payments. This year only 11 percent—2.1 million are receiving them. Next year's figure could bring the percentage to an all-time low of fewer than 10 percent. Part of the decline can be attributed to the number of aged who are now or will be collecting the social security benefits they earned during their working careers.

However, there will still be people who will require public assistance and social and rehabilitation services. In 1967, public assistance is the major source of income for nearly 8 million persons. Today many of these recipients are not being provided even a subsistence level of income. As most of us here know, public assistance programs vary widely from State to State, reflecting not only differences in State capacity to finance the programs but differences in State interest and concern for the needy. Although the States are required to set assistance standards for needy persons which they use to determine eligibility—they need not make assistance payments on the basis of these standards.

An Administration proposal would eliminate this situation. States would be required to meet the need in full as they determine it in their own assistance standards. States would eliminate all regulations which prevent a needy individual from receiving a payment which meets his need as the State determines it. The proposal would also further require States beginning July 1, 1968, to annually review their assistance standards to take account of cost of living increases that occur.

Needs should be adequately met not only in terms of assistance amounts but also in terms of availability for those who require it.

A number of changes should be made in the public assistance programs to reduce dependency and encourage self-sufficiency. The Administration proposed, and the Committee on Ways and Means, incorporated in H.R. 12080, provisions to train more parents on public assistance for productive work with appropriate safeguards; raise the incentives of welfare recipients to increase job earnings; provide more and better day care for the children of working mothers.

Although we have reservations about some of the new provisions in the bill, passed by the House of Representatives, I do believe that provisions which, in general, help the individual to become self-sufficient are a good step in the right direction. Based on the work experience programs that have been operating for several years, we have every reason to believe that there are many individuals who want to be and can be trained and employed. During a three month period last year 2,000 AFDC cases (representing 10,400) persons were closed because recipients got jobs after participating in a public assistance work and training program.

Disability and dependency often go together, also. There are millions suffering from disabilities who are unable to support themselves but who could become self-supporting through vocational rehabilitation. Last year 173,000 handicapped persons were rehabilitated into employment. Three-fourths of the rehabilitated were not working when they entered the program, while others had only marginal or part-time jobs. Expansion of the vocational rehabilitation program could be expected to reap high returns in relation to expenditures. Present estimates indicate that nearly 4 million people need vocational rehabilitation services if they are to become employable. Obviously we still have a major task ahead of us if we are to reach and restore those who need help. Many of these people are the most disadvantaged in our society. We must give them a program which gives them the dignity that comes from work, and the self respect that comes from personal independence. Past experience shows that his can be done. Persons rehabilitated in 1963 were earning income at the rate of $47 million a year before rehabilitation, a year after rehabilitation their earnings reached $238 million.

This year the Administration proposed a number of steps to strengthen programs for restoring the disabled, who make up a sizeable percent of the total number in poverty.

Improvements in social security and assistance and rehabilitation programs are immediate steps that can be taken to improve the plight of many of the poor.

INTERRELATED APPROACH

Growing recognition of the close correlation of poverty, low educational attainment, poor health, dilapidated housing, lack of family planning information and services have resulted in a new approach to these problems. The old Band-Aid treatment no longer works. We have learned that education alone is not the answer. Education offers little to those who are prevented by disability or disease from using it to achieve economic security. By itself education offers little to those whose family and community's orientation places no premium on what can be tomorrow because it is concerned solely with today.

We have learned that the development of modern medical techniques means little to those who could benefit from them but do not either because of ignorance or poverty.

But the lessons we have learned have been translated into new approaches.

In welfare, we are placing greater emphasis on education and training as a way out of the poverty trap.

In health, we have turned to welfare and social security as a way of making medical care more widely available.

In education, we are paying greater attention to the economic, social and health factors that are an integral part of the learning process.

On August 15, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare announced a major realignment of Federal welfare, rehabilitation and social service programs. The new reorganization reflects the recognition of the necessity of a unified approach to the problems of needy Americans by combining income support and social service and rehabilitation programs that many families need. The new agency, the Social and Rehabilitation Services, will carry out the functions of the former Welfare Administration, the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration, the Administration on Aging and the Mental Retardation Division of the Public Health Service.

CONCLUSION

The war on poverty will not be won overnight. But it can be won. We have come to view each member of society as important, not only to himself but to the well-being of the society. Our obligation is to assure and expand human freedom. We are deeply committed not only to secure political freedom for all people but to secure other basic freedom as well: freedom from want, from injustice, from indignity and despair. We seek the good life for ourselves and our children. We are not just seeking *exits* from poverty, despair, disease, ignorance and other social wastelands, but *access roads* to positive enjoyment of good health, education, meaningful employment and economic security.

It is true that not all of our citizens have gained access to these components of the good life, but I am confident that if each of us works a little harder to help the poverty stricken onto those roads, the poor will not always be with us.

The Canadian Centennial and Voyageur Canoe Pageant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1967

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, on Labor Day, September 4, the city of Montreal will welcome to its shores 91 hardy men in 10 "North" canoes, representing the 10 provinces of Canada, in a celebration marking the end of a more than 3,000 mile trek in honor of the Canadian centennial and the legendary Voyageur tradition.

The journey of these dauntless 20th century Voyageurs, who themselves are of Olympic caliber and whose exploits are of heroic proportions, commemorates both a memorable date in the history of the Americas—the independence of Canada in 1867—and the colorful fur trade era whose epic story has linked our two nations in a common bond of economic progress, international friendship, and national destiny.

Starting from the western slopes of the Canadian Rockies, deep in the heartland of the North American Continent, these modern day Voyageurs, under the leadership of Chief Voyageur W.H.V. "Bill" Matthews, followed the route of John MacDonnel of the Northwest Co., retracted the footsteps of the legendary MacKenzie, relived the experiences of the great Canadian fur traders such as Thompson, La Salle, and Radisson—linking East with West, the past with the present, and the United States with Canada.

While the events of Canada's centennial celebration and this unusual Voyageur canoe pageant will be permanently recorded in Canadian history, I earnestly feel that the 100th anniversary of our Canadian neighbors and the story of this incredible cross-continental journey over the ageless water route called "The Voyageur Highway" should be given recognition here and called to the attention of all Americans. For the fur trade was

Canada's principal molding influence and it was the intrepid Voyageur who, perhaps more than any other figure, endowed our two nations with a common historical legacy and cultural pride.

MINNESOTA: VOYAGEUR LINK WITH CANADA

I have the honor to note that the only place on this 3,283-mile water journey where the canoeists touched U.S. territory is in my Northeastern Minnesota congressional district where, in impressive festivities, they were welcomed at International Falls; Crane Lake; Ely, in the heart of the Superior National Forest; and Grand Portage—the "Great Carrying Place"—the bustling, 18th century fur trading post on the western shores of Lake Superior.

Few of us realize that the Voyageur tradition reaches far back in the history of the North American Continent, even beyond our own American Revolution, into the late 17th century. Few of us realize the widespread impact of the Voyageurs on our every day life until we recall the French place names of Duluth, named after Greysolon Sieur du Luth, Fond du Lac, the end of the lake, and Grand Marais, the great marsh land. The principal thoroughfares in Minnesota's largest city—Hennepin, Nicollet, Marquette, La Salle—all bear the imprint of the Voyageurs. Even Minnesota's largest county and one of our principal rivers were named by the Voyageurs in honor of St. Louis of France.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of my colleagues the following articles that bring to life the history of the Voyageurs and sum up the exciting adventures of their present day descendants:

Destiny of the Voyageurs

(By Hugo Skrastins)

In the annals of North American history some of the most colorful pages belong to the *Voyageurs*. Theirs was the time when the white man had already established himself on the Atlantic seaboard and the new colonies saw their first economic boom. For more than two hundred years, a lively fur trade was the mainspring of the growing economy of the American continent.

If by now the term Voyageur has come to mean anyone in the long procession of traders, explorers and missionaries who took to their canoes to go West among the Indians, formerly the word applied only to the canoemen themselves, usually of French descent, coming from among the settlers of Quebec and Montreal. They could be recognized by their dress, which included a red or blue woolen cap, a bright sash and the inevitable white clay pipe. The Voyageurs were gay, adventurous and great lovers of song. They were stalwart and necessarily experts in handling their craft. The large "Montreal" canoes sometimes required a crew of sixteen, and the fate of men and boat depended on the strength, skill and nerve of the bowsman and steersman. When shooting the rapids, a single misjudged stroke of the paddle, a turn missed by a split second could send the canoe crashing on an underwater rock.

The craft of the Voyageur was the unique birch bark canoe which made possible the navigation of the various waterways to the interior. The canoes were made of strips of yellow birch bark, sewn together with fine spruce roots, stretched over a framwork of white cedar and "calked" with melted pine gum. No nails were used—canoe-building was an art found and perfected by the Indians who frequently built them for the Voyageurs as well.

Traders and explorers followed the same waterways and portages that the natives had used for centuries before the white man had set foot on the new continent. Eventually, the traders built forts near Indian villages in order to winter close to the source of the furs, and thus colonization of the interior began.

The main route of the fur trade led from Montreal to Grand Portage on the north shore of Lake Superior and thence west, branching out in several directions. Lachine, near Montreal, was the starting point of all canoes. Loaded with trading goods, they left in the spring and reached Grand Portage in July. There they were met by the smaller, six-man "North" canoes arriving from the interior with the furs obtained from the Indians. At Grand Portage, cargoes were exchanged: goods from Montreal would continue west in the "North" canoes while the "Montreal" canoes would turn back loaded with furs.

In later days, when fur trade was taken over by the British and Americans, the Voyageurs still continued their work as before because they could not be surpassed. Tough and gallant at the same time, they got along with the Indians, knew their language and frequently settled in spots they had eyed while passing by in their canoes. White women were not available; the Voyageurs often married Indian girls and became the first settlers of the interior. Their presence can still be discerned in the many French names of Midwestern lakes, rivers and towns.

The Voyageur days are shown with historical accuracy in the works of artists who witnessed the event with their own eyes. Cornelius Krieghoff painted many portraits of the Voyageurs, Frances Ann Hopkins created the most colorful and dramatic scenes of the past, and William Armstrong has left pictures which with great accuracy document the events and places.

(Following are the texts which accompany the beautiful photographs in Mr. Skrastins' masterful pictorial account of the Voyageurs:)

"A portrait of a Voyageur" by Cornelius Krieghoff shows the colorful cap and clay pipe which were indispensable to the Voyageurs. The town of Montreal, from which the main trade route led West, was depicted by Frances Ann Hopkins. The same artist captured the surprisingly beautiful scenery in the painting, "Canoe Proceeding along High Rocky Cliffs."

"Pulling Canoe" by Frances Ann Hopkins—The Voyageurs sometimes had a difficult time getting to territories where furs were in abundance. First to barter for furs with natives were the French, subsequently crowded out by the British, while the Americans entered the field last. The enterprise was very profitable, and competition often so tough that bloody skirmishes were not infrequent.

"The Explorers' Camp" by Frances Ann Hopkins—Overnight, canoes were taken out of the water; turned over, they provided shelter in case of rain for Voyageurs and their goods.

"Portaging" by Cornelius Krieghoff—All the waterways and portages had been discovered by the Indians long before the arrival of the white man. The use to which a canoe was to be put determined its size; the largest, meant for the great lakes and wide rivers, was the "Montreal" canoe, up to forty feet long and capable of carrying a cargo of five tons of furs and people.

"Lake Superior" by William Armstrong—The main route of the Voyageurs led by the north shore of Lake Superior. The strains of their French folk tunes, sunk rhythmically as they paddled across the Great Lakes, could be heard on these shores until the middle of the last century when the fur trade ended.

"Port Williams" by William Armstrong—Seen here as it was in the 1870's, this town owes its establishment to the fur trade. In pursuing their main object—beaver, otter, mink and many other furs—the Voyageurs brought many changes along the trade routes.

"Dogsled" by Paul Kane—In winter, travel was maintained with the help of dog teams and snowshoes. The fur traders built their forts near their source of furs—the Indian encampments. Most of the trading with the Indians took place in winter.

"Buffalo Hunt" by George Catlin—Buffaloes were hunted by the Plains Indians who used the meat for food and the hides for clothing and tepees. Dried buffalo meat, called pemmican, was also an item of trade with the Voyageurs who regarded it as a great delicacy on canoe trips.

"Settlers" by Cornelius Krieghoff—The first settlers of the Middle West were the Voyageurs who took Indian girls for their wives. In the beginning they lived like the Indians, trapping, hunting and gathering wild berries.

[From the Duluth News Tribune, July 23, 1967]

Modern Voyageurs Lean, Hardy Breed of Adventurers

(By Raymond E. Naddy)

The haze was still on Gunflint Lake Friday morning when the 10 North canoes representing the provinces of Canada moved on down the lake with the flashes of paddles in the sunlight revealing a remarkable cadence.

Across the quiet waters of Gunflint we could hear the cadence call of a steersman, "Huh! Huh! Huh!" echoing through the mist.

The voyageurs, taking part in a 3,283-mile canoe pageant of Expo 67, are no phonies. They are lean, hard and tough.

Saving already traveled 1,800 miles from Rocky Mountain House in the Canadian Rockies, Gunlint Lake was a breeeze for them. There was scarcely a ripple on the lake.

These crews a few weeks earlier had come across treacherous Lake Winnipegoosis of Manitoba with a northerly wind ripping up white caps 10 feet high and shot countless rapids in scores of legendary rivers.

They have passed places at the foot of rapids and on long, back-breaking portages where crude wooden crosses, long since weathered to dust, where hunderds of voyageurs found their final resting places.

Death often came in the rapids where entire parties were lost or on the portage trails where men often died of heart attacks or strangulated hernia under the 180-pound plus loads they carried.

But Gunflint Lake this day was a picnic.

Coming off Gunflint into North Lake the canoes, trailing out the length of the lake, moved into the "Height of Land" portage leading to South Lake.

It was here that the travelers were initiated into the elite fraternity of voyageurs and dubbed Nor'westers. Essentially, this legendary tradition was to let the world know that these were men, separated from boys.

On Aug. 11, 1793, John Macdonell of the North West Company was initiated in the same manner on this same spot and passed among his men two gallon jugs of rum in honor of the occasion, a tradition even then.

It was obvious here, however, that these modern voyageurs preferred oranges and cans of fruit juice, a luxury their counterparts of a century and more ago never dreamed of.

Slightly more than an hour after the ceremonies the men were to get a test to see if they were Nor'westers for real.

This came when they arrived at the head of Stairway Portage from Rose Lake into Duncan.

This portage is a quarter-mile long and most of it is at about the steepest angle one can imagine and still be able to climb.

And it wasn't voyageur songs the men were singing as they guided their 25-foot north canoes around massive boulders, slipping on the pine duff under foot, banging against great pines and feeling the slap of a branch across a sunburned face.

It was strictly cussing in colorful English and French.

The rapport and good natured kidding disappeared on the man-killing Stairway Portage. There the jibes and teasing turned into threats of broken arms and heads.

The men who rode the crests of Lake Winnipeg and shot the smashing rapids of the Athabaska stood in awe at Stairway Portage.

The portage, however, was not without its rewards. Only a few of the men who carried their canoes and gear across did not return for a look at the portage from the top or to look at the spectacular water falls of Rose Lake, a few feet off the trail.

There on the portage, amid the heady smells of balsam and cedar, the men earned the right to call themselves Northwesters.

And there, to, at the end of the portage, with the sun glistening on Duncan Lake ahead of them, they could feel the cool breeze of Lake Superior toward which they have been heading for so many hundreds of miles.

At 6 p.m. today the voyagers will see Lake Superior, many for the first time in their lives, when they complete another back-breaking portage, a nine-miler, into Grand Portage itself.

From there, there is another 1,500 miles to Montreal and Expo 67, the end of a long journey.

Watching the men move down the lake one suddenly became aware of the great number of them.

Their movements have become so organized and disciplined there was no confusion.

And each man of the party knew what he had to do and did it. The movement of the party through the area, likewise, was not without its planning and organization.

For months members of various North Shore civic and community groups joined with the Gunflint Trail Association and U.S. Forest Service and planned activities throughout the area to celebrate the arrival and the passing of the voyagers.

The teamwork and the efforts of many individuals on this side of the border earned the praises and heartfelt thanks of those friends on the other side.

Dr. John L. Taylor

SPEECH

OF

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 30, 1967

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, like many of my colleagues who have served on the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I was shocked and saddened to learn of the untimely death of Dr. John L. Taylor, the committee's staff consultant on territorial and Indian Affairs.

While serving as U.S. Representative on the U.N. Trusteeship Council in 1961, I had the pleasure of making a visit to the Pacific Trust Territory with Jack Taylor. I learned what a warm wonderful human being he was and how widely beloved he was in Micronesia.

In his quiet and unassuming way, he was always ready and able to serve the interests of the committee and of the comittee's clients effectively and selflessly. He will be sorely missed.

I join my colleagues in extending my deepest sympathy to his wife and five children.

Wendell Phillips Dodge and "The Mirror of the Century"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THEODORE R. KUPFERMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 30, 1967

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, my constituent, Wendell Phillips Dodge, historian, explorer, and raconteur, has written a review to be published in Voyages and Discoveries of a book entitled "The Mirror of the Century."

The review itself has special value as a historical record taking us back to the time before Mr. Dodge acted as press representative for the famous producer David Belasco, and including references to such significant literary items and people as Sherlock Holmes and E. Phillips Oppenheim.

I know that my colleagues will find the review of great interest and I am pleased to bring it to their attention:

"THE MIRROR OF THE CENTURY"

(The Strand Magazine, 1891–1950, by Reginald Pound (A. S. Barnes and Co., Inc., Cranberry, New Jersey, 1967))

(Reviewed, with reminiscences, by Wendell Phillips Dodge, F.R.G.S., American Editor of *The Strand Magazine* and *The Wide World Magazine* and Regular Contributor to *The Strand* in London, beginning in 1910.)

The same year, 1915 that this book reviewer became American editor of the two widely read publications of the great publishing house of George Newnes, Limited, of London, *The Strand Magazine* and *The Wide World Magazine,* he also became a professional member of the famous "The Lambs" theatrical club in New York.

This is the way that great newspaper editor of the famous *The Atlanta Constitution,* Clark Howell, Sr., long a director of The Associated Press, began an editorial in its issue of March 18, 1915: "An event of importance in the literary and dramatic world is the announcement that Wendell Phillips Dodge, general press representative of David Belasco, has also been made the American editor of *The Strand Magazine* and *The Wide World Magazine*. He is to be the sole representative in this country of the Messrs. George Newnes, Limited, publishers of London. To be press mouthpiece of David Belasco, who is sharply silhouetted as the greatest of the drama producers of America, is in itself a singular distinction, and argues rare equalities of judgment, training, ability and experience. Add to this the American editorship of these two widely-read magazines and Mr. Dodge becomes a character almost unique in publication and theatrical circles in this country. It takes a big and a versatile man to hold two such positions. . . ."

It was "The Strand" that introduced Sir Arthur Conan Doyle's celebrated character of "Sherlock Holmes" to the world. Among many other noted fictional, as well as scientific and other writers of wide repute "The Strand" brought out were the works of H. G. Wells and on down the years Sir Winston Spencer Churchill, who first wrote for "The Strand" in 1901. This was an article headed "The Most Sensational Motor Ride," under the pseudonym of "Winston Spencer."

Curiously, the young at age eighty-three reviewer of this new book first met Sir Arthur Conan Doyle, creator of "Sherlock Holmes," and also Sir George Newnes, Editor and Publisher of *The Strand Magazine,* that same year of 1901. The then eighteen-year-old Wendell Phillips Dodge was on his way to explore in the Holy Land, the Near East and Middle East. His father, Arthur Pillsbury Dodge, founder-publisher of three outstanding literary and historical magazines in Boston, Massachusetts—*The New England Magazine, The Bay State Monthly,* and *The Granite State Monthly,* all having as Editor-in-Chief that famous author of "The Man Without A Country," Dr. Edward Everett Hale, had written to a charming London hostess, Mrs. Thornburgh Cropper, of his son's arrival there in mid-September, and she graciously invited our present book reviewer to dinner in her town house.

Chatting with Sir George Newnes, who asked young Dodge what he was about to explore in the Holy Land, Sir George mentioned that he had been the financial sponsor of a young Norweigian, C. E. Borchgrevink, who was endeavoring to raise funds for an exploration expedition that was to make history. It was one of the earliest expeditions to be made to the Ross Sea in the Antarctic. It turned out to be one of the epoch-making Antarctic expeditions, the celebrated *Belgica* Expedition, under Lieutenant Adrien de Gerlache, of the Belgian Navy. Included were two famous Arctic and Antarctic explorers, the Norwegian Roald Amundsen, as First Mate, and Dr. Frederick A. Cook, American, as surgeon, anthropologist, and photographer. This was in 1899, and later Amundsen was to discover the South Pole, and Dr. Cook the North Pole. It was Dr. Cook who devised a way to free the ship *Belgica* from many months being frozen in the crushing Antarctic ice-pack by dynamiting an open channel of water ahead of it, saving the lives of all members of the expedition. Amundsen wrote of Dr. Cook: "We shall always honor Dr. Frederick A. Cook as the first man at the geographical North Pole of the Earth. It was a pity that Peary should besmirch his beautiful work by circulating outrageous accusations against a competitor who had won the battle in open field.

"Upright, honorable, capable and conscientious in the extreme; such is the memory we retain of Frederick A. Cook. I would trust no other man as I trust him." (Amundsen's book, "The South Pole," 1912).

For a young embryo explorer this dinner must have been an inspiring occasion, indeed. Dodge's article for "The Strand" appearing in its March, 1910 issue was entitled "The Hand of the Actor," and told how the human hands really *act*. It was amply and well illustrated with photographs showing the difference between the hand *acting* and mere gestures. Then followed several articles by Dodge, such as one on "David Belasco, Wizard of the Theatre," and two first "authorized" contributions, "The New York Stock Exchange and Wall Street," and "The New York Yacht Club and the America's Cup."

Another article written by Dodge for "The Strand" that attracted wide attention on both sides of the Atlantic was his "Anchoring A Skyscraper." Written from actual facts and figures obtained from The Foundation Company of America, this article told how all high buildings erected below Union Square literally had to be "anchored" to bed-rock because of the unusual features of the soil, silt and sand, often including quicksand, on Manhattan Island. A little above Union Square bed-rock is found right at the street level, and the tall tower of the Metropolitan Life Building needed no excavation other than for its sub-basement. But the foundations for the Singer Building on lower Broadway had to be sunk and "anchored" to bed-rock eighty feet below street level. For the Woolworth Building a little to the north its foundations had to be sunk some

130 feet below street level before bed-rock was reached for "anchoring." The Municipal Building, near City Hall, had to sink its foundations 135 feet before it could be "anchored" to bed-rock. Only fairly recently there has been serious trouble over the sinking of buildings in this area, undoubtedly because of the presence of quick-sand.

Also described in his article, "Anchoring A Skyscraper," Dodge told of the unique foundations for the Pulitzer-World Building in Park Row at the entrance to Brooklyn Bridge. This was New York's first "skyscraper" and its construction engineers also ran into a large quick-sand area. They were obliged to sink inverted arches in order to permit the weight of the building to sink evenly a little over the years, without causing any cracks in the building. At the time Dodge was a reported on *The Evening World* in 1906 the World Building had sunk, evenly, nearly three feet since it was built in the mid-Eighteen 'Eighties. It suffered no cracks, not even in the plaster of rooms on its various floors!

Incidentally, Wendell Phillips Dodge had been a civil engineer himself, and was a transitman with the Subway Rapid Transit Construction Company, working on the reconstruction of the first East River tunnel to be dug. It was from The Battery, Manhattan, to the foot of Joralemon Street, Brooklyn. In its construction the heading of the tunnel got out of alignment under the river-bed about midstream, and had to be moved over in construction to meet the other end of the tunnel being bored through in the opposite direction. It was a most unusual engineering feat, and Dodge was glad of this opportunity to work under such a situation.

One other feature article series the distinguished editor of "The Strand" commissioned Dodge to write bore the prophetic title of "The United States of Europe." A preliminary introductory article was written by Dodge and set up in type and mailed to numerous heads of State throughout Europe and the United Kingdom, and to a few persons high in the United States, for their views. Many favorable replies were received from Ex-President Theodore Roosevelt, Sir Edward Grey, Britain's Foreign Minister; Winston Churchill, Jules Henri Poincaré, of France; as well as from the last of the Czars of all the Russias, Nicholas II.; and the soon to become Prime Minister of Great Britain, David Lloyd George, as well as from none other than Georges Eugene Clemenceau, Premier of France. As Fate would have it, these two statesmen, Clemenceau, known as "The Tiger," and Lloyd George were to defeat President Woodrow Wilson's very simmilar grandiose plan for what eventually became the League of Nations in 1920, for the preservation of world peace, only to be dissolved in 1946, leaving some of its shreds to be woven into the fabric of the present United Nations.

As the American editor of "The Strand" Dodge was carrying on its great tradition stemming from Sir George Newnes' sagacity and its great forerunner authors Sir Arthur Conan Doyle, H. G. Wells, W. W. Jacobs, Max Pemberton, Jerome K. Jerome, A. E. W. Mason, Anthony Hope, A. M. Williamson, Baroness Orczy, P. G. Wodehouse, Sir Winston Churchill, and many other great literary "stars" on the world stage of dramatic events. But World War I. was to put an end to the American "Strand," and the German aerial bombing of London to destroy much of "The Strand's" records, most of which literally were sent up in flame and smoke from the even more severe aerial bombings of World War II.

Before many years more "The Strand" itself ended its enviable career among publications with a history long to be remembered, and cherished.

This unique in more ways than usual book review follows:

The Mirror of the Century—The Strand Magazine, 1891–1950, by Reginald Pound (A. S. Barnes and Co., Inc., Cranberry, New Jersey, publishers, 1967) is of only 200 pages. Its full story easily should require from 5,000 to 10,000 pages. However, even so this book is packed like sardines with the literary and human interest history that tells a great deal about a magazine familiar to two or more generations of readers in every part of the English-speaking world. It gives much interestingly told "facts and fancies" about and concerning numerous famous authors who made history and gave much pleasure to countless readers everywhere.

In particular, the author's chapter headed "Triviality Makes News" tells of Sir George Newnes' vastly popular weekly, "Tid-Bits," started in 1881 (October 22, 1881) that inaugurated a new era in journalism that quickly spread to the United States. Its sixteen pages printed on green paper, without cover, no illustrations, no advertisements, before the year was out became an enormous success. It bore such single-line headings as "How Our Queen Was Wooed," "A Strange Hobby," "Ancedotes of Gamblers," "Curious Epitaphs," "A Runaway Train," and so on.

The book being reviewed provides us with another bit of history that Newnes was the first periodical publisher to apply shop window-dressing techniques to his circulation campaigns. An early publishing "showman" was he. Another stunt of his was the announcement of a "hidden treasure" hunt for five hundred gold sovereigns buried at a site in the Hertfordshire countryside, indicated by clues scattered through a "Tid-Bits" serial story. The author of this entertaining book sets forth: " 'Ye gods!' exclaimed a writer in the Caxton Magazine, 'If there had been no Tid-Bits, it is likely there would have been no Daily Mail, no Daily Express!"

R. A. Scott James wrote in "The Influence of the Press" (1913): " 'Tid-Bits' marked the commencement of a new era in the history of the English Press and the English nation."

This book author sets forth: "Newnes's earnest personal attitude was expressed in his scrutiny of every line printed in his paper, down to the joke 'fillers' at the foot of the columns. His last-minute censorship was a trial to the staff, anxious about press time. He blue-pencilled a query about kissing in public, writing against it on a page proof: 'We should avoid any subject that may have an injurious effect on our readers'." What ho, these sexy teen-age days—and nights!

W. T. Stead, his term as editor of the "Pall Mall Gazette" coming to an end, was the first editor of which was to become "The Strand Magazine." But when he proposed to print a letter from Mrs. Annie Besant, the noted Theosophist, Newnes feared it might be injurious, and addressed the great Stead: "There is one kind of journalism which directs the affairs of nations. It makes and unmakes Cabinets. It upsets governments, builds up navies and does many other great things. It is magnificent. That is *your* journalism."

H. Greenough Smith had quickly succeeded W. T. Stead as editor of "The Strand," and remained its editor for almost half a century. My personal dealings were entirely with him, except for those of a strictly business nature, as besides being the American editor of "The Strand Magazine" and "The Wide World Magazine," I was the sole American representative of Georges Newnes, Limited, and thus represented their celebrated authors in the matter of American publications rights. My "boss" in this instance was Francis R. Grierson, General Manager of George Newnes, Limited in London.

One of Reginald Pound's most picturesque "human interest" touches in one chapter tells how the Prince of Wales, later King Edward VII, was a familiar figure in the parliamentary precincts for fully twenty-five years, and once was forced to leave the gallery under the "No strangers" rule. This occurrence, along with numerous others over the years beginning in the early 'Eighties, was reported in "From Behind the Speaker's Chair," Sir Henry Lucy's monthly article for "The Strand." Similar articles by Lucy appeared in the *Daily Telegraph* (London) under the general title, "Under the Clock; By One of the Hands." Also, Lucy wrote another series in *Punch* purporting to be from "Toby, M. P."

Writes the author of "Mirror of the Century—The Strand Magazine, 1891–1950": "From 'Behind the Speaker's Chair', his (Sir Henry Lucy) monthly article for "The Strand," was suggested by Newnes over the dinner table . . . His success was in his ability to present Parliament as a continuing pageant in the life of the nation. He wrote neither as political analyst nor interpreter but as a journalist whose facile pen was governed by a strong sense of the historical past. He had Defoe's gift for seizing on vivid, relevant details. . . . He told readers of 'The Strand' that the House of Lords was ordinarily a place of deadly dullness."

Continuing with an insight almost akin to Lucy's table-turning and "Conan Doyle and the Fairies," one of this new book's utterly delightful chapters, the reader should do more than skim through his chapter ten, headed "Famous 'Strand' Story Tellers." It might be well to suggest that our university and college literature classes be given as "must" reading this book on "The Strand Magazine."

This new book contains a lovely and thoroughly entertaining account of E. Phillips Oppenheim, who contributed copiously to "The Strand" between the two World Wars. Take this, for instance: "Applying business methods to literature, he ("Oppy"), settled down to write two novels a year by dictating an average of 4,000 words a day, four days a week. He kept it up for thirty years, during most of which he lived in style on the Riviera. He never sketched a plot. He decided on two or three characters and set them working out their own fortunes according to the formula:

Our deeds will follow from afar,
What we have been makes us what we are.

Chapter Four of the book under consideration tells how "The Strand" had its beginnings, which should interest everyone in these days of fast disappearing newspapers and magazines trying to keep track of publications of yesteryear. It was the celebrated W. T. Stead, then editor of the *Pall Mall Gazette,* who suggested that Newnes bring out a magazine which would do for educated readers what his "Tid-Bits" did for "the common man." Stead was thinking way ahead to what we now have in "The Reader's Digest," it would seem—only more than that. He suggested it be named "The Sixpenny Magazine: A Review of Reviews." With Newnes' backing the first issue reached the bookstalls in January, 1890, without the sixpenny appellation, which Newnes blue-pencilled. A learned professor alluded to it as "Stead's boiled magazine." However, the Archbishop of York, Cardinal Manning, Lord Chief Justice Coleridge, Mr. Gladstone and Lord Tennyson heartily received it. Then Stead proposed to print a letter from Mrs. Annie Besant, already referred to. Newnes feared that it would "shut the Review out of numberless homes." Soon Stead and Newnes parted company, and my fine old "Strand" chief, H. Greenough Smith became the long-time editor of "The Strand," coming from the editorial staff of "Temple Bar," one of London's older and stodgier magazines.

Newnes changed the name to "The Strand Magazine," ordering its famous cover design showing the church towers of St. Clement Danes and Mary-le-Strand, top hats, radial telegraph wires, newsboy, hansom cab, big round gas globe pendent from No. 339 Strand, at the corner of Burleigh Street. It was made by a freelance artist, G. H. Haire, later one of the founders of the London Sketch Club.

Writes Reginald Pound: " 'Tid-Bits' identified Newnes with the broad base of the English class pyramid, 'The Strand Magazine' was a passport to recognition at higher social altitudes. An ingratiating feature, Portraits of Celebrities at Different Times in Their Lives, guaranteed him valuable new goodwill among eminent persons of the time."

If for no other reason, every American worth his salt should rush out and buy a copy of this book if only to read its Chapter Five—"Enter Sherlock Holmes." A few of what are now labeled "senior citizens" may have seen the greatest of all Sherlock Holmes' on the stage of our legitimate theatre, William Gillette. Non-"senior citizens" throughout the U.S.A. will better recall seeing Raymond Massey or Basil Rathbone as Sherlock Holmes, either on the stage or screen. And as for our " 'teenagers" before the girls started wearing mini-skirts and the boys wearing their hair like the girls, some may have caught sight of these two fine actors on TV.

It was the Sherlock Holmes stories that carried "The Strand" forward into the first place in magazine popularity. The last of fifty-six complete Sherlock Holmes stories (novels, rather) published in "The Strand" through thirty-six years appeared in its issue of April, 1927. Conan Doyle died in 1930. Greenough Smith died in 1935 at the age of eighty.

"Time," our news weekly, recorded the forthcoming demise of the famous "Strand" as "the death of a tradition," noting that under Greenough Smith "The Strand" spurred the Edwardian spirit of adventure and empire by travelogues, pictures, biographies of famous men and foreign correspondence by Winston Churchill. . . . "The Strand" became part of British life, from drawing-room to below stairs, and colonists fondly regarded it as "a bit of London" in their far-off homes.

As this book's author sets forth: "Wrote one nostalgic old-timer: 'The Bible, Pilgrim's Progress and The Strand Magazine were my first three books'."

A Breakdown in Communication

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 30, 1967

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, perhaps one of the gravest lessons to be learned from our violent summer is the one most easily overlooked. That lesson—simply that black and white America are speaking different languages. The words are the same, the systems of communication are the same, but in plain, simple language the words have different meanings. The white community talks of "violence," "tragedy," and "riot" and within the white community these words have a meaning. But in the streets of a ghetto these words, if these words are used, mean something very different—they mean white people talking about rare incidents that are part of everyday ghetto life.

If we want to reach the troubled black population, it is time we realized that our terminology, our sociologically oriented phrases, have little or different meaning to the boy in the streets, to the sniper, to the mother in the ghetto. What does crime mean to people for whom the law has held no recourse. What does violence mean to people who have to learn to fight just to survive. What does riot mean to people whose daily condition of life contains little continuity or order. What does tragedy mean to people who do not have a chance to laugh happily.

Mr. Saville Davis has done a thought-provoking study of this real tragedy of a breakdown in communication. In his column he presents a hypothetical confrontation between this black and white langauge—the word in his example, "alienated."

White. "What we most need to understand is that the Negro is alienated from the white community?"

Black: "Alienated? We've never been let into the white community. Come down and see."

Mr. Speaker, I urge the Members to read the article of Mr. Saville Davis, which I insert in the RECORD at this point:

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 26, 1967]

WHITE ASSESSMENT OF RIOTS IGNORES THINKING OF BLACKS

(By Saville Davis)

Even now, as the flames of the big city riots turn to ashes in memory, the main lesson of the summer has not yet been learned: How differently most Negroes think from most Americans. The difference is that between black and white.

A brilliant array of stories in the news media have looked at the social and economic causes of the violence, but skirted around the pyschological. Experts have been widely quoted, and public figures have made statements—in white language, for whites.

Unwittingly the language and thinking of the blacks is left out. Only the tough, investigative reporters, ranging the wrecked streets, have collected spontaneous quotes from Negroes which told the real story. But these usually produced so much shock among whites that they were heard but not understood.

Consider, says a white specialist in this field, how statements that stir and even thrill well-meaning whites cause dismay among most blacks:

White (based on statements by President Johnson): "We have endured a week (in Detroit) such as no nation should live through: a time of violence and tragedy."

Black: "There is nothing extraordinary about violence and tragedy for us; we have spent our lives with them. It's the whites who had a bad time this week."

White: "Let there be no mistakes—the looting, arson, plunder and pillage which have occurred are not part of a civil rights protest. There is no American right to loot, burn, shoot from housetops. That is crime."

Black: "Are whites pursued, arrested, beaten, tried and convicted for crimes against blacks? How often? What's crime for blacks is not crime, most of the time, for whites."

White: "When violence strikes, those in public responsibility have an immediate job: Not to analyze but to end disorder."

Black: "The only time when violence is stopped with such a big noise is when it is against white."

White: "In America we seek more than the uneasy calm of martial law. We seek peace based on one man's respect for another—and upon mutual respect for law."

Black: "Whose law?"

White: "The only genuine, long-range solution lies in an attack, mounted at every level, on the conditions that breed despair and violence—ignorance, discrimination, slums, not enough jobs."

Black: "That's good. But how long do we wait, living with the rats, while the white man lives in his prosperous suburbs? How soon will he forget us again?"

White: "There must be no reward for violence."

Black: "When did Whitey start listening?"

White: "It's the Negro who loses, whose homes and streets are destroyed."

Black: "They are so filthy they ought to be burned. We couldn't get worse."

White: "We need faith between man and man, between race and race."

Black: "We need actions. The way things are now, nothing else talks."

These are polite versions of what is said much more pungently. They sound like exaggerations. Most of them are understatements. Few whites have any feel for what it means to live like a Negro. There was the terror of the sheriff in the South. Now it is the police patrol car in the North.

A high official of the Federal Government was walking through a Negro street in the Nation's Capital, to see what he could see. It was a hot night. A family was out on the sidewalk. A police car came up: "Get the hell back in the house." The smallest of incidents, it meant so much that it was told to the President himself and he has repeated it, struggling to grasp what he was up against.

White: "What we most need to understand is that the Negro is alienated from the white community."

Black: "Alienated? We've never been let into the white community. Come down and see."

Light One Little Candle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1967

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, many of us remember Father James Keller's admonition, when confronted with troubles around us, "to light one little candle."

Ralph Renick, vice president in charge of news for television station WTVJ, recently visited Washington, as he does periodically to background national news events and personalities. He confided to me that a few days here had left him somewhat depressed by the negative atmosphere he sensed in the city, resulting from the war in Vietnam and the war in American cities. But he related a story of an encounter he had with a Washington cabdriver which served to change his view of events. He passed that story on to those with whom he met, and I am sure that it did much to brighten the day for each one.

Ralph used the story as the basis for an article he writes for the Voice, and I offer it to be printed here in the RECORD so that it can help the perspective of even more people, expecially those who must deal with the problems of government every day.

I would not want this opportunity to pass without adding something about Ralph Renick himself.

Ralph started in television when, like himself, it was a young and untested newcomer. He grew up with the new medium of communications and became one of its best known spokesmen in Florida. He advanced to his present position as vice president in charge of news in a corporate giant which has spread out into many areas of business. Although still young, he could now afford to start taking life easy. Not Ralph

Renick. He continues to maintain a full schedule of news broadcasts and special features. He writes a weekly column for the Voice. He is active in countless civic endeavors. He backgrounds the news himself—on trips such as the recent one to Washington—and his editorials, particularly those on crime, have led the way to progress in many areas. He has done all this while raising a large family after the tragic loss of his wife. Florida is fortunate to have Ralph Renick—as Washington is fortunate to have its own gloom dispeller in the form of a cabdriver who served as the inspiration of Ralph's column. It is fortunate for America that such men still speak out. After all, we have relatively little to complain about ourselves, while we have so very much for which to be thankful.

"Philosophical Cabbie Is a Gloom Dispeller," by Ralph Renick, follows:

Philosophical Cabbie Is a Gloom Dispeller

(By Ralph Renick)

Washington.—These are the times that try the soul of a Congressman. Or, for that matter a Senator or any other public official in this seat of national government.

The riots which dotted cities like bursts of shrapnel on the national landscape came as a shock to the federal establishment. When lawlessness runs unchecked with the military forced to come to the rescue—the citizenry can rightly fear for personal safety and wonder whether we are on the brink of internal destruction.

Thus the Congress is under extreme pressure to "do something." What that something is comes under a different headache category. There is no one solution. What has taken decades to evolve is not solved with money or the passage of a new law.

Washington sags under the weight of national near despair over conditions in the cities and the plight in Vietnam. What many people fear may be war without an end frustrates the Congress as much as it does the public.

You get the feeling that most all is bad and there is little that is good when you check the constituency mail on a Congressman's desk.

National problems, personal problems, requests for all kinds of help—this is the daily flow of letters to the Capitol.

It's difficult to walk out of a Washington office and not carry with you some sense of the depressive, negative spirit which has settled over this city.

But then, I took a cab ride and all of this feeling changed.

It was an unusually cool day for summer in Washington. The cab driver agreed with me when I said "What a beautiful day!" "You're right," said the driver, "this weather beats air conditioning anytime."

The cab quickly passed the blocks as it went down one of the streets which radiate from the Capitol building.

As I looked out the window I spotted a figure of a man lying on the lawn of a church. His clothing was in a state of disarray. Obviously he was a down-and-outer who was much under the weather rather than enjoying it—as were the driver and I.

We continued our conversation about air conditioning. I remarked that we could do away with artificial cooling only if the good Lord would cooperate by giving us weather every day like He did today. The mention of the Lord's name seemed to trigger something in the driver's mind.

"Look," he said, "we just don't know how lucky we are. God has given us a soul. Don't we know that this is the greatest gift anybody can have? Just to be alive is reason enough to be constantly thankful.

"Why does everybody talk about all the things that are bad? Most of my customers are complainers. They complain about all that's wrong. They don't know how to appreciate the gift of life God has given us. Remember that fellow lying on the church lawn a few blocks back? He is abusing that gift. He doesn't know how to live, how to make the most of what he has."

The driver's statement amazed me. It not only made sense, but it occurred that I hadn't heard anybody say the things he was saying in a long time. I looked down to a card mounted on the dashboard containing his photograph and name. It read Paul Snowden. He was Negro. I asked him how long he had been in Washington. "Since 1943," he said, "I was born in Greenwood County, South Carolina."

"You know," I told him, "what you've just said should be in everybody's conversation. But how can you spread the word?"

"Look," said the driver, "when you get out of this cab, you pass the message on to the first person you talk with. That's how you can get the job done. You tell that person to tell the next person."

I promised him I would do it. That's the reason for this column.

As I was getting out of the cab, something else came to my attention. Stamped across his cabbie identification card was the word "Diabetic." As I bid him goodbye I said "Do you do this work fulltime?"

"No," he said, "I'm not able to anymore. My wife has been very ill and I've got to look after her, cook, and cleanup and things. But I'm getting along OK."

The cab pulled away.

Somehow, I didn't have a thing to complain about.

Texas American Legion Convention Resolution on Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE R. POOL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1967

Mr. POOL. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call to the attention of my colleagues in the House of Representatives, a sensible resolution adopted by the Texas American Legion convention in Dallas on July 29, 1967.

I think we should all stop to ponder these opinions of men who have firsthand experience in the Armed Forces:

Resolution 19

Whereas, North Vietnam's leaders have made clear they do not intend to enter into negotiations for peace in Vietnam until and unless forced to do so; and

Whereas, North Vietnam is enabled to continue its aggression against South Vietnam because of massive assistance from the Soviet Union, its satellites in Eastern Europe, and from Red China; and

Whereas, North Vietnam also enjoys the advantages of restrictions placed on our military forces in the matter of target selection in the north and the matter of enemy sanctuary across South Vietnam's borders; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by The American Legion, Department of Texas, in regular annual convention assembled in Dallas, Texas, July 28–30, 1967, That The American Legion reiterates its strong support of U.S. assistance to South Vietnam but urges, in the interest of bringing the war to a successful conclusion in the shortest possible time, that the U.S. commander of our military forces in Vietnam be given full authority to—

(1) bomb and destroy such military targets in North Vietnam as he deems necessary to end that country's ability to resupply communist forces in the South, including all air fields and all unloading, storage, transportation, power and manufacturing facilities,

(2) eliminate all foreign aid to Soviet Russia and other communist nations, and any other nation that is helping to defeat our war effort in Vietnam,

(3) close off the Ho Chi Minh trail by positive means, including the stationing of U.S. combat forces in Laos if necessary, and

(4) bomb and shell enemy bases in Cambodia, and permit U.S. combat forces to pursue retreating enemy forces into Cambodia, Laos, or North Vietnam, as required.

Meat Industry Anxious To Cooperate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HANSEN

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1967

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, recent reconsideration of legislation to amend the Federal Meat Inspection Act has prompted a flurry of public comments. Some are welcome and constructive criticisms, while others are written in such a manner as to cast unjustified doubt on the practices of a reputable and vital industry.

I personally favor adequate inspection and control to insure that all meat reaching our dinner tables is safe, and I commend the industry for its efforts and continued concern in this vital matter. The following statement by Mr. L. Blaine Liljenquist, president and general manager of the Western States Meat Packers Association, Inc., comments on this situation and brings comforting assurance that the industry is anxious to cooperate in seeking improved methods of meat handling and that things are not as bad as some writers would have us believe.

The statement follows:

Consumers Buy and Eat Meat With Confidence

The United States is the largest producer and consumer of meat in the world. Our per capita consumption of red meats is 170.5 pounds per year. A further analysis reveals that Mr. or Mrs. Consumer eats 104 pounds of beef; 4.5 pounds of veal; 4.0 pounds of lamb and 58.0 pounds of pork during an average year. An important reason for this is the Federal, state, county and municipal meat inspection systems. These systems provide American consumers with the most wholesome and safest meat supply in existence.

This remarkably effective achievement in safeguarding and protecting the American meat supply did not happen by accident. It was achieved through the strong cooperation of the livestock and meat industries with state and federal officials—working in the interest of the consuming public.

The goal of the Western States Meat Packers Association for effective inspection was established in 1946, the same year that the Association was founded. WSMPA's policy is to constantly improve and refine federal and state meat inspection programs. This means that each animal that enters trade channels for human consumption must have antemortem and post-mortem examination by well-trained specialists. It also requires that all meat be handled in a sanitary manner at every stage of packing, processing and distribution.

Western States Meat Packers Association supports the Federal Meat Inspection program. We recognize the importance of sound state and municipal inspection. We realize that meaningful meat inspection programs at all levels are necessary for maintaining a continuous check on the 32 billion pounds of meat produced each year throughout the Nation.

Federal meat inspection covers more than 85 percent of the commercial slaughter. The vast majority of the remaining slaughter is covered by state and municipal inspection programs. Some of the remaining portion is farm slaughter.

It is very rare that anyone hears of contaminated meat. Rigid inspection standards and highly trained experts prohibit contaminated products. As a matter of fact, the meat industry is the most regulated of all food industries.

The Subcommittee on Livestock and Grains of the House Agriculture Committee has completed hearings on meat inspection. The Subcommittee will soon report a bill which will further assure that meat in every state is wholesome and dependable. The legislation is designed to offer encouragement to the few states where improvement is needed. It will insure that the states act as quickly as possible. Livestock producers, farm organizations, meat packers and consumer groups are actively at work in establishing state inspection programs in states where further attention is needed.

The meat industry appreciates the confidence that consumers have in meat. We who work in the industry are justifiably proud of the safety of our products. Research facilities for the pursuit of even safer processing, packing and handling of our meat supplies, are constantly in operation. Many of these are industry sponsored. The industry will continue these efforts to fully safeguard the consumer.

We do deplore however, the efforts of some writers who have sought recently to discredit the entire meat industry by casting doubt on the safety of our products.

In a capitalistic, competitive enterprise system, such as ours, the industry helps safeguard meat by actively policing itself. No one is more interested in gaining the consumer's confidence by producting clean products than the packers and processors. They too, are first and foremost, consumers, and they must have the support of repeated sales for their very existence.

Dissent and Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN O. MARSH, JR.
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 31, 1967

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, several days ago, under the title of "Dissent and Democracy," I took the liberty of commending to the attention of the House a portion of an address by the Honorable J. L. Robertson, Vice Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, during a George Norris Day observance at McCook, Nebr., on July 11, 1967.

The late Senator Norris was a man of strong convictions, and I believe it is useful, from time to time, to refer to the records and utterances of such individuals in public life, because they often include expressions which have continued validity in our own times.

Mr. Robertson, in his remarks, after paying tribute to the public record of Senator Norris, made some comments on a critical ideological contest in progress in the world today, and I believe these additional remarks are worthy of serious thought by all who value the system of representative government under law and recognize the methodical nature of the threat it faces today.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, Mr. Speaker, I include some further thoughts of Mr. Robertson:

We need not speculate about what George Norris would do or say if he were still among us. We know that he would be shocked by much of what is happening—the burning of the American flag and the flight of young men to Canada to escape military service. He would also be shocked at those dissenters who try to deny to others what they claim for themselves—the right to state a case or to submit a rebuttal. He would be shocked at the refusal to recognize that the die has been cast and that the war is now everyone's war, not just the Administration's.

There is no doubt that George Norris would stand firm today for the defense of the democratic system and the security of the United States. There are not many Americans, even today under the threat of nuclear war, who would cringe before a tyrant and purchase life at the cost of chains and slavery. We have never been a nation of cowards, and the love of liberty burns more fiercely here than in any nation on earth. This country was founded by free men. It is up to each generation to guard that precious heritage of freedom and pass it on to the next. Those who follow will honor us if we succeed, as we honor the Lincolns and the Norrises who have handed us the torch. They will curse us if through a misreading of the objective facts we err, and permit the flame of liberty to die.

What are the objective facts that we must examine with such care?

One fact is that in 1967, no less than in 1941, there are in the world, governments that believe they have the right to conquer any other government or any other people and subject them to their totalitarian system. There is no room to doubt or deny this. The totalitarians—for that is their proper name—have told us repeatedly in speeches, articles and books that they have this right and that they intend to exercise it. What is more, they have shown by their deeds that they mean business.

The second important fact is that the totalitarians today plan to extend their sway not by massive use of their own manpower and armament, as did Hitler, but by the far less costly device of internal subversion and local wars, fought with manpower supplied by their intended victims.

The third important fact is that their ultimate goal is the subjugation of Western Europe and the United States to their brand of inhuman totalitarianism, employing the softening tactics of confusing our vision and weakening our will to resist, while gradually chipping away to undermine our alliances and detach our supporters throughout the free world. They plan to exploit our weaknesses, sowing the seeds of dissension and demoralization within our ranks. At the same time, they would bleed us abroad, confronting us with the dilemma of either committing our own manpower to battle in inconvenient places—such as Vietnam—or seeing additional millions of people and thousands of square miles of territory fall under their dominion. Anyone who doubts that this is their intent should read the lengthy article published in Cuba last month, under the name of "Che" Guevara, which stated the goal with perfect clarity.

We cannot afford to close our eyes to these unpleasant facts.

Some 2500 years ago a Chinese strategist said, "If a man knows himself and knows not his opponent, for every victory he will suffer a defeat. If a man knows neither himself nor his opponent, he is a fool and will suffer defeat in every battle."

And the great authority on war, Clausewitz, said, "The conqueror is always a lover of peace; he would like to make his entry into our state unopposed."

The totalitarians are bending every effort to encourage the notion that they are lovers of peace, so that they might better defeat us in every battle and enter our state unopposed. They have virtually taken out a copyright on the word "peace" itself. But while they talk of peace, they plan new aggressive adventures. This we discovered again for the umpteenth time last month when all the progress toward detente was rudely shattered in the Middle East.

This should not have come as any surprise, for it is merely another example of the pattern of tenson, relaxation, tension, relaxation that we have seen in operation for the last half century.

Listen to this: "The Communist Party has always acted on the assumption that the peaceful co-existence of the two systems does not exclude but, on the contrary, implies a further development of the working people's class struggle. The contemporary general line of the international Communist movement does not freeze the initiative of the people, but, on the contrary, mobilizes them to a greater extent. It opens up before all revolutionary forces of our day new prospects for successful advance."[1]

Those are not the words of any dyed-in-the-wool opponent of the totalitarians, bent upon slandering them. They are the words of the totalitarians themselves, published in one of their official organs in 1963, when relaxation was again being promoted after the awful tension of the Cuban missile crisis. But note: the relaxation was for us, not them. Those new prospects for successful advance were developed to the hilt in Vietnam.

Just last month, a special statement setting the theme for the fiftieth anniversary celebration of the Bolshevik Revolution was published in Moscow. While it spoke of peaceful co-existence, it made it clear that the relentless effort of totalitarianism to obliterate liberal systems of government throughout the world would go on. This struggle, it stated, "has become the pivot of world politics".

There are, perhaps, some people who might sincerely disagree with my insistence on calling a spade a spade and a totalitarian a totaliarian. They will insist that this is out of date, that things are changing. Perhaps they are. But we do not call a day-old baby a man merely because we hope that everything will go well and he will some day become a man. We have to deal with things as they are. Confucius once said that the first thing he would do if he were a ruler would be to call things by their right names, for, he said, if things were not called by their right names then statements would be misleading, and when statements are misleading, nothing can be accomplished.

How true! A young Harvard philosophy student was recently quoted in a Washington paper as saying that he found nothing "morally objectionable in communism". Now, any young man smart enough to gain admittance to Harvard is smart enough to know that "communism", as we know it in the twentieth century, is not simply an economic pattern; it has nothing in common with the old Utopian doctrine of "from each according to his ability, to each according to his needs". The countries that call themselves communist have the most totalitarian regimes history has ever known. Consequently, if we follow the advice of Confucius and apply the right name, it would appear that the Harvard student finds nothing morally objectionable in totalitarianism, and a particularly inhuman totalitarianism, at that!

---

[1] T. T. Timofeyev, "International Affairs", 1963, No. 9, pp. 18, 19, quoted in D. G. S. Stewart-Smith, "No Vision Here", p. 3.

By the way, Confucius erred on one point. We know today, as a result of experience during the intervening years, that when statements are misleading a great deal can be accomplished—by those who know how to use misleading statements to blind their innocent victims to the truth.

On the eve of World War II, George Norris was worried about the growing acceptance of the theories of those men who believed in using any means to achieve total concentration of power in their immoral hands.

Today, the men are different, but the passion to overthrow and destroy the liberal system of government is as strong as it was a quarter of a century ago. Why? Because the mere existence of a free country is a threat to the totalitarian rules, as the ugly wall that divides Berlin so graphically demonstrates. We may think the world can peacefully exist half slave and half free, but they know it cannot. They know that the free countries stand as proof, convincing to all who have access to the truth, that the totalitarians lie when they say their system is superior. That alone is enough to make the free countries targets for destruction.

This explains why that faithful servant of the totalitarians, Ho Chi Minh, presses relentlessly his effort to seize control of all Vietnam. This is why trouble is stirred up in Thailand and why the tools of the totalitarians are being prodded into renewed activity in the Philippines. This is why Cuba—using the name of "Che" Guevara—calls for Vietnams throughout Latin America and Africa, with the objective of weakening and eventually bringing down the United States itself.

This is why I feel obliged to do what George W. Norris did in 1917. I must exercise that precious right of dissent—in this instance, dissent against the dissenters—and tell the truth as I see it. The totalitarians have sighted in on us. We are the one country in the world that has both the material and moral strength to frustrate their plans. They seek to sap our material strength by drawing us into endless wars of attrition. They seek to sap our moral strength by a variety of means—playing on popular dislike of the costly wars they provoke, creating racial tensions, encouraging the spirit of alienation and purposelessness among our young people.

It is important to remember that the totalitarians derive their peculiar concept of morality from Lenin, who taught that morality was whatever contributed to the achievement of his objectives. It was proper, in those circumstances, he said, to resort to every kind of trick, cunning, illegal expedient, concealment, or suppression of truth.[2] And, of course, one of the most cunning and effective of their tricks is the concealment and suppression of the truth about their own tactics and goals, even though they must necessarily publish this information for the enlightenment of their own followers. The trick is to denounce and try to destroy the credibility of anyone who dares to make known to a wider circle what they, the totalitarians, say about themselves, but prefer to keep within the family. They have succeeded in developing an almost Pavlovian reaction, where exposure of their machinations is almost certain to evoke denunciation and ridicule of the exposer.

This is why it takes almost as much courage today to speak out against the totalitarian threat which confronts the free world as it did to speak out against the rush to war fifty years ago. But speak we must! As Milovan Djilas, the former Vice President of Yugoslavia, said, in one of the books that Tito had him jailed for writing:

> "Those who wish to live and to survive in a world different from the one Stalin created and which in essence and in full force still exists, must fight."[3]

We must fight, not, we hope, with guns (although in Vietnam guns seems to be necessary), but we must fight with the weapons of idealism, humanitarianism, freedom and devotion to truth. These are powerful weapons, if we can only marshal them and direct them at the proper targets. It is one of the bitter ironies of our age that the totalitarians who crush freedom and suppress the truth whenever they seize power, play on man's idealism and love of freedom and truth to undermine and destroy the societies that are free, humanitarian and respecters of truth. Many of those who helped build the tyrannical regimes that now crush idealism in Eastern Europe, Cuba, and China started out as idealists in search of greater freedom. But, by subordinating truth to goals that they thought were more important, they missed the idealistic and noble ends they sought, which got lost in the muck of absolute despotism.

And so while we uphold the right of each man to defend the truth as he sees it, let us also teach our young people that they must not tear the needle of truth from their compass just because they do not like the direction in which it points. If we can do this, we may be able to safeguard that most essential of all freedoms—the freedom of each of us to be, as was George W. Norris, a man of integrity and honor.

---

[2] W. W. Kulski, "Peaceful Co-existence", Regnery 1959, p. 80.

[3] Milovan Djilas, "Conversations with Stalin", 1962, p. 191.

UAW and Industrial Union Department of AFL-CIO Endorse Consumer Credit Protection Bill, H.R. 11601, Including Ban on Garnishment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1967

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, one of the best statements—one of the most forthright—presented to the Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs of the House Committee on Banking and Currency during our 2 weeks of hearings this month on consumer credit legislation was made by Mr. Pat Greathouse, vice president of the United Automobile Workers of America, who appeared also in behalf of the Industrial Union Department of the AFL-CIO. He endorsed most of the provisions of H.R. 11601, the Consumer Credit Protection Act, but opposed emergency credit controls, suggested a modification of the proposed 18-percent ceiling on credit charges, called for some additional consumer protections we did not include in the bill as introduced, and came out strongly for the bill's ban on garnishment.

The statement speaks for itself, and speaks very well of the need for the major provisions of the bill. I urge the Members to read this statement for the excellent arguments it makes in behalf of one of the largest unions in the United States and also in behalf of the Industrial Union Department of the AFL-CIO, which represents millions of American workers. The statement is as follows:

STATEMENT OF PAT GREATHOUSE, VICE PRESIDENT, UNITED AUTOMOBILE, AEROSPACE, AND AGRICULTRAL IMPLEMENT WORKERS OF AMERICA, AFL-CIO, ON THE CONSUMER CREDIT PROTECTION ACT (H.R. 11601), SUBCOMMITTEE ON CONSUMER AFFAIRS, HOUSE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY, AUGUST 18, 1967

Madame Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee:

I am grateful for the opportunity to appear here today to express the strong support of the 1,500,000 members of the UAW, and also of the Industrial Union Department of the AFL-CIO for the measures that you are considering to provide long overdue protection for the American public in the field of consumer credit. The bill that you are considering, H.R. 11601, is a piece of pioneering legislation of substantial significance that can be of great benefit to the average American family. This bill not only incorporates strong truth-in-lending provisions that should have been enacted at least five years ago, but also contains additional provisions that can begin to reform other predatory practices in the consumer credit field that have worked untold hardships on millions of American families.

THE NEED FOR TRUTH-IN-LENDING

Truth-in-lending legislation is sorely needed to protect the consumer's right to know the full facts about credit rates and interest charges so that he can compare all alternatives and make an intelligent choice among the various credit plans that may be available to him at any given time.

President Johnson stated this very simply in his 1967 Message to the Congress on Consumer Protection:

> "The consumer has the right to know the cost of this key item [credit] in his budget just as much as the price of any other commodity he buys . . . The consumer should not have to be an actuary or mathematician to understand the rate of interest that is being charged."

While the poor and the average factory worker are misled by current credit practices, middle-class and well-educated Americans also need the benefit of truth-in-lending legislation. A recent study revealed that 4 out of every 10 persons with a college education do not know how much they are paying in credit charges.

Truth-in-lending legislation can also make a definite contribution to lowering the cost of living for millions of American families. Interest on consumer credit amounted to some $13 billion in 1966. This legislation should results in cheaper credit for the American public. It will have an impact on the pockets and pocketbooks of men and women in all walks of life in all parts of the country. Furthermore, it will especially help those who are most deceived by present credit practices, the poor and the disadvantaged in the inner city ghettos and in the isolated rural slum areas.

Until now, the lack of effective price competition based upon accurate information has allowed high prices, excessive profits, and encouraged inefficient operations in the consumer credit field. Truth-in-lending will produce invigorated competition in the credit industry. Lenders offering low interest rates should see an increase in their business, as is rightfully due to those who offer the lowest prices in our free economic system. Businessmen extending credit at higher interest rates will be under pressure to economize and increase the efficiency of their operations, or to work under lower profit margins than they have been accustomed to in the past.

THE POOR ARE VICTIMIZED

Congress can contribute significantly to the war to eliminate poverty by enacting legislation to protect the consumer from the malpractices and misinformation that are all too common in the field of consumer credit. The poor have not escaped the mass media's bombardment of messages to buy now and pay later. Slogans such as "easy payments" and "no money down" have been very effective in luring even those on extremely limited incomes. The result is that substantial numbers of today's poor have been exploited in the marketplace. Many have become hopelessly entangled in problems of installment debt. Too often the consequences have been threats, legal penalties, and even loss of their jobs as a result of missed payments.

Because major department stores and other sources of reasonably priced credit are often unreachable and are not usually willing to extend credit to them, the poor usually fall prey to less scrupulous merchants.

Numerous studies have revealed how the poor pay higher prices and receive shoddy merchandise at the same time. On top of this, they pay usurious interest rates so that they wind up paying in total several times the usual retail price. Then, they are faced with the threat of repossession and losing their merchandise entirely if they are not able to keep up with the excessive payments they are required to make.

Is it then no wonder that we discover that in the recent catastrophic rioting in Detroit, the victims of burning and arson included 32 furniture, appliance and hardware stores, and 23 clothing and jewelry stores. These types of outlets in ghetto areas are very often known for their excessive credit practices. Numerous stories on the riots appeared in the Detroit press alluding to the systematic burning of stores which were believed to engage in excessive credit practices. One columnist writing for the *Detroit News* claimed that:

"A Negro woman on relief set fire to a furniture store because she felt she would never be able to pay the bill she owed there. Due to the interest rate she was being forced to pay $910.12 to satisfy an original debt of $285."

While our society can never tolerate looting and burning no matter how deep the social injustices that breed these irrational and lawless acts, it seems to me that we can take some elemental steps *right now* to begin to eliminate the conditions that lead men to become looters and burners. The passage of the strong truth-in-lending provisions and other sections of H.R. 11601 which help to stamp out shady and immoral practices in the consumer credit field can do more to help maintain law and order in our cities than a dozen repressive anti-riot bills.

ETHICAL MERCHANTS PROTECTED

The consumer is not the only one who will benefit from truth-in-lending legislation. Truth-in-lending will protect the ethical lenders and business merchants from losing business to unscrupulous competitors. An otherwise honest businessman is subject to tremendous pressure to adopt unethical credit practices by his unethical competitor in order to stay in business and earn a decent living. By requiring every lender to be truthful and to state the true interest rate in a uniform manner, we can break the endless chain of misleading claims and shabby deceptions which now characterize too large a segment of the credit industry. Businessmen would be secure in the knowledge that higher cost competitors cannot lure away their customers with deceptive credit information.

SENATE VERSION MUST BE STRENGTHENED

While the modified truth-in-lending bill passed by the Senate represents progress in the long efforts to enact meaningful legislation in this area, a number of glaring weaknesses and loopholes are contained in that version which can seriously weaken the effectiveness of truth-in-lending protection. I am most happy to see that H.R. 11601, which your committee is considering, closes most of these loopholes.

The basic premise behind truth-in-lending legislation is that the true facts as to interest and financing charges and annual interest rates should be disclosed on all types of credit so that the public can compare and make a sound choice in obtaining credit. The omission from coverage in the Senate version of revolving credit accounts, and purchases where the finance charge is $10 or less, opens up glaring loopholes that could possibly nullify most of the protection provided by this legislation.

COVER REVOLVING CREDIT

Revolving credit accounts is the fastest growing form of credit in the country today. In addition, the interest rate charged on these accounts is typically 18 percent a year, a most excessive rate of interest equal to the national interest rate ceiling recommended elsewhere in H.R. 11601. There is no reason why departments stores, credit card plans, and others who offer revolving credit accounts cannot state their interest rate charge on an annual basis. If they are required to state only the monthly rate of interest, millions of consumers could be led to believe that the interest rates on these accounts are among the lowest available to them, where in actual fact, revolving credit accounts are one of the most costly forms of credit available. The existence of such a glaring loophole as this can only encourage installment sellers and lenders to abandon other forms of credit that they now offer and operate on a revolving credit basis. The effect would be to water down considerably the protection that the consumer direly needs. Furthermore, it would place in an unfair competitive position those businessmen who would be required to state interest rates on an annual basis.

NO EXCLUSION FOR SMALL PURCHASES

The exclusion from coverage under the Senate bill of debts of small amounts where finance charges are less than $10 is completely unjustified. Interest rates are often the highest on these smaller loans, where the cost of the item is $100 or less. Moreover, these smaller sized purchases make up the bulk of the credit buying for the average worker and for those living in poverty. The argument that the true interest charges are hard to compute in these cases, or that this would constitute a costly inconvenience to merchants does not hold up when elaborate tables have been prepared which avoid the need for the seller to do any computations. The only difference in computing interest charges and interest rates on a $100 loan as compared to a $1,000 loan or a $10,000 loan is one or two decimal points. I am most happy to see that the bill your committee is considering does not allow such flimsy reasoning to stand in the way of providing needed protection for the low income family making small purchases.

CRITICAL NEED TO COVER ADVERTISING

One of the greatest sources of credit problems for the working man and the poverty stricken is the oversimplified, confusing, misleading, or blatantly deceptive advertising of credit and the sale of goods on credit. If truth-in-lending legislation is to be truly effective, the true facts of the interest charge and the interest rate should be available to the prospective customer before he has decided where he is to make a purchase or a loan. With the high pressure salesmanship that exists in many retail establishments, the average worker does not have a truly free choice to determine where he can make his purchases on the most economical basis if he is initially misled by advertising of the cost of credit.

While we cannot mandate that the true cost of credit be inserted in all advertising of consumer goods, we should require that any advertising of credit costs state the truth about interest charges. The omission of advertising from the coverage in the Senate-passed bill is a grave weakness. The UAW strongly supports the provisions of the bill before your committee which bring advertising under truth-in-lending protection.

Other improvements in H.R. 11601 as compared to the Senate passed version of truth-in-lending which we strongly support is the provision for full disclosure on charges on first mortgages, where discounts and the point system are most confusing to the average home buyer, and the inclusion of insurance charges levied against consumer credit as part of total finance charges in computing the true cost of credit.

FTC SHOULD ENFORCE LAW

I would like to point out one area regarding the truth-in-lending provisions of the excellent bill before your committee that we would like to see changed. This is the choice of the Federal Reserve Board as the agency charged with enforcing the truth-in-lending legislation. The Federal Reserve Board is an agency that is basically oriented towards the banking business. Furthermore, it has little or no experience in the consumer protection field, and has no staff ready to carry out the enforcement provisions in the bill.

In its place, we would recommend that enforcement of consumer credit legislation be placed in the hands of the Federal Trade Commission. The FTC is already in the field of advising and protecting the consumer. It has far more expertise in the fields of retail selling and advertising, has a history of dedicated efforts to protect the consumer from unjust, illegal and fraudulent practices, and has an efficient system for monitoring advertising for investigating complaints and for instituting the type of proceedings called for to bring about compliance with this legislation.

I am sure that the members of this committee are aware that placing a law on the statute books does not in itself accomplish the end objective of providing adequate protection for the American people. I urge that you make every effort to provide the best mechanism for vigorous, efficient, and fair enforcement in the consumer credit field.

WE SHOULD ABOLISH WAGE GARNISHMENTS

The UAW and the Industrial Union Department of the AFL–CIO would like to go on record in strong support of the provisions of this bill that would outlaw wage garnishments. The device of garnishing wages is used with abandon by numerous unethical merchants who prey upon unsuspecting workers with their easy payment schemes. The tragic results are pay envelopes reduced to the point where workers can hardly support their families, inconvenience and extra costs for employers, substantial court costs imposed on taxpayers, disciplinary suspensions which make it even harder for workers to repay their debts, and outright dismissal and loss of employment. Unscrupulous merchants often use the courts as a collection device without even attempting to use other legitimate means of collection. They often sell goods on credit when they know a worker is already over-extended in debt, with the knowledge that they have a sure-fire method of collecting the payment.

Legitimate businesses with substantial reputations are able to collect on bad debts without resorting to garnishments. Merchants and creditors in Texas, Pennsylvania, and Florida, where garnishments are outlawed, have learned to adjust their collection practices without ill effects or any noticeable reduction in the volume of retail sales.

The statistics on the extent of garnishments are staggering. In just one court alone in the City of Detroit, the Common Pleas Court, 55,000 garnishments were issued in 1966. It is estimated that 95 percent of these garnishments were issued by default where the defendant never defended himself from becoming garnisheed. This took place in spite of the fact that this court is a liberal court in dealing with this issue, and has established a conciliation system to attempt to settle debts without having to attach wages.

A most unfortunate side effect of the garnishment system is that the courts often become the "enemy" in the eyes of the poor. They become further convinced that the society which they come to know as the "system" only works against them and grinds them down.

A revealing study conducted among low income families in New York City uncovered the fact that one out of every five of the families interviewed had been threatened with garnishments, had their wages garnisheed, or had goods repossessed. Typically, low income families faced a major crisis of this type whenever the chief breadwinner became ill or unemployed.

The problems the poor face arising out of garnishments often go hand in hand with direct exploitation by merchants. In the same study in New York City mentioned above, David Caplovitz cited as typical this experience of a 28 year old Puerto Rican man:

"I bought a set of pots and pans from a door-to-door salesman. They were of very poor quality and I wanted to give them back but they wouldn't take them. I stopped paying and told them to change them or take them back. I refused to pay. . . . They started bothering me at every job I had. Then they wrote to my current job and my boss is taking $6 weekly from my pay and sending it to pay this."

An additional problem which compounds the consumer problems of low income families is the fact that these families often do not know where to turn to for help if they are cheated by merchants. Even if they do know where to go for help, they are usually unable to obtain it. The New York City study pointed out that 64 percent of the families interviewed did not have any idea of where to obtain help against unscrupulous merchants. Furthermore, only nine percent of the families who encountered these problems actually sought professional help, although more than one-third cited a source of help that they knew about.

It is apparent to the UAW and to the Industrial Union Department of the AFL–CIO that Congress must take additional steps to protect the consumer and to eliminate unethical practices in the merchandising and credit fields. The Commission on Consumer Finance provided under Title III of this bill appears to provide an excellent vehicle to determine further steps of a regulatory or legislative nature needed to provide the long overdue protection that the consuming public deserves.

NATIONAL INTEREST RATE CEILING

The provision of H.R. 11601 calling for a national ceiling on interest rates makes extremely good sense to us. Excessive profits from interest charges for fast buck merchants and small loan companies who prey primarily on the poor should rapidly become a thing of the past. However, the ceiling of 18 percent established in this bill is too high. The 18 percent rate charged by many department stores on revolving credit is so excessive that it can actually result in a greater profit on the credit transaction than on the original sale of the item itself. Conventional bank rates and interest rates on commercial credit are very substantially lower than 18 percent. Credit unions are able to extend loans to working people and to the poor at about half that rate.

In its place, we would suggest a flexible ceiling that would be related to going interest rates such as the Federal Reserve Board's discount rate. Your committee might investigate what multiple of the discount rate would be most appropriate to provide a flexible and workable ceiling that would relate to changing conditions in the national economy. The difficulty with any flat rate is that it would have to be high enough to provide adequate leeway in a tight money market when interest rates are extremely high generally. When you do this, however, the ceiling does not provide any significant protection against usurious interest rates in normal times when interest rates are low.

UAW OPPOSES EMERGENCY CREDIT CONTROLS

Madame Chairman and members of the subcommittee, we would like to go on record in opposition to that portion of H.R. 11601 which would provide for emergency control of consumer credit by the President of the United States. This provision does not come under the scope of consumer credit protection. Rather, it deals with overall economic policy. It is a form of economic control to which we are opposed. It could only lead to hardships for the individual consumer in need of credit, while the major borrowers in this country, business and industry, would not be subject to such controls. It would constitute discriminatory legislation, applying only to those with the least ability to overcome the consequences of such legislation. There appears to be no need to enact any economic controls over credit in the present state of the economy, nor does it appear likely that emergency credit controls will be needed in the foreseeable future.

BAN CONFESSIONS OF JUDGMENT

The provision in H.R. 11601 which prohibits the use of confessions of judgements in consumer credit transactions is highly deserving of legislative enactment. This device, used by predatory merchants to induce debtors to waive their legal rights to contest any judgements that may be entered against them, is an excellent example of how our legal system is perverted to exploit the poor. Typically, such a clause is inserted in the fine print of the contract which the borrower is required to sign. There is no justification for allowing this practice where the typical individual has no knowledge and no bargaining power to enable him to avoid surrendering valuable legal rights, and thus become subject to severe financial hardship at a later date.

PROHIBIT WAGE ASSIGNMENTS

In a similar fashion, the UAW and the IUD feel additional protection is needed to prohibit entirely the use of wage assignments in the consumer credit field. Here is another example where a borrower is placed under extreme pressure, often without any knowledge or full understanding of the consequence, to sign away his rights and allow a creditor to attach his wages at any time in the future that he sees fit. These so-called "voluntary" agreements to attach wages are coercive rather than voluntary in the typical seller-purchaser relationship. Since wage assignments have many of the pernicious effects of wage garnishments, both should be treated the same and abolished in the same legislation.

REGULATE REPOSSESSION PRACTICES

Another area where your committee should act to protect the consumer is to regulate the pernicious practices of many merchants in repossessing goods purchased on credit. This is particularly a problem in "add-on" purchases, where a merchant sells another item on credit before a purchaser completes payments on the original item that he bought. If the customer misses one payment, merchants have often repossessed both items, even though the amount already paid has been more than enough to completely repay the outstanding debt on the original item. Actual situations have been reported in the press where four or more items purchased on an add-on installment basis have been repossessed, even though the value of one item alone was sufficient to satisfy the outstanding debt.

Legislation should prohibit the repossession of any item whenever full payment has already been made. The language of the legislation could provide that when debt is outstanding on two or more items, payments be allocated to each of the items, based on the ratio of the original purchase price of each of the items to the other items. Further, repossessions should be limited by statute to the extent necessary to satisfy any outstanding debt. Merchants should also be required to return to the purchaser any proceeds gained from the sale of the repossessed items that is over and above the amount of debt still owing.

OTHER AREAS FOR FUTURE ACTION

There are a number of additional areas requiring legislative protection whch this committee should seriously consider. Many of the abuses and shady practices could be eliminated from the credit field if lenders and merchants offering goods on credit were licensed and had to meet adequate standards covering the entire scope of their lending practices. The lack of adequate legal recourse for consumers who have outstanding debt on shoddy and defective merchandise needs to be remedied. The common abuse of using fine print to prevent customers from knowing what they are signing could be abolished by requiring print to be a certain minimum size on credit contracts. Steps might also be taken to simply the obscure legal language on credit contracts so that customers would know exactly what they were agreeing to.

Madame Chairman, I want to thank you for the opportunity of appearing here today to express the views of the UAW, and of the Industrial Urban Development of the AFL–CIO which concurs in this statement. I hope I have spelled out for you very frankly the areas where our union would like to see positive Congressional action. We are aware of political realities, and do not take the position that this bill that comes out of your committee this year need contain all of our recommendations. We would leave it up to you and your committee to determine how much can be passed through the Congress this year and how much might be enacted next year and in subsequent years.

The members of our unions are extremely gratified with the efforts of you and your committee to enact long ovredue reforms in the field of consumer credit. You may be assured that the UAW and IUD will stand strongly behind your efforts to adequately prootect the American consumer. We hereby enlist in your crusade for the duration.

Headlines Tell the Story of Western Democratic Unity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LIONEL VAN DEERLIN

OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 31, 1967

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, Democratic Party leaders from the 13 Western States met in California last weekend and emerged with a ringing and united endorsement of President Johnson and his domestic and foreign policies.

It was a rare show of political unity—either for Republicans or for Democrats—and I am glad to see my State and my party leading the way.

The good feeling that pervaded the conference was reflected in the headlines of major newspapers covering the Los Angeles event.

The Los Angeles Times headlined: "Democratic Parley Back Viet Policy—Western Leaders Urge National Support of Johnson's Efforts."

The headline in the Herald-Examiner read: "West Demo Chiefs Unite Behind L. B. J."

Excerpts from the two articles follow:

[From the Los Angeles Times, Aug. 28, 1967]

DEMOCRAT PARLEY BACKS VIET POLICY—WESTERN LEADERS URGE NATIONAL SUPPORT OF JOHNSON'S EFFORTS

(By Carl Greenberg)

Delegates to the Western States Democratic Conference Sunday unanimously voted their support of President Johnson's Vietnam policies and urged the Administration's continued "all-out efforts to bring about an honorable solution."

Concluding four days of sessions at the Ambassador, the party leaders from 13 Western states adopted a resolution expressing their deep concern over the war and declaring:

"We call on all Americans to recognize and support, as we do, the efforts of the President to bring peace to Vietnam . . .

"We commend the President for his appointment of a commission of distinguished Americans to travel to the Republic of South Vietnam in order to observe and encourage free, fair and unfettered elections in South Vietnam."

NAME OF COMMITTEE CHANGED

The conference changed the name of its civil liberties committee to the Committee on Political Extremism and adopted its report that:

"Far right groups seem to be increasingly active and open in almost all of our states, and especially in Utah and Idaho.

"One of the areas in which they have moved is that of radio discussion programs.

"Preliminary evidence appears to show that there may well be a deliberate and planned effort to use this medium as a major propaganda conduit."

In other resolutions, the conference:

1. Viewed with "deepest concern" riots in American cities and "the refusal of the Republican Party to support programs designed to alleviate the causes of civil violence and poverty."

2. "Wholeheartedly" supported freedom of assembly and expression, but also backed the Administration's determination to prevent violence.

3. Urged expansion and orderly development of the oil shale reserves of the intermountain West to bring these resources into productive use, but "protecting the public interest of present and future generations."

4. Supported Administration legislation for "truth in packaging" and "truth in lending."

5. Asked the President and Congress to enact legislation giving the territory of Guam greater self-government, including the right to elect its own governor.

FARM, FISHING AID URGED

6. Called on Mr. Johnson to submit to Congress as soon as possible his proposals to improve the farm economy, and urged that commercial fishermen of the Pacific states and Guam also be aided. The conference said that both groups are not getting their fair share of the nation's income.

7. Asked Congress to pass more stringent antitrust laws "with an eye to limiting large concerns from merging in purchasing diversified businesses" on the grounds that this hurts the small independent businessman.

[From the Los Angeles Herald-Examiner, Aug. 28, 1967]

CONFERENCE ACTS: WEST DEMO CHIEFS UNITE BEHIND L. B. J.

(By Jud Baker)

President Johnson's policy in Vietnam had the complete support today of Democratic leaders in the thirteen western states.

Delegates to the Western States Democratic Conference wound up four days of discussions yesterday by unanimously adopting a resolution calling on all Americans, "to reconsider and support, as we do, efforts by the President to bring peace to Vietnam."

The resolution also commended the President for appointment of a commission to observe, "free, fair and unfettered elections in South Vietnam."

Eugene L. Wyman, California's Democratic National Committeeman, chairman for the conference, lauded the delegates for their support of the President's domestic and foreign policy.

President Johnson surprised the conference in a telegram received yesterday even as the Democratic leaders were adopting a resolution to congratulate him on his 59th birthday.

JOHNSON MESSAGE

The President told the delegates that, "there are no obstacles a renewed surge of enthusiasm and dedication cannot overcome," adding:

"As I commend you on your conference, I remind you anew that what is at stake is even more than partisan achievements . . . the programs we seek to carry forward transcend all party lines."

Boy Scouts From 74 Countries in 12th World Jamboree

SPEECH

OF

HON. JAMES A. McCLURE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 30, 1967

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. Speaker, during the first week of this month, 12,000 Boy Scouts from 74 countries gathered at Farragut State Park in my district in Idaho for the 12th World Jamboree, the first ever to be held in this country.

The theme of the jamboree was "friendship," and it was only natural that the Boy Scouts should choose Idaho as the site for the meeting. If there is one thing Idaho has an abundance of—in addition to mountains for hiking, game for hunting, streams for fishing and the most breathtaking outdoor scenery in the country—it is friendship.

Playing hosts to so many young men from so many countrys, with its implications for world peace and international understanding, placed a considerable burden on the shoulders of the citizens of Idaho. And they came through admirably.

If, as the saying goes, "today's Scouts are tomorrow's leaders," then the people of my State have enabled these young boys to return to their native lands with a view of the United States not seen in their countries' newspapers which talk mainly of race riots and other such American scandals. The Scouts surely take back with them some of the kindness, some of the generosity that is the true picture of America.

The preparation that paved the way for the conclave was enormous, and I wish to pay tribute to former Gov. Robert E. Smylie; Gov. Don Samuelson; Miss Louise Shadduck, executive secretary of the Idaho Department of Commerce and Development; and all of the others who worked so tirelessly to make the jamboree the success that it was. I would also like to thank the Post Office Department for their cooperation in issuing a special airmail postal card commemorating the event.

A number of newspaper articles have been printed concerning the jamboree, and I would like to include a few in the RECORD at this point. I call particular attention to the article by Dorothy R. Powers in the Spokane, Wash., Spokesman-Review. Mrs. Powers tells a warmly human story which probably captures the spirit of the jamboree more than any words that I could say.

The articles follow:

[From the Spokane (Wash.) Spokesman-Review, Aug. 8, 1967]

SCOUTS FROM MANY NATIONS HONOR PIONEER OF RATHDRUM

(By Dorothy R. Powers)

RATHDRUM, IDAHO.—Effie is just sitting there inside her small house in this small town when the world walks up on the porch.

What's more, it knocks—and asks that she come out to meet it.

Effie, does, too.

Because the world has never come to Rathdrum (population 710) before, much less to Effie's tiny house.

So Effie—who will be 90 in February—picks up her short, stubby crutch.

She hobbles painfully to her door, opens it—and gasps!

There stands the world—in 30 pieces with two arms and two legs each.

In other words, there stand 26 Boy Scouts and four adult leaders from all over the world, even from parts of it that hadn't even heard of back when Effie was town librarian.

It began with a newspaper story.

Brief days before the start of the World Boy Scout Jamboree at Farragut State Park, this writer visited several small towns to discover the impact of the forthcoming gathering of thousands of Scouts.

Among the towns visited was Rathdrum.

And in Rathdrum, the person who knows more about the town than anybody else—now, "back then," or ever—is Mrs. Effie A. Fields.

She should. Thirty and one-half years as town librarian and another stint of almost equal length as town treasurer taught her.

SHE TELLS ABOUT IT

Sure, say Mr. and Mrs. L. F. Dixon, Effie would talk to a reporter. They own the town's only drug store soda fountain, and what Effie doesn't know, they do. They point the way up the hill to Effie's.

It's a blisteringly hot day, but because she feels chilly, Effie has an electric heater going in her little sitting room.

Yes, she nods her head pertly, you bet she knows the Boy Scouts are having a World Jamboree right close by! Boys from all over the world, right here in North Idaho!

And, oh, she says wistfully, she wishes she could get a glimpse of just one of them.

She can't possibly, though.

Effie doesn't even go the few blocks to Rathdrum's main street unless somebody fetches her in a car. Her hubsand's death several years ago left her all alone. The years have left her the universal legacy of age—aching legs and a difficulty in getting about.

But she still wishes the world's boys all the best.

The whole town feels the way Effie does.

Behind the drug store fountain, Mrs. Dixon recalls ruefully that although Rathdrum's only a few miles from Farragut State Park, they didn't see "even one Girl Scout when they were at Farragut" (for the Girl Scout Round-Up, 1965).

BUS BRINGS SCOUTS

The story of Effie's wistful wish was published Sunday, July 30.

Six days later, a big bus pulled up across the street from the Dixon's drug store.

Out of it tumbled Boy Scouts from countries all over the globe.

And everybody aboard had begged to get to come to Rathdrum—and Effie!

Leading the contingent was C. Walter Hooper of New Bunswich, N.H., World Jamboree transportation director.

Even with that title, the doing wasn't easy.

It's hard to get a Scout off the Jamboree site.

Adult Scout Hooper had read The Spokesman-Review story of Effie's wish.

There had to be a way to grant it.

First, he got in touch with a sub-camp at the Jamboree that "had the most nations represented." It was Ermelunden, so named for the site in Denmark where the Jamboree took place in 1924.

He got the Scout leaders together first and explained Effie's wish.

"When the boys themselves heard of it," laughs Hooper, "they all wanted to go. We could take only one bus load."

"Going to see Effie" became such a project that the adult leaders had to select the boys by Scout rank and age and outstanding achievement. They also chose boys who could speak English, so they could talk to Effie.

But adult Scouts wanted to go on the mission to Effie as much as the kids. When Hooper asked for a physician aboard the bus for safety's sake, doctors in the sub-camp drew straws for the privilege, so eager were they. Dr. Wilson Foust of New Holland, Pa., won. There was "rank" aboard, without question! Only the best for Effie. Lee Shalhope, in private life the chairman of the board of Mid-American Trucking Company of Chicago but a volunteer baggage director for the Jamboree, asked to come. And Neils Engberg, Boy Scout commissioner from Denmark, wanted to be in on the fun, and was.

BIG WELCOME

"I think everybody in town was there to meet us," Hooper told a friend later.

Except for Effie, who still sat in her small house, unaware of the Scouts' arrival.

The Dixons ran out to meet the bus.

Would the Scouts walk across the street very slowly, so townspeople could get pictures as they did so? They would—and 20 minutes flew by as everybody in Rathdrum got their pictures of kids from everywhere.

"Miss Rathdrum," pretty Lynda Goodman, in a bright pink dress, was there to lead the Scouts to Effie's house.

Up over the dusty little hill to Effie's house they marched.

There were Scouts from Germany, England, France and Scotland. A kilt brought a sparkle to Effie's eyes. Cessell Pilgram was there from Guyana, South America, which in Effie's librarian days had been British Guiana. And Biarki Mortensen told her he came from the Faeroes Islands. In all this Danish group of isles, located in the Atlantic Ocean between the Shetland Islands and Iceland, there are only 31,664 people. Yet one of them stood right here, in Effie's yard!

There were Canadians and Danes and Swiss. Rock Marc represented tiny Luxembourg. Khedar Lutchman spoke in the soft tones of Trinidad. Terry Sousa brought a "hello" from Bermuda. Far-off Ceylon was "there," in the person of T. Rajeswaran. Victor Lee spoke of Honk Kong. And there were American Scouts, too.

SEATED IN GARDEN

They brought one of Effie's chairs out into her yard and seated her. Each Scout filed past, shook her hand and introduced himself. Effie repeated every boy's name out loud, and his country.

And then they told Effie their surprise.

They named her honorary "Mother" of the World Boy Scout Jamboree.

To make it official, Transportation Director Hooper bent over and placed a Boy Scout neckerchief around her throat.

She sat straight in her chair.

She fingered her cane.

"Oh, that's nice! That's so nice!"

Effie couldn't say any more.

Everybody cheered.

The crowd which had followed the Scouts to Effie's followed them back uptown.

A man walked up to Hooper to thank him, on behalf of all Rathdrum.

"Young man," he began, "what you did here today . . ." He couldn't finish. His eyes were full of tears.

TREAT FOR SCOUTS

At the drug store, Owner Dixon had his own treat for the Scouts. He took them to the far end of First Street, to show them the remains of the Pony Express station, where riders had changed horses. Overseas Scouts stared.

By now, the whole town was "walking with" the Scouts.

They opened the fire station door next, and showed the Scouts the town fire engine.

Back in the drug store, Dixon—somehow and somewhere—had managed to get a Kennedy half-dollar piece to give every Scout.

And then he treated everybody to American-type milk shakes.

Running into the drug store came a town resident.

"I need some film!" he cried urgently.

"You'll have to wait till the Boy Scouts leave," Mrs. Dixon, busily mixing milk shakes, told him. "They're our Rathdrum guests!"

"But they're why I need the film!"

"Oh," she smiled understandingly. "Just take it off the shelf. You can pay me later."

In came another man.

"I'd like to treat all the Scouts, over at the drive-in."

They had to leave, Hooper explained regretfully. They must be back in Jamboree camp at noon.

WATCH THEM LOAD UP

The whole town watched as the Scouts loaded into their bus.

Rathdrum would never see so many Scouts again.

Just as they were about to pull out, a pleasant-faced woman scurried across the street. She was carrying a huge bowl of fresh raspberries she'd just picked.

"I thought," she said, poking the bowl through an open window, "the boys could eat these on the way back to camp."

They did, too.

En route to camp, Hooper tried to thank the boys for having given up so much camp fun to make the trip.

But the boys turned back the thanks.

"They thanked me for the privilege of going," Hooper said proudly. "They thanked me!"

In the sudden quiet of the modest little house where she lives all alone, so did Effie.

And she will, for a lot of long days to come.

[From the New York Times, Aug. 10, 1967]

SCOUTS OF WORLD MIX OLD AND NEW

(By Robert Windeler)

COEUR D'ALENE, IDAHO, August 8.—They talk of tape recorders, Twiggy and traffic on the streets of Tokyo more than of tenting on the old camp ground.

When they were younger the Boy Scouts here from 74 countries for their 12th world jamboree, the first to be held in this country, came together for the adventure of camping and hiking. Now, at the advanced ages of from 14 to 20 their biggest interest by far is the opposite sex.

"There is one thing that all 12,000 of us have in common," said Danee Samonte, a 15-year-old Scout from Manila, the Philippines, "girls."

That is one commodity that is in short supply on the 5,000-acre jamboree campsite in Idaho's Farragut State Park, 20 miles north of here and 35 miles from the Washington State border.

[The jamboree ended Wednesday, United Press International reported, with a final round of fishing, boating, canoeing and archery.]

Visits to the jamboree by local young ladies—or anyone else—are limited to afternoons from 1 to 6 P.M. each day of the nine-day event, which began on Aug. 1, and two Canadian boys were expelled for being in the company of girls in the woods near their campsite at 1 o'clock in the morning, two hours after taps.

Most of the other necessities of the modern world, except hot water, are available to the young men of the non-Communist non-Arab world who are making their temporary home on the hard, dry ground (spikes had to be used in place of tent pegs) of this pine-forested part of the country.

And they themselves are a blending of the traditional values of the 60-year-old Boy Scout movement, and the contemporary themes, including that of the present jamboree—"For Friendship."

At their campfires here they sing everything from the African lullaby "Cumbaya" to the latest hits from London and Kuala Lumpur. Transistor radios are more prevalent than bugles to play taps.

"We've got to keep up with the world," said a 19-year-old Georgian. "We're behind in so many ways, like uniforms and formal ceremonies."

By pioneer standards, in camping out here at least they are pampered by the pressures of modern society. They cook over charcoal ("We are conservationists and it would take a national forest to supply us with firewood," explained one Montana school master), and a local lake was specially stocked with 20,000 trout trapped by a net to assure a catch by any amateur fisherman.

"A trout parlor in downtown Tokyo is more challenging," said one Japanese youth.

Yet the Scouts here won rigorous local competitions for the right to attend the jamboree and they are among the most committed youth of the 10,250,000-member movement. They share an interest in the outdoors and a strong loyalty to their individual conceptions of the ideals of world scouting.

"Only in the last two years have I been able to understand the real meaning of scouting," said Thomas Jansen, a 17-year-old West German youth from Krefeld, near Düsseldoff. "It is basically friendship and public service—but for five years I thought it was hiking."

"Nobody joins scouting to get their character built," said Matthew Mazer, 16 years old, of Scarsdale, N.Y. "But one day you wake up and realize that that is exactly what has happened."

The American and British Scouts attending this jamboree are at an age where their colleagues have largely lost interest in scouting and dropped out. Seventy-five per cent of American Scouts quit before they reach age 15, and only 1 per cent ever reach Eagle Scout, the highest ranking in the Boy Scouts of America.

The British Scouts recently revamped their uniforms to include long pants and four-in-hand ties instead of the traditional shorts and long socks and neckerchiefs. They also eliminated their program for 20- to 25-year-olds and dropped the word "boy" from their title.

American Scouts still wear shorts, to the dismay of most of them here who were requested not to bring civilian clothes in order "to create a good image of America for our visitors."

American Scouts account for 5,000 of the total of just under 12,000 here. The British sent 1,300 and the Canadians are represented by 1,200 Scouts. There are 5.8 million Scouts in this country.

[From the Idaho Sunday Statesman, Aug. 6, 1967]

POMP OF WORLD JAMBOREE BOASTS SPECTRUM OF COLOR

(By John Ulrich)

FARRAGUT STATE PARK.—Green, tan, and predominant colors of the spectacle that is the 12th World Boy Scout Jamboree.

The greens are in the official jamboree uniforms and in the pines of the surrounding Idaho mountains. The tans also show up in the uniforms and in the gradually thickening layer of dust that falls on tents, boys and everything else.

The painful pink is most noticeable as a band around the knees of both boys and Scout leaders, a band of sunburn which extends from the tops of their knee high socks to the bottom of their uniform shorts.

ALL COLORS DISPLAYED

Discounting all that, the jamboree shows every imaginable color and color is displayed in every imaginable way.

The Scouts from Northern Ireland in subcamp Makiling have decorated their entrance gate with travel posters glorifying Ulster and various maps of Ireland printed on Irish linen.

A Mexican troop in the same camp has panels made up of petates. Each square is a different bright color and the Scouts explain that the squares are hand woven of "ixtla" or jute.

United Kingdom Troop 32 from Warwickshire, Yorkshire and Norfolk decorate their entry with canvas panels on which are painted the symbols of the 12 world jamborees held to date. Their counterparts of U.K. Troop 22 from Yorkshire and Lincolnshire carry the crests of those two counties on their gate.

Tents come in every color including black, which is predominant in the tents of Scouts from Germany. The Germans explain that a founder of their movement brought back the black tents from Lapland. They are made up of triangular and square panels and look much like an American Indian tepee, complete with smokehole. The nomadic Lapps built fires in their shelters and the dark collor helps warm the tent when the sun shines on it. At jamboree it needs no warming but is relatively cool when one panel is left open to the air.

The "hometown" troop . . . Troop 41, made up of boys from the Inland Empire in the immediate vicinity of jamboree decorates its gateway with a stylized 20-gallon hat wearing Western and "howdy, partner" in 10 languages.

FUJIYAMA DISPLAYED

One troop from Japan has built a plywood Fujiyama mounted atop a replica of a Japanese high speed train. The Japanese have the card-shaped windsocks that are the symbol of good luck for boys and are most frequently seen in Japan on Boys Day (May 5).

A Canadian troop from Calgary has reproduced a replica of Fort Calgary and during flag ceremonies red-coated Scouts man guard posts on either side of the gateway representing the 1875 outpost of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police.

[From the Idaho Sunday Statesman, Aug. 6, 1967]

VIET SCOUTERS REMAIN QUIET ABOUT BATTLE

FARRAGUT STATE PARK.—The Vietnamese delegation to the Boy Scout World Jamboree says little about the war there.

Tony Do Van Ninh, Saigon commissioner for the Vietnamese boy scouts, said "We are not to talk about it, except we fight against aggression."

The five-member Vietnamese delegation, including three boys and two leaders, flew almost directly from Saigon to Spokane, then came to Farragut. Because of the direct route, Ninh said he had discovered no reaction among Americans toward the war.

Ninh explained his country sent only five scouts because "it is a long way to Saigon, and costs much."

Earlier, jamboree officials said one problem limiting the size of Southeast Asia delegations is transportation. "We can get them here, but we can't get them back," said Keith Kentopp. "It's hard to get a flight to Vietnam. They're all filled. Coming back is no problem though."

[From the Idaho Sunday Statesman, Aug. 6, 1967]

IDAHO'S BEAUTY, FRIENDLINESS BLEND TO ENTERTAIN 12,000 WORLD SCOUTS

(By David Zarkin)

FARRAGUT STATE PARK.—This beautiful sprawling 5,000 acres of state park may soon replace the potato as Idaho's claim to fame and state symbol.

With the advent of the 12th Boy Scout World Jamboree, which is taking place now, the park has achieved a level of utility and diversity held by few outdoor facilities of this size in the nation.

Scouts and Scout officials from throughout the world acclaim Farragut's assets daily and say that it's the only place a tremendous scouting event could be held comfortably for more than 12,000 youths. Nestled in the pines of the Bitterroot Mountains of Northern Idaho, this secluded area was a Navy training base during the 1940's, and then became a college. It was abandoned by the college and used as a wildlife refuge.

The site was used for the 1965 Girl Scout Roundup, but before the Boy Scouts could meet here this month improvements had to be made to meet their requirements.

After the Girl Scout event, former Gov. Robert E. Smylie took the lead in luring the Boy Scouts to Idaho for their first world jamboree in the United States. Idaho met their demands and made the needed improvements with a $729,425 program, part of it paid in 50–50 matching funds by the State and U.S. Bureau of Outdoor Recreation. These improvements are permanent and will be enjoyed by Idahoans and others in years to come.

Smylie's efforts in making Farragut a suitable place for two such noteworthy international events were noted after 1965 when the main street was named "Smylie Boulevard." But this year the title of that shrubbery decked stretch was tagged "Friendship Boulevard."

CHANGE TEMPORARY

A State Park Department official said it was in connection with the Boy Scouts' event which uses "For Friendship" as its theme. Scout officials said that there was an agreement that names of the streets would be temporarily changed for the jamboree.

Smylie was not on hand this week for dedication ceremonies, but Jamboree Commissioner Irving Feist made mention of him. Gov. Don Samuelson dedicated the park in ceremonies attended by 14,000 visitors.

During the jamboree there has been talk that the 1969 National Boy Scout Jamboree might be held at Farragut. Sweden and Japan have been rumored as possible sites for the next world jamboree.

BEACH DEVELOPED

The state's most significant and costly contribution to the park and the jamboree is the $194,338 beach development on Lake Pend Orielle. Half the funds for this man-made sandy cove came from the federal government. Also included in this project is a permanent brick bath house with restrooms, showers and a parking lot. A permanent restroom building was also constructed at Buttonhook Bay at a cost of $6,960—also on a federal-state matching fund basis.

A permanent water system was installed for the Boy Scout event with federal and state funds at a cost of $151,262. A 50,000 seat amphitheater, large enough to hold the national jamboree, was built with a total of $74,930 in state funds. The state and federal governments shared the $73,950 cost of the headquarters building which houses State Park Department offices.

BRIG CONVERTED

Other permanent developments include the entrance gate, kiosk and sign, seeding 194 acres, top soil and seeding for the Avenue of Flags, dock installation and renovation of the old Navy brig for the press. This building will be used later for maintenance and storage.

The State Parks Department is not the only state office that has played a big role at the jamboree. The Idaho State Police Department has one-third of its force located at Farragut with patrolmen in 18 cars cruising the park and nearby Highway 95.

The patrolmen have logged 1,200 miles a day on their blue and white cars and reunited 300 people with their families and friends during the hectic opening day.

SCOUTS BADGER POLICE

The state police have become "public relations men" for Idaho and have attracted the interest of many foreign scouts. These boys have offered to trade trinkets for the police officers' smart Stetson hats. The officers have resisted making the exchange, but spend a good deal of time showing the youths the many gadgets on their patrol cars.

The state police have been joined in security work with Kootenai County Sheriff John Bender who maintains a trailer alongside the state officers' own mobile living quarters. The law enforcement officials said their work has consisted mainly of patrolling and incidents here have been minor.

The State Forestry Department is responsible for fire protection for the park. So far, only minor fires caused by careless cigarette smoking have been reported. The department has roving patrols, radio communications and lookouts reporting to a main office. About 600 garbage cans filled with water have been dispersed through the park, to extinguish fires.

TAUGHT FIRE PROTECTION

State Forestry Official Wilbur Atwood, Boise, said the scouts have been indoctrinated on fire protection and have kept the grounds free of litter.

The Idaho Bureau of Mines is sponsoring a "gold digging" exhibit here and the State Fish and Game Department has cordoned off a corner of the lake and stocked it with 20,000 catchable rainbow trout.

The boys attending this event are fairly unanimous in their praise for Idaho and western hospitality. Their only complaint—the ground here is too rocky and dusty for pitching a tent, but all of them have managed to keep their abodes in an upright position.

[From the Parma (Idaho) Review Aug. 3, 1967]

GOV. DON SAMUELSON DEDICATES FARRAGUT PARK

Governor Don Samuelson dedicated beautiful new Farragut State Park Tuesday, August 1, first day of the World Scout Jamboree "for the use and enjoyment of the people of Idaho, of the nation and the free world."

In his dedicatory remarks, the Governor said: "I wonder how many of you here today for these dedication ceremonies recall that we are on the location of what was once the largest "city" in Idaho.

"The reason I remember so vividly is that 23 years ago I climbed off a troop train from Davenport, Iowa and became a resident of Camp Farragut along with 60,000 other sailors.

"This was the place I called home for two years during World War II, so there is a large amount of sentiment and affection included when I say what an unsurpassed pleasure it is for me to be here to participate in these ceremonies.

"As an ex-gunners mate in the Navy I can also report to you truthfully that boot camp at Farragut was never like this. I don't remember being called on to make too many speeches back in boot camp days.

"It is my high honor today to dedicate the permanent park facilities for the use and enjoyment of the people of Idaho, of the nation and the free world.

"With pride, I can say Idaho has done a tremendous job in the creation of Farragut State Park. I say this because monies have been wisely spent for the present and for the future. Facilities have been constructed that will not only serve the World Scout Jamboree, but also will be of lasting benefit to all the citizens who will hereafter visit this unexcelled spot.

"I should point out that without the excellent cooperation of everyone who has been associated with the state on this project, these facilities could not have become a reality. There are three entities who have cooperated so generously that I believe they merit special mention.

"I am indeed happy to acknowledge the splendid assistance, both financial and advisory, of the United States Department of Interior and the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation.

"The Boy Scouts of America certainly deserve special recognition and thanks from all of us for their extremely generous spirit of cooperation. The ultimate needs of the state park were given every consideration by Scout officials. The result of this fine spirit of cooperation will be to the lasting benefit of the general public.

"Finally, allow me to compliment highly the Idaho legislature and the all important role it played in the development of this project. Farragut State Park is a prime example of the fact that proposals and undertakings that are good for the entire state are met with enthusiasm by our legislators.

"It is my honest belief that Farragut State Park is rapidly becoming one of the most significant outdoor recreation areas in the Northwest. Its fame and renown will spread and I vision the day when this park's national reputation will underscore the fact that truly 'Idaho is the place to go.'

"It will take time and a great deal of energy on the part of the Park Board to realize the goal we work toward mutually for state parks in Idaho. That goal is to provide a major league quality state park system.

"Now, in reflection, we can observe that Farragut has run the complete cycle.

"From the largest city in the State nearly 25 years ago, the area became a ghost camp.

"But no longer.

"It emerges today in magnificence and splendor for the pure enjoyment of all peoples. Farragut ranks high on the list of attractions in a state like ours that is so richly blessed with an abundance of natural appeal. Mother Nature bestowed one of her most gracious smiles on this entire area," Governor Samuelson concluded.

[From the Parma (Idaho) Review, Aug. 3, 1967]

Samuelson Traces History of Park in Dedicatory Talk

Farragut State Park, Idaho.—From the "biggest city" of the state to a ghost town to the "most significant outdoor recreation area of the Northwest."

Tracing the evolution of Farragut State Park at dedicatory ceremonies for permanent facilities Tuesday, Idaho Gov. Donald W. Samuelson condensed the park's 25-year history.

The latest phase—outdoor recreation—is currently being provided for more than 11,000 Boy Scouts attending the World Jamboree—that first ever to be held in the United States.

Washington Gov. Dan Evans and Samuelson headed a delegation of State and Boy Scout officials in dedicating the $750,000 facilities.

Boy Scouts have a tradition of swapping and the ceremonies Tuesday afternoon in front of the park's new headquarters building would have made any scout proud.

Jamboree Commissioner Irving Feist, Newark, N.J., passed out souvenirs to members of the Idaho Parks Board, Gov. Samuelson, and Idaho Commere and Development Secretary Louise Shadduck.

Then Samuelson was presented with plaques by scouts from Mexico and Nepal. Samuelson then presented a plaque to William Frome, St. Anthony, chairman of the parks board, to dedicate the facilities.

Frome noted that the park had at various times been a naval training area, a college, a fish and game reserve and site for two prior jamborees.

Samuelson recalled that his first sight of Idaho was from a troop train in 1943 when he arrived at Farragut for two years of training as a gunner's mate during World War II.

"Boot camp was never like this," Samuelson quipped as he spoke from the platform in front of the administration building.

But in 1967, the governor contended, "Farragut State Park is rapidly becoming one of the most significant outdoor recreation areas in the northwest."

[From the Idaho Observer, Aug. 5, 1967]

How We Damned the Torpedoes

(By Robert E. Smylie)

Now that the Boy Scouts are World Jamboree-ing at Farragut State Park it is interesting to recall how hard it was to reclaim that concrete jungle on the shores of Lake Pend Oreille. There was a time when no one in Idaho's state government thought it could be done, except the Governor.

It all happened because the Girl Scouts were looking for a place to have a National Round-up in 1965. We invited them to look at old Camp Farragut and they were charmed. But they said the old concrete foundations of the city that had housed 50,000 naval trainees had to be caved in, broken up and buried. We said we would do it. Then they said the area had to be seeded to adequate ground cover. We said we would do it. Then they said they needed an amphitheater covered with grass to seat 14,000 people. We said we would build it. And they asked for a new water system and so on, and we promised them all of that, too.

We sent a team of experts to look it over. The price tag for cleaning up was 3 million dollars. Everybody wanted to give up. We turned to the National Guard. Two summers of training for the engineering troops and the help of a reserve outfit for their training session that same summer, and the clean up job was nearly done.

Then the Legislature was asked to appropriate funds to construct the water system, plant the grass, build the amphi-theater and the other needed facilities. Herman McDevitt of Pocatello made a scathing speech in the House about how the Governor had got us in trouble, and now there was nothing to do but bail him out. He likened me to the ne'er do well brother-in-law who could never pay his bills and said that family honor required that the legislature meet the Governor's unwise and outrageous obligations. I was supposed to be upset by the speech, but it really came as a great help. I am sure the Legislature could never have been convinced to make such a wise investment in advance, and only when there was really no choice would they take the first step toward creation of a magnificent state park.

It is interesting to observe how fast attitudes change. Some of yesterday's most impressive handwringers are now bell-ringers for the new park. They should be. It's a beautiful northern anchor for our park and recreation system and it will bring national renown to Idaho on a continuing basis. Creation of the park and its development have saved a 4,000-acre playground with a mile and a half of lake shore for public use forever. This was more than sound conservation, it was creative conservation at its best.

This year there is a new swimming beach with facilities to accommodate 500 people. There is a 50,000-seat amphi-theater that makes the park the greatest outdoor convention hall in all of America.

There are many without whose help the park would never have become a reality. General John Walsh, Col. James Brooks, hundreds of men of the National Guard, Roger Guernsey, the ex-state forester . . . and Jon Soderblom, are but a few. Louise Shadduck who sold the Girl Scouts on the idea of Farragut and Mrs. Warren Brown of McCall who had the idea in the first place are others. If you tried to write a list . . . you would give up. The only way you could be inclusive enough would be to say "All of Us," because all of Idaho with its tax dollars had a part of making the Farragut Park a reality.

This year the Park is playing host to the first World Jamboree of Boy Scouts ever held in the United States.

It is said that General McAulliffe who was commanding at Bastogne during World War II's Battle of the Bulge finally concluded that there was no way out of the encircling German ring. He called his staff together and when one of them asked how he was going to get out, he is said to have replied that he wasn't going to. What he planned to do he said, was to get deep enough in trouble that someone would rescue him.

That is about how Farragut was saved and built. If we had not invited the Girl Scouts we would never have made all of these commitments. If we had asked the Legislature in advance there would have been a thousand reasons for doing nothing, or doing less. So we issued the invitation, and the trouble commenced. First the National Guard came to the rescue, then several volunteer civic groups, then the Forestry Youth Camp. Finally the Legislature by nearly unanimous vote adopted the project as its own and Farragut state park was a reality once and for all.

Herman McDevitt was right, but as usual for the wrong reasons. It was wise to bail the Governor out. It's the best investment we have made in a long, long time.

Farragut is aptly named. It was the old Admiral at Mobile Bay who said "Damn the torpedoes, full speed ahead." That was the real spirit in which the Park was re-created.

[From the Wall Street Journal, July 28, 1967]

A Not-So-Rugged Life Awaits Scouts Heading for Jamboree in Idaho

(By James E. Bylin)

Coeur D'Alene, Idaho.—A Boy Scout is trustworthy, loyal, helpful, friendly and all those other wonderful things. And, judging from the setup here at the Scouts' World Jamboree, he is pampered.

Scouting apparently has changed. Remember how you spent hours foraging for firewood and then striking flint to make fire? Here, the scouts draw charcoal from a 70-ton supply and then ignite it with matches. Remember how you used to cook all your meals in your grubby mess kit pan and how as often as not you ended up with a plate full of twigs and grass and insects? Here, much of the food is precooked.

"The boys aren't coming here to spend their time over a hot stove," says Oren Felton, Jamboree food director.

What are the boys coming here for? One thing they're coming here for is to see some real live Indians perform those dances that Scouts have been imitating for decades. For pre-Jamboree festivities scheduled for Monday, officials passed up a performance by some well-trained Scout groups and elected to present real Indians who live in the Washington-Idaho area.

WANTED: INDIANS

The Redskins in the area, however, were less than familiar with war dances and picturesque incantations to the rain gods. "They haven't done a ceremonial dance in 100 years," moans a Scout official. "The one thing they have to go on for costumes are old National Geographic magazines," he says. Particularly worrisome was a sign he spotted on Spokane's skid row. It read: "Wanted—Indians for Boy Scout Jamboree."

Some 100 Indians did show up for dress rehearsals, and they proved to be apt, if not experienced pupils.

Besides the Indians, some 10,000 Boy Scouts and 1,000 adult leaders from 100 countries will gather for the quadrennial Jamboree, which starts Tuesday and runs through the following Wednesday. Each Scout has paid $50 for the privilege of attending.

The World Jamboree will be the first ever held in the U.S. The site is the 5,000-acre Farragut State Park, a World War II Naval training center that is 50 miles northeast of Spokane and 25 miles north of Coeur D'Alene. The state of Idaho and the Federal Government have spent $740,000 to improve the park for the Jamboree and for the public's use afterward.

The Federal Government has helped in other ways, too. Some Army units were sent to the area to help raise 7,000 Scout tents, dig 400 latrine pits and ready the bank, hospital, fire station and post office. The military men and equipment will be gone, however, by the time the Scouts arrive. "We don't want people to think we're militaristic," says one of the 1,300 Jamboree staffers.

GIFTS FOR THE LITTLE SHAVERS

American corporations are doing their bit, too. Perhaps optimistically, Gillette Co. is giving visiting Scouts—who range in age from 14 to 18—a complete shaving kit, and Minnesota Mining & Manufacturing Co. is donating 5,600 cameras.

The state of Idaho has shipped in 12 tons of old Idaho license plates, which, it is presumed, will be highly prized by the foreign Scouts. "We really didn't want them, but people here have been so nice that we took them," says Jamboree coordinator Robert Billington.

Keith Kentopp, another Jamboree official, says the Jamboree won't permit "crass commercialism," although it is gladly accepting the gifts and 27,800 cans of soup from Campbell Soup Co. and other food from Thomas J. Lipton Co. Is that commercialism? No, says Mr. Kentopp. For instance, he says "Campbell is interested in kids eating and we're interested in kids being well fed."

While the Scouts eat their soup and their precooked fare, staff members and volunteers will be dining in style. Their meals, to be catered by a Spokane hotel, will include veal scallopini, grilled salmon and roast turkey. There also will be 100 pounds of chicken heads on hand—but those are to feed a contingent of falcons, hawks and eagles appearing in a demonstration.

FISH AND SQUIRRELS

Besides eating and playing with old Idaho license plates, the Scouts will be busy with archery, hiking, arts and crafts, conservation training and the like. They can fish in a lovely mountain lake specially stocked with 20,000 trout, and they can swim in one end of the lake that has been contoured so the sun will warm the water.

They apparently can take part in some unofficial activities, too. Pointing at one of the ground squirrels that swarm over the area, an official of the Jamboree chuckles: "By golly, I bet a lot of those little fellows get caught and cooked."

Most activities will be highly supervised, though. "We've learned safety precautions the hard way over the years," says a Scout official. "All we need, for example, is to lose a French kid and have Charles de Gaulle on our necks."

Furniture, Appliance Dealers Assail Exemption for Revolving Credit in Senate-Passed Truth-in-Lending Bill as Discriminatory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1967

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, in the hearings of the Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs of the House Committee on Banking and Currency on H.R. 11601, the Consumer Credit Protection Act, and related bills, we received much testimony from bankers and from retailers about the discriminatory feature of S. 5, the Senate-passed truth-in-lending bill, which exempts revolving or open-end credit transactions of department stores from the requirement of stating an annual percentage rate on the credit charges. Revolving credit charges can be stated under the Senate bill on a monthly rate basis—usually 1½ percent a month—rather than as 18 percent annually. However, the banks, and those who extend credit on an installment basis, retaining a security interest in the article sold, would have to state the charge for credit on an annual-rate basis.

H.R. 11601, which six of us on the subcommittee have introduced and which nearly a score of other Members of the House have cosponsored in H.R. 11806 introduced by Congressman ABRAHAM J. MULTER, ranking member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, would eliminate such discrimination by requiring all consumer credit transactions to reveal the annual percentage rate which is charged.

FURNITURE DEALERS SEEK IDENTICAL DISCLOSURE REQUIREMENTS FOR ALL SELLERS

The furniture dealers would prefer the opportunity to state a monthly percentage rate rather than an annual rate, but feel that if an annual rate is required on their transactions, it also should be required on revolving credit. Thus, they endorse the equal treatment provision of H.R. 11601 instead of having different standards for the two types of credit extended by competing retailers, as provided for in S. 5 and in H.R. 11602, a bill sponsored by a number of the minority members of the subcommittee or of the full committee, which is identical to S. 5 as it passed the Senate.

I think many of the Members will be interested in a bulletin on this issue sent to members of the Tennessee Retail Furniture Association, as forwarded to me by a Tennessee furniture retailer. It states the issue from the viewpoint of one very large group of retailers who feel the Senate bill discriminates against them and in favor of those stores using revolving credit. Similar information was given to the subcommittee by Mr. Charles D. Stapp of New Jersey, president of the National Retail Furniture Association, when he appeared before the subcommittee on August 16.

The material referred to from the Tennessee Retail Furniture Association bulletin is as follows:

[Bulletin No. 26, from the Tennessee Retail Furniture Association, John W. Seay, executive vice president, Nashville, Tenn., Aug. 15, 1967]

We have in previous bulletins reminded you of the importance of action concerning the "Truth In Lending" bill (S–5) which was passed by the Senate on July 11, 1967, 92 to 0, requiring lenders to tell borrowers exactly the cost of loans on autos, appliances, repairs and house modernization, stating the true annual percentage interest rate and the total finance charge in dollars and cents.

This represented complete defeat for the retail and banking interests. Major features of S–5 are: Open-end installment plans must disclose the finance charge stated as an annual interest rate if the seller retains a security interest in the merchandise or if less than 60 per cent of the debt is repaid in first year. Revolving credit need disclose only the monthly interest rate. The effective date would be July 1, 1969. Violations will be $1,000.00.

This is a serious bill confronting every Furniture Dealer and could cause us much confusion and headache. The N.R.F.A. has vigorously opposed this bill as it now stands pointing out that it discriminates against independent home furnishings specialty retailers by permitting department stores using revolving credit to disclose finance charge as monthly percentage rate, forces furniture stores using installment or revolving credit to disclose finance charge with a retained security interest to disclose the finance charge as an annual percentage rate. N.R.F.A. plans action to persuade House to eliminate bill's discriminatory features. The American Bankers Association urged Congress to enact a "Truth In Lending" law that will require disclosure of all finance charges only on a monthly basis.

Much discussion is now going on in the House Banking Committee and on any day may well be presented to the House of Representatives for action. While the House bill will be an improvement over the Senate bill, it is not like we Furniture Dealers would prefer and therefore your voice is needed. On the Senate Bill S–5 we are advised that very few Senators knew our wishes in the matter, because we did not write, call or voice our opinion to them. Please do not let this happen to our House of Representatives. Contact your Congressmen now. It would also be wise to let the House Banking and Currency Committee and Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs know your opinion. Names as follows:

Leonor K. Sullivan (Dem., Missouri) Chairman.
Jonathan B. Bingham (Dem., New York).
Frank Annunzio (Dem., Illinois).
Richard T. Hanna (Dem., California).
Joseph G. Minish (Dem., New Jersey).
Henry B. Gonzalez (Dem., Texas).
Robert G. Stephens, Jr., (Dem., Georgia).
Chalmers P. Wylie (Rep., Ohio).
Lawrence G. Williams (Rep., Pennsylvania).
Seymour Halpern (Rep., New York).
Florence P. Dwyer (Rep., New Jersey).
Paul A. Fino (Rep., New York).
Address: House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Mr. Charles D. Stapp, President N.R.F.A. who was our featured speaker during our last State Convention, in a recent letter to N.R.F.A. members says: urge the Congressman from your State to support any credit service charge disclosure proposal that requires the universal application of either dollars and cents or an identical rate for all credit grantors, whether it be monthly, monthly and annual, annual or any other rate that will enable customers to compare and determine which is the cheapest rate available in the market place.

Let us be reminded that a "Truth in Lending" bill was introduced in our past State Legislature, which through your help and cooperation we were able to get passed to Committee, where it will lie until next February and we hope will never come to life.

Congressman Edward R. Roybal Reports From Washington

SPEECH
OF
HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 17, 1967

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point the text of my "Fifteenth Report From Washington" to the residents of the 30th District of California on my activities as the district's Representative in the Nation's Capital.

The report follows:

FIFTEENTH REPORT FROM WASHINGTON

This is the 15th in a series of regular "Reports from Washington" made to the residents of the 30th District on my activities as your Representative in the Nation's Capital.

In addition, I have also sent out 12 special reports designed to cover all major items of legislation considered by Congress, events of national and international significance, and particularly, those matters of immediate concern to Metropolitan Los Angeles and Southern California.

SOCIAL SECURITY INCREASE

By a nearly unanimous vote of 415 to 3, the House adopted a 12½ per cent across-the-board increase in social security benefits for more than 23 million elderly and disabled Americans, including over 2 million California residents.

I had worked for a larger cost-of-living benefit increase, as well as a substantial raise in the bill's $50-a-month minimum payment figure, and I was not satisfied with several of the other provisions of this omnibus bill.

However, since the "closed rule" under which the measure was considered, prevented making any changes or amendments on the House floor, I am hopeful the Senate will be able to improve the bill before the final version is passed and sent to the President for signature into law.

CONSUMER PROTECTION

With growing national concern over the rising cost-of-living, and the increased threat of inflation, I am happy to report success in obtaining public hearings in the House on my Truth-in-Lending Bill to ban hidden finance charges, and protect the Nation's private borrowers by requiring loan companies, financial institutions, and retail merchants to make full disclosure of total credit costs on all cash loans, and other forms of consumer credit and installment purchase contracts.

I believe that credit is a commodity like anything else you can buy—and the American consumer has just as much right to know the real cost of borrowing money, as he does to know the price of a loaf of bread, a pair of shoes, or a gallon of gasoline.

With recent unanimous passage of a similar bill in the Senate, I am confident this measure can be enacted into law during the present session of Congress.

The bill makes no attempt to regulate or control in any way the rate of interest or the cost of credit. But it would enable the consumer to tell at a glance, and be in a position to shop around and compare directly, the exact cost of credit from various sources.

It would help eliminate the present confusion over finance charges and true credit costs—and assist consumers in deciding whether to borrow, to pay cash, or to save toward the purchase instead.

FOR EAST LOS ANGELES NARCOTICS REHABILITATION, $750,000

I was happy to announce the recent approval of a $750,000 federal grant to finance a unique, new narcotic drug addition treatment and rehabilitation program for youth in the Boyle Heights area of East Los Angeles.

The project—featuring a 24-hour-a-day, seven-day-a-week community Narcotic Information and Service Center—will stress the most modern prevention and control techniques, comprehensive training and rehabilitation methods, and intensive education and counseling program through area schools.

This East L.A. project represents a fresh and imaginative approach which holds great promise of helping develop a more effective way of dealing with the serious problems of narcotics addiction among young people.

UNITED NATIONS PEACEKEEPING

There are new indications of widespread support in Congress for my resolution proposing that the U.S. take a more active lead in efforts to strengthen United Nations peacekeeping capabilities for dealing with recurring crises and threatened military conflicts around the world.

In our dangerous nuclear-space age, peace is no longer a luxury, it is vital to the very existence of life on earth.

Though conflict seems to be an inevitable part of our dynamic and fast-changing global community of 130 nations, what is *not* inevitable is that these differences must always lead to the tragedy of war.

We simply must find the ways and means of handling situations that threaten international peace and security, and of settling disputes, without resort to armed military action.

By taking this American initiative now in support of the United Nations peacekeeping role, we can show the world in a positive way that our objective is to improve and strengthen the UN so that it can assume its proper burden of leadership in our turbulent times to help prevent war and serve as an effective Power for Peace.

ON-THE JOB TRAINING, $2.7 MILLION

More than 2,500 new job opportunities, concentrated in the Greater Los Angeles area, will open for currently unemployed men and women in California's Mexican American community under terms of a unique $2.7 million government sponsored, industry oriented on-the-job training program that will utilize the facilities of various community organizations throughout the State to reach individuals who have never had a chance to upgrade their work skills and enter the active job market.

I was pleased to get this project approved because it provides an effective and comprehensive employment training and job placement program, and with the cooperative participation of local private enterprise, offers one of the best answers to our long-term unemployment problem.

MIDDLE EAST CRISIS

As Chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee Special Study Mission which surveyed the Middle East last November, I appreciate the difficult task facing us in that historic crossroads of civilization of getting discussions started between the opposing Arab and Israeli sides aimed at exploring for agreed terms leading to an enduring and workable peace in that volatile area.

I believe there are three essential requirements for achieving lasting peace and economic progress in the Middle East: (1) recognition of the sovereign right of all nations in the area to exist, to be secure within their borders from outside interference, and to freely exercise the right of innocent passage through the international waterways of the Suez Canal and the Gulf of Aqaba; (2) resolution of the twin problems—refugee resettlement and military arms limitation—which have frustrated every attempt since the 1940s to find permanent peace in the Middle East; (3) a bold, new regional development program to turn the energies of this entire area, once and for all, away from conflict, and toward the work of fashioning a more prosperous region and a better way of life for all the peoples who live there—in the ancient and strategic cradle of Western culture.

BILINGUAL EDUCATION

I have been highly encouraged by the almost universal support of leading educators and school administrators throughout the country for my bill, H.R. 8000, the Bilingual Educational Opportunity Act, to assist local school districts with special bilingual teaching programs to help overcome the serious language barriers that handicap America's estimated 4 million elementary and secondary school children from families whose home language is other than English.

With nearly 1 million California youngsters of limited English-speaking ability who could benefit from these programs, and with a favorable reception by both House and Senate Committees, I am hopeful we will be able to enact a Bilingual Education bill this year.

Sharing in the benefits of this legislation would be American school children from a wide variety of family linguistic and cultural backgrounds, including, Spanish, French, Oriental, Portuguese, Eskimo, Greek, Italian, Polish, Hungarian, and many more.

Today, job opportunities, income levels, economic advancement, in fact, all the aspects of personal and family well-being, are closely linked to educational achievement and the ability to communicate effectively with one another.

Those citizens who are handicapped because of language barriers in our modern predominantly English-speaking society, suffer a continuing denial of the opportunity to participate and share fully in the rich abundance of 20th Century America.

CLEAN AIR

As co-author of the Air Quality Act of 1967, I believe this measure can serve to help organize a truly national effort to eliminate, once and for all, the dangerous impurities in the air we breathe, and to create the kind of clean atmosphere we want for ourselves and for our children.

By providing for further research into the complex causes of air pollution, setting national standards for effective pollution control, and supporting state and regional programs in fighting the smog problem, the bill goes a long way toward a cooperative local-state-federal private industry approach to establishing a healthy living environment in America's increasingly crowded metropolitan areas like Los Angeles, where some 80 per cent of our population will soon reside.

NUCLEAR PROLIFERATION

As a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, I have consistently urged President Johnson to explore every possibility for international agreement on stopping the spread of nuclear weapons.

Recent developments at the 17-nation Geneva Disarmament Conference seem to point toward progress in working out acceptable terms for a non-proliferation treaty, with adequate safeguards and inspection control provisions.

We all have a vital stake in the success of these negotiations, for they may be civilization's last real chance to avoid nuclear destruction.

THE 1968 SERVICE ACADEMY EXAMS

Encouraged by last year's record number of applicants for our U.S. Service Academies, I am asking all young men from the 30th District who are interested in competing for 1968 nominations to the Military, Naval, Air Force, or Merchant Marine Academies to plan to take the special Civil Service Commission Academy Designation Exam scheduled to be given in Los Angeles next November (a make-up exam will be held early in December). For more information, call our District Office on 688-4870.

AT YOUR SERVICE

The members of our Congressional office staff in Washington, as well as those in our Los Angeles District Office, are anxious to help you in any way they can. Please continue to make full use of the many services available through our offices by contacting us whenever you feel we can be of personal assistance.

A VIEW FROM THE HILL

Here are some interesting reactions of this year's Congressional intern group to their summer in the Nation's Capital:

From the academic life of California universities, the impression of Washington, D.C. and the Nation's law-making process seems quite remote and almost abstract.

Even more distant are the visions of the public figures that control the government and enact its laws, for the mass media tend to glamorize the people and all else surrounding Capitol Hill.

Thus our ten-week exposure to Washington as summer Congressional interns has been a revelation and a genuine learning experience. In particular, the daily contact with Congressman Roybal and our attendance at morning committee meetings and House floor debates, quorum calls, and evening sessions has permitted us to see the busy, human side of active, dedicated Congressmen.

Because of the guest speaker forums for the House and Senate interns, we have received first-hand exposure to prominent government officials such as Vice President Humphrey, Dean Rusk, Averill Harriman, Attorney General Ramsey Clark, Governor Romney, and Senators Hatfield, Percy, and Kennedy.

Equally informative have been the early breakfasts and small-group seminars with important officials from the White House and various federal agencies. Their candid discussions have given us a unique opportunity to see the personalities and intricate legal and administrative machinery that comprise life in Washington, D.C.

But, just as important as this exposure to public life and the people involved, has been our contact with the 1300 other summer interns who have come to Washington out of their intense interest in government affairs.

It is indeed encouraging to meet some of the future "doers and builders" of American life, the concerned college students who feel the need for a view of our Nation's Capital.

SUMMER INTERN PROGRAM

Shown here discussing with me some of their activities as college interns in our Washington office this summer are: l to r, Mike Tirado (USC), Bea Svoboda (UCLA), and Tom Wong (Stanford).

1967 is the fifth year in a row I have participated in the Congressional Student Intern Program, which I believe to be extremely valuable—not only in helping with the office work—but as a fascinating way for young people to gain a personal understanding of how their government operates.

College students interested in coming to Washington in future years, should contact their school's intern director for information on this excellent program.

PRIVATE ENTERPRISE: KEY TO URBAN PROSPERITY

Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce President Paul Iverson expresses his organization's deep interest in continued economic expansion and business prosperity in our dynamic and fast-growing Metropolitan Area.

I have proposed several pieces of legislation this year to provide additional incentives for American private industry to invest in job-producing enterprises in our great urban centers, where hard-core unemployment has been one of our most difficult problems.

With Southern California's population due to triple from 10 million to over 30 million before the year 2000, when some 80 percent of our people will be living in cities, this kind of healthy industry-government cooperation is of vital concern to every citizen.

CONTROLLING JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

Police Chief Thomas Reedin talks about ways of improving communications and developing better police/community relations, especially between Los Angeles law enforcement officials and the young people of our crowded urban environment.

I have joined in co-sponsoring the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention Act of 1967 to provide a new program of cooperative federal assistance to help States and local communities fight juvenile delinquency, and control the increasing rate of youth crime.

Juvenile delinquency is one of America's most serious domestic problems. Besides the deep human tragedy involved, and the untold damage done to the lives of our youth, it costs this Nation's economy a staggering $4 billion a year.

Recent survey figures show that 1 out of every 9 youngsters in the United States will be referred to a juvenile court in connection with a delinquency charge before reaching their 18th birthday.

I strongly believe that our best hope of stemming this rising tide of juvenile crime is to increase our national investment in the prevention of juvenile delinquency. We cannot afford to wait until delinquent tendencies manifest themselves in serious criminal acts.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402, at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

Office Address: House Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20515

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Speaker: John W. McCormack

Abbitt, Watkins M., *Va*	
Abernethy, Thomas G., *Miss.*	6278 29th St.
Adair, E. Ross, *Ind*	4000 Mass. Ave.
Adams, Brock, *Wash*	
Addabbo, Joseph P., *N.Y.*	
Albert, Carl, *Okla*	4614 Reno Rd.
Anderson, John B., *Ill*	
Anderson, William R., *Tenn.*	3006 P St.
Andrews, George W., *Ala*	
Andrews, Mark, *N. Dak*	
Annunzio, Frank, *Ill*	
Arends, Leslie C., *Ill*	4815 Dexter St.
Ashbrook, John M., *Ohio*	
Ashley, Thomas L., *Ohio*	
Ashmore, Robert T., *S.C*	
Aspinall, Wayne N., *Colo*	The Towers Apts., 4201 Cathedral Ave.
Ayres, William H., *Ohio*	
Baring, Walter S., *Nev*	
Barrett, William A., *Pa*	
Bates, William H., *Mass*	
Battin, James F., *Mont*	
Belcher, Page, *Okla*	
Bell, Alphonzo, *Calif*	
Bennett, Charles E., *Fla*	3421 Rusticway Lane, Falls Church, Va.
Berry, E. Y., *S. Dak*	118 Schotts Court NE.
Betts, Jackson E., *Ohio*	
Bevill, Tom, *Ala*	6224 N. 35th St., Arlington, Va.
Biester, Edward G., Jr., *Pa*	
Bingham, Jonathan B., *N.Y.*	
Blackburn, Benjamin B., *Ga.*	
Blanton, Ray, *Tenn*	
Blatnik, John A., *Minn*	
Boggs, Hale, *La*	
Boland, Edward P., *Mass*	
Bolling, Richard, *Mo*	307 Warrenton Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Bolton, Frances P. (Mrs.), *Ohio.*	2301 Wyo. Ave.
Bow, Frank T., *Ohio*	4301 Mass. Ave.
Brademas, John, *Ind*	
Brasco, Frank J., *N.Y*	
Bray, William G., *Ind*	
Brinkley, Jack, *Ga*	
Brock, W. E. (Bill), *Tenn*	
Brooks, Jack, *Tex*	
Broomfield, William S., *Mich.*	
Brotzman, Donald G., *Colo*	
Brown, Clarence J., Jr., *Ohio.*	
Brown, Garry, *Mich*	
Brown, George E., Jr., *Calif*	
Broyhill, James T., *N.C*	
Broyhill, Joel T., *Va*	
Buchanan, John, *Ala*	
Burke, J. Herbert, *Fla*	
Burke, James A., *Mass*	
Burleson, Omar, *Tex*	
Burton, Laurence J., *Utah*	
Burton, Phillip, *Calif*	
Bush, George, *Tex*	
Button, Daniel E., *N.Y*	
Byrne, James A., *Pa*	
Byrnes, John W., *Wis*	1215 25th St. S., Arlington, Va.
Cabell, Earle, *Tex*	
Cahill, William T., *NJ*	
Carey, Hugh L., *N.Y*	
Carter, Tim Lee, *Ky*	
Casey, Bob, *Tex*	
Cederberg, Elford A., *Mich*	
Celler, Emanuel, *N.Y*	The Mayflower
Chamberlain, Charles E., *Mich.*	
Clancy, Donald D., *Ohio*	
Clark, Frank M., *Pa*	220 C St. SE.
Clausen, Don H., *Calif*	
Clawson, Del, *Calif*	
Cleveland, James C., *N.H*	
Cohelan, Jeffery, *Calif*	1202 Longworth House Office Bldg.
Collier, Harold R., *Ill*	
Colmer, William M., *Miss*	
Conable, Barber B., Jr., *N.Y.*	
Conte, Silvio O., *Mass*	5619 Lamar Rd., Washington 16, D.C.
Conyers, John, Jr., *Mich*	
Corbett, Robert J., *Pa*	
Corman, James C., *Calif*	
Cowger, William O., *Ky*	
Cramer, William C., *Fla*	6215 Beachway Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Culver, John C., *Iowa*	
Cunningham, Glenn, *Nebr*	
Curtis, Thomas B., *Mo*	
Daddario, Emilio Q., *Conn*	
Daniels, Dominick V., *NJ*	
Davis, Glenn R., *Wis*	
Davis, John W., *Ga*	
Dawson, William L., *Ill*	
de la Garza, Eligio, *Tex*	
Delaney, James J., *N.Y*	
Dellenback, John R., *Oreg*	6903 Crail Dr., Bethesda, Md.
Denney, Robert V., *Nebr*	
Dent, John H., *Pa*	
Derwinski, Edward J., *Ill*	
Devine, Samuel L., *Ohio*	
Dickinson, William L., *Ala*	
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., *Mich*	
Dingell, John D., *Mich*	
Dole, Robert, *Kans*	6136 Beachway Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Donohue, Harold D., *Mass*	
Dorn, Wm. Jennings Bryan, *S.C.*	2030 Laburnum St., McLean, Va.
Dow, John G., *N.Y*	
Dowdy, John, *Tex*	
Downing, Thomas N., *Va*	
Dulski, Thaddeus J., *N.Y*	347 Cannon House Office Building
Duncan, John J., *Tenn*	
Dwyer, Florence P. (Mrs.), *N.J.*	
Eckhardt, Bob, *Tex*	
Edmondson, Ed, *Okla*	
Edwards, Don, *Calif*	9201 Fox Meadow La., Potomac, Md.,
Edwards, Edwin W., *La*	
Edwards, Jack, *Ala*	
Eilberg, Joshua, *Pa*	
Erlenborn, John N., *Ill*	
Esch, Marvin L., *Mich*	
Eshleman, Edwin D., *Pa*	
Evans, Frank E., *Colo*	
Everett, Robert A., *Tenn*	
Evins, Joe L., *Tenn*	5044 Klingle St.
Fallon, George H., *Md*	
Farbstein, Leonard, *N.Y*	
Fascell, Dante B., *Fla*	
Feighan, Michael A., *Ohio*	
Findley, Paul, *Ill*	
Fino, Paul A., *N.Y*	
Fisher, O. C., *Tex*	Calvert-Woodley
Flood, Daniel J., *Pa*	The Congressional
Flynt, John J., Jr., *Ga*	
Foley, Thomas S., *Wash*	
Ford, Gerald R., *Mich*	514 Crown View Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Ford, William D., *Mich*	
Fountain, L. H., *N.C*	The Westchester
Fraser, Donald M., *Minn*	
Frelinghuysen, Peter H. B., *N.J.*	3014 N St.
Friedel, Samuel N., *Md*	
Fulton, James G., *Pa*	
Fulton, Richard, *Tenn*	
Fuqua, Don, *Fla*	
Galifianakis, Nick, *N.C*	
Gallagher, Cornelius E., *N.J.*	
Gardner, James C., *N.C*	
Garmatz, Edward A., *Md*	
Gathings, E. C., *Ark*	
Gettys, Tom S., *S.C*	
Giaimo, Robert N., *Conn*	
Gibbons, Sam, *Fla*	
Gilbert, Jacob H., *N.Y*	
Gonzalez, Henry B., *Tex*	200 C St. SE.
Goodell, Charles E., *N.Y*	3842 Macomb St.
Goodling, George A., *Pa*	
Gray, Kenneth J., *Ill*	
Green, Edith (Mrs.), *Oreg*	
Green, William J., *Pa*	
Griffiths, Martha W., (Mrs.), *Mich.*	
Gross, H. R., *Iowa*	
Grover, James R., Jr., *N.Y*	
Gubser, Charles S., *Calif*	
Gude, Gilbert, *Md*	
Gurney, Edward J., *Fla*	
Hagan, G. Elliott, *Ga*	
Haley, James A., *Fla*	
Hall, Durward G., *Mo*	
Halleck, Charles A., *Ind*	4926 Upton St.
Halpern, Seymour, *N.Y*	
Hamilton, Lee H., *Ind*	
Hammerschmidt, John Paul, *Ark.*	
Hanley, James M., *N.Y*	
Hanna, Richard T., *Calif*	
Hansen, George V., *Idaho*	
Hansen, Julia Butler (Mrs.), *Wash.*	
Hardy, Porter, Jr., *Va*	
Harrison, William Henry, *Wyo.*	
Harsha, William H., *Ohio*	
Harvey, James, *Mich*	
Hathaway, William D., *Maine.*	
Hawkins, Augustus F., *Calif.*	
Hays, Wayne L., *Ohio*	
Hébert, F. Edward, *La*	26 Cockrell St., Alexandria, Va.
Hechler, Ken, *W. Va*	
Heckler, Margaret M. (Mrs.), *Mass.*	
Helstoski, Henry, *NJ*	
Henderson, David N., *N.C*	
Herlong, A. S., Jr., *Fla*	
Hicks, Floyd V., *Wash*	
Holifield, Chet, *Calif*	
Holland, Elmer J., *Pa*	
Horton, Frank, *N.Y*	
Hosmer, Craig, *Calif*	
Howard, James J., *NJ*	
Hull, W. R., Jr., *Mo*	
Hungate, William L., *Mo*	
Hunt, John E., *NJ*	
Hutchinson, Edward, *Mich*	
Ichord, Richard (Dick), *Mo.*	
Irwin, Donald J., *Conn*	
Jacobs, Andrew, Jr., *Ind*	
Jarman, John, *Okla*	
Joelson, Charles S., *NJ*	
Johnson, Albert W., *Pa*	
Johnson, Harold T., *Calif*	
Jonas, Charles Raper, *N.C*	
Jones, Paul C., *Mo*	1111 Army-Navy Dr., Arlington, Va.
Jones, Robert E., *Ala*	
Jones, Walter B., *N.C*	
Karsten, Frank M., *Mo*	
Karth, Joseph E., *Minn*	
Kastenmeier, Robert W., *Wis.*	
Kazen, Abraham, Jr., *Tex*	
Kee, James, *W. Va*	5441 16th Ave., Hyattsville, Md.
Keith, Hastings, *Mass*	5906 Harwick Rd., Woodacres, Md.
Kelly, Edna F. (Mrs.), *N.Y*	
King, Carleton J., *N.Y*	
King, Cecil R., *Calif*	
Kirwan, Michael J., *Ohio*	
Kleppe, Thomas S., *N. Dak*	
Kluczynski, John C., *Ill*	
Kornegay, Horace R., *N.C*	
Kupferman, Theodore R., *N.Y.*	
Kuykendall, Dan, *Tenn*	
Kyl, John, *Iowa*	
Kyros, Peter N., *Maine*	
Laird, Melvin R., *Wis*	
Landrum, Phil M., *Ga*	
Langen, Odin, *Minn*	
Latta, Delbert L., *Ohio*	
Leggett, Robert L., *Calif*	
Lennon, Alton, *N.C*	
Lipscomb, Glenard P., *Calif.*	
Lloyd, Sherman P., *Utah*	
Long, Clarence D., *Md*	

Appendix

Col. Amos L. Wright Assumes Command as Buffalo District Engineer for U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY P. SMITH III

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 11, 1967

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago I was pleased to meet with Col. Amos L. Wright, the new Buffalo district engineer assigned by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. As a result of our 2-hour meeting in Washington, I was greatly impressed with Colonel Wright's enthusiasm for the challenges that face him in the Buffalo area. His outstanding background and experience uniquely qualify him to undertake the heavy Corps of Engineers' responsibilities along the Niagara Frontier. I am certain that Colonel Wright will prove to be a fine successor to his most capable predecessor, Col. R. Wilson Neff.

In its August 30, 1967, edition, the Buffalo Evening News provides some insight into the character and attitudes of our new district engineer. I insert at this point in the RECORD the text of the very excellent Buffalo Evening News article:

NEW HEAD OF ARMY ENGINEERS LIKES CHALLENGES IN BUFFALO—ENTHUSIASTIC OVER PLANS FOR "TURNING OFF" AMERICAN FALLS, STUDY OF HARBOR DREDGING

(By Lee Coppola)

Most first-time visitors to Niagara Falls gaze in awe at the beauty of the thundering waters.

Not Amos L. Wright.

Everything the rocks that in recent years have toppled from the brink of the American Falls, he says: "I noticed there was no way to haul them out without building a road, and that would mar the scenery for awhile."

Amos L. Wright, colonel, U.S. Army Engineers, had never in his 43 years seen the Falls before moving to Grand Island three weeks ago. Now he finds himself responsible for the agency charged by the federal government with enhancing their beauty.

That agency, the Buffalo District Corps of Engineers, administers all waterways flowing into Lakes Erie and Ontario in a three-state area of 35,000 square miles.

"DON'T HAVE TO BE SCARED"

"Some people have said this area is dying," notes soft-spoken Col. Wright. "That doesn't necessarily have to be at all."

His assignment brought him to the Buffalo area for the first time, but he talks like a member of the Chamber of Commerce's Boost Buffalo Committee.

Water pollution headaches in Lake Erie can be licked, he says. "Look at the tremendous water resources this area has . . . and water is going to be more and more an important commodity as time goes by.

"With the good old American characteristic of improvisation and with planning and the help of industry, we don't have to be scared of all this talk that the Great Lakes are going dead and urban development problems are putting us back in the Stone Ages."

STAFF OF OVER 500

For him, commanding the Buffalo District Corps of Engineers, fulfills a career-long wait. "Ninety per cent of engineer officers think commanding a district is the best assignment in the corps," he explains.

To accomplish his mission, Col. Wright needs a workforce of more than 500 civil service employees, whom he calls "extremely loyal and competent public servants."

His deputy, Major Linwood E. Lufkin, is the only other military member of the district.

Col. Wright comes to Buffalo from staff officer duties for the Joint Chiefs of Staff in the Pentagon. His job was writing policy papers for the war in Vietnam, sometimes involving 60–80 hours a week.

As son of career civil service employees and as an Army officer for 22 years, Col. Wright has never lived more than eight years in one locale. He lists Logan, Utah, as his home of record, but lacks any trace of regional accent.

PLANS TO PITCH IN

Calm and reserved, he ponders at length before answering a question.

"I look forward to working here," he says. "Our challenge is just terrific. Federal and state and local agencies are going to find themselves co-operating even further in the future in making the best use of natural and man-made resources in this area."

Col. Wright awaits anxiously the proposed "dewatering" of the American Falls, tentatively planned next spring. "Our people will be clambering all over the place," studying the waterless brink and fallen rock below, he explains.

Asked if he would roll up shirtsleeves and pitch in, he replied with a resounding "why certainly."

WATER POLLUTION IS PROBLEM

As he puts it: "I want to get down there and look too. What engineer wouldn't want to see that?"

Perhaps the main problem faced by the district engineers concerns water pollution in Lake Erie. The Army engineers have been criticized in some circles for adding to pollution by each year moving tons of lake sludge from the waterfront waters farther out into the lake.

"Previously we took the position that our dredging operations weren't contributing to pollution, since all we were doing was moving the waste from one place to another. But now we want to find out if indeed there is any aggravation in our doing this," Col. Wright says.

To lick that particular problem, the Army engineers have commissioned the building of a disposal dike adjacent to the Small Boat Harbor. Other methods of disposing of the sludge are also being investigated.

THREE IN BUFFALO DISTRICT

Col. Wright feels optimistic the dredging problem can be solved, but "it's going to take some time. When the studies have been completed then we can compare and see what disposal method is best," he says.

His position as Buffalo district commander puts him at the head of a Corps pilot project designed to find economical methods for dredge disposal. The program, involving seven test sites on the Great Lakes, includes three sites in the Buffalo district.

Col. Wright was graduated from the United States Military Academy at West Point in 1945. A full colonel since July, the new boss of the Buffalo district has enjoyed "every single" assignment since then.

Particularly, he remembers duties with another engineer district, in Seattle; commanding an engineer battalion at Ft. Lewis, Wash. and "planning the defense of West Germany" as engineer plans officer for 7th Army.

PLAYS TENNIS AND SQUASH

He has a masters degree in Civil Engineering from the California Institute of Technology, and has also attended the Army War College.

A Mormon, he mentions singing as his favorite pastime, "chorale singing, like the Mormon Tabernacle Choir."

His wife, "my built-in accompanist," plays the piano and has performed in concert on the organ. Colonel and Mrs. Wright have five children, ranging in age from a girl, 19, to four year-old twin daughters. The colonel says he and his only son, 10, "are in the minority in our house."

Col. Wright, not an avid sportsman, plays tennis and squash "to stay in shape."

From the way he appears to throw himself into the complex tasks facing him, he had better have his rackets restrung. After all, it takes physical stamina to go "clambering" up and down the sides of a dried-out Niagara Falls.

Tribute to Forrest B. Smith, Sr., Prominent West Texas Leader

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 11, 1967

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, on Friday, August 4, 1967, Forrest Bowley Smith, Sr., of Andrews, Andrews County, in far west Texas, passed away at the home of a daughter at Garland, Dallas County, Tex.

Forrest B. Smith, Sr., a native of West Virginia; educated at Porter Military Academy and Virginia Military Institute; with his bachelor's degree in pharmacy from the Medical College of Virginia; a registered pharmacist for 53 years; a resident of Andrews, Andrews County, Tex., for 22 years; Andrews County Democratic chairman for many years; and a good personal friend of mine, exerted an influence over many counties in the western part of Texas. He was known statewide for his leadership in many political fights for better government in Texas. Forrest Smith carried his idealism with him to his drugstore and pharmacy every day of his life. He was articulate, bold, uninhibited by regressive forces that swirled around him.

Operating his business and practicing his profession of pharmacy in the heart of a rich oil county of western Texas, he molded the philosophy of that county to fit his own ideals and turned it away from that of more populous oil-producing counties adjoining his.

Forrest Smith was known as "Mr. Democrat" not only in Andrews County, but also in many adjoining counties and areas of western Texas.

Forrest Smith never temporized; he was bold and forthright. His personal appearance was accurately described and recorded in a letter to the editor of the Andrews County News, written by Dan Sullivan, an Andrews attorney and elected member of the school board of the Andrews, Tex., Independent School District.

James Roberts, editor of the Andrews County News, paid a beautiful tribute in "Drifting Sands" on Sunday, August 6, 1967. The names of the 10 surviving children of Forrest Smith were printed in the account of his passing away printed by the Andrews County News of Sunday, August 6, 1967.

Mr. President, Forrest Smith is the kind of man who does not come along every year in every city in every county in every State. He is one of those rare individuals having a completely independent personality and independent judgment, and the courage to stand up to defend both. He had the intellectual acumen and attributes of character to put his imprint upon an area, a city, a county, and a portion of our population.

I honor Forrest Smith for his leadership and for his courage, both of which are needed in increasing degree in our democracy.

Another friend of Forrest Smith, Mr. Roy Bennett, county judge of Andrews County, Tex., has written an account of Forrest Smith in his letter to me of September 8, 1967, and tells of Forrest Smith's zeal and compassion. He states that Forrest Smith's compassion for his fellow man was the guiding force in his life.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the account of the passing away of Forrest Smith, published in the Andrews County News of Sunday, August 6, 1967; the editorial comment about Forrest Smith, under the title of "Drifting Sands," written by James Roberts, of the Andrews County News, published on the same date; a letter to the editor of the Andrews County News by Dan Sullivan, member of the school board of the Andrews Independent School District, Andrews, Tex.; and a letter to me from Roy D. Bennett, county judge of Andrews County, Tex., under date of September 8, 1967, be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Attack Fatal to "Mr. Democrat"

Andrews "Mr. Democrat" Forrest Bowley Smith, Sr. died late Friday in Garland, Texas at the home of a daughter.

Funeral services will be held in Andrews at 6 p.m. Monday at Means Memorial Methodist Church. Rev. Don Hungerford of St. John's Episcopal in Odessa will officiate.

Smith was Democratic County Chairman for Andrews for many years, a contributor to many Democratic campaigns and a personal friend of Senator Ralph Yarborough and other Democrats.

Born in Capon Bridge, West Virginia on December 17, 1892. Smith was 74 years old when he died. He attended Porter Military Academy and received his B.S. Degree from Medical College of Virginia.

He was a registered pharmacist for 53 years and moved to Andrews in June 1945. Smith operated Smith Drug here until last year when he sold out and retired.

Smith was also named to "Who's Who in American Politics." Although ill health prevented him from being very active as county chairman the past two years, the local Democrats kept him to the end, electing him to serve again last year.

Survivors include ten children. They are Jack Smith of Pampa, Dr. Jerome A. Smith of Lubbock, F. B. Smith, Jr. of Lawton, Oklahoma, Miss Virginia Smith and Mrs. Geraldine Turnbow of Andrews, Tommy Lynn Smith of Houston, Johnny Smith of Midland, Emory and Bobby Smith of Andrews and Mrs. Sally McComic of Garland. Thirteen grandchildren also survive.

Drifting Sands

(By James Roberts)

In this day and age, nothing is impossible . . . except trying to remove your name from a mailing list.

With the passing of Forrest Smith, a real old-line politician image ended.

Whether you agreed with Forrest on his politics or not, you had to admire and respect him because he stood up, consistently and constantly, to be counted.

Every other year, when the state and national elections hove into view, Forrest chose, picked and decided on his man . . . and he was his candidate from then on—thru thin, thick, or political mud.

Forrest probably never straddled a fence in his life and he had little patience with anyone who did—voter or candidate.

We always respected the man for the simple reason that he was one of the few all-out liberals we ever knew who put his money where his mouth was.

We'd bet dollars to sinkers that about the time Ralph Yarborough was making his second bid for the governorship, Forrest Smith was about the only liberal in Andrews who believed strongly enough in Yarborough's candidacy to send greenbacks to the liberal's war chest.

Most liberals—and conservatives—talk a pretty good political game in March and April but few are the ones that can be counted on in November for money.

We seldom agreed with Forrest politically but we liked him and we respected him because be enjoyed and played the game of politics to the hilt.

The state and national political races will be just a bit duller on the local level because of his passing.

Letter to the Editor

To many of us the death of Forrest Smith Friday was the end of an era. A couple of years ago ill health forced Forrest to sell that venerable local institution, "Smith City Drug" on North Main Street, the unofficial Democratic Headquarters in "off-years" and election years alike. The host of us who drank coffee at least twice a day at Smith Drug had lost a second home. Part of the joy of living in Andrews had been lost and has never been regained.

Forrest was a good, loyal and steadfast friend to many and words alone are grossly inadequate to express our deep feeling of personal loss.

Voted "Democrat of the Year" in 1963, Forrest never allowed business to interfere with his politics. His good friend, Senator Ralph Yarborough, commented on that occasion that Forrest was the very first contributor to his campaign for governor in 1952.

Forrest could spin hours of funny stories about the old "boom town" days of Borger, Rankin, Wink and McCamey. He lived life to the hilt and never pretended to be any better than he was. I never knew anyone who was down on his luck who ever left Smith Drug without a meal under his belt or a dollar in his pocket.

A memory that will never fade in my mind is election day, any election day, at Smith Drug. Forrest decked out in his bowler hat, red vest and suspenders, cigar clamped firmly in his teeth, an air of excitement, local politicians coming in and out all day long, rumors flying about who was ahead at the polls, last minute electioneering, worried looks and back slapping. Election day will never be as much fun again.

Goodby old friend—from all of us.

September 8, 1967.

Senator Ralph Yarborough,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Yarborough: I want to advise you of the recent passing of one of our old friends, Forrest Smith of Andrews. Memory takes me back over the years bringing to mind so many of the good things that Forrest accomplished during his lifetime. As you are aware, Forrest was one of your most stalwart supporters and a leader in West Texas in your behalf. Forrest was a typical Southern Gentlemen. He attended school at the Virginia Military Academy and received a degree in pharmacy from the University of Virginia. At an early age he came to West Texas and most of his adult life was spent in this area. I recall so many stories he told me of his grandparents, of their life, of Virginia, and the southern way of life. I could almost re-live with them some of the hardships and yet many of the accomplishments of their day and of his early manhood.

My first intimate relationship with Mr. Smith began in 1952 when he was your campaign manager for the office of Governor of Texas. He not only was campaign manager, he was also finance chairman, telephone chairman, block chairman and "get-out-the-vote" chairman for the county. If you recall in this particular race your percentage of the votes in Andrews County was greater than that of many other West Texas areas. This was satisfying to Forrest, for he felt he had been fighting for good government and for someone who had the interest of the State of Texas and the nation at heart. Forrest was the type man when he formed a friendship, it was for life. Those of us who live after him can not erect a monument to him, but he has left many monuments in the things he has done for others that will live in the memory of all of us.

When I think of the years we were associated together, I think of the Greek word that would best describe Forrest. He had Sphlagesnezthai, or translated from the Greek, compassion. He had compassion for the poor, for the underpriviledged, for the Mexican, Negro or for anyone we would classify as underpriviledged. His zeal in this direction is unmatched. This same Greek word is used in the Bible when it speaks of Jesus raising the young boy from the dead, it was said he had "compassion". Also this same word is used in a description of the Good Samaritan, that this Samaritan had "compassion." Forrest was a member of the Episcopal Church and was laid to rest under the guidance of the local Vicar.

I feel that long after we are dead and whatever age or clime and by whatever it is called the monuments he has left will live throughout the ages because of the compassion he had for his fellowman while he was here on earth.

None of us here can take his place but he would want me to assure you that we will do our best to try to accomplish for good government the goals he had. A great man has left us.

Sincerely yours,

ROY D. BENNETT,
Andrews County Judge.

A Democratic Leader Speaks Out

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 11, 1967

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following excellent speech by Mr. Richard B. Stoner, Columbus, Ind., outstanding industrialist, former Ninth District Indiana Democratic chairman and now a member of the National Democratic Committee.

Speaking at the annual meeting of the Indiana Democratic Editorial Association at French Lick last August 26, Mr. Stoner cited the Party's programs and progress "from Jefferson to Johnson."

Addressing himself primarily to the coming municipal elections in Indiana, Mr. Stoner charged that it will be with local government, local leadership that our pressing domestic problems will be met and solved.

The text of Mr. Stoner's excellent speech is as follows:

A DEMOCRATIC LEADER SPEAKS OUT

The Editorial Association has tonight put into operation Larry O'Brien's law—"the more expensive the meal—the less expensive the speaker." We in the 9th District—I trust Gov.—Orange County is still in the 9th District—are always grateful to the IDEA for this annual opportunity to host the leaders of our party. Again, we thank you for including us in your program. It is satisfying to know that once a year we can be with a sympathetic press.

The Democratic Editorial Association has nearly 90 years of service to our state. Although with few members—many of the papers with limited circulation—its voice has been effective in carrying our message across the state. Our party organization is appreciative of your continued support through these years—especially the opportunity your annual meeting gives us to open the fall campaign—3 out of every 4 years—at this historic resort, because here at French Lick the politicians can bend elbows with the press without fear of misinterpretation.

Someone once said we are governed by men and newspapers. I am not always sure how much we are governed but I never doubt the influence of the newspaper.

Like the IDEA, the Democratic Party also claims a long tradition—175 years this year. Although there may be some question as to the leigtimate date of the birth of our party, there never has been any doubt as to its vigor and vitality from Jefferson to Johnson.

The Party was born as a result of the struggle over the Bill of Rights and the principle of individual liberty has been the guiding star in the Democratic constellation. Historically, our role has been one of optimism. We have believed in change—unafraid to take the risks. We have believed in the inevitable improvement of the world and its people. Jefferson championed the inherent worth of each man. He believed that given the facts, the people would use the right of self-government correctly. To educate the people, Jefferson called for the founding of schools, libraries and *newspapers*. Through *newspapers* and speeches, the small farmers, workers and frontiersmen used their votes to give themselves a voice in the government—we have always been the champion of the minority and less fortunate of our society. But so much for history—as a Party, we do not dote on our history—we lend our energies to the challenges of today and finding the direction for the future.

In 1967, the fabric of American democracy is strained—torn in many cases. The greatest strain is in our cities. We face a grave national crisis. The most urgent domestic crisis since the Civil War. We have become an urban nation—70% of our people live in our cities. The crucial test for democracy lies in the cities. Indiana is no exception. Since this is the year, as we are all aware, for municipal elections in our State, it is well for us to consider this specific challenge to our Democratic party.

The problems that we will face in our city administrations next year—from Madison to East Chicago, and Kendallville to Evansville—differ only in degree. They are the problems of water and air pollution, noise, poverty, ignorance, unemployment, minority representation, racial unrest, sanitation, traffic, streets, sewers, parks, industrial development, etc. They all require funds—money—but just as Mother Hubbard, you too will find the cupboard bare. Where do we go from here?

To you Mayors—the local leaders of the Democratic Party—these problems must become challenges—opportunities. The solution lies not in Washington nor Indianapolis, but in your own city first, with the idea—then the State and Federal Government can help with the assistance of the Branigin and Johnson Democratic administrations. What will be the initial problem at home?

First, *change*—the resistance to change—will be foremost. We are all slaves to the same routine day after day from the time we get up in the morning. We like the familiarity of the same toothpaste to the same coffee cup. But, we cannot continue to fight our city problems the same old way. For we have failed there. First, *we* must change. Open our minds. Accept as fundamental—that the only constant in our society is change—there always is a better way of doing everything we do, performing every service. Our party has moved this country forward when we have accepted this challenge.

To obtain the change requires ideas. To get the ideas we need to enlist the aid of all our people. The small businessman on Main Street, the labor leaders, the industrial leaders, the professional community—the doctor, teachers and lawyers—the housewife and the young men and women of our community. They will be reluctant to contribute. Why? Because our society has made it popular to criticize the dedicated community leader rather than to support those who are giving of themselves to others. As you seek out the help in the community, *your role* is *that of leadership*. Leadership in solving the problems of the city must come from the city itself. The local community, under your guidance, can provide that absolute essential ingredient. Most of our problems are best challenged where they arise—at the local level. They are best dealt with by the people who are there—who know at first hand the people and the circumstances concerned. That means programs and policies and projects locally inspired, locally developed and administered.

The newspaper also plays a vital role in the solution of the problem. Its role is *not* to merely point out that the new approach is different, costs more and, therefore, is bad. Its role is *not* to criticize anyone who invests his personal time and talent. Its role must be one of *constructive positive support*—certainly to point out the problems, then to champion the efforts to achieve a solution. This means careful analysis of the purpose of the program, its objectives, the extent of the program, and the cost. This role of energetically supporting the efforts of community leadership earns for the newspaper its deserved position of leadership.

The problems that we must face will not always be ours alone to solve. The mounting costs of duplication of governmental services require our giving to the cities the power for them to decide for themselves what form of government best meets the needs. This means the township trustee, competing law enforcement agencies, highway departments, and other services have to be re-examined on a metropolitan or city concept. Given this freedom to act, the cities must also receive the financial freedom to accomplish the results. We cannot live in the last third of the 20th Century operating under a vehicle created in the middle third of the 19th. Constitutional changes are required. We must ascertain our need for constitutional changes at the local level and then initiate a move for a Constitutional Convention to up-date the State Constitution. The dogmas of the past are inadequate for the stresses and strains of the present—and the future. We must adapt to new situations with new approaches to meet the opportunities of the new way of life.

The Johnson administration will provide the framework for attacking the problem of the ghettos and slums, but only a beginning can be made in Washington. The fruition of solving the problems lies with each of us locally. This is not solely a problem for Washington. Just as our interstate highway system could never have become a reality had we not provided a detailed plan at the federal level with trust-fund financing and state participation to make it a reality. Consideration is being given to an approach to our urban problem through the creation of a trust-fund for urban development on a similar basis, using federal with matching state and private funds, to meet established standards. We can develop a partnership between the private enterprise system and government to make it financially attractive for the private enterprise system to become actively involved in solving the problems of the city. This type of joint venture, creative approach is the way we must meet this problem. It will not be an overnight solution—our interstate system moving rapidly toward completion under both Gov. Welsh and Gov. Branigin—has not been accomplished overnight, either. Although we have had tremendous support in Washington from Sen. Hartke (as a member of the Committee on Banking and Finance) and Sen. Bayh (on the Public Works Committee) and our Congressional delegation.

Our Party must be broadly based to incorporate the views of all Americans. We must, if we rae to remain true to our heritage, champion the rights of the minorities—challenge business and industry to actively make employment and promotional opportunities possible. It requires more than lip service. This means action. We also must encourage labor to remove restrictive union membership practices. If we are to merit the continued support of the electorate as the one truly representative party, we must in fact be that party!

The Democratic Party has emerged as the party of experimentation and ideas—whether it was under the leadership of Jackson, Roosevelt, Kennedy, McNutt or Branigin. If we look across the nation, we see the great majority of American cities are led by vigorous Democratic mayors—Boston, Philadelphia, Indianapolis, Chicago, Los Angeles. We are the party of urban government. This role has been earned by recognition of the problems and coming up with the solution. When we win in the urban areas, we elect our governors, senators, congressmen and—yes—the President—we need only to look to the 1960 election to see that the cities made John F. Kennedy President of the United States. Recognizing this, the State Committee, under the dynamic leadership of Gordon St. Angelo, has concentrated attention on our 112 candidates for Mayor. This new relationship which Gordon is developing will strengthen our Party for 1968—both through the organization at the county and district levels but also in the statewide races. After the fall election we will expect you Mayors to organize into an effective, supporting organization for our state administration.

In come areas of our party tonight there is lethargy, apathy—even defeatism. We can overcome this attitude by motivation—the role of the Democratic Party has been to take the idea and translate it into action—to effectively help his neighbor.When the leadership is convinced the cause is right, the people are inspired and follow effective leadership. Then their participation removes the lethargy and apathy.

As I reflect on the accomplishments of the 89th session of Congress, I am proud to be a Democrat—to be a member of the party that enacted into law the most significant and far-reaching benefits for all our people.

Education.—aid to secondary and elementary schools.

Medicare.—providing protection for the elderly against hospital costs.

Agricultural.—providing funds for rural water systems and community development.

Health and Safety.—creation of safety standards for cars and establishing standards to reduce air and water pollution.

Minimum Wage.—increased and extended coverage to 8 million new workers.

Bayh Amendment for presidential continuity.

Enactment of effective Civil Rights legislation.

These are just a few of the accomplishments of our Democratic Congress—whose leadership posts include Sen. Hartke and Sen. Bayh and our 5 outstanding Congressmen.

In Indiana we Democrats have additional reasons to be proud for Gov. Roger Branigin's leadership has established a brilliant record of accomplishment both in the legislative and administrative areas. Under the legislative guidance of Dick Bodine, our party pioneered in scholarship assistance, provided additional funds for education, and championed significant advances in mental health and civil rights.

We have also constructed at a record rate new highways and improved existing routes. We have made extensive improvements in our state parks—promoting tourism and industry. Tonight our Governor is held in the highest esteem nationally because of the success of his administration. We are proud to work with Gov. Branigin as our leader in the approaching municipal elections. He will personally be actively campaigning throughout the state for our Mayors.

As a Mayor, you have one of the most difficult roles in politics—for you are closest to the people. If my garbage isn't picked up, if my street light is out, if the snow blocks my driveway, if the street is dirty from yesterday's grass clippings—I know whom to call—whether it's a problem for the dog catcher or the street department—the Mayor is it. You never get away from your constituency—they are with you always—everywhere. This gives you the best opportunity to mold public opinion. You can bring together the complete resources of your city to get the ideas and the solutions—the academic, business, labor, church, agriculture leaders all are known to you and willing to help. You have only to ask them. Start people thinking about the problems. As you develop your organization and administration, remember that the average age of our electorate has dropped from 32 years in 1960 to 27 years. There are 22 million Americans in the age group of 21 to 35. As a party we want and need the active participation of our Youth. Just as Pepsi-Cola advertises, "think young," our Democratic Party must align itself with the younger generation. With 6 teen-agers in my own household, I find this a very close-at-hand challenge to me personally.

Both the National and State Committees have recently established Youth Divisions. President Johnson summarized our action when he said, "The treasure of America today, as always, is its young people. We must not permit that treasure to be lost or wasted."

As a Mayor, you will be working with Gov. Branigin and his administration and Lt. Gov. Rock in bringing new industry into Indiana and expanding the industrial development of these industries already here and continuing our building a new and better Indiana. Based on my experience, these industrial leaders will be looking at your city as a future location if they are convinced *first* that your schools are the best—for an industry cannot attract young people to the community if that community does not provide the best educational opportunities for the children—*second*, the recreational and cultural facilities that exist—and, *third*, an industry demands effective local government that faces the issues and is willing to experiment and achieve the results. Any industry is seeking a community that is *not the cheapest* but the best of its size in America. They want a city where the ablest and best young families want to live—a community that is open in every single respect to persons of every race, color and opinion, that makes them feel welcome and at home here—a community which will offer their children the best education available anywhere—a community of strong churches, genuine cultural interests, exciting recreational opportunities—a community whose citizens will not tolerate poverty for others, nor slums in their midst—a community with adequate health services. No such community can be created without city government which works boldly—ahead of its problems, and not always struggling to catch up—without money sufficient to get the job done, and without a newspaper that recognizes the problem and supports the forces of constructive leadership trying to solve these problems.

The industrial development that helps underwrite the costs of the community is not for *cheap education nor inadequate* or *poorly-paid* government nor *second-rate* facilities or low taxes. Their concern is to get the most for their dollar to build your city into the best in the Nation.

Our role as a party is to continue to develop the plans for the future, to continue devising ways to meet the needs and problems of all the people, to continue enlisting our communities' best talent in the unceasing search for new and better ways to accomplish our goal and dreams for our cities—for it is finally with you, our Mayors, that American democracy will succeed or fail.

There is only *one* party in our country today whose leadership can answer to all these challenges, to all these needs of our people, whose approach is optimistic, whose recourse is *action,* not just talk or criticism. For our party and our tradition has always called on the best in our people to perform our duty with courage and conviction, to enrich the lives of all our citizens.

You in this room tonight are members of that Party, are leaders in our exciting, progressive, young, energetic Democratic organization.

We have the programs, we have the imagination, we have the leaders, we have the people, and we have the initiative. We pledge to you, Sen. Hartke, Bayh, Congressmen, to you Gov. Branigin, and to our State Chairman, Gordon, and Vice Chairman, Agnes . . . to you, we pledge to carry the measures of progress and change that have developed under your sponsorship into the campaigns of every city in Indiana so that our cities may become model, ideal cities and our State may assume its rightful role of leadership in our Nation. To that kind of commitment, we know the people of Indiana will respond.

Training National Guardsmen for Riot Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 11, 1967

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, we have heard a great deal of criticism of the National Guard lately, much of it resulting from the role given Guard units in the Detroit riots this summer.

The National Guard plays a vital role in our national defense, and its response to various emergencies in peacetime and its record in wartime proves its worth without question.

Despite this undisputed record, the Guard continues to come under attack by domestic critics. An editorial entitled "Hard on the Guard," published in the State newspaper, Columbia, S.C., on Tuesday, September 5, 1967, serves to answer some of these attacks.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Hard on the Guard

Increased and improved riot control training for National Guard, Reserve and Regular Army forces is a prudent move. It comes a bit late, but now is better than never.

But it is regrettable that the National Guard, at this time of extreme internal trial in our nation, is coming under a barrage of abuse for the conduct of units deployed to quell riots in Newark and Detroit.

Perhaps some Guardsmen weren't paragons of military virtue as they ducked sniper bullets. Perhaps some of them were "inexperienced, nervous and trigger-happy," as charged by Lt. Gen. John L. Throckmorton, commander of the Regular Army forces in Detroit. After all, they are only part-time soldiers.

Few National Guardsmen have been trained for or subjected to this new form of rioting, this so-called urban guerrilla warfare. It is a lot different from controlling an unruly crowd.

Perhaps Throckmorton's crack professional troops were better disciplined and better trained. They were expected to be.

The point is that there seems to be some effort to make a scapegoat out of the Guard.

The President's special commission on riots, expected to take almost a year to analyze the causes of the disorders, required only a few days to recommend that the Guard needed more Negro members and more sophisticated riot control training.

But does the fault lie primarily with the Guard or with the powers-that-be in Washington from President Johnson and Secretary of Defense McNamara on down?

McNamara's continued efforts to reduce and downgrade the Guard and the Reserve have caused uncertainty among "citizen soldiers." Morale has been lowered; good men have gotten out.

Furthermore, Washington has had plenty of warning that trouble was brewing in the slums of America. The awful outbreak in Watts, requiring an outpouring of Guardsmen, came two years ago. Fire-bombing, sniping and the like were not introduced this year; they were only refined.

There were many open predictions from Black Power leaders that this would be a long, hot summer. And yet the Administration, not wanting to lose one urban vote, plugged away with its social programs, which offered little hope of quick results.

It made little or no effort to train police and military units in the new techniques needed to cope with this new brand of warfare in the streets.

The current effort, although welcome, is a bit like locking the barn door after the horse is gone.

It takes a lot of gall to point the finger of blame at the Guard. The administration must take its share.

Japanese-American Citizens League

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SIDNEY R. YATES
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 11, 1967

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege on September 3 to attend the banquet of the national convention of the Japanese-American Citizens League in Chicago. It was a most impressive occasion, for it marked a quarter of a century since the dark days of 1942 when Americans of Japanese ancestry were uprooted from their homes in California and other Western States, without trial or hearing of any kind, and dispersed. Most of the dispossessed were placed behind barbed wire fences in so-called relocation centers. Others found their way to inland cities such as Chicago. It is a source of great pride to me that in our city they found hospitality instead of hostility, and to mark their appreciation of the friendly reception given them by the people of Chicago the convention voted to make a gift in gratitude—an imaginative, wonderful gift of 1,000 Japanese cherry trees to be planted in and through Lincoln Park in Chicago. The delicate shimmering beauty of the lovely flowers will remind the people of Chicago and the myriads of visitors who will be attracted, of the good will of a grateful segment of Americans for friendship shown them by fellow Americans.

Chicago is known as the City of the Big Heart. It lived up to its name in that terrible period when the ill-treated tempest-tossed American of Japanese ancestry needed a helping hand. The newcomers wanted only the opportunity to become a part of our community, to work and to make their contribution as decent, thrifty, respectable hard-working citizens. Given that opportunity, they proved themselves to a superlative degree. Chicagoans share their pride in their accomplishments in their new home.

Mr. Speaker, presenting the JACL gift to the city was a distinguished member of the Chicago bar who himself had been one of the uprooted in 1942, Mr. Thomas Masuda. The following is Mr. Masuda's speech of presentation:

JAPANESE-AMERICAN CITIZENS LEAGUE

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Ambassador, Madame Shimoda, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen:

The purpose of my attendance here this evening, namely to represent the local Japanese-American community in making a special presentation to the City of Chicago, perhaps calls for a short review of history.

Twenty-five years ago, under pressure of war hysteria, the federal government through its military department ordered that all persons of Japanese ancestry living on the West Coast, more than a hundred thousand in number, citizens and aliens alike, be evacuated and confined in ten camps, euphemistically called War Relocation Projects. These actually were concentration camps surrounded by barbed wire fences with armed military guards standing sentinel. All of us who lived through those trying days felt as though the very roof over our homes had collapsed upon us.

It was not long, however, before the government realized the mistake it had made. For one thing, what a great waste of manpower it was to keep under lock and key a group of people, the majority of whom were American citizens, who had the reputation of being industrious and law-abiding, who were not being accused of any crime, whose only fault was that they looked like the enemy across the Pacific.

The voice of reason and the proverbial American sense of justice and fairplay were beginning to prevail. Numerous individuals and organizations in the areas removed from the West Coast raised their voices in protest over the injustice being inflicted upon a group of innocent people and offered help and cooperation in their resettlement. The government then mobilized its efforts upon a program of widespread resettlement.

To this heartland of America, to this dynamic city of Chicago, many of us came. At one time there were approximately 25,000 of us here. At present it is estimated that more than 13,000 remain. Those of us who have withstood the rigors of Chicago's winter weather have sunk our roots deep. Over the years, with the help, the friendliness and the understanding of the good citizens of Chicago, and with the countless opportunities that a great metropolitan area such as this has to offer, we have thrived and found life's fulfillment here.

The Japanese-American community is grateful and has been wanting for some time to express that gratitude to the city in some form. Ever since the community in 1960 observed the centennial of the ratification of the first Treaty of Commerce and Amity between Japan and the United States this matter has been under serious consideration. Inasmuch as this year marks the 25th year since our evacuation from the West Coast and this convention has chosen for its theme "A Quarter Century After—", it seemed that this occasion tonight would be an appropriate time for us to express our appreciation in a tangible form.

The committee working on this project conferred with Mrs. Elizabeth McLean, Assistant Commissioner of Public Works and Co-Chairman of the Chicago Beautiful Committee, and with Mr. Erwin Weiner, General Superintendent of the Chicago Park District, their enthusiasm for the idea of planting flowering Japanese trees in certain park areas and their helpful suggestions and offer of cooperation finally resulted in the decision to present the city with the trees.

At this time I would like to digress a moment to read a telegram we received from Mr. Irwin Weiner. He would like to have been present tonight but due to a prior commitment he could not be here. I am now reading from the telegram:

"Sorry a previous commitment makes it impossible for Mrs. Weiner and me to join you in welcoming Ambassador Takeso Shimoda. We are honored to have been invited in behalf of the Commissioners of the Chicago Park District. We appreciate very much the Japanese tree presentation and will be happy to work out all necessary details. Please express our best wishes to the new Ambassador."

Resuming my presentation, Mr. Hideo Sasaki of Watertown, Massachusetts, an eminent landscape architect and Chairman of the Department of Landscape Architecture at Harvard University, was called upon to survey the parks in Chicago and to make recommendations for planting. Yosh Nakazawa and Associates, a local architectural firm, has donated the services of one of its architets, Mr. Harry E. Patterson, to prepare a rendering of the proposed landscape and a site plan as recommended by Mr. Sasaki.

Although we originally had in mind the presentation of about a thousand Japanese cherry trees to be planted in Lincoln Park between North Avenue and Belmont, a conference with the Park District resulted in the suggestion that we do not limit ourselves to just cherry trees but rather intersperse them with a variety of Japanese trees such as crabapple, dogwood and maple. This plan would give some protection to the less hardy cherry trees and at the same time would stagger the flowering period from spring through fall, giving the people of Chicago a longer period of enjoying Nature's beauty.

It was also suggested that the area for planting these trees be around the lagoon between Fullerton and Belmont just west of the Outer Drive. The choice of trees and their planting and subsequent care are to be left to the discretion of the Park District. May these trees take root deeply and in the years to come contribute to the beautification of our city. May they also serve as a symbol expressing our hopes for lasting peace and goodwill between Japan and the United States.

Representing Mayor Daley and the City of Chicago in the acceptance of this presentation, Mrs. Elizabeth McLean, Assistant Commissioner of Public Works, whom I have previously mentioned, is here with us tonight. For thirteen years she has been with the City of Chicago, the last two years of which, before becoming Assistant Commissioner of Public Works, she was Chief Research and Planning Engineer in the Department of Public Works. With her is her husband, Mr. Charles H. McLean, who is Assistant District Engineer for the Illinois Division of Highways. They were the first husband and wife team to become registered professional engineers in the United States. May I now ask Mrs. McLean to come to the podium.

Mrs. McLean, on behalf of a very grateful Japanese American community of Chicago, I hereby present to the City of Chicago a gift of Japanese flowering trees to be delivered at any time upon order of the Park District, and as a token of this gift may I present to you this rendering of the proposed landscape, and also the site plan for these trees which is on display just outside of this dining room in the east foyer.

Indiana Pastor's Memorial Day Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VANCE HARTKE
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, September 11, 1967

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I invite attention to a Memorial Day address given by the Reverend Ernest C. Klein in Huntington, Ind., on May 30, 1967. Rev. Klein is pastor of St. Peter's United Church of Christ and also serves as chaplain for the Army Reserve 12th Special Forces Group.

Members of Congress may find this address helpful in particular because of the historical information it contains. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Memorial Day Address, May 30, 1967, at Huntington, Ind., by Ernest C. Klein

It is fitting that the veterans organizations sponsor this Memorial Day service. Ninety-nine years ago today, the first official Memorial Day (sometimes called Decoration Day) was observed by order of the Grand Army of the Republic, an organization of Union soldiers who had fought in the Civil War. General John Alexander Logan was then Commander-in-Chief of this newly formed veteran's group. What started as a Memorial to the Civil War dead, has now been expanded to memorialize the war dead from all wars. Since that time, it has been the custom to read General Order Number Eleven and Lincoln's Gettysburg Address at all public services held by the G.A.R. on Memorial Day.

My interest in Memorial Day began when I became pastor of a church in Boalsburg, Pennsylvania which jointly sponsored the cemetery where three women—Emma Hunter, Sophie Keller and Mrs. Meyer placed flowers on the graves of their departed soldiers July 4, 1864. A sign on the edge of the cemetery makes the claim that this is the Birthplace of Memorial Day. As a matter of record, a total of twenty-four places have been named in connection with the origin of Memorial Day.

One of the oldest, is the Jackson, Mississippi, claim where Sue Landon Vaughan, a descendent of President John Adams, put out a call to decorate Confederate graves on April 26, 1865. Her act is commemorated in stone on a monument erected 1888 on the old State Capital grounds at Jackson, now known as "Confederate Park."

James Redpath, a newspaper reporter who became superintendent of the Schools of Charleston, South Carolina during the days of reconstruction, tells of the decorating of 257 graves of Union soldiers by the families of former slaves on May 1, 1865. Properly speaking, this was a cemetery dedication.

Perhaps the most beautiful is the event at Columbus, Mississippi, where Miss Moreton, Mrs. Fontaine and Mrs. Hill gathered on April 25, 1866, in Friendship cemetery to decorate the graves of their fallen soldiers. It was here that their additional act of decorating the graves of forty Federal soldiers buried there, brought about the writing of the poem, The Blue and Gray" by Francis Miles Finch, an attorney in Ithaca, New York. Mr. Finch had read of the act in a New York newspaper, so he included a historical note with his poem when it was published in the Atlantic Monthly in 1867. No doubt this poem did much to make this event the best known of all celebrations of Memorial Day.

While the three women were making plans in Columbus, Mississippi, plans were being made by some women in Columbus, Georgia. As a result, a Mrs. Mary Williams wrote a letter in the Columbus, Georgia newspaper on March 12, 1866. Her appeal to dedicate one day to cover the graves with flowers was reprinted throughout the South. April 26th was chosen because that was the anniversary of the surrender of General Joseph E. Johnston, the last of the forces of the Confederate Army. In Linwood Cemetery in Columbus, Georgia, a tombstone marks the grave of Lizzie Rutherford Ellis, crediting her with the suggestion for originating Memorial Day.

In Waterloo, New York, Henry C. Welles suggested such an observance, but General John B. Murray is called the "Father of Memorial Day." The date of this celebration is May 5, 1866. Their claim is qualified as the "First formal village-wide observance of the day."

Richmond, Virginia has several variations. One is that Cassandra Moncure Lyne decorated graves or else had a part in decorating graves in Oakwood and Hollywood cemeteries. The date of May 10th was chosen because this was the anniversary of the death of Stonewall Jackson. Some states in the South still commemorate June the third as Memorial Day, as it is the birthplace of Jefferson Davis, President of the Confederacy. Belle Isle in James River near Richmond is mentioned. Winchester, Virginia had a Women's Memorial Society and observed June 6, 1866, the anniversary of the death of General Turner Ashby. It must be pointed out that Southern women established Memorial Societies to organize the return of their dead soldiers to a burial place near home.

Petersburg, Virginia observed June 9, 1866 on the anniversary of the assault made in 1864. In Blandford Cemetery, the stone on the grave of Nora Fontaine (Davidson) Maury credits her as "originator of Memorial Day which was inspiration for the National Decoration Day." Mrs. John A. Logan, wife of the Commander-in-Chief of the G.A.R. recounted more than once of her trip in March 1868 to see the battle fields around Richmond and Petersburg. Because the General, who was serving in Congress at the time, was busy with his legislative duties and thus unable to make the trip, Mrs. Logan described the trip to him, giving him the details about the decorated graves and tiny flags. According to Mrs. Logan, General Order Number Eleven was written at that time.

Another version given by Logan's Adjutant General of the G.A.R.—N. P. Chipman, claims that a comrade of German background from Cincinnati suggested the custom of decorating the graves with flowers. Chapman says he wrote most of General Order Eleven.

Nevertheless, it was reported by several of his friends and again repeated in his funeral sermon that John A. Logan considered General Order Eleven the "proudest act of his life." One historian says that no one act did more to remove public prejudice against the G.A.R. than did the inauguration of Memorial Day.

One year ago today, it was my privilege to be in Carbondale, Illinois, to take part in the Dedication of the Flag Bank. This was also the centennial observance of the Memorial service held there April 29, 1866. In that service over 100 years ago, returned veterans planned and participated in decorating the graves of their buddies who had fallen in battle. Significant is the fact that the speaker was General John A. Logan who would later become the Commander-in-Chief of the G.A.R. to sponsor Memorial Day services over the nation. This intent of Logan's combined with the suggestion of his wife, could well have been the conditions under which Memorial Day was born.

Lloyd Lewis, a newspaperman and friend of Carl Sandberg, suggested that Memorial Day was estaiblshed in the wild delirium following the funeral of Abraham Lincoln. According to Lewis, "The greater the number of claimants for its birthplace, the plainer the proof that the Republic as asking vaguely with eagerness to speak its grief after four years of killing. The funeral of the war's greatest figure points the way." Every local observance to decorate graves was interpreted to be a spontaneous outburst of the sentiment that had been crystallized at the burial drama of Lincoln. In the official celebrations of the G.A.R. those first two years (1868–69), Lewis could see the nation's attempt to reproduce the pomp and tearful grandeur of Lincoln's funeral.

With this background you can understand that it is difficult to draw a simple conclusion about the origin of Memorial Day. Regardless of where historians may decide to mark the origin of Memorial Day, it will continue to be of worth only so long as we remember. Memory is that thing which sets us apart as human beings. Tradition is a country's memory. It helps its people to be aware of themselves as citizens and of their responsibilities to their fellow citizens.

This then is the purpose of Memorial Day: to rememebr those who gave their lives that this nation might live. We need these ties to our past which remind us of the cost of freedom. When Memorial Day was first proposed in the days following the Civil War, one editor suggested that money should be spent for *flour* for the windows rather than *flowers* for the graves. This attitude even existed among the disciples when a certain woman anointed Jesus with precious ointment. Some thought that the ointment should have been sold and that the money should have been given to the poor. But Jesus said, "Let her alone . . . Wherever the gospel is preached in the whole world, what she has done, will be told in memory of her."

Memorial Day is a challenge to the nation to pause and to recall the sacrifices and bravery of her servicemen. Thousands of wooden crosses, gleaming white, mark the resting places in twenty-five military cemeteries scattered over five continents and many islands. They remind us of another cross that stool on a hill where the Prince of Glory died. "Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends." There are more than one million names on the honor rolls of American war dead and the number grows, day by day. In all the ninety-nine years that Memorial Day has been observed, the sacrifice of our young men on the field of battle has never been questioned as it is today. As Senator Vance Hartke from our State has put it, "Never since the Civil War has America been more morally torn apart." We cannot escape the fact that the intention of our involvement in Viet Nam is that the best interest of our Nation be served. There is, However, a wide range of opinion on whether or not our best interest will actually be achieved.

Besides the remembrance of our honored dead, the purpose of Memorial Day is helpful in recalling the heritage of freedom of our great Nation. It is a historic truth, that you cannot appraise the strength of our country apart from its faith in Almighty God. While we have a separation of the institutions of religion from institutions of government, religion has never been and never can be separated from our national life. Our life is based on a high faith in the ability of the common man. Our life is based on the belief in the dignity of man. We treat the person with respect because he obtains that worth as a child of God. Our life is based on belief in the freedoms of speech, of assembly and press, realizing that there will be those who use their freedom as an occasion for license. All other freedoms—the freedom to speak—the freedom to write—the freedom to assembly and the freedom to hold property—are derived from the freedom which God gave to man at creation, a truth set forth in our National documents. God is the source of all our rights.

As asserted in the Pledge of Allegiance, we need to be reminded that this is a "nation under God." If God is to be acknowledged—not in a sectarian manner but as creator-source of all that is good, then we must seek God through the development of Spiritual Values; not only in the personal realm but also in our public life. Doctor Charles Malik wrote that the tendency to put bodily comfort or material welfare ahead of the things of the spirit is a historical sign of decay—in nations or in people. Let us dedicate ourselves to the high calling given to us by God and let us pray that God can use this nation for the making of a new world. In the words of Lincoln, "It is for us the living to be dedicated to the great task remaining before us—that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion—that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain, that this nation under God shall have a new birth of freedom and that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth."

(Note: In addition to the eleven locations mentioned in the text of the address, these places have been named in connection with the origin of Memorial Day: Atlanta, Georgia; Camden, Arkansas; Cincinnati, Ohio; Fredericksburg, Virginia; Millegeville, Georgia; Mobile, Alabama; Montgomery, Alabama; New Orleans, Louisiana; Portsmouth, Virginia; Raleigh, North Carolina; Vicksburg, Mississippi; Warrenton, Virginia; and Washington, D.C.)

Tribute to the Peace Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD D. McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 11, 1967

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speakêr, as a tribute to the great work which has been done and is being done overseas by our Peace Corps, I include the following passage taken from a forthcoming book by a man who served for 2 years with the Peace Corps in Africa, Mr. Marvin H. Unger, in the Record.

Mr. Unger presents excellent testimony for the many personal efforts which are being made every day by our volunteers for the cause of peace and human understanding:

I am writing this as a last insert in this chapter twenty months after I first set foot on African soil. The reason for my writing it can be summed up in one word—change. For it is inevitable that the attitudes of the new volunteer will change as he nears departure. It is time for an evaluation of the Peace Corps.

Is the Peace Corps worthwhile? The answer is an unequivocal—yes. It is invaluable to the volunteer who learns, and commits himself for two years to helping other human beings. There is no question that he is a volunteer in the truest sense of the word. But more important, it is, in fact, the best possible type of foreign aid for developing nations—free from political implications, freer from the host country's governmental sanctions and policies which so often impede progress and action under programs like AID, free to live and work with people, free to commit oneself to a 24 hour day for one motive and one motive only—to assist. No other U.S. government agency can give claim to those statements.

Are the maximum efforts of a volunteer ever utilized? The answer is—no; but in the sense that progress in a developing nation is always measured in inches. Even if he were to devote every last ounce of energy to all he could do, it would never meet the aspirations he set out to accomplish. The challenge then is never optimal. There is too much time.

Is the Peace Corps beloved? Hardly so tender a word would fit the description of what is felt toward a volunteer by the people overseas. He may be respected; he often is gone to for medical and monetary assistance; sometimes exploited but seldom beloved. Many people are ignorant of what the volunteer is doing in their country; some feel he is too young and inexperienced, and others are suspicious of his motives. Some people are too nationalistic to feel their country needs the volunteer's assistance and still others feel that the Peace Corps is taking away their jobs such as in teaching. When the host country's Secretary of Education denounces the Peace Corps, what can thousands of his countrymen feel?

Would I do it again? Yes. But thinking back, I would have made a few changes.

Those changes might have been trying to meet, befriend and understand more of the natives than I did, trying to sell myself more to the Peace Corps representatives in the area, so that my fullest potential could have been used—that of an educator who possibly could have helped other volunteers improve their hit and miss approach to teaching.

Lastly, I wish I could have brought home those experiences and subtle moments I witnessed or heard of the volunteer in action—the volunteer as a moving force in his village—the volunteer who saved a life by rushing the victim 200 miles to a clinic—the volunteer whose home was always open to the small fry, to learn, to read, to help, to laugh, to hope—the volunteer who arbitrates grievances, aids the stricken, soothes the leper whom no one will go near—the volunteer who strikes down barriers of ignorance and prejudice—the volunteer who was a sucker for lending money, who knew it and never regretted it, the volunteer who laughed when the native laughed, cried as he cried, and loved as he loved.

Finally, will the Peace Corps survive? This question I do not presume to answer. But may I be so bold as to say that if the Peace Corps fails to survive, then our foreign aid program has lost its most important principle—helping others to help themselves. For this truly is AID, and nothing more has made a bigger impression in so few years on so many. If the Peace Corps goes, so goes our core of Peace.

Support the Local Police

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 11, 1967

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, today we find ourselves in a period of civil turmoil unmatched in this country since the War Between the States and the American Revolution. This is a time when all of us must put our best foot forward to strengthen the fabric of our society.

A splendid suggestion in this direction has been made by James J. Kilpatrick, nationally syndicated columnist, in an article entitled "Time at Hand To Rally To Support of Police," published in the Washington Star of September 5, 1967.

Mr. President, I recommend the article to the Senate and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Time at Hand To Rally To Support of Police

(By James J. Kilpatrick)

Miami, Fla.—This column comes from Miami. Under a larger dateline, it comes from the heart. The theme can be stated simply: The moment is at hand for the American people to rally to the support of their police as they have rallied in times past to the support of their schools.

For the last several days, about 2,000 members of the Fraternal Order of Police have been meeting in annual convention here. As delegates from lodges in 38 states, they represent 69,000 working cops. These are the career men—men with badges, men with guns, men who walk beats or have walked them in the past.

They need help, these men in blue, and not merely financial help. The average police salary in the United States in 1966 was precisely $107.11 per week, and this for a work week that often ran to 50 hours or more. It is a pathetic figure, especially when it is related to risks that saw 57 officers slain and 24,000 assaulted last year. But money is not the big trouble.

The overriding need, underlying every conversation here, is for a public attitude of positive support. It is incredible, when you think about it, that such a need should have to be expressed. These men are not philosophers; they do not profess to understand what has happened to American attitudes over the past 10 or 15 years. But they are baffled by experiences that have become commonplace; they are indignant at overblown charges of "police brutality"; and they wonder what has become of the days when an officer commanded respect as a symbol of law and order.

Yes, they ackowledge, the police have brought some of their troubles on themselves. They have made errors of judgment. If the rapist Mallory had not been interrogated for so many hours; if the slayer Escobedo had been permitted to see his lawyer; if the robber Miranda had been advised of admitted constitutional rights—if the police work in these cases had been better, the landmark decisions in Mallory, Escobedo and Miranda might not have been so sweeping.

It is acknowledged, too, that almost every large department has a handful of "bad cops"—bullies, petty tyrants, men who abuse their authority and dishonor the badge.

Yet over the country, the number of bad cops is a tiny fraction of the whole. A task force of the President's Crime Commission recently demolished the notion that "police brutality" is widespread. In a study of 850 eight-hour patrols, involving 5,339 encounters with citizens, only 20 instances were found of unnecessary force by police. That is a record of satisfactory performance in 99.63 percent of the sample under study. What other occupation or profession boasts a better record?

Even so, the police image suffers. And the officers who are stoically aggrieved by public indifference or hostility are inclined to ask what the public expects of them. Today's police officer has to be a psychologist, sociologist, criminologist, constitutional lawyer and judo expert; he must be marksman, diplomat, skilled technician and public relations man. And he must summon all of these talents, when the occasion arises, in a single violent second.

They were telling the story, and chuckling over it, of an officer who recently arrested an armed robber just as he emerged, gun in hand, from a liquor store. The two wrestled to the sidewalk. With his prisoner finally caught in scissors hold and armlock, the officer managed to extract a worn card from his pocket. He began reading, "You have a constitutional right to remain silent. . . . If you want an attorney to be present at this time or at any time hereafter, you are entitled to such counsel. . ."

That is part of the new police routine in a day that tends to see the criminal overprotected and the whole concept of crime and punishment reduced to soft sociological lectures. The police are coping as best they can with these added burdens. An outraged public, alarmed by soaring crime rates, can lighten the load overnight by a spontaneous move to support the police. No politician, and no civic organization, could ask a better cause this year.

What Patriotism Means to Me, by Stephen Nelson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. ZWACH
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 11, 1967

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, recently the New London Times ran an article entitled "What Patriotism Means to Me," written by Stephen Nelson of Spicer, Minn. Stephen was the winner of the theme contest sponsored by Robert Ihland Post 537 of the American Legion.

I think this theme stands as a tribute to millions of young men and women across this great land—men and women who know and believe that "freedom is not free" but must be won anew by each generation.

So long as young men and women continue to understand that loyal, honest, and morally decent people are the background of the Nation—as Stephen points out—the country will continue to grow and become stronger.

Mr. Speaker, in order to share with my colleagues this theme, I include it at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

WHAT PATRIOTISM MEANS TO ME

The United States, that integral complex of fifty states united into one glorious nation, is, I believe, slipping into one of the most horrible situations that can confront a country. The people of our land are starting to take our constitution, our preamble and bill of rights included, for something that will give them life, liberty, and happiness without them giving one ounce of their time and energy back to the thing that gave them everything: our country. If this keeps progressing our nation is doomed. Rome in all its glory could not hold the interest of the comman man and gradually sunk under its own corruption and moral decay. This, I am trying to say, is what is happening to us. How long, I ask, can a nation without a population of loyal, honest, morally decent people survive? Not very long!

Patriotism, in conjunction with an honest Christian faith and family life at home, is the only solution to this grave problem which could bring our ruin. To me the Christian aspect of charity and tolerance of all, no matter what creed or color, or race is what we must strive to attain if our nation is to go on to even greater heights.

I wonder how many of our people have actually stopped long enough to "count their blessings". Have you thought how lucky you were to be born in this country where everyone drives a nice car and has a TV set to go home and waste an evening away? I'm sure you have. But look at it this way: How do you like one in fifteen odds? That is approximately the chance you got to be here instead of some other nation. Do you consider yourself lucky? I don't think you've ever thought of yourself as lucky. But do you know, you won the biggest gamble you probably ever face?

But so what? This is what other members of our nation say. You can bet these are the people who are out to get every fellow human being they deal with. You can bet they don't go to church on Sunday morning. You can bet they don't care.

So then what makes people this way? It seems that after living in comparative luxury all their lives, complacency sets in so deep that all devotion to God and country are something that can be easily hidden down in the linen closet. They live for themselves.

It isn't easy to be a patriot. I can vouch for that because I have my own problems. I don't think it's easy for anyone. Patriotism is to me love of country, God, family, and anything near and dear to the American way of life.

The Old Testament is full of stories where patriotism is used in the most important part of the people's lives. Why did Israelites follow Moses out of Egypt into a barren desert? Why did Abraham offer up his only son Isaac to God? Because they believed in something more important than themselves.

This is what we must do if we are going to be able to pass on to future generations our wealth and the three basics: Life, Liberty, and the Pursuit of Happiness.

At Long Last: Enforcement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 23, 1967

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the concern of a great many people that the Department of Justice is not vigorously applying remedies at its command for suppression of violence in the streets is well borne out in a timely editorial in Gun Week newspaper of Friday, September 8.

I submit it for reprinting in the RECORD:

AT LONG LAST: ENFORCEMENT

Many must have been amazed a few days ago when H. Rap Brown, militant leader of the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee, was arrested by Treasury Department agents and charged with violation of the 1938 Federal Firearms Act, a law most newspaper readers, and apparently some congressmen, don't know exists.

The little-known (outside the gun world) provision under which he was charged prohibits a convicted felon or person under indictment from transporting, having transported, or receiving a firearm—any firearm—or ammunition across state lines.

The federal agents charged Brown with violating the 1938 federal law by carrying a carbine and ammunition from Louisiana to New York while under a Maryland indictment on a charge of inciting to riot. He was on his way to a rally in racially tense Cincinnati, Ohio, scene of rioting earlier this year, where local law enforcement officials, National Guard officers and FBI agents had already mapped plans for "any eventuality" that might have accompanied his visit.

Bond was initially set at an unusually high $25,000, for the alleged offense was termed "serious" by the U.S. Attorney's office. The high bond effectively prevented Brown's Ohio visit and conceivably could have helped prevent another outburst of violence.

Government officials have been making much noise about "the lack" of federal gun controls, citing the frequency with which convicted felons have slipped into states with "lax" gun laws to buy firearms, thus circumventing tough local and state laws.

By charging Brown with violating the 1938 act, to the accompaniment of massive publicity, the Treasury Department has let the cat out of the bag. In the government's justifiable haste to "get" Brown it has not only informed the public that there ARE federal gun control laws, but that these laws CAN be enforced!

During the House hearings last spring, Internal Revenue Commissioner Sheldon Cohen, while supporting the Administration's gun bill, testified that his department knew of several hundred cases of out-of-state gun purchases by known convicted felons. The commissioner, whose agency is responsible for enforcing federal firearms laws, cited similar cases during the 1965 hearings and said his agency was "contemplating" pressing charges against the criminals. As we have asked before, how long would the Internal Revenue Service "contemplate" pressing charges against several hundred known violators of the income tax laws?

We hold no plea for Brown, but if the federal government can "get" him, why cannot it "get" convicted criminals who officials know have violated the same 1938 law? The public is justifiably outraged by Brown's sweeps across the nation, his inflammatory speeches, and the shooting, looting and burning that often follows in his wake. The public demanded that he be stopped—and he was stopped, with a federal law that government officials have claimed is worthless.

The public also has been outraged by the use of guns in crime and the evidence that those same officials have presented that criminals have made state laws ineffective by buying guns out of state. Why haven't government officials shown the same eagerness to "get" criminals that they showed in "getting" Brown?

How can they plead for a new gun law when they have shown an astonishing lack of interest in enforcing the old 1938 law? Is it conceivable that the Federal Firearms Act can be enforced in an attempt to stop rioting, yet cannot be enforced in an attempt to stop other forms of lawlessness?

The interstate traffic in guns between hoodlums has been a rallying cry for the supporters of the Administration's prohibitive gun control bill, but Rap Brown's case, which involved four states, proves that the 1938 federal law could be enforced to stop the flagrant violation of state laws.

When will Treasury Department agents begin enforcing this 29-year-old law in the case of mere criminals?

Dr. John L. Taylor

SPEECH
OF
HON. SANTIAGO POLANCO-ABREU
RESIDENT COMMISSIONER FROM PUERTO RICO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 30, 1967

Mr. POLANCO-ABREU. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives has lost one of its finest and most able counsels, and I have lost a personal friend in the death of Dr. John Taylor, of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. He was also a friend to Puerto Rico. Jack, as he liked to be called, was both loved and respected here, an affection and regard which he had earned. No favor was too much to ask of him; no task too great; and it seemed that his time was never too limited for this, although his responsibilities kept him very busy, indeed. He was a truly dedicated public servant, and the Congress was indeed fortunate to have his capabilities for these many years. He will be sorely missed.

I had the good fortune in 1965 to take a long, extensive trip through the Trust Territory of the Pacific with the House Interior Committee. Jack Taylor accompanied us as an expert, as a counsel, and as a guide. It was on this occasion that I came to know him as a personal friend and to admire his intimate knowledge of this vast area and the people on these islands. For I was a newcomer to the Congress, while Jack Taylor had already become somewhat of a pillar because of his long and rendering service. An educator, a captain in the U.S. Naval Reserve, a World War II naval officer, an adviser to an important House committee, Jack Taylor spent his life serving his country and people.

I especially want to extend my deepest sympathy to his loving wife and to their five children.

Constructive Alternatives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 11, 1967

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, I support constructive answers to urgent problems of discrimination, lack of job opportunities, and economic hardship, regardless of color or religion. There are answers that are above and beyond the need for an act of Congress. One such answer, it seems to me, is reflected in an excellent advertisement of the Warner & Swasey Co., of Cleveland, Ohio, appearing in a recent issue of the magazine U.S. News & World Report.

I commend its reading to all interested and concerned Americans:

THE AMERICAN WAY TO BLACK POWER

We know a company which doesn't give a snap for a man's color but only for his willingness to learn and work. Today there are more than 430 colored men and women there (15% of all employees), many of them among the supervisors, professionals, technicians and highest paid mechanics.

We know a lot about that company. It is Warner & Swasey, in its Cleveland plants.

Many of these people have been here for many years. They came here, not demanding anything but looking for a chance. They were glad to take *any* job, and some began as sweepers. We seriously consider and hire if we can (and we usually can) anyone who is neat, respectable, ambitious, with basic education—and we pay taxes in every one of our plant cities to *provide* that education *free*. We are in business to make a good product which people will buy, so that we can earn enough profit to pay those taxes and still keep on enlarging the business. We want workers regardless of color who will help us do it—workers who are *equal* to an *opportunity*, and who help create their *own* opportunity by productive work.

And we believe the vast majority of American companies have exactly the same attitude.

The Taylor Wine Co.—Rewarding Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. GOODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 11, 1967

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, the greatness of the vineyards which grace the gentle slopes surrounding many of the Finger Lakes in upstate New York is known and appreciated across our land. The ancient and patient art of winemaking is a distinctive part of the economic life in my district.

Hammondsport, N.Y., in Steuben County, is the home of the Taylor Wine Co., Inc. It is a firm rich in tradition, and its people are proud of the important role they play in producing some 47 different Taylor and Great Western wines and champagnes.

Just recently, I received the 1967 annual report of the Taylor Wine Co. In their report to Taylor shareholders, George A. Lawrence, president, and Fred C. Taylor, chairman of the board of directors, have given what I consider to be a very impressive account of industrial growth.

Because I am proud of the many and diverse industries whose men and women I have the honor to represent, it is a pleasure to share this report of Messrs. Lawrence and Taylor with my colleagues in the House of Representatives:

THE TAYLOR WINE CO.—REWARDING PROGRESS

If all of our reports for recent years have seemed somewhat repetitive in the use of terms such as growth, improvement, development and expansion, it has been by design rather than a lack of imagination. We are pleased to note that the year ending June 30, 1967, although spanning some some months of doubt about the national economy, extended the familiar pattern. Sales of Taylor and Great Western wines, vermouths and champagnes set another record high of $25,992,219, improving on last year's $23,146,726 figure by 12.29%. Net profit after taxes rose 11.12%, from $3,208,114 in 1966 to the new high of $3,564,769 in 1967.

Earnings per share for the fiscal year amounted to $2.68 on 1,330,312 shares of common stock outstanding, compared wtih $2.41 on a like number of shares at the end of the 1966 fiscal year.

GROWTH IN THE MARKET PLACE

During fiscal 1967, a new record total of 2,412,115 cases of Taylor and Great Western products were sold in markets which are growing in population and in affluence. This repersents an increase of 11.07% over the 2,171,681 cases sold in 1966.

Again, our performance has been well ahead of that of the wine industry as a whole. While the industry gain in gallon sales in calendar 1966 was only .77% over 1965, Taylor's improvement for the same period was 9.62%.

Such success is due to a combination of many factors which we have mentioned in previous reports. Our traditionally strong advertising programs are expanded regularly to reach the widening audience of potential consumers. Point-of-purchase merchandising displays and literature have been emphasized. Packages, labels and displays are of the highest quality and have won awards from trade associations. Product planning has assured the development of new types of wine to meet the changing tastes and habits of the public. Strong, experienced sales staffs and an unusual degree of loyalty among our distributors and dealers are extremely important factors. All of these elements are essential in attracting new consumers. But in the final analysis, in order to build an ever-increasing volume, the consumers must like the product and develop brand loyalty. The steadily rising sales curve for Taylor and great Western Wines is a reassuring indication that our premium quality products are winning such loyalty.

PRODUCT DEVELOPMENT

In just one year's time, Taylor New York State Lake Country Red, our latest premium quality wine, has risen to rank fourth in sales among the six dinner wines under the Taylor label and all indications point to its continued growth in popularity.

The new Taylor brandy, the only Austrian brandy available in the American market, was introduced on a very limited scale just before the Christmas holidays. Distribution has been widened gradually and with sufficient representation throughout the country, greater promotional effort will be possible. Reports to date from dealers and consumers have been encouraging.

At the present time, our Pleasant Valley Division is introducing five Solera-processed ports and sherries to the national market. The Solera system is a method of aging which was developed many years ago in Spain and is used only in the production of finer ports and sherries. Wines which qualify for the Solera label must be aged systematically under strict Federal government supervision through a succession of oak casks and barrels ranging from 55 to approximately 15,000 gallons. Eventually this system will make it possible to market products which include some portion of century-old wines.

Pleasant Valley offers these Solera wines in four-fifths, quarts, half-gallon and gallon decanter bottles. New Great Western vermouths appear in newly designed labels and new quart-size bottles.

PLANT IMPROVEMENTS

The two-million-gallon fermenting and processing building which was constructed less than five years ago for the Taylor winery has a newly completed addition which will eventually provide another 2,400,000 gallons of storage. It is already equipped with 12 huge 100,000 gallon stainless steel tanks which will accommodate part of this year's harvest.

The extensive plant design and construction program which has modernized and expanded Taylor facilities so completely during the past five years has been carried out under the close personal supervision of Vice President Clarence W. Taylor. He has escorted many visiting experts through the new facilities in recent years and has heard them proclaimed as among the best in the world.

Our Pleasant Valley Division has just completed the installation of an entirely new finishing line for its sparkling wines under the personal supervision of Assistant Managing Director Walter S. Taylor. The system is the most modern possible and is considered the finest of its kind. This will substantially increase the production capacity for all Great Western champagnes.

VINEYARD ADDITIONS

To keep pace with the steadily increasing demand for our products, during the year we again encouraged the expansion and improvement of vineyards which supply our wineries. At our request, local growers have planted 250 more acres this season. We have supplied commercial nurseries with several hundred thousand cuttings of choice vines from which they develop roots that we will distribute to our growers. We have continued to participate in and support an extensive research program at the Geneva Experiment Station of Cornell University seeking to improve wine-making and to propagate superior grape varieties. Progress reports give us reason to look eagerly to future results of such efforts.

REVIEW AND OUTLOOK

During the past four years, net sales, net income and net income per share have shown outstanding increases. (See chart, page 6.) During this period net sales nearly doubled and net income more than doubled. On a compounded basis the growth of net sales averaged 11.15% per year and net income increased at an average annual rate of 21.97%. The trend in shareholders' equity is indicative of the increased investment required to sustain the sales and income growth. The result has been an average increase of 13.16% in shareholders' equity. Since 1963 dividends per share increased at an annual rate of 27.63%, compared to an average annual increase of 21.97% in net income per share.

In view of the many steps taken during fiscal 1967, as well as the past several years, to improve our product, plant, distribution and promotion, we believe we are in a strong position to move ahead as rapidly as economic conditions permit. Given a reasonably favorable national economy, we expect our markets to expand in keeping with recent trends. Because we have geared our program to such expectations, we hope to continue to outpace the industry in general in achieving a larger share of the potential market.

Once again we are pleased to express our gratitude to our employees, growers, dealers, consumers, and shareholders for the consistent and loyal support which makes such progress so rewarding.

The Calagna Development Corp. of Long Island

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. BRASCO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 11, 1967

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, with the growing need for better housing and for employment opportunities throughout our Nation, I want to call your attention to the superb efforts of the Calagna Development Corp., on Long Island.

This firm that specializes in custom-built homes has been making a tremendous impact in New York. The firm was founded by Anthony F. Calagna, a civil engineer and graduate of Georgia Tech, together with his brother Joseph, a graduate of the Wharton School of Business of the University of Pennsylvania. These experts in the housing field have opened up a new job opportunities for many workers in New York, and at the same time are providing superior housing at modest costs.

They have surveyed literally hundreds of families to determine the desires and needs of these people for the homes of the future. They have evolved interesting design concepts that do away with the drab look.

The Calagnas have been lauded by public officials throughout the State because of their desire to help keep prices within the reach of the average moderate-income family. The New York Times recently profiled their activities and pointed out what a significant contribution they were making to the Long Island communities.

I want to praise them for their integrity and their ability, and believe that this is the type of company—founded upon the principles of free private enterprise—that our Nation must encourage. This type of firms will lead the way toward a better environment for all.

Everyday Heroes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 11, 1967

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, the attached, entitled "Everyday Heroes," is prepared by Mr. Walter MacPeek of the national staff, American Humanics Foundation. He is a consultant, and has long been associated with the Boy Scouts of America. His home is in North Brunswick, N.J., and the succinct, clear message that he has to the youth of today who will be our leaders of tomorrow bespeaks the "American Humanics Foundation" whom he serves as a consultant, and whose primary objective is to educate for careers with youth agencies. This organization recently had its 18th annual meeting in Kansas City, Mo., and was blessed with high attendance and many of the founders, to say nothing of world and international figures of renown who serve voluntarily on its board of directors and as its direct supporters. With curriculums in five outstanding colleges for the training and educating of careers with youth agencies, as professional director, this organization is rendering a profound and certainly a nationwide service.

I am delighted to include this article for the stimulation and edification of all our colleagues, and through them, the Nation:

EVERYDAY HEROES

(By Walter MacPeek, national staff, American Humanics Foundation)

Boys need some super-special heroes like Washington, Lincoln, and Roosevelt. But they also need to have some heroes close to home.

They need to know some men of towering integrity on a face-to-face basis. They need to meet them on the street, to hike and camp with them, to see them in every day down-to-earth situations, to feel close enough to them to ask questions and to talk things over with them in a man-to-man fashion.

Boys need to learn that great worth, earnest purpose, and high idealism can be motivating forces in the lives of humble but great everyday men who may be not widely known nor publicly acclaimed. Boys need to rub shoulders with men who have honest pride in honest workmanship, solid integrity, and sense of responsibility—not necessarily famous men but fundamentally good citizens. Men who live down the street and just around the corner.

One of the greatest tragedies that can come to any boy is for him to accept the wrong kind of heroes—heroes too small. Yet there is possibly a still greater tragedy—the disaster to the spirit of a boy who never discovers any heroes at all!

Boys need heroes who walk and talk and eat, who go to church, who read books—men who dream of helping in their everyday way to build a better world. There's bravery there and heroism sometimes in the lives of those ordinary people who live close by. There has to be, and boys need to know about it.

National Drum Corps Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAGE BELCHER

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 11, 1967

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted, I wish to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following statement I have made supporting National Drum Corps Week: This year, the week of September 2–9 was designated as National Drum Corps Week. Inasmuch as the House was not in session during that week, I would like at this time to again call attention to the contribution of drum and bugle corps activity across this land.

The drum and bugle corps make a lasting contribution in the lives of those young people who have the privilege of belonging to a unit. The art of drum corps is rigid and exacting—it requires and develops a sense of self-discipline which is probably the most neglected character trait of our day. For we live in a time when young people and adults alike seem to hold self-discipline in less and less regard.

And drum and bugle corps makes a lasting contribution in the lives of those into whose communities and neighborhoods it comes. The art of drum corps is clean and inspiring. It is clean and wholesome recreation for those who participate and for those who still love to watch a parade. It is inspiring. What better motto for young people to live by than the corps motto: "Pagentry and Patriotism—on the march"? And what more inspiring to citizens all across the Nation than the flash of color, the pulsating rhythm, the blare of bugles, the waving of the flag, the snappy march step, all of which epitomizes the vigor, the color, the boldness and the strength that has always been America.

I have said before, and take pride in repeating, that I can vouch for the character-building qualities of the drum and bugle corps from personal experience. As a past commander of the Argonne Post No. 4 in my hometown of Enid, Okla., I once had the privilege of accompanying the Enid Legionettes, a corps sponsored by that post and composed of high school girls, on an 11-day tour. This group has consistently, over the years, been rated as one of the top corps in the Nation, and I was pleased and impressed with the skill, the exemplary behavior, and the fine character displayed by these young ladies as they traveled across the country and participated in American Legion parades, Community Chest drives, and drum and bugle corps competition. I was even more impressed by the impact they had on those who witnessed the parades—by the feelings of patriotism and pride they aroused in others.

Therefore, I am happy to again have an opportunity to endorse National Drum and Bugle Corps Week, and to wish them well as they continue their influence for good among our youth.

The Bombing of the North

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. CORMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 11, 1967

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, there has been much discussion these past few weeks concerning charges that our air power in Vietnam has been shackled. The advocates of the policy to "remove all restrictions on the bombing and the war will soon be won," fail to consider that the struggle in Vietnam remains a limited war for limited objectives; that the United States has no interest in destroying the North Vietnamese Government nor any government; that our only interest is in preventing a takeover of one government by another and in making certain that our involvement does not expand into a nuclear war. It is a credit to the President, to Secretary Rusk, and to Secretary McNamara that they remain firm in their policy against unrestricted bombing.

The Los Angeles Times, in an editorial of August 31, puts the matter into clear perspective—that the present strategy of bombing targets in the north is an integral part of our limited war for limited objectives and that the bombing must remain "only supplemental to the total war effort."

I suggest to my colleagues that the Los Angeles Times' editorial is worthy of careful attention. I quote its text:

BOMBING WON'T WIN THE WAR

The argument over whether North Vietnam can be bombed into submission continues to rage.

Proponents of victory through air power daily voice their conviction that the United States possesses sufficient air strength to destroy Hanoi's war-making capacity and thus end the flow of men and supplies to the south. Once that is accomplished, the supposition runs, the Communists will be unable to continue the struggle.

North Vietnam can be knocked out of the war, bombing advocates say, by the destruction of major installations which thus far have not come under attack. In particular, they contend the port of Haiphong should be closed down by bombing or mining, since the bulk of North Vietnam's imports enters the country through this point.

Other facilities such as factories, ports, airfields and storage areas thus far spared should also be made open to attack.

The Administration's answer to these contentions was presented last week by Defense Secretary McNamara, in a statement as detailed as it was persuasive.

The secretary first reminded his critics that all-out bombing of North Korea from 1950–53 failed to prevent adequate supplies from reaching the Communist troops. North Vietnam presents an even more difficult problem because of its geography.

Bombing, McNamara said, has been partially effective in reducing the flow of men and supplies from the north and in hurting Hanoi's economy. But North Vietnam is not an industrialized country, and its people are used to hardship. Although war weariness may be growing, he said, "there is no basis to believe that any bombing campaign, short of one which had population as its target, would be itself force Ho Chi Minh's regime into submission."

What of Haiphong? While it is the entry point for as much as 4,700 of the 5,800 tons of North Vietnam's daily imports, destroying the port would not put the Communists out of business in the war.

Little war materiel actually used in the south (about 100 tons a day, which can be carried in a few trucks) enters North Vietnam by sea. Most comes overland from China, across a 500-mile border where interdiction is difficult. In addition, off-shore and over-the-beach unloading from foreign shipping along North Vietnam's 400 miles of coastline could replace Haiphong if necessary.

In sum, bombing the north remains only supplemental to the total war effort. This is a fact many find hard to accept, given the immense difficulties in the south. But the truth must still be faced that there is no easy way out.

The magnitude of the task in the south has been illustrated again in the Viet Cong terrorist raids of recent days, which are aimed at disrupting the Sept. 3 elections. The success of these attacks points up again the freedom of movement the Viet Cong enjoy.

The only way to put an end to that is by rooting out the Communist organizational base in the villages, something that can only be accomplished by on-the-ground efforts in the south, not by bombing the north.

A Moral Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 23, 1967

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the Pensacola Journel, of Saturday, September 9, carried an important editorial entitled "A Moral Education." It has to do with the importance of shaping the moral character of the young. I recommend its careful reading by the Members of Congress:

A MORAL EDUCATION

A once-dominant goal of American education—shaping of the moral character of the young—is gaining prominence in educational planning again after a period of relative neglect. The reason is not hard to find.

What has been happening in the "youth culture" during the past few years has brought home a painful message.

Somehow the schools are not doing as good a job as they used to do in cultivating the traditional virtues of good citizenship in the young: honesty, sobriety, industriousness, sense of duty, regard for the rights of others, respect for constituted authority, etc.

Church and home may be called to account on the same score.

But prevailing trends in our culture show that the school is relied on to carry out the major job of "civilizing" the young.

Extension of the years of schooling and proliferation of school-linked activities are keeping many youngsters out of parental sight for most of their waking hours. As for the churches, clergymen are the first to confess their loss of contact, as a moral force, with the young.

Not everyone agrees that youth is in a sorry moral state.

But rising rates of delinquency and the violent nature of much delinquent behavior, the open hostility to authority shown by young people in all walks of life, such growing problems as cheating, petty thievery, vandalism and insolence in school, the cults of drug-taking, of sexual freedom, and pleasure-seeking, the disorders on college campuses, summer street riots, and the newly recognized phenomeon of alienated youth—all suggest a breakdown in the transfer of moral values from one generation to another.

The search for reasons—and scapegoats—for the moral shakeup goes on endlessly. Sociologists say youth reflects the uncertainties and value displacements of society as a whole during an era of rapid change.

Commercial exploitation of the youth market, flagrant emphasis on sex and violence in mass media, secularization of family and school life, parental neglect and permissive child-rearing practices have all come in for a share of the blame.

Efforts of schools to tackle the problem of moral education within the context of current concern take two main directions. One is to set up new programs to reinforce adherence to moral values among the majority of school children, who are at least familiar with them even though they may choose at times to ignore them.

The other is to make special provision for those children of the urban poor who have been raised in an environment where the moral values of middle-class society do not apply.

For the majority the trend is toward (1) revamping such social studies courses as History and Government to emphasize the values of good citizenship and (2) introducing new study-units aimed specifically at areas of youthful behavior causing alarm.

In the second category are courses in sex education that stress the moral factor in human relationships as well as the bare "facts of life," and new course-units on the uses and effects of drugs both good and bad.

A new course to be given in junior high schools of Montgomery County, Maryland, next semester is designed to strengthen respect for the policeman and to encourage more lawful behavior.

The idea for the course—a kind of introduction to the processes and purposes of criminal law enforcement—originated in the U.S. Department of Justice, which financed a three-week tryout in four county schools early this year. Inquiries from more than 30 states indicated widespread interest in such courses.

For the children of the so-called "subculture of poverty," the approach has been more practical than moralistc. It is based on the belief that if the hostile or apathetic adolescent can be convinced that conformity with prevailing standards of behavior will bring the rewards of social acceptance and a decent living, the moral problem will take care of itself. This accounts for the emphasis on "higher horizon" and work-study programs for dropouts or other "under-achievers" among teen-agers.

It has long been realized that such efforts must begin long before adolescence. A number of experimental programs for pre-schoolers have been tried in search of more effective approaches to the re-education of children whose characters are formed in slum "jungles."

Naturally, a report on a U.S. Office of Education-financed project in 14 widely scattered schools has startled educators by its emphasis on stern discipline for poor children at nursery school age.

Making the little ones toe the line by the classsic means of punishment and reward—a cookie given or withheld, even a slap to silence a naughty brat—were said to have done wonders both in helping the children to learn and in fostering among them a rudimentary sense of right and wrong.

Who knows: Americans may wake up one day and realize that respect for authority, moral values and the time-honored woodshed philosophy are not as antiquated and cruel as they are led to believe by dreamers and social reformers of modern-day education.

Representative Robert L. F. Sikes Addresses Conference of Armed Forces Management Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. McFALL
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 11, 1967

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, a principal speaker at the 14th national conference of the Armed Forces Management Association, conducted August 31 at the Washington Hilton Hotel, was our very able and dedicated colleague, the Honorable ROBERT L. F. SIKES.

Congressman SIKES addressed the group in his capacity as chairman of the Military Construction Subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations, on which I also have the privilege of serving, and as ranking majority member of the Defense Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee.

His observations, I am sure, were of great value to this important professional organization dedicated to the improvement of management throughout the Defense Establishment. They will prove equally meaningful to all Americans interested in providing the best possible defense system for our county.

His address follows:

SPEECH OF HONORABLE ROBERT L. F. SIKES BEFORE THE 14TH NATIONAL CONFERENCE, ARMED FORCES MANAGEMENT ASSOCIATION, WASHINGTON, D.C., AUGUST 31, 1967

I have been curious about this group. I have wondered what kind of people you are and you have probably felt the same way about me. But the fact that I sit across a table from you in our work doesn't mean there is a fence between us. Your distinguished Executive Vice President, Admiral Neblett, says most of you are old Washington hands, quite familiar with government workings. Many of you are Civil Service people—others are officers from the field and all of you are well up on the working of industry and defense. He says you have been through the mill. I don't know whether or not that means you have appeared before a Congressional Committeee. However, some of you have, and for most of those who sit across the table from me in hearings, I have a high degree of respect.

I note from your introductory pamphlet that the Armed Forces Management Association is a national non-profit, professional organization dedicated to the improvement of management throughout the defense establishment. It doesn't say whether Secretary McNamara is a member. Its objective is to make a significant contribution to the existing programs of the Defense Establishment for improved efficiencies, effectiveness and economy in the improvement of our national defense resources, etc.

I think one of the most significant things in all of this is the enormity of the job which confronts you in defense management and which confronts me in the Congress. Each in his respective sphere of responsibility deals with half the national budget. Yet the staggering responsibility of properly managing the expenditure of 70 billion dollars fades in comparison with the problem of insuring that we get at least 70 billion dollars worth of defense from that expenditure and that it is the type of defense which will deter or defeat major aggression against this nation and the free world.

Quite obviously all of this means there is no fence between us. We work for the same flag and there is much to be gained by closer understanding of our common interests and problems. For instance I find, as a Congressman, that your monthly publication—Armed Forces Management—and your annual Journal provide a valuable collection of reports and analyses of managerial problems and changes, and means for improvement in all areas of management concerned with the armed forces and military production.

We need all the efficiency and productivity we can bring to bear. We have more commitments than any other nation. We are at war. We haven't the manpower that the rest of the world has or even the manpower of some of our potential antagonists. Our greater strength must lie in effective deployment and in meaningful utilization of all those auxiliary powers that lie behind the concept of armed forces management. We can't accomplish this sitting down. We really have to be on our toes.

We are engaged in a war where the conditions of combat are more than a little frustrating. I could spend a lot of time talking about it and even finding fault. But let it suffice to say I believe we can and must win. Next to the men who are in combat, they also serve their country who are responsible for furnishing the proper equipment and specialized weapons. One is actually as necessary as the other. So let's talk about you—the man behind the man behind the gun.

Whether we are associated with the armed forces, private industry, or the Congress, there are some common problems which bear strongly upon our country's readiness posture and upon its combat capability. But for a little while, I want to try to look at your job through my eyes. First is the problem of communications. If we are to achieve the management objective of a strong and virile defense establishment at reasonable cost, we must improve the flow of communications between us. You have heard many, many times that a free flow of information and better use of information is most helpful in any management program. As a Member of Congress and as a Member of the Appropriations Committee may I say that we do receive quite a flow of information—good, bad, and indifferent. To legislate properly we need, we desire, we must have the cold, brutal, hard facts upon which defense budget programs and requests for appropriations should be based. No door to any Member's office or to the Committee's office is ever closed to those who conscientiously seek to tell their story. I urge you to take back to your jobs, to your commands, and to your industry the fact that the committee of Congress want and must have the simple truths, the actual facts, preferably without the veneer and polish some people like to apply.

May I also suggest more reciprocity in this exchange of information. Our Committee, and other committees in Congress, hold extensive hearings. We publish considerable testimony including many interesting and pertinent studies. We submit committee reports which are in effect statements of policy. Our committee hearings are replete with detailed discussions with top management officials on the various procurement programs of the Defense Department, all geared to sifting out problems, to reaching solutions, to achieving a better understanding of goals and methods of achieving these goals. Most of these hearings have been based on detailed examinations of pertinent procurement areas by our investigative staff. We have spent much time on management and control of technical data; on the procurement and logistical support of multiservice weapons systems; on overseas procurement as well as on the extent of studies and analyses being conducted within the Department of Defense. We discuss many of your problems on the floor of the House. We read, we study, we take to heart your communications. By the same token you, as responsible members of the armed forces management team, can profit from the information we assemble.

Now I call to your attention the problem which the uninitiated often refer to as "computers". By this I mean whatever machine system that might seek to replace the cool, calculating judgment of the experienced military professional, be he in uniform or civilian attire. You cannot be expected to run a 70 billion dollar business by the seat of your pants, as pilots first flew aircraft. The electronic age has brought to management a valuable and necessary tool. Computers have enabled you on the management side and your counterparts on the operational side to gain clearer and keener insights into the problems of the defense establishment. But we cannot substitute machines, systems, or the greatest intellects in the nation for the experience of those engaged in the operations of our military establishment. As you use these modern tools of management, may I urge you to temper the results therefrom with the judgment, logic, and the common sense which should be yours from position, training, and experience.

Then there is the very important matter of management of inventories. The billions of dollars worth of inventories of both real estate and personal property constitute one of the greatest responsibilities in the hands of DoD managers today. We in the Congress realize a greater effort is being made to manage and control these inventories. This is timely and it is necessary. One of the toughest jobs in Washington is to assess and evaluate the job done in the inventory field. Compared to the hundreds of thousands of people in the Defense Department involved in some form of inventory management, we on the Congressional side of government are but a handful. We are in many, many cases forced to rely upon the integrity and knowledgeability of the people who come before us to ask for funds to carry out DoD decisions. It is up to you as managers to have the best possible information at your fingertips when presenting a case for approval. We are, needless to say, very disturbed when your facts and figures fold up under some questioning. That's when Congress sometimes cuts too much.

My Committee has been particularly interested in the multi-service weapons system programs. Although savings have resulted in many of these programs, the defense establishment has not achieved the savings envisioned when these procurements were first presented to the Congress. My preliminary studies in this area lead me to believe that far too frequently the data used in determining potential savings to be achieved in programs of this type are not realistic, and that the logistics operator or manager is often called in after the fact rather than before the fact. To those of you working in this field, I urge that you seek out the advice of experienced personnel, actual operators and managers—and then assemble the data for your management decisions.

Now let me mention a program with which many of you are probably far too familiar. It is the so-called resources management system of the Department of Defense and an element of much interest to me—Project Prime. This project has been the matter of considerable discussion and comment in Congress, particularly in my Committee. I would be the last to criticize those who advocate improvements in the present character of defense budgeting and accounting. There is no system in the world of this type which cannot stand improvement. Frankly, my Committee has felt that Project Prime as proposed in the fiscal year 1968 budget program represented a proposal which was too large a step and had not been thought out or tested in sufficient depth. Change for the sake of change alone, or to implement theory, is questionable when void of practical experiences. I am glad to say that we have worked out with those responsible a middle-ground approach which will tell us more about Project Prime and about its potentiality. It will be tested within limitations during the current fiscal year to determine whether it should be applied defensewide. This is what comes of a mutual approach to the solution of major problems. Yet constantly we should look around us to see what is new in the world. It is well to remember that the winds of change blow constantly. What was good that we read in yesterday's books may be outdated today. We cannot afford to stand still.

Our nation is a strong one because it is made up of labor, management, professional personnel, government employees, military personnel, elected officials, and ordinary civilians—all with one objective—a greater America. Our nation is strong because the members of these groups work as a team with one basic thought in mind—to keep this nation strong. America's defense position today is evidence of the job this team has done. Yet you know perhaps better than anyone else that today's responsibilities require an even better job for the future. This can only be accomplished if you and I and all the others involved work together as a real solid, coordinated team. None of us can afford to have as our goal excellence only in our particular category of interest—the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, the Marines, or private industry, or even the Congress. We must have a bigger goal.

Chairman Mao says power grows out of the barrel of a gun. If this is the kind of world we live in, I want it to be American power out of American guns. America has and must continue to have powerful defense team—effective, modern, invulnerable—for this is America's security today and tomorrow. Give us this, but guard it zealously and use it carefully as is America's wont. Then our diplomats will have time in which to work and their words will be heeded—and God grant that they can do as well as those in uniform who fight on the field of battle.

And, while this is being done, let us remind ourselves—and the world—that America has not lost its unity or its purpose. Sometimes our objectives are not spelled out with the same detail that confusion and uncertainty are presneted to us and the world. Sometimes the voices of those who counsel retreat receive greater play than those who say, "Whatever the cost, we will not haul down the American Flag." Sometimes the efforts of those who seek to build a greater America fail to achieve the prominence of those who lead marches and demonstrations, of the draft-card burners, and the protesting beatniks; and sometimes the world is confused by what it sees here.

We here today know the soul of America is reflected by the glory of its past and the greatness of its present and its dreams for the future of mankind. And we who have no problems in understanding the meaning of America or the significance of its mission know that there may always be unpleasant and unhappy tasks like Vietnam, but we do not fear them. We know that our commitments must go on for as long as it takes to assure the nations of the world that America's dedication to the preservation of freedom is not a part-time obligation. We know that the symbol and the actuality of America are worth all of our efforts. We just want to get on with the job—and get it done.

There is a word for all of this—a word to insure the future of America as we know it. That word is called patriotism. May the God of our fathers help each of us to know patriotism in its richest meaning and to teach it to those around us every day that we live.

The Vanishing Pay Raise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT V. DENNEY

OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 11, 1967

Mr. DENNEY. Mr. Speaker, today we are being told by the Johnson administration that the health of our economy is such that it can carry a tax increase. Indeed, we are being told that, for the good of our economy, we need a tax increase.

I submit to this body that the effects of the proposed 10-percent surtax are not being fully considered.

A 5-percent pay raise is good news to anyone. In fact, a proposal is now being considered in Congress to give classified and other Federal employees a 4.5-percent increase. Such pay raises are common in other job areas.

Now, what would the tax increase and a 5-percent wage increase mean to a family of four receiving an income of $7,500 a year? Counting other important factors such as increase in living costs, the proposed increase in social security tax, and so forth, the family has a net loss of $24. The effect on Nebraskans is even more pronounced as our State taxes will probably be above the Nation's average increase, thus making the net loss more than $24.

This information was taken from the August 28 issue of U.S. News & World Report. I include the following table in the RECORD, showing the effect on families with other levels of income, as follows:

No. 1—Family of 4 getting $7,500 a year

Pay raise	$375
Proposed increase in Federal income tax	147
Proposed increase in social security tax	40
Increase in State-local taxes	31
Total tax increase	218
Leaving, out of pay raise	157
Increase in living costs	181
Family's net loss	24

No. 2—Family of 4 earning $10,000 a year

Pay raise	$500
Proposed increase in Federal income tax	216
Proposed increase in social security tax	44
Increase in State-local taxes	41
Total tax increase	301
Leaving, out of pay raise	199
Increase in living costs	238
Family's net loss	39

No. 3—Family of 4 with pay of $15,000 a year

Pay raise	$750
Proposed increase in Federal income tax	388
Proposed increase in social security tax	44
Increase in State-local taxes	58
Total tax increase	490
Leaving, out of pay raise	260
Increase in living costs	351
Family's net loss	91

Praise for Upward Bound

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LLOYD MEEDS

OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 11, 1967

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Speaker, the Second Congressional District of Washington State, which I represent, can boast one of the most outstanding Upward Bound projects in the United States. It is Project Overcome, sponsored by Western Washington State College in Bellingham and the Office of Economic Opportunity.

This particular Upward Bound project has been honored numerous times. Its work and successes have been reported frequently in national magazines. Dr. Thomas Billings, the initiator and first director of Project Overcome is now in Washington, D.C., to assume the directorship of the national Upward Bound program of the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Recently I asked the board of trustees of Western Washington State College to express their thoughts about this project. I insert in the RECORD their response:

PRAISE FOR UPWARD BOUND

We are convinced that the problem of America's disadvantaged can be solved only through educating the next generation. We therefore regard it not only as our privilege but as our responsibility to maintain such projects as the federally sponsored Upward Bound (Western's Project Overcome) and Rockefeller Foundation's Project Catch-Up. The first of these programs is designed to raise the educational and aspirational levels of socially disadvantaged high school students—the second to do the same for junior high school students. By every measure known to us these projects are outstandingly successful. In terms of sociological probability none of these students would have entered college, the vast majority of those who have reached college age are now enrolled in college. The cost of the programs is vastly less than the social welfare work, relief, and police expense that would have been entailed had these students remained in the ranks of the disadvantaged. More importantly still there is the vast potential now being tapped which before promised only a perverted and pernicious resource.

Hitherto, the cost to Western of these programs has far exceeded the allowed overhead. Western has borne the faculty time and monetary expense because we are convinced of the great need for such projects as Upward Bound and Catch-Up.

As Trustees we have taken pride in the

praise heaped upon these programs in national journals, the halls of Congress, and by professional educators. We are prouder far in our considered judgment that these programs are instrumental in building a fairer tomorrow for whose tomorrow had held no hope.

Iowa Banker Concerned

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED SCHWENGEL
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 11, 1967

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, Stanley Barber, president of the Wellman Savings Bank, is serving this year as the head of the Independent Bankers Association of America. He is serving with distinction.

Recently, the Iowa City Press-Citizen interviewed Mr. Barber. He voiced great concern about the cost-price squeeze in agriculture. His thoughts on the problem are appropriate and to the point.

A report of the interview and a related article from the Press-Citizen follow:

"RURAL EXODUS NOT A PROBLEM": INDEPENDENT BANKERS WORRIED ABOUT FARM PRICES

(By Claren F. Dale)

WELLMAN.—A banker from this small farming community, who represents some 6,500 of his contemporaries, isn't bothered a bit about what is often called "the rural exodus."

Stanley R. Barber, president of the Wellman Savings Bank, last spring was elected head of the Independent Bankers Association of America.

Although a number of facets in the current farm situation disturb Barber considerably, he believes the trend of farmers to take town jobs is a desirable, necessary and inescapable change.

He also feels that Americans may be falling under "a cheap food complex" and that this is being helped along by the administration in Washington.

Barber takes a let-the-chips-fly attitude in making his remarks, leaning back in his chair, just a couple of feet from the sidewalk of his main street Wellman bank. He has only two reservations:

He realizes what may work in southeast Iowa may not hold for his native sand hills in western Nebraska or the Kansas plains. Wellman's location near the State University of Iowa, in an area that welcomes modest-sized, clean industry, causes Barber to observe, "My opinions would not be valid everywhere."

A Republican, Barber also realizes that his outlook is likely to be taken as political. He denies any such intention, saying he could find the same faults with any administration, "under similar circumstances."

Discussing the growth in size of farms in the Central Region, and the resulting drop in the number of farmers, Barber comments, "Many farmers are no longer fully employed. I see nothing wrong with the farmer continuing to operate his 80 acres and also taking a job in town.

"I do not believe in subsidizing inefficiency, but I believe this solution to problems caused by increasing farm size is a highly desirable situation."

Barber expects an extremely productive economy in the future, in which agriculture will be highly efficient. "Usually the larger farms are more efficient," he adds, "and I expect farms and investment involved to continue to increase in size."

He notes that the farmer who goes to town looking for a job, rather than trying to compete where he cannot, makes a high-type employee available and gives industry an advantage for locating in a rural area.

The banker, whose almost tiny Danish-modern office testifies to his up-to-date interests, will not attempt to predict where the trend to bigger farms will end. He agrees with economists however it will probably be when efficiency declines.

Barber is careful to point out that his encouragement of small farmers to take supplemental city jobs does not mean he believes in dumping the farm and going into big-city manufacturing.

"We do not want the problems of metropolitan America here and similarly we do not want the people here moving to Kansas City, Denver or Minneapolis," he explains.

As a banker, Barber says he is concerned that agriculture is increasing its gross product in the face of falling prices. "The farmer is highly efficient, but he is not well compensated," he adds.

"Food in the United States is a tremendous bargain. I am afraid that the U.S. is falling under a cheap food philosophy."

He continues. "Perhaps it already has." He comments that such policy is sometimes used to "curry favor with urban voters," or as a means of holding down cost of foreign aid to hungry nations.

Barber comments, "Evidence of a cheap food philosophy is to be found in a number of administrative actions and proposals."

He chides Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman's "famous" 1966 stand for lower farm prices. Barber also charges that the government too often has used its stocks to keep prices from rising much above loan rates. "Federal payments are not a satisfactory substitute for adequate market prices," he contends, "because there is always a danger that an increasingly urban Congress will reduce or eliminate appropriations.

"It seems that the Department of Agriculture has become consumer-oriented and provides more for the public than for the farmers who are supposedly the recipients of the money expended by the department."

Barber, although disturbed, is as optimistic as the new modern facilities where he headquarters.

He describes agriculture as "one of the most dynamic sectors of our economy." Expectedly, Barber admits that one of his major endeavors is to preserve the independent homeowned bank but he also recognizes that in order to do this rural America must prosper.

"Both the banker and the farmer," Barber believes, "are going to have to be more astute businessmen."

ASSOCIATION LEADERS PLAN "SUMMIT" NEXT SPRING ON LOW RURAL INCOME

WELLMAN—A speaking engagement in South Dakota or planning for a national forum on rural economics, although not routine, are part of the day's work for Wellman's Stanley R. Barber.

Barber, 42, president of the Wellman Savings Bank, last spring was chosen president of the Independent Bankers Association of America. It is an organization of some 6,500 banks in 40 states.

Barber and a fellow banker, Don F. Kirchner of Riverside, are currently working out plans for a forum next spring on rural economic problems. The meeting is to be in Washington, D.C., and is being designed to bring rural leaders together with government officials. Barber said the forum will explore the problems of low net farm income and the resultant economic decline in rural communities.

Kirchner is president and cashier of Peoples Trust and Savings Bank and he is a member of the Agriculture-Rural America Committee of the IBBA. He and Barber recently were among 11 bankers from eight states who met in Chicago to plan the forum.

Both Barber and Kirchner express concern on the prices that farmers and ranchers are receiving for their production. Barber says there is no way to tell now what action is likely to come from the Washington forum, but he indicates the committee is looking toward some concrete suggestions.

Barber's office is in newly remodeled quarters on Wellman's main street. His office is just inside the door—a few feet from the passing representatives of the rural America for which he is concerned.

He maintains an "open door" policy and, even on short notice, although he must have hundreds of callers a week, he is "in" to anyone willing to wait the few minutes for his office to clear. He admits that America's independent bankers are disturbed over the farm price situation, and he is both free and outspoken in commenting.

A native of North Platte, Neb., Barber's family moved to Boone during his boyhood, where his father was president of the bank there. Barber came to Wellman and the Wellman Savings Bank in 1951. He was named president in 1957.

People Are Ready for Strong Moral Leadership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. ZWACH
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 11, 1967

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, my mail increasingly gives evidence of a troubled interest of the people back home in their Government in Washington. They are having serious discussions over their coffee about the need for strong moral leadership, the high cost of Government programs, and many other concerns.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include the following excerpts from a letter I received recently from the Reverend Bob Van Earden, pastor of the Hope Reformed Church in Montevideo, Minn.:

PEOPLE ARE READY FOR STRONG MORAL LEADERSHIP

"Although I am the Pastor of the Hope Reformed Church, I am writing simply as a citizen who is interested in the welfare of our country.

"I make it a practice to have coffee with a group of businessmen two mornings a week here on main street. Everywhere I go I ask questions and keep my ears open. I am sure that we are all aware of the fact that people are questioning things as never before, but for some reason this morning I came back from my coffee break feeling very anxious about some of the feelings that the men expressed.

"There is much dissatisfaction about many, many things in our nation and world and, Mr. Zwach, I believe that people are ready for strong moral leadership as has not been the case for a long time. More and more people realize that that which they get from Washington is not simply 'pie in the sky' but rather it is costing them in dollars and cents and, more important, their freedom. I am no politician but the time may be nearer than we think when strong leadership can once again help people in our local communities to assume much more responsibility for meeting their own needs.

"Although I came away from my coffee break this morning with anxious feelings, yet there is real reason for hope. First because people do not want to be told one thing one day from our leaders and then hear them say about the complete opposite thing the next day. People want the objective truth and this is not always the easiest to obtain. A second reason I am hopeful is that people are taking more time to express their opinions to their Representatives."

Revitalized Limestone Industry Seeks New Horizons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 11, 1967

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the August 27, 1967, edition of the Bloomington-Bedford Herald Times. Reporter John Fancher gives an excellent report on the work of the Indiana Limestone Institute in developing new techniques for the use of limestone in today's construction projects.

The article reads as follows:

LIMESTONE INSTITUTE PAVES THE WAY: REVOLUTION IN LIMESTONE

(By John Fancher)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Limestone's prominence in the building industry has waned in recent years with technological advances finding other methods less costly for major construction projects. Pre-cast concrete and aluminum and glass have pre-empted limestone in construction projects all over the country. The limestone industry is moving ahead on its own to cope with this new competition drastically changing the stone's appearance and use. The Indiana Limestone Institute is involved in much of the research and study being conducted. Here Herald-Times reporter John Fancher reports on the institute's work.)

Glue, color and modern textures are producing some exciting changes in the Indiana limestone industry.

Rough texture is "in" with many architects, and the limestone belt is producing beautiful effects.

Some of the work creates an illusion of deep, rich carpeting and could lead to the slogan: "The Stone You Love to Touch."

Other textures involve geometric designs and stripes.

Companies going after the big jobs no longer are selling blocks of stone, but large decorative panels that can be hung on steel skeletons or poured concrete supports.

"We have broken out of our shell just as have the architectural schools," said William H. McDonald, Jr., market Development director of the Indiana Limestone Institute.

The old stone-laid-on-stone concept in large buildings has been dead a long time. As construction costs increased during the past 25 years, architects sought new ways of enclosing space at a price the owner was willing to pay.

A few skyscrapers built with aluminum and glass sides pointed the way for revolution in the limestone belt nestled in the Southern Indiana foothills of the Cumberland Mountains.

The Indiana Limestone Institute was revitalized with 51 member companies, including 15 of the 19 major firms in the Lawrence-Monroe-Owen county Stonebelt.

Through a federal grant, the institute embarked on a research program with Richard Hartung, Bloomington architect, as director.

"The ability of an industry to fit itself into modern concepts is important to its survival," said McDonald. The limestone industry is making an effort to do this.

One of the purposes of the institute is to spread the word far and wide among architects and architectural students of the versatility of one of the world's most beautiful building materials. The stone is supplied for construction in 37 states.

"We can do much more at a cheaper price," McDonald said, pointing out the exterior limestone panel walls of University School in Bloomington cost $2.82 per foot in place. Brick construction at that time averaged $3.50 to $4, according to David O. Meeker, Jr., of the school's architectural firm.

"It's vital that our industry recognize design trends, and rough, craggy textured panels are the trend today," McDonald continued.

"The one-man, one-stone concept with mortar is so expensive today that it has become necessary to put up six, eight or 10-ton panels with a crane," said McDonald.

Hartung forsees greater use of colored limestone, and this combined with the variety of textures available will give architects a thrilling new material with which to work.

"Colored stone will have a place as long as it looks like stone. It must retain its natural character. It should be done in subdued, earthy colors," said Hartung.

"Otherwise," continued McDonald, "it will look like an ersatz type material."

Colored limestone was used in a medical building at 311 E. Kirkwood in Bloomington. The stone is of concrete block size.

Colored limestone is still in the experimental stage. An effort is underway to produce a permanent color through chemical reaction. This perhaps could be combined with a protective coating now being researched by the Illinois Institute of Technology Research Institute (IITRI).

Limestone has one of the best wearing surfaces, which accounts for its widespread use. Its surface withers away at the rate of one inch per thousand years. But, a protective coating could reduce this as well as guard against marks by vandals or nature.

At present, stone is quarried in natural buff, gray and variegated. If additional rich subdued colors could be combined with the modern "carpet" textures, it would be a great selling point with architects hunting new ideas.

There are 30,000 architects in the United States faced with the monumental task of rebuilding America in the next 30 years. It is estimated the population of the nation will be nearly doubled in that length of time.

With the construction industry facing this great boom, architects will be endlessly hunting variety to provide beautiful, distinctive buildings.

The limestone industry must constantly search for new uses of stone to fit the trends of the day, said McDonald.

The three-county limestone belt has in the ground enough stone to last for 1,000 years. It's value at today's price is $1 billion.

Should the population explosion necessitate using the stone at a faster rate, changes in quarrying could open up new fields west of here, McDonald commented.

He pointed out there is good quality limestone under the coal fields to the west, and 10,000 feet beneath Terre Haute is a bed of fine stone. Present-day methods of quarrying prevent the use of this supply, but this may not be the case in the distant future.

The Indiana Limestone Institute has contracted with the Illinois Institute of Technology Research Institute to carry out its research program in four major areas.

Research is being done on adhesives since these are playing an ever increasing role in construction. For example, an epoxy holds the cuts of stone in place on the huge panels being lifted into place by crane at Indiana University's new $14 million library.

IITRI also is experimenting with ways of removing stain from stone that is sometimes caused by construction debris or organic matter that finds its way through the back of the stone.

Further experiments are taking place with repair materials. Occasionally stone is chipped through an accident. In the past, this has necessitated replacing the entire block or panel. IITRI has nearly perfected a material that matches both the color and texture of stone.

McDonald and Hartung both say there is no substitute for research and aggressive sales promotion to meet the needs of today and tomorrow.

Despite new ideas introduced in erecting buildings, "there still is a couple hundred years difference today between space technology and construction technology," McDonald concludes.

The Conduct of the War in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 11, 1967

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I have the utmost respect for the members of the Senate Preparedness Committee, but I am deeply concerned at the tone of their most recent report, which criticizes the President because he does not follow in detail their conclusions on the conduct of the war in Vietnam.

I believe that every Member of Congress and every congressional committee has the privilege and duty to scrutinize and criticize, if they deem it justified, the acts of the President and the executive branch of the Government. But I believe that in the last analysis it is the responsibility of the Commander in Chief to make the decisions as to the policy, strategy, and use of the Armed Forces in combat.

A Congressman or a congressional committee takes on a grave responsibility when they attempt to substitute their individual or collective judgment for that of the President, who also is authorized by the Constitution to be the Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces of the United States.

The President has hour-to-hour access to a tremendous flow of information—military and diplomatic. Such information is far more extensive and far more timely than the information of a Congressman or a congressional committee.

The President has the constitutional responsibility for the conduct of our international relations and for the centralized direction of a war effort. That responsibility and direction, centralized as it must be, cannot be diffused among 535 U.S. Representatives and Senators. Delicate and well-balanced decisions must be made from day to day by the President, who must take into consideration the risks of that particular time and place.

I am inserting with my brief remarks, an article from the pages of the Washington Post under date of September 11, 1967.

The article is entitled "A Communication." It was authored by the Honorable McGeorge Bundy who has the distinction of having been special assistant to former President John F. Kennedy. More recently he has been recalled by President Johnson for similar advisory service.

I do not ask consideration for his critique of the Senate Preparedness Committee's report, however, on the basis of his former services or distinquished titles in Government service. I believe his critique is worthy of consideration on the basis of the logic contained in the article.

The article follows:

A COMMUNICATION

(By McGeorge Bundy)

The summary report of the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee is a document which repays study. There can be no question of the patriotism and dedication of Sen. Stennis and his colleagues, and their unanimous recommendation of wider air action seems impressive—until one examines the argument with which they support it. That argument contains four decisive weaknesses which fully explain the President's polite but firm insistence on hearing the counsel of all his senior advisers before deciding on matters of this moment.

First, the Senators appeal not to evidence but to authority. They set a group of generals and admirals against Secretary McNamara, and their position is that the generals and admirals are right simply because they are professionals. The Subcommittee does not demonstate the military value of the course it urges; it simply tells us that the generals and admirals are for it. It is true that both sides in such a public argument are hampered by problems of security, but Secretary McNamara, in his powerful public statement before the Subcommittee, offered extensive evidence—facts and figures—in support of his position. The Subcommittee answers only with a repeated appeal to the opinions of officers it heard.

Nothing is less reliable, in hard choices of this sort, than the unsupported opinion of men who are urging the value of their own chosen instrument—in this case military force. We must not be surprised, and still less persuaded, when generals and admirals recommend additional military action—what do we expect them to recommend? The interesting question is always whether their supporting argument is strong or weak, and on this critical point the summary report tells us nothing. There is literally no evidence at all, in this report, for the Subcommittee's sweeping conclusions that the restrictions currently in effect are "vital to the success of the air war."

In fairness it must be said that the appeal to authority instead of evidence is a habit which others have developed, too, in the long argument over Vietnam. Just last Sunday, for example, another journal once more cited the authority of the Secretary General in support of a new bombing pause, while on another page we were told that the Secretary General's own assistants say he has no direct evidence to support his judgment. Given his well-known views on the war in general and the bombing in particular, the Secretary General's obviously sincere belief in the value of a new pause is no more convincing—in the absence of supporting evidence—than military belief in intensified bombing.

Second, in reaching its conclusions and recommendations, the Subcommittee report pushes aside all political and diplomatic considerations—and all risks of wider conflict. The Subcommittee tells us simply to "take the risks that have to be taken and apply the force that is required." It thus neglects to examine what its own report calls the "serious and legitimate question" of policy "over and above purely military considerations." The Subcommittee heard no intelligence expert on the dangers of such an action as closing the port of Haiphong. It heard no political expert on the international costs of "striking all meaningful targets with a military significance (a definition so broad as to permit virtually unlimited target choice). It attempted no trial balance between the military advantages it claims for this course and the risks whose existence it admits but does not examine. The Subcommittee might well reply that other committees of the Senate are responsible for questions of intelligence and of foreign policy, but then it would have to tell us why it has chosen to move from its assigned field of preparedness into these very large questions of national policy.

Third, while the Subcommittee gives lip-service to the principle of civilian control, its main line of argument tends to deny that principle. The Subcommittee is quite right in its assertion that the military leaders of this war have been generally scrupulous in their respect for civilian control, but its own report is not so careful. It tells us that it is wrong for "strategy or tactics to come under the influence or direction of unskilled amateurs." In another place the Subcommittee recognizes the right of the Commander-in-Chief to set "broad policies and objectives," but it does not seem to understand that the real issues between military men and their civilian supervisors develop just where there is a conflict between the tactical or strategic desires of the military and the broad policies of the Commander-in-Chief. Is it really wrong to insist on directions of flight that minimize the danger of intrusion into Red China? Is it an error to insist on standards of accuracy and identification much tighter than those which "purely military considerations" have imposed in other wars?

When we move to larger issues, the case for civilian control is stronger still. These issues require a careful judgment between military value and political cost (I use the word political to include the whole range of non-military considerations ranging from simple humanity to complex intercontinental diplomacy). In such a calculation there is no escape from the necessity to ask hard questions—to test the evidence and not simply to bow to professional authority. Presumably nearly all well-executed military measures have some military effect, but how much? and how lasting? and at what overall cost? In our system of government there is only one place where these questions can be resolved; this is precisely why our Commander-in-Chief is the President. The President cannot delegate this responsibility, and I am sure the Subcommittee does not want him to. But civilian control means civilian control, and in a complex contest the exercise of that control will inevitably place limits upon both strategy and tactics.

Fourth, the Subcommittee Report moves onto dangerous ground when it suggests that the course chosen by the Administration has increased the cost of the war in American lives. The Subcommittee knows that the President yields to no one in the depth of his feeling for those whose lives are at risk in Vietnam. If he knew a cheaper way of doing this hard job, he would surely choose it. But it is a part of the necessary price of this war—as of all wars—that there is unequal sacrifice for the wider safety of all. To take an extreme example, the President could save American lives—at least in the short run and in the immediate theater—if he were to authorize the use of nuclear weapons in Vietnam. Obviously he will do nothing of the sort, and everyone knows it. Similarly—and the case is not extreme at all—General Westmoreland could probably limit his immediate casualties at least a little if he did not insist on standards of discipline in fire control and target identification, which are unique in American warmaking. But the President and General Westmoreland cannot serve the wider interest which is the true justification for the sacrifices asked of our forces if they do not insist on such restraint. No one on any side of these arguments can want larger human losses—to Americans, to allied forces, to civilians, or indeed to the enemy. So none of us should yield to the temptation to wave the bloody shirt of other men's sacrifices.

Taken together, these four weaknesses make the Subcommittee's report a poor guide to action. I am far from saying that there is no argument at all for intensified bombing—as far as I am saying that there should never be another pause. What I do say is that the Subcommittee report does not make its case.

My own summary belief is that both the advocates and the opponents of the bombing continue to exaggerate its importance. I think it has had the real but limited value that Secretary McNamara described in his statement to the Subcommittee, but I know of no solid evidence for believing with the Subcommittee that its expansion offers our best hope of success, or with others that its indefinite and unconditional suspension will produce serious negotiations. To me it is the struggle in and for the South that will be decisive—bombing or no bombing, pause or no pause. I believe with Mr. McNamara that limited bombing helps in the Southern struggle, but neither in expanded bombing nor in any unconditional suspension do I see a likely substitute for the very hard work ahead in the South—for us, and still more for the new government of South Vietnam.

"The Erie Maid"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD D. McCARTHY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 11, 1967

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, most historians agree on what a vital role and tremendous impact the Erie Canal had on the development of Transappalachian America in the early part of the 19th century.

Note of this, as well as an interesting glimpse of the politics involved in establishing a western terminus for the canal, was made recently in Buffalo in welcoming the *Erie Maid*, the floating historical exhibit of the New York State Council on the Arts.

The speaker was Mr. Richard C. Marcus, a friend of mine and a prominent Buffalo attorney. Mr. Marcus is the chairman of the Buffalo committee to commemorate the Erie Canal sesquicentennial.

Mr. Speaker, I, therefore, insert Mr. Marcus' speech in the RECORD:

"THE ERIE MAID"

(Remarks on the Erie Canal prepared by Richard C. Marcus, chairman, Buffalo committee to commemorate the Erie Canal sesquicentennial, delivered on welcoming the New York State Council on the Arts floating exhibit, The *Erie Maid*, on its arrival at LaSalle Park, Buffalo, July 16, 1967)

Should the international passenger airport for this area be located at Niagara Falls or should it be located at Buffalo?

Should the State University Campus be located here along the Buffalo Waterfront or should it be located on the plains of Amherst?

Controversies such as these are mild compared with the one which raged in these parts in 1817. When construction of the Grand Canal began at Rome in 1817, the residents of Black Rock decided that the western terminus should be at their village.

They had some good reasons. They had a harbor and a shipyard where a fleet for Commodore Perry had been fitted out for the War of 1812. They had the ferry boat landing for the crossing to Canada, and they had as their champion, Gen. Peter B. Porter, hero of the War of 1812 and ex-congressmen who fought well for them at Albany. Porter Avenue is named for him.

On the other hand, Buffalonians wanted the western terminus of the canal to be at the mouth of Buffalo Creek.

To help make a suitable harbor, Samuel Wilkeson and others guaranteed a loan of 12,000 to finance building a pier and making harbor improvements. Although the citizens of Black Rock accused Buffalo of shameless lobbying, Buffalo improved its harbor with the backing of private capital while Black Rock obtained an outright appropriation of $12,000 from the state.

Editorials in the Buffalo papers became so harsh that Black Rock, in self defense, produced its own newspaper called the Black Rock Beacon.

Buffalo prevailed and in 1823 work began on the Buffalo Section of the Grand Canal, amidst a celebration which, it is reported, "became a wild orgy".

Two years later a procession of boats formed at Buffalo to commence a voyage across the state which ended at New York with the pouring of Lake Erie water into the Atlantic. Black Rock had by this time cooled down sufficiently to contribute its boat "The Niagara" to join the procession at Lockport.

This gathering today is on neutral ground between Black Rock to the north and Buffalo Creek to the south; and the canal bed is now the Thruway which serves both areas.

But the controversy which had been raging over the location of the canal terminus gave way to new fights. On the canal itself, the passenger carrying packet boats had the right of way over freight boats. In 1827 the courts considered the case of Farnsworth v. Groot. At the approach to a lock, a freight boat wedged itself into the entrance, but the crew and passengers of an overtaking packet boat forcibly pushed it back and passed into the lock ahead of it. The owner of the freight boat sued; the court said that the master of the packet could use any means necessary, short of a breach of the peace, to enforce his preference and the owner of the freight boat lost his case.

Apart from the time spent in pushing freight boats out of the way, what was life for the packet boat passenger in the 1830's? It depends on who was looking at it. N. P. Willis, an author, said of his trip from Buffalo to Schenectady:

"As I walked up and down the deck of the packet boat, I though to myself, that, if it were not for the thoughts of things that come more home to one's business . . . I could be content to retake my berth at Schenectady and return to Buffalo for amusement. The Erie Canal Boat is a long and very pretty drawing room afloat. It has a library, sofas, a tolerable cook, curtains or venetian blinds, a civil captain, and no smell of steam or perciptible motion. It is drawn generally by three horses at a fair trot, and gets you through about a hundred miles a day . . . the company, say fifty people, is such as pleases heaven.

"The Erie Canal is cut a hundred or two miles through the heart of the primeval wilderness of America and the boat was gliding on silently and swiftly; . . . the luxuriant soil had sent up a rank grass that covered the horsepath like velvet; . . . the Erie water was clear as a brook in the winding canal (Congressman McCarthy please take note). The horses drew steadily and unheard at the end of the long line, the steersman stood motionless at the tiller and I lay on a heap of baggage in the prow attentive to the slightest breathing of nature . . ." Whatever tranquilizer Author Willis had found was apparently not available to the traveler, whose name I have not discovered, but who wrote of a journey on the same canal at the same time as follows:

"We left Schnectady about five, with a full cabin of passengers, of whom a good part were ladies . . . in fact we were as thick as two mice in a mitten; there were not seats enough for us to sit in . . . the drivers were halloing and swearing; the boat was bumping and thumping against others . . . that night, when we came to stow twenty-four of us into a little room 10 x 15, two or three deep, my hope of sleep was but small. The air was hot as an oven. Some were groaning and scolding. Some were snoring like a steamboat . . . I attempted to thrust my legs out the window but the noise of a passing boat made me glad to draw them in."

Which account do you believe? If you are inclined, as I am, to believe the latter account, consider this:

At the time the Canal opened in 1825, the first railroad corporation charter was granted in New York State. By 1836 trains were regularly traveling at 12 miles per hour between Schnectady and Utica while the packet boats were doing about 3 miles per hour. Small wonder that passenger traffic moved to the railroads, and the Canal Commissioners were happy to see it go. The packets were ruining the canal banks and their right of way over the freight boats was a nuisance. In 1842 the rail line between Buffalo and Attica was completed making it possible to travel by rail across the state. By 1855 there were no packet boats operating on the canal.

The parallel between the Canal Commissioners' attitude toward passengers in the 1840's and the railroads' attitude toward passengers in the 1960's was to obvious to discuss.

There is no disputing the great benefit from the canal to this area and, while we pay tribute to the persistent efforts of Buffalo's early leaders to establish the Port of Buffalo and the terminus of the Erie Canal there, we should look forward 150 years and ask what of our current efforts our descendants will find worthy of similar tribute.

Food Facts and Fancies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH P. VIGORITO

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 11, 1967

Mr. VIGORITO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

FOOD FACTS AND FANCIES

(Remarks by Trienah Meyers, staff assistant to the Administrator, Economic Research Service, USDA, at annual conference for the Pennsylvania Federation of Women's Clubs, Pennsylvania State University, July 19, 1967)

I'm most impressed with your conference theme, "Bridges to Understanding." It seems to me that it's particularly pertinent in today's world for we need many more and better bridges to understanding. We need to improve those we have and to plan others. Some of these may take decades to build; others may take a lifetime—or even more.

Undoubtedly, there are many reasons why we need more and better bridges to understanding. But one that seems important to me is that we are a far different country and world today than we were just two decades ago. Probably more changes have taken place since World War II than during all the earlier years of this century. The technological revolution we have witnessed has changed all our lives—and we have taken it in our stride. We have adapted readily to TV, push-button living, air-conditioned homes and cars, and even private planes and speed boats. But, this advance in technology has taken place so fast that our social adjustments have not been able to keep pace. Our understanding of this new society has moved slowly—has been difficult—we are way behind in this respect. We have found it easier to orbit the earth than to solve some of our social, economic, and political problems. . . .

Because of the rapid changes in this world and even in our outer world, we need to stop, look, listen, and take stock. We have traveled so fast, technologically, that we haven't taken time to really evaluate the impact of all of this on people. And, this we must do. We must be *alive*, *alert*, and *awake* to how these changes have affected us today and how they are likely to affect us in the future.

This is the broad picture, the big bridges to understanding that we must not lose sight of. They may seem far removed from an individual, so let's take a look at some of the smaller bridges that need to be built—those closer to home and the individual.

Before I talk about Food Facts and Fancies—or how Foods Go to Market—I'd like to say a word about our economy. I believe that we all need to know more about how it functions—about what has made us a great nation; why we have one of the highest standards of living in the world; why more of our people have more discretionary spending power than ever before; why more families are able to own or are buying homes; why we have more leisure. But probably equally or even more important is what is needed to keep us going in the right direction, and what our individual responsibilities are toward our economy to help keep it strong.

We have come to accept our country as it is today as normal—nothing unusual. Some consider it their right to enjoy these gains without any feeling of responsiblity toward them. Our younger people—and this is 50 percent or more of our population—have known nothing but this way of life—life in an affluent society—where wants come first; where boredom sets in quickly; where it takes a startling new discovery to excite an almost blasé younger generation.

Why do we seem to take all this for granted? I'd like to use our food system, which is a step closer to us, to illustrate some of the points I have made—to discuss what has been happening during the last two decades to foods on their way to market—to take a look at some of the facts and fancies related ot food buying and food prices.

I wonder how many of you have ever stopped to consider how much food we eat in a year. It is equal to 2½ tons of food a year for an average family of four. And this food has to be moved from farms to a supermarket so a family shopper can have the food she wants, where she wants it, when she wants it, in the form she wants it, and, hopefully, at a price she considers "reasonable."

Think how this task is compounded for a supermarket manager. This family shopper is only one of his customers. Others may differ in their wants because of the amount they can or want to spend for food, the kind and qualities of food they like, the amount of built-in maid service they want to buy, the size of their family, and the ages of their children. . . .

Think of all the people who are involved in one way or another in getting this food to the family shopper and to away-from-home eating places. Farmers, assemblers, truckers, processors, wholesalers and retailers—all working together, with each group making its own special contribution.

Then add to this others who supply these people with tractors, trucks, processing and packaging equipment, cartons and bottles, and the 11 million shopping carts, which, if placed end-to-end, would reach from Chicago to Paris.

All of these workers together have provided us with a wide variety of "seasonal" foods the year around along with foods that reach our kitchens in new and appealing forms—foods of high quality, packaged for more economical distribution, easier storage, and protection from spoilage and contamination.

Yet, today, most of us seem to take for granted all of these things that are done for us. Even some of us who have reached—or passed—the age where "life begins" have forgotten about the day when a fresh orange in the Christmas stocking was a real treat.

We have forgotten about all the hours that were spent in "putting up" the vegetables and fruit needed during the winter, about the treks to the bakery, the corner grocery where baskets of lettuce and other fresh produce were often left sitting in the sun, the butcher shop with sawdust on the floor and beef hanging uncovered, unrefrigerated, at the side of the store.

Many of us who can remember these days tend to recall only those things that look good to us from this distance—like the prices we paid. Many wonder—and sometimes very vocally—why we have to pay more now for steak than we did in 1935. We do pay more for most foods today than we used to. But, since our incomes have gone up faster than prices, we are spending a smaller share of our take-home pay for food than ever before in our history.

Statements in newspapers last fall indicated that many consumers see little, if any, relationship between incomes and prices. Their incomes should go up, but the prices of things they want or have to buy should stay the same. For example, a homemaker may not understand that when her husband gets a raise in salary this becomes part of the product or service he supplies. This may increase the cost to the buyer unless efficiencies offset some or all of this added cost. If consumers stop buying the product or service because they think the price is too high, their husbands may be out of jobs.

Gains in "purchasing power" or what we can buy with our take-home pay have not always proceeded at a uniform pace. At times, wages have gone up faster than prices. Most of us like this, for then we can buy more of the things we want. But this creates additional demands, and if there are not enough products to satisfy these demands, prices go up. We, then, may be in a period when prices tend to go up faster than income. We don't like this situation as well and call it inflation.

In both of these types of situations, an individual or a family may be affected differently from the so-called "average." A family whose income doesn't go up notices increases in prices more than the one getting a raise or promotion. Extra pressure is put on our pocketbooks too if wages stay the same and the family grows larger and older. If one is retired, any price rise, whether in rent, medical bills or food, is noticed.

As with other things, prices of food change. In part, this is because the amount paid for labor and materials becomes part of the cost of the item produced. Prices of the tractors farmers use have gone up in price over the years. The cost of equipment used by processors, wholesalers and grocers has gone up too. Added to this are the wages of workers all along the line, though theirs have not increased as much as wages of employees in many other kinds of jobs.

Overall, prices of most foods have been "reasonable" and, at times, a "bargain" in terms of our take-home pay. Often we don't think so for we tend to want the prices of "necessities" to stay the same so we can buy other things to satisfy our yearnings. Why is it that we seem particularly sensitive to changes in the prices of food? Why do we protest so vehemently when some foods go up a penny or two while other things we buy may have increased dollars? How much do we really know about food prices—about what our *food bills* actually are?

One observation is that family shoppers seem to be more aware of increases than decreases in food prices. You may say that this is fine—she should be—this is her job. But what seems to happen is that she remembers the high prices and doesn't balance them out over time when prices go down. It is normal for prices of many foods to fluctuate—season to season—from week to week.

But, you may say, prices did go up last year, and the women were quite vocal about it! Yes, food prices did go up last year. Until August, they increased at a faster rate than has been usual in recent years. And, during these months, each time the Bureau of Labor Statistics Food Index went up, it made the headlines. This served to accent price rises and, for some individuals, it accented them to the point that when newspapers now say that the cost of living has gone up, they subconsciously blame food.

Even last fall when some housewives were protesting the prices of foods, some very important foods in family purchases were already going down in price. In October 36 of the 87 foods priced by BLS were lower than they were in March (1966); 30 were cheaper than in September; and 14 were lower in price than the same month the year before. . . .

Let's see how some of these indexes have changed since 1957–59. As of May this year, the most recent data we have, the Food Index had risen 13.9 percent since 1957–59. *Food away from home* had increased 28.7 percent, while *food at the grocery* had risen by only 10.9 percent. By comparison, during this same period, medical care was up 35.7 percent; prices of footwear had increased 25.2 percent; and public transportation was up 30.9 percent. The index for "all items" together—or the overall increase in the cost of living—had risen 15.6 percent. Only fuel and utilities, household furnishings and operations, and women's and girls' apparel and upkeep had risen less than *food at home*.

Another observation as to why shoppers appear to be particularly sensitive to price increases is that food seems to be the one big item that isn't automatically built into the budget. We commit ourselves to monthly payments for rent or for a house mortgage, the family car, maybe even two cars, the washing machine, the set of encyclopedias for the youngsters, and other consumer items. We allow for insurance coverage, hospitalization, doctor and dental bills. These are budgeted expenditures, and we tend to pay for them by check.

Food, on the other hand, we usually buy for cash. And many times, and probably for most of us, it's the cash left over after other commitments have been met. If this remaining cash won't stretch far enough each week to include favorite foods, we may blame the price of food.

I'm inclined to think too that homemakers have a price range in mind when they shop. If the price goes above this mental price ceiling—because of short supplies—then the homemaker is reluctant to buy. If the price falls to an unusual low because of abundant supplies, she will buy more but may not stop to think what a bargain it is.

Food prices are "high" or getting there when they push this mental price ceiling and "normal" only when they go down. For items like fryers, she may consider the "special" price the regular price. Yet, the store may be using them as loss leaders, selling them at or even below cost on that particular day. I wonder how many of us would be willing to buy eggs, incubate them to raise little chicks—then feed these chickens for months, kill them, remove the feathers, head, feet, and entrails, wrap giblets in absorbent paper, insert these into the inner cavity, put the cleaned chicken in a plastic bag and get it to the retail meat counter for from 24 to 29 cents a pound—for less than $1 for a 3-pound ready-to-cook chicken?

While I'm talking about chicken, I'd like to digress a bit and discuss some of the comments we get about the packaging of meat. Some homemakers would like it cut-to-order, others think packaging adds to the cost. I believe that, today, most supermarkets do cut meat to order if a family shopper asks for it. But, let's just assume there is no precut, prepackaged meat available. Can you imagine what it would be like on a Saturday if every shopper had to wait to have meat cut to order? Imagine a hundred customers waiting in line while one shopper tells the butcher the cut of meat she wants, the grade of meat she wants, and the quantity she wants. Then the butcher would have to go to the refrigerator and bring out part of a side of beef, try to slice a piece of meat so it will weigh the amount specified, get the customer's approval of what he has done, and, then, he still would have to wrap it. Such a line would only inch along—be much slower than at any check-out counter—unless more meat cutters were hired.

Going back to food costs, there's another thing that tends to make it difficult for us to know precisely what we spend for food. This is because, on any one shopping trip, there can be quite a difference between the supermarket bill and the food bill. In today's supermarkets everything is displayed side by side. And, *everything* includes all the things that get added to the grocery bill that aren't foods at all—laundry soap, floor wax, children's socks, even hi-fi records and encyclopedias. About 20 percent of the average grocery bill—the bill we tend to think of as the family food bill—is made up of items to wear, or read, or listen to, or clean house with. We certainly don't eat them. I know I was surprised to find that we buy through the supermarket about 90 percent of all the cat and dog food sold, more than half of the toothpaste, half of the aspirin and now nearly half of the hair spray. We spend about the same amount in grocery stores for dog food as we do for canned baby food. We spend 3 percent more for three products—canned and bottled beer for off-premise consumption, cigarettes, and pet foods—than we do for fresh beef.

We find too that frequently homemakers compare what they are spending this year with last without considering changes in the family itself. There may have been an addition to the family. Or that son may have reached the "everlastingly hungry" stage! Let me give you an example of this: When a couple is first married, it may spend about $20 a week for food. The first child adds around $3 a week to the bill. This jumps another $4 with the second child. If the two youngsters are teenagers, the family is likely to spend around $40 a week for food—about twice what it cost the couple. This change in cost, as figured, is due *only* to increases in the quantities of food needed by each member of the family.

Often, it seems that price is the determining factor in buying food. But, there should be more to it than that. We all want to be good shoppers, but good food buying must be more than price—we must think of our family needs, about the food they like. And, remember, that the amount we spend for food depends on many things, in general, the size of our paycheck, the number in our family, how old each member is, how much we entertain, how important food is to us in relation to other things we need or want, and the general level of prices.

Now, for a moment, I'd like to talk a little about our young family shoppers as they are today and are likely to be tomorrow. For as you say, "Tomorrow is almost here."

It's difficult for some of us to realize that over half of our population is under 28—that three out of every four Americans living today are too young to remember World War I. That nearly two-thirds of us were not yet born when the stock market crashed in 1929! And, most amazing to me, is that to nearly a half of our population the Korean War is ancient history! This means they've been growing up during the period of greatest prosperity—and technological innovation—in our history.

The "under 30's" have a different attitude toward needs and wants than their parents and grandparents who grew up in the prewar and "flapper" eras. In general, these "under 30" homemakers have more formal education than their elders, are more sophisticated, marry younger, move around more, and tend to have better incomes earlier in life than former generations. They demand more conveniences—in fact, many of these are necessities, not luxuries.

Today's young homemakers have always shopped in supermarkets with from 6,000 to 8,000 or even more items from which to choose. They can and do select from a variety of precooked, prepackaged foods—processed potatoes, TV dinners, oven-ready pizzas, prepared cake mixes, brown-and-serve rolls. Studies have shown that these homemakers are among the heaviest users of such items. And, they especially like to try "new" ones.

Our young shoppers take for granted the fringe benefits provided by supermarkets—parking, check-cashing service, air-conditioned comfort in summer, loudspeakers to report lost children, sample demonstrations of new foods. The only supermarkets they have known specialize in selling a market basket of services along with their products.

What is being forecast for the next generation of young homemakers is largely more of everything. Unless unforeseen events take place, they are expected to have higher incomes; and there will be still more things to tempt them to spend this money. They will be even more used to extraordinary technological developments than our young people are today. I believe that work should be started today to build a wiser generation to cope with tomorrow's challenges . . .

There is need to "get" *more* understanding, *more* economic knowhow. This is where *you* can help immensely for *you* represent a group that can help provide such information, foster greater understanding, and have a unique opportunity to do so.

Reinecke Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT B. (BOB) MATHIAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 11, 1967

Mr. MATHIAS of California. Mr. Speaker, some of the best material I have read on the Congress comes from the Representatives, themselves, in their newsletters to constituents. I recently had occasion to read through one such newsletter from a California colleague, Congressman Ed Reinecke, who represents the northern section of Los Angeles County. Mr. Reinecke, in his report from Washington, provides his constituents with an up-to-date summary of legislative action in the first session of the 90th Congress. The citizens of the 27th District in California can be proud of their Congressman Ed Reinecke, who is endeavoring to keep them informed and aware of their Government.

I am pleased to call attention to this excellent report by presenting its contents for insertion in the Record:

Congressman Ed Reinecke Reports From Washington

Riots, rats, taxes, wars, deficits, inflation, crime! A prominent Senate Democrat recently summed up our situation by saying that instead of the promised Great Society, the Johnson Administration has managed to create a Sick Society.

In a rare display of modesty, the President magnanimously credited Congress for conditions which he says precipitated the riots. First of all, conditions don't precipitate riots, people precipitate them. Secondly, Congress has responsibility for passing the laws. The Administration is responsible for their implementation and enforcement. Third, Congress appropriates the money. It is the Administration's obligation to get top value for every dollar appropriated. Is the Administration living up to its obligation? Let us review the conditions cited by the President—in relation to appropriations and Administration spending.

HOUSING

Congress appropriated $2.1 billion in the past six years for low-income housing. The Administration, during this same period, produced only 40,000 low-income housing units. You or I could go out and buy two or three (depending upon location, size and construction) single-family homes for the $50,000 that the Administration is spending per low-income housing unit. Should Congress submit to Presidential demands for more of your money to perpetuate this type of waste and inefficiency? I say "no". Congress should seek a more economical and workable method of alleviating the shortage of decent housing for low-income families.

Along with a number of my colleagues, I offered such a method early in this Congress. The plan calls for the establishment of a non-profit Home Ownership Foundation which would raise $2 billion in private funds through the sale of bonds. The money would be used for housing rehabilitation and construction as well as mortgage assistance in low-income areas. Emphasizing the principle of self-help, the program will also provide technical assistance, budget counseling, job training, and employment opportunities. The enormous resources and strength of the private sector—business, labor, the professions and non-profit associations—would be mobilized in a comprehensive program of urban improvement. The role of government would be limited to reinforcement and guarantee, rather than execution and control. While this approach was Republican-oriented, it now has broad bi-partisan and ideological suppport in a Congress that is weary of bureaucratic mis-management.

JOB TRAINING AND EMPLOYMENT

Congress appropriated $22 billion in fiscal 1967 alone for programs associated with the Administration's war on poverty. This "war" is supposed to promote self-sufficiency by providing education, training and employment opportunities. Results? Today, there are more people (5 million) on the welfare rolls than ever before. Why? I'll give you a typical example—based on an actual case—of where the poverty money is going. OEO (headquarters for the poverty war) recently awarded $242,316 to an independent, non-official, non-professional group for a one-year project. Of the total grant, $120,000 will pay the salaries ($4,000 per annum each) of 30 youths who will work for local welfare-oriented government agencies, and another $2,740 will pay their transportation costs. The balance of the grant, or $119,576, will be absorbed by administrative and/or operational expenses. Training? The youths will compile a knowledge of "free" (tax-supported) services and benefits and then transmit this knowledge to the people in their communities. Jobs? The project sponsors "hope" the local agencies will hire the youths after the one-year grant expires.

By contrast, the Rockwell-Standard Corp. (based in Pittsburg, Pa.) recently trained and hired 198 unemployed men for jobs in its new axle plant in Winchester, Kentucky. The company spent $52,987 for the training program, or $267 per man, as compared to the $8,077 per trainee cost of the tax-supported poverty project.

The job of training the unemployed and unskilled should be done by those who would hire them after training. I have proposed legislation which would encourage private enterprise to meet the challenge of unemployment on a massive scale. My proposal would make a tax credit available to employers for expenses incurred in training prospective employees for jobs with the company. Tax incentives have been used to promote American investments in underdeveloped countries abroad with remarkable success. This same approach can and should be used to develop a fully productive society right here in America.

RATS

Congress has made available over $448 million for rat extermination programs. Three departments (Interior, Agriculture and HEW) and several agencies including OEO, are in the rat control business. Instead of consolidating these programs under a single department (HEW which is responsible for public health would be the logical choice), the Administration sought $40 million for still another program to be run by a fourth department—Housing & Urban Development. The President, of course, mentioned his rat control bill in conjunction with his address to the nation on civil riots. This set the scene for the "rats cause riots" demonstration, led by Jesse Gray—a $50 per day poverty worker, which disrupted the House of Representatives a short time thereafter.

As a matter of interest, Detroit, Michigan, has one of the most comprehensive rat extermination programs in the entire country. It is also one of the President's "model cities" and the recipient of many millions of dollars in federal aid. The cause for this particular riot—the worst in recent history—cannot be justified in terms of rats or lack of federal assistance.

RIOTS

By circumventing State and Local Governments to deal directly with the poor, the Administration has helped to create a black power structure which seems to feel a certain immunity from and contempt for State and Local authority. The war on poverty has been translated into a war on society by the militants who promote hate and violence, as well as the so-called moderates who are promoting civil disobedience as a means of strangling an economy from which they demand so much. One of the moderates when questioned about the paradox of negro affluence and the riot in Detroit, replied that a little prosperity whets the appetite for more. This is true enough, but impatience with the rate of one's material progress, is no excuse to murder, burn, loot and blackmail.

In addition to initiating and supporting a number of crime prevention and riot control measures, which have passed the House and are now awaiting action in the Senate, I have proposed a comprehensive overhaul of the poverty program. My recommendations include the creation of a Council of Economic Opportunity Advisors to replace OEO; the transfer of OEO administrative functions to existing departments and agencies; coordination of all programs with State and Local authorities; and, a statutory prohibition against use of poverty money for political or racist activity. The poverty program should be designed for the benefit of the poor, not for their exploitation by political partisans and racists.

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW

Since my last writing, the House has completed action on a number of bills including: (1) *The Social Security Amendments of 1967*. Provides a 12.5% increase in payments to 23.7 million Social Security beneficiaries; an increase in the minimum monthly benefit from $44 to $50; a liberalization of the earnings limitation from $1,500 to $1,680; and, improvements in provisions for those over 72. In addition, the bill made certain necessary changes in the program for Aid to Families with Dependent Children which are designed to restore more families to employment and self-reliance. The bill will cost $1.2 billion less than that recommended by the President, who is opposing the legislative changes in AFDC. * * * (2) *The Commission on Obscenity and Pornography*. This proposal which is similar to one that I sponsored in the 89th and current Congresses, establishes a special commission to study the problem of pornographic traffic and recommend appropriate constitutional means to curb the wholesale distribution of obscene and obnoxious advertising and materials. * * * (3) *A Civil Rights Measure*. Prohibits interference with a public official, a policeman or a fireman in the performance of his duties during a riot; prohibits interference with people who are lawfully engaged in the exercise of their civil rights; and, excludes from protected 'speech and peaceful assembly' acts and statements which constitute incitement to riot. * * * (4) *Veterans' Assistance*. Provides a cost-of-living increase in the non-service-connected pension program; raises education and training allowances; provides a burial allowance; and, improves the disability compensation and medical care programs.

WELCOME, VALENCIA!

On behalf of the 27th Congressional District, I wish to extend an official welcome to the new community of "Valencia" which was formally baptized in ceremonial style this month. Located in the heart of the 27th District, between the Antelope and San Fernando Valleys, Valencia emerged from the drawing board to reality since I first came to Congress three years ago. As a matter of fact, I was instrumental in reserving the name "Valencia" for the new postal facility which began processing mail under this postmark for the first time last month. The developers of this modern residential-commercial-industrial complex, anticipate rapid growth and a projected population in excess of 100,000.

THERE OUGHT TO BE A LAW

Congratulations are in order for the winners of my third annual citizenship essay contest for junior and senior high school students, who this year addressed themselves to the subject "There Ought to be a Law". The contest, which is approved by the Los Angeles Board of Education and judged by a voluntary citizens' committee, is designed to generate student interest in public affairs. Students from 16 area schools submitted entries in this year's contest. Division winners include *Diana Billet*, 17, of Quartz Hill, who received the senior high school award for her essay on the voting age; *Patricia DuBois*, 13, of Lancaster, who won the junior high school award for her entry on the draft system; and, *Debbie Webb*, 13, of Burbank, who received the special judges' award for originality. Debbie suggested a law "against growing up".

My People Want To Win

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL C. JONES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 11, 1967

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a feature article by Mr. Edward W. O'Brien, of the Washington bureau of the St. Louis Globe-Democrat. I want to say that the article included herewith sums up pretty well what the people of the 10th Congressional District are thinking, and they are not satisfied with the way the war has been conducted in Vietnam.

First, the people I represent do not like appeasement, sanctuaries, delays, indecision, gradualism, and halfway measures; in other words they do not like being in a war which they have every reason to believe is not being conducted with a determination to win.

I have said it before, and I say it again, Mr. Speaker, if our airmen had been permitted to hit the targets in 1965 that they are being permitted to hit today, this war would have been over, according to the opinion of those in whom I have the most confidence.

I ask you Mr. Speaker, to read this statement in the article below, which has been documented by more than one reliable source, wherein it states:

> Our bombers were prohibited, by rules imposed by civilians in Washington, from doing the obvious, which would be to strike and destroy these weapons before they became lethal.

This reference was to this paragraph:

> Most of the Communists' sophisticated air defense equipment—the missiles, radar, antiaircraft guns, Mig fighter planes, and elaborate control gear—has come from the Soviet. Our aerial cameras watched the unloading from Soviet and East European ships in Haiphong harbor, the temporary storage in the Haiphong and Hanoi area, shipment to the most valuable target areas, and finally the erection and use of these weapons.

Read this article Mr. Speaker. Most of it is taken from or based on the official report of the Stennis investigating committee in the Senate. It contains information which has been generally known for many, many months, but which has not been officially acknowledged until just recently. The longer we wait to take the actions necessary to win this war, the more costly it is going to be, both in terms of lives, dollars, and the reputation of the United States.

Again, I say, Mr. Speaker, read this article by Mr. O'Brien which appeared in the Saturday-Sunday issue of the St. Louis Globe-Democrat on September 2–3, 1967:

WASHINGTON

(By Edward W. O'Brien)

WASHINGTON.—Not many Americans realize the ferocity of the defenses thrown up by the Communists in North Vietnam against American airmen.

One measure is evident in the St. Louis area in the Phantom fighter-bomber aircraft rolling out of the McDonnell Douglas plant. The first call on the company's production is replacement of the American planes lost over North Vietnam. On some exceptionally bad days, losses have exceeded production.

Even on days that are not quite so black, the losses steadily mount. A few days ago, the Senate's Stennis investigating subcommittee reported that a total of 660 planes of all types have been shot down over North Vietnam.

By modern military standards, North Vietnam is a primitive nation. Why, then, such huge losses of American planes? The Stennis report gave the answer:

"Since our air attacks began, the enemy has accomplished a tremendous and very formidable buildup in his air defenses. The North Vietnamese air defense environment overall, including anti-aircraft fire, surface-to-air missiles, and Mig aircraft over the heavily defended targets in North Vietnam, has been described as the most deadly the world has ever seen."

Most of the Communists' sophisticated air defense equipment—the missiles, radar, antiaircraft guns, Mig fighter planes, and elaborate electronic control gear—has come from the Soviet. Our aerial cameras watched the unloading from Soviet and East European ships in Haiphong harbor, the temporary storage in the Haiphong and Hanoi area, shipment to the most valuable target areas, and finally the erection and use of these weapons.

What were our bombers doing all this time? They were prohibited, by rules imposed by civilians in Washington, from doing the obvious, which would be to strike and destroy these weapons before they became lethal.

After hearing sworn testimony from our top military commanders, the Stennis subcommittee reported:

"The long delay in approving targets in North Vietnam has almost certainly contributed to our aircraft and pilot losses since it gave the North Vietnamese the time to build up formidable air defenses . . . we shackled the true potential of air power and permitted the buildup of what has become the world's most formidable anti-aircraft defenses."

The key word in portraying President Johnson's conduct of the entire war is gradualism. He was persuaded that North Vietnam's will could be broken by slowly tightening the screws.

A fallacy was that there are no half-ways stops between life and death. There was no gradualism for the American airmen who have been shot down to their death. On the other hand, gradualism was and is acceptable to the North Vietnamese leaders. As the Stennis subcommittee remarked. "The price we have exacted from North Vietnam for its continued aggression is one that it is still willing to pay."

The Pentagon's Joint Chiefs of Staff and other military experts informed the Senators that air power can accomplish more—much more—though the toll in airmen's lives will be high. For the Senators, Vietnam war policy can be reduced to this proposition:

"What is needed now is the hard decision to do whatever is necessary, take the risks that have to be taken, and apply the force that is required to see the job through."

The same decision, if taken in February, 1965, when the bombing campaign began, would have been less hard to make and far less costly to carry out.

Missouri Federation of the Blind Gives Excellent Advice to Members in Using Credit in a "10 Commandments for Borrowers"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 11, 1967

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, the Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs of the House Committee on Banking and Currency is working on major legislation dealing with the protection of the public in the utilization of consumer credit. As chairman of that subcommittee, I hope that we come forward with a good, strong bill to provide consumers not only with the information which they need in order to use credit intelligently, but with additional protections against predatory credit practices.

Over and over again during our hearings on H.R. 11601 and related bills dealing with the disclosure of credit terms, the point was made by our witnesses that consumers very frequently fail to evidence any interest whatsoever in determining what the costs of the credit will be. Frequently they merely ask about the amount of the monthly payments, without bothering to ask how many payments they will have to make or what the finance charge amounts to in dollars or in percent. Undoubtedly, consumers could help themselves a great deal by paying more attention to the terms of the credit transactions which they enter into.

In this connection, I was most interested in reading a short article in the Missouri Chronicle, published by the Missouri Federation of the Blind, Inc., entitled "10 Commandments for Borrowers." The publication is edited by Mrs. Alma Murphey of 4103 Castleman Avenue in St. Louis. I commend this article to my colleagues in the Congress of the United States.

CONSUMER AFFAIRS SUBCOMMITTEE HEARINGS DOCUMENTED THESE PROBLEMS

Every one of the "commandments" contained in this short article relates to the kind of problems which have been described by witnesses in the hearings of the Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs arising out of failure of the purchaser or borrower to examine the contract carefully before signing it or to get a firm understanding of just what was expected from the purchaser or borrower in connection with the transaction.

All of us on the subcommittee are anxious to take what steps are necessary to protect the public from predatory credit practices, but we also recognize that there is an obligation on the consumer, too, to exercise reasonably good sense in the use of credit. The article in the Missouri Chronicle published by the Missouri Federation of the Blind, Inc., which spells out the obligations which the consumer has to himself in entering into a consumer credit transaction is as follows:

[From the Missouri Chronicle, June 1967]

TEN COMMANDMENTS FOR BORROWERS

1. No matter how good the interest rate sounds, find out what the credit or loan will actually cost you in money. This is the first thing to do.
2. Before you sign any papers, make sure all the figures are entered correctly. Never leave any blank spaces to be filled in later.
3. Question all insurance charges. Find out what kind of insurance you are buying, and exactly what it covers. Many different insurance "load-on" practices have been reported.
4. On installment purchases, you may owe the payments to some other firm, not the dealer. Find out who it is, and if it is a reputable firm. If you have any doubts, check with the Better Business Bureau.
5. Read the note or contract to see what penalties are imposed for late payments. Some penalties are exorbitant.
6. See if there are any other extra charges specified in the note or contract. Don't skip the fine print, or you may be sorry.
7. Read what is said about repossession in a time-payment contract. Do you get a fair notice before the item is repossessed? What repossession charges can be levied against you? This is important!
8. Understand clearly what security you are giving. On a purchase, find out if it includes other merchandise you have bought previously. Above all, look to see if the note or contract gives your creditor the right to collect your salary through a wage garnishment.
9. Make sure you do not sign away any of your legal rights or guarantees, such as the right to refuse merchandise which is not as promised.
10. See if there is provision for a refund of interest or carrying charges if you complete the payments ahead of schedule.

Remember! your credit union will gladly help you compare total costs and monthly payments. Then you can decide what's best. Nearly always, your credit union offers a payment plan as good or better. And life insurance is provided on insurable loans without extra charge!

Message of the President of the Republic of Poland to the Polish Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 11, 1967

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, on September 1, 1967, the 28th anniversary of the German invasion of Poland, His Excellency August Zaleski, the legitimate President of the Republic of Poland, issued the following statement to Poles throughout the world:

> When Germany and Russia invaded the Polish Republic in 1939 to carry out another partition of Poland, President Moscicki thus defined the aims of the defensive war we were obliged to wage:
>
> "We are fighting for law against lawlessness, for faith and civilization, against soulless barbarism, for good against the rule of evil in the world."
>
> Owing to the enormous preponderance of our enemies, the Polish authorities and a large number of our armed forces were forced to leave the homeland in order to carry on the struggle from the lands of our allies.
>
> However, when hostilities ended with Germany's capitulation, Poland did not recover her independence, and the whole country was under the occupation of Soviet Russia. But this fact did not change the attitude of the Polish nation.
>
> For, except for a tiny little group which entered the service of Russo-Communism, the whole nation is continuing the bloodless struggle for freedom and independence. The struggle waged by the homeland is an exceedingly difficult, onerous and dangerous one.
>
> This has made it all the more incumbent for us, whom the Almighty has enabled to sojourn in the free world, to accept the duty of helping the homeland by propagating the indubitable truth that there can be no justice and freedom in international relations until the hundred million Europeans who were free before the war are liberated.
>
> We must work ceaselessly for the propagation of this truth and implore Almighty God that it prevail.
>
> AUGUST ZALESKI.
>
> London, September 1, 1967.

The power of the Soviet Army, not the will of the Polish people, prevails today behind the Iron Curtain. The Polish people are vigorous in their personal opposition to Communist rule and I believe their courage will one day enable them to overcome their Communist oppressors. Their fortitude is strengthened by the knowledge that they have the support of thousands of Poles and other exiles among the captive peoples of Eastern Europe who are striving for the common goal of restoration of freedom to their homeland.

President Johnson's Excellent Appointment of Walter Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 11, 1967

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, as the New York Times commented in an editorial, President Johnson's appointment of Walter Washington as the new District of Columbia Commissioner "does honor to both men."

The Times notes that the President's appointment took "courage" in the fact of the summer rioting throughout the country. But the paper goes on to say that the President has appointed a man who "brings first-class credentials to his new post as head of local government in the Nation's Capital."

President Johnson's commitment to progress for the District of Columbia has been amply demonstrated in his leadership for District reorganization. This appointment, I believe, adds a further dimension to this commitment and will help to usher in an exciting and rewarding new era of progress for Washington's 800,000 residents.

I insert into the RECORD the editorial from the New York Times:

WASHINGTON'S FIRST "MAYOR"

The appointment by President Johnson of Walter E. Washington as first "Mayor" of Washington, does honor to both men.

The choice is based on Mr. Washington's outstanding qualifications, but it took courage for the President to make it in the aftermath of strife in the cities when Congressional troglodytes talk of any advances by Negroes as "rewarding the rioters." For a time it appeared that the President's familiar allergy to premature press disclosures might cost Mr. Washington his new assignment, but happily Mr. Johnson put pique aside.

There is no question that Mr. Washington brings first-class credentials to his new post as head of local government in the nation's capital. He started out as a Civil Service junior housing assistant in 1941 when Washington's public housing, spurred by Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, was known as the Alley Dwelling Authority. He and his wife are parallel success stories; while he served as head of the National Capital Housing Authority, she became a high school principal and director of the women's Job Corps.

In reversing the route that carried him from the District of Columbia to New York, Mr. Washington remains on the front lines of the most crucial work for a civil servant today: rebuilding our cities. He will have a formidable assignment. Whenever anti-American publications abroad want to needle Washington, they run photographs of slum buildings in the shadow of the gleaming Capitol. Unfortunately, the pictures are not retouched. The residents of these dwellings include many Negroes, who make up more than 60 per cent of the city's population.

When Mr. Washington left his job as director of the housing agency last November, The Washington Evening Star called it "Lindsay's greatest coup, and surely for this city its greatest loss." It is now the District of Columbia's turn to rejoice.

The first Commissioner is subject to Senate approval. On his qualifications—and that is what really matters—confirmation should come quickly. This is a step toward making the capital of the United States a better place to live and work in—and to tell the world that achievement wears no color in this country.

Abraham Lincoln Prophesies Our Times

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 11, 1967

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues and the readers of the RECORD the following speech delivered by Abraham Lincoln on January 27, 1838, and recently reprinted in U.S. News & World Report.

These remarks will, I believe, strike a familiar note with all of us who are concerned with the perils of our times:

RIOTS AND MOB SPIRIT—AMERICA'S GREATEST DANGER—A PROPHECY WRITTEN IN 1838

(Excerpts from a speech delivered by Abraham Lincoln in Springfield, Ill., on Jan. 27, 1838. He was then 28 years old, a lawyer and a member of the Illinois State Legislature. His views are quoted here because the disregard of law and the dangers in mob violence described nearly 130 years ago are strangely parallel to what is happening in our times—David Lawrence, Editor)

(By Abraham Lincoln)

At what point shall we expect the approach of danger? By what means shall we fortify against it? Shall we expect some transatlantic military giant to step the Ocean, and crush us at a blow? Never! . . .

At what point is the approach of danger to be expected? I answer, if it ever reach us, it must spring up amongst us. It cannot come from abroad. If destruction be our lot, we must ourselves be its author and finisher. . . .

I hope I am over wary. But if I am not, there is, even now, something of ill-omen amongst us. I mean the increasing disregard for law which pervades the country, the growing disposition to substitute the wild and furious passions in lieu of the sober judgment of courts, and the worse than savage mobs for the executive ministers of justice. This disposition is awfully fearful in any community. That it now exists in ours, though grating to our feelings to admit, it would be a violation of truth and an insult to our intelligence to deny.

Accounts of outrages committed by mobs form the every-day news of the times. They have pervaded the country from New England to Louisiana. They are neither peculiar to the eternal snows of the former nor the burning suns of the latter. They are not the creature of climate—neither are they confined to the slave-holding or the non-slave-holding States. Alike, they spring up among the pleasure-hunting masters of Southern slaves and the order-loving citizens of the land of steady habits. Whatever, then, their cause may be, it is common to the whole country. . . .

Such are the effects of mob law. And such are the scenes, becoming more and more frequent in this land so lately famed for love of law and order, and the stories of which have even now grown too familiar to attract any thing more than an idle remark.

But you are, perhaps, ready to ask, "What has this to do with the perpetuation of our political institutions?" I answer, it has much to do with it. Its direct consequences are, comparatively speaking, but a small evil, and much of its danger consists in the proneness of our minds to regard its direct as its only consequences.

Abstractly considered, the hanging of the gamblers at Vicksburg was of but little consequence. They constitute a portion of population that is worse than useless in any community, and their death, if no pernicious example be set by it, is never matter of reasonable regret with anyone. If they were annually swept from the stage of existence by the plague or smallpox, honest men would, perhaps, be much profited by the operation.

Similar, too, is the correct reasoning in regard to the burning of the Negro at St. Louis. He had forfeited his life, by the perpetration of an outrageous murder upon one of the most worthy and respectable citizens of the city. And had he not died as he did, he must have died by the sentence of the law in a very short time afterwards. As to him alone, it was as well the way it was as it could otherwise have been.

But the example in either case was fearful. When men take it in their heads today to hang gamblers or burn murderers, they should recollect that, in the confusion usually attending such transactions, they will be as likely to hang or burn someone who is neither a gambler nor a murderer as one who is, and that, acting upon the example they set, the mob of tomorrow may, and probably will, hang or burn some of them by the very same mistake. And not only so—the innocent, those who have ever set their faces against violations of law in every shape, alike with the guilty, fall victims to the ravages of mob law. And thus it goes on, step by step, till all the walls erected for the defence of the persons and property of individuals are trodden down and disregarded.

But all this even is not the full extent of the evil. By such examples, by instances of the perpetrators of such acts going unpunished, the lawless in spirit are encouraged to become lawless in practice. And having been used to no restraint but dread of punishment, they thus become absolutely unrestrained. Having ever regarded Government as their deadliest bane, they make a jubilee of the suspension of its operations and pray for nothing so much as its total annihilation. While, on the other hand, good men—men who love tranquility, who desire to abide by the laws and enjoy their benefits, who would gladly spill their blood in the defense of their country—seeing their property destroyed, their families insulted, and their lives endangered, their persons injured, and seeing nothing in prospect that forebodes a change for the better, become tired of and disgusted with a Government that offers them no protection, and are not much averse to a change in which they imagine they have nothing to lose.

Thus, then, by the operation of this mobocratic spirit, which all must admit is now abroad in the land, the strongest bulwark of any Government, and particularly of those constituted like ours, may effectually be broken down and destroyed—I mean the attachment of the People. Whenever this effect shall be produced among us, whenever the vicious portion of population shall be permitted to gather in bands of hundreds and thousands and burn churches, ravage and rob provision-stores, throw printing presses into rivers, shoot editors, and hang and burn obnoxious persons at pleasure and with impunity—depend on it, this Government cannot last.

By such things, the feelings of the best citizens will become more or less alienated from it. And thus it will be left without friends or with too few, and those few too weak to make their friendship effectual. At such a time and under such circumstances, men of sufficient talent and ambition will not be wanting to seize the opportunity, strike the blow, and overturn that fair fabric which for the last half-century has been the fondest hope of the lovers of freedom throughout the world.

I know the American People are *much* attached to their Government. I know they would suffer *much* for its sake. I know they would endure evils long and patiently before they would ever think of exchanging it for another. Yet, notwithstanding all this, if the laws be continually despised and disregarded, if their rights to be secure in their persons and property are held by no better tenure than the caprice of a mob, the alienation of their affections from the Government is the natural consequence, and to that, sooner or later, it must come.

Here, then, is one point at which danger may be expected. The question recurs, "How shall we fortify against it?" The answer is simple. Let every American, every lover of liberty, every well wisher to his posterity, swear by the blood of the Revolution never to violate in the least particular the laws of the country and never to tolerate their violation by others. As the patriots of 1776 did to the support of the Declaration of Independence, so to the support of the Constitution and laws, let every American pledge his life, his property, and his sacred honor. Let every man remember that to violate the law is to trample on the blood of his father and to tear the character of his own and his children's liberty.

Let reverence for the laws be breathed by every American mother to the lisping babe that prattles on her lap. Let it be taught in schools, in seminaries, and in colleges. Let it be written in primers, spelling books, and in almanacs. Let it be preached from the pulpit, proclaimed in legislative halls, and enforced in courts of justice. And, in short, let it become the *political religion* of the nation, and let the old and the young, the rich and the poor, the grave and the gay, of all sexes and tongues and colors and conditions, sacrifice unceasingly upon its altars.

While ever a state of feeling such as this shall universally or even very generally prevail throughout the nation, vain will be every effort and fruitless every attempt to subvert our national freedom.

When I so pressingly urge a strict observance of all the laws, let me not be understood as saying there are no bad laws, nor that grievances may not arise for the redress of which no legal provisions have been made. I mean to say no such thing.

But I do mean to say that, although bad laws, if they exist, should be repealed as soon as possible, still while they continue in force, for the sake of example, they should be religiously observed. So also in unprovided cases. If such arise, let proper legal provisions be made for them with the least possible delay. But, till then, let them, if not too intolerable, be borne with.

There is no grievance that is a fit object of redress by mob law. In any case that arises—as, for instance, the promulgation of abolitionism—one of two positions is necessarily true: that is, the thing is right within itself, and therefore deserves the protection of all law and all good citizens; or it is wrong, and therefore proper to be prohibited by legal enactments. And in neither case is the interposition of mob law either necessary, justifiable, or excusable. . . .

Passion has helped us, but can do so no more. It will in future be our enemy. Reason, cold, calculating, unimpassioned reason must furnish all the materials for our future support and defence. Let those materials be moulded into *general intelligence, sound morality*, and, in particular, *a reverence for the Constitution and laws.*

King Constantine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 11, 1967

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, in view of the visit today of King Constantine with President Johnson, the question of U.S. relations with and support of the Government of Greece is of very special interest. Therefore, I insert in the Record at this point a column from the September 8 edition of the Elgin Courier News, by Mr. Dumitru Danielopol, a very thorough student of international affairs:

King Constantine

(By Dumitru Danielopol)

Washington.—Melina Mercouri, the Greek star of stage and screen is putting on a dramatic performance to tear down the new Government of her native land.

Like the heroine of an ancient tragedy, she stages Press conferences, TV shows and pickets the United Nations denouncing King Constantine and Gen. Stylianos Patakos, reportedly the key man in the circle of colonels who lead the Government.

Patakos is a "fascist," she claims.

The angry colonels over-reacted and deprived Melina of her nationality. This action includes the threat to seize her properties, although this threat has not been carried out.

As one who has suffered a similar fate, I cannot but sympathize with Melina.

In April 1944 the pro-Nazi regime of Marshal Ion Antonescu deprived me of my nationality and seized my properties in Romania to punish me for my wartime anti-Nazi activities in London.

Melina comes from an anti-Fascist family, she says, in a recent Look Magazine article. Her grandfather, a former mayor of Athens was jailed and her father was exiled during Gen. Metaxas regime.

She says she can't forgive herself for having done so little to fight the Nazi occupation in World War II.

Today, she says, "The lights have gone out in Greece" and "the birthplace of democratic concept is presently under the heel of military dictatorship."

But Melina Mercouri tells only one side of the story.

Her picture of Greece is quite different from the one I found on trips to Athens in 1966 and again last May.

But, she admits she is not "a political person."

This probably explains some glaring omissions in her eloquent cry.

She says not one word, for instance, about the bloody war fought for five years in the late 40-ies against tough ruthless and well-armed Communist guerrillas.

After all, this is part of history. The Truman Doctrine, now 20 years old was created to preserve the independence of her country.

She says not one word about the mass murders perpetrated by the Reds or the 26,000 children kidnapped and taken behind the Iron Curtain.

Not a word of the constant fear of a new Communist coup engineered from neighboring Red nations.

These things are not irrelevant to the people of Greece.

I interviewed a great number of people on both my visits, from many strata of society, including two Prime Ministers.

In 1966 Premier Stephanos Stephanopoulos told me that his country's only security was her alliance with NATO. He reminded me that in this century alone Greece had been invaded seven times.

Many feared this might happen again if Andreas Papandreou, the leftist son of former Premier George Papandreou, was successful in his efforts to cut ties with NATO.

He now stands trial for high treason for his role in an antiarmy "ASPIDA" plot aimed at a leftist take-over of the Government and establishment of a "meritocracy with Socialist political-social background."

Last May, Prime Minister Constantine Kollias claimed that the seizure of power by the military came in the nick of time. Captured Communist documents, he said, disclosed a plot to overthrow the regime after a wave of civil disorders.

"Don't take my word," said Kollias, "go and speak with the people."

I did.

Although many deplored the fact that Parliamentary democracy had been temporarily abolished, they said that the coup was necessary. The alternative was disorder and possibly a civil war, they said.

Important businessmen told me that they were being blackmailed by Communist-infiltrated labor unions to contribute to Party coffers, or endure costly strikes.

No one suggests Melina Mercouri had any part in this.

"Everyone knows how much I hate all extremism including Communism," she says.

No one doubts her sincerity. But is she helping the Greek people whom she loves?

From what I saw in Greece, Melina Mercouri does not echo the voice of the majority of the Greek people.

However, she does echo another anti-Fascist, Leonid I Brezhnev, Secretary General of the Communist Party of the USSR who says:

"Greek reaction is trying to establish a fascist dictatorship . . . thousands of the best sons of the Greek people have been thrown in prison."

Melina should ponder this.

Her performances on stage and screen are unmatchable, but after all, she's not "a political person."

President's Rent Supplement Plan Praised By the Washington Daily News

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 11, 1967

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, there is no more critical issue before this Congress than the President's rent supplement program designed to improve housing conditions for low-income families and to stimulate private construction of decent low-cost housing.

The Senate Appropriations Committee wisely sought to alleviate this major factor in urban discontent by voting recently to recommend nearly all of the appropriations sought by President Johnson. We should follow the strong lead of the Senate Appropriations Committee in fully funding this program and matching President Johnson's commitment to the cities.

Under unanimous consent I insert, at this point in the Record, a recent editorial appearing in the Washington Daily News commending the President's rent supplement program:

[From the Washington Daily News, Aug. 25, 1967]

For Rent Supplements

We note with approval Senate Minority Leader Dirksen's shift from opposition to support for Federal rent supplements for the poor.

This, plus the announced support of 10 other GOP senators, should produce favorable action by the Senate for some expansion this year of this preferred type of program. The House in May had voted against any expansion, turning down the Administration request for an increase in rent supplement to $72 million a year from the existing level of $32 million.

Better housing, of course, is no panacea for the problems of the very poor. It will not in itself raise incomes or provide better education. Yet, as survey after survey has shown, substandard housing is a major reason for discontent in the ghettos. And, despite all the public and private programs of the past 30 years, bad housing of the poor remains a mammoth national problem.

The rent supplement plan, approved by Congress for the first time in 1965, is only one of several approaches in attacking substandard housing. But it strikes us as being of special merit.

Key idea behind rent supplements is that it will stimulate private construction of decent housing for poor people much faster than can be done thru public housing. It seems to be doing that. (In the past 30 years, only 654,000 units of public housing have been built. In the 15 months since the first funds were approved for rent supplements, 33,961 new units and 1902 rehabilitated units have been committed.)

Rent supplement projects, in addition to being privately launched and managed, pay taxes, tend to be smaller and more scattered than public housing and don't result in the sterile new slums which have developed in public housing projects in some cities. The rent supplement tenant, who must qualify for public housing, starts out by paying one-fourth of his income for rent but then doesn't have to move as in public housing when his income goes up. He simply pays a greater share of the rent, and the Government pays less.

Subsidized housing, much as we all could wish it weren't necessary, long has been and remains an essential in seeking to improve the lot of the poor. The still new idea of Federal rent supplements seems to be a desirable alternative in this field.

Russ Mum on Space Deaths

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 11, 1967

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Julius Epstein, of the Hoover Institution on War, Revolution, and Peace at Stanford University, has directly confronted a Soviet official on the question of Soviet tragedies in space, including death of Soviet cosmonauts in orbit or on launching pads, and wrote about the confrontation in a letter to the editor of the Palo Alto Times on August 23.

Since this subject is of great interest to all Members of the Congress and particularly to NASA officials, I believe the full text of Mr. Epstein's letter to the editor should be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The letter follows:

RUSS MUM ON SPACE DEATHS

Editor of the Times: With your permission, I would like to supplement the Palo Alto Times report on the Stanford Conference on the "Peaceful Uses of Space, A Symposium on Law and Technology."

During the second day's discussion, I availed myself of the opportunity to confront the Soviet delegate, Mr. Gaunnady Stachevsky, with a missing precondition of American Soviet cooperation in space: the mutual knowledge of each others' space activities, successes as well as failures.

While we publish not only our successes but also our failures, the Soviets do not adhere to the same principle. They usually announce only successful launches and keep their failures, including the deaths of Soviet cosmonauts in orbit or on launching pads, in the deep-freezer for top secret truths. (For obvious reasons, they could not hide Vladimir Komarov's death, since his launching was announced in advance).

It as the first time that a Soviet high official—Mr. Stachevsky is first secretary of the Soviet mission to the United Nations—was publicly confronted with the uncomfortable truth of Soviet fatalities in space and the record of their six deep-space-probe failures in the attempt to reach Vensus and Mars.

It was interesting to note that Mr. Stachevsky, in his reply, did not state that there were no Soviet failures in space, including deaths (with the exception of Komarov), but preferred to take refuge behind the smokescreen of outworn Soviet cliches about "American imperialism," etc. When another participant took the floor and asked Mr. Stachevsky pointblank: "Are there or aren't there any Soviet failures in space?", the Soviet delegate again preferred not to answer this simple question but to engage in ambiguous generalities.

Mr. Stachevsky either did not know the facts or did not dare to confirm what he knew. If the latter is the case, he had probably an understandable reason for his evasions: the possibility that some day Mr. Kosygin, or somebody else could deliver a speech about Khrushchev, similar to the one Khrushchev delivered about Stalin. In such a speech Khrushchev may well be blamed for various Soviet space catastrophes which took the lives of at least 12 Soviet cosmonauts. The possibility of such future revelation cannot be excluded, since most Soviet failures in space occurred during Khrushchev's tenurs.

Mrs. Eunice Shriver Addresses Plenary Session of International Conference on Abortion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 23, 1967

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, the great work of the Kennedy Foundation is evidenced once again by the recent International Conference on Abortion sponsored by the Harvard Divinity School in cooperation with the Joseph P. Kennedy, Jr. Foundation. This truly pacesetting conference attracted theologians as well as the medical profession. All one had to do was to listen to the vivacious Eunice Shriver in her most intelligent far searching remarks at the conference and it is easy to understand why the foundation is so successful. I commend her remarks for all to share:

TEXT OF MRS. EUNICE KENNEDY SHRIVER GIVEN AT PLENARY SESSION OF INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON ABORTION

The Kennedy Foundation over the last 15 years has dedicated almost all of its resources to research in child health and human development with the objective of preventing, or at least ameliorating, mental retardation. To achieve these goals we have established major research centers at Johns Hopkins, Stanford, Wisconsin, Chicago, and Harvard Medical School.

Important discoveries have been made in recent years at those centers and elsewhere which prefigure a new human setting. It is suggested that man may become the first species in world history able to control his own evolution.

As the scientists have moved more and more actively into the study of human conception, human fertility, human genetics, and mental retardation they have also begun to explore how best to control or manage man's own nature. Thus, some scientists have advocated "Sterlization of the unfit" while others proposed abortion as a remedy for mongolism, or for other birth defects.

For those interested in the prevention of mental retardation the question has thus developed: Is abortion a justified method for reducing mental retardation in our society?

One "expert" has described abortion as just another surgical operation comparable to appendicitis, but, another scientist at this very conference has suggested that legalized abortion of the human embryo is so profound an insult to the reverence for life that its adoption would lead to future demands for the creation of a national institute of death—an institute where experts of no race, creed, or color would scientifically determine who has the right to life, where, and for how long.

Abortion thus raises problems far beyond the scope of medicine or law. We need the wisdom and insight, the humanism and compassion of the world's most thoughtful and far-sighted men and women. And that is why we have invited experts from all relevant disciplines to this international conference.

Historically the theologians and philosophers and moralists were men of wisdom and a source of advice on public policy.

At the University of Paris in the 13th Century theology was known as the "Queen of the Sciences" Philosophy as second in importance. Yet today theology is not even recognized as a science. And few, if any, meetings of "Scientists" today would normally include students of theology, or philosophy or of justice, ethics or politics.

We disagreed with this concept and thus many moralists and theologians were invited to join in this conference. By including them we hope to remedy a defect of our intellectural life—a defect illustrated by a simple comparison between days gone by and today.

In olden days famous men were honored by titles extolling their humanistic qualities—Eric the *Wise*, Adelbert the *Just*, Richard the *Lion-Hearted*, Charles the *Bold*, Charles the *Good*—all *adjectives* descriptive of personal, human qualities. Today we read most often of Eisenhower the *General*, Johnson the *Politician*, Robert McNamara the *Computer*—all *Nouns* descriptive not of the person, but of his work.

This change in popular terminology has its counterpart in intellectual circles.

"Scientists" today are physicists who are experts in the study of matter.

"Chemists"—experts in the study of elements and compounds.

"Biologists"—experts in the study of living materials.

But where are the experts on man?

Psychiatrists and psychologists? Hardly—for even they make less and less pretense of dealing with the whole man. Indeed they suffer from the same fragmentation as the physical scientists.

It is not surprising that some of the most thoughtful of contemporary scientists ask ethical questions about their sciences.

For example:

Dr. Robert L. Sinsheimer of Cal Tech recently said: . . . "Discoveries in molecular biology in recent years . . . point the way to controlled evolution . . . far reaching changes in controlling the sex, and size of children may be wrought in the next few decades . . . we are learning the secret of life. Soon biologists will know how to modify, by genetic means, living systems in any way desired."

Other scientists are dealing with such questions as:

Is it ethically justifiable "To create" a creature half of whose organs would be drawn from animals and half from humans?

Is it ethically permissible to splice human genetic tissue together with animal tissue and thus create new organisms which would fundamentally modify the nature of human beings as we know them?

If organ transplantation becomes surgically routine, what members of society should receive the organs? The young and most promising? The elderly? The retarded?

Would we follow the traditional standard: "Women and children first?"

This problem already exists. A Seattle Hospital has contended with the question of deciding to whom artificial kidneys should be given.

A secret committee representing scientists and the public impounded to choose recipients.

If we leave the answers to these and similar questions only to scientists—if we seek answers only on the basis of what is most efficient or least expensive—someone lacking in moral judgment will surely advocate euthanasia as part of the solution to the population problem. Wouldn't it be more efficient and less expensive to do away with the people over sixty five who are ill and tired of living. Another board could select all the people who were going to be permitted to have babies on the basis of genetic prognosis. A whole new profession could be developed like race track prognosticators who would produce the best progeny for success. Does this sound like a bad dream or cheap scenario fiction. Most assuredly it is not. It is already a visible preview of the world to come.

Who will decide how behavior shall be controlled, for what purposes, and according to what standards? Who will decide to abort the mongoloid baby *in uterus*—the mother? the medical doctors? the lawyer? a panel of experts?

Current testimonies before state legislative committees advocate changes in abortion practices and laws to avoid the birth of defective children or of children whom "scientists" believe may be defective, or of children the mother fears would upset her mental health.

Should mothers be permitted to make their decisions solely on the basis of their own personal, individualistic, private desires? Or should someone speak in these matters for society as a whole, for ethical and religious principles?

These questions and a hundred others derived from our work in mental retardation. They explain our participation in and sponsorship of this conference. But they also reveal that we as a nation are weakest where once we were strongest. Benjamin Franklin, Jefferson, Emerson, Thoreau—the fighters for religious freedom in the early days of our country—all though they knew or were willing to discuss the question: "What is man?" These men knew that no one intellectual discipline can know all the truth about man—what is best for man, or what he ought to do.

Teilhard de Chardin has written: "Someday atfer mastering the winds, the waves, the tides and gravity, we shall harness for God the energies of love, and then, for the second time in the history of the world, man will have discovered fire."

Let us begin by harnessing the energies of love for man's sake. Then one day we shall realize that God can exist without man, but man cannot long exist without love, or without the origin of love.

Presidents Johnson and Eisenhower and Members of Congress Pay Tribute to the Late Richard H. Amberg

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 11, 1967

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson has described the death of Publisher Richard H. Amberg of the St. Louis Globe-Democrat as "a loss to our country as well as to the newspaper world." President Eisenhower hailed his patriotism and his many contributions to civic and charitable causes as well as his talents as a newspaperman.

Mr. Speaker, every public official who worked with Richard Amberg feels a keen sense of loss in his death. In addition to the statements from Presidents Johnson and Eisenhower, I include the tributes also from other Federal officials. Among them are Senators SYMINGTON, DIRKSEN, and PERCY; Representatives KARSTEN, CURTIS, ICHORD, and PRICE; FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover; and Mrs. Frankie M. Freeman, a member of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights.

President Johnson said:

The tragic loss of Richard Amberg is a loss to our country as well as to the newspaper world. All who work to keep our people better informed on the issues of the day perform a real service to our country.

It is fitting that just before his death Dick received deserved recognition from the American Legion for his distinguished career which contributed to the excellence of several of our national newspapers.

I share with all who knew and admired him the sense of loss that they feel today.

President Eisenhower said:

The untimely death of Richard H. Amberg has deprived his community and the nation of an outstanding newspaperman whose talents were long devoted to the furtherance of America's strength and welfare.

At first hand, as a working newspaperman, he had come to know his countrymen well from small town to great metropolises. Therefore, he was able persuasively to address himself to them with a knowledge of their interest and aspirations that was fortified by his own patriotism and commitment to the American way. He exemplified his concern for a stronger and better nation by his devotion to many civic and charitable causes.

All of us who knew him will miss him greatly.

Senator SYMINGTON said:

I am inexpressibly shocked and saddened to hear of the death of Richard Amberg. Dick Amberg worked ceaselessly for a better St. Louis and a strong America, and the causes he supported to those ends are legion. He will be sorely missed and long remembered by those who knew and respected him. My wife and I have lost a true friend. To his dear wife, Janet, and his three children, we send our love and deepest sympathy.

Senator DIRKSEN said:

I was deeply distressed to learn of the very sudden and untimely passing of Dick Amberg whom I regarded as an intimate friend. He was a great citizen, a great patriot, and a great publisher who made a tremendous contribution to the thinking of the public and to the dissemination of accurate information for its benefit. He exemplified in the highest way the true traditions of the press.

For a long time we collaborated in seeking an extra star for General of the Army MacArthur because we thought it was richly deserved, but we did not succeed before Gen. MacArthur's passing.

Senator PERCY said:

He was a provocative leader of American journalism. His contribution to our national strength and the St. Louis community was great.

Representative KARSTEN said:

I am saddened by the passing of Mr. Amberg. He was an outstanding publisher. He left a great imprint on St. Louis and a great St. Louis newspaper. He will be missed by his many, many friends and admirers in St. Louis, Missouri and the nation.

Representative CURTIS said:

It's hard to make a statement. Dick has done so much for this community. Not only St. Louis but this country has lost a very dynamic person. I don't know what to say.

Representative ICHORD said:

I think Missouri has lost one of its greatest publishers and one of my own very highly valued personal friends. This is a great loss for Missouri and a great personal loss to me.

Representative PRICE said:

He was a very aggressive newspaperman and through his efforts built The Globe-Democrat into a strong force for community improvement, into a leading voice in city, state and national affairs. He was an able, sincere and forthright person who directed his newspaper into many worthwhile activities.

FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover said:

Richard Amberg was an outstanding, dedicated American citizen and an excellent journalist. He was also a true friend of law enforcement and we indeed mourn his passing.

Mrs. Frankie M. Freeman, member of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, said:

The people of St. Louis have lost a valiant and courageous citizen. He brought skill and compassion to the task of creating and maintaining the Herbert Hoover Boys' Club. He worked to improve the lives of all people. He leaves a void in his beloved Globe-Democrat. I mourn the passing of a dedicated man.

"Mayor" Walter Edward Washington of the District of Columbia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THEODORE R. KUPFERMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 30, 1967

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to state that New York City's loss will be Washington, D.C.'s gain.

Walter Edward Washington in returning as "chief executive" to the District of Columbia fulfills a natural ambition.

Having had an opportunity to observe his work as chairman of the New York City Housing Authority, in my hometown, I want to assure my colleagues who have justifiable concern for the future of the Nation's Capital, that in Walter Washington they have a competent and intelligent professional.

Mayor John V. Lindsay, my predecessor in the House, chose well in bringing him to New York City and President Lyndon B. Johnson made a wise decision in bringing him back.

For those who would like to know him better, I attach the New York Times biographical sketch from the Friday, August 25 issue, but the quality of the man will best come through by his ability in dealing with local problems and with the Congress in the days ahead.

I know my colleagues will all want to join me in wishing our new "mayor" well.

The sketch follows:

DUE FOR POST IN CAPITAL: WALTER EDWARD WASHINGTON

"Walter Washington has a solid ring," one of his associates said yesterday.

That statement, according to other associates, sums up the man who is quitting as chairman of the city's Housing Authority to assume a top position in the municipal government of Washington. Mayor Lindsay confirmed yesterday that Mr. Washington was departing, and it is generally believed that he will be nominated by President Johnson to become the first commissioner of the nation's capital. As "mayor" of Washington, a new post created two weeks ago by Congress, the housing expert would be the first Negro to head a large American city.

Mr. Washington's critics contend, however, that even though he is a former president of the Washington Urban League, he has not been a conspicuous activist in the civil rights cause. Some feel he has spent too much time ingratiating himself with influential whites.

But his supporters insist that he is superbly qualified for the job because he is a "solid" professional dedicated to the difficult and often frustrating work of building houses and improving services for the poor of all races.

Walter Edward Washington was born in Dawson, Ga., on April 15, 1915. His family lived in Jamestown, N.Y., but his mother returned to her home town to have her baby.

THE COLLEGE DAYS

In 1934, Mr. Washington left Jamestown to enter Howard University, the largely Negro institution in Washington. He was graduated in 1938 with a bachelor's degree in public administration and sociology, two subjects he later pursued on the graduate level at American University.

In 1941, he joined the National Capital Housing Authority, which builds and manages low-rent housing in Washington.

Mr. Washington served in many capacities with the authority before becoming its chairman in 1961. When he accepted Mayor Lindsay's offer to come to New York last November, he described the city as "the Supreme Court of housing."

The analogy came easily. With typical tenacity, Mr. Washington gained a law degree at Howard by attending night school and was admitted to practice before the United States Supreme Court.

Perhaps a more important reason why Mr. Washington left the capital, however, was President Johnson's reluctance to name him head of the three-man Board of Commissioners. which then governed the District of Columbia.

He had been promoted strongly for the job by civic groups and The Washington Post, which said of him when he left that he was the "most effective bridge between the Capital City and the Other City—between the Federal power structure . . . and the voteless and almost voiceless ninth largest city with its huge number of Negroes who are largely ill-housed, poorly serviced and badly educated."

Associates expressed surprise yesterday at Mr. Washington's decision to return to the capital, but one noted that he had retained his home in Washington and lived here in temporary quarters at the Fifth Avenue Hotel in Greenwich Village. The new commissioner or his deputy would have to be a Washington resident.

In nine months here, Mr. Washington has had to deal with a strike by the employes who service the authority's 522,000 tenants, a new law requiring more efficient incineration, and increasing maintenance costs that continually challenge rent levels.

CHAMPION OF FLEXIBILITY

But he has had time to emphasize more flexible use of various public housing programs and to promote well-designed architecture and beautification.

Mr. Washington's wife of 26 years, the former Bennetta Bullock, is a well-known educator and social worker. She was a pioneering principal of a slum high school in Washington and has served as director of the Women's Job Corps, an antipoverty program agency, before accepting a professorship in education last spring at City College.

"Walter loves people," Mrs. Washington said. "He is sensitive to them and their problems. This is his major concern."

Mr. Washington's colleagues in the Housing Authority find him uniformly charming, easy to work with, and determined to make his point. As one said: "If you don't know what Walter wants at the start of a meeting you get the signal very quickly."

Call BETA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LARRY WINN, JR.

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 11, 1967

Mr. WINN. Mr. Speaker, Kansas businesses with problems have a new answer—they call BETA. BETA, the Business and Engineering Technical Applications group, consists of students from the University of Kansas who assist industrial plants in solving their problems and keeping businessmen apprised of the information explosion in their field.

The organization was created with the help of a small grant from the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and is proving a tremendous success to both industrialists and participating students.

I would like to draw to the attention of my colleagues this article from the Kansas University Alumni Magazine, May 1967, which describes the BETA program:

CALL BETA

You have an industrial plant in Kansas, and you have a problem. Your engineers are too busy to solve it for you. Or you don't have enough men. Where do you turn?

In the past year your answer could have been: "Call BETA at KU."

Didde-Glaser, an office machine manufacturer in Emporia, needed a special, no-spill lubricant for a printing press. Bob Lambour, a KU graduate student from Prairie Village, found a company that made just such a lubricant for space capsules.

Precision Devices in Lawrence wanted a way to weld radio parts without heat. A KU student found the answer in a technical journal.

The opportunities offered by BETA—the Business and Engineering Technical Applications group—even go beyond the state's borders. Northern Natural Gas in Omaha, Neb., wants a timing device accurate to one-thousandth of a second and so rugged it can be used in the field. The BETA people are looking, but the search may take awhile.

Northern Natural is sufficiently impressed by the answers KU has provided in the past, however, that it has signed a one-year contract with BETA.

Besides Didde-Glaser and Precision Devices, BETA has supplied answers to firms in Hesston, Hutchinson, Independence, and Kansas City, Mo., since it was created with the help of a small grant from the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

NASA wants to be sure the fruits of space research reach private industry. The BETA people want to be sure Kansas industries have a chance to share in the benefits to come from space research, to make a profit for themselves and for Kansas.

Most businessmen don't have the time or the resources to keep up with the information explosion in their fields.

But a university has its libraries with their thousands of professional journals, its computers with their tapes of information, the trained personnel.

Cessna Aircraft's industrial division in Hutchinson, for example, has renewed its one-year contract with BETA just to study the literature, and has shown interest in specific research projects. Graduate students systematically search trade magazines, manufacturers' brochures, and government reports for items which might interest Cessna. The company gets digests and complete bibliographies at low cost. Any business in Kansas can get the same service.

Too good to be true? Bill Barr and R. R. Gatts, two of the men who created BETA, make no bones about what BETA and KU get in return.

First, good classroom material. For example, Superior Boiler in Hutchinson called for help when it began expanding so rapidly it didn't have time to study equipment layout and traffic flow.

"We got to put an entire industrial design class to work on a real problem requiring a real answer," Prof. Barr said. "That's more valuable than the most ingeniously constructed textbook example."

And the students' designs worked.

Second, the program may encourage engineers to stay in Kansas. They become more aware of what Kansas industry can offer. And a firm which has never hired an engineer may suddenly discover it needs one—that he can pay for himself in efficiency and new ideas several times over.

"We want to do anything we can to promote the engineering aspect of Kansas firms," Prof. Gatts said. "The stronger the engineering 'climate' in the state, the better the Engineering School will be—and vice versa."

To Charles B. Saunders, a professor in the School of Business who was the third man involved in BETA's creation, there's another important benefit. BETA keeps KU in touch with business and industry.

"We want to be a communications link between university research and industry, not only in engineering and business, but wherever the requests take us," Prof. Saunders said.

That point came home when the Vendo Corp. of Kansas City, Mo., asked BETA to do research on the effects of a new vending machine on the KU campus. BETA called in a psychology class, which did a complete study of the machine's psychological impact. To the student who wrote the best report Vendo gave a $250 prize to attend a professional meeting.

BETA will adapt itself to the problems faced by any industry or business in Kansas and the Midwest, in effect bringing to bear on the problems of a private firm the entire resources of a major university.

A student working with BETA visits the firm to get first hand knowledge of the problem, then researches the problem at KU.

In return, the firm pays transportation costs of the student, plus the average rate for graduate employees—about $3 an hour.

The first step, usually, is to search the literature. If that doesn't turn up an answer, the firm can commission research, paying the costs of special test equipment.

Or it can wait. If the problem is interesting enough, KU students may adopt the problem as a thesis project; every thesis written at KU is available without charge.

An example is the Electra Manufacturing Co. in Independence which makes resistors. A new one has been designed to last three years, but the company needs a scientific check now to prove the resistor will last that long—it can't wait three years to find out. A search of the literature has failed to turn up a way to speed up the testing; company officials now are deciding if they want BETA to design a test.

Barr and Gatts are enthusiastic about BETA's future. Almost 100 search requests have been handled, and more come in weekly. Negotiations are in progress with a firm which might want all of BETA's services for a new product—from literature search to feasibility study to product design.

BETA, Barr and Gatts say, is one of those happy arrangements where everybody benefits. Industry is kept abreast of technological changes, students get practical experience, graduates get jobs with Kansas firms, and KU and BETA learn more about the needs of Kansas industry.

"We may have to hire a full-time director," Barr says happily.

Highway Beautification Funds Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT TENZER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 24, 1967

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, the authorization bill for highway beautification is now pending before the House Public Works Committee. The Senate has approved an authorization of $85 million for this program and I urge my colleagues to join me in voicing their approval of the Senate action.

It would be tragic if the House did not act on the authorization for this program just as we are on the threshold of action to prevent the further blight of Federal highways by countless junkyards and billboards.

A recent editorial in Newsday presents a solid case for congressional action. With permission granted I placed the Newsday editorial of September 5, 1967, in the RECORD at this point:

FOR BEAUTY: $85,000,000

The Senate has rescued the President's highway beautification program, which faced extinction, by an infusion of $85,000,000.

This program renews the existing ban on billboards within 600 feet of federal interstate and primary highways, provides for the screening of automobile junk yards, and would reduce the number of billboards. All these are laudable objectives.

The trouble is that the House of Representatives is downright hostile to the program. The billboard lobby has been busy whooping up opposition, as have the owners of restaurants and gas stations and resorts that depend on highway advertising and contribute so much to the defacement of the scenery. Maximum citizen effort is essential if highway beautification is to become a fact rather than a happy dream.

While on this subject, we'd like to pay a compliment to the skill and imagination with which New York State has preserved the beauty of the Adirondack Park along the course of the Adirondack Northway (Interstate 87). Billboards have been controlled with great strictness. At many of the most scenic interchanges the state has acquired control of enough land so that necessary commercial enterprises are hidden from sight. Advantage has been taken of the terrain, and scenic overlooks have been constructed. The result is a delight to the eye—and an object lesson to highway builders, as is our Thruway, too.

Highways can be made beautiful, but only if enough of our representatives in Congress and the Legislature have the will to oppose the lobbyists, to resist pressures from local businessmen and to provide the money so that vulnerable land can be preserved. One look at Hempstead and Jericho Turnpikes will serve as an object lesson of what happens when outdoor advertising is permitted to run riot.

Mr. Speaker, last year the Governor of the State of New York responded to public protests by withdrawing a proposal to construct a raised expressway alongside Sunrise Highway in Nassau County. This proposed Atlantic Expressway would have been an eyesore and a blight upon a central business route of Long Island.

We must preserve the areas surrounding our highways which have not yet been destroyed and implement programs to beautify and improve those which have fallen victim to the numerous junkyards and billboards along the Nation's roads.

A Giant Has Passed Our Way—St. Louis Globe-Democrat Editorial Eulogy to Publisher Richard H. Amberg

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 11, 1967

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, the people of St. Louis, and the profession of journalism in the United States, suffered a grievous loss 8 days ago when the publisher of the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, Mr. Richard H. Amberg, was stricken with a heart attack and died only a few hours later at the age of 55. The death of this vigorous journalist while visiting in New York City came as a great shock to everyone who knew him as a hearty and zestful person, and cast a deep pall over the civic and community life of my city.

Dick Amberg had been a resident of St. Louis for only a dozen years. With an impressive record in the field of newspaper work, he was sent to St. Louis in 1955 by Mr. Samuel I. Newhouse, then the new owner of a well-known but stodgy St. Louis newspaper, and in the short 12 years since then he revitalized the Globe-Democrat into a forceful and effective and highly readable publication which is again among America's outstanding daily papers.

The Globe-Democrat, under Mr. Amberg's vigorous personal direction, covered both local and national news, and the international scene as well, with imagination, resourcefulness, and courage. Although the word "Democrat" was in the title of this long-established newspaper, it leaned heavily toward the Republican Party on political issues and generally supported Republican candidates for office. As a Democrat, I constantly found editorial opinions in this newspaper with which I completely and strongly differed. But in its news coverage, under Dick Amberg's leadership, there was, nevertheless, a willingness in nearly all instances to present both sides of an issue and to treat fairly those of us who disagreed with its editorial position on national issues.

When it came to matters of deep and overriding concern to the welfare and advancement of St. Louis, the Globe-Democrat ignored politics and fought alongside Democrats and Republicans without distinction for the betterment of our community. I was particularly grateful to Dick Amberg for the long history of support he gave to the food stamp legislation over the years, to the legislation I sponsored on consumer issues, and to the long fight to authorize the appropriation of funds to build and to complete the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial and the Gateway Arch. These were just a few of the many issues in which I was directly involved in which I could count on effective editorial support and news coverage from the Globe-Democrat.

THE GLOBE-DEMOCRAT'S OWN EULOGY TO RICHARD H. AMBERG

Mr. Speaker, the staff of the newspaper which he headed for 12 years, in an editorial eulogizing their late publisher, described the impact of Richard H. Amberg upon our community, and upon journalism in St. Louis, and I think this editorial, better than anything I could say, sums up a very useful life and a very effective force in our community. Under unanimous consent, I submit the text of that editorial, entitled "A Giant Has Passed Our Way," for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

[From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, Sept. 5, 1967]

A GIANT HAS PASSED OUR WAY

When he came to St. Louis from his home in the East a dozen years ago hardly a soul knew him here. He was new to the Midwest and when he walked along the streets he received only rarely a greeting or a nod of recognition from a passerby. But seldom has a stranger become so quickly a vital part of his new community, and seldom has he contributed so much to its progress and welfare or left such an impress on its people and its spirit in so short a span of years.

Now he is gone from the community as suddenly as he came. And there is a deep sadness and an empty feeling of great loss among those men and women on The Globe-Democrat who worked intimately with and for Richard H. Amberg, who was publisher of this newspaper for the past 12 years. His untimely and unexpected death occurred in New York last Sunday a few hours after he was stricken by a heart attack.

But there is equally a feeling of deep sadness and irreparable loss among the people of the St. Louis community, where he labored courageously and tirelessly for the right and for the public welfare.

They say—many of these people—that his like will not soon be found again, that he will be sorely missed because he gave the community an inspiring and a dynamic leadership that did much to move it forward from its former lethargy and put it among the cities of the nation which are in the forefront of progress.

They speak of his courage to fight indomitably for what he believed was right, and of his zeal for good and just causes, and of his abiding compassion for his fellow man and his selfless expenditure of time and energy in behalf of the public welfare.

They say he was a catalyst who stimulated many constructive civic programs in this community, who brought a new driving force which has done much to inspire the amazing renaissance which has given the downtown business section new life. He helped transport the eyesore riverfront now dominated by the incomparable Gateway Arch of world renown, encouraged the new downtown stadium, helped effect the miracle of the Mill Creek Valley renewal and brought to imminent completion the vital new Poplar street free bridge which will span the Mississippi.

They speak, too, of the dynamism he gave The Globe-Democrat, changing it from a lackadaisical newspaper into a vigorous and beneficial force locally and natonally, causing it to be ranked among the nation's top dailies. And whether they agreed with him or not, they speak of his pungent, incisive and eloquent editorials which gave crystal-line clarity to the issues of the day.

And they speak of his many humanitarian campaigns to raise funds for those who need help of some kind.

There are, indeed, those who say it may have been these relentless efforts through his newspaper and presonally in behalf of the public weal that hastened his death.

He was at the apex of a brilliant newspaper career which had spread his name far beyond St. Louis and the Midwest and had made him one of the best known publishers and editors in America. He was consulted by Governors and even Presidents, and was the subject of occasional articles in national magazines and other publications.

The most recent of the giant community projects on which he worked long and assiduously was the establishment of the new Herbert Hoover Boys' Club of St. Louis on the historic old baseball field where Busch Stadium stood on North Grand boulevard. He was the prime mover of this project from the beginning and headed a campaign which raised approximately $1,000,000 to build the club, the finest of its kind in America.

There, 3300 boys from 6 to 16 years can get off the streets, find recreation, entertainment, instruction and a practical application of ideals that will make them good and responsible citizens. It was a project close to Mr. Amberg's heart, and one that will remain as a living monument to his deep concern for the youth of the community and the nation and to his devotion and admiration for the late Herbert Hoover—in whose honor he asked that the club be named.

Mr. Amberg was an enduring patriot, and he manifested it in his daily life as well as his editorials. Transplanted from the Eastern seaboard to the Middle West, he soon came to love St. Louis and its people. He will be buried here among those he came to know so fondly. But his devotion to his country was not more than that to his community.

During World War II he served with the Navy and saw enough active duty in the Pacific to receive seven battle stars and 13 medals and citations. Among them was the Legion of Merit, given him by General Douglas MacArthur, whose naval advisor he had been. A comradeship developed between the two which continued until the General's death.

And Mr. Amberg came to regard General MacArthur as one of the great Americans, and he shared the old warrior's resolute conviction that there is no substitute for victory. Hence, with a strong clear voice he unceasingly advocated editorially that the United States should not dally with Communist aggression in Vietnam, but should strike the enemy with the full and devastating force of America's military might to bring the war to a complete and decisive victory in the shortest possible time.

Indeed, it was partly his courageous editorials for sterner measures against North Vietnamese and the Viet Cong—in the face of a great outcry from some quarters for soft measures and compromise—together with other manifestations of selfless patriotism that took him to Boston three days before his death to receive from the American Legion its highest honor to newspapers—the Fourth Estate Award for distinguished public service in the field of communications.

Richard H. Amberg was born in New York City 55 years ago. He was educated at Harvard where he graduated in 1933 magna cum laude. He started his newspaper career shortly thereafter and his first position of prominence was as publisher and editor of the Oil City (Pa.) Blizzard. He was 25, and the youngest publisher of a daily in the United States.

World War II interrupted his career and afterward he caught the eye of Samuel I. Newhouse, who was building a giant newspaper empire. He became publisher of the Syracuse (N.Y.) Post-Standard. He was a refreshingly new kind of publisher and editor. He was also a speaker and writer with a fluent, trenchant style who projected a lot of positive opinions from his editorial page.

Mr. Newhouse bought the sluggish St. Louis Globe-Democrat in 1955. "Dick" Amberg, as he was commonly known to his friends, was made publisher.

To the people of St. Louis and to his staff he introduced himself by announcing, "We are going to be a fighter for the right. We are going to take sides on every issue. . . . The Globe-Democrat will never run away from a battle. . . . We may not always be right, but we will take an honest cut at the ball."

He set the new pace and spirit of the newspaper. Editorials acquired a new zing.

A rousing Globe-Democrat campaign, together with effective personal maneuvering by Mr. Amberg among railroads and politicians, did much to break the riverfront log jam. Today the result is the beautiful new Jefferson National Expansion Memorial and its towering Gateway Arch. This inspiring success brought an exciting chain reaction of new developments in the area which has rejuvenated the entire downtown area.

The equally revitalized Globe-Democrat became a crusading newspaper, with the publisher himself as the dynamo in nearly all crusades. He used the hard-hitting newspaper campaign to get things done. He fought for better public health, better public safety, better government, greater civic growth, more prosperity. He detested and castigated crime and corruption in any form and attacked them with stinging articles and editorials.

He believed newspapers had lost the capacity for indignation. Certainly he hadn't.

He did more than that. He moved out among the people. He went to luncheons and dinners and other gatherings. He served on a plethora of boards and committees. He talked to the people individually and collectively. He talked to them from the speaker's platform—his extemporaneous addresses sounded as though they had been meticulously prepared and rehearsed.

In his prodigous participation in the affairs of the community—the people's problems became those of his newspaper—he belonged to a great list of civic, welfare, business, educational, fraternal and other organizations. He served on the boards of 19 local and state associations, on nine national boards. He was trustee of a half dozen colleges.

His honors and awards for his selfless services added up to the dozens. One of them was the coveted St. Louis Award, of 1966.

A giant has passed our way. His courage and good works will long be remembered.

Congressman Horton Praises Elmer Louis, Rochester, N.Y., Jewish Community Leader, on 25 Years of Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 11, 1967

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, September 13, 1967, an outstanding community leader of Rochester, N.Y., Mr. Elmer Louis, will be honored by his friends and by civic dignitaries at a dinner of the Jewish Community Council of Rochester, and of the United Jewish Welfare Fund of Rochester.

Elmer Louis' concern with the welfare of his fellow citizens in Rochester, has won him the respect of the entire community. It can truly be said that Rochester is a better community because Elmer Louis, for 25 years, has patiently translated a firm sense of humanity into programs which have built stronger ties between the people of our area.

I remember very well when in September 1965, Elmer Louis headed a delegation of concerned Rochestarians who came to Washington to protest the ill-treatment of Jews by the Soviet Government. I was pleased to host this group at an early morning coffee and donuts session in my office.

In the fall of 1966, Mr. Louis was again very helpful in the planning of and reporting of my mission to the dedication of the Knesset in Jerusalem.

I congratulate Mr. Louis on his 25-year career of service. I hope that for many more years we may have the benefit of his wise and patient counsel on affairs of the American Jewish community and the State of Israel.

Don Wolin, whom I know as the journalist of the Rochester Jewish community, and who has worked side by side with Elmer Louis for the past decade, has said of him:

> I have had the pleasure of knowing and working with Elmer Louis for the past 10 years, and I have found him to be among the most talented individuals I have known, and one of the most modest people I have known. In my work as editor of the *Jewish Ledger*, I have found all segments of Rochester Jewry to hold similar warm feelings toward Elmer, and similar gratitude and admiration for his accomplishments.
>
> I am looking forward to the continuance of our very valuable and warm relationship.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to share with my colleagues the tribute to Elmer Louis contained in the following article, which appeared in the current issue of the Rochester Jewish Ledger:

Elmer Louis Tribute Dinner Wednesday Evening

Elmer Louis, executive director of the United Jewish Welfare Fund of Rochester and the Jewish Community Council of Rochester, will be honored for his 25 years of service to these organizations at a dinner in his honor Wednesday at 7 p.m. in Temple Beth El, 139 Winton Rd. S.

Active in almost every phase of Rochester's civic, cultural and religious life over the past 25 years, Louis has held leadership positions in Friends of the Rochester Public Library, the NAACP, Monroe County Human Relations Commission, the United Negro College Fund, the Anti-Defamation League of Western New York, Otetiana Boy Scout Council, the Advertising Council of Rochester, Memorial Art Gallery and the Civic Music Association.

Louis has also been active on the national level in many Jewish organizations, including the Joint Distribution Committee, National Community Relations Advisory Council and the National Conference of Jewish Social Welfare. An amateur painter, he has been an annual exhibitor in the Finger Lakes Exhibit and has won many awards.

As executive director of the Welfare Fund, he guides the community's second largest annual fund raising effort. His other post as executive director of the Community Council is responsible for coordinating Jewish communal life in Rochester as well as representing the city's Jewish community in various interfaith and joint cultural efforts with non-Jewish groups.

A native of Cleveland where he earned both BS and MS degrees at Western Reserve University, Louis was formerly executive director of the Jewish Federation and Jewish Community Council of Toledo. A widower, he has a married son who is a staff writer for Fortune Magazine and a daughter who is a senior at Western Reserve. Louis resides at 70 Wilshire Rd., Brighton.

Virginia Greer, Outstanding CAP Director

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 29, 1967

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Virginia Greer, the director of the Solano County, Calif., Economic Opportunity Council, is a woman of exceptional ability and dedication.

Her medical background, her energy, and her compassionate attitude have contributed immeasurably to the psychological and physical health of many individuals in my congressional district.

Mrs. Greer is creative in her approach to programs and she is determined in their execution. She has been widely praised for her efforts and I am pleased to note the following remarks by reporter Charlotte Pruitt of the Vallejo Times-Herald:

DIRECTOR OF SOLANO OEO MAKING HISTORY IN PROJECT

(By Charlotte Pruitt)

Virginia Greer, a woman of many profiles and great human compassion, has made history in OEO (Office of Economic Opportunity) circles since she became director of the Solano County Economic Opportunity Council in December, 1965.

The vivacious war on poverty director, against overwhelming odds, set out to achieve in six months what local social agencies had been attempting to do for many decades. The uplifting of the poor and the re-education of all its citizens in the areas of equal job opportunities were her primary objectives.

To initiate this program, Mrs. Greer was granted the sum of $10,500, one staff person and few facilities. In a period of 18 months the program grew from the initial grant to $1.5 million and the OEO staff will soon move into larger quarters.

A registered nurse, Mrs. Greer has a Bachelor of Science degree and also is a public health nurse. She finished her graduate work at San Francisco State College and received her public health training at the University of California.

She is the mother of Stephen, 22, a college graduate employed as a Juvenile Counselor by Contra Costa County; Nadine, 20, a registered nurse, and Janice, 19, Solano Junior College student.

Nadine and Stephen both serve as volunteer workers in the Solano County OEO program.

Before her OEO career, Mrs. Greer devoted all her extra time to volunteer work in the field of health with indigent groups. She also tutored children of low-income families.

Asked about her endeavors, the attractive 41-year-old woman replied, "I never will retire from this type of work. To give of oneself is the greatest reward a person can receive."

Many of Solano's OEO programs under Mrs. Greer's direction have been so successful they since have been adopted by the federal OEO as suggested guidelines for use throughout the nation.

The Mare Island pre-apprentice training program, written especially for heads of households on welfare, has been able to place many men on productive jobs. Men on the program are paid $2 an hour during the one-year training. This particular poverty project has received national recognition.

Other records have been set by the Neighborhood Youth Corps, Big Brother and Headstart projects.

The growth of the Solano agency from an executive director and secretary to a staff of 40 persons and many programs with new OEO money is a prime example of Mrs. Greer's foresightedness, compassion and leadership ability.

The Financial Powers Agree on "Paper Gold"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 11, 1967

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, one of the most significant agreements in international economics has just been negotiated in London for the settlement of accounts among nations.

This complicated transaction is most ably and succinctly articulated by Edwin L. Dale, Jr., in the New York Times of September 3. I include this excellent description of the new international monetary reform at this point in the RECORD, and recommend it to the attention of my colleagues:

THE FINANCIAL POWERS AGREE ON "PAPER GOLD"

(By Edwin L. Dale, Jr.)

WASHINGTON.—After 12 hours of difficult negotiations in London last weekend, which in turn climaxed nearly four years of detailed international discussion and bargaining, the finance ministers of the 10 leading industrial nations have produced an agreement that history is likely to regard as one of the major financial events of this or any other century.

For what the ministers have agreed upon is a plan for future creation of a new international money. It is a checking account kind of money that no citizen will ever see or spend. It is usable only in settlement of accounts among nations. But its creation, due probably in 1969 or 1970, amounts to a decision by the leading nations to "manage" the international money supply just as governments and central banks manage the domestic money supply with an eye to preserving growth and prosperity without inflation.

The new money has been appropriately dubbed "paper gold," for it will serve the same function in international settlements that gold has long served.

What, then, is the new money to be called? What is the need for it? How will it work? How will it come into being?

The new money already has a name—special drawing rights, or S.D.R.'s for short. This refers to the right of nations under the new plan to "draw" the money from the 20-year-old International Monetary Fund, which will set up a special account for the purpose.

The need for the new money stems essentially from the astonishing growth in world trade—which in turn has been a major factor in the prosperity of the industrial world. All nations have an interest in liberal trade. But exports and imports must be paid for. They are actually paid for by foreign traders, who exchange their money into the needed foreign currencies.

This works smoothly as long as a nation's total international transactions—not only trade, but tourism, investment by business, foreign aid and the like—are in balance. But a number of things can happen, such as a rise in imports, to throw payments into deficit.

PAYING OUT RESERVES

That is when a nation's monetary "reserves" come into play. Its reserves can be used to settle a balance of payments deficit, leaving traders, tourists and others free to operate as before. The nation in deficit, in effect, pays out some of its reserves to other nations that are in surplus.

Clearly, the more reserves a nation has, the more relaxed it feels about losing some of them. A nation with inadequate reserves is forced to take measures—such as controls on imports or a sharp squeeze on domestic growth and prosperity—that can damage not only itself but the rest of the trading world. Britain is a perfect current example.

No amount of reserves can avert the need for each nation eventually to balance its payments. But adequate reserves can make the difference between hasty and damaging action, on the one hand, or a more orderly and relatively painless adjustment on the other.

The problem is that as world trade has grown, the possibility of big "swings" in each nation's payments has grown. A nation might feel that $500-million of reserves was enough when its imports were $3-billion. But that $500-million would look dangerously small with imports at $6-billion.

The global total of reserves is, in effect, the world money supply. It must grow with the total of world transactions just as the domestic money supply is allowed to grow with the incomes of the people and their total volume of transactions.

Up to now world reserves have consisted first of gold, second of two "reserve currencies" (dollars and pounds), and third of a limited right to borrow usable currencies from the monetary fund (which must be repaid in five years at the most).

For several reasons the growth of world reserves has ceased. A key reason is that private buying of gold, for hoarding or speculation, now equals or exceeds the whole of the annual newly mined supply, leaving none to be added to official reserves.

Thus the issue arose of deliberately creating new reserve assets, that would be as acceptable as gold, by international decision. After much reluctance on the part of the continental European nations, particularly France, that was what was agreed upon in London, though the plan will not be "activated" until later.

When the plan comes into being, each nation will automatically be credited with an amount of S.D.R.'s proportionate to its present quota in the monetary fund, which in turn is based essentially on the nation's role in the world economy.

If the nation has a deficit in its balance of payments, it can use its S.D.R.'s through the monetary fund, to get dollars or other usable currencies, which can then be used by its traders or its central bank. Each nation will stand willing, within specific limits, to supply its own money in exchange for S.D.R.s.

COMFORTABLE DEFICIT

Take the case of a deficit on the part of Argentina. Suppose its reserves now are $200-million, rather low in relation to its foreign trade. If it gets another, say, $20-million of S.D.R.'s, it will feel more comfortable if its payments swing into deficit. It may not have to devalue its currency or impose import controls or cut government spending to check domestic inflation.

The $20-million will not save it for long, of course, if its basic policies are wrong. Britain, as an example, cannot possibly get enough S.D.R.'s to save it from the task of drastically improving its efficiency and other reforms to make itself competitive. But the addition to the global money supply will help head off needless emergency action and permit trade and domestic growth to continue.

The S.D.R.'s would be a nation's own money to use when its likes, except that it would have to restore its "bank balance" at the monetary fund to the extent of at least 30 per cent at the end of five years.

For the United States, which has a "reserve currency," the S.D.R.'s could be used to "buy back" dollars held by other countries that might otherwise be cashed for gold. The United States would offer S.D.R.'s to, say, Italy for dollars that Italy holds.

The key point is that the grand total of world reserves would rise each time S.D.R.'s were created even if not a penny of them were ever spent, though of course they will be spent. When they are spent, one nation loses reserves and another gains—just as now. But the total money supply will rise in the act of creation.

The creation will come about by a carefully worked out method of international decision.

First, the plan agreed to by the "Group of Ten" in London will be submitted to the annual meeting of the International Monetary Fund in Rio de Janeiro at the end of September. After the governors of the fund—who are the world's finance ministers—approve it on that occasion, it will be drafted as a legal document in the form of an amendment to the fund's articles of agreement.

Then it will be submitted to governments for ratification, including approval in the United States by both houses of Congress.

When a sufficient number of countries has ratified, probably late 1968 or 1969, the system will be in existence. The next stage will be a decision by the managing director of the monetary fund—presently the highly esteemed Frenchman, Pierre-Paul Schweitzer—that a need for more reserves exists.

After he makes his proposal, there will be an international vote. If nations with 85 per cent of the "weighted" vote (weighted according to quotas) approve, the S.D.R.'s will be created. This formula gives the European Common Market countries a veto, if they vote as a bloc.

The intention is to approve creation of a specific amount of S.D.R.'s each year for five years—probably between $1-billion and $2-billion a year. If the amount were $1-billion a year, the United States would get $245-million a year. The second "creation" would follow five years after the first, in whatever amounts then deemed appropriate.

The London agreement was a personal triumph for the U.S. Secretary of the Treasury Henry H. Fowler, who has pressed intensively for this world monetary reform for two years against difficult odds. In the end it signaled, as he himself put it, "a great day in the history of international financial cooperation."

If effect, the nations were impressed by the facts of the situation, and by the need to keep the spectacular growth of world trade—and with it, prosperity among the leading trading nations—going. It would indeed have been ironic if the amazing prosperity of the industrial world for more than 15 years were sacrificed for a lack of money.

National Flood Insurance Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM V. ROTH, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1967

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, before the recess, I introduced the National Flood Insurance Act designed to enable property owners to purchase flood protection at a reasonable cost. This is a companion measure to that introduced by the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS]. Recent disasters in Alaska and other areas of the Nation have caused much suffering and economic loss which, under present insurance coverage, often result in a total loss to the individual affected. The cost of flood insurance, based on actuarial computations, is prohibitive in the high-risk areas where it is most needed, and we would be remiss in our responsibilities to the people were we to allow this situation to prevail any longer.

No program of insurance such as the one proposed in the bill I am introducing can eliminate entirely the suffering and inconvenience that is the result of floods, but it can prove invaluable in assisting people in flood-ravaged areas in getting back on their feet, and freeing them somewhat from the financial strains stemming from a wholly nonreimbursable loss.

Briefly, this measure would create a Federal Flood Insurance Corporation with a five-man board of directors headed by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development. Initially capitalized at $150 million through the sale of bonds, the Corporation would be empowered to contract with private insurance firms either individually or in groups to aid the companies in offering flood insurance at costs within the reach of property owners. Toward this end, payment to the companies would represent the difference between economically feasible premium rates borne by the insured and the actuarial premium rates which would otherwise be required to provide such insurance. As an adjunct of this subsidized insurance program, the Secretary is required to enocurage private insurance firms to develop nonsubsidized programs and to extend coverage of existing policies to include rising waters, earthslides, mudslides, and subsidence. In addition, the Secretary is to work closely with State and local governments and the Secretary of the Army in determining risk zones and developing long-range plans for land use in flood hazard areas.

In March 1962, the coast of Delaware and neighboring States was pounded unmercifully by an unusually severe storm complex. A number of people lost their lives as a result of the storm, and property damage was extensive. Along the shores of the Delaware Bay and the Atlantic Ocean, houses were ripped from their foundations, roads and vital communications facilities were severed, and important community services were interrupted. One of Delaware's major natural resources, the sandy beaches stretching from Lewes to Fenwick Island, was almost destroyed as the sea scoured it away leaving only the underlying clay. In several places the ocean breached the thin stretch of land separating the ocean from the Rehoboth Bay. Only recently have the remaining signs of the extensive damage been eliminated.

The recent heavy rainfall that has lingered over the eastern United States has caused flooding twice in as many weeks in the town of Elsmere near Wilmington, Del. Although most of the town has not suffered damage, residents of the affected areas have been subjected to a great deal of inconvenience and financial loss, and the Governor of Delaware has appealed to the Office of Emergency Planning for aid.

I would hope therefore that the recent flood disasters, great and small, will lend added impetus to congressional action on this important legislation to provide coverage at a reasonable cost. Compared with the social benefits to be derived from enactment of this needed program, the costs are indeed small, and I urge swift action by the House on flood insurance proposals.

A Prophetic Look at Asia in 1954

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 11, 1967

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, many of us have been questioned as to our position on the Vietnam situation prior to the actions of the present administration.

I was one of those who had forebodings about American participation in what was then Indochina over 10 years ago. Recently one of my constituents sent me a copy of a newspaper dated May 31, 1954, that carried excerpts from a speech that I made on this subject.

In that 1954 Memorial Day speech, I said:

> Why should we send our boys to fight in Indochina if there is no certainty that such a military venture will bring about the settlement political and economic problems that have caused unrest in that region? We must calculate the risks in advance so that the price we have to pay is worth the result.

If such risks were calculated by the present administration, they most assuredly were evaluated incorrectly or we would not have had such piecemeal escalation. Though I have resented the ambidextrous statements of the administration, I have supported all of the appropriations of the Defense Department for our Armed Forces in South Vietnam.

I would call to the attention of my colleagues a column written in that very same year by John S. Knight, chairman of the board of the Knight newspapers. Mr. Knight had been a longtime observer and commentator on international affairs and was well aware of the situation in what is now the country of South Vietnam. I would that his advice had found more receptive ears in Washington.

John S. Knight had just returned from South Vietnam. President Johnson had chosen him as one of the 22 impartial observers of the South Vietnam elections. I know that my colleagues will be most interested in reading his viewpoints on that election. Mr. Knight's reputation for clear objective reporting is recognized by all of us. I do know that his fellow newspaper publishers will unquestionably accept this report.

To follow is Mr. Knight's newspaper column of the year 1954 and also his most recent column of September 10, 1967:

A Prophetic Look at Asia in 1954

Note.—John S. Knight is in South Vietnam as one of 22 election observers appointed by President Johnson. The Editor's Notebook which we publish today is reprinted from the Beacon Journal of April 25, 1954. Even before the fall of Dien Bien Phu, Mr. Knight could see the danger of U.S. involvement in the war in what was then Indochina, now is Vietnam.

For some time I have been warning readers of The Beacon Journal and other newspapers that the United States is headed toward another war through the pattern of gradual involvement.

Nearly a month ago, Secretary of State Dulles declared that "the imposition of the Communist system on all Southeast Asia could not be passively accepted by the United States."

He urged resistance, in a form not specified, no matter what "serious risks" are involved and called for "united action" from the free nations.

The Secretary's statement was the first official notification given the country that our policy makers were getting ready to fight, if necessary, to save Southeast Asia.

Dulles' views were amplified the following week at the President's press conference when Eisenhower warned that loss of Indochina might cause nearby countries to topple like dominoes.

The President likewise talked about the will of free nations to protect Southeast Asia through "a concert of opinion" and "a concert of readiness of react in whatever way is necessary."

What he meant was that the free nations must not permit the Communists to gobble up Indochina even if it calls for war.

Ten days later, Vice President Nixon made a so-called "off the record" talk to the American Society of Newspaper Editors. It dealt with the problems of Asia in general and Indochina in particular.

In the question period, Nixon was asked what he thought about the use of American ground troops if the French were unable to hold Indochina.

The Vice President replied that the question was hypothetical and that he did not accept the premise of the question, but—and this is important—he personally would favor using American ground forces if that step seemed necessary to avert the loss of Southeast Asia to Communist control.

Unlike some editors present, I do not believe the question was "planted" or that Nixon was sending up a trial balloon to test U.S. opinion.

It seemed to me to be a perfectly frank but distinctly alarming response. While Nixon cannot speak for the President or the Secretary of State on matters of foreign policy, he does possess all of the information that comes before the National Security Council.

One must conclude, therefore, that the possibility of going to war over Indochina is very much in the minds of those entrusted with our national defense.

The next step in the pattern of gradual involvement came a few days ago with the announcement that U.S. Air Force planes had started flying French paratroopers from Paris to Indochina.

This was a desperate measure to stave off the Communists at Dien Bien Phu, a beleaguered airport surrounded by hills and Communist guns. The French were quick to point out that the U.S. paratroop airlift in no way violated "American neutrality."

It is clear that this series of steps, from Dulles to Dien Bien Phu, is intended to (1) serve notice on Russia that we mean business and (2) to put some backbone into the British and French at the Geneva conference when they and we sit down at the bargaining table with Russia and North Korea.

The stakes are high in this international poker game and there is not only the possibility, but the probability that the Russians will call our bluff.

What happens then? Can we anticipate what the President calls "a concert of readiness" to react in "whatever way is necessary"?

In the event that France and Britain refuse to take "united action," will the United States go it alone no matter what "serious risks" are involved?

Last Thursday night, speaking in New York, President Eisenhower advocated a common crusade to build a "cooperative peace." Either that, the President said, or "one by one . . . the free nations will be forced to accept an imposed peace, now sought by the Communist powers as it was by Hitler."

Timely as the President's warning may be, there is small indication that the war-weary French and the realistic British intend to join in any "concert of readiness" that involves them further in another Korea.

We alone seem determined to get into war.

It is indeed ironic that the Eisenhower administration, pledged to end the fighting in Korea and to avoid future "little wars," is now sounding even more bellicose than Roosevelt or Truman.

But let us go back to the words of Richard M. Nixon, replying to Adlai Stevenson as recently as March 14, 1954: "We found when we went to Washington that we were still involved in a war in Korea; that it cost us 125,000 American boys as casualties. And again, not a single Russian soldier lost in that war."

Or this paragraph: "We found that militarily their plan (the Kremlin) apparently was to destroy us by drawing us into little wars all over the world with their satellites."

And again: "We found that economically their plan was to force the United States to stay armed to the teeth, to be prepared to fight anywhere—anywhere in the world—that they, the men in the Kremlin, chose. Why? Because they knew that this would force us into bankruptcy; that we would destroy our freedom in attempting to defend it."

Nixon said: "Well, we decided that we would not fall into these traps. And so we adopted a new principle:

"Rather than let the Communists nibble us to death all over the world in little wars, we would rely in the future primarily on our massive mobile retaliatory power which we could use against the major source of aggression at times and places that we chose."

And get this: "The Korean war has been brought to an end. Two American divisions have been brought home because under our new policy we have decided we will not fight the Communists on their terms . . ."

I have quoted from Vice President Nixon's address of March 14, 1954 rather fully because, better than any argument I can offer, it proves that in the space of one month he had completely reversed his position.

What would war in Indochina be other than "fighting the Communists on their own terms"?

Isn't Nixon now following the Kremlin's plan "to destroy us by drawing us into little wars all over the world with their satellites"?

Would intervention in Indochina be a demonstration of "our massive mobile retaliatory power . . . to use against the major source of aggression at times and places that we chose"?

If Nixon was right on March 14, 1954, can he also be right today as he advocates punishing as aggression any foreign aid to an internal Communist revolution, a policy which might conceivably embroil us into "little wars" all over the globe?

As we edge precariously nearer to war, I warn again that military victories alone will not resolve the situation in Southeast Asia.

Mr. Nixon has said that we should associate ourselves with the legitimate aspirations of the natives.

The admonition comes many years too late. The Communists of China have long since done so while we have been associating ourselves with French colonialism in North Africa as well as in Indochina.

Intervention in Indochina would find us fighting another dead end war with virtually no support from our Allies.

This week's conference at Geneva will see the French and the British unprepared to support "united action" against the Reds except as it is expressed in the high sounding but meaningless phraseology of statesmen.

What action then is the United States prepared to take? Would Secretary Dulles rather have war than risk the chance of appeasement?

Defense Secretary Wilson said the other day that he sees no possibility that American troops may have to fight in the jungles of Indochina and that no such plan is even under study.

But Wilson conceded that "my crystal ball may be clouded."

Well, I'll clear it up for you, Mr. Secretary.

If the President, the Vice President and Secretary Dulles are men to be believed, the United States will be messed up in an Asiatic war before the year is out.

If the Election Was Rigged—It's Strange That Generals Thieu and Ky Got Less Than 35 Percent of the Vote

(By John S. Knight)

Washington.—When President Johnson greeted 22 American observers of the South Vietnam elections at the White House last Wednesday, he mentioned that "only one" had entertained "any reservations" about the mission.

This observation was offered because I had sought assurances from the President that no inhibitions would be placed upon my freedom to write or say what I chose. As anticipated, the desired pledge was freely given.

Our mission was to determine if the Sept. 3 elections were fair or rigged. By arrival time in Saigon, we had read most of the political literature on ways to rig an election in South Vietnam. We also analyzed the new constitution and rules for election procedures.

My next undertaking was to talk with the dissidents, including Ton That Thien, editor of the Vietnam Guardian which has been suspended by the government for 10 months, and Au Troung Thanh, former Minister of Economics and presidential candidate who was excluded from the balloting because of his "neutralist" views on the war.

These men are understandably bitter. They called the forthcoming election a farce, an outrage being perpetrated in the name of democracy by Gen. Nguyen Van Thieu and his vice presidential running mate, the colorful Gen. Nguyen Cao Ky.

Gen. "Big" Minh, former junta leader whose candidacy failed to meet constitutional requirements because his running mate once held French citizenship, was out of the country and could not be interviewed.

AMERICANS ALERTED

Elements of the American and foreign press likewise cast aspersions upon the military ticket. The government controlled, they said, the district and province chiefs so the elections results were a foregone conclusion.

A province chief is somewhat comparable to a governor in the United States, the district chief heads a "county" while village and hamlet chiefs are leading functionaries in areas of township size or less.

Since most of these chiefs are military men in uniform and owe allegiance to the Saigon government, they are indeed a powerful force at election time.

With these factors in mind, the American observers were alerted to the possibilities of fraud and vote stealing. For several days we studied the mechanics of the election, the printing of ballots and their distribution, voting poll procedures and methods of counting the votes.

Eligibility to vote is determined by prior registration. The voter is then given a card with four marked corners which he presents upon entering the voting booth. This is compared with his name on the registration list. One corner of the card is then cut off and he is handed the ballots.

In the Sept. 3 election, a voter was given 11 presidential ballots and 48—10 man ballots from which to choose six slates of senatorial candidates with 60 senators to be elected.

To assist the illiterate, each ballot bears a candidate symbol such as three cocoanuts, a dove, horse, elephant or an agricultural implement along with photographs of each candidate. Candidates are free to choose their own symbols but "queer, international or religious symbols are forbidden."

HOW THEY VOTE

The citizen first enters a curtained booth similar to ours and votes for the presidential and vice presidential candidates by placing the ballot he favors in an irregular envelope. The other 10 ballots are then either torn or discarded into a receptable for this purpose.

When the voter leaves the booth, he displays the envelope to prove there is only one in his possession and places it in the ballot box.

The same procedure is followed in the senatorial contests but here the voter must select no more than six slates of candidates from the 48 provided by election officials. The rest are discarded but must not be removed from the booth.

Even with this seemingly complicated procedure, the voters I observed averaged about three minutes and none more than five minutes. Each candidate is entitled to have his own poll watcher in the voting locations. Rules provide that "no rifles, ammunition, explosives, grenades, knives, hampers or weapons of any kind are permitted at the polling place."

The committee chairman and his assistants have "the right and duty to invite the stubborn voter who does not respect the order to get out of the polling place so the other voters may continue voting." Regulations say, however, that "the committee chairman must behave politely."

At the head of all election procedures is Nguyen van Tuong, a special commissioner for administration at Saigon. Mr. Tuong says, "Many candidates blame me for anything that goes wrong. But I am only the handy man in the theatre. I announce the title of the play. I raise the curtain. I try to keep order in the audience. After the play I lower the curtain. If the play is a hit I get no credit. I did not write it and the candidates are the actors."

DEADLY SERIOUS

Candidates in the United States will be interested in learning that the government pays for posting all campaign literature and provides equal time on radio and television. Each presidential and senatorial slate receives a specified grant of money for the campaign. Candidates may spend more if they choose but this must come from their own pockets.

Every city, village and hamlet is literally plastered with campaign posters. No citizen can possibly be unaware of the election or who is running.

On Sept. 3, election day, the American observers split into small groups and visited various areas of the country. My assignment was to Hue, the ancient capital city and former home of the emperors. Hue is about 30 kilometers south of North Vietnam and the demilitarized zone.

The election processes were orderly and dignified. I watched about 200 people cast their ballots, observed the clerical procedures and talked with poll watchers who sit at a bench in the voting area.

The people seemed deadly serious about the election. There was no visible evidence of fraud or cheating.

Polls open at 7 a.m. and close at four o'clock in the afternoon. No voting is permitted atfer that hour except for those already in the polling places.

The Vietnamese vote early with a lull in activity during the siesta period. Voting picks up again from two o'clock to four. Ballot counting must be carried out publicly on the spot and immediately after closing of the polls. Signed reports are made in quadruplicate with two copies going to the main polling place in Saigon, one copy is posted at the district office and one copy is retained for the local file.

The possibility of illegal voting is remote at the village level where rival observers and inquisitive citizens are on hand to watch. There is, of course, the possibility that dishonest officials at the district or province level could alter reports sent in from the villages.

All reports from provincial headquarters must be forwarded to the National Assembly in Saigon by Sept. 10. Complaints of irregularities are considered by the Central Executive Committee and the finding reported to the National Assembly by Sept. 25. The National Assembly must announce official results by October 25.

FAIR AND HONEST

It was the unanimous opinion of the American observer mission which covered representative sections of the country that the Sept. 3 election was, so far as we could determine, reasonably fair and honest.

This view was generally shared by observers from 23 other countries.

Unquestionably, some irregularities will come to light. But as Eugene Patterson, editor of the Atlanta Constitution observed: "The election was mighty clean compared to what we have had in Georgia and much of the South."

If the election had been rigged, as was so freely predicted by the Western world, it seems passing strange that the formidable ticket of Generals Thieu and Ky with all of the power that goes with incumbency received less than 35 per cent of the total vote.

The large vote given to Truong Dinh Dzu, the self-styled peace candidate, may be indicative of the yearnings of the South Vietnamese for a cessation of hostilities.

If the constitution had provided for a runoff election when no presidential candidate receives a clear majority, Generals Thieu and Ky could well have been in trouble next time around.

True significance of the voting is that a national election could be held under war conditions and strong threats of violence from the Viet Cong.

Yet 83 per cent of the registered voters appeared at the polls. Reported Viet Cong terrorism includes 579 incidents with several hundred South Vietnamese civilians being killed.

The larger question of whether two rivals Thieu and Ky—now living together in an uneasy accommodation—can or will cooperate in the formation of a stable government will be discussed in a subsequent article.

There are also the problems of pacification, our military posture, the need for stronger political parties, government censorship, land reform and the resurgence of Catholic power in the Senate which foreshadow nothing better than slow and painful progress.

Having made a conscientious effort to look at conditions in Vietnam objectively and without any prejudgments, to talk with the dissidents as well as the incumbents, I shall submit further observations as time and space permit.

Labor Looks at Our Merchant Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB H. GILBERT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 11, 1967

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to call to the attention of my colleagues the very timely and informative Labor Day address of AFL–CIO Vice President Paul Hall. An outstanding labor leader, Mr. Hall is also president of the Seafarers International Union and president of the Maritime Trades Department. His address, delivered over national radio network facilities, is a sober reminder of the plight of our American merchant marine. I share his concern, and I urge every Member of the Congress to read his excellent address, which follows:

LABOR DAY ADDRESS OF PAUL HALL: AMERICAN LABOR LOOKS AT OUR MERCHANT MARINE

For millions of Americans, this Labor Day is a holiday—but for millions more, it's business as usual. For our American forces in Vietnam, for example, there's no thought of a Labor Day holiday.

In countless defense plants across the country—the ones that are making the planes and tanks, the guns and ammunition—American workers are manning the production line. And aboard the ships of our merchant fleet—the ships that are keeping the lifeline open to Vietnam—American seamen are on the job just as they are any other day.

This is as it should be.

Whenever democratic concepts are threatened—whenever freedom is endangered—American labor, as a matter of principle, supports, and is involved in, the efforts to preserve the ideals on which this country is founded.

That is why the CIO–AFL—13.5 million members strong—is in full accord with our national policy that we must win this struggle for freedom in Southeast Asia.

The American labor movement is deeply concerned about South Vietnam—because a threat to the freedom of any country, anywhere in the world, is a threat to American freedom, too.

There's an old trade union saying—that an injury to one is the concern of all—and it applies to the freedom of nations as well as to the freedoms of the individual.

We, in the maritime industry—and I'm talking about maritime management, as well as maritime labor—know something about America's struggle for freedom. After all, it was our merchant fleet—our civilian-owned and civilian-manned cargo and passenger vessels—which played such an important role in the winning of World War II. And it is our merchant fleet—our civilian-owned and civilian-manned cargo and passenger vessels—which are maintaining the sealift to Vietnam today.

SEA POWER INDISPENSABLE

This may be the age of air power—but the oceangoing ship is still indispensable to our national welfare. This is being proved everyday in the Vietnam war—where 98 percent of all of the supplies, and two-thirds of all of the troops—are being transported, not by planes, but by ships.

But this has been an assignment for which our nation was not prepared. The unhappy fact is that our national maritime policy has not provided us with a merchant marine adequate for our commercial or security needs.

To get enough ships for this Vietnam sealift, ways had to be found to meet this emergency situation. Vessels had to be pulled off of their regular commercial runs. More than a hundred ships had to be taken out of mothballs—ships that were old and outdated, many of them which had served in World War II. And seafaring unions had to rapidly expand their training programs so that we would be sure of having enough skilled crews to keep these ships operating.

The American labor movement recognizes the serious nature of the problem which confronts America on the high seas. As recently as a year ago, the AFL–CIO Executive Council, meeting in Chicago, had this to say about our merchant marine:

"Today, the American merchant marine is being called upon to meet a war situation for the third time in 25 years.

"Owing to the neglect of this industry by the government since the end of World War II, and the failure of the Defense Department to foresee and admit the need for merchant ships to transport troops and supplies across the seas, the condition of the merchant fleet, its supporting shipyards and available skilled manpower have reached the point of crisis.

"Merchant shipping has played a vital part in American history. Today, as the result of short-sighted policies on the part of government officials with no understanding and sympathy with the significance of commercial seapower, we have fallen to third-rate status among the maritime nations of the world."

That's what the American labor movement feels about the plight of our commercial fleet.

FEAST OR FAMINE

The sad fact is that—since the beginning of this century—the lot of the American merchant marine has been one of feast or famine. During peacetime, the U.S. maritime industry has starved for lack of attenton. During the fat days, our nation has been unwilling to spend the funds necessary to build up our merchant fleet.

It's only when our security is threatened that America wakes up to the importance of our merchant fleet.

In spite of today's obstacles, the American merchant marine—the civilian-owned and civilian-manned fleet—is getting the job done. But we're doing it with a fleet that is not large enought nor modern enough for our position as a maritime power.

Just look at the record:

At the end of World War II we had a merchant fleet of more than 5,000 ships; today we have less than one-fifth that number, and few of them are modern vessels.

At the end of World War II, American ships carried 40 per cent of our oceangoing export-import cargoes; today our vessels carry only 7 percent of that cargo—in other words, ships of foreign countries carry 93 per cent of America's cargo.

At the end of World War II, our merchant fleet provided jobs for 80,000 sailors; today these jobs have shrunk to only about half that number.

At the end of World War II, we were first among all of the nations of the world in shipping; today, we're sixth and still going down.

At the end of World War II, we were first in the great craft of shipbuilding; today we've dropped all the way to 16th.

And while we've been going backward on the high seas, the Russians have been frogging ahead at breakneck speed. The situation is so acute that, within the next few years, the Soviets may have a 2-to-1 superiority over the United States in merchant shipping.

Over the years, Russia has threatened to "bury" the United States--and today she is in danger of "sinking" us—of driving us from the world's sealanes, of dominating the fishing industry, of taking the lead in the science of oceanography.

The Soviet Union today is well on the way to becoming a dominant maritime power—perhaps the world's leading maritime power. If the Russians get the upper hand, they'll be able to withhold their shipping services whenever it serves their political purposes.

Remember this:

America's industrial complex depends on 77 strategic materials—and 66 of these have to be imported. At this moment, virtually all of these strategic materials move in the holds of foreign-flag ships.

Suppose those ships were the ones flying the hammer and sickle? Does anyone believe that Russia—the nation that has threatened to "bury us"—would deliver these strategic materials to our shores?

The answer is obvious. We would be under Russia's thumb—without a missile having been fired. The Russians know that a merchant marine is far more than just a part of a country's defense posture—as important as that role is. The Russians know that a merchant marine is part of a country's economic strength—and a part of its international strength.

That's why Russia—and every other maritime power in the world—actively supports its merchant marine with strong public policies—policies that make possible the building and manning of larger, faster and more modern commercial ships.

And therein lies the difference—therin lies the reason why other nations are moving forward, and we're moving backward, in maritime affairs.

A modern merchant marine is possible only with full government support—and full public support. This is true with virtually every industry, when you stop and think about it.

Here in this country, the industries that are making the greatest strides are the ones that have adequate public programs to support them.

American agriculture, for example, could not continue to be the world's leader in the production of food and fiber without the countless programs of government assistance. Our aviation industry could not stay ahead of its foreign competition—particularly in the race for supremacy in the supersonic transport field—without billions of dollars of public investment.

We've got to put the same sort of government investment into our maritime industry as we're putting into aviation. This kind of investment is vital if we are to carry our proper share of American cargoes in time of peace. And it is vital if our merchant marine is to be available to backstop our armed forces in time of conflict.

We've got to start—and start right now—to build a fleet that is modern enough, fast enough and large enough to serve all of our needs. And we've got to make sure that this fleet is built in American yards—because this will reinforce the entire American economy.

A domestic shipbuilding program means a lot more than just jobs for American shipbuilding crafts and profits for American shipyards.

When you build a ship in an American shipyard, you're using steel manufactured in Pennsylvania—from ore mined in Minnesota. America shipbuilding involves electrical equipment from Kentucky—lumber from Washington—machine tools from Connecticut—valves and fitting from Idaho—and so on.

And the men who are employed in all of these industries are able, as a result, to buy shoes made in Missouri and clothing made in Tennessee. They're able to feed their families crab from Alaska and lobster from Maine—and oranges grown in Florida and brought to the market aboard planes made in California and powered by fuel from Texas.

PROVIDES NEEDED JOBS

What's more, a strong and growing merchant marine can provide needed jobs—for the young men from the ghettos of Harlem and Detroit and Chicago, and from the pockets of poverty in Appalachia—as the union I represent the Seafarers, and others have been doing for years.

In other words, America's maritime affairs—shipping and shipbuilding alike—affect all geographic areas of the country and all economic levels. This industry can contribute to a healthier American economy and to a stronger defense shield against aggression.

No one disputes the importance of our merchant marine—yet we have no positive national program that inspires the confidence of all who are concerned with the future of this vital segment of our economy.

Government and industry, labor and management, are all agreed that we must have a bold new maritime program—but up to now there has been no agreement on what this program should contain.

On this Labor Day, we in the trade union movement call on government, industry and labor to knuckle down to the problem of developing the kind of program that will assure that U.S. shipping and U.S. shipbuilding can make their maximum contribution to our economy and our defense.

This isn't just a maritime problem—it's an American problem.

If we as a nation fail to resolve this problem, the impact of that failure will be felt by every American—businessman, farmer, and worker, alike.

A strengthened, modernized and expanded merchant marine, is essential to America's future as a healthy, thriving, prosperous nation.

Labor Day Reminder

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 11, 1967

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, although Labor Day is past I feel the following editorial which appeared in the Palos Regional prior to that holiday was of such outstanding impact that it is worthy of attention by the Members:

LABOR DAY REMINDER

Labor Day, to be observed on September 4 this year, marks the termination of summer, in the minds of most people. It is the last long holiday of the season, and is a time for the final outing of swimming, picnicking, boating, or just loafing. The meaning of Labor Day is lost for many in the frantic pursuit of fun. Never before have so many people been able to enjoy the leisure, the luxuries and comforts we see around us in these United States. The rights of labor have never been so certain, nor its obligation to act in a responsible manner more necessary. We must not become insensible to the time-honored virtues of thrift, competence and pride in a job well done.

These are things that have made possible the turning of Labor Day into a holiday of fun and leisure. These are the things that Labor Day commemorates, and if the nation is to survive in its greatness, they will be needed as never before in the years to come. They are needed now desperately to back up the men in Viet Nam, let alone all future advancments in space, science, industry and technology. Think of these things as you go to the beach or to the mountains this Labor Day.

The Heat in the Kitchen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 11, 1967

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous-consent request heretofore granted, I will insert an article from the Los Angeles and San Francisco Examiner, written by the editor in chief of the Hearst newspapers, Mr. William Randolph Hearst, Jr.

It is refreshing to read an editorial which is not designed to destroy the prestige and reputation of the President of the United States. This editorial is entitled "The Heat in the Kitchen." Mr. Hearst has, in my opinion, attempted to balance the prevalent wave of criticism of the President which appears in many newspapers, both in editorials and in special articles by columnists.

In my opinion his editorial is fair and objective. I hope that the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will have an opportunity to read this fair and impartial editorial.

The editorial follows:

THE HEAT IN THE KITCHEN

(By William Randolph Hearst, Jr.)

NEW YORK—During the last week of my reluctantly-ended vacation at San Simeon I prepared for the chore of resuming this column by doing more reading than time generally allows. I didn't have to look far for a theme.

It's really amazing. Whatever newsmagazine I picked up, whatever commentator or pundit whose deathless prose I encountered, in print or on the airwaves, all seemed to be engaged in discussing the same topic—Lyndon B. Johnson "in trouble."

Lambasting the President these days is practically a full-time job for his howling pack of vociferous critics. He is being bedeviled, reviled, belittled and beset on all fronts. And I, for one, think it's damned unfair.

The point I propose to make are not intended as a defense of Mr. Johnson, per se. He's a man who can take care of himself. Furthermore, I am hardly what you would call a life-long, dyed-in-the-wool Democrat.

But the fact is the President is getting all kinds of blame he does not deserve and little or no credit for what he does deserve. It offends my sense of fair play to see him so unjustly attacked for whatever happens in Vietnam, for the riots in our cities, for lack of congressional action on civil rights and social programs and for practically everything else that's wrong.

What I would like to try to do here is to put things in a clearer perspective, to encourage a little sober reflection on what Mr. Johnson has done and is attempting to do, and even possibly influence some of his critics to use logic instead of invective.

There's not much chance of any success on the last point, not when you line those critics up and take a look at them. They're a great bunch.

Over here we have the unwashed beatniks. Over there are the pink-eyed super-liberals. Behind them are such racist anarchists as Stokely Carmichael, and H. Rap Brown. Howling loudest are the enemy-serving stop-the-bombing gang and congressional popoffs, led by Democrats Sen. J. William Fulbright and Sen. Robert F. Kennedy and countless Republicans whose names escape me at the moment.

The latest to join the gang is a beaut—that sterling, tongue-tied governor of Michigan with the halo of white hair over his ears, George Romney. This new war critic who would be President himself now claims he was "brainwashed" into his earlier support of the Vietnam war effort.

This might be funny if it weren't for the mischief a man in Romney's position can create. But still, imagine having a President who proclaims he can be brainwashed by a high-pressure sales-talk. If he ever got in the White House they wouldn't dare let him out of the country. I hate to think what would happen to him at the hands of the diplomatic slickers in Moscow, England, France, Rome or even India.

Any fair-minded person who examines the various charges being leveled at President Johnson, either directly or by snide implication, will find they just don't stand up. Let's take a brief look-see at the three major areas in which he is taking the most abuse—Vietnam, the Negro problem and social legislation.

Not even the President's severest critics can accuse him of starting the war; he inherited it. Whether his policies are right or wrong, only time will tell. Meanwhile, in accordance with the advice of the nation's most experienced experts, he has chosen a course of action and is sticking to it.

That course of action, no matter what anyone else says, is clearly aimed at achieving a just and lasting peace in Vietnam by arresting Communist aggression. Our commitment to contain communism is not new: we followed it in Korea, Berlin and Cuba. It is a highly honorable commitment, and the honor of the nation is at stake. In pursuing it, President Johnson—far more than anyone else in the world—at the same time has done everything in his power to get peace talks under way. Yet every one of his initiatives has been spurned by the enemy.

Just as nobody has done more to get us out of Vietnam than Mr. Johnson, so no President with the exception of Abraham Lincoln has done more for the American Negroes. His record on civil rights exceeds even that of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, whose philosophy of spending to help the poor he adopted and expanded. Time and again he has defied southern political forces by naming qualified Negroes to high office, even to the U.S. Supreme Court.

One would think the liberals who are so busy criticizing the President would instead be commending him for his civil rights record. The thing that strikes me as especially interesting on this point is that the great majority of the Negro population knows what Mr. Johnson has done and is trying to do for them. No single group in the country was subjected to a more concerted organizational drive by the Communists, yet that drive notably failed. So far as loyalty to their country is concerned, the record of our Negroes as a group is far better than that of some of our intellectuals and college professors.

Social legislation, of course, is interlinked with the problems of underprivileged Negroes. Here, again, the sweep and number of Johnson-sponsored laws passed by the last Congress is without precedence in our history. The slowdown in further action by the present Congress is certainly not the President's fault, nor his desire.

His administration has spent tremendous sums of money to improve the lot of our poor, both in the cities and elsewhere. Yet he is accused of not spending enough when mass rioting continues in the cities—even though what happened in Detroit and New Haven proved that money alone is not the answer. There is no simple answer to social unrest and President Johnson has done all a sound executive can do by summoning the nation's best brains to work out effective remedies.

And so, right down the line, we find a man in the White House who is wrestling with tremendous problems. He is doing what he believes to be the best for his country according to the dictates of his truly liberal conscience based on the most expert advice available. I think, under the circumstances, he is doing very well. At least as far as I'm concerned I have not heard anybody make any suggestions which are preferable.

The man unquestionably has a most serious drawback. He speaks with a Texas accent and that's against the grain of our self-proclaimed enlightened intellectuals. They prefer the Oxford variety or that Harvard accent with which they were charmed by FDR and Jack Kennedy. With them, apparently, it's not so much what you say as how you say it.

If Mr. Johnson has this drawback, he also has a counterbalancing asset. That big plus in his remarkable patience and unflappability. His self-control in the midst of the critical storm raging about him sometimes seems superhuman. Yet, after all, why should he bother to answer every heckler who comes along—most of whom are far beneath him intellectually, morally and in every other way?

Another of our down-to-earth Presidents, Harry S. Truman, once remarked when the going was toughest that anybody who can't stand the heat should get out of the kitchen.

The heat is on President Johnson—much of it unfair and undeserved—but I have a feeling he likes the job of head cook.

Address by Representative Gerald R. Ford, Republican, of Michigan, Before the 49th National Convention of the American Legion, August 30, 1967, at Boston, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HASTINGS KEITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 11, 1967

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, on August 30, the distinguished minority leader of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GERALD R. FORD], delivered an address of great interest and importance to the National Convention of the American Legion in Boston, Mass. His address dealt with the crisis of national policy which faces us in Vietnam, and with the crisis of confidence which the President now faces with the American people here at home. I would like to include the text of his statement in the RECORD, so that other Members of the Congress may have the benefit of the perspective which Mr. Ford offers.

In this statement, Mr. Ford makes clear what we have all sensed in one way or another: our involvement in Vietnam has generated a giant cloud of confusion and a great gulf between the people and the administration. The crucial question being asked by millions of Americans is, Can we really win in Vietnam? The answer, as expressed by the minority leader, is that with the President's present policy of gradualism, we could very well find ourselves with a chronic stalemate or even a defeat. For 2½ years, the administration has pursued a war of gradualism, allowing the enemy to anticipate our moves and to adjust with minimum hardship to each one. No wonder that we have seen our commitment grow from 15,000 men to 525,000 men during this period without conclusive results.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the minority leader's remarks on the need for success in the political war and the economic war in Vietnam as well as in the military war, deserve to be considered by all Members of the House. The war is not a partisan issue, and in this time of crisis these words of constructive and loyal criticism are needed and welcomed by us all.

The text of the address is as follows:

Address by Representative Gerald R. Ford, Republican, of Michigan, Before the 49th National Convention of the American Legion, August 30, 1967, at Boston, Mass.

Legionnaires, it is a distinct pleasure and a great honor to be with you. It's a bit like Old Home Week. *I* am a Legionnaire—a member of Furniture City Post No. 258 for 21 years—and proud of it. In fact, I suspect there might be some of my old shipmates in this audience—men of the aircraft carrier Monterey on which I spent two of my four years in the Navy.

I'm proud to be associated with the Legion because it is a good, sound, common sense organization dedicated to the advancement of all Americans, with a long-standing record of insistence on military preparedness.

Let me digress at this time. For as long as I have been in the Legion, one of our principal legislative aims has been the establishment of a separate Senate Committee on Veterans Affairs. Over the years, for a variety of reasons, we have been thwarted. Now the Senate has passed a Congressional Reorganization proposal which would establish this separate Committee on Veterans Affairs. For months this proposal which is a part of the Congressional Reorganization legislation has been bottled up in the House Committee on Rules.

On one side of the aisle we have pressed for action. I pledge that we will continue to push as hard as we can as long as necessary to write this legislation into law.

One reason I take pride in being a Legionnaire is that our organization stands up for America. Legionnaires love America—its principles, its people and its history. The American Legion has been unwaveringly determined to protect America's security and, at the same time, promote the cause of peace throughout the world.

The Legion fought for preparedness before World War 2. The Legion suppported President Truman's firmness in Korea. The Legion supports our commitment in Vietnam. Secretary of State Rusk has recounted the history of our involvement in Vietnam—and I want to say that I have always endorsed our basic policy of repelling Communist aggression there.

We are *all* working for peace—*all* of us, whether we're called hawks or doves—and never more than at this moment.

Now we have arrived at a critical point in time and history, a time of great national perplexity, a time of choosing and decision—yes, a moment of truth.

Millions of Americans who have never doubted the rightness of our being in Vietnam are asking themselves a soul-searching, devastatingly disturbing question: Is the Vietnam War "winnable?" Can we *really* win in Vietnam? Not "win" in the sense of unconditional surrender. Not "win" in the sense of bringing the Viet Cong and the North Vietnamese to their knees. But "win" in terms of assuring the South Vietnamese the right to choose the government under which they will live. "Win" in the sense of protecting the security of the United States and bolstering the Free World in its struggle against Communism.

My objective—I want the United States to succeed in Vietnam.

I hope the Administration also has the same clear-cut objective.

When our Nation became actively engaged in the fighting in Vietnam in February, 1965, the American people supported the action.

But our involvement in Vietnam has since generated a giant cloud of confusion and a great gulf between the people and the Administration.

The reason is simple. For more than two years the Administration has been playing it by ear. The Administration's conduct of the war has been based on a new and naive theory—that if we gradually do just a little bit more, the enemy will some day lay down his arms and talk peace.

Initially we achieved a success. We stopped a quick communist take-over. Then we threw away our advantage by fighting the war on the enemy's terms.

Today the United States is bogged down in a massive land war in Southeast Asia, contrary to the views of great military strategists like the late General Douglas MacArthur.

For 2½ years we have fought a war of gradualism. We have allowed the enemy ample time to adjust to every turn of the screw. We have made it possible for Ho Chi Minh to anticipate and counter nearly every move we have made.

Is this any way to get an enemy to talk peace?

The Administration has followed a course of gradualism in Vietnam that has not worked because it could not work. It was contrary to all sound military strategy.

General Dwight D. Eisenhower recently said that when you must use force to support a national aim, for example in the defense of another country, there is no higher authority to which you can appeal. Therefore, you must win. To do that, Ike said, you need sufficient force and you must use it quickly and secretly so as to achieve surprise. He warned that a war of gradualism cannot be won.

Our fighting men have been tragically handicapped by the Administration's policy of gradualism. At the same time, the South Vietnamese have not done enough in their own behalf. In the first instance, too much political instability. Then a shoring up of a tenuous military regime. And now an election that may have too many American overtones.

Meantime, our leaders have almost completely Americanized the war.

There are two equally important fronts in South Vietnam—the military war and the program of pacification.

How are we doing? We and our allies—South Korea, The Philippines, Australia, New Zealand, and Thailand—must succeed on both fronts if we are to achieve our basic objective in Vietnam.

The pacification effort is aimed at winning the people's allegiance to their government with social, economic and political reforms.

Let's not mince words. The South Vietnamese regular army thus far has failed to meet the military challenge. The local militia has failed to provide the security needed to make the pacification program work.

Tragically, the Saigon Government probably would collapse if both the Americans and North Vietnamese were to withdraw from the battlefield and let the South Vietnamese military and the Vietcong fight it out.

The reason—the basic problems in South Vietnam have gone unsolved.

Whatever the outcome of the Sept. 3 presidential election in Vietnam, the United States must insist that the post-election regime fully carry out a number of reforms, notably land reform. Such reforms *must* be achieved if a Saigon government is to have *genuine support*. Otherwise military success in Vietnam will be meaningless.

What is the military situation?

In recent days we have seen what amounts to an Administration propaganda campaign on our chances for success in Vietnam. It is obviously aimed at countering a rising wave of frustration among the American people.

I hope there is a basis for such optimism. But the record does not seem to justify it. Secretary McNamara, judging from his latest public statement, certainly does not share it. More than 90,000 Americans have been killed or wounded in combat in this war of gradualism. There have been more than 250,000 casualties from all causes. To what end? We and our allies have been able to secure only a fraction of a country roughly the size of my own state of Michigan.

We and our allies have killed an estimated 200,000 of the enemy. Yet we now face the largest force the Communists have yet put together in Vietnam—nearly 300,000.

The war in Vietnam is pretty much of a standoff right now—certainly this is the view of the American people—even though we have increased the American manpower commitment in Vietnam from 15,000 to 525,000 in the past 2½ years.

We have inflicted heavy losses on the enemy—with mounting American casualties—but the supply of Communist cannon fodder seems unlimited.

We are told the North Vietnamese have committed only one-fifth of their regular army to the war in South Vietnam. At the same time we are reaching the bottom of our ready manpower pool.

Because the Soviets have had 2½ years to deliver the most modern weapons and train the enemy in their use, our soldiers, sailors, airmen, and Marines are now fighting a much tougher war. Today the Communists are employing missiles, heavy artillery, and powerful mortars, all emplaced and fortified during the Administration's war of gradualism.

A way to the peace table *must* be found in Vietnam. I submit that the American people have the correct formula—*succeed or get out.*

To succeed in Vietnam we need a clear and coordinated plan with the determination at the top to see it through. If this fails, then the story of American participation in the Vietnam war will be written in five words in the history books—too little and too late. Too little early in the war—and too late now.

On Dec. 13, 1965, my party's National Coordinating Committee warned that we were getting bogged down in what could become an endless land war in Southeast Asia.

We pleaded for maximum use of our conventional air and sea power. We begged that the flow of supplies in North Vietnam through the port of Haiphong be stopped.

These thoughtful recommendations by those who support American objectives were ignored. The Administration has failed to carry out the first commandment of military strategy—cut off the enemy's supplies at the source, destroy the logistical support he needs to make war.

The Administration has not followed this course. Publicly, the Secretary of Defense has categorically cast it aside.

The Secretary has accused advocates of a more eeffctive air war in the North of trying to substitute air attacks there for ground fighting in the South. This charge is ridiculous. What's more, it's a fabrication. I know of no one who has ever contended that meaningful air attacks against North Vietnam can be substituted for hard ground action in the South. Mr. McNamara sets up a straw man with such charges and then knocks it down. That is no defense at all for the mistaken course the Administration has followed in Vietnam.

A nation at war cannot afford confusion and doubt about its basic policies.

Mr. McNamara's recent argument against making the air war more effective was that there is no use trying it because it won't work anyway.

Where does the President stand? Does he stand with Mr. McNamara or with his military chiefs and those members of Congress who believe a meaningful air war will help us succeed in Vietnam?

What is our policy? Is it still Mr. McNamara's policy? What hope is there for success in Vietnam? That's what the American people wonder, and they want to hear it from the man in charge, the President of the United States.

If the President continues the indecisive and ineffective policies of the past 2½ years, then the American people are committed to a war of attrition that could last for 10 to 20 years.

If Mr. McNamara is right in his latest public assessment of the Vietnam situation—and I do not for a moment concede this—then the United States should get out of Vietnam at the earliest possible time and under the best possible terms.

Our last opportunity for success in Vietnam may be fast disappearing.

I have called for a clear and coordinated plan to achieve success in Vietnam. Such a plan would include more effective and more meaningful bombing of significant *military* targets in North Vietnam. Not necessarily more tonnage, but dropping our bombs on meaningful targets instead of jungle trails or into the sea.

We must by one of several sound military tactics greatly reduce the flow of supplies through the port of Haiphong. This can be done in such a way that no enemy, misled by our past mistakes, will misjudge our will or intentions.

The South Vietnamese Army must be forced to shoulder more of the burden of the fighting in the South.

All of our allies who have enjoyed American aid should be called upon to join in a big push toward success in Vietnam.

The pacification program must be made to work.

Three weeks ago I disclosed that many highly significant military targets in North Vietnam were on a list declared off-limits by the President as commander-in-chief of our armed forces. I said it then and I say it now. I am opposed to sending one more American foot-soldier to Vietnam if our pilots are prevented from doing the job that needs doing—a job that should have been done months before.

Some people are concerned about civilian casualties in North Vietnam. I am *more* concerned about the lives of Americans and our allies in South Vietnam. I am not contending that air power alone will bring success in Vietnam and open the way to the peace table. It is just one of the paths we must take or accept the alternative of disengagement.

I am not advocating that civilian centers be bombed.

I am not proposing the use of nuclear weapons.

I am not advocating a ground invasion of North Vietnam by American forces.

So far as I know, no responsible Americans advocate these extreme measures.

There *is* substantial military agreement, and I concur, that if the war is waged more efficiently in the North it will aid our men in the South and save American lives.

The American people are saying "let's succeed or get out."

The voice of the people is invariably the voice of wisdom.

The American people know the Vietnam War could go on endlessly unless there is a concerted joint effort to bring it to the bargaining table. Events make men, but men also make events. The President of the United States has to power to change the pattern, to break the mold, to demand that our South Vietnamese allies shape up or lose our support.

Genuine success in a guerrilla war results when the local population is willing to fight its own war, with a conviction that their enemy—the Communists—be defeated. We saw the proof of this in South Korea, the Philippines, in Greece and in Malaya.

Let us fulfill our commitment in Vietnam. Let us stop labeling each other as hawks and doves. Let us admit past mistakes—stop defending past failures. Let us decide we are going to end this bloody war, quickly, successfully and honorably.

We cannot and should not do it alone.

I call upon the South Vietnamese soldier to engage in the imitation of excellence—to pattern himself after our American soldiers and Marines.

To the South Vietnamese, I say in the words of Pericles: "Take these men for your example. Freedom is the sure possession alone of those who have the courage to defend it."

Our objective in Vietnam is honorable. Our cause is just. Let us—we and our allies—pursue it to an honorable end. Thank you.

Labor News Conference on Administration Tax Proposal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB H. GILBERT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 11, 1967

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, the AFL–CIO chief economist recently called on Congress to look at "the very large sums of money now completely exempt from taxes" as a source of revenue to finance the war in Vietnam. Nathaniel Goldfinger, AFL–CIO director of research, put some $22 to $24 billion annual income in this exempt category.

He was interviewed on the AFL–CIO public service program, Labor News Conference, heard on the Mutual Broadcasting System. So that we may all be able to consider what Mr. Goldfinger said, I include, Mr. Speaker, a transcript of the program in the Record, as follows:

ADMINISTRATION TAX PROPOSAL

Guest: Nathaniel Goldfinger, director, AFL–CIO Department of Research.

Panel: Hobart Rowen, business and financial editor, the Washington Post; Alan Adams, Washington correspondent for Business Week magazine.

Moderator: Harry W. Flannery.

Flannery. Labor News Conference. Welcome to another edition of Labor News Conference, a public affairs program brought to you by the AFL–CIO. Labor News Conference brings together leading AFL–CIO representatives and ranking members of the press. Today's guest is Nathaniel Goldfinger, director of the AFL–CIO's Department of Research.

One of the major issues now before Congress is President Johnson's proposal for a temporary tax increase. Last week, AFL–CIO President George Meany outlined the Federation's views on the proposal in testimony before the House Ways and Means Committee. Here to question Mr. Goldfinger about the AFL–CIO's position on the Administration-proposed surtax are Hobart Rowan, business and financial editor for the Washington Post, and Alan Adams, Washington correspondent for Business Week magazine. Your moderator, Harry W. Flannery.

And now, Mr. Rowan, I believe you have the first question?

Rowan. Mr. Goldfinger, with the outlook for the economy still somewhat cloudy, why does the AFL–CIO favor a tax increase at this time?

Goldfinger. Well, in the first place, Mr. Rowan, we are in accord with the President's view that a tax increase is needed. However, we are firmly opposed to the Administration's proposals on how to increase taxes.

The way we propose to increase taxes is considerably different from the Administration's.

However, in terms of the reasons why we think there is a need for a tax increase, we think that the American public generally, not only the armed forces, should share the sacrifice of the war in Vietnam.

In addition, we are concerned about the problems of financing a very large prospective federal budget deficit, which it now appears will be somewhere in the area of $20 to $25 billion or more in this fiscal year—the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968. Financing this kind of large budget deficit with the flotation of a very large volume of government bonds in the money market could very well mean tight money and very high interest rates.

Now, tight money and high interest rates could throw—would throw—residential construction for a loss. We had the experience of tight money and high interest rates last year, when residential construction and related industries were thrown into a deep recession.

So, we think that in order to reduce the dangers of very tight money, very high interest rates and a distorted economy—one part of the economy in a recession while the rest of it is moving up—in order to reduce those dangers, a tax increase is needed.

Adams. Mr. Goldfinger, you seem to agree in principle, but certainly disagree in particulars, on a tax increase, with the Administration. As I understand it, one of the points of a tax increase is concern over inflation. Does the AFL–CIO agree with this as a reason for a tax increase?

Goldfinger. No, Mr. Adams, we do not agree with the Administration's view that inflation is imminent or around the corner.

Manufacturing industries, at this point, are operating at about only 85 percent of their productive capacity.

There still is unemployment and underemployment.

The labor force is growing—productivity is increasing—new plants and machines are being installed.

We fail to see where there is any imminence at all of shortages of goods, shortages of plants and equipment, or shortages of manpower. We don't think that the kind of situation that some of the people in the Administration are talking about is anywhere in the near future.

Adams. If this is the case, Mr. Goldfinger, wouldn't a tax increase then, perhaps, cause a recession, or, at least a downturn in the economy?

Goldfinger. No. We don't believe that either, Mr. Adams, because the economy is moving up—industrial production has moved up.

Flannery. Has it moved up sufficiently?

Goldfinger. It has begun to move up. It is not moving up anywhere close to a classic inflation situation, in terms of shortages of goods, plants, equipment, and so on.

But, economic activities are picking up. We are not in a recession and we are not in an economic downturn. Things are moving up.

But, the problem that we do see—and to us, it is an important one—is that in the absence of increased government revenue in this year, and in the absence of some reduction of the large prospective federal deficit, there is a real danger of tight money and high interest rates, which would distort the pick-up. That is why we think increased federal revenue is needed.

However, I want to emphasize, Mr. Adams, that we are opposed to the specific Administration proposals on how to raise taxes.

We believe in the principle of ability to pay. We believe in the principle that equality of sacrifice should be based upon the ability of the various groups in the economy to sacrifice. Therefore, we think that the surtax rate on corporations should be at least twice as great as the rate on individuals.

We think that low-income taxpayers should be completely exempt from the surtax, and that the tax increase on other income groups should be based on ability to pay.

Rowen. Mr. Goldfinger, let's examine at least one of those in a little more detail.

When Mr. Meany testified last week, he acknowledged that if a tax increase is adopted, the pace of the economic upturn that you just spoke about will probably be slightly slower than would otherwise be the case.

In other words, a tax increase, to some extent, is deflationary. Now, if you get up to the kind of corporate surtax rates that Mr. Meany talked about—up to say, 20 percent—wouldn't that put quite a crimp in the economy and possibly lead to growing unemployment?

Goldfinger. We don't think so, Mr. Rowen. Profits have been very high. In fact, they skyrocketed from 1960, well into 1966, before they dipped a bit. They began to move up again in the past spring and summer.

The corporations have loads of dough, not only in terms of profits after taxes, but in terms of depreciation writeoffs.

Cash flow to corporations in the April–June quarter of this year was at a yearly rate of $87½ billion. Now, the cash flow in the April–June quarter was far greater than at any time in American history before 1966, and only slightly less than in 1966. So, a 12, or 15, or 16, or even 20 percent surtax charge on corporations is not going to throw business investment into a depression.

Rowen. Did you notice that one of the steel company heads—I think it was Armco—said that if there were a ten percent surtax, the steel companies would have to raise prices? Do you think they are kidding about that?

Goldfinger. Well, I have no idea whether they are kidding or not. We are not psychiatrists nor mind readers. The point is, that in many of the key industries in this economy, prices are set by the leading corporations.

I guess it is possible that some industries, such as steel, may try to take advantage of a tax increase and try to put through a price increase.

Flannery. Using that as an excuse?

Goldfinger. Using it as an excuse.

The point is, Mr. Rowen, that profits and profit margins have been very high.

Look at the record and you see that from 1960, to the first half of 1967—in a period of 6½ years—corporate profits after taxes went up to 74½ percent. Dividend payments to stockholders went up 69½ percent.

But, the weekly after taxes take-home pay of the average factory worker with a wife and two kids, increased only 24 percent.

Now, it is because of this situation—because of the great disparity between the way corporate profits and dividends shot up on the one hand, and the way workers wages have moved up in recent years on the other hand—that we think the ability to pay principle requires a substantially greater surtax rate on corporations than on personal income.

Adams. The AFL–CIO proposal, Mr. Goldfinger, would, apparently, at least double the rate on corporations. What would your plan do for individuals? How much lower would the tax be on individuals under your plan than under the Administration's plan, for instance?

Goldfinger. Our proposal on a surtax on personal income, Mr. Adams, is altogether different from the Administration's proposal of a surtax on individuals.

The Administration's proposal would place a flat ten percent surtax on all incomes of families of four with a gross income above $5,000 a year.

Now, our proposal is considerably different.

We think that it is unfair to apply the same ten percent surcharge on the total tax liabilities of a $6,000 family, or a $10,000 family, that you would apply to a million dollar income family.

What we are proposing is to place the surcharge on an ability to pay basis. We think we have made a very concrete, practical suggestion here—that every taxpaying family filing a joint return would subtract $300 from its tax liability before it applies the surcharge.

Now, what this would mean to a family of four, with an income of $5,000, for example, is that there would be no surtax at all. Such a family would be exempt from the surcharge.

At a $6,000 income, for example, the Administration's proposal would mean a $45 surtax. Under our proposal, with a deduction of $300 before they figure the surtax on their form, such a family would pay a surtax of only $15—at a ten percent surtax rate.

Adams. With a smaller return from individuals, Mr. Goldfinger, what kind of net increase do you have to make up for the deficit?

Goldfinger. Oh, we have made very concrete proposals on that. We are convinced that they are very practical and sound proposals.

It is our view, for example, that a six percent surtax rate on personal income, along the lines that we have suggested—with a $300 deduction for families filing joint returns, and a $150 deduction for single individuals—that something like $2.8 billion could be raisd. Or, at an eight percent surtax along those lines, $3.9 billion could be raised.

Now, additional revenue to the federal government could be raised by a surtax on corporate income that would be at least twice as great as the surtax rate on individuals.

But in addition, Mr. Adams, it is our view that the very large sums of money which are now exempt—completely exempt from taxes—such as one-half of the capital gains on the sale of stock, real estate and other property, the income from interest on tax-exempt state and local government bonds, and the income from oil and mineral depletion allowances, should be subject to at least, some kind of small tax rate.

There are very great sums of money involved here. It is our estimate, Mr. Adams, that something like 22 to 24 billion dollars a year, in recent years, has been exempt from taxation, just in those three categories.

A small degree of taxation on those exempt forms of income could raise at least one to two billion dollars, along the lines that we have proposed, specifically, to the Congress of the United States.

Rowen. Mr. Goldfinger, I want to get back a minute to the AFL–CIO's rationale for supporting a tax increase, because the basic justification, as you see it, still eludes me somewhat. As I understand what you have been saying, you don't have the fear of inflation or excessive demand, which is the principal reason behind the Administration's proposal. As I understand it, you fear that if we don't raise taxes, we will have to borrow so much money that it will push up interest rates and put a crimp in housing. That, plus the need to make a show of support for the boys who are actually fighting, seems to me to be your basic reasons for a tax increase. It seems to me, looking at the history of the AFL–CIO's economic policies, that in other years, faced with this situation, you might have said, leave it up to the Federal Reserve Board to keep money easy. Let them pump enough money into the markets to make sure that interest rates aren't tight. Isn't there a kind of shift in position here?

Goldfinger. Not really, Mr. Rowan. We have not been faced, in any recent year, with this kind of a very large budget deficit in a period of economic upturn. And it is that which impresses us.

Furthermore, we had a very concrete experience of a distorted economy last year. Most industries were moving up, while home building and related industries, such as lumber and furniture, went into a recession or some kind of decline.

Now, it is our view, Mr. Rowan, that tight money and very high interest rates this year would probably trigger similar results again. And the goal—the very important goal—of more and better housing would be thrown for a loss.

In addition to that, hundreds of thousands of people would pay the price for such a development—consumers, small businesses, state and local governments, farmers—all kinds of people who have to borrow money—as well as the workers in the affected industries.

So, Mr. Rowen, the alternatives that we see—the practical alternatives—are, on the one hand, a distorted economy, with one part of the economy—home building and related industries—being thrown into a slump, while the rest of the economy moves up. Homebuilding is not only an industry which employs many workers, but it also is an industry which has great social importance.

Rowen. Well, are you willing to predict that if the tax increase—either along the lines of the President's proposal or your own—if some tax increase is passed, that interest rates will come down?

Goldfinger. No, we are not predicting that. Such a prediction at this point would be crystal ball-gazing. What we have said is that we think the tax increase is needed to reduce the dangers of very tight money and very high interest rates. To us, this is very important.

It would at least curb the tendency of interest rates to move up sharply, because interest rates are already high, and if they move up any higher, they will be much higher than they were 40-odd years ago—back in the 1920's.

Rowen. There are some critics of the program who point out that there is a good flow of funds right now in the banks, savings and loans, and that interest rates are still high and the housing industry hasn't really recovered.

Goldfinger. The housing industry has begun to move up, as you know, Mr. Rowen. Housing starts have been moving up. However, in the past two or three months, mortgage rates have begun to move up, too, in anticipation of tight money and high interest rates in the next several months.

In June and July, mortgage rates began to move up. In July, which is the latest month for which I have any information, the average mortgage rate on FHA-insured homes was as high as 6½ percent. It is this kind of condition that I think is a danger—a very serious danger. That is what has to be curbed.

Now, we can talk about monetary policy theory and the theory of what the Federal

Reserve Board should do. But the Federal Reserve Board, historically, unfortunately, has always moved to tighten money, with the result of higher interest rates, as soon as the economy begins to move up.

We have to curb the possibility of the flotation of a very large volume of government bonds into the money market. I think a good deal of public and Congressional pressure is needed on the Federal Reserve System to not tighten money and to not boost interest rates.

FLANNERY. Mr. Goldfinger, you have been emphasizing the idea of a "temporary" war tax. Are you concerned that this surtax will be permanent?

GOLDFINGER. Oh, I don't think that the surtax, in this form would be permanent, Mr. Flannery. The Administration's proposal that the surtax be put into effect for approximately two years, or so long as the extraordinary expenditures for the Vietnam War continue.

And, I think that the surtax would be needed for approximately that period of time.

ADAMS. Do you have a prediction, Mr. Goldfinger, on what Congress will do with the President's proposal?

GOLDFINGER. No, Mr. Adams, I have no prediction on what Congress will do. I certainly hope that Congress adopts the kind of surtax increase that we have proposed.

FLANNERY. Thank you, gentlemen. Today's Labor News Conference guest was Nathaniel Goldfinger, director of the AFL–CIO's Department of Research. Representing the press were Alan Adams, Washington correspondent for Business Week magazine, and Hobart Rowen, business and financial editor of the Washington Post. This is your moderator, Harry W. Flannery, inviting you to listen again next week. Labor News Conference is a public affairs production of the AFL–CIO, produced in cooperation with the Mutual Radio Network.

Commemorative Stamp in Honor of American Heart Month

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 11, 1967

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, for the past several years, Americans have observed the month of February as American Heart Month. As many of my colleagues will recall, Heart Month is the result of a resolution which I originated in this body in 1963 and which was adopted in the same year.

The primary purpose of Heart Month is to focus nationwide attention on the problem of heart and blood vessel diseases, which account for more deaths than all other diseases combined. The contribution which Heart Month has made toward medical progress and greater public awareness in this field has been very gratifying to me personally.

Not only are cardiovascular afflictions the No. 1 killer in America today; they are also responsible for a staggering economic and physical loss to the Nation. In addition to the almost 1 million who die of heart ailments each year, there are approximately 20 million of all ages who are afflicted in varying degrees, many losing their productive capacity as a result of such affliction.

Medical science is fighting these diseases, however, and significant improvements have been registered in the areas of prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of cardiovascular diseases. Most heart victims can now recover from the first attack, and three out of four of these are able to return to work. This progress has been made possible by cooperation between the American Heart Association, financed largely by voluntary contributions, and the Federal Government, particularly the U.S. Public Health Service.

The aim of American Heart Month is twofold. First, it is intended to make people aware of the medical, social, and economic aspects of the problem of cardiovascular diseases. Such an awareness is essential to the health and well-being of our Nation. These diseases can be fought with preventive steps, and the risks of a severe or disabling stroke can be reduced. Early discovery and treatment can make the difference between a full, productive life, or a crippling illness or death.

The second purpose of Heart Month is to encourage the continued support of the American Heart Association, and its direct affiliates and chapters, so that further progress, both in research and in making new discoveries and methods known to the public, may be made.

It is my firm belief that American Heart Month deserves the fullest support of Congress and the American people. For the purpose of attracting public attention to Heart Month, to the problems of cardiovascular disease, and to the new sources of hope for heart victims, I am today introducing a bill that would authorize and direct the Postmaster General to issue a stamp in honor of American Heart Month. Such a stamp would be an invaluable aid in accomplishing the objectives of Heart Month. I hope my colleagues will give their vigorous support to this worthy cause and to this legislation.

Jim Richardson: An Outstanding Contributor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 29, 1967

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, on August 23, 1967 the board of commissioners of the Vallejo, Calif., Housing Authority held a testimonial dinner honoring one of Vallejo's finest citizens, Jim Richardson, the director of the Vallejo Housing Authority.

Jim Richardson has served the Vallejo Housing Authority for 25 years. He is a man with a unique social conscience and he has played an outstanding role in the development of Vallejo. Jim's record with the Vallejo Housing Authority is only a part of his success story. He is also the administrator of Vallejo's multimillion dollar Marina Vista redevelopment project and his leadership has turned a dream of progress into reality for Vallejo.

I am very pleased to note the following remarks about Jim Richardson by reporter Carol Cross of the Vallejo Times Herald:

JIM RICHARDSON: AN OUTSTANDING CONTRIBUTOR

(By Carol Cross)

James D. Richardson, executive director of the Vallejo Housing Authority, will be honored tonight at a dinner marking his completion of 25 years of distinguished service in behalf of public housing in Vallejo.

The no-host dinner, sponsored by the Authority's Board of Commissioners, will be held in the Redwood Inn, beginning at 6:30 p.m.

Commissioner Dr. Louis C. Moore, in an invitation addressed to former commissioner Senator Luther E. Gibson, had this to say about the occasion:

"The year 1967 is significant to Jim Richardson and to the Vallejo Housing Authority. For Jim, it represents 25 years of employment by the Authority and, for the 26 commissioners during that period, it represents 25 years of capable leadership.

FLOYD TO CLOSE

"Also significant is the closing of Floyd Terrace—25 years of wartime housing comes to an end." . . .

Dr. Moore very properly could have added that 1967 brings to a close an era of public war housing in Vallejo which quite possibly was not equalled anywhere in the country—most certainly not in any other town of 30,000 people, which Vallejo was in 1939 when World War II erupted in Europe.

Newcomers to this community may find it difficult to realize that at the peak of its operations the Vallejo Housing Authority:

Managed an equivalent of 10 small cities with a total population of 37,500 to 40,000 people whose apartments and dormitories occupied 1,220 acres of land.

Had 600 employes; operated four fire stations; maintained some 35 miles of streets and 95 miles of sidewalks, and played a major role in the construction of schools in Carquinez Heights and Chabot Terrace.

As Hitler began his rampage in Europe, the possibilities that the war eventually could spread into this hemisphere became increasingly apparent.

Preparedness dictated that Mare Island Navy Yard—then geared for a normal employment quota of 6,000—should step up its all-important national defense activities.

The shipyard expanded rapidly, established training courses and began to recruit new workers to build submarines and repair surface craft.

In order to keep pace with the increasing demand for living accommodations, various federal agencies were called upon to enter into a crash building program in the Vallejo area.

FEDERAL FIRST

Federal Terrace, an 858-family development, was the first public housing project built in Vallejo. Constructed and managed by the Public Building Administration, it was completed by November, 1941.

In July, 1941, the Federal Works Agency started a 1,692-family development on the brush and grass-covered hills overlooking Carquinez Strait. Tiers of prefabricated, demountable structures, spaced for garden areas between units, sprung up on Carquinez Heights.

Immense Chabot Terrace, a 3,000-unit project located on rolling hills three miles north of downtown Vallejo, began operation in the fall of 1942. Although a portion of it sprawled over the Napa County line, it was the second largest "city" in Solano County at the time.

But it was scarcely completed before new demands for housing proved even this huge project to be insufficient.

DORMITORY UNITS

Some 4,500 dormitory units were constructed, concentrated in two locations. The Northside dormitories, comprising some 500 units, were built in another area north of Vallejo. It was primarily for women and apprentices.

The former Northside administration building is now the home of Vallejo Post 104 of the American Legion. The Northside site is occupied today also by the administration building and maintenance yards of the Vallejo Unified School District, and by the Broadway Medical Hospital.

The Hillside dormitories, consisting of 4,000 units for men, together with cafeteria facilities and a community building, occupied the present-day site of the Kentwig Lodge and bowling lanes.

This was one of the largest operations of its kind anywhere in the world—a hotel-type establishment with daily maid service provided to make up the 4,000 beds and to keep the premises clean.

Other smaller projects were known as Amador, Solano, Lakeview and Victory.

Harry Floyd Terrace, with 1,000 family units, was built in 1944–45. It was destined to become the only one of the 10 different war housing projects in Vallejo which was not ordered to be closed out entirely in the years which succeeded the end of World War II.

In 1953 Floyd Terrace was bought from the federal government by the Vallejo Housing Authority—which two years earlier had entered into an agreement with Solano County concerning its continued operation. (At the time, the project was outside the city limits of Vallejo.)

Following its annexation to the city in 1958, a dispute arose as to whether the city or the county should receive the project's annual profits. Litigation ensued and in March, 1962, a Superior Court judgment decreed that the profits were to be divided equally between the city and the county.

GRANT DEED

In addition, the county was directed to deliver a grant deed to the city for a 40 per cent interest in the real property and improvements.

The court further ordered the Board of Supervisors to adopt a resolution directing the Authority to discontinue operations of Floyd Terrace when requested to do so by the city.

On Aug. 20, 1962, the city council passed a resolution requesting closure of the project by August, 1965. The supervisors, in a resolution adopted Aug. 28, 1962, concurred in the city's action.

After that—while the Authority proceeded with an orderly phase-out and demolition of Floyd Terrace buildings as they were vacated—both the city and the county granted periodic postponement of the date of final closure.

NO EXTENSION

But there was no extension asked nor granted beyond March 31, 1967—when termination of the remaining tenancies officially became effective.

In July, 1966, with 228 families still left in Floyd Terrace, the Housing Authority embarked on a new program of housing low income families in private accommodations, with rental assistance provided under provisions of the U.S. Housing Act.

Hence, this new program will keep the Board of Commissioners—and Richardson—busy for an indefinite period into the future—although there will be no more public housing projects, as such, for them to operate.

Regressing to the early 1940s, Congress, under the Lanham Act, had decreed that all public war housing construction and management be under the control of the Federal Public Housing Administration.

In order to coordinata the complex problems of supplying housing for the burgeoning number of defense workers in the Vallejo area, that agency requested the city establish a local housing authority.

On June 8, 1942, the city council voted to create what is formally known as the Housing Authority of the City of Vallejo, to be governed by a board of five commissioners appointed by the mayor. The commissioners in turn chose Maurice J. Wilsie as the first executive director.

Richardson, who had come to Vallejo in 1937, was promptly appointed superintendent of mantenance for the vast—and growing—complex of residential developments. He soon became Wilsie's deputy executive director and when Wilsie resigned in January, 1946, Richardson was selected as his successor.

BIG BUSINESS

From its earliest inception, with the completion of Federal Terrace in 1941, public war housing in Vallejo was a very big business which, in the Vallejo area, was second only to Mare Island Navy Yard itself.

The Housing Authority, with Richardson playing the key role, had much more to do than to just manage the apartment buildings and dormitories.

It also leased commercial buildings where food, drugs, clothing and other essentials were available. It operated cafeterias. It provided coordinated services for child care, family welfare, recreation and education. It supervised community buildings and public grounds. It organized community activities, collected rents, cleaned and repaired dwelling units, etc., etc.

LONG STORY

But it would take a large book—or perhaps several of them—to tell the full story of the war housing program in Vallejo, and the significance it had in the development of this community.

Moreover such a book or books could not be written without frequent mention of "Jimmie" Richardson—whose reputation as an expert on housing, as well as on the somewhat more recent urban renewal programs has earned him national prominence.

This fact is borne out by his repeated invitations to speak at seminars and other events held under the auspices of the National Association of Housing and Urban Renewal officials—a top-flight organization which has elected him to high national offices.

In Vallejo, he has been concerned over the years not only with the prodigious business of being responsible for the operation of 8,750 rental apartments and 4,500 dormitory units—he also has been deeply involved in the affairs of tenant councils organized in every project to deal with such common problems as medical care, sanitation, fire protection and the like.

Under his direction recreation facilities and supervised recreation programs were emphasized. Outstanding among the facilities are the James D. Richardson Pool and the Wade Madren baseball park in Floyd Terrace. The former Clarence George Youth Center, also in Floyd Terrace, served thousands of youths and adults during its long use as an indoor sports, games and meeting place.

ORDERLY PHASEOUT

Another tremendous undertaking which has required much time, skill and effort from Richardson, and which remains to this day, although it is now near a successful conclusion, has been the orderly phase-out and the disposition of the thousands of war housing units and the sizeable parcels of land on which they stood.

When the last of the 148 apartment buildings in Floyd Terrace falls before the wrecking contractor's bulldozers and clam-shell-equipped cranes this year, just about all that will remain as a reminder of the heyday of war housing in Vallejo are 316 apartments still left in what formerly was Federal Terrace.

Those apartments, constructed in buildings designed for permanent rather than temporary use, are in private ownership. Refurbished and otherwise improved, they constitute what is now Hillcrest Park.

As for Richardson, he continues to make his prestige and influence felt in Vallejo's affairs. A "two-hat" executive director, he also is the administrator of Vallejo's multimillion dollar Marina Vista Redevelopment Project.

It would take several books to tell about the accomplishments of that program, too.

Congressman Horton Lauds Fred Wellington for Outstanding Service to Boy Scouting in Rochester, N.Y.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK HORTON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 11, 1967

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, the role of Boy Scouts in helping to form the character of millions of young men in America is well known. Many of our colleagues, in fact, look back with reverence to years of their youth during which they were taught not only the mysteries of knots and wood-lore, and the pleasures of camping and hiking, but perhaps more important, what it meant to live up to the high principles of the Scout oath and to live by the Scout law.

Thousands of men and women have worked to make Scouting a successful experience for millions of boys since Scouting was first brought to the United States in 1910. Most of them take up their Scouting duties in addition to their professional lives and regular social demands.

Behind them is a small group of men who devote their lives to promoting the growth of Scouting units and activities so that more and more American boys and benefit from the principles of Scouting and enjoy the constructive companionship and lessons Scouting teaches.

FORTY-TWO YEARS OF SCOUTING

Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay tribute to one such man, Mr. Frederic Wellington, who is retiring as Scout executive of the Otetiana Council, Boy Scouts of America, in Rochester, N.Y., after 42 years of professional Scouting, 24 of them in Rochester.

Mr. Wellington has been an outstanding guide for the youth of the Rochester area. Under his patient and creative leadership, Scouting in the area served by the Otetiana Council has flourished as an example for the rest of the Nation.

The Rochester Times Union, on August 31, 1967, told how Fred Wellington became involved in Scouting:

> When Frederic Wellington was graduated from the University of Rochester in 1925, he worked a few years part-time for The Times-Union and thought he was interested in becoming a newspaperman.

> "First, though, there was this Scouting program I was interested in . . .," he says—and 42 years later Wellington is still in scouting.
>
> Wellington, 64, of 204 Wyndale Road, Irondequoit, retires tomorrow from the executive director's post on the local Otetiana (Oh-tee-shee-on-ah) Council of the Boy Scouts of America.
>
> It began with a boyhood membership in the scouts.
>
> Born in Dansville, Wellington moved to Rochester as a boy and became a scout in the Dewey Avenue Presbyterian Church troop. From there it was an easy step up to scoutmaster while attending UR.
>
> By the spring of his senior year he was working with the scouts for programs at old Camp Otetiana on Canandaigua Lake, when the decision was made to build a new council camp.
>
> "I agreed to work for two years," Wellington says, "and in that time we located Camp Pioneer at Seneca Lake . . . 165 acres that were purchased in 1926 and opened the year after."
>
> Wellington, by then, was hooked.
>
> He was director of Camp Pioneer from 1927 to 1929, and then was named scout executive of Adirondack Council at Saranac Lake.
>
> In the 1930's and 40's he directed councils in the New Hampshire-Maine-Vermont and Delaware-Maryland-Virginia areas. In 1947 he returned to lead Otetiana, a council that now covers Monroe County.

The growth of Otetiana since then has been remarkable.

All Scout units are sponsored by permanent institutions or groups. Since Fred Wellington became the Scout executive in 1947, the total number of different sponsors in Rochester and Monroe County has grown to 296. They represent a cross section of Rochester churches, schools, parent-teacher associations, police and fire departments, civic and service groups.

In the same period, the number of Scouts has grown from about 6,000 to almost 18,000 boys in Cub Scout packs, 238 Boy Scout troops, and 81 Explorer units.

Typical of Mr. Wellington's ability to transmit his enthusiasm for Scouting to others is the fact that he has been able to attract 6,800 adult volunteer leaders into the Otetiana Council.

OTETIANA: A CAMPING COUNCIL

One of the many exciting rewards of Scouting for boys from Cub-Scout age to Scoutmasters themselves is camping. The Otetiana Council provides a varied fare of camping experiences. Under Fred Wellington's leadership, two capital fund campaigns were conducted which resulted in development of the Massawepie Scout camps, 225 miles from Rochester in the Adirondack Mountains. A description of Massawepie is enough to make any man realize that this is a golden age for Scouting in Rochester. The 3,600-acre camp property includes 10 lakes and ponds, miles of hiking trails, and canoe routes. There are three base camps, Camp Pioneer, Camp Mountaineer, and Camp Voyageur, each a separate camp with its own facilities.

Each of the three camps operates four 2-week periods during the summer months.

In addition to the extensive formal camp program at Massawepie, the 10 districts of the Otetiana Council conduct one or more weekend encampments known as camporees during the year. These are typically held in the spring and early fall. Each of the camporees usually finds 300 to 500 Scouts participating.

Through Mr. Willington's determination, the Otetiana Council camping program has been augmented by the acquisition of 1,000 acres of new camp property in the Bristol Hills near Naples, N.Y. This is the Warren Cutler Scout Reservation, and is the center for year-round camping for scouts, and for special adult leader training events.

The vast and varied activities of an organization as large as Otetiana Council requires efficient administration. Under Mr. Wellington's guidance the council has established a council center as its administrative headquarters. It is located at 474 East Avenue, Rochester, N.Y., and is staffed by 18 executives and 16 office-workers.

One of the measures of a Scouting program is the advancement and continued participation of Scouts.

In each of the past 5 years, between 8,000 and 9,000 merit badges have been earned by Scouts. In 1966, 132 Scouts earned Scouting's highest honor—the Eagle Scout badge.

As impressive as these statistics are, Mr. Speaker, I think the measure of Fred Wellington is even better illustrated by the enthusiasm for Scouting which is evident throughout Rochester and Monroe County because of his years of dedication to gathering as many boys as possible under the influence of Scouting and its principles.

One of America's strengths is the devotion of private citizens to the task of guiding young, future citizens into paths of clean, moral living.

Fred Wellington's whole career has been devoted to that task. His contribution to the future of Rochester and Monroe County seems beyond our capacity to repay him. But Fred finds his reward in every young man who faces the problems of life armed with the principles he learned and absorbed as a Boy Scout in the Otetiana Council.

The generous, outgoing spirit which Fred Wellington brought to his work is illustrated by his farewell remarks to the Otetiana Council in the council's monthly publication, Smoke Signals, for September 1967:

> THE VIEW FROM HERE
>
> The privilege of being your Scout Executive for the past 20 years has meant more to me than I can tell you. When, in 1947, I returned to Rochester after 17 years of promoting Scouting in other states, I immediately began to appreciate how well those local Scouting pioneers wrought who set a high standard for those early Troops and organized top quality community leadership for a Council to guide them.
>
> The Scouts I knew as a boy, and later as Scoutmaster and camp director, have for many years been an important leaven in our community's business and professional life,—and an important part of the community's leadership and conscience. Old Scouts have helped build a community of unusual quality, and in turn the community supports a Boy Scout Council of unusual quality.
>
> As I complete my work and turn over the privilege of being Scout Executive of the Otetiana Council to Gene Cruse, it is with two predominant thoughts. The first is that you are to be congratulated on bringing Gene and his fine family to Rochester and Monroe County and can expect to go forward to new Scouting heights with him. The second is that I have been a very lucky man, indeed, to have had these 20 years of working with you fine volunteer Scouters and my fine staff associates in the service of our boys.
>
> May God bless you and your new leadership in the exciting years ahead!

WAR MEMORIAL TRIBUTE

On the 19th of September, the leading citizens of Rochester and the surrounding metropolitan area will gather at the Rochester War Memorial for a council-wide recognition dinner to pay tribute to Fred Wellington.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud at this time to add my congratulations to those of others to Fred Wellington on the completion of 42 years of professional Scouting. I wish Fred a very pleasant and rewarding retirement. In one sense he will be missed in Scouting in the Rochester area, but the creative imprint he made on the Otetiana Council and the thousands of men and boys who will carry on the Scouting program, ensures that his spirit will be with the executives and Scouts for a very long time.

H.R. 11816 and the Police

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 11, 1967

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, every law-enforcement official faces grave physical risk each day. In the city of Chicago, for example, five policemen have lost their lives in the line of duty during the past 19 months. As the Committee on the Judiciary reported, 278 police officers were killed in the line of duty in 1966 nationwide.

I am pleased that H.R. 11816, similar to a bill I introduced on March 13, 1967, was overwhemingly approved by the House today. This bill affects only those local law-enforcement officials who are killed or disabled in an attempt to apprehend individuals who are wanted for the violation of a Federal offense. Although the impact of this legislation is limited, the motivation behind it is extensive and significant. As President Johnson said in his crime message, this legislation is an "Official acknowledgment of the debt the Federal Government owes for the assistance given by local law enforcement personnel."

The 11th District, which I represent, has an extremely large proportion of the men who serve in the Chicago Police Department. These men risk their lives in order to protect the lives and property of the citizens of Chicago. Although, under the leadership of Mayor Richard Daley, the city has substantially raised the salaries of the police officers, their pay is not yet commensurate with their duties. I am, therefore, in favor of all measures which aid the police officer both financially and professionally.

The days that a policeman might have been pictured as having only to provide ice cream to lost children are over. Today the policeman must exercise the acumen of a sociologist in dealing with explosive situations. Today the policeman must demonstrate the expertise of a constitutional lawyer in questioning individuals suspected of criminal offenses. Today the policeman must have the impartiality of a judge. He is called upon to protect the rights of demonstrators. He is, at the same time, quite often the target of those who feel their rights are being denied—a target not only of words but, as many cities have shown this summer, the target of bricks and bullets. In the riot-torn cities of America, we have heard the cry of "police brutality." It is my contention that cities such as New York, Los Angeles, and Chicago did not witness great civil disorders because of the professional and competent activities of those cities' police departments. It is time to recognize that police do not cause riots. They prevent them. It is time to reaffirm our confidence in our various police departments. Throughout the United States the men who constitute our first line of defense against the encroachment of the lawless deserve the respect and support of the citizens they swear to protect with their lives. The passage of H.R. 11816 serves as such a reaffirmation.

World Food Needs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL E. BUTTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 11, 1967

Mr. BUTTON. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, August 31, I entered in the Record remarks of Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman dealing with the problem of the sufficiency of our world food supply.

These remarks were made at an important forum, entitled "World Food Sufficiency," held at the Bankers Club of America in New York City on June 16, 1967. Several hundred members of the American investment and banking communities were present. I am pleased to include in the Record a significant response to Secretary Freeman made at the forum.

This response on behalf of the investment community and at the request of the forum's sponsors was by Mr. Robert Price, the former deputy mayor of New York City, and now the executive vice president of the Dreyfus Corp.

World Food Needs

(Response by Robert Price, executive vice president of the Dreyfus Corp.)

Mr. Secretary, American business and finance will accept the challenge to meet the critical world food needs. It will do so even though the industries you look to and the industries you want to have participate have their own current problems, and even though we are cognizant that as managers of other people's money we can take only reasonable risks in that direction.

The specific industries that you talk about are prepared to do what they can to help meet the food problems of the world. These current problems include volatile price swings, erratic demand, high operating costs, and considerably below average return on sales. But they have their chins up and are prepared to move forward.

Other problems they face, include normal depreciation schedules which are sometimes difficult to live with, large gross plant investments required to generate sales, and other constant heavy capital needs which hold down cash dividends.

Hence the stock of these companies that you look to in the investment community have little appeal for conservative much less appreciation-minded investors.

The price-earnings multiples are 10, 12, 14 times, somewhat less than the industrial averages. This makes equity financing expensive. Dividend income is average at best, thus eliminating any real speculative appeal, and the substitute reliance on internal financing restricts cash payouts.

To be specific, I would like to talk for a minute about three companies: International Minerals, Deere, and Central Soya. In the case of International Minerals, an excellent company, the average depreciation rate runs about 4½% over the last five years, and profits have approximated 8% of total capitalization. However, even though this is respectable, it would be trimmed to about 4.2% if a 50% tax rate prevailed. Fortunately, they have a more favorable allowance and taxes are held to about 20%. But this does create a serious headache for these industries.

Another company is Deere, which has approximately the same experience as International Minerals. Only with respect to sales volume and capital investment does it do better. This is because farm machinery producers require somewhat less complicated manufacturing facilities.

However, here, as with International Minerals, we have a price-earnings ratio that is low with a dividend yield that is low, and only a 25% to 35% dividend payout.

Central Soya, with which I know you are familiar, has operating figures that can even more dramatically be used to show the low investment return in the industry as it now exists, even before they undertake the world-wide responsibility that we all hope they will.

During the past five years Central Soya's operating expenses have trimmed all but 6% of their sales dollar, and after depreciation and taxes, only 2% remains. Earnings on invested capital approach 10%, but depreciation deductions over 20 years still interfere with this figure. It sells at about 14 or 15 times earnings with only a 3% yield and a rather unattractive 28% dividend payout.

These companies have problems, but they can be encouraged to help even though they understand, as we all do, that the investment community must live by the basic law that resources have to flow to the best risks available.

Encouragingly, more and more business will commit itself to this moral and public responsibility, even though the profit may not be attractive. However, one heartening note is that around the world "profit" is becoming a more respectable word.

The New York Times this morning, June 16th, in its story on "think tanks" mentioned the public executives in Nigeria who spoke of a rather healthy return on investments. Countries are beginning to see something we have preached for a long time, that private industry does do a better job than public industry.

However, I must disagree with you, Mr. Secretary. Countries like India still live, in my opinion, in yesteryear and they unfortunately, must continue to suffer.

I have just returned from a rather brief trip around the world, and I was amazed at how atmospherically American capital is treated differently in Hong Kong, Bangkok and even Tokyo than it is in New Delhi and, of course, Moscow. American industry wants overseas markets and we will make overseas investments, but we need the cooperation of these governments.

The American government, thanks to you and to your cabinet, has done significant things to help encourage us, and we are thankful for it. But we need encouragement and protection or, I daresay, in India at least, not the antagonism of the local government. We are willing to accept, Mr. Secretary, lower returns and higher risks where the motivation to increase food supplies is present. We are prepared to make somewhat unattractive investments in agriculture and in industries which are in effect a downpayment on an insurance policy that business will be allowed to continue as is in the future in these countries.

Our protection and our return is in a better, healthier and more profitable world tomorrow. In 1965 only 70 United States firms accounted for half of the United States investments in overseas underdeveloped countries, and less than 500 American firms were totally involved in this overseas problem.

In 1965 the net capital outflow from the United States for direct investment, with the exception of oil and mining—and this is an important figure—the 1965 net capital outflow to the underdeveloped countries in Asia, Africa and the Middle East came to only $66,000,000.

This can be improved because we realize that the alternative to improving this is a scramble for survival in which either world bankruptcy or expropriation will be the penalty.

The food-population relationship, Mr. Secretary is, as I think you have stated once, a very "in" topic among American businessmen, and there is rising interest. Witness this audience trying to do something about it.

The American investment community, while we may believe right and want to do right, has to undertake new ventures with caution. We are basically fiduciaries dealing with other people's money, and what we may do with our own money is different from what we may do with other people's money. There seems to be no purpose in showing that we can do something at a loss. But we understand we have an obligation.

With this in mind, Mr. Secretary, I think that I can say we are prepared to have you help us in our joint responsibilities, the joint responsibilities being to both the people of these less developed countries, who will be the direct and ultimate beneficiaries of these policies, and the people whose money we manage.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

Monday, September 11, 1967

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Senate considered proposed Election Reform Act.

See Résumé of Congressional Activity.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S 12707–S 12754

Bills Introduced: Eight bills and one resolution were introduced, as follows: S. 2380–2387 and S. Con. Res. 44. **Page S 12711**

Resolution Reported: Resolution was reported as follows:

S. Con. Res. 40, to print as a Senate document report of the proceedings of the 43d biennial meeting of the Convention of American Instructors of the Deaf (S. Rept. 562)—reported September 8 under prior authorization. **Page S 12710**

Independent Offices Appropriations: Senator Byrd (Virginia) submitted on behalf of Senator Magnuson notice of intention to move to suspend rules for purpose of proposing amendment to H.R. 9960, fiscal 1968 appropriations for independent offices, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development. **Page S 12711**

Authority To Meet: All committees were authorized to meet while Senate is in session on Tuesday, September 12. **Page S 12793**

Election Law Revision: Senate considered S. 1880, proposed Election Reform Act. Prior to adopting a debate limitation agreement, the following actions were taken on amendments:

Adopted: All committee amendments en bloc, which were then considered as original text for purpose of further amendment; by 62 yeas to 5 nays (motion to reconsider tabled), modified Williams (Delaware) amendment No. 284 (for Senator Carlson and himself) to prohibit National or State committees from soliciting election contributions from Government employees; and

Rejected: By 19 yeas to 46 nays (motion to reconsider tabled), Williams (Delaware) amendment No. 283 barring contributions or expenditures by national banks, corporations, or labor organizations, in connection with elections or primaries.

Order was entered limiting debate as follows: On amendment No. 291 (by Senator Clark) and amendment No. 292 (by Senators Clark and Scott), and any amendments thereto, 1 hour each, equally divided. **Pages S 12754–S 12757, S 12774–S 12800**

Treaty Ratified: By unanimous vote of 69 yeas, Senate adopted resolution of ratification of Treaty of Amity and Economic Relations with Thailand (Ex. P, 89th Cong., 2d sess.). **Page S 12767**

Nominations: The following nominations were received: Thomas H. Nielsen, of California, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Air Force; Paul Rand Dixon, of Tennessee, to be a Federal Trade Commissioner; Walter E. Washington and Thomas W. Fletcher, both of D.C., to be Commissioner and Assistant to the Commissioner of the District of Columbia, respectively; and numerous Army, Navy, and Marine Corps. **Pages S 12801–S 12808**

Record Votes: Three record votes were taken today. **Pages S 12767, S 12782, S 12800**

Program for Tuesday: Senate met at noon and recessed at 6:40 p.m. until 10 a.m. Tuesday, September 12, when it will continue consideration, under debate limitation agreement, of S. 1880, proposed Election Reform Act. **Pages S 12793, S 12800**

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

SOCIAL SECURITY

Committee on Finance: Committee resumed its hearings on H.R. 12080, proposed Social Security Amendments of 1967, receiving testimony from Charles I. Bevans, Assistant Legal Adviser, Treaty Affairs, Department of State; Norman V. Lourie, American Public Welfare Association; Garland Bonin, commissioner, Louisiana State Department of Public Welfare; John Doyle Elliott, the National Townsend Plan; John F. Nagle, National Federation of the Blind; John W. Edelman, National Council of Senior Citizens, Inc.; Martin Morgenstern, representing the National Federation of Social Service Employees and the Social Service Employees Union; Dr. Joseph D. Cooper, professor of government, Howard University and American University; Dr. J. Buroughs Stokes, Christian Science Committee on Publication, Washington, D.C.; Dr. Blue A. Carstenson, National Farmers Union; and Leonard Kershner, International Association of Fire Fighters.

Hearings continue tomorrow.

Appendix

President Johnson at 59—Wholeheartedly Devoting Himself to the Most Important Job in the World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JIM WRIGHT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 12, 1967

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, Merriman Smith, of the UPI, one of Washington's mose perceptive writers and news analysts, has written a birthday story about President Johnson which brings out some fundamental characteristics of the President that are often obscured in usual press reports.

Mr. Smith talks about the President's total concentration on his job; about his demanding schedule, which often fatigues his younger associates but not himself; of the President's belief that he holds "the most important job in the world."

Here is the portrait of a man wholly dedicated to his programs and to the service of his country.

Here is a man who, when he thinks about the distant future, thinks about helping young people understand history and appreciate the importance of public service.

The problems the President faces are enormous.

The successes he has already achieved in less than 4 years are also enormous.

It is no wonder that President Johnson feels he has the most important job in the world.

He has worked himself up through the Congress to the highest governmental responsibility American Government bestows on any man.

And he has fulfilled that responsibility with a record of legislation and programs unparalleled in this century.

I join Merriman Smith and my fellow Americans in wishing the President many more happy and productive years in the White House.

Under unanimous consent I insert in the RECORD Mr. Smith's excellent article entitled: "L. B. J. Taking Problems as Part of Job.":

[From the Denver (Colo.) Post,
Aug. 25, 1967]

L. B. J. TAKING PROBLEMS AS PART OF JOB

(By Merriman Smith)

WASHINGTON.—President Johnson would have every right to be somewhat cynical next Sunday when people wish him "happy birthday"—his 59th.

Were he not propelled by what an associate once called "extra glands," the chief executive might be expected on his birthday to retort, "Happy about what?"

His birthday view of the world encompasses war in Vietnam and continued tension in the Middle East, a kind of racial warfare at home, conflict with Congress over raising taxes and his personal decline in the public opinion ratings.

Many men of any age would wilt under such scorching problems, but Johnson seems to tolerate his troubles much better than many longtime president-watchers may realize. For one thing, he has been around the upper echelons of government long enough to accept the fact that no modern president ever can expect a holiday from crisis.

Also, he knows that bogging down in worry, self-recrimination and pity would accomplish nothing but damaging inhibition of his executive performance.

Johnson, in fact, can become quite amused when friends and interviewers catalog his troubles, then express amazement that he can sleep nights. He not only can sleep at night, but in the afternoon, too.

Not long ago a visitor expounded on what by now is a most familiar theme, listing one crisis after another and then expressing amazement that the President was not crushed by such a terrible load.

"Any man in this job would be up against the same situation," the President said, "but there is another way of looking at it—life for me may be better than it is for most people. I have my health and a wonderful family. I have no worries about money, my taxes are paid and I don't owe a soul. Many of the every-day chores which the average man faces are done for me.

"This means I can devote almost all of my time and energy to what I believe is the most important job in the world. And, by God, that is what I am doing."

FATIGUING SCHEDULE

As Johnson observes his 59th birthday, he follows a schedule which some of his younger associates often find painfully fatiguing. This leads some people to express concern for the President's health, but their fears fail to consider personality traits which seem to override certain physical factors.

An eminent medical specialist here who is closely familiar with Johnson's record had this to say recently in a private conversation with friends of the President:

"The President, it is true, did suffer a rather serious heart attack in 1955, and while he must be regarded as a cardiac patient for the rest of his life, he did make a good recovery; he has been a better-than-average patient, and I am convinced his present rate of activity is better for him than what would be the debilitating frustration of artificial or enforced idleness.

"This man would be utterly miserable loafing on a beach a la Harry Truman or sailing off Cape Cod in the manner of John Kennedy. Work has been his hobby, his vocation, his life ever since I've known him, and while it may be contrary to the rules of well-being for most of us, it certainly seems to work for him."

TALKS LITTLE ABOUT POLITICAL FUTURE

If he has any deep concern about his political future and what the 1968 elections may hold in store for him, Johnson does not talk much about it. His actions, his Great Society policies and programs certainly appear to be those of a chief executive who intends to seek re-election.

And no matter how obvious other signs may become, those who know him well doubt he will say what he is going to do in 1968 until the last possible moment. This not only is characteristic of him, but it is good political strategy for an incumbent.

Regardless of what history may say about his accomplishments as president, Johnson typifies the sort of success story which American parents have dreamed for their sons generation after generation. Some historians believe that because of an increasingly affluent society with its constantly multiplying complexities, Johnson may be the last of the "log cabin presidents."

He was born Aug. 27, 1908, on a rocky farm near Stonewall, Tex., and today his home is on the same land—with a few added marks of opulence such as his own private airport and a heated swimming pool.

His parents were Sam Ealy and Rebekah Baines Johnson who were dutiful and hard-working the stern Texas hill country, but considerably less than well-off. Both his father and grandfather served in the Texas Legislature, and he grew up on their political tales, many of which he can recite today with much jovial embellishment.

HARD STRUGGLE THROUGH COLLEGE

Critics who see him today as the flashy rich Texan with $10,000 automobiles, a lucrative family broadcasting company, four ranches and other symbols of wealth forget how hard he struggled to get through Southwest Texas State Teachers College. This was followed by lean years as a country schoolteacher.

Some of his critics also forget that his political career started on a low rung—as secretary to a Texas congressman—then moved upward a step at a time with apprenticeship in his own House seat, then long service in the Senate and into the vice presidency with John F. Kennedy in 1960. After some 30 years on the Washington scene, he was catapulted into the presidency by the 1963 assassination of Kennedy.

At this 59th birthday stage of his life and career, Johnson speaks at times in the privacy of his family and closer friends about the many things he wants to do when he leaves office such as helping younger people to understand history and appreciate the importance of government service. He expects to base his post-presidential operations at a library to be erected on the University of Texas campus in Austin.

As to when he will drop to the slower pace of private life must be a matter of conjecture until it happens.

Pierre Salinger Discusses Communications Revolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 11, 1967

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, on August 17, Pierre Salinger spoke to the Kansas City Rotary Club. His discussion of the communications revolution was informative, and I insert the text in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

REVOLUTION IN COMMUNICATIONS AND INTELLIGENCE

(Speech by Pierre Salinger, before Kansas City Rotary Club, August 17, 1967)

I would like to discuss today a new revolution which is affecting our daily lives in many ways we have yet to perceive. This is a revolution in communications and intelligence. It is a technicological revolution which has made many of your jobs easier. It is also, however, a revolution which in many ways has unsettled public reaction and rendered unpredictable public response.

Never in history has information of both a specific and general nature been so available to the person who must make informed judgments and decisions. It's getting so he or she is reading all the time—at the office, at home, on weekends—and the unending pile of material never diminishes.

No matter what your occupation is, you must, to a greater or lesser extent, rely on public support for the work you do. Another ingredient, therefore, enters your decision-making process—public opinion.

The public is also being assaulted through new and revolutionary channels of information. This information and the way it is being transmitted is having a startling effect on his opinion-making process.

Let me give you a few examples.

For the first time in the history of our nation, a war 12,000 miles away is being fought in the living room of every American family each night of the week. It is one thing to read about battles far away in your daily newspaper. That has about the right quality of impersonality for most people, but to see your sons dying on your home TV screen—in living color—is something else, indeed. Few people have considered the effect on the American people and their opinion about the war in Vietnam when attempting to arrive at an official decision about what to do about it. It is very difficult to urge a public position of caution and non-escalation in the face of this visual onslaught. The capable associate editor of The New York Times, James Reston, said in his recent, excellent book, *The Artillery of the Press:* "The people have so much information about the violent incidents of the war that it is questionable whether the President of a democratic country can really sustain his policy over a long period of time while the public is being invited to tune in on the eleven o'clock news and see Johnny killed." What Mr. Reston goes on to say is that the old relationships between public opinion and public policy need seriously to be reexamined.

Since the median age in our country is now approaching 25, what the young think and what we think about the young becomes important in the relation of public opinion to public policy. The impact of total communications has reached the student on every campus in the land—grammar school, high school and college. Today's young generation knows a great deal more, feels a great deal more and is a great deal more aware of what is going on around them than we were at their age.

The public opinion of the young, therefore, it not what we expect it to be—and the public opinion about the young is seriously distorted because the generation gap is real and wide—and caused by communications. If, as a politician, you tell a college student that racial segregation is disappearing from our land or that there is no need for any kind of poverty program because there are no poor—he knows differently. Some go to Mississippi or work with the poor as their answer. Others grow long beards, hold sit-ins and take LSD. The pressure is then on the politician to do something about these good-for-nothings. We react instinctively to the acts of a few while barely bothering to find out what is happening to the many.

The recent riots in Newark and Detroit and other cities of our Nation also reflect, it seems to me, the impact of the communications revolution. One of the ingredients of our modern communications is the powerful advertising message dispensed by television. It is a compelling message, and it imbues the recipient with a desire to buy. What I am saying is not critical of the advertising profession, but the fact of the matter is that this message is reaching literally millions of people who cannot afford to buy. They are the poor, living in an affluent society, barraged on every side by messages on the impossibility of going through life without a particular product. The buying urge is created but not satisfied until, as we saw in Detroit and Newark, the stealing of goods becomes the compelling factor in a situation bordering on anarchy.

Public opinion should never be the dominant force in decision-making. But no government of a democratic society can survive if it ignores it. What I have attempted to say with these examples, however, is that the communications assault on the public mind is having side effects and that the reliability of public opinion as a guide to public policy has been changed drastically by the communications revolution.

And the revolution is not going to diminish much in intensity. We talk a great deal about such things as management of the news and credibility gaps. These things may indeed exist from time to time, but the real problem is the failure to understand what modern communications have done to our world and our tendency to think that all the old information and intelligence techniques will continue to work.

It is all well and good for me to tell you what is a great truth—that without candor about public policy there is no understanding of public policy. I could even tell you another truth—that the real understanding of public policy requires that debates which lead up to the creation of that policy be open and that, to the extent possible, the public participate in that debate. For government administrators to sit in a room and discuss the important decisions they have to make and then to make those decisions and announce them to the public without prior discussion is to invite disaster.

The relationship between government and the public media will necessarily be an unhappy one. The two institutions have different missions and different objectives, and they cannot and should not live in total harmony. The future of the democratic system is bound up in this conflict and it is to the interest of a living democracy to have an effective and searching press looking over your shoulder.

These truths, however, in no way reach the fundamental problem of our modern time; that is, how we all can learn to effectively use the new media of our times and how you can better learn and understand the impact that this new media is having on the general public.

Television is, of course, the key example. Much has been written about the impact of television on our lives, but the fact of the matter is that it has drastically altered the patterns of our culture. Among other things, it has eliminated in a great part the bloc-type voting structure of our society and therefore, in a manner largely unknown to the leaders of our great parties, has changed the structure of politics itself. The television debates of the 1960 campaign are a dramatic example of that fact. Without those debates it is my view that John F. Kennedy could not have been elected. Seventy million Americans were brought into the forefront of the political campaign in a manner never before tried. This is not to say that there is still not some use in the old forms of political campaigning, but the supermarket tour, the Whistle-stop train and other traditional forms of politicking have been seriously upstaged by the electronic media.

The current discussion of the possibilities of the presidency in 1968 is another example of this point. Almost none of the presently considered candidates for president would even have been mentioned 30 years ago. The operating forms of media at that time would not have made it possible for them to get their views known in time enough for them to be considered as serious candidates for President of the United States, and yet today television has made it possible for people to seriously consider men for president who have been in public office for less than 6 months.

The modern media have also had a tremendous impact on American attitudes about the rest of the world. These media have over the past 20 years eroded a rather fundamental desire of Americans to live their own lives in peace and not to be concerned about what is going on in the rest of the world. The media have simply made this impossible. Not only does what is going on in the rest of the world intrude into our daily lives in such a way as to make our participation in world affairs a necessity, but an American president can no longer afford the luxury of appealing to the American people alone. He must now take into account, in addition to American opinion, the public opinion of the rest of the world.

We have not reached an end of this process. Soon communications satellites will be in place, making a system of instantaneous global communications not only possible, but a reality. World leaders will be able to speak to other nations over the heads of their leaders, and traditional forms of propaganda will gradually disappear because it will be impossible for one nation's leaders to tell untruths about another nation's people when they can be seen directly, and on live televison.

I had a startling example of that during the Kennedy administration. As you will recall when President Kennedy became president, there was a great deal of discussion about the possible devaluation by the United States of the dollar or the possible raising of the price of gold which, of course, would have the same effect. President Kennedy very specifically and forcefully denied that he had any such intentions on a number of occasions, but these denials read in the cold print of The Times in London had no effect on those who chose to speculate in gold in the hope that the price would be raised. Then one day President Kennedy held his first and only press conference by Telestar. He was asked, by coincidence, the same question about the devaluation of the dollar and the raising of the price of gold. He gave the same answer. But this time the President was seen directly on the television screens of Europe and the gold market dropped dramatically. What the gold speculators had refused to believe in print, they accepted as fact when the President talked to them directly. This is a small example, but it is a portent of things to come in the sphere of international communications.

The advent of international communications satellites will have other effects. The peasant in Bolivia, and in India, and in Upper Volta, who now has some vague idea that his lot is not what it should be, is going to come up square against the realities of life in other parts of the world. His rising expectations and hopes for a betterment of his own life will place almost unbearable pressures on those with the responsibility for his social and economic development.

What I am trying to say is not very optimistic. At a time when we are receiving more massive and more vidid and almost instantaneous communication about what is is going on in the world around us, there is growing suspicion between government and its people, a complete breakdown in understanding between the older and younger generations, and even a breakdown in understanding between nations. In actual fact, the more information we seem to receive, the less becomes our capacity to either understand it— or act upon it.

Some new forms of radio programming are playing a great role in confusing the American people and alienating groups of our society from one another. I refer to the talk shows which permit people with the most extreme views to free access to the air waves. In many instances, these views, which include anti-Semitism, anti-Negro, just about anti-anything sentiments, do not get any counter-balancing views from the radio announcers who handle these shows, and who are, in many instances, totally unequipped to conduct serious discussions on any subject. In many cases, these announcers graduated to talk shows from years of service as disc jockeys. The result of many of these programs is an almost unending stream of poison being injected into our national life—a real pollution of the air waves. In this particular case, I think it is high time that the federal communications Commission look into this kind of programming.

I wish I could give you some pat answers to these problems. I cannot. Certainly, those responsible for the media must apply some form of selectivity to what they disseminate—and perhaps there is some weakness in the quality of that selectivity. To quote Mr. Reston's book again: "We are not covering the news of the mind as we should. There is where rebellion, revolution, and war start, but we minimize the conflict of ideas and emphasize the conflict in the streets, without relating the second to the first. If the Secretary of Defense says, for the thousandth time, that the United States has enough hydrogen bombs on airplanes and submarines to wipe out both China and the Soviet Union, even after they destroy every major city in the United States, he is assured a big boxcar headline on the front page of every big-city newspaper in America and a prominent place on the Cronkite and Huntley-Brinkley shows. But if some thoughtful professor makes a speech demonstrating that the destructions of the human race can be avoided, he may easily be ignored even in his home town."

While the discussion of selectivity is a difficult one and can often overflow into a discussion of censorship, one must wonder whether or not the drive to fill up an hour and a half of news time in the evening on most of our major networks does not lead the excessive attention to the statements of the Stokely Carmichaels and the Rap Browns because they are sensational in character, and too little attention to what is done in the Watts, the Newarks and the Detroits after they have been ravaged by riot.

Certainly those in politics and public administration need to re-examine the fiber of government for there is much evidence that many of our governmental practices and goals are archaic in the terms of the kind of world we live in now. Perhaps in the long run, we will find that the communications revolution has run away from us and that we have neither the ability nor the desire to adjust life and our practices to meet the problems with which it has presented us. In this unhappy (but not totally impossible) eventuality, we will find that the greater the amount of information, the greater the amount of communication, the result will be that we have fragmented the fabric of our lives in such a way that no future generation will ever be able to totally cope with the problems of their time in any really satisfactory way. In such an eventuality, we will ride from crisis-to-crisis, from crest-to-crest of "happenings", many of which are completely fabricated in order to give people access to the media because they will find that is the only way left for them to communicate.

High Cost of Ineffective Gun Control Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 11, 1967

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an excellent editorial appearing in the Handloader magazine of September–October 1967, entitled "High Cost of Ineffective Gun Control Laws." That excellent editorial points out that a permit to purchase a firearm in Philadelphia costs $1 and the paperwork required in processing that same permit is estimated to cost the city $15. The deficit, which is paid by the taxpayer, is estimated at $10 million.

That figure would pay for something on the order of 1,000 additional policemen, or an increase of about 15 percent over the present police force.

The editorial makes clear that the funds squandered in this program of demonstrated ineffectiveness could much better be spent in other ways.

HIGH COST OF INEFFECTIVE GUN CONTROL LAWS

How many of you would shell out 10 million dollars a year for a worthless product? Three million, maybe? It's doubtful that anyone in his right mind would even consider throwing away that much money.

But don't snicker too loudly—they're doing it in Philadelphia, and if you don't keep a watchful eye on your legislators in Washington, D.C., as well as in your home state, you may soon be doing the same.

According to information obtained and reported to us by John Marsman of Savage Arms, that's what Philadelphia taxpayers are paying for a worthless crime prevention law—but officials there don't like to talk about it. They are having a rough time proving their gun control law works. Crime rate statistics prove it doesn't—at least, not yet. It's an embarrassing situation.

How about the cost of the magic law that doesn't work? The permit required for a gun purchase costs $1. The investigation and paper work required in processing a single permit is estimated to cost the city $15. The taxpayer picks up the difference.

According to the city's leading newspaper, Philadelphia taxpayers are shelling out or have lost between 3 and 10 million dollars annually on this program. That's certainly enough to pay for an *effective* crime prevention program. These estimates were based on the 90 per cent drop in tax receipts from firearms sales, the taxpayer-borne cost for police investigations, and taxes lost through *non-sale* of related hunting accessories and reloading supplies.

What kind of crime prevention could 10 million dollars buy if used effectively? At a rather nice (and above average) salary of $10,000, it could pay for 1,000 additional policemen—an increase of about 15 per cent over the present force. This would provide added protection for all the citizens—protection against crimes they have real cause to fear, like robbery, beating, rape.

Any city contemplating a gun law like Philadelphia should perhaps give consideration to *really* effective ways of reducing crime—not just using gun control laws as a false panacea, and gun owners as scapegoats.

By providing more policemen, residents could return to the parks and playgrounds, they could have the peace of mind that comes with knowing there is little chance their house or apartment will be robbed, that they could take a walk on a warm summer night and know they could return home without being mugged or robbed, that their wives could shop or their daughters return from a school dance without being attacked.

Gun laws won't stop these crimes; effective crime prevention can!

Even in the face of the *facts* in the *Philadelphia fiasco*, civic leaders in that city are urging the adoption of their worthless and costly law as a model for state and federal legislation. Don't allow it to happen in Washington and don't let it happen in your city or state.

Up until now, little has been said about the cost of gun control laws. The Philadelphia case proves the law is worthless and the cost high. Taxpayers, sit up and take notice!

Rumsfeld Legislative Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 11, 1967

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit the text of my last legislative report, volume 3, No. 2, which is being mailed to all postal patrons in the 13th Congressional District of Illinois.

The report follows:

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Since the last *Legislative Report*, a substantial tax increase has been proposed, war erupted in the Middle East, riots have rocked many of our major cities, the Selective Service Act has been extended for four years, and the war in Vietnam has continued with little progress. While it is not possible in this brief space to discuss all of these issues, details on any measure before Congress may be obtained by writing me in the House Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20515. Your comments and views on matters of importance to our Nation are appreciated.

President Johnson proposes a tax increase.—A number of the Nation's leading economic experts, including the chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, recently testified before the Joint Economic Committee, on which I serve. The most hotly debated topic was the President's recommended tax increase. Most Committee members felt that Executive Branch witnesses failed to make a case for the President's proposed tax surcharge, then at the 6 per cent level. Since the Committee hearings ended in late June, the President has recommended that the tax surcharge be raised to 10 per cent, to be levied against both corporate and individual taxes.

There is continued concern that a tax increase at this time might slow economic growth at a critical time and reduce anticipated revenue gains. Moreover, many believe the Administration ought to place greater emphasis on curbing non-essential government spending, particularly in view of costs of the war in Vietnam. As reported a year ago, it is my view that priorities in Federal spending must be established. Regrettably, this has not been done. If the President's tax increase proposal is accepted by the Congress, it may very well be less than the 10 per cent requested, and come later than the October deadline set by the Administration.

In an effort to bring about the establishment of priorities and reduce non-essential Federal spending, I have supported amendments to five of the major omnibus appropriations bills to restrict expenditures to 95 per cent of the total amounts apppropriated. These motions to cut spending were approved by the House in two of the five instances. The Subcommittee on Economy in Government recently received testimony which documented a distressing record of careless management in government, especially in the Department of Defense. Recommendations for remedying many of the problems uncovered are made in a subcommittee report which is available by writing our Washington office.

Middle East Crisis.—The outbreak of war in the Middle East temporarily jolted the Administration away from its concentration of effort and attention on Southeast Asia. In the wake of the swift and decisive Israeli victory, the task of rebuilding after the loss of lives and resources is beginning. This conflict will either mark the beginning of a new era of stability or merely another episode in decades of hostility and unrest. The answer will lie in how these problems are resolved: right of passage through the Suez and the Gulf of Aqaba, the status of Jerusalem, security arrangements on Israeli borders, refugee and other economic problems, and, most important of all, whether or not the hostility of the Arab nations will be replaced by recognition of Israel and a resolve to find constructive approaches to the political and economic problems separating the two sides. Progress in finding answers to these vexing questions has been slow, but the path to peace and stability in the Middle East must be found.

Legislative action.—Legislation I have supported included bills to: 1) assist state and local governments in reducing crime and to increase the effectiveness and coordination of law enforcement and criminal justice systems at all levels of government; 2) prescribe Federal penalties for persons who interfere with the civil rights activities of others, and provide Federal penalties for persons who move from state to state with intention to incite riots and other civil disturbances; 3) extend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act; 4) revise the Copyright Law; 5) extend the Older Americans Act; 6) extend the Mental Health program; 7) extend the Higher Education Act; and 8) provide for a comprehensive review of national water resource problems and programs.

Legislation I have opposed included bills to: 1) increase the debt limit; 2) amend the Food Stamp Act; 3) revise peanut acreage allotments; 4) institute several unbudgeted public work projects; and 5) the Public Works Appropriations Bill, in the hope of trimming excessive Federal spending.

Legislation sponsored.—Part of a Congressman's job involves the identification of problem areas and the initiation of proposals to resolve them. This year, bills and resolutions I have sponsored or co-sponsored have included the following:

Human Investment Act of 1967.—To provide tax incentives for companies to hire and train unemployed workers lacking skills for available jobs.

National Home Ownership Foundation Act.—To promote home ownership among low-income groups through low-cost financing.

National Commission on Public Management.—To apply modern systems and management techniques to national and community problems.

Miscellaneous.—To eliminate the patronage consideration in the appointment of postmasters; and to permit those receiving Social Security benefits to earn a maximum of $3,600 annually. (Since my bill was introduced, the House voted to raise the earning limitation from $1,500 to $1,680.)

Rumsfeld amendments on NASA.—The House and the Senate have passed, and the President has signed into law, an amendment I offered to the bill authorizing funds for 1968 for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA). The Amendment establishes an Aerospace Safety Advisory Panel to monitor NASA safety activities in the interest of avoiding accidents such as the tragic Apollo 204 spacecraft fire of last January which took the lives of three astronauts.

Approval of the safety panel will mark, I believe, the beginning of substantially improved safety procedures in the U.S. space programs. The proposal was amended by a House-Senate Conference Committee to permit a minority of the panel members to be NASA employees, whereas the original language would have restricted membership to non-NASA personnel. The importance of a truly independent safety panel can be seen in the successful Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards of the Atomic Energy Commission. Hopefully, the presence of NASA employees on the NSA safety panel will not impair the panel's ability to objectively analyze safety hazards in the space program.

A second amendment which I offered to the NASA authorization bill, known as the "information amendment," was defeated in the House-Senate Conference. This amendment charged NASA with the responsibility of keeping the House and Senate Space Committees fully and currently informed with respect to all NASA activities. During hearings to investigate the Apollo 204 tragedy, it became clear that the Congress was not receiving full information from NASA officials. For example, Congress was unaware of the existence of the Phillips Report, a document highly critical of NASA operations. It is vital that the burden for providing information about NASA's programs be placed upon that agency. Under present law, NASA is simply forbidden from withholding information from Congress once it is requested, but is under no obligation to provide information voluntarily. In the case of the Phillips Report, Members of Congress did not know of its existence and therefore were in no position to request copies of it. I will continue to press for improvements in this important area.

Riots in the cities.—A summer marked by rioting in many of our Nation's cities is coming to a close. While it is tempting and obviously fashionable to strike out with words of blame, rhetoric will not bring order or restore Detroit, Newark, or the other communities hit by violence and lawlessness. Unfortunately, many of our Nation's leaders—in government, religion, and other fields—have attempted to divert responsibility for strife in the cities by blaming others in shrill tones. Neither disobedience to law nor the basic causes for the rioting will be checked by angry accusations, gimmickry, acquiescence, or inattention. There is ample evidence that our society as a whole has failed to deal effectively with both lawlessness and the causes of the urban problems facing us. It has become increasingly apparent that such problems require the direct involvement of all sectors of society—the voluntary sector, the private sector, Federal, state, and local governments, but, above all, the individual.

It is considerably easier to look to everyone but oneself for blame or responsibility. However, the strength and hope of our Nation is in the people—individuals—and it is here, in the last analysis, that we will win or lose the battle to strengthen our system and to enrich our lives and the lives of our fellow citizens. It is within our power to do what we will with the great human and economic resources of this land. If we have done less than we would wish, as the riots indicate, we must look to ourselves for the reasons. If we would do better in the future, we must look to ourselves for the answers.

Selective Service Act.—When the director of the Defense Department's Manpower Office testified before the Joint Economic Committee in April, I questioned him concerning the Department's attitude on increasing the proportion of volunteers in the armed forces. He stated: "I can say categorically—and this is on the record—that the Department of Defense has had as its objective to obtain as many or all of its personnel through voluntary means." Notwithstanding this position of the Department, by the President, and the Democratic and Republican 1964 platform promises, the Military Selective Service Act of 1967 was totally devoid of any attempt to increase the number of volunteers for military service.

The House version of the Act contained my amendment to declare the sense of Congress that "the obligation of serving in the armed forces should be enforced through the provisions of this Act only when necessary to insure the security of this Nation." However, the House-Senate Conference Committee deleted this amendment, seemingly indicating a Congressional preference for compulsion in military service, regardless of need. Much that could have been done to improve the Selective Service Act was not done, to the discredit of both the Executive and the Legislative Branches of the Federal Government. Copies of my testimony before the House Armed Services Committee are available through my office.

Freedom of information.—The Federal Public Records Law (P.L. 89–487), which I cosponsored, took effect on July 4, 1967. This "Freedom of Information" law reasserts the fundamental right of the American people to know what their Federal government is doing. It provides that government records are to be made available at the request of any citizen, and gives a person wrongfully denied access to information the right to go to court for an immediate ruling.

The new law will not work miracles overnight. It may have little impact on the "Credibility Gap." But the law is a weapon—and a powerful one—which will help to reduce unwarranted secrecy in government. How well it will work will depend on how effectively the people, the press, and the Congress use it as a guarantee of the right to know.

Congressional assistance.—Members of Congress frequently receive appeals from individuals, organizations, and municipalities for assistance of one kind or another. Some types of assistance can be provided—other types cannot.

It is my belief that a Congressman has a duty to assist where possible in making the relationship between a citizen and his Government fair and workable, for there are times, in the impersonality of Government, when the Congressman serves as the only personal link between a constituent and an Executive Branch Department. But occasions and situations arise when it is improper, and, in some instances, illegal, for a Member of Congress to attempt to influence governmental decisions.

Members of Congress are legislators—not executives or administrators. Their basic responsibility is the drafting and passing of legislation. The Executive Branch has the responsibility of administering those laws. There are many areas in which a Congressman can assist—in cutting red tape, in helping to correct administrative errors, or in expediting action when it is unduly delayed.

Because of the misunderstandings which arise from time to time, I appeared before the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress and recommended that "the policy of encouraging or assisting Members of Congress in the announcement of Federal grants, contracts, or projects in their states or districts be terminated . . . To encourage or assist Members in making initial announcements of Federal grants, projects, and particularly Federal contracts, leaves at least a shadow of question as to whether or not the contract or project was awarded solely, as it should have been, on factors such as cost, performance, and national interest."

Academy appointments.—Congratulations are in order for the young men from the 13th District who earned appointment to the U.S. service academies and who commenced their studies this June: *U.S. Air Force Academy*—Lawrence F. Blameuser, Jr., Skokie; Steven DeHaven, Mt. Prospect; Charles E. Dehlinger, Evanston; John Ekeberg, Palatine; Gerald Lemke, Wheeling; Casey Scott, Wilmette. *U.S. Military Academy*—Richard J. Appleton, Mt. Prospect; Brian Bruckner, Niles; Ford G. Droegemueller, Arlington Heights; Christopher B. Timmers, Wheeling; Mark M. Weiman, Evanston. *U.S. Naval Academy*—Jeffrey Currie, Evanston; Thomas R. Dussman, Jr., Winnetka; Charles L. Keating, Arlington Heights. *U.S. Merchant Marine Academy*—Scott K. Summers, Wilmette. Those interested in applying for academy nominations for classes beginning in June 1968 may write to my office for full details.

Visitors and letters.—Visitors to Washington from the 13th District are always welcome in our office in the House Office Building. If you are planning a trip to the Nation's Capital, write ahead and let us know you are coming. In this way, we may be able to assist in making your visit a more enjoyable one. Also, your letters are always welcome. Our Washington office is open daily from 8:00 A.M. to 6:00 P.M. and generally later. If you communicate with the office and do not receive a response within a week, please write again. We have discovered instances where mail has not reached the office or where it has been delayed. Since we respond to some 600 letter a week, and receive hundreds of pieces of non-letter mail in addition, there is always the possibility that a letter may go astray in the Postal Service or in the Congressional postal facilities. I look forward to hearing from you.

Dr. John L. Taylor

SPEECH

OF

HON. SAM STEIGER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 30, 1967

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to pay tribute to Dr. John L. Taylor who passed away on August 29. I knew Dr. Taylor for only these months of the 90th Congress, when we had the opportunity to work together on the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, but it was apparent to me from the beginning that he was a tremendously talented individual who was making a very important contribution to the committee.

This versatile man at once portrayed expertise on both the Pacific islands and the American Indian, and was widely recognized in his important post as consultant to the committee, a position he served for 14 years with distinction.

Dr. Taylor will be sorely missed by the committee and by Congress and it is fitting that his mark be memorialized by the John L. Taylor scholarship memorial fund for students from the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. It was my privilege to know Dr. Taylor, and it will be the privilege of students of the trust territories in years to come to know of him.

VISTA Contributions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 12, 1967

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to include in the RECORD a copy of a memorandum sent to Mr. Cyrus Vance—President Johnson's special assistant to Detroit during the riots—from Mr. Bill Crook, Director of the VISTA program within the Office of Economic Opportunity. Bill Crook's message illustrates very well the excellent service to our Nation that VISTA and the OEO are providing.

The Office of Economic Opportunity has made many gallant efforts in Detroit to prevent and eliminate the underlying causes of urban riots and violence. OEO funds are limited, however, and not enough has been done previously to correct the injustices and despair of poverty.

VISTA's contribution was important and I believe deserves our sincere praise and support.

To: The Honorable Cyrus Vance.
From: Bill Crook, Director, VISTA, Pat Kennedy, Deputy Director, VISTA.
Date: August 2, 1967.

Last Friday afternoon at 5:00 p.m. the VISTA headquarters received a telegram from Governor George Romney approving the assignment of 200 VISTA Volunteers to assist in Detroit's rehabilitation efforts. The Volunteers were requested by the Governor and the Mayor's Committee for Human Resources Development.

VISTA staff members were on the ground in Detroit in a matter of hours. And VISTA's Director, Bill Crook, arrived in the city Saturday morning to take personal charge of launching VISTA's emergency task force.

Less than 24 hours after Governor Romney's request for Volunteers, the first Volunteers were in Detroit and additional contingents arrived in the city over the next three days. The schedule of their arrival for emergency duty was as follows:

Friday, 32 VISTA's already in Detroit.
Saturday, 45 VISTA Volunteers.
Sunday, 20 VISTA Volunteers.
Monday, 55 VISTA Volunteers.
Tuesday, 48 VISTA Volunteers.
Wednesday, 15 VISTA Associates.
Volunteer Total, 215.

Volunteers were lodged in the Tuller and Strathmore Hotels near the target areas and moved immediately into special VISTA briefing sessions on the purpose of VISTA's mission in Detroit and the special discipline and curfews required in light of the disturbances. All Volunteers also received a special three hour briefing by the Mayor's Committee on the immediate problems and needs in target areas and on services available.

VISTA Volunteers then moved out and went to work. They helped reinforce CAP neighborhood staffs in the four Administrative Centers and eighteen Local Subcenters. They went to the city's major emergency receiving hospital, Detroit General, to supplement overtaxed and exhausted staff. They moved into the Neighborhood Legal Services headquarters and the City Prosecutor's office in police headquarters to assist in interviewing and processing that week's staggering 4,000 arrests. (Normally, felony arrests in Detroit run around 8,000 a year.) Their goal was both to relieve massive clerical and legal problems and to facilitate release on bond of citizens so they could return to their jobs and families. VISTA Volunteers manned an emergency rat control project and worked out of Archdiocese Headstart Centers locating children absent since the riots began. And, VISTA Volunteers boarded donated dump trucks for clean up campaigns.

During the crisis itself, some VISTA Volunteers repeatedly exposed themselves to sniper fire in order to assist refugees, report disasters and help direct relief agencies to areas of greatest need. Others performed small and sometimes menial tasks that took some of the burden off overworked local staff.

The Volunteers were supervised by 20 VISTA staff members who came from the VISTA office and VISTA Regional Training Centers. Their work was at all times closely coordinated with Mr. Vance's office and with the Major's Committee for Human Resources Development. They gave valuable guidance and direction every step of the way.

One of the most important efforts now is to put the community in a position to help rebuild itself. To further this objective, VISTA has just launched a campaign to recruit ghetto residents to serve as VISTA Associates. On Wednesday, the first fifteen VISTA Associates were selected. Additional Associates will be added in the coming days. VISTA regards the recruitment of local people to carry on work begun on an emergency basis by VISTA's themselves as a high priority endeavor. The staff is also now beginning to work with local authorities to plan an orderly phase out of the VISTA emergency force in Detroit.

Samuel Richard Davenport

SPEECH

OF

HON. E. ROSS ADAIR

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1967

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA] in tribute to Samuel Richardson Davenport are certainly well merited. During his 26 years of service on the Hill, he has contributed greatly to the efficiency and effectiveness of most, if not all, of our congressional offices. Not only his efficiency, but his pleasant smile and friendly manner have made him particularly effective.

But, there is another aspect of Sam's life that deserves mention. He is in most regular attendance at the House of Representatives prayer breakfast on Thursday mornings and, as he leaves for his visit to Ireland, we shall certainly miss him at these meetings. Sam is the only person not a member or officer of the House who is invited to and does regularly attend these breakfasts. There, too, with his knowledge and wit, he contributes a great deal.

I want to join with the many others who wish him a happy visit to Ireland and hope that in the greater leisure which he now has he will find time to do more writing.

More Sedition Courtesy Supreme Court

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 12, 1967

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, three so-called poverty workers, all active in the Southern Conference Education Fund—SCEF—a cited Communist-front group, have been arrested in Kentucky and charged with plotting to overthrow the government of Pike County.

SCEF gained national headlines when their headquarters in New Orleans was raided by State and local law enforcement officials a few years ago and tons of Communist material uncovered. The Louisiana joint committee on un-American activities published several volumes of documents, confiscated in the raid, all of which were pro-Communist and seditious in nature.

Two of those apprehended in Kentucky were the notorious Ann and Carl Braden, who pack a long list of Communist-front citations. They were indicted previously and Carl Braden convicted, in Kentucky—back in 1954.

Louisiana obtained convictions against top leaders of SCEF, but these were nullified by the Supreme Court which struck down the Louisiana law.

Unfortunately, Braden's conviction in Kentucky was overturned by the State court of appeals, citing a Federal Supreme Court decision knocking down State jurisdiction in the field of sedition.

Herein is where many of our present-day problems lie. The runaway Supreme Court denies jurisdiction to the very agencies—the States—that are taking the initiative in the fight against this form of subversion from within.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following release from the New Orleans Times-Picayune of September 12, 1967, in the RECORD:

JURORS ORDER SEDITION TRIAL—INDICT POVERTY WORKERS, SCEF LEADERS

PIKEVILLE, KY.—Three Pike County, Ky., poverty workers and the leaders of the Southern Conference Education Fund (SCEF) were indicted Monday on sedition charges by the Pike County Grand Jury.

Named in the indictment were Ann and Carl Braden of Louisville, leaders of SCEF; Mr. and Mrs. Alan McSurely, field workers for SCEF in Pike County; and Joseph Mulloy, Appalachian Volunteer staff member in the county.

The latter three were arrested Aug. 11–12 following raids on their homes, which, according to Pike County Commonwealth's Atty. Thomas Ratliff, produced "a truckload of seditious material."

The indictment charged that a "well organized and well financed effort is being made to promote and spread the Communistic theory . . . to overthrow the government of Pike County."

INDICTED IN 1954

The jury report said Communist organizers have been sent to Pike County by "racial organizations which have paid and supported them. . . .

Some employes of the Appalachian Volunteers and other federally-financed anti-poverty programs have collaborated and cooperated with known Communist organizers."

The jury said "local officials of the Appalachian Volunteers have cooperated with known Communist organizers by allowing them to conduct training among the Vista Workers, Peace Corps trainees and local citizens."

The Bradens and four others were indicted under the same state statute in 1954 after the couple bought a home in an all-white suburb of Louisville for the purpose of transferring it to Negro contractor Andrew Wade IV. The home was bombed one month later.

CONVICTION VOIDED

Only Braden stood trial, and his conviction was overturned by the state Court of Appeals. The ruling cited a U.S. Supreme Court decision in a Pennsylvania case which said the federal government has jurisdiction in the field of sedition.

Clarence Muse

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. TUNNEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 12, 1967

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. Speaker, this Nation has many outstanding Negro citizens. One of the most prominent of these citizens is Clarence Muse, a popular and outstanding entertainer, a tireless crusader for a responsible and sane progress for his race, and a humanitarian in the fullest sense of the word.

In a recent letter, Mr. Muse, who I am proud to say resides in my district, called for the country to ferret out those social conditions that often contribute to civil disturbances. Mr. Muse, like myself, does not believe that the answer lies in "black power," separatism, and hate. But rather, the continual search by men of good will for the solution of those problems that trouble all citizens in this confusing time in our Nation's history.

Because of this man's stature, and because he espouses what I feel to be a correct approach, I include his remarks in the RECORD:

REMARKS OF CLARENCE MUSE

"I am sure you are most concerned by now that the man at the bottom of the social pattern of our Country is frustrated and disturbed. In noting this disturbance, I remember the same kind of unrest was at the same level when the Great Depression fell over our Country."

"One philosophy at that time was that monies and opportunities should flow from the top and eventually reach the man at the bottom. This proved to be disastrous. Then Franklin Delano Roosevelt, our Noble President, inserted the philosophy of reaching the man at the bottom first and slowly and progressively, harmony was restored and the Country began its long trip towards social advancement."

"Today, in my opinion, we have the same situation only it is more sophisticated. The hope of our future is (if we can) rise above the crowd by bringing thoughtful and active consideration in Congress. Not the type of approach to 'save' the Negro population or other minority groups; but to *save the Nation.*"

"We must love each other as human beings. We must do things for each other as human beings. We must live solely for the purpose of helping human beings."

"I trust that this will inspire you to meet the challenge and take a forward step in restoring peace and harmony in our great Country, the United States of America."

Vilification of Johnson Is Denounced

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 12, 1967

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, legitimate criticism is a necessary part of the national scene but vilification of public officials, especially the President, is unwarranted. Therefore, I feel the following commentary of Walter Trohan, noted Washington bureau chief of the Chicago Tribune, deserves thoughtful review by those individuals, especially the radical left, who have lowered themselves to excessive thoughtless personal attacks on the President:

VILIFICATION OF JOHNSON IS DENOUNCED

WASHINGTON, September 7.—"All the world is familiar with Lincoln, the emancipator, the author of the Gettysburg address, the timeless spokesman of democracy," wrote the late James G. Randall, historian. "Few of us are acquainted with Lincoln, the baboon, the imbecile, the wet rag, the Kentucky mule, yet these are typical examples of the names heaped upon him in those cruel days when high office [held] less of glory than insult and abuse within the ranks of the nation he was struggling to save from dissolution."

While this writer is no gentle Randall any more than Lyndon Baines Johnson is any Abraham Lincoln, I am impelled to speak out against the flood of vilification, descending even to obscenity, being poured upon the President of the United States. It is the worst I have seen in 33 years in the capital. There are placards, buttons, jokes, and songs, many of which do not bear repetition in family newspapers, striking at hime and his family in such a manner as to cause good citizens to shudder, even though they have no love for him or his policies.

Much was made of Mr. Johnson as a wheeler-dealer and an arm twister. His Texas size ego did not help him in this respect. Nor did he get any help from those members of his own party who resented him the most for the fact that he succeeded to the Presidency after the assassination of their beloved hero, John F. Kennedy, the personable charmer, who was a President more of promise than accomplishment.

OBJECT TO USE OF OBSCENITY IN CRITICISM

The stream of abuse being directed at Johnson would seem to be endangering the very freedoms his most violent critics profess to love. All leaders are open to criticism. Perhaps Johnson is more vulnerable than most but not thru the low road of obscenity.

There must be times when Johnson would like to turn over his desk to Sen. J. William Fulbright [D., Ark.], his severest foreign policy critic; or to Hubert Rap Brown, the violent black power critic; or to many others, and say: "Here, it's yours; you run it." Even this commentator, who is among the President's critics, must say it's a good thing he can't.

In the last year of his first term, even some of Lincoln's supporters thought that the game was up. There were movements to displace Lincoln. Many felt he was not big enough for his job. Republican governors had no confidence in him.

GOVERNORS DOUBT JOHNSON COULD WIN TODAY

Today a similar situation exists in the Democratic camp for Johnson. Governors make no secret of their belief that he could not win their states if the election were to be held today. Many in Congress in his own party say he is not big enough for his office on the domestic or foreign fronts. Some predict he will withdraw before the convention, either openly and frankly or by having doctors advise him to give up the Presidency for reasons of health.

If Republicans had the same drive to displace Johnson that some Democrats have, it might all be over but the shouting. But he is not going to be taken out of the race by the wishful thinking of some of his fellow Democrats or out of the White House by the wishful thinking of some Republicans.

In the opinion of this commentator he will run and nothing will keep him out of the race but death. And he will be hard to beat, especially so if the Republicans splinter themselves, for which they have a proven genius.

The Plight of Our Teachers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY L. PETTIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 12, 1967

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, I am profoundly disturbed by strikes in many cities among teachers needed to educate our country's children. I am convinced that wages, while much talked about, are not the only issue. People who go into this profession do not do so for the money.

But the role of teachers in many communities is gradually being undermined by much publicized poverty war people, who, though usually better paid, often lack the level of professional skill attained by our teachers.

These teachers, Mr. Speaker, are thoroughly upset. With a breakdown of discipline in the homes, a disrespect for law and order in the streets, and anarchaic conditions in many classrooms, the teachers are prevented from doing what they know to be best for their students. Because of a discipline crisis, many teachers have almost given up the battle. They have told me that their position is rapidly becoming untenable.

"How can we instill principles of honor and industry in our students when these virtues are denied by wholesale Great Society programs?" they say. "These programs, with their waste, graft, and giveaway philosophy are destroying any sense of realism or economic integrity our children may have developed. The value of a dollar is forgotten and individual pride and their sense of personal responsibility evaporate."

Our American teachers, Mr. Speaker, have played and must continue to play an important and basic part in the preservation and development of our free society. If they lose their idealism and sense of mission, we are in real trouble. The sooner we get away from artificial elements and stimuli in our economy, the sooner we can move forward to genuine growth and solid progress.

Workers Describe Firings, Intimidation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 12, 1967

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, witnesses told an incredible story of dismissals and blacklisting as they appeared recently before the Special House Subcommittee on Labor. They told of "discrimination, coercion, intimidation, surveillance, threats, company and community interference, and massive illegal discharges," to prevent them from doing what the law says they can do: organize into unions.

The AFL–CIO News told about this in its current issue. Under unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, I include the article in the RECORD at this point so that we may all be informed of this tragic situation:

FIRST-PERSON TESTIMONY: WORKERS DESCRIBE FIRINGS, INTIMIDATION

(By Eugene A. Kelly)

Workers from American mills and factories came to the Capitol to tell in their own words the methods their employers use to prevent them from doing what the law says they are free to do—organize into unions of their own choosing without unlawful interference.

As one witness told the Special House Subcommittee on Labor, it was a story of "discrimination, coercion, intimidation, surveillance, threats, company and community interference and massive illegal discharges."

The intimidation and the discharges are still occurring, another witness testified, "this week and last week and every week" despite the law and the courts.

As the witnesses left the stand, some in tears, Rep. William D. Ford (D-Mich.) observed that "even union people wouldn't believe that this is still happening" unless they can read the testimony. It is, he added, "like something out of Alice in Wonderland" to hear of events in sections of the nation that have been "totally cut off from what has been happening for the last 25 years in this country."

Subcommittee Chairman Frank Thompson (D-N.J.) scheduled additional public hearings until all who want to testify are heard. Thompson's invitation to appear was rejected by Pres. Robert T. Stevens of J. P. Stevens & Co., Inc., big government textile contractor which has fired more than 500 workers to date and has refused to reinstate any of them while it appeals lower court rulings to the Supreme Court.

Union witnesses included Robert Starnes, assistant AFL–CIO regional director for Mississippi and Louisiana, who read into the record details of widespread community interference with unions and workers; Organizer Claude Davis of the Molders, who told of being beaten by an employer in Tuppers Plains, O., when he went to the plant to seek reinstatement of five workers fired for joining the union.

Other union representatives also gave evidence supporting their belief that the law against employer harassment of union members should be given "real sharp teeth." But the most moving testimony came from rank-and-file workers.

With tears in her eyes, Mrs. Doris Hicklin of Rock Hill, S.C., mother of a soldier now serving in Viet Nam, told in soft accents how she was fired by J. P. Stevens & Co. for wearing a union button in the plant where she had worked seven years until 1964.

"I was called into the office and told to take off the button. This I refused to do," she said. Mrs. Hicklin has no job now because she was fired from her last two jobs—a report Thompson referred to the Justice Dept. for investigation of possible witness intimidation.

WORKERS ENSLAVED

Shirley Hobbs of Roanoke Rapids, N.C., said she was fired by Stevens management after joining the Textile Workers. So was her husband. Of her experiences Mrs. Hobbs said "Lincoln freed the slaves but J. P. Stevens enslaves his workers with fear, blackballing and work overloads."

Lillian Hux told how she worked three days at the Roanoke Rapids plant and was fired after a union organizer handed her a leaflet.

"Someone told me to get rid of it, quick. There wasn't any trash basket handy so I handed it to my cousin who was due to go off duty. Her supervisor saw her put it into her purse and I was fired for interfering with another employe. Then they fired my cousin too," she said.

"I haven't worked since," said the witness, the mother of two children. Sobbing, she cried "J. P. Stevens has denied me my rights as an American," and rushed from the hearing room.

A solemn witness was Jess Cudd, Whitmire, S.C., who worked 50 years for the Stevens firm and was discharged for joining TWUA. Worse than firing, he said, was management's attempt to get him to help "run out of town" his son, also fired for joining the union.

He said: "They come to me and say 'Mr. Cudd, how come you don't adopt that boy's two children and you could make about as much out of it as you could in the mill by getting social security and run him out of town?' "

Cudd's story previously led a National Labor Relations Board trial examiner to cite the incident as a "horrible example" of employer callousness. The Cudds were among 71 fired Stevens employes that the NLRB, and two federal courts, ordered reinstated with backpay to 1964.

Four committee witnesses came from Hartwell, Ga., to relate how they took part in an attack on union handbillers at the Monroe Auto Equipment Co. plant in 1963. One quoted a company foreman as telling workers "it might mean your job if you don't run them off."

The union men were attacked by 50 employes who poured outside the plant to manhandle them and burn their handbills and leaflets. The union lost one election there, won a second one but still is fighting for recognition, the committee was told.

Ray Smithhart of the Rubber Workers said he was arrested in Mississippi for passing out handbills, jailed and fined $10 by the mayor of Ripley, Miss. In Tupelo, Miss., his car was riddled by buckshot but he himself was not hit.

James M. Pierce of the AFL–CIO Industrial Union Dept., wrapped up his experiences with Stevens Co. by calling it a "story of firings and discrimination."

"Fighting unions in the South is big business," he testified. Naming several law firms that specialize in combatting unions, he said retention of these firms "automatically means a campaign of fear, community interference, massive discharges, delays and no contract.

"I can assure you there is no stigma attached" to labor law violations in the South, Pierce said. "In fact, the labor law violator is a hero . . . wined and dined."

Castro Sees Panama Canal as Gateway to Guantanamo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 12, 1967

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, the proposed Panama Canal treaty which would abdicate U.S. sovereignty over that crucial Carribean waterway has caused grave concern in the Congress and among our military experts who are aware of Communist designs on our security.

One of the most penetrating examinations of the dangers in this secretly negotiated pact which has been hidden from the American public, is a recent article by retired Brig. Gen. James D. Hittle, of the U.S. Marine Corps.

General Hittle, director of national security and foreign affairs, for the Veterans of Foreign Wars, has highlighted the inherent dangers in our abandoning control over the canal.

In order that all Members of Congress may read this timely report, I offer General Hittle's summary for the RECORD. The article follows:

EYES PRECEDENT IN TREATY—CASTRO SEES PANAMA CANAL AS GATEWAY TO GUANTANAMO

(By Brig. Gen. James D. Hittle, USMC, Ret.)

WASHINGTON.—Anyone who thinks the proposed Panama Canal treaty would ease tensions for the United States in the Caribbean has underestimated Cuban Prime Minister Fidel Castro.

It is no coincidence that Castro has been on his good behavior recently. He has cut down on public insults and threats against the United States. According to recent reports, he even has granted permission for our weather planes to overfly Cuba.

Such a show of good conduct, phony as it is, has a purpose.

He does not want to do anything at this time to upset the new treaty now in the works between the United States and Panama.

Castro knows that the proposed Panama Canal treaty is playing squarely into his hands. Here is why:

A key objective of Communist policy in the Americas is to control the Caribbean. Red control of this strategic sea would shatter the defense of the hemisphere.

KEY OBSTACLE TO RUSSIAN LAKE

The biggest obstacle to the Moscow-Havana plan to turn the Caribbean into a Russian lake is our naval base at Guantanamo Bay, on the southeast tip of Cuba.

Getting us out of Guantanamo Bay is necessary to obtain it as a base for Russian submarines in the Caribbean.

Castro and his Kremlin bosses realize the threats, pressures and propaganda a few years ago did not scare us out of Guantanamo. Now they apparently are planning another technique. Their scheme hinges on U.S. ratification of the canal treaty.

The broad principle of the agreement reportedly calls for us to voluntarily give up exclusive U.S. control of the Panama Canal Zone.

Once we agree to that, we have lost our freedom of action in protecting our strategic lifeline. From that point on, our position is subject to repeated renegotiations and concessions.

That Castro and the Kremlin plan to use the proposed Panama treaty as a lever for prying us loose from Guantanamo Bay is not mere speculation. It is what Castro's Communist spokesmen have said will be done.

SPELLED OUT BY HAVANA RADIO

Communist propaganda has carefully tied the Panama Canal treaty and Guantanamo Bay together. Here is what the official Havana Radio said more than a year ago regarding Guantanamo Bay and its relationship to the U.S.-Panama treaty, then being negotiated.

"The standards of modern times apply everywhere, and Guantanamo—just as Panama—is an anachronistic survival of colonialism. . . . The question of Panama is a political question . . . not to be decided by admirals or generals . . . but between states in accordance with international law."

Soviet Premier Alexei Kosygin and Castro know an opportunity when it is given them. They intend to make the most of the proposed canal treaty as a legal precedent for demanding renegotiation of the Guantanamo treaty. They know that once our full control of the base is weakened, it will take only a few more renegotiations to get us out.

One thing should be clear: The proposed Panama Canal treaty may buy us a few temporary smiles in Panama, but it moves us closer to a crisis in the Caribbean.

It also moves the world closer to the day when the Russian submarine fleet has Guantanamo Bay as a base in the strategic heart of the Americas.

Sam Davenport

SPEECH

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1967

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA] for yielding. I am happy to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to a great public servant, Sam Davenport. He has been a close personal friend for the past 15 years, and has been most cooperative and helpful to me and my entire office staff by keeping us advised of matters of national interest as well as things of particular interest to my district in California.

I recall one incident especially. During the earthquake in Alaska, one of my constituents had relatives in Kodiak and were unable to find out whether they had survived the quake. Through the assistance of Sam Davenport, messages were relayed by way of ham radio operators and, within less than 24 hours, we received information as to the safety of my constituent's relatives.

Seldom a week would go by that we did not have occasion to seek Sam's assistance, which was always given most freely.

We will miss him greatly, as he retires from a long term of public service. Mrs. Utt joins me in wishing Sam Davenport and his wife happiness in their retirement. I know he will find use for his many talents, and that he will continue to be of service to our Nation.

War on Poverty Defended

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JIM WRIGHT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 12, 1967

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, today, when it seems to be in fashion to spout forth irresponsible charges about the Office of Economic Opportunity, it is a real pleasure to read an objective analysis of the program.

Such an assessment recently was prepared by my distinguished colleague, the Honorable EARLE CABELL, of Dallas, Tex. With his usual clear thinking and sense of fairness, the Congressman as set forth the issues involved as we prepare to debate the antipoverty bill. I agree with Congressman CABELL's conclusion that the war on poverty must go on. With unanimous consent, I insert his statement in the RECORD so that all Members may benefit from it:

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN EARLE CABELL

Despite a growing volume of criticism of the War on Poverty, there appears little real sentiment in Congress for ending it completely.

Along with the daily reports of criticism from all areas are small signs from divergent sources that the effort being made in this field needs to be expanded rather than contracted.

Even in Dallas a few days ago when Representative Ray Roberts of McKinney painted a dark picture for the future of the $1.4 billion OEO appropriation, he suggested that a replacement had to be made and his idea was a make-work program that carried a $4 billion price tag. This would be along the lines of the old N.Y.A. during the 30's.

In an appearance before the House Education and Labor Committee, John Burkhart, an Indiana insurance executive and chairman of the United States Chamber of Commerce education committee, testified that "the problems of poverty cannot be swept under the rug," and had high praise for the Community Action Program.

And in a recent issue of the U.S. News and World Report, this weekly magazine strongly implied our priorities are out of balance and that the war against poverty is receiving a pittance when compared with the war in Viet Nam.

As yet, no final bill has been approved by the House Education and Labor Committee for funding this year's Poverty War program and any criticism of it at this time would be premature.

Much of the headline content today centers around the possible role played by local OEO units in the recent riots, but these give a distorted picture of the entire program.

I am familiar with the work done by our Dallas CAP and am convinced much of the credit for our current peaceful situation is a direct result of its intelligence and understanding.

I know that the War on Poverty has faults. I know that it has not yet achieved all of the goals it so hopefully raised two years ago. I know that it is only beginning to be effective and that many of its programs have yet to get off the ground.

The major weaknesses that I have observed and which I believe merit correction are:

(1) The proponents have "oversold" it and built up false hopes as to immediate and dramatic results;

(2) Many community leaders have not given it sufficient time and guidance to keep it on an even keel, and

(3) The Administration has been hesitant in eliminating obviously poorly designed programs and have leaned too heavily on sociological "dreamers" and not enough on horse sense.

But I also wonder what might happen to this country if the underprivileged were told that all Poverty funds were to be cut off and all such programs abandoned.

We have opened a door. I cannot see how it can ever again be shut.

The best hope that I can offer is an assurance to do all in my power to see that the poverty authorization written in Congress contains as much money as is prudent to keep the programs going and that all possible safeguards against a repetition of past mistakes are built into the program.

Hillsdale College Declaration of Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. ROSS ADAIR

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 11, 1967

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, the Chicago Tribune recently had an excellent article on my alma mater, Hillsdale College, Hillsdale, Mich. Because it shows the independent philosophy of this school, I am sure it will be of wide interest and include it herewith.

Along this same line, Mr. Speaker, the Fort Wayne News-Sentinel also recently had an editorial which included Hillsdale's "declaration of independence." This, too, is worthy of wide reading and is included also.

The material referred to follows:

[From the Chicago Tribune, Aug. 27, 1967]

College Proves Federal Aid Dropouts Succeed: "Declaration of Independence" Gives Hillsdale Revolutionary Role

(By Chesly Manly)

Hillside, Mich., August 26.—Hillsdale college, which rejected federal aid in a "Declaration of Independence," adopted in 1962 and reaffirmed in 1966, is flourishing with the support of friends who admire its commitment to freedom and self-reliance and all the great ideals and achievements which constitute the American heritage.

Hillsdale's president, J. Donald Phillips, is proud of the college's success since he came here in 1951, but he is by no means complacent about the future of this country's independent colleges.

Hillsdale and a few other schools which have refused federal aid are free from the threat of government control. As President Phillips said in an interview, however, the government could put these colleges out of business by abolishing income tax deductions for contributions to education by individuals and corporations.

SOME FAVOR ABOLITION

Many leaders of the education establishment in this country, particularly in the United States office of education and the National Education association, favor abolition of the tax-deduction privilege because they are opposed in principle to the privately-supported, independent colleges. They regard these colleges as centers of special privileges for the more favored classes, anachronistic and undemocratic, if not un-American.

Phillips noted that when President Johnson was asked to support a proposed tax credit plan for higher education, this was the written response:

"The position of this administration is to advocate direct use of federal resources to meet specific educational needs, rather than to support possible assistance thru indirect means such as a tax credit plan."

OVER $4 BILLION A YEAR

The federal government already is spending more than 4 billion dollars a year on education. A possible explanation for this "avalanche of governmental largess," Phillips said, is that the government desires "to move directly toward a centrally-controlled society—taxing, collecting, disbursing—to carry out its good or not-so-good plans."

As early as April 13, 1961, Phillips recalled, the report of an office of education planning committee, stamped "administrative, confidential," mentioned "broadening of federal interest in curriculum and in the improvement of instruction" as one of the government's concerns for the future.

In March of this year the defense department threatened to cancel its contracts with the University of Michigan unless it hired more Negroes for campus jobs, appointed more Negroes to faculty positions, and enrolled more Negro students.

HIGHER THAN PROPORTION

A survey disclosed that the percentage of Negroes employed and enrolled as students at the university was higher than the Negro proportion of the state's total population. When the university asked what percentage of Negro representation the government would consider desirable, it could get no reply.

Nothing was said by the government about the availability of qualified Negroes for greater representation in the university, or what would happen to its standards if it adopted such an open door policy.

Phillips said he had heard reports that the government already is looking into history and social science textbooks to see whether they conform to the current liberal orthodoxy. Whether these reports are true or not, he remarked, government support of educational institutions inevitably will be followed by government control of everything they teach.

CALLS LEADERS DEPENDENT

"The entrance of full-scale support by federal aid has created dependent educational leaders and will create more," Phillips said. "Independent thought and effort cannot be taught by scared, dependent men."

Phillips, an ex-officio member of Hillsdale's board of trustees, was the prime mover of the board's "Declaration of Independence." It declares the college, founded in 1844, was dedicated and has remained faithful to "an educational philosophy embracing America's basic ideals."

It declares that Hillsdale students have been taught, among other fundamental truths, that "our country's greatness is the result not of government benevolence but rather of individual initiative and enterprise" and that "responsibility is the counterpart of independence."

Acknowledging that independence of federal aid involves "the possibility of failure," the declaration says the "trustees place their trust in God and in the dedication and generosity of students, alumni, and friends who share their views."

HEAD OF ADULT EDUCATION

Phillips had been director of adult education at Michigan State university for six years when he became president of Hillsdale in 1951. His experience as a consultant to business management and his free enterprise philosophy, as well as his background as an educator, commended him to Hillsdale's conservative board of trustees, headed by Ralph C. Rosecrane, of Rockford, Ill., president of the J. L. Clark Manufacturing company.

In a survey of what high school seniors know and believe about American business, Phillips had found evidence of widespread and growing prejudice against the profit system, as well as appalling ignorance of the way it works. As a result of this discovery, he decreed that all students at Hillsdale must take one three-hour course in the principles of economics and two three-hour "American heritage" courses.

GIFT FINANCES CENTER

Another Phillips innovation at Hillsdale is its 1.5-million-dollar Leadership Development center, financed mainly by a gift from the Herbert H. and Grace A. Dow foundation, which has been described by the Dana corporation of Toledo as "one of the finest educational facilities of its kind in the world."

Some business firms, such as Dana, send management personnel to the college for special courses taught by its faculty and others use the facilities of the center for conferences and training programs of their own.

The center has 32 guest rooms with twin beds, four executive suites, dining rooms, seminar and conference rooms, and an auditorium with swivel chairs and other equipment designed to facilitate "group communication" as conceived by Phillips. There are seats behind one-way glass walls from which students can see and hear business leaders engaged in discussing and solving problems of their companies.

NEW STUDENT CENTER

The leadership development center is connected with Hillsdale's new million-dollar student center and dining hall, to promote rapport between students and business leaders. Inspite of this business orientation, however, Hillsdale essentially is a liberal arts college, with the standard requirements for admission and for graduation with the bachelor of arts or bachelor of science degree.

Its 63-member faculty has predominantly a liberal philosophy and almost all speakers in its annual lecture series are certified liberals.

Hillsdale admits a good many students who could not get into Oberlin or the University of Chicago and its median SAT [scholastic aptitude test] scores for the four categories [men's and women's verbal and men's and women's math] range between 500 and 550, instead of 600 plus, as in some of the more selective colleges.

SELECTIVE ADMISSION POLICY

Yet its admission policy definitely is selective, for only about one in four applications received are approved and many students who seek admission are persuaded to save the $10 it costs for a formal application.

Hillsdale puts more emphasis on leadership potential than on academic aptitude. Phillips said he would rather have a good "C" student who had been a campus leader in high school than an "A" student who had not been a leader. The college gets its share of high school "A" students, however, and many of the "late bloomers" who have not done so well in high school do better than average work before they finish at Hillsdale.

About 44 per cent of the graduates go directly into graduate or professional schools and many others continue their education after military service. About half of the graduates have teacher certificates but not all go into teaching.

LAST YEAR, 1,086

Hillsdale's enrollment last year was 1,086 and Phillips would like to keep it at a maximum of 1,100. For a small liberal arts college, the geographical distribution of its students is unusual. About 69 per cent comes from states other than Michigan and 7 per cent come from foreign countries. Last year 39 states and 24 foreign countries were represented.

Hillsdale does not release information about faculty salaries but it pays well enough to prevent a large turnover. This year two are retiring, three are taking other jobs, one is leaving to get married, and three are leaving because their tenure was not approved.

Hillsdale raised only $12,800 from outside sources in the year before Phillips became its president. Its endowment was only $750,000. Now it must raise $400,000 a year from outside sources to meet operating costs, allowing nothing for capital investment, and its endowment totals 4.5 million dollars.

Its operating budget, now more than 2.5 million dollars a year, has been balanced for 11 years. Tuition, fees, room and board next year will cost $2,414 for men and $2,370 for women.

A total of $10,290,247 was raised in the first three phases of Hillsdale's master plan [1957 through 1966] and it is well on its way toward a goal of $8,740,000 for the current fourth phase [1966–69]. The goal for the next three phases [1969 through 1978] is $16,380,000.

WANTS NEW LIBRARY

Phillips is seeking a million dollars for a new library, with room for 100,000 books, faculty studies, and other facilities. The present library, with 50,000 volumes, will be retained and renamed the American Heritage library.

Among other Phillips achievements are new dormitories for 194 men and 176 women, which the college financed for $2,980 a bed on a 20-year amortization basis.

The same facilities, under the government's standard plan, would cost $4,500 a bed on a 40-year amortization basis.

E. C. Hayhow, publisher of the Hillsdale Daily News and one of the college's trustees, is an alumnus of a large state-supported university.

He says it is a privilege to serve on the board because of Hillsdale's emphasis on the liberal arts concept and basic tenets of Americanism which he says are de-emphasized in other educational institutions.

[From the Fort Wayne (Ind.) News-Sentinel]

HILLSDALE'S ELOQUENT DECLARATION

These are extremely critical times for small, private colleges and universities which perform a vital educational function in our society.

Certainly, any president or controller of a small Hoosier college could wring tears from the Great Stone Face as he details the economic tale of woe which plagues his and similar institutions of higher learning who have no state funds to support their operation.

This is what makes the carrot of Federal aid to education at the college and university level so appealing and, to be realistic, almost essential. But there are a few private colleges who spurn the bait of the Federal dollar on grounds that it is followed by the hook of Federal control.

Included in this group are several Hoosier colleges. But we think few have couched their refusal in quite the eloquent manner of Hillsdale College in our neighboring state of Michigan—the alma mater of a number of Fort Wayne and area residents. To permit a taste of that eloquence and the philosophy that undergirds it, we reprint below the Hillsdale College Declaration of Independence:

"DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE OF HILLSDALE COLLEGE, HILLSDALE, MICH.

"Whereas, Hillsdale College was conceived as an independent educational institution and dedicated to an educational philosophy embracing America's basic ideals; and

"Whereas, since 1844 it has remained steadfastly faithful to these concepts; and

"Whereas, the thousands of young men and young women who have studied here have been taught some fundamental truths; among these is that the freedom guaranteed them as citizens of this great country is the freedom to dream and aspire without limit and the freedom to fulfill their dreams and aspirations without interference; that our country's greatness is the result not of government benevolence but rather of individual initiative and enterprise; that responsibility is the counterpart of independence; and

"Whereas, we hold these views to be as valid today as they were in 1844 despite the appearance and growth of a contrary philosophy based on government paternalism; and

"Whereas, it is our conviction that this contrary philosophy is negatory to the traditional beliefs and teachings of Hillsdale College and is to be deplored as harmful to the continued development of our country both morally and economically; Now

"Therefore, be it resolved, That it be the decision of the Board of Trustees of Hillsdale College to reaffirm its historic independence and to resist subsidization of its affairs by the Federal government. Acknowledging that the possibility of failure is a concomitant of independence, the Trustees place their trust in God and in the dedication and generosity of students, alumni and friends who share their views. With this help, and through their own continuing efforts, they are confident that the principles to which the College is dedicated will continue to be available to young men and young women seeking independent higher education.

"THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES,
"RALPH ROSECRANCE,
"Chairman.
"J. DONALD PHILLIPS,
"President."

Adopted February 16, 1962.
Reaffirmed June 3, 1966.

A Tribute to the Late Dr. John L. Taylor

SPEECH
OF
HON. HUGH L. CAREY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 30, 1967

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, like all of my colleagues on the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, I was deeply saddened by the untimely passing of Dr. John L. Taylor, the committee's consultant on territorial and Indian affairs, on August 29.

Dr. Taylor had served the committee with dedication and distinction since 1953. It had been my privilege to know and work with him since 1961 when I became a member of the committee.

Since assuming the chairmanship of the Subcommittee on Territorial and Insular Affairs at the beginning of the present Congress, I found Dr. Taylor's counsel and knowledge of legislation affecting those areas to be invaluable.

Dr. Taylor's life aside from his work on the committee staff was also one of achievement. The recipient of a masters degree from Columbia and a doctorate from Clark University, he devoted a number of years to teaching, both here and abroad. He also contributed a number of articles to various publications concerning education in the islands and prepared instructional materials for the schools of the trust territory which were published by the Navy and Interior Departments.

Dr. Taylor served the committee impartially and objectively, giving his time and energies unstintingly even in the face of a terminal illness as was the case during the past several months. His absence will be keenly felt by everyone on the committee.

I join with my colleagues in extending to the members of his family my heartfelt sympathy and condolences on the occasion of their loss.

Toward Aid For Cities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SIDNEY R. YATES
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 12, 1967

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, the Chicago Daily News recently published an editorial urging Congress to deal with the urgent problem of urban reform.

The editorial noted that the model cities program is "not only a paint-up, fix-up program, but one that aims at a more thorough approach to the urban crisis." The important aspect of the model cities program is that it allows a community to mount a comprehensive attack on their particular problems—unemployment, dilapidated housing, poor education, and so forth. Only with such a coordinated approach can we hope to begin our fight against the physical and human blight of our city slums.

Another program designed to provide decent housing for our low-income citizens in the rent supplement program. In commenting on this program the Daily News said:

> A government that long has subsidized industry and agriculture would now encourage landlords to meet one of our crucial needs: decent housing.

The editorial continued:

> Actually this approach would represent a significant step away from government housing projects toward private initiative.

Both the model cities and rent supplement programs are necessary and important measures in our fight to rehabilitate America's urban areas. To be effective, they must be adequately funded.

So that my colleagues might read the views presented by the Chicago Daily News I would like to include this editorial in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

[From the Chicago Daily News, Sept. 5, 1967]

TOWARD AID FOR CITIES

On returning from its Labor Day holiday, Congress will have to deal with the urgent problem of urban reform.

The Senate Appropriations Committee already has made a good start by approving both a model cities program and a rent subsidy bill. The committee's action was a welcome change from the sick jokes that greeted the rat control bill in the House, restoring hope that Congress will treat urban reform seriously.

The committee voted $537,000,000 for the model cities program, which is $125,000,000 less than President Johnson requested but $300,000,000 more than the House reluctantly approved.

This is a clear, though far from final, victory for the model cities program, which is basic to the administration's long delayed drive against slums. It is not only a paint-up, fix-up program, but one that aims at a more thorough approach to the urban crisis. The bill would provide money to those cities that devise the most effective attacks not only on slum buildings but on the slum way of life.

The more comprehensive programs would mix job training, education, action against crime and open housing with the physical renovation of slum neighborhoods.

The Senate committee also approved the President's $40,000,000 request to initiate a rent subsidy program this year. This would allow the government to pay landlords a part of poor tenants' rent in apartments built under the program; the tenant himself would have to pay at least 25 per cent of his rent. A government that long has subsidized industry and agriculture would now encourage landlords to meet one of our crucial needs: decent housing.

The "aginners" have attacked rent subsidies as subversive, but certifiable conservatives such as Illinois' Everett Dirksen and columnist William F. Buckley Jr. have given the bill a hospitable reception. Actually, this approach would represent a significant step away from government housing projects toward private initiative.

The House has refused to vote any appropriation at all for rent subsidies. But the Senate committee has not given way to the visceral temptation to punish slum dwellers all over again for having had their neighborhoods and lives disrupted by the riots.

Something is terribly wrong in the very heart of America's great cities, and the Senate committee's action is a recognition that empty indignation is no solution at all.

Leftist Danger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES M. TEAGUE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 12, 1967

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, the following is a letter written by Mr. Samuel Wolfe to the editor of the Goleta Gazette-Citizen, Goleta, Calif., which appeared on August 17, 1967:

SIR: Will the riots be quenched by pouring more federal funds into the ghettos? Humans and enlightened people have certain reservations.

A strange moon-madness has come in the wake of the War on Poverty. The penetrating book by Newman and Wenger entitled "Pass the Poverty, Please" shows how the handling of the Poverty War added fuel to start the Watts riot.

Criminal idiots like Carmichael and Brown emerge in the limelight with the presumed status of responsible adults. Now since the Detroit riot a Victor Riesel column quoted in "Human Events" of August 5 gives hard evidence the anti-poverty offices are riddled with revolutionists and leftists.

The same issue quotes documentary evidence from Congressman Gardner of North Carolina that anti-poverty workers paid with federal funds were in the forefront of the riots.

He would be naive indeed who missed the significance of Carmichael's current felicitation with Castro. It could well be questioned whether soothing the rioters with more money wouldn't in effect be paying tribute to Castro.

It was good the President asked for a Day of Prayer but God will only answer prayers made in faith. A hard look is needed as to whether poverty funds are being administered by crooks and murderers. In the dark night that lies ahead the only winners are those who can say, "We fear God and Him only."

Project Pride

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT N. C. NIX

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 12, 1967

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, perhaps thousands of words have been spoken here about riots, slums, poverty and their cure or possible cure.

In recent months, I have spoken some of them.

There is no cure-all or panacea or magic formula to solve these problems. If there were, I am sure that by now, some one, either within these walls or without, would have come forth with that solution.

The cure is a long one, almost arduous, spiced liberally with a great deal of patience and understanding and most of all with the sincere desire to help cure these conditions.

Mr. Speaker, in line with these thoughts, I take this opportunity to comment on the much publicized and sometimes controversial Project Pride which recently ended a successful summer of operation in the streets of Washington, and now promises to embark on a year-long operation.

Mr. Speaker, I have commented before that the myth that poverty stricken people do not want to work is exactly that—a myth.

At that time, I discussed a project in Philadelphia called Jobmobiles which encountered a great success—which made opportunity to work available and which opportunity was eagerly grasped by a waiting mass of persons.

Project Pride follows along this path.

Project Pride combined the opportunity of working with the opportunity of performing a civic deed—that of cleaning up the streets and alleys of those areas that are called slums and ghettos.

Project Pride is aptly named for it deals with youth whose pride has been restrained, yes almost beaten down.

A youth to whom opportunity has been somewhat limited and whose earning power has been and promises to be less than limited.

Now they have something to grip on to. A job with the blessing of the community, a job that pays more money than they dreamed could be earned with their limited training.

The beauty of the whole project however is that the youth are now being offered this job part time.

They are being encouraged to continue with their schooling while aiding the financial situation of their homes.

Now they will have the money for proper food, for presentable clothing plus the opportunity to gain more schooling.

At the crux of each situation are two words—opportunity and training.

Combined, they make perhaps the best medicine for a discontented corps of people.

This is what Jobmobile sought to do. This, I believe is what Project Pride seeks to do.

Let us do all in our power to continue making available opportunity and training.

I do not believe that these people will let us down—that is if we do not let them down.

Springfield and Its Air Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 12, 1967

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, recently Dr. R. V. Mrozinski, of the National Aeronautics and Space Council, addressed the chamber of commerce of Springfield, Mo., on the subject of "Springfield and Its Air Service—Partners in Growth," Dr. Mrozinski noted some of the reasons for the remarkable growth of Springfield and the importance of adequate air facilities to support such growth.

I am inserting Dr. Mrozinski's speech in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

SPRINGFIELD AND ITS AIR SERVICE-PARTNERS IN GROWTH

(Address before the chamber of commerce, Springfield, Mo., Sept. 8, 1967, by R. V. Mrozinski, National Aeronautics and Space Council)

It is a real pleasure for me to be here today. As residents of Springfield you represent a community in widespread constructive growth and change. You represent a city on the move. Those of you from the airline industry servicing Springfield also represent remarkable change and growth.

The parallel expansion of this city and the airlines serving it is no accident. Their growths are intimately interwoven and mutually interdependent. The growth of one serves to stimulate the other in a two way flow of benefits.

When we look for reasons underlying the remarkable growth of Springfield—from 66,000 to 95,000 between 1950 and 1960, and with continued growth prospects for the future—we can find a number of answers.

(1) The climate is temperately ideal with enough of a seasonal variation to be stimulating. However, the seasonal temperature swings are not so great as to interfere with productive activity. Springfield has the added advantage of being smog-free, unlike so many of our modern industrial cities.

(2) The area's cultural and educational facilities are among the finest with a total of five modern colleges. These are supported by a high quality grammar and secondary school system.

(3) The recreational facilities consisting of the many beautiful lakes and rivers in the Springfield area make it one of outstanding attraction for pleasant living on a day to day basis.

(4) A well established stable population of religious people who are prepared to do a productive day's work in return for a good income. A stable population such as this tends to keep the area free of the civil disorders which have beset some of our metropolitan centers this summer.

(5) A central location at the crossroads of the nation with an excellent set of transportation facilities to take full advantage of this national hub position.

Such a combination of civic advantages is bound to result in the influx of new and desirable industry. The movement into Springfield of blue chip railroads, paper products, rubber goods, milk processing plants, and typewriter and television manufacturing plants affords the city a splendid diversity of economic activity. It is a tribute to the city's qualities; it is also a challenge to its future growth.

Like the city of Springfield, the principal airlines serving it have also had a vigorous ten year period of growth.

In the past ten years Ozark Airline passengers have tripled; its freight lift has almost tripled. The Airline's earnings have grown in a proportionate manner.

Delta Airlines, with a north-south service through Springfield, has likewise had a period of strong growth.

The growth of these airlines paralleling the expansion and diversification of the community they serve is a natural cause and effect relationship.

It is a specific and glowing example of a national trend. City growth is booming, and, along with it, air transportation is expanding rapidly to serve the cities' needs. In 1960, 56% of the U.S. population was located in cities; by 1980 the estimate is 77%. When you consider the congestion and other problems this city population increase will cause in the large metropolitan centers you can consider yourself fortunate to have established a base in an uncluttered community like Springfield.

In 1950 the nation's airlines carried 19 million passengers; in 1966 they carried 110 million passengers. In 1956 the airlines carried an estimated one-third of public intercity transportation; in 1966 they carried about two-thirds of this traffic.

Indications of future airline traffic growth are even more dramatic. Current U.S. air traffic is estimated to be doubled by 1971 and trebled by 1975. Currently about 60% of all air travellers are businessmen; the great untapped air market of the future is the vacation and leisure traveller. Cargo growth is estimated to be even greater with a five fold growth between now and 1975.

Equally impressive of phenomenal growth is the present and future civil airplane population. Today the airlines have about 2,000 planes in operation, with general aviation, i.e. private and corporate planes, totalling 104,000. In 10 years the Federal Aviation Agency predicts 3,500 planes in the scheduled airlines and 180,000 among private users.

This vast growth in the national use of air transportation will not take place without the coordinated Federal, State, community and industry solution of complex new problems.

Many new airports will need to be built and existing ones improved to handle the number and size of the new aircraft. The planned building of airports is far below the probable national needs.

Safety of air operations will require a major effort; the U.S. air safety record presently is the world's best. The passenger safety rate for 1966 is 99.99995%, which probably makes flying safer than driving.

Aircraft noise is an acute and growing problem around large airports with the increasing size and power of planes. Basic research is being done on quieter engines. We're also going to have to remove some of the carbon coming out of the plane exhausts in order to cut down on air pollution.

The sonic boom is another area of research which requires much effort. As the airplanes get bigger and faster, like the SST and some of our newest military aircraft, we need to look for improvements to quiet them at speeds greater than sound.

Improving the reliability of the airplane for the passengers' comfort and safety requires a constant search for ways to reduce equipment malfunction.

Air safety and air traffic control will need strong research to insure the safety of the large fast aircraft of the future enroute and at take off and arrival at terminals.

Some of these problems in aviation's future may seem somewhat removed from the Springfield scene. Let me assure you, however, that they are not. The person boarding the plane in Springfield may be a typewriter company executive headed for New York and/or London. He should be able to make a quick and convenient connection with a trunk air carrier in St. Louis. He wants to get to his office destination in New York with equal convenience, speed and safety. In looking at his service, the air traveller will consider it as an integrated whole. In the upcoming air age the problems and the opportunities of air travel in Springfield, Kansas City, St. Louis and New York will all form part of our national picture.

Red Penetration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 12, 1967

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, a most interesting and thought-provoking editorial recently appeared in the Lafayette Sunday Advertiser dealing with Communist penetration in south Louisiana. Our Nation is apparently being eaten up by Communists gnawing like so many termites.

Those in the upper echelon must be removed so the people can again defend themselves against riots, looting, and the threat against our sovereignty. The Federal system stands indicted as responsible for handcuffing the States and local governments.

We, in Congress, are the only elected spokesmen and representatives of the American people. We must take action. The Supreme Court must be curtailed or its members removed. The personal futures and reputations of a few judges are naught when it comes to the lives and security of our American people.

Mr. Speaker, it is our duty to reactivate the power of the people under the Constitution.

I insert the editorial following my remarks:

SOUTH LOUISIANA FACING SECOND DANGER: RED PENETRATION

South Louisiana faces a greater danger than the violence that has stalemated labor-management relations, convened a special session of the state legislature, and virtually destroyed a carefully nurtured industrial image.

That danger, now documented beyond any reasonable doubt, is Communist penetration of some of the most sensitive areas of community life in the state, and more particularly in southern Louisiana.

The Joint Legislative Committee on Un-American Activities has now provided proof that known Red organizations, fronts and/or individuals have wormed their way into the Civil Rights movement, the poverty program and some university and college campuses.

A revolutionary Communist organization known as the "Spartacist League" is the latest of this ilk to be exposed by the diligent and largely unappreciated work of this committee.

Lest the skeptical and the naive continue to blind their fellow citizens to the nature of the threat to the public welfare a few references to the Spartacist League may be in order. Following are excerpts from the "Declaration of Principles" of the league:

"The Spartacist League of the U.S. is a revolutionary organization which, as part of the international revolutionary movement, is committed to the task of building the party which will lead the working class to the victory of the socialist (Communist) revolution in the United States."

And all through the League's declaration of "principles" are references like these: ". . . Seizure of political power . . . destruction of capitalism . . . national and racial divisions . . . imperialism oppress the colonial peoples and impoverish the masses . . . organizing the overthrow of all forces standing in the way of the conquest of power."

The Spartacist League, with Marxism as a guide, claims that it ". . . as a national section of the international Trotskyite movement, is in the forefront of the struggle for a socialist (Communist) future."

A professor at Louisiana State University—New Orleans is the leader of the state and southern regional effort. Campus penetration has also been recorded at Southern, Loyola and Tulane in one form or another. The Spartacists have cells or subcommittees that they call "fractions" aimed at labor unions and campuses and civil rights and "police brutality." The wives of two members are employed by the Michoud Plant, one of the nation's most sensitive facilities.

And what sayeth the Louisiana legislature about its own brand new law that forbids a Communist, as an advocate of violent destruction of the American system, to speak on the campus of a tax-supported institution

What will the State Board of Education do about it all? The LSU Board of Supervisors? The State Sovereignty Commission? The attorney general? The district attorneys? The legislators? The congress? The people themselves?

"Is life so sweet, peace so dear . . .?"

Some Facts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 12, 1967

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, sometimes instead of flights of chance and poetic statements, cold, hard facts tell a more interesting story. This is also true of editorials. The following editorial which appeared in the August 24 edition of the Lansing, Ill., Journal, makes for thought-provoking reading:

SOME FACTS

Since 1930 the population of the United States has increased 60 per cent and the per capita income has increased 300 per cent.

But during the same period of time the costs of the federal government have soared 5,000 per cent, and the federal debt has climbed from $15 billion to $330 billion today.

An indebtedness of $6,000 on each and every family in the nation.

The cancer-like growth continues.

The federal government employed, as of December 1, 1966, a total of 2,964,687 people.

That runs to about $20 billion a year in salaries alone.

This is five times the total 1930 federal budget for everything, including national defense, foreign aid, federal "aid" programs, Post Office Department deficit and all federal programs.

Defending Against Surprise Attack

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 12, 1967

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, the age we live in is filled with many uncertainties, and a major concern is whether or not we have an adequate defense against a surprise nuclear attack.

David Lawrence has written an interesting article on this aspect for the September 11 issue of the Evening Star, touching on some vital aspects of this defense proposition. Because of its timely nature, I insert it into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and recommend that my colleagues give it their attention.

The article follows:

DEFENDING AGAINST SURPRISE ATTACK

(By David Lawrence)

Most people do not understand the problems involved in trying to avert a nuclear war. They have assumed that America is strong enough to deter any country from making such an attack.

But it is not so simple. There are developments which indicate that the United States will have to do far more than has been planned to protect the American people against a "surprise attack."

Two speeches made over the weekend tell a significant story. One was delivered in London by Prof. William Polk, director of the center for Middle East studies at the University of Chicago. The other was given by Sen. John O. Pastore, Democrat of Rhode Island, who is chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Their statements shed new light on the risks and perils of nuclear war despite the negotiations going on now for the signing of a treaty to prevent more countries from making weapons of the nuclear type.

Polk pinpoints a potentially dangerous situation in the Middle East. He says that either Russia or Red China may endeavor to set up nuclear missile bases in Egypt. This might, incidentally, explain why the Russians have been investing so many millions of dollars in giving arms to Egypt. Most people have been puzzled over Russia's continuing interest in Egypt.

Polk declares that a Soviet medium-range-missile base, established in Egypt, could be used as a threat to force the U.S. 6th Fleet and Polaris submarine units from the Mediterranean. He says:

"This would be a rational Soviet objective, particularly if it involved—as it probably would—a substantial increase in the Communist position in the Arab countries."

Polk, whose talk was presented by the British government's broadcasting system, suggested the net result might be an apprehensive reaction by Israel to the setting up of either a Russian or Red Chinese nuclear base on its doorstep. He remarked that Israel has "both the capacity to manufacture and to deliver a nuclear weapon."

All this has a direct relationship to the facts revealed in an address Saturday at Groton, Conn., by Pastore at the ceremony launching a new nuclear submarine. The senator said a subcommittee of the joint Committee on Atomic Energy soon will start hearings to consider a program of expansion of both Polaris submarines and nuclear-attack submarines. He stressed that another, Senate committee soon would take up the question of an anti-ballistic-missile system. He added:

"There is little doubt that the Polaris submarine represents our most formidable deterrent to an all-out war . . .

"The Soviet Union's offensive nuclear striking power is increasing in comparison to our own—while at the same time they are deploying one and probably two anti-ballistic-missile systems to defend their country—which we are not doing—I repeat—which we are not doing . . .

"We cannot live in a world of atomic energy and discount completely the possibility of 'surprise attack' on our nation. . . .

"Our offensive weapons are second to none—but it has been our announced and continuing policy for generations never to strike first. Today—in effect—we are asking the American people to be prepared to accept near nuclear annihilation because our strategy calls for absorbing the first nuclear strike . . .

"With all our offensive power, our defense posture could be our Achilles' heel. We cannot sit back and let ourselves be lulled into a sense of false security, relying only on the hope that fear of retaliation will deter potential aggressors.

"Development of an ABM system is, I repeat, extremely expensive but, indeed, necessary. In this kind of a world, the alternatives are few. The security of our country—the ultimate in its defense—deserves the highest national priority. An affluent America—with so much to lose—must not face this mortal challenge cheaply."

For several months now, there have been reports that American naval experts are urging a plan to help defend India and other friendly countries on the Indian Ocean from coming under Communist control through nuclear blackmail.

The idea is for the U.S. Navy to station Polaris submarines permanently in the waters bordering Asia. It is argued that this would furnish a way to reach a new set of targets in Russia and Red China as a part of the American plan of defense. The program of "deterrence" of a nuclear war has by no means been completed.

Resolution in Support of 3-Day Holiday Weekends

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 12, 1967

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I favor legislation which would change the dates of five Federal holidays so that they can be observed on a Monday and thus provide a 3-day weekend.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include below a resolution adopted by the board of supervisors of Erie County, Buffalo, N.Y., on September 8, 1967, expressing support for such a proposal:

Whereas, there is presently before the Congress of the United States, a bill introduced by Senator George Smathers, in which it is proposed that five Federal Holidays be changed to fall on a Monday, and

Whereas, said bill would change the celebration of Memorial Day from May 30 to the last Monday in May; Independence Day from July 4 to the first Monday in July; Veterans Day from November 11 to the last Monday in October, and Thanksgiving Day from the fourth Thursday in November to the fourth Monday in November; and Washington's birthday would be changed to President's Day, to honor all U.S. Presidents, and would be observed on the third Monday in February rather than February 22, and

Whereas, the enactment of said bill would increase the number of three-day weekends and thereby reduce absenteeism which occurs when employees arbitrarily extend their holidays, and

Now, therefore, be it resolved, that the Honorable Body memorialize the Congress of the United Sttaes to enact the Smathers Bill, and be it further

Resolved, That certified copies of this resolution be sent to Congressmen McCarthy, Smith and Dulski.

A. SAMUEL NOTARO,
Supervisor, 24th Ward.

Boxer KO's Hatemonger's Rabid Pleas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 12, 1967

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Archie Moore:

THE 1930'S WERE TOUGHER: BOXER KO'S HATEMONGER'S RABID PLEAS

(By Archie Moore)

The devil is at work in America, and it is up to us to drive him out. Snipers and looters, white or black, deserve no mercy. Those who would profit from their brother's misfortunes deserve no mercy, and those who would set fellow Americans upon each other deserve no mercy.

I'll fight the man who calls me an "Uncle Tom." I have broken bread with heads of state, chatted with presidents and traveled all over the world. I was born in a ghetto, but I refused to stay there. I am a Negro, and proud to be one. I am also an American, and I'm proud of that.

The young people of today think they have a hard lot. They should have been around in the '30s when I was coming up in St. Louis. We had no way to go, but a lot of us made it. I became light heavyweight champion of the world. A neighbor kid down the block, Clark Terry, became one of the most famous jazz musicians in the world. There were doctors, lawyers and chiefs who came out of that ghetto. One of the top policemen in St. Louis came from our neighborhood.

We made it because we had a goal, and we were willing to work for it.

Now then, don't get the idea that I didn't grow up hating the injustices of this world. I am a staunch advocate of the Negro revolution for the good of mankind. I've seen almost unbelievable progress made in the last handful of years. Do we want to become wild beasts bent only on revenge, looting and killing and laying America bare? Hate is bait, bait for the simple-minded.

Sure, I despised the whites who cheated me, but I used that feeling to make me push on. If you listen to the professional rabble-rousers, adhere to his idea of giving up everything you've gained in order to revenge yourself for the wrongs that were done to you in the past—then you'd better watch your neighbor, because he'll be looting your house next. Law and order is the only edge we have. No man is an island.

Granted, the Negro still has a long way to go to gain a fair shake with the white man in this country. But believe this: If we resort to lawlessness, the only thing we can hope for is civil war, untold bloodshed, and the end of our dreams.

We have to have a meeting of qualified men of both races. Mind you, I said qualified men, not some punk kid, ranting the catch phrases put in his mouth by some paid hate-monger.

There are members of the black community who call for a separate nation within America. Well, I do not intend to give up one square inch of America. I'm not going to be told I must live in a restricted area. Isn't that what we've all been fighting to overcome? And then there is the element that calls for a return to Africa.

For my part, Africa is a great place to visit, but I wouldn't want to live there. If the Irishmen want to go back to the Emerald Isle, let them. If the Slavs want to return to the Iron Curtain area, okay by me. But I'm not going to go to any part of Africa to live. I'm proud of ancestry, and of the country that spawned my forefathers, but I'm not giving up my country. I fought all my life to give my children what I'm able to give them today: A chance for development as citizens in the greatest country in the world.

I do not for a moment think that any truly responsible Negro wants anarchy. I don't think you'll find intelligent—no, let's rephrase that—mature Negroes running wild in the streets or sniping at total strangers.

ANY BOY CAN

Something must be done to reach the Negroes and the whites in the ghettos of this country, and I propose to do something.

As a matter of plain fact, I have been doing something for the past several years. I have been running a program which I call the ABC—Any Boy Can. By teaching our youth, black, white, yellow and red, what dignity is, what self-respect is, what honor is, I have been able to obliterate juvenile delinquency in several areas.

I would now expand my program, change scope. If any boy can, surely any man can. I want to take teams of qualified people, top men in their fields, to the troubled areas of our cities. I know that the people who participated in the recent riots, who are participating and who will participate, are misguided rather than mad.

If some bigot can misguide, then I can guide. I've spent too much of my life building what I've got to put it to torch just to satisfy some ancient hatred of a man who beat my grandfather. Those men are long dead. Do we have to choke what could be a beautiful garden with weeds of hate? I say NO! And I stand ready to start "Operation Gardener." I invite the respected Negro leaders of our country to join me.

Percy's Home Plan Can Help Low Income Families

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 12, 1967

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, as a House cosponsor of the homeownership legislation introduced by Senator CHARLES PERCY, of Illinois, I am pleased to note that the Homewood-Flossmoor Star saw fit to commend him in an editorial which appeared in their August 27 edition. The editorial follows:

PERCY'S HOME PLAN CAN HELP LOW INCOME FAMILIES

Home ownership for low income families, as proposed by United States Sen. Charles H. Percy, impresses us as being a source of real hope in the essential effort to upgrade a large segment of our citizens and contribute significantly to the well-being of the nation as a whole.

Sen. Percy, the Republican freshman from Illinois, outlined his imaginative proposal in a 1966 speech before the Chicago Kiwanis club and later presented it to the Senate after being elected to that body. And if imitation is indeed the sincerest form of flattery, he should be pleased by reports from Washington that Senate Democrats are incorporating large slices of his housing program into one of their own.

No matter who might eventually receive the credit, the plan to make available the pride of home ownership to a great new segment of our population has much to recommend it. At the very outset, it is superior to public housing—20-story concrete cages, as Percy described units in the large cities—on one most important score. It would provide the homeowners an incentive to improve not only their property but their personal financial status, perhaps leading to the acquisition of better homes. Public housing necessarily clamps a lid on initiative; if the tenant's income passes a set figure, out he goes, and not to better accommodations by a long shot.

Briefly, the Percy plan calls for non-profit associations which would buy up housing shells and other structurally sound but rundown buildings from private owners. The structures would be rehabilitated by local contractors with the help of unskilled and unemployed men wishing to be trained as rehabilitation craftsmen. The rehabilitated homes and condominium apartments would be sold to families taking part in the program, which would include the opportunity to build up "sweet equity" toward a down payment by contributing their own labor.

As envisioned by Sen. Percy, the plan would not only provide home ownership to low income families; it would offer basic education, job training, counseling and other services designed to give them self respect and a deserved feeling of dignity and independence. And it would eliminate blighted areas which we can no longer endure.

Surely, there is much to be done in the over-all task of assisting the underprivileged and making life meaningful to them. The Percy plan—one which, as he says, has proved successful on a small scale in several cities—can be a step toward meeting the obligation.

Free Enterprise Success: Jobs For Hempstead Poor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. WYDLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 12, 1967

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, a recent article in the Long Island Daily Review, one of our Nation's outstanding business daily newspapers, told the encouraging and interesting story of the success of free enterprise in finding jobs for the poor. This particular undertaking is happening in the Fourth Congressional District of New York, which I represent. In my opinion, it could well serve as a model in pointing the way to a breakthrough in our efforts to find good jobs for our neediest people. I am sure my colleagues will find it of interest:

FREE ENTERPRISE SUCCESS: JOBS FOR HEMPSTEAD POOR

The new Hempstead Job Development Corp., less than a month old, is already attracting serious attention from persons who would like to emulate it elsewhere. The organization, entirely backed by private enterprise, apparently is the first of its kind to operate in Nassau-Suffolk without govt dollars.

Director James Rudd says several queries have come from other L.I. communities for organizational information. Rudd has even been asked to speak before other groups, but has been too busy.

In its first 2 weeks, beginning Aug. 14, the corporation placed at least 170 Negroes in jobs in Hempstead Village.

Rudd said he was "overwhelmed" at the program's initial success.

Village businessmen, partly motivated by a desire to dampen any potential riot sparks in Hempstead, have pledged more than $36,000 to operate the corporation for a year.

"I'm enthused," Rudd, a Negro, said of initial results. He said good jobs were being offered, with good salaries.

"We placed a salesman trainee with a biscuit company at $100 a week," he noted. "We started a trainee with a paper company at $80. An oil company took on a truck driver at $3.54 an hour. A donut company hired a baker-helper trainee at $95 a week."

A college hired a custodian for $83, a hydraulic concern took on a trainee at $2 an hour and an experienced machine operator at $3.50, he said. A chemical concern took a trainee at $2, and Nassau County offered $80 a week and up to porters.

Rudd, 32, said the corporation—with an office at 8 W. Columbia St., staffed by himself and 2 other paid employees, Dan Hester, 25, and Mary Scott as secy—is also moving into training. Would-be truck drivers, for instance, are being tought to drive by truck owners who lend themselves and their vehicles at no charge to the program after hours, Rudd said. Drivers are in demand at $100 a week and better, he said.

The Hempstead Job Development Corp. is run by a 20-man board, half Negroes. Chairman is Clarence Newall, president of the local NAACP chapter.

Herman Schwartz, owner of the Hempstead Furniture Co. and a prime mover behind the corporation's formation, says it came to life on a private basis to bypass red tape.

"If we had gone to the govt. for help, we probably wouldn't have gotten started until next year," said Schwartz, also treasurer of the Hempstead Village Office of Economic Opportunity Council which, he noted, took a year and a half to get off the ground.

The new job development corporation is not alone, of course, in seeking jobs for poor minorities. A host of other L. I. organizations and municipal agencies are doing likewise with federal and state help—organizations such as the Nassau and Suffolk Human Rights Commissions, several local Office of Economic Opportunity Councils, and a number of job training programs (mainly U.S. Manpower Development and Training Act-funded).

International Drum Corps Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 12, 1967

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, last week—the week of September 2–9—was International Drum Corps Week.

This year we have seen the sorry spectacle of teenage youths rioting in cities all across our land—sniping, looting, and burning. But not all American youths are like that. The great overwhelming majority are dedicated, hard-working, and hard-playing individuals. There are no finer examples of this spirit than the boys and girls of our Nation's drum and bugle corps.

In my own district, and in the rest of Bronx County, we are proud to have a number of drum and bugle corps units—the Midshipmen, the Kingsmen, the Mother Butler Girls, the St. Benedict's Fife and Drum Corps, and the St. Helena's Cadet Corps.

The 24th Congressional District of New York is also the home of Harvey N. Berish, the national chairman of the Drum Corps Publicists Association, who has done so much fine work in publicizing the drum corps art. Mr. Berish is a teacher at Herman Ridder Junior High School, and he also serves as a youth worker and general manager of the Midshipmen drum and bugle corps.

I insert in the Record at this point, Harvey Berish's excellent short article on "The Art of Drum Corps."

The Art of Drum Corps

(By Harvey Berish, National Chairman)

Drum Corps performance has been called, and rightly so, a new art form. Like other areas of art, its history dates back to the glories of Greece and the conquests of Rome, but drum and bugle corps activity has not been nurtured through the centuries by wealthy patrons of state subsidy.

The art of drum corps rises from the grass roots. It has the common, rather than the classic touch, but it is very definitely an expression of order, color, symmetry, and beauty; and in emotional impact it parallels, at its own level, the impact of the masterpieces of the ages.

The art of drum corps is rigid and exacting. It is clean and inspiring. It has risen through its own efforts to its present stature in our communities and neighborhoods. More and more it is becoming recognized as one of the most effective of youth activities; and despite the unyielding discipline it requires of its members, it is becoming more and more accepted by the young people of our own hemisphere in search of a worthwhile activity.

The flash of color, the pulsating rhythm, the brassy blare of syncopated jazz, the waving of flags, the snappy march step serve as herald for the newst art form of the youngest generation.

The loyalty to one's unit, the pride in one's appearance, and the group spirit assure perpetual continuation of drum corps as a colorful youth activity for the future.

Your Money's Worth in Social Security Value

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 12, 1967

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, during the lengthy deliberation and hearings in the House Ways and Means Committee concerning the recently passed social security bill, there seemed to be a mood of opposition expressed by the heavily taxed younger workers.

Writing in the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette of August 25, Sylvia Porter explains very clearly how the social security bill is designed to provide their money's worth—in benefits and protection—not only for the younger worker, and the older worker, but also for the employer in terms of goods and services.

I commend this thoughtful article to the attention of my colleagues, as follows:

Your Money's Worth: Social Security Value Weighed for Worker

(By Sylvia Porter)

Will you, the young American worker who is now contributing the maximum Social Security tax, get back your money's worth in Social Security benefits when you retire?

Or, as has been charged repeatedly in the past few months, will you lose on the deal by paying a bigger tax total than your expected future benefits?

Take, for instance, a young worker who began working last year at age 21. Assume he has been paying and will continue to pay, the maximum Social Security tax until he retires at age 65 in the year 2010. Under today's law, the total value of this worker's contributions over his working lifetime, including interest on the contributions accumulating at the rate of 3½ per cent, would amount to $31,692. Yet the total "value of his retirement benefits over his expected lifetime would be only $19,761—$11,931 less than the total value of his contributions.

This workers, who is typical of millions now pouring into the labor force, is on the surface getting an abominable deal in Social Security.

DISABILITY PROTECTION

But consider the fact that in addition to his retirement benefits, he will be protected against disability throughout all but five of his 44 working years. Consider also that his wife and children will be eligible for survivors' benefits in the event of his death before he retires. The value of this additional protection is estimated by chief Social Security actuary Robert J. Myers at many thousands of dollars.

Moreover, today, a man retiring at age 65 has an 81 per cent chance of having a wife and the total value of a retired worker and wife's combined benefits, including widow's benefits, is figured at $34,023. This is in addition to disability benefits and to benefits payable to survivors if the breadwinner dies before 65.

If this worker became totally disabled sometime in the next few years, he would get back many times the amount of his Social Security tax contributions in disability benefits alone. If this worker died at a young age, leaving a widow and several young children, his survivors might get as much as $30,000 to $40,000 in survivor's benefits.

On average, says Myers, today's young worker will contribute 80–85 per cent of the total value of his benefit protection, counting the interest that would accumulate on his contributions. The average young worker just entering the labor force could not possibly buy, for his Social Security contributions, a private annuity that would pay as much as his expected Social Security benefits.

Myers concedes that the higher income worker who begins working in 1973 or later, when maximum Social Security contribution rates under present law take effect, will "no more than just about pay for the value of his protection." But this, he adds, does not take into account the certainty that Social Security benefits will continue to be increased in the years ahead.

DIFFERENT FOR ELDERLY

Far different is the situation of the elderly worker who reached retirement age at the beginning of 1967 and who had paid maximum Social Security taxes since they were first deducted from his paycheck in January 1937. He is way ahead. He has contributed a total of $3,355, including interest, his benefits will amount to many times this.

In sum, you, the young American worker, will get at least your money's worth in protection before and after you retire.

You, the older worker who is due to retire soon, will get a lot more than your money's worth.

And you, the employer, are by your contributions, helping to make it possible for millions of older Americans to avoid dependency and destitution, and you are thereby guaranteeing a huge and stable market for your production of goods and services.

The Politics of Courage: An Exercise in Semantics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 12, 1967

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, the Governor of one of our States recently called President Johnson a "political animal." I think some comment on this is called for.

If someone understands politics and is attuned to political realities, we call him a political animal. I sometimes flatter myself by thinking of myself as a political animal. By that I mean someone adept in the art and practice of government, including politics with a small "p."

Now as to President Johnson, it has become quite obvious to anyone who cares to look at the facts that despite his reputation as a first-rate political animal, lately he has been practicing the art with a capital "P" only. He is knowingly endangering his popularity—and his political strength—by doing what he knows to be best for the Nation.

I do not see any political expediency in his Vietnam policy.

I do not see any political expediency in his tax proposal.

I see only a single-minded determination to guide this country as best he possibly can, through some of the most complex challenges we have ever faced as a nation—and to guide us through safely and honorably. There must be some truth, after all, in former President Truman's sign, "The Buck Stops Here."

This, in fact, was the subject of a recent editorial by Mr. William Lindsay White, the editor and publisher of the Emporia, Kans., Gazette.

Not because I especially like the President's proposals, but because I respect his position and his courage—and Mr. White's as well—I include this editorial in the Record:

Hard Ways

For what little it may be worth, this editor is strongly behind President Lyndon Johnson in the two proposals which are said to be the cause of his sinking popularity at the polls.

We favor his 10 per cent surtax, and pray that this may be enough to check the inflation which is destroying our money.

We favor the proposed additional 45,000 men he has pointed out that we will need in Vietnam, and pray that they will be enough to win this war, which they may not be.

It took character and courage to make these two painful proposals at this time. We hope that our country still has both, and that in time they will come around to see that their President was right, that this money and these men are needed, and to get behind him on both.

As for the Republicans, as we see it they also have a duty here, and this is not to fight the President's brave and needed proposals, but to get in and hack pork barrel civilian spending out of the budget. This may be hard on them in their districts, where factions of the voters may favor various pork barrel bills. But in this respect they should show character and courage equal to that of the President.

Ad Astra Per Aspera—"To the Stars by Hard Ways"—is the motto of Kansas. In this painful year of 1967 we will find that the ways are hard, but that there is no other road to the stars.

W. L. W.

Progress in Southern Africa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 12, 1967

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, despite the rumblings of the so-called Organization of African Unity, constructive progress is being made in southern Africa.

The recent announcement of the establishment of diplomatic relations between Malawi and South Africa thwarts the race-baiting harangues of the members of this devious "unity" conglomeration.

Mr. Speaker, I insert an article from the September 11 Washington Evening Star:

MALAWI SWINGS AX: AFRICAN UNITY TAKES BLOW

JOHANNESBURG.—Hastings Banda, prime minister of Malawi, thumbed his nose at the Organization for African Unity with his carefully timed announcement that Malawi and South Africa would open diplomatic relations.

The simultaneous announcement last night in Pretoria, South Africa's capital, and Mzuzu, capital of Malawi, came within hours of the opening of the three day OAU summit conference in Kinshasa, the Congo.

Banda, the odd-man-out among rulers of black Africa, obviously took great delight in pulling the OAU's tail. The organization is violently opposed to South Africa, especially this country's policy of apartheid.

The Malawian premier, of course, is against apartheid, but he claims to be an "unprecedented realist in African affairs."

SAYS BOYCOTT NOT ANSWER

Banda says, "Shouts and threats will not demolish the wall of Jericho of apartheid in South Africa. You can shout all you want you can boycott South Africa all you want, but you won't solve the problem."

Banda will solve some of his economic problems with the new links forged with South Africa.

Prime Minister Balthazar J. Vorster's formal announcement that South Africa would open diplomatic ties with Malawi is the first major step taken by Pretoria in its new "enlightened" approach to black Africa.

It was a step that was carefully measured during the past year.

CLOSE TIES ESTABLISHED

During that year South Africa has established close ties with Malawi and this country's three black neighbors. The olive branch also has been offered and taken by Lesotho (Basutoland), Botswana (Bechuanaland) and Swaziland.

Previous hints of ties with Malawi came Aug. 8 when the minister of agricultural technical services, Jim Fouche, said it would be "suicide" for South Africa not to recognize the fact that it would have to admit black diplomats eventually.

"We will have to do the right thing at the right time to strengthen our economic ties as well as our ties of friendship," he said.

There are strong indications that South Africa is likely to extend its ties with further commercial agreements and arrangements to give black African states the benefit of South African technical and economic advice and assistance.

Three countries that have been suggested as the next to establish links with South Africa are the Malagasy Republic, Kenya and Ghana.

The Pleasant Places to Live in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 12, 1967

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, a recent issue of the U.S. News & World Report carried an article entitled "Not All This Country Is Tense, Troubled." Among the places this article described as "the pleasant places to live in the United States," is the area in which I was born and now represent as a Member of this great body.

For the information of my colleagues, I include that portion of the U.S. News article as well as two editorials from Wisconsin papers. I also take this opportunity to invite my colleagues to visit Winnebagoland.

[From the U.S. News & World Report, Aug. 7, 1967]

VIGOROUS COMMUNITIES

A somewhat different Midwestern setting is found in Wisconsin's "Winnebagoland." On the shores of Lake Winnebago are five live-wire communities: Appleton, with a population of around 50,000; Menasha, with about 15,000; Neenah, with close to 20,000; Oshkosh, at around 45,000, and Fond du Lac, with upward of 35,000.

Here, in an invigorating climate, the people appear to be much too busy with work, play and civic improvement to cause each other trouble. Work stoppages and labor disputes are rare in the region's growing number of industries.

The communities of Winnebagoland are hard at work renovating their downtown areas and planning traffic arteries for future growth of the region. Appleton is the home of Lawrence University, said to rank among the top U.S. liberal-arts colleges. There are also colleges at Oshkosh and at Fond du Lac. Local musicians make up the fine Fox Valley Symphony Orchestra. Fond du Lac has a military band.

When it is time to enjoy the outdoors, there is Lake Winnebago, famous for sailing, boating, water skiing, houseboats, iceboats and year-round fishing.

[From the Twin Cities News-Record, Aug. 11, 1967]

SOURCE OF STABILITY

After a staffer for *U.S. News & World Report* finished his part of a survey of "the pleasant places to live in the United States," he concluded: "You come away from these places with the feeling that there is more that is right about America than many of our leaders realize."

The article was done in reply to the ideas held by many, especially those abroad, that this country is torn and ripped by racial strife, crime, falling morality and political corruption.

The central theme of the article is that there are many nice places to live in communities under 50,000 where law enforcement controls crime, riots never occur and the local governments are honest and responsive. Two-thirds of the nation's people live in these smaller communities, though some of them are suburbs on the edge of our restive big cities.

In these towns lies a stability that keeps this country going even when riots are burning down the cores of our metropolises.

One of the places especially listed was "Winnebagoland," which for the magazine includes Appleton, Oshkosh, Neenah, Menasha and Fond du Lac.

"Here, in an invigorating climate," the magazine reports, "the people appear to be much too busy with work, play and civic improvement to cause each other trouble. Work stoppages and labor disputes are rare in the region's number of industries. The communities of Winnebagoland are hard at work renovating their downtown areas and planning traffic arteries for the future growth of the region.

"When it is time to enjoy the outdoors, there is Lake Winnebago, famous for sailing, boating, water skiing, houseboats, iceboats, and year-round fishing."

This pretty picture didn't just happen. It has taken more than 100 years of hard work by generations of people. Nor will it continue a pretty picture, unless our new generations continue to use the same kind of imagination and energy.

Prosperity is no excuse for smugness, because we have our downtown cores and the clogging of our traffic arteries at every rush hour. Furthermore, the stable areas of the country have a direct obligation to lend a strong hand with the problems of the metropolises, since the quality of life in the core areas also affects, in a broad way, our quality of life.

[From the Oshkosh Daily Northwestern, Aug. 12, 1967]

TROUBLE? LET'S FIX IT

"There's No Trouble With Oshkosh."

That is the headline of an article in the Aug. 7 edition of The Evening Bulletin of Philadelphia to which attention is called by a Philadelphian writing to The Daily Northwestern in today's People's Forum. A chance acquaintance with some Oshkosh people who were ambassadors of good will for this city gave her a favorable impression of the community. It would be well if all persons spoke highly of their hometown when away from it—and we agree that residents of Oshkosh can.

That "there's no trouble with Oshkosh" was the contention of Willard West of the editorial page staff of The Evening Bulletin—a kind-looking gentleman of the Fourth Estate if judged by his picture which accompanied the article.

We wouldn't go so far as to say there is no trouble. There are things wrong with our community—nothing so serious, mind you, that cannot be corrected and we are in the process of changing them. So, if we are a good city now—and we are (our friends tell us)—we can be even better.

Mr. West based his article on one in a recent issue of U.S. News & World Report titled "Not All This Country Is Tense and Troubled." The original article listed what it described as some "pleasant places to live in the U.S." Among them were Neenah and Menasha, as well as Oshkosh, but Mr. West checked on the latter since "Oshkosh" still has a sound to some people in the East that is "different." (Editor's note: But Pennsylvania has such places as "Punxsutawney." Isn't that strange sounding?"

Mr. West's article said: "The towns and the cities mentioned (as pleasant places) were all small—no more than 50,000 population. The picture that came through in the article was one of a tree-shaded Shangri-La with a main street and friendly people living the good and simple life.

"This sort of escape literature about the inner America is spreading nowadays—and is especially appealing to those of us who are caught in the stress and strain of our East Coast Megalopolis and want out.

"The slick magazines have been telling us for years about exotic places in foreign lands where you can live cheap in a mystic shroud and avoid the problems of too many people. But as people have gotten to see those places and returned home the illusions have worn off.

"The trend now is to find Utopia in our own America. Everybody must know a half dozen people who are on their way to California to find it (Utopia) or are on their way back having decided it isn't there.

"Much of this restlessness may be inspired by slogans of the day like 'Discover America' or 'See the U.S. First,' but then a lot of it is stirred by the troubles and problems, real and imaginary, that beset us.

"U.S. News & World Report claims there are 'hundreds and thousands' of towns across the U.S. where the law is enforced, streets are safe day and night, pupils are healthy and motivated and there is no racial strife. Among the places it mentions is Oshkosh, Wis., a name that brings to mind corny vaudeville jokes or the famous slogan of overalls once worn by millions of American workmen, 'Oshkosh B'Gosh.' "

Mr. West then proceeds to tell his Philadelphia readers what he learned about Oshkosh, some of it through a telephone conversation with your correspondent who, he said graciously, "sold us on the claim that Oshkosh is a pleasant place to live."

We told him also, in answer to his questions, about the student unrest on the campus of Wisconsin State University-Oshkosh last spring because of a proposed change in the beer-drinking age and the earlier snowball fight. This led him to write that "all is not peaches and cream in Oshkosh, either."

Mr. West concluded with "So you see, even in a Utopia like Oshkosh there is trouble to be found."

Speech by Gov. Robert Docking, of Kansas, to the Great Plains Regional Young Democratic Conference, at Topeka, Kans.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL ALBERT
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 12, 1967

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, recently a great midwestern Democrat, Gov. Robert Docking, of Kansas, visited Vietnam to judge for himself our role in that country.

Governor Docking found that this war is not in one country alone but is a continuing war to preserve democratic life against those determined to quash freedom and liberty.

The Governor said that he talked to civilians, soldiers, and Vietnamese officials—and all of them are optimistic about Vietnam's future and proud of the role in the work there.

In an excellent speech to the Young Democratic Conference in Topeka, Kans., the Governor summed up his impressions of a memorable trip.

I think my colleagues will find what he had to say important and timely. The Governor's speech follows:

SPEECH BY GOV. ROBERT DOCKING TO THE GREAT PLAINS REGIONAL YOUNG DEMOCRATIC CONFERENCE, AT TOPEKA, KANS.

Thank you for your generous welcome. I am very happy to be home—I am very happy to have the opportunity to visit with Young Democrats from seven midwestern states. I always appreciate the opportunity to visit with our younger citizens because of the important role they must assume in the future of our country. We should all be grateful we are living in what I consider the greatest part of the continental United States. Having just returned from a trip to Asia, I want to tell you that there is no country like the United States of America.

I am still having some difficulty with the biological time clock. It takes a little while for your body to adjust to rapid changes in time as you travel with or away from the sun. I am still having difficulty—I get hungry at the wrong time—I get sleepy at the wrong time—but I'm certain that in a few days I will get down to a normal routine.

Traveling to Asia gives you not only a biological time clock change, but there is quite a cultural shock involved in going from the United States to Southeast Asia. The first cultural shock was as we were flying over in a 707 Jetliner and had just reached the coast of South Vietnam. I looked out the window as we flew up the Saigon River and saw the craters that had been left by the bombs of our B–52's against the Viet Cong. We flew at a high altitude—around 40,000 feet—in order to avoid ground fire. When we came to the Saigon airport, we went into a steep dive to avoid ground fire. There is no landing pattern like we experience in jet flights in the United States. This is also a somewhat different experience than I've had in landing in Kansas City from time to time.

When we first arrived in Asia, the old houses made of tin—the people riding bicycles—the thousands of motor bikes—the congested traffic—the narrow streets—the filth—the smell—the rhythm that is Asia—surely let you know in a very short time that you are indeed in another country, and makes you realize the approximate 11,000 miles difference has truly carried you halfway across the world.

Brig. Gen. Edward Fry, Commanding General of our Kansas Air National Guard, and I, left Honolulu August 14 aboard a commercial jet bound for Vietnam. The plane made a stop in Guam, where I had an opportunity to call the Governor of Guam. While we were in Honolulu, I had the opportunity of visiting with John Burns, the Governor of Hawaii, whose son was a classmate of Paul Pendergast's at St. Benedict's in Atchison, and I also visited with Governor Owen Aspinall, the Governor of American Samoa.

Physically, it was not the most pleasant trip in the world. General Fry fell through a Vietnamese "monkey bridge"—a South Vietnamese "monkey bridge"—about 10 feet into water he didn't dare to swallow. The day they told us the temperature was 127 degrees we were wading through shin-deep sand. I must admit the General's St. Christopher Medal got quite a polishing on several occasions. One night—the night we stayed in Bearcat with the Ninth Division—our forces fired 300 rounds of artillery. I believe that I counted everyone of them.

In six days—from August 15 through August 22—the General and I were escorted through every section of South Vietnam. From Can-To, in the South—to Da Nang, in the north—we traveled by military jet, small aircraft, jeep and Sampan. We walked through the small hamlets around Pleiku, through the rise paddies of the Delta, in knee-deep mud near Rock Kein, and waded across streams to see and talk to Americans who are involved in the war in Vietnam, the people who live with it every day, and worry about winning it, and whether the world understands why they are there. From these people—from Ben Finley, a Methodist minister from Conway Springs, Kansas, and from a Kansas Corporal in the Ninth Division, and Miss Looney of Wichita, a civilian worker in the American Red Cross, and from a province chief near Bearcat Camp—from these people, I learned about the war. Whatever preconceptions I had of the conflict and the pacification program were wiped away. No one can surely be prepared for what he finds in Southeast Asia.

I went to Vietnam because the President of the United States extended an invitation to the Governors of the 50 States to travel to Vietnam and view the situation, and judge our role in Vietnam for themselves. It was quite apparent that the people in Vietnam whom we visited believed that the Kansas Administration is good. They were impressed with the fact that Kansas was the only state to reduce tax rates this year; that for the first time in 108 years, conflict of interest legislation was passed; and that we were one of the few states which were entirely free of state debt.

Whether or not a trip to Vietnam by the Governors of any of the states is a good political move for them personally, or a bad political move, I am not able to judge. But I do believe that when invited by the President of the United States, you make a trip wherever it may be. Your hope is that you might be of help and assistance to your country. As a citizen, I felt a responsibility to go. Every Kansan and every American has a great involvement in Vietnam. I hope that my trip and my report will help to clarify United States involvement in Southeast Asia.

Make no mistake about it. This is a war in Vietnam, but it is not a war in one country alone. This is a continuing war to preserve the democratic way of life—this is a war against international communism.

By the way, I should add that on one of the days in South Vietnam, we ran into the movie actor Wendell Corey. Actors and actresses do a terrific job of keeping up the morale of our men. If it is important and helpful for movie actors to tour war-torn areas, surely it is equally as important to have Governors of states visiting our soldiers and bringing greetings from home.

I went with three basic missions in mind. One: Kansas is the only state which has trained two Army divisions stationed in Vietnam. I wanted to visit as many Kansans as I could locate. Two: to observe the pacification program and to attempt to evaluate its effectiveness. Three: to know if there are ways in which our Kansas colleges and universities might aid the people of South Vietnam in much the same way they have served several other foreign countries—through social and technical training programs.

My trip home began with these questions in mind. I found my answers. But I found so much, much more. I will tell you tonight about my impressions of South Vietnam—the sights, the sounds, the smells—and about the people I met there—the people who talk excitedly, emotionally—and I will outline for you what I believe the United States—and Kansas—can do to further aid the people of

South Vietnam, and, consequently, our own fighting men.

There needs to be a new awareness of the problems of this infant nation, and the difficulties of a world power attempting to provide aid and guidance. It comes with the awareness by the people of a world power that people of another nation are threatened, and that they must be given the opportunity to build their own schools, educate their people, develop their own bridges and roads. With these opportunities will come a new awareness of the world on the part of the Vietnamese—a social awareness.

The late President Kennedy set the tone for the kind of program our government is trying to carry out. In a speech on May 8, 1956, titled, "America's Stake in Vietnam," President Kennedy said:

"I shall not attempt to set forth the details of the type of aid program this nation should offer the Vietnamese, for it is not the details of that program that are as important as the spirit with which it is offered and the objectives it seeks to accomplish. We should not attempt to buy the friendship of the Vietnamese. Nor can we win their hearts by making them dependent upon our handouts. What we must offer them is a revolution—a political, economic and social revolution—far superior to anything the Communists can offer—far more peaceful, far more democratic, and far more locally controlled."

It is this thinking which has helped to shape American policy in Southeast Asia—the United States' long-standing concern for its neighbor. This idea has been shaped into the Civilian Operations Revolutionary Development Program—shortened to CORDS—which I saw working in South Vietnam. Since returning, I have been repeatedly asked why this Revolutionary Development Program is carried on at the same time the nation is entangled in the military field. Bernard Fall, the respected journalist who was killed in Vietnam, gave the best answer to that question in the October 1966 issue of *Foreign Affairs:*

"While it is obvious that the middle of a war is not the best place to start such reforms, it must be realized that in Vietnam the choice no longer exists, for the reforms are as essential to success as ammunition for the howitzers; in fact, more so, because the failures of land reform create an almost hopeless vicious circle."

With this very objective in mind, the CORDS Program is essentially concerned with making South Vietnamese aware that their government in Saigon—and the rest of the world—is interested in their well-being, and that it is capable of providing them with educational, health and agricultural services—bringing, in effect, the government to the countryside. The South Vietnamese have known war for many years; the social ills of the country are as old as the land itself. The meaning of the battles has escaped the majority of the people. Their thinking is not politically sophisticated enough to completely distinguish between Communism and Democracy. We must push this CORDS Program, this social awareness, from the hamlets into the villages, into the districts, and into the provinces.

Through CORDS, we must first secure the area; second, we must integrate civilian and military personnel into a single purpose; third, the CORDS teams will then be safe from Communist threat to begin rebuilding each province through training in health, education and government.

When I reported my impressions of the Vietnam trip to President Johnson, Vice President Humphrey, and cabinet officers, their questions revolved around the welfare of our fighting men, the welfare of the Vietnamese, and the Vietnamese response to our concern. At the State Department, an official of the Agency for International Development was pleased when I asked if there was some way Kansas might be of some assistance to the CORDS Program in Vietnam. He said: "We need your help. The problem has always been to find people interested, willing to talk, and willing to help."

No one has any illusions about the difficulties involved in effectively carrying out the CORDS Program. The problems are many—America's late start, guerrilla warfare, infiltrators, transportation, importation of products and materials, communications. But General Fry and I talked to civilians, soldiers, and Vietnamese—from the hamlets to Saigon—the people who have been there for months and years—and they all are optimistic and proud of their role in the work there. Everyone said to us, "We have made great progress—you should have been here six months ago."

To describe the work of these people with the word "pacification" is wholly inadequate. Under the direction of R. W. Komer, Special Assistant to the President, with whom the General and I talked in Saigon, there is no stalemate in the CORDS Program. I must emphasize, however, that CORDS cannot succeed in South Vietnam until villages are militarily secure. Once the countryside is secure and the people can live without the threat of terrorist attack, the CORDS workers are ready—ready with an integrated civilian-military operation to focus United States resources in support of the Vietnamese people.

During the trip I saw every phase of the CORDS Program. Part of it involves initial 59-man teams that move into rural areas, screening and classifying residents, establishing government, training local officials, adjusting complaints, reorganizing economic activities. During my debriefing sessions at the State Department, which lasted more than two and one-half hours, I asked for any statistics that had been gathered about the accomplishments of the program to supplement what I had seen actually taking place. I was given the latest State Department staff memorandum, dated August 13, 1967. I refer to this material in explanation of CORDS.

CORDS is the securing of 4,500 of the country's 12,500 hamlets so that elections could be held. (Fifty-nine percent of the population lives in areas under government control, 17 percent are under control of the Viet Cong, the remainder lives in contested areas.)

By the way, I found it most admirable that elections for officials of South Vietnam will be held in the midst of war. Everywhere I went, I saw the campaign posters, the work of an election underway with great enthusiasm—a courageous undertaking. Elections are a new experience for Asians. Their officials are usually appointed to office.

CORDS is the training of the Vietnamese in nation-building. Revolu-Development team members have increased from 3,000 at the end of 1965 to 24,000 in 1966 to 35,000 in mid-1967. By the end of 1968, more than 60,000 RD teams will have graduated from the National Training Center at Vung Tau, a center which General Fry and I visited.

CORDS is also a dedicated band of people. During the first six months of 1967, 333 workers were killed and 573 wounded.

CORDS is an education program, training 2,900 teachers and building 2,266 elementary school classrooms and 300 secondary school classrooms. Since 1963, more than 8,500 classrooms have been built, and over 8,500 teachers trained. More than 8 million text books were delivered to schools.

CORDS is increasing the number of doctors from 300 just 18 months ago to approximately 1,200 today.

CORDS in treating 150,000 patients per month by 43 Free World medical teams.

CORDS is the establishing of an Agricultural Development Bank, providing low-interest credit to the peasant.

CORDS is the strenghtening of the peasants' own organization—the Agricultural Cooperatives, the Farmer's Association, and the Tenant Farmers' Union. Through these groups, the peasant's voice can be heard.

CORDS is increasing the agricultural income which is visible in the countryside where bicycles, sewing machines, pumps, and consumer goods are now appearing in rapidly increasing quantities.

CORDS is the aerial surveying of the rice lands in the Mekong Delta so that the farmers, for the first time, can secure permanent titles to their land.

It is with this struggle that I am asking that each Kansan become involved.

A century ago, pioneer Kansas men got together with their neighbors for a barn raising, pioneer women met for quilting bees, and there was always help for a neighbor at harvest. The world may be smaller 100 years later, but the spirit remains the same. It is exemplified by the Rev. Ben Finley, whom I met in I Corps, where he is working with agricultural personnel; by Miss Looney, now a Red Cross worker in Da Nang; and by the Ninth Infantry Division of Kansas, which provides food, clothing, and medicine for Vietnamese families through their own "Operations Kansas."

In this spirit, I asked the Kansas colleges and universities to prepare proposals, suggesting how Kansas might become dramatically involved in the CORDS Program. During the debriefing sessions in Washington, the Governor's Office perfected a liaison relationship between the colleges and universities and the State Department. It will make possible maximum utilization of Kansas resources in the nation-building task.

The lack of depth in political leadership and archaic agency procedures is an area where Kansas can make a significant contribution. We take for granted the relatively smooth operation of our state government. Our experience should be shared, our manpower and methods should be exposed to the people of developing countries. As Governor, I have the opportunity to greet a number of foreign visitors to our State. I regret that I cannot show them our government operation first-hand over an extended period of time.

In Saigon, there is a modern water purification plant, constructed by the United States, but still I was warned not to drink water from the tap. The plant is operable, but the distribution system is bad. By the time the water reaches the faucet, you should not drink it—it becomes polluted in the pipes. I sat there, wondering how we could share the knowledge we have gained attempting to put before the Kansas Legislature a Water Quality Control Act last session.

Although the administrative manpower shortage is critical in Vietnam, I will ask the State Department to consider arranging a limited exchange of personnel to study Kansas water supply systems at state and local levels.

There are other agencies which may contribute to this program. Business, labor and education leaders, too, should think of volunteering for a tour of duty in Vietnam—working alongside the people.

The Province Chiefs talked with me at length about how Kansas last year lowered the tax rate and passed a conflict of interest bill. I will ask the Legislative Council to contact Mr. Komer in Saigon and offer to supply his office with copies of Kansas legislation and pertinent legislative studies.

On the economic side, I have asked the State Department to consider urging the Vietnamese to adopt a fiscal year which differs from the calendar year. Money now moves slowly into the provinces because the fiscal year commences at the same time as a number of holidays.

Secretary of State Dean Rusk showed interest in the Kansas Cash Basis Law and how it may be applied to Vietnamese government. I have instructed my staff to prepare additional information for Secretary Rusk.

I will propose to the State Department that a stronger provincial government be established. I will urge that they observe some Kansas counties as functioning units, which might be comparable to the Vietnamese. This is another point where an extended, on-the-site visit of court houses may be useful.

As I pointed out earlier, my mission to Vietnam was to visit Kansas servicemen and observe the pacification program. I found much more. Let me summarize my recommendations:

(1) Greater use of Kansas colleges and universities, their proposals, and the various political structures in the whole process of nation-building. A liaison with the State Department has been established and work is continuing.

(2) A program of on-site visits by Vietnamese officials to Kansas institutions for an extended study.

(3) An exchange of bills and other legislative information.

(4) Serious attention to monetary problems, especially as related to the fiscal year and utilization of the Cash Basis Law concept.

(5) Kansas business, labor, education, and political leaders should give thought to touring Vietnam, hosting Vietnamese in Kansas, or offering to train Vietnamese to fill their leadership vacuum.

That was the trip to Vietnam.

I met Kansas marines and civilians and the commanders of the First and Ninth Divisions. I gave them flags that were made by the 3,300 Kansas Waiting Wives. I presented two purple hearts to young men from Kansas; 1 distinguished flying cross; 2 bronze stars for valor; and 1 army commendation medal for valor. They seemed happy to see us, and I was happy to see them.

The young men of today, those in Vietnam, those who are fighting, those who have died, are the heroes. In time, they will be known, and the debt this nation owes them will someday be realized. I can only admire the young man who takes a deep breath—whether the uniform of the soldier or civilian worker—puts on the uniform of his country, goes forth and fulfills the responsibility of citizenship in a hostile climate—far from home. I came back from Vietnam better informed, more humble and satisfied that American patriotism is not going out of style.

The 10-Percent Surtax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 12, 1967

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, as Members of Congress, each of us will continue to give thoughtful consideration during the next few weeks to the proposed surtax.

I commend for my colleagues' attention this excellent editorial from the Oshkosh Daily Northwestern which speaks directly to this subject:

THE 10-PERCENT SURTAX

There isn't much consolation in the fact that income taxes once were higher than they are now, or will be if the 10-percent surtax President Johnson has proposed, becomes effective.

There are many who would prefer a greater effort to reduce the cost of government than the suggested step now to increase its income, for more spending. Costs in connection with the Vietnam War are generally expected to go up before the conflict is brought to an end—if ever it is going to be—but there is not a similar agreement on the many other spiraling costs of government.

The President has asked Congress to raise the income tax bill of each individual and corporation by the amount of a 10-percent surtax. For individuals the increased cost would become effective Oct. 1 and would apply for the final quarter of 1967 and from then on until—who knows how long?

Various taxes have gone higher already, social security, gasoline, and others. Federal income taxes were reduced three years ago and as a result taxpayers "saved" $23 billion that they did not pay out for this purpose since that time. What the President is asking for now is the restoration of about half of that revenue lost to the government.

It is maintained that a tax increase will halt (or at least slow down) the spread of inflation. This remains to be seen. However, an increase in taxes would be less of a drain on the family budget than continued devaluation of the dollar through inflation. Those on fixed incomes and the poor and the elderly are hurt most by rising prices, but all of us feel the inflationary bite and find it difficult financially to keep abreast of the times.

The government deficit, already at an unconscionable figure, should not be permitted to get completely out of hand. The debt places a burden on business and the job market. If the economy slips and jobs fall off, our country may be in for more troublesome times than those in which we now live.

Is President Johnson right in believing that the American economy is strong enough, that the level of personal income and corporation profit is secure enough to take higher taxes in stride?

We don't know the answer. We know only that if taxes are to be higher, government must do all in its power to spend that money (our money) to end the war, to reduce expenses, to live within its budget. We must. Or at least we try to, if we are to control our own destiny.

Commonsense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK BRINKLEY
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 11, 1967

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, the following column by the editor of the Columbus Ledger, Mr. Carlton Johnson, puts into simple perspective the weight to be accorded the philosophy of different groups in our country. This writer suggests in a direct, straightforward fashion, to use the words of Thomas Edison, that the reason a lot of people do not recognize opportunity is the fact that it usually goes around wearing overalls looking like hard work.

COMMONSENSE

(By Carlton Johnson)

Who speaks for the white majority in this country? Certainly not the discredited, ragtag Ku Klux Klan. And who speaks for the Negro? Certainly not the likes of Rap Brown and Stokely Carmichael, who would, if they had their way, destroy this government, this country.

Some good people, both white and Negro, have been talking good, hard commonsense in recent days.

Recently, we were struck by the good sense, the commonsense, the American sense of a 47-year-old Negro pilot who is in the thick of the fighting in Vietnam. Col. David James said that thousands of Negroes are fighting bravely in Vietnam "and when we go home, we'll have to live down the trouble he (Carmichael) and other idiots like them have built."

"Men like Stokely Carmichael acting as if they speak for the Negro people," he asserted with anger. "They don't . . ."

Now comes another speaking with equal common sense in the person of Archie Moore, the former light heavyweight champion.

". . . I'll fight the man who calls me an 'Uncle Tom' . . . I was born in a ghetto, but I refused to stay there. I am a Negro, and proud to be one. I am also an American, and I'm proud of that.

". . . The young people of today think they have a hard lot. They should have been around in the '30's when I was coming up in St. Louis. We had no way to go, but a lot of us made it. I became light heavy-weight champion of the world. A neighbor kid down the block, Clark Terry, became one of the most famous jazz musicians in the world. There were doctors, lawyers and chiefs who came out of that ghetto. One of the top policemen in St. Louis came from our neighborhood.

"We made it because we had a goal, and we were willing to work for it. Don't talk to me of your 'guaranteed national income.' Any fool knows that this is insanity. Do we bring those who worked to get ahead down to the level of those who never gave a damn? The world owes nobody—black or white—a living. God helps the man who helps himself!

"Now then, don't get the idea that I didn't grow up hating the injustices of this world. I am a staunch advocate of the Negro revolution for the good of mankind. I've seen almost unbelievable progress made in the last handful of years. Do we want to become wild beasts bent only on revenge, looting and killing and laying America bare? Hate is bait, bait for the simple minded.

". . . Do we have to choke what could be a beautiful garden with weeds of hate? I say no!

Both Archie Moore and Colonel James make good sense.

New Hope In South Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. CORMAN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 12, 1967

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, as the dust settles on the election held in South Vietnam on September 3, some significant and encouraging facts emerge.

It is, I believe, highly significant that 83 percent of those registered to vote did so, despite acts of terrorism by the Vietcong aimed at preventing South Vietnamese from going to the polls; that all American observers are reported to generally agree that the election was conducted fairly and honestly; and, most important, that for the first time in many years South Vietnam now has a legitimate government freely elected by a sizable percentage of the South Vietnamese of voting age.

While certain doubts are inevitable as to the ability of the Thieu government to cure all the ills that beset South Vietnam, the election must be construed as a strong determination of the people to become a political entity, to work out their own future and to solve their own problems.

On September 5, the Washington Post editorialized on the "New Hope in Vietnam." This editorial seems to be a reasonable and responsible evaluation of the election, and its significance should be of interest to us all.

I quote the text of this fine editorial:

NEW HOPE IN VIETNAM

When all the necessary reservations have been made about the election in Vietnam, we think it is a highly significant event. The fact that about 83 per cent of the registered voters went to the polls (compared to 62 per cent in our presidential election of 1964) is indicative of widespread interest. These people were not herded to the polls by a dictator. About two-thirds of them voted against the ruling military junta. In order to vote at all they had to defy the orders of the Vietcong and risk death in a shocking campaign of terrorism.

Reports from many parts of South Vietnam indicate that the election was relatively free and fair. It would be surprising, indeed, if some instances of fraud did not turn up. But the press and the observers sent to South Vietnam by President Johnson are in general agreement that the voting was carried out free from major irregularities. The returns themselves also suggest an absence of rigging. The candidates in control of the voting machinery predicted that they would receive at least a majority vote. Since they turned up with less than one-third, rigging charges without concrete evidence behind them sound very hollow. (As in other multiparty systems, the winning candidate was not required to have a majority, but only a plurality.)

Despite the absence of a popular majority for Gen. Nguyen Van Thieu, the President-elect, he has a mandate to preside over a legitimate constitutional government. A new Senate has been elected, and a House of Representatives will be chosen in October. The extent to which this National Assembly will be able to influence the direction of events in South Vietnam is not yet clear. But at least that country now has an opportunity to move down the road of stable and responsive government.

One other fact may be significant. In the recent past power in South Vietnam has seemed to dangle uncertainly between General Thieu and Premier Nguyen Cao Ky, with the latter playing the dominant role. Under the new government, the executive authority will be clearly and unmistakably in Thieu's hands, with Vice President-elect Ky carrying out such duties as may be assigned to him. Here again there is a question as to whether the evolution will be in accord with the constitutional pattern. But the opportunity for the creation of a new system is there if the President-elect has the statesmanship to carry through on the basis of the hopeful start that has been made.

What effect the election will have upon the war is necessarily speculative at this time. The one certainty is a strong popular demand for peace. This was reflected in the emergence of an unknown Saigon lawyer, Truong Dinh Dzu, with the dove as his symbol, as the second runner in the presidential race. It was reflected also in the campaign promises of almost every candidate to seek an end of the war. The new President-elect himself is committed to a number of peace-seeking ventures.

There is, of course, a broad gulf between campaign talk and peace negotiations with a tough and unrelenting enemy. The chief element of new hope that rises out of the election is that it gives the newly elected government a firmer footing for the pursuit of negotiations.

For all these reasons the outcome of the election must be welcomed as a strong plus in the struggle to save South Vietnam as a political entity entitled to determine its own future.

Nigerian Events No Surprise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 12, 1967

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the civil war in Nigeria has had a minimum of attention from the press. Richard Pattee, a very knowledgeable columnist, commented on this subject in the September 1 edition of "The New World." I believe that his thoughtful comments are most timely and insert them in the RECORD at this point:

NIGERIAN EVENTS NO SURPRISE

(By Richard Pattee)

The events in Nigeria these days with a war between the central government at Lagos and the break-away state of Biafra, are certainly no surprise to anyone with the least knowledge of Africa. Since my own first hand knowledge of Africa is extremely limited, I am not sure of the extent to which commentators and "experts" were led to believing that things would go well on that continent once the dreadful British and French got out and left the management of affairs to the local gentry.

But from four visits to Africa, I find it a source of permanent wonderment that there could ever have been the sort of illusions that prevailed about the future of that area.

Nigeria was a case in point. Some months ago we had the violence in Kano and the north with the Ibo tribesmen massacred by the dominant Hausas. Now we have secession in the south and the prospect that the state of Biafra may actually make a go of independence and defeat the central government.

The difficulty is that almost all of these terms, even the ones I am using of "central government" and the like are almost meaningless in the African context. There is, of course, a national government at Lagos under Major Gowon.

But there is no meaning at all in equating this central authority with that exercised in Washington, Ottawa or Canberra. The names and labels are all there, but behind this facade there is almost nothing at all.

The peculiar insistence that there is something tragic about the falling apart of the Congo or Nigeria assumes that there was originally something logical about their existence as "national" states in the first place.

I have written before and repeat once again that nationhood presumes the existence of a nationality; of a community of some sort with reasonably compatible interests and a strong sense of association.

If you eliminate that, there is simply no cement to hold the bricks of a country together and it will inevitably fall into the natural arrangements that prevail in its own particular social and even political order.

The observers of Africa were proud of Nigeria as the model state. Events have taken care of that. A Nigerian leader can declare that within the boundaries of the country as presently constituted, there are tribes, running into the millions in number, as different one from the other as a Persian is from an Icelander.

The business of predicting what may happen in Africa is not excessively difficult. I have just returned in late July from a short revisit to that continent, to attend a conference held in Mozambique.

Once again, the impression was vivid as it has been since I first saw Africa in 1957; that the fundamental error is not the capacity of Africans or the possibility that their territories can become productive, but that they have been catapulted into a complex political and international society—not to mention a technical one—with which their own traditional institutions simply are incompatible. The result has to be a greater or lesser degree of chaos.

Nigeria seems to be moving toward a breakdown in which it is very possible that four or five states may emerge. It may not be such a disaster as is commonly imagined. At least the larger tribes whose hostility to each other is as traditional as that of French for Germans, will not be in each other's hair as they are now under to so-called "federalism."

Serious Pilot Shortages

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 12, 1967

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, recent hearings in the other body indicate that serious pilot shortages now exist in the Navy and Air Force and are expected to continue at least through the fiscal year 1971.

Many reasons are given to account for these shortages—failure to increase pilot training in time to meet the expanded needs of combat in Vietnam; the adverse effects of the war itself on the retention of pilots in service, and the intense recruiting of Air Force and Navy pilots by the civilian airlines.

It is also stated that the decision not to allow the Navy and the Air Force to call up their reserve pilots is likewise a factor in the shortages.

The Air Force is said to be suffering from a shortage of 6,815 pilots and would still have a shortage of 3,636 pilots in the fiscal year 1971.

The Navy also faces a shortage of 2,430 aviators, and this shortage, according to Admiral McDonald, would not be made up until 1974.

Officials say that these shortages have not affected air operations in Vietnam, but no doubt further checks will be made on this point to ascertain the facts, even though it is said that combat pilots have been maintained at 100 percent.

The Air Force states that it has been forced to return to flight status 2,400 officers who had been relieved from flight duty because they had reached the age of 45. The Air Force also testified that it has reduced the normal pilot manning levels of squadrons in the United States and Europe and cut back on the number of qualified pilots sent to advanced training schools.

It was testified by Admiral Miller, director of the Navy's Aviation Plans and Requirements Division, that the Navy had taken similar measures and that pilot manning levels in the carrier attack squadrons of the Atlantic and Mediterranean fleets were below the strength desired in case of an emergency. For security reasons, the exact strength of these squadrons cannot be publicly disclosed.

It further appears that since July 1962, the Air Force had requested an annual output of 3,000 pilots by 1966, and that in 1963 the Air Force had asked to build 3,400 pilots annually by 1968, but the request was disapproved and only 2,760 pilots by 1967 and 1968 were approved.

In July 1966, the Air Force asked the Defense Department to allow it to expand pilot training by 912 men over the 2,760-man level reached in the fiscal year just ended. Last December, however, the Department of Defense reduced this request by an additional 476 pilots.

Intense recruiting by private airlines was seriously affecting the ability of the Air Force to retain pilots in the service, and by last summer 80 percent of the pilots resigning from active duty said they were doing so to join the airlines. In 1966 the Air Force expected to lose only 638 pilots through resignations, but instead lost over 1,000. In previous years, the Air Force was able to retain for at least 6 years 70 percent of the pilots that it recruited. Now, however, it is testified that the proportion has fallen to 60 percent and appears to be declining further, and 67 percent of the pilots now leaving the Navy said they were doing so to join the airlines.

There are alarming implications in the testimony given to the committee of the other body, indicating that the Air Force and the Navy are paying a heavy price for certain, economy decisions that substantially scale down reliance on manned aircraft and put the overall defense of the United States more increasingly dependent on missile systems, and weaken our potential for coping with so-called brush and conventional wars, in which we are now engaged, although I do not want in any sense to minimize the seriousness of Vietnam, which is very costly in terms of young men, aircraft, Navy components like the *Forrestal*, which was so severely damaged with heavy loss of life and diminished prestige in the world for American arms, American policy, American know-how, and American judgment in handling its military and diplomatic problems.

I recognize that the administration has been continuing to make massive efforts to establish peace, and I have persistently joined these efforts to render every assistance in my power toward the goals of peace, not only in Vietnam, but elsewhere.

However, until fighting ceases and peace comes, we must zealously insist upon maintaining and building all necessary strength, and that is a duty we cannot take lightly, nor can we brush it under the table, and I am greatly concerned by present shortages of men and equipment, some of which have undoubtedly sprung from unfortunate miscalculations.

I do not wish to belabor these points at this time, rather, I want to urge again, as I have done so many times, that we intensify our efforts to keep strong at all levels, because much of the world, and unfortunately, much of the Nation, are aflame with revolutionary spirit, and we must make very sure that we are not lacking in any element of the overall power package that comprises total defense and the necessary potential of this country to face up to every contingency at home and abroad.

Missile systems, especially nuclear missile systems, are no answer to our present military engagements. In fact, they are no answer, in my judgment, to any of our problems, because their use in any event would be when we come in extremis, and would produce a horrifying holocaust on this earth that no person in his right mind would want to take the responsibility for.

Among other things, added to our international problems, we have the frightening problems at home of maintaining law and order in local communities and the several States, and this problem must receive top priority, and cannot be subordinated or neglected.

I am not going into the causes of lawlessness here, because they are known to the American people, to the extent they are sparked or augmented by social needs. We must move to close any existing gaps in national programs that are designed to attack and alleviate these deplorable conditions. At the same time we must demonstrate keenest awareness of all facets of these problems.

To the extent that subversive elements may be involved in inflaming public sentiment and inspiring lawlessness, we must move speedily into the breach and check and punish known malefactors that contemptuously and wantonly violate our laws. Above all, we must be ready to meet any contingency and emergency that arise, and we cannot afford to take chances or risks with the security, stability, law and order of this great free society of ours—the lives, the homes, the property of our people.

Let it not be said that this Congress has been unwilling to face up boldly to these problems of external and internal security, national defense, striking power, and peace because the American people are waiting and watching to see whether we, as their representatives in this body will carry out their mandate, as we should, or trifle with or delay in striving with all possible vigor, determination, sound judgment, and speed for necessary solutions.

I have pointed out the Congress must, and should, practice practical economy, wherever and whenever we can do so. This must be done in the interest of our taxpayers as well as in the interest of our great free economy and our vital, high standards of living. But our economy must not be practiced unsoundly at the expense of the national defense, national needs, or the imperative essential demands of this Government and this Nation.

Failure to keep strong and powerful, because of questionable economy would be a great mistake, just as lavish, unnecessary expense for defense, or any other purpose, would be a grave error and injustice to the American people.

The budget of no governmental activity should be beyond careful scrutiny by Congress to apply justified economy. But shortsighted, unjustified economy should not and cannot be practiced or exercised, and that is true in defense, and any other ncessary activity of this Government.

I hope that all high officials and all officials of Defense and every other department will have these principles in mind, so that if we avoid lavishness and imprudence in expenditures, we may likewise prevent peremptory, poorly conceived, unjustifiable cuts in critically important activities, and that goes for the Navy, the Air Force, the Army, the Defense Department, as well as all other departments and agencies of Government.

Youth Makes Sense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 12, 1967

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, David J. Kuter, of Fond du Lac, Wis., has received a great deal of recognition for his accomplishments in high school. All of this recognition is certainly well deserved.

In a recent speech to the Elks Grand Lodge Convention in Chicago, David made a great deal of sense when he talked about the youth of today. I take a great deal of pride in presenting here, for the information of my colleagues, an editorial from the Elks magazine of September 1967, which points to David Kuter's speech as being "remarkable for its clear and convincing insights."

I hope the Members of this great body will read and reflect upon the words of David Kuter, first-place winner in the national Elks youth leadership contest:

A MESSAGE FROM YOUTH

These are usually described as confused times, when people, especially young people, are badly mixed up, their sense of values lost or sadly distorted. The description is valid, but only to a certain extent. There was offered at the recent Grand Lodge Convention in Chicago reassurance that young America has kept a level head. Not everyone is confused.

The reassurance came in the talks that were made by the boys and girls who placed first in the Elks National Foundation Most Valuable Student scholarship competition and in the Youth Activities Committee's Elks National Youth Leadership contest. They all were splendid, and one was remarkable for its clear and convincing insights into what is going on in the minds of a large majority of American boys and girls. The speaker was David J. Kuter, 17, Fond du Lac, Wis., top boy in the Leadership contest.

"The typical image of today's generation is that of a carefree hippie, an ill-kempt collegian. But on a more unpublicized front, it is also a boy working in a stockroom to go to college, a youthful volunteer with retarded children, a prayerful entreaty to God for guidance, and a tingle of spirit as the flag goes by. Youth is a time of search . . . for a purpose, a direction. Out of this search comes a concern for nearly every facet of our society, from the bomb to morality to Vietnam to poverty. The essence of this is not that such youthful concern has just descended upon our socety, for every past generation has recognized such problems, but that for the first time American youth is able to act and exert its influence upon these problems.

"Long thought of as 'the leaders of the future', American youth presently is recognizing that it is a leader of today. Lacking the wisdom of personal experience, however, they rush to hasty decisions. . . . Lacking a direction, a purpose for the expression, undesirable consequences often arise. It is up to the elder generation to help reveal the true challenges and responsibilities of our times and to inject a purpose, a direction, into the lives of our youth. . . . This, I believe, is what the Elks are attempting in their youth programs. With the grace of God and the concern of adults such as you for youth, our world will be better."

How different these words from the sullen self-indulgence manifested by those unfortunate and unwashed young people, who, as this young man pointed out, too often get the headlines. We hope that adults everywhere will take David Kuter's words to heart and build bigger and better youth programs.

Tougher Job Corps Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 12, 1967

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct the attention of my colleagues to a very informative article about the Job Corps which appeared in the August 10, 1967, edition of the New York Times. The article is entitled "Tougher Training," and it describes the "new" Job Corps. By "new" Job Corps, I mean that it is a different Job Corps than the Job Corps of only a year ago. The Job Corps has been tightened up and the results have been very good.

The cost per enrollee per man-year has dropped to $6,950, and is expected to go down to $6,700 in fiscal year 1968. This is well below the congressionally imposed ceiling of $7,500. Job Corps has also wiped out most of the criticism it got from communities with centers near them. Many former critics now have only praise for the Job Corps. And this well-deserved praise has been merited by the hard work and the good example of those associated with the various centers. Critics have also maintained that the Job Corps was a costly failure, but since its beginning in January of 1965, over 95,000 youths have been in the Job Corps for varying periods. Of that total, 70 percent are either working, in school, or in the military. When you consider that these Corps members were the "Hardest core of the hard core poor," the 70-percent figure is quite respectable.

Yes, the Job Corps has had its problems. But any beginning program will have problems, too. When you consider what the Job Corps has accomplished to date, it is a highly commendable record. The "new" Job Corps, today's Job Corps, is an efficient, well-run organization performing an excellent job of human reclamation. I salute the "new" Job Corps, and urge my colleagues to support it in its very worthwhile efforts.

At this point, I insert the article from the New York Times, which points out the progress of the Job Corps, in the RECORD:

TOUGHER TRAINING: EMBATTLED JOB CORPS TIGHTENS UP DISCIPLINE, IMPROVES ITS PROGRAMS—BUT CRITICS IN CONGRESS ARE NUMEROUS STILL—REWORKING THE HARD CORE OF THE POOR—THE NEW LIFE OF BOB PARRIS

(By Stanley W. Penn)

Theodore Nelson, director of the Rodman Job Corps Center, in New Budford, Mass., is called "Sundown" Nelson by his charges. Make a lot of trouble, they say, and you'll find yourself out of the center by nightfall.

At the Kilmer Job Corps Center in Edison, N.J., Director D. L. Webber has gotten tough, too. Clamping down on rowdyism, he has formed elite groups of selected enrollees at the center who act as a sort of military police. They are regularly dispatched to neighboring towns to keep fellow corpsmen out of trouble during leisure hours.

Both directors took control of their camps only last year, after complaints about the behavior of corpsmen. The New Bedford City Council threatened to kick the Job Corps out of town, and numerous gripes about drunkenness and disorderly conduct by Kilmer enrollees were being lodged by local citizens. Now tougher discipline and greater attention to the niceties of social behavior are paying off at both camps. Complaints about rowdy corpsmen have declined and an increasing number of enrollees are completing their job-training programs.

THEIR JOB IS JOBS

This tightening-up is being repeated at many of the 123 Job Corps centers, where some 41,000 youths aged 16 to 22 are enrolled. As a unit of the antipoverty program's chief agency, the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO), the corps is charged with providing basic education and job training for poorly schooled, unemployed and underemployed youths, who generally take six to nine months to complete the program. Most of the urban centers are managed by corporations under contract with the OEO.

The tougher approach is, in large part, a response to an increasing drumfire of Congressional criticism of the management of the Job Corps and the whole OEO. At this point, in fact, the corps now faces the biggest threat yet to its existence.

A House Republican group wants to abolish the entire OEO, on the ground that it has been grossly mismanaged. The Job Corps has become a favorite target. Rep. Charles Goodell (R., N.Y.), a leader of the House group, points to recurring discipline problems at Job Corps camps and allegedly excessive training costs as proof that the corps has botched its job and should give up its occupational training to the Health, Education and Welfare Department. Rep. Goodell contends HEW could do the job better and cheaper.

BITTER FUNDING BATTLE DUE

Administration forces probably can beat back any attempt to destroy OEO itself, but it's not certain they can preserve and expand the Job Corps—considered by friend and foe alike as one of the OEO programs most vulnerable to the Congressional ax. At the very least, the Administration can expect a bitter battle over its request for $2 billion for OEO in the current fiscal year, an increase of $400,000 from last year's allotment. And one of the separate programs most likely to draw the attention of budget pruners is the Job Corps, which is asking for $295 million this year. Last year it got $211 million.

It's hardly surprising, then, that the corps has been trying so hard to clean house. Its new boss, National Director William P. Kelly, concedes that much needed to be done, and that the staff of the centers had been far too easygoing. "There was too much permissiveness," he says. "When kids know that they're expected to do, they're happy; when they don't they're not." Mr. Kelly, a squarely built man with a crew cut, got his job only last January. He is the third director in less than three years.

Mr. Kelly claims the corps is now beginning to shake down into a far more efficient operation. He says operating costs per enrollee fell from $8,000 in fiscal 1966 to $6,900 in the fiscal year ended June 30—below the Congressionally imposed ceiling of $7,300. A big increase in enrollment since the beginning of year accounts for much of the decline in the per-capita figure, though.

A CENTER CLOSES

The corps also has taken a variety of steps to win over hostile communities, improve efficiency and remove discipline problems. Only one center has been closed permanently because of complaints from the community—a woman's center in St. Petersburg, Fla.—but gripes have been heated and numerous in many locations.

At least two men's urban centers have changed managements after various complaints. General Precision Equipment Corp., Tarrytown, N.Y., last year took over the Breckinridge Job Corps facility at Morganfield, Ky., from the original contractor, Southern Illinois University. Westinghouse Electric Corp. replaced Midwest Educational Foundation, also last year, as operator of the Atterbury Job Corps Center in Edinburg, Ind.

Also, some contractors have been forced to replace their center directors. Packard-Bell Electronic Corp., Los Angeles, named a new director of the center it manages to Albuquerque, N.M., in February after a woman student became pregnant and newspaper stories stated that the father was probably a center staff member who had been discharged earlier. Other allegations included the charge that some of the training courses the girls were supposed to take didn't exist. (The OEO concedes this and says the courses now are offered.)

The directors of Job Corps camps seem to be taking advantage of powers given them by Congress last fall to kick out troublemakers. Previously, permission from Washington was required for such action, though some directors say they had been doing it all along on their own.

At Kilmer, which is operated by International Telephone & Telegraph Corp., Director Webber says he has discharged about 100 enrollees since he got there, for offenses ranging from possession of weapons and marijuana to absence without approval and sexual deviation. "Without the authority to go with the responsibility, your hands are tied," says Mr. Webber.

Robert J. Hadden, director of the Atterbury Job Corps center, says that when taking over for Westinghouse last year he found that troublemakers at the camp were driving out boys who wanted to learn. So he began kicking out the offenders—some 250 have been discharged since he took control—"taking strong action with a few in order to make it beneficial for the many." He also levies fines of 50 cents for every class they miss. Attendance has improved considerably, he says.

Community relations are getting more attention at many centers. Mrs. Henry Fleischer, who lives across the road from the Kilmer center, says that "the boys used to walk across our property and ruin our flowers, and stay up all night making lots of noise." Mr. Webber, however, straightened that out. He visited Mrs. Fleischer, ordered a cleanup of litter and bottles left by corpsmen, and stopped the noise at night. "All they needed was a little discipline," says Mrs. Fleischer, who now serves as a volunteer tutor for some of the camp's slow readers.

BRECKINRIDGE PRAISED

The Breckinridge camp, which had a riot in 1965, has also been put under tighter rein. Recently a police chief in a nearby community wrote a letter to the Job Corps in Washington, praising the center and the enrollees.

To keep discipline problems to a minimum, the Job Corps now is rigorously screening all applicants. Youths with records of "violent antisocial behavior" are barred. In the past, they weren't.

Still, some discipline problems persist. Recently, 12 enrollees at McCook Job Corps Center in McCook, Neb., were discharged after a half-hour brawl involving scores of corpsmen. Many others left voluntarily. Even "Sundown" Nelson at the Rodman Camp in New Bedford has had his troubles. There was a minor disturbance there last week.

Though the corps has received harsh criticism for its discipline problems, an even more serious charge is leveled by its detractors—namely, that it has failed to do its basic job of redeeming lives that otherwise probably would be wasted.

The corps' own statistics show that in fiscal 1967 some 40% of its enrollees either left voluntarily or were kicked out before serving even three months. Critics see this high dropout rate as another indication that the corps is a costly flop, and there are those who charge that the dropouts may be worse off than before as a result of their brief stints in corps camps.

REINFORCING FAILURE?

Christopher Weeks, a one-time aide to OEO boss Sargent Shriver and author of a recently released book, Job Corps, puts it this way: "The kid is told when he joins that this is a last-ditch attempt to salvage him. So in his first day at camp, he's beaten up; his stuff is swiped the second day; after 10 days he goes home. The corps has reinforced a failure."

Mr. Weeks applauds the basic aim of the corps, but he too believes that it is not functioning effectively. There isn't enough attention to quality, he contends, and far too much attention to quantity—pushing large numbers of trainees through programs of doubtful effectiveness.

National Director Kelly says many who criticize the corps don't comprehend the difficulties inherent in making useful citizens out of the "hardest core of the hard-core poor." He ticks off a stream of figures: 4 of 10 corpsmen are from families on relief; 3 of 10 cannot read or write; more than 1 in 10 has been convicted of a crime; 6 of 10 are from broken homes, and 8 of 10 haven't seen a doctor or a dentist in the past 10 years. Sometimes, he says, the corps must try to undertake physical rehabilitation before it can think about training an enrollee for a job.

HOMESICKNESS

These youths, from ghetto slums and rural areas, are taken far from home and installed in centers where they live and work. Many have felt unwelcome in these "alien" communities and have quit. Others have given up after finding that center staffs weren't properly equipped to give them the needed instruction.

The racial mix is explosive, too. Roughly 55% of Job Corps enrollees are Negroes, many of them from such urban poverty areas as Watts and Harlem. Many of the white enrollees are Southerners. "Getting these to live together in racially integrated dormitories on a voluntary basis is certainly no easy task, even for an expert in social psychology," says Sar A. Levitan, an economist who is writing a book on the antipoverty program.

Given all these difficulties, says Director Kelly, it's hardly surprising that there is a high dropout rate. To him, it's more significant that the rate has declined sharply to 40% from the 65% dropout rate that prevailed during the 1965–66 period.

How many corps graduates are finding and keeping jobs? The corps doesn't have complete follow-through information, but Mr. Kelly offers some data to support his contention that the corps has made a definite contribution to the well-being of its enrollees.

As of May 1, he says, 75,000 youths had been in the corps for varying periods since its beginning in January 1965. Of that total, 70% were either working, in school, or in military service. Those working were averaging $1.71 an hour in pay, compared with the $1.19 average hourly rate of those youths who were working before they joined the corps. Mr. Kelly considers this 70% figure a high batting average. Critics claim the corps figures aren't reliable.

Critics also have maintained that the corps has washed its hands of its graduates after training them, making little effort to actually find jobs for them. Now the corps and its contractor-operators are making a great deal more effort.

Some centers have set up placement bureaus. "Right now we're getting jobs for 86% of our graduates," says Director Hadden of the Atterbury camp. Westinghouse, the Atterbury contractor, is hiring a number and so are the company's suppliers and customers. The Urban League is aiding in placements, too.

MIXED RESULTS AT FORD

At Kilmer, officials have been inviting employers to the camp, and some have hired graduates. Ford Motor Co. has employed several at its Metuchen, N.J., assembly plant. The results have been mixed.

Ford is very happy with Bob Parris, 21, who has been working for it since October. He makes $130 a week now, compared with the $30 a week he made as stock boy in his home town of Damascus, Va., before joining the corps, and he drives his own car. "I love my job," he says. "Kilmer gave me a little more knowledge about the world—about living, working and associating with colored people." Bob is white.

But two other Kilmer grads left Ford after a month because they were homesick and another vanished after four months. "He just disappeared—never showed up, never said anything," reports a Ford man.

Mr. Nelson, the Rodman center director, notes that the corps only has a year or less to train its boys, and believes that, considering this, results have been generally favorable. He says: "Our mission is to get them employable, not to turn out a highly finished product. Sometimes the statistics can be confusing. You have to look at these boys when they come in—hostile, undereducated, not sure they want any of this stuff, not really believing they'll make it. When they graduate, the attitude has changed. They want to succeed."

Prayer and Benediction Offered at Dedication of James A. Farley Junior High School, Stony Point, N.Y.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 12, 1967

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, on July 12, I had the privilege of placing in the RECORD the text of an address delivered by the Honorable James A. Farley on the occasion of the dedication of a junior high school at Stony Point, N.Y., named in his honor. At that time the prayer and benediction offered by the Reverend William R. F. Thomas, of St. John the Divine, Tomkins Cove, N.Y., was not available. I include the prayer and benediction at this point in the RECORD:

DEDICATION OF THE JAMES A. FARLEY JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL—PRAYER AND BENEDICTION

O Thou Great God of All our Days and Years, by whose mercies we are spared and by whose power we are sustained, we thank Thee for this day so significant in the life of our highly esteemed and dearly beloved Servant whom we delight to honor and upon whom we are bestowing heartfelt praise and affection of his many years for outstanding service and achievement.

We rejoice with one another as we contemplate the glorious privilege of walking and working with one of our fellow citizens whose integrity of character, lofty idealism, devotion to duty, and humility of spirit inspire us with confidence and courage as we also seek to serve our God, our country, and all mankind.

Grant that his own heart may be filled with joy and peace as he continues to accept the challenge of tasks which demand the consecration of his noblest manhood. We pray that at the close of each day he may receive the benediction which Thou dost give unto the faithful.

To Thy name we ascribe all the praise for the joys which cheer us and the trials which teach us to put our trust in Thee.

Almighty God, we beseech Thee with thy gracious favor to behold our universities, colleges, and schools, that knowledge may be increased among us, and all good learning flourish and abound. Bless all who teach and all who learn; and grant that in humility of heart they may ever look unto thee, who art the fountain of all wisdom; through Jesus Christ our Lord.

Unto God's gracious mercy and protection we commit ourselves. The Lord bless us and keep us. The Lord make his face up to shine upon us and be gracious unto us. The Lord lift up the light of his countenance upon us, and give us peace, both now and for evermore. Amen.

Bogus Products

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 16, 1967

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the August 21, 1967, Milwaukee Sentinel on counterfeit products:

The seizure in Kenosha last week of $26,000 in counterfeit currency serves as a reminder that there is another kind of counterfeiting that is almost as damaging to the American economy and costly to the consumer. That is the counterfeiting of products.

Unscrupulous men have made and sold inferior and unsafe products, marketing them under the trademark or label of a reputable company. Innocent purchasers have been thus cheated in buying fake and inferior radio and television tubes, perfumes, shirts, towels, cough and cold preparations (of which there are some 200 on the market).

Bogus products victimize unsuspecting buyers not only by taking their money but by endangering their health and safety. A few years ago, three persons were killed by the failure of truck brakes, which turned out to be marked with the fake trademark of a major manufacturer.

In 1962, Congress outlawed the transportation, sale or receipt of phonograph records bearing forged or counterfeit labels. In 1965, congress was persuaded by the drug industry, plagued by widespread illicit traffic in counterfeit depressant and stimulant drugs in interstate commerce, to amend the food and drug act by making it a federal crime to manufacture, transport or sell such counterfeit drugs.

The consumer defrauded by counterfeit products can seek his remedy by a civil suit. But this is little protection against an unprincipled defendant, who can charge the suit off as a minor business expense, while continuing to defraud thousands of other consumers. State and local laws might offer little practical protection against the product counterfeiter.

Congress has only scratched the surface of the program. Today, the counterfeiting of only three items is outlawed by federal law—money, drugs and phonograph records. Congress should consider an all-inclusive product counterfeit law.

Public Television Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 12, 1967

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I am hopeful that the House will soon begin consideration of the Public Television Act. This very important legislation was the subject of extensive hearings before my Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. As a member of the committee and as a Congressman from Maryland, where we are now embarked on the construction of a statewide interconnected educational television facility, I was very interested in the arguments in favor of this legislation and am now eager to see the House take final and favorable action in accordance with the committee's recommendation.

Among those testifying in favor of this bill was Dr. Frederick Breitenfeld, Jr., the executive director of the Maryland Educational-Cultural Broadcasting Commission. Because I believe his testimony would be of interest to my colleagues, I include Dr. Breitenfeld's statement in the Appendix to the RECORD:

STATEMENT OF DR. FREDERICK BREITENFELD, JR., EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, MARYLAND EDUCATIONAL-CULTURAL BROADCASTING COMMISSION, IN SUPPORT OF H.R. 6736, ON BEHALF OF STATE EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION AUTHORITIES, BEFORE THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. Chairman, members of the Committee, it is a priviledge to appear before you in support of HR 6736 introduced by the Chairman. I am here as vice chairman of an association of State Educational Television Authorities. The organization is affiliated with the Educational Television Stations Division of the National Association of Educational Broadcasters, and is made up of chief executive officers of the scores of state ETV agencies and authorities across the country.

My mission here is to urge favorable consideration of the Bill on behalf of my colleagues in this association. By the way, Mr. Chairman, I note with some pride that more than half of the members of this distinguished committee represent states that are affiliated with our association.

As you well know, there are basically four kinds of noncommercial education television licensees. First, private corporations, developed specifically to own and to operate educational television stations, are now prevalent across the country. Examples of these "community" stations include those in Boston, New York, Philadelphia, Washington, Chicago, Los Angeles, San Francisco, Pittsburgh, St. Louis and dozens of others.

Secondly, school systems own educational television stations. There are more than twenty stations across the country owned by public school systems.

Universities own educational television stations and there are more than thirty of these now on the air. All but a very few are public or state universities.

Finally, ETV stations, and some networks, are owned and operated by states and state authorities. A previous witness, Mr. Raymond Hurlbert, described one of these state systems, the Alabama ETV network. There are many other state licensees across the country with several stations and networks being planned or constructed at this time. With your permission, I am attaching to this testimony a list of State Educational Television Authorities as taken from the directory and yearbook of Educational Broadcasting, published by the National Association of Educational Broadcasters. Many are actual licensees, and some act in advisory capacities. The point here is that many states have already made administrative and financial commitments to this important instrumentality.

The Bill currently under consideration is one in which it is proposed that public federal funds be devoted to the development and support of educational television across the country. The point I would like to stress is that the appropriation of public money to educational television is not new. As a school system becomes an ETV licensee, for example, it devotes local public funds to noncommercial broadcasting. As a state university becomes involved in ETV it, too, uses public funds and in many instances even "community" stations realize substantial amounts of income from public sources, as with contractual arrangements made with schools or other public agencies.

Research carried on during the past year by the organization of State Educational Television Authorities indicates that more than two dozen states in the Union have made financial commitments to ETV. More than $51 million had been appropriated by individual states by the middle of 1966. Among those states appropriating funds, the average was more than $2,300,000.

Several states, as a matter of fact, are planning or are now operating ETV networks. My own state of Maryland is planning to build seven ETV transmitters, all of which will be capable of full color operation. We hope to include a multiplexed FM system.

The state system in Nebraska, as another example, includes several stations on the air now, and the flagship operation in Lincoln is nationally known as a leader in ETV.

Kentucky is building an eleven-station network which promises to have a significant educational impact on the citizens of that State.

The state system in South Carolina is well known, includes both closed circuit and braodcast stations, and presently reaches virtually every school child in the state.

The Alabama network, as described by Mr. Hurlbert, was the first in the nation and has proven itself to be a vital part of Alabama's educational system. Development work is also underway in many other states.

The educational services to be rendered through electronic media can be compared in many respects with those provided by state universities. The presence of public funds, as appropriated by legislatures, has provided the necessary and firm operational pedestal so sorely needed, and the fears of political overtones have been allayed.

The Carnegie Commission on Educational Television suggested that the combination of public and private funds provides for health among ETV stations, and that combination, we feel, must include federal as well as state and local public support.

Peskoe's Dedication Pays Off

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 12, 1967

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, it takes a dedicated and determined man to fight the establishment. Too often, discouraged by the frustrations of bureaucratic redtape and run-around, the average citizen simply gives up. But Mr. Irving Peskoe, of Homestead, Fla., is not an ordinary citizen. He believed that telephone tolls between Homestead and Miami were hindering the growth of his community and he set out to have the tolls removed. His fight took 3 long and tedious years, but in the end he was successful and, as of this past Sunday, it is no longer a long-distance call between Homestead and Miami.

The South Dade News Leader commended Mr. Peskoe in an editorial, and I join the paper in its congratulations to this public-spirited man:

PESKOE'S DEDICATION PAYS OFF FOR ALL OF US

South Dade has big dreams and you often hear a lot of big talk about things that are "going to be" in this area.

The big dreams and big talk are fine, but what we need are more men that can turn these big ideas into concrete achievements.

One such man who was able to do just that is Irving Peskoe, a Homstead attorney. He believed that telephone tolls on calls between Homestead and Miami were slowing down the area's growth. They were discouraging business, and industry, and new residents from moving into the Homestead area. By locating just a few miles closer to Miami, new-comers had toll-free access to almost all the telephones in the huge metropolitan Miami area.

Acting as chairman of a committee appointed by the South Dade Council of the Miami-Dade Chamber of Commerce, Mr. Peskoe went to work in 1962 to have the tolls lifted. He formed a committee and attended countless hearings all over the state, and devoted hundreds of hours to meetings, phone calls, and letter writing.

Victory came in 1965 when the Public Service Commission ordered the telephone company to remove all tolls. The order has resulted in a $4 million expenditure by the telephone company for trunk lines to connect Miami's exchanges. The equipment has been installed and toll-free service will go into effect on Sunday.

Irving Peskoe realized that a growing community is a prosperous community and his contribution to the growth of the Homestead-Florida City community is great indeed. His dedication will reward all of us with an economically healthier and more thriving community.

Bolstering State and Local Law Enforcement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH GREEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 11, 1967

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, with the passage of H.R. 11816, the House has taken an important step toward recognizing the Federal Government's responsibility in bolstering the position of State and local law enforcement officers.

This legislation would provide Federal compensation to a law enforcement officer injured while attempting to apprehend a person suspected of committing a Federal crime. Were the law enforcement officer to be killed, the Federal payments would go to his family.

The significance of this bill, however, is not in the extent of its coverage.

As the Judiciary Committee report points out, a total of 278 police officers were killed in the line of duty between 1960 and 1965. Of these, 13 died while attempting to enforce Federal laws.

The significance of this bill is that the Federal Government is acknowledging that it has a moral responsibility in the area of local law enforcement.

The President's Crime Commission report, the International Association of Chiefs of Police, and the International Conference of Police Associations have pointed to many problems facing law enforcement officers. Among them are:

Pay is often low. Fringe benefits are sometimes minimal. Criminal detection equipment is sometimes badly outdated. These and many other problems discourage continued recruitment of the highly qualified persons needed in the law enforcement field.

During the last few years, a growing concern has been evident that something must be done at all levels of Government to help improve the highly important and necessary function within our society.

Perhaps the most important events that have turned the national spotlight to the problems of police officers have been the ever-increasing numbers of riots in our cities.

The increasing numbers of riots which have spotlighted the problems of law enforcement officers, have also focused national attention on the plight of firemen called to quell these blazes.

These tragic and disruptive explosions have been accompanied by looting and fires. Property damage often runs to millions of dollars.

Over the last 3 years, according to the International Association of Fire Fighters, four men have been killed and 436 injured battling these riot-caused blazes.

In several instances, snipers have shot at firefighters attempting to protect life and property. One can only guess at how the gunfire added to the number of these injuries and deaths.

As a sponsor of legislation which would provide Federal compensation to law enforcement officers and firefighters, I am pleased to support the bill which today passed the House. However, I believe strongly that the Government has the same responsibility to firefighters.

Therefore, I plan to introduce legislation to give the firefighter this same compensation.

What a Small Part Kings and Laws Can Cure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 12, 1967

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, a most penetrating editorial appeared in the Red Wing, Minn., Daily Republican Eagle, for August 30, 1967. The theme is that of all the ills of society, comparatively few can be solved only through the action of government. The editorial draws attention to a statement made by my colleague on the Education and Labor Committee, Congresswoman EDITH GREEN. In a recent television program, Mrs. GREEN recalled an ancient truth: "Of all that human hearts endure, what a small part kings and laws can cure."

Mr. Speaker, we have passed numerous laws in recent years designed to guarantee equality to those who have been denied equal treatment. The series of laws we have passed have not and certainly cannot legislate what goes on in the hearts and minds of men. However, certain laws were necessary.

Now we must begin the really difficult task of changing the ingrained beliefs which have penetrated the very heart and soul of many Americans. It will take the wholehearted cooperation of every facet of American society—the churches, business and industry, the foundations, the family—to reorientate the heart and to root out the false and long-held beliefs which are such a handicap to this Nation. It will be a long and difficult road we travel together. But we must travel together. There is no other way to go.

As the editorial writer stated: "but the real problem is within the human heart."

Mr. Speaker, the editorial follows:

WHAT A SMALL PART KINGS AND LAWS

Mrs. Edith Green is the Democratic congresswoman from Oregon who successfully amended the federal school aid bill last spring to accomplish much of what First district Rep. Al Quie was seeking through his well publicized but unsuccessful "block grant" amendment.

Mrs. Green shares Quie's desire to loosen the federal strings on local school boards and give the states more say in how and where federal aid to elementary and secondary education is spent. In a Washington TV interview July 30, Mrs. Green remarked: ". . . to say all wisdom and all good judgment and all innovative ideas reside in Washington is sheer nonsense."

Mrs. Green applies this thinking also to the Anti-Poverty program. And here, it should be pointed out, the organization is so structured as to encourage local initiative and imagination in shaping the program. Groups like the Zumbrota-based Goodhue-Rice-Wabasha Community Action Council are an ideal place for originating ways and means of helping low income people lift themselves out of poverty.

In this July 30 TV conversation, Mrs. Green cited an old saying: "Of all that human hearts endure, what a small part kings and laws can cure." Speaking as a member of Congress, Mrs. Green added: "So we can pass legislation, but there remains so much to be done at the local level that the law will never touch."

How true this is!

We think, for example, of the curse of racial discrimination in this country. Congress, state legislatures, city councils can and should pass anti-discrimination laws, but the real problem is within the human heart. What's needed is the individual business executive who takes it upon himself to see that his firm extends a positive welcome to Negro job applicants; the union leader who stands up and says that the practice of barring Negroes from apprenticeship training must cease; the housewife who makes a special trip down the street to welcome a Negro family newly arrived in the neighborhood.

Or take that Urban Coalition that met in "emergency convocation" in Washington last Thursday. Some 1,200 of America's greatest names—Henry Ford, Walter Reuther, etc.—called for a million more jobs, a million new homes, better schools, and more job training to rescue America's cities from the disorders we've seen this summer. The Urban Coalition looked to Congress for action, but it's real call was for each city to form its own coalition of leaders in business, labor, education, religion, and government to go about achieving social justice on the local scene. New York Mayor John Lindsay urged the Urban Coalition to "begin by thinking in terms of one. One man. One woman. One child. One job. One home. . . ."

And so there it is—the responsibility for our own community rests squarely with us. No use asking, "Why dont they . . .?' because there isn't any "they"—only "we."

But federal programs, federal funds are quite properly used in this local, community effort. They are entirely legitimate tools. The DRE has burned up its own share of ink and newsprint criticizing federal programs, and such criticism is fair enough when viewing the question from a national standpoint, as a congressman should or a voter at election time. But from a local standpoint, in moving to meet our community problems of low incomes, of inadequate job opportunity, of squalid living conditions, we should make no bones about using federal antipoverty funds, federal urban renewal, federal rent supplement money, federally subsidized housing, etc., etc. But while federal tools may help toward this or that objective, community-building remains a task for community initiative and indivdual enterprse. "What a small part kings and laws can cure!"

The Late Dr. John L. Taylor

SPEECH

OF

HON. JAMES A. HALEY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 30, 1967

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, the death of Dr. John L. Taylor has removed from the House of Representatives and from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs one of the ablest congressional staff members I have ever known. He served as staff consultant to the Committee on Territorial and Indian Affairs for almost 14 years, and was known throughout the Federal Government as a leading authority in these two fields. Dr. Taylor was a man of great ability and integrity, and his services will be greatly missed and his loss deeply felt by all of us who have been privileged to know him.

I became closely associated with Dr. Taylor when I became chairman of the Indian Affairs Subcommittee in January 1955, at the beginning of the 84th Congress. He was a wonderful person to work with, and I knew him not only as a capable adviser but also as a genial traveling companion. Over the last 12 years, we made numerous long and tiring trips together throughout the West, visiting Indian reservations and conducting field hearings on Indian legislation. Thus, I know firsthand the importance of his contribution to the Indian people and to legislation relating to the various Indian tribes. I was continuously impressed by his special sense of dedication and his cheerful and optimistic outlook on life. His great concern for his fellow man and his intense desire to be of service made him especially qualified to deal with our Indian people.

Even with all of the energy and dedication he gave to his work, Dr. Taylor still found time to serve his community and enjoy a full life with his family. Mrs. Haley and I want to extend our deepest sympathy to his wife, Virginia, and to his five children.

The U.S. Soldier: What A Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 11, 1967

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I was very much impressed with the following editorial which appeared in the Mountain City, Tenn., Tomahawk, and I want to call it to the attention of my colleagues and the readers of the Record:

The U.S. Soldier: What A Man!

(Reprint from the Christian Standard)

The average age of the combat soldier in many units in Vietnam is under 19. And what a man he is!

A pale-cheeked, bushy-haired, tight-muscled fellow, who, under normal circumstances, would be considered by society as half-man, half-boy, not yet dry behind the ears—a pain in the unemployment chart.

But, here and now, he is the beardless hope of the free man. When he walks by Old Glory he salutes it. Doing so he is paying respect not just to a piece of cloth; but he is honoring the many brave fighting men before him who have fought, bled, and died that our nation might continue to be one nation under God. He also respects those of higher rank and those who are his elders.

He does not demonstrate or carry a poster in front of his commander's tent during off-duty time. He does not throw rocks at jeep windows or fellow GI's when he does not get his way. He listens. He has heat in the day and accepts mortars at night.

He probably graduated from high school within the past year, received so-so grades, played a little football, and had a girl who broke up with him when he went overseas or who swears she is still faithful.

He has learned to like beer by now because it is cold, and because drinking beer is "the thing to do". He smokes because he gets free cigarettes in his C (Combat) ration package, and smoking is also "the thing to do". But many GI's respect their bodies as the temples of God and refrain from doing "the thing to do". He is a private first class, a one-year military veteran with one more to go. His eyes are clear, but his future is not.

He still has trouble spelling, and writing letters home is a painful process. But he can break down a rifle in thirty seconds and put it back together in twenty-nine. He can describe the nomenclature of a fragmentation grenade, explain how a machine gun or an M-14 and M-16 rifle operates, and, of course, utilize all of them when the need arises.

He can also perspire. He can dig a foxhole, apply professional first aid to a wounded companion, march until he is told to stop, or stop until he is told to march. And he is not there marching on some fellow citizens to cause trouble. His mission there is to stop trouble.

He obeys now, without hesitation. But he is not broken.

He has seen more suffering than he should have in his short life. He has seen his buddies lost arms and legs, eyes and hands. He has stood among hills of bodies, and he helped to construct those hills.

He has wept in private and in public, and he has not been ashamed, because his buddies have fallen in battle and he has come close to going with them.

And he has become self-sufficient; he has two pairs of fatigues, washes one and wears the other. He sometimes forgets to brush his teeth, but never his rifle. He keeps his socks dry and his canteen full. He can cook his own meals, fix his own hurts, and mend his own rips—material or mental.

He will share his water with you if you thirst, break his rations in half if you hunger, split his ammunition if you are fighting for your life. If you talk like you would like to burn your draft card or to protest the draft, he will blacken both your eyes with one hand while still holding his rifle in firing position. He is a U.S. Soldier fighting in Vietnam.

Under nineteen years of age—what a man he is! He is a true American.

Firearms Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 12, 1967

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I submit for inclusion in the Appendix of the Congressional Record an excellent statement on firearms legislation prepared by the National Shooting Sports Foundation. The statement follows:

Firearms Legislation

The liberal dose of cure-all firearms legislation which was administered to Philadelphians more than two years ago has yet to produce any measurable effect on the social ills of crime and violence there.

But the city's anti-crime prescription did produce measurable side-effects, and Philadelphia's firearms dealers are still feeling the misdirected impact of the restrictive gun ordinance.

Firearms sales, which declined by as much as 90 per cent following passage of the ordinance in April of 1965, have failed to rebound sufficiently to support even the survivors of the initial slump in the gun business. A survey being conducted by the National Shooting Sports Foundation, Inc., shows more city dealers laying off employes, cosing out firearms inventories and even closing their doors as a result of the law.

This loss to Philadelphia's retail business community has not been justified by any measurable improvement in the city's crime problem, however.

On the contrary, criminal homicide during the two years after the law was passed showed an increase over the same period of time prior to the law. The number of homicides rose from 332, during the 24 months before the law, to 389 in the 24-month period following its passage, an increase of 17.2 per cent.

The annual sale of some 28,000 firearms in the city during 1964 has now dwindled to an estimated 5,000 a year. The loss of these legitimate gun sales and even more important, the loss of sales in related retail items, has already cost the city more than $1 million in tax revenue, according to dealer surveys.

Dealers contacted in the NSSF survey report 1967 sales are running even lower than the 1966 figures.

During the past year, three major dealers went out of business or closed their firearms counters. Two others relocated outside of the city.

Action by the large department stores in Philadelphia showed the effect of the declining firearms business in the city. Gimbels closed its gun department during 1966. Sears, Roebuck & Co. moved its stock to suburban outlets and no longer sells firearms in the city. Wanamaker's has halted handgun sales. The store continues to sell rifles and shotguns but plans to close its firearms department when its present inventory is sold out.

The Public Sports Shop in downtown Philadelphia reported 1967 firearms sales off 60 to 65 per cent from 1966. One employee was laid off in 1966, another this year. On October 1, the store will close its doors after 42 years in business.

The M & H Sporting Goods chain estimates a 60 per cent slump in sales from 1966 in three Philadelphia stores. One store in the city was closed this year.

Pearson's closed a store in 1966. The gun department in its remaining store will close probably in the next year. The dealer reports sales off 25 per cent from 1966 and 45 per cent since the restrictive gun law was adopted.

One major manufacturer of sporting shotguns and rifles reported business off 70 per cent over 1966 in Philadelphia, with a grand total of only 21 rifles and shotguns sold in the city during the first six months of this year.

According to the Uniform Crime Report—1966, issued by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, there were 3,243,370 serious crimes committed in the United States last year.

Firearms were involved in only 3.4 per cent of these crimes.

The F.B.I. lists as serious crimes: homicide; aggravated assault; robbery; forcible rape; burglary; larceny ($50 and over); and auto theft.

Redwood National Park

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 12, 1967

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, as cosponsor of the Redwood National Park bill, I was most gratified to have brought to my attention a letter to the editor which appeared in the Berkshire Eagle, of Pittsfield, Mass., the Boston Globe, and the Boston Herald. This letter sets forth most compelling arguments for preserving our majestic redwoods.

Mr. F. Stanley Mikelk, noted conservationist and chairman of the board of selectmen, Hardwick, Mass., writer of the letter, has long been a militant champion of the endangered redwoods and has won many conservation awards for his outstanding contributions in this field.

Mr. Mikelk states his case for the redwoods very convincingly and I include his letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It is inconceivable to me that anyone, having once laid eyes on a forest of redwoods, could fail to be moved by these most unusual and stately trees. They are a rare species that are quite unique in the flora of this country and the world; and it is my belief that our Nation cannot permit them to die out.

It is clear from the evidence that we have before us that unless something is done the time may be, in the not too distant future, when these giant trees will become extinct, and that, to my mind, would be a national tragedy of surpassing dimensions that this Nation must avert, if we possibly can, and thus preserve these unusual, beautiful, huge trees for posterity. The letter follows:

[From the Boston Globe, June 23, 1967]

ACT TO SAVE THE REDWOODS

The present "zero hour in the redwoods" points up the compelling necessity of examining the role of the principals engaged in the controversy over saving some of our last acres of the world's largest trees.

As the tallest living things, the redwoods symbolize the force of life itself in a world in which man has crowded nature too closely. The ageless redwoods refine our concept of immortality and divine majesty.

Conservation organizations such as the Sierra Club, the Wilderness Society, the Wildlife Management Institute, plus the National Park Service, at an earlier date, and 20 U.S. Senators and 40 Congressmen have refined legislation for the establishment of a Redwood National Park in the basin of Redwood Creek where some of the most representative virgin redwoods remain undisturbed by man. Their two bills before our national lawmakers are known as S–514 and HR 2849. . . .

The House Committee on Insular and Interior Affairs will hold hearings on HR 2849 in Washington on June 27 through 29. Since this hearing is for members of Congress and department heads, people who wish to be heard must appeal to their representatives in Washington to record themselves in favor of Redwood Creek and HR 2849.

With only a few days remaining before this committee session, these things remain clear: 1) the largest concentration of virgin redwoods, of record dimensions and variety, exist on Redwood Creek; 2) this area is being logged with more intensity, with immense damage having occurred in the past two years alone; 3) preponderant public support for this proposal is a matter of record; 4) feasible means of financing this project and softening its initial economic impact have been demonstrated (most of the companies will stay in business).

It is time that Congress debate the matter fully and act in the public interest. Behind-the-scenes negotiations by the executive branch have produced nothing but delays, continued clear-cutting and the destruction of watersheds.

There is still time for Massachusetts people to act. The trees that we save in the next few months shall be all that we will ever save!

F. STANLEY MIKELK.

New Long Weekends

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 12, 1967

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, as a sponsor of H.R. 12489, a bill which would establish four of our holidays as 3-day weekends, I bring to the attention of the House an editorial in the September 1, edition of Life magazine, which well sets forth that the purpose of the observance is more significant than the date. Already most of these nonreligious holidays which would be affected by the bill are not being observed on the date they occurred. The only thing left unsaid by the editorial is that my bill only affects the District of Columbia and Federal employees, although it is felt that passage of this legislation would be a logical start toward gaining uniform Monday holidays throughout the Nation even though it is up to the individual States to determine holidays. I ask unanimous consent that the Life magazine editorial be printed in the RECORD:

NEW LONG WEEKENDS

Like the character in Walt Kelly's *Pogo* who announces ominously that "Friday the 13th come on a Tuesday this month," we may all be telling our children soon that "The Fourth of July comes on the seventh this year." And there's something to be said for it. Members of both the House and the Senate are pushing hard this year for legislation that would rearrange four or five of our holidays so that they would always fall on Mondays, giving most people a three-day weekend.

If several recent public opinion polls can be believed, most Americans are all for the prospect of having five such "minivacations" scattered through the year. As one senator's aide put it. "When you find the AFL–CIO and the Chamber of Commerce agreeing on something, it must have wide appeal."

One proposal would change Washington's Birthday to "Presidents' Day" and celebrate it on the third Monday in February. Washington probably wouldn't have minded the date change, especially since he was born on Feb. 11th, not the 22nd (according to the calendar in use then). The D.A.R. is outraged. "We vigorously protest this downgrading of our national heroes" is how the society's president-general puts it. We agree: better one 21-gun salute for the Father of the Country than a scatter-shot fusillade for all our Presidents.

Shifting Memorial Day makes sense. The holiday commemorates men, not a date. And now that Veterans Day honors those who served in all our wars, not just in World War I, there isn't much reason left to insist it fall on Nov. 11, the day the guns were stilled in 1918. The best idea might even be to move that holiday to early April. It's a long haul from Washington's Birthday to Memorial Day and we could all use a break about the time the tulips are coming up.

We still would have Thanksgiving in November. And it could just as well fall on a Monday. For the Pilgrims, it was always a floating holiday, celebrated when the crops were in and the spirit moved.

But until people can be trained to speak of Independence Day, and not of "The Fourth," we are going to have trouble with that one. And it probably won't do much good to remind people that the Continental Congress really voted for independence on July 2.

The Need for Balance and Equity in Financial Policies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH P. ADDABBO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 12, 1967

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, my colleague from New York, Representative JACOB H. GILBERT, recently addressed the annual convention of the Savings Association League of New York on the subject of "The Need for Balance and Equity in Financial Policies."

The remarks of Congressman GILBERT, who is a member of the Ways and Means Committee, were timely and informative, and I wish to call them to the attention of other Members of the House:

THE NEED FOR BALANCE AND EQUITY IN FINANCIAL POLICIES

(Address of the Honorable JACOB H. GILBERT, Member of the Congress, 22d District, New York, before the 1967 annual convention of the Savings Association League of New York State, White Sulphur Springs, W. Va., September 5, 1967)

I am truly pleased to be here and to address this group which plays such an important role in the thrift industry of our great State of New York.

As a member of the House Ways and Means Committee, I have been in touch, from time to time, with some of you and your colleagues in the field of finance in the common effort to devise the best possible public policies. May I take this occasion to thank you for the assistance and advice you have rendered me in this regard.

MAKING ECONOMIC POLICY

First, I want to discuss briefly the results of our present, economic policy from my viewpoint as a Representative in Congress and a member of the Ways and Means Committee. One personal belief to which I adhere very strongly is that true progress in this area can only be achieved through a partnership of Government and the private sector seeking a policy that is both balanced and equitable. Such a partnership and such a policy goal have contributed so much to the great economic gains of the American economy. These gains, while familiar to most, are impressive and thus worthy of some review by me here again.

In the past 3½ years of the Johnson Administration, our economy has grown at a rate of about 4.9% a year in real terms, and the value of our goods and services has increased by some $170 billion, more than the total gross national product of Italy and France combined; almost 8.7 million nonfarm jobs have been added, and unemployment has been cut by 1.1 million people; some four million people are estimated to have been lifted out of poverty; personal income, after taxes, has grown by 30%; corporate profits, after taxes, have increased 35%.

All of these gains have helped produce the longest postwar business upturn in U.S.

history. This great economic accomplishment could not have been made except for a growing sense of partnership between American business and American Government striving for a balanced and equitable economic policy.

As an essential part of the total economic picture, the business of finance should likewise be developed by balanced and equitable policies. For these policies are like an investment portfolio. They are not something which we can acquire and then stow away in a safe and forget. They need watching and revising.

With this in mind, I would like to discuss today some areas where the need to achieve a policy of balance and equity is of great importance in the future.

THE TAX SURCHARGE

First and foremost of these areas from the standpoint of current national interest is the 10% tax surcharge that President Johnson has recommended. To be sure, there are a host of vital economic considerations that must be weighed by Congress before taking action on the President's proposal. I haven't committed myself yet on the proposal, but, in my mind a most important consideration—one which I know you here are very interested in—is what might happen in the financial markets without the tax increase.

One of the important questions posed in the Committee's present public hearings is whether or not the financial markets can tolerate the kind of demand for money they would receive in this current fiscal year from a Federal deficit of the size that would emerge without the proposed tax surcharge. Many of the witnesses have voiced the opinion that without enactment of the surcharge, market pressure would cause an interest rate escalation similar to, if not worse than, what occurred last year.

President Johnson voiced the Administrations rather solemn prediction on this specific point in his August 3 message to Congress; and I quote:

"Spiraling interest rates and severly tight money would return.

"What the Government does not raise through taxes, the Government must borrow.

"That additional borrowing would be imposed on financial markets already strained by the unprecedented demands of private borrowers and State and local governments. Long-term interest rates are already near their peaks of late last summer, and short-term rates have begun to climb.

"Without a tax increase, I am informed by Chairman Martin that nothing the Federal Reserve System could responsibly do could avoid the spiraling of interest rates.

"As interest rates rose, a starvation of mortgage funds would throw housing into a new depression before it had even recovered from the last one.

"Every other borrower—but most of all the small businessman and the farmer—would bear the cost of our fiscal irresponsibility."

One of the explicit goals of the Administration's surtax proposal is, therefore, to achieve measurable progress in bringing about equity and balance in the nation's financial markets—to enhance the prospects of more stable and sound conditions in such markets in the months that lie ahead.

Representatives of the savings and loan industry have already appeared before the Committee on Ways and Means in the public hearings now being conducted on the President's proposal. You may be assured that their testimony, which is generally favorable to the surtax, and that of all the other witnesses that come before the Committee in these current hearings will be given very careful consideration before any action is taken.

The Committee incidentally will complete its schedule of public hearings around the middle of this month. As you know, the legislative step that next follows will be executive sessions in the Committee in which the initial, very difficult legislative decisions on the surtax recommendation will have to be made.

FEDERAL MUTUAL SAVINGS BANKS

I would also like to discuss an item which is of particular interest to you—and that involves the chartering of Federal mutual savings banks. Some feel that a very good case can be made that such a move would be in the public interest. The argument is advanced that Federal mutual savings banks can potentially enhance the mobility of savings in response to investment needs, and can contribute to a stronger system of mutual thrift institutions.

But I am aware also that a question has been raised whether the present tax treatment of mutual savings banks is adequate.

Let me review the tax question for you.

Prior to the Revenue Act of 1962, mutual savings banks and savings and loan associations were virtually exempt from Federal income tax. By that Act, the Congress sought to correct the income tax provisions applicable to mutual thrift institutions generally. It provided a comprehensive set of rules governing the tax deductibility of additions to a reserve for bad debts and, with respect to savings and loan associations but not mutual savings banks, Congress enacted a detailed definitional requirement based on the nature of the lending functions of savings and loan associations.

As a result of that legislation, tax payments of $168 million from savings and loan associations and $32 million from mutual savings banks were anticipated. In fact, 1963 tax payments were $116 million from savings and loan associations and only $3 million from mutual savings banks. With respect to mutual savings banks, this situation has not improved significantly since 1963, I am told.

Some feel that the tax and chartering issues are naturally linked. If we are to broaden the powers of mutuals by allowing them Federal charter, perhaps concomitant legislative action should be considered to insure that these institutions carry, commensurately, a fair share of the tax burden compared with other financial institutions. A policy of equity, balance, and uniformity toward financial institutions would seem to me to necessitate such a consideration.

Thus far, I have discussed areas where balance and equity are necessary standards for future policy making. I would now like to turn to a final example, but one in which it appears such standards have been well applied. This involves the regulation of interest rates by Federal authorities.

As you all well remember, I'm sure, interest rates early last year began escalating sharply after December 1965 when the Federal Reserve Board allowed commercial banks to pay up to 5½% instead of 4½% on time deposits.

The repercussions of this move for financial institutions were great as a war for savings and time deposits developed. As 1966 progressed, the developing pressures suggested more clearly the need for a policy that would moderate the impact of rising interest rates and increased rate competition on thrift institutions, the mortgage market, and home building activity. It also became increasingly clear that Government authorities did not have the powers to maintain the competition for savings on a sound basis and avoid the excesses of unrestrained competition.

As a result, legislation was approved by the Congress and signed by President Johnson on September 21 that gave the Federal Reserve Board and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation temporary authority to set different rates on time deposits according to their size and other criteria. It also gave the Federal Home Loan Bank Board temporary authority to set interest ceilings on savings shares of insured savings and loan associations.

This legislation, by and large, contributed significantly to a moderation in the excessive competition for consumer savings and facilitated in an increased flow of funds into thrift institutions. In short, it worked. While I am aware of some limited competitive problems that developed, I believe the action illustrates the effectiveness of a balanced and equitable Government policy—both in terms of its aims and results—that should be sought.

In closing, may I emphasize that the task of carefully watching over our financial policies and their use is a task that every responsible group and every thoughtful citizen must share with the Government in partnership to realize the full potential of the American economy in the years ahead.

We know that financial policies, unless periodically reviewed and reformed, can become slipshod, develop grave defects, and can become obsolescent in a way which can both act as a barrier to sound economic growth and at the same time check popular faith and morale. We cannot let this happen.

The need to modernize financial policy in a balanced and equitable way is, of course, a long term concern. And I would hope and expect the thrift industry to play a vital and leading role in the achievement of this goal.

Thank you.

Tribute to the Memory and Work of Dr. John L. Taylor

SPEECH

OF

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 30, 1967

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to pay tribute to the rewarding life and meritorious work of the late Dr. John L. Taylor, staff consultant of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs for Indian Affairs and Territorial and Insular Affairs.

Dr. Taylor came to the committee on December 1, 1953. Before starting his effective work for us, he had served with effectiveness and outstanding distinction in the Navy during World War II and with the Department of the Interior in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. He held a degree of doctor of philosophy and a master's degree in geography from Clark University or Worcester, Mass., and a master's degree in political science from Columbia University.

Because of his experience in the Pacific during World War II and his work with the Department of the Interior, Dr. Taylor was uniquely prepared for the service he was to render to the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and to the people of the United States in general. He had a disposition and personality which expressly prepared him for work with our Indian population and with the people of our offshore areas. His patience with people and his genuine love for them as individuals were all-important assets in his work.

He rendered outstanding and effective service for all of us in the important and, at times, highly controversial legislative battles for statehood for Alaska and

Hawaii. In these programs, as in all other programs, he remained almost entirely in the background, furnishing factual information and material, and explaining the hopes and ambitions of those who were to benefit from such legislation to those of us who carried the legislative battle before the House. He was known to all of us as one who regarded the acquisition of factual material in order to build the proper legislative foundation as the most important part of the legislative process.

It was my good fortune, during the years that he was with us, to travel with Dr. Taylor into the territories, especially in the Pacific, and to various of our Indian reservations. He was trusted and admired by all of those with whom he came in contact—coworkers, fellow citizens, nationals, and wards alike. He gave unstintingly of his time and effort in our programs in the Antarctica area, and he personally visited Antarctica.

I can truthfully say that I have never known a more genteel, yet highly disciplined, personality. I shall miss him very much, as all other members of our committee will, as the days ahead of us come and go.

I have, of course, been most familiar with Dr. Taylor's outstanding service to our National Government. However, he has been just as energetic and devoted in serving his community, holding many responsible positions in connection with church, school, and other community activities. In addition, he was an understanding and kind husband and father.

Mr. Speaker, as an indication of Dr. Taylor's outstanding service to his country, I am including, as a part of these remarks, a resolution adopted by the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee on August 30, and a few of the many communications we have received:

RESOLUTION

(Adopted by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, August 30, 1967, upon learning of the death of Dr. John L. Taylor)

The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has learned with profound sorrow of the death on August 29 at the Washington Hospital Center of its consultant on Territorial and Indian Affairs, Dr. John Lewis Taylor.

Jack Taylor, or "Doc," as he was familiarly known to all of us, was born November 25, 1910, in Oriska, North Dakota. His education beyond the elementary and secondary schools was at the State Teachers College, Luverne, North Dakota, Clark University, Columbia University, and Stanford University. It culminated with Clark University's admitting him to the degree of doctor of Philosophy in 1953.

Before joining the Committee's staff in 1953, Jack Taylor had served in the Navy during World War II and had had a wide variety of teaching experience in schools and colleges in and out of this country before, during and after the war. He brought to his position as a member of the Committee's staff a personal knowledge, derived from experience, of the people of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands and of their problems. More important, he brought with him a gift of patience, a love of people, a spirit of cooperation, a constant good humor, and a willingness to learn and to accumulate knowledge concerning the problems of the Nation's Indian population and of the people of its territories that stood him and the Committee in good stead throughout his fourteen years of service on Capitol Hill. His life was an exemplary one and, though it did not reach three score years and ten, was full of accomplishments for the good of mankind.

In view of all the foregoing, be it

Resolved by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, That the Committee hereby records its sorrow upon the death of Dr. John Lewis Taylor, extends its sympathy to Mrs. Taylor and to all members of the family, and directs that arrangements be made for permanent preservation of this memorial by printing it in the Congressional Record.

AUGUST 31, 1967.

Hon. WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
U.S. Congress,
Washington, D.C.:

Death of Dr. John L. Taylor great loss to Micronesia. His deep and sympathetic interest in these islands and their people will be long remembered and will be of enduring inspiration to those privileged to know him. Appreciate your conveying this message to Mrs. J. Taylor.

W. R. NORWOOD,
High Commissioner, Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, Saipan.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS,
Washington, D.C., August 31, 1967.

Hon. JAMES A. HALEY,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HALEY: For myself, and for all of those in Indian Affairs who have known and worked with "Doc" Taylor, I am writing to express our sense of loss at his untimely death.

The scholarly wisdom and sense of justice with which he conducted the business of your subcommittee will remain in memory for us in Indian Affairs to emulate.

With deepest sincerity,

ROBERT L. BENNETT,
Commissioner.

AUGUST 30, 1967.

Mrs. VIRGINIA TAYLOR,
Hyattsville, Md.:

Word of the passing of Jack Taylor comes as a shock to me. Because of the proximity of my office to his, our contacts have been frequent and pleasant. I shall sorely miss his presence and his cheerful word.

In a larger sense, Jack was a friend of the people of Hawaii. While making our problems as a Territory his concern, he understood and appreciated our aims to achieve statehood.

Because of his work as an able and dedicated professional staff member of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, his name has also traveled into the far reaches of the Pacific. The people of these Pacific islands as well as the people of Hawaii share your sorrow in this hour of great loss.

My deepest sympathy to you and the other members of Jack's family.

SPARK M. MATSUNAGA,
Member of Congress.

SEPTEMBER 1, 1967.

Hon. WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Secretary Dickerson and the people of Guam join me in expressing our deepest sorrow and sympathy at the death of Dr. John Taylor. Dr. Taylor was an exceptional public servant and a good friend of Guam. His passing was a great loss to us.

MANUEL F. L. GUERRERO,
Governor of Guam.

SEPTEMBER 1, 1967.

Hon. WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

On behalf of the Senate and House of Representatives of the Congress of Micronesia, we wish to express our deepest sympathy to the family of the Honorable John L. Taylor and his colleagues on the House of Representatives Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

JOHN O. NGIRAKED,
President of the Senate,
Congress of Micronesia.
BETHWEL HENRY,
Speaker of the House,
Congress of Micronesia.

Mrs. Aspinall and I join with Dr. Taylor's legion of friends in acknowledging our loss and expressing our most sincere sympathy, especially to his fine family which he leaves to help carry on his contribution to immortality.

Dr. Redmond, Chicago's General Superintendent of Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 11, 1967

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, Dr. James Redmond is the present general superintendent of Chicago's public schools, one of the most challenging of all jobs. John Fink, editor of the Chicago Tribune Sunday magazine, says that Dr. Redmond "seldom makes the front pages. Months may pass without seeing his face on television. He is a big man in all ways, a man of uncommon intellect and humanity, but he is a quiet man in all ways as well, given more to private persuasion than to public contention. So Chicagoans have not come to know their new school chief as well as they might."

So Editor Fink assigned Tribune feature writer Ridgely Hunt to do a story on Dr. Redmond, which appeared in the Tribune Sunday magazine on September 3, 1967, under the headline, "Ridgely, the Conciliator" from which later I will quote.

First, however, I would mention the first general superintendent of the Chicago schools that it was my privilege, pleasure and pride to number among my friends, Dr. Ella Flagg Young, the first woman in Chicago's history to head the city's schools. In the Chicago magazine of July 1911 I wrote:

> Fortunate is the time and place that have at their disposal a person who, with unaffectedness and grace, can marshal into existence an educational ideal suited to the age!
>
> The leading educator of the nation, Chicago's possession, Dr. Ella Flagg Young, President of the National Educational Association, is working out through the public schools of Chicago such an educational ideal. It increasingly will challenge the attention of the seriousminded.
>
> The American child must make good at school, at home, and in his work world. He must make good with his hands, his heart, and his judgment, as well as with his memory. He must be fit to get a living. He must have the power to transform his industry into beauty; that is, he must have cultural power. He must form the habits of a dignified, democratic, social and civic life. Above all, he must carry responsibility as he carries health and happiness. Education no longer may be content with teaching the child to read, write

and count. It must deliver the whole personality of the child, as well as open up to him his environment. Otherwise it leaves him crippled.

Those educators only whose eyes are looking forward, whose spirit is at one with the spirit of the times, can direct, or even hope to understand the forces which are destined to create the American Public School System. Just what the superintendent of the Chicago schools is permitting to happen in the city of millions—the city whose struggle for democracy is eminently a hope of the people—is something which the future will chronicle.

That was 56 years ago and since that period, when a women blazed the educational path of one of the world's greatest cities, Dr. Ella Flagg Young has had many successors. The educational ideal of Chicago's first woman superintendent of schools never has lost its appeal and its influence.

REDMOND, THE CONCILIATOR

Returning to the present, when the Chicago schools are run by the "quiet man" 56 years after a "quiet woman" won the notice and the plaudits of the Nation, I am extending my remarks to include excerpts from Mrs. Hunt's interesting article on Dr. Redmond:

To replace Willis they brought in the superintendent of schools from Syosset, N.Y., a pleasant Long Island suburb that annually voted to spend $1,300 a year to educate its children. Redmond did not come as a stranger. A native of Kansas City, Mo., where he had taught school, he was brought to Chicago in 1948 as an administrative assistant to Willis's predecessor, Herold Hunt, whom he served until 1953 when be became head of the New Orleans school system. In New Orleans he had his baptism of fire from the guns of racial hatred when court-ordered school integration collided with the intransigence of white supremacists. The ensuing street demonstrations made television screens across the country. But tho Redmond did not surrender, neither could he win a clearly defined victory, and in 1961 he retreated to the relative security of a post as director of school administrative services for a management consulting firm.

"It was fine, good work," he recalls, but in time he "got tired of living in airplanes" and sought out the serene life in Syosset. Here the Chicago selection committee found him, tending his suburban schools and his flowers [he is an ardent gardener]. And from here, after a good deal of negotiation, they brought him back to Chicago to inherit the whirlwind.

* * * * *

Redmond took office on the first Monday in October, 1966. One month later he plunged into negotiations with the teachers union, which, freed from bondage and loaded for bear, had assembled all the wishes, worries, hopes, and gripes accumulated during the previous 20 years and printed them in a 52-page book of "collective bargaining demands." * * *.

For allies Redmond had to rely on a board of education whose members were strangers to him and on a handful of top assistants, only a few of whom he had known during his service in Chicago 14 years before. * * *.

As salary negotiations neared their climax one Sunday last January, a teachers strike appeared inevitable. Redmond taped a 25-minute talk to explain to parent why the schools would be locked the next day and to ask their help in safeguarding their children. The tape was to be released on the 10 p. m. news broadcasts, but 20 minutes before air time, David Heffernan, the schools' public relations chief, reached for the phone and canceled it. Redmond and the teachers had achieved an 11th-hour settlement.

Many critics opposed the idea of negotiating with the teachers union in the first place, but Redmond considered such bargaining inevitable. "We are where industry was 30 years ago," he says, "just getting used to the idea of dealing with labor unions. This is new to education." New and, in Redmond's eyes, not necessarily bad. "We're an organized society," he says, "and let's don't buck it."

Both sides could take satisfaction from the outcome of the bargaining, Redmond no less than the teachers. "There's not a thing in the new teachers' agreement that I can't live with," he says. "There's not a thing in the agreement that thoughtful school administrators haven't wanted to do for a long time. While I have agreed to meet with them monthly to discuss school problems, that doesn't mean that I have surrendered any of my authority. They didn't ask to make the decisions. They just asked to talk about them. Yet I know some of my fellow superintendents who would rather die than put this in a contract."

In fact, Redmond can use some advice and help. "I can't run 600 schools," he concedes, "but I've got to make it possible to run them, and I've got to find the people to do the job." Many of these people he already has on the payroll. "I know my classrooms are full of excellent teachers and potential leadership," he says, "and we'll find them. This is one of the real jobs of this office."

Recruiting leaders is only one of Redmond's problems. He has bigger ones: integration and money, to name the worst.

* * * * *

By thus easing the tension between the school system and its assailants, Redmond took much of the heat off the integration issue and even managed to shift its focus slightly.

"Physical integration is said to be necessary and desirable," he says, "but many concerned groups now say that quality education is just as important as integration. I would not give up the objective of getting rid of the ghetto schools, but also let's do everything we can to achieve quality education."

Specifically, in the case of the Negro ghettos, he intends to bring this about by reducing class size and by "pouring talent into the schools." The toughest Negro schools have customarily had the worst faculties because experienced teachers have used their seniority to claim positions in better neighborhoods. Redmond hopes to lure them into the slums with offers of special bus service to the school door, parking lots where their cars will be safe from vandals, and most important, classes small enough so that good teaching can produce results.

What about teachers who are afraid to work in the slums?

"Them I don't want," Redmond declares.

But smaller classes cost more money. "Because school is primarily a personal service," he says, "70 to 80 per cent of the total expenditures goes for hiring people. If I want to cut class size by one-half, it means I've got to double the budget. We talk about spending $600 a year per pupil in Chicago next year. Well, doubling that expenditure is not unrealistic. Suburbs like Evanston are already spending $1,200."

Finding this kind of money presents some tremendous obstacles. The city already spends almost as much as its tax structure will allow, and the state has dragged its feet on making up the difference.

* * * * *

Redmond does not publicly support a state income tax—or any other kind of tax for that matter—but restricts himself to commenting that "the real solution is not going to come until we make some kind of change in the tax structure. We must find some tax structure that taps the true wealth of this state, not just real estate alone. I would not think that personal and corporate income tax alone should be made the whipping boy."

* * * * *

To his task of persuasion Redmond brings a peculiar talent, solidly based on the fact that he likes people and admires them. A large man with a leonine head, he can dominate a meeting, leaning forward and driving home his points by poking the table with one finger. The fingertip angles off oddly to one side, as if it had once been broken and badly set, and it is hard to see anything else as Redmond pokes away to bolster his argument.

But he does more than talk. One eminent university educator reported with astonishmen. "He listens!" * * *

Redmond has much to hear and much to do before he can hope to surmount the Everest of problems that beset the Chicago schools. But he has started the ascent with an easy gait and so far seems scarcely to be breathing hard. He leaves his apartment on East Schiller each morning at 7:30 and rides to his office in a chauffeur-driven car that goes with the job. [He would like to drive himself, but the chauffeur takes care of parking and saves him time.] Within five minutes he enters his office with its two window air conditioners and its framed kindergarten paintings on the walls. By starting early, he says, "I can get in an hour and a half before the phone starts ringing."

* * * * *

What that future will be not even Redmond can foretell with precision.* * *

"I believe the schools 20 years from now will be so changed that we won't recognize them," Redmond says. "We'll have a 20-hour-a-day operation, not just 6 the way we do now, and I don't mean an authoritarian system where the state takes the kids away and rears them. Adults will use these facilities too. The schools should provide a service to the entire community."

Remedy for Farm and City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 12, 1967

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues a recent editorial which appeared in the authoritative publication, the Farm Journal. It is titled "Remedy for Farm and City" and is reprinted in a newspaper from my home district, the Daily Republican Eagle of Red Wing:

REMEDY FOR FARM AND CITY

The most promising long-range solution to the "farm problem" is more off-farm jobs in rural America. Such jobs would let those farmers who want to, or have to, leave farming, part way or all the way, do so. They might well make more money, and so would the farmers who would be left. Meanwhile all of them could continue to live where they do now, or not far away. How much better for them than to move as strangers to South Chicago, South Philadelphia, or South Big City anywhere!

The big cities would benefit, too. They might begin to solve their problems of crime, traffic, wretched housing, slums and ghettos. How much better off Detroit would have been if the people who swarmed in from rural communities had been able to find jobs, and the vocational education to go with them, where they came from.

It's no wonder big cities have riots. It is simply abnormal for so many people to live atop one another in so little space, like ants in an ant hill. Nor is it any longer necessary in this day of rapid transportation, of communications media that bring the best of the arts that the cities have to offer, of branch stores of the biggest emporia of large cities, of decentralized health and education facilities. The Mayo Clinic is in Rochester, Minn. Many universities are in small places, and now Community Colleges are bringing higher education to the countryside.

The nation as a whole would gain, both economically and socially, from a spread-out of people and jobs. It would be sounder of fibre if more of its people had a little elbow room, access to the open country, a part in community affairs—in short a normal kind of life.

Mr. Speaker, I fully agree that making rural and small town life more attractive could help to stem the tide of migration to large cities which are already beset with a myriad of problems.

Mr. Speaker, at the same time I believe the present administration could take immediate action to alleviate the growing problem by assuring farmers a better break economically. A cause of this continued rush to the cities is the unfair treatment farmers have received from the present administration. As I have pointed out many times in recent years, the present administration has all but abandoned farmers. The administration, through the U.S. Department of Agriculture, has sought to hold down farm prices. The only motive, as far as I can see, for the deliberate attempt to penalize farmers, is to court the votes of urban residents.

Even the present administration should understand that this is self-defeating. Low farm prices are driving more and more farmers to the cities where they in turn add to the burden of the cities, which are already heavy enough.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the administration to examine its shortsighted policy of trying to hold down the prices of commodities produced by farmers. If prices were not continually and artificialy depressed, many more farmers would stay on the farm and the Nation as a whole would be much better off.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: the Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided,* That the makeup of the RECORD shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the Official Reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the Official Reporters of the respective Houses.

The Official Reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the Official Reporters in the next issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, nor to RECORDS printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

Tuesday, September 12, 1967

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Senate passed election reform bill.

House adopted Department of Defense appropriations conference report.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S 12816–S 12844

Bills Introduced: Nine bills and one resolution were introduced, as follows: S. 2388–2396; and S. Res. 168. **Page S 12817**

Bill Reported: Report was made as follows: S. 2388, proposed Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1967 (S. Rept. 563). **Page S 12809**

Bills Referred: 21 House-passed bills were referred to appropriate committees. **Pages S 12816–S 12817**

Printing: Senate adopted S. Res. 168, to print additional copies of a report to accompany S. 2388, proposed Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1967. **Page S 12809**

Election Reform: By unanimous vote of 87 yeas, Senate passed with amendments S. 1880, proposed Election Reform Act of 1967, after taking the following additional actions on amendments thereto:

Adopted: Cannon amendment to eliminate language that the term "person" as used in subsection on political contributions and purchases shall not include a political committee, and instead inserted language that nothing contained in that subsection shall prohibit transfer of contributions received by a political committee; by 79 yeas to 7 nays, Curtis amendment providing that the section in the bill allowing political contributions by the candidates' relatives shall not apply if such contributions would be prohibited under other provisions of the legislation; Javits amendment respecting the barring of sale of goods, commodities, advertising, or any services to anyone other than a political candidate; Yarborough amendment providing that any criminal conviction, under the legislation, where the punishment does not include imprisonment, shall be deemed a misdemeanor conviction and will not include loss of citizenship; Cooper amendment No. 297 barring solicitation of political contributions from a corporation or individual engaged in a contractual relationship with U.S. or an agency thereof; and Ervin amendment to eliminate from the bill the language, as amended by Senator Curtis' amendment, respecting allowance of political contributions by candidates' relatives; and

Rejected: By 30 yeas to 56 nays, Clark (and Scott) amendment No. 292 to establish within the GAO an automatic information retrieval system to give prompt access to all information contained in financial statements required, which in the presence of an alleged violation shall be transmitted to the Attorney General for criminal prosecution (prior to rejection of this amendment, Senate adopted a Pearson amendment thereto to add language providing for a "Registry of Election Finance" in the GAO); and by 42 yeas to 46 nays (motion to reconsider tabled), Clark amendment No. 291 to add new title to the bill "Disclosure of Gifts and Certain Compensation."

Pages S 12809–S 12816, S 12844–S 12850, S 12859–S 12873

Private Bill: Senate concurred in House amendment to S. 653, a private bill, clearing it for the President. **Page S 12877**

Missouri River Basin: S. 1601, increasing authorizations for work on the Tiber Dam of the Missouri River Basin project, was cleared for President when Senate concurred in House amendment thereto. **Page S 12877**

Printing: Senate adopted without amendment S. Con. Res. 40, to print as a Senate document report of the proceedings of the 43d biennial meeting of the Convention of American Instructors of the Deaf. **Page S 12877**

Government Employees: Senate took up S. 1035, relating to the protection of the constitutional rights of Federal employees. **Pages S 12877–S 12880**

Legislative Program: Acting majority leader announced it is anticipated that on Wednesday, September 13, Senate will, after completing action on S. 1035, to protect privacy of Government employees, consider one or more of the following measures: S. 798, to provide compensation to survivors of local law enforcement officers killed while apprehending certain Federal law violators; and S. 1985, national program of flood insurance. It is also expected that Senate will consider conference report on H.R. 10738, defense appropriations. There will probably be one or more votes tomorrow. **Page S 12862**

Nominations: The following nominations were received: Arthur J. Goldberg, of Illinois, William B. Buffum, of Maryland, Representative L. H. Fountain, of

Appendix

Deputy U.S. Marshal T. P. McNamara, of Waco, Completes 25 Years of Federal Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 13, 1967

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, in July of this year, Attorney General Ramsey Clark, accompanied by chief of the executive offices of the U.S. marshals, James McShane, conferred upon Deputy U.S. Marshal T. P. McNamara of Waco, Tex., his 25-year pin for 25 years of service as a deputy marshal.

So outstanding has Deputy Marshal T. P. McNamara's service been, that in 1961 those interested in law enforcement in Texas sought to present his name to President Kennedy for appointment as U.S. marshal for the western district of Texas. Deputy McNamara turned down this request, and asked that his name not be submitted, because such service would require removal of his place of residence from Waco, Tex., to San Antonio, Tex., and travel over a vast area of territory from Waco to El Paso, supervising the operations of the deputy marshals' offices. For this reason alone, though he comes from a famous law enforcement officer family, including his uncle, Guy McNamara, who served as U.S. marshal for the Western District of Texas, Marshal McNamara remained in his deputy position at Waco, Tex. He has served under numerous marshals of differing political parties, all of whom reappointed him because of his record of distinguished service as a law enforcement officer.

Mr. President, I join in the commendations that Deputy U.S. Marshal McNamara has received and ask unanimous consent that an article entitled "McNamara Receives 25-Year Pin for U.S. Deputy Marshal Service," published in the Waco Tribune-Herald be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MCNAMARA RECEIVES 25-YEAR PIN FOR U.S. DEPUTY MARSHAL SERVICE

Deputy U.S. Marshal T. P. McNamara of 3121 Comberland Avenue was in Washington last week to receive his 25-year pin, but it wasn't just an ordinary pin ceremony. The man who pinned the pin on McNamara was the attorney general of the United States, Ramsey Clark.

Also present for the ceremony was James J. P. McShane, chief of the executive office for United States Marshals. McShane was a body guard of the late John F. Kennedy before he became President. After President Kennedy's election, the office of chief of U.S. marshals was created and McShane was appointed.

McNamara's family also was present for the ceremony, Mrs. McNamara, two sons, Mike and Parnell, and daughter Miss Betty Rose McNamara. Later McNamara and family went to New York and planned to leave there Sunday morning on a KLM airliner for Munich and an European holiday. Mike and Parnell McNamara will go to the Riviera after a Munich visit. The marshal, Mrs. McNamara and Betty Rose will go to Rome, southern Italy, Spain, and Portugal before they return to the United States in time for McNamara to attend the Conference of Deputy U.S. Marshals in Baltimore, Md., on Aug. 13. McNamara is president of Region 6 (Texas, Oklahoma, Arkansas and Louisiana) of the marshals' organization.

In addition to the job he loves, serving as a deputy marshal, McNamara has extensive investment interests in business, farm and ranch properties.

His official career as a marshal began on July 28, 1942, when he was appointed by U.S. Marshal Guy McNamara, his uncle. He has served continuously since that time, but he said he believes the whole thing dates back to his "first experience at marshaling." That was when he was 8 years old, on Dec. 16, 1919. His father, Parnell McNamara, was appointed a special U.S. marshal to take Tom Parker to the U.S. penitentiary at Leavenworth, Kan. Parnell McNamara took young T. P. and Gene McNamara, then 10, along with him on the trip.

Parker had received a five-year sentence for killing his brother-in-law on the steps of the old post office building at Fourth and Franklin. During the trial it became a matter of inches almost whether the shooting took place on federal property or on the sidewalk (city property).

McNamara's first real job as a lawman was when he was chief deputy under sheriff W. B. Mobley. He worked for Gibson Gale as a deputy in the McLennan tax collector's office for three years. When the assessor and collector offices were merged and Joe Alexander won the combined job, McNamara worked for Alexander five months before he went into the sheriff's office. In 1939 he went to East Texas as a "hot oil" investigator for the state comptroller's office and held that job until he became a deputy U.S. marshal.

McNamara figures in his 25 years as a marshal he has traveled 1,100,218 miles, handled 15,429 prisoners (without losing a one), and served 37,574 civil processes.

He and his whole family enjoy horseback riding. And every winter they gather up their ski equipment and head for a ski resort in this country or abroad.

Safe Driving as School Opens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 13, 1967

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, as we return to work in this building, the symbol of representative government in a free world, millions of youngsters across the Nation are returning to other buildings across the country. These buildings, whether big or small, of brick or wood, are symbols of a better world and of a better nation—they are symbols of an educated society.

We have passed many laws to protect these youngsters. They range from laws prohibiting the passing of stopped school buses to a Federal program for a school lunch program.

The American Automobile Association has long protected school youngsters through its school safety patrol program. With over 900,000 patrol members in 40,000 schools in 15,000 communities in every State, these youngsters guide and protect children at school crossings. Organized by school authorities with the cooperation of police and motor clubs affiliated with the AAA, these boys and girls do an excellent job. Witness the fact that since 1922 the traffic death rate of school-age children has dropped nearly one-half, while the death rate of all other age groups has doubled.

Early this year, I was privileged to introduce H.J. Res. 39 to designate the second week of each May as National School Safety Patrol Week. Since that time, 31 of my colleagues have joined with similar resolutions. Still others will follow, I hope, in giving recognition to these deserving youngsters.

In addition to sponsoring the school safety patrols, the AAA conducts an information program directed at parents telling them what they can do to protect their loved ones.

I conclude my remarks with a statement by George F. Kachlein, Jr., executive vice president of the AAA, entitled "AAA Asks Parents To Adopt Driving Safety Rules as Schools Open":

AAA ASKS PARENTS TO ADOPT DRIVING SAFETY RULES AS SCHOOLS OPEN

School Safety Patrol boys and girls will take to their posts soon, protecting their classmates as they walk to and from school, but thoughtless parents may make their job difficult when driving into the school area, the Executive Vice-President of the American Automobile Association said today.

George F. Kachlein, Jr., appealed to parents to follow some basic safety rules when they drive their children to and from school.

"Parents can be serious traffic hazards around school buildings and school bus stops where there is a heavy concentration of child traffic," Mr. Kachlein said "Without meaning to, they can be very thoughtless."

The AAA official listed 10 rules for parents who must drive their children to or from school.

1. Drive children to and from school only if absolutely necessary. Going to and from school on their own can teach children self-reliance and better prepare them to meet other everyday problems.

2. Wherever possible, pool rides with neighbors to reduce the number of cars going to and from school areas.

3. Have a designated location to meet your child. This should be on the school side of the street, away from the crosswalk or corner

and, if possible, on a different side of the school building from that which the pedestrian children are using. Let your child out at the same location.

4. Arrange, if possible, with the school principal to dismiss children with rides, and those who walk from different sides of the school building. Or, dismiss one group slightly earlier than the other.

5. Do not double park.

6. Avoid the necessity for driving your child to school because of a late start. Get him ready in plenty of time so that he can walk or take the school bus.

7. Use more than ordinary caution when approaching a school.

8. Have your child sit on the seat and use the seat belt.

9. Lock all doors. Children can be taught to do this for themselves.

10. Know and have respect for all traffic laws and school regulations.

Tribute to Representative John Blatnik, of Minnesota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. McCARTHY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 13, 1967

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, the dedication of the National Water Quality Laboratory at Duluth last month was also an occasion for public tribute of the work of Representative JOHN BLATNIK against water pollution and in behalf of clean water research.

Representaive BLATNIK was one of the early leaders in support of Federal legislation to help to meet the serious problem of water pollution, and his continued efforts and the congressional hearings he has conducted have been most important in raising the Federal effort to the level it has today. I ask unanimous consent that an editorial published in the Duluth Tribune, a well-deserved tribute to the leadership of JOHN BLATNIK, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A SALUTE TO BLATNIK

Dedication today of the $3.3 million National Water Quality Laboratory in Duluth marks a milestone of great magnitude in the nation's efforts to preserve one of its most precious assets—pure water. It also presents an ideal opportunity to salute "the chief architect of federal water pollution control legislation," John A. Blatnik, Minnesota's Eighth District congressman.

Congressman Blatnik was instrumental in obtaining the Duluth Laboratory, which will be the national center for a concentrated research program to establish the scientific basis for setting national fresh water quality standards. Of the 140 persons to be employed, many will be high-level research scientists.

Interior Secretary Stewart Udall, who will dedicate the laboratory, describes the installation as "a real tribute to the life-long efforts of Congressman Blatnik on behalf of the conservation of clean water."

Congressman Blatnik, since his election to Congress in 1946, has built an impressive record of accomplishments for this region. His triumphs in water pollution control legislation on the federal level have won him high praise and recognition throughout the nation. He has been called "Mr. Clean Water" and is the recognized authority in Congress on water pollution problems.

The Duluth plant, appropriately located on the largest body of fresh water in the world, area-wise, was created by the 1961 Blatnik Water Pollution Control Act. It was in 1962 that Congressman Blatnik announced that the laboratory would be located in Duluth.

One of the congressman's first major victories in this sphere of work came when he authored and piloted the Federal Water Pollution Control Act of 1956, and Public Law 87–88, making for a more effective national program of water pollution control.

In 1965, he sponsored a bill in the house which guides states in establishing water standards. He has charted numerous water pollution hearings as chairman of the House rivers and harbors sub-committee. And his clean-water activities are reflected in his activities as ranking congressman in the House Public Works Committee.

His fruitful efforts won him the description by President Johnson as "the fighting general in the war on pollution."

The congressman has observed: "Just a short decade ago, the people we could interest in water pollution control could meet in a phone booth. We have come a long way from this small beginning to an International Conference on Water Pollution that brought representatives from 80 countries to exchange ideas on our mutual problems of preserving and cleaning up our waters."

The splendid new laboratory and the program today appropriately recognize Congressman Blatnik's achievements. The Eighth District is proud, indeed, to welcome him especially, on his visit to Duluth for this significant occasion.

Viet Injury Kills Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 13, 1967

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, L. Cpl. John A. Rodenberg, a marine from Baltimore, has died of wounds received in combat in Vietnam. I wish to commend the courage of this young man and to honor his memory by including the following article in the RECORD:

VIET INJURY KILLS MARINE—CPL. JOHN A. RODENBERG DIES IN BETHESDA

A 21-year-old Baltimore marine, Lance Cpl. John A. Rodenberg, has died of battle wounds received in Vietnam, the Defense Department announced yesterday.

Corporal Rodenberg, the husband of Mrs. Janis S. Rodenberg of the 7200 block Woodrow avenue, died in Bethesda Naval Hospital August 11 of head wounds received last May 19 when he was hit by shrapnel while on patrol near the demilitarized zone in South Vietnam.

His brother, Joseph Rodenberg, said last night that the young marine had been operated on four times since—once aboard the hospital ship the U.S.S. Sanctuary while in Vietnam and three times during the 2½ months he was at the Bethesda hospital.

DUNDALK HIGH

Corporal Rodenberg was a graduate of Dundalk High School. After school he worked in the Chevrolet division here of the General Motors Corporation for about a year and a half until he was drafted into the marines.

He had been in Vietnam for about eight months when he was wounded, his brother said.

Corporal Rodenberg wrote home frequently. He often said how sorry he felt for the Vietnamese children and "how much he wished they could live in a country like ours," Mr. Rodenberg said.

Corporal Rodenberg was buried August 14 in Baltimore National Cemetery.

In addition to his brother and his wife, the former Janis Brown, he is survived by a daughter Jacquelyn, 9 months old, his sister Mary and his mother, Mrs. Julia M. Rodenberg, all of Baltimore.

Black Power Movement in Hands of Reds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 13, 1967

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, as the Members are aware there was a National Conference for New Politics Convention in Chicago recently. Columnist Jack Mabley, of the Chicago American, was an interested observer to the conference and his column in the September 5 edition of that newspaper is worthy of special attention. Therefore, I place it in the RECORD:

BLACK POWER MOVEMENT IN HANDS OF REDS

(By Jack Mabley)

The new politics convention in Chicago served a useful purpose. No longer is there any question that the radical Black Power movement is being run by the Communists.

The open appearance of anti-Semitism in Black Power is unquestionable evidence of direction from world Communists.

Seven identifiable American Communists were at the convention and an uncounted number of undercover Reds were helping run the show.

There's nothing surprising about this. The American Communists have been working for 20 years toward revolution. They originally thought that an economic depression after World War II would bring chaos and fertile grounds for them to work. But the depression didn't come, so they picked a new target, racism.

With the sides clearly defined, it should be easier for American Negroes to choose their course. And I don't think that H. Rap Brown and his haters speak for the American Negro any more than George Lincoln Rockwell spoke for the white American.

It should be clear by now that a major objective of the Communists is to counteract the progress that has been made in race relations in this country in the last 2 decades.

The threats and insults by posturing radicals, who say they speak for all Negroes, are intended to inflame whites and divide the nation. The bums aren't any more representative of Negro Americans than the Hells Angels are of whites.

The New Politics meeting has been enlightening. One of the leaders, one Cleveland Robinson, was given a forum to spew hatred for whites. He asked, "Will the United States negotiate terms with the black people? Will it agree to sue for peace?"

He is prepared to negotiate, he said, "but we want reparations. We want billions of dollars paid to us as an organized people, not as charity for which we should be grateful, but as a partial return for what is rightfully ours."

When the talk gets as sophomoric as this, you realize it is coming from infantile minds.

One key man in the convention spent many years dedicated to the Revolutionary

Workers league, which called for the violent overthrow of the American government.

It advocated defense of the Soviet Union, reestablishment of a Marxian party, and an armed workers militia in the United States.

This man claims the Revolutionary Workers league is a thing of the past. At the convention last week, he was author of the statement, "We can educate tens of millions of people to the follies of twentieth century life, the folly of the arms race, Viet Nam, racism, anti-communism. We can also lay the groundwork for changing the American electoral system."

He also called on the conventioneers "to continue and enlarge protest and resistance outside the framework of electoral action. New Politics will be effective only to the extent that it not only canvasses campaigns and votes, but marches, vigils, protests, and commits civil disobedience."

Americans, especially liberals, have been extremely tolerant of the excesses of the black militants because there's no question that our treatment of the minorities has been unjust and un-American. We are trying to correct this, but the liberals should begin to realize that rioting and revolution are not going to do it.

Part of the blame for the mischief of the radicals must be shouldered by the mass media—newspapers, radio, TV. We give these people entirely too much attention. And they revel in it.

But at least their continued boldness has led them to show their true political color, and that color is Red.

There aren't many of them, and they don't speak for anyone but themselves, and I think it's time we stopped building them up. If they commit criminal acts, bring them before a court of law. If they don't, let them blow. But let's get on with the job with responsible Negro leaders.

The Reverend Andrew Stim

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH M. McDADE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 13, 1967

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, the Holy Ghost Catholic Church of the Ruthenian Rite in Jessup, Pa., is commemorating the 40th anniversary of their pastor, the Reverend Andrew Stim, in the holy priesthood. They are also paying their own testimony to his spiritual and physical achievements in his 20 years as pastor of this parish.

It is easy to point to the physical memorials which Father Stim has given this parish. There is the beautiful church with its artistic Renaissance interior and marble altars. There is a modern school and a new convent building. There is also a modern yet modest rectory.

It is far more difficult to define the spiritual achievements of this splendid man. One need only note, however, the active sacramental life of this parish and the enthusiastic activity of the parish organizations covering every age group to learn what Father Stim has meant to the Holy Ghost Parish in Jessup.

In almost every other job in America a man who has worked 40 years puts that work behind him but in the work of Father Stim, he will never put his work away.

I know the esteem and love the people of Jessup hold in their hearts for Father Stim. I know I speak for every one of them when I wish him many more fruitful years of service to God and to his people. We are fortunate indeed to have such a distinguished servant of God among us. He has made all of our lives richer by his own life.

Small Business Act Amendments of 1967

SPEECH

OF

HON. ROBERT G. STEPHENS, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 13, 1967

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 10409) to amend the authorizing legislation of the Small Business Administration, and for other purposes.

Mr. STEPHENS. Mr. Chairman, quite a large number of small business investment corporations, with the approval of the Small Business Administration, have concentrated investments in real estate small business concerns. These have provided a great deal of equity money to land developers, apartment and shopping center developers, operative builders, and similar type concerns in the real estate field. Last year the Administrator of Small Business Administration issued a memorandum to the effect that any small business investment corporation previously approved by Small Business Administration for concentration of its investments in real estate small business concerns could not receive any additional funds from the Small Business Administration unless the small business investment corporation agreed to reduce its investments in real estate small business concerns to not more than one-third of the small business investment corporation's portfolio.

Specifically, the purpose of the amendment is to provide that a small business investment corporation which had previously received the approval of Small Business Administration to concentrate its investments in real estate small business concerns would be permitted to continue such concentration and be eligible for the full benefits of the program in the same manner as any other small business investment corporation.

As I have said, the Small Business Administration has licensed a large number of small business investment corporations that have substantial real estate portfolios. The regulation to cut them back to one-third has affected about 100—or one out of every six—and will virtually put these out of the Small Business Administration program. My amendment will stop this. There is no valid reason to put these types of small business investment corporations out of business.

Regulations now exist to prohibit unbridled land speculation by small business investment corporations. Proper policing by Small Business Administration to enforce this regulation is all that is necessary—not an order that will put out of business both the good and the bad—if any—with no distinction.

If these types of small business investment corporations are put out of business, so will the people be out of business who have been their clients, such as small homebuilders, suppliers of homebuilders, and employees of homebuilders such as carpenters, plasterers, and brickmasons. We cannot let that happen.

The amendment has been presented on this side of the aisle, and I believe it is acceptable to the committee, and I believe the minority has passed upon it, and it is acceptable to them.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEPHENS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. Is it acceptable to the Members on our side?

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEPHENS. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. WIDNALL. I believe it is acceptable to all Members on our side.

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEPHENS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. BROCK. Why did the Administrator impose this new regulation?

Mr. STEPHENS. The opinion I have is that the original regulation said there would be no land speculation. The small business investment corporations which were organized were not supposed to be engaged in land speculation.

Rather than policing this properly, as it should have been done, the procedure has been just to treat everybody exactly alike, the good and the bad, without making any differentiation.

If the Small Business Administration would take the time to look at the good ones—and, if there are any, the bad ones—it should be done on that basis, rather than by arbitrary regulation.

Mr. BROCK. What the gentleman is saying—and I believe I would concur—is that under existing law the Small Business Administration has the authority to stop involvement in speculative or dangerous practices in real estate transactions, but has not exercised the jurisdiction in this regard except by blanket indictment of a practice for all concerned.

Mr. STEPHENS. My amendment would stop that. They would have to do it properly.

Mr. BROCK. The effect of the gentleman's amendment, and I want to have it clearly understood, is not to broaden the authority of the SBIC's to engage in any speculative activity which they would not have been able to engage in before.

Mr. STEPHENS. You are absolutely right.

Mr. BROCK. It does not in any way reduce the authority of the Small Business Administration to pursue these maltransactions if so they be. That is true, is it not?

Mr. STEPHENS. That is correct.

Mr. BROCK. So, in effect, we are saying we have existing authority that the Small Business Administration should be required to enforce the statute as it was originally drawn.

Mr. STEPHENS. That is correct.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEPHENS. I will be glad to yield to the chairman.

Mr. PATMAN. Much of this confusion I am sure is due to the fact that every year we have had a new Administrator. I think we are nearer on a permanent basis now the time when we would have good people to administer this law than we have been at any time in the past. I believe we will have less confusion under this administration than we have had in the past.

Mr. STEPHENS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to yield now to the gentleman from California [Mr. HANNA].

Mr. HANNA. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I want to associate myself with his amendment and strongly associate myself with the remarks made by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BROCK], because I know last year we passed the legislation which gave them the powers that would allow them to go ahead and regulate this industry. At the same time they want us to pass a law now that will completely prohibit it. I certainly agree with both gentlemen that we are proceeding in the right way with this amendment.

Congressman Horton Says Insurance Industry Pledge of Massive Investment in Inner City Jobs and Housing Shatters Myth of Disinterested Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 13, 1967

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, today Mr. Eugene Fitzhugh, president of Metropolitan Life Insurance Co., announced that the life insurance companies of this country have pledged $1 billion for investment in city core areas to improve housing conditions and to finance job-creating enterprises.

This is an outstanding example of enlightened corporate action. During the past year, both the executive and legislative branches have recognized that any Federal effort to rehabilitate our slum areas must be accompanied by private investment. However, we were warned time and again that private enterprise would never invest in rebuilding our slums because the risks far outweighed possible returns on the investments.

Mr. Fitzhugh has destroyed the cliche that private enterprise is unwilling to take high risks to meet necessary social goals.

This cliche was resoundingly crushed earlier this year by the leading industries of Rochester, N.Y. More than 40 Rochester industries joined civic leaders to form Rochester Jobs, Inc. Through Rochester Jobs, the local industries pledged to hire 1,500 untrained, disadvantaged men and women; to provide them with whatever training is necessary to make them employable; and to put them to work on full-time jobs. Further, industries and other private groups in Rochester and throughout the country are working to provide rehabilitatated housing for the inner city poor.

Mr. Speaker, this is creative participation in urban rehabilitation by private enterprise. It is positive proof of industry's realization of its responsibility to lead the rebuilding of our cities as an important means of promoting a healthy economy under our free enterprise system.

The actions announced today by the life insurance industry and the programs of Rochester Jobs, Inc., and numerous other groups have set precedents for others to follow. I applaud these people because we so desperately need the investment of private funds in the massive task ahead. I hope that other companies will add their strength to this fight to rebuild urban America.

Further, I hope the Congress will continue to support programs which foster this urgently needed participation of the private sector.

Hon. Edna F. Kelly Appears Before National Commission on Urban Problems in New York City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 13, 1967

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, because of the recent recess in our congressional proceedings, I was fortunate enough to have been able to spend more time in my district than is normally permitted during a session of the Conggress. Therefore, I found that I was able to tour various parts of my district, which is the most populous in the State. I was able to visit with numerous constituents and neighbors, in order that I might personally gage how they felt about various domestic and foreign problems facing our Nation, State, and local communities.

Mr. Speaker, my discussions and meetings at home only confirmed what my mail in recent months has indicated—that the major domestic concern of my constitutents is the rapid decline of living conditions and opportunities in our city of New York.

Therefore, I welcomed the opportunity I had during the recess to share my own personal concern and the concern of my constitutents regarding the plight of our city by testifying before the National Commission on Urban Problems on September 8, during the course of their 3-day hearings in New York City. The Commission, appointed by President Johnson and chaired by our former colleague, U.S. Senator Paul H. Douglas, is seeking ideas in order to break the log jam of inertia, inappropriate taxation, outdated zoning laws and building codes, and discrimination which have prevented us from making our cities more livable.

In calling for action to alleviate some of the problems facing the city, I stated:

> It is self-help on the part of individuals and self-determination which could make this City even more livable than it formerly was. No government nor any amount of money can do the job alone. What is needed is a combination of all forces in the Community: business, industry, the professionals and religious and civic organizations. All must work together for progress—to correct the errors of the past—with mutual trust of each other.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD the full text of my testimony detailing constructive proposals toward solving the problems of our cities and urban areas:

STATEMENT OF HON. EDNA F. KELLY, 12TH DISTRICT, BROOKLYN, N.Y., BEFORE THE NATIONAL COMMISSION ON URBAN PROBLEMS, AT THE COMMUNITY CHURCH OF NEW YORK, SEPTEMBER 8, 1967.

Mr. Chairman and members of the Commission, I welcome the opportunity to participate in today's hearings of the "National Commission on Urban Problems". Your task is a difficult assignment—to look into the local issues affecting the cities of the United States. Mr. Chairman, you stated in your release of August 31st, "We are trying to break the log jam of inertia, inappropriate taxation, outdated Zoning Laws and Building Codes, and discrimination which have prevented us from making our cities more livable. We are seeking workable ideas from all sources—government, labor, business, education, civic organizations—on what is required to overcome these obstacles to create decent low-cost housing and good neighborhoods for all Americans."

You have been listening to expert witnesses testify on issues involving the problems of our cities—problems which have caused devastating inroads on the lives of city dwellers and the tranquility of urban society.

I do not propose to agree or disagree with the points presented or with prior witnesses' suggested "workable ideas". Consideration and appraisal of all of these proposals is your difficult task.

In my capacity, I offer my assistance, my office and my personal knowledge in any manner you consider helpful.

As you know, I appear today as a Member of Congress, having the honor of representing the 12th Congressional District, the most populous Congressional District in the State of New York, which is located in the most populous Borough of the City of New York—Brooklyn.

Based upon the 1960 census, more than 2,600,000 people reside in the Borough of Brooklyn. It is separated from the other Boroughs of the City of New York by seven bridges and a tunnel. At one time it was a city unto itself. While Brooklyn is now only part of the City of New York, its problems are as extensive, or more so, than those of many of our larger cities. Brooklyn is unique, as is each of the Boroughs of the City of New York. While there are common threads, each Borough requires individual attention as their problems are different due to natural barriers which separate the Boroughs of the City of New York.

We are all aware that our cities are facing perhaps the greatest challenge of this era. We know that every facet of urban living is on the move. This momentum has a formidable bearing on the city dweller—economically, socially, politically and psychologically. I believe this leads to the "log jam of inertia" to which you referred in your release of August 31st.

How can we try to break this "log jam"? Mr. Chairman, my answer is action! Action on our part—the city dweller. There must be a return to the positive feeling of love, of pride and respect for the Community and the City in which we live. It is self-help on the part of individuals and self-determination which could make this City even more livable than it formerly was. No government nor any amount of money can do the job alone. What is needed is a combination of all forces in the Community: business, industry, the professionals and religious and civic organizations. All must work together for progress—to correct the errors of the past—with mutual trust of each other.

We are all aware of the broad background of the problems this Commission has earmarked. Many of them, such as outdating Zoning Laws and Building Codes, fall within the scope of local city governments. To these I add many of more urgent nature. They are: taxation problems, discrimination, housing, employment, education, crime and exodus of the middle-incime group from cities.

In addressing myself briefly to these issues I realize, Mr. Chairman, that you are an Economist and I take a deep breath before mentioning this first item.

I submit for your consideration that a complete study of taxation and taxing powers of all levels of government must be undertaken. This should include taxation from the Federal level down to the smallest unit of local government. In some instances the burdens of taxation on businesses and individuals have become oppressive. For example, certain taxes which are essential to produce required revenue for the City of New York are causing an exodus of businesses from the City and of the middle-income group. Without this group no Community can survive. I am as sure as we are here today that if the exodus of business and middle-income people is not halted in New York—New York will soon lose its position as the business center of the world.

The second issue to which I refer is discrimination. The Federal government has acted to help to restore and insure the inherent rights of all persons. Both federally and locally, laws have been enacted to prohibit discrimination on all fronts. These are matters of public record. I submit, however, that it is the duty of government to enforce these laws, people to accept these laws and those affected to measure up to their responsibilities. Congress has taken action on urban problems. It has created a Cabinet post of Secretary of Urban Affairs. It has enacted the Poverty Program and has provided for a small number of new low-income housing units. There is, however, much more Congress must do to measure up to its responsibility to the commonweal. In this instance our responsibility is to our urban communities.

There are many excellent Bills in Congress concerning urban problems which await action. I have introduced many of these along with my colleagues. I trust the Commission will review them and make recommendations on them in its report.

My colleague, Senator Robert Kennedy, testified before you on Wednesday and addressed his remarks to these Bills. I agree that passage of them would be a substantial step towards our objectives.

These Bills, which I have also introduced, would provide incentives for the creation by private industry of additional employment opportunities for residents of urban poverty areas and would provide new low-income housing by creating a mechanism by which private enterprise can and will build and rehabilitate large numbers of low-cost housing units in urban poverty areas.

It is obvious to me, as I believe it is to many others, that while much valuable legislation is pending in Congress, the Federal government may find it difficult, at this time, to provide the enormous sums of money required to achieve the goal of constructing sufficient low-income housing. Other ways and means must be found to achieve this necessary goal.

Business is now ready to take its place in the social mission of government. It now has a little better recognition of the function of profit than it formerly held.

One of the best methods of breaking the "log jam" is, as I see it, to devise means of eliminating the problems which have kept private enterprise out of the low-cost housing field. Basically, these problems are two in number. They are, the high cost of constructing low-income housing and the high cost of maintaining the same due to prevailing interest rates, taxes, vandalism and virtual destruction of many properties by those who occupy the same.

I am not an expert in the field of housing, but I submit that in addition to the legislation I have referred to, a cooperative program can be developed whereby private enterprise could construct low-income dwelling units for sale on a cooperative basis. I envision a program providing for federally guaranteed low-interest, long-term mortgages under which the Federal government would contribute the differential between the interest rate paid by the borrower and the going rate of interest. I further envision cities granting tax reductions or tax abatements on these properties. Combined with these suggestions, I further propose that in connection with these properties the Federal government institute a program whereby a low-income purchaser could negotiate a federally guaranteed low-interest, long-term loan to help pay a large part of the cost of purchasing the cooperative housing unit.

By this method, private enterprise would find it feasible to construct low-cost housing. Normal banking and financial channels could be utilized to provide the necessary financing.

Perhaps most important, low-income families would, through ownership, develop pride which would guarantee the preservation and proper maintenance of these properties. In this regard, I am convinced that the greatest majority of low-income families are hard-working, decent people who, if given the opportunity to live decently, will justify our confidence.

I wish to make one further observation concerning the problems faced by this Commission. I believe that this Commission should not only concern itself with existing housing problems, but that it must also give consideration to developing ways and means of preventing existing housing from deteriorating to slum-like conditions. I have in mind what has happened, for example, in the Bedford-Stuyvesant section of Brooklyn, part of which is within my Congressional District. Several years ago there were few areas of sub-standard housing in the Bedford-Stuyvesant area. As a result, this area was completely overlooked by the City planners. Priority was given to bulldozing already deteriorated areas and constructing, in their place, high-rise apartment buildings. Bedford-Stuyvesant, a transitional neighborhood, was left untouched and rapidly deteriorated so that vast numbers of its housing accommodations are now substandard. In this regard, I urge that serious consideration be given to such problems as code enforcement, vestpocket construction and rehabilitation of existing housing accommodations. Preventing deterioration of housing along with selective construction of new units, are the steps that are necessary.

The problems faced are difficult and many long-existing prejudices must be conquered.

It is my hope that this Commission's recommendations will serve as a blueprint for the future—for a great part of our future is bound up in our ability to solve the problems of our cities and urban areas.

Tribute to Councilman Edmund D. Edelman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS M. REES

OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 13, 1967

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I want to call to the attention of Members of the House an event which is taking place in my district at the Century Plaza Hotel, in the Los Angeles Room, on Wednesday, September 27, 1967, at 7 p.m. At that place and time, City Councilman Edmund D. Edelman, who represents the Fifth District, will be honored by citizens of my district as well as citizens of the city of Los Angeles not only on the occasion of his 37th birthday, but also for having completed his first 2 years in office as a city councilman.

Councilman Edelman has had a long and distinguished career in government service prior to his election to the city council in May 1965.

After graduating from UCLA Law School in 1958, he worked as a law clerk for U.S. District Court Judge William M. Byrne, in Los Angeles. He then became a deputy legislative counsel to the California State Legislature in Sacramento. He came to our Nation's Capital in 1962 as counsel for the Special Subcommittee on Labor headed by my distinguished predecessor, Congressman James Roosevelt. He worked in the Kennedy administration as a special assistant to the General Counsel on the National Labor Relations Board, also in Washington, D.C.

In his first 2 years as a city councilman, Mr. Edelman has made significant contributions to this district which he represents and to the city as a whole.

I would like to call to the attention of the Members of the House one particular area where Mr. Edelman has been most active; that is, finding solutions to the growing problem of financing local government.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, the cities of our Nation are finding it increasingly difficult to meet their responsibilities to provide municipal services to the people of the urban areas. These services include police and fire protection, street cleaning and street maintenance, recreation and parks, libraries, and all the other essential areas that make life in our cities safe, enjoyable and meaningful. Mr. Edelman, as chairman of the Revenue and Taxation Committee of the Los Angeles City Council, has approached the problem of financing Los Angeles city government in an enlightened and tangible way. He has, for the first time in the history of the city of Los Angeles, asked academic experts in the field of municipal taxation from various universities in California to come before his committee and present recommendations on reforming the tax structure of the city of Los Angeles as well as suggesting new sources of revenue with which to finance city government.

As a result of Mr. Edelman's efforts this past year, the property tax rate in the city of Los Angeles was reduced by a fraction of a cent. In this age of ever-increasing tax burdens being placed upon property owners, this result was certainly welcomed by the citizens of Los Angeles. There is now also in preparation a report by Dr. Harold Somers, of UCLA, which will have significant impact for city governments throughout California as well as the Nation. This report looks into the problems of the future financing of the city government of Los Angeles.

Mr. Edelman, as chairman of the Revenue and Taxation Committee, has traveled to Sacramento on numerous occasions, conferring with the leaders of the legislature to bring to the attention of the State the importance of finding common solutions to help city governments meet their municipal obligations. As a result of Mr. Edelman's efforts, an Assembly Interim Committee on Revenue and Taxation will meet in Los Angeles later this year to find ways by which the State government can assist cities in California.

Mr. Edelman is also a member of the National League of Cities' Revenue and Taxation Committee as well as the Revenue and Taxation Committee of the League of California Cities.

I believe his work truly merits the commendation of all those who are interested in approaching the urban problems of our cities and who are attempting to meet them in a thoughtful way.

Mr. Edelman has also been active in the fight for progressive legislation in the city of Los Angeles. He was the sponsor of the establishment of a City Human Relations Commission. He also was cochairman of the citizens committee against the so-called clean amendment, known as "proposition 16" and aided immeasurably in its defeat in November 1966.

Mr. Edelman has constantly raised his voice in defense of civil liberties. Recently in a motion he introduced in the city council, he called for an investigation of the handling by the police of the June 23 peace march at the Century Plaza Hotel.

Beyond these accomplishments for the city as a whole, Mr. Edelman has given tremendous service to his particular council-manic district. Not only has he established a district office for the convenience of his constituents but he has helped the senior citizens by the opening of a new senior citizens' center on Fairfax and by the expansion of facilities for senior citizens at the Robertson Playground; he has helped those who use the libraries by insisting that the Robertson Library maintain hours for the public on Sundays; and he has helped pedestrians and motorists through his concern for traffic safety by obtaining the installation of new stop signs and signals at various problem intersections in his district.

Mr. Speaker, I am truly pleased to call Ed Edelman my friend. He certainly represents an independent and enlightened voice in the city hall of Los Angeles.

The Kee Report—World Food Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 13, 1967

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a recent public service television and radio newscast, "The Kee Report."

The subject discussed in this report is the steps being taken to avoid the threatened world food shortage.

WORLD FOOD SHORTAGE

This is Jim Kee—bringing you the Kee Report.

In the past few years, a grim warning has been coming from our experts in the field of nutrition. Unless world food production is doubled within the next few decades, the results will be mass starvation on a frightening scale.

The work being done to prevent this catastrophe is known as the war on hunger. The United Nations is playing a major role in this campaign and so is the Government of the United States. A basic cause of the projected food shortage is the rapid increase in world population. But other causes also contribute and unless these are eliminated, the campaign for food expansion will end in failure. In this brief talk, I would like to outline what the problem is and how it should be met.

The American people are the most generous on earth. They have given lavishly to other peoples in distress since this nation was founded and they always will. In former times, when famine threatened in Asia, Africa, or South America, the sufferers could count on food in abundance being shipped from the United States.

But, in the current race between food and population, the mere export of agricultural products will not be enough. Unless production is drastically improved, the war on hunger will be lost. In that event, even the entire grain surplus of the United States would do little to relieve the situation.

Those working on the problem agree that the primary need is for the export of American farm know-how to those regions where farming is being carried on just about as it was a thousand years ago. In other words, as one expert said, the biggest teaching job in history is the only thing that will win the war on hunger.

The fascinating story of how modern methods have increased the quantity and quality of American food may be summed up in a few words. Even though we have fewer farmers than twenty-five years ago, they grow more food on fewer acres. Even with fewer acres planted, the sale of farm machinery has increased more than sixty percent since the year 1960. As a result, the output per man-hour has increased seventy-five percent. Another factor is the increased use of fertilizers by American farmers. These factors combine to make our agricultural industry the most efficient on earth.

These are some of the things which must be taught in those countries where farmers are still scratching the soil with wooden plows. Government experts will do a large part of the teaching job. But the Johnson Administration has appealed to private industry to help bear the burden, and our businessmen are responding in splendid fashion. American corporations are establishing food processing factories in those countries where they are urgently needed. Food spoilage is a dreadful problem in most needy countries and local officials are being taught how to process, store, and transport food after it leaves the farm.

A recent news item shows the need for this. This report said that in India, where food is already in short supply, from three to five million tons of food are consumed each year by rats, squirrels, birds and monkeys. This is just about the amount imported each year to avoid starvation.

If this experience is repeated in other countries, the war on hunger will certainly fail. That is why a teaching campaign is so urgently needed.

Thank you for listening.

Unfunny Political Comedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 13, 1967

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, during the congressional Labor Day break a National Conference for New Politics took place in Chicago, which had for its intention the organizing of the radical left of the country into a new political vehicle. The conference received widespread coverage from our news media. This coverage should alert the public to the great danger facing our Nation from the radical left. The Chicago Daily News, on September 6, carried a very penetrating editorial commentary on the conference which I feel merits the attention of the Members. The editorial follows:

UNFUNNY POLITICAL COMEDY

Perhaps the promoters of the just-ended National Conference for New Politics were right in believing the moment is ripe for a new political movement. But the first duty of a new political movement is to offer a proposition that has at least a thimbleful of sense to it. That ingredient never surfaced in the five raucous days of the Chicago meeting.

What did emerge—as Mike Royko pointed out—was a curious masochistic ritual of white liberal intellectuals baring their backs so the black power fetishists could lay on with whips. "In the end," wrote our Jerry Lipson, "the image was one of militant Negroes in African garb, or with shorn heads and Chinese-style beards, stalking the halls of the Palmer House and brushing coldly past white delegates." Sometimes, indeed, they paused to jostle or insult their white fellows. There has seldom been a ranker example of pure, even exultant, racial prejudice.

As for the meeting's declared purpose of righting fundamental wrongs in the United States, that was lost in the shuffle. The meeting busied itself with such idiocies as condemning Israel for its "imperialistic Zionist war" against the Arabs, and demanding that the United States throw down its arms and get out of Vietnam tomorrow morning. Civilized people like Norman Thomas, the aging socialist, and the Rev. Martin Luther King came with hope of finding something significant, and departed without finding any common-ground with the kook element that took over the show.

If any good comes of the conference it will be strictly negative—an object lesson in how not to go about setting up a third political force.

As in the summer street riots, the serious-minded people found themselves shouldered out of the way by a sick element whose only real cause is hate.

Perhaps in this fiasco the Negro leadership will find cause for a reassessment of aims and methods. There may still be something to gain from a serious conference aimed at refining and focusing the political power of the civil rights movement. But unless it could find a way to circumvent the hoodlums and crackpots and hatemongers, such a meeting would be a total waste.

Soldier in Vietnam Writes Condemning Riots

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 13, 1967

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, the gallant young Americans fighting on the frontiers of freedom in Southeast Asia have their viewpoints sharpened by the turbulence of war and the realities of this far-from-perfect world. One such young soldier is Sgt. Lonnie Miller, of Pocahontas, Ark., now serving with the 8th Artillery in the Mekong Delta of Vietnam. A letter that Sergeant Miller wrote to his sister, Mrs. Doris Tanner, recently was published in the Pocahontas, Ark., Star-Herald, and what this fine young soldier has to say will be of keen interest to all citizens.

It is a privilege to bring this letter to the attention of the Members of the House by placing it in the RECORD:

SOLDIER IN VIETNAM WRITES CONDEMNING RIOTS

A soldier who has been in the midst of fighting with the 8th Artillery in the Mekong Delta in Vietnam, writes the following letter this week to his sister, Mrs. Doris Tanner, in Pocahontas:

"DEAR JOE, DORIS AND GIRLS: How are things in Pocahontas? Great, I hope. I'm doing as well as could be expected, trying to stay cool, which is the most difficult job in the world!

"This is Thursday night and I'm on duty tonight, firing. So far, we haven't fired but one round tonight, but we will probably fire a hundred before morning. I don't have too much time left over here.

"Boy, this place is something else. Maybe it's because I want so much out of life, maybe more than I'm entitled to. Over here, you see children running around naked, hungry and without parents and home, and it makes me stop and think how fortunate we are as Americans and how the United States is right to take a stand in Vietnam. If we don't help, no one else will. And these kids' children will be no better off!

"I thank God that I was born in the United States and not in Vietnam, and that my children will be born in a land free of war and poverty. I probably sound a little patriotic. Well, I think I have to! I'll do anything for my country! I've come to the most remote part of the world for it, and it's a shame that there aren't enough people today who will stand up for our country instead of degrading it with riots and demonstrations.

"After I finish these five months I have left here, I know that I have done my part, and anyone who can't give two years of his life for an entire life of freedom doesn't deserve to be a free man!

"Well, Sis, I have to get back on the job. Tell everyone I said, "Hi," and write real soon.

"Love always,
"Your brother,
"Sgt. LONNIE MILLER."

A Private Enterprise Approach to Better Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 13, 1967

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, recently I joined with our junior Senator from New York, Senator ROBERT F. KENNEDY, in sponsoring a new approach to better housing on a dignified basis for those who are trapped in the slums.

It would be distressing if this session of the Congress were to come to a close without some indication that we have learned a lesson from our previous mistakes in the field of housing.

If ever a new approach were needed to the obviously ineffective, tangled, and inadequate measures to rebuild our cities, the time for that new approach is now.

Curiously, this need not mean a heavy assessment of new funds from the obviously inadequate resources of the Federal Government. Everyone in America wants to live in a decent home, and I have enough confidence in the people of this country to believe that each of us wants his neighbor to live in a decent home within the means of his family. Such an objective is not only feasible, it is preferable to the present system under which the Federal Government grants over $2 billion a year to be used for the rental of substandard, fully subsidized slum housing.

The feasible alternative to this wasteful, demeaning system would be the program proposed in the legislation to which I refer above.

The least that this legislation deserves is an airing and open hearing without delay in the appropriate committees of this body.

I realize that there is a National Commission on Urban Problems currently conducting forums on this and related matters in the great cities. I also am well aware that a Presidential Commission looking to the cause of riots of the summer past is examining similar situations. However, in the ultimate and final analysis, no one can respond to this need but the Congress of the United States. Why, then, should we delay or wait for collateral groups when we should be examining at first hand the matters which are our own particular responsibility. In support of the contention that there is an answer for us which demands our immediate attention, I ask my colleagues to read the recent article which appeared in the New York Daily News referring to this legislation and I place it in the RECORD at this point:

BOBBY'S PLAN WORTH CLOSER SECOND LOOK

(By Ted Lewis)

WASHINGTON, July 18.—Bobby Kennedy's recent proposals for getting private enterprise dynamically involved in helping cure the ghetto problems of the nation deserve a second more careful look. This is because there are indications that President Johnson is thinking along the same line.

What Kennedy proposed in the Senate last week was a tax incentive system aimed at establishing industries in slum areas, thus providing neighborhood jobs. Also similar tax credits for investors in low-cost housing.

In the process of offering these two programs, Bobby said the present government-run effort is a flop—"ineffective, inefficient and degrading."

On the basis of those cracks it was easy to conclude that the New York Senator was targeting in on Johnson on this big domestic issue. Whatever Bobby does always is supposed to be inspired by an anti-Johnson motivation.

In this instance, however, such an assumption could be completely erroneous. The President has clearly been aware of the bureaucratic bungling, of what Kennedy called "a screen of government agencies keeping the poor apart from the rest of us."

Otherwise, Johnson would not have had a task force headed by Edgar Kaiser, the industrialist, working for some time in an effort to get private enterprise in on the ghetto rehabilitation effort. In addition, it has not been denied that the problem of slum joblessness is under study by another Presidentially-selected "hush-hush" group.

If the war against poverty in the slums had been going well, neither task force would have come into being. There is similarly no doubt that Johnson has his heart in the campaign against poverty because he was once a poor boy himself. Moreover, unless it starts clicking soon, especially in ending ghetto frustrations, he could be in a political spot in Presidential 1968.

The Kennedy-sponsored new approach, therefore, could be most appealing. And it was perhaps significant that the two Kennedy bills were introduced and sponsored in the House by Democratic Whip Hale Boggs (La.), who seldom moves in a controversial way without White House acquiescence.

What also is not realized is that the President has considerable respect for imaginative new ideas tossed out by Bobby for coping with serious domestic problems. He may resent Bobby being first with a proposed solution, but he would have to admit that few new ideas with any merit come from within his own tired Administration.

A RIOT-CURB WEAPON, CHEAP AT THE PRICE

And the merit of the Kennedy plan is its relative cheapness as a potential riot-curb weapon. For example, it is estimated that $50 million in the form of tax credits would attract large-scale private enterprise investment in low-cost housing.

Similarly, Kennedy has claimed comparative low cost for his proposed system of tax incentives to get private enterprise to set up plants in poverty areas. The subsidies would go to any firm agreeing to create at least 50 jobs, two-thirds of which would go to area residents.

Kennedy's Senate speeches emphasizing the need of immediate action to enroll private enterprise were delivered just before the Newark riots, but his statistical case is equally pertinent in the aftermath.

He pointed out that in the last seven years almost every Congress has enacted "another bill designed to put people to work." Yet, in the big city slum statistics across the nation, after seven years of federal effort, "the proportion of adult men in the work force in these areas dropped from 74% to 65%.

FAMILY INCOME DROPS IN POVERTY POCKETS

Government figures also showed, he said, that while family incomes nationwide increased 14% over a five-year span, in the nation's poverty pockets they dropped by 8%.

The most significant statistics he offered were from the Labor Department. They showed that from June, 1965, to June 1966, a total of 950,000 new jobs "were created for young men." How many went to "the youth of the poverty ghetto?" Only 33,000.

While Kennedy did not have the Newark situation to refer to, he did have the Buffalo, N.Y., riots of June. What happened in Buffalo he said, pointed up how "we have failed for the young men in the poverty ghetto who struggle with unemployment rates of 40 or 50% or more."

Kennedy's conclusion was that "the lack of private enterprise participation is the principal cause for our failure to solve the problem of employment in urban poverty areas."

URGES TAX INCENTIVE TO BOOST INVESTMENT

The federal government gives tax breaks to encourage private enterprise to invest in have-not countries abroad. Why then, asked Kennedy, should not the government use the tax incentive device to encourage investment in poverty areas?

Much more is going to be heard of this Kennedy-sponsored program in the Congressional months ahead. It may well be revamped so it will look different, and more like a Johnson package than a Kennedy plan of action.

But it is the way the Administration is moving, and faster than appreciated, for each ghetto riot only emphasizes the ineffectual inefficiency of federal bureaucracy.

Majority Rule?—Maybe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. ANDREWS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 13, 1967

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues and the readers of the RECORD the following editorial which appeared in the September 7 issue of the Alexander City Outlook. This editorial very clearly expresses the views of the people I talked to while in Alabama for the Labor Day recess, as well as some of my colleagues in this august body.

The editorial follows:

MAJORITY RULE?—MAYBE

The majority of the people in these United States want an immediate halt to the riots, their destruction, and a swift and sure stroke of justice against their perpetrators.

A majority also wants an honorable, decisive peace in Vietnam that will bring American men home for good. More than 50 per cent want Stokley Carmichael arrested and tried for violating his passport privileges by traveling to Cuba and Hanoi and for preaching overthrow of the U.S. government—in short, open Communism.

More than half the nation wants the Communist liberation school in Nashville, Tenn., smashed for an eternity and its leaders arrested along with Carmichael. More than half our people want Rap Brown silenced and defanged.

Practically every American wage earner does not want the proposed surtax, the proposed postal increase or any more so-called civil rights legislation.

Moreover, the majority of our citizens do not want the Supreme Court legislating and directing policies that are provinces of other branches and levels of government.

Therefore, if ours is a government of the people, for the people, etc., as we have always been taught and still believe, why aren't the wishes of the majority being carried out? Judging by the trend today, we are getting everything we don't want and nothing we do.

Congressman Horton Notes Article by Hon. Kenneth Keating, Judge of the New York Court of Appeals, Supporting Compensation of Criminal Victims

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK HORTON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 13, 1967

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, a recent issue of the New York State Bar Journal reprinted a speech delivered by my good friend and constituent Ken Keating, who formerly represented the congressional district which I now have the privilege of representing. Judge Keating, now a distinguished jurist on the New York Court of Appeals, delivered this address—which supports granting compensation to victims of crimes—to the annual convention of the Association of New York Supreme Court Justices.

Judge Keating points out that the administration of the criminal law in this country is oriented toward protecting the interests of society against the criminal element and doing whatever possible to rehabilitate criminals so that they may resume their proper place in society. However, at present this Nation makes no effort to assist the victims of crime whose person or property is injured.

I have sponsored a bill to provide compensation to victims of crime—H.R. 714—and I found Judge Keating's remarks to be thought provoking and worthy of sharing with my colleagues. I think they merit the serious consideration of all of us in Congress as well as all citizens who are concerned about the growing crime problem this Nation faces.

The address follows:

COMPENSATION FOR VICTIMS OF CRIME

(By Kenneth B. Keating)

(NOTE.—Judge Keating has had wide experience both in law and in government. He is a new judge of the Court of Appeals whose views on compensation for victims of crime merit our readers' attention.)

The administration of criminal law in the United States has become what I would call "defendant-oriented." To put it another way, the administration of criminal law in the United States has largely concerned itself with a one-dimensional approach: the interests of an entity usually labelled "society" are protected against the transgressions of the individual criminal. When that individual has "paid his debt to society," as the phrase goes, that is usually the end of the matter, although society may in turn express an interest in rehabilitating the criminal.

The neglected factor in this equation is the victim of the crime—the citizen whose person or property has been invaded by the criminal. This morning I should like to ask, "What about this citizen?" I should like to consider what recourse, if any, he has? Does the criminal owe a debt to him as well as society? And more important, is there some sort of debt or duty owed by society?

A great deal of our efforts and resources have been directed toward the definition and protection of the rights of alleged criminals, and justly so. For herein lies one of the truly significant steps forward in the protection of human rights and civil liberties. As a former legislator I can fairly say that it has been the judiciary—both judges and lawyers—who have been in the forefront of this movement. However, while we can congratulate ourselves for efforts to protect the rights of the alleged criminal, I think we must admit that we have been negligent in failing to devote comparable concern to the innocent victims of crime.

We frequently defend the accused, provide him with transcripts and other necessities. If convicted, we lodge him, feed him, clothe him and even entertain him—and then we try to rehabilitate him. All the while his victim—perhaps injured, hospitalized or out of work—has the questionable consolation of paying taxes to the treasury which finances the paternal care of the criminal. It is only within the last few years that this victim has begun to receive attention.

The principle which has spurred the recent attention to the problem of the victim—and the principle which I wish to discuss with you this morning—is the compensation of innocent victims of violent crimes by the community as a whole. Although it may surprise some to know that the principle of compensation of victims dates all the way back to 2200 B.C.—it is found in the Code of Hammurabi—there has been very little public or scholarly interest in the matter until very recently. Perhaps it is true—as most of the scholars point out—that the revival of our long dormant interest in compensation should be credited to the dedicated work in England by Margery Frye in the 1950's.

However, it is also true that mere reading of a large urban newspaper cannot help but point up the problem. For example, last October the father of a 15-month-old infant was stabbed to death in a New York City subway when he went to the aid of two women being molested by a young thug. One result of that crime was the passage by the City Council of the so-called "Good Samaritan Bill" which authorized pension payments to persons injured or killed while trying to prevent crimes.

The principle of compensating innocent victims of violent crimes goes far beyond the "Good Samaritan." Professor Childres of N.Y.U. has divided the problem of compensation into two questions: Ought it be done? and can it be done?

With regard to the first question, some have argued that society as a whole is responsible for the existence of conditions in which crime festers and therefore is responsible to the victims of crime. Others say that the community has failed in its duty to protect the victim against crime and therefore should compensate him for his injury. Still others point out that industrial mishaps—among others—are compensated by workmen's compensation laws so why not criminal attacks? Whatever be the theoretical basis, we should keep in mind that our objective is to solve a great social problem.

Those who oppose the principle of compensation to victims argue that it is another step—and a very big one at that—along the road to abandonment of all notions of individual responsibility and a resort to complete dependence upon governmental paternalism. They say the sociological decadence that could come from that kind of thinking might be far worse than the economic consequences.

Now, no one could be more committed to the principle of individual responsibility than I. However, I refuse to be blinded by dogma. The extent and nature of any solution depends on the extent and nature of the problem. The crime problem facing us is immense and our response to it must be correspondingly large. The principle of compensating victims is a sound one and I fail to perceive any side effects such as abandonment of individual responsibility.

Quite the contrary, a system of compensation would have beneficial effects which are often overlooked. For example, it would call the attention of the public to the frightening growth in the crime rate, which I think may well be the single greatest threat today to our society. There would be a greater interest in the matter of law enforcement—the public would be more likely to insist upon and secure adequate police protection. It is a sad commentary today when a crowd of citizens can stand around helplessly while a man is stabbed in a subway or a woman raped in a courtyard. Rather than abandoning it, I think a system of compensation would lead to an increase in the sense of individual responsibility.

Jeremy Bentham once wrote:

"Punishment, which, if it goes beyond the limit of necessity, is a pure evil, has been scattered with a prodigal band. Satisfaction, which is purely a good, has been dealt out with evident parsimony."

The victim of a crime gets little satisfaction from the fact that the criminal might be convicted and punished. The victim of a crime, of course, usually has a cause of action in tort against the perpetrator. But, as we all know, persons who commit violent crimes are generally immune from civil reparation actions, either because they cannot be apprehended or, if apprehended, they are destitute. It is suggested that the state can help to fill this breach.

In 1963, New Zealand passed the Criminal Injuries Compensation Act. A three-member administrative tribunal administers the scheme under which personal damages—not property damages—may be recompensed. A similar statute became effective in Great Britain January 1, 1964.

Since then, several of our own states have considered proposals, and numerous Bills have been introduced in the 89th Congress, the best probably being one which is patterned after the New Zealand law. Though I am at present more concerned with the principle of compensation than with the details of the system, I would say that the type of implementation which I envision is the compensation for expenses resulting from injury or death, including loss of earning power and other reasonable pecuniary loss, suffered by victims of homicides, criminal assaults, and forcible rapes.

Such compensation would not necessarily be dependent upon criminal guilt or conviction. It is the loss suffered by the victim which is determinative, not the acts or motives of the perpetrator. In fact, there need not even be a criminal—for example, a person's acts may be deemed criminal for compensation purposes although by reason of tender age or insanity, for example, he cannot be classified as a criminal.

I do not deny that there are many, many problems to be faced in working out such a system. It is true that all too often victims are equally to blame for the criminal act, if not on a legal standard then on a moral standard. The rape victim has often acted in a highly provocative manner; the assault victim may have started the fight himself. Then there is the racketeer who tries to "muscle in" on a competitor and receives a gangland beating in return.

Then there is the further problem of collusion, although it is unlikely that someone would intentionally suffer physical injury merely to be recompensed for expenses and loss of earning power. However, it is possible that evil thoughts might be inspired. As Maitland wrote of the Anglo-Saxons and early Normans who believed in compensation:

"The sons of a villanus who had but two oxen must have been under some temptation to wish that their father would get himself killed by a solvent thegn."

We would have to construct new criteria to determine when a victim is eligible. The line would have to be drawn at a place different from, say, the line dividing culpable from non-culpable homicide, or that dividing murder from voluntary manslaughter. As under the New Zealand statute, the administering body, whether an independent commission or a court, would have to consider the behavior of the victim.

My point is that the problems should not deter us, particularly if they can be kept within reasonable bounds. If the principle be good—and I believe it is—it is certainly worth further study.

One of our states has already acted—California has adopted legislation. Though the California program has serious defects, the state is to be congratulated on its initiative. California requires a conviction of the criminal prior to the eligibility of the victim for aid, and integrates its victim compensation system into its state welfare program. While this may be administratively desirable, I think the root of the California error is in its equation of compensation for victims of violent crimes with welfare laws. Welfare and compensation are not necessarily related in their rationale, their victims, or the social problems they seek to alleviate. However, I repeat that California has taken a step in the right direction and all of us should follow their experiment very closely to see what can be learned from it.

Professor Mueller of N.Y.U. has said:

"The issue of victim compensation should not be resolved emotionally or politically until its implications have been ascertained academically. Victim compensation is a problem crying for a solution, but even Americans are not capable of solving a problem until its dimensions are known. All avenues of approach must be explored and the social consequences of suggested changes in the status quo should be projected and analyzed."

I am not asking you this morning to write your assemblyman or your Congressman, or to vote for any particular legislation. But as judges and as leading citizens, you are most keenly aware of the problems of crime and the criminal law. As those most closely related to the problems of the victims of crime, I ask you to think about it . . . study about it . . . and contribute, if you can, to the scholarship and academic analysis which is so vitally needed by our community today.

Sam Davenport

SPEECH

OF

HON. WALTER S. BARING

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1967

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join in paying tribute to one of the finest public servants to ever work on Capitol Hill, Sam Davenport. His retirement is truly a great loss to all of us. A personal friend for more than 20 years, Sam, to me, was almost like being a member of my staff. He never failed to keep me advised of matters that would be of particular interest to my State of Nevada. Whenever a question arose, and seemingly no answer was available, a telephone call to Sam produced the answer.

As editor in the office of the House Coordinator of Information, Sam Davenport was as indispensable as any person could be. His warm and personal service was above reproach.

I wish Sam Davenport and his wife untold happiness in their retirement.

Antipoverty Workers Praised for Antiriot Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 13, 1967

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, I was glad to see that the Office of Economic Opportunity has issued a very thoroughly researched publication which shows that the overwhelming majority of antipoverty workers have proven to be an important force for peaceful communities. It is just not so, as some ill-informed people would have the public believe, that poverty workers contributed to civil disorder during the summer months.

An example of the very excellent antiriot work performed by antipoverty workers has been furnished by the Los Angeles Times. In a recent story, which I recommend to my colleagues, the Times described a youthful citizens patrol named "Gangbusters" which has won praise from police and from other community leaders for its work in keeping community peace.

Mr. Speaker, one of the Gangbusters, 21-year-old McKinley Soil, was shot to death after breaking up a fight. This unfortunate death, in my opinion, was as much in the line of duty as any death of a law enforcement official in any riot-torn city. Yet stories of courage and self-sacrifice by antipoverty workers such as McKinley Soil and the Gangbusters are, unfortunately, not as well known as the outrageous rumors that the poverty program is responsible for riots. I am grateful to the Los Angeles Times for helping to set the record straight. It is a simple matter of fact that people associated with OEO programs have been a tremendously positive and peaceful influence in cities all across the country. The Times article follows:

Win Police Praise—Negro Gangbusters Avert Race Trouble

(By Paul Houston)

A newly formed Negro citizens patrol, named the Gangbusters and composed mainly of ex-convicts, was credited by police Monday with staving off serious trouble in Venice Sunday night.

When 500 youths threatened to burn down the home of a 16-year-old murder suspect, police withdrew and let the seven poverty program employes calm the crowd.

Five hours later all was quiet and the house still stood.

"I haven't thought much of some of the Gangbusters in the past, but they did a hell of a good job," one officer said. "They averted serious trouble."

Police are so encouraged by the patrol's three weeks of summer peacekeeping that one community relations official tentatively recommends formation of similar patrols elsewhere in the city.

Lt. Frank Wysocki of the Venice Division police station noted, however, that the Gangbusters patrol operates differently from the controversial Community Alert Patrol in South Central Los Angeles.

ABILITY TO COMMUNICATE

"We don't want an organization to watch the police," he said. "We want somebody to keep the peace. The work the Gangbusters are doing is splendid. What's important is their ability to communicate with the young toughs on the street."

Gangbusters don't wear identifying badges or armbands, although the matter is being studied by the patrol's leader, John Fleming, 41.

The patrol can't afford radio equipment for their cars, so they rely mainly on the telephone for communication.

Contrary to the policy of the CAP, the Gangbusters work closely with police. They claim that if they witness a crime, they will give police a license number or follow a suspect on foot to a place where police can apprehend him.

Such cooperation with police would not seem designed to win the favor of the community.

THINKS THEY'RE ACCEPTED

"But we're not thought of as Uncle Toms," said Gangbuster Clarence Dove, 36, a soft-spoken, bearded ex-convict. "Some of them call us 'police with no money' (actually they earn $320 a month), but I think we are accepted."

There was evidence pro and con in this regard Sunday afternoon and night.

Twenty-one-year-old McKinley Soil, a Gangbuster, tried to break up an argument between Edward F. Anderson, 16, and another teenager, Dove said.

"Soil pushed Anderson back and told him to break it up," Dove related. Anderson didn't like the advice and later, police said, he shot Soil to death at the corner of Indiana and Lincoln.

Soon after Anderson was arrested and booked on a murder charge, a crowd of 500 angry youths began assembling in front of Anderson's house at 704½ 7th Ave.

"Soil was popular in the neighborhood," Dove said, "and some of the kids wanted revenge on Anderson's family."

CRIES OF "BURN, BABY, BURN"

There were cries of "burn, baby, burn." According to Dove, a girl swinging a jack handle smashed the windows of the car of young Anderson's sister.

Police, understandably wary of provoking serious trouble, called on the Gangbusters to help.

When the seven members arrived—unarmed and in street clothes—police withdrew and kept in touch by telephone. The code word to summon them back was "Castille" (after Negro poverty worker Robert Castille). Just in case, police also made plans to declare a riot-ready Tactical Alert.

None was needed, although the Gangbusters did not have entirely smooth sailing.

Ernie Jefferson, 26, the first Gangbuster on the scene around 5 p.m., was resisted by two teen-age boys when he tried to stop the girl's window smashing. The boys backed off, however, when Gangbusters Bobby Neal Lott, 23, and Henry Scott, 23, arrived.

"They saw we meant business," said Dove.

At the height of the disturbance, Gangbusters went so far as to evacuate Anderson's father, mother and five brothers and sisters from their house and put them up for the night in a motel.

The patrol also got merchants nearby to close early as a precautionary measure.

CALMING ACTION

To calm the crowd, Gangbusters went through weeding out about five "ringleaders."

"We talked 'em into getting in our cars and taking a ride around Santa Monica," Dove said. "We told 'em. 'This man (Anderson's father) didn't have anything to do with his son. Let the police take care of him. Why burn the man's house down? He won't have any place to live.'"

Dove said persuasion was the Gangbusters' sole weapon.

"I think they appreciated it. They talked later about how glad they were they didn't burn the house down. After you get to a guy and talk to him. I don't care how hard-core he is, deep down he doesn't want to burn down the man's house."

Dove was asked how words alone should work so well.

"All of us but Jeff (Jefferson) have records. The people in the community realize we know what's happening inside the jails, how dirty they are, how you can't get a job when you leave. They listen to us."

The Gangbusters patrol operates as an arm of Project Action a three-year-old nonprofit youth center founded to get teenagers and young adults off the street corners and into a purple-walled recreation building at 1101 Washington Blvd.

Dove said Gangbusters patrol the 15 square blocks of Venice's Negro area from noon until 3 a.m., seeking out groups of youths "stacking up on the corners." They patrol in their own cars.

One Gangbuster also is stationed at a liquor store at 7th and Indiana—a "hot spot"—to watch for thieves or crowds gathering.

THEY'RE TOO TIRED

The patrol tries to get youths to head for the Project Action recreation center, "where we dance them until they're too tired to get into trouble," Dove said. Pool, table tennis and reading also are available.

Gangbusters have an ingenious way to break up two-man fights.

"We take the guys inside the building and put boxing gloves on them," Dove said. "Then they don't want to fight. They know that nobody is going to come to their aid then."

When Gangbusters spot young troublemakers on the streets, they pick them up and take them home, giving a stern lecture en route—and discussing the matter with their parents on arrival.

"Parents seem to be all for it," Dove said.

If a serious fight appears under way, a Gangbuster will take one of the participants on a ride and get his story while another Gangbuster stays behind with the second belligerent.

Dove said relations between police and the community of 5,000 Negroes have improved noticeably in the last six months.

Lt. Wysocki of the Venice Division pointed out, "Any help the Gangbusters give us is good. It takes a little pressure off us. The only effective law enforcement we can have is not by the police but by the people themselves."

Small Business Act Amendments of 1967

SPEECH

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 12, 1967

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 10409) to amend the authorizing legislation of the Small Business Administration and for other purposes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIDNALL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PATMAN. May I state to the gentleman that the Members on the majority side are familiar with the amendment and favor it. We have examined it, along with the minority Members and the members of the committee staff on each side, and we are convinced that it is a good amendment and we would like to accept it.

Mr. WIDNALL. I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

Dr. John Lewis Taylor

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 30, 1967

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, it was with profound sorrow that I learned of the passing of Dr. John Lewis Taylor, Consultant on Indian and Territorial Affairs of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. It is with a deep sense of personal loss that I rise to pay tribute to the life and memory of "Doc" Taylor.

It was my privilege to recommend Dr. Taylor for the staff position on the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the duties of which he professionally and faithfully performed since 1953, until his passing on August 29, 1967. During these 14 years, those of us who came to know "Doc" Taylor were impressed with the knowledge, counsel, and dedication he espoused so effectively in all his endeavors.

Dr. Taylor was aptly qualified to serve as our Consultant on Indian and Territorial Affairs because of his education and experience. A native of Oriska, N. Dak., Jack was a graduate of State Teachers College, Valley City, N. Dak. He was the recipient of a master's degree from Columbia University in political science, as well as a master's in geography and doctorate in philosophy from Clark University. Thereafter, Dr. Taylor served in Malaysia as an educator and administrator until entering the military service with the U.S. Navy.

Throughout the period of World War II, the Korean conflict, and thereafter, Dr. Taylor developed an expertise on territorial and insular affairs which, in addition to his experience in the field of education, made him acutely aware of the problems of the American Indian community. His outstanding service in these fields have made the name of "Doc" Taylor known in every Indian community of this Nation and throughout the territorial and insular possessions of the United States. His service to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs was an outstanding contribution to our national life. The absence of his counsel and person will long be felt.

Although we shall no longer have the benefit of his hard work and good counsel, his spirit will remain with us, for Dr. Taylor was an exceptional person. He displayed a kindness and understanding seldom seen to all who sought his counsel. His patience and optimism instilled others to keep the light of hope burning.

"Doc" brought prestige to his professional, civic, and community responsibilities, and maintained a active interest in his professional military status, retiring as a Captain in the U.S. Naval Reserves. He participated in the activities of the Association of American Geographers and local parent-teacher associations. Dr. Taylor held many responsible positions in the activities of his church and served as a trustee at the time of his death. I had the good fortune to meet his associates in these other endeavors and all, I am sure, are deeply saddened by his passing.

Mr. Speaker, I would be remiss if I did not mention the love and devotion Dr. Taylor had for his lovely wife, Virginia, and their five children. I am certain that such a fine family can be justly proud of their father and husband. For, it can be truly said that he served his family, community, and Nation in the spirit of a great living American.

Mrs. Saylor and I extend our most heartfelt sympathy to his lovely wife, Virginia, and the children, in this hour of their great loss—a loss we shall all share for time to come.

Mr. Speaker, I include herewith the remarks of Dr. James Elliott Mooney, a friend of Dr. Taylor, on the occasion of his untimely passing:

Dr. John Taylor's Interest in Antarctica on Behalf of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee

(By Dr. James Elliott Mooney)

In recent years many historians and geographers indicate that "both here and abroad they have been interested in the social aspects of history." There is, however, an underlying intellectual assumption that the historian as a craftsman imparts geography as an integrated portion of their discipline. John Taylor always gave me the impression that writers and intellectual planners were taking time to place their historical subject within geographic bounds.

Doctor Taylor was firm in his belief that any intellectual perspective that dealt with social and economic matters should also include geographic information in order to properly place the thought expressed. He looked with some reservation upon historians, scientists, and economists who kept within the narrow range of their subject. He wanted history and geography to be living attributes with vital motivations. That was why he thought of the new continent of Antarctica (new in the sense of geography, science and economics) as a real opportunity to explore the many facets common to our modern society. He envisioned U.S. Antarctica efforts as a perfect circle, containing all of modern thinking and researching, and that there would be one central place where such would be amalgamated.

So he went to the source of things to find out how this could be accomplished. He studied the many aspects of Antarctica which was an area among many others with which he was concerned. It should be stated here that the many interests which the United States had in Antarctica were not, and are not simple. They are complicated. To glean facts and to research are expensive motivations and during the past ten or fifteen years have largely been the responsibilty of the Federal government.

Antarctica exists as a relatively new continent over the horizon, and at the bottom of the world which is increasingly attracting, and I might add challenging, the interests of modern man and his technology.

Dr. Taylor envisioned that the efforts down there that concerned the United States should be centralized and not diffused, and I agreed with him, and for a number of years I have, with a number of my colleagues, tried to do something about it. Neither Doctor Taylor nor I wanted to tolerate "willy-nilly" or "catch as catch can" scientific organization for scientific research. We both opposed unattached, and uncentralized activities. So, Doctor Taylor and I, at the behest of the late Congressman, (later Senator) Engle, studied to find out ways and means to accomplish something of a basic organizational nature which would make posible good administration through the most practical implementation. It was our belief that a unit in the government should be established as a means to this end.

Doctor Taylor visited Antarctica on two occasions during the recent activities on that continent. He talked with operations people, logistics specialists, scientists, legislators and administrators.

He inspected buildings being used, and spent a good deal of time reading programs and visiting projects being developed. He went inland by tractor and airplane, and I am sure he would have treked by dog team if one had been available. He wanted facts. He, upon his return, outlined what he had seen and heard, and he turned this information over to the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. He talked with a number of those who were directly involved with Antarctic projects, in particular Admiral Dufek, Admiral Byrd, Admiral Tyree and myself. These conferences were held over a considerable period of time—perhaps several or more years. Doctor Taylor also discussed the programs with repersentatives of the State Department, the National Science Foundation and the National Academy of Sciences.

He talked with Senators as well as with Congressmen. He arranged with others to have Congressional representation in Antarctica each year so that the legislators could observe at first hand the many operations carried on down on the "ice."

Doctor Taylor, in conjunction with others, arranged to have the Commander of the Naval Support Force, Antarctica, and the director of the scientific program appear before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs each year to impart first hand the efforts of the United States in Antarctica.

Doctor Taylor came to the conclusion that no matter what activities were being carried on by the United States in Antarctica, they were not tied closely enough together. On this, he conferred with Congressman Engle and Congressman Saylor, with Admiral Byrd and me, and like myself, was a leading proponent of the need for legislative authority to establish an Antarctic Commission. As a result, we were asked to prepare such legislation.

Doctor John L. Taylor did much to further the interests of Antarctica among legislators, who realized millions of dollars were being spent by our Government each year in Antarctica, and it has been difficult to properly assess the benefits gained from our activities in Antarctica year after year.

Doctor Taylor will be greatly missed for his many and greatly varied contributions. Not least among these was his untiring effort to improve the stature of Antarctic research and logistic organization.

Somewhere in the autobiography of Doctor William Lyon Phelps he wrote:

"The vast majority of persons are compelled to live without prodigious adventures, and without gratification of most of their transient desires; yet ordinary circumscribed existence can be exciting too."

Yet, Doctor Taylor was able to live both types during his life, but his calling while a member of the Interior Committee staff could hardly be termed a "sheltered life." It was "anything but dull."

I think most of us envied Doctor John L. Taylor's calmness and self control, and I might add, lack of ostentation. While Doctor Taylor seemed placid of temperment he was the kind of man who would go to the South Pole, who would endure hardships, not as a dull part of his daily existence, but rather because he had an inquisitive mind and a quiet self-reliance. There is a passage in "Pilgrim's Progress" which is rather emblematical of Doctor Taylor's life:

". . . . yet now I do not repent me of all the trouble I have been at to arrive where I am. My sword I give to him that shall succeed me in my pilgrimage, and my courage and skill to him that can get it. My marks and scars I carry with me, to be a witness for me that I have fought his battles who will now be my rewarder."

Widely Differing Functions of Commodity Futures Markets: "Lloyds of London and Las Vegas"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 13, 1967

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, the futures markets, on which $75 billion of trading in agricultural products is conducted annually, are now receiving the attention of the House Committee on Agriculture. Proposed legislation, H.R. 11930, is designed to improve the regulatory legislation under which the markets have operated for many years.

The need for regulation of these markets, both in their own interest and that of the public, arises largely from that fact that they are the scene of two types of operation which on their surface might seem unrelated and conflicting.

The feature of these markets which is most directly related to the distribution of the actual commodities is that of "hedging," that is, transferring price risk from handlers who wish to be rid of it to speculators who are willing to assume it. This is a sort of "Lloyds of London" insurance function.

The other function of the markets is to provide a place where persons speculating on price movements can back their judgment with their money. This has some of the characteristics of activities associated with Las Vegas.

Actually the two features are interdependent. Without the Las Vegas type activity there would be no speculators to whom risks of price could be shifted. Without active participation by many thousands of speculative traders the markets would quickly wither and die.

The Lloyds of London aspect is equally essential to the existence of the markets. Even though only a relatively small part of the trading is connected with the handling of actual commodities, it is essential to the operation of futures markets that there be this relationship to the production and marketing of the physical products.

The reconciliation and control of the potentially disrupting effects of these differing market forces has been carried on under the Commodity Exchange Act and earlier legislation for some 45 years. The amendments now proposed in H.R. 11930 are designed to correct certain deficiencies in the present law and promote continuation of the orderly and constructive operation of the markets.

A New World Money Created for Growth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 13, 1967

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, 4 years of hard bargaining among the financial powers of the non-Communist countries has resulted in a revolutionary monetary reform package expected to be signed in Rio de Janeiro later this month.

Details of this hopeful reform, the creation of its new assets, the "SDR", and its implications on the balance sheets of the world's powers are outlined in an excellent article by Sylvia Porter, appearing in the September 12 Pittsburgh Post Gazette.

I include the article for the attention of my colleagues at this point in the RECORD:

A NEW WORLD MONEY CREATED FOR GROWTH

(By Sylvia Porter)

Let's say you are head of a thriving business which has a sensational future if you can get enough cash to finance an expansion program. With enough credit to go ahead, you're almost 100 per cent sure of an indefinitely prolonged period of prosperity. Without it, you could be squeezed into bankruptcy.

You go to your leading banker who extends to you a line of credit. This assures you the cash to finance your business growth over the years ahead. Says the banker:

"We're extending this credit because your expansion is essential to the community's overall good health. As long as you don't try to overborrow, don't bother to repay the credit."

What assets do you put up as collateral to get the credit? None, except your good faith and prospects. Whose money will you be spending? Credit "created" for you by the banker.

This is gross oversimplification, of course, but it explains, in essence, what the International Monetary Fund will do when it creates a new form of world money governments can use to finance expanded trade and settle debts with each other.

NEW MONEY COMING

At Rio de Janeiro Sept. 25, finance ministers of the 106 nations belonging to the IMF will approve a plan to bring the new world money into existence, a step never before taken.

This will signal the first fundamental reform of our international monetary system since it was created at Bretton Woods, N.H., 23 years ago. The IMF is now a pool of $21 billion of paper currencies and gold. Development of a new "currency" marks a milestone in world finance.

After all technical details are hammered out, the plan, in the form of an amendment to the International Monetary Fund's charter, will go to parliaments of each nation for ratification. (A law must be passed by our Congress.)

Then, between 1969 and 1970, a new first-class monetary asset will be created which the governments of the world will use in addition to gold and U.S. dollars to settle national accounts.

Q. What will the IMF do?

A. It will create new "Special Drawing Rights"—SDR's—and issue a specified amount of them each year to member nations in accordance with each nation's economic importance or quota in the IMF.

Q. Who will use the SDR's and how?

A. Government central banks only will use them. The rights will exist solely on the books of the IMF and the member nations. Private citizens will never see the new money.

As the volume of world trade grows, the volume of the new credit will be increased, too. Danger of a shortage of credit to finance the expanded trade will be eliminated.

When a country gets into debt, it will draw on and use its SDR's along with its other basic reserves of gold and U.S. dollars to settle up.

Muscatine Looks Ahead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED SCHWENGEL
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 13, 1967

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, every week Gil Dietz, editor of the Muscatine Journal, writes a column which takes the form of a letter to his mythical "Aunt Sadie."

On September 9, 1967, Mr. Dietz' letter talked about the population growth of Muscatine and the education and vocational training needs that lie ahead. The letter is an excellent analysis of the problem which exists not only in Muscatine but elsewhere.

The column follows:

A LETTER TO DEAR "AUNT SADIE"

DEAR AUNT SADIE: It was reported Friday by the U.S. Census Bureau that Iowa was one of four states to lose population between the 1960 census and last July 1.

Overall the nation's population grew 10.4 per cent in the last seven years. There are now 197,884,000 persons in the United States.

Iowa's population is now 2,753,000—down two-tenths of one per cent since 1960. Wyoming dropped 4.6 per cent to 315,000; West Virginia was down 3.4 per cent to 1,798,000; and South Dakota dropped 1 per cent to 674,000.

Iowa's population loss has primarily been a shift from the small towns and farms. The cities, particularly in Eastern Iowa, continue to show population increases.

What's been hapepning in Muscatine?

A detailed study of population trends and predictions is contained in the Background for Planning—the extensive report compiled by Stanley Consultants. The report is now being utilized to prepare the ctiy's Comprehensive Plan which is expected to be completed later this year.

Population trends in Muscatine over the past 15 years closely parallel the changes in the city's economy.

Between 1950 and 1960, with the number of jobs available in Muscatine county actually declining, population held about constant. Since 1960, the Muscatine economy has taken a sharp upturn and population growth has accelerated.

Between 1950 and 1960 the population in Muscatine county increased by 1,700 persons or 5.3 per cent. This was an annual growth rate of only 170 persons. Between 1960 and 1965 the number of persons added was 1,600—an annual rate of over 300 persons or twice the rate of the 1950–60 decade. About 1,300 persons were added in the city of Muscatine, and another 300 in the surrounding urbanized fringe. Population in the rural portions of the county continued to decline.

The city of Muscatine had a population of 20,997 in the 1960 census. This increased to 22,194 in the 1966 special census. Estimates by Stanley Consultants, based upon projections by a Washington consulting firm in Economics, indicate that the city will have a population of 25,800 by 1970; 27,800 by 1975; and 34,000 by 1985.

Muscatine county now has a population of 36,200-plus. Population of the county is expected to grow to 40,100 by 1970; 44,100 by 1975; and 53,900 by 1985.

One of the most surprising factors revealed in the population study is low education and skill level which exists in the community. In 1960 the median number of years of school completed by Muscatine males 25 years old and over was only 9.3 and that for females 10.1. What it means is that over-half of all males in the prime earning years had not even entered high school let alone completed it. The 1960 census reported that of all persons from 14 to 17 years old, only 80 per cent, four out of five, were in school. This was the lowest share found among any urban community in Iowa.

The planning report says the low educational level is a serious problem and one that will require continued effort over the forecast period if Muscatine is to achieve a continued healthy rate of economic growth. "Vocational training and on-the-job upgrading of skills must be emphasized in Muscatine's plans for future community action."

Some advances have been made since 1960. One of the most important steps was the formation of the Eastern Iowa Community College and Vocational-Technical school district. The report would seem to indicate, however, that Muscatine needs to be broadening its vocational and job-training programs on the high school level.

Your nephew,

GIL DIETZ.

Taft-Hartley Law Hailed at Age 20 by U.S. Officials

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 13, 1967

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, we have recently witnessed the 20th anniversary of the Taft-Hartley law. The bill was an outstanding work of Senator Robert A. Taft, in whose cause I first campaigned when I ran for Congress during the classic battle of 1950. As most of my colleagues know, the Taft-Hartley Act was opposed by most of organized labor. It is now, however, hailed as a measure that has done much to prevent damaging strikes and to improve labor relations.

The following article from the August 22, 1967, New York Times comments on some aspects of the Taft-Hartley Act's anniversary:

TAFT-HARTLEY LAW HAILED AT AGE 20 BY U.S. OFFICIALS

WASHINGTON, August 22.—Top Government officials hailed today the Taft-Hartley Act's emergency provisions on the 20th anniversary of that labor law.

Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz and William E. Simkin, Director of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, said in separate interviews that the act had worked well since 1947 in preventing damaging strikes.

Both officials said that minor improvements could be made in the act's emergency provisions. But they observed that the act was working so well fundamentally that they saw no need for new antistrike legislation that would have the Government impose a settlement in major disputes.

The emergency provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act empower the President to seek a court order enjoining for 80 days a strike or lockout that he deemed would imperil the national health or safety. The law was passed by Congress over a veto by President Truman and went into effect on Aug. 22, 1947.

Its passage was bitterly assailed in 1947 by organized labor, which called it a "slave labor" law and sought unsuccessfully to have it declared unconstitutional. Many Independent labor-management experts also doubted the value of passing the legislation at the time.

The statments today from Mr. Wirtz and Mr. Simkin, and similar comments from union officials, made it clear that most authorities now take a brighter view.

"My general feeling is that it has worked out a great deal better than expected," Mr. Wirtz said, recalling that in 1947 he had opposed the law. "It covers comparatively satisfactorily all except a very few cases. It has given us a good strike record as a nation over that period."

Mr. Simkin said that the act was burdened by a "clumsy procedure."

Report From the 10th Congressional District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH M. McDADE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 13, 1967

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, each year I have had the opportunity of listening to the voices of my constituents through their answers to my annual questionnaire. This year, as before, I commend the answers to these questions to the attention of my colleagues here in the Congress. This is the thinking of the 10th Congressional District on the questions I placed before them:

[In percent]

1. Would you favor expansion of trade in non-strategic items with the Soviet Union and the countries of Eastern Europe?

Yes	53.0
No	34.0
Undecided	13.0

2. Do you favor an effort to reach an enforceable arms control and disarmament agreement with the Soviet Union?

Yes	72.0
No	21.0
Undecided	7.0

3. In the light of our current position in South Vietnam should we (mark one):

Continue our present course?	9.0
Mount a stronger effort for military victory?	57.0
Hold key positions and try to negotiate a settlement?	24.0
Withdraw gradually and completely?	10.0

4. Do you approve continued U.S. opposition to the admission of Red China to the United Nations?

Yes	65.0
No	22.0
Undecided	13.0

5. Do you favor a cutback of our troops in Europe?

Yes	50.4
No	33.6
Undecided	16.0

6. Do you favor an increase in the present limitation of $1,500 on outside earnings for those receiving social security benefits?

Yes	69.0
No	25.0
Undecided	6.0

7. Do you favor the proposed 6% surcharge on corporate and individual income taxes to help pay the cost of the war in Vietnam and hold the lid on inflation?

Yes	23.0
No	65.0
Undecided	12.0

8. Do you favor a reduction in Federal domestic spending in place of a 6% surcharge?

Yes	72.0
No	18.0
Undecided	10.0

9. Do you favor a tax-sharing arrangement, under which the Federal Government would return a portion of income tax revenues to the States, with no strings attached?

Yes	58.0
No	23.0
Undecided	19.0

10. Do you favor an income tax credit for parents with children in college?

Yes	65.0
No	29.0
Undecided	6.0

11. Do you favor an increase in social security benefits, to be financed through an increase in the social security payroll tax?

Yes	43.0
No	48.0
Undecided	9.0

12. Do you favor a rent supplement program to aid lower-income families?

Yes	28.0
No	60.0
Undecided	12.0

13. Would you favor a new Federal law which would: (mark one)

Totally ban the use of electronic listening devices?	7.0
Permit their use, at the discretion of the Attorney General, in national security cases?	21.0
Permit their use, as requested by the Attorney General and approved by court order, in investigations involving either organized crime or national security?	72.0

14. Do you favor a substantial increase in Federal expenditures to control air and water pollution?

Yes	68.0
No	23.0
Undecided	9.0

15. Would you approve granting tax credits to assist industrial plants in installing air and water antipollution facilities?

Yes	60.0
No	28.0
Undecided	12.0

16. In our present agricultural program, do you favor: (mark one):

Increased farm price support and increased crop control?	8.0
The present price support and crop control program?	16.0
A program to end farm price support and crop control?	76.0

17. Do you favor legislation limiting the import of dairy products?

Yes	64.0
No	27.0
Undecided	9.0

18. Would you favor the drafting of younger men first, rather than the present system of drafting the older ones first?

Yes	42.0
No	38.0
Undecided	20.0

19. Present draft laws call upon local draft boards to furnish quotas of men classified 1-A. Would you favor a law which would place all 1-A's in a national pool, with draft quotas filled from the pool by lottery?

Yes	41.0
No	38.0
Undecided	21.0

20. Do you favor the present system of deferring a college student who is in good standing?

Yes	57.0
No	33.0
Undecided	10.0

21. Do you favor legislation prohibiting the sale of firearms by mail?

Yes	65.0
No	31.0
Undecided	4.0

22. Do you favor raising postal rates to meet the deficit in our Postal Department?

Yes	43.0
No	49.0
Undecided	8.0

Pfc. Francis B. Amoroso Killed in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 13, 1967

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Pfc. Francis B. Amoroso, a young soldier from Maryland, was recently killed in action in Vietnam. I wish to commend the courage of this young man and to honor his memory by including the following article in the RECORD:

PRIVATE FIRST CLASS AMOROSO, OF NORTH EAST, KILLED IN VIET ACTION

NORTH EAST, MD.—Army Pfc. Francis B. Amoroso, 19, of North East, has been killed in action in Vietnam, the Defense Department announced yesterday.

Private Amoroso, the son of Mrs. Ruth Amoroso, was killed Sunday after an armored personnel carrier in which he was riding was hit by a Viet Cong anti-tank shell.

ENLISTED IN JUNE 1966

Private Amoroso was born in Newark, Del., where his family lived until several months ago when they moved to North East.

The young soldier attended Newark Senior High School and enlisted in the Army immediately after graduation in June, 1966. While in high school, he worked as a barber at the University of Delaware.

He received his Army training at Fort Gordon, Ga., and Fort Sill, Okla., and left for Vietnam on March 25. He was a member of the 25th Infantry Division.

ASKED FOR FOOD, CANDY

He wrote home recently that his unit was ambushed and that American soldiers killed four Viet Cong. He said that he didn't really mind Army life, according to his mother.

His last letters asked his mother to send him food and candy.

Besides his mother, he is survived by two brothers, Darryl Amoroso and Carroll Amoroso, both of North East, and two sisters, Mrs. Suzanne Swank, of Newark, Del., and Miss Joanne Amoroso of North East.

Observes 25th Anniversary of Death March

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 13, 1967

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, September 10, the residents of my congressional district observed the 25th anniversary of the Bataan death march. Thousands of residents lined the route of a mammoth parade in which scores of service, veterans, and civic organizations participated. Included among those taken prisoner were 98 men from Maywood and surrounding suburbs of Chicago.

The harsh and bitter memories of Bataan are doubtless indelibly impressed upon the minds of those who have survived, but for most of their contemporaries recollections of the fall of Bataan have been crowded out by a never-ending series of other episodes, and for the 90-some millions of Americans who have been born since 1942, Bataan may have little meaning. That is why, as your Representative in the Congress of the United States, I have again introduced a measure that would help keep green the memory of the gallant men who gave their lives in the defense of Bataan, as well as express our appreciation of the heroism of those who fought and bled with them.

My resolution calls on the President of the United States to proclaim the second Sunday in September of each year as Bataan Day in memory of the courageous defenders of the Bataan Peninsula and the fortress of Corregidor during the early days of World War II. I am hopeful that it will soon be adopted by both the House of Representatives and the Senate.

I want to narrate the story of Bataan and Corregidor, as well as the events that preceded and followed. To those who lived through those stirring days, this will be a mere rereading of an old chapter from your book of memories, but perhaps it will inspire the young people who will be hearing it for the first time.

America was unable to defend the Philippines, as the treacherous Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941, had immobilized her Pacific Fleet and made it impossible for her to get reinforcements and supplies to the 7,000 American and 75,000 Filipino troops that were commanded by Gen. Douglas MacArthur. These forces were concentrated chiefly on the island of Luzon, which was the keystone of the Commonwealth's defense system.

Because of its devastating attack on Pearl Harbor and its highly successful raids on our airfields in the Philippines, Japan had air and naval supremacy. She was all but immune from naval or aerial attack as her troops invaded the Filipino Archipelago. While MacArthur's army could not win and could only postpone the day of inevitable surrender, such delay would help America and her allies by slowing down Japan's advance elsewhere.

The Japanese landed on Luzon on December 10, 1941. Two of their armies which drove toward Manila had as their objective the encirclement of MacArthur's greatly outnumbered units. He avoided the trap by evacuating Manila and withdrawing his forces to Bataan Peninsula. The fall of the Philippine capital took place on January 2, 1942.

The defense of Bataan's rugged terrain began on the following day. Despite the fact that they were outnumbered by 5 to 1, the Americans and their Filipino comrades were in an excellent position for a prolonged defense of the peninsula.

MacArthur skillfully parried an attack on his right flank on January 11 and the Japanese suffered heavy losses. Eight days later he crushed another attempt to break through his lines. On the 29th, fierce artillery fire broke up headlong Japanese infantry assaults against both flanks simultaneously. On February 2, an invading force which assembled opposite Corregidor was smashed by a sudden bombardment from the fortifications, and the following day small American motor torpedo boats attacked a warship and torpedoed Japanese transports.

MacArthur's lines held firm throughout February and March, but the enemy continued to send reinforcements into the region of Bataan. The defenders of the peninsula had suffered heavy casualties, their remaining equipment consisted of a few tanks and cannon, and the men were exhausted by almost 3 months of constant fighting without air support. A few patched up pursuit planes constituted their air force. Even if they had been able to obtain aerial reinforcements, there were no airfields in the Bataan sector, neither were supplies of gasoline, bombs, or other ammunition available. Supplies could not be brought in from outside, as the American fleet was still out of commission as a result of the attack on Pearl Harbor.

General MacArthur was ordered to Australia and Gen. Jonathan M. Wainwright succeeded him. Late in March Gen. Tomoyuki Yamashita demanded that Wainwright surrender. The demand was refused and the Battle of Bataan continued.

The Japanese general began the effort to dislodge the defenders on March 28 with a heavy bombardment of the American lines. On the 31st, enemy infantry units, who were protected by a barrage of shellfire from offshore warships, forced a breach in the Bataan lines. The gap was widened by tanks, while enemy aircraft harried Wainwright's rear lines and disrupted communications. In the fiercest attack of the campaign, on April 8, waves of enemy shock troops poured through the crumbling defense lines. Wainwright's eastern flank collapsed and on the 9th the Japanese overran the entire Bataan sector.

Of Wainwright's entire force of 43,000, some 36,000 were captured, killed, or wounded in this battle. The general himself, leading a force of 7,000 soldiers, marines, and sailors, along with 3,000 civilian refugees, escaped to Corregidor, which was less than 5 miles away. Gen. Masaharu Homma's 80,000 troops held Manila and the entire rim of Manila Bay.

In a 10-mile triangle left to Gen. Edward P. King, Jr., now in command on Bataan, were 12,500 American officers and enlisted men, mostly army; 66,500 Philippine army men; 6,000 Filipino civilians, employees of the army; and about 20,000 refugees, many of them women and children. Hospitals and aid stations had 24,000 patients and disease was spreading, aided by bad diet and bad water. Food was almost gone. Bataan's defenders had eaten the peninsula's 600 water buffaloes, as well as the 250 horses and 48 mules of the cavalry.

"We have no further means of organized resistance," General King told his officers. He had orders not to surrender, but the alternative was slaughter. The general refused to accept the alternative and 12,500 Americans and 66,500 Filipinos were surrendered to the Japanese.

General Wainwright was determined to hold out as long as possible on the island of Corregidor, but the position of the fortress was hopeless. It was surrounded by a huge force which was supported by a heavy concentration of air power. There was no hope of reinforcement in men, guns, ammunition, food, or medicine. The exhausted garrison was subjected to daily bombardments. The Japanese attack on the fort began early in May. Corregidor's beach defenses were destroyed by a terrific bombardment from heavy guns emplaced in the mountains on Bataan Peninsula. Enemy landing parties which stormed the fortress captured it in an all-out asault on May 6. After having held out for 26 days, the sick and starving garrison capitulated.

Let us listen to the eloquent words of Gen. Douglas MacArthur:

> Corregidor needs no comment from me. It has sounded its own story at the mouth of its guns. It has scrolled its own epitaph on enemy tablets, but through the bloody haze of its last reverberating shots, I shall always seem to see the vision of its grim, gaunt, and ghostly men, still unafraid.

After the fall of Bataan, nearly 200,000 people were herded together on the lower end of the peninsula—the advancing Japanese army, the defeated American-Filipino army, and thousands of civilians. General Homma, whose bag of prisoners was twice the size he had anticipated, had barely sufficient food, medicine, and transport for his own army and was unprepared for the thousands in the hospitals, for other thousands hardly able to walk, and for thousands who had no food. The Japanese general wanted Bataan Peninsula cleared of his enemies and took care not to ask how it was accomplished.

The first of the survivors began to walk out of Bataan on the morning of April 9. Although they did not know it at the time, they were destined for Camp O'Donnell, which was 65 miles to the north. After the marchers had covered 31 agonizing miles on foot, they traveled 25 miles by rail, and then marched the final 9 miles to their prison.

Many of them failed to make it. Anyone who was caught with Japanese money in his possession was assumed to have taken it from a Japanese he had killed and was himself killed. At one point, nearly 400 Filipino soldiers were marched into the woods, tied together, and beheaded with sabers. The conditions under which the emaciated, hungry, and ill men marched are almost too horrible to relate.

General King estimated that 9,300 Americans had reached Camp O'Donnell by the end of May and that between 600 and 650 Americans had died on the march. Probably 10,000 Filipinos also died, while 6,000 escaped.

Throughout the pages of our history, brave men have written their names in blood so that their descendants could read about their heroic deeds and be inspired to emulate them. Valley Forge, Lake Erie, Chapultepec, Gettysburg, San Juan Hill, the many battles of the two World Wars, and the wars in Korea and Vietnam, are all accounts of brave men who fought to obtain, preserve, and extend freedom. Let us reserve one of the brightest pages for those who fell in the defense of Bataan and Corregidor and thus paid with their lives for the precious time that enabled other brave men to keep the enemy from extending his conquests.

Let us pause on one Sunday afternoon in each and every year to pay reverent tribute to these fallen heroes and to salute those who survived the sieges of Bataan and Corregidor and the infamous death march. How grateful we are that many of them have assembled here today, 25 years after they experienced a living hell. Let us hope that they will have many happy and useful years ahead of them and that the Nation for which they did so much will never forget them.

Pot and Kettle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 13, 1967

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, one of the most succinct and effective rebuttals to Communist propaganda appeared in the Washington, D.C., Sunday Star on September 10. This editorial speaks for itself and I insert it in the RECORD at this point:

POT AND KETTLE

Let us take note of how the unfree Soviet press has commented on the election in free South Vietnam.

Izvestia, the government newspaper (which means that it is a mindless enterprise completely controlled by Premier Kosygin and his fellow-bureaucrats) has called the vote a "farce."

And Pravda, the equally mindless organ of the Soviet Communist Party, has cried that the turnout of South Vietnamese—over 80 percent of the eligible voters—can only be regarded as a "foul" that should be viewed with contempt by the rest of the world.

Well, now.

Consider how the Kremlin and its satellites, not to mention Red China, run things.

Observe the splendid "free elections" in all the lands behind the Iron Curtain.

Who in those places—in Prague, in Bucharest, in Sofia, in Budapest, in Moscow—has been able to run as a free candidate?

Salute to the Thieu-Ky ticket.

It looks vastly better and more honest than anything the Communists have to offer.

Welfare Recipients Without Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 13, 1967

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, in Louisiana, aged and infirm white welfare recipients at a rest home were bodily ejected because the homeowner refused to racially mix his establishment and comply with all the Federal redtape.

Yet, in our Nation's Capital, welfare recipients are promoting a guaranteed right to welfare benefits with the State and taxpayers having no control over eligibility or supervision.

Quite a double standard. In the South, the recipient has no rights—Lyndon's law must be followed to the race quota. In the North, the welfare recipient is exempt from all laws—that is, laws of the people.

Mr. Speaker, I include the story from the Baton Rouge State Times for August 29, an article from the Washington Evening Star for September 12, and a letter from the Louisiana Department of Public Welfare, following my remarks:

[From the State-Times, Baton Rouge, La., Aug. 29, 1967]

DENHAM SPRINGS NURSING HOME DROPPED BY WELFARE PROGRAM

DENHAM SPRINGS.—A Livingston Parish nursing home owner has become the first to be dropped from the State Welfare Department's medical vendor program for non-compliance with the Civil Rights Act.

Claude D. Spring, operator of the Golden Age Nursing Home, was informed by Welfare Commissioner Garland Bonin that the department will discontinue payments for the 28 welfare clients now residing at the Golden Age, effective Sept. 15.

Alvis Roberts, welfare services director, said today the staff has recently completed inspection visits of homes throughout the state to see if they have integrated their facilities. Roberts said the staff is in the process of evaluating questionnaires and that figures on the number of non-complying homes will be available later in the week.

Roberts said Spring is the first nursing home operator to be informed that vendor payments will be withheld.

The vendor payment program is practically the backbone of the nursing home business, since roughly 70 per cent of the nursing home residents receive welfare payments.

The vendor payment program is heavily subsidized by the federal government.

Spring said he has participated in the vendor program for almost five years, since the inception of his nursing home. Twenty-eight of his 44 residents are welfare recipients, he said.

"They have you over a barrel," Spring said. "It's hard to make it without the vendor payments."

The home operator said, however, he does not intend to integrate his home or staff and that he expects his welfare clients to leave at the end of the month.

The Livingston Parish Welfare Department has sent leters to the relatives of the welfare clients telling them that the department will discontinue its vendor payments.

"Your parent will no longer be eligible for any services or payment from the Department of Public Welfare," the letter to the daughter of a client said. "However, if you desire transfer to another nursing home, the parish welfare office will assist in every way possible."

MAY RECEIVE $225 PER MONTH

Nursing homes classified as A1 by the Department of Hospitals may receive up to $225 per month per client from the welfare department and may collect up to an additional $100 per month from the families of the clients.

Springs's loss therefrom could conceivably come to $9,100 per month as a result of failure to abide by the integration directive.

Spring said he has received guidelines from the Department of Health, Education and Welfare calling for nursing home operators to meet with their employees and send minutes of the meetings to Washington.

Bonin pointed out the department was taking the action in order "to fulfill its responsibility as a recipient of federal aid funds."

The welfare commissioner told Spring he may still take steps to comply with the Civil Rights Act, including an open admissions policy and public announcement of the policy.

Spring was given sample notice for newspaper, radio and other communications media informing the public that the nursing home will integrate its waiting rooms, rest rooms, dining facilities, recreation rooms, therapeutic rooms and room accommodations.

The welfare department said a policy statement should be given "to each individual and organization that refers patients to the home and it should be conspicuously in the home.

[From the Evening Star, Washington, D.C., Sept. 12, 1967]

FOUR IN WELFARE SUIT GET AID TILL RULING

(By John Fialka)

A three-judge panel of the U.S. District Court has ordered District welfare officials to provide temporary aid for four women previously considered ineligible for welfare under a one-year residency requirement.

The panel's order yesterday said the District should provide aid until the judges decide the constitutional issues involved in the women's claim that the residency requirement deprived them of their basic rights to travel and subsistence.

The panel sat as a unit of the District Court, although two of its members are Chief Judge David L. Bazelon and Judge Charles Fahy of the U.S. Court of Appeals. They signed the order.

The panel's third member, District Court Judge Alexander Holtzoff, dissented. He had previously ruled that the case presented no substantial constitutional questions.

Dave Marlin, a spokesman for Neighborhood Legal Services, which is bringing the suit on behalf of the women, said he thought the order was a significant step in the court battle to have the residency requirement stricken.

Although Neighborhood Legal Services attorneys had argued their suit was a "class action" seeking relief for all welfare applicants affected by the rule, the court order mentioned only the four plaintiffs.

Asst. Corporation Counsel John Suda, who opposed the women's request for a declaratory judgment during a hearing Thursday, said 203 applications currently are on file which were denied because of the rule.

Under the rule, one must be a resident of the District for one year immediately prior to applying for public assistance.

Although 41 states, including Maryland and Virginia, still have similar residency statutes, three-judge panels, sitting as U.S. District Courts, struck down the laws on constitutional grounds in Connecticut and Delaware in separate decisions in June.

A similar panel of the U.S. District Court for Eastern Pennsylvania on June 5 issued a temporary order similar to yesterday's order in the District.

The decision of a three-judge panel may be appealed only to the U.S. Supreme Court. The Connecticut and Delaware decisions have been appealed already. Some observers feel the high court may hear all the cases together some time next spring.

A spokesman for the District Department of Public Welfare said temporary relief during suits for declaratory judgments is granted frequently and that the order should "have no bearing" on the merits of the case.

Suda argued that if the residency requirements were stricken, Washington would become "a mecca for the transient poor," because its welfare payments are higher than in surrounding jurisdictions.

The suit was brought originally by Mrs. Minnie Harrel, a 28-year-old mother of three, who came to the District last Sept. 3 from Bay Shore, N.Y. She is suing for back payments.

Mrs. Vera M. Barley, 65, of St. Elizabeths Hospital, later joined the suit, charging that although she had been a patient at the hospital since April 1, 1941, she was not eligible for welfare because the District law does not count time spent in the hospital as residency.

She came to the District one month before she was committed to the hospital and became eligible for rehabilitation two years ago. Mrs. Barley says she cannot be placed in a foster home until she is eligible for public aid.

The two other plaintiffs, who joined the suit later, are Mrs. Clay Mae Legrant, of 139 Bates St. NW., and Mrs. Gloria Jean Brown, of 4662 Hillside Drive SE.

STATE OF LOUISIANA,
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WELFARE,
Baton Rouge, La., August 17, 1967.

DEAR MRS. LANDRY: We regret that it is necessary to inform you that after September 15, 1967 the Department of Public Welfare will discontinue payment on behalf of clients who are patients in Golden Age Rest Home. Mr. Claude Spring has informed the Department of Public Welfare that he does not desire to comply with the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

It will be necessary for you to make other arrangements for continued care of your Mother, Mrs. Effie G. Deffez. If you wish for your parent to remain at Golden Age Rest Home it will be necessary for you to meet the total cost of nursing home payment. Your parent will no longer be eligible for any services or payment from the Department of Public Welfare. However, if you desire transfer to another nursing home, the Parish Welfare Office will assist in every way possible.

If you wish any other information regarding the present change, please get in contact with your worker at the parish office.

Sincerely yours,
NORWOOD T. C. CARTER,
Director.

Sam Davenport

SPEECH
OF
HON. PAUL FINDLEY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 31, 1967

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, with great regret and sadness I have learned of the retirement and departure from Capitol Hill of Sam Davenport. As a neighbor on the fifth floor of the Cannon Building and as an associate in the prayer breakfast group I came to know and admire Sam tremendously. We all wish him the best of health and happiness in his richly deserved retirement.

The Vietnamese Elections—A Constructive Result of Johnson Policies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ED EDMONDSON
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 11, 1967

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, the Nation's press is telling us, almost unanimously, that the elections in South Vietnam were fair, honest and democratic by almost any standard applied.

This is now the opinion of most of the world press which observed the event. And it is the opinion of a vast majority of the American people.

The Plain Dealer of Cleveland said in its editorial on September 4:

> There is no question about the determination of the Vietnamese people to establish a stable constitutional government.

The Chicago Daily News of September 6 said:

> The fact that an election could be held at all, given the circumstances that prevail there, ranks as a near miracle.

Yet it is not a miracle that Vietnam held an open free election.

It was, in good part, the result of 2 years of the most intense official and private American effort to help make democracy live and grow in an area which had formerly known only feudal or oligarchical rule.

It is not a miracle that South Vietnam still exists as an independent state today. It exists because the United States and its allies would not stand idly by and watch another nation taken over by communism.

The recent elections are not merely vindications of America's faith in the free impulses of the Vietnamese people. The elections are also vindications of American foreign policy in Vietnam—economic, military and political.

Peace will come in Vietnam as it must, when Hanoi and the Vietcong are satisfied that we will continue to inflict heavy penalities on them.

But when peace comes, it will come to a nation which has fought for its own survival—and has won.

It will come to a nation in which the United States has given its best resources and its best men.

It will come to a nation now building democratic and representative institions.

That is the American legacy to Vietnam. It is a proud legacy. And we ought to be immensely proud of President Johnson for strengthening that legacy by the policies he now pursues.

I insert in the RECORD editorials from the Chicago Daily News and the Cleveland Plain Dealer which support the American effort in Vietnam.

I also insert the Oklahoma City Times report of September 9, 1967, in which former national commander Eldon James gave his views on the Vietnam situation:

[From the Chicago Daily News, Sept. 6, 1967]

NEW START IN VIETNAM

The State Department has good reason to describe the election in South Vietnam as a "major step forward." The fact that an election could be held at all, given the circumstances that prevail there, ranks as a near-miracle. And if the outcome was about as expected, it detracts little from the premise that the war-torn nation has made the transition from a government by military junta to one based on the expressed choice of the people.

It is true enough that the military slate won, and that therefore the basic leadership is unchanged. The number of opposing parties also garnered enough votes among them to emphasize that President-elect Nguyen Van Thieu and his vice president, Nguyen Cao Ky, lack a solid majority among the electorate. But many an advanced country with a long history of democracy has experienced a similar outcome, yet developed a viable government. The observer team sent by President Johnson seems convinced that the election was conducted as fairly as possible and that the cries of "fraud" raised by defeated candidates lack any solid basis.

The Viet Cong enemy provided the best evidence that the election was not a sham. Its efforts to prevent the election and harass the voters expanded into the bloodiest sort of terror tactics as the day approached. For 83 per cent of the eligible voters to turn out in defiance of this threat required a high degree of courage.

The election marked the achievement of one of the goals set by the United States—to help the South Vietnamese people establish a representative government. This has been regarded as a first essential in creating conditions that could lead to peace. But if this "forward step" is to be meaningful it must be followed by many others.

The campaign speeches in South Vietnam were heavily larded with promises to make peace, and even Thieu and Ky, the military candidates, came around to saying they would do nearly anything—including talk directly with the Viet Cong—to bring an honorable end to the war. Now that the election watershed is behind them, promises must be replaced by action.

Vietnam has already demonstrated that there are no instantaneous solutions to its problems. The election altered only one factor in a puzzle so complex it has defied solution through months and years of increasing toil, sweat, blood and tears.

Yet if it remains true that the ultimate answer in Vietnam must come through political rather than military moves, the factor that has been altered could eventually prove to be the key. President-elect Thieu has acquired the political base he lacked to pursue both domestic reforms and negotiations for peace. Assuming he can solidify his new base, the door is open to initiatives barred to him before.

That is at least a more optimistic prospect than the one that has prevailed—the unending road of more troops, more bombing and more frustration.

[From the Cleveland (Ohio) Plain Dealer, Sept. 4, 1967]

BIG GAIN IN VIETNAM VOTING

"An election has been held in Asia in a country at war and this is a mighty step forward" regardless of criticism.

This comment by the Rev. Dr. Edward R. L. Elson of Washington, one of President Johnson's observers at the Vietnam voting, sums up the major immediate benefit of yesterday's historic event.

There may have been intimidation and even some fraud. There most certainly was confusion and questionable influence but

Vietnam has had its first free presidential election and has cleared another barrier to constitutional government.

The apparent victory of Nguyen Van Thieu as president and Nguyen Cao Ky as vice president came as no surprise. Too much was going for them for opponents to overcome in a nation embroiled in war.

The two men have been voted into an awesome responsibility, which, depending upon how they discharge it, can advance the cause of the free vote or set it back for decades.

With completion of the government in election of a House of Representatives next month, Thieu and Ky must move strongly toward establishment of a stable rule in which the peasants can place their trust.

They are committed to an elimination of corruption and to a request to Hanoi for opening peace talks. Success in either endeavor can do much to gain the people's confidence.

The Vietnamese voters contributed a spectacular display of courage. More than 80% of those registered cast ballots and despite relentless terrorism voting was blocked in only three of the 8,824 polling places.

President Johnson's panel of election observers deserve this nation's thanks for taking on a complicated assignment at great personal risk. Two of the members narrowly escaped terrorists' bombs and all of them found assessment of involved election procedures in a strange land a most difficult task.

There is no question about the determination of the Vietnamese people to establish a stable constitutional government. Proof of the wisdom of their choice of men to lead it is up to Thieu and Ky.

[From the Oklahoma City Times, Sept. 9, 1967]

Observer Sees Start of Vietnam Freedom

(By Jim Standard)

South Vietnam has achieved the basic foundations for the establishment of a strong democracy and its people are resolved to bring it about, one of President Johnson's observers at the recent Vietnam elections said Saturday in Oklahoma City.

E. Eldon James, a Hampton, Va., trial lawyer and a past national commander of the American Legion, said he found Vietnamese people throughout the war-torn nation are determined to make democracy work.

He said he also believes the election was "reasonably honest considering the conditions in the country.

"I wasn't brainwashed," James said. He said he formed his conclusions by talking to Vietnamese people in all walks of life and in small out-of-the-way places.

"I shook my security guards once so people I talked to would not be inhibited," he said.

He said an important thing he found was that the people were determined to vote in the election despite threats of Viet Cong reprisals. News services said 84 percent of those eligible to vote went to the polls.

"There was one place where a bomb hit," he said. "The people waited for the polling place to be cleaned up and put in order and then went ahead and voted."

He said he noted free expression among the people.

"One service station attendant volunteered to me he wasn't going to vote for the military ticket," he said. I asked him why and he said 'I just don't like (Premier) Ky.'

"It sounded like something I would hear back home."

James said one military man was running for a senate seat on a ticket not endorsed by the Vietnamese military.

"He said he didn't think he would win and planned to go back to his job with the military when he was defeated," James said. "I asked him if he thought he could get his job back and he said there would be no trouble. I thought this was significant."

James said the warmth shown him by the Vietnamese people as well as their resolve convinced him we are winning the war.

"It's no longer a stalemate . . . we are winning," he said.

He said people are no longer as fearful of the Viet Cong. On a previous trip to Vietnam, he said, he noticed the large number of unused roads.

"In a helicopter I looked at the roads this time and there was traffic on them," he said. "The roads are now secure—at least in daylight."

He said military briefings convinced him the Viet Cong are hurting for manpower and recruiting 12- and 13-year-olds. Even so, he said they are now supplemented as much as 50 percent by North Vietnamese regulars.

"I asked one man about the election and he said it was the result of sacrifice and 20 years of dead Vietnamese," James said. "I think these people now have a purpose for all their suffering and sacrifice."

James, who returned last Wednesday, said he has already reported his findings to President Johnson.

James is a member of the U.S. Veterans Advisory Commission and was in Oklahoma City for hearings on veterans affairs.

"Africa" Triumphs as 4-Hous Show

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 13, 1967

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, this Sunday night I was given a rare treat that combined entertainment and education. This treat was a television program on ABC–TV called Africa. For 4 straight hours I was entertained, enlightened, and delighted. It is an unusual and much appreciated occurrence when a television viewer's attention can be held for such a length of time, and ABC should be congratulated for this innovation in television programing.

The continent of Africa offers many hopes and problems for American foreign policy. The hopes can be fulfilled and the dangers avoided if Americans understand the peoples and the problems of Africa. This program, I am sure, increased that understanding.

It had many of the characteristics of a documentary—information, facts, interviews. But this is not what made the program unique and so worth while. We have all read and heard about Africa. This program presented the facts in their true context, not as separate entities, dry and colorless. The context was the very life of Africa; the strength of its history reflected in age-old customs, the land and its effects on the people and their way of life, the possibilities and limitations on development. And of special interest and importance, it gave the histories of the political development of many of the states of emerging Africa.

Television editor Eleanor Roberts of the Boston Herald-Traveler has described the quality and worth of this program. Her article in the Monday Herald is an excellent work of criticism. She discusses, as a critic in the field of the arts should, the artistic merit of the program. But she also sees the significance of the informational side of the program and its worth as a documentary. Miss Roberts' appreciation is for the skillful blending of these two aspects of the program.

I would like to include Miss Roberts' article in the RECORD. Not only is it a tribute to her critical ability, but it praises a program that I hope will be the first of a series:

[From the Boston (Mass.) Herald-Traveler, Sept. 11, 1967]

"Africa" Triumphs as 4-Hour Show

(By Eleanor Roberts)

Television reached new heights last night, when ABC-TV took a $2 million gamble and telecast four straight hours of "Africa" on Ch. 7.

It was one of television's finest achievements—a triumph! In 10 years of reviewing I've seen nothing to equal it. Not once did it drag—and I sat through the four hours in an ABC screening room in New York expecting to be restless. Instead, I was mesmerized.

The superb photography, the lucid, indepth examination of tribalism and emerging African independence, the exiciting musical score by Alex North, the whole tremendous scope of the presentation was monumental.

"Africa" is the ice-breaker in the frozen wastes of TV. By proving it can be educational, informative and yet entertaining it should blaze the trail for other TV blockbusters.

In view of the revolutionary programming format of this unique, full-evening of television, ABC was wise to break up the topics so that viewers could make their choice.

But you really had to see it all—Africa's culture, it politics, its unrest, its black-and-white relationships, its emerging nations and their problems, its animals and people—to appreciate it.

The story of this vast continent of over 300 million people was a fascinating melange of the old and the new—gleaming, modern cities and the tribal rites of the primitive Gwi Bushman—glorious views of Mt. Kilimanjaro and Victoria Falls—the excitement of watching Miriam Makeba perform—the appalling scenes of lepers being treated.

One of the most gripping segments came in the 10–11 p.m. period when the tragic story of the apartheid was told with Alan Paton, author of "Cry, the Beloved Country" explaining the problems of multi-racial South Africa and diamond merchant Harry Oppenheimer decrying the apartheid plight.

But more impressive than words were the scenes of men who live by passbooks—telling each African where he may work or live—cruelly shutting him out from the white man's world.

The four-hour epic examined the problem of education in Africa where the children learn by rote and students feel they should be looked upon as the elite.

It showed, in a most effective segment, the efforts being made to conquer disease with some vivid scenes at a Canadian missionary clinic. Sports were covered—including a shot of a pair of Lute wrestlers outside Dakar in Senegal battling to the beat-beat-beat of the drums.

There were sharp contrasts in the failures and successes of various countries. The story of Ghana, where millions of dollars of the people's money was squandered and its leader, Kwame Nkrumah deposed, was astounding.

Far more hopeful was the story of Kenya where a multi-racial state is working successfully under President Jomo Kenyatta. Most of the African leaders were interviewed on the program but the plight and potential of this vast continent is best summed-up by Howard K. Smith.

He found that none of the new Black African leaders had yet found the grail. It is far the poorest continent. Tom Mboyah of Kenya has said that the great danger is that the new nations may fail to develop.

ABC deserves tremendous credit for leading the way to better TV through "Africa". And kudos to executive producer James Fleming, who spent almost two years making it and men like Blaine Littell and Eliot Eliofson whose genius and craftsmanship contributed to its success. Gregory Peck made an excellent narrator.

Wise and Devoted Parents Essential for the Rebirth of the Spiritual Greatness of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES R. GROVER, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 13, 1967

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Speaker, it was with deep sorrow that I learned of the passing of one of my oldest constituents, Mrs. Mary J. Leitch, of Babylon, N.Y. I wish to pay tribute to her as a shining example of the wise and earnest parents our country needs for a rebirth of its spiritual greatness.

This remarkable woman came as a young girl from Ireland, many years ago, to West Islip, a stone's throw from Babylon. There, she met the man who became her husband, William B. Leitch. They were not endowed with an abundance of worldly goods, but together weathered the storm and raised a family of six boys and two girls. This family, from difficult and frustrating beginnings, developed into one of Babylon's finest. I am proud to remember the younger members from school and count them all as friends.

Mr. and Mrs. Leitch lived to see their children and their children's children to the third generation which, in itself, is not unusual. But, what is extraordinary about their descendants is the number of them, 65 in all.

Many of the first and second generations, due to the inspiration and love of this devoted couple, have already made their marks in the professional and business fields.

Mr. Leitch died 6 years ago. Undaunted, Mrs. Leitch, then in her 80's, flew to Ireland to beguile her old friends and relatives.

This mother was proud of her children's industry, their aspirations, their loyalty to one another and their ability to enjoy one another. They achieved what ordinarily might have been impossible but for here lively interest in each one of them, which interest continued to the moment of her death on August 25, 1967. Importantly, they were united by her warm love.

I stress this because, although there are many mothers in America who are as dedicated to the vocation of motherhood as Mrs. Leitch was, as a nation would benefit immeasurably if all of our mothers, regardless of race, creed, or origin of nationality, became single-minded about the most important work in this life: That of parents instilling in their children and, through them, in their children's children, a strong faith, inspiration, encouragement, and actual help in obtaining an education, teaching them to set their sights high, justifiable pride in their works, the virtue of industry, an interest in their fellowmen, a strong sense of loyalty to their country, and a deep humility toward God. These are the things that, if found in every family in America, would renew the faltering spirit of America.

The poet, Kay Magenheimer, has captured the spirit of this wonderful woman who, through the achievements of her family, had contributed so much to America.

With the hope that it will remind our colleagues of this pressing need in America; namely, devoted and wise parents, I commend their attention to my friend's poem, which follows:

AN IRISH MOTHER

(By Kay Magenheimer)

"Mary, come Home,"
Said God, months and months ago.
But Mary *didn't she once have red and shining hair?*
Was not about to leave; but coaxed Him in her irresistible way
To let her stay a while to see
And smile once more upon,
Or *who minds pain?* to inquire for
By name, those near and not too far, her own:

The sixty-five human beings
To whom she was Mother
And Grand- and great-Gran' Ma,
All of them *didn't she teach them?* destined too for heaven.

Moreover, she wanted time
For remembering *would she ever forget?*
How his hand, tentative with wonder,
Throbbed to each new pulse
His love had gifted her womb
The while, with the other
He tilted her head until her soft, blue eyes
Irish they were! met male eyes
That laughed with pride
As he reminded her:

It was he, William Barry Leitch,
He couldn't have been more Irish if he'd been born in Ireland!
Who was the progenitor
Of this great, new family . . .

The family that produced
A butcher; a baker *who was that?*
A candlestick maker *and that?*
And one who followed the sea;

Teachers, writers, administrators,
Entrepreneurs, thoughtful educators
And oh! the splendid one *she'd be seeing him soon*
Who might have become the scientist.

But, nothing accomplished
By this charmed and charming darlin'
Meant so much to her
Or truly to the world!

As the exceedingly singular
And most awesome fact
Dear, blessed God, remember . . . ?
That she was, besides,
The mother of a priest.

Small Business Act Amendments of 1967

SPEECH

OF

HON. GARRY BROWN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 12, 1967

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill H.R. 10409 to amend the authorizing legislation of the Small Business Administration, and for other purposes.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, the 1967 small business investment corporation legislative bill—H.R. 10409—as recommended by the Small Business Administration and considered by the House Banking and Currency Committee contains certain provisions which would have granted increased incentive provisions to the industry's medium and larger sized companies without detracting in any way from the small SBIC. Although our committee took no positive action at the time of its hearings to consider or adopt the recommended incentive legislation, it was nevertheless my understanding, and that of my fellow members, that such incentive legislation was vitally important to the SBIC industry and would be given consideration under a separate bill.

Let me point out and emphasize that the committee's failure to take action on the incentive provisions of the bill was by no means meant to indicate that the committee did not agree with such incentive legislation or consider it less than vital to the program. Rather, the committee's action in reporting out H.R. 10409 as it did was to first deal with those matters on which there was general agreement by the committee members. Since the reporting out of H.R. 10409 and talking with various members of the SBIC industry, we have become more convinced then ever that incentive legislation is needed and needed now for the medium and larger companies if the SBIC industry is to survive.

It is, I believe, important to note that the additional incentives requested would not in any way take away or reduce the incentives already provided for smaller SBIC's. As a matter of fact, the ratio of the additional incentives sought by the SBA and industry for the medium and larger SBIC's would not be as large as those presently provided to the smaller SBIC's.

Since the committee's failure to adopt or act upon incentive legislation, two of the largest public companies in the SBIC industry have served notice of their intent to leave the program. The departure of these two companies will take $58 million, or approximately one-sixth, of all the total private funds out of the program.

Obviously, there were probably many reasons which entered into the decisions by these two large companies to leave the program; however, the fact remains that their decisions were not announced until shortly after the committee reported out the SBIC bill without any provision for incentive legislation.

Of major interest to our committee in considering whether to provide incentives for medium and larger SBICs, was the Administration's report that it had established a reserve for losses on Government loans of $50 million. It should be noted, however, that it is impossible to determine at this time, by the Administration or anyone else, if all of this reserve will ever be needed. To date I understand that only $10,000 has actually been charged off by the SBA against this reserve. Although the size of this reserve is certainly significant, we must not lose sight of the fact that this industry, as created by Congress and by its very nature, is "venture" or "risk" oriented and consequently will have some losses. I think it also important to point out that almost 90 percent of this loss reserve has been set up on Government loans to the smaller SBICs and not the medium and larger companies for which incentive legislation is now being requested. No doubt much of the reason for SBA's loss reserve stems directly from the admitted laxity under which SBIC licenses were issued during the first few years of the industry's existence.

Our committee, in considering H.R. 10409, recognized the need for tightening licensing standards and accordingly added appropriate language to this section of the bill. I am informed that representatives of the SBIC industry strongly favor the committee's action in providing tighter licensing requirements. In offering this amendment in committee, I recognized that most of SBA's problems with the SBIC's arise out of inadequate examination of proposed businesses and their chance of success.

It is obvious from my conversation with members of the industry that they feel both smaller and larger SBIC's are equally important to the program. The smaller SBIC is important in that it covers many areas which would not be economically feasible for the larger. On the other hand, it is the larger SBIC which captures the financial writer's interest. And through publicity for the larger SBICs, small businessmen and the financial community as a whole become aware of the existence of this source of capital. The publicity for the large SBIC rubs off on the small businessman looking for a "source" of capital close to home.

In summary, many, if not all, on the committee believe that adequate incentive provisions, along the lines requested by the SBA and the SBIC industry, are required for all small, medium, and large size SBICs if the industry is to continue to meet the demands of small business. Further, we believe that such incentives should be provided as quickly as possible before other large companies leave the program, taking with them a further substantial portion of all private capital presently invested in the program.

To this end I am offering two amendments. Both would reinstate the language of the existing law but would raise the maximums of Government participation.

A résumé of where we stand today with respect to this legislation would be helpful to the Members, I believe.

The present law provides, in section 302, for the purchase by SBA of debentures of our SBIC—subordinated to all other obligations except return of the private capital—of not to exceed $700,000. This is on a one dollar-for-one dollar private capital matching basis.

In turn, the existing law in section 303 provides for loans to be made to an SBIC by SBA in an amount equal to 50 percent of the paid-in capital and surplus of the SBIC but not to exceed $4 million. Collateral must be provided to secure the repayment of loans under this section.

The effect of these provisions taken together is that an SBIC with $7.3 million private capital base can get as much Government participation as another SBIC twice its size; and whereas an SBIC of only $700,000 or less receives, in effect, a 2-to-1 contribution of Government participation, this ratio falls off as the SBIC becomes larger until, at say a $15 million capitalization, this ratio of Government participation to private capital is only 1 to 3.

Recognizing this inequity in the law, the SBA recommended, and the Senate passed, a new provision which would, in effect, combine Government funds available to SBIC's under sections 302 and 303, and increase the maximum available to $7.5 million rather than the $4.7 million maximum of the present law.

A further $2.5 million is made available under the Senate bill to the SBIC's who qualify by having at least 65 percent of their funds in equity type financing.

But repayment of all of this $10 million—that is, the $7.5 and the $2.5 million—of Government funds is completely subordinate to all other obligation and claims of the SBIC except its capitol and surplus.

Our House committee, although impressed with the necessity of increasing the maximums of Government funds available to SBIC's and cognizant of the necessity to add incentives for growth, did not feel we were ready to accept a complete subordination of all Government funds as is provided for in the Senate bill. We feel Government should still have at least a major part of its loans collaterally secured.

Therefore, the amendments I am offering do raise the maximums to the same total recommended by SBA and passed by the Senate but retain the requirement of collateral for loans under section 303. The result, section 302 is retained in its present form, but the maximum participation by SBA is raised from $700,000 to $4 million.

Section 303 is retained with its requirement for the furnishing of security but the maximum borrowing permitted under this section is increased from $4 lion to $6 million.

In essence, these amendments will limit the unsecured participation by Government in an SBIC financing to $4 million and make available an additional $6 million borrowing maximum, such borrowings to be secured by the furnishing of collatural; whereas, the original bill as proposed by SBA and passed by the Senate would make the total of $10 million available on a totally unsecured basis.

I urge the adoption of these amendments, which I understand the chairman of the committee accepts.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Let me add one thing first, if I may.

I would further add that these amendments certainly provide a broader basis from which to work in conference than would be the case if they were not adopted.

Mr. PATMAN. I agree with what the gentleman has said; it will provide a broader basis for the conferees to work in. We have discussed the gentleman's amendments; that is, the Members on the majority side, and the Members on the minority side, along with the staff, and we have agreed to accept the gentleman's amendments. I believe Mr. WIDNALL will verify what I am saying, that we have agreed to accept the amendments.

Mr. WIDNALL. We have accepted them.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. I thank the gentlemen.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Then by the acceptance of the amendments the conferees have an expression of the House that they want to expand on the medium and larger loan companies which are required to get loans from the Federal Government, and that is the expression of the House as well as the Senate, but the details will be worked out in conference at the time of the conference?

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. That is correct.

The 222d Anniversary of Commodore John Barry's Birth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 13, 1967

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, the first American commodore, John Barry, was born on this day in 1745, in the village of Tacumshane, Ireland. Of poor and humble parentage, he became, before his death, a signal figure in the U.S. Navy, a gifted and spirited leader in the American struggle for independence from Great Britain.

He early displayed a love of the sea, and at the age of 11 adopted America as his home. Until the commencement of the American Revolution, he made several voyages in merchant ships, and upon the outbreak of hostilities in 1776, offered his services to the American Government. He was one of the first officers commissioned by Congress in the naval service, and thereafter enjoyed a distinguished and brilliant career in positions of increasing responsibility.

As commander of the ship *Lexington*, he captured the British vessel *Edward* in the spring of 1776, and was thereafter transferred to the *Effingham*. His command of that ship was distinguished by the daring capture in the Delaware River of several vessels loaded with munitions and stores intended for the British. In December of 1781, in command of the *Alliance*, he sailed from Boston with the Marquis de Lafayette, bound for France on public business. He succeeded in capturing a number of enemy ships during the remainder of the war.

Following the cessation of hostilities, he was appointed to oversee the construction of the frigate *United States*, intended for his command. In 1798 he saw active duty in the West Indies and became in

1802 senior officer in the Navy. He died in Philadelphia in 1803, secure in the knowledge that his adopted land was a free and independent power.

The example of John Barry should be remembered, as a testament not only to the courage and devotion of the man, but also to the worth of the ideal for which he fought. It is altogether fitting that we pay tribute, on the day of his birth, to a great American and an able seaman, Commodore John Barry.

Bellmore, Long Island, Citizens Hold Interfaith Rally for Soviet Jewry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT TENZER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 12, 1967

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, recently I was privileged to attend an interfaith rally in Bellmore, N.Y., on behalf of the plight of the 3 million Jews living in the Soviet Union.

The courage and religious dedication of the Jewish community in the Soviet Union is known throughout the world, and the rally in Bellmore was an indication of the widespread sympathy in the United States for the plight of these people. Clergymen and laymen of all faiths gathered in Bellmore to plead for a relaxation of the restrictions placed upon Soviet Jewry. Church and synagogue leaders placed themselves on record opposing the discrimination against Jews by the Soviet Government.

As the Representative in the Congress of the residents of Bellmore, I am proud to have been associated with this interfaith effort, and include excerpts from the remarks made that day in the Congressional Record:

Remarks Delivered by Rabbi Nathan Rosenbaum, Temple Beth-El, of Bellmore

We meet to protest the religious and cultural deprivation of Russian Jewry during Passover—the Festival of Freedom.

At the Seder service the Jewish family thanks God for all the miracles and wondrous acts He performed in a song called "Dayenu" which means "Enough". We say that it is "Dayenu"—it is "enough" that God brought us out of Egypt. It is "Dayenu"—"enough" that He gave us the Torah and so on down a long list of "counting our blessings."

But I say to you on this day of protest that we shall not say "Dayenu"—enough to a few crumbs of matzoh which some families may have eaten during Passover in the Soviet Union. We say "Lo Dai"—it is not enough.

We will not say "Dayenu"—it is enough that every once in a while a Bar Mitzvah is held in Russia. We say "Lo Dai"—it is *not enough* so long as Jewish families cannot teach their sons the meaning of the covenant, the laws and practices of Judaism.

We will never say "Dayenu"—it is enough for one Jewish monthly magazine to exist with a limited circulation.

We will never say "Dayenu"—Enough—to a cemetery for the Jewish dead which Russian Jewry wants and needs. We say "Lo Dai"—it is not enough to bury Jews in a Jewish cemetery. We ask that Jews be permitted to *live as Jews* as well as die as Jews.

We say "Lo Dai"—it is not enough—until Jewish books and Prayer Books and Bibles and volumes on Jewish History and newspapers can be published to meet the needs of all Soviet Jews who want to read and study about their heritage.

Never say "Dayenu"—it is "enough". We say "Lo Dai"—it is *not* enough.

This past Sabbath the prophetic selections read was Chapter 37 in Ezekiel. Ezekiel finds himself in a valley full of scattered dry bones. The Lord says to Ezekiel: "Son of man can these bones live?"

The very same question is being asked of each of us. Judaism in the Soviet Union is a valley of dry bones. They are not alive to the study of our sacred texts. The Festivals and Sabbaths have been dried up. They don't even have Hebrew calendars so that they can at least remember if not observe the approach of our holy seasons. They have no life-giving contact with synagogue groups or religious organizations outside of the Soviet Union. The Jews are the only group not permitted general organizations. They have become a valley of dry bones.

"Son of man—can these bones live?"

Though they seem bereft of sinew and flesh—though they seem dried up—their hope is not gone. They look to us to help bring back the breath of Jewish life to their dried out bones. They look to us to encourage them, to give them faith, to tell them that we shall not rest until full religious and cultural rights are granted to them—the same rights, no more but no less—that are granted to other groups in the Soviet Union.

The Soviet Union dare not become the graveyard for the synagogue, the Jewish book, the Jewish holiday. We cannot permit Judaism to be buried alive.

I therefore call upon every man, woman and young person of good will—Jew and non-Jew alike—to raise his voice in protest and to continue to cry out against Soviet discrimination. And until such time as full religious and cultural rights are granted to Soviet Jews, we say "Lo Dai"—*it is not enough*. Russian Jewry must not remain a Valley of Dry Bones. We want those bones to rise up and live again as Jews!

Remarks by the Rev. Avery C. Manchester, Bellmore Methodist Church

Rabbi, distinguished guests, and friends, it is a privilege for me to be present and participating in this meeting and I would like to center my brief remarks around three words; tragedy, tribute and triumph.

It is indeed a great tragedy that the Jewish people have been denied their God-willed right of worship in the U.S.S.R. I repent on behalf of the Christian community which perpetrated the injustices of a great tragedy because of our silence during the demonic regime of Hitler in the thirties. I repent on behalf of the Christian community of Russia which has had greater privileges of worship than our spiritual forefathers of the Jewish tradition. We feel that it is against divine law and will, that any people should be denied the right to worship God and feel that this tragedy must be protested and we who support this tragedy by our silence must repent.

The crisis faced by the Jewish community in the U.S.S.R. is a tribute to their religious integrity; is a tribute to people who persevered and who stand faithful to their religious heritage and who understand that their loyalty to God is above their loyalty to any man or any nation. It is important for the future of all men and all nations that a faithful community be preserved, that can see and sense and witness man's first responsibility to God. For a powerful political state to be threatened by a religious minority and forced to suppress its freedom of expression, is a tribute to its vitality.

We feel confident that the sense of commitment and faithfulness of the Jewish community in Russia will ultimately triumph, that the greatness of the Judeo tradition of prophetic responsibility has called every nation into question and been a renewing, strengthening challenge to our Christian tradition. Our survival is closely related to the survival of the religious heritage of the Jewish people in the U.S.S.R. and in any other state. We must understand that prejudice, like a plague, knows no national or linguistic boundaries, that it can not be left unchallenged.

Our confidence in the triumph is based on the Biblical heritage offered "not by might nor by power, but by my spirit", saith the Lord, "will right prevail, will truth and righeousness by served."

On the 50th anniversary of the Polish Revolution, we can hope and pray and work, that like the ancient tradition, it may be a year of jubilee, of forgiveness and that, indeed, the shalom of God will be a reality for all the people in the U.S.S.R. and in our world. We join with the voice of all people of faith that peace and righteousness and truth may be the living foundation for all people.

I thank you.

Remarks by Rev. Dennis M. Regan, Assistant Pastor, Church of the Sacred Heart, North Merrick, N.Y., on the Occasion of the Rally for Soviet Jewry

May I greet you all with a single title: My Brothers. I am very happy to have this occasion to express on behalf of Bishop Kellenberg and the Catholics of the Diocese of Rockville Centre, our support of your protest against religious persecution and cultural oppression of Soviet Jews.

In the one world, unfortunately more a world of our dreams than of reality, there must be a unanimity of belief in and respect for, the basic freedoms of man. The right to worship God as one knows Him is the most important and most elevating of all freedoms. We join with you in a profound sadness that your brothers—and they are our brothers as well—should be subjected to such abuse and outrage. Every one who believes in the brotherhood of all men must rally around the banner of this important truth—"If there be one single man who is not free, then I am less than free." May the God and Father of us all look upon men of good will gathered throughout this country today and lend His aid to those Soviet Jews who keep faith in Him alive in a land which proves itself unworthy of their goodness. Our prayers are with you.

Remarks by Nassau County Executive Eugene H. Nickerson at Rally on Behalf of Soviet Jewry, Veterans Plaza, Railroad Station, Bellmore

I heard a man say the other day: What does it matter if a group of people march in Bellmore to keep vigil for the Jews of the Soviet Union?

And this man said: There's no problem in Russia today. After all, the Jews were permitted to observe Passover ceremonies this year.

Well, my friends, we know *why* the Soviet Government relented this year—it was because of rallies just like this one. It was because we *can* influence world opinion; our voices *can* be heard hundreds of thousands of miles away by the men in the Kremlin.

The voice of protest and remembrance that we raise here today does not please the Soviet Government. They are embarrassed; they are ashamed. They *know* that the shadow of persecution lies across that land which claims to be the liberator of the masses.

Just a few days ago, a delegation of outraged citizens from my own community of Roslyn—Jews and non-Jews—took their protest to the Soviet mission at the United Nations. The door was locked. They were not allowed to deliver their protest.

And so they placed that protest up on the door for all the world to see—for all the delegates from all nations to know that the

Soviet Union stands indicted of discrimination and persecution.

Yes, the Soviet Government has begun to take notice—ever since the great poet Yevtushenko dared to stand up in public and read Babi Yar. He was criticized at the time for reminding the Russian people of those wartime atrocities, and warning them that a more subtle policy of genocide is being carried out today.

But now Yevtushenko is hailed as a great artist by the Soviet people and the Soviet rulers. Last week in Russia the traditional customs of Passover, which had been outlawed by official action against the temples and the bakeries and the bookbinders—these traditions were observed openly.

And it is our duty to see that the pressure on the Soviet Union is not lifted for one moment.

Your voices *can* be heard. I saw that two years ago in both Tel Aviv and Moscow. There was great concern about the effect which action here in America, by private citizens and private groups, would have on world opinion.

But we have succeeded only in small measure. This struggle is not yet won. We must make it clear to the Soviet Government again and again and again—that we as Americans, as citizens of the world, are united with one voice to uphold freedom of worship, freedom of expression, freedom to honor cherished customs and beliefs.

We must show them that we share *our* vision of justice and freedom with the oppressed of the world.

We must lift the weight of the Communist state from crushing the Jewish religion and culture.

We must remind the Soviet rulers and the Soviet judges again and again that with a Jewish population of slightly more than *one* percent in Russia today, nearly *sixty* percent of those sentenced to death for so-called "economic crimes" have been Jews.

We must remind them that in the Ukraine, where Jews comprise *two* percent of the population, *ninety* percent of those sentenced to death have been Jews.

We must cite the Supreme Court of the USSR itself, which has admited that these trials have been contrary to established laws of justice.

We must warn the Soviet Union not to suppress Passover ceremonies *next* year, and the year after that, and every year.

We here today call upon the Soviet Union to reverse the official Government policy which has shut down Yeshivas; which has spread virulent anti-Semitic propaganda in the official Soviet press; which has published cartoons portraying rabbis as criminals.

We call upon the Soviet Union to open its borders to those who long for the promise of freedom—who seek to emigrate to Israel.

We call upon the Soviet leaders to halt their efforts to destroy Israel through foreign intrigue and direct military aid.

Only when these demands are met, can we say that we have ended this crime against humanity.

We must in this vigil today, be *vigilant*. We must do our utmost, each one of us, to inform and mobilize world opinion; to spark the conscience of *all* the people of *all* the free nations who are committed to uphold and defend the rights of all.

When one people suffers, all people suffer everywhere. Let us pray that we do not have to re-learn that lesson in this nuclear age.

Let us act and speak out together against Soviet repression. Let our voices be heard with others around the world. And let us not forget.

Remarks Made by Presiding Supervisor Ralph G. Caso on the Occasion of the March for Soviet Jewry, Held in Bellmore

My friends, I am deeply moved by this observance today—particularly coming as it does during the holiday that relives the fight of the Hebrews to freedom. Not as a Jew, but simply as a human being, as a citizen of a free state, I share with you the sadness of knowing that some three million people in the Soviet Union are denied some of the rights that we here take for granted. As Job asked God, "Why?" Why have you broken my back and bowed my head . . . Why me?," so the Jewish people in Russia . . . and the Jewish race through the ages . . . have probably asked, "Why me?"

I am neither a philosopher nor a clergyman, but I do know that totalitarian societies feed on intolerance . . . fatten on the agony of the underdog. This is not the only time in the long history of the Jews that the temple has been destroyed and the altar defiled. If any one people's history has been written in suffering . . . in prejudice and in the deprivation of human rights, it is yours. There can be no tranquility for any of us who stand in the full sunlight of religious freedom while others suffer in darkness. So today, like the many other times I have attended similar demonstrations, I can only hope that the feeling which prevails here will reach those in Russia who wield the hatchet—and that those who suffer will know that they are not alone—that the world *does* care. Doesn't it say, somewhere in the story of the Exodus, "In every generation let each man look on himself as if *he* came forth out of Egypt?"

The matzos eaten at the Seder table recall the haste with which the Hebrew slaves left Egypt to look for freedom—and it was a slow and agonizing search, lived out in deprivation and in tears. Is there not a parallel between this exodus and the search of civilization itself for a world in which men can live together with compassion for each other . . . with tolerance for religious differences . . . with an end to senseless and unfeeling prejudice?

We send men to the moon and to the floor of the ocean. We split the atom and we outfly the speed of sound. We have freed space and time and energy . . . but we have not freed ourselves. The prayer you say at your seder table has endured for 3200 years because it comes from the deepest yearnings of man's heart. We say it now, as a plea, to the government of the Soviet Union. We say it to the Russian Jews who must worry, each year, about whether they will be allowed a box of matzos for their seder table. "Proclaim liberty throughout the land, unto all the inhabitants thereof," What can I add to that but Amen.

Remarks Delivered by Victor Zager, President, Temple Beth-el of Bellmore, N.Y., at Rally for Soviet Jewry

On behalf of Temple Beth-El of Bellmore it is an honor and privilege to greet you and welcome you to our Synagogue this afternoon.

We who represent diverse elements of this community, people of different faiths, different beliefs and different interests are here today united in purpose. We are gathered here on this holiday of freedom to express our deep concern for the Jews of the Soviet Union.

We gather because we are troubled by a question that lingers in our mind and memory. We have been asked, "Where is your Jewish brother in the Soviet Union?" and in our heart we know, "He lives in darkness—he lives in fear—he lives in silence unable to express himself as a Jew and we are truly troubled because we are our brothers keeper."

To their darkness we say, "Let there be light."

To their fear we say, "They shall not be given over to their death."

To their silence we say, "We shall go forth and shout."

And shout we will because our brothers shall not die but live.

And we shall continue to shout.

This year marks the Fiftieth Anniversary of the Russian Revolution, "The Jubilee Year" and by our continuing to shout perhaps the Russian leadership will be in the words of our tradition "Be moved to hallow the Fiftieth Year, and proclaim liberty throughout the land unto all the inhabitants thereof."

We are grateful for your presence and we thank you for your participation on this historic day in the life of the Bellmores.

Mr. Speaker, the Soviet Union is sensitive to world opinion. The rally will help publicize the petition to the Soviet leaders to:

First. Restore its Jewish citizens to a position of equality with other nationalities.

Second. Permit its Jewish citizens to freely practice, enhance, and perpetuate their culture and religion by removing all discriminatory measures designed to restrict this freedom.

Third. Make available all the institutions, school, textbooks, and materials necessary to teach Jewish children the languages, history, beliefs, practices, and aspirations of the Jewish people.

Fourth. Permit the Jews of the Soviet Union to freely develop Jewish groups and to associate and work with Jewish groups inside and outside of the Soviet Union.

Fifth. Use all means at its disposal to eradicate anti-Semitism.

Sixth. Permit Soviet Jewish families, separated as a result of the Nazi holocaust—over 20 years ago—to be reunited with their relatives abroad.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the Record.

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20515

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Speaker: John W. McCormack

Abbitt, Watkins M., *Va*	
Abernethy, Thomas G., *Miss.*	6278 29th St.
Adair, E. Ross, *Ind*	4000 Mass. Ave.
Adams, Brock, *Wash*	
Addabbo, Joseph P., *N.Y*	
Albert, Carl, *Okla*	4614 Reno Rd.
Anderson, John B., *Ill*	
Anderson, William R., *Tenn.*	3006 P St.
Andrews, George W., *Ala*	
Andrews, Mark, *N. Dak*	
Annunzio, Frank, *Ill*	
Arends, Leslie C., *Ill*	4815 Dexter St.
Ashbrook, John M., *Ohio*	
Ashley, Thomas L., *Ohio*	
Ashmore, Robert T., *S.C*	
Aspinall, Wayne N., *Colo*	The Towers Apts., 4201 Cathedral Ave.
Ayres, William H., *Ohio*	
Baring, Walter S., *Nev*	
Barrett, William A., *Pa*	
Bates, William H., *Mass*	
Battin, James F., *Mont*	
Belcher, Page, *Okla*	
Bell, Alphonzo, *Calif*	
Bennett, Charles E., *Fla*	3421 Rusticway Lane, Falls Church, Va.
Berry, E. Y., *S. Dak*	118 Schotts Court NE.
Betts, Jackson E., *Ohio*	
Bevill, Tom, *Ala*	6224 N. 35th St., Arlington, Va.
Biester, Edward G., Jr., *Pa*	
Bingham, Jonathan B., *N.Y.*	
Blackburn, Benjamin B., *Ga.*	
Blanton, Ray, *Tenn*	
Blatnik, John A., *Minn*	
Boggs, Hale, *La*	
Boland, Edward P., *Mass*	
Bolling, Richard, *Mo*	307 Warrenton Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Bolton, Frances P. (Mrs.), *Ohio.*	2301 Wyo. Ave.
Bow, Frank T., *Ohio*	4301 Mass. Ave.
Brademas, John, *Ind*	
Brasco, Frank J., *N.Y*	
Bray, William G., *Ind*	
Brinkley, Jack, *Ga*	
Brock, W. E. (Bill), *Tenn*	
Brooks, Jack, *Tex*	
Broomfield, William S., *Mich.*	
Brotzman, Donald G., *Colo*	
Brown, Clarence J., Jr., *Ohio.*	
Brown, Garry, *Mich*	
Brown, George E., Jr., *Calif*	
Broyhill, James T., *N.C*	
Broyhill, Joel T., *Va*	
Buchanan, John, *Ala*	
Burke, J. Herbert, *Fla*	
Burke, James A., *Mass*	
Burleson, Omar, *Tex*	
Burton, Laurence J., *Utah*	
Burton, Phillip, *Calif*	
Bush, George, *Tex*	
Button, Daniel E., *N.Y*	
Byrne, James A., *Pa*	
Byrnes, John W., *Wis*	1215 25th St. S., Arlington, Va.
Cabell, Earle, *Tex*	
Cahill, William T., *N.J*	
Carey, Hugh L., *N.Y*	
Carter, Tim Lee, *Ky*	
Casey, Bob, *Tex*	
Cederberg, Elford A., *Mich*	
Celler, Emanuel, *N.Y*	The Mayflower
Chamberlain, Charles E., *Mich.*	
Clancy, Donald D., *Ohio*	
Clark, Frank M., *Pa*	220 C St. SE.
Clausen, Don H., *Calif*	
Clawson, Del, *Calif*	
Cleveland, James C., *N.H*	
Cohelan, Jeffery, *Calif*	1202 Longworth House Office Bldg.
Collier, Harold R., *Ill*	
Colmer, William M., *Miss*	
Conable, Barber B., Jr., *N.Y.*	
Conte, Silvio O., *Mass*	5619 Lamar Rd., Washington 16, D.C.
Conyers, John, Jr., *Mich*	
Corbett, Robert J., *Pa*	
Corman, James C., *Calif*	
Cowger, William O., *Ky*	
Cramer, William C., *Fla*	6215 Beachway Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Culver, John C., *Iowa*	
Cunningham, Glenn, *Nebr*	
Curtis, Thomas B., *Mo*	
Daddario, Emilio Q., *Conn*	
Daniels, Dominick V., *N.J*	
Davis, Glenn R., *Wis*	
Davis, John W., *Ga*	
Dawson, William L., *Ill*	
de la Garza, Eligio, *Tex*	
Delaney, James J., *N.Y*	
Dellenback, John R., *Oreg*	6903 Crail Dr., Bethesda, Md.
Denney, Robert V., *Nebr*	
Dent, John H., *Pa*	
Derwinski, Edward J., *Ill*	
Devine, Samuel L., *Ohio*	
Dickinson, William L., *Ala*	
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., *Mich*	
Dingell, John D., *Mich*	
Dole, Robert, *Kans*	6136 Beachway Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Donohue, Harold D., *Mass*	
Dorn, Wm. Jennings Bryan, *S.C.*	2030 Laburnum St., McLean, Va.
Dow, John G., *N.Y*	
Dowdy, John, *Tex*	
Downing, Thomas N., *Va*	
Dulski, Thaddeus J., *N.Y*	347 Cannon House Office Building
Duncan, John J., *Tenn*	
Dwyer, Florence P. (Mrs.), *N.J.*	
Eckhardt, Bob, *Tex*	
Edmondson, Ed, *Okla*	
Edwards, Don, *Calif*	9201 Fox Meadow La., Potomac, Md.,
Edwards, Edwin W., *La*	
Edwards, Jack, *Ala*	
Eilberg, Joshua, *Pa*	
Erlenborn, John N., *Ill*	
Esch, Marvin L., *Mich*	
Eshleman, Edwin D., *Pa*	
Evans, Frank E., *Colo*	
Everett, Robert A., *Tenn*	
Evins, Joe L., *Tenn*	5044 Klingle St.
Fallon, George H., *Md*	
Farbstein, Leonard, *N.Y*	
Fascell, Dante B., *Fla*	
Feighan, Michael A., *Ohio*	
Findley, Paul, *Ill*	
Fino, Paul A., *N.Y*	
Fisher, O. C., *Tex*	Calvert-Woodley
Flood, Daniel J., *Pa*	The Congressional
Flynt, John J., Jr., *Ga*	
Foley, Thomas S., *Wash*	
Ford, Gerald R., *Mich*	514 Crown View Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Ford, William D., *Mich*	
Fountain, L. H., *N.C*	The Westchester
Fraser, Donald M., *Minn*	
Frelinghuysen, Peter H. B., *N.J.*	3014 N St.
Friedel, Samuel N., *Md*	
Fulton, James G., *Pa*	
Fulton, Richard, *Tenn*	
Fuqua, Don, *Fla*	
Galifianakis, Nick, *N.C*	
Gallagher, Cornelius E., *N.J.*	
Gardner, James C., *N.C*	
Garmatz, Edward A., *Md*	
Gathings, E. C., *Ark*	
Gettys, Tom S., *S.C*	
Giaimo, Robert N., *Conn*	
Gibbons, Sam, *Fla*	
Gilbert, Jacob H., *N.Y*	
Gonzalez, Henry B., *Tex*	200 C St. SE.
Goodell, Charles E., *N.Y*	3842 Macomb St.
Goodling, George A., *Pa*	
Gray, Kenneth J., *Ill*	
Green, Edith (Mrs.), *Oreg*	
Green, William J., *Pa*	
Griffiths, Martha W., (Mrs.), *Mich.*	
Gross, H. R., *Iowa*	
Grover, James R., Jr., *N.Y*	
Gubser, Charles S., *Calif*	
Gude, Gilbert, *Md*	
Gurney, Edward J., *Fla*	
Hagan, G. Elliott, *Ga*	
Haley, James A., *Fla*	
Hall, Durward G., *Mo*	
Halleck, Charles A., *Ind*	4926 Upton St.
Halpern, Seymour, *N.Y*	
Hamilton, Lee H., *Ind*	
Hammerschmidt, John Paul, *Ark.*	
Hanley, James M., *N.Y*	
Hanna, Richard T., *Calif*	
Hansen, George V., *Idaho*	
Hansen, Julia Butler (Mrs.), *Wash.*	
Hardy, Porter, Jr., *Va*	
Harrison, William Henry, *Wyo.*	
Harsha, William H., *Ohio*	
Harvey, James, *Mich*	
Hathaway, William D., *Maine.*	
Hawkins, Augustus F., *Calif.*	
Hays, Wayne L., *Ohio*	
Hébert, F. Edward, *La*	26 Cockrell St., Alexandria, Va.
Hechler, Ken, *W. Va*	
Heckler, Margaret M. (Mrs.), *Mass.*	
Helstoski, Henry, *N.J*	
Henderson, David N., *N.C*	
Herlong, A. S., Jr., *Fla*	
Hicks, Floyd V., *Wash*	
Holifield, Chet, *Calif*	
Holland, Elmer J., *Pa*	
Horton, Frank, *N.Y*	
Hosmer, Craig, *Calif*	
Howard, James J., *N.J*	
Hull, W. R., Jr., *Mo*	
Hungate, William L., *Mo*	
Hunt, John E., *N.J*	
Hutchinson, Edward, *Mich*	
Ichord, Richard (Dick), *Mo.*	
Irwin, Donald J., *Conn*	
Jacobs, Andrew, Jr., *Ind*	
Jarman, John, *Okla*	
Joelson, Charles S., *N.J*	
Johnson, Albert W., *Pa*	
Johnson, Harold T., *Calif*	
Jonas, Charles Raper, *N.C*	
Jones, Paul C., *Mo*	1111 Army-Navy Dr., Arlington, Va.
Jones, Robert E., *Ala*	
Jones, Walter B., *N.C*	
Karsten, Frank M., *Mo*	
Karth, Joseph E., *Minn*	
Kastenmeier, Robert W., *Wis.*	
Kazen, Abraham, Jr., *Tex*	
Kee, James, *W. Va*	5441 16th Ave., Hyattsville, Md.
Keith, Hastings, *Mass*	5906 Harwick Rd., Woodacres, Md.
Kelly, Edna F. (Mrs.), *N.Y*	
King, Carleton J., *N.Y*	
King, Cecil R., *Calif*	
Kirwan, Michael J., *Ohio*	
Kleppe, Thomas S., *N. Dak*	
Kluczynski, John C., *Ill*	
Kornegay, Horace R., *N.C*	
Kupferman, Theodore R., *N.Y.*	
Kuykendall, Dan, *Tenn*	
Kyl, John, *Iowa*	
Kyros, Peter N., *Maine*	
Laird, Melvin R., *Wis*	
Landrum, Phil M., *Ga*	
Langen, Odin, *Minn*	
Latta, Delbert L., *Ohio*	
Leggett, Robert L., *Calif*	
Lennon, Alton, *N.C*	
Lipscomb, Glenard P., *Calif.*	
Lloyd, Sherman P., *Utah*	
Long, Clarence D., *Md*	

Appendix

The Vietnam Election: A Major Step Forward in Fulfilling U.S. Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK BROOKS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1967

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, the recent Vietnam election—witnessed by the world—was a major step forward in fulfilling U.S. policy in Vietnam.

It was a successful test of President Johnson's policies in supporting the growth of democratic institutions in South Vietnam.

It was a successful test of the internal strength and security of the Vietnamese people who held a public, open and free election in the face of terrorism and an enemy trying to subjugate the land.

In short, it was a major step in demonstrating that President Johnson's military, economic and political policies are bearing fruit.

There could have been no election without the American presence.

There would have been no nation of South Vietnam without our aid and support.

It is understandable that editorial opinion of the United States is almost unanimous on one point: the election was a victory for our efforts.

Following are two editorials from the Wichita Eagle and the Dallas Morning News which strongly support our past and present policies.

I urge my colleagues to read them:

[From the Wichita Eagle, Sept. 6, 1967]

VIETNAM ELECTION A MAJOR STEP IN FULFILLING U.S. POLICY

The South Vietnamese election is over. The military ticket won, as everyone supposed it would, and there are now the inevitable cries that the thing was rigged.

The team of observers President Johnson sent over to inspect the voting process said the election went off about as well as could be expected. And while the team apparently wasn't picked because of its qualifications for pollwatching, its report probably is reasonably accurate.

It would be astonishing if there weren't a few irregularities in the Vietnamese election. After all, free elections are a novelty there, and it's about time we gave up the foolish notion that our own particular brand of democracy can be imposed ready-made upon nations that have no background or real preparation for it.

Even in this country every national election brings charges of irregularities somewhere. It's hard to understand how anyone could expect voting to be more honest in Saigon than in, say, Chicago.

The important thing is that the election was held, and that more than 80 per cent of the electorate turned out despite threats by the Viet Cong.

A military slate was elected for the top positions, but many civilians won spots elsewhere in the government—notably in the Assembly, and the so-called "peace party" rolled up enough votes that it should persuade the winners there is a genuine desire in the country for an end to the war.

Free elections are one of the principal aims of the United States in its Vietnam policy. The first major one has just been concluded, with what from this distance appears to be reasonable success.

This must be regarded as a victory, and Americans can hope that it is a major step toward the ultimate pacification of Vietnam and an end to the war.

[From the Dallas Morning News, Sept. 6, 1967]

SOUTH VIETNAM VOTES

South Vietnam's election, as one American leader put it, was "a remarkable exhibition of democracy in action in most trying circumstances."

The "trying circumstances" included an all-out Viet Cong terror campaign, designed to frighten the voters away from the polling places. The elections were held in a country lacking in national democratic tradition and ravaged by nearly three decades of war.

Yet observers, both the presidential team and correspondents in Vietnam, reported that the vote was fair. According to one of the three American election experts who witnessed the elections, "They were reasonably efficient, reasonably free and reasonably honest."

"I would use exactly the same words to describe elections in the United States," he concluded.

The turnout of better than 80 per cent would be enough, even under peacetime conditions, to put our own presidential voting record to shame. In the perilous environment of Vietnam, it is particularly impressive.

Naturally, there are charges that the elections were rigged. These charges were not unexpected. They come largely from those whose interests are readily apparent. In Vietnam, as in most elections held in the United States, the defeated candidates are charging fraud and demanding a recount.

The President's tireless critics in the U.S. also immediately denounced the outcome and conduct of the voting. Judging from their past performance, this would have been the case regardless of the results.

The dovecote critics have been calling for elections for years, just as they have been calling for cessation of bombing. Yet, when the elections were scheduled, they were quick to label them as fraudulent and meaningless, just as they had earlier lowrated as insufficient the bombing pauses they had been urging, once these were attempted.

It should now be clear that there is nothing either the U.S. or the South Vietnamese governments can do to satisfy these critics, unless it be immediate abandonment of the Asian country.

The big lead rolled up by the Thieu-Ky ticket gives the two incumbents a mandate of clear popular support that had been lacking. The elections gave the South Vietnamese a chance to choose their own government to lead them through the days of crisis toward a peaceful future.

There are still many battles to be won and much work to be done before South Vietnam can enjoy all of the benefits of the independence that so many have died for. But the successful conduct of free elections is an encouraging sign that it is making progress.

Sonic Boom or Bust

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 14, 1967

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, dislike for the sonic boom and its disturbing effects is so widespread and elemental that it has brought forth satirical comment in verse form. One example of this was printed recently in the Cleveland, Ohio, Plain Dealer. It was written by Klaus G. Roy, director of publications for the Cleveland orchestra. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the comment was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SONIC BOOM OR BUST?

"Oklahoma City Protests Use as Boom Guinea Pig" (1964).

"Staggering Risk of An Economic Disaster" (Aeronautical Research Institute of Sweden, 1967).

"Too Much Shock for Human Beings?" (Plain Dealer editorial on sonic booms at sea, June 20, 1967).

The implications of the boom
Are not designed to lift our gloom,
To make us less concerned or tense,
About our government's good sense.
The boom, with its concatenations,
Scares our children, shakes foundations;
It countermands the doctor's orders
By sending shock waves down the corridors;
It fractures hearts as well as windows . . .
You say you wonder where the din goes?
When planes exceed the speed of sound
The sound of speed must hit the ground.
They say, "We're sorry, but the fact is
We need you for our target practice!
We have to see what you can stand,
Test the endurance of our land.
Accept the less than supersonic?
Why, it's supversive and moronic!
If you can only get there faster,
What matter if it breaks the plaster?
Soon, on the giant SST's,
You will commute across the seas.
Oh, spare yourself all this emotion—
They'll only boom above the ocean!
For ships this should not cause dismay:
Their cargo's seasick anyway.
With progress there're no ifs and buts;
Yes, even if it drives you nuts."
This country, possibly, enjoys
Bombardments by incessant noise!
A people gets what it deserves—
From scattered brains to shattered nerves.
The boom's intent is clean and pure;
It means to make us more mature.
This proves how far we have progressed:
Top speed, at any price, is best.

—KLAUS G. ROY.

Mrs. Geraldine L. Thompson: The Great Lady of Brookdale

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. HOWARD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1967

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, last week an outstanding woman whose contributions to her fellow citizens were innumerable, passed away at the age of 95.

Mrs. Geraldine L. Thompson, of Brookdale Farm, Lincroft, N.J., became known for her pioneering efforts in the field of welfare work. Mrs. Thompson also worked hard in the fields of education and health, was a well-known philanthropist and had the distinction of being the first national Republican committeewoman from New Jersey.

Mr. Speaker, two of New Jersey's leading daily newspapers, the Daily Register of Red Bank, and the Asbury Park Evening Press, editorialized on the fine contributions this outstanding and compassionate woman made to Monmouth County as well as to the entire State of New Jersey.

At this point I include the editorials in the RECORD and urge the Members of this House to take a few minutes from their busy schedule to reflect on the loss of this truly fine person:

[From the Daily Register]

MRS. GERALDINE L. THOMPSON: THE GREAT LADY OF BROOKDALE

The county, the state and many people throughout the nation are saddened today by the death of Mrs. Geraldine L. Thompson of Brookdale Farm in Lincroft.

Here was truly a great lady—one of the state's foremost pioneers in welfare work—who devoted her long and active life to benefit others.

She was a humanitarian, a philantropist, a strong leader in the fields of social welfare, education, health and agriculture. A great deal of the social progress that Monmouth County and New Jersey enjoy can be attributed directly to Mrs. Thompson. She was championing noble causes long before many of them were as popular as they are today. For this, she always will be remembered.

Mrs. Thompson was a personal friend of presidents, governors, social leaders and the giants of business and industry. She used her influence not in any way for herself or her own personal aspirations—but to help the unfortunate. She was a woman of compassion and understanding and she helped to bring, especially to the field of welfare, those tremendous qualities. The sophisticated progress that Monmouth County long has known in the field of welfare always will stand as a treasured monument to Mrs. Thompson.

She was a founder and longtime president of the outstanding Monmouth County Organization for Social Service. She pioneered the establishment—again ahead of her time—of the Allenwood Tuberculosis Hospital which only recently was renamed in her honor.

She was the first woman member of the Board of Control of the New Jersey Department of institutions and Agencies and served on it for 39 years. She was active in hospital work, in fund-raising, and in such organizations as the Mental Health Association and the Cancer Society.

She was a hard-working Republican political figure—a lifelong GOP party member who gave her talent and her strength to the organization. She was the first Republican national committeewoman from New Jersey as well as a state GOP committeewoman. She was the first president of the county Federation of Republican Women, which she organized.

She received degrees from Rutgers University and Monmouth College and countless honors from organizations and governmental units throughout her life. They cited her for vigor, her dynamic leadership, and her accomplishments.

But there was another side to Mrs. Thompson—one that kept her close to the family, the Brookdale Farm, the Lincroft and the Middletown Township she loved.

Many are the stories that can be told about the ways in which Mrs. Thompson helped the people of Lincroft and Middletown. She gave her time and her money to make her community a better place. Her church was important to her and she found the hours to teach Sunday school. Education was important to her not only on a state level—but in Middletown as well. She fought for good schools and served as a member of the Parent-Teacher Association.

Last March—when Mrs. Thompson celebrated her 95th birthday—we editorially saluted this First Lady of Monmouth County and this First Lady of New Jersey.

We said then—and we repeat today—that life is better and more meaningful for many of New Jersey's citizens because of the efforts of Mrs. Thompson. Her positive influence was directed at making our society a better place in which to live and, even in her later years, that continued as her guiding force. For this, all of us can be thankful.

[From the Asbury Park (N.J.) Evening Press, Sept. 12, 1967]

GERALDINE L. THOMPSON

Monmouth County and New Jersey have lost a truly great citizen.

Geraldine L. Thompson lived a long life and a useful one. She was a pioneer in bringing to the public a realization of the need for new concepts of social work. She lived to see the success of her campaign to replace the dreary "poorhouse" with the modern welfare home. She led the march against tuberculosis and threw her great influence into the war against the White Plague with the result that thousands are alive today who would have died under traditional treatment. The Monmouth County Organization for Social Service was her brainchild and under her direction it became the county's leading social force, supplying nursing service in many municipalities and bringing other services to the needy.

Nor did Mrs. Thompson confine herself to social work. She believed it to be the duty of every citizen to take an interest in politics and make the party of his choice as reputable and representative as possible. She was a force for good in the Republican party throughout New Jersey and she was an effective force in campaigning for the rewriting of the state's ancient Constitution. Though not a delegate Mrs. Thompson was so influential at the Convention that she became known as its "eighty-first delegate."

The good that Mrs. Thompson achieved will live long after her. She was that fortunate sort of person who, when the time comes to give up life, has the satisfaction of leaving a shining example as a legacy to those who follow.

The Approved List

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1967

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

THE APPROVED LIST

(By Louis Stockstill)

Apparently we are back in the numbers game again.

We have just been, and continue to be, treated to a parade of high-ranking witnesses in and out of the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee rooms where hearings are being held on the conduct of the air war in Vietnam.

The basic question for which the committee is seeking answers is whether our bombing attacks on North Vietnam are adequate and effective; should they be expanded or curtailed.

Because the hearings involve classified information, they are being conducted behind closed doors. All we get are the neatly mimeographed, carefully sanitized "opening statements" of the witnesses, and then the terse, after-the-hearing comments made to reporters or before TV cameras. This is far from satisfactory. We are not certain how to interpret what is being released for public consumption.

For example, Secretary of Defense McNamara in his "prepared statement"—which has won some substantial editorial support—observed that "the Operating Target list, currently used by the Joint Chiefs as a basis for the planning of attacks on fixed targets, contains a total of 427 targets."

Now it may not worry the general public, and perhaps it shouldn't worry anyone, but one of the phrases in the statement nags us—the phrase "currently used by the Joint Chiefs." When we reached that sentence in the McNamara statement, our reading slowed down. There should be no ambiguity in the statement, but there seems to be.

Why the use of the word "currently?" Does this mean of recent vintage, or of long-standing? How long has this particular list existed?

The Secretary said the Chiefs "use" the list. Does this mean they also prepared it, unassisted? Does it mean it was prepared by them and possibly revised by others? Or does it mean that it was prepared by someone else and handed to the Chiefs for their use?

The Pentagon can be precise when it wants to be. Why wasn't McNamara more precise?

As he continued his statement, the Secretary of Defense reported that the 427 targets "currently used by the Joint Chiefs," the JCS "do not now recommend 68 for air attack" and that of the remaining 359, strikes have been authorized against 302. He said "There are only 57 targets recommended by the Joint Chiefs of Staff against which strikes have not yet been authorized."

Many people might believe, after reading that statement, that the Chiefs have achieved a reasonably high batting average. McNamara says "85%" of the targets the JCS recommended from the list "currently used" have been OK'd. (Actually, the percentage is nearer 84 than 85, but we won't quibble about that).

What we do question is the numbers-game.

Numbers of targets may not mean a thing. The 302 approved-targets might be less important than six or a dozen of the 57 rejected-targets.

Of the rejected group, Secretary McNamara says seven are recognized by the Chiefs as of little value to the North Vietnamese war effort, nine are petroleum facilities with small storage capacity, and 25 are "lesser targets."

This leaves 16. Four of these, Secretary McNamara notes, are "more significant targets" in populated, heavily defended areas; three are ports; four are airfields and five are in the Chinese Buffer Zone.

Conceivably, any one or several of these could be of equal or greater strategic importance than dozens of those on the approved list. We don't know that that is the case. But the three "ports" which are lumped into the statistical array make us wonder.

Senator John Stennis, who heads the Preparedness Subcommittee, has publicly announced that some of the military witnesses have stated "clearly and strongly" that they have been unable to gain approval to strike important targets. Following Secretary McNamara's testimony, the Senator said a fundamental question which remains "is why our military leaders would recommend these targets for strike if in fact they have no appreciable military significance."

We hope this question will be answered.

American Legion Head Backs Greek Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1967

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, on August 31, the Hellenic Chronicle carried an article on the support of the national commander of the American Legion has given the present Government in Greece. In view of the shortsighted attitude of the State Department toward the Greek Government in failing to recognize the key role that Greece has played in NATO, protecting the eastern Mediterranean from Communist aggression, I believe this report on Commander Davis' position is of special significance.

The article referred to follows:

AMERICAN LEGION HEAD BACKS GREEK GOVERNMENT

John Davis, national commander, American Legion, currently holding its national convention here, has voiced his support for the military government of Greece, which took control in a coup d'etat April 21.

The Legion commander told Ray McHugh in the Sheraton-Boston Hotel this week that he bases his support on personal observation of conditions in Greece.

Similar support was forthcoming from AF Gen. David S. Burchinal, deputy commander-in-chief of the US European Command.

PERSONAL OBSERVATIONS

"On the basis of what I saw in Greece and my conversations with people in many walks of life, I am convinced that Greece faced a political crisis when the military acted," Davis stated. "There were sincere fears that Communists might even have been planning a civil war.

"There is no question but that the Greek people have reacted with relief. A great fear has been removed. No one likes to see a military regime, but this government is staunchly anti-Communist; it is pro-American, and it has pledged an orderly return to constitutional rule.

"I think we should support it; I think the state department should end its opposition to military aid shipments; I don't understand why those shipments have been delayed," Davis concluded.

NATO FRIENDS

General Burchinal, also interviewed by McHugh, indicated that Greece was getting some material but that the big items, those important to modernization of Greek forces, were being held up.

"I think we should go ahead and support these people," the general stated. "They are certainly anti-Communist and they are committed to NATO. We should help and encourage them to rebuild their democracy. A great many Greeks honestly believe that the new government saved the country from a Communist civil war."

Brotherhood and Good Will

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. BRASCO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1967

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, this summer we have witnessed a series of tragic riots in a number of cities throughout our Nation. These riots were destructive to human life and property. No one gained by these horrible events.

Rioting does not provide jobs. Rather, riots drive industry out of a city. They do not advance civil rights, nor provide housing or quality education. Those who preach riot, or passively accept riot, are betraying the poor and destroying the civil rights movement, which has gained constructive momentum in this country.

Mr. Speaker, recently I took part in a parade through the Brownsville section of my district, which was composed mainly of participants in local antipoverty programs. Its sole purpose was to exhibit to the community, and the country, the many types of services made available through the comprehensive summer programs, and to stress the need for community unity—a need for which everyone is striving.

The parade consisted of thousands of marchers, and many colorful floats, depicting activities of the programs in existence. Some of the themes for the floats were: the beautification of Brownsville, voter registration, jobs for all, and new ideas in education.

I want to commend the community, the officers and member organizations of the Brownsville Community Council, all of whom worked so diligently to make this parade a success.

I would also like to commend the Council for Better East New York, United Youth Action, the United Negro and Puerto Rican Front, and all the organizations, both religious and civic, whose activity in summer programs contributed to the maintenance of harmony in our community.

Mr. Speaker, this was the answer of the people in my district to the summer disturbances; this was the answer of all those who are sincere about civil rights progress, who are sincere about helping the poor to a better share of America. This is the message that must be brought to all in the troubled areas of our Nation.

We must not permit pressures caused by rioting to cause people to move backward in their views of social problems. I urge all Americans, and particularly all of my colleagues in the House of Representatives, to recognize that the urban poor are saddled with serious problems—problems that all men of good will must continue to bend every effort to solve. Let us look forward to a new horizon of progress, based on brotherhood and good will.

United States Rejects Socialist Shipbuilding

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1967

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, Tuesday, by a vote of 233 to 144 the House, representing the voices of the American people, rejected any administration proposal to develop armament industries in Socialist countries to supply vessels of war or other armaments for America's military might.

By this vote, the American representatives rightfully rejected plans to continue subdizing Great Britain's Socialist industries—the same bygone power which profits from the Vietnam war by supplying the Communist enemy.

This was not nearly as great a slap in the face to Socialist Britain as it was a directional notice to the present administration that our people are still one in heart and in mind—that the American people want to buy American. Hang the British—they have already cost us in pride, individuality, and international prestige.

Our people are interested in what our people think of our people.

Our fighting men's morale must have soared 1,000 percent.

Mr. Speaker, I include the sorry report as contained in the September 13 Washington Evening Star following my remarks. The British should run Wilson and his Socialist regime out of the country.

The report follows:

HOUSE VOTES ARMS BILL, ADDS SHIPYARD SECTION

(By Robert K. Walsh)

A $70 billion defense appropriation bill went back to the Senate today with a House demand for a ship-building ban that defied the Johnson administration and threatened a reciprocal agreement with Britain.

The House voted, 354 to 4, late yesterday to approve the overall compromise measure worked out by a conference committee before the Labor Day recess.

Then the House voted, 233–144, to insist on an amendment it had written into its original bill but which the Senate had knocked out. That amendment would prohibit construction of American naval vessels in foreign shipyards.

Senate acceptance of the amendment today would send the measure to the White House. But the Senate gave no indication it would give in.

If if balks at the House version, the bill would return to a Senate-House conference committee. This could delay final congressional action on the $70 billion to finance defense operations—including $20 billion for the Vietnam war—during the current fiscal year.

PACT WITH BRITAIN

Immediately involved in the House stand yesterday was an agreement made in 1965 by which the United States would sell more than $2.7 billion in aircraft and missiles to Britain. Almost $1.7 billion already has been purchased by that country.

The United States agreed to place orders totaling $325 million in Britain. It also agreed to allow British shipyards to submit competitive bids for construction of several wooden-hulled mine sweepers. The bidding would be open likewise to American shipyards.

The Pentagon plans to have 16 such minesweepers constructed. Building of nine previously was authorized. The other seven would be provided for in the $70 billion defense appropriation bill. The seven on which the British yards might bid would cost about $61 million. The electrical equipment and most other devices, however, would be bought from American manufacturers.

As adopted on a 119–61 vote when the House originally passed the defense money bill last July, the amendment sponsored by Rep. John W. Byrnes, R-Wis., did not mention minesweepers. It called for a ban on use of any of the funds for construction of American naval vessels in foreign countries.

WARNING BY LEADERS

House Democratic leaders and other opponents of the Byrnes amendment charged yesterday that final congressional approval of the ban would be "read around the world as indicating that the United States was welching on its agreement with Britain."

They warned also that such action by Congress might even cause the present British cabinet to fall and that in any event "no government could afford to trust our agreements in the future."

The amendment's supporters said it was necessary not only to help American shipyards but also to prevent the Pentagon from "buying a pig in a poke" by entering into still other agreements for foreign construction of U.S. naval vessels.

Democratic Leader Carl Albert, Appropriations Committee Chairman George Mahon, D-Tex., Foreign Affairs Committee Chairman Thomas E. Morgan, D-Pa., and others urged House rejection of the Byrnes amendment not only because the ban would be a "slap in the face" of a friendly nation but mainly because "it would not be in the best interest of the United States."

Noting that only two or three comparatively small shipyards in the United States went to bid on the minesweeper construction, Mahon said:

"The United States cannot afford to stand alone as a military power in the free world. We need as many allies as we can get. The United Kingdom should be made stronger. To protect a small shipyard in Wisconsin and perhaps two more in our country, we would wreck an agreement made in good faith with the British and which is overwhelmingly in our favor financially. Why throw a monkey wrench into it?"

While most Republicans favored the amendment as did many Southern Democrats, the voting showed strong support from members of both parties from seaboard or Great Lakes states. Many members of the Merchant Marine Committee, including Chairman Edward Garmatz, D-Md., voted for it.

The 233 voting for the ban included 158 Republicans and 75 Democrats. The 144 against it included 131 Democrats and 13 Republicans.

The Kee Report: Labor Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1967

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a recent public service television and radio newscast, "The Kee Report."

The subject discussed in this report is Labor Day and its history and significance.

The report follows:

This is Jim Kee—bringing you the Kee Report.

This coming Monday, we celebrate Labor Day, the day on which we honor the dignity of honest toil, the very basic foundation of our American society.

The observance of Labor Day is designed to remind the American people of the tremendous debt which we owe to each and every laborer, as individuals, and to organized labor as a whole. It is a day when we salute labor organizations for all they have done to improve the standard of living of the average American worker, such as the splendid job organized labor is now doing educating "drop-out" youngsters in job skills so that they can earn a decent wage.

The history of Labor Day goes back to 1882 when the idea was first presented in a resolution offered by Peter J. McGuire, a later Vice President of the American Federation of Labor. The resolution was passed by the Central Labor Union, and the first Labor Day was observed that year in New York. Two years later, the American Federation of Labor unanimously adopted a resolution to the effect that the first Monday in September of each year be set apart as a laborer's national holiday by all wage workers, irrespective of sex, calling or nationality.

The movement to set aside a holiday to honor the laborer grew steadily and many towns adopted such a holiday by municipal ordinance. Within a decade, twenty-three state legislatures had also set aside statewide observances of Labor Day as a result of a widespread campaign conducted by organized labor. On June 28, 1894, the Congress of the United States passed a bill, signed by President Grover Cleveland, which made Labor Day a legal holiday for all Government employees. This Act was widely regarded as establishing Labor Day as a national holiday, although it actually applied only to Federal Government employees. However, by 1900, most of the States had, by their own legislative action, recognized the observance of Labor Day.

The significance of Labor Day is seen in the fact that not only the United States Congress, but each and every State, has passed legislation setting aside the first Monday in September as a legal holiday in recognition of the great role which American Labor has played in the economic growth of our Nation.

In the words of the late President John F. Kennedy, and I quote:

"We look upon man's toil as an expression of individual personality and will, not a commodity to be exploited for the benefit of a state or ruling political party. Tyranny deprives a man of the freedom and joy of his work."

It is this recognition of the dignity and freedom of labor which distinguishes our democratic way of life from the tyranny of totalitarian Communism. In a world full of economic upheaval, one of the main lines of Communist attack is upon our economic structure, as well as military and political. The importance of the laborer's contribution can never be sufficiently acknowledged.

Labor, today as always, is still one of the very foundations and bulwarks of our way of life.

Thank you for listening.

Progress Instead of Chaos

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT N. C. NIX

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1967

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, Samuel L. Evans, of Philadelphia, has never aggressively intruded himself or his opinions on the American press or other communications media, but Mr. Evans is deeply concerned about chaos in our cities and lack of distinct direction in the affairs of the black man in the United States.

Therefore, as chairman and organizer of the American Foundation for Negro Affairs, Samuel Evans is dedicated to the promotion of progress for Negroes with emphasis on self-help and mutual encouragement.

Evans says:

Rioting and burning and looting in American cities have focused attention on the plight of Negroes frustrated by joblessness and poverty.

It is too easy to forget that most Negroes not only are law abiding but are gainfully employed and that increasing numbers of Negroes are achieving substantial success in business and industry, in medicine and science and law, in education and many kinds of public service.

The American Foundation for Negro Affairs is made up of just such hard-working, dedicated, prominent Negroes, whose primary purpose is to act as a federation of existing Negro organizations and a kind of national information bureau on Negro affairs.

These men and the organization will further act as an inspiration to those Negroes who have not yet gained the proper tools to free themselves from the many ills that make community resentment possible.

The American Foundation for Negro Affairs plans a national convention of all Negro organizations in 1968.

Mr. Speaker, this is the kind of thinking and the kind of action which is dedicated toward bringing reason out of chaos.

This is the kind of leadership which can show the proper paths to those who have not yet had the opportunity to take advantage of a new freedom, to take advantage of their newly acquired rights of citizenship in this great country that we represent here in Congress.

Mr. Speaker, too many words of contempt have been spoken in general and not enough words of commendation for those forgotten men such as Sam Evans and his foundation, who ask nothing and expect nothing but the same opportunities as every other American, who, when they received that opportunity, made the most of it, and who now seek to assist the less fortunate, the less informed, in making the most of their rights of citizenship.

Mr. Speaker, I hereby submit the resolution calling for the convention of the American Foundation for Negro Affairs and I urge my colleagues to endorse the principles upon which the foundation is founded.

The resolution follows:

> RESOLUTION OF AMERICAN FOUNDATION FOR NEGRO AFFAIRS, PHILADELPHIA, PA., AUGUST 22, 1967
>
> Whereas recent rioting, burning and looting in American cities has focused attention on the plight of Negroes frustrated by joblessness and the ills of poverty, and
>
> Whereas a large number of American Negroes are gainfully employed and that a number of them are achieving substantial success in business and industry, in medicine, science and law, in education and in many kinds of public services, and
>
> Whereas too often the achievement and contributions of citizens and country is obscured by the compelling and pressing problems of a large segment of the American Negro population who has not as yet gained the proper tools to free themselves from the many ills that make community resentment possible, and
>
> Whereas a group of Negro Leaders from all walks of life announced plans here in Philadelphia on Tuesday, August 8, 1967 to form a nationwide unity organization aimed at working out a ten year plan for Negro Progress in America under the name of the newly organized American Foundation for Negro Affairs (AFNA), and
>
> Whereas the proposed American Foundation for Negro Affairs is envisioned as a federation of existing Negro organizations and a kind of national information bureau on Negro affairs, and
>
> Whereas the group plans to set up subsidiary commissions covering the life of the American Negro from "the cradle to the grave" each to be headed by a Negro of national stature in a specific area of activities and to catalog the evolution of the Negro in America and set a practical goal for future progress in each area, and
>
> Whereas a convention has been scheduled tentative for the late Fall (September) of 1968 in Philadelphia at which time the research collected in each area will be cataloged and the projected goal established, and
>
> Whereas commissions will be established in the area of Education, Health and Welfare, Manpower, Labor and Employment, Law, Civil Liberties and Civil Rights, Political Activities, Commerce and Finance, Communications and Transportation, Crime and Delinquency, Family Counseling, performing in Creative Arts, Science, Religion and Athletics,
>
> Therefore be it resolved that the City Council of the City of ——, County of ——, endorse the plan of the American Foundation for Negro Affairs to hold a nationwide unity convention which will be held in Philadelphia during September, 1968 for the purposes stated above in the Resolution,
>
> We further resolve that a copy of the Resolution be forwarded to Samuel L. Evans, Acting Chairman and Organizer for the Convention.

"Well Done, Thou Good and Faithful Servant"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1967

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, it has been said many times in this Chamber that local government is the cornerstone around which our democracy is built. Yet, all too often we forget those who toil making local government a reality. Unfortunately, most citizens only become aware of the operations of municipal government when they are dissatisfied. Rarely do they appreciate the town or city official who fulfills his trust year in and year out and never fails to live up to the confidence which the sovereign people in their wisdom have placed in him.

In my own 14th District of New Jersey we have many individuals who have done their job without fanfare and in every way merit the scriptural "Well done thou good and faithful servant." Foremost among these is the Honorable John E. Otis, a commissioner in the town of West New York.

In the Hudson Dispatch of September 13, 1967, the respected columnist, James Ferguson, has paid a deserved tribute to Commissioner Otis. I would like to call the attention of all Members of this House to the fine work that Commissioner Otis has done for the young people in West New York, and I know that if there were more eternally young men like Commissioner Otis in this Nation, America would be a better place in which to live. I insert Mr. Ferguson's column at this point in the RECORD.

The column follows:

> Since the days this writer not too gracefully adorned the halls of Memorial High School, Bergenline av. has been the nightly gathering place of the town's teenagers, usually to the despair of other residents, businessmen et al.
>
> When the situation got unbearable, however, veteran Commissioner John E. Otis stepped into the emergency with a radically expanded summer program for the teenagers, along with a tough anti-loitering ordinance.
>
> But let Otis describe it in his own words: "To accomplish our objective—to hold youth activities evenings during the summer vacation period—cooperation and help were needed. The Committee of the Clergy were deeply interested and very active in their support and held several meetings with me. Your newspaper gave us constant support. Our staff under supervisor of our vacation recreation program Carl Raparelli, spent many extra hours with the youngsters. And our mayor and commissioners assured me that the extra cost would be met."
>
> "Our summer expansion, under this plan, began with dancing and children's entertainment at the pavillion on Boulevard East five nights a week instead of one night a week. At Memorial Park we increased our athletics and all round play five nights and also at Miller Stadium. At our Exempt Firehouse, a young people's forum was organized by the youngsters (16 to 21) four nights a week and was always jammed, with dancing and refreshments available. At School 4 we had dancing and refreshments for youngsters 12 to 16 conducted by the kids, always with a packed house. The extra lighting also kept our Boulevard East playland busy."
>
> What Otis neglects to add is that he personally put in many long hours at the teenage functions, although his 76-year-old ears are probably no more attuned to rock and roll than many of us decades his junior. But for any politician seeking longevity in office, it might be noted that the WNY official has practically built his career around his work with the youth of the town. Since he was recently reelected for his seventh four-year term, making him Hudson's senior official in point of service, he must be doing something right.
>
> As always, Labor Day has probably swept the problems under the rug until next summer. But, barring the Gotterdammerung, it will be back next vacation time. Any answers?

Students From Kamehameha Schools Carry Aloha Spirit to Japan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1967

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, this past summer an outstanding group of students from Honolulu's Kamehameha Schools participated in an imaginative and meaningful goodwill tour to Japan.

The activities of the 10 young citizens of Hawaii are summarized in a letter from the American Consul in Fukuoka, Japan, the Honorable John E. Kelley, to Dr. James W. Bushong, president of the Kamehameha Schools.

Consul Kelley commented:

> It is my judgment that this group is doing an outstanding job, both of representing the United States and of demonstrating Hawaii's unique contribution to man's search for a better society. It is important that the aloha spirit, which has done so much for Hawaii, should play an international role in binding America and Japan together in friendship and understanding.

I believe my colleagues in Congress would wish to join me in commending these talented and knowledgeable youngsters who have helped to strengthen the friendly ties between the people of the United States and Japan. The group, chaperoned by Mr. and Mrs. Burl Yarberry, included Thomas Akana, Moses Akana, Edward Hall, Stewart Williams, Robert Cazimero, Donna Brandl, Consuelo Dupio, Sharlene Holt, Haunani Keahi, and Darlene Kehua.

I take considerable pleasure in inserting Consul Kelley's letter of July 31, 1967, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I am also inserting a letter from Gov. John A. Burns, praising these young men and women from Hawaii for their notable success in promoting international friendship on their recent goodwill tour to Japan:

CONSULATE OF THE UNITED STATES
OF AMERICA,
Fukuoka, Japan, July 31, 1967.

DR. JAMES W. BUSHONG,
President, Kamehameha Schools,
Honolulu, Hawaii.

DEAR SIR: I thought you might be interested in an interim report on the activities of the ten very fine representatives of the Kamehameha Schools who are in the midst of their good-will tour through Kyushu, Japan. The group has left Fukuoka Prefecture after a 2-week stay which saw them play to packed houses every day and brought swarms of Japanese students backstage for informal exchanges afterwards. Discussion meetings with Japanese students were reportedly well-attended and lively. A charity show, held here in Fukuoka City, played to a packed house. I understand that in Kokura, the group's last program ended in a shower of confetti and streamers from the audience.

It is my judgment that this group is doing an outstanding job, both of representing the United States and of demonstrating Hawaii's unique contribution to man's search for a better society. It is important that the aloha spirit, which has done so much for Hawaii, should play an international role in binding American and Japan together in friendship and understanding. I can think of no better way to accomplish this than through the mutual exchange of the cultural heritages of Hawaii and Japan through the medium of visits such as this one.

The students of the Kamehameha Schools are the best representatives I have seen so far of Hawaii's aloha spirit. For this reason, it would be extremely beneficial to the American image here in Japan if these visits could continue as a supplement on the private level to our official effort to promote friendship and understanding with Japan.

You have good reason to be proud of these Kamehameha School students.

Making friends seems to come natural to them and this gift makes them excellent good-will ambassadors.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN E. KELLEY,
American Counsul.

STATE OF HAWAII,
Honolulu, August 8, 1967.

DR. JAMES W. BUSHONG,
President, the Kamehameha Schools,
Honolulu, Hawaii.

DEAR DR. BUSHONG: It is with much pleasure that I relay to you a message I have received from Mr. John E. Kelley, the United States Consul in Fukuoka, Japan, regarding the recent appearances of Kamehameha students in Fukuoka Prefecture.

As you will note, Consul Kelley is highly enthusiastic about the impression made by your students on their Japanese audiences, especially the young people who sought out the students for informal discussions.

The Kamehameha Schools and the students are to be most highly commended for their most significant contribution to international good will and understanding. As Consul Kelley says, this achievement is in behalf of our Nation as well as of the State of Hawaii.

This fine report on the success of the Kamehameha students in Japan is particularly pleasing to me for it demonstrates once again the manner in which the great potential of our people, especially those of Hawaiian ancestry who are knowledgeable of their culture, can perform a most important function with better hope of success than those of any other background.

Please convey my personal thanks and aloha to each of the young men and women who participated in the tour.

Warmest personal regards. May the Almighty be with you and yours always.

Sincerely,

JOHN A. BURNS,
Governor.

OEO's Effectiveness With Riots

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 14, 1967

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, the results of a survey of 64 cities, half of whom had riots and half which did not, were released recently by OEO, and it was the unanimous opinion of the cities' mayors that both the OEO programs, and its workers, played a major part in keeping cities cool this summer, and helping to settle disturbances in cities where they did occur.

In Pittsburgh, which has an effective antipoverty program, city officials have claimed that antipoverty employees have been a very effective civilian force in maintaining peace and order. I do not believe that the antipoverty program was designed to be an antiriot program, but it is noteworthy that there has been a drop in juvenile delinquency in Pittsburgh, and there have been no riots. This is at least partly due to the fact that the program has convinced many of the poor that someone cares, that something can be done.

Roscoe Drummond in discussing the mayors' testimony says:

> Whatever else Congress may do to help solve the urban crisis, the one thing not to do is tear up the antipoverty administration and program.

I commend his thoughtful article in the September 13 Washington Post to the attention of my colleagues at this point in the RECORD:

MAYORS SAY OEO PROGRAMS HELPED SUPPRESS CITY RIOTS

(By Roscoe Drummond)

The people who know the most about race riots and what to do about them are the people who run the cities—the mayors.

Their views deserve the most responsive attention—by Congress and by the country.

A nationwide survey in 64 cities, half of which had riots this summer and half of which didn't, shows that the mayors are overwhelmingly agreed on what does most to cause riots and what can help most to prevent them.

The causes they cite most frequently are two: lack of jobs and lack of trusted communication between the Negroes and local officials.

As to cures, they know better than most that there is no single solution, no instant panacea, but the mayors—democratic and republican—of these 64 cities are unanimous in their conviction that the antipoverty programs are crucial and constructive forces which need to be continued.

This survey shows conclusively that both the OEO programs and its workers played a major role in keeping scores of cities cool this summer and helped hold rioting down when it wasn't averted.

Because the survey was carried out by the OEO, some might dismiss it as self-serving. But after reading pages of direct quotations by the mayors themselves, I am convinced its findings are authentic. The message is this:

Whatever else Congress may do to help solve the urban crisis, the one thing not to do is to tear up the antipoverty administration and programs.

In the Senate the outlook for the antipoverty bill is good. The Labor and Public Welfare Committee, by a vote of 12 to 3, endorsed a bill to continue and somewhat expand the OEO programs for two years.

But there are ominous storm clouds in the House. There are still some Republicans and Southern Democrats who want to dismember the OEO and distribute the programs to other agencies.

Critics of the war on poverty have seized on headlines about the one or two incidents where poverty workers were charged with helping create a riot-causing climate.

The testimony of the mayors shows that without the antipoverty programs there would have been more violence, little communication with the slum Negroes, and no significant beginnings of hope and assistance for the urban poor.

As to poverty workers abetting riots, some communities undertake high-risk experiments involving some of the most disaffected and alienated youth. Young men who six months ago were on the streets and in trouble are carefully and cautiously given responsibility, trained to leadership and learn to feel it is just as manly to lead a work program as to lead a gang.

A few proved unreliable. But out of 30,000 community action employes, only 16 were arrested, none convicted. And the poverty program has 244 buildings in the hearts of the riot areas; none was burned or destroyed.

In 15 cities local community action agencies calmed down bad situations.

In 13 cities they patroled trouble spots and served as communication posts between the police and slum areas.

In 14 cities the police and community action agencies had joint programs to prevent riots.

In 8 cities the Juvenile arrest rate dropped this summer and there is good evidence this was caused by more summer jobs.

The testimony of the mayors is that the poverty programs help convert militancy into responsibility and offer an alternative to violence.

Pfc. Baxter F. Ervin Killed in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLARENCE E. MILLER

OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 14, 1967

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, Pfc. Baxter F. Ervin, a young soldier from Ohio, was recently killed in action in Vietnam. I wish to commend the courage of this young man and to honor his memory by including the following article in the RECORD:

PRIVATE FIRST CLASS ERVIN, OF ALBANY, KILLED IN VIETNAM ACTION

ALBANY, OHIO.—Army Pfc. Baxter F. Ervin, 19, Albany Route 1, has been killed in action in Vietnam on August 21. He entered service on January 4, 1967, and had volunteered for service in Vietnam.

Private Ervin underwent basic training at Ft. Knox, Kentucky. He had been in Vietnam for one month at the time of his death, as a paratrooper with the 101st Airborne Division.

Born in Columbus, Ohio, he was a graduate of Albany High School with the Class of 1966, and was a member of the basketball team while at the school, including the 1964–65 squad which competed in the State Class A Tournament in Columbus.

He is survived by his parents, Kenneth and Betty Ervin, Albany Route 1; two brothers, Forrest and Mark, both at home; and his grandparents, Mr. and Mrs. French Ervin, Athens, Route 1; and Mrs. Josephine Randall, Los Angeles, California.

Address of Vice President Hubert Humphrey at Weizmann Institute of Science Dinner Honoring Philip M. Klutznick, of Chicago

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1967

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it was my pleasure to attend a dinner in Chicago on Sunday night honoring Philip M. Klutznick.

Vice President Humphrey delivered the major address of the evening and I believe it should be called to the attention of all of us who are honored to serve in Congress. Its eloquence and sense of purpose reaffirms for all of us the goals we must never lose sight of in our quest for development which, as Pope Paul says, is the new word for peace.

It was significant that Vice President Humphrey chose a dinner honoring Philip Klutznick for his timely remarks. For Mr. Klutznick epitomizes the very spirit of challenge which Vice President Humphrey used for his theme.

Mr. Klutznick has served five American Presidents, beginning with Franklin Roosevelt, in the field of urban planning. Many of the innovative ideas gaining wide acceptance today are the products of his recommendations years ago. Currently he is adviser to the Center on Housing and Planning for the United Nations.

He has served with distinction as international president of B'nai B'rith, general chairman of the United Jewish Appeal, president of the American Friends of the Hebrew University, vice president of the National Jewish Welfare Board, vice president of the World Federation of the YMHA and Jewish Community Centers, and he is a member of the national board of the American Committee for the Weizmann Institute of Science.

The banquet honoring Philip Klutznick in Chicago on the occasion of his 60th birthday was attended, in addition to the Vice President, by Lieutenant Governor Shapiro, Mayor Richard Daley, Adlai Stevenson III, Congressman Yates, and numerous prominent Americans who willingly and readily met to pay tribute to an outstanding American.

Philip Klutznick is an American in the finest tradition of the word. He knows the complexity of the job to be done and is not deterred by the challenge of progress. Millions of Americans, millions of people throughout the world have benefited from his creativity and enthusiasm. The Weizmann Institute of Science has established the Philip M. Klutzman professorial chair in developmental biology—immunology cancer. Philip Klutznick will continue to serve as an inspiration to men of vision and ability throughout the world.

Mr. Speaker, the Vice President's remarks follow:

Address of the Honorable Hubert H. Humphrey, Vice President of the United States, at Weizmann Institute of Science Dinner Honoring Philip M. Klutznick, Palmer House, Chicago, Ill., September 10, 1967

We are here tonight to pay honor to two men of excellence: Dr. Chaim Weizmann and Philip Klutznick.

Dr. Weizmann is no longer with us, but his spirit lives and grows in the Weizmann Institute and, in the State of Israel itself. I did not have the privilege of knowing Dr. Weizmann, but his transcendent goodness and greatness shine through everything I have heard and read about him.

As for Phil Klutznick, I think of him not only as a public servant and a supremely public-spirited private citizen, but as my good friend. Phil, I know that once you gain a reputation as a publicly spirited citizen, there is no escaping it.

Dr. Weizmann once said: "The walls of Jericho fell to the sound of shouts and trumpets. But I have never heard of walls being raised that way."

Those words today, more than ever, should have special meaning to each of us. For in our America—and in our world—this must be the time of the builders. This must be the time of those who seek neither easy glory nor cut-rate success, but who are willing to pay the price of work . . . and frustration . . . and oftentime, self-sacrifice to build a nation, and a world, where neighbor may live peacefully with neighbor . . . where human dignity is not a speechmaker's phrase, but a reality in the daily life of every man.

What does it take to build a nation? Dollars? Factories? Tools and resources? Yes, it takes these things. But the lesson of Israel, and of America, is that it takes, above all, people—people united, people with respect for themselves and for their neighbors, people filled with faith and hope in future, people inbred with indomitable and courageous perserverance.

Nation building is not for the weak or timid nor is it without its uncertainties. Today our nationhood is being tested. It is being tested in every American community where strife and pain have shattered the calm of a society grown accustomed to the late, late show and the reassuring hum of the Dow Jones ticker. It is being tested in the choices we make in responding to the disruptive events in our city streets.

For now, when the many are well-fed, clothed, educated and housed and the few are not . . . when the many walk through open doors and the few are barred—now is a time of testing far more demanding than when the many sought to reach what only the few had achieved.

Now is a time when it could be all too easy to deny in our own hearts the spiritual and ideological precepts which have guided us, and to say: We are not our brothers' keepers.

Now is a time when it could be all too easy to forget that we serve God by serving man, created in His image, by loving our neighbor as ourself, by "doing justly and loving mercy and walking humbly" before our Maker. But we must not. And I have faith that we shall not.

There is no more repellant word in our vocabulary than the word "ghetto." The very sound and inference of it offend our senses. Yet we must recognize that there are ghettos today in America every bit as real as those of the past in other places. And within those ghettos—we've grown accustomed to calling them slums—live fellow American citizens whose world is so far distant from yours and mine as to be unrecognizable. Yet until those Americans can stand in unity with us—and we with them—our Nation will remain unbuilt. It will remain only a blueprint—one more of history's uncompleted frameworks.

How are we to remove from the American environment the ghetto and the slum? How are we to help lift the left-out few into the growing, prosperous mainstream?

This is the work for builders. This is the work for those in America who want to be "where the action is." This is the task for those who look beyond the country club veranda to the Nation we are building for the 21st century. For the time has passed in America—just as it has in the world-at-large—when "trickle-down" prosperity, "trickle-down" education, "trickle-down" social progress will be enough to satisfy men and women who see on television, and hear on transistor radios, what the outside world has to offer.

Now we're down to the bottom of it. We shall have to practice what we preach. We shall have to reach out to the one American in six or seven who lives on the margins of our general well-being. We shall have to make the extra effort for the 6-year-old child who comes to school from three generations of illiteracy, ignorance and discouragement. We shall have to give him the best, not the least, that school has to offer or another generation will be lost.

We shall have to make room in our office, factory, and business training programs—and in our trade unions—for the willing but untrained young men who will never be back to school, who do not have the standard credentials for the world of work. Or those young men will be lost for time to come to the world of welfare, relief and crime.

All of us will have to re-examine our old ways of doing things. We shall have to ask questions. Does the private sector need new incentive to enter critical areas of public need, such as low-cost housing? Are there ways we in government can offer that incentive? Does our public welfare system penalize rather than help the mother striving to support a young family without a father? How can it be changed?

Do we force our old people, particularly those trapped in poverty, to live on small, fixed incomes in an economy of growth? How can we help them not just subsist, but live?

Are our units of government—especially at state, local, and municipal level—organized, funded and staffed for the turn of the century, or for tomorrow?

Are our tax dollars being wasted through the sheer inefficiency and disorder of old divisions of governmmental responsibility designed for an agrarian society? Or can they be put productively to use in meeting problems, for instance, such as the poisonous pollution of our water and air, or the lack of mass transit, which cut across all the old jurisdictional lines?

And, finally, does each one of us really believe that every other American—regardless of race, name, religion, or color—ought to have the same equal chance that we have? Or do we save that belief for lip-service at school commencements and patriotic meetings?

Every one of those questions carriers within it a challenge for our affluent, generally-well-off America. For, if we chose to do so, we could ignore every single one of them. Oh yes, there would be disturbances from time to time. We could put them down. we'd pay a lot in taxes to pay for the unproductive people in our midst, and for the cost of crime.

We'd be offended from time to time as we drove past the dirty, dilapidated neighborhoods on the other side of town. But everything would still be comfortable enough—at least for quite a while—for ourselves and for the people we know.

But the price we would pay in conscience is one we could not afford. And our moral stature in this world—and I believe it is considerable—would be damaged beyond repair.

I think we must ask all the questions I have just asked, and more. And when we think we have the right answers, we must be willing to act on them. Jobs. Education. Training. Decent, low-cost housing. Convenient mass transit. Health services. Participation by people in the life of their neighborhood. Respect for every fellow citizen. These are the things our society will have to produce in the months and years ahead—far more than the newest accessory for the woman who has everything—if the work of nation-building is to go on in America. And now is the time to get on with it.

Finally, especially before this audience, I must add a few words about this same process of nation-building in the larger world environment in which we live.

When we think of nation-building, we think of Israel. We think of the work of the Weizmann Institute. We think of the efforts that the United States, Israel and other "have" nations have undertaken in the postwar world to help the "have nots." And, we rightly take some satisfaction. Yet—since this seems to be an evening for fact-facing—I think we should see these efforts in their proper perspective.

Pope Paul's recent and historic encyclical said it simply and directly: "Development is the new name for peace." And, if peace is indeed to be preserved in this nuclear age, all the industrialized nations of the world—regardless of ideology—will have to mount a far greater effort in international nation-building than they do today.

If our rich and powerful nation is challenged by the gap that still exists within our society here at home, the industrialized world in general is challenged far more by the sickening gap that divides it from the two-thirds of the world's people who live hungry, desperate and ready to turn to anyone who offers food, hope, and answers. And if our American ingenuity is tested in meeting our domestic trials, it is all the more tested in the task of peaceful development around the world.

I need point no further than the Middle East to bring clearly into focus the seething turmoil that can stem from societies of poverty—victimized by fear and suspicion fed by ignorance and despair. Yet, in that same Middle East, we see a noble example of nation building by men and women who in the spirit of our American forefathers have pledged "their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor" to the creation and defense of a free and independent Israel.

Today the story of Israel inspires millions of people all over the world. Israel in peace and war commands respect. Yet Israel knows, as her neighbors must know, that the hope of a better life in peace and freedom requires regional cooperation and massive development of all the resources of the area.

I need point no further than the Middle East to demonstrate the urgent need for the application of the advanced knowledge and technology we and others possess, in the cause of peace and peaceful development. The Middle East needs water—and what is more, a symbol of peace and life.

For the past three years our Government, and the Government of Israel, have been working together in planning for a massive installation which would use nuclear energy to desalt sea water. Right now we are concerned with the practicality and cost of a plant which would produce 100 million gallons a day of desalted water and 300 megawatts of electric power. Other studies are underway for application in other parts of the world.

Two eminent Americans—President Eisenhower and Admiral Strauss—have put forward another such proposal in the same spirit. This proposal, and others like it which might contribute to development in the Middle East and elsewhere, are receiving careful attention within our Government.

As President Johnson said this June 19:

"If the nations of the Middle East will turn toward the works of peace, they can count with confidence upon the friendship and help of all the people of the United States . . . we here will do our share . . . and do more . . . to see that the peaceful promise of nuclear energy is applied to the critical problem of desalting water and helping to make the deserts bloom."

I use the Middle East, and I use desalinization of water, as examples of the challenges—and of the hard, practical work which will be needed to meet them—which lie ahead of us. Assume, for instance, that the ultimate in regional cooperation might be achieved—yes, even in the Middle East.

Assume that the ultimate in private-sector participation might be obtained. Then assume that the state of technological art already existed to cheaply undertake such projects wherever they were needed.

You would still be astounded by the cost, the time, and the commitment that would be necessary by the "rich" nations to bring the projects into full operation. And it would be still months and years later before their benefits really begin to be broadly felt among the people living near them. Is this any reason for giving up on desalinization, in Israel, the Middle East, or anywhere else?

It is not. But it is reason for all of us to realize that time is growing short and that the scope of the challenge of development must at least be acknowledged by those who will have to meet it. Yet again this year, we saw the President's foreign aid request emasculated in the Congress. And we saw a good deal of the hatchet work done by people who in the same breath decried the necessity of our involvement in unfamiliar parts of the world.

I have news: To cut off foreign aid, to leave the field to disorder and poverty, is to invite trouble in unfamiliar parts of the world. Yes, as Pope Paul said, development is the new name for peace.

And this, again, is where the builders come in. All men profess to seek peace. But peace is like a flower—it needs fertile soil in which to grow. (And this is as true in America as it is in the most remote mountain province in Asia, Africa or Latin America.) Peace cannot, and will not grow, in the rocks of bitterness and poverty, in the dry sands of backwardness and despair. It needs the fertile soil of education and food, of health and hope.

The pursuit of peace resembles the building of a great cathedral. It is the work of generations. In concept it requires a master architect; in execution, the labors of many.

Yes, the pursuit of peace requires time—but we must use time not as a crutch, but as a tool. We must use time to see our country and the world as they really are . . . to measure what needs to be done and how.

And then, as Dr. Weizmann said, without shouts or trumpets—with only the rewards that lie within our own hearts—we must build, brick-by-brick, a cathedral of peace and justice and brotherhood to stand a thousand years.

Sam Davenport

SPEECH
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 31, 1967

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, information has come to me that Sam Davenport is leaving the Office of the Coordinator of Information of the House of Representatives after many years of devoted and dedicated service.

He served with zeal and dispatch in the handling of requests made of him by Members of the House. A few days ago I called Sam and asked his assistance in connection with a vital research problem. He fulfilled the assignment capably and cheerfully as he had done every time I had asked him to assist me.

It was a genuine pleasure to know Sam Davenport. I knew him particularly well from our association at the Thursday morning prayer breakfast meetings. He usually arrived about 15 minutes before 8 o'clock along with Jimmy Utt and Art Younger. He contributed greatly to the success of the group by his faithful attendance and learned participation in the discussions. He prepared a valuable history of the founders and subsequent members as he was the individual with the longest service. He knew every one of the first members. He gave his impressions of each of them.

As he goes into new fields of endeavor, I wish he and Mrs. Davenport every continued happiness and success.

Support for Monday Holidays

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 14, 1967

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, there is growing support for the legislation now pending before the Judiciary Committee to create Monday holidays. It was a pleasure for me to appear before the subcommittee which held hearings last month on the bills in support of H.R. 1292 by the gentleman from New York [Mr. Stratton]. Since the hearing, more support has been garnered from newspapers in Wisconsin and for the information of my colleagues I include as a part of my remarks at this point three editorials on the subject:

[From the Ripon (Wis.) Commonwealth Press, Aug. 10, 1967]

Those Wonderful Long Weekends

An overwhelming vote of Wisconsin citizens—77 per cent of those answering a survey—favors the proposed uniform Monday holiday plan so heavily endorsed by the Wisconsin state chamber of commerce and now being considered by Congress.

The plan would reschedule major existing non-religious holidays so they would always fall on Monday each year. Included would be Memorial Day, Independence Day, Veteran's Day and perhaps Thanksgiving among others. Christmas and New Year's would not be affected.

There are some pretty good reasons for scheduling these big holidays on Mondays.

The obvious one is the additional day of vacation time that would be provided for so-called long weekends. Families will appreciate these three day weekends.

Split weeks—with a day of vacation on Tuesday, Wednesday or Thursday—interrupts production in factories, leads to absenteeism and causes loss to the state's tourist industry.

In addition, records of the National Safety Council show that one-day, mid-week holidays result in the highest highway kill rate because people feel obliged to hurry too fast to get someplace and make it home again in time.

Hearings are now being conducted in Washington on the bill. Here's hoping our legislators will pass it. It makes logical sense.

[From the Hartford (Wis.) Times-Press, Aug. 10, 1967]

EDITORIAL

The move to get most national holidays to fall on a Monday is about to get a push in Congress, according to word sent us by Congressman Bill Steiger. A House Judiciary subcommittee has scheduled hearings for August 16–17 on bills that would shift Washington's Birthday, Memorial Day, Independence Day and Veterans Day to Monday. Several bills have also been introduced to move Thanksgiving Day to Monday also. We would go along with this.

We still think that this activity could be modified by dropping Washington's Birthday and Veterans Day, for the simple reason that they are not observed as regular holidays. What will happen if they are included is that they will be restored to nationwide observance, and this will mean two additional days that business and industry will have to shut down. There are enough of these days now, without adding to them.

[From the Milwaukee (Wis.) Journal, Sept. 7, 1967]

MORE FOR MONDAY HOLIDAYS

Latest ally of the movement for mostly Monday holidays is the National Association of Manufacturers. This influential Washington lobby group gave its support at public hearings on a house bill to make Monday observances uniform nationwide.

NAM spokesmen candidly stated the most persuasive though unsentimental argument, that fixed date holidays are economically wasteful when they fall in midweek. The additional shutdowns and startups of production are costly and also breed absenteeism.

The movement appears to be developing into a pretty good ground swell. It has not aroused any significant opposition, and mainly has to overcome the inertia of tradition and old habit. In another session or two, congress might actually get interested enough to legislate it.

Providing for an Appeal by the United States From Decisions Sustaining Motions To Suppress Evidence

SPEECH
OF
HON. PAUL FINDLEY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 11, 1967

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, under general leave last Monday for extension of remarks in connection with H.R. 8654, I welcome this opportunity to congratulate my able colleague from Illinois [Mr. RAILSBACK].

This bill represents a unique legislative achievement for any member of the minority and especially one who, like Mr. RAILSBACK, is in his first year of service. It symbolizes the splendid talent of Mr. RAILSBACK and is a tribute to the good judgment of the people of the 19th Congressional District of Illinois.

Robert A. Chadbourne Receives Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HASTINGS KEITH
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 14, 1967

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, it is a real pleasure for me to inform the Congress that Mr. Robert A. Charbourne, the executive vice president of Associated Industries of Massachusetts, received one of six Grand Key Awards from the American Society of Association Executives on August 29 in Montreal, Canada. Mr. Chadbourne is a close, personal friend of mine and I am certain this recognition is well deserved.

The award was presented to Mr. Chadbourne for an Associated Industries of Massachusetts project, under his direction, entitled "Focus on Industry and Water Pollution in Massachusetts." Since the project dealt with water pollution, a subject of increasing interest to everyone, I am certain that the following summary of Mr. Chadbourne's winning project will be of interest to all:

SUMMARY OF WINNING ENTRY OF ROBERT CHADBOURNE, ASSOCIATED INDUSTRIES OF MASSACHUSETTS

Water pollution is a national problem today, but the Associated Industries of Massachusetts took the lead in that state with a series of seven conferences to interpret and evaluate the new federal, state, and local water quality control laws.

Entitled "Focus on Industry and Water Pollution in Massachusetts," the meetings sought to clarify the new laws in terms of the demands and responsibilities imposed on industry and all segments of the community. With only six months to go before the new laws became applicable, industrial managers, executives, administrators, and legal and public relations personnel had the opportunity to examine the specific changes the new laws would bring to their industries. This approach to the water pollution menace also alerted local governments and community-action groups to AIM's activity in this area of public concern.

The Associated Industries of Massachusetts acts as the unified voice of industry in the state; its 2400 member firms employ 85% of the state's industrial workers. To notify the membership, other industrial interests, and the general public of the meetings, association-wide mailings and a mass publicity program were undertaken. The press was fully informed in advance, and in addition, association and public relations personnel personally contacted major newspapers, and radio and television stations in the seven meeting areas to invite the attendance of their representatives.

At the meetings, the participants received a kit of references to water pollution and water quality management, including a detailed analysis by AIM counsel of the comprehensive state water quality management program and regulations. The Water Resources Committee of AIM had worked closely with legislators in the drafting of the legislation, known popularly as "The Massachusetts Clean Waters Act of 1966".

At the same time the state-wide meetings were in progress, A.I.M. counsel testified at a public hearing on the proposed new water quality standards, stating industry's concern for practical standards.

In coordination with the water pollution activities, A.I.M. devoted the May, 1967 issue of its official publication, *Industry Magazine*, to a review of optimum water quality management and control. The special issue was the most timely and comprehensive water pollution review published for industry in Massachusetts. In addition to the general membership of the association, all those who attended the meetings received a copy of this special issue. The association has had hundreds of requests for reprints from interested organizations and individuals.

However, A.I.M. didn't stop there. With so much concern apparent in the water pollution area, the association inaugurated a new publication: "Air and Water Pollution Control Viewpoints for Executives."

The meetings were dramatically successful from every viewpoint. Not only are the new water quality policies more fully understood among the industrial managers who must cope with them in day to day operations, but government officials and community leaders are also more aware of the responsibilities imposed on industry. In addition, A.I.M. and industry were identified as responsive and responsible corporate citizens interested in solving a problem which greatly affects the general public. The communications media was forceful in its support of industry's affirmative approach to the problem and complimentary toward A.I.M.'s leadership role.

British Publication Evaluates Joint Committee on Atomic Energy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 14, 1967

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the following excerpt from Nature, volume 215, July 8, 1967, affords an interesting assessment of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy of the Congress:

COMMITTEE AND AEC

The relationship between the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy and the Atomic Energy Commission in the United States has changed a great deal since the time, a decade ago, when the annual examination of the AEC budget seemed more a public spectacle of enmity than an orderly contribution to good government. At the beginning, of course, the AEC was prevented by a combination of arrogance and innocence from learning quickly how to get on with Congress. The Joint Committee also had to make its reputation in what must them have seemed an exceedingly difficult technical field—and in the event it has succeeded so well that it has not merely become a power in the land on its own account but has also become a model to other committees of Congress which have somehow to make themselves effective critics in technical fields.

The American Constitution is a great help, of course. Congress is as jealous of its independence from the Administration as the British House of Commons is jealous of its independence of the monarchy. In Washington, one result is that the committees of Congress responsible for the detailed scrutiny of legislation are invested with all the prestige and authority that Congress has to muster. Even if the chairman of a committee, who may find that he owes his appointment to nothing but seniority, turns out to be a wayward eccentric, Congress as a whole will not willingly let the Administration make a monkey of him. The committees which make the pace in Washington, however, are those which can somehow establish an authority of their own. The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy has done this, and its success derives almost exclusively from its diligence. Since the early fifties it has been building up an enviable reputation for understanding of and discernment in the operations of the AEC. A decade ago it was largely responsible for persuading the AEC and the other government agencies concerned that there are more problems in regulating the safe use of radioactive materials than could be solved by setting rigid numerical limits for the kind of dose which should not be exceeded. By now, the committee has become expert on a host of technical matters. It can be relied on to know what the AEC is getting at when it says that one type of reactor is less promising than another. It can take a line of its own on the importance of plasma research. It has views on nuclear propulsion for rockets. Its competence has clearly won the respect not merely of other committees of Congress but of the AEC as well.

How has all this come about? Committees elsewhere—the Select Committee of the House of Commons on Science and Technology, for example—should be asking this question. When the prestige of Congress is discounted, the secret of the Joint Committee's success is principally to be found in the way in which it has been able to employ a full-time staff of able people willing to devote themselves to a continuing study of one branch of government administration. One striking proof of how this works is that the man who was for several years the committee's chief of staff, Mr. James T. Ramey, became three years ago a member of the AEC. But this, of course, is also a proooof of how close has now become the relationship between the committee and the AEC.

But could it be that the relationship is now closer than it should be? There is certainly something in the view that a certain tension between congressional committees and agencies of the Administration is desirable as well as unavoidable. One danger is that if a committee and the agency which it is supposed to superintend live too closely in each other's pockets, there will be no means of making sure that their combined attitude to the outside world is sound. Another is that a committee which is too knowledgeable and too winsome may find itself persuading a government agency to particular lines of development which become, in retrospect, unwise. In other words, there is a danger that too expert a committee might find itself able to exercise power without responsibility.

On the face of things, the Joint Committee tends towards errors of the second kind. Its report on this year's budget application by the AEC shows how carefully the committee picks over the details of the budget, subtracting a few thousand dollars here and there, and sometimes even adding a few thousand. On one view, this is a splendid illustration of the democratic control of public institutions. On another, it is a sign that Congress and the Administration are too closely entangled.

There is no reason to believe that the committee's work has been unreasonably intrusive in the recent past. On the contrary, the chances are that the prodding needed to make accurate calculations of the cost of running particle accelerators before constructing them, and the campaign for better regulations to protect the health of uranium miners, have helped to make the policies of the AEC more sensible. But what if the question should arise of whether the AEC in its present form should continue to exist?

Would the Joint Committee take kindly even to the much more modest proposal that responsibility for high energy physics might be transferred to the National Science Foundation? There is bound to be a suspicion that the Joint Committee, for all its expertise, would resist too radical a change. The trouble is that the time has probably come for a detailed re-examination of the function of the AEC. The best proof the committee could give of its resolution would be to begin an investigation off its own bat.

Some Governors Refuse To Stand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1967

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, when it came time for elected representatives to stand and be counted, some Governors were absent.

Mr. Speaker, I include the September 13 Washington Evening Star report on the 1967 Governors' conference following my remarks:

GODWIN, MADDOX TANGLE ON EDUCATION

(By Paul Hope)

ASHEVILLE, N.C.—The Southern Governors' Conference, which for years has been a forum for condemning school integration, has for the first time taken a positive step toward eliminating racial barriers.

And Gov. Mills E. Godwin Jr. of Virginia, who not many years ago was an advocate of "massive resistance" to integration, turned up as a champion of integration in higher education facilities in the South.

Godwin, a Democrat, took on segregationist Gov. Lester Maddox of Georgia, also a Democrat, yesterday in a debate over a report from the Southern Regional Education Board.

The board's report was highly critical of the college educational opportunities offered Negroes in the South and made several recommendations to correct them.

KEY RECOMMENDATION

One of the most significant of the recommendations was this:

"Long-range plans should be devised to complete the evolution of the South's dual system of higher education into a single system serving all students."

Another recommendation was that white colleges and universities adopt "high risk" quotas for the admission of "educationally disadvantaged students."

While the long-range plans called for a single system for Negro and white students, the report said the "cause of equal educational opportunity" would not be served at this time by putting all Negro colleges out of existence.

It recommended putting more money into Negro institutions that could properly serve Negro students but eliminating "unnecessary duplication of programs" in areas where all students could be served better and more cheaply together.

Maddox claimed that admitting "high risk" students would lower standards and make for inferior education. He also said that dropping programs at Negro institutions would result in the closing of many of them and he could not see how that would provide more educational opportunities for Negroes.

Godwin countered, "I feel this probably is a real landmark report so far as equalizing opportunity in the South. If we fail to realize the extent of the problem and fail to take into account these recommendations we are doing nothing but perpetuating education of inferior quality to young Negroes of the South."

Godwin said that a visit to any Negro institution of higher education in the South "would reflect that it is way below the white institutions. This is an area that cries out very loudly to do something about . . .

"I don't know of anything that will better cure the troubles we have in the South—and the nation—than to upgrade education for Negroes, and white, children . . . We have a pitifully poor program in many of our institutions above high school."

Several other governors defended the report and it was adopted by a voice vote without dissent. Maddox didn't seem to vote.

(But in an action today, Maddox and Gov. Paul Johnson, D-Miss., defeated an attempt to put the governors on record in support of a regional institute to improve higher education for Negroes, United Press International reported.

(Maddox and Johnson were able to kill the resolution because of a conference rule that require unanimous approval. On the first vote Maddox cast the lone "no," but on the roll call Johnson joined him.

(The report accepted yesterday included virtually everything that was in the defeated resolution.)

Maddox also was taken to task by Democratic Gov. Warren E. Hearnes of Missouri at another point in yesterday's deliberations.

Maddox, who was reporting on highway safety, said it seemed to him that the country was going down the wrong highway and "breeding a nation of bums" through federal welfare and antipoverty programs.

It was the first time Maddox had the podium during the conference and he said he wanted to make a few general observations. He said it "seems to be old-fashioned to speak up for what you believe in anymore." He claimed that state and national governments have "failed miserably in their first duty to protect the life and property of citizens."

Hearnes countered that it is "one thing to criticize but another to offer solutions."

Hearnes told Maddox that governors ought to "show a compassion for the unfortunate of our states."

He said the Georgia governor's reference to a "generation of bums," "makes good speech material but we owe our people more than a speech."

"It's very easy to make statements like that, it makes good press," Hearnes said. "But we need to carry it further and attempt to solve problems."

Wounds Fatal to Sgt. D. R. Ward, of Silver Spring, Md.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 13, 1967

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Sgt. Donald R. Ward, a marine from Maryland, was recently killed in action in Vietnam. I wish to commend the courage of this young man, and to honor his memory, by including the following article in the RECORD:

WOUNDS FATAL TO STATE MARINE—SGT. D. R. WARD SHOT DOWN ON VIET PATROL

SILVER SPRING, MD., September 11.—A 24-year-old marine from Silver Spring, Sgt. Donald R. Ward, was killed in combat in Vietnam, the Defense Department announced today.

Sergeant Ward died September 6 of multiple wounds received while on patrol in Quang Tri province. He had been stationed at Phu Bai with the 2d Battalion, 9th Marines, since December, 1966.

Sergeant Ward was the father of a 1-year-old daughter. He had been in the Marines for more than three years, having enlisted the day before his graduation from Montgomery Blair High School in the spring of 1963, his father explained last night.

Mr. Ward said his son had "at one time" thought of making a career of the Marine Corps, "but may have changed his mind after his experience out there."

In addition to his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Arthur P. Ward, Sergeant Ward is survived by his wife, the former Helen Louise Hedger, his daughter Vicki Louise and a sister Diane Ward, all of Silver Spring, and a brother Douglas, of Richmond.

The Trail of the "New Left" in Kentucky

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. M. G. (GENE) SNYDER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1967

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, a very interesting article by Alice Widener in the Indianapolis Star entitled "Here's a Travelog To Interest Congress," should be read by every Member. It is of particular interest to those of us in the Kentucky, Tennessee, and West Virginia area.

This article shows the network of people and organizations in this area who are involved in the National Conference of New Politics. Although Dr. Martin L. King, Jr., has publicly stated there is no Communist influence in the movement, an enormous weight of evidence shows that not only is the Communist Party a motivating force, but some of the New Politics group are impatient with the Communist Party and prefer the Progressive Labor Party which is Maoist in its method and outlook. This article also shows how the key personnel of the antipoverty movement is involved up to their ears in the politics of the New Left. According to a memorandum published by David Lawrence, in the Courier-Journal, September 5, 1967:

> Communists from various parts of the country have been converging on Chicago in recent days . . . Whatever were the intentions of the original founders of the National Conference of New Politics, it is now obvious that the Communists and other subversive groups have moved in on them, lock, stock and barrel.

The Widener story follows:

Here's a Travelog To Interest Congress

(By Alice Widener)

> Investigating committees of Congress trying to find out who is traveling where in our country and for what purpose in relation to radical leftist activities might be much interested in the travelogue sent by Don and Carol Boner of Nashville, Tenn., to headquarters of the National Conference for New Politics, which is holding a Labor Day convention in Chicago. Don and Carol Boner were on a trip to round up delegates to attend the NCNP convention and wrote:
>
> "Report: July 29–Aug. 11
>
> "Here in Nashville we had a meeting at St. Anselm's Episcopal Chapel on July 31 . . . The Nashville Committee for Alternatives to the War had the largest representation. Also the Tennessee Council on Human Relations, Middle Tenn. ACLU, Motive Magazine, Peabody Vietnam Committee, North Nashville Project, Community Improvement Assn., Organized Neighborhood of Edgehill (ONE), and SSOC. Also, a city councilman (Negro), a person who had run and lost for County Democratic chairman, VISTA and Metro Action Commission (OEO) field workers, and a food industrialist (who said he was more left than anybody in the room.) . . .
>
> "On Sat. Aug. 5 we traveled to Louisville, stopping first at the SCEF office. That evening we met with Dorcas Ruthenberg (SCEF treas.) and discussed possible contacts for NCNP. We met with Roger Woock (Vietnam Summer organizer) and we got a different set of contacts. . . . We got a contact from SCEF we couldn't get to see but handed over to both Woock and the Baptist people—a guy working in a Negro neighborhood on OEO staff . . . He has a group organized and is also connected with the newly organized Welfare Rights group. We talked to the secretary of the West End Community Council, a large Negro and white organization with neighborhood affiliates which Anne Braden has been active in from the beginning over 3 years ago."
>
> At this point, it must be noted that Anne Braden is the wife of the notorious Carl Braden, who served a prison term for refusal to answer questions put to him by the House Committee on Un-American Activities.
>
> The Don and Carol Boner report to NCNP headquarters in Chicago continues:
>
> "They want material. We asked others to follow up and raise New Politics with the council. . . We went on to Charleston (West Virginia) . . . Monday we met with three staff people of Aid to Appalachian Youth Community Development, OEO funded. They have organized little groups . . . and had a list of 12 people who wanted to go to the convention, 5 staff, 7 community . . . We went to Beckley Tuesday morning and talked with the CAP organizer . . . We drove on to Pikesville, Ky. Arriving after 4 that afternoon and talked with *Al & Margaret McSurely* and others working in that area. Al had just prepared a cover letter to send out the (NCNP) Call newspaper to a list of people in community groups all over his area and down into Virginia . . . We compiled mailing lists, discussed New Politics and its relationship with mountain whites, had supper and left around 8 for Knoxville, Tenn. . . . We compiled a mailing list of about 175 for NCNP from Tenn., W.Va., and Ky. Then we began writing letters to follow up on our visits. We arranged to meet with Joe Sir of Tenn. Forum in Fayettesville, Tenn., this Saturday. Don will go to W. Tenn. shortly . . . Don will plan on attending the Chicago meeting along with the Nashville delegation . . . He will need a travel allowance and has applied for it. . . ."
>
> The official call to New Politics—issued for the Chicago convention—describes our nation as "the scourge of the world." It orders radicals: "Don't mourn for America—organize!"
>
> Seems as how they really are organizing—inside the OEO (Office of Economic Opportunity) supported groups, among white mountain folk and Negro housing development residents, in congressional offices on Capitol Hill, and in every kind of leftist united front possible to invent. And behind almost all the organizing is one relentless group—the Communist Party, whose public relations director, Arnold Johnson, is cooperating closely with the NCNP convention steering committee.

Hon. Edna F. Kelly Appears Before National Commission on Urban Problems in New York City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1967

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, because of the recent recess in our congressional proceedings, I was fortunate enough to have been able to spend more time in my district than is normally permitted during a session of the Congress. Therefore, I found that I was able to tour various parts of my district, which is the most populous in the State. I was able to visit with numerous constituents and neighbors, in order that I might personally gage how they felt about various domestic and foreign problems facing our Nation, State, and local communities.

Mr. Speaker, my discussions and meetings at home only confirmed what my mail in recent months has indicated—that the major domestic concern of my constituents is the rapid decline of living conditions and opportunities in our city of New York.

Therefore, I welcomed the opportunity I had during the recess to share my own personal concern and the concern of my constituents regarding the plight of our city by testifying before the National Commission on Urban Problems on September 8, during the course of their 3-day hearings in New York City. The Commission appointed by President Johnson and chaired by our former colleague, U.S. Senator Paul H. Douglas, is seeking ideas in order "to break the log jam of inertia, inappropriate taxation, outdated zoning laws and building codes, and discrimination which have prevented us from making our cities more livable."

In calling for action to alleviate some of the problems facing the city, I stated:

> It is self-help on the part of individuals and self-determination which could make this City even more livable than it formerly was. No government nor any amount of money can do the job alone. What is needed is a combination of all forces in the Community: business, industry, the professionals and religious and civic organizations. All must work together for progress—to correct the errors of the past—with mutual trust of each other.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert in the Record the full text of my testimony detailing constructive proposals toward solving the problems of our cities and urban areas:

Statement of Hon. Edna F. Kelly, Member of Congress, 12th District, Brooklyn, N.Y., Before the National Commission on Urban Problems, at the Community Church of New York, September 8, 1967

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Commission: I welcome the opportunity to participate in today's hearings of the "National Commission on Urban Problems". Your task is a difficult assignment—to look into the local issues affecting the cities of the United States. Mr. Chairman, you stated in your release of August 31st, "We are trying to break the log jam of inertia, inappropriate taxation, outdated Zoning Laws and Building Codes, and discrimination which have prevented us from making our cities more livable. We are seeking workable ideas from all sources—government, labor, business, education, civic organizations—on what is required to overcome these obstacles to create decent low-cost housing and good neighborhoods for all Americans."

You have been listening to expert witnesses testify on issues involving the problems of our cities—problems which have caused devastating inroads on the lives of city dwellers and the tranquility of urban society.

I do not propose to agree or disagree with the points presented or with prior witnesses' suggested "workable ideas". Consideration and appraisal of all of these proposals is your difficult task.

In my capacity, I offer my assistance, my office and my personal knowledge in any manner you consider helpful.

As you know, I appear today as a Member of Congress, having the honor of representing the 12th Congressional District, the most populous Congressional District in the State of New York, which is located in the most populous Borough of the City of New York—Brooklyn.

Based upon the 1960 census, more than 2,600,000 people reside in the Borough of Brooklyn. It is separated from the other Boroughs of the City of New York by seven bridges and a tunnel. At one time it was a city unto itself. While Brooklyn is now only part of the City of New York, its problems are as extensive, or more so, than those of many of our larger cities. Brooklyn is unique, as is each of the Boroughs of the City of New York. While there are common threads, each Borough requires individual attention as their problems are different due to natural barriers which separate the Boroughs of the City of New York.

We are all aware that our cities are facing perhaps the greatest challenge of this era. We know that every facet of urban living is on the move. This momentum has a formidable bearing on the city dweller—economically, socially, politically and psychologically. I believe this leads to the "log jam of inertia" to which you referred in your release of August 31st.

How can we try to break this "log jam"? Mr. Chairman, my answer is action! Action on our part—the city dweller. There must be a return to the positive feeling of love, of pride and respect for the Community and the City in which we live. It is self-help on the part of individuals and self-determination which could make this City even more livable than it formerly was. No government nor any amount of money can do the job alone. What is needed is a combination of all forces in the Community: business, industry, the professionals and religious and civic organizations. All must work together for progress—to correct the errors of the past—with mutual trust of each other.

We are all aware of the broad background of the problems this Commission has earmarked. Many of them, such as outdated Zoning Laws and Building Codes, fall within the scope of local city governments. To these I add many of more urgent nature. They are: taxation problems, discrimination, housing, employment, education, crime and exodus of the middle-income group from cities.

In addressing myself briefly to these issues I realize, Mr. Chairman, that you are an Economist and I take a deep breath before mentioning this first item.

I submit for your consideration that a complete study of taxation and taxing powers of all levels of government must be undertaken. This should include taxation from the Federal level down to the smallest unit of local government. In some instances the burdens of taxation on businesses and individuals have become oppressive. For example, certain taxes which are essential to produce required revenue for the City of New York are causing an exodus of businesses from the City and of the middle-income group. Without this group no Community can survive. I am as sure as we are here today that if the exodus of business and middle-income people is not halted in New York—New York will soon lose its position as the business center of the world.

The second issue to which I refer is discrimination. The Federal government has acted to help to restore and insure the inherent rights of all persons. Both federally and locally, laws have been enacted to prohibit discrimination on all fronts. These are matters of public record. I submit, however, that it is the duty of government to enforce these laws, people to accept these laws and those affected to measure up to their responsibilities. Congress has taken action on urban problems. It has created a Cabinet post of Secretary of Urban Affairs. It has enacted the Poverty Program and has provided for a small number of new low-income housing units. There is, however, much more Congress must do to measure up to its responsibility to the commonwealth. In this instance our responsibility is to our urban communities.

There are many excellent Bills in Congress concerning urban problems which await action. I have introduced many of these along with my colleagues. I trust the Commission will review them and make recommendations on them in its report.

My colleague, Senator Robert Kennedy, testified before you on Wednesday and addressed his remarks to these Bills. I agree that passage of them would be a substantial step towards our objectives.

These Bills, which I have also introduced, would provide incentives for the creation by private industry of additional employment opportunities for residents of urban poverty areas and would provide new low-income housing by creating a mechanism by which private enterprise can and will build and rehabilitate large numbers of low-cost housing units in urban poverty areas.

It is obvious to me, as I believe it is to many others, that while much valuable legislation is pending in Congress, the Federal government may find it difficult, at this time, to provide the enormous sums of money required to achieve the goal of constructing sufficient low-income housing. Other ways and means must be found to achieve this necessary goal.

Business is now ready to take its place in the social mission of government. It now has a little better recognition of the function of profit than it formerly held.

One of the best methods of breaking the "log jam" is, as I see it, to devise means of eliminating the problems which have kept private enterprise out of the low-cost housing field. Basically, these problems are two in number. They are the high cost of constructing low-income housing and the high cost of maintaining the same due to prevailing interest rates, taxes, vandalism and virtual destruction of many properties by those who occupy the same.

I am not an expert in the field of housing, but I submit that in addition to the legislation I have referred to, a cooperative program can be developed whereby private enterprise could construct low-income dwelling units for sale on a cooperative basis. I envision a program providing for federally guaranteed low-interest, long-term mortgages under which the Federal government would contribute the differential between the interest rate paid by the borrower and the going rate of interest. I further envision cities granting tax reductions or tax abatements on these properties. Combined with these suggestions, I further propose that in connection with these properties the Federal government institute a program whereby a low-income purchaser could negotiate a federally guaranteed low-interest, long-term loan to help pay a large part of the cost of purchasing the cooperative housing unit.

By this method, private enterprise would find it feasible to construct low-cost housing. Normal banking and financial channels could be utilized to provide the necessary financing.

Perhaps most important, low-income families would, through ownership, develop pride which would guarantee the preservation and proper maintenance of these properties. In this regard, I am convinced that the greatest majority of low-income families are hard-working, decent people who, if given the opportunity to live decently, will justify our confidence.

I wish to make one further observation concerning the problems faced by this Commission. I believe that this Commission should not only concern itself with existing housing problems, but that it must also give consideration to developing ways and means of preventing existing housing from deteriorating to slum-like conditions. I have in mind what has happened, for example, in the Bedford-Stuyvesant section of Brooklyn, part of which is within my Congressional District. Several years ago there were few areas of substandard housing in the Bedford-Stuyvesant area. As a result, this area was completely overlooked by the City planners. Priority was given to bulldozing already deteriorated areas and constructing, in their place, high-rise apartment buildings. Bedford-Stuyvesant, a transitional neighborhood, was left untouched and rapidly deteriorated so that vast numbers of its housing accommodations are now sub-standard. In this regard, I urge that serious consideration be given to such problems as code enforcement, vestpocket construction and rehabilitation of existing housing accommodations. Preventing deterioration of housing along with selective construction of new units, are the steps that are necessary.

The problems faced are difficult and many long-existing prejudices must be conquered.

It is my hope that this Commission's recommendations will serve as a blueprint for the future—for a great part of our future is bound up in our ability to solve the problems of our cities and urban areas.

Vietnam Mishap Kills Baltimore, Md., Soldier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 13, 1967

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Spec. 4 Benjamin A. Thomas, an Army paratrooper from Baltimore, was recently killed in Vietnam. I wish to commend the courage of this young man and to honor his memory by including the following article in the Record:

VIET MISHAP KILLS SOLDIER — SPECIALIST THOMAS DIES IN ACCIDENTAL GRENADE BURST

A United States Army paratrooper from Baltimore was killed in Vietnam September

5 when a grenade exploded accidentally while he was on a combat mission, the Department of Defense reported yesterday.

Killed was Spec. 4, Benjamin A. Thomas, 20, son of Mrs. Margaret L. Thomas, 4812 Greencrest road.

The Department of Defense said the accident occurred when the detonating mechanism of the grenade caught against a bush.

SCREAMING EAGLE

Specialist Thomas entered the Army in 1966 and was assigned to Vietnam about a year ago. He was a member of "A" Company, 1st Brigade, 327th Infantry, 101st Airborne Division.

He received basic training at Fort Gordon, Ga., and later underwent paratroop training at Fort Benning, Ga.

A native of Baltimore, Specialist Thomas was a 1964 graduate of Calvert Hall College. While in school, he worked part-time as a supermarket clerk.

He also worked as a supermarket cashier for about a year after graduation.

The Big Hit at Young GOP Parley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1967

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, there was an article in the Washington Evening Star of September 13 by Mr. William F. Buckley, Jr., with reference to the Young Americans for Freedom convention at Pittsburgh. The article brings out two important points: First, the patriotism and dedication of this group of young Americans who hold to the constitutional principles which built our great country; and, second, it goes a long way toward proving, what so many of us have been claiming, that the American press in general is not truthful and objective in its news coverage.

There were hundreds of thousands of inches of space in our American newspapers given to the raucous "new politics" convention in Chicago, which preached anarchy and which advocated the violent overthrow of this country. There were hundreds of thousands of inches of news space given to the national convention of the National Student Association, an extreme, leftwing organization, unworthy of the majority of American students. But there was scarcely any coverage of this patriotic convention of the Young Americans for Freedom, which is dedicated to constitutional government. They deserve better treatment from the press.

I include Mr. Buckley's column, and I hope that it will be read by everyone:

THE BIG HIT AT YOUNG GOP PARLEY

(By William F. Buckley, Jr.)

The big hit at Pittsburgh last weekend at the annual convention of the Young Americans for Freedom wasn't John Tower, though he was splendid, or Barry Goldwater, who was ditto, or any other of the half-dozen luminaries, ditto, but a young Negro student, 17 years old, named Alan Keyes, from San Antonio, Tex.

He was a hit partly because of what he said and how he said it. But also he was a hit because of the way the audience of ardent young conservatives responded to him. That is to say, he brought out the best in them, and they were pleased—pleased with themselves. As well they might have been when one considers how their counterparts on the left would have treated a guest speaker who spoke out, say, in favor of our involvement in Vietnam, or against the Free Speech Movement at Berkeley, or against free marijuana.

That was the thing of it. Young Keyes, though attracted to a part of the philosophy of YAF, rejected some of its most cherished principles, such as that legislative acts, state and federal are largely useless instruments for combatting discrimination. Keyes thought differently, and there was nervousness in the large banquet hall with its thousand delegates from all over the country who were there not only to think and to analyze, but also to cheer their heroes and boo their enemies: There was a total silence, a respectful silence.

They were—of all things—listening. In part because they were disposed to do so perhaps in reaction against the anti-intellectualist discourtesy of the left protesters who either boo the opposition or march noisily out. But also because Keyes spoke with a singular eloquence.

And what he said wasn't all of it heretical from the conservative point of view. He also spoke of the necessity to view the struggle of the Negroes as taking decades and generations, thus showing a contempt for the instant evangelism of "Freedom Now." And he spoke of the necessity for individual responsibility.

When he was through, the entire convention rose to its feet and applauded him. And in a sense—as I say—applauded themselves, and quite rightly too.

It was the seventh convention of the Young Americans for Freedom who, by contrast with the Students for a Democratic Society, are an oldish organization. Their constituency is the high school student, the undergraduate and postgraduate and young professional, age from about 16 to 30 or so. They are unselfconscious, keenly aware that the life of the mind is the special concern of those who care to cultivate a rational basis for freedom; dignified and fun-loving. And there was more individuality in the one room at the Hilton Hotel in Pittsburgh than you see in Haight-Ashbury, which is the biggest broken record in America, in a season.

While the New Left was on exhibit in Chicago, demonstrating yet again the intellectual and moral futility of anarchy and the self-destructiveness of denying other people's rights in the vague attempt to establish your own, the YAFers met, listened to the first echelon of American political orators, had themselves a spirited election for the presidency (the victor is Alan MacKay, a young lawyer from Boston), and did some hard thinking on a number of resolutions that had been distributed.

Those they passed were thoughtful and generic, pleasingly radical in the best sense of the word. "Whereas a 22-year-old worker earning $6,600 or more a year will have paid the federal government $63,894 in social security taxes and interest by the time he is 65; and whereas the most he can get back under present law is $3,024 a year or $252 a month; and whereas, if the same worker invested in a pension plan he could get back $5,933 a year of $494 a month"—a few more whereases like that, and YAF resolved to recommend direct government subsidies for the poor, and placing social security on a voluntary basis.

Other resolutions called for abolishing the minimum wage ("Whereas in 1948 the legal federal minimum wage was 40 cents an hour, unemployment among teen-age workers, white and Negro, was about 8 percent. In 1950 the rate was raised to 75 cents an hour. Almost immediately unemployment among Negro teenagers jumped to about 15 percent and unemployment among whites jumped to about 12 percent . . .") Etc. And a philosophically tough, finely honed argument against the progressive feature of the income tax. Support for the Vietnam war.

They do not make the headlines, such ventures in sanity. But there are those who will be glad to know there are such people out there, and that they are more nearly representative of American youth than all the keening of the Fugs about the failure of the world to sweeten their senses.

Platform of the American Veterans Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1967

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the American Veterans Committee held its annual convention recently and adopted a comprehensive platform.

Regardless of one's judgment on the merits of any individual plank in this platform, it represents a thoughtful and responsible analysis of a complex field. For the benefit of our colleagues and other readers of the RECORD, I insert at this point the section dealing with veterans and Armed Forces affairs:

PLATFORM OF THE AMERICANS VETERANS COMMITTEE

(Adopted June 16–18, 1967, Atlantic City N.J.)

VETERANS AND ARMED FORCES AFFAIRS

The American Veterans Committee has constantly reiterated, since its founding, its fundamental belief that rehabilitation and integration of veterans into the community is the proper scope and purpose of a veterans program. The achievement of economic security for veterans through sound economic planning for all citizens rather than through special grants or favors to veterans is basic AVC policy.

1. Compensation

For many years, AVC has pointed out the need for a thorough review and reappraisal of this Nation's policies on veterans as follows:

1. We oppose bonuses and general pensions as being class legislation and unrelated to the real needs of individual veterans and tending to set veterans apart from their fellow citizens.

In the matter of benefits, two basic standards should be applied.

(a) For death or disability incurred in military service: Are the benefits sufficient to provide a decent standard of living for the veteran, his family or survivors?

(b) For all veterans: Are the benefits so designed as to enable a readjustment from military service to civilian life with a minimum economic loss?

Since benefits are a Federal responsibility, uniform standards of administration and compensation should be applied nationally without regard to race, creed, color, sex, or national origin.

2. Draft

AVC recognizes the necessity for the United States to maintain adequate military forces in present world circumstances. It also recognizes the citizen's obligation to military service and recognizes a selective service system as an appropriate mode of raising military manpower. We object, however, to the inequalities of the draft system as presently administered, especially the deferment of students, the lack of uniform guidelines and the lack of fair representation of the citizenry, especially for minority groups, on the draft board.

3. Reserve programs

The world we live in, with its emphasis on speed of operation and technical superiority, demands standing Armed Forces of sufficient size, training and equipment and organization to be effective immediately for defense and counter attack. It is apparent that the Regular Armed Forces must remain our first line of defense. They must be of sufficient size and mobility for deployment anywhere on the globe within a minimum of time so that we may continue to provide, when necessary, those forces needed for collective security under our international obligation in peripheral conflicts occurring in the strategic localities of the world.

AVC believes that any reserve program, present and future, which does not completely revoke segregation in the Armed Forces is incompatible with democratic ideals and frustrates the moral fiber of our society. It is essential for the future security of this nation that our manpower resources be used for the defense of our way of life without regard to regional prejudices.

AVC maintains that insofar as national defense is concerned, the National Guard is a military anachronism. It should be eliminated from the Federal military structure. In the meantime, we believe that federal funds not be allocated for the National Guard of any State where said National Guard still permits a policy of segregation of units or where a state refuses to integrate its National Guard because of color or national origin.

We believe that reservists should not suffer loss of job rights and privileges and employment opportunities because of their participation in reserve training.

AVC is opposed to any policy whereby the Armed Forces award discharges other than honorable to reserve personnel based upon the political or other activities in which these individuals may participate following separation from active service under the draft.

We believe that the conditions of discharge should be based solely upon the military activity and efficiency of the reservists.

4. Benefit dollar

AVC believes that provision should be made to maintain automatically the purchasing power of the benefit dollar and upward adjustments be made annually in accordance with the Bureau of Labor Statistics, Consumer Price Index.

5. Civil service

AVC believes that veterans point preference in the civil service be limited to the initial appointment only, and that no person should receive a position unless fully qualified to perform the duties involved.

We oppose the principle of granting absolute preference to veterans in state and local civil service.

6. GI bill

AVC applauds the passage of a permanent G.I. Bill of Rights as a responsible means of enabling servicemen and women to return to civilian life with facility and ease at the end of their service and become useful and productive members of their communities.

However, we urge the Congress to adjust the benefits more in line with the World War II and Korean G.I. Bills and the current cost of living so that the programs may be used by veterans without the financial stress they now entail. The G.I. Bill of Rights should be administered in such manner as to guarantee the absence of discrimination.

7. VA hospitalization

AVC urges that treatment of non-service-connected disabilities in VA hospitals be continued on a space-available basis, but that such treatment be charged at the full cost, if a patient has the means to pay for such service; certificates that a veteran is unable to pay should be investigated thoroughly to determine the true ability to meet the cost of hospitalization. Further that terms of coverage of all prepaid medical associations, plans and companies be amended by action of the legislatures, supervisory bodies or membership, so as to provide payment to VA hospitals for non-service-connected treatment on the same basis as payment to private voluntary and public hospitals.

8. Unification

AVC notes with satisfaction that the process of unification of the Armed Forces has been making progress. AVC commends the actions hitherto taken in this regard and urges that the Department of Defense continue these efforts vigorously.

9. Discrimination—Foreign and domestic

We maintain that no assignment of any military personnel should be made whether within the United States or overseas, for considerations which include discrimination on grounds of color, religion, ancestry or national origin.

Our goal is to insure that no member or employee of the Armed Forces, and no dependents of such persons shall be subjected to discriminatory treatment, on or off base within the United States or outside the United States, on the grounds of color, religion, ancestry or national origin, and that the power, including the economic power, of the United States be consciously used to further this objective.

10. Information service

We owe the men of our armed services the best possible training to equip them for the rigors of modern combat under the most adverse conditions of weather, terrain, supply and enemy action. We further believe that an orientation program be instituted in order to acquaint the prospective draftee, at the time of registration, with the rights, privileges, benefits and special training he and his family will be entitled to if and when he is inducted into the Armed Services.

11. Jurisdiction over ex-servicemen and civilians accompanying the Armed Forces overseas

We believe that the ex-servicemen, military dependents, and civilians accompanying the armed forces abroad should not escape punishment for serious offenses committed while in such status, but should be tried before civilian courts. By serious offenses we mean crimes of the same degree of seriousness as felonies at common law.

12. Awards and benefits

All laws of the United States pertaining to the granting of military medals or decorations, military disability retirement or compensation, dependents and survivors benefits, veterans benefits (including benefits to dependents or survivors), or other special benefits to military personnel or their dependents on the basis of wartime service of such military personnel shall apply in like manner to service performed in such areas and during such periods as proclaimed by the President where combat or combat conditions exist and the United States forces to which such person is attached are either engaged in the combat, engaged in military operations designed to carry out any treaty or other international obligation of the United States.

13. Expeditious naturalization of service personnel and dependents

AVC believes that any man who assumes the risks and responsibilities of entry into the Armed Forces, whether in wartime or time of peace, should be entitled to citizenship.

AVC therefore urges the enactment of legislation which provides in substance that:

Any person regardless of age who is serving, served, or hereafter serves honorably in the Armed Forces of the United States may be naturalized, irrespective of how he entered the United States. No period of residence within the United States shall be required; no residence within the jurisdiction of the naturalization court; the petitioner shall not be required to speak the English language, sign his petition in his own handwriting, or meet any educational tests; no fee shall be charged or collected for making, filing or docketing the petition for naturalization, or for the final hearing thereon, or for the certificate of naturalization, if issued. Since some aliens who enter the Armed Services are sent overseas before the naturalization processing can be completed, even though no prior period of residence may be required, AVC urges that, following the precedent set in former Section 702 of the Nationality Act of 1940, provision be made for such a person to be naturalized while outside the United States.

AVC further urges the Amendment of Section 319(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act which shortens the residence requirement for aliens married to citizens from 5 to 3 years be deemed met even if the spouse dies while in active service or from service causes or because of the absence of the spouse from the United States or the state by reason of military service.

RESOLUTION ON CONTRACT COMPLIANCE, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

The American Veterans Committee, aware of the important role which must be played by the Department of Defense under Executive Order 11246 to assure equal employment opportunity in this nation;

Taking cognizance of the fact the Department of Defense is the largest procurement organization in the country;

Noting the recent reorganization of the contract compliance enforcement work far down in the chain of command under Defense Contract Administrative Services;

Expresses alarm that this reorganization may be a downgrading of contract compliance enforcement;

Urges that the highest priority and support for Federal Contract Compliance in the Defense Department under Executive Order 11246 be given from the Office of the Secretary and;

That overall responsibility for contract compliance, although administratively under DCAS, remain in the Office of the Assistant Secretary, Manpower.

Duty Fulfills Word of Three Presidents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1967

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Chicago Heights Star has asked servicemen in Vietnam to write and express their views on their assignments there. In response Pfc. Kenneth L. Burdick, 164 West Richton Road, Steger, Ill., wrote to the Chicago Heights Star, which serves the community in which he resides. I feel that his letter merits wider dissemination and, therefore, place it in the Record:

Letter From Vietnam—Says Duty Fulfills Word of Three Presidents

(Editor's Note.—In response to an invitation from this newspaper, Marine Pfc. Kenneth L. Burdick, son of Mr. and Mrs. Kenneth

> Burdick, 164 West Richton road, Steger, has written the following letter from Viet Nam.)
>
> I received your letter today and was very surprised to get a letter from a newspaper. I would be very happy to write about Viet Nam. I will try and write what the people back home would like to know.
>
> This country is partly desolate. The people here live in small villages and their houses are made of wood. Some of the houses have tin roofs.
>
> They are short people whose age shows very much in their faces. They are very friendly to us and everyone waves at us as we pass each other.
>
> The people still farm the old way with water buffalo.
>
> The weather here is completely different from the States. When it's summer back home, it is more like a desert here. The rain just pours down.
>
> Why do they have to protest about us being here? I don't think they know why we are here. I will tell you.
>
> There are three Presidents who gave their word to help any country that asked for it. The three are Eisenhower, Kennedy and Johnson. When they gave their word, it was really the people of the United States giving theirs, too.
>
> Most of us are boys ranging in age from 18 to 20 years old. But we age fast here. A person has to in order to stay alive.
>
> Why do they have to fight back home? We're fighting here. Isn't it enough? We are helping to keep communism away from our country. Why don't they let us know they appreciate our fighting for them?
>
> This place is hell, or at least most of us refer to it that way. We all work as a team. That's the only way to do it, so why don't the people back home get on a "team" and help us in any way they can? If people only knew how people over here live, it would change their whole outlook on life. The people here have been fighting for centuries. They are tired of fighting and being pushed around.
>
> The guys over here like to get letters even though they can't answer all of them. So if anyone wants to write . . .

New-Style Model Cities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1967

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, we are in a vise. Our population grows constantly larger. Space for our people to live shrinks. Last week President Johnson asserted the power of his great office to alleviate our space squeeze. He announced plans for the construction of a "new town" on the 335-acre plot that has housed the National Training School for Boys in Washington, D.C. As the following editorial from the New York Times points out, the use of idle Government properties to provide new housing within our cities may be the key to solving our critical urban space problem.

Mr. Speaker, I include the editorial at this point in the RECORD:

NEW STYLE MODEL CITIES

> President Johnson's plan for construction of privately financed model communities on surplus public land offers exciting prospects for breaking urban housing bottlenecks.
>
> The first effort is planned for a 335-acre plot in Washington which is about to be abandoned by the National Training School for Boys. On the President's orders, the General Services Administration has agreed to make the land available for a planned community that will include housing for 25,000 citizens of all incomes, as well as schools, recreation areas, shopping and service facilities and some light industry.
>
> The President has assigned a top-level committee to seek other tracts of surplus Federal land for similar new communities throughout the nation. One possibility close to home is Fort Totten in Queens.
>
> The key to the new scheme is the President's intervention to pry loose from a reluctant General Services Administration idle Government properties. Such properties—city and state as well as Federal—offer the last, best opportunity in many cities to secure the open space needed for the kind of total community planning embodied in Europe's "new towns" and more recently in the United States in the imaginative new Washington suburb of Reston. Developing new communities on unused public land avoids the lengthy condemnation proceedings and the displacement of slum families that marred earlier urban renewal efforts.
>
> The President's new urban plan is not, of course, foolproof, nor is it in any sense a final answer to the crisis in American cities. The new communities will require local and private initiatives which may not be forthcoming. And the Federal Government will have to use the leverage of its contribution to make sure that minority groups get a fair share in both the construction and the occupancy of the Washington city-within-a-city and its hoped-for successors.
>
> In many cities, there may be no public property suitable for this kind of project. It will not promote prudent urban renewal if vacant public lands are seized to meet pressing needs just because they are there, without due consideration for their proper role in a comprehensive urban development plan. Even where appropriate public land is available for development, the need will continue on an urgent basis for costly redevelopment efforts.
>
> Nevertheless, the President has started something in the capital that offers a promising wedge for new and different community development across the country. The dread sameness of high-rise barracks need no longer be the badge of urban renewal.

WTVJ Celebrates 10 Years of Editorials

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1967

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, 10 years ago this month, Miami television station WTVJ broadcast its first editorial. It turned out to be the first daily editorial broadcast by any TV station in the United States.

Television has now taken its place alongside the older news media in the presentation of its editorial opinions on matters affecting the community in which it operates. It performs a valuable public service in this respect by bringing key problems to the public's attention and, very often, by offering solutions to these problems for consideration.

There are those who believe that it is not proper for a television station to editorialize. However, I would call my colleagues' attention to a portion of the testimony given before a Senate committee in 1963 by Mitchell Wolfson, president of Wometco Enterprises, which owns and operates WTVJ. Mr. Wolfson said:

> In every freedom there is an element of risk. We must accept the risks if we are to achieve the benefits. We must take the risk inherent in unrestricted broadcast editorials. If we dare not take that risk, we dare not let Americans think for themselves, much less be permitted to think. We will destroy the dialogue which began when this nation began. Just as surely we will destroy our nation.

Ralph Renick, vice president for news of WTVJ, is the man who initiated the daily television editorial in 1957. He has been honored by his colleagues for his efforts by being the recipient of the 1962 Radio and Television News Directors' Association Award for being the first in the Nation to editorialize; and also in 1962 by the National Headliner's Club which gave him its top award for an editorial campaign which resulted in the reinstatement of Miami's city manager.

In a recent editorial commemorating the 10th anniversary, Renick talked about the objectives he tries to achieve. I commend some of his remarks to my colleagues:

> Many of the other 2,142 editorials did produce constructive positive action. Eighty-three per cent of the editorials dealt with state, county, city or local subjects. We have tried to keep the topics close to home where first-hand research could be obtained and follow-through action could be charted. . . . Over the past ten years, we have tried to harness this energy for the good of the South Florida region. We would hope that the editorials have focused attention on the important so that public concentration could be more easily turned to the key problems and solutions. . . . As we enter our second decade, we pledge to remain alert to wrongs that need righting; corruption that needs exposing and, above all, people that need help.

"Differences" Between Our Leaders Placed in Proper Perspective

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JIM WRIGHT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1967

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, at the Air Force Association dinner here in Washington Tuesday night, many of us heard two speeches that should reassure every American.

One address was delivered by Gen. J. P. McConnell, Chief of Staff of the Air Force. The other was made by the Honorable Harold Brown, Secretary of the Air Force.

Both speeches clearly and forcefully answered recent allegations of differences of opinion between our military and civilian leaders over the conduct of the war in Vietnam.

In my opinion, General McConnell and Secretary Brown put these "differences" into proper perspective. With brevity, clarity, and candor, they reminded us of a lot of fundamentals about our form of government—fundamentals which some critics appear to have forgotten. I urge my colleagues to read these two speeches:

Gen. J. P. McConnell, Chief of Staff, U.S. Air Force

As we commemorate the twentieth anniversary of the United States Air Force as an independent Service, we should also remember that the beginnings of military airpower in this country go back exactly sixty years.

It is most fitting that we reflect with pride and gratitude on the accomplishments of the nation's pioneer airmen because their great record, especially during the two World Wars, helped bring about the establishment of the United States Air Force in 1947. But whether we go back twenty years or sixty, we find no parallel to the new airpower chapter that is being written in the skies over Vietnam today.

I will not dwell on the contributions airpower is making in this war. But I do want to use this opportunity to clarify one misconception concerning this conflict.

I have heard and read—as I know you have—recent commentaries which make it appear that there are fundamental disagreements on the conduct of the bombing campaign between the President and the Secretary of Defense, on the one hand, and the Joint Chiefs of Staff on the other. In my view this is an erroneous conception. To be sure, there have been differences of opinion, but the expression and consideration of different points of view are essential elements of our form of government. If the Joint Chiefs of Staff failed to put forward their opinions and recommendations—regardless of what these may be—to their civilian superiors, they would not be conforming with the requirements of law. And if the Commander in Chief and the Secretary of Defense did not modify or disapprove some of these recommendations when, in their opinion, it served the best interest of the nation to do so, they would not be conforming with the law or the Constitution of the United States.

We, the Joint Chiefs, are given every opportunity to express our opinions and recommendations freely to the President, to the Secretary of Defense and before Congressional Committees. We do so in our capacity as military advisers and Service Chiefs, and the recommendations we make are based on our thorough evaluation of military requirements, with full realization that other factors are also involved and must be considered.

Our recommendations may not always be accepted to the full degree which we consider militarily desirable. But once the decisions have been made, it is the job of the military to implement these decisions to the best of our ability.

Speaking for the Air Force, I am proud to say that this is widely understood by our men, from generals to airmen. The many hundreds of men of all ranks to whom I talked during my various visits to Southeast Asia know what is expected of them, and they perform their assigned duties loyally, professionally and effectively. They recognize that there are considerations other than military, and they abide strictly by the rules established by proper authority and do so with the unquestioning discipline that is the mark of the true professional.

Let us never forget that, in a democracy such as ours, it is the grave responsibility of the elected Commander in Chief to make the final decisions. He does so after carefully weighing the counsel he has obtained from the Congress and from his various advisers, including the military. I believe that a better understanding of this democratic process would be more helpful to all concerned.

I am grateful for the opportunity to discuss this matter before such a distinguished audience. This is not the first time—and surely not the last—that the Air Force Association has provided a forum for discussing subjects of national interest. And so, in conclusion, I want to express to the Air Force Association and its leaders my sincere appreciation for the invaluable service they have rendered to the Air Force and to the nation throughout the past twenty years. Their active interest and dynamic support have helped to make airpower one of the most vital assets in the protection and defense of our national security.

Address by Hon. Harold Brown, Secretary of the Air Force

It is truly a great honor as well as a great pleasure for me to be with you tonight on this occasion which marks the 20th Anniversary of the United States Air Force as a separate service. The exhibits which we have seen are only one indication of how far airpower and the Air Force have come during the past twenty years—in the development and use of technology, in effectiveness, and in support of our national objectives.

I would like to associate myself with the remarks the Chief of Staff has just made. In recent weeks there has been a good deal appearing in the press, and in other news media, about alleged divisions between civilian and military authorities in the government.

These allegations bother me. They bother me because our military leaders are cast in the role of irresponsible militarists on the one hand, or prophets in revolt on the other. Some charge our generals with going behind the backs of their civilian superiors to lobby with Congress, the press, and industry for a program of unlimited and indiscriminate bombing. Others argue that our military leaders have a sure solution to the conflict while civilian officials are uncertain, bemused, and inconsistent.

Both of these pictures seem to me to be completely baseless. I think I am in a position to know the truth about this. I am a civilian by education and experience. Yet two years as Air Force Secretary, and over 15 years before that in the field of national security, have given me close connections with the military, and with the Air Force in particular.

I have been in Vietnam and to Thailand twice during the last twenty months, and talked wtih hundreds of our pilots. I have spent a great deal of time with our commanders in the field. I spend most of nearly every day with senior Air Force generals at Headquarters. I find neither a clique of irresponsible militarists nor a set of supermen who have the only right way to succeed in a terribly complex and difficult war.

What I see is a group of professionals who understand how to apply airpower within the constraints which the larger picture imposes, and who have done so in a very precise and skillful way. I see a group many of whom are fighting their third war—and in all three, airpower has played a vital role. I see men who understand the military picture and who appreciate the fact that this is not simply a military conflict. They know it has unique diplomatic, international-political, and other important components. They are thoughtful; they are loyal to their military and civilian superiors; they have integrity.

Spike Momyer in Saigon, Jack Ryan in Honolulu, and J. P. McConnell in Washington are neither irresponsible advocates of the use of airpower nor men who pretend to have all the answers. They know their job. They make their recommendations on the basis of military and other factors as they see them, but recognize that the factors other than the immediate military situation not only enter the picture but in many cases can be overriding. They recognize that all factors—the military factors, the intelligence estimates, the international and diplomatic situation—must be balanced by the authorities constitutionally responsible for making the overall decisions. And when those decisions are made our airmen—from the Chief of Staff through the pilots who fly and crews who maintain the aircraft—carry them out promptly and with professional skill.

Our Air Force leaders and the people of the Air Force are not justly served by either of two implications. They are not justly served by the implication that our top officers oppose national policies and are *right* in doing so. Neither are they done justice by the implication that they oppose national policies but are *wrong* in doing so. In fact, our military leaders support national policies, and they carry them out superbly.

Because many of you have "felt the heat in the kitchen"—to paraphrase President Truman—you have the advantage of being able to put today's events and attitudes into their proper perspective. You had—some still have—a part in the hammering-out process through which decisions are made in our government. You understand this process and trust its inherent rightness. Those of you here tonight, therefore, can make a special contribution by assisting others to understand the real issues at stake as well as by helping those in authority to meet the difficult problems at hand. To do so is to do no more than you have *always* done—and in the true tradition of our Air Force.

New Assets for Expanding Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1967

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I include at this point in the Record, the second of Sylvia Porter's articles on the International Monetary Fund, from today's Pittsburgh Post-Gazette.

I particularly commend this article to the attention of my colleagues because her sequel points out to critics of the reform the significant contribution that the new reserves will make toward underwriting our expanding international trade, and achieving world stability.

Cynics Cannot Discredit Money Reform's Value

(By Sylvia Porter)

The 10 leading financial powers of the free world agreed last month to create a new type of world money which governments can use in addition to gold and U.S. dollars to settle their debts with each other. The plan will be approved by the 106 nations belonging to the International Monetary Fund at the IMF's annual meeting in Rio de Janeiro starting Monday, Sept. 25.

After final details have been hammered out, the plan will be submitted to the parliaments of each member-nation for ratification. (This would necessitate a Congressional law here.) The timeable calls for establishment of the machinery to issue the new world money in 1969–70.

When the cables start rolling out of the Rio meeting Sept. 25, there undoubtedly will be many reports downgrading the achievement. Cynics will be measuring the curbs on the proposed new world money against what might have been accomplished and minimizing the accord as a result; they already are minimizing it as considerably less valuable than gold or U.S. dollars.

But the central fact is that a new international reserve asset is being developed to supplement gold and the U.S. dollar in international trade. The new reserve is to stand as a top asset for the world's central bankers, designed to be ultimately as "good as gold" in the eyes of the world's finance ministers.

BASICALLY STRONGER

After four years of hard negotiations and frequent vetoes by France, the leading financial powers have agreed upon a basis strengthening of the monetary system. (The Group of Ten are the U.S. Britain, France, West Germany, Japan. Italy, Sweden, Belgium, the Netherlands and Canada.)

This telegraphs an ultimate reduction in the responsibilities of the U.S. dollar in the financing of world trade and thus, a lessening of pressure on our dollar and on our dwindling gold reserve.

It assures sufficient credit in coming years to finance the free world's continued economic growth. In May, the free world completed the greatest round of tariff cuts in history and laid the foundation for a vast expansion of international trade. Now the free world is inventing the means for financing this expanded trade.

It signals a step toward scrapping the traditional role of gold in world trade and ending the reign of gold over international exchange. This reform is not radical, will not in one stroke transform our monetary system (as many U.S. experts wanted).

But it will provide for a new, acceptable paper money to underwrite the growth of world trade. It will help fill the dangerous gap created by the fact that newly mined gold is no longer adding to the world's money reserves and when the U.S. finally stops spending so much more abroad than it earns abroad, U.S. dollars won't be adding to the reserves either.

DEPRESSION WEAPON

It promises to erase the danger of worldwide depression caused by a shortage of money to finance essential trade.

It implies a move toward the ultimate creation of a single world currency.

I remember "Bretton Woods" in 1944 and the skepticism about whether the monetary system born there would survive. The system has not only survived but it has also been a force behind free world prosperity ever since.

MCAP Did a Fine Job

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES J. HOWARD

OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 14, 1967

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, in the aftermath of the civil strife that swept many cities in our Nation this summer, some statements have been made accusing employees of the Office of Economic Opportunity, especially local community action program officials, with fanning the flames of riotous destruction.

For this reason a survey was taken of mayors and police officials in the cities affected to determine what they thought on this issue. No police chief or mayor has said that the agency heightened tensions in any community. In fact, in many cases, the city's arrest rate for the summer was down due to the creation of summer jobs for unoccupied youth.

To this date, a total of 16 antipoverty workers have been arrested and accused of foul play. Nine of these were summer employees. None has been convicted. These are the 16 we have heard so much about, Mr. Speaker. But, not enough has been said about the 30,000 dedicated Americans who worked day and night this summer to prevent confusion and small incidents from becoming turmoil.

The work of the antipoverty program this summer has been effective in finding work for the jobless, training for the young, and creative outlets for the idle.

In a recent editorial, the Daily Record, of Long Branch, N.J., reviewed for the public the achievements of our antipoverty workers this summer. That editorial is a fitting tribute to the high quality of community leadership we have in Monmouth County and throughout New Jersey.

At this point I wish to have the editorial inserted in the Record:

[From the Daily Record, Long Branch, N.J.]

MCAP Did a Fine Job

The Office of Economic Opportunity has been accused of being a vehicle through which some Negro radicals have added to racial unrest and thus become a contributing factor in the mid-summer riots.

So the agency has done some soul searching and has come up with some interesting facts to prove that anti-poverty units have helped to prevent violence in a great many cities.

In two Monmouth County cities, Long Branch and Asbury Park, workers of the Monmouth County Action Program, Inc. were responsible for cooling the tempers of youthful Negroes who nearly triggered disturbances in the two cities.

In Long Branch on successive nights, Daily Record photographer Thomas Herde was brutally beaten and incidents of bottle and rock tossing at automobiles were reported in the Liberty street area.

However, even as the bottles and rocks were being tossed on the second night, MCAP workers and several Long Branch Negro leaders were circulating among the errant youths and cooling them down. The threat of a racial disturbance dissipated almost as quickly as it had sprung up.

In Asbury Park, a group of Negro teenagers set fire to a car and threw rocks at other cars driving through the neighborhood. MCAP staff members went into the neighborhood and talked the teenagers out of precipitating a riot.

In both cities, MCAP staff members worked closely with the police and reported rumors of trouble to police liaison officers.

Asbury Park Police Chief Maurice Fitzgerald said, "The efforts of MCAP in working with the police has certainly had a positive effect on reducing racial tensions. The racial climate in Asbury Park is better because of the work of MCAP."

Rep. James J. Howard said, "MCAP has done everything it could in the tense areas. The poverty program had had a lot to do with keeping things cool."

One night of high tension in Elizabeth was dispelled by the local Community Action Agency under the leadership of the mayor and the police and a possible riot was averted.

The OEO has determined that no police chief or mayor has said that the agency has heightened tensions. In 16 cities bad situations were quickly cooled down. In 13 cities special groups were formed to patrol trouble areas and to serve as communication posts between police and the slum areas. In 14 cities municipal police CAP agencies had joint programs to prevent riots. In 8 cities the juvenile arrest rate went down this Summer, a fact that OEO attributes to more Summer jobs through the agency.

The agency admits that 16 Community Action employes have been arrested during riots but says that that figure is a low percentage among a total of 30,000 employes. Of these 9 were Summer workers. Also, none of the 16 has been convicted.

It is always easy to find a whipping boy among the unreasoning in times of turmoil. Unfortunately, the temper of the times is to act hastily and to speak without reasoning.

But the situation will beggar improvement unless men of reason prevail and find a solution to the ills which beset the nation.

It would be difficult to fault the county's anti-poverty agency in view of the fact that rioting was averted in Monmouth County despite a time of terror early in August when rumors of impending trouble ran through Red Bank, Long Branch and Asbury Park.

Congressman McDade Sets Forth Some Cogent Observations on the Problems of Crime and Poverty in His Letter to the Washington Post

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT C. McEWEN

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 14, 1967

Mr. McEWEN. Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that there is very much disagreement among Americans as to what two of our most disturbing—and pressing—domestic problems are. Few, if any, issues here at home have commanded the news space and the television and radio time that crime and poverty have during this summer and, indeed, over the past few years.

While public scrutiny and concern are indispensable to winning the war against these blights, it is only through positive action that we shall ever be able to deal succesfully with them. Crime and poverty are intertwined, and we will never eradicate either unless we root them out together.

My distinguished colleague from the Keystone State of Pennsylvania, the Honorable Joseph M. McDade, has addressed himself to these twin problems in a letter to the Washington Post of yesterday, setting forth some cogent observations that merit our attention and our thoughtful consideration.

I am pleased to insert Congressman McDade's letter in the Record so that those who may have missed it in the newspaper may read it herein:

September 1, 1967.

The Editor,
The Washington Post,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Editor: The *Post* editorial of August 30th on crime was in keeping with the traditional concern for human needs of which the *Post* is so justly proud. It contributes to the start of a vital dialogue on organized crime.

There are two kinds of crime in America—street crime and organized crime. Both are violent. Both are serious. Both are threats to law and order. All citizens should be concerned about both—but few seem genuinely worried about organized crime. The Administration is inexplicably indifferent.

We must be concerned because organized crime breeds street crime. Experts estimate that fully 50% of all the street crime in New York City, for example, stems from the desperate need of the drug addict to find the money, anywhere and anyway he can, to feed his habit. The business of illegal narcotics sales is the business of organized crime. If the crime rate is to be significantly lowered, a real war against organized crime must be waged. And it is not.

Perhaps of even more significance is the apparent mis-conception of organized crime which so many commentators share. Organized crime is far more than internecine violence in the underworld, far more than an intricate nationwide network of racketeers, and far more than crooked men in legitimate business enterprises. It is a monstrous leech on the urban poor in contemporary America.

Organized crime will take from the urban poor this year through the numbers racket alone more than three times as much money as the War on Poverty will put into the same areas. Organized crime through narcotics sales will take from the urban poor this year as much money as Project Head Start will spend to provide a chance to the children of the urban poor. Organized crime's loansharking this year will take seven times as much money from the marginal businessmen among the urban poor as the Small Business Administration will extend to them in loans under the anti-poverty program.

This is the context in which organized crime must be viewed, but seldom is. In this context the debate on wiretapping and electronic surveillance takes on a different light. We favor legislation to restrict severely the use of these devices in order to protect man's sacred right to privacy. But we cannot ignore the judgment of almost every law enforcement official and the President's Crime Commission that electronic surveillance is the only truly effective tool to fight organized crime.

The present Supreme Court is noted for its devotion to civil liberties. The major significance of its recent decision in the Berger Case is not that the permissive New York State wiretap law contains insufficient safeguards for personal privacy. The major decision of the Court was implied consent it gave to wiretap legislation which would permit electronic surveillance by law enforcement officers under court authorization and stringent, Court imposed controls.

Our recommendation is for a wiretap law that conforms to the latter of the Supreme Court's ruling in the Berger Case. In view of the threat which organized crime represents to the success of the War on Poverty, we do not understand why the Administration feels that it must ignore the view of the Court in the Berger Case.

A fight against organized crime is inseparable from a genuine war on poverty, inseparable from a sincere battle against street crime, inseparable from a real effort to rout out political corruption, and inseparable from a substantive effort to reestablish public respect for law, order and public officials.

Sincerely,

JOSEPH M. MCDADE,
Member of Congress.

Who Will?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1967

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, for many weeks the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HALL] has diligently tried to persuade the Department of Justice to investigate the St. Louis Steamfitters Union, Local 562, on charges of violating the Corrupt Practices Act. Thus far, he has received nothing but an evasive response.

As the gentleman properly asks:

> If the Department of Justice, as the protector of the people, won't pursue wrongdoing, who will?

The St. Louis Globe-Democrat, in an excellent editorial, asks the same question. It was the Globe-Democrat which first revealed that the St. Louis local had failed to report more than $80,000 in political contributions to out-of-State Democrat candidates, including $52,000 for the campaign of President Johnson.

I commend the editorial to the attention of my colleagues, and to Attorney General Ramsey Clark:

PAGING ATTORNEY GENERAL CLARK

It is a curious and outrageous spectacle when the United States Attorney General's office takes evasive action rather than undertake an investigation of the St. Louis Steamfitter Union, Local 562, on charges of violating the federal corrupt practices law.

But this is what is happening. Congressman Durward G. Hall has been besieging the Attorney General's office for more than six weeks trying to persuade government attorneys to take some action in the case.

To date Representative Hall has received only an evasive reply from Fred M. Vinson Jr., assistant attorney general in charge of the criminal division, in which Mr. Vinson completely dodged the specific question asking "if the Department of Justice is pursuing legislative violations in this instance, to what degree, and if not, why not?

The Globe-Democrat has revealed that the St. Louis Steamfitters Union has failed to report more than $80,000 in political contributions made to Democratic candidates out of the state, including $52,000 for the reelection campaign of President Johnson and $10,000 for Robert F. Kennedy's successful race for United States Senator from New York.

Representative Hall had written the Attorney General's office when it became apparent that the Justice Department was showing no interest in undertaking a real investigation of the steamfitter's unreported out-of-state political gifts.

From what can be learned there has been all kinds of high-level scurrying about to avoid investigating, much less prosecute, the steamfitters officials involved.

Representative Hall justifiably asks "If the Department of Justice, as the protector of the people, won't pursue wrongdoing, who will?"

Yes, Attorney General Ramsey Clark, if your office won't take an interest in these alleged violations of the corrupt practices act, who will?

Is it the practice of your office, Mr. Clark, to issue evasive answers to Congressmen when they ask for action on serious allegations concerning law violations, hoping that if the inquirer is put off long enough he will go away?

Hopefully, Mr. Clark, your answer will be that this is not the practice of the highest enforcement branch of justice in the land. If our country has reached the point where those entrusted with this enormous responsibility shirk their duty because of political or other considerations, then we truly are on the way out as a society dedicated to law and order.

The provisions of the corrupt practices statute governing reporting of campaign contributions were included to prevent undue influence or pressure being used by any individual or groups in elections. The ballot is one of our most fundamental rights, its integrity to be guarded above all else. If the election process is corrupted, then so is our entire form of government.

This newspaper regards this as a very serious matter, Mr. Clark. It is certain the people of this region feel likewise. What does your office intend to do about these charges?

No Constitutional Right To Demonstrate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1967

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the prohibitions against Federal interference in the right of individuals and States clearly applies to religion, speech, press, peaceable assembly, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.

Through an educational brainwashing the word "prohibition" against Congress has been promoted into a "guarantee" by the Federal Establishment against the State and the individual.

Yet, even so, no theory ever so remote can possibly stretch the "prohibition against" to a "guarantee to" demonstrate—to usurp the highways, public buildings, and upset peaceful communities.

Nothing morally wrong can ever be made politically right. Blackmail is but blackmail and it is being made profitable by elected leaders who either do not understand constitutional law or who are afraid to fulfill their obligation of trust from their people.

Mr. Speaker, I include a hard-hitting report prepared by Mr. Thomas A. Lane, of McLean, Va., following my remarks:

NO CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT TO DEMONSTRATE

(By Thomas A. Lane)

WASHINGTON.—There is no constitutional right to demonstrate. The relevant constitutional words are, "peaceably to assemble and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances."

The claimed right to demonstrate is in practice a right to foment civil strife. It doesn't exist, and it cannot exist in any orderly society.

Our free society has never been without friction. Strife between early settlers and later immigrants, and between successive waves of immigrants, has studded our history. Strife is endemic in a free society.

However, it has never heretofore been a function of government to promote such strife. The clear duty of government has been to reduce tensions and to prevent or end conflict.

The different nationality groups could get parade permits for their special holidays. It would have been considered preposterous, however, to suggest that the Irish should have police protection while they marched into the Italian sector to shout their imprecations. That would have been the sure way to provoke a riot.

Civic order required each group to respect the privacy and security of the others. The law sustained that rule.

Why then did Governor McKeithen of Louisiana mobilize his state police and incur heavy expense to protect a group of civil rights demonstrators marching from Bogalusa to Baton Rouge? Why did the Mayor of Milwaukee allow Father James E. Groppi to march his civil rights demonstrators into the Polish wards of the city?

These are the fruits of a right to demonstrate which has been falsely asserted by civil rights activists and has been sustained by the federal executive. When Dr. King claimed a right to march down the highway from Selma to Montgomery, Governor Wallace rightly denied his claim. No group in our society has a right to march down the highway obstructing traffic and endangering its members. Nevertheless, President Johnson said the demonstrators did have a right to march down the highway and that the federal government would protect them.

Mobilizing three thousand members of the Army and the National Guard was a costly way to deliver a petition to the State Capitol. But President Johnson and Dr. King were content because the strife secured the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1965.

The President had no right nor precedent for his position. When our police forces are already overburdened with problems of crime, it is clearly intolerable to waste them in protecting political blocs which are deliberately provoking racial strife. It was President Johnson's duty to support the correct legal position taken by Governor Wallace. He chose instead to exploit the emotional tension of the conflict.

Governor McKeithen faced this same threat to the public order. If he denied the right to march to Baton Rouge, would he provoke a new conflict with the federal government and provide national publicity for the demonstrators? As a matter of practical politics and not of law, he decided to accept the costs of escorting the marchers. But he thereby compromised his responsibilities as Governor.

Father Groppi, serving a parish in a predominantly negro sector of Milwaukee, is caught up in the political turmoil of his neighborhood. Surely he must know that his people have no right to demonstrate in hostile areas of the city. Surely he must recognize the immorality of stirring racial conflict. He may win his spurs as a political activist but he will lose his credit as a man of God. He has brought grief to black and white alike.

It was imprudent of Mayor Maier to grant permission for Father Groppi's first march. It was an obligation of his office to protect the Polish citizens of the residential area from such belligerent intrusion.

It is apparent from these examples that the evil precedent set by President Johnson has tended to establish a right which has no existence in law and which, if allowed, would be destructive of public order. That precedent must be reversed.

Mayors and Governors must return to the sound rule that no one in America has a right to provoke the hostility of law-abiding citizens. Public officials must reject the phony assertion of a right to demonstrate.

The Courage of Cardinal Mindszenty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. JOELSON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1967

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, my distinguished colleague from New Jersey [Mr. PATTEN] has clearly told us the facts of the precarious situation of the brave Cardinal of Hungary, Archbishop Joseph Mindszenty.

It is well to recall now the events which led to the rise and the Communist arrest and imprisonment of the leader of the Catholic Church in Hungary, a deed without precedent in 1,000 years of Hungarian history.

After receiving his ordination as a bishop in March 1944—just before the German occupation of Hungary—the new bishop uncompromisingly denounced Nazism and anti-Semitism and was even at one point arrested for the audacity of his statements.

As the Primate of Hungary died in the days following the Russian ocupation of his see, on October 2, 1945, Bishop Mindszenty was promoted to Archbishop of Esztergom and Primate of Hungary.

His first act was an appeal to the world to feed the starving Hungarian people. Raised to the position of a cardinal on February 18, 1946, by Pope Pius XII, he soon had occasion to protest the behavior of the Red army and the new antichurch drive of the coalition government already heavily infiltrated by Communists.

Cardinal Mindszenty visited the United States and Canada in 1946, and expressed his thanks for American aid. The position of the Hungarian Catholic Church in 1945 was still good. About two-thirds of the population was Catholic, half of the nation's secondary schools were under church auspices, and the land possession of the church allowed it to continue independent charitable and educational work.

Yet the church's troubles began soon enough. First, the apostolic nunciature was ousted from Budapest. Next, land reforms deprived the church of its income to maintain Catholic schools and charitable institutions. Restrictions were placed on the Catholic press, thereby depriving the Catholics from responding to the scurillous attacks in the Government press.

A secularized marriage law was put into effect in 1946; Catholic youth organizations were banned; priests were arrested for opposing the Communist-induced seizure of all power; and Catholic schools were nationalized in 1948.

The cardinal protested in vain; he pointed out that the measures not only contravened constitutional guarantees and traditions, but also the human rights pledge of the Government under the 1947 peace treaty. By 1948, a drive had begun to oust the cardinal. But when the schools were nationalized, the cardinal announced in July 1948 the excommunication of every Catholic member of the Parliament who had voted for it. He also took note of the stepped-up hate campaign of the Communist-dominated Government in November 1948 in a pastoral letter declaring any confessions he may make under Communist duress after his probable arrest null and void.

It was under such circumstances that his arrest and farcical trial occurred. However, even under the 1949 law, his conviction by the court remained a miscarriage of justice as he had never fulfilled the criminal intent of the statutes by his actions. After 10 years in prison and after being liberated by the freedom fighters in 1956, he has been residing in the American Embassy. It would be time for us to tell the Hungarian Government that if it wants bridgebuilding, it should solve the Mindszenty case, overturn the illegal sentence, and return him to his ecclesiastical functions. Otherwise the whole story of liberalization and religious freedom will remain a mirage.

Keep the Guard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1967

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, station WBBM-TV, Chicago, Ill., in a fine editorial commentary on Friday, September 1, expressed proper concern over Secretary of Defense McNamara's plan to reorganize the National Guard. The editorial, which is especially timely, follows:

KEEP THE GUARD

From the aftermath of last January's paralyzing snowstorm, this summer's tragic tornado, and through the agony of last summer's civil strife, the Illinois National Guard has proven its usefulness and, indeed, its effectiveness in time of necessity.

The Guard has supplemented law enforcement officials and has acted alone by order of the Governor to assist in time of God made or man made disaster.

Unfortunately, however, it appears as if the valiant attempts of Governor Kerner to keep the Illinois National Guard intact may have failed.

In fact, the Pentagon has even rejected a request by Governor Kerner for more time to evaluate the proposed reorganization of the Guard in Illinois.

This proposed reorganization of the Guard, unwisely we think, would decrease many of the combat units Illinois has trained in riot duty.

It has been charged that the reduction in the Guards strength could leave our state without the proper capacity to maintain law and order.

In fact, General Francis P. Kane, Commander of the 33rd National Guard Division in Illinois, has told us that one of his greatest concerns with the possible reduction in the Guard is whether there will be a large enough force to effectively deal with state emergencies.

In view of this summer's violent eruptions in cities—the need for supplementing law enforcement units seems all too painfully obvious.

We believe, the hasty action by the Pentagon to reorganize the Guard is a foolhardy attempt at economy and—a dangerous one.

Hopefully, Congress will have the last word on retaining the National Guard—we urge our Congressmen to support keeping the Guard.

Miss American Teen-Ager Contest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 14, 1967

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Eighth Annual Miss American Teen-Ager Contest was held Friday evening, September 8, at the Palisades Amusement Park in New Jersey, a part of the Ninth Congressional District.

The Miss American Teen-Ager Contest, which originated in 1960, seeks to honor the American teenage girl in her role as a daughter, sister, and friend; emphasizing her influence on the American way of life and her participation in activities in her community surroundings, such as school, church, civic, and charitable participation.

Thus, Miss American Teen-Ager is a symbol of juvenile decency in this era of constant talk of juvenile delinquency. She can become an image by personifying today's ideal teenage girls—alert, intelligent, knowledgeable, a well-rounded personality, mature, and realistic; with a clean, attractive, energetic, and youthful appearance.

A young girl will sympathize with Miss American Teen-Ager because the winning girl, chosen as Miss American Teen-Ager is not merely a beauty contest winner. Her attributes are those all America lands and which all teenage girls consider to be an ideal for their own identification and personality.

While there may be awe and glamour with the title, there is also warmth and credibility in the Miss American Teen-Ager name, since it reflects everything that American teenage girls are or wish to become.

The Miss American Teen-Ager Contest is the oldest and largest competition for girls in the age bracket of 13 through 17, giving recognition, prestige, and acclaim to teenagers in a rewarding fashion.

I wish to take this opportunity to express my heartiest congratulations to the winner of this year's contest, Miss Kenna Michele Patrick. Miss Patrick is a 16-year-old high school senior from Bethesda, Md., who claims to be an average student and who has studied modern dance for 14 years. She plans to attend Pennsylvania State University, to become a social studies teacher.

Along with the title, Miss Patrick won some additional prizes including TV appearances.

I also wish to express my congratulations to the person most responsible for instituting this program, Mr. Irving M. Rosenthal, president of the Palisades Amusement Park, also the sponsors of this Miss American Teen-Ager Contest; for their splendid cooperation in presenting to the American public the teenage girls who are dedicated to the advancement of human dignity and furthering international good will. These teenagers set an example by encouraging other teenagers to grow and develop into fine American citizens who will be the future leaders of our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to include with my remarks the proclamation issued by the Honorable Richard J. Hughes, Governor of the State of New Jersey, relative to this teenager competition.

The proclamation follows:

PROCLAMATION

Whereas, citizens of our great state of New Jersey extend their warm hospitality and gladly welcome "Miss American Teen-Ager" finalists between the ages of 13 through 17 from all parts of the United States of America for the nationwide 8th annual "Miss American Teen-Ager" pageant at Palisades Amusement Park, N.J. and

Whereas, "Miss American Teen-Ager" will be selected at Palisades Amusement Park, N.J. on Friday, September 8th, 1967 on the basis of outstanding beauty, poise, personality, good grooming, scholastic achievement, community service and leadership, and

Whereas the nationwide "Miss American Teen-Ager" contest was founded at Palisades Amusement Park, N.J. to honor the American teen-age girl of every race, color and creed and the role she plays in her community which includes her family, her home, her church, her synagogue and in community organizations, and

Whereas the "Miss American Teen-Ager" contest is dedicated to the advancement of human dignity, the furtherance of international good will, to support research for the cure and prevention of the many diseases that plague mankind, to supporting and upholding the Constitution of the United States of America and to the advancement of Americanism, to helping underprivileged children, to advancing brotherhood and understanding among all people and to encouraging teen-agers to grow and develop into fine American citizens who will be the future leaders of our nation and

Whereas this spectacular "Miss American Teen-Ager" pageant has been designed to stimulate and encourage good grooming, educational and community service activities among the youth of our nation, and

Whereas the commerce and industry of Bergen County and the State of New Jersey will greatly benefit from the "Miss American Teen-Ager" pageant originating therefrom,

Now, therefore, I, Richard Hughes, Governor of New Jersey, do hereby commend the "Miss American Teen-Ager" contest and pageant at Pallisades Amusement Park, N.J. for its effort to enrich our lives and developing better understanding among people and a respect for the dignity of all people, regardless of race, color and creed; and proclaim the week of September 3rd, 1967 as "Miss American Teen-Ager Week" and urge all citizens to participate and honor the nation's outstanding teen-age girls who will be guests of our state at Pallisades Amusement Park, N.J. for the 8th annual televised nationwide pageant.

RICHARD HUGHES.

Another View of Jerusalem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 14, 1967

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, recently I have received a number of publications telling me how terrible are the actions of the Israelis following their successful defense of their country and their efforts to obtain more defensible positions. I am sure many of the Members also have received such propaganda.

Because of this I was pleased to note in at least one American newspaper a little seeking to sort out the truth about some of the things now happening in the Middle East. I would like to have reprinted in the RECORD the text of that letter as it appeared in the Knoxville News Sentinel:

JULY 27, 1967.

The EDITOR,
Knoxville News Sentinel,
Knoxville, Tenn.

DEAR SIR: In a recent letter in the News Sentinel Mr. George Harb quotes the wife of a Lebanese doctor as a basis for totally untrue charges about Israel's conduct in Jerusalem.

It is not true that there is danger of starvation in Jerusalem. The stores are full with an abundant selection of all goods, and, in any event, as Jerusalem is now one city Arabs can and do move freely in the New City and shop in its stores. There was no destruction of religious shrines. Indeed, the battle for Jerusalem was fought at heavy loss of life to the Israelis in order to ensure that religious shrines would be unharmed. The Jordanians, who opened the hostilities, shelled the New City, damaged the Dormition Church and caused numerous civilian casualties in killed and wounded.

No Arabs were driven out to the East Bank, and Arabs who nevertheless left of their own accord and wish to return may do so.

The record shows a very different picture from that portrayed by your reader, and this has been adequately testified to by the news media. Israel's occupation of Jerusalem was as careful and humane as was possible. The restoration of normal services was immediate. Food supplies were rushed in and the water supply was immediately improved, assuring a constant flow of water in all homes for the first time. The official representatives of the Red Cross expressed their appreciation of the effectiveness of Israel's moves to prevent the Arab population of Jerusalem (and indeed of all the occupied territory) from suffering the results of the war launched in Jerusalem against civilian populations by the Government of Jordan.

The unification of the city has brought a peace and freedom from fear and a mingling of populations which has given the life of Jerusalem a normalcy it had not previously known.

Sincerely,

BENAD AVITAL,
First Secretary.

U.S. Gold Gone

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 14, 1967

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, foreign aid and planned destruction of U.S. financial stability have brought us to the point that U.S. gold is gone. Our people are being educated to accept Warburg toilet paper as a medium of currency. For how long, Mr. and Mrs. America? For how long?

Mr. Speaker, I include the Washington Evening Star article for September 13 following my remarks:

MORE ABOUT GLOBAL MONEY

(By Sylvia Porter)

The 10 leading financial powers of the free world agreed last month to create a new type of world money which governments can use in addition to gold and U.S. dollars to settle their debts with each other. The plan will be approved by the 106 nations belonging to the International Monetary Fund at the annual meeting in Rio de Janeiro starting Sept. 25.

After final details have been hammered out, the plan will be submitted to the parliaments of each member-nation for ratification. The timetable as of now calls for the establishment of the machinery to issue the new world money in 1969–70.

After the Rio meeting, there undoubtedly will be many reports down-grading the achievement; the downgradings began within hours of the signing of the London agreement by the "Group of Ten." Cynics will be measuring the curbs on the proposed new world money against what might have been accomplished and minimizing the accord as a result; they already are minimizing it as considerably less valuable than gold or U.S. dollars.

NEW RESERVE ASSET

But still the shining central fact is that a new international reserve asset is being developed to supplement gold and the U.S. dollar in international trade. The new reserve is to stand along side gold and the U.S. dollar as a top asset for the world's central bankers and it is designed to be ultimately as "good as gold" in the eyes of the world's finance ministers. The negativism of the weeks ahead must not be permitted to obscure the fundamental meaning of what is being done. Specifically:

It means that after four years of hard negotiations and frequently infuriating vetoes by France, the leading financial powers have agreed on a basic strengthening of the monetary system. (The Group of Ten are the U.S., Britain, France, West Germany, Japan, Italy, Sweden, Belgium, the Netherlands and Canada.) The extent to which these major powers consulted and conceded marks a major triumph for international financial cooperation. In itself, this is exceedingly heartening.

It indicates an ultimate reduction in the responsibilities of the U.S. dollar in the financing of world trade and thus, a lessening of pressure on our dollar and on our dwindling gold reserves.

It assures sufficient credit in coming years to finance the free world's continued economic growth. In May, the free world completed the greatest round of tariff cuts in history and laid the foundation for an expansion of international trade. Now the free world is inventing the means for financing this expanded trade. In a world turning back to economic nationalism, these are magnificent accomplishments.

GOLD'S ROLE CHANGING

It signals a step toward scrapping the traditional role of gold in world trade and ending the reign of gold over international exchange. This reform is not radical, will not in one stroke transform our monetary system (as many U.S. experts wanted).

But it will provide for a new, acceptable paper money to underwrite the growth of world trade. It will help fill the dangerous gap created by the fact that newly mined gold is no longer adding to the world's money reserves and when the U.S. finally stops spending so much more abroad than it earns abroad, U.S. dollars won't be adding to the reserves either.

DEPRESSION WEAPON

It promises to erase the danger of worldwide depression caused by a shortage of money to finance essential trade.

It implies a move toward the ultimate creation of a single world currency.

I remember "Bretton Woods" in 1944 and the skepticism about whether the monetary system born there would survive. The system has not only survived but it has also been a force behind free world prosperity ever since.

Reapportion Thicket

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEL CLAWSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1967

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, an editorial in the September 6 issue of the Southeast News and Downey Champion, Downey, Calif., provides a provocative commentary on the apportionment controversy in California and its larger significance. I commend the discussion which follows to the attention of my colleagues in the House:

[From the Southeast News and Downey (Calif.) Champion, Sept. 6, 1967]

REAPPORTION THICKET

The California State Supreme Court granted petitions last week requested by Phil Silver and Abe Vickter challenging the validity of the apportionment of California's congressional districts.

In his petition Silver seeks to block any California congressional election based on existing apportionment and seeks a court order requiring that the legislature enact a new plan without reference to provisions of the California Constitution precluding the division of counties in the composition of congressional districts. Failing such legislative action the suit would require a court order forcing all California congressmen to run at large in 1968.

REAPPORTIONMENT MASTER?

Vickter, basically challenging the same California constitutional provision on the alleged grounds that it is in conflict with the "equal protection" clause of the 14th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, asks the court to either adopt a new plan of apportionment which he has submitted or to submit the question of congressional apportionment prior to the 1968 elections to a "reapportionment master" for determination.

The California State Supreme Court has directed the defendants to the Silver and Vickter cases to file their opposing briefs by September 22, 1967.

With this timetable set forth by the court it would seem likely that argument would commence before the court in October.

The practical facts of life, in view of a long succession of U.S. Supreme Court reapportionment decisions, are that the courts have little leeway, and no hesitancy, in forcing compliance with the new-found "equal protection" interpretation of the 14th Amendment.

In the event the California State Supreme Court grants the action sought by either Silver or Vickter, California's 1968 congressional elections will be a wonder to behold. The State Legislature in the recently concluded session refused to reapportion congressional districts on the basis of the 1960 census on the grounds that to do so would create greater population inequities than presently claimed. The Legislature contends a new census is requisite to intelligent reapportionment.

SPECIAL SESSION

The Governor, of course, if the Court so orders, would direct the Legislature into special session to consider the subject anew. The Legislature either could enact a plan or again refuse, at which point—if the court ruled with Silver—all congressional candidates would run in statewide elections.

The irony and utter political absurdity of the whole reapportionment mess is that the logic and legal precedent cited in support of legislative and congressional reapportionment within states could apply as well to a demand that congressional districts be equalized between states, thus eliminating the one congressman some states now have, dividing U.S. Senators on the basis of national population and stripping that representation from the smaller states, and in fact rendering state borders meaningless.

The courts, having gotten into what Justice Frankfurter termed the "political thicket", are going to have about the same problem extricating themselves as the U.S. Government is in its Vietnam involvement.

President Johnson Blasts Negro Militants

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1967

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson earlier today delivered an historical speech in Kansas City in which he properly assailed leaders of slum riots as "poisonous" and called them "vulgar men who provoke violence and then flee the consequences."

President Johnson obviously was talking about H. Rap Brown and Stokely Carmichael—both of whom I have urged should be prosecuted for treason or sedition.

Mr. Johnson's speech deserves the highest praise from all Americans who love America—Negro and white—for it was a speech which needed saying.

Mr. Speaker, I am including in the RECORD today the report of excerpts from Mr. Johnson's bold speech as reported in today's Washington Star.

Excerpts from the article follow:

JOHNSON BLASTS NEGRO MILITANTS—RAPS LEADERS OF SLUM RIOTS AS "POISONOUS"—SAYS VULGAR MEN PROVOKE VIOLENCE, FLEE CONSEQUENCES

(By Lyle Denniston)

KANSAS CITY.—President Johnson today blasted Negro militants as "wretched, vulgar men" and "poisonous propagandists."

Without naming the persons, Johnson made it clear he was talking about such men as H. Rap Brown and Stokely Carmichael, who have been urging Negroes to rise up in violence.

The President accused the militants of "provoking others to destruction, while they fled its consequences."

The President's unusually strong language was in a speech here to the International Associatiaon of Chiefs of Police.

His speech also included a strong plea for his proposed anticrime program, which has been changed drastically in Congress.

SEES DAMAGE TO RESPECT

Making it clear that he considers this summer's riots as an important factor in the public attitude about crime, the President said:

"Much can explain, but nothing can justify the riots of 1967. They damaged more than store fronts and homes. They damaged the respect and accommodation among men on which a civilized society depends, and without which there can be no progress toward social justice."

It was at this point that the President lashed out at persons like Brown and Carmichael.

"These wretched, vulgar men, these poisonous propagandists, posed as spokesmen for the underprivileged and capitalized on the real grievances of the suffering people."

In his speech, Johnson said, "the vast majority" of the "suffering people' believe in law and order and "know that the law in a democratic society is their refuge and that lawless violence is a trap for those who engage in it."

He said that the faith of Negroes and others in slum areas that law is "their refuge" must be restored by making sure that "law enforcement is fair and effective" and that "protection is afforded every family, no matter where they live—that justice is swift and blind to religion, color, and status."

Speaking strongly about the riots this year the President said:

"We cannot tolerate behavior that destroys what generations of men and women have built here in America—no matter what stimulates that behavior, no matter what is offered to justify it."

SEEKS ACTION, NOT TALK

The President was critical of persons who condemn crime but do nothing to add to public efforts to solve it and stop it.

"Let's not be content to bewail the rising crime rate or the number of repeaters who fill our jails and prisons. Let us act against crime, and repair as many shattered lives as we can."

Crime legislation is vital, he said.

The President said: "What America needs is not more hand-wringing about crime in the streets. America needs a policy for action against crime in the streets."

URGES GUN CONTROLS

He also strongly urged Congress to pass a bill to limit the sale of guns. That measure has been blocked so far.

Johnson said:

"Respect for law and order begins at home. Children learning from parents. Your children learning from you—by example.

"That means everytime you water the lawn when there is an ordinance against it, they learn the wrong lesson about respect for law and order.

"That means every time you write a note to the teacher to excuse Mary's or Johnny's absence from school when they were not really sick they learn the wrong lesson about respect for law and order."

Johnson stressed heavily the responsibility of local officials, rather than state or federal authorities, to solve crimes and improve investigative and prosecution techniques.

"Officials in Washington cannot patrol a neighborhood in the Far West, stop a burglary in the South or prevent a riot in a great metropolis," he said.

The police association appeared to be pleased with the President's speech, and applauded loudest when he said that he thought policemen and sheriffs "should be among the best equipped, best trained and best paid people in the world."

Johnson spoke in Kansas City's City Auditorium, which was packed to standing room only.

I Died a Soldier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. EVERETT

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1967

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, several months ago Lt. Robert Del Peel, the son of Mr. and Mrs. Fred Peel of Paris, Tenn., which is in our congressional district, was captured by the North Vietnamese and is now a prisoner of this Communist nation.

This family, who are close personal friends of mine, is portraying the courage of proud Americans that their son was in this conflict. They realize the chance that their son took when he flew over North Vietnam. Their attitude has been above and beyond the call of duty.

Only recently there appeared in the Paris Post-Intelligencer, an outstanding newspaper of the Nation, published by the Williams family at Paris, an editorial which is self-explanatory. I feel those beatniks and draft card burners who are trying to destroy the American way of life should read this editorial and preface by Mr. and Mrs. Peel.

It is certainly outstanding in every respect and I felt that it should be brought to the attention of the Congress. The article follows:

[From the Paris (Tenn.) Post-Intelligencer, Aug. 31, 1967]

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Lt. Robert Del Peel, son of Mr. and Mrs. Fred Peel, was shot down over North Vietnam in May 1965 and is a prisoner of the communists. After reading an article in the May issue of Reader's Digest, reprinted from Army Times, Mr. Peel suggested that we get permission to reproduce the article. Mr. Peel said:

"Many people come in to the store and ask about Bobby. Then they say how terrible it is that we're in Vietnam and what a stupid thing we're doing.

"That's not the way Bobby felt at all, and when people say that it just makes it worse.

"Bobby told us he thought this was the most wonderful thing America is doing—defending the freedom of these people. He felt so strongly about it that he went back to Vietnam after already having served there once.

"This article might help some mothers who have sons in Vietnam to realize that it's not just a waste."

We have received written consent from Army Times to reprint the article, which follows:)

I DIED A SOLDIER

(Reprinted from Army Times)

A 20-year-old soldier killed in action on February 1 of last year has been honored posthumously with the top 1966 Freedoms Foundation award, for a "last letter" to his parents. The foundation's George Washington Award, which carries a $5,000 honorarium, was presented to Mr. and Mrs. Donald Strickland of Graham, N.C., in the name of their son, Pfc. Hiram D. Strickland. Private Strickland's letter was found among his personal effects after his death.

Dear folks:

I'm writing this letter as my last one. You've probably already received word that I'm dead and that the government wishes to express its deepest regret.

Believe me, I didn't want to die, but I know it was part of my job. I want my Country to live for billions and billions of years to come.

I want it to stand as a light to all people oppressed and guide them to the same freedom we know. If we can stand and fight for freedom, then I think we have done the job God set down for us.

It's up to every American to fight for the freedom we hold so dear. If we don't, the smell of free air could become dark and damp as in a prison cell. We won't be able to look at ourselves in a mirror, much less at our sons and daughters, because we know we have failed our God, Country and our future generations.

I can hold my head high because I fought, whether it be in heaven or hell. Besides, the saying goes, "One more GI from Vietnam, St. Peter. I've served my time in hell."

I fought for Sandy, Nell, Gale (his sisters), Mom and Dad. But when the twins and Sandy's kids get old enough, they'll probably have to fight, too. Tell them to go proudly and without fear of death because it is worth keeping the land free.

I remember a story from Mr. Williams' (Thomas Williams, a teacher at Strickland's high school) English classes when I was a freshman that said, "Cowards die a thousand times. The brave die but once."

Don't mourn me, Mother, for I'm happy I died fighting my Country's enemies, and I will live forever in people's minds. I've done what I've always dreamed of. Don't mourn me, for I died a soldier of the United States of America.

God bless you all and take care. I'll be seeing you in heaven.

Your loving son and brother,

BUTCH.

Our No. 1 Domestic Need: Jobs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1967

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to be among Members of this body who are sponsoring the proposed Guaranteed Employment Act (H.R. 12280) along with its author, my good friend and distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Michigan, Congressman JAMES G. O'HARA.

Enactment of the O'Hara bill would represent a major step along the road toward a full employment economy which is so desperately needed if we hope to cure the social ills facing our Nation—and more partcularly our urban centers. As Congressman O'HARA has written, now is the time to redeem the promise of the Employment Act of 1946 which pledged Congress and the Nation to provide useful employment for those able, willing, and seeking to work.

The August issue of Agenda, the magazine published by the Industrial Union Department of the AFL–CIO, includes an article by Congressman O'HARA entitled "Jobs Now." It summarizes the case for enactment of the Guaranteed Employment Act. I commend the article to the attention of our colleagues, Mr. Speaker, and have asked that it be printed at this point in the RECORD. The article follows:

JOBS NOW

(By Congressman JAMES G. O'HARA, of Michigan)

The United States is in its sixth consecutive year of unprecedented prosperity. A record 76 million persons are gainfully employed in the civilian labor force. Total personal income has reached the astounding level of $622 billion a year. The average paycheck is larger than ever before.

But there is, in prosperous America, a second America—the other America.

It is the America of nearly 3.5 million unemployed and over 30 million poverty stricken.

It is the America in which 14 percent of our young people aged 16 to 21 cannot find work.

It is the America of the ghettos and the slums.

While our nation is enjoying its most prosperous year ever, the forgotten millions of the other America are left to face the effects of economic hopelessness: the destruction of initiative, the pull toward crime, the abandonment of family life, and the inoculation of youngsters against ambition.

There is in the other America a dangerous sense of irrelevance that makes strangers in their own land of many of our fellow countrymen.

This sense of irrelevance, I suggest, is a deeper wound to the human soul than segregation or discrimination or poverty—although they add to the pain.

When the strength and willingness to work, which is all that many Americans can bring to the marketplace, are no longer a sufficient commodity with which to earn a living, then people begin to wonder what they exist for, and whether they have any meaning as individuals in the economy and in the society. They drift into pessimism and despair. Their spirits are twisted and deformed. They lose any sense if identity and become easy prey for the first demagogue who comes along.

In the other America, with its poverty, degradation and alienation, the seeds which exploded into Watts and Detroit were first planted.

It would be an oversimplification to say that the conditions of the other America are wholly responsible for civil unrest—but I doubt that we would be experiencing insurrection in the streets today had there never been a second America.

There is, of course, no simple cure-all for the other America and the ills which have produced it.

There is not one answer to every problem. No single program will forever and immediately erase unemployment and poverty, nor will it bring within the first week or the first year of its operation a total sense of belonging—a full realization of every American who today feels he does not have anything to offer this society.

But there must be beginnings and one such beginning would be an attempt to achieve full employment.

Americans are complex people and our needs are complex. But the basic need of any human being is a purpose—a function to fulfill—a job to do.

Jobs are not the whole answer to the problems that are facing our society, but they are an essential answer. And while the agenda of our society does not end with the goal of full employment, it most certainly begins there.

For that reason, a large number of my colleagues in the House of Representatives and I have advanced legislation—the proposed Guaranteed Employment Act, H.R. 12280—which would help us move toward fuller employment.

This legislation calls upon the federal government to take the leadership in an effort to provide employment for today's unemployed and underemployed who are willing and able to work.

H.R. 12280 would provide $4 billion in grants, during the first year, to federal, state and local government agencies and to private nonprofit organizations to help them bear the cost of providing one million new jobs in public service occupations.

This is not a program to make work for the unemployed, but to make jobs for the whole community. It would create new positions in areas of our society which have great manpower needs but which do not have the resources to fill them.

It is indisputable that the potential for these positions exists.

The National Commission on Technology, Automation and Economic Progress, only a year ago, found that there are 5.3 million new public service positions which could be created. The Commission found that there could be available—immediately—jobs as aides in medical institutions and health services, in schools, in welfare services, and in public protection.

There could be jobs in urban redevelopment and sanitation and in conservation and reforestation.

The use of the grant mechanism will allow state and local governments and private organizations to take the initiative in putting these people to work where they are most needed.

To guard against erosion of the worth of this employment, safeguards have been written into the leglislation to assure normal wages, normal working conditions and benefits (such as workman's compensation).

The bill, in one of its most essential provisions, sets up a mechanism for training programs under which these workers can receive the basic education and advanced job training which they need to climb further up the ladder out of the other America.

The program outlined in the Guaranteed Employment Act will, I believe, be a start toward eradication of some of the root causes of violence in our streets.

It will make inroads into the core of unemployment. It will begin to spread in the slums and ghettos a sense of hope—a sense that the poor and the disadvantaged can make a place for themselves in society. It will help the other Americans to help themselves.

It will eliminate poverty for many, rather than merely make them comfortable in perpetual poverty.

The value of this program will not stop at its benefits to the unemployed. It will benefit all of us. The work that these people can contribute can go far toward redressing the nelgect of years in attacking the problems of medical care, educational and recreational needs, urban decay and erosion of our national resources.

The economic benefits of this program alone would justify its serious consideration. The unemployed consume, they do not produce. To provide them with meaningful jobs increases not only their income but that of society.

In terms of loss to our economy, our output of goods and services is cut by billions of dollars when unemployment keeps men and machines idle. The proposed Guaranteed Employment Act, H.R. 12280, could help reclaim a portion of these costs.

The worth of converting welfare recipients into producing citizens is illustrated by our experience with the Manpower Development and Training Act.

It has been estimated that each person trained and placed in a job under the Act, represents a reduction in welfare and other payments and an increase in tax receipts of almost $8,000 in the first 10 years after training. In addition, each trained individual will probably provide $30,000 to the national economy in that decade.

Our proposal is not new. H.R. 12280 was foreshadowed, and in important respects formulated by the Automation Commission, the Full Employment Steering Committee of the Democratic Study Group, the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice, the Advisory Council on Food and Fiber and others in the last few years.

These advocates have pointed out, as I have, the expected effects of a program of guaranteed employment on the problems of deprivation, discrimination and poverty.

What is new about the Guaranteed Employment Act is the sense of national urgency which now surrounds the discussion of such a plan.

In a nation becoming ever more prosperous, we are witnessing the development of a huge impoverished underclass. While most of us enjoy the benefits of one of the highest standards of living ever known, some cannot find work or earn a living wage.

This schizophrenia is growing worse—not better.

We cannot ignore the other America any longer. If we do not undertake the task of ending unemployment and poverty we will be the losers. So will our children. And, most of all, so will our nation.

Twenty one years ago, the Empoyment Act pledged those of us in Congress and the entire country to the goal of providing "useful employment opportunities for all those able, willing and seeking to work." The time to redeem that pledge is now.

Insurance Industry and the Automobile

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

Hon. G. V. (SONNY) MONTGOMERY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1967

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues a recent letter by Mr. Arthur F. Blum, president of the National Association of Insurance Agents, Inc., to the Honorable Alan S. Boyd, Secretary, Department of Transportation. In the letter, Mr. Blum puts forth in a statesmanlike manner the problem of the insurance industry and the automobile.

This letter also underscores the need for an in-depth, long-range study of this problem:

SEPTEMBER 1, 1967.

Hon. ALAN S. BOYD,
Secretary, Department of Transportation, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: The National Association of Insurance Agents is pleased that the lately created Department of Transportation under your direction is, apparently, seriously considering the making of a study in depth of automobile insurance.

The automobile has become an essential part of the daily life of Americans and whether or not mandated by law, insurance is equally essential.

Increased in automobile registration between 1960 and 1966 from 61,682,304 million vehicles to 78,315,000 million vehicles and the completed, in-process, and planned construction of thousands of miles of new highway are testimony to the continuing impact of the automobile upon local, state and Federal government as well as the people.

The congestion in metropolitan areas, brought about through immense population increase of urban vs. rural districts and the increasingly common situation of our people living in one community while working in another, are factors bearing upon the cost of automobile insurance and claims for damages.

As a measure of the importance of automobile coverage to the economic welfare of the country, the insurance industry reports over $9.5 billion of Earned Premium for Automobile coverages in 1966.

Unfortunately, the average citizen has been unwilling to as readily accept the fact of increased automobile insurance cost as he has the increased cost of food, clothing, shelter and his automobile. For, until a claim is paid to him or on his behalf, his insurance is a comparative intangible.

The processes of Insurance are relatively simple. The premiums of many are intended to accommodate the losses of a few. Any guesswork as to the relationship between premium income and loss and expense outgo has long since been eliminated. Long since too, have the computers clearly indicated the susceptibility of one classification of automobile risk as compared to all others. Only through that process of careful screening can premium costs be equitably applied.

Too often, it is forgotten, that insurance companies are not philanthropic institutions but are, in fact, organized for profit. That being the case, they avoid, if possible, the assumption of the risk which is most likely to produce a loss. At the same time, risks exposed to variable degrees of hazard are rated according to exposure. In its simplest form, this procedure is demonstrated in the relationship between automobile rates for the urban driver vs. the rural resident.

Both insurors and the automobile rate-making bureaus have been criticized and even condemned by the uninformed or those unwilling to accept the simple facts of underwriting. Worse, non-existent mysteries have been suggested by inference, by presumably responsible people, as existing in the automobile insurance industry.

There is no denying existence of some unhappy conditions in the auto insurance field. There have been failures of undercapitalized and mismanaged insurors for which preventative measures are rapidly being applied by the States. There are people who own automobiles and retain driver licenses who cannot obtain insurance. There are valid claims pending in courts where dockets are so crowded as to prevent adjudication for years to come, and there might even be need to adopt new concepts with respect to fault liability as pertains to automobile accident suits.

At the same time, there are, inevitably, users of the highways whose privileges should be rescinded. The ownership and use of an automobile is not a God-given right but a privilege extended to people by their fellow citizens. Those who misuse that privilege are insurable only on penalty or not at all. Unfortunately, too few regard the whole proposition in that light.

Considering the magnitude of the problem of accommodating motor vehicle use and collateral need for insurance, it is fitting that a sincere and unbiased study be made of all aspects of both. As a result, the public should be benefited; the insurance processes better understood; the need for law enforcement accented and alleged mysteries dispelled.

We are completely frank in stating our opinion that much good may be derived from such a study conducted in an atmosphere of genuine objectivity and statesmanship.

The National Association of Insurance Agents stands ready, as always, to render such assistance as may be requested of it.

Very truly yours,

ARTHUR F. BLUM.

Statement of AFL–CIO Executive Council on American Farm Bureau Federation

SPEECH

OF

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 13, 1967

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the executive council of the AFL–CIO yesterday issued a statement supporting the courageous efforts of my colleague from New York [Mr. RESNICK] to uncover the facts with regard to the nature and activities of the Farm Bureau Federation.

I commend this statement to the attention of my colleagues and the other readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

STATEMENT BY AFL–CIO EXECUTIVE COUNCIL ON AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION

America's working farmers along with their fellow nonfarm workers have been the consistent target of the ultraconservative, big business-oriented American Farm Bureau Federation.

Operators of small and medium sized farms have been financially maimed by the Farm Bureau's campaign for smaller Federal farm subsidies. Oil interests, simultaneously, have cheered the Farm Bureau in its lobbying efforts toward maintaining and increasing the oil depletion allowance, a major tax loophole that costs Americans billions of dollars a year.

Many farmers fight for survival against the poverty plague sweeping the rural areas. The Farm Bureau stands tall in the ranks of the enemies of the struggling farmer by opposing with their vast resources all rural area development and anti-poverty programs.

Elderly Americans have been victimized by the determined effort of the Farm Bureau to weaken, if it cannot kill, Federal and State Medicare legislation. Americans young and old can find the Farm Bureau actively opposing improved Social Security benefits.

Farm Bureau leadership has fought the application of any minimum wage to farm workers. The battle by farm workers to receive the protection of the National Labor Relations Act, as accorded millions of nonfarm workers, finds the Farm Bureau aligned in solid opposition.

Right to Work legislation is actively pursued by the Farm Bureau leadership as a part of its campaign to destroy trade unionism. The Farm Bureau would further damage organized labor by prohibiting industry-wide collective bargaining, by stopping unions from attempting to save the jobs of men and women replaced by machines, by shackling unions with anti-trust laws.

Farm Bureau policy calls for the recruitment of farm laborers from Mexico and other foreign lands for exploitation by large farm operators in America.

The Farm Bureau is a haven for right wing extremists, providing them platforms and pay for speeches and distributing literature which attacks with venom the institutions that are the foundation of democracy and freedom.

The Executive Council of the American Federation of Labor-Congress of Industrial Organizations now takes note of the courageous attempt by Congressman Joseph Y. Resnick of New York to unveil the tainted business and lobbying activities of the Farm Bureau. Though opposed by the House Agriculture Committee of which he is a member Congressman Resnick, alone with his own funds, has revealed startling new information about the operations of the Farm Bureau. In conducting hearings as a one-man ad hoc committee, the Congressman contends that:

1. The Farm Bureau's membership makeup violates the tax-exempt status given the organization since nearly half of its purported membership of 1,600,000 are not farmers.

2. The Farm Bureau operates a massive insurance trust that encompasses more than fifty companies with interlocking directorships of Farm Bureau officials. These companies have in force more than ten billion dollars worth of insurance. The Farm Bureau uses membership as a device for selling insurance.

3. The Farm Bureau buys and sells human labor through the operation of at least five migrant labor camps, locking employees into a condition of abject poverty and filth.

4. United States Government buildings are used to headquarter Farm Bureau operations, including insurance sales offices, giving the impression that the Farm Bureau has the endorsement of the Federal Government.

5. Though a tax-exempt organization, the Farm Bureau is engaged in oil, chemical and fertilizer businesses, as well as operating multi-million dollar shopping centers and other retail outlets. Farmers are frequently squeezed by these endeavors, being forced to sell to and buy from the Farm Bureau enterprises.

6. The Farm Bureau manipulates the editorial policies of rural newspapers through the pressures that can be applied with its heavy advertising disbursements.

7. The Farm Bureau has issued "patronage dividends" to customers of its cooperatives which under no circumstances are convertible to cash and which cannot be used as credits against purchases—which are, in fact, worthless.

8. The Farm Bureau has subverted many rural youth organizations, including the Federally supported 4–H Clubs and Future Farmers of America, by indoctrinating them with right wing extremist propaganda.

9. The Farm Bureau wields an iron first over its subdivisions, punishing those who disagree with Farm Bureau policy.

10. The Farm Bureau in many areas dominates the Agricultural Extension Service, a Federal agency, by maintaining such an intertwined relationship that many are led to believe the Extension Service is a Farm Bureau agency.

We, the members of the Executive Council of the AFL–CIO, support Congressman Resnick in his endeavors to get the Farm Bureau to make public the true nature of that organization.

We further call upon the House Agriculture Committee to work with, rather than hamper, Congressman Resnick in his attempt to find the truth about all farm organizations.

Further, we call upon the appropriate agencies of the United States Government to investigate in depth the Farm Bureau's tax-exempt status, its lobbying activities, its use of United States property and personnel to advance its fortunes and its ultra-right wing philosophies.

The Polish National Alliance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1967

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, September 18, the Polish National Alliance of America will begin its 35th Quadrennial Convention in Detroit, Mich.

This is a most significant day, not only for Americans of Polish descent, but for all Americans because the Polish National Alliance since its founding in 1880 has served as the mortar for holding together the imposing and impressive Polish spirit in America.

The convention, which begins in Detroit next Monday, is but another landmark in the history of this fine Polish-American fraternal organization which today enjoys assets totaling $132 million and has more than $300 million of insurance in force among its members scattered through 35 States in America.

Assembled in Detroit for this convention will be the most impressive leaders of Polish-American communities representing 1,420 local Polish National Alliance Lodges throughout the country.

Since the very founding of the Polish National Alliance in 1880, this inspiring organization has been the voice and the conscience, not only of Americans of Polish descent, but more important, this great organization has served as the beacon of hope for ultimate freedom and justice for 35 million Poles today living behind the Iron Curtain in their native Poland.

It would be difficult, Mr. Speaker, to fully evaluate the magnitude of the contribution made by the Polish National Alliance, its officers, and its members during the past 87 years toward the growth of America. The Polish National Alliance has been in the forefront in leading the cause of human dignity in this country since its very inception.

Through four difficult wars, World War I, World War II, Korea, and now Vietnam, the Polish National Alliance has stood in the forefront in urging Americans to defend our hard-won freedoms.

The president of the Polish National Alliance, Mr. Charles Rozmarek, has been a constant target of the Communists because of his stubborn refusal to entertain any form of compromise in demanding full freedom and dignity for Poland.

In 1944, it was the Polish National Alliance which sounded the first warning to the American Government of the evil intentions that the Soviet Union had in planning to absorb Poland and her neighbors into the Communist orbit.

The Polish National Alliance, through its president and its officers exposed the Communists for their evil designs from the early days of World War II.

Before that, the Polish National Alliance played a key role in helping mobilize volunteers for America's expeditionary forces in World War I. By helping organize American volunteers who fought so gallantly under the leadership of Gen. Joseph Haller in World War I, the Bolsheviks suffered their most disastrous defeat at the hand of the Poles. This heroic victory by the Poles paved the way for the restoration of Poland through President Wilson's Fourteenth Point after seeing Poland literally removed from the map for more than 150 years.

Mr. Speaker, the 35th Quadrennial Convention of the Polish National Alliance gives all of us as Americans an opportunity to review the impressive record of this magnificent American institution.

From its very inception, the Polish National Alliance has brought guidance to millions of Polish immigrants who migrated to the American shores from Poland.

These fine people who arrived on our shores, bewildered and uninformed, suffering the disadvantage of not knowing the English language, and unable to find employment, found their greatest friend in the Polish National Alliance.

This great organization has consistently led the fight to improve America's immigration laws to provide greater equity for those who want to immigrate here from Poland.

By maintaining its two Polish language newspapers, the Polish National Alliance through its membership has helped retain in this country the appreciation and the dignity of the Polish language and the Polish culture.

One of the watermarks of its illustrious history is the founding by the Polish National Alliance of an outstanding institution of higher learning at Cambridge Springs, Pa., known as Alliance College. Here thousands of young Americans of Polish descent who might otherwise have been denied the benefits of a college education, have been able to graduate with a college degree and a substantial part of their education has been subsidized through the generosity of the Polish National Alliance membership.

The Censor of the Polish National Alliance, Mr. Dworakowski, the President of this organization, Mr. Rozmarek, and the Dean of Alliance College, Dr. Parczynski, as well as all of the officers and members of the Polish National Alliance, deserve this country's highest gratitude for the understanding and devotion they have given toward making Alliance College one of the truly great institutions of higher learning in America.

Mr. Speaker, the Polish National Alliance has brought understanding of the deep yearning for freedom by the Polish people to every segment of our own country and, yes, to every corner of the free world.

In 1945, when the United Nations was being formed, it was the officers of the Polish National Alliance led by its president, Mr. Rozmarek, that called to the attention of the American Government the great tragedy that befell Poland when the Communists swept her into their own orbit. It was in San Francisco, that the Polish National Alliance, through its officers, demanded that 16 Polish leaders arrested in Moscow be liberated.

The work of the Polish National Alliance is beyond measure. It has stubbornly defended Poland's right to her recovered western boundaries; it continues to this day to demand the restoration to Poland of her eastern boundaries illegally seized by the Soviet Union; it is today fighting stubbornly for reparations for Poles who suffered great losses at the hands of the Nazis.

Mr. Speaker, we as Americans can be proud that in this great Nation of ours there are organizations like the Polish National Alliance whose imprint can be seen on every single page of our country's spectacular growth.

This is why this 35th Quadrennial Convention is more than just a meeting of dedicated people who belong to the Polish National Alliance—it is a national holiday in which all Americans can find pride.

The Statesman and the Students

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BASIL L. WHITENER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1967

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, Hon. C. K. Yen, Vice President and Prime Minister of the Republic of China, recently took part in a question and answer program at George Washington University. It was the first time that university students in the Washington area had the privilege of directing questions to a visiting head of state.

Questions directed to Mr. Yen reflect the interest that our university and college students have in the welfare of the Chinese people.

I believe the Members in the House will find Dr. Yen's answers to the students' questions to be of great interest and I am inserting the article from the summer issue of the George Washington University magazine, entitled "The Statesman and the Students," in the Appendix of the RECORD:

WHAT THEY'RE SAYING ON CAMPUS: THE STATESMAN AND THE STUDENTS

(Questions and answers from Vice President Yen's Afternoon at George Washington)

Area university students were the first in history to address questions to a head of state visiting Washington when C. K. Yen, Vice President and Prime Minister of China, accepted the University's invitation to speak to them and to answer their questions.

Vice President Yen inaugurated a continuing series of programs, The Statesman and The Students, being arranged by Assistant to the President of the University Max Farrington working with faculty and students at George Washington. Heads of state planning visits to Washington are invited to the University's Lisner Auditorium to meet students from five Washington universities. These visits are being arranged in cooperation with the Department of State, are televised by the National Broadcasting Company, and broadcast in the speakers' own countries through the cooperation of Voice of America.

Vice President Yen's appearance drew a large turn-away audience. He received a standing ovation for prepared remarks which reviewed historical relationships between China and the United States and presented also a picture of Nationalist China today, stressing its economic growth. He issued a plea for the destruction of Red China as a prerequisite to world peace.

Vice President Yen was introduced by University President Lloyd H. Elliott. Following his address he was named Honorary Lecturer at The George Washington University by Vice President for Academic Affairs Harold F. Bright. In response, Vice President Yen presented a scroll of Chinese painting of galloping horses to the University. Dr. Kurt London, Professor of International Affairs and Director of the University's Sino-Soviet Institute, chaired the student question session, excerpts from which appear below.

Q: I'd like to know how your large military expenditures have affected the total economic growth of Taiwan?

A: The situation, as you all understand, necessitates the maintenance of comparatively large armed forces. The policy that has been taken during recent years is not a reduction of the absolute amount in expenditure, rather the reduction of the percentage of that expenditure in relation to the gross national product. And that has been going on so the large military expenditure has gradually occupied the smaller and smaller percentage in relation to the GNP.

Q: You've mentioned that one of your problems is the large population. I was wondering if your country is doing anything in the way of population control?

A: Population control is a very controversial subject in all countries. But we see there is a possibility of a gradual reduction of the birth rate, both through a natural process and through artificial processes. The natural process is through industrialization. As we are gradually being industrialized, the birth rate has been declining. And then, we have introduced family planning—family planning not only purported for birth control, but also for advice on family health and so on. And as a result of these two factors combined, the birth rate has been declining. At one time, it was around three and a half per cent—now it's below three per cent per annum. And probably in a few years it will drop to around two per cent.

Q: Your Excellency, I would like to ask you this question. Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek and Mao Tse Tung have been rivals and leaders of antagonistic and opposing movements that have fought each other for almost 40 years. And I'm sure that during this time they've faced each other personally many times. I'd like to ask you, what do you think is the Generalissimo's personal estimate of Mao Tse Tung—not so much as a rival and as an opponent, more as an individual—as well as his estimate, if you can express it, of Mao Tse Tung's style of leadership?

A: Personally, I have never known Mao Tse Tung so I could not know, I cannot say anything in particular regarding Mao Tse Tung. But I know Chiang Kai-shek very well. President Chiang Kai-Shek is a Christian and he is a proponent of Chinese traditional culture. But on the other hand, Mao Tse Tung has pursued the so-called "Great Cultural Revolutionary Movement," and in his proclamations, some of his proclamations, he has specifically mentioned that he has to get rid of the four olds—including the old culture. So I have already mentioned that Mao Tse Tung and the other communists are un-Chinese, while what we are trying to do is to preserve the traditional Chinese culture. And I think President Chiang Kai-shek on the one hand, and Mao Tse Tung on the other hand, are two entirely different personalities.

Q: Is your country currently aiding the U.S. commitment, both economically and militarily, in Vietnam?

A: We are not sending any military forces to Vietnam for reasons I think most people understand. But we have sent an agricultural team and also a team in psychological warfare, so we have quite a number of people over there, and I think we have still a number of people helping in transportation. So we have people in the non-combat sector. In the meantime, of course, the military position is such that, on account of our military strength, the communists have quite a large part of their military forces across the strait. So, we are immobilizing part of their military forces.

Q: I believe you spoke, sir, previously about the removal of the diabolical elements from Peking. I assume you mean the communist regime. Would you care to comment on when or how the time is ripe for a removal, and by whom?

A: As a member of the free democratic world, we have to cooperate with many other friendly countries. As to when and how, we have to evaluate our own position as well as the position of the free world as a whole. The fact is now quite clear, the turmoil on the communist mainland is going to continue, has not run its course yet—probably has just begun. The turmoil will intensify in the future, and this turmoil will lead not only to the intensification of the anti-Mao, anti-Liu feelings, but also to the general anti-communist feelings. And political measures are at the present time very, very important. Of course these measures, at a certain stage, have to be complemented with non-political measures. . . . I think the communists are themselves shortening their own life. . . .

Q: Do you have any idea who will succeed Mao in Red China and how this change in leadership would affect your country?

A: . . . The relationship between Mao Tse Tung and Lin-Piao is such that each party is utilizing the other as a means for self-aggrandizement. Mao Tse Tung is making use of Lin-Piao because he needs the military forces to crush his enemies who have permeated into the rank and file of the party or party organization. And Lin-Piao needed the influence of Mao Tse Tung to make himself assume a higher position in the ladder of ascendancy. So, formerly Lin-Piao was a minor figure, comparatively minor figure, but now he has become a number two man. Under present circumstances we think Lin-Piao will be the successor to Mao Tse Tung.

Pittsburgh Moves Toward Rapid Transit System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1967

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, Pittsburgh is helping to solve its traffic congestion problems with the same determined spirit, effort, and cooperation on all levels of government that was applied to solve the earlier problems on urban blight, flood control, water and air pollution marking the pre-Renaissance days in Pittsburgh.

In an excellent article in the August issue of Pittsburgh Business Review, Mr. Edward Jensen, of the Port Authority of Allegheny County, describes the new transit picture in Allegheny County, and the potential for Pittsburgh to be a world leader in urban mass transit. I include his article at this point in the RECORD:

PITTSBURGH'S VENTURE INTO PUBLIC TRANSIT

(By Edward Jensen)

At 3:45 A.M., March 1, 1964, a 77/54 Bloomfield-North Side bus rolled out of the cavernous Homewood Garage. Until the day before, the dingy, red-brick structure and the bus had been the property of the Pittsburgh Railways Company. Now both were owned and operated by the Port Authority of Allegheny County. At 3:57 A.M., another newly-acquired Port Authority bus was involved in a collision. This accident signified in a very down-to-earth way that public transit, instead of being a political and philosophical subject, had become an operational problem for the Port Authority Board of Directors and Management. The change in ownership proclaimed the community's determination to solve the critical mass transit problem through public ownership.

Since that unromantic dawn in Homewood, life at the Port Authority has been hectic. Our task was (and still is) simple to identify: rehabilitate, improve, expand, and modernize public transit in Allegheny County. Achievement of these goals was (and is) something else again. The magnitude of the challenge will be more keenly appreciated by a review of the properties we acquired and the situations we inherited.

Prior to our take-over, the largest and the principal public transit operation in this area was owned by the Pittsburgh Railways Company. The Railways Company had all the ailments that afflicted transit companies in major urban areas and suffered from a few peculiar to Pittsburgh. Its political relations with City Hall were notoriously poor; it invariably received a bad press; it was beset with labor difficulties (three strikes in ten years), rising costs and, in the preceding decades, had been in and out of bankruptcy and through a number of reorganizations. Patronage had steadily declined from a high of about 289,000,000 riders per year in 1947 to about 63,000,000 riders a year in 1962. Its plant facilities were obsolete; its aging bus fleet required high maintenance costs; and the faltering heart of its system was a sprawling network of street car lines, a mode of transit abandoned by all but a handful of urban areas.

While the Railways Company provided the bulk of transit within the City of Pittsburgh, most suburban areas were serviced in an uneven fashion by a conglomeration of small, usually family-owned, bus companies. Because their market was in the geographic area where the post-war population boom had occurred, they should have been enjoying rising income and ridership. However, in fact, about half of the 30 small companies acquired by PAT were losing both money and ridership. The remainder operated in the black some years and in the red in others. Collectively, their patronage loss each year was about 5%—not quite as discouraging as the Railways Company loss of about 10% a year. In common with the Railways Company they faced heavy increasing costs which could be met only through increased fares and/or curtailment of service. But raising fares and/or curtailing service invariably resulted in a decline in ridership and thus a loss of revenue.

In carrying out its statutory mandate, the Port Authority was directed to acquire all transit properties which generated at least 80% of their revenue miles within Allegheny County. Under this category PAT acquired through private negotiations 30 independent bus companies and two inclined plane companies (serving Duquesne Heights and Mt. Washington). However, we were unable to reach agreement on a purchase price with the Railways Company and assumed control through the power of eminent domain. Litigation before the Board of Viewers of Allegheny County spanned three years and in an out-of-court settlement the Port Authority and the Company agreed upon a purchase price of $14.2 million plus 5% interest from March 1, 1964. Total paid for the thirty-two other companies was approximately $12 million.

Like the Railways Company, the smaller operations used generally antiquated plant facilities and rolling stock. One for example used a garage which had no running water and provided an outside "Chick Sale" toilet for its employees. Another didn't even have a garage—the owner simply parked the buses in front of his home at the curb. Another company used a converted stable as its main operating garage and maintenance center.

The total transit picture in Allegheny County was a dreary one, although not unusual in the United States. Public transit since World War II has steadily deteriorated and the reasons are obvious. The preference for the private auto and the proliferation of autos has made ruinous inroads into transit riding. This has been facilitated by government on all levels which, until recent years, denied public funds for transit while generously providing tax money for new highway and new parking garage construction. Another nail in transit's coffin was the reduction in the average work week from six days shortly after World War II to five days, thus reducing the size of transit's riding market. The suburban building boom further deteriorated the potential transit market by redistributing the commuting population over wide areas. Even if transit companies had possessed the financial resources to follow the population into the suburbs it is unlikely they would have done so on any wide scale because the new developments were characterized by low population densities, insufficient to support profitable transit operations. Moreover, most of the suburban housing developments were planned and occupied under the assumption that the private auto would be the major mode of travel.

In seeking to achieve its goal (rehabilitate — improve — expand — modernize) the Port Authority had first to solve its myriad internal problems. The first was the integration of the work forces and managerial staffs of the 33 acquired companies while, at the same time, continuing uninterrupted service. Although all were in the same business, each company had its own procedures. This was a problem right out of a management text book and suffice to say it was solved, but not without headaches and heartaches.

There was no textbook solution for our operational problems, many of which continue until this day. For example, the system we put together was serviced by 38 separate operational centers or garages. The number was wildly uneconomical. While each may have been strategically situated for single company operation, together they were poorly located for effective use in a unified system. We have been able to reduce the number to 12 and eventually we hope to use only 6.

We found 33 different fare structures, few of them following a consistent relationship to each other. Thus, very early it became necessary to establish a unified county-wide fare structure which equalized the cost of a ride for all of our customers regardless of which private company formerly served them. The variation in fares was considerable. Some companies charged 45¢ for the basic fare while others charged 30¢, and there were no transfer privileges from one private company to another. In equalizing fares we made no effort to increase revenue, except by establishing weekly and monthly permits which provide reduced fares through frequent use. The new fare structure, adopted in September of 1964, was a major public relations challenge because we were dealing directly with our customers and we spent large sums in advertising and promotional literature to reduce the inevitable confusion.

Labor relations, that is organized labor relations, were also high on the list of challenges encountered. Before our takeover, the Amalgamated Transit Union (which represented Railways Company employees and those of several of the smaller companies) obtained bargaining representation for the majority of the operating and maintenance personnel in the unified system. The ATU hourly wage rate at the Railways was $2.92 but the scales of the other companies ranged upwards from a low of $1.60 per hour. Under the State enabling law we were required to equalize wages upward to the level of the Railways Company. Wage equalization added $3.2 million to our annual operating costs.

Under a contract entered prior to our takeover, the basic hourly rate was set at $3.02 per hour beginning on March 1, 1964. Subsequently a neutral arbitrator granted wage increases of 25¢ an hour atop this. As a result of a cost-of-living escalator clause in our contract the wage rate has risen to $3.47 an hour. Incidentally, the present contract expires December 7, 1967. Under the Port Authority law we are required to submit to compulsory binding arbitration in the event we are unable to reach agreement with the employees' bargaining unit. We appealed this clause to the State Supreme Court on grounds that it was unconstitutional but the Supreme Court ruled against us. Thus we face the prospect of another arbitration when the present agreement expires.

The overriding external problem which we faced however was the state of deterioration of the transit system we found. Its equipment was dilapidated and its supporting plant facilities obsolete or inadequate or uneconomical. Two months after we began operations we placed into service 150 new air-conditioned buses, all used to retire buses which could not be rehabilitated. The funds for the new buses came from a $45 million loan guaranteed by the full faith and credit of the Board of Commissioners of Allegheny County. But, it was apparent that additional funds must be obtained to buy large additional quantities of new equipment and to build modern, strategically located operating facilities.

By a stroke of good fortune, in September, 1964 Congress appropriated $375 million for the nation's first aid to transit legislation. We moved very promptly and obtained an initial grant of $5,567,780 to be used for the purchase of an additional 180 new buses and the construction of two new operating garages. The federal grant was made after County Commissioners agreed to supply the required local ⅓ matching grant. By another stroke of good fortune, and we must say enlightenment, on the part of the state administration and legislature, Pennsylvania established a $13 million aid-to-transit program in the summer of 1965. Funds from this program were used to reduce the amount of the County's contribution toward the 180 new buses and 2 garages.

With the assurance of capital improvement funds available in Washington and Harrisburg, we then proceeded to develop what we call Phase II of our modernization program and under this phase we obtained approximately $11.3 million from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development; $2.8 million from the State of Pennsylvania and $2.8 million from the County. Under this phase we purchased 200 new air-conditioned buses and drew up plans for the construction of three more centrally-located operating garages and a new main shop-administration building.

With the new buses, we were able to make a start in erasing the derogatory reputation Pittburgh endured as the largest trolley museum in America. So far we have replaced street cars on the North Side and East End areas with new buses. Only the South Hills area is served by street cars, and our plans are to eventually replace them when funds for new buses and operating facilities become available.

The grants we have received from the federal and state governments have been available only for capital improvements, such as the purchase of new equipment and construction of new facilities. They could not be used for operating losses incurred in each of the last three years. In 1964 the cash loss was approximately $200,000 but this was absorbed by the $45 million loan fund. In 1965 the operating cash deficit was $1,740,367, and the County Commissioners agreed to appropriate $1,650,000 as a subsidy. In 1966 the operating cash deficit was $1,992,705 and the Board of Commissioners appropriated $1,788,725. Our experience indicates that operating deficits will continue if we provide service at the level demanded by the public and maintain the present fare structure. It would be possible to reduce or even eliminate the deficit by resorting to fare increases and curtailment of service. But, we are under a mandate to expand rather than contract service, as well as to *price* public transit so that it can be used by the masses. It thus apepars that if we are to operate as a public service in the same fashion as the police or fire departments, we will necessarily have to turn to the taxpayers for support.

The achievements of the past few years have produced gratifying results. For example, we have reversed the downward trend in transit riding in Allegheny County. Our patronage figures for last year were 2.5% higher than the previous year. This is not a large figure but it is significant when compared to the losses of the past and it ranks as an achievement when compared with the nationwide ridership trend which continues inexorably downward. We have greatly improved the reliability and attractiveness of transit riding through the introduction of the 530 new buses and through the removal, at the same time, of old, obsolete equipment, most notably the street car. We feel that through a vigorous public relations program we have markedly rehabilitated the damaged image of public transit. We have established excellent relationships with all levels of government, with the business community and with the public.

A rapid transit system is our next logical challenge for, we feel, such a system will finally solve Pittsburgh's "mobility crisis." We have, by sponsoring the Westinghouse Transit Expressway Project, made a significant contribution toward a solution of the urban mobility crisis through development of a completely new concept in rapid transit. We have also retained the Transportation Research Institute of Carnegie-Mellon University and Parsons, Brinckerhoff, Quade and Douglas, transit consulting engineers, to provide PAT with a blueprint for the development of a modern rapid transit system for Allegheny County.

Dr. H. H. Kung

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 13, 1967

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include the text of a speech by President Chiang Kai-shek at a memorial service in Taipei on September 2, 1967. These remarks by the President of the Republic of China serve to emphasize the great contribution to the cause of good government and freedom, on the part of the late Dr. Kung. The address follows:

DR. H. H. KUNG

Dr. Kung Hsiang-hsi (better known in the West as H. H. Kung), senior adviser to the President of the Republic of China, passed away at the New York Hospital in the United States on August 15, 1967. The funeral rituals are matters of national dignity. In the case of Dr. Kung, I want to tell the people of the world about some of the more important aspects of his life. I knew him well, because we shared the same troubles and triumphs for a long time.

In China, Dr. Kung is also known by his scholarly name of Yung-chih. He was born in Taiku, Shansi province, on September 11, 1880. His grandfather's given name was Ching-lin and his father's Fan-tzu. His mother was from the family of Pang. The Kungs have been a Shansi family of high repute. From the time of Ching-lin, the Kungs were engaged in business and were founders of such firms as Yi Sheng Yuan in Taiyuan, Yi Ho Chang in Peking, Chih Cheng Hsin in Sian, Yuan Chuan Pu in Shenyang (Mukden) and Kuang Mou Hsing Herb Medicine Co. in Canton. These companies formerly had branches in all the important cities of China proper and also in every province in Manchuria, Kulun (Ulan Bator) in Mongolia, Tihua (Urumchi) in Sinkiang and Saigon in Vietnam. The Kungs of Taiyuan were called the business tycoons of Shansi.

In his early years, Dr. Kung studied in the United States in the hope that he might learn to serve the country. After his return to China, he became a faithful follower of Dr. Sun Yat-sen, the founding father of the Chinese Republic. Because of his diligence and loyalty, Dr. Kung soon won the confidence of Dr. Sun and was sent to North China. With a copy of the Plans of National Reconstruction autographed by Dr. Sun, he tried to persuade the warlords there to join in the task of unifying the nation. He made great contributions to the expansion of the Kuomintang (Nationalist Party) in North China and to raising the morale of both the military and civilians.

After his return from Europe in 1926, Dr. Kung was appointed commissioner of finance of the Kwangtung Provincial Government and enjoined with the responsibility of providing for the development and growth of the people's gross income and for the need of logistics by the National Revolutionary Forces. He continued to direct the nation's finances until Nanking was occupied by the Northward Expeditionary Forces and designated the Republic's new capital.

When the Shanghai incident occurred on January 28, 1932, the National Government adopted a policy of regarding internal security as a prerequisite to resistance against external aggression, and of modernizing the army as a prerequisite to resistance against Japan. The government thereupon sent Dr. Kung to Europe and the United States on a secret mission to negotiate loans for the purchase of munitions. Upon his recommendation, the government accelerated establishment of the Central Air Force Academy, the cornerstone of Chinese aviation.

Dr. Kung became governor of the Central Bank of China in April of 1933 and vice president of the Executive Yuan (Cabinet) and concurrently minister of finance in November of the same year. After the Marco Polo Bridge Incident of July 7, 1937, he was appointed president of the Executive Yuan and concurrently governor of the Central Bank of China and minister of finance. A little later, I became president of the Executive Yuan. He then served as my deputy while remaining as the chief executive of the nation's top financial and monetary organizations. During this period, he carried out such measures as the relief of poverty-stricken rural areas, abolition of the likin system (an internal provincial tax on imports or articles in transit), customs office autonomy, and the development of national resources to enrich the national treasury. During the war he was able to implement such notable measures as the establishment of a budget system and the national treasury system, introduction of direct taxation, initiation of farm loans and cooperatives and the payment-in-kind of agricultural taxes.

Dr. Kung was an honest man who abhorred ostentatious living. As an executive and government administrator, he displayed a pragmatic spirit and was invulnerable to difficulty and discouragement. Despite a heavy schedule of duties in the administration of the government, he always had time for the education of the rising generations. He continuously encouraged and assisted young people. This enthusiasm for youth was exemplified in the many invitations he received to serve as chairman of the board of of such institutions of higher learning as Chilu and Yenching universities. He enjoyed the company of men from academic circles and was at ease in discussions with students and scholars. Throughout his life, he always had a watchful eye for outstanding talent. His love for the masses and his readiness to help led him into programs for relief and social welfare. He was indefatigable in the planning and implementation of such projects. He received wide recognition for these services.

In effect, Dr. Kung gave his whole life to the nation. In the 20 years from 1926 to the end of World War II in 1945—a difficult period for the National Government—Dr. Kung held various important posts and responsibilities in administration, finance and economics, and made outstanding contributions. Specially noteworthy were his services in the 1930's, when China was faced with Communist rebellion from within and Japanese military aggression from without. Dr. Kung took up the burden of steering the cabinet in this critical stage. His genius for planning enabled the national revolution to survive a succession of trials and brought China to final victory in the war of resistance against Japan.

These are Dr. Kung's principal contributions to the nation during his period of government service:

Establishment of a uniform national currency.

Unification of the financial systems of the provinces.

Maintenance of consistent educational financing.

Supply of adequate funds for military purposes.

Also of special significance was the completion of many railways and highways during Dr. Kung's administration. He carried out strategic plans and economic policies that gave priority to appropriations for rail and road construction. With the cooperation of the Ministry of Communications, he was able to complete China's basic transportation network before the Japanese militarists launched their invasion of the mainland. These constructions included the Canton-Hankow, Chekiang-Kiangsi and Hunan-Kwangsi-Kweichow railways and the Lunghai section from Kuangyintang in Honan to Sian in Shensi province. Highway projects carried out in the same period included the Chengtu and Paochi trunk roads and new roads in Kwangtung, Kwangsi, Kiangsi, Szechwan, Kweichow and Yunnan in the Southwest and Honan, Shensi, Kansu, Shansi, Suiyuan, Ninghsia and Chinghai in the Northwest. These roads were built in accord with the strategic communications plan of that time and largely contributed to China's victory. Such constructions were carried out in the years between 1933 and 1937 just before Japan's invasion of China proper. These years of all-out national reconstruction became known throughout the world as the period of China's rapid progress.

The government's strategy for facing Japanese aggression called for resistance on an east-to-west rather than north-to-south basis. The idea was to draw the enemy inland and mire him down ever more deeply. It was a grand strategy that enabled China to trade space for time, to turn small victories into big victories, and finally to defeat Japan totally after eight years of incessant fighting. In all these, it is well known, Dr. Kung made a greater contribution than anyone else. His were the responsibilities of administration, finance and the nation's economy.

Yet the greatest triumphs of Dr. Kung's government service were to come during the period between the start of Japan's 1937 invasion and 1942, the year after the outbreak of the Pacific War. China was cut off from the outside world both by land and by sea, the enemy having sealed off all the harbors. Foreign trade came to a standstill. Even after Pearl Harbor, international transportation to China remained blockaded by Japan for some time. But thanks to Dr. Kung, our forces on the frontlines and our people in the rear never lacked supplies. China has an old saying: "The builder of a nation is at his best during times of difficulties, the great statesman is at his best in the nation's most critical hour." Dr. Kung lives up to the description of both builder and statesman.

Toward the conclusion of our war of resistance, shortly following that of World War II, the Chinese Communists left no stone unturned in spreading rumors to dupe the people and sway public opinion at home and abroad in their efforts to overthrow the National Government by way of attacking and overthrowing the nation's financial and economic authorities. They directed their spearhead at Dr. Kung and rendered it impossible for him but to tender his resignation. There was in the national treasury when he left office US$900 million, not including US$130 million worth of each in the form of gold, silver and nickle bullion and coins. These two categories of foreign exchange reserve thus amounted to more than US$1 billion. This is a brilliant, unique administrative achievement in the whole of China's financial history. The slander leading up to Dr. Kung's resignation had succeeded in misleading and inducing vast numbers of people at home and abroad into entertaining serious doubts concerning the integrity and competence of the National Government, but his unprecedented accomplishment now provided a factual rebuttal clearing him of all possible stain. It was self-evident that Dr. Kung was a man of integrity, not of corruption; and that he was competent, not incompetent. Once he was out of office, the nation's finances and economy fell apart and the Communist plot to overthrow the government succeeded in less than three years. Thus, both the state and the people of China were plunged into calamity and ignominy. These events have combined to demonstrate Dr. Kung's single-minded devotion to the nation, the party and the revolution in the 20 years spanning the interval between the Northward Expedition and the victorious end of our war of resistance. We of this generation and posterity will always remember and respect him.

Dr. Kung had sought to recover his health in North America in recent years. But he was concerned about the state of the nation every waking hour. He literally lived for the recovery of the mainland. Unfortunately, to the lament and sorrow of all his friends, Chinese or otherwise, fate overtook him at last. How very intimately was the fate of China intertwined with the lot of this great man—with his being in or out of office. This is the time when fair judgment will be passed on him by people and history. By mandate of the people, I have been holding the national rudder in these rough seas for a long time and I have felt compelled to give this brief account of the merits and demerits in my colleague's life. Dr. Kung died for his country. I could not therefore remain silent on his virtues merely because I am one of his relatives. I hope world public opinion will not judge me self-indulgent for my vindication of him. Finally, I pray that the soul of Dr. Kung, who was loyal to the party and the nation, will be consoled, where he is—a place in heaven.

New York Times Notes Gains in Hawaii's Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1967

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, the continued growth and vitality of Hawaii's economy was the subject of a special business report in the Sunday, September 3, 1967, issue of the New York Times.

The exceptional strength of the State's economy, which advanced in all major categories last year, was revealed in the Bank of Hawaii's 1967 Annual Economic Report. I take pleasure in calling these growth factors to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress.

Among the significant advances indicated in the bank's 18th annual economic report was a 17.3-percent increase in tourism. Construction in the State in 1966 set a record of $370.9 million, up 8.1 percent from the 1965 level, and retail sales posted an 8-percent gain. This comprehensive review of the 50th State's economy also showed personal income up 9.6 percent, and employment up 5.5 percent.

I submit for inclusion in the Congressional Record the article from the New York Times, which summarized the highlights of Hawaii's business gains as found in the Bank of Hawaii's 1967 Annual Economic Report:

U.S. Business: Hawaii Gains

Honolulu, September 2.—Hawaii's economy advanced in every major category in 1966, according to the Bank of Hawaii's 1967 Annual Economic Report.

The report, which presents an over-all review of the state's economy for 1966 and the first half of 1967, records gains in agriculture, manufacturing, construction, tourism, trade, transportation, finance and government. One surprise was a smaller-than average rise in pineapple sales.

Among the biggest gainers was tourism, where volume in 1966 was 17.3 per cent above that for 1965 despite a 43-day airline strike. By mid-1967 the tourist business showed a rise of 37 per cent above that a year earlier. In addition, the hotel industry is in the middle of a record expansion.

Construction in the state in 1966 set a record of $370.9-million, up 8.1 per cent from the 1965 level. However, residential construction, which makes up the largest share of the total, declined, chiefly as a result of tight money. This segment of the building industry picked up in the second quarter of this year, following a similar trend on the mainland.

Employment rose 5.5 per cent to 274,150, compared with an average increase of 3.1 per cent. Personal income was up 9.6 per cent, against an average of 7.1 per cent.

Retail sales posted a gain of 8 per cent, to $1.2-billion, compared with an average increase of 5.4 per cent.

Pineapple sales, which had been showing an average rise of 1.1 per cent, were up only 0.8 per cent.

The 10-Percent Surtax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 13, 1967

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, Prof. Robert Lekachman, chairman of the Department of Economics at the New York State University in Stoney Brook, Long Island, has made some crucial observations concerning the President's proposal for a 10-percent surcharge on personal and corporate income tax liabilities. In an article in the September 11 issue of the New Leader, Professor Lekachman points out that the administration's tax program not only has to be evaluated in terms of technical economic grounds, but more importantly that it must be assessed in terms of its political implications, particularly its relationship to the escalating war in Vietnam.

I urge my colleagues to read Professor Lekachman's persuasive article, which follows:

"NAY" ON THE SURTAX

(By Robert Lekachman)

Nearly a decade ago, when I was certainly younger and possibly more naive about the connections between taxes and politics, I wrote an article which pleaded the case for fiscal policy as merely a neutral, technical tool of the hydraulic family. When inflationary pressure manifested itself, I argued, money should be withdrawn from the economy either by raising taxes or reducing Fedearl spending. When the economy was sluggish (as in those Eisenhower years it always seemed to be) then a prudent President and a responsible Congress pumped money into eager hands by cutting corporate and personal income taxes, raising public expenditures, or both. A beautiful symmetry could characterize public policy, I alleged, if only. . .

Right then and there I should have scrapped the article, for the several "if onlies" were quite enough to reveal the implausibility of a neutral tax policy. "If only" taxpayers came to think of taxes as national policy, not as additions to their incomes (when the rates fell), or subtractions from their pleasures (when rates rose), then politicians could make their recommendations free of the fear that what they did might imperil their prospects of re-election. "If only" tax changes had no equity effects, then various classes of taxpayers would refrain from looking suspiciously at each other (and tax proposals), out of apprehension that some were being treated better than themselves. And just for good measure, "if only" the citizen, informed or otherwise, could separate tax policy from his estimate of taxation's impact upon the fortunes of an Administration he either favored or opposed, then Americans could leave it all in the hands of the economists and live happily ever after.

The foolishness of my youthful aspirations is extremely easy to illustrate out of the events of the 1960s. Thus the investment tax credit, the Kennedy Administration's initial tax initiative of any consequence, was designed to stimulate business investment and, via its multiplier effects, national income, consumer expenditure, and total employment. But it did so by increasing the size of corporate profits, expanding dividends, and consequently altering the distribution of income in favor of the prosperous.

The $10-billion tax cut of 1964, a major monument to the conversion of the politicians to the New Economics, was also worth more to some than to others. For one thing, it reduced personal income tax rates from 20–91 per cent to 14–70 per cent. For another, it reduced corporate profits tax rates. For a third, it opened more loopholes for the affluent than it closed. Again an overriding public goal, faster economic growth, involved larger benefits for the rich than for the poor.

Or take a somewhat different case—the tax that never was. In January 1966, most economists, who expressed themselves on the topic (myself included) were urging the President to raise taxes. Certainly the inflationary signs were at least as plain as they are now, and far more visible than they were in January 1967 when the President first proposed the issue of new taxes during the current year. The President did not heed the economists and, what may be more astonishing, the economists turned out to have been right. Price increases did accelerate. The Federal Reserve was given the chance to exercise its favorite policy of hiking interest rates and tightening credit. That the rentier's share in the national income rose was possibly a minor issue. More serious was the collapse of the home building industry, the rejection by voters of school bond issues inflated by their interest costs, and the difficulties small businessmen encountered in securing credit on bearable terms.

What explained Presidential inaction? Possibly the President believed that in 1966, an election year, more taxes must remind the voters of the burden of a dreary, interminable, morally-suspect war. Moreover, only economists could believe that raising taxes was in the least symmetrical with lowering them. The great truth is that politicians will always delay raising taxes. Often they will hasten to lower them. So Johnson must have hoped that something would turn up—the Vietcong's collapse, trade union cooperation in holding down wage increases, corporate restraint in price behavior, or a less feverish rate of economic activity. It was a suitable judgment upon the President that despite all his political calculations, his party lost 47 Congressional seats and effective control of the House of Representatives.

Although the errors of the past cannot be corrected, they occasionally improve present courses of action. Is Lyndon Johnson, a sadder and wiser man, now meekly accepting the technical recommendations of advisers whom he so recently overruled? My own answer is on the whole affirmative. While factory output rates are still below optimum percentages of capacity and retail prices (despite a July jump explicable largely on seasonal grounds) have not been moving upward at dangerous rates, there are many portents of trouble to come. After five months of stability, wholesale prices have started to move. The decline in corporate profits has been arrested. Once again, military spending is exceeding earlier estimates, though presumably by a smaller number of billions than last year's $11-billion underestimate of Vietnam costs.

The Wharton econometric model at the University of Pennslyvania is predicting a sharp spurt in expansion. Such respectable economists as Walter Heller and Joseph Pechman (of the Brookings Institution) are circulating a pro-tax increase petition among university economists. And the case for a tax increase is reinforced by a possible deficit in its absence of $30 billion. Such a deficit will impose the pressure of large government borrowing upon money markets, tighten credit, raise interest rates and risk a repetition of the 1966 money squeeze. Of course, the Federal Reserve *could* pump additional funds into the economy, but no one expects William McChesney Martin and his merry men actually to do so.

Second question: Is the new tax program as neutral in its impact upon rich and poor, business and individual taxpayers, as the wit of the Treasury can devise? At a quick glance it seems to be. Corporate and individual taxpayers would simply add 10 per cent to their tax payments. As between businessmen and consumers, rich man and poor man, what could be fairer? Indeed, on the face of it the only discrimination is against corporations, which are asked to pay the surcharge retroactively to July 1 and to adjust the schedule of the quarterly payment in such a manner that would slightly increase their tax liabilities. Naturally, this was the very issue raised by the National Association of Manufacturers in the course of testimony generally favorable to a tax increase. But as ever the appearances deceive. The fact is that for several years corporate profits have been swollen out of the proceeds of a war boom. In the midst of a national pretense of business as usual, the argument for an excess profits tax has lost by default. Yet at the least equity demands that the corporations pay a good deal more than the same 10 per cent asked of individuals. This is a point that was not made (but should have been) by George Meany in his testimony in favor of tax increases directed more substantially to the affluent.

Nevertheless, it is only fair to concede that this tax program is probably as nearly equitable as this particular Congress is at all likely to enact. In sum, when the constraints of Congressional mood, Vietnam policy, and Federal Reserve conservatism are noted, the President's case for his tax program is strong on technical economic grounds, though somewhat short of overwhelming.

All the same, I shall not add my name to the economists' pro-tax document. My reasons for abstention are to be found in the wildly unneutral political effects of Congressional passage of the tax program. In the sort of Congress which Robert Sandoz so eloquently denounced in these pages ("Sharing In the Nonrewards," NL, August 28), higher taxes amount to an additional pretext for slaughter of the pitiful remains of Great Society programs. It goes without saying that in a sensible legislature, higher taxes would permit more leeway for the support of domestic action. In this Congress attempts to curtail the tax increase will move in parallel with slashes in social spending.

This is sufficiently appalling. But there is much worse. For the President the tax increase is justified by Vietnam. His message to Congress contained the news of escalation: "I have concluded . . . that I should authorize an increase of *at least* [my italics] 45,000 in the number of men to be sent to Vietnam this fiscal year." The Treasury or the Council of Economic Advisers are hardly the source of Johnson's rhetoric: "This Nation has taken a solemn pledge—that its sons and brothers engaged in the conflict there shall never lack all the help, all the arms, and all the equipment essential for their mission and for their very lives." The President has defined the rules: Anyone who supports the war in Vietnam should vote for higher taxes. It is a game while the President has played before with defense appropriation measures. Here he plays it much more disingenuously, since there is no real issue of denying necessary arms and equipment to the Armed Forces. Congress has appropriated generous funds. If taxes fall short, then further borrowing will fill the gap.

A final consideration. In 1968 the President will run for re-election either as a war leader or as a Man of Peace who has succeeded at last in de-escalating, if not ending, the Asian war. Recent events make the first posture by far the more probable. And passing a war tax encourages an increasingly hawkish President. Failure to do so offers a chance, however slight, that he will think again.

Politics are more important than economics and peace is a larger issue than inflation. It is little short of idiotic to place technical considerations ahead of possibly catastrophic political consequences. If I were a Congressional dove, I should vote against this war tax.

In Praise of the Peace Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. REES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1967

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, perhaps no thought is more appropriate to the Peace Corps' history than that of Victor Hugo when he stated "nothing in this world is so powerful as an idea whose time has come." Established after lengthy debate and some skepticism by domestic critics, the Peace Corps has grown every year in the confidence of the United States and of the world. Today there are more than 12,000 volunteers at work in more than 50 countries, and 6,000 more are in training. In the short 5 years of its existence, the concept of harnessing the idealism of a nation's youth to the seemingly impossible task of creating a new and better world—a world of peace—has spread around the globe.

In Africa the praise seems to be most voluble. On May 17, the President of Liberia, Dr. William V. S. Tubman, said that in his opinion—

> The American Peace Corps [has] contributed more to the United States Foreign policy than any other agency.

Just last month the Minister of National Education of Ivory Coast, Mr. Lambert Amen Taneh, proclaimed that the Peace Corps has "planted across the Ivory Coast, in every area in which they serve—public health, youth and sports, national education—the seeds of peace and of color. They have, in a way, been able to become an integral part of the living reality which inspires this country, brotherhood."

Mr. Speaker, I was most gratified to receive a letter from one of my constituents who recently returned from a 7-week trip to Africa with his wife and three sons. During their trip they had an opportunity to see firsthand the results of the Peace Corps' efforts in East Africa, and I insert this letter by Dick Gunther to be printed in the RECORD. I hope that others will concur as I do with the desire of His Excellency Adamou Mayaki, Niger Ambassador to the United States who proclaimed last June, "Long live the Peace Corps."

I felt that one of the most worthwhile aspects of our trip, i.e., the contact with numeorus Peace Corps personnel, was both in the East African areas of Kenya, Uganda and Tanzania, and in the West African areas of Ghana, Ivory Coast, Toga, et al. The Peace Corps people whom we met ranged from instructors in secondary schools to directors of the program in specific countries. These men, without exception, were dedicated, alert, aware and the best possible ambassadors that our country could send. They had a real sense of mission, a desire to make a personal contribution to bettering this world and to them, a contribution meant a personal commitment and they were engaged in fulfilling that commitment with their heart and soul.

We talked about it repeatedly in our family and to us all, the Peace Corps personnel seemed to embody those qualities which we Americans are capable of displaying at our best moments, i.e., an openness, a generosity, a sensitivity to other people. It seemed particularly noticeable when contrasted to what appears to be a mood spreading through our country today, a mood of conservatism, a resistance to change, a fear of the future, not the vigorous, enthusiastic acceptance of the future we found in these young men.

I want you to know it was quite an inspiring experience. I can only urge you to be as generous in your congressional support of the Peace Corps as you possibly can. I don't think that Federal money could be spent for a better cause.

In Memoriam: Dr. H. H. Kung

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 11, 1967

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I am honored and privileged to submit for reprinting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a memorial to Dr. H. H. Kung, senior adviser to the President of the Republic of China, who died on August 15, 1967. The memorial is from a speech by President Chiang Kai-shek, distinguished leader of the Chinese Nationalists:

IN MEMORIAM: DR. H. H. KUNG

(Text of speech by President Chiang Kai-shek at a memorial service, Taipei, September 2, 1967.)

Dr. Kung Hsiang-hsi (better known in the West as H. H. Kung), senior adviser to the President of the Republic of China, passed away at the New York Hospital in the United States on August 15, 1967. The funeral rituals are matters of national dignity. In the case of Dr. Kung, I want to tell the people of the world about some of the more important aspects of his life. I knew him well, because we shared the same troubles and triumphs for a long time.

In China, Dr. Kung is also known by his scholarly name of Yung-chih. He was born in Taiku, Shansi province, on September 11, 1880. His grandfather's given name was Ching-lin and his father's Fan-tzu. His mother was from the family of Pang. The Kungs have been a Shansi family of high repute. From the time of Ching-lin, the Kungs were engaged in business and were founders of such firms as Yi Sheng Yuan in Taiyuan, Yi Ho Chang in Peking, Chih Cheng Hsin in Sian, Yuan Chuan Puin Shenyang (Mukden) and Kuang Mou Hsing Herb Medicine Co. in Canton. These companies formerly had branches in all the important cities of China proper and also in every province in Manchuria, Kulun (Ulan Bator) in Mongolia, Tihua (Urumchi) in Sinkiang and Saigon in Vietnam. The Kungs of Taiyuan were called the business tycoons of Shansi.

In his early years, Dr. Kung studied in the United States in the hope that he might learn to serve the country. After his return to China, he became a faithful follower of Dr. Sun Yat-sen, the founding father of the Chinese Republic. Because of his diligence and loyalty, Dr. Kung soon won the confidence of Dr. Sun and was sent to North China. With a copy of the Plans of National Reconstruction autographed by Dr. Sun, he tried to persuade the warlords there to join in the task of unifying the nation. He made great contributions to the expansion of the Kuomintang (Nationalist Party) in North China and to raising the morale of both the military and civilians.

After his return from Europe in 1926, Dr. Kung was appointed commissioner of finance of the Kwangtung Provincial Government and enjoined with the responsibility of providing for the development and growth of the people's gross income and for the need of logistics by the National Revolutionary Forces. He continued to direct the nation's finances until Nanking was occupied by the Northward Expeditionary Forces and designated the Republic's new capital.

When the Shanghai incident occurred on January 28, 1932, the National Government adopted a policy of regarding internal security as a prerequisite to resistance against external aggression, and of modernizing the army as a prerequisite to resistance against Japan. The government thereupon sent Dr. Kung to Europe and the United States on a secret mission to negotiate loans for the purchase of munitions. Upon his recommendation, the government accelerated establishment of the Central Air Force Academy, the cornerstone of Chinese aviation.

Dr. Kung became governor of the Central Bank of China in April of 1933 and vice president of the Executive Yuan (Cabinet) and concurrently minister of finance in November of the same year. After the Marco Polo Bridge Incident of July 7, 1937, he was appointed president of the Executive Yuan and concurrently governor of the Central Bank of China and minister of finance. A little later, I became president of the Executive Yuan. He then served as my deputy while remaining as the chief executive of the nation's top financial and monetary organizations. During this period, he carried out such measures as the relief of poverty-stricken rural areas, abolition of the likin system (an internal provincial tax on imports or articles in transit), customs office autonomy, and the development of national resources to enrich the national treasury. During the war he was able to implement such notable measures as the establishment of a budget system and the national treasury system, introduction of direct taxation, initiation of farm loans and cooperatives and the payment-in-kind of agricultural taxes.

Dr. Kung was an honest man who abhored ostentatious living. As an executive and government administrator, he displayed a pragmatic spirit and was invulnerable to difficulty and discouragement. Despite a heavy schedule of duties in the administration of the government, he always had time for the education of the rising generations. He continuously encouraged and assisted young people. This enthusiasm for youth was exemplified in the many invitations he received to serve as chairman of the board of such institutions of higher learning as Chilu and Yenching universities. He enjoyed the company of men from academic circles and was at ease in discussions with students and scholars. Throughout his life, he always had a watchful eye for outstanding talent. His love for the masses and his readiness to help led him into programs for relief and social welfare. He was indefatigable in the planning and implementation of such projects. He received wide recognition for these services.

In effect, Dr. Kung gave his whole life to the nation. In the 20 years from 1926 to the end of World War II in 1945—a difficult period for the National Government—Dr. Kung held various important posts and responsibilities in administration, finance and economics, and made outstanding contributions. Specially noteworthy were his services in the 1930's, when China was faced with Communist rebellion from within and Japanese military aggression from without. Dr. Kung took up the burden of steering the cabinet in this critical stage. His genius for planning enabled the national revolution to survive a succession of trials and brought China to final victory in the war of resistance against Japan.

These are Dr. Kung's principal contributions to the nation during his period of government service:

Establishment of a uniform national currency.

Unification of the financial systems of the provinces.

Maintenance of consistent educational financing.

Supply of adequate funds for military purposes.

Also of special significance was the completion of many railways and highways during Dr. Kung's administration. He carried out strategic plans and economic policies that gave priority to appropriations for rail and road construction. With the cooperation of the Ministry of Communications, he was able to complete China's basic transportation network before the Japanese militarists launched their invasion of the mainland. These constructions included the Canton-Hankow, Chekiang-Kiangsi and Hunan-Kwangsi-Kweichow railways and the Lunghai section from Kuangyintang in Honan to Sian in Shensi province. Highway projects carried out in the same period included the Chengtu and Paochi trunk roads and new roads in Kwangtung, Kwangsi, Kiangsi, Szechwan, Kweichow and Yunnan in the Southwest and Honan, Shensi, Kansu, Shansi, Suiyuan Ninghsia and Chinghai in the Northwest. These roads were built in accord with the strategic communications plan of that time and largely contributed to China's victory. Such constructions were carried out in the years between 1933 and 1937 just before Japan's invasion of China proper. These years of all-out national reconstruction became known throughout the world as the period of China's rapid progress.

The government's strategy for facing Japanese aggression called for resistance on an east-to-west rather than north-to-south basis. The idea was to draw the enemy inland and mire him down ever more deeply. It was a grand strategy that enabled China to trade space for time, to turn small victories into big victories, and finally to defeat Japan totally after eight years of incessant fighting. In all these, it is well known, Dr. Kung made a greater contribution than anyone else. His were the responsibilities of administration, finance and the nation's economy.

Yet the greatest triumphs of Dr. Kung's government service were to come during the period between the start of Japan's 1937 invasion and 1942, the year after the outbreak of the Pacific War. China was cut off from the outside world both by land and by sea, the enemy having sealed off all the harbors. Foreign trade came to a standstill. Even after Pearl Harbor, international transportation to China remained blockaded by Japan for some time. But thanks to Dr. Kung, our forces on the frontlines and our people in the rear never lacked supplies. China has an old saying: "The builder of a naton is at his best during times of difficulties, the great statesman is at his best in the nation's most critical hour." Dr. Kung lives up to the description of both builder and statesman.

Toward the conclusion of our war of resistance, shortly following that of World War II, the Chinese Communists left no stone unturned in spreading rumors to dupe the people and sway public opinion at home and abroad in their efforts to overthrow the National Government by way of attacking and overthrowing the nation's financial and economic authorities. They directed their spearhead at Dr. Kung and rendered it impossible for him but to tender his resignation. There was in the national treasury when he left office US$900 million, not including US$130 million worth of each in the form of gold, silver and nickle bullion and coins. These two categories of foreign exchange reserve thus amounted to more than US$1 billion. This is a brilliant, unique administrative achievement in the whole of China's financial history. The slander leading up to Dr. Kung's resignation had succeeded in misleading and inducing vast numbers of people at home and abroad into entertaining serious doubts concerning the integrity and competence of the National Government, but his unprecedented accomplishment now provided a factual rebuttal clearing him of all possible stain. It was self-evident that Dr. Kung was a man of integrity, not of corruption; and that he was competent, not incompetent. Once he was out of office, the nation's finances and economy fell apart and the Communist plot to overthrow the government succeeded in less than three years. Thus, both the state and the people of China were plunged into calamity and ignominy. These events have combined to demonstrate Dr. Kung's single-minded devotion to the nation, the party and the revolution in the 20 years spanning the interval between the Northward Expedition and the victorious end of our war of resistance. We of this generation and posterity will always remember and respect him.

Dr. Kung had sought to recover his health in North America in recent years. But he was concerned about the state of the nation every waking hour. He literally lived for the recovery of the mainland. Unfortunately, to the lament and sorrow of all his friends, Chinese or otherwise, fate overtook him at last. How very intimately was the fate of China intertwined with the lot of this great man—with his being in or out of office. This is the time when fair judgment will be passed on him by people and history. By mandate of the people, I have been holding the national rudder in these rough seas for a long time and I have felt compelled to give this brief account of the merits and demerits in my colleague's life. Dr. Kung died for his country. I could not therefore remain silent on his virtues merely because I am one of his relatives. I hope world public opinion will not judge me self-indulgent for my vindication of him. Finally, I pray that the soul of Dr. Kung, who was loyal to the party and the nation, will be consoled, where he is—a place in heaven.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402, at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Thursday, September 14, 1967

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Senate passed bills on flood insurance and local police benefits and took up independent offices appropriations.

See congressional Program Ahead.

House passed Appalachian Region bills.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S 12981–S 13021

Bills Introduced: 11 bills were introduced, as follows: S. 2403–2413. **Pages S 12985–S 12986**

Flood Insurance: Senate passed (motion to reconsider tabled) S. 1985, to provide a national program of flood insurance, after adopting the following amendments thereto:

All committee amendments en bloc; Proxmire amendment to bar profits for 5 years by private insurance companies until the Government recovers its expenses of reinsurance under the bill; Ellender amendment of a technical perfecting nature; and Hruska amendment to provide for 90 days rather than 30 days while Congress is in regular session, for report to Congress on implementation of flood insurance program. **Pages S 13021–S 13043, S 13050–S 13057**

Authority To Report: Committee on Finance was granted extension of time until Friday, September 22, to file its report on legislation covering Federal financing of presidential election campaigns. **Pages S 13057–S 13059**

Local Police: Senate took from calendar and passed with amendment H.R. 11816, providing compensation to survivors of local law enforcement officers killed while apprehending persons for committing Federal crimes (motion to reconsider tabled), after substituting for its language the text of S. 798, companion bill, with adopted amendments, as indicated below:

Committee amendment (in the nature of a substitute for the bill), which was then considered as original text for purpose of further amendment; four Hruska amendments en bloc, as follows—(1) to include in the bill's coverage apprehension of Federal fugitives or location of material witnesses for testimony in Federal cases, (2) to provide that benefits shall not be barred because the fugitive was also being sought for violation of State law, (3) respecting procedures for payment of disability benefits, and (4) defining a local law enforcement officer; and Yarborough-Pastore amendment to include among those acts of the law enforcement officer that may be rewarded by stated benefits the lawful prevention of or lawful attempt to prevent commission of a crime against the U.S.

Senate insisted on its amendments, asked for conference with House, and appointed as conferees Senators McClellan, Eastland, Ervin, Hart, Kennedy (Massachusetts), Hruska, Scott, and Thurmond.

S. 789, companion bill, was indefinitely postponed. **Pages S 13059–S 13072**

Senate Authorizations: Secretary of the Senate was authorized during adjournment of Senate until 5 p.m. Friday, September 15, to receive messages from the President and from the House, and all committees were authorized to file reports together with individual, supplemental, and additional views. **Page S 13072**

Independent Offices Appropriations: Senate took up H.R. 9960, fiscal 1968 appropriations for independent offices, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development. **Page S 13076**

Withdrawal of Treaties: S. Exec. Res. 1, directing Secretary of the Senate to return to the President in accordance with his request the following treaties, was reported: (1) Protocol, dated at The Hague September 28, 1955, to amend Convention for the Unification of Certain Rules Relating to International Carriage by Air, signed at Warsaw October 12, 1929 (Ex. H, 86th Cong., 1st sess.); and (2) Convention (No. 109) Concerning Wages, Hours of Work on Board Ship, and Manning, adopted by International Labor Conference at its 41st (maritime) session at Geneva, May 14, 1958 (Ex. L., 86th Cong., 2d sess.) (Ex. Rept. 16). **Page S 12985**

Treaty To Be Voted On: By unanimous consent it was agreed that Senate will vote at 3 p.m. Monday, September 18, on adoption of resolution of ratification of Consular Convention between U.S. and France, together with Protocol, and two exchanges of notes relating thereto, signed at Paris on July 18, 1966 (Ex. I, 90th

Appendix

Address by Hon. John J. Wicker, Jr., Richmond, Va., Before National Association of American Legion Historians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 18, 1967

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, the National Association of American Legion Historians held its annual breakfast meeting in Boston on August 27. One of the major addresses delivered at that meeting was by former State Senator John J. Wicker, Jr., of Richmond, Va., who is the past national president of the Society of American Legion Founders and one of the three surviving members of the Legion's first national executive committee.

I ask unanimous consent that Senator Wicker's remarks be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The American Legion, the largest and greatest of all veteran organizations of any country in the world, was "conceived" and its birth begun in Paris March 15–17, 1919, by representatives of all branches of the American Expeditionary forces. The "birth" of the organization was completed, officially and definitely, in St. Louis May 8–10, 1919.

The Founders of the Legion were men of vigor and enthusiasm and proven patriotism. In their deliberations, the Constitution of the Legion was adopted, along with splendid resolutions implementing the purposes and ideals of the organization.

In the nearly half century that has passed into history since the Founders gathered and deliberated and acted, The *American Legion has had to overcome many obstacles* and solve many problems. But, it has steadily grown in stature and influence for the good of our beloved America.

Today, The American Legion with its vast and cosmopolitan membership, is found in every part of the world.

Truly, *"the sun never sets on the American Legion."*

As we look back through the years to the very beginning of The Legion, it seems obvious that *the Founders must have been blessed with divine and providential guidance.*

Amongst the many important decisions they made, were first and foremost, a *recognition of Almighty God* and a declaration demonstrating *love and loyalty to our Country.*

They decided that the organization would *include all who had served honorably in the armed forces* of the United States during "the Great War," regardless of where they were located, branch of service, or rank or grade.

They further decided that while Legionnaires, as good citizens, would be expected to stand up and be counted for the best interests of our country, at the same time *the organization itself must not become involved in partisan politics.*

They further decided that the Legion would concentrate upon rehabilitation of disabled veterans; *national defense* strong enough to insure national security; *100% Americanism* which would combat all subversive ideologies and anti-American activities.

In addition, they dedicated the Legion to individual and organizational *service to community, state and nation.*

In the nearly 50 years that have passed, *The American Legion has remained true to the ideals* established by the Founders.

History has already proven that our Nation would have avoided many of the woes and misfortunes of the past and of the present, if the declarations and recommendations of The American Legion had been accepted and followed by our Governmnt.

New blood and new vigor have come into the Legion for many years in the form of veterans of World War II and veterans of the Korean War. And now, for nearly a year, the Legion has been further strengthened by the admission of American veterans of the Viet-Nam war. They have proven just as loyal and devoted to the high principles and noble ideals set forth by the Founders as had been demonstrated by the veterans of World War I.

Thanks to the foresight and support of the Legion, all of these veterans of World War II, Korea and Vietnam, found conditions here at home far better than World War I veterans faced upon their demobilization.

Although we had sustained over 100,000 casualties prior to the 1918 Armistice, no sort of G.I. Bill of Rights had been enacted or even introduced. *Not a single Veterans' Hospital had been erected or even authorized.*

Totally disabled veterans after honorable discharge had to apply to the U.S. Public Health Service, the War Risk Insurance Bureau and other governmental agencies—and all they could get—after struggling through rounds of red tape—was a certificate authorizing a civilian hospital to take them in at $3.00 per day, if beds were available.

In most cases no such beds were available. *The resulting situation was pitiful and deplorable.*

In my own home town (Richmond, Va.) the only hospitalization many disabled veterans could get was on the top floor of the City Jail, where Legion volunteers and patriotic ladies looked after them as best they could.

These disgraceful conditions were never remedied until after the Legion had been fully organized—with an initial membership of over a million veterans—and took the lead in bringing about national hospital construction, the consolidation of veteran agencies into one national organization, and the drafting and passage of sensible rehabilitation laws.

No wonder that so many veterans—when they recall conditions in 1919–21—fervently say *"Thank God for The American Legion".*

Great progress has indeed been made by the Legion for care and welfare of disabled veterans and widows and dependents of those who have passed on into "the Golden Legion."

Substantial progress has been made in bringing about national recognition of the necessity of keeping our national defense fully abreast of fast moving developments.

Subversive elements have been vigorously combatted and constantly exposed by the Legion's devotion and practical demonstration of Americanism.

The Legion's service to "community, state and nation", can hardly be over-estimated.

But, my friends, we cannot afford to rest upon our laurels of the past. *Our greatest danger today is complacency mixed with apathy.* There is no room for either in America or in any other part of the free world today.

Indeed, if we are to survive and hand down to posterity an America worthy of the ideals upon which the Legion was founded, we must be ever on the alert, guarding against the *"treason termites"* of this era—the insidious influences which seek to infiltrate every phase of American life, *boring from without, and from within.*

It is utterly repulsive to all truly patriotic Americans to see rampant violence and defiant lawlessness in so many parts of our country today. Mob riots, brazen looting, pillage and destruction of life and property—all occur in every part of our beloved land. Many different causes and excuses are volunteered by various people. Worst of all is the fact that *some of our highest governmental officials have publicly encouraged lawless irresponsible elements* to disregard and break any and all laws they do not personally approve.

These terrible things do not just happen—accidentally or spontaneously. They are planned in advance and directed from one central source. *Down underneath it all is the cunning, treacherous, diabolical hand of international Communism.*

One of the most outstanding achievements of The American Legion occurred forty years ago when it successfully organized and conducted the *"Second A.E.F."* That was, and still is, *the largest peacetime trans-Atlantic migration in all history.*

Thirty-four great ocean liners steamed out of Boston, Quebec, Montreal, New York and Hampton Roads carrying nearly 20,000 Legionnaires on their "pilgrimage of remembrance" to the battlefields and American war cemeteries abroad. As National Director of that gigantic undertaking, I was privileged to accompany General Pershing and National Commander Savage on the Captain's bridge of the USS "Leviathan"—which was the flagship, as it led our great fleet on that historic journey.

Some of you here today—like myself—can still experience the thrill of memory recalling the scenes in our cemeteries in France, Belgium, England and Italy, when Legionnaires knelt and placed poppies on graves of our fallen comrades, symbolically assuring them that their buddies in the Legion had not forgotten, and would not forget.

As American Legionnaires, faithful to the principles enunciated and adopted by the Founders, *we must never cease to concern ourselves with the welfare of the disabled, with the supreme importance of national security, and with the preservation of law and order and our American heritage*—"the faith of our fathers."

We must keep ever uppermost in our minds and hearts, and in our daily lives, that the Legion was founded, and has grown great, and will continue to grow, in vitality and usefulness, *by fidelity to the noble prin-*

ciples and ideals set forth in the *Preamble* to our Constitution, based fundamentally upon *devotion and loyalty to God and Country.*

> "Great God of Hosts, be with us yet,
> Least we forget; Least we forget."

Japanese American Citizens League Banquet, Chicago, Ill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1967

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, on September 3 the Japanese Ambassador, Takeso Shimoda, addressed the Japanese American Citizens League banquet in Chicago.

It was his first public address since assuming his diplomatic post in Washington and we in Chicago were honored that he made this important address in our city.

Ambassador Shimoda's remarks deserve to be read by all Americans, for they represent all that is finest and progressive about modern Japan. We value our alliance and our economic and cultural ties with Japan.

Ambassador Shimoda ably represents his country and his people and I believe my colleagues will find his speech of great interest.

Mr. Speaker, his remarks follow:

ADDRESS BY HIS EXCELLENCY, AMBASSADOR TAKESO SHIMODA AT THE JAPANESE AMERICAN CITIZENS LEAGUE BANQUET, CHICAGO, ILL., SEPTEMBER 3, 1967

Mr. Chairman, Distinguished Guests, Ladies and Gentlemen:

Thank you very much for your cordial reception. It is a great joy to me to meet the distinguished members of the Japanese American Citizens League because I know that you and I are both working in our separate spheres towards a common goal—that is, to try to build up a deeper understanding and stronger friendship between the United States and Japan.

This happens to be my first public speech after assuming my duties in Washington as the Ambassador of Japan, and it is a very special pleasure for me to be able to deliver my maiden speech here in Chicago.

Chicago is the center of the Midwest which is the industrial heartland of the United States and it is rapidly becoming one of the most important cities in U.S.-Japan relations. Until recently, many Japanese considered the Midwest as an isolated region within the United States, inaccessible to Japanese businessmen because of its reportedly protectionist tendencies. But Japan has reevaluated the significance of the Midwest. We have discovered the Midwesterners are not protectionists at all but rather that they are willing and ready to understand Japan and to establish closer economic ties with us.

Japan, as you all know, is a nation whose economic survival is totally dependent on foreign trade and hence it is only natural that we for our part are more than willing to expand our trade with the American Midwest. Midwesterners, too, have realized the necessarity and benefit of increasing trade with Japan. In 1966, the twelve Midwestern states sold $683 million worth of farm and factory products to Japan. Within ten years by 1975, Midwestern exports to Japan are expected to more than double to a figure of approximately $1,500 million.

You will recall that last June an Economic Mission, headed by Mr. Kazutaka Kikawada, President of the Tokyo Electric Company and one of the most influential leaders of the Japanese business community, visited the six Midwestern states of Illinois, Minnesota, Wisconsin, Indiana, Ohio and Michigan. The Mission's visit was a tremendous success. The fact that it received the warmest welcome everywhere and was able to exchange frank views with leading citizens of the Midwest indicates the already high level of mutual interest. That this mission specifically selected the Midwest as the area for its visit and that a large group of more than a hundred Chicago businessmen, in turn, are scheduled to visit Japan this November illustrate the strong mutual interest and desire to increase the level of economic cooperation. We are hoping that communication between Midwesterners and the Japanese will be established on a regular basis and all signs indicate that this hope is likely to be achieved.

But it is not just the prospect of economic gain alone that brought Japan closer to the Midwest. To a great extent this was made possible through the friendship and understanding that already existed between Japanese-American and the native Midwesterners. Twenty-five years ago, when persons of Japanese ancestry were evacuated from their West Coast homes, it was here in Chicago and the Midwest that many received the warmest hospitality and found new homes. Even during the unfortuante period of strained relations between the United States and Japan the citizens of Chicago well demonstrated their good will.

The Japanese-Americans responded with a display of disciplined and dedicated conduct indicative of truly first class American citizenship and their tremendous contribution in the past quarter century to bring about the current acceptance and understanding of Japan cannot be too highly praised.

I have long felt that the United States of America is a unique experiment in human history in the sense that it was founded, not on racial or national origins, but on the ideal of freedom, liberty and equality between all men. The United Nations is an attempt to translate a similar ideal into the international society, but it appears that the stern realities of international politics will keep the United Nations from realizing its full potential for some time to come. On the other hand, the United States of America is already a living reality, and no other country on earth offers such opportunities for such a wide range of diverse contributions from its citizens. It is a great source of satisfaction to me to be able to note that the Japanese-American contribution to life in the United States is gaining in importance and weight, and that the significance of such contribution is being recognized by your fellow Americans of different backgrounds.

The accomplishments of Japanese-Americans are living proofs of my belief, after many years of service abroad in various foreign countries, that relations between states always come back to the individual. States are merely groups of individuals, whatever may be the ties which bind them into a cohesive whole, and hence mutual understanding or feeling of closeness between them is but the sum total of numerous personal contacts. Before the war few Japanese resided in the Midwest or the East Coast and for this simple reason many Americans of these areas tended to misunderstand Japan or to consider Japan as a very distant nation in the Far East largely irrelevant to their daily lives. But Japanese-Americans who moved to this area dispelled, by their excellent conduct, any myths or prejudices that might have existed previously, helped win recognition for the Japanese and Japan as a trustworthy people and nation, and laid the groundwork for the present excellent cooperation between the United States and Japan.

I should now like to say a few words about the nature of the existing friendship between the United States and Japan, and its relation to the present world political situation in general. During the last decade great changes have taken place in Asia and the Pacific region. First, Japan, starting from scratch, has more than recovered from the almost total destruction of the war. Economically it is today one of the five major powers in the world in terms of its gross national product, which reached the unprecedented figure of $101.3 billion in 1966. Japan continues to be the leading shipbuilding country in the world, a position she has held consecutively since 1956, and is also the world's leading maker of transistors and other electronic products. Japan ranks second, only after the United States, in the production of automobiles, and her steel and steel products rank third, only surpassed by the United States and the Soviet Union. Politically, too, the so-called "post-war" era may be said to have ended when Japan ratified a treaty with the Republic of Korea last year, thus normalizing its relations with all the countries of the world except Communist China.

Japan is now entering a stage where it is actively formulating its new foreign policies from a fresh point of view. What then is this "new stage" that Japan is entering? In order to understand the true meaning of Japanese re-emergence in the world arena, one must read it against the background of the changing political situation in Asia which Secretary Rusk once described as the "new wind in Asia."

One of the most notable aspects of this "new wind" is the Asian realization of the need to make concerted efforts towards the most basic objective shared by all Asians—the conquest of poverty. In April last year, the Japanese Government took the initiative in calling the so-called "Tokyo Conference" where Asian countries discussed basic principles of cooperation for economic and industrial development of the countries of the region. This was followed up by more concrete proposals for development projects, mainly in the fields of agriculture and fishery, at the second meeting of the countries concerned held in Manila this spring. Another example of regional cooperation in Asia is the establishment of the Asian Development Bank last year. This Bank was established mainly by the initiative of the Asian countries themselves, with the United States and Japan being the two largest contributors of funds, and it is designed to meet Asia's development needs by pooling technical and professional resources and providing a consultative machinery.

In this context, the new role Japan sincerely desires is that of active initiative in the rendering of its services towards the economic development and social stabilization of Asia. But such a role brings with it responsibilities which Japan is not yet capable of assuming all by herself. Even though Japan is by far the most advanced industrial nation in Asia, it still has not accumulated sufficient capital to embark upon economic assistance of major magnitude to the less developed countries of the region. In 1966, Japan's economic assistance to the developing countries amounted to approximately 0.7% of its total national income. We are now making our utmost efforts to reach the target of expending 1% of our total national income for external assistance, but we are in great need of active cooperation from other advanced countries bordering on the Pacific. Japan no longer requires economic assistance of this nature from the United States for its own development, but in view of the United States' commitment to the development of Asia and its evident role as the major Pacific power, we would greatly appreciate the cooperation of the United States in this important field. Australia, New Zealand and Canada, which are not Asian countries but, as Pacific countries, share an increasing interest in the welfare and stability of Asia, have already expressed their intention to lend their active support for a joint development of the Asia-Pacific region.

Against this background, you will see that friendship between the United States and Japan does not concern our two countries alone. It is truly a matter of concern for all of Asia. The United States and Japan are, in effect, partners participating in a joint venture, the outcome of which affects the destiny of all Asians. And since the prosperity and stability of the Far East is the key to preserving world peace, it is absolutely necessary that the U.S.-Japan partnership should be strong and durable.

It is my feeling that in our official efforts further to improve and consolidate friendly relations between our two countries, the warm support and understanding of Americans in all walks of life is essential. In this respect the members of the Japanese American Citizens League occupy a unique position. Though full fledged Americans by birth and by upbringing, they also feel an affinity towards Japan and the Japanese because of their ancestry and because of their cultural heritage.

I salute the distinguished members of the Japanese-American Citizens League for their great contribution to the furthering of this essential understanding between our two great Pacific nations and I wish you all continued strength and health in your endeavors.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF HIS EXCELLENCY, AMBASSADOR TAKESO SHIMODA

1907: Born in Tokyo, Japan.

1931: Entered Diplomatic Service.

1931: Attaché, Embassy of Japan, Paris, France.

1934: Attaché, Embassy of Japan, The Hague, Netherlands.

1940: Third Secretary, Embassy of Japan, Nanking, China.

1943: Second Secretary, Embassy of Japan, Moscow, Soviet Union.

1945: First Secretary, Embassy of Japan, Moscow, Soviet Union.

1945: Chief, First Section, Treaties Bureau, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Tokyo, Japan.

1946: Chief, Treaties Section, Treaties Bureau, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Tokyo, Japan.

1946: Chief, Archives Section, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Tokyo, Japan.

1946: Chief, Accounting Section, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Tokyo, Japan.

1948: Chief, Treaties Section, Treaties Bureau, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Tokyo, Japan.

1950: Director, Japanese Government Overseas Agency, The Hague, Netherlands.

1952: Counselor, Embassy of Japan, The Hague, Netherlands.

1952: Director, Treaties Bureau, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Tokyo, Japan.

1957: Minister Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary, Embassy of Japan, Washington, D.C., U.S.A.

1960: Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Belgium..

1963: Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Soviet Union.

1965: Vice-Minister, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Tokyo, Japan.

1967: Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the United States of America.

Comparison of Korea and Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 18, 1967

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, there is a striking analogy between South Vietnam and South Korea.

I have seen a number of articles discussing the similarity between these two countries and the events which have shaped their history. However, a most succinct statement on this situation appeared in the Thursday, September 7, 1967, issue of the State newspaper, an editorial entitled "Korea's Example."

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the conclusion of these remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KOREA'S EXAMPLE

South Vietnam today could well be described as the South Korea of yesterday. Pursuing the analogy one logical step further, the South Vietnam of tomorrow could be the South Korea of today.

This optimistic vindication of the American presence in Southeast Asia is not just the hopeful conclusion of *The State*, it is the openly expressed conviction of American diplomats and military men in the Far East. And, more to the point, it is a view shared and promulgated by many Asians who count on the United States as their chief bulwark—at least for the present—against a Communist tide which, if unchecked, would soon roll over all of the Orient.

The road ahead for South Vietnam is beset with obstacles, detours, and slippery places. But so was the path taken by the non-Communists of North Korea in the early 1950's.

All of the derogatory and discouraging things being said about South Vietnam today were being said of South Korea when that courageous nation began fighting for its life against Communist aggressors. Go back through the files of the Korean War days and you will find the same sort of charges which today are being leveled against the South Vietnamese.

They won't fight for themselves, so why should Americans fight for them?

There is too much corruption in the government.

They don't know anything about democracy and it won't work there.

You can't depend on their military forces.

There's no real hope of winning the war against an enemy backed by Red China.

If the United States carries the fight to the enemy, Red China would begin World War III.

The people don't have any real interest in who rules them.

So much for the allegations. Now, what of the consequences?

Today, thanks to the United States and the United Nations, Korea stands as a strong and developing nation, possessed of a large and highly competent military establishment, a surging economy, a boisterously democratic government, and an unflagging determination to thwart the spread of Communism.

In short, the free world—by its timely aid to a fledgling nation in desperate straits—thas fostered the growth of a viable and vigorous ally in its resistance to Communism.

The Korean experience stands both as an example and incentive to South Vietnam. Bit by bit, the South Vietnamese are overcoming the same sort of criticism which was laid, justly or unjustly, at the door of the South Koreans.

But it is not the Vietnamese who need to ponder the Korean anology so much as the Americans who despair of their involvement in Asian affairs. Today, the free world is stronger because of the fight made in—and for—South Korea. Tomorrow, the same can be said of South Vietnam if we and our allies persevere through these difficult days.

Justice Department Should Investigate Plan for Revolution Revealed by Writer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAN KUYKENDALL

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1967

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to insert a column written by Alice Widener which appeared in the Memphis Commercial Appeal on September 15, 1967.

The writer reveals open threats of revolution, violence, murder, and burning voiced at a meeting held in New York during the past week. Will the Department of Justice make a serious attempt to investigate this report, or will it follow its usual practice of ignoring the threats until after it is too late?

Mr. Speaker, it is time the Government took steps to prevent lawlessness before it happens by taking action against those who are openly threatening to burn down our Nation.

The Widener column follows:

SOCIALISTS TAKE "PULPIT" TO PREACH BURNING

(By Alice Widener)

NEW YORK.—While comfortable, complacent capitalist Americans went to church or played golf or lolled around at home reading the papers or watching TV last Sunday morning, a Black Power workshop session at the Third Annual Conference of Socialist Scholars at the New York Hilton Hotel was talking about burning down 20 American cities next year and waging "a military struggle in the streets." The session took place in the Rhinelander Gallery which seats 1,000 and was filled to overflowing, with standees along the walls.

Sic transit gloria mundi.

After the cities are burned and shot up, next year, "downtown" as well as in the so-called ghettos, and after blood has run in the streets, there doubtless will be congressional and presidential investigating committees—as there were this year—to find out why the riots (rebellions, insurrections) took place.

Probably Senators Robert F. Kennedy, Javits, Clark and McGovern will speak their pieces next year as this year, claiming there was no outside instigation of the riots which were started by drifters up from the South, or by young hoodlums, or by a regrettable incident involving a charge of "police brutality."

Probably Huntley, Brinkley, Sevareid, Mike Wallace and Sander Vanocur will broadcast their analyses of what happened.

Probably the Washington Post, New York Times, Chicago Tribune, Los Angeles Times, Look, Life, Newsweek and Time will carry front page stories about the revolution and horrifying pictures of it. Democratic and Republican candidates will express their shock and indignation at the bloodshed while reaching out for votes and promising billions for urban reconstruction.

What I want to know is where were the press and congressional and presidential investigators on Sunday morning? Why weren't they where I was? After Watts, Cleveland, Newark and Detroit, why weren't they at the Red-Black Power session held from 10 to 12:30 a.m. by the Socialist Scholars in the Rhinelander Gallery at the New York Hilton?

Had they been there, they really would have found out some facts of life in our nation today. They would have heard chairman James Boggs of Detroit set forth all the strategy and tactics for Red-Black Power destruction of 20 cities in our nation next year.

They would have heard Ivanhoe Donaldson, campaign manager for Julian Bond in Georgia, declare that next year the revolution will move from the black ghettos to the white ghetto banks and draft centers and everywhere else. They would have heard Donaldson say, "There's a Chase Manhattan Bank at 125th Street in this town. We're trying to get jobs in a bank we ought to destroy."

They would have seen Socialist scholars Raymond S. Franklin of Queens College and Gilbert Osofsky of the University of Illinois in Chicago share the dais with Boggs and Donaldson and utter nary a word of outraged protest.

They would have heard the Black Power spokesmen and Communists explain why guerrilla warfare in the United States is different from that in Cuba and other countries where it starts in the mountains and countryside.

They would have heard in plainest, coldly calculated detail why guerrilla warfare in our country is best conducted, from the strategic military point of view, in the cities where a combination of violence and sabotage can "bring down the system." They would have heard Ivanhoe Donaldson boast, "In Detroit, we defeated the police and the National Guard." They would have heard Boggs' reply to the question whether the blacks and whites could ever live together in our nation, "The whites have to struggle against another set of whites and the struggle will be equally as violent."

There is only one way to save our country now from revolution and bloody counter-revolution intigated by the Red-Black Power criminals. The United States Government must move now to round up and imprison the intellectual and activist leaders. Otherwise, woe be tide our land.

San Antonio Summer Programs for Children Merit High Praise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 18, 1967

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I have recently received a copy of a report relating to the 1967 summer programs for children and youth in the city of San Antonio, Tex. This impressive report, compiled by Mr. Joel E. Falcon and Mr. Jess Gratehouse, assistant regional directors of the State department of public welfare, presents a laudable picture of the dedicated caseworkers with the aid to families with dependent children programs in San Antonio, who have worked untiringly to involve AFDC children and youth in one or more of the summer programs. Mr. President, these men and women who do the actual "legwork" for these programs are the ones most deserving of this Nation's praise, for it is only through their inspired efforts that a cold and seemingly distant law, no matter how sincerely motivated, is warmly and personally translated into meaningful action—in this case, a better opportunity for the children of our AFDC families to enjoy a productive and rewarding life.

In order that others may see the fine work that these people are doing in San Antonio, I ask unanimous consent that the report on their 1967 summer efforts be printed in the appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUMMER PROGRAMS FOR CHILDREN AND YOUTH

In order to accomplish the objectives outlined in PA–M 304, planning towards this end was initiated during the month of May, '67. This consisted of a careful caseload review to determine the actual number of children that we would be working with during subsequent months in this effort to get as many children as possible involved in some form of summer activity. The ages of the children concerned were also noted in anticipation of a Head Start Program for Bexar County.

Information on summer programs and activities that would be available to Bexar County children started to crystalize during the latter part of May. During supervisory and other staff meetings we began to formulate plans whereby staff members were given assignments to make direct contacts with these resources. The objective, of course, being to get first hand information about these programs and simultaneously to make known our interest to involve as many of our AFDC children in these as possible.

One of our major objectives this summer was to get as many of our eligible children involved in the Head Start Program. In 1965 we had encouraged our AFDC parents, mostly through correspondence, to involve their children in Head Start as well as other limited summer activities that were available in the county. In 1966 we approached the matter in a more realistic manner by personally encouraging the parents and in many instances the children themselves to enroll and participate in all available summer programs and activities in Bexar County.

In 1967 as soon as word was released by the local news media that Bexar County would again participate in a Head Start Program, we set our wheels in motion. When the local EODC office received word that this project had been approved we contacted that Agency to get specific data concerning this resource. They, in turn, noting our interest pledged their full support and cooperation in getting our AFDC children enrolled.

A committee of local staff members developed a form letter to be shared with our AFDC client at the time of our discussion about the Head Start Program. The plan was to have this letter serve the dual purpose of introduction of the parent and child as well as a check system that would give us some specific data regarding the acceptance or non-acceptance of each child referred. The proposal was shared with the Program Associate and Head Start Coordinator at EODC and he not only assured us of his approval of the referral plan, but added that he would send a directive to each Head Start Project Director with a sample copy of this referral letter to alert them of our procedure and to request their full cooperation with our Agency.

The response by all concerned was overwhelming. We not only received information from the schools about children that had been enrolled in the Head Start Program, but also about children that had been enrolled in the ongoing pre-school age program during the previous spring school semester, and who are well prepared for their first school experience this fall.

The first hand reports resulting from caseworkers' visits to the school rooms are plentiful and most encouraging. In most instances parents concerned are non-English speaking. In the beginning the children were reluctant to become involved in the Head Start Program, nevertheless, the end result was usually adequate adjustment and fast learning taking place during the course of the program.

Typical quotations from workers' reports indicate, "The mother is very pleased with the Head Start Program. She stated that she wished her oldest son, Alberto, had enrolled and perhaps now he would be doing much better in school. She also expressed the fact that the Head Start Program provides the child with many things he misses at home as she is not able to help him. She is able to help him speak English . . ."

From a contact with a teacher we learned, "Like the other children, Benjamin's initial attitude of noncomformity changed during his involvement in the Head Start Program. He now conforms to rules of the program, the rules of play among other children and to the rules of the school . . ."

From another report, "Before Orlando entered the Head Start Program he was very timid and depended on his mother for almost everything he did and wanted. This child made very good progress in the Head Start Program. Obviously it helped him to have more confidence in himself as I found him able to carry on a very rational conversation in the absence of his mother. He also seemed to be more aware of the people around him . . ."

The number of children involved in Bexar County Head Start Program as a result of our concerted efforts was no doubt small, nevertheless, we feel, effective. As a follow-up to the emphasis in this area this summer, it is now planned that a carry over during the regular school semester will be attempted. Obviously, if this plan can be carried out on an ongoing basis, eventually all of our AFDC children needing pre-school help will be involved.

Advance, Inc. is a local national youth corps project funded through the labor Department under Title II. The purpose of this project is to secure summer employment for children of low income families. In years past most of the jobs we reassigned to children selected by school counselors. In 1967 they granted us an "exclusive" and we immediately set out to refer as many of our unemployed children over the age of 16 as could be contacted. Again the response to this local resource was overwhelming. Not all of the referrals that were made were accepted nor did they all follow through on job referrals. Nevertheless, those that crystalized (which often occurred only because of the concentrated caseworkers' efforts of our staff) met with a good degree of success.

The following report of a success story involving Advance, Inc. has been quoted in full to show some of the typical obstacles that some of these children enocuntered and how they were eventually removed.

"When I received notice that Advance, Inc. had job opportunities for summer employment for children in low-income families, I immediately placed a call to Hector, son of my AFDC client, Elva. I explained what the opportunity would mean to him and he became very enthusiastic and promised to call Advance, Inc. immediately for an application blank.

"Two days later I was in the family's home on a routine visit and I helped Hector with his application and we readied it for mailing.

"The next I heard of Hector was a call from his mother, thanking me for helping Hector and telling me that he was to start to work the next day at St. Lukes Episcopal Church which is in Alamo Heights and not easily accessible by bus. So, I was happy to know the family appreciated the job even though it presented a transportation problem.

"About a week later I received a call from Mr. Contreras, the counselor at Advance, Inc. saying Hector was not working and he requested my permission to call Hector in for an interview to see what had happened. I consented to this request. Hector went to Advance, Inc. office and he had a very interesting story.

"It seems on the first day of work Hector borrowed a friend's car to drive to work and he had to return the car before the work day was over. So, long before quitting time Hector got in the car and left and did not return. In addition, to this, Hector had shown up for work dressed in his Sunday best suit and he was completely in the wrong clothing for the work they had lined up for him.

"The next morning Hector tried coming to work on the bus and he arrived much too late on the job, which annoyed all concerned. As it turned out there was really only enough work for four and Hector was the fifth person. So, Hector did not come back. It was after that that the counselor talked to Hector again about job responsibility and punctuality, etc., and then Hector was placed on a job at the San Antonio TB Hospital where, according to Mr. Contreras, he is working out fine. He has solved his transportation problems, he knows the proper dress and he has a new concept of time. Mr. Contreras has visited with Hector since his transfer and Hector is happy in the job and he has a good work attitude.

"The Advance program involves a forced savings plan. Each worker designates a certain amount of his weekly pay which goes into savings and each worker is issued their own individual savings books. They can watch their savings grow during the summer, thereby assuring a lump sum available to them late in August when they need to purchase school clothing, books, supplies, etc. It was interesting that Hector wanted to save the maximum allowed, leaving for himself just enough for transportation and a few incidentals.

"I feel Hector has had a few traumatic experiences this summer in connection with getting calmed down and into the right job. I am sure he has learned more than those who slid into the program without problems. This might be the summer this 16 year old boy becomes a man. Mr. Contreras of Advance, Inc. handled the counseling of Hector very professionally and I was glad he put this young lad back on "the right track" as the family is indeed needy and Hector's earnings will assure his school attendance this fall."

This year was no doubt the first in the history of this country when recreational facilities for children in all sectors of town were readily available. These facilities included the city organized and conducted recreational facilities as well as baseball leagues. Neighborhood centers both public and private as well as SANYO (San Antonio Neighborhood Youth Organization) played a very important role in filling in the recreational youth gaps in the city heretofore left uncovered.

Employment opportunities for the youth of this county has always been an area of concern to educators. School districts have independently carried out their own "Career Days" with some degree of success. In 1966 the idea was conceived to have a similar program held at one central location for all interested children in the community. From this unique concept evolved the first Youth Opportunity Fair held in 1966, the second of which will be held September 19–20, 1967. The purpose of this fair is to inform the youth, especially those from social and economically deprived groups of the occupations that offer them the greatest opportunities. This fair is aimed at all youth in the county between the ages of 14 and 21 regardless of whether enrolled in school, graduates or drop outs. The fair consists of exhibits from business, industry, labor, government, nonprofit organizations, etc. These exhibits will depict the job opportunities that exist within these areas of endeavor. The exhibits will be manned by personnel who can answer questions about specific occupations in the exhibitors' field of work.

Currently we have many of our staff members assisting to plan the program for the 1967 Fair. In addition, as caseworkers are contacting the families they are discussing the fair with parents as well as children whom they feel may benefit from it. It was interesting to note that a survey made by a member of our local staff has revealed that Bexar County has 37,928 junior high school and 39,326 high school students. Therefore, considering the pledge of cooperation made by the 14 school districts in the county it is anticipated that a good portion of these 77,000 children may attend the fair thereby learning the immediate and future prospects of employment, the educational and other training requirements of these jobs, the opportunities for advancement, where to get job placement counseling, aptitude and proficiency testing, range of salaries in their field of interest, etc.

It should be added that nationwide attention has been drawn to the Youth Opportunity Fair with the Chairman of the President's Council on Youth Opportunity, Hubert H. Humphrey, pledging his support.

The foregoing is but a sketchy outline of activities that took place during the summer of 1967 in our efforts to get as many of our AFDC children involved in some form of summer activity. The credit for that accomplished must be given to the caseworkers who did the actual "legwork" both in getting information about resources as well as counseling and encouraging the parents and children to take full advantage of these. Hopefully, many of the resources available this summer will be available during the school months. If so, it is our endeavor to continue making full use of these in order that all children in our AFDC families may have a better opportunity for a normal and productive life.

STATE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WELFARE STATISTICS ON SUMMER ACTIVITIES CHILDREN AND YOUTH

There are approximately 10,000 children and youth, from one to twenty-one years of age, under the Aid to Families with Dependent Children program in Bexar County.

Some 50 per cent of them were enrolled or participated in one or more summer programs. The following statistics show in what programs these young people participated:

Program	Age level	Number of participants
Headstart [1]	6 years old	[1] 730
Recreation	5 to 21 years	2,095
Summer school	13 to 16 years	29
Employment	16 to 23 years	335
Youth opportunity center	16 to 21 years	228
Health care	1 to 22 years	982
Camping	10 to 22 years	152
Manpower development and training (MDTA).	16 to 23 years	23
Other programs	6 to 23 years	259
Total children and youth enrolled in all programs.		4,833

[1] Includes number of children who were enrolled in preschool academic school year program.

SURVEY ON NUMBER OF JUNIOR AND SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS IN BEXAR COUNTY

On May 25, 1967, I made a telephone survey on the total number of junior and senior high school students in Bexar County.

I contacted fourteen (14) school districts and obtained each district's total enrollment as of May 1, 1967.

The report which follows is the result of this survey.

NUMBER OF JUNIOR AND SENIOR HIGH STUDENTS IN BEXAR COUNTY

School district	Junior high school students	Senior high school students	Total
Alamo Heights Independent School District, 7101 Broadway	940	1,846	2,786
East Central School District, Stuart Rd	406	621	1,027
Edgewood Independent School District, 6458 West Commerce	3,396	4,260	7,656
Fort Sam Houston Independent School District, Winans Rd	320	446	766
Harlandale Independent School District, 102 Genevieve	3,600	3,650	7,250
Judson Rural School District, Old Seguin Rd	245	350	595
North East Independent School District, 10214 Sommers	2,837	2,256	5,093
Northside Independent School District, Evers Rd	3,946	6,681	10,627
San Antonio Independent School District, Lavaca at Matagorda	18,385	15,192	33,577
Special education enrollment, SAISD	239	169	408
Schertz-Cibolo Independent School District, Schertz	428	572	1,000
South San Antonio Independent School District, 2515 Navajo	950	1,200	2,150
Southside School District, Martinez Rd	505	398	903
Southwest Independent School District, Macdona Rd	287	339	626
San Antonio Catholic Archdiocese Schools, 9123 Lorene	1,444	1,386	2,830
Total	37,928	39,366	77,294

There are, then, approximately 77,294 junior and senior high school students enrolled in some fourteen (14) school districts, in approximately sixty-three (63) junior and senior high schools.

Representative Whitener Addresses Combed Yarn Spinners Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. FLYNT, JR.
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 18, 1967

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, September 15, 1967, our colleague, the Honorable BASIL L. WHITENER, delivered an address to the 42d annual convention of the Combed Yarn Spinners Association at Sea Island, Ga.

During his entire service to date, Representative WHITENER has been a recognized leader in the preparation of legislation which bears directly and indirectly on the interest and importance to the American textile industry.

His knowledge of this industry has been gained over a lifetime of close contact and association with all segments of this industry and the persons who comprise it in both employee and employer capacities.

He is an articulate spokesman on the subject of this industry because he has a basic knowledge of it and has continued to be an enthusiastic seeker after more knowledge.

His presentation last Friday was an outstanding one, and it is with pleasure that I include it at this point in the RECORD:

Address by Basil L. Whitener, Member of Congress, Before 42d Annual Convention, Combed Yarn Spinners Association, September 15, 1967

I am honored to participate in this final convention of the Combed Yarn Spinners Association. This is an historic occasion in the annals of the textile industry since it marks the beginning of the American Spinners Association, an organization which will combine the talents of those primarily interested in the carded yarn field with yours.

I am proud of my textile heritage. Through this heritage, I have developed an abiding interest in the industry and its service to its employees and the economic welfare of our nation.

The Southeastern region—and the State of North Carolina particularly—is dependent up on a dynamic and thriving textile economy for its economic well-being. The weekly wages of thousands of textiles employees constitute the warp and woof of prosperity for our merchants, professional men, and related businesses.

As an example of the importance of the industry to our region, we note that in North Carolina alone our textile plants are capitalized at more than $1.18 billion. This figure does not include the capitalization of hosiery and garment plants. Textile properties have an assessed valuation of $983 million resulting in millions of dollars in tax revenues to our state and local units. Tarheel textile workers earn more than $1 billion per annum out of a total payroll in North Carolina of $2.5 billion for all workers.

The record shows that the volume of trade of the textile industry with some other industries is as follows:

$100 million with the trucking industry, $240 million with the paper industry, $150 million with private power companies, $190 million with sheep ranchers, more than $1 billion with the cotton farmer, $2.4 billion with the man-made fiber industry, $640 million with machinery manufacturers, $500 million with the construction industry.

These are mere examples of the value of a vibrant textile industry to the economy of our nation.

When we add these contributions to our economic welfare and the fact that in the United States $4.6 billion is paid out in wages to employees each year, we begin to realize the essentiality of the preservation of the industry.

No organization has been more keenly aware of the necessity for growth and stability in the textile industry than the Combed Yarn Spinners Association. You have made your voices heard. Those voices have been of great assistance to me as I have sought to represent our area in the Congress of the United States. For that assistance I extend to you my sincere thanks. I express the hope that you will continue to provide guidance and counsel as we seek to protect the jobs of thousands of our fellow Americans who work in your plants.

Recent years have produced burdens for your industry which have made your business climate cloudy. These burdens resulted in great measure from unwise and unrealistic government programs. Other basic American industries are now feeling the pinch of the same unrealistic government actions. They are now joining hands with us as we seek to find solutions for our problems.

This is particularly true in connection with the imports of excessive amounts of foreign-made goods. These other industry people are now joining with us in urging effective import controls by our government.

They are joining with us in making the American people aware of developments in the field of foreign trade during the past 20 years. They are helping point out that our domestic and economic policy has been reshaped in such a way as to do injury to the economic hopes and ambitions of the American people.

We are all properly alarmed that our exports of manufactured products have been decreasing as imports have made an alarming growth in volume. Let me illustrate by briefly reciting statistical data relating to facets of our industrial situation.

(a) Between 1950 and 1965 the number of nations producing commercial steel grew from 32 to 65 nations. In that period the volume of world export of steel more than doubled, going from 23 million tons in 1953 to 51 million tons in 1965. Of this new foreign steel production, 20% of it has come into the United States, notwithstanding the fact that our own steel mills have the capacity to supply all of our needs.

(b) Foreign shoe manufacurers are now shipping into this country 23% of our total domestic production of shoes, causing the loss of thousands of jobs to American shoe workers.

(c) Within the past 10 years we have seen the importation of rugs in this country in such volume as to now command 70% of the American market.

(d) In 1957 only 4.2% of foreign-made athletic goods were shipped into the United States. 84% of our domestic athletic goods market in 1966 was supplied by foreign-made products.

Many other examples of this dramatic and devastating invasion of the American market could be given.

This rapid depletion of American industrial opportunity commenced with the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act of 1934 when the Congress surrendered to the executive agencies the regulation of international trade. With each passing year, these administrative agencies have played a heavier role in trade policy.

In my judgment, there will be no appreciable relief for our American workers and industries unless significant Congressional action is taken. This action will be taken when the people of America are convinced that trade agreements must be based on economic considerations rather than upon international political considerations. The record of no industry can equal that of the textile industry in pointing out to our people the dangers of foreign trade policies based primarily upon international political considerations.

Because of a foolhardy approach by persons in our government we now find many high officials in both the executive and legislative branches asserting that the textile industry is expendable. Only last year in the House of Representatives one of my colleagues, who was a delegate to the recent Kennedy Round negotiations in Geneva, said: "It would seem to me that imports could be substantially higher without damage to the domestic cotton textile industry."

This same gentleman also advocated discontinuing the Long Term Arrangement and called for stepped up activity on the part of the Congress to see that our government guarantee a larger share of the domestic textile market to foreign countries. He further advocated that developing cotton textile exporting countries should unite under the auspices of the United Nations and present a united front combatting those of us who believe that we must have a more realistic trade policy for our domestic industry.

These contentions are made in a glib manner, notwithstanding the shocking statistics which are available to these misguided persons. They know, as you and I know, that in 1963 United States textile imports amounted to $646 million and that in 1965 this figure had grown to $880 million. In 1966 the figure had risen to $1 billion 34 million of textile imports, a fact which seems to worry these free traders very little.

These same people know that Japan, Hong Kong, Mexico, and India furnish more than half the United States textile imports and are crying for a larger share of our market.

I know that you join me in being alarmed that in 1966 we only shipped to Japan $4,040,000 worth of man-made fiber and fabrics, while at the same time the Japanese manufacturers shipped in $161,510,000 worth of the same type products—a difference of $157,470,000.

Most of the countries flooding our nation with cheaply-produced textile products have no reluctance to building barriers against the entry of American textiles into their countries.

A good example is Brazil. The United States has furnished vast amounts of money in economic assistance and trade concessions to that country and has permitted it to furnish 6% of all of our textile imports while we purchase 31% of its total coffee production.

When the American manufacturer seeks to ship textiles to Brazil he is faced with the requirement of an import license and after the license is granted a 100% ad valorem duty for cotton cloth and a 120% ad valorem duty for synthetic fabrics.

Colombia, another of our South American neighbors, has been the recipient of many favors from the United States. Yet they also have a licensing system which makes it virtually impossible to do business in their country.

Mexico has a similar policy. In those two countries, tariff duties may range from 100% ad valorem on denims to nearly 300% on synthetic fabrics. These are not isolated examples. The same conditions apply in many other countries of the world where we seek to do business. Their ideas of reciprocity are bizarre, to say the least.

The evil results of this strange approach to international trade are not confined to the textile industry. They are nationwide in their scope. When we consider that the balance of payments deficit is in large measure attributable to textile imports, we realize that it is not just a local or limited problem. We have seen our gold reserves go from $23 billion 252 million in 1952 to $10 billion 93 million in 1966.

This trend will continue unless there is an immediate change in our national approach in world trade. Textile imports represent approximately one-half of the total volume of our annual balance of payments deficit at this moment. In the light of this fact it is inconceivable to me that any American could fail to demand a return to sanity in our trade policies.

For 16 years we have experienced a deficit in our international accounts in each fiscal year, with one exception. How long can we continue such practices?

Many of us are also concerned with the fact that practically every foreign country shipping textiles into the United States has a flourishing trade with our communist enemies.

In 1965 our nation did almost $300 million in trade with communist and satellite nations. During this same period trade between some of our so-called friends and communist and satellite nations amounted to $15.8 billion. Thus, we see that we are affording to nations engaged in active trading with our communist enemies a virtual open textile market in the United States while we send to them our foreign aid dollars.

The question of East-West trade is now commanding the attention of many American people. They are demanding that the United States' policies be reexamined quickly.

On August 1, 1967, I introduced in the House of Representatives a resolution calling for the establishment of a select committee to investigate all facets of East-West trade. It was gratifying that within a few days more than 100 members of the House had introduced identical resolutions.

It is expected that the House Rules Committee will consider this resolution within the next few days. If this resolution is approved by the Congress, I believe that the select committee can render a great public service in making available to the nation all of the facts surrounding the subject of trade with communist nations and their satellites.

Recently more than 100 members of the House and 61 members of the Senate have joined together in demanding Congressional action to further limit textile imports. We have said, in effect, that we have no faith in the negotiated import arrangements and agreements made by executive agencies of the government.

We were all delighted that Congressman Wilbur Mills, Chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, which has jurisdiction over foreign trade legislation, has agreed to be the principal author of this legislation and is joining in the demand that a realistic approach be substituted for present policies.

If enacted into law, this legislation will bring about an equitable and orderly program of textile trade in such a way as to prevent market disruption, unemployment, and foster a healthy climate for a strong and growing domestic textile industry.

The major cause for optimism for the future of this legislative proposal is the fact that the popular and able gentleman from Arkansas, Congressman Mills, has agreed to lead the fight. His sponsorship of the legislation will be most persuasive to many of our colleagues.

Another legislative proposal, which has not received great publicity, has been sponsored by Congressman John Dent of Pennsylvania. It results from 2 years of investigations and hearings by Mr. Dent and his subcommittee. They have studied the impact of imports of all types upon domestic employment opportunities.

The Dent bill, which has been reported favorably by the House Committee on Education and Labor, proposes substantial curtailment of imports when a finding is made that such imports deprive Americans of jobs and job opportunities. The bill would take the matter out of the hands of those bureaucrats who heretofore have been so blind to the loss of employment resulting from excessive imports.

The Dent proposal is a sound approach to the problem and deserves the support of the textile industry and all Americans who are interested in the preservation of a vibrant economy.

Another heartening development in recent months has been the accelerated interest of labor, industry, and agricultural organizations in bringing about textile import controls. Just a few days ago the National Cotton Council went on record in favor of greater controls on imports of textile products.

At about the same time the United Textile Workers Union of America stated to the President of the United States its dissatisfaction with the Kennedy Round negotiations as they affected textiles. The Union stated to the President: "We do not believe our present foreign trade policy is achieving the purpose it was supposed to achieve. There has been no appreciable rise in the living standards of the people of those countries which are the major beneficiaries of our present policy."

It might well have been added that unless sensible policies are immediately instituted the living standard of our American textile workers will be seriously lowered.

This heightened activity in behalf of the domestic textile industry on so many fronts gives us reason for the conclusion that affirmative action will be forthcoming during the 90th Congress. I know that you join in the hope that this relief will come promptly.

As I conclude, I would like to bring to your attention another legislative activity in which I am directly engaged. I believe that it has a direct impact on the economic well-being of the domestic textile industry and many other business sectors. This activity has gone on for 7 years as I served as a member of a special subcommittee to study state taxation of interstate transactions.

This long investigation clearly shows that there are domestic trade barriers in the form of state and local taxes which are similar to some of the problems that we see in the field of foreign trade. These barriers are harmful to American business. They have come about in large measure because of conflicting court decisions and the eagerness of local state tax administrators and legislators to impose heavy burdens on out-of-state business organizations doing business within their states.

We were told by reputable businessmen that many industries find it easier to locate in foreign countries and market their products in the United States than to ship domestically produced products across state lines.

A legislative proposal, co-sponsored by members of our special subcommittee, is now awaiting debate on the Floor of the House of Representatives. It will be my responsibility to manage the debate when the bill is called up. Unless we have the support of the busines community, I apprehend that the bill is in jeopardy because of the bitter opposition of the several state tax administrators who do not want their playhouse disturbed.

Briefly stated, the legislation would permit a small company in one state to do business with other states without burdensome and capricious regulation by the taxing authorities in states where the company has no local property and no local employee.

The data collected by our subcommittee during our long study indicates that the bill would not significantly affect the amount of revenue collected by any state. On the contrary, we believe that it would in the long run bring about an increase in revenues because of accelerated business activity.

In our own State of North Carolina much misinformation has been dispensed by those who would confuse the issue. I urge that each of you carefully consider the merits of the legislation and urge your own Representatives in the Congress to support it.

It has been a pleasure to be with you at your great convention. I commend you for the zeal that you have for providing greater employment opportunities for our people through an expanded and healthy textile industry. Your leadership is essential for the economic health of our nation.

Those of us who have been raised in the mills and in communities where the textile industry has provided so much leadership are grateful to you.

As you merge into the American Spinners Association, I wish you every success and urge that you continue your zeal for a better America.

Increasing Federal Control of State Educational Systems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, September 18, 1967

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, each day we are witnessing new efforts by this administration through the U.S. Office of Education, to bring our schools under total and absolute Federal control.

Many of the controls which are being exercised by the Federal Government today would have met violent resistance by the public if they had not been effected in a piecemeal manner.

Local control of matters pertaining to education is vital to the very preservation of our Republic, for only through control of these processes could a totalitarian government retain authority over the people.

An excellent article on the tactics to which we have been subjected in this area has been written by Dr. George H. Aull, consulting economist, South Carolina National Bank, and has been published by a large number of newspaper editors in my State. This editorial, under the title "Politics vs. Education, Who Will Win," was printed in the September 12, 1967, issue of the Dillon Herald, and I ask unanimous consent it be printed in the Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the conclusion of these remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POLITICS VERSUS EDUCATION: WHO WILL WIN?

(By Dr. George H. Aull)

The Bible says that "Parables are given to us for our enlightenment." From whatever source, many of the great teachings of past generations are couched in the language of parables and have come down to the present not only by word of mouth but through primary and elementary texts which for so long combined knowledge with wisdom and learning with the development of character.

Unfortunately, this is no longer the case and there is a terrific waste of time and energy as a result. How much better it would be if Johnny could be made to understand that "The wicked flee when no man pursueth" instead of wasting his time on nothing more profound than "Run, Dick, run; see Dick run." Before it is too late, someone should compile a "Dictionary of Parables" for the benefit of today's unenlightened—and it might be a good idea to include a hint concerning their applicability.

There is, for example, the marvelous old parable which admonishes the unwary concerning the evils of allowing a prying stranger to get his "foot in the door." The same idea, of course, finds expression in another great parable which teaches that, unless the camper enjoys sleeping with camels, it is best not to permit one to get his nose under the edges of his tent.

Somewhat along the same line, an old story says you can't kill a frog by dropping him in boiling water; he reacts immediately and jumps out. On the other hand, if you put the frog in cold water and then warm it up gradually, he doesn't make up his mind to jump until it's too late—by then he's cooked!

All of this brings to mind the inescapable and obvious fact that the federal government is getting its feet very far into the door of our schools and its nose quite effectively under the tent of a whole series of activities which formerly were the exclusive concern of the localities involved, and even the private concern of individual citizens acting for themselves.

Maybe it's just the weather, but the evidence is strong and ought to be convincing that the water is getting a might hot. If there is any freedom to be preserved or any jumping to be done, it's about time we got started.

Just the other day, a federal judge in Washington who knows nothing about educational techniques and apparently not a great deal about law, ruled that an "honors curriculum" introduced 14 years ago by an experienced school superintendent and highly respected educator in the District of Columbia as a purely academic device, is "discriminatory" and, therefore, unconstitutional and must be abandoned. The superintendent has resigned in protest, calling this "clear evidence" of a "concerted attack upon public education" by people in "high political office" with the connivance and support of "social activists in the Office of Economic Opportunity and the Department of Health, Education and Welfare."

These are some of the same people who have been warming the water—and not too gradually—over the past several years. It is a frightening thought that, had we been dropping in suddenly, we would not have hesitated to jump out immediately.

Oh, well, "Experience teaches a dear school but. . . "

The Republic of Indonesia: Outlook for Stability

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1967

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, September 30, 1965, marked a series of events in the Republic of Indonesia that were of extreme significance to the development of Southeast Asia. On this date an attempted coup, instigated by the Communist Party of Indonesia—PKI—was thwarted by the military authorities. The attempted coup led directly to a bloody purge of thousands of Communists in Indonesia and further, to the eventual fall from power of President Sukarno. The decline of Sukarno, a man who was having an extremely questionable effect on Indonesia and the entire area, and the rise of General Suharto and a new Cabinet, including the imaginative Adam Malik, provided a great lift to Southeast Asian expectations. I would like today to make a few remarks on the beneficial ramifications of the new Government and include in the RECORD an excellent work by Ralph Baxter, one of my interns, on the developments since 1945 and the social and cultural makeup of that country which provide the foundation for present conditions.

The administration of General Suharto, in its first few months, appears to be on the road to serious progress. The administration is taking a realistic view of the problems that confront Indonesia. They have declared an end to the "sloganism" that once characterized the Government. Rather than try to cover up their problems, the new Government is willing to admit that they exist and to attempt to find a solution. This new attitude is apparent in several recent developments in the island republic.

There is much discussion of postponing the elections scheduled for July of next year. The reasons for the proposed delay are mainly technical. It is hoped that the Parliament can find a solution to two problems that have plagued Indonesia for many years: First, the legislature, due to the method of elections, has failed to accurately represent the people; and secondly, the proliferation of political parties and interest groups has prevented a clear delineation of issues during a campaign. The Parliament is now discussing possible measures, and if it appears that a delay would mean a significant difference in the quality of the government the elections will be postponed.

The Republic of Indonesia has also long been burdened with the danger of Communist insurrection. After the attempted coup of 1965, many serious measures have been taken to prevent the recurrence of the Communist problem. Most of those who had important roles in the uprising are now in jail and the PKI has been banned from any further political activity. Although a hard core of Communists still operates within the Republic, they have lost almost all of their influence and following. In fact, the Government is now having a problem protecting the Chinese Communist Embassy in Djakarta against demonstrations of anti-Communist groups. The Government permits, however, instruction about communism in the schools; they feel that the best protection against future outbreaks is the education of the people to the realities of the modern Communist systems. There is little chance that the Indonesia Government will again tolerate a Communist buildup.

Indonesia is now making a serious attempt to reenter the world community. Since the fall of Sukarno, it has rejoined the United Nations, ECAFE, the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank, the Asian Development Bank, and is beginning to take a more active part in the Colombo plan as well as the newly founded Association of Southeast Asian Nations. Indonesia is now making a sincere effort to reopen friendly relations with nations throughout the world. The new administration believes that the nations of Southeast Asia can go far toward helping each other in their drives toward economic stability and will be active in most programs designed toward that end.

Although Indonesia is open to participation in organizations for regional economic cooperation, she is firm in her stand against any form of military or political alliance. Indonesia wishes to have warm relations with all nations, desiring to maintain an active, yet independent foreign policy.

Indonesia's relations with Malaysia are of special significance. These two nations have long been involved in serious conflict. Today Indonesia is making realistic steps toward the renewal of friendly relations between the two. Both countries signed a pact on August 11, 1966, and full diplomatic relations will be restored shortly.

Indonesia's most serious problems, certainly, are economic. Suharto's administration has already done much toward overcoming the dreadful situation it found itself in at the time of its rise to power. First, the Government has rescheduled their foreign debts through the cooperation of their creditor nations. Second, they secured an emergency loan of $200 million to finance immediate necessities of the economy.

Third, the administration has made a number of reforms. Steps have been taken to control the inflation; imports have been limited to the products deemed essential at this time—foodstuffs, spare parts for industrial development, material for construction, and so forth—export-import regulations and foreign investment laws have been rewritten to alleviate the problems that emanated from those two areas. At the same time, the Government has instituted public works to repair the dilapidated transport system that gravely hindered commerce. Further, Indonesia is scheduled to start on a 5-year plan in 1969. It is hoped that by that time the economy's most pressing problems will have been adequately controlled in order to make possible realistic long-range planning.

We can expect substantial progress from Indonesia in the future. Growth and development seem certain, along with an increased contribution to the stability of Southeast Asia—through internal stability and participation in regional programs. It is important that we understand the problems and resources that Indonesia has to contend with. Mr. Baxter's work should be of value in this regard, and at this point I include it as part of my remarks:

THE REPUBLIC OF INDONESIA: OUTLOOK FOR STABILITY

(By Ralph H. Baxter, Jr.)

Today, the eyes of the world focus on Southeast Asia. This small once insignificant area, far behind most of the world in technical and economic development, now divides the East from the West: both geographically and through the question of affiliation. It is here that the major powers of East and West are locked in an ever growing conflict for control and leadership. While attention is greatest to the conflict in Viet Nam, one of the most important nations of Southeast Asia and one which must receive a great deal of consideration is the Republic of Indonesia. Lying between the continents of Asia and Australia and straddling the major sea lanes connecting Western Asia with China and the Pacific, Indonesia commands one of the most strategic positions on the globe. Rich in national resources and the world's largest archipelago, Indonesia is also the fifth largest country in population.

These islands have long been a center of trade, but today their significance is far greater than international commerce. The internal stability of Indonesia plays a key role in world affairs. If Indonesia has the stability to remain independent and sovereign, it will provide a buffer between East and West and thus a measure of security for the world. If, however, it is weak enough to fall prey to Communist infiltration or to the constant beckoning of the West, it will create a decisive advantage for one side or the other. Consequently, a brief look at Indonesia's internal situation could be extremely enlightening as to the future course of Southeast Asia.

THE STRUGGLE FOR INDEPENDENCE

The national motto of Indonesia is "Unity Through Diversity." This slogan is indeed fitting for the young Republic; at first glance it seems incredible to consider this vast and highly diversified archipelago as a national unit. The first stirrings of Indonesian nationalism are usually dated from the turn of the century, when the Dutch finally integrated the entire island system into the Dutch East Indies. Through this external definition of the territory, the peoples could identify as parts of one definite political and economic system. The actual formulation of a nationalist movement, based on this common identity, began with the exposure of a number of Indonesians to Western nationalism and liberalism through education in Western schools. This group, mainly sons of Indonesian aristocrats, was small in number, but of vital importance.

They became aware of the glaring discrepencies between Western political thought and the realities of the Dutch East Indies. These realities were: discrimination in jobs and pay, discrimination in their social contact with the Dutch and discrimination in educational opportunities. These circumstances were not in accord with the theories of human dignity and equality flourishing throughout the Western world.

Moreover, the Indonesians faced growing poverty, pitiful educational facilities, and tremendously insufficient health facilities. A spirit grew among these young students that something must be done to correct these injustices. They perceive the resolution of these problems not merely in an end of foreign control, but in the rise of a new and independent Indonesian state based on modern social and economic concepts of justice.

The first organizational steps of a nationalist movement took place as early as 1908, with the founding of the *Budi Utomo* or "Glorious Endeavor." The *Budi Utomo* was originally formed by a group of students as a cultural society, but it quickly took on political overtones as discussion centered upon the concepts discovered through Western education. Other more politically oriented groups developed as the years went on, highlighted by the formation of the Indonesian Nationalist Party (PNI) in 1926. This became one of the largest and most radical groups, standing without compromise for Indonesian independence and led by the man who was destined to lead the republic from its inception: Sukarno.

This group was forced by the Dutch to disband within two years of its organization and Sukarno was jailed.

In 1932, two other very important men entered the nationalist picture: in 1932, Sultan Sjahrir and Mohammed Hatta returned from Europe to form a Socialist Party, also standing for independence. In 1933, all three leaders (Sukarno had been released) were forced into exile, but their writings, especially Sjahrir's *Out of Exile* and Sukarno's many pamphlets, helped keep the spirit of nationalism alive. The Dutch were also of great assistance during this period, though indirectly. Through their supression of all nationalist groups they served only to "fan the flames" of the nationalist spirit; the activities of the Indonesian parties had been merely discussion and promulgation of ideas to this point, but the actions of the Dutch further outraged the nationalists.

Another step taken by the Dutch in an attempt to temper the nationalist movement, was the formulation of the *Volksraad* or People's Council in 1918; this served only as a place for the various movements to unify rather than a conciliatory move intended to pacify them. It was in the *Volksraad* that the various nationalist groups drew together in the years from 1939 to 1941 and formed the Indonesian Political Concentration, for the first time using the "daring" word—Indonesia.

The nationalist movement made great progress and gained solidarity during the Japanese occupation which began a few weeks after the bombing of Pearl Harbor. Sukarno and Hatta as well as other leaders of the movement accepted responsibilities of authority in the Japanese administration, with the ulterior purpose of furthering their own ends. Thus they gained much power and experience for the coming revolution and were kept in the public eye. Meanwhile, Sukarno and Sjajrir worked extensively with underground groups. The Japanese also served the nationalist cause by continuing practices of racial discrimination against the Indonesian peoples and resisting moves for independence; an opposition still existed at which to aim the nationalist sentiments.

By late 1944 and early 1945, as their military defeats continued, the Japanese resistance to nationalist pressures weakened. On June 1, 1945, Sukarno announced to the people the *Pantja Sila*—the Five Principles. These principles (Faith in God, Humanity, Nationalism, Representative Government, and Social Justice) were the foundation upon which an independent Indonesia was to be based. In this speech he said further:

"We will establish an Indonesian national state. . . . This is what we must all aim at: the setting up of one National State upon the unity of one Indonesian land from the tip of Sumatra to Irian! . . . The national state is only Indonesia in its entirety, which existed in the time of Shrivajaya and Majapahit, and which now too, we must set up together . . . let us take as the first basis of our state: Indonesian Nationalism. Indonesian Nationalism in the fullest sense."

This was the true beginning of the revolution. Just two and one half months later, on August 17, 1945, Sukarno proclaimed independence. The vast archipelago had become one national entity; unified, Indonesia was now prepared to enter the military struggle for her sovereignty.

Sjahrir later wrote that the effect of the proclamation "was as if our people had been electrified." The Indonesian people "rose to the occasion" as fighting broke out immediately. The Japanese forces, which had been directed by the Allies to maintain control of the area until the British troops arrived, were quickly defeated by the revolutionary forces. Unable to secure assistance from the United States or the United Nations, the Indonesian government moved its capital to Jogjakarta and prepared for a long struggle. The British, who did not arrive until six weeks after the proclamation, quickly realized that nothing short of full scale war could suppress the Indonesians. They pressed the Dutch to reach a settlement with their rebellious colony. Consequently, the Linggadjati Agreement was signed in November of 1946. This agreement failed to hold, and the Dutch launched a full scale attack on the Republic in July 1947.

The United Nations Security Council in a series of resolutions called for a cease-fire. After months of negotiations the Renville Agreement was signed aboard the USS Renville on January 17, 1948. But the Dutch were still not through: they set up a stringently enforced blockade against the areas controlled by the Republic. This greatly weakened Indonesia and caused an attempted communist take-over in September of 1948. The rebellion dragged on for almost two months before it could be contained. Then, with the manpower of the Republic at a low point, the Dutch violated all prior commitments and agreements and launched another full scale attack on the badly weakened Indonesians. But, to the surprise of all concerned, the Indonesians fought back with incredible energy and success. With an almost complete lack of modern arms, the Indonesians waged a struggle, vividly demonstrating the depth of national feelings in the new Republic. Although they were not able to defeat the Dutch, they were able to maintain their position. The Dutch, although prepared to defy the mandates of the United Nations, finally realized that there was no hope of regaining control over the stubborn new Republic.

Indonesia's sovereignty was finally realized in December of 1949. Had the Indonesians not felt so strongly the desire for independence, they could never have continued the struggle over this four and one half year period. The revolution not only demonstrated the degree of nationalist sentiment, but also, in its spirit, served to further unify and solidify the Republic of Indonesia. The people of this archipelago now considered themselves a nation. They felt a strong responsibility to the Republic and looked for great rewards from it.

A FLEXIBLE YET UNIFIED SOCIETY

The twentieth century has witnessed a tremendous change in the social system of Indonesia. A great trend developed away from the traditional structures of authority and status distribution. This trend began during the Dutch colonization period with the advent of a money economy and trades. People began to free themselves from ties to rural villages and agrarian societies and question the assumptions on which the old society was based. Western education, also beginning in the Dutch period, served to undermine traditional Indonesian standards.

The Japanese, during their period of occupation, further infringed upon the traditional static order and loosened the bonds of social life. The propaganda of the Japanese played a major role, but most significantly, they recruited a large number of young Indonesians from the ordinary classes for positions of administration and police. This not only gave these people authority for the first time, but it also often served to move them away from their birth places and thus tear them away from their traditional environment. Through administrative positions the young Indonesians gained footholds in the economic controls of the nation which diminished the social distance between themselves and the aristocracy. The greatest shattering of social barriers took place, however, during the revolution.

Farmers and common laborers found themselves leading guerrilla forces and holding other important positions. This led to a growth in self-confidence and pride among the Indonesian people. A feeling of true equality spread throughout the nation; people from cabinet ministers to taxi drivers regarded each other as *bung* (brother or comrade). This egalitarian trend led, of course, to a denunciation of traditional criteria of birth and family rank for social status. Man began to receive recognition and prestige for what he did—not who he was. Certainly this spirit of egalitarianism has subdued since the struggle for independence, but the aristocratic traditions were permanently broken; the status structure of Indonesia now sought a new order.

Because no landlord class existed in Indonesia and the aristocratic considerations had been forgotten, many people expected Indonesia to have a classless society after the revolution. There are, however, other criteria for ordering a society and modern Indonesia can indeed be seen to have a stratified social structure. This structure correlates to a great degree with the position one holds within the new power structure. Education garners one of the highest social levels as it does in political circles. Professional men and university professors share an extremely high degree of prestige. Although Indonesians have never valued highly the mere amassing of money as an occupation, the rising business class can also be seen to have a high social status for their positions of tradeship and authority. Certainly the leaders of the government maintain high positions in the Indonesian social structure also; again for the authority they possess. Civil service employees of lesser ranks, tradesmen, and skilled laborers are found in the middle ranges of the social strata. Manual labor and farming are on the bottom. Great numbers of Indonesians, as a result of their newly found independence from traditional ties, are abandoning the soil and moving to the city to seek a better life. This trend combined with increasing educational facilities gives Indonesia a growing rate of social mobility. Not only has the structure of society changed in the past decades, but the members of that society today are able to change their individual positions as well.

Certain unifying and stabilizing factors are evident in modern Indonesian society. First of all, the concept of *Adat*, or customary law, which encompasses many aspects of social relations and which is similar throughout the islands in its approach to the essentials of life, has remained unaffected by the great changes that have taken place. The most prevalent element of the *Adat* is *gotong royong*, a concept of mutual assistance. *Gotong royong* has a much more positive character than merely helping someone who is in need; it is a concept that things are to be done by the entire community for the entire community. *Gotong royong*, which originated in rural agrarian communities, has, since independence, grown to be a national code. It is expressed in many governmental publications and can be seen to have a great stabilizing force on the new Republic.

A second unifying force is the increasing loyalty of the Indonesian people to various types of mass organizations. This is especially true of the younger generations. Groups such as labor unions, agrarian peasant organizations, student movements, and political parties are attracting the energetic participation of Indonesian citizens. People draw together to further common goals and desires in all spheres of their lives. Social standing may even be affected by one's position in an organization and the status of that organization within the society. The unifying effect of this collective tendency has extreme significance. They provide a definite substructure to the nationalism that binds all people together. In drawing together, Indonesians are recognizing the aspects of their lives that give them a collective meaning and a national sort of kinship above old racial considerations. This greatly adds to the stability of the nation as a whole.

The third factor leading toward Indonesian unity can be seen in the prejudice exercised against certain ethnic minorities within Indonesia. For much of their history, the people of Indonesia were considered second rate citizens. The Dutch, the Chinese, the Japanese, and even the Indo-Europeans held higher social positions and exercised discrimination against the native inhabitants of the archipelago. After the revolution, the Republic took quick measures to clarify the Indonesian social structure. Nearly all Europeans and Japanese were ousted; only a limited number of Indo-Europeans were allowed to remain. Today widespread prejudice exists against the Chinese, Arabs, and Indians. These feelings are not based on racial considerations since the Indonesians are extremely open to foreign ideas and customs, but is a result of their strong feelings of national pride. The Republic of Indonesia belongs to the natural and racial citizens of those islands first; they are the leading and most important people and thus will receive the greatest respect. Members of other racial groups must accept lower positions of social acceptance. Once again, one sees a unifying force: a definite social value is attributed to being an Indonesian. This serves to further articulate the bonds of the society of the Republic.

The new society of Indonesia can be seen then, to further stabilize the nation in a number of ways. In general, the social systems serve to accentuate the importance and meaning of being Indonesian. Without forces such as these, the great physical separation of the peoples of the archipelago could make the Republic little more than a nominal organization.

RELIGION IN INDONESIA

Religion in Indonesia also acts as a stabilizing and unifying device. It is one of the few elements of the culture of that state which has remained relatively unaffected by the social and political revolutions which have taken place in the last thirty years. This stability can be attributed to the almost innate capacity of the Indonesian people to reconcile differing views and to adapt and adopt varying religious beliefs into their own religious codes. Religious tolerance is one of Indonesia's proudest attributes. When they speak of tolerance, however, Indonesians refer to a concept much more positive than the ordinary connotation of allowing different faiths to live and worship together without antagonism; the Indonesians have, throughout history, been very open to proponents and ideas of new faiths. The ancient religion of Indonesia was one devoted to the worship of ancestors and to animistic beliefs, endowing all of nature with a living spirit which must be propitiated and honored.

Around the sixth century, the influx of Hindu and Buddhist faiths began. As can easily be seen in the architecture of the sixth century, these faiths did not replace the original religion, but rather they merged with it. In the eleventh century came the influence of Islam and again a merger took place between the existing religion and the new one. The effects of Christianity during the Western colonial period, although much smaller in magnitude, can be seen to have followed a similar course.

In Indonesia today, this remarkable synthesis of religious philosophies and traditions, which constitutes one of the most important aspects of the whole structure of Indonesian life, can be seen in the fusing of ideas from the ancient religion to those of the various imported faiths and in the merging of all religions. Statistically, ninety per cent of the population of Indonesia is Moslem, six per cent is Hindu, and four per cent are Christians and followers of other faiths. But statistical descriptions and delineations of Indonesian religion have little meaning and may be misleading. There is no clear-cut pattern with sharp lines drawn between faiths; it is rather a complex design with subtle shadings, the one into the other. The central theme of Indonesian religious life is the importance of maintaining harmony in one's relations with supernatural and natural forces and with one's fellowmen. This is based on the ancient belief in a divine, cosmic order of nature in which all aspects of life, including after-life, are woven into an harmonious pattern. Among rural communities and among city people who have received little or no education, many of the elements of animism and ancestor worship remain today and there is a broad strain of mysticism in the beliefs of many Indonesians. Further, while religions may differ in fundamental doctrine, many of the same symbols and rituals are used today by all Indonesians regardless of faith.

The strength of the Moslem religion today can be attributed largely to its susceptibility to the Indonesianizing process. The early leaders of the Islamic religion in Indonesia accepted the *Adat* in preference to many of their own legal and social codes; the *Adat* was often sanctified by ritual.

In modern Java, many religious ceremonies which are nominally Moslem include many elements of the Hindu religion. There are many rituals in the faith which have Islamic names, but which have little or no connection to the standard teachings of Islam. The Five Pillars of Islam, the basic Moslem code, have been modified to meet cultural needs in Indonesia.

Many of the various rituals of Islam are not energetically adhered to. The practice of praying five times a day is forgotten by the majority of Indonesians and very few can afford to make the pilgrimage to Mecca. Yet Islam can be seen to have a substantial influence on the life of every Indonesian. For example, Friday, the day of prayer, is honored throughout the archipelago with all work halting at 11:00 A.M. Moslem is the major religion of Indonesia, yet it is not the same faith that was brought to the islands in the eleventh century; it has been Indonesianized.

Christianity has had very little effect on Indonesia. The Western people came to Indonesia primarily for economic motives; they wanted to take from the land, not give to it. They were not interested in spreading Western culture to the islands. The little Christianity which has taken root, however, has been modified by the Indonesian culture.

In discussing the religion of Indonesia, one must be aware of the fact that it is not based upon one definite set of precepts, but falls into a pattern which had resulted from the modification of many religious doctrines and cultures. A certain degree of tension has arisen between the orthodox Moslems and the majority of Indonesians over this synthesizing. But in the overall picture, religious tolerance in Indonesia can be seen to be a very valuable cultural element. The spiritual beliefs of all the people have a common foundation. This further extends the spirit of kinship of the various peoples of the archipelago. Moreover, it lends a degree of stability and solidarity to Indonensian culture. The religion has been modified to fit the cultural foundations of the people; it is consequently deeply seated in their lives and very unlikely to be discarded.

EDUCATION

Education is a highly valued goal in Indonesia, both on the individual and national levels. Tremendous progress has been made in the field of education, but need still exists for increased facilities. Lack of educational opportunities was one of the key motivating factors in the Indonesian cry for independence from the Dutch. In 1940, with a population of seventy million, ninety-three per cent of the people of Indonesia were illiterate; only six hundred and thirty students were enrolled in colleges in their own country; and only two hundred and forty graduated from public high schools. The only adequate education was to be found in the Dutch schools or by going abroad and very few Indonesians had the money for either. Early in the Republic, steps were taken to remedy the situation. Student groups participated in a "Mass Education" program. They went out into the villages to teach the people to read and write. Classes were held for the children during the day and for the adults at night when the day's work in the fields was concluded. Resources were extremely limited for instruction. The general practice was for those who mastered the fundamentals to assist in the instruction of others. Despite the war, illiteracy was reduced to seventy per cent by 1950. Today only ten to fifteen per cent of the population is illiterate and these are primarily the elderly. Labor unions, political parties, and other private groups continue to sponsor literacy classes. This war against illiteracy admirably demonstrates the spirit of *gotong royong* discussed earlier. Once again, unity is evident in the Indonesia culture.

In the area of formal education, progress has not been as rapid. The schools and facilities must wait for the economy to progress before they will be adequate. In 1960, approximately seven million children were enrolled in elementary school; five hundred thousand were enrolled in high schools, vocational schools, and colleges. The education that is available is serving to further stabilize the nation.

The young people are educated in the language, history, and national symbols of the state. They are made more aware of the meaning of the workings of their nation and the world around them and thus are better able to serve their country and strive for its growth. Yet much work must be done in Indonesia to substantially raise the intellectual level of the people. The Indonesians are caught in a difficult situation: industry needs more trained personnel to enable it to raise the level of the economy, while increased training facilities require a higher economic level. In education, the outlook is not quite as bright as in other areas.

THE NATIONAL LANGUAGE

The development of a national language was an extremely significant step for Indonesia's culture. There are over two hundred languages and dialects spoken throughout the archipelago. Although all of these belong to the Malayo-Polynesian linguistic group, a native of one part of Indonesia often cannot understand the local tongue of another area. Thus, to facilitate national unity, a national language has been developed. The new language is called *Bahasa Indonesia*. The national language was first called for by the nationalist congress in 1928. In the early thirties, a new magazine "Pudjangga Baru" (The New Post) championed the use of *Bahasa Indonesia* in prose and poetry. During the Japanese occupation the national language was given great impetus as an instrument of national unity when it was officially used by the administration. In 1945, the government of the Republic established a Language Commission to guide the growth and expansion of the language; this commission works were actively to educate the people to the precise use of the language and to develop accurate terminology.

The new language is based on the pure Malay tongue, but has adopted words from Sanskrit and Arabic—traces of Indonesia's linguistic history. It also borrowed many words from the Dutch, Portuguese, and English. *Bahasa Indonesia* is written in the Roman Alphabet. The language is used today in all government publications, most newspapers and magazines, films and other forms of public entertainment; it is used in all school after the first two years; many classic works of European, American, and Asian literature have been translated into *Bahasa Indonesia* as well. Although people from the same area still tend to use the local tongue, *Bahasa Indonesia* has become a significant symbol of a "sense of cultural unity."

TROUBLED ECONOMY

The Indonesian economy is a "study of extremes and contrasts." Although Indonesia ranks as the world's third richest nation in natural resources—a leading producer of rubber, tin, and oil, with vast expanses of fertile soil, rich mineral deposits, good sources of natural power, and tremendous manpower potential—she stands just above the poorest nations in standard of living. It was the wealth of these islands that made Holland a world power, yet today she has trouble supporting herself. The standard of living in Indonesia today is fifteen per cent below the pre-war level; per capita income was under one hundred dollars in 1960. Inflation is running rampant: between the fall of 1965 and the spring of 1966, the general price index rose five hundred per cent; the rate of exchange is erratic—in May of 1965, four hundred and fifty Indonesian Rupia were worth one United States dollar officially, but were selling eight thousand for the dollar on the black market. Meanwhile, production is also declining. Exports have dropped forty per cent since independence; industry is functioning at twenty per cent of capacity. Transportation is miserable throughout Indonesia and the harbors are in terrible condition. Beyond all of this, the national debt currently stands at 2.4 billion dollars. The economy of Indonesia, despite its natural advantages, is in exremely poor condition.

Indonesia's current economic difficulties began when the Dutch departed. Along with the agreement made to secure sovereignty, the Indonesians were obligated to absorb a five hundred and sixty million dollar debt the Dutch had incurred. The Republic took over the management of a vast colonial economic system for which they were tremendously unprepared. They new Indonesian management lacked experience and the Dutch that remained were resentful of the authority of the new state and thus were a hinderance rather than an aid. Also, strikes broke out early in this period as people bickered for the fruits of the new nation. The military blockade that the Dutch set up before the final agreements were reached further handicapped the early Republic.

There were also many inherent weaknesses in the economic system which the Indonesians inherited from the Dutch. There was a tremendous lack of diversification; more than eighty per cent of the Indonesian people depended on agriculture for their livelihood. With the economy this lopsided, the Republic was forced to depend mainly on exports for stability. In turn, Indonesia is highly dependent upon the world market for her income. Yet world market prices for produced goods and raw materials do not always vary in the same direction. The cost of finished products often tends to rise, while prices for raw materials remain stable or decline. As a result, Indonesia often found herself sinking in an inevitable economic vortex. A further problem was that Indonesia lacked the social and economic overhead to take advantage of her industrial potentials: she lacked adequate roads, communication systems, power plants, skilled labor, experienced management, and other fundamentals for industrialization. Another difficulty arose in the area of capital investment. Being a basically agrarian society, Indonesia was highly dependent of foreign capital for growth. This of course put her in a compromising position. Obviously, the new nation found grave economic difficulties from the moment it was born. They could not possibly have been rectified over night, yet it is remarkable that the situation has not progressed by the present time.

The failure of Indonesia's economy to progress during its first thirty years of existence lies mainly with the government and its head, President Sukarno. At first, economic stagnation was blamed on the oppression of foreign capitalists. But after 1959, when Dutch estates were nationalized and various steps were taken to loosen the grip of the Chinese middlemen on Indonesian commerce, the leaders of the government began to run out of excuses for their failure to satisfy the cries of the people for *sandong pangan*—economic welfare. The government introduced a number of programs for economic development, but without much noticeable success. What Indonesia needed was reform, but Sukarno's regime seemed so "heavily committed to the status quo, which would not disturb the balance of forces supporting it," that few strong realistic measures were enacted. The plans and promises Sukarno did make were never realized.

Along with its failure to take meaningful, positive steps toward economic build-up, certain policies of the government can be seen to have had a detrimental effect on the economy. First, the economy of Indonesia was operated on a strong nationalist basis as opposed to one of internationalism. Indonesia turned inward, rather than looking outside for assistance. Sukarno was happy to accept foreign aid and loans, but stood firmly against any foreign investment of capital in Indonesia. Indonesia desperately needs the experience and capital resources of other nations to help build her industry and rectify her lopsided economy. Under Sukarno, this aid was forbidden. Furthermore, certain actions taken by the Indoneisan government especially the *Konfrontasi* with Malaysia, caused foreign aid from many nations to be cut off. Secondly, Sukarno's policies of expenditure were not consistent with the economic needs of the Republic. Sukarno consistently overlooked domestic economic crisis to finance the war against Malaysia; twenty per cent of the budget was spent on the war in 1964. In 1963, Sukarno spent twenty million dollars for stadiums, sports arenas and recreation parks. A placard appearing in a student demonstration in 1965 well expressed the needs of the Indonesian people: "Industry Yes—Monuments No!" People in the cities were finding it difficult to make ends meet, the peasants in the rural districts were living at a subsistence level, and Sukarno was building monuments to the spirit of Nationalism in Djakarta. As one reporter put it:

> "Most, if not all, of these shortages and shortcomings are the result of Sukarno's megalomanic desire to play on the world stage as head of a country with a huge army, navy, and air force, and to build expensive prestige projects that the country didn't need. To pay for everything Sukarno ran the government printing presses day and night, with the result that Indonesia has one of the world's worst inflations. Price of rice rose 2,400% last year—one of Indonesia's staples."

The government not only failed to develop Indonesia's economy, but in many instances actually hindered progress.

NEW HOPE

Amidst this dark cloud of economic despair, a ray of hope has recently shone. The recent change-over in the Indonesian government promises to bring progress to the economy. Immediately after General Suharto took over actual control of the government, foreign businessmen began arriving in Djakarta to make "soundings." Representatives from the Netherlands, the United States, and especially Japan are negotiating with the new government for the opportunity to develop industry in Indonesia. The new regime is very open to foreign investment, as evidenced by the return of the Goodyear Tire plant at Bogor to its owners and the institution of a more favorable monetary exchange rate for foreign oil companies. Steps have already been taken to halt unnecessary spending: the *Konfrontasi* with Malaysia is over; all of Sukarno's flamboyant projects have been stopped; Indonesia is entering the International Monetary Fund; and measures have been taken to tighten up the leakage of foreign exchange as well as the exertion of pressure on former governmental officials to return millions of dollars secreted in foreign banks. Furthermore, to demonstrate foreign confidence and encouragement for Suharto's government, a meeting has been scheduled of Indonesia's nine major creditor nations to draw up a plan for deferred payments and to give Indonesia a chance to stabilize her economy. President Suharto recently said:

> "As you know Communism will flourish in a community where the economy is poor. That's why we would like to rebuild the economy as soon as possible. If the people and the country are prosperous and the welfare is good, of course, the Communists will never be able to gain in our country again. Communism can be fought when you have a strong counter ideology and the Indonesian peoples have the *Pantja Sila*—the Five Principles, of which the first one is "belief in God." But of course the *Pantja Sila* has to prove that it can give prosperity and welfare to the people. If it cannot do this then Communism will begin to grow again. That is why we must improve our conditions as soon as possible."

The new government is willing to accept foreign investment; it will accept foreign aid as long as no restricting conditions are involved; and it has asked for foreign assistance with engineering and other technical problems. A strong economy can have a great stabilizing effect and conversely a weak economy can easily lead to instability throughout all facets of a nation. Thus, the degree of progress made by Indonesia is of critical importance to her international role.

INSTABILITY IN YOUNG GOVERNMENT

The government of the Republic of Indonesia has had a record of instability since its inception. Parliamentary based cabinets rise and fall with increasing velocity; between 1950 and 1960, nine cabinets held office. Political parties coalesce, split apart, and come together again in a new alinements. New parties rise while other parties suffer from internal divisions. Most elements of the government agree on three basic premises: 1) the government should be generally socialistic; 2) it should maintain the *Pantja Sila;* 3) Indonesia should attempt to stay out of international conflicts (in which she is not directly involved) as much as possible. But beyond these ideas, very little finds general acceptance in the field of Indonesian politics.

There are four major causes of instability in Indonesian government. First, there has been a general disappointment among Indonesian people in the performance of the administration. Few of the expected, tangible fruits of independence have been realized. Living standards have not increased at all (if they have even remained stable); Indonesia still has a society of classes; and they still fight wars. The disappointment of the people serves to overshadow the political stage.

Secondly, Indonesia has suffered from serious regional disputes. When Indonesia gained full sovereignty in 1949, the nation was organized as a federal system: it was composed of sixteen separate states in which the Republic was combined with fifteen Dutch puppet governments. In 1950, Sukarno reconstituted the Republic into one centralized government based in Djakarta. Thus the island of Java, with the bulk of the population, has by far the upper hand in the government. This has led to widespread and extremely vocal dissent in the outer islands—which actually produce the greater part of the national income. Dispute has, in some instances risen to the point that military rebellions and civil war have broken out. This has occurred most notably in the Moluccas, in Salawesi, and in Sumatra where a revolutionary government was proclaimed in 1958. Generally, however, those involved in the regional disputes do not seek to dissolve the union; they want merely to reorganize it so they will have sufficient representation in the government. The problem of ruling justly over an archipelago spread over three thousand miles of ocean is an extremely difficult one. Federalism appears to be the best solution, but it was given such a bad name by the Dutch that the government is very hesitant to reinstate it.

The third major problem is the proliferation of interest groups that seek satisfaction in Indonesia. The number of political parties vying for election made it nearly impossible to attain majorities for cabinets early in the Republic, and Sukarno consequently took steps to decrease their number. There remains, however, the problem of reconciling those parties which remain. Beside the political parties, many other organizations, formed by people with common interests and desires to increase the scope of their influence, make demands upon the government. Students groups, labor unions, religious groups, and myriad other organizations have played a prominent role in keeping the government unsettled.

Finally, Indonesia's government has been troubled by external forces. Although she preferred to remain uninvolved in the competion between the major power blocs of the world, Indonesia was not afforded that pleasure. At the outset, the Republic was troubled by the Dutch, of course. Once she had gained her independence, three major powers competed seriously for Indonesia's favor. The United States with vast sums of money, the Soviet Union using military aid, and Communist China sending books to a nation starved for literature, sending propaganda and giving support to the Communist Party of Indonesia (PKI). Indonesia has not remained extremely warm toward any power for a long period of time. She has seriously attempted to stay as uninvolved as possible. Sukarno, in fact, took a leading role in forming the Afro-Asian bloc in the United Nations to demonstrate desire to remain uncommitted and then in January of 1965, withdrew from the United Nations altogether.

THREE FOCI OF POWER

From the beginning of this decade until 1965, the government has remained balanced between three foci of power: President Sukarno, the PKI, and the army. President Sukarno has been the most stable element of the Indonesian government since its inception. He has not only maintained control over the government, he has retained the following of the people.

When asked why he had maintained such enormous and warm support for so long, Sukarno's third wife, Ratna Sari Dewi, a beautiful Japanese woman, replied: "Can you explain why you love your father?" He is known to the Indonesian people as "Bung Karno" (brother of comrade Sukarno). He was the leader of the fight for independence and to most people he now symbolizes that struggle; "his face and name evoke virtually the same emotion as the country's flag or national anthem." Furthermore, Sukarno is a truly great orator. He has the ability to capture his audience and carry them with his emotion; he is adept at sensing the feelings of the Indonesian people and identifies with them in his speeches. Sukarno also has a great talent for manipulating and maneuvering various political powers within the government. He played opposing forces against each other with consumate skill. He demonstrated this best in his dealings with the military and the PKI. Yet without Sukarno, acting as a buffer, the army and the communists would have clashed long before they did. Despite all of this, he was not without his enemies; five attempts were made on his life between 1957 and 1965. But Sukarno managed to escape his assassins, just as he managed to escape being deposed by the waves of this unstable government.

The second key element of control was the PKI. Until 1965, Indonesia had the third largest communist party in the world. It should be realized that communism has never been an ogre in Indonesia. Communism in Asia is known for its appealing slogans of anti-imperialism and anti-capitalism, neither of which commands extensive support from impoverished colonial peoples. In Indonesia, especially, this was an attractive stand because of their strong anti-Dutch feelings; thus the PKI was easily able to develop a large following.

Twice in its early history, in 1926 and 1948, the PKI was shattered by making poorly planned and immature attempts to overtake the government through revolt, but both times it was able to rebuild to an even greater extent. The PKI has had three major sources of assistance in its growth since 1948. First, it received a great deal of financial support from wealthy Chinese businessmen, which enabled it to grow much faster. Secondly, Sukarno used it to defend himself against other power groups, especially the army. He underestimated the party's potentialities as a rival and soon the PKI had grown to be one of the three most powerful forces in Indonesian politics. Finally, the PKI has also been found to receive support from the communist forces of China. This was particularly disconcerting to many people but the party was so large it could not easily be stopped.

The third force involved in the Indonesian government, and the one which finally emerged as the supreme power, was the army. The army, of course, did not formally appear until after independence. When it was formed, it consisted of a large number of units nominally tied to the central command, but actually all loyal to the local leaders. The military has developed into a more organized and unified body in recent years, but still the farther one travels from Djakarta, the weaker is the hold of KOTI (Supreme Operations Command). As the military stabilized, it gradually grew more involved in politics. The army made its first significant political move when it outlawed certain "dangerous political activities" during the crisis in Sumatra in 1958.

The importance of the army was also boosted by Sukarno, both as a bargaining device against the PKI and as a weapon in his dealings with Malaysia and West Irian. One writer feels that: "Not since the frantic rearmament in the days of Hitler's Reich has one observed an army so omnipotent and obviously dominant . . . The military are everywhere." The political alignment of the army until 1965 was never extremely clear. Under the nominal leadership of General Nasution, the army appeared anti-communist and at times opposed to Sukarno's policies. Yet it was divided within its own organization and its positive stands were not clearly articulated.

ATTEMPTED COUP

The struggle for control of the government came to a head on September 30, 1965. Colonel Utung, a communist supporter, seized a Djakarta radio station and an attempted coup began. In the ensuing battle, six rigidly anti-communist generals were brutally murdered. General Nasution was wounded and his five-year-old daughter was killed. A counter coup, led by Nasution in the name of KOTI, easily overwhelmed the original attempt. The people of Indonesia were enraged. Although the PKI was not publicly, totally committed to Utung's actions, it was quickly blamed. Youth groups burned the PKI building in Djakarta and stormed the streets crying "Kill Aidit" (the leader of the communist party.) The coup had not only served to push the army to the forefront in the Indonesian government, but had also unleashed a great deal of latent hatred for the PKI and for the Chinese with whom they were connected. Anti-Communist and anti-Chinese demonstrations continued, culminating with the slaughtering of as many as four hundred thousand Communists in the summer of 1966. The PKI was shattered.

SUKARNO IS DEPOSED

These events left only the army and Sukarno to battle for power. Sukarno, however, was also tied to the coup of September 30. In the preceding months he had grown closer to the PKI. As he used their power more and more, he increasingly became subject to their demands as well. Moreover, recent evidence appeared in the trial of Brig. General Supandjo—accused of master-minding the entire scheme of September 30. When asked if Sukarno had patted him on the shoulder when he reported the kidnapping of the six generals, Subandjo replied "with words that outraged Indonesian public opinion, 'Patted me on the shoulder?' he snapped, 'He embraced me.' "

Since the events of 1965, the army has slowly whittled away at Sukarno's power—with the consent of the legislature. General Suharto is now the head man in both the army and in the government. In March of 1966, Sukarno informally handed over his powers to Suharto, but he still remained President. Suharto appointed an entirely new cabinet. Meanwhile, Suharto worked to rid the country of all remaining communists, first arresting the higher PKI officials, then forbidding the party to enter the capital, and finally outlawing them altogether.

During the first part of March 1967, Sukarno was officially deposed by the People's Consultative Congress. Suharto is now acting President. The fact that the disposal of Sukarno was taken so easily by the Indonesian people, considering his charisma, demonstrates how keenly the Indonesians desire progress. One writer feels that "for the first time since the Dutch pulled out . . . Indonesia has a chance to work for political stability." Besides General Suharto, a quiet, rigid man, there are two key figures in the new regime. Adam Malik, an experienced and imaginative civil servant, is the new foreign minister and director of political affairs. Sultan Hamegku Buwono IX, the Sultan of Jogjakarta, is the director of finances. Buwono is a man of aristocratic heritage who makes a very outward show of his democratic motives and has a following of millions from his Sultanship; many believe he will be the next President.

What the future holds for this government is difficult to say. They have already taken some steps to rectify the economy, the war against Malaysia has been ended, and the threat of an immediate resurgence by the PKI is slim. It will certainly be less friendly to Peking, but probably no warmer to the West than was the former government. The key question, however, with regard to stability, is how well they will be able to cope with the problems that have plagued the government of the Republic for twenty years. This only time will tell.

FUTURE LOOKS BRIGHT

The future of Indonesia, all things considered, looks bright. In its culture and society one finds tremendous bonds to tie the various peoples together. The economy and government, which have long caused grave problems for this young nation, look as though they may finally overcome their basic deficiencies and bring about the progress that the Indonesian people have been longing for since before 1945. As Henry P. Van Dusen wrote, "It is quite possible that the fulcrum that will determine the future not only of Southeast Asia, but of the world balance of forces, lies not in Viet Nam, but in Indonesia." The stability of Indonesia is of great significance; if the possibilities for future growth materialize, the globe will be more secure. The events of the next few years, especially the national elections, will reveal the full effect of recent developments. The outlook, however, should be one of optimism.

Problems of Riots

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 18, 1967

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, there is increasing talk that the instigators of riots in northern cities this past summer were chiefly southern Negroes who moved north but were unable to adjust to life in a large metropolitan area.

This theory is knocked squarely in the head by an editorial entitled "Problems in the North," which appeared in the September 11, 1967, issue of the Charleston News & Courier, Charleston, S.C.

Another editorial in the News & Courier entitled "Ghetto: True or False," in the September 13, 1967, issue, also points out another misleading impression that all of the riots occur in "ghetto" areas.

Both of these articles express thoughts that deserve wide attention, and I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Charleston (S.C.) News & Courier, Sept. 11, 1967]

PROBLEMS IN THE NORTH

Though migration from farm to city is one of the great facts about Twentieth Century America, some authorities are too quick to blame race riots on Southern Negroes moving North.

In Detroit, scene of the worst riots of 1967, a banner year for rioters, the Urban League with assistance from the Detroit Free Press made a survey based on interviews with a representative sample of 437 Negroes. Among other things, the survey showed that of the rioters, 46 per cent were born in Detroit, while only 23 per cent of the non-rioters were natives of Detroit.

"This explodes whatever remained of the theory," The Free Press said, "that race riots are caused by Southern Negroes who can't adjust to the pressure of big-city life."

While one survey does not answer all the questions about so big a problem as the shift of populations, irrespective of race, color or region, we accept The Free Press comment as valid.

Agriculture - Secretary Orville Freeman, nevertheless, during his visit to South Carolina, seemed to be laboring under the common delusion that strife in the ghettos is due to the South's failure to make life on the farm sufficiently attractive to hold Negroes away from the cities.

"To fail to understand the causes of Negro frustration and violence," Mr. Freeman said, "and to refuse to recognize and attack the underlying forces is to perpetuate more frustration and more violence. Such a course threatens the foundation of our Republic."

He proposed redevelopment of rural opportunities so rich that "many of the 100 million additional people we shall have by the year 2000 can choose to live in the country if they wish."

While we applaud rebuilding of the land, we doubt that ghetto people will be the ones who voluntarily trek back to fields and pastures of the country. Like Secretary Freeman, we too yearn for better understanding. We agree that foundations of the Republic are shaking. Whether the Secretary's ideas on how to keep the folks down on the farm are practical is by no means clear.

While touring the Congaree Steel and Iron Co. near Columbia, President Frank Threatt told Mr. Freeman:

"Until 1958, it was generally conceded in this area that the Negro was capable only of farm work or janitorial work." But on the basis of his experience in building a payroll of 400 in his plant, Mr. Threatt said he had concluded "there is no such thing as an unemployable man due to race, education or background."

These items of evidence add to our impression that methods of dealing with the North's racial problems should be sought in the North—among the people who are causing the trouble—rather than in the remote background in the South.

The migration has been in progress for more than half a century. Gov. George Romney of Michigan will be another visitor to South Carolina this month—"to get a first hand look at a typical rural area from which Negroes are migrating to American cities", says an Associated Press Dispatch.

Mr. Romney will go to Williamsburg County Sept. 23. He will be welcome in South Carolina, but we doubt that he will find the answers here for his troubles in Michigan. The search for truth is more likely to prove fruitful for him back home.

[From the Charleston (S.C.) News & Courier, Sept. 13, 1967]

GHETTO: TRUE OR FALSE

A current practice of calling Negro neighborhoods "ghettos" is misleading. In the opinion of some persons it is a deliberate piece of propaganda to imply oppression of a minority race.

Our thoughts on this subject turn today to Milwaukee. When Negro marchers entered a region known as the South Side, reporters for press, radio and TV did not call it a ghetto. They called it "predominantly white" or—as The Associated Press said in an article now at hand—"virtually all white."

White inhabitants hurled bottles and rocks at the Negroes and were dispersed by the police. The police already had prevented white marchers from leaving their neighborhood and invading the Negro North Side. Apparently the right to march in Milwaukee is not granted equally according to race.

Be that as it may our thoughts about ghettos were refreshed by a recent article in U.S. News & World Report. The news magazine quoted from the Encyclopedia Britannica, which defined a ghetto as "a separate quarter of a city in which Jews were forced to live apart from the rest of the inhabitants . . . The term is occasionally applied to Jewish districts of modern cities." The word comes from the Hebrew "ghet," meaning divorce.

A few years ago, U.S. News & World Report notes, "somebody conceived the idea of applying the word 'ghetto' to Negro neighborhoods in the United States. Used in this way, the word gives an impression of an oppressed people, restricted by law, compelled to live in a certain area. A look at the facts, however, shows that the Negro neighborhoods of today do not have the true characteristic of a 'ghetto.'"

The magazine reminds that for years big American cities have had neighborhoods predominantly Polish, Irish, German or Italian. Nobody called them "ghettos", Milwaukee's South Side, now under steady attack by Negro marchers, has been described as a Polish neighborhood—but not a ghetto. Inhabitants apparently want a ghetto in reverse—namely, to keep the neighborhood for themselves. A Polish "ghetto" thus might be called voluntary.

Negro neighborhoods in an American city are by no means compulsory. Nor are they necessarily slums. In Plainfield, N.J., riot broke out amid tree-lined streets and single-family homes. In the Watts district of Los Angeles, palm trees shade the lawns of many Negro homes.

The racial issues are confusing enough without distortion of words. While we doubt the existence of ghettos of any kind in the United States today, we do not exclude the possibility that someday they may be suggested as a means of protection against turmoil and destruction.

South Vietnamese Army Fights 5½-Day Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILLIP BURTON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1967

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues an article which appeared in the Washington Post on Sunday, September 17, 1967. Mr. Peter Arnett, the author of this piece, is a highly respected correspondent for the

Associated Press and is a Pulitzer Prize winner. This particular article takes a look in depth at the performance of the South Vietnamese armed forces in the present conflict in that country. The article follows:

SOUTH VIETNAMESE ARMY FIGHTS A 5½-DAY WEEK

(By Peter Arnett)

(NOTE.—This hard look at the South Vietnamese army represents months of research and thousands of miles of travel by Arnett, Pulitzer Prize winning war correspondent for the Associated Press, plus the assistance of other AP reporters on the scene.)

SAIGON.—The dispirited South Vietnamese army, shot through with inefficiency, often lacks the will for combat and is increasingly prone to let the Americans do the fighting. Fighting statistics and a detailed survey of field operations bear out this observation. In much of the country the Vietnamese military effort has steadily tailed off as that of the Americans has increased.

The size of the South Vietnamese armed forces has doubled since 1962, yet the number killed has held constant at about 10,000 a year. In the first six months of 1967, the army lost 5494 men. The statistics are so constant from year to year as to raise questions about their validity.

By contrast, the American forces, having lost 2532 killed in the first six months of 1966, lost 4909 in the first six months of 1967, when the number of Americans engaged had doubled.

Nowhere in the country can South Vietnamese troops be said to have made real gains against the enemy, although it is clear that the army must play a significant role if there is to be any hope of lasting success against the Communists.

The American Army is clearly limited in the depth it can reach into the countryside to crush the foe and hold ground. In no instance, however, have the allies been willing to hand over any of the territory won to Vietnamese units. Allied commanders fear that the Communists would be in charge again within weeks.

A 5½-DAY WEEK

An extensive survey of the situation established these points:

South Vietnamese military ineffectiveness costs American lives in the ambushing of convoys on roads supposedly cleared by Vietnamese troops, in the mortaring of U.S. installations by squads which slip past sleeping Vietnamese sentries, in sniping by guerrillas who move freely past Vietnamese outposts.

Most of the troops insist on a 5½-day week, taking Saturdays and Sundays off, while their allies and the Vietcong go on fighting.

American battalions seeking to break up enemy units operate through the night. So do the Vietcong. The South Vietnamese quit when the sun goes down.

Many South Vietnamese operations are staged in areas where no guerrillas are known to be. Huge troop concentrations are deployed in areas where small numbers of the enemy are hidden. Outnumbered, the Communists decline to stand and fight.

Only two of the 44 generals in the army in 1963 are still holding their rank. The others have been purged. This has sharply impaired morale in the command echelons.

Desertions from the armed forces are running at the rate of 10,000 a month and are expected to total more than 400,000 by the end of the year. This is twice as many men as the service lost to battle casualties.

Corruption is common at all levels of the army.

The loss of American lives traceable to Vietnamese inaction or incompetence is expected to rise directly in proportion to the depth that U.S. forces deploy in the countryside. American battalions already are operating independently in districts and villages. This trend is expected to continue.

Some Americans are demanding that the United States be given a command role over the Vietnamese similar to that held over South Korea forces in the Korean war.

Senior officials from Washington visiting Vietnam are being told, "If we have to see the war through, we will have to assume command responsibility eventually. Why not start now?" There has been an affirmative response to these views by most of the Washington visitors, a reliable source reported. But there are no indications of pressure on the Vietnamese at the top levels of government.

Part of the high-level reluctance might stem from the perennial official viewpoint that the Vietnamese troops are performing satisfactorily. In February, 1964, U.S. Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara predicted that the United States would pull most of its troops out of the war the following year.

"It is a counterguerrilla war, it is a war thta can only be won by the Vietnamese themselves," McNamara said. "Our responsibility is not to substitute ourselves for the Vietnamese but to train them to carry on the operations that they themselves are capable of."

Last Aug. 14, Gen. William C. Westmoreland, the U.S. commander in Vietnam, struck at critics of South Vietnamese military effectiveness.

"I can say categorically that the Vietnamese armed forces are making steady progress," he told an interviewer. "They are far better than they were a year ago and this is evident from their discipline, their performance on the battlefield and the successes they are enjoying against the enemy."

Also last month, Gen. Wallace M. Greene Jr., commandant of the Marine Corps, said that six visits to Vietnam had convinced him that "the South Vietnamese forces are doing a first-class job" and "are carrying their share."

A TYPICAL WEEK

Frequent visits to the field with Vietnamese units, talks with Vietnamese and American officers and men and a close examination of results of operations give no indication that the Vietnamees military has changed much since the days when it was fighting the Communists alone and getting beaten. A typical week of the war shows this trend all too clearly.

In this particular week, ending Aug. 5, the 80 American combat battalions in Vietnam suffered 186 dead and 1064 wounded in operations that ranged from just south of Saigon to the Demilitarized Zone. The 100 battalions of Vietnamese regular troops operating in these same regions lost 32 dead and 60 wounded.

In that same week, U.S. Marines operating in the First Corps region lost 110 men killed. The 30 Vietnamese battalions in the Corps area lost six killed.

More than 60 per cent of the Vietnamese killed that week were not in Vietnamese regular battalions. These deaths occurred at the lowest level of the war among the neglected, low-paid regional and popular forces.

The mission of these troops, who comprise nearly one-half of the Vietnamese armed forces, is to defend towns, villages and bridges against the Vietcong. They operate from mud, brick or concrete outposts, often cringing in fear from an approaching enemy, only occasionally attempting to fight off an attacking force and usually dying after throwing their weapons away and attempting to run, hide or surrender.

Casualties often are taken without inflicting any upon the enemy. The 479th Regional Force Company in Thuthua District, Longan Province, has not killed a Vietcong in its two years of existence. Yet it has lost 12 dead and many wounded in frequent attacks on its position.

THIRD DIE IN OFFENSIVES

The statistics indicate that only one-third of the Vietnamese killed in the war lose their lives in offensive operations against the enemy. This one-third comes from the 285,000 regular Vietnamese arrayed in ten infantry divisions, one armored division, an airborne division and 20 ranger battalions.

The remaining losses are among the 283,000 regional and popular force men in their thousands of outposts across Vietnam.

Nearly all American losses are taken on offensive operations. The official kill ratio of one American dead to ten of the enemy reflects this aggressive stance.

The regular Vietnamese army claims a 1–3.6 ratio against the enemy and the popular forces about 1–1. These ratios are based on enemy killed counts that often are fanciful.

American battalions stay out in the field at night at a matter of course to achieve their results. All the battalions of the Second Brigade, U.S. 25th Division, based out of Cuchi, northwest of Saigon, were out 28 nights each in July. None of the battalions of the nearest regiment of the Vietnamese 25th Division stayed out a single night that month.

One of the best regiments in the Vietnamese army, the 33d of the 21st Division in the southern Delta, spent only 46 battalion days in the field in July out of a possible 120 battalion days—that is, 30 days for each of the regiment's four battalions. At no time did a battalion stay out at night, not in the operational area, anyway. Night duty for a Vietnamese battalion is guarding the perimeter of an outpost or a town.

A reluctance to come to grips with the enemy has characterized the Vietnamese military effort since the war began in earnest in 1961 with 15,000 Vietcong guerrillas terrorizing villagers, blowing bridges and overrunning outposts.

In the days of President Ngo Dinh Diem, field commanders were recalled for suffering too many casualties. The practice of operating judiciously to keep casualties at an acceptable figure may well have continued.

Whatever the reasons, there can be no question that the army has failed completely in its mission of overpowering the Communist guerilla movement. The official statistics over the years would have you believe otherwise, but there are statistics and statistics.

Walls of all the numerous U.S. advisory commands are dizzying with green, red and yellow lines that spiral ever upward, indicating greater and greater progress within the Vietnamese army. At the headquarters of the Fourth Corps Region at Canitho, an American colonel-adviser to Vietnamese forces will tell you, "Our percentage of major operations one battalion or larger are dropping off this year, but the percentage of contact is increasing. Better intelligence, you know."

The statistics don't say that in all these operations the enemy was given the field of battle each evening because government forces in the Delta like to get home before dark.

How, then, can progress be measured in a place like the Mekong Delta, still mostly in the South Vietnamese army bailiwick? One index is the estimated enemy strength, 80,000 at last count, half of them tough, skilled fighters.

The enemy estimate is the same as last year but twice as high as the previous year, which was twice as high as the year preceding that.

In July this year, half as many government troops were killed as in July, 1966. The number of enemy killed halved also.

AREA DIVIDED UP

The truth in the Delta seems to be that a status quo exists, with the Saigon government hanging on to the province and district capitals and their immediate environs and the Vietcong holding out in their lairs. The canals and roads are contested on occasion, but generally the Vietcong leave them open and collect tribute for their use.

As has been shown in the rest of Vietnam, only the infusion of American troops is likely to upset the status quo. This has happened in Giadinh Province, which surrounds Saigon, in Longan Province to the south and in Haunghia Province to the west.

By relentless operations, day and night, American troops have managed to break down the enemy battalions into small groups. They have them on the run and search for them constantly.

The Vietnamese do sometimes have major battles with the enemy, killing many and capturing sizable caches of weapons. Some of the elite Vietnamese marine and airborne units compare with American battalions. But the sustained effort that brings results has not been forthcoming from the Vietnamese and does not look likely in the months ahead.

The performance of Vietnamese regular battalions has hardly varied over the years. The 20 highly trained Ranger battalions still perform spottily. Only five of them killed more than 100 Vietcong last year, the highest with 255 kills. U.S. officers believe that, if properly utilized, a Ranger battalion should kill 600 to 900 enemy per year.

GOOD MEN AVAILABLE

How can the Vietnamese be persuaded to utilize their units better? Many Americans argue for a joint command with an American at the top. Short of that, they would like a strong voice in the selection of commanding officers.

An outspoken Vietnamese province chief commented, "The one big mistake the United States made when it sent combat troops into Vietnam was not to demand the right to relieve and appoint Vietnamese officers. You are paying for it now."

"There are plenty of young, aggressive, honest officers around," one U.S. official commented. "I have a list of them."

Unsupported by direct pressure from Washington, American commanders resort to subtle techniques of leverage. A senior American in the Delta entices his three-star general counterpart into taking field trips with him, casually discussing area problems within his earshot. This apparently satisfies the general's ego to the degree that he sometimes comes around to his American adviser the next day with a solution.

An American corps commander presents his Vietnamese counterpart with a list of five problems, no more no less, each Friday. By resubmitting the same problems, he hopes that eventually he will get something done about them.

This sort of advisory merry-go-round has proved completely ineffective in the past, but "with so many Americans around, breathing over their shoulders, the Vietnamese will have no choice but to knuckle under," a U.S. general said hopefully. He added, "They'll have to, if we are ever to get out of here."

But the problem is far more than just one of the Vietnamese listening and then doing, even though that would be a major step in the right direction, most Americans agree. Logistics problems in the Vietnamese army remain almost insoluble.

"The army is organized on American lines except for the logistics," one U.S. general explained. "Under the crazy French system they use, if an armored vehicle has its tires blown off in the foothills, the driver has to take the tires to Saigon so he can get new ones. There is equipment lying all over this country that could be repaired easily if the red tape were cut."

Vietnamese commanders are military dilettantes when it comes to running an operation. A division commander generally deploys and controls his battalions himself, unwilling to trust them to his chain of command. If he goes off for lunch or to a political conference, the operation will collapse because no one else dares give orders.

There are no long-range patrols made by the Vietnamese army, even though these patrols have proved most effective in every American unit in the country.

"We could never get any volunteers to go out in enemy territory in groups of four or five men like the Americans do," a regimental adviser said.

There is corruption at all levels. A province chief, holding the rank of colonel, commented: "Of course there is corruption. My salary is 17,000 piasters (about $150) each month. With that I have to feed, clothe and educate my family, support myself and pay for your breakfast and all the other breakfasts and dinners that I, as province chief, have to give.

"Can I be anything else but corrupt when the Americans pay 20,000 piasters salary each month to just an interpreter?"

THE HAVE-NOTS

Vietnamese troops, particularly the low-grade regional and popular forces, are poorly paid. Said a regimental commander: "My men live like pigs, in shacks, in squalor. They are forced to make love under the trees when their wives visit them. How can they be motivated with so little?"

A Vietnamese division commander complained: "American troops have helicopters, much artillery, many aircraft. Give us all these things and let us try. If we cannot do the job, then you can take over."

Vietnamese soldiers conduct themselves as their armies have for decades in much of the country, stealing and looting in the villages. A regimental commander said: "I will not condone my soldiers stealing chickens, but I accept it. Our logistics system is so bad, what else will they eat?"

There are elaborate plans for the improvement of the Vietnamese military, including the addition of 60,000 new troops, most of them militiamen. There is talk of breaking down some divisions into mobile groups similar to those used by the French.

American units are beginning to work with Vietnamese battalions, but the benefits of having Americans near at hand can boomerang. An adviser with a Vietnamese Ranger battalion working with the U.S. 199th Brigade commented: "This integration has ruined any chance there was that my battalion would ever operate independently. Now they depend completely on the U.S. All I do now is settle disputes between them and the Americans."

Rachkien, a town south of Saigon, was pacified by successive battalions of American troops who operated day and night in the paddy fields and the swamps. A Vietnamese battalion from the 25th Division worked with them and, according to senior Americans, "caught fire with enthusiasm."

In early August, American commanders judged that the time was almost ripe for the Vietnamese battalion to take over the area; the U.S. unit would move on. At the last minute, the Vietnamese division commander pulled his battalion back to home base for security guard, with no explanations.

The American battalion was left in Rachkien to continue the tough, endless task of seeking out the guerrillas in the paddy fields and the leech-infested swamps.

"Patents and Progress": Address by Gen. David Sarnoff

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 18, 1967

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, on June 7, 1967, Gen. David Sarnoff, chairman of the board of Radio Corp. of America, delivered a most interesting and enlightening address before the Interindustry Conference on International Patents in the Frankfurt/Main, Germany. Entitled "Patents and Progress," the address emphasizes the need for immediate development of an electronic world patent search system through the prompt and extensive application of modern technology. In view of the continuing need to insure that the seemingly unlimited spring of human creativity be channeled to beneficial ends, I believe the address bears careful reading and consideration.

I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PATENTS AND PROGRESS

(Address by David Sarnoff, chairman of the board, Radio Corp., of America, Interindustry Conference on International Patents, Frankfurt/Main, Germany, June 7, 1967

It is a great pleasure to attend this distinguished international gathering and to participate in the examination of a subject that bears significantly upon the welfare of men and nations everywhere.

In this era of advancing technology, it is becoming standard for speakers to speculate about the day when world conferences will be conducted through satellites and television. The theory is that the participants will stay at home and push buttons in front of a screen in order to see and talk with their fellow delegates.

Although this may have advantages on some occasions, I am, nevertheless, pleased and privileged by this opportunity to meet personally with so many knowledgeable leaders of both the industrialized and the emerging nations of the world.

There are many professions and technical disciplines represented at this conference. In the broadest sense, each shares a fundamental interest in human creativity and how to direct it to beneficial ends.

Just as physical fertility has produced a population explosion, mental fertility has produced an explosion in the arts, sciences, and industry. And there is a disturbing similarity between the two. If either explosion cannot be contained within the boundaries of reason and restraint, it can overwhelm man's capacity to deal with it.

No area of human endeavor has felt the impact of mental fertility more than invention and patents. This conference was convened in recognition of that fact and in the hope of suggesting solutions for the formidable problems it poses. These problems are economic, political, legal, and technical in nature.

While encouraging progress has been made in overcoming some of them, it seems to me that there can be no basic solution in the economic, political, and legal areas if we do not first come to grips with technical considerations.

THE NEED FOR MODERN TECHNOLOGY

I believe the dominant fact facing this conference is the need for prompt and extensive application of modern technology to the development of a viable and enduring world patent structure. This is essential if we are to keep the various national and regional patent groupings from being engulfed in a mounting tide of data, which are frequently duplicated and increasingly complex in their character.

Nearly 350 years after the introduction of the first patent law, we are still burdened with a fragmented territorial concept of patent coverage. An inventor is still compelled to go through separate and often widely different procedures in nearly every nation where he seeks to establish title to his work.

A sharp rise in the volume of patent applications strains the facilities and manpower of individual patent offices. In member countries of the Paris Union, the number of applications grew by nearly 50 per cent during the last 10 years.

The proliferation of patents keeps enlarging the size of the search file. Determination of prior art thus becomes more and more costly and time-consuming. In effect, we are burying patent needles in larger and larger haystacks.

What can technology do to answer these pressing problems? I believe that it can do for the world's patent services what it promises to accomplish on a broader scale for business and industry in general.

Electronic communications and data processing—those twin instruments of an Information Revolution—already are transforming the methods and prospects of international business. Together, they have given industry a global reach and limitless scope to its operations.

Through satellites, it is possible to transmit every form of information—written, spoken, or visual—in almost infinite quantity to and from major centers around the world. Tomorrow, their range will extend to all inhabited areas of the world.

THE COMING ERA IN COMPUTERS

Today's computers generate, receive, and process information in vast quantity at immense speed. They have moved into the offices of business management as powerful tools for the assembly and analysis of increasingly complex data vital to decision-making in global enterprises.

Yet with all of their sophistication, they are merely primitive harbingers of the coming era in business computers. Tomorrow's systems will respond to handwriting, drawings, and spoken comments. They will recognize a single voice, face, or symbol among tens of thousands. They will translate essential information whenever necessary from one language to another.

Eventually, a global network of voice, data, and facsimile communications will link man to man, man to machine, and machine to machine. An executive in his office will be able to query a distant computer center on any reasonable subject and within seconds receive an answer. Information utilities will serve thousands of subscribers simultaneously, and information itself will acquire the status of a basic commodity, comparable to electricity.

In terms of communication and control, management of an international enterprise will become as feasible as management of a domestic concern. Size, diversity, and distance will cease to be limiting business factors. In these respects, Frankfurt will be no further from San Francisco or Sydney than it is from Milan or Stockholm.

In this new environment, invention and innovation must flourish in an atmosphere free of national and regional restrictions if we are to stimulate economic growth and world trade. This was uppermost in my thoughts a year ago in Washington when I urged the application of advanced information technology to a new world patent system.

Such a system would combine the great capacity of satellite communications and the immense data storage and processing capabilities of computers. It would permit determination of the novelty and patentability of an idea on a worldwide basis, and with infinitely greater speed than is now possible.

PROSPECTS FOR A WORLD PATENT SEARCH SYSTEM

I hesitated at that time to predict just how soon such a system might become practical, because of the magnitude of the project. But so swift is the pace of scientific and engineering progress, that which seemed distant a year ago has now entered the realm of imminent reality.

By 1975, it should be possible to establish an electronic World Patent Search System containing instantly available data on every existing patent and patent application; accessible to every inventor or his agent as well as to every potential user of his invention. Such a center would be the vital heart of a workable global patent system.

In three major areas—communications, information storage, and electronic printing—advances and research breakthroughs in recent months have converged to bring this goal within early reach.

New generations of communications satellites with vastly increased capacities are on the drawing board, and new cable facilities are also being expanded. At the same time, a revolutionary discovery has opened the way to all but limitless capability for the central storage of information in easily accessible form.

This advance is based upon the use of lasers, which generate controlled light beams for the transmission of information, and a new lensless picture process known as holography. In the laser hologram, a standard typewriter-size page of copy and pictures can be reduced to a pinpoint of light—a minute fraction of the space required by microfilm. As the system is developed, it will be possible to transfer all of the information on 100,000 standard typewriter-size pages to a single card approximately the area of an automobile license plate.

There is parallel progress, too, in the development of computer circuits and memories to keep pace with the vast external storage capacity offered by the laser hologram. Computers now in planning will be able to store up to 100 million bits of information in their main memory units, and retrieve them at the rate of a millionth of a second per bit.

New electronic techniques are also becoming available to eliminate any significant delay in printing the rising torrent of information from the computer. High-speed electronic printers currently in development will be able to reproduce data flowing directly from computers at thousands of lines per minute—far more rapidly than the most advanced mechanical printers now in use.

Electronic systems now coming into use can compose images, diagrams, and text a hundred times more rapidly than conventional manual and mechanical methods. With the latest of these, a 600-page book could be made up in any desired typeface in only an hour.

All of these new electronic printing methods use memory systems that store a wide variety of type symbols. This arrangement would allow us to print our patent data in any one of many desired languages with different alphabets or characters—Roman, Cyrillic, Japanese, Arabic, or even Sanskrit.

CREATING A WORLD PATENT SEARCH CENTER

With all of these elements as building blocks, we can envision a working World Patent Search Center that can be the nucleus of a unified system for determining the originality of an invention anywhere in the world.

The search system would comprise a network of national and regional patent offices linked by satellite, cable, and overland circuits to a central computer. Each of the national and regional offices would maintain laser hologram files of all existing patents and patent applications in its area.

Whenever an inventor filed a patent application in any country in the system, the information would be flashed via the world network to the computer. From the computer, an automatic call would go to all offices in the network for any information in their hologram files needed to determine the novelty of the invention.

The whole process, from start to finish, would be automatic and virtually instantaneous, and the inventor filing the application would know within hours whether he could obtain a world patent on his idea.

Although the technical feasibility of such a system is imminent, this does not mean that it can start operating the moment it is delivered—like a toaster or a television set. An essential requirement for a global system of any type is prior agreement on basic standards and procedures.

THE NEED FOR STANDARDIZATION

In the patent field, there must be a common set of language symbols and computer codes. Data must be prepared and processed in a standard format applied throughout the system. A single procedure must be established for error control in the communication circuits linking the computer to national and regional offices.

Today, there are as many different codes, error control methods, and data formats as there are different computer systems. International discussions have brought some progress toward standardization, but there is still much to be done.

Beyond this, there are important operational questions to be resolved. Who should have access to the data in the search system, and under what conditions? What procedures should be followed in adding new information to the files? How will outdated material be eliminated?

The answer to these and other crucial questions can come only within the framework of a broad international accord. We can give birth to great concepts in our scientific laboratories, but they must be brought to fruition in the parliaments of nations. While technology forges the means, political agreements among nations must delineate the ends

We must resolve conflicts of attitude, tradition, and law. We must smooth differences in procedure and reconcile our varied policies and practices. We must cease, for example, to characterize the identical employment of patents as a privilege in one country and an abuse in another. Certainly, no global system worthy of the name can be built on the restricted foundations of nationalism.

Those of us who represent industrialized nations should be especially responsive to the value of a universal patent system that is reliable, fast, simple, and reasonably priced. For the great preponderance of invention in the world today continues to take place within our borders.

IMPACT ON DEVELOPING NATIONS

Nevertheless, whatever patent system evolves must also reflect a deliberate concern for the progress of the developing nations. It must recognize—as a resolution of the United Nations General Assembly has set forth—that access to knowledge and experience in technology is essential to the enlargement of their economic productivity.

Some of the benefits that an integrated patent processing complex can offer to the more needy lands are dramatically apparent. They will have complete access to worldwide facilities that can tell them what has been invented by whom and where. They will not have to divert scarce resources of money and skilled manpower to the creation of an independent patent operation. Conversely, their own inventors will be able to initiate filing of applications throughout the world, while avoiding much of the expense, time, and expertise now involved.

By having a continuously updated catalogue of emerging technology to examine for use in their own nation-building, these less-advantaged countries of the world may leapfrog some of the steps in conventional patterns of economic development. In addition, their participation in the world system will provide an environment more attractive to foreign patent holders and encourage greater local use of their patents.

We must assist the emerging countries in mastering technology rather than simply offering them its fruits. It is both enlightened self-interest and good business for the industrialized third of the world to seek advancement for the other two-thirds. If it does not, advancing technology will simply serve to magnify the already perilous imbalance between the have and the have-not nations.

This international conference in Frankfurt will seek, and undoubtedly find, agreement in many areas bearing on the problems of patents. But if it achieves agreement on one subject alone—the need for immediate development of an electronic World Patent Search System—it will have taken a major step forward toward the realization of true universality in the process of invention. In doing so, this conference can contribute significantly to man's long and continuing search for world peace and progress.

Strike Three on ABC

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1967

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, millions of American television viewers tuned in on the American Broadcasting Co.'s much heralded and unrealistically lengthy production, entitled "Africa."

This television presentation, screened nationwide on the evening of September 10, 1967, was lacking of responsibility and accuracy in many places.

Unfortunately, this is the case in far too many radio and television newscasts and related documentaries. And, in most instances no one bothers—or is successful if he does—to correct the distortions and perhaps intentional slanting and alteration of the true facts.

It was quite evident to any impartial viewer that ABC's production was biased and contained many inaccuracies—particularly in that portion dealing with South Africa.

Mr. Speaker, fortunately the record has been corrected. I follow my remarks with a statement on this matter by the Honorable H. L. T. Taswell, South African Ambassador to the United States, which appeared in the publication "News from South Africa," dated September 13, 1967:

SOUTH AFRICAN AMBASSADOR'S COMMENTS ON TV PROGRAM

Commenting on the ABC television production Africa which was screened nationwide in the United States on the evening of September 10, the South African Ambassador to the United States, Mr. H. L. T. Taswell, said:

"Basically the South African section of the film is biased and full of half-truths. It belittles SA's efforts in dealing with a complex problem of human relations and conflicting cultures and ignores the great progress made.

"Nowhere in independent Africa do people, regardless of their race or color have as high a general standard of living, education or health, as they do in SA. The soundest remarks came from Mr. Howard K. Smith at the conclusion of the program where he advises: 'don't push; Africa is going its own way.' He says South Africa should not be written off and forecasts that the Republic will play a greater role in Africa. I agree with that; I do not agree that this will come about through the breakdown of Separate Development. Rather the inherent soundness of our policy (not ABC's distorted version of it) will bring about mutual respect between races and conflicting cultures and provide the background both for future development in SA and for improved relations with our neighbors. If ABC genuinely believes our policy is wrong, can it point to any country in the world today—not just Africa—and say it has in fact found the solution to the age-old problems of getting people of different races and cultures to live together in peace and harmony?"

Interesting History on Auto Safety

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES HARVEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1967

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, just before our recent extended recess, a most interesting newspaper article on the development of the energy-absorbing steering column, was brought to my attention. I believe, Mr. Speaker, the article will capture the attention of all our Members as auto safety remains an active interest to us all.

The article, entitled "Reveals GM Steering Move Predated Nader Campaign," appeared in the Wednesday, August 30, 1967, edition of the Detroit News. The writer, Robert W. Irvin, interviewed Mr. J. E. "Joe" Godfrey, general manager of the Saginaw Steering Gear Division of General Motors, which has developed the column that has been installed on 1967 model GM cars.

I have a special interest inasmuch as Saginaw Steering Gear Division is located in Michigan's Eighth District and Mr. Godfrey is an outstanding constituent.

Let me just single out the tremendous growth of this plant as mentioned in the article. Employment now is up 300 percent in the last 16 years with a total work force of 7,400 workers. In the 3.3 million-square-foot plants, almost 6 million energy-absorbing columns have been built since June 21, 1966. Production now is running about 20,000 a day.

But the real point I would want to emphasize is the fact that this growth, this productiton, was not and can not be achieved overnight. As often is the case, time is required to develop the project from an idea, to the drawing board, through an experimental stage, and finally to production. The energy-absorbing steering column, still being improved, was nearly a 10-year project. The first experimental models were built back in 1959.

I am pleased to bring this article to the attention of my colleagues:

REVEALS GM STEERING MOVE PREDATED NADER CAMPAIGN

(By Robert W. Irvin)

SAGINAW.—"I had never heard of Ralph Nader when this broke in the summer of 1965."

That was when General Motors gave the go-ahead to build an energy absorbing steering column for installation on 1967 model GM cars.

The speaker was J. E. (Joe) Godfrey, general manager of the Saginaw Steering Gear Division of GM, which had developed the column.

He told about the division's seven-year project during a recent interview.

The first experimental models were built back in 1959. One problem then and now, Godfrey said, was to determine human tolerance levels.

Some information was provided by cadaver tests conducted at Wayne State University.

But even after the design was well along a "confusing atmosphere" made it difficult to put the idea across, Godfrey said, citing conflicting theories of some accident researchers several years ago.

In mid-1965, however, the safety hearings started in Washington and top auto leaders were called to testify. About the same time they announced new safety packages that would be incorporated into the 1966 models, such as rear seat belts, padded instrument panels and back-up lights. And it was about this time the new column got the green light.

Actually, the final design hadn't been determined at this time. Godfrey took the plans of the Koppy Tool Corp., Ferndale, and told them "to develop the dies while we made the final decision. They did a great job."

The same tool company built the equipment for manufacturing Ford Motor Co.'s energy absorbing column which is being introduced on the 1968 models. Saginaw sold its column or components of it to both American Motors and Chrysler Corp. this year.

The division is now working on an improved model of the column but it's not expected to be ready before 1969.

"We put a lot of dough in the project, but it was money well spent," said Godfrey. "The evidence thus far shows we did a good job."

He was referring to several hundred documented cases of the columns working in accidents and saving lives. In fact, Washington officials cite the results to date as one explanation of why they are willing to reconsider a previous requirement that shoulder belts be standard equipment in 1968 cars.

The column is just the latest achievement of the division. It's had a remarkable growth record since 1951 when it brought out power steering, now found on the overwhelming majority of American cars.

Employment is up 300 percent in the intervening 16 years, to a total of 7,400, and the amount of floor space is up 600 percent, to 3.3 million square feet. If it was a private company it would be rated as a $300 million-a-year business.

It has produced almost six million energy absorbing columns since they went into production June 21, 1966. Production is now running about 20,000 a day.

Incidentally, where was Nader when the production planning was being started for the column in mid-1965? He was finishing his book—"Unsafe at Any Speed"—which was published the following November.

The Kee Report: Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1967

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a previous public service television and radio newscast, "The Kee Report."

The subject discussed in this report is the small business establishments and how the Small Business Administration gives them the financial and business management assistance they need.

This is Jim Kee—bringing you the Kee Report.

The American economy is now pouring out goods and services at a rate never before seen on this earth. Because our economic life is so productive, it is under constant study by other nations, including the Communist powers which still cannot produce enough to meet their basic needs.

The efficiency of the big corporation is a major factor in the story of our economic growth. The industrial giants of America are the marvels of the age. They can produce more automobiles, more television sets, and more of everything else than their rivals abroad and still keep the price within the range of the average pocketbook.

A few big corporations in the United States do more business each year than the majority of countries in the United Nations. Quite obviously, it is in the national interest to keep these big combines healthy and prosperous.

However, it would be a mistake to assume that the nation's economic health depends solely upon the big corporations. You may be surprised to know that more than ninety-five percent of all business concerns in the United States are small in size and independently owned and operated. These small concerns employ more than forty percent of the nation's labor force. In other words, the butcher, the baker and the corner grocer are just as important to the nation's well-being as they ever were.

Several years ago, Congress established the Small Business Administration for the express purpose of helping both the man who wanted to go into business for himself and the man who wanted to stay in business.

Financial aid is the thing most needed by the independent operator. He may need $5,000 or $10,000 to meet current expenses or he may need that sum to finance plant expansion.

The Small Business Administration is authorized to lend government funds when the conditions warrant. These Federal loans have kept thousands of owners in business. But, direct loaning is only a part of the financial assistance rendered by the Small Business Administration. This agency has established a fine working relationship with the banking community in every part of our country. As a result, about one-third of the loans now under review involve local financing. In other words, the small business man is being taught how to take care of his financial needs in his own community.

In addition, the Small Business Administration keeps a sharp eye out to see that independent operators are given a share in the government procurement program. These government contracts often give an economic life to the entire business community.

The Small Business Administration has also found a way to provide individual counseling for the merchant or shopkeeper on the best way to run his business. This program is called SCORE. This is a corps of retired executives who have the experience and the know-how to give sound advice on business management. There are three thousand of these retired executives who perform this service in their home communities without compensation.

The Small Business Administration is doing a good job of keeping independent operators sound and healthy.

Thank you for listening.

Yes, a Giant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1967

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, on September 8 the Missouri Teamster newspaper carried a tribute to Richard H. Amberg, publisher of the St. Louis Globe-Democrat. I believe this article, coming as it does from an organization which did not often agree with Dick Amberg on many controversial issues of the day, reflects the high esteem in which he was held by all that knew him.

I insert this article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

YES, A GIANT

One could scarcely turn to the pages of the morning St. Louis *Globe-Democrat* these past 12 years without a mixed sense of distress and wonder. It would be hard to find a greater polarity in views than in that newspaper and ours.

One could find there some really strong journalistic stuff—for more bombing and for the wisdom of military men, for the exploits of the FBI, for the narrow, straight-laced virtues of the world of Horatio Alger. The communities of the ghetto and of organized labor and of those who view the world from a more liberal stance stood in awe and anger and frustration before the sharp blade of this unique and provocative newspaper. You did not simply read it; you cared—one way or another—about what it had to say.

It was this way because of the dynamic and committed personality of its publisher, Richard H. Amberg, who died last week before his time.

Dick Amberg disagreed with our views as much as we did with his, but there was a warmth and humanity in his disagreement which said he was an earnest man who believed passionately in the way he saw the world. He could differentiate persons and views, ideals and causes. It was a measure of his largeness that when he died, even those who disagreed with him felt the vacuum of his leavetaking.

There are various ways to speak praise of such a man. As a journalist he was superb. As a believer in civic causes, he was tireless. As an advocate of the right as he saw it, he was relentless. As a man he was kind, thoughtful, humble and good. As a figure in our midst, he was towering.

He lived in a world of controversy because to him it was urgent to speak his mind. He would be the first to expect that in death, the controversy would follow him. But it will be controversy of ideas and not of personhood, for he lived life as he saw it all the way.

His own newspaper set forth on Tuesday that "A Giant Has Passed Our Way." We have rarely agreed with its editorials, but in this instance, we find no fault with its judgment.

Halbouty on Middle East Oil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES F. BATTIN

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1967

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Speaker, another war in the Middle East this year, among other things, has brought to the attention of Americans our countries growing dependence upon Arab oil to supply our needs. The fickleness of the Arab nations became apparent soon after the war started when they closed down all trade with the United States forcing us to draw heavily on our own resources and to increase imports from other oil-producing nations. I submit that this country need not be dependent on the Arab States and that it would be foolhardy for us to continue to expect the Arab nations to supply our needs. Independent American oil operators are distressed with our Nation's continuing naive approach to Arab oil and the entire oil-import policy. At a recent meeting of the Oklahoma City Chamber of Commerce, Mr. Michael T. Halbouty, pointed out how costly Middle East oil actually is to America. I include a newsletter by the Rocky Mountain Association of Geologists regarding Mr. Halbouty's statement:

HALBOUTY ON MIDDLE EAST OIL

Claiming that Middle East oil is the "most costly commodity that we have in the world today," Michel T. Halbouty has called on the U.S. to eliminate dependence on Middle East, African or Communist oil. During an address before a meeting of the Oklahoma City Chamber of Commerce directors and members of the Oklahoma City Geological Society, Mr. Halbouty claimed that it is an "illusion" that Middle East oil costs only pennies a barrel to find and produce.

"This does not include the costs of our fleets in the Mediterranean waters to protect these interests," said Mr. Halbouty. "It does not include the hospitals and schools and highways and untold other facilities that we have to build for these countries. It does not include the international accommodations which are costly to our taxpayers and have to be made at every turn. It does not include the cost of the tremendous damage to our domestic industry which has seen exploration virtually limited to offshore areas, which has seen the disappearance of thousands of independent domestic operators, and which has seen experienced and needed drilling contractors move out of the picture. It does not include a thousand other untold costs to our economy and to our security."

While calling for a greatly increased exploration effort for more oil and gas reserves in the U.S., Canada and the Western Hemisphere, Mr. Halbouty called for an immediate elimination of "any vestige of dependence on Middle East, African or Communist oil."

"As an American and a geologist, I object strongly to the continuing effort, at the sacrifice of our domestic petroleum industry, of pouring American dollars into the development of the petroleum industry of the Middle East countries which have told us to get out," declared Mr. Halbouty.

He pointed out that as things stand now, whoever controls Middle East oil can control the world. "Beneath the surface of the Arab countries is two thirds of the world's known oil reserves, and from these reserves is pumped one-third of the world's production. Western Europe, as well as industrialized Japan, is dependent on this oil for rapidly growing energy requirements," he said.

Mr. Halbouty urged the build-up of domestic reserves to offset the present Middle East advantage.

He estimated that U.S. wildcat wells must be tripled to 25,000 wells or more per year to find minimal domestic requirements of 55 billion barrels of new oil and 300 trillion cubic feet of new natural gas just to satisfy U.S. energy requirements in the next ten years.

"It is unthinkable that our nation, which depends on oil and gas for three-quarters of our energy requirements, and which has been the greatest oil developer around the world, should ever be faced with an oil shortage," said Mr. Halbouty. "We have found oil in the Arab countries, for the Arab countries, but there are few indications that we have really developed mutual understanding with the Arabs. This vast source of oil is unreliable as we have already twice seen. No free nation can ever depend on it—despite its size.

"We must realize that our domestic petroleum is the only available dependable supply. Other sources are subject to nationalization, expropriation, confiscation by exorbitant taxation, the caprice of foreign sovereigns, war and other emergency disconnections."

Flanagan, Ill., Lady Has Message on Juvenile Delinquency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1967

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Jack Cohn, retired merchant of Gary, Ind., forwarded to me the following item from the Bloomington, Ill., Pantagraph.

Mrs. Evelyn May, of Flanagan, Ill., has a message which, if all parents throughout the Nation would emulate, the youth of America, our school system, and our Nation's future would greatly benefit therefrom.

The item referred to follows:

FLANAGAN LADY'S LETTER APPEARS IN DAILY PAPER

The following letter appeared in the Wednesday morning Pantagraph in the "Letters To The Editor" column:

"Soon mothers all over the nation will be settling down for a second cup of coffee and heaving a deep sigh of relief for at last the little offspring are finally out from under foot and off to school. Mothers will say: 'Peace at last.'

"However, it seems that this should also be a good time for serious reflection. Our children are among our greatest gifts given to us by God and along with this blessing comes many responsibilities.

"As sad as it is to say, it is very apparent that many parents are expecting the schools and churches to do the tasks that should be done in the home. These include the teaching of love and respect for fellow human beings (regardless of race or color), morality, discipline, respect for our nation and its laws and the joy of serving others.

"The only way these ideals can be taught is by parental example. A teacher once said that a parent is sending himself to school every day. We cannot wait until our child becomes a teenager to instill these qualities in him. They must be taught from the cradle. Naturally mistakes will be made, but only as we admit them can we gain the respect of our youngsters.

"During these times of war, riots and turmoil, we need to help our children in their search for the meaning of life and instill in them a deep and personal relationship with God in their daily lives so that they may truly find a purpose for their lives and be able to face the future with courage and hope.

"Flanagan MRS. EVELYN MAY."

The Peace Movement on Long Island

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OTIS G. PIKE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1967

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Speaker, for the last 2 weeks my office in the quiet little town of Riverhead has been the scene of demonstrations by some people who oppose the war in which we are engaged. The demonstrators have come armed only with posters, cameras, and press releases, but because this is an unusual occurrence in Riverhead, and because some of the local papers have printed the releases, they have attracted a certain amount of attention.

Mindful of the honor being conveyed upon me, and feeling responsible for placing it in its proper perspective, I have done a little research on the history of the peace movement in Riverhead. My search for a precedent was in vain until I found the following article, printed in the "Letters to the Editor" pages of the New York Tribune, in July 1863.

The President being damned, of course, was not named Johnson, but Lincoln. The style of the protesters of 104 years ago was somewhat more flamboyant than those who have surrounded my office for the last 2 weeks, but I am sure that, in current jargon, they were highly motivated.

The article follows without further comment. It speaks for itself:

"A COPPERHEAD PEACE MEETING ON LONG ISLAND

"Our usually quiet little village was yesterday invaded by a host of armed men, who came under the guise of Peace Democrats, to hold a Convention here. I say armed men, not because I saw bayonets or swords, but because at least one of the principal speakers intimated that he had a revolver in his pocket, ready for resistance in case "of attempted arrest, and others made use of expressions intimating a preparation for, if not expectation of, such arrest. One Burr, the editor of a Peace journal published in your city, as he announced at the close of the meeting, especially distinguished himself by the virulence of his language; and perhaps if I repeat a few of his expressions it may show what right he has to claim to be an especial lover of peace. He abhorred, he said, defied, and cursed the Administration, and asked no clemency from it. He would as soon stain his hands in his brother's blood as to ask any favor from such an assassin and thief as Abe Lincoln. And he, in another connection, called the President a 'd—d old fool'. He declared that if a Provost-Marshal were to come into Bergen County, New Jersey, he would need as many lives as a cat, and a basket of duplicate heads. He said that New Jersey would not have war-howling Democrats in her borders; Abe Lincoln and the devil wanted them. He thanked God that we could not conquer the South; and he considered this just the time to make peace, when we were going to get licked most thunderingly. The only quarrel he had with the Rebels was their going off so ungallantly, leaving us at the mercy of the bloody scoundrels of the Administration. He could not be arrested when awake; it would take an army of seven men to arrest him; for, said he, 'I have got seven of you fellows in my pocket here, and I am willing to die in defense of liberty, particularly if I can send into eternity before me seven traitors and scoundrels.' And he would engage to lead that crowd against any force Mr. Lincoln could get in this county. The 'Peace army' was being marshaled rapidly.

"I will not attempt to give you the language of other speakers. They all breathed the same spirit; and the most violent and aggressive sentiments were received with the greatest applause. Your readers can judge for themselves whether those Peace Democrats are really as meek and lowly as their name would indicate, or whether they are wolves in sheep's clothing, ready to fly to arms in support of treason, upon the first assurance of success."

The 20th Anniversary of the U.S. Air Force

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. WHALEN, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1967

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Air Force today marks its 20th anniversary as a separate service.

I would like to take this opportunity to express my congratulations to our airmen on this occasion. I know I speak for all of us in reaffirming our respect and esteem for the defense these men render the Nation.

The Air Force literally has provided a shield of safety under which the United States, since the end of World War II, has been able to pursue the goals of peace and a better life, both here and in the world.

We tend to take this fact for granted. But I think our Air Force men understand this and perhaps it is as it should be. We are not militarily powerful so much by choice as by necessity.

Aerospace power in the nuclear age is the decisive fact of life, or death, to be candid about it. There is no doubt in my mind that the long years of duty provided by the now-departed B–36 bomber, for example, which never fired a shot in anger, persuaded any would-be aggressor that an attack on the United States would result in his own destruction. I might add, parenthetically, that many of the emergency war plan missions assigned to the B–36 aircrews during that time were understood to be one-way trips. The men knew this and accepted it as part of the commitment they made, as volunteers, to their fellow citizens.

As we sit in this body today, thousands of our airmen stand on round-the-clock alert, day in and day out, both here and in foreign countries, to respond to any attack against our country. Few of us have much of an awareness of this fact. Fewer of us still have ever seen the bombers, fighters, and missiles only minutes and seconds away from launching. They have never been employed in this role and hopefully never will be.

The absence of any direct attack against the United States testifies to the effectiveness of this retaliatory force. And the security is reflected in a number of diverse ways.

It has compelled the Soviet Union to depend more on political and diplomatic initiatives than on outright military force. This security also has contributed to the development of nationalistic movements by some of our allies, to the point of causing distress to our policymakers.

This umbrella of retaliatory strength further has had its effect on our own internal life. The fact that there is now substantial debate and protest against war and weaponry indicates the viability of such basic American virtues as freedom of speech and thought, all of this ironically fostered to some degree by this 22 years of security provided by an effective deterrent.

Some residents of my district, centering on Dayton, Ohio, can remember the skepticism directed at the achievement of two of their neighbors, Orville and Wilbur Wright, in developing the world's first powered aircraft. But in the brief space of 60 years, their invention has become a key factor in world power.

Our Air Force has served with distinction in peace and war. I am conscious of the vital role these men play in our society and extend my tribute to them on this auspicious occasion.

Maryland, Poor Maryland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1967

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the un-American forces have successfully used the newspapers and television to do the thinking for our friends in Maryland. The people have been educated to believe that their grandfathers were lousy statesmen and that a brand new "establishment" type constitution, conforming with the ideas of L. B. J. and Earl Warren, is progress.

And unless providence and prayer lead them otherwise, Maryland will be the first State to go under appointed rather than elected State officials.

We will watch to see the results—are Marylanders as freethinking as their fathers; or will they fall victim to education—that is, the nonintellectuals cannot be trusted to govern themselves.

Mr. Speaker, I here insert the Washington Evening Star article for September 13 in the RECORD:

CONSTITUTION PARLEY OPENS MINUS STATE FLOWERS

(By Anne Christmas)

ANNAPOLIS.—Maryland's first Constitutional Convention in 100 years opened yesterday with no black-eyed susans for decorations. But the absence of the state's official flower from the podium was not the fault of the program committee, which conducted a statewide search.

A member of the committee, Del. Edward J. Clarke of Montgomery, even appealed to Rep. Gilbert Gude, R-Md., who owns a large nursery business near Rockville. Gude put his experts on the trail, but had to report the sad news that black-eyed Susans just don't bloom in Maryland at this time of year.

Instead of the state flower, Gude substituted an arrangement in the state colors of orange carnations and star flowers with green foliage painted black, as the only decoration on the podium of the House of Delegates.

Traditionalists pointed out that the black-eyed Susan is a summertime flower and that daisies must be dyed black and gold each May to adorn the winner of the Preakness, Maryland's world famed horse race at Pimlico. Black-eyed susans, designated as the state flower by the General Assembly in 1918, bloom only in July and early August, and heaven help the visiting stranger who refers to them as weeds.

Even without black-eyed Susans, however, there was a keen awareness of history as 142 delegates convened under the gavel of the convention president H. Vernon Eney, who already has achieved considerable fame as a man who runs a tight ship.

If the next 90 days appear to offer only hard work to participants, there are some bright spots. Not the least of them are 50 high school students aides nominated by their principals for scholastic ability and their interest in the constitutional convention and other leadership qualities.

Eney explained that the honor students will serve as pages to delegates and as messengers to committees, and urged members to "use them, make them feel that they are earning their pay, performing a service and participating in a public event of the highest order."

He added: "They will carry back to their homes, schools and friends an impression of the work of this convention which could be obtained in no other way."

The students, ranging from 16 to 18 years, will serve for two-week periods, then return to classes and come back later for another two weeks in Annapolis. The girls are boarding in private homes, and the boys are living in dormitories in St. John's College.

Betsey Harrison, 17, of Harwood, Md., termed the job "fascinating." Kathy Drake, 18, of Kensington, agreed: "terrific!"

The House of Delegates chamber in the old State House was jammed for the opening. The plan for a strictly ordered convention, apparent in Eney's speech, was rivaled by mass confusion elsewhere, as a crescendo of questions came from all sides.

Where could delegates find some official stationery? Could a telephone be ordered by a group from one county? Where could you hang your coat? Where is such and such a committee meeting? And, oh where, was the official shoe shine boy?

(There was an answer to that last query: It was promised that the shoe shine stand in the State House would be open for business today.)

As these and many more questions echoed around the old building, an observer commented: "I thought Eney's speech explained everything except the location of the ladies' lounge."

Belmar First Aid Unit To Mark 40th Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. HOWARD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1967

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, September 24, I will have the honor to address the Belmar, N.J., First Aid & Safety Squad on the occasion of its 40th anniversary. This wonderful organization concludes its 3-day celebration on September 24, and I consider it a great privilege to participate. The Belmar First Aid & Safety Squad throughout the years has rendered innumerable acts of public service, and I would suspect there are few families in the community that have not benefited in some way and, indeed, since Belmar's squad set the example for others, the entire State of New Jersey is indebted to this organization.

On Monday, June 12, 1967, the Asbury Park Evening Press, Asbury Park, N.J., contained an article about the Belmar First Aid & Safety Squad outlining many interesting facts and events, which I am pleased to have permission to insert, as follows:

BELMAR FIRST AID UNIT TO MARK 40TH YEAR—NEW JERSEY AIDMEN TO JOIN FETE

BELMAR.—First aidmen from 397 of the state's first aid squads are expected to meet here in September to observe the 40th anniversary of the Belmar First Aid and Safety Squad.

The squad was organized in 1927 and is believed to be the oldest in the East.

An informal gathering at the squad home on the northeast corner of 9th and D streets Sept. 22 will launch a three-day program.

DRILL CONTEST SET

Robert Connelly, program chairman, said 56 rescue squads will take part in a rescue drill the following morning. Details of the contest are being withheld to prevent any squad from planning a solution in advance. In past years squads have often been required to rescue a "disabled" person from the top of the borough water tower.

The squads will compete in first aid exercises in the afternoon. A dinner dance for 400 guests is planned for the evening at the Barclay Hotel.

A parade will be held on Sept. 24, a Sunday. Marchers will step off at 2 p.m. from Lake Como and march north on F street past a reviewing stand at 9th avenue. The McGuire Air Force Band and Drill Team will join high school bands in the parade, Mr. Connelly said.

Winners' trophies will be displayed in the window of Taylor's Hardware Store, F St., over the July 4th weekend. Mayor John A. Taylor, owner of the store, is one of the squad's 25 active members.

DONATED AMBULANCE

The squad got its start when a benefactor, Frank Mihlon, who maintained a summer home at 203 Ocean Ave., presented members with a fully equipped ambulance and uniforms for each man.

According to an article that appeared in the Asbury Park Press on March 27, 1928, the Belmar Exchange Club honored Mr. Mihlon's 11-year-old son, Frank Mihlon Jr., for his part in getting the squad started.

Frank Jr. was made an honorary member of the Exchange Club and its 900 affiliated clubs throughout the country. At the ceremony, William B. Connelly, then vice president of the Exchange Club, said that Frank Jr. had seen a newspaper article discussing the possibility of forming a first aid squad and suggested to his father that the latter contribute an "emergency car."

Mr. Mihlon was a sports promoter, who staged motorcycle and bicycle races at the Velodrome, which at the time was on South Orange avenue in Newark. He was principal owner of the Velodrome and also promoted races in London, Berlin, and Rome.

STILL LIVES HERE

Mr. Mihlon owned a home and business on the southwest corner of Broad and Market streets in Newark. Two bronze plaques set in the sidewalk still mark the site there of the family's home. Mr. Mihlon died in 1936.

His widow, Mrs. Minnie Mihlon, and his son, Frank Mihlon Jr., still live at the family home here on Ocean avenue.

Mr. Mihlon Jr. told the Asbury Park Press that he and his parents often observed persons hurt in mishaps on the waterfront and noted there was no one to care for the injured.

He recalled one instance that convinced the Mihlons that a first aid squad was needed:

One Sunday evening they saw a man trying to open his car after locking the keys inside it. The man tried to force a window which broke, cutting his arm severely. Before help was finally secured the man was in danger of bleeding to death.

A picture of the first ambulance operated by the first aid squad shows its side panel was lettered, "The Frank Milhon Jr. First Aid Squad."

SON GAVE SECOND VEHICLE

Other newspaper clippings reveal that the second ambulance owned by the squad was a gift from Mr. Mihlon Jr., then 12.

They recount that Mr. Mihlon gave his son $2,000 for Christmas in December 1929, which was to be savings for the future. Frank Jr. told his father he would like to use the money to buy another ambulance for the squad and his father agreed.

The gift was a fully equipped Studebaker.

Mr. Mihlon Jr. is married and the couple has a son and two daughters. A National Broadcasting Co. radio program in 1942 described his role in aiding the squad and the company presented him with a medal.

He himself has twice been aided by the first aid squad, once in 1932 and again in 1965, when he suffered a serious back injury.

INTERESTED IN WORK

Mrs. Mihlon said she has lived here 51 years. Her son credits her role in helping start the first aid squad and noted that she was "extremely interested in first aid work."

Records show that the squad answered 94 calls during 1928. Now the calls average more than 1,000 a year and during a 10-day period in July there were 100 calls for assistance.

When the Squad decided to move from the quarters it shared with the Union Fire Co. in the former borough hall on E street, Mr. Mihlon donated a site for a permanent home.

A $4,000 building was erected in 1931 and the squad moved into its present home in 1932.

Six Monmouth County communities followed Belmar's lead to form their own squads, and in August 1929 they met here to form the New Jersey State First Aid Council. Charles Measure was president and Frederick L. Duggan of Spring Lake was first vice president.

Mr. Measure, the squad's first captain, died in 1953. Another founder, former Police Captain William Briden died in October. He was known to state first aidmen as "Mr. First Aid."

FOUNDERS TO ATTEND

Three of the men who founded the squad plan to attend the celebration in September. They are Charles Burger, here, and Arthur Davenport and Albert Isola, who both live in Florida.

Others who will attend are Richard McEvilly, president of the state council, and officers of the state's three first aid districts.

Today four rigs are available for calls, including a 1938 Ford which is a consistent prize winner as the oldest ambulance in the state. The Ford is still used for emergencies on the beachfront when the others are in service.

Squad officers are Howard Megill, president; James McLoughlin and Frederick Rible, vice presidents; Robert Schward secretary; William Quakenbush, treasurer; William Yehle, captain; Thomas Walter, lieutenant; Frank La Point and John Dalton, sergeants.

CREATED AUXILIARY

In October, 18 women started an auxiliary. Mrs. Robert Connelly is president; Mrs. Frank La Point, vice president; Mrs. Francis Hines, secretary, and Mrs. Joseph Gillen, treasurer.

Dr. David Lukens serves as squad physician.

Members might be too modest to admit it, but each volunteer performs an important service for a fellow human in time of distress and suffering.

A Tribute to the Late Harry H. Woodring

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1967

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, Harry H. Woodring, who died on Saturday, September 9, had a distinguished career of public service, having served as Governor of Kansas from 1931 to 1933, as Assistant Secretary of War under the administration of Franklin Delano Roosevelt from 1933 to 1936, and as Secretary of War for a period of 4 years.

Although I was not personally acquainted with the late former Governor of Kansas, Harry Woodring, I am well aware of his great service to Kansas and the Nation. I join with many citizens of my home State of Kansas and of the United States in paying tribute to Harry H. Woodring, and include the following editorial from the Kansas City Star of September 12, 1967:

HARRY WOODRING

Harry H. Woodring, former governor of Kansas (1931–32) and secretary of war from 1936 to 1940, was blown out of the depression to a prominent place in national events.

Woodring, along with the late Guy T. Helvering, led the Democratic cause in Kansas in the days when few men of that political persuasion could be found. The Civil war background of "Bleeding Kansas" was at least one reason why Harry Woodring was only the fourth Democratic governor in the history of the state. But he was an able governor in difficult times, and he helped prepare the way for the 2-party atmosphere that is somewhat more prevalent in Kansas today.

As secretary of war, Woodring later said that one of his most important acts was the recommendation of Gen. George Catlett Marshall for Army chief of staff. He broke with President Roosevelt over the issue of sending weapons, principally bombers, to the British in 1940, and was replaced by the Republican Henry L. Stimson in what at the time was regarded as a shrewd political move by the President. Several years after, Woodring recalled that he, too, believed that England was our first line of defense but that the military had told him the airplanes were needed for the cover of Panama and Hawaii.

Harry Woodring was governor of Kansas in trying times of economic upheaval. He was the civilian head of the Army in the puzzling era just before World War II. His death, a generation later, recalls a period of fearful uncertainties when no one had all the answers.

Cities Versus Farms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAN KUYKENDALL

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1967

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Speaker, considerable discussion is heard at this time about the role of rural America in solving our present urban problems. Suggestions on this have come from many sources.

A recent editorial in the Memphis Commercial Appeal mentioned three diverse groups who are expressing themselves on the rural-urban relationship. These are: First, Republican Party leadership; second, National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, representing local electric associations who serve 20 million rural people, and third, Farm Journal, the Nation's largest farm magazine.

Because of the thoughtful nature of this editorial, which appeared on August 28, I am pleased to call it to the attention of my congressional colleagues:

CITIES VERSUS FARMS

Republican Party leaders have proposed a five-point program to turn the flow of migration in the United States back from the crowded cities to the rural areas.

The GOP proposal comes at the same time that the National Rural Electric Co-operative Association has been advertising in newspapers suggesting a similar approach to the "Crisis in Our Cities" and the Farm Journal, largest of the nation's farm magazines, has begun an editorial campaign for the same thing in its September issue.

All of these proposals deserve serious consideration and some action.

The American concept that the biggest is the best has not proved correct as far as cities are concerned. There comes a point in the growth of any city when it reaches an optimum of physical development. Many American cities have passed that point.

The solutions being offered include economic incentives for factories to locate in poor rural areas, increased aid to schools in rural areas with more vocational-technical schools, rural community action programs which would co-ordinate Federal and private efforts, employment services in rural areas comparable to those in the cities and a stepped up program of the Economic Development Administration to provide grants and loans to put water, sewer and other public works into the rural areas.

The South could use all such efforts, this region being one which offers space, clean water and air, raw materials and good transportation systems.

But two facts must be kept in mind.

One is that Southern out-migration resulted in part from the inability of many of the migrants to take advantage of opportunities which have developed here. If those people are going to be helped, wherever they are, the emphasis must be on upgrading people.

The second is that major cities still are essential. Cities grew because of the need for marketplaces—the gathering and distribution centers for goods and services.

The nation's economy needs such centers and people who remain there must learn to live in them. Part of the problem in urban core areas has been that they were abandoned to those who were unqualified for work in either new rural areas or cities.

While it is well to pursue decentralized economy—and a new migration back to rural America—that sort of program will not solve all city problems. It could, in fact, make the problems of the cities worse.

Midwest Old Settlers and Threshers Reunion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 12, 1967

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, the Midwest Old Settlers and Threshers Reunion has just been concluded at Mount Pleasant, Iowa. This year over 200,000 were in attendance.

The people at Mount Pleasant should be commended for the fine way their community works together on this project. As one who has often attended Old Threshers, I know how much work and effort goes into making it a success.

A column in the Mount Pleasant News by A. M. "Pat" Patterson on September 8, 1967, helps tell the story of this celebration which does so much to remind us of the richness of our heritage:

PAT'S BYSTANDER NOTES

This year's Midwest Old Settlers and Threshers Reunion gave further emphasis to a thing that looks obvious in the planning of the next few years. That is, McMillan park is becoming more and more a Threshers Reunion park. We can foresee the possibility that it should be sold to the Threshers association at a nominal figure within the next few years. The association could permit the Fair to continue, permit the use of the grounds for football games for five years or so until the high school has other accommodations, permit the use for boys baseball and the like, and permit gatherings such as the REC annual meeting. As a picnic area, let's face it, the park isn't much anymore. Most of the trees are gone and it will be 10 or 20 years before the area is heavily wooded again, if trees are wanted.

There should be great community pride in the success of the Reunion. It is nationally and internationally known, of course, and neighbor to neighbor praise of the event undoubtedly helps swell the crowds. The acclaim given in newspapers, on television and radio and by magazines booklets and circulars appropriately placed for public acceptance, have a part in spreading the good word.

Iowa is becoming more aware of the importance of the Reunion as a tourist attraction each year. We have a report that one prominent Iowan said the Reunion is the best thing that has happened to Iowa in many years. When you have something that attracts the fine people that this Reunion does in larger numbers than any other event in Iowa outside the State Fair, you cannot take it lightly. Undoubtedly there isn't a county in Iowa that wouldn't like to have the Reunion. It is hardly necessary to say again that community cooperation and volunteer support as have been given in the past have had much to do with the success of the Reunion. Similar cooperation and volunteer support will have much to do with its continuation.

The News has used literally hundreds of names in connection with the Reunion and finds that the event has become so large that many leaders and workers cannot be listed. We've been told for example that a host of people helped at the church where attendance was beyond the capacity of the building repeatedly again this year. We wish we could give credit to all. We must mention again the importance of the work of Bill Sater, president, and Herb Hult, secretary, and the board of directors and also those who see to it that the narrow gauge railroad goes, which is quite a crew under the leadership of Stan Mathews.

Our coverage of the event has been praised by many readers. Our regular staff spent much time in getting pictures and information, but much credit goes also to Billie Turley, Helen Virden, Veda Bates and Anna Lee Scott for writing and organizing the stories. We understand typewriters were clicking far into the night and at least on two occasions into the early morning to get out the stories. First ingredient necessary for the success of the Reunion is local interest. That comes in part from knowing what is happening each year through the published information.

Many will agree with one man's opinion of the Reunion as expressed in a letter printed in the Des Moines Register this week. He writes:

HE SHOULD HAVE STAYED IN IOWA

To THE EDITOR: I traveled all the way to California to see what I could have seen right in Iowa. After visiting the Midwest Old Settlers and Threshers Reunion at Mt. Pleasant, I couldn't recommend to anyone to travel all the way to Knott's Berry Farm in Buena Park, Calif., to see less than is at the Mt. Pleasant show.

This show has the old buildings, trains and train robberies just like Knott's, but also more steam engines than you can count, a great array of antique cars and equipment, plus much more. If you only have a few minutes to visit this show, don't bother. There are many interesting exhibits and events all over the grounds. To all who are associated with this show, congratulations.

MARLOW STEINBERG.

ALDEN, IOWA.

Progress in the Field of Veterans Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1967

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it is not uncommon for the men and women who devote many years of outstanding service to the people of this Nation through their work in the Federal Government to go unnoticed. The temptation to criticize too often makes precedence over recognition for a job consistently well done.

Because of our daily observations and associations, we of the Veterans' Affairs Committee have long been aware of the quiet but efficient performance of duty by the 170,000 employees of the Veterans' Administration on behalf of America's veterans and their dependents who constitute nearly half of our national population.

But we are not alone in our esteem for the work of the VA. I was especially pleased to note recent praise of VA employees by the President which was transmitted to VA field stations by William J. Driver, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, the very able leader of an agency staffed by able personnel.

It is my pleasure to submit for the RECORD a copy of Mr. Driver's September 12 memorandum to VA managers and directors enclosing a summary of progress made in the field of veteran affairs during the past several years.

Members of Congress can feel justifiable pride in knowing that they have shared in this record of progress, which I believe reflects the most outstanding gains made on behalf of veterans in all the years I have been a Member of this great body:

SEPTEMBER 12, 1967.

Managers and Directors of Field Stations:

Attached is a summary of a report I had occasion to submit recently to President Johnson concering progress in the field of veterans affairs during the past several years.

Because so very much of this progress is keyed to the fine performance of you and the employees at your station, President Johnson asked me to extend his personal appreciation to all Veterans Administration personnel for their dedicated work on behalf of the veterans we are privileged to serve.

I want you and members of your staff to know, too, that I am deeply grateful for your day-by-day efforts which make the VA the instrument of service it must always be if we are to carry out the intent of the American people as expressed through Congress and the President.

While there is much in this report that can give us satisfaction, I know you will agree that we must strive for constant improvement if we are to administer properly the programs designed to meet the needs of our nearly 26,000,000 veterans and their dependents.

W. J. DRIVER,
Administrator.

SUMMARY OF PROGRESS IN THE FIELD OF VETERANS AFFAIRS, 1964–67

Extension of Service: VA now provides counseling even before a serviceman is discharged from the Armed Forces. At the President's request, VA has stationed contact representatives in Viet-Nam to provide information on veterans benefits to personnel due to be separated, and has established bedside vocational counseling for the seriously disabled in 100 stateside military hospitals. Some 70,000 members of Armed Forces have been assisted in Viet-Nam, and 14,000 disabled have been counseled in military hospitals.

New Hospitals: Ten new or replacement VA hospitals (7,338 beds) have been built, with five more currently under construction (an additional 4,012 beds). Total cost: $269-million for the 15 new hospitals.

Waiting List Cut in Half: The list of eligible veterans waiting for beds in VA's 165 hospitals has been reduced by more than one-half. The number on the list seeking treatment for nonservice-connected conditions was 25,418 in 1948, was 16,873 in 1964, and is now about 7,500.

Compensation and Pension: More than 4,500,000 disabled veterans, dependent parents, widows and orphans have received over $12.2-billion in compensation and pension payments. Payments amounted to $3.9-billion in Fiscal Year 1964 and had mounted to $4.5-billion in Fiscal Year 1967.

Nursing Home Care: This new benefit has provided more than 3,700,000 patient days of nursing home care for veterans in a program involving VA, community nursing homes and state nursing facilities.

Aid to Children: Extra educational assistance amounting to $6,400,000 paid to 45,000 children of disabled or deceased veterans for school and college training, and special restorative training for the handicapped.

Rehabilitation Training: Nearly $4,000,000 in increased subsistence paid to 13,000 disabled veterans during rehabilitation training.

Major Legislation: G.I. Bill benefits and hospital care made available to Post-Korean veterans in legislation approved by the President on March 3, 1966. This third-generation G.I. Bill has an estimated five-year cost of $2-billion.

On Aug. 31, 1967, the President signed the Veterans Pension and Readjustment Assistance Act of 1967 granting additional benefits to millions of veterans at a first-year cost of $286-million. The new law, embodying features requested by the President on Jan. 31, 1967, in the most comprehensive veterans affairs message ever submitted to Congress, put Viet-Nam era veterans on a benefits par with older veterans, increased pensions payable to 2,000,000 disabled veterans and widows by an average of 5.4%, and provided higher payments and broadened training opportunities under the new G.I. Bill.

Appropriation Requests: Appropriation requests for VA up an average of $300-million a year for each of the past three years. Fiscal Year 1968 request of $6.6-billion highest in VA history excepting two peak years shortly following WW II.

Medical Care Budgets: Highest in the history of the VA. Budgets have exceeded a billion dollars in each of the last three fiscal years, and the F.Y. 1968 request of $1,357,293,000 is the most ever asked for the care of sick and disabled veterans.

U.S. Veterans Advisory Commission: Eleven member commission appointed as result of President's Jan. 31, 1967, Message to Congress. Commission to make recommendations to Administrator of Veterans Affairs based on the first series of grass-roots meetings ever held in veterans affairs field. Administrator to report to President by January 1968 proposals "to assure that our tax dollars are being utilized most wisely and that our Government is meeting fully its responsibilities to all those to whom we owe so much."

Hospital Care for More Veterans: With essentially the same number of beds, VA hospitals in F.Y. 1968 will treat 179,000 more sick and disabled veterans than were cared for in F.Y. 1958. A record 745,000 veterans were hospitalized in F.Y. 1967, and the total is expected to reach 787,000 in F.Y. 1968.

Medical Research: The Fiscal Year 1968 appropriations request of $45,061,000 is the highest in VA history. Constantly seeking new knowledge to improve medical care, funds earmarked for this program have been increased by more than 35% since F.Y. 1964.

Medical Training: About one-half of all new physicians graduated from medical schools each year receive some of their training in the vast VA medical program. VA also helps train thousands of others in 20 medical disciplines ranging from audiology to social work. VA now is affiliated with 76 of the 88 medical schools in the nation, and 32 of the 47 dental schools.

Outpatient Care: VA expects 6,435,100 visits—the highest number ever—to be made by beneficiaries to VA clinics and fee basis private physicians during the current fiscal year. Procedures for obtaining this care have been simplified greatly through use of a medical treatment identification card.

Savings: Cost reduction efforts in VA's Department of Medicine and Surgery accounted for savings of $12.9-million last fiscal year. Annual administrative savings of another $16.9-million is due to ever-greater use of computer systems. Savings amounting to $2-million a year have been effected in VA's Guardianship program.

Insurance Protection: More than 200,000 disabled veterans were granted $1.5-billion worth of new G.I. insurance during a one-year reopening period, from May 1965 to May 1966.

Insurance for Servicemen: Some 3,700,000 personnel in the Armed Forces have received $36-billion worth of minimal cost insurance coverage in a new program supervised by the VA. The President has recommended increased coverage from the present maximum of $10,000 to a new maximum of $30,000. Hundreds of commercial insurance companies participate in this program.

Loans: Nearly $10-billion worth of home, farm and business loans were guaranteed or insured by VA. Another $500-million was distributed in VA direct loans.

Economic Assistance Programs: Through Fiscal Year 1967, VA has served as host to at least 25% of all enrollees in the various economic assistance programs. A high proportion of the 28,113 enrollees trained at 120 VA stations last year received work experience in the manpower short health service occupations.

Women Employees: VA now employs 76,214 women—43.9% of its work force. This is a 20.8% increase over June 30, 1963. In higher level positions there are now 5.4% more women than one year ago.

Minority Group Employees: Negroes and members of other minority groups now constitute 29.3% of the full-time VA work face. The number of Negro employees has increased by 4.5% during the past year, and there was an increase of 575 Negroes in higher level employment.

Portugal's African Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1967

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, recent tragic tribal tribulations among the so-called nations of Africa have underscored anew the need for stability and intelligence before "independence."

A recent interview granted by Portuguese Foreign Minister Franco Nogueira, to a Norwegian reporter, provides an excellent insight into Portugal's present position and overall national philosophy regarding her African territories.

Mr. Speaker, I include pertinent portions of this interview following my remarks:

PORTUGUESE OPINION

(Interview granted to Frank Bjerjholt of the Norwegian daily "Morgen Bladet" by Foreign Minister Franco Nogueira, reiterates the Portuguese official view concerning Portugal's policy in Africa. We reprint those views for the special benefit of those who are interested in foreign affairs. Nogueira spoke in answer to questions, and here is what he told the reporter.)

The tendency is growing throughout the world, and even on the African continent, to recognize Portuguese presence in Africa as a reality. Already not everything is viewed pessimistically. There exists a certain amount of goodwill in taking into account the positive aspects of our work. And one already sees a change tending towards greater co-operation for the benefit of Africa, rather than the continuation of a disastrous quarrel. It is a "wind of change" which is more positive than the previous one and I believe there is hope that better relations with our African neighbors may be achieved.

I want to assure you to begin with; that Portugal has no problems with the Africans. Nor is it a Nyerere, nor a Mobutu who is creating trouble but rather the great powers, in the East and in the West, who desire to expel Portugal from Africa with a view to themselves appropriating the raw materials and the resources, for which reason they incite and encourage the African States to be hostile to us.

Neo-colonialism is a very strong reality.

The African States have only nominal independence: they know very well that economically speaking they are, in fact, "in the pockets" of the great powers. I do not know how long they will be prepared to put up with that situation, but Portugal proposes to offer them cooperation on an African basis. The true interest of the African States will be better served by co-operation with Portugal and not by fighting us. Little by little, a growing number of African States believe they will be the losers should Portugal leave Africa.

UMATT: A Flying Peace Corps Which Deserves Our Encouragement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. WHALEN, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1967

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to apprise the Members of the House of Representatives of a highly commendable and noteworthy humanitarian effort being conducted by the United Missions Air Training and Transport, Inc.

UMATT, a nonprofit Ohio corporation, is in reality a flying peace corps. It operates a fleet of six American light planes over an area of one million square miles encompassing underdeveloped countries in East Africa.

The organization is nondenominational, makes no charge for its assistance and has pledged itself, as stated in its articles of incorporation, "to distribute assistance without respect to social, religious and geographic difference according to the principles of the dignity of man and his needs as a fellow human being."

In addition to rendering humanitarian assistance, UMATT also is engaged in helping these people to help themselves by teaching them the use of one of the marvels of our technical age, the airplane.

UMATT outlined this goal also in its incorporation statement:

> To render material assistance to all private and public humanitarian agencies, and to all such agencies, or other groups or governments interested in establishing aviation training facilities, air transport support operations, aerial distribution of chemicals for agricultural or public health purposes, disaster relief and any and all peaceful uses for aircraft.
>
> To provide a continuing source of information on utilitarian aviation and to initiate and to support technical and economic studies looking toward more efficient and ever expanding application of aircraft in the sector of humanitarian interest.

UMATT has made possible greater utilization of professional volunteers in East Africa by increasing their mobility and availability. This has been true in the cases of medical doctors, educators and agricultural experts. In many cases, lives have been saved through the service of UMATT's aircraft. Schools in certain localities exist only because of the unique ability of the aircraft to keep them supplied.

Through this people-to-people program of foreign aid, the cause of friendly relations and the betterment of humanity has been served.

It is significant to mention also that one African government has requested UMATT to establish an air training program capable of training 3,000 young people.

Mr. Speaker, efforts of this kind reaffirm the commitment of Americans to our fellow man. UMATT certainly is to be congratulated for its work and deserves our encouragement.

Americanism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN YOUNG

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1967

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, good lessons in Americanism are important; they are good for us and they are good for our country. Last week we had just such a lesson and it was good one; and, political personalities aside, it is one we all should note seriously and objectively. I refer, of course, to the Detroit News' Romney editorial—with special emphasis on its Vietnam treatment. The editorial represented a clean break with a man that the paper had always supported and the excruciating circumstances of the News' decision add great credence, I think, to the validity of the editorial's judgment. Its reference to Vietnam is important because, I am confident, it speaks the voice of America.

As I see it, Mr. Speaker, the meat of the editorial is simple and direct—when our country is in trouble and its course is committed, whether we agree with the "whys and wheres"—which I do—every American should stand with his country and behind the boys who are fighting and dying for the cause. The Detroit News put it directly:

> This newspaper believes . . . we cannot retreat from Vietnam without betraying those who have died there in the belief that America's pledges will be redeemed.

When I first came to Congress some 10 years ago, I saw a similar lesson in Americanism under similar circumstances under a different President. As a freshman Congressman in 1957, the first vote I was called upon to cast in January of that year was in support of President Eisenhower in the very grave Mideast crisis. The matter involved a real danger of a direct confrontation with Soviet Russia; and, then as now, there was considerable doubt among the Members of Congress as to what course this country should take. But the doubts were soon resolved

Under the driving leadership of House Speaker Sam Rayburn and Senate Majority Leader Lyndon Johnson together with House Majority Leader John McCormack, it was made instantly clear to the Nation and the world that the country was in trouble and the Democratic Congress would stand firmly behind our President. That the President happened to be of the opposite political party had no bearing on the matter. That was as it should be then and is as it should be now.

In this connection, I recall a group calling itself the Democratic Advisory Council, or some such, attempted to prevail upon Mr. Rayburn and Senator Johnson to join them as a "clearinghouse" for legislation to be approved by the Democratic Congress. Messrs. Rayburn and Johnson declined the invitation, and their comments were and are unprintable.

Clearly, the lesson is—for good or bad we stay with our Government. It was so 10 years ago; it is so now; and, it will be so 10 years hence and as long as there is an America.

And while we are on the subject of Americanism and patriotism, it might be well to note that the draft-card burners and the flag desecraters are not our only problem. Our flag can be desecrated and our national purpose dishonored just as effectively and sometimes more injuriously, although more subtly, by citizens of high education in positions of great national importance. This is so whether it comes from a Rhodes scholar or from the peacenik demonstrator. And, if we fail to support our boys in Vietnam with the necessary money and implements of war, even if it does require an increase in taxes, we might well betray our boys in Vietnam more than the peaceniks and the fancy-talking doves.

Our President certainly deserves and will receive the overwhelming support of the Congress and the people in all matters of vital national concern. He will receive this because he is our President just as President Eisenhower received it when he was our President. But to us who are Democrats, the present President is our President in a special sense and should have the support of all Democrats in a special way. And, make no mistake about it, he will be our candidate for President in 1968. Whether many Democrats return to the Congress will depend to a considerable extent on how well Americans throughout the country understand and appreciate the problems confronting him and the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that we all can close ranks and respond to our Nation's call in its hour of need; for those who do not, the record will be clear—their country was in need, and they were absent; they were not there.

And the Rockets Red Glare, the Bombs Bursting in Air

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1967

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday marked the 153d anniversary of our national anthem, the "Star-Spangled Banner." It was on September 14 in 1814 that Francis Scott Key, a Georgetown, District of Columbia lawyer, wrote the thrilling words for this patriotic song.

Key was inspired to pen his immortal lines while witnessing the bombardment of Fort McHenry in Baltimore. One of his friends, a physician of Upper Marlborough, Md., had been seized by the British for interfering with their ground troops—this was during the War of 1812. Armed with a note from President James Madison, Key went to the fleet under a flag of truce to ask for the doctor's release. Admiral Cockburn, who was in charge of the British squadron, assented to the request, but circumstances were such that the lawyer and his friend were both delayed in their return to friendlier soil.

The British fleet was about to sail up the Patapsco River to bombard the fort, so Key was detained for the duration of the attack, which started at 7 in the morning of September 13. It lasted, with intermissions, for 25 hours. Although the enemy fired over 1,500 shells, each weighing as much as 220 pounds, the British were unable to approach closely because the Americans had sunk 22 vessels in the channel.

During the bombardment Key wrote a stanza of his poem on the back of an envelope. He completed it the following day at the Fountain Inn in Baltimore and gave it to Judge Joseph Hooper Nicholson; Nicholson and Key had married sisters. The judge suggested the tune "Anacreon in Heaven" and had copies of the new song printed.

The song appeared in the Baltimore American of September 25. Key later made three additional copies; one is in the Library of Congress and another is owned by the Pennsylvania Historical Society.

What became of The Star-Spangled Banner?

The flag that inspired Key to write the words for the song may be seen at the Smithsonian Institution here in the Nation's Capital. This flag, which is 30 by 42 feet, was made by Mary Young Pickersgill of Baltimore. It has 15 alternate red and white stripes and 15 stars to represent the States that formed the original United States, plus Vermont and

Kentucky. During the intervening years, the number of stars in our flag has increased with the number of States from 15 to 50, while the number of stripes has been set permanently at 13 to represent only the States that formed the Union.

The original copy of the song remained in the possession of the Nicholson family until 1907, when it was bought by Henry Walters of Baltimore. It was purchased at auction in New York City from the Walters estate in 1934 by the Walters Art Gallery, of Baltimore, for $26,400. The gallery sold the manuscript in 1953 to the Maryland Historical Society for the same price, the money having been donated by Mrs. Thomas Courtney Jenkins, of Baltimore, in memory of her mother-in-law, Mrs. Catherine Key Jenkins, who was a daughter of a first cousin of Francis Scott Key.

Why Are These Weapons Available?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1967

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, for many years I have been urging further restrictions on the sale and use of guns. My bill, H.R. 5463, is I believe a sensible approach toward restricting the sale and availability of firearms. I hope that we can see it or similar legislation enacted this year.

The following editorial from the September 4, 1967, edition of the Washington Post is very much to the point and I commend it to the attention of our colleagues, as follows:

Why?

> Anyone who looked at the picture published in this newspaper of the pistol which the police believe was used to murder George Lincoln Rockwell must wonder a little why it was available for this, or any other, purpose. The weapon was a Mauser of a type widely used by the German army in World War I. It fires a high-velocity cartridge equivalent to .30 caliber and has a long barrel that makes it accurate at more than normal handgun range. It is, in short, a device designed for a single, simple service—maiming or killing human beings.
>
> This is in no sense a sporting weapon. No one would dream of using it, say, to shoot birds or to hunt game, big or small, in the woods. It has no special utility for self-defense or home protection. For these purposes, a rifle or shotgun would be more effective, a law-abiding householder having no need to conceal the weapon. For murder, however—or for other crimes such as robbery to be accomplished through a threat of murder—the Mauser is ideal. The only question to be asked about it is why law-abiding citizens allow it to be offered for sale to any thug or lawbreaker.
>
> When asked by police what kind of sidearm the man accused of murdering Rockwell liked to carry, members of the American Nazi Party said they did not know. "We have all kinds of guns around here," one said. Why? Why should such hate-mongers and desperadoes have any kind of gun around a peaceful community?
>
> When you come down to it, why should anyone—excepting military men and men with law-enforcement responsibilities—be allowed to possess such a weapon? Would not the whole community, including sportsmen, be a great deal safer if purchase or possession of these deadly devices were rigidly forbidden? Target shooters could be allowed to keep them under lock and key at approved firing ranges; and collectors could be allowed to keep them in some nonfirable form. The degree of disarmament at home is now surely imperative.

Can the Administration Ignore the Challenge?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK MacGREGOR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1967

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, the Republican coordinating committee recently issued a statement entitled "The Middle East—Crisis and Opportunity." This was an excellent recital of the facts surrounding the Middle East situation and a thought-provoking guide to future action.

On August 18 the American Jewish World, published in the Twin Cities of Minneapolis and St. Paul, contained an excellent editorial entitled "Can the Administration Ignore the Challenge?"

L. H. Frisch, editor and publisher, clearly indicates the nature of the statement when he states:

> The Republican position, though understandably partisan in motivation, is nevertheless powerfully expressive of the Jewish position as well. Its complaints are our complaints, its disappointments our disappointments.

In closing, the editorial states:

> We think that both the Administration's wrong-headedness, on the one hand, and the Opposition's timely, vital and significant policy statement on the other, should arouse a great, widespread, genuinely grass-roots protest to Washington to get our nation back on course—and thus begin to serve the causes of settlement, cooperation, friendship, and peace.

The entire text of this excellent editorial follows:

Can the Administration Ignore the Challenge?

> Let us, without cynicism, accept the policy statement of the top-level Republican Coordinating Committee, calling on the Administration to proceed with intelligence and enlightened self-interest in the Middle East. Let us value it not alone for the several penetratingly vital things the document says, but for the head-on challenge it offers the incumbent planners, who have been guilty of lapses and errors both maddening and saddening.
>
> And let us clarify for ourselves the heart-of-the-matter reality that though the words Republican and Democrat are writ large in this particular situation, the issues raised are fundamentally non-partisan in nature; it is the direction, the impact, the effect of the American thrust among the nations of the world that is here being assayed.
>
> For the purpose, then, of discussion, there is no better approach than the indictments and recommendations put forward by the GOP in its earnest document, details of which were provided for our readers in our August 11th issue.
>
> One of the major faults the Republican statement finds with the Administration's pursuit of its Mideast policies is its failure to say, in the name of the American people, whether our "sympathies were with Israel or the Arabs." By contrast, the GOP writers of their document point out, "the declared Soviet position was one hundred percent pro-Arab."
>
> This reminder exposes the Administration as proceeding at serious cross-purpose with the will of the American people. Let's put it for Washington in the most colloquial and emphatic terms: America rooted, and rooted loud, hard, and clear, for Irsael, and hailed its smashing victory with partisan joy. Where, then, does that leave the Administration's planners? Somewhere outside the boundaries, hovering beyond the foul-line, limping for the showers.
>
> Another major point in the Republican document: As a result of Russia's all-out commitment to the Arabs, Israel handed the Kremlin "a serious reverse in terms both of power and prestige in much of the Arab world." Now, the GOP insists, is the moment for America to apply its own influence toward inhibiting the Soviets "from again creating disturbances in this area."
>
> In wilful disregard of the clear-cut situation that has developed in the Middle East, our State Department—eager to restore diplomatic relations and even aid-agreements with that great and kindly statesman Nasser, "seeks to outbid the Russians for Arab friendship." And what is the accompanying pressure? Our news headline told it a few weeks ago: State Department exertion of one-sided pressure on Israel to make concessions to the Arabs—to appease them! The State Department has not hesitated to disapprove and criticize the restoration of Jerusalem to Jewish law, and otherwise found fault with Israel—while Moscow was backing the Arabs to the murderous hilt.
>
> The Republican position, though understandably partisan in motivation, is nevertheless powerfully expressive of the Jewish position as well. Its complaints are our complaints, its disappointments our disappointments; the most significant aspect of the Republican statement is that both in the pressing present and in the long run, the American Jewish community's support of and commitment to the welfare of Israel is profoundly and necessitously American! There isn't a single comment, charge, or criticism of Administration policy voiced by the Repblican Coordinating Committee that is in the slightest at variance with the position of the friends of Israel.
>
> We cite one or two recommendations as characteristic of the understanding nature of the Republican assertion: "We believe American aid should not reward our enemies and punish our friends" . . . "The U.S. should insist on an international guarantee of innocent passage through international waterways as an inalienable right of all nations" . . . "The United States should exert its influence to secure a Middle East peace settlement which will confirm Israel's right to live and prosper as an independent nation."
>
> Will this thoughtful statement have an effect on our Administration? How can it—when the policy-makers are as disoriented, as cross-eyed in their views and motivations as they have been throughout the crisis, as in all the telling years that led up to it? They are guilty of a compound of offenses, distorting the will of the American citizenry, and subverting the great tradition of Ameri-

can democracy, backing the dictators and trouble-makers, and, in effect, subsidizing them to carry on their fetid hatreds of America.

We think that both the Administration's wrong-headedness, on the one hand, and the Opposition's timely, vital, and significant policy statement on the other, should arouse a great, widespread, genuinely grass-roots protest to Washington to get our nation back on course—and thus begin to serve the causes of settlement, cooperation, friendship, and peace.

Los Angeles County Voting System Goes Modern

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 11, 1967

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues an editorial which appeared in the September 15 issue of the Los Angeles Times. This editorial, entitled "County Voting System Goes Modern," appropriately commends the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors for the leadership they took in modernizing voting machinery. As the article describes the new voting punchcard system, it is not only more accurate, but more economical as well.

In passing, I would pay particular commendation to Chief Supervisor Ernest Debs of Los Angeles, under whose guidance the board took this action to move Los Angeles County's voting techniques into position as among the most modern in the Nation. The Times, in true California fashion, felt that this new voting technology was needed to "bring Los Angeles County into the 20th century." I would have to ask my colleagues who represent other large metropolitan areas how many have taken stock of the advantages of presently available technology to improve the casting and counting of votes?

Mr. Speaker, the editorial follows:

COUNTY VOTING SYSTEM GOES MODERN

It has been a long time coming, but it now appears Los Angeles County is going to have a modern vote-casting and vote-counting system. For this the county board of supervisors deserves a vote of thanks.

The supervisors had a pretty compelling reason for finally adopting a modern system: it's not only much more accurate, it's more economical.

While many parts of the state moved on to more advanced methods of voting and tabulating, Los Angeles County went year after year with the old-style paper ballot and the laborious business of a hand-count—the one-two-three-four-slash mark procedure which went out of style with the first computer.

Los Angeles faced severe problems largely because of the sheer magnitude of the matters of cost and of storage. When other counties were talking in terms of tens of thousands of votes, Los Angeles had to deal with millions of votes.

The new system of punchcard ballots and high-speed electronic tabulations brings Los Angeles County into the 20th century. Voters should find the process easy to master.

While commending county officials for bringing in the new system, there is an admonition which must go with it. Voting precincts will, of course, be enlarged with the new system. And even though you can't expect to have the polling place next door, by the same token, supervisors must see to it that precincts aren't made so large (in the interests of economy) that voters are discouraged from casting their ballots by the sheer distance they have to travel to the polling place.

Pittsburgh's Commission on Human Relations Communicates With the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1967

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, Pittsburgh was one of the first cities to enact civil rights legislation to insure equal opportunity in employment and housing for all of its citizens. A group largely responsible for the progress to date is the Mayor's Commission on Human Relations, a group of 15 citizens who serve the city on a volunteer basis.

They feel that in any city the choice between peace and chaos is ultimately that of the citizens, and have worked with the various religious, ethnic, and racial groups, and with public and private agencies to keep the lines of communication open and insure the enforcement of antidiscrimination laws.

Under unanimous consent, I include the introductory comments to their annual report of 1966, "Choice and Challenge," at this point in the RECORD:

The City of Pittsburgh, one of the first municipalities in the nation to enact civil rights legislation, continued its efforts during 1966 to achieve equal opportunity in housing and employment for all its citizens. Responsibility for these efforts has been vested by the City in the Mayor's Commission on Human Relations, a group of 15 citizens who administer the City's anti-discrimination laws on a volunteer basis.

The Commission is further mandated by City law to investigate cases of intergroup tension in the community, and, through programs of community relations and education, to work toward the achievement of intergroup communication, understanding, and harmony.

This Annual Report reflects the Commission's major activities during 1966 to meet these responsibilities. The Commission has conducted many more programs than can be reported here. Considerations of space and the Commission's policy of confidentiality make it impossible to cover all Commission achievements. This Report will attempt to enumerate only those activities which are deemed to have had the most significant effect on intergroup relations in the City.

The Pittsburgh Commission enjoys an enviable national reputation for being a "working commission." Commissioners, sensitive to the urgency of improving intergroup relations and equalizing opportunity in our time, have established a tradition of working closely with staff on compliance investigations, in meetings, and in other community endeavors which hold promise of helping to achieve Commission goals.

This tradition has borne fruit. Pittsburgh has seen progress in communication between its varied religious, ethnic, and racial groups during recent years. There are definite signs of progress in expanding opportunities for Negroes in employment and public accommodations and to a limited extent, in housing. To date, the City has been spared the racial discord which has rent other large urban centers in recent years.

Unquestionably, a number of factors have contributed to what progress and community understanding has been achieved, and there will be no attempt made in this Report to enumerate, analyze, nor relate them one to the other. It must be recorded, however, that the Commission has been given credit by a significant number of individuals and organizations in the community for these advancements.

When measured against aspiration, progress has been limited. A major challenge during the year past has been to maintain genuine and productive communication between the Negro and white communities. There is, however, some evidence of a breakdown in communication between the two groups and a resultant polarization of attitudes on the part of both.

On the one hand, Negroes are disheartened by the limited benefits that have accrued to them through federal civil rights and social welfare legislation. They are discouraged by a seeming impasse in the civil rights movement. Despite legislation and promises of progress, most Negroes are worse off educationally, economically, and socially than they were 12 years ago at the beginning of the civil rights movement—and they know it. The political sophistication developed during these years has not been translated into genuine social change in the lives of most Negroes.

Whites in large numbers, on the other hand, are convinced that "Negroes are getting everything." Many are alarmed by the same legislative and social developments which have most disappointed Negroes. The dramatic civil rights demonstrations of recent years were followed by what they consider to be "pro-Negro" legislation. The federal Economic Opportunity Program is thought to benefit poor Negroes more than it does poor whites.

Whatever the merits of the two positions, no real solutions are possible until resentments and prejudices are broken down, and this can be done only through continuing communication between the two groups. The Commission has directed its attention and best efforts to this end and will continue to do so. Programs of compliance, affirmative action, community relations, education, information, and research are developed with this as a primary goal.

During the past year, the Commission of necessity turned its attention to many new and complex problems of integration while continuing to process specific complaints of discrimination. Several such programs are described in these pages.

In 1966 and for several years past, the Commission on Human Relations has received the support, aid, and cooperation of many individuals, agencies, and organizations of this community. Government leaders and agencies, as well as religious, civic, community, educational, business, and union groups, social welfare agencies and civil rights groups have worked closely with the Commission to achieve mutual goals. For this cooperation, the Commission is sincerely grateful and is confident of their aid and support during 1967.

Fishermen's Protection: An International Numbers Games

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ED REINECKE

OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 18, 1967

Mr. REINECKE. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives today failed to take action to solve a very pressing problem. The problem is the continued harassment of American fishermen on the high sea. Several Latin American nations have confiscated, fined, and damaged American fishing vessels. They have arrested and even injured American fishermen, sailing in international waters. And ironically, these tiny nations have been using surplus American naval vessels to pursue our fishing boats. The problem is still with us, because of the inaction of the House. It must be dealt with, Mr. Speaker.

A timely editorial by radio station KNX in Los Angeles calls for action on this problem. The editorial is delivered by the new vice president of CBS radio, and general manager of KNX, Mr. George Nicholaw:

For 16 years we have played an international numbers game that has seriously affected the California fishing industry.

The numbers relate to the limit of a country's territorial waters. Since 1702, it has been an accepted principle that territorial waters go as far as a country can extend its effective force of arms. In those days, that was the span of a cannon shot or three miles. In the 20th century, there have been several international conferences that have discussed a change in this traditional limit. To date, though, no agreement has been reached. Currently, almost all maritime powers set a limit that is 12 miles or less. The United States, for example, claims a three mile territorial limit and a nine mile fishing limit. Marked exceptions to the rule are Ecuador, Peru and Chile which claim 200 miles.

This has great importance locally because Los Angeles is the largest fishing port in the United States. In 1965, ⅓ of a billion pounds of fish worth over $34 million were landed here. The most important species of this catch is tuna found in the Humboldt Current off the coasts of Ecuador, Peru and Chile.

When U.S. tuna fishermen have sailed into these waters during the last 16 years, there has been trouble. Many boats have been seized and, in some cases, our fishermen have been fired upon and wounded. The crowning irony is that the attackers often use ships supplied them by the United States.

In the past, Washington has reimbursed some of our fishermen part of the money lost in paying fines to those Latin American countries. Our State Department has issued several stern warnings to the Latins. So far, these have been flatly rejected.

Congress is now considering legislation to give our fishermen more fiancial relief. While we favor this as a stop-gap, it is the KNX's opinion that this only skirts the basic issue. The real issue is one dating back to the Roman Empire. It is *freedom of the seas*. These Latin government are gradually validating their 200 mile claim by force of arms. This year, they have seized ten fishing boats, one Canadian, one Japanese and eight from the United States.

Even more important as a maritime landmark was the seizure of the Dutch freighter Rosa Eugena on April 9th some 71 miles off the coast of Ecuador. The question of territorial waters is a matter of considerable international importance. It obviously concerns Californians because of our fishing industry. Even beyond that, California is a major maritime state in this country and anything that adversely affects marine trade must adversely affect our total economy.

Until this problem is settled, international friendships are jeopardized and trade and industry are frustrated. KNX urges President Johnson to issue a call for an international conference on territorial waters to settle this matter.

Mistakes Will Happen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 18, 1967

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, for all of those interested in the true conditions facing non-Russian peoples of the U.S.S.R., an editorial in the Wednesday, September 13, edition of the Chicago Tribune will have special significance. In inserting this editorial into the RECORD, may I add the information that there are over 100 million people of non-Russian nationality who are held captive within the U.S.S.R. This editorial briefly delves into the World War II history of some of these peoples. The editorial follows:

MISTAKES WILL HAPPEN

The Soviet Union has come around to admitting an oversight of 23 years ago. In 1944, after the Germans had been defeated at Stalingrad and had to abandon their deep penetrations of Russia, the soviet secret police rounded up and deported the peoples of four autonomous soviet republics and one autonomous national region. They were accused of collaborating with the invader.

These peoples were inhabitants of the Kalmyk, Crimean, Volga-German, and Chechen-Ingush autonomous republics and of the Karachev national region. They were uprooted en masse and deported to central Asia and Siberia. The "autonomous" republics and region ceased to exist.

By the time of the 20th soviet Communist party congress of 1956, the Russians were acquainted by Nikita Khrushchev with the fact that Josef Stalin, the long-time dictator, had been an evil fellow. Among changes which followed, Stalingrad became Volgograd.

A process of "rehabilitation" was then instituted to absolve, retroactively, the minorities of the Soviet Union which he was held to have wronged during the war. In 1956 five Moslem minorities of the northern Caucasus were relieved of the charge of collaborating with the enemy and permitted to return home. The Volga-Germans were acquitted in 1965, but their former republic was not reconstituted.

Now the Crimean Tatars have drawn a pass, but will be "encouraged" to remain where they have been for the last 23 years. They will not recover their former homeland. The decree of absolution says that it was unfair to engage in "indiscriminate accusation" against all the Tatars, tho a "certain segment" of them did welcome the Germans as liberators.

According to the assessment of Boris I. Nicolaevsky, a student of soviet affairs, the suggestion that only a minority of the Crimean Tatars were willing to accept anybody—even Nazis—as liberators from the communist despotism is a gross understatement. Writing in 1946, he says that the Tatars proposed in 1941, after the Germans had overrun their territory, that they be allowed to exterminate all Russians in the Crimea.

They submitted this request to the Romanian command, which, in its collaboration with Hitler, had been installed as an occupation authority. The Romanians withheld formal assent but did not interfere when the Tatars began putting their plan into practice. When the Russians reentered the Crimea, the secret police arrested and deported all but 200,000 of the 1,127,000 persons who had lived in the Crimea before the war.

The revised soviet mythology now holds that the Tatars were innocent and really were misunderstood soviet patriots. Condemned to exile, they may not find much satisfaction in their "rehabilitation," but the communist hierarchy finds it useful to reinstate the legend that solidarity exists and always has existed among the many nationalities sharing a common bondage to the soviet state.

The gruesome business of "rehabilitating" those who were wrongfully condemned has continued since the denunciation of Stalin. The "unpersons" who were victims of Stalin's purges have again become acceptable. The experience of being levitated into the sentient world from six feet underground [less in Siberia, where the frost line is permanent] may not excite feelings of excruciating pleasure in the subjects, but the true doctrinaire Communists will feel they are well rewarded with a vicarious afterlife at the pleasure of Mr. Khrushchev and his successors in the presidium.

As the experience of the Crimean Tatars demonstrates, mistakes will happen in the best of all possible workers' paradises.

The Tax Dilemma

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PHILIP E. RUPPE

OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 18, 1967

Mr. RUPPE. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Ralph Bertz is a friend of mine from Rogers City, Mich. Recently he was requested to write a guest editorial for the Presque Isle County Advance, one of the outstanding newspapers in northern Michigan. Mr. Bertz writes of the tax dilemma facing all levels of government. I feel Mr. Bertz is speaking of a problem facing local government in every locality in the United States. I commend his editorial to the attention of my colleagues, as follows:

THE TAX DILEMMA
(By Ralph H. Bertz)

On August 7th the voters of the Rogers City School District turned down a 4 mill increase to cover increased operating expenses. The defeat of the proposal has stimulated some lively and at times bitter discussion. Many proponents have suddenly sprung to life after the horse is out of the barn. All this interest has been generated over a proposed modest tax increase where the expenditures are controlled by a School Board and School Administration composed of local citizens that most of us know and trust. These people stand ready to discuss all phases of the school program personally with any citizen. Yet we reject their judgment as to the money required to operate an adequate educational program.

We as citizens are taxed by three levels of government, namely, the federal, the state and the local. At the local level we stand the best chance to receive 100 cents of service for the tax dollar collected. As we move to the state and federal levels the value of service returned for each dollar collected diminishes rapidly. We have developed a philosophy that federal and state programs are free of cost to the local community. This has even been expressed by certain citizens of Rogers City. The attitude of "If we don't get it somebody else will" is prevalent in communities throughout the nation. This attitude is dead wrong. We pay dearly for governmental services at all levels, but the most expensive is at the federal level.

The States have been trapped into matching fund programs with the Federal Government which are costly and mean increased state taxes. If this is hard to believe, then why the 2.6% State Income Tax and the proposed 10% surtax on the Federal Income Tax? Our governmental officials always answer that tax increases are needed to pay for increased services demanded by the citizens.

It certainly seems that one of the most basic demands for services should be for a first class educational system to equip our young people with the knowledge needed to meet the challenges and problems of the world of tomorrow. This can be done best when control remains at the local level. The State and Federal Governments are becoming increasingly active in elementary and secondary education. (Is education another area of our life which we are willing to relinquish to the control of the Federal Bureaucracy by default of one's responsibilities?) The dilemma in the minds of most people stems from feeling inadequate to be heard at the state or federal level.

So in 1967 with demands for increased taxes at all levels, Mr. Average citizen feels that the only place left for him to register a protest against the trend of increased taxation is in a local election. It is about time that a massive taxpayer protest be launched at the federal level of government which is primarily responsible for inflation and excessive spending. Can we afford "The Great Society", the war in Vietnam, the space race, foreign aid and all the "pork barrel" projects and still provide the climate for the personal incentive necessary to maintain our leadership in the world?

It looks doubtful as our problems continue to mulitply internally and externally in spite of increased government spending. We will receive more value by supporting an adequate educational system administered at the local level and demanding that our elected officials in Washington economize by eliminating nonessential spending and waste at the federal level. It is urgent that you relate your opposition to President Johnson's proposed 10% surtax on the Federal Income Tax to the people who represent us in Washington.

Sam Davenport

SPEECH

OF

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1967

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I should like to join with colleagues who have commended Sam Davenport who recently retired as Coordinator of Information for the House of Representatives. During some 20 years that I have known him he has been courteous, energetic and highly efficient. He took his job seriously and he performed his duties well. He has been my personal friend since I first met him. I express my appreciation for his services of the past and extend my best wishes for his future.

NLRB Seeks To Force Litigants To Confess Guilt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1967

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, it has always been my understanding that the National Labor Relations Board is supposed to be neutral with respect to issues which come under its jurisdiction. Under our system of Government that would seem to be elemental. Yet, a recent action by that agency puts the NLRB in the position of being highly partisan rather than neutral. That case is discussed in a Wall Street Journal editorial of September 15, 1967. The editorial follows:

THE PUBLIC CONFESSIONAL

Suppose you are operating a company which has just been found guilty by the National Labor Relations Board of committing certain unfair labor practices. Although you maintain your innocence, and in fact plan to appeal the finding, the labor board requires you to confess publicly that you are guilty.

Sound ridiculous? Well, in a recent case involving J. P. Stevens & Co. Inc., the NLRB in effect required exactly that. The board ruled that the firm must not only mail a copy of the NLRB "notice to employes" to each of the workers and post it on company bulletin boards, but also must "convene during working time . . . all its employes" at which occasion a company official or an agent of the NLRB shall read the notice.

That NLRB notice states, among other things, that after a "trial"—before the quasi-judicial board—the agency has "found that we, J. P. Stevens & Co. Inc., violated the National Labor Relations Act. . . ." It contains NLRB-dictated statements that "we"—ie., the company—"will not" engage in the activities which the board ruled were in violation of the law.

The company argues, with justification, that to force it "to stand up and make a public confession. . . . constitutes a first occasion on which a quasi-judicial agency of the Government has, in modern times, invaded a right so fundamental that it was deeply imbedded in Anglo-Saxon law long before it was incorporated in our own Constitution. Until today, no party believing in his innocence has been ordered to pronounce himself guilty."

In a case involving another company, also ordered by the NLRB to provide a public reading of a similar notice, the Stevens position has received some support. In this case the District of Columbia Court of Appeals has ruled that the forced reading by the company of such a notice was "degrading": "The ignominy of a forced public reading and a 'confession of sins' by any employer, any employe, or any union representative makes such a remedy incompatible with the democratic principles of the dignity of man."

Moreover, the appeals court observed that if an agent of the NLRB, instead of a company official, reads the notice the result is to put the imprimatur of the board on union activities and to remove the board from the neutral position it legally is bound to take.

How the "confession of sins" issue will fare when it gets to the Supreme Court, as it will, no one can say. It would be a sorry day, though, were this unusual remedy of the NLRB to be retained. For its effects can only be the humiliation of employers and a source of continuing bitterness between them and their employes.

Impact of Footwear Imports to the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BASIL L. WHITENER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1967

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, on previous occasions I have called to the attention of the House the serious effect that imports are having upon the economic stability of many basic American industries. I have been particularly concerned with the impact that unreasonable imports have had upon the textile industry.

Another basic American industry, which is experiencing great difficulty and whose survival is threatened by rapidly increasing imports, is the American shoe industry. I believe that the Members of the Congress will be greatly surprised to learn that shoe imports for the first 3 months of 1967 were 27.7 percent higher than the same period a year ago.

The National Affairs Committee of the National Footwear Manufacturers Association, Inc., New York, N.Y., has released some very interesting statistical information on shoe imports. I place a summary of this import information in the Appendix of the RECORD at this point:

THE IMPACT OF IMPORTS ON THE U.S. FOOTWEAR MANUFACTURING INDUSTRY

1. What is the extent of footwear imports to the United States?

Total footwear imports in 1966 amounted to over 131 million pairs for men, women, and children. In 1955, only 8 million pairs were imported.

For the first three months of 1967, imports were 48.4 million pairs, or 27.7% higher than for the same period a year ago. At this rate, 168 million pairs could be imported in 1967.

2. What is the per cent of imports to American production?

The percentage of footwear imports to United States output was 16.3% in 1966. Imports were 1.2% of domestic output in 1955.

Based on the first three months of 1967, imports will have risen to 23% of domestic output for 1967.

3. Which countries are the major exporters of footwear to the United States?

Footwear imports are the greatest from low-wage countries where, with the help of U.S. dollars, new footwear factories have been built. Imports are also coming in in increasing quantities from iron-curtain countries. Both Western European and Eastern European countries are striving to obtain more dollars, and one way is to increase exports of footwear to the U.S.

U.S. IMPORTS OF FOOTWEAR (INCLUDING CANVAS-RUBBER), 1955 AND 1966

	Millions of pairs		F.o.b. foreign value[3] (millions)	
	1955[2]	1966	1955	1966
Total, all kinds[1]	7.9	131.2	$13.7	$172.6
Japan	2.8	68.8	1.1	38.0
Italy	1.2	32.0	3.0	74.7
Canada	1.0	.9	1.3	2.9
United Kingdom	.8	1.9	4.3	10.5
Mexico	.7	1.1	.5	1.5
Hong Kong	.4	3.9	.2	2.1
Switzerland	.1	.4	1.2	4.8
France	(4)	2.0	.2	5.8
Spain	(4)	3.5	(5)	10.4
Czechoslovakia	------	1.7	------	3.4
Other countries	.8	15.0	1.8	18.7

[1] Except waterproof, rubber thongs, and slipper socks.

[2] Data for 1955 do not include vinyl-supported upper footwear which were minimal.

[3] By excluding cost and freight, understates value of imports by at least 10 percent, according to the FTC.

[4] Less than 50,000 pairs.

[5] Less than $50,000.

4. What types of footwear are being imported?

Virtually every kind of shoe made in American factories is being imported. In 1966, leather shoe imports alone increased 33% over the previous year. Imports of women's casual shoes were 65% of domestic production, while imports of men's cemented footwear were 18% of United States production. Rubber-canvas oxfords, women's dress shoes, and athletic shoes are among the other leading footwear imports.

Very substantial increases in imports of casuals took place in the first quarter of 1967.

IMPORTS AS A PERCENT OF DOMESTIC PRODUCTION

Product type	3 months		Total year	
	1967[1]	1966[1]	1966	1965
Women's casual	109	89	65	39
Men's cemented footwear	19	20	18	16
Rubber-canvas oxford	31	21	22	20
Women's dress	24	19	18	15
Athletic	(2)	(2)	18	16

[1] Annual rate adjusted for seasonal may be somewhat lower.

[2] Under 15 percent.

Source: National Footwear Manufacturers Association, based on census data.

5. Is the footwear industry concentrated in any particular area?

There are about 1,300 footwear factories located in some 600 cities and towns in the U.S. In the majority of these localities, shoe manufacturing is the major source of income.

Footwear plants are in 42 of the 50 states and in more than 260 Congressional Districts.

Approximately 265,000 men and women are employed by the industry and receive wages and salaries of $1 billion annually.

In 1966, these manufacturers produced more than 804 million pairs of footwear of all types.

Retail footwear volume, including imports, exceeded $5.7 billion.

6. Why can't the American footwear industry compete with foreign producers?

Because imports are produced by low-wage labor working at rates of pay that would be illegal in the United States.

American wage rates to employees in the footwear industry are the highest in the world. American production workers in nonrubber footwear manufacturing plants in 1966 averaged an estimated $2.35 an hour including fringe benefits, based on Bureau of Labor Statistics data.

In the rubber footwear industry in 1966, U.S. workers received $2.56 an hour *not* including fringe payments and allowances.

In 1965 and 1966, footwear workers in Japan received an estimated 63¢ an hour, and in Italy, 78¢ an hour including fringe benefits and bonuses.

The labor-cost advantage is so great that domestic footwear manufacturers, no matter how efficient, cannot compete.

7. Don't American advances in machinery and technology compensate for higher wage rates?

American footwear factories still lead the world in productivity. Scientific and engineering advances in footwear manufacturing, however, are not limited to our shores. Methods and technology are reasonably similar here and abroad. The industrialized nations with new and renovated plants have also made technological improvements to meet the competitive demands of a worldwide market, and footwear is one of the easiest products for them to produce and export. The low wages paid in these countries by the footwear industry account for almost all of the price differential with imports.

8. What do footwear imports mean to the American workman?

They mean a loss of jobs and a corresponding loss of income. In 1966, 39,000 job opportunities were lost because of imports. If footwear imports total 200 million pairs by 1970 and represent a much higher percentage of domestic production, 59,000 job opportunities will be absorbed by imports that year.

Is it more important to make jobs for Japanese and Italian workmen than for American workmen?

9. Are not U.S. footwear manufacturers enjoying prosperity at this time?

With tremendous competition existing among 850 footwear manufacturers, the industry is not and never has been a high-profit one. The average retail price of a pair of domestic-produced shoes is only about $7.50. And 57% of all men's shoes and 80% of all women's shoes sell at or below $11 a pair; 65% of all children's shoes sell at or below $6 a pair. And the average footwear manufacturer earned between 2¢ and 3¢ on each dollar of sales in 1966, compared with the 5.6¢ averaged by all other American manufacturing industries.

10. How have imports affected U.S. footwear industry growth?

Imports have absorbed practically all the growth of the domestic footwear industry. In fact, in 1966 U.S. shoe output was 545.4 million pairs, or only a 3.5% growth for the past decade.

SHOE PRODUCTION, LEATHER AND LEATHER TYPES[1]

	Millions of pairs		Percent increase, 1964 over 1957
	1957	1964	
EEC countries	242.0	358.0	48.0
EFTA countries	151.0	183.0	21.0
United Kingdom	109.0	127.0	16.0
United States	526.7	533.9	1.4

[1] EEC and EFTA data from The Shoe and Leather News, Jan. 5, 1967, London; latest data available, slippers excluded. U.S. output from U.S. Department of Commerce.

11. Do footwear imports exceed footwear exports?

Footwear imports in 1966 were 44 times as high as footwear exports. This trend is continuing into 1967.

Footwear exports have declined 37% since 1955 to about 3 million pairs.

12. Do other countries encourage footwear imports as does the United States?

Quite the contrary. Most shoe-producing nations of the world have high tariffs to protect their domestic footwear industry or discourage footwear imports by exchange restrictions, some form of taxation, or even outright prohibition. For example, footwear duties in the U.S. average 13% compared with an average of 28% for Italy and 25–50% for Japan. Moreover, many of these same countries encourage footwear exports to the United States through export subsidies, credits on domestic taxes paid on exported manufactures, and concessions on freight.

Foreign nations should open their gates to imports of American footwear by offering the same tariff levels as the United States on a reciprocal basis.

13. What type of footwear import regulations should be imposed?

Import regulations should offer foreign nations an opportunity to share in the development and growth of the American footwear market but not to an extent that weakens the domestic footwear industry as well as industries that supply and service footwear manufacturing, and, indirectly, the entire American economy.

14. What type of import regulation will accomplish this?

The orderly marketing bills (S. 1446 and H.R. 87 and H.R. 88) now before the Senate and House provide for flexible import quotas whenever imports are found to be contributing to the economic impairment of a domestic industry.

Kudos From Latin America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1967

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, one of our friends in Latin America, Brazil, has a newspaper in Sao Salvador called A Tarde. On August 7, 1967, this paper carried an excellent editorial concerning the commitment of the United States of America to freedom for all peoples.

The perspective from Brazil is, perhaps, more objective than that attainable by the minority in this country who allow themselves to be deluded as to where the enemy is located—Hanoi or Washington.

The editorial was quoted in the August 30, 1967, edition of the Washington Daily News and I commend it to the attention of our colleagues, as follows:

We Need More Friends Like This

(By Ray Cromley)

Critics of U.S. policy in Vietnam should read and re-read the following editorial.

It was carried Aug. 7, 1967, in A Tarde, a newspaper in Sao Salvador, Bahia, Brazil.

IT COSTS

"The United States Government is going to increase taxes by 10 per cent to support the war in Vietnam. What this means for the western world is probably not well understood. But we shudder to think what a collapse of democracy in the Orient would signify.

"Fighting in Asia, in the swamps and jungles of Vietnam against ambushes of the Viet Cong, the North American people and their allies . . . are fulfilling a pledge not only to the South Vietnamese. The lives being sacrificed there are for the freedom of the whole world, because if they were to leave Vietnam, we would have the war on our own frontiers.

"An empire like the American one does not need to resort to territorial expansion. The Vietnam war has a well-defined ideological meaning and the fate of two different worlds is in balance there.

"And now all of the American people are being called to contribute to this war. Giving their blood is not enough. It is also necessary for them to make a material contribution, from the national wealth, in favor of a long and tiring campaign with no end in sight.

YOUNG MEN

"Whether or not one agrees with the reasons the United States is in Vietnam, one must admire the tenacity, inspiration and bravery of the young American generation who risk their lives defending an ideal which made their country a truly universal symbol: the ideal of liberty.

"The stoicism of the Americans in this war, in the face of accusations of all types and sometimes from those who should be fighting at their side, is impressive. For the responsibility for maintaining the status quo in Vietnam should fall much more to other countries than to the United States which is there defending interests which were not theirs and which led them into a war in defense of all the democratic nations of the world.

"Nevertheless, the United States still considers itself committed to give economic help to the democratic nations, especially to the less-developed ones, in a second front in the war against communism.

"On this other front, the American people are also in the vanguard. Recent statistics show that in the past year more than 100 million Americans gave more than $13½ billion to help the well being of others, whether in their own country or in the other nations around the globe.

"There is no parallel in all the history of mankind to this vast and substantial solidarity. Since the end of the Second World War the United States has helped the world to free itself from poverty and has made great efforts to defend the dearest accomplishments of man and the self-determination of people. Devastated Europe was rebuilt under the Marshall Plan and many Asian, African and American nations have counted on the United States for substantial assistance in the fight against underdevelopment.

"It is really admirable that a nation so tormented by such serious external and internal problems can still find the spiritual and material reserves, which seem inexhaustible, to help other peoples.

"This example should be sufficiently dissuading to those who lightly presume that the United States is in a phase of incurable decadence."

Do We Really Need These Helpers?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TIM LEE CARTER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1967

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, if the purpose of the Office of Economic Opportunity is to educate and train the poor citizens of the United States to enable them to be gainfully employed and thus eliminate poverty, I support this purpose. However, the actions of the Appalachian volunteers and VISTA workers in eastern Kentucky indicate that they are more interested in destroying what they call the power structure—but it really is our Government.

Almost every elected official in the eastern half of my district will state that the actions of these groups are subversive. I am including an editorial from the Jackson County Times, and a letter from Mr. Teaberry Blanton, of Panbowl, Ky., concerning a typical meeting of Appalachian and VISTA volunteers with a group of Kentuckians. There is evident the same intent to incite to rebellion among the citizens of eastern Kentucky as there has been in Newark, Harlem, Detroit, and other cities.

DO WE REALLY NEED THESE HELPERS?

One of our letters to the editor today deserves commendation in our estimation for it takes "guts" to speak out about a matter so vital to us all. That is the questionable benefit derived from the presence in our county and area of the Volunteers, both Appalachian and Vistas. Their activities have been a matter of concern to many of us for some time with most of us inclined to ignore them hoping they'd just go away. Apparently they come in increasing numbers now and just how many nobody seems to know, not even Washington which doles out our tax dollars to keep them here spouting for insurrection.

Our hills and creeks may not be so far removed from riot-torn city streets as we've been thinking. This is evidenced in Mr. "Teaberry" Blanton's letter accounting the Volunteers' meeting at Pan Bowl last Friday when a Chicago welfare recipient urged our people to resort to violence to get what they want. It's a sad day indeed when we see the seeds of anarchy being sown in Breathitt County, one of the most patriotic places in the nation without doubt.

We have great admiration for the Pike County officials who acted last week to put a scotch under the wheels of the Volunteers who are allowed to foment trouble wherever and whenever they will. And we commend heartily the fast action taken by Governor Edward Breathitt to try to take the Volunteers from Kentucky permanently. However they seem to grow like weeds . . . pull up one and two more grow in its place.

At least two of our Breathitt County communities are in turmoil over these Volunteers. The Times has been reliably informed that Lost Creek and Vancleve residents are disturbed by the nocturnal habits of the Volunteers. Perhaps they are sincere in proclaiming they want to "serve" or "help" our people. We'd like to think so, but we're more inclined to believe that the Volunteers are politically motivated . . . they lust after power, the very thing over which they berate others.

LETTER TO EDITOR ABHORS VOLUNTEERS' ACTIVITIES

PANBOWL, KY.

DEAR EDITOR: Last Friday, Aug. 19, I attended a "welfare meeting" or so it was termed by the Appalachian Volunteers or Vistas (what's the difference?) who had arranged for this meeting held at old Pen Bowl Schoolhouse. The things I saw and heard there so alarmed me and other local citizens who attended that I feel the general public should know what's taking place in our very midst in Breathitt County and the rest of East Kentucky, according to the news we read and hear.

There were about 15 of us local people attending, also 15 AV's or Vistas and a woman guest speaker from Chicago whose name was Mrs. Peggy Terry. She sought to explain how to solve our local problems the way they had been solved in Chicago. Mrs. Terry, who is presently a welfare recipient, made a trip here especially to tell us how to get welfare money which "rightfully belongs" to us, as she put it.

During her talk, which was interspersed with profanity, she suggested . . . and I quote: "First stage, a Sit-In. And if this doesn't get us a check the first day, we stage another one. If we're taken to jail, we go right back when we get out. If this doesn't get us results, we are to tear up the office (welfare) and scare the employees."

The speaker also indicated that if we saw any money on the desks, we should take it for it "belongs to us anyway."

And her crowning attempt to incite us (the locals) to break the law in efforts to get welfare was this. She said here was "no use for anyone to go hungry as long as stores in Jackson had glass windows" which could be broken just by throwing a rock.

Now I'd be one of the first to admit that we'd be in bad shape if the welfare programs should be discontinued and that there are probably those who need welfare and haven't been able to "get on." But I doubt that the method advised by the Chicagoan would be advisable here. Chicago's recent riots attest the fact that violence accomplishes nothing but the destruction of lives and property.

Having stood all the speaker's wisdom that I could tolerate, I began to make a few comments of my own about the whys and wherefores of their (AV's and Vistas) operation in our area. When I questioned the background of the Volunteers, one young lady asked if I were calling them Communists. My reply to her, "You said it . . . I didn't."

Having been present at the meeting, I'm more than ever convinced that these people should be made known to the citizens whom they claim to be "serving." How does one go about getting the exact total of "Volunteers" in our county? To whom are they responsible? Apparently they are mostly unsupervised. Even Washington, which supplies much of their money, cannot or will not pin down these Volunteers.

Another thing that puzzles me. How could Mrs. Terry afford a trip here when she's on welfare? Couldn't this money have been better used for school clothing for her two children . . . or couldn't it have been used to hire a baby sitter (one she said she couldn't afford) so that she could work to earn a living.

I have tried to state the facts about what happened at this meeting in hopes that all of our good citizens will become alarmed and repulsed as I have been. We have a hard enough job trying to solve our problems ourselves without the interference of these outsiders, who give every indication of wanting power rather than being motivated by the desire to help us in Appalachia.

If you doubt the validity of my account of the meeting, ask the Volunteers to allow you to listen to the tape they made at the time. That is, if you can get it. They inferred that their meetings in future would be private rather than public.

I call on our patriotic Breathitt County citizens to become alarmed too, so that all of us working together may be able to rid ourselves of these parasites. I think they should return to their own homes to help their own people. We in the mountains, don't need their kind of help.

Respectfully,

"TEABERRY" BLANTON.

Percy's Answer to Johnson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK MacGREGOR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1967

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, earlier this year, I joined with 111 other Members of the House of Representatives and 40 Members of the U.S. Senate in sponsoring the National Home Ownership Foundation Act. Last month one of the Nation's leading university newspapers, the University of Minnesota Daily, printed a fine editorial backing our housing legislation and commending its principal author, Senator CHARLES PERCY, of Illinois.

Percy's Answer to Johnson

Perhaps the most encouraging piece of legislation before Congress this session is the Republican answer to Pres. Johnson's challenge to the opposition last January to come up with a reasonable alternative to the Great Society programs. Much to the administration's consternation, a freshman Republican Senator from Illinois, Charles Percy, has done just that.

Percy's plan for a National Home Ownership Foundation would solve the financial and social ills of the expensive and uninspiring bulldozer-and-mortar tactic of traditional urban renewal programs. Part of the plan's appeal is that the government would not run the program itself, but would simply be the guarantor for private initiative and development.

Briefly, the bill calls for the creation of a nonprofit private foundation which would raise up to $2 billion capital by selling government-guaranteed debentures. These funds would then be loaned to local nonprofit associations to build or restore homes that could be sold at not more than $12,500 on long-term loans at 3 per cent interest. The federal government would subsidize the 3 per cent interest—peanuts compared to the billions now being invested in public housing projects. A mere $20 million could, through this powerful leverage effect, generate the financing of 60,000 homes.

Best of all, the possibility of owning a home could inspire urban slum-dwellers with a new sense of purpose and self-respect. As Sen. Percy said, "It can bring a new sense of community responsibility, stability, and respect for law and order. It can yield the vital feeling of 'roots,' of having a place and an identity in urban mass society." Home ownership for the poor through private enterprise can inject new life into malignant urban areas.

Codes and Standards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY C. SCHADEBERG

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1967

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, I have today received from the Honorable Warren P. Knowles, Governor of Wisconsin, a copy of his letter to Secretary of Commerce Alexander B. Trowbridge regarding a conference of States to study, review, and promulgate codes and standards in conjunction with the National Bureau of Standards, Construction Building Division.

Governor Knowles raises some very provocative questions in regard to the formation of such a group, and I am in total agreement with the Governor's concern. There is no doubt but that the State of Wisconsin would be only too happy to take the lead in meaningful discussions which would develop codes and standards in fields of mutual interest, but it is certainly imperative that assurances be given the States by Secretary Trowbridge before they waste their time attending a round of meetings which would produce nothing more than press releases praising the administration.

With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I place the Governor's letter in the RECORD as an example of how willing the States are to cooperate with the Federal Government, but how leery they must be of the administration's intentions:

THE STATE OF WISCONSIN,
September 15, 1967.

Hon. ALEXANDER B. TROWBRIDGE,
Secretary of Commerce,
U.S. Department of Commerce,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. TROWBRIDGE: Several states, including Wisconsin, have been asked to work with the National Bureau of Standards, Construction Building Division to form a conference of states to study, review, and promulgate codes and standards. Commissioner Gene A. Rowland, of the Department of Industry, Labor and Human Relations attended the first meeting in May to discuss this possibility in detail, and again met with the National Bureau of Standards in August.

He also informs me that Mr. William G. Colman, Executive Director of the Advisory Committee on Intergovernmental Relations, advised that his committee felt the National Bureau of Standard should be the agency to work with the states, and coordinate the many federal government agencies developing codes and standards in this same field.

Several questions come to mind in regard to forming such a conference, which we would like answered by the federal government and your department before the states, and Wisconsin particularly, would be ready to participate in such a cooperative program.

Is there an executive order, congressional mandate, or any other clear directive of your department to follow up with the intergovernmental agency report of January 1966 (A-28), regarding coordination within the federal departments and bureau structure? This is basically necessary, since I am sure the states would not be willing to work for a common code and standards with the federal government, should the federal government wish to ignore such in its own building programs, and lease agreements.

Recognizing the problem of many different codes and standards throughout the country in political subdivisions other than states, is it the intent of the department to work out a program with the states rather than directly with local governmental units? Many present federal programs have gone directly to the municipality, causing considerable chaos in state governmental units.

Is the federal government willing to act only as a secretariat and catalyst, research and laboratory center to a states conference in building codes and standards structured parallel to the National Conference on Weights and Measures? We recognize that individual experts, laboratories, and research time in each state are costly and with product and construction development crossing all state lines it is necessary to look into those codes and standards which may be causing considerable additional building costs. Many codes may not be necessary with the many new products entering the market each year.

If the above questions can be answered in the affirmative, I would ask Commissioner Rowland to convene a meeting of all state officials involved in codes and standards, at our Capitol to further discuss what relationship the states could accept. I would offer my office as liaison.

There is a real need to work out some exchange of present codes and standards and to study the codes and standards as to their absolute necessitiy in the construction industry. I would hope Commissioner Rowland could call a meeting in November of this year.

Your prompt reply would be appreciated.

Sincerely,

WARREN P. KNOWLES,
Governor.

How Rap Brown Works for Congress and Saves the Country Billions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1967

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, in the language of the economist, ceteris paribus.

An article from the New York Times follows:

How Rap Brown Works for Congress and Saves the Country Billions

(By Russell Baker)

WASHINGTON.—Many persons have been infuriated this summer by the demagogic virtuosity of H. Rap Brown, but very few know "Brown's" true identity. His real name is John Green and he is an undercover agitator on the payroll of the Senate Appropriations Committee.

His assignment is to help Congress find inexpensive solutions to the nation's racial problem. When racial animosity threatens to erupt at a given location, Green—or "Rap Brown," to use his undercover name—hurries to the scene, delivers inflammatory harangues and in other unsubtle ways seeks to make himself highly visible.

In this way, Brown helps Congress to save billions. A Senate aide who insists on anonymity explains:

"If riots break out, Congress naturally has to investigate the cause and produce solutions to eliminate it. Some of these solutions can get pretty expensive. If you can discover that the riots are caused by outside agitators, however, you can let the taxpayer off cheap with a bill to provide prison accommodations for any agitators caught crossing state lines."

Thus, as an undercover outside agitator, Green performs an important financial service for the "white power structure" for which, in his identity as "Brown," he is forced to profess violent distaste.

The idea for a congressional corps of undercover outside agitators originated three years ago when the Appropriations Committee invented "Stokely Carmichael."

"Carmichael"—his real name is Peter Mulligan—was an ambitious young lawyer with a theatrical taste for rhetoric and undercover work which was not satisfied by the humdrum of his chores on the Senate staff.

At that time the civil rights movement had begun to generate such popularity that Congress foresaw it might soon be required to support public promises with large outlays of cash.

To forestall this possibility—after all, the United States could rebuild its cities or it could unbuild Vietnam, but it could scarcely be expected to do both without affecting the economy—Mulligan was sent forth as "Stokely Carmichael" to reduce public support for the civil rights movement.

It is said that "black power," his slogan which so successfully cooled the egalitarian ardor of white liberals, was actually the inspiration of Senator Eastland of Mississippi. In any case, it helped Congress avoid some rather heavy expenditures, and incidentally generated a good deal of New York sympathy for the Mississippi way of life.

When Mulligan tired of the thankless role of undercover outside agitator and expressed a yearning to see the world, he was taken on by the CIA, with the stipulation that he maintain his "Carmichael" cover. He was last heard from in Cuba.

Congressmen are naturally reluctant to say how many other undercover outside agitators they have in the field, ready to provide them with quick low-budget solutions should social breakdown continue. And, of course, as more sensitive congressmen remind us, the use of undercover agitators is not dictated solely by stinginess.

"The fact is," one such congressman explained, "that some problems are so difficult that we can't do much about them, no matter how much we have to spend. Still the public expects us to come up with answers. As long as we have a few 'Rap Browns' working for us we can be certain of having an answer when the public wants it."

The congressman's need to create the illusion of being at grips with great issues which are, in fact, beyond him extends to fields other than race. Congress maintains a large cadre of undercover peace agitators, for example.

These are the agents who conducted the now infamous flag burnings this year for the House of Representatives, which was then sorely frustrated by its inability to come to grips with the Vietnam issue.

With the speed of a Warner Brothers cavalry, The House galloped to defense of the flag by voting to imprison its desecrators. Thus its undercover agitators help it to deal with crisis abroad and at home, and 'Rap Browns" save the day.

Educational Television

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN O. MARSH, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1967

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, one of the remarkable developments in broadcasting in recent years has been the expansion of educational television. This type of service embraces both the use of television within schools and the provision of informational and cultural programing to an extent which might not be economically justifiable for the commercial broadcaster.

In this connection, I include a news article which appeared in the Daily News-Record of Harissonburg Va., outlining the progress made on the provision of an educational television service for the Shenandoah Valley of Virginia and adjacent areas.

This proposed service presented technical problems because of the proximity of the proposed transmitters to facilities of research agencies located in the national radio quiet zone.

It was encouraging to find a spirit of cooperation among the affected Federal agencies and present indications are that the Shenandoah Valley and adjacent areas of Virginia will have a useful new television service.

The pertinent news article follows:

VALLEY ETV PLANS PROGRESSING

The Shenandoah Valley Educational Television Corp. expects to have a major transmitter and production housing facilities under construction this year.

Arthur Hamilton, general manager, reported this to the groups' annual meeting Wednesday in the Rockingham Public Library. The SVET plans to serve school divisions in the Shenandoah Valley and bordering counties and in four cities.

After intensive negotiations with the Naval Radio Research Laboratories, Mr. Hamilton said, a uniquely designed antenna and transmitter has been cleared for Elliott Knob, south of Staunton. Work will start soon.

He also reported that state agencies have approved the building of the production center on the Madison College campus near the Port Republic Road and Interstate 81 interchange.

He is now seeking permission from the National Park Service and other federal and State agencies to erect another major transmitter on Hogback Mountain in the Warren County area of the Shenandoah National Park.

A translater station will be installed on Signal Mountain, at the north end of the Massanutten ridge.

Dr. G. Tyler Miller, president of the television corporation and also of Madison College, said Mr. Hamilton and his techniques overcame unprecedented problems in their lenthy studies with government agencies to preserve the National Radio Quiet Zone. This extends over 100 square miles to protect the Navy radio installation at nearby Sugar Grove, W. Va. from interference.

Mr. Hamilton said that present state and federal funds are not sufficient to construct all of the far-flung facilities at one time. He added that he has assurance that the additional funds have been earmarked in the next budgets.

The first phase will include the Elliott Knob transmitter, the Signal Knob translating facility and the production center at Madison College.

The second phase includes Hogback Mountain transmitter and a translater to serve Bath and Highland Counties.

The general manager said that considerable progress was made this year.

He noted that:

The Federal Communications Commissioner assigned Channel 51 for the Elliott Knob installation.

A license was granted to operate the channel and a federal construction grant of $377,000 was received.

The Virginia Advisory Council on Educational Television has reserved $500,000 for the system.

An enlarged location for the production center was provided by Madison College.

Officers who were re-elected are Dr. Miller, president; Hamilton Shea, Harrisonburg, vice president; Mr. Hamilton, secretary; and Charles E. Cooley, Harrisonburg, treasurer.

Vice presidents are Staige E. Miller of Warren County, northern division, and O. L. Boyd of Augusta County, southern division.

Wade W. Menefee is a new member of the board of directors for the Harrisonburg school division. Dr. H. G. H. Jopson of Bridgewater represents the Rockingham County schools.

Walnut Grove Grows Peppers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY BLANTON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1967

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, Jo Ann McWherter has written an article about a man, James I. Bell, and his efforts to see his community prosper. I marvel at his ingenuity and praise him for his devotion to the community. While it is incumbent on local, State, and National governments to do everything possible to help their citizens, it will never be accomplished without the dedicated efforts of men like Mr. Bell. I think all of us here in Congress can learn from the success story so beautifully told, as follows:

WALNUT GROVE GROWS PEPPERS

(By Jo Ann McWherter)

The War on Poverty is certainly not new to Hardin County, Tennessee—particularly to the Walnut Grove Community. "War" was officially declared in 1951 when all the small one-teacher elementary schools in the community were consolidated into one large elementary school. The County Superintendent of Public Instruction sent J. I. Bell, then vocational agriculture instructor at Central High School in Savannah, out on a new assignment.

"Go up there (Walnut Grove) and show those folks how to make a living," were the instructions given to Mr. Bell.

The Walnut Grove Community is 23 miles southeast of Savannah on Highway 69. This stretch of highway, which leads into Alabama, is better known as "Rabbit Jump"—so designated by the many truckers who use it.

A community survey conducted in 1951 showed that 250 farms in the area averaged a gross cash income of $768 yearly. This low income region suffered from many handicaps.

One was the soil itself, which is largely a coastal plain type called silerton. Highly erodible and basically poor, this soil will not support just any crop. However, it will respond well to fertilizer and warms early in the spring, making it ideally suited to truck crops.

Another problem was that the farmers had little, if any, knowledge of farm management, fertilizers, or marketing. Mr. Bell set out to correct this complex problem first.

Evening classes were started for the farmers at Walnut Grove School. They were given detailed instructions on growing a crop—told what to plant, when to plant, how much to plant, when to cultivate, when to fertilize, when to harvest, where to sell.

Strawberries were selected as the first crop to try. This venture proved a total failure due to the necessity for financing plants and fertilizers and then having to wait a year or two to receive profit. The farmers simply did not have the money needed to operate.

This failure did not dampen spirits or determination. Okra was selected as the crop to be grown in the area for the next year. About 15 farmers each agreed to try one acre of okra. The yield was good; the price high; and the crop a huge success. The following year, 150 acres of okra were produced with the same success.

"The okra almost seemed to turn to gold in their hands," commented Mr. Bell.

Mr. Bell always contracted the okra before it was planted and served as an intermediary between the farmer and buyer. Okra was grown successfully in Walnut Grove Community for three years.

During the fourth year, no canning or freezing company was interested in okra. A new money crop had to be found for which there would be a ready market. Pimento peppers were chosen.

The night classes, which often have as many as 100 in attendance, concentrated on producing pimento peppers to be sold to nearby canning factories. Since 1956, an average of $50,000 worth of peppers has been sent to market each year. This year the price per ton is the highest ever, and the annual crop income may more than double the average.

Mr. Bell led the farmers in organizing themselves into the Truck Growers Association, a cooperative which acts and sells as one body. No fees or dues are charged for membership. The only requirement is that the farmer grow peppers.

The Walnut Grove Community was formerly "rough and rugged" both in terrain and character. Soures of income were severely limited. Since the pepper crops have begun to bring additional money into the community, changes are evident in the social, educational, and economic life. In fact, the entire community is changed.

Beautiful new small churches have been built; new stores prosper throughout the area; and more new houses have been built there than in any other part of the county. The houses which were simple rough dwellings with a goose-neck stovepipe protruding out the side in lieu of a chimney have been replaced by modern, attractive structures. Better than 66% of the houses in the community have been constructed within the past five years, and a new one is begun almost every day.

"There has been an increase in school attendance from Walnut Grove," said Hardin County Superintendent of Public Instruction Homer F. Snodgrass.

He continued, "The children are actually learning faster due to better home and health conditions. They are fed better and they feel better. The drop-out rate has decreased. These are just some of the evidences of the impact of increased income in this community."

The requests for free school lunches have dropped 70%. There have been other indications of change.

"This community (Walnut Grove) can no longer be counted an isolated one, largely due to the efforts of Mr. Bell," stated Winnie D. Range, Supervisor of Instruction for Hardin County.

"Many improvements may be noted—improved social well being, self-concept, and general appearance. A larger number is going on to high school. The children are more alert in school; the timid, listless type that were once here are disappearing. Parent co-operation with the school is excellent," she said.

The faculty of Walnut Grove School includes three members who grew up in the community.

In the last two years, basic education classes for adults have been taught at Walnut Grove. Last year this was one of the largest classes in the county and was a most responsive class. Those in attendance ranged in age from 20 to past 60.

The area used to have good standing timber. This was all cleared out during World War II and no good timber is left. There is little pasture land or feed for livestock. Thus, the importance of the pimento pepper crop.

Mr. Bell, who is now Diretcor of Vocational Education for Hardin County, is still the literal Captain of the troops. The farmers rely completely on the "Captain", as they address him with affection and respect. They seek and follow his advice and instruction. Mr. Bell fights hard and long to secure the best contract for the crops, although he receives neither a commission nor extra salary for his trouble. The farmers all know they can count on him to serve their best interests and therein lies the strength and success of the entire operation.

The pepper crop has spread over into adjoining Wayne County. Farmers are allowed to market their peppers at either Collinwood or Walnut Grove. Loading is done two days a week at Walnut Grove and three days at Collinwood.

Mr. T. C. Story, vocational agriculture instructor at Collinwood, supervises the marketing there. During the first three weeks of loading, 225 tons of peppers have been shipped at $90 per ton.

Approximately 125 farmers sell at Collinwood. At either location the peppers are weighed on the spot and the farmers receive their checks immediately.

Walnut Grove has shipped 200 tons during the same period. The price is same at both points. Shipping will continue until October 10th, which means the harvest is only about one-third complete.

Most of the farmers get around four tons of pepper per acre. This is a high return on their investments in plants and fertilizers. Plants are $3.25 per thousand. Five thousand are set per acre. Four hundred pounds of 6–12–12 fertilizer are used per acre at a cost of $8 or $10. About sixty pounds of nitrogen are added for $6.

The plants are shipped in from Florida. All plants are set around May 10th, so the crop will "come off" at the same time for volume selling and shipping. Shipping is begun around August 4th.

Ten years ago the first pepper crop brought $60 per ton. The price has climbed steadily with Mr. Bell constantly searching for new and better markets. Next year the farmers hope to get $100 per ton.

All of this has been accomplished without federal financing or financial assistance from any source.

"The farmers just come to agriculture evening classes and set out to help themselves," explained Mr. Bell.

Ottie Pollard is fairly typical of the farmers who are growing pepper in the Walnut Grove Community. Beginning with one acre in 1956, he is harvesting ten acres this year. The additional income will be well used by the Pollard family which includes five children. Mr. Pollard intends to increase his acreage even more next year.

Another farmer, Clarence Stricklin, has been hauling peppers to Walnut Grove for ten years. Since he has no help, he grows one acre of peppers. This adds about $300 clear to his yearly income for his family. The Stricklins have six children.

"The money from the peppers comes in at a good time when nothing else is bringing in money," said Mr. Stricklin.

Change is even to be found in the lines which wait to unload their "red gold." More and more teenagers are seen hauling in their family's crop. This year many "moonlighters" are also growing peppers. These are small farmers who have found it essential to find work in a nearby town to support their families.

The Walnut Grove Community and all Hardin County have gained by this pepper project. Vocational agriculture has served the county well, and J. I. Bell has been and is the driving force behind such programs. Co-operation between related agencies and vocational education is excellent. Related agencies include the Soil Conservation Service, Agriculture Service Conservation Service, Farmers Home Administration, and the county agent.

The Soil Conservation Service has been responsible for a soil survey in Hardin County to help farmers in planning the kind of management that will protect their soils and provide the best crop yields.

"This report of the survey has been used extensively in adult agriculture classes," said S. D. Young of the SCS Office.

"Our office provides a wide range of conservation practices on land in Walnut Grove. The people are responding well," continued Mr. Young.

Ray S. Johnson of the ASCS Office emphasized the results of team planning, "Improvement is obvious in the Walnut Grove Community. Most of it is due to the effort from the farmers, but they have had leadership which has had the benefit of good agency co-operation."

The Farmers Home Administration, established to help farmers who are unable to obtain a loan from other sources, has loans to six families in the Walnut Grove Community, according to FHA representative Harry Parks.

These loans involve planning sessions with the farmer and agriculture advisors in the community who assist in developing a farm operation plan calculated to make more money for the farmer.

The county agent, James Tracy, works with the farmers both individually on their farms and in group meetings.

Other agricultural expansion includes the Hardin County Farmers Co-op, which was organized under Mr. Bell's leadership. The movement began by buying one carload of fertilizer and has expanded into an organization which now serves over 4,000 patrons. It is interesting to note that the employees at the Co-op are all graduates of Central High School and were all vocational agriculture students. Even the secretaries are married to men who were vocational agriculture students at Central High School.

The Co-op is a part of "Ag Center." This compound includes the Co-op, the Production Credit Association, the Farm Bureau, the stockyard, and the soybean buying station. Wise planning has made for convenience for the farmers in Hardin County.

Many boys from the county have attained the State Farmer Degree while members of the Future Farmers of America. Three boys from one community, Big Ivy, have been awarded the coveted American Farmer Degree.

Five members of the Agriculture Department of the University of Tennessee are natives of Hardin County.

The emerging growth of agricultural activities in the county has been partially responsible for the population increase. Hardin County is the only rural county in West Tennessee showing a population gain.

More progress is ahead. "Our next project is going to be a feeder pig co-operative," stated Mr. Bell.

Future plans also include a broiler marketing complex. This will include producing baby chicks, feed-mixing, killing and chilling, and marketing.

The farmers may also have marketing and distribution added to their evening classes in crop production and farm management.

Much has been accomplished in Hardin County, but it is probably no more than could be done in any county in Tennessee. The secrets to the success here are few: a capable leader, hard-working farmers who want to help themselves, and agency co-operation.

Vocational agriculture, one of the instructional services provided by the Tennessee Division of Vocational-Technical Education, continues to furnish the means by which knowledge and skills required in agricultural enterprises may be learned—learned by doing.

A Tribute to Sam Scheltzer, "Golf Coach of the Year"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1967

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, the people of the Florida 12th District are proud of the achievements of Sam Scheltzer, the "Golf Coach of the Year," and I would like at this time to comment on the record of this most remarkable young man.

Sam Scheltzer belongs to that breed of Floridians who believe in doing all they can, as hard as they can, as well as they can. While working his way through college, he also managed to become, through great practice, one of the outstanding golfers in the Miami community.

Sam is assistant football coach as well as head golf coach at Miami Palmetto High in Miami. He resides in Coral Gables, Fla.

As an athlete, as an instructor, and as a symbol of aggressive competition and good sportsmanship, Sam Scheltzer is deserving of all the praise that currently is coming his way.

I would like, in this regard, to insert here in the RECORD an article from the Globe Times, Bethlehem, Pa., showing how his former hometown feels about our local hero:

SAM SCHELTZER NAMED COACH-OF-YEAR

Friends of former local resident Sam Scheltzer will be pleased to learn that he's being honored as "golf coach of the year" by the Florida Athletic Coaches Assn. on Aug. 4 in Gainesville, Fla. Sam was too busy working his way through school at Moravian College to participate in sports but he's well remembered by all the Greyhound athletes and any fans during the early 1950's.

Sam was equipment manager for four years (1952–56) when the Greyhounds athletic schedule was confined to football, basketball, baseball and golf. This job, plus his studies, prevented Sam from active participation but he's more than made up for it since graduation. Although only 5–6 and less than 150 pounds, Sam is assistant football coach as well as head golf coach at Miami Palmetto High in Miami, Fla. His record as golf mentor in five years is 44–15 and his current squad won the 1967 state championship.

Gil Gillespie, Moravian athletic director, has maintained contact with Sam throughout the years and is elated that Sam is enjoying so much success. "I remember Sam when he was a kid at Nitschmann Jr. High and selling the Saturday Evening Post outside the Boyd Theatre. He was the kind of kid who was a real hustler. Even though you had a Post at home, you'd buy another from Sam." His parents, Mr. and Mr. Harry Scheltzer, reside at 1534 Mercury St., Bethlehem.

President Johnson Delivers Hard-Hitting Speech at Kansas City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM R. ANDERSON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1967

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, as all the Members are aware, President Johnson interrupted his schedule last week in order to go to Kansas City to address the annual conference of the International Association of Chiefs of Police. On this occasion the President spoke out most forcibly on the subject of law and order. His speech was hard hitting, timely, and excellent. Furthermore, by this action the President paid a great tribute to the importance of our Nation's police. I was privileged to address this same conference on Tuesday last on the subject of my bill calling for a broad program of Federal assistance for higher education of law enforcement and corrections personnel—H.R. 6628. The group the President spoke to constitutes the executive council of the law enforcement community in this Nation. It is a large, influential, and intelligent body. You will not find a group anywhere more vigorously taking steps to improve law enforcement capabilities and to meet the new challenge of the decade.

Mr. Speaker, I warmly commend the President for what he has done and, under unanimous consent, I include his Kansas City speech in the RECORD:

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT BEFORE THE INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF CHIEFS OF POLICE, KANSAS CITY, MO., SEPTEMBER 14, 1967

President Morris, Mayor Davis, Chief Lawrence, Mr. Tamm, Chief Kelley, ladies and gentlemen: There is an old story about President Calvin Coolidge and his response to the question, "What do you think about sin?"

As you may remember, President Coolidge is supposed to have answered, "I'm against it."

Most Americans would say the same thing today about poverty, disease, and ignorance, and crime.

So I don't expect special credit this morning for coming before the International Association of Chiefs of Police to talk about crime and only say, "I'm against it."

It would not enlighten your discussions, nor contribute to public understanding, if I were to spend my time here in a long lament about the evil consequences of crime. I think they are as self-evident as they are real.

Neither am I going to be content to just preach about decline in morality in America.

In the first place, I just do not believe that morality is declining. The responsibility that this Nation has shown, in meeting its human obligations at home and abroad, convinces me that America is a Nation that is strong today.

In the second place, I do not believe that sweeping indictments of our Nation's morality will help us get at the solution of the real problems that affect morality—the problems of poverty, the problems of disease, the problems of ignorance, or of international aggression, or of crime. Self-righteous indignation is not a policy. It is a substitute for a policy.

What America needs is not more handwringing about crime in the streets. America needs a policy for action against crime in the streets—and for all the people of this country to support that policy.

Believing that, as I strongly do, I established in March, 1965, the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, I instructed and charged this Commission to deal with the following questions:

How can law enforcement be organized to meet present needs?

What steps can be taken to insure protection of individual rights?

Through what kinds of programs can the Federal Government—of which I am a part—be most effective in assisting and supplementing, not supplanting, State and local law enforcement?

I asked the members that I carefully selected from throughout the Nation to consider the problem of making our streets, homes, and our places of business safer—and to inquire into the special problems of juvenile crime, to examine the administration of justice in the lower courts—to explore the means by which organized crime can be arrested by Federal and local authorities closely coordinating and cooperating together.

The Commission's report, rendered last winter, is a study of crime and a study of criminals. But it is much more than that. It is a systematic analysis of the strengths—as well as the weaknesses—in our American law enforcement. It is a prescription for action—action—action at every level of government, and it is a constructive guide for thoughtful citizens throughout this land in every walk of life.

Acting on its report, I urged the Congress this year to promptly act—promptly act—upon the most comprehensive Federal legislation that has ever been devised to help local authorities meet the problem of crime at the local level in their cities.

That legislation was called the Safe Streets and Crime Control Act. It was based on the five fundamental principles of the Crime Commission Report:

First, that crime prevention is of paramount importance.

Second, that the system of justice must itself be just. The system of justice must itself be just and it must have the respect as well as the cooperation of all of its citizens.

Third, better trained, better paid, and better equipped people are desperately needed throughout the land.

Fourth, police and correctional agencies must have better information and deeper and broader research into the causes, and into the prevention and control of crime.

Fifth, and last, substantially greater resources such as more judges and prosecutors, and faster court action, more and better court personnel, more modern court administration—thus modernizing, improving and bringing the entire criminal justice system up to date in the 20th Century.

I did not propose that the Federal Government take over the job of dealing with crime in American streets because from the birth of the Republic to the present moment responsibility for keeping the peace in our cities has been squarely on the shoulders of local authorities.

Respect for law and order begins at home. Children must learn it and must be taught it from their parents. Your children learn it from you—and by what you do and by the example you set. That means that every time we water the lawn when there is an ordnance against it at a certain time of day, the children learn their own lesson about respect for law and order—if we water the grass the wrong time.

That means that every time a parent writes a note the teacher to discuss Mary's or Johnny's absence from school when they really don't need to be excused and are not sick, they, the children, learn from the parents the wrong lesson about respect for law and respect for order.

The crimes that have most disturbed our people—homicides, robbery, physical assault, burglary, automobile theft and driving while intoxicated—are crimes against local and state law.

Those laws are made by the city councils and made by the state legislators. They must be enforced by the police and the state patrol. Their perpetrators are tried in local courts, by local citizens. They are sentenced locally. They are prosecuted locally by judges—by prosecutors who are elected by local people and by judges who are selected by local people.

They are returned to local communities when their sentence has been served—their penalty paid. These local communities look upon their record and they are under the supervision of local authorities.

Unlike most other countries, we—America—have no national police force. It desires none. Our founding fathers were very careful to see that none was provided for. Why, today in this country our largest city has more police officers than the entire United States Government. One city has more police officers than the entire government of the United States of America.

Officials in Washington just cannot patrol a neighborhood in the far west, or stop a burglary in the south, or prevent a riot in a great metropolis.

In the end, then, the quality of the local police, the action of the local prosecutor, the local grand juries, the fairness and the justice of the local courts, the effectiveness of the local correctional systems—all of this responsibility is lodged appropriately and properly in the hands of local authorities—of local citizens.

They at the local level must decide how good they want their law enforcement in their local cities to be.

They must determine whether it is right—whether it is just and whether it is fair—to ask a man to risk his life to protect their life for a salary that is lower than they pay another man for working behind a desk or standing on the assembly line in an industrial plant.

They must determine at the local level whether they want a court system that they select and provide for which delays justice until justice is denied.

They must determine locally whether they want a correctional system that deals with youthful offenders, not as lives to be redeemed, but as people who are doomed to clash repeatedly with the law.

If they decide that they want something better for their communities than what they are getting today, then we think that if they make this decision—and they can make it today through their Congressmen and their Senators supporting the recommendations that the President has made—some of which have been before the Congress many years—then their national government can, should and will help them get it—not by taking over the system of law enforcement, but by helping them strengthen and reform it.

That is what the Safe Streets Act which I recommended to the Congress would do. If its spirit and if its purpose survive, it will provide grants to those cities and to those states who not only increase their present commitment to criminal justice, but who are willing to go out and develop programs for better training, for better use of their personnel, or for higher standards and innovations such as tactical squads and community relations units, and new techniques of rehabilitation.

It will help pay the salaries of those who operate these programs. It will help pay the salaries up to one-third of the grant which could be used to increase the pay of policemen and other criminal justice personnel working with them.

The key to this program is experiment, innovation—and better use of the most advanced knowledge that we have gained in this country of crime, its treatment, and its causes. In my opinion, every law enforcement official in this country ought to welcome it in the spirit in which it is offered: as a practical and imaginative tool for helping our law enforcement officers cope with crime in the cities without in any way—in any way—diminishing either their responsibility or their authority.

Now to a matter that affects you and affects you much more than most of the citizens, but in the end it will affect every single one of us—it will reach into every home in this land—and this is the gun sale law. A law to limit—a law to safeguard—the sale of guns has been before our Congress for several years.

Its passage would plug up one more big loophole to save your life, and mine, or the life of some innocent child down the street. I hope it will pass.

Its purpose is simple—it is to keep lethal weapons out of the wrong hands—out of the hands of dangerous criminals, out of the hands of drug addicts, out of the hands of mentally ill people who really know not what they do.

Its basis aim is to limit the out-of-state purchases and the interstate mail-order sale of firearms. We believe this is the most effective way that the Federal Government has of protecting your safety and the safety of your children from criminals, drug addicts, and the mentally ill.

If we want to curb crime—if we want to arrest crime—if we want to restrain criminals—here is an action that we can take that will be a long step forward.

Let us not be content to bewail the rising crime rate or to talk about the statistics of the numbers of repeaters who fill our mails and prisons while we turn our back and ignore the fact that they can go to any mail order house and get a weapon to shoot your wife after they tear the door down at midnight.

Let us act instead of talk against crime. Let us repair as many shattered lives as we can. Let us do it within and through the American system of due process and in keeping with our tenacious regard at all times for the blessings of individual freedom.

You, and the men who you command, are American's front line in the fight against crime. You endanger your lives every day just as the man does in the rice paddies of Vietnam to protect freedom, to protect liberty, to protect your country.

This summer, some of you experienced a new kind of disorder in your cities. You faced, not individual acts of violence or just thievery, but you faced massive crimes against people and against property.

Much can explain—but nothing can justify—the riots of 1967.

They damaged a great deal more than the storefronts and the American homes. They damaged the respect and the accommodation among men on which a civilized society ultimately depends, and without which there can be no progress toward social justice.

The violence of this summer raised up a new and serious threat to local law enforcement. It spawned a group of men whose interest lay in provoking—in provoking—others to destruction, while they fled its consequences.

These wretched, vulgar men, these poisonous propagandists, posed as spokesmen for the underprivileged and capitalized on the real grievances of suffering people.

And the vast majority of those people—the vast majority of them—believe that obedience to the law, in Abraham Lincoln's phrase, must be our religion here in America.

They have seen the law change. They have seen it become more just as the years passed in our times. They have seen their rights more firmly established, their opportunities sharply increased in the last decade.

They know that the law in a democratic society is their refuge, and that lawless violence is a trap for all those who engage in it.

We must redeem their faith in law. We must make certain that law enforcement is fair and effective—that protection is afforded every family, no matter where they live—that justice is swift and justice is blind to religion, color, status, and favoritism.

We cannot tolerate behavior that destroys what generations of men and women have built here in America—no matter what stimulates that behavior, and no matter what is offered to try to justify it.

Neither can we abide a double standard of justice, based on the color of a man's skin or the accent of a man's speech.

Those who wear the police officer's badge—those who sit in judgment in the courts—those who prosecute in the chambers—those who manage our correctional institutions—all of these have a very special responsibility for the maintenance of order and the achievement of justice throughout the land.

But every single one of us—private citizen and government official—shares some in that responsibility.

We can all say very easily, "We are against crime"—and then we can let it go at that. We can preach sermons, we can write editorials, we can make speeches, and we can get our picture made talking about crime and moral behavior—we can think that we have done our duty.

Or we can respect—we can encourage—all of our citizenry to respect the law and to respect those who protect us in the name of the law.

We can be willing to pay the bill or improving the performance of our police, our courts, and our correctional institutions and give them the salary, pay and equipment that they need. We can insist on devoting enough of our resources and enough of our brainpower to meet the problem of crime—to make America safer and more just for all of its citizens.

I have always felt that we could make great strides forward if we would only realize that the nurse and the medical attendant who in the middle of the night may determine whether we live or die when we need attention—that they have better training, better pay and better inducements—that the teacher who prepares our children, sets an example for them and infuses knowledge into them—and sets an example—that they should be among our best trained, our best prepared and our best rewarded.

And that the policeman and the sheriff who protects the lives of our wifes, children, families and ourselves should be among the best equipped, best trained, and the best paid people in the land.

We cannot get those things just with rhetoric and conversation, picture-taking and television film. We have to pay for it. We have to desire it. We have to be willing to sacrifice in order to get it.

That is going to take a lot more than just talking "against" crime. That is going to take among other things being for action.

I would hope that we could all be for the Congress taking action to make our streets safer—and taking action that will better promote civil peace—that we can take action for better schools and better playgrounds, for more and better support of our churches and our spiritual leaders—for better housing and better homes, for better living of all our people—which in the end will give us better citizens and a better and stronger nation.

It will make us all a happier and more guilt-free people.

I am sorry that I could not be with you the early part of your convention. I did very much, though, want to come here and talk to you—and to salute you before you returned to your respective homes and again assume command of this most responsible service that you are rendering and performing this great duty that is yours.

We look to you to protect our families, our homes, and our lives. You have a right to look to your public servants, your political leaders, to see that your efforts are not forgotten, are not ignored, are not put at the bottom of the priority list.

I thought this morning by coming out here and visiting with you and telling you some of the things that was in the heart and the head of your President, that perhaps we could awaken this nation to a responsibility that we are not assuming—to an obligation that we are not discharging—to a job that the President and the Congress, the legislators, and the city councils must face up to.

I am ready to get on with my part of it. Thank you, very much.

There Ought To Be a Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED REINECKE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1967

Mr. REINECKE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to bring to the attention of the House of Representatives two outstanding essays by students in my district on the subject, "There Ought To Be a Law."

The essays follow:

There Ought To Be a Law

(By Patricia Du Bois, Lancaster, Calif., age 13, junior high school division winner)

There ought to be a law making the draft system more fair. The present method of selection by chance, deferments in some cases because of education commitments, rejections because of lack of education and often less serious physical or mental disabilities leaves a sense of uneasiness in our young men today.

It is very discouraging to boys trying to get a job. Naturally employers do not want to go to the time and expense of training a young man if he has not fulfilled his military service. It is very hard on the boy who wants a college education. He is not sure whether he should enroll and see how far he can progress or should he wait for that draft notice. If drafted it will be hard for him to pick up where he left off. If he waits, how much time has he wasted of a college career? The uncertainty of this way of drafting is not good.

Many boys are considered 4–F for one disability or another. Some of the reasons are for allergies, back problems, trick knees etc. That might cause difficulties with full military training. Yet there are many jobs that boys like these could be perfectly capable of doing. Such as office work, routine maintenance and other jobs. Why couldn't they do such jobs and take the place of the strong, capable men who could go out and fight? It doesn't seem fair to reject a boy for an allergy when he earns his living by loading bales of hay.

Today we have a lot of delinquency because kids drop out of high school. These become the problem kids with riots, fights, police records, and general nuisances. They are not ready to become good citizens and their lack of education keeps them from getting a decent job. If the draft law was changed to make dropouts eligible for immediate induction to the services it would make them think twice before leaving school. Two years in the service might help some of these dropouts grow up in a hurry.

There are some unfortunate young men who for one reason or another cannot read or write yet are able mentally to learn. Rather than declare these boys 4–F, it would be to the country's advantage to draft, teach, and train them. This is a better solution to the problem than the government is offering now through its poverty and VISTA programs.

For complete fairness to the young men of our nation, for better use of our manpower, and promoting better citizens the present draft law should be changed.

"There Ought To Be a Law

(By Diana Billet, Quartz Hill, Calif., age 17, senior high division)

There ought to be a law lowering the legal voting age from twenty-one to eighteen. There are many for and against this proposition. In my opinion, I think the voting age should be lowered because most eighteen years old are mature. Of course, there are a few who are immature but this is a small percentage. Some reasons supporting my opinion are:

1. Mock elections in class prove that students are well-informed and vote as intelligently as registered voters. The majorities are generally the same between class room polls and real elections. Students and teenagers do care who is elected and what is happening.

2. Discussions carried on in class about politics, candidates, and elections keep us well-informed. We can read any newspaper or magazine article, which most adults use as their source of information, along with television, and form the same opinions.

3. American History and Civics are course requirements in our junior and senior classes. The methods and form of government, arguments, mistakes, and accomplishments are still fresh in our minds.

4. As you know, boys (men) of seventeen and up to twenty-one are considered old enough and mature enough to fight, kill and die for our country and what it stands for. If a person is old enough to decide between life and death, he is old enough to decide whether to vote yes or no.

5. Most of the youth between eighteen and twenty-one years of age have earning and buying power and therefore are tax payers. Any time a person earns a dollar, 4.2% of it goes to social security of which they will have no benefits for approximately forty-four years unless disabled. Also they pay income taxes, federal and state, on any earnings over $600 a year. This means they have no say on where their taxes go thus, "taxation without representation."

Constitution Day, 1967

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK MacGREGOR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1967

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, if Americans were asked to list the four or five most important dates in this Nation's history, I feel certain that September 17, 1787, would be not among the chosen few.

This lack of awareness is unfortunate and undeserved, for the signing of the Constitution most certainly ranks in importance with the signing of the Declaration of Independence. It is, in fact, the signing of the Constitution more than almost any other single event in our brief history which epitomizes the character of our people and which provides the scaffolding for this great and unique American experiment.

Certainly ours was not the first—nor will it be the last—country to revolt against the yoke of foreign domination, to take up arms in the name of liberty and freedom. Typically, however, revolution in response to repression and injustice has itself bred excesses more devastating to these ideals than the social and political structures which preceded it.

The English journalist, Patrick O'Donovan, once remarked:

> The new country (America) set its mind to avoiding a repetition of the excesses of revolution, if possible, for all time. It was an act of reason and an act of will, and this one calculated act of creation was in fact the sweetest, the most reasonable and the most fecund act of revolution in history.

O'Donovan added that these statesmen clothed the ideals of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness "with a written Constitution which may be one of the supreme political works of man and which is certainly the supreme political work of any committee in history."

It took little time indeed for our revolutionary forefathers to recognize that the Articles of the Confederation were simply inadequate to the task. We were already then a nation indivisible and there was an evident need to establish a government which reflected this fact of life.

It took 4 months over that long hot summer 180 years ago before the architects of this new Constitution could hammer out a document with which almost all could live.

It is important to note that none of the participants in that great event signed a document that conformed completely to their individual desires. But it was better, far better in fact, than most ever dreamed possible. Its pragmatism intermingled with idealism captured the American spirit. It was truly a document of the people, by the people, and in the end, for the people, which perhaps explains better than anything else its continue relevance for us today.

It is altogether appropriate then that Congress should have designated September 17 as Citizenship Day and the week following as Constitution Week. I am happy to announce that the Governor of the State of Minnesota, Harold LeVander, shares this feeling as expressed in the following proclamation issued by him encouraging all Minnesotans to reflect again on the significance of this document in their lives today.

The proclamation follows:

PROCLAMATION OF THE STATE OF MINNESOTA

Whereas, for one hundred and eighty years the Constitution of the United States has been the symbol of man's capacity to govern himself, and

Whereas, from its wisdom have flowed growing concepts of liberty, justice, and human dignity, and

Whereas, the Constitution is still the certain guarantee of our basic rights, it is still the promise and protection from government—and by government, and

Whereas, liberty is a blessing that must be constantly nurtured, and in this rapidly changing world every American must understand the system of government by which we live—and for which so many have died,

Now, therefore, I, Harold LeVander, Governor of the State of Minnesota, do hereby proclaim September 17, 1967, as "Citizenship Day," and designate the week beginning September 17, 1967, as "Constitution Week," in Minnesota, and urge wide participation in public ceremonies to the end that our citizens may have a better understanding of the Constitution and of the rights and responsibilities of United States citizenship.

Attest:

HAROLD LEVANDER,
Governor.
JOSEPH L. DONOVAN,
Secretary of State.

Job Corps Success Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1967

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, it is always encouraging to hear of young people who possess both the motivation and the opportunity to learn and to increase their contribution to the community. Unfortunately, there are far too many American youth who have never had such an opportunity.

But thanks to the Job Corps this number is steadily decreasing. One of the many who have received a chance is 19-year-old Wilson Ricks, of Indianapolis, Ind., who never completed elementary school. He joined the Job Corps in June 1965 and received training in electrical maintenance.

When he completed his training the Office of Economic Opportunity helped him find a job. And now this former busboy, porter, and dishwasher is in an on-the-job training program with the Indianapolis Power & Light Co. After successful completion of the program he will be promoted to first-class lineman.

Such a success story is encouraging. But while the war on poverty directed by the OEO has achieved remarkable progress these past 3 years—serving more than 9 million poor Americans in various ways—we have but touched the surface. How many more there must be who, if given the chance, could emulate the success of Wilson Ricks.

I salute Mr. Ricks, the OEO, and the many thousands of Americans engaged in the war on poverty, and the Indianapolis Power & Light Co. who hired this young man. And I urge my colleagues to read this story of success—a story not unlike that of thousands who have become productive, contributing members of their communities. With the Speaker's permission I wish to insert in the RECORD the following article, "Determined Youth Finds Boost to Success in Job Corps, CAAP," which appeared in the Indianapolis Star of July 27, 1967.

The article follows:

DETERMINED YOUTH FINDS BOOST TO SUCCESS IN JOB CORPS, CAAP

(By Lynn Dunson)

It took six months and a lot of outside help, but Wilson Ricks, 19 years old, now is working in a training program with The Indianapolis Power and Light Company. He is a Job Corps graduate.

James A. Scruggs, former employment counselor at Broadway Economic Opportunity Office, points to Ricks as an example of what can happen when business and social agencies work together.

Ricks came to Indianapolis from Osceola, Ark., in 1964, when he was 16. He had no family here and he hadn't completed elementary school. He worked at various jobs as a bus boy, porter, stock boy and dishwasher, to support himself.

In June, 1965, he joined the Job Corps and was assigned to Camp Gary, Texas, where he received training in electrical maintenance. When he came back home he turned to the Broadway Economic Opportunity Office, operated by Community Action Against Poverty Inc. (CAAP) for help in finding a job.

"He was a boy willing to work and he wanted to work in the field in which he had gotten his training," Scruggs, said.

"He failed two IPALCO general knowledge tests, but he was determined to keep trying, so we found him a fill-in job while he attended basic education classes at Camp Atterbury Job Corps Center."

Ricks did better on the third test, and Ed Brown, assistant personnel manager at IPALCO, decided to give him a chance because he felt the young man could do the work.

Ricks is now in a three-months on-the-job training program at IPALCO. Brown reports that he is doing well. At the end of three months, he will attend lineman's school for a month and will then be promoted to first class lineman.

Windham, Conn., 275 Years; "Chronicle," 90 Years

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 11, 1967

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, the town of Windham, which includes the city of Willimantic, in my district, is celebrating the 275th anniversary of its founding. At the same time, the Willimantic Daily Chronicle is observing 90 years of existence as a newspaper. This double anniversary deserves more than local notice.

Windham-Willimantic is among the oldest communities in Connecticut, with a glorious history and record of achievements. Its present population is about 18,000. Likewise, the Chronicle ranks high among the newspapers of our State, with a great tradition of independent thinking and community service. I am proud to extend my greetings to the people of Windham-Willimantic, as well as those associated with the Chronicle, on their respective anniversaries.

On the occasion of these anniversaries the Chronicle published on September 8, 1967, a special 72-page edition containing many articles and pictures dealing with the history of the town and the newspaper. I am pleased to insert two articles in the RECORD, reviewing the history of Willimantic and the growth of the newspaper:

WILLIMANTIC, "LAND OF SWIFT RUNNING WATERS"

"Willimantic" is an Indian word meaning "land of swift running waters." The Indians named it aptly, for the Willimantic River drops a distance of 91 feet as it courses over a series of falls between where it enters the city on the west and where it empties into the Natchaug to form the Shetucket.

The first settlers were quick to recognize the utility of the Willimantic Falls, but slow to homestead there. When "sixteen gentlemen from Norwich" acquired the Indian title to the territory that became the town of Windham, they laid out three villages in the "new Plantation in the wilderness ten miles above Norwich." Beginning in 1688, settlers took up lots in Hither-Place (Windham Center) and Ponde-Place (later Mansfield Center) which was then part of Windham. But plots laid out at "the valley of the Willimantuck" were not settled.

The meadows near Willimantic Falls furnished the Windham settlers with most of their hay, however, and the records of 1693 show a highway was built to the river in the spring of that year.

In 1692 the Plantation received a charter as the town of Windham. In 1694 the original proprietors received permission from the town to exchange the plots laid out near Willimantic Falls for allotments closer to Windham Green "at or about the Crotch of the river," that curve of the Natchaug near its junction with the Willimantic also known as Horseshoe Bend. Seven lots were laid out here and while several settlers bought them this settlement never grew to be the central new village it first seemed destined to be.

This section also came to be known as Bricktop because the first houses with brick chimneys were built here. Benjamin Millard bought 100 acres there in 1695 which was still in his family 200 years later. In 1700 he received permission of the town to set up the trade of tanner here.

In 1705 a saw mill and grist mill was set up at Willimantic Falls near what is now the Threadmill Square. A highway was laid out along here but Colonists were slow to settle. They preferred to live in the higher ground believing that the river valleys were unhealthy and had vapors that brought miasma and illness.

In 1707 Thomas Hartshorn became the first settler in Willimantic Falls when he built a sawmill and house there. Johnathan Babcock was probably the second permanent settler when in 1709 he built his house away up the river to the west near the present Willimantic cemetery. In 1739 Stephen Fitch built his house in this same location on land that remained in the family for the next 200 years. The house was moved to Sturbridge village in 1939 and may be seen there today.

By 1772 an iron works and forge was operating near where No. 5 mill of the American Thread Company stands, to the left of the brige crossing to Jillson Hill. The first bridge was built here in 1722 and was known thereafter as the Iron Works Bridge. This same year the first dam across the Willimantic was constructed where the stone dam of ATCO is now.

The iron works continued in operation a number of years but were never very prosperous. Finally they were abandoned and later swept away in one of the frequent floods that regularly took out the wooden Iron Works Bridge.

Meanwhile Willimantic was not growing as rapidly as it should considering the water-power facilities there. Windham Green was the center of settlement and activity and Willimantic Falls remained little more than a small cluster around the waterfalls and some scattered home spreads.

After the French and Indian Wars, John Brown was manufacturing potash at Willimantic and Ezekiel Cary carried on a tannery there. At the outbreak of the Revolution Nathaniel Wales Jr., and Jedediah Elderkin manufactured a good share of the powder used by continental troops at a powder mill at Willimantic Falls. Hezekiah Huntington repaired and manufactured arms at the old iron works in the same locality.

Clark and Gray had erected a sawmill and grist mill near the site of ATCO's No. 2 mill. Machinery for picking, oiling and carding wool was erected in it by Cyrus Brewster and put into operation June 20, 1806. Farmers paid 7 cents a pound for "breaking and carding, cash in hand," for picking and oiling, two cents a pound, cash or one cent more in either case where barter was desired. The most niggardly farmer accustomed perhaps to working himself and family to the bone rather than spend a penny, found it to his advantage to pay out money or barter for wool carding. Women everywhere exulted in the white, soft, clean, fleecy rolls which made spinning a pleasure.

Next Clark and Gray built a paper mill at the Falls adding to their holdings there then of a carding machine, grist mill, saw mill, clothiery and blacksmith shop. In 1814 Elijah M. Spafford set up another clothiery works there doing dressing and dyeing as well. From this time on, manufacturing became the absorbing industry of the settlement.

Perez O. Richmond introduced cotton manufacturing to Willimantic when in September 1822 he bought land and built privileges on the river and built a mill near what later became ATCO No. 3 mill. In 1824 the Jillson Brothers came from Dorcester, Mass., purchased a site just above the old paper and grist mill west of the Iron Works Bridge and built three mills. One was a duck mill later the ATCO spool shop and the other two were nearby.

In 1825 Aranah Tingley and Matthew Watson came from Providence and started the Windham Company. They bought privileges westward up the river just past what is now Bridge Street. They built a dam here and erected a mill to make cotton sheetings and shirtings. On what is now Vermont Drive they built Yellow Row named from the original color of the company houses they erected. They also had a White Row along the front of what is now Soldiers and Sailors' Memorial Park.

Deacon Charles Lee of Windham in 1827 built a mill immediately to the east of Bridge street. Also that year he built the stone store and boarding house still standing at the corner of Main and Bridge streets and now owned by the Brown estate. Next he built what became known as Stone Row running along the tracks from Bridge street parallel with Main street. His company, which was later taken over by Smithville Manufacturing Company managed by Whiting Hayden, also built its White Row of houses which stood just across from the present Town Hall.

The Smithville Company and The Windham Company combined in later years as the Quidnick-Windham Company and occupied all the mill buildings, some of which are standing, in the Bridge street area. The Electro-Motive Manufacturing Company occupies one of these plants.

In 1829 then, the village of Willimantic consisted of the two mill companies each with its houses and company store in the Bridge street area and the settlement around the mills near Threadmill Square. A scattering of houses straggled between the settlements down the road that would later become Main street. This road was the original path the Indians followed along the river and down to Norwich where Uncas the sachem had his headquarters.

From the Main street a road ran up the steep hill known as High street which led on to Mansfield and the country lying north. About a mile down the main thoroughfare another road known later as Jackson street led in the same general direction.

Along the south bank of the Willimantic, in the section that dwellers on the north bank called "Over The River" ran the Columbia Turnpike along what is now Pleasant street. This turnpike and Card Road and South street were the only streets here. The Columbia Turnpike was the main road from Hartford to Willimantic. The only river crossing was at the Iron Bridge over to what is now Treadmill Square. Travelers had to proceed down this turnpike cross at Jillson and then travel up what is now Main street to reach the Windham Company and Smithville settlements.

In 1830 Stephen Hosmer lived in a large white house at the foot of Hosmer Mountain just east of the old Card Road. He owned 500 acres of land and kept a toll gate at one end at Post Hill in Columbia and the other standing at the northwest side of what is now the junction of Bridge and Pleasant streets. It used to cost six cents for a single toll when in business but one could pass free "to mill or meeting."

Demand arose for a bridge in the now Bridge Street area but the town did not want to bear the expense. A citizens' committee led by Mr. Hosmer took the appeal to court. The General Assembly after a series of vigorous hearings ordered the bridge built in 1831. It was a wooden structure and in 1868 the present stone arch was built by Lyman Jordan. In 1867 Lyman Jordan and Norman Melony also built the present stone arch bridge running from Main Street to Jillson Hill.

In 1825 during the administration of John Quincy Adams a post office was established by the name of Willimantic Falls as the village was called until the second word was dropped in 1833. It was located at Heberd Tavern, the large stone tenement at the corner of Main and Park Streets at the top of Jillson Hill. This is where the stagecoaches stopped and was the center of activity.

It took six years of agitation before Willimantic residents could get the town of Windham to widen and improve the main street. At this point in 1833 Willimantic successfully petitioned the state to be set off as a borough within the town. In July, 1833 the Borough of Willimantic held its first election voting for a warden, a court of burgesses of eight, a clerk, bailiff and a tax collector.

In 1825 the first school was built in Willimantic near the Iron Works Bridge. The Baptist Church, the First Congregational and the Methodist Church came along in the next three years.

This then was the early Borough of Willimantic. A long straggling assemblage of houses spread out between the manufacturing plants and company stores, interspersed with a growing number of other stores, the three churches and two schools. The factory bells rang out at 5:30 in the morning to arouse the sleepers that they might prepare themselves for the day's work which began at 6 and continued with a brief pause at noon for lunch until 6 at night. In the winter, to avoid lighting up the factories in the early morning hours, the work started at 7 a.m. and ended at quarter of eight at night. All work ceased at noon Saturday for the weekend.

In 1849 the railroad came through. The New London Northern came in 1849, The Providence, Hartford and Fishkill in 1853, The Boston, Hartford and Erie in 1872 and The Air Line through to Middletown in 1872 also. Willimantic became an important railroad center and the community grew and flourished.

The Willimantic Linen Company was organized by Austin Dunham and Lawson Ives in 1854 and this gave Willimantic another boom. They built No. 1 mill on the west side of the Iron Works Bridge in 1857. Just before the Civil War they bought up a large quantity of cotton and made a fortune with it. In 1964 they built No. 2 mill on the east side of the bridge from stone dug from the river bed in the rear of the mill.

While No. 2 was being built, they started construction of the section known as "New Village" and it was necessary to dig away a large hill which was the continuation of Carey Hill to provide land for the company houses.

In 1870 the stone dye house and inspection building were constructed and in 1883 the company purchased No. 3 mill, the old wooden Jillson mill located where Recreation park is today. In 1884 No. 4 mill was completed on the south bank of the river. When built it was called the model cotton mill of the world as well as the longest ground floor mill—it being 820 feet long and 174 feet wide.

In 1895 No. 5 mill was built. In 1898 The American Thread Company purchased the Linen Company and since then they have built No. 6 mill, the bleach house and concrete warehouse.

Since 1898, The American Thread Company has had only eight agents and general managers in this 68-year span. The first was E. S. Boss, who had been superintendent of the Linen Company. He was succeeded by his son A. D. Boss, Don H. Curtis, David Moxon, E. Burton Shaw, now president of the company, and Arthur K. Stewart, John B. Love, and presently, Edwin B. Shaw, Jr.

From 1833 the fledgling borough grew at a pace. Streets and roads were improved and the streets lighted first with kerosene lamps and later gas and then electricity. The fire engine company was organized in October, 1833. Some first water pipes were laid extending from the Smithville Company a short distance along Main Street in 1853.

Until 1862 residents of Willimantic had to go to Windham Green to vote but in that year the polling place was removed to Willimantic and the town records were moved here too as the borough became the seat of the town. The first town building was on Church street in the building now occupied by the AMVETS and The Graphic Photo Studio. The borough used what is now the rear of Bruce's Shoes on Main street as its lock-up until Mr. Atwood, the landlord, raised the yearly rent to $100. Then it rented space in the town lockup on Church Street.

Fine residences sprang up on Windham Road, along Valley street and up on "the hill." Business blocks were erected on Main street. The Willimantic Chronicle started in 1848. Wooden sidewalks were built, then paved. Dirt roads gave way to cobblestones and then macadam.

In 1883 the public waterworks was built with water taken from the Natchaug River and pumped from the station built in Mansfield to a distributing reservoir on Hosmer Mountain from where it fed by gravity flow. In 1892 a sewerage system was installed. In 1898 the State Normal Training School was established here.

By the early 1890's it seemed wise to the leaders of Willimantic for the borough to become a city. In December, 1893, the Willimantic was incorporated as a city and divided into four wards. The early city government consisted of two boards; a board of aldermen of four, one from each ward, and the board of councilmen of eight, two from each ward. There was also a councilman-at-large who presided over the board of councilmen; a mayor and city clerk and treasurer. Later the board of councilmen was abolished leaving one board of aldermen consisting of seven aldermen, one from each ward and three chosen at large. The city government organized a police, fire, water, sewer and other municipal departments. George Harrington was elected the first mayor.

Prior to 1896, the borough and then the new city rented space in the Willimantic Savings Institute Bank building at corner of Main and Bank Streets. The town offices moved from the smaller Church Street Town House to Hayden's Marble Front Block now the location of The Surplus Centre. When Mr. Hayden raised the rent the town decided to face up to the need for larger quarters. After a hassle over the site and a series of town meetings each of which rescinded the action of the previous meeting, a town hall was built.

In 1896 the town occupied the new Town Building and by a lease arrangement which continues to today the city rents space from the town there.

This then is the general story, in brief, of how the city of Willimantic grew to be the place we know now.

Chronicle Founded in 1897; 90 Years of Newspapering

For the first year and a half of its existence The Willimantic Chronicle was called The Willimantic Enterprise.

N. W. Leavitt of Scotland started publishing The Willimantic Enterprise in the basement of The Franklin Building on Main Street about where The Singer Sewing Machine Company store is located. Leavitt was a musician and writer who later wrote an opera "The Frogs of Windham" that achieved some national popularity.

Later that same year, John McDonald and Fayette Safford bought out Mr. Leavitt and became co-publishers of The Enterprise. Fayette Safford had worked for Leavitt as a printer and McDonald had come to Willimantic that year from Danielson where his parents lived and where he had been a printer at The Transcript.

They changed the name to The Willimantic Chronicle with the edition of December 4, 1879, and increased the size of the paper from four to eight pages.

Their announcement said they would "reach out into Windham and Tolland counties for their news gleanings as we are interested in news from towns within a radius of twenty miles."

The Willimantic City Directory for 1880 shows that McDonald & Safford, Publishers, had moved to Hall's Block at Main and Union Streets. Their advertisement described The Chronicle as "a paper filled with interesting matters and has a large local circulation. Terms, $1.50 a year in advance."

An early history of Windham says of John McDonald "he was a planner, a promoter, and took chances. He conceived the idea of a Democrat stock company and organized the Chronicle Printing Company which brought him large personal returns and established The Chronicle as one of the leading state weeklies. It was the only Democratic paper of that era which sustained the banner of that party during the period to 1889 when Republican administration was in power in Washington."

Today it is politically independent.

Needing more capital for the fledging weekly, in 1886 McDonald organized The Chronicle Printing Company. McDonald and Safford turned their newspaper assets over to the corporation in return for stock. They sold shares to the public. Among the 35 or so early stockholders were the following prominent Willimantic residents of that time: E.S. Boss, J.D. Chaffee, M.E. Lincoln, Elliott B. Summer, Dennis Shea, George K. Nason, James L. Walden, O.H. Risley, F. Webb, A.R. Morrison, M.M. Welch, H.M. Chapman and E.S. Jillson.

In May, 1887 the newspaper moved into the newly-constructed plant at 22–26 Church Street, where the paper is now located. In 1891 the paper began daily publication although the weekly Chronicle was continued until 1918 when rural free delivery allowed same day delivery in the outlying towns and the weekly Chronicle was discontinued.

Soon after the corporation was founded Mr. McDonald began buying back shares of stock and by the time of his death in 1904 he owned all the shares except that portion owned by his original partner Fayette Safford. Following Mr. Safford's death the McDonald-Bartlett family purchased his holdings and since 1917 have owned all the stock in the newspaper corporation.

John A. McDonald died on December 4, 1904, and management was taken over by his step-son George A. Bartlett. Under his direction many improvements were made. Mr. McDonald had purchased the first typesetting machine in eastern Connecticut and Mr. Bartlett added two more and purchased a new press in 1910.

When George A. Bartlett died suddenly in 1919, at the age of 45, management was taken over by Charles A. Gates and Herbert D. Pollard, his close friends. Charles Gates served as general manager for a few years and later as secretary of the corporation until 1932. Herbert D. Pollard was treasurer of The Chronicle Printing Company from 1920 until his death in 1941.

George A. Bartlett's son, G. Donald Bartlett and his stepfather, Harry Newton Bullard, who had married George A. Bartlett's widow, succeded to the active management of the newspaper in 1926. These two men had a long close association in building up the newspaper and improving the editorial product and production methods and equipment.

A new press was installed in 1923 and wire service leased from International News Service. All this while the newspaper was growing in circulation, in advertising, in size and in personnel.

G. Donald Bartlett suffered a heart attack in the newspaper office and died a week later on May 19, 1945. He was 45 years old as his father, George A. Bartlett, had been when he died. Harry N. Bullard who had been in semi-retirement, came back to the active management of the newspaper when Mr. Bartlett died.

When Bullard died in 1947, management was taken over by Willis Ridgeway, who had been appointed treasurer to succeed the late Herbert D. Pollard in 1941. Ridgeway at the time was an officer at The Windham National Bank.

Mr. Ridgeway was a tireless worker on behalf of the newspaper and under his capable guidance many improvements were inaugurated in the years following World War II including installation of a new press in 1951.

He served as publisher from 1947 until 1955 when he was succeeded by G. Donald Bartlett's daughter, Mrs. Lucy Bartlett Crosbie. He remained as treasurer of the corporation until his death in January 1960.

Teresa Shea Bartlett, widow of G. Donald Bartlett, has long taken an active interest in the management of the newspaper and has been secretary of the corporation since 1945.

Roy W. Downer, longtime Chronicle editor, was named as general manager of the Chronicle Printing Company following Mr. Bartlett's death in 1945. In 1953 he was succeeded in that position by Arthur W. Crosbie, who now also serves as vice-president of the corporation.

In the 90 years of its publication the Chronicle has grown continually in size, circulation, advertising and influence. A weekly publication The Chronicle Suburbanite has been carried on since 1954.

From two employes in 1877 The Chronicle has 46 in 1967. In addition are 13 town correspondents, 10 part-time mailroom crew, 13 route drivers and 96 newsboys in Willimantic and the 13 towns where The Chronicle circulates.

From the days of hand-set type and a flatbed press The Chronicle now uses the latest electronic automated equipment.

From John A. McDonald, to George A. Bartlett to G. Donald Bartlett to Lucy Bartlett Crosbie, four generations of the same family have managed the newspaper.

Mrs. Robert A. Fraser, of Bellevue, Washington the younger daughter of G. Donald Bartlett, is a director of The Chronicle Printing Company and active in the management of the corporation. Until she moved to the west coast Joan Bartlett Fraser was a member of the newspaper staff. Mrs. Fraser has three children, Kathleen, Shaun and Denise, Mrs. Crosbie has two sons, Vincent and Kevin.

Will there be a fifth generation of the family active in the directing the affairs of The Chronicle?

"It's too soon to tell," says Mrs. Crosbie. And she adds, with a twinkle in her eye, "But out of the five offspring we ought to get at least one newspaperman."

Golden Wedding Anniversary of Mr. and Mrs. Buck Hung Wong Offers Outstanding Example of Stable American Family

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1967

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, one of the eternal verities in this world of rapidly changing conditions is the importance of the American home, with that stability and environment so necessary in nurturing our Nation's responsible citizens.

An outstanding example of an American family which has contributed much to Hawaii and to the Nation is that of Mr. and Mrs. Buck Hung Wong of Honolulu. The Wongs recently observed their golden wedding anniversary, and some 1,500 friends of the Wongs gathered with their eight children and 18 grandchildren to help celebrate the happy occasion.

I know that my colleagues would wish to join me in extending warmest congratulations to the Wongs on this significant event. Fine marriages such as theirs, which have endured the span of a half century, are an inspiration to all of us.

The council of the city and county of Honolulu adopted a special resolution in honor of the Wongs on the occasion of their 50th wedding anniversary, citing their many contributions to the community. I take pleasure in submitting this resolution for inclusion in the Congressional Record.

I am also inserting in the Record a feature article highlighting the events of the Wong's golden wedding anniversary dinner, as reported by Riv Tobin in the September 12, 1967, issue of the Honolulu Advertiser:

Resolution 352 of the City Council of the City and County of Honolulu

Whereas, Mr. and Mrs. Buck Hung Wong will be celebrating their Golden Wedding Anniversary on September 10, 1967; and

Whereas, Mr. Buck Hung Wong distinguished himself not only in business as President of the Liberty Bank since 1953, President of Liberty News, a newspaper founded by Dr. Sun Yat Sen, Chairman and Treasurer of Tai Hing Company, Chairman and Trustee of Consolidated Development Company, Director of King Market, Ltd., and Director of Chun Chung Company, but also in civic and public activities as officer or member of the United Chinese Society, Palolo Chinese Home, Chinese Chamber of Commerce, Lung Doo Benevolent Society, Hoo Cho Chinese Language School, Chung Shan Society, Wong Kong Har Tong, Honolulu Community Chest, Hawaii Visitors Bureau, Oahu Society for Crippled Children and Adults; was selected Citizen of the Year in 1965 by the Citizenship Day Committee and was also selected Father of the Year by the United Chinese Society in 1958; and

Whereas, during the years following their marriage on August 28, 1917, Mrs. Wong has quietly but diligently and effectively met her responsibilities not only as wife and the proud mother of eight children who have taken their places as upstanding citizens of our community but also as the grandmother of eighteen grandchildren; and

Whereas, the life story of Mr. and Mrs. Buck Hung Wong has been printed in the Congressional Record of September 9, 1965 by unanimous consent of the Congress of the United States of America as typifying the American dream and a worthy reminder that our Nation's strength lies in the blending of the many cultures, many races and many religions; and

Whereas, the Congressional Record concludes the life story by stating that "if the qualities which the Wongs exemplify—by which they have guided their own lives and inspired their children's—are emulated widely and deeply enough, the goal of peace and justice may someday be within our grasp"; and

Whereas, this Council would like to join with their many relatives, friends and associates in extending its felicitations to Mr. and Mrs. Buck Hung Wong on this happy occasion; now, therefore,

Be it resolved by the Council of the City and County of Honolulu that congratulations and a happy anniversary be extended to Mr. and Mrs. Buck Hung Wong upon the occasion of this, their Golden Wedding Anniversary; and

Be it further resolved that best wishes for continued good health be also extended to the said Mr. and Mrs. Buck Hung Wong; and

Be it finally resolved that the Clerk be, and she is, hereby directed to transmit a copy of this resolution to Mr. and Mrs. Buck Hung Wong.

Introduced by:

HERMAN G. P. LEMKE,
G. KOGA,
EUGENE F. KENNEDY,
CLESSON Y. CHIKASUYE,
KEKOA D. KAAPU,
YOSHIRO NAKAMURA,
FRANK F. FASI,
BEN F. KAITO,
Councilmen.

[From the Honolulu Advertiser, Sept. 12, 1967]

WEDDING CAKE FOR THE BUCK HUNG WONGS

(By "Riv" Tobin)

Leonard D. Y. Wong and Kin Ming Wong and their sisters, Mrs. Milton J. Goo, Mrs. David Chu, Mrs. Stephen Chun, Mrs. Charles Yim, Mrs. Benjamin K. H. Lee and Leora Wong, decided long ago to send their parents on a 'round-the-world trip to celebrate their golden wedding anniversary. But Mr. and Mrs. Buck Hung Wong declined with a firm, "no," and said they'd prefer to share the event with family and friends.

So it was that Sunday night 1,500 people gathered in the Pacific Ballroom of the Ilikai Hotel to offer best wishes and congratulations to the Wongs and to enjoy a nine-course Chinese dinner.

Mr. Wong retired last year as president of the Liberty Bank. He is chairman of the board and treasurer of the Consolidated Development Co. and of Tai King Co. and is still active in many benevolent organizations. The Wongs' life story has been incorporated into the Congressional Record as an example of the American way of life and as an honor for their contributions to their community.

The honorees were seated on a low dais just inside the door, and before the receiving line ended they were up to their eyebrows in floral and money leis.

Mrs. Wong wore a gold brocade cheongsan and jade jewelry and she and her husband had a personal word for each guest.

Diminutive ladies with bound feet stood shoulder to shoulder with Honolulu's business, political and military leaders and modern Chinese girls wearing mini skirts over fishnet stockings.

At the far end of the room was a two-tiered stage. At the back was an altar arranged with bowls of oranges, bamboo and pine boughs and several tall candles.

In a sentimental ceremony, Wong Inn and Samuel K. Young rekindled these candles as they'd done on Mr. Wong's 61st and 71st birthdays. They were assisted by Mr. Wong's grandsons, Kendall Wong and Michael Goo.

Behind the altar hung magnificent silk scrolls. Two of them had been presented to the Wongs at their traditional Chinese wedding in 1917. Another pair had been inscribed by Wah Chan Thom, a Honolulu scholar.

Ronald Y. C. Lee, master of ceremonies, explained that Mr. Wong had designed the red and gold invitations and had chosen the pine and the crane as symbols for good luck. A replica of the design was presented to each guest in the form of a small gold medallion.

For the benefit of the Wongs' friends who speak only Chinese, K. Y. Quon spoke briefly in their native tongue and then Ernest Albrecht showed a series of slides made from pictures taken from the Wongs' family album.

No family party at the Buck Hung Wongs' would be complete without a violin solo by their son-in-law, Milton Goo. "I always play the same numbers," he said, "but every time I make different mistakes so they always sound like different songs." Then, accompanied by Alvin Isaacs and his troupe, he played several tunes that were popular during his in-laws' courting days.

Alvin had written a song entitled, "Kiss Me Dear Once Again," especially for the Wongs, which he sang and their 18 grandchildren sang a Chinese lullaby.

The eldest grandson, Jonathan Chu, explained that the lyrics were written by Mrs. David Chu but the tune was the same one Mr. Wong used to sing his children to sleep by.

All the grandchildren wore solid gold charms shaped as peaches which had been given to them by their grandparents and are worn at all momentous family celebrations.

Herman Lemke, chairman of the City Council, read a resolution from the Council and then Mr. Lee read congratulatory messages from far-away friends.

Wedding cake is not part of the traditional Chinese marriage service, but on this auspicious occasion there was a four-tiered cake topped with a huge "50."

Cheered on by their sons and daughters, the Wongs plunged the sliver knife through the frosting and then, quite surprisingly, Mrs. Wong popped a piece of the gooey cake into her husband's mouth. He responded, quick as a cat, with the same gesture.

"Everyone wanted to get into the act," said Mr. Albrecht, "but in the interests of time we had to limit the program. However, there was one person we couldn't say, 'no' to, Kee Fook Zane." He is the long-time friend and business associate of the Wongs, and played them a musical selection on his guitar.

Then it was time for the closing toasts that were made by Mr. Albrecht, Anji Tamayose and the Wongs' sons, Leonard and Kin Ming.

Among the dignitaries who raised their glasses to Mr. and Mrs. Buck Hung Wong were Mayor and Mrs. Neal S. Blaisdell, Chief Justice and Mrs. William S. Richardson, Judge and Mrs. Masato Doi, president-elect of the Chinese Chamber, Kenneth Lum, and Mrs. Lum, president of the United Chinese Society H. Bun Chong and Mrs. Chong, Dr. and Mrs. H. Q. Pang, Mr. and Mrs. Donald H. Graham, Mr. and Mrs. William Mau, Mr. and Mrs. Kim At Ching, Mr. and Mrs. Laurence B. C. Lau, Mr. and Mrs. Hung Wal Ching and Mr. and Mrs. Vern Brye.

Navy's Second Nuclear-Powered Carrier Will Be Named in Honor of Late Admiral Nimitz

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1967

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, it is most fitting that the Navy name its second nuclear-powered aircraft carrier in honor of the late Fleet Adm. Chester W. Nimitz.

Perhaps some do not know that there has been established at Fredericksburg, Tex., a naval museum in honor of the admiral. It has had an auspicious beginning, and I urge that everyone who travels in that area make it a point to go by for a look-see. The museum is being seen and appreciated by thousands.

Thus, this great patriot who contributed so much to the magnificent performance of the U.S. Navy in the Pacific during World War II is today being honored by many. These and other acts honoring the memory of this great American are timely and so highly deserved.

Under leave to extend my remarks I include a Navy release which announced the naming of the new carrier. The release follows:

The Secretary of the Navy has approved the naming of the Navy's second nuclear powered attack aircraft carrier (CVA(N)-68) in honor of the late Fleet Admiral Chester W. Nimitz.

Fleet Admiral Nimitz, who died February 20, 1966, was one of the Navy's foremost heroes. It was under his brilliant leadership and outstanding skill as a strategist that the Pacific Fleet was able to turn the tide of war against Japan.

The ship, which was authorized under the 1967 Shipbuilding and Conversion Program, will be powered with the new two reactor plant that has been under development in recent years. It will be the most modern warship in the world and will be the improved successor of the USS Enterprise (CVA (N)-65). The Nimitz will have a full Naval Tactical Data System and an Integrated Operational Intelligence Center. Automation in areas of main propulsion, ordnance handling, ship control, etc., will be included as possible wherever safety can be improved and manning reduced.

Although construction funds are provided in the Military Appropriation Bill, no contract for construction has yet been awarded. A $40,000,000 negotiated cost-plus-fixed-fee contract for advance planning, scheduling, engineering and design work, material procurement, and prefabrication for construction of the Nimitz has been awarded to the Newport News Shipbuilding and Drydock Company.

The cost of the carrier will be $427.5 million.

Gun Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1967

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the Appendix of the CONGESSIONAL RECORD an excellent article appearing in the Ann Arbor News of Saturday, September 9, 1967, by Mr. Doug Fulton, the distinguished outdoors and nature editor of that fine newspaper.

This excellent article points out some of the vices of the Dodd bill, and merits careful consideration in connection with that outrageous legislation.

The article follows:

A NATURALIST'S JOURNAL: GUN CONTROL PROPONENTS OFF TARGET

(By Doug Fulton)

Before I start this column, I'd like to make a few things clear. I am not a member of the Minutemen, nor do I approve of them in fact or in principle. I do not belong to the National Rifle Association, nor have I been wined, dined, or intimidated by them. And, as far as I can tell, I am not a member of any pro-gun lobby, either real or imagined.

I am a card-carrying member of several Audubon Societies, the National Wildlife Federation, the Izaak Walton League, and a few other conservation organizations, and I'm proud of it.

But I'm getting fed up with all the propaganda being foisted off on the American people on the subject of "gun control," and the vicious attempts to label all of us who sincerely disagree with the methods proposed as some kind of lunatic fringe.

The anti-gunners, with an assist from the Administration, are attempting to pass laws under the guise of "helping the states to control gun traffic." The laws they propose would not just be completely ineffective for the avowed purpose, but would cost millions of dollars to administer, snarl the honest sportsman in a mass of red tape, and effectively knock out one of the most imaginative and workable conservation programs ever dreamed up—the Pittman-Robertson Act.

The "Dodd Bill" for gun control, already bad enough before the Administration further "tightened" it, is touted as a major step in the administration's "war on crime." It is equivalent to treating a headache caused by a tumor of the brain with a patent-medicine pain-killer—it relieves the symptoms but does nothing for the cause. After a while the headache comes back even stronger, requiring more and stronger medicine. And the patient, unless he wises up and seeks competent advice, eventually dies.

The anti-gunners, of course, have allies.

There are those who think guns are intrinsically evil, and they use the pseudo-psychoanalytic jargon of the day to explain how the sportsman is "proving his manhood by the use of an obvious phallic symbol." (Some of these same people drive cars with too-big motors and too much chrome, but let us be charitable.)

Others are taken in by the genuine emotions of compassion toward the victims of criminals who use guns, and think the Dodd Bill would sove the problem. It will not, any more than the "Great Experiment" solved the problem of those who misused alcohol.

The misconceptions foisted off on the public by the Dodd bill backers are many.

There is the claim the bill will help the states to enforce their own laws. But 14 different states (including Michigan) have passed resolutions or motions opposing the Dodd bill, and 16 state fish and game commissions have done likewise. Not one state has gone on record for the bill.

Legislation has been proposed, and rejected by the antis, to allow interstate shipments of guns if not in violation of state laws. There was even a law proposed (and accepted by sportsmen, but not the antis) that would hold shipment of any mail-order gun pending receipt of notice of shipment by the chief law enforcement officer of the buyer's area.

Registration of guns is another phony issue, supported by those who cannot or will not face the fact that most crimes committed with guns would not be stopped. Criminals steal guns, just as they steal cars, to commit crimes.

And the idea that a file of bullets which could be traced to the gun owners, as fingerprints are, is ridiculous to a ballistics expert, who know how easily barrel markings can be changed. Not to mention the storage problems and systematization this would require.

If registration is for the purposes of taxation (as it is for cars), the public should be aware that gun owners already pay a high tax (instituted by sportsmen themselves) on the original gun purchase and all equipment and ammunition. Money collected under this tax (Pittman-Robertson) has purchased 2,500,000 acres of recreational land in the U.S.—land used not only for hunting but by the general public as well.

Incidentally—guns are already registered. Sellers are required to keep records of serial numbers of most weapons sold along with the buyer's name and address.

Any further registration can only serve one of two purposes—additional taxation, with its concomitant inefficient administrative bureaucracy, or the abolition of guns. The former is unnecessary, the latter would be tragic.

Fish and game programs and wildlife improvement programs rely upon the hunter to help harvest the surplus—to take the role of the predators which keep numbers in balance with their food supply. And P-R funds, collected from the hunter, and the sale of licenses to sportsmen promotes research on and habitat improvement for our native wildlife.

These are but a few of the misconceptions and downright deceptions by the anti-gun lobby.

Of more importance, however, is the basic fact that, like the patent-medicine pain killer, the proposed laws treat only the symptoms.

The problems involved are both moral and economic.

We need to wipe out the slums, eradicate unemployment, increase educational opportunities, put an end to juvenile delinquency, minister to mental illness, and research the basic causes of moral breakdown.

Cheap solutions to problems such as these are promoted by either those who are too unimaginative to think otherwise or those who would like easy answers to difficult questions.

The Dodd bill is a cheap political gimmick designed to mask and sweep under the rug a problem that the politicians would rather not face.

Slums: The $1 Billion Pledge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 11, 1967

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the Los Angeles Times' lead editorial of September 15, entitled "Slums: The $1 Billion Pledge," highlighted a most important development for the future of our cities. That was the announcement last week by officials of the Nation's insurance industry that they would invest $1 billion in slum housing and job-creating businesses in urban areas. I commend the industry for its public-spirited action. And I commend the Los Angeles Times for another editorial reflecting its growing national stature. I am proud that my city of Los Angeles speaks increasingly to the Nation in the perceptive voice of this progressive newspaper.

The action of the insurance industry gives impetus to the chances for congressional funding of the rent supplements program. This vote of confidence in the rent supplement program, coming from the private sector, should not be overlooked by Members of the House when the rent supplements program comes back from conference.

Mr. Speaker, the text of the editorial follows:

SLUMS: THE $1 BILLION PLEDGE

The nation's life insurance industry has written a $1 billion policy promising new life for the urban slums—and indeed new hope for the entire country.

Availability of private investment funds has been a critical question in the rent supplement program and other plans aimed at providing new and better housing in high-risk poverty areas.

That question was answered Wednesday with the announcement that $1 billion would be invested in slum housing and job-creating businesses by more than 300 participating life insurance companies.

"We want to record ourselves as sharing in the determination that the President, Congress and the leaders in urban affairs in the United States have expressed—a determination to find ways to improve the quality of life in the cities," declared Gilbert W. Fitzhugh, chairman of the industry's joint committee on urban problems.

The statement at the White House brought a broad grin to the face of President Johnson, whose rent supplement legislation has been in serious trouble on Capitol Hill. Although the $40 million appropriation received committee approval in the Senate, the House previously had refused any funding.

Mr. Johnson described the initiative as a "vote of confidence" in the rent supplement program, and industry leaders confirmed that such construction and rehabilitation projects would get first emphasis.

Only $32 million has been appropriated by Congress in the past two years to supplement the rents paid by the poor in existing units or new housing sponsored by local nonprofit organizations. Although 437 projects in 249 cities have been approved, the uncertainty as to private investment has kept the great majority from starting construction.

The federal government made its own contribution to the insurance companies' investment by authorizing FHA mortgage insurance in high-risk slums.

But since such mortgage guarantees usually impose limitations on interest, the money loaned in the poverty areas will draw less than if loaned or invested elsewhere.

Although the rent-supplement program will have first priority, the insurance investment funds presumably will be available for many other kinds of slum investment, including the business and private housing incentive programs proposed by Sens. Thomas Kuchel (R-Calif.), Robert Kennedy (D-N.Y.), Charles Percy (R-Ill.) and others.

In view of this massive pledge of private financing, there should be no further congressional reluctance to expand the rent supplement effort.

And the example set by the life insurance companies should stir every segment of U.S. business and industry to new action in solving the terrible problems of the slums.

For every company, as well as every individual, will ultimately share in the success or failure of the nation's response to the urban challenge.

Constitution Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 11, 1967

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, in observance of Constitution Week, the Johnson City, Tenn., Press-Chronicle published an outstanding editorial, which I feel is worthy of the attention of my colleagues and the readers of the RECORD:

A LIVING DOCUMENT

Constitution Week, now being observed, is a reminder to all Americans of the travail and the glory of their republic.

The United States Constitution, one of the world's great documents, grew out of the hearts and minds of men who loved freedom and detested tyranny, men who were determined to establish for themselves and to hand down to their children the blessings of liberty under law.

These men knew the meaning of subservience to a king. They knew what it was to pay taxes to a government without having an adequate voice in that government. And they had felt the oppressive weight of persecution for religious or political beliefs.

Many today take for granted the great guarantees of life and liberty the Constitution sets forth. Many others seek to read into the document words and meanings the authors never intended. And there are some who contemptuously dismiss the instrument itself as out of date, irrelevant to our modern age.

Daughters of the American Revolution, here and elsewhere, are to be commended for their consistent efforts to keep the Constitution before the people, especially young people. The Constitution is our political Bible. It embodies truths that are not diminished by the passage of time. It is the great pillar of our national strength.

We must ask ourselves if we, individually and collectively, are living in the spirit of the Constitution—in our attitudes toward our neighbors, in our attitudes toward our government, and in our attitudes toward life, law, property and peace at home and abroad.

It might help if we should take time to read the Constitution some time this week.

Congresswoman Sullivan Discusses "Truth-in-Lending" and Savings and Loan Holding Company Bills at Convention of Missouri Savings and Loan League

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1967

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, the Missouri Savings and Loan League was responsible several years ago for alerting me to the dangers to the federally chartered savings and loans, and to the public generally, as a result of the operations of savings and loan holding companies not now subject to Federal regulation even though the savings and loans they control may be insured by the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation.

It was my great privilege and pleasure on Friday to speak at the luncheon meeting of the annual convention of the Missouri Savings and Loan League in Kansas City, Mo., and to discuss the present status of the administration bill on savings and loan holding companies which grew out of the legislation I introduced 3 years ago on this subject.

In my talk, I also covered some of the issues of particular interest to savings and loans in connection with the truth-in-lending legislation now pending before my Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs in the House Committee on Banking and Currency as part of H.R. 11601, the proposed Consumer Credit Protection Act.

Because of the timeliness and importance of the savings and loan holding company legislation and the consumer credit bills, I submit herewith a copy of my remarks at the Kansas City convention, as follows:

Speech by Congresswoman Leonor K. Sullivan, of St. Louis, at Annual Convention of Missouri Savings and Loan League, Hotel Muehlebach, Kansas City, Mo., September 15, 1967

It is a great pleasure for me to have the opportunity to come to Kansas City for the annual Convention of the Missouri Savings and Loan League. I know that the Savings and Loan people in St. Louis and the surrounding area, as well as those elsewhere in the State, are vitally interested in my work as a Ranking Member of the House Committee on Banking and Currency, so it is a pleasure to find a receptive audience on issues which I must deal with on that Committee including some which the general public finds of little immediate concern.

Sometimes, we begin to think that our own values in the Congress are a little peculiar—at least as to what constitutes significant news. I can remember instances when we were engaged in the Banking Committee in a knockdown battle over some vital and far-reaching piece of legislation, while at the same time working long hours on the House Floor on major bills, with the press gallery virtually deserted and no one paying much attention to what we were doing. Then along would come one of the reporters who asked me whether we should have co-ed swimming in the Rayburn House Office Swimming Pool,and my answer went out over all the wire services and radio and television net works and was in every newspaper in the country as seemingly the biggest problem faced by the House of Representatives in the Congress of the United States.

This is certainly not a complaint about the press, which, on the whole, has been very gracious to me. But it does lead me to wonder occasionally whether it might have been simpler to ignore the big, tough, complex, technical issues in which I am so deeply involved and concentrate instead on the more frivolous aspects of the Washington Whirl which are sure to land you in the newspapers.

MISSOURI LEAGUE INSTIGATED HOLDING COMPANY BILL

One of the bills in which your organization is vitally interested is a good illustration of this point. How much political glamor is there in the phrase "Savings and Loan Holding Companies"? Not very much. On the other hand, is it important? It certainly is. Is it important enough to demand the attention of the 32 Members of the Committee on Banking and Currency at a time when we are also pressed with a variety of other urgent legislative concerns? Again, the answer is yes. And I know you agree.

Of all of the state Savings and Loan organizations in the country, I think yours is entitled to the greatest amount of credit for the degree of progress which has been achieved on the Savings and Loan Holding Companies bills. As you all probably know, the bill I introduced more than three years ago, H.R. 10189 of the 88th Congress, introduced on April 13, 1964, was the first of the current bills on this subject and was the precipitating factor in the development of a bill by the Federal Home Loan Bank Board on behalf of the Administration. That bill originated from discussions held with Boyd Ewing and other leaders of the Missouri League. So if any legislation passes in this Congress—as I sincerely hope it will now that the Senate has passed S. 1542 and the House Committee is putting together the record of Subcommittee hearings—our success in enacting legislation will flow from the initiative and leadership the Missouri League provided on this important issue.

I want to come back to that legislation later in my talk and discuss some of the details of the Administration bill, the Senate-passed bill, and H.R. 1322, which is the number of my bill in this Congress on Savings and Loan Holdings Companies. First however, I would like to tell you a little bit about the atmosphere in which legislation is now being considered in the Congress as a backdrop for the setting in which this bill, or any other, will be considered.

CONGRESS REFLECTS MOOD OF INDECISION

As we approach the 1968 Presidential election campaign, Congress could conceivably begin to show more and more concern—or at least more effective concern—over the problems confronting us in every aspect of our national life. Certainly the emphasis up until now—and we have been in session during most of the past eight and a half months—has been to argue a lot and pass very little.

Only three appropriation bills for the 1968 fiscal year which began last July 1 have actually been enacted into the law. This is one way to hold down expenditures! But it doesn't solve very much. In most of the agencies of the government, programs enacted in the last Congress have not yet been funded and therefore cannot proceed. Instead, we have passed resolutions authorizing the departments and agencies to continue to operate at the same levels of expenditures for the same programs for which they received funds in the previous fiscal year. It is not unusual for the Congress to go into September with many of the appropriation bills in a state of suspended animation, but the difference this time is that despite the crises confronting us in so many areas of our national life and in our economy, there is really no sense of urgency among the public and, therefore, no zeal to get on to the task of making difficult decisions in the Congress. This has nothing to do with partisan consideration. The answer seems to be that we are poised as a people on a great plateau of indecision. This could change over night, of course, under the pressures of events. But in view of the kind of events which *could* trigger vigorous action by the Congress, perhaps we are just as well off in our present state of uncertainty, because usually it is only the threat of disaster of one kind or anther which goads a Congress to this nature and composition to act.

COMPROMISES OFTEN INEFFECTIVE

On the other hand, there have been numerous occasions during the years in which I have served in the Congress when an effective, working majority—and we do not have that at the moment—pushed and prodded through long overdue reforms in the health, education, housing, social welfare, and financial fields not because we were in a crisis but because they were things which deserved being done and the votes were present to accomplish worthwhile goals. I guess all of us tend to hope that some miracle of awareness will sweep over the 90th Congress on a strictly intellectual level to prompt us to pass the bills we know in our hearts should be passed, and do it without the spur of a national emergency. But don't count on it!

In any event this is the rather becalmed atmosphere in which most legislation now lingers. What is passed is often so loaded down with compromises as to be almost ineffective. The so-called "Truth-in-Lending" bill passed by the Senate on July 11 by the remarkable—the fantastic—unanimous roll call vote of 92 to 0 is a good illustration of that. As most of you know, I am deeply involved in that issue as Chairman of the Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs which recently completed two solid weeks of hearings, morning and afternoon, on consumer credit legislation. The savings and loans have generally been in the forefront of support for effective Truth-in-Lending legislation, as well you should be, since of all of the institutions in this country granting credit, your practices are the least susceptible to criticism or, to put it another way, are among the very best from the standpoint of consumer understanding and consumer protection.

ANNUAL RATE OF 36 PERCENT ON GROCERY CREDIT!

I have been horrified by some of the practices we have uncovered among even the respectable elements of the credit industry. I noticed the other day that one of the bank credit card operations in California, is now promoting a special service among the supermarkets to charge *groceries* at the check-out counter for a mere 3% service charge. Apparently, many shoppers are seizing advantage of this dandy little convenience of being able to say "charge it" to the food checker for a mere 36% annual interest rate! Imagine that!

Undoubtedly credit service is expensive and no one should be expected to provide a business service as a charity. But 36% interest on a loaf of bread and a quart of milk and other groceries? Of course expressing it in terms of 3% a month sounds moderate and appealing. I wonder how much housewives charging groceries on a monthly bill and paying the equivalent of 36% annual interest are aware of the 36% figure. We have quite an educational campaign to wage if we are going to get consumers to use good sense on the purchase of credit. We can pass laws to protect the consumer from fraud and deception in the stating of credit charges, but certainly people should be able to figure out on their own that 3% a month is 36% on an annual rate basis, compared to the 4% or 4¾% they receive on an annual rate basis on their savings.

THE REVOLVING CREDIT CLAIM THAT 12 TIMES 1½ IS NOT 18

This leads me to wonder whether the savings and loans are doing enough educational work among their members to teach them the facts of credit life, including credit life insurance, too, which is so frequently a part of every consumer credit transaction. The department stores have had phenomenal success in promoting their revolving credit programs which involve a monthly charge of 1½%, which, in my old fashioned mathematics, comes out to 18% a year on an annual rate basis. We have argued over that figure during all of our hearings and received all sorts of disclaimers to the effect that the actual interest paid on the individual account is usually less than 18%. That may very well be true. But regardless of how you slice it, or with what grace, or grace period, or "free ride" on the number of days after the purchase is made for which no credit charge is made, the charge—when it is made—is for specified one month segment of the calendar—one twelfth of a year—no more, and no less—and under those circumstances the 1½% monthly rate is 18% on an annual rate basis.

If the convenience of a charge account is worth that much to the individual family, that is their business. Unfortunately, surveys have proved that most people entering into an agreement for a 1½% a month credit charge on store purchases have no conception at all of the true interest rate they are paying. One experiment had the credit clerks on one day quoting a rate of 1½% a month and on the next day a rate of 18% a year, and it was discovered that the customer signed up for the 1½% deal without batting an eye where as it took from 30 to 45 minutes per customer to explain the 18% charge as being the same as 1½% a month.

Suppose you people had to express your dividend rate on savings as one third of one percent a month? Do you suppose many of your members would think they were getting a good run for their money in your institution? I put that question to the witnesses for the American Bankers Association and they answered by saying that if they could express their credit charges on loans as a monthly percentage rate—as the Senate passed Truth-in-Lending bill would let the department stores do on revolving charge—they would be willing to express the interest rate on savings on a monthly rate also. Maybe so. But I doubt very much that very many banks would take full page ads in the newspapers to shout about the great advantages of depositing money in their institutions at the generous interest rate of one third of one percent a month!

METHODS OF AVOIDING HIGH CREDIT CHARGES

I would like to see the savings and loans lead an aggressive campaign to urge their members to revert to the old fashioned, outmoded, obsolete, unmodern, "square" custom of saving money by paying for things at the time they make the purchase, rather than retroactively at a substantial extra cost. Many of the stores still—yes they do—regard payment in 90 days as being the same as cash, with no credit charge, but apparently you have to ask for such terms. People should be urged to inquire. If ever I buy any large ticket item that I would like to pay for over three months instead of on one monthly statement, I always check the availability of 90 day credit, and I am sure other people do, too, but not enough of them do.

Are you advertising to your members that in building up their deposit accounts in your savings and loans, they can be in a position to pay cash for the things they want to buy and thus can effect substantial savings on credit charges?

How many of you stick relentlessly to a calendar year system which pays dividends only on March 31, June 30, September 30, and December 31? Have you given any thought to a fiscal year set-up which would enable your members to receive credit for their dividends say on February 28, May 31, August 31, and November 30? In this way, they could withdraw before Christmas, or before the children go off to college in the fall, without losing dividends on their savings. This might give you some headaches sometimes in your cash position or force the sale of some additional paper to Fanny Mae, but the service you would render to your members would be a tremendous factor in saving them money on credit transactions and thus provide them with *additional* funds they can deposit with you for the needs of the housing industry. Does that make sense?

FIRST MORTGAGES UNDER "TRUTH-IN-LENDING"

Now let me say a word about first mortgages under the Truth-in-Lending bill. You notice that I am putting off my discussion of Savings and Loan Holding Company legislation, in which you are so interested, until I get in some licks on some of my other legislative interests. In any event, the Truth-in-Lending bill as it passed the Senate, S. 5, exempts from the disclosure requirements all first mortgages. I know that the savings and loan organizations approve of and support that exemption. But I am fighting it and I hope to keep that exemption out of the House bill. It is not that I think savings and loans are defrauding the public on first mortgages and charging excessive interest rates you do not disclose. Not at all. The truth is the exact opposite. Whether FHA or Conventional, your mortgages almost always are accompanied with the full facts. Perhaps you are not anxious to tell a prospective borrower the total amount of interest he will pay over the life of the mortgage, as my consumer credit bill would require you to do. We would argue over whether this would discourage home-buying. I do not think it would. It has not had that effect in FHA mortgages. It would have a good effect, I believe, in convincing families to make a larger down payment and larger monthly payments, if they can, in order to reduce the total interest cost. This is something I would think you would want to encourage.

But what I am really concerned about—deeply concerned about—in any provision of a Truth-in-Lending law which would exempt all first mortgages is that there are a great many unconscionable credit frauds being perpetrated on elderly couples and on widows who have paid off their mortgages and suddenly find that a piece of paper they signed for a siding job or a new furnace or roof or other major repairs—a piece of paper handed to them by what I understand are commonly called the "suede shoe boys" who say it is merely a confirmation of the order or something of that nature—turns out to be what is regarded as and accepted as a mortgage, which then becomes a first mortgage, and thus exempt from coverage under S. 5.

There are enough such cases in existence—I have encountered enough of them myself in incidents involving elderly constituents, or overly trusting homeowners, in my district in St. Louis—that I feel we must force these credit gyps to come clean under any Truth-in-Lending law. We cannot let them escape under an escape clause written in primarily to save the legitimate home financing industry from a bit of bookkeeping annoyance. I don't know whether or not I can convince you on this issue, but I want you to understand why I feel so strongly on the coverage of all mortgages—first, second or whatever—under a Truth-in-Lending statute.

ORIGINS OF SAVINGS AND LOAN HOLDING COMPANY BILLS

You have been very patient in listening to my discussion of some issues in which my interest may be somewhat greater than yours. Now let us go to the matter of savings and loan holding company legislation. As I said earlier, the Missouri Savings and Loan League has done more than any other group in the country to push this issue to a point where legislation is now close to enactment. At your urging, I introduced the first bill of recent years on this issue in 1964. My introduction of that legislation led to a restudy by the Home Loan Bank Board of the problems growing out of the operation of the Spence Act of 1959—an Act which was recognized at the time as stop-gap legislation. And the Board then sent to Congress an Administration bill to carry out most of the changes I had recommended originally in my bill.

President Johnson called for stronger regulation of savings and loan holding companies in both his 1966 and 1967 Economic Messages. And this year the Senate acted by passing S. 1542 on June 26. The bill was then sent to the House Banking and Currency Committee and hearings were conducted by a Subcommittee on August 21 and 22. It is far from becoming law, of course, but progress definitely has been made and is being made. I will do my best in the full Committee to get a bill through and out to the House reasonably soon once the Subcommittee makes its recommendations.

We should all keep in mind the fact that the Senate-passed bill is not only substantially *weaker* than my bill but subject to a great many amendments which could undermine the whole purpose of the legislation. So we have a fight on our hands to get something through which is worth having enacted. The lobbying against this legislation is prodigious—because the stakes are very large.

SAVINGS AND LOAN HOLDING COMPANIES REQUIRE SCRUTINY

That this is indeed "reform" legislation, is emphasized by a statement in the House report when the Spence Act was enacted, that: ". . . the holding company method of operation is susceptible to abuse by unscrupulous promoters. . . . One of the fundamental rules of sound lending is that the parties concerned deal at arm's length. The bill would preserve this sound and tested lending requirement with respect to institutions whose loanable funds are derived almost entirely from the general public."

Savings and loan associations have been specifically created for expressly favored public purposes, to foster thrift and economical home financing. To insure that they adhere to, and successfully serve, those purposes, they receive special forms of public support—a public system of insurance for their accounts, a public system for obtaining credit at lower costs, and favorable tax treatment. The full thrust of the Federal Government is directed at assuring public confidence in their financial integrity, based upon a program of regular examinations and supervision. Thus the question of whether holding companies should be allowed to operate *at all* in such a field, and how the interests of their insured subsidiaries may be sufficiently protected if holding companies are permitted, are legitimate questions for public concern and for Congressional review.

Based upon the experience with the Spence Act since it was enacted by 1959, it is fair to say that it effectively achieved *some* but not all of its objectives, and achieved others only partialy. In addition, the Home Loan Bank Board has uncovered serious problems that the 1959 law did not undertake to deal with at all.

Although the 1959 enactment placed some restraints upon the growth of a holding company once formed, it can hardly be said to have prevented further encroachment by holding companies in the savings and loan field. At the end of 1959 there were 44 holding companies controlling 93 associations, which possessed 7.2% of the assets of all insured associations. By the end of 1966 every one of those figures had increased very substantially; there were 98 holding companies instead of 44, and they controlled 134 associations representing 12.5% of the whole industry, instead of the 7.2% of the industry so controlled in 1959. In dollar terms, the assets of holding company associations climbed from $4.25 billion in 1959 to over $16 billion, or by 375%. Of this $16 billion, some 83% is located in the *one* state of California; holding company operations are also to be found to some extent in 10 other states as well.

HIGH INCIDENCE OF "PROBLEM" CASES

Since the present law does not require holding companies to register or furnish any information to the Home Loan Bank Board, our knowledge about holding company operations, or even about their existence, is necessarily limited, and that, alone, is reason enough for us to be deeply concerned.

The Spence Act has been largely effective in keeping *new* holding company formation predominantly local in orientation, except in those instances where a large national corporation buys up a savings and loan in some areas. The Act has also been generally effective in preventing any individual holding company from increasing at an alarming rate that degree of concentration of economic control which had already come into being by 1959. Similarly, the restriction on newly formed holding companies to control of a *single* insured institution seems to have prevented circumvention of branching restrictions.

However, according to Chairman John Horne, of the Home Loan Bank Board, experience shows that the present law has not been sufficiently effective in safeguarding against abuses in holding company operations.

This is demonstrated by the statistical records kept by the Home Loan Bank Board of those institutions which are of some degree of supervisory concern. At the end of 1966, there were 28 institutions, with $2.3 billion in assets, that were ranked in the category of the *more serious* problem cases. And holding company associations, although possessing only 12.5% of the assets of the entire industry, accounted in asset terms for 63% of the serious problem group. In the less serious problem category were 29 associations, with $700 million in assets. If both categories are combined, the holding company associations account for 54% of the assets of institutions whose financial condition and operations are problems. In short, this one-eighth of the industry is producing over half of the Board's supervisory difficulties and almost two-thirds of its most serious problems. Such a situation cannot go unremedied, if the Federal Government is to discharge its responsibilities to protect the public's savings and the standing of the rest of the savings and loan business.

MANY SHORTCOMINGS IN SENATE-PASSED HOLDING COMPANY BILL

Now I will take a few moments to outline the differences between my bill, H.R. 1322 and the Senate-passed version of S. 1542. I firmly believe that my bill is a much simpler and much more effective bill, for S. 1542 is riddled with compromises. But the Senate bill is certainly better than nothing and, doubtless, can be very useful if not weakened further, which is always a danger.

My bill defines "control" by a holding company in terms of a holding of 10% or more of the stock of an insured association. The Senate-passed bill provides for a 25% ownership test. I must object to such a high figure unless an additional provision is added to include "de facto control". You will recall that the present Spence Act defines control as *10% or more* of the stock, *or* a finding by the Board that "a company directly or indirectly exercises a controlling influence over the management and policies of such institution or other organization." So the Senate bill, as it now stands, would weaken the present law in that respect.

I also now feel that there is no justification whatever for exempting partnerships from the Act.

Another important difference is this: my bill prohibits holding companies from engaging in any but certain specific activities, usually those traditional for savings and loan associations themselves; S. 1542, however, contains a loophole exemption for any holding companies which control only one association, no matter how many branch offices those associations may have. On the other hand, a holding company with two subsidiary associations would be required to divest itself of unrelated businesses even though its two associations had no branches at all. I feel there is no justification for this loophole favoring the companies controlling single associations and I expect to offer an amendment to close it if it remains in the bill recommended by the Subcommittee to the full Committee.

WE MUST PROHIBIT "INSIDER DEALS" WHICH CAN AFFECT INSURED ASSOCIATIONS

Another difference between my bill and the Senate bill is that while my bill flatly prohibits all transactions by holding companies with their affiliates without the prior approval of the Home Loan Bank Board, the Senate-passed bill permits any and all transactions with affiliates of up to $100,000 per year, or one-tenth of 1 percent of the association's total assets, whichever is the lesser, without Board approval. I do not favor this kind of insider dealings which can affect the integrity of public associations.

Taking another difference between the two bills, H.R. 1322 contains a flat prohibition against interstate acquisitions of savings and loan associations by holding companies and requires divestiture within three years of interstate subsidiaries presently held. But the Senate-passed bill contains a complete exemption from this prohibition for the three holding companies which already operate interstate, and only prohibits *future* interstate operations by other holding companies.

Furthermore, my bill flatly prohibits control by holding companies of more than one association, except where the Bank Board determines that an acquisition is necessary to avoid or forestall an insolvency.

S. 1542 would permit *unlimited expansion* of holding companies through merger and acquisition, subject only to the approval of the supervisory agency. In future years we might come to regret this potential for expansion of holding companies. I strongly feel that we should not retreat from the Spense Act to open up this avenue of potential expansion.

I am going to try my best to have the contents of my bill H.R. 1322 reported favorably to the House for passage, instead of a watered down version such as S. 1542. However, I recognize that the Senate bill represents workable legislation, if not further weakened, and is a useful forward step in most particulars, even if not as good as it should be. The Missouri State Saving and Loan League can be justly proud of the role it has played in instigating improvement in the Spence Act for there is little doubt in my mind that meaningful holding company legislation would still be years in the future if your officials had not started the wheels moving when you did. The wheels *are* moving now, and a lot of other groups are jumping aboard—but *you* started it.

ALL DEPOSITORS IN INSURED ASSOCIATIONS COULD BE AFFECTED

As I said earlier, there is not much political glamour or exciting news interest in the dull and technical provisions of a savings and loan holding company bill, or in many of the other important bills our Committee must handle for the House of Representatives. The important thing, of course, is that those of us who have the burden of recommending House action on these issues must be able to see in them a very close and direct relationship with the public interest, and particularly the interests of the people in our Congressional districts. There is certainly such a close and direct relationship in the savings and loan holding company bill, although it may not immediately be apparent to the public. It may sound like some sort of special interest bill of limited application to your industry.

The story we must get across if the legislation is to pass and be successful—and you must continue to help on this—is that the integrity of the entire savings and loan system—the main source of financing for the family home—is at stake in this issue. Although the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, which insures the deposits in your associations, was set up primarily to protect the Federally chartered savings and loans, which are mutually owned by their members, it also protects the privately owned profit-making savings and loans, too, just as the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation protects any bank which can qualify for its insurance. If, because of loopholes in the law, holding companies which control state-chartered profit-making savings and loans can milk them of their assets, or compromise them through self-serving intercorporate loans, *all* depositors in *all* savings and loans can be adversely affected by excessive drains on the FSLIC insurance fund.

Worse than that, if some of these holding company-controlled savings and loans go down, because of mismanagement or predatory practices by those who control them, confidence will be shaken in all savings and loans, including your associations which are so well operated, and which are so closely supervised by the Federal Home Loan Bank Board. Unfortunately, under present law, the Federal supervisory agency for savings and loans cannot exercise any supervision at all over the holding companies controlling savings and loans, and this must be corrected.

So there is a broad public interest in this legislation. When some of the state-chartered savings and loans in Maryland went under several years ago in a spectacular collapse growing out of very loose laws and regulations, every savings and loan in that area of the country shuddered and was hurt by the public backlash. Yet the Maryland associations which caused all the trouble were not even under the Federal insurance program. Imagine what the reaction would be if many Federally-insured associations were to succumb because of insider-deals with their parent holding companies operating outside the Federal regulatory system. The thought is intolerable in a field in which the main ingredient of public onfidence is the aura of integrity imparted by a Federal insurance program.

Again, I want to express my deep appreciation to the Missouri State organization for having recognized the danger when you did, and for having stimulated the introduction of legislation to correct it. I was glad to introduce the bill then—and I will fight for its passage.

Statement by S. J. Lefrak

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. WYDLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1967

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, the recent riots in the urban areas of our Nation make it clear that environmental conditions must be improved. Housing of our people is certainly one of the most important issues facing our Nation. I do not believe, however, that Federal programs can ever hope to make much of a change in conditions in and of themselves. It is apparent to me that the private sector must play the major role in improving our city areas. For this reason the recent statement by Samuel J. Lefrak, an outstanding private builder, is most important.

I am entering it in the RECORD:

STATEMENT BY SAMUEL J. LEFRAK

I am convinced that one of the practical ways to solve the problems of the cities is to use the technological skills of private enterprise in city planning.

I believe it is unfortunate that the President's new 11-man commission on racial disorders in cities does not include a single builder.

The commission is made up of outstanding, dedicated municipal and state officials. However, private enterprise should not be excluded.

From a practical standpoint, the private builder is an important key to helping solve the ghetto problem. He knows whether a building can be saved by rehabilitation or whether it has to be torn down; he knows the most efficient and economical way to do the job and he has the resources to act quickly. His know-how can help to transform programs into reality.

Housing must be an integral part of any program designed to alleviate the conditions that cause the rioting and destruction that has resulted in nothing but grief for white and Negro alike.

The grim fact is that we are already late in combating the critical illness that is infecting our cities. Nothing short of a massive program providing quick and economical housing is sufficient.

By failing to involve the private sector, we have not only ignored the potential contribution of millions of talented and energetic Americans . . . more dangerously, we have created for the poor a separate economy, almost a separate nation, a second-rate system of welfare handouts, a screen of government agencies keeping the poor apart from the rest of us.

The time has come to cut through the endless rolls of red tape, to stop the countless surveys that tell us what we already know, and to turn to our nation's builders for assistance.

I would recommend the prompt passage of bills designed to pump immediate aid into the ghetto areas as called for in the Model Cities Program and other measures.

The extensive use of air rights over railroad terminals, docks, highways and other useful sites to permit immediate construction of low-cost housing and to eliminate the need for slum clearance before building can be undertaken.

Unless immediate steps are taken, we can expect a continued disbelief in the sincerity of our intentions to better the lot of the disadvantaged.

Federal-State Balance of Power To Be Major Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 12, 1967

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, in my most recent report to constituents, "Congressman Al Quie Reports," for August of 1967, I included a section titled: "The Approaching Great Debate Over Federal-State Balance."

The Red Wing, Minn., Daily Republican Eagle, reprinted the article on September 13, 1967. In the same edition the Daily Republican Eagle published an editorial titled "Housing Frustration" which dealt with the same subject of Federal-State relations and the need to return more power to the States.

Because I believe this to be one of the crucial issues facing the Nation today, I insert both the original article from my report, and the editorial commentary from the Daily Republican Eagle:

FEDERAL, STATE BALANCE OF POWER TO BE BIG ISSUE

(By Congressman AL QUIE)

One of the great debates in the next decade will be how to restore the traditional balance between the federal government and the states. Unless this most necessary balance is restored by returning more power to the states, we will have lost one of our greatest strengths.

I have been deeply concerned with the rapidity of federal take-over in the past six years. As evidence, examine the host of now Great Society measures passed in the 89th Congress: 21 for health, 17 for education, 15 for economic development, 12 to aid cities, 17 for resource development and 4 for manpower retraining.

There are now 170 different federal aid programs financed by more than 400 separate appropriations and administered by hundreds of departments, agencies, bureaus and regional offices. The federal-state balance is indeed out of kilter. As Illinois Sen. Everett Dirksen said recently, we may see the day when the only people interested in state boundaries will be map makers like Rand-McNally.

I do not quarrel with the goals of most federal programs, those to aid cities, reduce poverty, strengthen education and secure jobs for the jobless.

But there is a right and wrong way to do this. The Great Society method, I am convinced, is the wrong way . . . concentration of power in Washington, with aid limited to specific, narrow programs. The States and their know-how are too often by-passed under this narrow, categorical grant approach.

That was what the debate over the Quie Amendment to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act was all about. I proposed a system of block grants to states, with the states required to prepare a state-wide plan for distributing the funds.

It is my belief, based on long observation, that the block grant method of federal aid is far superior to the narrow, specific, categorical method in use now. Although the Quie Amendment was defeated, other amendments submitted by my colleague, Cong. Edith Green of Oregon, did pass. They embodied much of what I had sought, for Mrs. Green's changes were essentially block grant in nature.

The block grant method is a sound approach. It will more directly involve the states and local communities. It is so sound that in the end I believe it will prevail.

I was greatly encouraged by the final form of the anti-crime bill as it passed the House. In its revised form the bill embodies the block grant of lump-sum principle. The bill, still to be taken up by the Senate, authorizes an expenditure of $75 million this fiscal year (1968), to help States and communities improve their methods of law enforcement.

It is known formally as the Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice Act. In the field of law enforcement, as in other fields, we must provide the incentive for strong state and local action with federal dollar aid. I am convinced that local responsibility is paramount.

You can look for this debate over returning power to the states and local communities to gain volume over the years ahead. It is without a doubt one of the most basic decisions Americans must make in the coming decade.

HOUSING FRUSTRATION

Al Quie is 100 percent right—see his comments elsewhere on this page—to keep plugging for righting the federal-state balance in the United States through placing more weight, power, and responsibility on the state's shoulders.

His comments today recall a remark he made to us once. The basic trouble with the urban renewal program, he said, is that the states don't have any real role in its operation.

The same point is most vividly illustrated in Red Wing's efforts to provide the federally offered low-rent housing for the low-income elderly. Let us briefly review the history of this local effort:

Red Wing debated the subject during the winter of 1965–66. The city council held a public hearing and voted to create the necessary Housing and Redevelopment Authority. It was last October before this new five-man agency first met, and its only real accomplishments in the 11 months since have been to select an architect and fill out federal forms. Before the Housing Authority can go farther, the city must come up with what the federal people call a Workable Program. And a prime element in the Workable Program is a city housing code—something Red Wing doesn't presently have and which, it is feared, may generate strong citizen opposition. But a housing code we must have if we want low-rent housing, and the Workable Program won't be approved until a housing code has been in force and operation here for six months' time. So the Housing Authority sees no possibility of taking its next step toward low-rent housing before next summer at best.

All this suggests why "frustration" is the most frequent word on the lips of citizens appointed to bring about the low-rent housing here. They begin to suspect that the low-income elderly who need better places to live will have passed on before the federally-financed better housing can become a reality for them.

This is not to suggest that Red Wing is without fault in its approach to participation in federal housing. We persist with a musty, creaking structure of city government which is very long on involving citizens and very short on getting things done. We fail to perceive and act upon the city's need for an effective, central city administration with sufficient authority to carry out the policies and decisions adopted by the people's elected representatives on the city council. A city can make progress through the maze of federal regulations, but this requires a strong executive who keeps continuously on top of the ball and pushes continuously for the necessary local and federal action.

The whole process would be much simpler, however, if Quie's "block grant" philosophy could be adopted and more responsibility restored to the states. Some controls are needed; a housing code may be desirable. But Red Wing could deal much more easily and sensibly with St. Paul than the Washington bureaucracy. We don't think state officials could possibly design such a stifling array of rules and paperwork as emanate from these over-structured federal offices.

Columnist Jim Becker Writes on Trip to Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1967

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, Hawaii's colorful and always interesting newspaperman, Jim Becker, has recently returned to Honolulu following a 23,000-mile world trip. On this eventful journey, he was accompanied by a large group of students from Roosevelt High School in Honolulu, and included on the our were visits to Moscow and Leningrad.

The noted columnist discussed his observations on the current Russian scene in a special report to the Honolulu Star-Bulletin, and I believe his timely evaluation of people an devents in the Soviet Union will prove of interest to my colleagues in the Congress.

I am, therefore, pleased to submit for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the article, "Jim Becker in Russia," as it apeared in the Wednesday, September 6, 1967, issue of the Honolulu Star-Bulletin:

Russian People "Are Very Kind But They Have Nothing"

(NOTE.—Is the Soviet Union making any progress in closing the gap with the United States? What is life like here? How has the war in Vietnam affected Soviet domestic policies? Jim Becker, fresh from a tour that included Moscow and Leningrad, discusses these and other questions about the other super power, in two special columns. This is the first.)

(By Jim Becker)

LENINGRAD.—The fellow tourist in the next seat at the ballet turned to me at the first intermission and let loose a stream of French, which was flattering but futile as I have none of that language.

He switched to hesitant English. Since he had a few English words he summed up the Soviet Union quite quickly.

"The people are very kind," he said. "But they have nothing."

Even with a full vocabulary it is difficult to improve on that comment.

For the sake of discussion, I suggested to the man in the next seat that there was a time—for example when I first visited the Soviet Union in 1963—when the people had even less than they have now.

"But they should have much more," the man said. "I am from Luxembourg. We are a tiny country. We are two, three, five years behind you in America. But here, they are 20 years behind us."

In the course of the conversation it developed that the man had been almost everywhere (except Hawaii) in his travels, so I asked him from his experience why he thought the Soviets were advancing so slowly.

"They are doing it wrong," he said. "They are clever. They split the atom. They put up the sputnik. But—they should first fix up the houses, give the people something—then put up the sputnik."

HEART OF SOVIET DILEMMA

My man from Luxembourg had gone to the heart of the Soviet dilemma. The best observers agree that the Soviet consumer is having his pocket picked to pay the price for huge space and military budgets.

(Where have I heard similar comments about the other super power?)

This is not to imply that the people are in rags, or restless over their lot.

Obviously they have enough to eat and wear, and there are jobs for all—even if much of it is make work. Housing—the major Soviet shortage—is improving.

(Incidentally, some of the new buildings are chrome-and-glass modern. The wedding cake architecture favored by Stalin has been discarded.)

But the people have no style. There seems to be as little joy in their lives as there was in Uncle Vanya's. And there is no drive, no purpose to it all.

In short, communism has run out of gas. (It lost its religious fervor at least a decade ago.)

This is not news to the Soviet leaders, but instead of doing something about it they have obviously decided to give the people excuses instead.

REVOLUTION'S 50TH ANNIVERSARY

That is one of the reasons why the government is making such a big deal out of the 50th birthday party of the 1917 revolution that brought the Communists to power. It will be celebrated officially later this year but guests are arriving already.

(The czar was overthrown in February, 1917, and Lenin's Bolsheviks overthrew the provisional government in October.)

Major public buildings, including the fabulous Winter Palace which is now the magnificent Hermitage Museum—only the Louvre can beat it—are being spruced up for the party.

The idea behind it all is to remind the people how much better they have it now than in the bad old czarist days. (There was 80 per cent illiteracy, wooden shacks to live in and a bungled agricultural system. Now almost everyone can read, apartments have replaced most of the log cabins—but the agricultural system is still botched.)

And for those who rate the revolution as ancient history and would like to know what the state has done for them lately, there is a campaign to remind them of the war with Hitler.

This campaign carries the strong implication that the war, which cost from 20 to 30 million Russian lives, is responsible for the failure to move more rapidly on the consumer front.

But no matter how the leaders explain it, it is obvious that the Soviet people are being asked to wait for the good things while their money goes to finance military adventures in the Middle East and Vietnam, and the space program.

Students of the economy say that expenditures on agriculture—the major Soviet failure—have been cut yet again in the current budget in favor of arms and space spending.

THE MIDDLE EAST FIASCO

Backing the losing Arab cause in the war with Israel, and replacing all the fancy equipment the Arabs dropped when they ran, has provided the latest drain on the Soviet treasury.

Costs are high in Vietnam, too, although nowhere near the almost $100 million a day pace of the United States.

And Vietnam may have had much to do with the Soviet involvement in the Middle East.

It is never possible to know these things for sure, but good observers feel that the Soviet government is delighted to see the United States bogged down in Vietnam, and cutting its own domestic programs to pay the bill, but the Soviet military is worried.

United States Testing its Weapons

These military leaders see the American military getting experience in Vietnam, and testing its arsenal of new weapons. (Many may be the wrong weapons for Vietnam, but they are the right ones for fighting the Soviet army, if that should ever come.)

These observers say that the Soviet military feels keenly the fact that it has not fought a battle since 1945. And it wants to test its new weapons, too.

Hence the heavy involvement in the Middle East.

Unfortunately for the Soviet generals, the neat new equipment mostly got dropped in haste by the fleeing Arabs. Some of the captured tanks had been driven less than 100 miles.

Now the Arab arsenals have to be replenished, to prove that the Soviets stick by their allies, and it is the Soviet consumer, as usual, who will have to pay.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H–112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

Appendix

President Johnson To Be Commended on His Proposal To Use Federal Surplus Property for "New Community"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1967

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend President Johnson for his recent announcement that the Federal Government will donate a 335-acre plot of Federal land to build a "new community" in the District of Columbia for families of all income levels. Present plans include 1,500 low-income units, 2,200 units for moderate-income families and 800 high-income units. Also to be included in this new community are schools, shopping and service facilities, and perhaps some industry.

As described by the President, this new venture will be "first and foremost a partnership—a partnership between local and Federal Governments, private developers and the people of the city."

The heart of this proposal is the use of Federal surplus land to keep down the costs for the developer which, in turn, will make it possible for him to make a profit from low rentals. We have learned from experience that incentives are necessary to encourage developers to produce low-income housing. Also, this proposal offers a clear alternative to public housing because it does not propose to segregate low-income tenants in large housing complexes. Instead it will allow them to live in a community which will have a cross-section of economic levels.

Further the President's proposal does not end with this one project. He has established a special committee to study Federal surplus property across the Nation to determine if such property could be used for similar new communities. Possibly this idea could be duplicated in numerous cities.

So many of us have expressed concern over the blight existing in our urban slums and numerous proposals have been made to alleviate these conditions. Each proposal has a common theme—the necessity of involving private enterprise in rebuilding our cities. The use of Federal surplus funds is but one technique for encouraging private enterprise to join with both Federal and local governments in providing decent housing alternatives for our low-income citizens. However, it is a practical and innovative proposal. I hope that both the legislative and executive branches will continue to provide such constructive proposals.

Since I believe that this proposal has tremendous significance in our deliberations on legislation designed to rebuild our urban areas, I would like to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a copy of the President's news release of August 30, 1967, and articles from the Washington Post and the New York Times describing the "new community plans."

The material referred to follows:

The President today requested Secretary Weaver, Administrator Lawson Knott of the General Services Administration and Walter Tobriner, Chairman of the District of Columbia Board of Commissioners to "move at once to develop a new community within the Washington city limits."

The new development, which will eventually provide modern housing and services for about 25,000 citizens, will be built on the 335 acre site in Northeast Washington formerly occupied by the National Training School for Boys. The school is being relocated in Morgantown, West Virginia and the site is surplus federal land.

The land is situated between the District-Maryland line, South Dakota Avenue, Bladensburg Road, and the Washington-Baltimore Parkway.

"This spacious open tract," the President said, "can become a new, attractive, and well-balanced community at a major gateway to the Nation's Capital. It can provide comfortable and urgently needed housing, built and operated under the new Turnkey concept. But it should be more than a housing project. Washington needs and deserves the best in community planning—and this new development can be the best of communities. It should offer a full range of educational, recreation and other public services to citizens of every station."

The President recently directed Administrator Knott to "seek, find and make available" surplus federal land to meet critical urban needs: housing, education, park land and industry. The new community project for Washington is the result of that search.

Ultimately, the planned community can provide up to 1500 low income housing units, 2200 moderate income housing units, and 800 units of high income apartments, homes and townhouses. A wide varietl of other services, including educational and shopping facilities would be developed.

"This new venture," the President said, "will be first and foremost a partnership—a partnership between local and federal governments, between public officials, private developers and the people of the city. The creative involvement of private enterprise will be a most important single element in the project."

The development of the site, the President announced, will be compatible with a detailed land-use study of the area recently completed by a major consulting firm. It will also substantially adhere to the 1985 comprehensive plan prepared by the National Capital Planning Commission for the District of Columbia.

"But it is my hope," the President said, "that this concept, if it can be applied successfully in the Nation's Capital, will be useful elsewhere in the Country. This new project could be the pioneer effort of a new program involving the comprehensive development of surplus federal land.

"With this idea in mind, I have today named a special Task Force composed of Administrator Knott, Secretaries McNamara and Weaver and Attorney General Clark to survey surplus federal properties throughout the Nation, and with State and local leaders, to evaluate the prospects for transforming these lands into vital and useful community resources."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Aug. 31, 1967]

"CITY" FOR 25,000 PLANNED AT TRAINING SCHOOL SITE—JOHNSON URGES PROJECT TO EASE HOUSING CRISIS

(By Robert G. Kaiser, Post Staff Writer)

President Johnson announced plans yesterday to create a vast "new community" on the site of the National Training School for Boys in Northeast Washington.

The community will be bigger than Georgetown, and will eventually include homes and services for 25,000 people.

The President also said he hoped the "concept" of the Federal Government's making surplus land available to help ease urban problems could be repeated in many other American cities.

He named a Cabinet-level task force to study possibilities of distributing other such sites to cities.

A 335-ACRE SITE

The first step here will be to designate the 335-acre Training School site as an urban renewal project, and 15 acres will be used to build 400 low- and moderate-income housing units. Construction on these is expected to begin in 1968.

According to Federal and District officials, it will be five to seven years before homes and other facilities for all 25,000 people are completed. Preliminary plans envisage schools, private industry, Federal buildings and recreational facilities on the site, but none of these are certain.

The decision to make the huge Training School site available to Washington is the first major breakthrough in years in what many city officials feel is a crisis.

The site is bounded by the District line, Bladensburg Road, South Dakota Avenue and the Baltimore-Washington Parkway.

GOVERNMENT SURPLUS

It is currently in the hands of the General Services Administration, and is considered surplus to the Government's needs. The Training School itself is moving to Morgantown, W.Va., next year.

GSA has been reluctant to relinquish the land to the District, but President Johnson reportedly insisted that this be done.

GSA will convey title of parcels of the tract as they are developed for specific projects. Some will be transferred to the city and other public agencies, and others will be sold to private developers.

The first step toward formally beginning the project will be taken Sept. 14, at the next meeting of the National Capital Planning Commission. The Commission will be asked to establish boundaries for the project and choose a 15-acre site for the first construction.

The D.C. Commissioners are expected to take action five days later on whatever the Planning Commission decides.

A public hearing will be held about 30 days later on a development plan for the 15 acres, according to D.C. government officials.

After that, the Redevelopment Land Agency—which will manage the urban renewal area—the District government and the National Capital Housing Authority will begin drawing up specific plans.

PRIVATE PROJECT

President Johnson said yesterday that the new project will be built largely by private enterprise under the "turnkey" concept. Turnkey projects are built to specifications by private contractors and bought by public authorities at predetermined prices.

Washington already has one such public housing project—Claridge Towers at 12th and M Streets nw.

District officials said the new project might be managed, as well as built, by private interests.

A White House spokesman said yesterday that the Department of Housing and Urban Development has already determined that the proposed project will be eligible for two-thirds Federal financing. The District will have to put up one third, but this can be in the form of services and facilities such as streets and schools.

Officials would not estimate the total cost of the project.

As the new community develops, RLA will presumably maintain over-all planning control, with the Housing Authority handling the public-housing component.

Officials hope that moderate-income housing can be built under a Federal program that provides subsidies to non-profit sponsoring agencies.

The preliminary GSA plan for the Training School site also includes high-income housing in the form of high-rise apartments and town houses.

Housing will be one part of the new community. It will probably have to include schools, and conceivably could be the home of the Federal City College or the Washington Technical Institute, institutions authorized by Congress but not yet in operation.

The Federal Government will consider locating offices on the site. Private industry will be encouraged to locate on sections of it, too.

SITE BEST SUITED

Robert Gladstone & Associates, a private consulting firm, completed a land-use study of the site for GSA earlier this year. The study concluded that the property was best suited to a combination of uses, emphasizing housing and supporting facilities, but including offices and industry.

But it took President Johnson's intervention to commit the GSA to making the land available for a new community.

The District Commissioners' Task Force on Easing Community Tension had also recommended using the land for housing.

Commissioner Walter N. Tobriner said the first construction would provide 250 low-income and 150 moderate-income units. The public housing would include high-rise buildings for elderly persons and multi-bedroom units for families.

Stephen J. Pollak, the President's adviser on District affairs, emphasized that all plans were still "very general." District officials confirmed this and said they couldn't answer specific questions about the project.

WELL-BALANCED CITY

In his announcement yesterday, the President said that the project "can become a new, attractive and well-balanced community as a major gateway to the Nation's Capital."

"But," the President added, "it should be more than a housing project. Washington needs and deserves the best in community planning—and this new development can be the best of communities."

"This new venture," the President said, "will be first and foremost a partnership—a partnership between local and Federal governments, between public officials, private developers and the people of the city. The creative involvement of private enterprise will be a most important single element in the project."

The White House said this "best of communities" would ultimately include 1500 housing units for low-income families and individuals, 2200 moderate-income units and 800 high-income units.

To his Nation-wide task force, the President named GSA Administrator Lawson Knott, Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara, Secretary of HUD, Robert C. Weaver, and Attorney General Ramsey Clark.

Presidential assistant Joseph A. Califano Jr. later stressed that the President hopes to do whatever he can using existing resources to provide for more housing in the Nation's cities.

The National Training School site has been eyed for a variety of projects in the past. The Government Printing Office almost used a large part of the land for a new plant, but this plan was squelched.

The National Capital Planning Commission's proposed 1985 plan suggests using the site for an integrated new community. This idea was first advanced by Wolf Von Eckardt, architecture critic of The Washington Post, several years ago.

Several groups have proposed using the land for the campus of Washington's new college and technical institute. However, the technical institute is reportedly reluctant to locate on the former site of a reform school.

GSA plans to begin exploratory ground borings "at once," to determine what kind of structures the land will bear.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Aug. 31, 1967]

NORTHEAST HOUSING PLAN: AN IMPRESSIVE FIRST STEP

(By Richard Severo)

The White House has made an impressive, if somewhat belated, move toward solving the housing crisis in Washington.

But the promise that 25,000 people are going to live on the National Training School site does not mean that the crisis is over.

If 25,000 sounds like a lot of people, these figures supplied by the National Capital Planning Commission are more formidable:

About 90,000 low-income families (at least 360,000 people) "now living within the District . . . need assistance to obtain adequate housing—although only one-tenth of them are currently receiving it through the public housing program."

Proposed public work projects for Washington will probably displace 6700 families over the next 20 years.

Washington will need about 50,000 units of federally subsidized housing within the next 20 years. This amounts to about half the expected housing construction.

LONG WAITING LIST

The National Capital Housing Authority has a waiting list right now of more than 5000 families—or about 23,000 people—who believe they cannot provide decent housing for themselves in the Washington real estate market.

In short, the elation over the capture of the National Training School site is tempered by the knowledge that a problem of considerable size remains.

The site was, to put it mildly, popular. The Government Printing Office had sought and almost got it.

But a host of social agencies and city officials put up a hue and cry. The President obviously thought that the decision to put at least some housing there was of sufficient magnitude for him to make the announcement himself.

The ambivalent feeling was summed up yesterday by Joan Howell, executive director of the Washington Planning and Housing Association. When told of the White House decision, she said: "That's great! Now, what about Anacostia-Bolling?"

ANOTHER PRIME AREA

Anacostia-Bolling is also much discussed as a site for housing, but it will remain under military control at least until 1971, under terms of a bill signed reluctantly by President Johnson last September.

If military control is relinquished, the Planning Commission plans to house 23,000 people there. But NCPC plans—no matter how well conceived—have a disquieting way of going from drawing board to oblivion.

Other possible sites for housing have been talked about. The Bureau of Standards' old site, for example. When the Bureau moved to Gaithersburg, it left behind 68 choice acres at Connecticut Avenue and Van Ness street, nw. The economic pressures in that part of town are such that it is doubtful that low or moderate-income housing will be built there. The land costs too much.

Others have suggested that National Airport be taken for housing. It is possible that this could happen, but such a move is not likely as of now.

The housing problem is one symptom of the total urban crisis. The solutions lie in more jobs, better jobs, transportation systems that get people to their jobs, better schools and a cogent plan that deals realistically with cities' problems.

There seems to be some question as to whether Washington has such a plan. The District Commissioners have been especially critical of the National Capital Planning Commission's 1985 Plan. That plan calls for only limited commercial expansion within the city limits—so jobs within the city will be limited.

The plan also calls for a retention of Washington's low skyline. It suggests that present neighborhood population densities be kept as they are. The Commissioners suggest that if the 1985 proposal were to become fact, Washington might never be able to keep up with the demand for housing.

With all of this, the President's action will have a good effect. Thomas Appleby, executive director of the Redevelopment Land Agency, said that "the President could not have issued any other directive that goes so immediately to the heart of the worst problem in the city."

SITE FOR RELOCATION

Mrs. Howell also had praise for it, in that it now gives Washington a "relocation resource"—a place to house people who lose their homes because of public works projects and urban renewal.

Mrs. Howell is also hopeful that landlords, faced with the prospect of 25,000 fewer people needing homes—will be more likely to comply with the Housing Code and become involved in programs to improve relations between landlords and tenants. She suggested that the Planning and House Association was interested in developing a program along these lines.

But for her, the most important thing that can happen now is public involvement in what happens at the Training School site. She believes that as many people as possible should be involved in the planning process.

"I certainly don't mean that they have to go to the people every time they sign a contract," she said, "but they ought to get their preliminary plans before as many people as possible as early as possible."

[From the New York Times, Aug. 31, 1967]

UNITED STATES PROVIDES SITE FOR A MODEL CITY BUILT BY INDUSTRY

(By E. W. Kenworthy)

WASHINGTON, August 30.—President Johnson announced today that a privately financed "new community" for families of all incomes would be built on a 335-acre plot of Federal land here.

The site is now occupied by the National Training School for Boys, which will be moved to Morgantown, West Va., next June.

The President said he expected that the new community, which will house 25,000 citizens, would be under construction by next summer.

He said he hoped that the project would be the first of many to be built on surplus Federal land in or near urban centers.

To that end, he named a special committee to conduct a survey of surplus Federal properties across the nation and "evaluate the prospects for transforming these lands into vital and useful community resources."

MEMBERS OF COMMITTEE

Those named to the committee are Robert S. McNamara, Secretary of Defense; Robert C. Weaver, Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, and Lawson B. Knott Jr., head of the General Services Administration.

Next week Mr. Knott will send out teams to inspect Federal property that might be declared surplus for the purpose of constructing model, mixed communities.

Mr. Knott said today that one such site might be Fort Totten, which occupies 140 acres in Queens. Another, he said, was a parcel of 3,300 acres in Mobile, Ala. He also said that there was "substantial" Federal acreage in Detroit, some of which is either surplus or might be declared so.

WILL INCLUDE SCHOOLS

The initial plans for the development in the District of Columbia, drawn up by Robert Gladstone Association, call for 1,500 low income housing units, 2,200 units for moderate income families, and 800 high income apartments, homes and townhouses.

The planned community will also include schools, recreational, shopping and service facilities and, it is hoped, some light industry.

Local public housing authorities set the limits for what may be regarded as low and moderate income families, and consequently there will be some variation in the projects eventually constructed:

However, a rough national definition of a low income family is one earning $2,700 to $3,700 a year. A moderate income family is one earning from $3,700 to $10,000 a year.

The Government will donate the land on which the low income housing units will be constructed in order to keep down the costs for the developer and so make it possible for him to make a profit from the low rentals.

The Government will either lease or sell the land for the construction of moderate and high income housing and commercial facilities.

"This new venture," the President said, "will be first and foremost a partnership—a partnership between local and Federal Governments, private developers and the people of the city."

EXAMPLE FOR STATES

It was his hope, the President said, that if this concept can be successfully applied in the nation's capital, it will prove useful elsewhere and so become a "pioneer effort of a new program involving the comprehensive development of surplus Federal land."

Though the President did not say so, it was learned that he would like to see states and cities follow the Federal example and release some of their land for similar, privately financed developments.

Joseph P. Califano, a special assistant to the President, said Mr. Johnson was attracted to the new concept by five considerations: A desire to move as fast as possible on the problem of urban housing; a belief that there was a "tremendous potential" in the use of Federal surplus land; the avoidance of condemnation proceedings and consequently of land speculation; the fact that poor families will not be driven out of their present homes, and the involvement of private enterprise.

Mr. Knott sad that all of the housing in the new community would be "open occupancy," but no guidelines would be laid down in an effort to achieve "racial balance."

President Johnson, it was learned, first broached his proposal for the use of Federal land in a talk with Secretary McNamara last fall at his Texas ranch. It was his assumption that most of the surplus Federal land would involve sites abandoned or used only marginally by the military services.

TURNKEY IDEA EXTENDED

This spring the President asked Mr. Knott to find a company to plan the project. Last Thursday the President called Mr. Knott told him that everything was moving along smoothly. Whereupon the President said he wanted the planning finished over the weekend.

Consequently, officials of the Housing and Justice Departments worked throughout the weekend with Walter Tobriner, chairman of the District of Columbia Board of Commissioners. Last night, the President approved the plans, decided on his committee and directed that the survey teams be dispatched next week.

The low income housing in the new community represents an extended application of a program already under way in the housing agency. This is known as "the turnkey" approach to Government-sponsored housing.

The Government Personnel Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 19, 1967

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, on Saturday, September 16, 1967, the Pittsburgh Press published an editorial in which it asks us to view our present personnel situation with a spirit akin to former President Hoover's, inasmuch as he subscribed to the practice of attempting to "get $1 worth of production for every $1 spent on Federal Government."

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

A Host of Federal Workers

The current total of Federal civilian employees is approaching three million.

If gathered into one community they would become the third largest city in the nation (nudging Los Angeles into fourth place). By any standard they constitute a great many people.

There are a number of reasons for the proliferation of Federal workers. The war, the Great Society, the growth of population are obvious explanations, and all of them have at least a taint of legitimacy about them.

But obviously when a nation of 200 million requires (or thinks it requires) a force close to three million to conduct the business of its Federal Government, a deeply philosophical question suggests itself.

The total is higher than ever before, save for atypical period at the end of World War II, and it is destined to increase if current requests for bureaucratic growth now pending in Congress are approved.

Government, if one includes state and local employes in the thundering total, has clearly become our nation's largest business. One need look no further than the sad, seedy non-performance of the Post Office to conclude that it is far from the most efficient.

A utopia of small government, although it might be desirable, obviously is no longeir possible. But the public longs for more evidence that increased efficiency is being sought in any systematic way.

There has been none since the Hoover Commission, and it might encourage great numbers of taxpayers to further sacrifices if some such evidence were to be forthcoming.

A business as big as the central Government of the United States deserves the best that we can produce in the way of management skills, but it isn't getting it.

Former President Hoover has gone to his well-merited rest. But there is much of his spirit left among us, and it should be invoked in a sharp, tough, well-considered attempt to get $1 worth of production for every $1 spent on Federal Government.

Harriman, Tenn., Surges Ahead on Rising Tide of Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1967

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the city of Harriman in Roane County, Tenn., is riding the tide of a great surge of growth and progress.

The Harriman Record, this city's newspaper, recently published an editorial summarizing the progress in all dimensions that is moving Harriman ahead in its program of municipal and economic development.

Harriman is a city of progress and its resurgence symbolizes the dedication and determination of officials of our local governments in the Appalachian area. Mayor A. B. Foster, of Harriman, and Roane County Judge Sterling Roberts are to be commended for their cooperation in the great program and partnership for progress.

I want also to commend Mr. Walter Pulliam, the able and distinguished publisher of the Harriman Record, for the leadership his great newspaper has provided in this program of development.

In this connection Mr. Speaker, I include the editorial from the Harriman Record in the Appendix of the Record.

The editorial follows:

Harriman: In 20 Years Small Town Into a City

In the years since the 1940's, Harriman has changed more than most of us who have been here realize.

The change has been gradual—and that is good. And the change itself has been beneficial. Harriman has changed, in these 20 or so years, from a small town to a small city.

Some of the changes show up physically in the appearance of the city.

For one thing, the annexations of recent years have extended the city limits, nearly doubling the city's geographic area and virtually doubling the city's official population. The inclusion of old South Harriman and Meadowview into the city proper was a tremendous step. For the first time, after annexation, area-wide planning was possible. Changes thus resulting are still in the making.

New highway construction, centering about Harriman, also has wrought vast change. The widening of Roane Street, making it into a white-way . . . the new bridge across the Emory River . . . the relocation of U.S. Highway 27, with its four-lane boulevard running from the new bridge all the way to Rockwood . . . and the completion of Bitter Creek Highway down from Wartburg . . . and now the extension of Roane Street eastward with a new bridge across the Southern Railway and a four-lane stretch behind Walnut Hill to DeArmond's . . .

All this, and we haven't even considered Interstate 40, with its important interchange at Emory Gap, within the city limits. Certainly, with all this highway construction, we owe a debt of gratitude to the State Administration of the past 20 years.

New buildings and new homes must be included in the 20-year change. The new utility building, the American Legion building, the new South Harriman Elementary School, Walnut Hill School and Cumberland Junior High—all have been built within this period. Dozens of new modern business buildings and several $50,000 to $100,000 homes have gone up. The new West Hills Subdivision, one of the largest in the South, has been laid-out and partially developed.

Also look at the new churches built during this time: Trenton Street Baptist, First Christian, First Presbyterian, Blessed Sacrament Catholic, Seven-Day Adventist, Walnut Hill Baptist, South Harriman Church of God, Riverside Baptist, West Hills Presbyterian, St. Andrews Episcopal, the Church of Christ and (addition to) South Harriman Baptist, and perhaps others.

And the new doctors' and dentists' clinics stretching along Devonia Street.

More important than the change in physical Harriman has been the change in the attitude of the people.

The people of Harriman today are thinking ahead more than ever before. True civic pride is being engendered. This is evident from the way people boast about their city, how they fix up their property, landscaping. Three times in recent years, Harriman has won national recognition on its clean-up efforts.

Civic pride also is reflected in new programs started by the city government, such as zoning to protect property values, urban renewal to clean out deteriorated sections of the city, and community planning being done by the Harriman Area Planning Commission. More needs to be done in this respect, but at least we have made a start.

The change of the past two decades must include the change in our industries.

Roane Hosiery—one of our now fine industries—was founded only in 1949. Since then, Burlington has expanded its Harriman Hosiery Plant more than once. Tennessee Glad and Yankie Lumber Company have both located here. Mead Corporation has modernized its facilities. And recently we have acquired as fine additions to our community such new industries as Tennessee Forging Steel and Beta-TEK.

Harriman today is truly a City of industry, as its founding fathers dreamed of.

The next 20 years? We see even more change for the better. We see Harriman become an even greater city, an industrial hub that is progressive, that is prosperous, that is an even greater place in which to live and do business.

Are you doing your part to insure this great future?

What Is "National Commitment"?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VANCE HARTKE
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, September 19, 1967

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, many citizens are concerned about how we got where we are in international relations. They are concerned about our national commitment—how commitment is determined and controlled. Current problems are only the first part of this concern; future problems seem all too probable unless we define and clarify our national commitment.

WANE-TV, in Fort Wayne, Ind., stated these concerns about national commitment in an editorial broadcast August 28, 1967. The editorial calls for debate and resolution. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A NATIONAL COMMITMENT

What is America's national policy regarding Samoa? What is our "commitment" in Biafra . . . in Laos . . . in Tanzania? Is there a chance that another Korea or Viet Nam will find new generations of Americans fighting in Sierra Leone or Malagasy? The experience in Korea and Viet Nam is disquieting . . . and the answer may be "yes."

At stake is the issue of what constitutes a "national commitment" of the United States. Some feel the President alone can commit this country to a course abroad, under his general powers to conduct foreign affairs. Others feel that a commitment is as sacred as a treaty, and requires congressional concurrence. Had this matter been thrashed out before Viet Nam, perhaps we would not find ourselves in the current mess.

Senator J. W. Fulbright has offered a resolution to define "national commitment". He would have it be of such importance that it requires senatorial assent. Hearings on this proposal are being held now.

We think such a step is in order. The topic is too important to ignore any longer . . . and from such a public debate, we hope will come not only a clearer understanding of how our foreign policy is made, but a resolution of this thorny issue of just what constitutes America's commitments abroad.

Further Support for Private Enterprise Approach to Better Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH L. CAREY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 19, 1967

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago I cosponsored, with our junior Senator from New York, Senator ROBERT F. KENNEDY, legislation to encourage and assist private enterprise to provide adequate housing in urban poverty areas. Since its introduction, this legislation has received considerable comment in the Nation's press, particularly by Columnist Ted Lewis of the New York Daily News.

On September 13, I placed in the RECORD an earlier column by Mr. Lewis concerning this private-enterprise approach to better housing. On the same date Mr. Lewis wrote a second article indicating the support and consideration this measure is receiving from various national figures concerned with this problem.

I commend to my colleagues this second column by Ted Lewis and insert it at this point in the RECORD:

HUBERT FOLLOWS KENNEDY LINE ON AID TO GHETTOS

(By Ted Lewis)

WASHINGTON, September 12.—A conference of industrialists, arranged by the Vice President, suggested today that Hubert Humphrey is thinking more like Bobby Kennedy than Lyndon Johnson about what to do about the ghetto riot problem.

The group of 20 or more from private enterprise was brought together in the hope that at least some would be inspired by a corporate enterprise in the Watts section of Los Angeles—an investment that is succeeding and already has produced jobs for 500 Negro slum residents.

This Humphrey move is right along the line urged by Kennedy. The New York Senator has argued that private enterprise should be induced, on an urgent basis, to move into the slums—on the basis that federal programs, despite the billions appropriated, have failed to produce the uplift needed.

Humphrey obviously cannot subscribe to Bobby's opinion that the federal programs have been pretty much of a flop and that, otherwise, there would not have been this summer's violence. He would risk a break with the President if he did that, for LBJ is still sold on the idea that, if Congress would only supply more billions, the federal programs would be more effective.

Today, at least he sponsored an effort to enroll the private sector into the war on poverty—joblessness and rotten housing—and in a significant way, for he had available a case history of successful slum infiltration by a private firm.

There to give details of the effectiveness of the experiment was Dan Kimball, executive committee chairman of Aerojet General, the big space corporation. Aerojet bought a building in the depressed Watts section, and then got the business, first through an Army contract for hospital tents and, more recently, with metal and woodworking contracts.

Aerojet's subsidiary in Watts has been run by Watts business men. On-the-job training was arranged. Standard hiring practices were pigeonholed, so educational requirements were waived. A police record did not ban a man from a job.

So 500 Watts residents now have jobs in the Aerojet plant, right in their own community. The firm's investment of $1 million is not yet profitable, but seldom does any corporation expect to show a profit in a plant's first year.

KIMBALL SAYS PROFIT IS GOAL

According to Kimball, the Watts enterprise was not a "do-gooder" effort. It was based on the belief that a profit could be made, and this conviction is more solid than ever.

Kimball made this profit motive clear at the plant dedication and was cheered when he said: "We are in Watts to make money." He has further explained the investment by saying: "We build plants in Arkansas to take advantage of surplus labor. Why not, then, in Watts?"

What is sociologically more significant is that the illiterate and police-record workers have been doing a good job. The on-the-job training was successful, and the theft rate lower than at comparable plants that hire only those without police records.

These details of the Watts experiment were displayed at today's Humphrey-sponsored meeting of industrialists. In the process Kennedy's argument for "bringing private resources into the ghettos" has to gain weight, for despite spasmodic Administration efforts in the past to enroll on a supplemental basis the private sector, there have been few tangible results—except the Aerojet effort.

Kennedy has proposed incentives, such as accelerated tax depreciation and investment credits, to encourage private enterprise to put plants in ghettos, train local workers and supply walk-to-work jobs, and make it profitable for private construction industry to build low-cost housing in city slums.

POLICY SWITCH FOR THESE LIBERALS

There is an important contradiction in the Kennedy private enterprise thrust as a cure for ghetto ills—a thrust that clearly has Humphrey's support, with qualifications. Both are liberal Democrats who in the past derided Republicans for daring to suggest that, what the federal government could do, private enterprise could do better.

Kennedy has made a clear-cut switch, even if Humphrey hesitates to. Kennedy did it emphatically, when in proposing a new ghetto problem approach he said: "No public program can match the skills and resources that private capital and enterprise can command."

Humphrey has to be more subtle because LBJ thinks the ghetto problem can be solved only by pumping more billions of federal funds into this project or that. But by sponsoring Dan Kimball's private enterprise project as one other industrialists should copy, wasn't Humphrey following a course closer to Kennedy than Johnson?

Moreover, as the ghetto-riot issue is developing in advance of the 1968 political campaign, it involves the extent that the private sector should be brought into the effort to solve the slum problem.

The Administration can only fuzz over this issue by getting one foot into the same act, but, in a pointing with pride to how Aerojet gave 500 Watts residents jobs, the dimensions of the nation's slum-jobless problem becomes only more glaring. The Bureau of Labor Statistics estimates that nationally a minimum of 260,000 jobs are required in big-city poverty areas simply to bring unemployment rates to the level outside those areas.

Antipoverty Legal Aid and Defender Program of Austin-Travis Counties, Tex., Ably Staffed by George Templin and Hamilton Lowe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, September 19, 1967

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the Austin-Travis County Legal Aid and Defender Society has just engaged the services of George J. Templin, former clerk of the Supreme Court of Texas, as supervisor of legal aid dockets, and assistant lawyer referral director, on a half-time basis.

George J. Templin was clerk of the District Court of Travis County, Tex., at the time I served as district judge of Travis County prior to World War II.

He resigned that position to become clerk of the Supreme Court of Texas.

George Templin has the respect of all the lawyers of Texas. For the past 24 years, he has signed the licenses of all the lawyers licensed by the Supreme Court of Texas to practice law in Texas.

His knowledge of Texas lawyers is unsurpassed in Texas and the acquisition of his aid, even on a half-time basis, will be a great assist to the very successful operation of the Legal Aid and Defender Society of Austin-Travis County.

The director of the Legal Aid and Defender Society of Austin-Travis County is senior attorney L. Hamilton Lowe. L. Hamilton Lowe is an able lawyer, descended from a family of public officers and servants. Ham Lowe and I were classmates in the University of Texas Law School. His ability as a lawyer has been proven over and over and it is a great credit to the Lawyer Referral Service of Travis County Bar Association and the Legal Aid and Defender Society of Austin-Travis County that two men of proven ability, high standing at the Bar, unimpeachable integrity, each with a genuine sympathy for the poor and the problems of the people without legal aid, should be engaged to head this legal aid effort.

It has been my privilege to work personally with L. Hamilton Lowe and George J. Templin in different capacities at different times, my relationship with Hamilton Lowe extending over 40 years and my acquaintance and work with George J. Templin extending over a period of more than 30 years. For 4 years I was a member of the State board of legal examiners of the State of Texas, which examined law students for licensing by the State, serving under appointment by the Supreme Court of Texas, and in that capacity I worked very closely with George Templin for 4 years in the licensing of young lawyers of Texas—from 1947 to 1951.

Ham Lowe and I have engaged in many joint activities.

I have never seen a legal aid and referral society more ably staffed than this one in Austin, Tex., by people each of whom I personally know to be dedicated to the interest and welfare of those whom they seek to serve.

The bar of the country is aiding greatly in the legal aid portion of the Office of Economic Opportunity activities. If this type of representation given the people of Austin-Travis County by the Legal Aid and Defenders Society there, is spread throughout the country, this legal aid portion bids fair to be one of the most successful of all of the programs of the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article entitled "Former High Court Clerk Joins Legal Aid Society," published in the Austin American be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Austin (Tex.) American, Sept. 8, 1967]

Templin—Former High Court Clerk Joins Legal Aid Society

George J. Templin, the man who signed Texas lawyers' licenses to practice for 24 years as clerk of the Supreme Court of Texas, has joined the staff of Legal Aid and Defender Society (LADS) of Austin-Travis County.

Senior Attorney L. Hamilton Lowe said Templin would be supervisor of Legal Aid dockets and assistant Lawyer Referral director on a half-time basis.

LADS is a $128,000-a-year antipoverty program to make available lawyer services to anyone in Travis County. Its chief role is to represent the poor in civil cases including domestic problems.

Templin attended both Southwest Texas Teachers College at San Marcos and the University of Texas. He was principal of a high school in Bradshaw near Abilene three years but returned to Austin in 1917 to become a banker. He was assistant cashier of one of the banks involved in a series of 1929-30 bank consolidations. He left to become a bookkeeper in a business office.

Templin was appointed Travis County district clerk to fill the vacancy when S. A. Philquist left to become clerk of the Court of Criminal Appeals in 1932. He won a special election, and was re-elected each term until he resigned in 1943 to become clerk of the Supreme Court. He retired in January this year.

Templin was president of Austin Kiwanis in 1936. He was active 15 years in Scottish Rite and Shriners.

Lowe said Templin would be invaluable to the success of the lawyer referral system and keeping court dockets of cases in litigation.

The Lawyer Referral Services of the Travis County Bar officers are in the Lowich building at 1107 Guadalupe.

OEO Legal Aid offices are in the Courthouse and antipoverty neighborhood centers at 1619 East 1st St. and 1309 East 12th St. Legal services are free to those who can not pay.

About 110 Travis County lawyers are available for volunteer, part-pay, and standard fee services according to needs of the client, Lowe said. OEO attorneys work full time under the LADS budget to serve those who can not, otherwise get legal help.

Start Helping Our President Win This War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL G. ROGERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 13, 1967

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Jess C. Moody, senior minister of the First Baptist Church of West Palm Beach, Fla., recently commented on the Vietnam war, the President and the critics, in the church bulletin.

I believe his comments should be brought to the attention of the Members of the Congress, so I am reprinting them in the Record:

From the Study of the Pastor

Perhaps . . . I don't belong here—in this country, I mean.

Or at least in this century.

There are so many things of which I am wearying.

I'm tired of meeting people who are trying to make my country and my president look like some sort of a Giant Evil. The old give and take of the Democrat-Republican exchange is all right, but I'm detecting what I think is absolute disloyalty to our nation and its roots.

It is kosher to caricature our president, but to pour venom on his head is to create the environment for another Dallas.

A leading citizen right here in West Palm Beach told me the latest 'joke" after which everyone howled in laughter, except this writer. He said, Oh, where is Lee Harvey Oswald—just when we need him most?"

I'm sorry but when we begin to play the game like that, I'm bowing out.

This is the kind of paranoia that created the grim stupidiy from the Texas School Book Depository.

That we're sick and perhaps a little bit stupid isn't difficult to prove these days.

Let's consider it a spiritual act to neither participate in nor put up with such hate.

It is acceptable to disagree but for Christ's dear sake, don't hate.

I read this week a statement by a student at San Francisco State, "I can't be pushed or bullied into a way I don't understand." Pray tell me what young man in 1917 or 1941 or 1950 understood those wars? I was 16 years old in 1941 and not a student with whom I went to school understood a tad about Hirohito, Hitler, or Il Duce—but every last one of them went when the call to colors came.

There is a fundamental difference between conscientious objection and what these young Pro-Ho's and All-for-DeGaulle's are pouring out of their hoppers.

You see, a sophomore at San Francisco State has a better vantage point to understand the world-wide communist cause than a mere General Westmoreland or the Joint Chiefs of Staff. That's why the student can write, "A Pacifist living with a woman, who takes a stand against what war does, can reach a higher state of moral conscience than, say, a business man who is faithful to his wife, yet never thinks about his nation's right to inflict cruelties against the Viet Cong."

Don't we understand that this boy wonder sees very clearly that the Viet Cong are a harmless lot, really? We are causing all the problems. We are the threat to freedom. Those poor communists don't intend to harm anyone. It was only a rumor that seven million people were murdered in North Korea and twelve million in China because they were followers of Christ.

All we must do is lie down and play dead and the nice communists will bring about a paradise where students won't be oppressed like that poor lad at San Francisco State.

This week I talked to a couple of very outspoken Doves. They were downing everything about America—our president, our churches, our schools, just everything. Then one of them began to make mock of the boys in Viet Nam and ended by saying, "Why is it that we in our air conditioned houses are such Doves and those soldiers in Viet Nam are such Hawks?"

I nearly bit off my tongue and finally I had to say to them, "Perhaps you are trying to protect air conditioned houses and they are trying to protect freedom."

I'll assure you of one thing. Let the communists win in Viet Nam and you will see the greatest revival of communist influence in the history of the world.

I say let's cut off Ho Chi Min's beard and start helping our president win this war.

If this is too political an article for your pastor to write, then fire me!

Curbing Monopolistic Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 19, 1967

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, by request, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Curbing Monopolistic Power," published in the Philadelphia Inquirer, of September 12, 1967.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CURBING MONOPOLISTIC POWER

When arrogant, monopolistic labor union leaders blatantly flaunt their power under the noses of the American people, and defiantly adopt a public-be-damned attitude, it is time for the Nation to be on the alert and for Government to demand antitrust regulations for labor, as well as for business, as a matter of equity, for the common good.

A crisis could develop that would threaten inflationary catastrophe and economic disaster. The public interest—including, especially, the financial self-interest of rank-and-file working men and women—is being trampled under a parade of power-obsessed union leaders led by Walter Reuther. Following boldly in Reuther's footsteps is an array of lesser labor lights across the country who will grow steadily in number and in militancy unless the American people summon the courage to stand up to them.

Must there be an irrevocable calamity before the Nation acts? Is greed to be allowed to run rampant, until the value of the dollar is eroded virtually to the point of worthlessness, before steps are taken to curb the headlong rush of reckless labor leaders into the spiraling quicksand of monetary suicide?

The time has come, and the need is desperately urgent, for a political leader of national stature to call for public discussion of labor union monopoly and Congressional enactment of a law that will bring labor unions within the scope of Federal antitrust regulations.

This Nation stands now, in regard to irresponsible big labor, at a critical crossroad comparable to the one reached around the turn of the century when it was necessary for the protection of the American people, to break up big business monopolies and place effective curbs on the power of industry leaders through antitrust legislation.

It took courage, then, to battle big business. It takes courage, now, to challenge big labor. Then, as now, political pressures were brought to bear against elected officials who would dare to speak out for protection of the public interest against the tyranny of monopoly.

The Inquirer does not shrink from the fight. We firmly believe that curbs on union monopoly are essential to orderly economic growth of the Nation. We believe the rank-and-file union members will come to realize the necessity for such curbs to safeguard their own interests and the future financial stability of their families.

Greed, as manifested by monopolistic union leaders, is self-defeating. As they vie to outdo one another in grasping for more and more, the purchasing power of the dollar slips away. Pay raises and pension benefits dwindle to a fraction of their former worth. Gains become illusory and meaningless. The grim truth of this may already be seen in the tragic faces of pensioners who have been reduced to near-poverty by the greed of younger generations enticed by pied pipers of the labor union barony.

We repeat, anti-trust regulations applicable to labor, as well as to business, are required as a matter of equity, for the common good. The duty of the President and Congress is clear. The question is whether they have the political courage to perform that duty.

Editor's Notebook—National Alliance of Postal and Federal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1967

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the following from the National Alliance, of August 1967:

EDITOR'S NOTEBOOK

The question has been asked many times, by many citizens, Negro and white, "Why the riots?" The failure of the U.S. Congress, State and City governments to be responsive to the needs of *all* citizens is perhaps the single most elementary of all reasons that can be given for the civil uprisings which have been occurring in city after city across the country this summer.

EMPLOYMENT

The high rate of unemployment among the Negro population, particularly Negro youth, has been pointed to as a primary factor in the riots. While employment figures for other groups of Americans is up, for the Negro citizen, finding a job which will afford a standard of living above the level of poverty, is a very real concern. The opportunities for employment and upgrading on jobs which are available to other groups of Americans are simply not available to Negroes. We are a long way from equal employment opportunities.

The Congress of the United States enacts laws which control the flow of foreign persons to this country. Under the immigration laws of this nation, since 1820 to the year 1965, some 42,994,576 persons have entered the United States from foreign countries. They are able to secure employment, it matters not whether they can read and write, or even speak the English language. This number of immigrants constitutes more than 23 per cent of the total U.S. population. There are jobs for these people, but there are no jobs for a large percentage of Negro American citizens. In the newspaper editorials, the columns of noted columnists and radio and television commentators, there has never been any mention of this fact.

HOUSING

Poor and segregated housing for Negro citizens has been given as another reason for much of the unrest in the cities. Many big cities have urban renewal projects. For many Negro families, urban renewal means nothing but Negro removal. The first land condemned by the city of Detroit and scheduled for its first urban renewal project was on the city's lower east side, often referred to in the old days as "Black Bottom." The first 226 acres cleared displaced over 3,244 families and many single home dwellers. It was said by the city when the condemnation of the homes and small businesses in the area was first started, that the land would be cleared for low-cost housing. After clearing the land lay vacant for approximately ten years and following that time was sold to private developers, who have erected low rise and high rise dwellings with rentals ranging from $150.00 to $650.00 per month. A large billboard sign describes this urban renewal project as "an exclusive residential" section of the city.

The building of two expressways in the city displaced another 1,100 families, and in addition, the city has condemned 560 acres on the city's east side and moved out the residents of the area; still another 460 acres has been condemned on the east side of the city. The majority of families displaced by urban renewal have been Negro families. Figures for families displaced by urban renewal on the city's west side are not included.

THE RIOT STATISTICS

In the 12th Street area of Detroit's west side where the first rioting began on Sunday morning, July 23, there are 40,000 persons housed in a square mile. The merchants in the area sell their commodities at a price higher than in other neighborhoods; the rate of interest and carrying charges for furniture and appliances is higher. The man who owns the store closes up at night and goes home to suburbia for a peaceful and quiet night's rest.

During the first three days of the riot in Detroit the sales loss was estimated at over $30 million; services loss, $15 million; and wages loss, $100 million. Other figures:

MORE THAN 5,000 HOMELESS; 250 STILL MISSING

Arrested, 5,557. Dead, 46. Injured 1,000 or more, including 91 policemen; 29 firemen; 19 National Guardsmen and 4 State Policemen. Stores looted, 1,700. Fires, 1,617. Food stores damaged, 460;, 93 totally demolished; 99 to reopen; 268 closed (Aug. 7 Board of Commerce estimate). Policemen on duty, 2,000; National Guardsmen, 6,800; U.S. Army troops, 3,300; 1,400 on stand-by.

Types of buildings set afire (Aug. 4 Fire Dept. estimate); apartment houses, 30; appliance repair shops, 2; Army-Navy store, 1; artists' supply shop, 1; auto wash, 1; bakeries, 2; bank, 1; bars, 9; barber shops, 9; barber supply, 1; beauty schools, 3; beauty shops, 2; churches, 3; cleaners, 18; clothing stores, 17; dance halls, 2; drugstores, 13; dwellings, 1 and 2-family, 87; dwellings and stores, 38; factory, 1; furniture stores, 19; gas stations, 3; gift shop, 1; grocery stores, 47; hardware stores, 5; hotels, 2; jewelry stores, 4; liquor stores, 5; loan shops, 2; multiple occupancies, 14; offices, 9; paint store, 1; party stores, 3; pest control store, 1; pet shop, 1; poolroom, 1; print shops, 4; private club, 1; private garages, 6; record shops, 3; repair garages, 3; rope splicing co., 1; restaurants, 12; shoe repairers, 2; store and dwelling, 1; undetermined, 46; upholstery shops, 2; vacant stores, 9; variety stores, 11; warehouses, 17, for a total of 477.

Detroit's riot was not a race riot! Looters and snipers arrested were both Negro and white. During the days of the riot in Detroit, the sniper activity was directed at the law enforcement agencies and the fire department of the cities and surrounding communities which assisted the city's fire department.

CITY GOVERNMENT

Detroit's mayor was elected because the city's Negro population supported his candidacy as a protest against the incumbent mayor. The first three years he was in office, his political appointments numbered 256, of which 18 were Negroes. The combined salaries of these jobs total approximately $600,000 annually. Negroes constitute more than 30 per cent of the city's population. In return for their vote, they received only 7 per cent of the appointments, while the remaining 93 per cent went to the majority group, even though their vote was not overwhelmingly in favor of the present mayor.

HOPE AND FAITH

Perhaps typical of the attitude of many of the victims of the riot was that of the elderly Negro woman who lost her home, furnishings, and everything she owned. Yet, when the urgent plea was made to give blood, she went down to the office of the Red Cross to give . . . to donate blood which was so desperately needed. She had hope and she had faith in the city of Detroit.

A TIME OF TRAGEDY

A special supplement on the riot in Detroit, titled "A Time of Tragedy" has been mailed to all of the branch presidents in order that you, as leaders of your branch, may have a more complete picture and fuller understanding of the trying days in Detroit during the month of July.

The Washington Post Commends Campaign Financing Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT GORE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 19, 1967

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Honest Election Law, 1967," published in the Washington Post of Saturday, September 16, 1967.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HONEST ELECTION LAW, 1967

The Senate Finance Committee has come up with a campaign financing bill which does it substantial credit. The measure is an enormous improvement over the hastily concocted law that Congress enacted last year. In some respects it is a refinement of the recommendations the President sent to Congress in May. Serious questions about the wisdom of some of its provisions remain, but at least the measure can now be debated as a carefully devised experiment in the public financing of campaigns.

Two of the bill's three titles are relatively noncontroversial. Title I would create an income-tax credit for political contributions. A taxpayer giving up to $50 to the candidate or party of his choice in state and local as well as Federal elections could deduct half of the sum from his income tax. This should greatly stimulate private giving for political purposes and thus ease the general burden of financing campaigns, and the Government aid involved would be distributed precisely as the rank and file of private donors wish.

Title III is identical with the campaign-fund reporting bill which the Senate passed separately the other day without a dissenting vote. It is highly desirable to have these reforms embodied in the campaign-financing bill when it reaches the House.

Title II would permit the candidates for President, Vice President and Senator to draw campaign funds from the Federal Treasury—up to $14 million for each presidential candidate and up to an aggregate of $26,428,000 for the senatorial candidates. These funds could be spent only for expenses incurred during a 90-day period immediately preceding and following an election. During that time the candidates could not accept or spend any private contributions, but any candidate unwilling to abide by the limitations could elect to run on private contributions. In taht event he could not participate in the public subsidy, but his spending from private funds would be limited only by the amounts available and his own discretion.

The most worrisome thing about this arrangement is the possibility of a race with one presidential candidate using limited public funds and the other unlimited private funds. If the unlimited spender should win, charges of having bought the election might prove a formidable handicap. Some experienced politicians say that no presidential candidate would risk the disadvantages of private financing if his opponent were in the system, and that the dangers of an unequal race would therefore not arise. Only experience can provide the answer.

Questions will certainly be raised as to whether $14 million is enough for a presidential campaign. This is less than half of what might have been provided to each party under the $1 income-tax checkoff approved last year and much less than the parties are reputed to have spent in recent campaigns. But the expense of raising money from private sources (always a large item) would be eliminated. We think the sum would be ample for a trial run if Congress would repeal Section 315 of the Federal Communications Act so that television and radio broadcasters could make available to the candidates a substantial amount of free time, without incurring the penalties of the present unworkable law.

The offer of Federal campaign funds for Senators is likely to be more controversial. The plan outlined by the Finance Committee has two notable advantages. It would enable a poor man, if nominated by his party, to run for the Senate without having to accept compromising gifts from the interests. It would doubtless strengthen the two-party system, especially in the South, by providing funds for candidates who would have little chance to win. No Senate seat would likely go uncontested. Yet sharp questions must be asked about a plan that would provide each candidate in such states as New York and California with $1,500,000 for what might prove to be only part of his campaign. Even in such states as Connecticut the allowance would be $334,000 for a 90-day campaign.

How many Senators would conduct intensive campaigns on private funds for a year before the cut-off date and then use the public funds for a whirlwind climax? The proposal appears to be open to this kind of abuse. We do not think the public would long tolerate a two-campaign strategy—one to be financed from private contributions and the other from the Treasury.

If this part of the bill is to be approved, the least Congress can do, in our view, is to outlaw testimonal dinners for Senators in the subsidy system and to require full disclosure of assets and income from all sources. That would be a small price for Senators to pay for the great advantage of having their campaigns publicly financed.

If Congress should decide to experiment with direct campaign subsidies, the Long-Gore bill that has now emerged is certainly the best approach yet devised. The Finance Committee is to be commended for its painstaking work, including the elaborate formula for dealing with minor party candidates. We hope that the bill will be seriously debated in both houses with sincere determination to remedy the critical defects in the present law.

Crisis in the Ghettos

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THEODORE R. KUPFERMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1967

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Community Council of Greater New York, located in my district at 225 Park Avenue South, consists of Academy of Medicine, American Red Cross in Greater New York, Brooklyn Tuberculosis and Health Association, Catholic Charities, Diocese of Brooklyn, Catholic Charities of the Archdiocese of New York, Central Labor Council, AFL–CIO, Chamber of Commerce, Children's Aid Society, Citizens' Housing and Planning Council, City of New York, Commerce and Industry Association, Community Service Society, Federation of Jewish Philanthropies, Federation of Protestant Welfare Agencies, The Greater New York Fund, Greater New York Hospital Association, Hospital Review and Planning Council, New York Tuberculosis and Health Association, United Hospital Fund, United Neighborhood Houses, Urban League of Greater New York, Visiting Nurse Association of Brooklyn, Visiting Nurse Service of New York.

Mayor John V. Lindsay serves as honorary president of this organization, whose officers are David Sher, president; John T. Burnell, Mrs. Henry T. Randall, Howard A. Seitz, vice presidents; Edwin Rosenberg, treasurer; Juan Sanchez, secretary; James W. Fogarty, executive director; Ted O. Thackrey, public relations director.

The Community Council, on August 31, in the wake of the severe crisis in the ghettos of the United States, adopted a position statement which gives deliberate and intelligent thought to the problem.

I commend this position statement for consideration by my colleagues:

Crisis in the Ghettos—A Position Statement by the Community Council of Greater New York

The deepening crisis in the ghettos is the nation's most urgent moral challenge. It also poses the greatest threat to our security as a democratic America.

Immediate action is essential at every level, public and private, federal, state and local, to avert longer, hotter summers and colder, more bitter winters. Moreover, such action must be on a scale matching the magnitude of the problems to be solved.

The Community Council of Greater New York calls on all Americans to join in demanding that top priority be given *now* to correcting the inequities which have created the ghettos and which tend to perpetuate the problems of the ghettos.

The Community Council holds that the benefits of democracy must be secured for the 16 million or more alienated and deprived Americans who now suffer the frustrations of our urban ghettos, as the nation's first concern. We believe democracy may be successfully exported and encouraged abroad only after it has been assured for all citizens at home. Our concern must be for moral justice before all.

The underlying causes of the crisis are well known. For more than 40 years, since its founding in 1925 as the Welfare Council, the Community Council has been documenting the nature and extent of the problems. The list is formidable, and despite some progress, the gap between the needs and the solutions is widening.

No new studies or conferences are required—however useful their long range purpose—to identify the reasons for ghetto unrest. They include unemployment; subhuman housing; inferior education; insufficient training opportunities; meager recreation and cultural programs; racial and religious discrimination; unresponsive public services; fourth-rate health care; inequality before the law; and fragmented voluntary social assistance. Consumer exploitation, usury, traffic in vice and narcotics, and violence against persons and property abound.

Law and order must prevail and violence must not go unpunished or uncontrolled; but the injustices which victimize the people of the ghetto are equally reprehensible and must be equally prohibited.

The Community Council calls upon the President of the United States to recognize that a national emergency exists, and to use his executive powers and discretionary funds to create a national employment and public works program centered in the ghettos which would:

A. Guarantee employment at a living wage to every citizen unable to find employment in private industry or service.

B. Where skills are inadequate, establish ghetto-centered paid training programs with a guarantee of employment upon completion.

C. Inaugurate an accelerated national program of public works, housing, hospital and health facilities, schools, recreation and cultural centers and a galaxy of added public services.

D. Utilize the available skills of the private sector at every level to insure rapid progress toward the goal of full employment, adequate housing, and effective social services.

E. Coordinate and rechannel the activities of the Departments of Labor, Housing and Urban Development, Health, Education and Welfare, and Interior to concentrate on resolving the inequities of ghetto life.

The Community Council calls upon the President of the United States to prepare a special message to the Congress outlining the executive steps taken to meet the emergency and requesting prior attention to the additional legislation and special appropriations required to fully implement and sustain the national employment, public works and housing progams as well as to the necessity of providing income maintenance as recommended by the Advisory Council on Public Welfare in its report to the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare last June.

The Community Council calls upon the members of Congress to increase their support for antipoverty and allied programs which attack the causes of ghetto frustrations, to recognize that reduction of support for these programs is an attack on the remedy rather than on the disease.

The Community Council calls upon the Governors of the States, the Mayors of the Cities, and the legislative bodies and legislative membership for similar statewided, regional and local employment, training, housing, and social service programs centered in the ghetto and directed to the national objectives.

The Community Council also calls upon business and industry, union labor, professional associations, private foundations, and religious organizations, individuals, and the private sector generally, to exercise the meaningful leadership for which it has the greatest capacity on earth in the establishment of ghetto-centered joint facilities for job finding, training and employment, housing and construction, and programs of consumer education and protection matching the ingenuity currently focused on the creation of consumer demand.

The Community Council calls upon religious leaders especially for recognition that the crisis in the ghettos urgently requires the exercise of moral leadership and the total involvement of the Church in establishing the ethical standards and providing the examples of service to which the whole nation may repair.

The Community Council calls for a continued review by the voluntary social agencies of all activities to discover how current programs may be more effectively reoriented to the needs of the ghetto, and to innovate with the cooperation of the ghetto, the services which will reach out to the needy.

And finally the Community Council calls upon the residents of the ghettos themselves—the very victims of our neglect—to increase their own efforts at self help and to recognize that if society owes a debt to each member, as it does, every member also owes a debt to society, that there is no labor which contributes to the social well-being of others which is demeaning; that dignity and self-respect are not alone due to every individual, but also must be earned by each of us within the scope of opportunity and ability.

It is the Community Council's contention that there can be no question of the ability of this Nation, this State, and this City to provide the leadership, the programs and the financial means required to bring the benefits of democracy to all Americans, without respect to race, color, class or creed.

Democrats Stalling on Congress Reforms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 19, 1967

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I believe that the American people will be interested in finding out what happened to S. 355, the proposed Legislative Reform Act, which passed the Senate last March 7 after 18 days of extended debate. Accordingly, I ask unanimous consent that Roscoe Drummond's revealing status report on this vitally needed measure, which was published in the Philadelphia Inquirer of September 18, be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Democrats Stalling on Congress Reforms

(By Roscoe Drummond)

Washington.—The Democratic leadership of the House of Representatives is treating Congress—and the country—to an arrogant example of partisan power-politics. It is giving the back of its hand to majority rule.

The Democratic leadership is adding bad politics to the already bad reputation of Congress on ethics and when the facts get out the voters will not be amused.

Here are the facts—and you can judge whether they tell a pretty story:

A year ago, after months of hearings and study, the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress presented its findings on what urgently needs to be done to enable Congress to transact the public business more efficiently.

The committee was made up of six Senators and six Representatives and equally divided between the parties. It was chaired by the able and experienced Sen. Mike Monroney (D., Okla.).

Its recommendations for modest and constructive reforms were unanimous. One of its central provisions would transfer some of the almost dictatorial power of the committee chairmen to a majority of the committee members.

No quick action was sought—quite reasonably. The members of Congress were given a year to study the proposals.

On March 7, after 18 days of debate, the Senate gave its overwhelming approval 75 to 9, the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1967, which embodied the Joint Committee recommendations.

And now the Democratic leaders are subverting majority rule by not allowing the House to vote on it.

Nice, isn't it?

For more than six months the so-called reformed House Rules Committee, controlled by the Democratic leadership, locked this measure so tightly in its solitary cell that Houdini couldn't break it loose.

It did venture to start some public hearings on the bill—but closed them down after one day. Evidently its supporters were expounding its merits too persuasively.

I don't want to say that the Democrats in the House have done nothing, absolutely nothing, about Congressional reform. They have. They looked over the proposals said "h-m-m" and introduced a bill dealing boldly with the guides who shepherd the tourists and the pages who run errands.

And one other thing. They peered a little further into the measure the Senate passed and found a nice little item—clearly justified as part of the whole package of reform—which gave increased travel allowances for Congressmen to and from their districts.

So they extracted this little dividend, introduced it all by itself passed it with a gleeful whoop—and left all the real reforms under lock and key in the vault of the Rules Committee.

Nice, isn't it?

Fortunately the Republicans are beginning to stand up and do something about this scornful refusal of the Rules Committee to permit the bill to come to a vote. Rep. James C. Cleveland (R., N. H.) put it pointedly in the House a few days ago:

"I want to know by what rationale this legislation can be permitted to reside so long in the dark recesses of the House Rules Committee."

They don't need any rationale. The nearly omnipotent Democratic committee chairmen aren't going to give up one iota of their dictatorial powers or anything else in the cause of Congressional reform and they are out to see it doesn't happen. Their strategy is to keep the bill bottled up until the last frantic days of the session and then to bring out a meaningless, watered-down measure—or nothing.

And nothing it is likely to be unless Congress feels the hot breath of public demand.

Recognition for a Patriotic American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1967

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, the Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge has honored a resident of Freeport, Pa., for a letter to the editor on "Patriotism Rebirth Needed" that appeared in the Valley Daily News-Daily Dispatch of May 18, 1966.

Victor J. Rutkoski, Sr., is busy enough as a diesel locomotive engineer on the Pennsylvania Railroad and in the performance of numerous civic and volunteer duties, but he still found time to devote his talent to a subject which, unfortunately, needs rekindling from time to time. He is justice of the peace, American Legion post adjutant, volunteer fireman, and publicity chairman for the Eagles, Veterans of Foreign Wars, and the American Legion besides contributing to a local newspaper and doing freelance writing.

For his thoughts on patriotism, Mr. Rutkoski was recipient of a George Washington Honor Medal and a check for $100.

His prize-winning letter follows:

To the Editor: Nine hundred million human beings more than one-third of the earth are dominated by communistic regimes, imposed by force. The overwhelming majority of these nearly one billion human beings would replace their anti-God government if given the slightest opportunity to choose their own form of free government overnight.

Thousands of people do not run away from their native land if they are enjoying the blessing of freedom.

United Nations, Article 21, Declaration of Human Rights states, "The will of the people shall be the basis of authority of government; this will shall be expressed in periodic and genuine election which shall be by universal and equal suffrage and shall be held by secret voting procedures."

As an American we exercise this right which is "the will of the people shall be the basis of the authority of government which is the God-given right of each nation to choose its own government."

Yet there is a growing apathy which threatens to lull Americans into a disastrous state of lethargy.

We can offset this lethargy by reaffirming our belief in America. We must make the spark of freedom burn brighter and the sense of individual citizenship responsibility become a real and living thing in the hearts of all Americans. We must not squander our precious heritage, we must take an interest in our government.

Every person in government, top to bottom, is a public servant. They are entrusted with the enormous responsibility of protecting your best interest and those of every American citizen. The better equipped he is and the higher his sense of purpose, the better for you and everybody else.

We must do something to offset the growing trend to overlook patriotic and spiritual values in the training of our youth. The effects of this neglect were particularly revealing in the behavior of many American prisoners captured in Korea, who were brainwashed.

This was the first time in history that we evidenced so much disloyalty to the United States. Lack of any grasp of the American heritage or American history was given as the reason for their disloyalty.

In our school all students should learn more about the country for which they are expected to stand and to defend. They will soon come to understand that there are reasons for our nations' rise from a loosely knit conglomeration of 13 colonies to the most powerful, yet liberty-loving country in the world, and all within a span of less than 200 years.

To shake our apathy, we must show a sense of personal responsibility, if we are to survive as a free nation. An average of only one out of 10 people vote at primary elections throughout the United States. This is a dangerous trend.

Remember, that bad politicians are elected by good citizens who don't take the trouble to vote. As someone has said, "The only thing necessary for the triumph of evil is that good men do nothing."

Victor J. Rutkoski, Sr.

Gold Reserves and Monetary Reform

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 19, 1967

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, we talk a great deal about gold and its relationship to the world's monetary systems. Most of us rarely see gold except in its ornamental form. We have little conception of it in bars or ingots, other than the general realization that its value is very great. Perhaps some comparisons with familiar things will help to clarify the reason gold has so long been the standard of monetary value—doubtless originally, and persisting in the tradition, because it packs so much value in so small a space.

For example, a solid gold bar the size of a legal filing cabinet drawer would weigh well over a ton and be worth about a million and a quarter dollars. The world's current annual production of gold would fit into a room no larger than many a living room—15 by 22 feet, with an 8-foot ceiling. All the world's monetary stocks of gold—35,100 tons—would be only half a load for a modern oil tanker.

Obviously, the world cannot add gold to its monetary reserves anywhere near fast enough to meet the demands of world trade. Since 1940 the output from gold mines has risen only 11 percent, while the volume of trade has exceeded that rise many times over. It is this pinch which is requiring sometimes painful rethinking by the world's monetary experts as they devise a means to meet the need which arises from these facts.

On June 21, I introduced S. 1983, a bill to remove the gold cover for Federal Reserve notes. It has been supported by Chairman Martin of the Federal Reserve, who agrees that the release of the billions now held in gold will ease the mounting anxiety concerning our ability to have enough for continued use in international settlements.

Agreement in principle has been reached for the use of the international monetary fund in the creation of a new "paper gold"—SDR's or special drawing rights—which will also relieve the international pressures settlement. But its implementation at Rio de Janeiro, when it is accomplished, will not obviate the need for the use of gold nor for the freeing of our reserves for that purpose.

Recently there appeared in a publication of the American Telephone & Telegraph Co., an interesting analysis of gold in the world monetary system, from which I have adapted some of the statements I made in the beginning. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

New Reserves Sought: Gold in the World's Monetary System

(Note.—On June 21, Sen. Vance Hartke (D-Ind.) introduced a bill that would end the requirement for Federal Reserve banks to maintain certain reserves in gold certificates against Federal Reserve notes in circulation.

("This soundness of the dollar," Sen. Hartke said, "does not depend on its backing by gold . . . since no one can redeem his money for gold anyway." He added, "The solidity of our economy, the fully warranted confidence in the dollar by our own people and the other people of the world—these are the true backing we need, and this is the true backing which we have.")

Most metals used by man have more utility than gold. We cannot fashion weapons with it or use it to produce the basic necessities of life. And it would be impractical to manufacture a solid gold automobile.

Yet no metal has no vigorously stirred the emotions of men, been so cherished by them, or so violently affected the course of history. Wars have been fought for it, ancient empires destroyed for it, lands colonized for it, enemies bought off with it.

Gold is a symbol of perfection, as witness the "golden rule," "the golden age," a "heart of gold," and "as good as gold." Perhaps gold is cherished because it shines like the life-giving sun. Of all the precious metals, gold is the one most easily worked, most conveniently transported and most readily accepted as a medium of exchange in world trade.

GOLDEN AGE

From 1870 to World War I, almost all major countries of the world were on a gold coin standard. Their currencies were convertible into gold, in both large or small amounts, at the initiative of any holder, and exports and imports of gold were unrestricted. This period was known as the "golden age of the gold standard."

After World War I, nations attempted to return to the gold standard. But the war had disrupted economic stability, and the gold standard was no longer viable. By 1922, at a conference in Genoa, the major powers reached agreement on the arrangement we have today. This is known as the gold-exchange standard, under which both gold and certain key currencies serve as monetary reserves.

The Great Depression caused further damage to world trade and monetary systems. Subsequently, the United States legally abandoned the gold coin standard in March, 1933, and nine months later established a gold bullion standard and reduced the gold value of the dollar. Gold coinage was ended and existing coins melted down into bars. Bullion was held domestically only under license for industry or the arts and sold for export under Treasury regulations. All coins and currency of the United States were declared to be legal tender for payment of debt.

Since the Thirties, only the United States and a few other countries have been on a limited form of gold standard. Most nations maintain a fixed exchange value of their currencies, most of them in terms of the dollar, which is linked to gold, thereby indirectly maintaining gold parities.

Hence gold today has no importance as a *domestic* medium of exchange, and managed currencies prevail as the monetary system. However, gold does remain an integral part of the monetary reserves of governments and central banks. And as a standard of value for international payments, gold has lost little of its luster.

DEMAND EXCEEDS SUPPLY

Because of its function in world monetary reserves, gold is a persistent source of worry. The basic problem is that gold production cannot be expanded sufficiently to meet the demands placed on it by rapid economic growth and by aggressive growth policies of nations. The result is that monetary gold supplies must be stretched over an ever-widening volume of world trade through the use of key currencies like the dollar and sterling as reserve supplements.

For example, at the end of the "golden age" in 1913, about 90 percent of the world's monetary reserves was held in gold; today the figure is less than two-thirds. Governor Daane of the Federal Reserve Board has summed this up by saying, ". . . the historical process by which substitutes for gold evolve and develop—evident in both domestic and international monetary history—will certainly continue with undiminished inexorability."

Last year, gold production in the non-communist countries of the world totaled 41.1 million troy ounces. (A troy ounce is equal to about nine-tenths of an ounce on the avoirdupois system.) Production was unchanged from 1965. A comparison over the period since 1940 shows that output of gold has risen by only 11 percent, far less than the expansion in the world's credit and currencies.

In bar form, a ton of gold would occupy a space 20 inches long, 13 inches wide and 15 inches high. Current annual production of gold is approximately 1,170 short tons, occupying 2,646 cubic feet—or about the same as the space of a fair-sized living doom.

South Africa is the free world's principal gold producer. Three-fourths of the new gold supplies come from its mines.

South Africa's production has expanded enormously since the period prior to the Second World War, when it produced less than one-third of the non-communist world's fresh gold. The increase came about through the development of new mines, which reached a climax in 1961–62. Since then, production has tended to level off, apparently because of increasing exploration and development costs and falling profit margins.

PRICE CHANGE UNLIKELY

The price of gold is not responsive to demand and supply factors because, since 1934, it has been officially pegged at $35 an ounce. The (inverted) pyramid of the free world's money and credit system has been based on this price. In theory, a rise in the price of gold, which could come about only by devaluing the dollar, would revive the gold mining industry. Central banks and governments say that devaluation would be a drastic step. It would quite likely disrupt the tenuous balance that exists today among monetary systems.

At $35 an ounce, total 1966 gold output was worth $1,440 million, unchanged from 1965. If this entire amount were added to official gold stocks, nations would have little trouble mantaining adequate reserves. It happens that only a small fraction of the annual output ends up in central bank vaults.

Last year, in fact, there was a net decline in official gold stocks, the first year since the Second World War in which gold stocks failed to register any increase. Altogether, in the 21 years since the end of the war, out of total new gold supplies of $25.2 billion, a cumulative amount of only $9.9 billion was added to monetary gold stocks.

Last year's drop in new gold supplies was caused by an abrupt halt in sales by the U.S.S.R. (Good grain harvests may have been responsible.) While the Soviets' annual gold production is not known, sales during much of the past decade from that country have added substantially to the West's supplies.

Private demand for gold tends to emphasize the traditional image of the metal as a gauge of confidence and haven of security. United States citizens, of course, aren't legally permitted to hoard gold; we prefer it in industrial forms such as jewelry, watch cases, leaf picture frames and plated plumbing fixtures. But in underdeveloped areas of the world, most individuals believe gold to be the most effective store of value, and this has caused a steady drain on world gold production over the years.

In Europe, private demand for gold is radically different. There, during periods of political and economic stress, people have a tendency to convert some of their savings and other assets into gold. French citizens especially seem so disposed.

LONDON'S BIG MARKET

Since 1954, the world's principal market for private gold sales and purchases has been in London. Five member firms of the London bullion market gather each morning to decide what the day's opening price ought to be. The price is determined by comparing the number of buy and sell orders in a procedure similar to that of a stock market transaction.

Non-residents of the Sterling Area may buy or sell any amount of gold they wish in the London market provided that payment is made in either dollars or "convertible" sterling. Residents of the Sterling Area can sell gold freely but can buy only limited amounts for approved industrial and export uses.

Figures in the accompanying table represent total official gold reserves outstanding at the end of 1966. The United States owns about 31 percent of the West's gold, compared with 60 percent at the end of the Second World War. France and West Germany have added substantilly to their gold reserves since the war, and together now possess more than one-fifth of the world's official gold reserves.

The International Monetary Fund has about six percent of total gold reserves. Founded in 1946, the I.M.F. extends short-term financial help to countries in temporary balance of payments difficulties. Its resources consist of gold and currencies of the individual member countries paid in by each member as its subscription.

The weight of the world's monetary gold stocks at the end of 1966 was approximately 35,100 tons. A modern tanker the size of the Torrey Canyon—aground off the coast of Britain—carries more than twice this tonnage in "black gold" on a single voyage.

The gold problem has been with us a long time, and the issues are complex. Since the war, nations and institutions have faced periodic monetary crises and somehow emerged with measures that at least overcame the immediate difficulties.

But there is persistent concern that monetary systems cannot remain sound indefinitely under conditions of insufficient growth in gold reserves and an excessive rise in dollar holdings. The problem confronting monetary authorities is to devise an acceptable asset that could be used for international payments to supplement gold and the present reserve currencies. Clearly, the free world looks to the United States, as keeper of the world's standard of monetary value, for leadership and answers.

In the late Forties, the United States possessed gold stocks valued at about $24 billion, about double the amount legally required as cover for Federal Reserve notes and deposit liabilities. By the end of 1964, our gold reserves had fallen to a level just above the legal minimum. Congress passed legislation early in 1965 eliminating the 25 percent gold cover requirement for deposit liabilities, leaving only the requirement of gold backing for Federal Reserve notes.

Today, of the $13.2 billion of U.S. Treasury gold stock, about $10 billion must be held as backing for the nearly $40 billion in Federal Reserve notes. At the rate of monetary expansion during the past few years, the peril point in gold reserves would be reached within two or three years.

CHAIRMAN MARTIN URGES ACTION

In June, Federal Reserve Board Chairman William McChesney Martin urged prompt action to free remaining currency from gold cover requirements. To do so, Mr. Martin said, would "remove any uncertainty" about the Treasury's readiness to maintain our gold price to foreign governments at the fixed price of $35 an ounce in exchange for surplus dollars.

Mr. Martin asserted that the steady increase in currency outstanding cuts available gold reserves by about $500 million a year, and sales to domestic industry would reduce the stock by about $150 million a year even if there weren't any more demands for gold by other governments. He said it therefore appears "inevitable" that the 25 percent cover must be ended eventually.

So Mr. Martin has set forth a specific proposal to deal with our domestic monetary gold problem, and the debate will likely intensify in the months ahead. "Hard" money advocates in Congress and elsewhere are not likely to remain silent. They will emphasize the traditional link between the dollar and a metallic backing—silver or gold. "Good as gold" may again become the railing cry.

Removal of our domestic currency from gold cover would resolve our immediate problem relating to legal minimum reserves requirements. And, as Mr. Martin pointed out, it would free domestic gold stocks for support of the dollar in international trade. However, it would not solve all the world's monetary problems.

As President Johnson told the International Monetary Fund's meeting in 1965, "Gold alone will not be enough to support the healthy (economic) growth the world demands." World trade in the past decade alone has doubled, reaching over $180 billion. Governments of both industrially developed and "emerging" nations continue to pursue aggressive economic growth policies in an attempt to raise domestic standards of living.

INSTANT GOLD?

If not gold, what then? The debate in recent years has centered on the possibility of creating a new international money—a "Composite Reserve Unit." Under one such arrangement, countries would obtain C.R.U.'s by depositing their own currency, and perhaps gold, in the I.M.F. or a similar institution. According to most plans, C.R.U.'s are intended to supplement monetary gold stocks and not replace them.

Thus "instant" gold might serve as a new store of value in international trade. Can gold and instant gold co-exist in an international environment? Concern has been expressed that, should the supplement be better than the dollar, holders of dollars may convert to the new form of money, thus perhaps putting pressure on the U.S. gold stock.

Conversely, if the new unit is not as good as the dollar, who will want it and how will it be a more acceptable supplement to gold than the dollar has been and is?

The standard of value of the world's goods and services, bonds, shares and insurance policies is more often specified in dollars rather than in other currencies or in gold. This is because the dollar has done a better job of maintaining its purchasing power than has any other major currency.

The gold problem has intensified because of the persistent deficit in the U.S. Balance of Payments. This deficit in the past 10 years has added substantially to other countries' reserves of gold and dollars. Should the United States succeed in eliminating its deficit, additions to these reserves would stop, and the financing of growing world trade would likely become more difficult. On the other hand, should we continue running a deficit, and pay with dollars convertible into gold, the gold exchange system we now have might be in serious danger.

Negotiations are now under way on the problem of international reserves and it is likely that some expansion of drawing rights in the I.M.F. may result. This would continue the process of gradual expansion of reserves under the present gold reserve standard and defer the question of fundamental reforms.

THE PARADOX OF GOLD

Discussions on international gold tend to illustrate regard for the metal as the very badge of monetary sovereignty and nationalism. The paradox is that a gold standard imposes restraints on national autonomy almost as far-reaching as those imposed by the establishment of a common currency among a group of nations. These restraints are unpopular among today's fiscal and monetary managers.

But gold has proved to be a remarkably durable symbol of wealth down through the ages. It would be premature to predict its demise even in the face of current world trade demands.

One indisputable aspect of gold is its ability to stimulate heated discussions among economists concerning its role. The late John Maynard Keynes expressed his general impatience with gold advocates by writing (irreverently) in 1936:

". . . the form of digging holes in the ground known as gold-mining not only adds nothing whatever to the real wealth of the world but involves the disutility of labour.

"If the Treasury were to fill old bottles with banknotes, bury them at suitable depths in disused coal mines which are then filled up to the surface with town rubbish, and leave it to private enterprise . . . to dig the notes up again, there would be no more unemployment, and . . . the real wealth of the community would probably become a good deal greater than it actually is."

Per Jacobsson, former managing director of the International Monetary Fund, expressed kinder views in his book, *The Market Economy in the World Today*.

"The alignment of currencies to gold gives a certain stability to the world's monetary system which cannot be ignored.

"When international liabilities are settled in gold, this is a definite and final settlement, leaving no credit nexus as is the case when settlement is made in other ways.

"The possession of gold inspires confidence in a way that the possession of no other monetary asset can.

"The use of gold . . . as the basis of money may not give cohesion to the world's monetary system but it greatly facilitates the task and it would not be easy to establish the same degree of cohesion in any other way."

In his opinion, this list indicates "why gold should be retained to play a role not as master but as an auxiliary in the world's monetary system."

The central question is, can a Currency Reserve Unit also be accepted as an auxiliary and not a master?

WORLD GOLD RESERVES

Amounts outstanding end; 1966

[In million of U.S. dollars]

United States	13, 235
Canada	1, 045
Western Europe	22, 835
Latin American Republics	985
Asia	1, 690
Africa	880
Other countries	250
International institutions	2, 285
Total	43, 205

Source: Bank for International Settlements, Basle.

MOST OF FREE-WORLD'S MONETARY GOLD IS IN UNITED STATES

Well over half the $40.9 billion of gold currently used for monetary reserves by the non-Communist countries is in the U.S. But the U.S. doesn't own all of it.

Uncle Sam does own $13.2 billion of gold—about $10 billion in vaults in Fort Knox, Ky., and the rest in Treasury Department Assay Offices in New York, San Francisco and Denver. The biggest single store of gold in the world, just under $13 billion worth, is housed five floors below ground level at the New York Federal Reserve Bank in lower Manhattan, and none of it belongs to the U.S. The Fed holds that gold in custody on behalf of about 80 "customers"—foreign central banks, governments and international agencies.

When the U.S. Government reports a "loss" of gold, title transfers to other countries but the gold itself usually stays in this country.

Foreign countries owning at least $1 billion in gold at the end of 1966 are France, $5.2 billion; West Germany, $4.3 billion; Switzerland, $2.8 billion; Italy, $2.4 billion; Great Britain, $1.9 billion; Canada, $1 billion.

A Citizen Views Civil Disorder

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1967

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, while violence rose throughout America and the world this summer, most thoughtful people attempted to pinpoint the causes of the violence and the cures. It is a pleasure for me to insert in the RECORD a letter from such a constituent of mine, Mr. Morton J. Netzorg:

AUGUST 12, 1967.

Hon. MARTHA GRIFFITHS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. GRIFFITHS: This is a letter from a citizen who has been a consistent backer of many—most, not all—of the ideas and programs you have either sponsored or backed during your term of office. He writes now to try to bring before you his feelings in a time of great stress.

It is late in the day to talk of amelioration while civil disobedience rises in tempo and savagery, from legitimate non-violent protest in the field of civil rights to the sort of thing that marked peasant revolts in Europe—e.g. Jack Cade's revolt in England, and the jacquerie in France long before the Revolution. When civil disobedience passes from protest to forthright violence, with damage to life and (less important) to property, no self-respecting government can survive without calmly taking all necessary steps to suppress violence. There can be no bargaining with those who come with arms in their hands to make their way by threats.

On the other hand, there can be no doubt at all that there are inequities in our American society that can in part be legislated away and in part be removed by the enforcement of existing legislation through proper manning by those vested with the duty and authority to execute these laws.

To some extent slums exist in America because the existing laws have had only token enforcement. Inspection of property has been lax and the enforcement of the requirement to bring sub-standard housing up to grade or have it razed has been worse than lax. As a nation we have been utterly remiss in properly funding the maintenance and upkeep of our housing supply, with totally inadequate provision for the deterioration that inevitably attacks buildings. All too well I remember a notable comment by Colin Clark, the Australian economist, before the National Industrial Conference Board, that the so-called house building boom of the mid-50's was at a rate that didn't even meet the annual wear and tear on the housing stock: Slums show up as the areas where failures of maintenance of property are worst and most highly concentrated, and where rack rents and exploitation of the helpless is a way of life. Means *must* be found to make inspection *frequent, thorough, uniform,* and *honest:* regulations lose their force when the odds favor breaching them, while civic morality suffers from examples of open contempt. What has been said so far would appear to be patently a truism, but is all the more true and all the more bitter to swallow because the obvious gets not even nominal attention, while elaborate schemes are undertaken for moon shots and shots at planets so far away that they concern the human individual not at all.

I for one have always considered taxes as money superbly spent *if* I could see that there was a good chance the money would be spent on items of high social priority—with something approaching the skill exhibited by the ordinary housewife in spending the family budget. At present I protest the rising level of local, state, and federal taxation because I fail to have placed before me evidence that the revenues will be spent with no more than that marginal waste that accompanies any attempt of skilled people to execute plans. I fail to see a program of public relations between any level of government and the laity, and I see an increasing proneness of the public to resist voting monies genuinely needed—because there is significantly less skill used in presenting a case than is used commercially in touting bobby pins or toothpaste.

Nowhere is this truer than in the field of public education. The monies spent here are popularly considered as very great, yet in terms of per capita expendable income we in this country spent a piffling rate compared even with have-not countries. Further, we place immense stress upon technical training, leaving it to chance that technical training will have a one to one correspondence with ability to live a full and rewarding life. The only hopeful thing on the horizon is that technological change will force even technical training to be considered as a lifelong process rather than as being accomplished by the laying of hands as exemplified by a sheepskin.

I came to the United States in 1940 as an American who had lived nearly all his life up to then in the Philippines. I came with no capital and no skills useful in the American milieu. I put my pride in my pocket and began again as a day laborer rather than think of going the welfare path. It took a good many years, but eventually, through willingness to expend effort and through good fortune, I have achieved something like a foothold in the economic sense. (I currently make my living as a management consultant.) This story has been an old one in our country, which has so often stressed the importance of a fifth or sixth freedom, *the freedom to compete without artificial barriers.*

For some time in 1942 and 1943 it was my fortune to be a salesman and bill collector in Paradise Valley, that then excessively blighted slum area of Detroit: It was a revelation to be exposed to the mixture of motives and attitudes that characterized this negro slum. There were gallant people and apathetic ones, people of native and uncrushable integrity and people only marginally human.. Taken on balance, there was a strong upward thrust, but it was a thrust not particularly supported by those able to give support or to create more favorable circumstances. That support has been increasing, at least to the extent of not placing new impediments on top of old ones (as in South Africa). It seems to me the problem today is how to take a firm line in the protection of life and property while opening the way for the Negro to hew to a position of self-respect through his own effort (and that effort is *the* prime ingredient). To me it seems then that the need is to try to rally public support for the removal of the sorts of restrictions that typify crafts unions, that typify lily white churches, that say that one man shall be deprived of the opportunity to compete in the sort of activity where effort is rewarded—some effort rewarded more, some less, but *all* effort rewarded.

It seems to me that the what of our societal needs is abundantly clear, but that the how to satisfy them is not. It seems to me that there is need for a massive ceaseless program to get and keep the ordinary human citizen involved and concerned at the grass roots level. To some extent success in such an effort has been achieved in New York state in the field of public education through the efforts of the New York Citizens Commission for the Public Schools, originally sponsored and backed by Roy Larsen (Time-Life) and Dr. Conant of Harvard. The blueprint for this kind of self-help has been made, and the means have been developed for channeling and developing public opinion. The capability of the average citizen to rise to challenge is immense, the challenges are endless. In this time of public humiliation and storm it might be wise to try to tap this pool of human resources and to get citizens to take their proper role in helping to shape a better society in America.

I am perfectly willing to defer a great society to the times of my children and grandchildren; my concern now is for creating a better society than we have now, with, as the saying goes, all due haste.

Sincerely,

MORTON J. NETZORG.

Bernard Lamb

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 19, 1967

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, those of us who knew him were saddened by the death, on August 13, of Bernard Lamb, a New Jerseyan who had a distinguished record of public service to his State and the Nation. I ask unanimous consent that an editorial from a local newspaper, where Mr. Lamb lived for 68 out of his 72 years, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BERNARD LAMB

In 1929 Ho-Ho-Kus was a sleepy village of about 900 people. That year the first six houses were sold in Cheelcroft, the former Ackerman farm, and that year Bernard L. Lamb was elected mayor, a post he was to hold for the next nine years. His record of public service in his home community was sufficient to earn lasting remembrance but his taste of local office only served to whet his appetite for political activities on a much broader scale. In the early 1930s he managed Harold Hoffman's successful gubernatorial campaign; he was state finance commissioner; he was credited with establishing the County Planning Board; during World War II he held a high position with the War Production Board and was a member of a special advisory mission to Iran; and he was organizer of the Republicn Party's national leadership training program.

In Ho-Ho-Kus, in Trenton and in Washington, Barney Lamb made an indelible mark before his retirement in 1960. Since then his name had appeared infrequently in the public prints but the programs he had set in motion stand as a vigorous monument to a special breed of public servant. Last week, at the age of 72, he died and let it be agreed that no community ever can boast a sufficient number of his kind.

Breaking the Poverty Cycle: Overcoming Barriers to Equal Opportunity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1967

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insist the following speech by Judge Wade H. McCree, Jr., entitled "Breaking the Poverty Cycle: Overcoming Barriers to Equal Opportunity," delivered at the University of Michigan sesquicentennial conference, Ann Arbor, Mich., August 26, 1967:

BREAKING THE POVERTY CYCLE: OVERCOMING BARRIERS TO EQUAL OPPORTUNITY

The theme of this session of the Conference, "Overcoming Barriers to Equal Opportunity," assumes correctly that America's racial sub-caste has problems different from as well as related to those of her economic sub-caste, the poor. Many Negroes are poor because they are Negroes. No whites are poor because they are white. I purposely exclude from this discussion women who comprise another identifiable population segment which is confronted by barriers to equal opportunity. I do so not because I condone or regard as insubstantial the discrimination woman faces, but because it has not consigned her to a condition of poverty. I am informed that America's women own, although they do not control, more of the country's wealth than do men, not because they earn more but because men bequeath most of their wealth to women, and women leave most of theirs to other women.

America's racial sub-caste consists primarily of persons called Negroes, although Puerto Ricans, Mexican-Americans, and American Indians may be included as may Orientals who, by reason of identification with powerful National States, for the most part receive a different and better treatment than these other groups. Since Negroes are several times more numerous than all these other groups and since the consequences of unequal treatment accorded them have the greatest impact on our society, I will be primarily concerned with their problems and possible solutions to it. In our discussions, however, we should not be unmindful of the other population groups to which I have referred.

The circumstances of this racial sub-caste were of little concern to the great body of American citizens until the so-called civil rights "revolution" erupted into the streets of our Northern metropolises and made it unmistakably clear that the very existence of our nation as a society based on the rule of law depends upon finding an immediate solution to what the Swedish social scientist Gunnar Myrdal characterized as America's Dilemma. This most pressing of our domestic problems present complexities of great subtlety and many unique aspects. One of its unique aspects affords me hope for an eventual solution. This aspect is the legal commitment of our government and the moral commitment of our religious establishments to an ethical resolution of the dilemma. Another unique aspect which affords hope is the faith of the overwhelming majority of America's Negroes in the sincerity of this commitment although as I will demonstrate this faith is currently waivering and patience is running out. The missing ingredient is the commitment of the majority of America's white citizens to the proposition that Negroes are people and fellow citizens who incidentally happen to manifest certain genetic differences. If anyone thinks there is such a committment on the part of America's white, consider for a moment a few recurring comments in the civil rights colloquy.

"Where else in the world do colored people enjoy a higher standard of living and greater opportunities for advancement than they do in America?", a well-meaning white American asks. He would probably consider it impertinent if he were asked in rejoinder, "Where else in the world but in America do Catholics, Protestants, Jews, Englishmen, Scotsmen, Italians, etc., enjoy a higher standard of living or a greater opportunity for advancement?" Yet, that rejoinder and his reaction to it demonstrates that he hasn't made the initial and fundamental commitment to the proposition that the American Negro is as much an American as is any white American and that the circumstances of Negroes should not be compared with those of anyone else anywhere else in the world in evaluating his American status.

A related comment is, "Look how far they have come. Why they have a Negro Senator, Cabinet member, Congressmen, Judges, etc. Why do they want to move ahead too rapidly!" Even statistically, which I submit, is not the proper approach, is one Senator out of 100, six (or is it five?) national representatives out of four hundred thirty-five, or a few dozen judges out of thousands noteworthy if race is an irrelevancy in the concept of citizenship, and are modest gains spectacular over the span of one hundred years? And of what moment is the achievement of a few persons of color to the overwhelming majority of Negroes who do not share in their elevation and how real is their individual achievement when a Negro judge may be denied access to a place of public accommodation where his official identity is unknown at the same time when a paroled white felon whom he has sentenced is accepted at face value?

This I submit is the primary cause of the problem—the basic attitude of the great majority of America's whites towards her Negro citizens. Identification of this primary cause is, of course, no profound deduction on my part. Proof that it is shared by millions of Negroes is evidenced by the confusion which exists today over the direction and thrust of the civil rights movement. Not only are most Negroes painfully aware of this basic attitude of whites, but also many now despair that it will ever change, or at least voluntarily.

This massive doubt is the new ingredient in the civil rights movement and the one which has fragmented Negro leadership and the Negro community and has alienated liberal whites whose bona fides have been questioned.

Historically, despite the dehumanizing effects of chattel slavery, the survivors and descendants of Africa's ravished population greeted emancipation with enthusiasm, faith and hope. Their early leaders knew that physical emancipation wasn't freedom but they believed in its promise. They accepted the necessity for social evolution, but, instead of resorting to violence to realize in fact what was theirs in theory, they waited patiently. When patience wore thin, they didn't arm as did the Irish Republican Army or the Irgun in Palestine or the Colonials in our national history. Instead, they went to court, confident that America's commitment to the rule of law would prevail once the courts handed down a clear mandate. Their leadership became, in due course, institutionalized. The N.A.A.C.P. devoted itself to the conduct of the legal struggle and the Urban League undertook responsibility for acculturation. Realistically, the cultural deficiencies of a slave heritage which had made Africa men and women humanoid robots, programmed only for work but with the capacity for reproduction, were recognized. However, it was confidently believed that these shortcomings, massive as they were, could be surmounted just as immigrant Europeans, many with substantial personal obstacles to overcome, had demonstrated.

Only a few people lost faith although the ascent was steep and the goal seemed at times unattainable. There were some who worshipped the false gods of Black Nationalism, but the Garvey movement and others of less renown failed and Negroes continued in their pursuit of the grail of full citizenship. Negroes burned no buses, dynamited no schools or churches or slaughtered innocent children at worship and lynched no one. No leaders of groups dedicated to segregation were assassinated from ambush. Instead, patiently, slowly, and often with maddening frustration, Negroes undertook countless legal battles to achieve equal treatment as citizens. They dared to dream the American dream of a country without tyranny or oppression, racial or religious caste, where every man was free, within the concept of ordered liberty, to realize his greatest potential for creativity and happiness.

Finally, after a series of defeats, the public climate changed, and in 1954 the legal wall was breached (although the President would not declare the decision to be the law of the land), and a great expectancy of entering the promised land of equal opportunity and unqualified citizenship excited a populace. The subsequent enactment of the first national civil rights legislation in the twentieth century heightened the anticipation and the outpouring of a hundred thousand citizens in the mall before the Lincoln Memorial in the nation's capital in 1963 gave dramatic public testimony to the triumph of faith.

However, the view on the other side of the wall was not that of the promised land. Instead there was a steeper cliff of stubborn citizen resistence to the clear mandate of the courts and the Congress. The great American dream seemed to many Negroes to turn into a nightmare. Many who had drunk great draughts of the heady intoxicant of liberty and believed and accepted the assurances of Negro leaders and of national leaders that Jericho would be entered when the walls came tumbling down were hurt, frustrated, confused and then angered.

The wisdom of established leaders was questioned and angry new voices are heard demanding a show-down with white America. Those voices proclaim that Negroes have been tricked into reliance on law and legislative efforts, and now, without defining the concept or how it will be exercised, they call for the creation of Black Power.

This new reaction repudiates any hope of integration into the life of America. Instead of wanting "in," the proponents of this movement want "out." Convinced that there is no possibility of acceptance by white Americans of black Americans as human beings and equal citizens, they have decided to create their own society with its own values and standards. The contours of such a program are indefinite and its proponents offer no details. They haven't been pressed for specifications because the current reaction is emotional and not critical.

I am not speaking of the Nation of Islam whose members are popularly called Black Muslims. I predict that their repudiation of the comfortable Judeo-Christian tradition and profession of an historically questionable Islamic heritage of American Negroes will prevent their becoming a mass movement. I speak instead of the less venturesome Negro who lives in a ghetto where employment is precarious, education of an inferior quality and rebuffs based on race are experienced daily who has suddenly questioned the sincerity of his country's promise to him. He is a young person in his late teens or early twenties whose personal experience does not include a recognition of the oft-cited "great gains" of the last three decades. He was born during World War II or shortly thereafter and grew up during the Korean War and now lives during the Vietnam adventure and has seen violence legitimized as an instrument of national policy. To him, God is dead or possibly never lived. He sees the sons of the poor and disinherited bearing the brunt of the fighting in Vietnam where by an ironic twist an army career affords him the best hope of equal opportunity for advancement in a fight proclaimed as an effort to bring democracy to another people across the sea. He wonders would it not be the wiser personal choice for him to risk his life to better his own conditions here than to lay it down on foreign soil for someone else.

I believe this group comprises a small minority of America's Negroes, but I believe with equal conviction that the great majority, although eschewing this direction, are without an alternative which offers any reasonable hope of a solution to his plight.

The majority of America's Negroes stand at the crossroads. Can they believe in the sincerity of America when during the decade from 1950 to 1960, which I characterize as the lost decade, 330,000 new housing units were built in the Detroit area, principally in the suburbs and predominantly financed by federal guarantees which forbade racial discrimination in their availability and only 3% of these new houses were made available to Negroes and much of this was public housing? Yet, no official action was taken to enforce the non-racial guarantees and we see today a suburban ring around Detroit 96.4% white. During this same decade, Detroit's Negroes could purchase only used housing at substantially greater costs usually without mortgage financing, with the result of the doubling up of families in order to meet the monthly land contract installments. Enforcement of city zoning and health ordinances has been lax to non-existent in neighborhoods which have become predominantly Negro and school attendance has increased because of overcrowding with the consequence that the Negro pupil often has a custodial experience instead of an educational one.

Police attitudes and the recent incredible behavior of some of Detroit's Recorder's Judges during the riot convince the Negro citizen that one of the missions of these agencies is containment of the ghetto population, and a resultant citizen animus against law and law enforcement agencies, too frequently justified by incidents of insult and brutality, characterize his neighborhoods.

The recent irrational and destructive civil disturbance in Detroit, parallelling those in other Northern cities, was easily predictable and the proposed panaceas of more head-start programs and job upgrading projects suggest treating a cancer with aspirin.

What is required is equal treatment under law. What is required is more law enforcement instead of less. The Negro wants enforcement of the laws which were enacted to give him equal access to jobs, housing, and places of public accommodation as were the former laws which denied him his rights as a citizen. He is waiting, very impatiently, to see if America will enforce with equal vigor the laws which were designed to protect its minorities as it does those which insure the rights of its majority.

It is no test of a nation's adherence to the rule of law if only its majority is protected in which it regards as its prerogatives. I realize the difficulty of the challenge I announce. A Scottish legal philosopher once said that a society's civilization is measured by its obedience to the unenforceable I recognize that every white American cannot be compelled by law to accord to his Negro fellow citizens the rights the Constitution and laws of this nation guarantee him. Laws are effective only when they have the support of the majority. He must decide for himself whether he wants this nation to continue as the noblest experiment in human relations the world has ever seen. He must, by a revolutionary re-orientation of his personal conduct, tell the great majority of Negroes standing at the crossroads that we shall continue this experiment together. If he does not, James Baldwin's prophecy of the fire next time, a preview of which we are witnessing across the nation, may be realized and I fear the result could be genocide because reservations of American Indian experience would be inadequate to contain twenty million black people.

I omit as irrelevant to this discussion but as an observation of vital importance that nothing can be more corrosive of our national moral fiber than to have the vast majority of our citizens in violation of the stated law.

George Schuyler, a Negro journalist, wrote twenty years ago:

"By a peculiar logical inversion the Anglo-Saxon ruling class, its imitators, accomplices and victims have come to believe in a Negro problem. . . . Continued reference to a Negro problem assumes that some profound difficulty has been or is being created for the human race by . . . Negroes. It has been centuries since any Negro nation has menaced the rest of humanity. The last of the Moors withdrew from Europe in 1942. . . . Negroes did not inaugurate the trans-Atlantic slave traffic, although some profited from it. They have not invaded anybody's territory in almost a millenium. They have passed few, if any, Jim Crow laws, established no Jim Crow customs, set up few white ghettos, carried on no discriminatory practices against whites and have not devoted centuries to propaganda attempting to prove the superiority of blacks over whites. . . . The only sense in which there has been a Negro problem is in the colored folks natural human aversion and opposition to conquest, enslavement, exploitation and debasement. . . ."

George Schuyler is right in this respect but wrong when he calls the problem a Caucasion problem. It is an American, or more accurately, a human problem, and its solution is the responsibility of us all.

Independence Hall at Minimundus, in Klagenfurt, Austria

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH SCOTT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, September 19, 1967

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, it is with pride that I reflect upon the patriotism exhibited by a fellow Philadelphian and civic leader, Arthur C. Kaufmann, in presenting a model of the most historic building in Philadelphia, Independence Hall, and a model of the Liberty Bell to Minimundus—small world—located in Klagenfurt, Austria.

Minimundus, which was opened to the public in 1959, is a mini-version of some leading manmade landmarks. Scale models of the Arc de Triomphe, the Eiffel Tower, Versailles, and the Leaning Tower of Pisa, as well as a Japanese palace from Osaka, can been at Minimundus. Model buildings portray English structures. Moscow is represented.

At the time of Arthur Kaufmann's first visit to Minimundus earlier this summer, there was no representation from the United States. Arthur Kaufmann was distressed by this lack; then, sparked by love of country, the idea of a replica of Independence Hall to fill this void was born.

So on Sunday, September 10, Arthur C. Kaufmann delivered, in the German language, the following dedication of models of Independence Hall and the Liberty Bell at Minimundus, Klagenfurt, Austria.

"Independence Hall" at Minimundus is dedicated in honor of former Judge Edwin O. Lewis, of Philadelphia, who is chairman of the Independence National Historical Park Advisory Commission and president of Independence Hall Association. Mr. Kaufmann also is a member of the advisory commission.

I ask unanimous consent that his statement, translated from the German, be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

REMARKS OF ARTHUR C. KAUFMANN AT DEDICATION OF MODELS OF INDEPENDENCE HALL AND THE LIBERTY BELL AT "MINIMUNDUS," KLAGENFURT, AUSTRIA, SEPTEMBER 10, 1967

Madam Chairman, Distinguished Guests, Ladies and Gentlemen, Boys and Girls, for many years, it has been our privilege to visit your beautiful country, but what's more important, to meet and to know your splendid people. In our judgment, *people make the world*, and your people have also created the "small world," or Minimundus, which is still another credit to Austria and its enterprising people. The underlying principles of Minimundus and the "Rettet das Kind" Movement are that children represent the future of the world. We believe this makes that future appear brighter.

Austria, like America, is fortunate in enjoying the benefits of freedom and democracy. It has been well said that "the passion for freedom is the love of all men." Let us cherish the hope that our two great countries may carry on together for many years this passion for freedom, through that fundamental principle—the love of all men!

Americans, like all thinking people, do not agree on all things, but we do agree that our two most significant and meaningful symbols of freedom and democracy, are the Independence Hall and the Liberty Bell. That's why we are proud and delighted to have this opportunity of linking closer together our two countries, which already have so much in common. It will be gratifying to us over the years to realize that these two symbols stand here in beautiful Klagenfurt, where they will serve the dual purpose of expressing our friendship and helping the "Rettet das Kind" Movement. Today's dedication of these small but exact replicas of our Philadelphia shrines, is still another manifestation of the fact that Philadelphia is known all over the world as "The City of Brotherly Love." This, once again, emphasizes that, indeed, the passion for freedom is the love of all men.

We take this opportunity of expressing our heartfelt gratitude for the splendid cooperation received from so many people here and in the USA. Included are:

Mr. Rudolf Mattesich, United States Representative of the Austrian Tourist Department; W. Hofrat Df. Peter Zojer, his lovely wife and the staff of Minimundus; Trans World Airlines, which flew over the Liberty Bell; the students of the Technical High Schools of Austria, who did such a creditable job in building this scale model; the Independence Hall Association of Philadelphia and Mr. M. O. Anderson, who serves as Superintendent of Independence Hall, representing the National Park Service, a branch of our Government's Department of the Interior; and the press, radio and television of both countries, as well as the Voice of America.

We also want to thank the following high officials and organizations on both sides of the water, who have written such enthusiastic and sincere letters. These have been turned over to the executives of Minimundus for their archives:

His Excellency, Dr. Ernest Lemberger, Austrian Ambassador to the United States; the Honorable Douglas MacArthur, II, American Ambassador to Austria, who is represented here today by the Cultural Attaché, Professor Martin S. Kermacy; the Honorable Stewart L. Udall, Secretary of the Interior of the United States; the Honorable Raymond P. Shafer, Governor of the great State of Pennsylvania; the Honorable Hugh D. Scott, United States Senator from Pennsylvania; the Honorable James H. J. Tate, Mayor of the City of Philadelphia who contributed the replica of the Liberty Bell that you will shortly see and hear; the Freedoms Foundation of the USA, located in Valley Forge, another historic landmark; and we thank all of those who cooperated so wholeheartedly in arranging today's impressive ceremonies.

And now, it is my pleasant to read a letter from The White House:

"The President was pleased to learn that a replica of the Independence Hall and the Liberty Bell are to become a part of the permanent exhibit at Minimundus in Klagenfurt, Austria.

"He has asked me to tell you that he shares the pride of Mayor Tate and the people of Philadelphia that this cherished symbol of American independence will now join historic replicas of other nations.

"With my own and The President's warm best wishes,

"Sincerely,

"JOSEPH A. CALIFANO, Jr.,
"Special Assistant to the President."

Finally, it is with pride that Mrs. Kaufmann and I dedicate these miniature models of Independence Hall and the Liberty Bell to a really great American, a distinguished Philadelphia jurist and gentleman, who, over three decades, has led the movement to enlarge and improve these two national shrines.

Without his able leadership, this restoration would not have begun. Because of his untiring efforts, it is now nearing completion.

Yes, we are delighted to present these models to the citizens of Austria and of Klagenfurt and to Minimundus, in honor of our good friend, Judge Edwin O. Lewis.

Thanks to all of you for being here today.

Students at Immaculate Heart of Mary School in Brooklyn Offer Views on Important National Issues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH L. CAREY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 19, 1967

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, at the close of the last school year, I had the privilege of awarding the trophies to students at the Immaculate Heart of Mary School in my district in Brooklyn. At that time I learned that the school, in collaboration with its own Home-School Association and the Lt. David Schnaars Post 1831 of the Catholic War Veterans, were sponsoring contests for essays on "Vietnam" and the "Burning of the Flag" issues.

The war in Vietnam and law and order in our society are perhaps the two most critical problems presently before the country. The interest and wisdom of these young people in regard to these important issues should be a source of encouragement to those of us who must deal with these matters at the national level.

Much of the credit for the success of the contests must go to Msgr. William Casey, pastor, Sister Thomas Aquinas, principal of the Immaculate Heart of Mary School, and Mr. Ignatius M. Paolilla who served as chairman.

So that our colleagues may have the benefit of the views of some of my younger constituents on these major issues, I am including the prize-winning essays as part of my remarks in the Record.

I would observe that seventh-grade children in my district appear to have more cogent views and expressions than certain so-called peace experts like Harry Ashmore of the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions.

HOW THE WAR IN VIETNAM IS HELPING THE UNITED STATES

(By Victoria Capuano, fourth grade, first place)

Vietnam is a country forming the easternmost part of the Indo-chinese Peninsula. On July 21, 1965, it was divided into two countries—South Vietnam and North Vietnam.

The United States Air Force launched air raids on North Vietnam in February in reprisal for Viet Cong attacks on United States Army bases at Pluku and Tury Hoa in the South. They concentrated on roads, railways, bridges, radar stations, ammunition dumps, oil supply depots, encampments, avoiding heavily-populated areas. In June the raids began to extend from the regions South of the Red River Delta to points west and south of Hanoi.

Communists are fighting there and have killed priests and sisters. They would take over the whole world and take all the people's money away. Our men stopped the spread of Communism in Southeast Asia.

They are learning culture and customs. They have fought for our country and died—but they did not die in vain. That is the way the war is helping us.

THE WAR IN VIETNAM AND WHAT IT MEANS TO ME

(By Teresa Paolilla, fifth grade, first place)

This war is the most unpopular, most talked about and the most confusing war the United States was ever in. Young men have burned their draft cards, marched in protest of the war. You hear many views expressed on radio and TV. It is claimed that we are the agggressor, and have no right to be in South Vietnam.

The Constitution of the United States states that only Congress shall have the power to declare war. Then the question is: Are we at war and why?

To try to understand, we must go back in history. After the war with France in 1954, Vietnam was separated into the North and South. South Vietnam made an agreement with the United States that upon request the United States would send men and material. The Senate ratifies all treaties and commitments. We are committed to send material and men to any nation that has signed treaties or agreements with the United States if they are invaded and ask our help.

North Vietnam sent material and men to support the Viet Cong and their revolution with the South Vietnam government. They feel that they are not invading a foreign soil because Vietnam is still part of their country—therefore they are not aggressors—the United States is.

West Germany and East Germany is a divided country and we recognize West Germany. North and South Korea is a divided country and we recognize South Korea. South Korea asked our help and we sent men and material. The war never ended—there is only an armistice.

Under the UN Charter all member nations are supposed to send troops to maintain peace when a member-nation is invaded. The United States of America has signed this obligation and other various treaties. The President, the Commander-in-Chief, has the power to send men and material to police a country or to maintain peace when that country is invaded by another, but only when that country requests our help. We did the same thing in the Dominican Republic when Cuban Communists invaded that country and when peace was restored we withdrew our troops.

In South Vietnam the USA wants a political solution to the Vietnam question and not a military one. Recently President Johnson wrote a personal letter to the Premier of North Vietnam. He offered to stop the bombing of the North and the sending of more men to South Vietnam if the North Vietnamese would also stop sending men and material. This direct offer of peace was rejected by North Vietnam.

We are trying to follow along the lines of Pope Paul's suggestion for an honorable peace. Many of our boys are dying in South Vietnam to protect the freedom of other people and thereby protect the freedom of the USA.

I am proud to be an American. We have the legal and moral right to be in South Vietnam. Right or wrong I am an American. I support our country because we value human life—and men have laid down their lives to protect their own rights and those of other human beings. By protecting the rights and freedom of other people, we thereby protect our own rights and freedom and that is what the war in Vietnam means to me.

THE VIETNAM WAR—A REAL WAR OR POLITICAL WAR?

(By Robert Benvenuto, sixth grade, first place)

Vietnam is a small insignificant country in southern Asia that has captured the hearts and minds of all men because of man's weapon to build and destroy other nations and peoples. The Vietnam war started as a political war caused by many disagreements between North and South Vietnam. North Vietnam declared war on the South. The United States felt that she should step in and try to stop the Communists from spreading their doctrines and cruel ways of life. After this, the war in Vietnam became a "real war."

While in the Vietcong territory, the North Vietnamese and Vietcong suffered great military losses. Even with these hardships there still seemed plenty of fight left in them. Despite America's decision in June to bomb oil dumps and installations in the vicinity of Hanoi and Haiphong, North Vietnamese infiltration into the South continued at a high rate. Notwithstanding their supply problems, the North Vietnamese boosted their total of troops fighting in South Vietnam to some fifty thousand by the end of 1966. This is a "real war."

Pope Paul, knowing the results of war, pleaded with all to cease fire. He knew a compromise on all sides was necessary. The Communists failed to see his ideas for compromise and peace. Therefore they demanded the withdrawal of all United States troops prior to the peace talks. Because of this the United States stated that they would meet the terms if the Communists would do the same. The Communists then made an attack on South Vietnam the next day. This is a "real war."

When President Johnson was running for reelection he commented that he would not send any more troops to Vietnam unless necessary. Circumstances have warranted doubling the number of troops in South Vietnam, raising the total to 327,000 at its peak. With more United States troops in action casualties took a sharp upward turn. Because of this, in March, the United States dead for the first time exceeded the South Vietnamese dead.

In the air war the United States lost more than 400 planes during the year, the bulk of them being shot down by intense ground fire. During the year there was a lull in air strikes against the North as President Johnson launched an intense peace drive. But with no response from Hanoi, United States jets again screamed northward after bombing was stopped for 37 days. This is a "real war."

For Americans, 1966 in Vietnam was a year of continuing hope and anguish. Hope stemmed from the fact that the military position of the United States and its allies was more improved. The anguish derived from the undisputable fact that this improvement was wrought with higher casualties and cost. The hope of all Americans and peace-loving people is in being victorious in the war and returning once more to the "the land of the free and home of the brave." It is the hope of America that this real war will be a real and lasting peace for all nations.

MY REACTION TO THE BURNING OF THE AMERICAN FLAG

(By Susan Hallran, seventh grade, first place)

My feeling is very strong for my country. I love it and would never want to see it destroyed. The American flag stands for my country, so I feel that same way about it. Anyone who burns the American flag could only be mentally ill, or not an American citizen.

If an American citizen burns the flag, in my opinion he is committing an act of treason. It really makes me angry to know that a citizen could burn a symbol that stands for peace and justice and also the representations of other states. The American flag is not only a symbol, but something hundreds of men have risked their lives for. The flag lets everyone know that all men are equal and that all love their country.

If I had been there when those men burned the American flag, I would have tried to stop them. I couldn't just stand by and see the flag, which represents so much, burned to ashes in front of my eyes. The people who were there and didn't try to stop this action should be totally ashamed and not be able to call themselves American citizens.

FLAG BURNING

(By Patricia Passadino, seventh grade, second place)

Our country is a strong and steadfast one until a law violated against its very meaning is permitted to occur.

A peace rally against the war was held some two weeks ago in Central Park. Demonstrators got carried away and very boldly burned the flag of the United States of America. This mob mentality is a sin and crime against our country as well as God. We have a duty to love and perfect our country. This goal cannot be obtained if the people of the states act so violently against the flag.

This act, performed in public, is the lowest form of government ridicule possible. No punishment is too harsh on the person or persons involved when we think of the blood, sweat and tears put into and represented by our flag. The development of a barren territory and the freedom of the individual—this is the meaning of the flag to hundreds of our citizens.

So many have fought for it and are striving to keep it—what of these ignorant individuals who would destroy it? We must overcome them and wipe them out and continue to progress in the ways seen fit for our welfare and that of our government.

As a student and prospective voter of the United States I feel that such treason cannot exist if we are to continue on in life. There cannot be any motive behind these insane people. If this were to be overlooked a great nation would collapse.

An act as horrible as this cannot and will not go unpunished.

THE BURNING OF THE FLAG

(By Annette Incarbone, eighth grade, first place)

I think the burning of the flag is showing that the boys in the United States are downright cowards. Look at all the boys shedding their blood in Vietnam for the freedom of our country. When our enemies see pictures of the United States flag being torn, dirtied and burned to ashes with no one being punished for it they laugh at the stupid Americans because they feel they are so weak minded.

Anyone who destroys the American flag is an enemy to himself and his country and would think nothing of conspiring with the Communists. They would love to force our freedom into dictatorship.

Our flag stands for freedom and always will.

As an American I feel that people who destroy or mishandle the flag in any way should be punished severely by fines or imprisonment.

I wonder how our forefathers would feel if they were alive today and could see how our flag is maliciously set afire and spit upon knowing of all the blood that was shed to preserve our flag and freedom. Again I say, punishment for those who mistreat our flag. Let us remember Philip Nolan—"the man without a country."

THE BURNING OF THE FLAG

(By Patricia Slesarchik, eighth grade, second place)

On April 15th something happened which all Americans can be very proud of. The American flag was burned by Americans. They should really be proud of what they did for our country. It was a real milestone in what our morals are coming to. When another country burns our flag, everyone is shocked and that is enough to break-off diplomatic relations. So what happens when our own country does it? We can't break off diplomatic relations.

What really gets me is that no one said anything. Nobody stopped it. Are we all so hardened as not to care? This time they can't blame it only on teenagers. There were grownups there too. Why didn't they stop it?

The burning of the flag didn't have anything to do with the war in Vietnam. Oh yes, it started out that way, but even if you don't like the way your country does something, out of respect you would not burn its flag!

Teenagers were *very* fairly represented at the demonstrations. Whose fault is it? Their parents? Maybe. After all, they were supposed to instill in their offspring a respect for their country.

But I doubt if that was the case with all of them. Most likely it was that they would be big shots with their friends. They probably didn't expect it to go so far, and when it did, they were afraid to speak up.

Why? Was it worth it—to lose all of your self-respect for a few minutes of fun?

Surely none of us can be so hardened that we wouldn't be ashamed of what happened.

In contrast, take the pro-Vietnam demonstrations. No disrespect was shown to the United States. Our flag was proudly carried down Fifth Avenue. The people who took part in that can really be proud.

What is this country coming to?

Antiballistic Missile System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM O. COWGER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 19, 1967

Mr. COWGER. Mr. Speaker, on July 6, 1967, in my weekly report to the citizens of my district—Louisville—I predicted "that the President will succumb to a thin defense system, costing between $3 and $5 billion." Today President Johnson and Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara announced that the United States will start building a $5 billion antiballistic missile system which will be a prelude to an expanding defense system that might ultimately cost $40 billion. On June 22, I joined with 35 first-term Republican Members of Congress in urging the administration to immediately establish an adequate ABM system. We sent a strongly worded resolution to Secretary McNamara demanding action at an early date. This was followed up by a meeting with the Secretary of Defense at the Pentagon, where additional arguments were voiced in favor of such a system.

In April, I sent a questionnaire to every resident of Louisville in which I asked the question, "Should the United States immediately begin action on an antiballistic missile system?" Sixty-two and six-tenths percent answered in the affirmative. To my mind, this is a perfect example of citizen participation in their Government. Through their elected representatives in the Congress, Americans have made their views known to the President and to the Defense Department. Continued pressure forced the President and the Secretary to bend to the will of the people.

Another Communist Graces Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. RARICK
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 19, 1967

Mr. RARICK, Mr. Speaker, while gallant Americans of Polish descent struggle to preserve their homes and families in Milwaukee, their National Capital sees a Pole from the Communist-suppressed homeland arriving to aid in the international undermining of these United States.

My prayers are for our gallant Milwaukee fellow countrymen. My political regards but scorn for the Washington Socialists representing the Communist regime of Poland.

Mr. Speaker, I am inserting the Evening Star article of September 13 following my remarks:

NEW ENVOY'S WIFE IS ARTICULATE CAREER WOMAN, TOO

(By Toni House)

She is a satirist, translator, art collector, mother, concert-goer and loves living in an apartment.

She is an outspoken, articulate proponent of the working woman and is a shining example of combining career and home to the advantage of both.

She is the diplomatic corp's newest distaff addition, wife of Polish Ambassador Jerzy Michalowski, who, yesterday, presented his credentials to the President.

The Michalowskis are temporarily in residence at the Washington Hilton. Come the month's end they will move to their permanent residence in the Colonade Apartments over-looking Glover Archbold Park in Northwest.

Such greenery, such trees, raptures Mrs. Michalowski—"There are more trees in that park than in all of Warsaw."

The mother of two sons interrupted a career in television writing three weeks ago when they moved to Washington.

But she has no intention of being a lady of leisure here.

The linguist said yesterday she has a great affection for the English language (which she divides into "English" and "American") and has translated about 15 works into Polish, including Hemingway, Caldwell and Miller.

Raising her eyebrows in a gesture of mock concern, she states her housekeeper once described her as a "woman who does nothing—just sits and reads or writes all day."

TRANSLATES

Before moving to Washington, Mira Michalowski finished translating an adult novel by the late A. A. Milne, author of everyone's teddybear, "Winnie-the-Pooh."

The Polish, she said, have a great affection for Pooh and friend's creator and at his death named a Warsaw street in his honor: "Winnie-the-Pooh Street."

This is not the Michalowskis first tour in the United States. From 1957 to 1960, the ambassador was the Polish envoy to the UN.

"I loved New York," said his wife, "but I find Washington intriguing. I suspect it will take me about 6 months to find my way around."

Ambassador Michalowski replaces former Ambassador Edward Drozniak, who died last November.

The Korean National Science-Cultural Center

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD T. HANNA
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 19, 1967

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, one of the most serious problems confronting the developing nations of Southeast Asia is the shortage of personnel capable of performing the technical tasks inherent in industrialization. Education and training are, of course, the keys to the solution of this problem, but these are not simple processes. Most of the Southeast Asian nations lack any base from which to commence any valuable training program; educational facilities are far below the necessary level. The United States and other friendly developed nations are lending what assistance they can, but this kind of aid has definite shortcomings. First, most often it cannot be adequately extensive. Second, it is Western training and education and does not provide a healthy incentive for the trainee to remain in the homeland—opportunities in the West are far too attractive. Consequently, if the shortage of qualified personnel is to be overcome, it must be overcome by the developing nations themselves.

I would like to make a few comments today on a program recently established in the Republic of South Korea which appears to be an outstanding effort to solve the technical manpower problem. The program is called the Korean National Science-Cultural Center. The program had its actual beginning in March of 1966, when Mr. Joseph Allen Patterson, then Director of the American Association of Museums, was asked to assist in the planning for a new institution to replace their science museum which had been destroyed during the war. From a series of meetings which followed, a plan evolved for a new center with a program combining all aspects of science and technology with the broad spectrum of Korean cultural history. The Korean officials realized that their people lacked an adequate base of understanding to fully appreciate or be of assistance in the rapid technological changes which are taking place in Korea. These officials further felt that the center should provide programs in the cultural history of Korea to help firmly establish for Koreans their historical identity, traditions, and heritage as they continue the remarkable postwar development of their country. By voting to appropriate $25,000 toward the costs of the study, the Cabinet of the Republic of South Korea wholeheartedly approved the plan on December 30, 1966.

A planning study, which will take 1 year, is the first phase of the program. The study is designed to produce a detailed description of the scope, size, priorities, time schedules, and estimates of cost. It calls for a total of $148,000: $83,400,000 from private American foundations and corporations; $25,000 which the Korean Government has voted to appropriate; and $40,000 from the USOM.

Although the proposed Korean National Science-Cultural Center is still in the planning stages, some basic outlines have already been set. Communication will be one of the most formidable obstacles to the success of the center. The center plans to interpret science and technology in terms which are intelligible to the layman by relating the information to the Korean experience, interests, and conditions. A continuous effort will be made to involve the Koreans' interest and participation in the center's program.

Communication will also pose a problem in the sense of dissemination; the Koreans have described this problem as "Milk is found only where the cows are." The scope of the center includes a main building in Seoul, with satellite centers located in other cities, and mobile trucks which will circulate to the rural and coastal villages. The satellite centers will be designed to receive exhibits and programs emanating from Seoul. The mobile trucks will carry exhibits, demonstrations, films, and lectures. Yet, the program must not be limited to these facilities. Information must be communicated wherever and however possible to afford the plan a significant effect on the populous of Korea. Toward this end means of incorporating programs with general educational facilities and other public media, including radio, television, and publications, are being explored.

One of the most important tasks of the planning study is the establishment of priorities of needs of the Korean people. Two are clear. First, the Korean educational system has undergone tremendous expansion in recent years and now needs to concentrate on the quality of the science instruction. Since 1953, the elementary school system has established 5,000 schools and 79,000 schoolteachers to serve more than 5 million schoolchildren. Elementary school is now free and compulsory. The center must consider how it can effectively help the teacher transmit to a class of more than 60 pupils basic concepts of science, such as gravity, sound, weather, or space. If the center can help the elementary school system form a basis among students for scientific comprehension, a tremendous step will have been made toward the technological advancement of the Korean people. Second, programs must be organized to assist the Korean farmer. He must learn to use the chemical fertilizers and insecticides and other progressive measures that agricultural science has developed. Obviously, if the farmers are unable to use these new methods, agriculture cannot benefit from them. The center can be of great assistance in this field.

As the Korean National Science-Cultural Center develops, I am confident we shall see it making a valuable contribution to Korean society. This kind of program can be of much greater importance than the technological advancement it will produce. The emphasis of the entire program will be on Korea; its human, natural, and historical resources; it shall concentrate on the cultural edification of the people as well. In this way the Korean National Science-Cultural Center can help establish a spirit of kinship and allegiance, based in the past—yet expanding into the technological future, that will be of immeasurable value as Korea undergoes its rapid transformation to a modern industrial state. Hopefully Koreans can assist nations in following her example.

The Kee Report—Citizenship Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1967

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include last week's public service television and radio newscast, "The Kee Report."

The subject discussed in this report is the observance of "Citizenship Day":

CITIZENSHIP DAY

This is Jim Kee—bringing you the Kee Report.

Each year on September 17th, we observe Citizenship Day, the day on which we honor those citizens, both native-born and foreign-born, who enter into active citizenship either by having come of age or by naturalization. This is an occasion on which we should remember the deep significance of United States citizenship.

In this report, I would like to outline for you a brief history of Citizenship Day, its purpose and why it should not be forgotten among American patriotic observances.

Citizenship Day is designed to emphasize both the importance of American citizenship and of the rights and duties which it entails under our Constitution. Until 1952, the significance of United States citizenship was observed in early spring on "I am an American Day." This sacred occasion was designed to honor all those who had just attained the full rights and privileges of citizenship. The anniversary of the signing of the United States Constitution, from which all those rights and duties flow, was observed separately.

Citizenship and the Constitution are inseparable. Without the rights guaranteed, and duties imposed by our Constitution, citizenship would be only an empty word. Realizing this, your Congress, in 1952, passed a Joint Resolution, signed by President Truman, uniting these two patriotic observances into one "Citizenship Day."

Citizenship Day celebrates the anniversary of the signing of the Constitution. On this day, we reaffirm our faith in our citizenship and in the principles of our Constitution. This is the week designated as "Constitution Week" to emphasize the vital relation of citizenship to the Constitution.

We should never forget that United States citizenship is a privilege. We all have a sacred obligation to live up to the high standards of achievement established by our fathers and forefathers, the high standards of being responsible United States citizens.

There has never been a period in our Nation's history when the principles of liberty under our Constitution have been more seriously threatened. We need only to look to the nations being attacked by the Communists, or to the millions of people living under Communist domination, who have no rights of self-determination where the state controls every aspect of their lives, to realize the truly great privilege that is ours. This privilege guarantees to each of us, native-born and naturalized, all of the rights protected by our Constitution. Surely the duty of responsible citizenship imposed by our Constitution is a very small price to pay in return for those guarantees.

President Grover Cleveland summed it up when he said: "As we rejoice in the patriotism and devotion of those who lived a hundred years ago, so may others who follow us rejoice in our jealous love of constitutional liberty."

We should never forget that our obligations as United States Citizens are to safeguard our constitutional liberties in order that our children and grandchildren may also enjoy these privileges in the years to come.

Thank you for listening.

Intervenor Delays: Is There a Way Out?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1967

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, hindsight provides little consolation for foresight, particularly when the public interest has been aroused. But unless every facet of a problem is explored before a decision is made, second guessers have every right to ridicule him who would adversely affect the general welfare through lack of proper planning.

With a new awareness for the need to preserve and conserve at least a portion of the American heritage, various industries have suddenly become faced with roadblocks erected by an alert citizenry. Electric utilities, for instance, often meet resistance from the very beneficiaries of their services because the general public is no longer satisfied with an exclusively practical approach to progress. Today the power company must satisfy neighbors of a generating station that air contamination will be kept to an absolute minimum, that water used to produce steam will not imperial aquatic life, that esthetic values will not be ignored.

Actually, there are innumerable questions that may arise before a new powerplant goes onto the drawing board. So many, in fact, that the utility shows poor judgment when it does not attempt to invite every possible objection before it undertakes to proceed with a new facility.

In bringing to the attention of my colleagues an editorial appearing in the July issue of Electrical World, I should like to suggest to the utilities that in the future they approach their planning with the knowledge and assistance of all groups which might become involved in any proposed project prior—repeat, prior—to any development beyond that planning stage. Such a policy would not only preclude unnecessary expense but also avoid adverse criticism that has been occurring with all too much frequency.

The editorial follows:

INTERVENOR DELAYS: IS THERE A WAY OUT?

Intervention by conservationist, civic, historical, farm, sport, and other groups today blocks or retards the construction of generating plants and transmission lines in many parts of the country. The necessity for such plants is argued to little avail.

A prominent New England utility executive provides a measure of the local effect of such intervention: More than 60% of the generation slated for that region during the next six years, he says, is held up or faces delay by intervenors of one sort or another.

The time lost in prolonged public hearings and the expense incurred in ameliorating the bases of complaint, therefore, must be factored into the planning of nuclear, steam, and hydroelectric generating stations and the routing of transmission lines by the electric utilities themselves. Companies facing the need for such facilities must countenance also the possibility of forced abandonment of a particular scheme in whole or substantial part. They have before them conspicuous examples of the results of intervention in the hearings over Cornwall, High Mountain Sheep, and the Keystone 500-kv lines in New Jersey and Pennsylvania.

Such intervention occurs at hearings on practically every governmental level, the Federal Power Commission, state public service commissions, and, in one instance, a city council. Intervenors have demanded to be heard on the putative damage to natural landscape, forests and wildlife, historical structures, and the purity of the air, rivers, and lakes. They have been heard and their cases, discounting oratorical embellishments, often have merit. The administration's program for natural preservation not only gives some objections official recognition, but extends aid and comfort wherever new facilities involve altering the environment.

Planning utilities in this country might profitably look at the way in which the Central Electricity Generating Board has handled this delicate problem in the United Kingdom. On that tight little isle, the CEGB has long faced the difficulties that plague our home utilities today, which were all the more severe there because the CEGB is a governmental agency. The CEGB procedure in anticipation of building a nuclear power station was described recently in a letter by Lawrence Dartwell to this publication (EW, June 12, p 5) and in a prior article (EW, April 17, p 81).

Before authorizing the lifting of a single shovel, the CEGB consulted with county planning officers, the Royal Fine Art Commission, the National Farmers' Union, riparian and other land owners, the Ministries of Defense, Civil Aviation, Agriculture and Fisheries, the Power Inspectorate of Nuclear Installations, and the Board of Trade. This painstaking approach to satisfying the "amenities" paid off.

Closer to home, Laurance S. Rockefeller, chairman of both the Citizens Advisory Committee on Recreation and Natural Beauty and of the Electric Utility Industry Task Force on Environment, interviewed by this publication (EW, March 20, 1967, p 65) pointed out:

"Heretofore each element of our society has drawn up its plans separately. And in this area of preserving or improving the environment, each element has hoped to pass the buck to the other to think through and pay for what really should be a common responsibility. Now what we have to do is preplan together, then work together to find a method for equitably sharing the cost and the common responsibility."

Congress Makes an Incredible Blunder

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHET HOLIFIELD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 19, 1967

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues a perceptive and forceful editorial from the September 15 edition of the Los Angeles Times. On several other occasions this year I have come to the floor to commend a particularly good editorial from this newspaper—this one is no exception. It is entitled "Congress Makes an Incredible Blunder." It deals with the Byrnes amendment which was attached last week to the defense appropriations bill.

The Byrnes amendment, in its singling attack on the good faith and credibility of America's relations with Britain, was perhaps a reflection of the "new isolationism" we hear much about these days. Its damage to our relations with our allies in Britain could far outweigh the few contracts for wooden minesweepers which the amendment sought to protect in certain congressional districts. The Times was not fooled, neither were the 144 Members who voted against inclusion of this petty legislative rider. I am proud to have been one of those who voted to uphold the good faith and credit of our dealings with our British allies. I am also proud to have recognized the false economies of the Byrnes amendment—we may have cut off a $900 billion "nose" to spite a $350 million "face," gentlemen.

Mr. Speaker, the text of the editorial follows:

CONGRESS MAKES AN INCREDIBLE BLUNDER

Congress, by voting to sabotage a U.S.-British arms arrangement which was stacked heavily in America's own favor, is adding a chapter to the record of muddle-headedness which has been all too prevalent on Capitol Hill this year.

Such flagrant disregard for the American national interest, or such astounding ignorance of where that interest lies, does nothing to enhance the congressional reputation for responsible lawmaking.

Unfortunately, it may prove difficult if not impossible to undo the damage which has been done.

The trouble stems from an amendment to the $70 billion defense appropriations bill which went to the White House Wednesday after approval by the Senate.

This amendment prohibits the Administration from allowing British firms to bid for construction of seven U.S. minesweepers worth some $60 million.

It is not surprising that Rep. John Byrnes (R-Wisc.), who has shipyards in his district, should sponsor such a provision. Members of Congress, after all, habitually represent the narrow pocketbook interests of their own constituents.

What is shocking is that the full House adopted the provision by a 233–144 vote, and that the Senate went along—despite the clear threat to the overall national interest.

By imposing the strict "Buy American" requirement, Congress gravely undermined the U.S.-British arms arrangement which was worked out in March, 1966.

Britain agreed to buy $2.6 billion worth of military equipment from the United States. In return, Washington promised that this country would purchase $350 million worth of military hardware from the British.

Can anyone seriously call that a bad bargain for America?

The British are understandably furious over the congressional action, and cries for retaliation fill the air. The Times of London, among others, is urging cancellation of the contract for purchase of 50 F–111 warplanes. That contract alone is worth eight times the money involved in the minesweepers.

Prime Minister Wilson's government is plainly apprehensive, too, that resentment among Britons will boil over into demands for an end to London support for the U.S. effort in Vietnam.

As a practical matter, President Johnson cannot veto the big defense money bill over this one deficiency. But, if the House and Senate really have this country's interests at heart, they should speedily pass a special bill nullifying the Byrnes amendment.

That would be a highly unusual step. But the lawmakers' own recklessness has created an unusual situation.

Progress in the Veterans' Educational Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 19, 1967

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Veterans' Pension and Readjustment Assistance Act of 1967 has just become law. This measure strengthens and improves the cold war GI bill which we passed last year.

I know you all share my deep satisfaction with these two fine pieces of legislation.

The cold war GI bill was enacted in March 1966. The educational benefits it provides became effective June 1, 1966.

In the first 13 months this law was in effect, more than 700,000 veterans applied for educational assistance. Over 470,000 actually entered training. This represents 9.8 percent of the 4,553,000 potentially eligible cold war veterans in civil life.

By contrast, under the Korean conflict GI bill, at the end of the first year 187,600 had entered training. This was 9.6 percent of the 1,955,000 potentially eligible veterans at that time.

Under the Korean conflict GI bill it took more than 2 years before the number participating equaled those entering training the first year under Public Law 89–358—Veterans' Readjustment Benefits Act of 1966.

With the new benefits we have now provided, veterans may now pursue on-the-job training, flight training, and cooperative farm training. We have also provided substantially increased rates of educational assistance allowance. With these more realistic monthly payments, up 30 percent in some cases, the prospects are excellent for increased and broadened participation in the educational assistance program.

Of those who entered training under Public Law 89–358, 95.4 percent were veterans and 4.6 percent were servicemen on active duty, a feature unique to this law. Approximately 99 percent of the trainees were male and 1 percent female.

The World War II GI bill and the Korean conflict GI bill were responsible for upgrading the educational attainments of our veterans and vastly increased our natural manpower resources, expanding both the skills and income levels of our society. The post-Korean GI bill promises to exceed the fine results of prior education programs. For example, under the Korean GI bill 51 percent had entered institutions of higher learning and 49 percent were in training at below-college level. Under our current law, 74 percent entered college and university training and 26 percent were in vocational, technical, and trade schools.

Not only are educational opportunities in this country more readily available to our veterans and servicemen, but for those interested in studying abroad at institutions of higher learning, Public Law 89–358 makes this possible. There are more than 450 colleges and universities in 46 countries throughout the world approved for GI training.

Since the inception of the new educational program through July 1967, over 2,844,000 checks for educatonal benefits have been issued, amounting to more than $259,639,000.

The administration of this vast educational program has been accomplished with surprising efficiency. Payments of educational assistance allowance are made through a computer. This has speeded payments to veterans and at the same time has reduced administrative costs. When this GI bill was enacted, jurisdiction over its educational benefits was returned to the Veterans' Administration regional offices in all 50 States. This wise move has enabled veterans and schools to deal directly with the local regional offices. It has meant improved service to the veterans and has permitted local problems to be speedily solved on a local basis.

From the very beginning of this new program I find that the Veterans' Administration has made continuous improvements in procedures for paying educational benefits. During the first 11 months of operations under Public Law 89–358, the Veterans' Administration required monthly attendance reports from students in colleges and universities, a procedure which was mandatory under the Korean GI bill. Since last May this procedure has been changed. For courses taken at institutions of higher learning, recurring monthly payments are now made without the necessity for monthly attendance reports. This change is fully justified by the fine record of responsible cooperation made by our college students and has expedited payments of educational assistance allowances to them.

The benefits available under Public Law 89–358 have been widely publicized by both the Veterans' Administration and the veterans' service organizations. Truly magnificent cooperation in explaining and administering the program has been obtained from the schools of this country. Over 3 million pamphlets and 1 million posters have been distributed. Representatives of the Veterans' Administration visited and personally talked to thousands of veterans, servicemen, and school officials. This was accomplished through 11,000 orientation sessions, through 1 million personal and phone interviews, through visits to 5,000 schools, and 102 Armed Forces separation points.

I have learned from the Veterans' Administration that the increased educational assistance allowance rates of S. 16 will be made by automatic computer adjustments. In this way there will be no delay in getting the new payments to all students in their October checks, which will be received early in November.

More than 700,000 veterans and servicemen are now expected to receive educational assistance under Public 89–358 in fiscal year 1968. The number receiving such benefits will remain fairly constant at that figure for the following 4 years.

Large as this expanded educational program is, I am convinced that the excellent record of the Veterans' Administration gives us assurance that the splendid service to our veterans and servicemen will continue. Special commendation is due the staff of the Veterans' Administration for the job they have done and are doing in the administration of the cold war GI bill.

Fino Introduces Bill To Restore 100-Percent Medical Expense Tax Deduction for Senior Citizens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1967

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to restore the Federal income tax provisions permitting full deduction of medical expenses—without regard to present floors—incurred for the care of persons over 65 years of age.

Many people do not know it, but, under an amendment to the Federal income tax law passed in 1965, our senior citizens will not be able to deduct the full cost of their medical expenses on their 1967 income tax returns. Of course, most of these expenses will be covered by medicare, but there are expenses which do not come under medicare and our senior citizens will not be able to deduct these from taxable income unless they exceed a certain level.

Frankly, I am disturbed that the Johnson administration, which is wasting money by the buckets all over the world even while bankrolling agitators here at home, has chosen to raise this cash in part at the expense of our aged and infirm senior citizens. I firmly believe that the 100-percent income tax deduction for medical and drug expenses for people over 65 should be restored.

The Late Brent Spence

SPEECH

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1967

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply saddened to learn of the passing of Brent Spence. My affection for this grand Kentuckian, this noblest of the old school of American statesmen, one of the ablest men who ever served in this historic body, began in 1949 when I came as a freshman to the 81st Congress and by kind providence and an assist from the beloved Tom O'Brien, was assigned to the Banking and Currency Committee. That affection grew with every passing year.

I am cradled in sweet memories as I recall the names and the faces of members of the Banking and Currency Committee of the 81st Congress, when Hugh Addonizio, now mayor of Newark, Isidore Dollinger, Hugh Mitchell, and I sat in the steerage, the row of seats below the dais where sat Chairman Brent Spence and Ranking Minority Member Jesse Wolcott, Paul Brown, the valiant warrior from Georgia who established the all-time attendance record of the House, the great Texan, WRIGHT PATMAN, now the distinguished chairman of the committee, MIKE MONRONEY, now an outstanding Member of the other body, Brooks Hays, Albert Rains, Frank Buchanan, whose wife succeeded him on his death, and later she too passed on to the great grief of all who knew her, and ABRAHAM MULTER who, with Chairman PATMAN are the sole remaining members of the Banking and Currency Committee as it was composed in the 81st Congress.

To the left of Jesse Wolcott sat Ralph Gamble, who in his earlier years was one of the great athletes of the world.

In those days the Banking and Currency Committee had no subcommittees. Spence and Wolcott were not only giants in the committee, they were giants in the House itself. Wolcott's district in Michigan, once safely Republican, is now a Democratic district, ably represented by JAMES O'HARA.

Even at that period Brent Spence's sight was failing and he had difficulty reading. So great was his power of concentration and so keen and retaining his mind and his memory that what had been read to him remained with him, and I had been at least 6 months on the committee before I had any inkling of his problem in vision.

Few men have made a richer contribution to the legislative history of our country. I count my long and close friendship with Brent Spence as one of the priceless treasures of my associations in this body.

While the years had taken a physical toll, Spence's mind and his intellect remained as keen as they had been in earlier times and I sensed that it was his desire to die in harness, while still serving as a representative of the people in the House of Representatives. Redistricting and the prospect of a hard campaign in new territory changed the picture of his expectation, and he accepted retirement philosophically. But much would Brent Spence have preferred to remain here, continuing to the last breath the work that he loved so much in the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, one of the all-time greats of the House has passed on.

Extension of Dairy Indemnity Payments Authority

SPEECH

OF

HON. FRANK A. STUBBLEFIELD

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1967

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to extend until June 30, 1968, the legislative authority for the Secretary of Agriculture to make indemnity payments to dairy farmers who, through no fault of their own, have their milk removed from commercial markets because it has been contaminated by residues of chemicals registered and approvel for use by the Federal Government.

The original dairy indemnity authority was contained in section 331 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.

This authority has been previously extended three times by the Congress of the United States, but it expired on June 30, 1967.

Mr. Speaker, S. 1657, as passed by the other body, establishes a separate statutory authority for this program during fiscal year 1968.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. I shall be happy to yield to the distinguished gentlewoman from Missouri [Mrs. SULLIVAN].

(Mrs. SULLIVAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I have no intention of opposing this bill, but I would like to ask the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky, a member of the Committee on Agriculture, several questions about the bill.

As the gentleman stated, S. 1657 continues a program originally written into the war on poverty bill in 1964 to have the Federal Government pay dairy farmers for their losses on milk which had to be destroyed because it contained illegal residues of DDT or other pesticides.

Is it not correct, however, that the main purpose of this extension is to take care of some dairy farmers in Texas whose milk was contaminated, not by the dairy farmers' own use of pesticides, but by the improper use of pesticides by neighboring farmers, with the spray then coming over onto the dairy farmers' crops?

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. I will say to the distinguished gentlewoman that she may be partially correct in that these crops are sprayed by airplanes at times and the wind currents blow the pesticides over into alfalfa fields, which is later fed to the cattle. However, in some cases it would probably be due to other causes.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, when we have the Federal Government pay indemnities to the victim for the wrongful or the accidental misuse of pesticides, do we remove all responsibility for damages from the farmer who committed the improper act which caused the damage? Is this not like having the Government pay damages for one individual's improper acts against another individual? Should not the farmer or the spraying firm which was at fault have to pay damages?

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. In the case of dairy farms, the dairy farmer would have to establish the fact that he was not negligent in the use of the pesticides before he could receive any payment whatsoever.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I have one further question.

Has there been any thought given by the Committee on Agriculture to amend the bill or the program to require the States to pay at least 20 percent of the amount of the Federal subsidy to the farmers receiving this poverty money?

I ask that because of the questions that were raised by the Bureau of the Budget when it sent up its report on this pending legislation.

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. I do not think any consideration has been given to the States participating in this, for the reason that the Federal Government has encouraged the use of these pesticides and, therefore, the problem has largely been a responsibility of the Federal Government.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I realize that the money is to go to the innocent victim. However, what about those responsible for the damage—the spraying firm, or the farmer who does this spraying on his own farm, and then the spray insecticide does go over onto the crops of an innocent victim. What has been done in the effort to make the spraying firm or the farmer conducting the spraying of his own farm pay these damages?

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. It is inevitable that when you are spraying from an airplane that the wind currents will carry it in various directions. I do not believe the spraying firms or the farmer who is having his crops sprayed would do this intentionally, but that, on the other hand, they would take precautions to keep it from contaminating their neighbors' fields.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Would this be a continuing thing, then?

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. No.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Are they trying to stop it so that the residue will not go over into other fields?

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. This is a temporary measure, it merely extends for 1 year this program in order to give Congress, the Department of Agriculture, and other concerned parties a chance to investigate and remedy the situation. This is stated in the report at page 3.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I thank the gentleman.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. I will be happy to yield to the gentlewoman.

Mrs. KELLY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Could the gentleman tell us how much is involved in the loss of dairy products in this program? Is $300,000 enough?

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. I believe the loss has been running about $300,000 or less a year.

Mrs. KELLY. Does the gentleman mean that $300,000 a year has been going on every year?

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. For the last 3 years, yes, between $200,000 and $300,000.

Mrs. KELLY. What are we doing to correct this? I do not understand the answer of the gentleman to the previous question.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. I will be happy to yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LAIRD. We have been spending at the approximate rate of $260,000 a year. This money has been paid from funds made available through the Office of Economic Opportunity because of the poverty nature of this program in which the farmer, through no fault of his own, has his milk condemned by the health authorities.

This is the only form of income that farmer has. Many times milk has been condemned but the farmer himself had nothing whatever to do with the use of insecticides. The funding of this program is not from a direct appropriation, but the funds have come from the Office of Economic Opportunity to fund this particular program.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. I will be happy to yield to the gentlewoman.

Mrs. KELLY. Notwithstanding the background given in the statement of the gentleman from Wisconsin, it is still the taxpayers' money, is it not, whether direct or indirect?

Mr. LAIRD. It is the taxpayers' money, but I felt the gentlewoman would like to know where this is charged to, as far as the appropriation is concerned.

It has been running about $268,000 to $297,000 each year, as I recall it. I do not have the exact figures before me at this time. But that is the manner in which we have funded this program.

Mrs. KELLY. I understand that is about the amount, but my concern is deeper than that in view of the fact that this is charged against the poverty program funds. I believe this is wrong. I am trying to find out what is being done, or what we are going to attempt to do, in the Department of Agriculture to correct this situation.

Mr. LAIRD. This particular bill is an attempt to correct that situation. From now on this will be a direct appropriation which will be provided for this purpose if this bill passes. There will be an authorization and this appropriation can be made, and then we will not have to use the subterfuge of the poverty program in order to take care of these indemnity payments.

I might add there have been no indemnity payments made in my State.

Most of the indemnity payments have been in New York, Maryland, Virginia, Ohio, and Texas. This has been limited to those particular States. Although my State of Wisconsin is America's dairyland, we have not had this problem in the production of milk in Wisconsin.

Mrs. KELLY. To pursue this question further, I want to know what is being done to stop the need for such an indemnity program.

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. May I say to the gentlewoman that the bill S. 1657, as passed by the Senate, establishes a separate statutory authority for this program during fiscal year 1968.

Mrs. KELLY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LAIRD. I would like to make some further comment on this bill.

There is something being done and it is a research program that is presently being carried on not only under the auspices of the Food and Drug Administration and the Public Health Service but in full cooperation with the U.S. Department of Agriculture. This has to do with the use of nontoxic insecticides in the production of milk and feed grains and hay that goes into the production of milk.

So in answer to the gentlewoman from New York, there is much being done in this research program that will be the answer to this and it will preclude the possibility in the future of this kind of indemnity payment.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. I yield to the gentlewoman.

Mrs. KELLY. I have the report here on the "extension of dairy and indemnity payments authority" and on page 2 it says:

> The Department of Agriculture anticipates that milk indemnity payments might reach $2 million during fiscal year 1968, the period of time covered by this legislation.

I still want to know what you are doing to endeavor to decrease that, or to do away with the need for this program, and I have not yet had an answer.

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. I would point out to the gentlewoman, as the gentleman from Wisconsin has said, the dairy co-ops and agricultural colleges and State departments of agriculture and the cotton co-ops and extension services are all cooperating in an endeavor to correct this situation.

I would further say to the gentlewoman that that figure of $2 million should be interpreted rather liberally because I do not think there will be that much involved.

Mrs. KELLY. May I assume then that the cost of the idemnity program will be assumed by the Department of Agriculture from now on and not by the antipoverty program?

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. Yes; it will.

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ECKHARDT. I am generally favorable to this bill and I assume since it is for a rather short period of time, and since it looks toward further study by A. & M. College, I believe at College Station, it would also ultimately yield to some other solution. But I would like to ask this question. Does the bill now permit a subrogation of the Government to that of the dairy farmer who has been wronged by some neighboring farmer?

In other words, could the Government step into his shoes as a plaintiff against another farmer who has wrongfully injured him by the use of the offending pesticide?

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. I suppose that the farmer who is damaged would have to bring a complaint up himself.

Mr. ECKHARDT. Of course, I suppose that he suffers no more damage after the Government pays him off. But the question is, Could there not be some solution, ultimately, perhaps after a study, by which the Government would be placed in the shoes of the original plaintiff, to bring action against the farmer who caused the damage?

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. I do not think that it would be intentional that the farmer would cause the damage. As I say, I do not think a farmer would intentionally do anything to contaminate another farmer's milk. I cannot conceive of such a situation. This merely reimburses dairy farmers who have been seriously damaged by the fact that they cannot market their milk as the result of the use of these pesticides. This is just a matter of adjusting a bad situation where the Department of Agriculture has recommended certain pesticides that have seriously damaged certain dairy farmers.

Mr. ECKHARDT. I see, and I am sympathetic with this at the present time. But it seems to me that at some time in the future, it may be said that a farmer who wrongfully uses pesticides, or a manufacturer who wrongfully recommends their use, should be required to reimburse the Government if the Government reimburses the farmer who is injured.

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. I should think so, after they have found corrective measures.

Mr. ECKHARDT. Surely. I thank the gentleman.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. I yield to the gentlewoman from Missouri.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. May I direct this question possibly to the ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture.

I do not think any of us would oppose a bill to help the farmer who is innocently victimized. We realize that this chemical, DDT, should not be in milk or in any other food. But how can the Government make farmers use DDT in the proper way? What can we do to recapture some of the money we have to pay to the farmer who is damaged by another farmer's actions.

Has the committee given any thought to that question?

Mr. BELCHER. I think that would be a question that would have to be answered by the U.S. Department of Agriculture through Secretary Freeman. If you would write him a letter and ask him why they have not stopped these insecticides from contaminating milk, I am sure he would reply. After all, the Department of Agriculture handles the administration of these problems and the withdrawal of the milk, and they do it on the theory that it contains insecticides. Down in Texas they say that the insecticide blew over from another field that was being sprayed from an airplane. I do not know whether that is so or not, but you have asked the wrong authority. You will have to ask your own Secretary of Agriculture.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I believe that somewhere in the Secretary's letter which is printed in the report he asks the committee to get into this problem, because it is a problem. Perhaps someone else can answer the question.

Mr. BELCHER. If the Secretary of Agriculture or the Agriculture Department, with all the scientists they have down there, cannot determine why this insecticide has gotten into the milk, I do not know how the Committee on Agriculture, on which there are no scientists, could determine that question.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WHITE].

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I am no expert, but, as I understand it, many years ago when the Government condoned the use of DDT, the insecticide was used by many farmers, particularly in my own area by the cotton farmers, and after they ceased using it, it still persisted in the soil. It now turns up in hay and alfalfa even 10 years or more afterward, long after they have ceased to use it. The farmers buy the alfalfa and they try to test it, but these things creep in. The cows ingest it and they retain the DDT. It comes out in the milk. The farmer is the unwitting victim of the indiscriminate use of DDT condoned by the U.S. Government years ago. That is what they are asking indemnification for today.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VANIK. I would like to point out that I oppose this kind of legislation because I think the Federal Government should not take the role of guarantor of a product of this type. I think it is something that ought to be within the purview of the States. The State ought to be held responsible in the dissemination of such insecticides. I do not think the Federal Government should guarantee against this type of thing any more than it should guarantee against the after effects of all these things used by the public or the farmer. I think it is a new endeavor that this Congress should be very reluctant to enter into.

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. Mr. Speaker, may I recall to the gentleman that the Government is taking the milk off the market, and so it does have an interest and responsibility.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Truth-in-Negotiations Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 19, 1967

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, the Cleveland Plain Dealer has conducted a series of excellent articles concerning the waste and improper handling of defense contracts. These articles, written by the Plain Dealer's astute Sanford Watzman, have pointed out the inadequacies of present legislation known as the Truth-in-Negotiations Act. On June 6, 1967, I introduced H.R. 10573, to provide authority to increase the effectiveness of the Truth-in-Negotiations Act, which would correct the deficiencies in the present law.

Mr. Watzman's articles follow:

[From the Cleveland (Ohio) Plain Dealer, Sept. 17, 1967]

DEFENSE PRICE WAR HEATS UP

(By Sanford Watzman)

WASHINGTON.—Price padding of defense contracts is drawing increasing attention on Capitol Hill. The issue is exciting both Democrats and Republicans, with investigations by two major committees on tap.

Target of the criticism is Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara, key man in what President Eisenhower once termed the "military-industrial complex."

McNamara contends his cost reduction program enabled him to save $54 million in the last fiscal year by "buying at the lowest sound price."

This assertion and others like it are the subject of frequent news releases handed out by McNamara's large corps of press officers.

But contradictory evidence has been emanating for some time from Congress' General Accounting Office (GAO), one of the few government agencies that had no press agent until one was hired less than a year ago.

Comptroller Gen. Elmer B. Staats, head of GAO, has repeatedly cited cases where the Pentagon allowed itself to be overcharged for weapons and other materials. These cases, turned up by GAO spot-checking, involve millions of dollars.

But the exact amount of overpricing is not known, since McNamara has refused to institute a comprehensive contract audit program.

Profiteering results from McNamara's failure to enforce the Truth-in-Negotiating Act strictly, GAO charges. Under the 1962 law, contractors must certify that they dealt fairly with military purchasing officers by supplying cost information that was "accurate, complete and current."

When the Plain Dealer published a series of articles last April focusing public attention for the first time on a broad range of GAO reports, Sen. Stephen M. Young, D-O., reacted swiftly. He had the newspaper stories reprinted in the Congressional Record and demanded a congressional investigation.

Meantime, as a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, Young quietly did some checking on his own. He obtained copies of confidential GAO reports and examined findings that had not been made public.

In July he disclosed to the Senate, in a speech entitled "'Private Letters' on War Profiteering," that the "dimensions of this problem are even greater than I first supposed." He reeled off a number of examples.

Rep. William E. Minshall, R-Cleveland, questioned Pentagon witnesses when they appeared before his defense appropriations committee last April, at a closed-door hearing. Last June Minshall introduced legislation to goad the Pentagon into an expanded audit program.

Sen. William Proxmire D-Wis., introduced an identical bill in the Senate.

Proxmire, chairman of the Senate-House Joint Economic Committee, read The Plain Dealer series in the Congressional Record. He ordered that the Truth-in-Negotiating Act be added to an agenda of hearings scheduled last May by his economy-in-government subcommittee.

The subcommittee rendered a verdict last July, accusing the Defense Department of a "disturbing record of loose management." Because McNamara's men are "lackadaisical," there had been "a serious and comprehensive lack of compliance" with the Truth-in-Negotiating Act, the panel said.

Paul R. Ignatius, as assistant secretary of defense, was McNamara's spokesman before the congressional groups. He has since been appointed secretary of the navy. He acknowledged the validity of much of the GAO criticism, but added that the Pentagon had long been working on reforms.

After the Proxmire hearings, the Defense Department proposed new regulations that would require contractors to file corroborating evidence with their "truth" certificates. GAO had complained the Pentagon was accepting the certificates on faith. A final draft of the regulations has not yet come forth.

In addition, Ignatius has informed Staats that the Pentagon was organizing truth-in-negotiating "seminars" for its purchasing officers across the country.

But the Pentagon still has not taken a stand on the Minshall-Proxmire legislation.

Besides the Joint Economic Committee report, McNamara has the censure of the 19 Ohio Republican Congressmen, that party's largest delegation in the House. Rep. Jackson E. Betts, R-Findlay, led the Ohio group into adopting a resolution that called McNamara "lax" and urged corrective action.

Like Sen. Young, Rep. Charles W. Whalen Jr., R-Dayton, has conducted his own inquiry. Whalen is a member of the House Armed Services Committee. He too obtained confidential GAO reports and disclosed new cases of padded pricing in a House speech last August.

Rep. Porter Hardy Jr., D-Va., will hold the spotlight in the weeks to come. He is chairman of the special investigations subcommittee of the House Armed Services committee. His panel expects to open hearings soon, first on the truth-in-negotiating act and then on defense procurement practices generally.

Proxmire's committee will resume hearings later in the year.

Rep. Otis Pike, D-N.Y., is the ranking Democratic member of the Hardy subcommittee. He has won attention recently with disclosures about overpricing. These transactions were not covered by the "truth" act because the dollar amounts were too small. Nonetheless, the Pike findings are being viewed as dramatic arguments for economy at the Pentagon.

[From the Cleveland (Ohio) Plain Dealer, Sept. 18, 1967]

MINSHALL CHARGES STALLING ON TRUTH BILL

(By Sanford Watzman)

WASHINGTON.—Rep. William E. Minshall, R-Cleveland, charged yesterday that Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara is blocking action on a bill to detect padded pricing of defense contracts.

"He's been stalling for more than three months," Minshall said. "I introduced my legislation on June 6, and there hasn't been a word from him since.

"What's he afraid of? Is it that action under the bill would turn up more cases of multimillion-dollar overcharges on contracts-chiseling that could have been prevented had McNamara strictly enforced the Truth in Negotiating Act?"

The Minshall measure, which would open company records to Defense Department auditors, has been pending before the House Armed Services Committee. An identical bill, introduced in the Senate by William Proxmire, D-Wis., is also inactive.

Hearings have not been scheduled because McNamara has not yet filed his comments on the legislation. Congressional committees usually wait to hear from cabinet members before launching proceedings that affect executive departments.

Comptroller Gen. Elmer B. Staats, head of Congress' General Accounting Office, earlier filed a strong endorsement of the legislation.

Over a 10-year period, GAO spot-checking has found overcharges totaling $130 million, forcing contractors to make refunds to the government in many cases.

The GAO reports have been attempts to prod the Defense Department, with its greater number of auditors, to assume responsibility for enforcing the Truth in Negotiating Act through a comprehensive contract audit program.

"How much less tax would be collected if word got around that the Internal Revenue Service had stopped auditing income tax returns?" Minshall asked.

He added: "Don't you suppose, then, that the temptation must be great for at least a few major defense contractors, since they know there will be no Pentagon audit?"

Minshall, member of the House defense appropriation subcommittee, made these observations in a Plain Dealer interview. He was one of the first congressmen to respond to Plain Dealer articles last April revealing a pattern of noncompliance with the Truth in Negotiating Act.

Minshall and Proxmire are trying to bring to a head an issue that has been dragging for years. In the face of this indecision, pentagon purchasing of weapons and other materials has soared to a rate of $125 million a day, with no one in government taking a measure of the amount of fat in this sum.

GAO already has legal authority to examine corporate records on the so-called firm fixed price (FFP) contracts, which cover most major procurements. It has urged the Defense Department to assert the same authority by making it a condition of the contracts it signs.

Eighteen months ago, a House government operations subcommittee remarked that perhaps legislation was needed to clear up any doubt that the Pentagon has such authority.

However, no one on that subcommittee bothered to introduce any legislation, and McNamara did not ask for it.

The Pentagon is split on the issue. Procurement offices are said to be opposed to post-award audits on the ground that the department's relationship with contractors would be damaged if it "second-guessed" them after negotiating and agreeing to a firm price.

Auditors at the Pentagon are reported to favor examination of company books as a matter of principle. "Business like" is the word used by some.

Since both procurement and auditing chiefs report directly to McNamara, it is up to him to resolve the impasse.

Purpose of post-award audits would be to determine whether the contractor acted in good faith when he estimated what it would cost him to deliver on the contract.

"I don't see why it's taking so long, and I'm going to try to find out," Minshall said. "Since a decision has to be made, why not now? Why not, for that matter, 18 months ago?"

Barnard's New President: Dr. Martha Peterson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1967

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, one of the very important things that happens in the city of New York is the continued flourishing of Barnard College. A new chapter is occurring in the distinguished history of this institution with the advent of the tenure of Dr. Martha Peterson as its president.

In the summer of 1967 issue of the Barnard Alumnae magazine, Marjorie Marks Bitker, provides an entertaining portrait of Dr. Peterson. Although Dr. Peterson's years are not yet many, her lengthy list of accomplishments and obvious skill should be a source of pride to Barnard in coming years. Included on this list are her years as an instructor in high school Latin, German, physical education, and mathematics—as a college instructor of mathematics at her alma mater, the University of Kansas—then as assistant dean of women at the University of Kansas and, finally, as full dean of women there. In 1956 she was named dean of women at the University of Wisconsin. In 1963 she became university dean of student affairs for men and women on all University of Wisconsin campuses and special assistant to president Fred Harvey Harrington. She was also president of the National Association of Women Deans and Counselors for 2 years and remains a member of one of its committees. She is, as well, a trustee of Chatham College in Pittsburgh, Pa. It is not surprising that Dr. Peterson was selected from among 134 candidates for the presidency of Barnard College.

As Dr. Peterson's residence in New York will enhance our city, it is to be hoped that our wonderful city will compensate for the distance between her and her beloved secluded wooded area on the shore of Lake Michigan.

I extend a hearty welcome to Dr. Martha Peterson, whose presence will, in particular, be a contribution to my own congressional district in which Barnard College is located.

The article from the summer 1967 Barnard Alumnae magazine follows:

BARNARD'S NEW PRESIDENT: A PORTRAIT OF MARTHA PETERSON

(By Marjorie Marks Bitker)

She is Juno—with a twinkle.

A surrealist might paint her, a tall, broad-shouldered, handsome woman, with a crown of gray-white hair; feet firmly planted in her ancestral wheatfields; eyes steadily fixed on an endless procession of young people moving forward across an ever-changing horizon. And if our painter possessed the visionary skill of a Max Ernst or a de Chirico, no viewer would doubt that those keen eyes, blue as the sea of her Scandinavian forebears, were seeing each of the marching thousands as an individual, with unique needs and goals.

Martha Peterson, Barnard's new president, is essentially a person-to-person person. Not even the responsibility for more than 50,000 students on the University of Wisconsin's 13 campuses has altered this basic tenet of her creed. Friendly warmth is in her handclasp, in her smile, in the generosity of her judgments. Capacious in spirit as in physique (she is five foot nine, with an untrammeled outdoor look), she is endowed with the twin capacities of both being at home in the world and equal to coping with its surprises. Once she has met you, the rapport is palpable as in any other kind of bridge. As one student put it: "When Dean Peterson looks at you, you know she sees you." Not that she likes everything she sees. After all, Kansas, her native state, shares a long border with Missouri. Specious behavior, muddle-headedness, discourtesy, don't sit very well with Martha Peterson.

She was born 50 years ago on a 160-acre wheat farm near Salina, Kansas, the only child of Anton and Gail French Peterson. Her mother's people, of English stock, migrated from Vermont via Canada and settled on the Kansas plains in the 1850's. Her paternal grandfather, a Baptist minister born in Denmark, made his way west from New York and, reaching Kansas, was given a little two-acre corner of the French homestead on which to build a church. The church, made of rock, still stands. "Saron Baptist Kirk (pronounced with a rolling Danish r as *keerk*) 1878" is carved over the entrance. Surrounded by its tiny family cemetery, it is now an official Kansas historical site.

"I have the same name as my grandmother who is buried there," says Dean Peterson with a wry smile. "It gives me quite a turn to see my name on her headstone." The farm, complete with *"keerk"* and the original farmhouse, will one day belong to Martha Peterson.

At the University of Kansas, she earned her Bachelor's degree and a Phi Beta Kappa key; later, at the same University, going on for her M.A. and Ph.D. Along the way, she taught high school Latin, German, physical education, and mathematics, and began her college teaching career as an instructor in mathematics at her alma mater. She took additional graduate work at Northwestern and Columbia. In 1952, after two years as Assistant Dean of Women at the University of Kansas, which then numbered 8,500 students, she was appointed full Dean of Women. Four years later, she became Dean of Women at the University of Wisconsin. In 1963, she was named University Dean of Student Affairs for men and women on all University of Wisconsin campuses, and special assistant to President Fred Harvey Harrington.

During her incumbency at Wisconsin, the student unrest that is sweeping the country has been a source of concern there, as elsewhere. Her attitude, sympathetic but firm; her habit of trying to get to the root of a problem before taking action; her regard for the welfare of the individual as well as for the institution, have won renewed respect for her abilities.

Long an active member of numerous academic associations which she has served with distinction, she was for two years President of the National Association of Women Deans and Counselors and is still acting on one of its committees. She is also a trustee of Chatham College in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, and feels she has learned much from that experience about the special needs of smaller colleges.

The Special Selection Committee considered 134 candidates for the Barnard presidency during its year of search. In May, the Board of Trustees at a special meeting unanimously endorsed the name of Dr. Martha E. Peterson. When the Barnard presidency was first offered to her, she was, though enormously interested, not at all sure she would accept. What sort of challenge would there be in a college with so small an enrollment? How would her years in public higher education equip her to adapt to the "narrower" field? How would she, essentially a country-oriented human being, manage to exist in the most urban of urban environments?

The first time she went east to talk to the Special Selection Committee, she was dubious; the second time, to talk to faculty, less so; and when finally she had a chance for a frank discussion with Columbia University President Grayson L. Kirk (himself an ex-UW professor) and Dean of Columbia College David B. Truman, her last doubts vanished. The challenge, though of a different sort from any she had ever encountered, was certainly there; so was the assurance of a uniquely splendid faculty; independence of—and cooperation with—the great University of which Barnard is part, and a student body of the highest quality. At Barnard, in what she calls "a smaller climate", she will, she feels, be able to work more closely with individuals. Previously, when confronted with problems or crises, she has set in motion the means of coping with them. In an environment involving hundreds, not thousands, she will have the satisfaction of seeing things through from start to finish rather than leaving the finish to others.

She is open-minded in regard to student protests, and thinks there is something odd about young people who do not question established policy. "Organized" protests are something different. Although often she sympathizes with their cause, she does not sympathize when the protestors interfere with the rights of others to work and to speak their own minds. Beyond the political turmoil in the world, she attributes present unrest to several chief factors: the undisputed atrophy of parental authority; the general decline of moral standards; the absence on the contemporary scene of "hero figures." At Wisconsin, she has been acknowledged champion of student rights. President Harrington himself has remarked that although in the discussion of University policy, certain members of the administration sometimes fail to take into account how a given policy might affect the students, Martha Peterson never forgets.

During her years of responsibility for student affairs, she has maintained mutually satisfying relations with a surprising number of individual students. Her face glows when she speaks of their progress and triumphs. A staunch believer in personal initiative, she supports the concept of independent study now being contemplated at Barnard. In fact, the capability of change is, according to her, basic to any worthwhile institution of learning. To a reporter from *The Milwaukee Journal* she remarked during an interview:

"Every educational institution has to be willing to adopt change when it's indicated. It must be relevant to its time."

Her idea of education for women is that "students should be thought of as people, not as men or women. . . . Now that women's rights are won, the only thing lacking is enough women who can and are willing to give the time, energy, and devotion it takes to use their talents." She is glad that Barnard and Columbia students have the privilege of exchanging and sharing academic opportunities when the situation warrants.

She herself might serve as the model of a woman who has given super-generously of her own time, energy, and devotion to reach her present peak. This has been possible, she admits, only through determined periodic retreats from professional activity. Though her main base in Madison is in a near-campus area facing the University arboretum, she has frequent access to the country home of two close physician friends, where she spends many peaceful week-ends away from the grind, in her favorite relaxation of long nature walks and canoeing in season. But for really significant vacations, she has her dream house.

This is a cottage on the sandy shore of Lake Michigan that she owns with one of her doctor friends. It is in a secluded, wooded area beside a fine sandy beach in Door County (sometimes referred to as the Martha's Vineyard of Wisconsin).

The house, built in 1964 after several years of tenting vacations, has been a source of joy to its owners. There, in peace and isolation, the two women spend even winter holidays. "I can't take New Year's Eve in civilization," says Barnard's new President. And it seems quite unlikely that any elevation in her academic status will change this predilection.

Soon after the news of her Barnard appointment was released, she and her friend, arrayed in old sweaters and jeans, left Madison to clean up the Door County house for spring. Stopping en route at a road-side auction to see if they could pick up this or that, Dr. Peterson was approached by a soberly clad gentleman who congratulated her on her appointment. He was, she discovered to her embarrassment, the Assemblyman from her district. "I'm sure he didn't think I could be the president of anything looking like that," she said.

Most of the newspapers picked up the fact of her interest in outdoors. This has produced dozens of invitations from fellow nature-lovers (both known and unknown) to go on bird walks and canoe on various bodies of water, from the Hudson River to remove lakes in the Adirondacks.

"I'd like to accept them all," she confessed over the luncheon table during this interview. "But I doubt if I'll have the time for a year or two. Besides, I hope to spend my summers in Wisconsin."

She looks forward with enthusiasm to living in New York and will try to find a home that is not ornate, and that is hospitable to the family heirlooms she enjoys. "I'm adaptable," she said. "And very excited."

The jungles of Manhattan do not frighten her. "Week-ends? Oh, I suppose eventually I'll find some way to get out of town. But at first I'll spend my free time getting acquainted with the city. There are so many cultural adventures right there. The Egyptian collection at The Metropolitan Museum of Art, for instance . . .," she said, looking dreamy. In 1966, Dean Martha Peterson was invited by Dean Frank W. Blaning of the American University in Cairo to conduct a two-week workshop for students there. It was one of the most interesting experiences of her life, and left her with a lasting interest in Egyptology. She left behind her, as one would expect, many friends among faculty and students. "But," she observed, *à propos* of the current crisis in the Middle East, "even then, while I was being briefed, I was warned that there was one subject I must stay away from: Israel. And I did. The present situation is no surprise to me, but I am worried. About what will happen to the world, of course. And to my old friends there."

Among the new friends she looks forward to meeting are the Associate Alumnae of Barnard College. She has not gone very often to her own alma mater for reunions. Having faithfully attended her 25th, she chose to stay away from any others, mainly because it seemed to her that the worst, not the best, of the college life she had known was being emphasized.

"Too much football, too much rah rah, too much stress on money and worldly success. A good alumni association should represent the very best of what was present in contemporary college life," she said.

"This may sound corny, but I really mean it when I say that the Barnard alumnae I happen to know have been a positive influence in my decision to accept the presidency."

One of her close friends is Professor Emily Chervenik '32, who is Coordinator of the University of Wisconsin Placement Services and President of the Midwest Placement Association.

Miss Peterson is notable for her striking appearance; even more for her personality, and will leave behind her a void difficult to fill. But she also will leave ineradicable evidence of her 11-year University of Wisconsin tenure: high on the list the creation of student-faculty committees where only faculty committees existed before. She leaves behind, too, the example of a woman, professionally and personally qualified, working side by side with men in the higher academic administrative echelons. Traditionally, Barnard's President has possessed this quality—and needs it, on both sides of Broadway.

As President Harrington commented: "Her wisdom and skill have been invaluable to Wisconsin. She will carry on Barnard's tradition of outstanding leadership."

Whatever she may bring to the College during her years of office, you may be sure that it will be neither arbitrary nor static. She is a firm believer in continuing education for men and women, not only in the classroom, but everywhere, all their lives.

"If we don't keep learning, what is living for?" she asks.

It is a good question, and she herself is the answer.

THE LONG, HARD JOB OF PRESIDENTIAL SELECTION

The selection of Martha Elizabeth Peterson as Barnard's new president climaxed an arduous ten-month search, the longest conducted in recent years for a head of the College. The search went on at a time when an estimated 300 colleges and universities—among them Michigan, California, Stanford and Haverford—were seeking presidents and deans.

One hundred and thirty-four candidates were considered for Barnard's presidency, in contrast to the 45 considered during 1959–61, after Millicent C. McIntosh announced her intended retirement. When Dean Virginia Gildersleeve retired in 1945, 60 names were considered. This time, 36 of those considered by the eight-member Presidential Selection Committee were men.

The committee, which met 25 times during the year, considered three basic criteria in reviewing candidates: scholarship, administrative ability and age. The preferred age range was between 40 and 50, because it was hoped that the new president would be able to serve at least 10 years.

Miss Peterson was first recommended to the committee by Marjorie Marks Bitker '21, an alumnae trustee.

Samuel R. Milbank, chairman of the Board of Trustees, was Chairman of the Committee and Jean T. Palmer was Secretary. The other members were trustees Wallace Jones, Mrs. John Elliott, Jr. (Eleanor Thomas '48), Mrs. Frederick Woodbridge (Catherine Baldwin '27); Professor Mirra Komarovsky; Dean Henry Boorse and Columbia College Dean David B. Truman.

Extension of Dairy Indemnity Payments Authority

SPEECH

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1967

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted that the gentleman from Maryland gave such a good explanation, because I think the questions we have been asking needed to be answered. Most of us who raised questions are not objecting to this bill. We want our food to be as pure as possible, and particularly so in the case of milk. The farmers whose milk was accidentally tainted through no fault of their own should have the burden lifted from their shoulders as this bill would do. But there ought to be some kind of study to find out how this indemnity program can be phased out, and to find out if some farmers are spraying under wind conditions when they should know that the spray will go over to some other area. If they are doing that, they should be stopped, or held liable. This is what I wanted to add.

Catawba County Memorial Hospital Dedication

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVID N. HENDERSON

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1967

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, the people of North Carolina have demonstrated their willingness on every occasion to support the Nation's effort to provide the very best of medical facilities. Many new hospitals have been built throughout North Carolina during the past several years.

I was very pleased to note over the weekend an article in the September 15 edition of the Observer-News-Enterprise, published at Newton, N.C., that the people of Catawba County, N.C., were dedicating a magnificent new $6 million hospital on September 17.

I was gratified to note that our distinguished colleague from North Carolina, the Honorable BASIL L. WHITENER, was to make the dedicatory address for the new Catawba County Memorial Hospital.

The people of Catawba County are to be congratulated on their new medical facility. I believe the Members of the House will be interested in reading the dedicatory address of our distinguished colleague from North Carolina. I include the speech, together with the story of September 15 from the Observer-News-Enterprise in the Appendix of the RECORD:

ADDRESS BY BASIL L. WHITENER, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, AT CATAWBA COUNTY MEMORIAL HOSPITAL DEDICATION, SUNDAY, SEPTEMBER 17, 1967

I am highly honored to be with you today for the dedication of this magnificent new hospital. This is a great occasion. The hopes and dreams of many of the people of this community for the most modern medical facility possible are fulfilled.

The citizens of Catawba County are to be commended for bringing this project to a most successful conclusion. Those individuals who gave over and beyond the call of duty in the expenditure of their time and resources to bring this hospital into being deserve special praise and commendation.

This new hospital is symbolic of the dynamic and progressive community spirit prevailing in Catawba County. Catawba is one of the foremost counties in North Carolina in industry, education, and agriculture. Catawba is one of the fastest growing counties in the state. The years that lie ahead hold even greater promise for her citizens.

Nothing is more important to the well-being and advancement of our people than health. One of the great reasons the United States has forged to the forefront as the leader of the community of nations is that we have not suffered some of the ravages of the age-old enemies to health which plague nearly two-thirds of the rest of the world.

Through the generosity of the American people malaria, tuberculosis, typhoid fever, and many of the other diseases common to the less developed areas of the world are being conquered. Our humanitarian program of medical assistance to the less privileged peoples of the world is in keeping with the highest Christian traditions of our nation. Not only does our great nation stand as the bulwark of political freedom in the world; in the minds and hearts of countless millions of people throughout the world America also stands as the best hope of mankind for freedom from disease.

We have not been without problems with respect to health. While many of the killing and crippling diseases prevalent as recently as 30 years ago have been conquered we still have great challenegs remaining in the field of public health.

In conquering tuberculosis, pneumonia, diphtheria, smallpox, typhoid, tetanus, and a host of other diseases the life expectancy of the American has been remarkably increased.

In 1900 an American could expect to live 49 years. Modern medicine has made it possible for man's life span in our country to be increased today to 70 years. The future holds even greater promise of longer and more enjoyable life.

The advances that medicine has made in the last 50 years could not have been possible without the fine facilities offered by our hospitals and research centers. Through private and public medical research and medical discoveries we have seen a lessening of the hazards of childbirth and pregnancy. The scourge of common diseases of previous years is now only an unhappy memory. New drugs and appliances have brought hope and life to many who would have been doomed in other years.

Dr. John F. Gillespie of the Georgetown Medical Center, Washington, D.C., one of our foremost medical authorities, has stated that the basic vehicle in medicine today is the modern hospital.

The hospital as we know it, however, is an institution of comparative recent origin. Although our first general hospital was built 25 years before the signing of the Declaration of Independence, hospital construction progressed slowly in the United States until about 1920. The medical experiences of the First World War gave impetus to new medical research and to the construction of hospital facilities.

In 1920 only $63 million were expended in both public and private funds for hospital construction. By 1930, however, the nation was spending $227 million in private and public funds for hospital construction. World War II further accelerated the nation's interest in heightened medical research and hospital facilities.

As a result, the Hill-Burton Hospital and Medical Facilities Survey and Construction Act of 1946 was enacted. This act has resulted in the construction of many facilities in every state.

The Hill-Burton program in the past 20 years has contributed to more than 8,375 hospital projects in 3,445 communities. As of July 1, 1966, the total cost of these projects was $8.2 billion, of which the Federal Government had contributed $2.6 billion. As these expenditures indicate, the great majority of the funds expended in cooperation with the Hill-Burton program have been private and local government funds.

The program is designed to meet the medical and health needs of tomorrow. Future grants will be made for the construction and modernization of hospitals, for public health centers, nursing homes, and other health facilities for research and demonstration projects in hospital operations, utilization, design, construction, equipment, and projects for the area-wide planning of health facilities.

While the cost of hospital construction is great, the expense involved in adequate medical research, hospitalization, and medical attention for our citizens is infinitely greater. No one has intimated, however, that a nation which spends billions of dollars for luxury items cannot afford the $43 billion for America's annual private and public health medical care bill.

We stand upon the threshold of a new era of medical research. The future will bring a renewed and vigorous attack on the remaining major diseases which cripple, retard, and kill our people.

In his message on education and health delivered to the Congress on February 28, 1967, the President stated: "I am directing the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare to appoint immediately a lung cancer task force to supplement the continuing work of existing task forces on leukemia, cancer, chemotherapy, uterine cancer, solid tumors and breast cancer."

The President also stated that the nation must marshal our best minds to design hospitals, nursing homes, and group practice facilities which will provide effective care with the most efficient use of funds and manpower. He asserted that it was necessary for the nation to develop new ways for existing doctors to reach more people with good health services.

One of the most pressing medical needs in the nation is to provide additional medical manpower resources. In this connection I believe you will be interested to know that during 1967 Federal, State, and local programs will train 224,000 health workers, an increase of nearly 100,000 over 1966. More than 30,000 previously inactive nurses and technicians will be given refresher training this year.

This splendid new hospital stands as a monument to the vision and determination of the people of Catawba County to provide the very best in modern medical care and services. This hospital is a part of the vast and expanding network of medical facilities now being constructed and planned.

This nation cannot afford a lethargic attitude in hospital construction, in the training of medical personnel, or in medical research. The demands for enlarged and improved medical services must be met.

Although our nation is relatively young in the family of nations, our prolonged life span increases the number of our senior citizens. There are more than 19 million Americans today who are 65 years of age and older. This is equal to the total population of 20 of our states.

When the health insurance program authorized under the Social Security Act went into effect on July 1, 1966, approximately 19.9 million aged Americans were entitled to hospital insurance benefits. This program makes all of us realize the need for better and enlarged medical facilities for the citizens of our nation.

Private donors have been generous with their funds. The Congress and local, state, and Federal governments have not hesitated in following the popular mandate to provide public funds for health services.

Through this new hospital the people of Catawba County will share in the great advances being made in medicine. I again salute you for your foresight in providing for this magnificent facility.

[From the Observer-News-Enterprise, Newton, N.C., Sept. 15, 1967]

A New Day in Care for the Ill

Modern-as-tomorrow Catawba Memorial Hospital will be the subject of an open house Sunday, Sept. 17.

Dedication of the six-million-dollar 203-bed hospital is scheduled for 2 p.m. with Congressman Basil L. Whitener giving the keynote address.

Immediately after the address and ribbon-cutting, the hospital will be open for inspection for the remainder of the day.

A special invitation has been extended the public by the hospital board of trustees, medical staff, and personnel.

Special guests during the pre-tour ceremonies will be officials of Duke Endowment, the N.C. Medical Care Commission and staff members of Joseph Bluemencranz and Associates.

Trustees David Hunsucker and L. B. Hardesty are chairman and vice chairman respectively of the open house committee. Serving with them is Joe Moretz and Charles C. C. Bost.

This committee along with members of the governing board, medical staff and their wives, Red Cross volunteers and Jaycees and Jaycettes of Newton-Conover and Hickory will assist in the guided tours through the four story structure.

Plans have been made to accommodate several thousand visitors on tours. Welcomes will be extended by hospital trustees, doctors and their wives and other hospital personnel.

The facility, to be staffed by some 275 persons, is the second ever built as a county owned and operated hospital. Its talking stages extend back to 1960. A $4 million bond issue was passed by voters in 1963. Other financing was made possible through Duke Endowment and Federal Hill-Burton funds, made available through the N. C. Medical Care Commission.

Although the new building is substantially completed, it was pointed out by administrator James E. Case, its actual opening to patients will be sometime in the future.

The medical staff at Catawba Memorial Hospital is composed of some of the foremost physicians, surgeons and specialists in the nation. These include fulltime or active members, consulting members, and courtesy members. Dentists are also on the staff.

Developments of modern medicine have made the efficient hospital essential to the diagnosis and treatment of nearly all the diseases within which the physician has to deal. The community, through its hospital, provides the physician with the facilities necessary for carrying on his work.

Taking advantages of this invaluable support of his profession the physician seeks a privilege, that of becoming a member of the medical staff of the hospital. When he is granted that privilege he, in his turn, assumes certain responsibilities, such as to provide the best possible service for every patient admitted and entrusted to his professional care; and to do his share in maintenance of general efficiency.

Functions of an organized medical staff such as that at Catawba Memorial Hospital may be summarized as follows: providing professional care of the sick and injured in the hospital; maintaining its own efficiency; self-government; participating in education; auditing the professional work; and furnishing advice and assistance to the administration of the hospital.

The professional care of the sick and injured is the essential responsibility of the hospital's medical staff, the duty for which its members exist and around which all their activities are centered. Members of the Catawba Memorial Hospital's medical staff realize through years of training and experience that they must maintain their own efficiency and, in the care of the sick and injured, must always be capable of producing the results for which they are striving, results that the hospital and the patient both have a right to expect.

Catawba Memorial Hospital staff members live up to the qualifications required and enforced by the hospital and the staff itself. A member of the staff in a reputable, ethical hospital must be a graduate of a recognized school of regular medicine; he must be legally licensed to practice in the state in which the hospital is located; he should have served at least one year of internship in a hospital approved for interns by the Council on Medical Education and Hospitals of the American Medical Association.

The staff member should also have the reputation for being an ethical and competent physician, one who lives up to the codes of ethics of the American Medical Association and the American College of Surgeons; he should be a supporter of organized medicine as shown by his memberships in local, state, and national medical societies.

If the staff member claims the standing of a specialist he should have had such training and experience as will warrant his recognition by the national society of examining board representing his specialty; and finally, he should possess a temperament and disposition that will enable him to work harmoniously with fellow members of the staff and with the administration.

President Johnson Signs Cold War GI Bill of Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1967

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson made very appropriate remarks when he signed the cold war GI bill of rights into law on August 31, in the East Room of the White House. I commend the President's address to every veteran in the United States, to my colleagues, and to all the American people:

Mr. Vice President, Senator Yarborough, Congressman Dorn, Congressman Teague, other Members of Congress, Mr. Driver, ladies and gentlemen:

Today I have asked you to come here and join with me as I sign a measure that I feel will keep faith with this generation of our servicemen.

It is a way of saying to these men at arms in Vietnam and elsewhere that America does not forget.

It will also help needy veterans who have followed their country's flag in our past conflicts. .

This bill before us does three things:

It gives returning servicemen more money to help them pursue their education, or train for jobs and skills under the new GI Bill that we signed last year.

It will especially help those who have families make ends meet.

Second, it removes an inequity. It gives those now in service the same veterans benefits that have been granted to their brothers in other wars.

Third, it shows compassion toward the older and the poorer veteran, his widow and his children by increasing pension payments an average of 5.4 percent. This will make their standard of living a little better.

All of this will come at a time when we must exercise the utmost restraint in our spending. I reaffirm that necessity now.

Our budget is seriously deficient, and the deficit could run into many billions of dollars.

The first full year's cost of this bill is estimated to exceed by $115 million the amount the President proposed to the Congress. But it was passed without a single dissenting vote in either House.

This might reflect the fact that 148 members of both Houses remember from their own experience—and if they don't remember it, I am sure Senator Yarborough and Congressman Teague reminded them—the great assistance which the GI Bill can provide.

One compelling fact about this increase persuades me that it can be accepted in good conscience, because most of these extra funds are investments in education, and are investments in job training, for all of those who have borne the burden of military service.

Both of these are crucial to the completion of this Nation's work. Both are cornerstones of this Administration's program.

The GI Bill, itself, has been one of the best investments, I think, we have made as a people. I congratulate all the Members of Congress who have provided the leadership in that great effort.

Since I signed the GI Bill just 18 months ago, about a half-million returning servicemen and women have used its benefits to go back to school, or to train themselves for a better life. More than half a million Americans stack arms each year—their service over.

One day the numbers of men whom we must call upon in time of conflict to protect all of us will be reduced, because one good day the world is going to be at peace.

With every resource at my command I am working in every way I know how to hasten that day.

I welcome all the help that I can get along the way.

We are, and we will be, searching for a peaceful resolution to the war in Vietnam—every single day, and every single waking hour.

The forces who launched that war now, at this moment, are tragically using every terroristic plan, practice or device they can conceive to try to stop the people of Vietnam from freely electing their own government.

The aggressors must realize that they cannot defeat the efforts of the South Vietnamese people to secure and strengthen their nation, nor can they, by their speeches or their propaganda, deter America's commitment to assist them.

Until that realization comes, then we Americans are going to—we Americans must—man the line where that commitment runs.

This bill that is before us today is in great part for those men who man that line.

To those men who man that line, their Congress and their President are glad to sign together today to extend to them this modicum of recognition for the great sacrifices that they made for us throughout the years and that they are making particularly right now.

Riots and the Pros

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1967

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Polish American, a progressive publication serving the Polish-American citizens of the Chicago metropolitan area, has earned a reputation for objective editorial policy.

I deem their September 16 editorial to be of special interest and worth, of thoughtful scrutiny by the Members and, therefore, insert it in the RECORD at this point:

RIOTS AND THE PROS

One of the nation's leading Negro newsmen, writing from Detroit recently for national distribution, revealed that prior to the Detroit riots squads of phony magazine salesmen invaded the riot area, telling residents they were young college students working their way through southern colleges.

They obtained what information they could, asked families why they allowed white people, especially Jews, to own the stores in their neighborhood, who owed stores the most, so as to profit from burnings etc.

These advance men were followed by professionals who knew how to burn and loot, and—at least in the case of Detroit—the police helped when the moment came to trigger the riot. Following orders, they didn't attempt to arrest the looters who began breaking windows or mobs which ran amuck in the first hours.

During the rioting, some window breakers revealed they had also been at the game in Newark. These revelations, by writer Louis Lomax, come as evidence appears that black power advocates like Stokely Carmichael are dedicated to the use of force, because of a conviction that the political structure of the nation can't be changed without first reducing society to ashes.

Thus the picture shaping up for the nation is a grim one and some recent riots might not have been as spontaneous as has been assumed. Good citizens of all races regret the recent turn of events. And while every fair-minded American will stand up for equal opportunity and equal rights for all, they will also favor punishment of professional instigators of lawlessness, who follow the Castro-Peking revolution philosophy.

William Randolph Hearst, Jr., Writes: Lambasting the President Is Unfair—"He Is Getting Blame He Doesn't Deserve"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1967

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, William Randolph Hearst, Jr., the distinguished editor in chief of the Hearst newspapers, has written a most perceptive editor's report entitled "The Heat in the Kitchen."

The thesis of this report is that President Johnson is being blamed and criticized unjustly—and that those who are most vocal in their criticism are those who should be most grateful for the courage the President has shown in championing various programs and policies.

Because of the interest of my colleagues and the Nation in this most important matter of public and national interest, I include this editor's report, by Mr. Hearst, in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The report follows:

EDITOR'S REPORT: THE HEAT IN THE KITCHEN

(By William Randolph Hearst, Jr.)

NEW YORK.—During the last week of my reluctantly-ended vacation at San Simeon I prepared for the chore of resuming this column by doing more reading than time generally allows. I didn't have to look far for a theme.

It's really amazing. Whatever news magazine I picked up, whatever commentator or pundit whose deathless prose. I encountered in print, or on the air waves, all seemed to be engaged in discussing the same topic—Lyndon B. Johnson "in trouble."

Lambasting the President these days is practically a full-time job for his howling pack of vociferous critics. He is being bedevilled, reviled, belittled and beset on all fronts. And I, for one, think it's damned unfair.

The points I propose to make here are not intended as a defense of Mr. Johnson, per se. He's a man who can take care of himself. Furthermore, I am hardly what you would call a life-long, dyed-in-the-wool Democrat.

But the fact is the President is getting all kinds of blame he does not deserve. And little or no credit for what he does deserve. It offends my sense of fair play to see him so unjustly attacked for whatever happens in Vietnam, for the riots in our cities, for lack of congressional action on civil rights and social programs and for practically everything else that's wrong.

What I would like to try to do here is to put things in a clearer perspective, to encourage a little sober reflection on what Mr. Johnson has done and is attempting to do, and even possibly influence some of his critics to use logic instead of invective.

There's not much chance of any success on the last point, not when you line those critics up and take a look at them. They're a great bunch.

Over here we have the unwashed beatniks. Over there are the pink-eyed super liberals. Behind them are such racist anarchists as Stokely Carmichael and H. Rap Brown. Howling loudest are the enemy-serving stop-the-bombing gang and congressional popoffs led by Democrats Sen. J. William Fulbright and Sen. Robert F. Kennedy, and countless Republicans whose names escape me at the moment.

The latest to join the gang is a beaut—that sterling, tongue-tied Governor of Michigan with the halo of white hair over his ears, George Romney. This new war critic who would be President himself now claims he was "brainwashed" into his earlier support of the Vietnam war effort.

This might be funny if it weren't for the mischief a man in Romney's position can create. But still, imagine having a President who proclaims he can be brainwashed by a high-pressure sales talk. If he ever got in the White House they wouldn't dare let him out of the country. I hate to think what would happen to him at the hands of the diplomatic slickers in Moscow, England, France, Rome or even India.

Any fair-minded person who examines the various charges being leveled at President Johnson, either directly or by snide implication, will find they just don't stand up. Let's take a brief look-see at the three major areas in which he is taking the most abuse—Vietnam, the Negro problem and social legislation:

Not even the President's severest critics can accuse him of starting the war; he inherited it. Whether his policies are right or wrong, only time will tell. Meanwhile, in accordance with the advice of the nation's most experienced experts, he has chosen a course of action and is sticking to it.

That course of action, no matter what anyone says, is clearly aimed at achieving a just and lasting peace in Vietnam by arresting Communist aggression. Our commitment to contain Communism is not new; we followed it in Korea, Berlin and Cuba. It is a highly honorable commitment, and the honor of the nation is at stake. In pursuing it, President Johnson—far more than anyone else in the world—at the same time has done everything in his power to get peace talks under way. Yet every one of his initiatives has been spurned by the enemy.

Just as nobody has done more to get us out of Vietnam than Mr. Johnson, so no President with the exception of Abraham Lincoln has done more for the American Negroes. His record on civil rights exceeds even that of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, whose philosophy of spending to help the poor he adopted and expanded. Time and again he has defied Southern political forces by naming qualified Negroes to high office, even to the U.S. Supreme Court.

One would think the liberals who are so busy criticizing the President would instead be commending him for his civil rights record. The thing that strikes me as especially interesting on this point is that the great majority of the Negro population knows what Mr. Johnson has done and is trying to do for them. No single group in the country was subjected to a more concerted organizational drive by the Communists, yet that drive notably failed. So far as loyalty to their country is concerned, the record of our Negroes as a group is far better than that of some of our intellectuals and college professors.

Social legislation, of course is interlinked with the problems of underprivileged Negroes. Here, again, the sweep and number of Johnson-sponsored laws passed by the last Congress is without precedence in our history. The slowdown in further action by the present Congress is certainly not the President's fault, nor his desire.

His administration has spent tremendous sums of money to improve the lot of our poor, both in the cities and elsewhere. Yet he is accused of not spending enough when mass rioting continues in the cities—even though what happened in Detroit and New Haven proved that money alone is not the answer. There is no simple answer to social unrest and President Johnson has done all a sound executive can do by summoning the nation's best brains to work out effective remedies.

And so, right down the line, we find a man in the White House who is wrestling with tremendous problems. He is doing what he believes to be the best for his country according to the dictates of his truly liberal conscience based on the most expert advice available. I think, under the circumstances, he is doing very well. At least as far as I'm concerned I have not heard anybody make any suggestions which are preferable.

The man unquestionably has a most serious drawback. He speaks with a Texas accent and that's against the grain of our self-proclaimed enlightened intellectuals. They prefer the Oxford variety or that Harvard accent with which they were charmed by F.D.R. and Jack Kennedy. With them, apparently, it's not so much what you say as how you say it.

If Mr. Johnson has this drawback, he also has a counterbalancing asset. That big plus is his remarkable patience and inflappability. His self-control in the midst of the critical storm raging about him sometimes seems superhuman. Yet, after all, why should he bother to answer every heckler who comes along—most of whom are far beneath him intellectually, morally and in every other way?

Another of our down-to-earth Presidents, Harry S. Truman, once remarked when the going was toughest that anybody who can't stand the heat should get out of the kitchen.

The heat is on President Johnson—much of it unfair and undeserved—but I have a feeling he likes the job of head cook.

Winning Entrys in New York State Masonic Essay Contest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1967

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, for some years now it has been my privilege to place in the RECORD the winning essays submitted by students in the annual contest sponsored by the Grand Lodge Youth Committee of the Free and Accepted Masons of New York.

The subject this year was "God: A Living Force," and the prize winners were as follows: First prize, Thomas Sartain, 65 Lewis Street, Southhampton, Long Island, N.Y.; second prize, Madlyn Ruth Bernstein, 1142 East Ninth Street, Brooklyn, N.Y.; third prize, Peter Backus, Mexico, N.Y.

I commend to the attention of our colleagues the winning essays by these young people, as follows:

GOD: A LIVING FORCE

(By Thomas Sartain)

God lives! God loves! Love—Life—Man—God. In this complex, maze-like world of today, there exists in each Human-being—a Singular Spirit—a Force—a Power, that guides our lives and makes them meaningful. This feeling is part of the most precious gift to Mankind—the gift of Life. It is God, who has given Man this wonderful gift and who has taught him to live by loving. Therefore, every life and every love is a reflection of this presence and existence of God.

God—Life—Love. To me, these three words are synonymous; they appear in each day of my life. In the quiet understanding and trust of a true friend; in thoughtful prayer; and in kind words and helping hands, God lives. In the warm smile and tender kiss of a mother; in the admiring respect a son holds for his father; and in the satisfaction of sharing and giving; God is there. God is Love and Life; Love and Life is God.

But what does this Being, constantly dwelling within us, give to every man? The answer is simple: everything that he has or will have; a body in which to exist; a mind with which to think and reason; but, most of all, a Soul and Living Spirit. This is where He lives and helps us as we make our journey through mortal life. Though we may stumble through darkness and disappointment, He is always with us to see us through and to light the future.

Man's belief in himself and in his fellow man is a goal to be achieved. It can be achieved only with the help of God, a Living Force, that enables man to find personal peace.

God lives, therefore, we live. Love—Life—Man—God.

GOD: A LIVING FORCE

(By Madlyn Ruth Bernstein)

Who needs God? There is no such person. How can worldly, well educated, sophisticated people believe in such a fantasy or mystical belief? Today we have nuclear weapons, atomic energy, scientific know-how and definite concepts of how the laws of nature control our lives. Why should we put our faith in some supernatural being we are not even sure exists.

The key word is faith!

Every human in the world is essentially the same; we are all God's children. No two people are exactly alike, and this is good. Individuality is what makes this an interesting and exciting world. Not everybody has the same views and feelings and to each individual God means something else. But for people who believe in God, the faith we have in a Supreme Being or presence is paramount, real and necessary.

God is the motivating force of life for most people. When situations arise that seem impossible and there is no apparent solution, we pray to God. We ask for his strong guidance to direct our thinking toward the best possible answer. We ask for aid and comfort to keep from falling into deep pits of despair or despondency. God is a mighty counselor, a miraculeous cure-all, a vision, a feeling, a shepherd or whatever you want God to be.

However you may think God only plays a role in our lives when there is trouble, grief or misery. But when a baby is born, an operation is successful, or we greet the morning sun and feel good, we somehow "Thank God" that all is well. God is associated with good fortune, blissful occasions and happy events. Faith in God has encouraged and inspired men throughout the centuries to write beautiful music, to paint masterpieces of art and to compose sweet words of praise and love in honor of His name. Faith in God has enabled men to sacrifice their lives and energies to help others, to endure hardship and pain.

How does God work a living force? Not as a computer programming our lives or living force of God causes us to reflect, to think and to become imbued with a wondrous feeling. This feeling permeates our entire existence and helps to shape the course of the world.

Modern science clearly shows that man developed through an evolutionary cycle. Man grew from simple amino acids to more complex molecules. This accounts for the physical development of man. How do we account for the inner man? God as a living force molds and shapes the "inner structure" that is the vital force of life.

God: A Living Force

(By Pete Backus)

The words living force taken literally may mean the power to control, convince, persuade or influence human beings and their environment. We also know that God is spirit; infinite and eternal. God is also the Holy and Righteous Being; perfect and absolute. So by having some idea of what God is and what He must do to be a living force we may continue on to prove this statement.

One may ask that if God is a living force in that he may control man's actions, why then does he permit evil to exist in our world? Well, we believe in one Absolute and Holy God, the "Father of Lord Jesus Christ." In this very Fatherhood of God evil in our world is explained. God rules as a father heads a family, not as a dictator rules a dominion, and therefore is limited by the rules of fatherhood. God like any other good father cannot regiment his children, for enforced regimentation makes slave minds and not free characters. If God interfered with man's right of free choice, he would cease to become a father and become a dictator. Because he is our Heavenly Father and has to leave us free, evil is allowed as part of man's life. We then may say God's guidance is not a substitute for our own best thought, but a supplement to it.

Also one may ask that if God is a living force to the millions of people on earth, how may he look after them and love them all? Love has a way of individualizing, irrespective of numbers. As in a family of ten children, when one child dies the father does not think of the fact that he has lost only one-tenth of his brood. Each member is a person, not a percentage. And if earthly fathers thus individualize their children, who can set limits to the infinite love of God?

So by seeing that God's force is much like that of a father's and that God has no limits except those ordained by himself in watching over his children, we may now say that God, the Holy Father of mankind, is mankind's living force.

The Amazing Dr. Craig

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROGER H. ZION

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1967

Mr. ZION. Mr. Speaker, in the September 11, 1967, issue of the AMA News is the amazing chronicle of Dr. Harry L. Craig who demonstrates that life, indeed, does begin at 40. I might especially commend this article to our "under 30" generation that doubt that one over that magic age can possess the ability to try a new life or hold the vision for dedicated service. Dr. Craig's life refutes that theorem and I urge my colleagues to attend this interesting story:

Also a Magician, Singer—MD, a Graduate at 44, Serves in Vietnam

Those who coined such phrases as "Life begins at 40," or "A rolling stone gathers no moss"—may not have known Harry L. Craig, MD. But they must have had men like him in mind.

On the surface, there's nothing unusual about Dr. Craig, a general practitioner from the small southern Indiana community of Huntingburg.

But, he is one of the few physicians around who was 40 and a grandfather when he enrolled with the freshman class at Indiana U.'s School of Medicine in Indianapolis.

INDIANA NATIVE

That, however, is getting ahead of the story. The place to start is at the beginning and that was Oct. 11, 1914, in the rural area of Otwell, Ind., where Dr. Craig was born, a community not far from his present home.

Almost from the beginning there was little doubt that this "rolling stone" would gather no moss. At the age of 16 he entered Indiana State and, at the age of 19, began a three-year teaching career at Otwell Junior High School.

He left teaching to organize a feed manufacture and grain elevator operation in Otwell, a business which he maintains today and which is operated by two of his three sons. (There also is a daughter and eight grandchildren.)

At the age of 37 Dr. Craig decided to forego the life of a successful businessman and study medicine.

SUDDEN INSPIRATION

I never thought of becoming a doctor before then," he said. "It just came to me . . . kind of like out of the clear blue sky. I had this feeling that I had to do something for mankind and that becoming a doctor was the best way to do it."

He took his pre-medical training at Evansville College, driving 110 miles a day from Otwell to attend classes while still maintaining his grain and elevator business. Despite this difficult schedule, Dr. Craig never missed a class, never was late, and, in his junior year, was the highest scholastically ranked student in his class. Dr. Craig was graduated from medical school in 1959.

In addition to his school and business activities, Dr. Craig and his wife, Marilou, were billed as professional magicians and staged their act throughout southern Indiana for several years. Though he had to drop this phase of "show business" while in medical school, Dr. and Mrs. Craig resumed the act when he served for a year (1965–66) with the Kaiser Foundation Hospital in Hawaii. There, he worked mostly with native patients out of a small clinic at a lonely end of the island of Oahu.

ALSO A SINGER

In addition to his ability as a magician, Dr. Craig also gained prominence as a baritone singer, presenting several concerts in his home state before pre-med training.

Today, he is a partner in a clinic in Huntingburg. Dr. Craig began his medical career by serving his first year of practice (1961–62) in the depressed area of West Virginia.

VIETNAM VOLUNTEER

Since interning in 1960 at the Methodist Hospital in Indianapolis, Dr. Craig has continued to live a life of perpetual motion. Just last May he returned from Vietnam after two months of service under the AMA's Volunteer Physicians for Vietnam program.

Dr. Craig says his greatest personal achievement while serving in a hospital in My Tho was to "get one ward in a hospital to pass out medicine to patients three times a day instead of just once. At least that way," he said, "we were sure the patients took some of the medicine instead of trading it or selling it or throwing it away."

As for the AMA program, Dr. Craig says "it seems to be working out but I believe the doctors should be better oriented on the problems they'll face when they get to Vietnam. However, by and large, the program is most worthy and the military and civilian leaders are . . . eager to get our help."

EFFECT ON WAR

The way Dr. Craig sees it, the AMA program and its physician representatives could be the difference in the war.

"The doctors work mainly with the peasants and, I believe, the job we're doing can prove very valuable in selling the idea of democracy to these people. One thing is for sure, you can't whip the Delta by force."

Has he had any second-thoughts about leaving the daily life of a businessman for the practice of medicine?

"It can be a harsh life," he admits. "But I like it and I'm glad for it. Yes, I'm very happy I am a doctor."

Wonderful Wisconsin Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1967

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday of this week, Wisconsinites began a 7-day observance of "Wonderful Wisconsin Week." It is the second annual Wonderful Wisconsin Week, sponsored by the Greater Wisconsin Foundation, Inc., Madison.

Today—Tuesday—is government day during the celebration. I would like to join the Members of this body and officials of Wisconsin in saluting the State for undertaking this program.

I include for the information of my colleagues an editorial from the West

Bend News on Wonderful Wisconsin Week:

[From the West Bend (Wis.) News, Sept. 14, 1967]

WE LIKE IT HERE—WONDERFUL WISCONSIN WEEK, SEPTEMBER 17–23

How long has it been since you've paused a few moments and given some thought to everything that means "Wisconsin"? How long since you've told others about the Wisconsin pride, the Wisconsin people and the things that really make you say: "I do like it here?"

Wonderful Wisconsin Week, Sept. 17–23, is designed to give you just that opportunity. It's a time to pay special tribute to agriculture, youth, business, labor and tourism, education and government, which make Wisconsin what it is.

I urge you to take this opportunity to recognize Wisconsin's total environment where you can discover, experiment with, learn, practice and exercise those pursuits in which you, as an individual, find meanings, purpose and satisfaction.

This is a time to note the diversification present in Wisconsin. Our "potential for progress" is a simple product of the heterogeneous characteristic of our ethnic and nationality background.

Your local community organizations will, no doubt, have special events planned in observance of Wonderful Wisconsin Week—participate in them. Join in the promotion of Wisconsin both among yourselves and throughout the world.

Never before has our population experienced as much mass education, high employment, mass access to recreation and natural resources coupled with leisure in which to make the best of them.

Never before have we had the health and wealth that today enables Wisconsin to thrive.

Enjoy Wonderful Wisconsin—Sept. 17–23. Make a special effort during this period to stop and reflect a bit.

Veterans' Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1967

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, last weekend my distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania, Congressman EILBERG, addressed a meeting of Catholic War Veterans in his district. In his speech he touched on a number of areas of legislation of benefits to our Nation's veterans. As a matter of fact, he outlined rather succinctly, I think, the achievements of this Congress in the fields of veterans' legislation.

This morning this same colleague testified before a subcommittee of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and again succinctly listed reasons why two bills which he also sponsored should be favorably considered.

In both cases, Mr. Speaker, I think that Congressman EILBERG's remarks deserve reprinting in the RECORD so that both their accomplishments in this field and reasons for achieving still more in this session of the Congress may be read by all of us.

I ask permission to include these remarks in the RECORD at this time:

LEGISLATIVE ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE 90TH CONGRESS IN THE FIELD OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

(By Congressman JOSHUA EILBERG)

To address you who have borne the greatest burden of America's defense is indeed an honor. The honor is all the greater tonight, with this being the occasion of presentation of your Catholic War Veterans "Man of the Year" award, and with the privilege of sharing this podium with a deserving recipient of that award, Representative John Pezak.

Let me then make use of this honor by speaking on that most basic duty of Congress—the duty which from the time of the American Revolution has been defined and is still defined as—"to care for him who shall have borne the battle and for his widow and his orphan." I wish to explain the major veterans benefit legislation which Congress has just enacted. That which I consider most important eliminates the inequity of exclusion of Vietnam veterans from certain broad areas of assistance. Much of this legislation I introduced, and I am especially glad to report its enactment. Let me explain it to you as I expounded it on the floor of Congress.

I believe that most citizens would express surprise if not consternation were they to realize that disability compensation for service-connected injury or death provided for all other veterans and their families was not provided for Vietnam veterans until legislation was signed into law only a few days ago. Now Vietnam veterans will receive compensation for their wounds and disability incurred in battle just as all other veterans do.

The new law also ends the unfair exclusion of Vietnam veterans and their dependents from eligibility for the non-service-connected disability pension. All veterans who served for ninety days or more after August 5, 1964, or their dependents will be eligible for the disability pension just as are veterans of World War I, World War II and the Korean War.

Besides extending the disability pension and war-time compensation rates to Vietnam veterans, Congress has increased the rate of this assistance. The rates are now adjusted to correspond to the increased cost of living.

Other changes in disability and pension assistance do not affect the entire range of recipients but are nonetheless of great importance to particular groups of veterans. They are as follows:

All veterans over sixty-five who meet the requirements of limited income will be eligible for the non-service-connected disability pension regardless of their physical condition. Until now, only veterans who are permanently and totally disabled receive the pension.

Veterans in nursing homes shall be considered to be in need of regular aid and attendance and therefore will be eligible for assistance provided for such need.

Veteran's widows who meet certain age requirements will receive increased pensions.

A psychotic condition arising within 2 years after discharge or termination of the Vietnam conflict would be considered to be service-connected for purposes of hospitalization by the Veterans Administration.

Payments for prescribed drugs and medicines will be provided for Vietnam veterans who are on the pension rolls and in need of regular aid and attention.

Disabled Vietnam veterans will be eligible to receive an amount of up to $1,600 for especially equipped automobiles and other special conveyances and appliances. The need for the allowance and its amount, as you know, is determined by the Veterans Administration.

Also I should add, the $250 burial allowance will be extended to Vietnam veterans.

The new law, just signed by President Johnson, also extends to the area of education. By incorporation of the bill I introduced, the new law increases subsistance allowance paid student veterans. Last year Congress provided educational assistance for veterans who have served in the armed forces since the Korean conflict. The purchasing power of the allowance is made commensurate by the new law to that of the allowance of previous G.I. Bills. Furthermore, veterans who attend high school will receive the allowance. Many veterans entering the service have not finished high school. I feel that they should not receive less educational assistance simply because they answered the call to arms at an earlier stage of their educational careers.

Orphans of those killed in the military service, and children of severely disabled wartime veterans will receive educational benefits until the age of twenty-six, instead of age twenty-one. These benefits are provided to restore to the children the education opportunities otherwise lost by their parent's death or disability.

Besides increasing the allowance, the new legislation further expands the areas of education. The landmark 1966 Act which first provided educational assistance for Vietnam veterans did not include flight training and on-the-job training. However, the public response left no doubt but that our Nation needs more trained pilots. Flight training was eliminated from the Act last year because it was thought that such training had previously been used for recreational purposes. I believe, however, that regulations limiting flight training to vocational ends can be adequately formulated just as they have in other areas of training. I see no reason why one of our nation's most extensive educational acts should exclude preparation for an industry upon which our Nation is increasingly dependent.

The legislation of this Congress also remedies the conspicuous shortcoming of exclusion of assistance for on-the-job and apprenticeship training. Our government is heavily financing and calling upon the citizenry to support programs for increasing manpower skills. I think it only logical, therefore, that the veterans educational program include vocational training.

The Ninetieth Congress has also enacted provisions which liberalize veterans loans. The period for World War II veterans to apply for home and small business loans, rather than expiring now, is extended to July 25, 1970. Secondly, also by enactment of legislation which I sponsored, the Veterans Administration is empowered to make direct home loans up to $30,000. Until last month, the limit was $17,500.

Of course, there are still issues that are unresolved. The 90th Congress, for instance, has not decided the question of the effect of social security benefit increase on receipt of the veterans pension. An estimated 29,000 veterans and widows received reduced disability pensions, or none at all, as a result of the 1965 Social Security benefit increases. This is because, as you know, the disability pension is determined by income limitations. A social security cost of living adjustment may augment a veteran's income just enough so that he reaches a higher income bracket and the pension is therefore reduced. I believe that such reduction is unfair because a social security increase should not result in a pension decrease—certainly not if the social security increase is only a cost of living adjustment and does not compensate for the loss of pension. I have urged my colleagues that all future social security increases be excluded from computation of veterans' income. It could not then decrease the veterans pension. I trust that I will be able to report to you successful passage of this proposition, just as I have today reported enactment of my proposal to extend to Vietnam veterans the benefits a grateful nation provides for all other veterans, and my proposal to increase the educational allowance of Vietnam veterans.

Finally, I should mention one further piece of pending legislation I have presented before the 90th Congress. The bill, H.R. 9808, reads:

"Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America assembled, That the Catholic War Veterans are authorized to erect a statue of Saint Sebastian, the patron saint of the military, in the northwest quadrant of the District of Columbia. . . . And the National Capitol . . . and the United States . . . shall be put to no expense in the erection thereof."

With the erection of this statue of Saint Sebastian, a section of our capital city will be made more beautiful, and the public will be made more aware of the contribution and work of the Catholic War Veterans, just as Philadelphia is made aware of that good work by the presentation of the "Man of the Year" award tonight to Representative John Pezak.

Laos

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1967

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, an important, but little noticed, job is being performed by the U.S. AID program in northeastern Laos. There, Edward Buell, an able and dedicated American official whom I have had the pleasure of meeting, is bringing education and medicine to the Laotian people in the slow, but hopefully successful, attempt to provide these people with a non-Communist way of achieving well-being.

I commend this article from the New York Times to the attention of our colleagues, and insert it in the Record at this point:

Coordinator of U.S. Aid in Laos Feels Victory There Is Far Off

Samthong, Laos.—Pop Buell is an American engaged in helping the Laotian people in their struggle against Communism. He is also a realist who knows the task will never be simple or easy and will take a long, long time.

Edward "Pop" Buell, 54 years old, once a resident of Hamilton, Ind., came to Laos as a field worker for the International Volunteer Service. He is now coordinator for the American aid program in northeastern Laos.

Mr. Buell is gray-haired and has face and arms burned dark brown by the sun. He is a master of the dialects of the Meo and other hill tribes with whom he works.

He is aware of both the potential and limitations of the people. Yet he is rather optimistic about stopping the march of Communism in Laos without a massive American commitment such as in Vietnam.

BEST YEAR WE'VE HAD

"This is the first year that I've really thought that we were winning," he says. "It's been the best year we've ever had. I've got hope now.

"I've learned a hell of a lot since I've been here and most of what I've learned has been from the Communists.

"Down on the PPJ (Plaine des Jarres) I saw them giving out some medicine and building some schools and going out to win over the people as well as fighting.

"Right then I figured the only way to beat them at this game was to do it better."

Mr. Buell led a march of 70,000 Laotian refugees in 1961, when the pro-Communist Pathet Lao and North Vietnamese launched an offensive that was successful in seizing the Plaine des Jarres in North-Central Laos.

TOWN HAS HOSPITAL

There was no such place as Samthong then, but it now has a flourishing airfield, hospital of more than 120 beds complete with operating room, dental facilities, doctors and nurses comparable to an American Army field hospital.

The town of 5,000 is headquarters for Laos' second Military Region and the home of Gen. Vang Phae, a Meo who has the reputation of being one of the toughest, bravest officers in the Laotian army.

Mr. Buell roams this territory on foot and by plane, supervising the building of schools, wells, dispensaries, and overseeing numerous other projects. He believes in guiding the people, not doing their work for them.

"It helps a man's pride when he accomplishes something himself," Mr. Buell said. "You destroy his pride when you do for him what he should be doing for himself.

"I think we've accomplished a lot here and we started with nothing and did it right in the face of our enemy.

"Now we've got 16,000 kids in schools and we've got 16 dispensaries going. Here at the hospital we've trained 350 medics. The Pathet Lao have killed 48 of them and that's an indication of how successful they've been. Seems like you always lose the good ones, the brave ones who really get out and work close with the people."

Mr. Buell came to Laos because his wife had died and, as a semiretired farmer, he had time on his hands.

Radiation Hazards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 13, 1967

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues an editorial which appeared in the Washington Star concerning the danger of X-radiation and the need for legislation too insure that the public is not endangered by X-radiation.

The editorial points to the fact that during hearings held by the Subcommittee on Public Health and Welfare, under the chairmanship of the Honorable John Jarman, of Oklahoma, testimony pointed out the lack of knowledge in the field of radiation as it pertains to the public.

As a member of the subcommittee, and as the author of the bill, which Congressman Jarman sponsored, I would like to commend the Star for its awareness of the problem and its public service in supporting this legislation.

I enter into the Record the editorial for the information and interest of my colleagues:

Radiation Hazards

The battle that began in the 1930s by individual states against careless use of fluoroscopes in shoe stores now largely won. But as a House Commerce subcommittee has brought out recently, other radiation perils to the public have arisen.

James G. Terrill Jr., director of the National Center for Radiological Health, testified that not only color television sets but a host of other modern gadgets are potentially hazardous. Among them are infrared and ultraviolet lamps, microwave ovens for bakeries, radar beams and ultrasonic devices. Studies at Johns Hopkins University, for example, show that children of radar technicians are more prone to a type of mental retardation.

The testimony is not conclusive. Authorities admit they need to know more, a line also frequently heard in warnings about air pollution. That should certainly not deter lawmakers from supporting the bill by Representatives Jarman of Oklahoma and Rogers of Florida directing the Health, Education and Welfare Department to pursue studies of the biologic effects of radiation and set safety standards for the host of electronic products now on the market.

Lt. Gen. J. M. Masters' Superb Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1967

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, Gen. J. M. Masters, Sr., U.S. Marine Corps, Commandant of the Marine Corps schools, delivered an outstanding address on September 8 at the annual Apple Festival in Westminster, in my congressional district. At the conclusion of General Masters' superb address the audience responded with a sustained standing ovation. I commend General Masters' great speech to my colleagues and to the American people:

General Masters' Address

Mr. Mayor, Distinguished Guests, Fellow Americans: First let me say that I am delighted to be here with you on the occasion of your Annual Apple Festival. I understand that you have had a bumper crop. I am happy for you and wish you many more bountiful seasons.

My remarks to you this evening are of a serious nature, but I trust that you will consider them appropriate. As a matter of fact, I am confident that you will for many in this audience, I am sure, have had military connections—and all in this audience, I am sure, have a deep love for their country. Some of you have served your country in uniform perhaps in World War II and during the Korean conflict and perhaps a few saw service as early as World War I—and undoubtedly many of you at this moment have loved ones, that is—sons, husbands, or relatives serving with our armed forces in far away Vietnam. I am confident to make these statements for it is a known fact that the men and women of the South have always responded nobly to the country's call in time of crisis. Because of this, I feel that this is indeed an appropriate time to review the bonds that bind the military and the civilian. This is also the time for each of us to consider the issues that confront us as a nation and to clarify in our own minds the constructive part we each must play in the affairs of free men.

I, for one, am firmly convinced that we in the armed forces and you, our fellow Americans, are bound together by an unbreakable knot—a knot which is based on mutual respect and trust—and I am also firmly convinced that we mutually adhere to the same principles and traditions upon which this great country was founded. This truly is the real keystone of our whole system of defense and security.

We, who proudly wear our country's uniform, should not, in my opinion, be expected to solve the many difficult economic, social and political crises that exist in the world today. On the other hand, one thing we are sworn to do, and one thing we are qualified to do, is to carry out our nation's commitments—to defend our country, our constitution and the body of our national beliefs—and to reflect the will of the American people to win any battle over any enemy who would destroy that which we have sworn to uphold.

Today, as you know, our people are deeply concerned—deeply involved in the conflict in South Vietnam and many questions have arisen and unquestionably many more will arise about this conflict. Accordingly, for a few brief minutes I would like to discuss a couple of these questions. First—how are our men in the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps and Coast Guard faring in the task that has been assigned to us and secondly how is the individual fighting man meeting the challenge that this difficult war has posed? I shall do my best to answer these questions relating to the military and when I have concluded, the converse side of these questions will remain for you to answer. That is—what is the will of the American people in these difficult times—and what as an individual are you doing to discharge the obligation that responsible citizenship in this country entails?

I would like to begin with a quote from General George Marshall—speaking to the men in uniform he once said, "The soldier's heart, the soldier's spirit, the soldier's soul, are everything. Unless the soldier's soul sustains him he cannot be relied on and will fail himself and his commander and his country in the end." General Marshall went on to say that the fighting man must have steadfastness and courage and hope—he must have confidence, zeal and loyalty. He must have esprit de corps and determination and finally he must have staying power, the spirit which endures to the end—the will to win. General Marshall's analysis is as true today and as pertinent as it was 26 years ago.

The cost to the individual, the fighting man, who hopes to hold these qualities is high—and today more than 450,000 of your fighting men are in Vietnam doing just this. They stand together with the valiant people of South Vietnam to save a nation of 17 million people from being blotted off the globe. This is a tremendous and deadly task.

Because of this, there are indeed difficult times in our nation's life—and in spite of all the advances in technology and science, there has never been and there will never be a replacement for the individual serviceman. I refer to the American in uniform. He is the all important citizen who places his life on the firing line to defend his country and freedom. I refer specifically to your sons, your husbands, your relatives and your friends.

This is not an easy task, but let me assure you, it is a rewarding one—rewarding not in money or material awards, but in the sense that a man that gives much of himself, receives much in return—and honor, I say to you, is the highest of his rewards.

One other point upon which I would like to reflect before going into the specifics of how we Marines, along with our fellow servicemen, are trying to meet the challenge of the troubled time and that is—many doubts have been raised in many places today concerning the character of this nation and I would like to point out to you that if the caliber of today's young fighting man is a true reflection of the American people whom he represents, and I am firmly convinced that it is, then I have no doubt about the character of this nation and this nation's people. For I say to you, what is seen daily in the mud and sorrow and havoc in Vietnam on the part of our American fighting man is proof positive of their dedication and motivation, is proof positive of their belief in our country and what our country represents. As you know, daily on television programs we are eyewitness to the weariness, the lined faces, the mud covered clothing, the suffering and sorrow and even the fear that now and then touches both the combat veteran and the new replacement on the battlefield—but always, and I repeat but always, there is still visible a quality that we Marines both love and hold dear—and I would point out to you that the mud of battle sometimes obscures it but cannot hide it—I refer to the spirit, the indomitable will that stands out in the American fighting man—it cannot hide the innate honesty and integrity that makes an American refuse to trade security for freedom. It cannot hide the generosity that has made Americans for almost 200 years reach out to help a man—help a family—or help a nation that had tried but cannot win a just battle alone—and I would remind you that this nation was founded by a people, and is still populated by a people who, thank the good Lord, believe in and are ready and willing to sacrifice their very lives, if necessary, for liberty, for justice, for freedom and for honor.

If we ever accepted less, if we ever expected others to accept less, then I am sure you would agree we would be selling our country short. In a sense, we would be joining the side of the fuzzy thinking cloud sitters, the cynics, the misguided who would sell cheaply the sacrifices in which they take no part—in which they have never taken a part.

And now to the question of how we are faring on this day, approximately two and a half years after the President sent our first American troops—a Marine Expeditionary Brigade—into a struggling, dying nation that had called for our help. Just what has been accomplished in Vietnam? The communist efforts to take over the government of South Vietnam have been turned back. Their efforts to strike at the very roots of the government, to prevent local elections, are being defeated. In short, if we had not been there, there would be no legitimate government of the people, by the people and for the people. Without our presence the communists could have taken all, almost unopposed. But this, praise the Lord and the American serviceman, did not come to pass and will not come to pass. Slowly and surely we are winning and they, the communists, will NOT take over. They will be defeated and history, I am confident, will confirm the statement that I have just made. These then are the things we have accomplished and are accomplishing. It is a slow process but triumph in the end we will.

And now specifically how is the individual man faring? Never in past wars have we asked so much of our young serviceman as we are asking today in Vietnam. And never have they responded with so much professionalism and understanding. Never have they been quicker to grasp the fundamental nature of the threat to freedom. Daily they are proving their deep devotion to this great and beloved land of ours. They have willingly accepted the fact that the current task requires their sustained exertions and continuing sacrifices. They radiate idealism and dedication. They believe in their job and in their country.

Today's heroes, and the list is almost endless, would endorse the opinion of that revolutionary war patriot, Thomas Paine, who wrote, "Those who expect to reap the blessings of freedom must, like men, undergo the fatigue of supporting it."

Let me give you a few samples of what our modern day Tom Paines' are writing from their foxholes in Vietnam as they undergo the fatigue and sacrifice of supporting freedom. While their literary style may be lacking their patriotism is not.

Here is what one young corporal writes—"What has happened to the flag wavers, the pride in support of our president and our nation and our own belief in freedom. Since when is it old fashioned to love the sight of old glory—to celebrate the 4th of July—to fight for the security of the world."

A young airman writes and I quote—"My father fought in the second world war in the Pacific area—now I am proud to serve my country as he did. If it becomes necessary I will lay down my life for the country I love." Now I ask you, could Patrick Henry have said it better?

Still another young corporal writes, "We all know we are here for a good cause. I can assure you of one thing—this is one Marine who is proud to be an American. After what I have seen here—I know what it is to have freedom. These people in Vietnam need help. These people deserve freedom as much as anyone else. We are doing our best to give them a chance."

I could present scores of other examples—but those which I have just quoted sum up the prevalent spirit and attitude of our American serviceman in Vietnam today—and I think that those of you here on this occasion, both veterans and citizens, share my pride in the men who stand knee deep in rice paddy mire with their heads held high, asking no favors—giving much to the people of South Vietnam—and I am also sure that you share my opinion that the attitude of our fighting men is altogether becoming of our great national heritage. And I am also sure that you will agree that with such a spirit, such an attitude, our fighting men cannot but fare well in this demanding struggle.

In passing, with your permission, I should point out that our program of assistance in Vietnam, both on the battlefield and in the civic action areas is a program of assistance, not one of charity. It is a program for freedom, and let me say to you, that in this great country of ours—freedom is everybody's business. To this I might add—defense is everybody's business too, particularly when it is concerned with freedom.

That is why today we Marines are proud to stand in the front ranks and on the firing line in South Vietnam. There are some irresponsible dissenters, as you know, but as I pointed out earlier they have contributed nothing to the cause of freedom. Thank God, however, the vast majority of our American people pay their way in this program for freedom using the currency of effort, personal sacrifices, and deep commitment to the principles for which this nation stands.

In closing, permit me to inform you that your Marines and other American servicemen in Vietnam have been armed with the best equipment which our American technology can produce. But let me say to you—their hardiest armor, their most potent weapon is the American spirit—their American ideals and principles.

It is on these ideals and principles which our American servicemen have been nurtured since their birth. It is in their communities, their American home towns like Westminster, where we are gathered here tonight, that they have been imbued and fortified with this American spirit. You, the citizens, with whom they have associated, you their fathers and their mothers have sown the seeds of this spirit—and for this, the people of South Vietnam and the free people of this entire world own to you the American people a great debt of gratitude. By your daily actions and deeds here at home you must keep this spirit alive—this is your most important task. This is the best way for you to support these dedicated Americans who today face the communist enemy in South Vietnam. This spirit is the spirit that binds—this is the spirit that is unbreakable.

William Francis Gibbs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THEODORE R. KUPFERMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1967

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, William Francis Gibbs, my constituent was an outstanding naval architect and marine engineer.

His work was vital to the United States and to the ultimate success of our Navy in World War II.

He lead a full and constructive life and so with his passing, we once again recognize his accomplishments which became a part of the history of this great Nation.

His widow, the former Vera Cravath Larkin and his family share that history with the entire country in his memory.

His biography from the New York Times of Thursday, September 7, 1967, follows:

WILLIAM FRANCIS GIBBS DEAD—DESIGNED LINER "UNITED STATES"—SELF-TAUGHT NAVAL ARCHITECT PLANNED PROTOTYPE OF THE LIBERTY SHIP FOR THE NAVY

William Francis Gibbs, one of the world's outstanding naval architects and marine engineers, died yesterday in Roosevelt Hospital after a long illness. He was 81 years old.

As president of the firm of Gibbs & Cox, Inc., of New York, Mr. Gibbs was responsible for the design of the superliner United States. High-ranking Navy officers have credited him with contributing more than any other individual to the success of the United States Navy in World War II.

In the nineteen-thirties he led a long and hard-fought battle in Federal and shipbuilding circles to convert warship design to high-pressure and high-temperature steam, which eventually gave fighting ships the high speed and great endurance that played an important part in naval operations in the war.

His plans were the basis for construction of more than 2,000 Liberty ships as the work horses of the war.

A determined and vociferous advocate of perfection in ship safety, he personally dogged construction of the fast trans-Atlantic liner United States to see that the builders used no combustible materials. There was no wood in the ship, except the kitchen chopping blocks and the pianos in her public rooms.

Another of his convictions involved better compartmentation of ocean vessels with automatically closing bulkhead doors to assure the ships' remaining afloat even if one or more compartments opened in a collision.

FIRM DESIGNED 6,000 SHIPS

It is thought that more than 6,000 naval and commercial vessels have been built to Gibbs & Cox specifications.

The man who directed nearly 3,000 employes at the firm's peak of design work during the war had no formal training as a naval architect. A graduate of Harvard University and holder of law degree from Columbia University, he taught himself naval architecture.

In his youth, before World War I, he and his equally enthusiastic brother, Frederic H. Gibbs, who is vice president of the design firm, spread drawing sheets out on the floor of their father's home in Philadelphia and worked out ship designs.

For practice, they redesigned some of the battleships of the British fleet. After World War I the brothers proposed the construction of superliners for the United States and worked out a project for a big trans-Atlantic shipping terminal at Montauk Point, L.I.

The two Gibbs brothers were inseparable friends from their youth. In the industry William Francis was recognized for his brilliant concepts in ship design and for his ability to plan details of vessels in his mind. The younger brother has been, as it was said of him, the "financial and administrative brains."

They founded their company as Gibbs Brothers, Inc. in 1922. In 1929 they formed a new partnership with the late Daniel H. Cox, a naval architect who specialized in yachts and other small craft. He died in 1955.

The terminal never came to fruition and the superliner dream was not realized until July, 1952, when the United States crossed the Atlantic to Southampton at an average speed of 35.9 knots, taking the speed record from the Cunard liner Queen Mary. She bested the Queen Mary's record time in countless other subsequent crossings without ever opening to full power.

The design of her hull and other features and her low rate of fuel consumption were matters of top secrecy.

The liner was built for quick conversion as a naval auxiliary, and the Department of the Navy officially designated Mr. Gibbs as the sentinel on secret features. Even after the ship had long been in service, news media could not obtain underhull pictures of the United States, although other war vessels could be photographed.

A "HEART OF STONE"

A lanky man of somber mein and ascetic habits, Mr. Gibbs cultivated the role of the curmudgeon.

"I am not a pleasant personality," he would say. An eloquent public speaker, he would often refer to his reputation as a tough task-master in dealing with his staff.

"Under this dour exterior beats a heart of stone," he would say.

His principal aides reported that it was not unusual on a Sunday to get an early morning telephone call from William Francis, as everyone called him. They did not have to inquire where he was.

He was at the office, a 30-story building at 21 West Street where Gibbs & Cox occupies 15 floors, fourteen of them inaccessible to the public, under rigid security surveillance to protect models, designs and top-secret Navy contract work.

DEDICATED TO LINER

Mr. Gibb's dedication to the superliner is legendary in the shipping industry. In the first ten years of the ship's operation he seldom missed an arrival. He stalked through the ship checking instruments and records. Until a year or so ago the ship's chief engineer, Capt. William Kaiser, was called on ship-to-shore telephone, to relate the revolutions of the turbines and a drop-by-drop count of fuel oil consumption.

On her arrival day, after his customary breakfast of tea and toast at dawn in his home at 945 Fifth Avenue, Mr. Gibbs would speed in his chauffeur-driven Cadillac along the Brooklyn shore to a point where he would stand in all weather to watch the big liner move in from sea.

Some shipbuilders disliked him. He was the scourge of the builders constructing a vessel to Gibbs & Cox plans; he moved into the yard, set up an office and haunted the place, tapping around at all hours, testing materials and ordering changes when equipment did not meet specifications.

In 1940, before this country's entry in the war, Federal authorities directed to him a team of British officials seeking the construction of a fleet of freighters in this country. They proposed 20 ships.

"You don't need them," Mr. Gibbs told the visitors bluntly. When they asked why, he replied, "if you are that near winning the war you have no need for them."

He persuaded the team to order 60 ships. They were designed as modifications of the British coaster, which the naval architect considered perfect for the job. They were the precursors of the hundreds of Liberty ships built for this country's war use, many of which are still running.

OPERA, LITERATURE, BASEBALL

With all his rigid work schedules he had broad outside interests. He and Mrs. Gibbs, the former Vera Cravath Larkin, the daughter of the late Paul D. Cravath, prominent lawyer and patron of the arts, were often at the opera and theater.

At the many affairs on the United States the rangy man in the rumpled dark suit, sitting without a cocktail on a lounge at the rear of the room, would be Mr. Gibbs, carrying on a low-key conversation about music or books, or straightening out a new acquaintance on the batting record of a currently sensational baseball player.

Next to the liner United States, he was proudest of his design of the New York City Fire Department's Super Pumper, an $875,000 wheeled pumper and tender with tremendous power. A life-time fire buff, he designed it to draw water from many hydrants, or from the river more than a mile way. It can knock a building down and can throw water 74 floors up the Empire State Building.

Mr. Gibbs served in World War I as a shipping consultant to the War Department. In 1937 he was on a special advisory board on battleship plans, for the Department of the Navy. In 1942 and 1943 he was controller of shipbuilding, War Production Board. He held numerous honors, awards and honorary degrees.

In addition to Mrs. Gibbs and his brother, he is survived by two sons, Francis and Christopher; a stepson, Adrial Larkin, and two grandchildren.

Funeral arrangements will be announced later.

Pfc. Henry M. Wharton, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1967

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Pfc. Henry M. Wharton, Jr., a marine from Maryland, was recently killed in action in Vietnam. I wish to commend the courage of this young man and to honor his memory by including the following article in the RECORD:

PRIVATE WHARTON DIES IN VIETNAM COMBAT, WAS 18

An 18-year-old Baltimorean, Marine Pfc. Henry Marvin Wharton, Jr., was shot to death in Vietnam, the Defense Department announced yesterday.

Private Wharton, the son of Mrs. Gloria M. Wharton, of 4804 Pilgrim road, died September 10 of multiple gunshot wounds received while on an assault mission.

Private Wharton had attended Northern High School, but he left after completing the eleventh grade and went to work as a warehouseman for the Joseph M. Zamoiski Company, a wholesale distributor of electrical supplies in Southwest Baltimore, his brother-in-law, Philip A. Hoffman, said last night.

In December, 1966, the youth enlisted in the Marines. "He signed up with the express purpose of going to Vietnam," Mr. Hoffman said.

After basic training at Parris Island, S.C., and a few months at Camp Lejeune, N.C., Private Wharton went to Vietnam last June.

"He never complained about the military life," but always told us that "he was okay," Mr. Hoffman said, adding that the young soldiers's letters were often interrupted by his having to leave on a combat mission.

His last letter, dated September 9, the day before his death, said that "he was okay" and asked that he be sent some "ketchup, mustard, a rain suit and some candy bars," Mr. Hoffman said.

Private Wharton had once thought of making the Marine Corps a career, but later letters indicated he was thinking about going into the Secret Service or the F.B.I., Mr. Hoffman said.

In addition to his mother, Private Wharton is survived by three sisters, Mrs. Agnes Hoffman, Mrs. Elizabeth C. Wagner and Mrs. Helen M. Goldsmith, all of Baltimore.

A Debate: Peace Against War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN N. ERLENBORN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1967

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Speaker, one of the good communities in the district which I represent is Naperville. It has been engaged in a heated debate during the past summer—a debate engendered by the Naperville Summer Peace Project. The sponsoring committee includes a number of leading citizens, and it has worked in cooperation with the American Friends Service Committee.

Some Napervillians believe the project committee has gone too far in urging young men to become conscientious objectors in order to avoid being drafted. Some would silence the committee, and I think a great many want the committee's message toned down.

The Summer Peace Project sent a letter to all the young men in Naperville and included a reprint of a well-known letter to the editor of the Akron Beacon-Journal entitled, "We Burned Every Hut."

I believe nearly all of us have seen this letter. It has gotten wide circulation. Presumably written by a soldier to his parents, it tells of a search-and-destroy sweep through some Vietnam villages. Huts were burned to flush out Vietcong guerrillas but, on one occasion, a soldier's grenade killed a woman and her three children.

Here are some excerpts from the Summer Peace Project's letter:

> Now is the time to realize your own human dignity by questioning the morality of our foreign policy and of the reliance upon conscription for its implementation. . . . Is it right to determine the future of other people without their consent? Similarly, is conscription right? Shouldn't you have the right to a voice in the decision to engage in a war that might cost you your life? Is it good to have a killer mentality forced upon a segment of the young men of our society? . . . Maybe you are a conscientious objector to war or maybe not. . . . For further clarification on conscientious objector status. . . .

For myself, I would not for a moment doubt the sincerity of the people on this committee, nor would I suggest that Americans ought to remain silent on the great questions which face us.

By inadvertance, I am sure, one of the recipients of the Summer Peace Project's letter is beyond the reach of conscientious objector advice. He is a marine, now in Vietnam. I think that all of us, whether we be hawk or dove, or somewhere between, will do well to read what this young man has to say.

It was printed as a letter to the editor of the Naperville Sun, and I present it for insertion in the RECORD:

FROM A MARINE IN VIETNAM, A VIEW ON THE PEACE PROJECT PROGRAM

SOUTH VIETNAM,
September 1, 1967.

DEAR MR. WHITE: I'm presently stationed in South Viet Nam with the United States Marine Corps. Just recently I received a copy of the Naperville Summer Peace Project's letter.

I have never been so completely disappointed and appalled in my life!

Are these people Americans? Have they been to Viet Nam and seen what it is really like so they can truthfully say they know what they are talking about?

It states in the letter that a person owes it to his conscience to answer all the questions. Well, I'm going to answer them in the way all the men in Viet Nam and all true Americans would! I have been in Viet Nam for 10 months, so I know how the men over here feel.

To start off, who says we are determining the future of other people without their consent? I'm sure this was meant in respect to the Viet Nam war, as is most of the letter. If a person were to check, the Vietnamese people asked us to come and help them in their fight against communism and its tyrannical dictatorship. They need our help, for they are economically and militarily unable to defend their own human rights.

I wish that all the people who feel we are unjust in what we are doing could be put in a protective shell, where no harm could come to them, and they be given a real view (in person) to see what Viet Nam is really like.

The Vietnamese people are living in conditions that would make our slums look like a Hilton hotel. Disease is outrageous and cleanliness is almost unheard of. How would you like to have your children digging and rummaging through a garbage dump to try and get one decent meal a day?

They have a confusing life to live, too. On one hand, they have a government trying to help them, and on the other, they have the Viet Cong saying, "if you don't follow our ways and beliefs, we will kill your youngest child and keep murdering your family until you will." Do you call this freedom? Are we obstructing human dignity when we are fighting against this?

Also, you have said that if we follow the dictates of our foreign policy we will kill and die for issues never made clear. What can be more clear? These people need, and have asked, for our help!

Granted, maybe this is a job for the United Nations, but I think the UN is falling short of its true purpose of being. When this happens, why shouldn't we, as one of the strongest nations on earth, jump in and help? Is this conflict economically hurting us? No!

This statement that policies were never brought to a vote and that we have no real voice in our government is a fallacy. We have, as adults, a right and an obligation to vote in every election. (Did all of you vote in the last one?) Also, what in the world are senators and representatives for, if not to voice the opinion of the public. All you have to do is contact them!

You are probably asking, why should we go halfway around the world to fight for something that isn't affecting us? It is—or soon will—affect us! Would you rather fight this in our own street and back yards? Do you want to see your own relations abused and possibly murdered by this brutality?

It is human nature not to want to die, but where would we be if our forefathers had said, "To hell with it. Let someone else do it." As you know, in the Revolutionary war, they tried to run from England's abuse, but it followed them and, eventually, they had to fight and die to procure the freedoms we, as Americans, enjoy today.

You try to say that we are killers and aggressors over here—but we are not! We battle when it is needed to stop Viet Cong rule or aggression and not to soothe a sadistic pleasure. I might add, too, that with every American unit that goes into battle, there is also one or more Vietnamese run unit.

As far as developing a killer mentality in our men, it hasn't and never will happen. This is a guerrilla war; not a conventional one. It appears dirty and lousy because of guerrilla tactics that are used.

This burning the hut episode was something that had to be done. The Viet Cong are sneaky and tricky and can hide almost anywhere. If you were to check the true facts, the innocent people were removed first and given food and housing to replace what was lost. (Probably much better than what they had.)

The men who are returning to the States all the time—are they killers? No! They have lived and seen the bad part of life. They know what it is like to fight for a belief. They have seen people that are so bad off they should give up, still are determined to better themselves. These men now know—without a doubt—how great we have it as Americans! ! !

The men who are still here—are they killers? Would a killer, when something like the "Star Spangled Banner" or "God Bless America" is played, have tears in his eyes? They do. Believe me, they do.

In conclusion I would like to say one more thing. If something should happen to me—if I should be killed over here and not make it home—you, each one of you, ask my parents, Mr. and Mrs. Ward C. Shiffler, if I have died in vain and for no plausible reason. I know what they will say, for they have taught and instilled in me a sense of patriotism and obligation. I'm not a hero, but I do believe in my country, my God, and my rights!

Also, I say this to my generation—go ahead and dodge the draft, but I pray to God that my kids and yours won't have to do what you were too scared to do.

Sincerely,

Cpl. JACK C. SHIFFLER.

Firearms Control and Law Enforcement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1967

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson is to be commended for his recent letter to the Congress stressing the urgent need for prompt enactment of firearms control legislation. With him and with the law enforcement officers throughout the country, I strongly endorse the prompt enactment of such legislation.

FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover has also spoken out upon this issue. On September 1 he wrote an open letter to all law enforcement officers setting out his recommendations for Federal and State legislation. In that letter he made it quite clear that the "time for action is here" and that "mail-order firearms purchases should be banned, interstate transportation of firearms controlled, and local registration of weapons required and enforced."

What is done locally is something as to which we have no control or responsibility in Congress. But we do have both control and responsibility as to what is done nationally. We must answer to our conscience as well as to our constituents each time we read of another shooting which might have been prevented with appropriate control legislation.

I append Director Hoover's complete statement to my remarks, as follows:

Message From the Director to All Law Enforcement Officials

Each year, thousands of businessmen look up from their work into the menacing muzzle of a gun wielded by a trigger-happy robber. In recent months, murderous snipers have waged guerrilla warfare against law enforcement officers in our city streets. In 1963, our President was slain with a mail-order rifle. During the calendar year of 1966 alone, more citizens were killed or assaulted with guns in American streets and homes than were killed in battle during the entire Korean conflict.

The use of firearms in crime is indeed a serious and major problem in our country today.

A firearm continues to be the instrument of death in virtually every murder of a law enforcement officer. Last year, 55 of the 57 law enforcement victims killed in the line of duty died from gunshot wounds. These figures are in keeping with the trend since 1960 which reflects that firearms have been the murder weapons in 96 percent of the 335 police killings.

There has been an increasing interest on the part of the public in this admittedly complex issue. I have publicly stated my view for many years that better control of firearms is not only desirable, but also necessary to public welfare. We have reached the point where the time for debate is past; the time for action is here.

I think mail-order firearm purchases should be banned, interstate transportation of firearms controlled, and local registration of weapons required and enforced.

The primary thrust against this serious problem must be from the local level, but Federal assistance must strongly complement State gun legislation. While it is true a hardened criminal will obtain a gun regardless of statutes in force, most authorities agree that controls would make acquisition more difficult. With a large percentage of the murders in the United States occurring within the family or among acquaintances, the readily available lethal firearm, seven times more deadly than other murder weapons, becomes a major factor.

Enforced controls at the local level provide the possibility of investigative leads in tracing stolen weapons and those used in crime. This possibility takes on added significance in view of the nationwide capabilities of the rapidly expanding FBI National Crime Information Center. Pertinent weapons information stored in this computer network is available to law enforcement throughout the country in a matter of seconds.

Some States and jurisdictions have laws which allow courts to impose stiffer penalties for criminals who use firearms in the commission of felonies. A realistic application of these laws by the courts, plus the passage of similar legislation in areas where none now exists, together with mandatory prohibitions against suspended sentences in cases involving firearms, would certainly be a strong deterrent to those who contemplate using firearms for violence.

There is no doubt in my mind that the easy accessibility of firearms is responsible for many killings, both impulse and premeditated. The statistics are grim and realistic. Strong measures must be taken, and promptly, to protect the public.

John Edgar Hoover,
Director.

Two-Week Tour of Southeast Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD D. McCARTHY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 19, 1967

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, as I announced earlier today in a short speech on the floor of the House of Representatives, I will include in the Appendix of the Record over the next several days the text of nine articles I cabled to the Buffalo Evening News during my recent 2-week tour of Southeast Asia. The first two of these articles follow:

Representative McCarthy To Report Viet Election for the News

(When Representative McCarthy of Buffalo announced that he was going to Vietnam to observe the conduct of the election The Buffalo Evening News contracted with him to report his observations and offer his judgment of the historic event. Mr. McCarthy is a former reporter for the News.)

(By Richard D. McCarthy)

New York, August 29.—"We are in South Vietnam today because we want to allow a little nation self-determination. We want them to be able to go and vote for the kind of leaders they want, and select the type of government they want."

These words of President Johnson highlight the significance of next week's South Vietnamese presidental election for all Americans. The ability of the South Vietnamese to choose their own political leaders and institutions free from external aggression and internal subversion is central to U.S. aims in South Vietnam.

SEVERAL DISQUALIFIED

So it was, that members of the U.S. Congress this summer became increasingly gloomy over developments which cast a dark cloud over the campaign and the projected elections.

First came the news that several tickets opposing the ruling military junta's slate of Gens. Thieu and Ky were ruled off the ballot. One was excluded because its vice presidential nominee is French. Another, because its presidential nominee is a Communist. Buddhist tickets also were ruled off the ballot by the elected constituent assembly.

Next came a profoundly disturbing forecast from a respected American journalist that a military committee would run the Saigon government regardless of who won the September race for President. Premier Nguyen Cao Ky's subsequent promise to honor the outcome of the elections and U.S. Ambassador Ellsworth Bunker's statement supporting Gen. Ky's pledge did little to dispel skepticism in many U.S. Congressional quarters.

URGE WARNING TO KY

Sen. Robert F. Kennedy said flatly that the whole affair constituted a "fraud."

Compounding the gloom was the disclosure late last week that 50 South Vietnamese military officers, including some generals, would be fired for corruption and inefficiency. One U.S. Congressman's exclamation: "It looks as though we're just propping up a corrupt military dictatorship," reflected the disenchantment of many House Members.

Fifty-seven, including the writer, went so far as to urge President Johnson to warn Ky that unless his regime took prompt steps to insure that free elections are held the U.S. would undertake a serious reappraisal of our involvement in Vietnam.

KY INVITES OBSERVERS

A highly-placed official of the U.S. Government Thursday informed the writer that he was convinced that the U.S. Congress concern was having the desired effect on Gen. Ky and that efforts were in fact being exerted to guarantee free elections and insure that the outcome would be honored by the contesting factions.

Stung by the charges of "fraud" and irregularities, Premier Ky invited the U.S. Congress to send observers. Other nations were also invited to send representatives.

President Johnson announced he would send a mission of prominent Americans, including three U.S. Senators, to observe the Sept. 3 voting. More than two score other nations are expected to have either journalistic or official observers on the scene.

ALREADY ON WAY

Imbued with the inate skepticism characteristic of most present and former newspapermen and fired by a normal desire to "see for one's self," Rep. Lester Wolff, (D., N.Y.), and the writer, both former newsmen, decided to make an independent trip and depart from here today for Vietnam to observe the wind-up of the campaign and the election itself.

This will be Congressman Wolff's fifth trip to Vietnam. On his four previous journeys there, he has developed many direct contacts with members of a number of Vietnamese factions which will be tapped in making an unbiased assessment of the election.

By the time you read this we will be over the Pacific headed for Tokyo on Northwest Orient Flight 7. Our ultimate destination, Vietnam, will capture world attention during the next 10 days because it will be the scene of an election as well as a vicious war.

The Central Issue at Stake in Viet Rioting Is Legitimacy

(By Richard D. McCarthy)

Tokyo, August 30.—"We have no more business in attempting to police an election in Vietnam than the Vietnamese would have in sending observers to the U.S. to assure an 'honest count' in our presidential race in 1968."

This statement of Rep. Henry C. Schadeberg (R, Wis.), with all due deference to the able and affable gentleman, grasps one central point but misses another at issue in the Sept. 3 South Vietnamese presidential election.

If this were just one in a long series of elections there would be little justification for another nation sending observers. But it isn't. It's the first election under a newly established democratic form of government.

The central issue at stake is legitimacy.

CHANGING CONCEPTS

No one seriously questions the legitimacy of United States institutions and democratic processes. But countless persons all over the world wonder whether South Vietnam, in the midst of a war, can establish a popularly based, legitimate government.

The stamp of legitimacy has been sought by aspirants to power since time immemorial. In medieval days when the concept "from God the King, from King the Law" was generally accepted, monarchs sought the pope's stamp of approval.

In modern times, since the advent of representative democracies and acceptance of the concept that sovereignty resides in the people and that only they, collectively, can choose their leaders, legitimacy is found in the integrity of the electoral process.

COULD OPEN DOORS

After a series of colonial and military governments, the people of South Vietnam are seeking to establish representative government, with leaders chosen freely by the people.

The present military government, which has ruled by decree for two years, is slated to resign with the election of a President and a national legislature.

The election could mark a significant turning point in the history of a long troubled land. It could open new doors to peace.

The writer has advanced the proposition that a new, legitimate, freely elected government, with a mandate from the people, might be able to launch new peace initiatives immediately after the election.

Sen. Joseph D. Tydings (D. Md.) Saturday saw the elections as the current best hope for renewal attempts for peace.

MANY PESSIMISTIC

Whatever the shortcomings of the elections may be, he said, they will provide a government with a popular mandate in place of a regime "which is despised by many of the people it rules."

But many U.S. observers—at home, here and elsewhere—take a more pessimistic view. Contrary to an apparently widely held view, they see the election as having little effect on the war.

Indeed they see the stepped-up terrorist attacks of the Viet Cong as an attempt to disrupt the elections and as an opportunity to score military advances while the nation's attention is turned to the elections.

With this report and the one of Tuesday as background, the writer and his colleague, Long Island Congressman Lester Wolff, embark from here today on the last leg of their trip to Vietnam to observe the final days of the campaign and the election Sunday.

Secretary Freeman Dedicates Rural Water District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1967

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, Secretary Orville Freeman is rendering our Nation outstanding service as Secretary of Agriculture. Secretary Freeman is devoted and dedicated to building up rural America. He is looking ahead to the year 2000 when we will have 300 million people in our country. Mr. Freeman realizes that if this Nation is to continue as the heart and core of the free world, we must have a balance between our urban and rural population.

On September 7, Secretary Freeman made an excellent address in my congressional district in Pickens County at the dedication of Six Mile Community Water District and the Bethlehem-Roanoke Rural Water District.

I commend this great address to my colleagues and to the people of our country:

> A dedication should be both a tribute and a commitment.
>
> A tribute to those people who believed enough, cared enough and did enough to achieve something worthwhile and lasting.
>
> A dedication is also a commitment to the future where unfulfilled hopes will be realized and reachable expectations attained.
>
> This is such an occasion and I am proud to share this moment with you.
>
> Congratulations are, of course, in order to many, many people who contributed their energies, their experience, and their strong sense of community responsibilities to see these two great projects to completion and reality.
>
> It is not possible to name them all, but in behalf of all I want to single out the two chairmen: W. R. Reid of Central, South Carolina, and Norwood Cunningham of Pickens, South Carolina, and the officers and directors of their boards: Donald Mitchell, Sam R. Bolding, Kay Baumgarner, Nathan Kelly, all of the Six Mile Water District, and W. E. Dalton, Mrs. Ellen G. Irwin, Brandon Breazeale and Oliver Patterson, all of the Bethlehem-Roanoke Water District.
>
> I am certain all of you share with me and this Administration an unshakable confidence in the ability of people in rural America to create the kind of attractive, prosperous communities that mean expanding economic opportunities with jobs and new business enterprises and the kind of living environment that every American deserves, with good housing, good schools, good health services, and adequate recreation.
>
> While the basic thrust for attaining this kind of rural America for all its people, largely rests with the efforts and determination of the people themselves, it also requires Federal, State, and local programs, plus financial and technical assistance to realize them.
>
> The progress you have already made is remarkable:
>
> More than 1,100 families now have a good, clean and safe supply of water, in an area where it is difficult and expensive to obtain. Tomorrow your two systems will be serving more than 2,000 families—not to mention your schools, other public institutions and all your business places.
>
> Your land and property values are steadily increasing.
>
> One small industry has moved in—others will.
>
> You will soon get a new telephone exchange and a new post office.
>
> A new Vo-Ag training school is being built.
>
> New homes are being constructed.
>
> The signs of progress and community expansion are evident everywhere and as the circus barker says: "It's only the beginning folks—only the beginning!"
>
> As you celebrate you will be glad to know that more than 2,000 rural communities like yours have installed water or sewer facilities and another 500 have constructed fine recreation areas since 1961. This, too, is only the beginning of the total job President Johnson has set for this Administration—the rebuilding and revitalizing of *all* of rural America.
>
> Why is it so important and so urgent that we plan *now* and start *now* the job of full and complete development of ALL our rural resources?
>
> Why do we put the highest kind of Administration priority on our *"rural communities of tomorrow"* program?
>
> One compelling reason is this:
>
> For too many years—yes, for too many decades—the people in rural America have been falling farther and farther behind urban areas in quality of housing, community facilities, job opportunities, education, health and all those things essential to a good, creative and rewarding life.
>
> This unconscionable and unnecessary gap in economic and social advantages between rural and urban living—this alone as a matter of simple justice would justify a crash program to upgrade the quality of living in rural areas.
>
> But this is only part of the reason.
>
> The very fact that this opportunity gap was permitted in the first place and then allowed to pervade and erode the whole economic and social structure of rural America created not just an isolated rural problem, it created, as well, an awesome, sometimes terrifying, urban problem of national proportions.
>
> The absence of job opportunities in rural areas, the dwindling and sometimes total lack of educational, health and social advantages; unattractive communities and a pervasive feeling of hopelessness and lack of confidence in the future, have literally forced 20 million rural people into our urban areas since 1950.
>
> The creation of this rural-urban imbalance of population—where more than 70 percent of our population has jammed itself into 1 percent of our land area, cost rural America millions of its best young people.
>
> While the cities got many of our best young people, they also got millions of unwanted, unprepared, uneducated people—young and old—most of them incapable of coping with urban life with its tensions, its congestions, and almost total lack of jobs for the unskilled and untrained.
>
> In this same two decades, some two-thirds of the rural Negro population migrated to the cities—where they found even less desirable living conditions, and much more frustration and despair than they had in the countryside.
>
> Well, you know the results.
>
> To fail to understand the causes of ghetto frustration and violence and to refuse to recognize and attack the underlying forces is to perpetuate more frustration and more violence. Such a course threatens the very foundation of our Republic.
>
> We in rural America have a responsibility to help alleviate the pressures that we have imposed on the cities.
>
> As we go about the job of redeveloping the resources of our countryside and our rural communities and our family farms, we may not be able to reverse the tide so that mass numbers of people return to rural areas—but surely we can accomplish two things:
>
> We can stem this lemming-like migration; and we can build a rural America rich in opportunities, so that many of the some 100 million additional people we shall have by the year 2000 can choose to live in the countryside if they wish. As President Johnson said: "we must give these millions of people a right of choice where two live."
>
> To do this we must develop our rural environment in an orderly, wise and constructive manner. We must not repeat the mistakes made by the cities.
>
> As Winston Churchill once said: "those who forget history—repeat it."
>
> We do not intend to repeat and emulate the mistakes of the cities, where so many men have no face, no name, no identity.
>
> We do not intend to industralize rural America to the point where the countryside is just one string of factories.
>
> We do not intend to deface the beauty of open spaces or pollute the streams, the lakes and the air.
>
> We are going to build a rural America of the kind I see about me. A beautiful area—

with expanding opportunities—with unlimited potential for as many of your people and your sons and daughters and cousins and friends as choose to live here.

The big industrial complexes—the steel mills, the auto plants, the huge chemical and other manufacturing centers need not be eyesores and blights that poison the surroundings. Instead, they can be fitted into the landscape and built to serve, not pollute.

Service industries will follow industrial and recreational developments. Each is nourished by the other, and, as the wealth of a community grows, so can its facilities for education, health and cultural life.

Industrial, recreation and service industries will come to rural America, if we work at it, and, along with our agriculture, they will provide the economic backbone for jobs, new tax income, new business, and the subsequent social benefits that people want and need.

But you and I know that these things don't just "find their way" to a community; they can't be bestowed by a benevolent government; they don't just happen. They are the product of dynamic local leadership, working with determined local citizens such as you have here, and using every tool—public and private—that is adaptable to the task.

I am happy to report to you that other communities, in other States and in other regions, are doing what you people are doing—working together, using their own resources and those of their governments, to build better communities . . . . communities of opportunity for all.

This series of Town and Country tours which I began last June has confirmed to me that there is positive action and dynamic action in small town and rural America. The countryside is stirring.

I visited an area in Iowa last June where local leaders and officials of 10 counties have combined to plan for the wise use of the resources in all 10 counties to improve the economy and enhance the living in the entire region.

On that same trip, I visited Tupelo, Mississippi, a city that has made itself the base for an amazing record of economic growth in a 7-county area.

At Liberty, Texas, last week I was briefed on a Resource Conservation and Development project which is drafting a plan of action for conserving, developing and using the natural resources—including human resources—of 11 counties in the wisest and fullest ways.

And just this morning, at Congaree in your own State, I visited the Congaree Iron and Steel Co., Inc. Ten years ago, it was a roofless assemblage of used machinery; today it is a thriving industrial plant; with 400 employees and a million-and-a-half-dollar payroll.

People who had fled, jobless, to the big cities a few years ago, are actually returning to Congaree, because this is where they want to live, and this is where they can get jobs now, thanks to dynamic local people.

These are the kinds of things that are happening in scores of communities. They are the first steps in what must be a *national* commitment to rural-urban balance if we are to be prepared for the year 2000, and its 300 million Americans. We need many more steps; we have a long way to go. But we are on the move.

We must plan, and we must act, if we are to be able to give these 300 million people a choice in the whole spectrum of life—jobs, environment, health, recreation, culture and education.

Studies are now under way to see how best we can decentralize our higher education so that every young person who wants to go to college need not travel more than a few miles from where he lives. And these small rural colleges will become, not ony centers of learning and training, but centers of culture and artistic opportunity and enjoyment.

To me, what you are doing here—and what is being done all over rural America—represents one of the most exciting developments of this century.

And people like you are making it possible.

It is you who are providing the leadership and the ideas. It is you who have confidence in your own communities and in yourselves. And it is you who are making the Federal and State programs work because you are demonstrating an infinite capacity for cooperation.

It can't be done any other way.

In building a better rural America—we build a better whole America.

This you are doing and that's why I am so proud to be here today.

Thank you.

Address of L. Mendel Rivers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLETON J. KING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 11, 1967

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, this is my first year as a member of the House Committee on Armed Services. Of all the committees I have had the pleasure to serve on during the 7 years I have been a Member of Congress, my participation on this committee has been most informative, rewarding, and reassuring under the leadership of our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from South Carolina, the Honorable L. MENDEL RIVERS. Personally, I feel the future of our country is far more secure due to the diligent efforts and dedication on the part of our able chairman.

As an example of his thinking on matters of national importance and more specifically, the necessity of maintaining a strong National Guard service, I wish to share with my colleagues an address made by Chairman RIVERS on Monday, September 18, 1967, at the 89th General Conference of the National Guard Association of the United States here in Washington, D.C.

His address in defense of the National Guard is indeed inspirational and should be required reading by all Members of Congress. I also think his speech should be printed as a public document and made available to all schools. I salute Chairman RIVERS as an outstanding, patriotic American citizen and one of our Nation's leading military authorities.

The chairman's speech follows:

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE L. MENDEL RIVERS, CHAIRMAN, COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, 89TH GENERAL CONFERENCE OF THE NATIONAL GUARD ASSOCIATION OF THE UNITED STATES, WASHINGTON, D.C., SEPTEMBER 18, 1967

General Cantwell, Distinguished guests, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I am immensely privileged and honored to be given the opportunity, once again, to speak to you.

I know of no single group of Americans in our nation who today have a more sacred responsibility than that entrusted to you as Members of the National Guard.

It is you and your organization on which has been placed such a frightening obligation to serve your nation in both peace and war—in prosperity and adversity—as both civilians and men in uniform.

It is you, who in the last analysis, insure our country's very existence—make no mistake about that!

The last time I addressed this distinguished group was in Detroit on September 28, 1964. As you will recall, at that time I promised you and every man and woman in uniform that I would dedicate my efforts as the prospective Chairman of the House Armed Services Committee to insure that our soldiers, sailors, and airmen, and their loved ones would be guaranteed a level of compensation and a standard of living equal to that which they were dedicated to defend.

You will forgive me in pointing out that that was not an idle boast or an idle gesture.

In 1965, the House Committee on Armed Services doubled the pay raise for military personnel recommended by the Pentagon, and established I hope once and for all the principle that our uniformed personnel would receive compensation comparable to their Federal civilian counterparts.

Believe me, that job was not easy. The Executive Branch fought us with every weapon it could muster.

You know the rest of the story. We made believers out of the Department of Defense.

At a matter of fact, the formula developed by our Committee in computing the 1965 military pay raise is now one utilized by the Department of Defense in computing the 1966 and the proposed 1967 military pay raise.

The Congress and our Committee on Armed Services are determined to continue our constitutional responsibility. On this, there can be no compromise.

When I addressed you in September of 1964, Detroit was a happy city. As a matter of fact, Detroit was repeatedly pointed out as the city in the United States which was a model of progressive race relations—a city which had provided all segments of its citizenry with equal opportunity to live a normal and decent family life.

It was a city which had a bright and unlimited future. A city which had become a mecca for conventioneers from all over the United States. Indeed, we too enjoyed the hospitality and cordiality offered by the City of Detroit when we last met at Cobo Hall.

But look at Detroit now—a city of fear, distrust, and apprehension. A city filled with the grim, stark reminders of the futility of civil war and anarchy—a city filled with block after block of charred and gutted buildings whose ugly skeletal remains bear mute testimony to the folly of our new and lawless society.

How can anyone who has seen this tragic and wretched city after its exposure to uncontrolled violence call the National Guard irresponsible and trigger-happy?

How can any man, how can any American, accept with any complacency the frightening, pointless destruction which follows when law and order are replaced by anarchy?

The National Guard has been the organization which has prevented our country from slipping permanently into the abyss of total violence and total lawlessness.

Since 1957 the National Guard has been called approximately 75 times to restore law and order during civil disturbances in this country. In Watts, Newark, Detroit and Milwaukee, among others, the Guard has displayed its unique and absolutely indispensable capability in assisting local law enforcement officers in the restoration of law and order.

The distinguished service and performance of the Guard over these past many years has now become the object of the strongest criticism and yes, slander, from some of the most surprising sources. You and I both know how completely undeserved are these criticisms. Nonetheless, the seed of distrust has been effectively planted and its offspring will be nutured by some less responsible members of the fourth estate.

Tragically this assault on the image of the National Guard continues with only the most feeble defense from the Pentagon and many of our Governors. It is strange indeed to view the Pentagon, the foster parent, if you will, of the National Guard, bowing and scraping to those voices of discord in the nation who are attempting to identify the Guard as a boy trying to do a man's work.

I do not charge these forces with treason, but certainly you and every American have every reason to ask why the Guard has suddenly been singled out as the whipping boy.

Could it be that these voices of dissent are frantically attempting to somehow transfer the responsibility for these civil disorders to the National Guard?

Could it be that these voices of dissent, who in fact are heard in even the highest echelons of our Government, have suddenly recognized that their counsel to ignore laws and obedience to laws has now borne evil fruit?

Could it be that these voices of discord and hate have suddenly recognized that the National Guard does, in truth, represent the bastions of freedom and the guarantors of our liberty and constitutional government?

Is it not probably that certain of these critics in the Executive Branch have suddenly made the Guard a scapegoat for their own mistakes and miscalculations?

I don't know the answers but I am frightened and alarmed. I am concerned that these insidious criticisms are designed to destroy you—the National Guard—and change the course of America.

Remember and don't forget—they are tampering with your country.

I shudder to think of what America would be without the National Guard. Consider for a moment what would happen in our great cities and communities if the Governors of our various States were unable to look to their own State militia forces for such strength as would be necessary to insure domestic tranquility.

Think for a moment of what would happen to the last vestige of State's rights if our National Guard disappeared from the scene.

Don't forget those prophetic words, "What is past is prologue".

I say to you there is nothing wrong with the National Guard. Certainly there is nothing wrong with its dedication, its motivation; or its patriotism.

You and I both know that we have begged and pleaded and threatened the Pentagon to obtain equipment and trained personnel with little success. The Pentagon now wishes to hide and conceal the miscalculations of its "cost effective" creatures and shoulder you with the blame for their own folly which has descended upon them like a whirlwind.

Now, you can take this abuse lying down, or you can fight back.

Your Constitution gives you your life—your Congress gives you your hope. I have given you your forum. You have only to tell us your story—your friends of days gone by will continue to be your refuge in days to come. The going will be tough, but only the tough can survive. If you go, we all go. Our country and constitutional Government cannot survive your demise. America is too young to die. Meet your challenge—the tocsin sounds—your country calls. We will walk this road together—tell us your story and I give you my word you will not bear this cross alone.

You don't have to be cannon fodder for the hate mongers who have been offered and provided sanctuaries by officers of our Government and the highest echelons of our courts.

You and your Governors need not knuckle under to the demands of bureaucrats in our Federal Government. Welcome this challenge to your survival—your cause is right.

How else can you and I answer our children and unborn generations to come if we falter now. Can we leave them a legacy of failure—a legacy of fear—a legacy of anarchy and the loss of constitutional Government? This is your day in history.

Perhaps Daniel Webster on February 18, 1832, was most prophetic when he said—

"Other misfortunes may be borne, or their effects overcome. If disastrous war should sweep our commerce from the ocean, another generation may renew it; if it exhausts our treasury, future industry may replenish it; if it desolate and lay waste our fields, still, under a new cultivation, they will grow green again, and ripen to future harvests. It were but a trifle even if the walls of yonder Capitol were to crumble, if its lofty pillars should fall, and its gorgeous decorations be all covered by the dust of the valley. All these might be rebuilt. But who shall reconstruct the fabric of demolished government? Who shall rear again the well-proportioned columns of constitutional liberty? Who shall frame together the skillful architecture which unites national sovereignty with State rights, individual security, and public prosperity? No, if these columns fall, they will be raised not again. Like the Coliseum and the Parthenon, they will be destined to a mournful, a melancholy immortality. Bitter tears, however, will flow over them, than were ever shed over the monuments of Roman or Grecian art; for they will be the remnants of a more glorious edifice than Greece or Rome ever saw, the edifice of constitutional American liberty."

You must resist these efforts to pervert and destroy the traditional and constitutional nature of the National Guard.

Remember that you share with your brother in arms in Vietnam the responsibility for the future security of our nation.

You are the guardian of liberty at home. Can you honestly believe that you have discharged your responsibility if you have failed to meet this challenge to National Guard survival?

Our men in Vietnam, as well as every law-abiding citizen in America, looks to us to preserve America.

You and I must share this burden—we must carry the torch:

> "Lord, lest I go my uncaring way
> Help me to remember
> That somewhere out there
> A man died for me today.
> So long as there be war
> I must ask and answer,
> Am I worth dying for?"

There are two burning issues facing the nation today: Law and order at home and victory abroad. You are involved directly in both. You stand ready to serve, once again, against the onslaught of communist aggression; you have already been called upon to suppress insurrection at home. You can be proud of your accomplishments, but the greatest deed you can perform for our nation today is to rekindle the fading light of the once brightly burning torch of patriotism that used to symbolize our Nation.

Thank you.

Sees Lending Bills as Meaningless

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD BOLLING
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 19, 1967

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, in July, the Senate passed truth-in-lending legislation. In the House my able colleague from St. Louis, Representative LEONOR SULLIVAN, Democrat, of Missouri, and her Consumer Affairs Subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee is beginning markup, after hearings on the House version. On September 16, 1967, the Kansas City Times published an interview with Mrs. SULLIVAN by Mr. Robert P. Sigman. Mrs. SULLIVAN persuasively outlines her criticisms of the Senate version and discusses her hopes for developing a more effective bill within her subcommittee. I agree with Mrs. SULLIVAN. I include the article in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

SEES LENDING BILL AS MEANINGLESS

(By Robert P. Sigman)

A Missouri member of Congress appears to be on a collision course with the United States Senate over truth-in-lending legislation.

Rep. Leonor K. Sullivan, a Democrat from St. Louis, said here yesterday a bill passed 92 to 0 in the Senate in July is "nothing much except a label." She spoke at a luncheon of the Missouri Savings and Loan league at the Hotel Muehlebach.

In an interview, Mrs. Sullivan said a bill she is sponsoring in the U.S. House is much stronger than the Senate measure. Affected by the legislation would be about 100 billion dollars in borrowing a year, about 92½ billion in consumer credit, and the rest in second mortgages on homes.

Mrs. Sullivan, chairman of the House subcommittee on consumer affairs, said testimony has been completed in the House on her legislation and executive sessions will begin Monday in Washington to develop the final draft.

Basically, the legislation would require lenders and merchants to disclose in writing the true annual interest rate and finance charges in dollars and cents. It would enable consumers to compare the cost of credit and obtain the best buy.

Mrs. Sullivan said many persons, especially those who are undereducated and on low incomes, are misled by unscrupulous lenders and salesmen.

"The Senate-passed bill is not only substantially weaker than my bill but subject to a great many amendments which could undermine the whole purpose of the legislation," she said. "So we have a fight on our hands to get something through that is worth enacting. The lobbying against this legislation is prodigious—because the stakes are very large."

Mrs. Sullivan takes vigorous exception to two provisions in the Senate measure. It excludes revolving charge accounts and first mortgages.

"Department stores have had phenomenal success in promoting their revolving credit programs which involves a monthly charge of 1½ per cent," she said, "which in my old-fashioned mathematics comes out to 18 per cent a year on an annual rate basis."

Mrs. Sullivan said she is not concerned about conventional loans or those made under the FHA.

"There are a great many unconscionable credit frauds being perpetrated on elderly couples and on widows who have paid off mortgages and suddenly find that a piece of paper they signed for a siding job or a new furnace—a piece of paper handed to them by what I understand are commonly called the 'suede shoe boys' turns out to be a first mortgage, and thus exempt under the Senate bill," she explained.

Her bill also includes control over "open end" credit cards, which also are exempt under the Senate bill.

A bank credit card operation in California, she said, is now promoting a special service in supermarkets: Charge groceries for a 3 per cent service charge.

"Apparently many shoppers are seizing advantage of this dandy little convenience of being able to say 'charge it' to the food checker for a mere 36 per cent annual interest rate."

In her speech, Mrs. Sullivan discussed truth-in-lending and pending legislation in Congress to regulate holding companies that own savings and loan companies. They operate in California and 10 other states, she explained. Abuses have been reported by such firms that draw off public funds, thus endangering the fiscal welfare of the loan companies.

Late Summer Evening

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 11, 1967

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, seldom does one see so lovely a word picture as painted in an editorial which appeared in the Morristown, Tenn., Citizen-Tribune on the beauty of a late summer evening.

As autumn hurries to meet her annual deadline just a few days away, I think it fitting to pause, in this day when the newspapers are filled with accounts of violence and unrest, for a moment's quite contemplation of the summer that is leaving.

I insert this editorial in the Appendix of the RECORD:

MOOD OF SUMMER'S NIGHT

Whether on vacation or at home, instantly rewarding is the long-formed habit of lingering on the front stoop nightly at late bedtime, to sniff the air, catch any slight breeze, and read the old wall thermometer by matchlight. One reads also the mood of the night and shares unexpected sights, sounds, feelings, fragrances of the velvety dark.

Particular instances, which will always be remembered, are the magical gleam of a row of Shasta daisies on the moonlight, the sound—almost supersonic in pitch—of a kildeer calling from scene far afield, the smell of honeysuckle and madonna lilies released on the cool, heavy air.

Unforgetable is the evening star shining brightly enough to cast shadows, and the eerie, mysteriously silent beauty of heat lightning or northern lights—sudden flashes of a horizon beyond our ken.

Remembered is the very special glimpse, in spring or fall, of a band of high flying geese sweeping across the moon, and evenings when the Milky Way was so lacteally rich as to invite skimming off some cream with the Big Dipper.

In season, in the country, the smell of newly mown hay has power to awaken a nostalgic longing for something intangible—something almost but never quite remembered—and not of this world.

In the city, the sounds of humanity are hushed. A sleepy baby whimpers drowsily; a man and a woman murmur. Trees in the park swim in an aùra of misty gold.

Compared to these natural glories of the night, what real chànce has an occasionally sighted man-made satellite to arouse more than a cursory passing interest? Now even an UFO could create the deep emotions and memories evoked by a late summer's night.

A Marketing Order for Apples

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1967

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, one of the problems facing today's agricultural producers is that modern methods have resulted in greatly increased crop yields, but modern methods of marketing the product that is grown have been applied only with great difficulty. The Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended in 1965, authorizes the use of modern promotional methods, including research and development and paid advertising, for a large variety of fruits, nuts, and vegetables.

I am today introducing a bill that would extend this marketing authorization to apples. Under this bill, if two-thirds of the applegrowers in a given region request it, a Federal marketing order would be issued which would involve the assessment of all applegrowers in the region for research and development projects and paid advertising.

The soundness and usefulness of such marketing orders is attested by their wide use with respect to other agricultural products. In the large-volume apple-producing States of New York and Washington, such orders are already in effect on a State basis. In the six New England States, however, and in other regions, the administrative cost of such arrangements on a State-by-State basis would be prohibitive. A Federal program is needed to offer apple producers in those States with small production a means to effect a more orderly marketing structure.

This bill would also allow the continuation of research and development programs, including paid advertising, during above-parity price conditions. A very similar provision was added to the act in 1965 with respect to the continuation or initiation of container and pack regulations in above-parity situations. The provision in my bill embodies a longstanding recommendation of the U.S. Department of Agriculture that research and development projects be implemented and maintained independent of the price level of the product involved. This provision is necessary to avoid the confusion of trying to maintain these projects on an intermittent basis.

This bill, like other marketing order legislation, is intended to improve returns to farmers. It would be extremely valuable to applegrowers in States with small apple production in maintaining a healthy economic position, and I hope it will be passed without delay.

Responsible Dissent

SPEECH

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1967

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, September 14, 1967, I had the pleasure of being the guest speaker at the fall business meeting dinner of the New York Claim Association, at which time I chose to discuss responsible dissent. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my statement of that evening:

RESPONSIBLE DISSENT

I must begin by warning you that I have chosen not to be limited in my choice of topic by tyranny of precedents. I know that those who have appeared before you have addressed themselves to matters within your special interest, and properly so. But I have chosen a theme which literally haunts me these days and it appears to me that until I deposit it upon the minds and the conscience of those willing to listen, I shall get no peace.

Today there reverberates through the land the rallying cry of the "right to dissent." I know of no thoughtful person who would deny that right. The First Amendment has withstood every assault made upon it, and the right to dissent, voices to the contrary notwithstanding, has become so embedded in our political and social structure that it is often infuriating to have to argue that such a right really exists. The right of dissent is precious. I respect that right in others, and I invite your respect for my right to differ. A nation without controversy is politically dead. With the dead there is no dissent. In the cemetery there is no controversy. An old Japanese proverb murmurs, "Move not that which is still." We say, "Leave well enough alone." Well, that's just great for the smug and the slack, for the fearful and the feeble.

I think it is far better for a nation to be politically alive, with dissent, with the clash of opinion and ideological rivalry. And so do you. Had you remained docile and stagnant, you would not have gone into the midst of controversy that once surrounded such questions as Workmen's Compensation, the Disability Benefits Law, and the like. Reasonable men may differ and must differ at times, just as different men boil at different degrees and their hearts beat differently, and their lungs breathe differently.

But—and this is the *but* tragically ignored—what about the responsibilities which march along with dissent? Is the dissentor free from any responsibility whatsoever? Is his dissent based upon reason, fact and contemplation of the consequences? Does he deny the right of dissent to a George Wallace, to an H. L. Hunt, or a Mario Savio of Berkeley "fame", but insist upon it for a Stokely Carmichael? Or vice versa? How throughly does he understand the right to dissent which must be accorded, if the First Amendment is to be meaningful, even to ideologies we most abhor? Is he at any time aware of the point where the flow of the First Amendment reaches the wall of a clear and present danger?

Now that I've brought some names into the discussion, I'd like to use one of each extreme group as illustrative of the questions I posed. What are their objectives? First, Stokely Carmichael. Dissentor and disclaimer, how well has he reached his objective—to bring the Negro closer to the reality of equality of opportunity? He has not. Instead, he and the fanatically militant have brought the civil rights movement to a dangerous precipice. The wild uninhibited statements of a Stokely Carmichael have tragically frightened the majority.

Where there should be understanding, there is now fear, fear hardening into opposition against the legitimate demands of our Negro citizens. Who benefits, may I ask, when at the recently held National Conference on the New Politics, the white leftists abjectly surrendered to the demands of the Black Militants, as they call themselves? The beneficiaries of Black Militants will not be the Negroes enclaved in the slums, who face daily impoverishment in all aspects of living. I recall the magnificence of the Washington March. Nationwide sympathy was awakened and the white majority responded, albeit slowly. Now the tide of sympathy and understanding and willingness to undertake remedies recedes. The consequence may be a national crisis of unmeasurable dimension. It is the irrational response to irrationality we all must fear and all must curb.

George Wallace dissents from the 1954 Supreme Court decision. That again is his First Amendment right. But the manner and tone of his dissent has inflamed passions, given aid and comfort to the most irresponsible elements in the country, and encouraged the white backlash. But has he succeeded in his objective to keep Alabama completely segregated? No, no more than he succeeded in keeping the doors of the University closed to Negroes.

We have too often seen the right to dissent debased to include violence and physical assault. Dissent need not be *respectable,* but it must be *responsible* lest excess beget excess and the devil take the bow—front stage.

Let's take a look at the "hippies." Dissenting from the mores and culture of our society, they have shed themselves of every responsibility. They seem to care little for the heritage of the past and nothing for the promises of the future. They propose to spend their youth in a sick trance of rejecting. What they see as "wrong in society," they make no effort to right. They are locked in the prisons of their own fantasies and, frankly, I ache for them, for what will they see when they search the mirrors of their souls at the age of, let us say, 30?

The dissentors on Vietnam hug to themselves the right to dissent, but overturn cars, smash windows, and irresponsibly denounce with all possible vulgarity not only those who disagree with their position but even those who agree.

Then there are those bravados who advocate riots, who make the noises, and then depart to leave the rioters and the destroyers to fend for themselves.

And what of those, who like shrill, hysterical biddies, screech for impeachment of our Supreme Court Justices without ever having read even one of the opinions?

I might as well add a word about the students' revolts and demonstrations. If only *they* could run the colleges and universities, sweet reason would prevail. And how would *they* define "reason?"

When an anti-Vietnam assembly cries "murderer" at Lyndon Johnson and when a Birchite cries "traitor" at Earl Warren, we are witness to a malignant debasement of the right to dissent.

When I observe all the disturbances around the world, not just in the United States, I often feel that rational man is being dismissed as a creature without consequence or without commitment.

It is here that the attorney can play his most significant role—to extend the rule of law within and without the boundaries of this land. For this task the attorney is well equipped. The tools of the profession—precision, analysis, logic, documentation, the probing skills, the inquiring mind—are exactly what is needed.

This does not mean I argue for the status quo. Dissent is the spur which leads to an examination of the weaknesses in our social and political structure. Nor am I an alarmist. The recent rash of retreats from reason—this too shall pass. But we are dependent upon you, the attorney, to keep the pendulum more truly in balance. Untrammeled emotion and hysteria will always be with us in one degree or another. I am not so foolish as to believe otherwise. The perspective of the attorney, however, *is* larger than the landscape surveyed. It carries into a future beyond which we, the living, cannot penetrate.

Edmund Burke said in a few lines what has taken me seven pages to say:

"Men are qualified for civil liberties in exact proportion to their disposition to put moral chains upon their own appetites . . . society cannot exist unless a controlling power upon will and appetite be placed somewhere, and the less of it there is within, the more there must be without. It is ordained in the eternal constitution of things that men of intemperate minds cannot be free. Their passions forge their fetters."

To mind come some names of dissenters who swam against the currents with clean strong strokes, proposing alternatives to that to which they objected, their reasoning incisive and affirmative. I have picked such names at random and I am certain there isn't one here who could not add his own choices to a long and honorable list, but let us recall: Senator George Norris, John Peter Altgeld, Norman Thomas, Alexander Hamilton, Patrick Henry, Andre Malraux, Bishop James Pike, Margaret Sanger, John Locke, Abraham Lincoln, Oliver Wendell Holmes, Lincoln Steffens. They sought, not self-aggrandizement, but the building of a more humane society. They struggled against inertia, indifference, and greed to perfect a vision of civilized man; in short, they were rational and engaged.

I do not suggest there was an absence of passion. On the contrary. But neither was there an absence of inhibition nor, above all, an absence of responsibility.

I cannot tell you how I appreciate your attentiveness and how much I appreciate the opportunity you have given me to say that which I have been thinking these days.

Thank you.

Noted Economist Strongly Supports Surcharge Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1967

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, as many of us know, the great mass of economic experts have made known their support for the administration's temporary 10-percent surcharge proposal.

The noted economist, Dr. James J. O'Leary, chairman of the economic research firm of Lionel D. Edie & Co., Inc., New York, is among these experts. He recently presented one of the strongest and most convincing cases I have read for the surcharge proposal.

Because of this, I think Dr. O'Leary's presentation is certainly worthy of thoughtful consideration by Members who, like myself, are uncommitted now on the surcharge proposal.

Dr. O'Leary argues his case in terms of the general economic need for fiscal restraint. He points out that the surcharge is urgently necessary to dampen inflationary pressures, to avoid the onset of a new "credit crunch," to prevent a deterioration in our balance of payments, and to encourage and permit a healthier and better balanced business expansion in the months ahead.

Mr. Speaker, I believe Dr. O'Leary's recent testimony before the House Ways and Means Committee should be of interest to my colleagues, and I insert it in the Record at this point:

STATEMENT BY DR. JAMES J. O'LEARY

I am James J. O'Leary, Chairman of the Board and Chief Economist, Lionel D. Edie and Company, a leading investment counseling and economic consulting firm in New York City. I am honored by your invitation to participate in this panel discussion of the President's recommendation of a 10 percent surcharge on personal and corporate income tax liabilities.

The challenge which the President's tax proposal poses to the Congress today is as great as that presented by his recommendation for tax reduction in 1964. Congress made a wise decision in 1964. The tax cut helped greatly to stimulate the economy to achieve and maintain full employment. The question which many economists are asking today is whether Congress will be equally wise in applying an increased measure of fiscal restraint to head off emerging inflationary pressures as business activity begins a new wave of expansion from an already full employment level.

In February, 1966 I submitted a statement to the Joint Economic Committee of the Congress, commenting upon the Economic Report of the President. In this statement, a copy of which I am attaching to my testimony today, I warned that the Federal budget for fiscal 1967 was "much too expansionary" and that it would cause overheating of the economy. I took the position at that time that (1) "nondefense Federal expenditures should be reexamined with an eye to substantial cutbacks wherever possible"; (2) "the legislative process should be started to permit an increase in both personal and corporate income tax rates to yield about $5 billion annually"; and (3) "the monetary authorities should move promptly to slow down the rate of expansion of bank credit—but at the same time care must be taken by the authorities to avoid measures that might precipitate a financial crisis". The general tenor of my comments was that inflationary pressures were intensifying and that an increased measure of fiscal restraint was needed to avoid undue monetary restraint and a possible "credit crunch".

This was also the general position of Lionel D. Edie and Company in early 1966. I am embarrassed to quote my views of last year to you—I do so only to lend greater strength to the views I am going to present today. The situation which confronts us today is remarkably similar to that which developed in the second half of 1965 and early 1966. If anything, it is much more serious. Fiscal and monetary policies are administering a powerful dose of expansionary medicine. The price level is rising at a faster rate than in the second half of 1965 and early 1966. The unemployment rate is lower. Wages are increasing at a faster rate. And long-term interest rates have already risen to the peak of the "credit crunch" of last summer, far above the level of the second half of 1965. My sense of urgency today about the need for greater fiscal restraint is stronger than it was in early 1966.

SUMMARY OF MY VIEWS ON THE PRESIDENT'S FISCAL PROGRAM

I would like first to summarize my views on the President's fiscal program before going into somewhat greater detail about the reasons for my position. Wise policy *does* call for a greater measure of fiscal restraint in the months ahead. The emphasis which the President places upon cutting back or controlling the increase of Federal spending is commendable. I would prefer that the Administration's target for expenditure reduction be larger than $2 billion. Realism compels me to agree, however, that the main emphasis of fiscal restraint must be on increased revenues, and the temporary surcharge is a simple and fair means for this purpose.

There is an urgent need for greater fiscal restraint for four important reasons:

1. To dampen serious inflationary pressures likely to develop in the months ahead;

2. To avoid the onset of a new "credit crunch" such as we experienced last summer, with all the inequities and dislocations which it produced;

3. To prevent a deterioration in the deficit in our international balance of payments; and

4. To encourage and permit a healthier and better balanced business expansion in the months ahead.

Accordingly, I strongly support the President's tax proposals in terms of general economic need for fiscal restraint. Proper timing of Congressional action is just as important as enactment of the tax program itself. To be effective, enactment should be as prompt as possible. Modern medicine does not wait until cancer has spread—it seeks to remove the malignancy at an early stage or, through treatment, to prevent it from developing into a grave condition. This is the way we must apply fiscal restraint at this time to arrest the spreading of the cancer of inflation.

Fiscal and monetary policy will be confronted by difficult decisions in this and the next year. The proposal before this Committee today should not be thought of as a complete answer to the problems ahead. But it is, in my judgment, a wise step at this time.

THE FORCES TOWARD STRONG ECONOMIC EXPANSION

In reaching a decision about the need for more fiscal restraint, the primary question, of course, is whether without greater restraint the rate of economic expansion will be excessive in the months ahead. I feel confident that there are several powerful forces which are beginning to work toward a very strong business expansion which, if not checked somewhat, will place serious upward pressures on the general price level. These forces, which are described briefly because I am sure you are familiar with them, are as follows:

1. The Federal budget, on a national income accounts basis, has swung from a surplus of $3 billion at an annnal rate in the first half of calendar 1966 to a deficit of $13 billion at an annual rate in the first half of 1967. Without the President's program, it is estimated that the national income accounts deficit will rise to $15–18 billion in fiscal 1968. This is particularly significant because it occurs under virtually full employment conditions. At no time previously since the Korean War has the Federal budget on a national income accounts basis been actually in deficit under high employment conditions. During the Korean War period the peak deficit rate for any half-year period was $5½ billion, about the same as the current $13 billion rate when viewed in relation to GNP. So, the economy is today receiving a very powerful fiscal stimulus. Part of the stimulus is involuntary because the Government has little discretion over the largest portion of its expenditures.

2. Since late last year the monetary authorities have pursued a policy of active credit ease, and this policy continues today. The money stock, which includes currency held by the public in addition to private demand deposits, has increased at a 9 percent annual rate over the past six months and at a 7 percent rate over the past nine months, compared with a 4 percent annual rate from 1964 to 1966. Time deposits of the commercial banks, which many economists would today include in the monetary stock, have been expanding at a 17 percent annual rate since last January. Total loans and investments of the commercial banks in the first seven months of this year increased by $24 billion, or at an annual rate of $41 billion, or 13 percent. The largest prior increase was $27.2 billion in 1965. The strength of monetary ease is evident when it is realized that under full employment conditions, such as exist today, the economy has the capacity to grow in *real* terms about 4-4½ percent per annum. The combined expansionary power of fiscal and monetary policy has seldom, if ever, been matched in the modern history of this country.

3. Personal income has been increasing strongly at a 9 percent annual rate since May. Personal saving rose to the unusually high rate of 7.3 percent of disposable personal income in the first quarter, but the rate dropped to 6.7 percent in the second quarter and seems likely to fall further in coming months. The liquid asset position of the consumer is strong and the index of consumer confidence compiled by the Survey Research Center of the University of Michigan is rising after a decline last year. Under these conditions, it is not surprising that the consumer is coming back strongly. Retail sales expanded markedly from May to July, primarily due to increased purchases of durable goods. Sales have increased at an 8 percent annual rate since January compared with a 2.4 percent rise during the previous year. Consumer spending on durable goods rose markedly from the first to the second quarter, compared with a downdrift in the previous four quarters.

4. Final sales (i.e., total production sold to final users—consumers, home buyers, government at all levels, business fixed investment, and net sales abroad) have been very strong, rising $15½ billion per quarter during the first two quarters. The $31 billion total for the first half was an all-time record. During the same period, however, the rate of business inventory accumulations fell by $18 billion, so that the GNP increased by only $13 billion in the first half. The inventory adjustment has already been completed at the retail and wholesale levels and the remaining excess of inventories at the manufacturing level should be cleaned up readily as demand rises. Manufacturers' new durable goods orders exceeded shipments throughout the second quarter for the first time since last December. As a result, the backlog of orders increased $1.7 billion from May to July of this year. Reflecting the strong demand and improved inventory situation, the FRB index of industrial production increased a full point in July after declining at a 3.4 percent annual rate from October to June. We may expect that the rate of inventory accumulation, after bottoming out in this quarter, will begin to rise again to a more normal level by the fourth quarter of this year and early next year. Thus, the GNP will not be dragged down by inventory correction but will be further increased by a more normal rate of accumulation.

5. Since the first quarter of 1966 the annual rate of state and local government spending has been rising in excess of $2 billion per quarter and there is no reason to expect that this strongly expansionary force will diminish in the months ahead.

6. Fed by greater availablity of mortgage credit, residential construction has been expanding and should continue to increase in the months ahead. Private nonfarm housing starts have moved up from a seasonally adjusted annual rate of 824,000 at the low point last October to 1,347,000 in July. Permits have also risen markedly and, after a slow start this year, the home mortgage loan commitments of mortgage lending institutions have risen strongly. In general, vacancy rates are low and the dearth of new construction last year has built up a sizeable backlog of unsatisfied demand. The rate of home-building may be expected to increase further during the balance of this year and in the first half of 1968 if not choked off by decreased availability of credit.

7. Finally, although most economists are not expecting more than a moderate increase in capital spending by business and industry this year, it would not be surprising if such spending did in fact expand more strongly than currently expected in view of the other powerful forces for economic expansion which have been already enumerated. Some of the leading indicators suggest that the rise in capital spending may be greater than expected. For example, since February contracts and orders for plant and equipment have increased by 6.2 percent, and new orders in the machinery and equipment industries by 13.2 percent. From January through July, construction contracts for commercial and industrial building have risen by 13 percent. Rising labor costs, the buoyancy of the current expansion, and business confidence in strong economic growth over the longer run could make capital spending in the next several months a stronger force for general business expansion than currently expected. We do not want to second guess the results of our Edie annual survey of capital expenditures even though some indicators point to an improvement. Results of the survey should be available by mid-September and I will be happy to supply this Committee with the findings. It should be noted, however, that our experience with the survey indicates that in a period of business recovery business firms have a tendency to underestimate their investment requirements a year in advance.

These gathering forces which I have enumerated are not atypical of the strong pressures and strains which our economy has undergone in past recovery periods, except that this time we have one added factor over which there is little control—Vietnam. This not-so-minor item makes the implementation of sound fiscal policy more imperative. This is why, if we take into account all of the aforementioned forces for general economic expansion, I believe that there is a clear danger that, unless dampened by fiscal or monetary restraint (possibly both), the rate of business expansion during the balance of this year and in 1968 will turn out to be excessively high from the standpoint of sustainability and freedom from serious inflationary pressures. Business forecasting is far from an exact science, but we certainly seem to have most of the ingredients for a strong surge in activity. My judgment is that the degree of fiscal restraint in the President's program will serve to dampen the rate of expansion somewhat, but certainly will not abort it. Even with the surtax, we are estimating that GNP will expand by $30–35 billion in the second half of this year. Prompt use of fiscal restraint now will provide a better basis for sustained growth later on.

THE URGENT NEED FOR THE PRESIDENT'S PROGRAM

There are four principal reasons, then, why the President's program for greater fiscal restraint is urgently needed:

1. It is needed to prevent the development of serious inflationary pressures in the

months ahead. We are already witnessing an acceleration in the rise of prices. From April to July consumer prices rose at a 4.0 percent annual rate, compared with a 2 percent rate from August of 1966 to April of this year. Wholesale prices rose at a 4.4 percent annual rate from April to July, compared with a 2 percent rate of decline from August a year ago to last April. It should be noted, however, that the marked shift in the trend of wholesale prices was caused chiefly by developments in farm products and processed foods. Inflationary pressures are bound to be strong with wage costs rising 5–6 percent this year and with business firms seeking to escape narrower profit margins by raising prices. We tend to think of the current inflation as "cost-push" inflation, but it must be remembered that a strong demand situation is required to permit the shifting of higher costs onto the consuming public. Without the surcharge, the strong expansion of demand in the economy will add the force of "demand-pull" to the "cost-push" inflation.

2. The President's program for greater fiscal restraint is urgently needed to head off a new "credit crunch" like the one which dealt the economy such a severe blow last summer. I am convinced that prompt enactment of the surcharge, and determined efforts to curtail Federal expenditures, are necessary if we are to avoid a new liquidity squeeze. The behavior of financial markets this year has been nothing short of amazing. Beginning late last year, after the economy had become sluggish and the monetary authorities had turned to active credit ease, both short- and long-term interest rates declined. The yield on 90-day Treasury bills, for example, fell quite steadily from around the 5.50 percent level in late September to 3.41 percent in early June of this year, a drop of more than two full percentage points. On the other hand, the average yield on long-term Government bonds, after dropping from a high of 4.97 percent in late August of last year to 4.37 percent in early February of this year, has since risen steadily and is now back at the peak of the credit squeeze of last year. Since June there has been a marked rise in short-term rates, with the average yield on Treasury bills, for example, now at 4.35 percent (August 25). And this persistent rise in interest rates has occurred in the face of determined efforts by the monetary authorities to maintain easy credit and to lower interest rates, especially long-term rates.

What is the explanation for this surprising performance of interest rates? Basically, of course, it has been the enormous demand for funds relative to available supply, but the situation has been accentuated by powerful psychological forces in the financial markets. Early this year the decisions of financial institutions, the business community at large, and state and local government officials were influenced by two things: (a) the traumatic recollection of the "credit crunch" of 1966 and the severe hardships it had imposed; and (b) confidence that the "new economics," by means of easy credit and Federal deficit financing, would bring about a resumption of economic expansion in the second half of the year. The general expectation was that as economic expansion resumed in the second half of the year, interest rates would rise again because of increasing credit demands and because of a move by the monetary authorities to tighter credit as inflationary pressures developed. It was anticipated that, as economic expansion occurred in the second half, the main burden would again be thrust upon the Federal Reserve to combat inflation because Congress and the Administration would be slow to impose fiscal restraint.

This set of expectations created powerful forces toward higher long-term interest rates. Lending institutions this year have been living in fear that as interest rates moved upward there would be another round of "disintermediation" in which funds would flow out of commercial banks, mutual savings banks, savings and loan associations, and life insurance companies. The result is that the lending institutions have placed much greater stress upon building their holdings of liquid assets and have not moved aggressively to make long-term loans. Similarly, after long-term rates moved down somewhat early this year, business firms and state and local government officials quickly flooded the market with new offerings to take advantage of the lower rates before the expected rise of interest rates later in the year.

The result, as you know, has been a record flood of bond offerings by corporations and state and local government units. In the face of these pressures, long-term interest rates inexorably moved back to peak levels despite heroic efforts by the monetary authorities to prevent the rise. The more the authorities increased credit availability, the greater the conviction of the financial and business community that the economy would soon expand sharply and that interest rates would have to rise. Moreover, it became evident that a huge Federal deficit was in the making and that this, too, would be a powerful force toward higher interest rates.

These, then, are the principal forces which have led to a sharp rise of long-term rates in the face of massive credit ease by the monetary authorities. As long-term rates rose to record levels, they ultimately have begun to pull short-term rates along with them. If interest rates are moving upward in this period of credit ease, what will happen to them when the Federal Reserve is faced by stronger inflationary pressures, unwieldy loan demand, and rising Federal deficit financing? The Federal Reserve's responsibility, barring greater fiscal restraint, will be to curtail credit, thus adding more to the upward pressure on interest rates.

The financial and business community was highly skeptical that the Administration would recommend strong fiscal action. The President's recommendation has for the time being slowed the increase of interest rates, but Congress would make a serious mistake to underestimate the power of expectations operating in financial markets. The financial markets are waiting to see whether fiscal restraint will be applied. If Congress does not enact the surcharge, I am convinced that interest rates will rise to new heights. This will occur not only because of rising demands for credit, in which the Federal Government will play a major role. It will also occur because the monetary authorities will be required to reduce the availability of credit as inflationary pressures strengthen.

We saw last year the awesome process of disintermediation as long- and short-term interest rates soared. Any further increase of long-term rates is bound to trigger a further rise in short and intermediate interest rates and thus begin to pull funds out of the financial institutions. Last year provided bitter evidence of the way in which a credit crunch can choke off activity in key sectors of the economy, such as housing, and ultimately in the economy as a whole. The President's program is urgently needed to avoid this contingency.

3. We also need a greater measure of fiscal restraint to avoid a serious deterioration in the deficit in our international balance of payments. So far this year we have experienced an encouraging rise in our export surplus which we are counting upon to offset the increased foreign exchange drain of Vietnam. However, if the economy expands at too high a rate in coming months and develops inflationary excesses, imports will rise because of higher domestic demand and exports will decline, thus narrowing our export surplus. We cannot be complacent about our continuing large balance of payments deficit. Surplus countries are becoming increasingly impatient about adding to their holdings of dollars and we cannot count upon them to refrain from buying gold indefinitely.

4. Finally, the greater measure of fiscal restraint recommended by the President is needed to permit and encourage a better balanced and healthier expansion of business activity—free of serious inflation and painful dislocations such as occurred last year. In particular, it is needed to avoid another drying up of home mortgage credit and the choking off of home construction as occurred last year.

WHAT ARE THE ALTERNATIVES TO THE PRESIDENT'S PROGRAM?

If Congress should not enact the President's proposal, what are the alternatives? One would be to permit the economic expansion to proceed unchecked and to allow a serious increase in the price level. I am certain that Congress would never permit this situation to develop. In any event, the monetary authorities would be forced to restrict credit, and this would bring on the "credit crunch" which would be very dangerous. Finally, Congress could deal with emerging inflationary pressures by means of direct controls over wages and prices and over credit. We know from the experience in World War II and in the Korean War that such controls are likely to be ineffective and an administrative headache. They would be a poor alternative for fiscal restraint.

WILL THE PRESIDENT'S PROGRAM SOLVE EVERYTHING?

Finally, it would be a mistake to assume that the President's tax and expenditure control program will be a complete solution. We have seen the difficulty which the Administration has experienced in containing Government spending and the fact that it has tended to underestimate its fiscal requirements. The large budget deficit merely reflects the need for preventive action. The economic expansion ahead of us may be stronger than assumed in setting the terms of the surcharge. The requirements of Vietnam may escalate further. Moreover, we have a legacy of forces in the economy as the result of the events of mid-1966. One of these is the strong tendency for labor compensation to rise at a much higher rate than productivity. Another is the inflationary psychology which seems to have been growing in the public's mind. Still another is the shift of interest rates to a higher average level.

It may turn out that the degree of fiscal restraint recommended by the President will not be enough. Utimately the monetary authorities may be required to reduce the availability of credit. But, it does seem to me that at this point of time the President's proposals make a great deal of sense and urgently need to be enacted.

Thinking beyond the short time span, it is important to dampen excesses in periods of boom by sound fiscal policy which furnishes the Government with ammunition which can be used later in maintaining sustained growth in a climate of price stability. Enactment of the surtax will provide the Government with additional fiscal flexibility. When the Vietnam War comes to an end, the Government can quickly discard the surtax if such an action is needed to provide a stimulus to the economy. Indeed, if the stimulus is needed, Congress could permit individuals and corporations to use the amount paid under the surcharge as a tax credit.

A Cost Analysis of the Vietnam War: Win or Lose

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1967

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, the Sunday edition of the Washington Post carried a thoughtful article by its editor, J. R. Wiggins, on the subject of the Vietnam war. The controversy about the Vietnam war is too often carried on shrilly and in extreme terms of historical analogy by all parties. This article is not only substantively thoughtful but devoid of the errors I have recited above. I include the article in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

A COST ANALYSIS OF THE VIETNAM WAR: WIN OR LOSE

(By J. R. Wiggins)

It is natural, logical and inevitable for a people to make periodic reexaminations of a struggle involving half a million fighting men, requiring $27 billion a year and influencing domestic and foreign policy in every quarter.

Wars have their own dynamics and make and unmake issues as they go along, so we need to examine what now is the central issue of the war in South Vietnam, to study the consequences of having that issue settled one way or another and at least to enter conjectures whether the cost of influencing the settlement of that issue in accordance with our preferences is worth the pain and the burden.

In Vietnam, there is a host of subsidiary issues (by no means unimportant because subsidiary). But the central issue is now, as it has been for some time, quite clear.

A BEARABLE PRICE

The world is watching Vietnam to see if the rulers of one country, state sovereignty or territory, at an endurable risk and a bearable price, can impose a government and system of their choice upon a neighboring people by inciting internal subversion, supporting indigenous insurrection, engaging in infiltration and intervening and invading as necessary. This is the formula of the Communists' celebrated "wars of liberation."

The North Vietnamese so far seem convinced that the risk is endurable and the price bearable. The United States has intervened to make the price unbearable and the risk not endurable. The practical issue before the American people is simply whether the costs of preventing such a conquest or the costs of acquiescing in it are greater. That, for us, is the single, central issue of the conflict.

Since the ascendancy of Mao Tse-tung it has been popular in the Communist world to call such conquests "wars of liberation"; in the diplomatic vernacular of any prior generation, they would have been identified as ordinary aggression.

American policy ought to proceed from decisions on what would be likely to happen if the conquest succeeded and what would be likely to happen if it failed. So what would happen if it succeeded?

PROOF OF A THEORY

To begin with the broadest philosophical consequences, it surely would give an impetus throughout the Communist world to the forces that are persuaded of the efficacy of "wars of national liberation." Such a practical demonstration of the minimal risks and relatively low costs of this kind of conquest would play into the hands of every doctrinal Communist hawk in every undecided Communist government, lending great force to the proponents of adventurous imperialistic policy in every arena offering any plausible opportunity for such conquest. It would greatly strengthen the Chinese Communists against the Soviet Communists and it would immeasurably fortify the hard-liners in the Soviet regime.

What this would mean for the United States and other non-Communist states, no one can say in any specific way, but it is safe to say that it would not mean a period of peaceful coexistence. On the contrary, it would probably usher in decades of political tumult and conflict, particularly in Asia, Africa and South America, and might even propel us into a worldwide thermonuclear holocaust set off by wars in even more dangerous areas than Southeast Asia.

The effects in Southeast Asia of North Vietnam's success in South Vietnam are more foreseeable. It is clear that the military predicament of Laos would be totally untenable. It is plain that Cambodia could not long support an independent role. Thailand certainly would have to re-examine its position and might have to exercise its genius for accommodation with neighboring aggressors.

The failure of United States policy in South Vietnam would certainly prompt the reasonable conclusion in every government in Asia that the United States was unable or unwilling to defend countries theatened with this kind of aggression. It would be logical for many of them to make appropriate diplomatic changes.

It is quite clear that American power and influence would be at an end in South Asia. This adverse consequence might be diminished, of course, by a demonstration elsewhere (say in Thailand) that the United States retained its willingness and ability to defend Asian friends.

But to lay down the gauge in South Vietnam and pick it up elsewhere would be illogical and politically impossible. And the lesson of failure in South Vietnam might fatally prejudice any subsequent endeavor if it were made. It would be wise to write off South Asia for the time being.

NATIONALISM A FACTOR

Would this be fatal to American interests? Probably it would not be fatal, however damaging in the immediate future. It is possible to make a tenable argument that the removal of American power from the region would not permanently put all of the area into the control of forces hostile to American interests.

In the fullness of time, forces of nationalism and regionalism would undoubtedly assert themselves in Asia and produce states with differing degrees of independent sovereignty. There is no reason to suppose that the system which has failed to produce progress and peace in China would find it easier to impose peace and achieve progress in an even larger and less homogeneous environment involving the whole of non-Soviet Asia.

Whatever degree of submission to communism might temporarily prevail over much of Asia, from India to Japan, in the final unrolling of history, reassertion of national impulse and local interests could be expected. India and Pakistan might surrender or compromise their independence but a residual passion for national recognition and identity would linger within the body politic, "murmuring in the shell and waiting for the tide to return and flood it again."

LESS THAN AN ECLIPSE

It is reasonable to suppose that a century very different from the one hitherto foreseen would emerge from the triumph of North Vietnam and the humiliation of the United States. But it would be unfair to suggest that even a United States of vastly curtailed international influence and power would be fatally impaired or permanently diminished.

If its affairs in this vastly altered world were conducted with skill and prudence; if its international policy were realistically realigned in conformity with its diminished capacity to influence events; if its leaders accepted their liabilities philosophically; if its people cheerfully acknowledged the limitations on their power—then the nation might go on, its world role greatly changed but not necessarily eclipsed permanently.

And if North Vietnam's war against South Vietnam fails and there emerges in the South a viable state with a government that is reasonably representative of its people, will that usher in the millennium? No, it must be said in fairness that it will not do so.

The Philippines and Malaysia demonstrated that wars of liberation do not always succeed, but that did not prevent the war in Vietnam. The tragedy in Indonesia demonstrated that infiltration and subversion can fail with calamitous consequences, but no one supposes that that was the last of Communist China's efforts to subvert and overthrow regimes friendly to it.

But if this failure did not usher in the millennium, it might diminish the zeal of many Communist states for this kind of conflict. There would be fewer "wars of national liberation" than there would be if North Vietnam's attempt at conquest succeeded.

The scale of the Vietnam war already has demonstrated that the price tag on such wars is higher and the risk greater than the hawks of North Vietnam must have anticipated. If there occurs in Vietnam a demonstration that such wars involve an unendurabe risk and an unbearable cost and are not likely to succeed, prospects for peace in the future will be increased.

Peace, however, in any sense that we have enjoyed it in the past, is not in our future, whatever happens or does not happen in South Vietnam. The world has yet to accomplish the accommodation between great historical forces that are at present antipathetic to each other and that proceed on paths that preclude any peaceful reconciliation.

Statesmen in our generation, and in generations immediately ahead, will vindicate their stature and make bold their claims on the gratitude of posterity if they succeed in holding this irrepressible conflict within such bounds that history in its patient unfolding may subject the rigidities of doctrine to the ameliorating influences of time's subtle and insidious solvent.

In this long and perilous interval, the peoples who survive will be those who keep awake to the disagreeable fact of our time; that there are no easy alternatives, no painless choices, no magic palliatives, no miracles that can spare us the anguish of struggle or guarantee is immunity to risk and danger.

A British View of U.S. Policy in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 21, 1967

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, the highly respected British journal, the Economist, in its issue of September 9, featured an article on U.S. policy in Vietnam which deserves the attention of this body.

The article notes the progress made toward representative government as evidenced by the recent elections in South Vietnam. The author also outlines the alternatives open to the United States in now bringing the war to a conclusion.

After an incisive look at some suggested alternatives, including wider bombing, the blockade of Haiphong Harbor, and an invasion of the north by American forces, the article reaches the conclusion that present Johnson administration policy is the most practical and realistic, particularly in view of the seeming internal disintegration of Communist China.

The article suggests that the crucial question is whether Americans will go on supporting a limited war in Vietnam. Because of its pertinence to the continuing national debate on the Vietnam issue, I am including the article, "It's the American's Choice," in the RECORD at this point and submit it to the attention of my colleagues:

IT'S THE AMERICANS' CHOICE

Now that South Vietnam has got a legitimate government again, President Johnson can make up his mind what he is going to do about the war. There is no need to pretend that Sunday's election of President Thieu (see page 868) was the sort of thing that maiden aunts at Bournemouth would recognise. But it is also right to say that it was much better than many people thought it was going to be. The number of registered voters amounted to three-quarters of the adult population of South Vietnam, and of those who were registered to vote 83 percent actually did so; the Vietcong may control large areas of jungle and mountain but, in daylight at any rate, it does not control most of the people. The choice available to the voters, though far from complete, was broader than expected: the emergence of Mr. Dzu as a "peace" candidate calling for negotiations and an end to the bombing saw to that. Some ballot-stuffing there almost certainly was; but so there is in Corsica and Cook County and Northern Ireland. Some of the losers have said we-wuz-robbed; but so losers traditionally do.

Despite the scorn poured on it, the election has achieved several things. In the first place, it puts South Vietnam among the small collection of countries whose governments risk holding elections with any significant degree of choice at all. Out of nearly 70 independent countries in Asia and Africa, there are only a dozen or so that pass that test. As the practices of democracy go, the South Vietnamese have not gone very far: as a rough guide, they are a bit behind Turkey; a bit ahead of Jugoslavia; and miles ahead of any orthodox communist country. The thing is that they have made a start; and in the middle of a shattering war that establishes some sort of record. In the second place, the election means that the Saigon government will now be obliged to submit itself, to some extent, to the give-and-take of political pressure. Ever since the late 1950s, when President Diem withdrew into his palace and stopped listening to anybody except his brother and his sister-in-law, the government of South Vietnam has operated in a political vacuum. It cannot do so any longer. With only 35 per cent of the vote behind him, President Thieu will have to seek some sort of accommodation with one or more of the men who have been given political substance by the election. He may look to Mr. Huong and his middle-class supporters; or to the ambiguous Mr. Dzu. Whichever way he turns, the result will be to some degree a revival of the country's moribund political life.

But none of this means a thing unless South Vietnam is still there a year from now. The most important effect of the election is its effect on President Johnson. He now has a reasonably solid base in South Vietnam, in the shape of a government there with a claim to legitimacy, for his next decision about the conduct of the war. If he decides to negotiate, it will be important that the man who speaks for the Saigon government in the negotiations has been elected to office, not put there at gunpoint. If he decides to continue with the war, it will be beside an ally with some evidence of popular support. The election has done that much for Mr. Johnson. It is one of the few things that can give him encouragement as he reviews the options now open to him.

TIRED OF A LIMITED WAR?

The first option is to continue the war at its present level for its present, limited, objectives. This is what Mr. Johnson, left to himself, would undoubtedly prefer to do. But it is important to recognise what the war has become. It has developed into a war of attrition. This is not what Mr. Johnson and those who supported him originally hoped. They hoped that the American intervention in 1965 would make Ho Chi Minh change his mind about supporting the rebellion in the south, and that most of the southerners who had joined the Vietcong when it seemed to be winning would abandon it when an American army arrived. *The Economist* was among those who had hoped that this would happen, and it was wrong. Even so, the war of attrition that the Americans are now faced with is one they can almost certainly win if they are willing to grit their teeth and stick it out. The basic calculation remains unchanged. It is increasingly unlikely that Russia or China will enter the war. If the issue is left to be settled between the Americans and the Vietnamese communists, the odds are overwhelmingly on the side of the country which can pay for the war out of the annual rise in its national income (and still have some left over) and which loses more young men in road accidents each year than it is losing in Vietnam. That is the measure of the Americans' ability to sustain a war of attrition.

It is their will to do so that is now in doubt. The latest Lou Harris poll reports that the number of Americans who support the idea of a limited war has dropped from 51 per cent in July to 37 per cent in August, and that those who want to get out of Vietnam "as quickly as possible" (whatever that means) have grown from 24 per cent to 34 per cent. That is a big change in one month. It is not just that a lot of Americans dislike the idea of pursuing a war of attrition against what turns out to be a substantial number of Vietnamese. The more important reason for their growing uneasiness lies in the fact that for the first time in history a whole electorate is able to see, on television, what war is really like. If this had been a war fought by professionals and described by the written word alone—if it had been the sort of war that Britain used to fight in Asia—the Americans would have taken it in their stride. Watching the bloody business in their living rooms, they have flinched. The August poll may turn out to be no more than a temporary wavering in the ranks of the majority that Mr. Johnson has commanded for the last two years. When it thinks over the consequences of getting out "as quickly as possible," public opinion may rally behind him. But if it does not, the conclusion will be that television has made it much harder for free societies, in which reporters and camera crews can go where they want and describe what they see, to conduct their relations with authoritarian societies that allow no such dangerous nonsense.

So what does Mr. Johnson do? Four other possibilities are open to him. Three involve an extension of the war in an attempt to do quickly what a limited war would mean doing more slowly. The fourth is to reexamine the prospects of coming to terms with the Vietnamese communists.

MORE BOMBING?

First, he could try more bombing. Senator Stennis and the rest of the air-power lobby are sticking to their bomb-sights on this issue; but it really is very difficult indeed to get around the statistics that Mr. McNamara has produced in evidence against them. If the air-power boys think that more bombing can stop the flow of guns and ammunition through North Vietnam, they are plainly wrong. Mr. McNamara has revealed that the amount of military equipment coming into North Vietnam is probably only about 550 tons a day, almost all of it by the overland route from China. The amount that passes on into South Vietnam is under 100 tons a day. Much of this can be carried on human backs along a variety of jungle trails that bombs cannot block for more than a few hours. The bomber is too imprecise a weapon to stop more than a small percentage of a traffic as diffuse at this.

There is a better case for using air power against what might be called the second-rank sinews of war: North Vietnam's supplies of steel, trucks, generators, concrete and so on, and its road and rail network. The more damage the Americans do to these, the more men the North Vietnamese have to put on repair work instead of sending them to fight in the south; and the more dependent they become on the Russians for replacements. The trouble is that stopping this sort of replacement getting into the country is only slightly less difficult than stopping the flow of actual military equipment. The tonnage involved is not very large: Mr. McNamara has not revealed the actual figure, but it may be only about 1,000 tons a day. It comes in by sea, road and rail along a number of different routes. To stop most or all of this traffic would mean very large-scale air attacks on the centres of communication: that is, on the cities. If Mr. McNamara's figures are correct, the conclusion is inescapable. Unless the United States is prepared to resort to obliteration bombing, it has reached the limits of what air power can do.

BLOCKADE HAIPHONG?

Second, Mr. Johnson could throw down the gauntlet to the Russians and blockade Haiphong. This would be a cleaner and more humane way of trying to stop the flow of Russian supplies. The main objection to blockading Haiphong is not, as many people assume, that it would inevitably mean a direct military clash with the Russians. The Russians would certainly stop co-operating with the Americans in other matters, like the non-proliferation treaty, but the odds are that they would not try to challenge the blockade. Their local naval forces are weaker than those of the Americans. They could call out their submarine flotillas to sink the Seventh Fleet, but in that case it would be the Russians who were escalating a local skirmish into a general war, and the signs are that they would not be mad enough to do that. A blockade of Haiphong would mean taking a big risk; but it might be a risk worth taking if the blockade really worked. The decisive objection is that it almost certainly wouldn't. It happens that right now North Vietnam brings most of its imports in through Haiphong (4,700 tons out of the all-in total of 5,800 tons a day) because that is the handiest way of doing it. But its overland communications are reckoned to be capable of handling nearly twice as much traffic as now comes into Haiphong. So the probable result of blocking Haiphong would merely be to switch the imports to the China route, and thereby increase China's leverage in Hanoi. That isn't what the Americans want.

INVADE THE NORTH?

The third way of trying to accelerate the war would be to invade North Vietnam. In some ways this is the least unsatisfactory of the three possibilities. A year ago an American invasion of the north would almost certainly have brought China's army over the border to meet it. Chairman Mao's "cultural revolution" has so shattered China that there is now a reasonable chance that the Americans could get away with it. But here too, as with the Haiphong blockade, the real difficulty is that there is no certainty that this extension of the war would achieve what it set out to do. The Americans' aim would be to bring the North Vietnamese army to battle, and destroy it. To do this it would be no use pushing fifty miles or so northwards into the North Vietnamese panhandle. The enemy would merely pull back in front of them, and the Americans would find themselves with a few hundred extra square miles of guerrilla war on their hands. They would have to go for Hanoi and Haiphong. The capture of North Vietnam's two major cities would seriously damage Ho Minh's war capacity. But Ho himself and most of his army might still escape into the western highlands and carry on fighting from there. A great deal would depend on catching the North Vietnamese army in the open. Has Mr. Johnson got a General MacArthur—and an Inchon where the trap can be sprung?

A NEGOTIATED PEACE?

There remains Mr. Johnson's fourth option: a negotiated peace. The temptation is obvious; so are the dangers. Let us assume that Mr. Johnson halts the bombing of the north and, after a discreet interval, President Ho agrees to sit down for negotiations. There is no certainty that Ho would agree; but Mr. Kosygin and U Thant say he probably would, and they may be right. The first danger is that Ho would refuse to talk about anything except getting the American army out of South Vietnam. But maybe Mr. Kosygin could argue him out of that. The negotiations could then get down to the heart of the matter: the political future of South Vietnam, and the relationship between the Saigon government and the National Liberation Front. Ho Chi Minh's minimum aim would be to get the Vietnamese communists into a position from which they could seize power once the Americans had pulled out. To achieve this, he would certainly try to exploit the halt in the bombing to pile on the military pressure in the South. Mr. Johnson, if public opinion at home was crumbling, might feel obliged to make concessions. It is clear that negotiations begun on these terms could end with a "settlement" that was, at best, a lightly camouflaged surrender of the non-communist interest in Vietnam.

This is where the chaos in China comes back into the calculation. This newspaper said on June 5, 1965—the week before the Americans launched their army into battle in Vietnam—that the Americans' chief concern in south-east Asia was not Vietnam itself; it was to draw a stable demarcation line somewhere between China and India, like the line that has successfully been drawn between the communists and the free world in Europe. This remains the heart of the matter. It is India that is the West's prime interest in Asia. Last year, as Chairman Mao and Marshal Lin Piao hammered home their theme of world revolution, a great many Asians began to share the Americans' interest in drawing such a line. But the disorder to which Mao has reduced China in 1967 raises the hope that something new, and very important, may be happening in the Far East. China may be ruling itself out of the Asian balance of power.

It is still too early to be sure of this. The reins of power in Peking may yet be grasped by a man capable of reuniting China and leading it, once again, on an adventurist foreign policy. But it is also possible that, six months or a year from now, the disintegration of China will have reached a point where nobody in Peking can run an effective foreign policy for some time to come. Mao and his cultural revolution may be in the process of discrediting China as a serious country. If that happens, a new situation will have arisen.

There will still be the problem of Ho Chi Minh's own expansionism. Ho is not interested in South Vietnam only: he wants Laos, and possibly Cambodia too, and he has a stake in the rebellion that has been bubbling in north-east Thailand for years. But, by comparison with China's pretensions to be the dynamo of a revolution destined to sweep through the "countryside of the world," Ho's claims are small beer. If China had discredited itself to the point of being unable to exploit a communist victory in Vietnam, an accommodation would be possible with Ho. It would be possible because, if the Russians no longer felt obliged to take China into account, they could make sure that Ho limited his own aims. That line could be drawn, if not along the 17th parallel, then at least along the Mekong.

No one outside Mr. Johnson's circle of advisers can make the necessary calculation with any claim to accuracy. It depends on knowing just how far China's break-up has gone; how much influence Mr. Kosygin has with Ho Chi Minh; what Ho's own calculations are. This paper can see the danger of talking about concessions in Vietnam when it is entirely possible that by next year a reunited China will be back on the rampage in Asia. We can also see the danger in any of the three forms of escalation open to Mr. Johnson. The curious thing is that, since Sunday's election, the decision turns less on public opinion in South Vietnam than on public opinion in the United States. If the Americans are unwilling to go on supporting a limited war in Vietnam, Mr. Johnson will have to turn towards one danger or the other. Are they really unwilling to say, with Grant in 1864: "I propose to fight it out on this line, if it takes all summer"?

Support for Monday Holiday Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1967

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, when I introduced my bill (H.R. 12213) to provide for the uniform annual observances of certain legal public holidays on Mondays, I pointed out that this legislation would apply only to the District of Columbia and for Federal employees across the Nation. States would have to enact their own laws if they wished to follow suit. I was pleased to note, therefore, that KDKA, radio-TV, Pittsburgh, carried an editorial recently mentioning the obvious advantages of Monday holidays to workers and employers and urging the Pennsylvania Legislature to go on record as favoring the change. I include the editorial at this point in the Record:

For Better Holidays

The idea of uniform Monday holidays is getting a lot of attention these days, and we are glad to see it. Congress is considering several bills that would change the dates of four or five national holidays so they would always fall on a Monday. We would then have a series of three day holiday weekends, like the Labor Day weekend, throughout the year. Some observers say the chances for passage this year are very good.

Congress can set the pattern, but if Monday holidays are to become a reality each state must also act, and in Harrisburg we are getting some action. As a result of our editorial a few weeks ago, Representative George Haudenshield of the South Hills has introduced a bill that would make uniform Monday holidays the law of the state. Another bill already in the hopper would be the legislature on record as favoring action by Congress.

The advantages of uniform Monday holidays are obvious. The mid-week holidays we now have would be done away with, and no one would miss them. For business, the one day shutdowns are a nuisance. For workers, they have only limited possibilities for leisure time activities. We do not buy the argument that we would be damaging our national heritage by changing the dates of important holidays. Several of them have been shifted in past years.

The legislature can encourage Congress to act by going on record as favoring the change. Once Congress has set the pattern our lawmakers should be prepared to adopt it as law in our state. The result will be longer and better holidays for everyone and who can quarrel with that?

A Tribute to WICS

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1967

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, in a recent letter to the Minneapolis Star, Vice President Humphrey paid well-earned tribute to the Women in Community Service—WICS—who have so willingly and ably helped the Job Corps achieve success. WICS helps find, screen, and place Job Corps girls. As the Vice President pointed out, this important WICS activity has a very salutory by-product:

> Because of the direct involvement of thousands of women in this work, communities all over the country are much more aware of the need to do something about young women in poverty.

The Vice President also reminded us of the progress being achieved by the OEO's Job Corps program. As he said, this continuing attempt "to recruit, train, and find employment for America's neglected youth will never be easy, but it is moving forward." In fact:

> The Job Corps centers are now successfully helping over 41,000 hard core poverty youth in 123 centers for men and women across the Nation.

I know my colleague's will be interested in the full text of the Vice President's letter. It follows:

[From the Minneapolis (Minn.) Star, Aug. 22, 1967]

Humphrey on Job Corps

To the Editor:

The Minneapolis Star article of July 31 outlines the arduous process of "reach out" necessary to locate the hard core poverty girl. These are the disadvantaged, suspicious, rejected youth in whom must be engendered the motivation to help themselves by volunteering for the Job Corps. Their recruitment is not easy. But the situation is definitely improving.

The Women in Community Service (WICS) have pioneered a most difficult field of social endeaver. There is reason for them and all Americans who would serve our disadvantaged youth to be heartened. The Job Corps dropout rate is down: from 33 per cent who dropped out within 30 days in 1966 to 21 per cent in 1967. The dropout rate for girls who stayed less than 30 days is only 11 per cent in 1967. Job Corps youth are showing higher educational gains; 38 per cent completed senior and advanced training in 1966; 51 per cent in 1967. The WICS, in following up the girls they recruit, have provided guidelines to improve Job Corps operation: permissiveness is out; a commitment executed by parents and youth for a 180-day stay at a center has been instituted to alleviate the initial homesick dropout lass.

The cost of $7,000 a full year at a Job Corps center compares favorably with the cost at a university like Harvard. These university costs stand over $10,000 when the contributions from endowment and alumni gifts are prorated per student for the 9-month academic year. Further, the Job Corps cost includes clothing; travel; pay and allowances for an enrollee's family; and the sometimes extensive medical and dental care these poverty youth require.

The struggle so graphically related in the Star are the growing pains of a new venture to provide in Job Corps centers what is probably a last chance for America's disadvantaged youth.

The Job Corps mission to recruit, train, and find employment for America's neglected youth will never be easy, but it is moving forward. The Job Corps centers are now successfully helping over 41,000 hard core poverty youth in 123 centers for men and women across the nation. The volunteer assistance of WICS in recruiting disadvantaged girls for the Women's Centers is appreciated.

WICS, representing 27,000,000 women across the country, not only screen and recruit, but also utilize community resources for girls who do not qualify or are unable to take the step to leave home. Because of the direct involvement of thousands of women in this work, communities all over the country are much more aware of the need to do something about young women in poverty. As leaders in their towns and cities, WICS have increased the awareness of others to this need and have sought to work out alternate solutions at the community level.

Every young woman contacted by the WICS benefits in some measure from their concern and interest.

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Vice President.

WASHINGTON, D.C.

Your Opinion, Please

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. MARVIN L. ESCH

OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 19, 1967

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, recenly I conducted a mail poll of my constituents in the Second Congressional District of Michigan. Over 25,000 persons responded and gave me the benefit of their views on 15 vital issues facing this Congress. I am delighted with this response and encouraged that so many citizens would take the time to make their voices heard in Washington.

I would like to take this opportunity to make the entire membership aware of the results of this survey:

"YOUR OPINION, PLEASE"—QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS, SECOND DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN, MARVIN L. ESCH, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

1. Realizing that the war raises many complex questions and problems, which of the following general courses of action do you favor in Vietnam?

	Percent
a. Continue present policy	14
b. Immediate withdrawal	20
c. Gradual deescalation and gradual withdrawal	36
d. Step up military effort	31
e. Other	[1] 15

2. Congress will soon be considering the East-West trade bill.

a. Do you believe we should encourage trade with the Soviet Union and Eastern European countries?

	Percent
Yes	58
No	36
No answer	6

b. Would your answer be different if the Vietnam war was over?

	Percent
Yes	13
No	72
No answer	15

3. Congress has extended the draft in substantially its present form. Do you consider this system reasonably fair?

	Percent
Yes	41
No	44
No answer	15

4. If Congress were to change the draft, which of the following features would you like to see included?

	Percent
a. End student deferments	38
b. Employ a lottery system	22
c. Apply uniform national criteria	43
d. Phase out conscription and rely on higher paid and specialized volunteers	29
e. Establish universal service providing a choice between the military and some form of social service	43
f. Other	[1] 9

5. In the area of civil rights, should Congress:

	Percent
a. Eliminate discrimination in State and Federal jury selection	62
b. Pass legislation to protect civil rights workers	34
c. Adopt antiriot legislation	73
d. Pass an open housing law	[1] 35

6. Do you favor a Federal income tax increase as recommended by the administration?

	Percent
Yes	13
No	76
No answer	11

7. Should Federal Government spending be cut?

	Percent
Yes	81
No	13
No answer	6

8. If Congress were to cut Government spending, in which of the following areas should it concentrate?

	Percent
a. Defense	35
b. Foreign aid	74
c. Space projects	57
d. Education	19
e. Health	17
f. Poverty program	48
g. Highways	28
h. Agriculture	40
i. Add to cities	44
j. Beautification	[1] 53

9. Do you favor tax incentives for industry to encourage the construction of air and pollution control devices?

	Percent
Yes	69
No	23
No answer	8

10. Do you favor a Federal income tax credit to offset, in part, costs incurred by parents sending children to college?

	Percent
Yes	63
No	33
No answer	4

11. Do you approve a tax sharing or tax credit concept whereby a fixed amount of Federal income tax revenue would be used by state and local governments without Federal control?

	Percent
Yes	58
No	33
No answer	9

12. Again this year legislation to control and regulate firearms has been introduced. In your opinion, should Congress:

a. Require registration of all firearms.

	Percent
Yes	64
No	25
No answer	11

b. Establish Federal controls over the interstate sale of firearms through the mail.

	Percent
Yes	69
No	18
No answer	13

c. Deem Federal legislation unnecessary.

	Percent
Yes	22
No	48
No answer	30

13. Revision of social security benefits will come before the 90th Congress. Do you favor:

a. A flat 8% increase, with additional provisions for increases tied to the cost-of-living index:

	Percent
Yes	42
No	27
No answer	31

b. A flat 20% increase, across the board, with the necessary increase in the social security taxes:

	Percent
Yes	13
No	48
No answer	39

c. An increase in the amount which beneficiaries can earn without forfeiting their social security from the present level of $1,500 to a higher level:

	Percent
Yes	77
No	9
No answer	14

If you favor such an increase would you increase the limit to:

Footnote at end of speech.

	Percent
$2,000	13
$2,500	15
$3,000	27
Other	22

14. Do you favor further legislation to curb serious national strikes?

	Percent
Yes	73
No	24
No answer	3

15. Do you favor replacing the present National Labor Relations Board with a Labor Court as a part of the judicial system?

	Percent
Yes	36
No	35
No answer	29

[1] Where total percentage equals more than 100%, respondents selected more than one alternative.

Thoughts to Ponder From Tunisian Chief

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1967

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, of special interest to the Members who continue to be concerned with complications in the Middle East is an interesting commentary which appeared in the Elgin Daily Courier-News on September 15, in which international Columnist Dumitru Danielopol studies a recent discussion by President Habib Bourguiba, of Tunisia.

His commentary follows:

INTERNATIONAL SCENE: THOUGHTS TO PONDER FROM TUNISIAN CHIEF

(By Dumitru Danielopol)

WASHINGTON.—Every once in awhile a national leader makes a speech that sends worthwhile ripples of thought far beyond the frontiers of his own country.

President Habib Bourguiba of progressive little Tunisia recently made such a speech to the General Union of Tunisian Students.

What he said should be pondered by young men and women throughout the Arab world, in all underdeveloped lands and even on campuses in the United States.

Bourguiba, who led his nation to independence from France 10 years ago, is no rubber stamp for pan-Arab nationalism of President Nasser of Egypt. He is no blind anti-Israel fanatic, nor is he a puppet of the United States.

Bourguiba is Tunisian.

Too many so-called revolutionary countries, he told his students, are playing "Don Quixote."

"While they battle with the windmills of imperialism, their peoples continue to wallow in abject misery," he said. "The most elementary freedoms are denied them."

The president held up Tunisia as an example to his youth. He pointed to the technical, economic and educational progress of the last 10 years. He pointed to the national policies that have permitted Tunisia to maintain respectful relations with the United States, France and Russia.

Then he pointed to the crisis now confronting those Arab countries that became involved in Nasser's misadventure in the Middle East.

"We do not suffer the complexes of those badly decolonialized countries which have not been able to overcome old hatreds," he said.

Bourguiba does not minimize the problems of survival in a world split into East and West.

Students, he warned, have become special targets of the two camps as both try to woo the leaders of tomorrow.

But he cautioned Tunisia's youth particularly against the propaganda and blandishments of Communists who seek to whip up youthful enthusiasm to the point of intoxication. "Satellitized students," he said, "are no longer capable of honest judgments."

At this point, he said, young nations flirt with destruction.

Bourguiba made his speech at a time when the United States is feeling the weight of a major Moscow propaganda offensive, wrapped in the end-the-war-in-Vietnam package.

It serves as a reminder that no matter what course Moscow follows for the moment, its target is always the same—the United States.

Moscow knows that only the United States can block its dreams of world domination.

Moscow also knows that too many Americans take the truth of our position self-evident. The people in other lands, particularly the students, aren't always convinced of this. They have to be wooed and educated.

That's why we owe President Bourguiba a vote of thanks. He's doing part of our job for us.

Only Bourguiba among Arab leaders have been brave enough to stand up and call Nasser a fool for provoking Israel into a war the Arabs couldn't win.

"As a consequence," he said, "the Arab countries are today submitted to the grievous humiliations of defeat and occupation."

He lectured his students that "the mistakes of a leader can be fatal for his people, despite his best intentions."

"What I ask from the young is to be useful to their country," he said. "Don't take attitudes on all questions until you have studied carefully, until you understand them and all the risks involved."

What Bourguiba was saying is that education comes at an early age, but political maturity is a product of long years.

The Middle East and North Africa would be better places if the quixotic Arabs heeded his advice. Our campuses would be better places if our quixotic students listened too.

October Calendar of the National Gallery of Art

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 11, 1967

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to call the attention of the Congress and the American people to the usual fine calendar of events for the National Gallery of Art for the month of October. The lectures, films, tours, and special exhibits of the National Gallery continually enrich the cultural life of our Nation's Capital:

NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART—CALENDAR OF EVENTS, OCTOBER 1967

MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 25, THROUGH SUNDAY, OCTOBER 1

* Painting of the week: Manet, "The Dead Toreador" (Widener Collection), gallery 83, Tuesday through Saturday, 12 and 2; Sunday, 3:30 and 6.

Tour of the week: "Art and the Reformation. "Rotunda, Tuesday through Saturday, 1; Sunday, 2:30.

Tour: Introduction to the collection, Rotunda, Monday through Saturday, 11 and 3; Sunday, 5.

Sunday lecture: "Vermeer," Guest Speaker: Roland E. Fleischer, professor of art, George Washington University, Washington, D.C. Lecture hall, 4.

Sunday concert: National Gallery Orchestra, Richard Bales, conductor; Jeanne Chalifoux, harpist, East garden court, 8.

MONDAY, OCTOBER 2, THROUGH SUNDAY, OCTOBER 8

* Painting of the week: Largillière, "Elizabeth Throckmorton" (Alisa Mellon Bruce Fund), gallery 53, Tuesday through Saturday, 12 and 2; Sunday, 3:30 and 6.

Tour of the week: "Art and the Enlightenment." Rotunda, Tuesday through Saturday, 1; Sunday, 2:30.

Tour: Introduction to the collection, Rotunda, Monday through Saturday, 11 and 3; Sunday, 5.

Sunday lecture: 'Swiss Master Drawings." Guest Speaker: François Boucher, professor of art history, Princeton University, Princeton. Lecture hall, 4.

Sunday concert: Carolyn Reyer, mezzo soprano; James Benner, pianist, East garden court, 8.

Inquiries concerning the Gallery's educational services should be addressed to the Educational Office or telephoned to 737–4215, Ext. 272.

MONDAY, OCTOBER 9, THROUGH SUNDAY, OCTOBER 15

*Painting of the week: Lucas van Leyden, "The Card Players" (Samuel H. Kress Collection), gallery 41. Tuesday through Saturday, 12 and 2: Sunday, 3:30 and 6.

Tour of the week: "Art and the Nineteenth Century." Rotunda, Tuesday through Saturday, 1; Sunday, 2:30.

Tour: Introduction to the collection. Rotunda, Monday through Saturday, 11 and 3; Sunday, 5.

Sunday lecture: "Great Men and Great Furniture in the 18th Century." Guest Speaker: Richard H. Randall, Jr., director, the Walters Art Gallery, Baltimore. Lecture hall, 4.

Sunday concert: Madeleine Malraux, pianist. East garden court, 8.

MONDAY, OCTOBER 16, THROUGH SUNDAY, OCTOBER 22

*Painting of the week: Fantin-Latour. "Still Life" (Chester Dale Collection), gallery 89, Tuesday through Saturday, 12 and 2; Sunday, 3:30 and 6.

Tour of the week: "Swiss Drawings: Masterpieces of Five Centuries." Central lobby, Tuesday through Saturday, 1; Sunday, 2:30.

Tour: Introduction to the collection. Rotunda, Monday through Saturday, 11 and 3; Sunday, 5.

Sunday lecture: "Daumier." Guest Speaker: Oliver Larkin, professor emeritus of art history, Smith College, Northampton. Lecture hall, 4.

Sunday concert: National Gallery Orchestra, Richard Bales, conductor; Samuel Lipman, pianist (Concert in honor of United Nations Day). East garden court, 8.

All concerts, with intermission talks by members of the National Gallery Staff, are broadcast by Station-WGMS–AM (570) and FM (103.5).

MONDAY OCTOBER 23, THROUGH SUNDAY, OCTOBER 29

* Painting of the week: John Singer Sargent. "Street in Venice" (Gift of the Avalon Foundation), gallery 68, Tuesday through Saturday, 12 and 2; Sunday, 3:30 and 6.

Tour of the week: "Seasons, Time, and Weather." Rotunda, Tuesday through Saturday, 1; Sunday 2:30.

---

* 11" x 14" reproductions with texts for sale this week—15¢ each. (If mailed, $1.00 for 4; orders under $1.00, 25¢ each, plus 25¢ handling charge.)

Tour: Introduction to the collection. Rotunda, Monday through Saturday, 11 and 3; Sunday 5.

Sunday lecture: "The meaning of Rembrandt's Aristotle." Guest Speaker: Julius Held, professor of art history, Barnard College, Columbia University, New York. Lecture hall 4.

Sunday concert: Takako Nishizaki, Violinist. East garden court 8.

New exhibition: Swiss Drawings: Masterpieces of five centuries. Central gallery, October 8 through October 29.

New publication: Catalogue. Swiss Drawings: Masterprieces of five centuries. 175 pages, 10″ x 7½″, with introduction and catalogue notes by Walter Hugelshofer, 127 illustrations. $3.00 postpaid.

Continuing exhibition: "Ginevra de'Benci" by Leonardo da Vinci. New acquisition. Lobby B.

New reproductions: 22″ x 28″ Color reproductions: Cézanne, "Still Life"; Constable, "Wivenhoe Park, Essex"; Corot, "Ville d' Avray"; Dali, "The Sacrament of the Last Supper"; Fragonard, "A Young Girl Reading"; Goya, "Señora Sabasa García"; Harnett, "My Gems"; Homer, "Breezing Up"; Monet, "Banks of the Seine, Vétheuil"; Picasso, "Le Gourmet"; Rembrandt, "A Girl with a Broom"; Renoir, "A Girl with a Watering Can." $3.00 each postpaid.

Reproductions of bronze heads of Deputies by Honoré Daumier: Comte de Montlosier (The Cheat and Shrewd). $18.50; Jean Charles Persil (The Scrupluous). $18.50; Jacques Lefebvre (The Sharp and Cunning Wit). $18.50; Comte de Lameth (The Irresolute). $15.00.

1967 Christmas card catalogue: Available upon request, free of charge, with black-and-white illustrations and descriptions of 48 Christmas cards and notefolders reproduced from paintings, sculptures, and prints in the Gallery collection.

Acoustiguide: A new recorded 45-minute tour of the National Gallery with the Director. A small, portable unit may be rented for 25¢ for one, 35¢ for two persons.

LecTour: A radio lecture device is installed in 28 exhibition galleries. Talks last about 15 minutes in each gallery. A small receiving set may be rented for 25¢.

The Gallery is open on weekdays from 10 a.m. to 5 p.m. and on Sundays from 2 p.m. to 10 p.m. The cafeteria is open on weekdays from 11 a.m. to 4 p.m. and on Sundays from 4 p.m. to 7 p.m. Admission is free to the Gallery and to all programs scheduled.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Code of Laws of the United States

Title 44, Section 181. Congressional Record; arrangement, style, contents, and indexes.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the Congressional Record, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the Congressional Record semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

Title 44, Section 182b. Same; illustrations, maps, diagrams.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the Record without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the Congressional Record the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily Record as follows: the Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided,* That the makeup of the Record shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the Congressional Record, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the Record shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the Record issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the Record for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the Record of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the Record shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the Record style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the Record.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the Congressional Record any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent Record is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the Congressional Record the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the Congressional Record.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the Congressional Record shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the Official Reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the Official Reporters of the respective Houses.

The Official Reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the Official Reporters in the next issue of the Congressional Record, nor to Records printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the Congressional Record by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the Congressional Record which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

Appendix

New Veterans' Administration Center Needed at Mountain Home

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD H. BAKER, JR.
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, September 20, 1967

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, last week I was pleased to join with my distinguished colleague in the House of Representatives, JAMES H. QUILLEN, in urging the Veterans' Administration to build a new hospital at the site of the present Veterans' Administration center at Mountain Home, Tenn.

Representative QUILLEN has again shown his leadership and dedicated concern for the problems of east Tennessee by writing William J. Driver, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, underlining the deteriorating condition of the present complex and recommending that steps be taken to construct a new hospital.

The present hospital, built in 1903, is rapidly approaching the time when it will be impractical to maintain. Representative QUILLEN wrote the Veterans' Administration on July 28 and I wrote a letter on September 13. In the meantime, several groups have joined supporting this project. They include the Greeneville City Council, the American Legion's Department of Tennessee, and the Disabled American Veterans'.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions of the American Legion and the Disabled American Veterans be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION 2 OF THE DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS

Whereas, the Veterans Administration Center facility at Mountain Home, Tennessee, was constructed more than sixty years ago;

Whereas, technical advancement in the medical field has progressed substantially since that time, even to the extent of making this facility obsolete in its present condition; now

Therefore, be it further resolved, that this convention assembled go on record as recommending that this facility be replaced by a new and more modern plant to take care of the increased work load now being required for this location.

QUENTIN L. HOUSHOLDER,
HUGH R. HAMBLEN,
JAMES B. CLEMENTS, Jr.

RESOLUTION

Whereas, the present hospital at the Veterans Administration Center in Mountain Home, Tennessee was opened in 1903; and

Whereas, the Veterans Administration Center serves a large veteran population in East Tennessee, Virginia and North Carolina; and

Whereas, in addition to the veteran population in these areas, there are approximately fifteen hundred domiciliary members at the Center; and

Whereas, the Veterans Administration for several years has been replacing hospitals that are obsolete;

Now therefore be it resolved, by the delegates of the forty-ninth annual department convention of the American Legion assembled in Nashville, July 7, 8 and 9, 1967, go on record urging the Veterans Administration to replace the hospital at Mountain Home, Tennessee, with a new modern facility;

Be it further resolved, that a copy of this resolution be furnished to the members of the Senate and House of Representatives from Tennessee and urge their support in securing this much needed new hospital.

Signed:

JAY E. HARVILLE,
Department Commander.

Attest:

BARNEY W. GREENE,
Department Adjutant.

The Kee Report: Water Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES KEE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 20, 1967

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a previous public service television and radio newscast, "The Kee Report."

The subject discussed in this report is the shortage of water and the measures that can be taken to augment the natural water supply.

This is Jim Kee— bringing you the Kee Report.

Recently, on this program, I discussed the warning that the worst famine in history is inevitable unless world food production is drastically increased in the next decade.

American agriculture can produce food in such abundance, it is hard for us to realize that in some countries, famine may be just around the corner. Yet food is already in short supply in more than fifty undeveloped nations and the need will increase as the population increases.

Next to the threat of nuclear war, the projected food scarcity has been described as mankind's greatest problem. But, there is another oncoming danger which must be given high priority. This new danger is the growing shortage of life-sustaining water over vast areas of the globe.

It may seem ironic in this age of scientific marvels, when men have conquered distant skies, that most members of the human race are worried about satisfying their need for nourishing food and safe drinking water. This is the grim reality.

A few months ago, you were privileged to see on your television screen the dreadful toll taken when the land loses its normal water table. You may recall the recent war in the Holy Land, which was waged over barren ground too parched to sustain even a blade of grass. However, much of this same land comprised the fertile acres so beautifully described in Sacred Scripture. Modern science has the know-how to make the desert bloom again if Arab and Israelites would cooperate in brotherly love, but, unfortunately that day seems far off.

The water shortage is closely tied in to the predicated food shortage. The first need of the war on hunger is to supplant primitive hoes and plows with modern farm machinery wherever possible. But the best equipment on earth will fail to do the job if the soil lacks sufficient moisture. After all, plants need water to survive the same as human beings.

Here, in southern West Virginia, there is no danger of a water famine although some communities need expanded facilities to meet growing needs. The problem takes on more serious proportions in other parts of our country. Until this year's adequate rainfall, the big industrial states along the Eastern Seaboard were plagued by a critical decrease in rainfall, which lasted for several years. The result was that many of the larger cities found their water reserves fast disappearing. Authorities assert that consumption in America will catch up with all existing facilities by 1980.

Can measures be taken to augment the natural water supply? Fortunately, yes. For centuries, men have dreamed of desalting the oceans to provide an abundant water supply for all human purposes. After years of experimentation, this has now become a reality. The City of Key West, Florida, recently dedicated the first municipal desalting plant in our country. The product is good and the cost bearable. But for most communities, especially those inland, the cost of obtaining desalted sea water is prohibitive. However, progress is also being made in finding a workable method to sterilize those ponds and streams which form the natural reservoirs of inland America. This is good news for those communities which have a water problem.

Thank you for listening.

Baylor University Makes Valuable Acquisition in Historian-Journalist Dayton Kelley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, September 20, 1967

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, an encouraging and significant move has recently been made by Baylor University, one of Texas' outstanding educational institutions, in the appointment of Dayton Kelley to a post with Baylor University's Texas history collection. Coming from 12 years of distinguished service at Mary Hardin-Baylor College at Belton, Tex., where he has served as chairman of the journalism department, Mr. Kelley brings a unique background of work as a journalist, historian, educator, and writer. In these various fields he has gained a unique knowledge of and acquaintance with Texas history, past and current, and has himself become an integral part of the current history of Texas. He describes Texas history as "here all around us," which is not surprising, as Mr. Kelley encounters and writes about the historymaking forces in Texas in his Heart O' Texas Notebook column in the Waco Tribune-Herald. Mr. Kelley has edited and republished a number of rare out-of-print books.

I congratulate Baylor University on its choice, and have no doubt that the appointment of Mr. Kelley will benefit the university, its outstanding collection of Texas memorabilia, and, I am sure the already rich historical background of the Heart O' Texas Notebook which Dayton Kelley writes for and about the people of Texas.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "History: Kelley's First Love," written by Mike Phillips, and published in the Thursday, September 14 edition of the Baylor Lariat, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HISTORY: KELLEY'S FIRST LOVE—JOURNALIST, HISTORIAN TO HELP DIRECT TEXAS COLLECTION

(By Mike Phillips)

One of the few men to turn Judge Taylor over in his grave has accepted a post with the Texas Collection.

Dayton Kelley, assistant director of the collection, comes to his desk in the dimly-lit ante-room of Dr. Guy B. Harrison's office from the chairmanship of the Mary Hardin-Baylor Journalism Department.

His interest in Judge R. E. B. Baylor, a founder and first president of Baylor University, is great.

Kelley is editing the educator's autobiography from handwritten notes that are "nearly illegible because he wrote them in his old age."

Since Baylor included few dates in his life's story, Kelley has written a brief biography to go with the autobiography.

Kelley has come as close to his subject as a historian can. A building burned on the Mary Hardin-Baylor campus in 1964, ruining Baylor's adjacent grave site.

"We had to dig him up and move him to a little historical park, and I was the one who got down in the grave, picked up his bones piece by piece and put them in a metal urn," Kelley said.

A soften-spoken man, Kelley fits well into the hushed atmosphere of the Texas Collection.

A newspaper columnist and historical writer, he will be writing "about and out of the Texas Collection." Other duties will be aiding the expansion of the collection through field work and representing the collection at statewide historical functions.

Kelley is enthusiastic about the collection.

"I never thought I would find anything that pleased me as much as the work here," he said. He called the collection "a real monument to Dr. Guy B. Harrison."

"I guess history has always been my first love," he said. He explained that he finds Texas history especially intriguing because "it's here all around us. You can even talk to some of the people who experienced it."

Kelley holds a bachelor's degree in history from Baylor and a master's degree in journalism from the University of Texas.

"History and journalism go together real well," Kelley said. "You can present history to people through columns and historical features."

Kelley writes a weekly column, "Heart O' Texas Notebook," for the Waco Tribune-Herald. "I get a good bit of mail from readers," he said. "Even telephone calls."

Kelley said that, although he has never taught history, his love of history "rubbed off" on some of his journalism students at Mary Hardin-Baylor.

He said he hasn't "had time yet to miss teaching, although I enjoy it."

"The thing I miss most is the enjoyment in seeing a student's achievements after she's left school."

"But I enjoy my work here too much to miss teaching," he said.

Partnership for Health Amendments of 1967

SPEECH

OF

HON. SHERMAN LLOYD

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1967

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 6418) to amend the Public Health Service Act to extend and expand the authorizations for grants for comprehensive health planning and services, to broaden and improve the authorization for research and demonstrations relating to the delivery of health services, to improve the performance of clinical laboratories, and to authorize cooperative activities between the Public Health Service hospitals and community facilities, and for other purposes.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Chairman, the vote to add $20 million annually to the authorization to the HEW represents a phenomenon of sorts. This is action which has not been requested by the administration, has not been requested by the HEW, but is the culmination of attacks upon the Congress over the past 2 months for refusing to adopt ill-conceived legislation to make a categorical grant to the Housing and Urban Development Agency for a rat-control program.

There used to be a fictional character in the 'Lil Abner cartoon strip named "Available Jones." Anyone having a frustration or grievance against anyone or against the world in general could make a payment to "Available," 2 bits or 4 bits or whatever, for which compensation "Available" would permit the payor to give him a good, swift kick. In a frustrating summer marked by riots which became intolerable, a large part of the American public and the press found the Congress to be a convenient "Available Jones" upon which to vent their frustrations. The rat-control measure seemed to offer a dramatic and apparently easily understood specific measure, upon which to zero in.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER] has again called our attention to the fact that OEO already has plentiful funds which may be distributed to the cities for rat-control expenditure, and that there are eight other Federal programs which provide rat-control money. The city of Chicago, for example, has a reported $3 million rat-control program under the aegis of OEO. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MINSHALL] has pointed out as an example, that the city of Cleveland, from which criticism of the previous congressional action has emanated, has failed even to make application for such funds already made available.

We are told that the Ways and Means Committee is demanding that the executive branch bring in indications of expenditure reductions as a condition precedent to favorable consideration of the tax increase proposal. The additional authorization of $40 million over the next 2 years for a program which is already operative, for which no request for additional funds has been made, appears then to be an action not warranted by the evidence or by the realities of today's fiscal situation, but rather a surrender to the unwarranted insistence that the Congress of the United States take action demanded as a result of misapplied frustrations.

"Red" Emory—Poet Laureate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT P. GRIFFIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 20, 1967

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, recently I received an enlightened and amusing message from a factoryworker in Michigan. His thoughts, set down in the form of a poem, are about his resignation—but not the kind you might expect. With the thought that his message will be appreciated by many Senators, I ask unanimous consent that the poem written by Aubrey "Red" Emory, tube-machine operator and poet laureate of Cadillac, Mich., Rubber & Plastics, Inc., be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MY RESIGNATION

(By "Red" Emory)

Of course we must have taxes and revenues and such
But the running of our government is costing me too much.
They repossess my T.V. and they disconnect my phone;
And my take-home pay is just enough to barely take me home.
The government has governed my income in such a way
That I'm hesitant to accept my check on each pay day
The politicians of our time just can't seem to conceive
That they require of my pay much more than I receive.
And when I file my returns at the ending of each year
I'm inspected and suspected and subjected to much fear.
For if I cannot supply them with the money they demand,
They seem happy to inform me they will take my house and land.
And "Security", the social kind was introduced years back.
Somehow, somewhere along the line this, too, has jumped the track.
For the politicians borrowed and they left an I.O.U.—
That's just about as worthless as a debt years overdue.
How they intend to pay it back? Now people, just relax—
It's very simple—in their minds; they'll conjure one more tax.
I've fought the wars and done their chores and tired to the bone,
I'm going to let the politicians carry on alone—
"I quit."

Government and Business Can Cooperate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT N. C. NIX
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 20, 1967

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, the National Postal Forum held in Washington last week was an outstanding example of cooperation between business and Government.

This unique 2-day meeting, sponsored and promoted by the Postal Service under the leadership of Postmaster General Larry O'Brien, brought together some 2,300 businessmen and postal officials from throughout the Nation.

There was a free and frank exchange of opinions and ideas on where the Postal Service now stands and what can be done to make it better serve the American people and the American business community.

The Postmaster General is to be commended for having the foresight and courage to schedule this unprecedented forum. And the mailers who attended in such great numbers are to be congratulated for spending their time and money to contribute to a meaningful dialog between Government and private enterprise. The mailers who came to the meeting paid all their own expenses and a registration fee to attend the sessions.

The Post Office Department arranged an outstanding program, and businesses, with an important stake in our mail delivery system, reciprocated by sending many of their top executives. Mailers and postal officials discussed a broad range of postal problems at the panel sessions which were the heart of the program.

The mailers attending the forum did not pull their punches. Where they have differences with the Post Office, they expressed them forthrightly, but in the spirit of constructive criticism.

In addition to meeting with local and national postal officials, the mailers had an opportunity to exchange views with members of the key House and Senate committees which deal with postal affairs. Members of the House and Senate Post Office Committees and Post Office Appropriations Subcommittees were on hand for a give-and-take question-and-answer session that I am sure proved extremely valuable to all concerned.

Vice President HUMPHREY provided a fitting climax to the forum with a speech urging American industry and business to commit the full scope of their talent and resources to wiping out the last vestiges of social and economic injustice in America.

As an example of effective business-government cooperation, the National Postal Forum has had few equals. And at the close of the forum Postmaster General O'Brien pledged that the recommendations which grew out of the panel sessions would be the basis for an immediate action agenda for the Post Office.

The Postmaster General also announced a nationwide drive starting immediately to double the membership in the Mail Users Councils located throughout the Nation. These councils, composed of local postal officials and mailers who make extensive use of the postal service, are the backbone of the Post Office's campaign to enlist the full support of its customers in improving mail delivery. A doubling of Mail Users Council membership could not help but result in more efficient and economical postal service for the entire Nation.

Veterans Hospitalization Insurance Coverage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 20, 1967

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, late in May the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, exercising its legislative oversight responsibilities, conducted a survey to determine to what extent veterans are covered by some form of prepaid health insurance. The survey involved veterans on the compensation and pension rolls and those paying the premium on their national service life insurance on a monthly basis. Some 32,955 questionnaires were sent to this randomly selected sample. Some 56 percent of the questionnaires were returned.

The committee is indebted to several individuals in the Veterans' Administration for the compilation of the data involved in this survey, but particularly to Mr. Bernard Kaufman, of the Department of Medicine and Surgery, who provided the analysis of the results of this survey which has been published as House committee print 98.

Under leave to extend my remarks I include two summary tables of this important survey:

SURVEY OF VETERANS HOSPITALIZATION INSURANCE COVERAGE—VETERANS ON COMPENSATION AND PENSION ROLLS BY SERVICE CONNECTION STATUS AND AGE, TOTAL

Item	Veterans							
			In hospital					
					Days			
						Percent by type of hospital		
	Total	Not in hospital	Number	Percent of total veterans	Number	VA	Military	Other
Number of veterans responding	18,312	14,202	4,110	22	178,224	75	5	21
Number responding having service-connected disabilities	11,847	9,390	2,457	21	9,535	75	3	22
Percent with service-connected disabilities	65	66	60	--------	--------	----	----	-----
Covered by hospitalization:								
Total	8,252	6,770	1,482	18	31,762	55	3	42
Less than 10 percent	19	14	5	26	70	34	----	66
10 percent	3,537	3,000	537	15	8,168	44	4	52
20 percent	1,198	993	205	17	3,532	49	1	50
30 percent	1,092	896	196	18	3,810	48	6	46
40 percent	601	486	115	19	1,786	42	3	56
50 percent	378	311	67	18	1,054	57	1	41
60 percent	310	237	73	24	1,859	69	4	28
70 percent	178	137	41	23	1,529	57	9	33
80 percent	96	78	18	19	565	19	----	81
90 percent	38	33	5	13	98	51	----	49
100 percent	313	209	104	33	6,175	80	1	19
Not stated	492	376	116	24	3,116	52	1	47
Not covered by hospitalization:								
Total	3,595	2,620	975	27	58,773	86	3	11
Less than 10 percent	6	5	1	17	333	100	----	-----
10 percent	893	707	185	21	6,997	80	8	12
20 percent	428	326	102	24	4,701	89	1	10
30 percent	456	346	110	24	4,089	86	2	12
40 percent	286	204	82	29	3,284	89	4	7
50 percent	196	143	53	27	2,402	91	1	7
60 percent	193	140	53	27	1,935	84	7	9
70 percent	93	69	24	26	599	76	4	20
80 percent	80	60	20	25	683	83	15	2
90 percent	25	23	2	8	1,143	13	----	87
100 percent	610	383	227	37	23,759	91	2	7
Not stated	329	214	115	35	8,848	83	2	15
Number responding not having service-connected disabilities	6,465	4,812	1,653	26	87,689	72	1	27
Age of veterans responding:								
Under 25	110	75	35	32	1,676	79	16	5
25 to 34	615	473	142	23	9,650	74	3	23
35 to 44	3,339	2,743	596	18	27,985	71	3	27
45 to 54	4,962	3,928	1,034	21	44,919	77	2	21
55 to 64	2,056	1,471	585	28	26,386	81	1	18
65 and over	7,020	5,335	1,685	24	65,534	69	2	29
65 to 74	4,995	3,835	1,160	23	41,157	67	2	32
75 and over	2,025	1,500	525	26	24,377	72	2	25
Not stated	210	177	33	16	2,074	73	0	26
Number of veterans indicating coverage under medicare	5,832	4,453	1,379	24	42,898	62	1	38
Percent covered, 65 and over	83	83	82	--------	65	----	----	-----

SELECTED DATA ON HOSPITALIZATION INSURANCE COVERAGE, SURVEY BY STATE

State	Veterans responding: Compensation and pension groups		Veterans responding	Percent covered by health insurance			Compensation and pension groups in hospital	Days in hospital: Percent by type of hospital			Days in hospital
	Number	Percent	NSLI group	Compensation group	Pension group	NSLI group	Percent of total responding	VA	Military	Other	Per veteran[1]
Total	18,312	56	2,782	70	63	94	22	75	5	21	49
Alabama	309	53	9	59	60	89	21	69	2	29	40
Alaska	11	39	----------	70	100	----------	9	100	----------	----------	10
Arizona	170	66	2	61	69	100	26	74	3	22	40
Arkansas	261	61	1	46	46	----------	28	82	2	17	45
California	1,641	63	4	68	65	75	22	65	1	34	54
Colorado	213	63	----------	69	68	----------	24	62	19	19	23
Connecticut	238	57	217	85	72	96	16	70	----------	30	52
Delaware	29	51	2	85	63	100	14	77	----------	23	41
District of Columbia	54	35	2	67	50	100	22	45	----------	55	21
Florida	773	67	28	64	72	93	25	62	3	35	41
Georgia	352	57	12	68	57	100	29	70	4	26	46
Hawaii	37	48	----------	79	75	----------	8	88	----------	12	34
Idaho	68	55	3	64	52	100	16	69	----------	31	51
Illinois	760	56	383	75	58	94	23	72	----------	28	55
Indiana	416	59	151	75	72	92	24	64	9	27	34
Iowa	244	59	74	73	63	86	23	84	----------	16	36
Kansas	219	60	----------	67	69	----------	22	57	----------	43	21
Kentucky	326	56	8	53	47	88	22	88	----------	12	42
Louisiana	309	58	2	56	54	100	23	92	----------	8	46
Maine	106	59	40	62	62	93	29	88	----------	12	63
Maryland	267	61	13	73	70	100	22	56	1	44	26
Massachusetts	725	55	421	80	72	95	19	63	2	35	43
Michigan	415	33	15	84	66	100	23	72	1	28	55
Minnesota	739	90	200	74	69	94	22	66	2	33	42
Mississippi	238	62	55	51	48	95	31	81	----------	19	61
Missouri	414	52	111	64	58	94	25	85	1	14	61
Montana	77	60	26	60	76	96	27	51	29	19	34
Nebraska	119	56	1	54	45	100	24	98	----------	2	58
Nevada	35	53	----------	61	58	----------	29	76	----------	24	51
New Hampshire	79	64	28	59	75	93	20	80	5	15	48
New Jersey	617	58	435	81	66	96	18	83	4	13	62
New Mexico	128	65	----------	58	41	----------	30	84	3	13	53
New York	1,570	54	177	78	68	95	19	73	1	26	53
North Carolina	385	57	9	61	52	100	22	74	4	21	56
North Dakota	54	61	15	78	65	100	13	67	----------	33	81
Ohio	949	55	23	81	70	100	19	66	----------	34	42
Oklahoma	303	59	1	58	49	100	26	79	----------	21	44
Oregon	236	65	1	61	65	100	25	88	----------	12	45
Pennsylvania	1,077	56	14	73	72	93	19	64	6	30	70
Rhode Island	118	53	46	73	61	89	14	86	----------	14	58
South Carolina	194	59	----------	65	50	----------	23	68	2	30	52
South Dakota	61	53	16	58	59	88	41	86	----------	14	32
Tennessee	346	54	13	60	51	100	24	73	10	17	54
Texas	963	55	1	63	59	100	25	86	----------	13	47
Utah	83	52	----------	80	56	----------	24	73	----------	27	18
Vermont	38	68	28	81	76	93	34	66	----------	34	33
Virginia	326	57	12	67	61	100	26	90	----------	10	74
Washington	316	63	1	71	63	100	24	72	----------	28	45
West Virginia	231	60	1	57	52	100	22	84	----------	16	50
Wisconsin	428	59	178	74	67	93	22	74	----------	26	31
Wyoming	29	56	----------	75	56	----------	21	93	----------	7	49
All other locations[2]	216	15	3	28	32	67	27	66	3	31	41

[1] Per veteran reporting number of days in hospital.

[2] Includes U.S. veterans in Puerto Rico, Guam, Virgin Islands, and all foreign countries.

Unnecessary Delay on Tax Increase

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 20, 1967

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, the Kansas City Times presented a persuasive case for immediate action on the pending proposal for a tax increase. The editorial states my position, although I am not committed to the specific recommendation as to the magnitude of the increase.

I include the editorial in my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD:

THE UNNECESSARY DELAY ON THAT TAX INCREASE

The medicine is going to be unpleasant, and no one has a spoonful of sugar that will help it go down. Perhaps the dosage prescribed by the administration—a surtax of 10 per cent—is on the hefty side. But specific aside, it is difficult to see why Congress is taking so long to issue the prescription—or change it. We had assumed there was some urgency in making a decision. The testimony of William McChesney Martin, Jr., Federal Reserve Board chairman, before the House ways and means committee merely bolstered the assumption. Martin suggested that Congress should act as soon as possible. Thus far, it has been largely a matter of hurry up and wait. For that matter, there is now the new approach offered by Rep. Gerald Ford, who believes that action should be deferred until next year. But to his credit, Ford at least had a specific timetable, which is more than can be said for some Democratic leaders. An Associated Press poll of the House ways and means committee shows something less than enthusiasm for the bill as it now stands.

It seems to us, that the put-it-off-until-next-year approach would simply keep the economy in the shadow of uncertainty, and neither business nor the consumer would know how much more—if any—Uncle was going to be taking from the old pocketbook. If the nation is on the brink of a period of critical inflation, there is every reason to head it off at the pass. Let's not kid ourselves that this can be accomplished by an immediate reduction in spending.

The fact is that the government is going to run a tremendous deficit this year. This will add to inflationary pressures to the degree that it necessitates greater borrowing which, in the chain reaction, would have an upward effect on interest rates in general. The pain would be great. And while we'll admit that a tax increase never is pleasant, the pain involved could be significantly less.

In short, the nation is confronted with two courses: Inflation or a tax increase. The course of the tax increase seems the lesser of two evils. Yet Congress just sits there unwilling to chart either course. The public confusion is understandable.

Congress—obviously frightened at the political implications of voting higher taxes—is in a stubborn mood. But it might be possible for the President himself to restate the case in the clearest and simplest of words. At least it would be worth a try. And it would make it perfectly clear that further delay on this important public business would be the responsibility of Congress.

The Honorable Brent Spence, of Kentucky

SPEECH

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. BARRETT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1967

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, America lost a great statesman and many of us lost a valued friend when Brent Spence, of Kentucky, died this week at the age of 92. When he retired from the Congress in 1962, he had given his country more than 30 years of outstanding statesmanship as a legislator of the highest integrity and ability. When I came to Congress in 1944 and took a seat on the Banking and Currency Committee, this great gentleman was my chairman until he retired in 1962. Over these many years he was an inspiration to me with his guidance and counsel and his earnest efforts on behalf of legislation to improve the life and environment of our people.

As chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, Brent Spence led some of the toughest legislative battles that were fought in the Congress. He pioneered in the establishment of the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank, which are basic and vital cogs in our world monetary system. He was the field marshal in our committee and in the House for the complex banking legislation which often seems mysterious to the layman but which is vital in helping to make our economic system work.

He was a great leader in the field of housing legislation and played a major role in the first great hurdle to bring better housing to Americans and to improve our cities, the Housing Act of 1949.

He was indeed a worthy successor to the great Kentuckians who have enriched our Nation, such as Henry Clay and Alben W. Barkley.

We mourn the loss of this great leader of men and outstanding servant to the American people. Mr. Speaker, he was truly a man among men.

Tom Anderson's Report From Rhodesia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 20, 1967

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the renowned and highly respected American journalist Tom Anderson recently returned to this country from a trip to Africa.

He has penned several interesting and informative columns on his tours of that continent.

Mr. Speaker, I include one of Tom Anderson's columns entitled "Report From Rhodesia" following my remarks:

Report From Rhodesia

(By Tom Anderson)

Salisbury, Rhodesia.—After talking with many Rhodesians and with Prime Minister Ian Smith himself, I am convinced he is a devout Christian, a devoted family man, a great war hero, a dedicated patriot with great moral and physical courage. And he's even honest! Although he's been a winner in politics for years, he's not even rich. Imagine!

During one's life, one invariably knows many things which just aren't so. Prejudice, misinformation by the press, misinterpretation and disregard for truth are just a few of the reasons we are all so wrong on so many things. The hypocrisy and moral bankruptcy of the world's press and politicians is incredible. Travel is broadening, to coin a phrase. That's because one *sees* at first hand. Take my trip to Africa. Among the many things I have learned is that there are actually few cannibals in Africa, even in "states" which are members of the United Nations. By cannibals I mean people who eat people for *food*. I learned on this trip that some of the people-eaters are not really people-eaters at all. They are merely people-tasters. They partake of humans not for sustenance but for ritual. And they eat only certain parts, prescribed by the witch doctor, tribal tradition and Voodicare. These people, whose skin happens to be brown, believe that certain goodies eaten bestow certain qualities on the eater. The top delicacy is the liver, not especially because of its succulence but because these people believe the liver is the source of strength and courage. (I don't know, but I suppose the gall bladder is the source of gall: and for several reasons, I hope so.) They don't always eat it—they sometimes parch one of these parts to powder (instant people!) and insert the powder under their skin. (It's not the color of the skin which counts, but the color of the powder.) Or they might mix the powder with water and have a liverade, or a gall bladder on the rocks!

Africa is a Pandora's box opened by our own misguided idealists and our guided "liberals." The United States was mainly responsible for the retreat of the West from Africa and Asia and the creation of a conglomeration of so-called nations which take from us with one hand and throw spears at us with the other. South Africa and Rhodesia, however, are stable, peaceful, prosperous, Christian governments. So naturally they are Dean Rusk's enemies.

Our aid and proffered friendship to the nations and tribes of the world has been returned for the most part with envy and hatred. They tear down our flags, stone our embassies and spit on our ambassadors as we continue to deliver billions of dollars worth of our grandchildren's seed corn to them.

As for our *real* friends, such as South Africa and Rhodesia—*we* spit on *them*. We boycot them. We give no foreign aid to them. We threaten—through the United Nations—to invade them.

The United States punishes Rhodesia with a trade embargo but sells billions of dollars worth of products on credit to the criminals of the Kremlin. The United States gives billoins in foreign aid to "friends," neutrals and enemies busily engaged in helping kill our boys in Vietnam. Some "super patriots" think this is treason.

Support for Public Broadcasting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 20, 1967

Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, this august body will soon have the opportunity to make possible a great step forward in communications when we debate the proposed Public Broadcasting Act of 1967.

The great strides this bill would make possible in the field of educational broadcasting would surpass anything done in the past and would set a precedent for future development of our communications media for the benefit of all our people.

The Boston Globe, on its editorial page of Monday, September 18, advocates, as I do, that the bill be passed.

I recommend the reading of this editorial to my colleagues:

Public TV Should Be Passed

President Johnson's proposal to create a Public Broadcasting Corp. for noncommercial TV comes up, probably tomorrow, for a crucial vote in the House. Ably piloted by Sen. John O. Pastore (D.-R.I.), it sailed through the Senate last May with but one dissenting vote. But in the House Commerce Committee it has run into trouble.

There is little or no disagreement with two parts of the bill, to appropriate money to build noncommercial TV stations and for a study of instructional TV. The opposition is to Title 2, which would create the nongovernment, nonprofit corporation that would disburse funds to noncommercial stations for program production and delivery.

Opponents have raised the bugaboo of political control and proposed a series of amendments whose effect is to increase the controversy. The danger is that a coalition of Southern Democrats and Northern Republicans can thus defeat the bill.

This must not be allowed to happen. Congress long ago delivered most of the public's airwaves over to private enterprise. It is time at long last, in the public interest, for it to help noncommercial TV.

Depletion: Let's Make It Fair

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT DOLE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 20, 1967

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, every time there is talk of a tax increase, many people throughout the United States begin agitating for reduction of the depletion allowance on oil and gas. I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to an article appearing in the Wichita Eagle on Friday, September 15, 1967, by Mr. Ted Brooks, of the Eagle staff. This article tells the real truth about depletion allowances and gives an accurate picture of the problems faced by producers in the industry. The article, entitled "Depletion: Let's Make It Fair," is inserted in the Record at this point:

We have seen here how the defense of the much maligned mineral depletion tax allowance has been left in the hands of those who abuse it. Clumsy attacks have been aided by insincere rebuttals containing no element of disclosure necessary to justify the allowance. Yet we have found that the allowance theory fits into accepted uses of taxation in its triple role as an instrument of revenue, a control on the economy and a guardian of very large concentrations of productive capital and property held by large corporate interests. In this relationship, which one must either accept or hire a hall, it was demonstrated that depletion most nearly resembles the depreciation allowance.

The oil and gas allowance, most often referred to as percentage depletion or simply depletion, amounts to a maximum deduction of 27½ per cent from gross income figured on a lease by lease basis. An interesting limitation is ignored by its critics, who, more often through ignorance than malice, berate it as an across-the-board deduction. This limitation halts the deduction at a level not to exceed 50 per cent of net profit on the lease before taking depletion. To summarize it another way, it amounts to 27½ per cent of gross or 50 per cent of net, whichever is lesser. This is a slow curve that may be swung at and missed.

Let us, for example, set up a typical lease in eastern Kansas with a handful of deplorable wells that gross $10,000. Operating expenses amount to $8,000, leaving a net of $2,000. According to the political gossip columnist, the operator is a robber who gets a $2,750 deduction that leaves the government owing him money. The simple truth is that one-half of the net is $1,000. This is the limit of his deduction, which amounts to an allowance of but 10 per cent. He pays a tax on the remaining $1,000.

This example may set upon by critics as misrepresenting the condition of the poker-player millionaires they are so fond of describing. Let them be disillusioned. There are 46,745 oil wells in Kansas; they average out less than six barrels daily each. Nine-tenths of them are unprorated wells—the so-called "strippers"—that account for about two-thirds of the state's production; they average out at less than four barrels daily. Relatively, the figures would not vary much in other midcontinent areas.

The $10,000 lease example picked from the 42,674 stripper wells is more than fair. Most of the wells are closer to the margin of abandonment than the $2,000 before-tax profit instance we have recounted. A critic who would look, rather than surmise, would find that most of them remain in operation only because the operator himself is a pumper and lease roustabout who takes the profit in the form of wages. There are mom and pop family operations where producing property, held by both lease and fee, would be sold for salvage instantly if the operators were unable to provide their own labor.

How true this is may be assessed by the fact that even now the producing stripper oil wells are being abandoned at the rate of 142 per month—1,199 oil well abandonments—in the first eight months of this year, as compared to an estimated 700 replacements. The deficit of 500 indicates that the advantage of depletion must be slight indeed and the "loophole" doesn't exist in ordinary operations.

Slightly less than nine per cent of Kansas wells get substantial benefits from depletion. These 4,071 wells are the newly drilled, so-called "flush" producers. They get allowables ranging from 35 to more than 60 barrels daily. But they fall ingloriously to make their allowables, averaging in fact a little more than 25 barrels daily per well. Some properties earn the full allowance. Most of them don't. A 1961 study revealed an average of 22 per cent among representative companies. It is thought that a subsequent decline in productivity (state output has fallen from 300,000 to 276,000 barrels daily) has reduced the allowance to an average of less than 20 per cent.

It should be noted that the allowance is not a subsidy on poor properties. As larger manufacturing concerns commonly earn larger depreciation allowances, so do larger wells get larger depletion allowances. The parallel is fundamental up to the point of demonstrated need and the intent of the provision. To this extent the depletion allowance stands or falls alongside depreciation, investment credits, capital gains, income averaging and numerous avenues left open for the recovery and growth of capital, especially in productive enterprises. The intent and unpredicted uses of the allowance will be discussed in subsequent columns.

U.S. Control of the Panama Canal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 12, 1967

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Richard Whitehead, currently president of the Laconia National Bank, formerly testing engineer for the Panama Canal Commission, superintendent of the Pacific locks of the Panama Canal and a member of the Goethals Memorial Committee, is one of millions of Americans who are deeply concerned that the proposed treaties relating to the Panama Canal would be harmful to the national security, and has outlined his views in response to my request.

Inasmuch as this relates to a matter of major importance and Dr. Whitehead's background qualifies him as an expert in the field, I commend his statement to the reading of all Members of Congress, as follows:

WHY WE SHOULD KEEP FULL CONTROL OF THE PANAMA CANAL AND NOT GIVE UP OUR SOVEREIGN RIGHTS TO THE CANAL ZONE

(By Richard H. Whitehead, pioneer electric mule wrangler, Panama Canal)

Over five weeks ago I received copies of the Proposed New Treaty from Panama under which we are to give up our sovereign rights to the Canal Zone, abolish the Panama Canal Board, set up a dual operating authority, greatly increase the annual payment to Panama by raising canal tolls, and give all canal property in the Zone not used by the canal to Panama, all in the expectation of our building a Sea Level Canal elsewhere. The Treaty would give the present canal eventually to Panama without payment of any kind on their part. The proposed treaty was published in all Panama newspapers. The new treaties not only abrogate the 1903 Treaty, under which we took the gamble of building the present canal, but also all other treaties including the Treaty of 1936. Under this 1936 Treaty, a so-called treaty of friendship and mutual accord, *our sovereign rights were reaffirmed*, thus disposing of that old canard that we have our position in Panama by force and the imposing of our will on a reluctant people.

The American People have been kept ignorant of these treaties and brainwashed by a steady barrage from government sources aimed to minimize the importance of the present canal to our economy. This not withstanding the fact that 70% of the cargo transiting the canal originates in or is landed in U.S.A. ports. Even the effect of increasing tolls to give a greater take to Panama will have serious repercussions. For instance, we now are exporting a heavy tonnage of coal mined in the U.S.A. through the canal to Japan. This coal is carried to port by the Norfolk and Western Railroad. Only the present low tolls through the Canal make it competitive to other world sources. The Treaty therefore provides not only for eventually *giving away* the canal but also meanwhile raising the cost of living in the U.S.A. by increasing costs of our imports and exports. It will also, as in the case of our exports of coal, put a lot of Americans out of jobs.

In Panama there is a University with a dominant far leftist group that plan and promote the troubles we encounter in Panama that is independent of government. This University is the protected sanctuary from where all the riots start in Panama, that destroy Canal property and lives, and make it unsafe for an American Canal employee to cross the street from the Zone into Panama. The Panama authorities let them riot, kill, and burn and then blame it all on us. There will always be trouble in Panama as long as the government of Panama is unable under their laws to restrain the leftists in their University.

Besides the riots that have burned and destroyed property and lives in the Zone, Panama has had frequent armed insurrections of its own as attested by the bullet marks in the walls of the National Palace. Recently there was an invasion planned from within. In 1936 we revised our treaty and gave up our right to maintain law and order in Panama. Without our military presence with such an unstable government, the safety of the Canal would be most problematical. The only power that maintains order in Panama is their police force. Their former Chief, who became President, was assassinated by opposite political forces who were never punished a few years ago.

Every step we have taken to help Panama, every concession made by us, has simply resulted not only in a lack of appreciation but increased demands. The organized leftwing group in the University hate us and there is nothing we can do about it. When we built the new Thatcher Memorial Bridge at a cost of $26,000,000 for the sole benefit of Panama did we get thanks? No. We had another riot. In 1964 we couldn't even have a pleasant commemmoration even to celebrate the 50'th anniversary of the opening of the Canal.

The U.S.A. has invested 1.9 billion in the Canal. On the balance sheet of the Panama Canal only 350 million has been capitalized. Countless millions have gone by gifts and grants to Panama in property, public roads, water supplies, sanitation, education, and into many other channels for their well-being. In the fiscal survey of Panama, "Report of the Fiscal Mission of the Organization of American States, Etc., 1964", the opening paragraph states: *"Panama has been inaptly referred to as a small poor country*. The country is small, with a population of only 1,100,000, but compared to countries in Latin America . . . Panama is relatively well off. Panama has the fifth highest per capita income among nineteen Latin American states." In considering our relations with Panama we must bear in mind that there is no great middle class.

There are twenty or so wealthy families, a small middle class, and a large part of the population live in the interior in what we would consider a primitive state. What we are up against in Panama are the ruling families and their *uneasy relationship* with a leftist-oriented University. There is no possible solution by us to a peaceful and lasting settlement to our Canal problems with Panama. Every concession simply hastens the day and probability of giving up the Canal to our shame and future regret. If what we have already done for Panama hasn't produced an atmosphere of mutual friendship and trust, nothing ever will. There is no way of having the Panama University friendly to the American people. Here is a basic conflict that can only be held in check by our determination to assert our rights. It is part of the cold war. Revolutions are common in Panama. With 20 political parties, no great stabilizing middle class, a few wealthy ruling families, and a leftist University ready to stir up trouble, our giving up any control of our life-line Canal is unthinkable. The future interest of Panama itself would logically be best served by our standing by our present rights. This does not mean, however, that we should not increase canal payments to Panama and help continue to develop their economy. The removal of our military arm is just inviting more trouble.

What would happen to the present Canal if the Senate approves this give-away treaty? My answer, and I organized the operating force on the Pacific side, is that *the safety of the canal would be jeopardized by dual operation*. I know many simple ways that sabotage could wreck the Canal. Such sabotage is likely when sensitive positions are filled under the proposed treaty by unscreened graduates from the Panama University under a dual control of the Canal.

In spite of all the facts given, which should be known to our State Department, the proposed treaty is being carefully pushed through an unsuspecting Senate. The strategy is transparent to one who is cognizant of the facts leading up to its proposed presentation.

First the Army Engineers claim the Canal is obsolete, that the locks should be eliminated, and the Canal changed to a sea level canal. This implies that such a sea level canal would be free from locks. They suggest also a sea level canal may be built to replace the present Canal elsewhere and that when this is done the present Canal will be obsolete entirely. Therefore, they reason we might as well get rid of it and give it to Panama. Then the Army and the State Department collaborated and had Congress pass a bill with an initial appropriation of $17,500,000 to study the situation. But the commission appointed *is limited to a study of a sea level canal*. The problem of tides is discussed by the proponents of the legislation but lightly passed over. After three years the commission finds that the tidal currents in a sea level canal would make its transit hazardous and states that "tidal navigational devices will be required". What are these tidal navigational devices? They don't state, but I can tell you in simple language, *they are tidal locks*.

I can easily prove that they will be more complicated than the present locks. Why? Because a ship from the Pacific entering the tidal locks must be locked either up or down to enter the Canal. Thus depending on whether it is high or low tide in this *so-called sea level canal* there still remains the locks they would like to eliminate, but the locks required are more complicated. The problem of caring for the flood waters from tropical rainfall, whose natural route to the sea is through the line of a canal, still remains. These flood waters reach in the present Canal 350,000 cubic feet per second. A sea level canal costs billions more than a high level canal that works with and harmonizes with the forces of nature like our Panama Canal at present. Both Stevens and Goethals, who built the present Canal, emphatically stated they would prefer a high level canal that tames the Chagres, to a sea level canal even at the same cost. We have tides of over 5 knots in the Cape Cod Canal with 12 foot tides. At the entrance to the Panama Canal tides reach 22 feet. These tides, without tidal locks, will produce tidal currents of 7 to 8 knots. This would make navigation in a narrow waterway of say 600 foot width for large ships hazardous and impractical.

The commision study of a sea level canal is a red herring to distract the attention of the American people from realizing how important the present Canal is to us. The limiting factors in the present Canal are its depth of 40 feet, the limited size of its locks of 110 feet, and the width of Culebra Cut of 360 to 500 feet. Water supply is no problem as pumped storage, a device used by many utility companies, can inexpensively care for any seasonal shortage.

The Army, contrary to popular belief, *did not build* the Panama Canal. That was a historic *civilian* achievement of the American People. The Army, 20 years ago, made a study of converting the present canal into a sea level canal and delayed the installation of larger locks on which we have already spent in excavation over $50,000,000—locks that are badly needed now. Their estimate for converting an inadequate sea level canal to care for the larger ships built since was nearly 2½ billion dollars. The study was rightly shelved by a previous administration and never reached Congress or the public. I believe that when all the chips are down, this is still their objective and they are the agent for the commission. It will never be done, but if such an objective could be achieved the Army could say *We built the Panama Canal*. It is interesting to note since the Army made its study the canal was threatened with closure by a rock mass breaking away from Contractors Hill in Culebra Cut. Only prompt action and months of work removed the moving mountain slab of rock that had broken away. What would have happened if the canal had been 100 feet deeper through the Continental Divide as they propose?

When the 300 foot width to Culebra Cut was decided on, the estimates for excavation were increased to 195,000,00 cubic yards. Before we reached the 40 foot depth in the Cut, we had taken out 325,000,000 cubic yards. To date we have removed over 700,000,000 cubic yards and the slides *are still in motion*. It will take us 4½ more years to widen Culebra Cut from 300 to 500 feet. For every ship that has gone through the Canal we Americans have excavated over two thousand cubic yards of material, and we are still digging.

They talk of using atomic energy to remove dirt and rock and illustrate the effect of its use by showing a hole in the dry desert of Nevada from a single blast 350 feet deep. In the tropics the rainfall would change the material on the slopes to *sliding mud* and fill up the hole made by the blast. The so-called new science of soil mechanics will quickly realize that atomic energy will at the same time it blasts a hole in the ground, also weaken the adjacent supporting structure, with the probability of starting slides like Culebra and Cucuracha of the Panama Canal. So estimates on costs based on use of atomic energy are very problematical; the Army estimates of excavation made initially for the Panama Canal were far off in left field, and the estimates for costs of a sea level canal are subject to the same unreliable guesswork.

The answer to the Panama Canal problem is a simple, relatively inexpensive one *that cannot be proposed by the commission* under the present limiting sea level legislation. It is simply to *keep control of the present Panama Canal*, deepen it, widen it, and add a set of larger locks. Then build a high level lock canal through Nicaragua for smaller ships using locks the same size as the St. Lawrence Seaway. Most of the engineering studies have been made and the costs factor are available. As the construction of the St. Lawrence Seaway is recent, estimates of a similar canal through Nicaragua would be reliable. This canal would divert the smaller ships from Panama and shorten the distance from New Orleans to San Francisco by 360 miles. It would be a self-liquidating venture, costing about one-half billion. It would create the new wealth that a new line of communication always does. This canal could be a joint venture *under our control* with participation by the Central American States. Castro wouldn't like it because of its proximity to Cuba but started on the right basis it would help us and the Central American countries.

I would suggest if we do this that we insure establishing an educational system that will put our contributions in the proper light to the nations we work with. If we do not look ahead to our future relationships with the countries we are cooperating with the result will be as in the case of Panama. We will do wonderful things for others, spend vast sums to advance their economies, but instead of building lasting good will they will openly, as in the case of Panama, refer to the treaties they have entered into as "cursed treaties" and give no credit to us for the benefits they have received from our hands.

Having been in Government, I know partly how propaganda is set in motion by government agencies to promote a policy that is frequently not declared beforehand to the American public. The present aim is to promote the new treaty with which the American public is unfamiliar. The first step is *secret* negotiations, the past two years in the case of Panama. During this period future obstacles are cared for by brainwashing publicity. In the present case a red herring device of a sea level canal has been used and Congress has been prevailed on to pass legislation to study a sea level canal only *so that other sensible and more practical proposals* cannot even be discussed.

We are now in the final stage. Panama has known all about, and deliberated on, the proposed treaty for months. They are in—the American public is out. They know of the unlikelihood of a sea level canal ever being built and the great importance of the present canal. They also know that the vast majority of ships built recently that are too large to transit the Canal, will never use any canal and can operate only between a few places having sufficient depth to care for them. Many were built to avoid payment of tolls to the Suez Canal, a busier waterway than Panama, when Egypt lets it open. While the Panamanians are being informed fully we are kept in ignorance, except for the brainwashing propaganda that is given to us meanwhile.

Now we come to the final and present stage: The State Department knows if the American people have the opportunity of digesting all the facts that the Senate *will not likely approve* the proposed treaty, so they take the next step, just before releasing the treaty for Senate approval. This step has just been made in the Christian Monitor of August 29, 1967, in a brainwashing article from Panama entitled *"New Canal Treaties Stir Panama Politics"*. This article is a clever piece of propaganda. Here is how it ends:

"The existence of a foreign colony supported by a massive military force in the heart of Panamanian territory, whether sanctioned by treaty or not, works as an irritant to Panama pride and nationalism". "Naturally Panamanians want control over the Zone and an end to military bases," *a student said*. "After all the definition of national sovereignty is to have political and economic control over national territory."

The article then concludes:

"Under these circumstances *any delay* in signing of the treaties *or any revisions to the detriment of Panama*, could spark violent protests, a coup, or open revolution . . . that could be far more dangerous to United States interests than any of the concessions contained in the agreement."

Thus notice is served by those we have done so much for, and to whom we have made concession after concession and assisted in every conceivable way, that we had better not deliberate the merits of the proposed treaty, only sign it without regard to the equities in the situation which have cost the American taxpayer to date nearly two billions. We must not discuss the recent riots and what might have happened to the canal if we had had no protective military force. We must not remark that our past acts of generosity have only led to more trouble, dissatisfaction, and increased demands. It is plain that if the Senate passes this treaty that future historians of our great Nation will mark it as a great unwise step.

"Without wisdom", the Good Book says, "the people perish". May He grant our leaders not only wisdom but the courage to fight for the right. A shameful surrender of our heritage is being planned of which the public is almost unaware. If it succeeds it will be a major victory for world Communism in which the University of Panama has played a major part.

I, as one of the builders of the Canal, will feel that something precious has gone out of my life and that those of mine who follow are going to have fewer opportunities in the America of Tomorrow.

This I have prepared in beloved memory of Stevens and Goethals, who build the Canal and with whom I had a long-standing, intimate relationship.

Commissioner Bennett Issues a Challenge to Indians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 19, 1967

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, the people of Oklahoma, and particularly the Indian people of our State, were honored Labor Day weekend with the presence of Robert L. Bennett, our progressive Commissioner of Indian Affairs.

Commissioner Bennett is an Oneida Indian, and I believe he is able to talk with understanding to the Indians because he is one of them. The Commissioner believes the future of our Indians is in the hands of the Indians themselves, who should play a major role in Government policy decisions. This has been emphasized during his leadership of the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

On September 2, it was my privilege to be on the platform when Commissioner Bennett spoke at the Cherokee national holiday celebration in Tahlequah, a celebration which included the dedication of three new businesses important to the Cherokees. On Labor Day, the Commissioner was present with our distinguished majority leader, the honorable CARL ALBERT, at the Choctaw Nation's traditional Labor Day celebration at Talihina, Okla.

The speeches the Commissioner made on these occasions give a good illustration of the thinking of the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Indians themselves on the important problems the Indians face in catching up with modern America. At Tahlequah, Commissioner Bennett recounted some of the success stories of Indian tribal efforts at economic development, and some of these stories are wonderful. At Talihina, Commissioner followed this with a direct challenge to the Indians of America to take the lead in mapping their own course in 20th-century America, and he pledged to help them follow this course.

Mr. Speaker, I insert the Tahlequah speech by Commissioner Bennett in the RECORD:

CHEROKEE NATIONAL HOLIDAY

(Address by Commissioner of Indian Affairs Robert L. Bennett before the Cherokee Nation, Tahlequah, Okla., Sept. 2, 1967)

Your invitation to participate in the celebration of the Cherokee National Holiday—and the dedication of three new businesses in your growing Cultural Center—was a most welcome one. I always enjoy most those occasions when I can share the pride of our Indian accomplishments—and the accomplishments of the Cherokees, throughout history, have been many.

Your contribution to the greatness of this Nation, and to the State of Oklahoma, has been monumental in the past. The present and the future offer new directions for the Cherokees to travel, and new honors to win.

It is significant that Oklahoma's two niches in the Congressional Hall of Fame are occupied by Cherokees—Sequoyah, the great humanist, and Will Rogers, the gentle, pointed humorist. But these are only two of a roster of Cherokee names in the annals of American history. Art, music, business, law, medicine, soldiering, teaching—in all of these fields the Cherokee people are represented.

The spirit that endowed your great leaders of the past has not been left to languish in the halls of history. It is vitally alive. Today, another great Cherokee—Principal Chief W. W. Keeler—can point with pride to the accomplishments of his people.

When the Oklahoma Cherokees received their judgment award, a business organization was promptly established to manage financial affairs, and it is their achievements that bring me here today. For the development of both the human and natural resources, as well as for the preservation of the rich Cherokee heritage, you set aside $2 million dollars. That investment is returning dividends of pride and progress today.

The plans you made were broad in scope but realistic. You planned for education and industrial development in a two-pronged attack on pockets of poverty—the first to acquire skills for today's job market, and the second to bring the job market to the skilled. Today three new businesses are to be dedicated—the handsome new Arts and Crafts Center, restaurant and service station complex—constituting an impressive total of 12 new enterprises and an industrial park established in the span of one brief year.

Simultaneously, housing and home improvement came under sharp scrutiny. At Pryor, 25 homes were purchased and made available for rental. In two other locations—Briggs Community and the Baron-Wauhillau Communities—the new Turnkey plan will enable Cherokees to earn their way to ownership of 26 new homes to be constructed within the next year. Financed jointly by the Department of Housing and Urban Development and the Tribal Housing Authority, and with the cooperation of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, this program is an example of the new wider horizons in Indian affairs.

The Turnkey program, with its combination of approaches to housing needs, is particularly suited to the requirements of Indian communities, and has been widely accepted in Indian country. The Mutual-Help aspect of the plan permits prospective owners to contribute their labor in place of cash down payments. In some cases tribes are contracting for the construction of low-rental housing, providing employment for tribal members on the projects. Some of the other tribes, who like the Cherokees, have adopted this solution to their housing needs are the Navajos, Crows, Chippewas, Jicarilla Apaches, and your neighbors—the Choctaws.

These activities among the Oklahoma Cherokees herald a sharp new wind of change blowing across Indian country, bearing with it the seeds of challenge, initiative, and self-determination. The dead leaves of defeat, despair and disillusion are being driven into dark corners where they will finally moulder away. There are those who still heed the arid voices in the rustle of their passing, and would discourage our people from confronting new challenges.

Everywhere, exciting new developments are infusing our Indian people with new vitality. I would like to tell you about the accomplishments of a few other Indian areas that, like the Cherokees, are looking forward instead of uselessly backward.

For a long time Rosebud Sioux Reservation of South Dakota had typified most of the handicaps of an isolated reservation—remote from the heart of the Nation's industrial and commercial centers; with a land base too small to support its exploding population; with nearly two-thirds of the labor force unemployed; and with all but a few families living in shacks and shanties without heat or plumbing to make the long hard winters easier.

Rather than being defeated by a seemingly endless series of problems, the Rosebud Tribal Council last year decided to move in the direction which seemed the most urgent—housing. With a grant from the Office of Economic Opportunity, training funds from the Department of Labor and Housing and Urban Development, and help from the Public Health Service and the Bureau of Indian Affairs, plans were laid for building 375 new homes. The houses are prefabricated—thus costing less to produce, and enabling production to move swiftly. Every day, two more houses are assembled on homesites selected by the families who will occupy them.

In addition to new housing, employment is provided for many tribal members in the assembly of the homes. Thus, two needs are partially met with one effort—the need for jobs and the need for adequate shelters.

Even before the prefabricated housing program began, the Rosebud Sioux had organized a housing authority which became their agent for negotiating loans and grants from the U.S. Public Housing Administration. The Tribe has built enarly 100 low-rent houses which are rented to members on the basis of ability to pay; and there is still a third housing project underway—the "mutual-help" project, under which family members work on the construction of new homes in lieu of cash down payments.

More than 90 tribes have established tribal housing authorities, so that they may participate in public housing projects of the kind I have described.

But other things are happening, too. Take the Zunis of New Mexico, for example. Like the other Pueblo groups the Zuni people have traditionally not tended to mix very much with their neighbors. Their "extended family" way of life is strongly influenced by their religious beliefs. They treasure their land, but have been reluctant to put it to modern day uses. They farm, but not on a large scale, mechanized basis. Consequently, their economic standard of living is low compared to communities around them.

But just last month, the Zunis presented to us a 24-point plan for development that is so far-sighted and modern in its objectives that I was astounded. The plan calls for a dual effort—industrial, commercial and agricultural development of their lands, coupled with an intensive campaign to urge young people to take every opportunity available to become as well educated and well trained as possible for the world of tomorrow.

This decision by the Zunis has come slowly, after much thought. They have finally reached the conclusion that it is unwise to try to live altogether in the past; that it is necessary to preserve the best of the past; and that the only way to preserve what to them is good is to make use of it in new ways. Their values and their beliefs—and their land—will continue to be cherished. But a life less ridden with poverty will be the result of their decisions.

What the Zunis are trying to do could not conceivably be done without the knowledge that there are many Federal and State agencies available to them from which they can draw financial and technical aid. This is the basis of their planning.

The Pima Indians of Arizona are planning in similar ways. Their lands are scattered around the outer rim of the booming city of Phoenix. Some of the Pima groups are now preparing to lease some of their lands for urban development and industrial complexes. As development occurs, there will be many sources of employment for people who once lived only by small farming. Good communities attract good school administrations, and doctors and dentists and shops and other services. These things are in the forecast of the future for the Pimas.

The greatest satisfaction I have received during my first year as Commissioner of Indian Affairs has been the response of Indian leadership to expectations placed upon them. I think you will agree that there is more happening in Indian areas than at any time in history—and Indians are making it happen.

More and more, the role of the Bureau of

Indian Affairs is shifting from one of exclusive responsibility for Indians, to that of "finder" and "coordinator" of other sources of aid. The Bureau, today, serves as a channel for services provided by many other Government agencies. To name a few—The Public Health Service, the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the Economic Development Administration, the Office of Economic Opportunity and the Labor Department.

It is more often our function in the Bureau to acquaint Indian tribal councils with the tools for doing the job than to provide the tools and do the work.

As Indians we share a priceless heritage. Today, more than at any other time in our history, we can combine the priceless values of that heritage with the new opportunities available to us, in the creation of a better life for our own and all future generations.

It is easy to sit in a rocking chair and give our opinions about what is wrong with our world; but a rocking chair never goes anywhere but back and forth over the same old ground. It's the man who has the energy to get up and do something about his problems, as you are doing here, that will make a better world for his children.

In 35 years of working with my Indian people, I have never ceased to stress to them the value of education. In Sequoyah's time, the Cherokees were often more literate and more widely read than their non-Indian neighbors. Cherokees established the first system of public education in world history for their children in 1821. In 1907, when Indian Territory became the State of Oklahoma, the Cherokees turned over 126 public schools and a thriving college. When the educational record of this generation is written, what will it say?—That the Cherokees of today were equal to their ancestors?—Or that we failed to equip our youth with the tools necessary for survival in a world of ever-advancing technology?

Opportunities abound today for young people, Indian and non-Indian alike. Scholarships for Indian youth are more plentiful than ever before. To today's Indian youth I would say: Before you can engage in an occupation, build toward a career, and assume full responsibility for yourselves and your personal lives, you must acknowledge your own responsibility to yourselves. The means for acquiring a first-class education are yours for the asking. Will you accept the challenge and enter the doors that are open to you, or will you become statistics in a drop-out rate that continues higher than the national average. Will your children perpetuate the cycle of joblessness that is already ten times the national average, or will you bridge the widening gap and become fully participating citizens in the American society that your forbears helped to build?

This is an age wherein minimum achievements will not suffice. We must build our homelands and we must look beyond our boundaries. If opportunities for fulfillment of our social and economic needs are greater beyond our immediate home communities, then we must venture forth. To do so does not mean a loss of identity, but an enrichment of personality and a broadening of the narrow perspectives that have inhibited our people in past generations.

We can retain that special something that is Indian, and be special as American citizens, too. Indian people have a talent for survival—not merely physical survival but spiritual as well. Indians have demonstrated throughout their history the ability to accept change without allowing it to obliterate them. And, in so doing, they have themselves subtly enforced changes upon this Nation as a whole.

Let us live in our world of today and build new greatness into our future upon a firm foundation of reality. Those who would perpetuate discontent do Indian people a serious injustice. Listen, rather, to the forward-looking Indians—old and young alike—to whom we are indebted for their willingness to accept challenges, embrace opportunity, and move forward with the times into a new era of Indian achievement.

You have woven your Cherokee heritage into the fabric of this State and Nation. Your accomplishments are a matter of pride to all of Indian America.

The English alphabet was 3,000 years in its evolution. Sequoyah's syllabary was only twelve years in the making, and yet it stands second among the alphabets of civilized nations. If your ratio of progress is equal to that of Sequoyah, you will soon be setting the pace for all Indians—indeed, for all Americans—to follow.

Weep for the Innocent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE BUSH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 20, 1967

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, on September 5, 1967, television station KHOU-TV in Houston presented a one-half hour commentary on crime in the United States. This program created such local interest and prompted so much mail, that I feel it appropriate to place in the RECORD the remarks of one of the program's participants—Mr. Jenkin Lloyd Jones, editor and publisher of the Tulsa Tribune—in the RECORD so that all my colleagues may have the benefit of it.

WEEP FOR THE INNOCENT

(Commentary by Mr. Jenkin Lloyd Jones, editor and publisher, the Tulsa Tribune)

In the past five years the population of the United States has risen eight per cent. And in the past five years, according to the F.B.I., the incidence of major crime in America has gone up 40 per cent. This is a staggering statistic. When—not merely misbehavior, not merely juvenile delinquency—but murders, robberies, rapes, and aggravated assaults go up five times as fast as the population increase, we had better start looking for remedies. A lot of people are. And they include many patriotic and compassionate citizens who keep claiming that crime is largely caused because non-criminals don't have enough social conscience. It is their theory that the cure for crime is better schools. And more public housing. And a more equitable racial mix to be achieved by integrating neighborhoods and cross-hauling children. And the giant infusions of Federal money into so-called depressed areas. And persuading the drop-outs to stay in. And hiring only those cops who will promise to behave like benevolent big brothers. And more relief and more social workers and more youth clubs. Oh yes, and because a number of dope addicts have robbed in order to find money to support their habit, it has been seriously suggested that the Government supply the drugs free so that its users may float around the streets in narcotic euphoria, paid for by the squares who work.

Ladies and gentlemen, I am sure all these theories are splendidly meant. But I would like to raise some questions. If poverty is the root of crime, how does it happen that crime has increased most rapidly in a period in which the general per capita income has increased more rapidly? If ignorance is the root of crime, why does the crime rate rise at a time when there has never been so much free schooling and trade training offered and when the national index of illiteracy is at its all-time low? If lack of social services and relief are responsible, how does it happen that crime is most out-of-hand in those cities filled with recent migrants from rural areas who were attracted to those cities for the plain reason that work was no longer necessary and relief was available to all? There are deeper reasons for this national malaise than can be cured by the simple outpouring of more public funds. And it is time that people of good will and intelligence recognize that, unless the rewards for gross irresponsibility can be diminished and unless the wages of sin can be cut, the overwhelming majority of law-abiding Americans of all races is going to be increasingly victimized by the unprincipled and vicious minority. According to latest U.S. Government estimates, the number of serious offenses committed against American citizens last year will run to well over 2¾ million.

This means that last year you had one chance in 70 of being murdered, maimed or robbed. The measure of this risk can best be appreciated by the fact that you had only one chance in 100 last year of dying from any and all causes, including accidents. The annual crime bill is running at $27 billion. That's equal to $143 for every man, woman and child in America. The whole cost of public education in America comes to only $20 billion. In behalf of cutting the wages of sin I would like to make a few suggestions: We had better, for example, take another look at the doctrine of "reasonable doubt". In recent years many thousands of men, known to be guilty by judges and juries, have been turned loose because of strained and far-fetched technicalities that would have appalled and astonished the creators of our Bill of Rights. Now, man's effort to free himself from the possibility of false conviction is an inspiring story and worthy of applause. In ancient and medieval times thousands were hurried to the scaffold or the rack, and millions rotted in dungeons as a result of charges made of cheesecloth. The man of law was often only a man of terror and oppression.

Slowly man's anger grew and he gathered his strength. With the Magna Carta the nobles curbed the excesses of the kings, and with the growth of the common law the people curbed the excesses of the nobles. And then came the American constitution and the prohibitions against unreasonable search and seizure, and cruel and unusual punishments. But, because it was impossible to write definitions that would be fair under all circumstances, interpretation of these rights was still largely left to the courts. And gradually there has risen a bit of sonorous but unthinking rhetoric that says: "Better to let 10,000 guilty men go free than to imprison one innocent person." This sounds great—in a high school debate. It serves to clothe the sayer with the white robe of a lover of humanity and a protector of human rights. Yet there is hardly a law enforcement officer who, in the light of his practical experience, doesn't realize that if the interpretation of "reasonable doubt" were so broadened that 10,000 criminals were left unpunished in order to avoid a single bum rap the cause of public order and equity would be miserably served. For these 10,000 arrogant in their contempt for law, could be counted on to kill, rob, maim, and rape hundreds of innocent citizens.

Let us not forget that the unoffending men and women who fall victim of criminals who had been previously turned loose on tortured technicalities are also the victims of bum raps—very bum. Not long ago, in a speech to the Pennsylvania society J. Edgar Hoover said: "When this great nation was founded and when its guidelines were being established for future generations of Americans, George Washington proclaimed, 'the administration of justice is the firmest pillar of government.'" "What," asked J. Edgar Hoover, "has happened to that 'firm pillar' in the intervening 175 years?" "Far too often it has become weakened by impractical theorists, emotion-blinded pressure groups, warped idealists and self-serving politicans. Misguided leniences, including pardons, paroles and probation for unrepentant and unreformed offenders, continue to prevail in many jurisdictions—as does the use of loopholes, technicalities and delays in the law which benefit rogues at the expense of decent members of society." In many court jurisdictions we are going to have to do better than we have in finding that narrow middle ground which gives maximum protection to the falsely accused without jeopardizing in far greater measure the safety of blameless Americans.

Secondly, it seems to me that we are going to have to do more solid thinking about reasonable procedures under the criminal law. The presumption of innocence, the access to counsel, the privilege of refusing to testify against oneself, and the right of habeas corpus are all previous. But when, in the Mallory case, the U.S. Supreme Court turned loose a confessed Washington rapist because 18 hours had elapsed between his arrest and his arraignment, I believe the court was not simply way out in left field. It wasn't even in the ballpark. The culprit, incidentally, to whom the august Justices referred as "that lad", was subsequently arrested in Philadelphia for a similar crime, the Court's ruling, according to many better legal minds than mine, was faulty on two counts. Under certain circumstances its dictum would give officers insufficient time to make a case where a case could be made. And the hurry it imposed might cause prosecutors to rush to arraignment persons against whom no case really existed, with consequent damage to their reputations. It is one thing to let a man languish in jail without a charge being filed against him, and it is another thing to force officers either to charge or release a man before they have had reasonable time to complete an investigation and interview witnesses. Somewhere there is an area of commonsense which, I believe, the Supreme Court just whizzed by.

Thirdly, I think we are going to have to make up our minds about capital punishment. We have failed between two stools. Thirty-five of our 50 States retain capital punishment on their lawbooks, yet they commute practically all death sentences, and those that are carried out occur only after interminable stays and delays. It is popularly assumed that murder and forcible rape are punishable by death. Yet in 1965 there were 9,850 murders in America and 22,470 forcible rapes. And there were exactly 15 executions for all causes. That means that only 1 out of each 2,080 persons who committed what are believed to be capital crimes actually paid with his life. Few persons are executed in America who are not impoverished and friendless and incapable of wielding even the slightest political pressure. It is a solemn thing to take the life of a man, even with the sanction of law and in just retribution for the highest crimes. Anyone who has sat with a Governor on execution night knows what a bleak and nervous ending it is. What we have done with capital punishment in America, through our hesitancy and lack of courage is turn it into a form of slow torture which the law, itself, never contemplated nor condoned Caryl Chessman in California languished through 12 years of legal gymnastics before the State finally had the courage to put him in the gas chamber. In Oklahoma recently a condemned prisoner was adjudged insane after having suffered through 23 stays in 5 years.

Yet capital punishment has some uses. Most obvious is the fact that the executed criminal never commits another crime. And there would be a strong deterrent factor if executions were carried out resolutely and with promptness. Manitoba went without a bank robbery for 20 years after a gunman killed a teller. The robbery occurred on Tuesday. He was captured immediately. The trial was held Thursday. He was sentenced to be hanged on Friday. And the hanging took place the next Tuesday. With the actual time served for life sentences in most states running at less than 12 years, we had better consider the consequences of junking the death penalty. Last year one out of every nine officers were attacked while trying to make an arrest. Between 50 and 80 policemen are murdered each year by criminals who, in a split second, must compare the chances of escaping arrest with the weight of the penalty in case they are caught. If the probability is that, even if you pull the trigger and are subsequently captured, you will walk out of prison some day, the temptation to pull the trigger will be greater. Instead of eliminating capital punishment, states might be smarter if they passed laws providing that any death sentences not carried out within 100 days of sentencing will be automatically committed to life imprisonment. One hundred days will provide plenty of time to resift the evidence, and the deadline will force the appellate justices to make up their minds.

Fourthly, I think the courts must ask themselves why a hold-up man puts a real bullet in his gun. If he claims he brought the gun only for the purpose of frightening his intended victims, the court should note that an empty automatic looks just as frightening as a loaded one. If he says he wanted to enforce the fright by letting go with a wild shot, the court should realize that a gun loaded with blanks can make an adequate noise. The plain fact is that the hold-up man who puts real bullets in his weapon is prepared to kill someone. He is prepared to sentence to death without trial persons who have committed no offense except, perhaps, to oppose his unlawful purpose. It seems incredible that courts should often take a lenient view of the criminal with a loaded gun just because he didn't pull the trigger. The loaded gun, it seems to me, is prima facie evidence of the intent to murder if necessary. When we quit weighing armed robberies by the value of the loot and start looking upon them as the next thing to murder itself, we may begin to make life a little safer in America.

Fifth, we ought to be doing a lot more thinking about this puzzle: When should you pardon without punishment, and when should you parole after punishment? According to the latest F.B.I. records three-quarters of the people arrested for criminal acts are repeaters, and over one-half of those have been given some form of pardon, parole or suspended sentence. In other words, they had been trusted and betrayed that trust. For years now we have heard the argument that every juvenile should be allowed one stolen car on the house because to punish him in any way might upset him sufficiently to send him into a career of crime. This has been going on long enough to permit some pragmatic observations on its effectiveness.

Today, two-thirds of the arrests for automobile thefts, one-half of the burglaries and larcenies and one-fourth of the robberies involve persons under 18 years of age. Again quoting J. Edgar Hoover. "Too many young people are developing neither the self-discipline nor the moral restraint to get along in a free society. Their world is a narrow island of irreverence, intolerance and irresponsibility too often encouraged by parental delinquency. It is time to stop slapping young hoodlums on the wrist and begin clapping them into jails and reform schools. Justice is not served when the innocent victim and society suffer while the vicious young criminal goes free." There is, however, honest and understandable concern about the consequencies of sending young people to our existing reformatories. For in too many States court face the bleak option of excusing the offender altogether or of committing him to a graduate school of crime which differs little from an adult prison.

It seems to me that we are going to have to do some experimenting. We might do well to set up some "swift kick" correction farms to which young ,incipient delinquents would get three-to-five day sentences. Individual, barred cells, hard work all day in the fields, no privileges and little companionship would be unpleasant enough to show that society does not intend to be long-suffering. And at the same time, the shortness of the sentences for early offenders would prevent the development of prison maladjustments. Our whole prison system, for adults as well as juveniles, nedes a long, new look. We do not have enough medium security institutions for prisoners judged reclaimable. Our programs of vocational training are generally poor. Yet the ex-con needs a trade more than any other man, for he has to offer to the employer a special inducement to hire him. In too few States do we have pre-releaes camps to which prisoners within six months of the completion of their sentences or probable parole can be sent for a minimum-security indoctrination into the responsibilities of freedom.

Our present prisons, generally speaking, twist as well as they keep. They tend to accentuate the weaknesses that brought the inmates to them in the first place. They diminish the purpose and drive of men who were already lacking in purpose and drive. They deepen the perversions of the already-perverted. They make more anti-social those who fell into trouble because they could not cope with society. They are hospitals which often take in the ailing and turn out the mortally ill. There's a lot we must do about our prisons. And it is tragic in America that few decent citizens interest themselves in penology. You can get scores of prominent people excited about orphanages. In recent years it has become fashionable to work for mental health. Mothers march around shaking tambourines for such rare ailments as muscular dystrophy and multiple sclerosis. But practically no one on the outside looks through the bars. So let us shed a tear for th ecriminal. And let us resolve to drag our medieval corrective institutions out of the shadow of the dark ages. However poor their raw material, they can, if properly manned and operated, produce more cures than they are doing.

But, above all, ladies and gentlemen, let's weep for the innocent. Let our citizens contemplate not only with sorrow but also with anger the fact that the streets of our Nation's Capital are no longer safe. Let us pump up some honest indignation that no one dares walk after dark in the great Central Park of New York, or Fairmount Park in Philadelphia, or Forest Park in St. Louis. Fast as our great cities have grown, even faster has grown the jungle within them where the vicious and the depraved are on the prowl. On the nights when a long-delayed and overdue execution takes place within the prison walls let a few of us forsake the sappy crowd of placard-carrying pickets at the gate, and go instead with a handful of flowers to the quiet and deserted graveyard where the killer's victim has long been lying. Let us weep for the innocent. For our communities, ourselves and our children are in needless peril because we in America have forgotten a fundamental truth: The primary function of the law is the protection of the innocent. It is well to try to understand the criminal. It is well to exert every effort to put the wreck back on the rails. But the only excuse for the institution of criminal law is to keep the unoffending citizen from getting hit. If this requires tougher courts, so be it. If this requires bigger jails, so be it. Today the innocent citizen in America is being hit too often. And the repeated suspended sentences, the quick paroles and fatherly scoldings are not working..

Some day it may be possible to read the electroencephalogram of a child and detect at an early age those brain-waves that foretell runaway egos, or violent tempers, or self-pity, or amorality. It may also be possible by future phyco-therapy to dampen the cussed and stimulate the constructive elements of young brains. It may even be possible in some future glorious time to brainwash an adult criminal mind of its filth and delusions and render it unwilling to wage war against society. But until the sciences of psychiatry and correction catch up to our present inclinations to forgive and excuse, great damage can be done to our Nation.

Let us remember that among all civil rights there are no rights more fundamental than the right of an honest man to his life, the right of a child to walk the streets without peril, the right of young people to sit in safety beneath the moon.

In much of America we have lost these civil rights, and it is time our courts became concerned with their restoration.

For as Cicero said: "The safety of the people shall be the highest law."

Main Street: Hope for Our Cities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. R. POAGE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 20, 1967

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, it is immensely gratifying to me that powerful voices are being heard on the role main street U.S.A. and rural America generally can, and must, play in rescuing our cities.

On April 16, in an address at Louisville before a group of Kentucky bankers, I urged a "Main Street Crusade."

On Monday, September 18, Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman spoke to the National Association of County Agricultural Agents in Omaha, saying:

> It is my opinion that Main Street and the farm—I call it town and country—hold the key to the destiny of this Nation. Today this is what I want to review with you. I want to discuss a worsening situation that threatens the very foundation of American life and institutions. I refer to the suicide road we have been traveling for the last 20 years as we have dumped 20 million Americans into the great cities from the countryside. If we permit this trend to continue, if we fail to use space in the countryside to make a place for the 100 million more people, at a minimum, who will inhabit this Nation by the year 2000, we will be committing national suicide.
>
> This may well be in the long run our greatest national challenges, and our greatest national threat.

I have just read an editorial from the Memphis Commercial Appeal in which that great newspaper mentions three groups who now are expressing themselves on rural-urban relationship. These are: First, Republican Party leadership; second, National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, representing local electric associations serving millions of rural people; and third, Farm Journal, one of the Nation's largest farm magazines.

Mr. Speaker, in the thought that what I had to say may be helpful to those who may find hope for the cities through development of Main Street and rural America, and with the permission of the House, I submit for printing in the Appendix of the RECORD a press summary of the remarks I made in Louisville. It may not be 100 percent accurate as the speech was made without script, but it does reflect my general thought. The summary follows:

POAGE URGES MAIN STREET CRUSADE

LOUISVILLE, KY., April 16.—Congressman W. R. (Bob) Poage of Texas, Chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, U.S. House of Representatives, advised bankers tonight to "invest in Rural America, for your own self-interest—and to halt and reverse, the crowding and packing of our people in city slums and ghettos."

"I urge the bankers of America to lead a Main Street U.S.A. crusade," he said. "America desperately needs this. And your investments in Main Street will return profits to you."

Poage addressed an Agricultural Credit Conference of the Kentucky Bankers Association.

"Many of our cities," he said, "have become centers of revolt against law and order. Some areas are on the verge of anarchy. Crime is escalating at an alarming and dangerous pace. It is unsafe to walk the streets. This Nation confronts a moral and a spiritual crisis."

The Texan then declared:

"This crisis will never be met by a coercive manipulation of our people from Washington. The Federal Government, spending billions on handouts, never can bribe the criminal and the malcontent into obedience of the law. Our Government actually encourages lawlessness by pampering the lawless.

"The time has come—for swift and unequivocal action—to let every person know he is accountable to his fellowman, that society rewards the worthy and there is certain punishment for every crime against another person or his property.

"And I think the time has come—for the long run—to look questioningly at the crowding of our people into cities, and to direct our attention again to Main Street U.S.A., and to our great expenses of rural areas, the original source from which flowed the fundamental values on which this great nation was founded."

Mr. Poage commended the Kentucky bankers for organizing the conference on agricultural credit.

"It is heartening and encouraging to me," he said, "that you bankers are aware of the importance of agriculture to the business you are in, to the general economic well-being of the nation. I am here today to stress that beyond these considerations in the prosperity of agriculture and the economic revival of our Main Street towns may lie the beginning of the recovery of our cities from the ills, the sickness, that besets them."

Mr. Poage observed that few people seem to realize the impact that conditions in agriculture have had upon our cities in the last 15 to 20 years.

"During this time," he said, "the number of farms has decreased from 6 million to around 3 million. The farm population has diminished from 25 million in 1947 to less than 12 million today. The mechanization of agriculture and poor farm income, especially in the 1950's, was largely responsible.

"Millions of people have been forced from the land and crowded into cities. Many Main Street towns have deteriorated, some have become ghost towns, aggravating the migration from rural America. Many cities actually have worsened their problems by establishing various 'relief' and handout programs that, while aiding many worthy people, drew into the packed urban areas millions who had no hope or expectation of becoming self-sustaining. Slums have been created where people can exist on handouts without working. Self-reliance to a large measure has been stifled. Idleness and agitation have bred and provoked such a wave of depravity and lawlessness as the Nation has never known before."

Poage told the bankers: "Something's got to be done."

"I'm thinking of rural America, Main Street America—not our impacted cities," he said, "as a place for people to live—to grow in spirit, to become self-reliant, to respect the law, and to be happy.

"Of course many things will be involved in curing the sickness of our cities and of our Nation. The revival and spread of the worship of God, of course, tops the list. Next I would place emphasis upon the integrity of family life, which seems to have waned in this country. Then we must instill in great numbers of our people, especially in the slums, the dignity and pride of self-reliance. We must make opportunity for self-reliance and ambition. Harshly, but unavoidably, we must deny the benefits of our Society to those who can but will not work. We must provide certain and exact punishment for those who scorn honest labor and turn to crime.

"Today I am urging upon you the thought that our total problem will be lighter if we place great—greater than before—emphasis upon revitalizing Rural America.

"This means:

"1. Good income for the people who produce our food and fiber.

"2. The establishment of industry, according to the traditional free enterprise principle, in thousands of Main Street communities."

The Congressional farm leader reviewed the farm income situation. He emphasized that 11 consecutive years of farm prices at or above parity, from 1942 through 1952, under the old production and price stabilization program, enabled farmers through their own income to finance a mechanized and scientific agriculture that brought food abundance to this nation that has been shared by hungry people throughout the Free World. He pointed to the general deterioration of farm income during the middle and late 1950's when farm production and price support programs were relaxed. He noted the recovery of prices which began in 1961.

"But now," he said, "in this year 1967, we are on the edge of another farm depression. Farm prices in March and April were at 74 percent of parity. In only one other month since 1934 have prices received by farmers for what they produce been so low in relation to the prices they must pay for the machinery, fertilizer and other materials they must have to make crops, grow livestock and live on the farm. Farm prices have dropped by 8 percent since last August.

"On top of this the minimum wage law is being applied to agriculture for the first time in 1967.

"Low prices and higher labor costs no doubt will bring about greater mechanization in agriculture. I fear that many thousands more people will migrate from our farms to the cities."

Poage urged bankers throughout the country to insist upon policies to assure fair income for agriculture.

"Obviously, this is to your own self-interest. It is important to the general well-being of the economy of our country. It is especially vital to our cities."

Then he urged the bankers to give their attention especially to encouraging and financing industry in Main Street towns.

He concluded:

"Good farm income and humming small industries in our towns and villages will hold people in Rural America. It will stop and reverse the flow of people into our impacted and slum-ridden cities. This nation today is face to face with a crisis, in the identification and selection of values that will shape the spiritual, social and economic order in all the years ahead. I am convinced that a revitalization of Rural America can be our best investment to meet this crisis. I am convinced that more voices should be raised from our countryside, from Main Street U.S.A., in the councils of government in Washington.

"Nobody can be more important in all this than you bankers. The job ahead is not to be accomplished by superimposed programs from Washington. The Government can help by establishing policies, especially with respect to farm production and prices, that are essential. But the real job is in the states, in the towns and on the farms—in private enterprise.

"I've always thought that bankers, through their loan policies and their leadership, could accomplish almost anything. There is a great challenge and great opportunities here for you. I pledge myself to work with you in every way in such undertakings."

An Unfortunate Mistake

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT N. C. NIX

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 20, 1967

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, last week, when the Defense appropriations bill was passed, an amendment was tagged on to it overturning a Presidential agreement to permit Britain to bid on the construction of a number of minesweepers.

I opposed this amendment at the time.

Great Britain has always been one of our dependable allies. The agreement would have given the British some $80 million in minesweeper contracts but would have called for British purchase of $2.6 billion in other military supplies.

Economically, the agreement was in our favor. Diplomatically, it would have continued relations with one of our truer friends.

The Philadelphia Inquirer on September 18 looked at this questionable amendment and devoted a column of editorial space to it—terming it "An Unfortunate Mistake."

I submit that editorial for the RECORD:

AN UNFORTUNATE MISTAKE

To admit a mistake and move to rectify it is a mark of responsibility and maturity. The Senate and House made a mistake last week in rushing through an amendment to the defense bill which would scuttle a Presidential agreement to permit Britain to bid on the construction of a number of minesweepers. This action was stupid and irresponsible and the members of Congress should redress the wrong which they have—thoughtlessly, perhaps—inflicted upon our closest Ally, and one of the few dependable friends we have left in the world.

The Johnson Administration has shown its concern by hastening to authorize the purchase of two ocean-going tugs from Britain and the solicitation of British bids for nine U.S. minesweepers to be financed under previous appropriations. This does not, of course, have any effect on future U.S. purchases of minesweepers from Britain ruled out by last week's Congressional action.

Representative John W. Byrnes, chairman of the Republican Policy Committee, wanted the amendment to the defense bill because its requirement that all U.S. naval vessels be built in American shipyards would help his district in Wisconsin obtain minesweeper construction jobs. Fellow Congressmen supported the Byrnes proposal in the time-honored tradition of log-rolling politics.

The agreement with Britain, so casually overturned, called for British purchase of $2.6 billion worth of military equipment in this country, a figure which makes the approximately $80 million which might have gone to British shipyards on the minesweeper deal appear mathematically ludicrous.

Of much greater consequences is the blow given to Anglo-American relations by this cynical pork-barrel action. The U.S. has been handing out hundreds of millions of dollars to Governments which detest us and which lose no opportunity to oppose our every policy. Yet, in this act by Congress, we have undermined the one nation that has consistently worked with us and supported us. It is a double-cross kind of thing that must deface the image of America throughout the world, and seriously imperil our friendship with the British people.

It has been said that nothing more can be done, now that the defense bill has been approved with the rider attached. *There is always something to be done, to right a grievous wrong.* Congress can retrace its steps; can repudiate the amendment; can make clear that the agreement, entered into in good faith with the British, still stands. Anything less would be monstrously unfair.

Government Can Help Prevent Riots

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MASTON O'NEAL

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 20, 1967

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, my friends in south Georgia are pleased that President Johnson has finally spoken out against insurrectionists and anarchists, but they are perplexed by his timing. To use a vernacularism of my region, it is too late to lock the barn door after the horse gets out.

Two highly respected daily newspapers in my district have experessed the thinking of a majority of my constituents in well written and timely editorials. I would like to share with my colleagues the following editorials from the Albany, Ga., Herald, and the Moultrie, Ga., Observer:

[From the Albany (Ga.) Herald, Sept. 16, 1967]

MR. JOHNSON-COME-LATELY

Lyndon Johnson, the creator of the consensus technique, was a little late joining that which already had been reached by the American public on the issue of the nihilists and anarchists in our midst. Apparently he had been hoping beyond hope that the civil rights movement would wrest itself from the Black Power insurrectionists and thereby, in regaining its senses, preserve the philosophical position he had adopted for his Presidency at such great political profit.

But no longer. Mr. Johnson has now attached himself to the thunderous chorus of denunciation for those "wretched, vulgar men" and "poisonous propagandists . . . whose interest lay in provoking others to destruction while they fled its consequences." It was not difficult to imagine precisely whom the President had in mind—Stokely Carmichael and "Rap" Brown principally, and others of their ilk in general.

Thus the same President who stood before the 89th Congress as the champion of civil rights and provided the weight of his august office to the catch-all slogan "we shall overcome" has now condemned in the most certain terms the current corruption of that social thrust. Selecting as his forum a convention of police chiefs, he went to the extreme of belaboring the obvious: "The violence of this Summer raised up a new threat to local law enforcement." The menace must be met: "We cannot tolerate behavior that destroys what generations of men and women have built here in America, no matter what stimulates that behavior, no matter what is offered to justify it." Finally, the remedy: It lies in the redemption of the faith of all Americans in law enforcement, and a rededication to law as the chief cement that glues together our diverse society.

Granted that these large truths needed to be restated by the First American Citizen, it nevertheless leaves open the question of why he did not choose to do so sooner, and why he permitted himself to lag so far behind the national temper in these tempestuous times. Keeping the peace is indeed, as Mr. Johnson maintains, a job for local law enforcement agencies. But the question nags: Why did they not receive this greatly-needed Presidential support much, much sooner?

[From the Moultrie (Ga.) Observer Sept. 16, 1967]

GOVERNMENT CAN HELP PREVENT RIOTS

President Johnson has finally lashed out in strong, understandable language against those "wretched, vulgar, poisonous" propagandists who "provoked others to destruction while they fled the consequences."

The President either has been prodded by necessity to recognize the rights of the majority or he has awakened to the fact that the current rioting and looting are not products of sectional intolerance or the outgrowth of a denial of civil rights. Apparently he is becoming convinced that while there is an urgent need for "equal justice," there is also a graver need for quelling the formenters of hate and doing away with the seeds of revolution.

Mr. Johnson has warned that those leaders in Washington cannot halt a riot in one of the metropolitan centers of America—that it is primarily a job for local authorities.

That is what local authorities have been attempting to get across to Washington for several years. Most unruly demonstrations and incitements to riot could be headed off by local authorities, provided they are given the support of federal authority. Instead of being viewed as the aggressors and investigated for their possible brutality, police and sheriff's officers from one end of this land to the other need to feel that both state and federal governments are solidly behind their efforts to fulfill their duty. That duty is to maintain law and order and to do it with fairness and dispatch. Failure to act promptly can result in rioting and looting which may cost unnecessary lives and great loss of property. Either must be considered a heavy drain on both humanity and the economy.

Crime, which has been increasing at an alarming rate for the past several years, again rose 17 per cent during the first six months of 1967. Police and sheriff's officers need to be at work, in cooperation with state and federal law enforcement officers, to solve these crimes and to reverse the trend. Yet they cannot do so if their time and funds are spent controlling rioting and looting.

The government of this country can be of immeasurable help in this crisis. Strong support for local law enforcement agencies and an unwavering condemnation of those who would poison America and run from the consequences will help prevent rioting and looting.

Castro's Goals Remain the Same

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 20, 1967

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, Fidel Castro's Communist Cuba has dropped from headline news in most press media of late, and many Americans may think that the Communist threat to this hemisphere has subsided.

Certainly this is not the case, for "Infidel Fidel" still exports his Communist brand of infiltration, subversion, and terrorism into neighboring countries to the South.

From a military standpoint, Castro's Cuba posseses what is undoubtedly the second strongest military might in the Americas—despite its small size.

His interesting report on this subject has come to my attention. Mr. Speaker, I follow my remarks with a transcript of the September 15, 1967, "Life Line" radio program of Dallas, Tex.:

CASTRO'S CUBA TODAY

We need, by all means, to keep an eye on Fidel Castro and his small but militarily strong nation. Cuba is still counted on heavily by leaders of both Russia and Red China as the center from which communist infiltration can be launched into other Latin American nations. Communism's ultimate objective is the undermining and surrounding of the United States.

Communists have long said that their way to the conquest of the United States would lead through Latin America. Castro is the tool which the Reds have used to obtain a foothold in our hemisphere.

A great many Americans have been hoping ever since Fidel Castro assumed power and declared himself a communist that he would be overthrown by the people in a popular uprising against his dictatorship.

Observers today brand such hopes as wishful thinking. Castro, with the help of Russia and other communist nations, has consolidated support of his government through the use of ironclad police power. His police state apparatus is called by diplomats one of the most effective in the world.

With characteristic shrewdness, Castro has tossed favors to students and Negroes, and has sought to lift old injustices from some peasants, with the result that he has gained much support among these groups.

Of the three men most likely to succeed him, one is dead, one is in prison, and the whereabouts of the third is not definitely known. Credited with consolidating power behind Castro and administering the police state is Interior Minister Ramiro Valdez.

The heart of the police state is the neighborhood spy system under which neighbors watch neighbors. Nobody knows who is working for the government and spying on the activities of friends and neighbors.

The Department of State Security has a secret unit whose responsibility it is to penetrate every factory, women's club, and children's group. These hidden informers have wrecked non-communist efforts to organize and re-take the island nation.

Not only is Castro more secure in his position as head of the Cuban government, he is continuing, and even stepping up, his efforts to export communism to other nations in Latin America. Castro has publicly listed Venezuela, Colombia, Bolivia and Guatemala as targets for his communist infiltration and aggression.

Reports from La Paz, the capital of Bolivia, indicate that a band of guerrillas, 60 to 100 strong, is operating in a sparsely settled area some 400 miles from the capital. The statement identified 17 members of the band as Cubans and said others had been trained in Cuba.

The guerrillas, while a relatively small band, have inflicted heavy losses on the Bolivian army by means of ambushes. There is danger that a coup may overthrow Bolivia's government—which is just now giving some appearance of stability. This goes back to 1961, when Bolivians began going to Cuba for training. Soon afterward some were identified in Russia.

It is the overwhelming judgment of informed officials that there is now operating in Southeast Bolivia a band of hard-core, well trained guerrillas, professionally led and helped from Cuba.

This is but one example. Communist Cuba was indicted in June by the Organization of American States as a result of "landing an invasion force" in Venezuela on May 8. The OAS Council voted unanimously to conduct an inquiry into what Venezuela's OAS ambassador called "a real, certain, and serious danger."

Last spring Mexican security police arrested Victor Hugo Martinez, a member of Guatemala's communist party, for arms smuggling. He had been shipping arms from Mexico to rebels in Guatemala. Police watching the residence of Martinez also caught Julian Lopez Diaz, third secretary and cultural attache of the Cuban embassy, who came to call on Martinez. He had $6,000 in small bills in his pocket and police determined that he had been directing the entire program of arms smuggling to Latin America from headquarters in the Cuban embassy. He was ousted from Mexico. Interestingly enough, agents learned Lopez' wife was Irina Trapote, daughter of a Soviet undercover agent.

In May four Cubans were surprised delivering men and supplies to the shores of Venezuela. Two who were seized alive confessed to being military officers and members of a special commando unit in Cuba's Directorate of Intelligence. The two commandos were carrying $10,000 in United States bills.

A half-dozen Russian advisers are attached to Cuban intelligence, and Russians clearly are supporting and financing the espionage, observers state.

But Venezuela remains the nation most desired by Castro. He would like Venezuelan oil to give him a strong economic base on which to support what Castro thinks is his role as the savior of Latin America. Venezuela is also a prime target because it is the best example of a democracy in the area and comunists feel it must not be permitted to thrive.

There is evidence that Red-trained agents have been sent into almost all the nations of Central and South America. In some their activities are minor and the danger from communism relatively nonexistent at this time. In others, rural areas are being ravaged by rebel bands and strife and sabotage are fostered with growing boldness.

We know where this Red-sponsored trouble is coming from. Yet, we have sat back and allowed Castro to consolidate his position. He has built up the Cuban educational system, realizing that education in the theory of communism is a most important part of his effort to maintain Cuba in the Red sphere of influence. Soon the young people coming out of his schools will be able to remember no form of government except communism, with Castro as its strong man in Cuba.

Militarily, Cuba is stronger than any other Latin American nation. With Russian aid Castro has organized and equipped a fighting force which appears able to repel any force other than an all-out invasion effort by a major power.

Castro has been described as a nuisance, a cancer in the Caribbean, the source of sabotage and revolution in Latin America, and a tyrannical dictator in his own land. Many people have talked at length about the bearded dictator who mouths loud insults against the United States and all non-communist nations. But nobody has been willing to use the force necessary to oust him from his Russian-supported seat of power, nor even to stop our own allies from trading with the Cuban nation.

Somehow, we have been too soft on this danger which exists right on our doorstep. It is time we took Castro far more seriously. In fact, there are predictions that a new crisis may be developing over Cuba and Castro's nefarious activities. It's time we did something more than talk.

Land Stabilization, Conservation, and Erosion Control Provisions of the Appalachian Act

SPEECH

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1967

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (S. 602) to revise and extend the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965, and to amend title V of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Chairman, the questions propounded by the distinguished Speaker and the capable chairman of the Ad Hoc Subcommittee on Appalachia, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES] can best be answered by examining in detail the existing section of the Appalachian legislation which my amendment seeks to amend, section 203.

First, despite attempts by the other side to prove to the contrary, this land stabilization, conservation, and erosion control section is unfair and smacks of favoritism. It does not treat comparable situations throughout the United States in the same way as it treats the Appalachian area. The section does afford the Appalachian region preferential treatment in an area of great concern to most Members of this body—agriculture.

Second, my friends from Massachusetts and Alabama skirt the issue here by citing acts of Congress which they indicate do not have direct application to their particular congressional districts. The question is not a political one: Does this bill directly aid my own district? Rather, the question is a philosophical one: Does this bill apply equally to all sections of the Nation? In other words, to use the example cited by our distinguished Speaker—farms, the question becomes: If I had a farm in my district, wherever my district might be within these United States, would the provisions of this act be applicable to it? The distinguished Speaker addressed himself to political considerations, while I addressed the questions of parity and equity for all sections of America.

Third, in the particular circumstances of this case, those of agricultural assistance for Appalachia versus agricultural assistance for all portions of the Nation, the question of priorities becomes even clearer and even more resolved in favor of my arguments. If funds to stabilize and to conserve our land are to be expended by the Federal Government, where ought they best be expended: First, fertile agricultural areas of the Midwest, South, and portions of the Southwest, or, second, generally unproductive Appalachian areas—lands not particularly suited for economic agricultural production. The topsoil of our great breadbasket lands of America needs conserving far more than do the craggy, jagged rocks and peaks of Appalachian hills. It is a question of priorities; the soil ought to be conserved first where the land is most valuable for the agricultural and economic well-being of the people of our Nation.

Fourth, the remarks of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES] that Iowa, by receiving a per capita Federal investment in soil conservation of $75.85—and I use his figures—is supposedly being favored over Tennessee, an Appalachian State, which receives a Federal per capita investment for conservation of $9.96—and I use his figures again—strengthens my arguments here today. Under existing conservation statutes the formulas for the allocation of funds are based upon need. Thus, by the citing of the figures one can clearly see the greater need for conservation funds in Iowa than in Tennessee. The gentleman from Alabama's figures strengthen my case. They surely do not show preferential treatment for the great farming areas of the Midwest.

Fifth, my amendment would not handicap the on-going conservation programs—those provided in statutes applicable to all areas of the Nation—in Appalachia in the least. Their present programs, as I pointed out in my initial remarks, would go forward, but on an equal and equitable basis with the rest of the Nation.

Sixth, this section has been substantiated by spokesmen for the administration on the basis that it contributes to small watershed flood control. As I pointed out to the House in my initial remarks, at the present time we are hoping to complete the protection of small watersheds in our Nation around the year 2000. But unless the present rate of work is greatly accelerated, this goal will not be met. The cost-benefit ratio of this kind of watershed protection program in the Midwest area is very favorable. We are losing the best soil of America every year by millions of tons by erosion in the Midwest. This fertile soil can never be reclaimed from our river beds in any degree constituting significance to our agricultural effort. The loss of natural resources is irretrievable.

The great floods of America have usually been in the Mississippi-Missouri Rivers basins. For years we suffered the effects of ravaging waters; but through years of effort, we eventually constructed a fairly effective flood control system. Why should Appalachia be given preferential Federal assistance, when other sections had to wait their respective turns?

Seventh, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES] has stated, with respect to the Mississippi River, that "it receives more money annually, and has, than any other river." He attempts to show the House that this is favoritism to the Mississippi River Basin areas. This argument also supports my contentions here today. Flood control, navigation, and related legislation is applicable to the entire Nation—to any section which can meet the requirements for obtaining needed works of improvement. There are flood control, navigation, and related works of improvement in all the States. Particular projects are obviously for particular States, but the general provisions under which such projects may be formulated are those with national application. I would say to the gentleman that the Mississippi River receives the largest amount of money for flood control because it just happens to be the largest and most important river in our Nation; for this reason, it receives those funds, not because Congress decided to give it a "special" program.

Mr. Chairman, I have taken much of the valuable time of the House in my responses to the questions of our distinguished Speaker and our capable subcommittee chairman. In the interest of dispensing with this legislation at a reasonable House this afternoon, I include in the RECORD at this point, the Supplemental Views on S. 602, which views address themselves wholly to this question.

These views follow:

SUPPLEMENTAL VIEWS

We concur in the foregoing minority views, which we have signed. However, we feel constrained to voice strong opposition to section 203 of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965, entitled "Land Stabilization, Conservation, and Erosion Control," and the provisions of section 108 of S. 602, to amend section 203, to authorize additional appropriations to carry out that section.

The minority opposed the enactment of section 203 of the act in 1965. We feel that opposition to this particularly unfair and discriminatory section should not lapse and that opposition to any expansion of the program or any additional authorizations for appropriations to carry out the section is essential.

Section 203 of the 1965 act authorized the Secretary of Agriculture to enter into agreements of not more than 10 years with landowners, operators, and occupiers, individually or collectively, for payment by the Federal Government of up to 80 percent of the costs of providing for land stabilization, erosion and sediment control, and reclamation through changes in land use, and conservation treatment including the establishment of practices and measures for the conservation of soil, water, woodland, wildlife, and recreational purposes.

This preferential section was entitled "Pasture Improvement and Development" in the Appalachian legislation of 1964. This bill was reported by this committee, but no further action was taken by the House as opposition to its provisions mounted. The 1964 bill would have authorized the Secretary of Agriculture to make grants to landowners in amounts of up to 80 percent of the costs of improving and developing 25 acres of pastureland owned by such landowner in the region. The 1964 proposal was considerably broadened in the 1965 act to include lands other than pastureland and to increase the acreage available for assistance to 50 acres, despite the fact that there was no increase in funds available to carry out the section. This generated substantial concern as to the standards of the conservation program which was to be established and the effectiveness of the techniques to be employed, for it was obvious that it would cost more to improve 50 acres than 25 acres.

However, with reasonable assurances that section 203 would not be used to put more land into pasture, the section was enacted in 1965 without the intensity of the opposition which had arisen to confront it in the previous year.

After closely examining the operation of this program since its enactment over 2 years ago, we feel that it is clearly in the public interest not to authorize any additional funds to carry out section 203.

The section is patently discriminatory to the rest of the Nation.—That "mountain land boldly upthrust between the prosperous eastern seaboard and the industrial Middle West, a highland region," which we know as Appalachia, is not a particularly productive agriculture area. For the most part, it is a land of upthrust mountains and of narrow valleys, a land of barren rock and scarred earth. A great part of the Appalachian region is not even suitable for economic agricultural production. Yet, under the provisions of section 203, this region is being given federally financed preferential treatment over the more productive agricultural areas of our Nation, areas which are in many instances in dire need of preserving immeasurably valuable and fertile topsoil through enhanced conservation, erosion control, and land stabilization measures.

In addition to conservation programs for which all sections of the Nation are eligible, the Appalachian region gets special treatment for its land problems. This is most unfair to other sections of the Nation, like the Black Belt areas of the South and the plains regions of our great Midwest, which need additional assistance to save valuable topsoil that is an essential national resource.

Section 203 funds for erosion control are being expended for the improvement of pastureland and cropland, and for fencing, hunting, fishing and sporting improvement, and recreation.—There is no provision in section 203 which prohibits the expenditure of funds under the section for the improvement of pastureland and cropland. Pastureland and cropland are the backbones of agricultural regions. The great food-producing areas of America know this well. Yet funds are being expended under section 203 for pastureland and cropland improvement in Appalachia, a most unproductive agricultural area, despite assurances in 1965 that funds would not be expended for such purposes.

Democrats and Republicans alike fought in 1964 and again in 1965 to obtain assurances that section 203 would not be used for the improvement of pastureland and cropland, which would give beef and food producers in Appalachia a federally financed advantage over producers in other areas. Objections to this section was one of the principal reasons why the 1964 legislation was never considered by the House. It was for this reason alone that the 1965 legislation changed the concept underlying section 203 from pastureland improvement to supposedly a more land stabilization, conservation, and erosion control oriented section. Today, section 203 money is being used to improve pastureland in spite of assurances to the contrary.

The most recent figures on expenditures under section 203 indicate that over three-fourths of all funds expended have been either for improvement of existing pastureland and cropland or for the conversion of unused land into pastureland or cropland, with the remainder of the expenditures being made for the conversion of existing pastureland and cropland into forest land and for wildlife and recreation enhancements.

To our great surprise, we have also discovered that section 203 funds—intended for land stabilization, conservation, and erosion control—have been expended for such diverse items as pastureland fencing, hunting and fishing enhancement, sports facilities improvement, and recreation. This is pure nonsense, in our opinion.

This is a most unauspicious time to be spending money on pastureland improvement to support larger beef stocks.—During the past half decade the production of beef in the United States and the importation of beef reached alltime highs, resulting in the decline of gross cash receipts for beef producers and a reduction in the average net price of beef for the producer. Although this problem is not as critical today as it was several years ago, it still remains a problem of great concern for our beef-producing and dairy areas.

Section 203 has the effect of subsidizing dying, marginal farmland.—Providing Federal assistance to farms of a marginal character for the improvement of cropland and pastureland will have the effect of subsidizing these marginal units and thus prolonging the inevitable closing of uneconomic farm units and delaying the development of higher and better uses for such lands.

We feel that one of the cruelest aspects of this land improvement section, as the minority pointed out in 1965, is the false hopes which it raises among many farmers in Appalachia by subsidizing uneconomic farm units and, thereby, leading farmers to believe that their farms can become viable, productive, economic units when, in fact, this cannot be done.

We feel this section will perpetuate the status quo rather than doing away with rural poverty.

The administration unwisely seeks increased authorizations for appropriations for section 203 while at the same time failing to ask for appropriations even equal to the authorizations for the past fiscal years.—The administration's own budgetary actions with respect to section 203 show better than anything else that the program is not needed in Appalachia. The 1965 act authorized the appropriation of $17 million to carry out section 203 for the last 3 months of fiscal year 1965 and for all of fiscal years 1966 and 1967.

Despite the administration's cries about the need for these funds in the Appalachian region, the administration requested only $12.88 million appropriations for section 203 for that 27-month period, some $4.12 million less than that authorized. Of the $12.88 million requested by the administration, only $10 million was appropriated by an administration-dominated 89th Congress. The $10 million appropriation is slightly more than one-half of the authorizations for the section. To us, this does not indicate a great need for section 203 expenditures in Appalachia.

Despite the obvious lag in implementation of this section, the administration has asked for an increased authorization for appropriations for fiscal years 1968 and 1969, to carry out section 203, in the amount of $19 million.

The administration has requested appropriation of only $3 million of this $19 million for fiscal year 1968, leaving an authorization balance of $16 million for fiscal year 1969. The request of a mere $3 million for fiscal year 1968 indicates to us that this program is not needed.

Section 108 of S. 602 should be stricken out.

Strikes Against the Public

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 20, 1967

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, the last time the Congress took a look at the problem of labor disputes affecting the public interest was in the railroad strike which came to a head in Congress on July 17. Since that time, very little has been said here on the subject, despite the fact that there have been many new strikes to make us realize that the rights of the public deserve a stronger voice at the bargaining table. The social problems created by strikes of policemen, teachers, and public sanitation workers cannot be permitted for long, and I notice that an increasing number of writers are taking note of this fact.

Mr. Speaker, at this point in the RECORD, under unanimous consent I include an article by Erwin D. Canham, from the September 19, 1967, issue of the Christian Science Monitor, entitled "Strikes Against the Public":

STRIKES AGAINST THE PUBLIC

(By Erwin D. Canham)

The breakdown of civic order in the United States is now tragically heightened by the teachers' strike.

There have also currently been policemen's strikes and firemen's strikes and sanitation workers' strikes. Workers in the most badly needed defense plants have struck. Communications and transportation have been seriously jeopardized in recent years. The end is not yet. And so Congress and people must give renewed thought to strikes against the vital public welfare.

A strike is a naked power struggle. It is not a method of achieving balanced justice. Typically, each side makes extreme demands, well knowing them to be extreme, and compromises when it judges that its power can obtain no more. This is not a good way of obtaining justice. The best approximation of justice in any such confrontation would be for an impartial and objective tribunal to examine the facts and make a finding, which would be binding on the parties.

NEW YORK TRIED

Sooner or later, it seems to me, we will have to come to some such kind of arbitration. It may be preceded by various stages of negotiation and conciliation, when many differences may be removed. But in the last resort, the decision will have to be taken somewhere and it can no longer be left to the struggle of brutal power.

The legislators of New York, perceiving these needs two decades ago, enacted the Condron-Wadlin Law, which sought to apply drastic penalties against strikers against the public service. The law was not enforced. It was declared to be "unenforceable," which meant that politicians and the courts did not have the strength and determination to carry it out.

Again the New York Legislature has tried, passing the Curtis Law on the advice of leading authorities in labor relations. It has many constructive provisions, but in the end has enforcing power against the treasuries and dues of law-breaking unions. Now the New York teachers' union is seeking to destroy the law. If they succeed, the prospect of holding the line for balanced and fair settlements with public employees will be dim indeed.

ARBITRATION CITED

In Detroit, it is not old guard reactionaries who are pitted against the striking teachers, but one of the most advanced and liberal city regimes in the nation.

Congress has reluctantly authorized ultimate compulsory arbitration in the rail dispute. By irony, the first finding under the law is highly favorable to labor, which resisted the law bitterly.

But Congress still refuses to extend the doctrine to strikes against the public interest, in other than federal employ. There, for two decades, a tough law has made it a felony to strike against the government. The law has not yet been challenged and flouted, as it has on the state and local levels.

People are asserting the right to make law for themselves all across the national scene. Individuals who disapprove of the war in Vietnam burn their draft cards. They assert a higher law—the right of civil disobedience.

RIGHTS COMPLEX

The moral and ethical aspects of civil disobedience are complex. We respect certain rights of protest and of conscience. But it is readily possible to carry civil disobedience right into anarchy. Each man is not a law unto himself, as Henry Thoreau was properly reminded by his night in Concord jail.

Economic justice and public service must also function under law. Sooner or later it is to be hoped that the United States, and other nations striving to administer free institutions, will outgrow the strike. Labor and management can avoid or minimize the compulsion both abhor by making free negotiations work more effectively. The automobile strike shows these institutions at nearly their worst.

However messy and wasteful the automobile dispute, the strikes of public employees are far more menacing. They must be ended.

Ninety-eight Years of Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 20, 1967

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, the Jonesboro, Tenn., Herald and Tribune recently observed its 98th anniversary of service to east Tennessee.

It is with pleasure that I make available to my colleagues the following editorial published in the Herald and tribune in observance of this momentous occasion:

HERALD AND TRIBUNE MARKS 98TH YEAR OF SERVICE

Few people reach the ripe old age of 98, and those who do have accomplished quite a feat just in living that long—so it is with a newspaper.

In a time when daily papers in the big cities are ceasing publication, the Herald and Tribune proudly enters its 98th year of bringing local news to Washington Countians wherever they may be.

The Herald and Tribune started only four years after the Civil War ended when much of the state was still reconstructing its wartorn properties.

Each week when the presses roll, the Herald and Tribune marks the progress of Jonesboro and Washington County, and at the same time serves as a reminder of the heritage of Washington County.

It is the press that has recorded much of the history of Upper East Tennessee, for whenever a settlement grew up on the frontier a printer was sure to follow, his covered wagon loaded with a press and type and his family out in front of the wagon making sure the trail was clear.

The Herald and Tribune is the oldest newspaper in Upper East Tennessee according to the 1967 Tennessee Newspaper Directory. There are 160 newspapers in the state and 123 of them are weeklies. Only 12 of those weeklies are older than the Herald and Tribune.

There have been 21 different newspapers published in the Washington County seat. The first ones were the Manummission Intellingencer and the Emancipator which began publication in 1819. The paper was edited by Elihu Embree and published by Jacob Howard. Embree's papers were the first periodicals in the United States to be devoted exclusively to the abolition of human slavery. Although there were few slaves in East Tennessee, it is unusual that such a paper was located in slave territory.

Embree's papers failed in 1820, and after them came a long line of papers many of which floundered after only a few years of publication.

On Aug. 26, 1869 the first copy of the Herald and Tribune came off the press, and it is now entering its 98th year of consecutive publication. The Herald and Tribune has outlived seven competitors. They were The Union Flag and Advertiser, Tennessee Patriot, Jonesboro Journal, Jonesborough Times, Woman's Appeal (which apparently didn't have too much appeal), Advance and Washington County News.

In only two more years the Herald and Tribune will celebrate its 100th year of service to its readers not only in Washington County but in many states across the nation.

As the Herald and Tribune enters its 98th year, the staff will endeavor to bring to you the news of your community and county and to perform the services necessary to a growing area. And it is our hope that the Herald and Tribune will be serving you and your families for the next 98 years.

Sounds of Support for L. B. J. Welcomed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE R. POOL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 20, 1967

Mr. POOL. Mr. Speaker, in recent days I have spoken out in favor of the policy we are pursuing in Vietnam. It was gratifying to me to learn that a notable newspaper of west Texas, the San Angelo Standard-Times, has supported my position. The following editorial points up the effectiveness of our policy in arresting the Communist drive toward world domination, and I believe the article in its entirety should be brought to the attention of my colleagues. The article follows:

[From the San Angelo (Tex.) Standard-Times, September 14, 1967]

SOUNDS OF SUPPORT FOR L. B. J. WELCOMED

These are unsettled times to say the best and the present day mode seems to be that of criticism, justified or not. Not constructive criticism, giving basic suggestions, but just outright "knocking" of practically everything and everybody. Unfortunately, much of this is directed at our President.

Therefore, it was refreshing to see Rep. Joe Pool of Dallas come out Tuesday with the flat statement that he is 100 per cent behind President. Also to hear Gov. Ronald Reagan's statement that the immediate question is not why or how we got involved in the Vietnam conflict but to resolve it victoriously as quickly as possible.

These are indeed troublesome times. President Johnson has taken a firm stand on the Vietnam undeclared war and, contrary to some of his possible political opponents next year, he has not wavered in his stand. This is to be admired and supported. It behooves all of us who are 100 per cent behind the President, like Rep. Pool, to speak up and let him and the loud-mouthed dissenters—including the draft dodgers, the beatniks and pacifists—know that the substantial citizens of this country are supporting the President and his quest for an honorable solution to our commitments in Vietnam.

The recent turn-around in national policy in Cambodia is another bonus of our efforts in the Far East which have already earned huge dividends in stopping the Communist drive for world domination. However slowly, we are winning, and it is up to the American people to show the patience and resolution needed to bring this tremendous effort to a successful conclusion. If we are to honor our own commitments, to retain our self-respect and to maintain our position of leadership in the world today, we have no alternative.

Government Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 20, 1967

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, once in a while a constituent writes a letter which seems to express my own feelings in better words than I can summon. My constituent, Mr. M. E. Neuman, wrote me under date of August 21 regarding Government spending and its impact upon the taxpaying public. I believe Mr. Neuman's point is made so succinctly that his letter should be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The letter follows:

SAN JOSE, CALIF.,
August 21, 1967.

Hon. CHARLES S. GUBSER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. GUBSER: In view of the impending federal tax increase, it appears that some observations from the "bill-payers" point of view are in order to give the subject the proper perspective.

First, it should come to you as no surprise if I state that the federal government, unlike twenty years ago, is now competing with exponentially increasing state and local taxes—and there are a bunch!! This year finds my family budget wrestling with a 25% increase in the state sales tax, a whopping 80% increase in my state income tax, another 10% increase in the taxes on my home, the addition of a $10.00 county tax on my automobile in addition to a 10% increase in the registration fee and a proposed 10% surcharge on my federal income tax—all this before the $44.00 increase in my Social Security tax.

Needless to say, most of us are not so fortunate as to have our income rising at these kind of rates. Obviously, then, most taxpayers' standard of living is not even holding its own—and mine is certainly slipping downward.

It is apparent that if ultimate economic disaster is to be avoided, our government must reduce its spending and learn to live within its income. Contrary to currently popular governmental philosophies, there does exist a limit to the tax load the public can, or will, accept before all motivation is lost and the entire economic system stagnates.

It should be obvious to even the most diehard "giveaway" politician that we are on "thin ice" in trying to pay for multitudes of "Great Society" boondoggles and a full scale war at the same time. For Heaven's sake, let us be realistic and admit we can not do both.

Recognizing all this, the public (myself included) would willingly accept a tax increase if it could be shown that all attempts at economy that could be devised had been applied. Such is not the case; the Congress clearly is not "watchdogging" our tax money as it should. Some specific examples follow:

1. The August 9, 1967 Wall Street Journal indicates that 1210 farmers received $50,000 or more for not growing wheat, corn, etc.; five farms received in excess of $1,000,000 for not growing crops; and one corporate farm received $2,807,633 for not growing crops.
2. The Defense Department insists on building the multi-million dollar F-111 "Flying Edsel" despite testimony from Navy pilots who state flatly it is too heavy to ever be operational aboard a carrier.
3. We supplied millions of dollars in foreign aid to the UAR's Nasser so he can mount an attack on Israel and make the U.S. look like the "goat" in return.
4. We are supporting Job Corps personnel who are fomenting riot and civil disorder (a "Hate Whitey" EOC funded course was uncovered right here in the Bay Area).

The list could go on and on and on; we must have some economy and common sense in our government and soon. We neither need nor want a federal tax increase and it is my opinion that the public will be watching very closely what every Congressman's position is on this issue because "we are hurtin' ".

Very truly yours,

MELVIN E. NEUMAN.

P.S.: Would you please explain to this layman how it is that money I spend for food and clothes for my family is inflationary but it is anti-inflationary if the federal government takes the money from me and spends it instead on wars and not-growing crops and not-working?

Two-Week Tour of Southeast Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD D. McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 20, 1967

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following articles:

VIET ELECTION IS COMPLEX PROCESS—EACH VOTER WILL BE GIVEN 59 BALLOTS, MUST CHOOSE SEVEN

(NOTE.—Representative McCARTHY, in Vietnam on a personal visit to observe the elections, is writing his reaction and assessment for The Buffalo Evening News.)

(By RICHARD D. McCARTHY)

SAIGON, August 31.—Nguyen Van Tuong is the man in charge of the mechanics of Sunday's presidential and legislative elections. His was the task of overseenig the printing of 460 million paper ballots. The job required the use of two thirds of this city's printing capacity.

The ballots were distributed between Aug. 8 and 21 to the 8000 polling places throughout South Vietnam. With 7.8 million persons registered to vote, there are that many paper ballots for each of the 59 presidential and senatorial slates.

Each ballot has the photograph and names of the candidate on that ticket along with their campaign symbol.

POLL WATCHERS PRESENT

Mr. Tuong, whose regular job is to supervise South Vietnam's 44 provincial and 234 district chiefs, must satisfy the 11 presidential and 48 senatorial slates that the elections are fairly and efficiently run.

Despite allegations of rigging, Mr. Tuong—a career civil servant—has not himself been charged with any wrongdoing.

At each of the polling places, the voting will be supervised by a committee of village notables. Poll watchers representing various slates also will be on hand.

When the prospective voter arrives at the polling station, he must show an identity card. Each voting card has four marked corners, one of which is torn off when the voter appears.

COUNTING TO BE ATTESTED

Each qualified voter will be handed 59 ballots and may put one presidential and six senatorial ballots into an urn.

The counting is done at the local polling place by the committee of notables. Observing will be poll watchers. A sworn statement attesting to the results is telephoned or radioed to the district, province and Saigon headquarters where the unofficial results will be announced.

After the elections, the sworn statement will be forwarded to district headquarters where the results will be counted and then relayed to provincial headquarters where the totals will be combined and sent on to the National Assembly by Sept. 10.

MECHANISM FOR COMPLAINTS

The final official results are expected to be announced by the Assembly on or before Oct. 3.

American officials here say experience indicates that irregularities are unlikely at the village level. There are too many rival factions looking on. The opportunities, they say, are greater at the district and provincial levels where corrupt officials could alter the village returns.

If a candidate believes there have been irregularities he can file a complaint with the Central Election Committee which is obliged to check it out and report its findings to the National Assembly on or before Sept. 25. The Assembly could order new elections wherever fraud was found.

(By Representative RICHARD D. MCCARTHY)

CAN THO, VIETNAM, September 2.—Election zeal has reached a fever pitch throughout South Vietnam. More than 80 per cent of the eligible voters are expected to vote tomorrow in the climax of the month-long campaign.

Blaring sound trucks, torch light parades, motorcades, rallies, speeches on radio and television and millions of campaign posters on every available inch of wall space assault the eyes and ears of the some six million eligible voters.

Although cannon fire thuds in the distance and flares illuminate the countryside at night as the war goes on, most of the people go blandly about their daily chores and seem ready and even anxious to vote. Few of them are willing to say how they will vote. The military ticket of Gens. Thieu and Ky was heavily favored at the outset of the campaign. Chinese gamblers in Saigon now rate their slate as only an even bet to win. Former Schoolteacher Tran Van Huong and President Phan Khac Suu of the Provisional Legislative Assembly seem to have gained strength.

The ending of censorship in July seems to this observer to have been a significant turning point in the electoral process here. When the people began to see that the ruling military junta was being freely and openly criticized, they began to believe that this election, unlike some previously held, would indeed be free and secret.

There is a widespread feeling that this will be the freest election in South Vietnam's history. But many persons are troubled by the barring of some candidates from the ballot and a much-publicized charge that some soldiers have been given more than one voting card.

Congressman Wolff and the writer today are interviewing voters and inspecting the election machinery here in the intensely green, rice-rich Delta region. Tomorrow we will observe the voting in Pleiku in the Central Highlands and in the northern city of Hue. We will wait for returns tomorrow night in Saigon.

On Friday evening we attended an election rally at Nguyen Hue and Le-loi in the heart of Saigon where we talked with candidates Tran Van Huong, Phan Khac Suu and the latter's vice presidential running mate, Harvard-educated Dr. Than Quang Dan. Dr. Dan said the campaign has been free and open but was less sanguine about the counting process. Peace candidate Truong Dinh Dzu blistered the Ky regime during the hectic and often uproarious session during which the public asked pointed questions of the candidates. Gens. Thieu and Ky failed to show up.

Observers were told the size of the crowd was cut out of fear that an extra large turnout might provoke a Viet Cong attack.

This morning, before flying here to Can Tho, Rep. Wolff and the writer interviewed Chief of tSate Thieu and last night questioned Mr. Huong at some length. Huong would like to see an end to war through negotiations between North and South without U.S. and other foreign participation. He does not envision the Viet Cong as a part of a future government. Thieu, however, says the Viet Cong could be a legal opposition party in two or three years.

In a private meeting Friday at the heavily fortified U.S. Embassy, U.S. Ambassador Ellsworth Bunker told Rep. Wolff and the writer that he sees the outcome of the election as having a favorable psychological effect on the prospects for peace. "A permanent, functioning government," he asserted, "would have a good psychological effect on Hanoi-indicating stability and permanence in a government with which they could deal.

"Here in the South," he continued, "it will have a good effect because there would be a government in which the people's rights would be respected and where they could integrate themselves into the economic and social framework of the nation." He emphatically rejected the charge that the elections are fraudulent.

Regarding the war, the Ambassador said he "sees a light at the end of the tunnel." He cited "steady but not spectacular progress" in the social, military and economic sides of the conflict and deplored any talk of a U.S. pullout at this time. He specifically cited the effect this would have on nations in the arc fronting Communist China including Japan, India, Burma, Australia, Thailand, and Laos.

In the meantime, the very heat of the elections rises with the temperature in this very hot and humid land. In the lush, teeming city of Saigon the election momentum is topped only by the incredible, uncontrolled movement of vehicles of every description. The exotic beauty of the people is challenged only slightly by the broad, tree-lined avenues and the handsome shuttered, stucco homes that proclaim the long French influence here.

(Because of cable delays, this article was not received by the Buffalo Evening News until September 4—too late for publication.)

VISTA Program Vital Part of War on Poverty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 20, 1967

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, the VISTA program has become a vital part of the war on poverty in the Indianapolis area. An article recently appearing in the Indianapolis Star describes the experience of two young VISTA volunteers who have served for the past year among the poor of Indianapolis.

As I believe my distinguished colleagues may be interested in their story, I insert the article at this point in the RECORD:

(By Lynn Dunson)

Two unselfish young women from New York State who are winding up a year's work as Volunteers In Service To America (VISTA) pioneers in Indianapolis will depart with some definite views about the state capital and its people.

They are Miss Susan Mary Stone, 20 years old, Port Chester, N.Y., and Miss Sylvia Grosz, 20, Sodus, N.Y.

Both are concerned that many people hereabouts do not yet know much about VISTA and about housing for the poor.

However, their final days here included a strong dose of Hoosier hospitality—a visit to the Indiana State Fair as guests of the State Fair Board and Maplehurst Inc.

They were among the first VISTA people to arrive in the city last fall to live and work with the poor in the Broadway poverty area.

At that time their specific assignment was to help the indigent displaced find suitable housing under a proposal written by Community Action Against Poverty Inc. (CAAP).

Since then their activities have been varied and their area assignments have been shifted several times. They and other VISTAs scrubbed the floors, shelves and walls of Marion County General Hospital. They tried to set up emergency stores of food and furniture and they worked closely with families on individual problems.

Despite the fact that Indianapolis had a VISTA training center at Flanner House Inc. and VISTA volunteers have been working in various parts of the inner-city for almost a year, many persons do not know what the volunteers do, they lament.

VISTAs are found where the poor are found. They work in large urban centers, rural areas, Indian villages, Spanish-speaking settlements and depressed Appalachian areas.

They teach crafts and skills, they supervise play and work, and they organize community action groups. They do just about everything in the United States that is done by the Peace Corps abroad.

And many suffer the same traumatic emotional and mental upheavals reported by Peace Corps returnees.

But where Peace Corps has gained respect at home and around the world, the 3,713 volunteers in the United States have found themselves in the same position as the proverbial prophet who was without honor in his own country.

Slightly more than 25 interested persons showed up during the VISTA recruitment drive in Indianapolis last week and recruiters were not able to get a booth at the fair. In many parts of the country, VISTAs do not receive the community support they need, the young women said.

Here, the emergency food and furniture stores plan fell through because VISTAs got such poor response, they said.

Miss Grosz and Miss Stone, while working here, were often reproached by older adults for the type of work they were doing.

Why does a person become a VISTA? The standard answers are based on cliches about brotherhood and trying to make a better world.

Miss Stone takes a forthright look at the question and says, "There isn't just one answer. A lot of people go in for different reasons. Some want to get away from home or school. Some of the fellows, if they're honest, admit that it's an attempt to beat the draft. Others wants to find their own way and think their own thoughts."

VISTA becomes a learning process and bridges the ever-widening gap between economic groups.

"Leaving a middle-class home and going to live in a slum ghetto is like entering a different world," Miss Stone adds.

"After a while, you begin to think like the people in the ghetto. You begin to see things the way they do because you're a part of it," she said.

From personal experience the young women learned something of the mentality of the poor who too often live on a day-today basis.

"There were times when we had nothing to eat but peanut butter and jelly," Miss Grosz said. "You learn what it's like to scrimp and skimp and do without. But even then we were better off than a lot of people here because we always had another check coming. With some of them, a peanut butter and jelly diet is a regular thing."

When the pressures of slum living become too great, the two VISTAs would dress up and go out to dinner or an evening together.

VISTAs working under CAAP receive $87 a month with a $40 a month rent allowance.

The pair felt that even with the big comedown in their living situations, they fared better than most of the families around them. They lived in a regular apartment building and not one of the overcrowded houses chopped up into apartments that are so common in the Broadway area.

"Also, we were better off because we brought all our middle-class training and values with us," Miss Stone explained.

"Some of the VISTAs in slum ghettos say, 'This is great. This is just the way I want to live—like the poor.' But they don't mean it. At least, not after living that way for awhile."

"Without each other, we wouldn't have been able to stick it out. We are the last two of the first group. Those coming in now find it easier because they learn from us," Miss Stone said.

There are indications that their experiences here will carry over into their later lives.

"My attitude toward the middle class has changed," Miss Stone explained.

Miss Stone cares. When she returns home she wants to go into VISTA recruiting or social work.

Miss Grosz said that when she returned to her home town for a visit, for the first time she really saw the one room shacks of migrant workers. For the first time she began to have ideas about the lives and problems of the inhabitants.

"Housing in Indianapolis is terrible," she said. "There should be some way to force landlords to make repairs. I wish we could get 'tenement unions' started here."

Articles on Farm Bureau

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 20, 1967

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished colleague, the Honorable JOSEPH Y. RESNICK, of New York, has rendered the Congress of the United States a great service in studying the operation of the Farm Bureau cooperatives and their failure to distribute dividends in the usual and customary manner.

Following are three articles which appeared in the Cleveland Plain Dealer. One appeared on September 15, 1967, entitled "Farmers' Stock Just a Joke"; another appeared on September 16, 1967, entitled "Grain Dealers Feel Squeeze of Ohio Farm Bureau"; and the third appeared on September 18, 1967, entitled "Farm Co-op Stock Is Hard To Market."

FARMERS' STOCK JUST A JOKE

(By Richard C. Bixler)

ASHLAND.—A hearty laugh was the reaction of a bank official here yesterday when asked if he would make a small loan, using Ashland County Farm Bureau common stock as collateral. He said the stock has no known value.

Personal property tax, assessed by the Ashland county auditor for many years on outstanding shares of the stock, has been dropped this year because the stock is considered worthless, County Auditor E. L. Ryland told The Plain Dealer.

The stock is given to farmers as dividends by the Farm Bureau at the end of each business year in lieu of cash payments for profits earned by the co-operative.

The stock certificates give par value as $10 a share. The number of shares in a stockholder's name are typed on each certificate, reflecting the amount of business done between the co-op and the stockholder that year.

Virgil L. Cox, vice president in charge of loans for the Farmers Bank of Ashland, has been with the bank 25 years and "in all that time we have never accepted Farm Bureau stock as collateral for a loan," he said.

"I can remember one case where an individual brought in a portfolio of stock that included one Farm Bureau share. We kept it as part of the portfolio but discounted it as having any value as part of his security," Cox said.

A suggestion that anyone would expect him to loan money on the stock was met with an immediate burst of laughter from Cox, followed by a comment "you must be kidding."

County Auditor Ryland said his office has been assessing personal property tax on the shares at two mills, based on the Farm Bureau's statement that each is worth $10 a share. Tax would amount to two cents a share.

Ryland said this is not much money, but over a period of years it could add up.

"We questioned the Ohio Department of Taxation last year about assessing taxes on this stock, explaining to them that the Farm Bureau refuses to redeem it and no one wants to buy it, indicating there is no apparent market value. They told us to quit charging tax on it beginning with 1967," Ryland said.

Robert R. Henderson, prominent lawyer here, said he has handled many estates in which Farm Bureau stock was among assets to be divided among the heirs.

"The Farm Bureau has refused to buy it back, so we listed it as having no value in the estate," Henderson said.

Clayton Keener, a farmer who lives six miles north of here in Orange Township, owns 40 shares of the stock, 20 earned by him and 20 inherited after his father's death in 1962.

Keener said he had been a staunch supporter of the Farm Bureau until it refused to redeem the stock from his father's estate.

"Since then I've been dealing with an independent feed mill and grain elevator in Ashland. I've found I can buy cheaper and sell at better prices than I can get from the Farm Bureau," Keener said.

Keener said this way at least he has his savings in cash, instead of apparently worthless paper certificates.

"If the Farm Bureau bought this mill and put it out of business, I'm not sure where I'd go," Keener said. "Maybe to Mansfield, but that's pretty far away."

Mrs. Nora Williams of Nova, in Troy Township on the county's north edge, helped instigate an investigation of the Farm Bureau by U.S. Rep. Joseph Y. Resnick, D-N.Y.

Mrs. Williams, a widow, raises veal calves and choice lambs on her 77-acre farm and uses most of her produce to feed them. But she did have 10 acres of wheat to sell last year.

"I consider myself one of the lucky ones," she said. "The Farm Bureau has been buying up small mills and putting them out of business, forcing some farmers to haul their grain to Farm Bureau mills and elevators farther away. If they want to deal with an independent mill, they must go still farther," she said.

"I'm lucky because the Nova Elevator Co., a small independent mill, is just a mile away. I deal there. But if that one were closed, I'd have to go to small mills in Greenwich or New London, both 16 miles away. I would have to hire a truck because that is too far to haul with a tractor and wagon. Cost of the truck would cut profits," she said.

The small mills in Greenwich and New London, she said, are types the Farm Bureau has been buying and closing. Were that to happen, the next closest independent mill would be in Mansfield, nearly 40 miles away, she said.

William H. Fagert, president of Nova Elevator Co., where she deals, said the Farm Bureau has never offered to buy his mill and he would not be interested in dealing with them if they did.

"I believe free enterprise still can, and will, survive," Fagert said. "But it could survive more easily if given equal tax breaks."

Fagert said the Farm Bureau received government subsidies when it was founded that no private owners were ever given, and that it enjoys many tax deductions and benefits not afforded to private mills.

The Farm Bureau is looked upon by the government as a nonprofit co-operative designed to help farmers sell at higher and buy at lower prices, and is therefore exempt from taxes.

But farmers here, whose profits have been held by the co-op and used to form a huge combine of commercial businesses, are charging that the Farm Bureau is doing them more harm than good.

GRAIN DEALERS FEEL SQUEEZE OF OHIO FARM BUREAU

(By Richard C. Bixler)

MILLERSBURG.—Two independent grain elevator and feed mill operators here say they are feeling the squeeze of what some farmers are calling monopolistic practices of the Ohio Farm Bureau Cooperative Association.

The Farm Bureau is an organization that offers purchasing and marketing services to farmers. It currently is under fire for some of its practices by U. S. Rep. Joseph Y. Resnick, D-N. Y.

Floyd Crilow and Roman Weaver, partners who operate the Holmesville Elevator in Holmesville, with a branch elevator here, sold and stored wheat at the Dover Milling Co. plant in Wooster until the Farm Bureau bought that plant and refused to do business with them, they said yesterday.

Holmesville is five miles north of this Holmes County community. The partners have operated the elevator there 10 years. Their elevator here is the former Millersburg Equity Plant which went bankrupt, was bought by a lumber company and then leased to Crilow and Weaver.

"We often bought more wheat than we had room to store in our elevator and trucked the excess to the Dover Milling Co. at Wooster to store for our customers," Crilow said. "We've also sold wheat to Dover Milling from time to time."

"After the Farm Bureau bought Dover Milling last July, they refused to buy or store any of our wheat. They said they would buy only from individual farmers and wouldn't handle wheat from an independent mill, only from a co-op.

"Now we have to truck wheat fifty miles to Mansfield instead of 15 miles to Wooster."

Crilow said there was no money in handling wheat at today's prices but "if we made any money on it at all before, it's gone now with the extra cost of hauling it so far.

"The only reason we bother with it at all is as a service to our farm customers who also trade with us for other things."

Crilow said the Farm Bureau has never approached him about buying his business and that he was not sure he would be interested if they did. There are not many Farm Bureau members in Holmes County, he added.

Crilow continued:

"About half my customers are Amish and they don't belong to farm organizations. Of the other half, a few belong to Farm Bureau, a few to other farm organizations and some are strictly independent."

He said that with most of his customers having no connections with or interest in the Farm Bureau, it is not likely to pressure him out of business.

Another independent mill owner-operator, this one in southeastern Wayne County, told The Plain Dealer he had experienced the same problem. He asked not to be named "because I have to live with these people."

The Wayne County man said he, also, had sold wheat to Dover Milling at Wooster before the change of ownership.

One day, he said, he sent a truckload of wheat to Wooster and his driver was told it would not be accepted for the same reasons given the Holmsville Elevator owners.

As a result, the Wayne County man says he now trucks his wheat "considerable farther."

"But it may have been for the best. I am getting a better price, more accurate weight accounting and better grading."

He did not disclose the name or location of his new buyer.

FARM CO-OP STOCK IS HARD TO MARKET

(By Richard C. Bixler)

ASHLAND.—The value of Ashland County Farm Bureau Co-op stock certificates, also known as patronage dividends, apparently depends on one's point view.

A banker here, the Ashland County auditor and others have declared them valueless for loan collateral and tax purposes.

But Franklin Keener, a director of the Ashland Co-op, says "I'd like to buy all I could get" at reduced prices.

U. S. Rep. Joseph Y. Resnick, D-N.Y., has criticized the practice by some farm bureaus co-ops of issuing nonredeemable certificates instead of cash. He has called it an "outright deception and fraud" and has asked for an investigation by Ohio Atty. Gen. William B. Saxbe.

Keener lives near Nankin, a small community four miles north of here. His neighbors and other farmers in the area, including those opposed to the Farm Bureau, regard him as a fine man and a successful farmer.

"I heard somebody was offering this stock for 25 cents a share," Keener said. "I'd like to buy all I could get my hands on at that price. But I haven't been able to find out who made that offer."

An advertisement in the classified column of the local newspaper has—for several days—offered for sale "cheap" an undisclosed amount of Class A common, Class B common and Class A preferred Ashland County Farm Bureau stock—and certificates of ownership.

Farmers who buy merchandise from and sell commodities to the Farm Bureau here earn a share of the profits the Co-op makes each year. Instead of cash, they received stock certificates until the early 1950s.

In the 50s and early 60s, the co-op switched from stock certificates to certificates of ownership. In the early to mid-60s, it again switched, this time to a letter of advice.

The stock certificates included a stated par value of $10 a share.

The certificates of ownership are smaller, less complicated in language and state no par value. Typed on them is a dollar figure representing the holder's share of that year's profits.

The letter of advice first was issued after a government ruling that the co-op, in order to be exempt from corporate income tax, must pay farmer-members at least 20% in cash from profits earned. The individual profits can be held in reserve.

The balance owed the farmer-member is typed on the letter of advice telling the holder he must declare the withheld dividend, plus the amount of the check, for income tax purposes.

Keener said he believed the co-op would eventually redeem the stock certificates, many of which date back to 1946, for full par value.

"We talked about it last year," he said. "But the directors agreed we would only put it back in blocks. A block costs $80,000. Our profits last year were $85,000. But we had to build a new mill at Loudonville and that cost $200,000.

"The mill was needed because the smaller mills can't handle the amount of grain farmers produce these days. They'd be waiting in line for hours and there wouldn't be enough storage room. These new mills operate more efficiently; save them lots of time."

Keener said to his knowledge the co-op here had made money only in the last two years.

"One year they were $40,000 in the red," he declared. "I'd say we have made quite an improvement."

Hawaii's Leigh-Wai Doo Outstanding Despite Polio Handicap

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 20, 1967

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, it is always an inspiration for me to read of a young person who has distinguished himself in scholastic endeavors or other worthwhile pursuits. It is particularly inspiring when success is achieved despite a serious physical handicap. In this connection, I call attention to an exceptional young Hawaii citizen, Leigh-Wai Doo, of Honolulu.

This young man was stricken with polio at the age of 9 months, which left him crippled in both legs. Despite the loss of use of his legs from infancy, Leigh-Wai has never considered himself to be a handicapped person. He set his goals high, and with courage and determination has shown that what matters in life is not what people cannot do, but what they can do. Leigh-Wai has become an expert surfer and has appeared in numerous surfing movies which demonstrate what a man can achieve without the use of strong legs.

Leigh-Wai has also excelled in other activities. His leadership ability and the preeminence he has gained among his contemporaries are indicated by his election as student body president at Punahou School in Honolulu, as well as the American College in Paris. He is presently a senior at Columbia University, majoring in history, with his eyes set on a future in either business or law.

I believe Leigh-Wai's story has a very special message for handicapped persons across the Nation, as it focuses attention on the very real abilities which can be developed by persons with physical handicaps.

As we salute the 20th anniversary of the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped, I would like to take this means to commend this young Hawaii citizen who has shown what a handicapped person can accomplish through the attributes of superb courage and determination.

I therefore insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an excellent article about Leigh-Wai Doo, by Staff Writer David Butwin, which appeared in the September 10, 1967, issue of the Honolulu Sunday Star-Bulletin & Advertiser:

HE SURFS, DATES, DRIVES DESPITE LEGS HANDICAP

(By David Butwin)

Leigh-Wai Doo bears his handicap so well he seems almost unaware of it.

He surfs, skin-dives, dates and fools around in an old station wagon like any other 21-year-old college boy on summer vacation—despite a pair of cripled legs that have been useless since infancy.

Leigh-Wai—one of six children of Mee Chow Doos, 1035 Kinau St.—says the handicap has caused him deep mental anguish only once in his life.

"I'll tell you," he said the other day, driving through Waikiki, "the first time it really struck me was not when I was very young.

"In those days my family and friends accepted me fully. We played touch football, swam and everything, and although I knew I was different, it didn't bother me.

"But the first time it hurt was seeing myself in a surfing movie. Until then all my conceptions of surfing formed an idea of standing up on the board, even though I have to kneel down and . . ."

He broke off to ogle a well-endowed blonde swinging by on the sidewalk.

"What was I saying?" He laughed, "Oh, I was about 15 then, and there I was on the screen surfing on my hands and knees. I think it was the first time I realized I was handicapped, that I was different from others.

"So for a while—you might consider this a bit juvenile—I didn't feel much like surfing in front of crowds. I was embarrassed."

Not for long. After a period of agonizing self-appraisal in which he faced up with his handicap and decided to accept it, Leigh-Wai returned to the waves and surfed with a new gusto.

"I'm very thankful for surfing," he said. "It's given me a whole outlook, a way of leading a hardy life.

"I unleash a lot of my aggressiveness in the surf, work off a great deal of anxieties and frustrations. I don't recall a time I ever came out of the water not smiling."

Leigh-Wai—who has never stood up on a surfboard but has conquered the big waves of Pipeline, Sunset, Waimea and Haleiwa in a low crouch—will look up his board this week and head back to New York for his senior year at Columbia University.

This does not portend a land-locked existence. If he sees as much as a ripple in New York Harbor, Leigh-Wai will hunt up a board and paddle out.

He has surfed such improbable spots as Biarritz on France's south coast, the Guernsey and Jersey Channel islands off Normandy, Newport, R.I., and New York. He's appeared in a dozen surfing movies, usually demonstrating what a man can achieve without strong legs.

Mee Chow Doo, a successful Honolulu entrepreneur, said he brought up his son with no more or less consideration than the five other children.

"Leigh-Wai was stricken with polio when he was 9 months old," his father said. "That's why it was very difficult for us to diagnose it, because he wasn't old enough to walk anyway.

"The fortunate part, he never felt any self-pity. A lot of people feel sorry for themselves, and then regress. But he never asked any special consideration.

"In a way you got to give some credit to us: We never gave him special consideration."

Leigh-Wai thinks it somewhat fortunate that he was stricken before he knew how it feels to walk and run on strong legs.

"I was quite fortunate in that I was raised this way all my life," he said. "Thus I didn't have to make an adjustment, which I would imagine would make it 10 times harder. I've never known anything else."

Leigh-Wai is thankful that, unlike a friend of his who was crippled in a diving accident, he has feeling in his legs.

Normally Leigh-Wai wears a brace on his left leg, which is considerably weaker than his right. When he takes off the brace, he uses a pair of aluminum crutches or a cane.

"I take the crutches when I go hiking," he said. "That way I'm able to leap over boulders. I've climbed in the Sierra Nevadas, the western Washington mountains, and even little old Diamond Head."

Above the waist Leigh-Wai is powerfully built, the result of long swims and years of board-paddling.

At Columbia he is majoring in history, but this summer he got an inside look at the business world, working in the management training program at Dole Co. "I have been toying with the idea of going into business or maybe law," he said.

Strangers often tend to treat handicapped persons with painstaking courtesy. Leigh-Wai hasn't noticed this, and wouldn't expect it.

"I'm very fortunate," he said, "that so far I've had no trouble getting along with people."

Fellow students at Punahou (1964) and the American College in Paris thought enough of Leigh-Wai to elect him student body president.

"From time to time," he went on, "I have felt . . ., embarrassment, if you wish. When it does occur I try to throw myself more fully into the situation.

"But the thought rarely occurs to me that I'm handicapped. In fact I don't even know much about polio. I've never studied up on it. Really, it's been no hindrance at all."

Platform of the American Veterans Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 20, 1967

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, the American Veterans Committee, which lives by its motto "Citizens First, Veterans Second," this year held its national convention in Atlantic City, N.J., in June. In its platform were planks about foreign affairs and resolutions about Vietnam and the Middle East. These planks are both sober and sensible. I include the international affairs plank in the Appendix of the RECORD:

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

We the members of the American Veterans Committee, believe that in international affairs the objective of the United States is the maintenance of peace. All else aside, the world must avoid the holocaust of nuclear war. Within that framework our foreign policy, like our domestic policy, must be oriented to enhance the welfare of the individual, be he black, white, brown, or yellow, so that he may eat and sleep in safety, live his life under government of his choice and realize to the fullest extent possible the measure of his aspirations.

I. THE UNITED NATIONS AND WORLD GOVERNMENT

Only the progressive subordination of national sovereignty to a democratic world government operating under and implementing world law can ultimately and permanently eliminate the heavy burdens of national armaments and the scourge of international welfare, and permit the full development of human freedom. Because of its successful experience with federalism, its worldwide position of material and moral strength and its desire for peace, the United States, by precept and example, should take the lead in promoting the ultimate subordination of national authority to that of the United Nations on a progressive basis that will enhance our freedom and well-being. Recognition of the rule of law in international relations where such law presently exists, by prompt repeal of the Connally reservation would be one such step.

We believe that there must be an acceleration of progress of the ratification of the international, human rights agreement by the United States and other member nations of the United Nations and a greater assertion of leadership by the United States in the United Nations in furtherance of the work of the United Nations Commission on Human Rights.

The United Nations continues to be man's best hope for peace; and support of the United Nations must be an essential part of our foreign policy. We favor encouragement and aid to the formation of supranational authorities of a regional nature and of treaty agreements which limit the sovereignty of the participating nations in order to secure mutual advantage, such as the European Common Market, Euratom and others.

We regard the integrity and independence of the Secretary General's office as expressed in the Charter crucial to the existence and growth of the United Nations. We shall oppose any attempt which seeks to weaken the powers of this office.

We fully support a United Nations police force as one of the important contributions to peacekeeping in the world. The peacekeeping forces of the United Nations must be supported financially by all members of the UN and this support must be obligatory.

II. NUCLEAR TESTING AND DISARMAMENT

Complete elimination of nuclear weapons testing should be the goal of American foreign policy. Our world finds itself in the unique and unenviable position where one generation can make life on earth unlivable for another generation.

The United States, as the foremost nuclear power, must take the lead in bringing the other nuclear powers—Britain, France, the Soviet Union, and Communist China—together in good faith in efforts to reach agreement for cessation of nuclear weapons tests.

Complete and total disarmament is the ultimate summum bonum, but this is an objective remote in time and immediate achievement is not feasible. Efforts toward that goal, nonetheless should be made by the United States and should be encouraged in other nations. Mankind can never reach its true destiny if it must continue to allocate so high a percentage of its resources to forge the weapons of war.

III. THE UNITED STATES AND ITS ALLIES

Inevitably differences will arise between the United States and its Allies, but these are differences which can be resolved around the conference table. In its negotiations the United States should seek no more than the rights and privileges of a willing partner.

The North Atlantic Treaty Organization was formed in a world considerably different from the world of today. It is time for the NATO Nations to reassess the objectives and reformulate the NATO role. Its continued organization and operation should reflect its changing purpose.

In Latin America, the United States has uneasy allies, but allies nonetheless. We must bend every effort to erase the image of the United States as a prosperous, patronizing, and paternalistic benefactor. It should be the objective of the United States foreign policy to create instead an image of a United States that wants to be a good partner, as well as a good neighbor, in helping the peoples of Latin America work out their own destinies.

The United States should, at every turn, encourage the United Nations or the Organization of American States to be the forum in which to resolve differences and disagreements among or with our Latin American neighbors. We must show by word and deed that we have no desire to impose our own form of government or way of life upon any country of Latin America. At the same time we must make it clear that we will honor a call for help by any Latin American country whose existence and destiny is being threatened by external foreign directed activity.

IV. THE UNITED STATES AND THE WORLD

The twentieth century is the era of the new nations of Africa and of Asia. The United States must stand ready to help those nations and peoples, if they seek our help, to establish their way of life and direct their own destinies.

The forum of the United Nations must be held open to them in their efforts to develop responsible independence, and the services of the specialized agencies should be placed at their behest.

United States foreign aid to developing countries should be continued and utiliezd at points of greatest potential. The United States should use its financial and economic resources to help the people of weak and developing nations achieve self government, and should, if requested, provide economic help to protect them from engulfment or encroachment by foreign powers seeking to impose their own ideologies, disciplines or governments.

The Peace Corps, since its founding, has been an effective ambassador. It should be continued and expanded.

Only when asked and only when it is clear that armed force is necessary to thwart a takeover by powers inimical to the welfare of a weak and developing nation, should the United States furnish military assistance. In these circumstances the United States should stand ready to give military aid to such a country to oppose imposition of an external power, and should make it clear that its military effort is directed toward that objective alone.

V. SOVIET UNION AND COMMUNIST CHINA

The years have shown that coexistence with the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics is not only possible, but is also a necessity, if the world is to remain at peace. This must be our modus vivendi for the foreseeable future. Every step should be taken to enhance, improve, and expand the spheres of coexistence whether by more frequent cultural exchanges, increased travel by United States citizens to the Soviet Union and the satellite countries, expanded trade beyond the Iron Curtain, or others. If we follow this policy and practice, we shall find the areas of agreement becoming wider and the differences, narrower. The inevitable result, where people meet people, is that the government of the Soviet Union will no longer be able to insulate the Russians from the ways of the Russians from the way of the free world and disregard the yearnings of the Russian citizenry—which we believe to be the same as ours—for a world at peace and for good will to other peoples of the earth.

Communist China is the riddle wrapped up in the enigma that Russia used to be.

Any and all avenues that help us learn more about it or initiate exchange of ideas, must be explored. The forum of the United Nations is one primary means of increasing our knowledge. It should no longer be denied the Communist Chinese. We would not, however, deprive Nationalist China of its place in the United Nations.

VI. WORLD TRADE

The path to world peace through world trade is long, tortuous, and not always clearly marked. The United States should take the lead in, where possible, and encourage, where not, the movement toward freer trade among nations. Countries must export as well as import and stabilizing adjustments will have to be made. Where hardships are visited upon domestic industries, some form of temporary relief should be provided. AVC endorses the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 and urges its continued implementation by negotiations and agreements.

VII. THE EXAMPLE OF AMERICA

Events beginning with World War I and continuing in the post World War II world we live in have thrust upon the United States a position of power and responsibility it can neither avoid nor minimize. That position inevitably generates envy, jealousy, and hostility by less fortunate peoples of the earth. It is the difficult, but essential, task of the United States to wear its mantle of world leadership gracefully, to use its power cautiously, and to exercise its responsibility wisely, striving to make the right decisions in order to preserve world peace and to enable the peoples of the world to work out their destinies in an atmosphere that accords the individual his basic human right and permits him to achieve the fullest measure of self-expression.

RESOLUTION—"VIETNAM"

The war in Vietnam is far more than a military struggle taking place in one small distant country. At stake are the peace and freedom of the world. The Vietnamese conflict—presently confined to one country—could spread to a general Asian war or even another world war. Hence, it is in the best interest of the United States and of world peace to settle this conflict under terms that will strengthen the basis for peace and freedom in the world. To settle this conflict, the U.S. has three possible courses to follow:

1) to withdraw unilaterally;

2) to destroy both the Vietcong and North Vietnam by military action;

3) to hold the line in South Vietnam while pursuing a settlement for an enduring peace.

AVC rejects the first two approaches.

Unilateral withdrawal would not bring peace but would unleash totalitarian forces in Asia and in the rest of the world that would upset the delicate international balance that has so far checked a third world war.

The second alternative—to establish a total military victory over both Vietcong and North Vietnam—would likewise hasten the likelihood of a cataclysmic clash with China and, perhaps, Russia as well.

Under these circumstances, AVC advocates the pursuit of a dual policy:

1) to halt a Communist takeover in South Vietnam by continuing the American presence;

2) to probe every possible channel for a settlement that would further an enduring peace.

For this reason, AVC endorses the U thant proposals for a peace effort:

a) an immediate multilateral ceasefire;

b) immediate negotiations on the agenda and parties to participate in a formal conference.

c) a reconvened Geneva Conference to work out the terms of a proposed settlement.

While the U.S. should press for this three point program, we ought also use our full influence to guarantee a free and fair election in South Vietnam with the objective of establishing a representative and viable government.

RESOLUTION—"MIDDLE EAST"

The American Veterans Committee calls upon the government of the United States to use its maximum effort to create a fair and lasting peace between Israel and the Arab nations. Such peace must be based upon such economic and military realities as will insure the survival of Israel and the Arab States and resolution of the human problems of Arab refugees and must be guaranteed by the major powers.

The Best Kind of Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1967

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, in these times when it becomes increasingly difficult to understand what has happened to the great American ideal, I find solace in the message of a Wisconsin clergyman, the text of which was recently sent to me by one of my constituents. The sermon was delivered the Sunday before Independence Day by the Reverend Norman S. Ream, pastor of the First Congregational Church of Wauwatosa, Wis. Perhaps we would not have as much chaos and hatred in the country today if there was more of this type message and a little less of the constant antagonistic attacks upon the great American traditions which have been so prevalent in recent years.

Under the unanimous consent of my colleagues, I include the above-mentioned sermon:

THE BEST KIND OF GOVERNMENT

(By Norman S. Ream)

"Behold, I have bought you this day . . ."—Genesis 47:23.

There are a few acres of land not far from here which mean a great deal to me. Because of the nature of my profession, those few wooded acres with a little stream running through them, and on which is a small white house, are the first real estate I ever owned.

The day after I had bought those acres I drove out from hy home aud walked over every foot of my "country estate." As I did so I found myself repeating the words. "This land is mine, this land is mine." To own a piece of land, to have proprietorship in those few acres, gave to me a sense of well being and security which somehow or other I had never known before. Even though I realize that our ultimate security ought never to be in things, the ownership of that piece of land gave me a real satisfaction and a new appreciation of and love for this grand and glorious country called the United States of America where a man can still enjoy the privileges of private property.

Soon after I had acquired my little piece of earth, I installed a flagpole because I wanted to see my country's flag, which I unashamedly admit to loving and honoring, flying over my acreage. At the base of the flagpole I placed in the concrete a small bronze plaque. On it are two nouns joined by a conjunction. The two nouns are word symbols representing God's two greatest gifts to man. They are, "Faith and Freedom".

It would be a wonderful thing if every family in America could own a piece of the soil. It does do something to a person. Jefferson knew it, and no doubt that is why he advocated that only land owners should be able to vote in the new country which he was helping to establish. One somehow or other has a greater love for his country and a greater interest in its welfare when he owns a piece of it which he can call his.

There are some strange things happening in our country today which I doubt would be happening if more of our citizens felt that they owned this land in which they live. One of these strange and different things is a black power advocate shouting,

"I will not go to Vietnam. I will not serve in the army. I will say, 'Hell, no' . . . I will go to jail. To hell with this country."

This is indeed a strange thing to be happening in America, but it is only one of many strange things that are happening. It is strange to see an unthinking mob of New York beatniks publicly burning the American flag.

It is strange to see college students demanding that the institutions which they are privileged to attend be run by themselves, instead of the administrative and faculty officials who have been charged with that responsibility.

It is strange to see American streets which are unsafe for honest ciitzens, and court decisions which protect the criminal more than the criminal's victim.

It is strange to see a national policy which fights communism 10,000 miles away but permits it to flourish 90 miles ayway.

II

On this Sunday closest to Independence Day it is appropriate to remember the words and lives of some of those men who made this country possible, and to reflect on our national heritage.

In a time when some theologians are saying, "God is dead", it is refreshing to recall that the Mayflower Compact, that document which was the first in all recorded history to be signed by those it was meant to govern, mentions the deity five times in its three short paragraphs. Certainly these were men and women of faith, in search of freedom.

It is thrilling to read the concluding words of the Declaration of Independence and reflect on the character and the conviction of those men who wrote there:

"With firm reliance on the protection of Divine Providence, we mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes and our sacred honor."

It is good to remember General George Washington praying at Valley Forge, and Abraham Lincoln saying in his Gettysburg Address:

"That this nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom, and that government of the people, by the people, and for the people shall not perish from the earth."

Yes, it is indeed strange, that the religious faith which helped establish America and gave strength and courage to its founders is more and more being outlawed in the land.

Faith and freedom are interdependent and always belong together. As a nation during the last several decades we have lost much of our traditional faith in God. Along with it has gone much of our traditional freedom. Now we look more to the state than to God, and with each increasing glance in that direction we chip away a bit of our free heritage. To look to the state always increases the power of the state, and a concentration of power is what always precedes the destruction of liberty.

III

Let me illustrate that last point—a concentration of power is what always precedes the destruction of liberty. The illustration is at least 3000 years old.

I need but refer to the passage of scripture contained in the 47th chapter of the book of Genesis. In that book we read how the father and brothers of Joseph left the land of Canaan and went to Egypt because there was a scarcity of food. They settled in the land with the Pharaoh's blessings. Joseph, the younger brother, was the Pharoah's prime minister, but he was still under the domination and rule of the Pharaoh. As time went on, the famine which had covered the land of Canaan spread into Egypt. Joseph had foreseen it in the Pharaoh's dream which he had interpreted. Joseph proceeded to store great quantities of food during a seven year period in preparation for the seven years of famine that were to come. It was the people's food; it belonged to them. It was gathered by the government into vast warehouses and kept there in preparation for the future.

When the famine came, however, the food was not given back to the people; it was sold to the people. Finally when the people had no more money with which to buy the food, the Pharaoh said to them, "You don't need money, just bring me your cattle." So the people brought their cattle, their herds, their oxen and asses, and gave those to the Pharoah in exchange for food. The following year when the famine still continued and they had no money and no cattle, the Pharoah said, "You will not need money and you will not need cattle, Just give me your land, and I will give you food in exchange for that." The hungry people gave their land to the Pharaoh and the Pharaoh gave them food, their food which they had produced and given to the Pharaoh in order to prepare for this very emergency.

The following year the famine still continued. The people now had no money, they had no cattle, they had no land. So they went once more to the Pharaoh and you can read what Joseph, speaking for the Pharaoh, told them by turning to the 23rd verse of the 47th chapter of Genesis:

"Behold, I have bought you this day, and your land, for the Pharaoh."

The food which the Pharaoh had taken from the people represented power over the people, and a concentration of power, in that instance as in every instance, preceded the destruction of freedom. The Pharaoh had bought the people, they were now his slaves.

James Madison, one of the founding fathers, knew and understood this truth, and he one day said:

"There are more instances of the abridgment of freedom of the people by gradual and silent encroachment of those in power than by violent and sudden usurpations."

Men, if they want to remain free must have faith in God and faith in themselves. Once they lose faith in themselves and faith in God and turn to some other source for the things which are necessary to life, they have begun to sacrifice their freedom and have taken the first step toward slavery.

IV

There are many, many people in our society today who speak and act as if they hated the heritage which is ours as Americans. They are the kind of people I cited at the beginning of this sermon—they can think only of how evil America is.

America is not perfect because Americans are not perfect. This country has done some things for which all of us are ashamed. But this is the freest, the grandest, the most glorious nation that the human race has ever known. Rather than decry it, and berate it, and condemn it, we need to try to make it even better, to correct its faults, but not at the price of sacrificing the freedom which has made it the greatest nation of all history.

Eric Hoffer, the part-time longshoreman and philosopher, has characterized some of the people who are America's worst critics:

"The attitude of the intellectual community toward America is shaped not by the creative few but by the many who for one reason or another cannot transmute their dissatisfaction into a creative impulse, and cannot acquire a sense of uniqueness and of growth by developing and expressing their capacities and talents. There is nothing in contemporary America that can cure or alleviate their chronic frustration.

"Even if we should banish poverty from the land, lift up the Negro to true equality, withdraw from Vietnam and give half of the national income as foreign aid they will still see America as an air-conditioned nightmare unfit for them to live in."

Which leads us to the title of this sermon, "The Best Kind of Government." The best kind of government is always, of course, self government, but if men and women cannot or will not be self-governing in their desires, their passions, their greed, then they will always be governed by others. The less self government there is, the more imposed government there will be. If each one of us cannot be a self-governing, self-reliant, independent, honest person of good character, then we invite some external force to take over our life and to govern it for us.

The whole history of the loss of human liberty is the history of men and women who will not govern themselves properly and adequately. When things get difficult, when they suffer the consequences of their own lack of self-government, they cry out to someone (ultimately the government), "Here is our land, here is our cattle, here is our money. Come, give us food, and we will be your slaves."

We live in a world where, as always, there is opportunity and challenge, but in order to meet the opportunity and the challenge, we must remain free. With a firm reliance on Almighty God and with deep conviction that our heritage of freedom and individualism is a blessing bestowed upon us by Almighty God, we will be able to write another chapter in man's continuing struggle for meaning and fulfillment, and succeeding generations will rise up and call us blessed.

The Requirements of Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 20, 1967

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, in the midst of the frustrations and emotions that too often seem to rule in troublous and perilous times it is truly refreshing to read the words of President Bourguiba of Tunisia, as taken from an address he recently delivered to the Tunisian Students Association.

In that address, President Bourguiba commented in a statesmanlike and realistic manner on two of the major foreign policy issues of the day—the Middle East and Vietnam—and it seems to me that underlying his words is some clear evidence of the trust and confidence that he and his people place in our Nation, a condition that was heretofore served and, I hope, will continue to serve as the foundation for a friendly and cooperative relationship between our two countries.

I submit President Bourguiba's remarks for the information of my colleagues:

President Bourguiba on the Middle East and Vietnam

(Excerpts from an address delivered on August 23, 1967, before the executive committee of the Tunisian Students Association)

Ever since the cold war divided the world into two opposite camps, students have been the subject of a keen competition for their allegiance and support. Each of these two camps wanted to have them on their side. Being endowed with great generosity of spirit and views, the young rather than the adults can become easily stirred up by great ideas. Therefore, a certain kind of propaganda aims at sparking and exploiting this enthusiasm to a point where the students are so highly intoxicated that they lose their ability to exercise their personal judgement. Thus conditioned, they become the tool of a propaganda which they have not bothered in most cases to analyse.

On every issue they want to have progressive ideas, and it so happens that in their eyes, the Soviet positions bear the perfect label of progressive thinking. These students tend, therefore, to always ally their views on attitudes which they have not themselves conceived and they come to consider Marshall Sallal of Yemen as a progressive leader, but not Bourguiba whose actions aim at emancipating the women, instructing and guiding the youth, and insuring dignity and a decent standard of living for his people.

FOR A RATIONAL APPROACH TO WORLD PROBLEMS

I would only have to attack the Americans or "Imperialism" to be classified among the progressive and revolutionary leaders of the world. This is not serious. This attitude of proselytism flows from the very foundations of the Marxist-Leninist philosophy, which assumes that communism will eventually triumph in the world. Since the United States is the only Power capable of barring the achievement of such a purpose, the Soviet Union does everything it can to increase the number of its supporters, or at least, to decrease the number of America's friends. In this endeavor the U.S.S.R. is guided by some sort of a messianic attitude for it is convinced that it obeys a fundamental law of history and if the propaganda slogans sometimes happen to change according to international circumstances, the objective remains the same.

But paradoxically, while some countries of the "Third World" are using such slogans, the country where communism was first introduced is in the process of changing the very foundations of Marxism.

It is also significant that the Soviet Union and the United States have come to a point where they can reach agreement on a certain number of issues, and they sometimes do so over the shoulders of some countries of the "Third World" which believed that they could count on the revolutionary "solidarity" of Soviet Russia.

All things being what they are and especially what they become, we are determined as far as we are concerned to seek every possible assistance whether it comes from the East or from the West, with a view to implementing our development programs.

We all know too well what it costs some countries which label themselves revolutionary to act like the legendary Don Quixote. While they battle against the windmills of imperialism, the people whom they are responsible for continue to endure the worst kind of misery, and live under conditions where the most elementary liberties are denied.

ARAB POLICY TOWARD ISRAEL

The fight against "Imperialism" remains the prime concern of these regimes and in the specific case of Palestine, they have continued to pursue a policy of dropping the substance for the shadow.

The State of Israel is recognized by the United States and the Soviet Union. It is furthermore a member of the United Nations and its existence is only challenged by the Arab States. It is useless in these conditions to refuse adamantly to recognize this reality. To claim to eradicate Israel from the map of the world is to condemn oneself to virtual isolation. No matter how regrettable and unjust it is, such a situation does exist.

This injustice dates back to when the United Nations founded Israel in violation of the moral code and the principles which are contained in its Charter.

I maintain that in our action to put an end to such an injustice, we must take such a factor into account. Instead the policy which the Arabs have pursued up to now, has resulted in showing the sympathy of all the people, even those of the Soviet bloc, and of the "Third World", to the side of Israel.

It is generally believed that it is Egypt who created the casus belli while in our view it is the very existence of Israel which constitutes an aggression. Ever since Israel has been recognized by the United Nations, we ought to have considered such a fact so as to better choose an appropriate strategy which would have ensured, in the long run, complete victory over Israeli colonialism.

THE RESULTS OF MISCALCULATION

Because the aggressor was expected to come from the east and he came instead from the west, because an error was committed in weighing the actual balance of forces, and because the circumstances were most inappropriate to modify by force an injust equilibrium which resulted from a previous defeat, the Arab countries are now subjected to the terrible humiliation of a new defeat and the occupation of new parts of their territories.

Israel was content with her borders of 1956 and neither did she claim the entire city of Jerusalem, nor the west bank of the Jordan River, nor half of the Suez Canal, nor the other territories which she now occupies in the Sinai Peninsula. But a series of measures were taken deliberately and without considering the risks involved to bar her access to the Gulf of Aqaba, which was one of the elements of this equilibrium that had been tolerated as the lesser evil following the tripartite aggression of 1956 and which had been embodied in an international agreement.

One very well knew that the opponent would not fail to react and the Arab press itself hinted at such a possibility, (Al Ahram, of May 26, 1967). This reaction was indeed clearly foreseen. It was even expected so as to justify a counter-offensive which would "Put an End" to the State of Israel.

Since then, the Israeli forces have reached the bank of the Suez Canal and after being subjected to a downpour of fire and napalm, the Arabs are once again on the road to exodus.

FOR A NEW APPROACH

After the defeat which they just endured, the Arab States should reconsider the policy which they have stubbornly pursued for the past 20 years. Whatever it costs them, the lesser evil would be to end the state of belligerency in order to recover the lands which have been conquered by the Jewish State, and to avert greater dangers.

After that, they would have to strive and promote their people to the level of strong and highly developed nations, so that they would one day, be capable to prevent any injustice, to deter any aggression, and to wield, one day, the greater power.

I referred specifically to the case of Palestine to illustrate my thoughts and to demonstrate to you that the young people, who would be called upon to exercise responsibilities in their countries, must learn to reason sensibly and soundly, and not to shut their eyes on some realities, no matter how unpleasant they are.

VIETNAM AND POWER POLITICS

I read with interest the various motions which you have adopted during your recent Congress and I particularly noted your concern over the problem of Vietnam. I believe, however, that you have not analysed this issue deeply enough, for it is not as simple as one might be led to believe. It is indeed a most serious issue which is liable to disrupt the whole balance of power in the world.

Following the last war, the world found itself divided into two blocs: the communist countries and the others. If the requirements of the war had temporarily brought together the so-called Allied Powers against Hitler's Germany, the fundamental differences of their regimes did not in anyway disappear. Once Nazism was clamped down, each of the former allies hurriedly attempted to enlarge its zone of influence.

Therefore, after the Soviets and the Americans had, each for themselves, proceeded to simultaneously "liberate" some parts of the world, they established a demarcation line which corresponded to the advance of their respective armies. The grounds of such a confrontation were successively Germany and Austria, later Korea and later still, Vietnam.

On several occasions, the Soviet Union attempted to improve her positions, but she had to back down in the face of firm resistance. The Berlin crisis and the Korean war were the most acute developments of Soviet-American confrontation, and it is with a view to presering such a balance that the Soviet Union and the United States are still maintaining their forces in both Germanies.

If sometimes the two great Powers collided in an armed conflict by proxy like in Korea, such a war nevertheless, always ended with a return to the status quo ante. It was finally realized that the division of some countries would only end when first a detente, then an understanding prevail between the two super Powers. Great progress has already been made in that direction.

THE CHALLENGE OF CHINA

But since then, China entered the scene and in pressuring Hanoi to maintain its intransigent stand, she seeks nothing else but to confound the Soviet Union and to prove that guerrilla warfare can defeat the American armies. If such were the case, it would demonstrate that the United States are not invincible in spite of their nuclear hardware.

China's hopes could then be fulfilled and nothing would prevent the outpour of its multitudes over Vietnam, Asia, and even Russia. She would furthermore be in a position to claim and indeed grab the leadership of the communist world.

It is in the light of these considerations that we ought to understand the oft repeated demand by Hanoi's leaders that: "The aggressor should leave first, then peace, freedom, and reunification would then set in by themselves". This is a precondition which has never been set forth by any people struggling for their liberation even in colonial wars. During the Algerian war, neither did the Algerian Provisional Government, nor Ben Bella, nor Boumedienne, ever insist that the French Forces withdraw before any negotiations could begin.

A close analysis of the events leads indeed to the conclusion that the Vietnam war is being fought behind the scenes by the United States and China. Considering that the world balance of power hovers in the midst of such a conflict, it seems unlikely that the United States would give up in these conditions. Mao Tse Tung on the other hand is bent on demonstrating that the U.S. can indeed be forced to surrender.

THE DANGER OF WAR

One can imagine the kind of danger to which the world would be exposed if East Germany or the Federal Republic attempted to achieve for their own sake—like in Vietnam—the reunification of the country. A conflict between the red army and the American forces would be unavoidable.

Now everyone knows that the United States are willing to close their military bases abroad. In the case of Vietnam, they simply want to make sure that once their forces are withdrawn, appropriate conventions would insure complete self determination for the Vietnamese people, that is their ability to elect the regime of their choice and the men of their choice. I fear that should the United States withdraw without prior agreement specifying such a guarantee, Vietnam might not be reunified, and neither would it become free nor independent. History and the specific weight of China somehow seem to point toward such an eventuality which would without fail bring mankind to the brink of a third World War.

China is left today to the destructive frenzy of the Red Guards who do not even respect the immunity of diplomatic missions. One could fear the worst from these unleashed hordes. The Soviet Union certainly does not wish to see a victorious China emerge, for she knows all too well the danger to which she herself would be exposed. The whole Asian part of her territory could be dangerously threatened.

Today one can say without paradox that the Soviet Union fears China more than she would the United States. Perhaps she even does foresee that one day she would need their help just as in the darkest years of Hitler's aggression. Therefore things are far from being that simple and the so called "Imperialism" is quite often only a question of point of view.

It is only unfortunate for mankind that peace should be based upon a balance of power. At Potsdam and Yalta the world was sliced into spheres of influence and everytime one of the major Powers attempted to expand its own zone, it was generally the country situated on the threshold which paid the heavy price of such a move. This is the case of Germany, of Korea, and of Vietnam.

But while in the first two instances some sort of an agreement seems to prevail on the basis of peaceful coexistence that is in effect the maintenance of the status quo until a more meaningful understanding could be sought, in Vietnam, China regards "peaceful co-existence" as an act of treason in terms of revolutionary principles and she strives hard to demonstrate that her position is the only right one.

THE REQUIREMENTS OF PEACE

I do not seek to spare or please any country when I maintain that the world would be in danger if in the event of a movement of public opinion the United States were to return to their former isolationism. One could content that Vietnam means little to them after all, and that the Chinese are, at the moment, in no position to threaten them, but, granted a U.S. unilateral withdrawal from Vietnam, China would most certainly submerge all the countries of the region, and pull away from Moscow the leadership of the communist world, thus jeopardizing world peace. Vietnam would be the first country to be overrun, then would come the turn of India, which already experienced Chinese aggression, then Outer Mongolia, whose position is believed to be threatened. Thus determined to expand their vital space by conquest, the Chinese would march off to reestablish their old empire. A Third World War would be doomed to break out. The dimensions and the significance of the conflict being waged in Vietnam go therefore far beyond the border of this country and although it may seem paradoxical, one could contend that the Vietnamese are fighting the wrong enemies. Those who actually encourage them to fight the Americans are none other than the very same leaders, who behind the scenes, await the opportunity to enslave them and to rebuild the former Chinese Empire.

Given the facts of geography, the specific weight of China, and her insistence to cling to Stalin's ideology, one could not but conclude that Vietnam would experience a fate similar to the one which had befallen the countries of Eastern Europe in the days of Stalin.

If communism champions democracy and independence, it certainly does so in countries other than those who were subjected to the tyranny of Stalin or who are now threatened to fall under Mao's. Even the Soviet Union has now realized that and is proceeding to change her ideological concepts. When the real image of Stalinism was finally unveiled, the iron clad unity which held the communist world together, disintegrated forever, but in the process, the Soviet Union won the confidence of a great number of democracies which did not doubt Khrushchev's sincerity when he initiated his historic turn-about in favour of peaceful coexistence.

PROGRESS VERSUS DEMAGOGY

I am therefore surprised that some young people still continue to measure the substance of progressive leadership in terms of standards established by such and such country, and that they systematically and blindly use this arbitrary yardstick to judge the position of their own country.

Real progress amounts to raising the standards of one's people and to actively promote its evolution through an appropriate social policy, through the education of youth, the emancipation of women, and the eradication of obsolete traditions; so many endeavors, that even the Soviet Pravda acknowledges, are being achieved in Tunisia.

It is therefore unfortunate that some rather sound-minded people who are sometimes plagued by a feeling of guilt, do not dare express their opinions freely and feel obliged to conform their views to the ideology which is "in" at the moment. If one is genuinely convinced of the righteousness of his opinion, I do not object, for there is nothing I appreciate more than a sincere action. But I cannot stand systematic alignment. One must have the courage to defend his point of view in as much as it is founded on reason, realities, and precise facts. If such a point of view happens to be contrary to mine, I nevertheless respect it, for no specific ties of dependence bind me either to the United States, or to Great Britain, or to any other Power.

A French official was recently quoted as saying, "Among all the countries I visited, it is Tunisia which appeared to me as being the least dependent." It is true indeed, that we hang on no one's coat tails. Our people are relatively mature, we have a long history behind us, and we try to analyse events objectively. This is why we have never stooped to resort to the kind of demagogic practices which are being followed by some so called revolutionary countries. Their setbacks are all too well known, and if the gentlemen who govern these countries really wanted to serve their people, why don't they strive to help them make up for centuries of backwardness and raise their social, economic, and technological standards, instead of being reduced to begging right and left, in order to feed them.

Tunisia enjoys everybody's respect and esteem, whether it be the Soviet Union, the United States, or France, whom we fought for so long. We also never laboured under the complexes of those countries whose process of decolonization was ill started and who were never able to overcome their past bitterness.

It is essentially in this spirit that I would like to see the students fulfill their mission which is to serve their country first, instead of trying to conform themselves to uncompromising attitudes.

Ghetto Riots' Message Clear

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1967

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, in an editorial in the Arlington Heights Herald and 15 other suburban newspapers published by Paddock Publications, Inc., Arlington Heights, Ill., the urgent matters of ghetto rioting and urban poverty were discussed in a most thoughtful, dispassionate way.

The Paddock editorial of September 1, 1967, not only presented the problem and defined the devastation it causes, but it also suggested some possible solutions.

I offer for the RECORD the Paddock Publications' editorial entitled: "Ghetto Riots' Message Clear." The editorial follows:

GHETTO RIOTS' MESSAGE CLEAR

The nightmare of slum rebellion, breakdown of civil discipline, crime and crisis erupting in our cities has left the nation numb with horror.

The message carried by the bricks and bottles of ghetto rioters is unmistakable: participation in our competitive society cannot be limited by skin color, economic background, or denial of education. An individual must be measured in terms of his own work, efforts, skill, and potential.

There is no cheap or simple answer to an accumulation of more than 100 years of deprivation, exploitation and injustice. Somehow, the means must be found to distribute opportunities in our society more equitably.

Our system must be made to work between the majority "haves" and the minority "have nots." We can no longer afford to survive in cities half-prosperous and half-poor, half free and half less-than-free.

Indifference and inaction have helped to create the atmosphere for violence and are the result of our refusal to deal with the legitimate grievances of Negroes and other disadvantaged citizens.

Both the public and private sectors of our society have failed to identify and treat the conditions that lead to such violence: to erase slum housing, to raise incomes, to provide better education and medical care, to furnish cultural standards for people who have never known them.

The first necessity is to provide for proper law enforcement.

There can be no freedom, no progress in the absence of order; laws cannot be rewritten by warfare in the streets.

The rights of some citizens cannot be protected by destroying the rights of all others. Majorities have a right to protection of life and property as much as minorities; it is a crime for rioters to terrorize cities, and such law breakers are criminals, not "social protesters."

While law and order must prevail—including stern measures if necessary—we cannot abandon our national commitment to equal opportunity and equal justice.

If our current crises have taught us nothing else, they have demonstrated the inability of government alone to cure all national ills, guarantee equality, create incentives develop self-respect, or erase overnight a century of neglect and injustice.

Tired refinements of 30-year-old political themes, drawn from Depression Era conditions, are scarcely suited to meet the needs of 1967.

New ideas, new methods and approaches are needed that will challenge the workings of our society at its critical core. There must be a commitment of resources, reordering of priorities, and redirecting of programs and funds.

We need constructive programs to train; to impart skills to the jobless; to repair the disadvantages of inadequate education; to teach adults to read and write; to enable people to own their own homes and businesses; to make possible full participation in the market place as responsible citizens.

Such commitments must come not only from government, but from private industry, private organizations, and private individuals as well.

Private investment must be attracted to deteriorating neighborhoods; "investment partnerships" created to eradicate slum housing; racial barriers to gainful employment and union membership lowered; industry's efforts to recruit, train, and hire the hard-core unemployed accelerated; new jobs created by strengthening, expanding the economy.

More attention must be directed to new proposals, such as "Earn and Learn Centers" developed jointly by business, labor, and local government widen career opportunities, as well as the "Neighborhood Action Crusade" offered by 40 GOP congressmen as an immediate program of preventive action to defuse city tensions.

Solving America's urban dilemma is the obligation of every citizen, for all of us are inescapably involved. It must command our full effort, support and resources.

Vietnam Election Observer States Views in Honolulu Advertiser Interview

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 20, 1967

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, the South Vietnamese election is over, and the voting demonstrated the overwhelming unity of the South Vietnamese in assuring their nation the right of self-determination. As we know, despite the most adverse of conditions in that embattled country, more than 80 percent of the electorate tufned out to vote on September 3.

The U.S. observer team sent by President Johnson to inspect the voting process, correspondents on the scene, and experts who witnessed the election, have agreed as to the general fairness and responsibility with which the election was handled.

One of the most informative reports which I have read by a member of the observer team was that of Pulitzer Prize editor, Eugene Patterson of the Atlanta Constitution.

Mr. Gardiner B. Jones, associate editor of the Honolulu Advertiser, had an in-depth interview with Mr. Patterson following his mission to Vietnam, and I would like to have the results of that interview printed in the RECORD for the attention of the Members.

The article, "Observer Finds Hope in Vietnam Election," which appeared in the Wednesday, September 6, 1967, issue of the Honolulu Advertiser, follows:

Observer Finds Hope in Vietnam Election

(By Gardiner B. Jones)

The Viet Cong threatened: "If you vote, you die." Yet the peasants voted, and some indeed may die for it.

"This is the result of 20 years of Vietnamese dead," said a young man at a polling place.

Artillery rumbling within hearing of a voting booth. Free but not free. A first step but not democracy arrived. Peasants beset by pressures, yet in the circumstances given a "reasonably fair" chance to choose.

So the picture unfolded yesterday as seen by Eugene Patterson, Pulitzer Prize editor of The Atlanta Constitution and a member of the 20-man American mission to observe the Vietnam election.

Patterson is a hawk—or, at least, strongly pro-Vietnam—and there's little doubt his views were reinforced. But even the doves on the mission seem to have-been sold that the election was, in Vietnam terms, a fair one.

Patterson was fishing on a Georgia lake when the White House called, asking him to go to Vietnam. Long an Administration supporter, nevertheless he was leery of becoming party to a venture that conceivably might be designed for narrow partisan purposes. After shooting some blunt questions to his White House caller, he agreed to go.

Obviously, he is glad he went. Just as obviously, he was a good choice for the assignment. He is a short, solid pink man who conveys strength. He has flat blue eyes, thinning reddish hair, and a wide, tough mouth. There is no-nonsense brain behind the square face.

OVER VIETNAM'S SHOULDER

Patterson spoke in a Southerner's soft, round-cornered tones, using measured, thoughtful sentences. He is how he recounted his four days of looking over Vietnam's shoulder while the embattled country elected a President.

"I think it is a major step forward. It gives me some hope that at last the long turning will come. Up to now, the only way the Vietnamese peasant could express dissatisfaction was to go out into the paddies and take up a gun.

"But once he has the alternative of the ballot there is the beginning of hope for the peasant. Without that, the gun is his only recourse. I don't mean to say that we suddenly have a flourishing democracy in Vietnam, but the first step has been taken.

"I had a translator and an escort and a bodyguard and a helicopter, and I was able to talk with about 100 Vietnamese, ranging from officials in Saigon to the province and hamlet chiefs and the little guys. I got away from Saigon and the official parties and could drop in on hamlets where they had no notice and could not prepare.

"I was impressed by the organizational efficiency. It is supposed to be an inefficient central government but they had the word out, right down to the hamlet chiefs.

"The polling places were set up just as they should have been and the officials were serious about their work. The polling places were open to observers for the candidates, and they could sit there all day and I was able to interview them. This, of course, is the self-policing aspect that makes the democratic system work.

"On the other hand, it wasn't free for General Minh. The regime wouldn't allow him back in the country as a candidate. To that extent it wasn't a free election. In Saigon, I was impressed by the freedom of the press, and they used it richly to smite the candidates hip and thigh and to criticize the government.

"Yet they shut down two newspapers on the eve of the election, so again you can't say it was a free election in the Western sense.

"AN IRONY

"There is an irony. Many critics of our Vietnam policy have been very vociferous in saying why should we try to transplant our system and values to an Oriental country.

"Now the past week they have been saying the opposite—why aren't those people out there using these values in an election? They can't have it both ways.

"I was pleased by the conduct of the election. I don't think it was rigged.

"Now there were certain pressures. In an autocratic tradition where the province chiefs are appointed by the Saigon government, the village chiefs are going to turn out the vote to please the province chiefs. And this is bound to generate pressure on the voters. Yet almost two-thirds of the peasants voted against the government. In the context of Vietnam, this election was reasonably fair.

"I went to Hue on election day. This is a very political city and I saw something really moving: A doddering old man and a bright young woman casting their votes, and they both obviously believed in what they were doing.

"This one old blind man came out of the polling place. He couldn't see but he had a great face and he was tapping along and when he got to the stairs one of the other members of the mission took his arm to help him.

"And then this member of the mission asked a young Vietnamese standing there what he thought of all this, and the young man said he was impressed. And then he pointed to the old man and said:

" 'This is the result of 20 years of Vietnamese dead—for that old man to vote.'

"There was some concern there might be efforts to manipulate the returns after the polls closed. It is always possible to stuff the boxes after the ballots are cast. We have had that in some elections in the United States.

"In Vietnam the polls closed at 4 p.m., and at 11 I went down to the place in Saigon where they did the tabulation and they still had nothing and there began to be a suspicion that there might be some rigging.

"But there are arguments against that: The U.S. Embassy had some spot checkers scattered around the country and Radio Vietnam also was doing some checking very fast and broadcasting partial returns. The day after the election, in comparing the specific figures of the Embassy and Radio Vietnam, they tallied very well with the official figures.

"There was a certain authoritarianism in that 83 per cent turnout. The people wanted to do what they were expected to do, which was to vote. So in a sense there was pressure for a big vote, but it is the beginning of independent thought and choice.

"Now Dzu (Truong Dinh Dzu, the civilian peace candidate) ran better than expected and there were several factors in that. The biggest was peace. He said, 'Vote for me and I'll make peace.' But he did not concern himself with how he would do so. But it had its appeal. The other civilian candidates were older men and familiar and, as we have learned in our own politics, it's a young man's world. Dzu proved that demagoguery works in Vietnam as well as in the U.S.

SUPPORTER OF POLICY

"When the White House asked me to go on this mission they just said that the President felt it was in the best interest of the United States. I inquired whether it was going to be such that opponents of our policy would not be included and I was told, no, that the mission would be a cross-section of the American people without regard to views on policy.

"I am a supporter of our policy but the other newspaperman on the mission, John Knight, has fought our policy since 1945. We are poles apart.

"I also asked whether I would have to join in a concensus statement. I doubt that we could. The Vietnamese at a high level repeatedly made the point that they were glad we had come and that they felt our presence would help insure the honesty of the elections.

"We were criticized by some of the candidates who indicated they thought we had no business there. Other countries were represented by observer teams: Malaysia, Korea, Japan, New Zealand and Australia—and I even ran into some Dutchmen. Premier Ky invited all these countries to be represented and I think he was pretty smart to do so.

"We wanted to break into little groups and the U.S. government wanted us to do so. They had some things laid on for us but made it clear we were free to operate as we wanted. We all had escort officers. The security was pretty heavy because they feared Viet Cong demonstration attacks on us.

"The first day I followed the State Department plan and went down into the Delta. The second day Gov. Tom McCall of Oregon and I got an airplane and went up the coast. The province chief was on hand and suggested one hamlet to visit; we also visited two others that he did not suggest. We got away sufficiently and I think we had an independent look.

"In talks with voters I would ask if they had a voting card. Each person had an identity card and also had to have a voting card and had to show both of them to vote. We had reports that in some sections the government had refused to issue cards. I asked people if they thought the election would be fair and the answer was uniformly yes, but you had to be aware that the hamlet chief was usually right there to overhear.

IT WAS REMARKABLE

"It was remarkable, an election in this war. In one place you could hear the artillery rumbling off in the distance the day of the voting.

"The Viet Cong put on tremendous pressure. I asked voters if the Viet Cong had made any threats. The average peasant would say no, but the province chiefs would tell you yes. In one province there were three places where the government could not provide security and those people did not get to vote. Altogether, there were 2 million people who could not vote.

"An American Army major impressed me. He said, 'This is a great thing. I don't know about their politics and I don't care, but we have half a dozen villages on our security perimeter and the Viet Cong have been coming in but the province chief goes on issuing voting cards and Charlie comes in and tells the peasants: If you vote you die. We went out and told them: If you vote, you live.

" 'It's that simple and I am going out there election day with troops and guns. If I do this and then next week I see this farmer out there plowing with his buffalo, we have made some headway. So I'll be there with guns and troops.'

"You can see they have had to make a judgment between a rock and a very hard place. I think we have to understand the position the Vietnamese is in today. If he voted, his card has been clipped on the corner and so if he wants something from the government he can show that he voted on election day. But if the Viet Cong catch him with that card it might go hard for him.

"I hope we have the beginnings of a system that they can believe in. It gives them an alternative to terrorism as a way to bring about change."

I Am an American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HERBERT BURKE
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 19, 1967

Mr. BURKE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, earlier in this session I was privileged to bring to the attention of my colleagues a thoughtful letter from one of my constituents whose husband is currently serving our country in Southeast Asia. Since then the writer has further shared with me her views concerning the problems faced by our military personnel as well as her personal feelings concerning this Nation of ours, I was particularly impressed by an article she had recently written which in her words, contains her "comments on some events as they are taking place all over America." I think the article speaks for itself and for countless Americans who share the concern and the feelings expressed by the author, Sandra A. Burke—Mrs. Thomas J. Burke—of Fort Lauderdale, Fla. I commend it to the attention of my colleagues, and place the article at this point in the RECORD:

I AM AN AMERICAN

(By Sandra A. Burke, Fort Lauderdale, Fla.)

I am an American.

I am proud of the heritage of this young nation and I am inspired by the courage of those who have made her great and those who have kept her free.

I am an American, angered by the "browbeaters", who being envious of our prosperity and world position, endeavour to vilify America's image and distort American purpose.

I am an American, enamoured of the democratic process by which we elect our governing bodies, and as an American, I am confident that in a democracy no Hitler, Stalin, nor Ho Chi Minh could survive a government "of the people, by the people, and for the people."

I am an American, proud of the youth who serve in the Peace Corps. I am filled with admiration at the constructive activities of some 110 UCLA and Valley State students who prefer to spend their spare time erecting buildings for the blind in Tijuana, thereby serving as good-will ambassadors to our Mexican neighbors. As an American, I am disturbed by the black booted Nazi youth members who desire the return of the super race and prefer the abominable swastika to the beautiful and bold "Stars and Stripes."

I am an American who welcomes research, industry, and progress as a means to building a better America, but I am also apprehensive that research, industry, and progress choose to be complacent, even apathetic about the problems of air pollution and the carnage of American waterways to which they are contributing.

I am an American who admires the natural beauty to be seen across the face of this vast land . . . the majestic Grand Canyon . . . the beautiful Cascades . . . the towering Redwoods. As an American, I am sorely distressed that there are those who for personal, monetary gains, would destroy or diminish the beauty of America's natural wilderness areas.

I am an American who believes in God, and as a God-fearing American, I find it difficult to comprehend that in a land dedicated to the concept of Religious freedom and a land whereon the coin of the realm contains the motto "In God We Trust", that there are those who would have us think that God is dead.

I am an American, weary of the anti-war demonstrators who flagrantly strive, in the name of peace, to halt troop trains, picket military installations, and sabotage the morale of the American fighting man. I am tired of the bearded beatnik and the pacifist placard bearer who give assistance in blood, money, and supplies to the Viet Cong. I am incensed with those who burn draft cards or pretend to, and wtih those who flee into Canada to avoid the draft simply because they are neither men enough, nor American enough to accept the responsibilities which freedom entails.

I am sickened with the deranged "doves" who utilize the telephone to harass families of men who have died in freedom's defense on the battlefields of Vietnam. And as an American, I am totally exasperated with United States citizens who feel they must make an excursion to Communist China or North Vietnam for humanity's sake, thereby furnishing "Charlie" with excellent propaganda for the Communist cause.

I am an American, opposed to American representatives of humanity who refuse to face the real issues; who refuse to see that the real atrocities to man lie with the very enemy that they choose to consort with . . . an enemy who utilizes terrorism in its vilest forms and who deals in the wholesale slaughter of civilians. This slaughter is not attributable to bombings, but to direct, premeditated murders and multilations.

I am an American who feels overwhelming pride at the sight of the American flag flying aloft, above this nation's pillars of democracy. As an American, I am shocked at the sight of deluded agitators who dare to desecrate, to burn, to defile that flag for which so many Americans have died.

I am an American who feels strongly that our men in Vietnam should be backed to the fullest, yet as a concerned American, I cannot understand the complacency which prevents the active blockades of Communist ports, when we are totally committed to see this war through to the end. As a concerned American, I find it difficult to tolerate the perpetual doling out of US dollars for any kind or type of aid, to errant allies engaged in shipping goods and supplies to the Chinese Communists. Does it not matter that the persistent existence of these situations is daily increasing the number of American casualties and was dead? Does it not matter that these situations are prolonging the war and increasing the power of the enemy forces?

I am an American, and I, for one, am proud of it. As an American, I feel that our military members are a people, individuals, and families who each in their own way, contribute to and help maintain the defense of the United States of America so that all of the citizens of this nation, may pursue in peace, their ways of life.

I am an American. I am the wife of an enlisted United States Airman and the mother of four sons and a daughter. We are proud of the uniform he wears and proud of the nation he represents. As Americans, we can thank God, that such dedicated men and women exist, for without their dedication to duty, tomorrow's sun might never rise over our nation as she is today, and the American flag might not be the one flying over "the land of the free and the home of the brave".

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402, at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Appendix

Systems Analysis Approach to Community Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY L. PETTIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1967

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, in an age when we have complicated problems and I have repeatedly called the attention of the Congress that we must use every conceivable modern technology in solving our cities' problems, I think the following editorial from the San Bernardino Sun may point the way to the solution of the many headaches which beset out leaders.

Mr. Speaker, I applaud a modern company like the TRW Systems group, San Bernardino operations, for offering its expertise in solving "people" problems. If more private organizations would contribute to the solutions of community needs, such as TRW Systems is doing, many of our most serious and critical problems in this field could be solved.

The editorial follows:

APPLYING THOUGHT TO PROBLEMS

For several months, a group of volunteer citizens has been working on an approach to community problems that is new, different, and perhaps revolutionary in a quiet sort of way.

The approach is to use orderly thought in place of vague guesses and excessive emotion.

Sponsored by United Community Services, the program is befng guided by TRW Systems, Inc., a space firm which has lent three of its executives to the year-long project.

Last January the group began community analysis in two broad areas, identification of problems and identification of resources. A list of 88 problems was prepared, and of that list four have been declared critical and chosen for action.

The next step will be to evaluate and design programs of action to meet the problems. The third step will be to integrate and coordinate programs to solve specific problems, utilizing all resources, private and public.

The four critical problems for the UCS area (including Crest Forest, Rialto, Crestmore-Bloomington, Colton, San Bernardino, Grand Terrace, Loma Linda and Highland) are ranked as lack of leadership, unemployment of minority groups, park and recreation facilities, and emotional problems and drug abuse of adolescents.

All of these problems are complicated. Take, for instance, that of "leadership." Evaluators of the problem must first consider defining and identifying characteristics of leadership, something that can produce argument in itself.

They must study methods of developing leadership skills; ethnic and cultural barriers and their effect on leadership roles; the unwillingness or inability to relinquish or share leadership functions; the tendency to seek leaders whose value systems and education, and socio-economic status, coincide with our own; the difficulties of mobility between ethnic, cultural or economic status of our society.

The cost to society of the lack of leadership, as priorities project points out, can run high. The inability to identify and encourage new leaders leaves a vacuum in the social order. This vacuum is either filled by persons with a vested interest and ulterior motives, or the responsibility for local citizen involvement is relinquished to someone else who may have little or no interest in the local community.

Certainly, this problem comes first. If this area had effectively used its leadership potential in past years, then the other critical problems of minority unemployment, parks and recreation, and teen-age troubles might now be negligible.

This is the first time in the history of the nation that the "systems approach" has been applied to community needs, and it may become a national model. High praise is due for the citizens who have given—and will give—many hours of their time, to TRW, which has donated expensive manpower, and to UCS, which is flexible enough to serve as a catalyst for such a program.

The contributions of these fine people could well provide a key to an exciting future.

Smoking Is Harmful to Health

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD W. CANNON

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 21, 1967

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, last week in New York City some 400 delegates, representing over 30 nations, gathered to participate in the World Conference on Smoking and Health.

The conference heard firm, unrefuted evidence that smoking is harmful to health. It was stated during the conference that a greater effort must be made in the United States to provide educational programs and materials aimed at giving our young people sufficient evidence to enable them to make an affirmative decision against cigarette smoking.

As a climax to the world conference, the American Broadcasting Co., produced a television and radio program devoted entirely to the conference. The Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss] and the Senator from New York [Mr. Kennedy] appeared on the program "Issues and Answers" on ABC.

I ask unanimous consent that a transcript of the broadcast be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the transcript was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

ISSUES AND ANSWERS

Sunday, September 17, 1967

Guests: Senator Frank E. Moss (D.-Utah); Dr. Luther Terry, Former Surgeon General of the United States; Sir George E. Godber, Chief Medical Officer, British Ministry of Health.

Interviewer: ABC News Science Editor Jules Bergman.

Producer: Peggy Whedon.

Senator Robert Kennedy. Every year cigarettes kill more Americans than were killed in World War I, the Korean War and Vietnam combined. Nearly as many as died in battle in World War II. And that is every year here in the United States. Each year cigarettes kill five times more Americans than traffic accidents. Lung cancer alone kills as many as die on the road. And we must accept the fact that the cigarette industry is peddling a deadly weapon. It is dealing in people's lives for financial gain. If cigarettes turned people the same color outside that they do inside, instead of just killing people they would surely have been banned a long time ago.

The cigarette companies have demonstrated a total inattention to public responsibility. It is also a reflection on our society as a whole, on all of us, that cigarette smoking has been permitted to continue in our various countries. There is no reason for another generation of mankind, however, to end up disabled and the victims of premature death.

We must act, and we must act now. I would only suggest the anti-smoking material should show the danger involved clearly and graphically, and with all the ingenuity that Madison Avenue uses to suggest that smoking is desirable.

One suggestion I want to pass on to you for your consideration which I thought would be appropriate would be to place the tough, rangy man with the tattoo on his hand in front of a hospital ward, and have him say: "This is emphysema country."

Dr. William Stewart. The 100 millimeter cigarette is absolutely in the wrong direction, based on the evidence we have. It's really an affront to the American people.

We have no authority at the present time to limit the size of cigarettes. We do have evidence that people smoke those cigarettes down as far as they smoke the smaller cigarettes, so they're getting a much bigger dose of tar and nicotine.

Announcer. How great is the health hazard from smoking cigarettes?

What can be done to discourage young people from beginning to smoke?

How can we make cigarettes less harmful?

From New York City, the American Broadcasting Company brings you ISSUES AND ANSWERS. Our guests: Sir George Godber, Chief Medical Officer, British Ministry of Health, in charge of Great Britain's smoking controls; Senator Frank Moss, Democrat of Utah, author of legislation to deal with the hazards of smoking; and Dr. Luther Terry, former Surgeon General of the United States, who this week headed a world conference on smoking and health in New York City. They will be interviewed by ABC Science Editor, Jules Bergman.

Bergman. Dr. Terry, five hundred scientists from thirty-four countries met here this week at this first world conference on smoking in health. What did you accomplish? Can you stop people from smoking?

Terry. Well, you have a double question there. I think, in the first place, that we did have some very significant accomplishments as a part of this conference. In the first place, we brought up to date an understanding and discussion of the scientific facts related to smoking, not only the basic facts but many facts related to the psychological and sociological aspects of smoking and why people smoke. I think this is in meeting with our program people who are working out in the field, it's done a great deal to disseminate information to help give them new approaches.

One of the most important things I think was to get this group of five hundred people together and to get the unanimity of understanding of the health hazard of smoking so clearly brought out, understood and agreed upon.

Bergman. Scientists around the world feel the danger is common, feel that it is absolutely uniform. Are we stopping people from smoking?

Dr. Godber, you've had a unique experience in Britain that you reported on this week.

Godber. I think we've stopped people by persuading them to stop themselves. I don't think someone from outside can stop a man from doing that sort of thing, but in fact from 1961 on, after our own report in 1962, we did succeed in getting an appreciable number of people to give up smoking. We've got a million more non-smokers now than we had in 1961.

Bergman. And you brought out the rather dramatic fact, I thought, this week that British doctors who had stopped smoking showed a markedly lower rate of lung cancer.

Godher. Well, we've more lung cancer than you have in the United States. But British doctors began to get the evidence fifteen years and more ago, and they began to absorb it and to act on it. And in fact now not more than one in four of our doctors is smoking cigarettes only and regularly. Some of them smoke cigars, some of them smoke pipes, but less than half of them are smoking at all, and their reath rate from lung cancer has gone down by 30%, while the general male death rate from lung cancer has gone up by 25%. Because two-thirds of our people are still smoking, our men.

Bergman. Senator Moss, where does the Congress stand on this all-important issue? Do you feel you can stop people from smoking by legislation, or what?

Moss. Well, I don't think that we can ever just legislate to stop smoking. But I think there is an area for legislation in education and warning people about smoking. We took the first tentative steps of course last year when we required that a label be put on the package of cigarettes. It was rather a milktoast and tentative sort of warning, and it is hoped now, and there is a bill now pending that would beef up that warning greatly, saying that cigarettes are harmful to health, and may cause lung cancer and other diseases.

I think that we need to do this. I think we need to be more direct. I think we need additional requirements such as requiring the printing of the amount of tar and nicotine in the cigarettes that are contained in the package, which is one of the things that it's an additional warning, but I don't believe that it's in the cards to just make a flat prohibition against smoking. It's a matter of education and getting the message through as to the effects, the bad effects there are that come from smoking, and especially getting it to our younger people.

One of the things that we've noticed in the United States since the Surgeon General's report came out is that a number of our adults have voluntarily stopped smoking; about a million of them a year give up smoking. But at the same time the young ones come on, and at least as many and probably a few more than give it up. So we're not gaining very much. We have just about as many smokers now as we had before we started any legislation in this field.

Bergman. And cigarette sales, Dr. Terry, do continue to show a slight increase.

Terry. Total sales, yes. Actually, per capita consumption is remaining over the recent months, has remained about the same or has actually dropped some. So that it does represent a reversal in trend of what we had over a period of years where there were, even the per capita consumption was rising steadily every six months and every year.

Well, at least this has plateaued off now and is showing a tendency to drop.

Bergman. Dr. Godber, what has happened in England where cigarette advertisements have been banned from television these past two years?

Godber. Well, things began to happen before the ban on television advertising, and there has been a reduction, not yet a big reduction, but there has been a reduction, and it's still continuing. I'd like to see it go a lot faster.

Terry. In that respect I think we should give the British a great deal of credit for the real stimulation of one of the first comprehensive reports to come out on smoking and health, the Royal College of Physicians report which came out in '62.

Godber. In '62, yes.

Terry. And it was a real stimulus to move ahead faster with our studies in this country and elsewhere in the world.

Moss. I was going to say on this ban of cigarette advertisings on television that Britain has put into effect, we've taken a step in this direction now with the ruling of the Federal Communications Commission on the equal time doctrine, that if cigarette advertising is carried extolling the virtues of cigarette smoking that equal time must be allotted to educational programs explaining the hazards of cigarette smoking. I think this is a fine step forward. I hope that it can be wired and tied into the law and can be expanded.

I understand that the American Cancer Society has had a sudden demand for a lot of their spot educational spots on television since this ruling came out.

Bergman. Excuse me, gentlemen. In just a moment we'll be back with more issues.

Dr. Terry, Senator Kennedy threw a triple-barrelled basket of hand grenades into the legislative hopper this week to end the smoking hazard. Do you think that's the right way to go?

Terry. In general, yes, I think his objectives are correct in what he's trying to do. I might have some difference of opinion with regards to certain of the specific proposals. For instance, the question of taxing certain types of cigarettes more than others because they have a higher nicotine content. I'm not sure that this could successfully be done.

On the other hand, I'm quite in sympathy with the objectives which he's approaching.

Bergman. Senator Moss, I understand the bill which you and Senator Magnuson authored rating the tar and nicotine content on packages is first up in that legislative hopper. What chances, realistically, do you give Senator Kennedy's proposals?

Moss. Well, I think Senator Kennedy has some very good proposals, and I was happy to join him on one of his bills that he introduced in the Senate. I don't think, however, that it's likely that we'll have hearings set this year. I think it will be next spring or the beginning of next year's session before we can have hearings. I think that there's a reasonably good chance.

Of course, you're in a tough field here; the tobacco industry is a very large and lucrative industry, and it employs a lot of people. It goes clear back down to the tobacco farms as well as all the manufacturing and salesmanship and Madison Avenue sales and all of this. So naturally there will be a great deal of counter-pressure from those who have an economic interest.

However, it seems to me that the evidence is in, and it's almost crushing now as it takes hold, and the conference that we were talking about, the World Conference, was one more step along the way. As that evidence piles up more and more I think the members of the Congress are convinced that we must move in a counterattack, and at least inform our people and try to educate them about the dangers of cigarette smoking.

Bergman. Dr. Terry, many hospitals have removed cigarette machines. Now there's pressure to stop the airlines from their customary habit of giving away free packages of cigarettes.

Terry. Many hospitals have not only removed cigarette machines but you will frequently find signs in hospitals, "Please, No Smoking While in the Hospital."

Getting to the airline question, we in the National Interagency Council have been working towards this problem over a period of, oh, almost two years, in which we have made representations to the airlines requesting that they cease the gratis distribution of cigarettes. Fortunately, some of the smaller airlines have already made movement in that direction and have stopped the routine distribution. Recently we have had communication with Air Transport Association, and I think this is our greatest hope for action, because many of the larger companies are reluctant to stop this service unless their competitors do.

But I think there's a real hope that we'll get action in this respect.

Bergman. It looks like the bigger airlines are about to act.

Terry. I think so.

Moss. I think it's interesting that our military hospitals have cut out the distribution of cigarettes. It wasn't long ago that it was considered very patriotic for veterans organizations and others to send a lot of cigarettes to the hospitals for hospital service men. Now we've of course come full cycle and decided that we were harming them rather than helping them, and the military hospitals have cut it out entirely.

Bergman. Deep down, though, where is the real secret stopping the smoker from smoking, or stopping the youngster from acquiring the habit of smoking? You can do so much to legislate it out of action. You can increase taxes on higher tar content cigarettes the way Senator Kennedy proposes, you can lessen cigarette advertising, but somehow there's a secret psychological satisfaction of some kind the smoker seems to get out of the act of smoking. How do you beat that?

Moss. Well, if I may volunteer, being the layman on the panel here—and this has been a part of the discussion of the conference and other conferences, is that we need really great research in the psychological and the sociological factors surrounding smoking. We've pretty well—well, at least we've got a handhold on the medical results of smoking. But why is it that people want to smoke? And I'm not sure that we have the answers yet, and that's the reason there must be continued research. But in the meantime we at least ought to make it so that people know they have their eyes wide open when they take on the cigarette habit, that they're not only lessening their life span, but it may have some immediate detrimental effects on the body functions, and that knowing that they must at least jump in that hurdle in order to go into the smoking habit.

Terry. Related to the Senator's remarks I think it's very important for one to appreciate that one of the things that we made quite clear in calling this World Conference was that we were not here to discuss whether or not cigarettes were harmful to health. We feel very clearly that this has been established beyond any doubt. And this conference was directed more towards, well, what are we going to do about it since this has been established?

Bergman. Dr. Godber, what do you tell your young medical students, for example, to stop them from smoking?

Godber. Well, we certainly don't tell our young medical students enough. This is one of the disappointing things, that too many of the medical students are smoking. But this conference helps to bring out quite clearly that we've got a connected story to tell them now. We can tell them that just smoking at all limits physical capacity. We can tell them that if they go on they'll certainly suffer more sickness absence from work. And we can certainly say that they're more likely to suffer premature death from a number of things.

There's a connected story that's really convincing that we haven't put across yet. And Dr. Terry gave some credit to the British Royal College of Physicians for their first report. But the really significant publication of the last few years has been the report produced by the United States Public Health Service in the last few weeks. I think that's the biggest step forward we've had in a long time.

TERRY. It was a great step. You may recall that in the report of January, 1964, over three thousand articles bringing a review of the medical literature up to date at that time was embraced in this report. Then the present report, which has just been brought out by the Public Health Service, is one which covers an additional two thousand scientific articles published since that time, and gives us a great deal more current information as what might be called a supplement or an extension of the report published in January of '64.

BERGMAN. There's an amazing wealth of detail now present linking the hazard.

TERRY. Yes. By the way, if I may turn back to a question you were discussing with Dr. Godber a moment ago, in this country of persons in the age group and sex of our medical students the lowest incidence of smokers among the young people in this country is among medical students; and the next lowest is among dental students.

So I think it brings out quite clearly as with the same thing, a very low incidence of smokers among physicians, and getting lower all the time. I think it brings out quite clearly that people who can appreciate the scientific facts related to the health hazard of smoking, that you will find a response to it. And this is very clear among medical students and physicians too.

BERGMAN. I was fascinated by one report at the meeting from the Agency for International Development Medic who brought out the fact that men over 35 who smoke more than one pack a day in effect double their chances of dying.

TERRY. Yes, and much information is brought out in the recent report from Public Health Service with relation to overall life expectancy, and mortality, morbidity. As well as specific diseases. And it just amplifies the information which was brought out in 1964 and makes it even more completely convincing. I don't know how anyone could be doubt the question now.

BERGMAN. The British, Dr. Terry, have launched a massive advertising campaign against smoking. What does your group plan?

TERRY. We expect of course to expand our program. I think that the new ruling of the FCC will stimulate us to produce more material to make available to broadcasters to present. Actually, we have a shortage of such material now, so that we're going to need to put a great deal more money in this. We expect to continue the expansion of our programs with regards to youth education, whether we're doing it through civic groups or religious groups, or whatever.

You may recall that we started last year through the National Association of Parents and Teachers a large program directed at school children, in which the PTA's are cooperating in about twenty states, I believe, with the Inter-Agency Council and the National Clearing House, making information available to youngsters.

BERGMAN. Senator Moss?

MOSS. May I volunteer that I think perhaps part of the story that hasn't been told adequately is that there is an immediate effect such as illness and loss of work days which can be documented showing that those who are smokers and heavy smokers just have increased illness, they lose more days of work, and generally they have a health level that's below the average person.

I'm afraid that the idea up to now has been that, well, maybe you're going to die a few years earlier, and so a young fellow just brushes that off. He isn't thinking about when he's going to be sixty years old and worrying about getting in the bracket where he's going to die, until he gets near there.

But if he knows that right today it increases his chance of being sick and being out of work, et cetera, then perhaps the message will get through better.

TERRY. Since our report in '64 I think one of the things that I've had to continually combat is the impression and expression of so many people this was a report on smoking and lung cancer. Well, after all, lung cancer was only one part of the report, and there are many other diseases that are just as important and probably even more important in terms of the numbers of people involved, the disability and the deaths.

BERGMAN. Thank you very much, gentlemen. In just a moment we'll be back with more issues and answers.

There were other strong words on smoking this week from advertising executive Emerson Foote, Surgeon General William Stewart, and a call for legislation by Senator Robert Kennedy of New York:

KENNEDY. I introduced three bills today dealing with cigarettes and cigarette advertising. The first is a strengthened version of a bill requiring a warning in all advertising, and the warning would read: "Cigarette smoking is dangerous to health and may cause death from cancer and from other diseases."

The second bill would authorize the Federal Communications Commission to regulate the times and types of programs on which cigarette advertising may appear. And the overall volume of cigarette advertising as well.

These are self-regulatory steps that I think the industry should take, but as they have not taken them, as they have not seen fit to move in this field I think that the Federal Communications Commission should deal with the problem itself.

The third bill will establish a sliding scale on cigarettes. The current rate is four dollars per thousand cigarettes. It would remain on cigarettes with less than ten milligrams or .8 milligrams of nicotine. Others would be taxed at a higher rate, at a rate of fifteen dollars per thousand imposed on cigarettes with more than thirty milligrams of tar or 1.6 milligrams of nicotine. Eighteen brands of cigarettes would fall into this category, as would most of the hundred-millimeter cigarettes themselves.

This legislation would speed the development of low tar and low nicotine content for cigarettes and enable the public to spot the most dangerous cigarettes by the amount of their cost.

I would hope that the second Surgeon General's report would give impetus to the members of the Senate and the members of the House of Representatives to pass legislation which is so necessary. I think we'll only know that when the debate begins. But I think that this is extremely important. There wasn't a great deal of interest in passing legislation dealing with safety in automobiles. But we finally enacted it; and I think that there is public interest, public pressure, plus the interest and efforts of the Executive branch of the government that we could pass some legislation.

DR. WILLIAM STEWART. I personally feel that we do need some regulation of TV advertising of cigarettes, the right audience, something about the content. They're overpersuading.

BERGMAN. What kind of regulation do you advocate?

STEWART. Well, I can see regulation on time of showing TV commercials so that younger children are not exposed to them. I can see some regulation of content so that there is no symbolism of skiing, sporting, beautiful girls. I also would like to see the message added to it that cigarettes are hazardous to your health.

EMERSON FOOTE. A law enacted by Congress requiring a stern health warning in all cigarette advertising, a warning such as: "Cigarette smoking frequently leads to disease and death" might well result in the disappearance of cigarette advertising because those who pay for cigarette advertising might not wish to see such warnings fastened to it. I hope this will be the case.

But if cigarette manufacturers elect to continue advertising with such a warning as I've just suggested, an integral part of their copy, I feel sure it will do us more good than it will do them. One way or another, the disastrous effect of cigarette advertising on the health of our people, present and future, must be done away with.

BERGMAN. More points of view on how to deal with the hazards of smoking.

Thank you, gentlemen, for being with us today on Issues and Answers.

ANNOUNCER. Our guests were Sir George E. Godber, Chief Medical Officer of the British Ministry of Health; Dr. Lurther Terry, former Surgeon General of the United States; and Senator Frank Moss, Democrat of Utah. They were interviewed by ABC News Science Editor Jules Bergman.

Retains Rights to Ocean Floor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON FUQUA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1967

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, the vast wealth of the seas cannot be estimated by 20th century technology. Yet, we know that the potential is vast.

The United States has lately given more attention to the exploration of the seas, for it has been said that we know more about outer space than we do about the seas of our own planet.

I have presented a resolution (H.J. Res. 837) which would express the sense of the Congress that the seas not be placed under the jurisdiction of the United Nations as has been suggested by the tiny island of Malta.

Should we agree to such a proposal, we would be throwing away the vast sums of money we have invested and will invest to harvest the bounty of the seas. It would be an outright takeover by an unstable organization of most of the resources of this earth.

I certainly advocate peaceful exploration of the oceans and for international cooperation, but I see nothing to be gained by giving away all rights to ownership to the United Nations.

The day will come when we will need additional international rules and regulations. I understand and support that concept.

What I oppose is giving away ownership to the United Nations. We would thus be giving up rights and privileges which should not be restricted to Americans.

In this context I would like to include an enditorial from the Tallahassee, Fla., Democrat urging that our ocean floors be kept free.

I might add further that Tallahassee is the site of Florida State University, an institution that has taken the lead in oceanography research. Florida, with its great coastline, has a vital interest in a proposal such as this, and I submit that the resources of the sea are priceless. At one time it was felt that Alaska was a worthless piece of land. It was felt by many that the Louisiana purchase was sheer folly.

Giving away our rights to the ocean floors would be foolish and shortsighted for this Nation.

KEEP OCEAN FLOORS FREE

The wealth on the floor of the ocean is so great it can't even be imagined, let alone estimated—food, oil, gold, other rare and vital minerals.

Who owns it is a developing problem. Right now, it's finders-keepers with the various world governments getting their share mainly by taxation or attachment of the wealth when it comes ashore or produces income. Sooner or later, though, some government or company is going to make a strike so rich that it will be difficult to protect its investment from poachers operating under the doctrine of freedom of the seas. Obviously, some international rules and regulations will be needed.

Malta, a tiny island member of the United Nations, proposes that the U.N. assert its ownership of the ocean floors which lie beyond continental shelves. The Johnson administration is expected to oppose the suggestion in the U.N. General Assembly, and nearly a dozen resolutions have been introduced in Congress expressing opposition to U.N. ownership. These resolutions will get a hearing this week in a House committee headed by Rep. Dante Fascell of Miami.

We agree with sponsors of the resolution that it is at least premature, and probably inadvisable, to give ownership to the U.N.

The Malta plan offers the double attraction of international regulation and the means to finance the U.N., which so far has been mainly a drain on the United States treasury. But the U.N., under its present disproportionate line-up of members and the operating inhibitions of its charter hasn't shown it is capable of owning, managing or policing much of anything. Besides, the United Nations did no more to put that wealth on the ocean floor than any of us mortal individuals; so it has no more right to declare its ownership.

Perhaps some international law for protection of finders' rights would be in order with a severance fee to the supervising U.N. agency, if one is given the authority. However, let's leave something on this earth available for the free exploration and exploitation of those enterprising groups which are willing to take risks to find raw materials needed by mankind—and are willing to pay a fair share of their profits to the commonwealth. Ownership by the U.N., in its present state of inertia and confusion might cut off all effective exploration by making the potential profits too small for the risks.

Professionl Advice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 21, 1967

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, a very discerning editorial concerning the conduct of the war in Vietnam appeared in the September 17, 1967, issue of the State, in Columbia, S.C.

Under the title "Professional Advice," Editor W. D. Workman, Jr. draws attention to a recent letter by Lt. Gen. Edward M. Almond, U.S. Army, retired, to the Wall Street Journal. General Almond, a former commander of forces in Korea, and a respected officer with a distinguished record, writes that the political restrictions on the direction of the current war effort are "indefensive." He goes on to say:

> If the politicians initiate a war, they should either be willing to fight it themselves or turn it over to the military forces who have the knowledge to do so.

I realize that in these ties, wars can be more centrally controlled than they were before rapid communications. But I support General Almond and his many colleagues who believe strongly that there should be more national interest on winning this war, rather than in the unwarranted concern for establishing restrictions and over controlling the action from Washington.

Our present administration indulges too many fears over what might happen if they allowed our military leaders more positive direction of the war. Meanwhile, the conflict drags on, and we are daily suffering more casualties because of their shortsighted views.

I concur wholeheartedly with Bill Workman's remarks, that many of our military leaders would agree with General Almond if they were allowed to speak their minds.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROFESSIONAL ADVICE

Among military men whose experience qualifies them to speak out on the conduct of the Vietnamese war is Lt. Gen. Edward M. Almond, a three-star general who commanded major U.S. forces and operations in the Korean War.

Now retired, Gen. Almond shares the view of many of his colleagues—in and out of the service—who feel the war in Vietnam can and should be won. In a biting letter to *The Wall Street Journal*, Gen. Almond hangs the term "indefensive" upon the political restrictions which hamstring the military direction of the war effort.

"Any nation that engages in war," the general writes, "had better consider the ways to win it and not give way to its fears in the form of confrontation or escalation or other visions of destruction.

"If the politicans initiate a war, they should either be willing to fight it themselves or turn it over to the military forces who have the knowledge to do so."

We suspect that Gen. Almond could get a star-studded array of endorsements to that sentiment if our military leaders could speak their minds in contradiction to computerized calculations of Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara.

Wonju Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD H. POFF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1967

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, September 22, the city of Roanoke, Va., a part of the congressional district I am privileged to represent, will celebrate what has come to be known as Wonju Day.

In order that the other Members of the House and people in the Nation at large may have an opportunity to understand the true significance of this event and hopefully to pattern one of their own after it, I quote herewith the contents of the Wonju Day program published by the Sister City Committee:

> The Government's people-to-people program has provided a bridge between Roanoke, Virginia, and Wonju, Korea, which spans great differences in language, history and culture.
>
> But there are many similarities too between the international "sister cities" on opposite sides of the world which share a mountain background, equal population and important rail traffic.
>
> Roanoke and Wonju also share a friendship which dates back to 1964 when Dr. Young U. Kim, recalling the "hospitality and kindness" of Roanokers during his medical residence several years earlier, proposed the affiliation. Roanoke City Council authorized the relationship in May of that year and the project was turned over to the Roanoke Jaycees.
>
> An active pen-pal program between individuals, exchange of tapes, paintings by school children and art objects, visits from Wonju residents, and the hospitality shown Roanoke servicemen in Wonju soon made it clear the program had almost spontaneously grown beyond the Jaycees to include the entire community.
>
> So the International Municipal Cooperation Committee of Roanoke, Virginia, Inc., was chartered by Virginia as a non-profit corporation. Known as the Sister City Committee, it is composed of citizens who pay $1 annual dues and clubs which pay $25. An 11-member board runs the affairs of the organization.
>
> Wonju Day was inaugurated last September by the Hon. Hyun Chul Kim, Ambassador from the Republic of Korea. Since then, the committee has brought to Roanoke a medical social worker, Miss Dae Hoon Kim, for further study in her field at the city health department. A teacher from Wonju should soon arrive here for study, while Wonju is welcoming a Roanoker, Maj. Richard M. Hedrick.
>
> Each event continues to strengthen the ties of friendship between Roanokers and the citizens of their sister city in a rapidly progressing nation which is one of this country's closest allies.

The 150th Anniversary of Dunlapsville, Ind.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BIRCH E. BAYH

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 21, 1967

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, on September 24 the people of Dunlapsville, Ind., will be celebrating the 150th anniversary of the founding of that community. Located in Union County not far from the Ohio border in the east central section of the State, it is interesting to note that this town is only 1 year younger than the State of Indiana itself.

In commemorating its continuous existence for a century and a half, the residents of this pioneer settlement are observing a noteworthy landmark. I am pleased to call attention to this achievement, Mr. President, and ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD a short article from the Liberty Herald of September 8, 1967, describing the sesquicentennial program.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OBSERVANCE OF PLATTING DUNLAPSVILLE IS PLANNED

(By Mrs. Floyd Howard)

Did you ever live in Dunlapsville or the Dunlapsville community area? Did you ever attend school or church there? Were you a member of the school faculty, a bus driver, a cook or a janitor? Were you a member, committee worker or an officer of the Dunlapsville Parent-Teacher organization?

Did you ever attend a supper, carnival, Christmas program or a graduation at Dunlapsville? Were you a trustee who had any connection with Dunlapsville school? Or are you just a friend to the school and church? Well, you are invited to join with your former classmates and friends for church and a school reunion Sept. 24, 1967.

The residents of Dunlapsville and the Dunlapsville community and the Union County Historical Society join to announce the observance of the 150th Anniversary of the platting of Dunlapsville Sunday, Sept. 24. The actual platting date is Sept. 8, 1817 with the observance later in the month.

Continued efforts toward the program of the relocation and restoration of the Dunlapsville Covered Bridge brought statewide attention to this quiet residential town in Union county located five miles southwest of Liberty. This sesquicentennial observance will again bring visitors to this historic area. These simple events are planned around the two most important things to the pioneers and to people everywhere, church and education.

The historic 1839 Presbyterian church will hold church service at 10:30 a.m. The public is invited to re-visit this church which for so many years was a large part of the community. This is the time for all former members and anyone who ever attended or those interested in the preservation of such church landmarks to attend service in this church in the country which has seen little change over the years. Formerly the center of much community activity the church was the scene of Eighth Grade graduations for many years. The church was decorated with spring flowers, the class colors and a lofty motto to inspire the class members to continue their education. The speaker for the service will be announced later.

After church services, there will be a pitch-in dinner at the Dunlapsville school. Each family is requested to bring a well-filled picnic basket and join in the fellowship of the dinner and afternoon activities at the school. Old acquaintances will be renewed and there will be new family members to meet from the babies to the "proud-grand-parents!"

Start looking through your keepsakes for mementos to bring for display. If possible, prepare a card and attach it with the identification, the year and the owner of the exhibit. The display committee will announce when displays will be set up.

Work is being done on class lists. The committee is asking for people to take their class to list. Notification of the events will be mailed as fast as addresses are available.

Contact any of the following if you will help on lists, help work or have items to display: George Dragoo, Mr. and Mrs. Floyd Howard, Byron Nickels, Earl Frank, Mr. and Mrs. J. Louis Stanley, Miss Susan Judd, Mr. and Mrs. Glen Bryson, Mrs. Ruby Moore, Roy Coffman, Mr. and Mrs. Robert Bryson, Marsh Pouder, Mr. and Mrs. Clint Bryson, Mr. and Mrs. Virgil Beck, Mr. and Mrs. Marion Nash, Mr. and Mrs. Dick Howard or Mr. and Mrs. Clyde Kassens.

It's Our Stand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1967

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I insert the following poem, written by one of our American fightingmen in Vietnam, Sp4c. Tommy Walker of the 214th Combat Aviation Group, in the RECORD at this point:

IT'S OUR STAND

(By Sp4c. Tommy Walker)

I thought that I would stop a while
  And write a bit today.
About this world of ours,
  And the war so far away.

Now I know that many read of it,
  And see it on TV.
Sit back and say "Why worry,"
  It's thousands of miles across the sea.

You drive your fancy sportscars.
  You go and have your fun.
You worry not about this war,
  Or whether it'll be won.

You only live from day to day
  There in your sheltered home,
You never think of the soldiers
  Miles away, in Vietnam.

You take your girl to movies,
  You take her to the beach.
You take her to do all these things
  Because it's easy, they're in reach.

You laugh and joke about the war.
  About the guys that are over here.
You laugh and say you beat the draft.
  Then you say that you don't fear.

You have your fancy convertibles.
  You have your loads of fun,
While many of your good buddies
  Are walking in war with a gun.

We are fighting here in Vietnam.
  Each day always brings something new.
But freedom is what we are fighting for.
  And all these things we must do.

Yes, Vietnam is a strange, strange, place.
  It's a strange type of land,
But it will have its freedom some day
  The reason: we Americans will stand.

Crisis in the Cities: Rural America's Role

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT V. DENNEY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1967

Mr. DENNEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call my colleagues' attention to an excellent editorial that appeared last Sunday, September 17, 1967, in the Sunday Journal and Star. The editorial confirms the opinion expressed by me in my August 1 radio show, in which I pointed to the same problem and offered a similar solution. In fact, in October of 1966 I partially outlined a program along these lines aimed at revitalizing rural America and through this approach providing the ultimate solution for the urban problem. My staff is currently in the process of drafting legislation which hopefully, I can introduce early next year.

The editorial is as follows:

CRISIS IN THE CITIES: RURAL AMERICA'S ROLE

From President Johnson to the lowliest ghetto-dweller, Americans are becoming increasingly alarmed by the monumental problems of their cities. Yet scarcely anyone in the country is giving even the slightest attention to a major cause of the condition and an associated remedy.

This particular cause is the movement to the cities of rural and small town people, largely untrained in industrial skills and unprepared for big city living. While mostly disregarded, there is no disputing the impact this phenomenon has had on urban troubles.

More than 10 million persons moved from rural to urban areas during the 1950s, according to census figures. In a little noted report recently, Jonathan Lindley, deputy assistant secretary of the Economic Development Administration, blamed this on "the push of poor rural conditions rather than the pull of urban economic opportunities."

Moreover, Lindley forsees this city-bound trek of poor people from rural sections continuing into the mid-1970s. Perhaps by then everyone will have made the move.

The national president of the Farmers Union, Tony T. Dechant, took note of this situation and wondered, quite naturally, why big-city mayors and other urban authorities ignore rural and small town problems, the solution of which would help materially to ease the population pressures on the cities.

Many of these refugees from rural America would much rather stay put—if they could make a living there. At least some of the residents of the super-cities would gladly move to the less-congested and less-troubled sections of the country—if sufficient professional, intellectual and leisure opportunity could be found there.

The message in this reality is undeniable: one approach to the crisis in the cities is to develop many more off-the-farm jobs in rural areas and to create in these areas educational, cultural, recreational and other services comparable to those of the cities.

The message must be beamed in both directions: to the leaders of government and commerce in the nation and the cities and to the remaining people of rural America who would like to see a reversal of the population trends.

One force which is doing something about the problem is the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association.

In a recent full-page advertisement in the Washington Post, the NRECA proclaimed, "We believe it is time we use one of our nation's greatest assets . . . our uncrowded countryside . . . to help solve the problem which concerns us all."

The NRECA pointed out:

"In the towns and villages of rural America there are uncrowded streets and sidewalks. There is electric power and transportation. There are good roads to bring the products of hard-working people to the great market places.

"What rural America lacks are job opportunities. Of the nearly 14 million new jobs created in our country in the past 15 years, few were created in rural areas. Yet polls say half our population would like to live and work in rural areas."

One portion of the statement should be directed more to the people of Nebraska and other mid-America states than to the cities:

"We must start now to develop job opportunities, adequate hospitals and medical facilities, better schools and theaters and libraries, better water and sewer systems, and improved public services and facilities for industry in our rural areas. With them, rural America can meet the job hunger of its own people. It can provide the space and living room city people so desperately seek."

Here is an answer to the most frustrating domestic problem ever to face this nation. Its potential benefits cannot be ignored in the highest government and business councils of the land.

It will be up to the people and the leaders of regions such as Nebraska to make sure it is not ignored.

Nikola Petkov: Champion of Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1967

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, Monday, September 25, marks the 20th anniversary of the political martyrdom of the Bulgarian statesman and patriot, Nikola Petkov.

To commemorate the death of this hero, the Bulgarian National Committee, representing the anti-Communist Bulgarian emigrees and Americans of Bulgarian ancestry, will hold a memorial meeting in New York City.

The following day a religious service will be held here in Washington, D.C., at the Russian Orthodox Church in Petkov's memory, with a reception following in the evening.

On this occasion, I join my colleagues in saluting the courageous anti-Fascist, anti-Communist, democratic and liberal statesmen and people of Bulgaria, whose efforts and sacrifices are epitomized in the life of Nikola Petkov.

True nationalists, these persons have been made to suffer persecution, death, and exile because of their political beliefs. Bulgaria, their homeland, has been crushed under totalitarian governments and manipulated by stronger neighbors for decades.

We join our hearts and hands with them in the prayerful hope for a future in which Bulgaria will take its place among the truly free, independent, and democratic nations of the world.

In that time, truly, the memory and inspiration of Nikola Petkov will come to fruition. Then we will recognize the truth we hold so dear: Nikola Petkov did not die in vain so long as the memory of his courage inspires us to continue the fight for justice and liberty.

A Salute to Clyde T. Ellis, Able Rural Electric Leader

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1967

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I wish to pay tribute to a dynamic and dedicated American for the outstanding contributions which he has made to rural America in general and rural electrification in particular. I salute one of our former colleagues, Clyde T. Ellis, who has just announced his retirement as general manager of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association.

Clyde Ellis has served his country well, first in the State legislature of his native Arkansas, then as a Member of the House of Representatives, and later as the dynamic leader of the national association of the nearly 1,000 rural electric cooperatives which provide electricity in rural areas of 46 States.

In the 25 years it has been my privilege to serve in the Congress, I have seen firsthand the wonderful work which has been accomplished by the rural electrics in electrifying rural America. And the 10 rural electric cooperatives in my home district have done much more than simply providing lights to their almost 45,000 consumer members and their families. The power furnished by these co-ops is helping our farmers produce the food and fiber which make our Nation the best fed and best clothed in the world. That co-op power is also a vital ingredient in the revitalization of the rural economy by making possible the recreational and rural industrial developments which are so important to rural areas development.

Mr. Speaker, the 25 years I have served in the Congress parallel the 25 years that Clyde T. Ellis has been general manager of NRECA, so I have had the opportunity and pleasure of working with Clyde many times on matters of importance to the rural electrification program. I have found him to be a man of great knowledge, vision and dedication.

I was very pleased to learn that Clyde Ellis will continue to serve the cause of rural electrification in the capacity of special consultant to NRECA. In this way, the rural electrics—and rural America—will continue to benefit from his experience and talents.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that many of my colleagues in the House who know and admire Clyde T. Ellis join me in saluting him for his numerous contributions to the social and economic welfare of the Nation. We wish him well in his new role as NRECA general manager emeritus, special consultant to NRECA, and young-in-spirit elder statesman of the rural electrification program.

A Letter to the President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN L. McMILLAN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1967

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a copy of a letter addressed to me and the President of the United States from Maj. Hughes A. Robinson, retired. I have known Mr. Robinson for several years and I am certain he is very much concerned over the crime situation now existing in this country.

FORT VALLEY, GA.,
August 7, 1967.

To the President of the United States of America:

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Inquires and investigations are being made in order to determine the origins and causes of disturbances resulting into violence and looting in many metropolitan centers of the United States. The idea has been advanced that riots among Negroes can be restricted or discontinued if the causes were known.

It requires no sage to determine the circumstances which gave rise to civil disobedience in our metropolitan centers. The memory of our citizens is not so deranged as to forget the concerted effort made by Martin Luther King, Jr., to discredit the local law enforcement authorities in various centers in the South just a few years ago. He went into such cities as Albany, Georgia; Birmingham, Alabama; Selma, Alabama; Montgomery, Alabama; St. Augustine, Florida; and Danville, Virginia, and in each city, he staged marches, and in said mraches he carried with him professional agitators and hoodlums from other states, and instructed the to provoke local enforcement officers to such action as to embarrass the local police. Martin Luther King, Jr., refused to commence Marches in locations where permits for said marches were easy to obtain. On purpose the *early marches were designed to discredit the police on the local level*. Why? The answer to this question is the answer to the origins of the riots among Negroes in the United States. Any local community, be it Negro or White, resented outside agitators and hoodlums coming into their community for the specific purpose of disturbances of the kind that would erupt into conflict with constitutional authorities. Martin Luther King, Jr., directed his Corps of Hoodlums to obey only the local ordinances that he, Martin Luther King, Jr., deemed just, and he ordered his followers to disregard all laws that he, Martin Luther King, Jr., decided were not reasonable and just.

Martin Luther King, Jr., organized and trained a Corps of agitators, professional rabblerousers, and hoodlums to accompany him from state to state for the specific purpose of participating in marches, and with the idea of creating situations in which disturbances would arise in such manner as to embarrass the local police, and thereby provide an opportunity to cry out "police brutality". It is observed that Martin Luther King, Jr. would never end a March until violence erupted even though he pretended to preach nonviolent.

There seemed to have been a conspiracy between Martin Luther King, Jr., and certain newspapers, commentators, radio, and television management: it is observed that the news media was always on the spot when Martin Luther King, Jr., arrived, and the same news media always pictured Martin Luther King, Jr., in the right and local constitutional authorities in the wrong. This is still being done. The television seemed to have been assigned as public relations agency for Martin Luther King, Jr., and special efforts seemed to have been put forth to glamorize all agitators, rabblerousers, and hoodlums associated with Martin Luther King, Jr.

Men, such as James Farmer with the Congress of Racial Equality, and John Lewis and James Forman with the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, were inspired by the news coverage of Martin Luther King, Jr., and they went further in connection with the program designed to discredit the local police and the constitutional authorities in each community in which marches were held in 1964, 1965, 1966, and 1967. Floyd McKissick succeeded James Farmer while Stokely Carmichael, and H. Rap Brown have since taken over the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee with their slogan of "Black Power." The newspapers, radio and television management, together with their commentators, must share the blame, with the so-called Civil Rights Leaders, disguised as such but representing only the hoodlums, for riots among Negroes in the United States.

The appropriation of One Hundred Billions for poverty programs each year will not eliminate disturbances, riots, and looting unless the cause is first removed: namely, demonstrations and inflammable speeches by the professional agitators, self-appointed Negro leaders, and rabblerousers. You cannot satisfy the lust for power and prestige by agitators, and rabblerousers with money, however large amounts that may be channeled into Negro communities by the Federal government.

Large amounts of money channeled into Negro communities only invite more riots instead of less; it is impossible to resolve social ills of any community with an invitation to remain idle and depend more and more upon government financial support for those who have no desire to improve their individual status. There must be an incentive on the part of each citizen to clean up his home, his yard, and keep his house in order. Certain types of Negroes, and I am among those myself, resent the Federal government encouraging the hoodlums with cash at the expense of the tax payer. There have been no riots in the "so-called ghettos" in either Alaska or Hawaii where minority groups of one type or that of another also have among them the "so-called ghettos". Why not? There have been no self-appointed leaders and professional agitators who spend their entire time stirring up disturbances and inflaming the minds of the youths of those two states with propaganda against constitutional authorities. Until such time as demonstrations, agitators, self-appointed Negro leaders, and rabblerousers are removed from the streets of our metropolitan centers, riots will continue notwithstanding enormous amounts of the taxpayer's money being appropriated and channeled into sections of the city or metropolitan centers where riots have been observed to have commenced by the hoodlums of the same locations.

There is much discussion going on in high places with regard to a conspiracy being involved in disturbances resulting into riots; it is my view that a definite conspiracy exists between Martin Luther King, Jr., and certain radio and television commentators. It is observed that when Martin Luther King, Jr., carried his campaign into Albany, Georgia, Birmingham, Alabama, Selma, Alabama, and Danville, Virginia, Martin Lurther King, Jr., and his Corps of Rabblerousers did every act possible in order to create a situation in which the local police would be both embarrassed and charged with "Police Brutality". In this connection, in each case, Martin Luther King, Jr., seemed to have received 100% support of Northern commentators and radio and newspapers from the North, plus the management of all leading television companies with headquarters outside of the South. Regardless of the circumstances, the commenators sided against the constitutional authorities and in favor of Martin Luther King, Jr., and his Corps of professional agitators, disguised as Civil Rights leaders.

It is further to be observed that the Honorable J. Edgar Hoover is given the responsibility for matters involving the internal security of the nation. In this connection, approximately 95% of commentators for radio and television companies from the North sided against Mr. J. Edgar Hoover and in favor of Martin Luther King, Jr., when there were statements made with regard to Martin Luther King, Jr., being a "notorious liar", and many went so far, including Walter Cronkite, as to ridicule the distinguished Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and referred to the Honorable J. Edgar Hoover, over national television, as being senile and made concerted efforts to force the resignation of the Chief of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. This is evidence of a conspiracy between radio-television and Martin Luther King, Jr., to destroy the United States with the use of hoodlums and mob leaders.

Were it not for publicity that was made available to Martin Lurther King, Jr., by certain newspapers, magazines, commentators for certain radio and television companies, the demonstrations would have disappeared from the streets of our cities long ago, and the opportunities which had arisen for hoodlums and criminals to be glamorized would have ceased to exist, thereby eliminating the causes and the origins for disturbances and riots among the Negroes in the United States.

The foregoing pages enumerated the causes and origins of riots. They will continue if the professional agitators and rabblerousers are permitted in our streets with their inflammable speeches and interference with normal traffic, and the protection of the law when they, themselves, disregard, continuously, constitutional authority and local police.

An appropriation of large sums of money by the Congress of the United States for "so-called Ghettos and Poverty programs" will only encourage the professional agitators and rabblerousers to further arouse hoodlums to start disturbances for the specific purpose of extracting from the Congress still more large sums, much of said money being channeled into the hands of the very people who sponsor disturbances.

HUGHES ALONZO ROBINSON,
Major, Army of the United States (ret.)

The Late Honorable Brent Spence

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN C. WATTS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1967

Mr. WATTS. Mr. Speaker, it can be truthfully said that Brent Spence gave his life to the House of Representatives and the constituency he served so capably and well for many years.

I am sad and deeply grieved at the passing of this great statesman from Kentucky.

Brent Spence will go down in history for his dedicated loyalty to America, his willingness to allow each the opportunity to express his views, his fairmindedness, and his sound judgment. His long service as chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee earned him the respect and admiration of his colleagues. He was a giant among men and I was one of the fortunate ones to share his friendship and to benefit from his wise counsel and advice over the years.

Panama Canal Treaty a Threat to Hemisphere

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1967

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, as many of my colleagues know, I am deeply concerned over the proposed Panama Canal treaty which the President and his advisers developed. On several occasions in this Chamber during the last 2 months I have spoken of the threats to the United States which are inherent in the proposed agreements.

Once again I would like to call my colleagues' attention to this ill-written plan—this time by way of an editorial from the Monday, September 18, Nashville Banner, as follows:

PANAMA CANAL TREATY A THREAT TO HEMISPHERE

Brig. Gen. James D. Hittle, USMC, (Ret.) recently spotlighted the inherent dangers involved in abandoning U.S. control over the Panama Canal through negotiation of a new treaty.

The geenral, director of National Security and Foreign Affairs for the Veterans of Foreign Wars, made two points:

Fidel Castro is counting on U.S. relinquishment of the Canal Zone as a basis for scuttling the deal whereby Cuba now is bound to recognize this nation's right to maintain its naval base at Guantanamo.

A pull-out from Panama would be the first step by which the Russians hope to attain control of the Caribbean.

Gen. Hittle's warning is not idle speculation. It is grounded in fact. Havana Radio (Castro's mouthpiece) more than a year ago bluntly stated that "the standards of modern times apply everywhere, and Guantanamo—just as Panama—is an anachronistic survival of colonialism."

It now is evident that Premier Alexei Kosygin and Castro are covertly working to promote the pending Panama Canal Treaty as a prelude to demands that we also get our military forces off that Cuban base. With a Panama pull-out as a precedent, they can be expected to renew their tirades for that.

Gen. Hittle's apprehension is shared by other able military leaders who agree that control of the Caribbean by Russia would pose an intolerable threat to Western Hemisphere defenses.

As Gen. Hittle put it: "Once we agree to relinquishing control over it (the Canal) we have lost our freedom of action in protecting our strategic lifeline and the whole hemisphere."

One thing Congress should bear in mind in the consideration of any one of the several Panama Canal treaties before it for action is that success of the Red scheme to nose us out of the Caribbean hinges on U.S. ratification. With that trophy tucked under their belt, Kosygin and Castro could then proceed to put Operation No. 2 into action—an effort to boot us out of Cuba.

It should be quite clear that ratification of the proposed Panama Canal Zone treaty would move the world closer to the day when

Russian submarines would be able to prowl Caribbean waters in comparative safety.

It is a canny Communist trap to avoid.

Raw Deal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1967

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, James Madison said a long time ago:

> I believe there are more instances of the abridgement of the freedom of the people by the gradual and silent encroachments of those in power . . . than by violent and sudden usurpations.

The vacillating, indecisive and mixed up policies of the Johnson administration—which is terror stricken at the thought of war escalation in Vietnam—have been escalating the loss of freedom which the people of this Nation have been experiencing through the many years of the New Deal, the New Frontier, and the Great Society. Our people have truly been the recipients of the "raw deal."

Sold as a "rediscovery of the consumer," by the administration, the expensive consumer specialist, Betty Furness, is busy selling L.B.J., via Madison Avenue techniques, to the American public. She says he has started the "most ambitious and comprehensive consumers' program a President ever presented to Congress."

What has he done for the consumer? What he has done can better be characterized as "to" rather than "for." The inflation caused by his wild spending has robbed every housewife of a portion of her grocery budget. It has inflated the cost of every repair, every loan for whatever purpose, and every type of education. It has motivated businessmen, harassed by restrictions and tax upon tax, to seek every avenue of sales pressure, with growing instances of unethical activity being inevitable. He has "protected" the consumer by making sure he doesn't have sufficient money to buy too many things and thereby reducing his chances of being "taken."

Judging from his activities while serving as Secretary of Defense, Robert Strange McNamara is one of the most scrambled of the mixed-up whiz kids in Washington. The most charitable description of him would be to call him stupid, but it would hardly be an accurate characterization.

The news columns of the Nation have included almost daily instances of contradictory statements by this amazingly tenacious Secretary. A few months ago, he issued a dispatch to the UPI stating that he was calling upon the whole Military Establishment to give "maximum disclosure of information except for that which would be of material assistance to potential enemies." Later developments make one wonder whether he was in truth referring to political enemies of the administration rather than to foreign nations.

On the same day that the "full disclosure" order was reported, the good Secretary suppressed the facts accompanying the award of contracts for the TFX plane. Rejecting the recommendation of acknowledged experts, the Secretary favored the higher bidder with the award, calling for a price tag of $2.9 million each. The price is now up to $8 million, and is still climbing, as military men put it, "higher and faster than can the plane itself, as it is overweight and underpowered." As one Washington wag puts it:

> This just about sums up the Great Society in general.

Again ignoring the recommendations of military experts and the demands of many Congressmen, Secretary McNamara refused to bolster our defenses and, in fact, in the view of many of us, actually weakened them by decisions regarding the Strategic Air Command. In 1963 he urged the Russians to get more missiles so they would be on a par with us. They took his advice and keep building antiballistic missiles at the rate of 240 a year and putting them in hardened—shielded against enemy missiles—silos. They are equipping them with warheads which spray out like a shotgun blast upon reentry into the atmosphere.

Now the Secretary announces that we will spend $5 billion on a defense system, but that it would be foolish to spend more to protect the people—that it would be more practical to further develop our offenses. If we had, and continued to have, the vast military superiority we once had, and made it unmistakably clear that we had the capability, and would use it, of massive retaliation, as ex-President Eisenhower expressed it, Mr. McNamara's policy might make sense. But no such believable warning can be expected from this pussyfooting administration.

The State Department has an equally long history of addled operation. One of the reasons the United States is in so much trouble around the world is that we have more "experts" working at it. Prior to World War II, the State Department had approximately 6,000 employees. The population explosion hit there, too, and they now have 44,000 and are seeking more men and money all the time. Too infrequently does Congress block the efforts of this "diplomatic" corps to give away American jobs. They take away from American firms, and give, as good will bribes to foreigners, business that makes such jobs possible. One of the rare instances occurred last week when we did succeed in blocking the award of shipbuilding contracts to the British. The direct result of such State Department bribery has been a proportionate decline in the respect in which we are held by its recipients.

The Johnson administration piously deplores the effect on American business and American jobs when the Congress takes steps to reduce the ability of foreign nations to supply North Vietnam. The President warned last week that restrictions on exports to countries dealing with North Vietnam will "cost American businessmen $1.5 billion and Americans 150,000 jobs."

Yet he takes no cognizance of the heavier loss of life resulting from that trade. Our exports reaching Haiphong Harbor become part of the military resupply which enables the Vietcong to continue fighting and more effectively to kill and wound our boys. At the same time, it prolongs the war and increases the monetary cost of its prosecution.

Every American family is disturbed and apprehensive about the rapidly escalating crime rate. Violent crime in the United States soared 18 percent during the first half of 1967. The number of robberies jumped 30 percent. Congress made it unlawful to counsel others to refuse or evade the draft registration or service in the Armed Forces, setting a penalty of 5 years imprisonment and a fine of up to $10,000 for violation.

The Justice Department, bolstered by Supreme Court decisions, takes little or no action against criminals, even indicating that they do not intend to prosecute such individuals as Martin Luther King, Stokely Carmichael and others who have been publicly urging men to evade the draft.

In 1962 Congress sought to bar deliberate fraud in award of military contracts without competitive bidding. In a review of 186 major prime and subcontracts since then, the General Accounting Office found that only 20 met conditions of the law. Scores of other contracts were awarded during the 4-year period, but this sampling was enough for the Comptroller General to charge the Defense Department with failure to obey the law. Total value of the contracts involved is approximately $600 million. Yet the Justice Department has not taken the slightest action against McNamara.

Our Attorney General apparently should have taken more lessons from his fine father, and listened a lot less to the liberal professors who taught him. He would then have realized that the oath of office he took obliged him to enforce the law as it is written, not as he would like to have it written, and that such enforcement should not be altered in the slightest, whether the offender is unknown or infamous.

President Johnson submitted to our committee a proposed budget of $135 billion. In 6 months he raised this to $144 billion, blaming the increase on the Vietnam war, in spite of the fact that some 55 percent of the budget is for domestic, nondefense spending in support of his Great Welfare Society. In the 1960–68 period, such spending increased by 97 percent. From 1965 to 1968, it increased by 39 percent—referring to fiscal years.

If it were possible that Mr. Johnson honestly erred by $9 billion 6 months earlier, it is an indictment of the inadequacy of his administration. If he erred intentionally, his action is completely reprehensible.

Ways and Means Committee members are now repeating the demand made upon the President at the time the Congress first refused to pass the $9 billion raise in the debt ceiling. They want to know where spending will be cut on nonessential matters. As before, the administration remains absolutely silent on reduction of spending while stepping up the pressure for a tax increase.

President Theodore Roosevelt once said:

> We have room in this Country but for one flag, the Stars and Stripes . . . We have room but for one loyalty . . . loyalty to these United States.

That is more true today than ever, and we have no room for the type of individuals who make up so much of this administration in Washington.

The Home of the Brave?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. E. (BILL) BROCK

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1967

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to offer for my colleagues' consideration an article entitled "The Home of the Brave?" which appeared in the August 21 issue of the Chattanooga Times.

There is little I can add to what is so powerfully stated here. But, I can say that we all should profit from a careful reading of these lines.

The man who has not sensed the "smell of fear" in our American atmosphere has not sniffed the air. It is time that we in Congress shoulder our responsibilities and move to combat the forces that threaten the very existence of our Nation.

Under unanimous consent I insert this article in the Appendix of the RECORD:

THE HOME OF THE BRAVE?

(By J. C.)

Fear has a smell all its own.

Those who have known the face of war and those who have played contact sports—boxing, wrestling, football—remember the sharp smell of perspiration just before the contest. It is the same whether we be frightened by men or animals, by guns or by height, by fear of death or grave hurt of any sort.

Today the atmosphere of our whole country is sharp with the acrid smell of fear.

Why is it?

Here are some of the reasons:

One is that we have little faith in the ability of ourselves or our leaders to stem the rising tide of ill manners, arrogance, and violence that threaten us. There is a vacuum of strong leadership—of those who are willing to speak bluntly the heavy, unpleasant words that sometimes need to be spoken to a child, to an immature and unreasonable adult, or even to an animal. We are, you must remember, part animal ourselves, and we react like animals sometimes.

Will there be any who will stand up, careless of praise or criticism, to tell us all that we must behave responsibly or suffer for it? Perhaps even suffer death?

We are sick and tired of politicians who talk out of both sides of their mouths and who want to be all things to all people.

Another reason is that we are beginning to doubt the invincibility of our riches. For the past couple of centuries we have, as a nation, become increasingly wealthy at an unheard of rate, thanks to "the unearned increment" of our land. Money and the making of money have become our god—and we are beginning to discover that the golden calf we worshipped has bitter breath.

We still shamelessly seek to buy the love of our neighbors, domestic and foreign, forgetting that not even friendship, much less love, can be bought.

There is an element of Neville Chamberlain at Munich in our fawning over the poor, both here and abroad, whether they be deserving or undeserving, and in our sackcloth and ashes apologetics over the natural inequality of people.

Money, alas, is not going to save us, either on the domestic or foreign fronts.

And the realization of this causes fear, because, alas, money is all that so many of us have.

Still another cause of our fear is our sudden awareness that we are at present perhaps arranging and making installment payments on our own funeral.

We are promoting civic disorder and insurrection, by tolerating those who incite riots. The Stokely Carmichaels and Rap Browns are no more deserving of liberty than cholera-infested animals. Why is it that we hesitate to do something about them before it is too late?

We are augmenting the forces of revolution and destruction by financing them. We give relief money and ask no work in return for it. We have replaced the natural laws of rewards and punishments with an artificial law of rewards only. (By so doing we destroy all hope of developing motivation!) Even in our law enforcement, we apologize to the criminals and insist on putting their interest ahead of that of their victims and of society. Is it any wonder that the morale and efficiency of our police system suffer?

We have developed a cult of lawlessness—and the most ironic thing is that Washington, D.C., is probably the outstanding example of it.

And aren't we also afraid because we are beginning to see that we really don't understand nearly so much as we thought we did?

We obviously misunderstood the propriety of democracy for Africa. We're beginning to doubt that it can possibly be proper in Vietnam.

Obviously we were mistaken in our assumption that we could "win" without winning in Vietnam.

Only now are we beginning to comprehend the diabolic cunning of our international enemies in staring "brush fire" wars all over the world to disperse our forces and to divide our efforts and strength.

We have seen our faith in the mythology of the equality and dignity of man severely shaken—and have realized that merely "being concerned" is not enough. The desperate danger of our quick-time "progress" toward "pure democracy" is becoming more obvious every day. We're beginning to realize that it is but an invitation to anarchy.

It's individuals who count—or don't count—and collectivism has well nigh destroyed individualism.

But we must not forget that fear is actually a healthy reaction, though mere anxiety is not.

Fear is given us by God to warn us of danger—nor is it cowardly to fear.

(How interesting that our leaders now exhort us to prayers for racial peace, after doing so much to divorce our government from any God-orientation!)

No—courage is not the lack of fear. It is, instead, the doing of what has to be done despite the fear.

Cowardice is to not do one's duty.

Now is the time for responsible people everywhere, of all races and economic conditions, to stand up and be counted, realizing that the struggle today is not between black and white or rich and poor, but between the Responsibles and the Irresponsibles.

If we can, even at this late hour, rally the forces of Responsibility—if we can find the courageous leadership we so desperately need—then the smell of fear that presently pervades our land will indeed have served us well.

And the way we answer this challenge to Responsibility will truly tell us and the whole world whether America is, indeed, the home of the brave!

Steel Feels Peril of Import Squeeze

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1967

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, David Lawrence's column in the Washington Evening Star, of September 18, entitled "Steel Feels Peril of Import Squeeze," caught my attention because there is a definite parallel between the problems of domestic steel producers and domestic agriculture. I have long been concerned with the effects of price-depressing imports on agriculture and obviously the same economic factors are being felt in the steel industry.

Because of low labor costs and practically no tariff barriers, many steel products as well as agricultural commodities can be produced abroad and delivered to any part of the United States at prices less than domestic producers can offer.

Mr. Lawrence's column clearly substantiates the need for Congress to impose restrictions curbing the easy flow of ruinous imports into our country. The column follows:

STEEL FEELS PERIL OF IMPORT SQUEEZE

The steel industry is in serious trouble. Congress is being urged to help it out by giving the President power to stabilize the import of steel which have been depriving the American companies of approximately 12.5 percent of domestic steel consumption.

Textiles and dairy products also have been adversely affected by an increase in imports.

The situaton in steel has arisen because foreign producers are enjoying much lower labor costs as well as the benefits of a gradual removal of tariff barriers by this country. At the same time, American export of products to other lands has been encountering trade restrictions.

The steel industry of this country has been trying in the last two years to get Congress to do something about the situation, but the efforts have thus far failed.

It appears now that the steel companies may seek what has been called a more practical approach. Instead of requesting temporary levies or tariffs, the American companies are inclined to support a formula whereby steel imports would be limited by the establishment of quotas.

There are some analysts who feel that the steel industry could compete in the long run with foreign producers if the imports were held at present levels. What steel men really fear is the possibility of losing 20 to 25 percent of domestic production in the future if no restraints are applied at this time.

The most recent figures show that the steel industry has the lowest return on equity capital invested of any of the 35 leading industries in this country. The average for the last five years has been 7.6 percent, as contrasted with a return of 14.4 percent a decade ago.

Just the other day, Secretary of Commerce Trowbridge had a meeting with the heads of the leading steel companies, at which Gardner Ackley, chairman of the President's council of economic advisers, frowned upon the recent price increases and implied that extreme measures might be required if there were any further raises. The producers, however, made it clear that they had been left no choice but to move up their prices on selected products.

Some of the steel men call attention to the fact that the automobile industry has lifted its prices higher, relatively speaking, than have the steel companies. It is pointed out that, in an automobile selling for $3,000, the steel used costs only about $250 to $275

The automobile companies, however, have found it necessary to increase their prices even more than the added cost of steel because they, too, are confronted with higher labor costs. It is evident that the principal reason why automobiles are rising in price is not the higher cost of materials in the car but the increased labor costs of putting together an automobile.

Some of the basic steel products can be manufactured abroad and delivered today to any part of this country at a price which is less than the American companies can offer, even though the latter's only transportation charges are from plants within the United States. Foreign producers sold here during 1966 at least 11 million tons of steel, which represents approximately 75,000 jobs that would have been available to American steelworkers.

The administration has not yet shown concern over the plight of the steel industry. A surprising factor also is that more has not been heard from the labor unions about the threat which the steel industry faces. But they now are beginning to take a deeper interest in the subject.

Unlimited competition from abroad could gravely endanger the position of American steel companies, and, as their stocks become less attractive for purchase by the public, difficulties might be encountered in obtaining the capital needed for constant replacement of plant facilities.

There are evidences of a growing demand for action by Congress—at least to hold steady the volume of imports and to prevent any substantial increase in the future.

The Spirit of '76 (Trombones, That Is)

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1967

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, "76 trombones hit the counterpoint"—and the boys of River City marched away from the pool table into purposeful activity. Of course the "Music Man" was written about an era before girls, too, joined bands and drill teams, but the reasons for having just such a band are as true today as they were in the era when Meredith Wilson's Professor Hill suggested a boys band as a way to keep the River City "young ones moral after school."

Professor Hill was right. There was trouble right there in River City. Well, we have got trouble today, too, in Newark, in Detroit, in Hampton Beach, and a whole long list of et ceteras. But on the bright side, we have got several regiments of young people who, instead of turning their youthful energy against society, are spending their after-school hours practicing, rehearsing, drilling, and working for money to support their activity: the drum and bugle corps. The youths who join these units have found a very worthwhile way of using their time. It may not keep them off the streets, but it keeps them off the sidewalks.

But there are better reasons for drilling with drum and bugles than killing time. The drum corps keeps kids away from the pool halls and Cap'n Billy's Whiz Bang because it teaches them character, an idea as old-fashioned as the sight of 76 trombones in the big parade, but one we miss just as much. The drum corps drill promotes discipline, responsibility, reliability, precision, attention to dress and grooming, respect for authority, cooperation, creativity, and a striving for a perfection which, if attainable only in theory, still inspires high standards of performance.

We try very hard to install these traits in youth, but as long as we use only words, we rarely succeed. Youngsters know the trust that actions mean more than words, and they learn character when they see that they need it for their activities. It takes a high degree of self control to make a drum corps go, and these youth learn that quickly.

A drum and bugle corps is a hobby, but it is more than just a hobby. It produces an impressive musical performance that is almost an integral part of our folk culture. It is a part of our folk art, and requires the dedication that art demands. It is a drill team and competitive unit, and instills the pride and poise that comes from athletics.

From each of these aspects of drum and bugle drill, something can be learned: the musical art fosters creativity and dedication; the drill—precision and perfection; the competition—perfection and group cooperation; and all of these traits, separately and combined, produce discipline, responsibility, and reliability.

I find it very fitting that we recently observed International Drum Corps Week in honor of the music men and women of America who have devoted their time and energy to the traditions of the drum and bugle corps. By their example, they have shown what a reward it can be to:

> Get your kicks
> With horns and sticks.

It Bears Repeating

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. CORMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1967

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, from time to time the Christian Science Monitor has pointed out editorially that our racial troubles are not beyond solving.

In an editorial on August 30, the Monitor commented again on our need to take hold of the opportunities we have to battle what is admittedly a tremendous problem, but one that can and must be solved quickly.

I insert this timely editorial in the RECORD:

OPPORTUNITY FOR PROGRESS

Paul wrote to the Romans: ". . . the good that I would I do not: but the evil which I would not, that I do." This wise comment on men's actions would seem to apply with particular force to the racial situation in the United States today.

Although Americans in general accept the vision of a society without discrimination or artificial barriers, and although the nation as a whole is committed to equality of rights, opportunities and obligations for all, progress in these fields is too often frustrated by a kind of perversity which finds men taking wrong steps and neglecting right ones.

Seldom in American history has there appeared to be greater confusion over the ways and means of achieving a right goal than prevails today on the urban social crisis. Nor is this surprising. It is frequently found that, when a man, a group or a nation is called upon to meet a dire emergency, he or it is assailed by a flood of conflicting thoughts, discouraging doubts, and frightening imaginations. Unless faced and thrust aside, these would becloud one's vision, and paralyze action.

On the other hand, it has been truly said that devotion to an honest achievement makes the achievement possible. The United States must solve its racial crisis, and it must solve it with the least possible delay. Every wasted day makes the problem more severe. The challenge must be tackled quickly, decisively and wisely. If so, this honest achievement can be won.

The danger today is that too many persons have begun to say that the problem is too big, that it is intractable, that the nonwhites are irresponsible in their demands and that the whites remain unyielding. If these statements were true, then the United States would indeed be in a desperate way.

But that is not remotely the case. There is in the United States a fund of knowledge, of skill, of wealth, and, above all, of good will which put it fully within America's capacity to solve this admittedly tremendous problem. The need is to fight back against the forces of confusion, apathy and discouragement.

These columns have stated before, and we believe that it bears repeating, that the racial crisis has arisen at this time because the moment is ripe for solving it. The unfoldment of history has a practice of doing just this. Seen in this light, the urban crisis is an opportunity for progress rather than an indication of national retrogression.

The Outstanding 28th National Guard Division of Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1967

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, recently there has been much criticism aimed at the leadership and administration of the National Guard of the several States. If applicable to some, this criticism is not universally applicable to all of the Guard.

The Pennsylvania National Guard in the past several months has performed exceedingly well and has achieved or exceeded the standards established by the Department of the Army.

The 28th Infantry Division—SRF—was initially directed to perform annual field training in New York. After most of the planning had been completed, plans were changed to train in North Carolina and participate in a joint training exercise. This training was canceled by the Department of the Army with instructions to train in Virginia. The plans were again changed and directed to train at Indiantown Gap Military Reservation, Pa. This change occurred after all unit advance detachments departed home stations for Virginia. The ability of commanders and staffs to rapidly adjust themselves to these continued changes, some of which occurred on short notice, demonstrates the capability and professionalism of all ranks.

All organizations of the Pennsylvania Army National Guard including the 28th Infantry Division—SRF, despite all the difficulties that were incident to their training, accomplished every training objective imposed by the Department of the Army and U.S. Continental Army Command. The three infantry brigades of the division each successfully completed a 3-day brigade field training exercise. The division, by making adjustments in previously prepared training schedules, completed 32 hours of riot-control training. This is of particular significance because this requirement was not placed upon the division until after it had arrived at the training site.

Despite the many changes, most of which took place on very short notice, the morale, discipline, and esprit de corps of all units was above average. The morale, as well as the enthusiastic spirit of the Pennsylvania Guardsmen was commented on specifically by the representative of the commanding general, 1st U.S. Army, who was evaluating every aspect of the training of these units. He wrote as follows:

> As per conversation with Colonel Ralph G. Moye, Senior Army Advisor, Pennsylvania Army National Guard, and myself, the following informal evaluation of the morale of the troops of the 28th Infantry Division at the half way point in their training is submitted for your information.
>
> My evaluators find that the state of morale of the troops of the 28th Infantry Division is very high. It is very noticeable that a very high percentage of the personnel have a "Can Do" attitude.

Many units of the 28th Infantry Division—SRF—had 100-percent attendance at their annual field training. The average attendance of Pennsylvania units of the 28th Infantry Division was 98.9 percent. The attendance of the entire Pennsylvania Army National Guard was 98.8 percent. The sick call, including accidental injuries was 1 percent. This is substantially lower than the absentee sick rate in civilian life.

Training of all units of the Pennsylvania Army National Guard was evaluated by Regular Army evaluators during annual field training. No deficiencies or unsatisfactory ratings were received in any of these evaluations. The final results of these evaluations for all units of the Pennsylvania Army National Guard were 41 superior ratings, 103 excellent ratings, and three satisfactory ratings. Of these, the 28th Infantry Division received 23 superior ratings and 43 excellent ratings.

In addition to annual field training, all units are inspected annually at home stations by the inspector general, 1st U.S. Army. The results of these inspections reflect performance of the units during armory training periods. A total of 195 inspections were made, of which 62 were superior ratings, 100 excellent ratings, and 33 satisfactory ratings.

All personnel of the Guard are required to be technically qualified in their military occupation specialty. Tests prepared by the Active Army are administered periodically throughout the year: 94.1 percent of Pennsylvania Guardsmen are MOS qualified; 94 percent of 28th Infantry Division—SRF—personnel are MOS qualified.

Members of the National Guard are all volunteers. As a volunteer organization, the Pennsylvania Army National Guard, from the information and facts stated herein, has achieved or exceeded established standards and speaks for itself. It is well qualified in command, training, and administration to perform both State and Federal missions.

Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1967

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday's New York Times carried a report from Saigon by Bernard Weinraub that the Director and the top staff members of the International Voluntary Services in Vietnam have resigned in protest against the Vietnam war. In addition, 45 of the volunteers there in such fields as agriculture, social work, and education have written the President calling the war an "overwhelming atrocity."

The International Voluntary Services is a highly respected organization. It was the prototype for the Peace Corps. It is the largest voluntary agency in South Vietnam. These volunteers are probably closer to the Vietnamese people than any other group of Americans there. Unlike the AID mission, they are not required to defend our policy publicly.

When four leading field officials of a group of this caliber and knowledge are sufficiently disturbed by the effect of the war on the people they serve to resign, it is past time to reevaluate the policy. I hope the administration will not view this as one more public relations problem, but rather will examine ways to deescalate this war and bring about a political resolution of the conflict.

[From the New York Times, Sept. 20, 1967]

FOUR CHIEFS OF VOLUNTEER UNIT IN VIETNAM QUIT OVER WAR

(By Bernard Weinraub)

SAIGON, SOUTH VIETNAM, September 19.—The director and three key field staff members of a major volunteer agency partly financed by the United States Government have resigned in protest against the Vietnamese war.

At the same time, 45 teachers, agricultural specialists and social workers in the agency, the International Voluntary Services, have signed a letter to President Johnson that calls the war "an overwhelming atrocity." The letter will be given to Ellsworth Bunker, the United States Ambassador to South Vietnam, tomorrow.

"We have seen enough to say that the only monuments to this war will be the dead, the maimed, the despairing and the forlorn," the letter says. "The trend has been escalation of the war. We say the trend should be de-escalation."

WORKS AT VILLAGE LEVEL

The International Voluntary Services, a private group supported by the United States aid program, has 170 volunteers, more than any other American relief group in South Vietnam.

As one of the most highly respected agencies in the country, it has sought to help the Vietnamese at the village and hamlet level. Volunteers teach English, train refugees, work on agricultural projects and aid widows and orphans.

Most of the volunteers, who usually remain in Vietnam for two years, are former college students and social workers. More than 20 are conscientious objectors who are performing alternate service in Vietnam.

The volunteers live, eat and work with the Vietnamese. They earn $80 a month, which is paid by the aid program. They also receive a $75 monthly living allowance, which is paid by the United States and Vietnamese Governments.

In the last few months, a dispute has developed between several relief agencies, and the United States mission here. It centers on the right of American civilian volunteers to discuss the war with South Vietnamese and Americans and on what several agencies feel are pressures by the United States to involve them in the war effort to a greater extent.

The resignations disclosed today, as well as the letter to President Johnson, were the first public acknowledgements of a dispute that threatens several other agencies composed of vocal and, in some cases, antiwar volunteers.

The four officials who submitted their resignations in the last week were Don Luce, of East Calais, Vt., the 33-year-old director of the agency; Don Ronk, of Arcata, Calif., the agency's leader in the Danang area; Willie Meyers of Souderton, Pa., leader in the Mekong Delta, and Gene Stoltzfus, of Aurora, Ohio, associate chief for community development, which includes refugee and youth work.

RESIGNATIONS WERE SEPARATE

The resignations were submitted in separate letters to Arthur Z. Gardiner, the executive director of the agency in Washington, D.C.

In one of the letters, Mr. Ronk, a former military policeman who has worked in Danang for two years with juvenile delinquents, wrote:

"As much as I love these Vietnamese who have gathered with me, as much as I desire to be here as some form of shelter and solace in these times of horror, as much as I realize their personal hurt if I must go, I must weigh it against speaking out against the cost of so much of their anguish and the anguish of all Vietnamese."

Mr. Ronk added: "I believe that my protest is in the best interests of my Vietnamese friends and is intended to say what they are largely unable to say: Stop this war."

Sitting in the agency headquarters, Mr. Luce, who has worked in Vietnam for nine years, spoke slowly and intensely.

"We need an end to this war," he said. "We're witnessing right now the destruction of Vietnamese family life, of its agriculture and transportation. We're seeing the development of city slums.

"A LAND OF REPORT WRITING"

"I have tried to make suggestions," added Mr. Luce, a Cornell graduate with a master's degree in economic development. "I have made suggestions on our refugee policies, our destruction of villages, our use of defoliants.

"People in U.S. aid listen and suggest we write a report and then nothing happens. It's become a land of report writing."

Leaning forward and staring down at his folded hands, Mr. Luce shook his head, and said slowly: "As individuals, we can not become part of the destruction of a people we love.

"We're leaving here because this is the only way to express our disagreement with the tragedy going on here."

Officials at the United States mission said that they had heard rumors of the resignations, but would not comment on them. They said that they had not yet seen the letter to President Johnson, which was taken to the embassy today by Mr. Luce. Officials there kept the letter, but told Mr. Luce to return at 4 P.M. tomorrow to give the document to Mr. Bunker officially.

REACTION FROM REFUGEE CHIEF

"There's nothing I would do—or should do—about people expressing their personal views," said George Goss, the chief of the mission's refugee division, which serves as the liaison between the voluntary agencies and the United States Government.

"It's not for the United States Government to decide whether they should be here," he went on. "It's for the agencies to decide. It's their business, not ours.

"I do think, though, that if these people feel this way they shouldn't be here," he said. "It would be less than honest of them to stay."

In their five-page letter to President Johnson, the volunteers—many of them young agricultural specialists from small towns in Illinois, Pennsylvania and Ohio—said that anti-Americanism was growing in Vietnam, that Washington was supporting "a Government which jails pacifists and neutralists" and that the suffering of the Vietnamese was "greatly intensified by today's American presence."

Vietcong terrorism is real," the letter went on, "So are the innocent victims of U.S. bombing, strafing and shelling."

The letter urged the President to stop bombing North Vietnam, to recognize the National Liberation Front, the political arm of the Vietcong, and to begin peace talks.

The International Voluntary Services is a private, nonprofit organization chartered under the laws of the District of Columbia in 1953, eight years before the formation of the Peace Corps, for which it served as the prototype.

The corporation has 21 directors drawn from such fields as education, religion, government and industry. The president of the board of directors is William T. Snyder, secretary of the Mennonite Central Committee, Akron, Pa.

Msgr. Edward O'Rourke, executive director of the National Catholic Rural Life Conference, Des Moines, Iowa, is chairman of the executive committee. Arthur Z. Gardiner, a retired Foreign Service reserve officer who served in Pakistan, Vietnam and Japan from 1955 to 1964, is the executive director.

The agency's headquarters are in Washington at 1555 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., where it employs a staff of 19. It now has 180 young men and women in Vietnam and 100 in Laos working in economic and social fields with provincial agricultural and educational officials and villagers. Among the volunteers are conscientious objectors and youths rejected by the armed forces.

Mr. Gardiner, speaking in Washington, said yesterday that the volunteers were supported by contracts with the Agency for Internaional Development at a cost of about $5,500 a year each. Last year, he said, the agency received about $1.5-million in public funds. The expenditures at the Washington office, including rent, salaries, travel and publicity come to about $200,000 a year, he said. The agency also gets funds from private sources.

Mr. Gardiner said that the resignations reported yesterday had not been received by his organization in Washington and that the letter of protest represented the individuals involved.

Vivacious Audrey McClory Won't be Forgotten

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1967

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, the recent passing of Audrey McClory, wife of our colleague, Congressman Robert McClory, of Illinois, 12th District, has produced many wonderful tributes to this beloved and talented woman.

One who knew Audrey McClory well was Bill Schroeder, editor of a chain of newspapers which circulate throughout much of Congressman McClory's district and are published by Lakeland Publications in Grayslake, Ill.

In the September 14 issue of these publications, Bill Schroeder recalled Audrey McClory in his column, "Editor's Viewpoint," in the following impressive and descriptive paragraphs:

Vivacious Audrey McClory Won't be Forgotten

Vivacious Audrey McClory's untimely death has left a void in the political life of this community.

Petite and pert, her head moving quickly from side to side in animated conversation, Mrs. McClory's presence was sure to make any group more interesting.

With a natural interest in people, she was the perfect compliment to a man who chose politics as his field of endeavor. There can be little doubt that Congressman Robert McClory feels that he has lost his greatest asset—his wife. The congressman must be going about his duties with a heavy heart.

Audrey McClory had an inborn ability of making everyone she met feel important. When she greeted a person with outstretched hand and a cheery, "Why, hello. I'm so happy to see you!" your exhilaration was like taking a whiff of pure oxygen.

McClory generally is rated the most indefatigable campaigner ever to hit the political scene in this locality. That point might be argued with Bob on the campaign trail alone. But with Audrey at his side there was no question about the greatest campaigners. And Audrey usually was at her husband's side, from the early days in their political career up to the present when Mrs. McClory accompanied her husband on conferences of the Inter Parliamentary Union throughout the world. We are proud to attest to the fact that Mrs. McClory was the perfect Washington hostess. Their home always is open to visiting constituents.

An indelible memory is the time a blizzard all but blew away a school meeting to which McClory, then a state senator, was invited. The meeting was important to the townsfolk involved. The fact that a public figure would attend was expected to attract a large turnout. Then the weatherman turned the meeting into a night that was almost foolhardy to venture from home. Only a handful straggled in. This reporter "swelled" attendance to a grand total of nine. Then Senator and Mrs. McClory arrived with a look of "Where is everyone?" They brushed the snow and ice off their outer clothing and joined in the meeting seemingly unaware of the disappointingly small turnout.

Gay, lighthearted, cheerful. That was Audrey McClory. She will be missed.

We extend heart-felt condolences to Congressman McClory, the McClory family and other survivors.

Hiring the Handicapped Is Good Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1967

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, as we approach national Employ the Physically Handicapped Week, to be observed October 1–7, I would like to bring to the House's attention the efforts being made by the Governor's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped in Mississippi.

Gov. Paul B. Johnson recently expanded the Governor's committee, a volunteer, nonpolitical group dedicated to enlarging job opportunities for the physically handicapped.

Jackson industrialist Charles B. Ryan was named chairman of the Governor's committee. At the meeting of the new committee on August 31, Mr. Ryan made forceful and timely remarks on the importance of all citizens concerning themselves with hiring the handicapped. As a part of my remarks, I include Mr. Ryan's address.

It follows:

When Governor Johnson asked me to serve as Chairman of this Committee, I didn't feel I was very qualified for the job, but I couldn't turn him down. How can anyone fail to jump in and work with people who want to help themselves, who want to overcome the handicaps fate has thrust on them—particularly when so many able-bodied people are satisfied to live on relief roles.

Thanks to the work of committees like this, thanks to the dedicated men in the state and federal service and to volunteers from private life who serve on these committees, and thanks to the determination and guts which show up in so many people who suffer handicaps—self-supporting handicapped persons have paid Federal Income Taxes of almost $200 billion in the 20 years these committees have been in existence.

Many of these have made and are making substantial contributions to society instead of society making contributions to them.

But there are many more handicapped persons appearing in our society every day—victims of accidents, birth defects, disease, and, of course, the war in Vietnam.

We have a job before us which no one in his right mind could fail to tackle with all his energy and enthusiasm. I think our new Governor will have a particular place in his heart for our work.

Many of you have been members of the

Governor's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped for a number of years and know more of its purpose and organization than I. Others, however, are like myself, new members of the committee.

For the benefit of new members, and to review for older members, we recall that the Mississippi Governor's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped is a volunteer, non-political group of Mississippians concerned with promoting the employment of the handicapped. The committee represents many groups—rehabilitation, other social work groups, labor, management, education, medicine, veterans groups, and others.

The late R. L. Sullivan, Director of the Mississippi Employment Security Commission and former coach at Ole Miss, was the first chairman when the committee was organized 20 years ago, soon after the organization of the President's Committee.

In Mississippi, there are 36 local committees, each with two or more counties represented in its organization. It is the purpose of these committees to carry out the Employ the Handicapped program at the community level. You have a listing of the personnel of these committees among the material at your plate.

The President's Committee, the Governors' Committee, and local committees seek to establish, with the help of friendly news and entertainment media, a climate of acceptance for qualified handicapped workers.

It has been the goal of the Governor's Committees to cooperate in every way possible with the President's Committees in conducting comprehensive and worthwhile programs. Because there is no budget and no paid staff, the program of the Governor's Committees has been carried out entirely by members serving on a volunteer basis. Efforts have been devoted chiefly to the annual observance of "National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week" and to conducting the community survey or reports contest (formerly called the essay contest) among junior and senior high school students. Although the Mississippi Governor's Committee has participated in some of the other national committee activities, it has not been on a regular basis. Much progress in reaching the national program standards has been made, but much remains to be achieved.

With the reorganization and expansion of the Governor's Committee we hope that we can achieve a *year-round program of activities* to be carried out through the work of sub-committees.

It is our further hope that the committee may obtain a modest state appropriation to be used in employing an executive secretary and an office secretary and to pay for travel. This would assure a coordinated, year-round program, but the work would still largely be done by you—volunteer, un-paid committee members.

You will be named to a sub-committee in the near future, and you also are asked to work with the local committee in your area to promote the program on the community level. In the meantime, there is important work you can do. The 1967 observance of Employ the Physically Handicapped Week is scheduled nationally October 2nd through the 7th.

Here are some things you can do:

If you are an employer, you can study your employment opportunities to see if there is a place which might well be filled by a qualified handicapped worker. If you find such a place, notify your employment office, Vocational Rehabilitation, Division for the Blind, or Veterans representatives. They will be especially glad to place handicapped persons in connection with the NEPH observance or at any time throughout the year.

If you work with the disabled, use this observance to double your efforts for placing handicapped workers. If you have placed a handicapped workers who is doing a good job, let the publicity sub-committee of the Governor's Committee or the NEPH committee in your local community know about it. It can be publicized during the observance in October.

Do you have a place of business in which one or more posters could be placed? Let the local committees know about it.

Do you have a fresh new idea on how to interest employers in hiring the handicapped? Do you have special friends among the local press, in a TV or radio station? If so, you can be of great assistance to the publicity sub-committee on the Governor's Committee or to your local NEPH committee.

Mr. McCahill will outline many opportunities for our committee. Opportunities for developing the program are unlimited.

I realize that all of us are agreeing to serve in a program which must be carried on with time taken from our other areas of living—our jobs, our homes, our other church and civic responsibilities. I can assure you it will be time well spent.

As an employer and a member of my community I have over a period of years learned the importance of the handicapped worker to his community, state and nation. I have come to believe strongly that the handicapped worker, properly placed, is an asset—not a liability—that in many cases handicapped workers are more dependable and eager to please than nonhandicapped workers.

Above all, I believe that men and women such as you—leaders in various phases of Mississippi's community life—are well equipped to lead the program for demonstrating that "Hiring the handicapped is good business."

I ask your cooperation and help. Your presence here indicates that you are offering both. I challenge all of us to launch the reorganized program on a sound basis, and to use our energy and ingenuity to make it a continuing success.

Rio Grande Water for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1967

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article which appeared in Engineering News-Record, July 27, 1967. This article features the outstanding accomplishments of the International Boundary and Water Commission, under the superb direction of the U.S. commissioner, Joe Friedkin.

The article follows:

RIO GRANDE WATER FOR PEACE

Guns and guerrillas have yet to be overthrown as the traditional arbiters of international border and water disputes. But the United States and Mexico have achieved a version of water for peace through their International Boundary and Water Commission (IB&WC). Largely as a result of its negotiation and supervision, 4 million U.S. and Mexican citizens face, farm and fraternize with each other in 11 pairs of border cities and on 2 million acres of irrigated borderland, producing an annual $1-billion across-the-border economy. Between now and 1969, two IB&WC projects alone will total $119 million; the 6-mile wide, multipurpose Amistad (Friendship) Dam (ENR 12/2/65 p. 22) and the Chamizal Project (ENR 7/25/63 p. 15).

The continuing success of the commission, despite myriad responsibilities and assignments, is witness to the engineering and diplomatic skills of its commissioners, Joseph F. Friedkin of the U.S. and Mexico's David Herrera Jordan. Headquartered in El Paso and Juarez, respectively, they maintain close touch with the needs of their countrymen and with each other as resolving different nationalistic interests demands. Says Herrera, "I understand Friedkin's English and he understands my Spanish. . . . We have met so many times. On many matters it has been very difficult; we must work for the present and for the future. But our countries' relationships are improving constantly."

Not all is sweetness and light, however. Both countries zealously guard their own rights and interests, testing each other through the IB&WC. The commission is charged by treaty with resolving all disputes affecting the border's location and with "acts needed for coordination of the governments' water control and development plans, to safeguard their respective rights and to enable each to obtain legitimate benefits that could not be achieved by unilateral action."

Designed, constructed, paid for and maintained in proportion to benefits derived, joint U.S.-Mexico projects under the aegis of the IB&WC include dams, bridges, river control and sanitation works. It is also responsible for apportioning irrigation water from the boundary rivers.

FROM IDEA TO CONSTRUCTION

Usually, the commission follows a standard procedure in initiating a joint construction project. Once the governments recognize the need, IB&WC surveys the feasibility and urgency of a project. If its findings are positive, each commissioner will seek government authorization and appropriations, then contract for design, construction and operation of his country's portion of the project.

Cooperation between the two governments is a measure of Friedkin's and Herrera's harmonious relationship. Their offices are only 20 minutes apart and the commissioners and their bilingual secretaries meet weekly and talk by phone daily. Such communication allows the commission to resolve construction problems quickly. On Amistad Dam, for example, excavation of the bedrock disclosed unforeseen conditions affecting foundation design. The commissioners convened their respective consultants and, on the basis of their recommendations, quickly modified the design.

Agreements reached at the meetings become, in effect, executive agreements between the two governments, if neither objects within 30 days. Concludes Herrera, "Both governments want to solve problems. This makes them easier to solve. The very close communications between the two sections, at all levels, helps. Our solutions are in tune with the times."

SOLUTIONS NOT ALWAYS SIMPLE

During the past five years, IB&WC has undergone the most severe tests of its 80-year history. Not only were Friedkin and Herrera charged, in 1962, with the final resolution of the Chamizal border dispute that had plagued U.S.-Mexico relations for over a century, but the tremendous growth of the border population and its water needs had resulted in a tight water situation on the Rio Grande and Colorado rivers that demanded action.

The Chamizal Treaty, finally establishing the border in the El Paso-Juarez area (see box, p. 35), was signed in 1963. The two commissioners served as technical advisers to their respective governments throughout the period of negotiations.

Months prior to the settlement Friedkin met with the civil leaders of El Paso and authorities of the State of Texas to bring about an understanding of the importance and need of an equitable settlement. Says one observer, "They really had what I considered primarily a political package to sell. The engineering part was secondary. They made it sound like the other guy's idea by seeking advice and reaction."

As technical advisers, the commissioners jointly studied and recommended the precise net area to be transferred from the U.S. to Mexico, 437.18 acres. Their proposal was based on a previous arbitration award (1911) and upon surveys made of the river channel at El Paso and Juarez before and after the Rio Grande changed its course, resulting in the dispute. They studied and recommended the engineering plan for relocating the boundary and river channel. The recommendations were presented in an engineering report that was made a part of the convention.

The settlement resulted in agreement to undertake $44.9 million worth of construction for the U.S. Section of IB&WC alone. The U.S. will bear the $9.1-million cost of relocating public facilities now on the land ceded to Mexico. Joint U.S.-Mexican construction accounts for the rest of the appropriations. It includes three international bridges, two railroad overpasses and 4.3 miles of concrete-lined channel to relocate the Rio Grande as the new boundary. While these projects may be carried out by either country, costs are divided evenly, with the exception of the bridges because the spans on the U.S. side are longer to pass over a highway and railroad tracks.

Commissioner Friedkin is responsible for coordinating all U.S. Chamizal construction and contracting for the railroad and canal relocations, scheduled for September completion. Congress also assigned Friedkin the now nearly completed task of acquiring the 860 public and private parcels of land for transfer to Mexico and relocating public facilities.

The U.S. and Mexican commissioners are jointly responsible to their governments for the plans, specifications, and construction of the bridges and river channel; the bridges will be completed this fall and the channel is scheduled for completion by May, 1968.

One of the commission's most difficult assignments was solving the problem of increased salinity in Colorado River water delivered to Mexico from the U.S. under a 1944 treaty. To establish U.S. interests, Friedkin consulted with representatives of the State and Interior departments and the seven states on the Colorado. In March, 1965, after three years of study, the U.S. and Mexico announced plans to construct and operate, for five years, a 13-mile extension of a drainage channel in the U.S. so water could discharge either above or below Mexico's main diversion dam, Morelos Dam. By November of that same year, the extension was in operation.

A similar problem developed on the lower Rio Grande, with Mexico the source of the salt through its Morillo drainage canal. The solution is construction of a 23-mile drain in Mexico that will carry practically all of the Morillo waters directly to the Gulf of Mexico. It was begun in January, 1966, and will be completed next year.

The intricacies of implementing an international construction project go beyond deciding what to build. Amistad Dam is an example of bidding complications that irked contractors on both sides of the border (ENR 11/19/64 p. 28).

Under the IB&WC agreement, construction was to be split between Mexican and U.S. contractors and bidding for the two portions was to be carried out separately. The only way a U.S. contractor could bid on the Mexican portion was in a joint venture with a Mexican contractor. Complicating the procedure was a provision that contractor could submit a bid for the portion of his own country, without regard for who built the other portion; and he could submit another bid for the portion contingent on a certain contractor building the part on the other side of the border. As it turned out, essentially the same U.S. firms are doing construction on both sides of the border, but on the Mexican side a U.S.-Mexico joint venture bearing a Mexican name has the job.

THE MEN WHO MAKE IT WORK

The ability of commissioners Friedkin and Herrera to solve international problems through practical engineering is the key to their effectiveness. Both men have worked long and hard for the responsibility they now hold. Friedkin has invested his entire working life, 33 of his 57 years, in reaching the top rung of the U.S. Section. Born in Brooklyn, the son of an actor and tailor, Friedkin is a bouncy, early-rising (5:30 am) civil engineer (1932 graduate of Texas College of Mines and Metallurgy, now the University of Texas). Between graduation and his current position (reached in 1962), Friedkin's hard work with the commission took him from hydrographer to hydraulic engineer, then resident engineer at San Diego (1947–1952), to principal engineer at El Paso headquarters (1953–1961), with five years out for World War II service with the Army Corp of Engineers.

The Mexican IB&WC commissioner for 20 years, Herrera, who holds the rank of ambassador, has supervised the planning and construction for the Mexican portion of every major IB&WC project since the 1948 Morelos Dam. Admirers acclaim him engineer *primero*.

Herrera, 56, has made a career of government work, first with the National Commission of Irrigation, in Tamaulipas and Sonora. Born in Tampico, he graduated as a civil engineer from the University of Mexico in 1934, as close as he wanted to come to his rancher father's wish that he be a chemical engineer. A chain-smoker with a quick smile and a wry sense of humor, he operates from a modest second-floor office in Juarez.

IB&WC: AGENCY OF PEACE

Created in 1899 as the International Boundary Commission, then growing into the International Boundary and Water Commission by 1944, with the added responsibility of controlling and improving the Rio Grande, Tijuana and Colorado rivers, the IB&WC reached a full head of construction steam by 1934.

That year it started the Lower Rio Grande Flood Control Project to prevent recurrences of the 1922 and 1927 floods. It includes 96 miles of protective river levees and 137 miles of interior floodways in the U.S., and 69 miles of levees and 78 miles of interior floodways on the Mexican side.

The Rio Grande Rectification Project (1934–1938) straightened and shortened the river in the El Paso-Juarez Valley from 155 miles to 87 miles to stabilize the boundary and improve the channel. This straightening peacefully effected boundary changes aggregating 5,121 acres transferred between countries.

Between 1933 and 1954, the commission completed 12 international construction projects.

Largely responsible for this early burst of activity and a signer of the Water Treaty of 1944 that outlined the commission's present responsibilities was U.S. Commissioner Lawrence M. Lawson. An engineering graduate of Stamford, with 22 years with the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, Lawson held the post of commissioner for 27 years (1927 to 1954). It is said that he possessed the most critical eye that ever looked down a transit or sized up a congressional committee. And, if that failed, he would switch to charm, pull out his sack of Bull Durham, roll a cigarette, then smile through smoke at his antagonist.

Lawson's crowning achievement was the $46-million Falcon Dam, the first major international storage dam on the Rio Grande. Falcon provides flood protection and irrigation water for the rich lower Rio Grande Valley. It earned its weight in fruit, vegetables and cotton by preventing an estimated $150-million loss in the 1954 and 1958 floods.

After 1959, under Leland H. Hewitt, the U.S. Section moved into its highest budget years ever. Between 1962 and 1967, U.S. Section budget appropriations totaled $112 million, with the annual construction budget reaching a high of $41 million in 1965, principally because of the Chamizal and Amistad projects. Hewitt worked with Herrera to construct the Anzalduas flood control diversion dam in the Lower Rio Grande (1957–1959), and together they made important advances in the planning for the second major international dam in the Rio Grande—Amistad.

A PROUD ACCOMPLISHMENT

With completion of Amistad Dam in 1969, the commission will have completed the major part of the construction program with which it is charged by treaty. It will have provided the storage works needed to control and conserve flood flows of the Rio Grande. Flood protection for the cities, towns and most of the improved lands along the international part of the Rio Grande will have been provided through the lower Rio Grande flood control project for the delta region, the Rio Grande rectification project and the new Chamizal channel for the El Paso-Juarez area.

The Morelos diversion dam, constructed in the boundary section by Mexico, under the direction of the IB&WC, and the related levee works completed in the U.S. that same year, are the international works required on the Colorado River.

Under the most recent agreement (ENR 7/13 p. 45), the IB&WC will build, operate and maintain a flood control project for the Tijuana River in California and Mexico. It will channelize the river, confining floodwaters in San Diego and Tijuana to a narrow, concrete-lined waterway. The total project is estimated at $25.8 million, with the U.S. paying for the 5.7 miles of channel in its territory and Mexico paying for the 2.7 miles in its territory.

Other future construction includes improvement of an international sanitation project at Nogales, Sonora, for the increasing population.

The U.S. Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 21, 1967

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, a constituent of mine, Mr. Gene Rickett, 5000 Terrell Street, Annandale, Va., has written a poem paying tribute to the Congress of the United States.

I feel it is most appropriate for Mr. Rickett's poem to be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as it seems that all too often we hear criticism of our colleagues but seldom words of praise. It is good to see an example such as Mr. Rickett has provided of the appreciation many Americans feel for what we in the Congress are trying to do for our Nation.

Mr. Rickett's poem follows in full:

THE U.S. CONGRESS

(By Gene Rickett)

Within these hallowed walls of Congress
Rest the American dream.
To these hallowed walls of Congress
Come men of courage, men of esteem.

Within these hallowed walls of Congress
For the right the men must stand.
They must be wise and find the answers
To make this a better land.

Within these hallowed walls of Congress
Are the defenders of our nation
And their job is quite enormous
For the greatest nation in all creation.

Within these hallowed walls of Congress
Progress and hope can never cease.
We must ever be remindful
That we want a lasting peace.

Within these hallowed walls of Congress
Many problems here are solved.
Because of the devotion and dedication
Of the many people involved.

Chief of Navy Medical Service Corps Should Have Rank of Rear Admiral

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERVEY G. MACHEN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1967

Mr. MACHEN. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill I introduced September 19 is to provide for the rank of rear admiral for the chief of the Navy Medical Service Corps. Although the corps was established in 1947, the position of chief of corps with the rank of captain was not authorized by law until 1954. At that time, there were 39 officers in the grade of commander under the corps chief, who was a captain. The corps has grown to the point where there are now 76 officers serving in the same grade as the chief of the corps. However, the chief of the Medical Service Corps is not legally authorized to attain the rank commensurate with this responsibilities which have grown over the past 20 years.

The Navy Medical Service Corps is composed of widely diversified professional specialists embracing the academic disciplines utilized in health research, patient care and in all aspects of health administration and financial management. The corps consists of the allied health sciences: optometry, pharmacy, podiatry, supply and administration, and medical specialist sections. Educational requirements for original appointment into the corps conform to those prescribed by the civilian community and include all academic and health doctorate degrees, including the doctor of philosophy degree, and the attainment of license or certification when required.

Within the entire Navy there are but 136 officers who hold the doctor of philosophy degree and almost half—64—of these officers are in the Medical Service Corps.

There are now approximately 1,600 officers in the Medical Service Corps. Within the Navy, the Medical Service Corps is the only male staff corps not entitled to flag rank. There are several other staff corps in the Navy composed of fewer or an approximately equal number of officers that have been authorized from two to seven flag officers. Yet, the Medical Service Corps has none.

Enactment of Public Law 89-603 permitted the appointment of a brigadier general in the Army Medical Service Corps, and the chief of that corps is now serving in that grade. The duties and responsibilities of the chief of the Navy Medical Service Corps are as varied and demanding as those of his Army counterpart. It is to correct the existing grade disparity within the Navy that I am proposing this bill for your early consideration and approval.

At this point I wish to insert a copy of my bill, H.R. 13002, followed by a sectional analysis and a table showing Navy flag officer strength as of May 31, 1967.

H.R. 13002

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 5139 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking out "captain" each place where it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "rear admiral," and by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(c) For purposes of determining the number of officers in the grade of rear admiral and above, any officer holding the grade of rear admiral under the provisions of this section shall be disregarded."

SECTIONAL ANALYSIS OF H.R. 13002

1. The amendment of section 5139, title 10, USC provides for the rank of rear admiral in lieu of the present grade of captain for the Chief of the Medical Service Corps of the Navy.

Other corps in the Navy with smaller, or just slightly larger numbers of officers have already been authorized the rank of rear admiral for the corps chief and other members of the corps. (see table attached). The Medical Service Corps, established in 1947, has now reached a size and composition comparable to other corps in the Navy. Medical Service Corps officers now occupy command billets, and the responsibilities of the Corps' Chief are such that the position warrants the rank of rear admiral. The Medical Service Corps, composed of over 1500 officers is comparable with the Chaplain Corps (just over 1100 officers), and the Civil Engineer Corps (just over 1700 officers). Yet, the Chaplain Corps is authorized two (2) rear admirals; the Civil Engineer Corps seven (7); the Medical Service Corps *none*. In the last Congress the Medical Service Corps of the Army was authorized one Brigadier General; the present Corps Chief has been appointed to this grade. This bill would provide equitable treatment for the Medical Service Corps of the Navy.

2. Addition of new subsection (c) provides that the appointment in the grade of rear admiral for the Chief of the Medical Service Corps shall not be subject to the legislative or administrative limitations on the number of flag rank in the Navy. Since the Medical Service Corps of the Navy is under the cognizance of the Chief of the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery, authorization for one (1) additional rear admiral under the Surgeon General of the Navy would permit the appointment of the Chief of the Medical Service Corps to this grade. Unless the legislation makes provision for the appointment to be over and above the authorized number limitations on flag rank, there can be no assurance that the appointment will ever be permitted.

NAVY FLAG OFFICER STRENGTH AS OF MAY 31, 1967

Designator	Corps	Corps strength	Flag officers
210x	Medical Corps	4,283	14
220x	Dental Corps	1,898	4
230x	Medical Service Corps	1,569	0
310x	Supply Corps	5,015	19
410x	Chaplain Corps	1,056	2
510x	Civil Engineer Corps	1,870	7
	UNRESTRICTED LINE		
110x	Surface	27,727	133
130x	Aviation	22,151	96
	RESTRICTED LINE (ANALOGOUS TO STAFF)		
14xx	Engineering duty	987	17
15xx	Aeronautical engineering duty.	598	8
16xx	Special duty	1,400	5

The Kids Are Coming

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1967

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, with the passing of Labor Day comes the arrival of another day—the first school day.

This is the time of year when children accustomed to 3 months of romping and having fun, head back to school. The youthful exuberance of these boys and girls means additional responsibilities for each driver on our Nation's highways.

Assisting in this gigantic task of watching these schoolchildren will be the 900,000 school safety patrols.

Early in this session of the 90th Congress, I introduced House Joint Resolution 79 to designate the second week of each May as National School Safety Patrol Week. Thirty-one of our colleagues have joined with me in introducing similar legislation, and I want to urge the remainder of our colleagues to do likewise in tribute to these fine youngsters.

Since 1922 the traffic death rate of school-age children has dropped nearly one-half, while the death rate of all other age groups has doubled. This is testimony of the effectiveness of the school safety patrol program.

Mr. Speaker, in concluding my remarks, I think it appropriate that I include an editorial written by the American Automobile Association, sponsor of these safety patrols, entitled "The Kids Are Coming."

The editorial follows:

THE KIDS ARE COMING

It's that time again. Thousands of youngsters will be returning to school shortly following three months of vacation in towns and cities all across the country. Many of these children lack mature knowledge of pedestrian safety rules and often are more interested in their youthful pursuits than in the danger of passing traffic.

Motorists are urged, therefore, to exert increased caution when driving in and around school areas. Watch out for signs of children such as a dog crossing the street or a ball rolling out between parked cars. Often, they are followed by a child.

In many communities, lower speed limits in school zones are removed during the summer months. As a result, local motorists become accustomed to driving at the regular rates of speed and fail to observe the reduced speed limits when they are reinstated in the fall.

Whenever possible, parents of beginning students should personally map out the "safest route to school," and accompany their children for the first few trips. Your local AAA motor club will provide suggestions.

Youngsters using school buses should walk to the bus stop instead of riding there with parents. A serious traffic safety hazard is often created around school bus stops by parents loading and unloading their children from the family car.

Above all, motorists should remember that it is their responsibility to watch out for children in traffic. It would be foolhardy to assume the youngsters will consistently observe the safety rules. Drive defensively and remember—the child's life you save could be your own.

Lesson on Africa: Keep Aloof

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HASTINGS KEITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1967

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that many Members of this body had the opportunity in recent weeks to see the American Broadcasting Co.'s 4-hour special program on Africa. This was a most interesting and valuable review of the problems and the promise of this vast continent. Such a program is especially appreciated by those of us whose duties do not permit sufficient study of the dynamic and turbulent developments of Africa.

In one important area, however, the ABC program exhibited an old blind spot in its perspective: the slanted treatment of the Portuguese territories in Africa. For some reason, the spirit of understanding, of tolerance, and of patience which ABC counseled in viewing the rest of Africa, was not applied to the Portuguese provinces of Angola and Mozambique.

Africa is a unique continent, and each country is defining its own unique personality and future. This is as it must be. Each area of Africa will travel its own path to prosperity, racial harmony, and cooperation in the international community. For this to happen, however, the rest of us must maintain a spirit of tolerance and respect for the efforts which all areas of Africa are making.

Mr. Speaker, in order to offer a proper perspective on the peaceful and progressive character of the multiracial societies in Portuguese Angola and Mozambique, I am presenting two brief statements for the interest of the Members of the House. The first is an editorial from the New Bedford Standard-Times which counsels objectivitiy and noninterference in Africa's problems. The second is a statement by the Embassy of Portugal, which so graciously assisted the ABC television team in traveling through and filming the people and territory of Portuguese Africa.

The texts are as follows:

[From the Standard-Times, New Bedford, Mass., Sept. 15, 1967]

LESSON ON AFRICA: KEEP ALOOF

The American Broadcasting Co.'s four-hour essay on Africa was a forceful pictorial review of the problems the huge middle and southern parts of the continent present to the world—and to themselves.

Unfortunately the viewer was not always permitted to draw his own conclusions from the striking photography, especially in the portions dealing with so-called colonialism and "white rule." Here, as usual, the slant was directed against Portugal, in particular.

The production showed the modern-city profile of Mozambique's Lourenco Marques, one of the most impressive scenes of progress in the entire film. It was conceded that color discrimination virtually does not exist. But lest an impression be left that Portugal is, indeed, as claimed, creating another Brazil in Africa, the commentator blandly declared that the existence of thousands of troops in the provinces showed Portugal must be wrong.

Which is to say, that the presence of America in Vietnam, or say, the Dominican Republic, or that of Britain in Malaya after World War II, or now in Hong Kong, was an injustice to the people because troops were required to support it.

Portugal's real enemy in the African provinces—the real enemy anywhere—is Communist aggression. The evidence to date is that the anti-Portugal movement in Africa is Communist inspired and led.

The documentary, whatever its commentary, was of signal value. No words were needed to emphasize the necessity for the United States and its people to avoid a commitment in any of the complexities and contradictions of Africa's newly emerging nations, "provinces" and "white rule" states. When Washington sends planes to the Congo, or puts restrictions against Rhodesia, it takes a dangerous first step.

STATEMENT BY HIS EXCELLENCY THE PORTUGUESE AMBASSADOR TO THE UNITED STATES, DR. VASCO VIEIRA GARIN

The Portuguese section of ABC Television network's program on Africa was an exercise in deceiving public opinion, as it failed to give an honest view of Portugal's realities in Africa.

The Portuguese Government gave in good faith all facilities to the ABC television team who for weeks were in Angola and Mozambique.

We know that ABC has many hours of film showing the great educational, economic, technical, social and political progress there, instead of the so-called barricades the program insisted so much upon. Also, the climate of peace and order prevailing in those Overseas Provinces was recorded by the cameras. Racial equality and harmony were in those films for anybody to see.

All this was, however, set aside deliberately. Prominence was given to the statement of a terrorist leader operating from a foreign country, who publicly acknowledges receiving assistance from communist nations. On the other hand, another foreign gentleman had a lengthy appearance on the screen. He is a man expelled from Angola for his open activities against Portugal, as he was supporting both terrorism and subversion. Furthermore, some tiresome old allegations were repeated, although they long since have been discredited by highly respected international agencies and observers who conducted impartial and painstaking investigations on the spot. Among these was the International Labor Organization of the United Nations.

It was as distorting as it would have been if a foreign television team came to the United States, filmed freely and then have its network practically refer only to allegations by extremist groups on problems prevailing in this Country today.

We cannot but escape the impression that ABC let itself be influenced by some people, inside or outside the organization, to produce a serious and misleading disservice to the American people and an injustice to Portugal, a friend and ally of the United States.

Tax Increase Urged by 455 Distinguished Businessmen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1967

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, last Wednesday, Stuart T. Saunders, of the Pennsylvania Railroad Co. presented to our Committee on Ways and Means a statement signed by 455 business leaders urging enactment of a temporary tax increase together with a reduction in Federal expenditures. I admire the decisive and, in many cases, courageous commitment to fiscal responsibility on the part of these gentlemen.

Tax increases are always unpleasant duties for legislators and unpopular with the public. This representative group from the business world has contributed their influence and prestige to the difficult task of educating the Congress and the public of the dangerous economic consequences which must follow if a tax increase is not enacted.

At this point, I am inserting in the RECORD the names of the signers of the statement. My colleagues will note that the list reads like a "Who's Who" of the American free enterprise system:

STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES

We, the undersigned members of the business community, believe that:

(1) The Congress should enact a temporary, uniform tax increase on corporations and individuals for such period as the Vietnam war requires; and

(2) The Congress and the Administration should control and reduce Federal expenditures—civilian and military—to the maximum degree that is consistent with the nation's security and economic soundness.

The combined result of the tax increase and expenditure reductions should hold the deficit to manageable proportions.

These steps are necessary to prevent a Federal deficit so large that it could lead to dangerous inflation, spiraling interest rates, tight money, and a serious weakening in our balance of payments position.

We invite others who concur in principle to help gain understanding, support and acceptance for this program. This does not preclude the right of anyone joining in this Statement to disagree with specific features of the Administration's tax proposal or to advance other ideas. For example, many businessmen, while accepting the need for a tax increase, will urge amendments to the Administration's proposal to provide a common effective date and application of the surcharge after all tax credits, both for individuals and corporations.

It is our hope that as soon as practicable the Congress and the Administration will reinstate a program of tax reductions.

C. F. Adams, Chairman, Raytheon Co.

Eugene H. Adams, President, First National Bank (Denver).

William M. Allen, President, The Boeing Co.

Robert B. Anderson, Partner, Loeb, Rhoades & Co.

Roy L. Ash, President, Litton Industries, Inc.

Calvin W. Aurand, President, Iowa-Des Moines National Bank.

J. Paul Austin, President, The Coca-Cola Co.

S. Clark Beise, Chairman, Executive Committee, Bank of America.

Keehn W. Berry, President, Whitney National Bank of New Orleans.

B. F. Biaggini, President, Southern Pacific Company.

William Blackie, Chairman, Caterpillar Tractor Co.

Roger M. Blough, Chairman, United States Steel Corp.

Harold Boeschenstein, Chairman, Owens-Corning Fiberglas Corp.

Fred J. Borch, President, General Electric Co.

John W. Brooks, President, Celanese Corporation.

George R. Brown, Chairman, Brown & Root, Inc.

George Bunker, President, Martin-Marietta Corp.

John F. Burditt, Chairman, ACF Industries, Inc.

Carter L. Burgess, Chairman, American Machine & Foundry Co.

Donald C. Burnham, President, Westinghouse Electric Corp.

Louis W. Cabot, President, Cabot Corporation.

Paul C. Cabot, Chairman, State Street Investment Corp.

Edward E. Carlson, President, Western International Hotels, Inc.

James V. Carmichael, Chairman, Scripto, Inc.

Goodwin Chase, Chairman and President, National Bank of Washington.

Howard L. Clark, President, American Express Co.

Lucius D. Clay, Senior Partner, Lehman Brothers.

John Cowles, President, The Minneapolis Star & Tribune.

A. E. Dahl, Chairman, American National Bank & Trust Co. (Rapid City, Iowa).

John H. Daniels, President, Archer-Daniels-Midland Co.

Frank R. Denton, Vice Chairman, Mellon National Bank & Trust Co.

Honorable Douglas Dillon, Former Secretary of the Treasury.

Alphonsus J. Donahue, President, Donahue Sales Corp.

Frederic G. Donner, Chairman, General Motors Corp.

Donald W. Douglas, Jr., President, Douglas Aircraft Co.

J. A. Elkins, Jr., Chairman, First City National Bank of Houston.

A. M. Eriksmoen, President, Dakota National Bank of Fargo.

Sam M. Fleming, Chairman, Third National Bank of Nashville.

Henry Ford, II, Chairman, Ford Motor Co.

John Fox, Chairman, Mercantile Trust Company (St. Louis).

Fred C. Foy, Chairman, Koppers Co., Inc.

H. B. Friele, Retired President, Nakat Packing Corp.

A. H. Galloway, President, R. J. Reynolds Tobacco Co.

Theodore R. Gamble, Chairman, Pet, Inc.

Thomas S. Gates, Jr., Chairman, Morgan Guaranty Trust Company of New York.

Paul Gerot, Chairman, Pillsbury Co.

Carl J. Gilbert, Chairman, Executive Committee, The Gillette Co.

Robert F. Gray, Chairman, George A. Hormel Co.

Robert P Gwinn, President, Sunbeam Corporation.

Michael L Haider, Chairman, Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey).

Joseph B. Hall, Chairman, Federal Reserve Bank of Cleveland.

E. J. Hanley, Chairman, Allegheny-Ludlum Steel Corp.

R. V. Hansberger, President, Boise Cascade Corp.

Daniel J. Haughton, Chairman, Lockheed Aircraft Corp.

William A. Hewitt, Chairman, Deere & Co.

James P. Hickok, Chairman, First National Bank of St. Louis.

Milton P. Higgins, Chairman, Norton Co.

Jack K. Horton, President, Southern California Edison Co.

Alvin H. Howard, Partner, Howard, Weil, Labouisse, Friedrichs & Co.

Gilbert W. Humphrey, Chairman, The M. A. Hanna Co.

Reed Hunt, Chairman, Crown Zellerbach Corp.

William B. Johnson, President, Illinois Central Railroad.

Alfred W. Jones, Chairman, Sea Island Co.

Edgar F. Kaiser, President, Kaiser Industries Corp.

W. W. Keeler, President & Chief Executive Officer, Phillips Petroleum Co.

J. Ward Keener, President, The B. F. Goodrich Co.

Donald M. Kendall, President, Pepsico, Inc.

John R. Kimberly, President, Kimberly-Clark Corp.

Murray Kyger, Chairman, First National Bank of Fort Worth.

Joseph L. Lanier, Chairman, West Point-Pepperell, Inc.

Harding Lawrence, President, Braniff International.

Ralph Lazarus, President, Federated Department Stores, Inc.

George H. Love, Chairman, Consolidation Coal Co., Inc.

Ray W. MacDonald, President, Burroughs Corporation.

William P. Marsh, Jr., President, National Distillers & Chemical Corp.

William F. May, Chairman, American Can Co.

John A. Mayer, Chairman, Mellon National Bank & Trust Co.

S. M. McAshan, Jr., Chairman, Anderson, Clayton & Co., Inc.

L. F. McCollum, Chairman, Continental Oil Co.

Alexander N. McFarlane, Chairman, Corn Products Co.

Frank E. McKinney, Chairman, American Fletcher National Bank & Trust Co.

John M. Meyer, Jr., President, Morgan Guaranty Trust Co. of New York.

J. Irwin Miller, Chairman, Cummins Engine Co., Inc.

Frank R. Milliken, President, Kennecott Copper Corp.

John A. Moorhead, President, Northwestern National Bank of Minneapolis.

W. B. Murphy, President, Campbell Soup Company.

Gordon Murray, President, First National Bank of Minneapolis.

Charles F. Myers, Jr., President, Burlington Industries, Inc.

Philip H. Nason, President, First National Bank of St. Paul.

Albert L. Nickerson, Chairman, Mobil Oil Corporation.

John H. Perkins, Sr. Vice President, Continental Bank (Chicago).

Rudolph A. Peterson, President, Bank of America.

Mark Robeson, Vice President, Yellow Transit Freight Lines, Inc.

David Rockefeller, President, The Chase Manhattan Bank.

H. I. Romnes, Chairman, American Telephone & Telegraph Co.

Donald J. Russell, Chairman, Southern Pacific Co.

Stuart T. Saunders, Chairman, The Pennsylvania Railroad Co.

C. R. Smith, Chairman, American Airlines, Inc.

Charles H. Sommer, Jr., President, Monsanto Co.

J. P. Spang, Jr., Retired Chairman, The Gillette Co.

Julien Steelman, Chairman & President, Koehring Co.

Robert S. Stevenson, Chairman, Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co.

Gardiner Symonds, Chairman, Tenneco, Inc.

A. Thomas Taylor, Chairman & President, International Packers, Ltd.

Juan T. Trippe, Chairman, Pan American World Airways, Inc.

B. Finley Vinson, President, First National Bank (Little Rock, Ark.)

John C. Virden, Chairman, Eaton Yale & Towne, Inc.

J. Harris Ward, Chairman, Commonwealth Edison Co.

Thomas J. Watson, Jr., Chairman, International Business Machines Corp.

Sidney J. Weinberg, Partner, Goldman, Sachs & Co.

W. H. Wheeler, Jr., Chairman, Pitney-Bowes, Inc.

William G. White, Chairman & President, Consolidated Freightways.

George K. Whitney, Trustee, Massachusetts Investors Trust.'

John Hay Whitney, Chairman, Whitney Communications Corp.

Frazar B. Wilde, Chairman Emeritus, Connecticut General Life Insurance Co.

Joseph S. Wright, President, Zenith Radio Corporation.

Walter B. Wriston, President, First National City Bank of New York.

Additional signatories since August 24 to Statement of Principles reocmmending temporary tax increase and reduction in Government expenditures.

Ridley Alexander, President, The Second National Bank (Jackson, Tenn.).

James L. Allen, Chairman, Booz Allen & Hamilton, Inc.

O. Kelley Anderson, Chairman, New England Mutual Life Ins. Co.

William E. Anderson, Chairman of the Bd., The Central Trust Company (Cinn., Ohio).

T. T. Anden, President, Robertshaw Controls Co.

James W. Aston, Chairman of the Bd., Republic National Bank of Dallas.

Julian B. Baird, St. Paul, Minn.

Melvin H. Baker, Honorary Chairman, National Gypsum Company.

Robert C. Baker, President, American Security & Trust Co. (Wash., D.C.).

E. Colin Baldwin, President, The Sherwin-William Co.

Russell C. Ball, Jr., President, Philadelphia Gear Corp.

Fred G. Bannerot, Jr., President, Elk Refining Company.

Perry M. Barnes, President, ERB Hardware Company.

William Barnhardt, Barnhardt Elastic Corp.

F. W. Bartlett, Chairman of the Bd., Bartlett and Company.

Eduard Baruch, President, Heli-Coil Corporation.

E. T. Barwick, E. T. Barwick Mills, Inc.

Philip Behr, Chairman of the Bd., Joseph Behr & Sons, Inc.

Robert S. Bell, Chairman, Packard Bell.

Joseph Bianco, President, Bank of Idaho (Boise, Idaho).

William R. Biggs, Washington, D.C.

Thomas W. Binford, President, D–A Lubricant Company, Inc.

Jack T. F. Bitter, Chairman, The Parker-Hartford Corporation.

Donald S. Bittinger, President, Washington Gas Light Company.

L. F. Black, General Manager, Limestone Operations (United States Steel Corporation).

Joseph L. Block, Chairman, Inland Steel Company.

S. E. Blumenthal, Blumenthal Print Works.

Fred Bohen, Chairman, Meredith Publishing Company.

Dominic A. Borrasca, District Manager, The Equitable Life Assurance Society of the U.S.

James Boyd, President, Copper Range Company.

S. Russell Bridges, Jr., Chairman of the Bd., Piedmont Southern Life Insurance Co.

G. P. Brock, President, Gulf, Mobile & Ohio Railroad Co.

Edwin R. Broden, Chairman of the Bd., SKF Industries, Inc.

G. W. Bruce, President, I. S. Berlin Press.

James Bruce, New York, New York.

John D. Brundage, President, Bankers National Life Insurance Co.

J. Lawrence Buel, Jr., President, Formsprag Company.

Edward Burling, Jr., Washington, D.C.

F. L. Byrom, President, Koppers Company, Inc.

John L. Cameron, Chairman of the Bd., The Guardian Life Insurance Co.

Orton P. Camp, The Platt Bros. & Co.

Walter W. Candy, Jr., Chairman, Bullock's-Magnin Company.

Francis A. Cannon, Administrative Vice Pres., The First Boston Corporation.

Noble O. Carpenter, President, First National Bank of Canton (Canton, Ohio)

Cale W. Carson, Chairman, First National Bank in Albuquerque (N.M.)

James R. Carter, President, Nashua Corporation.

Marvin Chandler, Chairman and President, Northern Illinois Gas Co.

William R. Chapman, President, Midland National Bank of Minneapolis (Min.)

Goodwin Chase, Chairman and President, National Bank of Washington (Tacoma, Wash.)

G. Frank Clement, President, Shenandoah Life Insurance Co.

Frank A. Godchaux, Jr., Chairman, Lastarmco, Inc.

Lewis Gottlieb, Chairman, City National Bank of Baton Rouge.

Donald M. Graham, V. Chairman of the Bd. Continental Illinois National Bank and Trust Company of Chicago.

Orville F. Grahame, V. Pres. & Gen. Counsel, The Paul Revere Life Insurance Co.

B. C. Grangaard, Chairman and President, Central National Bank & Trust Co. (Des Moines).

Harold T. Graves, Jr., President, Summit & Elizabeth Trust Co. (Summit, N.J.).

William F. Graves, Chairman of the Bd., The First National Bank & Trust Co. of Fargo.

John M. Griffith, President, The City National Bank (Taylor, Tex.).

W. Arthur Grotz, President, Western Maryland Railway Co.

William S. Guthrie, Chairman of the Bd. and Pres., Buckeye Federal Savings & Loans Assn. (Columbus, Ohio).

Walter A. Haas, Jr., President, Levi Strauss & Co.

Bruce Wood Hall, Chairman of the Bd., Hempstead Bank (Hempstead, L.I., N.Y.).

C. H. Hallett, President, Allison Steel Manufacturing Co.

J. C. Hamlen, Jr., President, J. H. Hamlen & Son, Inc.

Maynard L. Harris, Chairman, Suffolk Franklin Savings Bank (Boston, Mass.).

Ralph A. Hart, Chairman, Heublein, Inc.

J. F. Hickey, Chairman and President, National Home Life Assurance Co.

James C. Hill, Division Mgr., City Mortgage Dept., Equitable Life Assurance Society of the U.S.

John A. Hill, Chairman of the Board, Airco.

Robert C. Hill, President, Bateman Eichler, Hill Richards, Inc.

Robert B. Hobbs, Chairman of the Board, First National Bank of Md. (Baltimore).

R. N. Hoerner, Chairman of the Board, Hoerner Waldorf Corporation.

Philip B. Hofmann, Chairman, Johnson & Johnson.

H. Dail Holderness, President, Carolina Telephone & Telegraph Co.

H. M. Horner, Chairman, United Aircraft.

Norman O. Houston, Chairman & Chief Exec. Off., Golden State Mutual Life Insurance Co.

Alvin H. Howard, Howard, Weil, Labouisse, Friedrichs & Co.

Roger Hull, President, Mony, The Mutual Life Insurance Co. of N.Y.

Gilbert W. Humphrey, Chairman, The Hanna Mining Company.

O. C. Hurst, President, Hurst Printing Co.

William M. Jenkins, Chairman, Seattle-First National Bank.

John Jeppson, President, Norton Company.

Frank A. Johnson, Chairman of the Board, Endicott Johnson.

Samuel C. Johnson, President, S. C. Johnson & Son. Inc.

Wilbur S. Jones, Pres. & Gen. Manager, Stone and Thomas.

O. M. Jorgenson, Chairman, Security Trust & Savings Bank (Billings, Montana).

E. E. Joynt, Chairman of the Board, The Millikin National Bank of Decatur.

Leland J. Kalmbach, Chairman of the Bd., Massachusetts Mutual Life Ins. Co.

Charles H. Kaman, President, Kaman Corporation.

J. Ward Keener, President, The B. F. Goodrich Company.

James M. Kemper, Jr., Chairman, Commerce Trust Company (Kansas City, Mo.)

D. P. Kennedy, President, First American Title Insurance & Trust Co.

George W. Kennedy, Chairman, Kelsey-Hayes Company.

Walter Kennedy, Chairman of the Board, The First National Bank of Montgomery.

Charles F. Kenny, President, Island Federal Sav. & Loan Assn. (Hempstead, N.Y.)

Thomas Kerr, President, Kerr Grain Corporation.

Forrest H. Kirkpatrick, V. Pres. & Sec'y., Wheeling Steel Corporation.

Sherman R. Knapp, President, Northeast Utilities Service Co.

C. B. Knappen, Jr., President, Knappen Milling Co.

Simon Korshoj, Korshoj Construction Co., Inc.

Raymond J. Kraft, C.L.U., Director, Group Annuities, The Equitable Life Assurance Society of the U.S.

Ferd Kramer, President, Draper & Kramer, Inc.

Chester A. Kuebler, President, Uniflow Manufacturing Co.

William G. Laffer, President, Clevite Corporation.

L. Evert Landon, Chairman, Nalley's Fine Foods (Div. of W. R. Grace & Co.).

Carleton G. Lane, President, Union Mutual Life Insurance Co.

Mills B. Lane, Jr., President, The Citizens and Southern Nat'l. Bank (Atlanta).

W. H. Lang, President, Foley Brothers, Inc.

Oscar T. Lawler, Los Angeles, Calif.

G. Albert Lawton, President, Georgia International Life Ins. Co.

W. Kemp Lehmann, President, The C. M. Kemp Mfg. Co.

Elwood E. Leonard, Jr., President, H & H Screw Products Mfg. Co.

Robert H. Levi, Chairman of the Board, The Hecht Co.

J. P. Levis, Chairman, Bd. of Directors, Owens-Illinois.

Ellis I. Levitt, Chairman of the Bd., Dial Finance Company.

S. A. Lewis, President, Robertson Paper Company, Inc.

E. W. Littlefield, Pres. & Gen. Manager, Utah Construction & Mining Co.

Edwin A. Locke, Jr., President, Modern Homes Construction Co.

John F. Lott, President, Fort Duquesne Steel Company.

Louis B. Lundborg, Chairman of the Bd., Bank of America (Los Angeles, Calif.).

Walter Lundell, President, C.I.T. Financial Corporation.

Edward W. Lyman, President, The U.S. National Bank of Omaha.

C. McK. Lynch, Jr., Chairman of the Bd., Moore, Leonard & Lynch, Inc.

Charles D. Lyon, President, The Potomac Edison Co.

R. R. Lyons, Exec. Vice President, Maui Electric Company, Limited.

Earle J. Machold, President, Niagara Mohawk Power Corp.

Herbert J. Madden, Chairman of the Board, East Tennessee Packing Co.

Carl S. Madger, Chairman of the Board & President, Triangle Conduit & Cable Co., Inc.

James F. Malone, President, Pennsylvania Manufacturers' Assn.

Frank L. Marcon, President, Duggan & Marcon, Inc.

C. V. Martin, President, Carson Pirie Scott & Co.

Roblee B. Martin, President, Dundee Cement Co.

E. W. Mathias, Treasurer, Hooker.

George G. Matkin, Chairman, The State National Bank of El Paso.

William K. H. Mau, Owner-Developer, Waikiki Business Plaza.

Baldwin Maull, Chairman of the Board, Marine Midland Corp.

J. Ray Maust, Chairman, Maust Coal & Coke Corp.

Arthur F. Maxwell, President, The First National Bank of Biddeford.

Armand May, Chairman of the Board, American Associated Companies.

William A. Mayberry, Chairman of the Board, Manufacturers National Bank of Detroit.

George D. McConnell, Chairman of the Board, Munsingwear, Inc.

R. C. McDowell, Chairman & Chief Exec. Officer, McDowell Wellman Engineering Co.

C. E. McKay, President, Copolymer Rubber & Chemical Corp.

Paul B. McKee, Director & Consultant, Pacific Power & Light Co.

F. C. McMath, President, Whitehead & Kales Co.

W. P. McMullan, Chairman of the Board, Deposit Guaranty National Bank (Jackson, Miss.)

J. Finley McRae, Chairman of the Board, The Merchants National Bank of Mobile.

Allen W. Merrell, Vice President, Civic & Governmental Affairs, The Ford Motor Co.

D. C. Mieher, Executive Vice President, Southern Farm Bureau Life Ins. Co.

Arjay Miller, President, The Ford Motor Co.

Max H. Miller, President, United Cement Products Co.

Robert L. Milligan, Chairman, Pure Oil Company.

John B. Mitchell, President, First National Bank in St. Louis.

E. H. Moak, President, Moak Machine & Foundry Co.

George G. Montgomery, Chairman, Kern County Land Co.

Walter S. Montgomery, President & Treasurer, Spartan Mills.

Edward A. Mooers, Chairman of the Board, The Hilliard Corporation.

J. M. Moore, Jr., District Sales Manager, Ford Motor Co. (East Point, Ga.).

R. Cosby Moore, Chairman, Virginia National Bank (Norfolk).

Warren S. Moore, President, W. S. Moore Company.

John A. Moorhead, President, Northwestern National Bank of Minneapolis.

E. A. Morris, Chairman of the Board, Blue Bell, Inc.

Charles G. Mortimer, Chairman, Exec. Com., General Foods Corporation.

Wilson Mothershead, Chairman of the Board, The Indiana National Bank (Indianapolis).

George A. Murphy, Chairman, Irving Trust Co. (New York, N.Y.).

Robert D. Murphy, Chairman of the Board, Corning Glass International.

Charles E. Nail, President, The Lumbermens Mutual Ins. Co.

Walter C. Nelson, President, Eberhardt Company.

Frank L. Newburger, Jr., Partner, Newburger & Company.

Joseph E. Nolan, Exec. Vice Pres. Weyerhaeuser Company.

Lloyd U. Noland, Jr., Chairman, Noland Company, Inc.

J. Van Dyke Norman, Jr., Chairman of the Board, First National Lincoln Bank (Louisville, Ky.).

F. J. Nunlist, Chairman of the Board, Worthington Corporation.

James F. Oates, Jr., Chairman of the Board, The Equitable Life Assurance Society.

W. J. O'Connor, President & Gen. Mgr., Independent Coal & Coke. Co.

John F. O'Neill, President, Lincoln Mutual Life Ins. Co.

W. Irving Osborne, Jr., Chairman & President, Pullman Incorporated.

Robert W. Ostermayer, Sr., Chairman, Pennsylvania Industrial Chemical Corp.

Edward H. Ould, President, The First National Exchange Bank of Va. (Roanoke).

W. W. Overton, Jr., Chairman of the Board, Texas Bank & Trust Co. of Dallas.

Stephen C. Owen, Chairman of the Board, Beacon Manufacturing Co.

David Packard, Chairman, Hewlett-Packard Co.

John Panchuk, Sec'y & Gen. Counsel, Federal Life & Casualty Co.

Donald H. Parsons, Chairman, Bank of the Commonwealth (Detroit).

Emil J. Pattberg, Jr., Chairman of the Board, The First Boston Corporation.

T. A. Paxton, President, Southern Textile Machinery Co., Inc.

Richard K. Paynter, Jr., Chairman of the Board, New York Life Insurance Co.

John W. Pease, Pease Woodwork Co.

Douglas G. Peet, President, Peet Packing Co.

Guy S. Peppiatt, Chairman of the Board, Federal-Mogul Corp.

R. T. Person, President, Public Service Co., of Colorado.

K. M. Peterson, Depot Controller, Salt Lake City Parts Depot, Ford Motor Co.

Herman H. Pevler, President, Norfolk & Western Railway Co.

G. L. Phillippe, Chairman of the Board, General Electric Co.

Richard E. Pille, Chairman of the Board & Pres., Security Mutual Life Ins. Co. of New York.

Harlan Potter, Mid-West Conveyor Co., Inc.

Henry W. Putnam, Partner, DeCoppet & Doremus.

Harold W. Quinlan, Pres. & Gen. Mgr., The Lehigh & Hudson River Railway Co.

Harold Quinton, Chairman of the Board, Southern California Edison Co.

Frederic K. Raiff, President Raylass Department Stores, Inc.

Addison H. Reese, Chairman of the Board North Carolina National Bank (Charlotte).

Everett D. Reese, Chairman, the City National Bank & Trust Co. of Columbus.

William S. Renchard, Chairman, Chemical Bank New York Trust Co.

Ray R. Reter, Reter Fruit Co.

R. S. Reynolds, Jr., Chairman of the Board, Reynolds Metals Company.

Volney Richmond, Jr., Northern Commercial Co.

Oscar A. Richter, President, Richter Vinegar Corp.

Harold E. Rider, Chairman, The Fairfield County Trust Co. (Stamford, Conn.)

F. J. Robbins, President, Bliss & Laughlin Industries.

Henry R. Roberts, President, Connecticut General Life Ins. Co.

W. E. Roberts, Vice Pres. & Sec'y., The Carpenter Steel Co.

William E. Roberts, Ampex Corporation.

N. S. Rogers, President, Deposit Guaranty National Bank (Jackson, Miss.)

John L. Roper, 2nd, Pres. & Gen. Mgr., Norfolk Shipbuilding & Drydock Corp.

James B. Ross, President, Puritan Life Insurance Co.

Henry E. Russell, President, Carling Brewing Co.

John D. Saint-Amour, President, API Instruments Co.

T. Schlesinger, President, Allied Stores Corp.

Walter M. Schwartz, Jr., President, Proctor-Silex Inc.

W. Harry Schwarzschild, Jr., President, The Central National Bank (Richmond).

Ellery Sedgwick, Jr., Ch. of the Bd. & Chf. Exec. Off., Medusa Portland Cement Co.

Bruce B. Selkirk, Chairman, Midwest Curtain Co.

C. H. Sethness, Jr., Sethness Products Co.

Charles W. Shaeffer, Chairman & President, T. Rowe Price and Associates, Inc.

David B. Shaw, Vice Pres. & Trust Officer, The First National Bank (Pueblo, Colo.).

John C. Shenk, Sr., President, First Federal Savings & Loan Assn. of Davenport.

A. G. Shireman, President, Tower Federal Savings & Loan Assn.

S. N. Shure, President, Shure Bros., Inc.

Thomas C. Simons, C.L.U., Agency Vice Pres., Connecticut General Life Ins. Co.

David B. Simpson, Chairman, Norris, Beggs & Simpson.

Joseph W. Simpson, Jr., Chairman of the Board, First Wisconsin National Bank of Milwaukee.

Thomas B. Singleton, President, The Murine Co., Inc.

J. Thomas Smith, President, Dura Corporation.

Olcott Damon Smith, Chairman, Aetna Life & Casualty.

Leonard Spacek, Arthur Andersen & Co.

R. A. Spaugh, Chairman, Washington Mills Co.

Philip Sporn, Consultant, New York.

Richard C. Steele, President & Publisher, Worcester Telegram (Worcester, Mass.).

R. A. Stranahan, Jr., President, Champion Spark Plug Co.

C. P. Street, McDevitt & Street Co.

Allen P. Stults, President, American National Bank & Trust Co. of Chicago.

Dabbs Sullivan, Vice Chairman, Worthen Bank & Trust Co. (Little Rock, Ark.).

F. L. Sulzberger, Chairman of the Board, Enterprise Paint Mfg. Co.

Samuel Reid Sutphin, Chairman, The Beveridge Paper Co.

Ernest O. Swigert, Chairman of the Board, Hyster Company.

Paul E. Taliaferro, Ch. of the Board,. Sunray DX Oil Co.

Robert H. Taylor, Chairman, Taylor Engineering Corp.

A. D. Theobald, President, First Federal Savings & Loan Assn. of Peoria.

Charles Allen Thomas, Chairman of the Finance Comm., Monsanto Company.

Herbert L. Thomas, Jr., President, First Pyramid Life Ins. Co.

J. T. Thomas, President, Thilmany Pulp & Paper Co.

Malcolm D. Thomas, President, Southwest Indemnity & Life Ins. Co.

Rupert C. Thompson, Jr., Ch. of the Board, Textron.

T. M. Thompson, Ch. of the Board, Gen'l. American Transportation Corp.

Robert M. Thorpe, President, Educators Manufacturing Co.

John F. Thurston, President, Mueller Co.

R. C. Thwing, President, Loyd W. Richardson Construction Corp.

Laurence E. Tierney, Jr., Ch. of the Board, Eastern Coal Corporation.

J. A. Tillett, TRW Incorporated.

E. Don Toll, President, Cummins Engine Co., Inc.

Jack A. Tompkins, Vice President, American Airlines.

S. K. Towson, Jr., President, The Elwell-Parker Electric Co.

William I. Trader, President, Peninsular Steel Company.

L. H. True, President, Mobile Pipe Line Co.

Norfleet Turner, Chairman, The First National Bank of Memphis.

Charles R. Tyson, President, The Penn Mutual Life Ins. Co.

Fred B. Underman, President, Danner Press, Inc.

E. P. Vanderwicken, Exec. Vice Pres., Motorola, Inc.

Paul E. Van Horn, C.L.U., Ch. of the Board, The American Life Ins. Co. of New York.

M. P. Venema, Chairman of the Board, Universal Oil Products Co.

Richard D. Vermillion, Vice Pres., Smith, Barney & Co., Inc.

Arthur L. Wadsworth, Exec. Vice Pres., Dillon, Read & Co., Inc.

R. M. Waters, President, Security Trust & Savings Bank (Billings, Mont.).

Frederick D. Watkins, President, Aetna Insurance Co.

Philip H. Watts, Alex. Brown & Sons.

Robert F. Weischel, President, Great National Life Ins. Co.

H. D. Weidig, President, Theo. H. Davies & Co., Ltd.

Arthur O. Wellman, President, Nichols & Company, Inc.

W. H. Wheeler, Jr., Chairman, Pitney-Bowes, Inc.

S. W. White, Jr., President, Oliver Corporation.

E. Paul Williams, President, Second National Bank (Ashland, Ky.)

Frank O. H. Williams, Chairman, Puritan Life Ins. Co.

John H. Williams, Williams Bros. Company.

Luke Williams, Jr., President, American Sign & Indicator Corp.

J. Harry Wood, C.L.U., President, Home Life Insurance Co.

John W. Woods, Jr., President, Third National Bank of Ashland (Ky.)

Joseph E. Workman, Vice Chairman, Latrobe Steel Co.

W. E. Wright, President, Pioneer Mutual Life Ins. Co.

Harold L. Yoh, President, Day & Zimmermann, Inc.

Lyle E. Yost, President, Hesston Manufacturing Co., Inc.

Charles J. Zimmerman, C.L.U., Chairman, The Connecticut Mutual Life Ins. Co.

Henry Zinmaster, Henry Zinmaster Baking Co.

Kenneth V. Zweiner, Chairman of the Board, Harris Trust & Savings Bank (Chicago).

Polish Painter Wins Sao Paulo Biennial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1967

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I was interested to learn this morning that an important competitive exhibition of contemporary art gave one of its highest awards to a Polish painter, Tadeusz Kantor.

This event took place yesterday at the São Paulo Biennial, one of the two or three most influential international exhibitions of modern art.

Mr. Kantor, I am informed, was awarded $2,500 for one of his entries in that exhibition.

As some of the Members may recall, modern Polish painters made a considerable impression on the Western world following the so-called October Revolution in Poland in 1956.

Their works, finally made available to us, proved to be as inventive, as expressive, as technically excellent, and as modern as any produced in the West.

It was in 1961, if I recall correctly, that Mr. Peter Seltz, then the assistant director of the Museum of Modern Art in New York City, put together an exhibit of the works of 15 modern Polish painters and brought it to the United States where the exhibit met with great praise.

Mr. Kantor's works were among those selected by Mr. Seltz for that exhibit and they were received enthusiastically in our country.

The award made to Mr. Kantor yesterday in São Paulo, Brazil, is an eloquent testimonial of the fact that even the most totalitarian and oppressive ideology cannot for long suppress the human spirit.

Men and women of talent, wherever they may live, will express themselves through their writings, paintings, and sculpture regardless of how their particular government may view such activities.

Man's spirit remains free even in a Communist environment—and the tribute paid at São Paulo to Mr. Kantor is in some measure a tribute to the indomitable spirit of the Polish people.

World Diplomacy No Amateur Job

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON FUQUA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1967

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, the woods seem to be full of candidates for the Nobel Peace Prize.

Recently we have seen an incident blown all out of proportion regarding a letter drafted by Harry Ashmore and Bill Baggs. These gentlemen went to Hanoi to seek the participation of North Vietnam in a peace conference to be sponsored by the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, which Mr. Ashmore heads.

It is hard to see how the fact that they informed the State Department of their letter should have altered the decision of the President of the United States to draft a letter setting forth terms for the beginning of peace negotiations.

The efforts of private citizens to encourage peace is laudable, but it is not wise for our Government to inform amateur diplomats of its decisions of official policy.

I think that an editorial which appeared in the Tallahassee, Fla., Democrat, on Tuesday, September 19, 1967, makes a very clear and concise point with regard to this incident:

NO JOB FOR AMATEURS

The conduct of our United States foreign policy is by constitutional mandate, and should be, in the hands of the President and the State Department. Private citizens should not be allowed or encouraged to meddle in it independently.

So the State Department must bear some criticism for letting Harry Ashmore and Bill Baggs go to Hanoi under some impression that they could open peace negotiations with Ho Chi Minh, and for letting them follow up their visit with a letter written with State Department knowledge.

However we see little justification for complaints now by Ashmore and Baggs that President Johnson scuttled their efforts by laying down hard terms for beginning peace negotiations three days before their more conciliatory note was to be delivered to Ho.

Ashmore and Baggs, professional writers and amateur statesmen, went to Hanoi to seek North Vietnamese participation in an unofficial peace conference to be sponsored in Geneva by the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions. This is a Ford Foundation establishment with which Baggs and Ashmore are associated. It's general inclination is more conciliatory toward North Vietnam in particular and communism in general than is the official policy of the United States government. Naturally, therefore, they found Ho more friendly to their approach than to those by official representatives of the United States government through regular diplomatic channels.

It is logical, and proper too, that the U.S. State Department should not let these self-propelled emissaries know all the secrets of official diplomacy. And if the President's hard-line letter was sent deliberately to undercut private efforts in conflict with official policy, it was a maneuver justifiable on diplomatic principles. Failure to make the government's official position clear in the face of contrary unofficial negotiations could have created a worse mess than we have in Vietnam.

Ashmore and Baggs should have stuck to their specialties. The State Department should not have encouraged them to consider themselves agents of our diplomacy. Now they should pipe down. They got their stories, but no peace prize.

Faith

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1967

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an inspiring poem by the great American composer and lyricist, my friend, John Redmond, native of Clinton, Mass., and an outstanding member of ASCAP.

This work is all the more significant because it is timely in the light of the confusion, bewilderment and moral obliquity that seems to be so much a part of the time in which we live.

Mr. Redmond is not only a famous, popular composer, but a gifted author of many songs of faith and inspiration.

The poem follows:

DID YOU EVER STOP TO "THINK"

(By John Redmond, ASCAP)

Did you ever stop to "think",
When you look up at the sky,
The wonder of the moon and stars
And things with wings to fly?
Did you ever stop to "think",
How they ever came about,
The things you live with every day,
You couldn't live without,
Sun and showers, helping flowers
Work their way up thru the ground,
Or a falling snow on a rolling hill
When winter rolls around?
Look about you here and there,
You have blessings everywhere, and
Did you ever stop to "think", not far away
There is someone you can "thank" every day?

Harold W. Greenwood, Jr., President, Midwest Federal Savings & Loan Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1967

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Harold Greenwood, Jr., a distinguished Minnesotan and the dynamic president of Midwest Federal Savings & Loan Association of Minneapolis, Minn., testified recently before the Subcommittee on Bank Supervision and Insurance in support of legislation providing for Federal chartering of mutual savings banks.

Mr. Greenwood's comments reflect a commonsense, mature, and sound approach to a complex issue. Not only does he have a thorough understanding of the savings and loan field, but he also has a keen grasp of the problems of the homeowner, the small businessman, and the banking industry, as well as their relationship to the best interests of the general public.

I feel that Mr. Greenwood's statement is of special significance and would like to share it with my colleagues by including it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

FEDERAL CHARTER LEGISLATION FOR MUTUAL SAVINGS BANKS—1967

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, SUBCOMMITTEE ON BANK SUPERVISION AND INSURANCE OF THE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY,
Washington, D.C., July 20, 1967.

Mr. MULTER. Good morning, gentlemen. We will resume our hearings this morning on bills to authorize Federal chartering of mutual savings banks.

We are very pleased to welcome here our distinguished colleague, Congressman John A. Blatnik. It is always good to have any of our colleagues come in and visit with us and we are particularly pleased to have Congressman Blatnik with us. He is one of the most able Members of the House, and this is without any partisan reflection. It is well known that he always does a good job on any of the work he tackles.

We are very pleased to ask him to take his place at the witness table, together with Mr. Greenwood, whom I believe he will present to the subcommittee.

STATEMENT OF HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE EIGHTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF THE STATE OF MINNESOTA

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate your very kind, generous and sincere words.

I am truly pleased to be here personally to present to the chairman of the subcommittee and the members of the subcommittee a very close friend of mine for quite some years now, Mr. Harold Greenwood, Jr., one of the very dynamic, progressive, imaginative and forward-looking young men that are not too frequently found in the field of finance. It comes to few, so early in life, to achieve the measure of success as has he. Mr. Greenwood is president of what is now the second largest savings and loan instittuion in the State of Minnesota. He is now, and has been for some years, president of the Midwest Federal Savings & Loan Association in Minneapolis.

Further accomplishments: Mr. Greenwood has already served as president of the Minnesota Savings & Loan League; he is currently a member of the legislative committee of the United States Savings & Loan League; he is also chairman of the Minnesota Small Business Administration Advisory Committee, and also serves on other important committees.

Through his own initiative he has, more than any other single person I know in his field of enterprise, advanced—not only his personal interest, but to a commendable degree has worked for the broader general interests of the financial institutions, as well as the home and property owner, the small businessman, and the general community and State in their best interests.

So, Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the special courtesy extended to me to present to you and to the subcommittee Mr. Harold Greenwood, Jr., of Minneapolis.

Mr. MULTER. Thank you, Mr. Blatnik. We are very happy to have you here, Mr. Greenwood.

I notice that you have a prepared statement. You may summarize it or you may read it as you please.

STATEMENT OF HAROLD W. GREENWOOD, JR., PRESIDENT, MIDWEST FEDERAL SAVINGS & LOAN ASSOCIATION; ACCOMPANIED BY HAROLD J. SODERBERG, COUNSEL

Mr. GREENWOOD. I wish to read it, Mr. Chairman.

My name is Harold W. Greenwood, Jr., and I am president of Midwest Federal Savings & Loan Association which has its principal office in Minneapolis, Minn. I have served as president of the Minnesota Savings & Loan League and I am currently a member of the Legislative Committee of the United States Savings & Loan League.

The subject of the bill which is now before your committee, H.R. 10745, providing for Federal chartering of mutual savings banks, has been discussed among members of the savings and loan industry for some time. In my opinion, the objects of this bill are in the public interest and I appreciate this opportunity to appear to express my support of H.R. 10745.

As president of Midwest Federal, my first obligation in any matter of this nature is, of course, to protect the interests of that association. I wish to say, therefore, that it is my view and the view of the members of our board of directors, that passage of this bill would not adversely affect our institution. In fact, we believe its passage would be very beneficial. The most obvious benefit is the option the bill provides for a savings and loan association such as ours to apply for conversion to a Federal savings bank if and when such a conversion appeared to be in the best interests of the institution. A large mutual savings bank, the Farmer & Mechanics Savings Bank of Minneapolis, is located within a few blocks of our principal office and I feel that we do now, as a savings and loan association, compete effectively with it. We are not prepared, at this time, to indicate any intention to seek conversion to a savings bank if this bill were to pass. On the other hand, a Federal savings bank as constituted under this legislation, would have a number of attractive features the advantages of which we would certainly consider. With the many innovations and changing currents which everyone in the financial industry is experiencing, the availability of this alternative is clearly advantageous to us.

I feel also that this legislation deserves our support for the effect it will have on the expansion and possible unification of the mutual thrift industry. The interests of our association are tied not only to the success and development of the savings and loan industry, but to that of the mutual thrift industry as a whole. It is difficult to predict the extent to which that industry would be expanded as a result of the passage of this bill, but I think it is fair to assume, in view of the limited number of States which presently authorize the formation of mutual savings banks that some expansion, especially geographically, of mutual savings banks and, therefore the mutual thrift industry, would occur. Savings and loan associations and mutual savings banks, as members of the mutual thrift industry, have many interests in common which the expansion of that industry should serve to promote.

The organizations of mutual savings banks and savings and loan associations have both expressed support for unification of the mutual thrift industry. If this unification is to become a reality, I think its best prospects lie in the passage of this legislation.

Apart from the effect this bill might have on our associations or the mutual thrift industry, I feel very strongly that its objectives are to protect and promote the public interest. The history of savings and loan associations and mutual savings banks has already been extensively presented to this committee and I wish to say, as a member of the savings and loan industry, that I am extremely proud of that record. In view of the role that the mutual thrift industry has played in the development of our country and the function that it continues to serve in our society, I am convinced that its further expansion is definitely in the public interest. Among other things, this expansion would broaden the promotion of thrift, would improve the flow of funds between savers and borrowers, would provide savers and borrowers with an alternative source of accommodation, and, where needed, would provide the stimulation of competition.

In regard to the effect of this bill on savings and loan associations and other financial institutions, I do not believe that it would be prejudicial to them. H.R. 10745, providing for the Federal chartering of mutual savings banks, makes extensive provisions for such chartering, their regulation and the nature of their powers.

The bill follows extensive studies and hearings and it carefully and comprehensively defines the circumstances under which any such institution would be created and the conditions under which they would operate. I am satisfied that the law, under the administration of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, would not result in any undue prejudice to existing financial institutions of any nature.

In view of the numerous safeguards which exist to protect the interests of existing financial institutions, I think it is appropriate to note the considerations of fairness which apply to existing mutual savings banks seeking passage of this legislation.

The bill would give to mutual savings banks, or the organizers of mutual savings banks, the option to become federally chartered and regulated in the same manner that that option now exists for commercial banks, savings and loan associations and credit unions. The importance of that option is readily apparent to me in the light of experience in my own State. Our association began as a State savings and loan association in 1891 and was converted to a Federal association after 72 years as a State-chartered institution.

At the time of our conversion, we were the largest State association in Minnesota as well as the oldest. We finally concluded, however, that limitations in the laws of our State caused certain competitive handicaps and prevented our association from having the growth which it should have in relation to other competing institutions. Since our problem under State law involved the question of authority to establish branches, among other things, I have watched with interest and sympathy the efforts of Farmers & Mechanics Bank to obtain authority to establish branches under the laws of the State of Minnesota.

Following a decision of the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota that Farmers & Mechanics Bank did not have such authority, the bank has in repeated efforts before the State legislature tried without avail to gain authorization for the establishment of branch offices to better serve its customers and maintain a competitive relationship with other financial and mutual thrift institutions in the Twin City metropolitan area.

Similar problems undoubtedly confront mutual savings banks in other States of the country where their establishment is authorized and would be equally lacking in justification. In the field of commercial banks, savings and loan associations and credit unions where a dual system of Federal and State chartering and regulation exists, once the law under which the institution was chartered no longer meets the needs of the institution as they have developed, it can at least consider the possibility of converting to regulation under another authority where its legitimate goals can be realized.

Savings and loan associations were first established in 1831 and mutual savings banks in 1816. It was not until 1933 that provision was made by Congress for Federal chartering of savings and loan associations. In that accomplishment, as you are no doubt aware, it was necessary to overcome much of the same reluctance which now exists with regard to the Federal chartering of mutual savings banks.

Experience has shown that the decision to authorize Federal savings and loan associations was a good one. I can see no reason why authorization of Federal mutual savings banks would not likewise add to the public good. The basic needs to encourage thrift, to facilitate the flow of funds and to provide mortgage loans at better rates and terms are all desirable goals which this proposal should help to achieve. The eventual unification of the mutual thrift industry, for which this legislation may serve as a vehicle, would be a most fitting objective of congressional acticity in this field.

In conclusion, I wish only to say that my views are shared by a number of other members of the savings and loan industry, that the time has come for the authorization of Federal mutual savings banks.

Thank you.

Who'll Pick Up the Tab?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1967

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, now that the U.S. Government's fiscal situation is in such a mess that the Congress is being begged to increase taxes and there is belated talk of cutting unnecessary spending, it seems to me that there are many areas where one program after another can be deferred if the heads of the agencies are in any manner concerned with our fiscal plight.

Last July, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare announced that 38 elementary and secondary school administrators will receive $95,000 in awards from the U.S. Office of Education to attend a 4-week seminar and 2 additional weeks of junketing in a second country which has not even been designated as yet. I understand that three such projects have been planned.

Even though part of these funds are presumed to come from excess foreign currencies under Public Law 83—480, this is the kind of thing that can and should be deferred. The fact of the matter is that we are getting too much lipservice in some quarters and not enough action where it really counts. The only way we are ever going to reduce expenditures is to call the various department heads in and determine which programs can be deferred and just let some of these nonpriority things wait as long as necessary to get our fiscal situation back in order. The alternative is to expect the American taxpayer to foot the bill on any programs that John Q. Public would oppose if he ever had the opportunity to do so and since he does not, it seems to me that Members of this body have a responsibility to occasionally act in the interest of those people who are called upon to pay the tab.

South Vietnam Land Reform Might Shorten the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1967

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the respected historian, Dr. Stefan T. Possony, director of the international political studies program at the Hoover Institution on War Revolution and Peace has lately devoted a great deal of his talents to the situation in Vietnam. Dr. Possony has spent considerable time in that unfortunate land and knows whereof he speaks on an intimate personal basis. One of his suggestions appeared in the Los Angeles Times for September 14, as follows:

LAND REFORM COULD SHORTEN WAR

(By Stefan T. Possony)

Now that South Vietnam's elections are over, the long-stalled land program should be revitalized. A basic land reform law has been on the books since 1956, but substantial holdings of land were distributed only during three years (1959–1961). Economic conditions throughout the country are far from catastrophic. But there still are large numbers of landless peasants; two-fifths of the 1.5 million South Vietnam farms are too small to support a family; and many small farmers must supplement their income by onerous tenancy contracts.

A good reform would satisfy the peasants' yearnings for private land property. It would deprive the Viet Cong of support by peasants who fear the return of the landlords to whom, they think quite wrongly, they are heavily indebted. It would reduce the flow of food to the guerrilla areas from the Mekong delta, the center of rice production, where most of the land is tilled by tenants and laborers.

Land reform would strengthen the morale of the Vietnamese peasant-soldiers who do not want to go home to dwarf plots and pay giant rents. It would resettle the 1 million refugees from Viet Cong oppression, many of whom are still in camps, while others fear expulsion from the lands on which they are "squatting."

More important still: an imaginative land reform could accelerate victory in the ground battle. For example, the soldiers could be given homesteading rights proportionate to the areas which they liberate. Furthermore, by giving to the soldiers and peasants bulldozers and huge modern plows which allow the clearing of dense jungle at $50 per acre, new lands could be added and Viet Cong hideaways eliminated. Finally, Viet Cong soldiers could be attracted with offers of land: a stepped-up desertion rate would result in an earlier collapse of the rebellion.

To make the reform effective, about 5 million acres need to be given to the peasants. Although the Viet Cong still control about 3 million acres, there is enough land for an ambitious program. After having distributed 650,000 acres under the land reform law, the government is now holding close to 1 million acres for distribution.

Much cultivated land is subject to expropriation under existing laws. Of the 8.6 million acres (20% of the total surface), which are presently considered arable, 7.5 million acres are under cultivation. But since forests cover 12.5 million acres, much additional acreage, which need not be expropriated, is potentially available.

There are five major reasons why the program has bogged down.

1. The landlords, who wield considerable political influence, are not being properly compensated for their loss. Yet, as was demonstrated on Taiwan, land reform can be profitable to the landlords; and the Vietnamese landowners know all about the Taiwan model. Instead of "expropriating" operating wealth, it would be economically, politically and militarily more advisable to create new resources.

2. There are few opportunities to reinvest the compensation payments. Indemnities are paid slowly in installments and are largely in the form of government bonds. At the same time, the peasants are not given the land outright but must buy it in 12 yearly installments. Saigon also lacks the tools and organizations to clear new land.

3. The land surveys are not completed and many titles are disputed. Hence the issuance of new titles has been delayed and the peasants doubt the government's sincerity.

4. Vietnam is simply unable to finance a truly effective land reform.

5. Though paying lip service to land reform, the United States has shown no real interest in this program. The war now costs about $25 billion a year, but since 1954 the United States has budgeted only $5.1 million for the Vietnamese land reform. The current allocation is $700,000 plus $800 for an aerial survey. Yet, if adequate compensation were to be paid for 2 million presently cultivated acres, and if 3 million acres of jungle were to be cleared, the cost would be well over $1 billion.

The United States should revive the land reform program by offering Vietnam a substantial long-term loan. Since a good reform program would be productive, we could even get our money back.

On their part, the Vietnamese should establish a Land Reform Bank to buy land, deed it to the peasants and help the landlords re-invest their capital, for example in fertilizer and food processing plants, storage facilities, distribution systems and large modernized rubber, coffee and tea plantations. The bank could issue land titles, not necessarily titles to particular pieces of land, but acreage rights; pending definitive land allotments, those titles could bear interest. The Vietnamese also should set up organizations for large-scale land clearing and military homesteading.

Once the program is moving the Viet Cong should be informed by all useful communications media that they can get their share of land as soon as they return and claim it. The political atmosphere would be changed dramatically, and democracy would prevail that much easier and that much earlier.

Mental Retardation Amendments of 1967

SPEECH

OF

HON. ROBERT O. TIERNAN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 20, 1967

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 6430) to amend the public health laws relating to mental retardation to extend, expand, and improve them, and for other purposes.

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to commend the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and the Health Subcommittee for the excellent mental retardation legislation which it brought before the House. Great progress has been made recently in the field of mental retardation, and this legislation will provide continued Federal support for programs to attack a condition which afflicts over 6,000,000 Americans.

H.R. 6430 as passed by the House provides $160,000,000 for a 3-year program of grants for the construction of university-affiliated and community facilities for the care and treatment of mentally retarded. It also provides for the establishment of a new program of staffing grants, and authorizes a total of $86,500,000 for this purpose. This authority is patterned after the staffing provisions in the community mental health legislation and is designed to help communities pay a portion of the cost of professional and technical personnel for their facilities.

The programs contained in this legislation offer a challenge and a stimulus to States and communities to continue their efforts in meeting the particular needs of the mentally retarded. Under existing legislation, my own home State of Rhode Island has begun construction of two community facilities which, when completed, will serve over 1,100 mentally retarded. And we hope to make even greater gains under H.R. 6430 which the House has unanimously endorsed.

All of us recognize that mental retardation is a difficult and complex affliction, with varied causes and resulting handicapping conditions. There are those children who are so severely retarded that they cannot survive unless constantly cared for and sheltered. On the other hand, there are those whose handicapped condition allows them to adjust in a limited way to the demands of society and to play a positive role in gainful employment. To these persons, we must provide a wide range of services which will enable them to function as fully as possible at their particular levels of adaptive behavior.

This we must do for persons who have already been diagnosed as mentally retarded. However, we must continue our efforts to prevent mental retardation. Under existing legislation, 12 research centers were constructed to provide the facilities and resources necessary for a major attack on the problems of mental retardation across a broad front of research involving all major disciplines including the biomedical, behavioral, social and educational sciences. The development of these 12 centers has provided new opportunities for cross-disciplinary research; created mechanisms for coordinated research efforts by many investigators; and provided new and expanded training programs and resources for training research investigators for work in the field of mental retardation.

It is encouraging to see considerable achievements in the field of mental retardation. Much remains to be done, however.

It would be impossible to discuss programs for the mentally retarded without mentioning the late John E. Fogarty, whose distinguished service to the health needs of this country earned him the Nation's gratitude and admiration while he lived and deepest sorrow when he died.

No one had a greater concern for the problems of the retarded than my distinguished predecessor, John E. Fogarty. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Labor and HEW Appropriations, Mr. Fogarty showed a deep interest in the problems of the retarded, securing through his committee efforts, funds to launch the original mental retardation legislation passed in 1965, Public Law 89–105.

The House has honored his memory as well as served a critical health need of the Nation by passing this legislation.

Stay in School Month

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 20, 1967

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, Jefferson City, Tenn., is a very progressive city in the First District, which has come to grips with one of the most pressing problems now facing the American people.

The following proclamation by the mayor of Jefferson City appeared in the Jefferson City Standard-Banner, and I insert it in the Appendix of the Record:

STAY IN SCHOOL

Whereas, the future strength and welfare of our Nation rests with the young people who are now receiving education and training in our school systems; and

Whereas, the demands of modern technology have become such as to require increasingly higher levels of educational attainment on the part of American workers; and

Whereas, the fall term of the new school year has begun and large numbers of American youths are weighing a decision as to whether to return to the classroom; and

Whereas, this year, almost a million youngsters will drop out of school before completing their education:

Now, therefore, I Everett Moyers, do hereby call upon parents, teachers, business, labor, religious, civic and all organizations and private citizens to emphasize to the youth of our city the importance of getting a good education, and hereby proclaim the month of September as "Stay In School" month in Jefferson City.

Johnson Sticks by His Viet Guns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1967

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, Editor-Publisher William G. Conomos, of the Orlando Sentinel has recently editorialized on the position of the President in the Vietnam conflict which merits the attention of Members of the Congress, and I insert his editorial in the Record:

JOHNSON STICKS BY HIS VIET GUNS

It is not correct to say that America has a tiger by the tail in South Vietnam, even if it so appears to many Americans.

It is more accurate to say that America has the Communist dragon at bay in Southeast Asia, and quite logical to assume that this determined dragon would like nothing better than for America to step out of the way to let it be about its business.

And the business of the Red dragon is to subvert and control the world.

This is the way President Johnson sees the situation in Southeast Asia, and he is determined to stop the dragon in its tracks and to keep it stopped—now when it can be done without plunging the world into nuclear war.

President Johnson seems to have made his decision to see this war through to a successful conclusion, even if he has to sacrifice his own domestic programs and even if it costs him defeat at the polls in 1968.

Obviously the job of stopping the determined dragon is tougher than he or anyone else had anticipated, and he has no other choice but to see it through to the end. He is meeting force with superior force and is stepping up the air war to weaken and discourage the stubborn enemy.

While mistakes have been made, America's policy will pay off, even if it makes Lyndon Johnson very unpopular, as the equally necessary Korean war made Truman an unpopular President and a great man in history.

No President outside of Truman and Lincoln has been so criticized in time of war than has President Johnson. He apparently understands and accepts the criticism as the price he must pay for doing what he must do, come what may.

While he has not mentioned it, it would be safe to assume that the words President Lincoln uttered in the darkest days of the Civil War frequently come to President Johnson's mind. When critics were pounding him on all sides, Lincoln said:

"I do the very best I know how—the very best I can; and I mean to keep doing so until the end. If the end brings me out all right, what is said against me won't amount to anything. If the end brings me out wrong. 10 angels swearing I was right would make no difference."

While the situation is different, President Johnson does find himself in a similar predicament. Lincoln and all embattled Presidents have had their Martin Kings, William Fulbrights and Bobby Kennedys.

Whether we all like it or not, President Johnson is sticking by his guns, and he is stepping up the bombing pressure, which is the only sensible course he can follow. If he subdues the charging dragon, this victory will bring its own consensus, sooner or later.

Montville, Conn.: Past and Present

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1967

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the Record the text of an article about the town of Montville, Conn., in my congressional district. Montville was first incorporated as a town back in 1786, or 181 years ago. Its first settlers, however, dates from the year 1670, nearly 300 years ago.

This very interesting article is written by my good friend Comdr. Robert H. Barnes, a retired Navy officer, who is a former Democratic Representative from Montville in the Connecticut General Assembly where he served with distinction for a number of years. He is also known as an historian, particularly of local Connecticut history.

The article by Commander Barnes appeared in the July–August 1967 issue of Connecticut Circle, which is published periodically at New London, Conn., and is devoted to Connecticut, its past and its present. I commend this article to the attention of my colleagues. It reads as follows:

MONTVILLE: QUITE A TOWN

(By Robert H. Barnes)

Located between New London and Norwich you hear very little from the Town of Montville until Commander Robert H. Barnes, member of the State Assembly gets on his feet. Then you learn that Montville's problems are about to be solved—and that after all Montville has some 45 square miles—about eight times the size of New London.

Originally a part of New London, it was called the North Parish of New London—and included at one time a part of the present town of Salem. But Montville became separated and was incorporated as a Town of the State of Connecticut in 1786.

Historian Robert Barnes says that archaeologists think that over 15,000 years ago a Mongoloid breed of Indian migrated from Siberia across Bering Straits and spread over N. and S. America. The first Indian population in Connecticut remained constant until the Mohegan-Pequot group moved in from New York. Then commenced trouble for the white settlers. The Pequot leader Sassacus was hostile to the whites while Sachem Uncas, leader of the Mohegans was friendly. Banding together the Mohegans and the whites inflicted a destructive defeat on the Pequots. Then it was that the whites expanded, with the Mohegans being most liberal in giving away or selling their lands.

Montville's first farm sites sales were made to Richard Haughton and James Rogers receiving their farm grants in 1658 along the Thames River at Massapeag and Pamechaug. The first settler actually was Samuel Rogers, in 1670.

The Oxoboxo River offered power early for sawmills. Governor Winthrop opened a bog iron mine and later a sawmill in Uncasville. When Montville was incorporated there were four grist mills, seven saw mills and one fulling mill. The plentiful supply of water and stream power made possible small manufacturing such as woolen cloth, cotton textiles and paper products. Then it seemed that numerous businesses came and went—oil-mills, dye works, distilleries, bicycle works, silk mills, cotton batting, twine, rope and wooden wheel clocks.

1870 saw 13 manufacturing concerns along the Oxoboxo employing from 10 to 85 each—with quite a turnover in industry and employees until the last quarter century when it has been reasonably stable.

Montville, when incorporated in 1786 had about 2,000 residents, dropping off later to 1,800, then by 1900 increasing to 2,400. This increase was due to immigration from Ireland. This was followed by French-Canadians, Russians and Poles. But today distinct separation by nationalities has just about faded out—and the population is now estimated at 13,500.

From 10 small elementary schools in 1835 there has been a modernization, to five new primary schools and a new High School—with a new 72-classroom mid-school in the works. There is also a private Roman Catholic boy's high school being constructed.

With over 100 miles of town roads and streets, Montville consists of the communities of Chesterfield, Kitemaug, Mohegan, Montville Manor, Oakdale, Oakdale Heights, Palmertown, Skyline Terrace and Uncasville. State highways 32, 82, 85, 161 and 163 crisscross the town. Bus lines, the Thames Valley Transit, Shore Line and Blue Line offer excellent passenger service, while the Central Vermont and several motor common carriers furnish freight service.

Montville has seven churches—Baptist, Methodist, Mohegan Congregational, Montville Center Congregational, Our Lady of the Lake (Catholic), Route 82; St. John's (Catholic) Uncasville and St. Mary's Episcopal, Old Colchester Road.

Montville's Indian History is preserved to some extent by the Mohegan Reservation for descendants of the Mohegan Nations; while at Fort Shantok there is a fort and palisaded Indian burial ground. The Indian name Cochegan Rock is suppose to be the largest glacial erratic in Connecticut.

The famous Samson Occum, First Indian to be ordained as a minister in New England, has a marked site of the home of his birth. He it was, who visited England and succeeded in getting Lord Dartmouth and some of his English friends to give enough funds to enable the Indian School to move from Lebanon to Hanover, N.H., and thus Dartmouth came into being.

Descendants of Tantaquidgeon maintain an Indian Museum on Mohegan Hill, on Route 32.

The General Assembly, in May, 1792, same year as were authorized Connecticut's first banks, authorized the first turnpike in Connecticut—a toll road between New London and Norwich—now Route 32.

Oakdale is credited with a first wooden mill—in 1804 where broadcloth was woven.

Indian history has been designated in several ways. There is the Mohegan Congregational Church—erected in 1831 for continuance of religious instruction among the Indians. There is extant the cellar of Uncas's cabin and two springs nearby are supposed to have medicinal properties. In the Indian Village are the frames of Indian Houses in the round and long type.

Today Montville is proud of its Industrial plants which include the Robertson Paper Box Company, with 400 employees; the Continental Can Co., Inc., Thames River Plant employing some 200; the Thomas G. Faria Corp., with 100 employees; the Cuno Engineering Corp., Maxim Division, employing 75; the United Nuclear Corp. employing 90; the L. W. Greiner Company, with 50 employees; the Federal Paper Board Co. Inc. employing 45; the All-Time Mfg. Co. with 32 employees; the Jayfro Corp. listing 20 employees and the Thames Permacrete Corp. having 16 employees.

Two-Week Tour of Southeast Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD D. McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 20, 1967

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following articles:

FEAR IN THE SHADOW OF RED CHINA—MANY ASIAN NATIONS FACE THREAT OF COMMUNIST SUBVERSION

(NOTE.—Representative MCCARTHY, in Southeast Asia on a personal visit to observe conditions there, is writing his reaction and assessment for the Buffalo Evening News.)

(By RICHARD D. MCCARTHY, Representative, 39th District)

NAKHON PHANOM, THAILAND, September 7.—While the world focus is on the big war in Vietnam, a "dirty little war" is going on here in northeast Thailand.

"One thousand Communist terrorists are operating in the forests of this remote area on the border of Laos," reports Norman B. Hannah, deputy chief of mission at the U.S. Embassy in Bangkok.

"Most of them were born there," said Mr. Hannah. "Some are of Chinese ancestry, trained in either North Vietnam or China, they are infiltrated back into their native land through Laos. While they get their ammunition and supplies from China, their political direction comes from North Vietnam."

AGRICULTURE IMPROVED

On Wednesday Rep. Lester L. Wolff of Great Neck, L.I., and I flew by helicopter from the city of Chiengmai to the primitive village of Huai Fuang in northwest Thailand 20 miles from Laos, 100 from China and 300 from Bangkok. There the Thai government, with U.S. aid, is seeking to win the allegiance of Yao mountain tribesmen.

A school, medical station and a road—all firsts—have recently been built by U.S. Navy Seabees with local help. Agricultural aid also is being stepped up to help the tribesmen improve their primitive, forest-destroying method of growing rice.

They also grow opium which, U.S. personnel say, is sold to remnants of the Chinese Nationalist army. The opium eventually finds its way to Hong Kong and other opium trade centers.

WIDESPREAD TERROR

On the return flight, we brought along a frightened expectant mother and her tribesman husband. The wife was experiencing difficulty in childbirth in her thatched-roof hut and the Americans, with the concurrence of the village chief, decided to take her to the hospital in Chiengmai.

Situations similar to the one in northern Thailand are developing across the wide arc that fronts on China.

In East Java, Indonesia, this week a hand grenade was thrown by terrorists into a soldiers' home.

In northern Ceylon supporters of Red Chinese Chairman Mao are helping along a communal clash based on cast.

COULD TOPPLE HONG KONG

In Hong Kong, which Rep. Wolff and I visited last week, Red Guard terrorists Sunday killed a policeman and injured 28 civilians.

Guy Searls of the London Observer notes that China could topple Hong Kong in days or hours but holds back because Mao's thought "calls for all seizures of power to take place from below . . . political power cannot be imposed from above or from the outside. . . .

"What the Chinese claim to provide for the masses is the guidance of Mao's thought and help in the use of tactics," Mr. Searls explains.

"The first gesture," he continues, "is to create a feeling of hate for whatever is to be opposed."

Peking currently is calling on the people of Indonesia, Burma, and other nations to seize power.

SUPPORT FOR UNITED STATES

Edwin D. Reischauer, former U.S. ambassador to Japan, observes that many nations in the shadow of Communist China haxe expressed open or quiet support for the U.S. effort in Vietnam.

"Many of these countries," Mr. Reischauer writes in a magazine article, "are themselves unstable and either fear the sort of internal subversion that has torn South Vietnam apart or are apprehensive about the intentions of the great Red Chinese neighbor and suspicious of the loyalties of the sometimes sizable Chinese populations within their borders."

How some of these nations are responding to this situation will be the subject of a future article.

VOTE STRENGTH OF "WHITE DOVE" MAY HERALD PEACE TALKS IN VIET

(NOTE.—Representative MCCARTHY, who has been in Vietnam on a personal visit to observe the elections, is writing his reaction and assessment for the Buffalo Evening News.)

(By RICHARD D. MCCARTHY, Representative, 39th District)

SAIGON, September 5.—New peace initiatives are expected here soon in the aftermath of Monday's presidential election.

The big surprise was the strong showing of avowed peace candidates Truong Dinh Dzu who ran second to the military ticket of Gen. Nguyen Van Thieu and Nguyen Cao Ky.

Mr. Dzu, who ran on the "White Dove" ticket, said he would negotiate with the National Liberation Front as well as the North Vietnamese.

Rep. Wolff, of Long Island, and this writer met privately with both Gen. Thieu and Mr. Dzu on Saturday.

STRESSES LEGALITY

Gen. Thieu was sharply turned out in a gray suit, black silk tie and brightly polished black shoes when he greeted us in the plush red-carpeted receiving room adjacent to his office in the Presidential Palace.

The general, who said he would sever all connections with the military if he was elected, stressed the word "legality."

Speaking in English, the Chief of State emphasized that a free, fair and secret election in which some 80 per cent of the population was represented would bring a "legal government" into being.

Such a government, he said, could deal with the legal government of North Vietnam and other nations as well.

The National Liberation Front, he declared, "is not a legal government. It is a tool of Hanoi." He envisioned new international guarantees, standing behind agreements reached by the legal governments of North and South Vietnam.

WOULD "ATTACK PROBLEMS"

Alluding to the 1954 Geneva accords, Gen. Thieu said: "To bring an end to the war, the most practical solution is to settle on the 17th Parallel. Above that, they have what they want.

"After that, we could plan jointly for unification of the two Vietnams but first we would have to jointly attack problems like disease, poverty and illiteracy which plague both countries."

He estimated that it would take "five, 10 or even 15 years to unify Vietnam."

Regarding the Viet Cong, Gen. Thieu said: "The problem is to be strong enough to absorb the VC. We are not ready yet to accept the Communist Party." But he did envision a day "two to three years away" when the Viet Cong, if they laid down their arms, might organize a legal opposition party.

TALKS OF BOMBING PAUSE

Today, Gen. Thieu told the press: "I will talk to North Vietnam first and if I get a favorable response then I will talk to the Americans. I may then even ask for a cessation of the bombing of North Vietnam that may be longer than what I had previously suggested." He had earlier talked of a one week pause.

Mr. Dzu received us in his law office in downtown Saigon, and he also spoke in English.

"My people are seeking peace," Mr. Dzu told us. "I would talk with the NLF and Hanoi. The heart of the problem is the 145,000 men of the NLF. To talk with them doesn't mean you accept everything they say."

With tears in his eyes he talked of a trip to the U.S. to thank the mothers of U.S. dead and wounded who have "given so very much in our behalf."

NO HINT OF "RIGGING"

To some, the other big surprise in Monday's election was the strong showing made by the civilian candidates collectively. This tends to support the view that the election was, for the most part, fair, free and secret.

No instance of overt rigging was found by Rep. Wolff and the writer in several days in checking into the process. Saturday afternoon we flew in an Army helicopter to the Town of Phung Hiep in the Mekong Delta region.

The Viet Cong the preceding night had attacked a South Vietnamese outpost 300 yards from where we landed. Two men were killed and four wounded.

NARROW ESCAPE FROM VC SHELLS

Our talks with election officials and voters in their homes, on the streets and in sampans in the waterways, disclosed nothing that would indicate that the election would be anything but honest and secret.

As we were preparing to depart a U.S. Army major rushed up to say that the Viet Cong again were attacking the nearby outpost. Artillery shells aimed at the VC thudded under our helicopter as we flew up and over the scene of the encounter.

On Sunday a twin engine Army plane carried us up over the Central Highlands to the coast of the South China Sea and on to Da Nang. Smoke billowed from nearby Dong Ha as North Vietnamese gunners rained rocket and artillery shells on a U.S. Marine position in this critical, most northern area of South Vietnam.

IMPRESSIVE TURNOUT

Visits in polling places, during which we interviewed voters and election officials, uncovered no signs of rigging. The same was true later on inspection tours of voting on the story-book imperial city of Hue and the Montagnard stronghold of Pleiku.

Despite numerous incidents of Viet Cong terror, voters at all three cities turned out in impressive numbers and in a festive atmosphere to cast their ballots for president, vice president and senator.

FAMILIAR SITUATION

With so many civilians and military officials dependent on the Thieu-Ky regime for their jobs, it was obvious that many of these officials were working for the election of their patron.

But this is a situation familiar to every U.S. President, governor, mayor and country excutive who enjoys the advantage of incumbency and patronage.

One leaves here with satisfaction that the U.S. has realized one of its chief aims in South Vietnam—self-determination for its people and profound respect for the dedicated and courageous Americans here and the stolidly brave South Vietnamese who voted at the risk of being shot, bombed or knifed.

Twenty-Eighty Club

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1967

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, in my district, at the Naval Air Rework Facility, located at the naval air station in Alameda, Calif., an employee organization was recently formed with 64 charter members called the "Twenty-Eighty Club." To qualify for membership a person must have acquired 2,080 unused hours of sick leave. This amounts to a full year of working time or 52 weeks at 40 hours a week. To earn this amount of sick leave requires 20 years of service, earning 13 days sick leave per year without using any of it.

An article in the September 15, 1967, issue of the Alameda Times-Star sets forth further particulars concerning this new organization. It is interesting to note that, in addition to the 64 charter members, an additional 37 employees at the naval air station will become eligible for membership by the end of 1967 and 53 more employees will be recognized in 1968. By the end of 1969 a total of 250 employees will qualify for membership.

I am pleased to insert in the RECORD the above-mentioned article from the Times-Star and to salute the employees of the naval air station who have established this outstanding record:

TWENTY-EIGHTY CLUB FORMED BY VETERAN NAS EMPLOYEES

What does the number "2080" mean to you?

It is a very significant number to 64 charter members of the newly organized "Twenty-Eighty Club" at the Naval Air Rework Facility in Alameda, California. 2080 is the number of hours a person spends at his job in one year, working 40 hours a week for 52 weeks.

To earn this amount of time in sick leave requires 20 years of service, earning 13 days sick leave per year; without using any sick leave. Using only three days of sick leave per year, it would take approximately 26 years to obtain 2,080 hours.

On June 30, 1967, the "2080 Club" was formed with the purpose of providing recognition to Naval Air Rework Facility personnel for the outstanding achievement represented by accumulating a credit balance of two thousand and eighty hours of sick leave to their accounts.

VETERAN WORKERS

The time required to earn eligibility means that most personnel recognized will probably be over 50 years of age and have 25–30 years of service (not including military time), making membership in the 2080 Club very exclusive.

The election of charter members to the 2080 Club at Alameda was based upon analysis of the personnel leave accounts for the leave period ending July 1, 1967. Any individual having records showing that he had accumulated a credit balance of 2,080 hours of sick leave between January 1, 1967 and July 1, 1967, was recognized as eligible for charter memberships.

An analysis of the accounts representing the balance of this Command's personnel shows a significant picture. By the end of 1967, another 37 people will become eligible for the 2080 Club. There is indication that approximately 53 more members will be recognized in 1968, and by the end of 1969, the Club potential will have grown to approximately 250.

"Twenty Eighty Club Members" include:

Haydn W. Purvis, Orris R. Toops, Wallace F. Pearce, Cecil N. Paget, Bruce B. Harriman, Leon Pon, Peter Doroshevich, Walter E. Bosworth, Ralph J. Cuevas, Clifford G. Westby, Franklin Lee;

Forbes W. Duncan, Stanton D. Pieratt, Francis L. Gambino, Harold W. Stewart, George G. Metz, Vernon J. Adams, Varney W. Yuen, Allen F. Thor, Helen M. Corkery, Harold M. Smith, August C. Rettig, Norman W. McMillan;

Herchel C. Littler, Stanley P. Baker, Alfred Y. Boggs, W. Harold Sullivant, Robert K. Crump, Arthur R. Murphy, Benito J. Fandinola, Wilburn W. Sharp, Richard Vander, Roest, Richard D. Parke;

Grover T. Bales, Emiliano Andrada, Herman H. Thorton, Frank V. Gray, Robert B. Gray, Robert B. Slangerup, Richard Cerri, Frederick C. Hartley, Aundy D. Benetis;

George Nawell, Roy C. Vaughn, Marcus H. Coffman, John V. Fernandez, John J. O'Brien, Raymond C. Phillips, William O. Fuller, Herbert Love, Dennis Moore;

Herbert C. Dorner, Enrique M. Sotelo, James H. Glover, George W. Chan, Jesse E. Easton, Callie R. Hughes, Albert Y. LeBars, Frank B. Loomis, Robert J. Buelow, Arthur J. Rumpel, Elizabeth Miranda and Joseph Maggiora.

Under this criterion, 62 of the Naval Air Rework Facility, Alameda personnel, including three women, were recognized and presented with charter memberships in the 2080 Club by Captain Rupert S. Miller, USN, Commanding Officer. The presentation included the certificate of membership, the Club pin and a hearty "Well Done."

These charter members represent the cumulative total of 64 man-years of sick leave credit. In case of illness they have over a half-million dollars to carry them through Very few of us could afford to pay for this kind of insurance.

But the members of this unique 2080 Club are not the only ones who benefit.

A. Naval Air Rework Facility, Alameda, benefited by the production that these 64 man-years represent.

B. The Navy and the Department of Defense also benefited from the increased Command capacity for the added products processed and returned ready for use, which were produced by these man-hours. The 64 man-years represent the equivalnt production of 54 "Skyhawk" aircraft of 165 J52 model engines used in the late models of this aircraft.

C. The length of service required to achieve the 2,080 hours of sick leave credit indicate that these civil servants are getting close to the eligibility for retirement. The recognition that has been provided for these personnel through the initiation of the 2080 Club can also be considered as a "thank you" from each of us for the tax dollars that potentially will be released for other purposes upon their retirement.

Hawaii Labor Leader Supports Failing Newspaper Merger Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1967

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, as the introducer of H.R. 7446, the Failing Newspaper Act, I was delighted to learn that the highly respected labor figure and civic leader, Jack W. Hall, regional director of the Hawaii ILWU, has spoken out in favor of a similar bill, now undergoing hearings in the Senate.

This legislation would grant a limited exemption from antitrust laws to newspapers which, because of economic distress, are compelled to operate through mergers or other joint publication arrangements and combinations. In urging passage of the legislation, Mr. Hall said that it would fortify competition in the American press.

Mr. Hall knows whereof he speaks, having observed from firsthand experience the joint production plan of the two major Honolulu newspapers since early 1962.

In a recent interview with the Honolulu Advertiser, Mr. Hall stated that this joint production plan "has resulted in Honolulu continuing to be a two-paper town, with two clearly independent editorial policies."

I include, for the Congressional Record, an article from the September 12, 1967, issue of the Honolulu Advertiser in which Mr. Hall advocates, as I do, that the failing newspaper merger bill be passed:

HAWAII LABOR LEADER SUPPORTS FAILING NEWSPAPERS MERGER BILL: "MEASURE WOULD FORTIFY PRESS COMPETITION," HALL SAYS

Jack W. Hall, regional director of the 23,000-member Hawaii, ILWU, said yesterday that passage of the "failing newspaper bill," now before a U.S. Senate subcommittee, would fortify competition in the American press.

"I feel very strongly that what was done here in Honolulu by The Advertiser and The Star-Bulletin"—in going into a joint operating plan—"is right and greatly preferable to a full merger without news and editorial competition," he said.

Under the Senate bill, limited antitrust exemption would be granted to two newspapers sharing common mechanical, advertising and circulation departments, but with separate editorial departments and policies. The exemption would be conditioned on one of the papers being in dire financial distress.

"All points of view are expressed in the two papers here," Hall said during an interview. "I've lived in other places that have had a single editorial policy and they're always anti-labor.

"The liberal policy of The Advertiser in recent years has undoubtedly stimulated the afternoon paper to provide a more enlightened coverage of labor.

"The community on major matters is given sufficient information to make its own judgment. I think, as an example, that the coverage of the Vietnam war in our papers is better than I've seen in papers in any city."

Hall—who is not only a major labor figure but a leader in the Aloha United Fund, the Hawaii Visitors Bureau and other civic endeavors—said that both The Advertiser and The Star-Bulletin are providing "far more sophisticated coverage, and in-depth material, than ever before."

He noted that The Advertiser carries the Washington Post-Los Angeles Times Service and that The Star-Bulletin has the New York Times Service—both of which he described as "thorough and excellent" and "going behind the news to tell what it really means."

"It was well known that when The Advertiser was having real and extended financial problems, it couldn't put out anywhere near as good a paper as it now produces," Hall said.

Hall said The Advertiser's voice was saved through the joint production plan, "which has resulted in Honolulu continuing to be a two-paper town, with two clearly independent editorial policies."

If The Advertiser had died and this had become a single-ownership community, Hall said, "there would undoubtedly have been fewer newspaper jobs than there are today."

He declared that "the quality of contracts between the papers and the unions are good—and have brought about a healthy level of pay, benefits and conditions. They have also brought about industry negotiations, which are always desirable."

Hall said that because the ILWU is one of the unions having contracts with the papers here, he has tried to keep himself posted in developments in the U.S. newspaper field generally, over a number of years.

He said that suburban newspapers "have multiplied and largely been successful" because of the substantial population movement everywhere from the central city to the outlying areas.

"At the same time the large or metropolitan press has had the toughest kind of going, and I'm referring to some of the really big cities.

"The remarkable thing, the healthy thing, is that in some of our smaller communities across America, where one of the papers or perhaps both have been seriously ailing, they have gone into a common facility and have managed enough savings to enable them both to live.

"That means a person or an organization has two newspaper doors to knock on, instead of just one. It means that if someone doesn't feel he's getting a fair shake, he's always got another newsroom and another editor he can go and see.

"That is tremendously important, especially in a time like this of great ferment. Society is in great flux all around the world. The news has to be carried and analyzed. Communities also have big issues to work out and they need those issues to be laid out clearly and fully. Having two newspapers competing to see which can do the better job is something we all better want to keep alive."

Hall said that since antitrust doctrine permits a "sick" company to enter a full merger, it only makes sense for it to permit an arrangement that stops short of a full merger—"especially when the result is two separate newspaper viewpoints." That is why he feels "this bill is both fair and sensible."

He said that some unions were contending that the Senate bill would freeze out fresh competition, in the score of cities which have joint operating arrangements and the few cities where two ownerships still exist, but he declared "they couldn't be more unrealistic."

"Anybody who talks that way is talking theory, not conditions," said Hall.

"Nobody is lining up any place, in event the largest cities, to start new newspapers. And the reason is very simple—newspapering in the cities is a risky business, economically. People with millions to invest can find safer opportunities, and do.

"Too many cities have wound up with one company owning the morning and afternoon editions. Minneapolis and Milwaukee and Atlanta, these are some, and I don't see anybody rushing in to start any competition.

"That is why I hope this Senate bill will pass."

Hall added he was glad to see that the majority of the Hawaii delegation had come out in favor of the measure.

Veterans' Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1967

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, last weekend my distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania, Congressman EILBERG, addressed a meeting of Catholic War Veterans in his district. In his speech he touched on a number of areas of legislation of benefits to our Nation's veterans. As a matter of fact, he outlined rather succinctly, I think, the achievements of this Congress in the fields of veterans legislation.

This morning this same colleague testified before a subcommittee of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and again succinctly listed reasons why two bills which he also sponsored should be favorably considered.

In both cases, Mr. Speaker, I think that Congressman EILBERG's remarks deserve reprinting in the RECORD so that both their accomplishments in this field and reasons for achieving still more in this session of the Congress may be read by all of us.

I ask permission to include these remarks in the RECORD at this time:

LEGISLATIVE ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE 90TH CONGRESS IN THE FIELD OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

(By Congressman JOSHUA EILBERG)

To address you who have borne the greatest burden of America's defense is indeed an honor. This honor is all the greater tonight, with this being the occasion of presentation of your Catholic War Veterans "Man of the Year" award, and with the privilege of sharing this podium with a deserving recipient of that award, Representative John Pezak.

Let me then make use of this honor by speaking on that most basic duty of Congress—the duty which from the time of the American Revolution has been defined and is still defined as—to care for him who shall have borne the battle and for his widow and his orphan." I wish to explain the major veterans benefit legislation which Congress has just enacted. That which I consider most important eliminates the inequity of exclusion of Vietnam veterans from certain broad areas of assistance. Much of this legislation I introduced, and I am especially glad to report its enactment. Let me explain it to you as I expounded it on the floor of Congress.

I believe that most citizens would express surprise if not consternation were they to realize that disability compensation for service-connected injury or death provided for all other veterans and their families was not provided for Vietnam veterans until legislation was signed into law only a few days ago. Now Vietnam veterans will receive compensation for their wounds and disability incurred in battle just as all other veterans do.

The new law also ends the unfair exclusion of Vietnam veterans and their dependents from eligibility for the non-service-connected disability pension. All veterans who served for ninety days or more after August 5, 1964, or their dependents will be eligible for the disability pension just as are veterans of World War I, World War II and the Korean War.

Besides extending the disability pension and war-time compensation rates to Vietnam veterans, Congress has increased the rate of this assistance. The rates are now adjusted to correspond to the increased cost of living.

Other changes in disability and pension assistance do not affect the entire range of recipients but are nonetheless of great importance to particular groups of veterans. They are as follows:

All veterans over sixty-five who meet the requirements of limited income will be eligible for the non-service-connected disability pension regardless of thier physical condition. Until now, only veterans who are permanently and totally disabled receive the pension.

Veterans in nursing homes shall be considered to be in need of regular aid and attendance and therefore will be eligible for assistance provided for such need.

Veteran's widows who meet certain age requirements will receive increased pensions.

A psychotic condition arising within 2 years after discharge or termination of the Vietnam conflict would be considered to be service-connected for purposes of hospitalization by the Veterans Administration.

Payments for prescribed drugs and medicines will be provided for Vietnam veterans who are on the pension rolls and in need of regular aid and attention.

Disabled Vietnam veterans will be eligible to receive an amount of up to $1,600 for especially equipped automobiles and other special conveyances and appliances. The need for the allowance and its amount, as you know, is determined by the Veterans Administration.

Also I should add, the $250 burial allowance will be extended to Vietnam veterans.

The new law, just signed by President Johnson, also extends to the area of education. By incorporation of the bill I introduced, the new law increases subsistence allowance paid student veterans. Last year Congress provided educational assistance for veterans who have served in the armed forces since the Korean conflict. The purchasing power of the allowance is made commensurate by the new law to that of the allowance of previous G.I. Bills. Furthermore, veterans who attend high school will receive the allowance. Many veterans entering the service have not finished high school. I feel that they should not receive less educational assistance simply because they answered the call to arms at an earlier stage of their educational careers.

Orphans of those killed in the military service, and children of severely disabled wartime veterans will receive educational benefits until the age of twenty-six, instead of age twenty-one. These benefits are provided to restore to the children the education opportunities otherwise lost by their parent's death or disability.

Besides increasing the allowance, the new legislation further expands the areas of education. The landmark 1966 Act which first provided educational assistance for Vietnam veterans did not include flight training and on-the-job training. However, the public response left no doubt but that our Nation needs more trained pilots. Flight training was eliminated from the Act last year because it was thought that such training had previously been used for recreational purposes. I believe, however, that regulations limiting flight training to vocational ends can be adequately formulated just as they have in other areas of training. I see no reason why one of our nation's most extensive educational acts should exclude preparation for an industry upon which our Nation is increasingly dependent.

The legislation of this Congress also remedies the conspicuous shortcoming of exclusion of assistance for on-the-job and apprenticeship training. Our government is heavily financing and calling upon the citizenry to support programs for increasing manpower skills. I think it only logical, therefore, that the veterans educational program include vocational training.

The Ninetieth Congress has also enacted provisions which liberalize veterans loans. The period for World War II veterans to apply for home and small business loans, rather than expiring now, is extended to July 25, 1970. Secondly, also by enactment of legislation which I sponsored, the Veterans Administration is empowered to make direct home loans up to $30,000. Until last month, the limit was $17,500.

Of course, there are still issues that are unresolved. The 90th Congress, for instance, has not decided the question of the effect of social security benefit increase on receipt of the veterans pension. An estimated 29,000 veterans and widows received reduced disability pensions, or none at all, as a result of the 1965 Social Security benefit increases. This is because, as you know, the disability pension is determined by income limitations. A social security cost of living adjustment may augment a veteran's income just enough so that he reaches a higher income bracket and the pension is therefore reduced. I believe that such reduction is unfair because a social security increase should not result in a pension decrease—certainly not if the social security increase is only a cost of living adjustment and does not compensate for the loss of pension. I have urged my colleagues that all future social security increases be excluded from computation of veterans' income. It could not then decrease the veterans pension. I trust that I will be able to report to you successful passage of this proposition, just as I have today reported enactment of my proposal to extend to Vietnam veterans the benefits a grateful nation provides for all other veterans, and my proposal to increase the educational allowance of Vietnam veterans.

Finally, I should mention one further piece of pending legislation I have presented before the 90th Congress. The bill, H.R. 9808, reads:

"Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America assembled, That the Catholic War Veterans are authorized to erect a statute of Saint Sebastian, the patron saint of the military, in the northwest quadrant of the District of Columbia. . . . And the National Capitol . . . and the United States . . . shall be put to no expense in the erection thereof."

With the erection of this statue of Saint Sebastian, a section of our capital city will be made more beautiful, and the public will be made more aware of the contribution and work of the Catholic War Veterans, just as Philadelphia is made aware of that good work by the presentation of the "Man of the Year" award tonight to Representative John Pezak.

CONGRESSMAN JOSHUA EILBERG'S TESTIMONY IN SUPPORT OF H.R. 6916 AND H.R. 6920, TO PREVENT FUTURE SOCIAL SECURITY AND OTHER FEDERAL RETIREMENT BENEFIT INCREASES FROM AFFECTING THE AMOUNT OF OR ELIGIBILITY FOR VETERAN'S PENSION

Mr. Chairman, I speak in support of H.R. 6916 and H.R. 6920, introduced by me on March 9th during the present session. Both bills are efforts to prevent social security increases from reducing or eliminating a veteran's disability pension.

Strict income limitations of course determine entitlement to the veteran's pension in cases of non-service connected disabilities. For instance, no veteran whose income exceeds $3,000 yearly, although he is completely and permanently disabled, receives pension benefits at all. A disabled veteran with dependents with less than $2,000 annual income receives only $84 monthly. If his income is pushed just over the $2,000 mark by, for instance, increased social security, that eighty-four dollars is reduced to fifty.

The Administration has given special attention to this problem. In his special message on veterans affairs to Congress last January, President Johnson asked, among five other principal requests, that we "make certain that no veteran's pension will be reduced as a result of increases in Federal retirement benefits, such as social security." With the exception of that one proposal, Congress has enacted all the requests into law. I see no reason why we should particularly exclude it, especially now that the House has passed H.R. 12080 which increases social security benefits.

H.R. 6920 provides that future increases in Federal retirement benefits may be waived wholly or in part. The amount rejected will not count as income in computing entitlement to veteran's pension. Under the present law, ten percent of amount of payments from public or private retirement or annuity programs may be deducted from income computation. My bill provides, of course, that the veteran may not include amounts which he waives among that excludable ten percent.

H.R. 6916 would allow exclusion of all future social security increases from income computation. The Senate passed a similar proposal which was not, however, accepted in the conference report to the Veterans Readjustment Act, signed by the President a few days ago.

In disallowing this proposal to exclude social security increases, the conferees stated that it was their intention to take action to assure that social security increases resulting from enactment of H.R. 12080 will not result in reduction of combined income from the veteran's pension, from veteran's indemnity compensation, and from social security benefits. Since that conference report, the House has passed H.R. 12080. Because the social security increases are therefore all the more imminent, surely it is time that the conferees' intent to prevent pension reduction be acted upon.

Under the present law (P.L. 89–730) pension reduction resulting from social security increases enacted during 1967 will not take effect until the last day of the year. This delay is expressly provided so that Congress will have time to enact legislation preventing pension reduction by the social security increase. Therefore, because of the foresight of the 89th Congress, time for this hearing has been particularly designated for deciding on the objectives which H.R. 6916 and 6920 are designed to achieve.

H.R. 6916 and H.R. 6920 would attain that objective by, to recapitulate, allowing waiver of Federal retirement benefits, and by excluding future social security increases from income computation. I believe that even the maximum income limitation $3,000, is low enough. H.R. 12080 will result, in effect, in lowering the limitations still further. Yet, the increased social security income, which it will provide—being only a cost-of-living adjustment—will in no way compensate for the loss it occasions, of pension income.

Judge Pine, a Great American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 21, 1967

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, I include herein an excellent address which was made some time ago at an anniversary of historic William and Mary College by the very able, distinguished, Federal court judge and illustrious jurist, the Honorable David A. Pine.

This speech is extremely well done and contains much food for thought. It is a sound, knowledgeable, penetrating discussion of some of our basic problems, and it points the way to possible remedies for those who are really seeking remedies for the unbelievably chaotic conditions we face in the world and country today.

Judge Pine is a great judge and his name will go down in history as outstanding in every respect—learned, dedicated, just, and courageous.

Long life and good health to him and his gracious wife.

The address follows:

Remove Not the Ancient Landmark

(An address by Hon. David A. Pine, judge, U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia)

(Note.—September 25, 1954, marked the beginning of the John Marshall Bicentennial Year and the 175th Anniversary of the establishment at William and Mary College, Williamsburg, Va., of the first Chair of Law in the United States. Many notables attended ceremonies commemorating these events and before that august group the Honorable David A Pine, Judge of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia made the address.)

You have been surfeited with speeches. Word! Words! More words! And if words be tyrants, you have indeed become their liege subjects remaining throughout the day, although in a slightly modified sense from that intended by the author of that expression, or my recollection of it. But perhaps it is good training, and designed to put you in condition so to speak, for President Chandler has informed me that today's proceedings are but a prelude to a series of programs during the ensuing year, rededicating the Bench and Bar to the traditions of representative constitutional government. Indeed, he has asked me to select a topic bearing some relation to that general theme, and one which might serve as a basis for further discussion. That would seem to give me wide latitude, but I take it he means a discussion on the Constitution.

And I am happy that he asked me to speak on the Constitution, because that is a speaker's paradise. Although innumerable volumes have been written and countless words have been spoken concerning it, the Constitution seems never to pall, and, I am glad to say, insures audience interest, regardless of the speaker. Small wonder that I accepted your kind invitation with such eagerness, as I was provided, so to speak, with a captive audience. And there is another reason, a secret reason! Lawyers and judges are peculiarly susceptible to the temptation of a discourse on the Constitution.

Of course, one has to be selective in a discussion of the Constitution, because even that great document has a limit to its antidotal capacity to resist audience boredom; and selection generally presents difficulties on account of its many fascinating possibilities.

But here I have an added burden. Adm. Chandler has also stipulated that my topic must be of "broad interest to the layman as well as to . . . the legal profession." Apparently the layman comes first, but my topic must be suitable for both. And that presents an almost insuperable obstacle, for no lawyer worthy of the name, at least none of my acquaintance, certainly no member of the faculty or graduate of this institution, would admit to a status beneath that of an expert on the Constitution, in court or out. The lawyer generally acquires that distinction at graduation, or shortly before, and never questions his title. How, then, may I say anything of interest to a man of his scholarship which would be within the meager understanding of the layman? And by the same token, how may I say anything of interest to the layman which would be other than commonplace to my learned former brother at the Bar? I have no answer to these questions, and the two conditions to be mutually exclusive, but I have not allowed the obstacle to stand in my way and have come before you nevertheless, in the hope, perhaps born of optimism, that what I shall say will be of some interest to the layman and not too shallow for polite attention of the expert.

And in casting about in my mind for some phase of the general subject which perhaps is not too shopworn, it occurred to me that you might be interested in an analysis of the mental state of the men who assembled in Philadelphia to salvage something from the wreckage of the Articles of Confederation—a sort of psychoanalysis without therapy or need for therapy, if I can use the term in that non-technical manner, for Heaven knows that those giants needed no therapy. In other words, what emotions gripped them? What dominated their thinking and their actions? What were their compulsions?

Of course, such an analysis will have to be based on what they said and what they did in the light of their background and surrounding circumstances. It cannot be comprehensive, as such an inquiry would add another volume to the sagging shelves, and indeed I know that you will be glad to hear that I am not prepared for any such undertaking. My text, therefore, if I need one, might be, "By their fruits, ye shall know them," and at the end I shall be orthodox and point a moral, if you will permit.

These men will have to be considered collectively, and not individually, as their achievement was collective, and individual consideration would be beyond the scope of my remarks. Indeed, what I have to say might not be wholly applicable to each one and might be more applicable to one than to another. With a few exceptions, notably Jefferson, John Adams, and Patrick Henry, who were absent, they contsituted the leading citizens of the erstwhile colonies. Lawyers predominated, although there were a number of doctors, educators, bankers, merchants, and others in attendance. There were some who had served as soldiers in the Revolution, and a number who had signed the Declaration of Independence. Six were members of the Continental Congress of 1774. Six were signers of the Articles of Confederation, one of whom had drawn it, forty-three had been members of the Continental Congress, and two had been presidents of the Congress.

They were men of deep learning, scholarly attainments, and wide experience in statecraft. They had been brought together under a resolution passed by the expiring Congress under the Articles of Confederation, for the purpose of "revising" the Articles. The government established by it had utterly failed, because of its weakness. The country was in a desperate condition. Radical measures were being agitated. The French Revolution was just around the corner, and its spirit was in the air. The currency was of uncertain value. Credit was practically nil. Life, liberty, and property were not safe. Chaos was imminent.

With their background and under those circumstances, I have no hesitancy in saying that fear dominated them, and that the object of their fear was first a lack of government. Before them loomed disunion, disorder, and anarchy, which in my evaluation produced profound fear in their hearts. This would seem to be obvious.

On the other hand, I think the record shows that they had a competing fear, equally consuming and tending to counteract the other. They knew that to remove the fear of lack of government, it was necessary to establish one of sufficient strength to cope with the situation, and that equated strength on a national scale which was far from palatable. They were devoted to their local self-governments, and they had distrust and hatred for absentee authority. The list of grievances in the Declaration of Independence is ample evidence of this, and they were fearful that a strong federal government might, in time, produce a counterpart for that which the sacrifices of the Revolution had sought to destroy. They feared it would be an instrument of tyranny, despotism, and oppression; and my conclusion that they were possessed by this fear can be found, as I shall later show, in the Constitution of the United States, without looking elsewhere.

And so, when they assembled in Philadelphia, as they later said, "to form a more perfect union," ignoring the mandate of the resolution appointing them to "revise" the Articles of Confederation, which incidentally could not be amended except by unanimous vote of all the states, it is my view that collectively they were controlled by fear, or more accurately, two competing, incompatible fears: a fear of government and a fear of a lack of government. Nevertheless, with such dismaying premise, and actuated by such warring emotions, a miracle was performed, and by a strange and unique adventure in the science of government they did the impossible—they reconciled the irreconcilable, they squared the circle. In the oft-repeated words of Gladstone, they forged "the most wonderful work ever struck off at a given time by the brain and purpose of man." They found a formula by which the hard-won freedom of the people and the sovereignty of the states could be preserved and at the same time a national government of sufficient strength to provide order and security and perform national functions could be created.

In their plan of government, they took the totality of sovereign power residing in the people, a theory on which there was no disagreement, and vested a portion of it in the United States, reserving the remainder to the states and the people, a distribution, but not an equal distribution, of sovereign power. They made the United States supreme in its national sphere, without detracting from the supremacy of the states within their respective state spheres, except for the imposition of several restraints deemed necessary in the national interest or for the protection of individual or property rights, for example, the restraint upon the states against the passing of any bill of attainder, ex post facto law, or law impairing the obligation of contract. They thereby formed a duality of sovereignty within the same orbit, a device, I believe, without exact historical precedent.

They created the United States as a sovereignty, and granted it those powers considered necessary for the proper conduct of national functions, but they granted no more than necessary, and thereby lessened its capacity for harm to the states and the people whose powers were only diminished to the extent of those granted away or prohibited. And then, to make assurance doubly sure, the people, when it came to ratification, apparently entertaining the same fear, but probably more fervently than that which actuated the delegates to the Convention, insisted on the incorporation of the Ninth and Tenth Amendments, which provided that the enumeration of powers in the Constitution were not to be construed to deny or disparage the others retained by the people, and that the powers not delegated or prohibited were reserved to the states or to the people.

Next, as showing the fear of tyranny and despotism incident to the creation of a strong central government, I cite to you the first eight amendments to the Constitution. As you know, they guarantee freedom of religion, speech, and press; secure the people against unreasonable searches and seizures; require indictment in felony cases; forbid a person to be compelled to be a witness against himself; and prohibit the deprivation of life, liberty, or property without due process of law, along with the other restraints for the protection of rights inherent in free men. These are all restraints placed upon the Federal Government, not upon the states. Could anything more eloquently demonstrate the fear alluded to than these amendments which were so uppermost in the minds of the people that it was necessary to agree to add them formally to the Constitution in order to be sure of its ratification? And if this fear was in the minds of the people, is it not reasonable to presume that it was in the minds of the delegates who represented them, but who felt that the amendments were unnecessary because the Constitution itself was so scrupulously careful to enumerate and delimit the granted powers?

Next, fearful of wrongful or excessive exerercise of such powers as were necessarily granted to the Federal Government, the founders diluted their strength by distributing them among three departments of government: the legislative, executive, and judicial. In this they were probably influenced by the teachings of Locke and Montesquieu, particularly the latter, who advocated some separation of powers as a measure of safety, and also by the historical excesses of monarchs and parliaments when powers were concentrated in one. They therefore granted the powers because of necessity, but weakened their exercise by distribution; and as a further safeguard, in certain categories they set up a system of additional checks by one branch of the government against another. For example, the treaty-making power of the executive is conditioned on the concurrence of two-thirds of the Senate present; the appointive power of the executive in specified cases requires the consent of the Senate; the law-making power of the legislative is subject to the veto of the executive, which again is subject to circumvention by two-thirds of the votes of both houses, and although not expressly provided therein, implicit in the language granting the judicial power is its power to nullify acts of either of the other branches and of the States which go beyond or are in contravention of the Constitutional authority. This was made certain by the historical opinions of Chief Justice Marshall, to whose memory we do honor today. Even within the legislative branch alone, there is a similar check in the creation of two houses of Congress, which convincingly shows the fear of government, including a fear of government by a unbridled democracy as well as a fear of king or parliament.

There are many other road blocks, some express and some implicit in the practical operation of government, growing out of this fear of government because of tyranny and despotism always inherent therein unless curbed. But I shall not elaborate the point further, and shall pass on to several quotations on the subject.

The first is from Washington's farewell address, in which he said: "The spirit of encroachment tends to consolidate the powers of all governments in one, and thus to create, whatever the form of government, a real despotism."

The second is from the 47th paper of the Federalist written by Madison, where he stated: "The accumulation of all powers, legislative, executive and judicial in the same hands, whether of one, a few, or many, whether hereditary, self-appointed, or elective, may justly be pronounced the very definition of tyranny."

The third is from John Adams, who was not a delegate to the Convention because of his absence abroad as envoy to Great Britain, but whose views can surely be considered as a reflection of those who were present. In Volume I of his Works, at page 186, he wrote: "It is by balancing one of these three powers against the other two that the efforts in human nature toward tyranny can alone be checked and restrained and any degree of freedom preserved."

I shall not call other witnesses, although many more are available, but rest on what I have said to establish that fears of the kind I have described dominated the delegates. The marvel is that this experiment in government, novel in so many respects, has worked so efficiently that this nation is now the envy of the rest of the world. Starting as a weak, struggling, uncertain group of states calling themselves a union, it has been transformed into the most powerful of all nations. Instead of thirteen debt-ridden colonies emerging into statehood after a devastating war for independence, there are now 48 sovereignties, strong and robust, some virtually empires in themselves, two territories, the District of Columbia, and possessions beyond the seas. Instead of a population of four million inhabitants, there are now forty times that number. Instead of a national wealth too insignificant to evaluate, it is now estimated at close to a thousand billion dollars; and the legal basis for this phenomenal accomplishment, and the legal basis for the protection of your most priceless possessions—your life, your liberty, and your property—is that single parchment document containing some four thousand words emanating from those inspired men who assembled in Philadelphia in the summer of 1787.

Now, what is the moral to which I said I would point before concluding my remarks? It is this: Follow the example of the founding fathers and be as alertly fearful as were they, of usurpation of power, the forerunner of tyranny and despotism. Oh, you might say, that is seeing ghosts, the Constitution stands in the way, it is in no jeopardy, and is held in such high esteem and reverence as to be immune from destruction. I agree, if you refer to frontal attack; but what I ask you to fear are attacks on the flanks, made in the cause of expediency and supported by vast popular demand of the moment. The technique will be the argument that the Constitution is a living thing and therefore susceptible of growth, and must be adaptable and flexible enough to meet changes in the social and economic life of the country.

There can be no doubt as to the validity of that argument when properly applied, but I ask you to take heed when its application would be destructive in fact, but not in name, of the very foundations and pillars of our constitutional government.

In recent years, there has been a trend toward enhancement of the powers of the federal government. This has been accomplished by the expansion of what was formerly believed to be the limits of the interstate commerce power and the taxing and spending powers, and the federal government has thereby taken over the control of great fields of activities formerly considered the province of the states.

There has also been a disposition in the federal government itself toward encroachment by one department upon the powers of another, particularly the executive upon the legislative and judicial. This is not to say that the legislative has not cast covetous eyes toward the executive, nor that the judicial has been demurely free from flirtations with the legislative powers, but at the moment, as I see it, the executive advances predominate.

I could cite many examples, but time will not permit. Suffice it to say that any encroachment by one department upon the powers of another gives added power to the trespasser and diminishes the balance accordingly.

Take heed that the barriers so carefully constructed are not eroded by subtle means, sometimes not immediately discernible, but to my mind more dangerous than a direct attack.

If conditions require a change in the Constitution in its basic provisions, let it be done by amendment in the manner provided therein, and stand out against the plausible but insidious argument of flexibility induced by expediency or the pressures or rewards of the moment.

I am aware that the view I express has vocal opponents, but on consideration of their utterances, I detect, beneath their reasoning, a predisposition to authoritarian government, hidden by a facade of constitutional form. So often such people are willing to exchange liberty for efficiency, and freedom for temporary security or reward.

And as I read the opinions of the great chief justice, the incomparable John Marshall, to whom we pay tribute today, he would not, as they sometimes contend, support their point of view, but would challenge it with every ounce of his unconquerable spirit and persuasion. To be sure, he is known as the great nationalist, the anti-states-right exponent, the liberal expounder of the Constitution, but these appellations came at a time when the pendulum was swinging toward its nullification. They were applied to the man who bravely stood foremost in opposition to theories which would have vitiated the plain purpose of the Constitution to establish a national government supreme within its sphere, theories which would have reduced it to the same state of impotency as had descended upon the Articles of Confederation which it supplanted. Now, when the pendulum is pointing the other way, it is useful to recall his words in *McCulloch* v. *Maryland,* that "no political dreamer was ever wild enough to think of breaking down the lines which separate the States and of compounding the American people into one common mass." And I believe Marshall, also known as the Guardian of the Constitution, today would be equally fervent in opposing a nationalism or liberalism in construction which would imperil duality of sovereignty or separation of powers, or both, because that in the long run would be as destructive of his cherished Constitution as was the narrow, debilitating states-right doctrine of his day. The latter spelled national dissolution and chaos; the former, if pursued to its logical end, spells totalitarianism and tyranny.

"Remove not the ancient landmark, which thy fathers have set."—Proverbs 22:28.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20510

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey

Aiken, George D., *Vt*	
Allott, Gordon, *Colo*	
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.*	6 Wesley Circle
Baker, Howard H., Jr., *Tenn.*	
Bartlett, E. L., *Alaska*	
Bayh, Birch E., *Ind*	
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*	
Bible, Alan, *Nev*	
Boggs, J. Caleb, *Del*	
Brewster, Daniel B., *Md*	
Brooke, Edward W., *Mass*	
Burdick, Quentin N., *N. Dak.*	
Byrd, Harry F., Jr., *Va*	
Byrd, Robert C., *W. Va*	
Cannon, Howard W., *Nev*	
Carlson, Frank, *Kans*	Sheraton-Park
Case, Clifford P., *N.J*	
Church, Frank, *Idaho*	
Clark, Joseph S., *Pa*	
Cooper, John Sherman, *Ky*	
Cotton, Norris, *N.H*	
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr*	
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill*	
Dodd, Thomas J., *Conn*	
Dominick, Peter H., *Colo*	
Eastland, James O., *Miss*	
Ellender, Allen J., *La*	
Ervin, Sam J., Jr., *N.C*	
Fannin, Paul J., *Ariz*	
Fong, Hiram L., *Hawaii*	5519 Uppingham St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Fulbright, J. W., *Ark*	
Griffin, Robert P., *Mich*	
Core, Albert, *Tenn*	
Gruening, Ernest, *Alaska*	
Hansen, Clifford P., *Wyo*	
Harris, Fred R., *Okla*	
Hart, Philip A., *Mich*	
Hartke, Vance, *Ind*	
Hatfield, Mark, *Oreg*	
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz*	
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa*	5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala*	
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla*	Sheraton-Park
Hollings, Ernest F., *S.C*	
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr*	
Inouye, Daniel K., *Hawaii*	
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash*	
Javits, Jacob K., *N.Y*	
Jordan, B. Everett, *N.C*	
Jordan, Len B., *Idaho*	
Kennedy, Edward M., *Mass*	
Kennedy, Robert F., *N.Y*	
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif*	
Lausche, Frank J., *Ohio*	
Long, Edward V., *Mo*	
Long, Russell B., *La*	
McCarthy, Eugene J., *Minn.*	5916 Bradley Blvd., Bethesda, Md.
McClellan, John L., *Ark*	
McGee, Gale W., *Wyo*	
McGovern, George, *S. Dak*	
McIntyre, Thomas J., *N.H*	
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.*	The Shoreham
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont*	
Metcalf, Lee, *Mont*	453 First St. SE.
Miller, Jack R., *Iowa*	5417 Kirkwood Dr., Bethesda, Md.
Mondale, Walter F., *Minn*	
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*	
Montoya, Joseph M., *N. Mex.*	
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg*	
Morton, Thruston B., *Ky*	
Moss, Frank E., *Utah*	
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak*	122 Schotts Court NE.
Murphy, George, *Calif*	
Muskie, Edmund S., *Maine*	
Nelson, Gaylord, *Wis*	
Pastore, John O., *R.I*	
Pearson, James B., *Kans*	
Pell, Claiborne, *R.I*	3425 Prospect St.
Percy, Charles H., *Ill*	
Prouty, Winston L., *Vt*	
Proxmire, William, *Wis*	
Randolph, Jennings, *W.Va*	4608 Reservoir Rd.
Ribicoff, Abraham A., *Conn*	
Russell, Richard B., *Ga*	
Scott, Hugh, *Pa*	
Smathers, George A., *Fla*	
Smith, Margaret Chase (Mrs.), *Maine.*	
Sparkman, John, *Ala*	4928 Indian Lane
Spong, William B., Jr., *Va*	
Stennis, John, *Miss*	
Symington, Stuart, *Mo*	
Talmadge, Herman E., *Ga*	
Thurmond, Strom, *S.C*	
Tower, John G., *Tex*	
Tydings, Joseph D., *Md*	
Williams, Harrison A., Jr., *N.J.*	
Williams, John J., *Del*	
Yarborough, Ralph, *Tex*	
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak*	Quebec House So.
Young, Stephen M., *Ohio*	

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Francis R. Valeo.
Sergeant at Arms—Robert G. Dunphy.
Chief Clerk—Darrell St. Claire.
Secretary for the Majority—J. S. Kimmitt.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences

Messrs. Anderson (chairman), Russell, Magnuson, Symington, Stennis, Young of Ohio, Dodd, Cannon, Holland, Mondale, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Hickenlooper, Curtis, Jordan of Idaho, Brooke, and Percy.

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Holland, Eastland, Talmadge, Jordan of North Carolina, McGovern, Montoya, Mondale, Byrd of Virginia, Hollings, Aiken, Young of North Dakota, Boggs, Miller, and Hatfield.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell, Ellender, Hill, McClellan, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Pastore, Monroney, Bible, Byrd of West Virginia, McGee, Mansfield, Bartlett, Proxmire, Yarborough, Young of North Dakota, Mundt, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Kuchel, Hruska, Allott, Cotton, Case, and Javits.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell (chairman), Stennis, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Cannon, Byrd of West Virginia, Young of Ohio, Inouye, McIntyre, Brewster, Byrd of Virginia, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Thurmond, Miller, Tower, Pearson, and Dominick.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Sparkman (chairman), Proxmire, Williams of New Jersey, Muskie, Long of Missouri, McIntyre, Mondale, McGee, Spong, Bennett, Tower, Hickenlooper, Brooke, and Percy.

Committee on Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Lausche, Bartlett, Hartke, Hart, Cannon, Brewster, Long of Louisiana, Moss, Hollings, Cotton, Morton, Scott, Prouty, Pearson, and Griffin.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Bible (chairman), Morse, Kennedy of New York, Tydings, Spong, Prouty, Dominick, and Morton.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Long of Louisiana (chairman), Smathers, Anderson, Gore, Talmadge, McCarthy, Hartke, Fulbright, Ribicoff, Metcalf, Harris, Williams of Delaware, Carlson, Bennett, Curtis, Morton, and Dirksen.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Sparkman, Mansfield, Morse, Gore, Lausche, Church, Symington, Dodd, Clark, Pell, McCarthy, Hickenlooper, Aiken, Carlson, Williams of Delaware, Mundt, Case, and Cooper.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Ervin, Gruening, Muskie, Ribicoff, Harris, Kennedy of New York, Metcalf, Montoya, Mundt, Curtis, Javits, Hansen, and Baker.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Jackson (chairman), Anderson, Bible, Church, Gruening, Moss, Burdick, Hayden, McGovern, Nelson, Metcalf, Kuchel, Allott, Jordan of Idaho, Fannin, Hansen, and Hatfield.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Eastland (chairman), McClellan, Ervin, Dodd, Hart, Long of Missouri, Kennedy of Massachusetts, Bayh, Burdick, Tydings, Smathers, Dirksen, Hruska, Fong, Scott, and Thurmond.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), Morse, Yarborough, Clark, Randolph, Williams of New Jersey, Pell, Kennedy of Massachusetts, Nelson, Kennedy of New York, Javits, Prouty, Dominick, Murphy, Fannin, and Griffin.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Monroney (chairman), Yarborough, Randolph, McGee, Brewster, Hartke, Burdick, Hollings, Carlson, Fong, Boggs, and Fannin.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Randolph (chairman), Young of Ohio, Muskie, Gruening, Jordan of North Carolina, Inouye, Bayh, Montoya, Tydings, Spong, Cooper, Fong, Boggs, Murphy, Jordan of Idaho, and Baker.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Jordan of North Carolina (chairman), Hayden, Cannon, Pell, Clark, Byrd of West Virginia, Curtis, Cooper, and Scott.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D.C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 4852 Hutchins Pl.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.
Mr. Justice Brennan, of New Jersey, 3037 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Stewart, of Ohio, 5136 Palisade Lane.
Mr. Justice White, of Colorado, 2209 Hampshire Rd., McLean, Va.
Mr. Justice Fortas, of Tennessee, 3210 R St.
(Vacancy.)

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—John F. Davis, 4704 River Rd.
Deputy Clerk—Edmund P. Cullinan, 4823 Reservoir Rd.
Deputy Clerk—Michael Rodak, 6311 Joslyn Pl., Cheverly, Md.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Rd.
Reporter—Henry Putzel, Jr., 3703 33d St.
Librarian—H. C. Hallam, Jr., 10927 Pleasant Acres Dr., Adelphi, Md.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS JUSTICES ASSIGNED TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Fortas. Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Connecticut, New York, Vermont.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Brennan. Delaware, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, West Virginia.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Alabama, Canal Zone, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, Texas.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Stewart. Kentucky, Michigan, Ohio, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: ——— ———. Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice White. Arkansas, Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Alaska, Arizona, California, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Washington, Guam, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice White. Colorado, Kansas, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Utah, Wyoming.

Appendix

Federal Employees Provide Own Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CHURCH

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 22, 1967

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, we hear much talk about economy these days, but much of its fails to recognize that economy is not always a matter of millions or billions of dollars. Small economies, multiplied, would lead to saving the Government the millions we so often speak of.

A good example of a small economy which in the long run will save much is reported in the Caldwell, Idaho, News-Tribune of September 16, 1967.

Three Idaho Bureau of Land Management employees took it upon themselves to develop a machine to save time and money in the salvaging of barbed-wire fence in the Boise, Idaho, area. This job had previously been done by hand.

The three men are to be commended for their work. The efforts of Alma Fisher, Charley Roberts, and Jim Luttman are in the highest traditions of the Federal service.

In recognition of their successful effort, I ask unanimous consent that the story dealing with their economy efforts be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT USES COST-FREE WIRE WINDER—DEVICE MADE BY EMPLOYEES

BOISE.—A unique wire winding device, developed by three employees of the Bureau of Land Management in Boise, is currently being used by the Bureau to save time, money and materials for taxpayers.

The trio of Bureau workers—Alma Fisher, Charley Roberts, and Jim Luttman—were asked to develop a machine that would speed the collection of barbed wire on fence salvaging projects. (A fence salvaging project is the dismantling of fences, removal of posts and the wrapping of wire into a smooth roll for future use.) The only stipulation was there would be no funds available to buy materials.

The embargo on funds didn't hamper the project. Fisher, yard foreman at the Bureau, went to his scrap piles and uncovered the necessary materials for construction.

A half-inch cold roll iron from an old fire hose reel was used to make the wheel and angle iron was used for the base. The prongs that collect the wire were made from cold roll iron and the handle, stand and other parts were improvised out of available pieces of scrap iron. Roberts constructed the device and when it was finished the only cost to the Bureau was labor.

The wire winder is proving to be, in its short month of use, a quicker and more economical method of collecting wire.

It was used by the Bureau to roll eight and one-half miles of barbed wire in salvage of the protective fence on the Naylor Creek Seeding, 10 miles west of Caldwell. The previous practice has been to wind the wire by hand, which is very difficult and slow. The resulting roll of wire is also unfit for re-use purposes.

"With this device we can roll as much as two miles of wire a day," Fisher noted. "Before, a half mile of wire was the most you could roll and that was if you were working in good terrain."

Fisher also mentioned that since the wire is wrapped in such a tight, uniform roll it can be used the next year to restring fences.

Fisher added that the wire winding machine could prove to be a big asset to farmers and ranchers that have at least 80 acres of land.

"The machine can be constructed by anyone who has any access to scrap metal and welding equipment," Fisher explained. "The cost would be under twenty dollars and it would speed the collection of wire along with saving money and manpower."

President Johnson Salutes Shah Reza Pahlevi of Iran

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 11, 1967

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, President Lyndon B. Johnson recently greeted His Imperial Majesty Shah Mohammed Reza Pahlevi, of Iran, a great leader and friend of the United States.

As the President's opening remarks indicated, the royal welcome the President extended was richly deserved for this progressive monarch.

Now in the 26th year of his reign, he has already marked himself as one of the great leaders in his country's long and proud history. Not since the days of the great Persian Empire has Iran risen to such heights.

The renaissance of Iran, which had its roots in the reign of his father, Reza Shah, has been carried to fruition under Shah Pahlevi. The deeds of his peaceful social and economic revolution should serve as a model for all developing nations. As President Johnson said, Iran's efforts to achieve progress "without violence and bloodshed" is a lesson "others have still to learn."

An immense land reform program was begun, in which the Shah himself participated by distributing his own holdings to the peasants. To increase productivity, 800 extension corpsmen teach new farming skills and techniques. Women have been enfranchised and granted equal rights. An all-out attack on illiteracy has been launched led by the Literacy Corps. Iran's war on disease is being advanced by a Health Corps of doctors and technicians. And Iran's economic growth rate has averaged over 10 percent in recent years, making it one of the fastest growing nations in the world. The Shah's continued dedication to Iranian progress is amply demonstrated by the fact that over 80 percent of the country's oil revenue is used for economic and social development.

Just as the United States is fortunate to have such a friend in the Near East, Iran has long had a genuine friend in the United States—a friendship renewed by President Johnson during the Shah's visit.

In 1943, the United States sent experts to help Iran's war-ravaged economy and induced Russia to recognize Iran's territorial integrity at the Tehran Conference.

Today, our economic assistance, wisely continued and strengthened under the Johnson administration has helped the Shah push forward his vigorous social and economic program.

I join with President Johnson in wishing the Shah, the Royal family, and the people of Iran the best in the months and years ahead.

More Politics Than Logic Seen in New Decisions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 22, 1967

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "More Politics Than Logic Seen in New Decisions," written by Crosby S. Noyes, and published in the Washington Evening Star of September 21, 1967.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MORE POLITICS THAN LOGIC SEEN IN NEW DECISIONS

(By Crosby S. Noyes)

With the advent of the electoral season, politics rather than logic seems to be casting the deciding vote in the councils of the administration.

President Johnson's major decisions during the last few weeks—extremely important decisions concerning national security and the war in Vietnam—were clearly calculated to disarm his domestic critics. There is something in them for almost everyone, including those who disagree violently with the policies of the administration and with each other.

That they served the purposes of the administration itself is a good deal less clear. Johnson's intention, presumably, is to continue to keep to the center of the road, ignoring the advice of extremists on both sides of the hawk-dove fence.

Yet the decision to proceed with the construction of a fixed defensive barrier in South Vietnam and the renewed peace efforts in the United Nations are obvious concessions to soft-liners within the ranks of the Democratic party. And the decisions to bomb the ports of Haiphong and Campha and to begin setting up a limited antimissile defense in the United States have the effect of heading off criticism from the hawks.

The administration contends, as it must, that these decisions were all made exclusively in the national interest without any regard for politics. But in fact every President must calculate the political consequences of his acts. And Johnson is certainly not less sensitive to this aspect of his job than his predecessors have been.

In any event, there are powerful forces in Congress—and presumably in the country, also—who have advocated each of these steps. The really curious thing is that the administration itself until very recently advocated none of them. In fact, its spokesmen have spent a good deal of time pointing out the futility, and in some cases the danger, of the things they now propose to do.

The defensive barrier in Vietnam is perhaps the most striking case in point. The idea has a certain appeal to civilians who have never been in Vietnam, who see in the barrier a possible substitute for the bombing of infiltration routes, or who believe, quite wrongly, that fortifications are a substitute for men.

Yet in many months of questioning this reporter has yet to find a military man—or for that matter a civilian expert on Vietnam—who takes the barrier concept seriously.

The fortifications, if they are ever really built, will require far more manpower than is justified by the rate of infiltration from North Vietnam toward the South. And since the major infiltration routes are far to the west in Laos and Cambodia, they will at best be no more than a minor nuisance to the Communists.

In terms of strategy, the only significant success of the Communist forces in recent months has been to pin down a large number of American troops in the northernmost part of South Vietnam by threatening a masive invasion across the demilitarized zone. The proposed barrier promises to make this advantage permanent, diverting tens of thousands of troops into a futile, fixed defensive effort which cannot prevent infiltration and which has no bearing at all on the outcome of the military struggle in the South.

The decision to go ahead with the building of a "thin" missile defense system in the United States, though supported by some top military men, is equally dubious logic. It was perhaps inevitable, since the President could hardly afford to leave himself open to the charge of failing to protect the home front while billions were being spent to defend South Vietnam.

Yet top administration spokesmen, including notably Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara, have argued long and eloquently about the futility and the possible dangers of a defensive system which would not, in fact, increase the security of the United States in any significant way. And here again the final decision seems to have been heavily weighted on the political side.

And so, in Vietnam we are building a barrier that is not a barrier and at home we will be building a missile defense that will not defend the country. The two decisions, by no coincidence, have the political effect of cancelling each other out—as do, incidentally, the bombing of Haiphong and the new peace efforts at the United Nations.

Whether this is good policy or even good politics remains to be seen. The administration seems to be trying to give the impression of moving in two opposite directions at the same time, depending at what moment and with what degree of interest one tunes in on the news. But since the primary objective is to stick to the present line, it all amounts to little more than a sort of illusion which politicians at this stage of the political cycle feel is important.

WCAU–TV of Philadelphia, a CBS-Owned Station, Calls for Closing of Revolving Charge Loophole in Truth-in-Lending Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1967

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, how important is it that consumers making use of credit on the revolving charge basis, now favored by so many of the large retailing chains, be made aware of the annual rate of the finance charge they pay for credit? This is the most bitterly fought issue in connection with the truth-in-lending section of consumer credit legislation now pending in the Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs of the House Committee on Banking and Currency.

As chairman of the subcommittee, and on behalf of five of the other members of the 12-member subcommittee—Representatives Gonzalez, Minish, Annunzio, Bingham, and Halpern—I have introduced H.R. 11601, the Consumer Credit Protection Act, which includes comprehensive and across-the-board requirements for the disclosure, both in dollars and cents and in terms of an annual percentage rate, of the cost of credit in all consumer credit transactions. Unlike S. 5, the truth-in-lending bill which passed the Senate on July 11, H.R. 11601 does not exempt revolving or open-end credit from the annual rate disclosure requirement.

We have received a great deal of testimony in our hearings for and against this provision. I think all of the Members of the House realize that the revolving charge issue will be a critical one when the bill eventually comes before the House. The retailers using revolving charge are adamant against requiring that their credit costs be stated on an annual rate basis, insisting that a credit charge of 1½ percent per month on a specified unpaid balance is not at the rate of 18 percent a year. On the other hand, furniture, appliance, hardware, music, sporting goods, and other stores which generally sell large items on an installment basis, usually retaining a security interest in the merchandise, maintain that the exemption in the Senate bill for revolving credit would give to the department stores and big chain stores a very great and unfair advantage in stating credit costs. Even though the percentage rate charged by the furniture store might be substantially lower than the true annual rate of the department store credit, to most shoppers, the 1½ percent a month stated on the department store bill sounds like a very low rate of interest, whereas the same charge shown as 18 percent sounds like an extremely high rate. It is this kind of confusion which truth-in-lending legislation is supposed to eliminate, but will not do so if revolving charge is treated differently from other types of credit.

Since this issue is so basic in the controversy over truth-in-lending legislation, I am pleased to call to the attention of the Members an editorial broadcast by WCAU–TV in Philadelphia, on September 15, entitled "The End of a 7-Year Wait?" presented by Peter Duncan, WCAU–TV editorial director, the statement of editorial position of the Philadelphia station, a division of the Columbia Broadcasting System, states that truth-in-lending legislation should definitely include revolving charge accounts on an annual rate basis.

The broadcast editorial referred to is as follows:

[Editorial broadcast by WCAU–TV, Philadelphia, a CBS-owned station, on Sept. 15, 1967]

THE END OF A 7-YEAR WAIT?

(Presented by Peter Duncan, WCAU–TV editorial director)

Hollywood used to ballyhoo a new movie by proclaiming: two years in the making.

Well, Congress has outdone Hollywood. They have a piece of legislation which has been 7 years in the making—and they're still working on it.

In 1960, the first "Truth-In-Lending" legislation was proposed. Now in 1967, Congress is still working on it. The Senate finally passed one this session and sent it over to the House (where it's still in committee).

The truth-in-lending bill is designed to help anyone in this country who buys something on credit. It should spell out exactly what you're paying when making an installment purchase.

Unfortunately, the bill (as passed by the Senate) specifically excluded a most important area of credit buying: Revolving charge accounts.

WCAU–TV urges members of the House to amend the bill to include revolving charge accounts.

Figures on a credit sale form can be presented in such a way as to confuse almost anyone. Hearings have been held on this legislation and there is example after example where people apparently just didn't know what they were getting into. One shopper signed up to buy an item for about $125, and evidently agreed to pay $17.50 for 24 months. That meant the consumer ended up paying $400 for the item. Credit charges on that transaction amounted to 224%.

The truth-in-lending legislation has nothing to do with setting interest fees. It's designed to let you know how much you're paying for the item, and how much (in dollars and cents) you're paying for interest or carrying charges.

The truth-in-lending legislation is now in the House Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs. We urge members of that subcommittee to make sure that revolving charge accounts are a part of that legislation when it's reported out onto the floor of the House. And, of course, when that happens, we urge members of the House to pass the bill.

Truth-in-lending bills have been in the legislative mill for seven years. It's about time one was made law so it could (at long last) help the consumer.

Deployment of the Nike X

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 22, 1967

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, ever since the release of Secretary McNamara's September 18 address on the establishment of an ABM system in the United States, there have been many published comments in newspapers around the country.

The reactions of independent publishers and editors in our city papers represent the grassroots opinion of thoughtful citizens. One of those whose judgment I respect is the publisher of the Nashville Banner, James G. Stahlman, Jr. His editorial entitled "For ABM Policy U-Turn, McNamara Awakened Late" was published in the September 19, 1967, issue of the Banner.

In this penetrating article, the Banner scores Secretary McNamara for his Rip Van Winkle attitude and his tendency to sleep through the number of alarm bells that warned of the Soviet ABM construction.

In order to further document the mounting criticism over the delay by the Department of Defense in this matter, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOR ABM POLICY U-TURN, MCNAMARA AWAKENED LATE

Defense Secretary Robert McNamara is not too adroit on those security policy U-turns, but he did manage yesterday to signal one—a change of directions toward installation of an anti-ballistic missile system. Speaking before an assembly of United Press International editors and publishers in San Francisco, he let it be known that a start would be made on that for a "thin" defensive deployment of such with the Nike-X.

It has taken some time for the necessity to register on him. As in the case of Rip Van Winkle, the awakening on his part was slow. But seven years—the tenure of Secretary McNamara to date—is a long time to sleep with numerous alarm bells ringing.

The whole Pentagon wasn't snoozing. Competent military authorities, beginning with the Joint Chiefs of Staff, have been advocating such an installation, protective of America's cities. The Joint Chiefs unanimously have recommended it as essential to survival of the nation in the event of a missile attack triggered by the Red aggressors. That was their view when Soviet Russia was the only member of that team possessing nuclear capability; and they emphasized it again when it became clear that Red China—with its own bomb—could acquire a delivery capacity.

So, finally, the Secretary of Defense has acknowledged the realities he no longer could deny—and indicated consent for at least a partial preparedness step in that particular. The "umbrella" he proposes is addressed primarily to the threat from Red China.

Had he initiated this step at the outset of a necessity foreseen, it would have been in a state of readiness by now. He did not. Last year Congress appropriated some $153 million for initial procurement steps toward antimissile hardware. But the administration turned thumbs down on that proposal, too.

So there is a big job of catching-up to do—even on the present recommendation, which calls for a start on this program at the end of the present year.

Nobody is suggesting—nor has suggested—that the United States is undefended; nor lacking in a stockpile of nuclear weaponry and the capacity to use it for retaliatory purposes. The facilities sought in the form of Nike-X and kindred devices were—and are—for defense of America at home; to protect population areas from enemy missiles either intentionally or accidentally triggered in this direction.

The Banner has said this nation can afford whatever it takes to provide this maximum protection, and cannot afford less than that.

As mentioned, Mr. McNamara awakened slowly. The security installation here is of far greater importance than the barbed wire fence he has proposed to construct against the Viet Cong across that DMZ.

There is no room for Rip Van Winkleism at the civilian helm of national security planning—a sort of Z-Z-Z line denoting the protracted snore.

Roscoe Drummond Says "Poverty Programs and Workers Vital to Keeping Cities Cool"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1967

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert in the RECORD a column by Roscoe Drummond, published in the September 15, 1967, issue of the South Bend (Ind.) Tribune, entitled, "Poverty Programs and Workers Vital To Keeping Cities Cool":

POVERTY PROGRAMS AND WORKERS VITAL TO KEEPING CITIES COOL

(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—The people who know the most about race riots and what to do about them are the people who run the cities—the mayors.

Their views deserve the most responsive attention—by Congress and by the country.

A nationwide survey in 64 cities, half of which had riots this summer, shows that the mayors are overwhelmingly agreed on what does most to cause riots and what can help most to prevent them.

The causes they cite most frequently are: lack of jobs and lack of trusted communication between the Negroes and local officials.

As to cures, they know better than most that there is no single solution, no instant panacea, but the majors—Democratic and Republican—of these 64 cities are unanimous in their conviction that the antipoverty programs are crucial and constructive forces which need to be continued.

This survey shows conclusively that both the OEO programs and its workers played a major role in keeping scores of cities cool this summer and helped hold rioting down when it wasn't averted.

Because the survey was carried out by the OEO, some might dismiss it as self-serving. After reading pages of direct quotations by the mayors themselves, I am convinced its findings are authentic. The message is this:

Whatever else Congress may do to help solve the urban crisis, the one thing not to do is to tear up the anti-poverty administration and programs.

They are needed and nobody knows it better than the American mayors who have endured the riots and who have seen the programs at work in their communities.

In the Senate the outlook for the antipoverty bill is good. The Labor and Public Welfare Committee, by a vote of 12 to 3, endorsed a bill to continue and somewhat expand the programs of the Office of Economic Opportunity for two years.

But there are ominous storm clouds in the House. There are still some Republicans and Southern Democrats who want to dismember the OEO and distribute the programs to other agencies whether the agencies want them or not.

Critics have seized on headlines about the one or two incidents where poverty workers were charged with helping create a riot-causing climate.

The testimony of the mayors shows that without the anti-poverty programs there would have been more violence, little communication with the slum Negroes, and no significant beginnings of hope and assistance for the urban poor.

As to poverty workers abetting riots, some communities undertake high-risk experiments involving some of the most disaffected and alienated youth.

Young men who six months ago were on the streets and in trouble are carefully and cautiously given responsibility, trained to leadership and learn to feel it is just as manly to lead a work program as to lead a gang. A few proved unreliable. But out of 30,000 Community Action employees, only 16 were arrested, none convicted. And the poverty program has 244 buildings in the hearts of the riot areas; none was burned or destroyed.

In 15 cities local Community Action agencies calmed down bad situations.

In 13 cities they patroled trouble spots and served as communication posts between the police and slum areas.

In 14 cities the police and Community Action agencies had joint programs to prevent riots.

In eight cities the juvenile arrest rate dropped this summer and there is good evidence this was caused by more summer jobs.

The knowledgeable testimony of the mayors is that the poverty programs help convert militancy into responsibility and offer an alternative to violence.

Their testimony is practical and nonsentimental. It deserves to be heeded.

Day of Recognition for Firefighters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY M. JACKSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 22, 1967

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, on January 25, 1967, I introduced Senate Joint Resolution 24 which would have authorized the President to proclaim May 4, 1967, as a "Day of Recognition" for firefighters. The senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] has introduced a similar resolution, Senate Joint Resolution 77, except that it would authorize the President to proclaim the first Wednesday in May of each year as a "Day of Recognition" for firefighters; and H.R. 2156, introduced by Representative WALDIE, of California, would authorize the "Day of Recognition" to be the first Saturday in May of each year.

A proclamation honoring the dedication and heroism of the Nation's firemen is particularly appropriate during these difficult times.

Recently, Mr. C. Wilson Harder, president of the National Federation of Independent Business, the largest business organization in the United States, having more than 239,000 small business members, addressed a letter to the President on the subject. The White House reply indicates that should a joint resolution of Congress ever be forthcoming, the President will be most happy to honor the request.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of Mr. Harder's letter and the White House reply.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL FEDERATION OF
INDEPENDENCE BUSINESS,
San Mateo, Calif., August 31, 1967.

President LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: It is respectfully suggested that national attention be given to the courage and devotion to duty that has long been displayed by the members of the fire departments of this nation, with the institution of a national Firemen's Day.

For generations, at the risk of their own life and limb dedicated corps of men throughout the land have battled to save life and property and the honor roll of those who have died in the line of duty is indeed long.

Such a proclamation setting aside a day for observance of the heroism of firemen would be especially appropriate during this era of anarchy when on many occasions firemen have been the prime targets of snipers, while helpless to defend themselves in carrying out their duties.

Sincerely,

C. W. HARDER,
President.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D.C., September 4, 1967.

Mr. C. W. HARDER,
President, National Federation of Independent Business, San Mateo, Calif.

DEAR MR. HARDER: The President has asked me to reply to your recent suggestion that he proclaim a national Firemen's Day.

The President is deeply appreciative of the heroic contributions our firemen make to this country and also of the unfortunate and inescapable hardships under which they are sometimes compelled to perform their duties.

Unfortunately, there are so many requests for special days of observance that it has been the policy, for many years, that Presidents of the United States issue such Proclamations only in response to those requested by a Joint Resolution of the Congress. Should such a Joint Resolution ever be forthcoming, I can assure you that the President will be most happy to honor the request.

With the President's and my own best wishes,

Sincerely,

WILL SPARKS,
Assistant to the President.

The "EPIC" Program at California State College at Los Angeles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 11, 1967

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, last year over 1,000 students at California State College at Los Angeles took advantage of a unique and exciting opportunity to supplement their classroom education with meaningful and rewarding activities in the community.

Serving as EPIC volunteers, these students gained valuable preprofessional experience by working with one of over 100 agencies in the Los Angeles area.

Among other things, the Cal State at Los Angeles students tutored dropouts and potential dropouts, served as hospital assistants and staffed a summer school.

EPIC's first year had two keys to its success.

Students and college officials welcomed the opportunity to extend the college learning experience beyond the campus.

Community service agencies were happy to expand agency activities and services by using college students in paraprofessional roles.

During the coming academic year EPIC—educational participation in communities—offers even more opportunities for the campus and the community. Funding for an additional year and expanded program has made it possible for EPIC to continue its rapid growth.

Some Cal State at Los Angeles students will be able to earn academic credit for field experience or independent study through EPIC programs. Now, other colleges in the Los Angeles area have shown an interest in developing EPIC outposts to serve their own students and communities.

Cal State at Los Angeles, because of its location and nature, has been an ideal campus for EPIC and its programs. Most of its 20,000 students are working commuters who live and have activities away from campus. These students are not attracted by traditional collegiate activities such as pep rallies or bonfires. But, like all of today's college students, they are seriously concerned about contemparary problems and have a strong desire to improve both themselves and society.

EPIC has channeled these student energies into constructive community activities. In so doing EPIC has made good use of pent-up concerns for society, provoked intellectual stimulation, added a sense of student commitment, and provided countless service hours to community agencies needing volunteers the most. As a result, interest in EPIC from other colleges and the community has never been higher.

FUNDING

EPIC receives part of its funds from the Federal Government under title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965 as a demonstration—pilot—project. These funds, 75 percent of the total budget, are allocated by the Coordinating Council for Higher Education in California. Remaining funds and support for the project are provided by the California State colleges and the Associated Students at California State College at Los Angeles. During the current year, August 1967 to July 1968, the EPIC budget totals $111,864. The previous year's budget was $87,473.

The "Rat Act" Controversy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 22, 1967

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Rat Act Reversal," published in the Richmond Times Dispatch of Friday, September 22, 1967. The editorial commends Virginia's 10 Representatives in Congress for distinguishing between a Federal problem and a local problem.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RAT ACT REVERSAL

Virginia's 10 congressmen are to be commended for standing firm in the face of considerable emotional pressure and demagoguery on the great "Rat Act" controversy of 1967.

On Wednesday, the House of Representatives passed a bill authorizing $40 million in federal funds for state health agencies to use in fighting rodents. Though they did not prevail, all of Virginia's congressmen—six Democrats and four Republicans—voted against the bill.

Two months ago, the House had rejected a similar measure. Almost instantly, the issue became a *cause celebre*. Those who voted against the bill in July were denounced as hard-hearted reactionaries, enemies of the poor, pro-rat. In view of the propaganda barrage, it is really no surprise that 48 congressmen switched their votes to favor the rat bill between July and September, but there was not a Virginian among these switch-hitters.

This is not to say that a case could not be made for a switch. For certainly the measure which passed the House this week is an improvement over the bill rejected two months ago. If approved by the Senate, it will channel funds through an existing program—instead of setting up an entirely new one—and state health agencies, rather than federal housing officials, will administer the expenditures.

Lost in the emotional uproar following the rejection of the July rat bill was the fact that many congressmen who voted against the measure did so not because they are stingy or unconcerned about rats, but because the bill was poorly planned and thrust upon them in great haste.

There were—and are—already three federal rat eradication programs in existence. One is operated by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, another by the Office of Economic Opportunity, a third by the Interior Department. The July bill would have set up a fourth program under the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Even though the House has reversed itself, the issue is still up in the air. The vote on Wednesday would escalate the federal war on rats through an existing health program, but the Senate had planned to add rodent eradication funds to a housing bill.

Thus the issue has now been reduced to a question of whether rats are a health or housing problem. The larger issue of whether they are a local or federal problem, unfortunately, seems to have been resolved in favor of the feds.

We would have thought—and apparently Virginia's congressmen agree—that if ever there were a strictly local problem, this was it. If America's cities can't contend with their own rats without turning to Washington for help, is there anything, really, that they can do all by themselves?

Two-Week Tour of Southeast Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD D. McCARTHY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 20, 1967

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following articles:

Laos: Now a Land of Intrigue Amid Fury of War and Politics—Diplomats of All Sides Mix Freely in "Switzerland" of Vietnam Conflict

(Note.—Representative --McCarthy, in Southeast Asia on a personal visit to observe conditions there, is writing his reaction and assessment for the Buffalo Evening News.)

(By Richard D. McCarthy, Representative, 39th District)

Vientiane, Laos, September 13.—The round of diplomatic functions is a bore in some capitals. Not here. A typical cocktail party will include representatives of the United States, the Soviet Union, Communist China, North and South Vietnam.

The French, particularly, take delight in mixing these disparate elements—especially the stiff and remote Chinese—at a single function.

Laos is the Switzerland of the Vietnam war—only more so. There is more intrigue and strange goings on at this Asian listening post than in possibly any other nation in the world.

The Geneva Accords of 1962 called for a neutral Laos. They also called for the removal of all foreign troops from this land-locked nation of 2,500,000, bounded by North and South Vietnam, China, Cambodia, Burma and Thailand. It is primitive land where ducks, chickens and water buffalo roam the roads to the despair of the few drivers.

SHIFTS ALLEGIANCE

Prince Souvanna Phouma, the durable neutralist prime minister, co-operated with the Russians up to and after the Kennedy-Khrushchev Vienna summit meeting, which headed off a possible U.S.-U.S.S.R. confrontation over Laos.

When the North Vietnamese refuse to withdraw from Laos as the other nations did, Souvanna protested to the International Control Commission, which is composed of representatives of India, Canada and Poland. The ICC is headquartered here.

When this move produced no results, he shifted his allegience to rightist forces loyal to the shaky throne. Communist cabinet members promptly withdraw from the government. (Souvanna has left their seats vacant.)

Unable to confirm the exact extent of infiltration into Laos, Souvanna asked the U.S. to photograph North Vietnamese activities from the air and granted permission for the airplanes to fire back if fired upon. These resulted in the recent new reports that the U.S. has bombed Laos.

MEETS WITH MINISTERS

An estimated 25,000 Vietnamese continue to hold much territory in Laos. In the north, they hold the key Plain of Jars and two full provinces. In the south, they control the Ho Chi Minh trail, the key route for re-supplying Viet Cong and North Vietnamese forces in South Vietnam. But several of the previously dissident Lao factions have united against them.

Rep. Lester L. Wolff (D., Great Neck) and the writer met with two Lao cabinet ministers at the home of the U.S. aid director, Joseph Mendenhall, on the banks of the Mekong River overlooking Thailand. Then we flew by helicopter into the rugged mountains of northern Laos to meet Gen. Vang Pao, the undisputed chief of 250,000 Meo tribesmen. Proud and independent descendants of itineran Mongolians, the Meos supported by the Lao air force, are fighting to recapture mountain territory, which they have occupied for centuries, from the North Vietnamese.

AMERICAN MURDERED

This year the Lao government, with U.S. assistance, will re-locate some 40,000 Meo and Lao refugees to bring the total resettled to 300,000. The U.S. has also provided food and helped the Meos build roads, schools and medical facilities—all firsts for this primitive but proud people.

Next we flew south to meet Col. Somphet Sotsavan, who recently ousted Gen. Kong Ly to gain leadership of the 10,000 neutralist armed forces. Using arms, including Russian artillery, obtained in the pro-Russian days, the neutralists are engaged in a fight with the Communist Phathet Lao which recently stepped up its incursions into the countryside.

Ten days ago the Pathet Laos murdered a Lao rural development leader who had organized a tractor co-operative. Earlier they murdered an American Volunteer Service worker—a conscientious objector to the U.S. Draft—and two Lao workmen on a U.S.-sponsored road building project.

MAKE LITTLE HEADWAY

Despite deep unease over the terror among unarmed American civilians, the U.S.—under Mr. Mendenhall's energetic leadership—has a very effective program under way of school and road building, teacher training and agricultural assistance.

With a new U.S.-built road into Vientiane, farmers are able to transport their crops into the swarming, sociable morning market. We visited several promising "self-help" projects including one which, with the use of new seeds, fertilizer and irrigation, can double and even quadruple rice production.

Despite increased efforts, the Pathet Lao is making little headway. The reason seems obvious to the dedicated and hard-working civilians here, who say: "They can point to negative aspects of the Lao government. But they offer only terror and vague promises about the future. They have no positive, practical program for improvements as we do."

McCarthy Sees Hope for Early Settlement of War in Vietnam—Turmoil in China To Have Big Effect on All Asia and May Speed Pressure on Hanoi

(By Richard D. McCarthy)

Hong Kong, September 12 (delayed).—The favorite game in this bustling and troubled enclave is "China watching."

And what do the China watchers watch?

Turmoil bordering on anarchy inside a nation with nuclear weapons.

A seemingly senile Mao Tse-tung locked in a desperate internal encounter with his opponents.

A nation of more than 700 million people exporting subversion and terror to more than a dozen nations. There even have been reports here that Mao is trying this tactic on his Soviet neighbors.

All of which is having a profound effect on both the Communist and non-Communist worlds.

FORGING STRONG CHAIN

Leonid Brezhnev, the Soviet Communist Party chief, has condemned the "inhuman repression and fanaticism of the Red Guards' terror" in China. He charged that Mao is replacing Marxism-Leninism with adventurism and asserted that Mao "could no longer be called a communist." He said the Soviets will hail the victory of those resisting Mao's leadership.

Non-communist Asia is reacting to the thunder out of China with a burst of unparalleled energy. For the first time in history, the nations in China's shadow are working together to forge a regional chain strong enough to withstand the pressure from the Sino giant.

REGIONAL PLAN DRAFTED

Last week delegates from Thailand, Indonesia, Brunei, the Philippines, Singapore, Laos, Malaysia and South Vietnam met in Kuala Lumpur.

They agreed to launch 90 regional air, rail, road, marine and telecommunications projects. Japan, the undisputed industrial and economic leader of non-Communist Asia, will provide the necessary technical assistance.

In Thailand last week, delegates from the same countries convened to draft a regional plan for manpower development and educational planning.

Individually, Asian countries—several with U.S. financial aid—are moving to counter Communist subversion and guerrilla warfare with "revolutionary development programs."

ASIAN HELP STRONG

Thailand will devote 60 per cent of a sharply increased budget next year to rural and national development programs.

Militarily, the nations of Asia are providing more help in Vietnam than many Americans realize. South Vietnam has 154 battalions in the field. The U.S. has 84, South Korea, with 46,000 men on duty, is third.

Thailand, this observer learned, will soon increase its combat force in Vietnam. The Thais also permit the U.S. to launch 70 per cent of its air strikes against Vietnam from six Thai air bases.

SOVIET CONCERNED OVER CHINA

The convulsions inside China have a direct bearing on the prospects for peace in Vietnam. Highly placed U.S. diplomats in Asia believe that while North Vietnam and China may not wish to terminate the conflict, the Russians might.

One U.S. ambassador put it to the writer this way: "The Soviets are deeply concerned over what's happening in China. At home, they have serious farm problems.

They hardly have enough ships to keep up with their requirements and they have financial problems with their East European allies.

"The Vietnam war is a major strain on them. They would like to redirect spending to other areas."

U.S. ROLE TO REMAIN BIG

Another U.S. diplomat, a charge d'affaires, described the situation as follows:

"The Russians have a lot of fish they'd like to fry with us. They have got to settle this war. The Chinese don't want it settled.

"But if North Vietnam does go to the conference table at Soviet urging, the Russians probably will have to pick up the billion dollar tab to repair North Vitnamese war damages."

If peace comes to Vietnam—and the observer believes it's blowing that way—one still leaves Asia with the grim realization that the United States will be expected to continue to carry the mantle of leadership in this part of the world.

U.S. PROBLEM CITED

A response to this argument came last week from a high American official at a meeting of leading Thai citizens:

"We Americans," he said, admire your determination to preserve the independence which you struggled for a thousand years to maintain. We will help you. But you must understand that back home in the cities of America, we have grave problems of our own that must be solved promptly.

"So we welcome the many signs of increasing regional strength here in Asia and look forward to the day when you will be militarily, economically and politically strong enough to shoulder the bulk of the burden yourselves."

Anti-Ballistic-Missile System for the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 22, 1967

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, as I stated on the Senate floor earlier this week, while the proposed limited anti-ballistic-missile system is a crucial step in the right direction, it should also be understood that a thin ABM system is not enough to protect the people of this country.

We would have to spend billions of dollars on defense before anyone could say a dime was wasted if it led to the saving of the lives of our American servicemen or of American civilians.

The need for an ABM defense second to none is recognized in an editorial entitled "Defense Against Missiles," published in the September 20, 1967, issue of the News and Courier at Charleston, S.C.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEFENSE AGAINST MISSILES

The Johnson administration's decision to deploy a limited anti-ballistic missile system represents a concession to strong demands from Congress. An ABM is a weapon for knocking nuclear missiles out of the skies.

Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara favors only a thin ABM system designed to counter Chinese Communist missiles in the 1970s and accidental firings of a few missiles by the Soviets. The proposed system is not a countermeasure against the strong ABM system which the Soviets are installing. Mr. McNamara remains hostile to a heavy ABM defense.

The public may be lulled into imagining that a limited ABM system is adequate protection for the United States. The need for a full-scale defense is more difficult to present than the need for offensive missiles. Yet ABM defenses are a key part of the nuclear defense equation. As the Soviets increase their ABM defenses, they will feel more secure. They will be tempted to engage in nuclear blackmail if the U.S. lacks anti-ballistic missile protection.

Mr. McNamara, in his speech at San Francisco, pinned his hopes on negotiations with the Soviet Union. He urged the USSR to join in "a race toward reasonableness," instead of an arms race. He made this same appeal months ago. The Soviets have continued to deploy ABM forces. At the same time, they have proceeded with development of sophisticated missiles with large payloads.

In short, Mr. McNamara, in rejecting a full-scale ABM system, is engaging in what Technology Week has called "unilateral nonarmament." He favors defense against Red China—the No. 2 threat to American security—but disapproves adequate ABM defense against Russia, which is the No. 1 danger to the United States, on the ground that constructing such a defense would be provocative.

Members of Congress intend to see that the light ABM system shall be expanded into a heavy system. Sen. John O. Pastore (D-R.I.), chairman of the Joint Atomic Energy Committee, has called the limited ABM system "a starter toward an over-all effective anti-ballistic system."

Advocates of a full-scale ABM system recognize that the cost is high in dollars. Maintenance of freedom is never cheap. All the defensive systems created since World War II, which have preserved American liberties, have been costly in national treasure.

Nevertheless, the challenges of a resolute, ambitious enemy require a free nation to utilize its technological resources to the fullest. Failure to move ahead in anti-ballistic missile defense would give the Soviet Union strategic superiority over the United States. Every American can understand what that would mean.

Being Mad at Presidents Is a Popular National Pastime: But the President's Record Speaks for Itself

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 11, 1967

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, it is popular these days to ask: "Are you mad at the President?" Is it not one of our favorite pastimes, being mad at the President? Yet, I doubt whether many Americans are mad at him—

Because there are 6 million more people at work, and in higher paying jobs, since President Johnson took office;

Because the jobless rate has dropped to less than 4 percent, and the number of jobless has been reduced 1½ million;

Because 3 million older Americans have received hospital care and 5.5 million received physicians' services under the President's medicare program;

Because the Elementary and Secondary Education Act is now helping 8 million disadvantaged children, and more than 135,000 needy college students are able to receive an education through Federal grants;

Because President Johnson has produced a 72 percent expansion of Federal programs that directly combat poverty and help the poor;

Because 4 million Americans have moved above the poverty line as a result of laws enacted under this administration; and

Because more than 8 million workers are covered by the minimum wage and because more human rights legislation has been passed under President Johnson than under any other President.

These are some of the accomplishments of Lyndon Johnson's Presidency. This is the President who is trying to make social security real security for Americans young and old.

He is trying to clean up the air, our rivers, and our cities.

Being mad at him may be a pastime—but Democratic progress has been full time for the past three and a half years.

It Is Time To Do Something About Attitude of People Rather Than Put More Money in Their Pockets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1967

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have included in the RECORD the enclosed article written by Dick West, of the Dallas Morning News, concerning an article by Archie Moore, the retired boxing champion. Archie Moore should be applauded many times over for what he has said about the conditions of our country today as compared to the misery of the depression. The point he makes about the motivation and drive of those of the depression which gave them the desire and determination to surmount the obstacles as compared to the lack of such qualities among the rioters and malcontents of today is, in my opinion, the basic problem in our country today and little attention is given to its solution. I would venture to say most of my constitutents agree with Mr. Moore completely that too many people want something for nothing and it is time to do something about the attitude of people rather than try to put more money in their pockets.

The article follows:

THE DEPRESSION'S COMPENSATIONS

(By Dick West)

He won't get a Pulitzer, but no piece of prose on the riots packs the punch of one written recently for the San Diego Union by Archie Moore, the retired Negro boxing champion.

"The devil is at work in America," wrote Archie.

"Snipers and looters, white or black, deserve no mercy.

"I was born in a ghetto, but I refused to stay there. I am a Negro, and proud to be one. I am also an American, and I'm proud of that.

"Today's young people think they have a hard lot. They should have been around in the '30s when I was coming up in St. Louis. We had no way to go, but a lot of us made it.

"I became light heavyweight champion of the world. A kid down the block, Clark Terry, became one of the most famous jazz musicians in the world. There were doctors, lawyers and chiefs who came out of that ghetto."

Now, here's the best part:

"We made it because we had a goal, and we were willing to work for it. Don't talk to me of your 'guaranteed national income.' Any fool knows that this is insanity.

"Do we bring those who worked to get ahead down to the level of those who never gave a damn?

"The world owes nobody—black or white—a living. God helps the man who helps himself."

There is more to it, but we picked out for quotation that part about the Great Depression for a particular purpose.

The depression (1930–41) was horrible, but those who experienced it came out with lasting compensations.

They learned, first, that even a penny was precious. I well remember my father walking eight blocks to save 2 cents on an armload of turnip greens—one grocer wanted 11, the other 9. I thought of him, rest his soul, when I read recently that a stenographer in New York City was getting $8,000 a year for teaching ballet in the Job Corps as a sideline.

Second, those who experienced the depression learned the value of a job—any kind of a job. You grabbed whatever came along, because you had to. There was no such thing as the present-day luxury of waiting for the most desirable.

The third compensation—well, let Archie Moore say it again: "We made it because we had a goal, and we were willing to work for it."

You learned that getting ahead demanded courage, work, sacrifice and guts. It was a way of life.

John Connally left a tenant farm, hitchhiked to Austin and worked his way through the University of Texas selling chewing gum and chopping weeds along narrow hot-topped highways.

Allan Shivers sold shoes.

District Atty. Henry Wade thumbed rides from his home town of Rockwall to Austin to study law and enrolled in the university with 50 cents in his pocket.

Columnist Paul Crume washed dishes, and when he got down to his last quarter "Dr. Walter Webb, who took an interest in me, would come up with some idea that carried me through."

In 1934 it was estimated that 5,000 students on the campus never ate breakfast, although you could get cereal and coffee for a dime.

Archie Moore says the devil is at work in America today.

The real devil, aside from the Red devil, is a decay in the American spirit.

Too many of us expect something for nothing. We demand this and that, when actually we have no right to demand anything without working for it. Now, even worse, what we want has become a "right."

During the riots in Detroit, jobs went begging at $1.50 an hour—some for $2.25. But a whole section of the city was destroyed by those who didn't have the character to sacrifice and lift themselves to a higher plateau by their own muscle and sweat.

We have enjoyed nearly 25 years of postwar prosperity—and may there never be another depression of despair. But the waves of economic plenty have washed away something that was sturdy and stable.

As income and pocket change have grown to unbelievable proportions, so has crime.

As home ownership has increased, so have divorce and bastardy.

As churches multiply and rise in architectural splendor, so does cynicism toward the verities of morality.

As bank deposits soar, so does bankruptcy of business and of personal honor.

America has not gone to hell, but this is true:

In times of adversity, there are more who are willing to sacrifice and fight—because they have to. In times of plenty, there are more who want to take it easy.

The tragedy of our slums is not only their filth and ratholes; it is the unwillingness of so many to sacrifice and work to get out of the ghetto.

The real devil Archie Moore was talking about is the attitude that life's blessings are to be served up, like turkey and dressing, on a silver platter.

A great society? Billions can't build it if the heart isn't right, the head is lazy and the hands unwilling to dig the solid foundations.

A Tribute to J. D. "Red" Hill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1967

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, one of the most distinguished citizens in my congressional district is J. D. "Red" Hill, one of the founders of the United Auto Workers Union.

On September 15, 1967, a tribute was paid to Mr. Hill on his retirement after 34 years of service to the United Auto Workers and to the people of his community.

Mr. Hill was one of the 17 employees of the St. Joseph County community who on July 19, 1933, applied for the charter of a local union which was the forerunner of the famous Studebaker Local 5, UAW.

"Red" Hill has not only been a leader in the UAW union but has been one of the most active citizens of St. Joseph County, Ind. in a wide variety of civic and community activities.

He has dedicated his life to helping make life better for American working men and women and I am pleased to pay this tribute to him.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include at this point in the RECORD an article from the September 16, 1967, South Bend Tribune describing the testimonial banquet honoring "Red" Hill:

SOME 300 ATTEND TESTIMONIAL—J. D. HILL RETIRES AFTER 34 YEARS WITH UAW

(By Ray Gregg)

It was like a homecoming Friday night in the Indiana Club for many of the men who helped to found the United Auto Workers Union in the depression years of the 1930s. The old-timers were part of the 300 or so friends and associates who gathered at a testimonial dinner, sponsored by UAW Local 5, to pay their respects to James D. (Red) Hill, retiring after 34 years in organized labor.

Even the site of the dinner lent itself to the occasion, because the Indiana Club figured prominently in the early years of the UAW. The union held its second convention there in 1936.

Both the rank and file and leaders in the UAW were on hand to felicitate Hill, who was one of the 17 Studebaker Corp. employees who applied July 19, 1933, for the charter of AFL Local 18310, the forerunner of Local 5.

CHARTER MEMBERS

Representing the rank and file were many of the charter members of the local union, which once was the largest labor group in the area when Studebaker was counted as a major automobile producer.

Representing the leadership were 10 past presidents of Local 5, including Hill and Raymond H. Berndt of Indianapolis, director of the UAW's Region 3. Also at the dinner were Emil Mazey, secretary-treasurer of the UAW International Union, and Dallas Sells of Anderson, president of the Indiana AFL–CIO Council.

Odell Newburn, current president of Local 5, which was stripped of most of its membership when Studebaker quit auto manufacturing here at the end of 1963, saw the testimonial dinner as the first bid of the revival Local 5 to resume its onetime role of community leadership.

REBUILDING MEMBERSHIP

Now called Amalgamated Local 5, the labor group is rebuilding its membership from employees of Kaiser Jeep Corp., Cummins Engine Co. and Allied Products Corp., all occupying parts of the former Studebaker manufacturing complex, as well as from employees of several smaller companies in the area.

Mazey, in listing Hill's contributions to organized labor, noted that the South Bend man "played a very important role in the greatest social revolution that ever has taken place."

Mazey pointed to the big strides made by organized labor in the last 30 years, contending that workers had thrown off the shackles of an industrial dictatorship to take part in an industrial democracy.

"Whenever an employer has the sole power to determine his employee's working conditions, the employer is a dictator, no matter how benevolent he might be," Mazey declared.

CITES UNEMPLOYMENT

He observed that in 1933, when the forerunner of Local 5 was organized, unemployment nationally was 26 per cent of the work force and 52 per cent in Michigan's auto industry, compared with the current figure of around 4 per cent.

"It was in this climate that Red Hill and the others began to build," Mazey went on. It was the time when thousands of auto workers were fired from their jobs because they dared to exercise their right of joining a union.

Berndt, who served as toastmaster for the dinner, also pointed to Hill's many organized labor and community activities. Reflecting Newburn's expectations for the future of Local 5, Berndt hoped that "the voice of Local 5 again will speak out in the community as it did for so many years."

DARES TO DREAM

Sells, in adding his felicitations, asserted that "men like Red Hill, who dared to dream are the ones responsible for Social Security, vacations with pay, paid holidays, pensions, insurance programs and many of the other benefits that have accrued to organized labor in the last 34 years."

He added, "'Back in the days when the going was difficult and dangerous, men like Red Hill put in an untold number of hours to bring these things about as they looked to tomorrow for a better world.

Sitting beside Hill at the head table was his wife. Seated in front of them were their several children and their families.

The Hills received gifts presented by Jack Welsh, recording secretary of Local 5, and a civic certificate of appreciation from Mayor Lloyd M. Allen.

PAST PRESIDENTS

Past presidents of Local 5 who attended, besides Hill and Berndt, were Russell Merrill, the first fulltime president of the local union, and Louis Nagy, Al Richardson, William Ogden, Forrest Hanna, Woodrow Frick, Harry Delinski and Vane (Skinny) Burgoyne.

Rev. Mark J. Fitzgerald, C.S.C., labor expert on the faculty of the University of Notre Dame, gave the invocation. Newburn presided at the dinner.

Hill became interested in union activities after being employed by Studebaker in 1924. After the formation of the Studebaker union, he was one of the first five stewards elected in 1934. Two years later, he became chief steward and alternate divisional representative.

Later, Hill served seven one-year terms as divisional representative and two one-year terms as president. He was editor of the Studebaker Local 5 News from 1940 to 1949, also taking part in UAW educational programs.

In World War II, Hill was on the plant ration board and was liaison between Local 5 and the War Labor Board. He also was chairman of a committee to serve the needs of wounded servicemen at Camp Atterbury, Ind.

In 1951, Hill was named assistant director of the Studebaker Intra-Corporation Council to service Local 5 and other Studebaker local unions in California, Illinois, New Jersey and Canada.

In 1958, he was reassigned to the UAW organizing department. In 1963, he went on the UAW Region 3 staff as a service representative.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Code of Laws of the United States

Title 44, Section 181. Congressional Record; arrangement, style, contents, and indexes.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the Congressional Record, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the Congressional Record semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

Title 44, Section 182b. Same; illustrations, maps, diagrams.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the Record without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the Congressional Record the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily Record as follows: the Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided,* That the makeup of the Record shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the Congressional Record, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the Record shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the Record issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the Record for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the Record of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the Record shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the Record style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the Record.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the Congressional Record any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent Record is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the Congressional Record the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the Congressional Record.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the Congressional Record shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the Official Reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the Official Reporters of the respective Houses.

The Official Reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the Official Reporters in the next issue of the Congressional Record, nor to Records printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the Congressional Record by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the Congressional Record which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the Record.

Appendix

Citizen Diplomacy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK BROOKS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 25, 1967

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, President Lyndon Johnson has made it clear to all the world that he is willing to pursue any road to meaningful discussions with the North Vietnamese regarding peace in Southeast Asia.

It is unfortunate that an individual, with an apparent overinflated valuation on his own importance, has seen fit to accuse our President of undercutting his own efforts for peace. While the charge itself borders on the ridiculous, the widespread coverage given to his statement has created some consternation.

An editorial in the Beaumont Enterprise, a Texas daily newspaper of outstanding reputation, places the episode in its proper perspective.

The editorial, which I feel will be of interest to my colleagues, follows:

CITIZEN DIPLOMACY

Harry S. Ashmore's venture in the tricky realm of diplomacy ended up with a lot of unnecessary noise.

Though we would not question the motives of the Pulitzer Prize-winning former editor of the Arkansas Gazette in his visit to Hanoi, and in the subsequent drafting of a peace proposal to Ho Chi Minh after consultations with someone in the State Department, we are disappointed that he did not accept in stride failure of those efforts.

Instead, he accused President Johnson of "effectively and brutally" canceling them out through a letter of firmer tone sent to the North Vietnamese leader about the same time.

As Sen. Everett M. Dirksen of Illinois emphasizes, it is ridiculous to conclude that the Chief Executive would knowingly torpedo any peace effort, no matter by whom inspired, that gave the slight hope of bringing North Vietnam to the conference table under conditions that were honorable and within the broadest framework of administration policy.

We are convinced that few Americans are more anxious than the President to bring an end to the frustrating conflict in Southeast Asia.

The State Department, it seems, didn't tell Ashmore and his associate in the Hanoi mission and private peace probe, Editor William C. Baggs of the Miami News, that what were considered much more significant contacts were being made in Moscow with North Vietnamese representatives. So, understandably, Ashmore and Baggs thought theirs was the top show at the moment. Not to have been fully filled in didn't, of course, leave a good taste in the journalists' mouths later.

Outbursts like Ashmore's play into the hands of those Americans in public life who seek every means of belittling the administration's Vietnam policies and piling additional burdens upon the shoulders of the harassed Chief Executive.

The Ashmore affair, and the resultant propaganda benefits to both the doves and the enemy, add to the picture of confusion and uncertainty which this nation is presenting to the world. No good can come of that.

We have serious doubts anyway about these peace efforts by private citizens. In this case, we have a feeling that more harm than good was done.

The government has at its disposal every conceivable channel for making known to Hanoi our position on every question that can possibly be raised in connection with the military confrontation. Let's leave the diplomatic maneuvers to that department.

President Dryden's Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT P. GRIFFIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 25, 1967

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, a report is now available by the president of the National Guard Association of Michigan concerning the role of the Guard in the recent Detroit riots. I ask that the report by President Howard M. Dryden be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A REPORT BY HOWARD M. DRYDEN, PRESIDENT, NATIONAL GUARD ASSOCIATION OF MICHIGAN

During the past few weeks the National Guard of Michigan has received a great deal of adverse publicity as a result of the duty it was called upon to perform in the civil disturbance in the City of Detroit.

In reading accounts of the riot in both local and national newspapers and magazines, we were appalled at the inaccuracies of the statistics, and the misinformation presented to the public as factual, on the spot accounts of the disturbance.

As a Commander, I am proud of the manner in which my officers and men conducted themselves. As an Association, it is our duty to compile and present to the public a factual account of the role played by the National Guard in the crisis and to correct the record once and for all in the eyes of the public and the other members of the National Guard of the United States.

The Detroit Police Department called to request that the National Guard be placed on alert for a possible call at approximately 7:30 a.m. Sunday morning. However, it was not until 4:30 p.m. Sunday afternoon that the Mayor was convinced that he should call the Governor and request the National Guard. It should be noted here that on a Sunday afternoon, without any warning over radio or television that a large number of Guardsmen were not contacted on the first call, so in many cases it took three or more calls to contact them. Also the strengths of units are misleading. Because of the time of year many were on vacations, some were at six months training, and others at Service School. As an example one Battalion with a strength of 473 men could only muster 254 men by midnight Sunday. As a comparence, of approximately 1700 troops in the Detroit area there were approximately 1000 on duty as of midnight Sunday night.

ALERT TIMES

July 23, 1967

Time

1630—156 Signal Bn.

1752—2nd Bn 182 Arty.

1703—1st Bn 225 Inf (AB).

1845—B Troop 146 Cav.

1845—2nd Brigade HQ.

1845—1/125 Inf Bn.

1845—3/126 Inf Bn.

2250—Remainder of Guard Units at Camp Grayling (minus Air Guard).

NOTE.—There is a seven hour road trip for military convoys from Grayling to Detroit—plus loading time.

The following is a schedule of troop arrivals at Central High School which will show the number of troops that were available and the times.

It becomes quite obvious after studying these figures that less than 2500 Michigan Guardsmen had been committed at the time that the Governor asked for Federal Troops.

TIME SCHEDULE OF TROOP ARRIVAL AND COMMITMENT AT CENTRAL

Time	*Men*
July 23, 1967	
1730—156 Sig Bn	200
2000—2/182 Arty	150
2045—156 Sig. Bn	80
2200—1/225 Inf. Bn	150
2230—B/146 Cav	15
2240—2/182 Arty	60
2315—1/225 Inf. Bn	36
2400—2/182 Arty	44
Total	735
July 24, 1967	
0020—1/225 Inf. Bn	80
0230—1/225 Inf. Bn	58
0250—1/225 Inf. Bn	[1]200
0400—3/126 Inf. Bn	[1]200
Total	538
Grand total	1,273

[1] Sent to Southeastern.

As the day passed on and more troops arrived in Detroit they were either sent to Central, Southeastern or placed in reserve at the Light Guard or the Detroit Artillery Armory.

A Command Post was set up at Central High School with Brigadier General Noble O. Moore in charge. The first unit dispatched to Central was a portion of the 156 Signal Bn (200 men) which was holding a weekend assembly on this day. At this time men were reporting to their respective Armories from the other SRF units in Detroit—approximately 1200 men. These units had completed annual field training two weeks early; however the greater portion of the Michigan National Guard were 200 miles away at Camp Grayling.

Prior planning by City, State and National Guard Officials has been on a continuing basis for the past two years. However, this planning had been on the basis that at no time would the Military be in charge, but would take their orders and instructions from the Civil Authorities (i.e. City or State

Police). The concept was that the Guard would be assigned tasks by the Civil Authority (such as clearing of streets, etc.). These tasks would then be carried out by the Military within the Military Command structure with at least one Police Officer with each unit who would be the responsible Civil Authority present (to make arrests, etc.). However this concept was not followed the first few days. As fast as troops arrived at the Central Command Post they were dispatched in small groups of 3 to 10 or 15 men, escorted by a Police Officer and in many cases left there to perform their assignments by themselves with the Police Officer returning to Central. The duties and initial assignments given to the National Guard were in most cases duties (some of which were guarding of liquor stores, hospitals, supermarkets, drug stores, etc.) which could be given to police officers so that unit integrity could have been maintained.

Due to the enormous number of requests from the Police Department, rapid and immediate dispatch of the requested troops became the first concern of the officer in charge. At one time Sunday night there were only 7 guardsmen available for dispatch.

The piece meal dispatch of troops from Central destroyed any chance of using the Guard effectively during this period.

The military system which the National Guard operates under makes it mandatory that all missions be handled by unit and organization Commanders using their Non Commissioned Officers within the Army command structure.

The initial employment of small groups of Guardsmen happens to be the first time that these men had ever been placed in the position of being away from their officers and Non Commissioned Officers and with live ammunition and expected to exercise good judgement as to when and if to load and fire their weapons, also in most cases they were left in isolated locations with little or no instructions. The outstanding manner in which they performed their duties under these conditions is a matter of public record.

The initial and rapid deployment of troops precluded setting up normal shifts to allow for relief and rest for the troops, so in many, if not all cases, the troops dispatched the first night performed their duties for upwards of two to three days with little or no sleep. After the first couple of days, the situation became such that reorganization was possible and units and assignments were realigned and units were given areas of responsibility. As soon as this was done it was only a matter of time until the situation came under control.

There is virtually no precedent for what happened in Detroit, from the point of view of the National Guard, charged with restoring order when Civil disorders are beyond the capability of Civil law enforcement agencies.

Unlike other Civil disturbances of recent times, Detroit's bordered on mass insurrection, more closely resembling guerrilla warfar than the riots and civil disorders with which the nation is more familiar.

It can be said that the Guard training is adequate to cope with the type of civil disorders that we have had in the past. In the past decade the National Guard has been called on 49 times to restore order. The largest single commitment of Guardsmen was in Watts, California, in 1965, when 13,393 Soldiers and Airmen were used. As of July 28, National Guard units had been called on 17 different occasions in 1967 . . . requiring the use of approximately 21,700 troops. The largest number was used in Detroit, where slightly more than 9,000 Guardsmen and Airmen were used.

In virtually every instance, the courage, proficiency, effectiveness and complete impartiality of the National Guard has been praised by all elements in Detroit. The teamwork developed by Guard, Police, and Firemen, was outstanding.

But in Detroit a completely new and more complex situation confronted the forces of law and order. Snipers blazed away from roof tops and apartment buildings, firing a couple of rounds then moving to another location. Fires were started all over the city, by arsonists. These fires were in many cases covered by snipers who stayed just long enough to prevent the Fire Department from getting them under control and preventing them from spreading.

Detroit counted over 1,100 fires spread over a 175 square block area.

Ordinary citizens, men, women, and children succumbed to the general hysteria and joined with the criminal elements to loot and burn.

In such circumstances, the tactics and methods of infantry combat are more applicable than ordinary riot control techniques, yet these tactics could be applied only with the greatest caution.

The rioting was taking place in heavily-populated areas, crammed with thousands of innocent citizens. How do you root out persistent, well-hidden snipers when any force you use may well bring injury or death to innocent persons? What degree of force do you use, when hundreds of ordinary citizens turn into a mob, and smash, loot and burn stores in wholesale fashion? How do you bring peace back to a city with minimum harm to its citizens when scores of its residents roam the streets defying the curfew and all authority without apparent concern for the consequences? More important, how do you accomplish these things without injuring the innocent or causing widespread damage?

The Department of the Army dictates doctrine and training for the National Guard and the Active Army. The Guard uses the same training manual and programs as the Active Army. The emergencies of Detroit, and other cities, are completely unlike any disturbances this country has ever experienced, and our officials at all levels of government have been caught by surprise.

In light of this new kind of disturbance, new training is certainly called for and we will be among the first to call for it. But along with new training we also must talk about new equipment (which means additional funds). Army doctrine for dealing with a concealed sniper is with an M-79 grenade launcher which is capable of hurling a grenade into a window at distances of a hundred yards or more. Yet destruction caused by this method cannot be used in our cities; against our own people. To deal with the insurrections, our military forces need Jeep mounted chemical dispensers, helicopter borne illuminators, water cannons, riot shotguns equipped with bayonets, and small shot ammunition, low velocity rifles, small compact radios similar to the "prep" radio used by the Detroit Police, Flack jackets, and hand bull horns for talking to crowds. The guard does not have this equipment. The Active Army has little more specialized equipment than does the guard.

Guardsmen brought law and relative peace back to Detroit as they have to other communities, working closely with Civil Authorities. They performed their dangerous chores as requested by the Civil Authority in a manner that reflects credit on them and their leadership. Their preparations for these tasks was deficient only in the sense that no responsible authorities, military or civilian, could have envisioned American cities erupting in such a devastating and almost suicidal manner.

The civilians who are critical of the Guard today do not seem to realize that Guardsmen are civilians first and have jobs and families that take the majority of their time. When these men are suddenly called to duty they must be located, which can take considerable time, then they must report to their armory to get their equipment, then be taken to the scene of the disturbance.

If in the 48 drills and two weeks of summer training a Guardsman receives every year he could be as well trained as the regulars then there would be no reason for the regular military establishment.

In closing, the National Guard Association of Michigan wishes to state that many lessons have been learned by all concerned (which has been called by some as "an intensive course in riot training") and we hope that the new riot training and equipment that is involved from this experience is better suited to prepare the National Guard to effectively control the type of civil disturbance that has been occuring in the United States.

Pittsburgh: Project Equality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 25, 1967

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, at the Labor Day mass in the Pittsburgh civic area on Labor Day, September 4, 1967, Bishop John J. Wright, speaking for an interfaith committee of Christian and Jewish clergy, announced that Project Equality will be initiated in the Greater Pittsburgh area for the fiscal year 1968. Standing with Bishop Wright as he made the announcement were Dr. Robert L. Kincheloe, executive director of the Council of Churches of the Pittsburgh area and Dr. Walter Jacob, rabbi of Rodef Shalom Congregation. Catholic diocesan officials and over a score of Protestant clergy joined members of the Labor Day committee on the platform.

The statement was made in behalf of a committee comprising representatives of 13 religious groups in the Greater Pittsburgh area who have been working out a program for an ecumenical attack on job discrimination against members of minority groups.

Bishop Wright's decision to adopt Project Equality for the Catholic diocease was based on the findings of the Human Relations Commission and approval of the Diocesan Pastoral Council. The plan had been recommended by the Greater Pittsburgh Religion and Race Council and by the social welfare departments of all the religious groups joining in the Labor Day statement.

The proposal has not yet been acted on by the standing committee of the Episcopal Diocese of Pittsburgh, but Bishop Pardue has given it personal encouragement. He was represented at the Labor Day ceremonies by Very Rev. Dean A. Dixon Rollit and two members of the diocese worked on the study group, Canon Robert Merry, and Reverend Alex Seabrook.

Bishop Frederick B. Newell of the Methodist Church participated in discussions of the committee and headed the Protestant clergy in the ceremonies surrounding the announcement. Other members of the committee were: Bishop J. Gorden Howard of the Evangelical United Brethren Church, Western Pennsylvania Conference; Rev. Dr. Brannon J. Hopson, moderator, Allegheny Union Baptist Association; Rev. Dr. William C. Hankey, president, Western Pennsylvania-West Virginia Synod, Lutheran Church in America; Rev. Dr. Edward A. Cahill of the First Unitarian Church of Pittsburgh; Rt. Rev. Msgr. Edward V. Rosack of the Byzantine Catholic Diocese; Rev. Dr. Russell C. Eroh, pastor, Penn West Conference, United Church of Christ; Rev. Dr. Oliver W. McCully, executive secretary, the Association of Christian Churches; Rev. Dr. William F. Ruschhaupt, Jr., general presbyter, Pittsburgh Presbytery-United Presbyterian Church; and Rev. Charles H. Foggie of the Wesley Center A.M.E. Zion Church.

Statement on Project Equality Made at Labor Day Observance, Civic Arena, Pittsburgh, Monday, September 4, 1967, by Bishop John Wright for Special Inter-Faith Committee

Representatives of most religious traditions in the Greater Pittsburgh area have been meeting for a number of months to work out their common responsibilities to the problem of the employment opportunities of members of minority groups.

We see social progress, the building of the good society, as resting on four cornerstones which, while involving economic, sociological and political elements, are ultimately moral and therefore our direct concern.

These four cornerstones are: first, the right to education in accordance with one's ability and interest; second, the right of access to decent housing under the formula called "open-housing;" third, the right to participate in the benefits of community health and welfare programs; fourth, the right to voice and vote in the affairs of civil society.

Basic to all these, as Labor Day reminds us, is the right of equal opportunity to secure employment proportionate to one's skills, needs and ambitions. We have therefore addressed ourselves to this question in the first of our inter-faith efforts to bear a common witness in the realm of community morality and social justice.

Prominent among programs proposed to implement equal employment opportunity is one called "Project Equality." The purpose of Project Equality is to work toward the elimination of employment discrimination, even unconscious, in organized religion and in the firms which receive the patronage of churches, synagogues and their institutions. It asks the voluntary acceptance by religious agencies of certain requirements which parallel those imposed by law upon Federal agencies and an increasing number of state and municipal communities. It thus adds a dimension of morality and conscience beyond mere legal obligation; for this reason it has been endorsed and implemented by religious groups separately or in ecumenical cooperation.

We have studied this program in its principles and to some degree in its performance elsewhere. We do not pretend that we find it a cure-all for the social problems of minority groups; we cannot claim that it is all, or even most of what is needed to save or strengthen the civil rights of minority group workers. It is, however, one positive approach to a fundamental aspect of the grave problem of social justice which weighs on the conscience of us all. In the determination to leave nothing untried which can mobilize the forces of conscience behind the effort to promote social justice, we have decided to impose upon ourselves and to sponsor the Project Equality program on an inter-faith basis. We have already invited the national office to come to Pittsburgh to establish their program among us.

We wish to be candid about the initial reservations we all felt in its regard. Each of us in his own religious tradition and all of us together have historic reasons for avoiding economic boycotts or organized discrimination, even in the name of religious or moral motives. We shall not use Project Equality as an economic boycott but as an instrument of self-discipline and of community education.

Our motivation in testing Project Equality as a weapon in the present fight for social justice is entirely positive. It is the motivation which, in other periods of our history, prompted seekers after justice to fight the use of child labor, slave labor or similar morally unacceptable policies in the production of goods which may otherwise have met marketing standards. Once it became a moral imperative in the struggle for social justice to buy from those who did not exploit child labor or use slave labor. Now it is an imperative to give preferential patronage and the support of our organized purchasing power to those who deliberately and conscientiously promote equal opportunity of employment to all who are objectively qualified applicants.

As representatives of religious communities, we shall not seek to police the commitments in conscience which we ask of suppliers to our institutions and organized purchasing programs. Obligations in conscience do not admit of policing and no one of our groups is prepared to set up policing or coactive agencies. Our task is the education and guidance of conscience, not check up on conduct.

Therefore, we are uniting to underwrite and to establish a Project Equality office which will be identified with none of our religious organizations nor with all of us combined as an inter-faith group. Our respective religious headquarters will be the first voluntarily to submit our policies and procedures to the scrutiny of Project Equality. We will be the first to make the pledges in conscience which we shall ask of others. We are confident on the basis of the performance of Project Equality elsewhere that it can do its work of promoting social justice without recourse to procedures offensive to conscience or destructive of good will. On the basis of this confidence we have united in the decision to give Project Equality every opportunity to prove itself in the Greater Pittsburgh Area.

We feel it particularly appropriate, once we have pledged ourselves, to appeal, precisely on Labor Day, to the enlightened conscience of organized labor for full and generous compliance with the Project Equality requirements. These will be set up among us in the fiscal year 1968. Many probably all of our religious groups have long since bound themselves to help promote social justice by the support of organized labor and by restricting our major construction contracts to contractors or companies using organized labor. Our Project Equality commitment in behalf of minority groups is in this same tradition; it is, in fact, a necessary consequence of our commitment to social justice for workers. It is one further stop toward realization of those ideals, personal and social, to which organized labor appealed in the days of the struggle for its rights and which still motivate labor today.

We are confident that we shall not take this step alone but that organized labor will take it together with us; some groups have already taken steps similar to it. It is important that Religion and Labor be supported by the management, the industrial and the political leadership of the community in this and like projects to give moral reinforcement to decent community desires; an encouraging number of our major industrial enterprises have already demonstrated their eagerness and ability to provide not only support but example in forward-looking social programing.

May 1968 be a year which finds religion, labor, industry and government in our corner of America united in the insistence that no discrimination inconsistent with human dignity and civil rights will stand in the way of any man or woman, or any minority group, who seeks the opportunity for that employment essential to all the other rights and advantages bound up with personal fulfillment and social justice.

Statement of Dr. Robert L. Kincheloe, Executive Director of the Council of Churches of the Pittsburgh Area

Inter-faith cooperation in the Pittsburgh area took a significant step forward in the Labor Day observance statement. This was jointly issued by the Roman Catholic Diocese, the Jewish religious community and a strong majority of the Protestant communions in an effort to strengthen our religious witness for social justice in the employment arena.

As Executive Director of the Council of Churches of this area I strongly endorse the stand taken in this matter by the several Protestant communions and pledge "Project Equality" the support of the Council of Churches.

Recent Trip to Soviet Union by Mr. A. Howard Stebbins

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 25, 1967

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the September 13 issue of the Arkansas Gazette contains an interesting account of a recent trip to the Soviet Union by a prominent Arkansas businessman, Mr. A. Howard Stebbins. I believe that his observations will be of interest to Senators and other readers of the Congressional Record.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Visitor Says Russians "Put on Their Pants the Same Way We Do"

Most Americans have a distorted picture of Russia and the Russians, according to A. Howard Stebbins, who recently returned from that country, and the United States government has done little to correct the picture.

"Officially, they appear black as hell," Stebbins said Tuesday, "but the land is fair and the people, amazingly enough, put their pants on just as we do."

Stebbins, of 34 Edgehill Road, and his wife were in a tour group of 23 Americans that left New York August 3 and spent two weeks in Russia and another week in Czechoslovakia and Hungary. They went from New York to Amsterdam to Moscow to Leningrad to Sochi (the "Soviet Riviera" on the Black Sea) to Kiev to Prague to Budapest and then back home.

Stebbins, the executive vice president of the Coca-Cola Bottling Company of Arkansas, said that before the trip, his impression of the Russians was the same as most Americans'—a holdover from the Bolshevik Revolution of 1917. The impression was of a people "coarse, crafty, sly, suspicious, ill-fed, ill-clothed, ill-humored, ignorant, bearded, with stocky, square bodies, tight-lipped and politically browbeaten * * * waiting their chance to revolt.

FOUND RUSSIANS KIND, COURTEOUS

Instead, Stebbins said he found a kind and courteous people, who are now enjoying the fruits of their labor and are not too painfully oppressed by the governmental dogma. "Life is obviously gayer," he says. He emphasizes that he's talking about the people, and not their leaders.

In Stebbins' opinion, Russia is no longer Communist, if it ever was. He defines communism as state ownership of everything, with everything divided equally among the people.

"It's nothing like that now," he said. "Wages vary, people can own cars, homes, yachts and can bequeath them, you can sell produce from your garden. Really what Russia has is a form of socialism where the state owns the land and means of production. To me, it appears that both Russia and we are moving toward a middle course in socialism and can have or will have much in common."

Before Westerners condemn the Russian Revolution, Stebbins said, they should remember that "Russia has no Martin Luther or Reformation to break the greedy power of the church, no Cromwell to behead an arrogant English king, no French Revolution to topple a blood-sucking aristocracy, no industrial revolution to develop a strong middle-class society. We have forgotten the bloody price we paid for these foundation stones of our Western society. However revolting it is, we are witnessing the prodigious unparalleled Russian accomplishment of all these social gains in a matter of less than 50 years.

"We can't approve the means to these ends but who would help them against an implacable, stupid aristocracy and a ruthless church except the untrained Russian people themselves?" Stebbins said, "Leaders arose among the people who saw that the dirty deed had to be done. The Russian nation is celebrating the 50th anniversary with obvious approval and satisfaction."

RUSSIAN CITIES BRIGHT, CLEAN

Stebbins studied the Russian cities and said he found them bright and clean, with broad avenues, well-trimmed parks, flowers in abundance and old and modern statues everywhere.

"Multitudinous giant apartment complexes attract the eye in every city," he said, and a small flat with living room, bedroom, kitchen and bath, plus utilities, can be had for less than $15 a month. Russian office workers earn $100 a month and specialists $250, he says. "Of course the government owns all land without exception and sets the prices of the various sized flats as well as the salaries of everyone, including the priests."

(There aren't very many priests. Stebbins said that in Moscow, a city of 7 million people, there were one synagogue, one mosque and five Christian churches. "Atheism is state approved and taught in the schools, but the magnificent old churches with their treasures of jewels are preserved as historical museums and are looked upon as a phase through which their society has progressed," he said. "When we asked to attend church services to see a wedding, there was no animosity, no hatred. Religion is simply a dead issue. No Jew-baiting was admitted or noticed.")

ICE CREAM PRICES LOWER IN RUSSIA

Stebbins said that consumer goods and clothing of reasonable quality were available everywhere at prices higher than in America, but not out of reach. "We never saw a ragged person or beggar in the whole of Russia," he said. He said dress was informal, even at the ballet and the opera, which some men attended without coat or tie, and that he never saw a woman in high fashion or a miniskirt. Department stores, butcher shops and grocery stores, all state-owned, were well stocked, he said, and "Ice cream better than ours is sold for 15 cents a generous helping on nearly every street corner, as are sweets, fruits and melons."

The rivers, lakes, seashore, museums and former palaces were crowded every day, Stebbins said. He said the Russians were adopting the five-day week and he assumed that they staggered the days off somehow because some of the stores were open on Sunday. The cities' river banks all were revetted with concrete and steps at intervals for bathers and fishermen, he said, Kayaks for one, two or four were numerous; sculls and four- and eight-oared shells were common; personally owned motor boats or sleek, high-speed hydrofoils were plentiful, he said.

Stebbins said that the state and collective farms, forests and fish hatcheries appeared to be well tended, although his group was never invited to make a close inspection. All of the equipment was mechanized, he said.

"Absolutely everyone was interested in education and bodybuilding," Stebbins said. He said the Russian stadia, many seating 100,000 people, were "a delight to the eye" and that bookstands and newstands were always crowded and short-wave radios were common "Children are taught English and rarely in the city are you unable to communicate," he said.

MAYBE NEITHER OF US HAS RIGHT ANSWER

"The intelligentsia chafe at the lack of freedom of expression and there are many shortcomings if compared to our advanced status," Stebbins said. "But perhaps we'd be better off if our writers refrained, or were restrained, from giving the general public books like "Coming Thru the Rye," [sic] "Fanny Hill" and "Valley of the Dolls," etc., and if we sternly forbade such freedom of expresison as used by Stokely Carmichael and Rap Brown.

"We saw no beatniks or hippies—their young folks are molded and cared for in the youth camps and the Army," Stebbins said. "Maybe neither of us has exactly the right answer."

Stebbins said the Russian airplane service almost equaled American, that privately owned cars and public taxicabs and trucks created traffic jams, that street cars and buses were cheap and that the beautifully decorated subways were packed.

Soldiers and police were rarely in evidence, Stebbins said, and "No one item was ever stolen from all our baggage even when money was purposefully left available." He said no one mentioned "the theft of a statue by one of our citizens." (Buel Ray Wortham of North Little Rock was arrested in Russia last October for stealing a statue of a bear from a hotel. He was sentenced to three years in a labor camp, but the sentence later was suspended and he was released.)

SAYS RUSSIANS MUST BE RESPECTED

Stebbins said he thought the Russians must be respected "for what they have accomplished for the individual's physical existence where once humans were hardly treated as well as the aristocrat's animals.

"They have a right to wonder about our planes over China and how we'd react if Chinese planes flew over the U.S.A.," he said. "They question why we object to their friends in Cuba when we surround Russia with bases. They have a right to question our handling of the minority problem when they read such gory details in our papers. They frankly feel they have as equal rights in Vietnam as we do."

Stebbins said he hoped others would go to Russia to learn "how misinformed or uninformed we are. Then perhaps we can work out an accommodation with these people, who have much to offer."

Food Controls Without Surpluses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 25, 1967

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, despite the lack of food surpluses our farmers continue under regimented allotments which are said to be for the purpose of price controls and protection of small farmers.

Yet small farmers have all but gone out of style, food prices have never reached parity, and the food production potential of America is hamstrung.

I have consent to here insert a most shocking report on our food situation from Gospel Tract Society, Lee's Summit, Mo.:

IS AMERICA FACING FAMINE?

World famine afflicting hundreds of millions of people by 1970 was predicted by a scientist speaking before the American Chemical Society in Chicago in September of 1964. Dr. Raymond Ewell told the group of scientists, "It will be the most colossal catastrophe in history." The report was made by columnist Richard Starnes from Washington, D.C. on September 11, 1964. At that time the reserve supplies of grains and foods in the United States were above emergency needs.

For almost fifty years the Communist Conspiracy, first in the Soviet Union, then in the satellites, has been unable to produce sufficient food for its own people. The Ukraine, where the Bolshevik murderers starved to death millions of Christian farmers, had once been known as the breadbasket of. Europe. Enormous quantities of wheat and grain were grown there, enough for large exports. In contrast to the communists' inability to feed their subjects, the free Western world has produced sufficient food for all its people and much to spare.

Beginning with the New Deal in 1933 in the United States. Federal programs were initiated to control and regulate food production. In the 1930's Henry Wallace was Secretary of Agriculture, and was surrounded by communists who conceived the New Deal farm program. They began a system of paying farmers to destroy crops and animals. Later this developed into rigid government control over what farmers could plant and how much. Taxpayers' funds are still shoveled out by the millions to hold back food production.

As the government collectivists became more international-minded and arranged give-away programs under the name of "Food for Peace," foreign governments (including communist countries) began to depend upon the United States for a portion of their food supply. Instead of supplying farm machinery, fertilizer and technical knowledge, we have seen fit to send abroad huge quantities of food. Had we supplied the means and knowledge for production, the nations involved could have become self-sufficient by this time. As populations increased and as communist agricultural failures developed, the demands upon the United States increased until today there exists an actual dangerous shortage of food supplies.

The U.S. News and World Report of July 4, 1966 printed a chart with the title "Is U.S. Running Out of Food." It showed food stocks at peak, stocks on hand and actual stocks needed to meet minimum emergency needs. Shortages were found to exist in wheat (shost 75 million bushels), rice (short 200 million pounds), soybeans (short 52 million bushels), butter (short 47 million pounds), cheese (short 111 million pounds), and dried milk (short 436 million pounds). This analysis showed the 1966 wheat crop in the United States is much smaller than was expected and raises a question of whether the United States is now moving toward a wheat crisis.

The report stated: "A flood of wheat has been pouring from U.S. bins to ease hunger abroad. What was once a great glut of grain now is largely gone.

"At the start of this year's harvest, U.S. wheat reserves have dropped below the amount held necessary to meet emergencies. Wheat-belt elevators that were chock-full five years ago now are nearly empty."

The United Press International in a dispatch from Washington, D.C. on May 21, 1966, reported, "Federal farm officials are facing a major policy decision on the issue of butter supplies for school lunchrooms—the surplus stockpile that once seemed bottomless is gone.

"In the past, school lunch needs have been met by donations from butter stocks held by the Government under the Federal dairy price support program.

"Now Agriculture officials say they have no surplus butter, and they do not know whether there will be any during the current flush milk producing season."

An indication of the developing meat shortages is reported in an Associated Press dispatch of May 14, 1966, which showed that the meat imports are running thirty-four percent ahead of last year. Imports of red meats (beef and veal) are expected to total over 685 million pounds this year and pork imports were over 85 million tons during the first three months of 1966. A substantial amount of pork was imported from communist Poland in the form of canned hams.

The Associated Press on May 31, 1966 reported that pork prices have increased by twenty-five percent in the last twelve months, and that they are still going up. The same dispatch stated that a check made of assorted fresh meat retail prices showed a rise of 21½ percent from March 1965 to March 1966. A survey in Washington, D.C indicated bread, milk and rice to be up four cents, and potatoes up from fifteen to twenty-five cents per ten pounds. The increase in food prices all over the United States is obvious to any American housewife. This is the law of supply and demand in action and the shortages are pushing up the prices.

The Omaha Sun of June 5, 1966 stated: "Shipments abroad plus a drop in production have caused a decline in wheat stocks. Recently, the Department of Agriculture estimated reserve supplies may fall to 350 million bushels before the 1967 crop starts moving to market. This is considered below a safe level for emergency needs. They said the need is 600 million bushels." In spite of this situation we have been exporting food as usual.

The N.Y. Times service warned on October 31, 1965: "The United States is running out of surplus food. As a result of growing exports for cash, food give-aways at home and abroad and restraints on production, excess stocks of farm commodities that are edible have declined, in nearly all cases to levels near or below the normal inventory needed for reserves."

"Dairy products give a good illustration of the changing situation. Surpluses are so sharply reduced that from time to time, in recent years, give-aways abroad had to be curtailed because the Government had no stocks."

"Of all the variety of crops grown, wheat is by far the most important in 'Food for Peace.' The total of shipments abroad ran about $1,900,000,000 annually in the last two years, and wheat accounts for two-thirds of this."

Back in 1964 the Associated Press, in checking on the "Food for Peace" program, found that from 1954 to 1964 we shipped overseas $12,300,000,000 worth of agricultural products. Of this enormous sum, sixty-three per cent was sold for foreign currencies (unusable except in the foreign country itself).

As the population of these countries increased so have their demands on the United States as a source of food. The funds we give away on loan (never to be repaid) have become so expected by the foreign countries that they are figured in their operating budgets. In the same way they have become dependent on the United States for food.

In the meantime American farmers have had their help lured away by higher wages in the industrial areas for those who want to work, and government welfare programs for those who do not want to work. An article in the Denver Post of May 16, 1966 stated: "Prominent farmers in this agricultural community (La Jara, Colo.) predicted Saturday afternoon that the farm manpower situation threatens to bring on a nationwide food shortage. . . . They blamed: An exodus of farm workers to other jobs. . . . Stoppage of the bracero program 18 months ago by Congress. Inability of farmers to pay wages that compete with industry. Their belief that War on Poverty and other welfare programs are robbing farmers of laborers. Government programs which control farm markets. . . . They contend poverty war officials have misrepresented the facts by leading all farm workers to believe they are eligible for training in the program. . . .they said hundreds of farm workers here decline farm jobs because they believe that if they're unemployed they automatically qualify for War on Poverty training."

According to the Allen-Scott Report of July 7, 1966, President Johnson promised Prime Minister Gandhi of India, during her visit to the United States in March of 1966, that the United States will supply India with nine and one-half million tons of wheat in spite of the fact that India is carrying on active trade with communist North Vietnam. The report stated: "If the Indian government wishes, the President indicated, the U.S. would be willing to work with the Soviet to solve India's food needs. 'This is the kind of international cooperation which I favor,' declared the President." With the Soviets unable to supply enough food for their own people their part of the "cooperation" would probably be to take credit for what we were doing, one of their favorite tricks.

Secretary of Agriculture Freeman has sought to calm concern over the dwindling U.S. wheat supplies and the dropping estimates for the 1966 wheat crop due to adverse weather. He has opposed a provision in a bill banning credit sales to nations which trade with North Vietnam and Cuba. However, he is not known to be an anti-communist and his department was the first government department to be penetrated by communists. The Hal Ware cell was in the Agriculture Department and from there the communists branched out with espionage units and underground cells in other government departments. Documentation concerning this can be found in the Senate Internal Security Hearings on "Interlocking Subversion in Government Departments."

Orville Freeman was born in Minneapolis, May 9, 1918. He graduated from the University of Minnesota in 1942 and after the war received his LLB from the same university (1946). He became a friend of Hubert H. Humphrey, Jr., who later, as mayor of Minneapolis, selected Freeman for his assistant. Freeman was associated with Humphrey in the formation of the Democratic Farmer Labor Party which took many radicals into its ranks.

Freeman married Miss Jane Charlotte Shields of Winston-Salem, North Carolina, on May 2, 1942. The 1934 edition of "America's Young Men" showed that her father, James Montgomery Shields, was principal of the Winston-Salem Junior High School and pointed out that he was active in the Progressive Education Movement, headed by John Dewey of Columbia University. This movement has proved to be the ruination of our schools and has the broader purpose of preparing young Americans for a new social order.

Freeman has long been a dues-paying member of the radical left-wing Americans for Democratic Action (ADA) and also the Americans Civil Liberties Union which has in the past been cited by State and Federal authorities as a communist front and which up to the present time mainly defends communists, atheists and pornographers. .

When the Billy Sol Estes scandal was breaking, Mr. N. Battle Hales, an attorney working for the Department of Agriculture, endeavored to show Secretary Freeman that he had a lot of evidence in his files which proved that favoritism had been shown to certain individuals. He had already warned of the activities of Billy Sol. Thereafter, Hales suddenly found himself barred from his office and files while Freeman's staff members seized his files. Hales' secretary, Margaret Kimbrough, who protested the file seizure, was forcibly removed from the office and the building and spirited away to a mental hospital. Secretary Freeman had appointed the notorious Billy Sol Estes as a member of the Cotton Advisory Committee of the U.S. Department of Agriculture and Estes was involved in cotton allotment deals, grain and fertilizer storage facilities frauds.

The question of grain storage bin frauds was not new to the Department of Agriculture. On January 16, 1956, the Senate Committee on Government Operations issued a report entitled, "Inefficiencies in the Department of Agriculture Grain Bin Program." This report showed that bins were erected of substandard materials, that the government was overcharged, that bins leaked out grains, that because of faulty construction they were subject to rodent and vermin infestation, and that little or no effort was made by the Department of Agriculture to get back money paid on fraudulent claims.

The Department of Agriculture was created by President Lincoln to "acquire and diffuse" information designed to promote agriculture. At the time of its 100th Anniversary (1962), according to Congressman James A. Haley, "The Agriculture Department now sprawls all over the world. Its budget for the new fiscal year is set at $5.8 billion, and it will spend much more. It has more than 90,000 employees—about one for each 40 farmers—and is growing fast. The number of farms and farmers in the United States has been dwindling steadily—but the Agriculture Department gained 3,700 employees last year alone."

Rep. Haley discussed the Department's role in "acquiring and diffusing" information on everything "from infant care to African violets," and continued:

"But the Department does more than this. It fixes prices, controls acreage, tells farmers what to plant and where and how much. It owns a vast hoard of 'surplus' crops and while it is constantly selling these in huge quantities at great loss to the taxpayers, and giving away great volumes of foodstuffs, it is day by day acquiring and storing, also at great loss to the taxpayers, far more than it can get rid of."

The Department has fooled Rep. Haley and has gotten rid of too much of its surpluses and thereby created a dangerous situation. The controls, however, remain and the regulations have increased. With the realization that continued controls on farmers through the collectivist programs of the Department of Agriculture were doing more harm than good, and in an effort to restore the true free enterprise system, Congressman E. Ross Adair of Indiana on February 9, 1961 introduced a bill (HR 4051) "To free farmers from Government control." The bill, which was not passed unfortunately, began with the following statement:

"Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, that, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, shall be hereby repealed."

By repealing this one act all authority for Federal control would be removed. The original AAA which the Roosevelt cabal created in 1933 was declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court. However, by 1938 Roosevelt had "packed" the Supreme Court and an even worse AAA was upheld. Concerning these federal agricultural programs, Dan Smoot has stated:

"Official investigation has revealed that the federal agricultural programs, thus initiated by Henry Wallace during the first two terms of Franklin D. Roosevelt, were actually created by communists in the Department of Agriculture, for the purpose of communizing agriculture in the United States.

"But the official purpose—the political argument which persuaded Congress to authorize, and the public to accept the federal agricultural programs—was to save the small farmers of America."

Not only have these programs not "saved the small farmers of America," they have all but eliminated them, and are now doing the same thing for the "big farmers of America." The AAA was described by George N. Peek, its first administrator who saw the members of the Hal Ware communist cell in action there. In his book, "Why Quit Our Own," he says: "A plague of young lawyers settled on Washington . . . in the legal division were formed the plans which eventually turned the AAA from a device to aid the farmer to a device to introduce the collectivist system of agriculture into this country. . . . They wanted to purge the AAA of all businessmen or any others who did not welcome the coming of the new day of revolution. . . . Most of that crowd . . . were Communists."

The members of Hal Ware's "parent" Communist cell, identified as such in sworn testimony, who worked for the original Agricultural Adjustment Administration were Alger Hiss, Lee Pressman, John Abt, Nathan Witt, Nathaniel Weyl and Charles Kramer. Another employee took the Fifth Amendment regarding membership in the Communist Party. Also working for this original AAA were Adlai Stevenson and Abe Fortas. Hal Ware worked as a "consultant" to the Agriculture Department after having served in the U.S.S.R. as a leader in the Soviet collective farm program under both Lenin and Stalin.

The program initiated by these communists is still in operation, and complete government control has been outlined by the Office of Emergency Planning when in "crises requiring extraordinary measures by the United States, the President or Congress might formally declared a national emergency." They state in Chapter 8 of "The National Plan for Emergency Preparedness."

"USDA (U.S. Dept. of Agriculture) national headquarters, subject to overall policy guidance and coordination by OEP, would direct the Nation's food program. . . . To the extent conditions permitted, overall direction of emergency operating programs would be conducted from national headquarters." They define "food" to include anything capable of being eaten or drunk and starting from the time it is a seed or on the hoof or in any state of development or preparation. The authority for turning control of the nation's food over to the government is found in Executive Order 10998, Assigning Emergency Preparedness Functions to the Secretary of Agriculture (27 FR 1524).

When the government is able to completely control a nation's food supply, the inhabitants either agree with it or starve. John Noble, who spent a number of years in a Soviet slave labor camp without ever having been given a trial for his unknown offense, has stated that the communist plan is to keep the people on a low calorie diet on which they can just barely subsist. Even this small amount of food is made difficult to obtain. . . . involving standing on long lines and waiting for rations. So much time and effort goes into getting the food and so much thought is given to the hungry pangs that very little time and energy are left to think about rights and freedom. The unhappy conditions do not exist for the elite of the Communist Party, however, who have special stores from which they can obtain any delicacy they wish. The "In" crowd eats and lives well even in the "peoples' democracies." It is just the people who nominally own everything who have nothing.

In non-communist countries when food is scarce and prices soar, many low-income families go hungry because they cannot afford to buy enough food. Reports received from contacts who have visited India indicate there is food available for those who have the money to buy it. The problem is that there are many poor who have remained poor in spite of the tremendous foreign aid given to India. It seems the aid just does not reach the ordinary people. On the other hand, in this so-called democracy there are many who possess fantastic wealth, live in magnificent splendor but do nothing to assist the poor of their own country, nor does their government arrange a tax system system which might benefit their people as is done in true democracies.

The food situation here in our own country is deteriorating and there is talk of "inflation" and "price controls." But even with dangerous shortages in basic foods developing, the federal government is still curbing production and giving away food. Dire predictions are being made. The N.Y. Times of August 16, 1966 reported the judgment of a group of scientists that man is multiplying faster than the food supply. The article states: "A group of scientists agreed today that man was rushing toward catastrophe . . . This appraisal of mankind's probable fate, in the not distant future, was made at the 1966 annual meeting of the American Institute of Biological Sciences, being held this week at the University of Maryland."

The scientists noted that pumping food into have-not nations only causes the population to rise, which makes the problem worse. The article stated: "As food-population pressures rise, they contended, the more will be the impulse toward war among the powers trying to control sources of supply." The United States, being a prime source of supply, will therefore be a target for the communists whose supply is always low due to the deficiency of their system of government, if these scientists have predicted correctly.

Constant warnings of impending world famines are going unheeded by the bureaucrats in Washington. Perhaps they will follow the Red Chinese practice which was simple. When there is not enough food for everyone, let a few million starve to death.

Proposed ABM Defense System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 25, 1967

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the reasoning behind Secretary McNamara's proposed ABM defense system continues to confuse a great number of responsible citizens of this country.

Although we can be thankful that he is at last aware of the danger of letting our adversaries gain an advantage, we nevertheless are not satisfied with the Secretary's piecemeal ABM approach. This general dissatisfaction is very clearly expressed in the September 21, 1967, editorial of the State, Columbia, S.C.

In an article entitled "Better Than Nothing," Editor W. D. Workman, Jr., points out the unrealism of Mr. McNamara's reasoning.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BETTER THAN NOTHING

The Defense Department's proposed antiballistic missile deployment probably will be better than nothing—but not much better, and certainly not adequate.

For one thing, the projected ABM system is to be geared to the threat of a possible nuclear attack coming from Red China. It apparently will *not* be designated to offer any protection against missiles coming from other areas, whether from the vastness that is Russia (and Siberia) or the island that is Cuba or elsewhere.

For another thing, as the American Security Council so well points out, "the value of a system of deterrence is that which the enemy *believes* about it."

Is Defense Secretary McNamara's ABM system believable? Will our Communist enemies be convinced that it affords America a high degree of defense capability? Or will they merely snort at the system, completed or not, and launch an attack when the time seems right according to their time-table and their opportunity?

Secretary McNamara has vigorously opposed the whole notion of an ABM defense system ever since he took over the Defense Department and imposed his own peculiar ideas upon it. Now, he seems to have been pushed to the point of acquiescing in the establishment of a $5 billion system which required more than $4 billion just to research. What will the grudging $5 billion actually buy us?

Protection against Red China, says McNamara. But what about Russia?

Red Star, the official publication of the Russian armed services, stated on June 3 of *this* year: "The Soviet Union has always been and will continue to be the main political and material base of the world revolutionary process."

Translated, that means Russia is still our first enemy. The Red Chinese are our enemies too, but Communism's *base* lies in Russia.

And is Secretary McNamara's ABM system designed to protect Americans against a Russian attack?

Well, no, not exactly. You see, the Cold War is over, it says here. Russia is not expected to attack the United States. We have only the "irresponsible" Chinese to fear.

This is unrealism carried to the "Nth" degree, or perhaps to the "McNth" degree.

We should be thankful that McNamara has at least, and at last, been budged to the point of agreeing to a partial ABM defense system. But when will we get the full defense system which the Joint Chiefs of Staff have long recommended?

"L. B. J. Echoes Goldwater's Words" and "Where Are the Dear Hearts Now?"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 25, 1967

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include two excellent editorials appearing in the September 20 issue of the Peoria Journal Star at this point in the RECORD:

L. B. J. ECHOES GOLDWATER'S WORDS

Lyndon Johnson's latest pronouncement on the subject of riots has been to blame them, in part, on "propagandists exploiting the emotions of the poor."

An interesting observation.

However, the guy who raised that same question three years ago got clobbered for his pains.

He said that civil rights were a dire necessity, but that propagandists were exploiting the emotions of the poor in an attempt to get votes, and, were irresponsibly raising unreal hopes that would create a furnace of resentment later.

He claimed the chief "propagandist" that concerned him was a vote-seeker named Lyndon Johnson.

His own name was Barry Goldwater.

Nobody, of course, took the statement at its face value.

It was regarded as a "cover-up"—a thinly disguised "excuse" to cover up an anti-Negro attitude and a prehistoric philosophy.

Goldwater, it now seems, has achieved his own total and final removal from serious influence on American policy for the great crime of speaking too frankly, of being right, and of being not prehistoric, after all, but perhaps a bit "ahead of his time."

Looking back in the files we find that we then offered the opinion that Goldwater was being a lot more honest about the seriousness of the Vietnam situation than was his opponent President Johnson—and getting clobbered for it.

But we can take scant satisfaction in that early judgment.

Like so many others, we didn't listen closely enough to what Mr. Goldwater was saying, and give him the benefit of the doubt and weigh his positions on their merits.

We ARE prepared to face facts now when those facts have been so blatantly demonstrated.

That isn't a very big accomplishment, either—but it seems to be too much to expect from a good many folks.

These dear hearts don't want to remember the days when they were blind to the troubles to come—from Vietnam to the streets of Detroit—and were in a tizzy of ecstasy over the golden world of the Great Society in which we were all going to live happily ever after under federal management.

WHERE ARE THE DEAR HEARTS NOW?

(By C. L. Dancey)

What we thought of Lyndon Johnson when he was candidate for President was set down in print at the time. What we think of him now ought to be pretty plain from many comments.

But we are downright kindly to him compared to many of the "dear hearts" who cheered for the Great Society and "peace" pitch of his original campaign.

Lyndon is now their scapegoat.

Rather than face and admit their own wrong-headedness and their own mis-judgments, they explode with unreasonable abuse, anger, and ridicule against Lyndon.

And where are all those pious "liberal" voices that cried out in horror against the "climate of hate" in Dallas, Tex. four years ago?

They said that this "hate" provided the "atmosphere" in which a crackpot like Oswald could be stimulated to murder John F. Kennedy.

Led by the Chief Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court, the assassination of a President (with suitable horror at this kind of politics), was laid at the door not of the Communist-crazy pro-Castro kook—but at the "climate of hate" in Dallas.

This was where, you will remember, that horrible "extremism" had gone to the terrible point that an over-excited middle-aged woman once actually struck Adlai Stevenson (accidentally or on purpose) with a portion of her paper protest sign! (The rest of the group of "protesting women" only shouted.)

Remember the howls of horror at such "extremism" and "violence", and concern about the safety of any duly elected President—and the responsibility of all Americans "whether they agree or not" to treat the President with reasonable respect?

Where are those voices now?

Where are they when brawny young men on college campuses in the east assault visiting speakers (be it the Governor of Alamaba or the Secretary of Defense)?

Where are they when passerbys are beaten by rampaging mobs because their color is "wrong?"

Where are those voices who were so horrified by the climate of "hate" and "violence," now, when Rap Brown speaks? When Stokely Carmichael directly urges the assassination of the president via Cuban radio?

Where are they?

Some of them were at meetings of supposedly "upper crust" writers and intellectuals in New York that staged spectacular walkouts on speeches by administration leaders screaming that the president is a "murderer . . . burning babies!"

The tune has changed.

Nice folks, huh?

Diversion of Investment Funds by Insurance Industry Into High-Risk Areas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES H. PERCY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 25, 1967

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, earlier this month the life insurance industry announced its intention to divert one billion dollars of investment funds into high-risk areas. I commend the insurance industry for taking this major step toward involving private industry and private capital in the job of rebuilding and rehabilitating our Nation's slum areas.

The National Home Ownership Foundation Act, S. 1592, introduced and supported by 40 Members of the Senate and 112 Members of the House, is based on this very principle.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a Chicago Sun-Times editorial of September 15, entitled "Clearing Slums Is Good Business," commending the life insurance industry for this noteworthy and urgently needed effort.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CLEARING SLUMS IS GOOD BUSINESS

The decision of the life insurance industry to invest a billion dollars in slum neighborhoods is the most dramatic evidence to date of the changing attitude of private investors and big business toward the need to remove urban blight as a cancer that could spread and destroy American cities.

Until comparatively recently, urban renewal has been considered mostly a matter of concern to government or public officials. In the 1930s and 1940s the emphasis was on public housing projects huge impersonal buildings that provided poor families with decent living quarters but that often created new social problems.

In later years, the emphasis was on the clearing of slum land with the hope of selling it to private investors. Some good projects resulted, such as New York Life Insurance Co's Lake Meadows project. But such projects often did little good for the actual slum dweller.

More recently efforts have been made to rehabilitate existing buildings or rebuild them, keeping neighborhood characteristics and tenants intact. To encourage private investment in such projects the government would supplement the amount of rent poor tenants could pay.

At this point a hitch developed. The House this year balked at a White House request for $40,000,000 to fund the program. Some 437 projects are blueprinted but Congress doubted whether private funds would become available to finance construction. Venture capital has long shied from the high risks of low-rent housing.

The insurance companies answered that doubt and okayed the principle. They would divert one billion out of their normal investments of $16 billion a year into the high risk areas. The industry may receive less interest on the money than their normal investments would yield but they will be investing in a type of insurance for their own and their policy holders' future.

As President Johnson said, the companies will be making a major investment in improving American life. The need for that investment to save the cities—and with them the very foundation of business and industry—is becoming more apparent with each passing day. Moreover rebuilding the nation's slums could create a new and profitable industry itself.

The recently announced partnership of the United States Gypsum Co. with public officials to rehabilitate five Chicago buildings should be profitable to the company. It will use Gypsum's own products. The company successfully and profitably rehabilitated six buildings in New York 18 months ago. Incidentally, the tenants are maintaining the properties well.

Interest in rebuilding American slums grows daily. They are being compared with underdeveloped countries. America has helped with loans and grants. Business appears ready to accept the reality that such efforts should begin at home and that they are not charity but are vital to the nation's survival.

Labor Day Trophy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 25, 1967

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, in presenting to A. Philip Randolph the annual Labor Day Trophy, a miniature of the statue of St. Joseph the Worker atop the bell tower of St.

Michael's Church, Munhall, Bishop Wright described the inter-faith adoption of Project Equality as "a singularly appropriate observance of Labor Day in a season of tension over civil rights, expressing as it does the determination of organized religion in our community to extend to all persons the benefits of which Labor Day is the symbol."

Noting that Mr. Randolph had devoted his life to the battle for working people and the struggle for civil rights, Bishop Wright declared:

> In presenting to him our Labor Day Trophy we salute his historic witness to the dignity of the worker. In linking to this presentation our inter-faith commitment to equal employment opportunity, we deliberately pay tribute to his positive, peaceful fight for civil rights. We are saying our Community-wide thank you to Mr. Randolph for the double witness of his career. We are expressing our united pledge to help preserve the gains of labor and promote the civil rights symbolized together in his person and so closely interrelated in the good society.

Labor Day and Racial Justice

(Address by A. Philip Randolph at Labor Day Observance in the Civic Arena, Pittsburgh, Pa., September 4, 1967)

This Labor Day is marked by a world in crisis, change and revolution.

Pope John XXIII's Encyclical, Pacem in Terris (Peace on Earth) reflects the vision of a world order—and a challenge to modern man with the fearful weaponry of the atom bomb with the capability of destroying the modern world.

But the destruction of civilization by atomic warfare is not the only threat to the human race. The need for effective action to relax the growing tensions and to arrest the present trend, which allows the rich nations to become richer and the poor nations to become poorer, is overwhelmingly great and imperative. Without achieving this objective the conflict between the house of "haves" and the house of "have-nots" will be as great a threat to the peace of the world as nuclear weapons of war.

It is vital that Western man realize that there can be no universal consensus to achieve a warless world so long as two-thirds of the world's rapidly growing population is fighting a losing battle for survival in decency and hope. Hungry, sick, impoverished, ignorant and oppressed people can do no more than struggle against the cruel present, and thing of the future world only in terms of their own hunger of body and hunger of soul.

Cognizant of this deepening and dangerous human condition of poverty and want, Pope Paul VI issued his encyclical, Progresso Populorum (Development of Peoples). This is a timely pronouncement concerning the need for development of peoples of poverty in the world.

In Geneva, a clear call to mankind, concerning the growing risk of a third World War to the peace of the world, has been vigorously registered by the Rev. Dr. Eugene Carson Blake, Secretary of the World Council of Churches. Thus is the call of great religious leaders to a world in turmoil for peace and social improvement.

PROBLEM OF POVERTY AT HOME

It is well to take note of the fact, on the occasion of this celebration of Labor Day, that just as the plight and plague of poverty of some two billion peoples of color in the world constitute a grave peril to the peace of the world, so poverty of millions of people of color in the United States constitutes a danger to peace in our land where the poor also grow poorer and the rich grow richer.

While the percentage of black Americans in the poverty line in practically all of the big cities is bewildering and frighteningly high, especially among teenagers, ranging in some areas around 40 to 50 percent, there are millions of white Americans in the poverty line also—but with the big difference that most impoverished white Americans, chiefly because of color, have the opportunity to escape into greener economic pastures while Negroes, because of color, find it more difficult and often impossible to escape.

Thus, while there are Negroes who have acquired education and training and have broken out of the poverty line, the broad masses of black Americans, because of a lack of opportunity for training and education, have been sentenced to a perpetual bare, hopeless existence for themselves and families in the most debasing, degrading and dismal areas in America, the black ghettos, breeding grounds of crime, narcotics addiction, rats and roach-infested slum housing, and high prices for poor quality goods.

NOT JOBS ALONE

But Negroes don't want jobs only. They want jobs with a living wage and decent working conditions with opportunity for advancement, with acquired training and skills, to higher wage levels to provide higher purchasing power with which to secure a more abundant life.

ROLE OF LABOR UNIONS

However, good jobs mean little without the means to protect them and make them better and secure. Hence, more than a million and a half Negro workers are members of unions affiliated with the AFL–CIO. Although the house of labor is not yet fully free from racial discrimination, only a few segregated local unions are left. The Negro worker is moving steadily ahead in apprenticeship training for membership in the highly skilled trades, increasingly with the cooperation of a sound, forward-looking leadership, and his militant refusal to take no for an answer.

CIVIL RIGHTS-LABOR ALLIANCE

One of the great constructive developments of the early 1960's was an unofficial alliance of the Civil Rights Freedom Movement and the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, without which it is highly doubtful that the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Voting Rights Act of 1965 could have passed in the Congress. And it is also highly doubtful that without the civil rights-labor alliance the fight of the AFL–CIO against anti-labor Right-to-Work laws in Oklahoma and Ohio could have succeeded.

If there is any single basic cause of the increasing value of the Negro market it is the wage increase of millions of Negro workers, made possible through the struggle and power of the organized labor movement. This fact renders a civil rights-labor alliance basically meaningful for it reflects the stake labor and civil rights have in such an alliance. Thus, the basis of the new Coalition, to fight for more and better jobs, integrated housing and education in the cities, is properly the civil rights-labor alliance, with business and the church.

While Negroes have the task of fighting to eliminate every vestige of racial bias in labor unions, as well as in business, schools, and even churches, Negroes and labor must have the good sense never to permit anything to break up the mutually advantageous labor-civil rights alliance even though they may not be in one hundred percent agreement on tactics and strategy at all times.

The reason for this alliance is simple and clear. It is that ninety-nine and nine-tenths percent of Negroes are workers who must work and fight for a living. Therefore, they belong in unions, not black unions competing with white workers to the disadvantage of black and white workers alike and to the advantage of business, but in unions of white and black workers devoted to fight for all workers regardless of race, religion or national origin.

RIOTS IN THE STREETS

Therefore, the solution of the basic problem of Black Americans is not riots in the streets, looting, vandalizing and pillaging stores, violence and lawlessness, throwing Molotov cocktails into buildings setting them afire, resulting in burning down their own communities, with Negroes being the chief victims of gunfire. While stores can be restored, the lives of Negroes killed in riots, some of whom are teenagers, are gone forever.

But it must not be forgotten that Negroes are not the only Americans who have staged riots in the streets. The Founding Fathers staged riots in the streets of Boston against King George III of Great Britain and seized the tea of British merchants and threw it into Boston Harbor. The workers staged riots in the streets for the rights to form unions and against starvation wages. White women rioted for women's suffrage. Farmers rioted and burned up their farms to create a scarcity of products to increase prices. However, this is in historical explanation, not justification of riots.

While H. Rap Brown and Stokely Carmichael can strike a match and apply it to a powder keg which may ignite and start the explosion of riots in the streets—they do not and cannot cause riots in the streets. If no powder keg was in the streets there would be nothing which could cause an explosion with a match. Neither can Communists cause riots in the streets but like anybody who throws a Molotov cocktail into a store window, they can start riots!

The basic cause of riots in the streets is racial and social injustice, the roots of which run back in history three hundreds years. The old South has sown the winds of racial hate with the pact of chattel slavery, racial segregation and discrimination, and now America is reaping the whirlwinds.

Of course, any one black or white who resorts to inflammatory propaganda to start race riots is a menace to himself, the Negro people and the country.

The only fundamental way to prevent riots in the streets is to remove the cause—namely—joblessness—illiteracy, inadequate integrated education—drug addiction, inadequate integrated housing and slums.

Laws against riots is not the answer.

It is like a doctor prescribing aspirin for cancer.

In a free, democratic society, with the right of free speech, free assembly and the right to vote, there is no logical reason for riots to achieve basic and desirable social change.

The fact is there can be no racial and social justice and freedom except within the framework of civil order, and there can be no civil order except upon a basis of racial and social justice.

Permit me to emphasize the fact that the behavioral patterns young Negro teenager display in riots in the streets are products of the ghettoization of their lives from birth, which has created in them a deep sense of frustration, alienation, resignation, desperation and hopelessness. Some of them are drug addicts, too weak to kick the habit. They are sick and need medical and psychiatric therapy. They are not hardened, evil criminals though their deeds are criminal and must be curbed in the interest of themselves, innocent citizens, and society as a whole. They can be physically and psychologically restored to normality and a useful life if firmly apprehended, and sympathetically and scientifically treated.

Moreover, these teenagers and adults, who engage in looting stores in riots, represent a minuscule percent of Negro youth, and Negroes generally, but they constitute a menace to law-abiding citizens. Their breed is belched up in every transition and convulsion of social change regardless of race or color. The adults who loot are not Negro workers. They are the lumpen proletariat who, in every revolution, prey upon property and persons and hence must be made to pay the price for their crimes.

Let no one, black or white, be deceived into believing that violence can win freedom and justice. Violence only begets violence. No one wins. Everybody loses, but especially the Negro, as shown in the recent riots. When leaders, black or white, counsel violence, for riots to achieve basic and desirable social change.

The fact is there can be no racial and social justice and freedom except within the framework of civil order, and there can be no civil order except upon a basis of racial and social justice.

Permit me to emphasize the fact that the behavioral patterns young Negro teenagers display in riots in the streets are products of the ghettoization of their lives from birth, which has created in them a deep sense of frustration, alienation, resignation, desperation and hopelessness. Some of them are drug addicts, too weak to kick the habit. They are sick and need medical and psychiatric therapy. They are not hardened, evil criminals though their deeds are criminal and must be curbed in the interest of themselves, innocent citizens, and society as a whole. They can be physically and psychologically restored to normality and a useful life if firmly apprehended, and sympathetically and scientifically treated.

Moreover, these teenagers and adults, who engage in looting stores in riots, represent a minuscule percent of Negro youth, and Negroes generally, but they constitute a menace to law-abiding citizens. Their breed is belched up in every transition and convulsion of social change, regardless of race or color. The adults who loot are not Negro workers. They are the lumpen proletariat who, in every revolution, prey upon property and persons and hence must be made to pay the price for their crimes.

Let no one, black or white, be deceived into believing that violence can win freedom and justice. Violence only begets violence. No one wins. Everybody loses, but especially the Negro, as shown in the recent riots. When leaders, black or white, counsel violence, they are like children playing with matches in an attic filled with dynamite in a house full of people. It is unthinkable; it cannot be tolerated. It is a matter of experience that anyone can start a fire he cannot stop.

And, while criticisms of President Johnson's policies may be justified in our free society, blaming him for riots in the streets is silly. Civil rights leaders in particular, and Negroes in general, should not forget that President Johnson has done more to advance the cause of civil rights and give Negroes a status of equality and dignity in Government and the country than any president in the history of this country, including Abraham Lincoln. But hurling intemperate threats at the President, whether one likes him or not, can hardly be considered valid criticism. Of course, President John F. Kennedy never had a chance since he was struck down early in his administration, but he was a pioneer champion in the fight for civil rights for Negroes, and Negroes will never forget him.

The paradoxical age we live in is well illustrated by the opening of Dicken's "Tale of Two Cities":

"It was the best of times, it was the worst of times," Dickens wrote, "it was the age of wisdom, it was the age of foolishness; it was the epoch of belief, it was the epoch of incredulity; it was the season of light, it was the season of darkness; it was the spring of hope, it was the winter of despair."

Dickens, of course, was writing about the time of the French Revolution but his dreams are not inapplicable to this era of the Civil Rights Revolution in America.

On the one hand, Black Americans are earning more and spending more today than ever before in their history. In this respect they are living in "the best of times . . . the season of light . . . the spring of hope."

On the other hand, there is a wide gap between the annual income of Negro and White families, unemployment among Negroes is twice as high as among white Americans, and they are sentenced to segregated housing and segregated schools. Thus, for the Negro it is "the worst of times . . . the age of foolishness . . . the epoch of incredulity . . . the season of darkness . . . the winter of despair."

THREATS

Finally, to my Negro brothers whom I love, with all your faults along with your virtues, let us stop this talk of burning down cities and urging Negroes to buy guns—which is a species of senseless suicidal folly and a pathetic exhibition of a sickness of infantile leftism and extremism.

Moreover, the cry of Black Power by some well-meaning but misguided leaders cannot achieve real power—economic, social and political—which every Negro naturally ought to fight for. Black Power is a giant leap backward to the degradation of segregation which, for a hundred years, has been and still is the source and cause of Black Americans being at the bottom of the economic political and social totem pole. It is just a weak edition of Garveyism, which was bankrupt, repudiated and rejected in the 1920's. Verily, Black Power is not the wave of the future for Black Americans.

Let us not retreat to segregation or racial isolation in the search of the road to economic, social and political salvation, for segregation is an evil and vicious thing originated and devised by the Ku Klux Klan and the worst elements of anti-Negro forces in America, following the Civil War to establish and force upon the Negro and the country the mythical doctrine of the hereditary racial inferiority of the Negro.

I reject the concept of Black Power because of its obvious overtones of racism. Black racism is just as ugly, indefensible and unsound as white racism. White racism begets black racism and black racism begets white racism. Black and white racism tends toward polarization, with incentives for hostile confrontation, instead of the cooperation of the races—a major imperative for the achievement of social peace and progress.

The inspiration and motivation of Negro youth to strive for the realization of their highest intellectual potential, for the service and advancement of Black Americans, requires a profound sense of historical identification with the glorious and ancient African cultural heritage, tradition and endowment which will give them a belief in their role of creative somebodyness in the society of man.

This concept stems from the reality of the challenge of Africa in her struggle for her place in the sun of history with all the races of mankind, not from racial hate and conflict reflected in the slogan of Black Power.

On this Labor Day may all workers, black and white, Catholic and Protestant, Jew and Gentile, join hands as members of one common human family of which God is Father and Creator, to banish fear and human hate from this land.

If all men are members of one common human family then all men are brothers; if all men are brothers then all men are equal; if all men are equal then all men are entitled to equal treatment; if all men are entitled to equal treatment, racial discrimination and segregation are morally wrong and should be abolished, and respect for the dignity of the personality of every human being recognized as his sacred right, a right which is God-given and not man-made.

On this Labor Day may all workers and citizens committed to the fight and struggle for civil rights and labor's rights understand that these rights can only be achieved and preserved within the framework of a free, democratic society. They cannot be won, or exist, in a totalitarian society, whether Fascist or Communist of the Peking or Soviet Union vintage.

On this Labor Day let white and black workers resolve that as they have labored, fought, bled and died to make this country free, strong and great, we shall continue to labor, fight and, if necessary, die to keep this country free, strong, just and great for all Americans.

May God give the workers, white and Black, Catholic and Protestant, Jew and Gentile the strength, faith, fortitude and dedication to march forward together to the promised land of peace and plenty, racial and social justice.

OEO Falsifies Its Records

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 25, 1967

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the Office of Economic Opportunity has done it again.

OEO has participated in many questionable activities and the longer this creature exists, more comes to light about some of its leading characters and their shenanigans.

An interesting development has been revealed regarding a Midwest Job Corps center. According to authoritative reports, certain OEO high-ranking officials instructed this center to falsify its records.

Apparently Jobs Director William P. Kelly was not content to be honest—which he must consider old fashioned and out of date in 1967—because he blocked investigations of other Job Corps centers. Strange action indeed, if Kelly had nothing to hide.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the OEO needs to be reminded that it is a creature of Congress, and that unless OEO puts its house in order Congress can cause the creature to cease to exist.

I follow my remarks with an AP release of recent date regarding this inexcusable action by OEO:

CLAIMS OEO FALSIFIED RECORDS

WASHINGTON.—A congressional investigator said Tuesday the Office of Economic Opportunity instructed a Midwest Job Corps center to falsify its records to indicate it had more enrollees than it did.

In a report to the House Education and Labor Committee, the investigator said efforts to determine whether the practice was being followed in other centers were blocked by Job Corps Director William P. Kelly.

The report said officials at a Midwestern center for women were told early in June by OEO regional headquarters that dropouts during the month were not to be reported until after the end of the fiscal year, June 30.

It said a request by the local center officials to get such instructions in writing was refused by the OEO.

The Job Corps center involved is located at Guthrie, Okla.

The report said records for the center show 23 women left in June, but their departure was not reported until July 1, after fiscal year-end figures had been compiled in Washington.

The report was presented to the committee as it began considering legislation to continue the antipoverty program for another year. It promised to add to the already considerable troubles of the OEO and the Job Corps.

Kelly issued a statement denying any Job Corps center had ever been asked to falsify records.

"Job Corps is making a tremendous effort every month of the year to encourage kids to stay in the Job Corps program and learn how to improve their lives," Kelly said, "but we don't hesitate to terminate them when it becomes clear that they can no longer benefit from the program."

He also called ridiculous the charge that he blocked the investigator's efforts to determine if other centers were involved.

"I am available to talk about this and any other aspect of Job Corps not only with a staff member but the whole House Education and Labor Committee," Kelly said.

The Job Corps is one of the chief targets for drastic revision among committee Republicans and Rep. Edith Green of Oregon, the ranking Democratic member.

At the first of what could be two or three weeks of meetings on the legislation, the committee voted to lay aside President Johnson's recommendations for continuing the antipoverty program and work on the law as it now exists.

Johnson has called for many administrative changes in the program and an increase in funding from $1.75 billion to $2.06 billion.

Committee Republicans sought to substitute their rival Opportunity Crusade, which would dismember the OEO and farm out its programs among existing agencies. The proposal was rejected on a party-line vote and the committee then decided to proceed on the basis of existing law. Rep. William H. Ayres of Ohio, senior committee Republican, said as shortcomings in existing law are demonstrated he will seek to have the committee make on-the-spot investigations.

Committee Chairman Carl Perkins, D-Ky., has declined to authorize such investigations in the past, but Ayres conducted an official hearing in Cincinnati recently that drew widespread attention locally.

More Attention to Quality Education and Less Attention to Color Lines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 25, 1967

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, it is not only impractical, but without legal authority for the District of Columbia to enter into agreements with suburban school districts for the busing of students.

As pointed out in the following editorial broadcast over station WMAL here in Washington during the week of September 17, 1967, it would be unfair to subject suburban students to busing to the District schools.

The editorial follows:

BUSING TO SUBURBS

The WMAL survey of suburban school superintendents shows predictable results. The suburban superintendents reject integrating District schools by voluntary busing agreements with the suburbs.

The suburban superintendents have good reason to oppose this recommendation of Judge J. Skelly Wright's decision on de facto school segregation.

Why, the superintendents ask, should suburban students be subjected to District schools that are admittedly inferior? Besides, the suburban superintendents have no authority to bus their pupils across state lines.

Judge Wright's views on education are again shown to be impractical. The District School Board should listen instead to the sound recommendation of Dr. A. Harry Passow of Columbia Teacher's College. Dr. Passow's study of District schools concludes that the basic answer to the problems of the schools is this: pay less attention to color lines and more attention to developing quality education.

Congressional Reform: Action Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 25, 1967

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, let me say at the outset that I do not entirely agree with or appreciate everything James Kilpatrick has to say about Congress and Congressmen in his article entitled "Congress: A Billion Words but Only Six Decisions," appearing in last Tuesday's Evening Star.

But writers employ exaggeration to dramatize the point they are trying to get across. However, his characterization of congressional reform is not an exaggeration. It is a matter of gravest urgency. I think Mr. Kilpatrick is eminently correct.

Mr. Speaker, it is now approaching 7 months since the Senate passed the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1967. I expect we are going to see an increasing number of columns in the Kilpatrick vein if the House Rules Committee does not soon report out the reorganization bill.

Accordingly, I call the attention of my colleagues to the full text of the Kilpatrick column:

CONGRESSS A BILLION WORDS BUT ONLY SIX DECISIONS

(By James J. Kilpatrick)

One of these days, you keep telling yourself, an exasperated people will turn upon the U.S. Congress and throw the bums out. You keep saying this, but it's hard to believe. The national body politic has a billy goat stomach, and the voters will swallow just about anything. Even so, the wonder is that the people continue to tolerate the performance they are getting on Capitol Hill.

Here are 535 men and woman, each of them drawing $30,000 a year plus perquisites, and what are they doing to earn their pay? Precious little.

The jobs, honest to goodness, aren't that tough or that prestigious. When it comes to prestige the typical member of the House can't even get an elbow on the bar. During his first two terms, he gets confused with the doorkeepers. Taxicabs won't pick him up. Little children stick out their tongues when he passes on the street. He wanders in and out of that great cave of the winds known as the House chamber, clutching his fellow orphans for support.

Being a senator, of course, is better. Being a senator is the softest job on earth. The work is congenial and the surroundings elegant. Once in your chair, you're set for six years, and such is the short memory of the voters that you can behave pretty much as you please in the first four. Senators have it made.

The 90th Congress came into session last January, with a flock of new Republicans on hand. There was a lot of talk that this time, the country would see its legislative needs tended to efficiently. Not so. It isn't the fault of the freshmen Republicans—it isn't anyone's fault exactly—but the record so far is about a billion words, but only six decisions.

Both House and Senate continue to slog along with inadequate legislative procedures. The congressional machinery is mostly junk. Back in March, the Senate heroically attempted improvement: It passed the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1967, providing some modest but helpful steps in the general direction of efficiency. The bill has been bottled up in the House Rules Committee ever since. It may never be seen again.

As this is written, Congress has completed action on only three of the 14 major appropriation bills for the current fiscal year. The affected departments and agencies are living hand to mouth. Crime in the streets is a big issue; it has absorbed little minds. The question of a tax increase remains unresolved. Social Security amendments are up in the air. Nothing significant has been done in air pollution, firearms control, or the revision of copyright law.

Members are floundering in a sea of legislative decisions; they are bailing themselves out with teacups. They cannot get a fix on foreign affairs: One day they ratify a Soviet consular convention, by way of building bridges; the next day they slap at the Russians by sinking the Fiat auto plant deal. Last week the Senate swatted the British, too. In the aviary known as Vietnam, it's getting so you can't tell the hawks from the doves.

Both Houses did get around to approving an increase in the debt limit, but they ran around this unavoidable fly ball like a bunch of rookie centerfielders in the Three-I League. They extended the draft and made it appear a great decision. Tom Dodd was censured and Adam Clayton Powell booted out. These are achievements?

What you hunger for, watching these gentlemen in action, is some original thinking. Mighty little can be seen. Down at the foot of Capitol Hill, workmen are digging a vast hole, 60 feet deep and a hundred yards wide. It was supposed to be a highway tunnel, but no; it is where they will bury Chuck Percy's novel housing bill. The several schemes for tax sharing with the states will lie in the same grave.

Two months to go before the first session ends. If they prove no more productive than the first nine, a dreary autumn is in prospect.

Bulgarian National Hero Reminds Us

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED REINECKE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 25, 1967

Mr. REINECKE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday afternoon at the Russian Orthodox Church here in Washington, D.C., a special memorial service was held commemorating the 20th anniversary of the death of Bulgarian national hero Nikola Petkov. He was a gallant leader of the united democratic opposition in the Bulgarian Parliament.

This occasion reminds us of the plight of the freedom-loving people who still languish behind the Iron Curtain in Bulgaria, and the other captive nations of the world. We have grown too accustomed to a world half free, and half slave. It is time that we as Americans determine once again that the cause of democracy must be a crusade. We must declare once again to the world that we shall not allow the torch of freedom to fall into the pit of despair and tyranny.

Responsible Reporting Lacking by ABC

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 25, 1967

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the recent television documentary by the American Broadcasting Co., entitled "Africa," continues to receive corrections.

On September 18, 1967, on page A4615 of the RECORD, I inserted the reply to the gross distortions in this program from the South African Ambassador to the United States.

It is little wonder, Mr. Speaker, that ABC ranks a poor third among the Nation's television networks if this is the degree of responsibility it practices regarding its news and so-called documentary telecasts.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to insert a statement from the Honorable Vasco Vieira Garin, Ambassador of Portugal to the United States. His remarks further underscore the lack of ABC's responsibility and veracity.

Statement From the Portuguese Ambassador on the ABC–TV Program "Africa"

(By Vasco Vieira Garin, Ambassador of Portugal)

The Portuguese section of ABC Television network's program on Africa was an exercise in deceiving public opinion, as it failed to give an honest view of Portugal's realities in Africa.

The Portuguese Government gave in good faith all facilities to the ABC Television team who for weeks were in Angola and Mozambique.

We know that ABC has many hours of film showing the great educational, economic, technical, social and political progress there, instead of the so-called barricades the program insisted so much upon. Also the climate of peace and order prevailing in those Overseas Provinces was recorded by the cameras. Racial equality and harmony were in those films for anybody to see.

All this was, however, set aside deliberately. Prominence was given to the statement of a terrorist leader operating from a foreign country, who publicly acknowledges receiving assistance from communist nations. Moreover, another foreign gentleman had a lengthy appearance on the screen. He is a man expelled from Angola for his open activities against Portugal, as he was supporting both terrorism and subversion. Furthermore, some tiresome old allegations were repeated, although they long since have been discredited by highly respected international agencies and observers who conducted impartial and painstaking investigations on the spot. Among these was the International Labor Organization of the United Nations.

It was as distorting as it would have been if a foreign Television team came to the United States, filmed freely and then have its network practically refer only to allegations by extremist groups on problems prevailing in this Country today.

We cannot but escape the impression that ABC let itself be influenced by some people, inside or outside the organization, to produce a serious and misleading disservice to the American people and an injustice to Portugal, a friend and ally of the United States.

"World Changes—So Do Politicians" and "Will Riots Wreck 1968 Conventions?"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 25, 1967

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, appearing in the Thursday, September 21, issue of the Peoria Journal Star are two editorials which I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues. I include them in the RECORD at this point:

World Changes—So Do Politicians

This editorial is for young people, who are sometimes inclined to think that they alone, understand the "changed world" and that grown-ups still live in the past.

This is a changed world, and we adults watched it change—and participated in the changes for good and ill much of the time. What is more important, it is an ever-changing world, and there are strong indications from time to time that adults understand this better than youth.

To understand this tendency for change, and just how drastic it can be, you have to "live in the past" a bit.

Let's turn the clock back to July of 1964, for example.

Who said this?

"I would remind you that extremism in the defense of liberty is no vice. And let me remind you also that moderation in the pursuit of justice is no virtue."

It sounds a bit like Martin Luther King discussing the right to "violate unjust laws" . . . or even a Stokely Carmichael or Rap Brown talking much of "freedom" and then advocating the use of guns in pursuit of their version of "justice."

It isn't of course.

It was Barry Goldwater's celebrated statement at the National GOP convention in 1964.

At that time it enraged liberals. Today it haunts conservatives.

We have enjoyed the twists of fate that have thrown previous "liberal" attacks on Goldwater back in their own mouths—but we also enjoy the twist of fate that reversed Goldwater's most famous remark of all!

To complete the picture, it was Gov. Rockefeller who blistered Goldwater for making those remarks on July 18, 1964, and Chuck Percy who demanded "clarification" because he found them offensive as stated.

On July 19, 1964, in the midst of the storm of protest against Goldwater's remarks and "extremism," and with the first "anti-poverty bill" before the U.S. Senate, who loudly condemned "hate groups?"

And who, after such condemnation, as reported in the AP that day, "repeated several times a promise that the federal government 'will always promptly assist local authorities to maintain order.' "?

It was, of course, President Johnson, and his condemnation was specifically directed against those who attempted to "intimidate" Negroes.

Interesting isn't it?

Who are the strong "law and order" people today?

And, who, when confronted with "extremism" now says, "We must understand, overlook, and seek the 'root causes'?"

Major groups have sort of traded places, haven't they?

Thus we learn with the passage of time in this and so many things, that change is not only inevitable, it also plays strange tricks on us all.

The person who thinks he has the key to the future changes is a prime candidate for a big surprise.

C. L. DANCEY.

Will Riots Wreck 1968 Conventions?

This is really a sequel to the above comments. We'll now violate our own conclusion.

It got us to thinking about the national conventions of 1968.

Curiously, "extremism" was a gigantic verbal storm in 1964, but as we approach new national conventions for 1968 all the old rules for picking a "convention city" are being altered.

Where can either party go where the delegates will be physically safe? Where can they be free not only from the usual pressures but from direct, physical threats?

Would you want to be a delegate this time?

Can we get through the intensity of two major conventions without injury or bloodshed this time?

Must they be held on Long Beach's new "Queen Mary" convention hall—at sea, to avoid massive mob activities?

Maybe what this country needs is a new convention city, built on the old frontier model—starting with a stockade. Something like the old "citadels", or as it is expressed in Russian—a "Kremlin".

The planners this time really have some worries to consider.

But, there we go, probably as eager to walk into this "future guessing" trap as anyone, when the real truth is that the future has a nasty way of double-crossing us . . . on current expectations.

Things do change.

Hon. Brent Spence

SPEECH

OF

HON. FRANK A. STUBBLEFIELD

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1967

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. Mr. Speaker, 32 years of dedicated service and wise leadership is a record of service which few men achieve; however, Brent Spence, of Kentucky, our beloved friend and former colleague, had reached this pinnacle when he retired from the House in 1962. While his passing on September 18, 1967, at the age of 92 years, brings a feeling of sadness to those of us who were privileged to know him and to serve in the House with him, we are comforted in the knowledge that the many worthwhile contributions he made over the years will stand as a monument to him in the hearts and lives of generations to follow:

The extent of Brent Spence's contributions to his country and his people cannot be accurately measured, but the following excerpts from a eulogy which appeared in the September 19 edition of the Courier Journal touch upon a few of the high points in his illustrious career:

During most of his Congressional career, Spence, a Democrat, was Chairman of the powerful Banking and Currency Committee. His role as a Committee member, and later as Chairman, made him an important figure in the New Deal revision of banking and currency security laws and the legislation that authorized economic controls during World War II . . . Spence probably influenced, indirectly, the lives of Americans as much as any other Congressman of his time. Banks in this country are now safer places to leave money because of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation Act. Spence helped write it. Homes are easier to buy in this country because of FHA mortgage insurance. Spence helped write that law. Workers can get quick and low-cost loans today through thousands of employee credit unions, with assets in the millions of dollars. Spence helped write the Federal Credit Union Act. Every public housing project built in this country resulted from legislation Spence helped to write. He helped create the federal slum-clearance program, the generous program of loans for college dormitories, the urban-renewal program, the Area Redevelopment Administration, the World Bank, and the International Monetary Fund.

In the death of Brent Spence, a great man has passed from the scene and we shall all miss him. I extend deep and sincere sympathy to the members of his family.

Labor Day Mass and Ceremonies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 25, 1967

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

DIOCESE OF PITTSBURGH,
Pittsburgh, Pa., September 8, 1967.

Hon. JAMES FULTON,
Pittsburgh, Pa.

DEAR MR. FULTON: Enclosed you will find the lists of several groups of personages and unions which may be helpful in the preparation of the printed record of the Labor Day Program of which we spoke last Tuesday.

My many thinks for your invaluable assistance in this matter.

May I also take this opportunity to again thank you for a very informative and pleasant afternoon Tuesday, September 5. I hope we shall again be afforded an opportunity to exchange views in such a relaxed atmosphere.

With cordial best wishes, I am
Sincerely yours in Christ,
Rev. DONALD W. WUERL,
Assistant to the Office of the Bishop.

Attendance at Labor Day Mass and Ceremonies, Pittsburgh Civic Arena, 1967

Methodist Church: Bishop Frederick B. Newell; Chaplains: Reverend Allan J. Howes, Reverend Harold T. Porter; Reverends Clarence Baldwin, Paul Easter, William Grove, William Daugherty, William Horner, John Warman, and Winston Trever.

Evangelical United Brethren Church: Bishop J. Gordon Howard.

Episcopal Diocese of Pittsburgh: Very Reverend A. Dixon Rollit, Dean Canon Robert E. Merry, Reverend Alex Seabrook.

Allegheny Union Baptist Association: Reverend Dr. Brannon J. Hopson, Moderator; the Reverend J. A. Williams and James Cayce.

Western Pennsylvania—West Virginia Synod, Lutheran Church in America: Reverend Dr. William C. Hankey, President; Reverend E. Jerome Alexis.

Byzantine Catholic Diocese: Right Reverend Monsignor Daniel P. Maczkov.

Penn-West Conference, United Church of Christ: Reverend Dr. Russell C. Eroh, Pastor.

The Association of Christian Churches: Reverend Dr. Oliver W. McCully, Executive Secretary.

Rodef Shalom Congregation: Dr. Walter Jacob, Rabbi.

Council of Churches of the Pittsburgh Area: Reverend Dr. Robert L. Kincheloe, Executive Director.

Pittsburgh Presbytery—United Presbyterian Church; Reverend Dr. William F. Ruschhaupt, Jr., General Presbyter.

Wesley Center A.M.E. Zion Church: Reverend Charles H. Foggie.

First Unitarian Church of Pittsburgh: Reverend Dr. Edward A. Cahill.

List of Union Locals Participating in Labor Day Parade

Amalgamated Transit Union Div. 85 AFL–CIO.

Amalgamated Food Employees Union Local 590 AFL–CIO.

Amalgamated Meat Cutters Local 424 AFL–CIO.

Bartenders Local Union 188 AFL–CIO.

Beer Bottlers Local 144 AFL–CIO.

Building Service Employees Union Local 29 AFL–CIO.

Canning and Pickle Workers Local 325 AFL–CIO.

Carpenters District Council AFL–CIO.

Cement Masons Local 526 AFL–CIO.

Construction, General Laborers Local 1058 AFL–CIO.

Electrical Workers Local 142 AFL–CIO.

Engineers Local 66 AFL–CIO.

Fire Fighters Local No. 1 AFL–CIO.

Hotel and Restaurant Employees Local 237 AFL–CIO.

International Union of Electrical Workers Local 601 AFL–CIO.

Iron Workers Local 3 AFL–CIO.

Iron Workers Local 527 AFL–CIO.

Letter Carriers Branch 84 AFL–CIO.

Moving Picture Machine Operators AFL–CIO.

Laundry and Dry Cleaning Union Local 141 AFL–CIO.

Musical Society Local 60–471 AFL–CIO.

Pittsburgh Federation of Teachers Local 400 AFL–CIO.

Typographical Union No. 7 AFL–CIO.

Plasterers and Cement Masons AFL–CIO.

Plumbers Local 27 AFL–CIO.

Post Office Clerks Local 81 AFL–CIO.

Steamfitters Local 449 AFL–CIO.

Transport Workers Local 2009 AFL–CIO.

United Steelworkers of America AFL–CIO, District 15, District 16, District 19, District 20.

Pittsburgh Municipal Employees Union Local 192–B, BSEIU, AFL–CIO.

Public Events Employees Union Local 188, BSEIU, AFL–CIO.

International Union of Electrical Workers Local No. 5, AFL–CIO.

Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America Pittsburgh District Joint Board AFL–CIO.

Carpet & Linoleum Workers & Associates of U.B.C. & J., AFL–CIO.

Operating Engineers Local 95, AFL–CIO.

United Auto Workers Unions, AFL–CIO.

Federation of Westinghouse Independent Salaried Unions.

Pennsylvania Telephone Workers Local 1944 T.B.E.W., AFL–CIO.

Teamsters Joint Council No. 40.

Teamsters Local Union No. 249.

United Mine Workers.

American Legion Post 707 (All Labor Post).

Police Marching Unit and Drill Team.

Sleeping Car Porters Union.

List of Dignitaries Seated on Platform Where Bishop Wright Celebrated Mass

Most Reverend John B. McDowell, Auxiliary Bishop of Pittsburgh.

Most Reverend Daniel Tji, Bishop of Won Ju, Kangwondo, Korea.

Bishop Frederick B. Newell, Methodist Church.

Bishop J. Gordon Howard, Evangelical United Brethren Church.

Very Reverend Dean A. Dixon Rollit, representing Bishop Austin Pardue of Episcopal Diocese of Pittsburgh.

Very Reverend Anthony G. Bosco, Chancellor, Diocese of Pittsburgh.

Right Reverend Monsignor Paul J. Simko, Vicar General, Diocese of Pittsburgh.

Dr. Robert L. Kincheloe, Executive Director of the Council of Churches of the Pittsburgh Area.

Dr. Walter Jacob, Rabbi of Rodef Shalom Congregation.

Mr. Regis C. Aiken, Parade Marshal.

Mr. Anthony J. Lutty, Chairman of Labor Day Committee.

Résumé of Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 25, 1967

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert in the RECORD my newsletter covering a résumé of legislation up to the Labor Day recess. It is as follows:

SEPTEMBER 22, 1967.

DEAR FRIEND: Congress has returned from its Labor Day recess with many important votes yet to be taken before adjournment, which is not expected to come before Thanksgiving. Several days at the State fair gave me an opportunity to visit with friends from every part of the state. They were concerned over the Vietnam war, the rising crime rate, the lower dollar value, the proposed tax increases, and everyone was really concerned over declining farm prices. In this report I will endeavor to give you a brief résumé of what has been done, and what remains on the agenda.

Probably first in the order of importance is news on the Oahe Irrigation Project. No hearings could be held in the House Initerior Committee until the Budget Bureau and the Department of Interior had presented a favorable report on the project. In spite of the fact that my office had called Budget twice each week for two months urging completion of the report, it was not filed until August 29, even though both Budget and Interior knew the House Committee was adjourning business on August 31. The delay means no House action this year.

Am happy to report, however, that our committee plans field hearings in Huron on October 27, in Redfield on the 28th, and then on the 29th will view the entire project by car and by air. The Senate Committee completed its hearings in Washington last week, (Sept. 13). They will without doubt pass the bill before adjournment, even though the House cannot act until next year. Of course we still have the problem of getting the appropriation even after the authorization has become law. This delay was the major determining ffactor in my decision not to retire from Congress. After 30 years of work for river development, I am determined to see it to completion.

A Three Hundred and Thirty-Five Kilovolt Line

I was assigned the task of handling this Interior Committee bill on the House floor.

It provided a high voltage transmission line from Ft. Thompson to Grand Island, Nebraska. I had originally blocked passage in the committee until the Interior Department changed their plan of operation of unit seven in the Oahe Dam. The penstock for unit seven is constructed with a "Y" so that part of the time this unit can be used for power generation and part of the time for pumping water to the irrigation project. The original plan of operation called for closing down the pumps on unit seven during July and August so that the unit could be used for the generation of power to be sold for irrigation pumping in Nebraska. My objection held up the transmission line authorization until the Bureau gave me their guarantee that South Dakota irrigation would come first. Catching this very serious flaw in the Bureau's plans not only insures South Dakota irrigators a constant water supply, but saves the $2.8 million in construction costs.

FOREIGN AID

At long last the House took a closer look at this spending program and sliced $500 million from the original request. At $2.8 billion it was still substantially more than should have been authorized. After an all-night session, at four in the morning we came within eight votes of sending it back to the committee for further cuts. I was not only successful in several dollar cut amendments but also in broadening a provision for food protein research. The amendment provided for research to include wheat, soybeans and other grains which show great promise as diet supplements for the people of underdeveloped nations.

TAX INCREASE

Instead of the 6 percent surtax originally suggested, the President has requested a whopping 10 percent boost. The Vietnam war was given as an excuse for this needed revenue, although domestic spending has increased at a greater rate than war expenses. Rep. Wilbur Mills, Chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, served notice on the administration that he would require a definite plan for reduced spending before considering a tax increase. Congress generally promises to take a long, hard look before turning more of the people's hard-earned money over to federal spenders.

FARM

Despite the fact that agricultural income is standing at 75 percent of parity, the lowest in 33 years, the Administration continues to belt the farmer. The belting includes further tariff cuts, increased import competition, inflated prices on everything the farmer must buy, as well as dumping of CCC stocks to help beat prices down. The explanation of course is that it is impossible to reduce consumer prices without beating down producers' prices, and there are more votes among the consumers. Their own reports are most discouraging for agriculture. The Department of Commerce reports that national income rose $5½ billion in the second quarter of the year while the Department of Agriculture reported a 2½ percent decline in farm income for the same period. We had a bumper crop of small grain in South Dakota but prices fell from $1.70 per bushel last year to $1.40 this year and many reported selling their wheat at the elevator for $1.18 or $1.20—this in spite of the famous wheat bill that was so highly publicized as the "farmers' friend" only two years ago.

GOLD

The bill providing a subsidy for gold production which I co-sponsored, has been reported from the Interior Committee to the House floor. It is awaiting action by the Rules Committee. The bill provides a 6 percent subsidy to current producers and a 125 percent subsidy to new mines. This is simply a cost of operation payment made necessary because all gold mined in this country must be sold directly to the Treasury at a price established in 1934. Kenneth Kellar of Homestake spent several days here helping me pry the bill out of Rules.

RIOTS

A bill which I co-sponsored, making it a crime to cross state lines for the purpose of inciting a riot, has passed the House and is currently under consideration in the Senate. I have also introduced another bill cutting off all federal benefits from anyone convicted of rioting. The nation cannot continue to tolerate violence and lawlessness terrorizing its citizens.

SOCIAL SECURITY

In an effort to help our senior citizens resist the ravages of Great Society inflation, the House has passed a measure providing Social Security increases averaging 12½ percent, with the monthly minimum raised from $44 to $50. To pay for it, the wage base was increased from $6,600 to $7,600 next year with the tax rate scheduled to reach 11.8 percent in 1987.

DRAFT

A four-year extension of the draft was enacted, continuing the present educational deferment for undergraduates. It also permits the President to reverse the order of induction to place 19-year-olds at the top of the list.

VETERANS

A major increase in veterans benefits was enacted providing pension increases for 2 million veterans and their widows averaging 5.4 percent. Vietnam veterans would receive benefits comparable to those of other conflicts, and educational allowances for those serving after February 1, 1955, would be increased.

OBSCENE LITERATURE

Legislation I co-sponsored in the past several Congresses to crack down on the flow of obscene books, movies, and other materials is awaiting conference committee action after passing both the House and Senate. It would establish a 16-member Commission to recommend legislation to curb the $1 billion-a-year traffic in obscenity and pornography.

POSTAL RATES

In all probability it is going to cost a lot more to mail a letter next year. The nation's postage bill is likely to go up by another $1 billion. The House is expected to act soon on increases proposed to raise air mail from 8 cents to 10 cents an ounce. First-class letters would go up from 5 to 6 cents, postal cards from 4 to 5 cents. Newspapers and magazines would go up 23 percent, and bulk mail 31 percent. Much of the increased income would be required to provide postal employees with an anticipated pay boost. The person who saved three cent stamps in the past was lucky—two of them will send a letter, first class.

RATS

The House refused to bring up for consideration a $40 million, two-year rat extermination act, rousing the ire of the President and resulting in Administration attempts to add the money to other measures. Needless to say, everyone is against rats but some felt Uncle Sam wouldn't make the best exterminator at a cost of $6 per rat under the proposal. Also overlooked has been the fact that the OEO, Interior Department, General Services Administration and Public Health Service already have extensive rat elimination programs.

Sincerely yours,

E. Y. BERRY.

General Assembly Action on Vietnam Is Necessary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT TENZER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1967

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, since the commencement of my service in the House of Representatives, I have on several occasions discussed and outlined comprehensive proposals for peace in Vietnam—see March 2, 1967, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pages H2048–H2049—because I join many colleagues in the thought that the pursuit of peace is the proudest tradition of our American democracy.

Last week in a speech to the U.N. General Assembly, Ambassador Arthur J. Goldberg repeated that the United States continues to seek a political solution in Vietnam. No restrictions were outlined in his endeavor to seek meaningful negotiations with Hanoi. Other than third-party statements, similar formulations directed toward Hanoi have not received a favorable response. It has been alleged that Hanoi will also fail to accept this offer.

On June 14, 1967, in a House speech, I called for the use of the "uniting for peace" resolution to bring United Nations action in Vietnam. This proposal directs the cochairmen of the Geneva Conference—Great Britain and the Soviet Union—to immediately reconvene the peace conference.

On September 22, 1967, I wrote to Secretary of State Dean Rusk asking that he instruct Ambassador Arthur Goldberg to take the necessary step to invoke the "uniting for peace" resolution, thereby bringing the Vietnam issue before the General Assembly. I believe this formula for peace can be both diplomatically and politically implemented.

Mr. Speaker, I am placing in the RECORD at this point the full text of my letter to Secretary Rusk for the benefit of my colleagues:

SEPTEMBER 22, 1967.

Hon. DEAN RUSK,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Our present course in Vietnam concerns every nation in the world. Because they have a vested interest in the maintenance of peace, each nation has the right to air its views and work toward a peaceful settlement of this conflict.

For that reason, I have consistently supported United Nations action to stimulate peace discussions at a Geneva Conference on Vietnam because the United Nations is the only body within which the nations of the world can be heard on this vital question.

The apparent failure of the United States efforts to involve the U.N. Security Council on this question should not lead to an abandonment of further efforts to bring about United Nations action.

The Soviet Union has expressed its opposition to Security Council discussion of the Vietnam issue in stating that the proper forum for discussions is a reconvened Geneva Conference. This position is inconsistent with the refusal of the Soviet Union—as a co-chairman—to convene a peace conference.

In the event of inaction by the Security Council, I urge you to instruct Ambassador Arthur Goldberg to take the steps necessary to invoke the "uniting for peace" resolution in order to bring the Vietnam issue before the U.N. General Assembly.

Until the Middle East crisis, the Soviet Union had not recognized the validity of that procedure. However, during that crisis, the Soviet Union recognized and utilized that procedure for the first time.

Now the United States has an opportunity to prove its good faith by using the same method to bring a resolution on the Vietnam war to the General Assembly.

Whether or not a nation supports or opposes United States involvement in Vietnam, that nation may well support a resolution of the United Nations calling upon the co-chairman of the Geneva Conference to immediately bring all interested parties together for peace talks.

In light of the Soviet position, I believe the United States should press for General Assembly consideration of a resolution urging that the Geneva Conference be reconvened.

Mr. Secretary, since Woodrow Wilson first dreamt of a world organization for peace, the hopes of men have longed for the day when an effective peace keeping force could be devised. At present, the United Nations represents our best hope for realization of that dream.

If the United Nations is to be effective, we must never fear utilizing every means available to us in that body to preserve and when necessary, restore the peace. It would indeed be ironic if we, as one of the principle architects of the United Nations, were the least bit reluctant to use it for the very purpose we helped create.

Sincerely,

HERBERT TENZER,
Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, if the United Nations fails to act, we will have lost nothing. If a resolution is passed for a Geneva conference, we will have accelerated the wheels of diplomacy in the pursuit of peace.

Ambassador Goldberg, in his address to the United Nations, stressed the importance of negotiations now. I not only want negotiation now—I wanted them yesterday, last week, and last year.

It is time to undertake a major new peace offensive in Vietnam and the United Nations—as the forum of world diplomacy—stands as one avenue of diplomacy which must be used.

Until the Middle East crisis, there appeared to be no way to overcome a Soviet veto of a Vietnam resolution. Now a possibility exists. However slim it may be, that possibility must be pursued.

War on Crime

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 25, 1967

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial, which appeared in the Johnson City, Tenn., Press-Chronicle, points out quite forcefully the disturbingly rapid rise in crime in all areas of our Nation, which continues its climb virtually unabated.

I wish to bring this very timely editorial to the attention of my colleagues and the readers of the RECORD:

STILL LOSING CRIME WAR

We are still losing the war with crime.

The Federal Bureau of Investigation's latest reports is disquieting. It says the number of crimes in the nation jumped 17 per cent during the first half of this year, with all sections of the country participating in the increase.

In cities, crime increased 17 per cent; in suburbs, the gain was 18 per cent; in rural areas, it was 15 per cent.

Murders—up 20 per cent.

Robberies—up 30 per cent.

All of this—and the report did not reflect the summer's ghetto rioting, since this took place after the period.

Either we strengthen our law enforcement resources or we continue to give ground to the lawless elements. This is the story told clearly in the figures.

The Other War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 25, 1967

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, the resignation of the director and other leaders of the International Voluntary Services in Vietnam should raise significant questions. Few Americans there work more closely with the Vietnamese people.

Most of us are conscious of the need to "win the other war", but we too easily speak of the other war as if the scope of military operations, the destruction of hamlets and crops, and the tally sheets of enemy dead, who are also—after all—Vietnamese, were somehow isolated from our ability to win the friendship of the people.

The New York Times today comments in an editorial on the International Voluntary Services' resignations and the letter to President Johnson signed by nearly a third of the volunteers there.

I commend the editorial to the attention of my colleagues.

ARE WE LOSING THE OTHER WAR?

Two years ago, Henry Cabot Lodge wrote a letter to The Times lauding International Voluntary Services, a private agency doing Peace Corps-type work in a number of foreign countries, including Vietnam.

The former Ambassador to Saigon said the achievements of I.V.S. volunteers constituted "one of the success stories of American assistance in Vietnam" and formed "a significant part" of a development effort that was "indispensable to military success." "Indeed," Mr. Lodge added, "a 100 per cent military performance cannot win the war if the civil side be not successful."

Last week the veteran director of I.V.S. in Vietnam and three top aides resigned, charging in effect that the civil effort, of which they have been the spearhead, is failing. They said the rising tempo of military operations is undermining their efforts to help the Vietnamese people and is destroying the fabric of Vietnamese society. They were backed by a letter to the President signed by 49 volunteers calling for deescalation and negotiation.

I.V.S. Director Don Luce, who has served in Vietnam for nine years, and his 170 volunteers know Vietnam more intimately than any other American group. They speak the language and work and live among the people. Their warning must be heeded that the United States is losing that "other war" which Mr. Lodge and other top U.S. officials have said is vital for "victory."

Support for Firearms Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 25, 1967

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, again the President has asked the Congress to enact firearms legislation.

In doing so, he has voiced the sentiments which have more and more been creeping into the editorials in our newspapers across the country.

The testimony which has been heard repeatedly for the past several years makes us wonder how, in the face of these statistics, we can still be questioning the need for this legislation or talking about its scope.

I urge the Judiciary Committee to bring the legislation before this body promptly. I am convinced of its merits and of the fact that it will be passed overwhelmingly.

Following are some of the editorials which have come to my attention since FBI Director Hoover wrote on September 1 that Congress can no longer delay the enactment of this essential legislation:

[From the Milwaukee (Wis.) Journal, Sept. 5, 1967]

HOOVER ASKS GUN CONTROLS

"I think mail order firearm purchases should be banned, interstate transportation of firearms controlled and local registration of weapons required and enforced." The maker of this unequivocal statement has never been accused, even by the most fanatic of the far right, as a pinko, a fuzzy minded intellectual or a bleeding heart. He is J. Edgar Hoover, the FBI director, and he was writing in that agency's Law Enforcement Bulletin. Other Hoover comments of note:

"During the calendar year of 1966 alone, more citizens were killed or assaulted with guns in American streets and homes than were killed in battle during the entire Korean conflict. . . .

"While it is true a hardened criminal will obtain a gun regardless of statutes in force, most authorities agree that controls would make acquisition more difficult. With a large percentage of the murders in the United States occurring within the family or among acquaintances, the readily available lethal firearm, seven times more deadly than other murder weapons, becomes a major factor. . . .

"There is no doubt in my mind that the easy accessibility of firearms is responsible for many killings, both impulse and premeditated."

Hoover's statement offered unqualified endorsement for administration legislation to put reasonable restraints on an interstate traffic in firearms that long has been dangerously out of control. It constitutes a national scandal. Remedial legislation has been knocking about in congress for nearly four years now.

"We have reached the point where the time for debate is past; the time for action is here," the FBI director wrote.

It is.

[From the Minneapolis (Minn.) Star, Sept. 5, 1967]

GUNS FOR SALE, UNLIMITED

Gun control in Minneapolis is a joke. A grim joke, as crimes involving hand guns increase at a rate that alarms police.

Contrary to popular impression, neither state nor city law prohibits the carrying of a concealed gun. Except for a weak law requiring the permission of parents or police for sale of firearms to city-dwellers under age 18, there are no state regulations on sales.

The city ordinance is silent on purchase and ownership of rifles and shotguns, although legally to carry a pistol or revolver you must be a 21-year-old citizen who has not been convicted of a felony and neither drunk nor under the influence of drugs.

No city or state permit is required, but the seller in Minneapolis is supposed to register the sale at the police department. He is under no compulsion to enforce the loose requirements.

And obviously yoŭ can buy a gun by mail or in an unregulated community nearby. The increase in hand gun ownership is alarming. Police records indicate that there are at least 60,000 *registered* guns in this city. In the first six months of this year there were 2,669 registered gun sales. Last year's total was 5,071. How many more are floating around? How many in criminal hands?

Last year there were 1,084 robberies, almost all at gun point, compared to 924 the year before. There have been five homicides this year in which guns were the weapon, and in August alone there were 17 shootings.

Veteran police officers say there is no question but that serious crimes involving guns are increasing, and, equally frightening, almost casual shootings during arguments or hoodlum attacks on bystanders appear to be on the upsurge. The danger of gun play during a riot is too obvious to need belaboring.

In the absence of state and federal control, and before this shocking situation gets worse, Minneapolis and surrounding communities should tighten up their laws. A bare minimum would be to make carrying a concealed gun illegal.

[From the Omaha (Nebr.) World-Herald, Sept. 5, 1967]

CONTROL GUNS, SAYS HOOVER

Count J. Edgar Hoover among the advocates of stern control of firearms.

He says in the current FBI Bulletin that he wants mail-order firearms purchases banned, interstate transportation of firearms controlled, and local registration of weapons required and enforced.

To the argument that hardened criminals will get guns regardless of laws, Mr. Hoover replies that this is true but that "most authorities agree that controls would make acquisition more difficult."

A large percentage of murders in this country take place within families or among acquaintances. Readily available guns are seven times more deadly than other weapons, says the FBI chief.

He asks for the imposition of stiffer penalties against criminals who use guns in their crimes, and mandatory prohibition of suspended sentences in cases involving firearms. And he concludes:

"There is no doubt in my mind that the easy accessibility of firearms is responsible for many killings, both impulse and premeditated. The statistics are grim and realistic. Strong measures must be taken, and promptly, to protect the public."

[From the Seattle (Wash.) Post-Intelligencer, Sept. 7, 1967]

VOICE OF AUTHORITY

The following guest editorial is by FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover, writing in the latest issue of the FBI Bulletin:

"There is no doubt in my mind that the easy accessibility of firearms is responsible for many killings, both impulse and premeditated. Strong measures must be taken, and promptly, to protect the public.

"I think mail-order firearm purchases should be banned, interstate transportation of firearms controlled, and local registration of weapons required and enforced.

The time for debate is past; the time for action is here."

"One Man, One Vote" Wears a Black Eye

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 11, 1967

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the Florida Times-Union of Thursday, September 21, carried in its editorial columns an impressive analysis of the problems of the one-man one-vote ruling by the Supreme Court as it applies to Florida.

I submit it for reprinting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

"ONE MAN, ONE VOTE" WEARS A BLACK EYE

Those who have maintained from the beginning that federal court invasion of the "political thicket" of legislative and congressional redistricting would open a Pandora's box of unpredictable troubles will find a wry confirmation of their predictions in the situation in which Florida's court-decreed congressional redistricting plan now finds itself.

There is nothing to be gained, and no satisfaction to be derived from indulging in smug comments of "I told you so." But at least it serves forcefully to make the point again that politics is a science of dealing with people, and as such cannot be conducted by slide rule. Human beings cannot be dealt with as impersonal units, and the newest turn in the redistricting issue shows that all human institutions, including federal courts, sometimes fall into error.

When the three-judge federal court in Miami wearied of waiting for an acceptable plan by legislative action and decreed its own plan for dividing the state into 12 congressional districts in compliance with the Supreme Court's "one man, one vote" edict, it was claimed that the plan would deviate no more than 1.2 per cent from perfect equality of representation.

Now, however, publication of the new Census Bureau statistics has revealed that drafters of the court plan used a mixture of 1960 census figures and more recent estimates in drawing the district lines which critics called unrealistic. As a result, it now appears, the court plan is in reality as far if not farther at variance from perfect equality than the plan the delegation itself proposed and the court rejected.

The Florida delegation in Congress has asked Attorney General Earl Faircloth to appeal the court-decreed plan on the basis of this discrepancy. Whatever the outcome, we hope the time will soon arrive when the courts can extricate themselves from the political thicket and the state legislature can carry out the responsibilities with which it has been charged but which it has not always discharged.

Why the Outlook Is Grim for Consumer Bills and Other Vital Legislation—Speech by Congresswoman Sullivan to Heads of National Voluntary Organizations at White House Consumer Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 25, 1967

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, September 22, it was my great honor to attend an all-day meeting at the Executive Office Building and at the White House, at which the heads of many of our national voluntary organizations met with the President's Special Assistant for Consumer Affairs, Miss Betty Furness, and members of her staff. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss the status of legislation vitally important to the people of this country as consumers.

It was a most impressive gathering of leaders in the civic and community life of this country, and I am sure that out of this conference will come wider awareness among the general public of the issues which affect every family in the United States in so many different ways.

I was called upon to present a "View From the House of Representatives" of the legislative situation. Perhaps not all the Members of the House will agree with my assessments and evaluations of the situation, but I am sure there will be general agreement among the Members that the outlook for much of the consumer legislation is somewhat grim. We may disagree as to why that is so.

I submit herewith my own analysis of this matter, as follows:

A VIEW FROM THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

(Remarks by Congresswoman LEONOR K. SULLIVAN, chairman, Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs, House Committee on Banking and Currency, at consultation with presidents of national organizations sponsored by President's Committee on Consumer Interests, Executive Office Building, Washington, D.C., Friday morning, September 22, 1967)

I am grateful to Betty Furness for inviting me to join you this morning because I certainly want to encourage her, and to encourage all of you, in the work this conference is intended to accomplish. To a very large extent, the organizations represented here today constitute the collective conscience of the American people, and it is only when we impress that conscience deeply enough to stir a national reaction that we can accomplish anything *for good*.

It is particularly urgent that the national conscience be touched now in just that way. We are here today primarily to discuss consumer issues, and all of us consider those issues terribly important or we would not be participating. But the very same blanket of apathy which smothers progress on the consumer front is stretched over most of the vital national issues which Congress is now wrestling with, and frankly, we aren't getting very far on many of them.

And for that, I blame the good people in the organizations this audience represents. Your members are fearful and discouraged but they aren't shaken up. They aren't "turned on"—if I can use that expression without psychedelic connotations. They are not pressing for solutions. And if *your* members are complacent and apathetic, this country drifts.

A good question might be whether the Congress reflects this apathy and indecision, or *causes* it. Perhaps the people feel that whether or not they got excited about some of the major issues now stalled on dead center, Congress would still do nothing effective about them.

If that is the feeling, it is based on a false assumption. This Congress apparently is not going to do very much about *anything* on the basis of its own initiative, enterprise and solid conviction, but any Congress composed of politicians who must constantly run for re-election can be prodded into taking whatever action it is convinced represents the overwhelming desire of the voters. Right now, however, the desires of the voters are seemingly just to be let alone to the greatest extent possible—don't bother me; don't tax me; don't upset my routine; don't push things on me; don't crusade at me; do something about that *other* fellow.

We can all deplore this attitude, and I'm sure all of us do. But the question I direct at you leaders of our voluntary national organizations this morning is: what can *you* do about it? I hope you *can* do something about it, for we in the Congress who try to work for consumer causes and for improvement in the quality of living for all of our citizens desperately need the help of a more aware and more issue-active public.

REWARD FOR GOOD CONGRESS WAS DEFEAT OF ITS BALANCE OF POWER

In the 89th Congress, which was elected with President Johnson in 1964, we had a good solid working majority in the House of Representatives on most of the major issues of domestic concern and we enacted some extremely far-reaching legislation which will have landmark significance equal to some of the great enactments of the first New Deal. Not everything went through smoothly, by any means, and some things went through with more title than substance—such as the packaging bill on which Senator Hart had labored so hard and so long only to have its ribs crushed in the embrace of many of its enemies, so that it fell miles short of its target.

On the other hand, much of what we did accomplish in the 1965 and 1966 sessions of the Congress will have tremendous impact on the future of this country and of the well-being of our people. It was a good Congress. But its reward, unfortunately, was the defeat of most of the young forward-looking new Members of the House who had given the 89th Congress its liberal muscle on the Yea and Nay votes which determined the fate of the major bills, from Elementary Education to Medicare, from Model Cities to Voting Rights, from minimum wage to rent supplements, from arms control to automobile safety.

Those who have taken the places in the 90th Congress of the defeated House one-termers of the 89th are far less inclined than their predecessors to prospect for new areas of public improvement, and are apparently quite willing to have the 90th Congress enact little more than the necessary appropriation bills, with as low a price tag as possible. In this attitude, I am sure they feel they are faithfully and accurately reflecting the wishes of their constituents—at least, those they hear from.

My own mail reflects this. Over the 15 years in which I have served in the Congress, I have built up quite a correspondence with thousands of constituents who have brought problems to my attention for whatever help I could provide or guidance I could supply, and with thousands of others who wanted to share with me their views or hopes or fears on legislative issues.

A CONGRESSMAN'S MAIL

A Congressman's mail is by no means an accurate reflection of the public view on any issue; it is, however, a very good indicator of what is *bothering* people. For every constituent upset enough to write in, dozens more are brooding over the same issue. Then you have vast numbers of others who *would* write in if they had time to think about the issue and if someone, or something in the newspaper, goaded them into writing. Generally, the mail we receive indicates to us not so much what we should be *for* but rather how far we dare go in opposing what appears to be a sizeable segment of our constituency.

It is a well known fact that those who are strongly against proposed legislation are far more likely to write to their Members of Congress than those who favor the same legislation. We learn rather quickly, therefore, not to weigh the mail or keep score of the yes and no letters as any reliable guide to prevailing sentiment. But we get so much No mail, on every issue, that an occasional thoughtful and encouraging letter *in favor*, from a constituent with no personal axe to grind but with a decent respect for the problems of other citizens, makes a profound impression upon us—if for no other reason than morale purposes. So please continue to encourage your members to wrote in to us. It *does* help. It is important.

Through my extensive correspondence over the years with many, many constituents, I know that most of them support my efforts on consumer issues, because they frequently mention this in their letters—but usually they do so in a reference made in passing, incidental to their main purpose in writing to me about personal problems or their reactions to some event in the news which may or may not have any connection with the work of the Congress. Presumably, they are just taking it for granted that I will continue to vote for, and work for, the things they have associated with my record in the Congress.

CONGRESS "NOT GETTING THE WORD"

But it is discouraging to me that despite my close identification with the Truth-in-Lending and other consumer credit issues, I received a total of about a dozen letters from my own constituents addressed directly to this issue—not as an afterthought in a letter dealing with another matter.

My mail on the rat control bill was practically nil. City officials wrote or wired about the appropriation for model cities and rent supplements—but no one else did. When the Public Television bill was scheduled to come up in the House this week, my office received a call from a Washington lawyer in behalf of the educational broadcasters of Missouri asking how I planned to vote on it. At that point, I had very little knowledge of what was in that bill—after all we have more than 15,000 bills pending in this Congress and we are submerged in the technical provisions of the bills we are working on in our own Committees and cannot possibly be up on everything in the other Committees. But I had not received a single letter from any Missouri college or university or other group interested in this legislation telling me what this bill would mean to their efforts in this field.

In other words—good Congress or bad, we're just not getting the word. We're not hearing the facts about the local application of national legislation. We have to dig for this informatin, and frankly, there isn't enough time for each of us to do that on every issue. This is one area in which all of your organizations are falling down right now.

OUR PROBLEMS ARE VAST

If everything in our economy were fine and dandy, and our cities were Camelots of joy and well-being, if our schools were flourishing and our elderly living in solid comfort and exposed to interesting activities, if the children were all getting their polio and diphtheria and whooping cough and measles shots under the free vaccine program we have enacted, if all the needy who qualified were signed up for the food stamp program everywhere it operates, if new homes and apartments were being rushed to completion to house the low-income families which desperately need decent places in which to live, if the people were safe in their homes or on the streets from the gun-wielding hopheads and violent criminals, if we had solved the air and water pollution problems and the crisis of waste disposal, if we had established scrupulous honesty in the marketplace and outlawed the predatory credit practices which victimize the poor, if we had done all of these things and more, then we would have a right to some complacency and lack of citizen concern.

But these necessities have not been accomplished, as all of you know in your own scared souls. Passing resolutions condemning Congress for not having passed more of the laws necessary to achieve these goals will not accomplish a thing. The fact is that in many instances, Congress *has* passed the essential laws, and even provided sufficient funds to carry out some of the objectives—not all—not nearly enough of the objectives—but many of them.

In a nation in which every boy and girl who can do the work can readily achieve a college-level or higher education—the opportunities are there, now, and so are the necessary financial aids—we have a frightening hard core of continuing illiteracy. Youngsters graduate from high school unable to read and write and speak well enough to hold meaningful jobs. And the nation's economy cries not only for skilled, but for merely trainable workers. The billions we have spent, and are spending, in trying to solve this dilemma will not accomplish the job unless and until every American who does function effectively in the economy and in our society is involved in helping to lift up or guide or encourage or inspire those who do not manage to function.

REACHING THE ULTIMATE

We have achieved miracles in the use of the handicapped and the retarded in many fields. But we have failed in reaching the unmotivated, whose envy, despair, and daydreaming, coupled with a desperate impatience to share in the good life they see all about them, threaten to tear down the whole fabric of our society in crime and internal strife.

I look out at you good people, and think of the millions of good people you represent who belong to your organization, and I am moved to say that it appears now that the solutions are going to be up to you. I am not passing the buck from the Congress; rather, I am trying to find a way for you to pass it back to us in a manner in which we can be prodded or forced into doing our share.

Let me give you one very elementary example. In the list I enumerated of some of the things which are NOT being accomplished, I mentioned the innoculation of children against the killing and crippling diseases. Congress has provided the funds to enable the states to innoculate *every* child. I was horrified to learn, the last time I checked into this matter, that an estimated 65 percent—I will repeat that figure, 65%—it is an unbelievable one—of children on Aid to Dependent Children had not been given the polio and other shots, even though the shots are available free. These are children whose mothers are, in effect, paid by the Federal and State Governments, out of tax funds, to care for their own children. That is the *job* for which they are paid the far-from-adequate monthly checks they receive.

WHOSE RESPONSIBILITY IS IT TO PROVIDE GUIDANCE?

It seems to me, as I am sure it must seem of you also, that the very minimum service one would expect in return for this subsistence payment is that the mother try to the best of her ability to keep the child alive and well. There are food stamps to assure adequate diets, public housing in many areas to provide dry and warm shelter, social workers to provide guidance—not enough, of course; all of these things break down in application for lack of sufficient funds and sufficient personnel and sufficient time to provide sufficient guidance—but we do provide some of the essentials, and we do provide free vaccines.

Where the shots have not been given, it is to be assumed it is a case of ignorance and not of venality. But who on the local level is assuming the *responsibility* to get those children innoculated? Is anyone?

"Medicare alert" showed us how community action can find the people who need to know about the existence of programs to help them, and then make sure the help is obtained. The whole poverty program was oriented toward guiding the poor to the help they can obtain. But the paid social worker or community action worker has too many families to cover and too little time to cover them.

In time of flood or hurricane or other natural disasters, the entire resources of the community are quickly mobilized by volunteers to feed the hungry, shelter the home,less, tend to the ill and elderly and the children, clean out the debris and restore the community's facilities.

Right now our cities are nearly all disaster areas, without the designations, and without the volunteer help a disaster brings. Instead of fearing typhoid from broken sewers in a devastating flood or storm, we face instead the slow but steady collapse of the city itself into the kind of sewer which poisons the spirits.

VOLUNTARY ORGANIZATIONS MUST HELP ADMINISTER PUBLIC PROGRAMS

For years, your organizations have been effective activist groups in helping to achieve necessary legislation to upgrade American society.

You have been instrumental as organizations in accomplishing great new programs. But somewhere along the line, the people to whom we have turned over those programs for administration have become submerged in a rising tide of problem families and problem situations, and all of our public services are collapsing under the traffic load.

We have reached a point, I am convinced, where the voluntary organization must do more than propose and press for solutions; it must now take a growing role in the administration of those programs.

In the field of housing for low-income families, we have numerous programs of financial assistance to non-profit organizations, or limited dividend corporations, to get in and do the job of providing decent housing, and managing that housing to keep it decent. Not nearly enough organizations have responded.

When we wrote the program into law for below-market-interest rate loans for housing for the elderly, I wrote to every union, every church organization, every fraternal or beneficial association I could find in the St. Louis directory to urge them to investigate this avenue for solving one of the greatest problems of our community, or of any city. Over a period of 8 years the Teamsters union has acted, and the Council of Jewish Women has acted. That makes two. There are also some FHA-insured elderly housing projects, sponsored by non-profit organizations.

How many of you here have undertaken any program of this nature?

HOW A NEW HOUSING LAW ORIGINATED

In St. Louis, two priests who were trying to cope with the human tragedies of broken families and deprivation in a slum area started from *nothing* to rehabilitate *one house* in a deteriorating neighborhood, finding a family which would help to restore the home, and then helped that family to buy the house through a sympathetic Federal savings and loan association. Thus started a program which has worked successfully on a *home-by-home* and *family-by-family* scale. It has worked so well that I was impressed enough to impress Congress enough to pass a separate provision of the Housing law to promote this unique home ownership idea by offering financing to such non-profit efforts at only 3% interest.

Senator Percy was also impressed by the St. Louis experiment—so much so that he wants to set up a $2 billion Foundation to spread this idea quickly to every city in the country. This is thinking big—but in my opinion much too big. What such a program must depend upon for success is the direct participation of civic-minded individuals who *will* volunteer endless hours of their own personal time and effort—NOT hired help, but their personal assistance to those families to teach them how to get and keep a job, how to budget their pay to meet the monthly mortgage costs, how to maintain the property, how to do all of the things a home owner has to learn how to do, and which very poor families which have never owned anything must learn from scratch.

It is a one-to-one relationship—one family to one volunteer businessman or lawyer or clergyman or teacher or banker. That is what made the experiment succeed so well in St. Louis.

AVENUES OPEN TO VOLUNTARY ORGANIZATIONS

In all of the numerous special assistance programs for low-income housing which require the participation of non-profit organizations, it is a monmumental task to find the local organizations willing to take on the responsibility.

If you will investigate the many, many avenues open to your organizations to provide administrative guidance and direct participation on the local level to help solve the problems which are strangling our cities, you can then get this Congress, or any Congress, to help you, for you have status and prestige and respectability, and even more important, you have lots of members with know-how, which is the prime requisite for success.

We need to get the local bar associations into the credit jungle, to help the gullible poor avoid signing away their rights to due process when buying something they cannot afford and don't need, or which they might need desperately but can buy only in return for constant garnishment leading either to unemployability or a life of indentured servitude. We must involve the real estate boards in providing advice to those house-hungry families who are subject to come—on deals which any reasonable person would know they cannot handle without illegally turning the property into a rooming house. We need to involve the food industry in helping the authorities to police the outfits selling tainted meat not subject to Federal inspection.

I guarantee that when the House of Representatives is presented with the kind of facts the non-profit organizations can develop out of personal involvement of their members in such issues as these, you will see action on the legislation now so long overdue.

In the meantime, short of a great national emergency, the 90th Congress will limp along for the rest of this session and through the next one doing much less than enough until and unless the good, solid, middle class of this country—which sets the national tone on most issues—gets enough involved to see its own stake in those issues. Right now, that sense of involvement is so numbed in personal comfort as to be virtually nonexistent and unreachable *except through your organizations* to which so many of them belong. Can you rouse them?

Unless you can, the anguished cries to Washington for help in solving this problem or that—from our mayors, our governors, our scientists and sociologists and others—will continue to make us all nervously guilty and we'll apply some bandaids, but very little will happen to provide basic solutions. For that's the way it is here.

War Claims Two From Maryland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE D. LONG
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 25, 1967

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Pvt. Elmer N. Davis and Pfc. Maurice P. Chapman, Jr., two servicemen from Maryland, were recently killed in action in Vietnam.

I wish to commend the courage of these young men and to honor their memory by including the following article in the RECORD:

WAR CLAIMS TWO FROM MARYLAND

Two more Marylanders—Army Pvt. Elmer N. Davis from Salisbury and Marine Pfc. Maurice P. Chapman, Jr., of Harwood—have been killed in combat in Vietnam, the Defense Department announced yesterday.

Private Davis, 21, died last Tuesday somewhere in the Da Nang area when hit by fragments from enemy hand grenade, his mother, Mrs. Hilda Johnson, said last night.

"I LOVE YOU ALL"

Private Davis leaves a wife and three children. A 1965 graduate of Salisbury High School, he was a member of the football, softball and track teams.

His last letter home was dated September 14 and was written as he was leaving on the ten-day mission which led to his death, his mother related.

"He said that of all the operations he'd been on, this one was different in that he was really scared and that if he didn't get back alive 'remember mother that I loved you all,'" Mrs. Johnson said.

After graduating from high school, Private Davis worked as a machine operator and then on the loading dock at the Campbell Soup Company in Salisbury. He also worked at the ChrisCraft Company there, she said.

DIED OF WOUNDS

Private Davis's father is dead. Besides his mother, he is survived by his wife, the former Julia Hall, and three children, Tony, 6, Ernest, 4, and Elmer, Jr., 1 year old.

Private Chapman, 20, died last Wednesday at a hospital in the Philippines from body wounds received August 31, his mother, Mrs. Rosetta Chapman, said last night.

A 1965 graduate of Bates High School in Annapolis, he attended Bowie High State College where he was an A-student for one year before leaving to enlist in the Marines.

"He majored in art. He liked to paint . . . all the time," Mrs. Chapman said, adding that their Anne Arundel county home was filled with oil paintings, "some finished, some unfinished," most of them outdoor scenes.

In high school, Private Chapman had played right field for two years on the baseball team and in his senior year had won the trophy for being the team's best player, Mrs. Chapman said.

Her son had hoped to become an elementary school teacher when he got out of the marines, she added.

In addition to his mother, Private Chapman is survived by his father, Maurice Chapman, Sr., a brother, Elston, and two sisters, Rita and Peggy Ann, all of Harwood.

Philip E. LaTendresse, Widely Known Inventor, Dies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP E. RUPPE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 25, 1967

Mr. RUPPE. Mr. Speaker, recent articles in the L'Anse Sentinel of Baraga County, Mich., eloquently expressed the sorrow of the people of northern Michigan on the loss of one of their most outstanding citizens, Mr. Philip E. LaTendresse. Mr. LaTendresse devoted his energies, talents, and bed of genius to the development of the Pettibone cary-lift. The cary-lift has proven enormously useful to the Forest Service of our United States, and has been the economic salvation of the people of Baraga, Mich. Mr. LaTendresse will be long remembered as a gentleman who extended his warmth and interest to his fellow citizens.

It is with a deep sense of humility that I insert the following articles from the Wednesday, September 6, copy of the L'Anse Sentinel:

PHIL LATENDRESSE, WIDELY KNOWN INVENTOR OF CARY-LIFT, DIES SEPTEMBER 4

Funeral services for Philip E. LaTendresse, 53, well known Baraga resident and inventor of the Cary-Lift, were held this morning (Thursday) at ten o'clock.

Rev. Fr. Joseph A. Kichak, pastor of St. Ann's Church was Celebrant of the requiem high Mass with former pastor Rev. Fr. A. Ehlinger, Sacred Heart Church, Paulding, as Deacon; Rev. Fr. A. Sterbentz of St. Bruno Chucrh, Nadeau as Sub-Deacon and Rev. Fr. Norman Clish, assistant pastor of St. Mary's, Iron Mountain, as Master of Cedemonies.

Phil, as he was fondly called by his host of friends, passed away Sept. 4th at the Baraga County Memorial Hospital, L'Anse, following a long illness.

He was born in Keweenaw Bay on May 8, 1914 and had been a life long resident of Baraga County. He was a member of the 1934 graduating class of Baraga High School.

Phil was a member of the St. Ann's Catholic Church and also a member of the Third Degree Knights of Columbus of L'Anse and the Fourth Degree Monsignor Rezek Assembly.

He was very active in community affairs and always had the welfare of Baraga at heart. He had served on the Baraga Fire Deprtment and the Baraga Township Board of Education. He was a member of the Ottawa Sportsmen Club, the Baraga Lions and of the advisory committee in the Institute of Wood Research at Michigan Tech.

IN BUSINESS SINCE 1944

In 1944 Mr. LaTendresse opened a shop of his own in the former Dove shop, now known as the Baraga Repair & Sales Service, after working a few years for Phil Foucault of the L'Anse Motor Co. and for the Koski Repair Shop of Keweenaw Bay. While welding and repairing logging equipment, he realized the need of a labor saving device in the logging field and one that would be effective under the rugged conditions of the woods in all seasons. He built his first machine in 1949 for the Umblad brothers and this model was later purchased by Osmen Ward, well known logger. From this humble beginning, the manufacturing of the Cary-Lift has expanded at great speed.

In 1951, the LaTendresse Manufacturing Co. became a subsidiary of the Pettibone-Mulliken Corp.; In 1957, the company became the Pettibone Michigan Corp., of which he was vice president and in charge of research and development of the Cary-Lift program.

Mr. LaTendresse was married to the former Beatrice Bergerson on Sept. 24, 1937 in the Assinins Mission.

Surviving besides his wife are: four daughters, Mrs. C. J. (Jeanne) Farmer, Eaugus, Calif., Mrs. Norman (Pauline) Flaga, Clausen, Mrs. Keith (Anne) Lambert, L'Anse, Miss Elizabeth Sue at home; two sons, George of Baraga and Thomas at home; his father, Mr. Joseph LaTendresse Sr. of Baraga; four sisters, Mrs. Charles (Blanche) Gant, Detroit, Mrs. Donnel (Elizabeth) Shelton, Franklin, Mich., Mrs. William (Mary) Aho, Livonia, Mrs. Lester (Eva) Miron, Baraga; a brother, Joseph Jr. of Baraga; a granddaughter, Carolyin Sue Farmer and several nieces and nephews.

The Rosary was recited at the Wittum Funeral Home Wednesday evening.

MEMORIAL FUND ESTABLISHED

A memorial fund is established to be used in the new Philip LaTendresse Elementary School which is being constructed in Baraga.

COUNTY LOSES OUTSTANDING CITIZEN

The citizens of Baraga County feel a personal loss in the passing of Philip LaTendresse, life long resident of the county, leader, benefactor, and inventor of the Cary-Lift.

No problem was too great or too little for him to consider and the future of Baraga and the whole county was always his concern.

The accomplishments of this unassuming citizen reads like a Horatio Alger story. With a firm belief that his Cary-Lift would uplift the economy of the area, he kept his manufacturing plant here. From a very modest beginning, the Cary-Lift operations have climbed so that at present the machine is distributed world-wide. The Pettibone Cary-Lift loaders and Speed Skidders are recognized as leaders in the handling of logs, lumber, pulpwood, as well as for moving heavy loads of any type. Snow-removal also comes into the picture. Admiral Byrd took four of these machines on his expedition to the South Pole. They were called the work horses of the expendition, being able to handle multiple chores, particularly in unloading cargoes from ships in the Polar region. The Federal government also has found great use for this machine in the Armed Services. The Cary-Lift has been a benefit also to mining operations as well as to the small woods operators, who can use the speed grab, manufactured by the company, for any tractor or Cary-Lift.

Over the years, numerous attachments have been developed, so that the Cary-Lift is a most versatile handling tool to industry.

The Cary-Lift was fittingly named the 1966 Michigan Industrial Award Winner.

Plants are scattered over the United States but the Baraga plant is the only Pettibone plant in Michigan.

With seventeen suppliers in the county furnishing parts for the Cary-Lifts which are assembled in the Baraga plant, the industry is the mainstay of the economy of the area.

All of this is due to Baraga County's Phil LaTendresse, who fulfilled his dream for Baraga and the whole county.

Officials of both councils, Baraga and L'Anse villages, have passed resolutions paying tribute to the leadership of Phil LaTendresse for the great part he had in changing the economy of the county.

Public Broadcasting Act of 1967

SPEECH

OF

HON. MARGARET M. HECKLER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1967

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 6736) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 by extending and improving the provisions thereof relating to grants for construction of educational television broadcasting facilities, by authorizing assistance in the construction of noncommercial educational radio broadcasting facilities, by establishing a nonprofit corporation to assist in establishing innovative educational programs, to facilitate educational program availability, and to aid the operation of educational broadcasting facilities; and to authorize a comprehensive study of instructional television and radio; and for other purposes.

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I am indeed happy that this honorable body saw fit to continue its support for noncommercial and educational television. As passed by the House and the other honorable body, this proposal should play an historic role in the development of noncommercial broadcasting in the United States. Enactment of this legislation will enable noncommercial and educational television stations to provide greater public services instead of struggling for mere survival.

Only half of my own State of Massachusetts is served by educational television. Title I of this bill will allow the University of Massachusetts, the Commonwealth, and WGBH to go ahead with plans for constructing educational communication facilities for serving the entire State.

Title II contains provisions for a nonprofit corporation for public broadcasting. This corporation would supply leadership for the local station without dictating to them. It would exert upward pressure on standards of taste and performance for all the station without requiring them to conform to any single philosophy of programing. It would represent local stations in matters affecting them all. It would be better able to encourage and support training and research programs, to procure programs from abroad, to establish and maintain libraries, and to utilize expert consultants and advisory boards for the benefit of all.

Title III would authorize a study to determine how educational programing might be further improved, so as to make optimum use of the facility grants provided under title I.

This legislation will clearly enhance noncommercial programs and planning, and it will provide much needed funds for keeping these stations abreast of changes in communications technology.

Mr. Chairman, certainly the future of noncommercial television looks much brighter with the passage of H.R. 6736.

Postwar U.S. Diplomacy Toward China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 25, 1967

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, a very thoughtful analysis of the postwar diplomacy of the United States toward China appeared in a timely editorial in the Sunday, September 24, Chicago Tribune, which I place in the RECORD recognizing it is practical for all to have an up-to-date recollection of the complications which have in part developed from the misguided policies of our State Department.

WHEN THIEVES FALL OUT

Radio Moscow, more in sorrow than in anger, has reproached Red China with the reminder that the Soviet Union supplied the Chinese Communists with large quantities of arms after the surrender of Japan in 1945 and thereby was instrumental in the conquest by the Communists of mainland China. The Nationalist government and army were forced out of China in 1949.

The Moscow broadcast stated that the Russians handed over to the Chinese Communists all weapons taken when the Japanese Kwantung army surrended. Among the weapons listed were 700,000 rifles, 11,000 light machine guns, 3,000 heavy machine guns, 1,800 pieces of artillery, 2,500 mortars, more than 700 tanks, 900 warplanes, and 800 large arsenal depots.

Charging the Peking regime with ingratitude, Radio Moscow said the Chinese Communists are returning good with evil and are inciting the people to hate their "Russian friends." The broadcast added: "Now Mao Tse-tung has even ordered that no more mentioning of the Russian aid should be made. The Soviet Union's intervention in the China situation after the war was a great help to Mao in his effort to take over the Chinese mainland. It was in northeast China that Mao and his followers established his so-called people's armed forces and bases for later development. But now Mao is attributing all these to his own efforts."

The fact of Russian transfer of surrendered Japanese arms has long been known, but Russian acknowledgment of the volume of the armament which made possible Nationalist defeat and communist victory is a useful addition to the historical record.

Almost 20 years ago we recorded that President Franklin D. Roosevelt's war aims in Asia had gone boom with the communist take-over of China. The American diplomacy which led straight to Pearl Harbor was predicated on the doctrine that the United States could not stand idly by and accept the subjugation of China at the hands of Japan. The minimum conditions of Secretary of State Hull in 1941 required the Japanese to withdraw entirely from China.

So America, in four years of bloody struggle, defeated Japan and forced its expulsion from the Asiatic mainland. Russia entered the war in the last few days and, as Moscow now admits, improved the opportunity to arm the Chinese Communists for a civil war against the Nationalists. Though this outcome could be foreseen, the Truman administration began complaining that the Nationalists were a "one party" government and that "democratic reform" demanded that it broaden "to include other political elements"—namely the Communists.

Gen. George C. Marshall was sent to China on a special mission to force Chiang Kai-shek into a coalition with the Communists. Though the Nationalists then had the Communists on the run, Marshall imposed a truce, effective Jan. 13, 1946. To enforce his idiotic dictate that Chiang must admit Communists into the government, Marshall saw to it that the Nationalist government did not receive a single American cartridge for 20 months, and that for 18 months it did not receive any planes or plane parts, though America was pledged to maintain 8⅓ government air groups.

Meanwhile, the Communists were being armed by the Russians, and, three months later, when this was accomplished, they broke the truce. The Nationalists responded forcefully but were again called off by Marshall. Meanwhile, the Communists were able to regroup and obtain further soviet aid. From then on in, their victory was assured.

The folly of American policy is indisputable. There is some small satisfaction in the fact that, since its falling out with Peking over Marxian ideology, Moscow also has cause to complain, but that satisfaction is not very great.

Equal Employment Opportunity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 11, 1967

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, in advancing the cause of equal employment opportunity for all our citizens, regardless of race, creed, color, or national origin, we have benefited from the leadership of outstanding American business firms.

One such firm has been the Lockheed Aircraft Corp., of my home State of California.

In addition to being the first U.S. company to sign a voluntary "plan for progress" to increase its efforts on behalf of members of minority groups, Lockheed has more recently expanded that effort by adding programs in allied fields such as youth opportunity and hard-core unemployment.

Lockheed's president, Mr. A. C. Kotchian, in a recent corporate management memo sent to all supervisory employees, stressed again that helping our disadvantaged citizens find and keep meaningful employment must become a prime objective of all American industrial concerns.

Reviewing recent efforts in this field, Mr. Kotchian stated:

> We have made good progress. Nevertheless, it is clear that we cannot be content with past or current efforts. We must do more. . . . We have an economic, social, and moral responsibility to provide greater job opportunities for the disadvantaged.

Because this Lockheed Corp. memo is such an excellent illustration of enlightened, forward-looking business management policy, closely attuned to the pressing needs of today's urban society, I would like to insert the entire text of the memo in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point:

CORPORATE MANAGEMENT MEMO TO ALL MEMBERS OF SUPERVISION

AUGUST 24, 1967.

From A. Carl Kotchian.

Subject: Equal Employment Opportunity.

I am attaching to this Memo a copy of a revised Management Policy Statement on equal opportunity. We have broadened our original statement not only to lay more emphasis on our Plan for Progress but also to include our more recent activities in youth opportunity and opportunity for the hard-core unemployed.

I would like to call your attention to the strength of our commitment to this policy and to urge you to give it your wholehearted support.

Everyone is of course aware of the serious problem of civil unrest that plagues the cities of our nation. All of us must be concerned with the underlying causes. One of these, surely, is lack of job opportunities for the "disadvantaged"—those for whom employment opportunities have been limited because of racial or cultural background, inadequate education, past lack of success, low motivation, or police records.

To help these people find and keep meaningful employment must become a prime objective of all American business and industry. It is a prime objective of Lockheed.

We of course have had a policy of equal opportunity for many years. We were a "merit employer" as far back as 1941. In 1961 we were the first company to sign a voluntary Plan for Progress to increase our efforts in behalf of minority races. More recently we have expanded that effort and have added programs in allied fields such as youth opportunity and hard-core unemployment.

All this has been useful, and we have made good progress. Nevertheless, it is clear that we cannot be content with past or current effort. We must do more.

This we plan to do. In the months and years ahead we will pursue existing programs diligently and add new ones.

We have an economic, social, and moral responsibility to provide greater job opportunities for the disadvantaged. It is my hope that in this area we can demonstrate the same kind of leadership that we have achieved in technical fields. The challenge is equally great, and the need is equally important.

In all of this we need your help and the help of everyone throughout our entire organization. I want to urge you who are in supervision to pay particular attention to the need to employ disadvantaged people wherever you can do so effectively and to give them every opportunity to qualify for advancement.

We expect that such people will be entering our plants in increasing numbers as our programs continue and grow. When they do, it will be up to all of us to give them all the help and encouragement they need to adjust to what to many will be a new and strange environment. We must help them become productive employees and to develop to the full potential of their abilities. I should point out that we are already finding that many of them have high potential.

I want to reassure you that no one will be asked to accept people who are not qualified to do the job. Every new hire from disadvantaged groups will be qualified for his job by virtue of ability, aptitude, or special training. I do ask that you be realistic in your requirements, that you be sympathetic and understanding with those who have adjustment problems, and that you give active, not passive, support to our policy. Your own attitude will largely determine the success or failure of our entire program.

This will require some extra effort on the part of all of us, but it is an effort that in conscience we cannot fail to make. We have before us the challenge to make equal opportunity a living reality. We must accept this challenge as a solemn responsibility.

I know you share my conviction that it is among the most important challenges that confront us, and I hope you will make, as I have made, a personal commitment to meet it.

A. CARL KOTCHIAN,
President.

"Lawyers Who Love the Law Enough To Pray for It"—Homily Delivered by the Reverend Patrick J. Holloran, S.J., at 25th Annual Lawyers Red Mass at St. Louis' Old Cathedral

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 19, 1967

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, each year the Catholic Lawyers Guild of St. Louis sponsors a votive Mass of the Holy Spirit, traditionally known as "The Red Mass," in the basilica of St. Louis, King of France, the lovely old Cathedral, which is the site on which the first Mass was celebrated in St. Louis in 1764, and is the oldest cathedral west of the Mississippi River. On Friday, September 15, the 25th annual lawyers red Mass was held.

On this notable occasion, the former president of St. Louis University, the Reverend Patrick J. Holloran, S.J., delivered the homily describing the role of the lawyer in helping to achieve "the just and peaceful living of men within the framework of civilized society."

> The practice of law can be one of the three things—

Father Holloran declared.

> It can be sheer slavery: or it can be one of the most honored of professions, as well as one productive of extremely great good; or it can be a splendid Christian vocation, resulting in high sanctity.

My husband loved the law with a devotion I found hard to understand until I became a Member of the Congress of the United States and a participant in the writing of our laws.

For my many colleagues who are members of the legal profession and who undoubtedly share the high valves ascribed to the moral practice of the law by Father Holloran at the 25th annual lawyers red Mass in St. Louis, I submit the text of the homily as follows:

HOMILY DELIVERED BY THE REVEREND PATRICK J. HOLLORAN, S.J., AT THE 25TH ANNUAL LAWYERS RED MASS, ST. LOUIS OLD CATHEDRAL, SEPTEMBER 15, 1967

"He who shall confess me before men, him shall I confess before my Father who is in Heaven." Words taken from the Holy Gospel according to Saint Luke, the 9th Chapter.

Today must be considered a most auspicious day, for it marks a full quarter century during which an honored and an esteemed profession has, as a body, offered the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass to God, humbly asking His blessing and guidance on the endeavors of the year. No more splendid or practical an act could be imagined—for the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass is, first of all, the most sublime action that takes place on this earth, repeating as it does, Christ's sovereign sacrifice of Calvary, and rising heavenward. It is the one act performed on this earth that is completely worthy of God.

Secondly, it is primarily an act of justice, for Calvary atoned for the transgressions of the world; it offered to the outraged majesty of God adequate satisfaction for the shortcomings of mankind—the weakness and the wickedness—of mankind.

For a full quarter of a century you gentlemen of the law have offered this divine sacrifice to God in the interests of your profession, to the honor of the greatest of the cardinal virtues, and in sincere supplication that the law, which all men of good will cherish, and which is the only safeguard of justice, may ever flourish in our midst and achieve its noble goal.

Not only do we honor the law; we love it, we love it enough to pray for it both publicly and perseveringly, as this twenty-fifth annual Lawyers Red Mass renders eloquent testimony.

As I think we are all aware, law—or rather the practice of law—can be one of three things. It can be sheer slavery; or it can be one of the most honored of professions, as well as one productive of extremely great good; or it can be a splendid Christian vocation, resulting in high sanctity.

The practice of law can be slavery, in the strict Funk and Wagnalls definition of the term—"involuntary servitude, complete subjection; mental, moral or spiritual bondage; slavish toil, drudgery." It can be slavery to procedures, it can be slavery to persons. It can be the endless searching for precedents—perhaps not too wisely arrived at by a not-too-bright person, but bearing some remote or tenuous relationship to the matter at hand. Such work can be done by a nimble high school lad or a moderately experienced law librarian. It is devoid of all the enthusiasm and joy of achievement in discovering and defending justice, the right and equity before the bar of law, and before the higher bar of truth and men's most honorable and conscientious conviction.

Or it can be slavery to persons, frequently not the most upright, but who hold the role of client, perhaps with unpardonable arrogance, and generally with unreasonable demands upon my excellent education and experience, as well as my fine mind, but more particularly on my good name and my position in the community of respected men. In many such instances the law is truly slavery, and although it may be in countless instances very lucrative, it has very little in common with the joyous and noble freedom always known by the men who both cherish and contribute greatly to the profession they love, and of which they are an ornament.

Or the law can be by every standard of judgment one of the most honored and necessary or professions. The sublime plan of Almighty God put men together in this world as members of society, in which all are equal in origin, nature and destiny, possessed of both rights and duties that elevate them immeasurably above all else in visible creation. On the twin anvils of centuries of experience and a wholesome wealth of wisdom and good judgment the men of this society have hammered out a quite genuinely acceptable canon of conduct which adequately protects the rights of both individuals and groups, as well as sharply delineating the duties of others, again both individuals and groups. In an almost endless variety of circumstances and conditions the law has provided for the just and peaceful living of men within the framework of civilized society. This code of conduct has been magnificently drawn up and preserved, and the faithful adherence to this code clearly establishes among cultured human beings what differentiates them from the barbarian, the hoodlum and the anarchist. It has always been the splendid function of the courts of the land to safeguard this code of conduct in all its various aspects.

One of the most comforting and heartwarming of experiences which comes to an individual, finding himself a victim of fraud, or threat, or brutality, or injustice is the assuring word of a good lawyer that he is within his rights, and that his fortune or his home, his life or his loved one have the strong and dependable protection of the law, and that anxiety and fear may be safely dismissed.

Providing that peace and security, in the right, is the privilege of every good lawyer, for to the worried and fearful client he extends a fine education and all he has gathered from it; he provides a thorough and competent knowledge of the magnificient structure of the law of the land; he supplies an up-to-the-minute acquaintance with the wisdom and skill and fine interpretation of law found in literally hundreds of scholarly legal journals. This devoted act, promising faithfully that all the powers of modern legal knowledge and the finest of human thought will be unsparingly invoked in safeguarding the right, is on the finest deeds of humankind.

Thirdly, the law can be a splendid Christian vocation, resulting in high sanctity. Just about a half century ago, as World War I was drawing to a close, the then reigning Holy Father, Benedict XV gave to the world his masterful encyclical: "Pacem, Dei munus pulcherrimum"—Peace, God's most spendid work. The beautiful definition of peace, as given to the human race over fifteen hundred years ago by the great Augustine of Hippo, has never been improved upon: "Peace is the tranquillity of order." And order is preserved only by law.

In this marvelous world in which we are privileged to pass our earthly careers we are constantly confronted with manifestations of God's wondrous order, all guided by God's natural laws. The quiet, restful majesty of the night is always followed by the bright productive possibility of the day. The seasons ever follow one the other with unfailing regularity, making possible the abundant and almost infinitely varied fruitfulness of the earth. The heavenly bodies rotate through space in flawlessly fixed fidelity to God's law. But the most splendid of the works of Almighty God is the blessed order of peace; that tranquil order that exists among the children of men, who form the crowning glory of His entire visible creation.

It is an order that exists within the ranks of thoughtful, free beings; an order the excellence of which they perceive, and not only choose but with dedication preserve with hand and head and heart. Only law can guarantee this cherished goal, and in doing so partakes in God's most splendid work. Peace reigns in the individual human conscience in its love for and faithfulness to the tranquillity of order; it remains in the home, within the nation and in the family of nations, by a similar love for and dedication to the order which law establishes and maintains.

The Creator's laws for those creatures whom He made to His own image and likeness differs from every other law that God has established for the universe. All God's other laws work necessarily; there is no escaping their powerful but blind effectiveness. The energy stored in coal and oil, the power of electricity and the atom; the nourishing life of plant and fruit and grain; all operate by inescapable compulsion; all form part of God's wondrous order by the inexorable law of their natures.

Alone in this entire visible creation man conforms to God's sublime order for human living with knowledge and with freedom; and possessing the knowledge by which he can recognize God's law and the freedom by which he can obey that law, God awaits man's free and knowing observance of His law in order that at the close of life's career He might commend him with those grandest words of all approval: "Well done, good and faithful servant, enter into the joys of your Lord."

To others we entrust the task of caring for the ills to which the human body is heir; the striking task of throwing bridge after bridge over the Father of Waters, on whose banks we are this morning gathered; the task of mapping the highways of the earth and of the skies; to others we entrusted the task of erecting our wondrous Arch, the Gateway to the West, in the shadow of which, literally, we are kneeling this day.

Ours is the task of creating and preserving that nobler work of order among men, that from this proving ground for Heaven, the tranquility of which the Creator has placed in our hands, man might enter everlasting happiness, where again, order is the first law.

For the twenty-fifth consecutive year we are humbly asking God's blessing and aid that we may prove equal to and worthy of the task; that we who have confessed Him before men, in our chosen profession, might merit a like commendation from Him before His Father in Heaven.

Urban Planning for the Future—Cooperation Between the Government and the Financial Community

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 25, 1967

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson has called for a joining of the private financial interests with the Federal Government in an attack on the problems of urban living in today's America. The thrift industry is ready and willing to participate in the revitalization of our cities, and the following speech given by Dr. Saul B. Klaman, vice president and chief economist of the National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, before the 1967 convention of the Savings Association League of New York, points the way toward that necessary cooperation.

I commend Dr. Klaman's remarks to the attention of our colleagues, as follows:

THRIFT INSTITUTIONS AND THE TOTAL URBAN COMPLEX

(A summary of remarks by Dr. Saul B. Klaman, vice president and chief economist, National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, before the 1967 convention of the Savings Association League of New York State, White Sulphur Springs, W. Va., September 6, 1967)

Has 1967 ushered in the millennium for thrift institutions? Month after month of record-breaking saving flows with near-record yields available on high-quality loans and investments. The realization of a financial manager's dream! And it has come right on the heels of the disastrous "disintermediation" of 1966. It has come, moreover, after a long history of financial perversity—high saving flows in periods of low yields and vice versa.

What has brought about this dramatic change? How are savings institutions able to compete so effectively in a still churning, uncertain financial environment? In a continued high and rising interest rate structure? It is in just such an environment that savings and loans and savings banks have found the going toughest. Indeed the bitter lesson of 1966, all financial observers agreed, was that thrift institutions are unable to compete for savings with commercial banks and open-market instruments when interest rates are high and rising. The prescription for this diagnosis was a major overhaul in structure and operations of the thrift industry.

Does our 1967 performance negate this prescription? Before we convince ourselves that all is well; that a structural overhaul is unnecessary; that 1966 was probably a freak year anyway; let's take a brief look at some of the underlying differences between 1966 and 1967:

1. Yields on shorter-term securities, most competitive with deposit interest rates, have only recently been rising and are still well below 1966 levels.

2. Federal agency and direct Treasury issues have, so far this year, been offered in smaller volume and less attractive yields than a year ago.

3. Interest rate ceilings have probably prevented a competitive scramble for savings, and consumer C.D.'s are not the attraction they were a year ago.

4. Thrift institutions are generally offering higher deposit interest rates, which are more favorable relative to alternative yields than a year ago.

5. There is more widespread use by thrift institutions of differential savings plans and deposit rates, which have attracted more savings and reduced withdrawals.

One can look further to find other basic differences between 1966 and 1967 which have made for a strikingly different performance by thrift institutions. The point is that beneath the surface similarities vital differences emerge, which do not support the view that our fundamental problems have been resolved. If interest rates should rise further, for example, I would hate to guess the consequences of a Treasury "Magic Six" this year or next. And for the longer-run, do we really want to live with deposit interest rate controls to protect us against ourselves and others?

To be sure, savings institutions are enjoying a great year—perhaps the best in history. But this is hardly the millenium; it does not assure our competitive resiliency into the infinite future. It does not, in short, obviate the need for structural changes in a dynamic financial environment.

Some financial observers believe, in fact, that even though savings are once again piling up at tellers' windows, specialized savings institutions will not, in the long run, be able to compete in a high interest rate climate characterized by rapid and unpredictable financial change. In this view, savings and loans and savings banks are the inevitably fated victims of a sort of financial Darwinism, marked for extinction because their basic role in economic life is becoming increasingly ill-suited to the rapidly changing environment in which they must function.

If these forecasts of doom prove to be right, it will not be because savings institutions are inherently ill-suited to modern economic life, but rather because they simply failed to adapt naturally to the evolving economic and financial needs of a modern urban society. And this does not call for the abandonment of our historic purposes and functions. Those who say so simply fail to appreciate the true economic role of the savings institution.

Savings banks and savings and loans have always been *consumer* financial specialists. The former, organized to promote individual thrift, the latter to promote individual home ownership, will maintain this traditional consumer orientation *by evolving from their narrow functional specialization of the past to a broader specialization of tomorrow*. This broader, though specialized economic role, must be *based on meeting all of the changing financial needs of consumers and families through their entire economic life cycle*. One does not have to be a prophet, therefore, to foresee the natural evolution of savings and loans and savings banks into the nation's primary family banking system specializing in a comprehensive package of consumer-oriented financial services—thrift, loans, insurance, counseling, and money-transfer activities.

And this natural evolutionary development will be successfully accomplished only if savings institutions successfully meet the major domestic challenge of our times—the revitalization of our cities and the rebuilding of our entire urban complex. For it is only in a healthy urban society that our institutions can flourish.

The federal government's commitment to urban problem-solving is large and growing. It extends well beyond the thrift institutions' traditional interests in housing and mortgage finance. It ranges from air pollution to blighted neighborhoods, to central city congestion, to ill-used land, to urban ghettoization, to shortages of community facilities, to inadequate and outmoded transport facilities, and to a myriad of other interrelated urban problems.

But it is increasingly apparent that the national commitment to urban problem-solving does not involve government alone. The private sector must substantially broaden its own basic commitment in this area, not in some selfless sense of contributing to the nation's social and economic welfare, but in its own self-interest. What we need to establish is a creative partnership between the private and public sectors, *a partnership which will seek the realization of broadly accepted public goals through maximum use of private means.*

And who is better qualified to lead the private sector in financing the revitalization of our nation's cities than savings banks and savings and loans? We are the nation's original anti-poverty fighters. We have always been urban-oriented. We are currently the leading sources of residential mortgage credit—savings and loans in the conventional mortgage area, savings banks in the FHA and VA area. This residential base must now be broadened to encompass the total urban complex.

The narrow functional specialization in home mortgage finance seems to me increasingly less justified in our broadened and interrelated urban society. Houses are not built, nor lived in, in isolation. A myriad of supplementary facilities and buildings are obviously necessary for complete family living. President Johnson recently announced plans for a new community to be built on federally-owned land with private financing, which in addition to housing for 25,000 people, would include schools, recreational, shopping and service facilities, and light industry as well. And the nation's largest home builder, William Levitt, has just announced the launching of several self-contained communities to include living, working and recreational facilities. The nation's thrift institutions must therefore, be geared to finance this total urban complex, not just the housing.

There is thus, no longer any special advantage of reason to limit an institution's lending activities to home finance. Why should it be left for other institutions to finance all of the essential supplementary non-residential facilities? The natural evolutionary role, especially of the savings and loan association, in an increasingly complex urban society, will be to broaden its specialization from home finance to urban finance. Housing finance may continue to be the lending core but urban finance must be the total target.

How can it be otherwise in a nation where 8 out of 10 Americans will soon be living and working in urban areas; where 3 out of 4 will live in metropolitan areas. In New York, 7 out of 8 already live in metropolitan areas. And in the Northeast region we are now witnessing a gradual merging of contiguous metropolitan areas into vast "strip cities" stretching for hundreds of miles and containing tens of million of people.

The sound growth of the megalopolis will require sound urban financing institutions. Savings banks and savings and loan associations will find a growing identity of interest as they move towards becoming the nation's prime urban family financial centers.

A unified, strengthened urban thrift system seems clearly in the making. And as we move in this direction, the process of financial Darwinism will lead not to the disappearance of the savings institution species but rather to its evolution to a higher stage.

Soviet Handling of the Tatars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 25, 1967

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, usually items inserted into the Record are editorials but occasionally a straight news story has an impact that makes editorializing unnecessary. Such a story in the September 20 edition of the Washington, D.C., Evening Star telling of the Soviet handling of the Tatars dramatizes the disregard for human rights and the colonization policies being perpetrated within the Soviet Union by the Russians to the detriment of non-Russian nationalities in that state.

The article follows:

Tatars Rehabilitated, May Return to Crimea

(By Edmund Stevens)

Moscow.—The Crimean Tatars have at long last been rehabilitated and presumably are free to settle in the homeland from which they were deported in 1944, if they wish to.

A decree issued by the Supreme Soviet has cleared them of blanket charges of collaborating as a group with the Nazi occupation—charges leveled when Soviet armed forces retook the Crimea in 1944.

The decree states that instances when "a certain portion of the Crimean Tatars collaborated with the invaders had been used to incriminate the entire Crimean Tatar population unjustly and that the decree accordingly voided the various punitive measures against citizens of Tatar nationality who formerly lived in the Crimea stemming from these unfounded wholesale accusations."

COMPANION DECISION

In a companion decision the Supreme Soviet said that Crimean Tatars and members of their families were now free to live wherever they wished in the USSR on the same basis as other Soviet citizens.

This is interpreted to mean they may resettle in their old homeland, which they were barred from doing until now.

I was among a group of foreign correspondents taken on a tour of the Crimea on the morrow of its liberation by the Red Army in mid-May 1944.

The corpses had not yet been removed from the battlefields and charred ruins were still smoking. But the Tatar village not far from Yalta, in which we were billeted, was buzzing with rumors of impending mass deportation.

Local Russian and Ukrainian civilians with whom we talked were voluble and bitter about how Tatars had collaborated with the Germans by serving as gendarmes, in the Gestapo and even enrolling in the SS.

CUSTOMARY RUTHLESSNESS

The collaborators were accused of having informed on their non-Tatar neighbors and of aiding the occupation authorities in ferreting out members of the underground resistance.

While it's doubtless true that not all Tatars were guilty of collaborating, the proportion must have been fairly large.

In any event, Stalin reacted with customary ruthlessness and lost no time before rounding up the entire Crimean Tatar community which, before the war, numbered about 125,000 or roughly one-quarter of the total Crimean population.

The operation was carried out with such thoroughness that to this day there's not a Tatar left in the Crimea.

The policy was to expunge all reference to the Crimean Tatars from history and reference books. They simply became an "unpeople."

A similar fate was shared by other nationalities judged guilty of collaborating with the enemy, such as the Chechens, Ingushi and Balkarians in the Caucasus, and the Kalmyks of the Volga steppes.

VOLGA GERMANS

The Volga Germans previously had been moved from their farmlands in the middle Volga area to the Altai territory in Siberia as a preventive security measure immediately after Hitler invaded.

Chechens, Ingushi, Balkarians and Kalmyks were all rehabilitated and repatriated to their homelands, which were restored to their former status as autonomous nationality republics in 1957.

But the Crimean Tatars and Volga Germans were bypassed then.

No move has yet been made to return the Germans to the Volga nor is one likely.

It's also problematical how many Crimean Tatars will want to go back now as they are well integrated in their present areas of resettlement, mainly in Tadjikistan and Kazakhstan, where many are reported doing very well.

New Director for Voice of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 25, 1967

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, September 20, 1967, the well-known American newsman, Mr. John Charles Daly, was sworn in as Assistant Director of the U.S. Information Agency in charge of its broadcast branch, the Voice of America.

When Leonard H. Marks, Director of USIA, announced earlier this year that Mr. Daly would succeed the equally capable John Chancellor, as Director of the Voice of America, Mr. Bernie Harrison, radio and television critic for the Washington, D.C., Star stated:

> The Voice is getting a pro to succeed a pro.

The famed American newsman and columnist, Bob Considine, stated:

> John Daly is the perfect choice for the exciting but little-understood job of directing the activities of the Voice of America.

The United States is indeed fortunate to be able to attract to Government service men with the skills and dedication of Mr. Daly and Mr. Chancellor and as noted by Director Marks "at a considerable sacrifice of income."

To John Daly, we say "thank you—and welcome to the challenges inherent in this vital task which you now undertake as Director of the Voice of America."

Parent-Child Preschool Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 11, 1967

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, the Los Angeles Times has given a ringing editorial endorsement to one of our finest local antipoverty programs, the parent-child preschool classes project, conducted by the Los Angeles School District, which brought together more than 3,000 disadvantaged children and parents as a supplement to the Headstart program.

Because of the tremendous success achieved by this parent-child preschool project, and because of its proven value to the community, I would like to insert in the Congressional Record the text of the Los Angeles Times editorial, as well as an excellent article on the project by Times Staff Writer Jack Jones:

[From the Los Angeles Times, Sept. 6, 1967]

Preschool Project Must Continue

The Parent-Child Preschool Classes project apparently has everything an effective anti-poverty program should have—except financing.

Conducted by the Los Angeles School District, these classes brought together more than 3,000 disadvantaged children and parents as a supplement to the Head Start preschool program.

A major limitation of the otherwise highly successful Project Head Start has been the lack of parental participation in preparing children for the transition from slum environment to schoolroom. The local parent-child pilot program developed new attitudes and taught new skills to the adults, thereby making the home a definite part of the preschool training process.

Total cost for the entire program, conducted at 40 different sites, was $306,662 for the past school year. That figure is considered relatively low in comparison with other anti-poverty program costs, and it seemed certain that the effort would be renewed or even expanded on the basis of results.

Unfortunately the project is caught in the anti-poverty tangle of fiscal red tape. It can't qualify for Head Start financing because classes are held only weekly. And there isn't sufficient "community action program" funding for the classes and other existing projects.

The continued hang-up on funding probably means that no classes can be held during the coming semester. But the local and federal anti-poverty agencies must find ways to assure that this worthwhile effort will be resumed as soon as possible.

Cutting the red tape can't be all that difficult.

[From the Los Angeles Times, Sept. 5, 1967]

Preschool Classes for Parent, Child Apparently Killed

(By Jack Jones)

An innovative local antipoverty program that brought parents together with their preschool children for the education of both apparently has gone down the drain in another of those last-minute funding decisions.

In this case the victim happens to be Parent-Child Preschool Classes, which under the Los Angeles City School District's adult education division during the past school year involved 1,250 mothers, 30 fathers and more than 1,800 children at 40 sites.

By observing professional teachers and participating in classes, parents were taught to develop new attitudes and skills to guide their children at home. In short, they learned to communicate.

Ironically, the end of the program in poverty areas of Los Angeles may have been been caused by its administrators' attempts to save it in the face of severe antipoverty cutbacks by Congress.

Last year, Parent-Child operated under a $306,662 federal Office of Economic Opportunity community action grant which expired last week.

FUNDS MAY DROP 50 PERCENT

With community action money being whittled in favor of such popular programs as Operation Head Start, this county may get about half the community action funds it received last year.

OEO has estimated, based on the drift in Congress, that Los Angeles County's 1967–68 fiscal year community action total will be about $11 million compared to the old guideline of $21 million.

Putting further pressure on the situation is the fact that the Economic and Youh Opportunities Agency now must share those funds with four other community action agencies newly operative around the county.

The EYOA, losing its hope of financing very many community action projects—designed at the neighborhood level—already is pressing the OEO to pay for $4.5 million worth of special school programs on top of the $11 million guideline.

All of this seemed to indicate that if the Parent-Child Preschool project was to survive, it should be included as part of the coming year's countywide Head Start program rather than as part of the special school package (community action).

OEO officials seemed fairly enthusiastic about it, said Mrs. Evelyn Pickarts, City School District supervisor of parent education.

But early last week—too late to get written into the community action package—the OEO regional office in San Francisco notified the School District that because Parent-Child classes met only once a week, the project does not qualify as a Head Start increment.

"Now we're getting calls from parents asking 'When do we start?' " Mrs. Pickarts said. "We had our 40 teachers standing by, but there aren't going to be any classes."

Actually, a similar program has been operating as an adult education program in middle-class neighborhoods for 30 years.

LARGER CLASSES

Larger classes and more immediate parental response in those areas make the program supportable through state funds based on average daily attendance.

"But," she said, "we just won't have it for the poor any more."

She said that since the program has been operating in poverty neighborhoods, there are many examples of mothers who have learned to know and work with their children.

Some have shown new interest in community action and have realized they need more education and have gone on to other forms of adult training she said.

"And we have seen noticeable improvement in the children—their relationship to each other and to adults."

The change is remarkable, she suggested, in a child whose mother has suddenly begun to read to him at home. Or, if she can't read, to tell him (or her) stories.

LEADS TO UNDERSTANDING

To last year's 1,250 mothers and 30 fathers, "child development" was a term that finally became understandable.

"We feel it's been very important," Mrs. Pickarts said. "And it's a very inexpensive program compared to others."

The School District had applied for $195,000 to Head Start funds to operate 50 classes at schools, parks, churches and housing projects.

Meanwhile, with federal approval so far for only $1.5 million worth of the total school antipoverty package, other projects already have been trimmed back or held in abeyance.

School opportunity centers to provide accelerated before-and-after school instruction, Saturday school classes and extended day classes have been cut from the proposal by the city schools.

The county schools have dropped a proposal for a project to develop community relations through outdoor science projects in the Bassett School District.

And the EYOA is hoping that the $1.5 million already approved plus the other $3 million it seeks for the schools package will not have to come out of its probable $11 million community action allocation.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the Congressional Record, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H–112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the Record at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the Record should be processed through this office.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402, at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the Congressional Record, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the Record.

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20515

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Speaker: John W. McCormack

Abbitt, Watkins M., *Va*	
Abernethy, Thomas G., *Miss.*	6278 29th St.
Adair, E. Ross, *Ind*	4000 Mass. Ave.
Adams, Brock, *Wash*	
Addabbo, Joseph P., *N.Y*	
Albert, Carl, *Okla*	4614 Reno Rd.
Anderson, John B., *Ill*	
Anderson, William R., *Tenn.*	3006 P St.
Andrews, George W., *Ala*	
Andrews, Mark, *N. Dak*	
Annunzio, Frank, *Ill*	
Arends, Leslie C., *Ill*	4815 Dexter St.
Ashbrook, John M., *Ohio*	
Ashley, Thomas L., *Ohio*	
Ashmore, Robert T., *S.C*	
Aspinall, Wayne N., *Colo*	The Towers Apts., 4201 Cathedral Ave.
Ayres, William H., *Ohio*	
Baring, Walter S., *Nev*	
Barrett, William A., *Pa*	
Bates, William H., *Mass*	
Battin, James F., *Mont*	
Belcher, Page, *Okla*	
Bell, Alphonzo, *Calif*	
Bennett, Charles E., *Fla*	3421 Rusticway Lane, Falls Church, Va.
Berry, E. Y., *S. Dak*	118 Schotts Court NE.
Betts, Jackson E., *Ohio*	
Bevill, Tom, *Ala*	6224 N. 35th St., Arlington, Va.
Biester, Edward G., Jr., *Pa*	
Bingham, Jonathan B., *N.Y.*	
Blackburn, Benjamin B., *Ga.*	
Blanton, Ray, *Tenn*	
Blatnik, John A., *Minn*	
Boggs, Hale, *La*	
Boland, Edward P., *Mass*	
Bolling, Richard, *Mo*	307 Warrenton Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Bolton, Frances P. (Mrs.), *Ohio.*	2301 Wyo. Ave.
Bow, Frank T., *Ohio*	4301 Mass. Ave.
Brademas, John, *Ind*	
Brasco, Frank J., *N.Y*	
Bray, William G., *Ind*	
Brinkley, Jack, *Ga*	
Brock, W. E. (Bill), *Tenn*	
Brooks, Jack, *Tex*	
Broomfield, William S., *Mich.*	
Brotzman, Donald G., *Colo*	
Brown, Clarence J., Jr., *Ohio.*	
Brown, Garry, *Mich*	
Brown, George E., Jr., *Calif*	
Broyhill, James T., *N.C*	
Broyhill, Joel T., *Va*	
Buchanan, John, *Ala*	
Burke, J. Herbert, *Fla*	
Burke, James A., *Mass*	
Burleson, Omar, *Tex*	
Burton, Laurence J., *Utah*	
Burton, Phillip, *Calif*	
Bush, George, *Tex*	
Button, Daniel E., *N.Y*	
Byrne, James A., *Pa*	
Byrnes, John W., *Wis*	1215 25th St. S., Arlington, Va.
Cabell, Earle, *Tex*	
Cahill, William T., *N.J*	
Carey, Hugh L., *N.Y*	
Carter, Tim Lee, *Ky*	
Casey, Bob, *Tex*	
Cederberg, Elford A., *Mich*	
Celler, Emanuel, *N.Y*	The Mayflower
Chamberlain, Charles E., *Mich.*	
Clancy, Donald D., *Ohio*	
Clark, Frank M., *Pa*	220 C St. SE.
Clausen, Don H., *Calif*	
Clawson, Del, *Calif*	
Cleveland, James C., *N.H*	
Cohelan, Jeffery, *Calif*	1202 Longworth House Office Bldg.
Collier, Harold R., *Ill*	
Colmer, William M., *Miss*	
Conable, Barber B., Jr., *N.Y.*	
Conte, Silvio O., *Mass*	5619 Lamar Rd., Washington 16, D.C.
Conyers, John, Jr., *Mich*	
Corbett, Robert J., *Pa*	
Corman, James C., *Calif*	
Cowger, William O., *Ky*	
Cramer, William C., *Fla*	6215 Beachway Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Culver, John C., *Iowa*	
Cunningham, Glenn, *Nebr*	
Curtis, Thomas B., *Mo*	
Daddario, Emilio Q., *Conn*	
Daniels, Dominick V., *N.J*	
Davis, Glenn R., *Wis*	
Davis, John W., *Ga*	
Dawson, William L., *Ill*	
de la Garza, Eligio, *Tex*	
Delaney, James J., *N.Y*	
Dellenback, John R., *Oreg*	6903 Crail Dr., Bethesda, Md.
Denney, Robert V., *Nebr*	
Dent, John H., *Pa*	
Derwinski, Edward J., *Ill*	
Devine, Samuel L., *Ohio*	
Dickinson, William L., *Ala*	
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., *Mich*	
Dingell, John D., *Mich*	
Dole, Robert, *Kans*	6136 Beachway Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Donohue, Harold D., *Mass*	
Dorn, Wm. Jennings Bryan, *S.C.*	2030 Laburnum St., McLean, Va.
Dow, John G., *N.Y*	
Dowdy, John, *Tex*	
Downing, Thomas N., *Va*	
Dulski, Thaddeus J., *N.Y*	347 Cannon House Office Building
Duncan, John J., *Tenn*	
Dwyer, Florence P. (Mrs.), *N.J.*	
Eckhardt, Bob, *Tex*	
Edmondson, Ed, *Okla*	
Edwards, Don, *Calif*	9201 Fox Meadow La., Potomac, Md.,
Edwards, Edwin W., *La*	
Edwards, Jack, *Ala*	
Eilberg, Joshua, *Pa*	
Erlenborn, John N., *Ill*	
Esch, Marvin L., *Mich*	
Eshleman, Edwin D., *Pa*	
Evans, Frank E., *Colo*	
Everett, Robert A., *Tenn*	
Evins, Joe L., *Tenn*	5044 Klingle St.
Fallon, George H., *Md*	
Farbstein, Leonard, *N.Y*	
Fascell, Dante B., *Fla*	
Feighan, Michael A., *Ohio*	
Findley, Paul, *Ill*	
Fino, Paul A., *N.Y*	
Fisher, O. C., *Tex*	Calvert-Woodley
Flood, Daniel J., *Pa*	The Congressional
Flynt, John J., Jr., *Ga*	
Foley, Thomas S., *Wash*	
Ford, Gerald R., *Mich*	514 Crown View Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Ford, William D., *Mich*	
Fountain, L. H., *N.C*	The Westchester
Fraser, Donald M., *Minn*	
Frelinghuysen, Peter H. B., *N.J.*	3014 N St.
Friedel, Samuel N., *Md*	
Fulton, James G., *Pa*	
Fulton, Richard, *Tenn*	
Fuqua, Don, *Fla*	
Galifianakis, Nick, *N.C*	
Gallagher, Cornelius E., *N.J.*	
Gardner, James C., *N.C*	
Garmatz, Edward A., *Md*	
Gathings, E. C., *Ark*	
Gettys, Tom S., *S.C*	
Giaimo, Robert N., *Conn*	
Gibbons, Sam, *Fla*	
Gilbert, Jacob H., *N.Y*	
Gonzalez, Henry B., *Tex*	200 C St. SE.
Goodell, Charles E., *N.Y*	3842 Macomb St.
Goodling, George A., *Pa*	
Gray, Kenneth J., *Ill*	
Green, Edith (Mrs.), *Oreg*	
Green, William J., *Pa*	
Griffiths, Martha W., (Mrs.), *Mich.*	
Gross, H. R., *Iowa*	
Grover, James R., Jr., *N.Y*	
Gubser, Charles S., *Calif*	
Gude, Gilbert, *Md*	
Gurney, Edward J., *Fla*	
Hagan, G. Elliott, *Ga*	
Haley, James A., *Fla*	
Hall, Durward G., *Mo*	
Halleck, Charles A., *Ind*	4926 Upton St.
Halpern, Seymour, *N.Y*	
Hamilton, Lee H., *Ind*	
Hammerschmidt, John Paul, *Ark.*	
Hanley, James M., *N.Y*	
Hanna, Richard T., *Calif*	
Hansen, George V., *Idaho*	
Hansen, Julia Butler (Mrs.), *Wash.*	
Hardy, Porter, Jr., *Va*	
Harrison, William Henry, *Wyo.*	
Harsha, William H., *Ohio*	
Harvey, James, *Mich*	
Hathaway, William D., *Maine.*	
Hawkins, Augustus F., *Calif.*	
Hays, Wayne L., *Ohio*	
Hébert, F. Edward, *La*	26 Cockrell St., Alexandria, Va.
Hechler, Ken, *W. Va*	
Heckler, Margaret M. (Mrs.), *Mass.*	
Helstoski, Henry, *N.J*	
Henderson, David N., *N.C*	
Herlong, A. S., Jr., *Fla*	
Hicks, Floyd V., *Wash*	
Holifield, Chet, *Calif*	
Holland, Elmer J., *Pa*	
Horton, Frank, *N.Y*	
Hosmer, Craig, *Calif*	
Howard, James J., *N.J*	
Hull, W. R., Jr., *Mo*	
Hungate, William L., *Mo*	
Hunt, John E., *N.J*	
Hutchinson, Edward, *Mich*	
Ichord, Richard (Dick), *Mo.*	
Irwin, Donald J., *Conn*	
Jacobs, Andrew, Jr., *Ind*	
Jarman, John, *Okla*	
Joelson, Charles S., *N.J*	
Johnson, Albert W., *Pa*	
Johnson, Harold T., *Calif*	
Jonas, Charles Raper, *N.C*	
Jones, Paul C., *Mo*	1111 Army-Navy Dr., Arlington, Va.
Jones, Robert E., *Ala*	
Jones, Walter B., *N.C*	
Karsten, Frank M., *Mo*	
Karth, Joseph E., *Minn*	
Kastenmeier, Robert W., *Wis.*	
Kazen, Abraham, Jr., *Tex*	
Kee, James, *W. Va*	5441 16th Ave., Hyattsville, Md.
Keith, Hastings, *Mass*	5906 Harwick Rd., Woodacres, Md.
Kelly, Edna F. (Mrs.), *N.Y*	
King, Carleton J., *N.Y*	
King, Cecil R., *Calif*	
Kirwan, Michael J., *Ohio*	
Kleppe, Thomas S., *N. Dak*	
Kluczynski, John C., *Ill*	
Kornegay, Horace R., *N.C*	
Kupferman, Theodore R., *N.Y.*	
Kuykendall, Dan, *Tenn*	
Kyl, John, *Iowa*	
Kyros, Peter N., *Maine*	
Laird, Melvin R., *Wis*	
Landrum, Phil M., *Ga*	
Langen, Odin, *Minn*	
Latta, Delbert L., *Ohio*	
Leggett, Robert L., *Calif*	
Lennon, Alton, *N.C*	
Lipscomb, Glenard P., *Calif.*	
Lloyd, Sherman P., *Utah*	
Long, Clarence D., *Md*	

Appendix

Terrorism Is Routine in Red Rule

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, September 26, 1967

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the September 20, 1967, issue of the Greenville News, Greenville, S.C., contains an editorial entitled "Terrorism Is Routine in Red Rule."

The editorial highlights the Communist's use of terror, murder, and starvation to attain their goals.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TERRORISM IS ROUTINE IN RED RULE

Let those who accuse the United States of deliberately killing and maiming civilians in Vietnam with bombs and rockets and of burning little children with napalm bombs take note of the technique and results of Communist terrorism in Hong Kong, where the United States has been in no way involved.

(Parenthetically, the napalm charges have been as severely distorted and exaggerated as the proven use of poison gas by Communists and their stooges has been foolishly ignored.)

In the weekly Associated Press Log, published for editors and bureaus, attention is called to the fact that Hong Kong has had four months of continuous Communist violence.

AP staff people there have lived amid continuing terror, some of it aimed specifically at them and not merely at anti-Communist civilians and government personnel.

The Chief of the AP bureau reports great difficulty in obtaining the news and greater difficulty in getting it out past government restrictions. He tells grim stories of a little girl and her baby brother being blown to bits by a terrorist bomb, or bombs planted in playgrounds and of men doused with gasoline and set afire.

These are the tactics used by the Communists in areas where they are not in position to use massive force as the Soviets did in putting down the Hungarian rebellion about ten years ago. Both the Soviets and the Red Chinese have used deliberate starvation to bring their own people under the yoke. This is just as heartless if less bloody than the knife, the gun, the fragmentation grenade and the fire bomb.

The latter, however, are the tools of the guerrillas and the less trained infiltrators by means of whom the Reds are exporting their "revolutions" and manning their vicious "national liberation fronts."

The Communists cannot afford to rely on persuasion; where a free popular choice is allowed, they are rejected. Because the hard-core Communists are in a minority everywhere, even in China and Russia, they must use terror and brute force to stage their takeovers, if more subtle means fail, and to rule when they do gain control, by whatever method.

Southeast Asia is rapidly becoming a land of terror where the United States and, to a lesser degree, Great Britain have not succeeded in establishing stable governments as in Burma, Indonesia and Malaysia, not to mention the Philippine Republic. Thailand, Laos, Cambodia and others, as well as Vietnam are feeling it.

And, unless the United States cleans out the Cuban snake pit soon, the Communists will have gained the strength and trained and infiltrated guerrillas and other agents to do the same thing in Latin America.

It is already starting anew in Venezuela, despite the forthright and effective manner in which the civilian police dealt with the Reds in their efforts to upset the last elections.

The Riots Must Cease

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT N. C. NIX
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 26, 1967

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, today, in September 1967, the United States stands uniquely challenged by circumstance and the force of history. We are confronted by a crisis through which we must, if we are to survive, be guided by firmness of purpose, clarity of vision, and staunchness of spirit. We must, as a people, devote ourselves unreservedly to the principles of social justice and individual concern espoused by the Founding Fathers. It is within the power of the present age to vindicate the historic promise of freedom and equality symbolized in the name of America; it is equally possible for us to show the world that the nation from which history has expected so much is in reality no more than a vicious fraud: that our unprecedented experiment in democracy is in truth a sordid sham, a sorry compromise with the forces of selfish intolerance—characterized by neither sincerity nor honest intent.

Today we are engaged, with renewed intensity, in the ancient struggles which have always been uniquely human: the struggles for mastery over the elements and for victory over the forces of darkness in the human soul. In the first of these struggles, we are achieving a modicum of success—though it is a success which at every turn is qualified by the same technology that has fed it.

Let me explain what I mean:

The extirpation of polio and measles, for example, leaves only more obvious, and intolerable, the menace of cancer, mental illness, or heart disease. Having vanquished the now quaintly historical threat of smallpox and plague, we stand helpless before a compulsive national urge to misuse new discoveries—to foul our lungs with cigarette smoke or to defile our minds and chromosomes with hallucinogenic drugs.

Consider the task of education, which grows increasingly difficult as the fund of human knowledge grows proportionately larger. Consider the tendency toward specialization, occasioned by our vast increase in knowledge, which threatens to reduce us all to computerized, dehumanized automatons.

Or consider the problems created by our highly complex, urbanized society problems requiring solutions which only constant scientific research and technological invention can provide.

It is a challenging age in which we live; and discovery is often balanced by discouragement. But make no mistake: wherever science and technology lead, we do make progress, however small. If the elimination of one barrier reveals two greater obstacles, we know, nonetheless, that the first one has been removed: polio is, in fact, obsolete, if cancer is not; and though our store of knowledge is doubling every decade, we have the computer, which helps us to cope with that increase.

The tragic irony is that for all the scientific and technological advancement to our credit, we have failed utterly to improve our understanding of the nature and the spiritual needs of man. It is as Toynbee has written:

> There has always been an extraordinary contrast between our amazing success in dealing with non-human nature, and by comparison, our amazing ill success in dealing with ourselves.

As if to make Toynbee a prophet, we are vindicating his words at this moment: the word crisis is written large across the face of America; and a curious and debilitating anxiety has clouded our future with fear and uncertainty. We, who should know so well, with such confidence, our destiny and purpose in the world, stand terrified before the specter of our own inadequacy, our own tormented soul.

Despite our wealth and our power, our numbers and our general enlightenment, we are a nation divided from within, and we are suffering the consequences of our dishonesty with ourselves. Our national conscience is playing the devil with our spiritual well-being, and the symptoms of the malaise will no longer lie dormant.

In short, America is the scene of a dangerous conflict between its vested white interests and its Negro minority—a conflict whose origins are synonymous with American history itself. The significance which this conflict holds for all Americans is simply that the Negroes—and particularly those who dwell in the urban ghettos—refuse any longer to accept the hypocrisy of white America which they find about them today. If the

American Negro has seen the advent of legislated justice before the law, he has not yet witnessed the reality of education and economic equality. The seriousness of the situation cannot be overemphasized. The savage frustration felt by a large segment of the American population has found, in the summer just past, a tragic, yet all too predictable, outlet. Nor can the senseless and destructive riots which occurred from coast to coast last summer be dismissed merely as a temporary aberration. They are a natural eruption of a grave disorder in our social system, and they will not cease as long as the wound is not cleansed.

I wish to make my position clear: these anomalous abrogations of the social order must cease; they must not be allowed to reoccur. We must seek to harmonize the interests and expectations of all segments of the population if we are to prosper in our common and historic pursuit of justice and equality before the law.

It is, however, not only irrelevant, but also unwise, to call merely for antiriot legislation and a toughening of police security. To be sure, the latter is a measure vital and necessary to the immediate restoration of order and sanity. But stronger police and court action are treatments only of the symptoms, not of the causes, of the illnesses which attend us. In order to make clear the gravity of the problem, and the deep-seated causes which underlie it, let me explore with you the disheartening and disillusioning truth of our national state of affairs. It is, summarily, as Ernest Dunbar wrote recently in Look magazine:

> If there has to be a year, it will probably be 1967. In this year, a significant number of black Americans have given up hope in the "American Dream." It was never more than a nightmare for them, but they clung to the notion that it would somehow be different for their sons and daughters—as their parents had earlier hoped it would be different for them. Now, the message has been received from Oakland to Englewood: It isn't.

It is, indeed, no different:

Equal opportunity notices do not prevent the rejection of black applicants. Labor unions still find ways of preventing black apprentices from joining training programs.

Black tenement dwellers watch while bulldozers level their rat-infested abodes, only to see erected new structures priced out of their reach.

In schools throughout the land, 13 years after the Supreme Court desegregation ruling, millions of black pupils are segregated in schools manned by teachers convinced of their inability to learn and resigned to producing yet another generation of domestic servants and pullman car porters.

In 1967, black youth, precluded from college deferment by second-rate education, are dying in numbers far out of proportion to black representation in the U.S. population.

And thus the story unfolds.

It is, of course, fatuous to expect an immediate rectification of the accumulated injustices of 200 years. It is unrealistic to expect the magic and immediate transformation of ignorance and disadvantage into skilled knowledge and privilege. But it is as W. B. Bentham has aptly observed:

> By losing present time, we lose all time.

And for the moment, it would seem, we are making ill use of the time at hand.

What, then, should we, can we, do?

I would propose three definite objectives, to the end that another year of lawless violence and anarchy be obviated, now and forever.

First, we should implement the legislation we now have on the books, that we may treat effectively and preventively the causes of potential violence which breed in the ghettos and slums.

Of the many grievances calling for proper redress, the general areas of employment, education, and housing are the most sensitive and require the most urgent treatment. Until the Negro can increase his earning power, and therefore improve his physical environment, until educational opportunity becomes a reality for urban slum dwellers, as well as for the suburban middle class, we can expect no real improvement in the present mood of tension and mutual distrust.

Let us first consider Federal job training programs and their relevance to the problem at hand. The Job Corps, the Neighborhood Youth Corps, and the manpower development training program all are the progeny of legislative action designed to better equip disadvantaged segments of the population to compete successfully in obtaining and holding occupational positions essential to economic advancement.

Improvement in occupational opportunity must be accompanied by an improvement in living conditions, however. The possession of a better job does little to augment a person's concept of his own worth if he must all the while live in filth and squalor. Federal financial assistance to public housing is available under the provisions of existing statutes. Let us make use of it.

Finally, and perhaps most vital, Federal assistance to education is of unprecedented scope and quantity. The broad provisions of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act offer hope for preschool and remedial problems requiring, in addition, only the thoughtful and innovative direction of local school authorities. Furthermore, the services of the National Teacher Corps may be used to mitigate the woeful inadequacy of ghetto instruction.

We must, in short, marshal our total national resolve toward a conscientious and determined effort by which we can take advantage of the practical opportunities made available by Federal statutes already in existence.

In order to make existing legislation genuinely effective, however, we must first create among the populace an awareness of the immediacy of the problem, so that the people will support the measures provided by law. For even as we must protect the sanctity of law against criminal violence, so must we remember that every law should be for the purpose of the common good. Thus, we can best ensure proper obedience to the law by the wise implementation of edicts designed to further the public welfare.

Finally, we must renew our national determination to deal with this problem now We can no longer afford to postpone action. Twenty million Americans can no longer be denied the amenities enjoyed by 180 million Americans. Nor can we tolerate the inevitable consequences of such continued denial. It is time for us to demonstrate to the Negro that we intend for him more than equivocal and pious cant; it is time for us to prove, in the words of Locke, that—

> The actions of men are the best interpreters of their thoughts.

The conversion of thought to deed, intention to action, will inevitably create a degree of unrest and upheaval. The times immediately before us will be difficult:

> Nothing is so unstable as a bad situation that is beginning to improve—

Wrote William V. Shannon recently in the New York Times. Psychologists would confirm that statement. For despair is greatest when a long-wished-for goal first glimmers on the horizen. The end is at that moment for the first time conceivable, but yet so far away as to seem unattainable. But it has been glimpsed. And that one vision is sufficient to release all of the heretofore pent-up frustrations that were previously repressed and held in abeyance by the absence of all hope—by dull insensate, adject despair.

But our cause is not without hope. It must not be. Our national purpose has been threatened before and it has prevailed. One hundred years ago Abraham Lincoln declared that a nation could not endure half slave and half free. It cannot today. It must continue to endure now, as it did then. Twice in this century we have defended the gates of the city from the barbarian without. Today we must confront the barbarian within ourselves. We must treat the sickness of the body politic and make it whole.

We must face the future with confidence. We must not allow pessimism to replace our traditional faith in the American way. However serious the situation may be, we must remember that it is not the worst we have faced. And today we have the wealth and human resources which a century ago, two decades ago, we did not have. Tempered by fire, we must make perfect our will, remembering, perhaps, the cogent warning of T. S. Eliot:

> The last temptation is the greatest treason
> To do the right deed for the wrong reason.

Let us prove that our victory over ourselves is every bit as convincing as our victory over the elements. Let us prove the admonition of Toynbee to be a judgment of the past, not of the future.

Let us devote our every effort to nurturing the small seed of hope which has been planted once again in the heart of the black America. I call on all Americans to attend the growth of that promise, that it flourish in the bright light of reason and compassion, that it may not once again be stunted and warped by the deadly gaze of prejudice and discrimination. Let black and white Americans work together, in the perilous times ahead, that the day may come when the Negro will use his boundless energy, not in a negative capacity, toward the destruction of an imperfect order, but in the positive creation of a viable and healthy society of which he is an indissoluble part.

In appraising the future of a united America—black and white—the noted columnist Max Lerner has perceptively defined the role which the Negro must play. I leave you with his hopeful words, secure in the certain conviction that America will not betray her heritage and her trust:

> Black power is quite simply the power that Negroes have now and can have in the future—in their work, their professions, their business, their voting, their thinking and writing and singing, their office-holding and governing. Every ethnic group in American life has had to struggle for this, but not by the route of "getting its opponents," not by looting and sniping, but by functioning.
>
> The Negro badge of color makes it all the harder, but there are no short cuts to this arduous task of learning one's identity and becoming part of the power and community structure.
>
> If the Negroes feel that they must somehow lose the awe in which they have held whites in the past, then surely that has now happened. They have effectively shown that they hold neither whites nor police nor national guardsmen in awe. What remains is to go from there to rebuild some trust between the races, and between man and man, in a common effort at shared power and shared community.

Congressional Approval of Executive Branch Commitments to Other Nations Sought

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 26, 1967

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the September 25, 1967, issue of the State, of Columbia, S.C., contains an editorial headlined "Open Covenants."

The editorial supports the resolution of the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] to discourage the executive branch from making commitments to other nations without congressional approval.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OPEN COVENANTS

The occasions on which we agree with Sen. J. William Fulbright, especially in the field of foreign affairs, are so rare as to warrant special notice.

This, then, is by way of drawing particular attention to a Fulbright proposal which is refreshing in its clarity and comforting in its concern for the nation.

The senator has offered a resolution intended to discourage the Executive branch from making commitments to other nations without congressional approval.

The proposal has drawn support from a diverse group of doves and hawks, many of whom want to see some measure of balance restored to the Executive-Legislative relationship.

There is also growing feeling that the United States, while involving itself where necessary to maintain peace and security, should not attempt to act as a policeman to the world.

We like the Fulbright resolution because it is in line with our oft-expressed desire for "open covenants, openly arrived at."

The United States is already committed to the defense of 42 nations by treaties or agreements which have been, as required by the Constitution, approved by the Senate. There are also other agreements, all of which are not spelled out publicly, with many of the 30-odd foreign nations in which the U.S. maintains military bases.

Fulbright claims the Executive department has too often acted on the basis of alleged national commitments, and sought later to justify its action "by dubious references to equally dubious prior commitments."

He is right when he says that Congress and the American people have a right to know what obligations we have abroad.

The Neighborhood Action Crusade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE BUSH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 26, 1967

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, the Neighborhood Action Crusade, introduced August 1, in the House by Representatives CHARLES GOODELL, WILLIAM COWGER, WILLIAM STEIGER, and myself, is still receiving attention from our Governors and mayors. I would like to insert the following three letters in the RECORD concerning House Joint Resolution 759:

CITY OF DETROIT,
September 18, 1967.

Hon. GEORGE BUSH,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BUSH: The joint resolution offered in the House by you and Congressmen Cowger, Goodell and Steiger on the establishment of a Neighborhood Action Crusade could be most helpful at this time in many areas of the nation.

In Detroit, as in many other large cities, the city's anti-poverty agency serves this community organization function.

Detroit's anti-poverty agency, the Mayor's Committee for Human Resources Development (HRD), is organized along lines which require that nonprofessionals from the program's target areas be hired as community aides to work in their own neighborhoods, maintaining a dialogue between residents of those neighborhoods and members of the so-called Establishment. These workers on the anti-poverty program's payroll also enlist the assistance of others in the neighborhood who serve in various capacities on a volunteer basis.

Detroit has reaped great benefits from this portion of HRD's efforts on a continuing basis. During the recent riot, many of these workers were assigned to the streets to help counter rumors and to keep the City administration and church and community leaders informed as to action in the street. Following the riot, these were the people who helped the City with emergency food and clothing distribution, assisted in locating housing for those displaced by the riot and gave general assistance in the post-riot clean-up.

In making a proposal such as yours for urban areas, lawmakers must understand that whatever the benefits of community organization and volunteer assistance, volunteering is not a concept which has relevance in areas of hard-core poverty. It is unrealistic to expect much volunteer work from persons who are lacking adequate money to maintain a proper life for themselves.

This is not to indicate that our community organization efforts with its system of block clubs and citizen advisory committees, serving on a volunteer basis, are not effective or meaningful. It just should be clear that there are limits to what can be asked of a voluntary nature of persons with extremely limited resources of their own.

My suggestion would be that future legislation relevant to the Office of Economic Opportunity increase the official significance of these positions allowing for expansion of the role of the community workers, requiring that they live in the area they serve, increasing their opportunities for self-improvement and advancement and, most important, increasing the number of paid workers allowed each community action agency.

With a proper balance of paid and volunteer community workers, your concept of a Neighborhood Action Crusade would serve an important function.

I look forward to your future action in this area.

Sincerely,

JEROME P. CAVANAGH,
Mayor.

STATE OF RHODE ISLAND AND PROVIDENCE PLANTATIONS,
Providence, September 7, 1967.

Hon. WILLIAM A. STEIGER,
Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives, Longworth Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN STEIGER: Thank you for your letter and the copy of your correspondence to the President regarding your interest in reducing national tensions.

I am in complete agreement with you that the overwhelming majority of Negro Americans are dedicated peace-loving citizens strongly opposed to disorder and violence. This faith was borne out in fact recently in a disorder in a section of Providence predominantly inhabited by Negroes. After the first night of the disorder, many responsible Negro leaders and community-minded citizens volunteered to assist the police authorities and local officials by circulating through the neighborhood and calling upon the residents not to resort to violent action in any degree but to seek through positive action improvements on the problems. As a result of this cooperative action, the trouble soon subsided without any fatalities and a curfew imposed by the Mayor of Providence was removed in a few days. There is no question but what the participation of the dedicated Negro citizens prevented the initial incident from developing into serious and violent disorder. After conferring with the Mayor of Providence, I ordered a contingent of the State Police into the area to relieve local police and placed the Rhode Island National Guard on an alert as precautionary moves and, though these moves seemed to discourage increased activities, I am convinced that the Negro volunteers contributed to a very strong and valuable degree.

You may be certain that your letter will serve my office as a useful source of future reference.

With best wishes,

Sincerely,

JOHN H. CHAFEE,
Governor.

CITY OF TACOMA, WASH.,
September 6, 1967.

Hon. WILLIAM A. STEIGER,
House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR BILL: On August 1, 1967, you sent to me a copy of your joint resolution and your communication to President Johnson relative to the establishment of the Neighborhood Action Crusade for the purpose of keeping order in cities threatened with violence. Your communication to the President pointed up the success of the air raid warden program in World War II, and suggested a similar step for the balance of the summer in the cities of the United States.

This letter came while the National League of Cities was meeting in Boston at which time I served as President.

While our meeting was in progress, the United States Conference of Mayors in conjunction with Urban America Incorporated working through the President's office, requested an emergency coalition meeting to take immeditae steps to formulate plans relative to short and long term programs affecting the racial unrest within our major cities. Since I was completely involved at Boston in our own conference, where we were concerned with these same vtial matters, I felt that it was impossible for me to accept the special invitation from John Gunther of the United States Conference of Mayors to leave Boston and go to Washington, D.C. For that reason I asked Mayor Lindsay of New York City to represent me and to also express my regrets.

As you are no doubt aware, leaders in labor, industry, religion, education, civil rights, etc., called the Urban Coalition Emerging Convocation for August 23 and 24, in Washington, D.C. I am making herewith a copy of the statement adopted by the conference. The language of this statement was determined by a steering committee of which I was not an invited member.

I invite your comments.

Returning to your letter and its enclosures, please be advised that I think the idea is a good one. I will suggest something of this same nature for our own city provided, however, that the Police Department and the many segments of negro population, small though the percentage may be, feels that this is advisable. As you are aware no single person nor group of persons seem to speak for the negroes as a whole, hence it is difficult to work in this area since one group might be entirely opposed to a plan which would be completely acceptable and supported by another group.

Thank you for your concern and consideration.

Yours very truly,
H. M. Tollefson,
Mayor.

CRLA Misuse of OEO Grant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT B. (BOB) MATHIAS

OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 26, 1967

Mr. MATHIAS of California. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I issued a press statement in which I called for an investigation of the OEO-financed California Rural Legal Assistance—CRLA—and its connection with the United Farm Workers Organizing Committee—UFWOC. I feel that the time has long since passed that the CRLA's activities and use of taxpayers' money be brought to the attention of the public.

It is my opinion that the CRLA has been misusing a $2 million OEO grant by associating itself with and aiding unionization efforts of the United Farm Workers. My colleagues will be interested in knowing that the UFWOC is presently being investigated by the California State Senate Un-American Activities Committee for "subversive involvement" in recent farm labor strikes in the 18th District, which I represent in the Congress. I have further been informed by the president pro tempore of the California State Senate, who serves as the chairman of the committee, that "the report will indicate that Communist functionaries were at the scene" and that "we must conclude that they were involved."

The California Rural Legal Assistance, Inc., was organized pursuant to the general nonprofit corporation law of the State of California on March 3, 1966. Some of the early directors of the CRLA included leaders of the United Farm Workers, including the organization's director, Cesar Chavez.

In September of 1966, the Office of Economic Opportunity attached certain special conditions to the activities of the corporation prior to the issuance of funds. Among the conditions was one which stated:

> The Rural Legal Assistance Program may not act as legal counsel for, nor supply any legal representation to any labor union or political organization.

The California Rural Legal Assistance, Inc., has almost completely ignored the stated purposes for which it was formed and the special conditions imposed by the Office of Economic Opportunity.

The list of questionable activities, and violations by the CRLA is long indeed. I stated in a letter to the General Accounting Office that I am willing to furnish the evidence, including photographs, a police report and signed statements, to aid in their investigation. There is no question in my mind that this information clearly points out the CRLA's participation in farm labor strikes organized by the United Farm Workers throughout the State of California.

I think it is time for the OEO, Sargent Shriver and the CRLA to set the record straight in this matter by making a full and complete disclosure of their activities and the use of taxpayers' money in unionizing activities for the UFWOC. What it should amount to is a top-to-bottom house cleaning.

I will be the first to admit that the legal services program of the OEO, in itself, has merit, but when the taxpayers are footing the bill for legal services for the United Farm Workers Organizing Committee then it is time to call a halt, and I hope that others will join me in calling upon the Office of Economic Opportunity to take immediate steps to sever the ties between the CRLA and the UFWOC.

Informative Letter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JACK EDWARDS

OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 26, 1967

Mr . EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Dickinson], has recently written a letter to his constituents which I feel is very informative and will be of interest to all Members. Mr. Dickinson's letter follows:

Dear Folks: During a recent visit to the Second District I had the opportunity to discuss with many of you the critical issues facing our troubled nation today. I found upon my return to Washington that most of my colleagues also had been home talking to the people they represent. Like most Alabamians, the rest of the country is deeply concerned about our national and international problems. In some very serious discussions with other members of Congress, here is the clear-cut consensus that came into focus:

Vietnam—Americans are frustrated with the Johnson Administration's limited, "no win" policy. There is a growing feeling that we should win in Vietnam, or get out. These have been my feelings since I was sent to Congress by you. We cannot continue to sacrifice our boys in a war the Administration has no intention of winning. *In fact, the Johnson Administration and Secretary McNamara are holding the military back.*

Taxes—Citizens across the country are strongly opposed to the President's so-called "war tax." I am talking, of course, about his proposed 10 percent surtax. If the Administration would cut back on non-essential domestic spending we would not have to raise taxes to get the extra money we need to finance the war. I will not vote for a tax increase unlti the Administration cuts back domestic and foreign aid spending.

Crime—Criminal activity, both organized (Mafia-type) and acts of violence in the streets, is on the increase. Violence and rioting this summer have understandably aroused resentment from law-abiding citizens. The Johnson Administration pays lip service to the need to curtail this lawlessness, but has been slow to initiate action. I am happy to report that the House, however, has taken steps to help even the odds in favor of our overworked law enforcement agencies.

Earlier this month the House approved what believe to be two sound law enforcement bills. One allows the District Attorney to appeal the decision of a federal judge who orders sized property to be returned or that certain evidence may not be used when that propery or evidence makes up he bulk of the D.A.'s case. The present law reads that such seized property must be returned if the judge so orders and there is no appeal from the decision. This means that in many cases the charges must be dropped. This bill was approved 311 to 1. It should help make it more difficult for the guilty to go unpunished because of legal technicalities.

The other bill, approved unanimously, provides additional benefits to state or local law enforcement officers or their survivors if they are disabled or killed while attempting to apprehend federal law violators. These officers would get the same benefits already authorized for federal employees, less any benefits provided by the state or local government. This would cover city, county and state law enforcement officers. It is hoped that his legislation will help police departments keep their veteran officers and aid recruitment of new officers.

Veterans' affairs—I appeared before the Committee on Veterans' Affairs recently in support of legislation which has been introduced to provide for an increase in the income limits for veterans and widows of veterans receiving pensions. Although prices on all goods and services have been rising steadily for the past few years, the outide income limit on veterans' pensions is the same as it was in 1960. Increased Social Security benefits will, in many instances, result in the reduction or extinction of pensions. I favor legislation which will raise income limts of pensoned veteran to a realistic level.

Defense appropriation trimmed—Congress approved a $69.9 billion defense appropriation this month, but not before we cut $1.6

billion from the President's request. I feel that this reduction is justified, even in an appropriation as important as defense. Unnecessary spending in every department of the government should be stopped. *For instance, the President asked for $287 million for the Navy version of the controversial TFX aircraft, now known as the F–111B.* Congress cut this nearly in half, providing $148 million for eight F–111B planes and continued development of the craft.

You will recall that this is the plane Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara overruled three independent boards and the military to build—at a higher cost than other bids, because he claimed it would be a savings in the long run as both the Navy and the Air Force could use the same plane. The Air Force is trying to get the "bugs" out of its model (the F–111A), and the Navy says its version (the F–111B) is not acceptable and probably never will be because of its weight. In fact, the Navy is suing the builder, General Dynamics, to recover part of the money it spent trying to correct defects.

If the Navy cannot use this plane, then the whole purpose of selecting this particular design has no justification, and Mr. McNamara has indeed done what Senator John McClellan of Arkansas charged—that McNamara committed a "billion dollar blunder." The F–111A is being tested at Nellis AFB, Nevada. I intend to make a personal inspection of the aircraft and I will report my findings to you next month.

Committee action—Our work on the Armed Services Committee has covered a number of important issues this session, most of which I told you about in the last newsletter. A bill we now have under study would increase compensation for military personnel. There are four specific changes in the existing law recommended by this legislation: 1) It increases the basic monthly pay by 5.6 percent effective Oct. 1, 1967; 2) It increases the allowances provided under the Dependents' Assistance Act of enlisted personnel in the lowest pay grades (E–1 to E–4) with less than four years of military service, effective July 1, 1967; 3) It provides authority to the Department to pay basic allowance for quarters and the dislocation allowance to certain bachelor personnel in conjunction with a permanent change of station, effective July 1, 1967; and 4) It provides a special higher basic pay rate for the senior non-commissioned officer position in each of the military services, effective Oct. 1, 1967. We should complete work on this bill in the near future and make our recommendations.

Visitors—With the peak visitors season just behind us, I thought I'd take the opportunity to say how much I've enjoyed having Second District visitors come by to see me. It's always a pleasure to have you come by, and my office is open to everyone. When you're in Washintgon, I hope you will make it a point to drop in to say hello. Also, I'm always happy to assist in any way possible to make your visit a pleasant one. Listed below are some of you who visited with me this summer: Mr. and Mrs. Roy Stansell and Susan, Mty; Mr. and Mrs. L.T. Chestnut, Mty; Mrs. Sidney Shinbaum, Mty; Curtis Springer, Jr., Drucilla and John, Mty; West Point Cadets Bill Wallis of Florida and John Bryant, Childersburg; Dr. and Mrs. A. J. Bearman, Linda and Mark, B'ham; Mrs. N. Sol Bearman, B'ham; Mr. and Mrs. Ben T. Williams, Taylor and David, Andalusia; Ann Riall, Mobile; Chris Warner, Mty; Mr. James E. Howard, Mty; Kenneth Blaylock, Mty; Mr. and Mrs. Gid Cottle, Andalusia; Mrs. John A. Fuller, Selma; Mr. and Mrs. L. C. Warren, Mty; Mr. L. C. Stabler and Family, Troy; Mr. Melvin Carter and Family, Ft. Deposit; Danny Reid, Mty; Lt. Col. Wm. Bacon and Family, Maxwell AFB; Mr. Wm. H. Rodimon, Marion; Kemper Waters, Mty; Kathryn Waller, Mty; Mr. and Mrs. Norman Rice, Childersburg; Mr. and Mrs. Dade Lancaster, Debbie and Kaye, Andalusia; Mr. and Mrs. C. A. Rowe, Kevin and Glenn, Mty; Mr. and Mrs. Winfred Davis and Russ, Mty; Mr. and Mrs. J. R. Mallory, Keith and Tobey, Mty; Mr. and Mrs. Wm. McGehee and Martha, Greenville; Mrs. Omer Cox, Roger and Debbie, formerly from Maxwell AFB, now stationed at Andrews AFB, Md; Doctors Otto Burton and A. E. Thomas, Mty. Co. Health Dept.; Bobby McSwean, Abbeville; Mr. and Mrs. Virgil Cornwell and Family, Mty; Mr. and Mrs. Joe Hurley, Virgil and Pam, Mty; Mr. J. C. Oliver, Mty; Chris Mooney, Mty; Ken and Jackie McLeod, Gulf Shores; Mrs. Frank Arnold, Forrest, Amy and Sid, Luverne; Mr. Kirby Smith, Mty; Mr. and Mrs. C. C. Lawrence, Mty; Jerry Bailey, Dothan; David Ward, Mty; Richard Medley, Mty; Curtis Liles, Sylacauga; Mrs. J. B. Brannan, Mty; Mr. and Mrs. Kenny Kaiser, Elberta; Mrs. E. N. Wright, Mathews; Gerhardt Engel, Summerdale; Miss Martha McInnis, Mty; Mr. Joe Hall, Mty; Lt. Col Paul Pharis and Capt. George Cox, Ala. Nat'l. Guard, Mty; John F. Hooper, Mty; Mr. and Mrs. Carroll Puckett, Mty.

Is Acoustical Pollution Next?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN N. ERLENBORN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 26, 1967

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Speaker, northern Illinois has been visited, once again, by American aircraft which fly faster than sound and which, in attaining these great speeds, create a sonic boom.

Our Air Force is the culprit here, and it tries to be fair and candid with the victims of these manmade thunderclaps. As an aside, I may point out that the supersonic transport plane, on which our Government will spend too many millions of dollars, will make these sonic booms an everyday occurrence in many parts of our country. At this moment, the SST project has few friends in northern Illinois.

The Air Force has told people to report any damage resulting from these sonic booms—but pity the poor, misguided propertyowner who complies.

I have gotten the evidence from Mr. Theodore O. Elsner, of Addison, Ill., as to what happens. On July 26, a vase in the Elsner home was cracked by a sonic boom. This was not the greatest vase in the world. It was not a priceless family heirloom. Rather, it cost $5.95, a fact which was included in Mr. Elsner's report to the Air Force.

It would have been enough if the Air Force had sent him an apology, and he would have been happy if they had sent him the $5.95, although he did not really expect that.

What did he get?

Let me list the items:

First. A letter of explanation running three pages, which proved conclusively that the sonic boom could not have caused the vase to crack.

Second. A two-page form entitled "Instructions for Submission of Claim."

Third. A one-page "Certificate of Ownership."

Fourth. A one-page "Claim for Sonic Boom Damage" form, in triplicate.

Fifth. A form entitled "Statement of Claimant in Support of Claim for Damage or Injury," which is four pages long.

Sixth. Two copies of a two-page form entitled "Statement of Witness."

Seventh. A form entitled "Statement Concerning Insurance."

In all, Mr. Elsner received 18 pages of forms to be filled out—all because he did what the Air Force had asked him to do by way of newspaper stories.

I can only suggest that this bureaucratic overkill startled and saddened Mr. Elsner. He is less concerned about the loss of his vase than about his loss of respect for a government which gives this thousand-dollar treatment to a $5.95 urn for flowers.

He and his neighbors are no doubt concerned about another thought. What kind of claims will be faced by the Government and the aircraft industry when the supersonic transport makes these sonic booms an everyday occurrence all over the country?

We Americans now are troubled by water pollution and air pollution. Is acoustical pollution next?

Paul Harvey's Program From Mississippi

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

Hon. G. V. (SONNY) MONTGOMERY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 26, 1967

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues the following excerpts from a nationwide broadcast on Tuesday, September 12, 1967:

(By Paul Harvey)

This is Jackson, Mississippi. At least once every year for a dozen years I have returned to Jackson to watch the Southland's exciting economic renaissance which is nowhere more apparent than right here. Figuratively, even in so short a while I have watched them build skyscrapers over the blacksmith's shop. I have seen the long-time cotton crop economy diversified and amplified. I saw much Yankee industry syphoned off from up there, settle here in the greener fields and cleaner air and water, water everywhere. But Mississippi is just not chasing smoke stacks any more; much more deliberately now this state is planning its future selectively. Modern industry invests much in what's called R & D, Research and Development; while marketing one product the progressive industry is busy looking for others; well, in this state they have created a Research and Development Commission. The State's own. Running out ahead to meet tomorrow, to be ready for the future, to be preparing for it today, in every way, they are educating and training and retraining manpower. Adapting and adjusting and co-operating toward the end, that tomorrow can't possibly take Mississippi by surprise. I am here today to help them launch this year's United Givers Campaign. The same thing we call The Community Fund, Community Chest in other areas. And the dynamism with which these Mississippians apply themselves to providing for their own home folks through these 33 charities is so contagious I want to get out there and ring door bells myself. I shan't . . . I shall need restrain myself, for if there is anything the South does *not* need it is another Yankee coming down here trying to tell them how to conduct their affairs. Now, I guess we can't lecture to the South any more on how to dress—with our own slip showing. That has changed, too. Today's Jackson Daily

News and Clarion Ledger report race strife in Milwaukee *factually;* not with pompous self-righteous condemnation, as the Northern press once reported on what was considered "the Southern problem." These folks who have been down that painful road are disinclined to salt others' open wounds. And, you see, there isn't—there is really nothing new about the tantrum syndrome. There have been some since Old Testament times who would lie in the street and kick up their heels and threaten and demand whatever they wanted and neither their demands or this tantrum technique have changed much. The South found the most effective deterrent to anti-social conduct is firmness. Last year of all our 50 states, Mississippi had less crime than 48 of them. Mississippi has the second lowest crime rate in the nation and in the reduction of crime, in the past year, Missisisppi leads the *entire nation*. Now may I run that by again? While the rest of us cower behind shuttered windows or try to survive the big city's jungle with armed guards and dogs on most every street corner and on every public conveyance, while our crime rate continues to increase seven times faster than our population is increasing, Mississippi's crime rate, already low, is decreasing. More improvement last year than in any other state in our nation. So the firmness the Yankee press found repugnant . . . it might want to reconsider.

Well, last evening, unescorted, unarmed and unafraid, I strolled the main streets and side streets of this lovely lawnscaped southern city, here, where the races have worked together and lived together in many neighborhoods for generations, I was able to window shop and browse about and exchange respectful greetings with friends of both races, and fellowship with bright-eyed, neatly dressed school-agers of both sexes and without any doubt about which was which.

Last evening I revisited our America the Beautiful as it once was and, God willing, may some day by again. From Jackson, Mississippi; Paul Harvey. Good day.

Midwestern Regional Republican Women's Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 26, 1967

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday it was my privilege to serve as moderator of a panel of Republican Members of Congress in a discussion of some of our major national problems. It was a part of the Midwestern Regional Republican Women's Conference held at the Pick-Congress Hotel in Chicago.

Each member of the panel was selected to discuss a subject on which he is recognized to be especially knowledgeable. After a short presentation of his individual views, the panel member was subjected to the most searching questions by the audience.

Congressman Tom Kleppe, of North Dakota, served on that panel with agriculture as his assignment. He has come to be recognized as something of an authority in that field. He is a member of the House Committee on Agriculture. While a junior in service on that committee, he is a senior in his knowledge of his subject. This he has demonstrated in his work in Congress and this he proved in his discussion of agriculture at the meeting last Saturday.

Under leave to revise and extend my remarks I am inserting in the Congressional Record his opening statement. I wish I had available to me the audience questions asked of him following his statement and the forthright, factual answers he so ably made to each and every question.

Congressman Kleppe's remarks follow:

A few days ago, I visited with a Western North Dakota rancher who was berating the U.S. Department of Agriculture for its monumental "goof" in vastly underestimating the number of cattle in the country. You may recall that last January the Department suddenly discovered its previous estimates were wrong—that there were actually some 4 million more cattle than USDA had been reporting. This had a disastrous effect on cattle prices which were already low. It cost cattlemen million of dollars.

"One thing for sure," said this rancher, "if Orville Freeman can't count sheep better than cattle, he must have a tough time getting to sleep."

Well, you can bet your last copper quarter that the Secretary of Agriculture is doing his share of tossing and turning these nights, what with farm prices banging on the floor and farm costs punching through the ceiling. Sleep probably doesn't come too easily, either, to Democrat farm state office-holders who, in 1968, must face the hopping maddest bunch of farmers this country has ever seen.

Back in Washington, the chief occupant of 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue can draw little satisfaction from polls which show him less popular with farmers than with any other large economic group in America. As of today, I am convinced that any of the Republicans who are being mentioned as 1968 Presidential candidates could snow LBJ under in virtually every rural precinct in the country. Right now, I can't see him carrying a single farm state in the Midwest or the West.

A few months ago, Senator Milton R. Young and I ran separate polls in North Dakota on the Johnson rating. They showed not only that several different Republicans could defeat the President handily but that Bobby Kennedy is also more popular with voters than LBJ.

In the poll, I asked several thousand farmers to rate the kind of a job Orville Freeman is doing as Secretary of Agriculture. Seven per cent said "good"; 27 per cent said "fair"; and a whopping 66 per cent said "poor".

You don't have to search far for the causes of farm discontent—only to your own books, if you happen to be a farmer, or to a few cold statistics if you are not. What used to be called the farm cost-price squeeze isn't a squeeze anymore—it's a crunch.

Farm production expenses climb to new, all-time highs month after month, while farm prices decline or, at best, hold about steady. Moreover, prices paid by farmers for the goods and services they must purchase will predictably continue to rise so long as this Nation remains on its Johnson-generated inflationary binge. All of the evidence points toward a widening disparity between prices paid by farmers and those they receive.

Today average prices for farm products are running about 4 per cent below those of a year ago, while prices paid by farmers are up 3 per cent. This widening imbalance is reflected in the parity ratio—the yardstick designed to measure farm prosperity—which currently stands at 75, compared with 81 a year earlier. In other words, farmers are receiving just three-fourths of what the government says is a fair return for their production. Moreover, with record-breaking crops of wheat, feed grains and soybeans now moving to market, prices may decline even further. The only certainty in the parity equation is that farm costs will continue to mount as to taxes go higher, as the price of machinery moves upward and as the latest round of wage increases cranks new inflationary pressures into the economy.

Consider for a moment these facts:

(1) Prices received by farmers in 1966 were 2 per cent lower than the 1947–49 average. But retail prices paid by consumers for food increased 40 per cent from the 1947–49 base period, reflecting sharply increased marketing and processing costs. Nevertheless, because of constantly increasing efficiency on American farms and a large increase in nonfarm wages and salaries, the average family spent only 18.1 per cent of its income, after taxes, for food in 1966—the lowest ever.

(2) During the last 20 years, hourly earnings of industrial workers increased by 123 per cent, while corporate dividends rose by 232 per cent. Over the same period, from 1947 to April 1967, average farm prices fell 11 per cent. This dropped the April parity ratio to 72, lowest in 33 years.

(3) The blended price for wheat, including the $1.36 certificates, is now around $1.80 per bushel in western North Dakota. By way of contrast, the national average price received for wheat by farmers in 1947 was $2.29 per bushel. This does not tell the full story, however. Since 1947 the value or purchasing power of a dollar has shrunk by one-third. This would make the 1947 wheat price $3.05 per bushel, in terms of 1967 dollars.

(4) Net farm income for 1967 is estimated at $14.6 billion, compared with $17.1 billion in 1947. But here again we are talking in terms of vastly different dollars. The $14.6 billion figure becomes only $9.8 billion when you translate it into 1947 dollars. To put it another way, net farm income in 1967 will be about 42 per cent lower than it was in 1947, in terms of constant dollars. Has any other economic group taken a 42 per cent pay cut over the last 20 years?

This is the price American farmers are paying for inflation. They, along with retired people and others living on fixed incomes, are the principal victims of soaring costs which are pushed ever higher by the Federal Government's own fiscal policies. Many farmers have told me that they could survive on today's agricultural prices, depressed as they are, if production costs were at the levels of 15 or 20 years ago. But they cannot make it in an economy where the price of virtually everything they sell goes down, while their production costs move higher and higher, with no end in sight.

The inevitable result of all of this has been a continuing migration of farmers from the land. Approximately 100,000 farm units are liquidated each year. Some 600,000 farm people move to the towns and cities each year. Since 1950, the U.S. farm population has declined from 23 million to less than 12 million—a drop of about 50 per cent. In 1950, more than 15 per cent of the Nation's total population lived on farms. Today it is less than 6 per cent.

To me it seems deplorable that this trend should continue. But it is continuing. A recently published study by President Johnson's National Advisory Commission on Food and Fiber indicates that the 3.2 million farm units in the United States today will shrink to about 2 million by 1980. This is a more optimistic estimate than some of the President's advisers came forward with 2 years ago when they foresaw a need for only 1 million farms in the future.

Republican candidates for public office in farm states and districts will not lack for issues. But it seems to me that we must offer more than just criticism of Administration farm programs and their disastrous consequences. We must also offer constructive alternatives. Here are five proposals which I believe would strengthen farm prices immediately—and they could all be accomplished without new legislation:

1. A freeze on stocks of government-owned wheat, feed grains and other storable commodities. These holdings could be insulated

from the market as a strategic reserve not to be offered for sale at less than 100 per cent of parity.

2. A stepped up Food for Peace program. It seems to me that we should be placing more emphasis on supplying food, rather than military hardware, to hungry people in the non-Communist world.

3. An increased government loan rate of 12½ per cent on storable farm commodities which would be in line with the inflation "catch-up" raise for Social Security recipients.

4. An improved livestock and crop reporting system. As I indicated earlier, farmers are often the victims of price declines brought on by inaccurate government estimates.

5. Tighter controls over imports of farm commodities already in surplus within the United States. Dairy farmers and cattlemen, for example, have seen their prices sharply depressed in recent years by competitive importations.

Some of these steps are stopgap measures but they would reverse the disastrous drop in farm prices overnight. It seems to me this must be done first, as a necessary preliminary to the development of an improved, long-range program for American agriculture.

It is quite possible that time and the population explosion at home and abroad will eventually take care of America's farm price and surplus problems. But for 1968, I believe we Republicans must offer American farmers immediate hope. If we do this, we will hold the farm vote which now seems so securely Republican.

It's Now Impossible for Police To Protect Public in New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 26, 1967

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the recent implementation of article 35 of the New York penal law makes it virtually impossible for a policeman to defend the public or himself.

Many officers in that State have been browbeaten as to when they can and cannot fire a weapon. In the split second it might take to save an innocent victim's life, the law-enforcement officer is busy trying to remember his past brainwashing—which must come first.

A theoretical case has been brought to light. Suppose an assailant is chasing a female would-be victim—and she is three or four steps ahead of her assailant. Can the law-enforcement officer discharge his weapon? No, not in New York, because this new type of enforcement theorizes that the weapon cannot be discharged on behalf of the victim because said victim is making a successful escape. How ridiculous.

Mr. Speaker, by previous permission, I include the following editorial and a most timely article from the New York Independent of September 18, 1967:

CAP PISTOLS FOR POLICE

On Septemhber 1st the new State Penal Law went into effect. Police Commissioner Howard R. Leary set up special regulations for the police. It seems year after year the laws are being changed to make life easier for the criminal and tougher for the policeman. Unless we reverse this attitude we will end up with the "laws of the jungle."

In fact, some of the Liberals in politics may next suggest that we give the police a cap pistol and a special brand of lollypop to give the criminal element. As an observer of this critical situation, the real victim and loser will be the law-abiding John Q. Citizen. I suggest to the ordinary voter that he wake up and take an active part in community matters.

Vote out of office every incompetent "Liberal" office holder, and the voter should not hesitate to stand up and be counted. To save your freedom you must fight for it 365 days a year; otherwise we will wake up some day and find it's Too Late!

NEW YORK POLICE NEWS

The New York Penal Law, Article 35, which was put into effect on September 1, 1967, has startled New Yorkers. This section of the Penal Law was adopted by the New York State Legislature in 1965.

It deals with the question of when a policeman may fire his gun. The law is so ambivalent that no policeman can in the heat of an attack make the proper determination as to whether he may or may not use his gun. The law makes it impossible for a policeman to defend himself or the public.

The question is: How did this thing happen? Men who were in the Legislature are whining that the Penal Code was given to them at the last minute; that it was long and complicated and that they voted on the law in its entirety.

The representatives of the PBA and of the citizens' committees have had two years' time in which to raise their voices against this legal monstrosity. They have allowed it to slide through.

We face an emergency. The time has come when all must join in a concerted effort to repeal Article 35. The time has also come to pass laws that will protect the innocent and apprehend the criminal, and not vice versa.

Hidden Part of Racial Violence Not Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 26, 1967

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, a recent article in the Bellefontaine, Ohio, Examiner directs the light of perspective on the revolutionary aspect of the racial violence that has rocked America. Syndicated Columnist William S. White restates the frequently voiced opinion that a small minority of Negroes are behind the violence, and calls for lawful action to neutralize the threats that extremists pose to the advancement of civil rights in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I commend Mr. White's article to our colleagues, and insert it in the RECORD:

HIDDEN PART OF RACIAL VIOLENCE NOT CIVIL RIGHTS

(By William S. White)

WASHINGTON.—The hidden part of the iceberg of racial violence has nothing whatever to do with civil rights. There will be no solution until this ugly but powerful reality is fully grasped.

The extremist Negro leadership is exploiting Negro discontent—some of it justified and much of it fictitious and wholly trumped up—to destroy the lawful, bipartisan foreign policy of the United States against communist aggression in general and specifically to force this nation to abandon its commitment to the invaded people of South Vietnam.

This is the frightening core of it all and this terrible truth is eluding the more liberal politicians of both parties, who from the best motives are in turn wholly obscuring the real name of this game. They are incessantly talking as though the crisis is purely domestic, and as though it can be cured solely by the panicky pouring out of countless additional billions of dollars for urban renewal and other reforms which are desirable in themselves.

The three most implacable of the black power leaders—Stokely Carmichael, H. Rap. Brown and Floyd McKissick—are simply revolutionaries is as plain as day itself. It was plain long before Carmichael went to Cuba to receive the warm salutes of Fidel Castro and to call upon American Negroes to take up arms "from New York to California, from Canada to Mexico."

In these grim and factual circiumstances proposals for "Marshal Plans" for Negro citizens and vast, cloudy crash programs to buy off public disorder by Federal funds are nightmarishly ill-conceived. To say that more must be done to bring Negroes into full participation in American society is right and just. To say that this should be done in open panic under naked political and social blackmail, with rioters' pistols pointed publicly at the United States Government itself, is to accept a proposition indefensible in elementary public morality and bankrupt in simple fact.

For these disorders are occurring at a time when more is already being done at greater cost for an undeniably underprivileged minority than has been done in all the previous two centuries of the American experience. The conclusion that more and more money is the one true answer here is thus demonstrably wrong, however compassionate its motive.

It is a notion that misses every actuality in this whole dreadful affair. It assumes that the great body of American Negroes is approaching a state of rebellion where the clear and self-evident fact is that nowhere has more than a tiny Negro minority been involved in riot and anarchy. It leads such public men as Vice-President Hubert H. Humphrey and Sen. Robert F. Kennedy to speak in public as though the very founding stones of the Republic might crumble at any moment.

It rejects the testimony of the best possible authorities—the governors and mayors in areas of infection—that legitimate civil rights grievances have not been the operative causes of violence. It ignores the solemn word of a liberal Democratic Governor of New Jersey, Richard Hughes, that the horror in Newark was brought off by fewer than five per cent of its Negroes and that of this five per cent the majority had criminal records. It ignores the consensus of the National Conference of Mayors that our tortured cities have been the work of men not at all interested in civil rights. It waves aside the sworn testimony of honorable police officials to similar effect.

This malady will never be cured until the firmest of action, entirely lawful but also entirely remorseless, is taken to put down Negro extremists. Only then can the genuine problems of racial disorder and racial unfairness be honestly and justly and wisely met. No rational society can continue to hide its eyes from patent truth. And rational men, however opposed on principle to a war in Vietnam, can no longer condone or co-operate with a clear and present danger to the constitutional conduct, by elected officials, of the foreign policy of the United States.

The Kind of Leadership Needed in Our Society Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE BUSH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 26, 1967

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, on September 17, 1967, I had the pleasure of attending the Mount Sinai Baptist Church in Houston and hearing a wonderful sermon by Rev. S. J. Gilbert. Because Reverend Gilbert highlighted such an important problem existing in our society today, I include the following excerpts in the RECORD so that my colleagues may have benefit of Reverend Gilbert's remarks:

In the first place, the type of leader Joshua made in his own time is the kind of leaders we need in our society today. Joshua was of the tribe of Ephraim. The Grecianized form of his name was "Jesus." Joshua was some kind of leader, he led God's people into the middle of the promised land. One of the great tragedies of our society is that many of our leaders promise us if we support them in a particular office, they will lead us into the promised land of opportunity and economic advancement, and the people promised never realize the joys of sharing the milk and honey. Joshua, I say was somebody's leader. He may have been a prototype of his great successor, who is leading his own into the promised land of Heaven. You see my kind friends, Joshua was able to become a successful leader, because he followed great leadership. Joshua had been the personal attendant of Moses throughout the forty years of wilderness wandering. Joshua was with Moses when God gave him the laws and commandments. It was this same Joshua that was sent out among the spies to see if the land could be possessed. It was Joshua who was a part of the minority report. The majority report read, there are giants in the land and we are like grasshoppers among them. We simply can't take the promised land. The minority report read, there are giants in the land but with God's divine help we can and will possess the land.

In the second place, this is an unusual day in which we live. This day of ours definitely demands God-fearing leaders, whether in the pulpits, schools, or governmental circles. Today we face tension, frustration and distintegration as never before in the history of the world. Someone in talking about this society of frustration has said, "As Americans we are so mixed up that we have invented what we call an escalator, that we may move as we stand, and we have another something we call a rocking chair, that we may rock while we sit.

But the thing that concerns leadership today that is vital and cardinal is not necessarily the matter of splitting the atom, but what we may do with split personalities. It is not the matter basically of guided missiles, but under God, what we may do to direct and discipline misguided minds. It is not the matter of supersonic motors, but under God what we may do in convincing our youth that this idea of superman is only fiction. Our youth are very disturbed today. They've watched superman jump from windows without getting a scratch and today they are taking pep pills, LSD, etc., and jumping out of windows just like superman committing suicide. You see my brothers and sisters, this is a real world in which we live. This is not a fictitious world. This world is a place where we are face to face with bitterness in the black race as well as in the white race. We see gross injustice being done to people as they go to courts in fenderless cars. The injustice is on both sides of the fence as it relates to the race question.

In attempting to analyze the perplexities of our times, it has been said that the problem is that this generation that rides on a four and six lane highway finds it hard to see the logic in walking the straight and narrow path. I don't care what you say my friends, our biggest problem is the hearts of men. Our greatest problem today is we simply don't love our brothers and sisters across the racial line. We haven't discovered yet, that we must learn to live together on earth as our brothers' keeper or learn to die separately. In times like these, we don't need more laws that are not going to be enforced anyway. I tell you what we need in America; we need more people to walk the straight and narrow path that God almighty has set before us. Most of our leaders today can talk the talk, but they can't walk the walk.

The masses of people in our society are only concerned about a good paying job, economic security, and a late model car. These are the times that try man's very soul. These are unusual times. These are extraordinary times. There are times that try America's religious conscience. I can hear the cries of people all over this land in this paraphrased poem:

"God give us leaders, the times demands, strong minds, great hearts, true faith and willing hands;
Leaders whom the lust of office does not kill;
Leaders whom the spoils of office cannot buy, Leaders who will not lie;
Leaders who can stand before demagogues, and damn his treacherous flatteries without winking;
Tall leaders sun crowned, who live above the fog."

In the third place, God sees the kind of leaders He needs; thus He asks; Have I not commanded thee? You see my kind friends, when a man feels like Joshua felt, God comes and lifts them up to leadership and responsibility. Leaders today need to watch out that they don't become too big for God to use them. We are too full of our own political schemes and our own way of doing things until God seldom, if ever, has a chance to speak a word.

The world speaks about the survival of the fittest, but my God gives power to the faint and He gives might to those who have no strength. The God I serve, perfects his strength in weakness, He uses the things that are not to bring to nought the things that are.

It Is Time To Begin To End the War in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 26, 1967

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, as one who has spoken out in favor of the "barrier-zone" concept as a method to apply in order to contain and quiet down the war in Vietnam, I am pleased to note corresponding support for the same idea—despite its controversial nature—from my colleague, the Honorable HOWARD W. ROBISON, of New York.

Mr. ROBISON recently delivered an address on this subject, and on the problems posed by the Vietnamese conflict generally, at a meeting of the Legion of Honor of Kalurah Temple of the Shrine, at Binghamton, N.Y., at which time he was also made an honorary member of that organization. I believe Mr. ROBISON's remarks are well worth consideration by all of us, and, under leave granted so to do, the same are hereinafter set forth:

IT IS TIME TO BEGIN TO END THE WAR IN VIETNAM

It is indeed privilege and honor enough for me to have been invited to address you tonight—but you have gone further and paid me what I must believe to be a wholly undeserved tribute.

Needless to say, however, I am deeply grateful—and will long remember this occasion. Thank you—so very, very much.

Now, speaking as I do to men who have previously worn our Nation's uniform—to men who have known the horrors of war and who have borne the burden of their Nation's trust with the same honor and valor now being exhibited by those of your sons or grandsons now on duty in Vietnam—it seemed to me appropriate that I should ask you to think with me, tonight, about the problems we face in that far off war which seems to be getting more and more close to home; that tragic war in Vietnam.

Perhaps I speak of this war too often—and surely it is never far from my thoughts—but if I do speak of it often it is because I recognize that this war, and its termination, is *the* one matter that is of the deepest concern to the American people at this moment in time.

To say this, is not to deny the fact that we face, as a nation, many other problems—many other challenges—some, if not most, of which are of the utmost urgency.

However, our preoccupation with our dilemma in Vietnam—our continuing uncertainty about our purposes there—the doubts so many of us are experiencing over whether or not we can bring it to some sort of satisfactory conclusion—all these things plus the very large financial cost of the war, itself (now running at somewhere in excess of $2 billion a month!), tend beyond any question to inhibit both our thinking and our ability, as a nation, to concentrate upon those other problems and to devise workable solutions for them.

So this is why—in the nature of things—the finding of a solution to our problem in Vietnam just simply has to come first; and the possibility that, in the search for such a solution we may well also find some answers to the larger question of peace-in-our-time, should add urgency to our task.

We Americans are an impatient people—and unaccustomed to failure.

We like to get things over and done with—and then move on to the next challenge, and heretofore we have been confident we could meet it, whatever its nature.

That sense of confidence, however, has been badly shaken in Vietnam—where things do not go well with us.

It is no more easy for us to accept than it is for the President to explain the fact that—somehow—we have become bogged down, at the end of the world's longest supply line, in a costly and seemingly endless ground war in Asia of the kind which, because of the supply and terrain problems, we vowed we'd seek to avoid; fighting to help a people whose desire to help themselves is, at best, suspect; seeking to build for them at the same time a form of government based on democratic principles of which they have, again at best, but the dimmest of understandings; and discovering to our frustration that, no matter how much more we pour of American lives and treasure into this effort, nothing ever really seems to be gained.

Truly, we seem to have stepped into a bottomless pit of quicksand, wherein the more we flail about the deeper we become mired.

It is no wonder, then, that more and more of our citizens are becoming subject to a growing sense of uselessness about whatever it is we have been trying to do.

It is no wonder that the nation, itself, is uncertain, ill at ease—exhibiting signs of edginess and depression.

And it is no wonder that more and more of our people are rather desperately looking for some way "out".

Surely, things have not worked out as we were once led to expect them to in Vietnam where, in the beninning, we were told that America would play only a limited role—a role limited to "helping" the South Vietnamese protect and preserve their right to self-determination.

We were to provide advice, logistical support and training assistance, but we were assured by the Secretary of Defense (on January 27, 1964) that: "This is a Vietnamese war, and in the final analysis it must be fought and won by the Vietnamese."

President Johnson followed through with similar statements—all on the same theme—of which the following are samples: ". . . we don't want our American boys to do the fighting for Asian boys"; "We don't want to get tied down to a land war in Asia"; "We are going to try to get them to save their own freedom with their own men, with our leadership, and our officer direction, and such equipment as we can furnish them," (but) ". . . we are not about to send American boys 9 or 10,000 miles from home to do what Asian boys ought to be doing for themselves."

All of these words, of course, were spoken in 1964—but somewhere around the beginning of 1965, the picture began to change and it kept on changing until now we have what is almost totally an American war, in which the South Vietnamese are playing the supporting role but not even doing that very well.

How did this come about?

Well, I suspect that not even future historians, who will be able to examine this episode in our history with far more objectivity than we, will be able to point to the exact moment in time when this war became an American war—nor to the specific Presidential decision, if there ever was one, that made it such.

That is because this change in emphasis—this change in the nature of our commitment and consequent involvement—came about with such gradualism, with such tiny steps of escalation of effort and of manpower and of newly-accepted responsibilities, all taken with their seeming logic at the moment, that practically no one outside of the President and his advisers realized what was happening until it was too late to do much if anything about it.

Certainly, Congress—which, as I said last week, has a far more-positive role to play in the making of foreign policy than this—seemed unaware of it for, following its hasty adoption on August 7, 1964 of the now-celebrated "Tonkin Gulf Resolution" which gave the President exceedingly broad authority to take such steps as *he* deemed necessary to prevent "further aggression" in Southeast Asia, and is undoubtedly sufficient authority under our system of government for such action as he has so far taken in Vietnam, there was little if any Congressional discussion, and no focused debate, over what as happening in Vietnam, or over the wisdom of the new course the President had begun to follow.

For what it is worth, I was concerned about what was happening during this time and, during 1965, repeatedly urged in Congress that hearings be held concerning the Vietnam question. I did this for reasons best explained, perhaps, by this excerpt from my May, 1965, newsletter:

"The increase in US ground strength in Vietnam implies a redefinition of US policy there—and the time for the Administration to explain this policy is *now*, not later when public doubts and uncertainties (which are likely to be misread in Peking and Moscow), have sperad and taken hold! Red China's leaders have long predicted that the American people would, in time, grow weary of the burden we have been carrying virtually alone in Southeast Asia. In the next several months—which will be *crucial* ones—this may well become the President's most serious problem."

The concern I expressed was, I believe, well taken—though the timing of my prediction was off. For the President's problems with the American people are only now really becoming "crucial".

No such Congressional hearings, of course, were held—as you know; unless one considers the earlier "Fulbright Hearings" as being of that nature. But even those came too late for any real consideration of the wisdom of the course on which we had been set for, by then, the die had been cast and *"there we were"* in Vietnam, even as we are today.

And, of course, one cannot say—for one does not know—whether or not, if the reasoning behind the President' decision to so change the nature of our effort in Vietnam had, through a focused Congressional debate, been placed on what might be called the "great anvil of democracy" where, traditionally, our major policy decisions are hammered out, the result might have been any different. It is altogether possible, if a full-scale hearing *had* been held, that the Congress would found enough validity in the Presidential reasoning, wrapped up somehow in the need to now contain the thrust of Red China as we had formerly and successfully contained that of Russia, to agree that an Americanization of the war in Vietnam was now necessary to save South Vietnam and that the saving of South Vietnam, difficult and costly though that might be, was now vital in terms of our *own* security.

On the other hand, I believe one *can* say that this is a point that the President has not yet been able to drive home to the American people!

And therein lies the source of much of his—and our—present difficulty.

For there can be no doubt that many Americans have come to question whether or not what we are trying to do in Vietnam is, after all, both necessary and worthwhile.

Some of this mood probably ebbs and flows with the tide of battle—which right now is not going especially well. Our military people—and the President—tell us, now, that they can "see light finally at the end of the tunnel", but they do not and cannot tell us how long is the tunnel.

But beyond this—as Vermont Royster pointed out in a recent column in "The Wall Street Journal":

"People have an instinctive feeling, the correctness of which is hard to deny, that even worthwhile objectives have a price beyond which it is foolhardy to pay. In battle, not every hill is of equal value in lives, and in a long struggle not every battlefield is worth the same cost to a nation's resources."

Perhaps this question has been bothering you; if so, you are not alone, for its answer, insofar as it pertains to Vietnam, is of tremendous concern to all of us.

And our common failure to find that answer—either through our President or on our own—must be of equal concern to all of us for, as James Reston wrote in a recent column of his, this time in "The New York Times":

"A nation is in trouble when its people feel helpless to deal with their major problems and do not know what to trust. . . . This is our present dilemma: The people cannot very well develop a strategy for the rebellion at home or the war abroad. Everybody can have an opinion but nobody can prove beyond reasonable doubt that he has the answer. Therefore, there must be *faith*, and this, for the present, is what we do not have—neither faith in our common purposes, nor in our old religious and philosophical institutions, nor in our present policies, nor in the men who are making and administering them."

That's quite an indictment, isn't it—but far too much of it rings true to me as I read my constituent mail these days and talk with the people I endeavor, to the best of my ability, to represent.

Are we *right* to be in Vietnam?

I do not know, but I have always said that I believed what we started *out* to do there was both right and proper.

In any event, can we now bring our effort in Vietnam to some *worthwhile* conclusion?

Again, I do not know, but I think we have to *believe* that we can.

For this nation to restore its faith in its own capabilities in this respect will not be easy, but it is of singular importance that we try, for a nation unsure of itself is ill-prepared for *any* of the challenges it must face, let alone the vicissitudes of battle.

Our seeming impotence, so far, in Vietnam has burned rather deeply into our national hide—and an awful lot of Americans would now like, somehow, to "turn off" Vietnam. The two most common expressions of opinion we used to hear as to how this could be accomplished were the polarized viewpoints of the all-out "hawks", to the effect that we ought to get *in* and "win" some sort of conventional military victory, and the all-out "doves", many of whom have always opposed any intervention on our part and have urged, simply, that we ought to just get *out*.

And, as whatever consensus the President used to have began to evaporate, more and more people began to move to one or the other of these extremes. But now we are beginning to hear from those—and this is a growing group—who *combine* both such extremes and demand that we ought to "either get in and win *or* get out"!

Though I can well understand this attitude—especially in view of the apparent absence of any clear cut plan or policy on the part of the President to end this conflict—it seems to me that it is a compulsive over-reaction, however tempting, to the present stalemate. Nevertheless, it is clearly time to *begin to bring this war to an end!* And I believe that, with patience and courage, we can do so!

This is what the American people demand—and it is also demanded by all logic—and I believe it can be accomplished if only we can break out of that *mental* stalemate which seems to exist in Washington, particularly in the White House, concerning the war, which I think is just as bad if not worse than the *military* stalemate that exists, no matter what the generals say, in Vietnam!

What *should* we do?

Well, let me say at the start that I, personally, *reject* the extremes of (1) "stone-age" bombing as the route to instant military "victory" simply because I do not believe it will work in this instance, or of (2) unilateral withdrawal—and this latter because we could not so retreat from Vietnam without betraying all those who have fought and died there on what we considered to be the side of "freedom."

However—while knowing that I, like you, can only have an opinion and no sure answer—I last week offered a four-point program of what I though we ought to now do in an effort to bring this war to an honorable conclusion, and I would like to repeat those points to you, now:

(*1*) I said that it was important for us to maintain the possible momentum towards peace-talks that has been provided by the recently-concluded South Vietnamese elections.

During the course of his successful campaign for the Presidency of his nation, the new head of the Saigon government—General Thieu—said that if he were elected he would ". . . ask Hanoi if it were interested in peace talks," and that if it would help to get such talks started he would ask us for a pause in the bombing of the North and, finally, he even said that he would be willing to meet, apparently during the course of such talks, with ". . . any who are representatives of the National Liberation Front" (political arm of the Viet Cong).

As one who has come more and more around to the view that the earliest path to negotiations of any sort would be that one laid out by the *Vietnamese*, themselves—North and South—I thereupon urged the President to encourage, if not insist, that Gen. Thieu follow through on these commitments. Perhaps they were merely "campaign promises" (of the sort we know all about in this country), and not "commitments"—who knows? But, the point is, there would be *no* new Saigon government—and no President Thieu—without our help, and important as it is to follow up every possible avenue towards peace I believe we ought to *insist* that he make this effort even though nothing may come of it.

Of *course*, Hanoi has already said it is not interested in whatever Gen. Thieu may offer—and is insisting that the NLF is still the only "legitimate" voice of the people in the South, but what else did we expect? And it will be increasingly difficult, I believe, for Hanoi to make its charge of "foul" and "fraud" concerning the South Vietnamese elections stick in that court of world opinion for, while far from perfect, such elections *were* a high-water-mark in experiments at democratic processes in that part of the world, and one might well ask when the last elections were held in *North* Vietnam!

(2) Concurrently with this effort in Vietnam, by the Vietnamese, I urged that our government take the initiative needed to get that dusty resolution calling for consideration by the United Nations of the Vietnam question *off* the desk of the Security Council's President where it has lain these many months.

Again, I noted that nothing may come of this, the UN being what it is—and the Russians being the way *they* are. On the other hand, the UN—which we have nurtured with our support, financially at least, all these years, is the proper forum for not only the prevention of these kinds of conflict but for their termination once started. It is, pretty much, the only "court" to which we can take our case, and we ought to do so unless we have no faith in it whatsoever. For, even if we should lose, at least the world would know at whose feet and on whose shoulders should rest the blame for the continuation of the conflict and the resulting loss of lives.

(3) For my third point, I turned to that "other"—or political—side of the war in Vietnam; the side that gets obscured by the fighting but is of no less importance, and in my book is possibly of even *more* importance in the long run. Here I said that we must insist of the new government in Saigon—that of Gen. Thieu—that it commit itself, firmly and clearly, as soon as it is functioning enough to do so, to a program of far-reaching (for an Asian country) social and economic reforms of the sort without which I do not believe it can ever hope to become a viable and responsible alternative to the continuing blandishments and harassments of the Viet Cong, especially in South Vietnam's rural areas.

As I said, this program should include not only evidence of determination on Thieu's part to clean out that mountain of graft and corruption in and around Saigon that has always been a deadweight on both the allied effort and the growth of local democracy, but evidence of his dedication to a reinvigorated pacification program and, finally, evidence that *this* time it will not be "business as usual" with this new government but, instead, a determination to get cracking with a program of *land-reform*, including land distribution to the poor tenant farmers of South Vietnam who up to now have seen little to choose between Saigon and the Viet Cong and will *never* do so until they are given a part of South Vietnam to have and to hold as their own, and thus given a *stake* in the struggle.

I believe, as I said last week, that the President should insist on these actions, now, in Saigon, and should make it clear that if there is not evidence that these things *will* be done then, indeed, American would have to reconsider the nature of its commitment to the South Vietnamese people for, if they are not *truly* willing to help themselves, we could no longer hope to help them!

(4) Finally, as point four, I turned to the military side of the conflict which—absent our withdrawal—will have to go on since none of my suggestions, even if adopted, nor anything else I could see on the horizon holds forth the promise of an early termination of our adopted task.

So, then I said—as I have been saying for over a year (and here I believe I was the first Member of Congress to call for consideration of such an idea)—that I again endorsed the idea of a *"barrier-zone"* to be built across Vietnam, South of the so-called "demolitarized zone", and I expressed my pleasure in learning—that same day—that Secretary McNamara had just announced that this was, indeed, what we were going to try.

Now, I know full well that this is a controversial proposal. In fact, when I first suggested it to a group of colleagues, one of them called it an "asinine" idea!

Generally speaking, most military people have had the same initial reaction, based on the assumption that this would be another supposedly impregnable "Maginot Line"—and we all remember what happened to that!—costly to build and requiring many troops to man. Actually, however, the kind of "barrier" now contemplated would be more like the so-called "Morice Line" that the French successfully used in the late 1950's to cut off nationalist guerrillas in Algeria from outside supplies and reinforcements.

Using a wide array of new, electronic detection devices as well as conventional mines and physical barriers plus aerial surveillance, such a "free-fire-zone" would need only to be lightly fortified and, at least in my opinion, manned by flying brigades of allied emergency forces. If it developed that more static ground forces *were* needed, why could not these be provided by South Vietnam whose army is not being very effectively used anyway and, according to some critics, insists on fighting on sort of a 5½ day basis a week?

In any event, I would agree with the critics of this idea on *one* point—which is that, unless such a barrier is carried on beyond the westerly border of South Vietnam and probably all the way through Laos to the Thai border, it would be less than effective since the Viet Cong would simply by-pass it, using the Ho Chi Minh Trail as they now do where it bends west of the present demilitarized zone and through Laos.

Of course, to do this presents us with some diplomatic problems but, in view of the large amounts of economic assistance we continue to give the Laotian government, these—if approached vigorously by the Administration—would not seem to be insurmountable.

Now, what could such a barrier-zone, if so constructed, *accomplish?*

It would probably not stop all infiltration of men and supplies from the North to the Viet Cong but, again in my opinion, it would make that process far more difficult than our extensive bombings of North Vietnam—on which we have already dropped more tons of explosives than were dropped by the allies on all of Germany during World War II—has accomplished.

Would it permit us to *stop* such bombing?

Probably not, but it would make us less dependent than now on this tactic, which has always been an international irritant of sorts, and would certainly reduce the hazards presently inherent in any bombing "pause" of the type necessary—according to so many domestic and foreign critics of our present policy—if negotiations are ever to get started.

Finally, would it help us to *"win"* this war?

Well, the answer to that depends, of course, on exactly what it is we are trying to "win," on which point there is bound to be disagreement.

We have been repeatedly told by such as Secretary McNamara, for instance, that ". . . we plan to win by proving to the enemy that *he* can't win."

And, in a nutshell, this is a pretty good definition of a "limited war"—a kind of warfare that most Americans neither understand nor like but, in a nuclear age, if we are to have wars at all, the kind of warfare we are probably going to have to learn to live with—if we hope to live at all!

Now, surely one can say in retrospect that, in the future, we ought to be more careful about picking our spots for fighting limited wars than we were in Vietnam, where the elements that have so hampered us there should have been predictable.

But, in order to now "win" that war in Vietnam into which we have stumbled, should we not now adopt a military strategy more in line than we so far have with our announced objectives? Or, to put that another way, have we not so far been playing into the hands of the enemy in Vietnam by fighting the kind of a war on the ground against an elusive and largely unseen enemy which, even with massive applications of largely ineffective air power, is slowly *bleeding us to death*—to the probable satisfaction of the Red Chinese, if not the Russians as well?

Our ground forces have been largely occupied by those costly and seemingly endless "search and destroy" missions—though military history teaches us that no government has sucessfully yet defeated a guerrilla movement that maintained access—safe haven—to an adjacent friendly nation. As I view it, a barrier-zone would not only help halt infiltration—it would also make it far more difficult for the Viet Cong to hit and then retreat to that kind of haven, to be re-supplied, to regroup and to hit again.

A barrier-zone would, it is true, return us to a defensive posture—but, by so doing, it would have the important political and psychological advantage of permitting us to highlight the essentially defensive nature of our objective—the holding nature of that objective—and at the same time to highlight North Vietnam's continued attempts at aggression.

Finally, such a zone in my opinion would permit us to stabilize this war—to contain it—to quiet it down—to move ahead faster and wih more lasting results with that all-important pacification program in the South that is also so badly bogged down, and will remain so until some sort of a front is stabilized.

But, will it permit us to *"win"?*

Probably not by itself—but, if adopted in lieu of our present strategy that has produced nearly a 100,000 U.S. casualties, and in conjunction with the kind of self-help program on the part of the new South Vietnamese government that I have indicated is absolutely essential, I believe—and again this is only an opinion—that it holds forth a better and an earlier promise of convincing the enemy that *he* can't win than does a constant escalation of the punishment we can inflict from the air on North Vietnam and its people.

Undoubtedly, that kind of aerial punishment could have been made more effective than it so far has long before this—and perhaps we should have tried before now to seal off the Port of Haiphong, for instance.

But, apparently, North Vietnam is prepared to accept—and finds acceptable—the cost of the limited bombing pressure we can only apply unless, that is, we are prepared, as I believe we are not, to begin to hit civilian centers.

In summary, no one can be sure what a winning strategy should really encompass—but, as I have said, we must *believe* we can come up with one—and with one that will permit us to bring this war to an honorable and worthwhile conclusion at a far earlier date than some gloomy prophets are now predicting it will take.

I do not know that any of the suggestions I have made will be useful in that respect—but I simply refuse to believe that our common intelligence and our capabilities, including the ability to perservere, are so limited as not to permit us to find a way out of our dilemma.

That way *must* be found.

With courage and patience—and liberal doses of common sense—it can be found; but it is time to get on with the task of doing so.

It is time to *get off dead-center!*

It is time to *begin to end this war!*

McCracken Supports Tax Increase

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1967

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, on September 12, our Committee on Ways and Means received testimony on the President's tax surcharge proposal from eight distinguished economists. The committee staff had carefully chosen the list of witnesses to present a broad range of political and economic philosophies.

Among those present was Paul W. McCracken, Emund Ezra Day University professor of business administration at the University of Michigan. Dr. McCracken, my colleagues will recall, served as a member of the Council of Economic Advisors to President Eisenhower.

Dr. McCracken delivered a stinging rebuttal to those who have advised the Congress to "wait and see" the extent of economic recovery before approving a tax increase. I quote:

> The decision about a tax increase, however, must be consistent with the economy of 1968 and 1969, not the economy of 1967.

Professor McCracken then discussed the underlying demands in our economy which have been obscured by the inventory adjustment—and their potential for real inflationary damage to our economic growth.

Mr. Speaker, because of his broad experience in government and academic circles, Dr. McCracken is particularly well qualified to comment on the need for prompt fiscal action. His statement merits the close attention of all Members of Congress and the public:

TESTIMONY OF PAUL W. MCCRACKEN, EDMUND EZRA DAY UNIVERSITY PROFESSOR OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION, THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN, PRESENTED TO THE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS, SEPTEMBER 12, 1967

Mr. Chairman, the Congress does not often confront a decision about economic policy that is as important and difficult as the proposal for a substantial tax increase. Because an unwise decision on this matter could have adverse effects on the economy of substantial magnitude in the year ahead, the matter must be examined with particular care before a legislative decision is made.

When the Budget Message was transmitted in January, a tax increase was not in order, and I would have opposed it. The deficits then projected were uncomfortably large, but the emergent slack in the economy then gave us time to re-gain better budgetary equilibrium through a policy of stronger expenditure controls.

I

We now find ourselves with a new fiscal ball game. For one thing, estimates of expenditures for the fiscal year have been revised upward sharply. Instead of an increase of $8 billion in administrative budget outlays from FY 1967 to FY 1968, the increase could apparently be as high as $18 billion. And the budget on the national income accounts basis could well show outlays rising by $20 billion or more instead of the $15 billion originally indicated in the January budget message. These are large displacements in the course projected last January for expenditures in the year ahead.

Second, the state of the economy now makes it desirable that we take steps to reduce the size of the budget deficit that is taking shape. Since the relationship between the strength of the economy and the state of the budget must be a crucial element in your decision about this proposed legislation, suppose that we explore it briefly. Thus far in 1967, of course, the economy has been sluggish. During the first half of 1967 real output increased at the rate of only 1.1 per cent per year, and industrial production was declining at a 4.6 per cent annual rate. An economy whose basic labor force is increasing about 1½ million per year was, during the first half of 1967, increasing job opportunities at the rate of only 0.5 million per year. With the decelerating pace of the economy, profits, after taxes (including the inventory valuation adjustment) went into an outright decline. Here clearly is the picture of an economy that seems to be in need of a pep pill rather than a sedative.

This decision about a tax increase, however, must be consistent with the economy of 1968 and early 1969, not the economy of 1967. What can we say about the probable course of the economy in the period ahead? On this matter we are not entirely empty-handed. For one thing we know that while total GNP has been moving along sluggishly, final demand (GNP less the inventory change) even in the first half of this year was rising at the annual rate of 8½ per cent per year (or about 6 per cent annually in real terms). The fact is that the basic, underlying demands in the economy even this year have been moving ahead strongly, but this has been obscured by the sharp inventory reversal. And unless these basic, final demands begin to slow down, all that is required for GNP to begin moving along an 8 per cent growth path is that there be a cessation in the decline of inventory accumulation. This may already have occurred.

FINAL DEMAND FOR OUTPUT

[Dollar amounts in billions; seasonally adjusted annual rates]

Item	1966, 4th quarter	1967, 2d quarter	Percent increase	
			Half-year	Annual rate
Personal consumption expenditure	$473.8	$489.7	3.4	6.8
Private fixed investment	103.7	104.6	.9	1.8
Net exports	4.3	5.3	23.2	52.0
Government purchases	161.7	175.0	8.2	17.3
Final demand	743.5	774.6	4.2	8.5
Final demand (1958 dollars)	644.0	664.0	3.1	6.3

Source: Basic data from the Department of Commerce.

There is little to suggest that these final demands for output are going to decelerate, in the aggregate, during the first half of 1967. Indeed, the evidence points the other way. Government outlays are now projected to rise strongly. The rise in Federal expenditures (NIA basis) that would be consistent with revised budget estimates is about $20 billion from the second quarter of 1967 to mid-1968. With higher state and local spending, government expenditures must be assumed to increase about $25 billion in the year ahead.

PROJECTED FEDERAL BUDGET EXPENDITURES ON THE NATIONAL INCOME ACCOUNTS BASIS

[Seasonally adjusted annual rate in billions]

Calendar year	Pattern implied by—	
	January budget message	August tax message
1966—3rd quarter	[1] $145.8	[1] $146.3
4th quarter	[1] 152.2	[1] 151.9
1967—1st quarter	155.0	[1] 160.9
2d quarter	159.0	[1] 162.8
3rd quarter	163.0	166.0
4th quarter	167.0	171.0
1968—1st quarter	171.0	177.0
2d quarter	175.0	182.0

[1] Actual. After January "actual" data for the final 2 quarters of 1966 were revised slightly.

Source: Actual data from Commerce Department. The January budget message projected Federal outlays (NIA budget) at $153,600,000,000 for fiscal year 1967 and $169,200,000,000 for fiscal year 1968. The August tax message giving administrative budget estimates, seems to imply outlays of $173,000,000,000 to $175,000,000,000 for fiscal year 1968 (NIA budget), assuming a rough allowance for contingencies. The 2 columns give a quarterly pattern of projections roughly consistent with these estimates.

INDICATORS OF MONETARY POLICY

Period	Free reserves [1]	Increase, money supply (percent) [2]
1966—3d quarter	−$373	3.5
4th quarter	−273	.9
1967—1st quarter	72	11.8
2d quarter	247	11.3
3d quarter [3]	275	11.0

[1] In millions.

[2] Seasonally adjusted annual rate of increase. Time deposits are included.

[3] Rough preliminary estimates based on incomplete data.

Source: Basic data from the Federal Reserve System.

We also know that by any unambiguous test monetary policy has been highly expansive all year. After the turn-about from last year's tight Federal Reserve policy, net free reserves have ranged in the $250 million zone, and this position seems to be continuing in the third quarter. With ample bank reserves, the rate of monetary expansion has been about 12 per cent per year all during 1967. This is about double the 6 per cent or so required to accommodate the ongoing growth of the economy. Monetary and credit changes exert their influence on business conditions in subtle and diffused ways that are difficul to disentangle and measure with conventional statistical tools. One thing, however, seems clear. There is a lag of two to three quarters between monetary changes and changes in business activity. We have seen this, of course, during the last year. While the economy continued to move along in 1966 even with stringent credit conditions, the effects of a tight monetary policy in the latter half of 1966 did finally begin to show up in 1967. This is about the lag that one would expect. If experience is any guide, we must now expect thta the rapid pace of monetary expansion in 1967 will soon begin to show up in an acceleration of the economic advance during the concluding months of 1967 and into 1968.

If the arithmetic is allowed to take its course, the evidence now available bearing on 1968 suggests a vigorous pace of expansion. This is true whether we work up a conventional GNP projection or whether we use something like a simple equation relating changes in GNP to earlier changes in the money supply (including time deposits). With no tax increase my own estimates of changes in GNP from 1967 to 1968 range from a low of 7.7 per cent to a high of 11.0 per cent. With something like the proposed tax increase, but as of January 1, estimates of the 1967–68 change in GNP still range from almost 7 per cent to about 8 per cent. (This would also assume a somewhat less expansive monetary policy.)

The evidence, in short, suggests that in the absence of further action the demand for output will be outpacing the 5–6 per cent that real output can be increased during the year ahead. The economy not only can tolerate more fiscal restraint but that restraint will positively be needed to keep the economic advance orderly and sustainable.

If we do not take action now to reduce the deficit, we must be prepared for growing pressures on credit markets as economic expansion accelerates and a large Federal deficit is financed—all at a time when the rate of monetary expansion would almost certainly need to be reduced. In the past this combination of developments has often laid the basis for a subsequent reversal of business activity.

II

There is, however, a more fundamental reason for a less expansive budget than guesses about business prospects. By the second quarter Federal outlays were running about $14 billion per year in excess of the receipts that our present tax structure would have produced even if our productive capacity had been utilized reasonably fully. We now have, in short, a budget in just as fundamental a state of disequilibrium as in the early 1960's with their obverse problem of excessive high-employment surpluses.

Federal budget surplus on a high-employment basis

[NIA budget; seasonally adjusted annual rate in billions]

Calendar year—quarter:	*Surplus*
1960	$14.8
1961	12.7
1962	9.8
1963	12.9
1964	5.9
1965	4.0
1966—1	−0.2
2	1.4
3	−1.9
4	−4.9
1967—1	−10.6
2[1]	−14.4

[1] Preliminary.

SOURCE.—Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis. This surplus is roughly the difference between expenditures and the receipts the revenue system would have produced at reasonably full employment.

If we attempt to make decisions about a major change in fiscal policy too exclusively on the basis of the economic situation, the results in practice are apt to be more destabilizing than we like to admit. A major change in fiscal policy must be consistent with economic developments as they unfold in the future. Yet we are apt to make a major change in policy only if that change is consistent with current (which really means recent) business conditions—which, in turn, were largely a function of past policies. Though it is with economic conditions in 1968 that the proposed tax increase must be consistent, we are now hesitant in part because we are uncomfortable about it in the context of sluggish conditions in 1967 (which were heavily influenced by 1966 policies). This strategy of policy can itself easily become one step out of phase, causing itself a wavering course for the economy.

We need a basic guideline for budget policy that is less dependent on the inevitably uncertain and tenuous assessments of business prospects. The high employment budget is helpful here. The basic budgetary guideline should to keep our expenditures in reasonable balance with the revenue producing capability of the tax structure at full employment. If that had been our guideline historically, there would have been fewer cases where the budget itself became an important source of uncertainty and instability in the economy.

This guideline now calls for a tax increase, and it is probably a more sure-footed helmsman here than our inevitably tentative guesses about the business situation and prospects. Its greater use as a basic guide to fiscal policy will make for a more stable economy.

III

Would a tax increase give us a smaller deficit or accelerated spending? Would a tax increase, in short, give us a less or a more expansive fiscal policy? (A tax increase that led to a like increase in spending would have a stimulating effect on the economy.) This accounts for some of the widespread opposition to the proposed tax increase, and it is an issue that must be faced.

The fiscal program initiated now should, therefore, include the expenditure as well as the revenue side of the budget. Too often discussions about the expenditure problem come to center around the question: "What would *you* cut out?" What any individual citizen would cut out of the budget is not a very important or helpful contribution to the problem. The real question is: *Can our procedures that decide the course of Federal expenditure be improved?* There is enough reason to think that they can to warrant a thorough exploration of the matter. And the time has come for a thorough examination of this process within the Congress, since an important part of this decision-making process is legislative in character.

Certain questions naturally present themselves here. For one thing should appropriations in each session of the Congress be for one fiscal year later than now? Should the Congress now, for example, be working on appropriations for fiscal year 1969 rather than 1968? As it is now, the energies of the Congress are absorbed with the budget for a fiscal year (at the moment FY 1968) already well under way and whose expenditures cannot easily now be deflected.

Should there also be some procedure by which the Congress considers and approves the whole budget, as well as passing on the merits of each program? This idea has had, of course, a rather checkered career. In principle, however, something like this needs to be a part of the budgetary process. Since the aggregate of programs which in themselves have merit will always be "too large" (if there is anything to the discipline of economics), good budgeting requires going from the top down as well as building from the individual program claimants to the total.

Should more organized efforts be made to evaluate the results of government programs? Too often the existence of a problem is presumed to justify a program—rather than whether the program is dealing effectively with the problem.

These are, of course, quick questions raised to indicate some of the expenditure dimensions of our fiscal problem that need thorough, fundamental exploration. It would be a constructive step if this exploration could be part of the fiscal program put together to deal with our present problem. The President earlier this year appointed a commission to review budget concepts. It would be useful to follow this with a commission to review the expenditure decision-making process.

IV

Three conclusions emerge from this analysis. First, it is more important that the decision on a tax increase be consistent with economic conditions in 1968 than with those in 1967. The evidence, as best it can now be evaluated, suggests that a tax increase will be desirable to minimize the danger of an overheated economy next year.

Second, we need a more sizable guideline for fiscal action than our inevitably uncertain and uneasy evaluations of business prospects. We need a basic fiscal guideline. The operation of fiscal policy will be more conducive to orderly economic growth if we endeavor to keep the revenues that our tax structure will yield at high levels of employment in reasonable balance with expenditures, the present high employment budget deficit of roughly $15 billion clearly means that the budget is in a state of fundamental disequilibrium, and it signals for action to reduce the deficit. We will have an economy with greater capacity for orderly, vigorous growth if we pay more attention to this fiscal guide.

Finally, a part of the needed fiscal program is a fundamental study of procedures that decide the course of Federal expenditures. Otherwise, a tax increase passed in the name of fiscal restraint might lead to a like acceleration of outlays and a more expansionist budget—which would be a paradoxical result indeed for an action that started out to achieve more restraint.

Economist Now Favors Surcharge Proposal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LUCIEN N. NEDZI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 26, 1967

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, the noted economist, Prof. Paul W. McCracken, of the University of Michigan, recently testified that he was initially skeptical of a tax increase, but was now convinced of its need.

Professor McCracken stated before the House Ways and Means Committee that "we now find ourselves with a new fiscal ballgame," and he went on to explain why he presently favors the surcharge.

Professor McCracken made an informative presentation—one that I found particularly useful in trying to appraise the real need for the surcharge.

I comment it to the attention of my colleagues:

TESTIMONY OF PAUL W. MCCRACKEN, EDMUND EZRA DAY UNIVERSITY PROFESSOR OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION, THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN, PRESENTED TO THE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS, SEPTEMBER 12, 1967

Mr. Chairman, the Congress does not often confront a decision about economic policy that is as important and difficult as the proposal for a substantial tax increase. Because an unwise decision on this matter could have adverse effects on the economy of substantial magnitude in the year ahead, the matter must be examined with particular care before a legislative decision is made.

When the Budget Message was transmitted in January, a tax increase was not in order, and I would have opposed it. The deficits then projected were uncomfortably large, but the emergent slack in the economy then gave us time to re-gain better budgetary equilibrium through a policy of stronger expenditure controls.

I

We now find ourselves with a new fiscal ball game. For one thing, estimates of expenditures for the fiscal year have been revised upward sharply. Instead of an increase of $8 billion in administrative budget outlays from FY 1967 to FY 1968, the increase could apparently be as high as $18 billion. And the budget on the national income accounts basis could well show outlays rising by $20 billion or more instead of the $15 billion originally indicated in the January budget message. These are large displacements in the course projected last January for expenditures in the year ahead.

Second, the state of the economy now makes it desirable that we take steps to reduce the size of the budget deficit that is taking shape. Since the relationship between the strength of the economy and the state of the budget must be a crucial element in your decision about this proposed legislation, suppose that we explore it briefly. Thus far in 1967, of course, the economy has been sluggish. During the first half of 1967 real output increased at the rate of only 1.1 per cent per year, and industrial production was declining at a 4.6 per cent annual rate. An economy whose basic labor force is increasing about 1½ million per year was, during the first half of 1967, increasing job opportunities at the rate of only 0.5 million per year. With the decelerating pace of the economy, profits after taxes (including the inventory adjustment) went into an outright decline. Here clearly is the picture of an economy that seems to be in need of a pep pill rather than a sedative.

This decision about a tax increase, however, must be consistent with the economy of 1968 and early 1969, not the economy of 1967. What can we say about the probable course of the economy in the period ahead? On this matter we are not entirely empty-handed. For one thing we know that while total GNP has ben moving along sluggishly, final demand (GNP less the inventory change) even in the first half of this year was rising at the annual rate of 8½ per cent per year (or about 6 per cent annually in real terms). The fact is that the basic underlying demands in the economy even this year have been moving ahead strongly, but this has been obscured by the sharp inventory reversal. And unless these basic, final demands begin to slow down, all that is required for GNP to begin moving along an 8 per cent growth path is that there be a cessation in the decline of inventory accumulation. This may already have occurred.

FINAL DEMAND FOR OUTPUT

[Dollar amounts in billions; seasonally adjusted annual rates]

Item	1966, 4th quarter	1967, 2d quarter	Percent increase	
			Half-year	Annual rate
Personal consumption expenditure	$473.8	$489.7	3.4	6.8
Private fixed investment	103.7	104.6	.9	1.8
Net exports	4.3	5.3	23.2	52.0
Government purchases	161.7	175.0	8.2	17.3
Final demand	743.5	774.6	4.2	8.5
Final demand (1958 dollars)	644.0	664.0	3.1	6.3

Source: Basic data from the Department of Commerce.

There is little to suggest that these final demands for output are going to decelerate, in the aggregate, during the first half of 1967. Indeed, the evidence points the other way. Government outlays are now projected to rise strongly. The rise in Federal expenditures (FIA basis) that would be consistent with revised budget estimates is about $20 billion from the second quarter of 1967 to mid-1968. With higher state and local spending, government expenditures must be assumed to increase about $25 billion in the year ahead.

PROJECTED FEDERAL BUDGET EXPENDITURES ON THE NATIONAL INCOME ACCOUNTS BASIS

[Seasonally adjusted annual rate in billions]

Calendar year	Pattern implied by—	
	January budget message	August tax message
1966—3rd quarter	[1] $145.8	[1] $146.3
4th quarter	[1] 152.2	[1] 151.9
1967—1st quarter	155.0	[1] 160.9
2d quarter	159.0	[1] 162.8
3rd quarter	163.0	166.0
4th quarter	167.0	171.0
1968—1st quarter	171.0	177.0
2d quarter	175.0	182.0

[1] Actual. After January "actual" data for the final 2 quarters of 1966 were revised slightly.

Source: Actual data from Commerce Department. The January budget message projected Federal outlays (NIA budget) at $153,600,000,000 for fiscal year 1967 and $169,200,000,000 for fiscal year 1968. The August tax message giving administrative budget estimates, seems to imply outlays of $173,000,000,000 to $175,000,000,000 for fiscal year 1968 (NIA budget), assuming a rough allowance for contingencies. The 2 columns give a quarterly pattern of projections roughly consistent with these estimates.

INDICATORS OF MONETARY POLICY

Period	Free reserves [1]	Increase, money supply (percent) [2]
1966—3d quarter	−$373	3.5
4th quarter	−273	.9
1967—1st quarter	72	11.8
2d quarter	247	11.3
3d quarter [3]	275	11.0

[1] In millions.

[2] Seasonally adjusted annual rate of increase. Time deposits are included.

[3] Rough preliminary estimates based on incomplete data.

Source: Basic data from the Federal Reserve System.

We also know that by any unambiguous test monetary policy has been highly expensive all year. After the turn-about from last year's tight Federal Reserve policy, net free reserves have ranged in the $250 million zone, and this position seems to be continuing in the third quarter. With ample bank reserves, the rate of monetary expansion has been about 12 per cent per year all during 1967. This is about double the 6 per cent or so required to accommodate the on-going growth of the economy. Monetary and credit changes exert their influence on business conditions in subtle and diffused ways that are difficult to disentangle and measure with conventional statistical tools. One thing, however, seems clear, there is a lag of two to three quarters between monetary changes and changes in business activity. We have seen this, of course, during the last year. While the economy continued to move along in 1966 even with stringent credit conditions, the effects of a tight monetary policy in the latter half of 1966 did finally begin to show up in 1957. This is about the lag that one would expect. If experience is any guide, we must now expect that the rapid pace of monetary expansion in 1967 will soon begin to show up in an acceleration of the economic advance during the concluding months of 1967 and into 1968.

If the arithmetic is allowed to take its course, the evidence now available bearing on 1968 suggests a vigorous pace of expansion. This is true whether we work up a conventional GNP projection or whether we use something like a simple equation relating changes in GNP to earlier changes in the money supply (including time deposits). With no tax increase my own estimates of changes in GNP from 1967 to 1968 range from a low of 7.7 per cent to a high of 11.0 per cent. With something like the proposed tax increase, but as of January 1, estimates of the 1967–68 change in GNP still range from almost 7 per cent to about 8 per cent. (This would also assume a somewhat less expansive monetary policy.)

The evidence, in short, suggests that in the absence of further action the demand for output will be outpacing the 5–6 per cent that real output can be increased during the year ahead. The economy not only can tolerate more fiscal restraint but that restraint will positively be needed to keep the economic advance orderly and sustainable.

If we do not take action now to reduce the deficit, we must be prepared for growing pressures on credit markets as economic expansion accelerates and a large Federal deficit is financed—all at a time when the rate of monetary expansion would almost certainly need to be reduced. In the past this combination of developments has often laid the basis for a subsequent reversal of business activity.

II

There is, however, a more fundamental reason for a less expansive budget than guesses about business prospects. By the second quarter Federal outlays were running about $14 billion per year in excess of the receipts that our present tax structure would have produced even if our productive capacity had been utilized reasonably fully. We now have, in short, a budget in just as fundamental a state of disequilibrium as in the early 1960's with their obverse problem of excessive high-employment surpluses.

Federal budget surplus on a high-employment basis

[NIA budget; seasonally adjusted annual rate in billions]

Calendar year—quarter:	*Surplus*
1960	$14.8
1961	12.7
1962	9.8
1963	12.9
1964	5.9
1965	4.0
1966—1	−0.2
2	1.4
3	−1.9
4	−4.9
1967—1	−10.6
2 [1]	−14.4

[1] Preliminary.

SOURCE.—Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis.

This surplus is roughly the difference between expenditures and the receipts the revenue system would have produced at reasonably full employment.

If we attempt to make decisions about a major change in fiscal policy too exclusively on the basis of the economic situation, the results in practice are apt to be more destabilizing than we like to admit. A major change in fiscal policy must be consistent with economic developments as they unfold in the future. Yet we are apt to make a major change in policy only if that change is consistent with current (which really means recent) business conditions—which, in turn, were largely a function of past policies. Through it is with economic conditions in 1968 that the proposed tax increase must be consistent, we are now hesitant in part because we are uncomfortable about it in the context of sluggish conditions in 1967 (which were heavily influenced by 1967 policies). This strategy of policy can itself easily become one step out of phase, causing itself a wavering course for the economy.

We need a basic guideline, for budget policy that is less dependent on the inevitably uncertain and tenuous assessments of business prospects. The high employment budget is helpful here. The basic budgetary guideline should be to keep our expenditures in reasonable balance with the revenue producing capability of the tax structure at full employment. If that had been our guideline historically, there would have been fewer cases where the budget itself became an important source of uncertainty and instability in the economy.

This guideline now calls for a tax increase, and it is probably a more sure-footed helmsman here than our inevitably tentative guesses about the business situation and prospects. Its greater use as a basic guide to fiscal policy will make for a more stable economy.

III

Would a tax increase give us a smaller deficit or accelerated spending? Would a tax increase, in short, give us a less or a more expensive fiscal policy? (A tax increase that led to a like increase in spending would have a stimulating effect on the economy.) This accounts for some of the widespread opposition to the proposed tax increase, and it is an issue that must be faced.

The fiscal program initiated now should, therefor, include the expenditure as well as the revenue side of the budget. Too often discussions about the expenditure problem come to center around the question: "What would *you* cut out?" What any individual citizen would cut out of the budget is not a very important or helpful contribution to the problem. The real question is: Can our procedures that decide the course of Federal expenditures be improved? There is enough reason to think that they can to warrant a thorough exploration of the matter. And the time has come for a thorough examination of this process within the Congress, since an important part of this decision-making process is legislative in character.

Certain questions naturally present themselves here. For one thing, should appropriations in each session of the Congress be for one fiscal year later than now? Should the Congress now, for example, be working on appropriations for fiscal year 1969 rather than 1968? As it is now, the energies of the Congress are absorbed with the budget for a fiscal year (at the moment FY 1968) already well under way and whose expenditures cannot easily now be deflected.

Should there also be some procedure by which the Congress considers and approves the whole budget, as well as passing on the merits of each program? This idea has had, of course, a rather checkered career. In principle, however, something like this needs to be a part of the budgetary process. Since the aggregate of programs which in themselves have merit will always be "too large" (if there is anything to the discipline of economics), good budgeting requires going from the top down as well as building from the individual program claimants to the total.

Should more organized efforts be made to evaluate the results of government programs? Too often the existence of a problem is presumed to justify a program—rather than whether the program is dealing effectively with the problem.

These are, of course, quick questions raised to indicate some of the expenditure dimensions of our fiscal problem that need thorough, fundamental exploration. It would be a constructive step if this exploration could be part of the fiscal program put together to deal with our present problem. The President earlier this year appointed a commission to review budget concepts. It would be useful to follow this with a commission to review the expenditure decision-making process.

IV

Three conclusions emerge from this analysis. First, it is more important that the decision on a tax increase be consistent with economic conditions in 1968 than with those in 1967. The evidence, as best it can now be evaluated, suggests that a tax increase will be desirable to minimize the danger of an overheated economy next year.

Second, we need a more stable guideline for fiscal action than our inevitably uncertain and uneasy evaluations of business prospects. We need a basic fiscal guideline. The operation of fiscal policy will be more conducive to orderly economic growth if we endeavor to keep the revenues that our tax structure will yield at high levels of employment in reasonable balance and expenditures. The present high-employment budget deficit of roughly $15 billion clearly means that the budget is in a state of fundamental disequalibrium, and it signals for action to reduce the deficit. We will have an economy with greater capacity for orderly, vigorous growth if we pay moré attention to this fiscal guide.

Finally, a part of the needed fiscal program is a fundamental study of procedures that decide the course of Federal expenditures. Otherwise, a tax increase passed in the name of fiscal restraint might lead to a like acceleration of outlays and a more expansionist budget—which would be a paradoxical result indeed for an action that started out to achieve more restraint.

Panamanian Paper Commends "Magnificent Job" of Aid Mission Director James Megellas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1967

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, James Megellas, currently Agency for International Development Mission Director in Panama, is highly regarded in his home State of Wisconsin. He is a much-decorated veteran of World War II and was for two terms a highly successful mayor of Fond du Lac.

More recently he has won the same high regard from the people of Panama. The appreciation of Panamanians for Jim Megellas' excellent administration of the AID program in that country was expressed in a recent editorial in La Prensa, of Panama.

Because public attention tends to focus on the difficulties and setbacks in our aid program rather than the more numerous accomplishments and success, I hope my colleagues will note this editorial. It is illustrative of the results which AID can achieve with the service of men such as Jim Megellas.

A translation of the editorial follows:

Panamanian Paper Commends Magnificent Job of AID Mission Director James Megellas

Recent news report had misinformed the public that the U.S. Government in Washington had replaced Mr. James Megellas, as Director of A.I.D. in Panama.

This information caused considerable uneasiness and discomfort in Panama, because if we evaluate the work of Megellas in our country, the goodwill he has displayed in performing his duties, and his ample eagerness in winning the acknowledgement and appreciation of all Panamanians, we must agree that he has a very favorable balance.

James Megellas is a very well known person from Darien to the boundaries with Costa Rica; but the knowledge the average Panamanian has of him is, not only for the assistance that in the performance of his official duties he has accomplished in the cities as well as in the rural areas; but for the appreciation he has won for his pleasant and noble manners, absent of all gestures of superiority, in dealing with all Panamanians of all social classes.

There has been many North-Americans who, in accomplishing official missions have helped in developing our country; but, if Mr. Megellas continues with his plans and policies as done so far, when he leaves our country, the people of Panama will keep an imperishable memory of his winning manners and nobility.

It is the desire of the people of Panama, that Mr. Megellas continues the magnificent job he is doing in our country.

Our Free Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 26, 1967

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, the "subtle restraints" on the freedom of the press in the United States must be resisted by constant vigilance and a continuing awareness that such restraints are harmful to the public interest.

At the recent meeting of the International Federation of Newspaper Publishers at Tel Aviv, Israel, Mr. J. Howard Wood, publisher of the Chicago Tribune, discussed certain restraints on press freedom and noted their dangers.

I submit for the Record a Tribune editorial which comments on Mr. Wood's remarks in Israel.

The editorial follows:

Our Free Press

The current meeting of the International Federation of Newspaper Publishers at Tel Aviv, Israel, provided J. Howard Wood, publisher of The Tribune and president of the American Newspaper Publishers association, with occasion to summarize clearly two threats to the freedom of the American press. Direct and obvious attacks on freedom to publish the news have no standing in American society, Wood observed, but there are attempts being made to impose "more subtle restraints which are 10 times more difficult to expose and combat" than overt censorship would be.

Two major current threats to the public's right to know, Wood told his international audience, are to be found in efforts by some government officials to "manage" news of government operations, and in attempts to limit press coverage of crime news. Both threats are advanced under cover of lofty motives. The news managers claim to be acting in behalf of national security. Critics of press coverage of crime news profess concern lest defendants lose their right to fair trials. But the American newspaper press, Wood told his Tel Aviv audience, is unitedly aware that indirect censorship, if it comes, will come in disguise.

Wood spoke in the best traditions of American journalism when he said forth-rightly that both national security and the welfare of citizens in court and out require a free press. It is an article in the American faith that freedom is both good in itself and productive of many varied benefits.

Is it in the public interest that the press be able and willing to cope with officials who try to hide shortcomings under unnecessary security classifications? Is it in the public interest that the press provide uncensored accounts of criminal acts and trials, among other newsworthy events, thus providing an indispensable check on arbitrary actions by courts and police? The answer given both by American history and by today's American newspapers is yes. We are pleased and proud that the able spokesman at Tel Aviv for our country and its press was our own distinguished publisher, J. Howard Wood.

Lost: Incentive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 13, 1967

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a copy of a radio report made by Earl Nightingale, entitled "Lost: Incentive." It is timely and contains much food for thought. The report follows:

LOST: INCENTIVE

The thing that made this country great was an extremely precious thing called "opportunity": The Land of Opportunity. Any man here has always been free to go for the big gold ring on the merry-go-round. The sky was always the limit, so everything has always been bigger here: bigger cars, bigger companies, bigger homes, bigger incomes, bigger and better products of all kinds. All because of that priceless thing—opportunity!

But, gradually, the picture changed, until now, as U.S. News & World Report shows, it seems to the young man with ambition hardly worth the effort. The problem? Taxes! The same kind of taxes that pulled the bottom out of England's economy.

Here's an example of how a businessman can wind up working for the government, whether he likes it or not.

Let's say a Mr. Smith is president and sole owner of Smith Corporation, a small company that pays him a salary of $25,000 a year. It pays 100 other employes a total of $500,000 a year, has annual sales of 2 million dollars.

First, government takes from Smith Corporation $30,000 in State and local levies, excises and other taxes.

Second, government takes from Smith Corporation $15,000 in Social Security taxes. Assume this leaves the company with $100,000 profit before federal income taxes.

Third, government takes from Smith Corporation $46,000 in federal corporate income tax. Profit has now shrunk to $53,000. Assume that Smith puts 20%—$10,700 in new equipment, which he must do to stay competitive, and takes 80%—$42,800 as dividends for himself.

Fourth, government takes from Mr. Smith $28,500 in personal taxes on his total income of $67,800 salary and dividends.

Fifth, government takes from the Smith employes $57,000 in personal taxes on their pay.

Now, think a moment, from all his work, planning, long hours and sleepless nights, from the hard years it took to build a successful business, Mr. Smith is granted a token $39,300 a year while the government takes $177,000. Nothing can be put aside for possible difficult days ahead.

Is there any doubt in your mind who Mr. Smith is working for? And what happened to the secret to the whole thing—that "opportunity" that made the country great? Where has it fled?

If Mr. Smith is successful, the government takes practically all of it. If Mr. Smith should fail. Tough! Can he ask for the kind of aid that the boys in Washington are so free with when it comes to strangers and noncitizens in foreign lands? No, he cannot. He is an American citizen so he is exempt from the billions flowing into the far corners of the world and what makes it really ironical is that it's his money, and the money of men like him, that's being so freely given away, and spent with such lavish hands.

Because of the almost unbelievable oppressiveness of taxes, opportunity has been dealt a terrible blow.

Rioting and Lawlessness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 26, 1967

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, concern for the growing wave of rioting and lawlessness that is sweeping throughout America was expressed recently by the adoption of a resolution by the Area 3, Florida District, Civitan International, in a council meeing assembled at Boca Raton, Fla., Saturday, July 29, 1967.

Because of the high regard Civitan International is held in, this resolution should be carefully read by the Members of this Congress.

I am therefore delighted to enclose in the RECORD at this point the resolution adopted by the Florida District of Civitan International dealing with this subject:

RESOLUTION 1

Whereas, There is a growingly distressful and morally decadent trend in our beloved country toward criminal activities, including murder, rape, mob violence, looting, riot and the destruction of private property;

Whereas, Many of our leaders in government, including the national government, and our courts condone this increase in crime as excused by "economic conditions" of the criminals concerned;

Whereas, The federal courts, particularly the Supreme Court, have been more concerned with the protection of the "rights" of criminals than with the rights, personal welfare and even the lives of innocent victims and with the safety of private property;

Whereas, The failure of our courts, and of Congress to provide measures that would overcome that failure, has led to disrespect for our law forces and violence and sometimes death for men in our forces of law and order;

And whereas, a major tenet of Civitan—a canon of its Creed—declaring: "My Mind teaches me respect for the law, unqualified allegiance to our government and love and respect for the Flag of our Country," requires our fullest support of law and order:

Now therefore be it resolved, That Civitans of Area 3, (also Areas 1 & 2) Florida District, Civitan International, decry and deplore, in the strongest terms at our command, the criminal activity that has become dominant in our nation;

Be it further resolved, That we urge upon the courts, and particularly the Supreme Court of the United States, to limit their over-obsession with the rights of crime and criminals to the end that they can give a greater measure of protection to the rights in law of peaceful citizens against crime and the protection of private property—rights our Founding Fathers aimed to protect and rights on which the nation was built.

Be it further resolved, That Civitans commend, in general, the sacrifices and services of our police and other law enforcement officers in their continuing dedicated service in the face of public apathy and the actual condonement by irresponsible citizens of attacks, both verbal and physical, upon them and that we pledge our support to them in the enforcement of law and order. Also that we condemn the growing popular cry, raised among elements that wish to violate the law, of "police brutality"—which actually occurs most infrequently in reality and then only, generally, is given only in such force as is required against criminal resisters.

Be it further resolved, That Civitans urge upon the Congress and all State Legislatures, the need for the passage of strengthened laws to prevent all crimes against persons and property that that will render them safe against violence, including rioting, mob action and looting.

And be it finally resolved, that copies of these resolutions be sent to the President of the United States, members of the Supreme Court, the Senators and Representatives from Florida in the Congress, the Governor of Florida, the President of the Florida Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

For Florida Civitan:

DONALD F. ROTHWELL,
Governor.
JOHN W. HUGHES,
Governor-Elect.
LEON W. NOEL,
Resolutions Committee.
HUGH H. SOPER,
Resolutions Committee.

Crime Cost Equals Viet War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM R. ANDERSON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 26, 1967

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, Robert Sheehan, one of this Nation's most astute and progressive educators in the field of criminal justice and law enforcement has written a very excellent and penetrating article which appeared in the Boston Globe this past Sunday. As acting dean of the pioneering College of Criminal Justice at Northeastern University, Robert Sheehan is in an ideal position to assess the grave costs of crime in this Nation and to recommend constructive solutions.

Further, he epitomizes the great benefits that can be reaped by continuing and greatly expanding the dialogue between our institutions of higher learning and the police and corrections professions.

Under unanimous consent, I would like to include Dean Sheehan's remarks, in the RECORD so that all Members may take note of his timely and most pertinent analysis:

[From the Boston Sunday Globe, Sept. 24, 1967]

CRIME COST EQUALS VIET WAR

(By Robert Sheehan, acting dean, College of Criminal Justice, Northeastern University)

While Attorney General Ramsey Clark was proclaiming this month that "public safety is the first purpose of government," his employer, President Johnson, was saying that "what America needs is a policy for action against crime in the streets."

If both men were right, then government is failing sadly at its task.

There has never been a time in history when the public and the Congress have been so aroused, and at the same time, so much in disagreement about a crime problem which is spreading like a malignancy across the face of the nation.

Crime has become a disease, seemingly incurable, affecting the security of every citizen and threatening the democratic process.

The statistics of crime dramatically point out its seriousness. According to figures released by the FBI, crime rose 17 percent in the first six months of 1967. At least two and one-half million serious crimes are committed in this country each year, costing the citizen an estimated $27 billion or approximately the same amount spent in Vietnam. The non-statistic costs in loss of human freedom and dignity, in wasted lives and in personal trauma are staggering.

The unfortunate reality at the core of the problem is that Congress has chosen to do precious little about it.

More is spent in researching tooth decay in this country than in researching crime. In fiscal '66, while the police of Vietnam were receiving 23 million American dollars, Congress provided less than $8 million to assist our own police. This is difficult to justify.

The public, unusually emotional about the problem and rather uncertain anyway about the propriety of the Federal government becoming involved in local law enforcement, has been very vocal about crime but has left the solutions to Congress.

Few in Washington have been able to agree on what we should do about crime. Most solutions have been shallow and unenlightened gestures which lack meaning and direction. With crime in the streets fast becoming the single most important domestic concern in the '68 elections, it has unfortunately become a partisan, political issue in Congress.

The Crime Control Act of 1967, conceived by the President and strongly endorsed by the Attorney General, failed to get support in the House. In amended state, it presently rests within the Judiciary Committee of the Senate. Many recognized authorities in law enforcement believe that if the bill passes in its present form it will actually contribute to lawlessness and establish a dangerous and wasteful precendent for Federal funding of local law enforcement agencies. $75 million of government money would pour into the 50 states to be doled out by each governor with little or no control over the spending.

In some of our less sophisticated states, it is believed that much of this money would be spent on tanks, guns and kill-oriented riot control equipment rather than on concentrated research and training to develop better police-community relations and more professional police departments. Indeed, if during this past Summer we have seen America as a nation at war with itself, then the Crime Control Act of 1967, as presently constituted, will hurl the country into a depression of violence, racial hatred and national shame.

If the Senate Judiciary Committee is at all visionary, it will restore the bill to its original form, allowing the Attorney General to administer the funds, thus providing a control that will minimise patronage and assure quality in granting procedures.

Congress must also act to establish college scholarship aid for the working police officer and for the young man in college who plans a career in municipal police service. Congressman William R. Anderson (D-Tenn.), who distinguished himself as commander of the Nautilus on its historic voyage under the North Pole (filed a bill in the House providing such scholarships as well as low-interest, partially forgivable educational loans for policemen. Sen. Abraham Ribicoff (D-Conn.), has had the foresight to introduce the Anderson bill as an amendment to the Crime Control Act in the Senate. Without public pressure, however, it is feared that the amendment will not pass even though it has strong support from police chiefs throughout the country.

The reputations, and in some cases the careers, of some of our governmental leaders in Washington may well rest, at least in part, on the positions they take to restore this nation to domestic peace. Whatever the cost, this must be done.

A Job Corps Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 26, 1967

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, as an additional indication of the truly fine job being done by Job Corps in the crucially important field of rehabilitating and redirecting disadvantaged young lives, I wish to call the attention of my distinguished colleagues to an item appearing in Lou Panos' column "Inside Baltimore," in the September 19 edition of the Baltimore Sun. Mr. Panos quotes from a letter written by a 19-year-old graduate of the Job Corps, who is now employed as a welder at Avondale Shipyard in New Orleans, La.

Mr. Speaker, the Job Corps prepared this young man for a fine job at a starting salary of $3.02 an hour. Prior to his Job Corps experience, finding a useful trade appeared to be "an impossible task," in his own words. The young man in question is James Fleming, who hails from Westport in my congressional district. Mr. Speaker, I strongly commend young Mr. Fleming for so successfully helping himself get out of poverty through the Job Corps, and, with permission, I insert Lou Panos' report at this point in the RECORD:

A JOB CORPSMAN WRITES

The folks who run the Job Corps and other anti-poverty groups come in for at least their share of raps, including an occasionally bad one.

So it seems only fitting to toss them a bouquet when they obviously rate one, like this.

It's in a letter from 19-year-old James Fleming, formerly of 2401 Dorton court in Westport.

He writes from the Gary Training Center of the corps, in San Marcos, Texas:

" . . . I will like to extend my gratitude to all the staff members that helped along in my trade, because I must admit that at first it seemed like an impossible task for me.

"But, however, with your help I finally overcome it and now I'm a welder at Avondale Shipyard in New Orleans, La.

"My starting salary there was $3.02 an hour. So, you see, I'm not doing too bad, and I owe it all to the founder of Job Corps and also the people like you that make it possible for me and other corpsmen.

"Well, I'm enclosing this letter . . . in order that you might put it in the daily newspaper because there're so many of my friends back home that don't know the real meaning of Job Corps or how it ticks, but if they could see me now I believe that they will also see the many opportunity that lie ahead of them if only they would make the first step up the ladder. . . ."

There's a post-script asking that the cost of publishing the letter be billed to its writer.

No charge, Mr. Fleming.

A Law That Discriminates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 26, 1967

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, earlier this session I introduced H.R. 7775 designed to remedy a defect found in the labor certification provisions, section 212(a) (14), of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1965 (8 U.S.C. 1182(a) (14) (Supp. 1965–66)). The present law places an unwarranted burden upon the prospective immigrant who typically must fulfill the requirements of this particular provision while in his own country and who, more often than not, is unfamiliar with our procedures.

My bill would, by reverting to the language of section 212(a) (14) prior to the effective date of the 1965 act, shift the burden from the immigrant back to the Secretary of Labor upon whose shoulders it rested prior to the 1965 act.

I commend to the attention of my colleagues an editorial of September 16, 1967, from the Irish Echo describing the discriminatory effect of the present law vis-a-vis the Irish who have made such great contributions to the culture and development of this Nation:

[From the Irish Echo, Sept. 16, 1967]

A LAW THAT DISCRIMINATES

The fight to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1965 has entered a new and perhaps decisive stage. A massive letter-writing campaign, spearheaded by the American Irish Immigration Committee, and directed to the members of Congress, has been initiated.

The effectiveness of this type of letter-writing campaign should not be underestimated, particularly since the entire 435 members of the House of Representatives and one-third of the Senate are up for reelection in 1968.

Readers of the Echo will recall how effective a letter-writing campaign can be when properly promoted. Last year when some preliminary moves were made to shift the day and site of the St. Patrick's Day Parade, a deluge of mail was directed at the Mayor and members of the City Council of New York. This newspaper joined with the St. Patrick's Day Parade Committee and other Irish organizations in that fight. The result was a decisive victory.

Now we are faced with a greater and more complicated problem. When the new immigration law was passed in December 1965, it was rightfully heralded for its liberal approach to immigration and for its elimination of discrimination against many nationalities.

However, what was not reckoned with was the interpretation and implementation of the labor preference sections of the law by the Labor Department.

Thus, in operation the law has resulted in blatant discrimination against would-be immigrants from several nations—particularly Ireland. The 1965 law simply exchanged one type of discrimination for another.

Undoubtedly, many members of Congress are unaware of this disgraceful situation. They lead a busy, complicated life with scores of issues vying for their attention. Each of us can help make them aware of the situation. Write today to your Congressman and your two Senators. Write to right a wrong.

The Effect of the Celler-Kefauver Antimerger Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 26, 1967

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I am pleased to include a statement I made before the Antitrust and Trade Regulation Committee of the National Chamber of Commerce at its luncheon, Tuesday, September 26, 1967, in Washington, D.C. My speech follows:

ENFORCEMENT OF THE CELLER-KEFAUVER ANTIMERGER ACT

(By Representative Emanuel Celler, chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. House of Representatives, before the Antitrust and Trade Regulation Committee of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, Sept. 26, 1967)

On December 29, 1950, President Truman signed the Celler-Kefauver amendment to Section 7 of the Clayton Act. This was the capstone to my years of hard labor to close the "assets" loophole that had rendered old Section 7 completely ineffective. Some of you will recall that the Federal Trade Commission in 1939 had reported to the Temporary National Economic Committee that ". . . the effectiveness of this section has been completely emasculated as a result of court decisions." Because the anti-merger provisions of the Clayton Act applied only to stock acquisitions of direct competitors, original Section 7 had no appreciable impact on the merger movement that swept many industries in the late 1920's.

Over the last seventeen years, enforcement of Celler-Kefauver has shown its vast potential. Supreme Court decisions have made the anti-merger section a veritable revolution in anti-trust enforcement. Between January, 1951 and June 30, 1967, the Government instituted a total of 205 anti-merger actions. Eleven cases have reached the Supreme Court, and the Government has had exemplary success. The Supreme Court has supported Government enforcement to a degree beyond my greatest expectations, and has made Celler-Kefauver a powerful instrument of public policy. It is good public policy, everyone benefits.

The Government's attack on corporate mergers since 1951 has challenged assets acquisitions amounting to more than $8.34 billion. Three-fourth (153) of the complaints challenged acquisitions by manufacturing and mining corporations, and involved a total of $6.8 billion. Eighteen complaints were filed against banking and financial institutions, nineteen cases involved companies in wholesale and retail trade, and five challenged joint ventures.

The Government has had an exemplary court record in enforcement of this Act. What, however, has been the economic consequence? Here, as you may suspect, there is considerable disagreement among the authorities. John Kenneth Galbraith has made a strident attack on contemporary anti-trust policy. He dismisses anti-trust, and the anti-merger act, as being largely irrelevant to today's industrial organization. Anti-trust, he says, is a "charade" designed "not to prevent exploitation of the public" but "to persuade people in general, and British socialists and American liberals in particular, that the market is still extant."

On the other hand, other critics find that the Celler-Kefauver Act has resulted in an attack on bigness and made it virtually impossible for big companies to grow by merger. *Fortune* Magazine, for example, has informed the business community that "recent Supreme Court decisions go so far in prohibiting specific mergers that any potential merger of two substantial, healthy companies is logically subject to challenge under the new precedents."[1] Clearly, both Professor Galbraith and *Fortune* cannot be right.

When Congress passed the Celler-Kefauver Act, we were concerned with industrial concentration: both high *market concentration*, when a few top companies dominate a particular market; and *aggregate concentration*, which measures the share of all manufacturing held by the top 100 or 200 concerns. Study after study at that time showed that in many of the vital industries of the United States, the top four concerns controlled 70% to 80% of the market. When Celler-Kefauver was passed, aggregate concentration was experiencing a rapid increase. Between 1947 and 1950, the 113 largest manufacturing corporations' share of all manufacturing assets rose from 40.0% to 43.5%. Between 1947 and 1954 the top 200 companies' share of value added in all manufacturing corporations rose from 30% to 37%.

We in Congress assumed that increases in concentration could be prevented by prohibiting horizontal, vertical, and conglomerate mergers which showed a reasonable probability of substantially lessening competition or of tending to create a monopoly. In other words, Congress, in the Celler-Kefauver amendment, attacked the problem of increasing concentration by seeking to prevent those mergers which had an adverse effect on competition.

Dr. Willard F. Mueller, Director, Bureau of Economics of the Federal Trade Commission, recently has prepared an analysis of the economic consequences that have been achieved by enforcement of the Celler-Kefauver Act. His analysis finds that ". . . the merger enforcement program since 1950 represents a unique event in American anti-trust history. And when measured by its effects, it has had a fundamental and widespread pro-competitive impact on the organization and performance of our economy."[2]

I have long thought that the most effective aspect of anti-trust, and the chief impact of enforcement policy, is the deterrent effect produced by threatened prosecutions. Dr. Mueller produces some interesting figures on deterrent effects that the legal rules against horizontal mergers produced. He states:

"In the first four years, 1951–1964, following passage of the Celler-Kefauver Act, horizontal mergers comprised about 37% of the number and 40% of the assets of all 'large' acquisitions in manufacturing and mining. [Large mergers are defined as those where the acquired company had assets of $10 million or more.] During the next four-year period, 1955–1958, the proportion of horizontals declined somewhat. But during the next four years, 1959–1962, horizontal mergers dropped off sharply, comprising only about about 17% of the number and 19% of the assets of large acquisitions. And during the last four years, 1963–1966, horizontals accounted for about 14% of the number and only 12% of the assets of all large mergers. In the last year, 1966, horizontal mergers represented only 8% of the assets of all large acquisitions.

"Not only has the relative volume of horizontal mergers declined, but the *absolute* volume has declined as well. The peak of horizontal merger activity was reached in 1956 when there were twenty-one large horizontal mergers with combined assets of $1.4 billion. Although there were 60% more large mergers in 1966 than in 1956, by 1966 the number of large horizontal mergers had fallen to twelve and involved combined acquired assets of only $311 million.[3]

The steel industry is a good example of Celler-Kefauver's effect on concentration. A landmark case under Celler-Kefauver was the attack on the puroposed merger in 1956 of Bethlehem Steel Corporation and Youngstown Sheet and Tube Company. This merger involved a combination of $2.9 billion in assets. Bethlehem was the country's second largest steel company, with 16.3% of the ingot capacity, while Youngstown was the sixth largest steel company, with 4.6% of the ingot capacity. The top four companies' share of ingot capacity would have increased from 59% to 64%.

The objective of Bethlehem-Youngstown was to permit Bethlehem to enter steel production in the Chicago area. Celler-Kefauver prevented Bethlehem from entering this market by the merger route. Since the court's decision, notwithstanding the many arguments by the companies at the trial about the necessity to merge in order to penetrate the Chicago markets and successfully compete there with U.S. Steel, Bethlehem has entered this market by internal growth, not by merger. Internal growth is far healthier for the economy. Its plant at Burns Harbor, Indiana, thirty miles east of Chicago, was started in 1962 and was producing steel plates by 1964. Subsequent internal expansion includes production of hot and cold rolled sheets. Since the case, both Bethlehem and Youngstown have expanded significantly and independently by internal growth.

The effect on concentration of the Celler-Kefauver Act in this case has been described as follows:

"The blocking of the Bethlehem-Youngstown merger had a clear effect on the structure of the steel industry. Between 1954 and 1963, concentration of shipments among the top steel companies actually declined. Whereas in 1954, the top four companies accounted for 55% of the value added by 'blast furnaces and steel mills', their share had dropped to 50% by 1963. This is almost identical to the market share of Youngstown. Consequently, had the merger been permitted, concentration almost certainly would not have declined. In fact, had this decision laid down a rule of law in permitting a horizontal merger of this magnitude, it is highly probable that Judge Weinfeld's 'chain reaction' theory would have become a reality, which would have greatly increased concentration."[4]

The effect on aggregate concentration resulting from Celler-Kefauver enforcement is not as susceptible to measurement. The level of aggregate concentration in the United States economy has risen steadily during the past century, and significantly since World War II. Between 1947 and 1963, the top 200 manufacturing firms expanded their share of the value added by all manufacturers from 30% to 41%, or over one-third. Between 1950 and 1965, the share of total manufacturing assets held by the top 100 companies rose from 38.8% to 45.4%, and the share of the top 200 rose from 46.9% to 55.4%.

There can be no doubt that mergers played an important role in this increase in aggregate concentration. Between 1948 and 1965 the largest industrial corporations of 1965 made at least 2,692 acquisitions with combined assets of $21.5 billion. Dr. Mueller believes that analysis will support the hypothesis that aggregate concentration actually would have declined after 1954 had it not been for the continuing mergers by the top 200 companies.

What would have happened if Section 7 had not been amended in 1950 and there had been no significant constraints on mergers? Certainly the 205 anti-merger cases would not have been brought by the Government. The more significant impact, however, I would imagine, has been the abandonment of many contemplated mergers because of the fear that the Government might act. It is not possible to estimate the volume of such abandoned mergers, but from the statements of businessmen and private anti-trust counsel, the number of potential mergers must be

---

Footnotes at end of speech.

enormous. Dr. Mueller believes that an expanded effort against conglomerate mergers will be beneficial in this regard. He says:

"It is still too early to predict the ultimate impact on aggregate concentration of an expanded policy toward conglomerate mergers. Chances seem good that such an expanded policy although directed solely at anti-competitive conglomerate mergers, will prevent further increases in the share of all manufacturing assets held by the top 100 or 200 industrial corporations. Indeed, it may well result in an erosion of their position."[5]

I want to say a few words about the Government's enforcement efforts with respect to conglomerate mergers. Section 7 of the Clayton Act, as amended by Celler-Kefauver, was intended to arrest anti-competitive effects of market power in their incipiency. The core question is whether a merger may substantially lessen competition, and this necessarily requires a prediction of the merger's impact on competition, present and future. The Supreme Court, in *FTC vs. Procter and Gamble,* has made it clear that "All mergers are within the reach of Section 7, and all must be tested by the same standard, whether they are classified as horizontal, vertical, conglomerate, or other."

The Supreme Court's definition of a conglomerate merger is ". . . one in which there are no economic relationships between the acquiring and the acquired firm." Procter and Gamble's acquisition of Clorox was not a true conglomerate. It was, rather, a "product extension" merger. The products of Clorox complemented the soap business of Procter and Gamble. They could be produced with similar facilities, marketed through the same channels, and advertised in the same media.

Although there are other factors, one of the most significant tests in weighing anti-competitive effects is to measure the *potential* competition in the industry that is eliminated by the acquisition. In the Procter and Gamble case, the findings clearly showed that Procter, the acquiring firm, was the most likely entrant. Further, this acquisition tended to raise barriers to new entry by other companies. The major competitive weapon in the successful marketing of bleach is advertising. A new competitor could have found it within his means to compete against Clorox, whose advertising expenditures were relatively small. But a newcomer, however, would be much more reluctant to face the giant advertising expenditures that Procter could devote to bleach.

In my view, as I have said before, it is much better, from a competitive standpoint, for these large companies to grow from within, rather than to grow by acquisition. In 1964, in commenting upon the Federal Trade Commission's decision on the *Clorox* merger, I stated:

"To few people realize that this utilization of corporate funds (for mergers and acquisitions) frustrates government efforts to stimulate investment activity and economic growth in two ways. First, it diverts corporate resources into mergers instead of the building of new plants and the development of new technical resources. Secondly, through the merger movement, economic concentration and oligopoly are increased, making our economic system less competitive and flexible. Indeed, the more monopoly or quasi-monopoly there is in America, the more rigid are prices and the less incentive there is for business to reduce prices to stimulate consumer demand and business activity."[6]

Consequently, from the point of view of maintaining competition, I think we should take a hard look at any merger involving the takeover of a dominant or leading firm in one industry by a dominant or leading firm in another industry, whether the two industries are functionally related or not. In the long run, the best protection for the consumer is *to hold the avenues open for potential entrants* who by coming into or even threatening to come into the market with new capacity would hold prices near competitive levels and prevent the garnering of undue profits or restricted productivity in oligopoly industries.

Although the Supreme Court has given us a few guidelines for consideration of conglomerate mergers, much more needs to be done. Elucidation of reasonable and realistic standards for testing conglomerate mergers is still an important item of unfinished business. It has been suggested that some monetary limit should be placed upon future conglomerate mergers that may not fit into the Celler-Kefauver Anti-Merger mould. The limit beyond which the conglomerate could not go by merger would be say, $100,000,000 of assets. Special treatment might be given all existing conglomerates. At this stage of the development of policy toward conglomerate mergers, cases should be litigated. Comprehensive trial records should be established in the FTC and in the courts. Consent statements by the Commission or by the Department of Justice at this state of enforcement experience can only result in decrees whose remedies are based on vague, obscure, and idiosyncratic foundations.

In closing, I want to thank you for this opportunity to meet with you and to discuss anti-merger problems.

Are there any questions?

---

[1] Max Ways, *Fortune,* March 1966, p. 222.

[2] Mueller, "The Celler-Kefauver Act: Sixteen Years of Enforcement", p. 87.

[3] *Ibid.,* pp. 24–26.

[4] Mueller, *op. cit.,* p. 37.

[5] Mueller, *op. cit.,* p. 79.

[6] Hon. Emanuel Celler, "Federal Trade Commission Decision on Procter & Gamble-Clorox Merger Is a Major Breakthrough in the Application of the Celler-Kefauver Act", *Congressional Record,* March 23, 1964, p. A1493.

Milwaukee Journal Rightly Praises President Johnson's Appointment of Walter Washington as District of Columbia Commissioner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1967

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, in a recent editorial, the Milwaukee Journal rightly praised President Johnson for following his modernization of the government of the District of Columbia with the appointment of Walter E. Washington as District Commissioner.

As the Journal points out, the appointment is noteworthy for several reasons. By appointing a Negro to this high position, President Johnson underscores his administration's determination to provide equal opportunity for all Americans. Moreover, by naming a chief executive with deep roots in the District, a keen insight into its problems, and a broad background of experience to solve them, the President reemphasized his commitment to the District's welfare.

I join in commending this excellent appointment.

The text of the Journal editorial follows:

[From the Milwaukee (Wis.) Journal, Sept. 11, 1967]

WASHINGTON OF WASHINGTON

Appointment of a Negro as Washington's mayor puts a man of experience and ability in charge of our nation's capital city and symbolizes the administration's determination to support the drive for civil rights.

Walter E. Washington knows Washington. He worked in the federal housing field for many years and served as head of the national capital housing authority. He went to New York last fall to head that city's housing agency. His experience will be valuable in dealing with the major problem of bad housing and slums that plagues Washington.

President Johnson deserves credit for the appointment. For years the congress has insisted upon acting as the city's common council and has rejected efforts to give Negroes a larger voice in local government. Southerners have time and again barred persons and programs purely on the ground of race. Now that congress finally has allowed reorganization of the city government, there is opportunity for greater home rule and more participation by the large Negro population. There had been pressure on the president not to name a Negro because it might be looked upon as a "reward" for rioting. The president nevertheless took the action needed in spite of critics.

The new mayor needs senate confirmation. If he is considered on the basis of his qualifications, there is nothing to worry about.

University of Houston Cougars, After 21 Years, Break Into Football's Top 10

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB CASEY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 26, 1967

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I bring to my colleagues' attention today an historic first in football.

My alma mater, the great and growing University of Houston, after 21 years of football, has finally broken into that select group known as the top 10 football teams in the Nation.

Those of us who have watched and rooted for our teams, good or bad, over the years, welcome this historic first. Two smashing victories this season have brought the recognition a great team and coaching staff deserve. All of us in Houston are proud of the Cougars—proud of their smashing victory over Florida State, which routed Alabama from the No. 2 position—and proud of their great victory and replacement of Michigan State as the third ranked team last Saturday.

On behalf of all the people of Houston, I extend sincere congratulations to the Cougars and to Bill Yeoman and his coaching staff. May the remainder of this season be brightened with a great string of victories for we have waited a long time to watch a team such as this.

NOTRE DAME FAR AHEAD IN TWO POLLS

Notre Dame gave the seers who pegged the Irish to repeat this year as No. 1 in college football no cause to change their minds in last weekend's opener and retains first place overwhelmingly in this week's polls by the wire services.

But while Notre Dame, which rolled over California, 41–8, lived up to expectations, the other preseason members of the top three—Michigan State and Alabama—plummeted while Southern California, UCLA and out-of-nowhere Houston moved up to challenge the Irish.

In the Associated Press ratings, it is Notre Dame with 31 of a possible 41 first-place votes and 390 poll points to 340 for runnerup Southern Cal. The AP places Houston—a 37–7 master of Michigan State on Saturday—in third place, UCLA fourth.

UPI HAS UCLA SECOND

United Press International's 35-member board of coaches accords Notre Dame 27 first-place votes and 337 points while UCLA edges USC for runnerup, 266–264 in its first poll of the year. Houston is No. 4.

The Associated Press, which ran its first poll last week, this time elevates Southern Cal from fourth to second on the strength of its 17–13 conquest of Texas, which consequently dropped from No. 5 to No. 8.

Houston, which was unranked last week although it had beaten Florida State, 33–13, in its first game, zoomed into the No. 3 spot in place of its latest victim, Michigan State.

ALABAMA NOW NINTH

The Cougars gained added lustre when the same Florida State team they routed fought Alabama to a 37–37 tie—dropping the Crimson Tide from second to ninth in the rankings. Michigan State fell all the way out of the Top Ten.

UCLA jumped from sixth to fourth in the AP ratings on the strength of a 40–8 romp over Pittsburgh; Georgia climbed from seventh to fifth by opening with a 30–0 triumph over Mississippi State; Colorado rose from ninth to sixth after tripping Oregon, 17–13; Nebraska jumped from tenth to seventh although idle.

The Top Ten in each poll has the same membership except that Texas failed to make it in the UPI vote. The coaches rate Missouri No. 10.

THE RANKINGS

Associated Press

The Top Ten, with first place votes in parentheses, season records and points on a 10–9–8–7–6–5–4–3–2–1 basis:

1. Notre Dame (31)	1–0	390
2. Southern California (4)	2–0	340
3. Houston (6)	2–0	279
4. UCLA	2–0	275
5. Georgia	1–0	260
6. Colorado	2–0	118
7. Nebraska	1–0	79
8. Texas	0–1	76
9. Alabama	0–0–1	75
10. Purdue	1–0	70

Others receiving votes, listed alphabetically: Army, Clemson, Florida, Florida State, Georgia Tech, Louisiana State, Memphis State, Miami, Fla., Michigan State, Minnesota, Missouri, Navy, Northwestern, Oklahoma, Oklahoma State, Oregon State, South Carolina, Syracuse, Tennessee, Texas Tech, West Virginia, Wyoming.

United Press International

1. Notre Dame (27)	1–0	337
2. ULCA (2)	2–0	266
3. Southern California (1)	2–0	264
4. Houston (5)	1–0	251
5. Georgia	1–0	193
6. Nebraska	1–0	112
7. Colorado	2–0	93
8. Purdue	1–0	84
9. Alabama	0–0–1	61
10. Missouri	1–0	50

Second 10—11, Wyoming, 44; 12, Texas, 36; 13, Florida, 28; 14, Northwestern, 27; 15, Texas Tech, 13; 16, Georgia Tech, 10; 17, Memphis State, 9; 18, Michigan State, Syracuse and Florida State, 7.

Other teams receiving votes: Tennessee, Navy, Michigan, Brigham Young, Louisiana State, Army, Mississippi and Princeton.

Tax Arguments That Work Both Ways

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD RUMSFELD
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 26, 1967

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, a major question of the hour is whether or not the Congress should approve the 10-percent surtax being urged by the President. There are those who feel that the tax surcharge is inevitable and that it must be approved to help slow down the inflationary spiral. There are others who feel that the tax increase is not needed and that cuts in nonessential Federal spending can be equally effective in stemming inflation.

In any event, the taxpaying public should not be expected to bear the full burden. Spending on nonessential or low-priority Federal programs can and should be reduced until our financial situation is in better shape.

An excellent editorial in the Chicago Tribune of September 25, 1967, aptly points out that the administration's arguments work both ways.

The editorial follows:

TAX ARGUMENTS THAT WORK BOTH WAYS

Secretary of the Treasury Fowler defended the proposed tax surcharge in a speech at the National Press club Thursday, and he dismissed the public opposition to it in somewhat cavalier fashion as "wholly normal but uninformed."

He said that Congress would be playing "political Russian roulette" if it allowed itself to be influenced by public opinion and that the result would be "an economy in shambles." He didn't predict the rate of inflation that would ensue, but he did recall that during the Korean war the dollar lost purchasing power at a rate of 5½ per cent a year. At this rate, he said, the average family would lose more thru inflation than from the tax increase.

These are all stock arguments in behalf of the tax increase, and they might be persuasive if the choice facing us were simply to raise taxes 10 per cent on the one hand or to suffer inflation on the other.

But it is not. For one thing, there is going to be inflation anyway; the proposed surcharge would offset only about one-quarter of the expected deficit and would, therefore, affect only the degree of inflation.

More important, Mr. Fowler and the rest of the Johnson team ignore completely something that most taxpayers know very well: that inflation can be fought just as effectively by reducing spending as by raising taxes. Yet scarcely a word has been said about economies since Mr. Johnson's last promise to cut out all nonessential spending. On the contrary, new spending projects keep popping up in areas having nothing to do with the war, and the federal civilian payroll continues to expand.

Mr. Fowler's "uninformed" taxpayer would be quite justified, therefore, in dismissing Mr. Fowler's attitude as "a wholly normal but selfishly misguided reluctance to sacrifice any federal plans." The administration, this taxpayer could properly say, is playing "political Russian roulette" by its stubborn determination to proceed as usual with the moon project and by its calculated blindness to waste in other programs ranging from foreign aid to the maintenance of a subversive activities control board with no duties to speak of. By persisting in this behavior, he could add, the administration may put the economy in shambles.

In short, Mr. Fowler's arguments work both ways. As long as the bureaucracy is unwilling to do its share by sacrificing nonessential projects, he is being presumptuous and hypocritical to suggest that the taxpayer should do all the sacrificing.

Courting the Unions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. O. C. FISHER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 13, 1967

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial which appeared in a recent issue of the Thirty-Three magazine. Here is found an excellent discussion of practical problems growing out of the administration of our labor laws. The editorial follows:

COURTING THE UNIONS

Do you remember when a Supreme Court decision *settled* things? When it was the *last* word, and not the preamble to a whole new set of litigation? When *res adjudicata* meant the thing had been *decided*, dammit, and that, for the millennium, was *that*?

Seems a long time ago, doesn't it? Lately Supreme Court decisions have sounded more like opening guns than anything else and the litigants of both sides go away from the halls of justice freshly provoked and muttering of revenge. The test cases which follow more often than not reopen the issue *ab initio*, and the root premise of the Court's reasoning—the reasoning which informed the majority opinion, since become the law of the land—finds itself Exhibit A. Again. And again. And yet again.

The question suggests itself whether it's so much harder nowadays for the citizens of our admittedly complex country to stay briefed. Or are they just harder to make law for, for some reason or other? Or—one shudders at one's own boldness in framing the unworthy suspicion—is it just that the Supreme Court of the United States is handing down some very wrongheaded decisions of late?

Alas. Consider the action of the Court in the Allis-Chalmers case of recent memory. The Court's decision—that the National Labor Relations Board was within its rights to rule that unions may impose large fines on their members and enforce them by lawsuit—covers a lot of ground in a few words. This is perhaps not apparent on a quick run-through, but the NLRB was not slow to press its gains, and less than two weeks after it was upheld by the Court it took action which clearly constitutes the biggest quantum jump forward for the union movement in this country in recent years: it endorsed the right of unions to have employees discharged from their jobs under a union shop agreement for what amounted to fines for non-attendance at union meetings.

The implications of this are staggering, and particularly anomalous in this period of civil-rights frenzy. For the first time a man's union may interpose itself between him and his employer *for its own purposes*, and the most confirmed union man must recognize that here is something very new in the vexed history of U.S. labor relations. Before this time, even a man who was pulled out on strike, against his better judgment, in implementation of a union grievance with an employer who was, in our man's judgment, blameless, could know at least that his union was trying to advance the general—i.e. his—welfare even if it *was* running out of control. Now, thanks to the NLRB and the Supreme Court, his union, no longer an association of men like himself grouped to advance and protect their common interests, but rather a legal fiction federally empowered to punish, may enter the privileged relationship between himself and his employer and sunder it. Virtually at will, it should be added, since the effective safeguards on the conduct of union leadership are few enough and provenly feeble.

The Allis-Chalmers doctrine did not spring from the noble brow of anyone now on the highest bench: it just growed, which insidious union legislation is all too prone to do, out of previous bad judicial judgment, Cf. 165 NLRB No. 97, *Local 171 Pulp & Paper Workers (Boise Cascade Corp.)*. An employee protested to the NLRB his union's exaction of higher dues under threat of discharge under a union shop agreement with the employer. His arrears included certain sums which the union compelled him to pay for non-attendance at meetings, a punitive device greatly favored by unions but prohibited by the Taft-Hartley Act of 1947, as interpreted by the NLRB since 1950. The pivotal point is worth stressing: Taft-Hartley confines discharge under union shop agreements to employes, failing to pay *dues*. The use of "refunds," "rebates," or other devices—fines, actually, against non-cooperating members, since the "rebates" go to those who toe the mark, is proscribed.

Suddenly, in 1967, after seventeen years of interpreting such cases in the light of such reasoning, the NLRB stated that in the Local 171 Cascade case: "The Board has . . . reconsidered its decisions in those cases and a majority of the Board has decided to overrule those decisions." Very little more time and space were given to the matter, over and above this extraordinary about-face, although something was said about restrictions on union fines constituting "an unwarranted intrusion into the internal affairs of a union." Nothing, you may be certain, was said about any unwarranted intrusion of a union into the internal affairs of one of its members!

The dissenters on the Board (the decision was 3–2) pointed out the frightening possibilities growing out of the case:

1) The device of the "refund" permits the union to do covertly what it is prohibited from doing outright: "The employe who does not wish to engage in union activities must pay for that privilege."

2) With such a precedent, unions may impose just about any requirements they choose, and enforce compliance by threat of discharge under a union shop clause. "The variety (of objectives sought by the union)" the minority opinion continued, "is limited only by the ingenuity and imagination of resourceful union leaders."

Showing that it means what it says (My own troubled imagination had doubted it), the Board early this year ruled, in the Montgomery Ward case (NLRB No. 38), that the employer in question may not exercise his own discretion in the face of union demand for an employe's dismissal. If the dereliction involves "dues," whatever these sums are in actuality, the employer has no choice but to put his power and prestige (eroded as they may be) behind the union effort to discipline his employe.

Comes now *Allis-Chalmers*, under which doctrine a union can levy astronomical fines for anything it chooses to call "conduct unbecoming a union member," and can collect, on the employe's wages or property. If he still refuses to pay, the union may bring suit against the employer for specific performance of the union shop clause. The employe can do, precisely, nothing.

The court has really tilted the board this time.

"Woman in the News: Representative Leonor Sullivan"—A Profile of an Outstanding Member of Congress, by the New York Post

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 26, 1967

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, every Member of the House will enjoy reading a personality feature in the Weekend magazine of the New York Post for Saturday, September 2, 1967, about the gentlewoman from Missouri, the Honorable LEONOR K. SULLIVAN, which tells a great deal about the character and integrity and ability of this outstanding Member of Congress.

The article, written by Helen Dudar of the New York Post, describes Congresswoman SULLIVAN's vigorous and valiant battle for effective consumer credit legislation as chairman of the Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs of the House Committee on Banking and Currency. In this connection, the article gives a fascinating insight into the kind of family in which Mrs. SULLIVAN grew up and, thus, helps to explain the high moral plane on which she attacks issues of vital importance to the American family.

For example:

> During her St. Louis childhood, simple calculation in the uses of a dollar was fairly crucial. Born Leonor Alice Kretzer, she was one of nine children in a close-knit Catholic family with ancestral German habits of diligent thrift and hard work.
>
> Her father, like his father before him, was a custom tailor. "When times were good we were comfortable. When they weren't, we struggled. Thank goodness, we were reared in a family that realized you had to work for what you got. There were six girls, and my mother made every stitch of clothing we wore. As we grew up, we knew we had responsibilities to the younger ones in the family."

Much of the article relates to Congresswoman SULLIVAN's work on the Banking Committee and on consumer issues, but, as the chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, I am greatly privileged to have her as the ranking member of that committee where she has done an outstanding job as chairman of the Subcommittee on the Panama Canal and as a member also of the Subcommittees on the Merchant Marine and on the Coast Guard. She is one of the hardest working Members of Congress and also one of the most popular. We all respect her ability and admire her graciousness and charm.

I feel that this article by Helen Dudar in the New York Post is one of the best I have ever read about the Honorable LEONOR KRETZER SULLIVAN and I take pleasure in calling it to the attention of all of my colleagues in the Congress by inserting it in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Weekend Magazine of the New York Post, Sept. 2, 1967]

WOMAN IN THE NEWS—REPRESENTATIVE LEONOR SULLIVAN: "IF I WANT SOMETHING BADLY ENOUGH"

(By Helen Dudar)

Just about the only political ammunition available to foes of Rep. Leonor K. Sullivan's "truth in lending" bill is the fact that in this easy age of credit the sponsor is almost subversively attached to a personal principle of paying cash for everything.

Mrs. Sullivan, a Democrat from St. Louis, has served in the House for nearly 15 years, some of which have been spent worrying the cosmetics industry, infuriating poultry processors and upsetting advocates of economy in welfare programs.

Now, as chairman of the House Banking and Currency subcommittee on consumer affairs, she is firmly pressing for a credit disclosure bill tougher than a Senate-approved measure and with more teeth than the Administration asked for.

Mrs. Sullivan good-humoredly describes herself as "one of those funny persons who saves before she buys. If I want something badly enough, I'll do without other things in order to get it." She even pinched pennies for a year to finance her first primary fight for her late husband's House seat.

By telephone from Washington, where she was fighting a siege of flu and laryngitis, the Congresswoman volunteered the information that once, years ago, she did buy something on an instalment plan.

Fresh out of high school and earning a pittance on her first job, she determined to make her music-loving family a Christmas gift of a console victrola, which is what they used to call a piece of furniture with a record player. "I paid for it over a year's time and when it was all paid for found that the credit costs almost equaled the price of the victrola."

The experience, one gathers from the cheerful account, was not so much traumatic as educational, Mrs. Sullivan is an even-tempered woman without any taste for personal dramatics. She is also lively, amiable, uncomplicated, direct and open. There is almost nothing she will not talk about except her birthdate, which is one of the best-kept secrets on Capitol Hill.

The Congresswoman is in her 50s, a tall, erect lady, with gray-streaked brown hair. She wears warm colors, loves jewelry, uses mascara, buys too many hats and shoes, confesses to a constant battle with a half-dozen unwanted pounds and has, according to a gallant admirer, "the best-looking legs in Congress."

Personal preferences aside, Mrs. Sullivan is convinced that credit-buying is "good and necessary—and it has helped build up the economy of our country." But, she is concerned about the "misuses and the oversell" and the lack of candor about credit terms.

"People," she says, "should be able to know exactly what it costs to use other people's money for something they want to buy."

The Senate bill requires disclosure, by annual rates and dollar amounts, of the costs of loans and of such major instalment purchases as cars, large appliances and furniture. One of the most controversial points of Mrs. Sullivan's measure is a section extending requirement to department store revolving charge accounts.

At hearings recently, retail representatives kept trying to persuade Mrs. Sullivan that it was impossible to compute an annual rate on their monthly 1½ per cent "service charge" on unpaid balances because the balances varied from month to month. An observer, watching the subcommittee chairman gently drum her fingers through a lot of the testimony, said, "You could almost see the comptometer keys working." As a veteran operator of accounting machines, Mrs. Sullivan is a hard woman to convince that 1½ per cent a month does not represent an annual interest rate of 18 per cent a year.

During her St. Louis childhood, simple calculation in the uses of a dollar was fairly crucial. Born Leonor Alice Kretzer, she was one of nine childern in a close-knit Catholic family with ancestral German habits of diligent thrift and hard work.

Her father, like his father before him, was a custom tailor. "When times were good we were comfortable. When they weren't, we struggled. Thank goodness, we were reared in a family that realized you had to work for what you got. There were six girls, and my mother made every stitch of clothing we wore. As we grew up, we knew we had responsibilities to the younger ones in the family."

Neither college nor a career interested her. "My dear," she said mildly, "all I wanted was a good husband, a big family and a nice home." She speaks with uncomplaining regret of her childlessness, but then adds brightly, "Yet I've loved every job I ever had."

The first one was sorting toll tickets for the local telephone company. Conscientious and quick to learn, the young Leonor Kretzer worked her way into the billing department and used her lunch hours to teach herself to operate a comptometer. Later she got a job in a business school and finally wound up running one.

At some point in those years, a matchmaking dentist decided that she and another patient, a politically ambitious attorney named John Berchmans Sullivan, would be an ideal couple, and he scheduled appointments for them at the same hour.

The courtship last 10 years. Miss Kretzer liked everything about her suitor except his intense involvement in municipal politics. "I had an idea there was some taint attached to politics," she said.

They might never have married if Sullivan had not won a Congressional seat in 1940. St. Louis proved to be so lonely without him that the following year Leonor Kretzer became Mrs. Sullivan. By then, the U.S. was at war and Congress was feverishly busy, as well as understaffed.

"In those years, if you wanted to see anything of your husband, you went to his office and worked for him." From a disdainful bystander, she was gradually converted into a fervent politician. "My husband loved our form of government. His whole political life—and I think mine, too—was spent in doing what he could to make life better for the individual and the home."

After a few years, Mrs. Sullivan was running her husband's office and his campaigns. He died, at the age of 53, in 1951. For the special election for a successor, St. Louis Democrats passed up his widow in the belief that "a woman couldn't win." They lost it to the Republicans, and Mrs. Sullivan went to work for another Missouri House Democrat, "saving my earnings because I knew I'd have to finance my own primary campaign."

In 1952, running against seven men, she captured the Democratic nomination and then defeated the Republican incumbent. She has been winning ever since, in recent years with better than 70 per cent of the total vote. Her district, which cuts through central St. Louis, includes some of the city's richest residents and many of its poorest.

In Congress, specializing in "the things a woman normally knows more about than a man," Mrs. Sullivan has concentrated on being a friend to the consumer and a partisan of the poor. One of her most successful efforts achieved federal inspection of poultry processing plants, some of which, before 1957, were as unsanitary as meat-packing plants had been 50 years before.

She has labored effectively for pre-testing chemical additives used in food and for federal control of barbiturates, but in 14 years has been unable to persuade Congress on the issue of pre-testing cosmetics. A modest but faithful user of make-up, Mrs. Sullivan wants to protect women from hair-coloring that produces baldness and fake fingernails that loosen real ones. Congressmen, she says, are "downright scared to do anything that could be construed as interfering with women's inherent right to try to be more beautiful."

Mrs. Sullivan frankly enjoys being one of 11 women in the House: "The men listen to us when we speak—although they don't always follow our advice." Feminine and ladylike, she is not without muscle or the capacity to apply it when and where she feels it is necessary.

A few weeks ago, a House Agriculture Committee hostile to the food stamp plan came up with some crippling amendments to the program. Now food stamps are Mrs. Sullivan's baby. She battled for 10 years for the 1964 legislation which gives welfare recipients a chance to buy adequate and nutritious provisions.

The Congresswoman bided her time. Finally, when a pet piece of committee legislation arrived on the floor—a regional bill favoring peanut farmers—she organized a revolt, rallying enough votes to kill it. She is now calmly waiting for the Agriculture Committee to see things her way.

Mrs. Sullivan lives in a one-bedroom apartment in Arlington, Va., with a gleaming, seldom-used kitchen. She likes to cook, sew and ride horses—activities curtailed by the 12-hour day she spends on the Hill.

A thousand letters come to her office every week, and she is fanatic about reading each one and seeing to answers. One weekend in each month she tries to get home "to see what's happening in the poverty programs, in public housing, in the neighborhood centers." From time to time there are big neighborhood street meetings where she can get to talk to constituents.

"I like to be close to them," she explained, "and I like to know what they're thinking."

Time To Salute the Achiever

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY C. SCHADEBERG

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 26, 1967

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, there is finally a realization by many Americans that we must congratulate those of our fellow citizens who are willing to work hard to achieve success—be it in school, industry, or homemaking. One of the best articles that I have been fortunate to read on "self pity" and "achievement" was an editorial by WITI-TV, of Milwaukee.

I would like to place it in the RECORD so that my colleagues and others may share the sentiments of the editorial writer with whom I am in complete agreement:

WHEN DO WE STOP CARRYING THE CRYING TOWEL AND HOLDING THE HAND OF THE FAILURE?

"To fail a student is bad." So says a New Jersey educator. He feels, if you fail a child in class . . . that child will consider himself a "lousy student" . . . to use his words. The young pupil will become neurotic, feel guilty and actually seek punishment for himself by acquiring more failing grades. What nonsense that is!

When do we stop pitying, coddling . . . sometimes, extolling the "failures" among us? Recently, Dr. Miller Upton, President of Beloit College, said this: "I have just about reached the end of my tolerance for the way our society seems to have sympathetic concern only for the misfits, the pervert, the drug addict, the drifter, the ne'er-do-well, the maladjusted, the chronic criminal, the under-achiever, the loser . . . in general, the underdog. It seems to me" . . . says Dr. Upton . . . "we have lost touch with reality and become warped in our attachments, if not in fact . . . psychotic."

Bravo, Doctor Upton! That says it well! When do we stop carrying the crying towel and holding the hand . . . of the failure? We grant, of course, that there are failures, unfortunates who cannot help themselves . . . and must be guided, encouraged and cared for. However, in our anxiety to help those who cannot help themselves . . . our cup of sympathy and pity runneth over. Now . . . more and more, it seems, we drool with pity over those who *can* and *should* help themselves. We encourage self-pity . . . resign them to failure . . . and kill any personal incentive they might possess.

Isn't it time we started to honor, to salute, to commend the achiever? Let's start saying (and say it over and over again) that it is better to win than to lose . . . better for a student to receive an *A* than a *C*. And, outside the classroom, let's admit that because of those who do achieve through hard work and determined effort . . . all of us live better lives. As Dr. Upton says: "The only people I feel sorry for are those who feel sorry for themselves." That educator in New Jersey would wipe out all competition in the classroom and have the teacher constantly cater to students with the low grades. Frankly, we hope there are more Dr. Uptons in our school systems than pitiful educators like the man from New Jersey. Let's start telling our young people . . . and our older people too . . . that it's *not* all right to be a misfit, a loser. Let's drop such self-pity. It could destroy us. Let's praise the achiever . . . and inspire others to become achievers.

Dr. Walter Heller Comments on 10-Percent Surtax Proposal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1967

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, in a recent economic letter of the National City Bank of Minneapolis, Dr. Walter W. Heller, former Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, sets forth some thought-provoking and significant economic analysis.

Dr. Heller, who is presently a member of the faculty of the University of Minnesota, and who is also a highly respected economist, recommended that the Congress enact a tax increase. His comments are of great value and deserve to be presented to the Members of Congress for their consideration, as follows:

ECONOMIC OUTLOOK AND POLICY

(By Walter W. Heller)

Seldom, given the imperfections in the "science" of forecasting, can one stand in September on one's GNP forecast of January. Yet, both in profile and in level, U.S. economic activity in 1967 has thus far come obligingly close to the pattern laid out in this Letter last January:

"A rather soft economy in the first half of 1967, gaining momentum in the second half and pushing toward a fourth quarter

GNP of $800 billion or a bit beyond." Subject to a margin of error growing mainly out of the automobile strike, fourth GNP should be about $806 billion.

"A 1967 GNP in the neighborhood of $780 billion, or about $42 billion above 1966." Adjusting the January forecast for statistical revisions in the benchmark 1966 GNP figure—upward to $743 billion—brings my 1967 figure to nearly $785 billion.

Needless to say, the forecast received an important assist from a strongly stimulative fiscal policy, including the early reinstatement of investment incentives and a postponement of the surcharge from July 1 to the January 1 date I assume now. But that's precisely what flexible fiscal policy is for; to cushion slowdowns, speed up recoveries, and curb overexpansion. If Congress enacts the 10% surcharge—or something close to it—within the coming weeks, it will round out a good Federal fiscal policy performance in 1967.

IN 1967 TO DATE

Without a responsive fiscal and monetary policy, the high-employment slowdown early in the year could have snowballed into the recession so freely predicted by the critics. The classical recession trigger was there—a sharp inventory correction. But prompt monetary easing and strongly expansionary budget policies kept final demand rising steadily and thus, in effect, quarantined the contractionary effects of declining inventory investment.

The numbers are revealing. From the fourth quarter of 1966 to the second quarter of 1967:

The rate of inventory accumulation dropped by a huge $18 billion.

Yet, final demand (of consumers, business, and government combined) rose by $31 billion. The net result was that GNP rose by $13 billion.

Two critical points stand out in this picture: First, nothing more spectacular than a continuing advance of final demand at about $15 billion per quarter—coupled with an end to the inventory correction—is needed to convert a flabby first half to a firm second half. Monthly data for July and August are already converting the forecast of firming into fact. Add just a little dash of inventory accumulation or added strength in housing or durable consumer goods, and the year which came in like a lamb will go out like a lion.

Second, the massive fiscal stimulus which was so effective in forestalling recession in the early months of 1967 will—if not cut to size by a tax increase—become an open invitation to inflation in the early months of 1968.

THE GOVERNMENT SECTOR

Of the $31 billion rise in final sales during the first half of 1967, two fifths, or $13 billion, was in the form of increased government purchases of goods and services. Predictably, state and local governments contributed $5 billion of this increase (and the 300,000 growth in state-local employment constituted half of the total growth of jobs in the economy between December and June).

Meanwhile, Federal purchases grew by $8 billion, all but $1 billion of it representing the rising costs of Vietnam.

Moving to total Federal expenditures as recorded in the National Income Accounts (NIA) budget (which includes transfer and interest payments, subsidies and grants in addition to purchases), one finds that they reached $155.5 billion for fiscal 1967, a rise of $23.6 billion over fiscal 1966. More directly relevant to the unfolding 1967 economic situation are these budget figures comparing the second quarter of 1967 with the fourth quarter of 1966:

Total spending rose from $152 billion to $163 billion.

Total tax receipts did not rise at all.

As a result, the NIA deficit jumped from $3.3 billion to $14.6 billion.

In these budget numbers lies the kernel of our contrasting experiences in 1960, when a $15 billion inventory shift did bring on a recession, and in 1967, when an $18 billion decline did not.

The rate of increase in Federal spending is not likely to drop much in the current fiscal year. True, even with defense costs now estimated $4 billion above the January budget, the rise in fiscal 1968 would be only $9 billion against the $13 billion of fiscal 1967. But assuming some further increases in both military and civilian spending, one may project increases of $2½ to $3 billion per quarter in Federal purchases during this fiscal year.

OTHER SECTORS

Investment

After a five-year surge ending with a 13.3% year-over-year advance in 1966, *business fixed investment* shifted to a more passive role this year. Given the strong sustaining force of monetary and fiscal ease and the direct stimulus of last April's reinstatement of special tax incentives, the pause in plant and equipment spending did not turn into a downturn as it has so often in the past.

The most recent Commerce-SEC survey of plant and equipment spending plans—coupled with low average industrial operating rates (below 85% against a preferred rate of around 92%) and rapid additions to capacity—lead one to expect the following:

The 1967 total will be about 2½% above 1966 (as compared with the 3% increase foreseen in this letter last January).

The modest uptrend developing in the second half of this year is likely to continue into 1968 in the light of relatively low operating rates, expanding capacity, and the expected tax increase.

Housing has responded briskly to the easing of mortgage markets so far in 1967, and further growth seems assured, provided that the various credit authorities continue to support expansion in this sector. For this year, housing starts will probably exceed last year's 1.2 million units by a little, and the value of building activity should be close to last year's $24.4 billion level.

Inventory investment, as already noted, was an $18 billion drag on expansion in the first two quarters of 1967. It should change to a very modest expansionary factor over the rest of the year. For the year as a whole, inventory accumulation is now expected to fall at least $10 billion below last year's excessive $13.5 billion. By year's end, stocks should be well adjusted to the rate of sales.

Consumption

Consumption spending will account for nearly two-thirds of the GNP advance in 1967 over 1966. This high proportion reflects the strong push consumer spending received from rapidly rising Federal outlays without matching increases in Federal revenues.

Between the fourth quarter of 1966 and the second quarter of 1961, the meagre $13 billion advance in GNP was accompanied by an $18 billion rise in disposable income.

Consumer spending advanced $16 billion, more than off-setting the net decline in other final demands in the economy.

In the period ahead, output will accelerate, but consumption will account for only about half the rise in GNP as sharp productivity gains convert a large portion of expanding sales into profits; the projected 10% surtax takes more than twice as much from the personal income stream as the projected social security liberalization adds to it.

JOBS, PROFITS, AND PRICES

With *employment* holding up better than expected, the unemployment rate touched 4.0% only one month and is now inching lower. For the year, it should match the 3.8% unemployment rate of 1966, even though real GNP is rising slightly less than 3% in 1967.

A concomitant of the strong employment picture in 1967 has been a sharp departure from the good *productivity* gains of recent years. In coming quarters this situation should reverse itself. Substantial GNP gains will be achieved with only moderate expansion in employment as industry realizes the pay-off on the recent surge in plant investment and capacity; a more seasoned labor force; the existing slack in its production schedules.

For *profits,* the combination of rising output and rising productivity promises some pleasant surprises. During the second half, profits should come close to the record year-earlier levels. And even with a 10% surcharge, after-tax profits in 1968 may well reach or even exceed 1967 levels.

The rise in *prices* moderated during the first-half slowdown, but the dilemma of reconciling high employment and price stability remains and will bedevil policy in the year ahead. The impact of excess demand in 1966 is still working its way through our economy in the form of wage-push and price adjustments. Superimposed on this is the prospect of a rising tide of effective demand. Excess capacity in most industries, coupled with favorable profit prospects, could—and should—blunt both the pressure and the desire for industrial price increases. Together with the expected surtax, these could be important moderating influences. Yet, for 1967 as a whole, both the Consumer Price Index and the GNP deflator now seem likely to end up with increases of nearly 3%, about the same size as last year. If Congress fails to enact the surtax, brisk expansion threatens to turn into a galloping advance that would make a 3% price rise the very least we could expect in 1968.

INTEREST RATES

Interest rates today are higher than many of us anticipated, mainly because we did not foresee how intense the scramble for liquidity would be after last year's great credit crunch. With both banks and businesses striving for liquidity, and the Federal government a big borrower, even the best efforts of the Federal Reserve System did not keep interest rates from bounding back up after their sharp and welcome decline last winter.

What is the prospect now? In brief, assuming that a tax increase is expected and enacted, I see no repeat of the 1966 money crisis; still a reasonable possibility of some easing of rates in their near term; the strong likelihood that, until the war in Vietnam ends, vigorous economic expansion will put a high floor under interest rates.

The possibility of an interim easing in long-term interest rates rests on the following judgments:

The corporate race to the capital market seems to be slowing down.

Loan demand in the next few months is likely to fall short of bank expectations.

Doubts about the tax increase are likely to be resolved for, not against, it.

No shift in Federal Reserve policy is evident yet, and any turn that comes will be gentle, not sharp.

For a time, at least, the foregoing factors may well outweigh the countervailing prospects of big Treasury borrowing, an increasingly taut economy, and rising price levels.

POLICY FOR 1968

The brisk expansion seen for the second half of 1967 is welcome. We have had a slow first half as production adjusted to the inventory excesses of 1966, and we can now welcome a transitional period of catching up with our expanding potential through quarterly GNP advances in the $15 to $17 billion range.

But indefinitely expanding demand at such a rate is a different matter. We could accept this prospect only if we were prepared to give up the attempt to keep prices and interest rates under reasonable restraint while steering the difficult high-employment course. Yet, the outlook for 1968 clearly confronts us with this prospect—without fiscal restraint, no slowdown in the rate of quarterly advances is in sight after the first of the year.

Thus, the 10% surtax proposed by President Johnson is needed to defuse a new round of demand inflation. Given the developing strength of demand, the chances of economic overkill are slight. Indeed, to fight the good fight against inflation and ghettos, side by side with war in Vietnam, will require not only the surcharge and the automatic growth of revenues in expansion, but quite possibly, even the proceeds of any loophole-closing bill that might follow the surcharge action.

Under the circumstances, one wonders why Congress, which had the gumption to enact some $15 billion of tax increases in 1950–51 to finance the Korean Conflict, should now balk at a much more modest increase (both absolutely and relatively).

In Congress prudently passes the 10% surtax, it will sharply improve 1968 prospects by bringing the expansion of demand back to a sustainable rate during the year; opening up enough breathing space for monetary policy to operate effectively without a drastic new credit squeeze; providing more elbow room for the most urgent domestic programs.

It takes time to debate and to implement policy. And it takes time to be fully effective once in motion. Thus, alert policy will always require some forecast of the future. And today's forecast—increasingly confirmed by hard fact—compellingly calls for a tax increase.

ADDENDUM ON THE BRITISH ECONOMY AND STERLING

It has become respectable, almost fashionable, to discuss devaluation of the pound. And the past summer has again seen sterling under heavy pressure. Yet, one detects no weakening in the conviction of Prime Minister Wilson and Chancellor Callaghan that it is politically and economically necessary to defend the pound, and no weakening of their resolve to do so.

This observation is based not only on the recent moves by the Prime Minister to take over the reins of the Ministry of Economic Affairs himself but on intensive discussions with leading British officials. In their perception, the economic outlook for the coming winter months may be rather bleak as Britain threads its way between the conflicting pressures of excessive unemployment and balance-of-payments difficulties. But they also see a number of short-term redeeming features:

The pound has survived a lot of bad news in 1967—e.g., demands for devaluation by backbenchers and *The Economist;* bad trade figures for three months; the Middle East war and closing of Suez—but the worst is now over.

The successful conclusion of the Group of Ten efforts on international monetary reform gave sterling a psychological boost and promises at least some concrete help.

The improved July trade figures, while not matched in August, are a harbinger of a better trade performance in the second half of 1967.

The readiness of other countries, particularly the U.S., to help Britain with currency swaps and related measures will help sterling over the rough spots it may encounter in the months ahead.

Britain still has a sizeable supply of liquid securities in the U.S. on which to draw in an emergency.

It is felt that beyond these difficult months, the skies will brighten:

Wage rises now running at perhaps a 6% annual rate will steady down to 3½% to 4½% per year.

The rise in productivity in 1967 will be coupled with a rise in output in 1968—a 3% rate of advance is expected before winter ends.

Quickened expansion in the United States, Germany, and France—together with the eventual reopening of Suez—would improve the trade balance and ease the pressure on sterling.

In the longer pull, North Sea gas and the gradual liquidation of British commitments east of Suez will offer further help.

Also, with the Prime Minister's hand directly on the throttle of industrial improvement and labor market policy, rather than at one remove, programs to improve the structure and functioning of British industry will get renewed impetus.

It is, of course, axiomatic that governments are over-optimistic, accentuating the positive factors and under-emphasizing the negative ones. And it is also true that intentions and determination alone cannot hold the pound—massive speculative raids could force devaluation. But as long as the leaders of the Labor Government identify their political and economic interests with a stable pound—as they do today—and as long as they have the support of central bankers and the U.S. Treasury, the odds are that the pound will hold firm.

Action Is Needed Against Entire Rat Populations, Scientists Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1967

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the August issue of the Sciences, published by the New York Academy of Sciences, contains much interesting and useful information about the depredations of rats.

It points out both the difficulties of and the great need for effective extermination programs directed against entire rat populations.

I include the article hereafter:

Rats, Rats, Rats

About 60 million years ago, some 50 million years before the birth of man, the first mammals began to appear. Among the early warm-blooded and hairy vertebrates was one order of placental mammals—the rodentia—that was endowed with superior survival capacities. They multiplied and diversified and the order now includes 30 families, 275 genera, and more than 1,000 species. Not only did they gnaw and tear a niche in history, but they swam, crawled, and climbed to a position from which they could compete with man for food, shelter, and even survival. Rats steal food from the hungry; inhabit ships, city tenements, and rural houses; they carry debilitating and fatal diseases; they prey on infants, the elderly, the infirm. At present, the rodentia is the largest order of mammals; the rat population alone equals the population of man with its three billion members.

The rat's kingdom is worldwide. Throughout Southeast Asia, particularly in India, the large, 22-pound bandicoot rat, *Bandicota bengalensis,* and the smaller *Tatera indica* are found; the black rat, *Rattus rattus,* and the brown rat, *Rattus norvegicus,* prowl the rest of the world. In the United States, the population of 90 million rats has even garnered Congressional and Presidential attention. However, apparently Congress is not too worried; President Johnson's request for $40 million for a national anti-rat program was turned down on July 20, 1967.

R. rattus, especially familiar to Europeans, has long pointed ears, a slender tail longer than its body, and a delicate build. It rarely weighs more than 11 ounces or grows longer than seven inches. Although *rattus* is called the black rat, it is not always so; those living in the open in warm countries most often have tawny coats; the black variety is common only where the rats live in buildings. One appropriate name for *rattus* is the roof rat: it likes warmth and is a climber; *rattus* is now found almost wholly in ports in temperate regions.

The brown rat is also a port-dweller. Russian cargo ships, arriving about 1700, probably carried it to Western Europe; *Norvegicus* originally came from the temperate parts of Asia. Weighing about a pound, measuring at most nine inches, and having small ears, a thick tail shorter than its body and a blunt nose, *norvegicus* disembarked at North American ports in 1775. Although the brown rat is sometimes black, unlike *rattus* it is a burrowing animal and lives in hedgerows, earth banks, haystacks, and both in and on the ground near sewers and streams. An albino variety of this common rat—the white rat—frequently dwells in research laboratories.

Although *norvegicus* is considerably larger than *rattus,* they usually do not fight; fighting is not necessary for the brown rat to emerge victorious. When threatened by a large belligerent *norvegicus,* the smaller *rattus* never retaliates. It assumes a submissive role and surrenders food and shelter; after repeated persecutions, during which no blood is drawn and no internal damage is incurred, *rattus* dies a quick, mysterious death.

The submissive role of the attacked rat is similar to roles played by rats in more peaceful social settings. In some rat species, specifically *norvegicus,* "each member of a herd or colony has a social status, or position in a peck order, that determines its behavior—dominant or submissive—toward other members," according to S. A. Barnett (*Scientific American,* Jan., 1967). While a structured social behavior orders and pacifies the pack, colony integrity is achieved by the noncooperative actions of its members. If a stranger with a different scent enters the colony, it is tolerated if a juvenile, mated with if a fecund female, or attacked if an adult male. The attack that ride the pack of a feared newcomer is performed independently by one of the larger males. Independent action is also apparent in the rats food-gathering behavior. For example, when several rats all try to bring the same piece of meat back to the nest, they pull in different directions. This lack of cooperation becomes destructive when such drives as hunger, the frustration of unconsummated sexual excitement, or the position of food and nests lead to territorial conflicts.

All of these conflicts tend to reduce the rat's birth rate; unfortunately, there is no danger that strife among the rats will lead to their eradication. Even temporary, yet intense, predation by dogs, cats, hawks, and men is offset by an adaptable birth rate that insures the survival of the species. In experiments at Johns Hopkins University, D. E. Davis found that after an intensive trapping operation that reduced a rat population by half, the pregnancy rate of the survivors doubled in two months. Under ideal conditions, these prolific animals, which produce about 10 young per litter and three to six litters a year, could produce 60 young per female per year. If this rate of six litters per year were maintained for three years, one pair of rats could, conceivably, produce 350 million descendants.

However, rat survival rates are low. Although its life span theoretically is from three to five years, the rat is usually attacked, trapped, or poisoned after six months of life. *World Health* (April, 1967), published by the United Nations World Health Organization, observed that when a female rat nests about 800 feet from a food supply, thus making it particularly difficult to obtain food, only one rat out of 12 litters will live long enough to be weaned. Nevertheless, there *are* three billion rats.

In their relations with man, rats wield a double-edged sword: they pillage his stores and his shelters; they bring him little but disease, famine, and death. When driven by hunger, they overcome their natural fear of man, and have even been known to attack and kill him as well as other large mammals. The amount of food rats eat and spoil often makes the difference between starvation and bare adequacy. Each month in Bombay, rats spoil enough grain to fill from 1,500 to 1,600 grain sacks. An anti-rat campaign disclosed that these rodents had pillaged enough food to supply 900,000 people—one fifth of the city's population (*World Health*). Rats have also been instrumental in spreading a large number of diseases including, of course, plague.

The plagues that ravaged Western Europe from 1345 to 1350, claiming 43 million recorded deaths, the plagues in India that killed 3.5 million people between 1896 and 1906, and the plagues that raced through London, Southern Europe, Moscow, Constantinople, and Egypt were spread primarily by rats. Such other rodents as moles and mice are also factors in the dissemination of the disease, but dead or diseased rats serve as long-term hosts for both the plague-causing bacteria, *Pasteurella pestis*, and the rat flea, *Xenopsylla cheopis*, that carries it.

By feeding on an infected rat, which may have 100 million plague bacteria in one milliliter of its blood, the flea picks up the disease. After the disease kills the rats, large numbers of infected fleas must find another host. Thus, they come to man. Bubonic plague is characterized by large, hard, and painful tumors, called buboes, in lymphatic glands nearest the infected bite. When the fleas bite directly into the blood stream, they cause septicemic plague, or the "Black Death," characterized by dark purple blotches of stagnant hemorrhagic blood under the skin. Pneumonic plague follows an invasion of airborne bacteria through the nose or throat.

In addition to plague, the rat flea also carries murine typhus from a diseased rat to man. This infectious disease is not transmissible from man to man. After biting its victim and sucking his blood, the flea excretes the disease-causing micro-organisms. *Rickettsia typhi*. Characterized by a high fever usually lasting approximately 14 days, murine typhus kills only about 2 per cent of its victims, but most of the deaths are among the aged.

Besides the deadly shadows of plague and rat typhus, these disease-riddled and parasite-infested rodents cary trichinosis, flukes, roundworms, and threadworms. Epidemics of trichinosis are caused by brown rats that carry eggs of the trichinosis worms, *Trichinella spiralis*, on their feet and legs, and excrete adult or embryonic trichinellae. Pigs contract the disease by eating infected dead vermin, or food that brown rats have contaminated. After eating improperly cooked, diseased pork, the minute parasitic threadworms migrate from the human intestines to the striated muscles and connective tissues throughout the body, causing fever and debilitation. High fevers, sometimes accompanied by jaundice and skin hemorrhage, result from handling or eating food contaminated by rat's urine, which contains parasites of the disease, leptospirosis.

Other rat-carried diseases include rat-bite fever, a widespread disease that does not affect the rat, but in man the spiral-shaped bacteria cause disabling ulcers at the site of the wound; some of the 600 salmonelloses, diarrheal diseases spread by rat pollution of food; and rat-mite dermatitis caused by the bites of the rat-mite, *Loponyssus bacoti*.

Anti-rat campaigns can cause a paradoxical increase in the number of rats. Because of their adaptable birth rate, curious capacity to develop poison-resistant strains, and outstanding ability to detect and remember where traps are placed, rats pose a most difficult problem for the would-be exterminator. Nevertheless, *World Health* says: "To fight the rat menace effectively, action must be taken against *entire* rat populations and not merely against individuals" (April, 1967).

Effective exterminations follow two basic principles; they force the rats to face such natural dangers and enemies as cats, dogs, and men; and they subject the rodents to biological limitations by forcing them to compete among themselves for reduced food supplies. Specifically, rat-proofing, which denies the animal entry to food supplies and stops it from settling in sewers, drains, and walls, and improved sanitation, which protects the human population and reduces the rat's food and nesting supplies, are two of the best anti-rat measures.

As a second line of defense, fast-acting poisons, and slow-acting anticoagulants that induce internal hemorrhaging have also been used. But these adaptable rodents have developed resistances to the chemicals, and have even bred equally resistant litters (See "Drugs to Stop Clotting," the Sciences, Nov., 1967).

Yet another form of chemical control, now in experimental use, incorporates one of the oral contraceptives, the sex hormone mestranol, in rat bait, and it promises to be of great effectiveness in helping to limit rat populations. According to Dr. Walter E. Howard and co-workers at the University of California, mestranol is believed to affect the hypothalamic growth regulating centers of the brain and can permanently sterilize both unborn and nursing rats up to 10 days old (*Chemistry*, May, 1967).

The cat is another exterminator of rats, but a notoriously ineffective one. These civilized creatures, when trained as rat-catchers, help a bit, but animal behaviorists have found that untrained cats, even when hungry, often enter into benign relationships with rats.

Many of the natural predators, such as the owl and the mongoose, have moved out of the path of encroaching urbanization and civilization and no longer serve much of a rat control function. To replace them and to add to the chemical means, more sophisticated methods are being employed; they range from electrocution effected by stringing live wires across sewer lines, to flame throwers thrust into rat warrens, and poison gases that kill adult rats and wipe out litters. These techniques are effective, but for poorer countries, which cannot afford them, the rat remains a menace to the health of the human, livestock, and wildlife populations, a drain on the economy, and a destroyer of native plants and flowers.

White House Country Fair Delights Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY P. SMITH III
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 26, 1967

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, on September 12 the First Family opened the White House Grounds to the children of a number of Members of Congress for a country fair.

Since parents were not invited, we have had to rely on the reports of these young people for the details of that happy event.

The Buffalo Evening News of September 13 contains the byline stories of four of the sons of our colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Goodell].

Their firsthand reports are contained in the article which I am pleased to insert at this point in the Record:

White House Fair Delights Eleven From Western New York; and Here's What Four Goodell Children Write

Washington, September 13.—The children of three Buffalo-area congressmen went to the fair Tuesday at an amusement park set up on the White House lawn.

President and Mrs. Johnson sponsored the country fair. The guests, ranging in age from 6 to 18, were the children and grandchildren of members of Congress, the Cabinet, the Supreme Court and heads of independent agencies.

Four sons of Rep. Goodell of Jamestown were there. Only one met President Johnson as he walked around the lawn, but they all met Mrs. Johnson and her daughter, the newly-betrothed Lynda Bird Johnson.

The Goodell sons who attended were William, 11; Timothy, 10; Roger, 8, and Michael, 7. The Goodells' fifth son, Jeffrey, is too young.

"VERY ROMANTIC"

All four children of Rep. Conable of Alexander were on hand. They missed both President and Mrs. Johnson but they met the President's daughter, Lynda Bird Johnson, and her fiance, Marine Capt. Charles S. Robb. The children told their mother that the meeting was "very romantic."

The Conable children—Anne, 12; Jane, 11; Emily, 9, and Samuel, 6—received autographed pictures of the Johnsons.

Mothers and fathers were not invited. The only parents allowed inside the gates were a few who helped run the fair.

Mrs. Conable told The Buffalo Evening News that she couldn't find a parking place and wound up driving around downtown waiting for the party to end.

M'CARTHY'S THREE ATTEND

Only three of the five children of Rep. McCarthy of Buffalo—Dean, 9; Barry, 8, and Brenda, 6—were within the age bracket. All three attended. Their father is on his way back from two weeks in South Vietnam and Southeast Asia.

The White House affair meant a short school day for the congressmen's children. Their parents wrote notes to their teachers, asking for early releases so the youngsters could arrive when the party started at 3:30 PM.

Here are the Goodell boys' own stories of the fair:

BY BILLY GOODELL, 11

It all started when we got big white envelopes addressed to us! It was an invitation to the White House. We were all excited, of course.

We were dismissed early for the purpose of going to the White House. When we got to the White House we saw a movie on the presidents of the United States.

I went outside to ride the large assortment of activities.

While I was walking around, the President, surrounded by a herd of news reporters, came down from the White House to kiss Mrs. Johnson hello.

There stood the President in all his glory—worried, but happy! That was the highlight of my visit to the White House.

(Asked what he meant by "worried, but happy," Billy explained: "He was smiling and seemed happy to see all of us kids. But he has lots of lines around his face that give him a worried look, too.")

I scored 150 on the strength tester and won a football. When I met Lynda Johnson she asked how I won it. When I told her, she said: "Good, that's not easy."

My brothers and I all met Mrs. Johnson soon after we arrived, but later I saw her standing alone for a moment and went over and thanked her for inviting me to the party.

she was very friendly and replied she was glad I could come and hoped I was having fun.

BY TIM GOODELL, 10

I met Frank Howard and Ken McMullen from the Washington Senators baseball team at the baseball throw booth.

I tried to get in and around everybody to meet the President, but just as I got near him he turned up the walk toward his office and we were stopped from following him. His white dog followed him all around the lawn.

There were lots and lots of prizes for all the games and at the end of the fair they gave away all the prizes that were left.

Our youngest brother, Jeffrey, was too little to go to the party so we each took a prize home to him.

I liked the old-fashioned cars and the ponies. My friends and I had an extra long ride on the ferris wheel.

I met Mrs. Johnson and I think she is very nice.

An artist was drawing pictures for anyone who wanted one. I saw him draw Abraham Lincoln for someone.

BY MICHAEL GOODELL, 7

Everything you wanted to eat—popcorn, hot dogs, pop and ice cream and cotton candy. The President's own band was playing, very loudly. We walked all over the lawn at the White House.

I rode the ferris wheel lots of times. There were two goats that ate popcorn and one calf. We got lots of prizes and a red, white and blue pen that says The White House, and a picture of the Johnson family.

I'd like to live at the White House forever.

BY ROGER GOODELL, 8

I was in the line for the baseball throw when someone said: "The President is coming."

I ran to see him but there were so many photographers around him I could hardly see him.

I finally caught up with him some time later and when he shook hands with me he asked: "Did I invite you to this party?"

I said "Yes" and we shook hands and I said: "How do you do, Mr. President?"

He asked me my name. I answered "Roger Goodell" and then walked away.

I loved the old-fashioned cars. We passed a big calliope at the entrance to the gardens that was playing loudly. I scored 110 on a strength test.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Code of Laws of the United States

Title 44, Section 181. Congressional Record; arrangement, style, contents, and indexes.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the Congressional Record, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the Congressional Record semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

Title 44, Section 182b. Same; illustrations, maps, diagrams.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the Record without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the Congressional Record the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily Record as follows: the Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided,* That the makeup of the Record shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the Congressional Record, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the Record shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will case will a speech be printed in the Record of unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the Record issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the Record for 1 day. In no the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the Record shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the Record style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the Record.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the Congressional Record any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent Record is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the Congressional Record the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the Congressional Record.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the Congressional Record shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the Official Reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the Official Reporters of the respective Houses.

The Official Reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the Official Reporters in the next issue of the Congressional Record, nor to Records printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the Congressional Record by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the Congressional Record which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20515

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Speaker: John W. McCormack

Abbitt, Watkins M., *Va*	
Abernethy, Thomas G., *Miss.*	6278 29th St.
Adair, E. Ross, *Ind*	4000 Mass. Ave.
Adams, Brock, *Wash*	
Addabbo, Joseph P., *N.Y*	
Albert, Carl, *Okla*	4614 Reno Rd.
Anderson, John B., *Ill*	
Anderson, William R., *Tenn.*	3006 P St.
Andrews, George W., *Ala*	
Andrews, Mark, *N. Dak*	
Annunzio, Frank, *Ill*	
Arends, Leslie C., *Ill*	4815 Dexter St.
Ashbrook, John M., *Ohio*	
Ashley, Thomas L., *Ohio*	
Ashmore, Robert T., *S.C*	
Aspinall, Wayne N., *Colo*	The Towers Apts., 4201 Cathedral Ave.
Ayres, William H., *Ohio*	
Baring, Walter S., *Nev*	
Barrett, William A., *Pa*	
Bates, William H., *Mass*	
Battin, James F., *Mont*	
Belcher, Page, *Okla*	
Bell, Alphonzo, *Calif*	
Bennett, Charles E., *Fla*	3421 Rusticway Lane, Falls Church, Va.
Berry, E. Y., *S. Dak*	118 Schotts Court NE.
Betts, Jackson E., *Ohio*	
Bevill, Tom, *Ala*	6224 N. 35th St., Arlington, Va.
Biester, Edward G., Jr., *Pa*	
Bingham, Jonathan B., *N.Y.*	
Blackburn, Benjamin B., *Ga.*	
Blanton, Ray, *Tenn*	
Blatnik, John A., *Minn*	
Boggs, Hale, *La*	
Boland, Edward P., *Mass*	
Bolling, Richard, *Mo*	307 Warrenton Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Bolton, Frances P. (Mrs.), *Ohio.*	2301 Wyo. Ave.
Bow, Frank T., *Ohio*	4301 Mass. Ave.
Brademas, John, *Ind*	
Brasco, Frank J., *N.Y*	
Bray, William G., *Ind*	
Brinkley, Jack, *Ga*	
Brock, W. E. (Bill), *Tenn*	
Brooks, Jack, *Tex*	
Broomfield, William S., *Mich.*	
Brotzman, Donald G., *Colo*	
Brown, Clarence J., Jr., *Ohio.*	
Brown, Garry, *Mich*	
Brown, George E., Jr., *Calif*	
Broyhill, James T., *N.C*	
Broyhill, Joel T., *Va*	
Buchanan, John, *Ala*	
Burke, J. Herbert, *Fla*	
Burke, James A., *Mass*	
Burleson, Omar, *Tex*	
Burton, Laurence J., *Utah*	
Burton, Phillip, *Calif*	
Bush, George, *Tex*	
Button, Daniel E., *N.Y*	
Byrne, James A., *Pa*	
Byrnes, John W., *Wis*	1215 25th St. S., Arlington, Va.
Cabell, Earle, *Tex*	
Cahill, William T., *N.J*	
Carey, Hugh L., *N.Y*	
Carter, Tim Lee, *Ky*	
Casey, Bob, *Tex*	
Cederberg, Elford A., *Mich*	
Celler, Emanuel, *N.Y*	The Mayflower
Chamberlain, Charles E., *Mich.*	
Clancy, Donald D., *Ohio*	
Clark, Frank M., *Pa*	220 C St. SE.
Clausen, Don H., *Calif*	
Clawson, Del, *Calif*	
Cleveland, James C., *N.H*	
Cohelan, Jeffery, *Calif*	1202 Longworth House Office Bldg.
Collier, Harold R., *Ill*	
Colmer, William M., *Miss*	
Conable, Barber B., Jr., *N.Y.*	
Conte, Silvio O., *Mass*	5619 Lamar Rd., Washington 16, D.C.
Conyers, John, Jr., *Mich*	
Corbett, Robert J., *Pa*	
Corman, James C., *Calif*	
Cowger, William O., *Ky*	
Cramer, William C., *Fla*	6215 Beachway Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Culver, John C., *Iowa*	
Cunningham, Glenn, *Nebr*	
Curtis, Thomas B., *Mo*	
Daddario, Emilio Q., *Conn*	
Daniels, Dominick V., *N.J*	
Davis, Glenn R., *Wis*	
Davis, John W., *Ga*	
Dawson, William L., *Ill*	
de la Garza, Eligio, *Tex*	
Delaney, James J., *N.Y*	
Dellenback, John R., *Oreg*	6903 Crail Dr., Bethesda, Md.
Denney, Robert V., *Nebr*	
Dent, John H., *Pa*	
Derwinski, Edward J., *Ill*	
Devine, Samuel L., *Ohio*	
Dickinson, William L., *Ala*	
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., *Mich*	
Dingell, John D., *Mich*	
Dole, Robert, *Kans*	6136 Beachway Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Donohue, Harold D., *Mass*	
Dorn, Wm. Jennings Bryan, *S.C.*	2030 Laburnum St., McLean, Va.
Dow, John G., *N.Y*	
Dowdy, John, *Tex*	
Downing, Thomas N., *Va*	
Dulski, Thaddeus J., *N.Y*	347 Cannon House Office Building
Duncan, John J., *Tenn*	
Dwyer, Florence P. (Mrs.), *N.J.*	
Eckhardt, Bob, *Tex*	
Edmondson, Ed, *Okla*	
Edwards, Don, *Calif*	9201 Fox Meadow La., Potomac, Md.,
Edwards, Edwin W., *La*	
Edwards, Jack, *Ala*	
Eilberg, Joshua, *Pa*	
Erlenborn, John N., *Ill*	
Esch, Marvin L., *Mich*	
Eshleman, Edwin D., *Pa*	
Evans, Frank E., *Colo*	
Everett, Robert A., *Tenn*	
Evins, Joe L., *Tenn*	5044 Klingle St.
Fallon, George H., *Md*	
Farbstein, Leonard, *N.Y*	
Fascell, Dante B., *Fla*	
Feighan, Michael A., *Ohio*	
Findley, Paul, *Ill*	
Fino, Paul A., *N.Y*	
Fisher, O. C., *Tex*	Calvert-Woodley
Flood, Daniel J., *Pa*	The Congressional
Flynt, John J., Jr., *Ga*	
Foley, Thomas S., *Wash*	
Ford, Gerald R., *Mich*	514 Crown View Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Ford, William D., *Mich*	
Fountain, L. H., *N.C*	The Westchester
Fraser, Donald M., *Minn*	
Frelinghuysen, Peter H. B., *N.J.*	3014 N St.
Friedel, Samuel N., *Md*	
Fulton, James G., *Pa*	
Fulton, Richard, *Tenn*	
Fuqua, Don, *Fla*	
Galifianakis, Nick, *N.C*	
Gallagher, Cornelius E., *N.J.*	
Gardner, James C., *N.C*	
Garmatz, Edward A., *Md*	
Gathings, E. C., *Ark*	
Gettys, Tom S., *S.C*	
Giaimo, Robert N., *Conn*	
Gibbons, Sam, *Fla*	
Gilbert, Jacob H., *N.Y*	
Gonzalez, Henry B., *Tex*	200 C St. SE.
Goodell, Charles E., *N.Y*	3842 Macomb St.
Goodling, George A., *Pa*	
Gray, Kenneth J., *Ill*	
Green, Edith (Mrs.), *Oreg*	
Green, William J., *Pa*	
Griffiths, Martha W., (Mrs.), *Mich.*	
Gross, H. R., *Iowa*	
Grover, James R., Jr., *N.Y*	
Gubser, Charles S., *Calif*	
Gude, Gilbert, *Md*	
Gurney, Edward J., *Fla*	
Hagan, G. Elliott, *Ga*	
Haley, James A., *Fla*	
Hall, Durward G., *Mo*	
Halleck, Charles A., *Ind*	4926 Upton St.
Halpern, Seymour, *N.Y*	
Hamilton, Lee H., *Ind*	
Hammerschmidt, John Paul, *Ark.*	
Hanley, James M., *N.Y*	
Hanna, Richard T., *Calif*	
Hansen, George V., *Idaho*	
Hansen, Julia Butler (Mrs.), *Wash.*	
Hardy, Porter, Jr., *Va*	
Harrison, William Henry, *Wyo.*	
Harsha, William H., *Ohio*	
Harvey, James, *Mich*	
Hathaway, William D., *Maine.*	
Hawkins, Augustus F., *Calif.*	
Hays, Wayne L., *Ohio*	
Hébert, F. Edward, *La*	26 Cockrell St., Alexandria, Va.
Hechler, Ken, *W. Va*	
Heckler, Margaret M. (Mrs.), *Mass.*	
Helstoski, Henry, *N.J*	
Henderson, David N., *N.C*	
Herlong, A. S., Jr., *Fla*	
Hicks, Floyd V., *Wash*	
Holifield, Chet, *Calif*	
Holland, Elmer J., *Pa*	
Horton, Frank, *N.Y*	
Hosmer, Craig, *Calif*	
Howard, James J., *N.J*	
Hull, W. R., Jr., *Mo*	
Hungate, William L., *Mo*	
Hunt, John E., *N.J*	
Hutchinson, Edward, *Mich*	
Ichord, Richard (Dick), *Mo.*	
Irwin, Donald J., *Conn*	
Jacobs, Andrew, Jr., *Ind*	
Jarman, John, *Okla*	
Joelson, Charles S., *N.J*	
Johnson, Albert W., *Pa*	
Johnson, Harold T., *Calif*	
Jonas, Charles Raper, *N.C*	
Jones, Paul C., *Mo*	1111 Army-Navy Dr., Arlington, Va.
Jones, Robert E., *Ala*	
Jones, Walter B., *N.C*	
Karsten, Frank M., *Mo*	
Karth, Joseph E., *Minn*	
Kastenmeier, Robert W., *Wis.*	
Kazen, Abraham, Jr., *Tex*	
Kee, James, *W. Va*	5441 16th Ave., Hyattsville, Md.
Keith, Hastings, *Mass*	5906 Harwick Rd., Woodacres, Md.
Kelly, Edna F. (Mrs.), *N.Y*	
King, Carleton J., *N.Y*	
King, Cecil R., *Calif*	
Kirwan, Michael J., *Ohio*	
Kleppe, Thomas S., *N. Dak*	
Kluczynski, John C., *Ill*	
Kornegay, Horace R., *N.C*	
Kupferman, Theodore R., *N.Y.*	
Kuykendall, Dan, *Tenn*	
Kyl, John, *Iowa*	
Kyros, Peter N., *Maine*	
Laird, Melvin R., *Wis*	
Landrum, Phil M., *Ga*	
Langen, Odin, *Minn*	
Latta, Delbert L., *Ohio*	
Leggett, Robert L., *Calif*	
Lennon, Alton, *N.C*	
Lipscomb, Glenard P., *Calif.*	
Lloyd, Sherman P., *Utah*	
Long, Clarence D., *Md*	

Appendix

Irwin H. Whitthorne

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 27, 1967

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, on September 30, 1967, Irwin H. Whitthorne, the top civilian group superintendent at the San Francisco Bay Naval Shipyard, with better than 20,000 employees, will retire from the Federal service with 59 years of Government service.

Irv is top quality, as is evidenced by the award presented to him last year by President Johnson in recognition of his years of service and contributions to the Polaris program. It is through Irv's technical capability that we were really able to build nuclear submarines on the Pacific coast, seven of our 41 Polaris fleet and nearly a dozen other attack nuclear submarines.

Irv Whitthorne is more than a long term Government employee * * * he is the highest exponent of a blending of experience with technological achievement.

I am very pleased to note the following remarks about Irv Whitthorne, by Adm. Edward J. Fahy, USN, Chief, Naval Ship Systems Command:

IRWIN H. WHITTHORNE

In his nearly three-score years in the same shop, in the same building, at the same Mare Island location at the San Francisco Bay Naval Shipyard, Mr. Whitthorne has enjoyed an amazing career. His over 59-year span of service is unequaled in the annals of the Navy's career civil service, and his outstanding achievements and performance bespeak an unusually productive and rewarding career.

After entering the yard as a helper-plumber on July 3, 1908, Mr. Whittborne advanced steadily in the pipefitting trade, winning many commendations and awards for his valuable contributions. He received four (4) Sustained Superior Performance Awards, a Meritorious Civilian Service Award (1945), the Navy Distinguished Civilian Service Award (1945), and the Department of Defense Distinguished Service Award (1959). In 1966, Mr. Whitthorne received a special letter of appreciation from President Lyndon B. Johnson in recognition of his years of service and contributions to the Polaris Program.

Mr. Whitthorne's career has spanned an era from sailing ships to nuclear powered submarines. His technical competence has kept pace with advancing technology, enabling him to develop concepts such as full scale submarine mock-ups which have led to savings in manpower and materials and increased efficiency in production. His concepts have been adopted by other submarine construction yards.

Mr. Whitthorne has developed a wide range of interests over the years. He has displayed loyal and dynamic devotion to the public service and has been equally active and effective in community affairs. He assisted in organizing and served as an original Director of the North Bay United Crusade. He is a long time member of the Vallejo Chamber of Commerce and served as a Director of that organization. He is a member of the Navy League and a past National Vice President of the Master Mechanics and Foremen's Association.

Mr. Whitthorne has won the respect and admiration of his many friends and associates. The high esteem in which he is held is exemplified by the following tribute from members of the Mare Island Metal Trades Council presented at a testimonial dinner in July 1964:

"We . . . gratefully acknowledge our appreciation to you for a heritage respected throughout the shipbuilding industry . . . born of true dedication, perseverance, fairness, sound judgment and willingness to accept a challenge. . . ."

Charles Rozmarek, Honorary President of the Polish Alliance at 70

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 27, 1967

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, it is with great pleasure that I bring to the attention of the Senate the designation of Charles Rozmarek as honorary president for life of the Polish National Alliance.

My association over the years with Charles Rozmarek has been a source of great personal satisfaction to me. A native of Wilkes-Barre, Pa., he has devoted his life to the maintenance of strong cultural ties within the Polish-American community. His philanthropic contributions to the welfare of his fellow man cannot go unnoticed. He has been the driving force responsible for the maintenance of one of Pennsylvania's leading private institutes of higher education, Alliance College at Cambridge Springs. His humanitarian efforts have touched all areas of life, including much work with veterans and juveniles. Surely here is a man of whom all citizens can be justly proud. He is a true American, for he has taken a hand in the molding of this Nation's fabric, and we owe him a great debt.

Consequently, I ask unanimous consent that an article entitled "Impressive Tribute to Native of City," published in the September 26, 1967, edition of the Wilkes-Barre Times Leader, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IMPRESSIVE TRIBUTE TO NATIVE OF CITY

In designating Attorney Charles Rozmarek honorary president for life and bestowing upon him the organization's highest award for distinguished service, the Polish National Alliance paid him an impressive tribute, as he completed seven terms in its highest office. He will be succeeded in the presidency by another lawyer, Aloysius Mazewski, also of Chicago, where Mr. Rozmarek has maintained his home for the past 28 years.

Mr. Rozmarek, a native of Wilkes-Barre, observed his 70th birthday anniversary on July 25. Although he had passed the traditional retirement age, he was re-elected in 1963 to another term. Even though he had attained three score and ten this year, there was strong sentiment at the Detroit convention last week for his retention. And with good reason, in the light of his record and its progress.

When the Alliance, the largest fraternal organization of Americans of Polish extraction in the world, elevated Mr. Rozmarek to the presidency after years of dedicated service, it had assets of $24,000,000. Today, it has $133,000,000 and 320,000 members. Equally important, it continues to thrive, while so many bodies in this category are struggling to maintain the status quo.

But that is only part of the Charles Rozmarek saga. For almost a quarter century, he has been the spokesman for more than 7,000,000 Americans of Polish extraction as president of the Polish American Congress, a post he still holds. He has dealt with Franklin Delano Roosevelt and other U.S. Presidents and such foreign statesmen as the late Sir Winston Churchill. He is listed among the 100 leading citizens of Chicago due to the statute he has attained in so many fields as well as in the Alliance and the Congress.

No mention of the Alliance would be complete without a reference to its achievements under his leadership. It has expended more than $10,000,000 on education through its sponsorship of Polish Alliance College at Cambridge Springs, Pennsylvania, alone. Since the Second World War, it has settled 16,000 Polish soldiers and displaced persons. Its juvenile program embraces 50,000. And there have been other projects in the fields of humanity, culture and patriotism.

It is a far cry from Irishtown where he first saw the light of day to Chicago where he became an international figure. During his absence, he has never forgotten Wyoming Valley and Wyoming Valley has never forgotten him. But after all these years as well as family and other ties in Chicago, the chances are he will continue to reside in the nation's second largest city, although Wilkes-Barre would put out the red carpet for him if he should decide to return home.

U.S. Delegations to U.N.

SPEECH
OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 26, 1967

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, September 19, 1967, the 22d session of the General Assembly of the United Nations was convened. In 1965 the gentleman from New Jersey, the Honorable PETER H. B. FRELINGHUYSEN, and I had the honor to represent the

Congress. This year the two congressional delegates are colleagues from the Committee on Foreign Affairs, L. H. Fountain and the Honorable William S. Broomfield.

Following is a list of the delegates and alternates of the United States to all the U.N. General Assemblies from the first to, and including, the 22d:

U.S. REPRESENTATIVES TO THE U.N. GENERAL ASSEMBLIES

FIRST SESSION, FIRST PART, JANUARY 10 TO FEBRUARY 14, 1946, LONDON

Representatives

Secretary of State James F. Byrnes.
Edward R. Stettinius, Jr.
Senator Tom Connally.
Senator Arthur Vandenberg.
Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Alternates

Sol Bloom, Member of Congress.
Charles A. Eaton, Member of Congress.
Frank Walker.
John G. Townsend, Jr.
John Foster Dulles.

FIRST SESSION, SECOND PART, OCTOBER 23 TO DECEMBER 15, 1946, NEW YORK

Representatives

Warren R. Austin.
Senator Tom Connally.
Senator Arthur H. Vandenberg.
Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt.
Sol Bloom, Member of Congress.

Alternates

Charles A. Eaton, Member of Congress.
Helen Gahagan Douglas, Member of Congress.
John Foster Dulles.
Adlai E. Stevenson.

SECOND SESSION, SEPTEMBER 16, 1947

Representatives

Secretary of State George C. Marshall.
Warren R. Austin.
Herschel V. Johnson.
Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt.
John Foster Dulles.

Alternates

Charles Fahy.
Williard L. Thorp.
Rev. Francis B. Sayre.
Adlai E. Stevenson.
Maj. Gen. John H. Hilldring, U.S. Army, retired.

THIRD SESSION, SEPTEMBER 21, 1948, PARIS

Representatives

Secretary of State George C. Marshall.
Warren R. Austin.
John Foster Dulles.
Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt.
Philip C. Jessup.
Benjamin V. Cohen.

Alternates

Ray Atherton.
Willard L. Thorp.
Ernest A. Gross.
Francis B. Sayre.
Dean Rusk.

FOURTH SESSION, SEPTEMBER 20, 1949, NEW YORK

Representatives

Secretary of State Dean G. Acheson.
Warren R. Austin.
Philip C. Jessup.
Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt.
John Sherman Cooper.

Alternates

Benjamin V. Cohen.
Charles Fahy.
Wilson M. Compton.
John D. Hickerson.
Ruth Bryan Rohde.
John C. Ross.

FIFTH SESSION, SEPTEMBER 13, 1950, NEW YORK

Representatives

Secretary of State Dean Acheson.
Warren R. Austin.
Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt.
Senator John J. Sparkman.
Senator Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr.
John Foster Dulles.

Alternates

Benjamin V. Cohen.
John S. Cooper.
Ernest A. Gross.
Edith S. Sampson.
John C. Ross.

SIXTH SESSION, SEPTEMBER 6, 1951, PARIS

Representatives

Secretary of State Dean Acheson.
Warren R. Austin.
Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt.
Michael J. Mansfield, Member of Congress.
John M. Vorys, Member of Congress.
Philip C. Jessup.

Alternates

John Sherman Cooper.
Ernest A. Gross.
Benjamin V. Cohen.
Annan Lord Strauss.
Channing H. Tobias.

SEVENTH SESSION, OCTOBER 14, 1952 NEW YORK

Representatives

Secretary of State Dean Acheson.
Warren R. Austin.
Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt.
Senator Theodore Francis Green.
Senator Alexander Wiley.
Ernest A. Gross.

Alternates

Philip C. Jessup.
Benjamin V. Cohen.
Charles H. Sprague.
Edith Sampson.
Isador Lubin.

EIGHTH SESSION, SEPTEMBER 14, 1953

Representatives

Secretary of State John Foster Dulles.
Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr.
James F. Byrnes.
Mrs. Francis P. Bolton, Member of Congress.
James R. Richard, Member of Congress.

Alternates

Archibald Carey, Jr.
James D. Zellerbach.
Henry Ford II.
Dr. Charles W. Mayo.
Oswald B. Lord.

NINTH SESSION, SEPTEMBER 21, 1954

Representatives

Secretary of State John Foster Dulles.
Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr.
Senator H. Alexander Smith.
Senator James W. Fulbright.
C. D. Jackson.
Charles H. Mahoney.

Alternates

James J. Wadsworth.
Oswald B. Lord.
A. M. Ade Johnson.
James P. Nash.
Roger W. Straus.

TENTH SESSION, SEPTEMBER 20, 1955

Representatives

Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr.
Brooks Hays, Member of Congress.
Chester E. Merrow, Member of Congress.
Senator John O. Pastore.
Colgate White Darden, Jr.

Alternates

Robert Lee Brokenburr.
Laird Bell.
Jacob Blaustein.
James J. Wadsworth.
Oswald B. Lord.

ELEVENTH SESSION, NOVEMBER 12 TO DECEMBER 21, 1956; JANUARY 2 TO MARCH 8, 1957

Representatives

Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr.
Senator William F. Knowland.
Senator Hubert Humphrey.
Paul G. Hoffman.
Ellsworth Bunker.

Alternates

James J. Wadsworth.
Richard Lee Jones.
Frank C. Nash.
Edward S. Greenbaum.
Mary P. Lord (Mrs. Oswald B.).

TWELFTH SESSION, SEPTEMBER 17, 1957

Representatives

Henry Cabot Lodge.
A. S. J. Carnahan, Member of Congress.
Walter H. Judd, Member of Congress.
George Meany.
Herman B. Wells.

Alternates

James W. Wadsworth.
Irene Dunne.
Philip Klutznik.
Mary P. Lord.
Genoa S. Washington.

THIRTEENTH SESSION, SEPTEMBER 16, 1958

Representatives

Henry Cabot Lodge.
Senator Michael Mansfield.
Senator Bourke Hickenlooper.
Herman Phleger.
George McGregor Harrison.

Alternates

James J. Wadsworth.
Marian Anderson.
Watson W. Wise.
Mary P. Lord.
Irving Salomon.

FOURTEENTH SESSION, SEPTEMBER 15, 1959

Representatives

Christian A. Herter.
Henry Cabot Lodge.
James J. Wadsworth.
James G. Fulton, Member of Congress.
Clement J. Zablocki, Member of Congress.
George Meany.
Walter S. Robertson.

Alternates

Charles W. Anderson, Jr.
Erle Cocke, Jr.
Virgil M. Hancher.
Mary P. Lord.
Harold Riegelman.

FIFTEENTH SESSION, SEPTEMBER 20, 1960

Representatives

James J. Wadsworth.
Senator George D. Aiken.
Senator Wayne Morse.
Francis O. Wilcox.
Mary P. Lord.

Alternates

Zelma Watson George (Mrs. Claiborne).
Arthur F. Lamey.
Frederick Blake Payne.
Charles Rosenbaum.
Frances E. Willis.

FIFTEENTH SESSION (RESUMED), MARCH 7, 1961, TO APRIL 2, 1961

Representatives

Adlai E. Stevenson.
Francis T. P. Plimpton.
Charles W. Yost.
Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt.
Philip M. Klutznick.

Alternates

Jonathan Brewster Bingham.
John H. Morrow.
Charles P. Noyes.

SIXTEENTH SESSION, SEPTEMBER 19, 1961

Representatives

Adlai E. Stevenson.
OMAR BURLESON, Member of Congress.
Mrs. Marguerite Stitt Church, Member of Congress.
Francis T. P. Plimpton.
Arthur H. Dean.

Alternates

Charles W. Yost.
Clifton R. Wharton.
Philip M. Klutznick.
Jonathan Brewster Bingham.
Gladys Avery Tillett (Mrs. Charles).

SEVENTEENTH SESSION, SEPTEMBER 18, 1962

Representatives

Adlai E. Stevenson.
Senator ALBERT GORE.
Senator GORDON ALLOTT.
Francis T. P. Plimpton.
Arthur H. Dean.

Alternates

Charles W. Yost.
Philip M. Klutznick.
Jonathan Brewster Bingham.
Carl T. Rowan.
Marietta P. Tree (Mrs. Ronald).

EIGHTEENTH SESSION, SEPTEMBER 17, 1963

Representatives

Adlai E. Stevenson.
Mrs. EDNA F. KELLY, Member of Congress.
WILLIAM S. MAILLIARD, Member of Congress.
Francis T. P. Plimpton.
Charles W. Yost.

Alternates

Mercer Cook.
Charles C. Steele.
Jonathan Brewster Bingham.
Sidney R. Yates.
Jane Warner Dick (Mrs. Edison).

NINETEENTH SESSION, DECEMBER 1, 1964 TO FEBRUARY 18, 1965

Representatives

Adlai E. Stevenson.
Senator RUSSELL B. LONG.
Senator FRANK CARLSON.
William C. Foster.
Francis T. P. Plimpton.

Alternates

Charles W. Yost.
Franklin H. Williams.
Gladys Avery Tillett (Mrs. Charles).
Richard N. Gardner.
Charles P. Noyes.

TWENTIETH SESSION, COMMENCING SEPTEMBER 21, 1965

Representatives

Arthur J. Goldberg.
Charles W. Yost.
BARRATT O'HARA, Member of Congress.
PETER H. B. FRELINGHUYSEN, Member of Congress.
William C. Foster.

Alternates

James M. Nabrit, Jr.
James Roosevelt.
Eugenia Anderson.
William P. Rogers.
Frances E. Willis.

TWENTY-FIRST SESSION, COMMENCING SEPTEMBER 20, 1966

Representatives

Arthur J. Goldberg.
James M. Nabrit, Jr.
Senator FRANK CHURCH.
Senator CLIFFORD P. CASE.
William C. Foster.

Alternates

James Roosevelt.
Eugenia Anderson.
Patricia Roberts Harris.
George L. Killion.
Harding F. Bancroft.

TWENTY-SECOND SESSION, COMMENCING SEPTEMBER 19, 1967

Representatives

Arthur J. Goldberg.
William B. Buffum.
L. H. FOUNTAIN, Member of Congress.
WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD, Member of Congress.
Adrian S. Fisher.

Alternates

I. W. Abel.
Robert S. Benjamin.
Hector P. Garcia.
Mrs. Patricia Roberts Harris.
Herbert R. O'Conor, Jr.

Thoughts To Ponder for 1968

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH SCOTT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, September 27, 1967

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, as a member of the Republican coordinating committee, I was much interested to read three editorials which were published during August in the Buffalo, N.Y., Evening News, examining several aspects of Republican activity. I believe the articles are worthy of wider circulation, so I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Buffalo (N.Y.) Evening News, Aug. 16, 1967]

SENSE ON FOREIGN AID

The GOP task force, headed by a former ambassador to Mexico, Robert C. Hill, calls for other basic foreign-aid reforms, but it clearly and properly emphasizes the long history of Republican support for "sensible" forms of foreign aid, geared to these five purposes: (1) promotion of peace, security and stability abroad in our own national interest; (2) promotion of prosperity abroad as an aid to prosperity at home; (3) narrowing of the dangerous gulf between "haves" and "have nots"; (4) demonstration that the free world can give a better life than communism, and (5) spread of co-operation and friendly partnership among freedom-loving nations.

In that spirit, the report laments erosion of domestic support for foreign aid owing to waste, misuse and too many downright failures. Then it goes on to spell out such sensible principles as: "No aid should be extended without commensurate self-help effort on the part of those aided" (including efforts to check runaway population growth), "special care should be taken to avoid aid being used to bolster corrupt and self-perpetuating oligarchies," and "more emphasis should be placed on projects that will visibly reach the masses of people."

On all these points, the GOP statement shuns the provincial viewpoint of so many of foreign-aid's carping critics in Congress, and accentuates instead the constructive national-interest viewpoint of those experienced in conducting the Eisenhower era foreign policy. It is a position paper that could well comprise the foreign-aid plank in the 1968 Republican platform.

In a report just adopted as party policy by the Republican Coordinating Committee, a national GOP task force makes a lot of sense on foreign aid.

We especially like the pertinent but reasonable line the report draws on aid to countries consistently hostile to American interests:

"While not making aid conditional upon support for our foreign policy," it says, "aid should not ordinarily be forthcoming to (a) those nations whose heads of state (like Nasser) engage in continual intemperate abuse of the United States or (b) those nations which give military aid to our enemies in Vietnam or which engage in military aggression, or (c) those nations which, in contravention of international law, harass American citizens engaged in commerce, or confiscate American-owned property without fair compensation."

Notice that this statement does not make the mistake of saying never, under any circumstances, give aid to our hecklers abroad. But while recognizing that there may be exceptions, it simply takes the proper stance that we shouldn't be giving aid and comfort to those who consistently help our enemies, or who rattle swords or engage in aggression. The statement even goes on to disavow any intent, "like Robespierre, Hitler or Stalin" to insist upon support of U.S. foreign policy in all its aspects. "We are dealing with independent nations," it wisely warns, "and a measure of demonstrated independence from us in certain matters is often a political necessity for their leaders."

[From the Buffalo (N.Y.) Evening News, Aug. 25, 1967]

FERMENT IN THE GOP

Even the brifest glimpse at the news these days quickly discloses a bubbling ferment of activity—and even ragged-edged division and outright contradiction—within the national Republican Party.

While the national GOP policy committee talked of Molotov cocktails and outside agitators in the urban riots, for example, the eight GOP governors called together by New York's Rockefeller a few days later fererred to "misery and frustration" as a part of the reasons for the crisis. In the Senate, GOP Minority Leader Dirksen is switching his stand on rent supplements. The Republican minority in the House often reflects strain and disunity on delicate issues. And while a Richard Nixon or a Gov. Reagan seems bent on out-hawking LBJ over Vietnam, men like Senators Morton, Percy and Javits and, particularly, Gov. Romney edge toward more dovelike positions.

Obviously, you can read some confusion, vacillation and shallow partisanship into such a mottled picture.

But the controlling causes of the bubbling Republican activity lie deeper.

Most immediately, the Rockefeller-Romney moderates are determined not to lose control of party policy and direction to the Goldwater wing in 1968, as they did almost by default in 1964. So part of the surface contradiction involves that fundamental intraparty struggle.

Deeper than that, though, is, and must be, a thoughtful groping for tenable, promising solutions to agonizingly complex problems. Positions on issues are shifting drastically in part because basic social awareness is changing throughout America. The urban riots have exposed serious flaws in traditional approaches to the problems of social welfare and housing. This is now visible to all. The old sense of national priorities, too, has gone askew. Our stalemated involvement in Vietnam while the race-relations lid blows off back home makes both parties' pat answers to old issues sound dated and absurd.

Not to learn from such explosive experiences would be to court disaster. Yet the Democrats in power devised many of these flawed programs and are now less free to overturn them. To a large extent, their responsibility for the past boxes them in for the future. Beyond that, too, is a growing feeling among people that the national administration is tired and just doesn't have answers.

Not only would the Republicans be politically stupid, but as the "loyal opposition" they would be irresponsible, if they failed to try to fill this developing vacuum of effective leadership with a burst of workable, appealing alternatives.

Yet this kind of political brainstorming isn't easy. The promising direction belongs to an untested future, not a well-trod past. Narrowing a range of creative new thinking to the best few ideas—then wrapping them convincingly into a package that conserves what has worked before and mercilessly cuts away what hasn't worked—takes time. It takes trial and error. Integrating a role for industry into the poverty program, refining a negative income tax plan, devising a promising home-ownership plan for people just above the poverty level, defusing the ghettos by diffusing them—these aren't accomplished overnight. And different men, different sections within a national party, aren't going to readily or simultaneously accept a flock of new ideas, either.

But this kind of viable, inventive alternative, we believe, is precisely what Americans are searching for themselves right now.

So the current contradiction and divergence within the national GOP may well mirror vigor, not lethargy; flexibility, not stultification; productive thought, not ritualized reflex. We hope so. For today's groping should mean a more fertile GOP alternative for next year's elections—and that is what America's two-party system is really all about.

[From the Buffalo (N.Y.) Evening News, Aug. 28, 1967]

The War Issue in 1968

Sen. Morton of Kentucky, a former Republican national chairman, made a significant if elementary point on a recent TV interview. The gist was that, since Mr. Johnson presumably will be running as a war President, the Republicans have no real choice in 1968 but to stress the quest for peace.

Gov. Romney of Michigan said substantially the same thing a few days later: "There is no question the Republican Party is going to pursue those programs they believe will produce peace in Vietnam on a sound basis as soon as possible."

Such comments are not cynical but realistic. What they recognize is that LBJ, for the next year, will control the course of the Vietnam war as much as any American can control it. He certainly will control the American tactics, strategy and timetable with respect to it. If he can bring off an acceptable solution in this short time remaining, well and good. Then there will be no war issue to fight about in the campaign, and what is now LBJ's most nagging political headache might well turn into a prime political asset.

The President himself is under tremendous political pressure to use all the power levers available to him to win the war by Election Day 1968—or at least to have broken the present sense of gloomy stalemate and to be clearly on the road to peace. But about this, the Republicans can do little except, as good Americans, to wish him well.

Meanwhile, the most tenable political assumption on which they can operate is that the war situation will not be greatly altered a year from now—that it will not respond to LBJ's great efforts to end it, and that the public will be even hungrier for an honorable solution than it is today.

The question is what kind of Republican, with what kind of background and credentials, will offer the alternative to continuance of the Johnson war leadership that the nation will be most likely to welcome. And the answer, it seems clear to us, is that it will not be an all-out hawk or dove who can thunder the most righteous I-told-you-so, but someone relatively uninvolved in the angry debates over how we got where we are who can most persuasively offer an unbiased and clearheaded new look at the situation.

If LBJ still has this war albatross hanging around his neck a year from today, in other words, we think it reasonable to assume that the public will be about ready to conclude that he's had his chance, that he's trapped by his whole past record, and that the best hope of honorably liquidating the war is to elect a new President who can start with a freer hand.

But that doesn't mean the public would take a chance on either a peace-at-any-price candidate or a super-hawk who seems likely to escalate the war on up into World War III. What it will be seeking, it seems to us, is someone whose experience and judgment clearly show presidential stature, and yet one not so tied to a past position of his own on Vietnam that he would be scarcely less free than LBJ to try a fresh approach.

Most Americans, we dare say, will not want to be harangued all through the '68 campaign about either the history of this war or about how terribly it is being managed or how much better the Republicans could run it. What they—or at least we—would much rather hear is a far broader and more statesmanlike call for a complete review of all our overseas commitments to see if we can't bring them into a far better balance with our true national interests, our expendable resources and the free world's strategic necessities.

What the voters will be looking for, in short, is the nearest analogy 1968 can offer to the Eisenhower candidacy of 1952. Then as now a Democratic administration was meshed in an increasingly unpopular war which it seemed neither able to win nor to liquidate. The Republican candidate was a man who, professing to have no great quarrel with our original involvement in Korea and no magic solutions to get us out of it, nonetheless commanded public confidence as a man of undoubted presidential stature. And with or without Ike's famous promise to "go to Korea," the message that came through to millions of voters was that here was a man who could be trusted to find a road to honorable peace if anyone could.

First Lieutenant Walter R. Daley Awarded Silver Star Posthumously

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HASTINGS KEITH
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 27, 1967

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago I had the honor and privilege of delivering the dedicatory address at a dedication ceremony of the 1st Lt. Walter R. Daley Memorial in Brewster, Mass.

Lieutenant Daley was awarded the Silver Star Medal for gallantry in action—gallantry which cost him his life on January 31, 1967. When an enemy force of unknown size attacked his platoon near Bong Son, Vietnam, Lieutenant Daley exposed himself to Vietcong fire to alert his men to the attack. He continued to encourage his men by his valorous leadership until he was mortally wounded.

Mr. Speaker, I was profoundly moved by the town of Brewster's expression of gratitude and appreciation for the selfless bravery of Lieutenant Daley. I herewith include the text of the Silver Star Medal citation for Lieutenant Daley's gallantry in action, as follows:

Silver Star Medal—Citation for Gallantry in Action

First Lieutenant Daley distinguished himself by exceptionally valorous action on January 31, 1967, while serving as a platoon leader with Company A, 2d Battalion, 12th Calvary during a search and destroy operation near Bong Son, in the Republic of Vietnam.

During the night of January 31, 1967 an enemy force of unknown size launched a savage attack against Lieutenant Daley's platoon. As the Viet Cong assaulted on three sides with automatic weapons, Lieutenant Daley braved the withering fire to crawl to each of his men rallying them to repel the enemy attack.

Lieutenant Daley constantly exposed himself to fire tracer rounds into the Viet Cong positions, pinpointing the enemy's locations for his men. Lieutenant Daley then began throwing grenades at the enemy, continuing to inspire and encourage his men by his gallant and aggressive leadership until he was mortally wounded by hostile fire.

Lieutenant Daley's outstanding display of personal bravery and devotion to duty stands in keeping with the highest traditions of the military service, and reflects great credit upon himself, his unit, and the United States Army.

Silt in Charleston Harbor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, September 27, 1967

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Charleston News and Courier has recently tackled a controversial subject in bringing out an unforeseen aspect of the Santee-Cooper project.

Not everyone can agree on the benefits and disadvantages of Government electric power, but the News and Courier has shown its characteristic spirit in pointing up a serious problem.

In order that this view may be presented to the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial entitled "A Costly Blunder," published in the Charleston News and Courier, be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

A Costly Blunder

As old-time readers know, The News and Courier has opposed Santee-Cooper from its beginning in the 1930s. It is no satisfaction to read, in Stewart R. King's remarkable series of articles about silt from the hydro-electric development in Charleston Harbor, that the federal government itself now regards this scheme as a "$115 million blunder."

Even after re-reading Mr. King's interesting articles, we are not sure exactly how the $115 million price tag is estimated. The maze of statistics about Santee-Cooper through the years is baffling.

We had occasion to look up some of them. The original estimate of the cost—supposed to be justified primarily as a "navigational project" to provide water transportation from Charleston to Columbia—was $37.5 million. The actual cost apparently was well over $60 million.

Generation of electric power—presumably cheap because it would come from the flow of the Santee River into the Cooper—was to be an added benefit, along with recreation facilities in the lakes and flood control for the entire region.

The original generating capacity was to be 125 megawatts. Steam plants later were added. They have brought the total to 247 megawatts. Plans now under discussion for additional generating capacity and purchase of current elsewhere for distribution to Santee-Cooper customers would raise the amount of current eventually to 547 megawatts.

Meanwhile, silting up Charleston Harbor—as estimated by Stewart King—already has cost $25 million. The cost of the diversion canal to stop the silting has been estimated at $35 million. In view of the history of these proposals, this figure is just a beginning and subject to increase later. Meanwhile, dredging must continue at $2 million or so a year to keep Charleston's ship channels open. Mr. King estimates that 190 million tons of Santee silt have settled on the harbor bed.

Many times in the past The News and Courier has suggested that the simplest and cheapest cure for Santee-Cooper's ailments is to turn the Sante River back to its original bed, keep the lakes and sell the generation equipment and service lines to private enterprise.

Eventually the silt might be cleaned from Charleston Harbor. The inundated plantation lands never will be reclaimed. Their value too should be computed in the final cost of a colossal blunder. Expensive as Santee-Cooper has been, many people still have not learned a lesson from it about socialism. Government invasion of private enterprise continues on many fronts.

If all these schemes are as foolish as Santee-Cooper, the lack of business intelligence among the American people will seem incredible to historians studying this era.

Federal Power Behemoth Nurtured by Public Apathy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACKSON E. BETTS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 27, 1967

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, the gradual encroachment on personal initiative, private enterprise, and individual liberty by our Federal Government is a major threat to our Nation. Because this creeping Government control is not brought vividly to the attention of our citizens, the concentration of power in Washington has grown each year. One newspaper which has consistently been a bellweather of this trend is the Dispatch, of Columbus, Ohio. I am pleased to include an editorial from this newspaper which persuasively presents the challenge of big Government to all Americans who wish to retain their birthright of liberty and freedom in this Republic. The editorial follows:

[From the Dispatch, Columbus, Ohio, Sept. 17, 1967]

Federal Power Behemoth Nurtured by Public Apathy

Concentration of power, such as that now vested in our federal government, is costly in dollars and deprives local communities and individuals of rights that should belong to them.

Although newspapers and others have been inveighing against this power concentration for 30 years, it has been to no avail and is growing. We are talking here of economic power, political power, social and every other kind of political authority.

History shows the fates which have befallen other republics over the centuries where power over lives and property finally became lodged in one person or coterie of people. This, of course, was made a mockery of by people who thought the "good outweighed the bad."

Now we are beginning to see such development come to pass in the United States where 30 years of concentration of power in Washington, arrived at largely by the use of federal largesses, have broken down state, city and county barriers.

The nation's thoughts are directed toward central government as the only source from which help can come in so many ways—even with the social problems of the day, let alone the economic and political answers.

As matters stand at this date, we have more hours lost by strikes than heretofore; we have the social problems which are as acute as ever. Except for a temporary lull since Detroit, we have unparalleled crime and many other evidences of social degeneration.

In the economic field, we have the unbalanced budget, payments deficit, the by-play between White House politicians and the Federal Reserve over interest rates and a variety of other monetary questions affecting not only financial institutions but the nation's consumers as well. The labor situation is clearly out of control.

In the foreign field it is obvious we do not have a single daily ally in the Vietnam mess—they not only do not support us but are trading with the enemy and making the bullets which are killing Americans.

Here again is an example of a war brought on by an individual president's say-so and without a clear-cut mandate from either house of Congress.

Through all this runs a long story of deceitful intrigue with foreign elements which were concealed and are being concealed from the American people under the guise of democracy.

In every field the federal programs reach into the cities behind the authority of elected officials in them, and likewise those of the counties and states, up to the international ventures. For example, injecting the nation's blood and treasure into war without specific authority is a story of the successive encroachments on the authorities of Congress and the rights of the people by the Chief Executive and his administrative bureaucrats.

Today we find many of these acts catching up with the President who cannot halt the increase of crime, rioting, strikes against the public interest, federal waste of money and—worst of all—war.

Many persons years ago predicted this eventuality but even then few believed it would come within a generation. In an offhand statement, Franklin D. Roosevelt once said we have created instruments of power which in other hands might be most dangerous. He certainly prophesied more truly than even he dreamed possible.

Part and parcel of this concentration of power has been the conversion of the United States Supreme Court from an independent status to a relatively subservient legal body split into competitive factions.

Instead of trying to agree on what is constitutional or otherwise, the court justices are trying to legislate as well as shape the social course of the country. Even the majority leaders in the houses of Congress have been undermined and minority leaders reduced to near-impotence.

The most sinister element in this national decline is the apathy with which the public is accepting the disorders of the day and the inability of any individual or faction to crystalize the opposition to these trends. America is losing its birthright!

Rats in Philadelphia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 27, 1967

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a revealing account of the problem of rats in Philadelphia, which was published in the Philadelphia Inquirer of September 26, 1967, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Port Richmond Family Flees From Rats

(By Stephen J. Sansweet)

David and Coralee Rispo and their 7-month-old son Mark moved into their Port Richmond home in February. They moved out again—suddenly—Sunday night.

They, along with other neighbors, have been plagued with rats. Rats in nearby Powers Park, rats in the street and rats in the bedroom.

The Rispos live at 2971 Mercer st. They had heard stories about rats from neighbors who have suffered with them for many years. But until last Friday night when they first heard the ominous and telltale scratching, they had not been bothered.

The Rispos' neighbors think they know where the rats come from and why they are attracted to humans in the 2900 block of Mercer.

The park across the street has more dirt than grass and more pigeons than anything else. Old men come in the morning with large bags of corn and bread crumbs and scatter the feed all around. People also dump their garbage in the park.

There are other birds. Mrs. Rispo's neighbor has, by several neighbors' count more than 150 canaries caged in the rear bedroom. He also has a delapidated pigeon coop on his rear porch. A neighbor across the alleyway has another pigeon coop, this one off the ground and in much better condition.

Mrs. Rispo called an exterminator Sunday after their dog trapped a rat in the kitchen and tried to kill it. The exterminator set out poisoned meat but the rats, so far, haven't nibbled. That's when she decided to move to her mother's house at 2978 Almond st. until the rats are gone.

"I called City Hall on Monday," Mrs. Rispo said. "They gave me a run-around and said they would try to get someone out to look at the problem this week. But what do we do until then? I'm afraid to bring the baby back."

Mrs. George Carr, 2981 Mercer, said she was troubled with rats two years ago but none have come in her house since a celler hole was bricked up and a neighborhood cat has taken up battle stations outside her basement.

Mrs. Adele Isaccs, 2979 Mercer, pointed to a rear lot next door to the Rispos. Weeds up to four feet high covered the entire area. "That certainly doesn't help matters," she said. "But the man who owns the home doesn't live there. It has been just about vacant for a year."

Her husband, Hugh, went rat hunting with Rispo Sunday night and will be out again with his spotlight the next few nights. The Isaacs said they have seen rats recently in the park and running across Mercer st. under parked cars.

Mrs. Raymond Czera, 2975 Mercer, said she was afraid to come out to her rear yard since she heard a rat there a few days ago.

Mrs. Isaacs said the neighbors had been trying for years to get the city to fix up the park. They've given up. These rats are something else, she added. "If I have to go over to Coralee's house to help her shoot them, then I will."

Possibility of New Tight Money Crisis Aired

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 27, 1967

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, in the August 15, 1967, edition of the American Banker the distinguished and very able former superintendent of banks in New York State, the Honorable George A. Mooney, wrote of the situation with respect to "tight money" and the relationship of that situation to the mutual thrift industry.

Mr. Mooney points out the relationship between mutual savings banks and savings and loan associations. This is particularly important in view of the fact that the Subcommittee on Bank Supervision and Insurance of the Committee on Banking and Currency, which I have the honor to chair, recommended yesterday to the full committee H.R. 13118, the proposed Federal Savings Associations Act. If H.R. 13118 is enacted into law, savings and loan associations and mutual savings banks will be accorded the opportunity to better serve our people.

Mr. Mooney's article follows:

POSSIBILITY OF NEW "TIGHT MONEY CRISIS" AIRED

(By George A. Mooney)

The last several months have seen conflicting trends in the money market and the economy in general. Some of these trends have been quite disturbing in that they indicate the distinct possibility of a recurrence of the "tight money" crisis of mid-1966.

A return to such a situation would, of course, be disastrous for the thrift industry and the home building business. Hopefully, the various monetary authorities and government agencies have learned well the lessons of last year and will move swiftly to alleviate any new problems before they become too great.

The fact is that many thrift institutions simpy could not survive a recurrence of the 1966 money crisis when the flow of thrift funds so essential to their operations was dried up largely by rates.

Even now, many savings institutions have not yet fully recovered from the thrift money drought of last year. Such institutions are today paying dividend or interest rates which are still not justified by current earnings.

Thus, these institutions must use undivided profits to support the payments to savers and to meet the necessary reserve allocations.

The Federal regulatory authorities now have broad-ranging powers to regulate dividend and interest rates. We can all hope that at some future date it will be possible to terminate these powers, but in the present situation they are essential.

Further, since the regulatory agencies sought and accepted these powers, it is incumbent upon them to set rates which, over the long term will be reasonably related to earnings of the institutions as well as to the competitive realities.

Of course, the biggest change which has taken place within the last few years—and which has been a major cause of the need for rate controls and a general realignment of banking regulations—is the changed attitude of commercial banks toward savings deposits and retail banking for the individual in general.

I think it is fair to say that we have witnessed the awakening of a "sleeping giant." Indeed, much as we may have thought it made our lives difficult in the past, we can now see that the competition which characterized the relationships between the thrift institutions over the years was merely a tea-time tempest.

Certainly it was no more than that by comparison with the present, when commercial banking, the giant, has awakened and decided to forage in the field of thrift.

Frankly, I am afraid that we savings institutions may in fact be starved, and ultimately rendered helpless if we are required to engage in such a struggle under the conditions which currently exist and which favor the commercial banking interests so pervasively.

The size, strength and legislated power of the commercial banks, taken all together, are so great that we cannot possibly compete on equal terms—and, what is most important, it never was the intention of Congress or the state legislatures that we should.

Thrift institutions should not have to be on the defensive in seeking legislation or regulations that would protect them against the actions of commercial banks. The necessity for such protection should be recognized as being inherent in the function of our institutions which, under the laws which created them, restrict our operations so that we cannot, even though some might like to, compete on any kind of equal basis with full-scale commercial banks.

I have no intention of denying the importance of commercial banks and their vital function in our nation's economy. I do reject, however, the suggestion that commercial banking is the only important and necessary entity in the banking field.

While modern conditions indicate the desirability of permitting savings institutions somewhat broader powers, by their nature they will never—nor could they ever—become commercial banks, in the modern sense, without surrendering their function as specialists and, ultimately, their charters and their very existence. Some commercial banking leaders, of course, would like to see them do just that.

The Federal Reserve Board is without doubt the most eminent and authoritative agency in the monetary area; that is as it should be. But sometimes even the Board itself—like so many in the legislative halls and certainly so many of the general public—tends to overlook the fact that savings institutions are not commercial banks.

They are necessarily limited, specialized banking institutions. "Equality" of treatment, therefore, is irrelevant and misses the point. As specialized organizations, restricted by their charters, as a practical matter savings institutions must concentrate almost entirely on mortgage investment as their field of economic activity.

The fact that they perform an essential role in this field is evidenced by the sorry state of the home building industry and unavailability of mortgage credit during last year's money crisis.

This situation, of course, was a reflection of the forced inability of savings institutions to perform their function during that time largely because of commercial bank activities which siphoned money out of the savings institutions through high interest rates.

This grim period also pointed up the inability or unwillingness of the commercial banking industry to supply the necessary though lower-yielding mortgage credit when business customers were clamoring for funds at any price. On the savings side of the ledger also, one does not need to go back many years to find a time when commercial banks had no interest in savings accounts.

The ultimate issue, therefore, is basically simple: Is the Government willing to take the steps necessary to insure a satisfactory flow of savings to thrift institutions, so that they will have the strength to perform their specialized functions, or is it willing to see these institutions straved out and perhaps ultimately disappearing?

Our plea for protection in our fiield is not unusual or unreasonable, for several reasons also inherent in our nature. Similiar examples can be found in many other fields:

The automobile manufacturers, for instance, rightly expect the state to concern itself with the quality of roads. The airlines expect to find adequate airports within reach of our major cities. And, particularly, the railroads, having seen government actions in other directions causing them considerable difficulty, are requesting and being given a sympathetic hearing on their problems.

Our deep concern with the prospect which the thrift industry faces would not be so great if we could assume that the situation was only temporary and that things would return to "normal" at some relatively near future date. But I don't think that we can make this assumption.

Having awakened and tasted the joys of stretching out its limbs and moving in many directions, it is highly unlikely that the commercial bank "giant" will go back to sleep voluntarily. He may focus his attention in one direction more than another from time to time, as his interests and appetite dictate, but that is all.

The only way that the savings institutions can be assured of continued healthy existence is to see to it that the rules of the game are such that their legitimate sphere of operations is not completely usurped. To this end I urge that all savings and loan institutions and savings banks recognize their mutual interest and cooperate, both independently and through their organizations, so that our tradition of thrift promotion can thrive.

Basic to our needs is a sympathetic understanding of the realities of the competitive situation on the part of the regulatory agencies specifically concerned with the savings institutions. Far from being merely the policemen who see to it that the institutions they regulate follow the rules, under today's conditions these agencies should not hesitate to be the industry's principal advocate and protector at the governmental level.

They should supervise and direct, but they should also speak with a clear voice on behalf of the industry. However much some may have disagreed with the more extreme positions taken by the recently retired Comptroller of the Currency there is no doubt that he actively concerned himself with the prosperity and advancement of his charges—the national banks.

There are several concrete steps in the direction of improving the position of the thrift institutions on which all segments of the industry agree:

One is the need for somewhat expanded investment powers so that thrift institutions can continue to be of service to the home owners of the nation.

Particularly important is the authority, for which we have been working for the past several years, to make so-called consumer loans, especially for the purchase of items related to the home such as appliances and home furnishings. Such authority lies squarely within our traditional function of facilitating savings and home ownership. Permission to make such loans would allow us to assist the home owner in making the bare walls of the house we helped him purchase into a true home for his family.

Another area of importance concerns the

artificial limits placed on the ability to charge the going realistic rate to mortgage customers in New York and a number of other states.

Savings institutions must be able to charge a rate on mortgages high enough to cover the cost of the going rate for interest dividends they must pay to their depositors. Artificial, so-called usury restrictions are not only detrimental to the building industry but also to home ownership in such states. We are caught in a dilemma: Although chartered to serve the public, thrift institutions also have an obligation to operate soundly and profitably for the protection of their depositors.

Faced with a high interest-rate situation, savings banks and savings and loan associations have little choice but to seek the highest rate they can find with safety for the benefit of their depositors. These days, this higher rate is only available outside New York and other states with unrealistic usury ceilings.

Thus, we must sit here and watch money saved by New York residents being used to provide housing for others.

What, anyway, is the magic in 6% as a ceiling on individual loan rates? There is none. Rather, it is the dead hand of an outmoded custom which, in most other fields of lending, has been recognized to be impractical in this day and age. Indeed, it was for the social good that the usury limits were relaxed years ago with respect to personal loans.

After lengthy study, the Russell Sage Foundation demonstrated that small loans just could not be made for 6% simple interest if the lender was to make any kind of a reasonable profit. The result of the ceiling, the study showed, was that legitimate businessmen went into other lines of endeavor and either the little man did not get his loan or he wound up in the clutches of a loan shark.

While we have not yet reached the loan shark stage in the mortgage field, there are times when we are virtually in the situation where the small man must do without in some states.

Savings banks and savings and loan associations had different origins, but both were created to fill a basic need of the people. Thrift before all else was the reason for the establishment of savings banks. In a later day, the modern savings and loan concept began when the need and desire for home ownership became prevalent and additional means of securing financing were necessary.

From these basic, socially oriented but divergent beginnings, we have traversed along the road to our present situation where we find our chief interests to be very much the same, and certainly our most pressing problems to be similar.

Strong competitors of one another we are. That is as it should be. The savings banks are also competitors of each other, and so are the savings and loan associations. But at least we compete on an equal footing, or nearly so.

Now that the commercial banks have entered the field, this equality is gone. To repeat, such "equality" cannot be established with the commercial banks if the thrift institutions are to maintain their identity and purpose.

The commercial banks are proud to advertise that they are "full-service" institutions. They have access to the broadest range of earning opportunities. This gives them the ability to generate profits at very high rates, which can be used to underwrite other operations until they, too, become profitable.

The thrift institutions, on the other hand, by law and charter, do not have these opportunities. They are strictly limited in both the services they can perform and the earning assets they can acquire. They must concentrate on savings and mortgage services, generally for the individual, while paying the highest dividends commensurate with sound operation.

We must see to it that the regulatory agencies keep these facts everlastingly in mind when they set the policies under which we—and particularly the commercial banks—operate.

Only in this way can we assure that at least our limited field of operations will be available to us and the thrift institutions will be able to remain strong and useful to the community.

Special Award to J. P. Stevens Plant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 27, 1967

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the Whitmire plant of the J. P. Stevens Co., in my congressional district received a special award from the Department of Defense on September 18—a special award of appreciation to this great plant and its employees for their outstanding contribution to our war effort in Southeast Asia.

I am proud of the Whitmire plant and its employees and am honored to represent in the Congress these patriotic, devoted Americans who support our country in its stand against Communist terror and aggression.

Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of the presentation of this special award the Honorable Robert T. Stevens, former Secretary of the Army and president of J. P. Stevens Co., introduced Gen. John M. Kenderdine commander of the Defense Personnel Support Center of the Defense Supply Agency, who delivered the principal address and presented the award.

I commend to the attention of my colleagues the following addresses of Hon. Robert T. Stevens and General Kenderdine:

Remarks of Mr. Robert T. Stevens, President, J. P. Stevens & Co., Inc., at Presentation of Defense Supply Agency Special Award, to Whitmire Plant, J. P. Stevens & Co., Inc., Whitmire, S.C., September 18, 1967

Reverend West, Mr. Harrell, fellow employees of J. P. Stevens & Co., Inc.: On January 12, 1943 I was honored to be here when the employees of the Whitmire Plant were awarded the coveted Army and Navy "E" Award. I was in military service at the time, as were 250 fine employees of the Whitmire Plant.

That was 24 years ago. Guadalcanal, a fly speck of an island in the Pacific, which had been the site of a huge Japanese air base, loomed large as then current news. In January of '43, after one of the most costly Allied Pacific campaigns, we finally wrested control of that island from the Japanese.

Those on the Whitmire home front were making the very finest contributions they could toward winning the war. It was mighty important work then. It is equally important today in supplying our military forces in South Vietnam and around the world.

Your able Plant Manager, Jim Abrams, tells me that of the 731 fine Stevens' people currently employed here, 331 of you were on the rolls of the plant 24 years ago when the Army and Navy "E" was presented here. I think that says a great deal about the pride you have in your work and of continuity in Stevens. This is a quality plant and you take pride in getting the finest product out of the very best equipment the company knows how to provide.

This Special Award ceremony honoring the Whitmire Plant and its people is official recognition for a job well done. It also marks a fact today, as in the past, that true leaders of men share admiration for people on whom they can count when the chips are down and when difficult jobs need to be done.

We have such a man with us today. His name is John Marshall Kenderdine, Brigadier General, United States Army.

General Kenderdine is Commanding Officer of the Defense Personnel Support Center. He is responsible for the management and procurement of industrial type items for all the military services. His job is difficult. Only successful performance will do. And this performance extends worldwide.

The product of your endeavors here, in Whitmire, is part of this worldwide performance. To name just one place in the world where your products go, probably the most important one today, is Cam Ranh in South Vietnam. That's a supply pipeline which extends more than 10,000 miles. Today General Kenderdine has come to thank you for being a solid supporter of Uncle Sam and, in turn, General, I would like to speak for everyone of our Stevens people and say we are backing our boys in South Vietnam 100%.

And now, I come to a very pleasant part of my responsibility on this short program—the only reason for my being here today—because this award is not being made to me or to any one individual but to the Whitmire Plant and to all of its employees.

General Kenderdine was born in Texas. He graduated from Texas A & M College in 1934. He was commissioned Second Lieutenant in the Army Reserve in May 1934. A full nine months before Pearl Harbor, when the clouds of war were gathering, John Kenderdine entered active military service. Throughout the war, he served in Alaska, Europe and in the office of the Quartermaster General in Washington, D.C.

When the Berlin Airlift became a matter of life and death for the residents of West Berlin, our distinguished guest was on the scene directing logistical support for food, petroleum and miscellaneous items. Freedom-loving West Berliners are obviously grateful that your efforts, General, were successful.

After the Russian back-off in Berlin, General Kenderdine moved on to ever-increasing responsibilities in the Far East, in France and in the United States. It has been my good fortune to know General Kenderdine for many years. We are especially pleased that Mrs. Kenderdine is also with us today.

General Kenderdine is a modest man who tries to conceal his many accomplishments and awards. But I have been able to learn that he is the holder of three citations and decorations, plus nine service medals.

General, you are, in addition, a man of few words and I can well understand that in your message to us today you may wish to be brief and to the point. But, last Wednesday I was honored to be a member of an audience you addressed in the Stevens' offices in New York. Without going into details, ladies and gentlemen, General Kenderdine recently returned from a fact-finding trip to South Vietnam. He was there to find the answers to some of the overwhelming and perplexing problems of supply which he and his command have.

General, if there is time, I hope you can touch upon some of these things and perhaps bring us word of our men in uniform there.

Ladies and gentlemen of Whitmire, it is a high honor and a great privilege for me to introduce to you General John Marshall Kenderdine.

REMARKS OF BRIG. GEN. JOHN M. KENDERDINE, COMMANDER, DEFENSE PERSONNEL SUPPORT CENTER OF THE DEFENSE SUPPLY AGENCY AT PRESENTATION OF SPECIAL AWARD TO WHITMIRE PLANT, J. P. STEVENS & CO., INC., WHITMIRE, S.C., SEPTEMBER 18, 1967

Thank you Mr. Stevens. Mr. Harrell, ladies and gentlemen: I am very pleased and honored to be here with you today in order to show and express to you in a small way the deep appreciation and thanks of the military for your efforts. As all of you well know, in the past 18 months to 2 years, we have been engaged in a massive supply effort to provide clothing and textiles for the Armed Forces of the United States to meet its increased requirements brought about by the war in Southeast Asia. Sometimes our efforts in this massive supply job have been very frustrating, but I can say to you in all sincerity, that the response of the textile industry as a whole, and specifically for this occasion here, the response of the Whitmire Mill of the J. P. Stevens Company has truly been one of the bright spots in our supply support. During all of the Wars in my memory, which include WWII and the Korean War, the textile industry and in particular the J. P. Stevens & Co. family of mills, have truly cooperated with the military forces to insure that all of their requirements were adequately filled. This type of performance is certainly what one would expect in a free enterprise economy that we enjoy in the United States, and it shows to the world that American industry, both management and employees can and do work side by side with the military to form a team that cannot be beaten.

During the month of July I was fortunate to make an extensive trip throughout Southeast Asia, and to all of you who may have loved ones or members of your family in Vietnam, let me assure you that they are the best fed, the best clothed, and the best taken care of American soldiers that we have ever put into a conflict overseas. Their morale is high and certainly they wish that their 12-month tour of duty be over quickly, but they realize why they are there and are going about in a magnificent fashion to do their job. During my trip in connection with supply matters. I want to tell you that the textiles made by American industry and by the J. P. Stevens Company, and yes, even the many types of textiles you have produced here at Whitmire, are in use today in Vietnam. Each of you can truly feel a sense of accomplishment and you should realize that you are making, and have made, a personal effort in helping our fighting forces in Vietnam.

On this occasion it is my great privilege to come here and make a special award to the Whitmire Mill, and I might add, that as of this date, it appears that only three such awards will be made throughout the textile industry. This award is the result of a tremendous effort on your part, and each of you made a significant contribution in achieving it. I congratulate all of you. May I now read the citation, which is as follows:

"Special Award presented to Whitmire Mill-J. P. Stevens & Co., Inc." September 1967.

In appreciation for its outstanding contribution to the support of the Armed Forces of the United States during the Southeast Asia build-up as a supplier of specialized cotton greige goods used in military fabrics. From July 1965 through June 1967, the Whitmire Mill produced 8,327,203 yards of these fabrics for Government contracts including over 3,000,000 yards of the type II nylon filled oxford cloth for the new Army raincoat.

I salute all of you and once again my heartfelt thanks and appreciation to each and every employee of this outstanding mill of the J. P. Stevens Company for your magnificent support of the military forces. It is indeed a tremendous honor to have you as a part of our military-industry team. Thank you very much.

Central Midwestern States Shortchanged as Result of Underpayment to Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. R. GROSS
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 27, 1967

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I would venture to say that few residents of Iowa and other central Midwestern States are aware of the frightening extent to which these States have been shortchanged as a result of the underpayment to agriculture.

From 1951 to 1966, the shortage of income for the 12 States totaled approximately $268 billion. The total for 1966 alone was nearly $38 billion. Iowa's share of this $38 billion shortage in 1966 was a shocking $3.4 billion.

When, if ever, Mr. Speaker, will Congress and the Johnson administration recognize the economic fact of life that when agriculture is shortchanged, our entire economy suffers?

A man who has devoted a great deal of time and study to this problem is Mr. Carl H. Wilken, an economic analyst, of Washington, D.C. I commend to the attention of my colleagues the following letter and accompanying balance sheet from Mr. Wilken:

SEPT. 15, 1967.

Hon. H. R. GROSS,
House Office Bldg.,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: On April 6th, 1967 you inserted in the Congressional Record a Balance Sheet of the Economic Record of the United States covering the period 1948–1950 as 100 and the following 15 years, 1951–1965.

This Balance Sheet pointed up an underpayment of $370.5 billion in terms of gross farm income, the source of income for farmers and others living in rural areas. We lost this initial income and the turnover of these newly earned dollars in our economy.

To offset the operating loss, we added $884 billion to the total debt, public and private, or the mortgage against future income. In spite of the unearned income created by excessive debt expansion, the Balance Sheet pointed up a shortage of $627 billion of national income in the 15-year period.

Approximately 43% of this shortage took place in the 12 Central Midwestern States or approximately $268 billion due to the fact that they produce approximately 43% of all farm production.

In August the Department of Commerce, in the Survey of Current Business, published the latest revised state income figures covering the period 1948–1966.

You will find enclosed a copy of a balance sheet of the state income records for the 12 states using 1948–1950 as 100. You will note the shortage of income for the 12 states in 1951, the first year that farm values moved down as a result of the price squeeze on private enterprise and farm values with an operating margin of 85% of normal under OPS price ceilings.

Since that period, the value of our farm production has continued to move down as compared to the increase in wages and interest and consumer prices.

You will note that by 1965 the shortage of income in the 12 states had moved up to $31.9 billion and in 1966 moved up to $38 billion. The shortage of national income in 1966 moved up to $88 billion in 1966 and the shortage of income for the 12 states moved up in proportion to the increase in underpayment to agriculture in 1966 as compared to wages and interest.

The loss by the state of Iowa in 1951 was $375 million. This may sound hard to believe but if you will examine the record of the income of Iowa in 1948 and 1949 you will find that the error of passing the 60–90% price support for farm products which in turn brought on the 1949 recession, cut back the income of Iowa over $600 million from 1948–1949.

The proof that the situation is not improving can be pointed up from the records published in the Economic Indicator in August 1967.

The Economic Indicator is published under the supervision of the Joint Economic Committee and under the supervision of the Council of Economic Advisers to the President and is mailed to all Members of Congress.

If you will pick up your copy you will find that on page 3 there is published the record of National Income. You will note that from the first quarter of 1966 to the second quarter of 1967 the national income at an annual rate increased from $600 billion to $641.9 billion, an increase of $41.9 billion.

Next if you will compute the increase in wage payments plus the increase in net interest you will find that these two items increased $45.4 billion or $3.5 billion more than the national income.

As a result the other four segments, net farm income, small business income, rental income and corporate profits, decreased $3.5 billion. In other words their share was $3.5 billion less than nothing out of the increase of $41.9 billion of national income in 18 months.

Incidentally this shortage took place in spite of the fact that in the 18-month period we added $150 billion to the total debt or mortgage against future income.

The best proof you can get that the spending of borrowed money will not restore farm income is found in the fact that the increase of $150 billion in deficits in 18 months finds the net farm income moving down from $17.1 billion in the first quarter of 1966 to $14.3 billion in the second quarter of 1967.

The reason for the terrific drop in farm income was due to a downward manipulation of the parity price the farmer received. At the present time an honest parity would be $2.25 a bushel for corn. (The average price received by the farmer in 1946–1950 adjusted to the increase in the consumer price level since the 1946–1950 average.)

The price support of $1.05 will be the approximate price the farmer will receive for the 1967 corn crop. Iowa on the average produces 20% of the nation's corn crop and on this basis the estimate of approximately 4.6 billion bushels in 1967 will find Iowa producing a little over 900 million bushels. An underpayment of $1.20 a bushel means a shortage of over $1 billion for the state of Iowa on just the corn production.

You will recall that in a letter to you in April 1965, John Schmittker, presently Under Secretary of Agriculture, stated that under the new parity formula they had reduced the parity price from $2.04 to $1.55 cents per bushel.

The $64 question is: Why haven't the so-called experts pointed up the facts as revealed in the Economic Indicator published in August, 1967? For the same reason that they have failed to prepare a balance sheet ever since 1946 when the Joint Economic Committee was set up under the Full Employment Act. They have been advising through fallacious theoretical assumptions.

Sincerely

CARL H. WILKEN, *Analyst.*

A BALANCE SHEET COMPARING THE INCREASE IN INCOME FOR THE 12 CENTRAL MIDWESTERN STATES WITH THE INCREASE IN THE WAGE AND INTEREST COMPONENT OF THE NATIONAL INCOME IN 1951-65 AS COMPARED TO 1948-50 PERIOD AS 100

[In billions of dollars]

	1951	1965	1966
Illinois	[1] 1.400	−7.900	−9.500
Indiana	[1] .108	−1.900	−2.300
Iowa	[1] .375	−3.050	−3.430
Kansas	[1] .134	−1.223	−1.474
Michigan [2]	+.063	−2.800	−2.500
Minnesota	[1] .382	−1.840	−2.260
Missouri	[1] .478	−3.140	−3.850
Nebraska	[1] .248	−1.370	−1.575
North Dakota	[1] .147	−.616	−.806
Ohio	[1] .400	−5.300	−7.400
South Dakota	[1] .061	−.744	−.851
Wisconsin	[1] .139	−2.100	−2.450
Total shortage	3.809	31.983	37.996

[1] Shortage.

[2] Michigan in 1951 had a slight gain due to increase in wages in auto industry and Government contracts for war materials in Korean war. Following 1953 the income of Michigan was indirectly subsidized by a rapid increase in installment credit for autos and household equipment. Note the large shortage for the State of Illinois, the trading hub in the 12 States. It suffered the loss of trade due to the lack of buying power in the 12 States.

The shortage of income for the 12 states in 1966 was their share of a shortage of $84 billion of national income as compared to wage and interest increases.

On the basis of National income figures as compared to wages and interest in the second quarter of 1967, the national income will be short $108 billion in 1967 thus indicating an increase in 1967 shortages of income in the 12 states.

Source of Data State income published by US Department of Commerce, August issue of Economic Indicator for 1967.

Credibility Gap Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 27, 1967

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, in an article of August 17, 1967, the Christian Science Monitor's Erwin D. Canham concluded:

> It is a melancholy fact, I believe, that the credibility gap has never been wider in American public life.

Indeed, as Mr. Canham observes, the credibility gap exists. It is becoming wider with every passing day. As unfortunate as this fact may be, it is nevertheless a fact which we must face.

I offer for the RECORD Mr. Canham's article, "Credibility Gap Again," as follows:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Aug. 17, 1967]

CREDIBILITY GAP AGAIN

(By Erwin D. Canham)

It is a melancholy fact, I believe, that the credibility gap has never been wider in American public life. Perhaps it is also true in other parts of the world. But in the United States, people are more dubious about their sources of information than I ever remember them being.

The chief targets of disbelief are the political leaders. But the media of information are far from exempt. Why has this all come about?

Well, the inscrutability of many great issues which troubled people has helped build the mistrust. Problems are very complex indeed. It is difficult to deal with many of them in any genuine objective fashion—even if there really is any such thing as objectivity in a world of human opinions.

It is not, I think, that people are lying more than they used to do. It is just that in the face of conflicting factors public statements of a categorical nature are simply not accurate. The subjectivity shows.

VIETNAM INVOLVED

Nowadays it is perferctly possible to be honest and yet to say things which not only will not be believed, but which may not even be true. Self-deception is the easiest form of falsehood.

In American public life, the shadow of Vietnam has fallen most heavily. The statements announcing imminent victory, proclaiming clear and definite progress, have been made by spokesmen of the United States administration over the last three or four years. Perhaps the spokesmen believed them at the time. But the public, recalling now what Secretary McNamara, Secretary Rusk, and President Johnson have said down the years, can be excused if it does not take them literally and faithfully when they speak today.

The interchange between President Johnson and Governor Romney over federal help to put down the Detroit riots did not reflect much credit on them. You have to take your choice between the statements of the two. The analyses of equally close-in eyewitnesses of any of the riot situations do not seem to be describing the same events.

CHARGES HURLED

The world has rarely witnessed a more hysterical misstatement of actual events than President Nasser's charges of American involvement in the air support of Israel during the six-day war. The speedy exposure of these statements has seemed to have little effect on public sympathies, perhaps because prejudices were already too deep-seated.

The abuses regularly exchanged between Moscow and Peking must have a curious effect on the peoples of the Soviet Union and of China. In a totalitarian society, there is a certain built-in mistrust. By definition, many people believe what the government says is bound to be untrue. And so allowances are made.

But the leaders of free society must be much more careful of their reputation for candor than of late. Prime Minister Wilson has had his serious troubles with the House of Commons and the British press. He has skated over the thin edge of credibility, and has been exposed.

LITTLE MISTAKES

President Johnson made his worst mistakes on little things, such as his observations that he had never intended to go on a campaign tour last November when the correspondents around him, and many others, knew the firm arrangements had all been made. On the whole, credibility is damaged worse by trivia than it is by grave events. It ought not to be worthwhile to lie about matters that don't count. Sometimes matters of state cannot safely be discussed with total candor. There is often need for withholding security news.

Sir Winston Churchill had a great reputation for candor. His credibility was high. And yet he withheld—sometimes for years—important news about British defeats. He chose his occasions for frankness with skill, and the people responded.

The tarnish of doubt extends, needless to say, not only through the information media but in the business community and even into the intellectual realm where truth should be a paramount goal. The disputes over fact and meaning between dedicated professors shake public confidence in intellecutal integrity.

So let us all remember the simple ancient virtue of telling the truth, and seeking it with as much detachment as we can possibly muster. We will gain in the end.

Hungarian Freedom Fighters' Federation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 27, 1967

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, now that the annual session of the United Nations has commenced and it has become a forum for anti-American propaganda, I believe the following letter by the World Federation of Hungarian Freedom Fighters to Secretary General U Thant is of special importance. I presume it will be ignored by the Secretary General and I am, therefore, inserting it into the RECORD:

HUNGARIAN FREEDOM FIGHTERS' FEDERATION

SOUTH ORANGE, N.J., *September 19, 1967.*

HIS EXCELLENCY U THANT,
Secretary General,
United Nations Organization,
New York City, N.Y.

YOUR EXCELLENCY: On September 8, 1967 the Budapest Government and the Soviet Union agreed upon extending the validity of the so-called "Soviet-Hungarian Mutual Friendship Pact" of 1948 for another twenty years.

On behalf of Hungary, the original treaty was signed in 1948 by a small group of intimidated and corrupt politicians, and by Moscow-trained Hungarian Communists still retaining their Soviet citizenship. This original "Friendship Pact" was primarly responsible for the brutal oppression, and exploitation of the Hungarian people who had never recognized the validity of this treaty "regulating" the Soviet-Hungarian relationship since 1948.

In October 1956 the entire Hungarian people revolted to shake off these shameful obligations imposed upon them without their consent. The free, independent democratic and short-lived Government of Hungary renounced the Warsaw Pact, declared its neutrality and announced an immediate reconsideartion of the "Friendship Pact" concerning economic relationship between the two countries.

After the Soviet military intervention in 1956, the Report of the U.N. Special Commitee on the problem of Hungary (Gen. Ass. Off. Rees, 11. Session, Suppl. No. 18 [A 13592]) clearly stated that: "Representative government does not exist for the time being in Hungary."

This statement is absolutely correct even in 1967 and, consequently, the Budapest Government cannot enter into a legally binding contract with anyone on behalf of Hungary because of their lack of mandate from the Hungarian people.

Still, the formal renewal of this Soviet-Hungarian Friendship Pact is one of the worst betrayals of the Hungarian people and interests by the Kadar-regime since November 4, 1956.

This new treaty envisages to keep the Soviet yoke on Hungarian shoulders for another two decades.

It expects to keep Hungary militarily occupied by foreign invaders for another twenty years.

It tries to maintain a state of colonial exploitation of Hungary by the Soviet Union for another long period of time.

In the spirit of the UN Charter, in the name of every people's right to self-determination and to freedom from colonial rule, we, former Hungarian Freedom Fighters living abroad, on behalf of our silenced brothers and sisters in Hungary hereby solemnly protest against this new Soviet-Hungarian Friendship Pact extending Hungary's colonial exploitation and suppression for a long time to come. We declare this new Pact an illegal, immoral, hypocretic colonial contract between foreign oppressors and their native collaborators which cannot and will not ever legally bind the Hungarian people.

The contracting parties, with great hypocrisy, decided to present a copy of the new Soviet-Hungarian Friendship Pact to the United Nations Organization. We are, therefore, compelled to present our solemn protest to Your Excellency as well as to all members of the U.N. and the representatives of the world-press.

At the same time, in light of these new and deplorable measures taken by the Soviet Union and the Budapest Government against the best interests and rights of the Hungarian people, we definitely urge Your Excellency to fulfill the obligations imposed upon you by the General Assembly by presenting a detailed and immediate report to the United Nations concerning the true state of affairs in Hungary. In view of this new and highly disturbing development in Soviet-Hungarian relationship, the Hungarian problem should be put on the agenda again.

We, and the entire Hungarian people at home, expect Your Excellency to act without delay.

Yours truly,
WORLD FEDERATION OF HUNGARIAN
FREEDOM FIGHTERS.

The Soviet Boost in Aid to Hanoi

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 27, 1967

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, it is distressing to observe that the Soviet Union recently made a public announcement with respect to its stepped-up program of military assistance for Hanoi. This only confirms, of course, what we have already known, but this open announcement evidences a boldness which gives us cause for further concern.

The Russians apparently feel that Americans are so confused they do not know how to react to this Russian aid to the enemy in Southeast Asia, and because of this, I feel it is high time we do something to bring home to Russia the dangerous route this country is pursuing through these aid-to-the-enemy tactics.

I have introduced to the Congress, House Concurrent Resolution 360, providing— "That it is the sense of the Congress that the Government of the United States should only consider further expansions of trade, educational and cultural exchanges, and other related agreements with the Soviet Union and its East European satellites when there is demonstrable evidence that their actions and policies with regard to Vietnam have been redirected toward peace and an honorable settlement and when there is demonstrable evidence that they have abandoned their policy of support for so-called wars of national liberation."

In this respect, I would like to point out that David Lawrence recommended an approach to this problem in an interesting article appearing in the September 26 issue of the Evening Star. This article is deserving of some serious study, and I insert it into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and commend it to the critical attention of my colleagues. The article follows:

THE SOVIET BOOST IN AID TO HANOI

If the press dispatches and radio and television were suddenly to broadcast the news that the Soviet Union had "declared war" on the United States, this would be regarded as a sensational development. But the equivalent of such an announcement came last Saturday and, as far as can be observed here, there was virtually no significant reaction. The United Press International carried the following dispatch on Sept. 23:

"The Soviet Union announced today a big program for delivering MIG jet fighter planes, antiaircraft rockets and other war materiel to North Vietnam in 1968. No figures were given, but the schedule was believed to be a sharp step-up in Russian military aid to Hanoi. The current level of Soviet aid is estimated at $1 billion."

A spokesman for the State Department commented:

"We have noted the Soviet statement concerning military aid to North Vietnam. We regret that the Soviet Union does not instead take action which would assist the search for a peaceful and honorable solution to the Vietnam problem."

But the realistic fact is that the Soviet Union is, in effect, a co-belligerent in the war in Vietnam. Russian munitions already are being used to kill American soldiers, and larger quantities are to be supplied next year for the same purpose.

Up to now, the Russians had not officially admitted their participation in the Vietnam war. The communique issued last Saturday marks the first time the Kremlin has formally stated that it was sending planes, rockets, and other war materiel to North Vietnam, though the Soviet press frequently has hinted at it.

The agreement was signed a few days ago at Moscow by the deputy premier of North Vietnam and the deputy premier of the Soviet Union. News dispatches also reported that, after the transaction was consummated, the North Vietnamese deputy premier met with Soviet Premier Alexei N. Kosygin "in an atmosphere of friendship and cordiality."

With the possible exception of some technicians or advisers, there are today no Soviet troops fighting along with the North Vietnamese army. So, for all practical purposes, the Soviet Union is withholding any manpower support but is furnishing to carry on war against United States forces.

This is not a new form of participation in war by the Soviet government. Back in 1950, the Moscow regime supplied arms and munitions to the Red Chinese for their invasion of South Korea and at a United Nations meeting defiantly admitted having done so. In Korea, the United Nations itself had mobilized an army to repel the aggression. But the Soviet government treated the charter with contempt and continued to furnish military assistance despite a formal resolution adopted by the U.N. General Assembly condemning Red China as an aggressor.

The United States has the right once more to demand in the United Nations that the Soviet Union refrain from assisting an aggressor country.

But even more important is the possible exercise by the American government of commercial and economic powers to persuade the Soviet Union that it has embarked upon a wrong policy. If an economic embargo against the Soviet Union as well as its captive nations in Eastern Europe were proclaimed, there would begin to be a realization in Moscow of the dangers of the course it is pursuing in the Vietnam war.

The official admission by Russia that it is supplying military aid to the North Vietnamese certainly brings up again the question of whether the United States should consider a "declaration of a state of war" so that belligerent ships may be intercepted under international law and delivery of war materials into North Vietnam interdicted. For if America intends to vindicate the policy it has followed in Southeast Asia, it will have to recognize formally that not only the Soviet Union but also Red China are enemies of the United States in the Vietnam war

---

L. B. J. Orders Bigger Air Safety Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 18, 1967

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I believe President Johnson is to be warmly commended for his request for an extra $7 million for the Federal Aviation Administration to hire 800 new air traffic controllers and 100 flight standard personnel.

Air travel is growing more rapidly than anyone anticipated, and the need for maintaining our enviable safety record is acute. The President's move is a significant step in the right direction.

Even more significant is the President's order to Secretary of Transportation Alan S. Boyd for a long-range plan to improve America's air traffic control.

Because of these moves, many, many lives will be saved.

The Chicago Tribune, of September 20, covered this important story in some detail. I would like to insert that coverage, by Robert Young, in the RECORD at this point:

L. B. J. ORDERS BIGGER AIR SAFETY PLAN

(By Robert Young)

WASHINGTON, September 20.—President Johnson today ordered development of a longrange, comprehensive plan to expand and improve the nation's air traffic control system.

The move could cost billions of dollars in the next few years and require added user taxes and higher passenger fares.

As a first step, the President asked Congress to appropriate an extra 7 million dollars for the Federal Aviation administration in the current fiscal year to hire and train 900 new air operations employes. These additional employes—800 of them for air traffic control and 100 to fill flight standard jobs—will be assigned to airports with the heaviest traffic.

Johnson said, in a letter to Secretary of Transportation Alan S. Boyd, it is apparent that the rapid growth of commercial and private flying is creating demands for substantial enlargement and improvement in the national air traffic control system.

"MORE FUNDS NEEDED"

Because the federal government manages this system, Johnson said, large additional outlays of federal funds will be needed. Emphasizing that he did not believe the general taxpayer should be asked to shoulder this financial burden, the President told Boyd:

"Those who benefit most from such expenditures, the aviation industry and the flying public, should pay their fair share of the costs of the system needed to handle the increase in air traffic while maintaining a high level of safety."

CALLS FOR REVIEW

Johnson instructed the transportation secretary to develop a plan to provide the facilities equipment, and personnel needed to meet the needs of mounting air traffic and a companion plan for financing this expansion "thru a system of charges by which the users of the nation's airways bear their fair share of its costs."

The President also directed Boyd to have the FAA review current air traffic regulations, flight rules, and standards and institute any changes needed to maintain air safety. Should this review show that maintaining safety in the face of increasing airport congestion requires regulation changes involving plane traffic delays, these changes should be made regardless, Johnson said.

The President commended that "this nation has an enviable record of air safety" and he was confident this record can be continued.

Stable Social Order Demands End of Destructive Violence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEL CLAWSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 27, 1967

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, this morning's Washington Post contains an article by Roscoe Drummond which is hereby commended to the attention of my colleagues. The fact that it should be necessary to issue a call to reinforce our American democratic society illustrates just how far supposedly thinking segments of our society have departed from reason. The column follows:

STABLE SOCIAL ORDER DEMANDS END OF DESTRUCTIVE VIOLENCE

It had to be said—and it had to be said openly, forcefully, and explicitly.

It could only be said effectively by a man of credentials which entitled him to be heard and heeded.

Daniel P. Moynihan is the right man with the right credentials saying what most needs to be said. He is an intellectual, a scholar, and a sociologist; he is a political liberal, an ADA Democrat, and a true friend of the Negro.

What Mr. Maynihan, who heads the Harvard-MIT Joint Center for Urban Affairs, is saying—calmly but courageously—is this: That the black militants and their white associates are irreversibly committed to the destruction of American Democratic society to achieve their racist goals.

That liberals had better quit their "curious condescension" of explaining away and justifying "anything, however outrageous, which Negroes, individually and collectively, might do."

That the preservation of a "stable social order" capable of peaceful change is the crucial necessity and that it can be preserved only if political liberals "make a much more effective alliance with political conservatives who share their concern."

There it is—Moynihan saying things which others have thought but not articulated. His words will need to be heeded if we are to achieve racial justice and still retain a Government of laws based on majority consent.

Anyone who knows Daniel Moynihan knows that he is not advocating a liberal-conservative alliance to hold back anything which needs to be done to enable Negroes to achieve dignity and equality of opportunity.

To the contrary, he is advocating a liberal-conservative alliance to secure "the stability of the social order" so that the mounting resort to violence will not destroy both social order and all chance of racial justice in America.

Moynihan's warning words deserve to be weighed by both liberals and conservatives because, for different reasons, each has been tending to look in the wrong direction.

Many liberals have been so burdened by their guilt complex for not having aided Negroes sooner and more forcefully that they minimize and justify the rioting and thus fail to see that we must protect society from self-destructive violence.

Many conservatives have been resentful of the heedless and reckless violence of the small minority of Negroes, which has pushed them into a punitive mood, withholding peaceful change at a time when it is most urgently needed.

What is required is for political liberals to quit justifying resort to violence and for political conservatives to show that they really care about removing the blight which Negroes have had imposed upon them by two centuries of inequality.

It is Moynihan's deep conviction that "there is nothing whatever to be done to change the minds of the Negro nihilists, nor of their white associates."

If this judgment is correct, then the outlook is that more, not less, terrorism is probable and that not to face up to it is risking the very survival of a society dedicated to peaceful change.

Moynihan is not urging any suspension of two-Party politics. Nor is he suggesting that there are not significant differences among liberals and conservatives. But he rightly pleads that liberals and conservatives join before it is too late in preserving government by consent without which nothing but chaos can come.

Reierson Warns of "Credit Crunch": Supports Tax Increase

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1967

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, among the economists summoned recently by our Committee on Ways and Means to comment on the President's tax surcharge proposal, Dr. Roy L. Reierson was particularly competent to testify on the outlook of the money markets. Dr. Reierson, as senior vice president and chief economist for the Bankers Trust Co. of New York, deals with the credit picture on a day-to-day basis.

Dr. Reierson described the congested outlook in the financial marketplace: Record State and local government borrowing; renewed business expansion in plants and equipment; a dangerous combination of a rebound from the current auto strike and an inventory buildup in anticipation of a possible steel strike next year; an improved demand for mortgage funds following last year's homebuilding recession. On top of these strong demands, the Treasury will enter the competition for funds to finance a cash deficit of $3 billion in the first part of calendar 1968, instead of relieving market pressures by retiring debt as they did in comparable periods of 1966 and 1967. Dr. Reierson points out that a credit crunch of this magnitude cannot be solved by simply expanding the money supply.

Record corporate borrowings in the first 8 months of 1967 have returned interest rates to their 1966 levels. The analysts have attributed the new interest rate spiral to fears of forthcoming monetary restraint and a conviction that necessary fiscal action would not be taken by the administration and the Congress. Interest rates are particularly vulnerable to such "market psychology." I share Dr. Reierson's deep disappointment that—

> The Presidential request for a tax increase did little to improve market sentiment, since it was accompanied by an official confirmation of the serious worsening in the country's fiscal condition.

Dr. Reierson's rigorous analysis leads him to the conclusion that a tax increase is absolutely essential. He comments further that—

> The tax increase would certainly do less to meet today's credit problems than would an equivalent curtailment of the rise in Federal spending. However, Congressional action on expenditures is being impeded by *the failure of the Executive branch to be more specific in suggesting cutbacks* in programs and appropriations. (Emphasis supplied.)

In the past 2 weeks, I have urged administration officials on the highest level to take the initiative in setting priorities and guidelines for spending cuts of at least $5 billion. Without a firm pledge of fiscal restraint, the tax increase supported by our Nation's leading economists is just not politically possible.

To acquaint my colleagues with Dr. Reierson's important testimony, I submit his statement for the RECORD:

STATEMENT ON THE PRESIDENT'S TAX PROGRAM PREPARED BY DR. ROY L. REIERSON, SENIOR VICE PRESIDENT AND CHIEF ECONOMIST, BANKERS TRUST CO., NEW YORK, BEFORE THE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, SEPTEMBER 12, 1967

The United States faces a fiscal emergency which is far more serious than is generally realized and which presents a grave threat to the economy as a whole. This threat stems from the Federal Government's tremendous cash deficit, which is inevitable for the fiscal year 1968 and which, unless the Congress acts, could well turn out to be the first in a series of huge deficits for years to come.

In the credit markets, the enormous Treasury borrowings required to cover the deficit will inevitably preempt funds that would otherwise be available to state and local governments, to home buyers, to business and to other borrowers, and will make credit to all borrowers more expensive. Moreover, financing the deficit will obviously require a further hefty expansion of the money supply, with all its present and future inflationary repercussions, at a time when production costs, wholesale prices and the cost of living are on the rise, when qualified manpower is in short supply, and when business has already started a renewed advance. In terms of the balance of payments, finally, the Federal deficit in the offing increases the pressures upon the dollar, and upon our gold reserves, in international markets.

According to the Secretary of the Treasury, in the absence of a tax increase and of "tight expenditure control," the administrative budget deficit could reach $29 billion in the current fiscal year—larger than any ever recorded, except during all-out war. Measures to curb Federal spending are essential, but it would be unrealistic to ignore the difficulties of obtaining results; in any event, such steps would take time to be implemented and would not be of much help in reducing the deficit for the current fiscal year. Today, hence, there is no practical alternative to higher taxes, although even the heaviest feasible tax increase will still leave the deficit sufficiently large to have an adverse effect upon credit conditions and prices. However, if the Congress wishes to avoid being confronted with a repetition of this bind next year and for an indefinite period ahead, action will have to be taken to regain control over the budget, and machinery will have to be developed for a more frequent, more informative and more meaningful Congressional review of the budget, and of its underlying assumptions, than has been the practice to date.

THE SPENDING EXPLOSION

The present fiscal emergency began to develop some two years ago and reflects three important developments, namely, (1) the expansion of military operations in Southeast Asia, (2) a simultaneous explosion in Government programs and outlays for purposes other than defense, and (3) the tax reductions enacted in 1964, coupled with the substantial ending of the temporary boost given to Treasury receipts by the acceleration of corporate income tax payments and the increased tax withholding on individual incomes.

Although Federal spending had been advancing peristently throughout the 1960s, outlays in the first half of the decade rose no faster than the gross national product. Thereafter, however, spending began to balloon, and to take an increasing share of the national output; moreover, the growth in expenditures has been accelerating. Cash outlays in fiscal 1968, as projected in the Summer Review, may be up by as much as $60 billion, or almost 50 per cent, from what they were in fiscal 1965. About half of this advance represents spending on national defense; of the other half, $20 billion is attributable to increased disbursements in the health, labor, welfare and education categories.

Furthermore, there is disturbing evidence that the Administration's control over the Budget is weakening. It will be recalled that the Budget Message of January 1966 projected cash expenditures for fiscal 1967 at $145 billion, or $10 billion below the final result, and net expenditures would have been even higher had it not been for substantial cash repayments of loans by Government agencies; also, economic activity, and hence revenues, increased more than expected. On balance, therefore, the cash deficit was held within manageable bounds.

The substantial underestimation of expenditures is being repeated for fiscal 1968. The Summer Review of the Budget for the current fiscal year, presented last month, projected cash outlays, including allowances for various contingencies at $10 billion higher than in the January Message. This time, moreover, tax receipts are falling behind the January estimates.

Last January, the President envisioned a cash deficit of $4.3 billion for fiscal 1968, after allowing for a tax increase estimated to yield about $4.7 billion. In August, the Administration presented a budget picture which indicated that, if taxes were not raised, the cash deficit for the current year might range between $18 billion and $26 billion. At the same time, the Secretary of the Treasury stated that the deficit, on an administrative budget basis, might reach a minimum of $14–18 billion and a maximum of $29 billion.

Seldom, if ever, have we witnessed such drastic revisions of budget estimates within so brief a period, or such a confusing variety of projections. One conclusion however, is clear: the budget picture has deteriorated dramatically in the past several months, foreshadowing serious repercussions upon the credit markets, the behavior of costs and prices, and upon the American economy in general.

RESURGENCE IN BUSINESS

We have had large budget deficits before, but whereas the hefty peacetime deficits of the past have usually occurred during periods of business recession or slack, the present monster deficit is emerging at a time when the economy, having weathered a slowdown, is giving widespread and convincing evidence of renewed strength.

Industrial production has already stopped its sag, and the ground seems to be set for a resumption of the advance. New orders and construction contracts are on the rise once more, and backlogs of unfilled orders are at record heights. The recovery of home building continues under way, business spending on new plant and equipment remains near the peak rates of the capital goods boom, retail sales have been posting good gains in recent months, and the adjustment of business inventory positions, which had been the principal reason for the decline in output in the first half of the year, seems about over; a return to at least a moderate rate of inventory accumulation is a reasonable prospect as we move into 1968. Meanwhile, not only are defense output and defense spending rising sharply, but requirements for goods and services are expanding strongly at all levels of government.

This significant improvement in the business outlook is confirmed by the behavior of a number of the leading business indicators; judging from past performance, an upturn of the breadth and extent recently demonstrated by a composite of these leaders appears to be a fairly reliable sign of an imminent rise in business activity. And we know from experience that, once the economy begins to move, more often than not its strength exceeds the expectations of most observers. This prospect could admittedly be undermined, temporarily, by a lengthy automobile strike, but the odds are that the eventual settlement of the strike would be followed by a sharp rebound. In fact, such a rebound could accentuate the strength of the economy early in 1968.

In this environment, there is no risk that a tax increase will precipitate a business recession, as has been suggested, or even that the expansion of the economy will be seriously retarded. In aggregate terms, the magnitude of any tax increase will be far less than the reduction of $18 billion in the annual rate of inventory accumulation in the first half of 1967, which the economy absorbed with no greater adversity than a slowdown in the rate of growth; employment and incomes have continued upward. Furthermore, any tax increase that may be enacted would still leave a very large cash deficit which would add substantially to aggregate purchasing power in an already active economy. The Wharton School, University of Pennsylvania, used its econometric model to test the effect of a significant rise in corporate and individual income tax rates upon the economy; the finding was that such a tax increase would retard the expansion of business to some degree and for a short while but would not materially affect the upward course of activity.

The real danger, rather, comes from the opposite direction, namely, that even after a tax increase, the Treasury deficit will still be so sizable as to overload an independently strong economy and to bring about overheated conditions similar to those of 1965–66—encouraging excesses in buying, spending and investing, generating bottlenecks and imbalances, and generally facilitatig cost and price increases, thus paving the way for another economic pause, correction, or decline.

VULNERABLE CREDIT MARKETS

Those who oppose a tax increase for fear that it might impede or cut short the economic recovery seem to overlook the fact that a huge Federal deficit likewise may jeopardize the growth of the economy because of the impact of Treasury borrowings upon the credit markets.

The effects of Treasury financing operations in an active economy were aptly illustrated in 1966. The Treasury's net borrowing requirements were far smaller than this year, but even these relatively moderate needs were compounded by the issuance of substantial amounts of Federal agency securities and participation certificates at a time when other credit demands were setting new peaks. This contributed significantly to the development of a credit stringency. Interest rates and yields were driven still higher, the savings and loan associations and other savings institutions were confronted with wholesale withdrawals of funds, and the ensuing squeeze on mortgage credit preciptated a severe drop in home building from which the economy has still not fully recovered.

Similarly, the decline in interest rates that followed the credit crisis of a year ago was short-lived, even though the Federal Reserve was pursuing, and has continued to pursue, a highly expansonary credit policy and even though the Treasury's operations produced a large seasonal cash surplus in the first half of calendar 1967. As the credit markets began to sense the deterioration in the Federal budget and the prospect of even larger Treasury borrowings in the final half of calendar 1967 than in the corresponding period of 1966, money market yields turned upward once more, bond yields approached—and in some cases exceeded—last year's peaks, and rates on conventional mortgage loans also began to stiffen. The President's request for a tax increase did little to improve market sentiment, since it was accompanied by an official confirmation of the serious worsening in the country's fiscal condition.

Credit demands from business and from state and local governments so far in 1967 have been running materially ahead of last year, and while the volume of corporate financing in the securities market may ease from this summer's record heights, new corporate issues should continue very substantial as business endeavors to improve its liquidity; corporate managements and security underwriters both report ambitious plans for new financing in the offing. Next year, credit requirements will probably be reinforced by a renewed expansion of business, the increase in costs and prices, a resumption of inventory building, and a larger rise in receivables. At the same time, state and local government borrowings will unquestionably continue heavy, and the improvement in home building and construction presages larger demands also for mortgage money.

Now, these financing requirements stand to be greatly augmented by Federal Government borrowings. Little or nothing can be done to ease the Treasury's enormous cash needs through the balance of this year, but without a tax increase, the Treasury in the first half of calendar 1968 may incur a cash deficit of perhaps $3 billion, in striking contrast to the cash surpluses of $8.7 billion and $12.7 billion in the comparable periods of 1966 and 1967, respectively. In other words, instead of relieving market pressures by retiring debt, the Treasury already in the first half of calendar 1968 would be adding its demands to those of other borrowers, and its financing needs in the second half would be gigantic.

Thus, one compelling reason for reducing the Treasury deficit is to relieve some of the heavy strains upon the credit markets. Admittedly, even a material reduction in the Treasury deficit and in the Treasury's borrowing needs will not assure easy credit or lower interest rates; total financing requirements in 1968 will still exceed this year's volume by a sizable margin. Without such a reduction, however, the danger of a repetition of the "credit crunch"—including spiraling interest costs, withdrawals of deposits from savings institutions, a renewed stringency of mortgage money and a curtailment of economic activity—would appear to be overwhelming.

It will be argued that this danger can be averted by the liberal provision of Federal Reserve credit. In the present business and financial environment, however, the futility of such a course would soon become manifest. If the Federal Reserve should attempt to stabilize or reduce interest rates by flooding the market with funds, the net result would merely be a further rapid expansion in the money supply at a time when demands upon the economy's physical resources are already being increased by heavy requirements on the part of the Federal Government. Additional borrowing and spending would be stimulated, and the uptrend of costs and prices would be accelerated. In turn, this would mean another increase in financing needs, thus pushing interest rates higher—or compelling the Federal Reserve to inflate credit in ever larger amounts. The consequences of this classical spiral surely require neither documentation nor elaboration.

MORE INFLATION AHEAD

Higher taxes are needed not only to help the credit markets but also to help prevent the already inevitable uptrend in commodity prices from gaining momentum. After a brief respite that began late in 1966, the tempo of price inflation has quickened once more in recent months. Not only have food prices spurted as a result of poor crops and unfavorable weather but, more ominously, the industrial wholesale price index has this summer resumed its advance, freight rates and other business costs have also moved higher, and sales prices are being marked up almost across the board. The chronic advance in consumer prices has also steepened recently, and the same is true of wage rates and hourly pay. At the same time, the decline in the raw materials price index, which had been in progress for about 1½ years in response to world market conditions, has almost come to a halt.

In this pricing climate, the combination of intensified private demands for goods and services, a grossly unbalanced Federal budget, and an unprecedented rate of bank credit expansion is a particularly vicious and virulent brew. The rapid growth in the money supply since late 1966 has surely provided some support to buying and spending in the private sector of the economy and has enabled some rebuilding of liquidity; now, the huge Federal deficit is injecting additional purchasing power into the spending stream.

This is all the more troublesome because the economy, despite the slowdown in the first half of 1967, is still operating at a rate very close to the effective optimum. The labor supply is hardly more plentiful than at the crest of the boom in 1966; in fact, the total unemployment rate last month declined to 3.8 per cent, which is last year's average. Unemployment among married males, which in many respects provides a more meaningful reading of labor availability, remains below 2 per cent, indicating continuing tightness, and business managements remain hard pressed to fill job vacancies that call for skilled help. Meanwhile, the length of the average workweek in manufacturing is only a shade below the high peak attained 12 months ago and still exceeds 40½ hours; thus, any significant increase in demands for goods, such as now seems to be shaping up, will bring additional pressures upon the labor supply and materially higher labor costs.

Finally, despite the massive inventory correction, the persistent additions of new industrial facilities, and the sag in industrial production, the utilization rate of manufacturing capacity has declined no further than from about 90–91 per cent during most of 1966 to approximately 85 per cent as of the latest reporting date. This is below the optimum, to be sure, but not so far below as to provide any important reserve of productive facilities at a time when order backlogs are building up again and the signals are pointing to stronger demands and higher output in the near future.

Because of the time lags, it is already too late to employ either fiscal or credit policy to dampen the current round of spiraling costs, and prices. However, if the present course of economic policy is not changed, it will underwrite a continuation, and very likely an acceleration, of the inflation spiral in 1968.

THE BATTERED PAYMENTS BALANCE

Another major consideration arguing for fiscal restraint pertains to the United States balance of payments, which, despite all efforts, persists in an uncomfortably large deficit postion. Part of the renewed deterioration in 1966, and so far in 1967, can be attributed to the increasing foreign exchange cost of our military operations in Vietnam, but an even larger share of the blame rests with last year's shortfall in our foreign trade surplus in an overheated economy; scarcities, longer delivery periods and higher prices at home encouraged imports while curtailing exports. Here the consequences of our failure to control inflation at a sufficiently early date are clearly visible.

This year, the trade surplus has recovered somewhat as pressures upon our resources have lessened; but, with industrial activity now turning the corner and costs moving higher, the recent improvement in trade will probably prove short-lived. In addition, of course, a continuation of a fiscal emergency in the United States would further weaken the already delicate state of world confidence in the United States dollar and would inevitably make it even more difficult to control the drain on our gold reserves. Thus, to the extent that curbs on Federal spending and a boost in taxes succeed in moderating the pressures upon the economy and upon the American cost-price structure, this country's foreign trade and international payments position stands to be a vital beneficiary.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ACTION

It seems clear, from this summary review, that a Treasury deficit of any significant size is at odds with the requirements of the present economic environment and that the deficit currently in prospect is far larger than can be supported without serious harm to the economy. The immediate task, therefore, is to achieve a material reduction in the budget deficit for the fiscal year 1968, and to this end a tax increase is unavoidable.

However, it would be unrealistic and misleading to suggest that the fiscal dilemma would thereby be resolved. If the Congress and the nation are to escape the politically embarrassing and economically unsettling prospect of having to cope with another fiscal emergency next year, and perhaps annually thereafter, steps will have to be taken both to bring soaring expenditures under control and also to establish a level of taxation appropriate to the size of the Government's outlays. In turn, integrated fiscal housekeeping calls for an overhaul of the present machinery for acting on budgetary matters.

The Tax Increase.—Admittedly, a tax increase is neither the best nor the final answer to the nation's fiscal difficulties. It would certainly do less to meet today's credit and inflation problems than would an equivalent curtailment of the rise in Federal spending. However, Congressional action on expenditures is being impeded by the failure of the Executive branch to be more specific in suggesting cutbacks in programs and appropriations. Moreover, because of the inevitable time lags, even a vigorous pruning of appropriations and expenditures would not make adequate inroads upon the colossal Treasury deficit shaping up in the current fiscal year. This makes a tax increase essential.

The Congress should take action as early as possible; uncertainty as to the fate of the tax bill, at a time when the Treasury is already a heavy borrower, has seriously unsettled the credit markets. Moreover, the tax increase should be made effective as soon as is feasible without incurring the onus of retroactivity—at the latest, on January 1, 1968. This is indicated not only by the pressing need for revenues, but also because of the economic outlook; if the rebound in the automobile industry from its work stoppage should coincide with a wave of accumulation of steel inventories in anticipation of a steel strike, business activity, the credit markets and commodity prices may all be exposed to a disturbingly strong combination of expansionary forces.

Controlling the Budget.—While a tax increase would moderate the budget deficit ahead, it would still leave an uncomfortably large gap between revenues and expenditures Furthermore, if Federal spending continues to soar, as it has in the past few years, another impossibly large cash deficit is in store for the next fiscal year, which will be upon us sooner than we think. It is obvious that if a viable budget situation is to be restored a way must be found to control the surge in Government outlays.

Some categories of spending are virtually certain to advance further. National defense outlays must be expected to keep growing, at least as long as we are engaged in Vietnam; in view of the record, it would hardly be responsible fiscal planning to assume any important improvement in the visible future. Interest payments are also sure to increase with the rise in the Federal debt.

Defense outlays and interest payments account for over 50 per cent of Federal cash disbursements. Among the remaining programs, some presumably merit larger appropriations. Consequently, sensible and effective control over the budget will require establishing a system of national priorities against which to measure the needs and results of the many programs competing for a limited amount of funds. The uninviting alternative would be another tax increase in 1968.

There is, admittedly, a third possibility, which is to acquiesce in mammoth Federal deficits and to accept chronic inflation, permanently high interest rates, and an erosion of the dollar internationally. Unfortunately, this course would help neither the intended beneficiaries of Federal spending programs nor the taxpayers. Instead, such a dissipation of the nation's economic strength would be at the expense of virtually everyone.

Modernizing the System.—Good intentions alone, however, will not do the job. If control over the budget is to be reestablished, the way of handling the fiscal affairs of the United States Government needs modernization, and both the Executive and the Legislative branches of the Government share responsibility for bringing this about. The Congress has enacted legislation to this end, but the situation has shown no improvement, to say the least.

At present, the consideration of appropriations by the Congress is highly diffused and exceedingly time-consuming. Spending programs are determined independently of decisions on taxation. The Federal budget is not dealt with as a whole; action is taken on individual spending programs without up-to-date and comprehensive information that would permit a broad assessment of the fiscal consequences. Such an unsophisticated approach is no longer consistent with the vast and complex operations of the Federal Government, nor is it responsive to the needs of our highly developed American economy.

The Executive branch, in turn, needs to make available to the Congress and to the public more frequent information on prospective receipts and expenditures and on the basic assumptions underlying the budget projections. Last year, despite important shifts in the budget outlook and in the economy, the Congress and the public were compelled to live with the information supplied in the President's Budget Message delivered in January; the customary midyear review was omitted. This year, a Summer Review was prepared but was incomplete and inadequate. For the Congress and the Administration to obtain the prerequisite insight into the budget picture and to be in position to make proper decisions, the Budget Bureau should be required to submit projections of the Federal cash budget quarterly, by major categories, for six quarters ahead.

The quarterly budget presentations should be accompanied by a statement of the underlying economic assumptions, including projections of the gross national product and its components, and of income and profits, as prepared by the Council of Economic Advisers. This would enable the Congress and the interested public to appraise the budget outlook more continuously, more intelligently and more effectively than is possible today. In turn, more frequent and more adequate budget information should enable Congressional action on fiscal matters to be taken with greater speed, thus reducing the time lag which presently is one of the great barriers to the flexible use of fiscal measures as an instrument of economic policy.

These are the rock-bottom essentials for raising the efficiency of the budget process. Further, a very real requirement is the incorporation of true long-range planning into the fiscal household, which involves looking beyond a maximum span of 18 months, as is the present practice, and establishing some benchmarks, based on current tax rates and spending programs, for the budget over, say, a five-year span in order to develop an awareness of the ultimate implications of proposals for new spending and taxes. American industry, educational institutions, municipalities and many other entities have found long-range planning of inestimable value in the management of their affairs. The United States Government, which is far superior in the size and scope of its responsibilities, can assuredly not afford to do less.

Hudson Valley, the Apple of the Nation's Eye

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH Y. RESNICK
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 27, 1967

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, we in the 28th Congressional District of New York have much to be proud of. We boast about our breathtaking scenery, our rich historical treasures, our fertile, rolling farmland. But around this time of year, we brag most of all about our succulent, sumptuous, Hudson Valley apples. The Thursday, September 21, issue of the New York Times featured an article by Jean Hewitt about our delicious McIntosh apples. Miss Hewitt toured the 250-acre farm of Mr. William A. Coy, of Clintondale, Ulster County, N.Y., one of the Hudson Valley's finest fruit farms.

Mr. Speaker, I respectfully insert this article in the RECORD so that everyone can read about our Hudson Valley, truly the apple of the Nation's eye:

RED-TINGED, CRISP, AND JUICY, THE NEW McINTOSH CROP IS IN

(By Jean Hewitt)

CLINTONDALE, N.Y.—"You're Now in McIntosh Country Where Apples Grow Best" read the billboard half a mile from the 250-acre fruit farm of William A. Coy in Clintondale, Ulster County, N.Y.

Throughout the Hudson Valley, tree branches are heavy with ripening fruit, and pickers began to harvest the main McIntosh crop this week.

Seventy-five per cent of the nation's McIntosh apples are grown in the New York-New England area, with the Hudson Valley orchards producing most of the apples for shoppers in the New York metropolitan area.

"The quality of the crop is good," Mr. Coy said recently. "The volume is about the same as last year, but I'm late picking on account of the weather."

Also, the color of this year's fruit is good and the size about average, according to Rockwood Berry, executive vice president of the New York-New England Apple Institute.

Most Hudson Valley apples are sold as fresh fruit, few go into processing, and 50 to 75 per cent are kept in cold storage, so that fruit of this year's crop will be available even next August. Many of the valley's apples are also exported to Great Britain and Sweden.

EDUCATING CONSUMERS

Although some of the older varieties, such as Baldwin, Northern Spy, Greenings and Kings, are no longer grown in quantity because the demand has slackened, Mr. Coy believes that the consumer should learn more about apple varieties, how to recognize them and how to use them to best advantage.

With this in mind, the Apple Institute has prepared apple-shaped signs listing such information. They'll be displayed in produce departments to help shoppers.

Besides, the name of the variety is on every polyethylene bag of apples marketed, and it is becoming increasingly common for the name of the grower and the location of his farm to be given, too.

Fruit farms in the Hudson Valley are changing. "The trend is toward larger farms, more mechanization and therefore a bigger investment," Mr. Coy said as he sat in the remodeled kitchen of the 100-year-old farmhouse where he was born.

A FAMILY HERITAGE

Four generations of his family have farmed the surrounding land, but in the last 15 years the Coys have shifted from dairying and fruit to fruit only. Meanwhile, they have increased their acreage from 120 to 250. Mr. Coy's son, William, Jr., who lives down the road, helps his father run the farm.

As the elder Mr. Coy talked about the apple business, his wife of 41 years was peeling a bowl of rosy apples for a dessert.

She took time out to point out of the window at neat rows of cabbage, broccoli and beans. "We still grow all our own vegetables," she said, and recalled the days when they made all their own butter and pot cheese.

Mr. Coy soon brought the conversation back to apples.

"I'm partial to apple pie and apple sauce made of Mac's, of course," he said. "Pure, unadulterated, with no spices added, so you can get the taste of the fruit."

Mrs. Coy prepares a variety of apple dishes, always making her pastry for pie with vegetable oil and the stir-and-roll method. An easy-to-fix appetizer and dessert that the Coys and their guests enjoy is cored and sectioned Golden Delicious apples served with blue cheese.

Cortland apples will be picked around the beginning of October, and Mrs. Coy uses these in salads as well as in cooking because they do not brown as readily when cut. For baking, plain or stuffed, Mrs. Coy prefers the Rome Beauty variety, which will be harvested in mid-October.

Mrs. Coy has a reputation in the valley for the excellence of her liver pâté, cakes and lemon meringue pies. "I make two pies when my husband's poker-investment club meets here," she said. "There are eight of them, and they murmur about diets, but it all disappears."

Desserts and the liver pâté are favorites with the members of Mrs. Coy's bridge club, but as most of the women "are in apples," bridge-playing will not resume until after the harvest.

The Coys grow some pears, cherries and crab apples, and Montmorency cherry pie is another of Mrs. Coy's specialties. "No spice in that either," she hastened to add. Pitted cherries are stored in the cavernous depths of the Coy freezer that hides such other delicacies as venison steaks and chops for year-round enjoyment.

Mr. Coy hunts pheasant, partridge, rabbit and deer in season in nearby Sullivan County, and after the harvest he goes to an island in the St. Lawrence River to hunt deer.

Rabbit is cut into serving pieces, seasoned and fried like chicken. Venison steaks are marinated in red wine before being broiled over the charcoal grill that Mr. Coy had installed in the kitchen as a center for informed entertaining.

Four Maryland Men Die in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE D. LONG
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 27, 1967

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, four servicemen from Maryland were recently killed in action in Vietnam. They were Cpl. Gary R. Schafer, Pfc. John L. Harris, Jr., Capt. William M. Van Antwerp, and Hospitalman John F. Pender.

I wish to commend the courage of these men, and to honor their memory by including the following article in the RECORD:

FOUR MARYLAND MEN SLAIN IN VIETNAM—DEAD ARE HARRIS, PENDER, SCHAFER, VAN ANTWERP

Four more Marylanders—three marines and a Navy hospitalman attached to a Marine division—have been killed in combat in Vietnam, the Defense Department announced yesterday.

The war victims were identified as:

Cpl. Gary R. Schafer, 21, the son of Mr. and Mrs. John W. Schafer, of the 900 block Rock Spring road, Bel Air.

P.F.C. John L. Harris, Jr., 20, the husband of Mrs. Melva Jean Harris, of the 100 block Bethune road, Baltimore.

Capt. William M. Van Antwerp, 32, the son of Col. and Mrs. William M. Van Antwerp, of Annapolis.

Hospitalman John F. Pender, 21, the son of Mr. and Mrs. John J. Pender, of the 7800 block Lansdale street, District Heights, Md.

Corporal Schafer, already the winner of a Purple Heart, was killed last Thursday by mortar fire during fighting in the province of Quang Tri.

He had been in Vietnam since last January and just two weeks ago had been sent to Honolulu for a week of "R and R" (rest and recreation), an aunt, Miss Claire Atkins, said last night.

Miss Atkins said that she, Corporal Schafer's mother and his brother, Richard, had gone to Hawaii to visit with him.

In addition to his parents and his brother, his survivors include three grandparents, Mr. and Mrs. P. J. Schafer, of Bel Air, and Mrs. Edna Greer, of Miami, Florida.

Private Harris was also a victim of bloody battles in Quang Tri. He died last Thursday while being evacuated to the hospital ship, U.S.S. Sanctuary, of shrapnel wounds.

In addition to his wife, Private Harris is survived by a son, John L. Harris 3d, 8 months old, a brother, Robert Lee Harris, and his aunt and guardian, Mrs. Ethel Muise, all of Baltimore.

Captain Van Antwerp was a career officer in the Marines who enlisted in 1958 upon his graduation from Yale University.

He commanded an amphibious tractor company in Vietnam and was killed September 16 when blown up by a land mine while on patrol outside of Da Nang.

Besides his parents, he is survived by his wife, Helen C. Van Antwerp, and two sons, William M. and Bradley P., all of Oceanside, Cal.

Hospitalman Pender was attached to the 9th Marine Division and was killed just last Sunday by rocket fire. He also died in Quang Tri, his father said last night.

He was married last April to the former Louise Eileen Pierce, of Portland, Maine, who is now a WAVE in the medical corps stationed at Buford, S.C.

Besides his wife and parents, he is survived by a sister, Carol Ann, 15, also of District Heights.

The Kee Report: Peace Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 27, 1967

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include last week's public service television and radio newscast, "The Kee Report."

The subject discussed in this report is the Peace Corps and the accomplishments being made by this organization.

This is Jim Kee—bringing you the Kee report.

Nearly 15,000 young Americans are working abroad this summer to give a helping hand to the world's most destitute people. These are the volunteers serving in the Peace Corps, an agency sponsored six years ago by the late President Kennedy.

When this novel organization first started, it was viewed with toleration and skepticism. Everyone wished it well but there was a widespread feeling that youngsters just off the college campus were hardly equipped to help the millions of ill-clad, ill-housed and ill-fed natives of the earth's backward areas. There was a companion feeling that eager volunteers might give offense by mixing too freely in local affairs.

Five years of successful operation have convinced the doubters. But, while just about everyone has a kindly feeling for the Peace Corps, the public is still pretty much in the dark about its actual operations. So let us take a look at what these youngsters are doing in far-off places.

Slightly more than half are engaged in teaching. There is a widespread need for English teachers in the fifty-three countries served by the Corps. Many volunteers teach other foreign languages. In countries where illiteracy is common, the Peace Corps is reaching an estimated half a million adults and children through educational television beamed into schools and community centers.

Nearly one-third are working in rural and urban community projects. This means they are helping to develop those health and food-growing projects which are so desperately needed where the most of the people live in poverty.

It may seem puzzling that volunteers with only two or three months training are competent to act in those fields where specialized training is usually necessary. But the fact is that these eager-beaver youngsters have done amazingly well at mastering the practical jobs which comprise most of their work.

Experience has shown that the expert is too often frustrated in primitive surroundings. To explain this, it may be pointed out that ten of the world's greatest surgeons would be of less help in a native village than ten young ladies properly trained in first-aid relief work. The main job is to heal the cuts and bruises of every-day life and to teach the basic facts of sanitation.

The Peace Corps is looked upon as primarily an organization of young people, which it is. But older volunteers are given a hearty welcome when they have skills which are urgently needed in the field. This is especially true in agriculture and allied pursuits because increasing the food yield is so important in backward areas.

India, where the food shortage is reaching crisis proportions, is a Peace Corps priority. One project designed to increase the poultry yield has worked out better than expected and similar projects are now getting underway.

The volunteers are taught to live simply so as not to offend the poor people among whom they work. This means a standard of living below what they were accustomed to in our country.

The Peace Corps may be described as an experiment in the idealism of American youth. I am happy to report that so far it has worked out very well.

Thank you for listening.

A Letter to the President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 27, 1967

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker. A most interesting letter to President Johnson has recently come to my attention.

It was written by Chief Sigola of the Sipezini area of Matabeleland in Rhodesia. The chief is descended from a long line of Matabele chiefs, descendants of the Zulus, and has been a member of the Chiefs Council since its inception.

His letter follows:

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I have seen what Paramount Chief Goraseb of South West Africa says in his letter to U Thant.

We have the same problem here in Rhodesia, how outside people speak about Rhodesia. I wonder whether you would like to come to Rhodesia to see for yourself and speak with people in the streets, and see the Chiefs, because it is the Chiefs that are the leaders of the people. We are disappointed at the overseas peoples' talk when they have not seen us.

Rhodesia is a peaceful country, there is no war here. The talk of the overseas people is the only thing that could cause a war here. How many people have died in Rhodesia from being killed by violence? How many people have died by violence in Vietnam? Yet they say Rhodesia is not a peaceful country. We know that there is no country as peaceful as Rhodesia. Most other countries are disturbed by troubles.

It saddens me to see that we Chiefs are called stooges of the Government. We and our fathers have been Chiefs and the leaders of the people from the beginning. We wish to be taught to be civilized. It is no good, our people taking over the Government of the country now, like the countries to the north of us. We want to be educated first.

Before this Government came in, people were killed and their houses were burned just because they did not belong to a political party. We in Rhodesia have thatched roofs on our houses. The African politicians used to lock our doors from outside and then set fire to the house and kill the people inside together with their innocent children who knew nothing about politics because they did not agree with them.

The only trouble we have now is from terrorists who come with bombs from China and Russia, Communist countries with no freedom of speech or opposition parties. We plead with you to come and visit us in our country to see for yourself what a peaceful country this is.

We know that we black people will be able to take over the Government when we are civilized enough to do so, but it would be wrong to do so overnight. We know it will take a long time.

Before the white man came, we were fighting among ourselves, we were being killed by diseases, and now we have hospitals and clinics and the Mashona and Matabele people are now at peace with each other.

Why should the United Nations which is made to keep the peace come and interfere with us in this country where we are already so peaceful?

Mr. Speaker, the Council of Chiefs also adopted a statement regarding the present situation in Rhodesia. In an effort to accurately portray the situation existing in that African country, I insert this statement:

We, the Council of Chiefs, the elected representatives of all the traditional leaders of the African tribes of Rhodesia, have today held one of our periodic meetings to consider problems which confront our people and our country.

We are concerned over the damage which is being caused to our country and the suffering to which our people are being subjected at this time by the economic sanctions imposed by Britain.

We wish to state quite clearly that we support the Government of Rhodesia, and we do not accept the claim by the British Prime Minister that he has continuing responsibility and authority for and over our people through the Government and Parliament of the United Kingdom. Why has the Government of the United Kingdom, while claiming this responsibility, seen fit to impose sanctions upon us, and why has the same British Government supported the Government of Zambia against us in what we regard as treachery?

We will stand firmly behind our Prime Minister in any steps which he decides to take.

Town Dedicates Square to Memory of Russell Almeida

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HASTINGS KEITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 27, 1967

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, the war in Vietnam has so far yielded a death toll of over 10,000 American men, and prospects are dim that an end to the killing is foreseeable in the near future. Hardly an American has not been affected by the death of a loved one, a son or husband, a relative, or a friend. Often the loss is shared in solitary grief by the family and close friends, but sometimes an entire community joins in sorrow to pay tribute to one who has sacrificed his life fighting aggression in South Vietnam.

Recently, residents of the town of Dartmouth, in my district, dedicated a small square to the memory of Russell Almeida, a U.S. marine who died at Da Nang in June 1965. Russell was killed in action, having thrown himself on a land mine to save the lives of three of his buddies. For his courageous deed, Russell was awarded the Purple Heart, the Cross with the Gold Palm, and the Republic of Vietnam Service Ribbon. The main reason, however, for the dedication of a square to Marine Almeida, is that he was the first young man from the town of Dartmouth to die in Vietnam.

State Representative Raymond Peck delivered the dedication, and I would like to give my colleagues a chance to read his very moving and fitting tribute to Dartmouth's first Vietnam war casualty:

Ladies and Gentlemen, we have come here today to dedicate this little square to the memory of a very young man, Russell Almeida.

Russell was an average American boy. He liked automobiles, and seemed forever to be taking them apart and putting them together. Football and baseball were his favorite sports. He went to school at St. John's Academy in New Bedford, and the Poole School in Dartmouth.

Russell's parents are average American parents. In Dartmouth, we know Mr. and Mrs. John Almeida as respected neighbors and a hard working mother and father, who, like all of us, are always trying to make life just a little bit easier for our children.

Any foreign visitor we might have with us would probably wonder why we have all come here today to name a square for Russell Almeida, the average American boy.

The reason is, that in June, 1965, Russell Almeida stopped being an average American. For, at that time, Russell gave his life in battle so others might live and the rest of us here at home might enjoy the comforts and freedoms we do.

Russell joined the marine corps at age seventeen. After receiving his basic training, he was stationed on the calm and safe island of Puerto Rico for six months. Then at the end of 1964, Russell volunteered for duty in Viet Nam.

In June, 1965, while serving with the Third Marine Division at Da Nang, Russell was killed in action. He is credited with saving the lives of three of his buddies by throwing himself on a land mine on a hill near Da Nang. For this courageous deed he has been awarded the Purple Heart, The Cross with gold palm, which is the highest Viet Nam award for gallantry, and the Republic of Vietnam Service Ribbon.

But Russell means more to us here in Dartmouth than a fistfull of medals. He was the first, although not the only young man from our town to die fighting aggression in Vietnam.

This memorial truly is a symbol to all of us in Dartmouth. It is a constant reminder to us that the freedoms and liberties we enjoy in this country, were not bought cheaply.

Russell Almeida not only represents the others from our town, who have died and who will die in Vietnam; he, and this memorial is also a monument to the more than 10,000 killed and almost 70,000 wounded average American boys who have given of themselves in Vietnam. Russell reminds us all of the four great wars we have fought in this century, four wars which have already taken the lives of 588,000 American young men and wounded, in body or mind, no one knows how many.

Russell Almeida represents the knowledge that the American people have gained from the lessons of 1917 and 1936. He knew that the greatest nation in the world cannot remain calm and at peace while the world around us rages in war. He knew, and we know, that, we in this country who enjoy the greatest benefits from being in this world have the greatest obligations, to help the less fortunate of the world, and cannot remain isolated and alone.

Russell also knew that appeasement is not the proper way to handle an aggressor. He didn't say, "Stop the bombing", or "Pull out now", or "Vietnam is not the place to make a stand". He knew what the world didn't know in 1936, when it let Hitler take Europe piece by piece. This young man volunteered to go to Vietnam and stop the aggression in Asia before it became uncontrollable.

Ladies and gentlemen, these are some of the reasons why I think we have named this little square after an average American boy from an average American family.

Gun Control Is Needed Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 27, 1967

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the Congress is moving closer to enacting much-needed legislation to further control the sale and use of guns. In my view this is priority legislation and we should enact a sensible law now.

For many years I have sponsored legislation to provide stricter controls on the sale of guns through the mails. In the 90th Congress my bill is H.R. 5463, which is pending before the Committee on Ways and Means.

The following recent editorials supporting more restrictive laws with respect to firearms are very much to the point and I commend them to the attention of our colleagues:

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Bulletin, Aug. 25, 1967]

EVIDENCE OF GUN CONTROL NEEDS

The amazing collection of deadly arms seized in New York from an ultra-rightist group raises many major questions.

What earthly use could any nongovernmental organization have for such weapons except violence, from the right or the left? What private organization needs an anti-tank gun?

A New York city official made a telling point. He said that anyone could buy such weapons with impunity in his city, from stores or through mail order houses, even the antitank gun.

This was the second large cache of weapons seized in New York. There have been other seizures made in the South and Midwest. The latest seizure is timely. It serves to focus attention on the delay in passing national and state gun control laws. It could also show those racial militants who claim that new and stringent laws on offensive weapons are aimed exclusively at them, that they actually apply to the self-styled super-patriots and even average citizens, as well.

[From the New York Times, Aug. 27, 1967]

DEBATE ON HOW TO DISARM THE SNIPER

(By Will Lissner)

"If we do not pass these laws, we sign the death warrant of more policemen and more children who will be caught in tomorrow's crossfire. If we act now, we can save hundreds of lives in this country and spare thousands of families all across the land the grief and heartbreak that may come from the loss of a husband, a son, a brother or a friend."

The speaker was Robert F. Kennedy and there was an emotional tremor in the hushed New York City Council chamber at his words. The Senator was testifying last week on the first day of two days of hearings before a Council subcommittee and a Joint State Legislative committee on firearm control. At issue was legislation to control the sale and possession of rifles, shotguns and other weapons—"the tools," he called them, "of the urban rioter, the machinery of senseless killing."

For Senator Kennedy, Mayor John Lindsay—who last week proposed strict gun control laws for the city—and other backers of the legislation, there is a particular urgency for such measures at this time. They point to a chain of senseless violence in recent years and say that if it was not triggered by the ease with which guns can be obtained, it was certainly helped along by the lack of control over the sale and possession of rifles and shotguns. And they point to a whole series of episodes:

Almost every urban riot this summer has witnessed snipers perched in windows and on rooftops sending a fusilade upon police, firemen and others—with weapons that could be purchased in any sporting goods store merely by putting down the necessary cash.

The 6.5 mm. Italian carbine which Lee Harvey Oswald used to assassinate President Kennedy in 1963 was purchased through the mails under an assumed name for less than $20.

In New York's Bryant Park last December, a former mental patient went on a rampage and killed two persons with a .30 caliber rifle—a rifle he had bought only an hour before in a store three blocks away.

In 1966, over 100,000 crimes involving guns were committed. Of 6,000 firearms homicides in 1965, 30 per cent were committed with shotguns and rifles. Since 1900, 750,000 American men, women and children have been killed by firearms—220,000 more than all the American servicemen killed in wars since the Revolution.

At least some of this "slaughter," backers of control legislation say, could be ended if laws were passed requiring registration and licensing of owners of rifles, shotguns and other weapons, and prohibiting their sale through the mails and to juveniles, criminals and defectives.

There are, of course, already some controls over firearms, but most of these are not directed at potential shooters. The National Firearms Act of 1934 and the Federal Firearms Act of 1948 license the manufacture and distribution, but attempts to extend Federal regulations to ownership and possession have been successfully throttled by the gunmakers' lobby and sportsmen's clubs.

At the state level, in 28 states there are no controls over the sale or ownership of any kind of guns, including handguns. Only Hawaii requires purchasers to register rifles and shotguns as well as pistols.

Gun enthusiasts have waged a long campaign against controls over rifles and shotguns. They say regulations would discourage legitimate hunters and other sportsmen, would ruin retailers * * *.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Aug. 28, 1967]

A MATTER OF CONVENIENCE

The Chief Assistant District Attorney of the Bronx, N.Y., said a few sensible, astringent words the other day for the benefit of gun enthusiasts. "It is time," said Burton B. Roberts, "we stopped worrying about sportsmen and started worrying about the great majority of the public." Mr. Robert's words were spoken at a press conference in connection with the discovery by New York police of a private arsenal including a submachine gun, rifles, shotguns and 250,000 rounds of ammunition; four men were charged with an assassination plot.

The interest of the public in this situation is an interest of life and death. The ease with which criminals and irresponsibles can obtain guns in the United States entails a dreadful toll in human suffering. Some 18,000 human beings were shot to death in this country during the past year. Many of those shootings could have been avoided by sensible regulations governing the purchase and possession of firearms.

The interest of sportsmen is an interest of convenience. No one suggests that they should not be allowed to go into the woods in appropriate seasons and enjoy themselves in the slaughter of birds and beasts. No one suggests that they should not collect as many firearms as they please. No one suggests that they should be deprived of the pleasures of target shooting. No one suggests that, if they choose to run the risks involved, they should be denied the satisfaction of keeping guns around their homes for self-protection.

Sportsmen are simply asked to undergo a moderate inconvenience for the sake of the general welfare. Under the Administration's gun bill, they would be required to make their firearms purchases from a licensed dealer in the state where they live—and thus to forego the convenience of ordering guns by mail. They would be required to identify themselves when purchasing a gun in such a way as to enable the police to determine that they are law-abiding adults. The hardship involved in this would be as severe as that involved in obtaining a license to keep a dog or in obtaining a license to hunt or fish.

It is hard to believe that American sportsmen would put their convenience ahead of the public safety in this matter. Perhaps those who presume to speak for them do not genuinely represent the views of their constituents. It is time for them to realize, in any case, that the American public is not going to submit much longer to senseless danger for the mere sake of avoiding a minor inconvenience to an intransigent minority. Self-interest as well as sportsmanship suggests a reasonable accommodation to the general welfare.

Textiles and Future Cotton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 27, 1967

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the dynamic and able president of Clemson University, Dr. Robert C. Edwards, recently delivered a very timely and outstanding address which will be of great interest.

Dr. Edwards' address follows:

ADDRESS OF DR. R. C. EDWARDS AT THE ASCS MEETING TO DISCUSS THE COTTON SITUATION AND THE 1968 PROGRAM IN COLUMBIA, AUGUST 23, 1967

For generations the textile industry has depended upon the cotton fiber as a primary raw material. Notwithstanding the fact that we have, in recent years, noted a tremendous increase in the consumption of competitive synthetic fibers, we believe an adequate supply of cotton fiber of acceptable quality will continue to be an essential requirement of the textile industry, and our national security.

Currently available are a number of synthetic fibers which were developed specifically to compete with cotton, either as a direct replacement fiber or to complement the good qualities of cotton in blended yarns and fabrics. In his efforts to develop a new synthetic fiber the researcher accepts as a basic premise the fact that his product must first "look like" and perform "as well as" cotton.

In recent years the future of cotton production in the United States has been threatened by many serious economic and other factors.

At the conclusion of World War II many countries in Europe and in the Far East were prostrate. With the support and encouragement of the United States Government many of these countries turned to the production of textiles as a quick means of regaining economic strength. Textile mills designed for the ultimate in efficiency were constructed. The plants were equipped with the most modern American machinery and equipment available. Highly skilled technicians, employing the latest technology, were soon producing textile products of great diversity and the highest quality. As one would expect, within a few years these products were being sold in the American markets in great volume. Our own textile industry soon began to suffer significant losses in income and textile wage earners, their jobs, from this flood of imports. The situation at this very moment is very serious indeed.

For a number of years prior to April 1964, the textile industry suffered great economic hardship because of the two-price system. Under this system American textile manufacturers had to pay for cotton on a pricing basis which was geared to the USDA price-support program, while their foreign competition was able to purchase the same cotton at the considerably lower world market price. This price differential ranged from 6¢ to, ultimately, as much as 8.5¢ per pound in favor of the foreign competition.

In addition to this tremendous saving in raw material cost, wage rates paid by foreign competition averaged from 75% to 66⅔% less than comparable labor costs in American mills. Since the competing foreign textile mills were equipped with the finest textile machinery available and employed the latest technology in the manufacture of yarns, fabrics and other consumer products, it is obvious that the American textile industry would face extremely serious problems.

In the decade prior to 1964 and the enactment by the Congress of new legislation which, among other things, established a one-price cotton system, a tremendous inventory of cotton was accumulated by the Commodity Credit Corporation. Based on experience gained in 1964 and 1965 under this legislation, the Congress passed additional cotton legislation which has served to greatly alleviate the overall problem. It is most appropriate that this meeting should be held since the Secreatry of Agriculture not only has the authority, but the responsibility for making important policy decisions relating to possible changes in the cotton program for 1968.

In the decade prior to the passage of the 1964 cotton legislation the USDA cotton program, including price supports, served to convince many producers and ginners that it was more profitable to produce cotton for the Government loan than for sale through normal trade channels.

In South Carolina in the years 1963 and 1964 approximately 60% of all the cotton produced finally found its way into the CCC inventory. At the beginning of 1965 it was clearly evident to South Carolina's cotton producers that there was no future in the continued production of cotton unless we produced a fiber possessing the quality characteristics required by the mills. Our farmers realized that such cotton was being produced in the Far West, particularly in California, and that it was selling at a premium. We resolved to do something about the situation as quickly as possible. To meet this challenge a State-wide cotton quality improvement program was launched.

In 1965, as a result of this State-wide cotton quality improvement, we reduced the proportion of our crop entering the loan program by almost 50%. As a matter of fact, in 1965 31.8 percent of our crop entered the CCC inventory.

In 1966 the cotton quality improvement program was further refined with the introduction of ginning standards. The latest available figures indicate that of the 289,000 bales produced in 1966, only 3.8 percent remained in CCC inventories as of August 1, 1967.

The USDA cotton program was drastically changed by the 1965 legislation. A new price support program, with additional direct payment as an incentive to reduce acreage planted, was designed to reduce the CCC inventory. Under the new legislation the producer could no longer afford to produce cotton unless his product could be sold through normal trade channels.

For the year 1964, among the 14 cotton producing States, South Carolina ranked 9th in average price received for cotton sold. In 1965 and again in 1966 South Carolina ranked third with only New Mexico and California receiving higher average prices.

The data relating to CCC inventories and average prices are based on information published by the USDA.

As of August 1, 1967 the CCC inventory has been reduced by more than 4 million bales. The 1967 cotton crop is currently estimated to be the smallest since 1921.

An examination of the fiber characteristics of the cotton remaining in the Commodity Credit Corporation inventory discloses the fact that a very high percentage of the inventory is of staple characteristics that are highly undesirable by the textile industry. As a consequence, it is quite likely that the textile industry will be unable to cover its total requirement of long staple cotton for next year after utilizing all of the desirable cotton produced in 1967 and purchasing from the CCC inventories such quantities as may be available that can be used. If a sufficient quantity of desirable cotton fiber is not available during the next 12 months, the textile industry will be obliged to cover the deficit by increasing the consumption of synthetic fibers or importing cotton.

In considering possible changes for the 1968 program the following suggestions are respectfully submitted for consideration by the Secretary of Agriculture:

A. The program should permit and encourage substantially increased production of fiber possessing the characteristics required by the textile industry. Price supports and other monetary incentives designed to assist the producer should be so arranged as to clearly distinguish between the production of longer staple fiber possessing the strength, length and length uniformity and fiber fineness characteristics required by the mills, and the shorter and undesirable fibers currently being produced in some parts of the belt.

B. The 1968 program should provide for the maximum flexibility in arranging for the possible shift of cotton acreage allotments within the State. This flexibility will help to assure that the cotton acreage planted within a State is located in those areas where the best quality fiber can be produced at the lowest possible cost.

We have made no attempt in this statement to present a comprehensive list of recommendations for consideration by the Secretary in his review of the 1968 program. We are simply trying to emphasize the fact that if we are to continue to produce cotton in South Carolina and in the Southeast, we must produce fiber possessing the quality characteristics that are demanded by the textile industry.

Experience in South Carolina in 1965 and 1966 proves conclusively that the job can be done.

We are convinced also that such an approach will assure the greatest profit to all segments of the cotton industry.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: the Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided,* That the makeup of the RECORD shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the Official Reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the Official Reporters of the respective Houses.

The Official Reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the Official Reporters in the next issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, nor to RECORDS printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Appendix

SABMIS: Sea-Based Protector of United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 28, 1967

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

SABMIS: SEA-BASED PROTECTOR OF UNITED STATES

SABMIS may sound like a hero of Greek mythology, but it's a new naval term that stands for a "sea-based anti-ballistic missile intercept system." It marks the start of a new naval strategic defense role. Its concept is to force potential enemies to spread their missile pattern and to provide for the preservation of the nation in a nuclear age through a defense in depth.

Upon returning to Washington after my trip to Viet Nam, I learned that our policymakers were giving the SABMIS concept priority consideration. I believe an up-to-date look at SABMIS would, therefore, be of interest.

The SABMIS plan is to place anti-ballistic missiles aboard surface ships and to deploy them off the Soviet and Chinese coasts, relatively close to Communist missile-launching positions.

By intercepting enemy missiles shortly after they are fired, the defense problem would be simplified and the blunting of a nuclear attack against the United States made manageable. There is another compelling reason to intercept quickly. The Soviets are known to be able to produce a multiple warheaded missile which breaks open at some point near the end of its trajectory and sends its several warheads against individual targets. By early interception, a single SABMIS can destroy all of the warheads at once.

The SABMIS ships, as contributors to continental defense, would be built to complement the proposed fixed NIKE-X land sites inside the continental U.S. Though final plans for the construction of these ships are not yet firm, naval strategists are counting on this mobile system to do for defense what Polaris has done for the offense.

Several months ago, the Navy took a historic step in adjusting its organization to the strategic realities of the 20th Century. At the instigation of the then Secretary of the Navy, Paul H. Nitze, the directorate of Strategic Offensive and Defensive Systems was set up in the Office of the Chief of Naval Operations under Rear Admiral George H. Miller, a recognized maritime strategist. SABMIS is the first tangible result of the reorganization. The rapidity with which this concept is taking hold is a tribute to the organizational wisdom and strategic discernment of Mr. Nitze, now Deputy Secretary of Defense.

Underlying all military strategies is the primary provision for the protection and preservation of a nation. This was the starting point for the naval strategists who conceived SABMIS. In moving seaward to solve this perplexing problem, the land deficiency of the United States as compared to the Soviet Union was a major consideration. Since the Soviets possess 2½ times more land mass than the U.S., we are, megaton for megaton, at a damage-inflicting disadvantage by a factor of 2.5.

By placing anti-missile defense forces at sea, nuclear fire is drawn away from the industrial and population concentrations of our cities. By the same action, the survivability of the defense systems is enhanced. Military systems, rather than civilian populations, are the primary targets enemy planners must destroy to insure their own country's survival. Consequently, much of their strike effort would have to be directed to SABMIS ships and Polaris submarines in launching a pre-planned nuclear attack against the United States. The result would be a lesser number of nuclear warheads directed at the United States. The fallout, as well as the blasts, would be at sea, away from our cities.

SABMIS is not being marketed as a defense panacea, but the problem of intercepting an ICBM early in its trajectory is much easier for a sea-based system to solve than for the land-based NIKE-X.

Few new strategic systems have gained such early interest and excitement. Industrial firms see much promise in it. They have moved quickly to offer the Navy their program and production know-how. The State Department is interested in SABMIS. Officials there welcome its anti-nuclear proliferation feature. Our allies could come under the protective umbrella of the mobile SABMIS ships and their need for nuclear defense armament would be eliminated.

With the deployment of SABMIS, opportunities for the naval contribution to the vitality of our national strategy would be tremendously enhanced. Therefore, as a matter of policy, I am placing SABMIS in a top priority in the Navy League's maritime education program relating to the national strength at sea. With all the purpose and prestige of the League backing up the Navy-industry team, I am confident that SABMIS will be on schedule and, on that day, we will have taken a long step towards the preservation of this maritime nation.

CHARLES F. DUCHEIN,
National President, Navy League of the United States.

Innovation in Labor Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 28, 1967

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, each month, American Builder magazine nominates "Innovators of the Month." In the August issue of the magazine, one of the persons nominated was Anthony J. Furlan, president of the Pittsburgh Building Trades Council and a member of the board of directors of ACTION-Housing in Pittsburgh. Mr. Furlan has come up with a simple and workable plan to provide jobs for Negroes in construction crews despite the fact that some craft unions reject Negroes.

I ask unanimous consent that a short article describing Mr. Furlan's plan, published in American Builder for August 1967, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANTHONY FURLAN, PITTSBURGH, PA.—UNION LEADER

Few people noticed Anthony Furlan, president of the Pittsburgh Building Trades Council, when he took his place at the head table of a dinner held to announce ACTION-Housing's imaginative plan for a large rehabilitation program.

But when the dinner was over, the main topic of conversation was Anthony Furlan. The union leader had made a short speech, and in the words of Sen. Charles Percy, "You've never said so much in so few words." Furlan had said that the unions would cross jurisdictional lines, using composite crews, and employ a substantial number of Negro workers.

Furlan explained later that the Pittsburgh locals "realize rehabilitation is a different type of construction and requires a different approach."

"The integration problem," says Furlan, "is a severe one. I had to come up with a plan to promote employment among minorities, and I came up with the idea of a composite crew. It doesn't matter if some crafts don't take Negroes. The device of composite crews will make it possible to put minority members to work by drawing from those crafts which do take Negroes."

"This," says Furlan, "is how I propose to remove the color barrier and assure an orderly construction pace."

More Alarm Voiced Regarding Antigun Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 28, 1967

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, there has been much public concern over proposed antigun legislation facing the Congress.

Many pro-American groups and organizations have spoken with alarm at this pending piece of legislation. Two thought-provoking editorials related to this subject were recently called to my attention.

Mr. Speaker, I insert two editorials from Gun Week, a weekly journal, published at Sidney, Ohio. The first editorial is taken from the February 24, 1967, issue and the second from the issue of September 8, 1967.

BOOBY TRAP IN CRIME BILL?

One of the best ways—sometimes the only way—to induce states to pass legislation, social reforms or other changes desired by the federal government is by the offer of federal assistance funds.

Various readers have expressed the worry that the President's anticrime plan, in which he proposes to grant huge sums of money to assist states and communities in crime prevention programs, could result in demands for stringent gun control laws as a prerequisite to receiving the grants. This speculation is perhaps unjustified, but even if the administration has no such motive, the question does deserve consideration.

Throughout the President's special message on crime to the Congress we find references to the need for comprehensive plans on the state and local level, including legislative overhaul, better training and equipping of police, streamlining of court procedures, revamping of penal systems and methods of rehabilitating criminals—in short, corrective innovations of our entire system of laws and law enforcement.

The President said: "I recommend Federal grants . . . to support approved programs in action."

The question immediately arises, "What would it take for an approved program?"

Perhaps the President answered that question when he later said: "Any effective crime control program requires the enactment of firearms legislation."

What kind of firearms legislation? A few sentences later, after outlining the firearms bill he has since sent to Congress he said: "This legislation . . . will gain added strength as states pass firearms legislation and licensing laws similar to the Sullivan Law in New York."

Perhaps we are seeing a pattern where none exists, but it would seem that for a state or city to be eligible for part of the $300 million the President proposes to spend next year for law enforcement assistance, the administrative bureau could or would require Sullivan-type firearms licensing laws.

Let's backtrack for a moment and look at how the President feels about narcotics control which, he said, "requires a careful synthesis of state and federal regulation."

He pointed to the "large disparities in state laws dealing with dangerous drugs . . ." He said "If our greatest strength is to be brought to bear on drug control, the states should act as soon as possible on the type of drug abuse control act now being circulated in model form by the Food and Drug Administration. I urge the states to enact this law as soon as possible."

Then his next sentence was: "Any effective crime control program requires the enactment of firearms legislation."

Are we to see narcotics control and rehabilitation funds withheld from states which do not pass the FDA model law? Are we to see police assistance and other crime prevention funds withheld from states which do not pass a Sullivan-type firearms licensing law?

We support the President's efforts to provide crime control assistance to states and cities. But we cannot support specific legislation to that effect unless the proposed bill clearly spells out that no federal agency can require the passage of any state or local gun control law as a prerequisite for granting crime control program funds.

Otherwise the gun prohibition forces could conceivably accomplish through bureaucratic regulation—and economic need—what they have not been able to accomplish through the legislative process—the spread of universal firearms licensing laws.

AT LONG LAST . . . ENFORÇEMENT!

Many must have been amazed a few days ago when H. Rap Brown, militant leader of the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee, was arrested by Treasury Department agents and charged with violation of the 1938 Federal Firearms Act, a law most newspaper readers, and apparently some congressmen, don't know exsits.

The little-known (outside the gun world) provision under which he was charged prohibits a convicted felon or person under indictment from transporting, having transported, or receiving a firearm—any firearm—or ammunition across state lines.

The federal agents charged Brown with violating the 1938 federal law by carrying a carbine and ammunition from Louisiana to New York while under a Maryland indictment on a charge of inciting to riot. He was on his way to a rally in racially tense Cincinnati, Ohio, scene of rioting earlier this year, where local law enforcement officials, National Guard officers and FBI agents had already mapped plans for "any eventuality" that might have accompanied his visit.

Bond was initially set at an unusually high $25,000, for the alleged offense was termed "serious" by the U.S. Attorney's office. The high bond effectively prevented Brown's Ohio visit and conceivably could have helped prevent another outburst of violence.

Government officials have been making much noise about "the lack" of federal gun controls, citing the frequency with which convicted felons have slipped into states with "lax" gun laws to buy firearms, thus circumventing tough local and state laws.

By charging Brown with violating the 1938 act, to the accompaniment of massive publicity, the Treasury Department has let the cat out of the bag. In the government's justifiable haste to "get" Brown it has not only informed the public that there ARE federal gun control laws, but that these laws CAN be enforced!

During the House hearings last spring, Internal Revenue Commissioner Sheldon Cohen, while supporting the Administration's gun bill, testified that his department knew of several hundred cases of out-of-state gun purchases by known convicted felons. The commissioner, whose agency is responsible for enforcing federal firearms laws, cited similar cases during the 1965 hearings and said his agency was "contemplating" pressing charges against the criminals. As we have asked before, how long would the Internal Revenue Service "contemplate" pressing charges against several hundred known violators of the income tax laws?

We hold no plea for Brown, but if the federal government can "get" him, why cannot it "get" convicted criminals who officials know have violated the same 1938 law? The public is justifiably outraged by Brown's sweeps across the nation, his inflammatory speeches, and the shooting, looting and burning that often follows in his wake. The public demanded that he be stopped—and he was stopped, with a federal law that government officials have claimed is worthless.

The public also has been outraged by the use of guns in crime and the evidence that those same officials have presented that criminals have made state laws ineffective by buying guns out of state. Why haven't government officials shown the same eagerness to "get" criminals that they showed in "getting" Brown?

How can they plead for a new gun law when they have shown an astonishing lack of interest in enforcing the old 1938 law? Is it conceivable that the Federal Firearms Act can be enforced in an attempt to stop rioting, yet cannot be enforced in an attempt to stop other forms of lawlessness?

The interstate traffic in guns between hoodlums has beena rallying cry for the supporters of the Administration's prohibitive gun control bill, but Rap Brown's case, which involved four states, proves that the 1938 federal law could be enforced to stop the flagrant violation of state laws.

When will Treasury Department agents begin enforcing this 29-year-old law in the case of mere criminals?

Writers From Hartford Courant Discover Why Hawaiians Do Not Leave Hawaii

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 28, 1967

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, it has been said that Hawaii was "discovered" three times—originally by a Polynesian seafarer plying the broad reaches of the Pacific Ocean in an outrigger canoe more than 1,000 years ago. Some say the Spanish first arrived in 1555, and history reports that the British navigator, Capt. James Cook, first sighted Hawaii in 1778.

Modern-day visitors and voyagers from many lands, however, are still discovering the breathtaking scenery of our beautiful islands. Another island secret recently discovered by two writers visiting the Aloha State explains why Hawaiians do not leave Hawaii.

The views of Shirley and Bob Sloane, of the Hartford Courant, also help to explain the upsurge in travel to Hawaii this year.

I take pleasure in inserting in the RECORD their engaging and perceptive article entitled "The Waikiki Tourists See," which appeared in the September 19, 1967, issue of the Honolulu Star-Bulletin:

THE WAIKIKI TOURISTS SEE

Hawaii may be the only place in the Western world where hotel men don't complain about the help situation.

In Europe the hand drain has become as serious as the brain drain. And if the cooks and waiters are migrating to the United States, it seems they work in tourist-type trades just long enough to learn English and then go on to bigger and better things.

Hawaii's secret is that Hawaiians simply don't leave Hawaii. Did you ever meet a Hawaiian living on the mainland? They may leave the sugar fields; who wouldn't? But it's not just because catering to tourists is easier work. It's also because they have that natural outgoing warmth travelers read about in the tourist folders of every country but rarely find. Hawaiians love people, they love life, and above all they love Hawaii.

They enjoy it so much that tourists often feel they're missing most of the fun. Oh, visitors may don muumuus and put flowers in their hair and take the daily free hula lesson on the hotel patio. But it isn't the same, and they often go back to the mainland with a defeated look about them, wondering why they don't feel like smiling, singing and dancing all the time the way of Hawaiians do.

The reasons for this attitude about Hawaii are best summed up as "What's Not to Like?"

The sun shines most of the time, and if you're a Hawaiian of Polynesian or Oriental extraction, as most are, you have enough pigment in your skin not to worry about sunburn like the malihinis do.

The surf is almost always up somewhere, and if you're Hawaiian you know how to surf. The fish are jumping, from the mahimahi off Oahu to the monster marlin on the Kona coast. And if all else fails to keep up your spirits, you turn on the radio and hula, because there's always twangy Hawaiian music playing, and if you're Hawaiian you know how to hula. You'd better—your parents probably started giving you lessons at the age of four, even if they had to go without television to pay for them.

You never, ever, dress up. The shapeless, colorful muumuu covers everything and touches nothing, so ladies happily eat and get fat. We've been asked whether it's true people wear hats and gloves in New York and Chicago. There is only one restaurant in all the islands that requires men to wear coats and ties, the Monarch Room of the venerable Royal Hawaiian Hotel. But the performers are barefooted and aloha-shirted. No wonder they think mainlanders are nuts.

The well known racial mixture of Hawaii—Polynesian, Chinese, Japanese, Korean and Filipino, with dashes of Portuguese, Spanish and Anglo-Saxon—makes for one of the most exotically beautiful people in the world. It also turns racial prejudice into a futile exercise for even the most dedicated bigot. Who exactly is superior to whom, and what percentage of him?

The relaxed atmosphere makes it feasible for Hawaiians to good-naturedly poke fun at each other's racial characteristics. Local entertainment is often studded with a kind of Polynesian calypso that takes off on the ways and manners of Japanese grocers or Chinese launderers to the utter delight of the locals and utter confusion of mainlanders, to whom it would be unthinkably bad taste on the mainland.

Enough Americana has been injected into Hawaii so that it is not, as might be expected, lazy-poor. Most Hawaiians happily hold down two jobs, maybe a policeman by day and an ukulele player by night. And Honolulu has been booming so that it is almost unrecognizable even if you saw it only a year ago.

Only 20 years ago there was just a handful of hotels spread across Waikiki Beach. Now new ones, as well as giant high rise condominiums, have sprung up like concrete mushrooms all over the area.

The huge Ilikai apartment-hotel complex dwarfs everything around it. The facade of the new Bank of Hawaii building is honeycombed with interlacing concrete arches. Ten minutes drive from Waikiki, the plush new Kahala Hilton surprised everyone but canny Conrad Hilton by being as successful as any Waikiki hotel ever was. And all over the volcanic mountains ringing the city, luxury housing developments climb even higher.

Because Hawaii has no clearly definable tourist seasons the way most resorts do, it is surprisingly reasonable, and prices are the same all year. Rooms in even luxury hotels cost hardly more than half what is charged in comparable Florida or Caribbean resorts, and comfortable modest apartment hotels off the beach, often with cooking facilities, offer accommodation for as little as $8 and $10 a room.

Food tastes have been standardized to either Oriental or simple American-modern, with the result that even a full course steak dinner in a top restaurant should cost no more than about $7. And there are many cheaper.

Hawaiians don't want to milk the tourists and get rich. They get their milk from coconuts and were born rich. What's not to like?

President Johnson's Leadership in Consumer Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 27, 1967

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, last week, during ceremonies at the White House, President Johnson reaffirmed his administration's commitment to meet the needs of the American consumer. In remarks made in the Rose Garden to a group of presidents or other top officials of many of our national voluntary civic, community, church, labor, and public service organizations, the President reiterated his position that the slogan "let the buyer beware" has no place in our society.

It was my privilege to be present in the Rose Garden when President Johnson met with consumer leaders to outline his continued support for the legislation he has recommended to the Congress for the protection of the American public from unsafe or deceptive products and from predatory selling or credit practices which keep the poor in a perpetual bondage of debt and despair, and which cheat even the sophisticated purchaser.

The group of national leaders gathered in the Rose Garden to hear the President had been summoned to the White House by Betty Furness, special assistant to the President for consumer affairs. I was glad to hear the President stress the importance of Federal, State and local efforts, including the full participation of voluntary organizations, to "improve the quality of consumer education in this country."

I was particularly pleased that the President used this occasion to express once again his strong support, and that of his administration, for effective truth-in-lending legislation "to assure that a consumer, shopping for credit, knows exactly what he is paying in interest costs."

He stated:

> These credit costs should be expressed at an annual percentage rate.

This, of course, is the toughest nut to crack in the truth-in-lending legislation as it affects open-end credit usually referred to as revolving credit.

JOHNSON ADMINISTRATION'S UNPRECEDENTED RECORD ON CONSUMER LEGISLATION

As Vice President, Lyndon Johnson worked diligently to help enact consumer legislation recommended by President John F. Kennedy in his consumer message of March 1962, which was the first message of its type ever sent to Congress. After he became Chief Executive, President Johnson recommended additional far-reaching consumer legislation to Congress and succeeded, during the 89th Congress, in achieving enactment of an unprecedented body of consumer law. The legislation is now helping to set new standards of consumer protection. As the President stated last Friday:

> We are creating a consumer ethic that is fair both to the seller as to the buyer. We are going to be unrelenting in our efforts. We are going to stay on the job. We are going to pursue it every day. We are going to win.

In his remarks, the President not only listed the achievements of the past several years in consumer legislation but called for renewed effort to enact those consumer bills still awaiting passage. Under unanimous consent, I am priviliged to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD President Johnson's remarks of September 22 before the heads of national voluntary organizations participating in the consumer conference called by the President's Special Assistant for Consumer Affairs, as follows:

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT BEFORE THE CONSUMER GROUPS, THE ROSE GARDEN, SEPTEMBER 22, 1967

Miss Furness, Congresswoman Sullivan, ladies and gentlemen, I am sorry I am late. I am very happy that Mrs. Sullivan, who is a champion of our cause, could be here with you this morning.

The people that all of you represent—the American consumers—are very much in our mind and we are concerned with many good things about them, and some problems they also have.

We are happy that we believe in this country our American consumers enjoy the highest standard of living of any people in the world.

We are very happy that that standard has constantly risen during the last four years.

There are more than 7 million more people working today, contributing to that economy instead of draining from it.

In the last three months, we have put more than 1.5 million people on new jobs.

Real income has risen about 17 percent for the average American.

The net financial wealth of the American families has risen $150 billion.

These statistics are important only because of the thing I want to say now.

Prosperity and progress are good, but they are all good. They bring problems with them. As new materials are created, as new inventions come on the market, as new methods of financing are devised, as new sales pitches are made, we must be constantly on the lookout for the dangers that accompany them.

That is Betty's job and that is your job. That is Mrs. Sullivan's job. That is a matter of great moment and concern to me.

We feel the consumer should have the satisfaction and the security of knowing that he is not being taken unfair advantage of. The slogan "let the buyer beware" has no place in our society.

Our consumers, we think, here at the White House, have the right to expect safety in the products that are sold to them.

They have the right to choose between a variety of products and to exercise a choice.

They have a right to be fully informed about the products they buy—and this covers everything from telling them the honest weight of a food product to spelling out precisely how much money they will be paying at an annual percentage rate on a loan.

We feel they have the right to have their views of matters of national importance represented in the highest councils of their country and their government.

We have tried, since the days I was Vice President, in this Administration and the preceding one. We have made a great and constant effort to try to assure these rights. We have tried to secure for the consumer his rightful place in our economy.

It has not been easy—special interests have usually fought us every step of the way—but I believe we have come a very long way in this consumer field, relatively speaking.

The 89th Congress, which some rightly called the consumers' Congress, saw its responsibilities to the consumers of America—meaning all Americans—and they did the following things about them:

The Truth in Packaging Act—which assured the buyer will know what he is purchasing, how much it weighs, and who made it.

The Traffic and Highway Safety Acts—which have begun our all-out attack on the mounting toll of death and destruction on our highways.

The Child Protection Act—which will safeguard our children from hazardous toys.

And bills providing for increased insurance protection for people who place their savings on deposit.

That is past. We don't want to live in the past. We don't want to spend our time talking about the past, except to provide an example that we can learn from and emulate.

Because of that progress, we have felt encouraged. If we could do this in the 89th Congress, what should we try in the 90th?

We have 12 actions that we have urged the Congress to take in behalf of the consumer.

They include the Truth in Lending Bill, which Mrs. Sullivan has done such yeoman service upon. I want to publicly acknowledge and congratulate her.

That is legislation to assure that a consumer, shopping for credit, knows exactly what he is paying in interest costs.

We have many others. I will just name a few.

One includes the amendments to the Flammable Fabrics Act. That is legislation to prevent accidents, to make clothing and household items much safer for all of us.

Betty Furness has worked on that legislation, was before the Congress for all of us on it.

I can say that our legislative package covers everything from making meat more wholesome to the safe movement of natural gas by pipeline.

We are trying to do everything we can to see that the consumer is protected. We will not achieve that this year. We didn't in the 89th Congress; we won't in the 90th Congress. We will be working on it when they have the 100th Congress. But we are breaking down old barriers.

We are setting new standards. We are creating a consumer ethic that is fair both to the seller as well as to the buyer. We are going to be unrelenting in our efforts. We are going to stay on the job. We are going to pursue it every day. We are going to win.

Betty is our leader in this field. I look to her and her office as my eyes and my ears in the consuming area. What she knows I can have a part of. What reaches her usually reaches me.

I want to ask each of you to talk to her about the information that you think you would like for me to know. I am sure she will relay it to me.

She had barely settled down in this job before she started planning this get-together here today.

I want to express the hope that you will work closely with her and with the Consumer Advisory Council. I believe this lady is bright, dedicated and determined. I believe she is going to make it possible for the consumer's voice to be heard loudly, clearly and effectively, if you give her support and if I give her support.

We have the President's Committee on Consumer Interest. That is a Cabinet level committee. It is sorely concerned with the consumers.

I would like you, with Betty, to try to work out ways for us to improve the quality of consumer education in this country. I know this is something that you have been devoting a lot of time to, but we must move on from just getting the catalog, looking at it, and seeing the rating. There are a lot of other jobs to be done.

If we are going to continue to make progress, we are going to have to have more than just one person working at it.

You, through your groups and the people you speak for, can actively support us and be the difference between success and failure.

What grievances you have we want to know. Your consumers can tell you, and you can tell Betty. She will tell me and I will try to tell your Congressman.

That is a part of this job.

Your organizations cover almost every conceivable area of American life. You are in touch with millions of people. That is your job, to work with those specific groups that add up to millions in the long run.

Our job is to adequately protect and properly serve all of those millions.

We don't always live up to their expectations. We don't always discharge our responsibilities as they think we should. But we are aware of them. We want so much to be equal to them.

I do feel that the country has moved forward in the last few years in consumer education and in consumer legislation. It hasn't gone as far as it needs to go. How far it will go is going to be determined somewhat by the way I do my job and Betty does her job. And it will be determined a lot by how well you do your job, taking the grievances, formulating them into reasonable, marketable suggestions, making them appealing, and bringing them in.

Let's try to effect and devise solutions to them.

This is not something we are going to settle this afternoon. It is something we are going to have to work at 30 days a month for 365 days a year.

There will be great rewards and great satisfaction that wil come to us if we can take these protective measures and move forward in an enlightened way to not only serve the buyer well in this country, but to be just, reasonable and helpful to the seller.

We just might as well face up to it. The good old days, where a person could make the best mouse trap, have his own way about what it did and the dangers associated with it, all of the prices he charged, the way it was sold, the interest that was requested—those days are gone and forgotten.

The bridge of the railroad now crosses the spot. We have turned the horses and the carriages out. We are going to try to make this Congress and the next Congress an improvement on the 89th, which I think history will show was more aware of and more concerned with the 200 million consumers of this nation than any Congress in all of our history.

If we can do that, I think the time you spend here this afternoon will be well worthwhile. It will be a great day for every American consumer.

Thank you very much.

Washington: An Election Fable

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD J. IRWIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 27, 1967

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, in Wednesday's New York Times there was an article entitled "Washington: An Election Fable," by James Reston. Like the old pro that he is, he has thrown a tantalizing pitch and I cannot tell whether it is a ball or a strike. I do not know whether his intent is to warn the Republicans that the only way they can win next year is by running a peace candidate or whether he has written a prescription for an honorable peace in Vietnam in 1968. In any event, it is a magnificent pitch and I believe my colleagues should find it interesting and instructive.

The article follows:

WASHINGTON: AN ELECTION FABLE

(Bq James Reston)

WASHINGTON, September 26.—The decisive events in the Presidential election of 1968 took place away back at the end of September of 1967. At that time the criticism of President Johnson on the Vietnam war took a vicious turn leading to unforeseen consequences.

Anti-Johnson Democrats began organizing a "Dump Johnson Movement." Fifty-two members of the House of Representatives formally asked the Congress to reconsider the the Administration's war policy. The newspapers that had supported him in 1964 turned solidly against him, and a wealthy Democrat in California, in a blazing indiscretion, published a full-page ad in The New York Times calling on him to get out.

The Republicans thus had their opportunity, but they didn't know what to do with it. The Governor of Michigan, George Romney, made the first bid for the Republican nomination, but he was an honest man who said silly things and soon began to slip. The former Governor of Pennsylvania, William Scranton, withdrew from the race for personal reasons, and the Governor of New York, Nelson Rockefeller, waited to be drafted.

On the Democratic side there was division amounting almost to rebellion. Slates of anti-Johnson delegates were put forward for the nominating convention. Prominent Democratic leaders supported the President in public but cut him up in private. Almost a third of the Democratic candidates for Congress ran for re-election while opposing their own President's policy on Vietnam.

THE BENEFICIARY

The political beneficiary of this confused situation in both parties was the former Vice President of the United States, Richard M. Nixon, a hawk who forgot the doveish traditions of his party. The more Romney and Johnson dropped in the popularity polls, the more Nixon came to the fore. He knew more Republican county and state chairmen than all the other Republican candidates together. As Romney faltered, he moved to the left to gain strength among the progressives in the party, and he won the first two Presidential preference primaries in New Hampshire and Nebraska.

At this point, a stop-Nixon drive developed. The progressive Republican Governors tried to persuade Rockefeller to enter the Oregon and California primaries, but he refused. Governor Reagan of California, popular with the conservatives, gained some support at the end, but the liberals, remembering Goldwater and 1964, rejected him; and by the time the convention opened in Miami Beach Nixon was so far ahead that the last-minute shouts for Rockefeller were lost.

It was a savage campaign centering on Vietnam. "I shall go to Saigon," Mr. Nixon announced, appealing to the peace vote. But meanwhile he was advocating more bombing and promising victory. Then an odd thing happened.

Hanoi, Moscow and Peking reappraised the situation. They had fought on in the belief that the election would bring them victory on their own terms. On one thing they were finally able to agree: Nixon was even worse than Johnson. He meant more war and a more extensive and damaging and riskier war, so they reached a decision.

In the last week of September of 1968, just as the campaign was really getting under way, they agreed to talk. On Oct. 7 the bombing stopped and on Oct. 15 a peace conference started at Geneva. President Johnson, abandoning the campaign, headed the U.S. delegation, stopping in Paris en route for a heart-to-heart talk with de Gaulle. Former President Eisenhower, in a touching ceremony on television at the White House, accepted the co-chairmanship of the delegation on behalf of the Republicans, and Senators J. William Fulbright of Arkansas, Robert Kennedy of New York and Everett Dirksen of Illinois went along.

AND LOSER

Nothing happened, really. They didn't make peace but they talked about it for months. All the leaders of the world praised

President Johnson and Ho Chi Minh for their restraint and appealed to everybody to give the conference a chance. Mr. Nixon, in Sioux City, Iowa, denounced the whole thing as a fraud, but the sentiment of the country was for peace, and in the end, his campaign speeches were overwhelmed by the news out of Geneva.

George Wallace carried only Alabama and Mississippi. Nixon did well in the Middle West and the Rocky Mountain states, but lost all the big states between the Mississippi and Massachusetts. This was not the way the Republicans planned it back in 1967. Mr. Nixon brought about the negotiations but lost the election, and President Johnson didn't even thank him for his help.

Moral: Never make up your mind too soon about an American election, and never underestimate the power of events.

Safety First in the Air

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. RONAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 28, 1967

Mr. RONAN. Mr. Speaker, the Chicago Daily News has commended President Johnson for his account on air safety and for his suggestion that the additional cost of this program be borne by air travel users—passengers and the airlines.

In view of the timeliness of the President's announcement, the News editorial should be of interest to all of my colleagues and, therefore, I insert it in the RECORD at this point:

[From the Chicago Daily News, Sept. 22, 1967]

SAFETY FIRST IN THE AIR

Even the occasional traveler will have no trouble understanding President Johnson's call for expansion of the nation's air traffic control system. Delays in takeoff and landing, increasing congestion in and around the terminals are the surface symptoms of growing danger in the air.

The airlines' safety record is remarkably good, no doubt about that. But if it is to be kept that way in the face of sharp expansion in the number of passengers and the number of planes in the air, the control system must expand, too. A couple of recent midair collisions and mounting reports of near misses testify that more traffic cops for the airways are a must.

For immediate relief, Mr. Johnson is asking Congress to provide $7,000,000 more for air traffic personnel this year. For the longer range, he is directing the Federal Aviation Administration to draw up plans for new facilities, equipment and personnel that may carry a price tag of $5 billion or more.

The President rightly suggests that this money come, not from the general taxpayer, but from the users of the service—from the airlines and their passengers. In the long run, this means that the economies promised by the new superjets will be offset by higher landing fees, taxes on jet fuel, and the like. The new planes will enable the airlines to absorb some higher costs, but expected cuts in air fares probably will not materialize, and higher fares may be required.

This is not likely to deter travelers from taking to the air in ever-increasing numbers. The saving in time and the relative comfort of air travel have long since made it the prime mode of long-distance transportation, and new airports, feeder lines and short-hop jets are bringing the air age to smaller cities everywhere.

But the same factors that have operated to increase air travel beyond all expectations have brought it to a point where radically new safety measures will have to come into play in the near future. The FAA now has its planning go-ahead. And the passengers should have no complaint. That extra dollar or so they may pay for safety couldn't be better spent.

Spending, Inflation, and Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS S. KLEPPE

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 28, 1967

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter to be distributed October 3, 1967, to the people of North Dakota's Second Congressional District:

SPENDING, INFLATION, AND TAXES

At the turn of the century, when people spoke of Federal spending they talked in terms of millions of dollars. World Wars I and II changed the arithmetic to billions. Now the word "trillion" is creeping into fiscal discussion.

Since 1947, the Federal government has made total cash expenditures of $1,700,000,000,000—nearly one and three-quarters trillion dollars. Twenty years ago Federal cash outlays totaled $36 billion. Now the annual rate is up to $160 billion, representing an increase of 344 per cent. Over that same 20-year period, U.S. population rose from 144 million to 198 million, an increase of 37 per cent.

In other words, over the last two decades, Federal spending has skyrocketed at a rate 10 times greater than the country's population growth. If our national government continues to increase its expenditures at this rate, a trillion dollar budget will become a reality within the lifetime of most Americans. Such a figure would be one-fourth larger than the Nation's gross national product in 1967—one-fourth more than the total value of all the goods, wealth and services generated by all of the people this year.

Since 1948, gross national product has grown from $243.5 billion to $762 billion. But more than one-third of this increase is *air*, rather than *substance. It represents inflation.* In terms of constant dollars, gross national product has about doubled, not trebled in 20 years. Ballooning government spending has generated inflationary pressures which keep gnawing away at the purchasing power of the dollar.

Administration spokesmen blame the war in Vietnam and the Korean War which preceded it for most of the increase in Federal spending. But since 1953, when the Korean War ended, defense expenditures have increased by $20.7 billion, up 41 per cent. For the same period, non-defense spending by the Federal government is up $63.3 billion, or *242 per cent.* Federal tax collections are up $109 billion since 1948, an increase of 241 per cent.

Now the Administration seeks a 10 per cent tax increase on personal and corporate income. Higher Social Security taxes become effective January 1. And some excise taxes which were scheduled to expire will be continued.

So, with Government taxes and spending going higher and with inflation continuing at a dangerous pace, I have been consistently voting for reductions in non-defense appropriations wherever possible. I have been asking whether it is essential that the United States get a man on the moon by 1970, whether we are getting an appreciable return for our multi-billion dollar investment in the war on poverty, whether the billions we allocate to foreign aid are actually promoting American objectives abroad. We must assign priorities for programs and enforce them. If we can't make some appreciable reductions in non-defense expenditures now, with a booming war-time economy, when will that day arrive?

My position will continue to be that reductions in non-defense spending must have a higher priority than increased Federal taxes.

HOW I VOTED

Since my last report, I voted: *for* amendments to the Vocational Rehabilitation Act for expanded grants to States for rehabilitation services. (Passed). *For* the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Appropriation Act for 1968. (Passed). (Earlier amendments to cut some $137 million from the bill had been rejected by voice votes). *For* cuts in the foreign aid authorization bill. When these cuts failed, I voted *against* passage of the bill. (Passed). (The critical importance of one's vote is evident here, where the bill passed by only 8 votes). *For* the Conference Report making appropriations to the Department of Defense for 1968. (Passed). I voted *against* a motion to permit funds under the bill to be used for construction of naval vessels in foreign shipyards. (Defeated). *For* a bill to extend for one year the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to indemnify farmers forced to remove their milk from markets because it contained residues of chemicals approved by the Federal government. (Passed). *For* the Partnership for Health Amendments of 1967. (Passed). Consistent with my earlier vote on the Rat Bill, I voted *against* an amendment providing funds for rat control. (Passed). *For* a bill to amend the public health laws relating to mental retardation. (Passed). *For* the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967. (Passed). I earlier voted *for* a recommittal motion designed to delete the public corporation provision of the bill. (Failed). *For* amendments to the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention and Control Act of 1967 providing that grants be made to state agencies (and not local organizations) to coordinate juvenile delinquency prevention programs. (Passed). The Act was then passed by a voice vote.

BILLS INTRODUCED

H.R. 12831, to establish a National Visitors Center in Washington, D.C. Enactment of this bill would provide a better organized transportation system between the many historic sites in the area. It would also provide visitors with the ease and convenience of having at their disposal a focal point to plan their vacations in the Capital. H.R. 13181, to place a yearly quota on mink imports that are in competition with domestic production.

HAM IMPORTS FROM EUROPE

The Common Market countries of Western Europe have established an export subsidy of about 50 cents on a two-pound canned ham. Even without this action, foreign hams were already coming into the United States in considerable volume, displacing domestic pork products and helping to depress hog prices. Present duty on canned ham is only 3 cents per pound. In fairness to our domestic producers, such imports should be limited either through quotas or higher tariffs. It is interesting to note that the Common Market countries apply an import duty of nearly $1 per bushel on U.S. corn imports. This, of course, tends to limit U.S. feed grain sales in Western Europe and encourages increased production there. *This puts a "double whammy" on American corn-hog producers: they must not only pay a high entry fee to market their corn abroad but on top of that they see it coming back into the United States in the form of subsidized ham imports.* Little wonder that American farmers feel they were shortchanged in the recently concluded "Kennedy Round" tariff negotiations.

U.S. CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES TOP 3 MILLION

Executive agencies of the Federal government had 3,012,387 employees in July, up from 2,980,159 in June. Major increases were *6,442 in Agriculture,* 4,822 in Treasury, 2,312 in Commerce, 2,193 in HEW and 1,876 in Veterans Administration. Cost of civilian employment in the fiscal year ending June 30 totaled $20.5 billion, up $1.8 billion from the preceding year. The increase in USDA employees for the month is roughly equivalent to the decrease in the number of farms in the United States for the same period.

CRIME RATE OUTSTRIPS POPULATION GAIN

The Nation's crime rate skyrocketed 48 per cent in the last six years while the population increased only 10 per cent. The House has acted to strengthen the hand of local law enforcement officials by approving the Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice Act.

THE MISSOURI RIVER LAKES

Senator Karl Mundt of South Dakota points out a little known fact: that the six man-made Missouri River lakes have a shoreline of 5,940 miles which exceeds the Great Lakes total of 5,362 miles. Oahe Reservoir, which runs between the Dakota capitals of Bismarck and Pierre has a total shoreline of 2,250 miles, some 400 miles longer than that of Lake Superior.

WHERE DOES THE MONEY COME FROM?

Senator Norris Cotton (R.-N.H.) says: "Recently I received a letter from a housewife whose husband makes $6,000 a year, whose taxes and cost of daily bread are increasing, and whose children are reaching college age. Her closing words, straight from the heart, are more meaningful than any speech I've heard in the Senate. She writes: 'Where does the government get its money? From the vacations we could never take. From the movies we never saw, the restaurant dinners we never ate, the clothes we never bought and the savings we haven't got.' "

OUR TOWERING FEDERAL DEBT

At the beginning of 1967, the U.S. public debt was $329.5 billion. This compares with an estimated public debt of $248 billion for all of the other countries of the "Free World". It raises the question of whether the United States should be receiving, rather than giving, foreign aid.

AGRICULTURE AND FARMING

I like the story about the farm boy who was asked by his teacher to write a report on agriculture. He started this way: "Agriculture is a lot like farming, except that in farming you really have to work at it."

A Letter to the Speaker From the Republican 90th Club

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM O. COWGER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 28, 1967

Mr. COWGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following:

A Letter to the Speaker From the Republican 90th Club

Hon. John McCormack,
Speaker of the House, House of Representatives, U.S. Capitol, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Speaker: We, as first-term Republican Members of Congress, respectfully seek your assistance to bring about some procedural improvements in the House of Representatives. We are vitally interested in the Congressional Reorganization Bill which appears to be stymied in the Rules Committee. We would hope that this important legislation can be brought to the floor of the House for early consideration.

We are also very much concerned with the apparent lack of organization relative to the "business of the House". We recommend that you schedule our legislative week on a six-day basis, beginning on Monday and ending on Saturday, until the session has been completed. We also seek your leadership in arranging the legislative calendar to bring up important bills early in the week, allowing ample time for debate and amendments. In this regard it might be well to begin many of our sessions at 11:00 A.M. instead of the customary noon call of the House.

Mr. Speaker, we are vitally interested in expediting the work of Congress. With so many urgent problems confronting the Nation, we believe many Members of Congress, with the support of the leadership, are willing to knuckle down and work a six-day week. As first-term Members of Congress, we are deeply concerned about the apparent lack of urgency on the part of those who are responsible for scheduling the business to come to the House floor. We offer this recommendation, not so much as a criticism, but as a constructive suggestion.

Thanking you for your consideration of our request, we are

Sincerely yours,

Ben B. Blackburn, Wm. O. Cowger, Dan Kuykendall, Geo. Bush, Edw. Biester, Fletcher Thompson, James Smith, Tom Kleppe, John Zwach, Wm. Steiger, Jas. McClure, Larry Winn, Bob Price, Chas. Sandman.

Tom Railsback, Robt. Denney, Roger Zion, Wiley Mayne, Don Riegle, Howard Pollock, Margaret Heckler, Wm. Roth, Chas. Whalen, Sam Steiger, Guy Vander Jagt, Garry Brown, John Dellenback, Chalmers Wylie.

Profile of Iran

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. ROSS ADAIR

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 28, 1967

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago the Smithsonian Institution, in cooperation with the Iran-America Society, opened a preview of photographs entitled "Profile of Iran" which depicts Iran today and the tremendous growth and progress she has made over the past 10 years. This has only been possible because of the dynamic, progressive, foresighted, and mature leadership of His Imperial Majesty, the Shahanshah of Iran, which has resulted in his being the stabilizing force in the Persian Gulf. Iran is successfully undertaking some of the most comprehensive and truly revolutionary reforms in the free world—the areas of universal suffrage, nationwide public education, administrative overhaul, and land ownership—displaying unusual degrees of realism in the face of seemingly insurmountable odds.

The Iran-America Society was formed just a few short years ago under the leadership of my good friend, Ralph E. Becker, with just a handful of people. Its membership has swelled to well over 500 members, and includes some of the truly outstanding individuals in the United States. Among the board of directors are directors or curators of major museums in America that are interested in Persian art, including the Freer Gallery of Art, Metropolitan Museum of Art of New York City, Cleveland Museum of Art, Museum of Fine Arts of Boston, Seattle Art Museum, and the William Rockhill Nelson Gallery of Art in Kansas City. The purposes of the society are to foster among Americans and Iranians a greater knowledge of the arts, literature, science, social customs, economic and political patterns, and to develop a deeper understanding of the similarities of the Iranian and American ways of life. Thus, the society opens a wide door to a stimulating and rewarding relationship among the two countries and affords the opportunity to meet and know statesmen, professional people, and students of Iran and America.

Mr. Speaker, on the auspicious occasion of the state visit of His Imperial Majesty the Shahanshah of Iran, I would like to take this opportunity to welcome him to the United States and to repeat the remarks of President Johnson in his toast at the state dinner:

> You have the satisfaction of looking back on a most impressive record of progressive leadership. You have taught Iran's people that they have in their own strength and imagination the power to solve their own problems and achieve their own dreams.
>
> When I visited Iran—just five years ago next week—the land reform program had barely begun. Today, 50% of Iran's rural families farm their own land. Some 7000 rural cooperatives have been established—and 800 extension corpsmen are helping farmers acquire new skills.
>
> This promise of new progress and dignity beckons all the Middle East. The people of that region have just suffered a great shock. But that shock should and must not obscure the vision of what they can do to solve their problems constructively, peacefully—working with their neighbors.
>
> We stand ready now, as before, to help those who ask our help—to strengthen the independence of all who seek it in purposeful partnership. Now as always, we seek no domination—by force of arms, by influence of wealth, by stealth or subversion.
>
> We seek to build in brotherhood. We want to continue giving and learning—as we will again when Iranian and American scientists soon begin to study ways to exploit Iran's water resources, and to employ the exciting new technology of desalting. Our cooperation will continue to grow in this and many other ways.
>
> But turning the dreams we share into a shared reality asks a long journey of both our nations. We take heart from the knowledge that the people of Iran, under Your Majesty's leadership, have the fortitude and vision to continue their advance, and so inspire all who would follow in hope.

Mr. Speaker, I include the remarks of Mr. James Bradley, assistant secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, and of His Excellency Hushang Ansary, Ambassador of Iran, on the occasion of the opening of the "Profile of Iran" exhibit, August 17, in the Appendix of the Record:

Remarks of James Bradley, Acting Secretary, Smithsonian Institution, August 17, 1967, at the Opening of the Exhibition, "Profile of Iran"

Your Excellency, Distinguished guests, Ladies and Gentlemen, On behalf of Secretary S. Dillon Ripley and the Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, and as Assistant Secretary, I welcome you here today for the opening of this fine exhibition of photographs and fine arts, representing a "Profile of Iran." As perhaps a great many of you know, this is not the first time that the Smithsonian has sponsored an exhibition concerning Iran. Just a few years ago, in 1964, the magnificent exhibition titled "7,000 Years of Iranian Art," was exhibited by the National Gallery of Art. This exhibit was then circulated throughout the United States under the auspices of the Smithsonian's Traveling Exhibition Service.

The Smithsonian is popularly known for its museums and art galleries. Behind the facade of these exhibitions, however, there is a community of scholars, of historians, scientists, and art directors. These are the men and women who pursue research in the traditional fields of history, science, and art; curate the national collections of about sixty million specimens and other objects of great interest and value; publish the results of their investigations and studies; and provide the essential professional support for the program of exhibitions in the galleries and museums.

As one other example of our interest in Iran, a survey of traditional Iranian arts and crafts has been carried out this year by a grant under the auspices of our program in Ancient Technologies. And during this summer, the Smithsonian is joining Harvard University and the Union Carbide Corporation in sponsoring an expedition which hopes to locate, in Iran, man's first source of tin.

Today, we view this splendid photographic exhibit, "A Profile of Iran"—one more cooperative activity bearing upon Iranian life and culture and accomplishments, with which the Smithsonian is happy to be associated.

In arranging this exhibition, Mr. Ralph Becker was most active. Ralph Becker is President of the Iran-American Society and is an old friend of the Smithsonian, with a heartwarming record of donations to our collections of political memorabilia; a distinguished American; an eminent lawyer and civic leader who has dedicated himself to the cause of expanding cultural relationships between Iran and the United States. Mr. Becker also serves as General Counsel of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, an affiliate of the Smithsonian.

It is now my pleasure and honor to introduce the Guest of Honor and the Patron of this show; a man of distinction and exceptional attainment, who has served his country as Economic Counselor in the Far East, Deputy Minister of Commerce, Ambassador to East and West Africa, Ambassador to Pakistan and to Ceylon, Minister of Information, and now Ambassador to the United States. Ladies and Gentlemen, His Excellency, the Ambassador of Iran, Hushang Ansary.

Text of Speech by Ambassador Hushang Ansary, of Iran, at the Opening of the Exhibition "Profile of Iran", at the Smithsonian Institution, August 17, 1967

Your Excellencies, Honorable Guests, Ladies and Gentlemen:

It is a pleasure to welcome you all to this Exhibit, so that you can actually get a "Profile of Iran"—in fact, two profiles: one the past, and the other the present with all its portent for the future.

Of Iran's glorious past, it is hardly necessary to tell a long story. It was, as we all know, the birthplace of great leaders. Cyrus the Great, founder of the Iranian Empire, still stands as a man admired by the West as well as the East. Darius and others who followed brought honor and fame. It was also the cradle of civilization. The marvelous creation of Iranian carpets, the elegant caligraphy, the miniatures, the illuminated manuscripts, the scholars, the artists, and the poets are known the world over. Its contributions to the world of art and culture, to science and medicine, to architecture and literature are indeed a source of pride to every living Iranian.

Of Iran today, on the other hand, we do have a story to tell: the story of the revolution of the Shah and the people—one that opens a bloodless, contemporary path to the rapid change so urgently desired by more than half the population of the world living in developing nations. It is an integrated series of basic reforms designed to solve at root-level chronic problems typical of most developing countries. The techniques employed in reaching these goals do not follow doctrinaire blueprints taken either from East or West. They are directly related to existing local institutions and traditions. They are directly related to existing local institutions and traditions. They have in common with all truly national movements certain distinctly national characteristics, which can be fully understood only with a knowledge of Iranian society, history and geography. But the principles involved transcend nationality and are at home in all progressive nations sincerely striving for a more ethically satisfying world of shared prosperity and greater human freedom.

Seen as an integrated program, the revolution called for the liquidation of the great feudal estates, which has to date brought more than 2,400,000 farmers the ownership of lands they tilled.

The urban worker was to find a place in the revolution through a share in the profits of rapidly expanding industry, as, by the end of 1966, the great majority of the 340,000 productive establishments in operation in Iran announced profit-sharing arrangements with their workers.

The democratic processes were advanced through a dynamic revision of the electoral laws, reflecting the social changes in the society by granting voting and other equal rights to women and by creating a broader base of better informed voters and a wider choice of candidates.

Social justice was to have legal force in rural areas through the establishment of Equity Courts in the villages to fill the vacuum left by the withdrawal of the old system of "Landlord Justice".

And, finally, social and economic support was given the farmers and their families by what has since proved to be a brilliantly conceived plan, making use of routine military draft of young high school graduates in a coordinated battle against rural poverty, ignorance, isolation, backwardness and disease. Today, over 10,000 young men serve in the Literacy Corps, Health Corps, and the Development and Extension Corps, which were thus created.

The gap between noble intentions and the implementing of urgent reforms is too often regrettably wide. But I take pride in saying that, in our case, the reforms were implemented with considerable success almost from the start, sweeping the small power-elite from domination and speeding Iran on the road to membership with the more advanced industrial nations.

Along with success in social reforms, there have been phenomental gains in the implementation of our development programs. In 1965, the Gross National Product in Iran rose by 11.9%, and, in 1966, by 9.5%—in both cases one of the highest in the world. Last year industrial investment rose by 16%. Whereas, in 1953, our total imports amounted to only $115-million, in 1966 it reached almost one billion.

The prosperity and stability thus gained, coupled with fantastic potentials, have gone a long way to attracting a great inflow of tourists and of foreign capital to Iran.

For all this the Iranian nation owes a debt of gratitude to the initiative and farsightedness of its dynamic leader. His Imperial Majesty the Shahanshah of Iran, who declared a long time ago that to reign over a land beset with poverty and illiteracy is no source of pride or satisfaction. The Shahanshah set the revolutionary goals before the nation in the national referendum of January 26, 1963. Said he, and I quote:

"We set ourselves to accomplish far-reaching social reforms, economic reconstruction commensurate with democratic ideals, development of education, international cooperation and respect for moral beliefs, as well as individual and social freedom."

The revolution can now be examined not simply for the goals promised in the first flush of enthusiasm, but for what has actually been accomplished. The present Exhibit is thus brought to you not only to illustrate seventy centuries of Iran's history, rich heritage and culture, but also to portray her achievements of the past decade. The work ahead is still vast, allowing for no complacency; but what has been accomplished is most encouraging and, to all of us, highly rewarding.

Before concluding, I wish to express my sincere thanks to the Regents and the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, as well as to the distinguished President and members of the Board of Directors of the Iran-American Society, for their kindness in arranging the Exhibit and for their wholehearted support and invaluable contribution toward better understanding and closer cultural ties between Iran and the United States.

I now take pleasure in inviting you all to view the Exhibit.

Mr. Speaker, His Imperial Majesty the Shahanshah of Iran is respected and admired not only by his countrymen, but the entire world and is a beacon of light in the Middle East.

ABC's Biased "Africa" Program: More Correction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 28, 1967

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the American Broadcasting Co.'s recent screening of "Africa" continues to bring widespread comment in many quarters.

The network's presentation was so obviously biased and one-sided that certainly the Federal Communications Commission should order the granting of equal time under the so-called fairness doctrine.

I have previously inserted in the Record statements by the Ambassadors of the Republic of South Africa and Portugal in regard to the many distortions in this lengthy documentary which were beamed toward American viewers.

It is most regrettable that ABC, which ranks a poor third in viewer popularity among the major networks, has so little concern for truth and accuracy.

Mr. Speaker, I follow my remarks with a statement issued by the Honorable K. H. Towsey, of the Rhodesian Office of Information:

Comments By K. H. Towsey, of Rhodesian Information Office, on ABC's "Africa" Program

I thought it was a very interesting travelogue. I wouldn't presume to comment on its treatment of countries other than my own except to say in general terms that I thought the tone of the program's observation tended to be judicious in the case of black-ruled Africa and malicious in the case of white-ruled Africa. For a country that is supposed to be a threat to world peace, I thought Rhodesia received very parsimonious attention. I was rather amused to find it described in terms of British colonialism. Depending upon the ideological spectacles that you wear, there are many phrases that can be used to describe the situation in Rhodesia. British colonialism, by which Rhodesia has never been touched, is certainly not one of them.

I think Howard Smith's summary struck a sensible note in offering the advice about Africa: "Don't push." It calls to mind some similar words of dispassionate wisdom offered during Congressional hearings on South Africa's policies by Professor Charles Burton Marshall of Johns Hopkins University, when he recommended that the best thing that the American Government and people could do about South Africa would be to "simmer down". If ABC's program has had that effect on the viewer, it will have been well worth the effort.

Grand Jury Rebukes Pampering of Criminals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT B. (BOB) MATHIAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 28, 1967

Mr. MATHIAS of California. Mr. Speaker, in view of the summer riots and the ever-increasing crime rate, it is refreshing to hear that the grand jury No. 1, of the District of Columbia, has spoken out in such a constructive and forceful manner.

The unprecedented letter, supported by all 23 members of the grand jury, states that the "pendulum has swung too far" in regard to consideration given to criminals. I, therefore, commend to my colleagues the following article:

GRAND JURORS CHARGE CURBS IN CRIME FIGHT

The outgoing Grand Jury No. 1 for the District of Columbia, in an unprecedented move, yesterday sent a letter to the editor of The Washington Post strongly attacking what it called the limitations imposed upon police, prosecutors and judges in their fight against crime.

The letter was signed by 19 of the 23 members of the jury with a notation that the remaining four, although unable to be present at its composition, gave their approval to its contents.

It stated in part that "we feel the pendulum has swung too far. After two months of duty we find ourselves amazed and shocked at the exaggerated consideration given those who roam our streets indulging themselves in acts of the most outrageous nature."

"If you happen to murder someone in the near future, feel free to confess to one or a hundred people. Unless you are informed of your rights in the most precise terminology, the odds are that the judiciary branch will see to your freedom."

Officials of the U.S. Attorney's office said that the letter had been drafted and sent without their knowledge or consent.

Strictly speaking, a grand jury is prohibited from taking such an action. Each juror is under oath not to discuss any phase of his activities or cases he hears inside the grand jury room.

The jury was dismissed Monday after sitting five days a week for eight weeks. It was predominantly Negro in composition.

Subscription Television

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1967

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, the AFL-CIO Executive Council, at its recent meeting in New York, declared support for the proposal of the FCC's Subscription Television Committee permitting subscription television.

So that we may all review the AFL-CIO statement, I include it in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY THE AFL-CIO EXECUTIVE COUNCIL ON SUBSCRIPTION TELEVISION (STV), NEW YORK, N.Y., SEPTEMBER 11, 1967

A committee of the Federal Communications Commission has submitted to the Commission a report proposing that the Commission permit a limited amount of paid television, in certain situations and subject to certain restrictions.

THE FCC PROPOSAL

More specifically, the FCC Committee Report proposes as follows:

Type of Service.—Over the air subscription television (STV) would be permitted. The question whether cable STV should be permitted is reserved for further study. Subscribers would lease, not buy, decoders which would be attached to their sets. The Commission would not, at least initially, fix the rates to be charged.

Safeguards against preempting of time for free TV

STV would be authorized only in communities having five or more commercial TV stations, including the one authorized to use STV. Only one station in a community would be permitted to use STV, and it would be required, in addition to STV programs, to broadcast free TV programs for the normal required minimum number of hours.

Safeguards against preempting of programs from free TV

STV could not broadcast any movies from 2 to 10 years old, and could broadcast only 12 movies more than 10 years old each year. Thus old movies would be largely reserved for free TV. New movies, i.e. those less than 2 years old, could be shown on STV, and are expected to comprise about 85% of the programming.

Sports events could not be shown on STV if they had been "regularly" televised in the community within the preceding 2 years. No series type of program, with interconnected plot or the same cast of characters, could be broadcast over STV.

No commercials would be permitted on STV programs.

THE AFL-CIO POSITION

The 1957 AFL-CIO Convention adopted a resolution of "Opposition to Pay TV." The issue has not been considered by subsequent conventions.

On August 3, 1967, a meeting was held of affiliates having a direct interest in the STV proposal. Considerable diversity of opinion was expressed by different unions, and by representatives of different groups within the same union. However, the preponderant view was that the FCC should permit STV, subject to appropriate restrictions and safeguards along the general lines of those proposed in the report, and subject to continuing review by the Commission. While STV could, if successful, have an adverse effect upon employment in some fields, it could have a beneficial effect on employment in others; and the belief was generally expressed that the development of new programing resources would be in the interest of the viewing public.

Now, therefore, be it resolved:

The AFL-CIO Executive Council supports, in general, the proposal of the FCC's Subscription Television Committee that the FCC permit Subscription Television, subject to appropriate restrictions and safeguards and to continuing review by the Commission.

Native Chicagoan Next President of the University of Chicago

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 28, 1967

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent I am extending my remarks to include the following news article from the Hyde Park (Ill.) Herald of September 20, 1967:

EDWARD LEVI

A native son has been chosen to be the next president of the University of Chicago, Edward H. Levi.

Levi, who lives at 1234 E. 50th, is the son of Rabbi Gerson Levi and the grandson of Rabbi Emil Hirsch. Rabbi Levi became the spiritual leader of the congregation of Temple Isaiah Israel in 1924, the year the synagogue at 1100 Hyde Park Blvd. was completed. He served as rabbi until his death in 1939.

Levi's mother, Mrs. Gerson Levi, who resides at the Windermore Hotel, 1642 E. 56th, is an honorary member of the congregation.

Rabbi Hirsch was the leader of the Sinai Temple congregation for four decades before his death in 1923. He was a scholar and a member of the faculty assembled for the University of Chicago by its founder William Rainey Harper.

Edward Levi attended the University of Chicago Laboratory School through high school, then earned a Ph.B. degree at the university. He took his law degree at the university, then an advanced degree at Yale.

During the 1940's he held several federal posts in Washington but became dean of the U. of C. law school in 1950, a position he held until 1962. He was acting dean of the university college before being named provost and second in command to President George Beadle.

With Beadle, he has worked to reorganize the undergraduate departments of the university and to strengthen the faculty of the university generally.

His name had been mentioned as the most likely to succeed Beadle ever since it was announced that Beadle would retire next year.

Levi is married to the former Kate Sulzberger Hecht, who also grew up in the community. She and her sister Mrs. Bernard Meltzer, 1219 E. 50, have been active in local community organizations. Just this week Mrs. Levi accepted the co-chairmanship of a committee of the Hyde Park Neighborhood Club, where she is a member of the board of directors.

Mrs. Meltzer's husband is a member of the law school faculty of the university.

Edward is a brother of Julian Levi, professor in the Center for Urban Studies and director of the South East Chicago Commission. Julian Levi has headed the University of Chicago's participation in the urban renewal and redevelopment of Hyde Park.

Doubt About L. B. J. Causes War Fears

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 28, 1967

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks I am inserting in the Record an editorial entitled "Doubt About L. B. J. Causes War Fears," which appeared in the Peoria Journal Star of last Monday.

The editorial comments favorably on a speech made by our colleague, Congressman Bob Michel, before the Rotary Club of Peoria. We who have served with Bob Michel in the Congress well know not only his capacity for analysis on national problems but the forthright manner in which he invariably presents his views.

As a member of the House Committee on Appropriations, which makes the funds available for all our Government operations, foreign and domestic, Congressman Michel has an opportunity to evaluate every aspect of the various problems that beset us. I, too, believe, as Bob Michel pointed out, that underlying all our problems, including the war in Vietnam, is a lack of confidence in the administration.

The editorial referred to follows:

DOUBT ABOUT L. B. J. CAUSES WAR FEARS

Congressman Bob Michel put his finger on the source of all the confusion and distrust that has made the Vietnam war "different" from previous American tests.

When he spoke before the Rotary Club here, Bob said: "For myself, I should like to see the United States succeed in Vietnam.

"I hope the administration also has the same clear-cut objective."

This doubt, this lack of confidence, this "unsureness" about the conduct of our President, to put it bluntly, is the core of the problem.

Our casualties are a fraction of the losses to auto accidents, and less than either gunshot wounds in the U.S. or industrial accidents—but there is a lack of confidence in what is being attempted and how it is being attempted that makes the war-loss of American lives hard to take.

Why?

Bob blamed it on "playing it by ear"—the philosophy that "if we gradually do just a little bit more, the enemy will someday lay down his arms and talk peace."

After stopping the Communist attempt at a quick take-over, says Bob, "we threw away our advantage by fighting the war on the enemy's terms."

"We have fought a war of gradualism. We have allowed the enemy ample time to adjust to every turn of the screw."

And he added, "It was contrary to all sound military strategy."

(Michel was decorated for gallantry in action in the Battle of the Bulge, and his continuing study and access to top military thinking during his many years as a Congressman had the hard, and real background of front-line experience, well performed. War isn't an imaginary condition to Michel, who was, himself, wounded in action.)

He doesn't advocate nuclear weapons, bombing civilian centers of a ground invasion of North Vietnam.

He does advocate an efficient waging of the war, with decisions based on sound military judgments—instead of political.

We think the congressman hit the nail on the head as to what disturbs many Americans today about this conflict, in part.

We think it goes farther than that.

We think many Americans simply distrust the President of the U.S. for a variety of reasons that go to subjects other than Vietnam. His 1964 campaign was duplicitous. His building a personal fortune while in government was questionable. His political life has been marked more by cunning than principle.

This is not a new discovery.

We commented when Johnson's "popularity" was at its peak, and all the talk was of a "one-party" system in the U.S. and the federal government taking charge of all our problems, that while "poll-wise" Johnson had wide support, it was not deep support.

Few people responded in ways that showed they "identified" with him or trusted him. His "big" popularity was simply measuring current choices and was not personal in its character.

We described it as fragile.

It is hard to accept the deaths of Americans when you lack confidence that they are fully supported as they go into combat, and when you aren't sure but what political expediency tomorrow may simply "write off" those dead, abandon the cause in which they died, and make it all for nothing.

This war is hard on the American people because it is being fought with one eye to politics, and because the American people lack a basic confidence in the commander-in-chief, in this, and in the guiding principles that seem to have marked his decisions through life.

The real trouble with the Vietnam war is that American policy and American support and sense of direction rests on this shaky base—lack of confidence in our President.

Air Quality Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. RONAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 28, 1967

Mr. RONAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw the attention of the House to the proposed Air Quality Act, which will shortly come before us for a vote. In the Air Quality Act we have an effective complement to the Clean Air Act of 1963 and its amendments of 1965 and 1966. This bill would strengthen the partnership between the States and the Federal Government in the battle against air pollution and would hasten the day when we can breathe without fear.

In January of this year, when President Johnson recommended the adoption of new legislation dealing with air pollution, he reminded us of the dangerour gases and chemicals with which we have filled our air. He recalled the days during the Thanksgiving weekend of last year, when the Nation watched in horror as New York City and the entire eastern seaboard lay under a shroud of polluted air, which brought death to an estimated 168 people in New York City alone. The President also reminded us that even the ordinary levels of pollution in the air of our cities are a serious threat to public health.

There are two provisions of the Air Quality Act which I would like to discuss. The first would authorize the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to designate air quality control regions throughout the country—regions which share the same air supply and which, therefore, should mount cooperative control programs. Within these air quality control regions the States would subsequently develop air quality standards and programs for their implementation. To assist in the establishment of air quality standards, another provision of the act directs the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to continue its promulgation of criteria describing the health and welfare effects of pollutants and to commence publication of information on control technology applicable to the sources of pollutants.

These provisions reflect the new era we are about to enter in the control of air pollution—an era in which the scattered, hit-or-miss efforts of the past will be replaced by a scientific, rational approach. I am confident that the Air Quality Act will prove a valuable tool in our continuing struggle with the deadly enemy of air pollution and I am pleased to support this worthwhile bill.

The President and the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT N. C. NIX

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 28, 1967

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, the newest vogue in Washington these past several days is to comment on the President's handling of the war in Vietnam

We have heard accusations, guesses, armchair strategy, intuitive analyses of North Vietnam thinking, and almost hysterical calls for peace at any price.

We have heard these comments from presidential hopefuls, from frustrated carriers of so called peace messages, from bearded peaceniks and yes from Members of Congress.

I often wonder why these people are unable to understand that although they have the right to unjustly criticize—yet the exercise of that right gives aid and comfort to the enemy, both by creating the false belief that the people of the United States do not back the President and by strengthening the will of the enemy.

I am convinced that these misguided prophets of doom must be chastised by every right-thinking American for their disservice to our country.

I herewith incorporate into my remarks an article written by Roscoe Drummond which appeared in the September 25 edition of the Philadelphia Inquirer, in which Mr. Drummond asks the question "Does the President Want Peace?" and then answers that question with an unequivocal "yes."

Let those who doubt, read this column then begin the painful process of correct thinking.

The article referred to follows:

Does the President Want Peace?—Yes

(By Roscoe Drummond)

Washington.—The purpose of this column is to try to get at the truth in answer to two questions of deep concern: Does President Johnson genuinely want to get the Vietnam war to the conference table or is he deliberately putting obstacles in the way of negotiations?

What are the real differences between the Administration and its critics as to what should be done to get peace talks started?

The truth is that the President wants peace in Vietnam and to get the negotiations going just as soon as possible.

The idea that Mr. Johnson—or Dean Rusk or Robert McNamara or anyone else in the Administration—is searching for ways to block peace talks is not borne out by the evidence and is contrary to all political reality.

There are plenty of Washington correspondents who are disenchanted with LBJ, but their overwhelming judgment is that the President is earnestly seeking a negotiated settlement.

And why shouldn't he.

He doesn't want American soldiers killed and the best way to stop the killing is to get a workable peace.

He doesn't want to lose next year's election and he knows that the one thing which would most insure his reelection would be to get a settlement of the Vietnam war.

His every instinct of humanity and every incentive of political survival combine to cause the President to do everything to get peace short of selling South Vietnam down the river.

Harry Ashmore, the former newspaper editor who recently accused the President of "duplicity" because Mr. Johnson did not give as much weight to Ashmore's peace feelers as he felt he deserved, opposes unilateral withdrawal of U.S. forces from Vietnam.

So does Sen. J. W. Fulbright. So do the 15 other "dove" Senators who wrote Ho Chi Minh that, whatever their criticisms of the President, they did not favor withdrawal and warned him not to count on the American home front crumbling.

Since the main critics of the Administration on Vietnam do not favor withdrawal, what then are the real differences on peace talks?

The critics hold that the U.S. is to blame for not getting the war to the conference table.

The Administration holds that Hanoi has been completely resistant to every negotiation proposal the U.S. has made.

The critics urge that the U.S. offer one-sided incentives to Hanoi to begin negotiations.

The Administration opposes one-sided incentives.

The critics propose a unilateral de-escalation of the U.S. of the war.

The Administration says it would accept any reciprocal de-escalation that would be agreeable to Hanoi.

Some suggest that the President go to Geneva and announce that he will sit there until Ho Chi Minh turns up.

The Administration doubts such a move would be useful.

The U.S. invites the U.N. to act in behalf of peace in Vietnam. Hanoi rejects its jurisdiction.

The U.S. proposes to reconvene the Geneva Conference. Hanoi and its allies refuse.

These are honest differences, but they do not mean that the President is any less eager to get a settlement than anybody else.

North Vietnam can have negotiations anytime it wants—secret or public. The U.S. will negotiate without preconditions or with preconditions, or will negotiate about conditions. No gimmick is needed, no intermediary is necessary. Hanoi has only to name the date and place and the U.S. will be there.

Meanwhile the South Vietnamese Army Was Taking the Weekend Off

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 28, 1967

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, this Nation is in Vietnam today, presumably to assist the people of South Vietnam to defend their new country from attack originating in North Vietnam. It is their war, not ours. We are there to help them defend themselves. At least that is the way this war has been described, and it is the way most Americans imagine it to be.

Reading news accounts of the fighting in Vietnam gives us an entirely different picture, however. Instead of assisting the Vietnamese to defend themselves it would appear we are taking over more and more of the task as our own while the Vietnamese show less and less capacity to be a part of their own defense effort.

Last Sunday the Arizona Daily Star of Tucson, Ariz., reprinted an Associated Press account by Peter Arnett summarizing the activities of the South Vietnamese Army in this joint enterprise, and along with the article the Star published an excellent editorial commenting on this state of affairs.

Without objection, Mr. Speaker, I will insert the text of the editorial and article at this point in the Appendix of the Record:

A New Hot Vietnam Political Issue

(By William R. Mathews)

Elsewhere on this page appears a reprint of a news story from Saigon, published last Sunday in the Star, which has been made more important by events of the last few days. The story describes in some detail how the South Vietnamese army is engaged in avoiding combat, and leaving that unpleasant job of fighting to the American and allied soldiers.

Thursday morning the Star published a report by the Gallup Poll, which emphatically confirms the importance of this new development, and the truth of the reprinted news story on this page.

The Gallup story starts out by reporting that the new president-elect of South Vietnam, Nguyen Van Thieu, believes that most of the fighting should be left to the Americans! On the other hand, the results of the poll, which asks the question, "At this time do you think the United States should let South Vietnam take on more responsibility for the fighting of the war in Vietnam?", are as follows:

	Latest	*1966*
Yes, should	77	62
No	11	22
No opinion	12	16

Of all the questions put to Americans concerning the Vietnam war in the past three years, none has generated such wide agreement as has this one. And, Democrats, Republicans and Independents all see the issue the same way.

This is shown in the following table:

	Republicans	*Democrats*	*Independents*
Yes, should	77	77	77
No	11	11	11
No opinion	12	12	10

"With Vietnam almost certain to be the number one issue in next year's presidential campaign, it is equally certain that the question of South Vietnam versus U.S. particpation will be widely debated. Already three (American) political leaders are on record as favoring greater participation in the fighting on the part of the South Vietnamese."

That 77 per cent of the American people, divided equally between Republicans and Democrats, agree that the South Vietnamese army should do more of the fighting, emphasizes the importance of this as a political issue. It prompts the question that, if the South Vietnamese people won't fight to liberate their country, why should we American people fight for it?

Let it be remembered that our involvement in South Vietnam started when our government brought in military advisers. At first, in 1954, there were just a few, but by the time President Kennedy took office there were 19,000. That these advisers could not get the Vietnamese to fight confirms how this apathy was present at that time.

Surely the time has come when President Johnson and his military advisers must take note of this issue. It emphasizes how our lenient, easy-going attitude must be changed into a firm, determined one that will call upon the new president of Vietnam either to get his armies fighting, or leave no other alternative to the United States but to withdraw its forces. If the Vietnamese army will not join the American and allied armies in a prompt and continuous offensive to bring this war to an end by liberating South Vietnam, the present stalemate will continue.

When 77 per cent of the Democrats and the Republicans are beginning to think this way, as shown by the Gallup Poll, this subject is bound to be a primary political issue next year. If President Johnson fails to let the world and the new Vietnam government know how the Americans feel about this South Vietnam apathy, as President of the United States, he will be held accountable. He is duty-bound to make a prompt and serious effort to rectify this astounding situation.

No matter how much we intensify the bombing and escalate the war, the unpopular fact remains that people who will not fight to liberate themselves from an oppressor cannot be liberated.

Because the story printed elsewhere on this page presents a graphic picture of how South Vietnam is not fighting, it should be read.

South Vietnamese Letting Americans Fight the War

(Editor's Note: The following dispatch from Saigon details South Vietnamese military activity in the Vietnam War. It originally was carried in last Sunday's Star. On Thursday, the Gallup Poll reported that 77 per cent of the American people think the Vietnamese should take a more active part in the war. The United States has approximately 480,000 military men in South Vietnam. The Vietnamese army totals 700,000. The Saigon story is reprinted today as a supplement to the lead editorial located elsewhere on this page.)

(By Peter Arnett)

Saigon.—The dispirited Vietnamese army, shot through with inefficiency, often lacks the will for combat and is increasingly prone to let the Americans do the fighting.

Fighting statistics and a detailed survey of field operations bear out this observation.

In much of the country the Vietnamese military effort has steadily tailed off as that of Americans increased.

The size of the South Vietnamese army has doubled since 1962, yet the number killed has held constant at about 10,000 a year. In the first six months of 1967, the army lost 5,495 men. The statistics are so constant from year to year as to raise questions about their validity.

By contrast, U.S. forces, having lost 2,532 killed in the first six months of 1966, lost 4,909 in the first six months of 1967, when the number of Americans engaged had doubled.

Nowhere in the country can the South Vietnamese military be said to have made real gains against the enemy. Meanwhile allied forces, including the Americans, the Koreans and the Australians, have wrested vast areas from direct Communist control.

Events have shown clearly that the Vietnamese army must play its role, and play it well, if there is to be any hope of lasting success against the Communists. The American army is clearly limited in the depth it can reach into the countryside to crush the foe and hold ground.

ALLIED SURVEILLANCE

In no instance, however, have the allies began willing to hand over surveillance of any of the territory won to Vietnamese units. Allied commanders fear the Communists would be in charge again within weeks.

An extensive survey of the situation established these points:

South Vietnamese military ineffectiveness costs American lives—in the ambushing of convoys on roads supposedly cleared by Vietnamese troops, in the mortaring of U.S. installations by squads which slip past sleeping Vietnamese sentries, in sniping by guerrillas who move freely past Vietnamese outposts. Troops insist on a 5 day week, taking Saturdays and Sundays off, while their allies, and the Viet Cong go on fighting.

American battalions seeking to break up enemy units operate through the night hours. So do the Viet Cong. The South Vietnamese quit when the sun goes down.

Many South Vietnamese operations are staged in areas where no guerrillas are known to be. Huge troop concentrations are deployed in areas where small numbers of the enemy are hidden. Outnumbered, the Communists decline to stand and fight.

Only two of the 44 generals in the South Vietnamese forces in 1963 are still holding their rank. The others have been purged. This has sharply impaired morale in the command echelons.

Desertions from the South Vietnamese army are running at the rate of 10,000 a month and are expected to total more than 400,000 by the end of the year. This is twice as many men as the service lost to battle casualties.

Corruption is common at all levels of the army.

U.S. LOSSES RISE

The loss of American lives traceable to Vietnamese inaction or incompetence is expected to rise directly in proportion to the depth U.S. forces deploy in the countryside. American battalions already are operating independently in districts and villages. This trend is expected to continue.

Some Americans are demanding that the United States be given a command role over the Vietnamese army, similar to that held over South Korean forces during the Korean War.

Relays of senior officials from Washington, visiting Vietnam, are being told, "If we have to see the war through, we will have to assume command responsibility eventually. Why not start now?"

There has been an affirmative response to these views by most of the Washington visitors, a reliable source reported. But no indications of pressure on the Vietnamese at the top levels of government have come to light.

"No one will pick up the ball and run with it," one frustrated U.S. official exclaimed.

Part of the high-level reluctance might stem from the perennial official viewpoint that the Vietnamese armed forces are performing satisfactorily and up to expectations.

THE 1964 PULLOUT

In February, 1964, U.S. Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara predicted that the United States would pull out most of its troops the following year.

"I don't believe that we as a nation should assume the primary responsibility for the war in South Vietnam," McNamara said then.

"It is a counter-guerrilla war, it is a war that can only be won by the Vietnamese themselves. Our responsibility is not to substitute ourselves for the Vietnamese, but to train them to carry on the operations that they themselves are capable of."

On Aug. 14 this year, Gen. William C. Westmoreland, the U.S. commander in Vietnam, struck out at critics of South Vietnamese military effectiveness.

"I can say categorically that the Vietnamese armed forces are making steady progress," Westmoreland told an interviewer. "They are far better than they were a year ago and this is evident from their discipline, their performance on the battlefield and the successes they are enjoying against the enemy."

Only last month Gen. Wallace M. Greene, Jr., commandant of the Marine Corps, said that six visits to Vietnam had convinced him that "the South Vietnamese forces are doing a first class job" and "are carrying their share."

On the same day, Rep. Gerald R. Ford, R-Mich., the House minority leader, accused the Johnson administration of the "shoring up of a tenuous military regime" and asserted that "the South Vietnamese regular army thus far has failed to meet the military challenge."

Frequent visits to the field with Vietnamese units, talks with Vietnamese and American officers and men, and a close examination of results of operations give no indication that the Vietnamese military has changed much since the days when it was fighting the Communists alone and getting beaten.

A typical week of the war shows this trend all too clearly.

In this particular week, ending Aug. 5, the 80 American combat battalions in Vietnam suffered 186 dead and 1,064 wounded in operations that ranged from just south of Saigon to the demilitarized zone.

The 100 battalions of Vietnamese regular troops operating in these same regions lost 32 dead and 60 wounded.

In that same week, U.S. Marines operating in the 1st Corps region lost 110 men killed.

The 30 Vietnamese battalions in the corps area lost 6 killed.

More than 60 percent of the Vietnamese killed that week were not in the Vietnamese regular battalions. Those deaths occurred at the lowest level of war among the neglected, low-paid regional and popular forces.

TOWN DEFENDERS

The mission of these forces, who comprise nearly one-half of the total Vietnamese armed forces, is to defend towns, villages and bridges against the Viet Cong.

They perform this mission from mud, brick or concrete outposts, often cringing in fear at an approaching enemy, only occasionally attempting to fight off an attacking force, and usually dying after throwing their weapons away and attempting to run, hide or surrender.

Such an outpost was overrun three times in this manner on Route 4, major artery from Saigon to the Mekong delta, in three nights in late July.

Casualties often are taken without inflicting any upon the enemy. The 479th Regional Force Company in Thu Thua district, in Long An Province, has not killed a Viet Cong in its two years of existence. Yet frequent attacks on the company's position have resulted in 12 dead and many wounded among the regional force men.

The statistics indicate that only one-third of the Vietnamese killed in the war lose their lives in offensive operations against the enemy. This one-third comes from the regular Vietnamese units arrayed in 10 infantry divisions, one armored division, an airborne division, and 20 ranger battalions. These total 285,000 men.

The official statistics over the years would have you believe otherwise. But there are statistics and statistics.

Walls of all the numerous U.S. advisory commands are dizzy with green, red and yellow lines that spiral ever upward, always indicating greater and greater progress within the Vietnamese army.

At the headquarters of the 4th Corps Region at Can Tho, a smiling American colonel, an adviser to Vietnamese forces, will tell you, "Our percentage of major operations (one battalion or larger) are dropping off this year, but the percentage of contact is increasing. Better intelligence, you know.

The statistics don't say that in all these operations, the enemy was given the field of battle each evening because government forces in the delta like to get home before dark.

How, then, can progress be measured in a place like the Mekong delta, still mostly in the bailiwick of the Vietnamese military?

One index is the estimated enemy strength, 80,000 at last count, half of them tough, skilled fighters.

The enemy estimate is the same as last year, but twice as high as the previous year which was twice as high as the year preceding that. With the kind of progress being made in the delta these days, the Vietnam war could last indefinitely.

In July this year, half as many government troops were killed as in July, 1966. The number of enemy killed halved, also.

STATUS QUO EXISTS

The truth in the delta seems to be that a status quo exists, with the Saigon government hanging on to the province and district capitals and the immediate environs and with the Viet Cong holding out in their lairs.

The canals and roads are contested on occasion, but generally the Viet Cong leave them open and collect tribute for their use. As has been shown in the rest of Vietnam, only the infusion of American troops is likely to upset the status quo. This has happened in Gia Dinh Province which surrounds Saigon, in the Long An Province to the south and in Hau Nghia Province to the west.

By relentless operations, day and night, American troops have managed to break down the enemy battalions into small groups. They have them on the run, and search for them continuously.

The Intelligent Square's Guide to Hippieland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM D. HATHAWAY

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 28, 1967

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, a distinguished author has just published an article which I believe every American adult should read. The author is June Bingham, wife of our esteemed colleague, JONATHAN BINGHAM, of New York.

The article, published in the New York Times magazine, of September 24, 1967, treats a social development which has caused great anxiety in our Nation.

Mrs. Bingham discusses with deep insight, that very visible though tiny minority of our young people, the hippies. Her article has value, and all who read it will be rewarded with a fuller understanding of what is happening in this subculture.

Though a reading of this analysis does not dispell all doubt and apprehension about where the hippie movement will lead or of its effects upon the young people who embrace it, it sounds a note of hopefullness.

In order that any of my colleagues or other readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD who may have missed this article may have another opportunity to read it, I am now inserting it in the RECORD:

THE INTELLIGENT SQUARE'S GUIDE TO HIPPIELAND

(By June Bingham)

No generation, it is said, can predict the weapons that the next one will use against it. Surely few Americans who grew up during the Depression and struggled to win middle- or upper-middle-class privileges for their family would have dreamed that, by 1967, some of their most gifted sons and daughters would purposely be hurrying from riches to rags.

Today, these visible, audible and sometimes smellable young rebels are loosely called hippies. Constituting a tiny minority, they are mostly white, carefully nurtured and educated beyond the average; some were former leaders of their class in school. Their young Negro counterpart is trying to achieve, rather than "drop out" of, higher education and professional status; or, if he is trapped in the slums, he may turn to addictive drugs, such as heroin, which are scorned by the hippies, or to violence, which is abhorred by them.

Within the hippie subculture—mostly urban—not all are intelligent and promising. Some are mentally ill or not very bright; some are merely unformed and seduced by the gross simplifications and absolute certainties that seem to result from even a rare use of LSD or a heavy use of marijuana. Mental hospitals throughout the United States report a startling drop in admissions of the two kinds of schizophrenics whose symptoms are similar to those of someone on an LSD trip: the young inappropriately laughing hebephrenics and frozenly posturing catatonics have gone to live among the hippies who tolerate them, thus discouraging their seeking phychiatric treatment.

But partly because many hippies are imaginative, articulate and artistic, their worldview has spread to the far larger number of their well-shod and well-shorn contemporaries, especially to those appalled by the American involvement in Vietnam. Hippiedom, in one sense, is part of the Vietnam fallout.

But this is not all that it is. For there are hippies in England and Canada, Denmark and France, countries not involved in Vietnam or in the credibility gap.

The hippies are in rebellion also against nuclear fission, automation, and bigness in industry, labor and government—in sum, against everything that diminishes the importance of the individual. Their slogan is, "I am a human being: Do not fold, spindle or mutilate." And their value system is the mirror-opposite of the middle-class or square system (while the hippie terms himself a "human being," he terms the square "subhuman" or "humanoid").

If one imagines the questions that a suburban father could ask of a future son-in-law, about family background and religious affiliation, academic degrees and career prospects, previous record and future plans, the hippies would say that None of These Matter (they always seem to talk in capital letters). What matters, they say, is not what a person *does* but what he is, not outer forms or "games," but "Being At One With Yourself."

The hippie phenomenon, once thought to be only a passing phase, is probably more dangerous to its conforming nonconformists than to society as a whole. For the hippie minority, though revolutionary, is neither subversive nor violent. There has been a recent divorce between the hippies and the New Left. While the hippies reject the capitalist emphasis on "mine," whether my house, my money, my gadgets, my child or my work of art, they also reject the Communist practice of job assignment and restriction of the arts and individual freedom. The love-ins, while sometimes unattractive, are an improvement over the deafening silence of the "cool" young of the McCarthy period, or the destructiveness of some beatniks, beats and hipsters, those immediate predecessors of the hippies. There is no hippie leader like Norman Miller, who tried to link the hipster to Black Power.

The squares who wish to alert a hippie—or demihippie—to the hidden dangers to which he is exposed will find disgust less helpful than an attempt to understand the hippie "transvaluation of values." Though the hippies' positive program comprises little that is new or practical, their negative strictures may well be a judgment upon the squares' value system.

There is nothing new, for instance, in the hippies' privatism (the solipsists long ago took it to the end of the line), nor in their hedonism (ancient Greece coined the word for it), nor in their reversion to the Natural (Rousseau promoted the "Noble Savage" whether with hair on his face, like the hippie boys, or under the arms, like the hippie girls). Similarly, there is nothing new in the hippies' passivity and pipe dreaming (hashish—a stronger variety of pot—has been used for millennia).

The following hippie judgments, however, are worth square consideration:

At a time when sexual excitement by way of the media has reached laughable, if not obscene, proportions, these boys and girls in identical tight pants and shoulder-length hair are signaling that the male and female secondary sexual characteristics are not that important; their form of address for one another is "Man."

At a time when racial antagonisms erupt on the street, these boys and girls appear relaxedly integrated. The problems of poverty and the ghetto—together with those of leisure—are no problems to the hippies who embrace all three. In their own sections of cities there is little serious crime and no prostitution.

At a time when national and ideological rivalry may lead to nuclear apocalypse, the hippies preach, "Make love, not war," and refuse to offer themselves for service to their country if this means that they may have to kill or be killed.

At a time when Organization Man and his wife have been clutching material possessions not only for health and comfort but for prestige and a kind of security, the hippies share their food, their pad, their guitars, and such cash as they earn or are given. They would agree with Joseph Wood Krutch that true security depends upon how much one can do without, and they are proud of their own instantaneous mobility. Some move onto the land in small rural kibbutzlike settlements reminiscent of Brook Farm and other 19th-century idealistic experiments. Their guru, Allen Ginsberg, notes that the only technologically complicated item they wish to own is a stereo phonograph:

At a time when some churches have been exposed as slumlords and some church membership stems from other than religious reasons, the hippies stretch for spiritual meaning beyond the Judeo-Christian tradition. This has led some to study Hinduism and Buddhism, ancient philosophies too long spurned by the West.

At a time when planning—by government, by business, by individuals—is still highly touted, the hippies do not bother to turn the leaves of the calendar, or look at their watches (if they own any), or read or listen to the news. They wish to live by whim, by spontaneity, by the non-rules of Now. They are not interested in what someone else has said is right or has planned for them. If they feel in the mood they will neglect all appointments to marvel at he sight of an onion: intricacy and beauty enclosing the purity of the Void. In reacting against pressures of home and school that may have started in kindergarten, many are taking what Erik Erikson has called a "psychological moratorium." Said a male 26-year-old demihippie: "We don't know what we'll be when we're 40; we'll have to wait and see."

At a time of Hidden Persuaders, when politics and advertising are frankly based on image-making, on fooling as many of the people as much of the time as possible, the hippies cry, "Hypocrisy!" As for the politeness and self-restraint that grease the social, as well as business and political, wheels, the hippies prefer discussion of Birth and Death, Creation and Destruction, to small talk. Say the Diggers, a leading subgroup in San Francisco's Haight-Asbury section, "Normal" citizens with store-dummy smiles stand apart from each other like cotton-packed capsules in bottles."

At a time when the American divorce rate is one out of four marriages (in California, one out of two), the hippies point to square hypocrisy in the sphere of sex. Many adults who have preached virginity before marriage and fidelity after it have practiced neither, the hippies say, and many who have practiced these have done so out of fear rather than love—out of, if you will, a form of biological capitalism.

Says a girl hippie: "What's the big deal when a girl hoards a bit of skin just so she can exchange it for a gold ring or a ranch house in the suburbs?"

Says a boy: "In the days before the Pill, people made a virtue of necessity and praised virginity; well the necessity is gone."

A physical factor in this new equation, in addition to the Pill, is that the average age for the onset of menstruation is 12, whereas a hundred years ago it was 17; while our female forebears—who usually married young—had only a year or two between menstruation and marriage, a girl today may have, because of the length and expense of education, more than a decade.

At a time when the "nuclear family," just two parents and their children, often must, because of the father's job, move away from grandparents, uncles and aunts and cousins, the hippies have established a form of the "extended family" in their pads. Unwittingly they may dilute the intensity of Oedipal conflicts that once were lessened by buffers such as relatives and, you should excuse the expression, servants. This would be "unwittingly," because most hippies, in their sentimental or drug-flattened view of human nature, deny that there is such a thing as primal aggression and possessiveness. They choose to think of the child as born "beautiful" and they blame any subsequent destructive behavior on the society or the parents that warped him (this view includes Hitler).

Their intention, therefore, cannot be to dilute what they deny exists, a denial that persists despite the rather stunning evidence to the contrary provided by the Bible and Sophocles, Shakespeare and Freud, by the ethologists who have added "territoriality" as a newly observed category of the power drive, and by lovingly nutured 2-year-olds themselves.

At a time when many squares assume that there has been no historic mutation, that nuclear warheads differ merely in quantity, but not in quality, from the fire raids of

World War II, the hippies insist on historic discontinuity. They believe both in the infinite plasticity of human nature and also in themselves as "a new kind of human being."

In a limited sense perhaps they are right, since theirs is the first post-nuclear generation: their impressionable earliest years were spent with parents who, for the first time, had to face the fact that the future of human civilization and of all life on earth had been thrown into question.

Underneath the hippie refusal to sacrifice the present on the altar of the future is often a black despair which is sometimes relieved and sometimes accentuated by the drugs they take. Basically they seem to be saying that only what they have already enjoyed cannot be taken from them. Perhaps, indeed, a hippie who faces up to the depth of his despair is more realistic than the square who blocks it out, who meticulously plans his life as if his personal future and that of mankind were any longer more than a good bet. In a time of rapid change, the radical may turn out to be more solidly grounded than the stand-patter.

The hippies are hipped on the value of the individual and the disvalue of the state. Thoreau is one of their gods. They speak, therefore, less about some crazy state in the future causing the annihilation of the world than of the crazy individual who caused the annihilation of one man, a President in his prime (it was less Kennedy's program than his style that appealed to them).

Their philosophy of "eat, drink and be merry, for tomorrow we die" is not irrational if, in fact, tomorrow we all do die. It is uncreative, however, if we and they do not die—if, in fact, as seems to be the prospect, we live even beyond the age when we can contribute to our society or enjoy ourselves.

The questions raised by the hippies are thus often profound ones; but their solutions, being neither well-thought-out nor realistic, are of value mostly when they raise other questions. Their greatest contribution may turn out to be "set-breaking," the "'put-on," which, though initiated by the "mind-expanding" drugs, can be followed without these. Primarily this involves an exploding of old mental associations, such as, "Love leads to marriage; marriage leads to children." Why? What if they don't? Certainly in some hippie pads—though not in all—sex has been broken out from the old privacy, the old heterosexual one-to-one, the old erogenous zones.

What will the hippie experimentation lead to? No one, psychiatrist or layman, can say for sure. The old and middle-aged take the dimmest of views. Often the demisquare young, like the psychiatrists, say let's wait and see; neither wishes to be caught voicing an automatic disapproval of something yet unproved.

The chief—and by now fairly well-proved—danger to the hippies comes from LSD. The person who takes it as rarely as once or twice, in moderate dosages, may have suffered a chromosome "breakage" comparable to that caused by radiation and perhaps equally inexpungeable. In the East Village, New York City's "Hashbury," there has been for sale, among other psychedelia, a campaign button with a one-word slogan, "Mutate." If the mutated babies of today's acidheads, babies reminiscent of the deformed creatures produced in Hiroshima and Nagasaki after 1945, begin appearing in sizable numbers, the irony will be almost unbearable: that the very people who most fear and hate the nuclear bomb should be the ones to perpetuate one of its direst by-products.

Many a hippie, as a result of learning about the chromosomes breakage, has renounced LSD. But some continue taking large doses of marijuana, which has been found to reactivate the effects of LSD previously ingested. LSD, like malaria, can remain in the bloodstream or the brain (no one yet knows where) and after a week or a month (the longest period on record is two years)—with or without pot—can cause a freak-out. This may happen without warning, as when a person is driving a car, and in parts of the U.S. acidheads are having their driver's licenses revoked. Dr. Dana Farnsworth of Harvard suggests that no one make any major decision for three months after an LSD trip.

Another danger from LSD or heavy use of pot is that its host may become a psychological Typhoid Mary, spreading infection through word and example to the tender young. Says Dr. Woodrow W. Burgess, a psychiatrist at the University of California at Davis, these hippies "are untreatable because they are so subjectively convinced of a better way of living."

Their subjective conviction is so unshakable ("I know more about me than those doctors do") that some of them, consciously or unconsciously are self-appointed missionaries for their "better way of living." Their negative bait to the adolescent is "Don't be chicken," their positive bait is, "LSD is the only way really to find yourself."

An adult who, for better or worse, has "found himself" sufficiently to know the areas wherein he is, and is not, chicken, may not be seriously tempted. But the adventurous young person naturally is tempted. No one, particularly when young, enjoys missing out on something good, even though, or especially because, it involves a mild amount of danger. The psychedelic "pusher"—not motivated by money like the narcotics pusher, but still "a clear and present danger" to those younger than himself—must be kept from long unchaperoned periods with baby-sitters or smaller siblings, lest he do them the "favor" of starting them at least on pot (hard-core hippies, such as Timothy Leary, give their own children LSD).

Certainly, to "find oneself" is a lofty—and ancient—goal. Unfortunately, however, it seems to involve arduous effort over an extended period of time. It can be done, but not on an "add water and mix" basis. The Lord Buddha, who left his affluent home 2,500 years ago to wander barefoot and long-haired in search of the answer to human suffering, spent 14 years in rigorous meditation before attaining the state of mind-expansion he called Nirvana and that others have termed "the peace that passeth understanding."

The Lord Buddha, also in contrast to the hippie, was tolerant of all kinds of people, princes as well as paupers, old as well as young, from every caste and no-caste; he did not consider the squares as untouchable, nor did he recline all day watching colorama behind his eyelids; he constantly checked his ideas against reality. ("The chief advantage of the uninterrupted daydream," says Dr. Fritz Redlich, dean of the Yale Medical School, "is its absence of risk.")

While LSD can shake people loose from old rigidities, and has some value as a psychotherapeutic tool, the "instant psychoanalysis" that some hippies claim for it appears to be mainly a reduction of physical aggression. Unfortunately there is no comparable reduction of verbal aggression (Leary's speeches are rife with it). The hippie who claims to have "found himself" has thus found only a part of himself, a part he wishes to find. While the hippie validly condemns some conscious hypocrisies of the squares, he often expresses unconscious hypocrisies or rationalizations that are damaging to other people—and ultimately to himself.

These rationalizations of the hippie may derive from carrying over into consciousness the both-and (as against either-or) thinking that is typical of the unconscious. In dreams we can all be both child and adult simultaneously, but in reality *either* we must prepare ourselves in youth for a career *or* we find ourselves unprepared in middle age. (The hippie answer: "It does not matter if an artist never produces a work of art, as long as he sees with the eyes of an artist." The hippie thus spares himself the need to choose one art form and master it.)

These rationalizations of his may derive from his preference for subjective feeling as against objective evidence ("There is no such a thing as objective truth"). Science, of course, is disparaged ("The truth has never been found under the microscope"), and so is cause-and-effect reasoning when inconvenient (a hippie may reject the advice of a doctor who himself has not taken LSD, but accept, in time of pregnancy, the advice of a male obstetrician, who has obviously not given birth).

These rationalizations of the hippie may derive from his paucity of mental furniture. Though bright, he is likely to be a drop-out who has studied little, and that little confined mostly to the recent past.

Society, moveover, is a subject he knows even less about than he does about the individual. For example, more than 30 years ago Reinhold Niebuhr showed that, while the individual can hold self-sacrificial love, *agape*, as his highest goal (and may indeed sacrifice himself for a national aim such as democracy), a state, because of its internal dynamics and the built-in responsibilities of its leaders, cannot. Sometimes, indeed, the very idealism and selflessness with which the citizen devotes himself to his society becomes a power factor in the injustice perpetrated by this society on other societies. The highest goal for international affairs, therefore, cannot be love, but justice, and the idealists who refuse to face the difference between "Moral Man and Immoral Society"[*] may muddy the issues and thus perhaps abet the forces of ruthlessness.

Admittedly terrible as are some aspects of the current American scene, the anthill society of China is no improvement. And when even a small section of America's greatest natural resource—namely, her young people—absent themselves from social responsibility, one is reminded that ancient Rome fell less because of the hammering outside the gate than of the listlessness within.

The hippie, however, cares little for history or for Santayana's dictum that those who do not study history are doomed to repeat it. "Who cares what those old writers had to say?" He refuses to admit that patterns may exist in history, just as he refuses to admit that patterns may exist in hippie behavior. He views himself as freely choosing each step he takes, while to the outsider he appears to be riding an escalator in a clump with his peer group. A hippie on a "high" will paint a picture he is certain is original, a psychiatrist can spot it at once as drug-influenced: It has no integal unity, merely repetitive motifs embellished with tiny—and often merry—detail.

All in all, the hippie, despite his high potential, often ends up with less self-knowledge than his square contemporary. Trying directly to "find oneself" seems paradoxically less effective than first becoming the kind of person upon whom others can rely and then learning existentially from this revealing experience.

The hippie honestly believes that he is practicing Love, but if you shut your eyes while he discusses suburbanites, you would think he was a bigoted white talking about Negroes.

The hippie honestly believes that he is achieving Freedom, but in fact he is slamming doors on himself, now as in the future. Because he operates on whim ("if it feels good, I'll do it.") he cannot be relied on in momentous times such as birth or death, family celebrations or crises. While dropping out he may have made himself worth dropping by the very people who are nearest, if not dearest, to him.

---

[*] Niebuhr today says ruefully that he should have named his seminal book "Immoral Man and Even More Immoral Society."

The hippie honestly believes that he is honest. He has nothing to hide—nothing, that is, except the curved knife that he refuses to admit generically rests in the human hand. When the person the hippie cuts by way of his "honesty" cries out in pain, the hippie's first reaction is genuine surprise. His second is, "Well that's your problem." Since, as he believes, there was, in his own purity, no wish to hurt, then the victim must surely be at fault, must have some hidden weakness that he would do well to explore.

And if the victim, in his freedom, has no wish thus to explore? Then the hippie may turn visibly hostile: "You are jealous, you wish you could live the way I do." If the older person responds that his concern is not about his own life at the moment but about the hippie's, the pat answer is that older people often use their worry as a means of subjugating the young. For the hippie, therefore, to avoid hurting his elders would be an unthinkable caving-in to pressure, a loss of his own integrity.

A clear difference between the hippies of today and their parents-when-young is that the parents handled their not so uncolorful rebellion discreetly and in the fear, if not of God, then of their parents. The hippies, on the other hand, through their ambivalent behavior—pregnancies out of wedlock, diaries left open to shocking pages—or their unambivalent appearance, trumpet their rebellion and thus challenge their parents, if not God, to smite them down.

A clear difference between the parents of today and their parents is the reluctance to smite the young down. Rarely is the cry "Never darken my doorstep" heard in the land; infrequently are the old expletives "impertinence" or "insolence" dusted off.

Instead, many concerned squares, either to keep open the paths of communication, or to help their almost-grown child, under whose truculence they think they hear a muted cry for help, or simply in the generic American willingness to admit that oneself may have goofed, are making the supreme effort to dissolve their own crystallized hierarchy of values into liquidity again. Is it possible, these parents ask themselves (or their spouse), that their dismay at their hippie is, in part, based on their own fear of loss of job, or of respect by their neighbors, or of approval by relatives?

In any event, some men and women in their 40's and 50's are putting themselves through, for a second time, the anxieties, even the agonies, of what is now called the "identity crisis"—it used to be called "growing pains." (One frantic parent in an attempt to have a hard-core hippie's marriage took LSD with the couple; the marriage did not survive, and the parent barely so.)

While the lucky parents can dissolve their value-system and re-establish one that does not make their whole past life seem futile, the unlucky ones may look back on the various crossroads of life and think, too late, that they took the wrong turn. The young person, through his unintentionally cruel questioning, may be topping Humpty Dumpty at a time in life when all the king's horses and all the psychiatrists cannot put Humpty Dumpty together again.

Those now over 40 were often burdened by their late-Victoriann and pre-Freudian parents with a harsh conscience, a tendency to overblame themselves. They are sandwiched between a generation that questioned too little and a generation that questions too much. They themselves never had the white meat of the turkey. When they were children, the best parts were saved, as a matter of course, for the adults; by the time they grew up, the best parts were being saved, as a matter of course, for the children.

Having been children in an adult-centered world, they are now adults in a child-centered world. And how do they react to finding themselves in this historic tide rip of values? By feeling guilty.

How can parents live through the period when their hippie or demihippie is testing every parental value; when he is busily devaluing the sacrifices they have made; when, in an odd reverse of the historic wheel, his brooding presence is reminiscent of nothing so much as that of a Victorian chaperone as he counts each parental drink, each cigarette, each tranquilizer, each white lie, each hour "wasted" in front of television or in talk about nonultimate matters, each mile above the speed limit (if the parents break the law by way of a car, the hippie argues he can break it by way of drugs?

Here are five main survival suggestions for square parents:

(1) To fight guilt and despair, since these are likely to be both inappropriate and counterproductive. The hippiedemic is in the air, whetted by the media, and it affects young people from united as well as disrupted homes, from permissive and strict ones. Just as parents cannot predict the form of rebellion chosen by the next generation, so they are not individually responsible for it.

(2) To rely on that tough, effective teacher, the parents' ally, Experience. The young person who refuses to learn the easy way will simply have to learn the hard way. But the gnarled old teacher has tended over the generations to keep to the same lesson plan: that the work one loves can be more fun than fun, and that permanent relationships grounded in loyalty are vastly preferable to ephemeral ones.

(3) To distinguish between parental affection and approval: affection is built in, approval must be earned. Though the parents may never fully approve of their grown child—or vice versa—a family, like a nation and a world, can, with effort, make room for diversity.

(4) To try to give an object lesson in tolerance and humor, cheerfully and admittedly borrowing those hippie attitudes that will come in handy for the time of retirement. Whereas the hippie has much to learn about work, the square may have much to learn about leisure, especially in appreciation of the arts and nature. Even before retirement the square may wish to shed some encrusted bugaboos, such as compulsive punctuality or servitude to already announced plans. Indeed, his health may benefit if he learns, as the young say, to "hang easy."

(5) To have hope that within the two years it usually takes for diminishing returns to set in, the hippie will emerge from the dangerous Children's Crusade of his time, the better prepared to cope in middle age with the gyrations of his and his children's century, the twenty-first.

The Control of Crime

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 20, 1967

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of my colleagues and the readers of the RECORD, the following resolution adopted by the State Council of Tennessee, Junior Order United American Mechanics, at its recent meeting in Columbia, Tenn.

In the face of ever-mounting crime rates, I feel that the action of this group is worthy of our thoughtful attention. The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION 2—THE CONTROL OF CRIME

Be it Resolved by the State Council of Tennessee, Junior Order United American Mechanics; that

Whereas, we are advocates of Law and Order, and view with grave concern the soaring increases in crime, especially among our youth; and

Whereas, we believe that the best deterrent to crime is punishment; and

Whereas, it is essential to the enforcement of law that our police forces are adequately well trained in modern techniques of detection, apprehension and prevention of crime; and

Whereas, it is essential that our police forces possess adequate knowledge of the suspects' rights under our Constitution and Laws pertaining to his right to counsel, a speedy trial and rehabilitation; and

Whereas, it is essential that there be a united effort on the part of the police departments, law enforcement officials and communities to achieve such ends; and

Whereas, we believe that this primary purpose of law enforcement is the protection of the society against the criminal and not the criminal against society; now therefore

Be it Resolved by the State Council of Tennessee, Junior Order United American Mechanics, in session assembled this 19th day of August, 1967, at Columbia, Tenn., that all our members be requested to lend their cooperation to all law-enforcing agencies to combat crime, guide youth and educate youth in the arts of good citizenship; and

Be it further resolved that wide-spread publicity be given to this Resolution.

W. S. WHITLEY.
SAM B. HILL.
EARL BREWER.

Motion made by T. P. Lawson. Seconded by Bill Potter, that this resolution be adopted and copies sent to Senators and Representatives. Vote taken and carried.

A New Day for the District of Columbia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 28, 1967

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply honored to be among those present today at the White House for swearing-in ceremonies for Walter Washington, the new Commissioner for the District of Columbia and his deputy, Thomas Fletcher.

President Johnson's remarks on this historic occasion were most appropriate. He called the reorganization of the District government a "new era" for which citizens of the city have waited nearly a century.

He continued:

> This is the day and year when the District emerges into the world of the 20th Century government.

The President had great praise for Mr. Washington—whom he referred to, quite accurately, as "Washington's first Mayor"—and for Mr. Fletcher. Later in the ceremonies, he announced the names of the nine persons he is recommending for the new City Council. It is an impressive list, Mr. Speaker. I cannot overstate my delight at hearing President Johnson announce that his choice for Chairman of the Council is Attorney Max Kampelman, known to many of us as a most able and dedicated person. While I am not personally acquainted with the other eight nominees for the Council, I am impressed by the depth of background they represent and the contributions they have made to their city. I hope the Senate approves the President's recommendations promptly. As Mr. Johnson told the District's new leaders:

> It is up to you to get with it.

Mr. Speaker, I include the text of the President's comments in the RECORD:

> More than ceremony summons us here to the East Room this morning.
>
> We celebrate a new era for the Capital City as we meet here to swear in Walter Washington as Washington's first Mayor, and Thomas Fletcher as his deputy.
>
> The citizens of the District have waited almost a century for this day to come, and all that it symbolizes.
>
> This is the day—and this is the year—that the District emerges into the world of the 20th Century government.
>
> With the recent reorganization plan, the Nation's Capital was liberated from the outworn practices of past years. That reorganization plan equips the city with new machinery to let its government serve the needs of its people.
>
> But the best machinery can function effectively only in the hands of the best men.
>
> I looked across America to try to find these men. And I think we found them—men with the strength and the character and the vision to deal with tough problems. Now, this morning, we commit those problems to their capable hands.
>
> No one here, for a moment, minimizes these problems.
>
> The District's new day comes at a time of real crisis for every American city. And Washington, D.C., the Capital City, represents the American city.
>
> It is alive with promise. And more than any other, it houses the heritage of our history.
>
> But beyond the monuments, urban erosion eats at a city's heart and at a city's hope.
>
> The needs are clear to all of us: Safety on the streets and in our homes; driving crime from our midst; health and education for our children; a decent roof over every family; a good job for every person who is willing to take it. Then every resident can share the pride that stirs every visitor to our Capital.
>
> The leaders who will help to solve those problems know the challenge. They are uniquely qualified to act because their careers have been spent in action, in meeting the needs of cities and the needs of their people.
>
> Together, this team has the energy and the experience to deal responsibly with the great urban and human problems of our time. Together, they will focus those talents on our national capital city.
>
> Mr. Fletcher wrote an outstanding and distinguished record as City Manager of San Diego, California. He brings to his task a deep knowledge of how modern city administration and fiscal planning can work to the benefit of the people.
>
> Mr. Washington brings unsurpassed skills as a city executive. He is taking a very large reduction in salary and making sacrifices to come here to accept this draft from his President. He is an authentic leader and he has devoted a lifetime of effective and inspired work in the cause of good housing, one of our most critical urban needs—to say nothing about what he has done for beautification in the District of Columbia. He has lived and worked on the streets of his home city. And he has said that he is going to travel those streets again, in pursuit of the progress that the people want and the people need and the people desire and expect.
>
> Mr. Mayor, your walk will be long and arduous, but I believe it will be rewarding.
>
> You will walk with the eyes of the Nation on you.
>
> Everything you do will be known. You will live in a goldfish bowl as most of us public servants do. But, Mr. Mayor, and Mr. Deputy Mayor, we wish you well—and bid you godspeed.
>
> Mr. Mayor, and Mr. Fletcher, you won't be walking alone. I am sending to the Senate my recommendations for the District of Columbia City Council.
>
> In filling this Council, it was our goal to find among the 800,000 residents of the District of Columbia nine exceptional men and women to work with you, to work on the team, to assist you in leading the government of the Nation's Capital, to represent the people at all times in this new venture in government that we are undertaking.
>
> We have spent weeks in considering recommendations made to us by organizations, in searching and consulting with the best authorities that we could talk to. We have reviewed hundreds of records and files. We have sought and obtained not only your recommendations, Mr. Mayor and Mr. Fletcher, but those of civic, labor, religious and other leading non-political groups.
>
> Today I am happy to announce the names of those that I recommend to serve on the Council. And if the Senate is willing, they will serve on the Council.
>
> As Chairman, a distinguished Washington attorney, a political scientist, a teacher, a wise counsellor, a leader in bringing educational television and modern transportation to the Nation's Capital, Council Chairman Mr. Max Kampelman.
>
> As Vice Chairman, a crusader for effective government, for broader opportunities, for better housing for all the people, the Pastor of the New Bethel Baptist Church—the Reverend Walter Fauntroy.
>
> Very deeply involved in the life of the city, honored as an outstanding citizen, an innovator in the field of programs for the young people of the District and Director of one of Washington's most successful youth projects, the Roving Leaders—Mr. Stanley Anderson.
>
> A leader in church activities, a fighter against discrimination, an eminent attorney, Mrs. Margaret A. Haywood.
>
> A second-generation Washingtonian, a leader in the District's Head Start Program, a worker for better housing, Mr. John Nevius.
>
> President of the Washington Urban League, a respected member of the community, an outstanding lawyer, a past President of the National Bar Asociation, Mr. William Thompson.
>
> A labor leader who knows the prolems of the workingman, who fought for the minimum wage, who has spent a lifetime of service in the cause of labor, a man who has made many contributions to helping his fellowman and to improving his city, Mr. J. C. Turner.
>
> One of 13 children, a lifelong resident of the District, and at present an executive at IBM, he finds the time to teach high school dropouts at night, Mr. Joseph Yeldell.
>
> A life-time Washington resident, an editor, a civic leader, active in the District's family and child welfare programs, Mrs. Polly Shackelton. Mrs. Shackelton this morning is observing conditions in Montreal as a background for what she is going to be called on to do here and cannot be present.
>
> These nine citizens, we believe, be a genuine voice for the people of Washington. We think they represent this city. We believe they know and understand and will certainly learn all about its urgent problems.
>
> I hope the Senate will act promptly so that the new city government can move rapidly from promise to performance.
>
> With them, Mayor Washington, you and your Deputy Mayor Fletcher can now show America what concerned and aroused municipal leaders can do. You can improve the lives of your fellow citizens. You can transform this city into a proud home for all the people.
>
> Some of the most enlightened Members of the Congress, who at great sacrfice to themselves, have fought for years for a better government for the District of Columbia, are here this morning. We are grateful to all of you for having come.
>
> Now, Mr. Mayor and Mr. Deputy Mayor and City Councilmen, it is up to you to get with it. And you had better learn these Congressmen and Senators.

"Food Stamps Continue"—Editorial From Washington Post

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 28, 1967

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I had the pleasure of attending, with members of the House Committee on Agriculture, the ceremonies in the Rose Garden of the White House when President Johnson signed the bill to authorize appropriations for the food stamp program for the 1968 and 1969 fiscal years. I was deeply grateful for the successful outcome of the legislative battle to prevent this highly effective food utilization program from being terminated for lack of authorization legislation.

When he signed the bill, the President pointed out that we had the food, the know-how, and the compassion to end hunger and malnutrition in this country, and, of course, the food stamp program is a vital aspect of the fight against hunger. In addition, as the President noted, we have the national school lunch program and the new Child Nutrition Act.

This morning the Washington Post, in an editorial entitled "Food Stamps Continue," described the food stamp program as the best device at hand for "ending the paradox of want in the midst of plenty, the anomaly of hunger in a land of abundance." The editorial states that the food stamp program is no cureall for the most impoverished, and of course, that is true—the poor need more than food. But it should be possible—and I have maintained this right along—for every needy family which can qualify by income and assets to participate in the program, and every effort should be made by Federal and State authorities, perhaps with the assistance of local philanthropic organizations, to assure that every family which can qualify is able to purchase the stamps. The food stamps constitute the best investment the family and the community could possibly make in the health and welfare of undernourished children and members of their families, and in the wellbeing of the elderly not otherwise able to eat properly.

The 2-year authorization for continued appropriations for the food stamp program will provide the Department of Agriculture and the States with a sound base upon which to plan for further expansion and improvement of the program. Therefore, I want to thank my many colleagues in the House whose support, work, understanding, and votes led to the enactment of the new food stamp law signed yesterday.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I submit as part of my remarks the editorial in this morning's Washington Post referred to above, as follows:

Food Stamps Continue

Under the law which Congress somewhat belatedly enacted, the food stamp plan will go forward for another two years with an appropriation of $425 million. It would have been an extraordinary lapse of good sense and sound policy if the plan had not been continued.

It is an ingenious method for multiplying the effective purchasing power of people who are unable to obtain the food they require through ordinary marketing channels. It is no cure-all for the most impoverished, as the situation in Mississippi's backward areas demonstrated this year. Those at the very bottom of the ladder have difficulty finding the money needed to buy the stamps so they can use their multiplied purchasing power in stores.

Nevertheless, it has improved the diets of millions of families who need some help with food budgets. It has facilitated the movement of vast amounts of foodstuffs to deserving people wtihout setting up the enormous bureaucracy that would be needed if government were to dole out rations through government distribution centers. There are no better devices at hand for ending the paradox of want in the midst of plenty, the anomoly of hunger in a land of abundance.

Foreign Affairs: From Cortez to Castro

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD J. IRWIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 27, 1967

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, in Wednesday's New York Times there was an article by C. L. Sulzberger entitled "Foreign Affairs: From Cortez to Castro" which describes in detail the success that the Venezuelan Government has had in repressing the efforts of Fidel Castro to communize Venezuela. It is my belief that this success is not unrelated to our efforts in Vietnam. If we fail to meet our commitments there, it is certain to encourage these elements that have tried to subvert democratic government in Venezuela. The article follows:

Foreign Affairs: From Cortez to Castro

(By C. L. Sulzberger)

Caracas, Venezuela.—For six years Fidel Castro has been trying hard to communize Venezuela Cuban style. But, to use the vernacular of Havana University's erstwhile star pitcher, he hasn't reached first base.

This country is an obvious target. Geographically it is convenient—just a boatride south of Fidel's stronghold—and with long deserted beaches. It is immensely rich, a center of vast U.S. investment. It is psychologically important to Latin America as Bolivar's birthplace and an admirable keystone, linking subversive possibilities in South and Central America.

CASTRO-FALTERS

Nevertheless, since the apogee of Castro's efforts in 1962–63, his movement has faltered. Dr. Leandro Mora, the interior Minister, estimates that less than fourscore guerrillas are operating here today and that the roster of active Communists, including all varieties, numbers less than 15,000.

This doesn't mean Caracas is either happy with the present situation or smug about the future as its bitter complaints to U.N. and the Organization of American States confirm. Venezuela resents Cuban intervention in its internal affairs and seeks to muster political support against Castro meddling.

This Government is proud that it has managed to shrug off the tradition of military dictatorship from which Latin America suffered so long. It suspects Castro hopes to stir up enough trouble so that some worried army officer might again try and seize power. Then the liberals would be tempted to join in opposition with the left.

Whatever his strategic plan, the Cuban boss has certainly intervened, sponsoring insurrection and acknowledging his material aid. Since 1963 he has dispatched occasional small but troublesome shipments of arms and trained guerrilla experts.

At some length I interviewed Capt. Manuel Espinoza Diaz of the Cuban Army, who told me he had spent months with Communist guerrillas in western Venezuela before being captured in Caracas last month. He admitted to being a regular officer trained for overseas insurrection, although he claims he thought he was being prepared for African revolutions, based on Brazzaville. Yet he knows no French.

Espinoza came here with a group under Luben Petkoff, a Venezuelan Communist of Bulgarian ancestry. Despite his assumed mask of smiling stupidity (belied by study of his taped confessions), Espinoza was clearly well regarded in Havana. He received expert training in subversion. Furthermore, he claims he was the last Cuban to see Camilo Cienfuegos, one of Castro's two closest friends, who disappeared on an airplane flight in 1959 amid rumors of assassination. The other closest friend, Che Guevara, hasn't been seen in years despite rumors he is in Bolivia, Espinoza personally suspects he's dead.

CONFUSION AND TERROR

Cubans and Venezuelans trained in Cuba have sought to spread confusion here by guerrilla activities in the back country and terror in the cities. The most dramatic act of terror was the kidnapping, torture and murder of the Foreign Minister's brother early this year. Havana has applauded these events and claimed it helped.

Yet the insurrection graph is going down. Caracas claims only four guerrilla outfits remain in the field and they total but 76 members. The Government insists they have received negligible aid from the local population and that the political steam has seeped out of the movement because of the split between pro-Soviet and pro-Chinese Communism. The Russian-school leftists now oppose insurrection, leaving a minority of Fidelistas and Maoists in the field. Espinoza told me the guerrillas he was with were demoralized by these schisms.

While insurgency is on the decline—although not, as Caracas hastily points out, for lack of Cuban effort—the difficulty remains that a handful of trouble makers, if properly schooled, can do considerable damage almost anywhere.

Venezuela's guerrilla front (F.A.L.N.) probably isn't as big as Al Capone's gang or Cosa Nostra in the United States (and is also, let us concede, far more nobly insired), but their aim was not the overthrow of the U.S. Government. Moreover, when considering the enormous impact tiny but well-organized groups can have, one should remember this has always been especially true of Latin America.

From Cortez to Castro bold conquistadors have managed to flummox disorganized societies when they attacked. Fortunately, Venezuela shows encouraging signs of developing a far more vibrant and resistant structure than either Montezuma or Batista.

Where Are They Now?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 28, 1967

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, "Where Are They Now?" is a regular feature in the Washington Post's Newsweek magazine and deals with celebrities of the past.

In the October 2d issue, the subject of the question is Roscoe Turner, one of the pioneers of aviation whose feats in the 1930's are still remembered by aviation buffs of today. Roscoe Turner is still the warm-hearted, lovable individual who rode in a plane with a lion as his companion.

His mustache is still as waxed and his eye as sharp as it ever was. He has never lost his zest for aviation and lives it every day; and above all, he lives in the future and not in the past.

I salute Roscoe and his charming wife, Madonna. I'm proud to be his friend.

The article is as follows:

Where Are They Now?—Days of Monoplanes and Pylons

Natty in his sky-blue tunic, fawn-colored trousers, gleaming boots and crimson flying helmet, Roscoe Turner cut a flamboyant figure in the airplane races of the 1930s. The sport of closed-course racing around pylons continues to attract enthusiasts: 50,000 spectators turned out to watch the 65 airplanes compete in last weekend's National Air Show in Reno, Nev. But former speed-king Turner thinks air races are a drag now. "It's not like in my day," he says, "when we were the experimental laboratory in aviation." Turner, 72, has scarcely slowed since the days he was winning the Thompson Trophy three times, the Harmon Trophy twice and breaking seven transcontinental speed records: last month, in a T–38 jet, he made his first flight through the sound barrier. He flies often in his job as the wealthy board chairman of the Roscoe Turner Aeronautical Corp. in Indianapolis, a Beech aircraft distributor. He lives with his second wife, Madonna, in a Tudor-style house on a 4-acre estate (an auto fancier, he includes in his collection a 1929 Packard phaeton and a 1960 Bentley).

A Mississippi farm boy who learned to fly under Billy Mitchell in World War I, Turner, along with Howard Hughes, Eddie Rickenbacker and Jimmy Doolittle, was one of America's most famous fliers. But few air aces had Turner's flair for self-promotion: he waxed his mustache and flew in his Wedell-Williams monoplane speedster—with his lion mascot Gilmore in the seat next to him. Gilmore logged 25,000 miles before he outgrew the cockpit. The lion died in 1953, is now stuffed and displayed in Turner's trophy room. So dashing was Turner that he was the model for Zack Mosley's comic strip hero, Smilin' Jack. He also starred with Jean Parker in the 1939 film "Flight at Midnight." But if he was flamboyant, he was durable too. "I was the only one who raced for ten years," he says. "I was a headline maker longer than any other man in aviation—for over fifteen years." He retired from competition in 1939, but continues to fly "anything I can get my hands on." And, not surprisingly, Turner has high praise for today's fliers. "They are the finest men there are in the world. Physically and mentally they are daredevils."

A Tribute to New York's Medical Men

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 28, 1967

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, Greater New York's Blue Shield United Medical Service, Inc., has recently published the following tribute to the fine doctors who practice in my State and city, and who sometimes leave their homes to bring their healing arts to others in less developed areas of the world.

I am pleased to commend Blue Shield's pamphlet to the attention of our colleagues:

MESSAGE FROM CHARLES M. BRANE, M.D., CHAIRMAN, BOARD OF DIRECTORS, BLUE SHIELD

The year 1966 saw many outstanding successes in the fight against disease and illness that is being continually waged by our doctors and hospitals.

These victories, significant as they are, must not obscure the fact that the one priceless quality every doctor, has over and above his professional competence, is the humanity that motivates him.

Since Blue Shield is one of the prime spokesmen for our physicians, we have prepared this series of vignettes which depict the humanity and dedication of medical people in general, of New York area doctors and nurses in particular.

These stories have a common theme: Wherever there is human suffering, there you will find doctors and nurses serving, manifesting their concern for others and striving to help. In New York City, Upstate New York, Long Island, on a hospital ship in a strange port, or in Vietnam, medical people, with whom we are proud to be associated, are helping others.

Greater New York's Blue Shield is pleased to offer this small tribute to the dedication of doctors and medical people in its operating area.

THEY'RE NOT ALL THAT RARE

Women doctors love to tell this story: A woman physician was leaving the home of a patient. "Wait a minute," she was asked. "I'd like you to meet my youngsters." When they appeared the mother said, "See children, *this* is a woman doctor."

Actually, women doctors aren't all that rare. In fact, there are over 15,000 in the United States today, 900 of them in Manhattan alone. Their skills are as varied as the shades of lipstick they wear. Some are gynecologists; obstetricians or pediatricians treating only women and children. But many are in general practice and in many specialty fields.

Women physicians take pride in pointing out that they bring to the practice of medicine many unique qualities, just because they are women. But they also note that they practice in the same scientific way as their male colleagues.

It was New York City's Dr. Elizabeth Blackwell who, in 1845, began the first crusade to allow women to receive a medical education and to practice in this country. She opened the New York Infirmary in 1857. Another woman doctor was the administrator of the world's first clinic for mentally retarded children, also in New York City. A woman doctor was once head of New York City's Board of Health and another was president of the Bronx County Medical Society.

Even among such purposeful women, white-haired, 57-year-old Dr. Virginia Apgar, who retired recently as clinical director of anesthesiology at Columbia-Presbyterian's Physicians and Surgeons Hospital, stands tall. A person of extraordinary energy and passion for work, she's now director of birth defects research for the National Foundation—March of Dimes.

As surgeon, anesthesiologist and humanitarian, Dr. Apgar received the Westchester Federation of Women's Clubs 1966 award as "The Woman of the Year." It is made annually to "that American woman who has achieved outstanding recognition in her chosen field."

Dr. Apgar was the first professor of anesthesiology at Columbia-Presbyterian and the first woman physician ever to hold a full professorship there. She's best known though, for devising the Apgar Score, a method used to gauge the health of newborn infants.

"After being present at 17,000 births I became aware that the focus was on the mother rather than the baby," she recalls. "Often a child wasn't examined until hours or days after birth. Then, if defects were detected, precious time for treatment was already lost."

So, Dr. Apgar—known as "Ginnie"—developed her checklist to be used within 60 seconds after birth. Heart rate, respiration, muscle tone, color and many other things are evaluated. If any of the tests aren't right doctors can go to work immediately to discover what's wrong.

As medical innovator, doctor and woman, Virginia Apgar will have left a mark for years to come.

WORLD'S MOST WELCOME SHIP

"That a ship flying only the flag of humanity could come and bring only good, and leave and ask nothing but understanding, is a wonderful thing."

So says 27-year-old Beverly Ann Brecken, of Port Chester, N.Y., a public health nurse who spent most of 1966 abroad the privately-financed S. S. Hope, a hospital ship staffed by American medical volunteers that leaves behind a cargo of good will wherever she sails.

Project Hope (Health Opportunity For People Everywhere) just may be America's most effective effort in international understanding. Visiting needy nations, she cares for the sick. It's a quiet sort of thing, with few headlines. But the Hope's good works are not soon forgotten.

For the 10 months blonde, hazel-eyed Beverly Ann was abroad, the world's most welcome vessel was tied to a dock at Corinto, a small port city on the Pacific coast of Nicaragua. This was the Hope's fifth mission. Since her maiden voyage in 1960, the hospital ship has been a visiting cener of medical teaching and treatment in Indonesia, South Vietnam, Peru and Guinea. This year the Hope will visit Colombia.

Everywhere she goes, the S.S. Hope is a white symbol of America's concern for the suffering. Doctors from the United States donate their services for two months at a time, flying in rotation to and from wherever the ship is berthed at the moment. Nurses get only token pay. All are typical of the new breed of medical missionaries who are helping to bring health to many medical-poor nations around the world.

In Nicaragua, the Hope's dedicated medical staff performed 1,551 major operations and treated 25,000 people. More than 150,000 immunizations—against polio, tetanus, whooping cough and diphtheria—were given.

Beverly Ann remembers vividly one trip to give immunizations in the mountain village of Achuapa: "We rode for hours aboard a 1900-vintage train. Then, in driving rain, we switched to horses. I'd never ridden a horse before. It was three and a half hours of positive thinking. We forded streams, went up rocks, down rocks, around rocks."

The Hope's public education programs traveled widely. Children laughed and shouted at Walt Disney movies on the importance of boiling water, how to avoid parasites, digging a safe well, or the danger of flies.

Maternity clinics and clinics for tuberculosis, babies and diabetes were established. In Corinto, housewives held health classes in their homes. The staff from the Hope used colorful charts and other visual aids to demonstrate how to brush teeth properly, why vegetables should be washed before eating, explain the importance of a balanced diet and the health reasons for wearing shoes.

"My most satisfying work was with the children," Beverly Ann remembers. "I'll never forget their big, brown eyes and sweet, shy smiles."

When the Hope—the principal activity of the People-to-People Health Foundation—left Corinto last November to return to the U.S. for overhaul, some 20,000 people lined the dock and adjoining beach. There was no ceremony, no speechmaking, just simple Nicaraguan people coming to tell their friends from the north how much they appreciated the peaceful visit.

THE INSULT SUPREME

Burns, one of the greatest insults to which the human body can be subjected, are a worldwide calamity. More than 8,000 persons die from burns in the United States each year, and another 300,000 are hospitalized.

One morning last winter, a siren-screaming ambulance delivered one of these victims to the emergency room of the Vassar Brothers Hospital in Poughkeepsie, N.Y. He was a migrant worker, who wandered the roads. He had no money, no hospital or medical insurance.

Seeking shelter from the cold, the 41-year-old man had climbed into an abandoned car behind a garage on the banks of the icy Hudson. He fell asleep with a lighted cigarette in his hand and set himself and the car afire. By the time police were attracted by the flames, and pulled him free, 34 percent of his body—scalp, face, neck, shoulders, chest, arms, hands—was seared with second- and third-degree burns. Smoke from the burning upholstery had poisoned his lungs.

"He was wearing only a pair of socks when we got him," remembers Mrs. Mary Haight, 23, the nurse on duty in the hospital emergency room at 8:30 that Sunday morning. "Everything else was burned off. His hair was all gone. He was in a lot of pain."

Mrs. Haight, two other nurses and an intern worked swiftly. A painkiller was administered. A surgeon, on his hospital rounds, was summoned to the ground-floor emergency room.

As the man's damaged lungs gasped for air, the surgeon ordered a tracheotomy. Skillfully, he made an incision in the throat. A tube from a suction pump was inserted. Fluids were started, blood samples taken.

Two and a half hours after arrival, fluids still flowing into him from suspended bottles, the semi-conscious man was wheeled upstairs two floors to the intensive care unit.

Mrs. Janet Kochis, 25, the nurse in charge of the unit, and her assistants moved to help. New suction pump tubes were attached. Constant blood pressure readings were taken. More fluids were given—over 7,300 cc in the first 72 hours in the hospital alone. The loss of regular body fluids through open burn wounds can impair or slow down the function of such vital organs as the kidneys, heart or liver, causing death.

The major cause of burn deaths, though, is infection. Within 24 hours after an injury as many as 100 million deadly bacteria can invade each gram of blistered or charred body tissue. On the third day, the Poughkeepsie victim's open wounds were covered with his first dressings as a protection against contamination. He was shifted from intensive care to a private room for further protection.

Nurses stayed on duty around the clock. On the 12th day a urinary tract infection flared up. Fever was 104°. A specialist was called. The crisis passed. Stil the care continued, over 200 hours of special nursing duty a week, for just one person.

During the third week the victim's temperature began to come down. His blood pressure returned almost to normal. Appetite increased. Breathing was better.

Skin grafting, to cover the deep burns, began in the fourth week. There was more in the fifth week. stil more in the seventh.

The man's son was located—he was serving in the Army. The youth arrived one day 2½ months after his father was burned, and took him out of the hospital. Outpatient treatment continued. Today the man is at work. A lot of his hair is gone. He has permanent scars on his scalp, neck, chest and arms. But he's alive.

The estimated hospital, nursing, medical and doctor's costs for this one case were more than $12,000.

From the beginning, everyone knew they wouldn't be paid. It didn't matter. This was humanity at work. Everything else was secondary. The measure of medicine is the therapy.

THEY FILL A NEED

Far out on Long Island last year, a father of four children, returning home from his night job, dozed at the wheel of his car. He crashed head-on into a truck.

Although the accident occurred near a very small town, there were two physicians at the scene in a hurry. They treated the victim, began intravenous feeding for shock. They called the well-equipped hospital at Riverhead, 20 miles away. Three surgeons and more blood plasma were waiting for the injured man when he arrived there by ambulance. The two country doctors continued treatment along the way. By the time the victim reached the hospital he was out of shock. Nine weeks later he was back at work.

It was not just luck that the two doctors who saved this man's life were practicing medicine in the small Long Island town. They were there because the American Medical Association has a special committee to provide physicians for towns in need of them.

The A.M.A. has 78 such committees, all working on different problems. Top doctors volunteer to serve on them. No matter what health problem you name, the best medical brains in the country, through national, state and local groups, are tackling it. Their reports, conferences and exhibits keep the nation's 200,000 doctors informed. The result is that everyone's doctor always has the best of his colleagues helping him.

The greatest asset that anyone can have is good health. But modern medicine, with all its specialties and new discoveries, is complicated. Patients have every right to ask, "How do I know I am getting the best care?"

One way proper care is assured is by the rigorous tests and continuing study required of doctors to qualify them for a specialty after completing their initial long medical training. In addition, once they begin practice, committees of doctors constantly check on how they meet professional standards.

"There are medical review committees in hospitals," reports Dr. Waring Willis, chairman of the New York State Society's Commission on Standards of Medical Care. "They study case records to make sure that preset ideals are met. These doctor-staffed committees are constantly being exchanged among hospitals so colleagues are not auditing each other."

No other profession makes as many tests of members' competence as does medicine. Many things are looked for: Was the operation necessary? Were the best procedures used? If something is wrong, the committees pinpoint it.

All of this is time-consuming. The average doctor spends 15 to 20 percent of his time on committee work or in postgraduate study to keep abreast of medical changes and advances. It is work for which he is never paid. It's part of his life-long responsibility and education.

Often, committee doctors take direct action to get things done that will make the country healthier and safer. For example, ten years ago, hardly anyone bought a car with seatbelts installed. That year the AMA Committee on Medical Aspects of Automotive Safety began to crusade for them. Today, seat belts are standard equipment.

Patients seldom hear about such contributions. But they are taken to improve health and life for everyone.

MEDICAL SAMARITAN

Two barefoot South Vietnamese farmers carried a neighbor into the Tra Vinh provincial hospital in the steaming Mekong Delta south of Saigon. There was a gaping wound in his neck.

"A tracheotomy," the hospital's American doctor decided after a quick examination. In a few days the farmer was learning to speak again by holding his finger over the tube in his throat. He told of being attacked by Viet-Cong guerrillas while working in his rice paddy. They had cut his throat with a pair of rusty scissors.

Typical of these American medical Samaritans is Dr. Samuel W. Mills, Jr., a Middletown, N.Y., surgeon. He was a volunteer in a continuing humanitarian program under which U.S. doctors serve 60 days without pay in South Vietnam's pathetically few and poorly-equipped civilian medical facilities.

These dedicated physicians staff 16 provincial hospitals but are only a patch on local medical needs. With a population of about 16 million, South Vietnam has fewer than 1,000 physicians, and only 200 are in fulltime civilian practice. The rest are either in the armed forces or engaged in teaching. Several provinces with populations in the hundreds of thousands have no doctor at all.

Transportation problems, Viet Cong activity, and other obstacles often make it difficult for the Americans to carry out their work. Medical supplies are hard to come by. At Tra Vinh, Dr. Mills often used rubber gloves with the tips cut off as valves for chest drainage. Traction devices were made of old plumber's pipe, clotheslines and bricks.

The Tra Vinh hospital itself, old and antiquated, was overcrowded. Two to three patients to a bed were common. Sanitation was scant. In the surrounding countryside, rare and exotic diseases flourished. Four-fifths of the population had been infected at one time or another with trachoma. Lepers roamed the streets.

"The maternal death rate was 25 times higher than in America," says Dr. Mills. "More than half the children never reach their fifth birthday. Life expectancy is only 35 years. Nowhere is the water safe for drinking."

On top of all this, the toll of civilian war wounded mounts each day. It was to help ease this suffering that 44-year-old Dr. Mills—the third generation of his family to practice medicine in Middletown—entered the American Medical Association's Volunteer Physicians for Vietnam program. He was given his transportation and an expense allowance of $10 a day. Otherwise his services were entirely unpaid.

"I have four children and I got the idea that young people today think that the adult establishment is preoccupied with materialism," says Dr. Mills. "I welcomed the idea to show some grain of idealism."

Arriving in Vietnam, he was told: "You are not a surgeon or a cardiologist or any other specialist any more. You're a doctor, and you do whatever there is to be done."

At Tra Vinh, though constantly harassed and terrorized by the Viet Cong, Dr. Mills did do everything. "Dau" (pain) was everywhere. Ten or 12 major operations were the average every day. He says of the hospitalized: "They bleed like hell and die like flies."

When he returned home, Dr. Mills was honored as Middletown's 1966 "Citizen of the Year." In giving the award, A. N. Romm, editor of the Middletown *Times Herald-Record*, applauded:

"Primarily, what Dr. Mills did in going to Vietnam was to make a voyage of conscience. He told his children and all children that the adult world isn't always and hopelessly materialistic."

FINDING THE RIGHT SPOT

A small factory had to cease operations when a vital piece of machinery broke down. The firm's mechanics couldn't get the thing working again, so an outside expert was called in. He looked the situation over for a couple of minutes, then took a hammer and tapped the machine at a certain spot. It started running beautifully.

When the expert submitted a bill for $100, the plant owner hit the ceiling. He demanded an itemized statement. The expert wrote one out: "For hitting machine, $1; for knowing where to hit, $99."

Helping other doctors find the right spot to hit are learned specialists in laboratory medicine. They are known as pathologists. Few physicians today will make a final diagnosis of any major ailment—tuberculosis, cancer, diabetes, pernicious anemia, thyroid disease, to name just a few—without the assistance of one of these skilled medical detectives.

What the pathologist finds is always shared with the patient's own doctor, who combines the laboratory results with his own watchful eye, alert ear, tactful finger, and logical mind to arrive at a final diagnosis and treatment.

The skill of these scientific factfinders was typified last year by a case at the Northern Westchester Hospital in Mt. Kisco.

A 42-year-old woman went to her family physician. "I don't feel right," was about all she could tell him. He could find no objective evidence of anything wrong. Still the woman complained. She was admitted to the hospital for further checking.

Dr. Robert A. Fox, 57, one of the nation's 5,000 certified pathologists, who is director of Northern Westchester's laboratories as well as chief of its medical staff, took over, along with his technicians. In three days' time more than 20 tests were performed. Blood, liver, kidneys, heart, esophagus, stomach—the functions of all were examined. Nothing appeared abnormal.

Dr. Fox, a quiet man who has kept company with a miscroscope most of his professional life, consulted again with the patient's doctor. "Let's try a liver scan," he suggested.

In this procedure a radioactive dye is concentrated in the liver. An electronic scanner traces the dye and records its tracings on sensitized paper and the pathologist then analyzes it for lightened or darkened spots which might be indications of abnormality.

"We found an abnormal spot," Dr. Fox recalls. "But what was it? An abscess? A tumor? Cyst?"

To find out for sure, the woman's doctor decided upon an exploratory operation. A surgeon was consulted. Next morning the operation was performed. An abscess was located deep in the liver. The contents were drained, and a section of tissue was cut away from the outer edge of the abscess. Both were examined by Dr. Fox, who used, among other tools, a 450-power microscope.

The patient had hardly returned to her own room from the operating theater when Dr. Fox reported his findings: The woman's liver had been invaded by amoeba, probably through contaminated water or food, and they were destroying the tissues. With this precise knowledge, the woman's doctor prescribed specific drugs. Within a month she was fully recovered.

Challenges like these give pathologists an immense satisfaction in their work.

"I can see positive benefits," says Dr. Fox. "I know I am helping to transfer knowledge to application."

SOME GOT HEADLINES

Since the Nobel prizes were established in 1901 under the will of Alfred Bernhard Nobel, the Swedish inventor of dynamite, 89 of these prestigious awards have gone to the

United States. Twenty-seven have been for achievements in medicine. The last two were given last year.

The 1966 medical laureates were Dr. Charles B. Huggins, 65, professor of surgery at the University of Chicago, and Dr. Francis Peyton Rous, 87, pathologist at Rockefeller University in New York City, who were honored jointly for their research in cancer. Dr. Huggins was cited for his discoveries concerning hormonal treatment of cancer of the prostate; Dr. Rous for his discovery of tumor-inducing viruses. For Dr. Rous, the prize crowned a long list of honors dating back to 1910.

Medical scientists don't work for prizes. They never deliberately seek recognition. Yet hundreds of New York area doctors were honored in 1966 for courage and creativity on many medical fronts. Some of them got headlines; others were saluted only by their colleagues.

Dr. George Emile Palade, of Rockefeller University's Department of Cytology, was a double winner. He received two of the nation's highest awards for biological reserach within ten days last November. First came the $10,000 Albert Lasker Basic Medical Research Award for 1966, followed by the $6,500 T. Duckett Jones Memorial Award of the Helen Hay Whitney Foundation.

Dr. Palade, a black-haired, dark-eyed, trim, courtly, 54-year-old Romanian-American, has altered many long-held concepts about the structure and function of the human cell. His goal is to define all the patterns of these incredibly small and fantastically complex structures, and thus perhaps find answers to some of the mysteries of cancer and other unconquered diseases.

Some of the other honors won by area doctors:

Dr. Erwin H. Rock of Yonkers, N.Y., was cited by the American Academy of Ophthalmology and Otolaryngology for outstanding contributions to medical education through motion pictures, particularly color films he took of operations in which he reconstructed ears for children born deaf and whose hearing never developed.

Dr. Robert W. Winters, professor of pediatrics, College of Physicians and Surgeons, won the American Academy of Pediatrics E. Mead Johnson Award for his original and unique contributions to the understanding of the biochemical and physiological mechanisms controlling acid-base equilibrium and electrolyte metabolism.

Dr. Elvin A. Kabat, a professor of microbiology at Columbia University, received the 1966 Karl Landsteiner Memorial Award of the American Association of Blood Banks for demonstrating, among other things, that antibodies are gamma globulins and that immunologic reactions may be studied quantitatively.

The list is long. Goals are demanding and exact. Courage walks through the laboratories in step with creativity. Persistence and patience are paramount.

It was back in 1911 that Nobel Prize winner Dr. Rous made one of his first major breakthroughs in the war against cancer, indicating that the disease may be spread by viruses. In World War I, he developed techniques for storing blood that are still used today. He cleared the way for modern ways of treating liver and digestive diseases in the 1920s. With a co-worker in the '30s, Dr. Rous devised an ingenious system of isolating certain cells from the bloodstream by use of a magnet, which opened up whole new areas of research on blood cells and antibodies. And Dr. Rous' wide-ranging work and discoveries go on.

New York's doctors and medical scientists never stop the search. Science still does not know what makes the blood clot, or the heart beat, or why cells run wild and become cancerous, or why some babies are born imperfect.

For physicians, as for mariners, the prayer remains:

"Oh, Lord, Thy Sea is so vast and my bark is so small . . ."

RESEARCH, ALWAYS RESEARCH

"We must make sure no life-saving discovery is locked up in the laboratory," President Lyndon B. Johnson told directors of the National Institutes of Health at a meeting in the White House in June 1966.

New York's medical researchers affirms this belief in many ways, spending lonely, isolated days or weeks or years trailing elusive truths and trends out of test tubes.

Before there is discovery, everything starts with a dream. Then fantasy becomes fact. New medical knowledge is generated. Trials turn to treatment.

Always, though, there must be research in order to achieve victory. At Brooklyn's Maimonides Medical Center, 48-year-old Dr. Adrian Kantrowitz, son of a general practitioner, has been working for a long time to perfect a device to pump blood artificially, thus allowing the heart organ time to rest while it heals itself.

Last year, for the first time, Dr. Kantrowitz successfully implanted one of his heart pumps inside a heart attack victim. For this advance, he was honored by the Berk Foundation, along with Dr. Michael DeBakey, of Houston, Tex., who is working along a similar but separate line of research.

Far less complicated than Dr. Kantrowitz's manmade heart replacement is the simple rubber band used by Dr. Samuel Karelitz, a pediatrician at Long Island Jewish Hospital, to probe the causes and effects of brain damage in children. Dr. Karelitz has found that a normal baby's bellowing response when a rubber band is snapped on the bottom of his foot is different from that of a baby with brain damage. He has also learned that a brain-damaged child requires more snaps to provoke crying than a normal baby.

Simple as the test sounds, perfecting it was tedious work. "We made recordings of normal infants crying from birth right through the second year of life to learn the chronology of their pre-speech sound," says Dr. Karelitz. "We accumulated thousands of recordings and then we went ahead trying to see if we could detect differences. The brighter infant was found to pass through the stages of crying, gibberish, and speech more quickly than one who ultimately measures a lower intelligence."

Dr. Karelitz's eventual aim is to be able to evaluate intelligence on the basis of the sounds made before speech.

Intricate or simple, medical research into both cure and comfort advances with lengthening strides. It stands—today as tomorrow—a dynamic equilibrium between the generation of knowledge and its effective use to improve health and life.

JAMES WINCHESTER.

To Protect Our Flag

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 20, 1967

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, at the recent meeting of the State Council of Tennessee, Junior Order United American Mechanics, the following resolution supporting legislation to prohibit the desecration to the flag was adopted.

I insert this resolution in the Appendix of the RECORD:

RESOLUTION 1—A FLAG LAW

Be it resolved by the State Council of Tennessee, Junior Order United American Mechanics, that

Whereas, fifty states have laws against the desecration of the flag, but fail to enforce them; and

Whereas, at various places and times in recent years the flag was desecrated; and

Whereas, a demonstration occurred last April in Central Park, New York City, as 100,000 viewed the burning of the Flag, but no arrests were made; and

Whereas, many bills have been introduced in the Congress which would make it a Federal offense, punishable by fine or imprisonment, to burn or desecrate the flag, but are bottled up in the Committee on the Judiciary; now therefore

Be it resolved by the State Council of Tennessee, Junior Order United American Mechanics, in session assembled this 18th day of August, 1967, in Columbia, Tenn., that we advocate speedy action by the Congress on legislation which would make it a Federal offense to burn or desecrate the flag, and to provide a severe penalty therefore; and

Be it further resolved that this resolution be given wide publicity among our membership and that a copy be sent to the Senators and Representatives.

W. S. WHITLEY.
SAM E. HILL.
EARL BREWER.

Motion made by E. L. Eolen. Seconded by Floyd Amos. This resolution be adopted. Vote taken and carried.

War on Poverty Calmed Situations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. O'HARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 28, 1967

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, there continues to be a great deal of discussion in this Congress about the value and effectiveness of the Office of Economic Opportunity. It has been subjected to what I consider unfair and irrational attack. It has, for example, been blamed by some for the tragic riots of the past summer, despite what I feel have been exemplary efforts by OEO to deal with the root causes of the riots. Recently, the Macomb Daily, a newspaper in my district, printed an editorial headlined "In Our Opinion: War on Poverty Calmed Situations." The editorial begins:

> Despite the blasts of critics, the War on Poverty must be doing something right.

It continues by citing the record of OEO work in riot prevention during the past summer. Because I feel this editorial from the Macomb Daily puts the role of OEO in clear focus, I include the editorial in the RECORD:

IN OUR OPINION—WAR ON POVERTY CALMED SITUATIONS

Despite the blasts of critics, the War on Poverty must be doing something right.

In 32 cities in which there were no riots or civil disorders this summer, most of the local authorities credited the summer programs of the Office of Economic Opportunity for helping to prevent violence.

This is what they told the OEO in a nationwide survey in which OEO inspectors talked to mayors, police chiefs, juvenile judges, heads of local Chambers of Commerce and other leading citizens.

Not one police chief or mayor blamed War on Poverty programs for heightening tensions, and in 15 cities, local Community Action Agencies were praised for calming down bad situations in specific instances.

In 14 cities, municipal police departments and CAAs had joint programs to prevent riots. In eight cities, the juvenile arrest rate went down this summer as a result, it is believed, of increased availability of summer jobs.

There is also negative evidence encouraging to the War on Poverty:

In the 32 cities that did experience riots, only 16 of the more than 30,000 CAA employes in those cities were arrested for taking part in them.

More than $300 million worth of property damage was done in riot cities, says the OEO, yet not one of its 244 buildings in the heart of the riot areas was burned or destroyed.

Total damage to Community Action buildings was $1,840 for seven sets of broken windows.

Problems of Federal Debt Management

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD RUMSFELD
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 27, 1967

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, inflation, Federal debt, priorities in spending, taxes, balance of payments, interest rates, and deficit financing are all subjects of major importance in the Congress and the Nation.

Significant contributions to this important economic dialog are made by two recently published articles: "Problems of Federal Debt Management" by our colleague, the gentleman from Missouri, Representative THOMAS B. CURTIS, and "The Inexcusable Inflation" by the Wall Street Journal.

Representative CURTIS, writing in a pamphlet published by National Associated Businessmen, Inc., exposes what he terms the fallacies of the new economics. The Wall Street Journal editorial argues that a "tax increase is a gratuitous insult to the public."

Both articles deserve thoughtful attention. I insert them at this point in the RECORD:

PROBLEMS OF FEDERAL DEBT MANAGEMENT

(By THOMAS B. CURTIS)

(FOREWORD.—The following article was prepared for National Associated Businessmen, Inc. by Congressman Thomas B. Curtis (R-Mo.). It brings to our members and others who read it a fresh and wholesome insight into the vital problems of Federal fiscal policy, particularly those arising from large continuing deficits and a huge and rapidly increasing Federal debt. We believe that this analysis of the "Problems of Federal Debt Management" is one of the best that has been made. It is easily read because of its clarity, non-technical language, and forthright conclusions. It should appeal not only to businessmen but to all others who watch with grave concern the continual decline in the purchasing power of the dollar and the growing threat to the Nation's solvency.

(Congresman Curtis has served in the U.S. House of Representatives continuously since 1951. He is a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, the Joint Economic Committee, the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, and the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress. Although a lawyer by profession, Congressman Curtis is also an able economist. Among his colleagues and his constituents he is known as a man who does his "homework," one sample of which is the article that follows.)

One of the most disturbing aspects of the New Economics (the economic gospel of the present Administratoin) is its lack of concern for the problems of debt and debt management and its concomitant lack of concern about increasing the wealth of the society. It is both unwise and unrealistic to attempt any analysis of the Nation's economic health without considering its wealth and discussing such issues as the proper size of the Federal debt and the probable economic results of additions to the debt at any given time, including the present time.

Anyone who raises questions about the economic soundness of debt financing is likely to face the accusation that he thinks that debt is inherently evil. This accusation is just a straw man, however, designed to disguise the real issues and harsh economic realities which confront us. No one really thinks that debt is evil *per se*. But debt is an economic tool, like fire, which can be very beneficial if properly used and very destructive if misused. Every businessman knows that debt can be wealth-creating, neutral, or wealth-destroying, depending on how the funds acquired by debt are spent. If spent to acquire productive assets and enhance the business' productive capacity, they produce wealth and increase purchasing power. If used to fight a war (protect the wealth we already have) they can eat up our wealth. It is senseless to talk about the merits of debt in the abstract without any consideration of the spending to be made through debt financing. The real question for government is—are the funds borrowed from the public going to be used for permanent additions to the nation's wealth or for temporay income-stimulation schemes (which can eat up wealth)? Wealth in this context means both the nation's stock of physical capital (machinery, buildings, *etc.*) and its equally important stock of human capital (the knowledge within the society and the range of skills in the labor force).

In deciding whether or not to use the tool of debt financing, we must also consider the level of the Federal debt. If the debt is already too high in relation to the economic activity and wealth of the society, we should then be very reluctant to use debt other than to finance emergencies and avoid other projects no matter how worthwhile. Even financing an emergency, such as war (which eats up wealth), requires that the proper debt ratio be sought as soon as possible after the emergency is over.

What should be the proper size of the Federal debt? This question cannot be answered in a vacuum, but must be related to the amount of wealth and economic activity in the society. Common business sense tells us that a corporation with sales of $100 million can support a greater debt burden than a corporation with sales of $1 million, and this is equally true of the Federal government. The economic activity of the society (GNP) through the Federal income tax system constitutes the basis for servicing and financing the Federal debt, and must be related to the amount of debt that can be economically utilized.

Instead of using the Debt-GNP ratio as a point of discussion, the New Economists seek to avoid the very issue they raise by citing the fact that the Federal debt was 124% of GNP in 1946 and was only 45% of GNP in 1966, and then concluding we are in a healthy fiscal situation. They imply that the economy can support a much higher debt at the present time, due to the increase in GNP since 1946. The fallacy in the theory of the New Economists lies in the selection of the year 1946 as a benchmark. Is 1946 the year from which our progress (if any) in debt reduction is to be measured? The United States of necessity financed World War II heavily by debt unparalleled in our nation's history. The question is not what the ratio was in 1946, but what it should be. From 1870 to 1940 the ratio of debt to GNP in peacetime never rose above 20%.

There is little reason for rejoicing at a reduction of this ratio (which took over 20 years) from its swollen post-war peak to a level more than double that which historically prevailed in the periods when the United States was growing most rapidly. The present level of the Federal debt gives little flexibility to cope with possible future wars or economic crises which could require extensive deficit financing.

In addition, two-thirds of the decrease in the burden of the debt (as measured by the debt-GNP ratio) is due to the serious depreciation of the dollar's value since 1946. This is one way to reduce the burden of the debt, because, through inflation, the government can pay off its fixed obligations with dollars that are now worth less. It is, however, a very economically costly and socially inequitable way to reduce the burden of government debt. Inflation, it must be noted, is a consumer tax which hits the low income groups in our society the hardest. We can take little pride in reducing the World War II debt burden in this fashion.

Relating the size of the debt to the level of economic activity in the society is one way to make a judgment on the proper size of the Federal debt. Another way is to relate it to the physical wealth of the Federal government which backs up the debt, just as a bank would look at a business' assets or a small loan company at a family's assets in deciding whether or not to make a loan. We can get some real insights into this ratio by comparing the Federal government's net worth with the net worth of state and local governments and of the private sector (both corporate and household sectors). In an article appearing in the *Morgan Guaranty Survey* (August, 1966), Dr. John W. Kendrick pointed out that in 1900 the Federal government's assets equalled its obligations. By 1958, the Federal government's debt had grown to be 8% greater than its assets.

A favorite contention of the New Economists is that the level of the Federal debt is not too high because the Federal debt is grown much more slowly since 1946 than the debt of state and local governments and the private sector. The statistical part of the argument is accurate. From 1946 to 1966 state and local debt went up by 743% from $13.6 billion to $101.1 billion. During this same period corporate debt increased by 536% while consumer credit rose by 1,131%. These facts are indisputable, but they tell only part of the story. By choosing 1946 as a base year, the New Economists have once again prejudged the argument in their favor. During World War II, while Federal debt was burgeoning, state and local governments actually reduced their debt because shortages of labor and materials made new building impossible for the duration. Similarly, private debt grew only slightly because of these same shortages. A large part of the percentage increase in state and local debt and private debt since 1946 must be attributed to the backlog of demand for construction projects and consumer goods which could not be obtained during the war. Actually what was happening to a large degree was that the ratio between Federal debt and state, local government and private debt was reverting to pre-World War II normalcy.

The argument is also fallacious because it leaves out any mention of the net worth of the various economic sectors. The Federal debt did grow more slowly, but its growth exceeded the growth in Federal assets, causing a decline in the net worth of the Federal government. From 1900 to 1958, the same period studied by Dr. Kendrick, however, the net worth of state and local governments (assets over their obligations) increased from 3% to 6% of the obligations. The surplus of asset holdings over debt obligations for state and local governments increased not only absolutely but as a percentage of total obligations.

A more striking picture holds true in the private sector. A basic reason corporate and consumer debt grew so rapidly in the postwar period was that it was being used to acquire productive assets. Despite rapid debt increases, the share of the nation's wealth owned by non-financial corporations actually increased from 20% in 1929 to 23% in 1958; the share of the nation's wealth owned by non-farm households also went up slightly. For the consumer sector as a whole in 1966 assets of $2.176 trillion balanced against liabilities of $.306 trillion given an astounding net worth figure of $1.870 trillion. These figures leave no doubt that the private sector has learned how to use debt as a tool to increase wealth and the Federal government has not.

It is fair to say that the level of the Federal debt is excessive. The Joint Economic Committee of the Congress recognized this in March in its annual report on the President's Economic Report when all 20 committee members, Democrats and Republicans alike, urged a reduction in Federal non-defense spending to minimize the deficit financing projected in the President's budget for fiscal 1968. The Administration has chosen to disregard this request and refused to consider any reduction in domestic spending. In fact, it has twice deliberately understated spending in order to avoid public demand for cutbacks in the Administration's appropriation requests of the Congress. A recent forecast of the probable deficit for fiscal 1968 was $13.5 billion, but this also contains juggled estimates and is far too low. An indication of how large the deficit might be can be found in the Administration's strenuous fight for an increase in the debt ceiling which gives it the power to run a $29 billion deficit in fiscal 1968. The Administration seeks to blame the war in Vietnam for these deficits.

However, two-thirds of the $28.3 billion increase in Federal expenditures from calendar 1963 through 1966—as measured in the national income accounts—is accounted for by non-defense spending. More recent figures show that over half of the proposed $37 billion increase in spending from fiscal 1966 through fiscal 1968 will be in non-defense programs. The picture should be clear—additions are being made to the Federal debt (which is already too high) either because of a belief in the erroneous theories of the New Economists or because of a lack of the political courage necessary to cut back or defer nonessential domestic programs in the light of increased defense spending.

What difference does it make how large the 1968 deficit is? If the administration relies entirely on debt to finance a deficit of the size presently contemplated ($30 billion), one of the results sure to follow is high interest rates and further inflation. The cost of living increased by 3.7% during 1966, and the increase during 1967 is likely to be at least this large. There is also a danger of having inflation contemporaneous with a serious slump in those sectors of the economy that are most sensitive to interest rate increases, which would decrease the Federal tax revenues. There is no question that marketing $30 billion worth of government securities at a time when private demand for savings is growing will drive interest rates up throughout the economy. Interest rates are now back up to the peak levels achieved last summer, and the homebuilding industry, as well as others, are again starting to feel the pinch. The Federal Reserve Board will have to tighten credit to keep inflation under some control when the Treasury itself is adding to the inflationary forces in the economy by refinancing its old deficits and financing the new one.

Upward pressure on interest rates coupled with a statutory interest rate ceiling of 4¼% on long-term Treasury obligations raises severe problems of debt management for the Treasury. When the market rate of interest is higher than the 4¼% ceiling, the Treasury must move into the short-term capital market for funds. All borrowing has to be in issues of less than 7 years maturity (defined by law as short-term). As a result, the average length of the marketable interest-bearing public debt has declined from 5 years, 4 months in 1965 to 4 years, 5 months in April 1967, with further decline likely. In April 1967, almost 50 percent ($99.7 billion) of the marketable, interest-bearing public debt was due in one year or less, up from $75.3 billion in December, 1960. Last year, the Treasury had to move completely into the short-term money market to refinance the $175 billion of the debt that became due. Increases in this class of Federal obligation (which approaches the liquidity of money) are highly dangerous in a time of inflationary pressure.

The inflation likely to be caused by these deficits would mean a further deterioration in our balance of payments position and an increased gold outflow. Inflation raises the prices which foreigners must pay for U.S. goods, while making foreign goods more competitive and attractive to U.S. customers. Partially as a result of our inflation, the surplus of exports over imports of goods and services declined from $8.5 billion in 1964 to an estimated annual rate of $4.5 billion in the last quarter of 1966. We were barely able to halt a worsening of our overall balance of payments in 1966 by two economically-costly policies: (1) restrictions on U.S. private investment in other countries (which will cut down on our future earnings from foreign investment, a major credit item in our balance of payments): and (2) high interest rates (which encourage a temporary inflow of short-term capital). The balance of payments deficit on the official settlements basis of $7.328 billion in the first quarter of 1967 shows how temporary this inflow was. Even with these damaging policies, the gold stock still declined by $571 million in 1966.

The reason why businessmen should be concerned about Federal deficits is more than the economic ills they cause (which are serious enough). The real danger lies in the remedies proposed by the Administration to cure the economic ills fostered by its own expenditure policy. Invariably, the Administration attempts to restrict or control the private sector through devices like the recently discarded guidelines on wages and prices, the guidelines on private foreign investment, and the Interest Equalization Tax. An Administration which refuses to face up to the economic damage its spending policies are causing is unlikely to avoid stronger, stricter controls on private economic activity if its existing controls prove unsuccessful. This is the danger to businessmen (and indeed to our whole society) posed by unrestricted deficit financing—the danger of increasing governmental control over private economic decisions of all kinds.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Sept. 12, 1967]

THE INEXCUSABLE INFLATION

Several things need to be said about the current, rapidly developing price inflation—which comes on top of considerable inflation in the past couple of years and a great deal of it over the past generation.

First and foremost, it is wholly unnecessary and inexcusable, being manufactured out of indiscipline in Washington. Gardner Ackley, the President's chief economic adviser, may find certain steel price rises distressing; he ought also to admit the Johnson Administration's heavy culpability in creating the conditions that make those and hundreds of other increases inevitable.

Unquestionably the Vietnam war has added a lot to Federal spending and hence to the enormous prospective deficits. The deep intervention in that war may have been the Johnson Administration's paramount mistake, but whether it was or wasn't, financial responsibility plainly required offsetting reductions in other spending. Instead the Administration recklessly increases spending on a host of domestic welfare programs.

To add to the taxpayer's bitterness, the programs are largely wasteful and ineffective; the problems they are aimed a grow worse, not better. Even so extreme a liberal as Senator Robert Kennedy perceives as much. Suddenly he and other liberals are talking of the need to involve private enterprise in the attack on poverty on a much bigger scale than at present, because the Government manifestly is unequal to the task.

Not all liberals, however. Vice President Humphrey, lambasting the "tired people" who oppose "Great Society" programs, insists that the Government can and must carry on the Vietnam war and all the welfare projects. This refusal to face the fact of failure, this determination to perpetuate error, ill become the holder of such high office.

Secondly, inflation is not necessarily proof of a boom. The Government economic planners doggedly maintain that a new boom is under way after a mostly stagnant year, and they could be correct. Yet a number of other economists don't see the evidence for their optimism. In any case, inflation itself can easily become a depressant; consumers bombarded by price boosts on all sides may stop buying on the grand scale to which they have become accustomed.

Finally, the proposed tax increase is no answer to inflation, given the Administration's adament resistance to any kind of restraint at all. Congress may end up enacting it, simply out of fear of the vast deficits in prospect, but to do so is to skip the relevant questions.

There is every reason to believe that if the Administration gets its tax "surcharge" it will boost its outlays that much more than it would otherwise have done. In that event the impact on the deficits will be minimal. Is Congress going to see to it that the surcharge is accompanied by substantial cuts in spending? Not likely.

And what about monetary policy? The Federal Reserve Board, presently an amiable handmaiden at the White House, has been inflating the money supply like crazy. This even more than the deficits (which to a degree can be financed in noninflationary ways) is generating the scourge of price rises. If Congress hikes taxes, is it also going to demand a cessation of that policy? Not likely. If not, the inflation will roll right along.

In the circumstances a tax increase is a gratuitous insult to the public. The Government waters your money by decreasing your purchasing power via inflation and then it confiscates more by the direct route of taxation. We hate to talk about morality in connection with supposedly hard, practical economic matters, but a Government so delinquent in its most fundamental obligations to the people is bound to raise questions of that nature.

The dismaying thing is that so far there is no really loud outcry; hardly anybody utters an audible Stop thief! Even sophisticated bankers and businessmen seem to throw up their hands and figure that that's the way it is—nothing is going to change the Government's wild habits no matter what anybody says.

Perhaps so. But to the extent we the people are silent we too are guilty, guilty of conniving in the undermining of the very financial foundations on which all else is built.

Income Maintenance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 26, 1967

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, in recent years academic theoreticians from various disciplines, and political activists from all sides of the spectrum have proposed one form or other of income guarantees as an answer to many of our social and economic problems. In a penetrating article in the September–October issue of Dissent, Prof. Robert Lekachman, chairman of the economics department of State University of New York, discusses the merits of some of the versions of this proposal.

I commend to my colleagues Professor Lakachman's article entitled "Can More Money End Poverty?":

CAN "MORE MONEY" END POVERTY?

(By Prof. Robert Lekachman)

One of the more tantalizing statistics of the decade is this: for a mere $11 billion we could raise every poor American above the poverty line as poverty is currently and officially defined—an income below $3,130 for a family of four. Now, as the world knows, poverty may be a great deal more than a shortage of money, and giving money to the poor may indeed amount to no more than treating the symptoms of deeper personal and social disorders with financial palliatives. All the same, even within the most sophisticated and sociological definitions of poverty, lack of money is at least part of the condition of the poor. Moreover, as every consumer of aspirin should be able to testify, symptomatic relief is much to be preferred to no relief at all.

Now $11 billion is not much, a mere one and a small fraction per cent of Gross National Product, considerably less than half of Vietnam's annual cost, just about the size of the Pentagon's *underestimate* in 1966 of Vietnam expenditure. It must also be said that of all the ways to assist the unfortunate, simple transfer of funds is the simplest, the least niggling, and the most respectful of human dignity. Either of two magnificently efficient agencies, the Internal Revenue Service or the Social Security Administration, can handle the affair with infinitely less sweat than the assembled social workers and Welfare Departments of the land who spend substantially smaller sums. No wonder than that economists of very different ideological preferences and diverging motives have come to perceive merit in some version or other of income maintenance as a part or (on occasion) the whole of the assault upon poverty.

This of course raises the question, if the New Conservatives at Chicago join New Frontiersmen at Yale, Harvard, and MIT in favor of income maintenance, why doesn't some alert, major-party politician adopt this mechanism for his very own? Why doesn't Lyndon Johnson incorporate income guarantees into his domestic program instead of merely promising to appoint a commission directed to make its report safely after the 1968 Presidential election? Some of the answer may lie in the politician's timidity before any new idea. The remainder just might be found in the sheer meanness which seems to compel so many pious Americans to deplore the prospect of giving their fellow citizens money they haven't worked for.

But even if sudden altruism swept over the national psyche, a number of issues of principle would be important, indeed rather more important than they are now in the 1967 political mood. One way to identify the issues is to list the criteria of a good income maintenance scheme. At the least these number four:

1. Money should be given to those who need it but not to those who do not (of this more later).
2. The grants should not be tokens. They must be substantial enough to achieve their stated purpose, the elimination of financial poverty.
3. Grants should be extended in ways that strengthen rather than damage the incentive to get paid jobs in the labor market.
4. Finally, the grants should be substitutes only for that portion of welfare assistance which covers goods freely available in the market place to those with the money to buy them—food, clothing, recreation, and the like. Where welfare counsels, trains, or treats, the argument is for extension of present programs not contraction.

Broadly, these criteria describe the position of economists who are also liberal Democrats. Those to the Left will not accept the first criterion as now stated. Those to the Right will quarrel with the last one.

Without further preamble, let us glance at some of the actual proposals that have been made. Take a very simple one first. If a family's earned income is too low, why not just give its members whatever is needed to bridge the gap between its present situation and the poverty minimum? Thus, if a family of four earns only $2,000, the prescription is a cash grant of $1,130. As the family's earned income rises to $2,500, diminish the grant to $630, and when earned income touches $3,130, discontinue the subsidy entirely.

This procedure severely tests the incentives of the poor and the generosity of the just barely not poor. As far as the effect upon the poor is concerned, increasing earned income from one point below the poverty line to another, higher point means a tax of 100 per cent upon earnings, a poor impetus indeed to initiative and extra effort. Those whose incomes just barely exceed $3,130 and who are therefore ineligible for assistance will, to put it mildly, be inclined to dislike a program that differentiates little between the fully employed at low wages and the "poor." A man earning $3,200 a year is unlikely to be thrilled at the sight of his neighbor, unemployed and granted a cash subsidy of $3,130.

Examine next a very different scheme. Chicago's Milton Friedman supports income maintenance because, as a believer in the free market, he desires a maximum freedom of choice. Cash benefits are superior to present welfare measures for reasons that Mr. Friedman summarizes in this way:

"The advantages of this arrangement are clear. It is directed specifically at the problem of poverty. It gives help in the form most useful to the individual, namely, cash. It is general and could be substituted for the host of special measures now in effect. It makes explicit the cost borne by society. It operates outside the market. Like any other measures to alleviate poverty, it reduces the incentives of those helped to help themselves, but it does not eliminate that incentive entirely, as a system of supplementing incomes up to some fixed minimum would. An extra dollar earned always means more money available for expenditure." [1]

In this statement Friedman made explicit his intent: rely on free choice, substitute grants for welfare services, and preserve incentives. This last point deserves amplification, for in Friedman's view the preservation of incentives requires termination of assistance at incomes far below the poverty line.

Without necessarily endorsing this limited assistance, the Wisconsin economist Robert Lampman has described the way Friedman's plan would work. Speaking of our present structure of taxes, Lampman notes that the "present rates fall from 70 per cent at the top to 14 per cent at incomes just above $3,700 for a family of five, to zero per cent for income below $3,700." It would be easy to extend the progressive tax structure downward:

"The average negative tax rates could move . . . from zero per cent to minus 14 per cent for, say, the unused exemptions that total $500, to 20 per cent for those that total $1,000 and 40 per cent for those that total $3,700. This would amount to a minimum income of $1,480 for a family of five; it would retain positive incentives through a set of grants that would gradually diminish as earned income rose." [2]

But the gain in incentives would entail a high cost; many families would be left far below the poverty line and some would be placed in a worse situation than welfare now puts them in. And the emphasis upon incentives appears decidedly misplaced so far as the elderly, handicapped, or disabled are concerned in groups which form a very large percentage of the poor.

The most seriously worked out (and the most generous) version of income maintenance is that of James Tobin, a member of the first Kennedy Council of Economic Advisers and now Professor of Economics at Yale. Tobin makes a deliberate effort to compromise among incentives, grant adequacy, and financial burdens upon the community. His proposal makes ingenious use of both cash grants and tax benefits. If a family has no income from earnings at all, Tobin would pay it $400 per person. For Lampman's family of five this would be $2000 as compared to the $1,480 contemplated on Friedman's assumptions by Lampman. But for Tobin this is by no means the maximum. As this family's earned income moves upward from zero, the grant is decreased by 33⅓ per cent of each additional dollar earned. It stops entirely when family earned income approaches $1200 per person. Above that income the family continues to pay taxes at the same 33⅓ per cent rates until it attains earnings of $7963 where it begins to encounter normal tax treatment. A portion of Tobin's illustrative table will make the consequences of the Tobin arrangement plainer.[3]

MARRIED COUPLE WITH 3 CHILDREN

Family income before Federal tax allowance (1)	Present tax (—) (2)	Tax schedule income after tax (3)	Tax (—) allowance (4)	Proposed schedule or income after tax or allowance (5)
0	0	0	$2,000	$2,000
$1,000	0	$1,000	1,667	2,667
2,000	0	2,000	1,333	3,333
2,500	0	2,500	1,167	3,667
3,000	0	3,000	1,000	4,000
3,700	0	3,700	767	4,467
4,000	—$42	3,958	667	4,667
5,000	—185	4,815	333	5,333
6,000	—338	5,662	0	6,000
7,000	—501	6,499	—333	6,667
[1]7,963	—654	7,309	—654	7,309
8,000	—658	7,342	—658	7,342

[1] Income level at which the present and the proposed methods of calculating taxes and benefits coincide; above this income (as at the $8,000 level included in the last line) the present tax schedule applies.

How successfully does this schedule of benefits and taxes compromise among Tobin's three objectives? On the incentive side, the plan scores well. Beneficiaries of the scheme are allowed to retain two-thirds of additional earnings. They receive special tax treatment all the way up to an earned income of $7963. On any reasonable computation the budgetary cost is also manageable. In the summer of 1966, Tobin estimated gross cost to be $12.5 billion annually. However, since welfare payments would be reduced (not eliminated as under Friedman's scheme) net costs would be much lower, possibly of the order of the year to year in-

---

Footnotes at end of speech.

crease (at full employment) of federal budgetary receipts.

Some important questions remain, even after this much is said. It is apparent that in Tobin's model, families whose earned incomes do not reach $2500 will still be below the poverty line even after they receive their income grants. Whether their lot will be improved by substituting grants for some portion (or all) of welfare payments will depend upon the political constituency in which the poor family resides. In the more ungenerous states where welfare assistance stops at a low percentage of the poverty minimum, Tobin's system would improve the lot of many families even if all welfare payments stopped as a consequence of the grants. But in comparatively liberal constituencies like New York City and Connecticut, many poor persons will actually be worse off. This is likely to be especially true of elderly widows or widowers whose sole present income derives from Social Security. A $400 grant added to a small Social Security pension leaves their beneficiaries well below the poverty line. Conceivably Tobin's position may be damaged if the income grant serves as a pretext for the elimination of more generous welfare supplements to his Social Security pension.

Such points, however, are far from fatal flaws. If the public will allow, it is perfectly possible to reform welfare practices in such a way as to avoid automatic curtailment of assistance by as much or more than the income grant. But it bears repetition to say that if the objective of public policy is the elimination of poverty, no plausible scheme of income maintenance can serve as a complete substitute for other measures, including welfare, housing subsidies, retraining allowances, and unemployment compensation.

Tobin's plan raises questions at the other end of the income scale as well. As the table makes clear, families will receive actual cash grants even though their income from earnings substantially exceeds poverty minima. Moreover, some families will enjoy special tax treatment all the way up to nearly $8000 of earned income. Should we thus assist families, substantially above the poverty line, and actually above the median income level of all American families, a figure not much in excess of $6000? Or, to put the matter sharply, should the extremely prosperous subsidize not alone the poor but also the *less* prosperous?

To say "yes" unequivocally to these questions (as I do) is to make a judgment about the equity of present taxes of the fairness of the present distribution of income between rich and poor. If one believes (as again I do) that present exemptions and rates outrageously favor the affluent, then any proposal which redistributes even a small sum from rich to poor and average citizens is a good thing. It is important to recognize that any proposal which promises really substantial help to the poor (on a scale far larger than Tobin contemplates) will redistribute income and at the same time fracture the fragile alliance which joins liberal and conservative exponents of income maintenance plans.

What finally of the rather different mechanism of income support favored by Daniel Moynihan? In his testimony before the Ribicoff Committee, Moynihan spoke strongly in favor of a family allowance scaled to the number and age of dependent children. As he noted, most industrial nations (including neighboring Canada) operates family allowance plans, so that the idea itself is less novel than negative income taxes or other forms of generalized income grants. For the United States Moynihan estimated the cost of a possible program as about $9 billion each year. Some of the relevant numbers appear in this quotation.

"A family allowance for the United States roughly equivalent to Canadian or Scandinavian levels would suggest payments of perhaps $8 a month for all children under 6 years of age, and $12 a month for children between 6 and 17. At present population levels this would cost $9 billion a year, just over 1 per cent of the gross national product. For a family of four children, this would increase income by, say, $40 a month, or roughly $500 a year." [4]

Of this approach to income support, it must be said at the outset that it raises in the most direct form an issue of social policy implicit in all income maintenance schemes. A public policy which simultaneously sings the virtues of birth control and small families, and actually rewards financially not the childless but rather the parents of large broods, is, to say the least of it, confusing. The mind rather boggles at public subsidy, say, to Senator Kennedy's 10 children. More seriously, family allowances at least on the scale presently advocated by Mr. Moynihan will not of themselves raise a very large proportion of the poor out of their poverty even when families are large. The program will evidently do nothing at all to assist the childless or the elderly.

Where do we come out at the end of this quick glance at the schemes of the well-intentioned? As now designed, no proposal is a complete remedy for financial poverty. In part this outcome is the consequence of intent (as in the Friedman proposal). In part it is the result of prudent estimates of political reality.

Here is an example of the political reality Tobin and Moynihan may have held in mind. The speaker is Senator Ribicoff, a cautious and presumably representative moderate northern Democrat:

"The idea of giving the poor more money—whether it is a guaranteed income or a negative income tax—is being discussed a great deal these days. As a person with some political experience, you can recognize how hard it is to put the idea across. Instead of talking about a guaranteed income tax, suppose we talk about guaranteeing everybody a job . . . The person earning $100,000 a year wouldn't be worried very much about someone who would be getting $3,000 a year, even though he was not working. But how about the man who works 40 hours a week for $3,500 a year and sees his neighbor get $3,000 a year for not working? I think the American people will just not be able to swallow this." [5]

Friedman set his final income after assistance at so low a percentage of the poverty minimum because he feared larger benefits would impair incentives and divert benefits to those who really did not need them. The Tobin approach has the effect of relieving a rather larger percentage of poverty but only at the cost or with the added merit (according to viewpoint) of indulging in some redistribution of income in the direction of equality. Though it is not so presented, the Tobin proposal is the most radical in its implications.

All plans seems to demonstrate that it is impossible to design a proposal which simultaneously eliminates financial poverty, stimulates incentives, and avoids "unneeded" rewards to the moderately prosperous, nonpoor. It is fair then to restate a point which has run through this essay.

At least for liberals and still more for radicals, income guarantees, however designed, are an addition to the armory of social care, not a substitute for everything from job retraining to psychiatric counseling. A good income maintenance scheme will substitute for that portion of welfare now most burdensome upon both recipient and social worker, the portion which consists of grants for food, shelter, and clothing. Income maintenance will facilitate the long-overdue reconstitution of welfare as individual case work. Income guarantees, properly viewed, fit properly into a public policy design which includes more liberal Social Security programs, a full-employment level of aggregate demand, provision in public service employment for those unable to secure jobs even in time of high demand, genuine desegregation of schools, suburbs, and cities and a serious attempt to turn our cities into livable abodes for free citizens.

---

[1] Milton Friedman, *Capitalism and Freedom*, University of Chicago Press, p. 192.

[2] *American Economic Review*, May 1965, p. 527.

[3] James Tobin, "The Case for an Income Guarantee," *The Public Interest*, Number 4, Summer 1966, p. 38.

[4] See *The New York Times Magazine*, February 5, 1967, p. 71.

[5] *Ibid.*, p. 68.

Vietnamese War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 20, 1967

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I insert in the Appendix of the RECORD the following resolution adopted by the State Council of Tennessee, Junior Order American Mechanics, at their recent meeting in Columbia, Tenn.:

RESOLUTION 4—VIETNAMESE WAR

Be it resolved by the State Council of Tennessee, Junior Order United American Mechanics, that

Whereas, the United States is committed to the principle that every nation shall have the right to determine its own form of government without interference from any foreign power; and

Whereas, this principle has been violated by the country of North Vietnam by invading the country of South Vietnam, with the intent to impose upon the people of South Vietnam a government and ideology that is contrary and foreign to its established government; and

Whereas, the United States has come to the aid of South Vietnam, to help it maintain its freedom of governing itself according to its own free choice, and in support thereof is engaged in a war against North Vietnam; and

Whereas, the Vietnamese War is constantly escalating, thereby demanding increased effort upon the United States to supply men and materials to support South Vietnam; and

Whereas, the President of the United States has on numerous occasions invited the government of North Vietnam to confer with the United States and South Vietnam to end the war and negotiate an honorable meaningful peace; and

Whereas, the government of North Vietnam has on every such occasion categorically rejected such invitations; now therefore

Be it resolved that the State Council of Tennessee, Junior Order United American Mechanics, in session assembled this 18th day of August, 1967, at Columbia, Tenn., strongly urges that the President of the United States continue relentlessly all his efforts to settle the Vietnamese War upon honorable meaningful terms of peace.

Be it further resolved that the people of the United States join in a united front to support the President of the United States to end the war and bring peace to the nations at war; and

Be it further resolved that the State Secretary be and he is hereby directed to send copies of this Resolution to the President of the United States, the President of the United

States Senate and the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives.

W. S. WHITLEY,
SAM E. HILL,
EARL BREWER.

Motion made by T. P. Lawson. Seconded by Johnny Strange that this resolution be adopted. Vote taken and carried.

Msgr. Michael Mulligan

SPEECH
OF
HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 25, 1967

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, my hometown of Bayonne, N.J. is saddened today as one of its most distinguished citizens has found his final rest. Msgr. Michael Mulligan, who was intimately connected with St. Henry's Church in Bayonne for many years, was buried yesterday, mourned by people of every religion for his understanding of his fellow man and their problems.

The life of Bayonne was improved, both in quality and in depth, by Monsignor Mulligan's time among us and we will all miss his wise counsel and enlightened influence. His life spanned many changes, not only in his church but in his county and his community, and he gave courage and faith to all who knew him to meet these complex changes in these trying times.

I would like to place in the RECORD at this point an editorial from the Bayonne Times of September 27, which reflects the feeling of affection that all members of the community had for this beloved man of God:

MONSIGNOR MULLIGAN

Msgr. Michael Mulligan, like St. Henry's Church, was towering, impressive, formed in the traditional mold and a symbol of the endurance of the eternal values.

Although his name was synonomous with St. Henry's, his contributions were community wide. His founding of the Bayonne Visiting Nurses Association in 1921 was an act of responsible citizenship which has reaped countless benefits for thousands of Bayonne people.

His sponsorship of sororities for young Catholic women of the city gave hundreds of girls a unique opportunity to broaden their social and cultural experience close to home. St. Henry's Catholic Center which he built on West 30th Street included a dance floor, modern kitchen facilities, meeting rooms and, most of all, a wholesome environment.

The New Jersey Opera Guild which Msgr. Mulligan sponsored was an outstanding vehicle for young performers from the entire city and a source of enjoyment for thousands who heard the group perform. It was an activity which has never really been replaced in this city.

The esteem with which Msgr. Mulligan was held in the educational community was shown in 1950 when Seton Hall College conferred an honorary degree of doctor of laws upon him.

A loyal son of his church, his country and his city, Msgr. Mulligan will probably be best remembered as a man who strove to raise the cultural horizons of his fellow citizens and had notable success.

The Wild West Division

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 28, 1967

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the 91st Infantry Division of the U.S. Army, known as "The Wild West Division," now in organized reserve and headquartered at the Presidio of San Francisco will, on October 1, 1967, celebrate the 50th anniversary of its organization.

It was my high privilege to be one of the original members of the 91st Division when it was put together at Camp Lewis, Wash., on October 1, 1917.

The officers of this new division, one of the 16 national Army divisions organized in World War I, were drawn from the graduates of the first officers training camp held at the Presidio of San Francisco.

Theh original division was an old "Square Division" consisting of two brigades of infantry and a brigade of field artillery with certain supporting elements. I was a lieutenant with the 346th Field Artillery.

After undergoing intensive training, the division departed for France in June 1918, and landed at Le Havre on July 20, 1918. In the four month period between the time it arrived in Europe and the Armistice, the 91st Division was engaged in the Lorraine campaign, the Meuse-Argonne offensive, and the Ypres-Lys campaign.

In the Meuse-Argonne offensive, the 91st Division smashed through three successive German lines driving 8 kilometers into enemy territory.

As part of the Ypres-Lys campaign, the division, on October 31, 1918, just 12 days before the end of the war, made a major attack against the German 207th Infantry Division.

After the Armistice the division left Europe and returned to the United States where it was demobilized. In 1921 the division was reconstituted as part of the Organized Reserves and stationed at the Presidio of San Francisco. Shortly after the beginning of hostilities in World War II, on January 30, 1942, the division was reorganized and trained at Camp White and Camp Adair. On April 18, 1944, the division went overseas and, on June 12, 1944, became engaged in the battle for the Arno River in Italy and was the first unit of the American Fifth Army to reach the river. In September of that year it crossed the Sieve River and opened the general Allied attack against the rugged Apennine Range. Two of its regiments, the 361st and 363d, outflanked the famous Gothic Line and the 362d captured the Fulta Pass. In the spring of 1945 it participated in the Po Valley campaign. Upon the termination of hostilities, the division was inactivated at Fort Rucker, Ala., on December 1, 1945.

Again, on December 31, 1946, the 91st Division was activated at San Francisco as part of the U.S. Army Reserves. Since that time it has had two commanders, Maj. Gen. C. Lyn Fox, who commanded the division until 1956, and its present commander, Maj. Gen. Stuart D. Menist. The division presently carries on its training program at Camp Roberts and is composed of 91 units under five regiments. The motto of the 91st Division is "always ready," which expresses the division's principal function today of training men in the event they may be called upon in the defense of this country.

The green fir tree, which men of the 91st Division wear, is symbolic of the far-western United States from which the division originally drew its enlisted personnel.

California is proud to be the home base of this fine Reserve Division. Maj. Gen. Stuart D. Menist, the division commander, has an enviable record of service to his country as has Brig. Gen. Mackenzie E. Porter, the assistant division commander. Col. Charles A. Briscoe, the division chief of staff, is an outstanding officer and one who has given greatly of himself to preserve the high tradition of the 91st.

Fiscal Crisis

SPEECH
OF
HON. AL ULLMAN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 27, 1967

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Nation is facing a fiscal crisis. If Congress does not act responsibly to meet this crisis, we are inviting a damaging inflation spiral and a credit crunch that will further escalate interest rates, already too high. There is no question that one of the most important steps that must be taken to avoid a chaotic economic situation is a substantial reduction in Federal spending.

Virtually every expert witness appearing in the recent Ways and Means Committee hearings on the proposed tax increase has urged a combination of expenditure reductions and tax increases. Many of the Nation's leading academic and business economists, a cross section of business and industrial leaders, and spokesmen for the Nation's financial community all agree that spending cuts are an essential element of the policies we must follow to keep our economy in balance.

I agree with this conclusion and have been urging the President to exert leadership in reassessing the administration's programs to advise where cuts can and will be made.

The recommittal motion without instructions which we are now considering, however, would be a meaningless gesture. It does absolutely nothing to reduce Federal appropriations or the authority of the President to expend funds already appropriated for fiscal year 1968. Passage of the resolution for continuing appropriations is essential, and every Member of the House knows it. It is not the appropriate vehicle for the job that needs to be done. We cannot escape difficult decisions by making futile gestures.

Mr. Speaker, although I am completely committed to reductions of $5 billion in spending for the current fiscal year, I am voting against the recommittal motion and am again calling on the President to suggest new priorities and guidelines for possbile reductions that will be meaningful and helpful to Congress in taking the several actions necessary to avoid a fiscal deficit of damaging proportions. I believe the President has a responsibility to do this and that the consequences for not doing it could be grave.

Job Corps Success

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 26, 1967

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, I was particularly interested, and believe many other Members of the House and Senate may also be interested, in the following article on the Job Corps which appeared in the English magazine, the New Statesman of London.

The writer, Nora Sayre, visited the Kilmer Job Corps Center in New Jersey and found what many Americans have already discovered:

The Job Corps has the simple evidence of success: thousands are now working who would probably have been on relief.

JOBS FOR THE DROPOUTS

(By Nora Sayre)

From fire to fire the riots flare across the summer, while many liberals automatically deduce that the Anti-Poverty Programme is a failure or an irrelevancy. Yet, sifting the ashes and the shattered glass of riot sites, while counting the dead, should clinch the conviction that the Job Corps should be urgently expanded. Currently, there are 122 centres in the U.S. Camp Kilmer, in New Jersey—a former army base that once held Italian prisoners of war and, later, Hungarian refugees—has placed 2,039 of its 2,377 graduates in jobs. Staff members stressed that these particular young men might otherwise have been burning, smashing and dying. Aged 16 to 21, these school drop-outs are damaged goods when they arrive—but all have come voluntarily. Conspicuous for self-contempt and uncertainty, they are selected according to need: poverty, bad family life, minimal education. Records of delinquency do not disqualify them, although "major criminal offences" aren't acceptable, nor is retardation. At Kilmer, 70 per cent are Negro and Puerto Rican. They receive $30 a month, and average nine months' training; they can stay for a maximum of two years. On finishing they get $50 for each month "satisfactorily completed." The Kilmer management is contracted to the Federal Electric Corporation, a subsidiary of the International Telephone & Telegraph Corporation.

The Corpsmen's reading and mathematics are improved so that they can receive the equivalent of a high-school diploma, and the choice of vocational programmes includes electronics, trucking, mechanics, carpentry, painting, cooking and offset printing. (At women's centres, the courses range from secretarial training to cosmetology.) Vocational counselling is intensive: a boy who's determined on electronics but has no ability is carefully guided to a related field. Another is advised against office machine repairs if he's going to return to a hometown of 200 inhabitants without a single typewriter. It's admitted that the kitchen is an inflammatory place, and that a nervous, irascible boy shouldn't become a short-order cook subjected to yells, heat and inevitably short tempers. They are trained in on-the-job behaviour, dress and hygiene, and how to act during interviews and towards an employer ("Keep to the point, he doesn't want to know about your sex-life. Watch the hep talk."), and how to budget their salaries. City drop outs are nocturnal creatures; they tend to sleep all day and roam at night, hence many are shocked by the requirements of punctuality. The intention is to raise them to a very strong apprentice level and to provide every graduate with a letter of introduction to a specific company. Industry and corporations have responded admirably, and Job Corps centres concentrate on encouraging firm representatives to visit the camps and inspect the professional level. Thus the Job Corps has the simple evidence of success: thousands are now working who would probably have been on relief.

However, personal rehabilitation is as crucial at Kilmer as the level of future employment. Counsellors and group-leaders stimulate Corpsmen to ventilate all their problems, including racial tensions (which do exist, but have not been serious), plus the numerous manifestations of homesickness. (They come from all over the US. Many miss their neighbourhoods or city blocks, rather than their families.) There's an emphasis throughout on expressing feelings—which must be a fresh and startling experience for many, since impoverished parents often stress silence, especially by shouting at their offspring to shut up. Today it's quite astonishing to realise that a large group can be good for its members. While armies, offices and school dormitories deaden and deflate so many psyches, it's evident that Corpsmen thrive on mutual exposure and on their eventual concern for one another. There are nightly group meetings: quite often these focus on a boy who wants to leave, while the others try very hard to persuade him to stay. They say that they feel like failures when they can't convince a classmate to remain. (Incidentally, anyone can leave whenever he wishes.) But the group aura is far from militant; Corpsmen say that they appreciate being allowed to work at their own different speeds, and the lack of competition. The staff is frank about intrinsic problems: one is the diversity of intelligence—mingling those who read like eight-year-olds with some who are college material. Discipline is naturally quite intense: fighting or returning drunk from a weekend results in menial tasks or fines. But, talking to Corpsmen, one learns that they are very concerned about the Corps reputation—and that they want each other to keep it clean. The verb "to blow" is often heard at Kilmer; there are many references to blowing your job or your salary as well as your cool. But repression isn't an albatross and griping is considered healthy.

Asked about their complaints (apart from the absence of girls, whom they do see on weekends or at many social events), Corpsmen were critical of the outside screeners who had glamorized the camp: "They promise roses and cream." Hence some are disappointed. Still, the national drop-out rate is less than 19 per cent. Over a canteen lunch of fried chicken and limitless gravy, three students of heavy trucking were indignant about the costs of the space programs, and very well informed about its budget in contrast to Anti-Poverty funds. So go to the moon. Later. Not now. We know too many people who need what we're getting here. However, they (and others) seemed to have little feeling about Vietnam; the army is still considered good employment, and a fair number of Corpsmen later enlist. They said that there hadn't been much "interest" in the recent riots in New Jersey or elsewhere. One behemoth added: "I used to be a . . . [careful pause] . . . hell raiser. Then I got sick of standing on the corner with the wine." They all agreed that their previous lives had been boring—"with your mother on your back all day long too."

Since the U.S. school system caters for the middle-class, it has already failed to serve anyone who is eligible for the Job Corps. Tangible results are important for morale at Kilmer, from the tools and machine-parts which a Corpsman can keep when he's completed them, to the final diploma. A librarian remarked that there's a fierce determination to own things—that Corpsmen are pleased by the fact that everyone's given his own paperback dictionary. Noting that thousands of wooden pencils vanish from the library, he suggested that "there must be something symbolic about owning them", and, since the camp is strewn with a host of broken pencils, he thinks that many must snap them in half during spasms of momentary frustration.

There has been ample hostility to the Job Corps, plus many tinted distortions by the press. It's true that the first applicants were not so carefully selected as they are now and that discipline has been accelerated. But the arrest rate among Corpsmen is less than half that for their age group throughout the U.S. Antagonism probably springs from envy of the swimming pools and other recreational amenities that nearby townsmen lack, homespun racism and the uneducated whites' fear of competition from Negroes with good vocational training. Also, rescuing people isn't cheap. Since its costs about $6,950 a year to maintain one Corpsman, there's a lot of rhubarb about "the taxpayer's dollar"—ignoring the fact that Corpsmen themselves pay taxes. Even among liberal New Yorkers there's a lax readiness to believe that Job Corps centres are festivals of delinquency. Hence visits should be compulsory for every critic. Energy and professionalism make their own testimony. At Kilmer's driving school vast trucks weave slowly between orange barrels in a serpentine obstacle course; in an autoservice station, Corpsmen's bodies dangle or protrude from capsized cars; amidst Plutonic showers of sparks an Irish instructor lyrically extols the poetry of welding and his students' exceptional "feel" for the medium; the dilemma of perfecting a pumpkin pie absorbs a crew of intent cooks. The Corpsmen hardly wear halos, but there are cordial and courteous greetings to any stranger. Numerous back pockets bulge with paperback books. Seeing so many alert and intelligent faces, it's hard to remember that many were almost illiterate not long ago.

Despite its achievements, the Job Corps' budget has not been enlarged. The President is never shy of asking Congress for fresh funds for Vietnam; his requests for Anti-Poverty money are punctual but less passionate. This particular Congress may be remembered for its anti-riot bill, cutbacks in aid to the poor, and a recent vote for an elegant $10 million Washington aquarium that few natives are said to desire.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20515

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Speaker: John W. McCormack

Abbitt, Watkins M., *Va*	
Abernethy, Thomas G., *Miss.*	6278 29th St.
Adair, E. Ross, *Ind*	4000 Mass. Ave.
Adams, Brock, *Wash*	
Addabbo, Joseph P., *N.Y*	
Albert, Carl, *Okla*	4614 Reno Rd.
Anderson, John B., *Ill*	
Anderson, William R., *Tenn.*	3006 P St.
Andrews, George W., *Ala*	
Andrews, Mark, *N. Dak*	
Annunzio, Frank, *Ill*	
Arends, Leslie C., *Ill*	4815 Dexter St.
Ashbrook, John M., *Ohio*	
Ashley, Thomas L., *Ohio*	
Ashmore, Robert T., *S.C*	
Aspinall, Wayne N., *Colo*	The Towers Apts., 4201 Cathedral Ave.
Ayres, William H., *Ohio*	
Baring, Walter S., *Nev*	
Barrett, William A., *Pa*	
Bates, William H., *Mass*	
Battin, James F., *Mont*	
Belcher, Page, *Okla*	
Bell, Alphonzo, *Calif*	
Bennett, Charles E., *Fla*	3421 Rusticway Lane, Falls Church, Va.
Berry, E. Y., *S. Dak*	118 Schotts Court NE.
Betts, Jackson E., *Ohio*	
Bevill, Tom, *Ala*	6224 N. 35th St., Arlington, Va.
Biester, Edward G., Jr., *Pa*	
Bingham, Jonathan B., *N.Y.*	
Blackburn, Benjamin B., *Ga.*	
Blanton, Ray, *Tenn*	
Blatnik, John A., *Minn*	
Boggs, Hale, *La*	
Boland, Edward P., *Mass*	
Bolling, Richard, *Mo*	307 Warrenton Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Bolton, Frances P. (Mrs.), *Ohio.*	2301 Wyo. Ave.
Bow, Frank T., *Ohio*	4301 Mass. Ave.
Brademas, John, *Ind*	
Brasco, Frank J., *N.Y*	
Bray, William G., *Ind*	
Brinkley, Jack, *Ga*	
Brock, W. E. (Bill), *Tenn*	
Brooks, Jack, *Tex*	
Broomfield, William S., *Mich.*	
Brotzman, Donald G., *Colo*	
Brown, Clarence J., Jr., *Ohio.*	
Brown, Garry, *Mich*	
Brown, George E., Jr., *Calif*	
Broyhill, James T., *N.C*	
Broyhill, Joel T., *Va*	
Buchanan, John, *Ala*	
Burke, J. Herbert, *Fla*	
Burke, James A., *Mass*	
Burleson, Omar, *Tex*	
Burton, Laurence J., *Utah*	
Burton, Phillip, *Calif*	
Bush, George, *Tex*	
Button, Daniel E., *N.Y*	
Byrne, James A., *Pa*	
Byrnes, John W., *Wis*	1215 25th St. S., Arlington, Va.
Cabell, Earle, *Tex*	
Cahill, William T., *N.J*	
Carey, Hugh L., *N.Y*	
Carter, Tim Lee, *Ky*	
Casey, Bob, *Tex*	
Cederberg, Elford A., *Mich*	
Celler, Emanuel, *N.Y*	The Mayflower
Chamberlain, Charles E., *Mich.*	
Clancy, Donald D., *Ohio*	
Clark, Frank M., *Pa*	220 C St. SE.
Clausen, Don H., *Calif*	
Clawson, Del, *Calif*	
Cleveland, James C., *N.H*	
Cohelan, Jeffery, *Calif*	1202 Longworth House Office Bldg.
Collier, Harold R., *Ill*	
Colmer, William M., *Miss*	
Conable, Barber B., Jr., *N.Y.*	
Conte, Silvio O., *Mass*	5619 Lamar Rd., Washington 16, D.C.
Conyers, John, Jr., *Mich*	
Corbett, Robert J., *Pa*	
Corman, James C., *Calif*	
Cowger, William O., *Ky*	
Cramer, William C., *Fla*	6215 Beachway Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Culver, John C., *Iowa*	
Cunningham, Glenn, *Nebr*	
Curtis, Thomas B., *Mo*	
Daddario, Emilio Q., *Conn*	
Daniels, Dominick V., *N.J*	
Davis, Glenn R., *Wis*	
Davis, John W., *Ga*	
Dawson, William L., *Ill*	
de la Garza, Eligio, *Tex*	
Delaney, James J., *N.Y*	
Dellenback, John R., *Oreg*	6903 Crail Dr., Bethesda, Md.
Denney, Robert V., *Nebr*	
Dent, John H., *Pa*	
Derwinski, Edward J., *Ill*	
Devine, Samuel L., *Ohio*	
Dickinson, William L., *Ala*	
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., *Mich*	
Dingell, John D., *Mich*	
Dole, Robert, *Kans*	6136 Beachway Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Donohue, Harold D., *Mass*	
Dorn, Wm. Jennings Bryan, *S.C.*	2030 Laburnum St., McLean, Va.
Dow, John G., *N.Y*	
Dowdy, John, *Tex*	
Downing, Thomas N., *Va*	
Dulski, Thaddeus J., *N.Y*	347 Cannon House Office Building
Duncan, John J., *Tenn*	
Dwyer, Florence P. (Mrs.), *N.J.*	
Eckhardt, Bob, *Tex*	
Edmondson, Ed, *Okla*	
Edwards, Don, *Calif*	9201 Fox Meadow La., Potomac, Md.,
Edwards, Edwin W., *La*	
Edwards, Jack, *Ala*	
Eilberg, Joshua, *Pa*	
Erlenborn, John N., *Ill*	
Esch, Marvin L., *Mich*	
Eshleman, Edwin D., *Pa*	
Evans, Frank E., *Colo*	
Everett, Robert A., *Tenn*	
Evins, Joe L., *Tenn*	5044 Klingle St.
Fallon, George H., *Md*	
Farbstein, Leonard, *N.Y*	
Fascell, Dante B., *Fla*	
Feighan, Michael A., *Ohio*	
Findley, Paul, *Ill*	
Fino, Paul A., *N.Y*	
Fisher, O. C., *Tex*	Calvert-Woodley
Flood, Daniel J., *Pa*	The Congressional
Flynt, John J., Jr., *Ga*	
Foley, Thomas S., *Wash*	
Ford, Gerald R., *Mich*	514 Crown View Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Ford, William D., *Mich*	
Fountain, L. H., *N.C*	The Westchester
Fraser, Donald M., *Minn*	
Frelinghuysen, Peter H. B., *N.J.*	3014 N St.
Friedel, Samuel N., *Md*	
Fulton, James G., *Pa*	
Fulton, Richard, *Tenn*	
Fuqua, Don, *Fla*	
Galifianakis, Nick, *N.C*	
Gallagher, Cornelius E., *N.J.*	
Gardner, James C., *N.C*	
Garmatz, Edward A., *Md*	
Gathings, E. C., *Ark*	
Gettys, Tom S., *S.C*	
Giaimo, Robert N., *Conn*	
Gibbons, Sam, *Fla*	
Gilbert, Jacob H., *N.Y*	
Gonzalez, Henry B., *Tex*	200 C St. SE.
Goodell, Charles E., *N.Y*	3842 Macomb St.
Goodling, George A., *Pa*	
Gray, Kenneth J., *Ill*	
Green, Edith (Mrs.), *Oreg*	
Green, William J., *Pa*	
Griffiths, Martha W., (Mrs.), *Mich.*	
Gross, H. R., *Iowa*	
Grover, James R. Jr., *N.Y*	
Gubser, Charles S., *Calif*	
Gude, Gilbert, *Md*	
Gurney, Edward J., *Fla*	
Hagan, G. Elliott, *Ga*	
Haley, James A., *Fla*	
Hall, Durward G., *Mo*	
Halleck, Charles A., *Ind*	4926 Upton St.
Halpern, Seymour, *N.Y*	
Hamilton, Lee H., *Ind*	
Hammerschmidt, John Paul, *Ark.*	
Hanley, James M., *N.Y*	
Hanna, Richard T., *Calif*	
Hansen, George V., *Idaho*	
Hansen, Julia Butler (Mrs.), *Wash.*	
Hardy, Porter, Jr., *Va*	
Harrison, William Henry, *Wyo.*	
Harsha, William H., *Ohio*	
Harvey, James, *Mich*	
Hathaway, William D., *Maine.*	
Hawkins, Augustus F., *Calif.*	
Hays, Wayne L., *Ohio*	
Hébert, F. Edward, *La*	26 Cockrell St., Alexandria, Va.
Hechler, Ken, *W. Va*	
Heckler, Margaret M. (Mrs.), *Mass.*	
Helstoski, Henry, *N.J*	
Henderson, David N., *N.C*	
Herlong, A. S., Jr., *Fla*	
Hicks, Floyd V., *Wash*	
Holifield, Chet, *Calif*	
Holland, Elmer J., *Pa*	
Horton, Frank, *N.Y*	
Hosmer, Craig, *Calif*	
Howard, James J., *N.J*	
Hull, W. R., Jr., *Mo*	
Hungate, William L., *Mo*	
Hunt, John E., *N.J*	
Hutchinson, Edward, *Mich*	
Ichord, Richard (Dick), *Mo.*	
Irwin, Donald J., *Conn*	
Jacobs, Andrew, Jr., *Ind*	
Jarman, John, *Okla*	
Joelson, Charles S., *N.J*	
Johnson, Albert W., *Pa*	
Johnson, Harold T., *Calif*	
Jonas, Charles Raper, *N.C*	
Jones, Paul C., *Mo*	1111 Army-Navy Dr., Arlington, Va.
Jones, Robert E., *Ala*	
Jones, Walter B., *N.C*	
Karsten, Frank M., *Mo*	
Karth, Joseph E., *Minn*	
Kastenmeier, Robert W., *Wis.*	
Kazen, Abraham, Jr., *Tex*	
Kee, James, *W. Va*	5441 16th Ave., Hyattsville, Md.
Keith, Hastings, *Mass*	5906 Harwick Rd., Woodacres, Md.
Kelly, Edna F. (Mrs.), *N.Y*	
King, Carleton J., *N.Y*	
King, Cecil R., *Calif*	
Kirwan, Michael J., *Ohio*	
Kleppe, Thomas S., *N. Dak*	
Kluczynski, John C., *Ill*	
Kornegay, Horace R., *N.C*	
Kupferman, Theodore R., *N.Y.*	
Kuykendall, Dan, *Tenn*	
Kyl, John, *Iowa*	
Kyros, Peter N., *Maine*	
Laird, Melvin R., *Wis*	
Landrum, Phil M., *Ga*	
Langen, Odin, *Minn*	
Latta, Delbert L., *Ohio*	
Leggett, Robert L., *Calif*	
Lennon, Alton, *N.C*	
Lipscomb, Glenard P., *Calif.*	
Lloyd, Sherman P., *Utah*	
Long, Clarence D., *Md*	

Appendix

Bluebonnets Wave Around the Globe—Lieutenant Colonel Rutherford Plants Them in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 29, 1967

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, Texans have a favorite flower, and that is the State's bluebonnet, which grows in fields of intense, waving, blue all over our Lone Star land. It becomes pretty dear to their hearts when they get any distance away from home.

For this reason, an article appearing in a recent issue of the Austin American-Statesman did not excite too much surprise in Texas, although it warmed quite a number of hearts, with its report on a Texas-style Johnny Appleseed. Lt. Col. James E. Rutherford, of Texas, stationed in Vietnam, successfully created a flowerbed of bluebonnets in the shape of the Lone Star State, only to be transferred away from the leprasarium where he had been stationed. Disappointed but undaunted, he reports that he has continued to bring a little of Texas to the people of Vietnam, planting a crop of bluebonnets in every flowerbed he sees. These seeds have been sent to him by Texans reached by his appeal in an Austin American-Statesman column, for this beautification project.

It will take a long time for the country of Vietnam to recover from the ugliness of war and destruction, and I commend Lieutenant Colonel Rutherford and his many friends in Texas for the beginning they have made.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "Bluebonnets: Texas Blooms Brighten Viet," published in the September 16 issue of the Austin American-Statesman, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BLUEBONNETS: TEXAS BLOOMS BRIGHTEN VIET

Bluebonnets are blooming in Vietnam.

Lt. Col. James E. Rutherford has planted a flower garden of bluebonnets (in the shape of a map of Texas) in front of a lepresarium in Vietnam.

His request for seeds and fertilizer was sent to Heloise Cruse, who writes the syndicated column "Heloise" for the Austin American-Statesman. Texans responded in a large way.

Reports from Lt. Col. Rutherford said he received 362 packages of seeds and 15 pounds of fertilizer for his project.

After successfully planting bluebonnets in the shape of Texas, Rutherford was transferred to Tan Son Nhut. In a letter to Heloise he said "anywhere I see a flower bed, I plant some bluebonnet seeds, and someday this country will be all rice and bluebonnets if I keep it up."

Milestone for Rent Supplement Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 29, 1967

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, on August 23, 1967, an event of national significance took place in Boston, Mass. It was a milestone for the rent supplement program—the dedication of the first all new construction project in the country. The occasion was the forerunner of many more such projects to come as the projects now under construction or in advanced planning are completed.

The rent supplemental program will do much for the poor of our country and we all can look forward to further advances in the housing program as these planning programs are strengthened. For me it is particularly pleasing because the first of these projects has been established in my congressional district.

The Honorable Robert C. Weaver, Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development presided at the dedication of this housing project. His remarks are informative as to the progress and potential of this very worthwhile Federal aid in helping to meet the housing needs of low-income families.

I am pleased to include in my remarks the speech of Secretary Weaver:

REMARKS BY ROBERT C. WEAVER, SECRETARY, DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, OPENING OF CHARLAME PARK HOMES RENT SUPPLEMENT PROJECT OF THE CHARLES STREET AME CHURCH, ROXBURY, BOSTON, MASS., AUGUST 23, 1967

SUMMARY

There is always a need for informed criticism but that criticism must be rooted in facts. What are the facts about FHA today? It is a principal source of mortgage financing for existing homes purchased by nonwhites across all of the urban complex. It has lifted the barriers that once prohibited insuring mortgages in changing neighborhoods. It is taking positive steps to finance the rebuilding of blighted areas in the central city. It is increasingly involved in building and rebuilding housing for low- and moderate-income families. Indeed, today FHA is an effective instrument that is providing opportunities to nonwhites in all parts of urban areas. In recent weeks, FHA initiated a housing counseling service for low-income families. Recently it moved into insuring mortgages in riot-torn or riot-threatened areas. Thus FHA today is operating in many ways in the slums and blighted areas of our cities.

This is a symbolic occasion. I want to assure you that this occasion of opening seven buildings for 38 families has importance far beyond Roxbury and the City of Boston. In a sense, we are today formally opening the Rent Supplements Program—and that is a significant moment, and a new direction, for the Nation's urban housing policies.

This is the first development in the Nation consisting entirely of new construction that was planned, financed and completed under the Rent Supplement Program. There are already some families residing in housing that has been rehabilitated for this program. In fact, there are already one thousand families receiving Rent Supplement assistance.

But most of them are residing in housing provided by older programs. Some of the programs are administered by the Federal Housing Administration. Some are administered by other parts of FHA's parent organization—which I head—the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

This occasion is appropriate to examine the Nation's efforts to help the ill-housed. Recently, it has become almost common to hear questions about whether the FHA—which has helped in housing millions of families—is genuinely concerned about the most serious social problem of housing low- and moderate-income families. Sometimes the criticism is confusing.

In a recent instance, the Mayor of a midwestern city asserted that FHA red tape had delayed a moderate-income housing development in his city. But only a few days earlier, he had written us to declare that the project could never have been completed without the full cooperation of FHA. Faced with this record of inconsistency, he recently wrote to me saying, and I quote: "Dear Mr. Secretary: I owe you an apology."

In a situation closer to home, the Mayor of Malden, Massachusetts, has complained of FHA's efficiency and concern for a moderate-income project in his city. He cited an 18-month delay. He attributed it entirely to FHA. He failed to mention that the site plan had been changed after the original submission had been approved by FHA. This occasioned a seven-month delay in processing.

Also the Mayor made much of FHA's requirement for a 100% bond. He was repeating a complaint made by the "packager" of the project. This is the same packager who had been placed on FHA's list of those determined to be undesirable risks—because of irregularities in his financial arrangements with the builders of moderate-income housing projects. And only last week, the same packager had to be advised that he has still failed to conform to the requirements that he had agreed to as a condition for being removed from the list.

Actually 100% bonds are not impossible nor even extremely expensive for builders who have the financial ability to construct the multiple-unit developments involved. It is not the amount of the bond but the financial capacity of the firm seeking it that is important. And the 100% requirement applies to *all* FHA insurance of multi-family projects in the Boston area. It was secured by the builder of this development. Bonding of this type is, in fact, a response to the requests of small subcontractors who frequently were unable to collect payment from out-of-town builders.

II

Let us turn to the Rent Supplement Program. It is administered by FHA. It received its first funds on May 13, 1966.

The specific chronology of this Charlame Park Homes Project is instructive. The sponsor, the Charles Street A.M.E. Church, applied for FHA insurance on June 11, 1965. On November 1, FHA agreed to make the commitment for the project. On May 30, 1966, the sponsor asked to change the project from that of standard, moderate-income housing to the new Rent Supplement Program. Two weeks later, June 17, FHA allocated funds for it. Two months later, August 29, FHA issued the commitment to insure it.

On September 26, 1966, construction was started. Today we are marking its completion.

Thus, 15 months after the new program was first funded; 11 months after initial endorsement; and 11 months after construction began, this development is complete.

One reason this development moved rapidly is that the sponsor has some experience. The Charles Street A.M.E. Church has already completed and now operates a moderate-income development near here. Thus, when the church undertook a Rent Supplement project, it was familiar with the procedures and processing requirements for an FHA multi-family development. And it was knowledgeable about construction and finance.

This development was financed out of the first $12 million appropriated for Rent Supplements, which became available on May 13, 1966. On September 6, 1966, an additional $20 million were appropriated. Between then and June, 1967, all $32 million were allocated. This involves 439 projects in 290 cities and 46 states. It will mean 33,905 dwelling units for low-income families.

All of these dwellings will be built and managed by private sponsors. Some will be non-profit and limited-profit corporations, some cooperatives. Since they are financed by mortgages obtained at normal market interest rates, as soon as the mortgages are seasoned, the financing, too, will be by private, rather than public funds.

Many are already privately financed, and this one today is an example. Indeed, I am confident that long before the first $32 million of Rent Supplements are translated into homes for low-income Americans, most of the mortgages will have been purchased by private investors.

If you recognize the size of the Rent Supplements Program, the relative inexperience of many sponsors, and the novelty of the undertaking, this is a record that simply does not fit the charges of indifference or ineptitudes by FHA.

There are problems of sites, land cost, design, construction cost, financial arrangements, and management proposals. Each has to be examined. Because the program is new, both FHA and sponsors have had to learn by doing. But the lessons are as important for the future as they are difficult for the present. Their importance is obvious when we recognize that the mortgages involved are long-term, extending over 40 years.

III

Aside from Rent Supplements, the moderate-income housing program of FHA holds a special interest for me. It was one of the innovations I sponsored in the Housing and Community Development Act of 1961. It is the first national program to provide housing for those who are too poor to afford housing in the open market, but who earn too much to qualify for public housing.

The subsidy here is a below-market-interest-rate mortgage. The other mortgage terms and eligible sponsors are similar to Rent Supplements.

It has been observed that only 40,000 moderate-income housing units are now occupied. It is alleged this reflects on FHA administration. These critics ignore the fact that the size of the program depends on the amount of funds authorized for financing the mortgages. Since the mortgage interest rates are below the market, special assistance funds are provided by our Federal National Mortgage Association.

Let us examine the records compiled in this effort. The first funds from FNMA were allocated in August 1961. This amounted to $30 million. In March, 1962, $100 million were added. And these additions followed: In July, 1962, $250 million; in July, 1963, $370 million; in May, 1964, $200 million; in August, 1964; $350 million; in June, 1965, $112.5 million; in October, 1965, $425 million; and in October, 1966, $32.5 million were added.

What about the housing? As of June 30, 1967, there were 40,000 units completed. Another 22,027 are under construction. An additional 83,000 are being processed. Thus, 145,000 units of housing for moderate-income families will be provided. And the effort will continue to expand with $500 million of further special assistance in the 1968 budget.

Both the moderate-income and rent supplements programs of FHA have moved more rapidly than any other multi-family program sponsored by the Department. They have not been neglected. Nor will they be neglected. I have constantly stressed their importance and the need to accelerate them. We are emphasizing improved processing and encouraging the development of more sponsors.

Every new housing program requires time for tooling up and developing effective processing methods. This involves trial and error. New sponsors have to become experienced. Standards have to be established. People inside and outside government have to be recruited and trained. These steps would have to be taken no matter what administrative machinery is devised.

Billions of dollars are involved. Those who commit the credit of the United States for immense programs have grave responsibilities. They are responsible to the taxpayer who may have to pay for any and all mistakes in market analysis, design, location, construction or management. They have a unique responsibility to protect and assist inexperienced sponsors. And most of all, they are responsible to the occpupants who ought to get the best possible housing at the lowest possible cost in all publicly-assisted developments.

IV

All of this is not to say that FHA is without fault. There have been instances where local offices lacked enthusiasm for low- and moderate-income developments. Some have questioned the wisdom of building in central cities. Some have been hesitant to approve developments that did not reflect traditional standards for mortgage insurance. But the record of these last few years clearly shows that these attitudes and practices are changing—and changing rapidly.

These years have also indicated to us in HUD what needs to be done to accelerate processing. We have brought in highly qualified teams from Washington to break administrative jams. We are experimenting with a series of techniques and methods to reduce processing time. We have simplified requirements and procedures.

In addition, we are increasingly bringing the decisionmaking in Rent Supplements and moderate-income housing into the HUD regional offices. This expedites processing. It also relates this housing more closely to other HUD programs. In short, we are learning how to act effectively in a market where private enterprise has had little previous experience, and where FHA has been equally uninvolved.

We are not satisfied with the results. Processing still takes too long. But we have profited from experience. These programs are moving. We are prepared to move them more rapidly in the future.

V

One striking fact about administering an agency such as HUD (and its predecessor the Housing and Home Finance Agency) is that there is a lag in public recognition of changes.

I first saw that in urban renewal. Initially it was somewhat insensitive about relocating families. It did often tear down the housing of low- and moderate-income families and rebuild housing for the affluent. It did too often emphasize bulldozer clearance. And it did take its lumps from the critics.

But we have significantly modified every one of these characteristics—yet the old reputation clings and persists, though it is no longer accurate or fair.

Today eight out of ten persons displaced by urban renewal are helped, or help themselves, to move into decent, safe and sanitary housing. Urban renewal today upgrades the quality of housing for the vast majority of those who originally lived in the slums and blighted areas involved. Of course, many people understandably resent being forced to move, regardless of what their conditions, or dissatisfactions, were before. That is one reason why we now stress rehabilitation rather than demolition. And today there are more dwellings scheduled for rehabilitation than demolition in the urban renewal process.

Last year a score of mayors and other officials helped us re-examine urban renewal. One result is that many of these cities have said that rebuilding their pockets of poverty will be their highest priority. Another result is that HUD adopted a new policy that says specifically that our urban renewal aid must advance these goals:

1. It must conserve and expand housing for low- and moderate-income families.

2. It must develop new employment opportunities for the unemployed and the underemployed.

3. It must emphasize renewal of urban areas that have the most critical needs.

This does not mean there will be no more central business district redevelopment or no more high-income housing redevelopment. Many cities must upgrade central business districts to provide a viable economic base. Some blighted areas should be redeveloped for higher-income occupancy. But this new policy means that every city must provide a balanced program—and the first priority must go toward rehousing the lower income segment of the population.

Culture is essential to an exciting city. Thus there will continue to be civic centers and university extensions in urban renewal areas. But they must concentrate first on housing those who need it most.

I think FHA suffers a similar reputation lag as has urban renewal. FHA is accused of having concern only for the suburbs, or upper-income groups in the central city. It is charged, with some justification, of having been a principal instrument in the spread of racial, residential segregation in the past. It continues to be labeled by many as unconcerned about housing the poor and those who are the victims of discrimination.

But what are the facts about FHA today? It is a principal source of mortgage financing for existing homes purchased by nonwhites across all of the urban complex. It has lifted the barriers that once prohibited insuring mortgages in changing neighborhoods. It is taking positive steps to finance the rebuilding of blighted areas in the central city. It is increasingly involved in building and rebuilding housing for low- and moderate-income families. Indeed, today FHA is an effective instrument that is providing opportunities to nonwhites in all parts of the urban complex.

I take pride in what Dempsey J. Travis, president of Chicago's Sivart Mortgage Corporation, wrote in the July issue of *Ebony*. He said: "I think FHA policies have made a 100 percent about face since Weaver's coming."

Let me mention two other developments. In recent weeks, FHA initiated a pilot effort in five cities to counsel low-income, minority, veteran, elderly and other families in securing housing.

The FHA counselor interviews prospective buyers and renters. He helps them determine their financial capacity. He tells them about all FHA-acquired or insured housing that is covered by the President's Executive Order on Equal Opportunity in Housing.

Through the interview, families select properties they like, and they are assisted in getting appointments to see them. All of this has several results.

It directs families to properties they like and can afford. That avoids useless explorations.

It alerts owners, managers and real estate firms that FHA will insist on open occupancy practices in its programs.

It provides machinery for seeing to it that those who are required to follow open occupancy practices are in fact doing so.

A second development, equally significant, is FHA's recent instructions to field offices requiring them, in accordance with new legislation, to insure mortgages in riot-torn areas, or areas threatened by riots. Thus FHA today is operating in many ways in the slums and blighted areas of our cities.

VI

At the outset, I said this was a symbolic occasion for the Rent Supplement Program. Today we can see tangible evidence of this program becoming the most imaginative and significant effort to house low-income families that this Nation has produced in the last 30 years.

With appropriations now available, we shall house some 34,000 families in developments similar to this.

But that is not enough. It does not even approach the need. Therefore all who are concerned with people must feel the enormity of the failure of the House of Representatives to appropriate the $40 million to expand Rent Supplements.

We are now attempting to restore this appropriation in the Senate. As you know, President Johnson has repeatedly urged such action. What we can see here today speaks eloquently to the need of the funds that the President urgently requests.

In recent days, the President has also had to ask the Nation to accept a tax increase—so that we can get on with many urban jobs long unfinished, and to support our armies abroad. I believe this Nation will accept both challenges—and the sacrifices they require.

For more than six years, it has been my principal goal to make HUD programs more responsive to the needs of people. Urban renewal has, I believe, turned the corner. And FHA is well on the way. The latter agency is in the business of augmenting the supply of decent moderate- and low-income housing.

I have always believed in FHA's potential for assisting a wide spectrum of income groups. Even years ago, when I was one of the agency's most severe critics, I wrote of that potential.

More recently, with the full cooperation of Commissioner Neal Hardy and today of Assistant Secretary Philip Brownstein, and many of their associates, we are beginning to realize that potential.

There is always a need for informed criticism but that criticism must be rooted in facts.

The central fact today is that this Nation needs all of the tools and weapons it can muster to meet the urban problems that affect all of us. FHA is such a tool. Our continuing need is to find the ways to make it increasingly effective.

Today, in this development, and in the nearby moderate-income projects now in existence, we can see what can be, and is being, accomplished. Let us build on that solid foundation.

Decrease in Social Welfare Expenditures in Relation to Gross National Product Since 1939

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 29, 1967

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, the Committee on Finance is presently considering amendments to the Social Act, amendments which, as I have stated in the past, I hope will end at least some of the many inequities in the present law.

Representatives of Walter P. Reuther, president of the United Auto Workers, AFL–CIO, submitted an important table of statistics to the Finance Committee during the course of their testimony on September 21. I commend the table to the serious consideration of all Senators. It reflects that Federal, State, and local social welfare expenditures exclusive of the social insurances, which are paid for by employers and employees, have decreased in relation to gross national product since 1939. I ask unanimous consent that the table be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL, STATE, AND LOCAL SOCIAL WELFARE EXPENDITURES

[Dollar amounts in billions for selected fiscal years 1940–66]

Fiscal year	GNP	Social welfare expenditures [1]					
		Total		Less social insurance		Less social insurance and education [2]	
		Amount	Percent of GNP	Amount	Percent of GNP	Amount	Percent of GNP
1939–40	$95.1	$8.8	9.2	$7.5	7.9	$4.9	5.2
1949–50	263.4	23.0	8.7	18.1	6.9	11.4	4.3
1959–60	495.6	52.2	10.5	32.9	6.6	14.9	3.0
1961–62	541.7	62.2	11.5	38.0	7.0	17.1	3.2
1964–65	654.0	77.5	11.9	49.4	7.5	20.8	3.2
1965–66	715.3	87.6	12.3	55.7	7.8	23.4	3.3

[1] Includes public and welfare services, health, medical and veterans' programs, public housing, social insurance, and education.

[2] Expenditures for education through Veterans' Administration included. Exclusion of such expenditures in 1950 would have decreased percentage of GNP figure from 4.3 to 3.3 percent. In other years listed, such exclusions have virtually no impact on percentage.

Note: The chief reasons for the increase in the proportion of GNP allocated to welfare between the fiscal years 1950 and 1966 are the sharp increases in social insurance payments and expenditures for education. The social insurance expenditures include OASDI primarily, but also railroad retirement, unemployment compensation, and other insurance items.

Source: Social Security Administration, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Social Security Bulletin, Annual Statistical Supplement, 1965, table 1, p. 2; table 3, p. 3. Economic Almanac, 1967–68, NICB. Economic Indicators, August 1967. Council of Economic Advisers.

The Vietnam Barrier as a Route to Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 29, 1967

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, Chalmers M. Roberts, writing in the Washington Post of September 9, concludes that the construction by the United States of an electronic barrier across Vietnam could provide us with a new route to the conference table.

The barrier, if successful, could stop infiltration from the north to the extent that the administration would feel safe in halting the bombing.

And then we might get to sit down to the necessary business of working out a negotiated settlement.

Mr. Speaker, my opposition to the bombing of North Vietnam is well known to our colleagues. I feel there are better ways to peace. The possibilities of new peace initiatives resulting from the building of a barrier across Vietnam deserve our serious consideration, and I call the commentary by Mr. Roberts to the attention of our colleagues by inserting it in the RECORD at this point:

VIETNAM BARRIER COULD BECOME ROUTE TO CONFERENCE ON PEACE

The electronic barrier that the United States is building across South Vietnam to stop infiltration from the North may knock down the stubborn barriers to the conference table.

About a year ago, when the DMZ barrier was being discussed, a senior official offered the view that it could, if it worked, provide the excuse for the President to halt the bombing of the North.

Since that time, North Vietnam has established the policy that if the United States "really wants to talk, it must first of all stop unconditionally the bombing and other acts of war" against the North. Furthermore, says Hanoi, the United States "has no right to demand any reciprocity whatsoever."

At his news conference yesterday, Secretary of State Dean Rusk stuck to the demand for reciprocity in principle, but tiptoed around it in detail. A growing number of people in Washington believe that in the end the President will have to accept Hanoi's proposal and Rusk seemed to be leaving an out for that possibility.

If the DMZ barrier turns out to be workable, it could provide the reciprocity without any act on Hanoi's part. While Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara said the barrier cannot stop infiltration, its aim is to make infiltration far more difficult.

Thus at a given point the President could announce that the barrier had so cut infiltration that he was prepared to halt the bombing and go to the conference table. In London in February, Soviet Premier Kosygin passed the word to Washington that Hanoi would come to a conference within two or three weeks of the end of the bombing.

A critical point in any such maneuver is timing. McNamara said the barrier is to be initiated late this year or early next year. Thus it could become effective enough, if Washington wants to make that finding, sometime next spring.

By next spring the presidential campaign will be under way and Mr. Johnson will have a better idea of where his prospective GOP candidate will stand on the war issue.

It is not impossible, if the two sides get to a conference table by summer, that the President could be campaigning on a peace platform—and admonishing the Republicans that any attack could upset the prospects for ending the war.

But what of the hawks? Already one of them, Republican Sen. John Tower of Texas, has expressed doubts about "the essentially static policies it signifies." Certainly those who want to close the port of Haiphong are not going to be happy with the DMZ barrier as an alternate method of cutting infiltration of men and supplies.

However, the evidence is that the Nation more and more wants an end to the war. Both McNamara and Rusk concede a high degree of public frustration. In short, the DMZ barrier may serve to outflank the hawks.

But even if this device should prove to be a means of getting to the conference table, talks between Washington and Hanoi would still have a long, long way to go. Any such conference almost inevitably would immediately be deadlocked on the role at the table of the National Liberation Front, the political arm of the Vietcong.

In short, it is possible and even probable that a Vietnam conference could go on for months or years, as was the case at Panmunjom in the Korean War.

Nonetheless, a solution by conference compromise may be the best the United States can get out of this war. And the DMZ barrier just could be the device leading to the conference table.

Alcohol and Alcoholism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 29, 1967

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to the new, National Center for Prevention and Control of Alcoholism for some up-to-the-minute information on the use of alcohol by young people in the United States.

The information appears in the first report published on "Alcohol and Alcoholism" by the National Institute of Mental Health. The new center is the focal point for the expanded national program to prevent and control alcoholism which was requested last year by President Johnson in his health message to the Congress.

The report points out that adult concern about the use of alcohol by young people "has been directed primarily toward the supposed relationship of juvenile drinking to juvenile delinquency." It goes on to say that accounts of riots and automobile accidents are so alarming to most adults that the violence of these events often obscures the facts.

And what are the facts? At first glance, they are alarming. Surveys show that the average American first tastes alcohol—usually in the form of an experimental sip—by the age of 10. As many as 50 to 85 percent of high school students—depending upon the area in which they live—say they drink at least occasionally.

But the national center's report quotes Dr. Robert Straus, of the University of Kentucky, an expert in this field, as follows:

> These figures, however, as shocking as they may seem, are meaningless in themselves. There is no proof to show that early exposure to alcohol will in itself lead to excessive drinking in later life. In fact, all the proof is clearly to the contrary.

Is a teenager who drinks a juvenile delinquent? A recent study in Massachusetts shows that the percentage of alcohol users is about the same among delinquents as among "normal" high school students. The chief difference, the study concludes, is not how many of each group drink but how they drink.

> Research shows that teenagers follow adult models in their drinking patterns—

The national center's report says—

> and the best single indicator of the teenage drinking pattern in any specific community is the adult pattern in the same community. If parents drink, there is a high probability that teenagers will drink; similarly, abstinent parents typically produce abstinent children.

These findings were based on five studies involving 8,000 high school students within the past 10 years in five areas of the United States. These studies also showed:

First. The average age at which students had their first drink is 13–14, although they may have "tasted" alcohol before.

Second. First exposure to alcohol is likely to be at home with parents.

Third. Practically every high school graduate will have experimented with at least one drink.

Fourth. One in four users claimed to have been "high" at least once during the month prior to the research in three of the five areas studied.

Fifth. One in 10 users in these studies reported having been "drunk" in this same period.

Sixth. In all the studies, beer was the most commonly used beverage.

Seventh. Laws relating to teenage drinking had little relationship to drinking practices.

There also have been studies covering 27 colleges and 17,000 college students. The national center's report says:

> Those colleges with the lowest percentage of drinking students were generally marked by the highest percentage of students who had been intoxicated. By contrast, excessive drinking was reportedly infrequent in those colleges where drinking was most common.

Mr. Speaker, I think the report makes an excellent summary of what is known today about the use of alcohol by young people. It says:

> A young person's decision to drink or not to drink is usually made on the basis of a complex of forces including the practices and wishes of his parents, the attitudes of his church, the influence of his peers, how much money he has to spend, and how strongly he may be impelled to assert his independence from adult authority.

I commend the National Institute for Mental Health and the National Center for Prevention and Control of Alcoholism for this first report. As Secretary Gardner observes in a foreword to the report, it surveys the present state of our knowledge of alcoholism. It represents a major step toward understanding and eventual control.

Establishing Procedures To Relieve Domestic Industries and Workers Injured by Increased Imports From Low-Wage Areas

SPEECH

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 28, 1967

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 478) to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to establish procedures to relieve domestic industries and workers injured by increased imports from low-wage areas.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY].

(Mr. FINDLEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, I am somewhat in doubt as to how far this bill goes in creating new restrictions upon imports.

I see on page 4, lines 16 through 18, the bill reads as follows:

> The President may take such action as he deems appropriate to remove such impairment or threat of impairment, in addition to any other customs treatment provided by law.

I would like to ask: Does this give the President any additional authority to deal with imports, to impose restrictions?

Mr. DENT. It gives this much additional authority over what authority there is presently in the tariff or trade law, in that we say he is not held to the levels that are now in the law. In other words, once we pass a trade bill and it sets the levels of the tariff, which we agree to and conform to, he can only stay within those particular figures other than those given to him by the Tariff Commission. So we give him the right, if he decides—let us say the tariff is 40 percent—we give him the right to go to 60 percent or we give him the right to go to a complete embargo—or to 100 percent.

In other words, we give him the right to go above the stated law as it is now in the tariffs.

Mr. FINDLEY. So he can do that on his own initiative without going through the Tariff Commission?

Mr. DENT. That is exactly right.

Mr. FINDLEY. Then this does not constitute actually an amendment of the basic tariff law?

Mr. DENT. It would not in any manner, shape, or form, because all he is doing is the same as a doctor does in administering to a patient when the patient is turned over to him. He is writing the prescription as to what he thinks the patient needs at the moment. If they increase the quota or decrease the quota, whatever is needed, either in his opinion or based on the advice of his counselors—he will do what is needed at the moment.

If we hold him to the restrictions as they are passed or set by the Tariff Commission which is the law at the time, then there is no need to have any legislation, because he has no remedy that is not already given by the Tariff Commission.

Mr. FINDLEY. That is what I am getting at. I am trying to find out what additional remedy, if any, is provided by this legislation.

Mr. DENT. That is all there is.

Mr. FINDLEY. Does this remedy that you have just described apply only for quotas that are authorized?

Some commodities are not encumbered by quotas at all. They are on a tariff basis.

Mr. DENT. That is right.

Mr. FINDLEY. As to that merchandise that has free access to this country, provided the tariff is paid, I assume that this legislation would not and could not possibly apply; is that correct?

Mr. DENT. Yes, it could. He could establish a quota for that import if it is needed to help that particular industry.

Mr. FINDLEY. He could establish a quota on an item even though under the authority of the trade expansion act and the GATT agreements we have lowered the tariff on that item, or have even eliminated the tariff? Am I correct in that statement?

Mr. DENT. He can do it and still be consistent with that because the GATT agreement is not an international trade agreement and it is not an international treaty. It is an agreement under the executive and the executive exercises his authority.

No agreement under them is longer than a 3-year period, and if at any time during the 3-year period any country which is signatory to the GATT agreement is threatened to the point where its existence is endangered in the opinion of the country, that nation can set aside any quota or any tariff that has been agreed to by GATT signatories. That is what we are saying in this legislation.

Mr. FINDLEY. This bill would give the President the authority to supersede any agreement now included or tentatively accepted as a result of the GATT agreements?

Mr. DENT. If it is an emergency such as we have described in the act.

Mr. FINDLEY. I still question whether this bill conveys any additional authority over imports. Would it also convey to him the authority to cancel the drawback privilege that importers have on raw materials, and under that privilege if they re-export the material after it has been processed, they can recover 99 percent of the import duty they have paid?

Mr. DENT. Any remedy that he sees fit that is consistent with the tariff laws of this country, not exclusively maintaining the rates, because even a drawback has a rate of tariff.

Mr. FINDLEY. It has a rate.

Mr. DENT. That is correct. That is the problem today which is complained about in a resolution passed by the AFL-CIO this last Sunday. It was put in the Record the day before yesterday.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Administration Must Take Initiative in Cutting Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1967

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, on September 24, the New York Times endorsed editorially the principle that the administration must pledge firm action to cut spending now—before our Committee on Ways and Means acts—if the tax surcharge is to have any chance of legislative success.

No one questions the executive authority to postpone, defer, and delay programs and projects approved by the Congress. The Bureau of the Budget and the various departments and agencies are well equipped to develop a schedule of essentials and priorities.

But, as the Times points out:

> Most of these programs . . . are deeply entrenched in Congress. It is unrealistic to expect that Congress will take the initiative in trimming them. But Mr. Johnson should not be afflicted by similar inertia. Since so many of these nonessentials actively undermine the economic prosperity he seeks, President Johnson could help calm the unsettled financial markets and temper inflationary psychology by proposing reductions.

Five appropriations bills for fiscal year 1968 are already enacted into law, and all 14 money bills have initially passed this House. It is clear that congressional opportunity to reassess pending needs and establish priorities is severely limited.

Yet the economic indicators and financial conditions also make it clear that the Congress must enact a firm pledge of spending restraint before it can approve a tax increase. If a tax increase is to effectively control inflation and market pressure it must be accompanied by spending discipline.

Cuts in both defense and nondefense spending are possible, and the administration is in a position to ferret them out. Parliamentary exercises such as the recommittal motion without instructions on House Joint Resolution 849 may have psychological impact, but they are meaningless gestures in the guise of fiscal responsibility. The administration must shoulder the responsibility for presenting a balanced program of expenditure restraint if our committee is to have an accurate picture of the economic consequences of a tax increase.

Before inserting the text of the Times editorial in the Record, I should note that my list of cutback possibilities would probably differ from those visible from Manhattan's towers. However, this difference of opinion does not obscure our substantial agreement of who is best able to present a program of fiscal restraint.

The editorial follows:

> Through techniques reminiscent of the scare tactics used by President Kennedy in 1963 when he predicted a recession if taxes were not cut, Secretary of the Treasury Fowler and other Administration spokesmen are now warning that the economy will become an inflationary "shambles" if taxes are not raised.
>
> The economy is already in trouble, largely because the Administration failed to recognize early enough that inflation was in the making. But it is irresponsible to do nothing but fan the flames of inflationary psychology until Congress is panicked into passing a tax surcharge that may or may not restrain demand.
>
> The Republicans have correctly pointed out that there is an alternative way of dealing with the problem. It is to cut spending. Unfortunately, the Republicans and the Southern Democrats are thinking mainly in terms of hacking away at the barely adequate outlays for social welfare. Such a course is as unacceptable as a cut in the military budget for Vietnam.
>
> But at a time when the nation is in combat abroad and in battle against poverty at home, there is no excuse for the kind of wasteful spending that is associated with business-as-usual. Instead of trying to pressure Congress into overhasty action on taxes and possibly dangerous decisions on spending, the President should be taking the lead in proposing a new prescription for reductions in nonessential spending that will bring the budget—and the economy—under control.
>
> There are many areas where reductions and postponements can be made. Federal spending on highway programs, which is running at over $4 billion, should be a prime target for a cutback. So is the space program, with its expenditures of over $5 billion, and so is the plan for subsidizing construction of a supersonic passenger plane. Quite apart from their potential inflationary impact, the technological problems involved in space and in the SST's sonic boom argue for delay.
>
> Prudent fiscal policy also calls for stringent economizing on all other Government subsidy programs, direct and indirect. Subsidies for shipping and for agriculture are, to an important extent, extravagances now that the deficit is out of control. Farmers who cannot make ends meet will require Federal assistance, but there is no reason to hand out more than $3 billion a year, mainly for the benefit of large-scale producers. And consumers should not be made to pay up to $3 billion in higher oil prices because of the oil import quotas granted petroleum producers.
>
> Most of these programs, products of lobbying and logrolling, are deeply entrenched in Congress. It is unrealistic to expect that Congress will take the initiative in trimming them. But Mr. Johnson should not be afflicted by a similar inertia. Since so many of these nonessentials actively undermine the economic prosperity he seeks, President Johnson could help calm the unsettled financial markets and temper inflationary psychology by proposing reductions.
>
> A cutback in nonessential spending would prevent a crippling of vital antipoverty spending and perhaps even allow for an increase. And it would give the Administration an opportunity to press for additional stabilizing insurance, whether in the form of excise-tax increases, which would have a direct impact on demand, or in the form of

discretionary authority to raise or lower tax rates.

Mr. Fowler can accuse Congress of playing "political Russian roulette" by failing to approve the tax increase. But the Administration is also running grave risks with the stability of the economy and the state of the nation's political health by failing to press hard for reductions in nonessential spending. The end result threatens to be a paralyzing stalemate with either no effective action at all, or a disastrous economic—and political—overkill that would entail both increases in taxes and reductions in programs essential to public welfare.

End of the Road for Small Communities?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM RAILSBACK

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 29, 1967

Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Speaker, over the past 50 years we have seen a tremendous shift in our population away from the small communities and rural areas in our country to the large cities. As a result, we all too often think in terms of the large cities without giving consideration to the effects this mass exodus has had and is having upon the small towns and the businessmen in these small communities.

In this regard, I consider worthy of attention, an editorial which appeared in both the Lewiston, Ill., News and the Cuba, Ill., Journal. The editorial alerts its readers to this problem and its effects.

I, therefore, insert the editorial, entitled "End of Road for Small Communities" in the RECORD:

END OF ROAD FOR SMALL COMMUNITIES?

What will life be like in Fulton County's smaller communities five, 10 or 25 years from now?

Will there even be communities worthy of the name on the spots where Lewistown, Cuba, Ipava or Astoria now stand?

That things change rapidly in the world today no one can argue. Whether all of the changes are for the best could be debated. But change is an inflexible law of nature, and the rate of change can be better understood when we compare the differences between community life between the first and second World Wars, and between World War II and today.

In the first 30 year period, we had to adapt to modernization of transportation from the horse to the automobile. From 5 miles an hour to 50 miles an hour.

But since World War II, transportation speeds have jumped from 50 to 500 miles an hour. A change is a change, it's true, but the degree of change is accelerating faster, perhaps, than the human mind can understand. Accept changes we do. But so great is our involvement in those changes, and so gradually do they come that we seldom comprehend their overall effects until it is too late to adapt to them.

Thus we must accept the premise that just because, for practical purposes, there has always been a Lewistown—or a Cuba, or Ipava, or Astoria—does not mean that there always will be communities of those names. Nor would we be safe in assuming that the day of the small town will not end as rapidly as did the day of the horse and buggy.

Many of us—especially those of us who either grew up in a small town or now live in one—tend to look at our world through rose colored glasses. We look for the sunshine at the edge of the cloud and ignore the lightning at its center.

Population is growing, we say. Therefore small towns have to grow. But how much has the population of this nation grown in the last 25 years? And has the population of our small towns increased the same percentage?

Industry is moving out to smaller towns, we report. "If we could just get a small factory, that would help us grow." Blue Bell of Abingdon and Bushnell closed their plants and knocked that argument in the head in the process. Small industry will not seek out small towns because small towns really do not want small industry. And I would be happy to cite some personal experiences to back up that statement.

Small towns, we are fond of claiming, offer better schools, better recreation facilites, a better place to raise your family. Oh yeah? How many cities the size of Canton or larger have swimming pools, recreation programs, park districts and so on? And how many can you find in this area's smaller communities?

The small town merchant is the backbone of his community. He'll keep the community alive. But how? As things stand now, most small town stores will close when their present operators decide to retire. Many already have closed—and the reason is simple. With today's economy—and because people do not shop at home any more, most small town businessmen can't show a big enough profit return for the number of hours they spend, or for the amount of money they have invested, to interest anyone in buying their business when they are ready to quit. Just because there's "always been a drug store on the corner" doesn't mean that there will be five years from now when your present druggist qualifies for social security and retires.

So what, you say. What does this have to do with you?

OK, let's say you are a farmer, or that you live in a small town but work in Canton or Peoria. Why should you worry about the small town businessmen?

Two reasons—and both of them are pronounced "money".

If the small town business community disappears before the onslaught of the big town discount store, where will you go to buy the film for the camera you bought at Arlens? Or to find the thread to match the material you "got for a bargain" at Spartan? Or to buy a new drain hose for the washer you ordered from Sears?

If the money now invested in small town stores is withdrawn, who will pay the taxes the business community has been paying to help finance your schools, police protection and the other government services all of us expect these days?

So if there is to be small communities in Fulton County 10, 20 or 30 years from now, it is up to you as much as anyone to keep them what they are today—and to help improve them.

War on Hunger

SPEECH

OF

HON. GRAHAM PURCELL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 26, 1967

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, the Food Stamp Act of 1967, just signed into law by President Johnson, will continue to extend America's abundance to undernourished families.

The Johnson administration has launched this comprehensive assault on hunger and malnutrition out of the conviction that there is no room in our society for even one hungry family. The broadened school lunch program, the Child Nutrition Act of 1966, the Department of Agriculture's commodity donation program, and now the 1967 Food Stamp Act, are all vital weapons in this assault.

While signing the food stamp legislation, the President added another tool to the arsenal by directing the Secretary of Agriculture to begin commodity distribution programs for low-income families living in the 300 poorest counties that have no food assistance.

The minds of our poor cannot be trained nor their spirits endowed with self-respect while their bodies go hungry. As President Johnson noted, "Poverty's cruelest wound is hunger."

I salute the President's continued fight to uproot the islands of hunger in our midst. We cannot be satisfied until this fight is won.

Upward Bound

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 29, 1967

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, Americans have always had a great respect for education. Even before our Constitution was written, the Central Government, acting under the Articles of Confederation, made provision in the Northwest Ordinance of 1787 for using some of the vast lands held by the Government to support secondary education. Later, in the midst of the Civil War, the Congress continued to provide for the future of education by passing the Agricultural Colleges Land Grant Act of 1862, promoting higher education. Today, engaged in another war, we are still giving our attention and resources to education.

One of our most successful methods of extending the benefits of higher education to the poor is the Upward Bound program, founded by the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Lynn Ludlow, of the San Francisco Chronicle, has written an article describing the excellent work Upward Bound is doing in northern California. So that my fellow Congressmen may share the chance to read a fine piece of reporting about a most worthwhile program, I include this article in the RECORD:

[From the San Francisco (Calif.) Chronicle, Aug. 20, 1967]

WAR ON TALENT WASTE PAYS OFF—"UPWARD BOUND" OPENS EYES

(By Lynn Ludlow)

Kenneth Porter, a cool and brainy kid from the restless Negro neighborhoods of West Oakland, hadn't thought seriously about college.

Now his attitude is changing. He talked about it outside Orchard Meadow Hall at Mills College, where he is one of 110 Oakland youngsters in a remarkable eight-week summer prep school that ended yesterday.

It is titled Upward Bound, subtitled "war on talent waste."

The U.S. Office of Economic Opportunity is investing $27 million in the motivations of 22,396 youngsters at 248 campuses and one state prison (in Oregon). The Mills program was one of five in Northern California.

KEEPS EYES OPEN

In upbeat stories about successful—and even unsuccessful—anti-poverty projects, the script calls for Porter, as a typical beneficiary, to murmur grateful appreciation and to promise to propel himself as quickly as possible into the upper middle class. He didn't.

Porter is 17, a senior next fall at McClymonds High School. Like his classmates in Upward Bound, he was recommended because he has more potential than family income—and because his academic performance hasn't measured up to his potential.

"I'm here, naturally, for what I can get out of it," he explained in a thoughtful tone of voice. "I've gotten a lot, I guess. I'm keeping my eyes open."

He wonders why only 110 youngsters in Oakland are getting the special help offered by Upward Bound, when he knows that thousands of others could qualify. He compares Mills with McClymonds, and it makes him a little bitter.

NO GRATITUDE

As for the motives of Upward Bound, Porter used the word "guilt." Most of his classmates are Negroes, and all come from low-income families or foster homes.

These views aren't a bit disconcerting to the director, Dr. Margaret Gill, an attractive professional educator with a Texas accent and a businesslike attitude. She said the program isn't intended to evoke gratitude.

"Ultimately, the purpose is to get these kids into college," she said.

Federal officials say they hope to do more than mere remedial instruction. They say, in a booklet, the goal is "finding a way to boost the deflated self-esteem of the impoverished youngster . . . convincing him of his own personal worth and ability to succeed despite the deprivation of his background."

THEY DON'T QUIT

In its second year, the program at Mills is proving that problems with dropouts and discipline tend to vanish when education becomes something more than baby-sitting. Of the 110 who began eight weeks ago, not one has quit. Of the 100 enrolled last summer, 57 returned—and 14 others have started in college.

Similar reports come from directors of Upward Bound programs at the University of California in Berkeley and Chico, Humboldt and San Francisco State Colleges.

The cost per student is about $1200, which includes followup tutoring and classes on weeknights and Saturdays during the regular school year. Students are nominated by high school counselors and teachers after they complete their sophomore year.

They come to Mills from a dozen Oakland schools and, in a few cases, detention homes. The girls lived at Ethel Moore Hall; the boys, at Mary Morse Hall.

The faculty included nine Mills professors, six Oakland teachers and 14 tutors who are students at UC, Standford, Mills and San Jose State College. For them, Upward Bound is exciting. Miss Gill noted, "Motivation works both ways."

Hugh Hope, a ceramics teacher, glanced at the campus potting shed where every potter's wheel was spinning away.

"I'm overwhelmed by their progress," he said. "It's fantastic."

COLLEGE GRAD

Mornings were devoted to classes in dance, drama, art, ceramics and music followed by an hour of sports instruction in swimming, tennis, golf and gymnastics. The afternoons were spent in seminars in biology laboratory work, history, literature, mathematics (including computer math) and reading.

In young Porter's hand was one of the textbooks in the history seminar, "Years of Darkness, Rivers of Blood," an analysis of the Watts riots by Robert Conot.

"Before I came here, I never thought about college. It was, you know, a knick-knack thing. Now I know the most important thing is to continue my education," Kenneth said.

Grace Johnson, another student, said, "I had a few ideas about college before, but this has really encouraged me to go on. The best part of all this is actual student involvement—and you get an idea of what college is really like."

The students will return to Mills for special tutoring two nights a week and all-day class sessions on Saturdays.

Kenneth fully intends to continue the work. He is talking about attending the University of Kansas, but he is looking around—keeping his eyes open.

Situation in Greece

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENJAMIN B. BLACKBURN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 29, 1967

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, recently, I received a letter from one of my constituents, Dr. John E. Skandalakis. In his communication to me he presents a first-hand account of the situation which is now present with the military government of Greece. I would like to place in the RECORD for all my colleagues to review, Dr. Skandalakis' letter:

ATLANTA, GA., *September 25, 1967.*

Hon. BEN BLACKBURN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR BEN: I have read with interest Congressman John Brademas' report to the Congress of the United States in which he gives his impressions of the political situation in Greece after a one week visit to that country.

I wish to go on record as protesting Congressman Brademas' recommendation that our military aid program to Greece be withheld.

First, let me tell you that I am, and always have been, greatly opposed to Communism. My sympathies have never been with the so-called "left". I fought for Democracy in the Greek underground against the Germans in World War II, and then against the Communists in the Greek Civil War of 1946. I have no affiliation in any form whatever, with the present government of Greece.

I returned recently from a month in Greece where I attended meetings as a member of the Archdiocesan Council of North and South America. If time is considered a criterion, I believe I am in a position to know a great deal more about what is going on in Greece than Congressman Brademas. I spoke with a great many people during my stay in Greece: high government officials, former cabinet members, and many friends and family members who fall into the category of "the common man". All those to whom I spoke saw the present government of Greece as an element of stability in the political havoc created throughout the past years, and all are enjoying this period of (to translate) "peaceful freedom".

Perhaps we do not agree with methods used in the military take-over in Greece, but for the most part, and in all honesty, we are aware of the reasons which compelled these drastic measures. "Under the old regime Greece had become the sick man of Europe, with graft, corruption and nepotism . . . the utter irresponsibility of most Greek politicians had brought Greece just prior to the coup to the same precipice France approached in 1958. . . . Some kind of military take-over was all but inevitable" (Newsweek, September 25, 1967). It was the realization that the threat of Communism had become very real that prompted the military coup, and not internal political disputes. If it were not that the Greek people with their historic pride and love of freedom found the courage to stop the tide towards Communism, the United States might today be faced with another Korea, Vietnam, or more probably, another Cuba.

Which brings us to the matter of military aid to Greece. When you consider the billions of American dollars spent each year to save the Vietnamese people from Communism, not to mention the thousands of American lives, the amount of money involved in continuing military aid to Greece for her protection against Communism is certainly negligable.

I am sure you will remember the Civil War of Greece in 1946–1948 in which the people defended themselves against a Communist take-over with advisory and financial assistance from the United States, and not with, as in the case of Korea and Vietnam, the loss of American lives. Surely, this heroic country deserves our continued support.

In looking over the record, no one can deny that the new government of Greece has not made radical and hitherto unheard of reforms in the political, economic, and religious structures of Greece. She is now working to do the same in her educational system. Add to this one very important fact: the country's most eminent jurists have been invited to revise the Constitution and to present it to the people for approval.

The people of Greece have always looked to the United States as a second country, and quite naturally so since statistics have shown that every family in Greece has a relative living in the United States. Can we, in all fairness, continue to withhold military support thereby jeopardizing these people who prize freedom above all else and whose only desire is to protect themselves against the threat of Communism? There is no need to point out that she is surrounded by Iron Curtain countries. Greece asks for the flow of American arms—not American blood.

Ben, I urge you to support the resumption of military aid to Greece.

With kindest personal regards, I am
Sincerely yours,
JOHN E. SKANDALAKIS.

A Tale of Textiles and Coffee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT T. ASHMORE

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 29, 1967

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues and the readers of the RECORD the following editorial which appeared in the Greenville News on September 8, 1967.

The article points out certain actions by the State Department which have perplexed me for some time. The State Department has in the past, and still is promoting the interests of textile manufacturing in underdeveloped nations as well as Far East nations at the expense of the textile industry in the United States. The article also demonstrates the paradoxical policy of the State Department in promoting the instant coffee industry of certain African nations at the expense of the newly emergent instant coffee industry of Brazil, a nation in our own hemisphere which most certainly needs to be bolstered economically in order to become a stable member of Western nations.

The article follows:

A TALE OF TEXTILES AND COFFEE

There is a strange inconsistency in the State Department's attitute toward textiles and its position on coffee.

For years the State Department has demonstrated its willingness, even eagerness, to sacrifice the American textile industry in order to help underdeveloped nations. That position is painfully familiar, old hat, to textile people who have suffered loss of markets and jobs as a result of the policy.

The Department recently put on a new hat, however, on the question of Brazilian instant coffee. The story is this:

Brazil, well known as a leading coffee producer, began developing a small instant coffee industry as part of its overall industrial diversification program. Beginning in 1965 Brazil began selling powdered coffee to U.S. instant makers. It did not attempt to compete with the American firms in the American market.

From the very beginning the South American nation ran into strong opposition from green (African grown) coffee importers and the big instant makers in this country. Joining in the opposition was the U.S. State Department. Its opposition now is becoming intense.

It is hard to see how State could oppose the development of an instant coffee industry in Brazil, in view of America's stated policy to give every possible assistance to Latin America. The United States has built textile mills in Brazil.

Surely, if the textile industry could be asked and forced to sacrifice for the development of textiles in Africa, the Far East and South America, the instant coffee makers could make a similar effort to help Latin America.

The State Department, however, is against Brazilian instant coffee in this country. It gives as a reason the fact that Brazilian coffee enjoys a subsidy under the international coffee agreement, and therefore, should not be allowed to compete with the non-subsidized American industry.

Well, now, how about that?

The State Department apparently forgets the fight to get the American textile industry out from under the two-price cotton system under which U.S. subsidies allowed foreign textile plants to buy American cotton cheaper than American mills. Throughout that long, hard struggle, the State Department was on the side of the foreign plants.

Even now, foreign textile mills get the American cotton subsidy, which is offset by a domestic subsidy. And the subsidized foreign textile firms still compete ferociously with American mills, with the State Department's blessing.

It is hard to explain the State Department's double standard for coffee and textiles.

Perhaps the big domestic coffee makers have more political pull than the textile industry.

Or maybe the unstable, left-leaning, coffee producing nations of Africa are more important to the State Department than a big, important, developing, pro-American country in our own hemisphere.

It makes for interesting speculation about the real priorities deep within the inner workings of the State Department's bureaucracy.

Revealing Reports on Greece

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 29, 1967

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, today's newspapers contain reports of two interesting and revealing developments in Greece. The first, and perhaps the more significant of the two, states that the Executive Commission of the Common Market has voted to cut off aid to the military regime. Such an action, the first of its kind taken against an associate member of the Common Market, is "part of a growing European tide of discontent" with the present Greek regime, according to an article in the Washington Post.

The second report tells the story of a courageous woman publisher in Athens who has refused to resume publication until the regime restores freedom of the press.

Following are the texts of both reports:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post]

EUROMART HALTS AID TO GREECE

(By Gordon Weil)

BRUSSELS, September 28.—The Common Market's Executive Commission has cut off economic aid to Greece in the first such political move against an associate member of the Europen economic community.

The 14-member Commission voted 9-to-5 at a secret meeting last night to veto a $10-million loan to Greece. It also took steps to block any further loans to Greece.

This action by the Common Market is part of a growing European tide of discontent with the Greek military regime which came to power in a coup last April. A week ago, three Scandinavian countries brought formal charges against Greece for alleged violations of the European Covention on Human Rights.

Yesterday's action followed strong pressure on the 6-nation Common Market's Commission from its socialist members, who sought a political gesture against Greece. They were led by Dutchman Sicco Mansholt.

Though a total of $55 million in authorized loans to Greece is now frozen, the trade advantages that come from association are not affected.

The Commission handles the day-to-day operation of the Market. Its veto of further aid to Greece can only be overridden by a unanimous vote of the Common Market members—France, West Germany, Italy, Belgium, the Netherlands and Luxembourg. But at least one of them is virtually certain to support the Commission. The Dutch government is scheduled to hold a Cabinet meeting on the issue Friday.

All financial aid given to Greece by the European Community takes the form of loans with easy repayment terms. The European investment bank, which makes the loans, had been eager to allocate the $55 million committed to Greece before the end of October when the commitment lapses. Now it is likely that Greece will lose this aid.

Other special agreements with the Market include those of Turkey, Israel, Lebanon, Iran and 18 countries in Africa. It has also signed an agreement with Nigeria. But the Community has carefully avoided even commenting on the political regimes of these countries. It did express support for Israel's application for associate membership.

The five members of the Commission who opposed the break with Greece were three Frenchmen and two Germans. They argued that because of a legal technicality the Commission was two days late with its decision.

The decision was a personal victory for Mansholt, who has long wanted the Commission to play a more political role. The fact that the decision was taken by a majority vote indicates that Commission President Jean Rey was willing to go along with Mansholt. Walter Hallstein, Rey's predecessor, was noted for prolonging discussions until unanimity could be reached.

The Commission's stand may get it into trouble with France at the meeting next week of the Market's Council of Ministers. French President de Gaulle has always opposed political powers for the Commission. The Commission's reluctance to make a formal announcement of its decision is considered here as an indication that the Executive realizes it may have opened a hornet's nest.

The Association agreement with Greece was initiated by the Community in 1962. Under the agreement, the Community has already given Greece soft loans of $70 million. Greece has been seeking a role in the Community's farm policy and more aid under easy conditions.

[From the New York Times]

WOMAN PUBLISHER IS ACCUSED BY THE GREEK REGIME

ATHENS, September 28.—Mrs. Helen Vlachos, who refuses to resume publication of the two conservative daily newspapers and a weekly picture magazine she owns until freedom of the press is restored in Greece, was charged today with having insulted the military regime.

After questioning, Mrs. Vlachos was released pending her trial before an extraordinary court-martial in Athens. No date was fixed.

"Now we'll have fun," the gray-haired, 55-year-old publisher said as she emerged from the court-martial building in downtown Athens.

Mrs. Vlachos was arrested at 11 A.M. by two plainclothes policemen who burst into her sixth-floor office at the now-deserted building where she used to publish the morning Kathimerini, the afternoon paper Messimvrini, and the pictorial weekly Ikomes.

Publication ceased after the April 21 coup in which the military came to power. In a letter to her employees, Mrs. Vlachos, who is a friend of King Constantine, said that censorship had made it "totally and absolutely impossible" to continue publishing.

CRITICISM IS BARRED

The press curbs imposed by the regime included prohibition on criticism of the Government. In June the regime announced that it would allow some criticism, but Mrs. Vlachos refused to resume publication until full freedom was restored.

This morning Mrs. Vlachos was taken to the crown prosecutor of the extraordinary court-martial, who charged her with "insulting the authorities" and "disobeying military orders." The charges were based on an interview with her published in the Italian newspaper La Stampa.

It quoted her as having described the Greek military regime as a circus in which Brig. Stylianos Patakos, the Interior Minister, was a clown.

La Stampa asked her if she was not afraid of being quoted. She replied: "I am more scared when I go to my dentist."

Mrs. Vlachos's Counsel, George Ramanos, said the charge of insulting the authorities carried under the penal code a penalty up to three years in jail. The charge of disobeying a military order, based on the martial law prohibition on all criticism of the regime, is punishable by a maximum term of five years.

SHE CHARGES OPPRESSION

Ten days ago Mrs. Vlachos accused the regime at a news conference of not having kept its promise to restore press freedom, of oppressing journalists and of striving for her economic ruin.

The accusation, which was an open challenge to the regime, went unanswered. But brigadier Patakos replied to the interviews in La Stampa, saying Mrs. Vlachos has violated "the elementary rules of social decorum" with abuse "unfit for a lady's lips."

"Her objective is transparent," he added. "She is trying to provoke a Government reaction to make a hero of herself. But I can assure her that she has failed there, too, because her best punishment is her own words, which brand her indelibly but also evoke contempt and hilarity."

The Minister's statement implied that the Government would not prosecute her. But on breaches of the martial law, the crown prosecutor may act independently.

Mrs. Vlachos's defiance of the regime is looked upon as having encouraged other Greeks to show their opposition.

Yesterday, former Premier Panayotis Canellopoulos, leader of the conservative National Radical Union, issued a public call for political freedom. Mr. Canellopoulos was leader of the government that was ousted by the coup.

The Government has not reacted to his defiance, which was an open breach of the martial-law ban on political activity.

Congratulations to Finland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 29, 1967

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, a warm and enduring friendship between the United States and Finland stretches back through more than three centuries, predating even the American War of Independence.

A few short weeks ago, those bonds of friendship were further strengthened when Finland opened the 44th year of payments to the United States on a modest loan of $9 million made in 1923. The story of the Finnish loan amortization is remarkably well told by Pulitzer Prize-winning writer Edward J. Mowery in a recent series of articles.

In another few weeks, on December 6, Finland will celebrate an event of profound national significance—her 50th year of independence. The U.S. Post Office Department has fittingly singled out that historic event with a commemorative stamp which will be issued in impressive first-day-sale ceremonies to be held next Friday, October 6, in Finland, Minn., in my congressional district.

These significant occasions deserve special mention, Mr. Speaker, and I am privileged to take this opportunity to call to the attention of my colleagues this heart-warming account of the financial integrity of Finland:

FINLAND FOLLOWS THROUGH

(By Edward J. Mowery)

WASHINGTON.—Finland, an independent, completely literate republic of 4,600,000 hardy souls, lies in the shadow of the Soviet Union with which it maintains a "friendship" pact. Once an autonomous grand duchy of Czarist Russia, Finland won her independence in 1917. But in 1939, Soviet hordes savagely attacked the little nation in a "war" that shocked the civilized world.

The Finns exacted a fearful toll in Russian lives, but sheer Bolshevik power prostrated the country and wrecked her economy. Finland was forced to cede 16,173 square miles of territory—12 per cent—to the invaders. The Russians also demanded $570 million in war "reparations."

Through her years of tragedy and adversity, Finland never forgot her debt to Uncle Sam. There'll be no payments June 15 from Britain on her $9.6 billion World War I debt . . . or France ($6.7 billion) . . . or Italy ($2.3 billion). And 14 other debtor nations will continue to shrug. But not Finland!

In a special message from Helsinki relating to repayment of his nation's debt of honor to the United States, Dr. D. Urho Kekkonen, Finland's 67-year-old physician-president, said:

"We Finns do not wish repayment of this loan to be regarded as an exceptional or unique achievement.

"The strict fulfillment of all our commitments and contracts is the cornerstone of Finnish foreign policy. For a small nation that maintains a neutral position, international confidence is an essential asset.

"We received many valuable loans after World War II which helped us to rebuild and develop our economy. But let me make it quite clear that we have not received any aid in grants, nor are we asking for such assistance. Every cent we receive will be paid back with interest."

FAITHFUL FINLAND IS STILL PAYING OFF DEBT TO UNITED STATES

(By Edward J. Mowery)

WASHINGTON.—In a couple of weeks, the Treasury Department will nonchalantly process a draft for $82,370.50 payable to the United States. It will bear the endorsement of the Bank of Finland.

This event will go unnoticed in Congress and the White House. But it should stir a tremendous ovation at every governmental level!

Payment of the draft will inaugurate the 44th year little Finland has religiously paid the interest on her $9 million debt to the United States incurred when she purchased grain on credit in 1923 to ward off a catastrophic famine.

Unlike the 91 deadbeat nations which consistently ignore their $40 billion indebtedness to this country, rugged, honorable Finland didn't ask for "aid" or charity, but for grain credits to cover the 62 Finnish bonds she delivered to Uncle Sam. And she promised faithfully to repay interest and principal on her debt of honor twice yearly.

The amortization began June 15, 1923. And excepting moratoriums in 1931, 1940 and 1941—through no fault of Finland's—the payments have been made on schedule through periods of economic adversity, crop failures and industrial slumps. The Finns tightened their belts and reduced their debt of honor. To date, they have repaid Uncle Sam $15,242,229 in principal and interest.

By mid-December of 1984, the remaining $4,707,000 will have been satisfied in full. Finland, in stark contrast to the parasite nations preying on America, stands alone as a staunch and honorable friend of this nation. And Americans salute Finnish integrity.

Congress decreed in 1949 that payments on the Finnish loan help educate and train Finns in the United States, supply U.S. books and technical equipment for Finnish institutions and assist American students in Finland.

This has been done to the edification of both governments.

Finland, an independent, completely literate republic of 4.6 million hardy souls, lies in the shadow of the Soviet Union with which it maintains a "friendship" pact. Once an autonomous grand duchy of czarist Russia, Finland won her independence in 1917. But in 1939, Soviet hordes savagely attacked the little nation in a "war" that shocked the civilized world.

The Finns exacted a fearful toll in Russian lives, but sheer Bolshevik power prostrated the country and wrecked her economy. Finland was forced to cede 16,173 square miles of territory—12 per cent—to the invaders. The Russians also demanded $570 million in war "reparations."

Federation of Jewish Philanthropies' 50th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 29, 1967

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, this week the Federation of Jewish Philanthropies of New York is celebrating its 50th anniversary. As the Nation's largest sectarian group of voluntary private service agencies, it serves millions of New Yorkers annually without regard to race, faith, or economic status.

In recognition of the work of the Federation, Governor Rockefeller proclaimed September 27, 1967, Federation of Jewish Philanthropies Day. I am pleased to include in the RECORD an editorial from the New York Times of September 27, 1967, and an article from the New York Times of September 28, 1967, by J. Anthony Lukas entitled "Jewish Federation: 50 Rewarding Years of Diverse Philanthropy."

[From the New York Times, Sept. 27, 1967]

FEDERATION'S GOLDEN YEAR

A half-century ago The Times editorialized: "The movement represented by the Federation for the Support of Jewish Philanthropic Societies of New York City is of broader import than its immediate important purpose, that of raising $2 million by annual subscriptions to meet the needs of the Jewish philanthropic institutions of the city. It is an organized step to put giving for charity on a true ethical basis."

Today, as the Federation's golden anniversary campaign officially opens, its sights have been raised but the broad aims remain. Now many New Yorkers—1,350,000 of every faith, race and economic status—are served by its 130 agencies. The pioneering social services—in hospitals, homes for the aged, community centers, day camps, family and child-care agencies, vocational guidance clinics—are so much a part of New York's life and hope that it would be impossible to contemplate the city without them.

The campaign goal this year of the largest private philanthropic group in any American city is $27 million. The theme, "Your Neighbors Need You—Here and Now," has special relevance this year, not only for the fiftieth anniversary but because there is fresh recognition that all America's cities must be made more hospitable—especially the Empire

City, that has been served so well by the Federation of Jewish Philanthropies.

[From the New York Times, Sept. 28, 1967]

JEWISH FEDERATION: 50 REWARDING YEARS OF DIVERSE PHILANTHROPY

(By J. Anthony Lukas)

Near the turn of the century, on New York's Lower East Side, the Kimpetoran Society was formed to care for indigent—and often unmarried—Jewish mothers.

The society gave a scuttle of coal, a clean bedsheet, a few diapers and $5 to the kimpetoran—Yiddish for new mothers—who were known in the neighborhood argot as "kimpies."

Today the society still operates as part of Recreation Rooms and Settlement, Inc., one of the 130 constituent agencies of the Federation of Jewish Philanthropies. It now provides mothers with a layette and $10, but most of the women it cares for these days are not Jews but Puerto Ricans.

A Jewish philanthropist recently asked the Kimpetoran Society's president, Mrs. Clara Liebowitz, how the federation could justify supporting an organization that dealt chiefly with Puerto Ricans.

"A child is a child," Mrs. Liebowitz replied.

This is the spirit that prevails increasingly within the federation, which celebrated its 50th anniversary last night at a dinner at the Plaza Hotel.

In an address prepared for the dinner, Governor Rockefeller said that despite increasing governmental support for health and welfare, private efforts like the federation's were still essential because of "the independence, the sense of mission and the humanitarian impulse that are the essence of philanthropy."

The federation's early concentration on the welfare of poor Jews arose in part from an incident in 1654, when 23 Sephardic Jews arrived in New York from Brazil. When Gov. Peter Stuyvesant discovered they were penniless he threw them in prison and released them only after they agreed they would not become public charges and would be supported by their own nation."

Within a year most of them had established themselves as merchants trading in tobacco, fish and furs, but they and succeeding generations of Jews took seriously their contract with the Dutch to take care of their own.

By 1917 this meant largely that the early wave of German Jewish immigrants, from whose ranks came such great New York merchant banking families as the Seligmans, the Loebs, the Strauses, the Lehmans and the Guggenheims, helped support the later wave of East European Jews.

ESCAPE FROM THE GHETTO

In the 50 years since, the East European Jews have largely left the Lower East Side, moving into such comfortable middleclass neighborhoods as Great Neck, Scarsdale and Forest Hills.

There are still needy Jews in New York, perhaps the only city in the country where they are still to be found in significant numbers. The Federation points to many of the 30,000 Hassidic Jews in the Williamsburg section of Brooklyn, the 8,000 to 10,000 black Jews and some of the elderly Jews who remain on the Lower East Side.

However, the Jews generally have escaped the old ghettos and their place has been taken by newer arrivals, notably Negroes up from the South and Puerto Ricans.

"This posed the question of what to do with the agencies and institutions set up in the old Jewish ghetto areas," says Samuel J. Silberman, board chairman of the Consolidated Cigar Corporation, who has served as the federation's president for the last year.

"Should they pull up roots and follow the Jewish population flow into the suburbs or should they stay there to serve the new populations, largely non-Jewish?"

The decision, made by each agency's board, but in consultation with the federation, has varied according to circumstances.

There are two notable cases of agencies that have moved. The Hebrew Education Society moved last year from Brownsville, in Brooklyn, to Canarsie, in the same borough, selling its building to a Catholic youth center. And Bronx House moved from Fulton Avenue out to Pelham Parkway South.

Most agencies have stayed on, however, and adapted their programs to the new populations. A striking example is the Educational Alliance, which since 1889 has served the recreational, cultural and educational needs of much of the Lower East Side.

In the first three decades of this century perhaps no agency in the city was as closely identified with the Jewish immigrants as the alliance. There they could learn everything from English to basketball or simply smoke a pipe over a game of checkers with a landsman, or fellow countryman.

Most of the talented Jews who emerged from the Lower East Side in the first part of this century had come in contact with the alliance. The young Eddie Cantor acted at its playhouse. Arthur Murray learned to dance there. Morris Cohen discussed philosophy. Artists like Jo Davidson and Jacob Epstein, and Chaim Gross paid 3 cents a week for instruction there.

Among others who studied at the alliance were David Sarnoff, who became board chairman of the Radio Corporation of America; City Councilman Stanley M. Isaacs, Rabbi A. Hillel Silver and the lawyer David L. Podell.

In the lobby of the alliance's David Sarnoff Building, there is a gallery of Alliance Hall of Fame alumni that includes Saul Price, a judge; Sarah Elkus, social worker and educator; Lazarus Joseph, former Controller of New York City; the industrialist Ferdinand Kuhn, and Joseph S. Gershman, a lawyer.

But the population of the Lower East Side has shifted rapidly in recent years. In 1950 only 12 per cent of its population was Puerto Rican or Negro, but by 1960 that figure was already up to 39 per cent and it is still rising.

CHANGING CLIENTELE

Louis Berkowitz, the Educational Alliance's executive director, now estimates that 35 to 40 per cent of the area is Puerto Rican, 5 to 10 per cent is Negro, 5 to 10 per cent is Chinese and only 35 to 40 per cent is Jewish.

The alliance has therefore had to adapt its program to a highly heterogeneous clientele, many of whom cannot even communicate with each other.

Mr. Berkowitz said in an interview the other day that the alliance was trying to do for the Puerto Rican, Chinese and Negroes today what it did for the Jews in decades past.

"It's still a matter of helping them assimilate to the conditions of urban American life without losing what is distinctively theirs," he said.

Mr. Silberman, the federation president, concedes that there have been contributors who objected strenuously to the shift from an almost exclusively Jewish clientele to a markedly mixed one.

"However, I would say that there is an almost equally large group," he says, "that wants us to go even faster in this direction and, for example, to establish a community center in Harlem. I would say we are managing to keep a pretty good balance between these two points of view."

Some of the federation's constituent agencies, particularly those for the care of the aged, and many community centers, still cater almost exclusively to Jews. The highest percentages of non-Jewish clients are at the hospitals and child-care centers.

FUND-RAISING IS BASIC

"You have to remember that we are basically a fund-raising organization and we can't raise funds successfully unless we are meeting the needs that most of the moneygivers think need to be met," Mr. Silberman said.

Over the last 50 years the Federation of Jewish Philanthropies has been exceptionally successful in raising funds—about $1.5-billion. Last year alone it raised about $20-million.

This money goes to 130 independent agencies, including medical centers and hospitals such as Mount Sinai, Beth Israel and Montefiore; family welfare and vocational services such as the Jewish Family Service, the Joint Passover Association and the Hebrew Free Loan Society; community enters such as the Central Nassau Y.M. and Y.W.H.A. and the Jewish Community House of Bensonhurst; and child-care groups such as the Jewish Board of Guardians and the Jewish Child Care Association.

Each agency and institution retains its autonomy, its own volunteer leadership and its professional staff. Moreover, with increasing support by Federal, state and local governments for the activities of voluntary agencies, the constituent bodies now depend far less on the federation than they formerly did.

The organization makes significant contributions, however, to all the 130 agencies and because of that it retains significant influence on their policies. It also helps coordinate the agencies' programs and helps allocate available services to meet community needs.

DOLLAR GOAL IS $27 MILLION

More than $4-million was expected to be pledged at last night's dinner by about 300 leaders of the Jewish community here as the federation opened its $27-million 1967–68 campaign under the slogan "Your Neighbors Need You—Here and Now."

Federation officials said this would be the largest amount ever raised in a single evening for maintenance of privately sponsored health, welfare and commodity agencies, in New York.

In another speech prepared for the dinner, George H. Heyman, Jr., a federation vice president, said that Charles Dicken's words in "A Tale of Two Cities"—"It was the best of times, it was the worst of times"—fitted the America today.

"Those of us here tonight share an affluence which no society has ever produced," Mr. Heyman said, "and yet to those who have not yet been touched by this miracle of economics, this may well be still the worst of times. Their impatience at the failure of the system to work its wonders for them and their consequent mood of helplessness and despair constitute the most menacing forces on this society's horizon."

Predicting China

SPEECH

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 28, 1967

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, in our involvement in the Vietnam conflict, an important imponderable threatening us in every decision has been China.

The China watchers thus far have stood on the proposition that—

> China will not enter the war as long as American troops do not invade North Vietnam and no attempt is made to destroy the regime of Ho Chi Minh.

The administration has based its decision in Vietnam on this advice and on the Korean precedent.

In the Washington Post of September 9, an article by Chalmers M. Roberts, raises a disturbing point about this policy. The mounting chaos inside China may lead to irrational actions unpredictable in terms of established precedent. He concludes:

> In fact, the scene internally in China is beginning to nag at least some of the China watchers. If the chaos continues, they wonder, will the premises on which non-intervention has been built remain valid? The answer today, at least for some, is beginning to reach the "yes, but—" stage.

Mr. Speaker, I call this excellent article to the attention of the Members by inserting it in the RECORD at this point:

PREDICTING CHINA: KOREAN PRECEDENT

(By Chalmers M. Roberts)

The other day a Washington-based China watcher in discussing the mounting chaos in the world's most populous nation commented that "it's decreasing my confidence in my ability to predict what they will do." He was referring to the possibility of a Chinese takeover of Hong Kong and to a Chinese intervention in the Vietnam war.

The China watchers, both here and in Hong Kong, have been all but unanimous that Peking's financial gains from Hong Kong precluded any attempt to take over the British crown colony. Likewise, they have stood on the proposition that China will not enter the war as long as American troops do not invade North Vietnam and no attempt is made to destroy the regime of Ho Chi Minh.

In both cases the China watchers have credited the Peking rulers with rationality. It is the seeming irrationality of what is now going on in China which is beinning to shake some of them, though the premise is still official doctrine.

President Johnson is operating on the advice of the China watchers and for that reason he has rejected any thought of a Korean war-type Inchon landing behind North Vietnamese lines to wipe out the threat to the Marines. Likewise he has opposed area bombing in Hanoi where Ho and the other leaders live.

In short, the rule is to do nothing that the Chinese could interpret as threatening their vital interests. It was the mistake of posing such a threat in Korea that led to intervention by Chinese "volunteers," the historians generally agree.

It is worth noting that when the Chinese crossed the Yalu into Korea in October, 1950, the Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs was a man named Dean Rusk. As Secretary of State, Rusk has been quoted as saying that "I was among those who thought they would not come in. I was wrong."

It was Rusk who received the secret dispatch in which the Indian Ambassador in Peking reported, via New Delhi, that the Chinese Army Chief of Staff had told him on Sept. 25 that China would not "sit back with folded hands and let the Americans come up to the (Sino-Korean) border."

There were other warnings, too, though some were not as easy to decipher. Yet the allied forces did drive North and the American Ambassador at the United Nations declared on Sept. 30 that "the artificial barrier which has divided North and South Korea has no basis for existence either in law or in reason."

In late August and again on Sept. 24 the Chinese protested that American planes had violated their border by flying across the Yalu to strafe and otherwise engage in "criminal action."

In the current Vietnamese war the Chinese again have complained of American "intrusions" and have captured at least two American crew members. But there is no sign of any private threat to intervene. Indeed, the bulk of the China watchers believe that the Peking regime has told the North Vietnamese they must win the war on their own according to the doctrine of "wars of national liberation."

Thus in the current war the United States has been careful to admit air intrusions into China, to try to explain them as accidental and on occasion to offer Peking words of apology.

Furthermore, in 1950 the Chinese engaged in a massive redeployment of troops from central China to Manchuria. This occurred during a period of at least a month while China was passing its warnings.

In the case of Vietnam today, American officials have discovered no sign of troop movements and there are far better intelligence devices available than was the case 17 years ago. Furthermore, there is no sign that North Vietnamese forces are being devastated the way the North Korean forces were being destroyed in the march to the Yalu.

Thus it is the Korean parallel, and the steps taken by President Johnson and Rusk to avoid a repetition of the Korean errors, that provides the basis of confidence in Washington that China will not enter the war.

Rusk yesterday referred to the efforts "to move with prudence" but he also said that he could offer no "gold-plated guarantees" of nonintervention. In fact, the scene internally in China is beginning to nag at least some of the China watchers. If the chaos continues, they wonder, will the premises on which nonintervention has been built remain valid? The answer today, at least for some, is beginning to reach the "yes, but—" stage.

Students Demonstrate Success of ABC Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 29, 1967

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct the attention of my colleagues to the extremely interesting, and revealing closing speeches made by three students, who studied under the ABC program this summer at Williams College.

Two years ago I introduced the ABC—A Better Chance—program to the Office of Economic Opportunity. The main purpose of the program was to demonstrate the special contribution private preparatory schools could make in enabling students from low-income families to exercise their tremendous intellectual potential both in high school and later on in college. Meaningful leadership cannot be grasped without preparation—preparation of such high priority that ABC, indeed, becomes vital to our Nation's future.

These graduates will provide a practical and worthwhile alternative to the all too frequent tragic spectacle of rioting and looting that we have seen in America's ghettos. By exposing these young potential leaders to the productive elements of our American society, ABC can contribute significantly in the fight against the tragic waste of this Nation's resources.

The three student talks given at the closing exercises August 16, 1967, Williams College ABC program, follow:

(By M. Eugene Pruitt, Cleveland, Ohio, Western Reserve Academy)

In summing up the program first of all I think it was a success in fulfilling its purpose. The program has opened our eyes from the narrow world we once lived in at home, to a vast new world of different people and experiences. The program has given us a taste of what we are to eat when we go off to school this fall. It has helped us to realize how regulated our lives will be once we get into prep school.

Our ABC summer session has given us a review of English and mathematical skills which we might have lost during the summer and has also introduced us to other principles in these subjects. I must say personally that I have learned that group discussion of material is one of the best ways to find out how the other fellow feels about the subject. I have also realized the amount that can be learned from another person in a private discussion. In a private discussion differences of opinions may be brought out into the open without either party making the issue public.

In a private discussion two people can talk about their problems without feeling greatly ashamed or without one person trying to show off in front of a group and humiliate the other person. When two people converse in private, they get a chance to hear each other's ideas and they therefore come to understand each other better. In such a manner two people or even large groups of people can get together and tell each other how they feel so there won't be any hard feelings and resentments building up. This is one of the greatest virtues that I have learned this summer.

During our stay here in Williamstown we have been exposed to a few things which we previously cared little about. Such as new sports, plays, and concerts to name a few. These experiences have helped us in gaining a better knowledge of the world around us.

With this vast amount of exposures of new phases of life and other new experiences added to our old ones, we will be better prepared to adapt to the new environment which we will encounter in prep school. And the easier that it is to adapt to a new environment, the easier it will be to succeed in this new environment.

Most of all the program has emphasized a point which will either make us or break us in prep school. This point is our individuality. If we intend to amount to anything in prep school, we will be forced to retain our morals and beliefs. I am talking principally to my soul brothers now. I mean we're going to be really oppressed when we get to school; one, because we are Negroes, two, because we're poor and finally, because somebody is going to be expecting you to show some sort of humility because you got into the school by being in this sort of program. And let me tell you white guys that it's going to be rough for you because there's always going to be someone looking down upon you because you're poor and because you don't change your socks every day or something of that sort. I mean there are going to be some days when you won't have a friend in your midst, and on that day if you can't go to yourself for friendship, you are lost. This is why I say keep that something that makes you unique or one day when you turn around and the group is gone, you'll find yourself in the middle of a world which is falling down on all sides and the bad part is, it's falling on you.

(By John V. Ciskowski, New Haven, Conn., Westminster School)

I was asked to make this small summary of this year's ABC Program at Williams College. Before I start I would like to thank and congratulate the faculty members, tutors, and tutor aids who have contributed much to assist me academically, athletically, and socially.

I learned much from the academics in the program this summer. In English I have gained much knowledge from the literature we studied. Here I am able to understand literature instead of just reading it. Even though the algebra was a review and a preparation for the independent schools, I learned a lot more than I already knew and the algebra I did know I realized I knew better. My reading class has improved my study skills for better reading. But that main thing that improved the academics was the size of the classes. The classes were small and the student able to receive more attention and the teacher was able to spend more time working with him individually.

In the athletic program I myself cannot say too much about the athletics because of the little time I participated in them. (John had a back injury before he came to ABC). The tutors, however, were very anxious to see us on the field and begin our daily activities. Soccer, touch football, tennis and baseball were the sports we played most. Even though we played soccer the most, everyone enjoyed it until the other sports came into existence on the field. Swimming was my most enjoyable sport and the tutors made sure everyone attempted, at least, to pass the test.

Now that I am finished with two minor points, academics and athletics, I would like to express my feelings toward a subject which has aided me throughout the summer. This subject is called social culture. One may ask, "What is social culture?" Social culture is mainly concerned with relationships between races. It is how one race can be compatible with another.

Before I came to Williams College, I felt afraid because I was going to be among boys of a different race and I was not used to moving into that kind of environment. Then the question appeared, "What if my roommate was a Negro?" At first I was scared but then I answered, "So what? I was around Negroes before, it won't kill me." After a few days with my roommate, I got to know him and began to grow fond of him. Soon I realized I was the only white boy in my tutor group. I did not mind this, I even began to think I was one of them.

When our tutor group went on trips and we entered a town, I was the only white person in our car and people gave this strange glance as if to say, "That's strange of a white person being in a car full of Negro boys." I remember commenting one time, "What is that white jerk looking at?"

During the time I was with my roommate, I would always meet more Negro boys and begin to grow fond of associating with them also. Being among so many Negroes, I began to take their attitudes toward issues such as rioting and civil rights. This occurred after a meeting in one of the tutors' rooms on the subject of rioting. I began to feel that what the Negro wanted was right and I discussed my view with one of the boys. My feeling now is to fight for the rights of Negroes because I considered him equal to me; same flesh, bone structure, heart, soul, and most of all the same God.

Now that I am finished with my small summary, before I go I would like to leave you with a little word for everyone in the Williams ABC Program, especially the students: "Keep the faith *Baby*."

Thank you.

(By Kenneth S. Blatch, New York City, Lawrenceville School)

Most of the students here this summer had been working hard in their hometowns to keep from having to go to summer school. Look where their hard work has gotten them. As Mr. Raybold would say, "It's ironic." In order to evaluate ABC 1967, it is necessary that its achievements be broken up into four categories: Academic, athletic, social and cultural.

The first of the categories, academics, appears to have been extremely successful at Williams this year. Five hours a day, six days a week, for almost eight weeks of the summer we have been mercilessly driven by top rate preparatory school teachers. No doubt, when we start school in the fall, we will be starting with much more than if we had not come here in the first place.

It is my opinion that Williams ABC has had a pretty good year in the athletic department. Well, more specifically, in the swimming department. Out of all the areas that the staff instructed, swimming was the best organized and executed. For the first four weeks, soccer was a little chaotic. When I think of the humiliating faculty-student soccer game score, I wonder if our soccer practices were shortened intentionally. They were always being cut short by swimming. But, oddly enough, we never had a swimming meet with the faculty. Tennis, to the dismay of many people, was like an unfinished sentence. The success of the swimming program is illustrated by the number of swimmers it turned out. If I learned nothing else, at least I can say I learned how to swim.

Thanks to the ABC cultural program, many people who might have guessed that an oboe is a type of fish now know better. Many times Mr. Smith has preached to us about staying awake at the stimulating lectures and performances we have attended. I notice that many of the faculty and tutors make a point of sitting behind Mr. Smith.

This summer also offered an opportunity for many Negro students who live in segregated or ghetto areas to see what their white brothers are like. The best piece of advice that we have been given on race relations this summer is something that Mr. Katz said in the talk he gave in chapel. It was, "Try not to judge a white person by the amount of soul he has." To do so is the easiest way to learn to despise him. Another opportunity that I found the program offered was not only to learn more about my white brothers, but, to use a term that has been worn out this summer, my soul brothers who live in other parts of the country .

On the whole, social life at Williams, except Holyoke and Andover, has been virtually non-existent. The scarcity of feminines in this area was borne out by the eagerness and zeal we displayed at Holyoke. Even our Commander in Chief, Mr. Smith, got into the act. After the slide show last night, it was rumored that he might end up sleeping on the living room couch for the rest of the summer.

One of the most important things that the program does that I hadn't mentioned earlier is that it introduces you beforehand to the atmosphere you are to encounter at prep school in the fall. If making it through this intense summer school program is like a mild dose of hell, prep school in the fall will seem like purgatory itself. But that is the irony of "A Better Chance," which only goes to prove that a good thing like your education has to be worked for. But now that it's over, I'm glad to be going home.

Air Safety

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 29, 1967

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, Newsday of Long Island commends the administration on two recent moves toward greater safety in the air.

First, there is the President's budget amendment to add several hundred new air controllers to the staff of the Federal Aviation Administration. Second there are the new FAA rules to save more lives in takeoff and landing crashes.

The Newsday editorial should be of interest to all Members; for this reason, I would like to insert it in the Record at this point.

Article follows:

FOR BETTER AIR SAFETY

Safety in the air becomes more urgent daily. Air traffic is increasing at a staggering rate, and with it the number of near-misses in crowded lanes leading in to our big city airports. The long-range answer is to provide more jetports, certainly including one to serve the 2,000,000 persons who live on Long Island. Short range, two steps have been proposed.

First, the Federal Aviation Administration is calling for more air controllers, the men who regulate air traffic as well as the number of takeoffs, landings and overflights. The regular budget of $811,000,000, pending in Congress, would recruit 648 additional controllers and 121 maintenance men. FAA feels it needs 1,500 new positions just to keep up with the traffic. Added money should be provided. Air safety cannot be jeopardized.

The FAA has also issued some sweeping new rules that may save more lives in "survivable" air crashes, meaning those that occur on takeoff or landing. Easier access to exits, better direction marking, more protection for fuel and electric lines and the use of less flammable materials for walls and ceilings are required. All these are essential to make air travel safer, and if the result is to increase the price of a ticket, it's well worth it. We rely upon airplanes for swift and dependable transportation. The word "dependable" can and should be equated with the word "safe."

Address of William G. Colman to the Cigarette Tax Enforcement Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1967

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, cigarette "bootlegging" to avoid the payment of State and local taxes appears to be reaching serious proportions. Estimates of the revenue loss to States and local governments run to many millions of dollars. The urgency of the problem prompted Gov. Nelson Rockefeller, of New York, with whom I have the pleasure of serving on the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, to convene an interstate conference 2 weeks ago to explore possible solutions.

One of the principal speakers at this conference was William G. Colman, Executive Director of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. The Commission is a bipartisan body created by Congress in 1959 to maintain continuing study and review of Federal-State-local relations and of ways in which the American federal system may be strengthened.

In his address to the conference, Mr. Colman reviewed the findings and recommendations of the Commission resulting from a study of cigarette taxation completed several years ago. At that time the Commission recommended that the Governors and their tax administrators, in cooperation with officials of the Internal Revenue Service, confer with representatives of the tobacco industry as to the procedure that would be required for State cigarette taxes to be collected at the manufacturers level.

I include in the RECORD at this point the text of Mr. Colman's remarks:

STATE CIGARETTE TAXES: A PLAN FOR COLLECTION AT THE SOURCE

(Remarks by William G. Colman, Executive Director, Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, before the Cigarette Tax Enforcement Conference)

Exactly three years ago the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations issued a report on cigarette taxation.[1] In conducting this study, the Commission was concerned with (1) the high degree of Federal-State tax overlapping, and (2) the cumbersome and costly administrative procedures used by the States to enforce their cigarette tax laws.

The Advisory Commission is a 26-member permanent bipartisan body representing all three levels of government. It was established by a 1959 Act of Congress. Nine of its members come from the legislative and executive branches of the Federal Government; 14 represent the States and localities; and three are "public" members. Fully half of the State and local members are from State government—three legislators and four governors. Governor Rockefeller, who is currently a member, was not on the Commission when it conducted the cigarette tax study.

At the time the Commission issued its cigarette tax report, 48 States and the District of Columbia levied such taxes. Fourteen of them imposed the same rate as the National Government—8 cents a pack—and one State exacted 9 cents, the top rate. Now Oregon has joined the fold, leaving North Carolina as the only holdout; 19 States levy the 8-cent rate, and eleven States exceed it, including three that now tax cigarettes at 11 cents a pack. In fiscal 1963, the State cigarette tax take was a little over $1 billion; now it is well over $1½ billion.

Because of the virtually universal use of cigarette taxation by the States, the great variation in State rates, and the different collection and enforcement approaches taken by the States and the Federal Government, the Commission concluded that little or nothing can be done about overlapping in this tax area; that is, there is little or no likelihood that either the States or the National Government would give up their prerogative to tax cigarettes.

Nor is there any likelihood, under present circumstances, that State and Federal cigarette taxation can be coordinated. The reason lies in the different collection methods that each use: The States collect their taxes from thousands of distributors (jobbers, wholesalers, and large retailers) requiring in almost all instances the attachment of tax stamps to each pack as evidence of payment; the Federal Government collects its tax at the source from 16 manufacturers who are required to file semi-monthly returns. The State procedure results in a system that is difficult and expensive to enforce; hence your growing concern with smuggling and stamp counterfeiting. Under the Federal Government's procedure there is virtually no evasion and relatively little expense.

The continued upward push in cigarette tax rates has tended to widen the spread, so that the prospect for Federal-State coordination is even less encouraging today than it was in 1964. At that time, there were eleven different States rates, ranging from 2 to 9 cents a pack; now there are 13 separate rates, from 2½ to 11 cents a pack. The average rate has jumped from 6 cents a pack in 1964 to 7½ cents a pack now.

There is no perceptible uniformity in State cigarette tax rates even on a regional basis, a factor which I would think adds to the smuggling and counterfeiting problem. The range, by region, is as follows:

[In cents]

New England	6½ to 10
Mideast	3 to 11
Great Lakes	6 to 10
Plains	4 to 10
Southeast	0 to 9
Southwest	6½ to 11
Rocky Mountains	5 to 8
Far West (including Alaska and Hawaii)	4 to 11

Having concluded that little can be done about cigarette tax overlapping and that the customary coordination techniques are not adaptable to cigarette taxation, the Commission turned its attention to the cumbersome, expensive, and often ineffectual cigarette tax collection and enforcement procedures used by the States. The Commission was struck by the fact that although the States collected only 60 percent as much as the Federal Government, the cost of administering the State taxes was almost 100 times greater. The reason for this difference is clear. The States' administrative expenses involve three elements: (1) the cost of preparing the stamps and other forms of indicia; (2) compensation of distributors for affixing the stamps; and (3) compensation of State employees involved in audit and enforcement. The Federal Government, on the other hand, can administer its tax with a very small staff, and with no expense related to the printing, sale, and affixation of tax stamps.

As we examined the system used by the Internal Revenue Service to collect the Federal cigarette tax, it became obvious that the States would be well advised to shift their collection efforts to the manufacturing level. It was also quite evident that the cigarette wholesalers would fight such a shift tooth and nail, for they have a fifty million dollar stake in the present system. They employ a considerable number of people for the sole purpose of breaking open cigarette cartons and affixing tax indicia to the individual packs, and they have a substantial investment in equipment for the same purpose. The Commission concluded, therefore, that it would take high level political action on the part of the governors and the State legislatures to bring about the kind of change that would result in more economical and efficient cigarette tax administration. To this end, the Commission recommended that:

(1) the governors direct their tax policy officials (possibly through the instrumentality of the Governors' Conference and the Federation of Tax Administrators) to explore with representatives of the tobacco industry the procedures that would be required to place the cigarette tax on a return basis at the manufacturing level in such a way that the burden on the industry would be minimized; and (2) the Treasury Department, Internal Revenue Service, participate in this exploration, which should include the potential scope of Federal-State administrative cooperation.

We do not think that collection of the State cigarette taxes at the source would impose a heavy compliance burden upon the manufacturers, even with the wide variation in State tax rates. In imposing such a system on them, however, the Commission suggested two modifications: (1) the tax collection process should be structured so that the manufacturer's responsibility for collecting this tax is limited to the liability indicated by the location (State) of his first consignee; and (2) the responsibility for adjustments required in those cases where cigarettes are re-shipped to other States should be left to arrangements between the reshipper and the States' tax administrations.

With sophisticated inventory control techniques backed up by automatic data processing, now being applied by the tobacco industry, we can foresee no inordinate difficulty in developing such a system. Elimination of the present cumbersome system will put cigarette tax administration on a businesslike basis and free up sorely needed revenue. The present employees of the wholesalers can easily be absorbed in new productive jobs, some indeed by the State tax administrations themselves.

Although this conference is concerned primarily with the tax evasion problem, you have a golden opportunity to start the wheels moving toward a system of State cigarette tax collection at the manufacturers level. It is going to take a lot of effort on your part, but the end result will be worth it. For such a system will facilitate the application of the controls you need to lick the smugglers and the counterfeiters, thus bringing the tax money back where it belongs—to the public domain. And you can put cigarette tax administration on a business basis and add more funds to your sorely pressed treasuries.

In the long run, efforts along these lines will facilitate Federal-State coordination in the cigarette tax field and I would urge you to heed the second part of the Commission's recommendation. Involve the Internal Revenue Service in your activities.

This conference should take immediate steps to initiate a meeting between representatives of the governors and of the Commissioner of the Internal Revenue Service to explore in detail the legislative and administrative actions needed to collect State cigarette taxes at the manufacturers level. This should be followed by a meeting with the manufacturers, for their cooperation in such an endeavor is essential. Consultation among State governments, the Internal Revenue Service, and the manufacturers will constitute an important first step toward the solution of your enforcement problems, regardless of whether you work toward Mr. Goodman's plan for Federal collection of all cigarette taxes or the Commission's plan for State collection of cigarette taxes at the source. The Commission stands ready to help in any way it can to get such a series of conferences off the ground.

Thank you very much for this opportunity to set the Advisory Commission's views before this conference.

STATE CIGARETTE TAX RATES, BY REGION AND BY STATE, 1964 AND 1967

[Cents per standard package of 20]

State and region	Sept. 1, 1967	July 1, 1964
U.S. average	7.5	6.0
New England	8.5	6.2
Maine	9.0	6.0
New Hampshire [1]	6.5	3.0
Vermont	10.0	8.0
Massachusetts	10.0	6.0
Rhode Island	8.0	8.0
Connecticut	8.0	6.0
Mideast	7.5	5.7
New York	10.0	5.0
New Jersey	11.0	8.0
Pennsylvania	8.0	8.0
Delaware	7.0	5.0
Maryland	6.0	6.0
District of Columbia	3.0	2.0
Great Lakes	7.8	5.6
Michigan	7.0	7.0
Ohio	7.0	5.0
Indiana	6.0	4.0
Illinois	9.0	4.0
Wisconsin	10.0	8.0
Plains	7.7	6.0
Minnesota	8.0	8.0
Iowa	10.0	5.0
Missouri	4.0	4.0
North Dakota	8.0	7.0
South Dakota	8.0	6.0
Nebraska	8.0	6.0
Kansas	8.0	6.0

Footnotes at end of table.

---

[1] *State-Federal Overlapping in Cigarette Taxes* (Report A-14), September 1964.

STATE CIGARETTE TAX RATES, BY REGION AND BY STATE, 1964 AND 1967—Continued

[Cents per standard package of 20]

State and region	Sept. 1, 1967	July 1, 1964
Southeast	6.5	6.2
Virginia	2.5	3.0
West Virginia	6.0	6.0
Kentucky	2.5	2.5
Tennessee	8.0	7.0
North Carolina	---	---
South Carolina	5.0	5.0
Georgia	8.0	8.0
Florida	8.0	8.0
Alabama	7.0	6.0
Mississippi	9.0	9.0
Louisiana	8.0	8.0
Arkansas	8.0	6.0
Southwest	8.4	6.3
Oklahoma	8.0	7.0
Texas	11.0	8.0
New Mexico	8.0	8.0
Arizona	6.5	2.0
Rocky Mountain	7.2	6.0
Montana	8.0	8.0
Idaho	7.0	7.0
Wyoming	8.0	4.0
Colorado	5.0	3.0
Utah	8.0	8.0
Far West	7.3	5.7
Washington	11.0	7.0
Oregon	4.0	---
Nevada	7.0	7.0
California	[2] 7.0	3.0
Alaska	8.0	8.0
Hawaii [3]	7.5	3.7

---

[1] The New Hampshire rate was 15 percent of retail price (about 3 cents) in 1964; 30 percent of retail price (about 6.5 cents) in 1967.

[2] Increased to 10 cents, effective Oct. 1.

[3] The Hawaii rate was 20 percent of wholesale price (about 3.7 cents) in 1964; 40 percent of wholesale price (about 7.5 cents) in 1967.

State in for "Battle Wounds" Under Kennedy Round Tariff

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1967

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, Robert D. Byrnes, of the Hartford Courant, has recently analyzed the announced results of the recent round of tariff reductions as he sees them affecting Connecticut manufacture. Mr. Byrnes has been reporting legislative activities for many years and has always demonstrated thorough and meticulous attention to his work.

I believe it would be of value to the House to have an opportunity to study his stories and I offer his first article of September 13 for the RECORD. This will be followed by the second and third which apeared on other dates.

STATE IN FOR "BATTLE WOUNDS" UNDER KENNEDY ROUND TARIFF

(By Robert D. Byrnes)

WASHINGTON.—When the United States cuts tariffs on about $8 billion worth of imports and other countries also change their tariffs on large volumes of their imports, there is bound to be a considerable economic impact. Supporters of the Kennedy Round of trade agreements concluded at Geneva in June concede there will be an uneven spread of benefits and damages.

Connecticut is a multi-industry state, including many small operations. It generally lacks raw materials but has a highly skilled and highly paid labor force. As far as the Kennedy Round tariff cuts are concerned, it appears to be an area that will suffer what the First National City Bank of New York calls "battle wounds" in lowering of world trade barriers.

WOULD AFFECT 30,000

In what is intended to be a conservative estimate, it appears from a study of available data that some 30,000 workers in Connecticut could be affected rather directly by tariff cuts made by the United States. This estimate is based on about 6,000 changes in the tariff rates on imports and the Department of Commerce report of 1966 business patterns, showing employment by industry in Connecticut. The estimates are necessarily flexible because job classifications do not match exactly tariff schedules. The worker estimates do not take into account the multiplier effect in service industries of job fluctuations in production industries.

This does not mean that any number of jobs are in immediate jeopardy in Connecticut because of the tariff reductions. There are a number of reasons for this.

While most of the tariff cuts agreed to by the United States are to 50 per cent of the tariff in effect in 1962, the full cuts generally are effective in steps over a four-year period, starting next Jan. 1. This lessens the immediate impact and will permit the industries that are able to do so to attempt to meet the increased flow of competitive imports from abroad.

The cuts made by other countries on exports to them from the United States should result in more production here for export and thus make additional jobs here, both in production and in the export service agencies.

In a poor public relations job, which is often the way government operates, the Office for Trade Negotiations has so far issued only sketchy information on the concessions made to the United States, and some of that information indicates that supposed benefits have little or no meaning as far as jobs are concerned.

CONGRESS HAS POWER

There is always the possibility that Congress may act, or force action by the executive department. Though Congress, in the Cordell Hull Reciprocal Trade Act and its revisions, delegated to the President, in effect the State Department, the power to negotiate tariff cuts, it has retained the power to enact tariffs. It has used this power many times, though probably more often to permit exemption from duty than to raise duties. Pressures from Congress unquestionably were a factor in the June 30 proclamation by President Johnson reducing dairy imports to the level prevailing before 1966.

In providing for the Kennedy Round negotiations, Congress exempted from further cuts in that agreement certain products on which the United States tariffs had been raised because it had been determined by the Tariff Commission and the President the industries making these products were being injured, or were threatened with injury, by foreign imports. Among significant Connecticut products in this category are certain carpets and stainless steel flatware. These industries will lose the extra tariff protection they now have next month unless the President acts to keep the higher duties.

SELLING PRICE

Another special situation involving Connecticut industry is the American Selling Price law. This affects rubber—soled footwear and certain chemicals, which concern Connecticut and a few other products. Sen. Abraham Ribicoff, D-Conn. is credited with having initiated action by which Congress warned the negotiators at Geneva not to usurp the law-making power of Congress. As a result, the United States got only small concessions on lowered barriers to certain exports and the Europeans particularly made further concessions by them contingent upon repeal of the American Selling Price law. The ASP bases the tariff on the imported article on the selling price of the like article here. The Administration has not yet asked Congress for repeal of the APS law.

Neither has the Administration moved yet for ratification of a new international wheat quota agreement, which is in effect a treaty and must be approved by the Senate, though this is part of the agreement on grains reached at Geneva.

The tariff issue has changed greatly from the days when each rate was an act of Congress which may have been fixed to balance low wage foreign production, to protect an infant industry, or just because a member of Congress was in a position to have a high duty set because he was asked to do so. The successive lowering of tariffs and the modernization of production methods in Europe, and Japan, with the resulting tide of imports, and mass production in many industries here has undercut the free trade argument that the tariff was largely a device to guarantee huge profits to the big corporations at the expense of the consumer.

MATTERS OF JOBS

In present day political termbs, trade and the tariff are matters of jobs. Both the Kennedy Trade Act and the Canadian automobile agreement provided for government financial aid to industry and workers who could show they had been injured. The Trade Act provision turned out to be inoperative, but some findings have been made under the Canada agreement, in cases brought by trade unions, that the workers have been injured by loss of employment. In the period immediately after the Kennedy Round there were general statements by various government spokesmen that Congress would be asked to enact new programs to compensate industry and labor for damage by imports resulting from the Kennedy Round.

The problems can be illustrated by that small segment of Connecticut industry classified by the Commerce Department as manufacture of candy and other confectionery. Thre are five companies, the largest of which has been 250 and 499 employes. Chocolate is used in many kinds of candy, and the three tariff rates on it have all been reduced. Unsweetened chocolate goes from 0.625 cents a pound to duty-free. Sweetened chocolate in 10-pound blocks goes from 8 cents a pound to 4 cents a pound.

Other forms of chocolate go from 10 per cent of the value to 5 per cent. Confectioners' coatings are in another schedule, but also are reduced from 10 per cent to 5 percent of the value.

Thus, candy manufacturers, if they get the benefit of the reduced tariff, will not have to pay as much for raw materials. But, the present tariff on candy itself is 14 per cent of the value, and when Geneva rates are fully effective, the candy tariff will drop to seven per cent of value. Candy imports in 1965, with the 14 per cent rate, were valued at $23,154,000, according to the Commerce Department.

President Johnson's Remarks in Signing Food Stamp Bill Into Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 27, 1967

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, the bright sun which shone on the rose garden at the White House at noon today signaled a bright new prospect for health and well-being for an estimated 1,200,000 additional Americans who should be able to share in the advantages of the food stamp program as a result of the President's signing today of Public Law 90-91. The new law authorizes appropriations of up to $200,000,000 for the 1968 fiscal year, and up to $225,000,000 for the 1969 fiscal year, to continue the food stamp program initiated on a very small pilot basis in eight areas of the country 6 years ago.

The program is now operating on an annual rate basis of $160,000,000, with nearly 2 million participants, so that the new authorization, if followed by appropriation of the funds budgeted for the current fiscal year, will make possible an expansion of about 600,000 persons this year. A similar expansion of 600,000 could take place in the following year if the authorized funds are appropriated. Boston, New York, and some of the other cities not yet in the program should be able to come in during the present year or soon thereafter. I certainly hope they do enter this successful program. I hope the plan can also be put into effect in other areas of Missouri than just St. Louis.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the remarks made by President Johnson this noon in signing Public Law 90-91, as follows:

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT UPON SIGNING THE FOOD STAMP ACT, SEPTEMBER 27, 1967

Good morning ladies and gentlemen, Senator Aiken, Senator Byrd, Senator Ellender, Senator Boggs, Chairman Poage, Congresswoman Sullivan, Congressman Purcell, and the other members of the House and Senate who I did not get recorded here:

I welcome one and all of you for the good work that you have done. I think we all share the common view that we want no American in this country to ever go hungry. We believe that we have the knowledge, the compassion, and the resources to banish hunger and to do away with malnutrition, if we will only apply those resources and those energies.

The bill that I have asked you to be here with me when I sign puts some of that abundance into the reach of the people of America.

Under the Food Stamp Program a low-income family can take what little money it has for food and purchase food stamps. At the neighborhood grocery these are worth more than they cost. The difference is made up by the Federal Government.

Food stamps are not the only weapon in the assault on hunger. The Food Stamp Act was passed three years ago. In that time, the program has expanded from 43 pilot areas in 23 States to 838 areas in 41 States. Today it is helping to feed nearly 2 million needy Americans. This extension will enable us to do still more.

We have nearly 20 million school children—more than ever before—receiving low cost or free meals under the School Lunch Program. That program today is in its 21st year.

More than 100,000 children have a better chance to learn because they began their day with a decent breakfast because of the Child Nutrition Act that we passed in 1966.

Three-million needy Americans in family units are receiving better diets in the Commodity Donation Program of the Department of Agriculture.

As I sign this Act, I am asking the Secretary to help America's 300 poorest counties which do not now have food assistance to start a Community Distribution Program to be available for the low-income families.

We are all mindful that the poor need more than food. The causes of poverty are complex. The answers to poverty are very difficult. The escape from poverty is not going to come soon, but we must all continue to try the best way that we can to give all that we can to banish poverty from our land.

Poverty's cruelest wound is hunger. The Act that we will sign today, I think, will do some little something to relieve some of that hunger.

To those men and women in the House and Senate who have had the vision to help us prepare this bill by the long drawn out hearings and the days in conference, and the debates on the floor, we owe them all a debt of gratitude which I want to acknowledge on behalf of the American people.

This will help our poor. This will help our farmers. And even though this is a bipartisan group, I hope it will help our Congress.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402, at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).